STABLE LAWS FOR RANDOM DYNAMICAL SYSTEMS

ROMAIN AIMINO, MATTHEW NICOL, AND ANDREW TÖRÖK

Abstract. In this paper we consider random dynamical systems formed by concatenating maps acting on the unit interval $[0,1]$ in an iid fashion. Considered as a stationary Markov process, the random dynamical system possesses a unique stationary measure ν. We consider a class of non square-integrable observables ϕ, mostly of form $\phi(x) = d(x,x_0)^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}$ where x_0 is non-periodic point satisfying some other genericity conditions, and more generally regularly varying observables with index $\alpha \in (0,2)$. The two types of maps we concatenate are a class of piecewise C^2 expanding maps, and a class of intermittent maps possessing an indifferent fixed point at the origin. Under conditions on the dynamics and α we establish Poisson limit laws, convergence of scaled Birkhoff sums to a stable limit law and functional stable limit laws, in both the annealed and quenched case. The scaling constants for the limit laws for almost every quenched realization are the same as those of the annealed case and determined by ν. This is in contrast to the scalings in quenched central limit theorems where the centering constants depend in a critical way upon the realization and are not the same for almost every realization.

Contents

Date: February 2, 2023.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 37A50, 37H99, 60F05, 60G51,60G55.

Key words and phrases. Stable Limit Laws, Random Dynamical Systems, Poisson Limit Laws.

RA was partially supported by FCT project PTDC/MAT-PUR/4048/2021, with national funds, and by CMUP, which is financed by national funds through FCT – Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia, I.P., under the project with reference UIDB/00144/2020. MN was supported in part by NSF Grants DMS 1600780 and DMS 2009923. AT was supported in part by NSF Grant DMS 1816315. RA would like to thank Jorge Freitas for several very insightful discussions about return time statistics and point processes. Data sharing not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated or analysed during the current study.

1. Introduction

In this paper we consider non square-integrable observables $\phi : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ on two simple classes of random dynamical system. One consists of randomly choosing in an iid manner from a finite set of maps which are strictly polynomially mixing with an indifferent fixed point at the origin, the other consisting of randomly choosing from a finite set of maps which are uniformly expanding and exponentially mixing. The main type of observable we consider is of the form $\phi(x) = |x-x_0|^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}$, $\alpha \in (0,2)$ which in the IID case lies in the domain of attraction of a stable law of index α. For certain results the point x_0 has to satisfy some nongenericity conditions and in particular not be a periodic point for almost every realization of the random system (see Definition 2.3). Some of our results, particularly those involving convergence to exponential and Poisson laws hold for general observables that are regularly varying with index α.

The settings for investigations on stable limit laws for observables on dynamical systems tend to be of two broad types: "good observables" (typically Hölder) on slowly mixing non-uniformly hyperbolic systems and "bad" observables (unbounded with fat tails) on fast mixing dynamical systems. For results on the first type we refer to the influential papers [Gou04, Gou07] and [MZ15]. In the setting of "good observables" (typically Hölder) on slowly mixing non-uniformly hyperbolic systems the technique of inducing on a subset of phase space and constructing a Young Tower has been used with some success. "Good" observables lift to well-behaved observables lying in a suitable Banach space on the Young Tower. This is not the case with unbounded observables with fat tails, though in [Gou04] the induction technique allows an observable to be unbounded at the fixed point in a family of intermittent maps. For recent results on limit laws, though not stable laws, in the setting of skew-products with an ergodic base map and uniformly hyperbolic fiber maps see also [DFGTV20a, DFGTV20b]. For a still very useful survey of techniques and ideas in random dynamical systems we refer to [Kif98].

Our main results are given in the next section. Other results are given in detail in Section 6.

2. Main Results

.

For the sake of concreteness, we restrict ourselves to observables of the form

$$\phi_{x_0}(x) = |x - x_0|^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}},\ x \in [0,1]. \tag{2.1}$$

where x_0 is a non-recurrent point and $\alpha \in (0,2)$ but it is possible to consider more general regularly varying observables ϕ which are piecewise monotonic with finitely many branches, see for instance [TK10b, Section 4.2] in the deterministic case. Note that ϕ_{x_0} is regularity varying with index α.

We will be considering the following set-up, with (Ω, σ) the full two-sided shift on finitely many symbols. In most of our settings we take $Y = [0,1]$.

Let $\sigma : \Omega \to \Omega$ be an invertible ergodic measure-preserving transformation on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. For a measurable space $(Y, \mathcal{B})$, let $\sigma : \Omega \to \Omega$ be the usual full shift and define

$$F : \Omega \times Y \to \Omega \times Y$$

by

$$F(\omega, x) = (\sigma\omega, T_\omega(x))$$

We assume F preserves a probability measure ν on $\Omega \times Y$. We assume that ν admits a disintegration given by $\nu(d\omega, dx) = \mathbb{P}(d\omega)\nu^\omega(dx)$. For all $n \geq 1$, we have

$$F^n(\omega, x) = (\sigma^n\omega, T_\omega^n x),$$

where

$$T_\omega^n = T_{\sigma^{n-1}\omega} \circ \ldots \circ T_\omega,$$

which satisfies the equivariance relations $(T_\omega^n)_*\nu^\omega = \nu^{\sigma^n\omega}$ for $\mathbb{P}$-a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$.

For each $\omega \in \Omega$, we denote by P_ω the transfer operator of T_ω with respect to the Lebesgue measure m: for all $\phi \in L^\infty(m)$ and $\psi \in L^1(m)$,

$$\int_{[0,1]} (\phi \circ T_\omega) \cdot \psi \, dm = \int_{[0,1]} \phi \cdot P_\omega \psi \, dm.$$

We can then form, for $\omega \in \Omega$ and $n \geq 1$, the cocycle

$$P_\omega^n = P_{\sigma^{n-1}\omega} \circ \ldots \circ P_\omega.$$

Definition 2.1 (scaling constants)**.** *We consider a sequence $(b_n)_{n\geq 1}$ of positive real numbers such that*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} n\nu(\phi_{x_0} > b_n) = 1. \tag{2.2}$$

Definition 2.2 (centering constants)**.** *We define the centering sequence $(c_n)_{n\geq 1}$ by*

$$c_n = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \alpha \in (0,1) \\ n\mathbb{E}_\nu(\phi_{x_0} \mathbf{1}_{\{\phi_{x_0} \leq b_n\}}) & \text{if } \alpha = 1 \\ n\mathbb{E}_\nu(\phi_{x_0}) & \text{if } \alpha \in (1,2) \end{cases}.$$

We now introduce two classes of random dynamical system (RDS) for which we are able to establish stable limit laws.

2.1. **Random uniformly expanding maps.** We consider random i.i.d. compositions with additional assumptions of uniform expansion. Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a finite collection of m piecewise C^2 uniformly expanding maps of the unit interval $[0,1]$. More precisely, we assume that for each $T \in \mathcal{S}$, there exist a finite partition $\mathcal{A}_T$ of $[0,1]$ into intervals, such that for each $I \in \mathcal{A}_T$, T can be continuously extended as a strictly monotonic C^2 function on $\bar{I}$ and

$$\lambda := \inf_{I\in\mathcal{A}_T} \inf_{x\in\bar{I}} |T'(x)| > 1.$$

The maps T_ω (determined by the 0-th coordinate of ω) are chosen from $\mathcal{S}$ in an i.i.d. fashion according to a Bernoulli probability measure $\mathbb{P}$ on $\Omega := \{1, \ldots, m\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$. We will denote by $\mathcal{A}_\omega$ the partition of monotonicity of T_ω, and by $\mathcal{A}_\omega^n = \vee_{k=0}^{n-1} (T_\omega^k)^{-1}(\mathcal{A}_{\sigma^k\omega})$ the partition associated to T_ω^n. We introduce

$$\mathcal{D} = \cup_{n\geq 0} \cup_{\omega\in\Omega} \partial\mathcal{A}_\omega^n$$

the set of discontinuities of all the maps T_ω^n. Note that $\mathcal{D}$ is at most a countable set.

In the uniformly expanding case we also assume the conditions (LY),(Dec) and (Min). (LY) is the usual Lasota-Yorke inequality while (Dec) and (Min) were introduced by Conze and Raugi [CR07].

(LY): there exist $r \geq 1$, $M > 0$ and $D > 0$ and $\rho \in (0,1)$ such that for all $\omega \in \Omega$ and all $f \in \mathrm{BV}$,

$$\|P_\omega f\|_{\mathrm{BV}} \leq M\|f\|_{\mathrm{BV}},$$

and

$$\mathrm{Var}(P_\omega^r f) \leq \rho \mathrm{Var}(f) + D\|f\|_{L^1(m)}.$$

(Dec): there exists $C > 0$ and $\theta \in (0,1)$ such that for all $n \geq 1$, all $\omega \in \Omega$ and all $f \in \mathrm{BV}$ with $\mathbb{E}_m(f) = 0$:

$$\|P_\omega^n f\|_{\mathrm{BV}} \leq C\theta^n \|f\|_{\mathrm{BV}}$$

(Min): there exists $c > 0$ such that for all $n \geq 1$ and all $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$\inf_{x\in[0,1]} (P_\omega^n \mathbf{1})(x) \geq c > 0.$$

Definition 2.3. *We say that x_0 is not periodic if x_0 is not periodic for $\mathbb{P}$-a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$.*

Theorem 2.4. *In the setting of exapnding maps assume (LY), (Min) and (Dec). Suppose that $x_0 \notin \mathcal{D}$ is not periodic and consider the observable ϕ_{x_0}.*

If $\alpha \in (0,1)$ then for $\mathbb{P}$-a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$, the Functional Stable Limit holds:

$$X_n^\omega(t) := \frac{1}{b_n}\Big[\sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor nt\rfloor -1} \phi_{x_0} \circ T_\omega^j - tc_n\Big] \xrightarrow{d} X_{(\alpha)}(t) \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{D}[0,\infty)$$

in the J_1 topology under the probability measure ν^ω, where $X_{(\alpha)}(t)$ is the α-stable process with Lévy measure $d\Pi_\alpha(dx) = \alpha|x|^{-(\alpha+1)}$ on $[0,\infty)$.

If $\alpha \in [1,2)$ then the same result holds for m-a.e. x_0.

Example 2.5 (β-transformations)**.** *A simple example of a class of maps satisfying (LY), (Dec) and (Min) is to take m β-maps of the unit interval, $T_{\beta_i}(x) = \beta_i x$ (mod 1). We suppose $\beta_i > 1 + a$, $a > 0$, for all β_i, $i = 1, \ldots, m$.*

2.2. **Random intermittent maps.** Now we consider a simple class of intermittent type maps.

Liverani, Saussol and Vaienti [LSV99] introduced the map T_γ as a simple model for intermittent dynamics:

$$T_\gamma : [0,1] \to [0,1], \qquad T_\gamma(x) := \begin{cases} (2^\gamma x^\gamma + 1)x & \text{if } 0 \leq x < \frac{1}{2}; \\ 2x - 1 & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} \leq x \leq 1. \end{cases}$$

If $0 \leq \gamma < 1$ then T_γ has an absolutely continuous invariant measure μ_γ with density h_γ bounded away from zero and satisfying $h_\gamma(x) \sim Cx^{-\gamma}$ for x near zero.

We form a random dynamical system by selecting $\gamma_i \in (0,1)$, $i = 1, \ldots, m$ and setting $T_i := T_{\gamma_i}$. The associated Markov process on $[0,1]$ has a stationary invariant measure ν which is absolutely continuous, with density h bounded away from zero.

We denote $\gamma_{max} := \max_{1\leq i\leq m}\{\gamma_i\}$ and $\gamma_{min} := \min_{1\leq i\leq m}\{\gamma_i\}$.

Theorem 2.6. *In the setting of intermittent maps suppose $\alpha \in (0,1)$ and $\gamma_{max} < \frac{1}{3}$. Then, for m-a.e. x_0 $\frac{1}{b_n}\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \phi_{x_0} \circ T_\omega^j \xrightarrow{d} X_{(\alpha)}(1)$ under the probability measure ν^ω for $\mathbb{P}$-a.e. ω (recall that $c_n = 0$ for $\alpha \in (0,1)$).*

Remark 2.7 (Convergence with respect to Lebesgue measure)**.** *We state our limiting theorems with respect to the fiberwise measures ν^ω but by general results of Eagleson* [Eag76]*(see also* [Zwe07]*) the convergence holds with respect to any measure μ for which $\mu \ll \nu^\omega$, in particular our convergence results hold with respect to Lebesgue measure m. Further details are given in the Appendix.*

Remark 2.8. *In the limit laws for quenched systems that we obtain of type (B) and (C), the centering sequence c_n* does not depend on the realization ω. *This is in contrast to the case of the CLT, where a random centering is necessary; see* [AA16, Theorem 9] *and* [NPT21, Theorem 5.3].

Our proofs are based on a Poisson process approach developed for dynamical systems by Marta Tyran-Kaminska [TK10a, TK10b].

3. Probabilistic tools

In this section, we review some topics from Probability Theory.

3.1. **Regularly varying functions and domains of attraction.** We refer to Feller [Fel71] or Bingham, Goldie and Teugels [BGT87] for the relations between domains of attraction of stable laws and regularly varying functions. For ϕ regularly varying we define the constants b_n and c_n as in the case of ϕ_{x_0}.

Remark 3.1. *When $\alpha \in (0,1)$ then ϕ is not integrable and one can choose the centering sequence (c_n) to be identically 0. When $\alpha = 1$, it might happen that ϕ is not integrable, and it is then necessary to define c_n with suitably truncated moments as above. If ϕ is integrable then center by $c_n = n\mathbb{E}_\nu(\phi)$.*

We will use the following asymptotics for truncated moments, which can be deduced from Karamata's results concerning the tail behavior of regularly varying functions. Define p by $\lim_{x\to\infty} \frac{\nu(\phi>x)}{\nu(|\phi|>x)} = p$.

Proposition 3.2 (Karamata)**.** *Let ϕ be regularly varying with index $\alpha \in (0,2)$. Then, setting $\beta := 2p-1$ and, for $\varepsilon > 0$,*

$$c_\alpha(\varepsilon) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \alpha \in (0,1) \\ -\beta \log \varepsilon & \text{if } \alpha = 1 \\ \varepsilon^{1-\alpha}\beta\alpha/(\alpha-1) & \text{if } \alpha \in (1,2) \end{cases} \tag{3.1}$$

the following hold for all $\varepsilon > 0$:

(a) $\mathbb{E}_\nu(|\phi|^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{|\phi|\le\varepsilon b_n\}}) \sim \dfrac{\alpha}{2-\alpha}(\varepsilon b_n)^2 \nu(|\phi| > \varepsilon b_n)$,

(b) if $\alpha \in (0,1)$,
$$\mathbb{E}_\nu(|\phi|\mathbf{1}_{\{|\phi|\le\varepsilon b_n\}}) \sim \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}\varepsilon b_n \nu(|\phi| > \varepsilon b_n),$$

(c) if $\alpha \in (1,2)$,
$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{n}{b_n}\mathbb{E}_\nu(\phi\mathbf{1}_{\{|\phi|>\varepsilon b_n\}}) = c_\alpha(\varepsilon),$$

(d) if $\alpha = 1$,
$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{n}{b_n}\mathbb{E}_\nu(\phi\mathbf{1}_{\{\varepsilon b_n<|\phi|\le b_n\}}) = c_\alpha(\varepsilon),$$

(e) if $\alpha = 1$,
$$\frac{n}{b_n}\mathbb{E}_\nu(|\phi|\mathbf{1}_{\{|\phi|\le\varepsilon b_n\}}) \sim \widetilde{L}(n),$$

for a slowly varying function $\widetilde{L}$,

3.2. **Lévy α-stable processes.** A helpful and more detailed discussion can be found, e.g., in [TK10a, TK10b].

$X(t)$ is a Lévy stable process if $X(0) = 0$, X has stationary independent increments and $X(1)$ has an α-stable distribution.

The Lévy-Khintchine representation for the characteristic function of an α-stable random variable $X_{\alpha,\beta}$ with index $\alpha \in (0,2)$ and parameter $\beta \in [-1,1]$ has the form:

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{itX}] = \exp\left[ita_\alpha + \int (e^{itx} - 1 - itx1_{[-1,1]}(x))\Pi_\alpha(dx)\right]$$

where

- $a_\alpha = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \beta\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} & \alpha \neq 1 \\ 0 & \alpha = 1 \end{array} \right.$,

- Π_α is a Lévy measure given by

$$d\Pi_\alpha = \alpha(p1_{(0,\infty)}(x) + (1-p)1_{(-\infty,0)}(x))|x|^{-\alpha-1}dx$$

- $p = \dfrac{\beta+1}{2}$.

Note that p and β may equally serve as parameters for $X_{\alpha,\beta}$. We will drop the β from $X_{\alpha,\beta}$, as is common in the literature, for simplicity of notation and when it plays no essential role.

3.3. **Poisson point processes.** Let $(T_n)_{n\geq 1}$ be a sequence of measurable transformations on a probability space $(Y, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$. For $n \geq 1$ we denote

$$T_1^n := T_n \circ \ldots \circ T_1. \tag{3.2}$$

Given $\phi : Y \to \mathbb{R}$ measurable, recall that we define the scaled Birkhoff sum by

$$S_n := \frac{1}{b_n}[\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \phi \circ T_1^j - c_n], \tag{3.3}$$

for some real constants $b_n > 0$, c_n and the scaled random process $X_n(t)$, $n \geq 1$, by

$$X_n(t) := \frac{1}{b_n}[\sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor nt\rfloor -1} \phi \circ T_1^j - tc_n],\ t \geq 0, \tag{3.4}$$

For $X_\alpha(t)$ a Lévy α-stable process and $B \in \mathcal{B}((0,\infty) \times (\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}))$ define

$$N_{(\alpha)}(B) := \#\{s > 0 : (s, \Delta X_\alpha(s)) \in B\}$$

where $\Delta X_\alpha(t) := X_\alpha(t) - X_\alpha(t^-)$.

The random variable $N_{(\alpha)}(B)$, which counts the jumps (and their time) of the Lévy process that lie in B, is finite a.s. if and only if $(m \times \Pi_\alpha)(B) < \infty$. In that case $N_{(\alpha)}(B)$ has a Poisson distribution with mean $(m \times \Pi_\alpha)(B)$.

Similarly define

$$N_n(B) := \#\left\{j \geq 1\ :\ \left(\frac{j}{n}, \frac{\phi \circ T_1^{j-1}}{b_n}\right) \in B\right\},\ n \geq 1,$$

$N_n(B)$ counts the jumps of the process (3.4) that lie in B. When a realization $\omega \in \Omega$ is fixed we define

$$N_n^\omega(B) := \#\left\{j \geq 1\ :\ \left(\frac{j}{n}, \frac{\phi \circ T_\omega^{j-1}}{b_n}\right) \in B\right\},\ n \geq 1.$$

Definition 3.3. *We say N_n converges in distribution to $N_{(\alpha)}$ and write*

$$N_n \xrightarrow{d} N_{(\alpha)}$$

if and only if $N_n(B) \xrightarrow{d} N_{(\alpha)}(B)$ for all $B \in B((0,\infty)\times(\mathbb{R}\setminus\{0\}))$ with $(m\times\Pi_\alpha)(B) < \infty$ and $(m\times\Pi_\alpha)(\partial B) = 0$.

4. Modes of Convergence

Consider the process X_α determined by the observable ϕ (that is, an iid version of ϕ which regularly varying with the same index α and parameter p). We are interested the following limits:

(A) **Poisson point process convergence.**

$$N_n^\omega \xrightarrow{d} N_{(\alpha)}$$

with respect to ν^ω for $\mathbb{P}$ a.e. ω where $N_{(\alpha)}$ is the Poisson point process of an α-stable process with parameter determined by ν, the annealed measure.

(B) **Stable law convergence.**

$$S_n^\omega := \frac{1}{b_n}[\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \phi \circ T_\omega^j - c_n] \xrightarrow{d} X_\alpha(1)$$

for $\mathbb{P}$-a.e. ω, with respect to ν^ω, for ϕ regularly varying with index α and $X_\alpha(t)$ the corresponding α-stable process, for suitable scaling and centering constants b_n and c_n.

(C) **Functional stable law convergence.**

$$X_n^\omega(t) := \frac{1}{b_n}[\sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor -1} \phi \circ T_\omega^j - tc_n] \xrightarrow{d} X_\alpha(t)$$

in $\mathbb{D}[0,\infty)$ in the J_1 topology $\mathbb{P}$-a.e. ω, with respect to ν^ω for ϕ regularly varying with index α and $X_\alpha(t)$ the corresponding α-stable process.

