

# Winding of geodesic rays chosen by a harmonic measure

Timothée Bénard\*

## Abstract

We prove limit theorems for the homological winding of geodesic rays distributed via a harmonic measure on a Gromov hyperbolic space. We obtain applications to the inverse problem for the harmonic measure, and winding statistics for Patterson-Sullivan measures.

## Contents

|          |  |           |
|----------|--|-----------|
| <b>1</b> | <b>Introduction</b>                                    | <b>2</b>  |
| 1.1      | The inverse problem for the harmonic measure . . . . . | 2         |
| 1.2      | Homological winding of $\nu$ -typical rays . . . . .   | 4         |
| 1.3      | Winding of Patterson-Sullivan measures . . . . .       | 8         |
| 1.4      | Strategy and organization of the paper . . . . .       | 9         |
| <b>2</b> | <b>Geodesic tracking of sample paths</b>               | <b>10</b> |
| <b>3</b> | <b>The norm and the Busemann cocycle</b>               | <b>12</b> |
| 3.1      | Busemann cocycle . . . . .                             | 12        |
| 3.2      | Exit estimates for the norm . . . . .                  | 14        |
| <b>4</b> | <b>Limit laws for geodesic rays</b>                    | <b>14</b> |
| 4.1      | Law of large numbers . . . . .                         | 14        |
| 4.2      | Central limit theorem . . . . .                        | 15        |
| 4.3      | The covariance matrix . . . . .                        | 17        |
| 4.4      | Law of the iterated logarithm . . . . .                | 18        |
| 4.5      | Principle of large deviations . . . . .                | 19        |
| 4.6      | Gambler's ruin . . . . .                               | 19        |
| <b>5</b> | <b>Winding and Patterson-Sullivan measures</b>         | <b>20</b> |
| 5.1      | Winding on convex cocompact manifolds . . . . .        | 21        |
| 5.2      | Singularity of harmonic measures . . . . .             | 24        |
| <b>6</b> | <b>Open questions</b>                                  | <b>25</b> |

---

\*The author has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No. 803711).

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>A Appendix : General limit laws for cocycles</b> | <b>26</b> |
| A.1 Central limit theorem . . . . .                 | 26        |
| A.2 Law of the iterated logarithm . . . . .         | 29        |
| A.3 Principle of large deviations . . . . .         | 34        |
| A.4 Gambler's ruin . . . . .                        | 34        |
| A.5 Exit estimates for drifting cocycles . . . . .  | 36        |

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 The inverse problem for the harmonic measure

Let  $\Omega$  be a proper geodesic hyperbolic metric space endowed with a basepoint  $o$ , and  $\Gamma$  be a finitely generated subgroup of isometries of  $\Omega$ . Given a non-elementary probability measure  $\mu$  on  $\Gamma$ , it is known that for  $\mu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}^*}$ -almost every  $b = (b_i)_{i \geq 1} \in \Gamma^{\mathbb{N}^*}$ , the sample path  $(b_1 \dots b_n \cdot o)_{n \geq 0}$  on  $\Omega$  converges to a point  $\xi_b$  in the Gromov boundary  $\partial\Omega$ . The distribution  $\nu$  of the exit point  $\xi_b$  is called the *harmonic measure* or the *Furstenberg measure* of generator  $\mu$ . It is the only probability measure on  $\partial\Omega$  satisfying the stationarity equation

$$\mu * \nu = \nu$$

The properties of regularity of  $\nu$  are very much studied [30, 45] [34, 43, 44] [11, 9], and can be used to describe the asymptotic properties of  $\mu$ -sample paths on  $\Omega$  [8, 33, 7, 45].

The motivation of this text is to address the following inverse problem for the harmonic measure:

*How much information on  $\mu$  can be read in (the measure class of) its harmonic measure  $\nu$  on the boundary?*

We will shed some light on this question by examining the homological winding of  $\nu$ -typical geodesic rays on  $\Gamma \backslash \Omega$ . As the statement of the main result requires a rather substantial introduction, we start with a few remarkable corollaries. The main result, as well as standard terminology concerning  $\mu$ , are presented in Section 1.2.

**(I) Expectation and covariance of  $\mu_{ab}$ .** In the context of random walks on hyperbolic groups, we see that  $\nu$  informs on the half lines spanned by the expectation and the covariance of  $\mu$  in the abelianization.

**Corollary 1.1.** *Let  $(\Gamma, d_\Gamma)$  be a word hyperbolic group equipped with a word metric,  $\mu$  a non-elementary measure on  $\Gamma$ , and  $\nu$  its harmonic measure on the Gromov boundary  $\partial\Gamma$ . Write  $H_\Gamma$  the torsion-free part of the abelianization of  $\Gamma$ , and  $\mu_{ab}$  the projection of  $\mu$  to  $H_\Gamma$ .*

- *If  $\mu$  has finite first moment, then the measure class of  $\nu$  determines*

$$\lambda_\mu^{-1} \mathbb{E}(\mu_{ab})$$

*where  $\lambda_\mu > 0$  is the rate of escape of the  $\mu$ -walk on  $(\Gamma, d_\Gamma)$ .*

- If  $\mu$  has finite second moment and centred projection to  $H_\Gamma$ , then the measure class of  $\nu$  determines

$$\lambda_\mu^{-1} \text{Cov}(\mu_{ab})$$

In the above statement,  $\mathbb{E}(\mu_{ab}), \text{Cov}(\mu_{ab})$  are respectively the expectation and the covariance of  $\mu_{ab}$  in the real vector space spanned by the free abelian group  $H_\Gamma$ . These quantities would not make sense on the torsion part of  $\Gamma/[\Gamma, \Gamma]$ .

It is remarkable that this formula links objects which have very different origins. The rate of escape  $\lambda_\mu$  arises from hyperbolicity, and depends strongly on the word distance  $d_\Gamma$  on  $\Gamma$ . In contrast,  $\mu_{ab}$  is independent from the metric and lives in a commutative setting.

Corollary 1.1 is a direct consequence of Theorem 1.4 below and the formulas for the drift and the limit covariance.

**(II) Non-centred walks are singular at infinity.** Assume  $\Omega$  is the real hyperbolic space  $\mathbb{H}^N$  of dimension  $N \geq 2$ , and  $\Gamma$  is convex cocompact. An established question is to understand the properties of measures  $\mu$  for which  $\nu$  is in the class of Patterson-Sullivan on  $\partial\mathbb{H}^N$ . Note that such measures do exist by a result of Connell-Muchnik [16], and can even be chosen with finite exponential moment by results of Lalley and Li [41, 46]. An active conjecture, commonly attributed to Kaimanovich-Le Prince, states that  $\mu$  cannot be finitely supported [36, 39, 40]. We prove here that  $\mu$  must be centred.

**Corollary 1.2.** *Let  $\Gamma \leq \text{Isom}^+(\mathbb{H}^N)$  be convex cocompact,  $\mu$  a non-elementary probability measure on  $\Gamma$  with finite first moment in a word metric. If the harmonic measure of  $\mu$  is in the class of Patterson-Sullivan, then the projection of  $\mu$  to the torsion-free part of  $\Gamma/[\Gamma, \Gamma]$  is centred.*

Corollary 1.2 is a direct consequence of Theorem 1.4 and Lemma 5.2 below.

**(III) Walks with cusps are singular at infinity.** Furstenberg's discretization of the Brownian motion [26, 27] implies that any (possibly non-uniform) lattice of  $PSL_2(\mathbb{R})$  is the support of a probability measure  $\mu$  whose harmonic measure is Lebesgue on  $\partial\mathbb{H}^2 \simeq S^1$ . The proof gives  $\mu$  with finite first moment in the metric induced by  $PSL_2(\mathbb{R})$ . It came thus as a surprise when Guivarc'h-Le Jan [31, 32] proved twenty years later that  $\mu$  cannot have finite first moment in the *word metric* of  $\Gamma$  when  $\Gamma$  is the congruence subgroup  $\Gamma(2) \leq PSL_2(\mathbb{Z})$ . The result was extended step by step to any lattice  $\Gamma \leq PSL_2(\mathbb{R})$  containing a parabolic element [20, 28]. Further generalisations were made in [50, 29], notably the case where  $\Gamma \leq PSL_2(\mathbb{R})$  is any discrete finitely generated subgroup with a parabolic element, which was solved under the additional assumptions that  $\mu$  generates  $\Gamma$  as a semigroup and has superexponential moment [29]. We show those two assumptions are unnecessary.

**Corollary 1.3.** *Let  $\Gamma \subseteq PSL_2(\mathbb{R})$  be a finitely generated discrete subgroup containing a parabolic element. Let  $\mu$  be a non-elementary probability measure on  $\Gamma$  with finite first moment in a word metric. Then the Furstenberg measure of  $\mu$  on  $\partial\mathbb{H}^2$  is singular with the class of Patterson-Sullivan.*

The proof of Corollary 1.3 is given in Section 5.2. It relies on Theorem 1.5 and a result of Enriquez-Franchi-Le Jan [22].

## 1.2 Homological winding of $\nu$ -typical rays

We address the inverse problem for the harmonic measure by reading information about  $\mu$  in the winding statistics of  $\nu$ -typical geodesic rays on  $\Gamma \backslash \Omega$ . More precisely, for every  $\xi \in \partial\Omega$ , call  $r_\xi : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \Omega$  a geodesic ray from  $o$  to  $\xi$  on  $\Omega$ . Letting  $\xi$  vary with law  $\nu$ , we obtain a family of random segments  $(r_\xi([0, t]))_{t \in \mathbb{R}^+}$  indexed by the time parameter. We prove limit laws for the winding of  $(r_\xi([0, t]))_{t \in \mathbb{R}^+}$  on  $\Gamma \backslash \Omega$ . In those limit theorems, natural numerical quantities appear (drift, limit covariance) and have explicit formulas involving  $\mu$ . Those formulas only depend on  $\nu$  so they yield numerical invariants for all possible generators  $\mu$  of  $\nu$ . This strategy is motivated by the work of Guivarc'h-Le Jan [31, 32]. It is also related to Randecker-Tiozzo's paper [50].

### Homological projection

The winding number of a geodesic segment  $[o, z]$  on  $\Gamma \backslash \Omega$  will be formally incarnated by a vector  $i(z)$  where  $i$  is a  $\Gamma$ -equivariant map from  $\Omega$  to a vector space. Examples below justify the relation with homology and the term winding.

**Definition.** A measurable map  $i : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  ( $d \geq 1$ ) is  $\Gamma$ -equivariant if there exists a morphism  $\pi : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  satisfying for all  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ ,  $x \in \Omega$ ,

$$i(\gamma.x) = \pi(\gamma) + i(x)$$

Note that  $\pi$  is unique.

We consider two natural levels of regularity on  $i$ :

- We say  $i$  is *locally bounded* if for every ball  $B$  of  $\Omega$ , we have  $\sup_B \|i\| < \infty$ .
- We say  $i$  is *quasi-Lipschitz* if there exists  $R > 0$  such that for all  $x, y \in \Omega$ , we have

$$\|i(x) - i(y)\| \leq R d(x, y) + R$$

### Examples.

1. (*Abelianization of hyperbolic group*). Let  $\Gamma$  be a word hyperbolic group, and  $\pi : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  any group morphism. Given any Cayley graph  $\Omega$  of  $\Gamma$ , we can extend  $\pi$  into  $i : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  by interpolation. The regularity of  $i$  is always Lipschitz.

2. (*Homological winding on Gromov hyperbolic manifolds*). Let  $\Omega$  be a simply connected complete Riemannian manifold which is Gromov hyperbolic, and  $\Gamma$  a subgroup of isometries of  $\Omega$ . Given a basepoint  $o \in \Omega$  and a family  $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_d$  of  $\Gamma$ -invariant closed 1-forms on  $\Omega$ , we can define a  $\Gamma$ -equivariant map  $i : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  by setting

$$i(z) = \left( \int_{[o, z]} \omega_1, \dots, \int_{[o, z]} \omega_d \right)$$

where  $[o, z]$  stands for any smooth path from  $o$  to  $z$ .

Observe that  $i$  is smooth, whence locally bounded. It can be quasi-Lipschitz, for instance if  $\sup_{x \in \Omega, i \leq d} \|\omega_i\|_x < \infty$ . However, if  $\Gamma \backslash \Omega = M$  is a manifold and some  $\omega_i$

has non zero integral on a loop of  $M$  that may be shrunk arbitrarily by homotopy, then  $i$  cannot be quasi-Lipschitz. For instance, this occurs if  $M$  admits a cusp containing a loop with non trivial homology, as in the hyperbolic 3-horned sphere (but not the punctured torus).

When  $M = \Gamma \backslash \Omega$  is a manifold, the vector  $i(z)$  is related to the *homological winding* of the path  $[o, z]$  projected to  $M$ . Indeed, assume that  $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_d$  project to a basis of  $H^1(M, \mathbb{R})$ . This yields a representative  $\omega$  for any cohomology class in  $H^1(M, \mathbb{R})$ , that we see as a  $\Gamma$ -invariant closed 1-form on  $\Omega$ . Using that the integral pairing  $H^1(M, \mathbb{R}) \times H_1(M, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is non-degenerate (De Rham Theorem), we then have

$$i : \Omega \rightarrow H_1(M, \mathbb{R}), \quad z \mapsto \int_{[o, z]}$$

A priori,  $i$  depends on the choice of basepoint  $o$  and on the basis representatives  $\omega_i$ . However, any other choice will lead to a  $\Gamma$ -equivariant map  $i'$  sharing the same morphism  $\pi : \Gamma \rightarrow H_1(M, \mathbb{R})$ . In this sense, the construction is canonical. The theorems below will not distinguish  $i$  from  $i'$ .

**Remark.** The study of abelianized geodesic rays in the context of a word hyperbolic group does not seem to have prior history. On the opposite, the homological winding for the geodesic flow on a negatively curved manifold has been thoroughly investigated, at least from the point of view of invariant measures. For the compact case, see [53, 51, 19]. In presence of cusps, see [32, 42]. Homological winding is also related to the problem of counting closed geodesics as in [38]. A more precise form of winding, involving 1-forms which are only closed in a neighborhood of the cusps, is studied in [23, 22, 25, 1].

## Statistics of $\nu$ -typical rays

We now present the main result of the paper, describing the winding statistics of geodesic rays on  $\Gamma \backslash \Omega$  chosen by a Furstenberg measure  $\nu$  of generator  $\mu$  supported by  $\Gamma$ . Several conditions of non-degeneracy on  $\mu$  will come up:

- $\mu$  is *non-elementary* if the semigroup generated by its support contains two hyperbolic isometries with disjoint sets of fixed points.
- $\mu$  has *finite  $p$ -th moment* if  $\sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} d_\Gamma(e, \gamma)^p \mu(\gamma) < \infty$  where  $d_\Gamma$  is any word distance on  $\Gamma$ .
- $\mu$  has *finite exponential moment* if  $\exists s > 0$  such that  $\sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} e^{sd_\Gamma(e, \gamma)} \mu(\gamma) < \infty$ .

We divide our result in two statements, assuming different levels of regularity for the projection.

Theorem 1.4 assumes  $i$  to be quasi-Lipschitz. This situation occurs if  $i$  is the projection of a hyperbolic group to its abelianization, or the homological projection for some convex cocompact hyperbolic manifold. We prove a law of large numbers (LLN), and a central limit theorem (CLT), a law of the iterated logarithm (LIL), a principle a large deviations (PLD), and a gambler's ruin estimate (GR).

**Theorem 1.4** (Limit laws for geodesic rays I). *Let  $\Omega$  be a proper geodesic hyperbolic metric space, and  $\Gamma$  a finitely generated subgroup of isometries of  $\Omega$ . Fix a quasi-Lipschitz  $\Gamma$ -equivariant map  $i : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ . Let  $\nu$  be a Furstenberg measure on  $\partial\Omega$  for some non-elementary probability measure  $\mu$  on  $\Gamma$ .*

- (LLN) *If  $\mu$  has finite first moment, then for  $\nu$ -almost every  $\xi \in \partial\Gamma$ ,*

$$\frac{i \circ r_\xi(t)}{t} \xrightarrow[t \rightarrow +\infty]{} e_\nu$$

*for some vector  $e_\nu \in \mathbb{R}^d$ .*

- (CLT) *If  $\mu$  has finite second moment, then as  $\xi$  varies with law  $\nu$ , we have the weak-star convergence,*

$$\frac{i \circ r_\xi(t) - te_\nu}{\sqrt{t}} \xrightarrow[t \rightarrow +\infty]{} \mathcal{N}(0, A_\nu)$$

*for some symmetric positive semidefinite matrix  $A_\nu \in M_d(\mathbb{R})$ .*

- (LIL) *If  $\mu$  has finite second moment, then for  $\nu$ -almost every  $\xi \in \partial\Gamma$ ,*

$$\left\{ \text{Accumulation points of } \left( \frac{i \circ r_\xi(t) - te_\nu}{\sqrt{2t \log \log t}} \right)_{t > 2} \right\} = A_\nu^{1/2}(\overline{B}(0, 1))$$

*where  $\overline{B}(0, 1) = \{t \in \mathbb{R}^d, \sum_i t_i^2 \leq 1\}$ .*

- (PLD) *If  $\mu$  has finite exponential moment, then for all  $\alpha > 0$ , there exists  $D, \delta > 0$  such that*

$$\nu\{\xi : \|i \circ r_\xi(t) - te_\nu\| \geq \alpha t\} \leq D e^{-\delta t}$$

- (GR) *If  $\mu$  has finite exponential moment,  $d = 1$ , and  $A_\nu > 0$ , then for any  $k, l > 0$  and any  $(k_s)_{s>0}, (l_s)_{s>0} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{R}^{>0}}$  such that  $k_s \sim sk, l_s \sim sl$ , we have*

$$\nu\{\xi : (i \circ r_\xi(t) - te_\nu)_{t \geq 0} \text{ leaves } [-k_s, l_s] \text{ via } (l_s, +\infty)\} \xrightarrow[s \rightarrow +\infty]{} \frac{k}{k+l}$$

**Remarks.** 1) In the second statement, we wrote  $\mathcal{N}(0, A_\nu)$  for the (possibly degenerate) centred gaussian measure on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  of covariance matrix  $A_\nu$ .

