

ON THE SUPPORT OF MEASURES OF LARGE ENTROPY FOR AUTOMORPHISMS OF KÄHLER MANIFOLDS

FABRIZIO BIANCHI, SOBIR BOYMURODOV, AND KARIM RAKHIMOV

ABSTRACT. Let f be a holomorphic automorphism of a compact Kähler manifold X with simple action on cohomology. We show that every ergodic measure with sufficiently large entropy is supported on the Julia set of f . In particular, when X is a surface, any ergodic measure with positive entropy is supported on the Julia set. The proof relies on quantitative estimates for the speed of convergence towards the Green currents of f , with respect to a suitable norm on an adapted functional space of non-necessarily closed currents.

AMS classification: 32H50, 32U40, 37A35, 37F80

1. INTRODUCTION

The study of the dynamics of holomorphic automorphisms on compact Kähler manifolds is a central topic in complex dynamics. We refer to [2, 30, 36, 37, 38] for interesting examples, to [16, 25, 20, 13] for the basic properties of these maps, and to [9, 10, 11, 29, 39] for more recent developments. Let (X, ω) be a compact Kähler manifold of dimension k , and f a holomorphic automorphism of X . For every integer $0 \leq q \leq k$, the q -th dynamical degree of f is defined as the spectral radius of the pull-back operator

$$f^* : H^{q,q}(X, \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow H^{q,q}(X, \mathbb{C}).$$

We denote it by $d_q(f)$, or simply d_q when the context is clear. It follows that $d_0 = d_k = 1$, and for each $n \geq 1$ we have $d_q(f^n) = (d_q)^n$, where $f^n = f \circ \dots \circ f$ (n -times) is the n -th iterate of f . By Poincaré duality, we have $d_q(f) = d_{k-q}(f^{-1})$ for every q . It follows from the fundamental Gromov-Khovanskii-Teissier inequalities [32, 34, 44] that the sequence $q \mapsto \log d_q$ is concave. So, there are integers $0 \leq p \leq p' \leq k$ such that

$$1 = d_0 < \dots < d_p = \dots = d_{p'} > \dots > d_k = 1.$$

Throughout this paper we shall assume that f has a *simple action on cohomology*. This means that $p = p'$ and that the action of f^* on $H^{p,p}(X, \mathbb{R})$ has a single eigenvalue of maximal modulus, denoted by d_p , which we call the *main dynamical degree* of f . We define δ_f to be the maximum between $\max\{d_{p-1}, d_{p+1}\}$ and the absolute values of all the eigenvalues different from d_p for the action of f^* on $H^{p,p}(X, \mathbb{R})$. Hence, simple action means $\delta_f < d_p$.

Automorphisms with simple action have been especially studied in [3, 24, 46] as this condition can be seen as a cohomological version of hyperbolicity. By [20], there exist unique positive closed currents T^+ and T^- , of bidegrees (p, p) and $(k-p, k-p)$, that are invariant under $d_p^{-1} f^*$ and $d_p^{-1} f_*$, respectively, that is, that satisfy

$$f^*(T^+) = d_p T^+, \quad \text{and} \quad f_*(T^-) = d_p T^-.$$

Key words and phrases. Automorphisms of Kähler manifolds, Julia sets, Green currents, entropy.

The currents T^+ and T^- are called the *Green currents* of f and f^{-1} , respectively. They can be obtained as the limit currents of the sequences $d_p^{-n}(f^n)^*(\omega^p)$ and $d_p^{-n}(f^n)_*(\omega^{k-p})$, respectively. We denote by $J^\pm$ the support of $T^\pm$ and define the *Julia set* of f as $J := J^+ \cap J^-$.

The Green currents $T^\pm$ have Hölder continuous super-potentials, and their intersection $T^+ \wedge T^- := \mu$ is well-defined and is referred to as the *Green measure*, which is totally invariant under both f^* and f_* . The Green measure μ is the unique measure of maximal entropy $\log d_p$ and satisfies strong ergodic and statistical properties, see for instance [3, 24, 25]. By definition, we have $\text{supp } \mu \subseteq J$. The goal of this paper is to prove the same inclusion for every ergodic measure of sufficiently large entropy. We refer for instance to [10, Example 7.3] for examples where $J \neq X$.

Theorem 1.1. *Let (X, ω) be a compact Kähler manifold and let $f : X \rightarrow X$ be a holomorphic automorphism with simple action on cohomology. Then every ergodic measure ν with entropy $h_\nu(f) > \log \delta_f$ is supported on the Julia set J .*

Let now X be a compact Kähler surface and f an automorphism of positive entropy. By [33, 47], the topological entropy of f is equal to $\log d_1$, see also [19]. In particular, we have $d_1 > 1$. By [9], all the eigenvalues of the action of f^* on $H^{1,1}(X, \mathbb{R})$ have modulus 1, except for two eigenvalues d_1 and $1/d_1$, which have multiplicity 1. In particular, we have $\delta_f = 1$ in this case. Hence, every automorphism of positive entropy of a Kähler surface has simple action on cohomology.

Corollary 1.2. *Let (X, ω) be a compact Kähler surface and let $f : X \rightarrow X$ be a holomorphic automorphism with positive entropy. Then every ergodic measure ν with positive entropy is supported on J .*

Parallel results to Theorem 1.1 have been obtained in the context of holomorphic endomorphisms of complex projective spaces [12, 14] and more recently for polynomial-like maps on $\mathbb{C}^k$ [1]. Observe that, in these cases, the maximal dynamical degree is the topological degree d_k , hence the problem is simpler as only expanding directions are present.

A key point of the proof in the case of endomorphisms of projective spaces in [12, 14] is that the $(1, 1)$ -Green current T and the Fubini–Study form lie in the same cohomology class. This method cannot be applied in our setting as the Green currents $T^\pm$ are not necessarily cohomologous to Kähler forms (it can, on the other hand, be applied to the so-called Hénon–Sibony maps, or regular automorphisms of $\mathbb{P}^k$ [15, 41], see [7]). As cohomology tools are also not available in the (non-algebraic) setting of polynomial-like maps, the proof in that case given in [1] relied on a different idea, based on the *exponential speed of convergence* of preimages of points towards the Green measure [18, 23].

The proof of Theorem 1.1 will be closer in spirit to that of [1]. However, instead of considering preimages of points (which – since f is an automorphism – cannot equidistribute), we rely on an exponential speed of convergence for the pull-backs of suitable currents towards the Green currents T^+ and T^- . Such a speed has been established in [24], see also [45] for a generalization of that result where the speed is measured against a more general class of observables. A crucial point in both works above is that one can use *closed* positive currents. In our setting, since we will need to work on a given

set (the complement of J) we will be naturally forced to work with *non-closed* currents. In particular, we will introduce a new norm for currents and prove a generalization of the convergence speed in [24] with respect to observables bounded in this more flexible norm, see Theorem 3.4. We observe that this difficulty is specific (and intrinsic) when the dimension k of X is at least 3. In the special case $k = 2$, we would not need to introduce a new norm (as, for dimensional reasons, the currents we use would be automatically closed), and we could apply the convergence speed of [24], see Remark 4.7 and Section 6.1 for more details. It would also be interesting to understand whether analogous results hold for non-invertible maps, holomorphic correspondences, or in non-algebraic settings such as Hénon-like maps. We briefly discuss these questions in Section 6.

Outline of the paper. In Section 2, we recall the notions concerning currents, superpotentials, and convergence towards Green currents that we will need in the sequel. We also introduce and study our new norm $\|\cdot\|^\star$ for currents. In Section 3 we state and prove our exponential convergence result towards Green currents. In Section 4 we give the main dynamical estimates that permit to control the action of f^* outside the Julia set J . The proof of Theorem 1.1 is then completed in Section 5. We collect in Section 6 some final remarks and related open questions. In the Appendix, we give a complete proof of two technical results which are needed in the proof of Theorem 3.4.

Acknowledgments. The first author would like to thank the National University of Uzbekistan and the V.I. Romanovskiy Institute of Mathematics of Uzbek Academy of Sciences for the warm welcome and the excellent work conditions. The authors would also like to thank Marco Vergamini for useful discussions and helpful comments. This project has received funding from the French government through the Programme Investissement d'Avenir (ANR QuaSiDy /ANR-21-CE40-0016, ANR PADAWAN /ANR-21-CE40-0012-01, ANR TIGeRS/ANR-24-CE40-3604) and from the MIUR Excellence Department Project awarded to the Department of Mathematics, University of Pisa, CUP I57G22000700001. The first author is affiliated to the GNSAGA group of INdAM.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we recall some basic properties of positive closed currents on a compact Kähler manifold that will be used throughout the article. We also introduce the dynamically adapted norm $\|\cdot\|^\star$, that plays a central role in our approach.

2.1. Currents on Kähler manifold. Let (X, ω) be a compact Kähler manifold with $\dim X = k$ and $\text{vol}(X) = \int_X \omega^k = 1$. For every $0 \leq q \leq k$ denote by $H^{q,q}(X, \mathbb{C})$ the Hodge cohomology group of bidegree (q, q) of X . If R is a closed (q, q) -current, its cohomology class in $H^{q,q}(X, \mathbb{C})$ is denoted by $\{R\}$. If R is a current on X and Φ is a test form of complementary bidegree, the pairing $\langle R, \Phi \rangle$ denotes the value of R at Φ . In particular, for a positive (q, q) -current R on X , define the mass of R by

$$\|R\| := \langle R, \omega^{k-q} \rangle.$$

When R is positive and closed, its mass depends only on its cohomology class $\{R\}$ in $H^{q,q}(X, \mathbb{R})$. Let $\mathcal{C}_q(X)$ denote the cone of positive closed (q, q) -currents on X . Let $\mathcal{D}_q(X)$ denote the real space generated by positive closed (q, q) -currents on X , and by $\mathcal{D}_q^0(X)$

the subspace of $\mathcal{D}_q(X)$ given by exact currents, i.e., currents R whose class $\{R\} = 0$. Following [25], define the norm $\|R\|_*$ of $R \in \mathcal{D}_q(X)$ as

$$\|R\|_* = \inf(\|R^+\| + \|R^-\|),$$

where the infimum is taken over the positive closed (q, q) -currents $R^\pm$ with $R = R^+ - R^-$, and is reached by compactness. We can equip $\mathcal{D}_q(X)$ and $\mathcal{D}_q^0(X)$ with the topology in which $R_n \rightarrow R$ if R_n converges to R in the sense of currents and $\sup_n \|R_n\|_* < \infty$. Given an integer $\ell > 0$, we define on $\mathcal{D}_q(X)$ the norm $\|\cdot\|_{C^{-\ell}}$ and the distance dist_ℓ by

$$\|R\|_{C^{-\ell}} = \sup_{\|\Phi\|_{C^\ell} \leq 1} |\langle R, \Phi \rangle| \quad \text{and} \quad \text{dist}_\ell(R, R') := \|R - R'\|_{C^{-\ell}},$$

where Φ is a smooth test form of bidimension (q, q) on X . Observe that we can also extend the notion of mass to any current, as the dual of the semi-norm C^0 on forms.

2.2. A dynamically adapted norm. For $0 \leq q \leq k$, denote by $\mathcal{H}_q$ the set

$$\mathcal{H}_q = \{\Phi \in \mathcal{C}_q(X) : \Phi \text{ is smooth, } \|\Phi\| \leq 1\}.$$

We define the $\star$ -norm on $\mathcal{D}_q(X)$ as

$$(1) \quad \|R\|^\star := \inf \sup_{\Phi \in \mathcal{H}_{k-q}} (\|R_1 \wedge \Phi\| + \|R_2 \wedge \Phi\|)$$

where the infimum is taken over all positive currents R_1, R_2 such that $R = R_1 - R_2$. We stress that we do not require R_1 and R_2 to be closed.

Lemma 2.1. *The function $R \mapsto \|R\|^\star$ defines a norm on $\mathcal{D}_q(X)$.*

Proof. If $R = 0$, we can take $R_1 = R_2 = 0$. Then $R = R_1 - R_2$, and clearly $\|R\|^\star = 0$. If $\|R\|^\star = 0$, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exist positive currents $R_{1,n}, R_{2,n}$ such that $R = R_{1,n} - R_{2,n}$ and $\sup_{\Phi \in \mathcal{H}_{k-q}} (\|R_{1,n} \wedge \Phi\| + \|R_{2,n} \wedge \Phi\|) \leq 1/n$. In particular, taking $\Phi = \omega^{k-q}$, it follows that $\|R_{1,n}\| + \|R_{2,n}\| \leq 1/n$. Let Ω be a $(k-q, k-q)$ -test form with $\|\Omega\|_\infty \leq 1$. Hence, $|\Omega| \leq \|\Omega\|_\infty \omega^{k-q}$ and

$$|\langle R, \Omega \rangle| = |\langle R_{1,n}, \Omega \rangle - \langle R_{2,n}, \Omega \rangle| \leq \|\Omega\|_\infty (\|R_{1,n}\| + \|R_{2,n}\|).$$

Letting $n \rightarrow \infty$, the right-hand side tends to zero, which implies $\langle R, \Omega \rangle = 0$ for all test forms Ω . Therefore, $R = 0$. It can also be checked directly that $\|\lambda R\|^\star = |\lambda| \|R\|^\star$ for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. So it only remains to prove the triangle inequality.

Fix $R, T \in \mathcal{D}_q(X)$. Write $R = R_1 - R_2$ and $T = T_1 - T_2$, where R_1, R_2, T_1, T_2 are positive. Then we can decompose $R + T$ as $(R_1 + T_1) - (R_2 + T_2)$, and it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\Phi \in \mathcal{H}_{k-q}} (\|(R_1 + T_1) \wedge \Phi\| + \|(R_2 + T_2) \wedge \Phi\|) \\ & \leq \sup_{\Phi \in \mathcal{H}_{k-q}} (\|R_1 \wedge \Phi\| + \|R_2 \wedge \Phi\|) + \sup_{\Phi \in \mathcal{H}_{k-q}} (\|T_1 \wedge \Phi\| + \|T_2 \wedge \Phi\|). \end{aligned}$$

As all decompositions of R and T also give decompositions of $R + T$, taking the infimum over all such decompositions gives

$$\|R + T\|^\star \leq \|R\|^\star + \|T\|^\star.$$

This concludes the proof. $\square$

We say that a subset of $\mathcal{D}_q(X)$ is $\star$ -bounded if it is bounded with respect to the $\star$ -norm. We will consider on $\mathcal{D}_q(X)$ and $\mathcal{D}_q^0(X)$ the following topology.

