

UNIQUENESS OF CONFORMAL MEASURES AND LOCAL MIXING FOR ANOSOV GROUPS.

SAM EDWARDS, MINJU LEE, AND HEE OH

ABSTRACT. In the late seventies, Sullivan showed that for a convex cocompact subgroup Γ of $\mathrm{SO}^\circ(n, 1)$ with critical exponent $\delta > 0$, any Γ -conformal measure on $\partial\mathbb{H}^n$ of dimension δ is necessarily supported on the limit set Λ and that the conformal measure of dimension δ exists uniquely. We prove an analogue of this theorem for any Zariski dense Anosov subgroup Γ of a connected semisimple real algebraic group G of rank at most 3.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let (X, d) be a Riemannian symmetric space of rank one and ∂X the visual boundary of X . Let $G = \mathrm{Isom}^+ X$ and $\Gamma < G$ a non-elementary discrete subgroup. Fixing $o \in X$, a Borel probability measure ν on ∂X is called a Γ -conformal measure of dimension $s > 0$ if for all $\gamma \in \Gamma$ and $\xi \in \partial X$,

$$\frac{d\gamma_*\nu}{d\nu}(\xi) = e^{s(\beta_\xi(o, \gamma o))}$$

where $\beta_\xi(x, y) = \lim_{z \rightarrow \xi} d(x, z) - d(y, z)$ denotes the Busemann function.

Let $\delta > 0$ denote the critical exponent of Γ . The well-known construction of Patterson and Sullivan ([8], [12]) provides a Γ -conformal measure of dimension δ supported on the limit set Λ , called the Patterson-Sullivan (PS) measure. A discrete subgroup $\Gamma < G$ is called *convex cocompact* if Γ acts cocompactly on some nonempty convex subset of X .

Theorem 1.1 (Sullivan). [12] *If Γ is convex cocompact, any Γ -conformal measure on ∂X of dimension δ is necessarily supported on Λ . Moreover, the PS-measure is the unique Γ -conformal measure of dimension δ .*

In this paper, we extend this result to Anosov subgroups, which is a higher rank analogue of convex cocompact subgroups of rank one groups. Let G be a connected semisimple real algebraic group and P a minimal parabolic subgroup of G . Let $\mathcal{F} := G/P$ be the Furstenberg boundary, and $\mathcal{F}^{(2)}$ the unique open G -orbit in $\mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{F}$. In the whole paper, we let Γ be a Zariski dense Anosov subgroup G with respect to P . This means that there exists a representation $\Phi : \Sigma \rightarrow G$ of a Gromov hyperbolic group Σ with $\Gamma = \Phi(\Sigma)$, which induces a continuous equivariant map ζ from the Gromov boundary

Edwards was supported by funding from the Heilbronn Institute for Mathematical Research and Oh was supported in part by NSF grants.

$\partial\Sigma$ to \mathcal{F} such that $(\zeta(x), \zeta(y)) \in \mathcal{F}^{(2)}$ for all $x \neq y \in \partial\Sigma$. This definition is due to Guichard-Wienhard [5].

Let A be a maximal real split torus of P and $\mathfrak{a} := \text{Lie}(A)$. Given a linear form $\psi \in \mathfrak{a}^*$, a Borel probability measure ν on \mathcal{F} is called a (Γ, ψ) -conformal measure if, for any $\gamma \in \Gamma$ and $\xi \in \mathcal{F}$,

$$\frac{d\gamma_*\nu}{d\nu}(\xi) = e^{\psi(\beta_\xi(e, \gamma))} \quad (1.2)$$

where β denotes the \mathfrak{a} -valued Busemann function (see (2.1) for the definition). Let $\Lambda \subset \mathcal{F}$ denote the limit set of Γ , which is the unique Γ -minimal subset. A (Γ, ψ) -conformal measure supported on Λ will be called a (Γ, ψ) -PS measure. Finally, a PS measure means a (Γ, ψ) -PS measure for some $\psi \in \mathfrak{a}^*$.

Let $\mathcal{L}_\Gamma \subset \mathfrak{a}^+$ denote the limit cone of Γ . Benoist [1] showed that \mathcal{L}_Γ is a convex cone with non-empty interior, using the well-known theorem of Prasad [9] on the existence of an \mathbb{R} -regular element in any Zariski dense subgroup of G . Let $\psi_\Gamma : \mathfrak{a} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ denote the growth indicator function of Γ as defined in (2.2). Set

$$D_\Gamma^* := \{\psi \in \mathfrak{a}^* : \psi \geq \psi_\Gamma, \psi(u) = \psi_\Gamma(u) \text{ for some } u \in \mathcal{L}_\Gamma \cap \text{int } \mathfrak{a}^+\}. \quad (1.3)$$

As Γ is Anosov, for any $\psi \in D_\Gamma^*$, there exists a unique unit vector $u \in \text{int } \mathcal{L}_\Gamma$, such that $\psi(u) = \psi_\Gamma(u)$, and a unique (Γ, ψ) -PS measure ν_ψ . Moreover, this gives bijections among

$$D_\Gamma^* \simeq \{u \in \text{int } \mathcal{L}_\Gamma : \|u\| = 1\} \simeq \{\Gamma\text{-PS measures on } \Lambda\}$$

(see [4], [6]). When G has rank one, $D_\Gamma^* = \{\delta\}$. Therefore the following generalizes Sullivan's theorem 1.1.

Theorem 1.4. *Let $\text{rank } G \leq 3$ and $\psi \in D_\Gamma^*$. Any (Γ, ψ) -conformal measure on \mathcal{F} is necessarily supported on Λ . Moreover, the PS measure ν_ψ is the unique (Γ, ψ) -conformal measure on \mathcal{F} .*

Our proof of Theorem 1.4 is obtained by combining the rank dichotomy theorem established by Burger, Landesberg, Lee, and Oh [2] and the local mixing property of a generalized Bowen-Margulis-Sullivan measure associated to any (Γ, ψ) -conformal measures on \mathcal{F} , which generalizes the work of Edwards, Lee and Oh [4]. Indeed, our proof yields that under the hypothesis of Theorem 1.4, any (Γ, ψ) -conformal measure on \mathcal{F} is supported on the u -directional radial limit set Λ_u (see (3.3)) where $\psi(u) = \psi_\Gamma(u)$.

