

Detecting random bifurcations via rigorous enclosures of large deviations rate functions

Alexandra Blessing (Neamțu)¹, Alex Blumenthal², Maxime Breden³, and Maximilian Engel^{4,5}

¹Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Universität Konstanz, 78457 Konstanz, Germany

²School of Mathematics, Georgia Institute of Technology, 686 Cherry Street, Atlanta, GA 30332-0160 USA

³CMAP, CNRS, Ecole polytechnique, Institut Polytechnique de Paris, 91120 Palaiseau, France

⁴Institute of Mathematics, Freie Universität Berlin, Arnimallee 7, 14195 Berlin, Germany

⁵KdV Institute, University of Amsterdam, Science Park 105-107, 1098 XG Amsterdam, The Netherlands

August 26, 2024

Abstract

The main goal of this work is to provide a description of transitions from uniform to non-uniform synchronization in diffusions based on large deviation estimates for finite time Lyapunov exponents. These can be characterized in terms of moment Lyapunov exponents which are principal eigenvalues of the generator of the tilted (Feynman-Kac) semigroup. Using a computer assisted proof, we demonstrate how to determine these eigenvalues and investigate the rate function which is the Legendre-Fenchel transform of the moment Lyapunov function. We apply our results to two case studies: the pitchfork bifurcation and a two-dimensional toy model, also considering the transition to a positive asymptotic Lyapunov exponent.

1 Introduction

Local bifurcations in ordinary differential equations result in qualitative changes to the long-time behavior of the dynamics through the creation or destruction of equilibria or periodic orbits. As past work has uncovered, however, the situation is more subtle in the presence of noise, e.g., for stochastic differential equations forced by white-in-time noise.

To illustrate the point and motivate the present manuscript, consider the normal form of a pitchfork bifurcation forced by additive, white-in-time noise:

$$dX_t = (\alpha X_t - X_t^3)dt + \sigma dW_t, \quad X_0 \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (1.1)$$

Absent noise ($\sigma = 0$), the resulting ODE undergoes a pitchfork bifurcation at $\alpha = 0$, resulting in the creation of a pair of stable equilibria and a change of stability for the equilibrium at 0. When $\sigma > 0$, however, it was shown in [33] that some features of the pitchfork are ‘destroyed’ in the following sense: if φ^t denotes the stochastic flow generated by equation (1.1) – the analogue of the solution flow to an ODE – then for all fixed initial $X_0, Y_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, one has that

$$|\varphi^t(X_0) - \varphi^t(Y_0)| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty \quad (1.2)$$

with probability 1, irrespective of the value of α . Contrast this to the standard pitchfork ($\sigma = 0$), where *synchronization* as in (1.2) also occurs unconditionally when $\alpha < 0$, but only if X_0, Y_0 are nonzero and share the same sign when $\alpha > 0$.

However, it was pointed out in Callaway et al. [26] that one can recover some “signature” of the original pitchfork by examining quantitatively the synchronization property (1.2). Their argument is framed around the statistics of *finite-time Lyapunov exponents* (FTLE)

$$\lambda_t(\alpha; X_0) = \frac{1}{t} \log |(\varphi^t)'(X_0)| \quad (1.3)$$

for fixed initial X_0 . When $t \rightarrow \infty$, the ergodic theorem implies $\lambda_t(\alpha; X_0)$ converges, with probability 1 and for all $X_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, to the *asymptotic* Lyapunov exponent $\lambda(\alpha) \in \mathbb{R}$. For equation (1.1), it holds that $\lambda(\alpha) < 0$ for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, compatible with the synchronization property (1.2).

On the other hand, the finite-time versions $\lambda_t(\alpha; X_0)$ undergo a qualitative transition through the bifurcation value $\alpha = 0$:

- (i) For $\alpha < 0$, it holds that $\lambda_t(\alpha; X_0) < 0$ for all $X_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and with probability 1; while
- (ii) for $\alpha > 0$ the event $\{\lambda_t(\alpha; X_0) > 0\}$ has *positive probability for all* $t > 0, X_0 \in \mathbb{R}$.

Statement (ii) holds because, with positive probability, trajectories $X_t = \varphi^t(X_0)$ can linger near the unstable region at the origin for arbitrarily long amounts of time. Viewed another way, for $\alpha > 0$ synchronization as in (1.2) is only true asymptotically, as $t \rightarrow \infty$, while transient derivative growth can persist for arbitrarily long times with positive probability, preventing the merging of $\varphi^t(X_0)$ and $\varphi^t(Y_0)$. For additional discussion on the connection between FTLE and synchronization, see [26].

Summary of this paper

The purpose of this paper is to study quantitatively the statistics of λ_t and the transition from negative FTLE to positive FTLE with positive probability, focusing on the case of stochastic flows generated by SDE. Our results are framed around the *large deviations rate function* tracking the statistics of deviations of the FTLE from its asymptotic value. For stochastic flows on \mathbb{R} , and for $r > \lambda(\alpha)$, this rate function takes the form

$$\mathcal{I}_\alpha(r) := - \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{P}(\lambda_t(\alpha; X_0) > r) \in (0, \infty],$$

where the RHS limit definition¹ exists and is constant over all $X_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and under mild conditions [5]. In particular, when $\lambda(\alpha) < 0$, the rate $\mathcal{I}_\alpha(0)$ quantifies the likelihood of transient nonsynchronization in the sense that

$$\mathbb{P}(\lambda_t(\alpha; X_0) > 0) \approx e^{-t\mathcal{I}_\alpha(0)}$$

at long times t .

This paper contains:

- (a) Conditions guaranteeing the existence of the rate function \mathcal{I} for a broad class of stochastic flows (Section 2);
- (b) Some general results on transitions from negative to positive FTLE (Section 3), including:
 - (i) A general result for stochastic flows on compact state spaces connecting transitions to positive FTLE with the LDP rate function (Theorem 3.2);
 - (ii) Some necessary and some sufficient conditions for transitions to positive FTLE in special cases;
- (c) Computer-assisted estimates of the rate function \mathcal{I} for two sets of worked examples:
 - (i) the stochastic pitchfork (1.1); and
 - (ii) a toy model given by a 2d linear SDE.

¹Here we use the convention that $\log 0 = -\infty$.

The 2d linear SDE model is not “dynamical”, i.e., originating as the linearization of some nonlinear system, but it can be realized as an appropriate scaling limit of a prototypical system exhibiting shear-induced chaos [54, 25, 31]. We include it here to demonstrate how a computer-assisted proof can be carried out for the estimation of LDP rate functions in higher dimensions, entailing a treatment of the *projective process*, a Markov process tracking tangent directions of the stochastic flow.

We note as well that the methods involved in the computer-assisted analysis for models (c)(i), (c)(ii) are substantially different: roughly speaking, (c)(i) amounts to finding eigenvalues of a self-adjoint operator on an unbounded space, and (c)(ii) to finding eigenvalues of a non-self-adjoint operator on a compact space.

Validated computer-assisted enclosures of $\mathcal{I}_\alpha(0)$ for the stochastic pitchfork

Figure 1 depicts a computer-assisted estimate of the rate function $\mathcal{I}_\alpha(0)$ for the stochastic pitchfork (1.1) as α is varied. Notable here is the nonlinear dependence of $\alpha \mapsto \mathcal{I}_\alpha(0)$, which we certify to exhibit a local minimum in the interval $\alpha \in [1.225, 1.229]$ (see Theorem 5.7). For comparison, we depict in Figure 2 numerical values from the known closed-form expression for $\lambda(\alpha)$.

In view of the connection between synchronization and FTLE, the enclosures presented in Figure 1 suggest that synchronization is at its ‘weakest’ at the minimum of $\alpha \mapsto \mathcal{I}_\alpha(0)$. Heuristically, the existence of this minimum should have to do with the tradeoff, between increased expansion near 0, which increases FTLE, and a shortening of the time spent in the expanding region, which decreases LE and FTLE. While this heuristic applies to FTLE as well as to LE, it is notable that the LE and FTLE exhibit their local extrema at distinct values of the parameter α : the argmax for $\alpha \mapsto \lambda(\alpha)$ at $\alpha \approx 0.25$ occurs appreciably below the argmin $\alpha \approx 1.2$ for $\alpha \mapsto \mathcal{I}_\alpha(0)$.




Figure 1: Rigorous enclosures of $\mathcal{I}_\alpha(0)$ for different values of α , and $\sigma = 1$ in (1.1). Upper-bounds are shown in red, and lower bounds in blue, but they are close enough to be hard to distinguish. The right figure is zoomed in near a local minimum at $\alpha \approx 1.2$.

Previous work

Stochastic bifurcations. Work in this field has historically distinguished between *phenomenological bifurcations*, to do with changes in the stationary measure, e.g., unimodal to bimodal, versus dynamical bifurcations, to do with the change in the stability type of typical sample paths signalled by a change in sign of the (asymptotic) Lyapunov exponent of the system. For a general discussion, see, e.g., the overviews [8] or [4, Chapter 9] or the representative




Figure 2: Numerical computation of $\lambda(\alpha)$ for different values of α , and $\sigma = 1$ in (1.1).

works [21, 38, 42, 52, 73, 82].

The additive pitchfork model (1.1) exhibits a phenomenological bifurcation, as can be seen from the form of the stationary density

$$\rho_{\sigma,\alpha}(x) = \frac{1}{Z} \exp \frac{2}{\sigma^2} \left(\frac{1}{2} \alpha x^2 - \frac{1}{4} x^4 \right), \quad (1.4)$$

with $Z > 0$ a normalization constant. At a fixed noise amplitude $\sigma > 0$, the stationary density for (1.1) goes from unimodal at $\alpha < 0$ to bimodal at $\alpha > 0$, reflecting the transition of stationary mass away from the now unstable region near 0 to the new stable regions near $\pm\sqrt{\alpha}$.

This co-incidence of P-bifurcations and the nonuniform synchronization scenario is likely to be common for a variety of one-dimensional stochastic flows. We caution, however, that a priori there is no reason to expect the two to coincide, especially for higher-dimensional systems: a P-bifurcation is a property of the stationary measure alone and has no bearing on FTLE, which have more to do with the fine statistics of tangent directions.

The transition of FTLE from negative to positive has been established in a variety of settings, including: near a Hopf bifurcation with additive noise [36]; as noise amplitude is increased in the logistic map family in a periodic window [72]; and for noised pitchfork bifurcations in Chafee-Infante and Swift-Hohenberg SPDEs [18, 20]. We also refer the reader to Section 6 for additional situations where the FTLE transition might take place.

Large deviations. Our work leans on existing large deviations principles for Lyapunov exponents and their connection to the spectral theory of tilted (i.e. Feynman-Kac) semigroups [3, 5]. More broadly, there is a long literature of work applying large deviations principles and related ideas to describe metastable states and other transient behaviors in random systems [41].

Particularly relevant to us is the work of Berglund and Gentz [14] which considers (1.1) in a small-noise regime ($\sigma \ll 1$) taking the parameter α to vary slowly through the bifurcation. The work [14] seeks to understand the role of small additive noise on *bifurcation delay* – a tendency for slowly-varying parameters to ‘delay’ the transition of an equilibrium from stable to unstable. It is shown that additive noise reduces the order of the bifurcation delay present in the deterministic system. See also the related studies [13, 15] and, for a broader perspective on the role of noise in slowly-varying systems, the book [16].

A crucial difference in our case is that we work beyond perturbative regimes, with (albeit time-independent) macroscopic values of the bifurcation parameter α as well as the noise amplitude σ . This regime is harder to treat analytically, and computer-assisted proof is a natural

tool, allowing for instance to discover nonperturbative features such as the discrepancy between the argmin of $\alpha \mapsto \mathcal{I}_\alpha(0)$ and the argmax of $\alpha \mapsto \lambda(\alpha)$ depicted in Figures 1, 2.

Computer-assisted proof. Computer-assisted proofs in dynamical systems go back, at least, to the pioneering work of Lanford on the Feigenbaum conjecture [53]. The usage of rigorous numerics for stochastic systems is more recent; lately, computer-assisted proofs have been leveraged in order to establish the existence of some forms of *transition* in random dynamical systems outside of perturbative regimes [25, 42]. However, both works study transitions characterized by an asymptotic Lyapunov exponent, which, as already mentioned, is too crude of a tool for the kind of problems we focus on in this paper.

As will be explained in Section 2, the central quantities for our study of the large deviation rate function \mathcal{I}_α are moment Lyapunov exponents $\Lambda(p)$. These can be characterized as principal eigenvalues of p -dependent elliptic equations (tilted generators), and the computer-assisted part of our argument consists in getting tight and rigorous enclosures for such eigenvalues. For self-adjoint operators, there exist computer-assisted techniques specifically devised for rigorously enclosing eigenvalues (see e.g. [67, 55] and [64, Chapter 10] for a broader overview). More generally, one can write down a zero-finding problem for an eigenpair, and then use more generic computer-assisted techniques for enclosing zeros based on the Newton-Kantorovich Theorem [78]. As will also be highlighted in Section 2, having precise but only punctual information on Λ (that is, knowing $\Lambda(p)$ for a few specific values of p) is already enough to precisely enclose $\mathcal{I}_\alpha(0)$. However, even more information becomes available if one can control, at least locally, the map $p \mapsto \Lambda(p)$ and some of its derivatives. This will be achieved thanks to recent developments on rigorous continuation techniques from [23] (see also [1]). We refer to Section 5 for more details on the different computer-assisted techniques we employ depending on the specifics of our two examples, and to Section 6 for open problems related to computer-assisted proofs suggested by our investigations.

Potential applications. FTLEs have encountered growing interest and usage in different subfields of climate and Earth science, serving as indicators of transitions between metastable regimes. A finite-time framework is particularly valuable here in view of the simple fact that both empirical and numerical data provide only finite time series, and so in principle the asymptotic Lyapunov exponent need not be directly observed.

Numerical FTLE and other dynamical observables of the quasi-geostrophic model of Marschall and Molteni [57] have been studied in [56]. In this context, it is argued that the emergence and disappearance of *atmospheric blocking* events corresponds to an increase in the number of linearly independent unstable directions for the finite-time dynamics, i.e., an increase in the dimension of unstable finite-time *covariant Lyapunov vectors* – see, e.g., [43].

A data-based method [58] has been used in [69] to yield a linear model that exhibits FTLEs and CLVs, indicating stable and unstable directions corresponding with atmospheric regimes in the North Atlantic Oscillation. Such methods and their reliability have been tested in [79].

Another field of application concerns glacial cycles, i.e. the life time and recurrence patterns of glacial periods. They have been studied under quasi-periodic astronomic forcing [60], yielding non-chaotic strange attractors. The transitions between ordered periods and chaotic transients have been investigated also in regimes with additive noise [61]. A theoretical quantitative understanding, as presented here, may well be relevant for such models.

2 Preliminaries

This section lays out necessary preliminaries and assumptions necessary for the definition of stochastic flows, Lyapunov exponents and rate functions. Section 2.1 addresses the case of a compact state space M , largely following [5], while Section 2.2 discusses what further assumptions are necessary in the noncompact case.

2.1 Large deviations and FTLE on a compact state space

Let M be a compact, connected, smooth manifold of dimension d and consider the general form of a stochastic differential equation

$$dX_t = f_0(X_t) dt + \sum_{j=1}^m f_j(X_t) \circ dW_t^j, \quad X_0 \in M, \quad (2.1)$$

where the W_t^j , $j \geq 1$ are m independent Brownian motions and \circ denotes the Stratonovich differential. Here, the vector fields f_0, f_1, \dots, f_m are assumed to be smooth, hence (2.1) admits unique strong solutions for all initial data. We write

$$G = f_0 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^m f_j^2 \quad (2.2)$$

for the generator of (X_t) in Hörmander form.

Assumption 2.1.

- (a) The vector fields (f_j) satisfy the *parabolic Hörmander condition*

$$\text{LA}(f_1, \dots, f_m, [f_0, f_1], \dots, [f_0, f_m])(x) = T_x M \quad (2.3)$$

for all $x \in M$, where $\text{LA}(\mathcal{V})$ stands for the Lie algebra generated by a collection of vector fields \mathcal{V} .

- (b) For all $x \in M$, for all open, non-empty $U \subset M$ and $t > 0$, one has that

$$P^t(x, U) := \mathbb{P}(X_t \in U | X_0 = x) > 0. \quad (2.4)$$

Assumption 2.1(a) implies absolute continuity of the transition kernels $P^t(x, \cdot)$ for all fixed $x \in M$ [47], while (b) is an irreducibility condition which can be checked for SDE using control theory and the Stroock-Varadhan Theorem [11, Theorem 6.1]. Taken together, it is standard that the two conditions imply (X_t) admits a unique stationary measure ν with smooth, strictly positive density ρ .

We further consider the extended variational process (X_t, Y_t) on TM given by (2.1) and

$$dY_t = Df_0(X_t)Y_t dt + \sum_{j=1}^m Df_j(X_t)Y_t \circ dW_t^j, \quad Y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}. \quad (2.5)$$

Following [5] we introduce the polar coordinates $\|Y_t\| \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and $s_t = Y_t / \|Y_t\|$. Identifying $s_t = -s_t$ we obtain the *projective process* (X_t, s_t) on the projective bundle PM with fibers $P_x M = P(T_x M) \cong P^{d-1}$:

$$ds_t = h_0(X_t, s_t) dt + \sum_{j=1}^m h_j(X_t, s_t) \circ dW_t^j, \quad s_0 = \frac{Y_0}{\|Y_0\|}, \quad (2.6)$$

where

$$h_j(X, s) = Df_j(X)s - \langle s, Df_j(X)s \rangle s.$$

In particular, (X_t, s_t) is a diffusion process on PM whose generator is given by

$$L = G + h_0 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^m h_j^2. \quad (2.7)$$

Finally, for $(X, s) \in PM$ we write $\mathbb{P}_{(X,s)}, \mathbb{E}_{(X,s)}$ for probabilities and expectations conditioned on $(X_0, s_0) = (X, s)$. The notation $\mathbb{P}_X, \mathbb{E}_X$ is defined analogously.