For the cases we are considering, the scaling constants b_n are given by (2.2) in Definition 2.1, and the centering constants c_n are given in Definition 2.2 (see also Remark 3.1).

5. A Poisson Point Process Approach to random and sequential dynamical systems

Our results are based on the Poisson point process approach developed by Marta Tyran-Kamińska [TK10a, TK10b] adapted to our random setting (see Theorems 5.1 and 5.3). Namely, convergence to a stable law or a Lévy process follows from the convergence of the corresponding (Poisson) jump processes, and control of the small jumps.

A key role is played by Kallenberg's Theorem [Kal76, Theorem 4.7] to check convergence of the Poisson point processes, $N_n \xrightarrow{d} N_{(\alpha)}$. Kallenberg's theorem does not assume stationarity and hence we may use it in our setting.

In this section, we provide general conditions ensuring weak convergence to Lévy stable processes for non-stationary dynamical systems, following closely the approach of Tyran-Kamińska [TK10b]. We start from the very general setting of non-autonomous sequential dynamics and then specialize to the case of quenched random dynamical systems, which will be useful to treat iid random compositions in the later sections.

5.1. **Sequential transformations.** Recall the notations introduced in Section 3.3. $(T_n)_{n\geq 1}$ is a sequence of measurable transformations on a probability space $(Y, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$. For $n \geq 1$, recall we define

$$T_1^n = T_n \circ \ldots \circ T_1.$$

The proof of the following statement is essentially the same as the proof of [TK10b, Theorem 1.1].

Note that the measure μ does not have to be invariant. Moreover (see [TK10b, Remark 2.1]), the convergence $X_n \xrightarrow{d} X_{(\alpha)}$ holds even without the condition $\mu(\phi \circ T_1^j \neq 0) = 1$, which is used only for the converse implication of the "if and only if".

Theorem 5.1 (Functional stable limit law, [TK10b, Theorem 1.1])**.** *Let $\alpha \in (0,2)$ and suppose that $\mu(\phi \circ T_1^j \neq 0) = 1$ for all $j \geq 0$. Then $X_n \xrightarrow{d} X_{(\alpha)}$ in $\mathbb{D}[0,\infty)$ under the probability measure μ for some constants $b_n > 0$ and c_n if and only if*

- $N_n \xrightarrow{d} N_{(\alpha)}$ *and*
- *for all $\delta > 0$, $\ell \geq 1$, with $c_\alpha(\varepsilon)$ given by (3.1),*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \limsup_{n \to \infty} \mu \left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq \ell} \left| \frac{1}{b_n} \left[\sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor -1} \phi \circ T_1^j \mathbf{1}_{\{|\phi \circ T_1^j| \leq \varepsilon b_n\}} - t(c_n - b_n c_\alpha(\varepsilon)) \right] \right| \geq \delta \right) = 0 \tag{5.1}$$

Remark 5.2. *In some cases the convergence $N_n \xrightarrow{d} N_{(\alpha)}$ does not hold, but one has convergence of the marginals, $N_n((0,1] \times \cdot) \xrightarrow{d} N_{(\alpha)}((0,1] \times \cdot)$. In this case, although unable to obtain a functional stable law convergence of type (C), we can in some settings prove the convergence to a stable law for the Birkhoff sums (convergence of type (B)).*

In particular, we are unable to prove $N_n^\omega \xrightarrow{d} N_{(\alpha)}$ for the case of random intermittent maps. On the other hand, in the setting of random uniformly expanding maps we use the spectral gap to show that $N_n^\omega \xrightarrow{d} N_{(\alpha)}$, and then obtain the functional stable limit law.

The next statement is [TK10b, Lemma 2.2, part (2)], which follows from [TK10a, Theorem 3.2]. Again, the measure does not have to be invariant.

Theorem 5.3 (Stable limit law, [TK10b, Lemma 2.2])**.** *For $\alpha \in (0,2)$, consider an observable ϕ on the probability measure μ, and $c_\alpha(\varepsilon)$ given by* (3.1).

If

$$N_n((0,1] \times \cdot) \xrightarrow{d} N_{(\alpha)}((0,1] \times \cdot)$$

and, for all $\delta > 0$,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \mu \left(\left| \frac{1}{b_n} \left[\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \phi \circ T_1^j \mathbf{1}_{\{|\phi\circ T_1^j| \le \varepsilon b_n\}} - (c_n - b_n c_\alpha(\varepsilon)) \right] \right| \ge \delta \right) = 0 \tag{5.2}$$

then

$$\frac{1}{b_n}[\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \phi \circ T_1^j - c_n] \xrightarrow{d} X_{(\alpha)}(1)$$

under the probability measure μ.

5.2. **Random dynamical systems.** Let $\phi : Y \to \mathbb{R}$ be a measurable function such that $\nu^\omega(\phi \neq 0) = 1$.

Proposition 5.4 ([TK10b, proof of Theorem 1.2])**.**

Let $\alpha \in (0,1)$. With b_n as in Definition 2.1 and $c_n = 0$, suppose that for $\mathbb{P}$-a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{b_n} \sum_{j=0}^{n\ell-1} \mathbb{E}_{\nu^{\sigma^j\omega}}(|\phi| \mathbf{1}_{\{|\phi|\le \varepsilon b_n\}}) = 0 \ \text{ for all } \ell \ge 1, \tag{5.3}$$

and

$$N_n^\omega \xrightarrow{d} N_{(\alpha)}.$$

Then $X_n^\omega \xrightarrow{d} X_{(\alpha)}$ in $\mathbb{D}[0,\infty)$ under the probability measure ν^ω for $\mathbb{P}$-a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$.

Proof. We will check that the hypothesis of Theorem 5.1 are met for $\mathbb{P}$-a.e. ω with $T_n = T_{\sigma^{n-1}\omega}$, $\mu = \nu^\omega$. Recall that $c_n = c_\alpha(\varepsilon) = 0$ when $\alpha \in (0,1)$. Using [KW69, Theorem 1] (see Theorem 5.6) and the equivariance of the family of measures $\{\nu^\omega\}_{\omega\in\Omega}$, we have

$$\nu^\omega \left(\sup_{0\le t\le \ell} \left| \frac{1}{b_n} \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor nt\rfloor -1} \phi \circ T_\omega^j \mathbf{1}_{\{|\phi\circ T_\omega^j| \le \varepsilon b_n\}} \right| \ge \delta \right) \le \frac{1}{\delta b_n} \sum_{j=0}^{n\ell-1} \mathbb{E}_{\nu^{\sigma^j\omega}}(|\phi| \mathbf{1}_{\{|\phi|\le\varepsilon b_n\}})$$

which shows that condition (5.3) implies condition (5.1) for all $\delta > 0$ and $\ell \ge 1$. □

Remark 5.5. *One could replace condition* (5.3) *by one similar to* (5.5)*, and use the argument in the proof of Proposition 5.7.*

Theorem 5.6 (Kounias and Weng [KW69, special case of Theorem 1 therein])**.**
Assume the random variables X_k are in $L^1(\mu)$. Then

$$\mu\left(\max_{1\le k\le n}\left|\sum_{\ell=1}^{k} X_\ell\right| \ge \delta\right) \le \frac{1}{\delta}\sum_{k=1}^{n}\mathbb{E}_\mu(|X_k|).$$

Proposition 5.7. *Let $\alpha \in [1,2)$.*
With b_n and c_n as in Definitions 2.1 and 2.2, and $c_\alpha(\varepsilon)$ as in (3.1), suppose that for all $\varepsilon > 0$ and all $\ell \ge 1$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\sup_{0\le t\le \ell}\left|\frac{1}{b_n}\left[\sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor nt\rfloor -1}\mathbb{E}_{\nu^{\sigma^j\omega}}(\phi\mathbf{1}_{\{|\phi|\le \varepsilon b_n\}}) - t(c_n - b_n c_\alpha(\varepsilon))\right]\right| = 0 \quad \text{for } \mathbb{P}\text{-a.e. } \omega\in\Omega, \tag{5.4}$$

and that for all $\delta > 0$

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\limsup_{n\to\infty}\operatorname*{esssup}_{\omega\in\Omega}\nu^\omega\Big(\max_{1\le k\le n}\Big|\frac{1}{b_n}\sum_{j=0}^{k-1}\big[\phi\circ T_\omega^j\mathbf{1}_{\{|\phi\circ T_\omega^j|\le\varepsilon b_n\}} - \mathbb{E}_{\nu^{\sigma^j\omega}}(\phi\mathbf{1}_{\{|\phi|\le\varepsilon b_n\}})\big]\Big| \ge \delta\Big) = 0. \tag{5.5}$$

If $N_n^\omega \xrightarrow{d} N_{(\alpha)}$ for $\mathbb{P}$-a.e. $\omega\in\Omega$, then $X_n^\omega \xrightarrow{d} X_{(\alpha)}$ in $\mathbb{D}[0,\infty)$ under the probability measure ν^ω for $\mathbb{P}$-a.e. $\omega\in\Omega$.

Proof. As in the proof of Proposition 5.4, we check the hypothesis of Theorem 5.1 with $T_n = T_{\sigma^{n-1}\omega}$, $\mu = \nu^\omega$ for $\mathbb{P}$-a.e. $\omega\in\Omega$. We will see that (5.1) follows from (5.4) and (5.5).

Using the equivariance of $\{\nu^\omega\}_{\omega\in\Omega}$, we see that condition (5.1) is implied by (5.4) and (5.6) below:

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\limsup_{n\to\infty}\nu^\omega\left(\sup_{1\le k\le n\ell}\left|\frac{1}{b_n}\sum_{j=0}^{k-1}\left[\phi\circ T_\omega^j\mathbf{1}_{\{|\phi\circ T_\omega^j|\le\varepsilon b_n\}} - \mathbb{E}_{\nu^{\sigma^j\omega}}(\phi\mathbf{1}_{\{|\phi|\le\varepsilon b_n\}})\right]\right| \ge \delta\right) = 0. \tag{5.6}$$

We next show that condition (5.5) implies (5.6).

Since

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\{\sup_{1\le k\le n\ell}\left|\frac{1}{b_n}\sum_{j=0}^{k-1}\left[\phi\circ T_\omega^j\mathbf{1}_{\{|\phi\circ T_\omega^j|\le\varepsilon b_n\}} - \mathbb{E}_{\nu^{\sigma^j\omega}}(\phi\mathbf{1}_{\{|\phi|\le\varepsilon b_n\}})\right]\right| \ge \delta\right\}\\
&\qquad\subset\bigcup_{i=0}^{\ell-1}\left\{\sup_{in<k\le(i+1)n}\left|\frac{1}{b_n}\sum_{j=in}^{k-1}\left[\phi\circ T_\omega^j\mathbf{1}_{\{|\phi\circ T_\omega^j|\le\varepsilon b_n\}} - \mathbb{E}_{\nu^{\sigma^j\omega}}(\phi\mathbf{1}_{\{|\phi|\le\varepsilon b_n\}})\right]\right| \ge \frac{\delta}{\ell}\right\},\end{aligned}$$

we obtain that, using again the equivariance, for $\mathbb{P}$-a.e. $\omega\in\Omega$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\nu^\omega\left(\sup_{1\le k\le n\ell}\left|\frac{1}{b_n}\sum_{j=0}^{k-1}\left[\phi\circ T_\omega^j\mathbf{1}_{\{|\phi\circ T_\omega^j|\le\varepsilon b_n\}} - \mathbb{E}_{\nu^{\sigma^j\omega}}(\phi\mathbf{1}_{\{|\phi|\le\varepsilon b_n\}})\right]\right| \ge \delta\right)\\
&\quad\le\sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1}\nu^{\sigma^{in}\omega}\left(\sup_{1\le k\le n}\left|\frac{1}{b_n}\sum_{j=0}^{k-1}\left[\phi\circ T_{\sigma^{in}\omega}^j\mathbf{1}_{\{|\phi\circ T_{\sigma^{in}\omega}^j|\le\varepsilon b_n\}} - \mathbb{E}_{\nu^{\sigma^j(\sigma^{in}\omega)}}(\phi\mathbf{1}_{\{|\phi|\le\varepsilon b_n\}})\right]\right| \ge \frac{\delta}{\ell}\right)\\
&\qquad\le \ell\cdot\operatorname*{esssup}_{\omega'\in\Omega}\nu^{\omega'}\left(\max_{1\le k\le n}\left|\frac{1}{b_n}\sum_{j=0}^{k-1}\left[\phi\circ T_{\omega'}^j\mathbf{1}_{\{|\phi\circ T_{\omega'}^j|\le\varepsilon b_n\}} - \mathbb{E}_{\nu^{\sigma^j\omega'}}(\phi\mathbf{1}_{\{|\phi|\le\varepsilon b_n\}})\right]\right| \ge \frac{\delta}{\ell}\right).\end{aligned}$$

Thus, condition (5.5) implies (5.6), which concludes the proof. □

The analogue for the convergence to a stable law is the following.

Proposition 5.8. *Suppose that for $\mathbb{P}$-a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$, we have*

$$N_n^\omega((0,1]\times\cdot) \xrightarrow{d} N_{(\alpha)}((0,1]\times\cdot).$$

If $\alpha \in (0,1)$ (so $c_n = 0$), we require in addition that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{b_n}\sum_{j=0}^{n-1}\mathbb{E}_{\nu^{\sigma^j\omega}}(|\phi|\mathbf{1}_{\{|\phi|\le\varepsilon b_n\}}) = 0 \tag{5.7}$$

If $\alpha \in [1,2)$, we require instead of (5.7) that for all $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\left|\frac{1}{b_n}\left[\sum_{j=0}^{n-1}\mathbb{E}_{\nu^{\sigma^j\omega}}(\phi\mathbf{1}_{\{|\phi|\le\varepsilon b_n\}}) - (c_n - b_n c_\alpha(\varepsilon))\right]\right| = 0$$

and

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\limsup_{n\to\infty}\nu^\omega\left(\left|\frac{1}{b_n}\sum_{j=0}^{n-1}\left[\phi\circ T_\omega^j\mathbf{1}_{\{|\phi\circ T_\omega^j|\le\varepsilon b_n\}} - \mathbb{E}_{\nu^{\sigma^j\omega}}(\phi\mathbf{1}_{\{|\phi|\le\varepsilon b_n\}})\right]\right|\ge\delta\right) = 0.$$

Then

$$\frac{1}{b_n}\left[\sum_{j=0}^{n-1}\phi\circ T_\omega^j - c_n\right]\xrightarrow{d} X_{(\alpha)}(1)$$

under the probability measure ν^ω for $\mathbb{P}$-a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$.

Proof. We check the conditions of Theorem 5.3.

The proof for $\alpha \in (0,1)$ is similar to the proof of Proposition 5.4, the proof of the case $\alpha \in [1,2)$ is similar to the proof of Proposition 5.7. □

5.3. **The annealed transfer operator.** We assume that the random dynamical system $F : \Omega\times[0,1] \to \Omega\times[0,1]$,

$$F(\omega,x) = (\sigma\omega, T_\omega(x))$$

which can also be viewed as a Markov process on $[0,1]$, has a stationary measure ν with density h. The map $F : \Omega\times[0,1]\to\Omega\times[0,1]$ will preserve $\mathbb{P}\times\nu$. Recall that $\mathbb{P} := \{(p_1,\dots,p_m)\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$.

We use the notation $P_{\mu,i}$ for the transfer operator of $T_i : [0,1]\to[0,1]$ with respect to a measure μ on $[0,1]$, i.e.

$$\int f\cdot g\circ T_i d\mu = \int (P_{\mu,i}f)gd\mu, \text{ for all } f\in L^1(\mu),\ g\in L^\infty(\mu).$$

The annealed transfer operator is defined by

$$P_\mu(f) := \sum_{i=1}^m p_i P_{\mu,i}(f)$$

with adjoint

$$U(f) := \sum_{i=1}^m p_i f\circ T_i$$

which satisfies the duality relation

$$\int f(g\circ U)d\mu = \int (P_\mu f)gd\mu, \text{ for all } f\in L^1(\mu),\ g\in L^\infty(\mu).$$

As above, we assume there are sample measures $d\nu^\omega = h_\omega dx$ on each fiber $[0,1]$ of the skew product such that

$$P_\omega h_\omega = h_{\sigma\omega}$$

where P_ω is the transfer operator of T_{ω_0} with respect to the Lebesgue measure.

Therefore

$$\nu(A) = \int_\Omega [\int_A h_\omega dx] d\mathbb{P}(\omega)$$

for all Borel sets $A \subset [0,1]$.

5.4. **Decay of correlations.** We now consider the decay of correlations properties of the annealed systems associated to maps satisfying (LY), (Dec) and (Min) and intermittent maps.

By [ANV15, Proposition 3.1] in the setting of maps satisfying (LY), (Dec) and (Min) we have exponential decay in BV against L^1: there are $C > 0$, $0 < \lambda < 1$ such that

$$\left| \int f g \circ U^n d\nu - \int f d\nu \int g d\nu \right| \le C\lambda^n \|f\|_{BV} \|g\|_{L^1(\nu)}$$

In the setting of intermittent maps, by [BB16, Theorem 1.2], we have polynomial decay in Hölder against L^∞: there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$\left| \int f g \circ U^n d\nu - \int f d\nu \int g d\nu \right| \le C n^{1-\frac{1}{\gamma_{min}}} \|f\|_{\text{Hölder}} \|g\|_{L^\infty(\nu)}.$$

We now consider a useful property satisfied by our class of random uniformly expanding maps.

Definition 5.9 (**Condition U**). *We assume that almost each ν^ω is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure m, and*

$$\text{for some } C > 0, \qquad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.e. } \omega \in \Omega \implies C^{-1} \le h_\omega := \frac{d\nu^\omega}{d\nu} \le C, \ m\text{-a.e.} \tag{5.8}$$

$$\text{the map } \omega \in \Omega \mapsto h_\omega \in L^\infty(m) \text{ is Hölder continuous.} \tag{5.9}$$

Consequently, the stationary measure ν is also absolutely continuous with respect to m, with density $h \in L^\infty(m)$ given by $h(x) = \int_\Omega h_\omega(x)\mathbb{P}(d\omega)$ and satisfying (5.8).

Lemma 5.10. *Properties* **(LY)**, **(Min)** *and* **(Dec)** *imply Condition U. Namely, there exists a unique Hölder map $\omega \in \Omega \mapsto h_\omega \in \mathrm{BV}$ such that $P_\omega h_\omega = h_{\sigma\omega}$ and* (5.8), (5.9) *are satisfied by* [ANV15].

Proof. By **(Dec)**, and as all the operators P_ω are Markov with respect to m, we have

$$\|P^{n+k}_{\sigma^{-(n+k)}\omega}\mathbf{1} - P^n_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}\mathbf{1}\|_{\mathrm{BV}} \le C\kappa^n \|\mathbf{1} - P^k_{\sigma^{-(n+k)}\omega}\mathbf{1}\|_{\mathrm{BV}} \le C\kappa^n, \tag{5.10}$$

which proves that $(P^n_{\sigma^{-n}\omega}\mathbf{1})_{n\ge 0}$ is a Cauchy sequence in BV converging to a unique limit $h_\omega \in BV$ satisfying $P_\omega h_\omega = h_{\sigma\omega}$ for all ω. The lower bound in (5.8) follows from the condition **(Min)**, while the upper bound is a consequence of the uniform Lasota-Yorke inequality **(LY)**, as actually the family $\{h_\omega\}_{\omega\in\Omega}$ is bounded in BV. To prove the Hölder continuity of $\omega \mapsto h_\omega$ with respect to the distance d_θ, we remark that if ω and ω' agree in coordinates $|k| \le n$, then

$$\|h_\omega - h_{\omega'}\|_{\mathrm{BV}} = \|P^k_{\sigma^{-k}\omega}(h_{\sigma^{-k}\omega} - h_{\sigma^{-k}\omega'})\|_{\mathrm{BV}} \le C\theta^n \le C d_\theta(\omega,\omega').$$

□

Remark 5.11. *Note that the density h of the stationary measure ν also belongs to BV and is uniformly bounded from above and below, as the average of h_ω over Ω.*

5.4.1. *The sample measures* h_ω. The regularity properties of the sample measures h_ω, both as functions of ω and as functions of x on $[0,1]$ play a key role in our estimates. We will first recall how the sample measures are constructed. Suppose $\omega := (\dots,\omega_{-1},\omega_0,\omega_1,\dots,\omega_n,\dots,)$ and define $h_n(\omega) = P_{\omega_{-1}}\dots P_{\omega_{-n}}1$ as a sequence of functions on the fiber I above ω. In the setting both of random uniformly expanding maps and of intermittent maps $\{h_n(\omega)\}$ is a Cauchy sequence and has a limit h_ω.