Open problem: Is Theorem 1.4 true without the hypothesis $\text{rank } G \leq 3$?

2. LOCAL MIXING OF GENERALIZED BOWEN-MARGULIS-SULLIVAN MEASURES

In this section, let Γ be a Zariski dense discrete subgroup of a semisimple real algebraic group G . Let $P = MAN$ be the Langlands decomposition so that A is a maximal real split torus, M is the centralizer of A and N is the unipotent radical of P .

In [4, Prop. 6.8], we proved that local mixing of a BMS-measure implies local mixing of the Haar measure on $\Gamma \backslash G/M$. In this section, we provide a generalized version of this statement, where we replace the Haar measure by any generalized BMS-measure and also work on the space $\Gamma \backslash G$, rather than on $\Gamma \backslash G/M$. We refer to [4] for a more detailed description of a generalized BMS-measure, but briefly recall its definition here.

Let $\mathfrak{a} = \log A$ and fix a positive Weyl chamber \mathfrak{a}^+ . We also fix a maximal compact subgroup $K < G$ so that the Cartan decomposition $G = K(\exp \mathfrak{a}^+)K$ holds. Denote by $\mu : G \rightarrow \mathfrak{a}^+$ the Cartan projection, i.e., for $g \in G$, $\mu(g) \in \mathfrak{a}^+$ is the unique element such that $g \in K \exp \mu(g)K$. Denote by $\mathcal{L}_\Gamma \subset \mathfrak{a}^+$ the limit cone of Γ , which is the asymptotic cone of $\mu(\Gamma)$. The \mathfrak{a} -valued Busemann function $\beta : \mathcal{F} \times G \times G \rightarrow \mathfrak{a}$ is defined as follows: for $\xi \in \mathcal{F}$ and $g, h \in G$,

$$\beta_\xi(g, h) := \sigma(g^{-1}, \xi) - \sigma(h^{-1}, \xi) \quad (2.1)$$

where $\sigma(g^{-1}, \xi) \in \mathfrak{a}$ is defined by the relation $g^{-1}k \in K \exp(\sigma(g^{-1}, \xi))N$ for $\xi = kP$, $k \in K$.

The growth indicator function $\psi_\Gamma : \mathfrak{a}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ is defined as a homogeneous function, i.e., $\psi_\Gamma(tu) = t\psi_\Gamma(u)$ for all $t > 0$, such that for any unit vector $u \in \mathfrak{a}^+$,

$$\psi_\Gamma(u) := \inf_{u \in \mathcal{C}, \text{open cones } \mathcal{C} \subset \mathfrak{a}^+} \tau_{\mathcal{C}} \quad (2.2)$$

where $\tau_{\mathcal{C}}$ is the abscissa of convergence of $\sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma, \mu(\gamma) \in \mathcal{C}} e^{-t\|\mu(\gamma)\|}$ and the norm $\|\cdot\|$ on \mathfrak{a} is the one induced from the Killing form on \mathfrak{g} . Denote by $w_0 \in K$ a representative of the unique element of the Weyl group $N_K(A)/M$ such that $\text{Ad}_{w_0} \mathfrak{a}^+ = -\mathfrak{a}^+$. The opposition involution $i : \mathfrak{a} \rightarrow \mathfrak{a}$ is defined by $i(u) = -\text{Ad}_{w_0}(u)$. Note that i preserves $\text{int } \mathcal{L}_\Gamma$.

For $g \in G$, we set $g^+ = gP \in \mathcal{F}$ and $g^- = gw_0P \in \mathcal{F}$. Then map

$$gM \rightarrow (g^+, g^-, \beta_{g^+}(e, g))$$

gives a homeomorphism $G/M \simeq \mathcal{F}^{(2)} \times \mathfrak{a}$, called the Hopf parametrization of G/M .

The generalized BMS-measure m_{ν_1, ν_2} . For a pair of linear forms $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in \mathfrak{a}^*$ and a pair of (Γ, ψ_1) and (Γ, ψ_2) conformal measures ν_1 and ν_2 respectively, define a locally finite Borel measure \tilde{m}_{ν_1, ν_2} on G/M as follows: for $g = (g^+, g^-, b) \in \mathcal{F}^{(2)} \times \mathfrak{a}$,

$$d\tilde{m}_{\nu_1, \nu_2}(g) = e^{\psi_1(\beta_{g^+}(e, g)) + \psi_2(\beta_{g^-}(e, g))} d\nu_1(g^+)d\nu_2(g^-)db, \quad (2.3)$$

where $db = d\ell(b)$ is the Lebesgue measure on \mathfrak{a} . By abuse of notation, we also denote by \tilde{m}_{ν_1, ν_2} the M -invariant measure on G induced by \tilde{m}_{ν_1, ν_2} . This is always left Γ -invariant and we denote by m_{ν_1, ν_2} the M -invariant measure on $\Gamma \backslash G$ induced by \tilde{m}_{ν_1, ν_2} .

PS-measures on gN^\pm . Let $N^- = N$ and $N^+ = w_0 N w_0^{-1}$. To a given (Γ, ψ) -conformal measure ν and $g \in G$, we define the following associated measures on gN^\pm : for $n \in N^+$ and $h \in N^-$,

$$\begin{aligned} d\mu_{gN^+, \nu}(n) &:= e^{\psi(\beta_{(gn)^+}(e, gn))} d\nu((gn)^+), \text{ and} \\ d\mu_{gN^-, \nu}(h) &:= e^{\psi(\beta_{(gh)^-}(e, gh))} d\nu((gh)^-). \end{aligned}$$

Note that these are left Γ -invariant; for any $\gamma \in \Gamma$ and $g \in G$, $\mu_{\gamma g N^\pm, \nu} = \mu_{g N^\pm, \nu}$. For a given Borel subset $Y \subset \Gamma \backslash G$, define the measure $\mu_{gN^+, \nu}|_Y$ on N^+ by

$$d\mu_{gN^+, \nu}|_Y(n) = \mathbb{1}_Y([g]n) d\mu_{gN^+, \nu}(n);$$

note that here the notation $|_Y$ is purely symbolic, as $\mu_{gN^+, \nu}|_Y$ is not a measure on Y . Set $P^\pm := MAN^\pm$. The following were obtained in [4]:

Lemma 2.4. [4, Lem. 5.6, Cor. 5.7] *We have:*

- (1) For any fixed $\rho \in C_c(N^\pm)$ and $g \in G$, the map $N^\mp \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by $n \mapsto \mu_{gnN^\pm, \nu}(\rho)$ is continuous.
- (2) Given $\varepsilon > 0$ and $g \in G$, there exist $R > 1$ and a non-negative $\rho_{g, \varepsilon} \in C_c(N_R)$ such that $\mu_{gnN, \nu}(\rho_{g, \varepsilon}) > 0$ for all $n \in N_\varepsilon^+$.