Definition 2.2. We say that a sequence $\{R_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ in $\mathcal{D}_q(X)$ (or $\mathcal{D}_q^0(X)$) $\star$ -converges to a current R if R_n converges to R in the sense of the currents and if $\|R_n\|^\star$ are bounded by a constant independent of n .

Lemma 2.3. We have $\|R\|^\star \lesssim \|R\|_*$ for every $R \in \mathcal{D}_q(X)$ and $\|S\|^\star \asymp \|S\| = \|S\|_*$ for every $S \in \mathcal{C}_q(X)$, where the implicit constants are independent of R and S .

Proof. In the definition of $\|R\|^\star$, the decompositions of R are taken over all positive currents $R_1, R_2 \geq 0$ such that $R = R_1 - R_2$. In that of $\|R\|_*$, we require that $R_1, R_2 \geq 0$ are positive and closed. As the cone of positive closed currents is contained in the cone of positive currents, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|R\|^\star &= \inf_{R_1, R_2 \geq 0} \sup_{\Phi \in \mathcal{H}_{k-q}} (\|R_1 \wedge \Phi\| + \|R_2 \wedge \Phi\|) \leq \inf_{\substack{R_1, R_2 \geq 0 \\ \text{closed}}} \sup_{\Phi \in \mathcal{H}_{k-q}} (\|R_1 \wedge \Phi\| + \|R_2 \wedge \Phi\|) \\ &\lesssim \inf_{\substack{R_1, R_2 \geq 0 \\ \text{closed}}} \sup_{\Phi \in \mathcal{H}_{k-q}} (\|R_1\| \cdot \|\Phi\| + \|R_2\| \cdot \|\Phi\|) = \inf_{\substack{R_1, R_2 \geq 0 \\ \text{closed}}} (\|R_1\| + \|R_2\|) = \|R\|_*, \end{aligned}$$

where we use the fact that, since integrals can be computed cohomologically, we have $\|R_1 \wedge \Phi\| \lesssim \|R_1\| \cdot \|\Phi\|$ (and similarly for R_2) for some implicit constant independent of R_1 and Φ . This proves the first estimate in the statement.

For the second, fix a positive closed (q, q) -current S . We can write $S = S - 0$. Hence, in particular, we have $\|S\|_* = \|S\|$. As the mass of a positive closed current can be computed cohomologically, we have,

$$\|S\|^\star \leq \sup_{\Phi \in \mathcal{H}_{k-q}} \|S \wedge \Phi\| \lesssim \sup_{\Phi \in \mathcal{H}_{k-q}} \|S\| \cdot \|\Phi\| = \|S\|$$

where again the implicit constant is independent of S and Φ . For the opposite inequality, by the definition of $\|S\|^\star$, for every $\kappa > 0$ there exist positive currents $S_1, S_2 > 0$ such that $S = S_1 - S_2$ and $\sup_{\Phi \in \mathcal{H}_{k-q}} (\|S_1 \wedge \Phi\| + \|S_2 \wedge \Phi\|) < \|S\|^\star + \kappa$. In particular, taking $\Phi = \omega^{k-q}$, we see that $\|S_1\| + \|S_2\| < \|S\|^\star + \kappa$. Moreover, since S is positive, we have $\|S_1\| + \|S_2\| = \|S + S_2\| + \|S_2\| = \|S\| + 2\|S_2\| \geq \|S\|$. Thus, we get $\|S\|^\star + \kappa > \|S\|$ and letting $\kappa \rightarrow 0$ yields $\|S\|^\star \geq \|S\|$. The assertion follows. $\square$

Corollary 2.4. Smooth forms are dense in $\mathcal{D}_q$ and in $\mathcal{D}_q^0$ for the $\star$ -topology.

Proof. By [25, Theorem 2.4.4], smooth forms are dense in $\mathcal{D}_q$ and in $\mathcal{D}_q^0$ for the $*$ -topology. By Lemma 2.3, we have $\|R\|^\star \leq c\|R\|_*$ for every $R \in \mathcal{D}_q$, where the implicit constant is independent of R . Therefore, any sequence R_n that converges with respect to the $*$ -topology also converges with respect to the $\star$ -topology. The assertion follows. $\square$

2.3. Super-potentials. We now recall the notion of the $(\alpha$ -normalized) super-potential for currents in $\mathcal{D}_{k-q+1}^0(X)$ for $0 < q \leq k$, see [3, 25, 22] for more details. Fix $S \in \mathcal{D}_{k-q+1}^0(X)$. Since $\{S\} = 0$, there exists a (not necessarily unique) current U_S of bidimension (q, q) such that $S = dd^c U_S$. We refer to U_S as a *potential* of S . Consider a fixed family of real smooth closed (q, q) -forms $\alpha_q = (\alpha_{q,1}, \dots, \alpha_{q,h(q)})$, where $h(q) := \dim H^{q,q}(X, \mathbb{R})$ is such that the family of classes $\{\alpha_q\} = (\{\alpha_{q,1}\}, \dots, \{\alpha_{q,h(q)}\})$ is a basis of $H^{q,q}(X, \mathbb{R})$. We further choose smooth real closed $(k-q, k-q)$ -forms $\check{\alpha}_q = (\check{\alpha}_{q,1}, \dots, \check{\alpha}_{q,h(q)})$ representing a dual basis of α_q in $H^{k-q,k-q}(X, \mathbb{R})$ for the Poincaré duality. By adding to the potential U_S a suitable combination of the $\check{\alpha}_{q,j}$'s we can assume that U_S is α_q -normalized, i.e., that $\langle U_S, \alpha_{q,j} \rangle = 0$ for every $1 \leq j \leq h(q)$. When S is smooth we can choose U_S to

be smooth and α_q -normalized. The α_q -normalized *super-potential* $\mathcal{U}_R$ of $R \in \mathcal{D}_q(X)$ is defined on smooth exact forms $S \in \mathcal{D}_{k-q+1}^0$ by the identity

$$\mathcal{U}_R(S) := \langle R, U_S \rangle,$$

where U_S is a α_q -normalized potential of S . Observe that the expression above is independent of the potential U_S of S , as soon as this is α_q -normalized.

Recall that we have defined two topologies on $\mathcal{D}_q$, induced by the $\ast$ -norm and the $\star$ -norm, respectively. We denote by

$$\mathcal{D}_{q,\ast}^1(X) := \{R \in \mathcal{D}_q : \|R\|_{\ast} \leq 1\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{D}_{q,\star}^1(X) := \{R \in \mathcal{D}_q : \|R\|_{\star} \leq 1\}$$

the unit balls of $\mathcal{D}_q(X)$ with respect to the two topologies.

Definition 2.5. Let $\bullet$ be either $\ast$ or $\star$. Take $R \in \mathcal{D}_q$ and let $M, \gamma > 0$ be positive constants.

- (1) We say that R has a continuous super-potential with respect to the $\bullet$ -topology if the function $\mathcal{U}_R$ extends continuously to $\mathcal{D}_{k-q+1}^0(X)$ with respect to the $\bullet$ -topology.
- (2) We say that the super-potential $\mathcal{U}_R$ of R is (M, γ) -Hölder continuous with respect to the $\bullet$ -topology if it is continuous with respect to the $\bullet$ -topology and satisfies

$$|\mathcal{U}_R(S)| \leq M \|S\|_{C^{-2}}^{\gamma} \quad \text{for every } S \in \mathcal{D}_{k-q+1}^0 \cap \mathcal{D}_{k-q+1,\bullet}^1.$$

In this case, we denote

$$\|\mathcal{U}_R\|_{\gamma,\bullet} = \inf\{M' > 0 : \mathcal{U}_R \text{ is } (M', \gamma)\text{-Hölder continuous with respect to the } \bullet\text{-topology}\}.$$

Lemma 2.6. Let $\bullet$ be either $\ast$ or $\star$. Let $Q \in \mathcal{D}_{k-s+1}^0(X)$ whose super-potential satisfies $\|\mathcal{U}_Q\|_{\gamma,\bullet} \leq 1$. There exists $A_1 > 0$, independent of Q and γ , such that $\|\mathcal{U}_{\omega \wedge Q}\|_{\gamma,\bullet} \leq A_1^{\gamma}$.

Proof. Take $S \in \mathcal{D}_{s-1}^0(X)$ with $\|S\|_{\bullet} \leq 1$. Since $\{Q\} = 0$, we have $\mathcal{U}_{\omega \wedge Q}(S) = \mathcal{U}_Q(\omega \wedge S)$. Moreover,

$$\|\omega \wedge S\|_{C^{-2}} = \sup_{\|\Phi\|_{C^2} \leq 1} |\langle S, \omega \wedge \Phi \rangle| \leq A_1 \|S\|_{C^{-2}},$$

where A_1 depends only on X . Hence, we deduce from the assumption on $\mathcal{U}_Q$ that $|\mathcal{U}_{\omega \wedge Q}(S)| \leq A_1^{\gamma} \|S\|_{C^{-2}}^{\gamma}$. This completes the proof. $\square$

We will need the following version of the “Skoda-type” estimate given in [24, Proposition 2.1] for the $\ast$ -topology. The proof is quite technical but similar to the one in [24], hence it is postponed to the Appendix. The statement would still hold if the assumption $\|S\|_{\ast} \leq 1$ is replaced by $\|S\|_{\star} \leq 1$, but the version below will be enough for our purposes, as in our application the current S will always be positive closed.

Proposition 2.7. Take $Q \in \mathcal{D}_{k-s+1}^0$ with $\|Q\|_{\star} \leq 1$ and $\|\mathcal{U}_Q\|_{\gamma,\ast} \leq M$. There exists a constant $A > 0$ independent of Q , γ , and M such that the super-potential $\mathcal{U}_S$ of S satisfies

$$|\mathcal{U}_S(Q)| \leq A (1 + \gamma^{-1} \log^+ M)$$

for any current $S \in \mathcal{D}_s^0$ with $\|S\|_{\ast} \leq 1$, where $\log^+(\cdot) := \max(0, \log(\cdot))$.

We conclude this subsection with a simple cohomological decomposition that will be used in Section 3.2 and Appendix A.3. We state and prove it only for currents in $\mathcal{D}_p$, as we will need it only in this case, but the same proof applies for currents in $\mathcal{D}_q$ for any q .

Lemma 2.8. For every $S \in \mathcal{D}_p$ there exists a smooth closed form $\tilde{S} \in \mathcal{D}_p$, called the standard form associated with S , such that:

- (1) $\{S\} = \{\tilde{S}\}$ and $\|\tilde{S}\|_* \lesssim \|S\|_*$;
- (2) setting $S^0 := S - \tilde{S}$, then $S^0 \in \mathcal{D}_p^0$ and $\|S^0\|_* \lesssim \|S\|_*$;
- (3) setting $M_{\tilde{S}} := \max_{\|\Omega\|_\star \leq 1} |\mathcal{U}_{\tilde{S}}(\Omega)|$, we have $M_{\tilde{S}} \lesssim \|S\|_*$.

All the implicit constants are independent of S .

Proof. Recall that, by the notation fixed above, $\alpha_{k-p} = (\alpha_{k-p,1}, \dots, \alpha_{k-p,h(k-p)})$ is a family of smooth closed real $(k-p, k-p)$ -forms such that $\{\alpha_{k-p,1}\}, \dots, \{\alpha_{k-p,h(k-p)}\}$ form a basis of $H^{k-p,k-p}(X, \mathbb{R})$, and $\check{\alpha}_{k-p} = (\check{\alpha}_{k-p,1}, \dots, \check{\alpha}_{k-p,h(k-p)})$ is the dual basis in $H^{p,p}(X, \mathbb{R})$ with respect to Poincaré duality. Write

$$\{S\} = \sum_{i=1}^{h(k-p)} s_i \{\check{\alpha}_{k-p,i}\}, \quad \text{where} \quad s_i = \langle S, \alpha_{k-p,i} \rangle.$$

Since the forms $\alpha_{k-p,i}$ are fixed and smooth, we have

$$|s_i| \lesssim \|S\|_* \quad \text{for every } 1 \leq i \leq h(k-p),$$

where the implicit constants are independent of S and can be taken independent of i .

Define

$$\tilde{S} := \sum_{i=1}^{h(k-p)} s_i \check{\alpha}_{k-p,i}.$$

Then $\tilde{S}$ is a smooth closed (p, p) -form and, by construction, we have $\{\tilde{S}\} = \{S\}$. Moreover,

$$\|\tilde{S}\|_* \leq \sum_{i=1}^{h(k-p)} |s_i| \|\check{\alpha}_{k-p,i}\|_* \lesssim \|S\|_*,$$

which proves (1).

Set $S^0 := S - \tilde{S}$ as in the statement. Since $\{S^0\} = \{S\} - \{\tilde{S}\} = 0$, we have $S^0 \in \mathcal{D}_p^0$, and by the triangle inequality,

$$\|S^0\|_* \leq \|S\|_* + \|\tilde{S}\|_* \lesssim \|S\|_*,$$

where the implicit constant is independent of S . This proves (2).

Finally, since each $\check{\alpha}_{k-p,i}$ is smooth, its super-potential $\mathcal{U}_{\check{\alpha}_{k-p,i}}$ is continuous with respect to the $\star$ -topology. Hence, it is bounded on the $\star$ -unit ball $\{\Omega \in \mathcal{D}_{k-p+1}^0 : \|\Omega\|_\star \leq 1\}$. Set

$$m_i := \max_{\|\Omega\|_\star \leq 1} |\mathcal{U}_{\check{\alpha}_{k-p,i}}(\Omega)| < +\infty.$$

By linearity of super-potentials, we obtain

$$M_{\tilde{S}} = \max_{\|\Omega\|_\star \leq 1} \left| \sum_{i=1}^{h(k-p)} s_i \mathcal{U}_{\check{\alpha}_{k-p,i}}(\Omega) \right| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{h(k-p)} |s_i| m_i \lesssim \|S\|_*.$$

This proves (3) and completes the proof. $\square$

2.4. A decomposition lemma. We conclude this section with the following lemma. The proof is standard, but we give it for completeness.

