

On Borel Anosov subgroups of $\mathrm{SL}(d, \mathbf{R})$

Subhadip Dey*

October 11, 2022

Abstract

We study the antipodal subsets of the full flag manifolds $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{R}^d)$. As a consequence, for natural numbers $d \geq 2$ such that $d \neq 5$ and $d \not\equiv 0, \pm 1 \pmod{8}$, we show that Borel Anosov subgroups of $\mathrm{SL}(d, \mathbf{R})$ are virtually isomorphic to either a free group or the fundamental group of a closed hyperbolic surface. This gives a partial answer to a question asked by Andrés Sambarino. Furthermore, we show restrictions on the hyperbolic spaces admitting uniformly-regular quasiisometric embeddings into the symmetric space X_d of $\mathrm{SL}(d, \mathbf{R})$.

1 Introduction

In the past decade, *Anosov subgroups* of higher-rank Lie groups have emerged as a well-regarded higher-rank extension of the classical *convex-cocompact Kleinian groups*. The notion of Anosov representations was introduced by Labourie [14] from a dynamical perspective in his pioneering work on *Hitchin representations* of surface groups and then extended by Guichard–Wienhard [9] for any *word-hyperbolic groups*. Afterward, Kapovich–Leeb–Porti [12] gave several geometrical and dynamical characterizations of Anosov subgroups; see the article by Kapovich–Leeb [11], giving an overview of their characterizations. One of the main features of Anosov subgroups is that they have a well-defined *limit set* in suitable *generalized flag varieties*, and any pairs of distinct points such limit sets are in a general position.

The main motivation for this paper is a question asked by Andrés Sambarino, namely, whether Borel Anosov subgroups of $\mathrm{SL}(d, \mathbf{R})$ are necessarily virtually free or surface groups. Combined works of Canary–Tsouvalas [4] and Tsouvalas [19] have affirmatively answered this question for $d = 3, 4$, and $d \equiv 2 \pmod{4}$ (note that $d = 2$ case is classical). In this

2020 *Mathematics subject classification*. 22E40, 14M15, 20F65

Key words and phrases. Anosov representations, Flag manifolds.

*Department of Mathematics, Yale University, 10 Hillhouse Ave, New Haven, CT 06511, email: subhadip.dey@yale.edu

paper, using a different approach, we give an affirmative answer to Sambarino's question for all $d \in \mathbf{N}$ satisfying

$$d \neq 5 \quad \text{and} \quad d \equiv 2, 3, 4, 5, \text{ or } 6 \pmod{8}. \quad (1)$$

See [Corollary D](#).

The objectives in this paper can be summarized as follows:

1. We study the subsets of full flag manifolds $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ whose all pairs points are *antipodal*, i.e., are in a general position. As noted above, the limit sets of Anosov subgroups share this property. We are specifically interested to understand when antipodal subsets of $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ are *maximally* antipodal. See [subsection 1.1](#) for discussions related to this.
2. We aim to understand which word-hyperbolic groups can be realized as *Borel Anosov subgroups* of $\mathrm{SL}(d, \mathbf{R})$. See [subsection 1.2](#) for the discussion related to this.
3. Finally, we aim to understand which geodesic metric spaces may admit *coarsely uniformly-regular quasiisometric embeddings*, a notion introduced by Kapovich–Leeb–Porti [\[11\]](#) strengthening the classical notion of *quasiisometric embeddings*, into the symmetric space X_d of $\mathrm{SL}(d, \mathbf{R})$. Notably, the *orbit maps* of Anosov subgroups are such embeddings. See [subsection 1.3](#) for further discussions.

1.1 Antipodal subsets

For $d \geq 2$, let $\mathcal{F}_d := \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ denote the manifold consisting of all complete flags in \mathbf{R}^d . A pair of points $\sigma_{\pm} \in \mathcal{F}_d$ is called *antipodal* (or *transverse*) if

$$\sigma_{-}^{(k)} + \sigma_{+}^{(d-k)} = \mathbf{R}^d, \quad \forall k \in \{1, \dots, d-1\}.$$

In the above, for $\sigma \in \mathcal{F}_d$, we use the notation $\sigma^{(k)}$ to denote the k -dimensional vector subspace of \mathbf{R}^d appearing in the complete flag σ . We denote by \mathcal{E}_{σ} , $\sigma \in \mathcal{F}_d$, the set of all points in \mathcal{F}_d which are *not* antipodal to σ . The complementary subset of \mathcal{E}_{σ} in \mathcal{F}_d which we denote by \mathcal{C}_{σ} is an open dense subset of \mathcal{F}_d homeomorphic to a cell. The subset \mathcal{C}_{σ} is called a *maximal Schubert cell*, whereas \mathcal{E}_{σ} is the closure of the union of all codimension-one Schubert cells in the Schubert cell decomposition of \mathcal{F}_d corresponding to σ .

Theorem A. *Let d be any natural number satisfying [\(1\)](#). Let $\sigma_{\pm} \in \mathcal{F}_d$ be any pair of antipodal points, and let Ω be any connected component of $\mathcal{F}_d \setminus (\mathcal{E}_{\sigma_{-}} \cup \mathcal{E}_{\sigma_{+}}) = \mathcal{C}_{\sigma_{-}} \cap \mathcal{C}_{\sigma_{+}}$. If $c : [-1, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_d$ is any continuous map such that*

$$c(\pm 1) = \sigma_{\pm} \quad \text{and} \quad c((-1, 1)) \subset \Omega,$$

then, for all $\sigma \in \Omega$, the image of c intersects \mathcal{E}_{σ} .

Although the following example is not covered in the setting of the theorem, we believe that it would still serve as a simple illustration of the statement: In the case corresponding to $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbf{R}) \times \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbf{R})$ and its minimal parabolic subgroup, the “full flag manifold” is realized as a torus. Let D denote the unit square in \mathbf{R}^2 from which we obtained the torus by identifying the opposite edges. We identify the four corners of D with σ_- , and \mathcal{E}_{σ_-} with its edges. Given any point $\hat{\sigma}$ in the interior of D , the subset $\mathcal{E}_{\hat{\sigma}}$ can be realized as the union of the horizontal and vertical line segments passing through $\hat{\sigma}$. Therefore, for any $\sigma_+ \in \mathcal{C}_{\sigma_-} = \text{int } D$, the intersection $\mathcal{C}_{\sigma_-} \cap \mathcal{C}_{\sigma_+}$ can be seen as the disjoint union of four open rectangles. For any path c connecting σ_{\pm} lying in (except for the endpoints) one such rectangles Ω , and for any point $\sigma \in \Omega$, it can be checked that \mathcal{E}_{σ} intersects c .

We prove [Theorem A](#) in [section 3](#). The main technical ingredient in the proof of this result is [Theorem 2.4](#), which states that, for natural numbers d satisfying (1), an involution ι defined on $\mathcal{C}_{\sigma_-} \cap \mathcal{C}_{\sigma_+}$ does not leave invariant any connected components. See [section 2](#) for more details.

Remark 1.1. We want to highlight why [Theorem A](#) and the other main results below have the restriction on d given by (1): This is due to the fact that [Theorem 2.4](#) possibly fails when d is of the form $8k - 1$, $8k$, or $8k + 1$, for $k \in \mathbf{N}$; in fact, we show that [Theorem 2.4](#) actually fails when $d = 8k \pm 1$, but, at present, it is unclear whether [Theorem 2.4](#) fails when $d = 8k$. When $d = 5$, with help from Su Ji Hong, we verified that [Theorem 2.4](#) is valid using computer. See further discussions in [Remark 2.5](#) below.

It would be interesting to know if [Theorem A](#) is true for these remaining natural numbers d if one strengthens the hypothesis by requiring that $c : [-1, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_d$ is also antipodal.

We apply [Theorem A](#) to get information about (locally) maximally antipodal subsets of \mathcal{F}_d , defined as follows.

Definition 1.2 (Antipodal subsets and maps).