Assumption 2.2.

- (a) The vector fields $\begin{pmatrix} f_j \\ h_j \end{pmatrix}$ on PM satisfy the analogue of the parabolic Hörmander condition (2.3) on PM .
- (b) The (X_t, s_t) process satisfies an analogue of the irreducibility condition (2.4) on PM .

Like before, (a) and (b) taken together imply the existence of a unique stationary measure μ on PM with smooth, positive density on PM . Observe that Assumption 2.1 is implied by Assumption 2.2, and that in this setting the stationary measure μ on PM projects to the unique stationary measure ν on M [6, 7].

In addition, one may readily deduce that the radial component of Y_t , which measures the growth of the variational process, satisfies

$$\|Y_t\| = \|Y_0\| \exp \left(\int_0^t Q(X_\tau, s_\tau) d\tau + \sum_{j=1}^m \int_0^t q_j(X_\tau, s_\tau) dW_\tau^j \right). \quad (2.8)$$

In particular, when $\|Y_0\| = 1$ is fixed (as we will do implicitly throughout what follows), $\|Y_t\|$ depends only on the representative $s_0 \in P_x M$. Here, we have written

$$\begin{aligned} q_j(X, s) &= \langle s, Df_j(X)s \rangle, \\ Q(X, s) &= q_0(X, s) + \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{2} \langle (Df_j(X) + (Df_j(X))^\top) s, Df_j(X)s \rangle - q_j(X, s)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

We note that the function Q takes the alternate form

$$Q = q_0 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^m h_j(q_j), \quad (2.10)$$

where here the h_j 's are treated as derivations acting on functions on PM . For further details, see [5, Section 1].

Lyapunov exponents and moment Lyapunov exponents

In this paper, we study the asymptotic statistics of the finite time Lyapunov exponents (FTLEs)

$$\lambda_t(X_0, s_0) = \frac{1}{t} \log \|Y_t\|. \quad (2.11)$$

When the initial data (X_0, s_0) is clear from context, we will simply write λ_t .

One can describe the asymptotic statistics of the FTLEs via all typical probabilistic categories, including a law of large numbers governing the asymptotic limit

$$\lambda(X_0, s_0) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_t(X_0, s_0),$$

and a large deviations principle concerning the rate at which this limit is realized. The large deviations principle is expressible in terms of the *moment Lyapunov exponents*

$$\Lambda(p; (X, s)) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{E}_{(X, s)} \|Y_t\|^p, \quad (2.12)$$

when this limit exists, where here $p \in \mathbb{R}$ is a fixed parameter.

Below, we will obtain $\Lambda(p)$ from spectral properties of the *tilted semigroup* S_p^t acting on bounded measurable observables $\psi : PM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$S_p^t \psi(X, s) = \mathbb{E}_{(X, s)} \left[\exp \left\{ p \left(\int_0^t Q(X_\tau, s_\tau) d\tau + \sum_{j=1}^m \int_0^t q_j(X_\tau, s_\tau) dW_\tau^j \right) \right\} \psi(X_t, s_t) \right]. \quad (2.13)$$

The following is standard – see, e.g., [5].

Theorem 2.3. *Under Assumption 2.2, the following holds:*

(i) *For all $(X_0, s_0) \in PM$, the limit*

$$\lambda(X_0, s_0) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \|Y_t\| = \lambda \quad (2.14)$$

exists with probability 1, and is almost-surely independent of (X_0, s_0) . The asymptotic Lyapunov exponent λ is given by the Furstenberg-Khasminskii formula

$$\lambda = \int_{PM} Q(X, s) d\mu(X, s). \quad (2.15)$$

(ii) *For all $(X_0, s_0) \in PM$ and $p \in \mathbb{R}$, the limit*

$$\Lambda(p; X_0, s_0) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{E}_{(X_0, s_0)} \|Y_t\|^p \quad (2.16)$$

exists with probability 1 and is independent of (X_0, s_0) .

(iii) *For all $t \geq 0$, it holds that $e^{t\Lambda(p)}$ is the simple dominant eigenvalue of S_p^t , treated as a bounded linear operator on the space of continuous functions on PM with the uniform norm.*

(iv) *$\Lambda : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is convex and analytic with $\Lambda(0) = 0$ and $\Lambda'(0) = \lambda$.*

(v) *The function $\gamma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by*

$$\gamma(p) = \begin{cases} \lambda & p = 0 \\ \frac{\Lambda(p)}{p} & p \neq 0 \end{cases} \quad (2.17)$$

is nondecreasing and analytic.

We set

$$\gamma_- = \lim_{p \rightarrow -\infty} \gamma(p), \quad \gamma_+ = \lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \gamma(p).$$

Note that either $\gamma(p) \equiv \lambda$ for all p , or γ is strictly increasing (as is typically the case) and satisfies

$$\gamma_- < \lambda = \gamma(0) < \gamma_+.$$

For additional comments, see Remark 2.6 below.

Comments on the proof. Item (i) is a standard consequence of the Birkhoff ergodic theorem. Items (ii), (iii) are the majority of the work, as (iv) and (v) follow from this – see [3] for details.

For (ii), (iii), set $\mathbf{1} : PM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ to be the function identically equal to 1. According to (2.8), it holds that

$$S_p^t \mathbf{1}(X, s) = \mathbb{E}_{(X, s)} \|Y_t\|^p,$$

where we recall that $s = Y_0 / \|Y_0\| \in P_x M$. One needs to prove that S_p^t admits a simple dominant eigenvalue $e^{t\Lambda(p)}$ and a spectral gap. This can be shown by using that, for $t > 0$ arbitrary, S_p^t is *uniformly positive*: for any $\varphi \geq 0$ continuous, φ not identically 0, $S_p^t \varphi \geq c > 0$ pointwise for some $c = c(\varphi)$. The uniform positivity of S_p^t can be checked using Assumption 2.2(b) and compactness of M . From here, [17, Theorem 3] yields that S_p^t admits a simple dominant eigenvalue $e^{t\Lambda(p)}$ with spectral gap, where the associated eigenpair (ψ_p, ν_p) is such that $\psi_p : PM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ is continuous and ν_p is a probability measure² on PM with $\int \psi_p d\nu_p = 1$. \square

²Note that at $p = 0$, ν_0 is the unique stationary measure for the (X_t, s_t) process on PM , and ψ_0 is the constant function identically equal to 1.

We now turn to large deviations principles, which can be read off of the *rate function* $\mathcal{I} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}$ defined as the Legendre-Fenchel transform of the moment Lyapunov exponents

$$\mathcal{I}(r) = \sup_{p \in \mathbb{R}} (rp - \Lambda(p)) . \quad (2.18)$$

The following basic properties are straightforward from Theorem 2.3 (iv), (v) and standard facts about Legendre transforms: if $\gamma_- < \gamma_+$,

1. $\mathcal{I}(r)$ is finite if $r \in (\gamma_-, \gamma_+)$ and infinite if $r \notin [\gamma_-, \gamma_+]$,
2. \mathcal{I} is strictly convex, analytic, and nonnegative on (γ_-, γ_+) ,
3. $\mathcal{I}(r) = 0$ iff $r = \lambda$, and $\mathcal{I}'(\lambda) = 0$. In particular, $\mathcal{I}(r)$ has its strict global minimum of 0 at $r = \lambda$.
4. \mathcal{I} is strictly decreasing on (γ_-, λ) and strictly increasing on (λ, γ_+) .

With this in place, we are now ready to state the large deviations principle.

Theorem 2.4. *Suppose that M is compact, the SDE (2.1) on M satisfies Assumption 2.2, and lastly that $\gamma_- < \gamma_+$ as in Theorem 2.3. Let $(X_0, s_0) \in PM$ be arbitrary.*

(i) *We have the following:*

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{(X_0, s_0) \in PM} \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{P}_{(X_0, s_0)}(r_- \leq \lambda_t \leq r_+) &\leq - \inf_{\tilde{r} \in [r_-, r_+]} \mathcal{I}(\tilde{r}), \\ \liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{(X_0, s_0) \in PM} \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{P}_{(X_0, s_0)}(r_- < \lambda_t < r_+) &\geq - \inf_{\tilde{r} \in (r_-, r_+)} \mathcal{I}(\tilde{r}). \end{aligned}$$

(ii) *For every $\varepsilon > 0$ it holds that*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{P}_{(X_0, s_0)}(|\lambda_t - \lambda| \geq \varepsilon) = c(\varepsilon),$$

where $c(\varepsilon) = -\min\{\mathcal{I}(\lambda + \varepsilon), \mathcal{I}(\lambda - \varepsilon)\} < 0$.

Theorem 2.4 is a consequence of the Gärtner-Ellis Theorem (Theorem B.1), which roughly-speaking implies a large deviations principle assuming convergence of the limit (2.12) to a differentiable function – see Appendix B for further discussion.

Below we record a mild strengthening of Assumption 2.2 allowing to ignore the distinction between open and closed intervals in Theorem 2.4.

Corollary 2.5. *Suppose that the SDE for the variational process (X_t, Y_t) satisfies the parabolic Hörmander condition (c.f. Assumption 2.1(a)). Then, one has that*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{P}_{(X_0, s_0)}(r_- < \lambda_t < r_+) = - \inf_{\tilde{r} \in [r_-, r_+]} \mathcal{I}(\tilde{r}),$$

where the limit is uniform over $(X_0, s_0) \in PM$. In particular, for $r > \lambda$ and for all $(X_0, s_0) \in PM$, it holds that

$$\mathcal{I}(r) = - \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{P}_{(X_0, s_0)}(\lambda_t > r), \quad (2.19)$$

Proof. Hypoellipticity of (X_t, Y_t) implies in particular that the law of $\|Y_t\|$ under $\mathbb{P}_{(X_0, s_0)}$ is absolutely continuous w.r.t. Lebesgue for any $t > 0$. \square

Remark 2.6. (a) We note that $\Lambda''(0)$ has been shown to coincide with the *asymptotic variance* appearing in the central limit theorem governing convergence in distribution of $\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}(\lambda_t - t\lambda)$. For further details, see [5].

- (b) The scenario $\gamma_- = \gamma_+$ implies immediately that $\Lambda(p) \equiv p\lambda$ [5]. This behavior is quite degenerate and straightforward to rule out in many practical cases. For instance, our computer-assisted enclosures of $p \mapsto \Lambda(p)$ preclude linear dependence on p , implying $\gamma_- < \gamma_+$ immediately.
- (c) It is also typically the case that $\gamma_{\pm} = \pm\infty$, and indeed that $\Lambda(p)$ scales like p^2 as $|p| \rightarrow \infty$. See, e.g., [9] for precise statements.
- (d) Morally, one expects that $\Lambda(p)$ can be obtained as the principle eigenvalue of the infinitesimal generator L_p , which in our setting should take the form

$$L_p = L + p \sum_{j=1}^m q_j h_j + pQ + \frac{p^2}{2} \sum_{j=1}^m q_j^2. \quad (2.20)$$

Doing so will form the basis of our computer-assisted enclosures of $\Lambda(p)$ presented in Sections 4 and 5, to which we refer the reader for further details on this point.

2.2 The noncompact case

Here, we specialize to the case

$$M = \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \text{and}$$

the vector fields $f_i, i \geq 1$, are constant vectors in \mathbb{R}^d ,

and will refer here and below to the $d \times m$ matrix $\sigma = (f_1 f_2 \dots f_m)$ with columns $f_j, j \geq 1$. Note that in this case, we identify PM with the Cartesian product $\mathbb{R}^d \times P^{d-1}$.

In this setting, further assumptions will be required to ensure that the equations defining (X_t) and (X_t, Y_t) admit global-in-time strong solutions and stationary measures. Both issues are addressed by the following assumption.

Assumption 2.7. There is a smooth function $W : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [1, \infty)$ with compact sublevel sets such that G defined in (2.2) satisfies the *drift condition*

$$GW \leq -\alpha W + \beta, \quad (2.21)$$

for some constants $\alpha, \beta > 0$.

It is straightforward to check that Assumption 2.7 ensures unique existence of strong solutions to (2.1) for (X_t) and (2.5) for (Y_t) , hence also (2.6) for (s_t) . Regarding stationary measures: it is standard that Assumptions 2.1 and 2.7 imply unique existence of a stationary measure ν for (X_t) on \mathbb{R}^d with smooth, everywhere-positive density. Since the P^{d-1} component is compact, Assumptions 2.2 and 2.7 similarly imply unique existence of a stationary measure μ for (X_t, s_t) on $\mathbb{R}^d \times P^{d-1}$ with smooth, everywhere-positive density. For further details, see, e.g., [45].

Large deviations

As described in Section 2.1, to prove a large deviations estimate for finite-time Lyapunov exponents it is enough to establish a spectral theory as in Theorem 2.3 for the tilted semigroup (S_p^t) , $p \in \mathbb{R}$, see (2.13). The main challenge is that S_p^t is not a bounded operator on the space of bounded continuous functions, since frequently in applications the exponent in (2.8) is unbounded at infinity.

Instead, an appropriate functional framework is to treat S_p^t as an operator on $C_W = C_W(PM)$, the space of continuous functions with finite weighted norm

$$\|\varphi\|_{C_W} = \sup_{(X,s) \in PM} \frac{|\varphi(X,s)|}{W(X)},$$

for some appropriately chosen function W . A natural choice would be the function W appearing in Assumption 2.7; however, the drift condition (2.21) is not enough to ensure S_p^t is bounded on

C_W : some stronger condition is required. This problem has been treated in some special cases (e.g., [10]); general frameworks addressing this include [40, 50].

The following framework is a version of the results of [40] adapted to observables of the projective process (X_t, s_t) on $\mathbb{R}^d \times P^{d-1}$.

Notation. Here and below, for nonnegative functions f, g on \mathbb{R}^d we write $g \ll f$ if f/g has compact sublevel sets. Note that if f, g are continuous, then $g \ll f$ implies that for any $a > 0$ there exists $R > 0$ such that

$$g \leq af + R.$$

Assumption 2.8.

(1) There exists a function V belonging to the Schwarz class³ such that:

- (a) V has compact sublevel sets;
- (b) $|\sigma^T \nabla V|$ has compact sublevel sets; and
- (c)

$$-GV \ll |\sigma^T \nabla V|^2.$$

(2) The function $x \mapsto \|Df_0\| = \|(Df_0)_x\|$ satisfies the bounds

$$\|Df_0\|_{C_W} < \infty, \tag{2.22}$$

$$\|Df_0\| \ll |\sigma^T \nabla V|^2. \tag{2.23}$$

Theorem 2.9. *In the setting of this section (additive noise, $M = \mathbb{R}^d$) let Assumptions 2.2 and 2.8 hold. Then:*

- (a) (i) *The limit (2.14) defining the asymptotic Lyapunov exponent λ exists with probability 1 and is constant over (X_0, s_0) . Moreover, the Furstenberg-Khasminskii formula (2.15) holds (in particular, $Q \in L^1(\mu)$ where Q is as in (2.9)).*
- (ii) *For all $p \in \mathbb{R}$, the limit (2.16) exists with probability 1 and is independent of (X_0, s_0) .*
- (iii) *For all $t > 0$ and $p \in \mathbb{R}$, the operators S_p^t are bounded in the C_W -norm, where*

$$W = e^{\theta V}$$

and where $\theta > 0$ is sufficiently small. Moreover, for all $t > 0$ the operator $S_p^t : C_W \rightarrow C_W$ admits a simple, isolated, dominant eigenvalue $e^{t\Lambda(p)}$.

- (iv) *$\Lambda : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is convex, analytic, and satisfies $\Lambda(0) = 0, \Lambda'(0) = \lambda$.*
- (v) *The function γ as in (2.17) is nondecreasing and analytic.*
- (b) *If $\gamma_- < \gamma_+$, then the conclusions of Theorem 2.4 hold⁴ with \mathcal{I} the Legendre-Fenchel transform of Λ as in (2.18).*

Remark 2.10. It is straightforward to check that Assumption 2.8 (1) implies Assumption 2.7 for $W = e^{\theta V}$, where $\theta > 0$ is sufficiently small. Assumption 2.8 (2) is imposed to ensure a sufficient level of control on $Q(X_t, s_t)$ so that $S_p^t : C_W \rightarrow C_W$ is bounded. A proof sketch, recalling pertinent features of the analysis in [40], is given in Appendix B.

Remark 2.11. While ellipticity of the generators L, G is not explicitly assumed, assumption 2.8(1)(b) is strong and essentially forces the noise vectors f_j to span \mathbb{R}^d . When this is the case, (2.22) is implied by (2.23). The authors are unaware of a more general approach, even in this additive setting, that would allow for truly hypoelliptic noise. We refer the reader to Section 6 for further discussion on open questions in this area.

³Recall that f is of Schwarz class if it is smooth and it and its partial derivatives have strictly polynomial growth at infinity.

⁴To be precise: the convergences listed in (i) and (ii) of Theorem 2.4 are uniform over compact subsets of PM .

Special case: gradient systems

Below we consider the special case of gradient systems

$$\begin{aligned} dX_t &= -\nabla V(X_t)dt + \sigma \sum_1^d e_j dW_t, \\ dY_t &= -D^2V(X_t)Y_t dt \end{aligned} \tag{2.24}$$

where the $(e_j)_{j=1}^d$ form the standard basis for \mathbb{R}^d , and where the potential function $V : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is smooth and satisfies the following:

Assumption 2.12.