Lemma 2.9. *Let K be a compact set on X . Let $0 \leq s \leq k-1$ be an integer and Φ a smooth (s, s) -form on X with compact support outside K . There exist two positive smooth $(s+1, s+1)$ -forms Φ_1 and Φ_2 such that*

$$dd^c\Phi = \Phi_1 - \Phi_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{supp}\Phi_j \cap K = \emptyset \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2.$$

Proof. Since Φ is compactly supported outside K , there exist open sets $W \Subset W_1$ such that $\text{supp}\Phi \subset W \Subset W_1$ and $\overline{W_1} \cap K = \emptyset$. The form $dd^c\Phi$ is smooth and supported in W . Choose a smooth cut-off function χ on X such that $\chi \equiv 1$ on W and $\text{supp}\chi \Subset W_1$. Since $dd^c\Phi$ is smooth, there exists $M > 0$ such that $-M\omega^{s+1} \leq dd^c\Phi \leq M\omega^{s+1}$ on W . Fix a constant $C > M$. Consider the following smooth $(s+1, s+1)$ -forms:

$$\Phi_1 := C\chi\omega^{s+1} \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi_2 := C\chi\omega^{s+1} + dd^c\Phi.$$

It is clear that Φ_1 is positive. We now show that Φ_2 is also positive. Since it is compactly supported in W_1 it is enough to show that Φ_2 is positive in W_1 . On W , we have $\Phi_2 \geq (C - M)\omega^{s+1} > 0$. On the remaining part $W_1 \setminus W$, we have $\Phi_2 = C\chi\omega^{s+1} \geq 0$. Hence, Φ_1 and Φ_2 satisfy the assertion. $\square$

3. ACTION OF AUTOMORPHISMS AND CONVERGENCE TOWARDS GREEN CURRENTS

Throughout this section, (X, ω) denotes a compact Kähler manifold of dimension k , and $f: X \rightarrow X$ is a holomorphic automorphism.

3.1. Action of automorphisms and dynamical degrees. For every integer $0 \leq q \leq k$ the q -th dynamical degree of f is defined as

$$d_q(f) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int_X (f^n)^*(\omega^q) \wedge \omega^{k-q} \right)^{1/n}.$$

Results by Khovanskii [34], Teissier [44], and Gromov [32] imply that the sequence $q \mapsto \log d_q$ is concave. So, there are integers $0 \leq p \leq p' \leq k$ such that

$$1 = d_0 < \dots < d_p = \dots = d_{p'} > \dots > d_k = 1.$$

Throughout this paper we shall assume that f has a *simple action on cohomology*. This means that $p = p'$ and that the action of f^* on $H^{p,p}(X, \mathbb{R})$ has a single eigenvalue of maximal modulus, denoted by d_p , which we call the *main dynamical degree* of f . We define δ_f to be the maximum between $\max\{d_{p-1}, d_{p+1}\}$ and the absolute values of all the eigenvalues different from d_p for the action of f^* on $H^{p,p}(X, \mathbb{R})$. We have $\delta_f < d_p$ by definition. Throughout the text, we shall refer to any δ with $\delta_f < \delta < d_p$ as an *auxiliary dynamical degree* for f .

Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. For every $0 \leq q \leq k$ define $\delta_q := d_q + \varepsilon$ if $q \neq p$, and $\delta_p := d_p$. When given an auxiliary degree δ , we will always assume that ε is small enough so that $d_q + \varepsilon < \delta$ for every $q \neq p$. Since the mass of a positive closed current can be computed cohomologically, for every $R \in \mathcal{D}_q(X)$ we have

$$(2) \quad \|(f^n)^*(R)\|_* \leq C\delta_q^n \|R\|_*$$

for some constant $C > 1$ which is independent of R and n (see [25, Lemma 4.1.2]). The following lemma shows that the dynamical degrees control the growth of the pull-backs of currents also with respect to the $\star$ -norm.

Lemma 3.1. *For every $R \in \mathcal{D}_q(X)$ and every integer $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have*

$$\|(f^n)^*(R)\|^\star \leq C\delta_q^n \|R\|^\star$$

for some constant $C > 1$ which is independent of R and n .

Proof. By definition, for every $\kappa > 0$ there exist positive currents R_1 and R_2 such that $R = R_1 - R_2$ and

$$\sup_{\Phi \in \mathcal{H}_{k-q}} (\|R_1 \wedge \Phi\| + \|R_2 \wedge \Phi\|) < \|R\|^\star + \kappa.$$

Since every $\Phi \in \mathcal{H}_{k-q}$ is a positive closed $(k-q, k-q)$ -current, by (2) (applied to f^{-1}) there exists a constant $C > 1$, independent of Φ and n , such that $\|(f^n)_*\Phi\| \leq C\delta_q^n \|\Phi\|$. For every integer $n \geq 1$ we decompose $(f^n)^*(R) = (f^n)^*(R_1) - (f^n)^*(R_2)$. Denoting $\Phi' := (f^n)_*(\Phi)/\|(f^n)_*(\Phi)\|$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|(f^n)^*(R)\|^\star &\leq \sup_{\Phi \in \mathcal{H}_{k-q}} (\|(f^n)^*(R_1) \wedge \Phi\| + \|(f^n)^*(R_2) \wedge \Phi\|) \\ &= \sup_{\Phi \in \mathcal{H}_{k-q}} \|(R_1 + R_2) \wedge (f^n)_*(\Phi)\| \\ &= \sup_{\Phi \in \mathcal{H}_{k-q}} (\|(f^n)_*(\Phi)\| \cdot \|(R_1 + R_2) \wedge \Phi'\|) \\ &\leq \sup_{\Phi \in \mathcal{H}_{k-q}} (C\delta_q^n \|\Phi\| \cdot \|(R_1 + R_2) \wedge \Phi'\|) \\ &\leq C\delta_q^n \sup_{\tilde{\Phi} \in \mathcal{H}_{k-q}} (\|R_1 \wedge \tilde{\Phi}\| + \|R_2 \wedge \tilde{\Phi}\|) \\ &< C\delta_q^n (\|R\|^\star + \kappa). \end{aligned}$$

As κ is arbitrary, the assertion follows. $\square$

The following lemma provides a uniform growth estimate for wedge products of pull-backs of ω .

Lemma 3.2. *Let δ be an auxiliary degree for f . There exists a constant $A > 0$ such that for every $1 \leq q < p$ and all integers $n_1 \geq n_2 \geq \dots \geq n_q \geq 0$ we have*

$$\left\| \bigwedge_{i=1}^q (f^{n_i})^*(\omega) \right\| \leq A\delta^{n_1}.$$

Proof. For $q = 1$, the statement follows directly from the definition of δ and the fact that $q < p$. Assume the result holds for $q - 1 \geq 1$. Thus there exists $A_{q-1} > 0$, independent of the n_j 's, such that

$$\|\Omega\| \leq A_{q-1} \delta^{n_1 - n_q}, \quad \text{where} \quad \Omega := \bigwedge_{i=1}^q (f^{n_i - n_q})^*(\omega).$$

We then compute

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \bigwedge_{i=1}^q (f^{n_i})^*(\omega) \right\| &= \|(f^{n_q})^* \Omega\| = \|\Omega\| \left\| (f^{n_q})^* \left(\frac{\Omega}{\|\Omega\|} \right) \right\| \\ &\leq c \|\Omega\| \delta^{n_q} \leq c A_{q-1} \delta^{n_1 - n_q} \delta^{n_q} = c A_{q-1} \delta^{n_1}, \end{aligned}$$

where $c > 0$ is independent of Ω and n_q . This completes the induction. $\square$

Finally, we will need the following explicit dependence on γ of the estimate in [24, Lemma 3.2]. A similar statement holds with $\|\cdot\|_{\gamma, \star}$ instead of $\|\cdot\|_{\gamma, *}$.

Lemma 3.3. *Fix $1 \leq s \leq k$ and $Q \in \mathcal{D}_{k-s+1}^0$. Assume $\|\mathcal{U}_Q\|_{\gamma, *} \leq 1$ for some $0 < \gamma \leq 1$. There exist constants $A > 1$ and $c > 1$, independent of Q and γ , such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have*

$$\|\mathcal{U}_{(f^n)_* Q}\|_{\gamma, *} \leq A^{n\gamma} (c \delta_s^n)^{1-\gamma}.$$

Proof. Take $S \in \mathcal{D}_s^0(X)$ with $\|S\|_* \leq 1$. By the Hölder continuity of $\mathcal{U}_Q$, we have $|\mathcal{U}_Q(S)| \leq \|S\|_{\mathcal{C}^{-2}}^\gamma$. Since $\{Q\} = 0$, we also have

$$\mathcal{U}_{(f^n)_* Q}(S) = \mathcal{U}_Q((f^n)^* S).$$

The above identity is clear when S is smooth. Since $\mathcal{U}_Q$ is continuous and smooth forms are dense in $\mathcal{D}_s^0(X)$, we deduce that $\mathcal{U}_{(f^n)_* Q}$ is continuous, hence the above identity holds for every $S \in \mathcal{D}_s^0(X)$.

By definition of dynamical degree there exists $c > 1$ such that $\|(f^n)^* S\|_* \leq c \delta_s^n \|S\|_*$ for all n . Hence $\|(f^n)^* S / (c \delta_s^n)\|_* \leq 1$ and we obtain

$$\mathcal{U}_{(f^n)_* Q}(S) = \mathcal{U}_Q((f^n)^* S) = c \delta_s^n \mathcal{U}_Q\left(\frac{(f^n)^* S}{c \delta_s^n}\right) \leq (c \delta_s^n)^{1-\gamma} \|(f^n)^* S\|_{\mathcal{C}^{-2}}^\gamma.$$

It remains to control the $\mathcal{C}^{-2}$ -norm in the last term. Since f^{-1} is smooth, there exists $A > 1$ such that $\|f_* \Phi\|_{\mathcal{C}^2} \leq A \|\Phi\|_{\mathcal{C}^2}$ for all test forms Φ . Therefore

$$\|f^* S\|_{\mathcal{C}^{-2}} = \sup_{\|\Phi\|_{\mathcal{C}^2} \leq 1} |\langle S, f_* \Phi \rangle| \leq A \|S\|_{\mathcal{C}^{-2}}.$$

Iterating gives $\|(f^n)^* S\|_{\mathcal{C}^{-2}} \leq A^n \|S\|_{\mathcal{C}^{-2}}$. Substituting into the previous estimate yields

$$|\mathcal{U}_{(f^n)_* Q}(S)| \leq A^{n\gamma} (c \delta_s^n)^{1-\gamma} \|S\|_{\mathcal{C}^{-2}}^\gamma,$$

which proves the assertion. $\square$

3.2. Speed of convergence towards the Green currents. As mentioned in the Introduction, f admits a unique probability measure of maximal entropy μ , called the equilibrium measure of f , which is the intersection of a positive closed (p, p) -current T^+ and a positive closed $(k-p, k-p)$ -current T^- (the Green currents of f and f^{-1} , respectively). The Green currents T^+ and T^- satisfy the invariance properties $f^* T^+ = d_p T^+$ and $f_* T^- = d_p T^-$. By [25, Section 4.3], they are the unique positive closed currents in their respective cohomology classes. Moreover, for any current $S \in \mathcal{D}_p(X)$ with $\|S\|_* < \infty$ there exists a constant $c = c_S$ such that $d_p^{-n} (f^n)^*(S)$ converges to $c T^+$.

The following theorem gives an exponential estimate for the speed of convergence toward the Green current that we shall need in the sequel.

Theorem 3.4. *Let f be a holomorphic automorphism of (X, ω) with simple action on cohomology. Let d_p be the main dynamical degree of f and δ an auxiliary dynamical degree. Take $S \in \mathcal{D}_p$ with $\|S\|_* < \infty$ and let c be the constant such that $d_p^{-n}(f^n)^*(S)$ converges to cT^+ . Let R be a $(k-p, k-p)$ -current with $\|R\| < \infty$, $\|dd^c R\|^\star < \infty$ and $\|\mathcal{U}_{dd^c R}\|_{\gamma,*} < \infty$ for some $0 < \gamma \leq 1$. Then, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have*

$$(3) \quad \left| \left\langle \frac{(f^n)^*(S)}{d_p^n} - cT^+, R \right\rangle \right| \leq B \left(\frac{\delta}{d_p} \right)^n \|S\|_* (\|dd^c R\|^\star + \|\mathcal{U}_{dd^c R}\|_{\gamma,*} + \|R\|),$$

where $B > 0$ is a constant independent of R, S , and n .

Theorem 3.4 is established in [24] (see also [3, Corollary 3.3]) with $\|dd^c R\|_*$ instead of $\|dd^c R\|^\star$. We observe also that recently Vergamini [45] gave a more general version of the above convergence in [24], where only the log-Hölder-continuity of the super-potentials $\mathcal{U}_{dd^c R}$ (with respect to $*$ -topology) is required. We will stick to the simpler version that we need here, but we observe that the arguments of [45] could also be adapted to this case.

A key ingredient in the proof of Theorem 3.4 will be Proposition 3.5 below. As for Proposition 2.7, the proof uses similar arguments as in [25] (adapted to the use of $\|\cdot\|^\star$ instead of $\|\cdot\|_*$), and is therefore postponed to the Appendix. We say that a convergence $S_n \rightarrow S$ of currents in $\mathcal{D}_p$ is $SP^\star$ -uniform if $\mathcal{U}_{S_n}$ converges to $\mathcal{U}_S$ uniformly on any $\star$ -bounded set of smooth forms in $\mathcal{D}_{k-p+1}^0$. Recall that we always assume that super-potentials are normalized as in Section 2.3. Observe also that, by linearity, it suffices to verify the $SP^\star$ -uniform convergence on the unit ball of $\mathcal{D}_{k-p+1}^0(X)$.