- (i) A subset $\Lambda \subset \mathcal{F}_d$ is called *antipodal* if all distinct pairs of points in Λ are antipodal.
- (ii) An antipodal subset $\Lambda \subset \mathcal{F}_d$ is called *maximally antipodal* if it is not contained in a strictly larger antipodal subset of \mathcal{F}_d .
- (iii) We call an antipodal subset $\Lambda \subset \mathcal{F}_d$ *locally maximally antipodal* if there exists an open neighborhood N of Λ in \mathcal{F}_d such that Λ is not contained in any strictly larger antipodal subset of N ; equivalently, every point of N is *not* antipodal to some point of Λ .
- (iv) A continuous map $\phi : Z \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_d$ is called *antipodal* if for all distinct points $z_{\pm} \in Z$, $\phi(z_+)$ and $\phi(z_-)$ is a pair of antipodal points.

Note that antipodal subsets of \mathcal{F}_d form a poset, partially ordered by inclusions, and the maximally antipodal subsets are precisely the maximal elements.

As an application of [Theorem A](#), we get the following result.

Corollary B. *Let d be any natural number satisfying (1). If $c : S^1 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_d$ is an antipodal embedding, then $\Lambda := c(S^1)$ is a locally maximally antipodal subset of \mathcal{F}_d .*

Proof. Let $x_1, x_2, x_3 \in S^1$ be any distinct triple. For distinct indices $i, j, k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, let Ω_{ijk} denote the connected component of $\mathcal{F}_d \setminus (\mathcal{E}_{c(x_i)} \cup \mathcal{E}_{c(x_k)})$ containing $c(x_j)$. Then, $Y = \Omega_{123} \cup \Omega_{231} \cup \Omega_{312}$ is an open neighborhood of Λ . Applying Theorem A, one can verify that every point in Y is non-antipodal to some point in Λ . \square

It is unclear whether one can drop the word “locally” in the conclusion of the above result. However, if the image of $c : S^1 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_d$ is the limit set of a Borel Anosov subgroup of $\mathrm{SL}(d, \mathbf{R})$, then $\Lambda := c(S^1)$ is a maximally antipodal subset of \mathcal{F}_d . See Proposition 5.1.

1.2 Borel Anosov subgroups

We recall the notion of *B-boundary embedded subgroups* of $\mathrm{SL}(d, \mathbf{R})$ introduced by Kapovich–Leeb–Porti [12].

Definition 1.3 (Boundary embedded subgroups). A subgroup Γ of $\mathrm{SL}(d, \mathbf{R})$ is called *B-boundary embedded* if Γ , as an abstract group, is word-hyperbolic and there exists a Γ -equivariant antipodal embedding $\xi : \partial\Gamma \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_d$ of the Gromov boundary $\partial\Gamma$ of Γ to the complete flag manifold \mathcal{F}_d .

The following result shows that the group theoretic structures of the *B-boundary embedded* subgroups of $\mathrm{SL}(d, \mathbf{R})$ are highly restricted.

Theorem C. *Let d be any natural number satisfying (1). If a subgroup Γ of $\mathrm{SL}(d, \mathbf{R})$ is B-boundary embedded, then Γ is virtually isomorphic to either a free group or the fundamental group of a closed hyperbolic surface.*

See section 4 for the proof of this result.

This result directly applies to the class of Borel Anosov subgroups, introduced by Labourie [14], who proved the seminal result that the image of the *Hitchin representations* of surface groups into $\mathrm{SL}(d, \mathbf{R})$ are Borel Anosov subgroups. The original definition of Borel Anosov subgroups given by Labourie is quite involved, however, the following simpler definition was subsequently given by Bochi–Potrie–Sambarino [2].

For $g \in \mathrm{SL}(d, \mathbf{R})$, let

$$\sigma_1(g) \geq \cdots \geq \sigma_d(g),$$

denote the singular values of g . For a finitely-generated group Γ , let $|\cdot| : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbf{N} \cup \{0\}$ denote the word-length function with respect to some symmetric finite generating set of Γ . The following definition does not depend on the choice of such a generating set.

Definition 1.4 (Borel Anosov subgroups). A finitely-generated subgroup Γ of $\mathrm{SL}(d, \mathbf{R})$ is called *Borel Anosov* if there exist constants $L \geq 1$ and $A \geq 0$ such that, for all $k \in \{1, \dots, d-1\}$ and for all $\gamma \in \Gamma$,

$$\log \left(\frac{\sigma_k(\gamma)}{\sigma_{k+1}(\gamma)} \right) \geq L^{-1}|\gamma| - A. \quad (2)$$

The main features of the Borel Anosov subgroups Γ of $\mathrm{SL}(d, \mathbf{R})$ includes (i) Γ , as an abstract group, is word-hyperbolic and (ii) there exists a Γ -equivariant antipodal embedding, called the *limit map*,

$$\xi : \partial\Gamma \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_d,$$

from the Gromov boundary $\partial\Gamma$ of Γ to the complete flag manifold \mathcal{F}_d . See [14, 2]. In particular, Borel Anosov subgroups of $\mathrm{SL}(d, \mathbf{R})$ are *B*-boundary embedded (Definition 1.3). Therefore, Theorem C has the following direct implication.

Corollary D. *Let d be any natural number satisfying (1). If Γ is a Borel Anosov subgroup of $\mathrm{SL}(d, \mathbf{R})$, then Γ is virtually isomorphic to either a free group or the fundamental group of a closed hyperbolic surface.*

This result partially answers a question asked by Andr s Sambarino (see [4,  7]) who asked if the statement is true for all $d \geq 2$. As mentioned above, this question previously has been affirmatively answered for $d = 3$ and $d = 4$ by Canary–Tsouvalas [4], and for all d of the form $4m + 2$ by Tsouvalas [19]. In fact, this article gives a new (and hopefully simpler) proof for the previously known cases from [4, 19].

For the remaining integers $d \geq 2$ excluded in the above result, we cannot give a satisfactory answer to Sambarino’s question; the main issue is the limitation of Theorem 2.4. We want to highlight a connection between maximal antipodality of limit sets and Sambarino’s question, which could be useful for further studies in the remaining cases: Suppose that there exist $d \in \mathbf{N}$ and a Borel Anosov subgroup $\Gamma < \mathrm{SL}(d, \mathbf{R})$, isomorphic to a surface group, such that the limit set of Γ in \mathcal{F}_d is not maximally antipodal. Then, applying the *Combination Theorem* of Dey–Kapovich–Leeb [6] (see also Dey–Kapovich [5]), one can construct a Borel Anosov subgroup of $\mathrm{SL}(d, \mathbf{R})$ isomorphic to $\Gamma' \star \mathbf{Z}$, where Γ' is a finite index subgroup (hence, a surface group) of Γ . This would produce a counter-example for Sambarino’s question.

1.3 Uniformly-regular quasiisometric embeddings

The notion of *uniformly-regular quasiisometric embeddings*, introduced by Kapovich–Leeb–Porti, of geodesic metric spaces into the symmetric space

$$X_d := \mathrm{SL}(d, \mathbf{R})/\mathrm{SO}(d, \mathbf{R})$$

is a strengthening of the quasiisometric embeddings. Since the definition of uniformly-regular quasiisometric embeddings requires a lengthier discussion, we refer our reader to [11,

Definition 2.26]. This notion is especially interesting in the context of Anosov subgroups since, by [11, Theorem 3.41], a subgroup $\Gamma < \mathrm{SL}(d, \mathbf{R})$ is Borel Anosov if and only if Γ is finitely-generated and the orbit map

$$\Gamma \rightarrow X_d, \quad \gamma \mapsto \gamma \cdot x_0,$$

is a uniformly-regular quasiisometric embedding, where Γ is equipped with any word metric and $x_0 \in X_d$ is any base-point (cf. (2)).

In the torsion-free case, the first part of the following result thus is a generalization of Corollary D.

Theorem E. *Let d be any natural number satisfying (1).*

- (i) *Let Γ be a finitely-generated, torsion-free group equipped with a word metric. Then, Γ admits uniformly-regular quasiisometric embeddings into X_d if and only if Γ is isomorphic to either a free group or the fundamental group of a closed hyperbolic surface.*
- (ii) *The only rank-one symmetric space of noncompact type that admits uniformly-regular quasiisometric embeddings into X_d is the hyperbolic plane.*

See section 4 for the proof of this result.