- (a) The function V is of Schwarz class and has compact sublevel sets $\{V \leq C\}$, $C \in \mathbb{R}$.
- (b) It holds that

$$|\Delta V| \ll |\nabla V|^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \|D^2V\| \ll |\nabla V|^2. \tag{2.25}$$

Corollary 2.13. *Consider the system (2.24) and let Assumption 2.12 hold. Then:*

- (a) Equation (2.24) for (X_t, Y_t) admits unique strong solutions. The process (X_t) admits the unique stationary density

$$\rho = \frac{1}{Z} \exp(-2V(x)/\sigma^2)$$

and the corresponding (X_t, s_t) process on $\mathbb{R}^d \times P^{d-1}$ admits a unique stationary measure μ with smooth, positive density.

- (b) Assumption 2.8 is satisfied for V . In particular, if $\gamma_- < \gamma_+$ then the conclusions of Theorem 2.4 hold with \mathcal{I} the Legendre-Fenchel transform of Λ .

Remark 2.14. Assumption 2.12(b) is mild and holds automatically for a broad class of potentials with superlinear growth at infinity, e.g., $V(x) = c|x|^p + v(x)$ where $c > 0$, $p > 1$ is an integer, and $v : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is of Schwarz class and satisfies $v/|x|^{p-\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$.

3 Random bifurcations via large deviation principles

Consider the SDE (2.1) on M with solutions X_t , linearization Y_t solving (2.5), and projective process (s_t) solving (2.6), where now the vector fields $f_j, j = 0, \dots, m$ depends smoothly on a parameter $\alpha \in I$, where $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ is a nonempty open interval. When M is compact, we impose that Assumption 2.2 holds for all $\alpha \in I$, while when $M = \mathbb{R}^d$ we additionally impose the additive noise setting at the beginning of Section 2.2 as well as Assumption 2.8. Note that in all cases considered, we have that (i) the SDE defining $(X_t, Y_t) = (X_t(\alpha), Y_t(\alpha))$ admits unique strong solutions for all time, and (ii) the asymptotic Lyapunov exponent $\lambda(\alpha) = \lim_t \lambda_t(\alpha; X_0, s_0)$ exists with probability 1 and is constant over (X_0, s_0) .

Definition 3.1 (FTLE transition). We say that (2.1) undergoes a *finite-time Lyapunov exponent transition* at $\alpha = \alpha_0 \in I$ if there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

- (a) for all $\alpha \in [\alpha_0 - \varepsilon, \alpha_0 + \varepsilon] \subset I$, the asymptotic exponent $\lambda(\alpha)$ satisfies

$$\lambda(\alpha) < 0;$$

- (b) for all $\alpha \in [\alpha_0 - \varepsilon, \alpha_0)$ and $(X_0, s_0) \in PM$, there exists $T = T(\alpha, X_0, s_0) > 0$ such that for all $t \geq T$ it holds that

$$\lambda_t(\alpha; X_0, s_0) < 0 \quad \text{with probability 1;}$$

and

- (c) for all $\alpha \in (\alpha_0, \alpha_0 + \varepsilon]$ there is a non-empty open set $U_\alpha \subset PM$, $c_\alpha > 0$ and $t_0 = t_0(\alpha) > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(\lambda_t(\alpha; X_0, s_0) > c_\alpha) > 0,$$

for all $t \geq t_0, (X_0, s_0) \in U_\alpha$.

3.1 FTLE transitions in terms of LDP

The following is a characterization, in the case of compact state space M , of the FTLE transition in terms of the large deviations principles laid out in Section 2.

Theorem 3.2. *Let M be compact. Assume $\gamma_- < \gamma_+$ and let \mathcal{I}_a denote the large deviations rate function as in (2.18). Suppose an FTLE transition occurs as in Definition 3.1. Then,*

- (i) $\mathcal{I}_a(0) = \infty$ for $\alpha \in [\alpha_0 - \varepsilon, \alpha_0)$; and
- (ii) $0 < \mathcal{I}_\alpha(0) < \infty$ for $\alpha \in (\alpha_0, \alpha_0 + \varepsilon]$.

Remark 3.3.

- (a) There is no reason a priori to expect that the ‘soft’, nonquantitative lower bound in Definition 3.1(c) implies a quantitative, exponential-in-time lower bound. That this implication holds is a consequence of stationarity and recurrence in ergodic theory.
- (b) At present the authors are not sure whether a version of Theorem 3.2 holds in some reasonable noncompact setting. See Section 6 for further discussion.

The proof of Theorem 3.2 is deferred to Section 3.2. In the meantime, we discuss below conditions, some necessary and some sufficient, for an FTLE transition to occur.

Necessary conditions for an FTLE transition

Suppose $M = \mathbb{T}^d$, and in addition that at all parameters $\alpha \in I$,

$$\text{the corresponding vector fields } f_j \text{ are constant for } j = 1, \dots, m. \quad (3.1)$$

In this additive-noise case, the vector fields h_j and functions q_j are identically zero, and

$$\lambda_t(\alpha; X_0, s_0) = \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t q_0(X_\tau, s_\tau) d\tau, \quad (3.2)$$

where $q_0 = q_0^\alpha : PM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is as in (2.9). Equation (3.2) is also valid in the additive-noise, noncompact setting of Section 2.2 with $M = \mathbb{R}^d$. In either of these additive-noise cases, the following is immediate from (3.2).

Corollary 3.4. *Assume either that*

1. $M = \mathbb{T}^d$, along with Assumptions 2.2 and the additive-noise setting of (3.1) for all $\alpha \in I$; or
2. $M = \mathbb{R}^d$, along with Assumptions 2.2, 2.8 and the additive-noise setting of Section 2.2 for all $\alpha \in I$.

Then, an FTLE transition at $\alpha_0 \in I^\circ$ can only occur if q_0 is sign-indefinite for $\alpha \in (\alpha_0, \alpha_0 + \varepsilon]$, i.e., $\{q_0 > 0\} \subset PM$ is a nonempty proper subset.

Remark 3.5. In the compact case, if $q_0 < 0$ pointwise in (X, s) and uniformly through $a \in I$, it holds that $\sup_{\alpha \in I} \sup_{(X, s)} q_0(X, s) = -c < 0$ for some $c > 0$. Here, it is straightforward to check that

$$\Lambda_\alpha(p) \leq -cp \quad \text{for all } p \geq 0,$$

and in particular

$$\mathcal{I}_\alpha(0) = -\inf_p \Lambda_\alpha(p) = \infty$$

for all $\alpha \in I$, consistent with Corollary 3.4.

Remark 3.6. It is straightforward to check that equation (3.2) and the above necessary condition for the FTLE transition are also true when M is compact and the vector fields f_j have the property that

$$Df_j + (Df_j)^\top = 0, \quad j \geq 1,$$

since this implies $q_j \equiv 0$ for all j , with q_j as in (2.9).

FTLE transitions and unstable equilibria

We now turn to a circumstance where sign-indefiniteness of q_0 is also sufficient for an FTLE transition: the emergence of an unstable equilibrium for the drift term.

Assumption 3.7. For all $\alpha \in [\alpha_0 - \varepsilon, \alpha_0)$ it holds that $q_0 < 0$ pointwise; and for all $\alpha \in (\alpha_0, \alpha_0 + \varepsilon]$ there exists a saddle-type equilibrium $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{p}(\alpha)$ for the drift vector field $f_0 = f_0(\alpha)$.

The above framework captures a variety of circumstances of interest, e.g., the pitchfork scenario of (1.1) or Hopf bifurcation.

Corollary 3.8. *Assume either setting of Corollary 3.4 and, in addition, that Assumption 3.7 holds. If in addition $\lambda(\alpha) < 0$ for all $\alpha \in [\alpha_0 - \varepsilon, \alpha_0 + \varepsilon]$, then an FTLE transition occurs at α_0 .*

Proof. The following proof addresses both settings in Corollary 3.4. To start, it is evident from (3.2) that for $\alpha \in [\alpha_0 - \varepsilon, \alpha_0)$ one has $\lambda_t(\alpha; X_0, s_0) < 0$ for all $(X_0, s_0) \in PM$.

Addressing $\alpha \in (\alpha_0, \alpha_0 + \varepsilon]$, write $\mathcal{V}(\alpha) \subset P_{\mathbf{p}(\alpha)}M$ for the (projectivized) unstable eigenspace of $Df_0(\mathbf{p}(\alpha))$ and let U be a relatively compact open neighborhood of $\{\mathbf{p}(\alpha)\} \times \mathcal{V}(\alpha)$ in PM along which $q_0 \geq c > 0$ uniformly for some $c > 0$.

Fix $X_0 = \mathbf{p}(\alpha)$, $s_0 \in \mathcal{V}(\alpha)$. By a standard control argument, $\exists C > 0$ such that for all $t > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}((X_\tau, s_\tau) \in U \text{ for all } \tau \in [0, t]) \geq e^{-Ct} > 0,$$

while conditioning on the above event, it holds that

$$\lambda_t(X_0, s_0) \geq c > 0.$$

It follows that $\mathcal{I}_\alpha(0) \leq C < \infty$ for such α . We conclude that an FTLE transition has occurred at α_0 . \square

3.2 Proof of Theorem 3.2

Let us assume that $\lambda(\alpha) < 0$, hence $\mathcal{I}_\alpha(0) > 0$, for all α . Theorem 3.2(i) is evident from the definitions and Theorem 2.4. To prove Theorem 3.2, it is enough to check the following for each fixed α :

Claim 3.9. $\mathcal{I}_\alpha(0) < \infty$ if there is a nonempty open set $U_\alpha \subset PM$ and $c_\alpha > 0$ with the property that for any $(X_0, s_0) \in U_\alpha$ there exists $T = T(\alpha) > 0$, uniform over $(X_0, s_0) \in U_\alpha$, such that

$$\inf_{(X_0, s_0) \in U} \mathbb{P}(\lambda_t(\alpha; X_0, s_0) \geq c_\alpha) > 0$$

for all fixed $t \geq T$.

Since the α dependence is not used, we suppress it in our notation throughout, writing, e.g., $U \subset PM$ and $c > 0$ for $c = c_\alpha$, $U = U_\alpha$ as in the hypothesis.

For $u < t$ and $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$, define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_{u,t}(\eta) &= \{\lambda_{u,t} \geq \eta\} \\ \mathcal{R}_{u,t}(\eta) &= \{\lambda_{u,t} \geq \eta\} \cap \{(X_t, s_t) \in U\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $T_G, T_R > 0$ and $\eta_G, \eta_R, \eta_E \in \mathbb{R}$, to be specified shortly. Here,

$$\lambda_{u,t} = \frac{1}{t-u} \log \frac{\|Y_t\|}{\|Y_u\|}$$

is the Lyapunov exponent measured from time u to time t . Throughout, we write $T = T_G + T_R$.

In short, our proof will be to “string together” segments of the trajectory (X_t, s_t) alternating between “good phases” $t \in [jT, jT + T_G]$, originating at $(X_{jT}, s_{jT}) \in U$ and along which the

FTLE grows for time T_G at rate $\eta_G > 0$; and controlled “return” phases $t \in [jT + T_G, (j+1)T]$ originating at some arbitrary (X_{jT+T_G}, s_{jT+T_G}) and along which the FTLE decays for time T_R at rate $\geq \eta_R$, terminating at time $(j+1)T$ at a state $(X_{(j+1)T}, s_{(j+1)T}) \in U$.

Let us make this more precise. In what follows, we will obtain and employ lower bounds of the form

$$\inf_{(X_0, s_0) \in PM} \mathbb{P}_{(X_0, s_0)} \mathcal{R}_{0, T_R}(\eta_R) \geq \delta_R \quad (3.3)$$

$$\inf_{(X_0, s_0) \in U} \mathbb{P}_{(X_0, s_0)} \mathcal{G}_{0, T_G}(\eta_G) \geq \delta_G \quad (3.4)$$

$$\inf_{r \in [0, T]} \inf_{(X_0, s_0) \in PM} \mathbb{P}_{(X_0, s_0)} \mathcal{G}_{0, r}(\eta_E) \geq \delta_E \quad (3.5)$$

for some $\delta_R, \delta_G, \delta_E > 0$ and for $\eta_G > 0, \eta_R, \eta_E < 0$. Supposing we had such bounds, it would follow from the Markov property that for $(X_0, s_0) \in U$, $t = nT + r$ for $n \geq 1, r \in [0, T]$, one has

$$\mathbb{P}_{(X_0, s_0)} \left[\left(\bigcap_{j=0}^{n-1} \mathcal{G}_{jT, jT+T_G}(\eta_G) \right) \cap \left(\bigcap_{j=0}^{n-1} \mathcal{R}_{jT+T_G, (j+1)T}(\eta_R) \right) \cap \mathcal{G}_{nT, t}(\eta_E) \right] \geq \delta_G^n \delta_R^n \delta_E. \quad (3.6)$$

The first two parenthetical terms are intersections over the alternating “good” and “return” phases, while the final term is a roundoff allowing to pass from the discrete-time sequence (nT) to the continuous parameter t . From this construction, conditioned on the above event one has that

$$\lambda_t \geq \frac{1}{t} [n(T_G \eta_G + T_R \eta_R) + T \eta_E]. \quad (3.7)$$

If the $[\dots]$ term can be made positive for all n sufficiently large via some choice of the parameters $\eta_G, \eta_R, \eta_E, T_G, T_R$, it will follow immediately that $\mathcal{I}(0) \leq \frac{1}{T} \log \frac{1}{\delta_G \delta_R} < \infty$, completing the proof.

We first choose T_R using the following Lemma. Below, U is as in the hypothesis.

Lemma 3.10. *Under Assumption 2.2, the (X_t, s_t) process is uniformly geometrically ergodic. In particular, there exists $T_R > 0$ such that for all $t \geq T_R$,*

$$\inf_{(X_0, s_0) \in PM} P^t((X_0, s_0), U) > 0. \quad (3.8)$$

Proof sketch. This is a standard application of Harris’ Theorem in the case of a compact state space, stated in Appendix A as Corollary A.4. The version presented there requires the following of the process (X_t, s_t) : (a) existence of a small set; (b) topological irreducibility; and (c) strong aperiodicity (see Appendix A for definitions). The parabolic Hörmander condition (Assumption 2.2(a)) is well-known to imply smoothness of the transition kernels for (X_t, s_t) , hence (a) follows. Item (b) is immediate from the irreducibility-type condition in Assumption 2.2(b). Finally, (c) follows from almost-sure continuity of $t \mapsto (X_t, s_t)$. For definitions and a brief additional discussion, we refer the reader to Appendix A.

Once established, uniform geometric ergodicity implies $P^t((X_0, s_0), K) \rightarrow \mu(K)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ uniformly in (X_0, s_0) and for any fixed Borel $K \subset PM$. It is straightforward to check that Assumption 2.2 and openness of U imply $\mu(U) > 0$, hence (3.8) follows on setting $K = U$. \square

Fixing T_R as in Lemma 3.10, it now follows from compactness of M that there exists $\eta_R < 0$ sufficiently negative so that

$$\delta_R := \inf_{(X_0, s_0) \in PM} \mathbb{P}_{(X_0, s_0)} \mathcal{R}_{0, T_R}(\eta_R) > 0. \quad (3.9)$$

Note that this implies (3.3) holds.

With η_R, T_R and δ_R specified, set $\eta_G = c$ as in the hypothesis and let $T_G > 0$ be sufficiently large so that

$$\delta_G := \inf_{(X_0, s_0)} \mathbb{P}_{(X_0, s_0)}(\lambda_{T_G} \geq c) > 0$$

as in the hypothesis. Taking T_G still larger, we shall assume, as we may, that

$$T_G\eta_G + T_R\eta_R \geq \frac{1}{2}c = \frac{1}{2}\eta_G. \quad (3.10)$$

Note that (3.4) holds. Finally, we fix $\eta_E < 0$ sufficiently negative so that

$$\delta_E := \inf_{r \in [0, T]} \inf_{(X_0, s_0)} \mathbb{P}_{(X_0, s_0)}(\lambda_r \geq \eta_E) > 0,$$

noting now that (3.5) holds.

From this construction, the term in the square brackets in (3.7) is positive for all n sufficiently large, and the proof is complete.

4 Two worked examples

We pivot in this and the next section to a treatment with computer-assisted proof of the large deviations rate functions for finite-time Lyapunov exponents associated to two concrete models: in Section 4.1 the pitchfork bifurcation discussed in Section 1 and in Section 4.2 a 2d linear SDE serving as a toy model of shear-induced chaos. Considerations involving computer-assisted work are deferred to Section 5.

4.1 Pitchfork bifurcation with additive noise

Our first test problem is an additively-forced version of the standard form of a pitchfork bifurcation in one dimension:

$$dX_t = (\alpha X_t - X_t^3)dt + \sigma dW_t, \quad X_0 \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (4.1)$$

where $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\sigma > 0$. As shown in [26], this family of SDE admits an FTLE transition (Definition 3.1). Our aim is to quantify this in terms of large deviations principles (see Corollary 2.5) as stated in Theorem 3.2. Note that this theorem applies here as Assumption 2.12 and, by that, Corollary 2.13 are clearly satisfied. As explained in Section 2, the rate function \mathcal{I} appearing in the large deviations principles is obtained via the moment Lyapunov exponents $\Lambda(p)$. Our study of $\Lambda(p)$ relies on the fact that it is the principal eigenvalue of the tilted generator L_p (4.9). Before proving this assertion in Lemma 4.2, we write down L_p explicitly and make a few observations.