Proposition 3.5. *Let $f : X \rightarrow X$ be a holomorphic automorphism of (X, ω) with simple action on cohomology. Take $S \in \mathcal{D}_p \cap \mathcal{D}_{p,*}^1$ and let $\tilde{S} \in \mathcal{D}_p$ be the standard form associated with S as in Lemma 2.8. Assume that $d_p^{-n}(f^n)^*\{\tilde{S}\} \rightarrow \underline{c} \in H^{p,p}(X, \mathbb{R})$. Then*

$$\tilde{S}_n := d_p^{-n}(f^n)^*(\tilde{S})$$

converges $SP^\star$ -uniformly to a current $T_{\underline{c}} \in \mathcal{D}_p$ which depends only on $\underline{c}$. Moreover, for every $\delta_f < \delta < d_p$, we have

$$|\mathcal{U}_{\tilde{S}_n}(Q) - \mathcal{U}_{T_{\underline{c}}}(Q)| \lesssim \left(\frac{\delta}{d_p} \right)^n \|Q\|^\star \quad \text{for every } Q \in \mathcal{D}_{k-p+1}^0,$$

where the implicit constant is independent of S and n .

Proof of Theorem 3.4. By homogeneity, we may assume without loss of generality that

$$\|S\|_* \leq 1, \quad \|R\| \leq 1, \quad \|dd^c R\|^\star \leq 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \|\mathcal{U}_{dd^c R}\|_{\gamma,*} \leq 1.$$

Recall that we normalize potentials and super-potentials as in Section 2.3. The current $R \in \mathcal{D}_{k-p}$ is a potential of $Q := dd^c R \in \mathcal{D}_{k-p+1}^0$, but it is not necessarily α_p -normalized. Let $\mathcal{U}_{S_n}$ and $\mathcal{U}_+$ denote the α_p -normalized super-potentials of $S_n := d_p^{-n}(f^n)^*(S)$ and T^+ , respectively. Set

$$(4) \quad R' := R - \sum_{j=1}^{h(p)} c_j \check{\alpha}_{p,j}, \quad \text{where} \quad c_j := \langle R, \alpha_{p,j} \rangle.$$

Then R' is an α_p -normalized potential of Q . We then have

$$(5) \quad \left| \left\langle \frac{(f^n)^*(S)}{d_p^n} - cT^+, R \right\rangle \right| \leq \left| \left\langle \frac{(f^n)^*(S)}{d_p^n} - cT^+, R' \right\rangle \right| + \left| \left\langle \frac{(f^n)^*(S)}{d_p^n} - cT^+, R - R' \right\rangle \right| \\ \leq \left| \mathcal{U}_{S_n}(Q) - c\mathcal{U}_+(Q) \right| + \sum_j |c_j| \left| \left\langle \frac{(f^n)^*(S - cT^+)}{d_p^n}, \check{\alpha}_{p,j} \right\rangle \right|,$$

where in the last step we used the fact that R' is a normalized potential (for the first term) and the definition of R' and the invariance of T^+ (for the second term). We now consider separately the two terms in the last line.

Step 1. Estimate of the first term. We have

$$(6) \quad \left| \mathcal{U}_{S_n}(Q) - c\mathcal{U}_+(Q) \right| \lesssim (\delta/d_p)^n,$$

where the implicit constant is independent of S, Q , and n .

Proof of Step 1. Let $\tilde{S} \in \mathcal{D}_p$ be the standard form associated with S as in Lemma 2.8, and set $S^0 := S - \tilde{S} \in \mathcal{D}_p^0$ as in that lemma. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$S_n = \tilde{S}_n + S_n^0, \quad \text{where} \quad \tilde{S}_n := d_p^{-n}(f^n)^*(\tilde{S}), \quad S_n^0 := d_p^{-n}(f^n)^*(S^0).$$

By the linearity of super-potentials, we have

$$\left| \mathcal{U}_{S_n}(Q) - c\mathcal{U}_+(Q) \right| \leq \left| \mathcal{U}_{\tilde{S}_n}(Q) - c\mathcal{U}_+(Q) \right| + \left| \mathcal{U}_{S_n^0}(Q) \right|.$$

We now treat separately the first term (the smooth part) and the second term (the exact part) of the right-hand side of the above expression.

Step 1a. The smooth part. Since $\tilde{S}_n$ is smooth, $\mathcal{U}_{\tilde{S}_n}$ is continuous with respect to the $\star$ -topology. Proposition 3.5 implies that the convergence $\tilde{S}_n \rightarrow T_{\underline{c}} = cT^+$ is $SP^\star$ -uniform and that

$$(7) \quad \left| \mathcal{U}_{\tilde{S}_n}(Q) - c\mathcal{U}_+(Q) \right| \lesssim \left(\frac{\delta}{d_p} \right)^n$$

where the implicit constant is independent of S, Q , and n .

Step 1.b. The exact part. We now estimate $|\mathcal{U}_{S_n^0}(Q)|$. Since $\{S^0\} = 0$, we also have $\{S_n^0\} = 0$. Fix $\tilde{\delta}$ such that $\delta_f < \tilde{\delta} < \delta$, and define

$$Q_n := C^{-1}\tilde{\delta}^{-n}(f^n)_*(Q),$$

where $C \geq 1$ is chosen large enough so that $\|Q_n\|^\star \leq 1$ for every n , see Lemma 3.1. Applying Lemma 3.3 with $s = p$, and using the assumption $\|\mathcal{U}_Q\|_{\gamma,*} \leq 1$, we get

$$\|\mathcal{U}_{Q_n}\|_{\gamma,*} = C^{-1}\tilde{\delta}^{-n}\|\mathcal{U}_{(f^n)_*(Q)}\|_{\gamma,*} \leq C^{-1}\tilde{\delta}^{-n}A^{n\gamma}(cd_p^n)^{1-\gamma} \lesssim A^{n\gamma}(\tilde{\delta}/d_p)^n.$$

Since $\|S^0\|_* \lesssim 1$ (by Lemma 2.8(2)), Proposition 2.7 gives

$$|\mathcal{U}_{S^0}(Q_n)| = \|S^0\|_* |\mathcal{U}_{S^0/\|S^0\|_*}(Q_n)| \lesssim 1 + \gamma^{-1} \log^+ \|\mathcal{U}_{Q_n}\|_{\gamma,*} \lesssim n/\gamma,$$

where the implicit constants are independent of S, Q , and n . Finally, we deduce

$$(8) \quad |\mathcal{U}_{S_n^0}(Q)| = C \left(\tilde{\delta}/d_p \right)^n |\mathcal{U}_{S^0/\|S^0\|_*}(Q_n)| \lesssim n \left(\tilde{\delta}/d_p \right)^n / \gamma \lesssim (\delta/d_p)^n,$$

where again the implicit constant is independent of S, Q , and n .

Combining (7) and (8) we obtain (6), which completes the proof of Step 1. $\square$

Step 2. Estimate of the second term. We have

$$\sum_j |c_j| \left| \left\langle \frac{(f^n)^*(S - cT^+)}{d_p^n}, \check{\alpha}_{p,j} \right\rangle \right| \lesssim \left(\frac{\delta}{d_p} \right)^n,$$

where the implicit constant is independent of S and n .

Proof of Step 2. Recall that every $\check{\alpha}_{p,j}$ is smooth, and that $d_p^{-n}(f^n)^*(S - cT^+) \rightarrow 0$. Applying [3, Corollary 3.3] (see also [45, Lemma 4.1]), for each j we obtain

$$\left| \left\langle \frac{(f^n)^*(S - cT^+)}{d_p^n}, \check{\alpha}_{p,j} \right\rangle \right| \lesssim \left(\frac{\delta}{d_p} \right)^n \|S - cT^+\|_* \|\check{\alpha}_{p,j}\|,$$

where the implicit constant is independent of S , c , j , and n . Since the constant $c = c(S)$ depends linearly on the cohomology class $\{S\}$, we have

$$\|S - cT^+\|_* \leq \|S\|_* + |c| \|T^+\|_* \lesssim \|S\|_*,$$

where again the implicit constant is independent of S , c and T^+ . We then obtain

$$(9) \quad \sum_j |c_j| \left| \left\langle \frac{(f^n)^*(S - cT^+)}{d_p^n}, \check{\alpha}_{p,j} \right\rangle \right| \lesssim \left(\frac{\delta}{d_p} \right)^n \|S\|_* \sum_j |c_j| \lesssim \left(\frac{\delta}{d_p} \right)^n \|S\|_*,$$

where in the last step we used the definition (4) of the c_j 's and the assumption $\|R\| \leq 1$ to get

$$\sum_j |c_j| \lesssim \|R\| \leq 1.$$

The desired estimate follows. $\square$

The assertion follows combining (5) with estimates in Steps 1 and 2. The proof is complete. $\square$

Remark 3.6. As in Proposition 2.7, the term (and assumption on) $\|S\|_*$ in Theorem 3.4 can be replaced by (an assumption on) $\|S\|^\star$. We did not emphasize this point, since, in the proof of our main Theorem 1.1 (see (15)), the current S will always be positive closed and the main difficulties arise when studying the current R .

4. DECAY ESTIMATES OUTSIDE THE SUPPORT OF T^+

Throughout this section, (X, ω) denotes a compact Kähler manifold of dimension k , and $f: X \rightarrow X$ is a holomorphic automorphism with simple action on cohomology. We assume that d_p is the main dynamical degree and fix an auxiliary dynamical degree $\delta < d_p$. All constants appearing below may depend on X , f , ω , and δ , but are independent of the integers n_j unless otherwise specified.

4.1. Notations and a preliminary estimate. For integers $n_1 \geq \dots \geq n_\ell \geq 0$ and a smooth (j, j) -form Θ , set

$$(10) \quad \Omega_{n_1, \dots, n_\ell}(\Theta) := (f^{n_1})_*(\Theta) \wedge (f^{n_2})_*(\omega) \wedge \dots \wedge (f^{n_\ell})_*(\omega),$$

and

$$(11) \quad \Omega'_{n_1, \dots, n_\ell}(\Theta) := \Omega_{n_1, \dots, n_\ell}(\Theta) \wedge \omega.$$

Proposition 4.1. *Let $j, \ell \geq 1$ satisfy $\ell + j - 1 \leq k - p$. Let Θ be a smooth dd^c -exact (j, j) -form with $\|\mathcal{U}_\Theta\|_{\gamma, *}\leq 1$ for some $0 < \gamma \leq 1$. There exist constants $A > 1$ and $C_{\gamma, \ell} > 1$ such that for all $n_1 \geq \dots \geq n_\ell \geq 0$ we have*

$$\|\mathcal{U}_{\Omega'_{n_1, \dots, n_\ell}(\Theta)}\|_{\gamma, *} \leq C_{\gamma, \ell} A^{n_1 \gamma} \delta^{n_1}.$$

Proof. Define recursively

$$R_1 = (f^{n_1 - n_2})_* \Theta \quad \text{and} \quad R_s = (f^{n_s - n_{s+1}})_*(\omega \wedge R_{s-1}) \quad (2 \leq s \leq \ell),$$

where we also set $n_{\ell+1} := 0$ for convenience. Then $R_\ell = \Omega_{n_1, \dots, n_\ell}(\Theta)$.

Applying Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 2.6 inductively, we see that $\mathcal{U}_{R_\ell}$ is $(\widetilde{M}_\ell, \gamma)$ -Hölder-continuous, where

$$\widetilde{M}_\ell = A_1^{(\ell-1)\gamma} A^{n_1 \gamma} c^{(1-\gamma)\ell} \left(\prod_{s=1}^{\ell} \delta_{k-j-s+2}^{n_s - n_{s+1}} \right)^{1-\gamma}.$$

Since $\ell + j - 1 \leq k - p$, the indices in the product belong to $\{p+1, \dots, k\}$. Hence we have $\delta_{k-j-s+2} < \delta$ for all s , and

$$\prod_{s=1}^{\ell} \delta_{k-j-s+2}^{n_s - n_{s+1}} \leq \delta^{n_1}.$$

Thus, we have

$$\widetilde{M}_\ell \leq A_1^{(\ell-1)\gamma} A^{n_1 \gamma} c^{(1-\gamma)\ell} \delta^{n_1}.$$

Finally, since $\Omega'_{n_1, \dots, n_\ell}(\Theta) = \omega \wedge R_\ell$, a further application of Lemma 2.6 gives the desired estimate. $\square$

4.2. Decay estimates outside the support of T^+ . Recall that T^+ is the Green current of f , and that d_p and δ are the main and an auxiliary dynamical degrees. Set $q := k - p$ and let χ be a smooth cut-off function supported outside $\text{supp } T^+$. We also fix $0 < \gamma \leq 1$. The goal of this section is to prove the following proposition, giving a bound for the $\star$ -norm of

$$\Omega'_{n_1, \dots, n_q}(dd^c \chi) = \Omega_{n_1, \dots, n_q, 0}(dd^c \chi) = \Omega_{n_1, \dots, n_q}(dd^c \chi) \wedge \omega.$$

Unless specified, the constant appearing below will depend on χ and γ , but not on the integers $n_1, \dots, n_q$.

Proposition 4.2. *There exist constants $A > 1$ (independent of γ) and $C > 0$ such that*

$$\left\| \Omega'_{n_1, \dots, n_q}(dd^c \chi) \right\|^\star \leq C A^{n_1 \gamma} \delta^{n_1}$$

for all integers $n_1 \geq n_2 \geq \dots \geq n_q \geq 0$.

