

# EXPONENTIAL MIXING OF FRAME FLOWS FOR GEOMETRICALLY FINITE HYPERBOLIC MANIFOLDS

JIALUN LI, WENYU PAN, AND PRATYUSH SARKAR

ABSTRACT. As a final work to establish that frame flows for geometrically finite hyperbolic manifolds of arbitrary dimensions are exponentially mixing with respect to the Bowen–Margulis–Sullivan measure, this paper focuses on the case with *cusps*. To prove this, we utilize the countably infinite symbolic coding of the geodesic flow of Li–Pan and perform a frame flow version of Dolgopyat’s method à la Sarkar–Winter and Tsujii–Zhang. This requires the local non-integrability condition and the non-concentration property but the challenge in the presence of cusps is that the latter holds only on a large *proper* subset of the limit set. To overcome this, we use a large deviation property for symbolic recurrence to the large subset. It is proved by studying the combinatorics of cusp excursions and using an effective renewal theorem as in the work of Li; the latter uses the exponential decay of the transfer operators for the geodesic flow of Li–Pan.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Preliminaries	7
3. Symbolic model for the frame flow	10
4. Transfer operators with holonomy	16
5. Local non-integrability condition	18
6. Non-concentration property	22
7. Large deviation property	24
8. Dolgopyat’s method	38
9. Exponential mixing of the frame flow	54
Appendix A. Analyticity of the complex transfer operator	57
References	60

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $\mathbb{H}^{d+1}$  be the  $(d+1)$ -dimensional hyperbolic space for any  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $G = \mathrm{SO}(d+1, 1)^\circ$  endowed with a left  $G$ -invariant and right  $K$ -invariant Riemannian metric, which can be identified with the group of orientation-preserving isometries of  $\mathbb{H}^{d+1}$ . Let  $\Gamma < G$  be a torsion-free discrete subgroup. Consider the hyperbolic manifold  $X = \Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}^{d+1} \cong \Gamma \backslash G/K$  whose unit tangent bundle is  $T^1(X) \cong \Gamma \backslash G/M$  and whose (oriented orthonormal) frame bundle is  $F(X) \cong \Gamma \backslash G$  where  $M < K$  are compact subgroups of  $G$ . Let  $A = \{a_t : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$  be the one-parameter subgroup of semisimple elements whose right translation action gives the geodesic flow on

$\Gamma \backslash G/M$  and the frame flow on  $\Gamma \backslash G$ . We take our frame flow invariant measure  $m^{\text{BMS}}$  to be the Bowen–Margulis–Sullivan probability measure on  $\Gamma \backslash G$  which is supported on the non-wandering set. It is the  $M$ -invariant lift of the Bowen–Margulis–Sullivan probability measure on  $\Gamma \backslash G/M$  which is known to be the unique probability measure of maximal entropy. The entropy coincides with the critical exponent  $\delta \in [0, d]$  of  $\Gamma$ .

If  $\Gamma < G$  is a lattice, i.e., if  $X$  is of *finite* volume, then  $m^{\text{BMS}}$  coincides with the  $G$ -invariant probability measure and it is well-known in the literature that the frame flow is exponentially mixing [Rat87, Moo87]. Its proof makes extensive use of spectral gap and representation theory.

In recent times, there has been significant progress regarding the mixing properties with respect to  $m^{\text{BMS}}$  for hyperbolic manifolds of *infinite* volume. Under the natural hypothesis that  $\Gamma < G$  is non-elementary and  $m^{\text{BMS}}$  is finite, mixing of the geodesic flow is due to Rudolph [Rud82] and Babillot [Bab02]. For frame flows, it is necessary to assume that  $\Gamma < G$  is Zariski dense because otherwise it is not even ergodic. Under the natural hypothesis that  $\Gamma < G$  is Zariski dense and  $m^{\text{BMS}}$  is finite, mixing of the frame flow is due to Winter [Win15] (see also [BP74, FS90]). Let us now turn to *exponential* mixing. If  $\Gamma < G$  is Zariski dense and geometrically finite, representation theoretic techniques were extended by Mohammadi–Oh [MO15], so long as the critical exponent  $\delta$  is large so that a certain spectral gap holds, to prove exponential mixing of the frame flow (see also [EO21] for the geodesic flow). However, when the critical exponent  $\delta$  is small, such a spectral gap does not exist. Hence, it is more fruitful to apply techniques which are more dynamical. If  $\Gamma < G$  is non-elementary and geometrically finite, exponential mixing of the geodesic flow is due to Stoyanov [Sto11] when  $\Gamma$  does not contain parabolic elements (i.e., convex cocompact) and due to the first two authors Li–Pan [LP22] (see also the work of Khalil [Kha21]) when  $\Gamma$  contains parabolic elements. If  $\Gamma < G$  is Zariski dense and geometrically finite without parabolic elements, exponential mixing of the frame flow is known by a joint work of the third author Sarkar–Winter [SW21] (see also [CS22]).

The purpose of this paper is to complete the remaining case for exponential mixing of frame flows for geometrically finite hyperbolic manifolds and thereby establish Theorem 1.1. That is, we prove Theorem 1.1 for Zariski dense torsion-free geometrically finite subgroups  $\Gamma < G$  with *parabolic elements*. For any  $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ , we denote by  $C^\alpha(\Gamma \backslash G, \mathbb{R})$  the space of  $\alpha$ -Hölder continuous functions on  $\Gamma \backslash G$ .

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $G = \text{SO}(d+1, 1)^\circ$  for any  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\Gamma < G$  be a Zariski dense torsion-free geometrically finite subgroup. Let  $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ . There exist  $\eta_\alpha > 0$  and  $C > 0$  (independent of  $\alpha$ ) such that for all  $\phi, \psi \in C^\alpha(\Gamma \backslash G, \mathbb{R})$  and  $t > 0$ , we have*

$$\left| \int_{\Gamma \backslash G} \phi(x)\psi(xa_t) dm^{\text{BMS}} - m^{\text{BMS}}(\phi) \cdot m^{\text{BMS}}(\psi) \right| \leq C \|\phi\|_{C^\alpha} \|\psi\|_{C^\alpha} e^{-\eta_\alpha t}.$$

As indicated above, the proof is a dynamical one and is based on a combination of the works of Stoyanov [Sto11], Sarkar–Winter [SW21], Li–Pan [LP22], and Tsuji–Zhang [TZ23] which build on the framework introduced in the work of Dolgopyat [Dol98], now commonly called Dolgopyat’s method. We emphasize that even when  $\Gamma < G$  is a *lattice* with parabolic elements such as the familiar settings  $\text{PSL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) < \text{PSL}_2(\mathbb{R})$  or  $\text{PSL}_2(\mathbb{Z}[i]) < \text{PSL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ , the work of Li–Pan [LP22] and the work of this

paper are the first *dynamical proofs*, to the authors' best knowledge, for exponential mixing of the geodesic flow and the frame flow respectively.

**1.1. Connections, applications, and further directions.** In broad context, frame flows have attracted substantial attention since they serve as typical examples of partially hyperbolic systems. Consider  $(\mathcal{M}, g)$  a smooth closed oriented Riemannian manifold of dimension  $n \geq 3$  with negative sectional curvature. Brin conjectured that if  $(\mathcal{M}, g)$  is strictly  $1/4$ -pinched, the frame flow is ergodic. In [BG80], Brin–Gromov verified the case when  $n$  is odd and  $n \neq 7$ . Recently, Cekić–Lefeuvre–Moroiianu–Sammelmann [CLMS21] made progress on the case when  $n$  is even or  $n = 7$ . For the quantitative theory, Dolgopyat [Dol02] treated the mixing properties of compact group extensions of hyperbolic diffeomorphisms which are discrete-time versions of frame flows. He proved the equivalence between an infinitesimal non-integrability condition and the exponential mixing of compact group extensions of expanding maps on closed manifolds. In [Sid22], Siddiqi considered the compact extensions of a certain class of Anosov flows, where he translated the accessibility properties of the extension into Dolgopyat's non-integrability condition. Besides dynamical approaches, there are works using further analytic tools to study frame flows. For example, Guillarmou–Küster employed semiclassical or microlocal analysis to study the spectrum of frame flows for 3-dimensional closed hyperbolic manifolds [GK21].

More specifically in the context of homogeneous dynamics, studying frame flows have proven to be fruitful due to numerous applications which have been derived in prior works. We state the following selection of them here for the convenience of the reader: decay of matrix coefficients with exponential error term; exponential equidistribution of holonomies; effective equidistribution of horospheres. Let  $\Gamma < G$  be as in Theorem 1.1 for the rest of the subsection.

Fix a Haar measure on  $G$ . It induces a right  $G$ -invariant measure on  $\Gamma \backslash G$  and also the unstable and stable Burger–Roblin measures on  $\Gamma \backslash G$  denoted by  $m^{\text{BR}}$  and  $m^{\text{BR}*}$ , respectively. Using an effective version of Roblin's transverse intersection argument as in [OW16, Theorem 5.8], Theorem 1.1 implies the following theorem. The original (ineffective) argument is in [Rob03] (see also [OS13]).

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let  $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ . There exists  $\eta_\alpha > 0$  such that for all  $\phi, \psi \in C_c^\alpha(\Gamma \backslash G, \mathbb{R})$ , there exists  $C > 0$  (depending only on  $\text{supp}(\phi)$  and  $\text{supp}(\psi)$ ), and independent of  $\alpha$  such that for all  $t > 0$ , we have*

$$\left| e^{(d-\delta)t} \int_{\Gamma \backslash G} \phi(x) \psi(xa_t) dx - m^{\text{BR}}(\phi) \cdot m^{\text{BR}*}(\psi) \right| \leq C \|\phi\|_{C^\alpha} \|\psi\|_{C^\alpha} e^{-\eta_\alpha t}.$$

For all  $T > 0$ , define

$$\mathcal{G}(T) = \#\{\gamma : \gamma \text{ is a primitive closed geodesic in } \Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}^n \text{ with length at most } T\}.$$

For all primitive closed geodesics  $\gamma$  in  $\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}^n$ , its *holonomy* is a conjugacy class  $h_\gamma$  in  $M$  induced by parallel transport along  $\gamma$ . Fix the Haar probability measure on  $M$ . Recall the function  $\text{Li} : (2, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined by  $\text{Li}(x) = \int_2^x \frac{1}{\log(t)} dt$  for all  $x \in (2, \infty)$ . Denote by  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{S}^k}$  the  $L^2$  Sobolev norm of order  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Since [DFSU21, Lemma 3.8] holds in our setting, in light of the remark in [SW21, Section 1], Theorem 1.1 implies the following theorem due to the work of Margulis–Mohammadi–Oh [MMO14].