2) The LLN and the LIL imply that the mean  $e_\nu$  and the covariance matrix  $A_\nu$  only depend on the measure class of  $\nu$ . We will also give explicit formulas in terms of  $\mu$ .

Theorem 1.5 below is more general, for it only assumes  $i$  to be locally bounded. As observed earlier in Example 2., it is particularly relevant when  $i$  is the homological projection to a hyperbolic manifold with a cusp. We prove a weak law of large numbers (WLLN), and a central limit theorem (CLT) encapsulating that of Theorem 1.4.

**Theorem 1.5** (limit laws for geodesic rays II). *Let  $\Omega$  be a proper geodesic hyperbolic metric space, and  $\Gamma$  a finitely generated subgroup of isometries of  $\Omega$ . Fix a locally bounded  $\Gamma$ -equivariant map  $i : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ . Let  $\nu$  be a Furstenberg measure on  $\partial\Omega$  for some non-elementary probability measure  $\mu$  on  $\Gamma$ .*

- (WLLN) If  $\mu$  has finite first moment, then as  $\xi$  varies with law  $\nu$ , we have the convergence in probability

$$\frac{i \circ r_\xi(t)}{t} \xrightarrow[t \rightarrow +\infty]{} e_\nu$$

for some vector  $e_\nu \in \mathbb{R}^d$ .

- (CLT) If  $\mu$  has finite second moment, then as  $\xi$  varies with law  $\nu$ , we have the weak-star convergence,

$$\frac{i \circ r_\xi(t) - te_\nu}{\sqrt{t}} \xrightarrow[t \rightarrow +\infty]{} \mathcal{N}(0, A_\nu)$$

for some symmetric positive semidefinite matrix  $A_\nu \in M_d(\mathbb{R})$ .

**Mean and covariance matrix.** The mean  $e_\nu$  and the covariance matrix  $A_\nu$  appearing in Theorems 1.4, 1.5 have explicit formulas in terms of the measure  $\mu$ . As  $e_\nu, A_\nu$  only depend on  $\nu$ , those formulas give numerical invariants on all possible  $\mu$  such that  $\mu * \nu$ .

To express  $e_\nu, A_\nu$  we need introduce the *rate of escape*  $\lambda_\mu$  of the  $\mu$ -sample paths on  $\Omega$ :

$$\lambda_\mu = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{d_\Omega(o, b_1 \dots b_n o)}{n}$$

where  $d_\Omega$  is the distance on  $\Omega$ , and  $(b_i)_{n \geq 1} \in \Gamma^{\mathbb{N}^*}$  is  $\mu^{\mathbb{N}^*}$ -typical. For  $\mu$  non-elementary with finite first moment,  $\lambda_\mu$  is well defined and non-zero. Moreover, the convergence also holds in  $L^1(\Gamma^{\mathbb{N}^*}, \mu^{\mathbb{N}^*})$ .

Letting  $\mu_{ab} = \pi_* \mu$ , we prove

$$e_\nu = \lambda_\mu^{-1} \mathbb{E}(\mu_{ab})$$

To describe  $A_\nu$ , we introduce the Busemann boundary  $X$  of  $(\Omega, d_\Omega)$ , the Busemann cocycle  $\sigma : \Gamma \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . We prove that uniformly in  $x \in X$ ,

$$\lambda_\mu A_\nu = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \int_\Gamma (\pi(\gamma) - \sigma(\gamma^{-1}, x) e_\nu)^t (\pi(\gamma) - \sigma(\gamma^{-1}, x) e_\nu) d\mu^n(\gamma)$$

In particular, we get the complement information that

- $A_\nu$  coincides with the covariance matrix  $\lambda_\mu^{-1} \text{Cov}(\mu_{ab})$  if  $\mu_{ab}$  is centred (but not in general).
- $A_\nu$  is non-degenerate if  $\langle \text{supp } \mu_{ab} \rangle_{\text{Vect}} = \mathbb{R}^d$  and the restriction of the stable length function  $l : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+, \gamma \mapsto \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} d_\Omega(o, \gamma^n \cdot o)$  to the semigroup generated by the support of  $\mu$  does not factor via  $\pi$  (Lemma 4.1)

The connection between the statistics of the winding  $i \circ r_\xi$  and that of the  $\mu_{ab}$ -random walk on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  arises from the strategy of the proof, which is to approximate  $\nu$ -typical geodesic rays on  $\Omega$  by  $\mu$ -sample paths then to project them to  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . It

came thus as a surprise, while working on this paper, to find that  $A_\nu$  may not be proportional to  $Cov(\mu_{ab})$ . Even worse: *it is possible that  $Cov(\mu_{ab})$  has rank  $d - 1$  while  $A_\nu$  has rank  $d$* . This is the case if  $\Gamma$  is the free group  $F_2 = \langle u, v \rangle$ ,  $\pi : F_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^2$ ,  $u, v \mapsto (1, 0), (0, 1)$ , and  $\mu = \frac{1}{3}(\delta_u + \delta_{uv} + \delta_{uv^{-1}})$ , (see Lemma 4.2). More explanations on this peculiarity are given in the strategy of proof below.

### 1.3 Winding of Patterson-Sullivan measures

Applying Theorem 1.4 to the context of Example 2 above, we obtain *winding statistics for the geodesic flow directed by a Furstenberg measure on a general manifold  $M$  with Gromov hyperbolic universal cover*. The particular case of Patterson-Sullivan measures on convex compact discrete subgroups yields the following. Recall that  $\mathbb{H}^N$  is  $N$ -dimensional real hyperbolic space.

**Corollary 1.6** (Homological winding for PS-measures). *Let  $\Gamma \leq Isom^+(\mathbb{H}^N)$  be a convex cocompact torsion-free discrete subgroup, and  $m$  be any probability measure on  $\partial\mathbb{H}^N$  that is absolutely continuous with respect to the class of Patterson-Sullivan of  $\Gamma$ .*

*Then the homological projection of  $m$ -typical geodesic rays to  $H_1(\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}^N, \mathbb{R})$  has sublinear escape, satisfies a central limit theorem with non-degenerate covariance matrix, the law of the iterated logarithm, and the gambler's ruin estimate (for any 1-dimensional projection). It also satisfies the principle of large deviations if  $m$  has  $L^{1+\varepsilon}$ -Radon Nikodym derivatives with respect to Patterson-Sullivan measures.*

The proof is given in Section 5.1. It combines Theorem 1.4, the fact that PS-measures arise as Furstenberg measures for walks with finite exponential moment [46], and -to establish sublinear escape- the fact that PS-measures represent the geodesic projection of the Bowen-Margulis-Sullivan measure, which is symmetric and flow-invariant on  $\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}^N$ .

The CLT (for  $m$  general), the (multi-dimensional) LIL, the GR, appear to be new, even in the most simple case of real hyperbolic surfaces, i.e. when  $N = 2$ .

The LLN, the PLD, and the CLT when  $m$  is a Patterson-Sullivan measure, can be obtained by combining results already present in the literature. The seminal case of the CLT on a compact hyperbolic manifold follows from Sinai's paper [53]. For the general case, the argument consists in coding the geodesic flow by a suspension flow above a shift of finite type [12, 17], then apply techniques of symbolic dynamics [51, 19, 57]. Our approach is different, we are directly able to simulate random geodesic rays projected in homology by a random walk on  $H_1(\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}^N, \mathbb{R})$  with i.i.d. increments, and apply classical results for additive Markov chains.

We also signal to the reader only interested in Corollary 1.6 that the proof of this result, once isolated, is much shorter than the present paper. Indeed, it does not use the appendix whose purpose is to deal with the non-centred case in Theorems 1.4, 1.5.



## 1.4 Strategy and organization of the paper

The guiding principle to prove Theorems 1.4, 1.5 is simple. Let  $(B, \beta) = (\Gamma^{\mathbb{N}^*}, \mu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}^*})$  denote the space of instructions. Typical  $b \in B$  give a sample path  $b_1 \dots b_n \cdot o$  on  $X$  that stays close to the geodesic ray  $r_{\xi_b}$ , whose distribution coincides with  $\nu$  (for  $b$  varying with law  $\beta$ ). Hence, we aim to infer the behavior of  $i \circ r_{\xi_b}(n\lambda_\mu)$  by comparison with that of  $\pi(b_1 \dots b_n)$ . Unfortunately,  $\pi(b_1 \dots b_n)$  only approximates  $i \circ r_{\xi_b}(t_{b,n})$  where  $t_{b,n} = d_\Omega(o, b_1 \dots b_n \cdot o)$  varies at scale  $\sqrt{n}$  around  $n\lambda_\mu$ . In order to prove second-order limit theorems, we have no choice but to introduce the stopping times  $\tau_n(b)$  at which  $(b_1 \dots b_i \cdot o)_{i \geq 1}$  leaves the ball of radius  $n\lambda_\mu$ , and study how  $\pi(b_1 \dots b_{\tau_n(b)})$  approximates  $i \circ r_{\xi_b}(n\lambda_\mu)$ . In the non-centred case  $\mathbb{E}(\pi_*\mu) \neq 0$ , we also need take into account the recentering parameter. This forces to deal with martingales instead of an i.i.d. additive Markov chain on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . The complications brought up by this recentering can be observed in the formula for  $A_\nu$ .

The paper is organized as follows.

Section 2 explains how  $\nu$ -typical geodesic rays on  $\Omega$  may be simulated with a small error by the  $\mu$ -sample paths on  $\Omega$ . More precisely, we recall various results of geodesic tracking from [56, 2, 15], and establish a uniform deviation inequality conditionally to a stopping time.

Section 3 recalls from [7] how the distance function can be replaced by a cocycle in order to study  $\mu$ -sample paths on  $\Omega$ . As a first application, we estimate the time of exit of sample paths from a ball, as well as the overshoot.

Section 4 is dedicated to the proof of Theorems 1.4, 1.5. It relies on the two previous sections and on Appendix A. We also comment on the limit covariance matrix  $A_\nu$ .

Section 5 starts by recalling the notion of Patterson-Sullivan measures associated to a geometrically finite discrete subgroup of isometries of  $\mathbb{H}^N$ . We then prove winding statistics for PS-measures in the convex cocompact case (Corollary 1.6), and establish singularity with harmonic measures in the presence of cusps (Corollary 1.3).

Section 6 records a few open questions leading to natural continuations of our study.

Appendix A establishes limit laws for martingales arising from cocycles. The interest is that our setting is very general, encapsulating that of [8, 7, 18], and deals with optimal<sup>1</sup> moment assumptions. We also obtain a stronger version of the CLT, in which the time variable  $n$  is replaced by a family of stopping times  $(\tau_n)$  approximating  $n$  at scale  $\sqrt{n}$ .

**Remark.** We believe the assumption of properness on  $\Omega$  is not essential in the paper, and could be replaced by only assuming separability. Without properness, the Gromov boundary does not identify with classes of geodesic rays, but with classes of  $(1, Q)$ -quasi geodesic rays, where  $Q > 0$  is some fixed constant determined by the hyperbolicity constant of  $\Omega$  [37, Remark 2.16]. Hence, we rather need define  $r_\xi$  as a  $(1, Q)$ -quasi geodesic ray from  $o$  to  $\xi$ . To adapt the proof, we point out that

---

<sup>1</sup>at least for the CLT, LIL, PLD.

we only use the properness assumption on  $\Omega$  in Section 3, while referring to Benoist-Quint's paper [7] to introduce the horofunction boundary, the Busemann cocycle, and its properties. We believe [7] could be adapted almost verbatim to remove the properness assumption, using the general theory of horofunction compactification developed by Maher and Tiozzo in [47]. Asking that  $\Omega$  be separable would guarantee as in [47] that this compactification is indeed a metric space. Not to burden the article, we do not pursue in this direction.

**Acknowledgements.** I am thankful to Péter Varjú for useful comments on a preliminary version of this text.

## 2 Geodesic tracking of sample paths

We explain how the distribution of  $\nu$ -typical geodesic rays on  $\Omega$  can be approximated by that of  $\mu$ -sample paths.

We keep the notations  $(\Omega, d_\Omega, o, \Gamma)$  of Section 1, let  $\mu$  be a non-elementary probability measure on  $\Gamma$  and  $\nu$  its Furstenberg measure on  $\partial\Omega$ . We set  $(B, \beta) = (\Gamma^{\mathbb{N}^*}, \mu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}^*})$  and recall that for  $\beta$ -typical  $b \in B$ , the sample path  $(b_1 \dots b_n.o)_{n \geq 0}$  on  $\Omega$  converges to some point in the Gromov boundary  $\xi_b \in \partial\Omega$ , whose distribution under  $\beta$  coincides with  $\nu$ . The corresponding geodesic ray  $r_{\xi_b}$  is said to be *asymptotic* to the sample path  $(b_1 \dots b_n.o)_{n \geq 0}$ . We also write  $t_{b,n} = d_\Omega(o, b_1 \dots b_n.o)$ .

We start with a very general result stating that  $\mu$ -sample paths on  $\Omega$  have a small chance to deviate from their asymptotic geodesic ray, regardless of the strategy deciding the time of observation. A strategy is incarnated by a stopping time on  $(B, \beta)$ , implicitly referring to the filtration  $(\mathcal{B}_k)_{k \geq 1}$  where  $\mathcal{B}_k$  is the sub  $\sigma$ -algebra of  $B$  generated by  $b_1, \dots, b_k$ .

**Theorem 2.1** (Deviation inequality with a stopping time). *There exists a family  $(\varepsilon_R)_{R \geq 0} \in (0, 1]^{\mathbb{R}^+}$  such that  $\varepsilon_R \rightarrow 0$  as  $R \rightarrow +\infty$ , and for every  $\beta$ -a.e. finite stopping time  $\tau : B \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^* \cup \{\infty\}$ , every  $R > 0$ ,*

$$\beta\{b : d_\Omega(b_1 \dots b_{\tau(b)}.o, r_{\xi_b}(t_{b,\tau(b)})) > R\} \leq \varepsilon_R$$

Moreover, if  $\mu$  has finite exponential moment, then one can choose  $\varepsilon_R = De^{-\delta R}$  for some constants  $D, \delta > 0$ .

**Remarks.** 1) For  $\tau = n$  constant, this result follows from [10, Proposition 2.11] and the remark that  $d(b_1 \dots b_n, r_{\xi_b}(t_{b,n})) \leq 2d(b_1 \dots b_n, r_{\xi_b}(\mathbb{R}^+))$ . We explained earlier in the strategy of proof why we need the stronger version above.

2) If  $\mu$  has finite  $p$ -th moment where  $p > 1$ , the proof of Theorem 2.1 combined with the  $\log^{p-1}$ -regularity of  $\nu$  [7, Proposition 4.2] allows to choose  $\varepsilon_R$  so that  $\int_{R>0} \varepsilon_R R^{p-2} dR < \infty$ .

*Proof of Theorem 2.1.* For  $x \in \Omega$ ,  $\xi \in \partial\Omega$ , we let  $F(x, \xi)$  be the image of any geodesic ray from  $x$  to  $\xi$ . By hyperbolicity, the family  $(F(x, \xi))_{x \in \Omega, \xi \in \partial\Omega}$  is coarsely

$\Gamma$ -equivariant, meaning that for  $g \in \Gamma$ , the distance between  $g.F(x, \xi)$  and  $F(gx, g\xi)$  is bounded  $O(\delta_\Omega)$  where  $\delta_\Omega$  is a hyperbolicity constant of  $\Omega$ .

We observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}d_\Omega(b_1 \dots b_{\tau(b)}.o, r_{\xi_b}(t_{b,\tau(b)})) &\leq d_\Omega(b_1 \dots b_{\tau(b)}.o, F(o, \xi_b)) + O(\delta_\Omega) \\ &= d_\Omega(o, F(b_{\tau(b)}^{-1} \dots b_1^{-1}.o, \xi_{T^{\tau(b)}b})) + O(\delta_\Omega) \\ &\leq (b_{\tau(b)}^{-1} \dots b_1^{-1}.o | \xi_{T^{\tau(b)}b})_o + O(\delta_\Omega) \end{aligned}$$

where  $T : B \rightarrow B, (b_i)_{i \geq 1} \mapsto (b_{i+1})_{i \geq 1}$  is the one-sided shift,  $(\cdot | \cdot)_o$  denotes the Gromov product at the origin.

In particular, using that  $T^{\tau(b)}b$  varies with law  $\beta$  when  $b$  varies with law  $\beta$ , and does so independently from  $b_1, \dots, b_{\tau(b)}$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \beta\{b : d_\Omega(b_1 \dots b_{\tau(b)}.o, r_{\xi_b}(t_{b,\tau(b)})) > 2R\} &\leq \beta^{\otimes 2}\{(b, a) : (b_{\tau(b)}^{-1} \dots b_1^{-1}.o | \xi_a)_o > R - O(\delta_\Omega)\} \\ &\leq \sup_{x \in \Omega} \beta\{b : (x | \xi_b)_o > R - O(\delta_\Omega)\} \end{aligned}$$

Given  $x \in \Omega, \xi, \eta \in \partial\Omega$ , the definition of the hyperbolicity of  $\Omega$  in terms of Gromov product gives

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} (x|\xi)_o \geq R \\ (x|\eta)_o \geq R \end{array} \right\} \implies (\xi|\eta)_o \geq R - O(\delta_\Omega)$$

In particular, the set  $\{\xi \in \partial\Omega : (x|\xi)_o > R - O(\delta_\Omega)\}$  is included in a ball of  $\partial\Omega$  whose radius is exponentially small in  $R$ . The fact that  $\nu$  has no atom, and is even Hölder regular when  $\mu$  has finite exponential moment [10, Corollary 2.13], finishes the proof.  $\square$

We now recall various bounds for the distance separating a fixed typical sample path on  $\Omega$  and its asymptotic geodesic ray.

**Theorem 2.2** (Geodesic tracking). • *For every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $R > 0$  such that for  $\beta$ -almost every  $b \in B$ ,*

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \#\{i \leq n : d_\Omega(b_1 \dots b_i.o, r_{\xi_b}(t_{b,i})) \leq R\} \geq 1 - \varepsilon$$

- *Assume  $\mu$  has finite  $p$ -th moment where  $p > 0$ . Then for  $\beta$ -almost every  $b \in B$ ,*

$$d_\Omega(b_1 \dots b_n.o, r_{\xi_b}(t_{b,n})) = o(n^{\frac{1}{2p}})$$

- *Assume  $\mu$  has finite exponential moment. There exists a constant  $D > 0$  such that for  $\beta$ -almost every  $b \in B$ , for large  $n \geq 0$ ,*

$$d_\Omega(b_1 \dots b_n.o, r_{\xi_b}(t_{b,n})) \leq D \log n$$

By way of proof, we make a few comments.

**Remarks.** 1) Notice that the first bound does not require any moment condition on  $\mu$ . A similar result in the context of random walks on homogeneous spaces of arbitrary rank appears in [2, Theorem A bis] and the proof easily extends to our setting. We will not use this estimate, but we recall it for completeness.

2) For  $\mu$  with finite first moment, Tiozzo establishes sublinear escape [56]. For any  $p > 0$ , the stronger estimates above is proven by Choi in [15, Theorem D].

3) The third bound assuming finite exponential moment follows directly from Theorem 2.1 and Borel-Cantelli Lemma.

### 3 The norm and the Busemann cocycle

The proof of Theorems 1.5, 1.4 requires a fine understanding of the distance  $t_{b,n}$ . However, it is not so handy to manipulate. We show here that  $t_{b,n}$  can be replaced by a cocycle, up to a bounded error. The latter is much easier to deal with. A similar analysis is carried out by Benoist-Quint in [7, Sec. 2.3, 3.2, 4.3]. As a first application, we infer estimates for the exit time and overshoot of  $t_{b,n}$  from a bounded interval.

We let  $(\Omega, d_\Omega, o, \Gamma)$  be as in Section 1, and fix  $\mu$  a non-elementary probability measure on  $\Gamma$ .

#### 3.1 Busemann cocycle

Every  $z \in \Omega$  defines a so-called horofunction

$$h_z : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, y \mapsto d_\Omega(z, y) - d_\Omega(z, o)$$

and the map  $\Omega \rightarrow C^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R})$  is injective continuous when  $C^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R})$  is given the (metrizable) compact-open topology. The *Busemann compactification*  $\overline{\Omega}^B$  of  $\Omega$  is the closure of  $\{h_z, z \in \Omega\}$  in  $C^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R})$ . The injection  $z \mapsto h_z$  is an embedding that identifies  $\Omega$  with a dense open set of  $\overline{\Omega}^B$ . Moreover, as every horofunction is 1-Lipschitz and vanishes at the basepoint,  $\overline{\Omega}^B$  must be compact. We call *Busemann boundary* of  $\Omega$  the set  $X = \overline{\Omega}^B \setminus \Omega$ . The  $\Gamma$ -action on  $\Omega$  extends continuously to the boundary, via the formula:  $\forall x \in \overline{\Omega}^B, z \in \Omega$ ,

$$h_{\gamma.x}(z) = h_x(\gamma^{-1}z) - h_x(\gamma^{-1}.o)$$

**Remark.** At the contrary of the Gromov boundary  $\partial\Omega$ , the Busemann boundary  $X$  is not invariant by quasi-isometry. For instance, let  $\Gamma = F_2 \times \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$  where  $F_2$  is the group freely generated by two elements  $\{u, v\}$ . For the systems of generators  $S_1 = \{e, u^{\pm 1}, v^{\pm 1}\} \times \{0, 1\}$ ,  $S_2 = \{e, u^{\pm 1}, v^{\pm 1}\} \times \{1\}$ , the Busemann boundaries of the associated Cayley graphs are<sup>2</sup> respectively  $\partial F_2$ ,  $\partial F_2 \times \{0, 1\}$ .

---

<sup>2</sup>To see this, call  $\Omega_1, \Omega_2, \mathcal{H}$  the Cayley graphs of  $(\Gamma, S_1)$ ,  $(\Gamma, S_2)$ ,  $(F_2, \{u^{\pm 1}, v^{\pm 1}\})$ , and  $\partial_B \Omega_1, \partial_B \Omega_2, \partial_B \mathcal{H}$  their Busemann boundaries. They come with natural projections  $\Omega_i \rightarrow \mathcal{H}, x \mapsto \bar{x}$ . On the one hand, we have  $h_x^{\Omega_1}(y) =$

However, the identity map  $\Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  extends continuously to a surjective  $\Gamma$ -equivariant map  $X \rightarrow \partial\Omega$ .

We define the *Busemann cocycle*  $\sigma : \Gamma \times \overline{\Omega}^B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, (\gamma, x) \mapsto h_x(\gamma^{-1}.o)$ . The term cocycle means that  $\sigma$  satisfies the relation  $\sigma(\gamma_2\gamma_1, x) = \sigma(\gamma_2, \gamma_1 x) + \sigma(\gamma_1, x)$  for  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \Gamma, x \in \overline{\Omega}^B$ . It is also useful to observe that for all  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ ,

$$\sup_{x \in \overline{\Omega}^B} \sigma(\gamma, x) \leq d_\Omega(o, \gamma.o) \quad (1)$$

as the  $h_x$  are 1-Lipschitz and vanish at  $o$ . In particular, if  $\mu$  has finite  $k$ -th moment, then the family of variables  $(\sigma(\cdot, x))_{x \in \overline{\Omega}^B}$  is uniformly bounded in  $L^k(\Gamma, \mu)$ . The next proposition claims that the cocycle  $\sigma$  gives a good approximation of the distance to  $o$  along the  $\mu$ -trajectories. It assumes no moment condition on  $\mu$ .

**Proposition 3.1** (Cocycle approximation). *For every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $R > 0$  such that for all  $x \in X$ ,*

$$\beta \left( b : \sup_{n \geq 1} |\sigma(b_n^{-1} \dots b_1^{-1}, x) - t_{b,n}| \leq R \right) > 1 - \varepsilon$$

*Proof.* This is [7, Proposition 3.2] applied to  $(\Omega, d_\Omega)$  and the image of  $\mu$  by the inverse map  $\gamma \mapsto \gamma^{-1}$ .  $\square$

When  $\mu$  has a finite second moment, the restriction of  $\sigma$  to the boundary is known to be cohomologous to a cocycle with constant  $\check{\mu}$ -drift [7, Proposition 4.6]: there exist a cocycle  $\sigma_0 : \Gamma \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and a *bounded* function  $\psi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that

- $\forall \gamma \in \Gamma, \forall x \in X,$

$$\sigma(\gamma, x) = \sigma_0(\gamma, x) + \psi(\gamma x) - \psi(x)$$

- $\forall x \in X,$

$$\sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \sigma_0(\gamma^{-1}, x) \mu(\gamma) = \lambda_\mu$$

It is worth noting that the definition of  $\psi$  is explicit: letting  $\nu_X$  be any  $\mu$ -stationary probability measure on  $X$ , we can set

$$\psi(x) = \int_X (x | y)_o d\nu_X(y)$$

where  $(\cdot | \cdot)_o$  refers to the Gromov product extended to  $X$  (see [7, Section 2.3]).

**Remark.** It will be important for us to know that  $\psi$  is not only bounded, but *continuous*. This property is not mentioned in [7]. However it can be deduced from the above formula, the fact that  $(\cdot | \cdot)_o$  is continuous, and Inequality (4.10) in [7]. Indeed the latter implies that the sub-integral  $\sup_{x \in X} \int_{\{(x | \cdot)_o \geq R\}} (x | y)_o d\nu_X(y) = o(1)$  as  $R \rightarrow +\infty$ .

---

$h_{\frac{\mathcal{H}}{p}}(\bar{y})$  as long as  $d_{\mathcal{H}}(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \geq 1$ , so  $\partial_B \Omega_1 = \partial_B \mathcal{H} = \partial F_2$ . However, for every  $p \in F_2$ , the horofunctions  $h_{(p,0)}^{\Omega_2}$  and  $h_{(p,1)}^{\Omega_2}$  do not have the same parity on  $\Gamma$ , hence the distance between them is bounded below positively independently of  $p$ . This implies that any sequence converging to the Busemann boundary eventually remains in one leaf  $F_2 \times \{*\}$ , and the equality  $\partial \Omega_2 = \partial F_2 \times \{0, 1\}$  follows.

### 3.2 Exit estimates for the norm

Given  $s > 0$ , set

$$\tau_s : B \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}, b \mapsto \inf\{k \geq 1, t_{b,k} \geq s\lambda_\mu\}.$$

As a first application of the cocycle approximation from Section 3.1, we show that the overshoot  $t_{b,\tau_s(b)} - s\lambda_\mu$  is essentially bounded, and that  $\tau_s$  lands roughly in a window of size  $\sqrt{s}$  around  $s$ , and that

**Proposition 3.2.** 1. (Overshoot control) *Assume  $\mu$  has finite first moment. Then*

$$\sup_{s>0} \beta(b : t_{b,\tau_s(b)} > s\lambda_\mu + R) \xrightarrow{R \rightarrow +\infty} 0$$

2. (Time control) *Assume  $\mu$  has finite second moment. We then have:*  
 $\forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists R > 0, \forall s > 1,$

$$\beta(b : |\tau_s(b) - s| > R\sqrt{s}) \leq \varepsilon$$

*Proof.* Fix  $x \in X$ . According to the cocycle approximation from Proposition 3.1, we do not lose generality by replacing  $t_{b,n}$  by  $\sigma(b_n^{-1} \dots b_1^{-1}, x)$ , both in the definition of  $\tau_s$  and in the estimates of the lemma. The time estimate for  $\sigma(b_n^{-1} \dots b_1^{-1}, x)$  follows from Proposition A.16 applied to  $\lambda_\mu^{-1}\sigma_0$ . The overshoot control also follows from Proposition A.16 after replacing  $\mu$  by a fixed convolution power  $\mu^{*n_0}$  to reduce to the case where the drift has a positive lower bound uniform on  $X$ .  $\square$

## 4 Limit laws for geodesic rays

This section is dedicated to the proof of Theorem 1.4 and Theorem 1.5. Several parts of the proof can be extended to general limit theorems for cocycles. Those are postponed to Appendix A.

### 4.1 Law of large numbers

We establish the law of large numbers for  $\nu$ -typical geodesic rays on  $\Omega$  projected to  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . We argue under various conditions of regularity on the projection  $i$ .

For  $i$  quasi-Lipschitz, we prove the strong law of large numbers in Theorem 1.4. The proof uses the sublinear geodesic tracking from Theorem 2.2.

*Proof of Theorem 1.4 (LLN).* By Theorem 2.2 and the quasi-Lipschitz assumption on  $i$ , we have that for  $\beta$ -almost every  $b \in B$ ,  $n \geq 2$ ,

$$\|i(b_1 \dots b_n.o) - i \circ r_{\xi_b}(t_{b,n})\| = o(n)$$

or in other terms

$$\|\pi(b_1 \dots b_n) - i \circ r_{\xi_b}(t_{b,n})\| = o(n)$$

as  $i(b_1 \dots b_n.o) = \pi(b_1 \dots b_n) + i(o)$ . By the law of large numbers for the  $\mu_{ab}$ -walk on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and the definition of the rate of escape  $\lambda_\mu$ , we also know that

$$\pi(b_1 \dots b_n) = n\mathbb{E}(\mu_{ab}) + o(n) \quad t_{b,n} = n\lambda_\mu + o(n)$$

Combining these estimates, we get

$$\|n\mathbb{E}(\mu_{ab}) - i \circ r_{\xi_b}(n\lambda_\mu)\| = o(n)$$

which implies that  $i \circ r_{\xi_b}(n\lambda_\mu) = n\lambda_\mu e_\nu + o(n)$ . The result follows for continuous times  $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$  as  $i$  is quasi-Lipschitz.  $\square$

For  $i$  locally bounded, we prove the weak law of large numbers in Theorem 1.5. The proof relies on the deviation inequality with stopping time from Theorem 2.1 and on the overshoot control in Proposition 3.2.

*Proof of Theorem 1.5 (WLLN).* For  $n \geq 0$ , recall the stopping time

$$\tau_n : B \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}, b \mapsto \inf\{k \geq 1, t_{b,k} \geq n\lambda_\mu\}.$$

The deviation estimate from Theorem 2.1 guarantees that for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $R > 0$  such that for all  $n \geq 0$ ,

$$\beta\{b : d(b_1 \dots b_{\tau_n(b)}.o, r_{\xi_b}(t_{b,\tau_n(b)})) \leq R\} \geq 1 - \varepsilon$$

Using Proposition 3.2, we may increase  $R$  to also have for every  $n \geq 0$ ,

$$\beta\{b : d(b_1 \dots b_{\tau_n(b)}.o, r_{\xi_b}(n\lambda_\mu)) \leq R\} \geq 1 - \varepsilon$$

Using that  $i$  is locally bounded and  $\Gamma$ -equivariant, we can see that those  $b$  satisfy  $\|\pi(b_1 \dots b_{\tau_n(b)}) - i \circ r_{\xi_b}(n\lambda_\mu)\| \leq C_R$  for some constant  $C_R$  only depending on  $(i, R)$ . Hence, it is enough to show the almost-sure convergence

$$\frac{\pi(b_1 \dots b_{\tau_n(b)})}{n} \rightarrow \lambda_\mu e_\nu = \mathbb{E}(\mu_{ab}) \quad (2)$$

The equivalence  $t_{b,n} \sim n\lambda_\mu$  implies  $\tau_n \sim n$ . Hence (2) follows from the law of large numbers for  $\mu_{ab}$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .  $\square$

## 4.2 Central limit theorem

We prove the central limit theorem from Theorem 1.5.