For (4.1) it is straightforward to see that the tilted generator (2.20) has the form

$$L_p g(x) = \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \partial_{xx} g(x) + (\alpha x - x^3) \partial_x g(x) + p(\alpha - 3x^2)g(x). \quad (4.2)$$

The operator L_p is self-adjoint on the weighted space $L^2(\rho)$, where ρ is the stationary density for (4.1) as in (1.4) and satisfies $L^*\rho = 0$. However, for computational reasons it will be more convenient to work with a flat L^2 space. To this end, the isometry $L^2(\rho) \rightarrow L^2$ given by

$$g \mapsto \rho^{1/2}g$$

conjugates L_p to an operator of Schrödinger type \tilde{H}_p on L^2 with the same spectrum as L_p :

$$\tilde{H}_p f(x) = \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \partial_{xx} f(x) + \left((3x^2 - \alpha) \left(\frac{1}{2} - p \right) - \frac{(x^3 - \alpha x)^2}{2\sigma^2} \right) f(x). \quad (4.3)$$

Remark 4.1. The above symmetrization procedure applies to FTLE of any scalar gradient SDE

$$dX_t = -U'(X_t)dt + \sigma dW_t,$$

for which the tilted generator L_p on $L^2(\rho)$, $\rho = Z^{-1} \exp(-2U/\sigma^2)$, will read

$$L_p g = \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \partial_{xx} g + U \partial_x g + p U' g$$

and for which the symmetrization \tilde{H}_p on L^2 reads as

$$\tilde{H}_p f = \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \partial_{xx} f + \left(\left(\frac{1}{2} - p \right) U'' - \frac{(U')^2}{2\sigma^2} \right) f.$$

For further details on the symmetrization procedure for tilted semigroups associated to gradient SDE, see [74, Section IV.C]. This allows to use the computer-assisted scheme in Section 5.1 to enclose the corresponding rate function \mathcal{I} for FTLE for this class of SDE.

We caution, however, that this symmetrization procedure cannot generally be applied to FTLE of gradient SDE in dimension ≥ 2 , as there is no reason a priori to expect to be able to symmetrize the generator for the projective process (X_t, s_t) on $P\mathbb{R}^d$.

Lemma 4.2. *The moment Lyapunov exponent $\Lambda(p)$ associated to (4.1) is the principal eigenvalue of the tilted generator L_p (4.2), treated as operator on $L^2(\rho)$ with domain $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$. Here, $L^2(\rho)$ is the weighted L^2 space with inner product*

$$\langle f, g \rangle_\rho = \int \bar{f} g \rho \, dx.$$

Proof. For our aims it is more convenient to work first with \tilde{H}_p as defined in (4.3). We observe that $\tilde{H}_p f(x) = \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \partial_{xx} f(x) - V_p(x) f(x)$, where $V_p(x) := \left(\frac{(x^3 - \alpha x)^2}{2\sigma^2} - (3x^2 - \alpha) \left(\frac{1}{2} - p \right) \right)$ and $\lim_{x \rightarrow \pm\infty} V_p(x) = +\infty$. This implies that there exists a constant $\tilde{c} > 0$ such that $\tilde{H}_p + \tilde{c}\text{Id}$ is bounded from above. Since \tilde{H}_p is essentially self-adjoint (see Section 5.1), we obtain as a consequence of the Lumer-Phillips theorem (see [37, Theorem 3.15]) that $\tilde{H}_p + \tilde{c}\text{Id}$ generates a C_0 -semigroup on L^2 . Moreover, due to the boundedness from above of \tilde{H}_p we get that $L_p + \tilde{c}\text{Id}$ is bounded from above as well. Since L_p is self-adjoint we conclude by [37, P.91] that L_p generates a C_0 -semigroup on $L^2(\rho)$. Therefore, by the spectral mapping theorem we obtain that

$$\sigma(S_t^p) \setminus \{0\} = e^{t\sigma(L_p)}.$$

By this and recalling that $e^{t\Lambda(p)}$ is the dominant eigenvalue of S_t^p we infer that $\Lambda(p)$ is the dominant eigenvalue of L_p . \square

4.2 A two-dimensional toy model

We consider the following linear stochastic differential equation

$$dY_t = AY_t dt + BY_t \circ dU_t, \quad A = \begin{pmatrix} -\alpha & 0 \\ b & -\alpha \end{pmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sigma \\ -\sigma & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad Y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2, \quad (4.4)$$

where $\alpha > 0$ is the linear contraction parameter, $b > 0$ represents some shearing, U_t is a two-dimensional Brownian motion and $\sigma > 0$ expresses noise intensity.

A version of this model was investigated in [38] as a linear model for shear-induced chaos [54], and more recently was shown to arise as a scaling limit for the linearization of the Hopf normal form with additive noise [31]. There are, however, two key differences between the model considered in [31] and that in (4.4):

- (1) The entry $A_{2,2} = -\alpha$ replaces 0 from the model in [38] to make it so that a transition from uniform to nonuniform synchronization takes place and is easier to describe.
- (2) For technical reasons we have replaced a zero entry in B by $B_{2,1} = -\sigma$ to make the diffusion for the projective process uniformly elliptic instead of hypoelliptic. This greatly simplifies the computer-assisted work in Section 5.2. See Section 6 for a brief additional discussion on this point.

Trivially, the assumptions of Section 2.1 are satisfied here such that Theorems 2.3 and 2.4 hold. As discussed in Section 2, we introduce the process $s_t = Y_t/\|Y_t\| \in \mathbb{S}^1$, which can be described on the projective space P^1 by identifying $s_t = -s_t$. The dynamics are given by (cf. (2.6))

$$\begin{aligned} ds &= (As - \langle s, As \rangle s) dt + (Bs - \langle s, Bs \rangle s) \circ dU_t \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} -\alpha s_1 - s_1(-\alpha s_1^2 - \alpha s_2^2 + bs_1 s_2) \\ \alpha s_2 + bs_1 - s_2(-\alpha s_1^2 - \alpha s_2^2 + bs_1 s_2) \end{pmatrix} dt + \sigma \begin{pmatrix} s_2 \\ -s_1 \end{pmatrix} \circ dU_t. \end{aligned}$$

Above, for notational clarity we have dropped the ‘ t ’ dependence for $s = s_t$, $s_i = s_{i,t}$, which should be read implicitly throughout.

The Furstenberg-Khasminskii functional Q is given by

$$\begin{aligned} Q &= \langle s, As \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle (B + B^\top) s, Bs \rangle - \langle s, Bs \rangle^2 \\ &= -\alpha s_1^2 - \alpha s_2^2 + bs_1 s_2 + 0 = -\alpha + bs_1 s_2. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, $q_0 = Q$ in this case (because B is anti-symmetric, see also Remark 3.6). By the change of variables to $s = (\cos \phi, \sin \phi)$, the SDE determining the dynamics of the angular component $\phi \in [0, \pi)$ on the one-dimensional projective space, based on [48, Section 2], reads as

$$d\phi = -\frac{1}{\sin \phi} ds_1 = b \cos^2 \phi dt - \sigma \circ dU_t, \quad \phi_0 \in [0, \pi). \quad (4.5)$$

We can now express the asymptotic Lyapunov exponent by the Furstenberg-Khasminskii formula (2.15)

$$\lambda = \int_{[0, \pi]} q_0(\phi) \eta(\phi) d\phi, \quad (4.6)$$

where $\eta = \frac{d\nu}{d\phi}$ is the density of the stationary measure ν for (φ_t) and solves the stationary Fokker-Planck equation $L^* \eta = 0$; and $q_0(\phi) = -\alpha + b \cos \phi \sin \phi$. Observe that the finite time Lyapunov exponents are given by

$$\lambda_t(\phi_0) = \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t q_0(\phi_\tau) d\tau, \quad (4.7)$$

i.e. are uniformly negative as long as $b < 2\alpha$ (see also Remark 3.5). The values of q_0 become sign-indefinite when b crosses 2α such that the situation of Corollary 3.4 occurs.

For computation of the moment Lyapunov exponents we consider the tilted generator

$$L_p f(\phi) = \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 \partial_\phi^2 f(\phi) + b \cos^2 \phi \partial_\phi f(\phi) + p(b \cos \phi \sin \phi - \alpha) f(\phi), \quad (4.8)$$

with periodic boundary conditions on $[0, \pi]$. Recall that the moment Lyapunov exponents $\Lambda(p)$ are exactly the maximal eigenvalues of L_p (Lemma 4.3).

Lemma 4.3. $\Lambda(p)$ is the principal eigenvalue of the tilted generator

$$L_p = L + p \sum_{j=1}^m q_j h_j + pQ + \frac{p^2}{2} \sum_{j=1}^m q_j^2, \quad (4.9)$$

where L is given in (2.7), and L, L_p are treated as closed linear operators on $\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{C})$ (see Section 5.2 for definition and details). That is, $\Lambda(p)$ is a simple, isolated eigenvalue of L_p and has real part strictly larger than that of the rest of $\sigma(L_p)$.

Proof. We observe that $q_j = 0$ for $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ meaning that $L_p = L + pQ$. Therefore we are in the setting of [3] and the statement follows by [3, Lemma 2]. \square

5 Rigorous enclosures for moment Lyapunov exponents

In this section, we derive explicit enclosures for the moment Lyapunov exponents $\Lambda(p)$ associated to the two problems described in Section 4, using computer-assisted proofs. The obtained information allows us to give precise statements about the rate function \mathcal{I} , and also about the asymptotic variance of the Lyapunov exponent for the example of Section 4.2.

It should be noted that each of the two examples presents different challenges when it comes to computer-assisted proofs. Regarding the problem of Section 4.1, the operator (4.3) is defined on an unbounded domain, and contains unbounded terms, whereas many existing computer-assisted approaches are restricted to bounded domains. Here we take advantage of the fact that this problem has only real eigenvalues and can be recasted using a self-adjoint operator, which allows us to make use of the homotopy method [64, Chapter 10]. With this approach, the fact that the potential in (4.3) is unbounded turns out not to be an issue because eigenfunctions are localized. To the best of our knowledge, the only other existing computer-assisted results in the context of unbounded domains and unbounded potentials is [63], which deals specifically with coupled harmonic oscillators, and the very recent [24], which does not focus on eigenvalue problems.

The problem of Section 4.2 is not self-adjoint (and cannot be made so because L_p has complex eigenvalues), therefore the homotopy method cannot be used to directly enclose the eigenvalues of L_p . However, we can consider a zero-finding problem associated to finding an eigenpair (eigenvalue and eigenfunction) of L_p , and then use other well-established computer-assisted techniques in order to rigorously enclose a zero of this problem (see e.g. [78, 64]). Because the operator (4.8) is this time defined on a bounded domain, a wider breadth of computer-assisted techniques are available. Furthermore, we make use of the recent development in rigorous continuation techniques introduced in [23] in order to get, not only enclosures for fixed p , but a rigorous enclosure of the map $p \mapsto \Lambda(p)$ over a compact interval $[p_-, p_+]$, in norm strong enough to also control derivatives, which allows us to directly get an enclosure of the asymptotic variance $\Lambda''(0)$.

As is typical for computer-assisted proofs involving infinite-dimensional objects (here functions), most of the work consists in controlling truncation errors between the infinite dimensional problem we care about and the finite dimensional approximation used to do numerics. However, for some specific steps floating point errors also have to be controlled, which we do using interval arithmetic (see, e.g., [62, 76]).

5.1 Pitchfork bifurcation with additive noise

The goal of this subsection is to provide an explicit and tight enclosure of the first eigenvalue of the operator \tilde{H}_p defined in (4.3), and to study its dependency with respect α . For the sake of convenience, we introduce $H_p = -\tilde{H}_p$, and therefore look for to the smallest eigenvalue of H_p . For a fixed value of p , we first use the so-called homotopy method [64, Chapter 10] in order to get an explicit, tight and rigorous enclosure of the first eigenvalue $-\Lambda(p)$ of H_p . After getting several such enclosures for different values of p , an elementary convexity argument allows us to rigorously enclose the rate function \mathcal{I}_α at 0.

5.1.1 General strategy

We introduce

$$V_p(x) = (\alpha - 3x^2) \left(\frac{1}{2} - p \right) + \frac{(x^3 - \alpha x)^2}{2\sigma^2},$$

so that

$$H_p f(x) = -\frac{\sigma^2}{2} \partial_{xx} f(x) + V_p(x) f(x),$$

and explain how to get a rigorous enclosure of $\Lambda(p)$ for this problem. Regarding H_p as an operator on L^2 with (dense) domain $\mathcal{D}(H_p) = \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, it is known that H_p is (i) an essentially self-adjoint operator⁵; and (ii) that its (unique) self-adjoint extension has purely discrete spectrum (see, e.g., [12]).

In the sequel, p is fixed and we drop the p -dependence from the notation for the moment. As we will require more than the first eigenvalue of H along the way, we denote by $(\lambda_m)_{m \geq 0}$ the sequence of non-decreasing eigenvalues of H counted with multiplicity.

The Rayleigh-Ritz method gives us a straightforward way of getting rigorous and computable upper-bounds for a finite number of eigenvalues of H .

Proposition 5.1. [64, Theorem 10.12] *Let f_0, \dots, f_M in the domain of the self-adjoint extension of H be linearly independent elements, let*

$$A_0 = (\langle f_i, f_j \rangle)_{0 \leq i, j \leq M} \quad \text{and} \quad A_1 = (\langle H f_i, f_j \rangle)_{0 \leq i, j \leq M},$$

and let

$$\bar{\lambda}_0 \leq \dots \leq \bar{\lambda}_M,$$

be the eigenvalues of the generalized eigenvalue problem

$$A_1 v = \bar{\lambda} A_0 v. \tag{5.1}$$

Then, for all $m \leq M$

$$\lambda_m \leq \bar{\lambda}_m.$$

Remark 5.2. This result is nothing but a generalization to more than one eigenvalue of the basic estimate $\langle H f, f \rangle \geq \lambda_0 \langle f, f \rangle$. The quality of the upper-bounds produced by Proposition 5.1 depends on the choice of the elements f_i . If we take them to be accurate approximations of the $M + 1$ first eigenfunctions of H , we expect to get sharp upper-bounds.

Provided the entries of the matrices A_0 and A_1 are computed with interval arithmetic, and the *finite-dimensional* eigenvalue problem (5.1) is also solved rigorously with interval arithmetic (see, e.g., [71]), the $\bar{\lambda}_m$ are computable and rigorous upper-bounds for the eigenvalues λ_m .

Regarding lower-bounds, the Lehmann-Maehly method can be used, assuming some a priori knowledge on the next eigenvalue.

Proposition 5.3. [64, Theorem 10.14] *Repeat the assumptions of Proposition 5.1. Assume further that there exists $\nu \in \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$\bar{\lambda}_M < \nu \leq \lambda_{M+1}, \tag{5.2}$$

and define the matrices

$$A_2 = (\langle H f_i, H f_j \rangle)_{0 \leq i, j \leq M}, \quad B_1 = A_1 - \nu A_0 \quad \text{and} \quad B_2 = A_2 - 2\nu A_1 + \nu^2 A_0.$$

Let

$$\mu_0 \leq \dots \leq \mu_M$$

be the eigenvalues of the generalized eigenvalue problem

$$B_1 v = \mu B_2 v, \tag{5.3}$$

and assume that $\mu_M < 0$. Then, for all $m \leq M$

$$\underline{\lambda}_m \leq \lambda_m,$$

where

$$\underline{\lambda}_m := \nu + \frac{1}{\mu_{M-m}}.$$

⁵We recall that an unbounded, densely defined and symmetric operator is said to be essentially self-adjoint if its closure is self-adjoint.

Remark 5.4. Again, in the case $M = 0$, this is nothing but the estimate $\langle (H - \nu)^{-1}f, f \rangle \geq (\lambda_1 - \nu)^{-1} \langle f, f \rangle$, which, taking $f = (H - \nu)g$, yields $\langle (H - \nu)g, g \rangle \geq (\lambda_1 - \nu)^{-1} \langle (H - \nu)g, (H - \nu)g \rangle$.

In order to use Proposition 5.3, we need to find an explicit ν satisfying (5.2). To that end, let us consider $a > 0$, $b \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$V^{(0)}(x) := ax^2 + b \leq V(x) \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (5.4)$$

and the densely defined operator $H^{(0)}$ on $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ given by

$$H^{(0)}f(x) = -\frac{\sigma^2}{2}\partial_{xx}f(x) + V^{(0)}(x)f(x).$$

Denoting by $(\lambda_m^{(0)})_{m \geq 0}$ the sequence of non-decreasing eigenvalues of $H^{(0)}$, we have that

$$\lambda_m^{(0)} \leq \lambda_m \quad \forall m \geq 0, \quad (5.5)$$

simply because, thanks to (5.4),

$$\langle Hf, f \rangle \geq \langle H^{(0)}f, f \rangle \quad \forall f \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}).$$

Moreover, the eigenvalues $\lambda_m^{(0)}$ are known explicitly, as $H^{(0)}$ is nothing but (a rescaled version of) the quantum harmonic oscillator, and we have

$$\lambda_m^{(0)} = \left(m + \frac{1}{2}\right) \sigma \sqrt{2a} + b \quad \forall m \geq 0.$$

In particular, if it happens that $\lambda_{M+1}^{(0)} > \bar{\lambda}_M$, then (5.5) ensures that any $\nu \in (\bar{\lambda}_M, \lambda_{M+1}^{(0)})$ satisfies (5.2).