**Theorem 1.3.** *There exist  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\eta > 0$  such that for all class functions  $\phi \in C^\infty(M, \mathbb{R})$ , we have*

$$\sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{G}(T)} \phi(h_\gamma) = \text{Li}(e^{\delta T}) \int_M \phi(m) dm + O(e^{(\delta-\eta)T}) \quad \text{as } T \rightarrow +\infty$$

where the implied constant depends only on  $\|\phi\|_{S^k}$ .

Let  $\mathcal{C}_0 \subset \Gamma \backslash G$  be a fixed compact subset from a thick-thin decomposition. For all  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$  and  $t_0 \geq 1$ , we say that  $x \in \Gamma \backslash G$  is  $(\epsilon, t_0)$ -Diophantine if any of its lift in  $G$  has backward endpoint in the limit set  $\Lambda_\Gamma$  and  $d(\mathcal{C}_0, xa_{-t}) < (1 - \epsilon)t$  for all  $t \geq t_0$ . Let  $N^+ < G$  be the unstable horospherical subgroup endowed with the induced Riemannian metric. Denote by  $N_{\max, R}^+ \subset N^+$  the image under  $\exp : \mathfrak{n}^+ \rightarrow N^+$  of the ball of radius  $R > 0$  centered at 0 with respect to the max norm. Fix the Haar measure on  $N^+$  compatible with the one on  $G$ . For any  $x \in \Gamma \backslash G$ , denote by  $m_{xN^+}^{\text{Leb}}$  the corresponding Lebesgue measure on  $xN^+$  and by  $\mu_{xN^+}^{\text{PS}}$  the Patterson–Sullivan measure on  $xN^+$ . Theorem 1.1 implies the following theorem due to the work of Tamam–Warren [TW22]. The latter result in Theorem 1.4 was earlier obtained by Edwards [Edw22] when  $d = 2$ , i.e., for surfaces.

**Theorem 1.4.** *There exists  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for all  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ , there exists  $\eta > 0$  such that for all  $t_0 \geq 1$ , the following holds. For all  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\Gamma \backslash G, \mathbb{R})$ , there exists  $C > 0$  (depending only on  $\text{supp}(\phi)$ ) such that:*

(1) *for all  $(\epsilon, t_0)$ -Diophantine  $x \in \Gamma \backslash G$  and  $R \gg_\epsilon t_0$ , we have*

$$\left| \frac{1}{\mu_{xN^+}^{\text{PS}}(xN_{\max, R}^+)} \int_{xN_{\max, R}^+} \phi d\mu_{xN^+}^{\text{PS}} - m^{\text{BMS}}(\phi) \right| \leq C \|\phi\|_{S^k} R^{-\eta};$$

(2) *for all  $(\epsilon, t_0)$ -Diophantine  $x \in \Gamma \backslash G$  and  $R \gg_{\epsilon, \text{supp}(\phi)} t_0$ , we have*

$$\left| \frac{1}{\mu_{xN^+}^{\text{PS}}(xN_{\max, R}^+)} \int_{xN_{\max, R}^+} \phi dm_{xN^+}^{\text{Leb}} - m^{\text{BR}}(\phi) \right| \leq C \|\phi\|_{S^k} R^{-\eta}.$$

We now mention some further directions which is outside the scope of this paper. Recently, Chow–Sarkar [CS22] extended the main theorem of [SW21] to convex cocompact rank one locally symmetric spaces. The natural further work is to generalize and combine the techniques in [LP22], [CS22], and this paper, to simultaneously extend the main theorems to geometrically finite rank one locally symmetric spaces. Another direction is the question of uniform exponential mixing which was addressed in the convex cocompact setting initially for hyperbolic surfaces by Oh–Winter [OW16], and later for hyperbolic manifolds by Sarkar [Sar22a]. The natural further work is to treat the geometrically finite setting. In the work of Avila–Gouëzel–Yoccoz [AGY06], they proved exponential mixing of the Teichmüller geodesic flow which was then shown to imply that the  $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ -action on the moduli space of Abelian differentials has a spectral gap (see also [AG13]). Inspired by this, it would be interesting to study whether one can deduce a spectral gap for the  $G$ -action on  $L^2(\Gamma \backslash G)$  from Theorem 1.1. Last but not least, inspired by results regarding resonance-free half plane for the resolvent of the Laplacian obtained from exponential mixing of the geodesic flow (see [OW16, Sar22a, LP22]), one could explore analogues for exponential mixing of the frame flow.

**1.2. Outline of the proof.** As mentioned before, we prove Theorem 1.1 for Zariski dense torsion-free geometrically finite subgroups  $\Gamma < G$  with *parabolic elements* using dynamical techniques, namely, using Dolgopyat’s method [Dol98, Dol02]. We recall that Dolgopyat’s method was originally developed for the finite symbolic setting. It was later adapted to the countable symbolic setting in the works of many authors such as Baladi–Vallée [BV05], Avila–Gouëzel–Yoccoz [AGY06], and Araújo–Melbourne [AM16]. These techniques were recently utilized by Li–Pan [LP22] for geodesic flows for geometrically finite hyperbolic manifolds with cusps. Similarly, our proof begins by utilizing the countably infinite coding constructed in [LP22]. The countably infinite coding is given by  $\Delta_\square := \bigsqcup_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \Delta_j$  which is a full Patterson–Sullivan measure subset of the fundamental domain  $\Delta_0$  of one of the parabolic fixed points. It also comes with an associated (piecewise) expanding map  $T : \Delta_\square \rightarrow \Delta_0$  which satisfies some important properties. Using this coding, we wish to proceed as in [SW21] by performing a frame flow version of Dolgopyat’s method using transfer operators twisted by holonomy.

As in [SW21], the cancellations in the summands of the transfer operators are derived using the *local non-integrability condition (LNIC)* and the *non-concentration property (NCP)*. Non-integrability type conditions have been in extensive use since the works of Chernov [Che98] and Dolgopyat [Dol98] and LNIC is the appropriate generalization for frame bundles. We first describe NCP *as stated in* [SW21, Proposition 6.6] for  $\Gamma$  without parabolic elements and why it is required, and then describe its generalization for  $\Gamma$  with parabolic elements. When dealing with frame flows, accessibility properties of the dynamical system play an important role in the analysis, sometimes without obstructions. In our setting, the non-wandering set of the frame flow is typically fractal in nature and consequently, there are obstructions. Roughly speaking, the non-integrability can be measured using certain ideal frames which are accessible starting from a reference frame via the strong stable and strong unstable foliations of the frame flow and we would like them to be contained in the non-wandering set. The latter condition is typically not satisfied by the ideal frames but at worst, we may use approximate frames which are close to the ideal ones where the closeness is measured precisely by an angular bound in the Lie algebra of the horospherical subgroup. NCP is a property for the limit set  $\Lambda_\Gamma$  which very roughly says that such an angular bound holds for vectors in  $\Lambda_\Gamma$ , or in other words,  $\Lambda_\Gamma$  does not concentrate along any proper affine subspace. This ensures that the approximate frames are contained in the non-wandering set. Note that if  $\Gamma$  is a lattice, there are no obstructions in accessibility—this can be seen either from the fact that the non-wandering set is all of  $\Gamma \backslash G$  or the fact that NCP is trivial since the limit set is all of  $\partial \mathbb{H}^{d+1}$ , and so we may use the ideal frames directly.

Throughout the literature, there has been technical difficulties in various contexts due to the parabolic elements of non-maximal rank (see [FHP91, Gui06, GM12, DFSU21, TW22]). Similarly, in our setting, the main difficulty for  $\Gamma$  with parabolic elements lies in the fact that if there are parabolic elements of non-maximal rank, then NCP *as stated in* [SW21, Proposition 6.6] does *not* hold— $\Lambda_\Gamma$  gets concentrated along a proper affine subspace near the parabolic fixed points of non-maximal rank (see Example 6.2)—which is insufficient to obtain the aforementioned cancellations (see Section 8). Nevertheless, an appropriate generalization of NCP still holds where we simply restrict to a large proper subset  $\Omega_t \cap \Lambda_\Gamma \subset \Delta_0 \cap \Lambda_\Gamma$  which is bounded away

from the parabolic fixed points, associated to large frequencies  $t \gg 1$ . Consequently, we can only obtain cancellations on  $\Omega_t$ . In order to tackle the small bad set  $\Delta_0 - \Omega_t$ , we turn to the recent techniques of Tsujii–Zhang [TZ23]. They developed a less stringent version of Dolgopyat’s method where they use stochastic dominance to show that it is sufficient to have cancellations inside a set with the *large deviation property (LDP)*. Here LDP is with respect to the expanding map  $T$  and so it is convenient to work with  $\Lambda_+ = \{x \in \Lambda_\Gamma : T^n \text{ is defined at } x \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  which is a Patterson–Sullivan full measure subset of  $\Delta_0$ . Using this version of Dolgopyat’s method, we need an extra step in our setting which is to show that  $\Omega_t \cap \Lambda_+$  satisfies LDP *uniformly* in  $t \gg 1$ . There are existing techniques to derive LDP for  $\Omega_t \cap \Lambda_+$  for a fixed  $t$  but the challenge comes from the uniformity in  $t \gg 1$ . The larger the parameter  $t \gg 1$ , the more irregular the set  $\Omega_t \cap \Lambda_+$ , making it unclear how to obtain LDP for the expanding map at first glance. The proof is based on the interplay of two different dynamics: for  $x \in \Lambda_+$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we see whether the points  $T^n(x)$  lying in  $\Omega_t$  is roughly equivalent to the corresponding unit tangent vectors  $u_{T^n(x)}$  (on a fixed piece of an unstable horosphere) returning to a fixed compact subset of  $T^1(X)$  under the geodesic flow  $a_t$ . From here, we study the combinatorics of cusp excursions. One of the key propositions is to estimate the probability of a “random walk” on  $\mathbb{R}$  with a large residual waiting time. It is proved using an effective renewal theorem as in the work of Li [Li22] which uses the exponential decay of the transfer operators for the geodesic flow of Li–Pan [LP22]. We think of this in the form of the following interesting observation: for  $\Gamma$  with parabolic elements of non-maximal rank, proving exponential mixing of the geodesic flow is *required first* as an intermediate step before proving exponential mixing of the frame flow.