To prove Proposition 4.2, we will first introduce some auxiliary currents. By Lemma 2.9, we can write $dd^c \chi = \beta_1^+ - \beta_1^-$, where $\beta_1^\pm$ are smooth positive forms with $\text{supp} \beta_1^\pm \cap \text{supp} T^+ = \emptyset$. Applying the same construction inductively, for every $1 \leq s \leq q$ we construct 2^s smooth positive forms β_s^I , where $I \in \{+, -\}^s$ is a multi-index of length s , such that

$$dd^c \beta_s^I = \beta_{s+1}^{I,+} - \beta_{s+1}^{I,-} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{supp} \beta_s^I \cap \text{supp} T^+ = \emptyset \quad \text{for every } 1 \leq s \leq q \text{ and } I \text{ with } |I| = s.$$

For $1 \leq s \leq q$ and I with $|I| = q + 1 - s$ define

$$R_s^I := \Omega'_{n_1 - n_s, \dots, n_{s-1} - n_s}(\beta_{q+1-s}^I) = (f^{n_1 - n_s})_*(\beta_{q+1-s}^I) \wedge \bigwedge_{i=2}^s (f^{n_i - n_s})_*(\omega).$$

In particular, $R_1^I = \beta_q^I$ for every I with $|I| = q$, $R_q^\pm = \Omega'_{n_1 - n_q, \dots, n_{q-1} - n_q}(\beta_1^\pm)$, and $\text{supp} R_s^I \cap \text{supp} T^+ = \emptyset$ for every s and I with $|I| = q + 1 - s$. Moreover, all the R_s^I are positive. We also set

$$(12) \quad M_s := \max_{|I|=q+1-s} \|\mathcal{U}_{dd^c \beta_{q+1-s}^I}\|_{\gamma,*} \quad \text{and} \quad M := \max_s M_s.$$

Lemma 4.3. *There exists a constant $B > 0$ such that*

$$\|\Omega'_{n_1, \dots, n_q}(dd^c \chi)\|^\star \leq B \delta^{n_q} \sum_{\circ \in \{+, -\}} \left(\|dd^c R_q^\circ\|^\star + \|\mathcal{U}_{dd^c R_q^\circ}\|_{\gamma,*} + \|R_q^\circ\| \right).$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{H}_{k-q-1}$ denote the set of smooth positive closed $(k - q - 1, k - q - 1)$ -forms Φ with $\|\Phi\| \leq 1$. By the definition of the $\star$ -norm and of the forms $\beta_1^\pm$ as above, we have

$$\|\Omega'_{n_1, \dots, n_q}(dd^c \chi)\|^\star \leq \sup_{\Phi \in \mathcal{H}_{k-q-1}} \langle \Omega'_{n_1, \dots, n_q}(\beta_1^+), \Phi \rangle + \sup_{\Phi \in \mathcal{H}_{k-q-1}} \langle \Omega'_{n_1, \dots, n_q}(\beta_1^-), \Phi \rangle.$$

Since the two terms can be treated in a similar way, it suffices to estimate the first term. Fix $\Phi \in \mathcal{H}_{k-q-1}$. Using the definitions (10) and (11), the corresponding component of the first term is equal to

$$\langle \Omega_{n_1, \dots, n_q}(\beta_1^+), \Phi \wedge \omega \rangle = \langle (f^{n_q})^*(\Phi \wedge \omega), R_q^+ \rangle.$$

Since $\text{supp} R_q^+ \cap \text{supp} T^+ = \emptyset$, Theorem 3.4 applied with $S := \Phi \wedge \omega$ and $R := R_q^+$ gives a constant $B > 0$ (depending only on γ) such that

$$|\langle (f^{n_q})^*(\Phi \wedge \omega), R_q^+ \rangle| \leq B \delta^{n_q} \|\Phi \wedge \omega\|_* \left(\|dd^c R_q^+\|^\star + \|\mathcal{U}_{dd^c R_q^+}\|_{\gamma,*} + \|R_q^+\| \right),$$

as the term $\langle R_q^+, T^+ \rangle$ vanishes. For $\Phi \in \mathcal{H}_{k-q-1}$ we have $\|\Phi \wedge \omega\|_* = \|\Phi \wedge \omega\| = \|\Phi\| \leq 1$. Taking the supremum over $\Phi \in \mathcal{H}_{k-q-1}$, we obtain

$$\sup_{\Phi \in \mathcal{H}_{k-q-1}} \langle \Omega_{n_1, \dots, n_q}(\beta_1^+), \Phi \wedge \omega \rangle \leq B \delta^{n_q} \left(\|dd^c R_q^+\|^\star + \|\mathcal{U}_{dd^c R_q^+}\|_{\gamma,*} + \|R_q^+\| \right).$$

A similar estimate holds with β_1^- in place of β_1^+ , and the assertion follows. $\square$

Lemma 4.4. *We have*

$$\|dd^c R_q^\pm\|^\star \leq B^{q-1} \delta^{n_1 - n_q} \sum_{|I|=q-1} \|dd^c R_1^{\pm, I}\|^\star + \sum_{s=1}^{q-1} B^{q-s} \delta^{n_s - n_q} \sum_{|I|=q-s} \left(\|\mathcal{U}_{dd^c R_s^{\pm, I}}\|_{\gamma,*} + \|R_s^{\pm, I}\| \right),$$

where B is as in Lemma 4.3.

Proof. It is enough to prove that, for every $1 \leq s \leq q-1$ and I with $|I| = q-s$, we have

$$(13) \quad \|dd^c R_{s+1}^I\|^\star \leq B \delta^{n_s - n_{s+1}} \sum_{\circ \in \{+, -\}} \left(\|dd^c R_s^{I, \circ}\|^\star + \|\mathcal{U}_{dd^c R_s^{I, \circ}}\|_{\gamma, *} + \|R_s^{I, \circ}\| \right),$$

where B is as in Lemma 4.3. The assertion then follows developing this recursion formula.

By definition of the $\star$ -norm and since $dd^c R_{s+1}^I$ is supported outside $\text{supp } T^+$, we can argue as in Lemma 4.3: for $\Phi \in \mathcal{H}_{k-q-1}$ we write

$$\langle dd^c R_{s+1}^I, \Phi \rangle = \langle (f^{n_s - n_{s+1}})^*(\Phi \wedge \omega), R_s^{I, +} \rangle - \langle (f^{n_s - n_{s+1}})^*(\Phi \wedge \omega), R_s^{I, -} \rangle.$$

Both terms in the right-hand side of the above expression can be estimated in a similar way; hence, we will bound the first one. For this, we apply Theorem 3.4 with $S := \Phi \wedge \omega$ and $R := R_s^{I, +}$, using that $\|\Phi \wedge \omega\|_* \leq 1$. Taking the supremum over $\Phi \in \mathcal{H}_{k-q-1}$ yields (13) and completes the proof. $\square$

Lemma 4.5. *There exist constants $A > 1$ (independent of γ) and $C' > 0$ such that for all $1 \leq s \leq q$ and I with $|I| = q+1-s$ we have*

$$\|\mathcal{U}_{dd^c R_s^I}\|_{\gamma, *} \leq C' A^{n_1 \gamma} \delta^{n_1 - n_s}.$$

Proof. By construction, we have

$$dd^c R_s^I = \Omega'_{n_1 - n_s, \dots, n_{s-1} - n_s}(dd^c \beta_{q+1-s}^I).$$

When $s = 1$ (and so $|I| = q$), we have $R_1^I = \beta_q^I$ which is smooth and by (12) we obtain $\|\mathcal{U}_{dd^c R_1^I}\|_{\gamma, *} \leq M$. For $2 \leq s \leq q$ we apply Proposition 4.1 with $\ell := s-1$, $j := q+2-s$, and $\Theta := dd^c \beta_{q+1-s}^I$. It follows that there exist constants $A > 1$ (independent of γ) and $C_{s-1} > 1$ such that $\mathcal{U}_{dd^c R_s^I}$ is $(\widetilde{M}_{s-1}, \gamma)$ -Hölder continuous with

$$\widetilde{M}_{s-1} \leq M_s C_{s-1} A^{(n_1 - n_s) \gamma} \delta^{n_1 - n_s} \leq M C_{s-1} A^{n_1 \gamma} \delta^{n_1 - n_s},$$

where M_s and M are as in (12). In particular,

$$\|\mathcal{U}_{dd^c R_s^I}\|_{\gamma, *} \leq M C_{s-1} A^{n_1 \gamma} \delta^{n_1 - n_s}.$$

Setting $C' := M \cdot \max\{C_1, \dots, C_{q-1}\}$ gives the assertion. $\square$

Lemma 4.6. *There exists a constant C'' such that for all $1 \leq s \leq q$ and I with $|I| = q+1-s$ we have*

$$\|R_s^I\| \leq C'' \delta^{n_1 - n_s}.$$

Proof. By definition, we have

$$0 \leq R_s^I = (f^{n_1 - n_s})_*(\beta_{q+1-s}^I) \wedge \bigwedge_{i=2}^s (f^{n_i - n_s})_*(\omega) \lesssim (f^{n_1 - n_s})_*(\omega^{q+1-s}) \wedge \bigwedge_{i=2}^s (f^{n_i - n_s})_*(\omega),$$

where the implicit constant depends only on s and the choice of the β_s^I 's (in particular, it can be taken independent of s and I). Observe that the last expression can be written as the wedge product of $q = k-p$ positive closed $(1,1)$ -currents, and that the one corresponding to $i = s$ is equal to ω . We can then apply Lemma 3.2 (with f^{-1} instead of f) to the current $(f^{n_1 - n_s})_*(\omega^{q+1-s}) \wedge \bigwedge_{i=2}^{s-1} (f^{n_i - n_s})_*(\omega)$, which gives $\|R_s^I\| \lesssim \delta^{n_1 - n_s}$. The assertion follows. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 4.2. Combining Lemmas 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, and 4.6 we obtain

$$\|\Omega'_{n_1, \dots, n_q}(dd^c \chi)\|^\star \leq (2B)^q \delta^{n_1} \left(\max_{|I|=q} \|dd^c R_1^I\|^\star + q(C' + C'') A^{n_1 \gamma} \right),$$

where the constants A, B, C', C'' are as in those lemmas. The assertion follows setting $C := (2B)^q (\max_{|I|=q} \|dd^c R_1^I\|^\star + q(C' + C''))$ and observing that the forms $R_1^I = \beta_q^I$ are fixed and depend only on χ . $\square$

Remark 4.7. *The estimate in Proposition 4.2 is the crucial reason for introducing the norm $\|\cdot\|^\star$, and the need for the generalization of the convergence speed of [24] given by Theorem 3.4 with respect to this norm. See Section 6.1 for more details on this.*

5. SUPPORTS OF MEASURES OF LARGE ENTROPY

5.1. Proof of Theorem 1.1. It is enough to prove that $\text{supp} \nu \subseteq \text{supp} T^+$. Indeed, the same arguments applied with f^{-1} instead of f yield $\text{supp} \nu \subseteq \text{supp} T^-$, and therefore $\text{supp} \nu \subseteq J$.

Assume that ν gives positive mass to a compact set $K \subset X \setminus \text{supp} T^+$. Let $W \Subset W_1$ be open neighborhoods of K such that $\overline{W_1} \cap \text{supp} T^+ = \emptyset$, and let χ be a smooth cut-off function which is equal to 1 on W and is supported in W_1 . By a now-classical construction due to Gromov [33], we have

$$(14) \quad h_t(f, K) \leq \text{lov}(f, W) := \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m} \log \text{vol}(\Gamma_m^W),$$

where $h_t(f, K)$ denotes the topological entropy of f on K ,

$$\Gamma_m^W = \{(z, f(z), \dots, f^{m-1}(z)) : z \in W\}$$

and

$$k! \text{vol}(\Gamma_m^W) = \int_{\Gamma_m^W} \omega^k = \sum_{0 \leq m_i \leq m-1} \int_W \bigwedge_{i=1}^k (f^{m_i})^*(\omega).$$

Since the number of terms in the last sum is m^k , it suffices to estimate each integral separately. Recall that δ denotes an auxiliary dynamical degree for f .

Proposition 5.1. *Fix $0 < \gamma \leq 1$. There exist constants $A > 1$ (independent of γ) and $C = C(\gamma) > 0$ such that for all integers $0 \leq m_k \leq \dots \leq m_1 \leq m-1$ we have*

$$\int_W \bigwedge_{i=1}^k (f^{m_i})^*(\omega) \leq C_\gamma A^{m\gamma} \delta^m.$$

Assuming Proposition 5.1 for now, we deduce from (14) that

$$\text{vol}(\Gamma_m^W) \lesssim m^k A^{m\gamma} \delta^m,$$

where the implicit constant depends on γ but is independent of m . Hence

$$h_t(f, K) \leq \log \delta + \gamma \log A.$$

Since $\gamma > 0$ and $d_p > \delta > \delta_f$ are arbitrary, we can choose γ and δ so that $h_t(f, K) < h_\nu(f)$, contradicting the variational principle. Thus, we have $\text{supp} \nu \subseteq \text{supp} T^+$, and the proof is complete.

5.2. Proof of Proposition 5.1. We may assume $0 \leq m_k \leq \dots \leq m_1 \leq m - 1$. Since $W \subset \text{supp} \chi$, we have

$$\int_W \bigwedge_{i=1}^k (f^{m_i})^*(\omega) \leq \left\langle \bigwedge_{i=1}^k (f^{m_i})^*(\omega), \chi \right\rangle = \left\langle \bigwedge_{i=1}^k (f^{m_i - m_{p+1}})^*(\omega), (f^{m_{p+1}})_*(\chi) \right\rangle.$$

Set

$$(15) \quad S := \bigwedge_{i=1}^p (f^{m_i - m_p})^*(\omega), \quad \text{and} \quad R := (f^{m_{p+1}})_*(\chi) \bigwedge_{i=p+1}^k (f^{m_{p+1} - m_i})_*(\omega).$$

Then

$$\int_W \bigwedge_{i=1}^k (f^{m_i})^*(\omega) \leq \left\langle (f^{m_p - m_{p+1}})^*(S), R \right\rangle.$$

We will estimate the above expression by means of Theorem 3.4. For this, we need to bound $\|S\|_*$, $\|dd^c R\|^\star$, $\|\mathcal{U}_{dd^c R}\|_{\gamma,*}$, and $\|R\|$. The implicit constants below can depend on γ but are independent of the integers m_i .