However, the eigenvalues of $H^{(0)}$ might be *too far away* from those of H , and it could be that $\lambda_{M+1}^{(0)} \leq \lambda_M$, in which case we cannot have $\lambda_{M+1}^{(0)} > \bar{\lambda}_M$. In order to make this procedure more general, we introduce a homotopy between $H^{(0)}$ and H , and consider

$$H^{(s)} := (1 - s)H^{(0)} + sH \quad \forall s \in [0, 1].$$

Denoting by $(\lambda_m^{(s)})_{m \geq 0}$ the sequence of non-decreasing eigenvalues of $H^{(s)}$, we still have that

$$\lambda_m^{(0)} \leq \lambda_m^{(s)} \quad \forall m \geq 0, \quad \forall s \in [0, 1],$$

and this time there will be a positive $s_0 \in (0, 1]$ such that $\lambda_{M+1}^{(0)} > \lambda_M^{(s_0)}$. We can then apply Proposition 5.1 to $H^{(s_0)}$, and, if the obtained upper bound $\bar{\lambda}_M^{(s_0)} \geq \lambda_M^{(s_0)}$ is sharp enough so that $\lambda_{M+1}^{(0)} > \bar{\lambda}_M^{(s_0)}$, also use Proposition 5.3 to obtain rigorous enclosure of the $M + 1$ first eigenvalues of $H^{(s_0)}$. In particular, we do now have a rigorous lower bound $\bar{\lambda}_M^{(s_0)} \leq \lambda_M^{(s_0)}$ for the $M + 1$ -th eigenvalue of $H^{(s_0)}$, and can therefore repeat the whole procedure in order to get rigorous enclosures of the M first eigenvalues of $H^{(s_1)}$ for some $s_1 > s_0$. We keep iterating this process until we reach $s = 1$, for which $H^{(1)} = H$. For further details, and generalizations of this homotopy method, we refer to [64, Section 10.2.4].

5.1.2 Results

Theorem 5.5. *Let $\alpha = 1$ and $\sigma = 1$ in (4.1). The rate function satisfies⁶*

$$\mathcal{I}_1(0) = - \inf_{p \in \mathbb{R}} \Lambda(p) \in [0.4551, 0.4553].$$

⁶Below and throughout, decimals in the endpoints of intervals are bolded if the upper and lower limits at those values disagree, e.g., $[-.12345, -.12332]$.

Proof. For any fixed p , we can obtain rigorous enclosures for the moment Lyapunov function $\Lambda(p)$ using the homotopy method described in Section 5.1. In particular, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda(0.71646) &\in [-0.455268764\mathbf{21}, -0.455268764\mathbf{19}], \\ \Lambda(0.71647) &\in [-0.455268764\mathbf{25}, -0.455268764\mathbf{22}], \\ \Lambda(0.71648) &\in [-0.455268764\mathbf{19}, -0.455268764\mathbf{16}].\end{aligned}$$

These three enclosures, combined with the convexity of Λ (Theorem 2.3 (iv)), yield that the infimum of Λ is reached in $[0.71646, 0.71648]$.⁷

Then, we evaluate Λ on this interval $[0.71646, 0.71648]$ (this means H_p is now an operator with interval coefficients, but that does not change anything to the homotopy method, for which interval arithmetic was already needed anyway), and the output provides the announced enclosure of $\inf_{p \in \mathbb{R}} \Lambda(p)$.

The computational parts of the proof can be reproduced by running the Matlab code `script_pitchfork_single.m`, available at [19], together with the Intlab toolbox [71] for interval arithmetic. \square

Remark 5.6. In principle, once an interval $[p_1, p_2]$ containing the minimizer of Λ has been obtained, one can first subdivide this interval into smaller subintervals, evaluate Λ on each subinterval separately, and then take the minimum of the obtained enclosures. This is more costly, but typically provides a sharper enclosure of $\Lambda([p_1, p_2])$.

There is of course nothing special about the parameter values that were chosen for α and σ in Theorem 5.5, and one can for instance repeat the same procedure for different values of α , leading to Figure 1. The rigorous computations required to produce this picture can be reproduced by running the Matlab code `script_pitchfork_all.m`, available at [19], together with the Intlab toolbox [71] for interval arithmetic. By narrowing in onto the minimum, we also obtain the following statement.

Theorem 5.7. *Let $\sigma = 1$ in (4.1). The map $\alpha \mapsto \mathcal{I}_\alpha(0)$ has a local minimum at some $\alpha_* \in [1.225, 1.229]$.*

Proof. Proceeding as in the proof of Theorem 5.5, we rigorously enclose $\mathcal{I}_\alpha(0)$ for three different values of α . We obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{I}_{1.225}(0) &\in [0.43605\mathbf{413}, 0.43605\mathbf{513}], \\ \mathcal{I}_{1.227}(0) &\in [0.43605\mathbf{254}, 0.43605\mathbf{354}], \\ \mathcal{I}_{1.229}(0) &\in [0.43605\mathbf{359}, 0.43605\mathbf{460}].\end{aligned}$$

In particular, $\mathcal{I}_{1.227}(0) < \mathcal{I}_{1.225}(0)$ and $\mathcal{I}_{1.227}(0) < \mathcal{I}_{1.229}(0)$, which yields the existence of a local minimum of $\alpha \mapsto \mathcal{I}_\alpha(0)$ in $[1.225, 1.229]$. The rigorous computations required for this proof can be reproduced by running the Matlab code `script_pitchfork_minimum.m`, available at [19], together with the Intlab toolbox [71] for interval arithmetic. \square

5.2 A two-dimensional toy model

The goal of this subsection is to provide an explicit and tight enclosure of the first eigenvalue of the operator L_p defined in (4.8). Most of the computer-assisted arguments used in this section are by now standard, except maybe for the rigorous continuation framework allowing us to easily

⁷There is a subtlety here due to the fact that the computer stores floating-point values in base 2. To be precise, we show using interval arithmetic that the infimum of Λ is reached in $[p_1, p_2]$, where p_1 is the largest floating point number (in the usual double precision) so that $p_1 \leq 0.71646$ and p_2 is the smallest floating point number such that $0.71648 \leq p_2$. It is then this interval $[p_1, p_2]$ on which we evaluate Λ in order to enclose $\mathcal{I}(0)$.

control at once the map $p \mapsto \Lambda(p)$ and its derivative. For the sake of convenience, we rescale the problem to $[0, 2\pi]$, and instead consider the operator (still denoted L_p) defined by

$$L_p f(\phi) = 2\sigma^2 \partial_\phi^2 f(\phi) + b(1 + \cos(\phi)) \partial_\phi f(\phi) + \frac{p}{2} (b \sin(\phi) - 2\alpha) f(\phi), \quad \phi \in [0, 2\pi],$$

with periodic boundary conditions. Keeping p fixed for the moment, and denoting by $(\bar{f}, \bar{\lambda})$ an approximate eigenpair of L_p , computed numerically, we introduce the zero finding problem

$$F_p(f, \lambda) = \begin{pmatrix} L_p f - \lambda f \\ \langle f, \bar{f} \rangle_{L^2} - 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5.6)$$

where

$$\langle f, g \rangle_{L^2} := \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} f(\phi) g(\phi)^* d\phi,$$

with z^* denoting the complex conjugate of a complex number z . A zero of F_p corresponds to an exact eigenpair of L_p , and then second equation in F_p is a normalization condition ensuring local uniqueness of the eigenpair.

5.2.1 General strategy

We use a Newton-Kantorovich type of argument, in an appropriate function space that will be introduced just below, to prove that there indeed exists a true zero (f, λ) of F_p near the approximate eigenpair $(\bar{f}, \bar{\lambda})$. We then also have to prove that the obtained eigenvalue λ is really $\Lambda(p)$, and not any other eigenvalue of L_p . Since eigenfunctions of L_p are eigenfunctions of $S_p^t, t > 0$ and since S_p^t is nonnegative and admits a simple dominant eigenvalue, it will be enough to check a posteriori that the eigenfunction f is nonnegative to get that $\lambda = \Lambda(p)$. For more on semigroups of compact, positive operators, see, e.g., [17].

Because of the periodic boundary conditions, we look for eigenfunctions as Fourier series:

$$f(\phi) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} f_n e^{in\phi}.$$

In the sequel, we always identify such a function with its sequence $(f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ of Fourier coefficients, still denoted f .

Definition 5.8. We define

$$\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{C}) = \{f \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbb{Z}}, \|f\|_{\ell^1} < \infty\},$$

where

$$\|f\|_{\ell^1} = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} |f_n|,$$

together with $\mathcal{X} = \ell^1(\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{C}) \times \mathbb{C}$, where $\|(f, \lambda)\|_{\mathcal{X}} = \|f\|_{\ell^1} + |\lambda|$.

In practice, we compute the approximate eigenfunction \bar{f} as a truncated Fourier series, therefore $\bar{X} = (\bar{f}, \bar{\lambda})$ trivially belongs to \mathcal{X} . We want to show that, for some (explicit and small) $r > 0$, there exists a unique zero $X = (f, \lambda)$ of F_p in \mathcal{X} such that $\|X - \bar{X}\|_{\mathcal{X}} \leq r$. This will be accomplished via the contraction mapping theorem, applied to a Newton-like operator associated to F_p , which we define momentarily.

Given a truncation level $N \in \mathbb{N}$, we introduce the corresponding truncation operator Π_N : For $f = (f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$,

$$(\Pi_N f)_n = \begin{cases} f_n & |n| \leq N, \\ 0 & |n| > N. \end{cases}$$

For $X = (f, \lambda) \in \mathcal{X}$, $\Pi_N X = (\Pi_N f, \lambda)$. In the sequel, we assume that the approximate eigenpair $\bar{X} = (\bar{f}, \bar{\lambda})$ belongs to $\Pi_N \mathcal{X}$, for some N to be specified later.

We then define the linear operator A by

$$AX = J\Pi_N X + \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \partial_\phi^{-2} (I - \Pi_N) X, \quad (5.7)$$

where J is a linear operator on $\Pi_N \mathcal{X}$, which can therefore be identified with an $(N+2) \times (N+2)$ matrix, computed numerically as an approximation of $(\Pi_N F'_p(\bar{X}) \Pi_N)^{-1}$. Provided N is large enough, such an A should provide us with an explicit and accurate approximate inverse of the Fréchet derivative $F'_p(\bar{X})$, which we can use in the following theorem.

Theorem 5.9. *Let F_p be as in (5.6) and A of the form (5.7). Assume there exist $Y, Z_1, Z_2 \geq 0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \|AF_p(\bar{X})\|_{\mathcal{X}} &\leq Y, \\ \|I - AF'_p(\bar{X})\|_{\mathcal{X}} &\leq Z_1, \\ \|A(F'_p(X) - F'_p(\bar{X}))\|_{\mathcal{X}} &\leq Z_2 \|X - \bar{X}\|_{\mathcal{X}}, \quad \forall X \in \mathcal{X}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.8)$$

If

$$\begin{aligned} Z_1 &< 1, \\ 2YZ_2 &< (1 - Z_1)^2, \end{aligned} \quad (5.9)$$

then, for any r satisfying

$$\frac{1 - Z_1 - \sqrt{(1 - Z_1)^2 - 2YZ_2}}{Z_2} \leq r < \frac{1 - Z_1}{Z_2},$$

there exists a unique zero X of F_p in \mathcal{X} such that $\|X - \bar{X}\|_{\mathcal{X}} \leq r$. Furthermore, if $\bar{X} = (\bar{f}, \bar{\lambda})$ is real, i.e. $\bar{f}_{-n} = (\bar{f}_n)^*$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\bar{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}$, then so is X .

For other versions of the above theorem, and its proof, see e.g. [2, 34, 68, 77, 81] and the references therein. In particular, we note that in general the Z_2 estimate only needs to hold in a neighborhood of \bar{X} , but here such an estimate will naturally be global because the map F_p is quadratic. We derive below explicit constants Y, Z_1 and Z_2 satisfying (5.8), and then check, using interval arithmetic [71] to control rounding errors, that these constants satisfy (5.9) for some given approximate solution \bar{X} .

Remark 5.10. Once Theorem 5.9 has been successfully applied, we get an explicit r such that $\|f - \bar{f}\|_{\ell^1} \leq r$. Note that the ℓ^1 -norm controls the C^0 -norm, hence

$$\inf_{\phi \in [0, 2\pi]} f(\phi) \geq \inf_{\phi \in [0, 2\pi]} \bar{f}(\phi) - r,$$

which provides us with an easy way of checking a posteriori that the eigenfunction f is indeed nonnegative.

5.2.2 The bounds

The Y bound. As \bar{f} is a truncated Fourier series, $AF_p(\bar{X})$ also has only finitely many non-zero coefficients. Therefore we can simply take $Y = \|AF_p(\bar{X})\|_{\mathcal{X}}$, which is a finite computation that can be carried out on a computer, with interval arithmetic to account for rounding errors.

The Z_1 bound. In order to derive a suitable Z_1 bound, let us introduce $B_p = I - AF'_p(\bar{X})$. We have to estimate

$$\|B_p\|_{\mathcal{X}} = \sup_{\substack{X \in \mathcal{X} \\ X \neq 0}} \frac{\|B_p X\|_{\mathcal{X}}}{\|X\|_{\mathcal{X}}},$$

which we do by noticing $\|B_p\|_{\mathcal{X}}$ can be split as follows:

$$\|B_p\|_{\mathcal{X}} = \max \left(\sup_{\substack{X \in \Pi_{N+1}\mathcal{X} \\ X \neq 0}} \frac{\|B_p X\|_{\mathcal{X}}}{\|X\|_{\mathcal{X}}}, \sup_{\substack{X \in (I - \Pi_{N+1})\mathcal{X} \\ X \neq 0}} \frac{\|B_p X\|_{\mathcal{X}}}{\|X\|_{\mathcal{X}}} \right). \quad (5.10)$$

The first sup is in fact a maximum:

$$\sup_{\substack{X \in \Pi_{N+1}\mathcal{X} \\ X \neq 0}} \frac{\|B_p X\|_{\mathcal{X}}}{\|X\|_{\mathcal{X}}} = \max \left(\|B_p(0, 1)\|_{\mathcal{X}}, \max_{0 \leq n \leq N} \frac{\|B_p(e_n, 0)\|_{\mathcal{X}}}{\|e_n\|_{\ell^1}} \right),$$

where e_n is the sequence having 1 as n -th entry and 0 otherwise. Similarly to the Y computation, each element $B_p(e_n, 0)$ of \mathcal{X} only has finitely many non-zero coefficients, and the above estimate can be evaluated on a computer.

In order to deal with the second supremum in (5.10) we take advantage of the fact that, for any $X \in (I - \Pi_{N+1})\mathcal{X}$, $B_p X$ does not depend on J . Indeed, for an arbitrary $X = (f, \lambda) \in \mathcal{X}$, denoting $V = (g, \mu) = F'_p(\bar{X})X$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} g_n &= (-2(\sigma n)^2 - \alpha p + ibn) f_n + \frac{ib(2n+p)}{4} f_{n+1} + \frac{ib(2n-p)}{4} f_{n-1} - \bar{\lambda} f_n - \lambda \bar{f}_n \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{Z}, \\ \mu &= \sum_{|n| \leq N} f_n (\bar{f}_n)^*, \end{aligned}$$

where we recall that $\bar{f} \in \Pi_N \ell^1$. In particular, if $X \in (I - \Pi_{N+1})\mathcal{X}$,

$$\begin{aligned} g_n &= 0 \quad \forall |n| \leq N, \\ \mu &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

hence

$$BX = X - AV = \begin{pmatrix} f - \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \left(\partial_{\phi}^{-2} \right) g \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then, still assuming $X \in (I - \Pi_{N+1})\mathcal{X}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|BX\|_{\mathcal{X}} &\leq \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \sum_{|n| \geq N+1} \frac{1}{n^2} \left((|\alpha p + \bar{\lambda}| + |bn|) |f_n| + \frac{2|bn| + |bp|}{4} (|f_{n+1}| + |f_{n-1}|) \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \left(\frac{|\alpha p + \bar{\lambda}| + |b|(N+2)}{(N+2)^2} + \frac{2|b|(N+1) + |bp|}{4(N+1)^2} + \frac{2|b|(N+3) + |bp|}{4(N+3)^2} \right) \sum_{|n| \geq N+2} |f_n|, \end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$\sup_{\substack{X \in (I - \Pi_{N+1})\mathcal{X} \\ X \neq 0}} \frac{\|BX\|_{\mathcal{X}}}{\|X\|_{\mathcal{X}}} \leq \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \left(\frac{|\alpha p + \bar{\lambda}| + |b|(N+2)}{(N+2)^2} + \frac{2|b|(N+1) + |bp|}{4(N+1)^2} + \frac{2|b|(N+3) + |bp|}{4(N+3)^2} \right).$$

We thus consider

$$Z_1^{finite} = \max \left(\|B_p(0, 1)\|_{\mathcal{X}}, \max_{0 \leq n \leq N} \frac{\|B_p(e_n, 0)\|_{\mathcal{X}}}{\|e_n\|_{\ell^1}} \right),$$

and

$$Z_1^{tail} = \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \left(\frac{|\alpha p + \bar{\lambda}| + |b|(N+2)}{(N+2)^2} + \frac{2|b|(N+1) + |bp|}{4(N+1)^2} + \frac{2|b|(N+3) + |bp|}{4(N+3)^2} \right),$$

which are both computable, and take $Z_1 = \max(Z_1^{finite}, Z_1^{tail})$.

The Z_2 bound. The only nonlinear term in $F_p(f, \lambda)$ being the $-\lambda f$ term, we have, for any $X = (f, \lambda)$ in \mathcal{X} ,

$$(F'_p(X) - F'_p(\bar{X})) X = \begin{pmatrix} (\bar{\lambda} - \lambda)f + \lambda(\bar{f} - f) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

therefore

$$\|(F'_p(X) - F'_p(\bar{X})) X\|_{\mathcal{X}} \leq \|X - \bar{X}\|_{\mathcal{X}} \|X\|_{\mathcal{X}},$$

and we can take $Z_2 = \|A\|_{\mathcal{X}}$. Because of the specific structure of A (see (5.7)), and of our choice of norm, this operator norm can also be computed explicitly:

$$\|A\|_{\mathcal{X}} = \max \left(\|J\|_{\mathcal{X}}, \frac{1}{2\sigma^2(N+1)^2} \right),$$

where the remaining operator norm applies to a finite dimensional operator and therefore amounts to a (weighted) ℓ^1 matrix norm.