In the setting of random expanding maps, h_ω is uniformly BV in ω as

$$\|h_n(\omega) - h_{n+1}(\omega)\|_{BV} \le \|P_{\omega_{-1}}P_{\omega_{-2}}\dots P_{\omega_{-n}}(1 - P_{\omega_{-n-1}}1)\|_{BV} \le C\lambda^n.$$

In the setting of intermittent maps with $\gamma_{max} = \max_{1\le i\le m}\{\gamma_i\}$, the densities h_ω lie in the cone

$$L := \big\{f \in \mathcal{C}^0((0,1]) \cap L^1(m), \quad \begin{array}{l} f \ge 0,\ f \text{ non-increasing,} \\ X^{\gamma_{max}+1}f \text{ increasing}, f(x) \le ax^{-\gamma_{max}}m(f)\big\} \end{array}$$

where $X(x) = x$ is the identity function and $m(f)$ is the integral of f with respect to m. In [AHN$^+$15] it is proven that for a fixed value of $\gamma_{max} \in (0,1)$, provided that the constant a is big enough, the cone L is invariant under the action of all transfer operators P_{γ_i} with $0 < \gamma_i \le \gamma_{max}$ and so (see e.g. [NPT21, Proposition 3.3], which summarizes results of [NTV18])

$$\begin{aligned}\|h_n(\omega) - h_{n+k}(\omega)\|_{L^1(m)} &\le \|P_{\omega_{-1}}P_{\omega_{-2}}\dots P_{\omega_{-n}}(1 - P_{\omega_{-n-1}}\dots P_{\omega_{-n-k}}1)\|_{L^1(m)} \\ &\le C_{\gamma_{max}} n^{1-\frac{1}{\gamma_{max}}}(\log n)^{\frac{1}{\gamma_{max}}}\end{aligned}$$

whence $h_\omega \in L^1(m)$. In later arguments we will use the approximation

$$\|h_n(\omega) - h_\omega\|_{L^1(m)} \le C_{\gamma_{max}} n^{1-\frac{1}{\gamma_{max}}}(\log n)^{\frac{1}{\gamma_{max}}}. \tag{5.11}$$

We mention also the recent paper [KL21] where the logarithm term in Equation (5.11) is shown to be unnecessary and moment estimates are given.

We now show that h_ω is a Hölder function of ω on (Ω, d_θ) in the setting of random expanding maps.

For $\theta \in (0,1)$, we introduce on Ω the symbolic metric

$$d_\theta(\omega,\omega') = \theta^{s(\omega,\omega')}$$

where $s(\omega,\omega') = \inf\{k \ge 0 : \omega_\ell \ne \omega'_\ell \text{ for some } |\ell| \le k\}$.

Suppose ω, ω' agree in coordinates $|k| \le n$ (i.e. backwards and forwards in time) so that $d_\theta(\omega,\omega^{'}) \le \theta^n$ in the symbolic metric on Ω. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\|h_\omega - h_{\omega'}\|_{\mathrm{BV}} &\le \|P_{\omega_{-1}}P_{\omega_1}\dots P_{\omega_{-n+1}}(h_{(\sigma^{-n+1}\omega)} - h_{(\sigma^{-n+1}\omega')})\|_{\mathrm{BV}} \\ &\le C\lambda^{n-1} = C'd_\theta(\omega,\omega')^{\log_\theta\lambda}\end{aligned}$$

Recall that $\|f\|_\infty \le C\|f\|_{\mathrm{BV}}$, see e.g. [BG97, Lemma 2.3.1].

That is, Condition U (see Definition 5.9) holds for random expanding maps.

The map $\omega \mapsto h_\omega$ is not Hölder in the setting of intermittent maps; in several arguments we will use the regularity properties of the approximation $h_n(\omega)$ for h_ω.

However, on intervals that stay away from zero, all functions in the cone L are comparable to their mean. Therefore, on sets that are uniformly away from zero, all the above densities/measures ($d\nu = hdx$, h_ω, $h_n(\omega)$) are still comparable.

Namely,

$$\begin{gathered}\text{for any } \delta \in (0,1) \text{ there is } C_\delta > 0 \text{ such that} \\ h \in L \implies 1/C_\delta < h(x)/m(h) < C_\delta \text{ for } x \in [\delta,1]\end{gathered} \tag{5.12}$$

Indeed, $h/m(h)$ is bounded below by [LSV99, Lemma 2.4], and the upper bound follows from the definition of the cone.

6. Ancilliary Results

Let $x_0 \in [0,1]$, and, for $\alpha \in (0,2)$, recall we define the function $\phi_{x_0}(x) = |x - x_0|^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}$. It is easy to see that ϕ_{x_0} is regularity varying with index α and that $p = 1$.

6.1. **Exponential law and point process results.** We denote by $\mathcal{J}$ the family of all finite unions of intervals of the form $(x, y]$, where $-\infty \le x < y \le \infty$ and $0 \notin [x, y]$.

For a measurable subset $U \subset [0,1]$, we define the hitting time of $(\omega, x) \in \Omega \times [0,1]$ to U by

$$R_U(\omega)(x) := \inf \left\{ k \ge 1 \, : \, T_\omega^k(x) \in U \right\}. \tag{6.1}$$

Recall that $\phi_{x_0}(x) := d(x, x_0)^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}$ depends on the choice of $x_0 \in [0,1]$. Recall also that

$$\mathcal{D} = \cup_{n \ge 0} \cup_{\omega \in \Omega} \partial \mathcal{A}_\omega^n$$

the set of discontinuities of all the maps T_ω^n.

Theorem 6.1. *In the setting of Section 2.1, assume* **(LY)**, **(Min)** *and* **(Dec)**. *If $x_0 \notin \mathcal{D}$ is not periodic, then, for $\mathbb{P}$-a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$ and all $0 \le s < t$,*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \nu^{\sigma^{\lfloor ns \rfloor}\omega} \left(R_{A_n}(\sigma^{\lfloor ns \rfloor}\omega) > \lfloor n(t-s) \rfloor \right) = e^{-(t-s)\Pi_\alpha(J)}.$$

where $A_n := \phi_{x_0}^{-1}(b_n J)$, $J \in \mathcal{J}$.

Theorem 6.2. *In the setting of intermittent maps, Example 2.2, assume that $\gamma_{max} < \frac{1}{3}$. Then for m-a.e. x_0 for $\mathbb{P}$-a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$ and all $0 \le s < t$,*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \nu^{\sigma^{\lfloor ns \rfloor}\omega} \left(R_{A_n}(\sigma^{\lfloor ns \rfloor}\omega) > \lfloor n(t-s) \rfloor \right) = e^{-(t-s)\Pi_\alpha(J)}.$$

where $A_n := \phi_{x_0}^{-1}(b_n J)$, $J \in \mathcal{J}$.

Theorem 6.3. *In the setting of Section 2.1, assume* **(LY)**, **(Min)** *and* **(Dec)**. *If $x_0 \notin \mathcal{D}$ is not periodic, then for $\mathbb{P}$-a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$, then*

$$N_n^\omega \xrightarrow{d} N_{(\alpha)},$$

under the probability ν^ω.

Theorem 6.4. *In the setting of Example 2.2 for m-a.e. x_0 for $\mathbb{P}$-a.e. ω,*

$$N_n^\omega((0,1] \times \cdot) \xrightarrow{d} N_{(\alpha)}((0,1] \times \cdot)$$

7. Scheme of proofs

7.1. **Two useful lemmas.** We now proceed to the proofs of the main results. We will use the following technical propositions which are a form of spatial ergodic theorem which allows us to prove exponential and Poisson limit laws.

Lemma 7.1. *Assume Condition U and let $\chi_n : Y \to \mathbb{R}$ be a sequence of functions in $L^1(m)$ such that $\mathbb{E}_m(|\chi_n|) = \mathcal{O}(n^{-1}\widetilde{L}(n))$ for some slowly varying function $\widetilde{L}$. Then, for $\mathbb{P}$-a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$ and for all $\ell \ge 1$,*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{0 \le k \le \ell} \left| \sum_{j=0}^{kn-1} \left(\mathbb{E}_{\nu^{\sigma^j \omega}}(\chi_n) - \mathbb{E}_\nu(\chi_n) \right) \right| = 0.$$

Therefore, given $(s,t] \subset [0,\infty)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, for $\mathbb{P}$-a.e. ω there exists $N(\omega)$ such that

$$\left| \sum_{r=\lfloor ns \rfloor + 1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} \left(\mathbb{E}_{\nu^{\sigma^j \omega}}(\chi_n) - \mathbb{E}_\nu(\chi_n) \right) \right| \le \varepsilon$$

for all $n \ge N(\omega)$.

Proof. We obtain the second claim by taking the difference between two values of ℓ in the first claim.

Fix $\ell \geq 1$. For $\delta > 0$, let

$$U_k^n(\delta) = \left\{ \omega \in \Omega \, : \, \left| \sum_{j=0}^{kn-1} \left(\mathbb{E}_{\nu^{\sigma^j \omega}}(\chi_n) - \mathbb{E}_{\nu}(\chi_n) \right) \right| \geq \delta \right\},$$

and

$$B^n(\delta) = \left\{ \omega \in \Omega \, : \, \sup_{0 \leq k \leq \ell} \left| \sum_{j=0}^{kn-1} \left(\mathbb{E}_{\nu^{\sigma^j \omega}}(\chi_n) - \mathbb{E}_{\nu}(\chi_n) \right) \right| \geq \delta \right\}.$$

Note that

$$B^n(\delta) = \bigcup_{k=0}^{\ell} U_k^n(\delta).$$

We define $f_n(\omega) = \mathbb{E}_{\nu^\omega}(\chi_n)$ and $\overline{f}_n = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(f_n)$. We claim that $f_n : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ is Hölder with norm $\|f_n\|_\theta = \mathcal{O}(n^{-1}\widetilde{L}(n))$. Indeed, for $\omega \in \Omega$, we have

$$|f_n(\omega)| = \left| \int_Y \chi_n(x) d\nu^\omega(x) \right| \leq \|h_\omega\|_{L^\infty_m} \|\chi_n\|_{L^1_m} \leq \frac{C}{n} \widetilde{L}(n),$$

and for $\omega, \omega' \in \Omega$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|f_n(\omega) - f_n(\omega')| &= \left| \int_Y \chi_n(x) d\nu^\omega(x) - \int_Y \chi_n(x) d\nu^{\omega'}(x) \right| \\
&\leq \int_Y |\chi_n(x)| \cdot |h_\omega(x) - h_{\omega'}(x)| dm(x) \\
&\leq \|h_\omega - h_{\omega'}\|_{L^\infty_m} \|\chi_n\|_{L^1_m} \\
&\leq \frac{C}{n} \widetilde{L}(n) d_\theta(\omega, \omega'),
\end{aligned}$$

since $\omega \in \Omega \mapsto h_\omega \in L^\infty(m)$ is Hölder continuous. In particular, we also have that $\overline{f}_n = \mathcal{O}(n^{-1}\widetilde{L}(n))$.

We have, using Chebyshev's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(U_k^n(\delta)) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\left\{ \omega \in \Omega \, : \, \left| \sum_{j=0}^{kn-1} \left(f_n \circ \sigma^j - \overline{f}_n \right) \right| \geq \delta \right\} \right) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\delta^2} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}} \left(\left(\sum_{j=0}^{kn-1} \left(f_n \circ \sigma^j - \overline{f}_n \right) \right)^2 \right) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\delta^2} \left[\sum_{j=0}^{kn-1} (\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}} |f_n \circ \sigma^j - \overline{f}_n|^2 + 2 \sum_{0 \leq i < j \leq kn-1} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}((f_n \circ \sigma^i - \overline{f}_n)(f_n \circ \sigma^j - \overline{f}_n)) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

By the σ-invariance of $\mathbb{P}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}} |f_n \circ \sigma^j - \overline{f}_n|^2 = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}} |f_n - \overline{f}_n|^2,$$

and, since $(\Omega, \mathbb{P}, \sigma)$ admits exponential decay of correlations for Hölder observables, there exist $\lambda \in (0,1)$ and $C > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}((f_n \circ \sigma^i - \overline{f}_n)(f_n \circ \sigma^j - \overline{f}_n)) &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}((f_n - \overline{f}_n)(f_n \circ \sigma^{j-i} - \overline{f}_n)) \\
&\leq C\lambda^{j-i} \|f_n - \overline{f}_n\|_\theta^2.
\end{aligned}$$

We then obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(U_k^n(\delta)) &\leq \frac{C}{\delta^2}\left[kn\|f_n-\overline{f}_n\|^2_{L^2_m}+2\sum_{0\leq i<j\leq kn-1}\lambda^{j-i}\|f_n-\overline{f}_n\|^2_\theta\right]\\ &\leq C\frac{nk}{\delta^2}\|f_n\|^2_\theta\\ &\leq C\frac{k}{n\delta^2}(\widetilde{L}(n))^2,\end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\mathbb{P}(B^n(\delta)) \leq C\frac{\ell^2}{n\delta^2}(\widetilde{L}(n))^2.$$

Let $\eta>0$. By the Borel-Cantelli lemma, it follows that for $\mathbb{P}$-a.e. $\omega\in\Omega$, there exists $N(\omega,\delta)\geq 1$ such that $\omega\notin B^{\lfloor p^{1+\eta}\rfloor}(\delta)$ for all $p\geq N(\omega,\delta)$.

Let now $P:=\lfloor p^{1+\eta}\rfloor < n \leq P' = \lfloor (p+1)^{1+\eta}\rfloor$ for p large enough. Let $0\leq k\leq \ell$. Then, since $\|f_n\|_\infty = \mathcal{O}(n^{-1}\widetilde{L}(n))$,

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\sum_{j=0}^{kP-1}\left(f_n(\sigma^j\omega)-\overline{f}_n\right)-\sum_{j=0}^{kn-1}\left(f_n(\sigma^j\omega)-\overline{f}_n\right)\right| &\leq \sum_{j=kP}^{kn-1}\left|f_n(\sigma^j\omega)-\overline{f}_n\right|\\ &\leq C\frac{P'-P}{P}\widetilde{L}(n)\leq C\frac{\widetilde{L}(p^{1+\eta})}{p},\end{aligned}$$

because on the one hand

$$\frac{P'-P}{P}=\frac{\lfloor (p+1)^{1+\eta}\rfloor-\lfloor p^{1+\eta}\rfloor}{\lfloor p^{1+\eta}\rfloor}=\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{p}\right),$$

and on the other hand, by Potter's bounds, for $\tau>0$,

$$\widetilde{L}(n)\leq C\widetilde{L}(P)\left(\frac{n}{P}\right)^\tau \leq C\widetilde{L}(P)\left(\frac{P'}{P}\right)^\tau\leq C\widetilde{L}(P).$$

Since

$$\left|\sum_{j=0}^{kP-1}\left(f_n(\sigma^j\omega)-\overline{f}_n\right)\right|<\delta$$

for all $0\leq k\leq\ell$, it follows that for $\mathbb{P}$-a.e. ω, there exists $N(\omega,\delta)$ such that $\omega\notin B^n(2\delta)$ for all $n\geq N(\omega,\delta)$, which concludes the proof. □

We now consider a corresponding result to Lemma 7.1 in the setting of intermittent maps.

Lemma 7.2. *Assume that $\gamma_{max}<1/2$, and that $\chi_n\in L^1(m)$ is such that $\mathbb{E}_m(|\chi_n|)=\mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$, $\|\chi_n\|_\infty=\mathcal{O}(1)$ and there is $\delta>0$ such that $\operatorname{supp}(\chi_n)\subset[\delta,1]$ for all n.*

Then, for $\mathbb{P}$-a.e. $\omega\in\Omega$ and for all $\ell\geq1$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\sup_{0\leq k\leq\ell}\left|\sum_{j=0}^{kn-1}\left(\mathbb{E}_{\nu_{\sigma^j\omega}}(\chi_n)-\mathbb{E}_\nu(\chi_n)\right)\right|=0.$$

Proof. In the setting of intermittent maps we must modify the argument of Lemma 7.1 slightly as h_ω is not a Hölder function of ω. Instead, we consider $h^i_\omega = P^i_{\sigma^{-i}\omega}\mathbf{1}$. and use that, by (5.11),

$$\|h^i_\omega-h_\omega\|_{L^1(m)}\leq Ci^{1-\frac{1}{\gamma_{max}}} \qquad \text{(leaving out the log term)}. \tag{7.1}$$

Note that h^i_ω is the i-th approximate to h_ω in the pullback construction of h_ω. Let ν^i_ω be the measure such that $\frac{d\nu^i_\omega}{dm} = h^i_\omega$.

Consider

$$f^i_n(\omega) = \mathbb{E}_{\nu^i_\omega}(\chi_n)\,, \qquad f_n(\omega) = \mathbb{E}_{\nu^\omega}(\chi_n)$$

$$\overline{f}^i_n = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(f^i_n)\,, \qquad \overline{f}_n = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(f_n).$$

By (5.12), on the set $[\delta, 1]$ the densities involved ($h^k_\omega, h_\omega, h = d\nu/dm$) are uniformly bounded above and away from zero. Thus $\|f^i_n\|_\infty = \mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$.

Pick $0 < a < 1$ is such that $\beta := (\frac{1}{\gamma_{max}} - 1)a - 1 > 0$.

For a given n take $i = i_n = n^a$. By (7.1), for all ω, n and $i = n^a$

$$|f^i_n(\omega) - f_n(\omega)| \le \|h^i_\omega - h_\omega\|_{L^1(m)} \|\chi_n\|_{L^\infty(m)} = \mathcal{O}(n^{-(\beta+1)}).$$

Then

$$|\overline{f}^i_n - \overline{f}_n| = \mathcal{O}(n^{-(\beta+1)})$$

and

$$\left| \sum_{r=0}^{kn-1} [f^i_n(\sigma^r\omega) - f_n(\sigma^r\omega)] \right| \le C\ell n^{-\beta}.$$

Given ε, choose n large enough that for all $0 \le k \le \ell$,

$$\left\{ \omega \in \Omega \,:\, \left| \sum_{r=0}^{kn-1} (f_n(\sigma^r\omega) - \overline{f}_n) \right| > \varepsilon \right\} \subset \left\{ \omega \in \Omega \,:\, \left| \sum_{r=0}^{kn-1} (f^i_n(\sigma^r\omega) - \overline{f}^i_n) \right| > \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right\}.$$

By Chebyshev

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left| \sum_{r=0}^{kn-1} (f^i_n \circ \sigma^r - \overline{f}^i_n) \right| > \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right) \le \frac{4}{\varepsilon^2} \sum_{r=0}^{kn-1} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}} \left(\left[f^i_n \circ \sigma^r - \overline{f}^i_n \right]^2 \right)$$
$$+ \frac{4}{\varepsilon^2} \left[2 \sum_{r=0}^{kn-1} \sum_{u=r+1}^{kn-1} \left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}[(f^i_n \circ \sigma^r - \overline{f}^i_n)(f^i_n \circ \sigma^u - \overline{f}^i_n)] \right| \right]$$

We bound

$$\sum_{r=0}^{kn-1} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}} \left(\left[f^i_n - \overline{f}^i_n \right]^2 \right) \le C \sum_{r=0}^{kn-1} \|f^i_n\|^2_\infty \le \frac{C\ell}{n}$$

and note that if $|r - u| > n^a$ then by independence

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}} \left[(f^i_n \circ \sigma^r - \overline{f}^i_n)(f_n \circ \sigma^u - \overline{f}^i_n) \right] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}} \left[f^i_n \circ \sigma^r - \overline{f}^i_n \right] \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}} \left[f^i_n \circ \sigma^u - \overline{f}^i_n \right] = 0$$

and hence we may bound

$$\sum_{r=0}^{kn-1} \sum_{u=r+1}^{kn-1} \left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}[(f^i_n \circ \sigma^r - \overline{f}^i_n)(f^i_n \circ \sigma^u - \overline{f}^i_n)] \right| \le \frac{C\ell}{n^{1-a}}.$$

Thus, for n large enough,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left\{ \omega \in \Omega \,:\, \left| \sum_{r=0}^{kn-1} [f_n(\sigma^r\omega) - \overline{f}_n] \right| > \varepsilon \right\} \right) \le \frac{C\ell}{n^{1-a}\varepsilon^2}.$$

The rest of the argument proceeds as in the case of Lemma 7.1 using a speedup along a sequence $n = p^{1+\eta}$ where $\eta > \frac{a}{1-a}$, since $\|f_n\|_\infty = \mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$ still holds. $\square$

7.2. **Criteria for stable laws and functional limit laws.** The next theorem shows that for regularly varying observables, Poisson convergence and Condition U imply convergence in the J_1 topology if $\alpha \in (0,1)$ and gives an additional condition to be verified in the case $\alpha \in [1,2)$.