**1.3. Organization of the paper.** First we provide the necessary background in Sections 2 and 3. We then introduce the transfer operators with holonomy for the countably infinite symbolic coding in Section 4. Sections 5–7 are independent of each other and provide the three key ingredients, LNIC, NCP, and LDP, required for Dolgopyat’s method in Section 8. We finish briefly with Section 9 to convert the spectral bounds to exponential mixing. We refer to Fig. 1 for a comprehensive diagram of the structure of the paper.




FIGURE 1. This diagram shows the dependence between sections. The solid (resp. dashed) lines are strong (resp. weak) dependence.

**Acknowledgements.** We would like to thank Zhiyuan Zhang for explaining to us the paper [TZ23]. Part of this work was done while the authors attended the conference “Ergodic geometry, number theory and Margulis legacy: the next generation” in June 2022. We would like to thank the organizers for providing the opportunity to collaborate.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

**2.1. Hyperbolic spaces.** Let  $\mathbb{H}^{d+1}$  be the  $(d+1)$ -dimensional hyperbolic space for any  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  endowed with the Riemannian hyperbolic metric. We will often use the upper half space model:

$$\mathbb{H}^{d+1} = \{x = (x_1, \dots, x_{d+1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} : x_{d+1} > 0\}.$$

Any complete connected  $(d+1)$ -dimensional hyperbolic manifold is then of the form  $\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}^{d+1}$  for some torsion-free discrete subgroup  $\Gamma < \mathrm{SO}(d+1, 1)^\circ$  where the latter can be identified with the group of orientation-preserving isometries of  $\mathbb{H}^{d+1}$ . We denote its unit tangent bundle by  $\mathrm{T}^1(\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}^{d+1})$  and its (oriented orthonormal) frame bundle by  $\mathrm{F}(\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}^{d+1})$ .

**2.1.1. Identifying  $\mathbb{H}^{d+1}$ ,  $\mathrm{T}^1(\mathbb{H}^{d+1})$ , and  $\mathrm{F}(\mathbb{H}^{d+1})$  with homogeneous spaces.**

Let  $(e_1, \dots, e_{d+1})$  be the standard basis of  $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ . Fix the reference point  $o := e_{d+1} \in \mathbb{H}^{d+1}$ , the reference vector  $v_o := (e_{d+1}, -e_{d+1}) \in \mathrm{T}_o^1(\mathbb{H}^{d+1})$ , and the reference frame  $F_o := ((e_{d+1}, e_1), \dots, (e_{d+1}, e_{d-1}), (e_{d+1}, e_d), (e_{d+1}, -e_{d+1})) \in \mathrm{F}_o(\mathbb{H}^{d+1})$ . Let  $G = \mathrm{SO}(d+1, 1)^\circ$  which we endow with a left  $G$ -invariant and right  $K$ -invariant Riemannian metric. We denote by  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  the inner product and by  $\|\cdot\|$  the norm on any tangent space of  $G$  or its quotient spaces. Similarly, we denote by  $d$  the induced distance function on  $G$  or its quotient spaces. Let  $K := \mathrm{Stab}_G(o)$  and  $M := \mathrm{Stab}_G(v_o) < K$ . Note that  $\mathrm{Stab}_G(F_o)$  is trivial. We can assume that the Riemannian metric on  $G$  was chosen so that we have identifications via the isomorphisms  $\mathbb{H}^{d+1} \cong G/K$ ,  $\mathrm{T}^1(\mathbb{H}^{d+1}) \cong G/M$ , and  $\mathrm{F}(\mathbb{H}^{d+1}) \cong G$ . For any torsion-free discrete subgroup  $\Gamma < G$ , we can extend these identifications to the quotient spaces:  $\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}^{d+1} \cong \Gamma \backslash G/K$ ,  $\mathrm{T}^1(\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}^{d+1}) \cong \Gamma \backslash G/M$ , and  $\mathrm{F}(\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}^{d+1}) \cong \Gamma \backslash G$ . In particular, the Riemannian metric on  $G$  descends to the Riemannian hyperbolic metric on  $\mathbb{H}^{d+1}$  and  $\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}^{d+1}$ , and  $d$  denotes the induced hyperbolic distance function on  $\mathbb{H}^{d+1}$  and  $\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}^{d+1}$ .

Let  $A = \{a_t : t \in \mathbb{R}\} < C_G(M)$  be the one-parameter subgroup of semisimple elements such that for any torsion-free discrete subgroup  $\Gamma < G$ , the geodesic flow  $\{\mathcal{G}_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$  on  $\mathrm{T}^1(\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}^{d+1})$  and the frame flow  $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$  on  $\mathrm{F}(\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}^{d+1})$  are represented by the right translation action of  $A$  on  $\Gamma \backslash G/M$  and  $\Gamma \backslash G$ , respectively. Exploiting the above identifications, for any  $u \in \mathrm{T}^1(\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}^{d+1})$  and  $F \in \mathrm{F}(\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}^{d+1})$ , we will often write the application of the geodesic flow and the frame flow for time  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  as  $ua_t$  and  $Fa_t$ , respectively. We denote by  $N^+$  and  $N^-$  the associated unstable and stable horospherical subgroups, respectively:

$$N^\pm = \{g \in G : a_t g a_{-t} \rightarrow e \text{ as } t \rightarrow \pm\infty\}.$$

They are abelian groups isomorphic to  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .

**2.1.2. Visual boundary.** Let  $\partial\mathbb{H}^{d+1}$  be the visual boundary of  $\mathbb{H}^{d+1}$ . The compactification of  $\mathbb{H}^{d+1}$  is  $\overline{\mathbb{H}^{d+1}} = \mathbb{H}^{d+1} \cup \partial\mathbb{H}^{d+1}$ . On  $\partial\mathbb{H}^{d+1} = \mathbb{R}^d \cup \{\infty\} \cong \mathbb{S}^d$ , we have the spherical metric  $d_{\mathbb{S}^d}$ . We also have the (extended) Euclidean metric  $d_E$  defined by  $d_E(x, x') = \|x - x'\|$  for any  $x, x' \in \partial\mathbb{H}^{d+1}$ .

The  $G$ -action on  $\mathbb{H}^{d+1}$  induces a  $G$ -action on  $\partial\mathbb{H}^{d+1}$  by conformal maps. For  $x \in \partial\mathbb{H}^{d+1}$ , let  $\|(dg)_x\|$  be the operator norm of the differential  $(dg)_x : \mathrm{T}_x(\partial\mathbb{H}^{d+1}) \rightarrow \mathrm{T}_x(\partial\mathbb{H}^{d+1})$  with respect to the Euclidean metric. Let  $\|(dg)_x\|_{\mathbb{S}^d}$  be the operator

norm with respect to the spherical metric. We have the relations

$$\|(dg)_x\|_{\mathbb{S}^d} = \frac{1 + \|x\|^2}{1 + \|gx\|^2} \|(dg)_x\| = e^{-\beta_x(g^{-1}o, o)},$$

where  $\beta : \partial\mathbb{H}^{d+1} \times \mathbb{H}^{d+1} \times \mathbb{H}^{d+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is the Busemann function given by  $\beta_x(z, z') = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} (d(z, x_t) - d(z', x_t))$  with  $\{x_t \in \mathbb{H}^{d+1} : t > 0\}$  an arbitrary geodesic ray tending to  $x \in \partial\mathbb{H}^{d+1}$ .

**2.1.3. Hopf parametrization of  $T^1(\mathbb{H}^{d+1})$ .** For all  $v \in T^1(\mathbb{H}^{d+1}) \cong G/M$  and  $F \in F(\mathbb{H}^{d+1}) \cong G$ , denote by  $v^+, F^+ \in \partial\mathbb{H}^{d+1}$  (resp.  $v^-, F^- \in \partial\mathbb{H}^{d+1}$ ) their forward endpoints (resp. backward endpoints), and denote by  $v_*, F_* \in \mathbb{H}^{d+1}$  their basepoints. Set  $\partial^2(\mathbb{H}^{d+1}) = \partial\mathbb{H}^{d+1} \times \partial\mathbb{H}^{d+1} - \text{Diagonal}(\partial\mathbb{H}^{d+1})$ . The Hopf parametrization is the identification via the diffeomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} T^1(\mathbb{H}^{d+1}) &\rightarrow \partial^2(\mathbb{H}^{d+1}) \times \mathbb{R} \\ v &\mapsto (v^+, v^-, s = \beta_{v^+}(o, v_*)). \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

The geodesic flow in the Hopf parametrization is simply the translation action on the  $\mathbb{R}$ -coordinate.

Given a torsion-free discrete subgroup  $\Gamma < G$ , it acts on  $T^1(\mathbb{H}^{d+1})$ , and hence it acts on  $\partial^2(\mathbb{H}^{d+1}) \times \mathbb{R}$ , which is given by the formula:

$$\gamma(v^+, v^-, s) = (\gamma v^+, \gamma v^-, s - \beta_{v^+}(o, \gamma^{-1}o)). \quad (2)$$

**2.2. Geometrically finite subgroups.** We now cover some fundamentals of geometrically finite subgroups. Let  $\Gamma < G$  be a discrete subgroup.

The limit set of  $\Gamma$  is the set  $\Lambda_\Gamma \subset \overline{\mathbb{H}^{d+1}}$  of all limit points of the orbit  $\Gamma o \subset \overline{\mathbb{H}^{d+1}}$ . It is independent of  $o \in \mathbb{H}^{d+1}$  and discreteness of  $\Gamma$  implies  $\Lambda_\Gamma \subset \partial\mathbb{H}^{d+1}$ .

A limit point  $x \in \Lambda_\Gamma$  is *conical* if there exists a geodesic ray tending to  $x$  and a sequence of elements  $\{\gamma_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \Gamma$  such that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_n o = x$ , and the distance between  $\gamma_n o$  and the geodesic ray is bounded for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . A subgroup  $\Gamma' < \Gamma$  is *parabolic* if it fixes only one point in  $\partial\mathbb{H}^{d+1}$ . A point  $x \in \Lambda_\Gamma$  is called a *parabolic fixed point* if  $\text{Stab}_\Gamma(x)$  is parabolic. It is said to be *bounded* if the quotient  $\text{Stab}_\Gamma(x) \backslash (\Lambda_\Gamma - \{x\})$  is compact.