5.2.3 Extension to a varying p

We explained in Sections 5.2.1 and 5.2.2 how to get rigorous a posteriori error bounds for an eigenpair (f, λ) of L_p , for a fixed value of p , and how to check that $\lambda = \Lambda(p)$. However, in view of Theorem 2.4, it would be interesting to have a rigorous enclosure of the map $p \mapsto \Lambda(p)$, at least on a compact interval $[p_-, p_+]$, in a strong enough norm so that we could also control quantities like the asymptotic Lyapunov exponent $\Lambda'(0)$ and the asymptotic variance $\Lambda''(0)$.

The rigorous continuation tools developed in [23] allows us to do exactly that in a straightforward manner. We expand all functions of p using Chebyshev series, and look for eigenvalues as Chebyshev series, and for eigenfunctions as Fourier-Chebyshev series:

$$\lambda(p) = \lambda_0 + 2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k \tilde{T}_k(p), \quad f(p, \phi) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \left(f_{n,0} + 2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} f_{n,k} \tilde{T}_k(p) \right) e^{in\phi},$$

where \tilde{T}_k , $k \in \mathbb{N}$, are the Chebyshev polynomials of the first kind, rescaled from $[-1, 1]$ to $[p_-, p_+]$: $\tilde{T}_k(p) = T_k \left(\frac{2p - (p_+ + p_-)}{p_+ - p_-} \right)$. We then define, for $\eta \geq 1$,

$$\ell_{\eta}^1(\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{C}) = \left\{ u \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbb{N}}, \|u\|_{\ell_{\eta}^1} < \infty \right\},$$

where

$$\|u\|_{\ell_{\eta}^1} = |u_0| + 2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |u_k| \eta^k = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} |u_{|k|}| \eta^{|k|},$$

and

$$\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}, \ell_{\eta}^1(\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{C})) = \left\{ f \in (\ell_{\eta}^1(\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{C}))^{\mathbb{Z}}, \|f\|_{\ell^1, \ell_{\eta}^1} < \infty \right\},$$

where

$$\|f\|_{\ell^1, \ell_\eta^1} = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \|f_n\|_{\ell_\eta^1} = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \left(|f_{n,0}| + 2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |f_{n,k}| \eta^k \right),$$

and look for a zero of (5.6) in $\mathcal{X}_\eta = \ell^1(\mathbb{Z}, \ell_\eta^1(\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{C})) \times \ell_\eta^1(\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{C})$, with norm

$$\|(f, \lambda)\|_{\mathcal{X}_\eta} = \|f\|_{\ell^1, \ell_\eta^1} + \|\lambda\|_{\ell_\eta^1}.$$

Our approximate zero $(\bar{f}, \bar{\lambda})$ is then made of a truncated (in k and n) Fourier-Chebyshev series \bar{f} and of a truncated Chebyshev series $\bar{\lambda}$.

The advantage of this setup compared to more traditional continuation methods is twofold. First, the estimates required for using the Newton-Kantorovich Theorem 5.9 in this new space \mathcal{X}_η are essentially the same as in the fixed p case, up to the fact that real numbers which depend on p becomes elements of $\ell_\eta^1(\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{C})$, and that absolute values applied to such quantities have to be replaced by ℓ_η^1 -norms. In particular, the Z_1^{tail} estimate naturally generalizes to

$$Z_1^{tail} = \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \left(\frac{\|\alpha p + \bar{\lambda}\|_{\ell_\eta^1} + |b|(N+2)}{(N+2)^2} + \frac{2|b|(N+1) + \|bp\|_{\ell_\eta^1}}{4(N+1)^2} + \frac{2|b|(N+3) + \|bp\|_{\ell_\eta^1}}{4(N+3)^2} \right).$$

The second reason why doing continuation via an extension in $\ell_\eta^1(\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{C})$ can be helpful, which is especially relevant in our context, is that the ℓ_η^1 norm allows us to directly control derivatives.

Lemma 5.11. *Let $\eta > 1$, $u \in \ell_\eta^1(\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{C})$, and also denote by u the map defined on $[-1, 1]$ by*

$$u : p \mapsto u_0 + 2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} u_k T_k(p).$$

For all $x \in [0, 1]$, let

$$\delta[x, \eta] = \begin{cases} \frac{\eta + \eta^{-1}}{2} - x & x > \frac{2}{\eta + \eta^{-1}}, \\ \frac{\eta - \eta^{-1}}{2} \sqrt{1 - x^2} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For all $p_1, p_2 \in [-1, 1]$, $p_1 \leq p_2$, define

$$C_\eta^1(p_1, p_2) = \min \left(\max_{\substack{k \in \mathbb{N} \\ 1 \leq k \leq \frac{2}{\ln \eta}}} \frac{k^2}{\eta^k}, \frac{1}{\delta[\max(|p_1|, |p_2|), \eta]} \right),$$

$$C_\eta^2(p_1, p_2) = \min \left(\max_{\substack{k \in \mathbb{N} \\ 2 \leq k \leq \frac{4}{\ln \eta}}} \frac{k^2(k^2 - 1)}{3\eta^k}, \frac{2}{(\delta[\max(|p_1|, |p_2|), \eta])^2} \right).$$

Then, the map u is twice differentiable, and

$$\sup_{p \in [p_1, p_2]} |u'(p)| \leq C_\eta^1(p_1, p_2) \|u\|_{\ell_\eta^1}, \quad \sup_{p \in [p_1, p_2]} |u''(p)| \leq C_\eta^2(p_1, p_2) \|u\|_{\ell_\eta^1}.$$

Remark 5.12. In fact, having u in ℓ_η^1 for $\eta > 1$ implies that the associated map is analytic, on a so-called Bernstein ellipse of size η containing the segment $[-1, 1]$ (see e.g. [75]). If useful, similar estimates on higher order derivatives could therefore also be obtained.

Proof. Classical properties of the Chebyshev polynomials yield, for all $p \in [-1, 1]$,

$$u'(p) = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} 2(2l+1)u_{2l+1} + 2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} 2(k+2l+1)u_{k+2l+1} T_k(p),$$

therefore

$$\begin{aligned} |u'(p)| &= 2 \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} |u_{2l+1}| \eta^{2l+1} \frac{2l+1}{\eta^{2l+1}} + 2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} |u_{k+2l+1}| \eta^{k+2l+1} 2 \frac{k+2l+1}{\eta^{k+2l+1}} \\ &\leq \|u\|_{\ell_\eta^1} \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}} \frac{k^2}{\eta^k}. \end{aligned}$$

It is straightforward to check that this supremum is in fact a maximum, which must be reached for $k \leq \frac{2}{\ln \eta}$. A similar computation yields

$$|u''(p)| \leq \|u\|_{\ell_\eta^1} \frac{1}{3} \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}} \frac{k^2(k^2-1)}{\eta^k} = \|u\|_{\ell_\eta^1} \frac{1}{3} \max_{\substack{k \in \mathbb{N} \\ 2 \leq k \leq \frac{4}{\ln \eta}}} \frac{k^2(k^2-1)}{\eta^k}.$$

The other part of the two estimates is obtained by using that, since $u \in \ell_\eta^1(\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{C})$, $\eta > 1$, u is analytic on the open Bernstein ellipse \mathcal{E}_η , defined as

$$\mathcal{E}_\eta = \{z \in \mathbb{C}, |z-1| + |z+1| < \eta + \eta^{-1}\},$$

and bounded on the closure $\overline{\mathcal{E}_\eta}$ of \mathcal{E}_η . Furthermore, one can check that, for all $x \in [0, 1]$, the ball in \mathbb{C} of center x and radius $\delta[x, \eta]$ is contained in $\overline{\mathcal{E}_\eta}$. The second part of the estimates then follows from Cauchy's integral formula and the fact that

$$\sup_{z \in \overline{\mathcal{E}_\eta}} |u(z)| \leq \|u\|_{\ell_\eta^1}. \quad \square$$

Once we successfully use Theorem 5.9 with the extended space \mathcal{X}_η , and check that $\lambda = \Lambda$ (see Remark 5.10) we can therefore combine the estimate

$$\|\Lambda - \bar{\lambda}\|_{\ell_\eta^1} \leq r,$$

with Lemma 5.11, in order to get

$$|\Lambda''(0) - \bar{\lambda}''(0)| \leq \left(\frac{2}{p_+ - p_-}\right)^2 C_\eta^2(0, 0)r, \quad (5.11)$$

where the $\left(\frac{2}{p_+ - p_-}\right)^2$ factor comes from the rescaling between $[-1, 1]$ and $[p_-, p_+]$. Since $\bar{\lambda}$ is merely a polynomial (a truncated Chebyshev series), $\bar{\lambda}''(0)$ can be evaluated explicitly, and (5.11) provides us with a rigorous and explicit enclosure of the asymptotic variance $\Lambda''(0)$.

5.2.4 Results

Theorem 5.13. *Let $\alpha = 1$, $b = 5$, and $\sigma = 1$ in (4.4). The rate function satisfies*

$$\mathcal{I}(0) = - \inf_{p \in \mathbb{R}} \Lambda(p) \in [0.0947750, 0.0947753].$$

Furthermore, the asymptotic first Lyapunov exponent and the asymptotic variance are given by

$$\Lambda'(0) \in [-0.35231598, -0.35231594] \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda''(0) \in [0.657787, 0.657789].$$

Proof. We consider $[p_-, p_+] = [-4, 6]$ and compute an accurate truncated Fourier-Chebyshev approximation $(\bar{f}, \bar{\lambda})$ of a zero of (5.6) over this interval, depicted on Figure 3. Using the methodology described in Sections 5.2.1-5.2.3, and in particular Theorem 5.9 with the space \mathcal{X}_η , with $\eta = 1.01$, we obtain that there is an exact eigenpair (f, λ) with

$$\|(f, \lambda) - (\bar{f}, \bar{\lambda})\|_{\mathcal{X}_\eta} \leq 8 \times 10^{-10}.$$




Figure 3: Representation of the approximate eigenfunction $\bar{f} = \bar{f}(p, \phi)$ (left) and approximate eigenvalue $\bar{\lambda} = \bar{\lambda}(p)$ (right) used in the proof of Theorem 5.13.

We then successfully check that $f \geq 0$ (see Remark 5.10), which implies that $\lambda = \Lambda$. Using Lemma 5.11, we also get a rigorous control on Λ' , which allows us to find a narrow interval $[p_1, p_2]$ containing the zero of Λ' (using the intermediate value theorem), and then to enclose $-\Lambda([p_1, p_2])$, which provides the announced value of $I(0)$. Using again Lemma 5.11, we also get the announced enclosures of $\Lambda'(0)$ and $\Lambda''(0)$.

The computational parts of the proof can be reproduced by running the Matlab code `script_shear_single.m`, available at [19], together with the Intlab toolbox [71] for interval arithmetic. \square

There is of course nothing special about the parameter values that were chosen for α , b and σ in Theorem 5.13, and one can, for instance, repeat the same procedure for different values of b . In Figure 4, we show rigorously validated enclosures of $I_b(0)$ for many different values of b . The rigorous computations required to produce this picture can be reproduced by running the Matlab code `script_shear_all.m`, available at [19], together with the Intlab toolbox [71] for interval arithmetic.

Remark 5.14. Note that in this example, we have a transition from negative to positive asymptotic Lyapunov exponent when b increases (see the evolution of $\Lambda'_b(0)$ on Figure 4). After that transition, when the asymptotic Lyapunov exponent is positive, the rate function \mathcal{I}_b still holds the information about the large deviations principle for the FTLE (see Theorem 2.4 and Corollary 2.5), but its specific value at 0 loses its prominent meaning.

There are some notable differences to the pitchfork example discussed in Section 5.1, in particular comparing $\mathcal{I}_\alpha(0)$, as depicted in Figure 1, and $\mathcal{I}_b(0)$, as depicted in Figure 4. In the latter case, there is no local minimum for $\mathcal{I}_b(0)$ as long as the asymptotic Lyapunov exponent is negative, in contrast to the existence of the local minimum α_* (see Theorem 5.7). This is due to the fact that increasing the shear factor b globally adds more expansion to the system without being limited to a local effect around some (deterministic) equilibrium. There is then a global minimum at some b_* where the asymptotic Lyapunov exponent crosses 0 and, hence, $\mathcal{I}_{b_*}(0) = 0$ (see Section 2).

6 Outlook

In the course of this paper we have laid out the connection between positive FTLE and the values taken by the large deviations rate function. In particular, in many circumstances a transition




Figure 4: Rigorous computations of $\mathcal{I}_b(0)$, $\Lambda'_b(0)$ and $\Lambda''_b(0)$ for (4.4), with $\alpha = 1$, $\sigma = 1$ and several values of b . The upper- and lower-bounds are too close to be depicted on the picture: all error bounds are below 9×10^{-9} for $\mathcal{I}_b(0)$, below 2×10^{-7} for $\Lambda'_b(0)$, and below 6×10^{-4} for $\Lambda''_b(0)$. Blue square markers are used for $\mathcal{I}_b(0)$ when the corresponding asymptotic Lyapunov exponent (given by $\Lambda'_b(0)$) is positive, see Remark 5.14.

to positive FTLE is accompanied by and detected from a qualitative change in the LDP rate function.

Many questions arose during the writing of this paper, which we feel provide a compelling program for future work in various directions, including both the treatment of more general systems and alternative characterizations of FTLE transitions. We record some of these below.

Treatment of systems on unbounded domains

As remarked elsewhere, the large deviations principle for unbounded domains we borrow from [40] essentially requires that one works with fully elliptic additive noise. This is somewhat unsatisfying as there should be some general LDP for hypoelliptic diffusions as well. It would also be interesting to develop an unbounded version of Theorem 3.2, the proof of which used compactness in a crucial way throughout.

Treatment of systems in infinite dimensions

It is of natural interest to apply large deviations principles to other circumstances where there is a known FTLE transition, e.g., stochastic PDE such as the Chaffee-Infante equation as it

undergoes a series of pitchfork bifurcations [20, 18]. To our best knowledge, however, several developments will be necessary even to prove a large deviations principle. At time of writing it is an ongoing project to lay out elements of the ergodic theory of the corresponding projective process on an infinite-dimensional domain. For recent advances in this direction we refer the reader to [46, 70].

Connection with quasi-stationary statistics

Positive FTLE amid a negative asymptotic exponent, as we have studied in this paper, should be understood as a transient-in-time behavior for typical trajectories. Quasi-stationary ergodic theory is a powerful toolkit for the description of transient behavior one can attach to a stopping time, e.g., the statistics on conditioning remaining in a certain region of phase space [32, 65, 66, 80], with notable recent advances [28, 29, 30]. A version of the multiplicative ergodic theorem for quasi-stationary dynamics [27] allows to assign Lyapunov exponents in this setting, and it is not hard to show that in many cases, a positive quasi-stationary Lyapunov exponent implies positive FTLE for all sufficiently large times, even when the overall asymptotic Lyapunov exponent is negative.

It is natural to study the extent of this connection and whether the converse is true: is there a set of assumptions guaranteeing one can assign to a system with positive FTLE a quasi-stationary statistic with a positive Lyapunov exponent?

CAP challenges

As already mentioned in Section 4.2, models of the form (4.4) appear naturally when studying the Hopf normal form, but with $B = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sigma \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. In that case, still describing the projective process s via the angular variable ϕ , equation (4.5) becomes

$$d\phi = b \cos^2 \phi dt - \sigma \sin \phi \circ dU_t,$$

and the corresponding generator L is no-longer uniformly elliptic:

$$Lf = \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \sin^2 \phi \partial_\phi (\sin^2 \phi \partial_\phi f) + b \cos^2 \phi \partial_\phi f, \quad \phi \in (0, \pi).$$

How to rigorously study the spectrum (of the associated tilted generator L_p) in this case seems to be an interesting challenge.

At the moment, it also remains unclear how rigorously control the spectrum of L_p when M is not compact and L_p is not self-adjoint.

Acknowledgements

We heartily thank Michael Plum for encouraging discussions regarding the example studied in Sections 4.1 and 5.1. Furthermore, we thank Sam Punshon-Smith and Dennis Chemnitz for fruitful discussions concerning moment Lyapunov exponents.

M. Breden was supported by the ANR project CAPPS: ANR-23-CE40-0004-01.

A. Blessing was supported by the DFG grant 543163250 and acknowledges seed support for DFG CRC/TRR 388 *Rough Analysis, Stochastic Dynamics and Related Topics*.

M. Engel has been supported by Germany's Excellence Strategy – The Berlin Mathematics Research Center MATH+ (EXC-2046/1, project ID: 390685689), via projects AA1-8, AA1-18 and EF45-5. Furthermore, M. Engel thanks the DFG CRC 1114, DFG SPP 2298 and the Einstein Foundation for support.

A. Blumenthal and M. Engel additionally thank MATH+ for supporting A. Blumenthal as a MATH+ Visiting Scholar in the summer of 2023, in particular appreciating the support by Rupert Klein and Nicolas Perkowski.

A Geometric ergodicity and Harris' Theorem

Below we recall some preliminaries on uniform geometric ergodicity used in the proof of Theorem 3.2. Let \mathcal{X} be a complete metric space, $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ a probability space, and let $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be a Markov process on \mathcal{X} with associated transition kernel

$$P^t(x, K) = \mathbb{P}(X_t \in K | X_0 = x)$$

and semigroup

$$P^t \varphi(x) = \mathbb{E}(\varphi(X_t) | X_0 = x).$$

Let $W : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [1, \infty)$ be measurable and let C_W be as in Section 2.2.