*Proof of Theorem 1.5 (CLT).* We want to show that, for  $b$  varying with law  $\beta$ , the family of random variables

$$\frac{i \circ r_{\xi_b}(s\lambda_\mu) - s\lambda_\mu e_\nu}{\sqrt{s}} \quad (3)$$

converges to a (possibly degenerate) Gaussian distribution as  $s \rightarrow +\infty$ . By Theorem 2.1 and Proposition 3.2 (overshoot control), for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $R > 0$  such that for any  $s > 0$ ,

$$\beta(b : d(b_1 \dots b_{\tau_s(b)}.o, r_{\xi_b}(s\lambda_\mu)) \leq R) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$$

Using that  $i$  is locally bounded and  $\Gamma$ -equivariant, we deduce that, up to increasing  $R$ , for any  $s > 0$ ,

$$\beta(b : |\pi(b_1 \dots b_{\tau_s(b)}) - i \circ r_{\xi_b}(s\lambda_\mu)| \leq R) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$$

Hence, the CLT for  $\nu$ -typical geodesic rays in (3) amounts to that of

$$\frac{\pi(b_1 \dots b_{\tau_s(b)}) - s\lambda_\mu e_\nu}{\sqrt{s}} \quad (4)$$

Fix  $x \in X$ . By Proposition 3.2 (overshoot control) and Proposition 3.1, the family of variables

$$\frac{s\lambda_\mu - \sigma(b_{\tau_s(b)}^{-1} \dots b_1^{-1}, x)}{\sqrt{s}}$$

converges to zero in probability as  $s \rightarrow +\infty$ . Hence we just need to check the CLT for

$$\frac{\pi(b_1 \dots b_{\tau_s(b)}) - \sigma(b_{\tau_s(b)}^{-1} \dots b_1^{-1}, x)e_\nu}{\sqrt{s}}. \quad (5)$$

We introduce the cocycle  $\tilde{\sigma} : \Gamma \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  defined by

$$\tilde{\sigma}(g, x) = \pi(g) + \sigma_0(g, x)e_\nu$$

This cocycle satisfies  $\|\sigma(g, x)\| \ll |g'|$  for  $|g'| = \|\pi(g)\| + d(o, g.o)$  and has constant zero drift for  $\check{\mu}$ . It is also continuous in the  $X$ -variable because  $\sigma$  is continuous and the function  $\psi$  relating  $\sigma$  and  $\sigma_0$  is continuous. Finally Proposition 3.1 confirms that  $\sigma$  is  $X$ -controlled. These observations ensure we may apply our CLT with stopping time from the appendix (Proposition A.2) to  $\tilde{\sigma}$ . It tells us that

$$\frac{i \circ r_{\xi_b}(s\lambda_\mu) - s\lambda_\mu e_\nu}{\sqrt{s}} \xrightarrow{s \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{N}(0, \lambda_\mu A_\nu)$$

where  $\lambda_\mu A_\nu$  is the limit, uniformly in  $x \in X$ :

$$\lambda_\mu A_\nu = \lim \frac{1}{n} \int_G \tilde{\sigma}(g, x) {}^t \tilde{\sigma}(g, x) d\check{\mu}^{*n}(g)$$

Using the cocycle relation and that  $\tilde{\sigma}$  has zero drift for  $\check{\mu}$ , we can replace  $\sigma_0$  in the above limit by the original Busemann cocycle  $\sigma$ :

$$\lambda_\mu A_\nu = \lim \frac{1}{n} \int_G (\pi(g) + \sigma(g, x)e_\nu) {}^t (\pi(g) + \sigma(g, x)e_\nu) d\check{\mu}^{*n}(g)$$

This limit is still uniform in  $x \in X$ .

□



### 4.3 The covariance matrix

We comment on the covariance matrix  $A_\nu$  of the limit distribution in the CLT.

We start with a criterion of non-degeneracy for  $A_\nu$ . Recall that the *stable length* of an element  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  is the quantity  $l(\gamma) = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} d_\Omega(o, \gamma^n \cdot o)$ . It is well defined by subadditivity. One can see it as an analog of the logarithm of the spectral radius for matrices in  $SL_d(\mathbb{R})$ .

**Lemma 4.1** (Non-degeneracy criterion). *If  $\det(A_\nu) = 0$ , then  $\langle \text{supp } \mu_{ab} \rangle_{\text{Vect}} \subsetneq \mathbb{R}^d$  or there exists  $\varphi \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^*$  such that  $\varphi \circ \pi(g) = l(g)$  on the semigroup generated by the support of  $\mu$ .*

*Proof.* Assume  $\det(A_\nu) = 0$  and  $\langle \text{supp } \mu_{ab} \rangle_{\text{Vect}} = \mathbb{R}^d$ . By the first hypothesis, there exists a non zero linear form  $\varphi$  such that  $\varphi A_\nu = 0$ . By Remark 2) following Proposition A.1, we can rewrite for every  $n \geq 1$ , any  $\check{\mu}$ -stationary measure  $\nu_X$  on  $X$ :

$$\lambda_\mu A_\nu = \frac{1}{n} \int_{\Gamma \times X} (\pi(\gamma) + \sigma_0(\gamma, x)e_\nu)^t (\pi(\gamma) + \sigma_0(\gamma, x)e_\nu) d\check{\mu}^{*n}(\gamma) d\nu_X(x).$$

Hence,  $\varphi A_\nu^t \varphi = 0$  reads as

$$\int_{\Gamma \times X} (\varphi \circ \pi(\gamma) + \sigma_0(\gamma, x)\varphi(e_\nu))^2 d\check{\mu}^{*n}(\gamma) d\nu_X(x) = 0.$$

Call  $\Gamma_{\check{\mu}} \subseteq \Gamma$  the semigroup generated by the support of  $\check{\mu}$ . We deduce that for  $\nu_X$ -almost every  $x \in X$ , for all  $\gamma \in \Gamma_{\check{\mu}}$ , we have

$$\varphi \circ \pi(\gamma) = -\sigma_0(\gamma, x)\varphi(e_\nu).$$

As  $\pi(\Gamma_{\check{\mu}})$  spans  $\mathbb{R}^d$  by assumption and  $\varphi \neq 0$ , we must have  $\varphi(e_\nu) \neq 0$ , so we may assume  $\varphi(e_\nu) = 1$ . Using that the difference  $|\sigma - \sigma_0|$  is bounded, we infer that for  $\nu_X$ -almost every  $x$ , for  $\gamma \in \Gamma_{\check{\mu}}$ ,  $n \geq 1$ ,

$$\varphi \circ \pi(\gamma) = \frac{1}{n} \varphi \circ \pi(\gamma^n) = -\frac{1}{n} \sigma_0(\gamma^n, x) = -\frac{1}{n} \sigma(\gamma^n, x) + o(1).$$

Using that the projection of  $\nu_X$  on  $\partial\Omega$  is not a dirac mass, the fact that for every  $x, y \in X$  with distinct projections, there exists  $C > 0$  such that  $\max(\sigma(g, x), \sigma(g, y)) \geq d_\Omega(o, g \cdot o) - C$  for all  $g$ , and letting  $n$  go to infinity, we get  $\varphi \circ \pi(\gamma) = -l(\gamma)$ . As  $l(\gamma^{-1}) = l(\gamma)$  and  $-\varphi \circ \pi(\gamma) = \varphi \circ \pi(\gamma^{-1})$ , the result follows.  $\square$

We also give an example showing that the rank of  $A_\nu$  may be strictly greater than the rank of the covariance matrix of  $\mu_{ab}$ .

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let  $\Gamma$  be the free group with two generators  $u, v$ , write  $\Omega$  the Cayley graph associated to  $\{u, v\}$ , and let  $i : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  continuous  $\Gamma$ -equivariant such that  $i(u) = (1, 0)$ ,  $i(v) = (0, 1)$ . For  $\mu = \frac{1}{3}(\delta_u + \delta_{uv} + \delta_{uv^{-1}})$  we have*

$$\det(\text{Cov}(\mu_{ab})) = 0 \neq \det(A_\nu)$$

*Proof.* We have  $\det(\text{Cov}(\mu_{ab})) = 0$  because  $\mu_{ab}$  is supported on an affine hyperplane of  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . Assume by contradiction that  $\det(A_\nu) = 0$ . By Lemma 4.1, there exists  $\varphi \in (\mathbb{R}^2)^*$  such that  $\varphi \circ \pi(g) = l(g)$  on the semigroup generated by the support of  $\mu$ . Writing  $e_1 = (1, 0)$  and  $e_2 = (0, 1)$ , we get the equations

$$\varphi(e_1) = 1, \quad \varphi(e_1 + e_2) = 2, \quad \varphi(e_1 - e_2) = 2.$$

These are not compatible, whence the contradiction. □

#### 4.4 Law of the iterated logarithm

We prove the law of the iterated logarithm in Theorem 1.4.

*Proof of Theorem 1.4 (LIL).* According to Theorem 2.2 and the second moment assumption on  $\mu$ , one has for  $\beta$ -almost every  $b \in B$ ,

$$d_\Omega(b_1 \dots b_n \cdot o, r_{\xi_b}(t_{b,n})) = o(\sqrt{n})$$

By the quasi-Lipschitz assumption on  $i$ , we infer

$$i \circ r_{\xi_b}(t_{b,n}) = \pi(b_1 \dots b_n) + o(\sqrt{n})$$

On the other hand, Proposition 3.1 yields that for a fixed  $x \in X$ , for  $\beta$ -almost every  $b \in B$ , we have

$$t_{b,n} e_\nu = \sigma(b_n^{-1} \dots b_1^{-1}, x) e_\nu + O(1)$$

Putting these together, we get

$$\frac{i \circ r_{\xi_b}(t_{b,n}) - t_{b,n} e_\nu}{\sqrt{2t_{b,n} \log \log t_{b,n}}} = \frac{-\tilde{\sigma}(b_n^{-1} \dots b_1^{-1}, x) + o(\sqrt{n})}{(1 + o(1))\sqrt{2\lambda_\mu n \log \log n}}$$

where  $\tilde{\sigma}$  is the cocycle introduced in Section 4.2. Applying the general LIL for cocycles from Proposition A.4, we deduce that for  $\beta$ -almost every  $b \in B$ ,

$$\left\{ \text{Accumulation points of } \left( \frac{i \circ r_{\xi_b}(t) - t e_\nu}{\sqrt{2t \log \log t}} \right)_{t \in \{t_{b,n}, n \in \mathbb{N}\}} \right\} = A_\nu^{1/2}(\overline{B}(0, 1)) \quad (6)$$

We just need to check there are no other accumulation points. As  $\mu$  has finite second moment, an application of Borel-Cantelli Lemma yields for  $\beta$ -almost every  $b \in B$ ,

$$|t_{b,n+1} - t_{b,n}| = o(\sqrt{n})$$

In particular, for large  $n$ ,

$$|t_{b,n+1} - t_{b,n}| \leq \sqrt{t_{b,n}}$$

It follows that for  $b$  typical, the intervals

$$I_n(b) = [t_{b,n} - \sqrt{t_{b,n}}, t_{b,n} + \sqrt{t_{b,n}}]$$

cover a translate of  $\mathbb{R}_+$ . Moreover, the condition that  $i$  is quasi-Lipschitz implies that for  $t$  varying inside  $I_n(b)$ , the quantity  $\frac{i \circ r_{\xi_b}(t) - te_\nu}{\sqrt{2t \log \log t}}$  is constant up to an error that tends to 0 as  $n$  goes to infinity. This implies that all the accumulation points of  $(\frac{i \circ r_{\xi_b}(t) - te_\nu}{\sqrt{2t \log \log t}})_{t>2}$  are attainable along a sequence of times among the  $t_{b,n}$ 's. The LIL now follows from (6). □

## 4.5 Principle of large deviations

We prove the principle of large deviations in Theorem 1.4.

*Proof of Theorem 1.4 (PLD).* As  $i$  is quasi-Lipschitz, it is enough to prove that, for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exist  $D, \delta > 0$  such that for all  $n \geq 0$ ,

$$\beta\{b : \|i \circ r_{\xi_b}(n\lambda_\mu) - n\lambda_\mu e_\nu\| \geq n\varepsilon\} \leq De^{-\delta n}$$

But we have the bound

$$\begin{aligned} & \|i \circ r_{\xi_b}(n\lambda_\mu) - n\lambda_\mu e_\nu\| \\ & \leq \|i \circ r_{\xi_b}(n\lambda_\mu) - i \circ r_{\xi_b}(t_{b,n})\| + \|i \circ r_{\xi_b}(t_{b,n}) - i(b_1 \dots b_n.o)\| + \|i(b_1 \dots b_n.o) - n\lambda_\mu e_\nu\| \\ & \ll |n\lambda_\mu - t_{b,n}| + d(r_{\xi_b}(t_{b,n}), b_1 \dots b_n.o) + \|\pi(b_1 \dots b_n) - n\lambda_\mu e_\nu\| + 1 \end{aligned}$$

It is then enough to prove a PLD for each of the terms on the right-hand side. The first term is treated by the PLD for the distance to the origin [10, Theorem 1.1], the second by the exponential deviation estimate in Theorem 2.1 for  $\tau = n$ , and the third by the classical PLD applied to  $\mu_{ab}$ . This concludes the proof. □

## 4.6 Gambler's ruin

We prove the gambler's ruin estimate in Theorem 1.4. In particular  $d = 1$ .

*Proof of Theorem 1.4 (GR).* Let  $\varepsilon > 0$ . It is enough to show that

$$\liminf_{s \rightarrow +\infty} \beta\{b : (\pi \circ r_{\xi_b}(t) - te_\nu)_{t>0} \text{ meets } [l_s, +\infty) \text{ before } (-\infty, -k_s]\} > \frac{k}{k+l} - \varepsilon \quad (7)$$

Indeed, the lower bound for the lim sup follows by symmetry, and one concludes letting  $\varepsilon$  go to  $0^+$ .

Let us establish (7). Fix a (large) parameter  $C > 1$  to be specified below, and  $x \in X$ . Write  $M_n(b) = -\tilde{\sigma}(b_n^{-1} \dots b_1^{-1}, x) = \pi(b_1 \dots b_n) - \sigma(b_n^{-1} \dots b_1^{-1}, x)e_\nu$  the martingale associated to  $x$ . For  $s > C$ , let  $E_s$  be the set of elements  $b \in B$  such that

- $\forall j \in \mathbb{N}^*, |M_j(b) - (\pi(b_1 \dots b_j) - t_{b,j}e_\nu)| \leq C$
- $\forall j \leq s^3, |\pi(b_1 \dots b_j) - i \circ r_{\xi_b}(t_{b,j})| \leq C \log s$
- $\forall j \leq s^3, |t_{b,j+1} - t_{b,j}| \leq C \log s$

According to Proposition 3.1, Theorem 2.2, and the exponential moment assumption on  $\mu$ , we can choose  $C = C(\varepsilon) > 1$  large enough so that for every  $s > C$ , one has

$$\beta(E_s) > 1 - \varepsilon$$

We can also assume that  $i$  is  $C$ -quasi-Lipschitz. Let  $F_s$  be the set of  $b \in B$  such that  $M_n(b)$  meets  $[l_s + 2C \log s, +\infty)$  before  $(-\infty, -k_s + 3C^2 \log s + 3C]$  and during the time interval  $[0, s^3]$ . Lemmas A.15, A.14 from the appendix yield

$$\beta(F_s) \xrightarrow{s \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{k}{k + s}$$

Finally we check that for  $s > C$ ,  $b \in E_s \cap F_s$ , the recentred projected geodesic ray  $(\pi \circ r_{\xi_b}(t) - te_\nu)_{t>0}$  meets  $[l_s, +\infty)$  before  $(-\infty, -k_s]$ . Indeed, let  $j_0 \leq s^3$  minimal such that  $M_{j_0}(b) \geq l_s + 2C \log s$ . Using the first two items in the definition of  $E_s$ , we get that  $\pi \circ r_{\xi_b}(t_{b,j_0}) - t_{b,j_0}e_\nu \geq l_s$ .

We also check that  $(i \circ r_{\xi_b}(t) - te_\nu)_{t>0}$  does not meet  $(-\infty, -k_s]$  for  $t < t_{b,j_0}$ . Suppose by contradiction it is the case:  $\exists t_1 < t_{b,j_0}$ ,

$$i \circ r_{\xi_b}(t_1) - t_1 e_\nu < -k_s$$

Let  $0 \leq j_1 < j_0$  such that  $t_{b,j_1} \leq t < t_{b,j_1+1}$  and observe that by the last item in the definition of  $E_s$ , we have  $|t - t_{b,j_1}| \leq C \log s$ . Using that  $i : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  is  $C$ -quasi-Lipschitz, we get

$$i \circ r_{\xi_b}(t_{b,j_1}) - t_{b,j_1} e_\nu \leq -ks + 2C^2 \log s + 2C$$

Then first two items in the definition of  $E_s$  yield  $M_{j_1}(b) \leq -k_s + 3C^2 \log s + 3C$ . Hence a contradiction. □

## 5 Winding and Patterson-Sullivan measures

The goal of this section is to prove Corollaries 1.6, 1.3. We first recall basic notions of hyperbolic geometry.

Let  $\mathbb{H}^N$  be the the  $N$ -dimensional real hyperbolic space,  $\Gamma \leq Isom^+(\mathbb{H}^N)$  a non-elementary torsion-free discrete subgroup of orientation preserving isometries. One can associate to  $\Gamma$  a class of measures on the visual boundary  $\partial\mathbb{H}^N \simeq \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ , called Patterson-Sullivan measures. We recall their construction.