Note that (7.2) is essentially condition (5.5) of Proposition 5.7.

Theorem 7.3. *Assume ϕ is regularly varying, Condition U holds and that*

$$N_n^\omega \xrightarrow{d} N_{(\alpha)}$$

for $\mathbb{P}$-a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$.

If $\alpha \in [1,2)$, assume furthermore that for all $\delta > 0$, and $\mathbb{P}$-a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \nu \left(\max_{1\le k\le n} \left| \frac{1}{b_n} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \left[\phi \circ T_\omega^j \mathbf{1}_{\left\{|\phi\circ T_\omega^j| \le \varepsilon b_n\right\}} - \mathbb{E}_{\nu^{\sigma^j\omega}}(\phi \mathbf{1}_{\{|\phi|\le \varepsilon b_n\}}) \right] \right| \ge \delta \right) = 0. \tag{7.2}$$

Then $X_n^\omega \xrightarrow{d} X_{(\alpha)}$ in $\mathbb{D}[0,\infty)$ under the probability measure ν^ω for $\mathbb{P}$-a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$.

Remark 7.4. *From* (5.8) *and Theorem 5.1, it follows that the convergence of X_n^ω also holds under the probability measure ν.*

Proof of Theorem 7.3. When $\alpha \in (0,1)$, we check the hypothesis of Proposition 5.4. Using (5.8), we have

$$\left| \frac{1}{b_n} \sum_{j=0}^{n\ell-1} \mathbb{E}_{\nu^{\sigma^j\omega}}(|\phi| \mathbf{1}_{\{|\phi|\le\varepsilon b_n\}}) \right| \le C \frac{n\ell}{b_n} \mathbb{E}_\nu(|\phi| \mathbf{1}_{\{|\phi|\le\varepsilon b_n\}})$$

Using Proposition 3.2, we see that condition (5.3) is satisfied since $\alpha < 1$, thus proving the theorem in this case.

When $\alpha \in [1,2)$, we consider instead Proposition 5.7. Firstly, we remark that condition (5.5) is implied by (7.2) and (5.8). It remains to check condition (5.4), which constitutes the rest of the proof.

If $\alpha \in (1,2)$ we have

$$\left| \frac{1}{b_n} \left[\sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor nt\rfloor -1} \mathbb{E}_{\nu^{\sigma^j\omega}}(\phi \mathbf{1}_{\{|\phi|\le\varepsilon b_n\}}) - t(c_n - b_n c_\alpha(\varepsilon)) \right] \right| \le A_n^\omega(t) + B_{n,\varepsilon}^\omega(t) + C_{n,\varepsilon}^\omega(t) \tag{7.3}$$

with

$$A_n^\omega(t) = \left| \frac{1}{b_n} \left[\sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor nt\rfloor -1} \mathbb{E}_{\nu^{\sigma^j\omega}}(\phi) - tc_n \right] \right|,$$

$$B_{n,\varepsilon}^\omega(t) = \left| \frac{1}{b_n} \left[\sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor nt\rfloor -1} \mathbb{E}_{\nu^{\sigma^j\omega}}(\phi \mathbf{1}_{\{|\phi|>\varepsilon b_n\}}) - nt\mathbb{E}_\nu(\phi \mathbf{1}_{\{|\phi|>\varepsilon b_n\}}) \right] \right|$$

and

$$C_{n,\varepsilon}^\omega(t) = \left| \frac{nt}{b_n} \mathbb{E}_\nu(\phi \mathbf{1}_{\{|\phi|>\varepsilon b_n\}}) - tc_\alpha(\varepsilon) \right|.$$

Since ϕ is regularity varying with index $\alpha > 1$, it is integrable and the function $\omega \mapsto \mathbb{E}_{\nu^\omega}(\phi)$ is Hölder. Hence, it satisfies the law of the iterated logarithm, and we have for $\mathbb{P}$-a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$

$$\left| \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \mathbb{E}_{\nu^{\sigma^j\omega}}(\phi) - \mathbb{E}_\nu(\phi) \right| = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\sqrt{\log\log k}}{\sqrt{k}} \right).$$

Thus, we have

$$\sup_{0\le t\le \ell} A_n^\omega(t) = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\sqrt{n\ell}\sqrt{\log\log(n\ell)}}{b_n}\right).$$

As a consequence, we can deduce that $\lim_{n\to\infty}\sup_{0\le t\le\ell} A_n^\omega(t) = 0$ since $b_n = n^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}\widetilde{L}(n)$ for a slowly varying function $\widetilde{L}$, with $\alpha < 2$.

By Proposition 3.2, we also have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} nb_n^{-1}\mathbb{E}_\nu(\phi\mathbf{1}_{\{|\phi|>\varepsilon b_n\}}) = c_\alpha(\varepsilon).$$

In particular, we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\sup_{0\le t\le\ell} C_{n,\varepsilon}^\omega(t) = 0.$$

This also implies that $\mathbb{E}_m(|\chi_n|) = \mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$ if we define $\chi_n = b_n^{-1}\phi\mathbf{1}_{\{|\phi|>\varepsilon b_n\}}$. From Lemma 7.1, it follows that $\lim_{n\to\infty}\sup_{0\le t\le\ell} B_{n,\varepsilon}^\omega(t) = 0$.

Putting all these estimates together concludes the proof when $\alpha\in(1,2)$.

When $\alpha = 1$, we estimate the RHS of (7.3) by $A_{n,\varepsilon}^\omega(t) + B_{n,\varepsilon}^\omega(t)$ with

$$A_{n,\varepsilon}^\omega(t) = \left|\frac{1}{b_n}\left[\sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor nt\rfloor-1}\mathbb{E}_{\nu^{\sigma^j\omega}}(\phi\mathbf{1}_{\{|\phi|\le\varepsilon b_n\}}) - nt\mathbb{E}_\nu(\phi\mathbf{1}_{\{|\phi|\le\varepsilon b_n\}})\right]\right|$$

and

$$B_{n,\varepsilon}^\omega(t) = \left|\frac{nt}{b_n}\mathbb{E}_\nu(\phi\mathbf{1}_{\{\varepsilon b_n<|\phi|\le b_n\}}) - tc_\alpha(\varepsilon)\right|.$$

We define $\chi_n = b_n^{-1}\phi\mathbf{1}_{\{|\phi|\le\varepsilon b_n\}}$. By Proposition 3.2, we have $\mathbb{E}_m(|\chi_n|) = \mathcal{O}(n^{-1}\widetilde{L}(n))$ for some slowly varying function $\widetilde{L}$, and so by Lemma 7.1,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\sup_{0\le t\le\ell} A_{n,\varepsilon}^\omega(t) = 0.$$

On the other hand, by Proposition 3.2, we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} nb_n^{-1}\mathbb{E}_\nu(\phi\mathbf{1}_{\{\varepsilon b_n<|\phi|\le\varepsilon b_n\}}) = c_\alpha(\varepsilon)$$

and so $\lim_{n\to\infty}\sup_{0\le t\le\ell} B_{n,\varepsilon}^\omega(t) = 0$ which completes the proof. □

8. An exponential law

We denote by $\mathcal{J}$ the family of all finite unions of intervals of the form $(x,y]$, where $-\infty\le x<y\le\infty$ and $0\notin[x,y]$. For $J\in\mathcal{J}$, we will establish a quenched exponential law for the sequence of sets $A_n = (\phi_{x_0})^{-1}(b_nJ)$. Similar results were obtained in [CF20, FFV17, HRY20, RSV14, RT15].

Since ϕ is regularly varying, it is easy to verify that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} n\nu(A_n) = \Pi_\alpha(J).$$

In particular, $m(A_n) = \mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$.

Lemma 8.1. *Assume Condition U and that ϕ is regularly varying with index α.*

If $A_n\subset[0,1]$ is a sequence of measurable subsets such that $m(A_n) = \mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$, then for all $0\le s<t$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\left(\left[\sum_{j=\lfloor ns\rfloor+1}^{\lfloor nt\rfloor}\nu^{\sigma^j\omega}(A_n)\right] - n(t-s)\nu(A_n)\right) = 0.$$

The same result holds in the setting of Example 2.2 if $A_n \subset [\delta, 1]$ for some $\delta > 0$ with $m(A_n) = \mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$. In particular, if $A_n = \phi_{x_0}^{-1}(b_n J)$ for $J \in \mathcal{J}$, then for all $0 \le s < t$.

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{j=\lfloor ns\rfloor+1}^{\lfloor nt\rfloor} \nu^{\sigma^j\omega}(A_n) = (t-s)\Pi_\alpha(J).$$

Proof. For the first statement, it suffices to apply Lemma 7.1 or Lemma 7.2 with $\chi_n = \mathbf{1}_{A_n}$. The second statement immediately follows since $\lim_n n\nu(A_n) = \Pi_\alpha(J)$. □

Corollary 8.2. *Assume the hypothesis of Lemma 8.1.*
Let $J \in \mathcal{J}$, and set $A_n = \phi^{-1}(b_n J)$. Then for $\mathbb{P}$-a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$, and all $0 \le s < t$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \prod_{j=\lfloor ns\rfloor+1}^{\lfloor nt\rfloor} \left(1-\nu^{\sigma^j\omega}(A_n)\right) = e^{-(t-s)\Pi_\alpha(J)}.$$

Proof. Since $\nu^\omega(A_n)$ is of order at most n^{-1} uniformly in $\omega \in \Omega$, it follows that

$$\log\left[\prod_{j=\lfloor ns\rfloor+1}^{\lfloor nt\rfloor} \left(1-\nu^{\sigma^j\omega}(A_n)\right)\right] = -\left(\sum_{j=\lfloor ns\rfloor+1}^{\lfloor nt\rfloor} \nu^{\sigma^j\omega}(A_n)\right) + \mathcal{O}(n^{-1}).$$

By Lemma 8.1,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{j=\lfloor ns\rfloor}^{\lfloor nt\rfloor-1} \nu^{\sigma^j\omega}(A_n) = (t-s)\Pi_\alpha(J),$$

which yields the conclusion. □

Definition 8.3. *For a measurable subset $U \subset Y = [0,1]$, we define the hitting time of $(\omega, x) \in \Omega \times Y$ to U by*

$$R_U(\omega)(x) := \inf\left\{k \ge 1 \,:\, T_\omega^k(x) \in U\right\}.$$

and the induced measure by ν on U by

$$\nu_U(A) := \frac{\nu(A\cap U)}{\nu(U)}$$

In order to establish our exponential law, we will first obtain a few estimates, based on the proof of [HSV99, Theorem 2.1], to relate $\nu^\omega(R_{A_n}(\omega) > \lfloor nt\rfloor)$ to $\sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor nt\rfloor-1} \nu^{\sigma^j\omega}(A_n)$ so that we are able to invoke Corollary 8.2.

The next lemma is basically [RSV14, Lemma 6].

Lemma 8.4. *For every measurable set $U \subset [0,1]$, we have the bound*

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\nu^\omega(R_U(\omega) > k) - \prod_{j=1}^k (1-\nu^{\sigma^j\omega}(U))\right| &\le \sum_{j=1}^k \nu^{\sigma^j\omega}(U)\; c_{\sigma^j\omega}(k-j, U) \prod_{i=1}^{j-1}(1-\nu^{\sigma^i\omega}(U)) \\ &\le \sum_{j=1}^k \nu^{\sigma^j\omega}(U)\; c_{\sigma^j\omega}(U)\end{aligned}$$

where

$$c_\omega(k,U) := |\nu_U^\omega(R_U(\omega) > k) - \nu^\omega(R_U(\omega) > k)|$$

and

$$c_\omega(U) := \sup_{k\ge 0} c_\omega(k, U).$$

Proof. Note that $\{R_U(\omega) > k\} = [T^1_\omega]^{-1}(U^c \cap \{R_U(\sigma\omega) > k-1\})$ and so, using the equivariance of $\{\nu^\omega\}_{\omega\in\Omega}$,

$$\nu^\omega(R_U(\omega) > k) = \nu^{\sigma\omega}(U^c \cap \{R_U(\sigma\omega) > k-1\}).$$

Hence

$$\nu^\omega(R_U(\omega) > k) = \nu^{\sigma\omega}(R_U(\sigma\omega) > k-1) - \nu^{\sigma\omega}(U \cap \{R_U(\sigma\omega) > k-1\}).$$

We note that

$$\begin{aligned}\nu^\omega(R_U(\omega) > k) &= \nu^{\sigma\omega}(R_U(\sigma\omega) > k-1) - \nu^{\sigma\omega}(U)[\nu^{\sigma\omega}(R_U(\sigma\omega) > k-1) + c_{\sigma\omega}(k-1,U)] \\ &= (1-\nu^{\sigma\omega}(U))\nu^{\sigma\omega}(R_U(\sigma\omega) > k-1) - \nu^{\sigma\omega}(U)c_{\sigma\omega}(k-1,U).\end{aligned}$$

Iterating we obtain, using the fact that for $\mathbb{P}$-a.e. ω, $\nu^\omega(R_U(\omega) \geq 1) = 1$,

$$\nu^\omega(R_U(\omega) > k) = \prod_{j=1}^{k}(1-\nu^{\sigma^j\omega}(U)) - \sum_{j=1}^{k}\nu^{\sigma^j\omega}(U)c_{\sigma^j\omega}(k-j,U)\prod_{i=1}^{j-1}(1-\nu^{\sigma^i\omega}(U))$$

which yields the conclusion. □

We will estimate now the coefficients $c_\omega(U)$.

Lemma 8.5. *Fix N. Then, for any measurable subset $U \subset Y$ such that $\mathbf{1}_U \in \mathrm{BV}$, we have*

$$c_\omega(U) \leq \nu^\omega_U(R_U(\omega) \leq N) + \nu^\omega(R_U(\omega) \leq N) + \frac{1}{\nu^\omega(U)}\left\|P^N_\omega([\mathbf{1}_U - \nu^\omega(U)]h_\omega)\right\|_{L^1(m)} \tag{8.1}$$

with C independent of N and

$$\nu^\omega_U(R_U(\omega) \leq N) \leq \frac{1}{\nu^\omega(U)}\nu^\omega(R_U(\omega) \leq N), \qquad \nu^\omega(R_U(\omega) \leq N) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{N}\nu^{\sigma^i\omega}(U) \tag{8.2}$$

Proof. The estimates (8.2) follow from

$$\{R_U(\omega) \leq N\} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{N}(T^i_\omega)^{-1}(U).$$

and therefore

$$\nu^\omega(R_U(\omega) \leq N) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{N}\nu^{\sigma^i\omega}(U)$$

For (8.1), note that

$$c_\omega(U) = |\nu^\omega_U(R_U(\omega) \leq j) - \nu^\omega(R_U(\omega) \leq j)|$$

If $j \leq N$ then

$$c_\omega(U) \leq \nu^\omega_U(R(\omega) \leq N) + \nu^\omega(R(\omega) \leq N)$$

If $j > N$ we write

$$\begin{aligned}\nu^\omega_U(R_U(\omega) \leq j) - \nu^\omega(R_U(\omega) \leq j) =\ & \nu^\omega_U(R_U(\omega) \leq j) - \nu^\omega_U(T^{-N}_\omega(R_U(\sigma^N\omega) \leq j-N)) \\ &+\ \nu^\omega_U(T^{-N}_\omega(R_U(\sigma^N\omega) \leq j-N)) - \nu^\omega(T^{-N}_\omega(R_U(\sigma^N\omega) \leq j-N)) \\ &+\ \nu^\omega(T^{-N}_\omega(R_U(\sigma^N\omega) \leq j-N)) - \nu^\omega(R_U(\omega) \leq j) \\ &= (a) + (b) + (c).\end{aligned}$$

To bound (a) and (c) note that

$$\{R_U(\omega) \leq j\} = \{R_U(\omega) \leq N\} \cup T^{-N}_\omega(\{R_U(\sigma^N\omega) \leq j-N)\})$$

so

$$|\nu^\omega(R_U(\omega) \leq j) - \nu^\omega(T^{-N}_\omega(R_U(\sigma^N\omega) \leq j-N))| \leq \nu^\omega(R_U(\omega) \leq N) \tag{8.3}$$

and similarly for ν_U^ω.

To bound (b) we use the decay of P_ω^k. Setting $V = \left\{R_U(\sigma^N\omega) \le j-N\right\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|\nu_U^\omega(T_\omega^{-N}(V)) - \nu^\omega(T_\omega^{-N}(V))| &= \frac{1}{\nu^\omega(U)} \left| \int_Y \mathbf{1}_U \mathbf{1}_V \circ T_\omega^N h_\omega dm - \nu^\omega(U) \int_Y \mathbf{1}_V \circ T_\omega^N h_\omega dm \right| \\
&= \frac{1}{\nu^\omega(U)} \left| \int_Y \mathbf{1}_V P_\omega^N([\mathbf{1}_U - \nu^\omega(U)]h_\omega) dm \right| \\
&\le \frac{1}{\nu^\omega(U)} \left\| P_\omega^N([\mathbf{1}_U - \nu^\omega(U)]h_\omega)\right\|_{L^1(m)}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

8.1. **Exponential law: proof of Theorem 6.1.** We can now prove the exponential law for $A_n = \phi^{-1}(b_n J)$, $J \in \mathcal{J}$.

Proof of Theorem 6.1. Due to rounding errors when taking the integer parts, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \nu^{\sigma^{\lfloor ns \rfloor}\omega} \Big(R_{A_n}(\sigma^{\lfloor ns \rfloor}\omega) > \lfloor n(t-s) \rfloor \Big) - \nu^{\sigma^{\lfloor ns \rfloor}\omega} \Big(R_{A_n}(\sigma^{\lfloor ns \rfloor}\omega) > \lfloor nt \rfloor - \lfloor ns \rfloor \Big) \right| \\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad \le \nu^{\sigma^{\lfloor nt \rfloor}\omega}(A_n) \le C m(A_n) \to 0,
\end{aligned}$$

and it is thus enough to prove the convergence of $\nu^{\sigma^{\lfloor ns \rfloor}\omega} \big(R_{A_n}(\sigma^{\lfloor ns \rfloor}\omega) > \lfloor nt \rfloor - \lfloor ns \rfloor \big)$.

By Lemmas 8.4 and 8.5, for all $N \ge 1$, we have

$$\left| \nu^{\sigma^{\lfloor ns \rfloor}\omega} \Big(R_{A_n}(\sigma^{\lfloor ns \rfloor}\omega) > \lfloor nt \rfloor - \lfloor ns \rfloor \Big) - \prod_{j=\lfloor ns \rfloor + 1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} (1 - \nu^{\sigma^j\omega}(A_n)) \right| \le \mathrm{(I)} + \mathrm{(II)} + \mathrm{(III)}, \tag{8.4}$$

with

$$\mathrm{(I)} = \sum_{j=\lfloor ns \rfloor + 1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} \nu^{\sigma^j\omega} \left(A_n \cap \left\{ R_{A_n}(\sigma^j\omega) \le N \right\} \right),$$

$$\mathrm{(II)} = \sum_{j=\lfloor ns \rfloor + 1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} \nu^{\sigma^j\omega}(A_n) \nu^{\sigma^j\omega}(R_{A_n}(\sigma^j\omega) \le N)$$

and

$$\mathrm{(III)} = \sum_{j=\lfloor ns \rfloor + 1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} \left\| P_{\sigma^j\omega}^N \left(\left[\mathbf{1}_{A_n} - \nu^{\sigma^j\omega}(A_n) \right] h_{\sigma^j\omega} \right) \right\|_{L^1(m)}.$$

To estimate (I), we choose $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $J \subset \{|x| > \varepsilon\}$ and we introduce $V_n = \{|\phi| > \varepsilon b_n\}$. For a measurable subset $V \subset Y$, we also define the shortest return to V by

$$r_\omega(V) = \inf_{x \in V} R_V(\omega)(x),$$

and we set

$$r(V) = \inf_{\omega \in \Omega} r_\omega(V).$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}\nu^{\sigma^j\omega}\left(A_n \cap \left\{R_{A_n}(\sigma^j\omega) \le N\right\}\right) &\le \nu^{\sigma^j\omega}\left(V_n \cap \left\{R_{V_n}(\sigma^j\omega) \le N\right\}\right)\\ &\le \sum_{i=r_{\sigma^j\omega}(V_n)}^{N} \nu^{\sigma^j\omega}\left(V_n \cap (T^i_{\sigma^j\omega})^{-1}(V_n)\right)\\ &\le \sum_{i=r_{\sigma^j\omega}(V_n)}^{N} \int_Y \mathbf{1}_{V_n} P^i_{\sigma^j\omega}(\mathbf{1}_{V_n} h_{\sigma^j\omega}) dm.\end{aligned}$$

It follows from **(Dec)** that

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\int_Y \mathbf{1}_{V_n} P^i_{\sigma^j\omega}(\mathbf{1}_{V_n} h_{\sigma^j\omega}) dm - \nu^{\sigma^j\omega}(V_n)\nu^{\sigma^{i+j}\omega}(V_n)\right| &\le \|\mathbf{1}_{V_n}\|_{L^1_m} \left\| P^i_{\sigma^j\omega}\left(\left[\mathbf{1}_{V_n} - \nu^{\sigma^j\omega}(V_n)\right] h_{\sigma^j\omega}\right)\right\|_{L^\infty_m}\\ &\le C\theta^i m(V_n) \left\|\left[\mathbf{1}_{V_n} - \nu^{\sigma^j\omega}(V_n)\right] h_{\sigma^j\omega}\right\|_{\mathrm{BV}}\\ &\le C\theta^i m(V_n),\end{aligned}$$

as BV is a Banach algebra, and both $\|\mathbf{1}_{V_n}\|_{\mathrm{BV}}$ and $\|h_{\sigma^j\omega}\|_{\mathrm{BV}}$ are uniformly bounded. [1].