The subgroup  $\Gamma < G$  is *non-elementary* if  $\#\Lambda_\Gamma \geq 3$  and hence  $\#\Lambda_\Gamma = \infty$ . Moreover, such a subgroup is *geometrically finite* if  $\Lambda_\Gamma$  consists only of conical limit points and parabolic fixed points, or equivalently,  $\Lambda_\Gamma$  consists only of conical limit points and bounded parabolic fixed points [Bow93, KL19].

**2.3. Structure of cusps.** Let  $\Gamma < G$  be a geometrically finite subgroup with parabolic elements and suppose  $\infty \in \partial\mathbb{H}^{d+1}$  is a parabolic fixed point of  $\Gamma$ . Let  $\Gamma'_\infty = \text{Stab}_\Gamma(\infty) < \Gamma$  be the parabolic subgroup fixing  $\infty$ . Then  $\Gamma'_\infty$  acts on  $\mathbb{R}^d \subset \partial\mathbb{H}^{d+1}$  by Euclidean isometries. The following result of Bieberbach gives a more precise characterization of the  $\Gamma'_\infty$ -action on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  (see [Rat19, Section 7.5]).

**Lemma 2.1** (Bieberbach). *There exist a maximal normal abelian subgroup  $\Gamma_\infty < \Gamma'_\infty$  of finite index  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and a  $\Gamma'_\infty$ -invariant affine subspace  $Z \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  of dimension  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\Gamma_\infty$  acts on  $Z$  as a group of translations of rank  $k$ . Consequently, decomposing  $\mathbb{R}^d = Y \oplus Z$  into orthogonal affine subspaces and viewing the later as vector spaces in their own right, we can write the  $\Gamma'_\infty$ -action on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  in the following form: for all  $\gamma \in \Gamma'_\infty$ , there exist*

$$A_\gamma \in O(Y), \quad R_\gamma \in O(Z), \quad b_\gamma \in Z,$$



where  $R_\gamma^m = \text{Id}$  and moreover  $R_\gamma = \text{Id}$  if  $\gamma \in \Gamma_\infty$ , such that

$$\gamma(y, z) = (A_\gamma y, R_\gamma z + b_\gamma) \quad \text{for all } (y, z) \in Y \oplus Z.$$

The dimension  $k$  in Lemma 2.1 is also called the *rank* of the parabolic fixed point  $\infty$ .

Consider the orthogonal decomposition  $\mathbb{R}^d = Y \oplus Z$  from Lemma 2.1. Since  $\Gamma_\infty$  acts on  $Z$  as a group of translations, it admits a fundamental domain  $\Delta'_\infty \subset Z$  which is an open  $k$ -dimensional parallelotope. Since  $\Gamma$  is geometrically finite,  $\infty$  is a bounded parabolic fixed point. By definition, the quotient  $\Gamma'_\infty \backslash (\Lambda_\Gamma - \{\infty\})$  is compact and so the quotient  $\Gamma_\infty \backslash (\Lambda_\Gamma - \{\infty\})$  is also compact as  $\Gamma_\infty < \Gamma'_\infty$  is of finite index. Therefore, there exists a constant  $C_\infty > 0$  such that the set  $B_Y(C_\infty) = \{y \in Y : \|y\| < C_\infty\}$  has the property that

$$\Lambda_\Gamma - \{\infty\} \subset \bigcup_{\gamma \in \Gamma_\infty} \gamma(\overline{B_Y(C_\infty)} \times \Delta'_\infty). \quad (3)$$

We call the open set  $\Delta_\infty := B_Y(C_\infty) \times \Delta'_\infty$  a *fundamental domain* for the parabolic fixed point  $\infty$ .




FIGURE 2. The intersection  $\Lambda_\Gamma \cap \mathbb{R}^d$  has bounded distance to  $\mathbb{R}^k$ .

**2.4. PS measure and BMS measure.** Let  $\Gamma < G$  be a geometrically finite subgroup. Denote by  $\delta \in (0, d]$  the critical exponent of  $\Gamma$ , i.e., the abscissa of convergence of the Poincaré series  $s \mapsto \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} e^{-sd(o, \gamma o)}$ .

**2.4.1. Patterson–Sullivan measure.** Patterson and later Sullivan constructed a  $\Gamma$ -invariant conformal density  $\{\mu_y^{\text{PS}}\}_{y \in \mathbb{H}^{d+1}}$  of dimension  $\delta$ , i.e., a set of finite Borel measures on  $\partial \mathbb{H}^{d+1}$  such that for any  $y, z \in \mathbb{H}^{d+1}$ ,  $x \in \partial \mathbb{H}^{d+1}$ , and  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ , we have

$$\frac{d\mu_y^{\text{PS}}}{d\mu_z^{\text{PS}}}(x) = e^{-\delta \beta_x(y, z)} \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_* \mu_y^{\text{PS}} = \mu_{\gamma y}^{\text{PS}}, \quad (4)$$

where the pushforward is defined by  $\gamma_* \mu_y^{\text{PS}}(E) = \mu_y^{\text{PS}}(\gamma^{-1}E)$  for any Borel subset  $E \subset \partial \mathbb{H}^{d+1}$ . Such a set of measures is unique up to homothety and the  $\Gamma$ -action

on  $\partial\mathbb{H}^{d+1}$  is ergodic relative to the corresponding measure class; in particular, the measures are supported on  $\Lambda_\Gamma \subset \partial\mathbb{H}^{d+1}$ . These measures are called Patterson–Sullivan measures (or PS measures).

Since the PS measures are absolutely continuous with respect to each other, it is convenient to fix  $\mu := \mu_o^{\text{PS}}$  for the rest of the paper. It enjoys the *quasi-invariance* property: for any Borel subset  $E \subset \partial\mathbb{H}^{d+1}$  and any  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ ,

$$\mu(\gamma E) = \int_E \|(d\gamma)_x\|_{\mathbb{S}^d}^\delta d\mu(x). \quad (5)$$

**2.4.2. Bowen–Margulis–Sullivan measure.** Using the Hopf parametrization, the Bowen–Margulis–Sullivan measure (or BMS measure) on  $T^1(\mathbb{H}^{d+1})$  is defined by

$$d\tilde{m}^{\text{BMS}}(v^+, v^-, s) = e^{\delta\beta_{v^+}(o, v^*)} e^{\delta\beta_{v^-}(o, v^*)} d\mu(v^+) d\mu(v^-) ds.$$

It induces the following measures which are also called BMS measures. Note that  $\tilde{m}^{\text{BMS}}$  is left  $\Gamma$ -invariant because of the conformality of the PS measure (Eq. (4)) and the formula for  $\Gamma$ -action on  $\partial^2(\mathbb{H}^{d+1}) \times \mathbb{R}$  (Eq. (2)). Hence  $\tilde{m}^{\text{BMS}}$  induces a measure  $m^{\text{BMS}}$  on  $T^1(\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}^{d+1})$ . Since  $\Gamma$  is geometrically finite,  $m^{\text{BMS}}(T^1(\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}^{d+1}))$  is finite and so we may normalize  $m^{\text{BMS}}$  to a probability measure. Using the identifications  $T^1(\mathbb{H}^{d+1}) \cong G/M$  and  $F(\mathbb{H}^{d+1}) \cong G$ , and the Haar probability measure on  $M$ , we lift the measure  $\tilde{m}^{\text{BMS}}$  to a right  $M$ -invariant measure on  $F(\mathbb{H}^{d+1})$ , which we also denote by  $\tilde{m}^{\text{BMS}}$  by abuse of notation. Similarly, for the quotient spaces, we lift the measure  $m^{\text{BMS}}$  on  $T^1(\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}^{d+1}) \cong \Gamma \backslash G/M$  to a right  $M$ -invariant measure  $m^{\text{BMS}}$  on  $F(\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}^{d+1}) \cong \Gamma \backslash G$ . It follows from definitions that the BMS measures are invariant under the geodesic flow  $\{\mathcal{G}_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$  on the respective unit tangent bundles and invariant under the frame flow  $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$  on the respective frame bundles.

### 3. SYMBOLIC MODEL FOR THE FRAME FLOW

For the rest of the paper, let  $\Gamma < G$  be a Zariski dense torsion-free geometrically finite subgroup with parabolic elements. Furthermore, conjugating  $\Gamma$  by an element in  $G$  if necessary, we can assume that  $\infty \in \partial\mathbb{H}^{d+1}$  is a parabolic fixed point of  $\Gamma$ . Denote  $X := \Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}^{d+1}$ .

**3.1. Expanding map on the boundary.** Let us first recall the symbolic model for the geodesic flow constructed by Li–Pan [LP22, Proposition 4.1].

One approach in symbolic dynamics to tackle the geodesic flow is to construct a Poincaré section  $S \subset T^1(X)$ . It is a  $2d$ -dimensional submanifold with boundary which is transverse to the geodesic flow and has good recurrence properties. The challenge lies in finding a return time map  $\mathcal{R}$  defined on a full measure subset  $S_0 \subset S$ , such that the map  $v \mapsto \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{R}(v)}(v)$  on  $S_0$  is hyperbolic and can be modeled by a full shift of a countably infinite alphabet. To overcome this difficulty, Li–Pan constructed a countably infinite symbolic coding on  $\partial\mathbb{H}^{d+1}$  equipped with an expanding map and connected it to the return time map.

Fix  $\Delta_0 := \Delta_\infty$  to be the fundamental domain for the parabolic fixed point  $\infty$ .

**Proposition 3.1** ([LP22, Proposition 4.1]). *There exist  $C_1 > 0$ ,  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\epsilon_0 \in (0, 1)$ , a countably infinite set  $\{\Delta_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{J}}$  of mutually disjoint open subsets of  $\Delta_0$ , and an expanding map  $T : \Delta_\square \rightarrow \Delta_0$  where  $\Delta_\square := \bigsqcup_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \Delta_j$ , such that:*

- (1)  $\mu(\Delta_0) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \mu(\Delta_j)$ ;
- (2) for all  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ , there exists  $\gamma_j \in \Gamma$  such that  $\Delta_j = \gamma_j \Delta_0$  and  $T|_{\Delta_j} = \gamma_j^{-1}$ ;

- (3) for all  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ ,  $\gamma_j$  is a uniform contraction: we have  $\|(d\gamma_j)_x\| \leq \lambda$  for all  $x \in \Delta_0$ ;
- (4) for all  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ , we have  $\|(d(\log \|d\gamma_j\|))_x\| \leq C_1$  for all  $x \in \Delta_0$ , where  $(d(\log \|d\gamma_j\|))_x$  is the derivative of the map  $z \mapsto \log \|(d\gamma_j)_z\|$  at  $x$ ;
- (5) the return time map  $\mathcal{R} : \Delta_{\square} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined by  $\mathcal{R}(x) = \log \|(dT)_x\|$  for all  $x \in \Delta_{\square}$  satisfies the exponential tail property:  $e^{\epsilon_0 \mathcal{R}} \in L^1(\Delta_{\square}, \mu)$ .