Inspired by Sambarino's question, it is natural to ask the following question.

Question 1.5. *Does the analogue of Theorem E hold when d is of the form $d = 8m, 8m \pm 1$?*

Plan for this paper

In section 2, we state and prove the main technical result in this paper, namely Theorem 2.4. In section 3, we prove Theorem A. In section 4, we prove Theorem C and Theorem E. Finally, in section 5, we give some further applications of the methods in this paper.

Acknowledgement

I want to thank Misha Kapovich and Yair Minsky for suggestions and encouragements. I am thankful to Richard Canary, Su Ji Hong, Or Landesberg, and Max Riestenberg for enjoyable discussions related to the results in this paper. I am thankful to Hee Oh for a question (see Proposition 5.2) she asked to me and motivational conversations related to it. I am grateful to Misha Shapiro for helpful discussions related to Theorem 2.4.

2 An involution on the intersection of two opposite maximal Schubert cells

The goal of this section is to state and prove the main technical result behind the main results discussed in the introduction. See Theorem 2.4 below.

We recall that $\mathrm{SL}(d, \mathbf{R})$ acts transitively on the set consisting of antipodal pairs of points in \mathcal{F}_d . From now on, we reserve the notations σ_{\pm} for the *descending/ascending* flags defined as follows: Let \mathbf{R}^d be equipped with the standard basis $\{e_1, \dots, e_d\}$. Define

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_+ : \quad & \{0\} \subset \mathrm{span}\{e_d\} \subset \mathrm{span}\{e_d, e_{d-1}\} \subset \dots \subset \mathrm{span}\{e_d, \dots, e_1\} = \mathbf{R}^d, \\ \sigma_- : \quad & \{0\} \subset \mathrm{span}\{e_1\} \subset \mathrm{span}\{e_1, e_2\} \subset \dots \subset \mathrm{span}\{e_1, \dots, e_d\} = \mathbf{R}^d.\end{aligned}$$

We reserve the notation U_d to denote the subgroup of $\mathrm{SL}(d, \mathbf{R})$ consisting of all upper-triangular unipotent matrices. It is easy to check that U_d fixes σ_- , and hence, preserves \mathcal{C}_{σ_-} . Moreover, U_d acts on \mathcal{C}_{σ_-} simply transitively, so we have a diffeomorphism

$$F_{\sigma_+} : U_d \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{\sigma_-}, \quad F(u) = u\sigma_+.$$

For notational convenience, for all $\sigma \in \mathcal{C}_{\sigma_-}$, let us denote

$$u_{\sigma} := F_{\sigma_+}^{-1}(\sigma).$$

We identify U_d with \mathcal{C}_{σ_-} under the diffeomorphism F_{σ_+} .

Furthermore, we identify U_d (hence \mathcal{C}_{σ_-}) with $\mathbf{R}^{\binom{d}{2}}$ by sending a matrix $u \in U_d$ to the vector $(u_{ij})_{1 \leq i < j \leq d}$. We describe the set $\mathcal{E}_{\sigma_+} \cap \mathcal{C}_{\sigma_-}$ algebraically as a subset of $\mathbf{R}^{\binom{d}{2}}$. Notice that, for $\sigma \in U_d$, σ lies in \mathcal{E}_{σ_+} if and only if there exists some $k \in \{1, \dots, d-1\}$ such that $\sigma^{(k)} + \sigma_+^{(d-k)}$ is a proper subspace of \mathbf{R}^d . Equivalently,

$$p_k(u_{\sigma}) := \frac{(u_{\sigma} e_{d-k+1}) \wedge \dots \wedge (u_{\sigma} e_d) \wedge e_{k+1} \wedge \dots \wedge e_d}{e_1 \wedge \dots \wedge e_d} = 0,$$

where $u_{\sigma} \in U_d$ is the unique element such that $u_{\sigma}\sigma_+ = \sigma$, see the notations from the previous section. Let $\mathcal{E}_{\sigma_+}^k := \{u \in U_d \mid p_k(u) = 0\}$. Then,

$$\mathcal{E}_{\sigma_+} \cap U_d = \bigcup_{k=1}^{d-1} \mathcal{E}_{\sigma_+}^k.$$

Example 2.1. If $d = 3$, then

$$p_1 \left(\begin{bmatrix} 1 & x & y \\ & 1 & z \\ & & 1 \end{bmatrix} \right) = y, \quad p_2 \left(\begin{bmatrix} 1 & x & y \\ & 1 & z \\ & & 1 \end{bmatrix} \right) = xz - y.$$

Therefore, $\mathcal{E}_{\sigma_+} \cap U_3$ can be written as the union of the hypersurfaces $\mathcal{E}_{\sigma_+}^1 = \{(x, y, z) \mid p_1(x, y, z) = y = 0\}$ and $\mathcal{E}_{\sigma_+}^2 = \{(x, y, z) \mid p_2(x, y, z) = xz - y = 0\}$ in \mathbf{R}^3 . See [Figure 1](#).

The following lemma can be verified by linear algebra. We omit the details.




Figure 1: The part of the set \mathcal{E}_{σ_+} lying in $\mathbf{R}^3 \cong \mathcal{C}_{\sigma_-} \subset \mathcal{F}_3$. The six components of $\mathcal{C}_{\sigma_-} \cap \mathcal{C}_{\sigma_+}$ are visible in the complement of this algebraic surface.

Lemma 2.2. *The polynomial $p_k(u)$ can be expressed as $p_k(u) = \det u^{(k)}$, where $u^{(k)}$ denotes the upper-right $k \times k$ block submatrix of u . In particular,*

$$\mathcal{E}_{\sigma_+}^k = \{u \in U_d \mid \det u^{(k)} = 0\}.$$

We define an involution

$$\iota : U_d \rightarrow U_d, \quad u \mapsto u^{-1}.$$

Note that ι is a diffeomorphism, $\text{Fix}(\iota) = \{\mathbf{I}\}$, and $d\iota|_{T_{\mathbf{I}}U_d} = -\text{id}$, where \mathbf{I} denotes the identity matrix.

Proposition 2.3. *For all $k \in \{1, \dots, d-1\}$,*

$$p_k(u^{-1}) = (-1)^{k(d+1)} p_{d-k}(u).$$

In particular, $\iota(\mathcal{E}_{\sigma_+}^k) = \mathcal{E}_{\sigma_+}^{d-k}$, ι preserves $\mathcal{E}_{\sigma_+} \cap U_d$ and, hence, preserves $U_d \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\sigma_+}$.

Proof. We apply the *Jacobi's complementary minor formula*: If A is an invertible $d \times d$ matrix, then for subsets $I, J \subset \{1, \dots, d\}$ of size k , $\det A_{IJ} = (-1)^{\sum I + \sum J} (\det A) \det(A^{-1})_{J^c I^c}$. Here we use the notation A_{IJ} to denote the submatrix of A obtained by its I 'th rows and J 'th columns. Since in our case $\det u = 1$, the above formula reduces to

$$\det((u^{-1})_{IJ}) = (-1)^{\sum I + \sum J} \det u_{J^c I^c}.$$

Fix $k \in \{1, \dots, d-1\}$. Notice that when $I = \{1, \dots, k\}$ and $J = \{d-k+1, \dots, d\}$, we have $p_k(\hat{u}) = \det \hat{u}_{IJ}$, $p_{d-k}(\hat{u}) = \det \hat{u}_{J^c I^c}$, and $\sum I + \sum J = k(d+1)$. Hence, by the formula in the previous paragraph, $p_k(u^{-1}) = (-1)^{k(d+1)} p_{d-k}(u)$. \square

By the above result, we have a well-defined involution ι on $U_d \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\sigma_+}$. The following is the main result of this section.

Theorem 2.4. *Suppose that d is any natural number such that $d \neq 5$ and $d \equiv 2, 3, 4, 5$, or $6 \pmod{8}$. Then, the involution $\iota : U_d \rightarrow U_d$ does not leave invariant any connected components of $U_d \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\sigma_+}$.*

Remark 2.5. When d is of the form $8m \pm 1$, then the $\iota : U_d \rightarrow U_d$ leaves invariant some components of $U_d \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\sigma_+}$, see below. Therefore, the theorem is false in these cases. When d is of the form $8m$, we are unable to make the conclusion because we could not study some “exceptional” connected components. See [Remark 2.8](#). However, in all these cases, the total number of these components is quite “small” compared to the total number of connected components of $U_d \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\sigma_+}$.