The discrete group  $\Gamma$  comes with a *limit set*  $\Lambda_\Gamma \subseteq \partial\mathbb{H}^N$  and a *critical exponent*  $\delta \in \mathbb{R}^+$  defined by

$$\Lambda_\Gamma = \overline{\Gamma.z} \cap \partial\mathbb{H}^N \qquad \delta = \lim_{R \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{R} \log \#B_{\mathbb{H}^N}(z, R) \cap \Gamma.z$$

where  $z \in \mathbb{H}^N$  is any point,  $\overline{\Gamma.z}$  is the closure of  $\Gamma.z$  in  $\overline{\mathbb{H}^N} = \mathbb{H}^N \cup \partial\mathbb{H}^N$ , and  $B_{\mathbb{H}^N}(z, R)$  denotes the ball of radius  $R$  centred at  $z$ . As  $\Gamma$  is non-elementary, we must have  $\#\Lambda_\Gamma \geq 3$ ,  $\delta > 0$ .

We also define the *Busemann function* by

$$\beta_x(z_1, z_2) = \lim_{z' \in \mathbb{H}^N, z' \rightarrow x} d(z', z_1) - d(z', z_2)$$

for  $x \in \partial\mathbb{H}^N$ ,  $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{H}^N$ .

**Definition** (Patterson-Sullivan measures [49, 54]). *There exists a unique<sup>3</sup> family of finite Borel measures  $(\nu_z)_{z \in \mathbb{H}^N}$  on  $\Lambda_\Gamma$  such that for all  $z, z' \in \mathbb{H}^N$ ,  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ ,*

$$\gamma_*\nu_z = \nu_{\gamma.z} \quad \text{and} \quad d\nu_z(\xi) = e^{-\delta\beta_\xi(z, z')} d\nu_{z'}(\xi)$$

The measures  $(\nu_z)_{z \in \mathbb{H}^N}$  are called the Patterson-Sullivan measures associated to  $\Gamma$ .

**Remark.** The PS measures of  $\Gamma$  are all equivalent to one another. Hence, they define without ambiguity a measure class.

We say that  $\Gamma$  is *convex cocompact* if the action of  $\Gamma$  on the convex hull  $C(\Gamma) = \text{hull}(\Lambda_\Gamma) \cap \mathbb{H}^N$  of  $\Lambda_\Gamma$  in  $\mathbb{H}^N$  is cocompact. It is equivalent to ask that the orbit maps  $\theta_z : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^N, \gamma \mapsto \gamma.z$  for  $z \in \mathbb{H}^N$  are quasi-isometric embeddings.

For convex cocompact subgroups, one can realise PS measures on the boundary  $\partial\mathbb{H}^N$  as Furstenberg measures for a suitable probability measure on  $\Gamma$ :

**Fact 5.1** ([46]). *Assume  $\Gamma$  is non-elementary and convex cocompact. For any  $z \in \mathbb{H}^N$ , there exists a probability measure  $\mu_z$  on  $\Gamma$  whose support generates  $\Gamma$  as a group, which has finite exponential moment, and such that  $\mu_z * \nu_z = \nu_z$ .*

## 5.1 Winding on convex cocompact manifolds

We now prove Corollary 1.6. We assume  $\Gamma$  convex cocompact, fix  $m$  a probability measure on the boundary that is absolutely continuous with respect to the class of Patterson-Sullivan. We aim to estimate the statistics of  $m$ -typical geodesic rays on  $\mathbb{H}^N$  projected via the map  $i : \mathbb{H}^N \rightarrow H_1(M, \mathbb{R})$  where  $M = \Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}^N$ . We can assume without loss of generality that the basepoint  $o$  is in  $C(\Gamma)$ . As  $C(\Gamma)$  has compact projection, the norms of the 1-forms defining  $i$  are bounded in  $C(\Gamma)$ , hence  $i$  is Lipschitz on  $C(\Gamma)$ . We are thus in a position to apply Theorem 1.4 if  $m$  is a Furstenberg measure for some probability measure  $\mu$  with moment conditions. Note this is not always the case, for instance if  $m$  lacks regularity. Our strategy is to start with the case where  $m = \nu_o$  is the PS measure based at  $o$ , then deduce the general result using the  $\Gamma$ -equivariance of the  $\{\nu_z, z \in \mathbb{H}^N\}$  to approximate any  $m$  by a combination of  $\nu_{\gamma.o}$ .

We start by proving that  $\nu_o$ -typical geodesic rays have zero drift in  $H_1(M, \mathbb{R})$ . Our argument relies on the dynamics of the geodesic flow for the Bowen-Sullivan-Margulis measure (denoted by  $m_{BMS}$ ) that we now recall.

The BMS-measure can be defined as the unique probability measure on  $T^1M$  which is invariant by the geodesic flow and has maximal entropy [48]. It is supported on the compact subset  $T^1M|_{K(\Gamma)}$  where  $K(\Gamma) = \Gamma \backslash C(\Gamma)$  is the *convex core*.

---

<sup>3</sup>up to scalar multiplication

The BMS-measure also has an explicit construction in terms of Patterson-Sullivan measures. Indeed, recall Hopf coordinates allow to identify  $T^1\mathbb{H}^N$  with  $(\partial\mathbb{H}^N)^{(2)} \times \mathbb{R}$  where  $^{(2)}$  refers to the direct product minus the diagonal. The identification is given by the map

$$v \mapsto (v^- = \lim_{-\infty} \phi_t v, v^+ = \lim_{+\infty} \phi_t v, B_{v^+}(o, v_*))$$

where  $\phi_t$  is the time  $t$  geodesic flow,  $v_* \in \mathbb{H}^N$  stands for the basepoint of  $v$ . We define a measure  $\tilde{m}_{BMS}$  on  $T^1\mathbb{H}^N$  by setting in Hopf coordinates

$$d\tilde{m}_{BMS}(x, y, s) = e^{\delta B_\xi(o, v_*)} e^{\delta B_\eta(o, v_*)} d\nu_o(x) d\nu_o(y) ds$$

where  $v$  is here the vector represented by  $(x, y, s)$ . The measure  $\tilde{m}_{BMS}$  is  $\phi_t$ -invariant (use that  $\phi_t$  acts by translation on the  $\mathbb{R}$ -coordinate) and  $\Gamma$ -invariant. Hence, it defines a  $\phi_t$ -invariant measure on  $T^1M$ , which is known to be finite and  $\phi_t$ -ergodic as  $\Gamma$  is geometrically finite [55]. Its normalization of mass 1 is  $m_{BMS}$ .

We now prove the centred law of large numbers in Corollary 1.6.

**Lemma 5.2** (zero drift). *We have*

$$e_{\nu_o} = 0$$

*Proof of Corollary 1.6 (zero drift).* Extend  $i$  to  $T^1\mathbb{H}^N$  by precomposing it with the natural projection  $T^1\mathbb{H}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^N$ . Introduce the cocycle

$$\sigma : T^1M \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow H_1(M, \mathbb{R}), (v, t) \mapsto i(\phi_t \tilde{v}) - i(\tilde{v})$$

where  $\tilde{v} \in T^1\mathbb{H}^N$  lifts  $v$ . Note that the  $\Gamma$ -equivariance of  $i$  guarantees that  $\sigma$  is well defined. One can interpret  $\sigma(v, t)$  as the winding of the path  $[v, \phi_t v]$  on  $M$ . Also,  $\sigma$  is a cocycle in the sense that

$$\sigma(v, s + t) = \sigma(v, s) + \sigma(\phi_s v, t)$$

Moreover,  $\sigma(v, t)$  is uniformly bounded on the compact set  $T^1M|_{K(\Gamma)} \times [-1, 1]$ .

The ergodicity of  $(m_{BMS}, \phi_t)$  combined with Birkhoff Ergodic Theorem yields that for  $m_{BMS}$ -almost-every  $v_0 \in T^1M$ ,

$$\frac{1}{n} (i(\phi_n v_0) - i(v_0)) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \sigma(\phi_k v_0, a_1) \longrightarrow \int_{T^1M} \sigma(v, 1) dm_{BMS}(v)$$

The integral on the right must be zero. Indeed, the measure  $m_{BMS}$  is invariant under  $\phi_1$  and the involution map  $T^1M \rightarrow T^1M, v \mapsto \varepsilon(v)$  reversing orientation, so

$$\int_{T^1M} \sigma(v, 1) dm_{BMS}(v) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{T^1M} \underbrace{\sigma(v, 1) + \sigma(\varepsilon(\phi_1 v), 1)}_{=0} dm_{BMS}(v) = 0$$

It follows that for  $\tilde{m}_{BMS}$ -almost every vector  $\tilde{v} \in T^1\mathbb{H}^N$ , the path  $[o, \phi_t \tilde{v}]$  has sublinear drift in  $H_1(M, \mathbb{R})$ . As the projection of  $\tilde{m}_{BMS}$  to the boundary  $\partial\mathbb{H}^N$  via  $\tilde{v} \mapsto \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \phi_t \tilde{v}$  is equivalent to  $\nu_o$ , we get nullity of the drift for  $\nu_o$ -typical directions, as required. □

We also claim that the Gaussian central limit theorem for  $\nu_o$ -typical rays is non-degenerate.

**Lemma 5.3** (definite covariance matrix). *We have*

$$\det(A_{\nu_o}) \neq 0$$

*Proof.* As  $e_{\nu_o} = 0$ , we know that  $A_{\nu_o} = \text{Cov}(\mu_{o,ab})$ . If  $A_{\nu_o}$  were degenerate, then  $\mu_{o,ab}$  would be supported on some affine hyperplane of  $H_1(M, \mathbb{R})$ . As  $\mathbb{E}(\mu_{o,ab}) = \lambda_{\mu_o} e_{\nu_o} = 0$ , this hyperplane contains  $o$ . We now get a contradiction, since the support of  $\mu_o$  generates  $\Gamma$  as a group and  $\pi(\Gamma)$  spans  $H_1(M, \mathbb{R})$ . □

We now extend the class of measures allowed in Corollary 1.6 from  $\nu_o$  to any measure on  $\partial\mathbb{H}^N$  absolutely continuous with respect to the class of Patterson-Sullivan. The LLN and LIL are immediate as they only consider fixed typical directions.

Let us check the central limit theorem and the gambler's ruin for geodesic rays chosen via  $m$ . We use the following decomposition lemma.

**Lemma 5.4.** *Let  $\varphi : \partial\mathbb{H}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  be a smooth positive function (for  $\partial\mathbb{H}^N \simeq \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$ ). Then there exist coefficients  $(c_\gamma)_{\gamma \in \Gamma}$  such that  $c_\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^+$  and for all  $\xi \in \Lambda_\Gamma$ ,*

$$\sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} c_\gamma e^{-\delta B_\xi(\gamma o, o)} = \varphi(\xi)$$

*Proof.* This follows from the appendix in [46]: just replace  $R_0 = 1$  by  $R_0 = \varphi$  in [46, Section A.3]. □

**Lemma 5.5.**  *$m$ -typical geodesic rays satisfy a non-degenerate CLT, with same covariance matrix as  $\nu_o$ , as well the Gambler's ruin estimate.*

*Proof.* We have proven the CLT and the GR for  $m \in \{\nu_{\gamma.o}, \gamma \in \Gamma\}$ . Observe that they remain true (with same covariance matrix) for any convex combination of these measures, i.e. for measures of the form

$$\sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} c_\gamma \nu_{\gamma.o} = \left( \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} c_\gamma e^{-\delta B_\xi(\gamma o, o)} \right) \nu_o$$

where  $c_\gamma \geq 0$ ,  $\sum c_\gamma = 1$ . By Lemma 5.4, the sum in the right hand side can be chosen to be any  $\varphi$  positive smooth function on the boundary  $\partial\mathbb{H}^N$ . Now, if  $m = \psi \nu_o$  with  $\psi \in L^1(\nu_o)$  non negative, we can approximate  $\psi$  in  $L^1(\nu_o)$  by such functions  $\varphi$  to extend the result to  $m$ . □

It remains to check to PLD in case  $m$  has  $L^{1+\varepsilon}$  Radon-Nikodym derivatives with respect to Patterson-Sullivan measures.

**Lemma 5.6.** *If  $m = \psi \nu_o$  where  $\psi \in L^{1+\varepsilon}(\partial\mathbb{H}^N, \nu_o)$  for some  $\varepsilon > 0$ , then  $m$ -typical geodesic rays satisfy the principle of large deviations.*

*Proof.* Given  $\alpha > 0$ , set

$$E_t = \{\xi : \|i \circ r_\xi(t)\| \geq \alpha t\}$$

By Hölder's inequality,

$$m(E_t) = \int_{\Lambda_\Gamma} \mathbf{1}_{E_t}(\xi) \psi(\xi) d\nu_o(\xi) \leq \nu_o(E_t)^{\varepsilon/(1+\varepsilon)} \|\psi\|_{L^{1+\varepsilon}(\nu_o)}$$

whence exponential decay by the PLD for  $\nu_o$  (consequence of Theorem 1.4 and Lemma 5.2).  $\square$

## 5.2 Singularity of harmonic measures

To conclude the section, we combine Theorem 1.4 and a result of Enriquez-Franchi-Le Jan [22] to prove Corollary 1.3: Furstenberg measures for  $L^1$ -random walks on a finitely generated discrete subgroup  $\Gamma$  of  $PSL_2(\mathbb{R})$  containing a parabolic element are singular with Patterson-Sullivan measures.

Observe that we authorize  $\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}^2$  to have only one cusp, of trivial homology. In order to apply Theorem 1.4, we need to generate cusps with non-trivial homology. This is the role of

**Lemma 5.7.** *To prove Corollary 1.3, we can assume that  $\Gamma$  is torsion free and  $\Gamma \setminus [\Gamma, \Gamma]$  contains a parabolic element.*

*Proof.* The idea is to replace  $\mu$  by its induction on a finite index subgroup of  $\Gamma$ .

By Selberg's Theorem,  $\Gamma$  admits a normal subgroup  $\Gamma'$  of finite index which is torsion-free. In particular,  $M' = \Gamma' \backslash \mathbb{H}^2$  is a hyperbolic surface of finite type with a cusp. Its topology is characterized by its genus  $g$  and its number of punctures  $p \geq 1$ . The first homology group is known to have dimension  $2g + p - 1$ . More precisely, a basis consists in the  $2g$  standard loops of the genus  $g$  compactification of  $M'$ , and any  $p - 1$  loops which are homotopic to different cusps. Up to replacing  $M'$  by a 2-cover, one may assume  $p \geq 2$ . In this case, cusps have non-trivial homology in  $M'$ . This means that  $\Gamma' \setminus [\Gamma', \Gamma']$  contains a parabolic element.

Let  $\tau : B \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ ,  $b \mapsto \inf\{k \geq 1, b_1 \dots b_k \in \Gamma'\}$  be the hitting time of  $\Gamma'$  for the right  $\mu$ -walk on  $\Gamma$ . As  $\Gamma' \backslash \Gamma$  is finite,  $\tau$  must have finite first moment. Introduce the measure  $\mu_\tau$ , whose distribution is given by  $b_1 \dots b_{\tau(b)}$ . By Wald's formula,  $\mu_\tau$  has finite first moment in any word metric on  $\Gamma$ , hence on  $\Gamma'$ . It is also non-elementary, for instance by [15, Theorem A]. Finally, we know from [3, Appendix A.2] that  $\mu_\tau$  and  $\mu$  share the same Furstenberg measure on the boundary  $\partial\mathbb{H}^2$ . Summing up, we can replace  $\mu$  by  $\mu_\tau$  to prove Corollary 1.3, whence the announced reduction.  $\square$

We now conclude the proof of Corollary 1.3.

*Proof of Corollary 1.3.* As in [32], followed by [28, 50], the idea is to show that the Furstenberg measure of  $\mu$  and the Patterson-Sullivan measure drive geodesic rays with different winding statistics on  $M = \Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}^2$ .



In view of Lemma 5.7, we may assume that  $\Gamma$  is torsion-free and let  $u \in \Gamma \setminus [\Gamma, \Gamma]$  be a parabolic element.  $u$  corresponds to a loop  $l_u$  around a cusp of  $M$  which is non trivial in  $H_1(M, \mathbb{R})$ . By the De Rham duality theorem, there exists a closed 1-form  $\omega$  on  $M$  with non zero integral on  $l_u$ . We write  $\tilde{\omega}$  its lift to  $\mathbb{H}^2$  and define the  $\Gamma$ -equivariant map  $i : \mathbb{H}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$i(z) = \int_{[o, z]} \tilde{\omega}$$

recording the homological winding around the cusp of  $u$ . Observe that  $i$  is locally bounded (though not quasi-Lipschitz).