Denote by  $\mathcal{H} = \{\gamma_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{J}}$  the set of inverse branches of  $T$ . Let

$$\mathcal{H}^n = \{\gamma_{j_1} \cdots \gamma_{j_n} : j_k \in \mathcal{J} \text{ for all } 1 \leq k \leq n\}$$

be the set of inverse branches of length  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . For any  $\gamma \in \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{H}^n$ , set

$$\|d\gamma\| := \sup\{\|(d\gamma)_x\| : x \in \Delta_0\}.$$

Define

$$\Lambda_+ = \Lambda_{\Gamma} \cap \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} T^{-n}(\Delta_0) = \{x \in \Lambda_{\Gamma} : T^n \text{ is defined at } x \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

This is the space that admits a countably infinite coding.

The expanding map  $T$  gives a contraction action in a neighborhood of  $\infty$ .

**Lemma 3.2** ([LP22, Lemma 4.8]). *There exist  $0 < \lambda < 1$  and a neighborhood  $\Lambda_-$  of  $\infty$  in  $\Lambda_{\Gamma}$  such that  $\Lambda_-$  is disjoint from  $\overline{\Delta_0}$  and for any  $\gamma \in \mathcal{H}$  and any  $y, y' \in \Lambda_-$ ,*

$$\gamma^{-1}(\Lambda_-) \subset \Lambda_-, \quad d_{\mathbb{S}^d}(\gamma^{-1}y, \gamma^{-1}y') \leq \lambda d_{\mathbb{S}^d}(y, y').$$

Using Proposition 3.1, it can be shown as in [You98, Lemma 2] that there exists a  $T$ -invariant ergodic probability measure  $\nu$  on  $\Delta_0$  such that

$$d\nu = f_0 d\mu \tag{6}$$

where  $f_0 : \Delta_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a positive Lipschitz density function which is bounded away from 0 and  $+\infty$ . Note that as a result,  $\Lambda_+ \subset \Delta_0$  is a full measure subset with respect to the equivalent measures  $\mu$  and  $\nu$ .

**Definition 3.3** (Cylinder). We call subsets of the form  $\gamma\Delta_0 \subset \Delta_0$  for some  $\gamma \in \mathcal{H}^n$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  *cylinders* of length  $n$ . We regard  $\Delta_0$  as a cylinder of length 0. These will typically be denoted by  $\mathcal{C}$  or other typewriter style letters.

In Subsection 8.1, we will use cylinders to construct  $\mu$ -measurable partitions of  $\Delta_0$ .

Following [Sto11, Section 5], we introduce another distance function  $D$  on  $\Delta_0$  by

$$D(x, y) = \min\{\text{diam}(\mathcal{C}) : \text{cylinders } \mathcal{C} \subset \Delta_0 \text{ such that } x, y \in \overline{\mathcal{C}}\}$$

for  $x, y \in \Delta_0$  with  $x \neq y$ , and  $D(x, y) = 0$  otherwise. The proof of the following lemma is straightforward.

**Lemma 3.4.** *The following holds:*

- (1)  $D$  is a distance function on  $\Delta_0$ ;
- (2) for all  $x, y \in \Delta_0$ , we have  $d_E(x, y) \leq D(x, y)$ ;
- (3) for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\gamma \in \mathcal{H}^n$ , and  $x, y \in \Delta_0$ , we have  $D(\gamma x, \gamma y) \leq \lambda^n D(x, y)$ .

The following lemma records basic estimates for cylinders which is used throughout the paper. The estimate for measures holds more generally for Borel subsets.

**Lemma 3.5.** *For all cylinders  $\mathbf{C} \subset \Delta_0$ , Borel subsets  $E \subset \Delta_0$ , and  $\gamma \in \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{H}^n$ , we have*

$$\text{diam}(\gamma\mathbf{C}) \asymp \|d\gamma\| \text{diam}(\mathbf{C}), \quad \mu(\gamma E) \asymp \|d\gamma\|^\delta \mu(E), \quad \nu(\gamma E) \asymp \|d\gamma\|^\delta \nu(E),$$

with some implicit constant  $C_{\text{cyl}} > 1$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $E$  be as in the lemma and  $\gamma = \gamma_{j_1} \cdots \gamma_{j_n} \in \mathcal{H}^n$ . We first estimate  $\mu(\gamma E)$  and  $\nu(\gamma E)$ . Using Properties (3) and (4) in Proposition 3.1 and the chain rule, for any  $x, y \in \Delta_0$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\log \|(d\gamma)_x\| - \log \|(d\gamma)_y\|| &\leq \sum_{l=1}^{n-1} C_1 d_E(\gamma_{j_{l+1}} \cdots \gamma_{j_n} x, \gamma_{j_{l+1}} \cdots \gamma_{j_n} y) \\ &\leq \frac{C_1}{1-\lambda} \text{diam}(\Delta_0). \end{aligned}$$

Then for any  $x \in \Delta_0$ , we have

$$\|(d\gamma)_x\| \asymp \|d\gamma\|. \quad (7)$$

Due to Eqs. (5) and (6), for any Borel subset  $E \subset \Delta_0$ , we have

$$\nu(\gamma E) \asymp \mu(\gamma E) \asymp \mu(E) \|d\gamma\|^\delta.$$

Next, we estimate  $\text{diam}(\gamma\mathbf{C})$ . We first show the latter part of the inequality. For any  $y \in \gamma\Delta_0$ , by writing  $y = \gamma x$ , we have

$$\|(d\gamma^{-1})_y\| = \|(d\gamma)_x\|^{-1} \asymp \|\gamma\|^{-1}. \quad (8)$$

Note that for any points  $x, y \in \mathbf{C}$ , the straight line  $\overline{xy}$  is contained in  $\Delta_0$  by convexity. Now,  $d_E(\gamma x, \gamma y)$  is bounded by the length of the curve  $\gamma \cdot \overline{xy}$ . Hence, using the inequality  $\|(d\gamma)_z\| \leq \|d\gamma\|$  for all  $z \in \Delta_0$  gives

$$d_E(\gamma x, \gamma y) \leq \|d\gamma\| d_E(x, y).$$

By taking the supremum of  $d(\gamma x, \gamma y)$  over all points  $x, y \in \mathbf{C}$ , we obtain

$$\text{diam}(\gamma\mathbf{C}) \leq \|d\gamma\| \text{diam}(\mathbf{C}).$$

Now, we show the former part of the inequality. Fix any ball  $B \subset \Delta_0$ . We write  $\mathbf{C} = \beta\Delta_0$  for some  $\beta \in \mathcal{H}^m$ , where  $m$  is the length of the cylinder. The images  $\gamma\beta B \subset \beta B \subset \Delta_0$  are still balls due to the conformality of the  $G$ -action on  $\partial\mathbb{H}^{d+1}$ . Thus, using convexity of the balls and Eq. (8) for  $\gamma^{-1}$  and  $\beta^{-1}$ , we can apply a similar argument as in the previous paragraph to obtain

$$\text{diam}(B) \ll \frac{\text{diam}(\gamma\beta B)}{\|d\gamma\| \cdot \|d\beta\|} \leq \frac{\text{diam}(\gamma\mathbf{C})}{\|d\gamma\| \cdot \|d\beta\|}.$$

From the previous paragraph, we also have

$$\text{diam}(\mathbf{C}) = \text{diam}(\beta\Delta_0) \leq \|d\beta\| \text{diam}(\Delta_0) \ll \|d\beta\| \text{diam}(B).$$

Combining these two inequalities, we obtain

$$\|d\gamma\| \text{diam}(\mathbf{C}) \ll \text{diam}(\gamma\mathbf{C}).$$

■

Fix a constant

$$C_{\Delta_0} \geq C_{\text{cyl}} \cdot \max\{1, \text{diam}(\Delta_0), \mu(\Delta_0)\} > 1. \quad (9)$$

**3.2. Symbolic model for the geodesic flow.** Recall the subsets  $\Lambda_+, \Lambda_- \subset \Lambda_\Gamma$  from Subsection 3.1. Define  $\hat{T} : \Lambda_+ \times \Lambda_- \rightarrow \Lambda_+ \times \Lambda_-$  by

$$\hat{T}(x, y) = (\gamma_j^{-1}x, \gamma_j^{-1}y) \quad \text{if } x \in \Delta_j, \text{ for all } y \in \Lambda_+ \text{ and } j \in \mathcal{J}.$$

Let  $\mathcal{R} : \Delta_\square \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be the function given in Proposition 3.1. By abusing notation, define  $\mathcal{R} : \Delta_\square \times \Lambda_- \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by setting  $\mathcal{R}(x, y) = \mathcal{R}(x)$  for all  $(x, y) \in \Delta_\square \times \Lambda_-$ . We define the space

$$\Lambda^{\mathcal{R}} = \{(x, y, s) \in \Lambda_+ \times \Lambda_- \times \mathbb{R} : 0 \leq s < \mathcal{R}(x, y)\}.$$

We use the notation  $\mathcal{R}_0 = 0$  and

$$\mathcal{R}_n = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \mathcal{R} \circ \hat{T}^j \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (10)$$

The hyperbolic skew product semiflow  $\{\hat{T}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is defined by

$$\hat{T}_t(x, y, s) = (\hat{T}^n(x, y), s + t - \mathcal{R}_n(x, y))$$

for all  $(x, y, s) \in \Lambda_+ \times \Lambda_- \times \mathbb{R}$ , where  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  such that  $0 \leq s + t - \mathcal{R}_n(x, y) < \mathcal{R}(\hat{T}^n(x, y))$ .