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathrm{I}) &\le \sum_{j=\lfloor ns\rfloor+1}^{\lfloor nt\rfloor} \sum_{i=r_{\sigma^j\omega}(V_n)}^{N} \left[\nu^{\sigma^j\omega}(V_n)\nu^{\sigma^{i+j}\omega}(V_n) + \mathcal{O}\left(\theta^i m(V_n)\right)\right]\\ &\le C\left(m(V_n)^2 nN + m(V_n) n\theta^{r(V_n)}\right).\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have by (8.2),

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathrm{II}) &\le \sum_{j=\lfloor ns\rfloor+1}^{\lfloor nt\rfloor} \nu^{\sigma^j\omega}(A_n) \sum_{i=1}^{N} \nu^{\sigma^{i+j}\omega}(A_n)\\ &\le CnNm(A_n)^2,\end{aligned}$$

and it follows from **(Dec)** that

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathrm{III}) &\le C\theta^N \sum_{j=\lfloor ns\rfloor+1}^{\lfloor nt\rfloor} \left\|\left[\mathbf{1}_{A_n} - \nu^{\sigma^j\omega}(A_n)\right] h_{\sigma^j\omega}\right\|_{\mathrm{BV}}\\ &\le Cn\theta^N,\end{aligned}$$

since $\{h_\omega\}_{\omega\in\Omega}$ is a bounded family in BV, A_n is the union of at most two intervals and thus $\|\mathbf{1}_{A_n}\|_{\mathrm{BV}}$ is uniformly bounded. We can thus bound (8.4) by

$$C\left(m(V_n)^2 nN + m(V_n)n\theta^{r(V_n)} + m(A_n)^2 nN + n\theta^N\right) \le C\left(n^{-1}N + \theta^{r(V_n)} + n\theta^N\right),$$

and, assuming for the moment that $r(V_n) \to +\infty$, we obtain the conclusion by choosing $N = N(n) = 2\log n$ and letting $n \to \infty$.

It thus remains to show that $r(V_n) \to +\infty$. Recall that V_n is the ball of centre x_0 and radius $b^{-1}\varepsilon^{-\alpha}n^{-1}$. Let $R \ge 1$ be a positive integer. Since x_0 is assumed to be non-periodic, and that the collection of maps T^j_ω

[1] Recall that, from the definition of ϕ, it follows that V_n is an open interval, and thus $\mathbf{1}_{V_n}$ has a uniformly bounded BV norm.

for $\omega \in \Omega$ and $0 \le j < R$ is finite, we have that

$$\delta_R := \inf_{\omega\in\Omega} \inf_{0\le j<R} |T_\omega^j(x_0) - x_0| > 0$$

is positive. Since all the maps T_ω^j are continuous at x_0 by assumption, there exists $n_R \ge 1$ such that for all $n \ge n_R$, $j < R$ and $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$x \in V_n \Longrightarrow |T_\omega^j(x) - T_\omega^j(x_0)| < \frac{\delta_R}{2}.$$

Increasing n_R if necessary, we can assume that $b^{-1}\varepsilon^{-\alpha}n^{-1} < \frac{\delta_R}{2}$ for all $n \ge n_R$.

Then, for all $n \ge n_R$, $\omega \in \Omega$, $j < R$ and $x \in V_n$, we have

$$|T_\omega^j(x) - x_0| \ge |T_\omega^j(x_0) - x_0| - |T_\omega^j(x) - T_\omega^j(x_0)| > \frac{\delta_R}{2} > b^{-1}\varepsilon^{-\alpha}n^{-1},$$

and thus $T_\omega^j(x) \notin V_n$.

This implies that $r(V_n) > R$ for all $n \ge n_R$, which concludes the proof as R is arbitrary. □

Remark 8.6. *A quenched exponential law for random piecewise expanding maps of the interval is proved in Theorem 7.1* [HRY20, Section 7.1]. *Our proof follows the same standard approach. We are able to specify that Theorem 6.1 holds for non-periodic x_0, since our assumptions imply decay of correlations against L^1 observables, which is known to be necessary for this purpose, see* [AFV15, Section 3.1]. *Our proof is shorter, as we consider the simpler setting of finitely many maps, which are all uniformly expanding. In addition we use the exponential law in the intermittent case of Theorem 7.2* [HRY20, Section 7.2] *to establish the short returns condition of Lemma 8.7 below.*

8.2. **Exponential law: proof of Theorem 6.2.** In order to prove the exponential law in the intermittent setting, Theorem 6.2, we need a genericity condition on the point x_0 in the definition (2.1) of ϕ_{x_0}.

Lemma 8.7. *If $\gamma_{max} < \frac{1}{3}$, for m-a.e. x_0 and for $\mathbb{P}$-a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{j=\lfloor sn\rfloor+1}^{\lfloor tn\rfloor} m\left(B_{cn^{-1}}(x_0) \cap \left\{R^{\sigma^j\omega}_{B_{cn^{-1}}(x_0)} \le \lfloor n(\log n)^{-1}\rfloor\right\}\right) = 0.$$

for all $c > 0$ and all $0 \le s < t$.

Proof. Let $N = \lfloor n(\log n)^{-1}\rfloor$ an $V_n = B_{cn^{-1}}(x_0)$. First, we remark that for m-a.e. x_0 and $\mathbb{P}$-a.e. ω,

$$m\left(V_n \cap \{R_{V_n}(\omega) \le N\}\right) = o(n^{-1}). \tag{8.5}$$

This is a consequence of [HRY20, Theorem 7.2]. Their result is stated for two intermittent LSV maps both with $\gamma < \frac{1}{3}$ but generalizes immediately to a finite collection of maps with a uniform bound of $\gamma_{max} < \frac{1}{3}$. The exponential law for return times to nested balls imples that for a fixed t, for m-a.e x_0 and $\mathbb{P}$-a.e. ω

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{\nu^\omega(V_n)}\nu^\omega\left(V_n \cap \{R_{V_n}(\omega) \le nt\}\right) = 1 - e^{-t}.$$

which shows in particular, since $\{R_{V_n}(\omega) \le N\} \subset \{R_{V_n}(\omega) \le nt\}$ for all n large enough, that for all $t > 0$, m-a.e x_0 and $\mathbb{P}$-a.e. ω

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{\nu^\omega(V_n)}\nu^\omega\left(V_n \cap \{R_{V_n}(\omega) \le N\}\right) \le 1 - e^{-t}. \tag{8.6}$$

Using (5.12), taking the limit $t \to 0$ proves (8.5). Note that, even though the set of full measure of x_0 and ω such that (8.6) holds may depend on t, it is enough to consider only a sequence $t_k \to 0$.

Now, for $k \ge 0$ and $n_0 \ge 1$, we introduce the set

$$\Omega_k^{n_0} = \left\{\omega \in \Omega \,:\, m\left(V_n \cap \{R_{V_n}(\omega) \le N\}\right) \le \frac{2^{-k}}{n} \text{ for all } n \ge n_0\right\}.$$

According to (8.5), we have for all $k \geq 0$,

$$\lim_{n_0\to\infty} \mathbb{P}(\Omega_k^{n_0}) = \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{n_0\geq 1} \Omega_k^{n_0}\right) = 1.$$

By the Birkhoff ergodic theorem, for al $k \geq 0$, $n_0 \geq 1$ and $\mathbb{P}$-a.e. ω,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k^{n_0}}(\sigma^j\omega) = \mathbb{P}(\Omega_k^{n_0}),$$

which implies that for all $0 \leq s < t$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{(\lfloor nt\rfloor - \lfloor ns\rfloor)} \sum_{j=\lfloor ns\rfloor+1}^{\lfloor nt\rfloor} \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k^{n_0}}(\sigma^j\omega) = \mathbb{P}(\Omega_k^{n_0}).$$

Let $n_0 = n_0(\omega, k)$ such that $\mathbb{P}(\Omega_k^{n_0}) \geq 1 - 2^{-k}$, and for all $n \geq n_0$,

$$\frac{1}{(\lfloor nt\rfloor - \lfloor ns\rfloor)} \sum_{j=\lfloor ns\rfloor+1}^{\lfloor nt\rfloor} \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_k^{n_0}}(\sigma^j\omega) \geq \mathbb{P}(\Omega_k^{n_0}) - 2^{-k}.$$

Then, for all $n \geq n_0(\omega, k)$ we have

$$\frac{1}{(\lfloor nt\rfloor - \lfloor ns\rfloor)} \sum_{j=\lfloor ns\rfloor+1}^{\lfloor nt\rfloor} \mathbf{1}_{(\Omega_k^{n_0})^c}(\sigma^j\omega) \leq 2^{-(k-1)}.$$

Consequently,

$$\sum_{\lfloor ns\rfloor+1}^{\lfloor nt\rfloor} m\left(V_n \cap \{R_{V_n}(\omega) \leq N\}\right) \leq (\lfloor nt\rfloor - \lfloor ns\rfloor)\,\frac{2^{-k}}{n} + (\lfloor nt\rfloor - \lfloor ns\rfloor)\,2^{-(k-1)} m(V_n).$$

This proves that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \sum_{\lfloor ns\rfloor+1}^{\lfloor nt\rfloor} m\left(V_n \cap \{R_{V_n}(\omega) \leq N\}\right) \leq C\,2^{-k},$$

and the result follows by taking the limit $k \to \infty$.

Note that the set of x_0 and ω for which the lemma holds depends a priori on $c > 0$, but it is enough to consider a countable and dense set of c, since for $c < c'$,

$$\left\{B_{cn^{-1}}(x_0) \cap \left\{R^{\omega}_{B_{cn^{-1}}(x_0)} \leq N\right\}\right\} \subset \left\{B_{c'n^{-1}}(x_0) \cap \left\{R^{\omega}_{B_{c'n^{-1}}(x_0)} \leq N\right\}\right\}.$$

$\square$

The exponential law for random intermittent maps follows from Lemma 8.7:

Proof of Theorem 6.2. We consider the three terms in (8.4) with $N = \lfloor n(\log n)^{-1}\rfloor$.

Let $V_n = \{|\phi| > \varepsilon b_n\}$ where $\varepsilon > 0$ is such that $A_n \subset V_n$ for all $n \geq 1$. Since V_n is a ball of centre x_0 and radius $b^{-1}\varepsilon^{-\alpha}n^{-1}$, and since $V_n \subset [\delta, 1]$, the term

$$(\mathrm{I}) = \sum_{j=\lfloor ns\rfloor+1}^{\lfloor nt\rfloor} \nu^{\sigma^j\omega}\left(A_n \cap \left\{R_{A_n}(\sigma^j\omega) \leq N\right\}\right) \leq C \sum_{j=\lfloor ns\rfloor+1}^{\lfloor nt\rfloor} m\left(V_n \cap \left\{R_{V_n}(\sigma^j\omega) \leq N\right\}\right)$$

tends to zero by Lemma 8.7 for m-a.e x_0.

The term

$$(\mathrm{II}) = \sum_{j=\lfloor ns\rfloor+1}^{\lfloor nt\rfloor} \nu^{\sigma^j\omega}(A_n)\nu^{\sigma^j\omega}(R_{A_n}(\sigma^j\omega)\le N) \le CnNm(A_n)^2$$

also tends to zero since $N = o(n)$. Lastly we consider

$$(\mathrm{III}) = \sum_{j=\lfloor ns\rfloor+1}^{\lfloor nt\rfloor} \left\| P^N_{\sigma^j\omega}\left(\left[\mathbf{1}_{A_n} - \nu^{\sigma^j\omega}(A_n)\right] h_{\sigma^j\omega}\right)\right\|_{L^1(m)}.$$

We approximate $\mathbf{1}_{A_n}$ by a C^1 function g such that $\|g\|_{C^1} \le n^\tau$, $g = \mathbf{1}_{A_n}$ on A_n and $\|g - \mathbf{1}_{A_n}\|_{L^1} \le n^{-\tau}$ (recall A_n is two intervals of length roughly $\frac{1}{n}$ so a simple smoothing at the endpoints of the intervals allows us to find such a function g). Later we will specify $\tau > 1$ will suffice. By [NPT21, Lemma 3.4] with $h = h_\omega$ and $\varphi = g - m(gh_\omega)$, for all ω,

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|P^N_\omega([g - m(gh_\omega)]h_\omega)\right\|_{L^1} &\le Cn^\tau N^{1-\frac{1}{\gamma_{max}}}(\log N)^{\frac{1}{\gamma_{max}}}\\ &\le Cn^{\tau+1-\frac{1}{\gamma_{max}}}(\log n)^{\frac{2}{\gamma_{max}}-1}.\end{aligned}$$

Using the decomposition $\mathbf{1}_{A_n} - \nu^\omega(A_n) = (\mathbf{1}_{A_n} - g) - (\nu^\omega(A_n) - m(gh_\omega)) + (g - m(gh_\omega))$ we estimate, leaving out the log term,

$$(\mathrm{III}) \le C\left[n^{1-\tau} + n^{\tau+2-\frac{1}{\gamma_{max}}}\right]$$

where the value of C may change line to line. Taking $\gamma_{max} < \frac{1}{3}$ and $1 < \tau < \frac{1}{\gamma_{max}} - 2$ suffices. □

9. Point process results

We now proceed to the proof of the Poisson convergence. In Section 11 we will consider an annealed version of our results.

9.1. Uniformly expanding maps: proof of Theorem 6.3.

Recall Theorem 6.3: under the conditions of Section 2.1, in particular **(LY)**, **(Min)** and **(Dec)**, if $x_0 \notin \mathcal{D}$ is not periodic, then for $\mathbb{P}$-a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$

$$N^\omega_n \xrightarrow{d} N_{(\alpha)}$$

under the probability measure ν^ω.

Our proof of Theorem 6.3 uses the existence of a spectral gap for the associated transfer operators P^n_ω, and breaks down in the setting of Example 2.2. The use of the spectral gap is encapsulated in the following lemma.

Lemma 9.1. *Assume* **(LY)**. *Then there exists $C > 0$ such that for all $\omega \in \Omega$, all $f, f_n \in \mathrm{BV}$ with*

$$\sup_{j\ge1}\|f_j\|_{L^\infty(m)} \le 1 \quad and \quad \sup_{j\ge1}\|f_j\|_{\mathrm{BV}} < \infty,$$

we have

$$\sup_{n\ge0}\left\|P^n_\omega\left(f\cdot\prod_{j=1}^n f_j\circ T^j_\omega\right)\right\|_{\mathrm{BV}} \le C\|f\|_{\mathrm{BV}}\left(\sup_{j\ge1}\|f_j\|_{\mathrm{BV}}\right)$$

Proof. We proceed in four steps.

Step 1. We define

$$g^n_\omega = \prod_{j=0}^n f_j\circ T^j_\omega,$$

where we have set $f_0 = \mathbf{1}$. We observe that for all $n \geq 0$, there exists $C_n > 0$ such that for all $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$\|g_\omega^n\|_{L^\infty(m)} \leq \left(\sup_{j\geq 1} \|f_j\|_{L^\infty(m)}\right)^{n+1} \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \|g_\omega^n\|_{\mathrm{BV}} \leq C_n \left(\sup_{j\geq 1} \|f_j\|_{\mathrm{BV}}\right). \tag{9.1}$$

The first estimate is immediate, and the second follows, because

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Var}(g_\omega^{n+1}) &\leq \mathrm{Var}(g_\omega^n)\|f_{n+1}\circ T_\omega^{n+1}\|_{L^\infty(m)} + \|g_\omega^n\|_{L^\infty(m)}\mathrm{Var}(f_{n+1}\circ T_\omega^{n+1}) \\
&\leq \mathrm{Var}(g_\omega^n) + \mathrm{Var}(f_{n+1}\circ T_\omega^{n+1}) \\
&= \mathrm{Var}(g_\omega^n) + \sum_{I\in\mathcal{A}_\omega^{n+1}} \mathrm{Var}_I(f_{n+1}\circ T_\omega^{n+1}) \\
&= \mathrm{Var}(g_\omega^n) + \sum_{I\in\mathcal{A}_\omega^{n+1}} \mathrm{Var}_{T_\omega^{n+1}(I)}(f_{n+1}) \\
&\leq \mathrm{Var}(g_\omega^n) + \left(\#\mathcal{A}_\omega^{n+1}\right)\mathrm{Var}(f_{n+1}),
\end{aligned}$$

and so we can define by induction $C_{n+1} = C_n + \sup_{\omega\in\Omega} \#\mathcal{A}_\omega^{n+1}$ which is finite, as there are only finitely many maps in $\mathcal{S}$.

Step 2. We first prove the lemma in the case where $r = 1$ in the condition **(LY)**. Before, we claim that for $f \in \mathrm{BV}$ and sequences $(f_j) \subset \mathrm{BV}$ as in the statement, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Var}\left(P_\omega^n(fg_\omega^n)\right) \leq \sum_{j=0}^{n} \rho^j \|P_\omega^{n-j}(fg_\omega^{n-j-1})\|_{L^\infty(m)}\|f_{n-j}\|_{\mathrm{BV}} \\
+ D\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \rho^j \|P_\omega^{n-1-j}(fg_\omega^{n-1-j})\|_{L^1(m)}\|f_{n-j}\|_{L^\infty(m)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{9.2}$$

This implies the lemma when $r = 1$, since

$$\|P_\omega^{n-j}(fg_\omega^{n-j-1})\|_{L^\infty(m)} \leq \|g_\omega^{n-j-1}\|_{L^\infty(m)}\|P_\omega^{n-j}|f|\|_{L^\infty(m)} \leq C\|f\|_{\mathrm{BV}},$$

and

$$\|P_\omega^{n-j}(fg_\omega^{n-j})\|_{L^1(m)} \leq \|fg_\omega^{n-j}\|_{L^1(m)} \leq \|f\|_{L^\infty(m)}\|g_\omega^{n-j}\|_{L^1(m)} \leq \|f\|_{\mathrm{BV}}.$$

We prove the claim by induction on $n \geq 0$. It is immediate for $n = 0$, and for the induction step, we have, using **(LY)**,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{Var}(P_\omega^{n+1}(fg_\omega^{n+1})) \\
&\quad = \mathrm{Var}(P_\omega^{n+1}(fg_\omega^n f_{n+1}\circ T_\omega^{n+1})) = \mathrm{Var}(P_\omega^{n+1}(fg_\omega^n)f_{n+1}) \\
&\quad \leq \mathrm{Var}(P_\omega^{n+1}(fg_\omega^n))\|f_{n+1}\|_{L^\infty(m)} + \|P_\omega^{n+1}(fg_\omega^n)\|_{L^\infty(m)}\mathrm{Var}(f_{n+1}) \\
&\quad \leq \left(\rho\mathrm{Var}(P_\omega^n(fg_\omega^n)) + D\|P_\omega^n(fg_\omega^n)\|_{L^1(m)}\right)\|f_{n+1}\|_{L^\infty(m)} + \|P_\omega^{n+1}(fg_\omega^n)\|_{L^\infty(m)}\mathrm{Var}(f_{n+1}) \\
&\quad \leq \rho\mathrm{Var}(P_\omega^n(fg_\omega^n)) + D\|P_\omega^n(fg_\omega^n)\|_{L^1(m)}\|f_{n+1}\|_{L^\infty(m)} + \|P_\omega^{n+1}(fg_\omega^n)\|_{L^\infty(m)}\|f_{n+1}\|_{\mathrm{BV}},
\end{aligned}$$

which proves (9.2) for $n + 1$, assuming it holds for n.