The case $d = 5$ has been excluded from [Theorem 2.4](#), however, with help from Su Ji Hong, we have verified using computer that the result is valid for $d = 5$. Since we could not find a way to present a proof here, we have excluded this case in the statement.

The proof of the theorem above is split into several cases and occupies the rest of this section.

2.1 Proof of Theorem 2.4 when $d = 3$

When $d = 3$, the connected components of $U_3 \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\sigma_+}$ in $\mathbf{R}^3 = U_3$ are

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega_1 &= \{(x, y, z) \mid x > 0, y > 0, z > 0, xz - y > 0\}, \\ \widehat{\Omega}_1 &= \{(x, y, z) \mid x < 0, y > 0, z < 0, xz - y > 0\}, \\ \Omega_2 &= \{(x, y, z) \mid x < 0, y < 0, z > 0, xz - y < 0\}, \\ \widehat{\Omega}_2 &= \{(x, y, z) \mid x > 0, y < 0, z < 0, xz - y < 0\}, \\ \Omega_3 &= \{(x, y, z) \mid y > 0, xz - y < 0\}, \\ \widehat{\Omega}_3 &= \{(x, y, z) \mid y < 0, xz - y > 0\}.\end{aligned}$$

See [Figure 1](#). By picking a representative in each component and applying ι to the representative, it can be checked that, for $k = 1, 2, 3$, $\iota\Omega_k = \widehat{\Omega}_k$. We omit the details.

2.2 Proof of Theorem 2.4 when $d \equiv 2 \pmod{4}$

Suppose that $d \equiv 2 \pmod{4}$. Let $u \in U_d \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\sigma_+}$ be any point. By [Proposition 2.3](#), $\iota u \in U_d \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\sigma_+}$. Let $c : [-1, 1] \rightarrow U_d$, $c(\pm 1) = u^{\pm 1}$, be any path. We show that such a path c must intersect $\mathcal{E}_{\sigma_+} \cap U_d$. In this case, since $d/2$ is odd, by [Proposition 2.3](#),

$$p_{d/2}(u^{-1}) = -p_{d/2}(u).$$

Thus, by continuity, the image of c must intersect $\mathcal{E}_{\sigma_+}^{d/2}$. Therefore, u and ιu lie in different connected components of $U_d \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\sigma_+}^{d/2}$, and hence, of $U_d \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\sigma_+}$.

2.3 Some preparation before the proof of Theorem 2.4 in the remaining cases

The proof of Theorem 2.4 we give below in the remaining cases is combinatorial; in these cases, we heavily rely on some sophisticated *invariants* developed in Shapiro–Shapiro–Vainshtein [16, 17], where they distinguish and count the number of connected components of $\mathcal{C}_{\sigma_-} \cap \mathcal{C}_{\sigma_+}$ using those invariants. In the following, we try to be consistent with the notations and terminologies from [17] so that we can freely refer to that paper for more details.

Let $n := d - 1$. Denote by $T^n = T^n(\mathbf{F}_2)$ the vector space of all $n \times n$ upper-triangular matrices with \mathbf{F}_2 -valued entries. There is certain subgroup $\mathfrak{G}_n < \mathrm{GL}(T^n)$ acting linearly on T^n . This action called the *first* \mathfrak{G}_n -action. See the introduction of [17]. There is also another \mathfrak{G}_n -action defined in that paper, which is called the *second* \mathfrak{G}_n -action. However, in the present article, we do not need to discuss the second action, and hence, we will call the *first* \mathfrak{G}_n -action simply by \mathfrak{G}_n -action.

For reader's convenience, we recall this action. For $1 \leq i \leq j \leq n - 1$, let $g_{ij} \in \mathrm{GL}(T^n)$ be the element acting linearly on T^n as follows: Let M^{ij} be the 2×2 submatrix of M formed by the rows i and $i + 1$, and the columns j and $j + 1$ (or, its upper-triangle when $i = j$). Then, $g_{ij} \cdot M$ is the matrix obtained by adding to each entry of M^{ij} its trace, and keeping the rest of the entries of M unchanged. The subgroup $\mathfrak{G}_n < \mathrm{GL}(T^n)$ is generated by all these g_{ij} 's.

By [16], the connected components of $\mathcal{C}_{\sigma_-} \cap \mathcal{C}_{\sigma_+}$ are in one-to-one correspondence with the \mathfrak{G}_n -orbits in T^n . The correspondence can be realized as follows (see [16, §2 & §3] for this discussion): Let S_{n+1} denote the group of all permutations of $\{1, \dots, n + 1\}$, let w_0^{n+1} denote the *longest element* in S_{n+1} , and let $s_k, k = 1 \dots, n$, denote the transposition which permutes k and $k + 1$ in $\{1, \dots, n + 1\}$. The element w_0^{n+1} can be written as

$$w_0^{n+1} = s_1 s_2 \dots s_n s_1 s_2 \dots s_{n-1} \dots s_1 s_2 s_1.$$

Corresponding to this (fixed) reduced decomposition of w_0^{n+1} , by [1, 15], a generic matrix $u \in U_d = U_{n+1}$ can be uniquely factorized as

$$u = (\mathbf{I} + t_1 \mathbf{E}_{s_1})(\mathbf{I} + t_2 \mathbf{E}_{s_2}) \dots (\mathbf{I} + t_n \mathbf{E}_{s_n})(\mathbf{I} + t_{n+1} \mathbf{E}_{s_1}) \dots (\mathbf{I} + t_{2n-1} \mathbf{E}_{s_{n-1}}) \dots (\mathbf{I} + t_{\frac{n(n+1)}{2}} \mathbf{E}_{s_1}),$$

where the coefficients $t_l, 1 \leq l \leq \frac{n(n+1)}{2}$, in the above are non-zero real numbers. In the above, the symbol \mathbf{E}_{s_k} stands for the $(n + 1) \times (n + 1)$ matrix with only nontrivial entry 1 at the place $(k, k + 1)$. One gets a map

$$u \mapsto M_u \in T^n, \quad u \in U_d \text{ is generic}, \quad (3)$$

such that the entry $(M_u)_{ij}, i \leq j$, is $0 \in \mathbf{F}_2$ (resp. $1 \in \mathbf{F}_2$) if the coefficient t_l of the i -th $\mathbf{E}_{s_{j-i+1}}$ appearing in the above decomposition is positive (resp. negative). Each connected

component $\Omega \subset \mathcal{C}_{\sigma_-} \cap \mathcal{C}_{\sigma_+}$ is associated with the subset $S_\Omega := \{M_u \mid u \in \Omega \text{ is generic}\} \subset T^n$. The vector space T^n partitions into the subsets of the form S_Ω and the correspondence $\Omega \leftrightarrow S^\Omega$ is one-to-one. By the Main Theorem of [16], the subsets S_Ω are precisely the orbits of the \mathfrak{G}_n -action.

With the above discussion, we observe that, for generic matrices $u \in U_{n+1}$, the matrix M_{u-1} is obtained from M_u by first reflecting it by its anti-diagonal and then adding to the matrix in T^n whose all entries in the upper-triangular region are $1 \in \mathbf{F}_2$. In other words, the involution $\iota : U_{n+1} \rightarrow U_{n+1}$ induces an involution $\iota : T^n \rightarrow T^n$ which sends a matrix $M \in T^n$ to the matrix $\iota(M)$ defined by

$$\iota(M)_{ij} := M_{(n+1-j), (n+1-i)} + 1, \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq i \leq j \leq n. \quad (4)$$

Note that, by definition, for every connected component Ω of $\mathcal{C}_{\sigma_-} \cap \mathcal{C}_{\sigma_+}$,

$$\iota S^\Omega = S^{\iota\Omega}. \quad (5)$$

The first part of the following lemma records the above discussion.