Lemma 2.5. [4, Lem. 4.2] *For any $g \in G$, $a \in A$, $n_0, n \in N^+$, we have*

$$d\mu_{gN^+, \nu}(an_0na^{-1}) = e^{-\psi(\log a)} d\mu_{gan_0N^+, \nu}(n).$$

Lemma 2.6. [4, Lem. 4.4 and 4.5] *For $i = 1, 2$, let $\psi_i \in \mathfrak{a}^*$ and ν_i a (Γ, ψ_i) -conformal measure. Then*

- (1) For $g \in G$, $f \in C_c(gN^+P^-)$, and $nham \in N^+NAM$,

$$\tilde{m}_{\nu_1, \nu_2}(f) = \int_{N^+} \left(\int_{NAM} f(gnham) e^{(\psi_1 - \psi_2 \circ i)(\log a)} dm da d\mu_{gnN, \nu_2}(h) \right) d\mu_{\nu_1}(n).$$

- (2) For $g \in G$, $f \in C_c(gP^-N^+)$, and $hamn \in NAMN^+$,

$$\tilde{m}_{\nu_1, \nu_2}(f) = \int_{NAM} \left(\int_{N^+} f(ghamn) d\mu_{ghamN^+, \nu_1}(n) \right) e^{-\psi_2 \circ i(\log a)} dm da d\mu_{gN, \nu_2}(h).$$

Local mixing. Let P° denote the identity component of P and \mathfrak{Q}_Γ denote the set of all P° -minimal subsets of $\Gamma \backslash G$. While there exists a unique P -minimal subset of $\Gamma \backslash G$ given by $\{[g] \in \Gamma \backslash G : g^+ \in \Lambda\}$, there may be more than one P° -minimal subset. Note that $\#\mathfrak{Q}_\Gamma \leq [P : P^\circ]$.

We fix a unit vector $u \in \mathcal{L}_\Gamma \cap \text{int } \mathfrak{a}^+$, and set $a_t = \exp(tu)$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}$. For each $i = 1, 2$, we also fix a (Γ, ψ_i) -conformal measure ν_i on \mathcal{F} for $\psi_i \in \mathfrak{a}^*$.

In the rest of the section, we assume that the associated BMS-measure $\mathfrak{m} = m_{\nu_1, \nu_2}$ satisfies the local mixing property for the $\{\exp tu\}$ -action in the following sense: there exists a proper continuous function $\Psi : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ such that for all $f_1, f_2 \in C_c(\Gamma \backslash G)$,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \Psi(t) \int_{\Gamma \backslash G} f_1(xa_t) f_2(x) dm(x) = \sum_{Y \in \mathfrak{Q}_\Gamma} \mathfrak{m}|_Y(f_1) \mathfrak{m}|_Y(f_2). \quad (2.7)$$

The main goal in this section is to obtain the local mixing property for a generalized BMS-measure from that of \mathfrak{m} :

Theorem 2.8. *For $i = 1, 2$, let λ_i be a (Γ, φ_i) -conformal measure on \mathcal{F} for $\varphi_i \in \mathfrak{a}^*$. Then for all $f_1, f_2 \in C_c(\Gamma \backslash G)$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \Psi(t) e^{(\varphi_1 - \psi_1)(tu)} \int_{\Gamma \backslash G} f_1(xa_t) f_2(x) dm_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}(x) \\ = \sum_{Y \in \mathfrak{Y}_\Gamma} m_{\nu_1, \lambda_2}|_Y(f_1) m_{\lambda_1, \nu_2}|_Y(f_2). \end{aligned}$$

In order to do this, we first deduce equidistribution of translates of μ_{gN, ν_1} from the local mixing property of \mathfrak{m} (Proposition 2.9), and then convert this into equidistribution of translates of μ_{gN, λ_1} (Proposition 2.13). Let G_ε denote the ε -neighborhood of e in G . We also use the notation $S_\varepsilon := S \cap G_\varepsilon$ for any subset S of G .

Proposition 2.9. *For any $x = [g] \in \Gamma \backslash G$, $f \in C_c(\Gamma \backslash G)$, and $\phi \in C_c(N^+)$,*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Psi(t) \int_{N^+} f(xna_t) \phi(n) d\mu_{\nu_1}(n) = \sum_{Y \in \mathfrak{Y}_\Gamma} \mathfrak{m}|_Y(f) \mu_{gN^+, \nu_1}|_Y(\phi). \quad (2.10)$$

Proof. Let $x = [g]$, and $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ be such that $\phi \in C_c(N_{\varepsilon_0}^+)$. For simplicity of notation, we write $d\mu_{\nu_1} = d\mu_{gN^+, \nu_1}$ throughout the proof. By Lemma 2.4, we can choose $R > 0$ and a nonnegative $\rho_{g, \varepsilon_0} \in C_c(N_R)$ such that

$$\mu_{ghN, \nu_1}(\rho_{g, \varepsilon_0}) > 0 \quad \text{for all } h \in N_{\varepsilon_0}^+.$$

Given arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$, choose a non-negative function $q_\varepsilon \in C_c(A_\varepsilon M_\varepsilon)$ satisfying $\int_{AM} q_\varepsilon(am) da dm = 1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{N^+} f(xna_t) \phi(n) d\mu_{\nu_1}(n) &= \quad (2.11) \\ \int_{N^+} f(xna_t) \phi(n) \left(\frac{1}{\mu_{gnN, \nu_2}(\rho_{g, \varepsilon_0})} \int_{NA} \rho_{g, \varepsilon_0}(h) q_\varepsilon(am) da dm d\mu_{gnN, \nu_2}(h) \right) d\mu_{\nu_1}(n) \\ &= \int_{N^+} \left(\int_{NA} f(xna_t) \frac{\phi(n) \rho_{g, \varepsilon_0}(h) q_\varepsilon(am)}{\mu_{gnN, \nu_2}(\rho_{g, \varepsilon_0})} da dm d\mu_{gnN, \nu_2}(h) \right) d\mu_{\nu_1}(n). \end{aligned}$$