**3.2.1. The map from  $\Lambda^{\mathcal{R}}$  to  $T^1(X)$ .** We introduce the following embedding:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Phi} : \Delta_0 \times \Lambda_- \times \{0\} &\rightarrow \partial^2(\mathbb{H}^{d+1}) \times \mathbb{R} \\ (x, y, 0) &\mapsto (x, y, \log(1 + \|x\|^2)). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

We can see from the formula of the Hopf parametrization (Eq. (1)) that  $\tilde{\Phi}$  maps  $\Delta_0 \times \{\infty\} \times \{0\}$  to the unstable horosphere based at  $\infty$  which contains  $o = e_{d+1} \in \mathbb{H}^{d+1} \subset \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ . Abusing notation, we define the following time change map:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Phi} : \Lambda^{\mathcal{R}} &\rightarrow \partial^2(\mathbb{H}^{d+1}) \times \mathbb{R} \\ (x, y, s) &\mapsto (x, y, s + \log(1 + \|x\|^2)). \end{aligned}$$

For all  $x \in \Lambda_+$  and  $y, y' \in \Lambda_-$ , the points  $\tilde{\Phi}(x, y, 0)$  and  $\tilde{\Phi}(x, y', 0)$  lie on the same stable horosphere based at  $x$ .

Using the identification  $T^1(X) \cong \Gamma \backslash (\partial^2(\mathbb{H}^{d+1}) \times \mathbb{R})$ , the map  $\tilde{\Phi}$  induces a map  $\Phi : \Lambda^{\mathcal{R}} \rightarrow T^1(X)$ . We have that  $\Phi$  defines a semiconjugacy between two semiflows:

$$\Phi \circ \hat{T}_t = \mathcal{G}_t \circ \Phi \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0.$$

**3.3. Symbolic model for the frame flow.** Fix a reference point  $x_0 \in \Lambda_+ \subset \Delta_0$ . We define a section

$$\tilde{F} : \Delta_0 \times \Lambda_- \rightarrow F(\mathbb{H}^{d+1})$$

which is *smooth* in the first argument in the following fashion:

- Fix a frame  $\tilde{F}(x_0, \infty) \in F(\mathbb{H}^{d+1})$  based at the tangent vector  $\tilde{\Phi}(x_0, \infty, 0)$ .
- Extend the section  $\tilde{F}$  such that for any  $x, x' \in \Delta_0$ , the frames  $\tilde{F}(x, \infty)$  and  $\tilde{F}(x', \infty)$  are backward asymptotic, i.e.,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} d(\tilde{F}(x, \infty)a_t, \tilde{F}(x', \infty)a_t) = 0.$$

Then, we must have  $\tilde{F}(x', \infty) = \tilde{F}(x, \infty)n^+$  for some unique  $n^+ \in N^+$ .

- Extend the section  $\tilde{F}$  such that for any  $x \in \Delta_0$  and  $y, y' \in \Lambda_-$ , the frames  $\tilde{F}(x, y)$  and  $\tilde{F}(x, y')$  are forward asymptotic, i.e.,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} d(\tilde{F}(x, y)a_t, \tilde{F}(x, y')a_t) = 0.$$

Then, we must have  $\tilde{F}(x, y') = \tilde{F}(x, y)n^-$  for some unique  $n^- \in N^-$ .

Then,  $\tilde{F}$  induces a map  $F : \Delta_0 \times \Lambda_- \rightarrow F(X)$ .

**Definition 3.6** (Holonomy). The *holonomy* is a map  $\mathcal{H} : \Delta_{\square} \times \Lambda_- \rightarrow M$  such that for all  $(x, y) \in \Delta_{\square} \times \Lambda_-$ , we have

$$F(x, y)a_{\mathcal{R}(x, y)} = F(\hat{T}(x, y))\mathcal{H}(x, y)^{-1}.$$

**Definition 3.7** (Generalized holonomy). We call the combined map

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G} : \Delta_{\square} \times \Lambda_- &\rightarrow AM \\ (x, y) &\mapsto a_{\mathcal{R}(x, y)}\mathcal{H}(x, y) \end{aligned}$$

the *generalized holonomy*.

The following lemma can be deduced using the construction of  $F$  (see [SW21, Lemma 4.2] for its proof).

**Lemma 3.8.** *For all  $x \in \Delta_{\square}$ , the maps  $\mathcal{R}|_{\{x\} \times \Lambda_-}$ ,  $\mathcal{H}|_{\{x\} \times \Lambda_-}$ , and  $\mathcal{G}|_{\{x\} \times \Lambda_-}$  are constant.*

We define the space

$$\Lambda^{\mathcal{R}} \times M = \{(x, y, m, s) \in \Lambda_+ \times \Lambda_- \times M \times \mathbb{R} : 0 \leq s < \mathcal{R}(x, y)\}.$$

We use the notations  $\mathcal{H}_0 = \mathcal{G}_0 = e$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_n &= \mathcal{H} \cdot (\mathcal{H} \circ \hat{T}) \cdots (\mathcal{H} \circ \hat{T}^{n-1}), \\ \mathcal{G}_n &= \mathcal{G} \cdot (\mathcal{G} \circ \hat{T}) \cdots (\mathcal{G} \circ \hat{T}^{n-1}), \end{aligned} \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

The symbolic frame semiflow  $\{\hat{T}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  is defined by

$$\hat{T}_t(x, y, m, s) = (\hat{T}^n(x, y), \mathcal{H}_n(x, y)^{-1}m, s + t - \mathcal{R}_n(x, y))$$

for all  $(x, y, m, s) \in \Lambda_+ \times \Lambda_- \times M \times \mathbb{R}$ , where  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  such that  $0 \leq s + t - \mathcal{R}_n(x, y) < \mathcal{R}(\hat{T}^n(x, y))$ .

**3.3.1. The map from  $\Lambda^{\mathcal{R}} \times M$  to  $F(X)$ .** Abusing notation, we define the map

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Phi} : \Lambda^{\mathcal{R}} \times M &\rightarrow F(\mathbb{H}^{d+1}) \\ (x, y, m, s) &\mapsto \tilde{F}(x, y)a_s m. \end{aligned}$$

This map is well-defined, and it induces a map  $\Phi : \Lambda^{\mathcal{R}} \times M \rightarrow F(X)$ . In fact, we have the relation

$$\Phi(x, y, m, a_s) = F(x, y)a_s m.$$

We claim that  $\Phi$  defines a semiconjugacy between two semiflows:

$$\Phi \circ \hat{T}_t = \mathcal{F}_t \circ \Phi \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0. \quad (12)$$

To see this, note that for any  $(x, y, m, s) \in \Lambda^{\mathcal{R}} \times M$ , we have the expression

$$\hat{T}_t(x, y, m, s) = (\hat{T}^n(x, y), \mathcal{H}_n(x, y)^{-1}m, s + t - \mathcal{R}_n(x, y)).$$

Then on the one hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi \circ \hat{T}_t &= \Phi(\hat{T}^n(x, y), \mathcal{H}_n(x, y)^{-1}m, s + t - \mathcal{R}_n(x, y)) \\ &= F(\hat{T}^n(x, y))\mathcal{H}_n(x, y)^{-1}ma_{s+t-\mathcal{R}_n(x, y)}.\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}_t \circ \Phi &= \mathcal{F}_t \circ \Phi(x, y, m, s) \\ &= F(x, y)ma_{s+t} \\ &= F(\hat{T}^n(x, y))\mathcal{H}_n(x, y)^{-1}ma_{s+t-\mathcal{R}_n(x, y)} \quad (\text{by Definition 3.6}).\end{aligned}$$

This finishes the justification of Eq. (12).

**3.3.2. Relating  $\hat{\nu}^{\mathcal{R}} \otimes m^{\text{Haar}}$  with  $m^{\text{BMS}}$ .** It is proved in [LP22, Proposition 4.11] that there exists a unique  $\hat{T}$ -invariant ergodic probability measure  $\hat{\nu}$  on  $\Lambda_+ \times \Lambda_-$  which projects to the measure  $\nu$  on  $\Lambda_+$ . We equip  $\Lambda^{\mathcal{R}}$  with the  $\{\hat{T}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ -invariant measure  $d\hat{\nu}^{\mathcal{R}} := d\hat{\nu} dm^{\text{Leb}}/\bar{\mathcal{R}}$ , where  $m^{\text{Leb}}$  is the Lebesgue measure and  $\bar{\mathcal{R}} = \hat{\nu}(\mathcal{R})$ . Fix the Haar probability measure  $m^{\text{Haar}}$  on  $M$ , which is implicitly used within integrals. On  $\Lambda^{\mathcal{R}} \times M$ , we consider the product measure  $\hat{\nu}^{\mathcal{R}} \otimes m^{\text{Haar}}$ : for any bounded continuous function  $f : \Lambda^{\mathcal{R}} \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$(\hat{\nu}^{\mathcal{R}} \otimes m^{\text{Haar}})(f) = \int_{\Lambda^{\mathcal{R}}} \int_M f(x, y, m, s) dm d\hat{\nu}^{\mathcal{R}}(x, y, s).$$

Recall the following result proved in [LP22].

**Proposition 3.9** ([LP22, Proposition 4.15]). *The map*

$$\Phi : (\Lambda^{\mathcal{R}}, \{\hat{T}_t\}_{t \geq 0}, \hat{\nu}^{\mathcal{R}}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{T}^1(X), \{\mathcal{G}_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}, m^{\text{BMS}})$$

is a factor map, i.e.,

$$\Phi_* \hat{\nu}^{\mathcal{R}} = m^{\text{BMS}} \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi \circ \hat{T}_t = \mathcal{G}_t \circ \Phi \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0.$$

**Corollary 3.10.** *The map*

$$\Phi : (\Lambda^{\mathcal{R}} \times M, \{\hat{T}_t\}_{t \geq 0}, \hat{\nu}^{\mathcal{R}} \otimes m^{\text{Haar}}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{F}(X), \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}}, m^{\text{BMS}})$$

is a factor map, i.e.,

$$\Phi_* (\hat{\nu}^{\mathcal{R}} \otimes m^{\text{Haar}}) = m^{\text{BMS}} \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi \circ \hat{T}_t = \mathcal{F}_t \circ \Phi \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0.$$

*Proof.* Given a bounded function  $f \in C(\mathbb{F}(X), \mathbb{R})$ , we define the function  $\bar{f} : \mathbb{T}^1(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$\bar{f}(\Gamma gM) = \int_M f(\Gamma gm) dm.$$

We have  $\bar{f} \in C(\mathbb{T}^1(X), \mathbb{R})$  which is also bounded. Note that for any  $(x, y, s) \in \Lambda^{\mathcal{R}}$ , we have

$$(\bar{f} \circ \Phi)(x, y, s) = \int_M f(F(x, y)a_s m) dm.$$

Hence, using Proposition 3.9, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
m^{\text{BMS}}(f) &= \int_{\mathbb{T}^1(X)} \int_M f(\Gamma gm) dm dm^{\text{BMS}}(\Gamma gM) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^1(X)} \bar{f} dm^{\text{BMS}} \\
&= \int_{\Lambda^{\mathcal{R}}} (\bar{f} \circ \Phi)(x, y, s) d\hat{\nu}^{\mathcal{R}}(x, y, s) \\
&= \int_{\Lambda^{\mathcal{R}}} \int_M f(F(x, y)a_s m) dm d\hat{\nu}^{\mathcal{R}}(x, y, s) = (\hat{\nu}^{\mathcal{R}} \otimes m^{\text{Haar}})(f).
\end{aligned}$$

■

#### 4. TRANSFER OPERATORS WITH HOLONOMY

In this section, we introduce the transfer operator with holonomy associated to the countably infinite coding. The main technical objective in this paper is to obtain spectral bounds for these operators in Section 8.