Lemma 2.6. *Let $n \in \mathbf{N}$. The involution $\iota : U_{n+1} \rightarrow U_{n+1}$ preserves a connected component Ω of $\mathcal{C}_{\sigma_-} \cap \mathcal{C}_{\sigma_+}$ if and only if the map $\iota : T^n \rightarrow T^n$ leaves S^Ω invariant.*

Moreover, the involution ι does not have a fixed point in T^n . In particular, no singleton \mathfrak{G}_n -orbits S^Ω are preserved by ι .

The “moreover” part of the lemma above is verified by noticing that the entries in upper-right corner of $M \in T^n$ and $\iota(M)$ are different.

We identify the dual space $(T^n)^*$ with the space of $n \times n$ upper-triangular matrices with \mathbf{F}_2 -entries so that, for $M \in T^n$ and $M^* \in (T^n)^*$,

$$(M, M^*) = \sum_{i \leq j} M_{ij} M_{ij}^*. \quad (6)$$

We recall the elements $E_k \in T^n$ and $R_k \in (T^n)^*$, $k = 1, \dots, n$, from [17, §2.1]

$$E_k = \sum_{s-r=k-1} E_{rs}, \quad \text{and} \quad R_k = \sum_{1 \leq r \leq k \leq s \leq n} E_{rs},$$

where E_{rs} denotes the matrix whose only nontrivial entry is at the position (r, s) . The subspace of $(T^n)^*$ (resp. T^n) spanned by the matrices R_k ’s (resp. E_k ’s) is denoted by \mathcal{D}_n (resp. \mathcal{J}_n). One checks that $\iota E_k = \sum_{i \neq k} E_i$, and hence,

$$\iota \mathcal{J}_n = \mathcal{J}_n. \quad (7)$$

Moreover, note that the matrices E_k are symmetric with respect to the antidiagonal; therefore, any element $I \in \mathcal{J}_n = \text{span}\{E_1, \dots, E_n\}$ is also symmetric with respect to the antidiagonal. Hence,

$$\iota(I + M) = I + \iota(M), \quad \forall M \in T^n, \forall I \in \mathcal{J}_n. \quad (8)$$

Let $\mathcal{D}_n^\perp \subset T^n$ denote the subspace orthogonal to \mathcal{D}_n with respect to the standard pairing (\cdot, \cdot) in (6). A translation of \mathcal{D}_n^\perp by a matrix $M \in T^n$ is called a *slice*. If $S \subset T^n$ is a slice, then its *height* h^S is defined to be the vector

$$h^S = (h_1^S, \dots, h_n^S) \in \mathbf{F}_2^n,$$

where $h_k^S := (M, R_k) \in \mathbf{F}_2$ and $M \in S$ is a(ny) matrix. Note that the slice at height zero is \mathcal{D}_n^\perp , and that the correspondence $S \leftrightarrow h^S$ is one-to-one. A slice S is called *symmetric* if its height vector h^S is a symmetric vector with respect to its middle, i.e., for all $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $h_k^S = h_{n+1-k}^S$. By the \mathfrak{G}_n -orbit structure theorem [17, Theorem 2.2], every orbit of $\mathfrak{G}_n \curvearrowright T^n$ lies in some slice $S \subset T^n$.

The following lemma, which computes the effect of ι on the height vectors, can be verified by a direct computation using (4).

Lemma 2.7. *For every slice $S \subset T^n$ and $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$,*

$$h_k^S \equiv h_{n+1-k}^S + k(n+1-k) \pmod{2}.$$

With the help of Lemma 2.6 and Lemma 2.7, our strategy now is to apply [17, Theorem 2.2] to check if any \mathfrak{G}_n -orbit is preserved under the involution ι .

2.4 Proof of Theorem 2.4 when $d = 4$

We give a proof of Theorem 2.4 when $d = 4$. This case is illustrative, and also does not fit into the discussion of the more general cases below. In this case, T^3 has 64 elements, and there are twenty \mathfrak{G}_3 -orbits, each corresponds to one connected component of $U_4 \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\sigma_+}$. The orbits are listed in Table 1. The theorem can be verified directly from the table.

2.5 Proof of Theorem 2.4 when d is odd and $d \geq 7$

We show that for odd numbers $d \geq 7$, when

$$d \equiv 3 \text{ or } 5 \pmod{8}, \tag{9}$$

the involution $\iota : U_d \rightarrow U_d$ does not preserve any connected components of $U_d \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\sigma_+}$. Furthermore, when $d \geq 7$ is odd and $d \equiv 1 \text{ or } 5 \pmod{8}$, we show that there are exactly $2^{\frac{d+1}{2}}$ number of connected components of $U_d \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\sigma_+}$ preserved by ι ; note that, by the main theorem of [17], there are $3 \cdot 2^{d-1}$ connected components of $U_d \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\sigma_+}$.

Let $d \geq 7$ be any odd number. Equivalently, we assume that $n = d - 1 \geq 6$ is even. Applying Lemma 2.7, for all $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $h_k^S = h_{n+1-k}^S$. Thus, if $S \subset T^n$ is a nonsymmetric slice, then $h^{\iota S} \neq h^S$. Hence, ι does not preserve any orbits lying in nonsymmetric slices.

[illegible]Table 1: The case $d = 4$.

However, for every symmetric slice S ,

$$h^S = h^{\iota S}. \quad (10)$$

In particular, for every symmetric slice S , $\iota S = S$. Using [17, Theorem 2.2(ii)], every symmetric slice S decomposes into a number of singleton \mathfrak{G}_n -orbits and two nonsingleton \mathfrak{G}_n -orbits of equal sizes. By Lemma 2.6, no singleton \mathfrak{G}_n -orbit is preserved under ι . So, it remains only to check how ι acts on the pair of nonsingleton \mathfrak{G}_n -orbits in each symmetric slices.

Any symmetric slice can be sent to any other by the action $\mathcal{J}_n \curvearrowright T^n$ by translations. It has been noted in the proof of [17, Lemma 6.7] that $\mathcal{J}_n \curvearrowright T^n$ maps \mathfrak{G}_n -orbits to \mathfrak{G}_n -orbits.

Claim. *If ι swaps (resp. preserves) the pair of nonsingleton \mathfrak{G}_n -orbits in one symmetric slice, then it swaps (resp. preserves) those for all symmetric slices.*

Proof. Let S_1 and S_2 be any two symmetric slices, and let $I \in \mathcal{J}_n$ be a matrix such that $I + S_1 = S_2$. Let $S_1^\pm \subset S_1$ denote the distinct nonsingleton \mathfrak{G}_n -orbits. Then, $S_2^\pm := I + S_1^\pm \subset S_2$ are the distinct nonsingleton \mathfrak{G}_n -orbits in S_2 . If $\iota(S_1^+) = S_1^-$, then, by (8),

$$\iota(S_2^+) = \iota(I + S_1^+) = I + \iota(S_1^+) = I + S_1^- = S_2^-. \quad \square$$

By the above claim, it is enough to understand how ι acts on the pair of nonsingleton \mathfrak{G}_n -orbits in \mathcal{D}_n^\perp , the symmetric slice at height zero. Consider the matrix $M_n^- \in T^n$ whose only nontrivial entries are the ones contained in the 2×2 submatrix at the upper-right corner, and let $M_n^+ := \iota(M_n^-)$. We note that, $M_n^- \in \mathcal{D}_n^\perp$ and hence, so is M_n^+ . Using the description of the \mathfrak{G}_n -action above, it is easy to observe that the \mathfrak{G}_n -orbits $S_n^\pm := \mathfrak{G}_n \cdot M_n^\pm$ are both nonsingleton. Finally, since $M_n^+ = \iota(M_n^-)$, we get $S_n^+ = \iota(S_n^-)$.