We now define $\tilde{\Phi}_\varepsilon \in C_c(gN_{\varepsilon_0}^+ N_R A_\varepsilon M_\varepsilon) \subset C_c(G)$ and $\Phi_\varepsilon \in C_c(\Gamma \backslash G)$ by

$$\tilde{\Phi}_\varepsilon(g_0) := \begin{cases} \frac{\phi(n) \rho_{g, \varepsilon_0}(h) q_\varepsilon(am)}{\mu_{gnN, \nu_2}(\rho_{g, \varepsilon_0})} & \text{if } g_0 = gnham, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and $\Phi_\varepsilon([g_0]) := \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \tilde{\Phi}_\varepsilon(\gamma g_0)$. Note that the continuity of $\tilde{\Phi}_\varepsilon$ follows from Lemma 2.4. We now assume without loss of generality $f \geq 0$ and define, for all $\varepsilon > 0$, functions f_ε^\pm as follows: for all $z \in \Gamma \backslash G$,

$$f_\varepsilon^+(z) := \sup_{b \in N_\varepsilon^+ N_\varepsilon A_\varepsilon M_\varepsilon} f(zb) \quad \text{and} \quad f_\varepsilon^-(z) := \inf_{b \in N_\varepsilon^+ N_\varepsilon A_\varepsilon M_\varepsilon} f(zb).$$

Since $u \in \text{int } \mathfrak{a}^+$, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $t_0(R, \varepsilon) > 0$ such that

$$a_t^{-1} N_R^+ a_t \subset N_\varepsilon \quad \text{for all } t \geq t_0(R, \varepsilon).$$

Then, as $\text{supp}(\tilde{\Phi}_\varepsilon) \subset gN_{\varepsilon_0}^+ N_R A_\varepsilon M_\varepsilon$, we have

$$f(xna_t)\tilde{\Phi}_\varepsilon(gnham) \leq f_{3\varepsilon}^+(xnham a_t)\tilde{\Phi}_\varepsilon(gnham) \quad (2.12)$$

for all $nham \in NN^+AM$ and $t \geq t_0(R, \varepsilon)$. We now use $f_{3\varepsilon}^+$ to give an upper bound on the limit we are interested in; $f_{3\varepsilon}^-$ is used in an analogous way to provide a lower bound. Entering the definition of $\tilde{\Phi}_\varepsilon$ and the above inequality (2.12) into (2.11) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Psi(t) \int_{N^+} f(xna_t)\phi(n) d\mu_{\nu_1}(n) &\leq \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Psi(t) \\ &\int_{N^+} \int_{NAM} f_{3\varepsilon}^+(xnham a_t)\tilde{\Phi}_\varepsilon(gnham) dm da d\mu_{gnN, \nu_2}(h) d\mu_{\nu_1}(n) \\ &\leq \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Psi(t) e^{\varepsilon\|\psi_1 - \psi_2\text{oi}\|} \int_{N^+} \int_{NAM} f_{3\varepsilon}^+(xnham a_t)\tilde{\Phi}_\varepsilon(gnham) \\ &\quad e^{(\psi_1 - \psi_2\text{oi})(\log a)} dm da d\mu_{gnN, \nu_2}(h) d\mu_{\nu_1}(n) \\ &= \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Psi(t) e^{\varepsilon\|\psi_1 - \psi_2\text{oi}\|} \int_G f_{3\varepsilon}^+([g_0]a_t)\tilde{\Phi}_\varepsilon(g_0) d\tilde{m}(g_0) \\ &= \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Psi(t) e^{\varepsilon\|\psi_1 - \psi_2\text{oi}\|} \int_{\Gamma \backslash G} f_{3\varepsilon}^+([g_0]a_t)\tilde{\Phi}_\varepsilon([g_0]) dm([g_0]), \end{aligned}$$

where Lemma 2.6 was used in the second to last line of the above calculation. By the standing assumption (2.7), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Psi(t) \int_N f(xna_t)\phi(n) d\mu_{gN, \nu_2}(n) &\leq e^{\varepsilon\|\psi_1 - \psi_2\text{oi}\|} \sum_{Y \in \mathfrak{Y}_\Gamma} \mathfrak{m}|_Y(f_{3\varepsilon}^+) \mathfrak{m}|_Y(\tilde{\Phi}_\varepsilon) \\ &= e^{\varepsilon\|\psi_1 - \psi_2\text{oi}\|} \sum_{Y \in \mathfrak{Y}_\Gamma} \mathfrak{m}|_Y(f_{3\varepsilon}^+) \tilde{\mathfrak{m}}|_{\tilde{Y}}(\tilde{\Phi}_\varepsilon), \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{Y} \subset G$ is a Γ -invariant lift of Y . Using Lemma 2.6, for all $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\tilde{\mathfrak{m}}|_{\tilde{Y}}(\tilde{\Phi}_\varepsilon) \\ &= \int_{N^+} \left(\int_{NAM} \tilde{\Phi}_\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{Y}}(gnham) e^{(\psi_1 - \psi_2\text{oi})(\log a)} da dm d\mu_{gnN, \nu_2}(h) \right) d\mu_{\nu_1}(n) \leq \\ &e^{\varepsilon\|\psi_1 - \psi_2\text{oi}\|} \int_{N^+} \frac{\phi(n) \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{Y}}(gn)}{\mu_{gnN, \nu_2}(\rho_{g, \varepsilon_0})} \left(\int_{NAM} \rho_{g, \varepsilon_0}(h) q_\varepsilon(am) da dm d\mu_{gnN, \nu_2}(h) \right) d\mu_{\nu_1}(n) \\ &\leq e^{\varepsilon\|\psi_1 - \psi_2\text{oi}\|} \mu_{\nu_1}|_Y(\phi), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that \tilde{Y} is invariant under the right translation of identity component M° of M . Since $\varepsilon > 0$ was arbitrary, taking $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ gives