Recall that we have fixed the Haar probability measure on  $M$ . Also recall that  $L^2(M, \mathbb{C})$  is a Hilbert space equipped with the standard inner product  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  defined by  $\langle f, g \rangle = \int_M fg$ . As usual, we denote by  $\| \cdot \|_2$  the corresponding  $L^2$  norm on  $L^2(M, \mathbb{C})$  and any of its subspaces.

In the proof of exponential mixing, we need to deal with the function space

$$C(\Lambda^{\mathcal{R}} \times M, \mathbb{C}) \cong C(\Lambda^{\mathcal{R}}, C(M, \mathbb{C})) \subset C(\Lambda^{\mathcal{R}}, L^2(M, \mathbb{C})).$$

Let  $\widehat{M}$  be the unitary dual of  $M$ . Denote the trivial irreducible representation by  $1 \in \widehat{M}$ . Define  $\widehat{M}_0 = \widehat{M} - \{1\}$ . Due to the above, it is natural to use the Peter–Weyl theorem and obtain the Hilbert space decomposition

$$L^2(M, \mathbb{C}) = \bigoplus_{\rho \in \widehat{M}} V_{\rho}^{\oplus \dim(\rho)}$$

corresponding to the decomposition  $\varrho = \bigoplus_{\rho \in \widehat{M}} \rho^{\oplus \dim(\rho)}$  of the left regular representation  $\varrho : M \rightarrow U(L^2(M, \mathbb{C}))$ .

For all  $b \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\rho \in \widehat{M}$ , we define the tensored unitary representation  $\rho_b : AM \rightarrow U(V_{\rho})$  by

$$\rho_b(a_t m)(z) = e^{ibt} \rho(m)(z) \quad \text{for all } z \in V_{\rho}, t \in \mathbb{R}, \text{ and } m \in M.$$

We introduce some notations related to Lie algebras. We denote Lie algebras corresponding to Lie groups by the corresponding Fraktur letters:  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathbb{T}_e(G)$ ,  $\mathfrak{a} = \mathbb{T}_e(A)$ ,  $\mathfrak{m} = \mathbb{T}_e(M)$ , and  $\mathfrak{n}^{\pm} = \mathbb{T}_e(N^{\pm})$ . For any unitary representation  $\rho : M \rightarrow U(V)$  for some Hilbert space  $V$ , we denote the differential at  $e \in M$  by  $d\rho = (d\rho)_e : \mathfrak{m} \rightarrow \mathfrak{u}(V)$ , and define the norm

$$\|\rho\| = \sup_{z \in \mathfrak{m}, \|z\|=1} \|d\rho(z)\|_{\text{op}}$$

and similarly for any unitary representation  $\rho : AM \rightarrow U(V)$ .

The following are useful facts regarding the Lie theoretic norms (see [SW21] for their proofs).

**Lemma 4.1** ([SW21, Lemma 4.3]). *For all  $b \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\rho \in \widehat{M}$ , we have*

$$\sup_{a \in A, m \in M} \sup_{\substack{z \in \mathbb{T}_{am}(AM), \\ \|z\|=1}} \|(d\rho_b)_{am}(z)\|_{\text{op}} = \|\rho_b\|$$



and  $\max\{|b|, \|\rho\|\} \leq \|\rho_b\| \leq |b| + \|\rho\|$ .

**Lemma 4.2** ([SW21, Lemmas 4.4]). *There exists  $\varepsilon_1 \in (0, 1)$  such that for all  $b \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\rho \in \widehat{M}$ , and  $\omega \in V_\rho^{\oplus \dim(\rho)}$  with  $\|\omega\|_2 = 1$ , there exists  $z \in \mathfrak{a} \oplus \mathfrak{m}$  with  $\|z\| = 1$  such that  $\|d\rho_b(z)(\omega)\|_2 \geq \varepsilon_1 \|\rho_b\|$ .*

The source of the oscillations needed in Dolgopyat's method is provided by the *local non-integrability condition (LNIC)* which will be introduced in Section 5 and the oscillations themselves are propagated when  $\|\rho_b\|$  is sufficiently large. But this occurs precisely when  $|b|$  is sufficiently large or  $\rho \in \widehat{M}$  is nontrivial. Let  $b_0 > 0$  which we fix later. This motivates us to define

$$\widehat{M}_0(b_0) = \{(b, \rho) \in \mathbb{R} \times \widehat{M} : |b| > b_0 \text{ or } \rho \neq 1\}.$$

We fix the related constant  $\delta_\varrho = \inf_{b \in \mathbb{R}, \rho \in \widehat{M}_0} \|\rho_b\| = \inf_{\rho \in \widehat{M}_0} \|\rho\|$  which is positive because  $M$  is a compact connected Lie group (recall from [Lub10, Example 3.1.4] that compact Lie groups have property (T)). Then,  $\inf_{(b, \rho) \in \widehat{M}_0(b_0)} \|\rho_b\| \geq \min\{b_0, \delta_\varrho\}$ . Thus, we also fix

$$\delta_{1, \varrho} = \min\{1, \delta_\varrho\}. \quad (13)$$

**Definition 4.3** (Transfer operator with holonomy). For all  $\xi = a + ib \in \mathbb{C}$  with  $a > -\varepsilon_0$  and  $\rho \in \widehat{M}$ , the *transfer operator with holonomy*  $\mathcal{M}_{\xi \mathcal{R}, \rho} : C(\Lambda_+, V_\rho^{\oplus \dim(\rho)}) \rightarrow C(\Lambda_+, V_\rho^{\oplus \dim(\rho)})$  is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_{\xi \mathcal{R}, \rho}(H)(x) &= \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}} e^{-\xi \mathcal{R}(\gamma x)} \rho(\mathcal{H}(\gamma x)^{-1}) H(\gamma x) \\ &= \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}} e^{-a \mathcal{R}(\gamma x)} \rho_b(\mathcal{G}(\gamma x)^{-1}) H(\gamma x) \end{aligned}$$

for all  $x \in \Lambda_+$  and  $H \in C(\Lambda_+, V_\rho^{\oplus \dim(\rho)})$  with  $\|H\|_\infty < \infty$ .

The above is well-defined due to the exponential tail property (see Property (5) in Proposition 3.1). Denote  $\mathcal{L}_{\xi \mathcal{R}} := \mathcal{M}_{\xi \mathcal{R}, 1}$ .

Let  $(V, \|\cdot\|)$  be any normed vector space over  $\mathbb{R}$  or  $\mathbb{C}$ . Let  $d$  be any distance function on  $\Delta_0$ ; in particular,  $d = d_E$  or  $d = D$ . For any function  $H : \Lambda_+ \rightarrow V$ , denote

$$\begin{aligned} \|H\|_\infty &= \sup\{\|H(x)\| : x \in \Lambda_+\}, \\ \text{Lip}_d(H) &= \sup\left\{\frac{\|H(x) - H(x')\|}{d(x, x')} : x, x' \in \Lambda_+, x \neq x'\right\}, \\ \|H\|_{\text{Lip}(d)} &= \|H\|_\infty + \text{Lip}_d(H). \end{aligned}$$

Denote by  $\text{Lip}_d(\Lambda_+, V)$  the space of functions  $H : \Lambda_+ \rightarrow V$  with  $\|H\|_{\text{Lip}(d)} < \infty$ . We omit  $d$  from the above notations if  $d = d_E$ . In particular, we will work with the function spaces  $\text{Lip}(\Lambda_+, V_\rho^{\oplus \dim(\rho)})$  and  $\text{Lip}_D(\Lambda_+, \mathbb{R})$  corresponding to the normed vector spaces  $(V_\rho^{\oplus \dim(\rho)}, \|\cdot\|_2)$  for some  $\rho \in \widehat{M}$  and  $(\mathbb{R}, |\cdot|)$ .

For any function  $H : \Delta_0 \rightarrow V$ , denote

$$\text{Lip}_d^\circ(H) = \sup\left\{\frac{\|H(x) - H(x')\|}{d(x, x')} : x, x' \in \Delta_j, x \neq x', j \in \mathcal{J}\right\}.$$

Define the PS measure  $\mu_E$  on  $\Delta_0$  with respect to the Euclidean metric by

$$d\mu_E(x) = (1 + \|x\|^2)^\delta d\mu(x). \quad (14)$$

Note that  $\Lambda_+ \subset \Delta_0$  is a full measure subset with respect to  $\mu_E$ . Using the quasi-invariance of the PS measure  $\mu$ , a straightforward computation gives  $\mathcal{L}_{\delta\mathcal{R}}^*(\mu_E) = \mu_E$ .