Claim. *For all even numbers $n \geq 6$, $S_n^+ \cap S_n^- = \emptyset$ precisely when $n \equiv 2$ or $4 \pmod{8}$.*

Proof. Let $\Phi_n : (T^n)^* \rightarrow T^{n-1}$ denote the linear map given by sending a matrix $M \in (T^n)^*$ to $N \in T^{n-1}$ such that

$$N_{ij} = M_{ij} + M_{i+1,j} + M_{i,j+1} + M_{i+1,j+1}.$$

It is proven in [17, Lemma 6.6] that the dual map $\Phi_n^* : (T^{n-1})^* \rightarrow T^n$ maps $(T^{n-1})^*$ isomorphically onto \mathcal{D}_n^\perp . The dual map Φ^* can be computed by

$$\Phi^*(E_{ij}^{n-1}) = E_{ij}^n + E_{i,j+1}^n + E_{i+1,j}^n + E_{i+1,j+1}^n, \quad (11)$$

where E_{ij}^k denotes the $k \times k$ matrix with only nontrivial entry at the position (i, j) , if $i \leq j$, or the zero $k \times k$ matrix, otherwise. Let $N_{n-1}^- \in (T^{n-1})^*$ be the matrix whose only nontrivial entry is contained in the upper-right corner. Let $N_{n-1}^+ = N_{n-1}^- + P_{n-1}$, where P_{n-1} denotes the $(n-1) \times (n-1)$ matrix whose nontrivial entries are precisely located at

the places (i, j) such that $i \leq j$, and i and j are both odd numbers. By the description of Φ^* above, it is easy to check that

$$\Phi_n^*(N_{n-1}^\pm) = M_n^\pm.$$

There is a quadratic function

$$Q : (T^{n-1})^* \rightarrow \mathbf{F}_2 \quad (12)$$

defined in [17, §5.1] which distinguishes between the pair of nonsingleton orbits. Applying [17, Lemma 5.1], we get

$$Q(N_{n-1}^-) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad Q(N_{n-1}^+) = \frac{\frac{n}{2}(\frac{n}{2}+1)}{2} - 1 \pmod{2}.$$

Note that the quantity $\frac{\frac{n}{2}(\frac{n}{2}+1)}{2}$ counts the number of 1's in the matrix P_{n-1} . Therefore, $Q(N_{n-1}^+) \neq Q(N_{n-1}^-)$ exactly in the cases when $n \equiv 2$ or $4 \pmod{8}$. Applying [17, Lemmata 4.3, 5.5 & 6.6], the claim follows. \square

By the above claim, for all even numbers $n \geq 6$, precisely when $n \equiv 2$ or $4 \pmod{8}$, ι swaps the pair of nonsingleton \mathfrak{G}_n -orbits in \mathcal{D}_n^\perp . Following the discussion before the claim, for such n 's, no orbit of $\mathfrak{G}_n \curvearrowright T^n$ is preserved by ι . When $n \geq 6$ and $n \equiv 0$ or $6 \pmod{8}$, then by the above claim it follows that $\iota S_n^+ = S_n^- = S_n^+$, i.e., ι preserves some orbits of $\mathfrak{G}_n \curvearrowright T^n$ (there are exactly $2^{\frac{n}{2}+1}$ such orbits). The proof of Theorem 2.4 when $d \geq 7$ is odd is complete.

2.6 Proof of Theorem 2.4 when $d \equiv 4 \pmod{8}$ and $d \geq 12$

Suppose that $d \equiv 4 \pmod{8}$ and $d \geq 12$. Equivalently, we assume that $n = d - 1 \geq 11$ is odd such that $n \equiv 3 \pmod{8}$. Applying Lemma 2.7, we observe that the \mathfrak{G}_n -orbits in the *symmetric* slices are not preserved, since, for every symmetric slice S , $h_1^S = 1 + h_1^{\iota S}$. Furthermore, by a similar application of Lemma 2.7 to the nonsymmetric slices S , we observe that $h^S \neq h^{\iota S}$ unless h^S satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \text{for all even } k, \quad h_k^S &= h_{n+1-k}^S, \quad \text{and} \\ \text{for all odd } k, \quad h_k^S &= h_{n+1-k}^S + 1. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

So our discussion reduces to the case of \mathfrak{G}_n -orbits contained in the *nonsymmetric* slices whose height vectors h^S satisfy (13); we call such nonsymmetric slices *special*. By definition, it follows that a slice S is special if and only if $\iota(S) = S$. By [17, Theorem 2.2(i)], every nonsymmetric (in particular, special) slice decomposes into a pair of orbits of equal sizes.

Claim. *Any special slice can be brought to any other by the action $\mathcal{I}_n \curvearrowright T^n$ by translations.*

Proof. If S and S' are any two special slices, then the difference vector $h^S - h^{S'}$ is symmetric with respect to the middle. We only need to remark that the image of the map $h : \mathcal{J}_n \rightarrow \mathbf{F}_2^n$ which sends a matrix $M \in \mathcal{J}_n$ to the vector $(h_1^M, \dots, h_n^M) \in \mathbf{F}_2^n$, where $h_k^M := (M, R_k) \in \mathbf{F}_2$, consists of all vectors $h \in \mathbf{F}_2^n$ which are symmetric with respect to the middle. \square

Since ι preserves the orbits structure of the action $\mathcal{J}_n \curvearrowright T^n$ (by (8)), and the action $\mathcal{J}_n \curvearrowright T^n$ preserves the \mathfrak{G}_n -orbit structure of the slices, by the above claim, it is enough to understand the involution $\iota : S \rightarrow S$ on *only* one special slice S . Let \bar{S}_n denote the special slice at height

$$\bar{h}_n = (\underbrace{1, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 1}_{\text{first } \frac{n-1}{2} \text{ entries}}, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbf{F}_2^n.$$

Note that \bar{h}_n satisfies (13). Let $\bar{M}_n^- \in \bar{S}_n \subset T^n$ denote the diagonal matrix whose diagonal entries are given by the vector \bar{h}_n , and let $\bar{M}_n^+ := \iota(\bar{M}_n^-)$. Let $\bar{S}_n^\pm := \mathfrak{G}_n \cdot \bar{M}_n^\pm \subset \bar{S}_n$.

Define a map $f : T^n \rightarrow T^{n+1}$ by sending a matrix M to the matrix $f(M) \in T^{n+1}$ obtained by appending the transpose of the vector

$$(\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{\frac{n+1}{2}}, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbf{F}_2^{n+1}$$

to M as the last column. By a direct calculation of the height, we observe that $f(\bar{S}_n) \subset \mathcal{D}_{n+1}^\perp$. Moreover, by definition of the \mathfrak{G}_n -action, it follows that $f(\bar{S}_n^-)$ (and similarly, $f(\bar{S}_n^+)$) is contained in a nonsingleton \mathfrak{G}_{n+1} -orbit in \mathcal{D}_{n+1}^\perp . Therefore, it is enough to show that $f(\bar{S}_n^-)$ and $f(\bar{S}_n^+)$ lie in two different \mathfrak{G}_{n+1} -orbits. Recall that $Q \circ (\Phi_{n+1}^*)^{-1}$, where $Q : (T^n)^* \rightarrow \mathbf{F}_2^n$ is the quadratic function in (12), distinguishes between the pair of nonsingleton \mathfrak{G}_{n+1} -orbits in \mathcal{D}_{n+1}^\perp . Let $\bar{N}_n^\pm \in (T^n)^*$ denote the $n \times n$ matrices given by

$$\begin{aligned} (\bar{N}_n^-)_{ij} &= \begin{cases} 1 & i \leq j, \text{ } i \text{ is odd and } i \leq \frac{n+1}{2} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\ (\bar{N}_n^+)_{ij} &= \begin{cases} 1 & i \leq j, \text{ } i, j \text{ are both odd and } i \leq \frac{n+1}{2} \\ 1 & i \leq j, \text{ } i \text{ is odd, } j \text{ is even, and } i \geq \frac{n+1}{2} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Using the description of the dual map Φ_n^* in (11), one checks that $f(\bar{M}_n^\pm) = \Phi_n^*(\bar{N}_n^\pm)$. With the help of [17, Lemma 5.1], we obtain that (modulo 2) the quantity $Q(\bar{N}_n^-)$ counts the number of nontrivial rows in \bar{N}_n^- whereas $Q(\bar{N}_n^+)$ counts the number of 1's in $Q(\bar{N}_n^+)$; since n is of the form $8m + 3$, we get that

$$Q(\bar{N}_n^-) = 1, \quad Q(\bar{N}_n^+) = 0.$$

This concludes the proof.

Remark 2.8. The whole discussion above applies when n is of the form $8m - 1$, except that in this case, $Q(\bar{N}_n^\pm)$ are both zero; therefore, the method above is inconclusive.