Step 3. Now, we consider the general case $r \geq 1$ and we assume that n is of the particular form $n = pr$, with $p \geq 0$. We note that the random system defined with $\mathcal{T} = \{T_\omega^r\}_{\omega\in\Omega}$ satisfies the condition **(LY)** with

$r = 1$. Consequently, by the second step and (9.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|P_\omega^n(fg_\omega^n)\|_{\mathrm{BV}} &= \left\| P^r_{\sigma^{r-1}\omega} \circ \ldots \circ P^r_\omega \left(f \prod_{j=1}^{p} g^r_{\sigma^{jr}\omega} \circ T^{jr}_\omega \right) \right\|_{\mathrm{BV}} \\ &\le C\|f\|_{\mathrm{BV}} \left(\sup_{j\ge1} \|g^r_{\sigma^{jr}\omega}\|_{\mathrm{BV}} \right) \le CC_r\|f\|_{\mathrm{BV}} \left(\sup_{j\ge1} \|f_j\|_{\mathrm{BV}} \right).\end{aligned}$$

Step 4. Finally, if $n = pr + q$, with $p \ge 0$ and $q \in \{0, \ldots, r-1\}$, as an immediate consequence of **(LY)**, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\|P_\omega^n(fg_\omega^n)\|_{\mathrm{BV}} &= \|P^q_{\sigma^{pr}\omega} P^{pr}_\omega (fg^{pr}_\omega g^q_{\sigma^{pr}\omega} \circ T^{pr}_\omega)\|_{\mathrm{BV}} \\ &= \|P^q_{\sigma^{pr}\omega}(P^{pr}_\omega(fg^{pr}_\omega) g^q_{\sigma^{pr}\omega})\|_{\mathrm{BV}} \le C\|P^{pr}_\omega(fg^{pr}_\omega)g^q_{\sigma^{pr}\omega}\|_{\mathrm{BV}}.\end{aligned}$$

But, from Step 3, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|P^{pr}_\omega(fg^{pr}_\omega)g^q_{\sigma^{pr}\omega}\|_{L^1(m)} &\le \|g^q_{\sigma^{pr}\omega}\|_{L^\infty(m)} \|P^{pr}_\omega(fg^{pr}_\omega)\|_{L^1(m)} \\ &\le \|P^{pr}_\omega(fg^{pr}_\omega)\|_{L^1(m)} \le C\|f\|_{\mathrm{BV}} \left(\sup_{j\ge1} \|f_j\|_{\mathrm{BV}} \right),\end{aligned}$$

and, using (9.1),

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Var}(P^{pr}_\omega(fg^{pr}_\omega)g^q_{\sigma^{pr}\omega}) &\le \|P^{pr}_\omega(fg^{pr}_\omega)\|_{L^\infty(m)} \mathrm{Var}(g^q_{\sigma^{pr}\omega}) + \mathrm{Var}(P^{pr}_\omega(fg^{pr}_\omega))\|g^q_{\sigma^{pr}\omega}\|_{L^\infty(m)} \\ &\le \left[C_q \|g^{pr}_\omega\|_{L^\infty(m)} \|P^{pr}_\omega |f| \|_{L^\infty(m)} + C\|f\|_{\mathrm{BV}} \right] \left(\sup_{j\ge1} \|f_j\|_{\mathrm{BV}} \right) \\ &\le C \left(1 + \max_{q=0,\ldots,r-1} C_q \right) \|f\|_{\mathrm{BV}} \left(\sup_{j\ge1} \|f_j\|_{\mathrm{BV}} \right),\end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof of the lemma. □

Proof of Theorem 6.3. We denote by $\mathcal{R}$ the family of finite unions of rectangles R of the form $R = (s,t] \times J$ with $J \in \mathcal{J}$. By Kallenberg's theorem, see [Kal76, Theorem 4.7] or [Res87, Proposition 3.22], $N_n^\omega \xrightarrow{d} N_{(\alpha)}$ if for any $R \in \mathcal{R}$,

$$(a) \ \lim_{n\to\infty} \nu^\omega(N_n^\omega(R) = 0) = \mathbb{P}(N_{(\alpha)}(R) = 0),$$

and

$$(b) \ \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_{\nu^\omega} N_n^\omega(R) = \mathbb{E}N_{(\alpha)}(R).$$

We first prove (b). We write

$$R = \bigcup_{i=1}^k R_i,$$

with $R_i = (s_i, t_i] \times J_i$ disjoint.

Then

$$\mathbb{E}N_{(\alpha)}(R) = \sum_{i=1}^k (t_i - s_i)\Pi_\alpha(J_i)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{\nu^\omega} N_n^\omega(R) = \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbb{E}_{\nu^\omega} N_n^\omega((s_i,t_i]\times J_i) &= \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{ns_i<j\le nt_i} \mathbb{E}_{\nu^\omega}(\mathbf{1}_{\phi_{x_0}^{-1}(b_nJ_i)}\circ T_\omega^{j-1}) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{ns_i<j\le nt_i} \nu^{\sigma^{j-1}\omega}(\phi_{x_0}^{-1}(b_nJ_i)) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=\lfloor ns_i\rfloor}^{\lfloor nt_i\rfloor-1} \nu^{\sigma^j\omega}(\phi_{x_0}^{-1}(b_nJ_i)).\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 8.1, for $\mathbb{P}$-a.e. $\omega\in\Omega$, we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=\lfloor ns_i\rfloor}^{\lfloor nt_i\rfloor-1} \nu^{\sigma^j\omega}(\phi_{x_0}^{-1}(b_nJ_i)) = (t_i-s_i)\Pi_\alpha(J_i),$$

which proves (b).

We next establish (a). We will use induction on the number of "time" intervals $(s_i,t_i]\subset(0,\infty]$. Let $R=(s_1,t_1]\times J_1$ where $J_1\in\mathcal{J}$. Define

$$A_n=\phi_{x_0}^{-1}(b_nJ_1).$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned}\{N_n^\omega(R)=0\} &= \{x : T_\omega^j(x)\notin A_n, ns_1<j+1\le nt_1\} \\ &= \left\{1_{A_n^c}\circ T_\omega^{\lfloor ns_1\rfloor}\cdot 1_{A_n^c}\circ T_\omega^{\lfloor ns_1\rfloor+1}\cdot\ldots\cdot 1_{A_n^c}\circ T_\omega^{\lfloor nt_1\rfloor-1}\neq 0\right\} \\ &= \left\{x : \left(\prod_{j=0}^{\lfloor nt_1\rfloor-1-\lfloor ns_1\rfloor} 1_{A_n^c}\circ T^j_{\sigma^{\lfloor ns_1\rfloor}\omega}\right)\circ T_\omega^{\lfloor ns_1\rfloor}(x)\neq 0\right\},\end{aligned}$$

we have that,

$$\tag{9.3}\begin{aligned}&\left|\nu^\omega(N_n^\omega(R)=0)-\nu^{\sigma^{\lfloor ns_1\rfloor}\omega}\left(R_{A_n}(\sigma^{\lfloor ns_1\rfloor}\omega)>\lfloor n(t_1-s_1)\rfloor\right)\right| \\ &\qquad\le \nu^{\sigma^{\lfloor ns_1\rfloor}\omega}(R_{A_n}(\sigma^{\lfloor ns_1\rfloor}\omega)=0)=\nu^{\sigma^{\lfloor ns_1\rfloor}\omega}(A_n)\le Cm(A_n)\to 0,\end{aligned}$$

because, due to rounding when taking integer parts, $\lfloor nt_1\rfloor-\lfloor ns_1\rfloor-1$ is either equal to $\lfloor n(t_1-s_1)\rfloor-1$ or to $\lfloor n(t_1-s_1)\rfloor$. By Theorem 6.1,

$$\nu^{\sigma^{\lfloor ns_1\rfloor}\omega}(R_{A_n}(\sigma^{\lfloor ns_1\rfloor}\omega)>\lfloor n(t_1-s_1)\rfloor)\to e^{-(t_1-s_1)\Pi_\alpha(J)}$$

as desired.

Now let $R=\cup_{j=1}^k(s_i,t_i]\times J_i$ with $0\le s_1<t_1<\ldots<s_k<t_k$ and $J_i\in\mathcal{J}$. Furthermore, define $s_i'=s_i-s_1$ and $t_i'=t_i-s_1$.

Observe that, accounting for the rounding errors when taking integer parts as for (9.3), we get

$$\tag{9.4}\begin{aligned}&\left|\nu^\omega\left(N_n^\omega\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^k(s_i,t_i]\times J_i\right)=0\right)-\nu^{\sigma^{\lfloor ns_1\rfloor}\omega}\left(N_n^{\sigma^{\lfloor ns_1\rfloor}\omega}\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^k(s_i',t_i']\times J_i\right)=0\right)\right| \\ &\qquad\le 2C\sum_{i=1}^k m(\phi_{x_0}^{-1}(b_nJ_i))\to 0\end{aligned}$$

so, after replacing ω by $\sigma^{\lfloor ns_1 \rfloor}\omega$, we can assume that $s_1 = 0$. Let

$$R_1 = (0, t_1] \times J_1$$
$$R_2 = \bigcup_{i=2}^{k} (s_i, t_i] \times J_i$$
$$R_2' = \bigcup_{i=2}^{k} (s_i - s_2, t_i - s_2] \times J_i$$

Then, with $A_n = \phi_{x_0}^{-1}(b_n J_1)$,

$$\left| \nu^\eta \left(N_n^\eta \left(R_1 \cup R_2 \right) = 0 \right) - \nu^\eta \left[\{ R_{A_n}(\eta) > \lfloor nt_1 \rfloor \} \cap T_\eta^{-\lfloor ns_2 \rfloor} \left(N_n^{\sigma^{\lfloor ns_2 \rfloor}\eta}(R_2') = 0 \right) \right] \right| \to 0 \tag{9.5}$$

as $n \to \infty$, uniformly in $\eta \in \Omega$, as in (9.4). Moreover, as we check below,

$$\left| \nu^\eta \left[\{ R_{A_n}(\eta) > \lfloor nt_1 \rfloor \} \cap T_\eta^{-\lfloor ns_2 \rfloor} \left(N_n^{\sigma^{\lfloor ns_2 \rfloor}\eta}(R_2') = 0 \right) \right] \right.$$
$$\left. - \nu^\eta (R_{A_n}(\eta) > \lfloor nt_1 \rfloor) \cdot \nu^\eta (N_n^\eta (R_2) = 0) \right| \to 0 \tag{9.6}$$

as $n \to \infty$, uniformly in $\eta \in \Omega$. Therefore, setting $\eta = \sigma^{\lfloor ns_2 \rfloor}\omega$ in (9.5) and (9.6), we have, by Theorem 6.1,

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \left| \nu^{\sigma^{\lfloor ns_2 \rfloor}\omega} (N_n^{\sigma^{\lfloor ns_2 \rfloor}\omega} (R_1 \cup R_2) = 0) - e^{-t_1 \Pi_\alpha(J_1)} \nu^{\sigma^{\lfloor ns_2 \rfloor}\omega} (N_n^{\sigma^{\lfloor ns_2 \rfloor}\omega} (R_2) = 0) \right| = 0$$

which gives the induction step in the proof of (a).

We prove now (9.6). Our proof uses the spectral gap for P_ω^n and breaks down for random intermittent maps.

Similarly to (9.4),

$$\left| \nu^\eta (N_n^\eta (R_2) = 0) - \nu^\eta (T_\eta^{-\lfloor ns_2 \rfloor} (N_n^{\sigma^{\lfloor ns_2 \rfloor}\eta} (R_2') = 0)) \right| \to 0 \text{ as } n \to \infty, \text{ uniformly in } \eta.$$

We have, using the notation

$$U = \{ R_{A_n}(\eta) > \lfloor nt_1 \rfloor \}, \qquad V = \left\{ N_n^{\sigma^{\lfloor ns_2 \rfloor}\eta} (R_2') = 0 \right\},$$

that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \nu^\eta \left(U \cap T_\eta^{-\lfloor ns_2 \rfloor}(V) \right) - \nu^\eta(U) \nu^\eta \left(T_\eta^{-\lfloor ns_2 \rfloor}(V) \right) \right| \\ &= \left| \int P_\eta^{\lfloor ns_2 \rfloor} \left((\mathbf{1}_U - \nu^\eta(U)) h_\eta \right) \mathbf{1}_V \, dm \right| \\ &\le C \left\| P_\eta^{\lfloor ns_2 \rfloor} \left((\mathbf{1}_U - \nu^\eta(U)) h_\eta \right) \right\|_{BV} \\ &= \left\| P_{\sigma^{\lfloor nt_1 \rfloor}\eta}^{\lfloor ns_2 \rfloor - \lfloor nt_1 \rfloor} P_\eta^{\lfloor nt_1 \rfloor} \left((\mathbf{1}_U - \nu^\eta(U)) h_\eta \right) \right\|_{\mathrm{BV}} \\ &\le C \theta^{\lfloor ns_2 \rfloor - \lfloor nt_1 \rfloor} \left\| P_\eta^{\lfloor nt_1 \rfloor} \left((\mathbf{1}_U - \nu^\eta(U)) h_\eta \right) \right\|_{\mathrm{BV}} \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the decay, uniform in η, of $\{P_\eta^k\}_k$ in BV (condition **(Dec)**).

But

$$\sup_\eta \sup_n \left\| P_\eta^{\lfloor nt_1 \rfloor} \left((\mathbf{1}_{\{R_{A_n}(\eta) > \lfloor nt_1 \rfloor\}} - \nu^\eta (R_{A_n}(\eta) > \lfloor nt_1 \rfloor)) h_\eta \right) \right\|_{\mathrm{BV}} < \infty, \tag{9.7}$$

which proves (9.6). This follows from Lemma 9.1 below applied to $f = h_\eta$ and $f_j = \mathbf{1}_{A_n^c}$, because

$$\mathbf{1}_{\{R_{A_n}(\eta) > \lfloor nt_1 \rfloor\}} = \prod_{j=1}^{\lfloor nt_1 \rfloor} \mathbf{1}_{A_n^c} \circ T_\eta^j,$$

and both $\|h_\eta\|_{\mathrm{BV}}$ and $\|\mathbf{1}_{A_n^c}\|_{\mathrm{BV}}$ are uniformly bounded. Note that for the stationary case the estimate (9.7) is used in the proof of [TK10b, Theorem 4.4], which refers to [ADSZ04, Proposition 4]. $\square$

9.2. **Intermittent maps: proof of Theorem 6.4.** We prove a weaker form of convergence in the setting of Example 2.2, which suffices to establish stable limit laws but not functional limit laws.

In the setting of Example 2.2, we will show that for $\mathbb{P}$-a.e. ω,

$$N_n^\omega((0,1] \times \cdot) \xrightarrow{d} N_{(\alpha)}((0,1] \times \cdot)$$

Proof of Theorem 6.4. We will show that for $\mathbb{P}$-a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$, the assumptions of Kallenberg's theorem [Kal76, Theorem 4.7] hold.

Recall that $\mathcal{J}$ denotes the set of all finite unions of intervals of the form $(x, y]$ where $x < y$ and $0 \notin [x, y]$.

By Kallenberg's theorem [Kal76, Theorem 4.7], $N_n^\omega[(0,1] \times \cdot) \to^d N_{(\alpha)}((0,1] \times \cdot)$ if for all $J \in \mathcal{J}$,

$$(a) \lim_{n\to\infty} \nu^\omega(N_n^\omega((0,1] \times J) = 0) = \mathbb{P}(N_{(\alpha)}((0,1] \times J) = 0)$$

and

$$(b) \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_{\nu^\omega} N_n^\omega((0,1] \times J) = \mathbb{E}[N_{(\alpha)}((0,1] \times J)]$$

We prove first (b) following [TK10b, page 12]. Write

$$J = \bigcup_{i=1}^k J_i$$

with $J_i = (x_i, y_i]$ disjoint.

Then

$$\mathbb{E} N_{(\alpha)}((0,1] \times J) = \sum_{i=1}^k \Pi_\alpha(J_i) = \Pi_\alpha(J)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}_{\nu^\omega} N_n^\omega((0,1] \times J) = \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{\nu^\omega}[\mathbf{1}_{(\phi_{x_0}^{-1}(b_n J_i))} \circ T_\omega^{j-1}] = \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{\nu^\omega}[\mathbf{1}_{(\phi_{x_0}^{-1}(b_n J))} \circ T_\omega^{j-1}]$$

We check that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{\nu^\omega} \left(\mathbf{1}_{\{\phi_{x_0}^{-1}(b_n J)\}} \circ T_\omega^j \right) = \Pi_\alpha(J)$$

for $J = \cup_{i=1}^k J_i$.

Write $A_n := \phi_{x_0}^{-1}(b_n J)$. Then

$$\mathbb{E}_{\nu^\omega}[\mathbf{1}_{(\phi_{x_0}^{-1}(b_n J))} \circ T_\omega^j] = \nu^{\sigma^j \omega}(A_n)$$

hence

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{\nu^\omega}[\mathbf{1}_{(\phi_{x_0}^{-1}(b_n J_i))} \circ T_\omega^j(x)] = \Pi_\alpha(J)$$

by Lemma 7.2.

Now we prove (a), i.e.

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \nu^\omega(N_n^\omega((0,1] \times J) = 0) = P(N_{(\alpha)}((0,1] \times J) = 0)$$

for all $J \in \mathcal{J}$.

Let $J \in \mathcal{J}$ and denote as above $A_n := \phi_{x_0}^{-1}(b_n J) \subset X = [0,1]$. Then

$$\{N_n^\omega((0,1] \times J) = 0\} = \{x : T_\omega^j(x) \notin A_n, 0 < j+1 \le n\} = \{R_{A_n}(\omega) > n-1\} \cap A_n^c$$

Hence

$$|\nu^\omega(N_n^\omega((0,1] \times J) = 0) - \nu^\omega(R_{A_n}(\omega) > n)| \le Cm(A_n) \to 0$$

and by Theorem 6.2, for m-a.e. x_0

$$\nu^\omega(R_{A_n}(\omega) > n) \to e^{-\Pi_\alpha(J)}.$$

This proves (a). $\square$

10. Stable laws and functional limit laws

10.1. **Uniformly expanding maps: proof of Theorem 2.4.** In this section, we prove Theorem 2.4, under the conditions given in Section 2.1, in particular **(LY)**, **(Dec)** and **(Min)**.

For this purpose, we consider first some technical lemmas regarding short returns. For $\omega \in \Omega$, $n \ge 1$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, let

$$\mathcal{E}_n^\omega(\varepsilon) = \{x \in [0,1] \,:\, |T_\omega^n(x) - x| \le \varepsilon\}.$$

Lemma 10.1. *There exists $C > 0$ such that for all $\omega \in \Omega$, $n \ge 1$ and $\varepsilon > 0$,*

$$m(\mathcal{E}_n^\omega(\varepsilon)) \le C\varepsilon.$$

Proof. We follow the proof of [HNT12, Lemma 3.4], conveniently adapted to our setting of random non-Markov maps. Recall that $\mathcal{A}_\omega^n$ is the partition of monotonicity associated to the map T_ω^n. Consider $I \in \mathcal{A}_\omega^n$. Since $\inf_I |(T_\omega^n)'| \ge \lambda^n > 1$, there exists at most one solution $x_I^\pm \in I$ to the equation

$$T_\omega^n(x_I^\pm) = x_I^\pm \pm \varepsilon, \tag{10.1}$$

and since there is no sign change of $(T_\omega^n)'$ on I, we have

$$\mathcal{E}_n^\omega(\varepsilon) \cap I \subset [x_I^-, x_I^+]. \tag{10.2}$$

We have

$$T_\omega^n(x_I^+) - T_\omega^n(x_I^-) = x_I^+ - x_I^- + 2\varepsilon,$$

and by the mean value theorem,

$$\left|T_\omega^n(x_I^+) - T_\omega^n(x_I^-)\right| = |(T_\omega^n)'(c)| \left|x_I^+ - x_I^-\right|, \text{ for some } c \in I.$$

Consequently,

$$\left|x_I^+ - x_I^-\right| \le \left(\sup_I \frac{1}{|(T_\omega^n)'|}\right) \left[\left|x_I^+ - x_I^-\right| + 2\varepsilon\right] \le \lambda^{-n} \left|x_I^+ - x_I^-\right| + 2\varepsilon \sup_I \frac{1}{|(T_\omega^n)'|}. \tag{10.3}$$

Note that if there is no solutions to (10.1), then the estimate (10.3) is actually improved. Rearranging (10.3) and summing over $I \in \mathcal{A}_\omega^n$, we obtain thanks to (10.2)

$$m(\mathcal{E}_n^\omega(\varepsilon)) \le \sum_{I \in \mathcal{A}_\omega^n} \left|x_I^+ - x_I^-\right| \le \frac{2\varepsilon}{1 - \lambda^{-n}} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{A}_\omega^n} \sup_I \frac{1}{|(T_\omega^n)'|} \le C\varepsilon.$$

The fact that

$$\sum_{I \in \mathcal{A}_\omega^n} \sup_I \frac{1}{|(T_\omega^n)'|} \le C \tag{10.4}$$

for a constant $C > 0$ independent from ω and n follows from a standard distortion argument for one-dimensional maps that can be found in the proof of part 3 of [ANV15, Lemma 8.5] (see also [AR16, Lemma 7]), where finitely many piecewise C^2 uniformly expanding maps with finitely many discontinuities are also considered. Since it follows from **(LY)** that $\|P_\omega^n f\|_{\mathrm{BV}} \le C\|f\|_{\mathrm{BV}}$ for some uniform $C > 0$, we do not have to average (10.4) over ω as in [ANV15], but instead we can simply have an estimate that holds uniformly in ω. $\square$

Recall that, for a measurable subset U, $R_U^\omega(x) \geq 1$ is the hitting time of (ω, x) to U defined by (6.1).