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Psi(t) \int_{N^+} f(xna_t) \phi(n) d\mu_{\nu_1}(n) \leq \sum_{Y \in \mathfrak{Y}_\Gamma} \mathfrak{m}|_Y(f) \mu_{\nu_1}|_Y(\phi).$$

The lower bound given by replacing $f_{3\varepsilon}^+$ with $f_{3\varepsilon}^-$ in the above calculations completes the proof. \square

Proposition 2.13. *For any $x = [g] \in \Gamma \backslash G$, $f \in C_c(\Gamma \backslash G)$ and $\phi \in C_c(N)$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Psi(t) e^{(\varphi_1 - \psi_1)(tu)} \int_{N^+} f(xna_t) \phi(n) d\mu_{\lambda_1}(n) \\ = \sum_{Y \in \mathfrak{Y}_\Gamma} m_{\lambda_1, \nu_2}|_Y(f) \mu_{gN^+, \nu_1}|_Y(\phi). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. For $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, set $\mathcal{B}_{\varepsilon_0} = N_{\varepsilon_0} A_{\varepsilon_0} M_{\varepsilon_0} N_{\varepsilon_0}^+$. Given $x_0 \in \Gamma \backslash G$, let $\varepsilon_0(x_0)$ denote the maximum number r such that the map $G \rightarrow \Gamma \backslash G$ given by $h \mapsto x_0 h$ for $h \in G$ is injective on \mathcal{B}_r . By using a partition of unity if necessary, it suffices to prove that for any $x_0 \in \Gamma \backslash G$ and $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(x_0)$, the claims of the proposition hold for any non-negative $f \in C(x_0 \mathcal{B}_{\varepsilon_0})$, non-negative $\phi \in C(N_{\varepsilon_0}^+)$, and $x = [g] \in x_0 \mathcal{B}_{\varepsilon_0}$. Moreover, we may assume that f is given as

$$f([g]) = \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \tilde{f}(\gamma g) \quad \text{for all } g \in G,$$

for some non-negative $\tilde{f} \in C_c(g_0 \mathcal{B}_{\varepsilon_0})$. For simplicity of notation, we write $\mu_{\lambda_1} = \mu_{gN^+, \lambda_1}$. Note that for $x = [g] \in [g_0] \mathcal{B}_{\varepsilon_0}$,

$$\int_{N^+} f([g]na_t) \phi(n) d\mu_{\lambda_1}(n) = \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \int_{N^+} \tilde{f}(\gamma gna_t) \phi(n) d\mu_{\lambda_1}(n). \quad (2.14)$$

Note that $\tilde{f}(\gamma gna_t) = 0$ unless $\gamma gna_t \in g_0 \mathcal{B}_{\varepsilon_0}$. Together with the fact that $\text{supp}(\phi) \subset N_{\varepsilon_0}$, it follows that the summands in (2.14) are non-zero for only finitely many elements $\gamma \in \Gamma \cap g_0 \mathcal{B}_{\varepsilon_0} a_{-t} N_{\varepsilon_0}^+ g^{-1}$.

Suppose $\gamma g N_{\varepsilon_0}^+ a_t \cap g_0 \mathcal{B}_{\varepsilon_0} \neq \emptyset$. Then $\gamma ga_t \in g_0 N_{\varepsilon_0} A_{\varepsilon_0} M_{\varepsilon_0} N^+$, and there are unique elements $p_{t, \gamma} \in N_{\varepsilon_0} A_{\varepsilon_0} M_{\varepsilon_0}$ and $n_{t, \gamma} \in N^+$ such that

$$\gamma ga_t = g_0 p_{t, \gamma} n_{t, \gamma} \in g_0 P_{\varepsilon_0} N^+.$$

Let Γ_t denote the subset $\Gamma \cap g_0 (N_{\varepsilon_0} A_{\varepsilon_0} M_{\varepsilon_0} N^+) a_t^{-1} g^{-1}$. Note that although Γ_t may possibly be infinite, only finitely many of the terms in the sums we

consider will be non-zero. This together with Lemma 2.5 gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{N^+} f([g]na_t)\phi(n) d\mu_{\lambda_1}(n) &= \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \int_{N^+} \tilde{f}(\gamma gna_t)\phi(n) d\mu_{\lambda_1}(n) \\
&= \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_t} \int_{N^+} \tilde{f}(\gamma ga_t(a_t^{-1}na_t))\phi(n) d\mu_{\lambda_1}(n) \\
&= e^{-\varphi_1(\log a_t)} \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_t} \int_{N^+} \tilde{f}(\gamma ga_t n)\phi(a_t na_t^{-1}) d\mu_{\lambda_1}(n) \\
&= e^{-\varphi_1(\log a_t)} \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_t} \int_{N^+} \tilde{f}(g_0 p_{t,\gamma} n_{t,\gamma} n)\phi(a_t na_t^{-1}) d\mu_{\lambda_1}(n) \\
&= e^{-\varphi_1(\log a_t)} \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_t} \int_{N^+} \tilde{f}(g_0 p_{t,\gamma} n)\phi(a_t n_{t,\gamma}^{-1} n a_t^{-1}) d\mu_{\lambda_1}(n).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\text{supp}(\tilde{f}) \subset g_0 \mathcal{B}_{\varepsilon_0}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_t} \int_{N^+} \tilde{f}(g_0 p_{t,\gamma} n)\phi(a_t n_{t,\gamma}^{-1} n a_t^{-1}) d\mu_{\lambda_1}(n) \\
&\leq \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_t} \left(\sup_{n \in N_{\varepsilon_0}^+} \phi(a_t n_{t,\gamma}^{-1} a_t^{-1} (a_t na_t^{-1})) \right) \cdot \int_{N^+} \tilde{f}(g_0 p_{t,\gamma} n) d\mu_{\lambda_1}(n).
\end{aligned}$$

Since u belongs to $\text{int } \mathcal{L}_\Gamma$, there exist $t_0 > 0$ and $\alpha > 0$ such that

$$a_t N_r^+ a_t^{-1} \subset N_{re^{-\alpha t}}^+ \quad \text{for all } r > 0 \text{ and } t > t_0.$$