3 Proof of Theorem A

In this section, we prove [Theorem A](#). We first need the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *Let d be any natural number satisfying (1), and let Ω be any connected component of $\mathcal{C}_{\sigma_-} \cap \mathcal{C}_{\sigma_+}$. Then, for every $\sigma \in \Omega$, $\sigma_+ \notin u_\sigma \Omega$.*

Proof. The equivalent statement that, for every $\sigma \in \Omega$, $u_\sigma^{-1}\sigma_+ \notin \Omega$, follows directly from [Theorem 2.4](#). \square

Now we prove [Theorem A](#).

Proof of Theorem A. Suppose that $d \in \mathbf{N}$ is any number satisfying (1), and let Ω be a connected component of $\mathcal{F}_d \setminus (\mathcal{E}_{\sigma_+} \cup \mathcal{E}_{\sigma_-})$. Let $\sigma \in \Omega$ be any point. Pick a continuous path u_t , $t \in [0, 1]$, in U_d from the identity element to u_σ . The set $\mathcal{E} = \bigcup_{t \in [0, 1]} u_t \mathcal{E}_{\sigma_+} = \bigcup_{t \in [0, 1]} \mathcal{E}_{u_t \sigma_+}$ is a compact set not containing σ_- . Let $B_r(\sigma_-)$ denote the closed ball in \mathcal{F}_d centered at σ_- (with respect to some background metric on \mathcal{F}_d compatible with the manifold topology) of radius $r > 0$ small enough such that it does not intersect \mathcal{E} . We show that

$$(B_r(\sigma_-) \cap \Omega) \subset u_\sigma \Omega. \quad (14)$$

By our choice of the radius r , any point $\hat{\sigma} \in B_r(\sigma_-) \cap \Omega$ is antipodal to σ_- and $u_t \sigma_+$, for all $t \in [0, 1]$. Equivalently, for all $t \in [0, 1]$, $u_t^{-1} \hat{\sigma}$ is antipodal to σ_- and σ_+ . Therefore, we obtain a path $u_t^{-1} \hat{\sigma}$, $0 \leq t \leq 1$, from $\hat{\sigma}$ to $u_1^{-1} \hat{\sigma}$ which lies completely in a single connected component of $\mathcal{C}_{\sigma_-} \cap \mathcal{C}_{\sigma_+}$. Since, by assumption, $\hat{\sigma} \in \Omega$, we must have $u_1^{-1} \hat{\sigma} \in \Omega$. Hence, $\hat{\sigma} \in u_1 \Omega = u_\sigma \Omega$.

Now we can complete the proof of the theorem. Let $c : [-1, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_d$ be a continuous path such that

$$c(\pm 1) = \sigma_\pm \quad \text{and} \quad c((-1, 1)) \subset \Omega.$$

Then, by (14), there exists $t_0 \in (-1, 1)$ such that

$$c(t) \in u_\sigma \Omega, \quad \text{whenever} \quad -1 \leq t \leq t_0. \quad (15)$$

However, by [Lemma 3.1](#), $\sigma_+ \notin u_\sigma \Omega$. Since σ_+ is antipodal to both σ_- and σ , $\sigma_+ \notin u_\sigma \bar{\Omega}$, where $\bar{\Omega}$ denotes the closure of Ω in \mathcal{F}_d . Therefore, there exists $t_1 \in (t_0, 1)$ such that

$$c(t) \notin u_\sigma \Omega, \quad \text{whenever} \quad t_1 \leq t \leq 1. \quad (16)$$

By (15) and (16), $c([t_0, t_1])$ must intersect the boundary $\partial(u_\sigma \Omega)$ of the subset $u_\sigma \Omega$ in \mathcal{F}_d . Note that the boundary of $u_\sigma \Omega$ is contained in $\mathcal{E}_{\sigma_-} \cup \mathcal{E}_\sigma$, because

$$\partial(u_\sigma \Omega) = u_\sigma(\partial \Omega) \subset u_\sigma(\mathcal{E}_{\sigma_-} \cup \mathcal{E}_{\sigma_+}) = \mathcal{E}_{\sigma_-} \cup \mathcal{E}_\sigma.$$

Furthermore, under our hypothesis, $c((-1, 1)) \cap \mathcal{E}_{\sigma_-} = \emptyset$, we must have

$$c([t_0, t_1]) \cap \mathcal{E}_\sigma \neq \emptyset.$$

This concludes the proof. \square

4 Proofs of Theorems C and E

We first prove [Theorem C](#). Proof of [Theorem E](#) is similar and given afterwards.

Proof of Theorem C. Suppose that $d \in \mathbf{N}$ is as in the hypothesis. By definition, since Γ is a B -boundary embedded subgroup of $\mathrm{SL}(d, \mathbf{R})$, Γ is a word-hyperbolic group. Furthermore, since Γ is finitely-generated, appealing to the *Selberg lemma*, we know that Γ is virtually torsion-free. After passing to a subgroup of finite index, we may (and will) assume that Γ is torsion-free. Then, by the *Stallings decomposition theorem*, Γ is isomorphic to a free product

$$\Gamma = F_k \star \Gamma_1 \star \cdots \star \Gamma_n, \quad (17)$$

where F_k is a free group of rank $k \geq 0$, and Γ_j 's are one-ended hyperbolic groups ($n \geq 0$). Suppose that Γ is not free. Hence, we must have $n \geq 1$. We show that $k = 0$, $n = 1$, Γ_1 is a surface group.

The subgroup Γ_1 is naturally B -boundary embedded in $\mathrm{SL}(d, \mathbf{R})$: Let $\xi : \partial\Gamma \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_d$ denote a (fixed) Γ -equivariant antipodal embedding, and let ξ_1 denote the composition of the following maps,

$$\partial\Gamma_1 \hookrightarrow \partial\Gamma \xrightarrow{\xi} \mathcal{F}_d.$$

Then, $\xi_1 : \partial\Gamma_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_d$ is a Γ_1 -equivariant antipodal embedding.

Lemma 4.1. *If $\widehat{\Gamma}$ is a one-ended hyperbolic group, then there exists a topological embedding $i : S^1 \rightarrow \partial\widehat{\Gamma}$.*

Proof. Such embedded circles can be constructed either by a direct topological argument by using the fact that boundaries of one-ended groups are locally connected and without any global cut points (by Swarup [18]), or by using Bonk–Kleiner's [3, Corollary 2]. \square

Let $i : S^1 \rightarrow \partial\Gamma_1$ be a topological embedding, and define

$$c := \xi_1 \circ i : S^1 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_d.$$

Then, c is an antipodal map. Define

$$\mathcal{E}_c := \bigcup_{x \in S^1} \mathcal{E}_{c(x)} \subset \mathcal{F}_d.$$

We show that $\partial\Gamma_1 = i(S^1)$, i.e., $\partial\Gamma_1$ is homeomorphic to a circle: Suppose to the contrary that $\partial\Gamma_1 \supsetneq i(S^1)$. Consider a sequence of points (y_n) in $\partial\Gamma_1 \setminus i(S^1)$ which converges to some point $y \in i(S^1)$. Then, $\xi_1(y_n) \rightarrow \xi(y)$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Since ξ_1 is antipodal, $\xi_1(y_n) \notin \mathcal{E}_c$. However, by [Corollary B](#), the image of c is contained in the interior of \mathcal{E}_c . Hence, we get a contradiction.

Since $\partial\Gamma_1$ is homeomorphic to a circle, Γ_1 is isomorphic to a surface group. This is a result of the combined work by Tukia, Gabai, Freden, Casson, and Jungreis. See Theorem 5.4 in the survey by Kapovich–Benakli [10].

Finally, we show that $\Gamma = \Gamma_1$ in (17): Suppose, to the contrary, that $\Gamma \setminus \Gamma_1$ is nonempty. Then, $\partial\Gamma \setminus \partial\Gamma_1$ is also nonempty (for example, the fixed points in $\partial\Gamma$ of any element $\gamma \in \Gamma \setminus \Gamma_1$ lie outside $\partial\Gamma_1$). Let $z \in \partial\Gamma \setminus \partial\Gamma_1$ be an arbitrary point, and let $\gamma_1 \in \Gamma_1$ be a nontrivial element. Then, $(\gamma_1^n z)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$ is a sequence in $\partial\Gamma \setminus \partial\Gamma_1$ accumulating in $\partial\Gamma_1 \cong S^1$. By a similar argument as in the previous paragraph, we obtain a contradiction. \square

Finally, we prove Theorem E.