Write  $\nu$  the Furstenberg measure of  $\mu$  on  $\partial\mathbb{H}^2$ . By the weak law of large numbers in Theorem 1.5, we have for any  $\alpha > 0$ ,

$$\nu(\xi : |i \circ r_\xi(t) - te_\nu| \leq \alpha t) \rightarrow 1$$

Let  $\delta$  the exponent of  $\Gamma$  (defined at the beginning of Section 5). Note that  $\delta \in (1/2, 1]$  since  $M$  has a cusp [55, p. 265]. Moreover  $\delta = 1$  if and only if  $M$  has no funnel. Let  $D \subseteq \mathbb{H}^2$  be a fundamental domain for  $\Gamma$ , and  $\nu_D$  the geodesic projection<sup>4</sup> of  $\tilde{m}_{BMS}$  on the boundary  $\partial\mathbb{H}^2$ . By [22], the winding of the geodesic flow directed by  $\nu_D$  satisfies a central limit theorem with renormalization in  $1/t^{\frac{1}{2\delta-1}}$ : for any  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\nu_D(\xi : i \circ r_\xi(t) \geq ct^{\frac{1}{2\delta-1}}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{G}([c, +\infty))$$

where is  $\mathfrak{G}$  some atom-free probability distribution on  $\mathbb{R}$  (more precisely a two-sided stable law of exponent  $2\delta - 1 \in (0, 1)$ ) and independent of  $D$ . Up to averaging on several domains  $D$ , this is still true for some probability  $\nu_1$  in the class of Patterson-Sullivan. In particular, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there is  $\alpha > 0$  such that

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \nu_1(\xi : |i \circ r_\xi(t) - te_\nu| \leq \alpha t) \leq \varepsilon$$

This proves that  $\nu$  and  $\nu_1$  are mutually singular. □

## 6 Open questions

We mention a few problems that were not discussed here, but might lead to interesting continuations of our study.

- (Nilpotent case) Let  $\Gamma$  be a non-abelian free group,  $N$  a simply connected *nilpotent* Lie group, and  $\pi : \Gamma \rightarrow N$  a group morphism. Let  $\nu$  be a Furstenberg measure on the Gromov boundary  $\partial\Gamma$ , determined by a finitely supported non-elementary probability measure  $\mu$  on  $\Gamma$ . What are the statistics of  $\nu$ -typical geodesic rays projected to  $N$ ? Note that limit theorems on  $N$  for i.i.d random walks are available [52, 13, 21, 35, 4].
- (Inverse problem) Let  $\mu_1, \mu_2$  be two finitely supported non-elementary measures on a non-abelian free group  $\Gamma$ . Is there a simple necessary and sufficient condition characterizing that  $\mu_1$  and  $\mu_2$  have the same Furstenberg measure?

---

<sup>4</sup>This means the limit of the push-forwards by the geodesic flow  $\phi_t$  as  $t \rightarrow +\infty$

## A Appendix : General limit laws for cocycles

We prove general limit theorems for cocycles. Similar results have been studied for the Iwasawa cocycle on linear groups in [8, 6] and the Busemann cocycle on hyperbolic groups [7], but they do not apply directly to the context of the paper. Our motivation is to propose an abstract setting, encapsulating both [8, 6, 7] and our needs, and which will hopefully apply to other situations.

We fix a compact metric space  $X$  and a measurable group  $G$  acting measurably on  $X$ .

We let  $\sigma : G \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  be a measurable cocycle and  $|\cdot| : G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  a subadditive function such that for all  $g \in G$ ,

$$\sup_{x \in X} \|\sigma(g, x)\| \leq |g|$$

We fix a probability measure  $\mu$  on  $G$  such that  $\int_G |g| d\mu(g) < \infty$  and assume for Sections A.1-A.4 that  $\sigma$  has constant zero-drift for  $\mu$ : for all  $x \in X$ ,

$$\int_G \sigma(g, x) d\mu(g) = 0$$

**Remarks.** 1) We can always choose the function  $|\cdot|$  to be  $|g| = \sup_{x \in X} \|\sigma(g, x)\|$ .

2) We could also assume that  $\sigma$  has constant drift  $\lambda$  where  $\lambda$  is possibly non-zero. However, for our purposes, one can always reduce to the centred case: set  $G' = G \times \mathbb{Z}$  acting on  $X$  via the  $G$  component, set  $\sigma'((g, k), x) = \sigma(g, x) - k\lambda$  and define  $\mu' = \mu \otimes \delta_1$ .

3) All the propositions in Appendix A remain true (with same limit behavior) for cocycles  $\tilde{\sigma}$  of the form

$$\tilde{\sigma}(g, x) = \sigma(g, x) + \psi(gx) - \psi(x)$$

where  $\psi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  is measurable and bounded. The upgrade is obvious for Sections A.1-A.3. For A.4, one can argue as in the proof of GR in Theorem 1.4. For A.5, the proofs still work up to replacing  $\mu$  by a convolution power to guarantee positive drift.

We set  $(B, \beta) = (G^{\mathbb{N}^*}, \mu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}^*})$ , and write  $\mathcal{B}_k$  the  $\sigma$ -algebra of  $B$  generated by the first  $k$  coordinates. We say that  $\mu$  has finite  $p$ -th moment if  $\int_G |g|^p d\mu(g) < \infty$ .

### A.1 Central limit theorem

We introduce a notion of continuity on  $\sigma$  with respect to the space variable in  $X$ . More precisely, we say  $\sigma$  is  $X$ -controlled if

- for every  $g \in G$ , the function  $\sigma(g, \cdot)$  is continuous.
- $\forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists R > 0, \forall n \geq 1 \forall x, y \in X,$

$$\mu^{*n}(|\sigma(g, x) - \sigma(g, y)| \leq R) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$$

Under this condition, we prove the central limit theorem for  $\sigma$ .

**Proposition A.1.** *Assume  $\mu$  has finite second moment and  $\sigma$  is  $X$ -controlled. Then,*

1. (Covariance) *Uniformly in  $x \in X$ , we have the convergence*

$$\frac{1}{n} \int_G \sigma(g, x)^t \sigma(g, x) d\mu^{*n}(g) \longrightarrow A$$

*where  $A \in M_d(\mathbb{R})$  is some positive semi-definite symmetric matrix.*

2. (CLT) *Uniformly in  $x \in X$ , as  $g$  varies with law  $\mu^{*n}$ ,*

$$\frac{\sigma(g, x)}{\sqrt{n}} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{N}(0, A)$$

**Remark.** 1) We see from the proof that the limit covariance matrix  $A$  satisfies

$$A = \frac{1}{n} \int_{G \times X} \sigma(g, x)^t \sigma(g, x) d\mu^{*n}(g) d\nu(x)$$

for any  $n \geq 1$ , any  $\mu$ -stationary probability measure  $\nu$  on  $X$ . One says that  $\sigma$  has *unique covariance*.

2) Benoist and Quint prove a CLT where the  $X$ -control assumption is replaced by the condition that  $\sigma$  is continuous with unique covariance [6, Theorem 3.4]. The  $X$ -control assumption seems to be more convenient. For instance, it applies directly to both the linear case and the hyperbolic case, whereas establishing unique covariance in the hyperbolic setting requires to go through the whole proof of the CLT, as in [7, Theorem 4.7].

For this paper, we actually *need a stronger version of the CLT*, dealing not only with  $\mu^{*n}$  but with  $\mu^{*\tau_n}$  where  $\tau_n$  is a stopping time distributed around  $n$  at scale  $\sqrt{n}$ . Let us define this notation.

Given  $\tau : B \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$  be a  $\beta$ -a.e. finite stopping time, we define  $\mu^{*\tau}$  as the distribution of the variable  $b_{\tau(b)} \dots b_1$  when  $b$  varies with law  $\beta$ .

We say that a family  $(\tau_n)_{n \geq 1}$  of stopping times is *tight around  $n$*  if for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $R > 0$  such that

$$\inf_{n \geq 1} \beta\{\tau_n \in [n - R\sqrt{n}, n + R\sqrt{n}]\} \geq 1 - \varepsilon$$

**Proposition A.2** (CLT with stopping times). *Assume  $\mu$  has finite second moment and  $\sigma$  is  $X$ -controlled. Let  $(\tau_n)_{n \geq 1}$  be a family of stopping times which is tight around  $n$ . Then uniformly in  $x \in X$ , as  $g$  varies with law  $\mu^{*\tau_n}$ ,*

$$\frac{\sigma(g, x)}{\sqrt{n}} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{N}(0, A)$$

We now engage in the proof of the CLT with no stopping time, i.e. Proposition A.1. We will combine methods used in [7] and [8]. Using Cramér-Wold device and the space control assumption (for the uniformity), it is enough to check those statements when  $\sigma$  is replaced by its image under a linear form. In other words, *we may assume that  $d = 1$* . We start by a non-uniform version of the claims.

**Lemma A.3.** *There exists  $x_0 \in X$  and  $A \in \mathbb{R}^+$  such that the following holds.*

$$\frac{1}{n} \int_G \sigma(g, x_0)^2 d\mu^{*n}(g) \longrightarrow A \quad (8)$$

and as  $g$  varies with law  $\mu^{*n}$ ,

$$\frac{\sigma(g, x_0)}{\sqrt{n}} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mathcal{N}(0, A) \quad (9)$$

*Proof.* Let  $x_0 \in X$  be a parameter and for  $k \geq 1$ ,  $b \in B$ , introduce the martingale difference

$$X_k(b) = \sigma(b_k, b_{k-1} \dots b_1 x_0)$$

We only need check to that for some good choice of  $x_0$ , there exists  $A \geq 0$  such that

- (i)  $W_n := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E}(X_k^2 | \mathcal{B}_{k-1}) \longrightarrow A$  in  $L^1$
- (ii) For all  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $W_{\varepsilon, n} := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E}(X_k^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{|X_k| > \varepsilon\}} | \mathcal{B}_{k-1}) \longrightarrow 0$  in probability

Indeed, this is sufficient: Brown's CLT for martingales [14] yields the convergence  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_i X_i \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, A)$  which is (9), and integrating item (i) yields (8) (use the zero drift condition and the cocycle relation).

Let us check (i). We observe that  $W_n(b) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} M(b_{k-1} \dots b_1 x_0)$  where

$$M(y) = \int_G \sigma(g, y)^2 d\mu(g) \quad (y \in X)$$

Choose  $\nu$  to be any ergodic  $\mu$ -stationary probability measure on  $X$ , then choose  $x_0$  to be  $\nu$ -generic for the (bounded) function  $M$ . Then by Birkhoff Ergodic Theorem,  $W_n$  converges in  $L^1(B, \beta)$  to the  $\nu$ -average  $M$ , which is

$$\nu(M) = \int_{G \times X} \sigma(g, x)^2 d\mu(g) d\nu(x) =: A$$

For item (ii), observe the equality  $W_{\varepsilon, n}(b) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} u_n(b_{k-1} \dots b_1 x_0)$  where

$$\begin{aligned} u_n(y) &= \int_G \sigma(g, y)^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{|\sigma(g, y)| > \varepsilon \sqrt{n}\}} d\mu(g) \quad (y \in X) \\ &\leq \int_G |g|^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{|g| > \varepsilon \sqrt{n}\}} d\mu(g) \end{aligned}$$

By the  $L^2$  assumption on  $\mu$ , we have  $u_n(y) \rightarrow 0$  uniformly in  $y$ . Hence  $W_{\varepsilon, n} \rightarrow 0$ .  $\square$

We now upgrade Lemma A.3 to Proposition A.1.

*Proof of Proposition A.1.* Let  $x_0 \in X$  and  $A$  be as in Lemma A.3. The uniform CLT follows directly from (9) and the spatial control assumption on  $\sigma$ .

To check the convergence of variances, we must prove that

$$\frac{1}{n} \int_G \sigma(g, x)^2 d\mu^{*n}(g) \longrightarrow A$$

uniformly in  $x \in X$ . Using the cocycle relation and the zero drift assumption, we can rewrite the left-hand side

$$\frac{1}{n} \int_G \sigma(g, x)^2 d\mu^{*n}(g) = \underbrace{\left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \mu^{*k} * \delta_x \right)}_{\kappa_{n,x}}(M)$$

where  $M$  is the function defined previously.

The  $\nu$ -average of  $M$  for any  $\mu$ -stationary probability measure  $\nu$  on  $X$  is equal to  $A$ . Indeed, one can assume  $\nu$  ergodic, and this follows from the proof of Lemma A.3 and the fact that the limit in the CLT for  $\sigma$  does not depend on  $x$ .

It follows that the empirical average  $\kappa_{n,x}(M)$  must converge to  $A$  uniformly in  $x \in X$ . Indeed, we would otherwise have some sequence  $\kappa_{n,x_n}(M)$  at distance  $\varepsilon$  from  $A$ . But  $M$  is bounded continuous and any accumulation point of  $\kappa_{n,x_n}$  is stationary, whence a contradiction. This concludes the proof.  $\square$

We now prove the CLT with stopping times.

*Proof of Proposition A.2.* Let  $R > 0$  be some (large) fixed parameter and set,  $q_n = \lfloor n + R\sqrt{n} \rfloor$ , then  $\tau'_n = \min(\tau_n, q_n)$ . By the tightness assumption,  $\tau'_n = \tau_n$  on a set of  $\beta$ -measure arbitrarily close to 1 as long as  $R$  is large enough. Hence, it is sufficient to check the above convergence for the stopping times  $\tau'_n$ , or in other words, we may assume  $\tau_n \leq q_n$ . Now we can use the cocycle property to write

$$\frac{\sigma(b_{\tau_n(b)} \dots b_1, x)}{\sqrt{n}} = \frac{\sigma(b_{q_n} \dots b_1, x)}{\sqrt{n}} - \frac{\sigma(b_{q_n} \dots b_{\tau_n(b)+1}, b_{\tau_n(b)} \dots b_1 x)}{\sqrt{n}}$$

By the CLT in Proposition A.1, the first term on the right-hand side converges to  $\mathcal{N}(0, A)$ , uniformly in  $x \in X$ . We only need to check that the second term goes to 0 in probability and uniformly in  $x$ . Denote by  $T : B \rightarrow B, (b_i)_{i \geq 1} \mapsto (b_{i+1})_{i \geq 1}$  the one-sided shift. Observing that  $T^{\tau_n(b)} b$  has law  $\beta$ , we just need to check that as  $a, b$  vary independently in  $B$  with law  $\beta$ , we have the convergence in probability

$$\frac{\sigma(a_{q_n - \tau_n(b)} \dots a_1, y)}{\sqrt{n}} \longrightarrow 0$$

uniformly in  $y \in X$ . This follows from the tightness condition on the  $\tau_n$  and the uniformity of the CLT in Proposition A.1.  $\square$

## A.2 Law of the iterated logarithm

We prove the law of the iterated logarithm for cocycles.

**Proposition A.4.** *Assume  $\mu$  has finite second moment,  $\sigma$  is  $X$ -controlled, and let  $A$  be the limit covariance matrix in the CLT (A.1). Then, for every  $x \in X$ , for*

$\beta$ -almost every  $b \in B$ ,

$$\left\{ \text{Accumulation points of } \left( \frac{\sigma(b_n \dots b_1, x)}{\sqrt{2n \log \log n}} \right)_{n \geq 3} \right\} = A^{1/2}(\overline{B}(0, 1))$$

where  $\overline{B}(0, 1) = \{t \in \mathbb{R}^d, \sum_i t_i^2 \leq 1\}$ .

A similar LIL is presented in the book [8] under the assumption  $\mu$  has finite exponential moment. To reach the optimal generality of  $\mu$  having only finite second moment, we build on truncation techniques used by de Acosta [18] in his proof of the LIL for sum of i.i.d random variables.

## The upper bound

**Lemma A.5.** *We may assume without loss of generality that  $d = 1$  and  $A = 1$ .*

*Proof.* Fix  $x \in X$ . If the case ( $d = 1, A = 1$ ) holds, then for every linear form  $\varphi$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , for  $\beta$ -almost every  $b \in B$ , the accumulation points of  $(a_n^{-1} \varphi \circ \sigma(b_n \dots b_1, x))_{n \geq 3}$  are included in  $\varphi A^{1/2}(\overline{B}(0, 1))$ . Now use that the inclusion in  $A^{1/2}(\overline{B}(0, 1))$  can be characterized via a countable set of linear forms on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  to conclude.  $\square$

From now on, we write  $a_n = \sqrt{2n \log \log n}$ .

**Lemma A.6.** *Fix  $r > 1$  arbitrary. It is enough to show that for all  $x \in X$ , for  $\beta$ -almost every  $b \in B$ ,*

$$\limsup \frac{1}{a_n} \sigma(b_n \dots b_1, x) \leq r^3 \quad (10)$$

*Proof.* The upper bound in the LIL follows by applying (10) to  $\sigma$  and  $-\sigma$ , and by letting  $r \rightarrow 1^+$  along a countable sequence.  $\square$

**Lemma A.7.** *Let  $\delta > 0$ . To prove (10), we may assume*

$$\int_G \sigma(g, x)^2 d\mu(g) \leq 1 + \delta \quad (11)$$

*Proof.* Notice that for fixed  $k \geq 1$ , and  $\beta$ -almost every  $b \in B$ , the sequences

$$a_n^{-1} \sigma(b_n \dots b_1, x) \quad a_{nk}^{-1} \sigma(b_{nk} \dots b_1, x) \quad (n \geq 1)$$

have the same accumulation points. Hence, we can replace  $(\sigma, \mu)$  by  $(\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} \sigma, \mu^{*k})$  without loss of generality. By the assumption  $A = 1$ , and the uniform convergence of variances in Proposition A.1, there exists  $k \geq 1$  such that for all  $x \in X$ ,

$$\int_G \frac{1}{k} \sigma(g, x)^2 d\mu^{*k}(g) \leq 1 + \delta$$

whence the result.  $\square$

We now introduce truncations of  $\sigma$ . These are crucial to deal with the weak moment condition on  $\sigma$ .