We first estimate $\|S\|_*$. By Lemma 3.2 (applied with $q = p - 1$), we have

$$\|S\|_* = \|S\| \lesssim \delta^{m_1 - m_p}.$$

Next, using the notation (10)–(11), we have

$$dd^c R = \Omega'_{m_{p+1}, m_{p+1} - m_{p+2}, \dots, m_{p+1} - m_k}(dd^c \chi).$$

Proposition 4.2 (applied to the integers $(m_{p+1}, m_{p+1} - m_{p+2}, \dots, m_{p+1} - m_k)$ instead of $n_1, \dots, n_q$) gives

$$\|dd^c R\|^\star \lesssim A^{m_{p+1}\gamma} \delta^{m_{p+1}}.$$

By Proposition 4.1 (applied with $j := 1, \ell := k - p, \Theta := dd^c \chi$ and with the integers $(m_{p+1}, m_{p+1} - m_{p+2}, \dots, m_{p+1} - m_k)$), the super-potential of $dd^c R$ satisfies

$$\|\mathcal{U}_{dd^c R}\|_{\gamma,*} \lesssim A^{m_{p+1}\gamma} \delta^{m_{p+1}}.$$

Finally, we bound $\|R\|$. From the definition of R (i.e., since $0 \leq \chi \leq 1$), it is enough to bound the mass of $\bigwedge_{i=p+1}^k (f^{m_{p+1} - m_i})_*(\omega)$. Observe that this is the wedge product of $k - p$ pull-backs of ω , and that the term corresponding to $i = p + 1$ is equal to ω . We deduce from Lemma 3.2 (applied to the current $\bigwedge_{i=p+2}^k (f^{m_{p+1} - m_i})_*(\omega)$ with f^{-1} instead of f and $k - p$ instead of p) that

$$\|R\| \lesssim \delta^{m_{p+1} - m_k}.$$

Since $\text{supp} R \cap \text{supp} T^+ = \emptyset$, Theorem 3.4 implies that

$$\left\langle (f^{m_p - m_{p+1}})^*(S), R \right\rangle \lesssim \delta^{m_p - m_{p+1}} \|S\|_* \left(\|dd^c R\|^\star + \|\mathcal{U}_{dd^c R}\|_{\gamma,*} + \|R\| \right).$$

Combining the previous estimates yields

$$\int_W \bigwedge_{i=1}^k (f^{m_i})^*(\omega) \lesssim A^{m_{p+1}\gamma} \delta^{m_1} \leq A^{m\gamma} \delta^m,$$

which proves the proposition.

6. FINAL REMARKS AND FURTHER QUESTIONS

6.1. On the role of the $\star$ -norm. We explain here why the norm $\|\cdot\|^\star$ is needed in our argument. The crucial point is Proposition 4.2, where we have to estimate currents obtained by iterating localized forms such as $dd^c\chi$ outside the Julia set. After writing $dd^c\chi = \beta_1^+ - \beta_1^-$, the positive currents that naturally appear in the inductive construction are in general not closed. Therefore, they are not directly controlled by the usual $\|\cdot\|_*$ -norm, which is defined through decompositions into positive *closed* currents.

This is precisely why Theorem 3.4 has to be proved with respect to the more flexible norm $\|\cdot\|^\star$. The latter allows one to work with decompositions into positive currents that are not necessarily closed, which is exactly what is needed in the localized estimates of Section 4. In this way, one obtains bounds at the auxiliary rate δ^{n_1} , with $\delta < d_p$, rather than at the dominant rate $d_p^{n_1}$.

In dimension $k = 2$, this difficulty disappears. Indeed, when $p = q = 1$, the relevant term in Proposition 4.2 reduces to $(f^{n_1})^*(dd^c\chi) \wedge \omega$. After decomposing $dd^c\chi = \beta_1^+ - \beta_1^-$, the forms

$$(f^{n_1})^*(\beta_1^\pm) \wedge \omega$$

have bidegree $(2, 2)$ and are therefore automatically closed. In this case, the equidistribution result of [24] is sufficient, and no new norm is needed. A similar simplification occurs in the proof of Proposition 5.1 (which builds on Proposition 4.2).

6.2. One-sided dominance. Let f be a holomorphic automorphism of a compact Kähler manifold X of dimension k . Assume that for some integer $1 \leq p \leq k$ the p -th dynamical degree is only one-sided dominant, for instance $d_{p-1} < d_p$. Let λ_f be the maximum between d_{p-1} and the absolute values of all eigenvalues different from d_p for the action of f^* on $H^{p,p}(X, \mathbb{R})$. In particular, we have $\lambda_f < d_p$.

It would be natural to expect that any ergodic measure ν with $h_\nu(f) > \log \lambda_f$ is supported on $\text{supp} T_+$. However, our proof does not apply at this level of generality. The point is that, although the conclusion only concerns $\text{supp} T_+$, the argument still uses estimates in the complementary directions. This already enters in Theorem 3.4, whose proof relies on the simple action assumption, and it appears again in the final part of the proof of Proposition 5.1, where the mass of the current R is estimated by applying Lemma 3.2 to f^{-1} in bidegree $k - p$. For this reason, our method genuinely requires a two-sided dominance assumption, even if one only aims at proving the inclusion $\text{supp } \nu \subseteq \text{supp} T_+$.

6.3. Non-invertible maps and correspondences. The invertibility of f is used at several points in our method, as it allows us to transfer the action and the relevant estimates from pull-backs to push-forwards. For example, in Lemma 3.1 we use the identity

$$\langle (f^n)^* R, \Phi \rangle = \langle R, (f^n)_* \Phi \rangle$$

and then control the mass of $(f^n)_* \Phi$.

Invertibility is also used in Lemma 3.3. There, the control of the $\mathcal{C}^{-2}$ -norm of $(f^n)^* S$ is obtained by moving the action to test forms and using the smoothness of f^{-1} to estimate the $\mathcal{C}^2$ -norm of $f_* \Phi$. This step has no direct analogue for a non-invertible map in the form needed here.

For these reasons, our localization argument does not directly extend to the non-invertible case, nor more generally to holomorphic correspondences. The lower-regularity

techniques and related tools developed in [45, 35] would likely be useful in this direction.

6.4. Possible extensions. It is natural to ask whether Theorem 1.1 extends to non-algebraic settings such as Hénon-like maps (see [4, 5, 17, 21]), where cohomological tools are no longer available, or to attractors as in [14, 43]. In both cases, one has invariant Green-type currents and equilibrium measures obtained by intersecting such currents. However, our proof relies crucially on the quantitative convergence estimate (3), in a form compatible with localized non-closed currents and with the $\star$ -norm. More precisely, one would need convergence estimates towards the Green currents which are uniform in the integers $n_1 \geq \dots \geq n_\ell \geq 0$ for mixed terms of the form

$$(f^{n_1})^*(\Theta) \wedge (f^{n_2})^*(\omega) \wedge \dots \wedge (f^{n_\ell})^*(\omega),$$

or for their localized analogues obtained by taking $\Theta = dd^c \chi$.

The convergence results currently available in these settings do not seem to provide this precise form. Therefore, an extension of our theorem would likely require a corresponding super-potential convergence theorem adapted to such mixed terms in these situations.

APPENDIX A. REGULARIZATION OF CURRENTS AND PROOFS OF PROPOSITIONS 2.7 AND 3.5

A.1. Regularization of currents. In this subsection we recall the definition of the regularization operators $\mathcal{L}_\theta : \mathcal{D}_s(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_s(X)$, $0 \leq s \leq k$, introduced in [25, Sections 2.3–2.4]. They are used to control super-potentials along structural lines and will be the main tool in the proof of Proposition 2.7. Recall that (X, ω) is a compact Kähler manifold of dimension k . Let $\Delta \subset X \times X$ be the diagonal and $\pi : \widehat{X \times X} \rightarrow X \times X$ the blow-up along Δ , with exceptional divisor $\widehat{\Delta} := \pi^{-1}(\Delta)$. Denote by $\Pi_1, \Pi_2 : \widehat{X \times X} \rightarrow X$ the compositions of π with the two natural projections from $X \times X$ to its factors. Let also $\tau_0 : \mathbb{P}^1 \times \widehat{X \times X} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ and $\tau : \mathbb{P}^1 \times \widehat{X \times X} \rightarrow \widehat{X \times X}$ be the natural projections.

We use the notation of [25, Example 2.3.1]. Let η be a smooth real closed $(k-1, k-1)$ -form on $\widehat{X \times X}$. Let γ be a smooth real closed $(1, 1)$ -form cohomologous to $[\widehat{\Delta}]$. Then there exists a quasi-p.s.h. function φ on $\widehat{X \times X}$ such that

$$dd^c \varphi = [\widehat{\Delta}] - \gamma.$$

Set $\Theta_0 := [\widehat{\Delta}] \wedge \eta$ and, for $\theta \in \mathbb{P}^1$,

$$\Theta_\theta := (dd^c \varphi_\theta + \gamma) \wedge \eta,$$

where φ_θ is a regularization of φ such that $\varphi_\theta \searrow \varphi$ as $|\theta| \rightarrow 0$. For a current S on X , define the transform

$$\mathcal{L}_\theta(S) := (\Pi_2)_*(\Pi_1^*(S) \wedge \Theta_\theta)$$

and for convenience denote by $S_\theta := \mathcal{L}_\theta(S)$. The family $(S_\theta)_{\theta \in \mathbb{P}^1}$ is called the *special structural line* associated to S . The following proposition and lemma summarize the main properties of such transforms that we will need, see [25, Section 2.3, and 2.4] and [45, Section 3.2].

Proposition A.1. *The transforms $\mathcal{L}_\theta$ satisfy the following properties:*

- (1) $\mathcal{L}_\theta$ depends only on $|\theta|$ and $\mathcal{L}_0(S) = S$;
- (2) $\mathcal{L}_\theta = \mathcal{L}_\infty$ for $|\theta| \geq 1$;
- (3) $\{\mathcal{L}_\theta(S)\} = \{S\}$ for every $\theta \in \mathbb{P}^1$ and $S \in \mathcal{D}_s(X)$;
- (4) $\mathcal{L}_\theta$ is continuous with respect to the $*$ -topology for every $\theta \in \mathbb{P}^1$;
- (5) $\|\mathcal{L}_\theta(S)\|_* \leq c \|S\|_*$, with $c > 0$ independent of θ and S ;
- (6) for $|\theta| \leq 1$ we have $\text{dist}_2(\mathcal{L}_\theta(S), S) \leq c|\theta| \|S\|_*$, with $c > 0$ independent of θ and S .

Lemma A.2. For $1 \leq m \leq k$, set $q_m = \frac{k+1}{k-m+1}$. Take $S \in \mathcal{D}_s^0$. There exists a constant $c > 0$, independent of S , such that:

- (1) $\|\mathcal{L}_\infty(S)\|_{L^{q_1}} \leq c \|S\|_*$;
- (2) $\|\mathcal{L}_\infty(S)\|_{L^{q_{m+1}}} \leq c \|S\|_{L^{q_m}}$ for every $1 \leq m < k$;
- (3) $\|\mathcal{L}_\infty(S)\|_{L^\infty} \leq c \|S\|_{L^q}$ for every $k+1 \leq q \leq +\infty$.

Let $Q \in \mathcal{D}_{k-s+1}^0(X)$ be smooth. On $\mathbb{C}^* \times \widehat{X \times X}$ consider the smooth closed form

$$T := (dd^c \varphi_\theta + \tau^*(\gamma)) \wedge \tau^*(\eta),$$

and define the current

$$(16) \quad \widehat{Q} := T \wedge \tau^*(\Pi_1^*(Q)).$$

It extends to a current on $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \widehat{X \times X}$, still denoted by $\widehat{Q}$. The following result was established in [25, Proposition 3.2.4] with $\|Q\|_*$ instead of $\|Q\|^\star$.

Proposition A.3. Let $(Q_\theta)_{\theta \in \mathbb{P}^1}$ be the special structural line associated to a smooth form $Q \in \mathcal{D}_{k-s+1}^0$. Take $S \in \mathcal{D}_s^0$. Then $\theta \mapsto \mathcal{U}_S(Q_\theta)$ is a continuous function on $\mathbb{P}^1$ which is constant on $\{|\theta| \geq 1\}$. Moreover, there exists $c > 0$, independent of Q and S , such that

$$\|dd_\theta^c \mathcal{U}_S(Q_\theta)\|_* \leq c \|S\|_* \|Q\|^\star,$$

where dd_θ^c is taken on $\mathbb{P}^1$ and the $\|\cdot\|_*$ on the left hand side denotes the mass of the resulting signed measure on $\mathbb{P}^1$.