Therefore, for all $n \in N_{\varepsilon_0}^+$ and $t > t_0$, we have

$$\phi(a_t n_{t,\gamma}^{-1} a_t^{-1} (a_t na_t^{-1})) \leq \phi_{\varepsilon_0 e^{-\alpha t}}^+(a_t n_{t,\gamma}^{-1} a_t^{-1}), \quad (2.15)$$

where

$$\phi_\varepsilon^+(n) := \sup_{b \in N_\varepsilon^+} \phi(nb) \quad \text{for all } n \in N^+, \varepsilon > 0.$$

We now have the following inequality for $t > t_0$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&e^{\varphi_1(\log a_t)} \int_{N^+} f([g]na_t)\phi(n) d\mu_{\lambda_1}(n) \\
&\leq \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_t} \phi_{\varepsilon_0 e^{-\alpha t}}^+(a_t n_{t,\gamma}^{-1} a_t^{-1}) \int_{N_{\varepsilon_0}^+} \tilde{f}(g_0 p_{t,\gamma} n) d\mu_{\lambda_1}(n). \quad (2.16)
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.4, we can now choose $R > 0$ and $\rho \in C_c(N_R^+)$ such that $\rho(n) \geq 0$ for all $n \in N^+$, and $\mu_{g_0 p N^+, \nu_1}(\rho) > 0$ for all $p \in N_{\varepsilon_0} A_{\varepsilon_0} M_{\varepsilon_0}$. Define $\tilde{F} \in C_c(g_0 N_{\varepsilon_0} A_{\varepsilon_0} M_{\varepsilon_0} N_R^+)$ by

$$\tilde{F}(g) = \frac{\rho(n)}{\mu_{g_0 p N^+, \nu_1}(\rho)} \int_{N_{\varepsilon_0}^+} \tilde{f}(g_0 p v) d\mu_{g_0 p N^+, \lambda_1}(v)$$

if $g = g_0pn \in g_0N_{\varepsilon_0}A_{\varepsilon_0}M_{\varepsilon_0}N_R^+$, and $\tilde{F}(g) = 0$ otherwise. The key property of \tilde{F} we will use is the following: for all $p \in P_{\varepsilon_0}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{N^+} \tilde{F}(g_0pn) d\mu_{g_0pN^+, \nu_1}(n) &= \int_{N_R^+} \tilde{F}(g_0pn) d\mu_{g_0pN^+, \nu_1}(n) \\ &= \int_{N_{\varepsilon_0}^+} \tilde{f}(g_0pn) d\mu_{g_0pN^+, \lambda_1}(n). \end{aligned}$$

Returning to (2.16), we now give an upper bound. We observe:

$$\begin{aligned} &e^{\varphi_1(\log a_t)} \int_{N^+} f([g]na_t)\phi(n) d\mu_{\lambda_1}(n) \\ &\leq \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_t} \phi_{\varepsilon_0}^+ e^{-\alpha t} (a_t n_{t,\gamma}^{-1} a_t^{-1}) \int_{N_{\varepsilon_0}^+} \tilde{f}(g_0p_{t,\gamma}n) d\mu_{\lambda_1}(n) \\ &= \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_t} \phi_{\varepsilon_0}^+ e^{-\alpha t} (a_t n_{t,\gamma}^{-1} a_t^{-1}) \int_{N_R^+} \tilde{F}(g_0p_{t,\gamma}n) d\mu_{g_0p_{t,\gamma}N^+, \nu_1}(n) \\ &= \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_t} \int_{N_R^+} \tilde{F}(g_0p_{t,\gamma}n) \phi_{\varepsilon_0}^+ e^{-\alpha t} (a_t n_{t,\gamma}^{-1} a_t^{-1}) d\mu_{g_0p_{t,\gamma}N^+, \nu_1}(n). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly as before, we have, for all $t > t_0$ and $n \in N_R^+$,

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{\varepsilon_0}^+ e^{-\alpha t} (a_t n_{t,\gamma}^{-1} a_t^{-1}) &= \phi_{\varepsilon_0}^+ e^{-\alpha t} (a_t n_{t,\gamma}^{-1} n(n)^{-1} a_t^{-1}) \\ &\leq \phi_{(R+\varepsilon_0)}^+ e^{-\alpha t} (a_t n_{t,\gamma}^{-1} n a_t^{-1}). \end{aligned} \quad (2.17)$$

Hence (2.16) is bounded above by

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_t} \int_{N_R^+} \tilde{F}(g_0p_{t,\gamma}n) \phi_{(R+\varepsilon_0)}^+ e^{-\alpha t} (a_t n_{t,\gamma}^{-1} n a_t^{-1}) d\mu_{g_0p_{t,\gamma}N^+, \nu_1}(n) \\ &= \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_t} \int_{N^+} \tilde{F}(g_0p_{t,\gamma}n_{t,\gamma}a_t^{-1}na_t) \phi_{(R+\varepsilon_0)}^+ e^{-\alpha t}(n) d\mu_{g_0p_{t,\gamma}N^+, \nu_1}(n_{t,\gamma}a_t^{-1}na_t). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.5,

$$d\mu_{g_0p_{t,\gamma}N^+, \nu_1}(n_{t,\gamma}a_t^{-1}na_t) = e^{\psi_1(\log a_t)} d\mu_{g_0p_{t,\gamma}n_{t,\gamma}a_t^{-1}N^+, \nu_1}(n).$$

Since $g_0p_{t,\gamma}n_{t,\gamma}a_t^{-1} = \gamma g$, it follows that for all $t > t_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} &e^{(\varphi_1 - \psi_1)(\log a_t)} \int_{N^+} f([g]na_t)\phi(n) d\mu_{\lambda_1}(n) \\ &\leq \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_t} \int_{N^+} \tilde{F}(\gamma gna_t) \phi_{(R+\varepsilon_0)}^+ e^{-\alpha t}(n) d\mu_{\gamma gN^+, \nu_1}(n) \\ &\leq \int_{N^+} \left(\sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \tilde{F}(\gamma gna_t) \right) \phi_{(R+\varepsilon_0)}^+ e^{-\alpha t}(n) d\mu_{\nu_1}(n). \end{aligned}$$

Define a function F on $\Gamma \backslash G$ by

$$F([g]) := \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \tilde{F}(\gamma g).$$

Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and for all $t > t_0$ such that $(R + \varepsilon_0)e^{-\alpha t} \leq \varepsilon$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(t)e^{(\varphi_1 - \psi_1)(\log at)} \int_{N^+} f([g]na_t)\phi(n) d\mu_{\lambda_1}(n) \\ \leq \Psi(t) \int_{N^+} F([g]na_t)\phi_\varepsilon^+(n) d\mu_{\nu_1}(n). \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 2.9, letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ gives