Let  $\alpha > 0$  be some parameter to be specified later. For  $j \geq 1$ , set  $LLj = \log \log j$ . We define  $X_1^{(j)}$  as the  $\alpha\sqrt{j/LLj}$ -truncation of  $\sigma$ , and call  $X^{(j)}$  the corresponding recentred variable:

$$X_1^{(j)}(g, x) = \sigma(g, x) \mathbf{1}_{|g| \leq \alpha\sqrt{\frac{j}{LLj}}} \quad X^{(j)}(g, x) = X_1^{(j)}(g, x) - \mathbb{E}_x(X_1^{(j)})$$

where  $\mathbb{E}_x$  refers to the  $\mu \otimes \delta_x$ -average.

For  $(b, x) \in B \times X$ , we set

$$S_n(b, x) = \sum_{j=1}^n X^{(j)}(b_j, b_{j-1} \dots b_1, x)$$

$S_n(b, x)$  corresponds to a version of  $\sigma(b_n \dots b_1, x)$  where the  $n$ -increments arising from the cocycle relation have been truncated with increasing margin of error and (slightly) recentred. We first note that  $S_n(b, x)$  is a good approximation of  $\sigma(b_n \dots b_1, x)$ , at least for the purpose of proving the LIL:

**Lemma A.8.** *For every  $\alpha > 0$ , for all  $x \in X$ ,  $\beta$ -almost every  $b \in B$ ,*

$$\sigma(b_n \dots b_1, x) = S_n(b, x) + o(a_n) \quad (12)$$

*Proof.* Using the inequality  $|\sigma(g, x)| \leq |g|$  and the zero drift assumption, we can bound the difference

$$|\sigma(b_n \dots b_1, x) - S_n(b, x)| \leq \sum_{j=1}^n |b_j| \mathbf{1}_{|b_j| > \alpha\sqrt{\frac{j}{LLj}}} + \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E}(|g| \mathbf{1}_{|g| > \alpha\sqrt{\frac{j}{LLj}}}) \quad (13)$$

The second moment assumption and [18, Lemma 2.3] imply that the right-hand side is  $\beta$ -almost surely of the form  $o(a_n)$ .  $\square$

We now play on the variance parameter  $\delta$  and the truncation parameter  $\alpha$  to prove the upper bound (10).

**Lemma A.9.** *We can choose the parameters  $\delta, \alpha > 0$  so that for some  $c > 1$ , all  $n \geq 1$ ,*

$$\sup_{x \in X} \mathbb{P}_x(S_n \geq ra_n) = O(\exp(-cLLn))$$

*Proof.* Using the relation  $e^s \leq 1 + s + \frac{s^2}{2} e^{|s|}$  for any  $s \in \mathbb{R}$  and the fact that  $X^{(j)}$  has zero average, we get for  $t > 0$ ,  $x \in X$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_x(e^{tX^{(j)}}) \leq 1 + \frac{t^2}{2} \mathbb{E}_x(|X^{(j)}|^2) \exp(t\alpha \frac{j}{\sqrt{LLj}})$$

The relation (11) allows to bound the second moment of  $X^{(j)}$ : for  $j$  large enough (say  $j \geq j_0$ ),

$$\mathbb{E}_x(|X^{(j)}|^2) \leq \int_G \sigma(g, x)^2 d\mu(g) + \delta \leq 1 + 2\delta := a^2$$

hence

$$\mathbb{E}_x(e^{tX^{(j)}}) \leq \exp\left(\frac{t^2 a^2}{2} \exp\left(t\alpha \frac{j}{\sqrt{\text{LL}j}}\right)\right)$$

We can now bound the exponential moments of  $S_n$ . For  $n \geq 1$ ,  $t > 0$ , using that

$$\mathbb{E}_x(e^{tX^{(j)}(b_j, b_{j-1} \dots b_1 x)} | \mathcal{B}_{j-1}) \leq \sup_{y \in X} \mathbb{E}_y(e^{tX^{(j)}}),$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_x(e^{tS_n}) &\leq \prod_{j=1}^n \sup_{y \in X} \mathbb{E}_y(e^{tX^{(j)}}) \\ &\leq \exp\left(\frac{t^2 a^2}{2} \sum_{j=1}^n \exp\left(t\alpha \frac{j}{\sqrt{\text{LL}j}}\right)\right) \end{aligned}$$

So by Chebychev inequality

$$\mathbb{P}_x(S_n > ra_n) \leq \exp\left(-tra_n + \frac{t^2 a^2}{2} \sum_{j=1}^n \exp\left(t\alpha \frac{j}{\sqrt{\text{LL}j}}\right)\right)$$

Setting  $t = 2ra^{-2} \sqrt{2(\text{LL}n)/n}$ , a direct computation yields

$$\mathbb{P}_x(S_n > ra_n) \leq \exp\left(-\left(r/a\right)^2 (2 - e^{ra^{-2}\alpha}) \text{LL}n\right)$$

As  $\delta, \alpha \rightarrow 0^+$ , we have  $c := (r/a)^2 (2 - e^{ra^{-2}\alpha}) \rightarrow r^2 > 1$ . This concludes the proof.  $\square$

The rest of the proof is dedicated to showing that for  $\delta, \alpha$  as in Lemma A.9, we have the upper bound (10).

**Lemma A.10.** *For all  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $n_0 \geq 0$  such that for  $n \geq n_0$ ,  $x \in X$ ,*

$$\min_{0 \leq k \leq n} \mathbb{P}_x(|S_n - S_k| \leq \varepsilon a_n | \mathcal{B}_k) \geq 1/2$$

*Proof.* Call  $r_n(b)$  the right-hand side of (13). We have

$$|S_n - S_k| \leq |\sigma(b_n \dots b_{k+1}, b_k \dots b_1 x)| + 2r_n(b)$$

As  $r_n(b) = o(a_n)$  almost-surely, we only need to check that for large  $n$ , for all  $y \in X$ ,

$$\min_{0 \leq l \leq n} \beta(|\sigma(b_l \dots b_1, y)| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} a_n) \geq 2/3$$

For  $l$  greater than some  $n'_0$ , this follows from the CLT assumption. For  $l \leq n'_0$ , this follows from the  $L^2$ -domination assumption.  $\square$

Set  $S_n^* = \max_{k \leq n} S_k$ .



**Lemma A.11.** For all  $c, \varepsilon > 0$ , for  $n \geq n_0$ ,  $x \in X$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}_x(S_n^* \geq (c + \varepsilon)a_n) \leq 2\mathbb{P}_x(|S_n| \geq ca_n)$$

*Proof.* It is enough to check that

$$\mathbb{P}_x(S_n \geq ca_n \mid S_n^* \geq (c + \varepsilon)a_n) \geq \frac{1}{2}$$

This follows from Lemma A.10. □

**Lemma A.12.** Choose  $\delta, \alpha > 0$  as in Lemma A.9. For all  $x \in X$ , for  $\beta$ -almost every  $b \in B$ ,

$$\limsup \frac{1}{a_n} S_n(b, x) \leq r^3$$

*Proof.* Fix some  $s \in (1, r)$  and set  $k_n = \lfloor s^n \rfloor$ . Writing *i.o.* for *infinitely often*, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_x(S_n \geq r^3 a_n \text{ i.o.}) &\leq \mathbb{P}_x(S_{k_n}^* \geq r^3 a_{k_{n-1}} \text{ i.o.}) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}_x(S_{k_n}^* \geq r^2 a_{k_n} \text{ i.o.}) \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality uses that  $r k_{n-1} \geq k_n$  for  $n$  large. Let us check that the right-hand side is 0. Using Lemma A.11 and Borel Cantelli Lemma, we only need to check that

$$\sum \mathbb{P}_x(S_{k_n} \geq r a_{k_n}) < \infty$$

By Lemma A.11,

$$\mathbb{P}_x(S_{k_n} \geq r a_{k_n}) \leq \exp(-c L L k_n) \ll n^{-c}$$

whence the finiteness. This shows that

$$\mathbb{P}_x(S_n \geq r^3 a_n \text{ i.o.}) = 0$$

□

**Conclusion of the proof.** We only need to check that Equation (10) is satisfied. This follows from Lemma A.12 and Lemma A.8.

### The lower bound

The proof of the reverse inclusion in the LIL follows verbatim the lines of the book [8, Section 12.4] given in the context of  $\mu$ -contracting cocycles with finite exponential moments. We choose not to repeat it.

### A.3 Principle of large deviations

We show the principle of large deviations for cocycles. The proof is classic but also very short, so we include it for completeness.

**Proposition A.13.** *Assume  $\mu$  has finite exponential moment:  $\int_G e^{\alpha|g|} d\mu(g) < \infty$  for some  $\alpha > 0$ . Then for all  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $D, \delta > 0$  such that for any  $n \geq 1$ ,  $x \in X$ ,*

$$\beta(b : \|\sigma(b_n \dots b_1, x)\| > \varepsilon n) \leq D e^{-\delta n}$$

*Proof.* We can assume that  $\sigma$  is  $\mathbb{R}$ -valued. Let  $t \in (0, \alpha)$  be a parameter,  $n \geq 1$ ,  $x \in X$ . Using the cocycle relation and Fubini Theorem,

$$\begin{aligned} \beta(b : \sigma(b_n \dots b_1, x) > \varepsilon n) &\leq e^{-t\varepsilon n} \int_B e^{t\sigma(b_n \dots b_1, x)} d\beta(b) \\ &\leq e^{-t\varepsilon n} \left( \sup_{y \in X} \int_G e^{t\sigma(g, y)} d\mu(g) \right)^n \end{aligned}$$

Using the bound  $e^s \leq 1 + s + s^2 e^{|s|}$  for any  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ , we get for  $y \in X$ ,

$$\int_G e^{t\sigma(g, y)} d\mu(g) \leq 1 + t^2 C \leq \exp(t^2 C)$$

where  $C = \mathbb{E}_\mu(|g|^2 e^{t|g|})$  is finite. Combining inequalities, we get

$$\beta(b : \sigma(b_n \dots b_1, x) > \varepsilon n) \leq \exp(-(\varepsilon - tC)tn)$$

Choosing  $t < \varepsilon/C$ , we have an exponential bound independent of  $x$ . Applying the argument to  $-\sigma$ , we get the desired bound for  $|\sigma(b_n \dots b_1, x)|$ .  $\square$

### A.4 Gambler's ruin

We show gambler's ruin estimates for cocycles.

**Proposition A.14.** *Assume  $\mu$  has finite exponential moment,  $\sigma$  is  $X$ -controlled,  $d = 1$ , and the limit variance  $A$  in the CLT (A.1) is non-zero. Fix  $k, l > 0$  and sequences  $(k_s)_{s \geq 0}, (l_s)_{s \geq 0} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$  such that  $k_s \sim sk, l_s \sim sl$ . Then for every  $x \in X$ ,*

$$\beta \{b : (\sigma(b_n \dots b_1, x))_{n \geq 1} \text{ meets } [l_s, +\infty) \text{ before } (-\infty, -k_s]\} \xrightarrow{s \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{k}{k+l}$$

For the proof, we fix  $x \in X$  and write  $M_n(b) = \sigma(b_n \dots b_1, x)$  the associated martingale.

We will need to know that  $M_n$  does leave the window  $[-k_s, l_s]$ , and the exit time is bounded polynomially in  $s$  with high probability.

**Lemma A.15.**

$$\beta \{b : (M_n(b))_{n \geq 1} \text{ leaves } [-k_s, l_s] \text{ for some } n \leq s^3\} \xrightarrow{s \rightarrow +\infty} 1$$

*Proof.*

$$\beta\{b : M_{[s^3]}(b) \in [-k_s, l_s]\} = \beta\{b : s^{-3/2}M_{[s^3]}(b) \in [-s^{-3/2}k_s, s^{-3/2}l_s]\} \\ \xrightarrow{s \rightarrow +\infty} 0$$

by the CLT for  $M_n$  proven in Proposition A.1. □

*Proof of Proposition A.14.* Set

$$\tau'_s := \inf\{n \geq 1, (M_n(b))_{n \geq 1} \text{ meets } [l_s, +\infty) \text{ or } (-\infty, -k_s]\}$$

and  $\tau_s := \min(s^3, \tau'_s)$ . By the optional sampling theorem applied to the zero-mean martingale  $M_n$ , we have

$$0 = \mathbb{E}(M_{\tau_s}) \\ = \mathbb{E}(M_{\tau_s} \mathbf{1}_{M_{\tau_s} > l_s}) + \mathbb{E}(M_{\tau_s} \mathbf{1}_{M_{\tau_s} < -k_s}) + \mathbb{E}(M_{\tau_s} \mathbf{1}_{M_{\tau_s} \in [-k_s, l_s]})$$

Let us estimate each term individually.

$$\mathbb{E}(M_{\tau_s} \mathbf{1}_{M_{\tau_s} > l_s}) = l_s \beta(M_{\tau_s} > l_s) + \mathbb{E}((M_{\tau_s} - l_s) \mathbf{1}_{M_{\tau_s} > l_s})$$

where the overshoot is controlled by

$$\mathbb{E}((M_{\tau_s} - l_s) \mathbf{1}_{M_{\tau_s} > l_s}) \leq \mathbb{E}(\sup_{k \leq s^3} |M_{k+1} - M_k|) \\ = \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} 1 - \beta(\sup_{k \leq s^3} |M_{k+1} - M_k| \leq t) dt \\ = \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} 1 - (1 - e^{-\alpha t})^{s^3} dt \\ = o(s)$$

for some  $\alpha = \alpha(\mu)$  coming from the exponential moment assumption on  $\mu$ . Also the last equality uses the remark<sup>5</sup> that  $\sup_{s>0} \int_{[\varepsilon s, +\infty]} 1 - (1 - e^{-\alpha t})^{s^3} dt < \infty$  for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ . To sum up, we proved that

$$\mathbb{E}(M_{\tau_s} \mathbf{1}_{M_{\tau_s} > l_s}) = l_s \beta(M_{\tau_s} > l_s) + o(s)$$

Using either the same line of argument, or Lemma A.15, we get as well that

$$\mathbb{E}(M_{\tau_s} \mathbf{1}_{M_{\tau_s} < -k_s}) = -k_s \beta(M_{\tau_s} < -k_s) + o(s) \quad \mathbb{E}(M_{\tau_s} \mathbf{1}_{M_{\tau_s} \in [-k_s, l_s]}) = o(s)$$

In conclusion,

$$0 = \mathbb{E}(M_{\tau_s}) \\ = l_s \beta(M_{\tau_s} > l_s) - k_s \beta(M_{\tau_s} < -k_s) + o(s)$$

so as  $s \rightarrow +\infty$ , one has  $\beta(M_{\tau_s} > l_s) \rightarrow \frac{k}{k+l}$  as desired. □

---

<sup>5</sup>To check this, argue as follows. The integral over the larger domain  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^+} 1 - (1 - e^{-\alpha t})^{s^3} dt$  is finite for every  $s > 0$  and increases with  $s$ . Hence, we only need to check the bound for  $s$  large enough. Now rewrite uniformly for  $t \in [\varepsilon s, +\infty)$ ,

$$(1 - e^{-\alpha t})^{s^3} = \exp(s^3 \log(1 - e^{-\alpha t})) = \exp(s^3(e^{-\alpha t} + o(e^{-\alpha t}))) = 1 + s^3 e^{-\alpha t} + o(s^3 e^{-\alpha t})$$

where  $o(\cdot)$  goes to zero as  $s \rightarrow +\infty$ .

## A.5 Exit estimates for drifting cocycles

For this last section, we replace the zero mean condition on  $\sigma$  by assuming a uniform lower bound on the drift: for all  $x \in X$ ,

$$\int_G \sigma(g, x) d\mu(g) \geq 1 \quad (14)$$

For  $b \in B, x \in X$ , we set

$$S_n(b, x) = \sigma(b_n \dots b_1, x)$$

and for  $s > 0$ , we write

$$\tau_s(b, x) = \inf\{n \geq 1, S_n(b, x) \geq s\}$$

Foster's criterion (see [24] or [5, Lemma 2.4]) implies that for any  $x$ , the exit time  $\tau_s$  is finite, and even has bounded expectation  $\mathbb{E}_x(\tau_s) \leq s$ . The goal of the section is to show that the overshoot  $S_{\tau_s} - s$  is essentially bounded. Assuming equality in (14), we also prove that  $\tau_s$  lands roughly in a window of size  $\sqrt{s}$  around  $s$

**Proposition A.16.** 1. (Overshoot control)

$$\sup_{x \in X, s > 0} \mathbb{P}_x(S_{\tau_s} > s + R) \xrightarrow{R \rightarrow +\infty} 0$$

2. (Time control) Assume  $\mu$  has finite second moment, and  $\sigma$  is  $X$ -controlled and has constant drift equal to 1. Then we have:  $\forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists R > 0$ ,

$$\sup_{x \in X, s > 1} \mathbb{P}_x(b : |\tau_s(b) - s| > R\sqrt{s}) \leq \varepsilon$$

**Remark.** The control of the overshoot implies that, given any large enough interval  $I$  in  $\mathbb{R}^+$ , the  $\beta$ -probability that the random sequence  $(S_n)_{n \geq 0}$  intersects  $I$  is close to 1. This can be interpreted as a weak form of renewal estimate for  $(S_n)_{n \geq 0}$ .