Proof. Since Q is smooth, Q_θ is smooth for every θ , and by [25, Lemma 2.4.6] the function $H(\theta) := \mathcal{U}_S(Q_\theta)$ is continuous on $\mathbb{P}^1$. It remains to bound the mass of $dd^c H = dd_\theta^c H$. Since this function depends continuously on S , by [25, Theorem 2.4.4], we can assume that S is smooth. So, if U is a smooth potential of S , then $H(\theta) = \langle U, R_\theta \rangle$. It is enough to estimate the mass of $dd^c H$ on $\mathbb{C}^*$. Indeed, the continuity of H implies that $dd^c H$ has no mass on finite sets. Consider in $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \widehat{X \times X}$ the currents

$$\widehat{Q}_U := \widehat{Q} \wedge \tau^* \Pi_2^*(U) \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{Q}_S := \widehat{Q} \wedge \tau^* \Pi_2^*(S).$$

These currents are smooth on $\mathbb{C}^* \times \widehat{X \times X}$. A direct computation gives $H = (\tau_0)_* (\widehat{Q}_U)$ and $dd^c H = (\tau_0)_* (\widehat{Q}_S)$ on $\mathbb{C}^*$. So, it is enough to estimate the mass of $\widehat{Q}_S$ on $\mathbb{C}^* \times \widehat{X \times X}$. Recall that, in (16), T is a smooth closed (k, k) form. It can be written as a difference of two positive closed smooth forms T_1, T_2 with bounded mass. By the definition of the $*$ -norm, for every $\kappa > 0$ there exist positive closed currents S_1 and S_2 such that $S = S_1 - S_2$ and $\|S_1 + S_2\| < \|S\|_* + \kappa$. By [25, Theorem 2.4.4], there exist smooth forms $S_{i,\varepsilon}$ such that $S_\varepsilon := S_{1,\varepsilon} - S_{2,\varepsilon} \rightarrow S$ and $\|S_{1,\varepsilon} + S_{2,\varepsilon}\| \rightarrow \|S_1 + S_2\|$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. By definition of the $\star$ -norm, there exist positive (non necessarily closed) currents Q_1 and Q_2 such that

$Q = Q_1 - Q_2$ and $\sup_{\Phi \in \mathcal{H}_{s-1}} \langle Q_1 + Q_2, \Phi \rangle \leq \|Q\|^\star + \kappa$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{Q}_S\|_* &= \|\widehat{Q} \wedge \tau^* \Pi_2^*(S)\|_* = \|T \wedge \tau^* \Pi_1^*(Q) \wedge \tau^* \Pi_2^*(S)\|_* \\ &= \|(T_1 - T_2) \wedge \tau^* \Pi_1^*(Q_1 - Q_2) \wedge \tau^* \Pi_2^*(S_1 - S_2)\|_* \\ &\leq \langle \tau^* \Pi_1^*(Q_1 + Q_2), (T_1 + T_2) \wedge \tau^* \Pi_2^*(S_1 + S_2) \rangle \\ &= \langle (Q_1 + Q_2), (\Pi_1)_* \tau_* ((T_1 + T_2) \wedge \tau^* \Pi_2^*(S_1 + S_2)) \rangle = \langle Q_1 + Q_2, \Omega \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where we set

$$\Omega := (\Pi_1)_* \tau_* ((T_1 + T_2) \wedge \tau^* \Pi_2^*(S_1 + S_2)).$$

Since T_1, T_2, S_1, S_2 are positive and closed, also Ω is positive and closed. So, its mass can be computed cohomologically, namely

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Omega\| &= \|(\Pi_1)_* \tau_* (T_1 + T_2) \wedge (\Pi_1)_* \Pi_2^*(S_1 + S_2)\| \\ &\lesssim \|(\Pi_1)_* \tau_* (T_1 + T_2)\| \cdot \|(\Pi_1)_* \Pi_2^*(S_1 + S_2)\| \\ &\lesssim \|T_1 + T_2\| \cdot \|S_1 + S_2\| \lesssim \|S\|_* + \kappa, \end{aligned}$$

where the implicit constant depends only on T and is independent of S . Up to replacing S_i with $S_{i,\epsilon}$ above, and since the map $S \mapsto dd_\theta^c U_S(Q_\theta)$ depends continuously on S , we can also assume that Ω is smooth. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{Q}_S\|_* &\leq \langle Q_1 + Q_2, \Omega \rangle = \|\Omega\| \cdot \langle Q_1 + Q_2, \Omega / \|\Omega\| \rangle \\ &\leq \|\Omega\| \sup_{\Phi \in \mathcal{H}_{s-1}} \langle Q_1 + Q_2, \Phi \rangle \lesssim (\|S\|_* + \kappa)(\|Q\|^\star + \kappa). \end{aligned}$$

Letting $\kappa \rightarrow 0$ we obtain the desired inequality. $\square$

We briefly recall the construction of a *Green potential* for dd^c -exact currents. Let $\Delta \subset X \times X$ be the diagonal. There exists a smooth real (k, k) -form $\alpha(x, y)$ cohomologous to $[\Delta]$ with $d_x \alpha = d_y \alpha = 0$. By [8, 31], one can construct a $(k-1, k-1)$ -form $K(x, y)$ on $X \times X$ such that $dd^c K = [\Delta] - \alpha$ and satisfying

$$(17) \quad K(x, y) = O(|x - y|^{2-2k} \log |x - y|)$$

near the diagonal. For $Q \in \mathcal{D}_{k-s+1}^0(X)$, we define

$$U_Q(x) := \int_{y \in X} K(x, y) \wedge Q(y).$$

A direct computation shows that $dd^c U_Q = Q$. We refer to U_Q as the Green potential of Q . We also have the following result concerning the L^1 -norm of the Green potential U_Q . The version of this statement with $\|Q\|_*$ instead of $\|Q\|^\star$ can be found in [20, Proposition 2.1] and [25, Proposition 2.4.7]. For convenience, we verify below that the estimates remain valid when the $\star$ -norm is used.

Proposition A.4. *Take $Q \in \mathcal{D}_{k-s+1}^0(X)$ and let U_Q be the Green potential of Q . Then there exists a constant $c > 0$, independent of Q , such that*

$$\|U_Q\|_{L^1} \leq c \|Q\|^\star.$$

Proof. Let $Q = Q_1 - Q_2$ be a decomposition realizing $\|Q\|^\star$ up to κ , that is, $\sup_{\Phi \in \mathcal{H}_{s-1}} \langle Q_1 + Q_2, \Phi \rangle \leq \|Q\|^\star + \kappa$. Since $\omega^{s-1} \in \mathcal{H}_{s-1}$, this implies $\|Q_1\| + \|Q_2\| \leq \|Q\|^\star + \kappa$.

From (17), we have $\|K(\cdot, y)\|_{L^1} \leq c$ for some constant $c > 0$ independent of y . Writing $U_Q = U_1 - U_2$ with

$$U_i(x) := \int_{y \in X} K(x, y) \wedge Q_i(y),$$

we obtain $\|U_i\|_{L^1} \leq c\|Q_i\|$ for $i = 1, 2$. Therefore,

$$\|U_Q\|_{L^1} \leq c(\|Q_1\| + \|Q_2\|) \leq c(\|Q\|^\star + \kappa).$$

Letting $\kappa \rightarrow 0$ gives the result. $\square$

A.2. Proof of Proposition 2.7. We follow the same strategy as in the proof of [24, Proposition 2.1]. Multiplying S by a constant allows us to assume $\|S\|_* \leq c^{-k-3}$, where c is the maximum of the constants given by Proposition A.1, Lemma A.2, Proposition A.3, and Proposition A.4. We define inductively

$$S_0 := S \quad \text{and} \quad S_{i+1} := \mathcal{L}_\infty(S_i) \quad \text{for} \quad 0 \leq i \leq k+1.$$

Define also

$$u_i(\theta) := \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{L}_\theta(S_i)}(Q) \quad \text{and} \quad m_i := u_i(0) = u_{i-1}(\infty).$$

Proposition A.1 (5) implies that $\|S_i\|_* \leq 1/c$.

When Q is smooth, we have $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{L}_\theta(S)}(Q) = \mathcal{U}_S(\mathcal{L}_\theta(Q))$, see [25, Lemma 3.2.5]. For such Q , applying Proposition A.3 we obtain

$$\|dd^c u_i\|_* = \|dd_\theta^c \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{L}_\theta(S_i)}(Q)\|_* \leq c\|S_i\|_* \|Q\|^\star \leq 1.$$

For a general Q , we use an approximation. Indeed, by Corollary 2.4 smooth currents are dense in $\mathcal{D}_{k-s+1}^0$ with respect to $\star$ -topology. Thus, the above extends by continuity to any Q with a continuous super-potential, as in the statement.

It follows from Lemma A.2 that $\|S_{k+2}\|_{L^\infty} \leq 1$. More precisely, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_{k+2}\|_{L^\infty} &= \|\mathcal{L}_\infty(S_{k+1})\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\leq c\|S_{k+1}\|_{L^{k+1}} && \text{by Lemma A.2 (3)} \\ &= c\|\mathcal{L}_\infty(S_k)\|_{L^{k+1}} = c\|\mathcal{L}_\infty(S_k)\|_{L^{q_k}} \\ &\leq c^2\|S_k\|_{L^{q_{k-1}}} && \text{by Lemma A.2 (2)} \\ &= c^2\|\mathcal{L}_\infty(S_{k-1})\|_{L^{q_{k-1}}} \\ &\leq c^3\|S_{k-1}\|_{L^{q_{k-2}}} \leq \cdots \leq c^k\|\mathcal{L}_\infty(S_1)\|_{L^{q_1}} && \text{by Lemma A.2 (2)} \\ &\leq c^{k+1}\|S_1\|_* = c^{k+1}\|\mathcal{L}_\infty(S)\|_* && \text{by Proposition A.1 (5)} \\ &\leq c^{k+2}\|S\|_* \leq 1/c < 1, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we applied the assumption $\|S\|_* \leq c^{-k-3}$. By Proposition A.4, Q admits a Green potential U_Q with $\|U_Q\|_{L^1} \leq c$. By definition, we have $m_{k+2} = \langle S_{k+2}, U_Q \rangle$. Thus, we have $|m_{k+2}| \leq c$.

We need to show that $|m_0| \leq A(1 + \gamma^{-1} \log^+ M)$ for some constant $A > 0$. For this purpose, we can assume that $M > 1$ and it is enough to check that $|m_i - m_{i+1}| \leq A(1 + \gamma^{-1} \log M)$ for some constant $A > 0$. We have $m_i - m_{i+1} = v_i(0)$ where $v_i := u_i - m_{i+1}$. The above properties of u_i imply that the v_i 's are continuous, vanish outside the unit disc, and satisfy $\|dd^c v_i\|_* \leq 1$. By classical Skoda-type estimates (see, for instance, [42, 25]), we have $\|e^{\lambda|v_i|}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{P}^1)} \leq \beta$ for some universal constants $\beta > 0$ and $\lambda > 0$. We

then deduce that there exists θ satisfying $|\theta| \leq M^{-1/\gamma}$ and $|v_i(\theta)| \leq (A-1) + A\gamma^{-1} \log M$ for a fixed constant A large enough. Finally, using the Hölder continuity of $\mathcal{U}_Q$ and Proposition A.1 (6), we get

$$\begin{aligned} |v_i(0) - v_i(\theta)| &= |\mathcal{U}_{S_i}(Q) - \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{L}_\theta(S_i)}(Q)| = |\mathcal{U}_Q(S_i) - \mathcal{U}_Q(\mathcal{L}_\theta(S_i))| \\ &\leq M \operatorname{dist}_2(S_i, \mathcal{L}_\theta(S_i))^\gamma \leq M|\theta|^\gamma \leq 1. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $|v_i(0)| \leq A(1 + \gamma^{-1} \log M)$. This completes the proof of Proposition 2.7.

A.3. Proof of Proposition 3.5. We will deduce Proposition 3.5 from the following version of [25, Proposition 4.2.2] for the $\|\cdot\|^\star$ norm.

Proposition A.5. *Let $f : X \rightarrow X$ be a holomorphic automorphism of (X, ω) with simple action on cohomology. Take $S \in \mathcal{D}_p$ with a continuous super-potential with respect to the $\star$ -topology. Assume that $d_p^{-n}(f^n)^*\{S\} \rightarrow \underline{c} \in H^{p,p}(X, \mathbb{R})$. Then $S_n := d_p^{-n}(f^n)^*(S)$ converges $SP^\star$ -uniformly to a current $T_{\underline{c}} \in \mathcal{D}_p$ which depends only on $\underline{c}$. Moreover, for every $\delta_f < \delta < d_p$ we have*

$$|\mathcal{U}_{S_n}(Q) - \mathcal{U}_{T_{\underline{c}}}(Q)| \lesssim \left(\frac{\delta}{d_p}\right)^n M_S \|Q\|^\star \quad \text{for every } Q \in \mathcal{D}_{k-p+1}^0,$$

where $M_S = \max_{\|\Omega\|^\star \leq 1} |\mathcal{U}_S(\Omega)|$ and the implicit constant is independent of $S, \underline{c}$, and Q .

Proof. As in Section 2.3, we let $\alpha_p = (\alpha_{p,1}, \dots, \alpha_{p,h(p)})$ be a family of smooth closed real (p, p) -forms such that $\{\alpha\} = \{\{\alpha_{p,1}\}, \dots, \{\alpha_{p,h(p)}\}\}$ is a basis of $H^{p,p}(X, \mathbb{R})$, where $h(p)$ is the dimension of $H^{p,p}(X, \mathbb{R})$. We always consider super-potentials normalized by α_p . For simplicity, as p is fixed, we will denote $h = h(p)$ and $\alpha = \alpha_p = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_h)$ in what follows. Let M denote the $h \times h$ matrix whose column of index j is given by the coordinates of $f^*\{\alpha_j\}$ with respect to the basis $\{\alpha\}$. Let $\mathcal{U}_j$ denote the super-potential of $f^*(\alpha_j)$ and define $\mathcal{U} := (\mathcal{U}_1, \dots, \mathcal{U}_h)$. Let $A = {}^t(a_1, \dots, a_h)$ denote the coordinates of $\{S\}$ in the basis $\{\alpha\}$ and $\mathcal{U}_S, \mathcal{U}_{S_n}$ the super-potentials of S and of $S_n := d_p^{-n}(f^n)^*S$, respectively.

We mainly follow the arguments of [25, Proposition 4.2.2], adapting them to the use of the $\star$ -topology. By [25, Proposition 4.1.1] the limit $\underline{c}$ of $d_p^{-n}(f^n)^*\{S\}$ is a class in $\{T^+\}$. Write $\underline{c} = {}^t(c_1, \dots, c_h)$ with respect to the basis $\{\alpha\}$. Then, $d_p^{-n}M^nA$ converges to $\underline{c}$. Following [25, Lemma 4.2.3], the super-potential $\mathcal{U}_{S_n}$ of S_n is equal to

$$(18) \quad \mathcal{U}_{S_n} = \sum_{l=0}^{n-1} (\mathcal{U} \circ (f^l)_*) \frac{M^{n-l-1}A}{d_p^n} + d_p^{-n} \mathcal{U}_S \circ (f^n)_*.$$

Since $\mathcal{U}_S$ is continuous on $\star$ -bounded sets, the constant $M_S = \max_{\|\Omega\|^\star \leq 1} |\mathcal{U}_S(\Omega)|$ is finite and depends only on S . Using this and applying Lemma 3.1 with $q = k - p + 1, R = Q$, and f^{-1} instead of f we obtain

$$(19) \quad |\mathcal{U}_S((f^n)_*(Q))| \leq M_S \|(f^n)_*(Q)\|^\star \lesssim \delta^n M_S \|Q\|^\star,$$

for any $\delta > \delta_f$. The implicit constant above is independent of S, Q , and n .