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Psi(t)e^{(\varphi_1 - \psi_1)(\log at)} \int_{N^+} f([g]na_t)\phi(n) d\mu_{\lambda_1}(n) \leq \sum_{Y \in \mathfrak{Y}_\Gamma} m|_Y(F) \mu_{\nu_1}|_Y(\phi).$$

By the definition of F , together with Lemma 2.6, we have

$$\begin{aligned} m|_Y(F) &= \tilde{m}|_{\tilde{Y}}(\tilde{F}) \\ &= \int_P \left(\int_{N^+} \tilde{F} \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{Y}}(g_0 hamn) d\mu_{g_0 ham N^+, \nu_1}^{\text{PS}}(n) \right) e^{-\psi_2 \text{oi}(\log a)} dm da d\mu_{g_0 N, \nu_2}(h) \\ &= \int_P \left(\int_{N^+} \tilde{f} \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{Y}}(g_0 hamn) d\mu_{g_0 ham N^+, \lambda_1}(n) \right) e^{-\psi_2 \text{oi}(\log a)} dm da d\mu_{g_0 N, \nu_2}(h) \\ &= \tilde{m}_{\lambda_1, \nu_2}|_{\tilde{Y}}(\tilde{f}) = m_{\lambda_1, \nu_2}|_Y(f). \end{aligned}$$

This gives the desired upper bound. The lower bound can be obtained similarly, finishing the proof. \square

With the help of Proposition 2.9, we are now ready for

Proof of Theorem 2.8. By the compactness hypothesis on the supports of f_i , we can find $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ and $x_i \in \Gamma \backslash G$, $i = 1, \dots, \ell$ such that the map $G \rightarrow \Gamma \backslash G$ given by $g \rightarrow x_i g$ is injective on $R_{\varepsilon_0} = N_{\varepsilon_0}^- A_{\varepsilon_0} M_{\varepsilon_0} N_{\varepsilon_0}^+$, and $\bigcup_{i=1}^{\ell} x_i R_{\varepsilon_0/2}$ contains both $\text{supp } f_1$ and $\text{supp } f_2$. We use continuous partitions of unity to write f_1 and f_2 as finite sums $f_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} f_{1,i}$ and $f_2 = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} f_{2,j}$ with $\text{supp } f_{1,i} \subset x_i R_{\varepsilon_0/2}$ and $\text{supp } f_{2,j} \subset x_j R_{\varepsilon_0/2}$. Writing $p = ham \in NAM$ and using Lemma 2.6,

$$dm_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}(hamn) = d\mu_{ham N^+, \lambda_1}(n) e^{-\psi_2 \text{oi}(\log a)} dm da d\mu_{N, \lambda_2}(h).$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Gamma \backslash G} f_1(xa_t) f_2(x) dm_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}(x) = \\
& \sum_{i,j} \int_{R_{\varepsilon_0}} f_{1,i}(x_j p n a_t) f_{2,j}(x_j p n) d\mu_{hamN^+, \lambda_1}(n) e^{-\psi_2 \circ i(\log a)} dm da d\mu_{N, \lambda_2}(h) \\
& = \sum_{i,j} \int_{N_{\varepsilon_0} A_{\varepsilon_0} M_{\varepsilon_0}} \left(\int_{N_{\varepsilon_0}^+} f_{1,i}(x_j p n a_t) f_{2,j}(x_j p n) d\mu_{hamN^+, \lambda_1}(n) \right) \\
& \quad \times e^{-\psi_2 \circ i(\log a)} dm da d\mu_{N, \lambda_2}(h).
\end{aligned} \tag{2.18}$$

Applying Proposition 2.13, it follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Psi(t) e^{(\varphi_1 - \psi_1)(\log a_t)} \int_{\Gamma \backslash G} f_1(xa_t) f_2(x) dm_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}(x) \\
& = \sum_j \sum_{Y \in \mathfrak{Y}_\Gamma} m_{\lambda_1, \nu_2|Y}(f_{2,j}) \sum_i \int_{N_{\varepsilon_0} A_{\varepsilon_0} M_{\varepsilon_0}} \mu_{x_i p N^+, \nu_1|Y}(f_{1,i}(x_j p \cdot)) \\
& \quad e^{-\psi_2 \circ i(\log a)} dm da d\mu_{N, \lambda_2}(h) \\
& = \sum_{Y \in \mathfrak{Y}_\Gamma} m_{\lambda_1, \nu_2|Y}(f_2) \sum_i \int_{N_{\varepsilon_0} A_{\varepsilon_0} M_{\varepsilon_0}} \mu_{x_i p N^+, \nu_1}(f_{1,i} \mathbb{1}_Y(x_j p \cdot)) \\
& \quad e^{-\psi_2 \circ i(\log a)} dm da d\mu_{N, \lambda_2}(h) \\
& = \sum_{Y \in \mathfrak{Y}_\Gamma} m_{\lambda_1, \nu_2|Y}(f_2) \sum_i m_{\nu_1, \lambda_2}(f_{1,i} \mathbb{1}_Y) = \sum_{Y \in \mathfrak{Y}_\Gamma} m_{\nu_1, \lambda_2|Y}(f_1) m_{\lambda_1, \nu_2|Y}(f_2)
\end{aligned}$$

where the second last equality is valid by Lemma 2.6. This completes the proof. \square

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.4

Let $\Gamma < G$ be a Zariski dense Anosov subgroup with respect to P .

u -balanced measures. Fix $u \in \text{int } \mathcal{L}_\Gamma$. There exists a unique $\psi \in D_\Gamma^*$ such that $\psi(u) = \psi_\Gamma(u)$ [6, Prop. 4.4]. Let ν_ψ denote the unique (Γ, ψ) -PS measure [6, Thm. 1.3]. Similarly, $\nu_{\psi \circ i}$ denotes the unique $(\Gamma, \psi \circ i)$ -PS-measure.