Definition A.1.

- (i) We say that (X_t) is *W-geometrically ergodic* if (X_t) admits a unique stationary probability measure μ for which

$$\|P^t \varphi - \int \varphi d\mu\|_{C_W} \leq C e^{-\gamma t} \|\varphi\|_{C_W}$$

holds for all $\varphi \in C_W, t > 0$, where $C > 0$ and $\gamma > 0$ are constants.

- (ii) We say that (X_t) is *uniformly geometrically ergodic* if it is *W-geometrically ergodic* for the constant function $W \equiv 1$.

Below we recall Harris' Theorem, which provides conditions under which a Markov chain is *W-geometrically ergodic*.

Definition A.2.

- (a) Let $A \subset \mathcal{X}$ be a Borel set, $t > 0$, and ν_t a positive Borel measure on \mathcal{X} . We say that A is a ν_t -*small set* (or just "small set" for short) if

$$P^t(x, B) \geq \nu_t(B) \quad \text{for all } x \in A, \quad B \in \text{Bor}(\mathcal{X}).$$

- (b) We say that a measurable function $W : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [1, \infty)$ satisfies a *Lyapunov-Foster drift condition* if there exists $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $C > 0$ such that

$$P^t W \leq \alpha^t W + C \quad \text{for all } t > 0.$$

The following version of Harris' Theorem follows from [59, Chapter 16]; see also the appendices of [22].

Theorem A.3. *Let (P^t) be a Feller transition kernel⁸ and assume the following conditions:*

- (a) *(Small set): There exists an open small set.*
- (b) *(Topological irreducibility): For every $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and nonempty open set $U \subset \mathcal{X}$ there exists $N = N(x, U) \geq 1$ such that $P^N(x, U) > 0$.*
- (c) *(Strong aperiodicity): There exists $x^* \in \mathcal{X}$ such that for all open $U \ni x^*$, we have that $P(x^*, U) > 0$.*
- (d) *(Drift condition) There exists a function $W : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [1, \infty)$ with compact sublevel sets and for which a Lyapunov-Foster drift condition holds.*

Then (P^t) is *W-uniformly geometrically ergodic*.

Corollary A.4. *Let (P^t) be a Feller Markov semigroup. If \mathcal{X} is compact and (a), (b), (c) hold in the statement of Theorem A.3, then (P^t) is uniformly geometrically ergodic.*

⁸We say that (P^t) is Feller if $\varphi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ bounded, continuous implies $P^t \varphi$ bounded, continuous.

B Large deviations in the noncompact case

Section 2.2 states a large deviations principle (Theorem 2.9) for the finite-time Lyapunov exponents of a stochastic flow on \mathbb{R}^d under some conditions; a setting not covered by the classical work [5] on the subject which considers only the case of stochastic diffusions on a compact manifold. The LDP we desire is essentially a version of the results of [40], extending the results for observables of an \mathbb{R}^d diffusion to the present context of observables of a diffusion on $\mathbb{R}^d \times P^{d-1}$ diffusion.

The plan is as follows. Section B.1 presents, without proof, a version of the Gärtner-Ellis theorem (Theorem B.1 below), an abstract tool for proving LDPs. In Section B.2, we briefly summarize how Theorem B.1 is used to prove Theorem 2.9, deferring to [40] for details. Analyticity of $p \mapsto \Lambda(p)$ as in Theorem 2.9(a)(iv), details of which are suppressed in [40] (c.f. Remark 6.8 of their paper), is checked in Section B.3.

B.1 The Gärtner-Ellis Theorem

Below we present a version of the Gärtner-Ellis theorem for empirical averages of scalar observables. In what follows, (Z_t^β) is a family of random variables on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ parametrized by $t \in [0, \infty)$, $\beta \in B$ for some abstract index set B . Let

$$\Lambda_t^\beta(p) = \log \mathbb{E} e^{pZ_t^\beta},$$

where throughout we assume the above expectation is defined and finite for all $t \geq 0$, $\beta \in B$.

The following is a version of [35, Theorem 2.3.6].

Theorem B.1. *Assume that for all $p \in \mathbb{R}$, the limit*

$$\Lambda(p) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \Lambda_t^\beta(pt) \tag{B.1}$$

exists and is uniform over $\beta \in B$. Assume moreover that $\Lambda : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is differentiable. Then, the family of random variables (Z_t^β) satisfies a β -uniform large deviations principle (LDP) with good rate function $\mathcal{I} = \Lambda^$. That is, for all measurable $K \in \mathbb{R}$,*

$$- \inf_{r \in K^\circ} \mathcal{I}(r) \leq \liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{P}(Z_t \in K) \leq \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{P}(Z_t \in K) \leq - \inf_{r \in K} \mathcal{I}(r).$$

Here, the *Legendre-Fenchel transform* Λ^* of Λ is defined as

$$\Lambda^*(r) = \sup_{p \in \mathbb{R}} (pr - \Lambda(p)).$$

Observe that Λ^* is automatically nonnegative since $\Lambda(0) = 0$. We say that $\mathcal{I} = \Lambda^*$ is a *good rate function* if $\mathcal{I}^{-1}[0, r]$ is compact for all $r \geq 0$. Using Hölder's inequality, our assumptions imply that Λ is convex and, hence, Λ^* is convex and a good rate function [35, Lemma 2.3.9].

A version of Theorem B.1, absent the parameter $\beta \in B$, is proved in [35, Section 2.3]. The extension to the ' β -uniform' version above is straightforward and omitted.

B.2 Proof of Theorem 2.9

Recall the notation that for nonnegative functions f, g on \mathbb{R}^d , we write $g \ll f$ if f/g has compact sublevel sets, and that if in addition f, g are continuous, then $g \ll f$ only if for any $a > 0$ there exists $R > 0$ such that

$$g \leq af + R.$$

We write $g \sim f$ if there exist $c, c', R, R' > 0$ such that

$$c'f - R' \leq g \leq cf + R.$$

Let (X_t, s_t) denote the process on $PM \cong \mathbb{R}^d \times P^{d-1}$ in the setting of Section 2.2, and let Assumption 2.8 hold. We intend to apply Theorem B.1 to the family of random variables

$$Z_t^\beta = \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t g(X_\tau, s_\tau) d\tau, \quad (\text{B.2})$$

where $B \subset PM$ is some compact subset, and $\beta = (X_0, s_0) \in B$. Here, $g : PM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ will belong to some appropriate class of observables, our ultimate goal being to set $g(x, s) = Q(x, s) = \langle s, (Df_0)_x s \rangle$ so that $Z_t^\beta = \lambda_t(X_0, s_0)$.

B.2.1 Components of the proof of Theorem 2.9

Like in the sketch of the proof of Theorem 2.4 presented in Section 2.1, convergence of $\Lambda(p)$ hinges on the spectral theory of the twisted semigroup $S^t = S_g^t$ acting on $\psi : \mathbb{R}^d \times P^{d-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$S^t \psi(X, s) = \mathbb{E}_{(X, s)} \left[\psi(X_t, s_t) \exp \int_0^t g(X_\tau, s_\tau) d\tau \right].$$

As mentioned in Section 2.2, we conduct this spectral theory on the weighted uniform space C_W with norm $\|\varphi\|_{C_W} = \sup_{(x, s) \in PM} |\varphi(x, s)|/W(x)$, where

$$W = e^{\theta V}$$

for $\theta \in (0, 1)$ fixed, and V is as in Assumption 2.8.

Theorem B.2. *Let $g \in C_W$ be smooth and assume moreover that $\sup_{s \in P^{d-1}} |g(\cdot, s)| \ll |\sigma^T \nabla V|^2$.*

- (a) *For all $t > 0$, it holds that S^t is a bounded linear operator on C_W .*
- (b) *There exist $\Lambda_g \in \mathbb{R}, r > 0$ such that for all $t > 0$, the operator $S^t : C_W \rightarrow C_W$ is compact and admits as a simple eigenvalue $e^{t\Lambda_g} > 0$ with the property that $\sigma(S^t) \setminus \{e^{t\Lambda_g}\} \subset B_{rt}(0)$.*
- (c) *There exists $\psi_g \in C_W, \psi_g > 0$ for which $S^t \psi_g = e^{t\Lambda_g} \psi_g$ for all $t > 0$.*

Theorem B.2 is essentially a version of the developments in [40, Section 6]. For completeness some salient features of the proof are recalled in Section B.2.2 below.

Let us write $\Lambda(p) = \Lambda_{pg}$ for $p \in \mathbb{R}$ corresponding to the semigroups $S_p^t := S_{pg}^t$.

Proposition B.3. *The function $\Lambda : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is convex and real-analytic.*

We sketch the proof of Proposition B.3 in Section B.3 below.

Proof of Theorem 2.9 assuming Theorem B.2 and Proposition B.3. Set $g = Q$. The Furstenberg-Khasminskii formula as in item (i) is standard in this setting under the condition $Q \in C_W$, which follows from our assumptions.

For the remaining items: The spectral gap in Theorem B.2(b) and positivity of $\psi_p = \psi_{pQ}$ as in Theorem B.2(c) imply existence of the limit (B.1). Differentiability of $p \mapsto \Lambda(p)$ follows from Proposition B.3. Theorem B.1 now applies to the family of random variables $Z_t = Z_t^\beta$ as in (B.2) indexed by $\beta \in B \subset PM$ for B compact. \square

B.2.2 Brief summary of the proof of Theorem B.2

Proof of (a). The following comes from [40, Lemma 6.1]:

Claim B.4. The process

$$M_t = W(X_t) e^{-\int_0^t \frac{gW}{W} ds}$$

is a supermartingale w.r.t. the usual filtration.

From here, to prove boundedness of S^t on C_W , one checks that

$$-\frac{GW}{W} = \theta \left(-GV + \frac{\theta}{2} |\sigma^T \nabla V|^2 \right).$$

Since $-GV \ll |\sigma^T \nabla V|^2$ (Assumption 2.8(1)(c)), it follows that $-\frac{GW}{W} \sim |\sigma^T \nabla V|^2$, hence $g \ll -\frac{GW}{W}$. Boundedness of S^t on C_W now follows from Claim B.4.

Proof of (b). Compactness will follow from two ingredients:

- (i) ([40, Lemma 6.4]) For any bounded measurable φ , $t > 0$ and compact $K \subset PM$, it holds that $S^t(\varphi \mathbf{1}_K)$ is continuous⁹; and
- (ii) the following ([40, Lemma 6.2]):

Claim B.5. For any $a, t > 0$ there exists a compact set $K_{a,t} \subset PM$ and $c_{a,t} > 0$ such that

$$S^t W \leq e^{-at} W + c_{a,t} \mathbf{1}_{K_{a,t}}.$$

Sketch of proof of compactness. The strong Feller-type property in (i) above for $S^{t/2}$ implies that for any compact $K \subset PM$ and any bounded sequence $(\varphi_k) \in C_W$, one has that $\{S^t(\mathbf{1}_K \varphi_k)\}$ is equicontinuous¹⁰. From here it follows that $\varphi \mapsto S^t(\mathbf{1}_K \varphi)$ is compact. One now uses Claim (B.5) to show that for any fixed $t > 0$, it holds that S^t is the norm-limit of the sequence $\varphi \mapsto S^t(\varphi \mathbf{1}_{K_{a,t}})$ as $a \rightarrow \infty$. \square

The irreducibility property as in Assumption 2.2(b) implies $\sigma(S^t) \neq \{0\}$ for all $t > 0$. From here, the Krein-Rutman Theorem [51] implies S^t admits an eigenvalue $r = r_t > 0$ coinciding with its spectral radius, with nonnegative eigenfunction $\psi = \psi^{(t)}$. Irreducibility as in Assumption 2.2(b) implies $S^t \mathbf{1}_K$ is bounded uniformly away from zero along compact subsets of PM for any measurable $K \subset PM$ with nonempty interior. It is immediate from this that $\psi > 0$ pointwise.

It remains to address the existence of a spectral gap as in Theorem B.2(b), which we shall do first for S^t for $t > 0$ fixed. Define

$$Q^t \varphi := r^{-1} \psi^{-1} S^t(\psi \varphi),$$

which, as one can check, is a genuine (untwisted) Markov kernel, defined for all $\varphi \in C_{\psi^{-1}W}$. We observe that Q^t and S^t are related up to an isometry $C_W \rightarrow C_{\psi^{-1}W}$, hence a spectral gap for Q^t will imply that for S^t .

Below, let us assume to have rescaled ψ so that $\|\psi\|_{C_W} = 1$, hence $\psi^{-1}W \geq 1$.

Claim B.6.

- (a) $\psi \ll W$, hence $\tilde{W} := \psi^{-1}W$ has compact sublevel sets.
- (b) Q^t satisfies a Lyapunov-Foster condition for the function \tilde{W} .

Both statements follow from Claim B.5 (for details, see [39, Appendix E]). One now checks that Q^t admits a spectral gap in $C_{\tilde{W}}$ using Harris' Theorem (Theorem A.3), noting that hypotheses (a), (b) and (c) in Theorem A.3 follow from Assumption 2.2(b), while hypothesis (d) is verified via Claim B.6.

To complete the proof, it remains to check that there is a single $\Lambda = \Lambda_g \in \mathbb{R}$ and a single $\psi = \psi_g \in C_W$ for which

$$S_g^t \psi_g = e^{t\Lambda_g} \psi_g \tag{B.3}$$

⁹This is referred to as a *strong Feller property* for (S^t) , a generalization of the strong Feller property for Markov kernels. See [39] for more details.

¹⁰This is an analogue of an equivalent formulation of the *ultra Feller* property of Markov kernels, and holds in view of an analogue of the standard fact that the product of two strong Feller kernels is ultra Feller (c.f. [44, Theorem 1.6.6]).

holds for all $t \geq 0$. Set $\psi_g = \psi^{(1)}$ and Λ_g so that $e^{\Lambda_g} = r_1$. Then, (B.3) evidently holds for $t = 1, 2, \dots$. Moreover, the spectral gap property for $S^{1/m}, m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, implies $r_{1/m}^{-n} S^{n/m} \psi_g \rightarrow \psi^{(1/m)}$, which when compared against (B.3) implies $\psi_g = \psi^{(1/m)}$, hence $r_{1/m} = e^{\Lambda_g/m}$. This argument implies (B.3) for rational t , from which (B.3) for all $t \geq 0$ follows by an approximation argument.

B.3 Analyticity of $p \mapsto \Lambda(p)$

To show the analyticity of $\Lambda(\cdot)$ we use the fact that $\Lambda(p)$ is the principal eigenvalue of the tilted generator of the Feynman-Kac semigroup. Consequently, we have that

$$S_t^p \psi_p = e^{t\Lambda(p)} \psi_p,$$

for an eigenfunction ψ_p . Similarly to [40, Lemma 6.6, 6.7], we show that the operator-valued function $p \mapsto S_p^t$ is analytic which implies the analyticity of the principal isolated eigenvalue $\Lambda(p)$ in p . The following computations are based on the supermartingale property of $W(X_t) e^{-\int_0^t \frac{GW}{W}(X_\tau) d\tau}$ together with the fact that $g \ll -\frac{GW}{W}$. We further set

$$\|\psi\|_{C_\kappa} := \sup_{(X,s) \in PM} \frac{|\psi(X,s)|}{\kappa(X)}, \text{ where } \kappa \ll -\frac{GW}{W}.$$

We now show the complex differentiability of the map $p \mapsto S_p^t$ in the operator norm on C_W . To this aim, we let $Q \in C_\kappa$, $\psi \in C_W$, $h \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|h| \leq R$ for $R > 0$, and show that there exists a constant $C > 0$, such that

$$\left\| S_t^{p+h} - S_t^p - h \mathbb{E}_{(X_0, s_0)} \left[\psi(X_t, s_t) e^{p \int_0^t Q(X_\tau, s_\tau) d\tau} \int_0^t Q(X_\tau, s_\tau) d\tau \right] \right\|_{\mathcal{L}(C_W)} \leq C|h|^2. \quad (\text{B.4})$$

First of all, we note that $\mathbb{E}_{(X_0, s_0)} \left[\psi(X_t, s_t) e^{p \int_0^t Q(X_\tau, s_\tau) d\tau} \int_0^t Q(X_\tau, s_\tau) d\tau \right]$ is a bounded operator on C_W for $Q \in C_\kappa$, since for $(X_0, s_0) \in PM$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E}_{(X_0, s_0)} \left[\psi(X_t, s_t) e^{p \int_0^t Q(X_\tau, s_\tau) d\tau} \int_0^t Q(X_\tau, s_\tau) d\tau \right] \right| \\ & \leq \|\psi\|_{C_W} \mathbb{E}_{(X_0, s_0)} \left[W(X_t) e^{|p| \int_0^t |Q(X_\tau, s_\tau)| d\tau} \int_0^t |Q(X_\tau, s_\tau)| d\tau \right] \\ & \leq \|\psi\|_{C_W} \mathbb{E}_{(X_0, s_0)} \left[W(X_t) e^{|p| \|Q\|_{C_\kappa} \int_0^t \kappa(X_\tau) d\tau} \|Q\|_{C_\kappa} \int_0^t \kappa(X_\tau) d\tau \right] \\ & \leq \|\psi\|_{C_W} \mathbb{E}_{(X_0, s_0)} \left[W(X_t) e^{(|p|+1) \|Q\|_{C_\kappa} \int_0^t \kappa(X_\tau) d\tau} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

In the last line we simply used that $x \leq e^x$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Since $\kappa \ll -\frac{GW}{W}$, there exists a constant $c > 0$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{(X_0, s_0)} \left[\psi(X_t, s_t) e^{p \int_0^t Q(X_\tau, s_\tau) d\tau} \int_0^t Q(X_\tau, s_\tau) d\tau \right] \\ & \leq \|\psi\|_{C_W} e^{(|p| \|Q\|_{C_\kappa} + 1) ct} \mathbb{E}_{(X_0, s_0)} \left[W(X_t) e^{-\int_0^t \frac{GW}{W}(X_\tau) d\tau} \right] \\ & \leq \|\psi\|_{C_W} e^{(|p| \|Q\|_{C_\kappa} + 1) ct} W(X_0), \end{aligned}$$

where we used in the last line the supermartingale property of $W(X_t) e^{-\int_0^t \frac{GW}{W}(X_\tau) d\tau}$. This proves the boundedness of $\mathbb{E}_{(X_0, s_0)} \left[\psi(X_t, s_t) e^{p \int_0^t Q(X_\tau, s_\tau) d\tau} \right]$ on C_W .