Recall that $\|M^n\| \sim d_p^n$. Analogous estimates as in (19) for $\mathcal{U}_j$ imply that

$$(20) \quad \left\| \frac{M^{n-l-1}A}{d_p^n} \right\| \lesssim d_p^{-l} \quad \text{and} \quad \left| (\mathcal{U} \circ (f^l)_*) \frac{M^{n-l-1}A}{d_p^n} \right| \lesssim M_S \delta^l d_p^{-l}.$$

Since $\sum_{l \geq 0} \delta^l d_p^{-l}$ converges, we can apply the Lebesgue convergence theorem to the sum in (18). We obtain the following uniform convergence on $\star$ -bounded sets:

$$\mathcal{U}_{S_n} \rightarrow \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} (\mathcal{U} \circ (f^l)_*) M^{-l-1} \underline{c}, \quad n \rightarrow \infty.$$

The last series converges because (20) implies that $\|M^{-l-1} \underline{c}\| \lesssim d_p^{-l}$. Hence, the sequence S_n converges to some current $T_{\underline{c}}$. Moreover, the last series defines a super-potential $\mathcal{U}_{T_{\underline{c}}}$ of $T_{\underline{c}}$ and $\mathcal{U}_{S_n}$ converge to $\mathcal{U}_{T_{\underline{c}}}$ uniformly on Q taken in a given $\star$ -bounded set. Hence, the convergence $S_n \rightarrow T_{\underline{c}}$ is $SP\star$ -uniform. Since $\mathcal{U}_{T_{\underline{c}}}$ depends only on the class $\underline{c}$, by [25, Proposition 3.2.3], $T_{\underline{c}}$ depends only on this class. More precisely, there exists a constant $\eta > 0$ such that $T_{\underline{c}} = \eta T^+$.

To conclude, we need to show that the convergence above is exponentially fast, as in the statement. Since $\delta > \delta_f$, by the Perron–Frobenius theorem, we have

$$\|d_p^{-n} M^n A - \underline{c}\| \leq C \left(\frac{\delta}{d_p} \right)^n$$

for some constant $C > 0$ independent of n . Therefore, for every $Q \in \mathcal{D}_{k-p+1}^0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{U}_{S_n}(Q) - \mathcal{U}_{T_{\underline{c}}}(Q)| &\leq \sum_{l=n}^{\infty} |(\mathcal{U} \circ (f^l)_*)(Q)) M^{-l-1} \underline{c}| + d_p^{-n} |\mathcal{U}_S((f^n)_*(Q))| \\ &\quad + \sum_{l=0}^{n-1} |(\mathcal{U} \circ (f^l)_*)(Q)) M^{-l-1} [d_p^{-n} M^n A - \underline{c}]| \\ &\lesssim \sum_{l=n}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\delta}{d_p} \right)^l M_S \|Q\|^\star + \left(\frac{\delta}{d_p} \right)^n M_S \|Q\|^\star \\ &\quad + \sum_{l=0}^{n-1} \left(\frac{\delta}{d_p} \right)^l \left(\frac{\delta}{d_p} \right)^n M_S \|Q\|^\star. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\delta < d_p$, it follows that

$$|\mathcal{U}_{S_n}(Q) - \mathcal{U}_{T_{\underline{c}}}(Q)| \lesssim \left(\frac{\delta}{d_p} \right)^n M_S \|Q\|^\star,$$

where the implicit constant is independent of S , Q , and n . This completes the proof. $\square$

We can now conclude the proof of Proposition 3.5.

Proof of Proposition 3.5. Let $\tilde{S} \in \mathcal{D}_p$ be the standard form associated with S given by Lemma 2.8. Since $\tilde{S}$ is smooth, its super-potential $\mathcal{U}_{\tilde{S}}$ is continuous with respect to the $\star$ -topology. Lemma 2.8 also gives

$$\{\tilde{S}\} = \{S\} \quad \text{and} \quad M_{\tilde{S}} := \max_{\|\Omega\|^\star \leq 1} |\mathcal{U}_{\tilde{S}}(\Omega)| \lesssim \|S\|_* \leq 1.$$

Hence, all the assumptions on S in Proposition A.5 are satisfied by $\tilde{S}$. Therefore, the sequence $\tilde{S}_n := d_p^{-n} (f^n)^*(\tilde{S})$ converges $SP\star$ -uniformly to a current $T_{\underline{c}} \in \mathcal{D}_p$ depending only on the class $\underline{c}$. Moreover, for every $\delta_f < \delta < d_p$, by Proposition A.5 we also have

$$|\mathcal{U}_{\tilde{S}_n}(Q) - \mathcal{U}_{T_{\underline{c}}}(Q)| \lesssim \left(\frac{\delta}{d_p} \right)^n M_{\tilde{S}} \|Q\|^\star \lesssim \left(\frac{\delta}{d_p} \right)^n \|Q\|^\star$$

for every $Q \in \mathcal{D}_{k-p+1}^0$, where the implicit constants are independent of S , Q , and n . This proves the assertion. $\square$

REFERENCES

- [1] Bazarbaev S., Bianchi F., and Rakhimov K., On the support of measures of large entropy for polynomial-like maps, *Anal. Math. Phys.* **15** (2025), no. 3, article number 69.
- [2] Bedford E. and Kim K., Dynamics of Rational Surface Automorphisms: Linear Fractional Recurrences, *J. Geom. Anal.* **19** (2009), no. 3, 553–583.
- [3] Bianchi F. and Dinh T.-C., Exponential mixing of all orders and CLT for automorphisms of compact Kähler manifolds, *Adv. Math.* **485** (2026), 110689.
- [4] Bianchi F., Dinh T.-C., and Rakhimov K., Monotonicity of dynamical degrees for Hénon-like and polynomial-like maps, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **377** (2024), no. 9, 6595–6618.
- [5] Bianchi F., Dinh T.-C., and Rakhimov K., Hölder continuity and laminarity of the Green currents for Hénon-like maps, *J. Inst. Math. Jussieu* **25** (2026), no. 2, 1363–1392.
- [6] Bowen R., Topological entropy for noncompact sets, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **184** (1973), 125–136.
- [7] Boymurodov, S., On the support of measures of large entropy for Hénon-Sibony maps, *preprint* (2026).
- [8] Bost J.-B., Gillet H., and Soulé C., Heights of projective varieties and positive Green forms, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **7** (1994), no. 4, 903–1027.
- [9] Cantat S., Dynamique des automorphismes des surfaces $K3$, *Acta Math.* **187** (2001), no. 1, 1–57.
- [10] Cantat S., Dynamics of automorphisms of compact complex surfaces, in *Frontiers in Complex Dynamics: In Celebration of John Milnor's 80th Birthday*, Princeton Mathematical Series, **51** (2014), 463–514.
- [11] Dang, N.-B. and Herrig, T., Dynamical degrees of automorphisms on abelian varieties, *Adv. Math.* **395** (2022), Paper No. 108082, 43 pp.
- [12] de Thélin, H., Un phénomène de concentration de genre, *Math. Ann.* **332** (2005), no. 3, 483–498.
- [13] de Thélin, H. and Dinh, T.-C., Dynamics of automorphisms on compact Kähler manifolds, *Adv. Math.* **229** (2012), no. 5, 2640–2655.
- [14] Dinh, T.-C., Attracting current and equilibrium measure for attractors on $\mathbb{P}^k$, *J. Geom. Anal.* **17** (2007), 227–244.
- [15] Dinh, T.-C., Decay of correlations for Hénon maps, *Acta Math.* **195** (2005), 253–264.
- [16] Dinh, T.-C., Suites d'applications méromorphes multivaluées et courants laminaires, *J. Geom. Anal.* **15** (2005), no. 2, 207–227.
- [17] Dinh, T.-C., Nguyen, V.-A., and Sibony N., Dynamics of horizontal-like maps in higher dimension, *Adv. Math.* **219** (2008), 1689–1721.
- [18] Dinh, T.-C. and Sibony, N., Dynamique des applications d'allure polynomiale, *J. Math. Pures Appl.* (9) **82** (2003), no. 4, 367–423.
- [19] Dinh, T.-C. and Sibony, N., Regularization of currents and entropy, *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)* **37** (2004), no. 6, 959–971.
- [20] Dinh, T.-C. and Sibony, N., Green currents for holomorphic automorphisms of compact Kähler manifolds, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **18** (2005), 291–312.
- [21] Dinh, T.-C. and Sibony, N., Geometry of currents, intersection theory and dynamics of horizontal-like maps, *Ann. Inst. Fourier* **56** (2006), no. 2, 423–457.
- [22] Dinh, T.-C. and Sibony, N., Super-potentials of positive closed currents, intersection theory and dynamics, *Acta Math.* **203** (2009), 1–82.
- [23] Dinh, T.-C. and Sibony, N., Dynamics in several complex variables: endomorphisms of projective spaces and polynomial-like mappings, in *Holomorphic Dynamical Systems*, Lecture Notes in Math. 1998, Springer, Berlin, 2010, 165–294.
- [24] Dinh, T.-C. and Sibony, N., Exponential mixing for automorphisms on compact Kähler manifolds, *Contemp. Math.* **532** (2010), 107–114.
- [25] Dinh, T.-C. and Sibony, N., Super-potentials for currents on compact Kähler manifolds and dynamics of automorphisms, *J. Alg. Geom.* **19** (2010), 473–529.

- [26] Dinh, T.-C. and Sibony, N., Rigidity of Julia sets for Hénon type maps, *J. Mod. Dyn.* **8** (2014), no. (3-4), 499–548.
- [27] Dujardin, R., Hénon-like mappings in $\mathbb{C}^2$, *Amer. J. Math.* **126** (2004), no. 2, 439–472.
- [28] Dujardin, R., A Closing Lemma for Polynomial Automorphisms of $\mathbb{C}^2$, *Astérisque*. **415** (2020), 35–43.
- [29] Filip, S. and Tosatti, V., Kummer rigidity for $K3$ surface automorphisms via Ricci-flat metrics, *Amer. J. Math.* **143** (2021), no. 5, 1431–1462.
- [30] Filip, S. and Tosatti, V., Gaps in the support of canonical currents on projective $K3$ surfaces, *J. Geom. Anal.* **34** (2024), no. 76, 1–14.
- [31] Gillet H. and Soulé C., Arithmetic intersection theory, *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci.* **72** (1990), 93–174 (1991).
- [32] Gromov, M., Convex sets and Kähler manifolds, *Advances in Differential Geometry and Topology* World Sci. Publishing, Teaneck, NJ (1990), 1–38.
- [33] Gromov, M., On the entropy of holomorphic maps, *Enseign. Math. (2)* **49** (2003), no. 3-4, 217–235.
- [34] Khovanskii A.G., The geometry of convex polyhedra and algebraic geometry, *Uspehi Mat. Nauk.* **34** (1979), no. 4, 160–161.
- [35] Luo, M. and Vergamini, M., Green currents of holomorphic correspondences on compact Kähler manifolds, *preprint* (2026), arXiv:2603.06093.
- [36] McMullen, C. T., Dynamics on $K3$ surfaces: Salem numbers and Siegel disks, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **545** (2002), 201–233.
- [37] McMullen C. T., Dynamics on blowups of the projective plane, *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci.* **105** (2007), 49–89.
- [38] Oguiso K., A remark on Dynamical degrees of automorphisms of compact Hyperkähler manifolds, *Manuscripta Math.* **130** (2009), no. 1, 101–111.
- [39] Oguiso, K. Some aspects of explicit birational geometry inspired by complex dynamics, *Proc. Int. Congr. Math. (Seoul, 2014)*, Vol. II, 695–721, Kyung Moon Sa, Seoul, 2014.
- [40] Oguiso, K. and Truong, T. T., Explicit examples of rational and Calabi-Yau threefolds with primitive automorphisms of positive entropy, *J. Math. Sci. Univ. Tokyo* **22** (2015), no. 1, 361–385.
- [41] Sibony N., Dynamique des applications rationnelles de $\mathbb{P}^k$, *Panor. Synthèses*. **8** (1999), 97–185.
- [42] Skoda H., Sous-ensembles analytiques d'ordre fini ou infini dans $\mathbb{C}^n$, *Bull. Soc. Math. France* **100** (1972), 353–408.
- [43] Taflin, J., Attracting currents and equilibrium measures for quasi-attractors of $\mathbb{P}^k$, *Invent. Math.* **213** (2018), no. 1, 83–137.
- [44] Teissier B., Du théorème de l'index de Hodge aux inégalités isopérimétriques, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A-B* **288** (1979), no. 4, 287–289.
- [45] Vergamini M., log-Hölder regularity of currents and equidistribution towards Green currents, *preprint* (2025), arXiv:2510.00789.
- [46] Vergamini M. and Wu, H., Exponential mixing of all orders on Kähler manifolds: (quasi-)plurisubharmonic observables, *Math. Z.* **312** (2026), no. 4, article number 118.
- [47] Yomdin Y., Volume growth and entropy, *Israel J. Math.* **57** (1987), no. 3, 285–300.

DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA, UNIVERSITÀ DI PISA, LARGO BRUNO PONTECORVO 5, 56127 PISA, ITALY
 Email address: fabrizio.bianchi@unipi.it

V.I.ROMANOVSKIY INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, UZBEKISTAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, 9, UNIVERSITET STR., 100174, TASHKENT, UZBEKISTAN
 Email address: sboymurodov.research@gmail.com

V.I.ROMANOVSKIY INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, UZBEKISTAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, 9, UNIVERSITET STR., 100174, TASHKENT, UZBEKISTAN
 Email address: karimjon1705@gmail.com