Proof of Theorem E. By [13, Theorem 1.2], if Y is a locally compact geodesic metric space admitting a uniformly-regular quasiisometric embedding into X_d , then Y is Gromov-hyperbolic, and the embedding extends to a topological embedding $\xi : \partial Y \hookrightarrow \mathcal{F}_d$. Such an embedding ξ is also antipodal [13, Theorem 1.4(ii)]. Both parts follow by the same argument used in the proof of Theorem C. \square

5 Some further results

Suppose that d is any natural number satisfying (1). Recall that, by Corollary B, antipodal circles Λ in \mathcal{F}_d are locally maximally antipodal. The following result shows that, if such a circle Λ is the limit set of some Borel Anosov subgroup of $\mathrm{SL}(d, \mathbf{R})$, then Λ is maximally antipodal; i.e.,

$$\bigcup_{\sigma \in \Lambda} \mathcal{E}_\sigma = \mathcal{F}_d.$$

Proposition 5.1. *Let d be any natural number satisfying (1). If $\Gamma < \mathrm{SL}(d, \mathbf{R})$ is a Borel Anosov subgroup, which is isomorphic to a surface group, then its flag limit set Λ is a maximally antipodal subset of \mathcal{F}_d .*

Proof. Suppose, to the contrary, that there exists a point $\hat{\sigma} \in \mathcal{F}_d$ antipodal to every point in Λ . Let $\gamma \in \Gamma$ be any hyperbolic element with attracting/repelling points $\sigma_\pm \in \Lambda$. Then, $\gamma^k \hat{\sigma} \rightarrow \sigma_+$, as $k \rightarrow \infty$. However, since γ preserves Λ , $\gamma^k \hat{\sigma}$ remains antipodal to Λ , for all $k \in \mathbf{N}$. Since Λ is homeomorphic to a circle, by Corollary B, Λ is locally maximally antipodal in \mathcal{F}_d , and so we get a contradiction with the preceding two sentences. \square

We prove the following statement, answering a question asked by Hee Oh, which was motivated by Theorem 5.2 in Oh–Edwards [7], where the authors mention knowing the result for $d = 3$ or when d is even (see Remark 5.4(4) in that paper).

Proposition 5.2. *Let $d \geq 2$ be any natural number. The image in \mathcal{F}_d of the equivariant limit maps corresponding to the Hitchin representations of surface groups into $\mathrm{PSL}(d, \mathbf{R})$, $d \geq 2$, are maximally antipodal subsets.*

Proof. By [Proposition 5.1](#), this result is true for all d covered under the hypothesis of [Proposition 5.1](#).

In any case, for all $d \geq 2$, it is enough to verify that Λ is locally maximally antipodal in \mathcal{F}_d ; compare with the first remark: By Fock–Goncharov [\[8\]](#), the Hitchin representations are characterized by Γ -equivariant, *positive* limit maps $\xi : \partial\Gamma \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_d$. Let $x_-, x, x_+ \in \partial\Gamma$ be any distinct points, and let $\sigma_\pm := \xi(x_\pm)$ and $\sigma := \xi(x)$. Then, the configuration of flags $(\sigma_-, \sigma, \sigma_+)$ in \mathcal{F}_d is *positive*, i.e., with an appropriate identification of U_d with the unipotent radical in the stabilizer of σ_- in $\mathrm{PSL}(d, \mathbf{R})$, there exists a *totally positive* matrix $u \in U_d$ such that $\sigma = u\sigma_+$. Such a matrix u corresponds to the zero matrix $\mathbf{0} \in T^{d-1}(\mathbf{F}_2)$, see [\(3\)](#). By [Lemma 2.6](#), the involution ι does not preserve the connected component Ω_d^+ of $\mathcal{C}_{\sigma_-} \cap \mathcal{C}_{\sigma_+}$ corresponding to $\mathbf{0}$, since $\mathbf{0}$ is a \mathfrak{S}_{d-1} -fixed point for the action $\mathfrak{S}_{d-1} \curvearrowright T^{d-1}$; see [section 2](#) for these notions. Therefore, for all $d \geq 2$, [Lemma 3.1](#), and hence [Theorem A](#), holds for the specific component Ω_d^+ . Following the proof of [Corollary B](#), one verifies that Λ is a locally maximally antipodal subset of \mathcal{F}_d . \square

References

- [1] Arkady Berenstein, Sergey Fomin, and Andrei Zelevinsky. Parametrizations of canonical bases and totally positive matrices. *Adv. Math.*, 122(1):49–149, 1996.
- [2] Jairo Bochi, Rafael Potrie, and Andrés Sambarino. Anosov representations and dominated splittings. *Journal of the European Mathematical Society*, 21(11):3343–3414, 2019.
- [3] Mario Bonk and Bruce Kleiner. Quasi-hyperbolic planes in hyperbolic groups. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 133(9):2491–2494, 2005.
- [4] Richard Canary and Konstantinos Tsouvalas. Topological restrictions on Anosov representations. *J. Topol.*, 13(4):1497–1520, 2020.
- [5] Subhadip Dey and Michael Kapovich. Klein-maskit combination theorem for anosov subgroups: Free products. *arxiv:2205.03919*, 2022.
- [6] Subhadip Dey, Michael Kapovich, and Bernhard Leeb. A combination theorem for Anosov subgroups. *Math. Z.*, 293(1-2):551–578, 2019.
- [7] Sam Edwards and Hee Oh. Temperedness of $L^2(\Gamma \backslash G)$ and positive eigenfunctions in higher rank. *arxiv:2202.06203*, 2022.
- [8] Vladimir Fock and Alexander Goncharov. Moduli spaces of local systems and higher Teichmüller theory. *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci.*, (103):1–211, 2006.
- [9] Olivier Guichard and Anna Wienhard. Anosov representations: domains of discontinuity and applications. *Invent. Math.*, 190(2):357–438, 2012.

- [10] Ilya Kapovich and Nadia Benakli. Boundaries of hyperbolic groups. In *Combinatorial and geometric group theory (New York, 2000/Hoboken, NJ, 2001)*, volume 296 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 39–93. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2002.
- [11] Michael Kapovich and Bernhard Leeb. Discrete isometry groups of symmetric spaces. In *Handbook of group actions. Vol. IV*, volume 41 of *Adv. Lect. Math. (ALM)*, pages 191–290. Int. Press, Somerville, MA, 2018.
- [12] Michael Kapovich, Bernhard Leeb, and Joan Porti. Anosov subgroups: dynamical and geometric characterizations. *Eur. J. Math.*, 3(4):808–898, 2017.
- [13] Michael Kapovich, Bernhard Leeb, and Joan Porti. A Morse lemma for quasigeodesics in symmetric spaces and Euclidean buildings. *Geom. Topol.*, 22(7):3827–3923, 2018.
- [14] François Labourie. Anosov flows, surface groups and curves in projective space. *Invent. Math.*, 165(1):51–114, 2006.
- [15] G. Lusztig. Total positivity in reductive groups. In *Lie theory and geometry*, volume 123 of *Progr. Math.*, pages 531–568. Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1994.
- [16] B. Shapiro, M. Shapiro, and A. Vainshtein. Connected components in the intersection of two open opposite Schubert cells in $SL_n(\mathbf{R})/B$. *Internat. Math. Res. Notices*, (10):469–493, 1997.
- [17] B. Shapiro, M. Shapiro, and A. Vainshtein. Skew-symmetric vanishing lattices and intersections of Schubert cells. *Internat. Math. Res. Notices*, (11):563–588, 1998.
- [18] G. A. Swarup. On the cut point conjecture. *Electron. Res. Announc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 2(2):98–100, 1996.
- [19] Konstantinos Tsouvalas. On Borel Anosov representations in even dimensions. *Comment. Math. Helv.*, 95(4):749–763, 2020.