Let us begin with the overshoot estimate. Our first step is to use the cocycle property of  $S_n$  to reduce the overshoot control for  $S_{\tau_s}$  to that of a stronger control for  $S_{\tau_1}$ .

**Lemma A.17.** For  $x \in X, R > 0, s > 1$ , we have

$$\mathbb{P}_x(S_{\tau_s} > s + R) \leq \sum_{n \geq 1} \sup_{x \in X} \mathbb{P}_x(S_{\tau_1} > n + R)$$

*Proof.* The argument goes by induction on  $s$ . Let  $R > 0, n \geq 1$ , and assume  $H_n$  is a constant such that

$$\sup_{s \in (1, n], x \in X} \mathbb{P}_x(S_{\tau_s} > s + R) \leq H_n$$

Let  $s \in (n, n + 1]$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_x(S_{\tau_s} > s + R) &= \mathbb{P}_x(S_{\tau_1} > s + R) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}_x(S_{\tau_s} > s + R \mid S_{\tau_1} < s) \mathbb{P}_x(S_{\tau_1} < s) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}_x(S_{\tau_1} > n + R) + \mathbb{P}_x(S_{\tau_s} > s + R \mid S_{\tau_1} < s) \end{aligned}$$

Let us bound above the second term. The cocycle property allows to write for  $0 \leq k \leq n$

$$S_n(b, x) = S_{n-k}(T^k b, b_k \dots b_1 x) + S_k(b, x)$$

where we recall that  $T : B \rightarrow B, (b_i)_{i \geq 1} \mapsto (b_{i+1})_{i \geq 1}$  is the one-sided shift. Applying this to  $k = \tau_1(b, x)$  and  $n = \tau_s(b, x)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_x(S_{\tau_s} > s + R \mid S_{\tau_1} < s) \\ &= \beta(S_{\tau_s(b,x) - \tau_1(b,x)}(T^{\tau_1(b,x)} b, b_{\tau_1(b,x)} \dots b_1 x) > s + R - S_{\tau_1}(b, x) \mid S_{\tau_1}(b, x) < s) \\ &= \beta(S_{\tau_s - S_{\tau_1}(b,x)}(T^{\tau_1(b,x)} b, b_{\tau_1(b,x)}^{-1} \dots b^{-1} x) > s + R - S_{\tau_1}(b, x) \mid S_{\tau_1}(b, x) < s) \end{aligned}$$

As  $S_{\tau_1}(b, x) > 1$ , the lower bound is in the initial segment  $[0, n + R]$  so we may apply the induction hypothesis to get

$$\mathbb{P}_x(S_{\tau_s} > s + R \mid S_{\tau_1} < s) \leq H_n$$

In sum, we have proven for any  $s \in (n, (n + 1)]$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}_x(S_{\tau_s} > s + R) \leq \mathbb{P}_x(S_{\tau_1} > n + R) + H_n$$

and the bound announced in the lemma follows.  $\square$

We now need to show that the sum  $\sum_{n \geq 1} \sup_{x \in X} \mathbb{P}_x(S_{\tau_1} > n + R)$  appearing in Lemma A.17 is small as long as  $R$  is large. We first check it is finite.

**Lemma A.18.**

$$\sum_{n \geq 1} \sup_{x \in X} \mathbb{P}_x(S_{\tau_1} > n) < \infty$$

*Proof.*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_x(S_{\tau_1} > n) &= \sum_k \mathbb{P}_x(S_k > n, \tau_1 = k) \\ &= \sum_k \mathbb{P}_x(|b_k| > n - 2, \tau_1 = k) \\ &\leq \sum_k \mathbb{P}_x(|b_k| > n - 2, \tau_1 \geq k) \\ &= \mu(|g| > n - 2) \sum_k \mathbb{P}_x(\tau_1 \geq k) \\ &= \mu(|g| > n - 2) \mathbb{E}_x(\tau_1) \end{aligned}$$

Foster's criterion (see [24] or [5, Lemma 2.4]) yields the bound  $\mathbb{E}_x(\tau_1) \leq 1$ . It follows that

$$\sum_{n \geq 3} \sup_{x \in X} \mathbb{P}_x(S_{\tau_1} > n) \leq \mathbb{E}_\mu(|g|)$$

which finishes the proof.  $\square$

We now conclude the proof of the overshoot estimate in Proposition A.16.

*Proof of Proposition A.16 (overshoot control).* We can assume without loss of generality that  $s > 1$ . By Lemma A.17, we just need to check that

$$\sum_{n \geq 1} \sup_{x \in X} \mathbb{P}_x(S_{\tau_1} > n + R) \xrightarrow{R \rightarrow +\infty} 0$$

For  $R = 0$ , this sum is finite by Lemma A.18, and the result follows by dominated convergence.  $\square$

We now deal with the time estimate in Proposition A.16.

*Proof of Proposition A.16 (time control).* Let  $R > 0$  be a parameter to be specified below. For  $s > 1$ , set  $q_s = \lfloor s + R\sqrt{s} \rfloor$ . If  $\tau_s(b) > q_s$ , then by definition  $S_{q_s}(b) < s$ , so  $|S_{q_s}(b) - q_s| > R\sqrt{s}$ . The central limit theorem for  $S_n - n$  (Proposition A.1) guarantees this event only occurs on a set of measure  $\varepsilon/2$  as long as  $R$  is large enough (independently of  $x$  and  $s > 1$ ).

For the lower bound, we argue similarly: for  $s > 1$ , set  $q'_s = \lfloor s - R\sqrt{s} \rfloor$ . We need to show that as long as  $R > 0$  is large, we have

$$\sup_{x \in X, s > 1} \mathbb{P}_x(\tau_s \leq q'_s) \leq \varepsilon/2$$

Using the cocycle property, we see that for every  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , there exists  $R' > 0$  such that any  $x \in X$ ,  $s > 1$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}_x(S_{q'_s} \geq s - R' \mid \tau_s \leq q'_s) \geq 1 - \alpha$$

leading to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_x(\tau_s \leq q'_s) &\leq (1 - \alpha)^{-1} \mathbb{P}_x(S_{q'_s} \geq s - R') \\ &\leq (1 - \alpha)^{-1} \mathbb{P}_x(|S_{q'_s} - q'_s| \geq R\sqrt{s} - R') \end{aligned}$$

Choosing  $\alpha$  small enough,  $R'$  accordingly, and applying the CLT for  $S_n - n$  from Proposition A.1 bounds the right-hand side by  $\varepsilon/2$  for  $R, s$  large enough. We can increase  $R$  even more to deal with all  $s > 1$ .  $\square$

## References

- [1] M. Babillot and M. Peigné. Asymptotic laws for geodesic homology on hyperbolic manifolds with cusps. *Bull. Soc. Math. Fr.*, 134(1):119–163, 2006.
- [2] T. Bénard. Some asymptotic properties of random walks on homogeneous spaces. *To appear in Journal of Modern Dynamics (arXiv:2104.13181)*.
- [3] T. Bénard. Mesures de radon stationnaires pour une marche aléatoire sur  $\mathbb{T}^d \times \mathbb{R}$ . *Annales de l'Institut Fourier (DOI : 10.5802/aif.3519)*, 2022.
- [4] T. Bénard and E. Breuillard. The local limit theorem on a nilpotent Lie group. In preparation.
- [5] T. Bénard and N. De Saxcé. Random walks with bounded first moment on finite-volume spaces. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 32(4):687–724, 2022.
- [6] Y. Benoist and J.-F. Quint. Central limit theorem for linear groups. *Ann. Probab.*, 44(2):1308–1340, 2016.

- [7] Y. Benoist and J.-F. Quint. Central limit theorem on hyperbolic groups. *Izv. Math.*, 80(1):3–23, 2016.
- [8] Y. Benoist and J. F. Quint. *Random Walks on Reductive groups*. Springer International Publishing, 2016.
- [9] Y. Benoist and J.-F. Quint. On the regularity of stationary measures. *Isr. J. Math.*, 226(1):1–14, 2018.
- [10] A. Boulanger, C. Sert, P. Mathieu, and A. Sisto. Large deviations for random walks on gromov-hyperbolic spaces. *To appear in Annales de l'ENS*.
- [11] J. Bourgain. Finitely supported measures on  $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$  which are absolutely continuous at infinity. In *Geometric aspects of functional analysis. Proceedings of the Israel seminar (GAFA) 2006–2010*, pages 133–141. Berlin: Springer, 2012.
- [12] R. Bowen. Symbolic dynamics for hyperbolic flows. *Am. J. Math.*, 95:429–460, 1973.
- [13] E. Breuillard. Local limit theorems and equidistribution of random walks on the Heisenberg group. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 15(1):35–82, 2005.
- [14] B. Brown. Martingale central limit theorem. *Ann. Math. Stat.*, 42(59-66), 1971.
- [15] I. Choi. Central limit theorem and geodesic tracking on hyperbolic spaces and teichmüller spaces. (*arXiv:2106.13017*), 2021.
- [16] C. Connell and R. Muchnik. Harmonicity of quasiconformal measures and Poisson boundaries of hyperbolic spaces. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 17(3):707–769, 2007.
- [17] D. Constantine, J.-F. Lafont, and D. J. Thompson. The weak specification property for geodesic flows on  $CAT(-1)$  spaces. *Groups Geom. Dyn.*, 14(1):297–336, 2020.
- [18] A. de Acosta. A new proof of the Hartman-Wintner law of the iterated logarithm. *Ann. Probab.*, 11:270–276, 1983.
- [19] M. Denker and W. Philipp. Approximation by Brownian motion for Gibbs measures and flows under a function. *Ergodic Theory Dyn. Syst.*, 4:541–552, 1984.
- [20] B. Deroin, V. Kleptsyn, and A. Navas. On the question of ergodicity for minimal group actions on the circle. *Mosc. Math. J.*, 9(2):263–303, 2009.
- [21] P. Diaconis and R. Hough. Random walk on unipotent matrix groups. *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4)*, 54(3):587–625, 2021.
- [22] N. Enriquez, J. Franchi, and Y. Le Jan. Stable windings on hyperbolic surfaces. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields*, 119(2):213–255, 2001.
- [23] N. Enriquez and Y. Le Jan. Statistic of the winding of geodesics on a Riemann surface with finite area and constant negative curvature. *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.*, 13(2):377–401, 1997.
- [24] F. G. Foster. On the stochastic matrices associated with certain queuing processes. *Ann. Math. Stat.*, 24:355–360, 1953.
- [25] J. Franchi. Asymptotic singular homology of a complete hyperbolic 3-manifold of finite volume. *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3)*, 79(2):451–480, 1999.
- [26] H. Furstenberg. Random walks and discrete subgroups of Lie groups. *Advances Probab. related Topics* 1, 1-63 (1971)., 1971.
- [27] H. Furstenberg. Boundary theory and stochastic processes on homogeneous spaces. *Harmonic Analysis homog. Spaces, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.* 26, Williamstown 1972, 193-229 (1973)., 1973.
- [28] V. Gadre, J. Maher, and G. Tiozzo. Word length statistics and Lyapunov exponents for Fuchsian groups with cusps. *New York J. Math.*, 21:511–531, 2015.
- [29] I. Gekhtman and G. Tiozzo. Entropy and drift for Gibbs measures on geometrically finite manifolds. *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.*, 373(4):2949–2980, 2020.
- [30] Y. Guivarc’h. Produits de matrices aléatoires et applications aux propriétés géométriques des sous-groupes du groupe linéaire. (Products of random matrices and applications to geometric properties of subgroups of linear groups). *Ergodic Theory Dyn. Syst.*, 10(3):483–512, 1990.
- [31] Y. Guivarc’h and Y. Le Jan. Sur l’enroulement du flot géodésique. (On the winding of the geodesic flow). *C. R. Acad. Sci., Paris, Sér. I*, 311(10):645–648, 1990.

- [32] Y. Guivarc’h and Y. Le Jan. Asymptotic winding of the geodesic flow on modular surfaces and continuous fractions. *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4)*, 26(1):23–50, 1993.
- [33] Y. Guivarc’h and É. Le Page. Spectral gap properties for linear random walks and Pareto’s asymptotics for affine stochastic recursions. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré, Probab. Stat.*, 52(2):503–574, 2016.
- [34] M. Hochman and B. Solomyak. On the dimension of Furstenberg measure for  $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$  random matrix products. *Invent. Math.*, 210(3):815–875, 2017.
- [35] R. Hough. The local limit theorem on nilpotent Lie groups. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields*, 174(3-4):761–786, 2019.
- [36] V. A. Kaimanovich and V. Le Prince. Matrix random products with singular harmonic measure. *Geom. Dedicata*, 150:257–279, 2011.
- [37] I. Kapovich and N. Benakli. Boundaries of hyperbolic groups. In *Combinatorial and geometric group theory. Proceedings of the AMS special session on combinatorial group theory, New York, NY, USA, November 4–5, 2000 and the AMS special session on computational group theory, Hoboken, NJ, USA, April 28–29, 2001*, pages 39–93. Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society (AMS), 2002.
- [38] A. Katsuda and T. Sunada. Closed orbits in homology classes. *Publ. Math., Inst. Hautes Étud. Sci.*, 71:5–32, 1990.
- [39] P. Kosenko. Fundamental inequality for hyperbolic Coxeter and Fuchsian groups equipped with geometric distances. *Int. Math. Res. Not.*, 2021(6):4709–4728, 2021.
- [40] P. Kosenko and G. Tiozzo. The fundamental inequality for cocompact fuchsian groups. (*arXiv:2012.07417*), 2020.
- [41] S. P. Lalley. Regenerative representation for one-dimensional Gibbs states. *Ann. Probab.*, 14:1262–1271, 1986.
- [42] Y. Le Jan. The central limit theorem for the geodesic flow on noncompact manifolds of constant negative curvature. *Duke Math. J.*, 74(1):159–175, 1994.
- [43] F. Ledrappier. Une relation entre entropie, dimension et exposant pour certaines marches aléatoires. *C. R. Acad. Sci., Paris, Sér. I*, 296:369–372, 1983.
- [44] F. Ledrappier and P. Lessa. Exact dimension of Furstenberg measures. (*arXiv:2105.11712*), 2021.
- [45] J. Li. Decrease of Fourier coefficients of stationary measures. *Math. Ann.*, 372(3-4):1189–1238, 2018.
- [46] J. Li, F. Naud, and W. Pan. Kleinian Schottky groups, Patterson-Sullivan measures, and Fourier decay. *Duke Math. J.*, 170(4):775–825, 2021.
- [47] J. Maher and G. Tiozzo. Random walks on weakly hyperbolic groups. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 742:187–239, 2018.
- [48] J.-P. Otal and M. Peigné. Variational principle and Kleinian groups. *Duke Math. J.*, 125(1):15–44, 2004.
- [49] S. J. Patterson. The limit set of a Fuchsian group. *Acta Math.*, 136:241–273, 1976.
- [50] A. Randecker and G. Tiozzo. Cusp excursion in hyperbolic manifolds and singularity of harmonic measure. *J. Mod. Dyn.*, 17:183–211, 2021.
- [51] M. Ratner. The central limit theorem for geodesic flows on  $n$ -dimensional manifolds of negative curvature. *Isr. J. Math.*, 16:181–197, 1974.
- [52] A. Raugi. Théoreme de la limite centrale sur les groupes nilpotents. *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheor. Verw. Geb.*, 43:149–172, 1978.
- [53] Y. G. Sinai. The central limit theorem for geodesic flows on manifolds of constant negative curvature. *Sov. Math., Dokl.*, 1:983–987, 1960.
- [54] D. Sullivan. The density at infinity of a discrete group of hyperbolic motions. *Publ. Math., Inst. Hautes Étud. Sci.*, 50:171–202, 1979.
- [55] D. Sullivan. Entropy, hausdorff measures old and new, and limit sets of geometrically finite kleinian groups. *Acta Mathematica*, 153:259–277, 1984.
- [56] G. Tiozzo. Sublinear deviation between geodesics and sample paths. *Duke Math. J.*, 164(3):511–539, 2015.



- [57] S. Waddington. Large deviation asymptotics for Anosov flows. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré, Anal. Non Linéaire*, 13(4):445–484, 1996.

Timothée Bénard

CENTRE FOR MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, WILBERFORCE ROAD, CAMBRIDGE CB3 0WB, UK

*Email address:* `tb723@cam.ac.uk`