We recall the following theorem of Chow and Sarkar:

Theorem 3.1. [3] *There exists $\kappa_u > 0$ such that for any $f_1, f_2 \in C_c(\Gamma \backslash G)$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} t^{(r-1)/2} \int_{\Gamma \backslash G} f_1(x \exp(tu)) f_2(x) dm_{\nu_\psi, \nu_{\psi \circ i}}(x) \\
& = \kappa_u \sum_{Y \in \mathfrak{Y}_\Gamma} m_{\nu_\psi, \nu_{\psi \circ i}|Y}(f_1) m_{\nu_\psi, \nu_{\psi \circ i}|Y}(f_2).
\end{aligned}$$

Following [2], we say that a locally finite Borel measure m on $\Gamma \backslash G$ is u -balanced if

$$\limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\int_0^T m(\mathcal{O}_1 \cap \mathcal{O}_1 \exp(tu)) dt}{\int_0^T m(\mathcal{O}_2 \cap \mathcal{O}_2 \exp(tu)) dt} < \infty,$$

for all bounded Borel subsets $\mathcal{O}_i \subset \Gamma \backslash G$ with $m(\text{int } \mathcal{O}_i) > 0$.

By Theorems 3.1 and 2.8, we get

Theorem 3.2 (Local mixing). *For $i = 1, 2$, let λ_{φ_i} be any (Γ, φ_i) -conformal measure on \mathcal{F} . For any $f_1, f_2 \in C_c(\Gamma \backslash G)$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} t^{(r-1)/2} e^{(\varphi_1 - \psi)(tu)} \int_{\Gamma \backslash G} f_1(x \exp(tu)) f_2(x) dm_{\lambda_{\varphi_1}, \lambda_{\varphi_2}}(x) \\ = \kappa_u \sum_{Y \in \mathfrak{Y}_\Gamma} m_{\nu_\psi, \lambda_{\varphi_2}}|_Y(f_1) m_{\lambda_{\varphi_1}, \nu_{\psi \circ i}}|_Y(f_2) \end{aligned}$$

where κ_u is as in Theorem 3.1. In particular, $m_{\lambda_{\varphi_1}, \lambda_{\varphi_2}}$ is u -balanced.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. The main ingredient is the higher rank Hopf-Tsuji-Sullivan dichotomy established in [2]. The main point is that all seven conditions of Theorem 1.4 of [2] are equivalent to each other for Anosov groups and $u \in \text{int } \mathcal{L}_\Gamma$, since all the measures considered there are u -balanced by Theorem 3.2. For the proof of Theorem 1.4, we only need the equivalence of (6) and (7), which we now recall.

Consider the following u -directional conical limit set of Γ :

$$\Lambda_u := \{g^+ \in \Lambda : \gamma_i \exp(t_i u) \text{ is bounded for some } t_i \rightarrow +\infty \text{ and } \gamma_i \in \Gamma\}. \quad (3.3)$$

Applying the dichotomy [2, Thm. 1.4] to a u -balanced measure $m_{\lambda_\psi, \nu_{\psi \circ i}}$, we deduce

Proposition 3.4. *Let $\psi \in D_\Gamma^*$ be such that $\psi(u) = \psi_\Gamma(u)$ for $u \in \text{int } \mathcal{L}_\Gamma$. The following conditions are equivalent for any (Γ, ψ) -conformal measure λ_ψ on \mathcal{F} :*

- (1) $\lambda_\psi(\Lambda_u) = 1$;
- (2) $\sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_{u,R}} e^{-\psi(\mu(\gamma))} = \infty$ for some $R > 0$

where $\Gamma_{u,R} := \{\gamma \in \Gamma : \|\mu(\gamma) - \mathbb{R}u\| < R\}$.

On the other hand, if $\text{rank } G \leq 3$, we have

$$\sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_{u,R}} e^{-\psi(\mu(\gamma))} = \infty$$

for some $R > 0$ [2, Thm. 6.3]. Therefore, by Proposition 3.4, we have $\lambda_\psi(\Lambda_u) = 1$ and hence λ_ψ is supported on Λ in this case. This finishes the proof of the first part of Theorem 1.4. The second claim follows from the first one by [6, Thm. 1.3].

REFERENCES

- [1] Y. Benoist. *Propriétés asymptotiques des groupes linéaires*. *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 7 (1997), no. 1, 1–47.
- [2] M. Burger, O. Landesberg, M. Lee and H. Oh. *The Hopf-Tsuji-Sullivan dichotomy for Anosov groups in low and high rank*. Preprint, arXiv:2105.13930.
- [3] M. Chow and P. Sarkar. *Local mixing of one-parameter diagonal flows on Anosov homogeneous spaces*. Preprint, arXiv:2105.11377.
- [4] S. Edwards, M. Lee and H. Oh. *Anosov groups: local mixing, counting, and equidistribution*. Preprint, arXiv:2003.14277, to appear in *Geometry & Topology*.
- [5] O. Guichard and A. Wienhard. *Anosov representations: Domains of discontinuity and applications*. *Inventiones Math.*, Volume 190, Issue 2 (2012), 357–438.
- [6] M. Lee and H. Oh. *Invariant measures for horospherical actions and Anosov groups*. Preprint, arXiv:2008.05296.
- [7] M. Lee and H. Oh. *Ergodic decompositions of geometric measures on Anosov homogeneous spaces*. Preprint, arXiv:2010.11337.
- [8] S. Patterson. *The limit set of a Fuchsian group*. *Acta Math.* 136 (1976), 241–273.
- [9] G. Prasad. *\mathbb{R} -regular elements in Zariski dense subgroups*. *Oxford quarterly journal of mathematics* 45 (1994), 541–545.
- [10] J.-F. Quint. *Divergence exponentielle des sous-groupes discrets en rang supérieur*. *Comment. Math. Helv.* 77 (2002), no. 3, 563–608.
- [11] J.-F. Quint. *Mesures de Patterson-Sullivan en rang supérieur*. *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 12 (2002), no. 4, 776–809.
- [12] D. Sullivan. *The density at infinity of a discrete group of hyperbolic motions*. *Publ. IHES.* No. 50 (1979), 171–202.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF BRISTOL, BS8 1QU, BRISTOL

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY, PRINCETON, NJ 08540

MATHEMATICS DEPARTMENT, YALE UNIVERSITY, NEW HAVEN, CT 06520

Email address: samuel.edwards@bristol.ac.uk

Email address: minju@ias.edu

Email address: hee.oh@yale.edu