Lemma 10.2. *Let $a > 0$, $\frac{2}{3} < \psi < 1$ and $0 < \kappa < 3\psi - 2$. Then there exist sequences $(\gamma_1(n))_{n\geq 1}$ and $(\gamma_2(n))_{n\geq 1}$ with $\gamma_1(n) = \mathcal{O}(n^{-\kappa})$ and $\gamma_2(n) = o(1)$, and for all $\omega \in \Omega$, a sequence of measurable subsets $(A_n^\omega)_{n\geq 1}$ of $[0,1]$ with $m(A_n^\omega) \leq \gamma_1(n)$ and such that for all $x_0 \notin A_n^\omega$,*

$$(\log n) \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} m\left(B_{n^{-\psi}}(x_0) \cap \left\{R^{\sigma^i\omega}_{B_{n^{-\psi}}(x_0)} \leq \lfloor a \log n \rfloor\right\}\right) \leq \gamma_2(n).$$

Proof. Let

$$E_n^\omega = \left\{x \in [0,1] \,:\, |T_\omega^j(x) - x| \leq 2n^{-\psi} \text{ for some } 0 < j \leq \lfloor a \log n \rfloor\right\}.$$

Since $B_{n^{-\psi}}(x_0) \cap \left\{R^{\sigma^i\omega}_{B_{n^{-\psi}}(x_0)} \leq \lfloor a \log n \rfloor\right\} \subset B_{n^{-\psi}}(x_0) \cap E_n^{\sigma^i\omega}$, it is enough to consider

$$(\log n) \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} m\left(B_{n^{-\psi}}(x_0) \cap E_n^{\sigma^i\omega}\right).$$

According to Lemma 10.1, we have

$$m(E_n^\omega) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor a \log n \rfloor} m\left(\mathcal{E}_j^\omega(2n^{-\psi})\right) \leq C \frac{\log n}{n^\psi}.$$

We introduce the maximal function

$$M_n^\omega(x_0) = \sup_{t>0} \frac{1}{2t} \int_{x_0-t}^{x_0+t} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathbf{1}_{E_n^{\sigma^i\omega}}(z)\right) dz = \sup_{t>0} \frac{1}{2t} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} m\left(B_t(x_0) \cap E_n^{\sigma^i\omega}\right)$$

By [Rud87, Equation (5) page 138], for all $\lambda > 0$, we have

$$m(M_n^\omega > \lambda) \leq \frac{C}{\lambda} \left\| \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathbf{1}_{E_n^{\sigma^i\omega}} \right\|_{L_m^1} \leq \frac{C}{\lambda} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} m(E_n^{\sigma^i\omega}) \leq \frac{C}{\lambda} \frac{\log n}{n^{\psi-1}} \tag{10.5}$$

Let $\rho > 0$ and $\xi > 0$ to be determined later. We define

$$F_n^\omega = \left\{x_0 \in [0,1] \,:\, m\left(B_{n^{-\psi}}(x_0) \cap E_n^\omega\right) \geq 2n^{-\psi(1+\rho)}\right\},$$

so that we have

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} m\left(B_{n^{-\psi}}(x_0) \cap E_n^{\sigma^i\omega}\right) \geq \left(\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathbf{1}_{F_n^{\sigma^i\omega}}(x_0)\right) 2n^{-\psi(1+\rho)}.$$

By definition of the maximal function M_n^ω, this implies that

$$M_n^\omega(x_0) \geq n^{-\psi\rho} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathbf{1}_{F_n^{\sigma^i\omega}}(x_0)\right),$$

from which it follows, by (10.5) with $\lambda = (\log n) n^{\xi - \psi\rho}$,

$$m\left(A_n^\omega\right) \leq m\left(M_n^\omega > (\log n) n^{\xi-\psi\rho}\right) \leq C n^{-(\xi + (1-\rho)\psi - 1)} =: \gamma_1(n),$$

where

$$A_n^\omega = \left\{ \left(\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathbf{1}_{F_n^{\sigma^i\omega}}\right) > (\log n) n^\xi \right\}.$$

If $x_0 \notin A_n^\omega$, then

$$(\log n)\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} m\left(B_{n^{-\psi}}(x_0)\cap E_n^{\sigma^i\omega}\right) \le (\log n)\left(\sum_{i=0}^{n-1}\mathbf{1}_{F_n^{\sigma^i\omega}}(x_0)\right) m(B_{n^{-\psi}}(x_0)) + 2(\log n)n^{1-\psi(1+\rho)}$$
$$\le C(\log n)\left((\log n)n^{-(\psi-\xi)} + n^{-(\psi(1+\rho)-1)}\right) =: \gamma_2(n).$$

Since $\frac{2}{3} < \psi < 1$ and $0 < \kappa < 3\psi - 2$, it is possible to choose $\rho > 0$ and $\xi > 0$ such that $\kappa = \xi + (1-\rho)\psi - 1$, $\psi > \xi$ and $\psi(1+\rho) > 1$ [2], which concludes the proof. $\square$

Lemma 10.3. *Suppose that $a > 0$ and $\frac{3}{4} < \psi < 1$. Then for m-a.e. $x_0 \in [0,1]$ and $\mathbb{P}$-a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$ and , we have*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}(\log n)\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} m\left(B_{n^{-\psi}}(x_0)\cap\left\{R^{\sigma^i\omega}_{B_{n^{-\psi}}(x_0)} \le \lfloor a\log n\rfloor\right\}\right) = 0.$$

Proof. Let $0 < \kappa < 3\psi - 2$ to be determined later. Consider the sets $(A_n^\omega)_{n\ge1}$ given by Lemma 10.2, with $m(A_n^\omega) \le \gamma_1(n) = \mathcal{O}(n^{-\kappa})$. Since $\kappa < 1$, we need to consider a subsequence $(n_k)_{k\ge1}$ such that $\sum_{k\ge1}\gamma_1(n_k) < \infty$. For such a subsequence, by the Borel-Cantelli lemma, for m-a.e. x_0, there exists $K = K(x_0,\omega)$ such that for all $k \ge K$, $x_0 \notin A_{n_k}^\omega$. Since $\lim_{k\to\infty}\gamma_2(n_k) = 0$, this implies

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}(\log n_k)\sum_{i=0}^{n_k-1} m\left(B_{n_k^{-\psi}}(x_0)\cap\left\{R^{\sigma^i\omega}_{B_{n_k^{-\psi}}(x_0)} \le \lfloor a\log n_k\rfloor\right\}\right) = 0.$$

We take $n_k = \lfloor k^\zeta\rfloor$, for some $\zeta > 0$ to be determined later. In order to have $\sum_{k\ge1}\gamma_1(n_k) < \infty$, we need to require that $\kappa\zeta > 1$. Set $U_n^\omega(x_0) = B_{n^{-\psi}}(x_0)\cap\left\{R^\omega_{B_{n^{-\psi}}(x_0)} \le \lfloor a\log n\rfloor\right\}$. To obtain the convergence to 0 of the whole sequence, we need to prove that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\sup_{n_k\le n<n_{k+1}}\left|(\log n)\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} m(U_n^{\sigma^i\omega}(x_0)) - (\log n_k)\sum_{i=0}^{n_k-1} m(U_{n_k}^{\sigma^i\omega}(x_0))\right| = 0. \tag{10.6}$$

For this purpose, we estimate

$$\left|(\log n)\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} m(U_n^{\sigma^i\omega}(x_0)) - (\log n_k)\sum_{i=0}^{n_k-1} m(U_{n_k}^{\sigma^i\omega}(x_0))\right| \le \text{(I)} + \text{(II)} + \text{(III)} + \text{(IV)} + \text{(V)}.$$

where

$$\text{(I)} = |\log n - \log n_k|\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} m(U_n^{\sigma^i\omega}(x_0)),\;\; \text{(II)} = (\log n_k)\sum_{i=n_k}^{n-1} m(U_n^{\sigma^i\omega}(x_0)),$$

$$\text{(III)} = (\log n_k)\sum_{i=0}^{n_k-1}\left|m\left(B_{n^{-\psi}}(x_0)\cap\left\{R^{\sigma^i\omega}_{B_{n^{-\psi}}(x_0)} \le \lfloor a\log n\rfloor\right\}\right) - m\left(B_{n_k^{-\psi}}(x_0)\cap\left\{R^{\sigma^i\omega}_{B_{n^{-\psi}}(x_0)} \le \lfloor a\log n\rfloor\right\}\right)\right|,$$

$$\text{(IV)} = (\log n_k)\sum_{i=0}^{n_k-1}\left|m\left(B_{n_k^{-\psi}}(x_0)\cap\left\{R^{\sigma^i\omega}_{B_{n^{-\psi}}(x_0)} \le \lfloor a\log n\rfloor\right\}\right) - m\left(B_{n_k^{-\psi}}(x_0)\cap\left\{R^{\sigma^i\omega}_{B_{n_k^{-\psi}}(x_0)} \le \lfloor a\log n\rfloor\right\}\right)\right|,$$

$$\text{(V)} = (\log n_k)\sum_{i=0}^{n_k-1}\left|m\left(B_{n_k^{-\psi}}(x_0)\cap\left\{R^{\sigma^i\omega}_{B_{n_k^{-\psi}}(x_0)} \le \lfloor a\log n\rfloor\right\}\right) - m\left(B_{n_k^{-\psi}}(x_0)\cap\left\{R^{\sigma^i\omega}_{B_{n_k^{-\psi}}(x_0)} \le \lfloor a\log n_k\rfloor\right\}\right)\right|.$$

Before proceeding to estimate each term, we note that $|n_{k+1}-n_k| = \mathcal{O}(k^{-(1-\zeta)})$, $|n_{k+1}^{-\psi}-n_k^{-\psi}| = \mathcal{O}(k^{-(1+\zeta\psi)})$, $|\log n_{k+1} - \log n_k| = \mathcal{O}(k^{-1})$ and $m(U_n^\omega(x_0)) \le m(B_{n^{-\psi}}(x_0)) = \mathcal{O}(k^{-\zeta\psi})$.

[2] For instance, take $\xi = \psi - \delta$ and $\rho = \psi^{-1} - 1 + \delta\psi^{-1}$ with $\delta = \frac{3\psi-2-\kappa}{2}$.

From these observations, it follows

$$\text{(I)} \le C\left|\log n_{k+1} - \log n_k\right| n_{k+1} k^{-\zeta\psi} \le C k^{-(1-(1-\psi)\zeta)},$$

$$\text{(II)} \le C(\log n_k)|n_{k+1} - n_k| k^{-\zeta\psi} \le C(\log k) k^{-(1-(1-\psi)\zeta)},$$

$$\text{(III)} \le C(\log n_k) n_k m(B_{n_k^{-\psi}}(x_0) \setminus B_{n^{-\psi}}(x_0)) \le C(\log n_k) n_k |n_{k+1}^{-\psi} - n_k^{-\psi}| \le C(\log k) k^{-(1-(1-\psi)\zeta)},$$

$$\begin{aligned}\text{(IV)} &\le C(\log n_k) \sum_{i=0}^{n_k-1} m\left(B_{n_k^{-\psi}}(x_0) \cap \left\{ R^{\sigma^i\omega}_{B_{n_k^{-\psi}}(x_0)\setminus B_{n^{-\psi}}(x_0)} \le \lfloor a \log n \rfloor \right\}\right) \\ &\le C(\log n_k) \sum_{i=0}^{n_k-1} a(\log n) m\left(B_{n_k^{-\psi}}(x_0) \setminus B_{n^{-\psi}}(x_0)\right) \\ &\le C(\log k)^2 k^{-(1-(1-\psi)\zeta)}\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\text{(V)} &\le C(\log n_k) \sum_{i=0}^{n_k-1} m\left(B_{n_k^{-\psi}}(x_0) \cap \left\{ \lfloor a \log n_k \rfloor < R^{\sigma^i\omega}_{B_{n_k^{-\psi}}(x_0)} \le \lfloor a \log n \rfloor \right\}\right) \\ &\le C(\log n_k) \sum_{i=0}^{n_k-1} a \left|\log n_{k+1} - \log n_k\right| m(B_{n_k^{-\psi}}(x_0)) \\ &\le C(\log k) k^{-(1-(1-\psi)\zeta)}.\end{aligned}$$

To obtain (10.6), it is thus sufficient to choose $\kappa > 0$ and $\zeta > 0$ such that $\kappa < 3\psi - 2$, $\kappa\zeta > 1$ and $(1-\psi)\zeta < 1$, which is possible if $\psi > \frac{3}{4}$. ☐

We can now prove the functional convergence to a Lévy stable process for i.i.d. uniformly expanding maps.

Proof of Theorem 2.4. We apply Theorem 7.3. By Theorem 6.3, we have $N_n^\omega \xrightarrow{d} N_{(\alpha)}$ under the probability ν^ω for $\mathbb{P}$-a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$. It thus remains to check that equation (7.2) holds for m-a.e. x_0 when $\alpha \in [1,2)$ to complete the proof. For this purpose, we will use a reverse martingale argument from [NTV18] (see also [AR16, Proposition 13]). Because of (5.8), it is enough to work on the probability space $([0,1], \nu^\omega)$ for $\mathbb{P}$-a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$. Let $\mathcal{B}$ denote the σ-algebra of Borel sets on $[0,1]$ and

$$\mathcal{B}_{\omega,k} = (T_\omega^k)^{-1}(\mathcal{B})$$

To simplify notation a bit let

$$f_{\omega,j,n}(x) = \phi_{x_0}(x) \mathbf{1}_{\left\{|\phi_{x_0}| \le \varepsilon b_n\right\}}(x) - \mathbb{E}_{\nu^{\sigma^j\omega}}(\phi_{x_0} \mathbf{1}_{\left\{|\phi_{x_0}| \le \varepsilon b_n\right\}}).$$

From (5.8), it follows that $\mathbb{E}_m(|f_{\omega,j,n}|) \le C\varepsilon b_n$, and from the explicit definition of ϕ, we can estimate the total variation of $f_{\omega,j,n}$ and obtain the existence of $C > 0$, independent of ω, ε, n and j, such that

$$\|f_{\omega,j,n}\|_{\mathrm{BV}} \le C\varepsilon b_n. \tag{10.7}$$

We define

$$S_{\omega,k,n} := \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} f_{\omega,j,n} \circ T_\omega^j$$

and

$$H_{\omega,k,n} \circ T_\omega^n := \mathbb{E}_{\nu^\omega}(S_{\omega,k,n} | \mathcal{B}_{\omega,k}) \tag{10.8}$$

Hence $H_{\omega,1,n} = 0$ and an explicit formula for $H_{\omega,k,n}$ is

$$H_{\omega,k,n} = \frac{1}{h_{\sigma^k\omega}} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} P^{k-j}_{\sigma^j\omega}(f_{\omega,j,n} h_{\sigma^j\omega}).$$

From the explicit formula, the exponential decay in the BV norm of $P^{n-j}_{\sigma^j\omega}$ from **(Dec)**, (5.8) and (10.7), we see that $\|H_{\omega,k,n}\|_{\mathrm{BV}} \le C\varepsilon b_n$, where the constant C may be taken as constant over $\omega \in \Omega$. If we define

$$M_{\omega,k,n} = S_{\omega,k,n} - H_{\omega,k,n} \circ T^k_\omega$$

then the sequence $\{M_{\omega,k,n}\}_{k\ge1}$ is a reverse martingale difference for the decreasing filtration $\mathcal{B}_{\omega,k} = (T^n_\omega)^{-1}(\mathcal{B})$ as

$$\mathbb{E}_{\nu^\omega}(M_{\omega,k,n}|\mathcal{B}_{\omega,k}) = 0$$

The martingale reverse differences are

$$M_{\omega,k+1,n} - M_{\omega,k,n} = \psi_{\omega,k,n} \circ T^k_\omega$$

where

$$\psi_{\omega,k,n} := f_{\omega,k,n} + H_{\omega,k,n} - H_{\omega,k+1,n} \circ T_{\sigma^{k+1}\omega}.$$

We see from the L^∞ bounds on $\|H_{\omega,k,n}\|_\infty \le Cb_n\varepsilon$ and the telescoping sum that

$$\left|\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \psi_{\omega,j,n} \circ T^j_\omega - \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} f_{\omega,j,n} \circ T^j_\omega\right| \le C\varepsilon b_n. \tag{10.9}$$

By Doob's martingale maximal inequality

$$\nu^\omega \left\{ \max_{1\le k\le n} \left|\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \psi_{\omega,j,n} \circ T^j_\omega\right| \ge b_n\delta \right\} \le \frac{1}{b_n^2\delta^2} \mathbb{E}_{\nu^\omega} \left|\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \psi_{\omega,j,n} \circ T^j_\omega\right|^2 .$$

Note that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}_{\nu^\omega} \left[\psi^2_{\omega,j,n} \circ T^j_\omega\right] = \mathbb{E}_{\nu^\omega} \left[\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \psi_{\omega,j,n} \circ T^j_\omega\right]^2$$

by pairwise orthogonality of martingale reverse differences.

As in [HNTV17, Lemma 6]

$$\mathbb{E}_{\nu^\omega}[(S_{\omega,n,n})^2] = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}_{\nu^\omega}[\psi^2_{\omega,j,n} \circ T^j_\omega] + \mathbb{E}_{\nu^\omega}[H^2_{\omega,1,n}] - \mathbb{E}_{\nu^\omega}[H^2_{\omega,n,n} \circ T^n_\omega].$$

So we see that

$$\nu^\omega \left\{ \max_{1\le k\le n} \left|\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \psi_{\omega,j,n} \circ T^j_\omega\right| \ge b_n\delta \right\} \le \frac{1}{b_n^2\delta^2} \mathbb{E}_{\nu^\omega}[(S_{\omega,n,n})^2] + 2\frac{C^2\varepsilon^2}{\delta^2} \tag{10.10}$$

where we have used $\|H^2_{\omega,j,n}\|_\infty \le C^2 b_n^2 \varepsilon^2$.

Now we estimate

$$\mathbb{E}_{\nu^\omega}[(S_{\omega,n,n})^2] \le \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}_{\nu^\omega}[f^2_{\omega,j,n} \circ T^j_\omega] + 2\sum_{i=0}^{n-1}\sum_{i<j} \mathbb{E}_{\nu^\omega}[f_{\omega,j,n} \circ T^j_\omega \cdot f_{\omega,i,n} \circ T^i_\omega]. \tag{10.11}$$

Using the equivariance of the measures $\{\nu^\omega\}_{\omega\in\Omega}$ and (5.8), we have

$$\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}_{\nu^\omega}[f^2_{\omega,j,n} \circ T^j_\omega] \le Cn\mathbb{E}_\nu(\phi^2_{x_0}\mathbf{1}_{\{|\phi_{x_0}|\le \varepsilon b_n\}}) \sim C\varepsilon^{2-\alpha} b_n^2, \tag{10.12}$$

by Proposition 3.2 and that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} n\,\nu(|\phi_{x_0}| > \lambda b_n) = \lambda^{-\alpha} \quad \text{for } \lambda > 0,$$

since ϕ_{x_0} is regularly varying.