We return to the complex differentiability of the map $p \mapsto S_p^t$ and further compute for $\psi \in C_W$ and $(X_0, s_0) \in PM$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \mathbb{E}_{(X_0, s_0)} \left[\psi(X_t, s_t) e^{p \int_0^t Q(X_\tau, s_\tau) d\tau} e^{h \int_0^t Q(X_\tau, s_\tau) d\tau} - \psi(X_t, s_t) e^{p \int_0^t Q(X_\tau, s_\tau) d\tau} \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. - h \psi(X_t, s_t) e^{p \int_0^t Q(X_\tau, s_\tau) d\tau} \int_0^t Q(X_\tau, s_\tau) d\tau \right] \right| \\
& \leq \|\psi\|_{C_W} \mathbb{E}_{(X_0, s_0)} \left[W(X_t) e^{|p| \int_0^t |Q(X_\tau, s_\tau)| d\tau} \left| e^{h \int_0^t Q(X_\tau, s_\tau) d\tau} - 1 - h \int_0^t Q(X_\tau, s_\tau) d\tau \right| \right] \\
& \leq C \frac{|h|^2}{2} \|\psi\|_{C_W} \mathbb{E}_{(X_0, s_0)} \left[W(X_t) e^{(|p|+|h|)\|Q\|_{C_\kappa} \int_0^t \kappa(X_\tau) d\tau} \left(\int_0^t Q(X_\tau, s_\tau) d\tau \right)^2 \right] \\
& \leq C |h|^2 \|\psi\|_{C_W} \mathbb{E}_{(X_0, s_0)} [W(X_t) e^{(|p|+|h|+1)\|Q\|_{C_\kappa} \int_0^t \kappa(X_\tau) d\tau}].
\end{aligned}$$

The third line was obtained applying Taylor's formula (with Lagrange remainder) to the complex-valued function $f(h) = e^{h \int_0^t Q(X_\tau, s_\tau) d\tau}$ and the last line follows due to the inequality $x^2/2 \leq e^x$ for $x \geq 0$. As before, due to the supermartingale property of $W(X_t) e^{-\int_0^t \frac{cW}{W}(X_\tau) d\tau}$, we can bound the conditional expectation by $e^{\tilde{c}t} W(X_0)$, for a constant $\tilde{c} > 0$, proving (B.4). This means that $p \mapsto S_p^t$ is complex differentiable and therefore analytic with respect to the operator norm on C_W . Therefore we conclude that the principal isolated eigenvalue $\Lambda(p)$ is analytic in a complex neighborhood of $p \in \mathbb{R}$ and hence analytic in $p \in \mathbb{R}$ according to [49, Chapter II, Theorem 5.4] and [49, Chapter IV, Theorem 3.15].

References

- [1] G. Arioli, F. Gazzola, and H. Koch. Uniqueness and bifurcation branches for planar steady Navier–Stokes equations under Navier boundary conditions. *Journal of Mathematical Fluid Mechanics*, 23(3):1–20, 2021.
- [2] G. Arioli, H. Koch, and S. Terracini. Two novel methods and multi-mode periodic solutions for the Fermi–Pasta–Ulam model. *Communications in mathematical physics*, 255(1):1–19, 2005.
- [3] L. Arnold. A formula connecting sample and moment stability of linear stochastic systems. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 44(4):793–802, 1984.
- [4] L. Arnold. *Random dynamical systems*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998.
- [5] L. Arnold and W. Kliemann. Large deviations of linear stochastic differential equations. In H. J. Engelbert and W. Schmidt, editors, *Stochastic Differential Systems*, pages 115–151, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1987. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [6] L. Arnold, W. Kliemann, and E. Oeljeklaus. Lyapunov exponents of linear stochastic systems. In *Lyapunov exponents (Bremen, 1984)*, volume 1186 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 85–125. Springer, Berlin, 1986.
- [7] L. Arnold, E. Oeljeklaus, and E. Pardoux. Almost sure and moment stability for linear Itô equations. In *Lyapunov exponents (Bremen, 1984)*, volume 1186 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 129–159. Springer, Berlin, 1986.
- [8] L. Arnold, N. Sri Namachchivaya, and K. R. Schenk-Hoppé. Toward an understanding of stochastic hopf bifurcation: a case study. *International Journal of Bifurcation and Chaos*, 6(11):1947–1975, 1996.
- [9] P. H. Baxendale and B. L. Rozovskii. Kinematic dynamo and intermittence in a turbulent flow. *Geophysical & Astrophysical Fluid Dynamics*, 73(1-4):33–60, 1993.
- [10] J. Bedrossian, A. Blumenthal, and S. Punshon-Smith. Almost-sure exponential mixing of passive scalars by the stochastic Navier–Stokes equations. *The Annals of Probability*, 50(1):241–303, 2022.

- [11] L. R. Bellet. Ergodic properties of markov processes. In *Open Quantum Systems II: The Markovian Approach*, pages 1–39. Springer, 2006.
- [12] F. A. Berezin and M. Shubin. *The Schrödinger Equation*, volume 66. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [13] N. Berglund and B. Gentz. Metastability in simple climate models: pathwise analysis of slowly driven langevin equations. *Stochastics and Dynamics*, 2(03):327–356, 2002.
- [14] N. Berglund and B. Gentz. Pathwise description of dynamic pitchfork bifurcations with additive noise. *Probability theory and related fields*, 122(3):341–388, 2002.
- [15] N. Berglund and B. Gentz. A sample-paths approach to noise-induced synchronization: Stochastic resonance in a double-well potential. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 12(4):1419–1470, 2002.
- [16] N. Berglund and B. Gentz. *Noise-induced phenomena in slow-fast dynamical systems: a sample-paths approach*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.
- [17] G. Birkhoff. Extensions of Jentzsch’s theorem. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 85(1):219–227, 1957.
- [18] D. Blömker and A. Neamțu. Bifurcation theory for SPDEs: finite-time Lyapunov exponents and amplitude equations. *SIAM J. Appl. Dyn. Syst.*, 2:2150–2179, 2023.
- [19] A. Blumenthal, M. Breden, M. Engel, and A. Neamțu. Matlab code associated to the paper “Detecting random bifurcations via rigorous enclosures of large deviations rate functions”. <https://github.com/MaximeBreden/LDPforFTLE>, 2024.
- [20] A. Blumenthal, M. Engel, and A. Neamțu. On the pitchfork bifurcation for the Chafee-Infante equation with additive noise. *Probab. Theory. Rel. Fields*, 187:603–627, 2023.
- [21] A. Blumenthal and Y. Yang. Positive lyapunov exponent for random perturbations of predominantly expanding multimodal circle maps. *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré C*, 39(2):419–455, 2022.
- [22] A. Blumenthal, M. C. Zelati, and R. Gvalani. Exponential mixing for random dynamical systems and an example of pierrehumbert. *Ann. Probab.*, 51:1559–1601, 2023.
- [23] M. Breden. A posteriori validation of generalized polynomial chaos expansions. *SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems*, 22(2):765–801, 2023.
- [24] M. Breden and H. Chu. Constructive proofs for some semilinear PDEs on $h^2(e^{|x|^2/4}, \mathbb{R}^d)$. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.04054*, 2024.
- [25] M. Breden and M. Engel. Computer-assisted proof of shear-induced chaos in stochastically perturbed hopf systems. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 33(2):1052–1094, 2023.
- [26] M. Callaway, T. S. Doan, J. S. W. Lamb, and M. Rasmussen. The dichotomy spectrum for random dynamical systems and pitchfork bifurcations with additive noise. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, 53(4):1548–1574, 2017.
- [27] M. M. Castro, D. Chemnitz, H. Chu, M. Engel, J. S. Lamb, and M. Rasmussen. The Lyapunov spectrum for conditioned random dynamical systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.04129*, 2022.
- [28] M. M. Castro, J. S. W. Lamb, G. Olicón Méndez, and M. Rasmussen. Existence and uniqueness of quasi-stationary and quasi-ergodic measures for absorbing Markov processes: a Banach lattice approach. 2021.
- [29] N. Champagnat and D. Villemonais. Exponential convergence to quasi-stationary distribution and Q-process. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 164(1):243–283, 2016.
- [30] N. Champagnat and D. Villemonais. Uniform convergence to the Q-process. *Electron. Commun. Probab.*, 22:Paper No. 33, 7, 2017.
- [31] D. Chemnitz and M. Engel. Positive Lyapunov exponent in the Hopf normal form with additive noise. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 2023.

- [32] P. Collet, S. Martínez, and J. San Martín. *Quasi-Stationary Distributions*. Probability and Its Applications. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2013.
- [33] H. Crauel and F. Flandoli. Additive noise destroys a pitchfork bifurcation. *J. Dynam. Differential Equations*, 10(2):259–274, 1998.
- [34] S. Day, J.-P. Lessard, and K. Mischaikow. Validated continuation for equilibria of PDEs. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 45(4):1398–1424, 2007.
- [35] A. Dembo and O. Zeitouni. *Large Deviations Techniques and Applications*. Springer, 1998.
- [36] T. S. Doan, M. Engel, J. S. W. Lamb, and M. Rasmussen. Hopf bifurcation with additive noise. *Nonlinearity*, 31(10):4567–4601, 2018.
- [37] K.-J. Engel and R. Nagel. *One-parameter semigroups for linear evolution equations*, volume 194 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2000. With contributions by S. Brendle, M. Campiti, T. Hahn, G. Metafune, G. Nickel, D. Pallara, C. Perazzoli, A. Rhandi, S. Romanelli and R. Schnaubelt.
- [38] M. Engel, J. S. W. Lamb, and M. Rasmussen. Bifurcation analysis of a stochastically driven limit cycle. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 365(3):935–942, 2019.
- [39] G. Ferré, M. Rousset, and G. Stoltz. More on the long time stability of feynman–kac semigroups. *Stochastics and Partial Differential Equations: Analysis and Computations*, 9(3):630–673, 2021.
- [40] G. Ferré and G. Stoltz. Large deviations of empirical measures of diffusions in weighted topologies. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 25(121):1–52, 2020.
- [41] M. Freidlin and A. Wentzell. *Random perturbations*. Springer, 1998.
- [42] S. Galatolo, M. Monge, and I. Nisoli. Existence of noise induced order, a computer aided proof. *Nonlinearity*, 33(9):4237, 2020.
- [43] F. Ginelli, P. Poggi, A. Turchi, H. Chaté, R. Livi, and A. Politi. Characterizing dynamics with covariant Lyapunov vectors. *Physical review letters*, 99(13):130601, 2007.
- [44] M. Hairer. Non-Markovian processes. *Trends in stochastic analysis*, 353:65–102, 2009.
- [45] M. Hairer and J. C. Mattingly. Yet another look at Harris’ ergodic theorem for Markov chains. In *Seminar on Stochastic Analysis, Random Fields and Applications VI: Centro Stefano Franscini, Ascona, May 2008*, pages 109–117. Springer, 2011.
- [46] M. Hairer and T. Rosati. Spectral gap for projective processes of linear spdes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.07472*, 2023.
- [47] L. Hörmander. Hypoelliptic second order differential equations. 1967.
- [48] P. Imkeler and C. Lederer. Some formulas for lyapunov exponents and rotation numbers in two dimensions and the stability of the harmonic oscillator and the inverted pendulum. *Dynamical Systems: An International Journal*, 16:29–61, 2001.
- [49] T. Kato. *Perturbation theory for linear operators*. Springer, 1995.
- [50] I. Kontoyiannis and S. Meyn. Large deviations asymptotics and the spectral theory of multiplicatively regular Markov processes. 2005.
- [51] M. G. Krein and M. A. Rutman. Linear operators leaving invariant a cone in a Banach space. *Uspekhi Matematicheskikh Nauk*, 3(1):3–95, 1948.
- [52] J. Lamb, M. Rasmussen, and C. Rodrigues. Topological bifurcations of minimal invariant sets for set-valued dynamical systems. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 143(9):3927–3937, 2015.
- [53] O. E. Lanford III. A computer-assisted proof of the Feigenbaum conjectures. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 6(3):427–434, 1982.
- [54] K. K. Lin and L.-S. Young. Shear-induced chaos. *Nonlinearity*, 21(5):899–922, 2008.

- [55] X. Liu. A framework of verified eigenvalue bounds for self-adjoint differential operators. *Applied Mathematics and Computation*, 267:341–355, 2015.
- [56] V. Lucarini and A. Gritsun. A new mathematical framework for atmospheric blocking events. *Climate Dynamics*, 54(1):575–598, 2020.
- [57] J. Marshall and F. Molteni. Toward a dynamical understanding of atmospheric weather regimes. *J. Atmos. Sci*, 50:1792–1818, 1993.
- [58] P. Metzner, L. Putzig, and I. Horenko. Analysis of persistent nonstationary time series and applications. *Communications in Applied Mathematics and Computational Science*, 7(2):175–229, 2012.
- [59] S. Meyn and R. Tweedie. *Markov Chains and Stochastic Stability*. Springer, 1993.
- [60] T. Mitsui and K. Aihara. Dynamics between order and chaos in conceptual models of glacial cycles. *Climate dynamics*, 42:3087–3099, 2014.
- [61] T. Mitsui and M. Crucifix. Effects of additive noise on the stability of glacial cycles. *Mathematical Paradigms of Climate Science*, pages 93–113, 2016.
- [62] R. E. Moore. *Methods and applications of interval analysis*. SIAM, 1979.
- [63] K. Nagatou, M. Nakao, and M. Wakayama. Verified numerical computations for eigenvalues of non-commutative harmonic oscillators. *Numerical Functional Analysis and Optimization*, 23(5-6):633–650, 2002.
- [64] M. T. Nakao, M. Plum, and Y. Watanabe. *Numerical Verification Methods and Computer-Assisted Proofs for Partial Differential Equations*, volume 53 of *Springer Series in Computational Mathematics*. Springer Singapore, 2019.
- [65] R. Pinsky. A classification of diffusion processes with boundaries by their invariant measures. *Ann. Probab.*, 13(3):693–697, 1985.
- [66] R. G. Pinsky. On the convergence of diffusion processes conditioned to remain in a bounded region for large time to limiting positive recurrent diffusion processes. *Ann. Probab.*, 13(2):363–378, 1985.
- [67] M. Plum. Eigenvalue inclusions for second-order ordinary differential operators by a numerical homotopy method. *Zeitschrift für angewandte Mathematik und Physik ZAMP*, 41(2):205–226, 1990.
- [68] M. Plum. Computer-assisted enclosure methods for elliptic differential equations. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 324(1-3):147–187, 2001.
- [69] C. Quinn, D. Harries, and T. J. O’Kane. Dynamical analysis of a reduced model for the north atlantic oscillation. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 78(5):1647–1671, 2021.
- [70] T. Rosati. Lyapunov exponents in a slow environment. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 170:104296, 2024.
- [71] S. M. Rump. INTLAB - INTerval LABoratory. *Developments in Reliable Computing*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, pp, pages 77–104, 1999.
- [72] Y. Sato, T. S. Doan, J. S. Lamb, and M. Rasmussen. Dynamical characterization of stochastic bifurcations in a random logistic map. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.03994*, 2018.
- [73] J.-n. Teramae and D. Tanaka. Robustness of the noise-induced phase synchronization in a general class of limit cycle oscillators. *Physical review letters*, 93(20):204103, 2004.
- [74] H. Touchette. Introduction to dynamical large deviations of Markov processes. *arXiv:1705.06492v6*, 2022.
- [75] L. N. Trefethen. *Approximation theory and approximation practice*, volume 128. Siam, 2013.
- [76] W. Tucker. *Validated numerics: a short introduction to rigorous computations*. Princeton University Press, 2011.

- [77] J. B. van den Berg, M. Breden, J.-P. Lessard, and L. van Veen. Spontaneous periodic orbits in the Navier–Stokes flow. *Journal of Nonlinear Science*, 31(2):1–64, 2021.
- [78] J. B. van den Berg and J.-P. Lessard. Rigorous numerics in dynamics. *Notices Amer. Math. Soc.*, 62(9), 2015.
- [79] A. Viennet, N. Vercauteren, M. Engel, and D. Faranda. Guidelines for data-driven approaches to study transitions in multiscale systems: The case of lyapunov vectors. *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science*, 32(11), 2022.
- [80] A. M. Yaglom. Certain limit theorems of the theory of branching random processes. In *Doklady Akad. Nauk SSSR (NS)*, volume 56, 1947.
- [81] N. Yamamoto. A numerical verification method for solutions of boundary value problems with local uniqueness by Banach’s fixed-point theorem. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 35:2004–2013, 1998.
- [82] H. Zmarrou and A. J. Homburg. Bifurcations of stationary measures of random diffeomorphisms. *Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems*, 27(5):1651–1692, 2007.