On the other hand, we are going to show that for m-a.e. x_0

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{b_n^2} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1}\sum_{i<j} \mathbb{E}_{\nu^\omega}[f_{\omega,j,n}\circ T^j_\omega \cdot f_{\omega,i,n}\circ T^i_\omega] = 0. \tag{10.13}$$

The first observation is that, due to condition **(Dec)**,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\nu^\omega}[f_{\omega,j,n}\circ T^j_\omega \cdot f_{\omega,i,n}\circ T^i_\omega] \le C\theta^{j-i}\|f_{\omega,i,n}\|_{\mathrm{BV}}\|f_{\omega,j,n}\|_{L^1_m} \le C\varepsilon^2 b_n^2 \theta^{j-i}$$

where $\theta < 1$. Hence there exists $a > 0$ independently of n and ε such that

$$\sum_{j-i>\lfloor a\log n\rfloor} \mathbb{E}_{\nu^\omega}[f_{\omega,j,n}\circ T^j_\omega \cdot f_{\omega,i,n}\circ T^i_\omega] \le C\varepsilon^2 n^{-2} b_n^2$$

and it is enough to prove that for $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n-1}\sum_{j=i+1}^{i+\lfloor a\log n\rfloor} \mathbb{E}_{\nu^\omega}[f_{\omega,j,n}\circ T^j_\omega \cdot f_{\omega,i,n}\circ T^i_\omega] = o(b_n^2) = o(n^{\frac{2}{\alpha}}).$$

By construction, the term $\mathbb{E}_{\nu^\omega}[f_{\omega,i,n}\circ T^i_\omega \cdot f_{\omega,j,n}\circ T^j_\omega]$ is a covariance, and since ϕ is positive, we can bound this quantity by $\mathbb{E}_{\nu^\omega}[f\circ T^i_\omega \cdot f\circ T^j_\omega] = \mathbb{E}_{\nu^{\sigma^i\omega}}[f_n \cdot f_n \circ T^{j-i}_{\sigma^i\omega}]$ where $f_n = \phi_{x_0}\mathbf{1}_{\{|\phi_{x_0}|\le\varepsilon b_n\}}$. Then, since the densities are uniformly bounded by (5.8), we are left to estimate

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n-1}\sum_{j=i+1}^{i+\lfloor a\log n\rfloor} \mathbb{E}_m[f_n \cdot f_n\circ T^{j-i}_{\sigma^i\omega}]. \tag{10.14}$$

Let $\frac{3}{4} < \psi < 1$ and $U_n = B_{n^{-\psi}}(x_0)$. We bound (10.14) by (I) + (II) + (III), where

$$(\mathrm{I}) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1}\sum_{j=i+1}^{i+\lfloor a\log n\rfloor} \int_{U_n\cap(T^{j-i}_{\sigma^i\omega})^{-1}(U_n)} f_n\cdot f_n\circ T^{j-i}_{\sigma^i\omega}\,dm,$$

$$(\mathrm{II}) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1}\sum_{j=i+1}^{i+\lfloor a\log n\rfloor} \int_{U_n\cap(T^{j-i}_{\sigma^i\omega})^{-1}(U_n^c)} f_n\cdot f_n\circ T^{j-i}_{\sigma^i\omega}\,dm$$

and

$$(\mathrm{III}) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1}\sum_{j=i+1}^{i+\lfloor a\log n\rfloor} \int_{U_n^c} f_n\cdot f_n\circ T^{j-i}_{\sigma^i\omega}\,dm.$$

Since $\|f_n\|_\infty \le \varepsilon b_n$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathrm{I}) &\le \varepsilon^2 b_n^2 \sum_{i=0}^{n-1}\sum_{j=i+1}^{i+\lfloor a\log n\rfloor} m\left(U_n\cap(T^{j-i}_{\sigma^i\omega})^{-1}(U_n)\right)\\ &\le a\varepsilon^2 b_n^2(\log n)\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} m\left(U_n\cap\left\{R^{\sigma^i\omega}_{U_n}\le a\log n\right\}\right),\end{aligned}$$

which by Lemma 10.3 is a $o(b_n^2)$ as $n \to \infty$ for m-a.e. x_0.

To estimate (II) and (III), we will use Hölder's inequality. We first observe by a direct computation that

$$\int_{U_n^c} \phi_{x_0}^2 dm = \mathcal{O}(n^{\psi\left(\frac{2}{\alpha}-1\right)}). \tag{10.15}$$

We consider (III) first. Let $A = U_n^c$. We have

$$\int_{U_n^c} f_n \cdot f_n \circ T_{\sigma^i\omega}^{j-i} dm \le \int_A \phi_{x_0} \cdot f_n \circ T_{\sigma^i\omega}^{j-i} dm \le \left(\int_A \phi_{x_0}^2 dm\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int f_n^2 \circ T_{\sigma^i\omega}^{j-i} dm\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \tag{10.16}$$

$$\le C \left(\int_A \phi_{x_0}^2 dm\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int f_n^2 dm\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{10.17}$$

By (10.15), $\left(\int_A \phi_{x_0}^2 dm\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \le C n^{\frac{\psi}{2}\left(\frac{2}{\alpha}-1\right)}$ and by Proposition 3.2, $\left(\int f_n^2 dm\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \le C n^{\frac{1}{\alpha}-\frac{1}{2}}$. Hence we may bound (10.16) by $Cn^{(1+\psi)\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}-\frac{1}{2}\right)}$.

To bound (II), let $B = U_n \cap (T_{\sigma^i\omega}^{j-i})^{-1}(U_n^c)$. Then,

$$\int_{U_n \cap (T_{\sigma^i\omega}^{j-i})^{-1}(U_n^c)} f_n \cdot f_n \circ T_{\sigma^i\omega}^{j-i} dm \le \int_B f_n \cdot \phi_{x_0} \circ T_{\sigma^i\omega}^{j-i} dm \le \left(\int f_n^2 dm\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_B \phi_{x_0}^2 \circ T_{\sigma^i\omega}^{j-i} dm\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{10.18}$$

As before $\left(\int f_n^2 dm\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \le C n^{\frac{1}{\alpha}-\frac{1}{2}}$ and

$$\left(\int_B \phi_{x_0}^2 \circ T_{\sigma^i\omega}^{j-i} dm\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \le \left(\int \phi_{x_0}^2 \circ T_{\sigma^i\omega}^{j-i} \mathbf{1}_{(T_{\sigma^i\omega}^{j-i})^{-1}(U_n^c)} dm\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \le C \left(\int_{U_n^c} \phi_{x_0}^2 dm\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \le C n^{\frac{\psi}{2}\left(\frac{2}{\alpha}-1\right)}$$

by (10.15), and so (10.18) is bounded by $Cn^{(1+\psi)\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}-\frac{1}{2}\right)}$.

It follows that (II) + (III) $\le C(\log n) n^{1+(1+\psi)\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}-\frac{1}{2}\right)} = o(n^{\frac{2}{\alpha}})$, since $\psi < 1$. This proves that (10.14) is a $o(b_n^2)$ and concludes the proof of (10.13).

Finally, from (10.11), (10.12) and (10.13), we obtain

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{b_n^2} \mathbb{E}_{\nu^\omega}[(S_{\omega,n,n})^2] = 0, \tag{10.19}$$

which gives the result by taking the limit first in n and then in ε in (10.10). □

10.2. **Intermittent maps: proof of Theorem 2.6.** We prove convergence to a stable law in the setting of intermittent maps when $\alpha \in (0,1)$.

Proof of Theorem 2.6. We apply Proposition 5.8. By Theorem 6.4, it remains to prove (5.7), since $\alpha \in (0,1)$. We will need an estimate for $\mathbb{E}_{\nu^\omega}(|\phi_{x_0}|\mathbf{1}_{\{\phi_{x_0} \le \varepsilon b_n\}})$ which is independent of ω. For this purpose, we introduce the absolutely continuous probability measure $\nu_{\max}$ whose density is given by $h_{\max}(x) = \kappa x^{-\gamma_{\max}}$. Since all densities h_ω belong to the cone L, we have that $h_\omega \le \frac{a}{\kappa} h_{\max}$ for all ω. Thus,

$$\frac{1}{b_n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}_{\nu^{\sigma^j\omega}}(\phi_{x_0}\mathbf{1}_{\{|\phi_{x_0}| \le \varepsilon b_n\}}) \le \frac{n}{b_n}\frac{a}{\kappa} \mathbb{E}_{\nu_{\max}}(\phi_{x_0}\mathbf{1}_{\{|\phi_{x_0}| \le \varepsilon b_n\}}).$$

We can easily verify that ϕ_{x_0} is regularly varying of index α with respect to $\nu_{\max}$, with scaling sequence equal to $(b_n)_{n\ge1}$ up to a multiplicative constant factor. Consequently, by Proposition 3.2, we have that, for some constant $c > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\nu_{\max}}(\phi_{x_0}\mathbf{1}_{\{|\phi_{x_0}| \le \varepsilon b_n\}}) \sim c\varepsilon^{1-\alpha} n^{\frac{1}{\alpha}-1},$$

which implies (5.7). □

11. The annealed case

In this section, we consider the annealed counterparts of our results. Even though the annealed versions do not seem to follow immediately from the quenched version, it is easy to obtain them from our proofs in the quenched case. We take $\phi_{x_0}(x) = d(x, x_0)^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}$ as before we consider the convergence on the measure space $\Omega \times [0,1]$ with respect to $\nu_F(d\omega, dx) = \mathbb{P}(d\omega)\nu^\omega(dx)$. We give precise annealed results in the case of Theorems 2.4 and 2.6, where we consider

$$X_n^a(\omega, x)(t) := \frac{1}{b_n}\left[\sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor nt\rfloor -1} \phi_{x_0}(T_\omega^j x) - tc_n\right],\ t \geq 0,$$

viewed as a random process defined on the probability space $(\Omega \times [0,1], \nu)$.

Theorem 11.1. *Under the same assumptions as Theorem 2.4, the random process $X_n^a(t)$ converges in the J_1 topology to the Lévy α-stable process $X_{(\alpha)}(t)$ under the probability measure ν.*

Proof. We apply [TK10b, Theorem 1.2] to the skew-product system $(\Omega \times [0,1], F, \nu)$ and the observable ϕ_{x_0} naturally extended to $\Omega \times [0,1]$. Recall that ν is given by the disintegration $\nu(d\omega, dx) = \mathbb{P}(d\omega)\nu^\omega(dx)$.

We have to prove that

(a) $N_n \xrightarrow{d} N_{(\alpha)}$,
(b) if $\alpha \in [1,2)$, for all $\delta > 0$,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\limsup_{n\to\infty} \nu\left((\omega,x)\ :\ \max_{1\le k\le n}\left|\frac{1}{b_n}\sum_{j=0}^{k-1}\left[\phi_{x_0}(T_\omega^j x)\mathbf{1}_{\{|\phi_{x_0}\circ T_\omega^j|\le \varepsilon b_n\}}(x) - \mathbb{E}_\nu(\phi_{x_0}\mathbf{1}_{\{|\phi_{x_0}|\le\varepsilon b_n\}})\right]\right| \geq \delta\right) = 0,$$

where

$$N_n(\omega, x)(B) := N_n^\omega(x)(B) = \#\left\{j \geq 1\ :\ \left(\frac{j}{n}, \frac{\phi_{x_0}(T_\omega^{j-1}(x))}{b_n}\right) \in B\right\},\ n \geq 1.$$

To prove (a), we take $f \in C_K^+((0,\infty)\times(\mathbb{R}\setminus\{0\}))$ arbitrary. Then, by Theorem 6.3, we have for $\mathbb{P}$-a.e. ω

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{E}_{\nu^\omega}(e^{-N_n^\omega(f)}) = \mathbb{E}(e^{-N(f)}).$$

Integrating with respect to $\mathbb{P}$ and using the dominated convergence theorem yields

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{E}_\nu(e^{-N_n(f)}) = \mathbb{E}(e^{-N(f)}),$$

which proves (a).

To prove (b), we simply have to integrate with respect to $\mathbb{P}$ in the estimates in the proof of Theorem 2.4, which hold uniformly in $\omega \in \Omega$, and then to take the limits as $n \to \infty$ and $\varepsilon \to 0$. □

Similarly, we have:

Theorem 11.2. *Under the same assumptions as Theorem 2.6, $X_n^a(1) \xrightarrow{d} X_{(\alpha)}(1)$ under the probability measure ν.*

Proof. We can proceed as for Theorem 11.1 in order to check the assumptions of [TK10b, Theorem 1.3] for the skew-product system $(\Omega \times [0,1], F, \nu)$ and the observable ϕ_{x_0}. □

12. Appendix

The observation that our distributional limit theorems hold for any measures $\mu \ll \nu^\omega$ follows from Theorem 1, Corollary 1 and Corollary 3 of Zweimüller's work [Zwe07].

Let

$$S_n(x) = \frac{1}{b_n}[\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \phi \circ T_\omega^j(x) - a_n].$$

and suppose

$$S_n \to_{\nu_\omega} Y$$

where Y is a Lévy random variable.

We consider first the setup of Example 2.2. We will show that for any measure ν with density h i.e. $d\nu = hdm$ in the cone L of Example 2.2, in particular Lebesgue measure m with $h = 1$,

$$S_n \to_\nu Y$$

We focus on m. According to [Zwe07, Theorem 1] it is enough to show that

$$\int \psi(S_n)d\nu_\omega - \int \psi(S_n)dm \to 0.$$

for any $\psi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ which is bounded and uniformly Lipschitz.

Fix such a ψ and consider

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int \psi(\frac{1}{b_n}[\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \phi \circ T_\omega^j(x) - a_n])(h_\omega - 1)dm \\
\leq &\int \psi(\frac{1}{b_n}[\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \phi \circ T_{\sigma^k\omega}^j(x) - a_n])P_\omega^k(h_\omega - 1)dm \\
&\leq \|\psi\|_\infty \|P_\omega^k(h_\omega - 1)\|_{L^1(m)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\|P_\omega^k(h_\omega - 1)\|_{L^1_m} \to 0$ in case of Example 2.2 and maps satisfying (LY), (Dec) and (Min) the assertion is proved. By [Zwe07, Corollary 3], the proof for continuous time distributional limits follows immediately.

References

[AA16] Mohamed Abdelkader and Romain Aimino. On the quenched central limit theorem for random dynamical systems. *J. Phys. A*, 49(24):244002, 13, 2016.

[ADSZ04] J. Aaronson, M. Denker, O. Sarig, and R. Zweimüller. Aperiodicity of cocycles and conditional local limit theorems. *Stoch. Dyn.*, 4(1):31–62, 2004.

[AFV15] Hale Aytaç, Jorge Milhazes Freitas, and Sandro Vaienti. Laws of rare events for deterministic and random dynamical systems. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 367(11):8229–8278, 2015.

[AHN$^+$15] Romain Aimino, Huyi Hu, Matthew Nicol, Andrei Török, and Sandro Vaienti. Polynomial loss of memory for maps of the interval with a neutral fixed point. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 35(3):793–806, 2015.

[ANV15] Romain Aimino, Matthew Nicol, and Sandro Vaienti. Annealed and quenched limit theorems for random expanding dynamical systems. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 162(1-2):233–274, 2015.

[AR16] Romain Aimino and Jérôme Rousseau. Concentration inequalities for sequential dynamical systems of the unit interval. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 36(8):2384–2407, 2016.

[BB16] Wael Bahsoun and Christopher Bose. Corrigendum: Mixing rates and limit theorems for random intermittent maps (2016 Nonlinearity 29 1417) [MR3476513]. *Nonlinearity*, 29(12):C4, 2016.

[BG97] Abraham Boyarsky and Paweł Góra. *Laws of chaos*. Probability and its Applications. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1997. Invariant measures and dynamical systems in one dimension.

[BGT87] N. H. Bingham, C. M. Goldie, and J. L. Teugels. *Regular variation*, volume 27 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987.

[CF20] Harry Crimmins and Gary Froyland. Fourier approximation of the statistical properties of Anosov maps on tori. *Nonlinearity*, 33(11):6244–6296, 2020.

[CR07] Jean-Pierre Conze and Albert Raugi. Limit theorems for sequential expanding dynamical systems on $[0,1]$. In *Ergodic theory and related fields*, volume 430 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 89–121. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2007.

[DFGTV20a] D. Dragičević, G. Froyland, C. González-Tokman, and S. Vaienti. A spectral approach for quenched limit theorems for random hyperbolic dynamical systems. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 373(1):629–664, 2020.

[DFGTV20b] D. Dragičević, G. Froyland, C. González-Tokman, and S. Vaienti. A spectral approach for quenched limit theorems for random hyperbolic dynamical systems. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 373(1):629–664, 2020.

[Eag76] G. K. Eagleson. Some simple conditions for limit theorems to be mixing. *Teor. Verojatnost. i Primenen.*, 21(3):653–660, 1976.

[Fel71] William Feller. *An introduction to probability theory and its applications. Vol. II.* John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York-London-Sydney, second edition, 1971.

[FFV17] Ana Cristina Moreira Freitas, Jorge Milhazes Freitas, and Sandro Vaienti. Extreme value laws for non stationary processes generated by sequential and random dynamical systems. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, 53(3):1341–1370, 2017.

[Gou04] Sébastien Gouëzel. Central limit theorem and stable laws for intermittent maps. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 128(1):82–122, 2004.

[Gou07] Sébastien Gouëzel. Statistical properties of a skew product with a curve of neutral points. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 27(1):123–151, 2007.

[HNT12] Mark Holland, Matthew Nicol, and Andrei Török. Extreme value theory for non-uniformly expanding dynamical systems. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 364(2):661–688, 2012.

[HNTV17] Nicolai Haydn, Matthew Nicol, Andrew Török, and Sandro Vaienti. Almost sure invariance principle for sequential and non-stationary dynamical systems. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 369(8):5293–5316, 2017.

[HRY20] Nicolai T. A. Haydn, Jérôme Rousseau, and Fan Yang. Exponential law for random maps on compact manifolds. *Nonlinearity*, 33(12):6760–6789, 2020.

[HSV99] Masaki Hirata, Benoît Saussol, and Sandro Vaienti. Statistics of return times: a general framework and new applications. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 206(1):33–55, 1999.

[Kal76] Olav Kallenberg. *Random measures.* Akademie-Verlag, Berlin; Academic Press, London-New York, 1976.

[Kif98] Yuri Kifer. Limit theorems for random transformations and processes in random environments. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 350(4):1481–1518, 1998.

[KL21] A. Korepanov and J. Leppänen. Loss of memory and moment bounds for nonstationary intermittent dynamical systems. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 385(2):905–935, 2021.

[KW69] Eustratios G. Kounias and Teng-shan Weng. An inequality and almost sure convergence. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, 40:1091–1093, 1969.

[LSV99] Carlangelo Liverani, Benoît Saussol, and Sandro Vaienti. A probabilistic approach to intermittency. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 19(3):671–685, 1999.

[MZ15] Ian Melbourne and Roland Zweimüller. Weak convergence to stable Lévy processes for nonuniformly hyperbolic dynamical systems. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, 51(2):545–556, 2015.

[NPT21] Matthew Nicol, Felipe Perez Pereira, and Andrew Török. Large deviations and central limit theorems for sequential and random systems of intermittent maps. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 41(9):2805–2832, 2021.

[NTV18] Matthew Nicol, Andrew Török, and Sandro Vaienti. Central limit theorems for sequential and random intermittent dynamical systems. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 38(3):1127–1153, 2018.

[Res87] Sidney I. Resnick. *Extreme values, regular variation, and point processes*, volume 4 of *Applied Probability. A Series of the Applied Probability Trust.* Springer-Verlag, New York, 1987.

[RSV14] Jérôme Rousseau, Benoit Saussol, and Paulo Varandas. Exponential law for random subshifts of finite type. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 124(10):3260–3276, 2014.

[RT15] Jérôme Rousseau and Mike Todd. Hitting times and periodicity in random dynamics. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 161(1):131–150, 2015.

[Rud87] Walter Rudin. *Real and complex analysis.* McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, third edition, 1987.

[TK10a] Marta Tyran-Kamińska. Convergence to Lévy stable processes under some weak dependence conditions. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 120(9):1629–1650, 2010.

[TK10b] Marta Tyran-Kamińska. Weak convergence to Lévy stable processes in dynamical systems. *Stoch. Dyn.*, 10(2):263–289, 2010.

[Zwe07] Roland Zweimüller. Mixing limit theorems for ergodic transformations. *J. Theoret. Probab.*, 20(4):1059–1071, 2007.

Romain Aimino, Departamento de Matemática, Faculdade de Ciências da Universidade do Porto, Rua do Campo Alegre, 687, 4169-007 Porto, Portugal.
Email address: romain.aimino@fc.up.pt
URL: https://www.fc.up.pt/pessoas/romain.aimino/

Matthew Nicol, Department of Mathematics, University of Houston, Houston, TX 77204, USA
Email address: nicol@math.uh.edu
URL: http://www.math.uh.edu/~nicol/

Andrew Török, Department of Mathematics, University of Houston, Houston, TX 77204, USA and Institute of Mathematics of the Romanian Academy, Bucharest, Romania.
Email address: torok@math.uh.edu
URL: http://www.math.uh.edu/~torok/