By Lemma A.1, the family  $\xi \mapsto \mathcal{L}_{(\delta+\xi)\mathcal{R}}$  of operators on  $\text{Lip}(\Lambda_+, \mathbb{C})$  is analytic on  $\{\xi = a + ib \in \mathbb{C} : a > -\frac{\epsilon_0}{2}\}$ . It can be shown as in [You98, Proposition A] that  $\mathcal{L}_{\delta\mathcal{R}}|_{\text{Lip}(\Lambda_+, \mathbb{C})}$  has a spectral gap with a maximal simple eigenvalue  $\lambda_0 = 1$  with a corresponding eigenfunction  $h_0 : \Lambda_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  given by  $h_0(x) = (1 + \|x\|^2)^{-\delta} f_0(x)$ , where  $f_0$  is the density function defined in Eq. (6). It satisfies  $\int_{\Lambda_+} h_0 d\mu_E = 1$ . Moreover, by perturbation theory of operators (see [Kat95, Chapter 7]), there exists  $a'_0 \in (0, \frac{\epsilon_0}{2})$  and analytic maps

- $[-a'_0, a'_0] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  denoted by  $a \mapsto \lambda_a$ ,
- $[-a'_0, a'_0] \rightarrow \text{Lip}(\Lambda_+, \mathbb{R})$  denoted by  $a \mapsto h_a$ ,

such that  $\mathcal{L}_{(\delta+a)\mathcal{R}} h_a = \lambda_a h_a$ , and  $h_a$  is bounded away from 0 and  $+\infty$  and normalized such that  $\int_{\Lambda_+} h_a d\mu_E = 1$ .

Recall the measures  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  from Subsections 2.4 and 3.1, respectively, and also Eq. (6). Combining with Eq. (14) and the definition of  $h_0$ , we have

$$d\nu = h_0 d\mu_E. \quad (15)$$

Define the function

$$\mathcal{F}^{(a)} = -(\delta + a)\mathcal{R} - \log(\lambda_a) + \log \circ h_a - \log \circ h_a \circ T$$

which is cohomologous to  $-(\delta + a)\mathcal{R} - \log(\lambda_a)$ . Due to Property (4) in Proposition 3.1, we can fix some  $a'_0 > 0$  and

$$C'_1 > \max \left( \text{Lip}^e(\mathcal{R}), \text{Lip}^e(\mathcal{G}), \sup_{|a| \leq a'_0} \text{Lip}^e(\mathcal{F}^{(a)}) \right), \quad C_2 = \frac{C'_1}{1 - \lambda}, \quad (16)$$

where  $\text{Lip}^e(\mathcal{G})$  is defined similarly using the Riemannian metric on  $AM$ .

For all  $\xi = a + ib \in \mathbb{C}$  with  $a > -\epsilon_0$  and  $\rho \in \widehat{M}$ , we *normalize* the transfer operator with holonomy as

$$\mathcal{M}_{\xi, \rho} = m_{\lambda_a h_a}^{-1} \circ \mathcal{M}_{(\delta+\xi)\mathcal{R}, \rho} \circ m_{h_a}$$

where  $m_h : C(\Lambda_+, V_\rho^{\oplus \dim(\rho)}) \rightarrow C(\Lambda_+, V_\rho^{\oplus \dim(\rho)})$  denotes the multiplication operator by  $h \in C(\Lambda_+, \mathbb{R})$ . For all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , its  $k$ -th iteration is simply given by

$$\mathcal{M}_{\xi, \rho}^k(H)(x) = \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}^k} e^{\mathcal{F}_k^{(a)}(\gamma x)} \rho_b(\mathcal{G}^k(\gamma x)^{-1}) H(\gamma x)$$

for all  $x \in \Lambda_+$  and  $H \in C(\Lambda_+, V_\rho^{\oplus \dim(\rho)})$ . Denote  $\mathcal{L}_\xi := \mathcal{M}_{\xi, 1}$ . Due to the above normalization, it satisfies  $\mathcal{L}_0^*(\nu) = \nu$ .

## 5. LOCAL NON-INTEGRABILITY CONDITION

In this section we establish the first key property called the *local non-integrability condition (LNIC)*.

Let  $\Gamma_b < \Gamma$  be the subsemigroup generated by  $\{\gamma^{-1} \in \Gamma : \gamma \in \mathcal{H}\}$ . Let  $\Lambda_b \subset \Lambda_\Gamma \subset \partial\mathbb{H}^{d+1}$  be the limit set of  $\Gamma_b$ . Recall the following results established in [LP22].

**Lemma 5.1** ([LP22, Lemma 6.62]). *The limit set  $\Lambda_b$  is not contained in any generalized sphere in  $\partial\mathbb{H}^{d+1} = \mathbb{R}^d \cup \{\infty\}$ .*

**Lemma 5.2** ([LP22, Lemma 6.64]). *Let  $\xi \in \Lambda_b$ . For any  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists  $n_\xi \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for all  $n \geq n_\xi$ , there exists  $\gamma \in \mathcal{H}^n$  satisfying*

$$d_{\mathbb{S}^d}(\gamma^{-1}\infty, \xi) \leq \epsilon.$$

*Remark 5.3.* It follows from Lemma 3.2 that  $\Lambda_b \subset \Lambda_-$ . Moreover, the construction of  $\gamma \in \mathcal{H}$  yields that  $\infty \in \Lambda_b$  (see [LP22, Section 6]).

Recall the reference point  $x_0 \in \Lambda_+$  from Subsection 3.3. We start with a definition similar to [SW21, Definition 6.1] which was inspired by Brin–Pesin moves [BP74, Bri82].

**Definition 5.4** (Associated sequence of frames). For any sequence

$$((x_0, \infty), (x_0, y), (x, y), (x, \infty), (x_0, \infty)) \in (\Delta_0 \times \Lambda_-)^5 \quad (17)$$

we define a unique *associated sequence of frames*  $(g_1, g_2, \dots, g_5) \in \mathbf{F}(\mathbb{H}^n)^5 \cong G^5$  by

$$\begin{aligned} g_1 &= \tilde{F}(x_0, \infty), \\ g_2 &= \tilde{F}(x_0, y) \in g_1 N^- \text{ such that } g_2 M = \tilde{\Phi}(x_0, y, 0) \in \mathbf{T}^1(\mathbb{H}^n) \cong G/M, \\ g_3 &\in g_2 N^+ \text{ such that } g_3 a_t M = \tilde{\Phi}(x, y, 0) \in \mathbf{T}^1(\mathbb{H}^n) \cong G/M \text{ for some } t \in \mathbb{R}, \\ g_4 &\in g_3 N^- \text{ such that } g_4 a_t M = \tilde{\Phi}(x, \infty, 0) \in \mathbf{T}^1(\mathbb{H}^n) \cong G/M \text{ for some } t \in \mathbb{R}, \\ g_5 &\in g_4 N^+ \text{ such that } g_5 a_t M = \tilde{\Phi}(x_0, \infty, 0) \in \mathbf{T}^1(\mathbb{H}^n) \cong G/M \text{ for some } t \in \mathbb{R}. \end{aligned}$$

We continue using the notation in the above definition. Define the subsets

$$\begin{aligned} N_1^+ &= \{n^+ \in N^+ : F(x_0, \infty)n^+ \in F(\Delta_0 \times \{\infty\})\} \subset N^+, \\ N_1^- &= \{n^- \in N^- : F(x_0, \infty)n^- \in F(\{x_0\} \times \Lambda_b)\} \subset N^-, \end{aligned}$$

where the first is open and the second is compact. Define  $\tilde{N}_1^- \subset N^-$  to be an open neighborhood of  $N_1^-$ . Now, if the sequence in Eq. (17) corresponds to some  $n^+ \in N_1^+$  and  $n^- \in N_1^-$  such that  $F(x, \infty) = F(x_0, \infty)n^+$  and  $F(x_0, y) = F(x_0, \infty)n^-$  respectively, then we can define the map

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi : N_1^+ \times N_1^- &\rightarrow AM \\ (n^+, n^-) &\mapsto g_5^{-1}g_1. \end{aligned}$$

To view it as a function of only the first argument for a fixed  $n^- \in N_1^-$ , we write  $\Xi_{n^-} : N_1^+ \rightarrow AM$ .

Now we relate this to the generalized holonomy  $\mathcal{G}$  and LNIC. Following definitions and using Lemma 3.2, for all  $\gamma \in \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{H}^n$ , there exists  $n_\gamma \in N_1^-$  such that

$$F(x_0, \gamma^{-1}(\infty)) = F(x_0, \infty)n_\gamma.$$

We want to show that the generalized holonomy  $\mathcal{G}$  is in some suitable sense rapidly oscillating. We begin by relating it to the map  $\Xi$  and the associated Lie theory as follows.

**Lemma 5.5.** *Let  $\gamma \in \mathcal{H}^n$  for some  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $n^- = n_\gamma \in N_1^-$ . Let  $x \in \Delta_0$  and  $n^+ \in N_1^+$  such that  $F(x, \infty) = F(x_0, \infty)n^+$ . Then, we have*

$$\Xi(n^+, n^-) = \mathcal{G}^n(\gamma(x_0), \infty)^{-1} \mathcal{G}^n(\gamma(x), \infty).$$

This lemma is analogous to [SW21, Lemma 6.2] and can be proved in a similar fashion.

Let  $\pi : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{a} \oplus \mathfrak{m}$  be the projection map with respect to the decomposition  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{a} \oplus \mathfrak{m} \oplus \mathfrak{n}^+ \oplus \mathfrak{n}^-$ . The following lemma can be proven exactly as in [SW21, Lemma 6.3].

**Lemma 5.6.** *For all  $n^- \in N_1^-$ , we have*

$$(d\Xi_{n^-})_e = \pi \circ \text{Ad}_{n^-}|_{\mathfrak{n}^+} \circ (dh_{n^-})_e$$

where  $h_{n^-} : N_1^+ \rightarrow N^+$  is a diffeomorphism onto its image which is also smooth in  $n^- \in \tilde{N}_1^-$  and satisfies  $h_e = \text{Id}_{N_1^+}$ . Consequently, its image is  $(d\Xi_{n^-})_e(\mathfrak{n}^+) = \pi(\text{Ad}_{n^-}(\mathfrak{n}^+)) \subset \mathfrak{a} \oplus \mathfrak{m}$ .

The following lemma can also be proven as in [SW21, Lemma 6.4] using Lemma 5.1 which replaces the fact that the whole limit set  $\Lambda_\Gamma$  is not contained in any generalized sphere in  $\partial\mathbb{H}^{d+1} = \mathbb{R}^d \cup \{\infty\}$ .

**Lemma 5.7.** *There exist  $n_1^-, n_2^-, \dots, n_{j_0}^- \in N_1^-$  for some  $j_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\epsilon > 0$  such that if  $\eta_1^-, \eta_2^-, \dots, \eta_{j_0}^- \in N_1^-$  with  $d_{N^-}(\eta_j^-, n_j^-) \leq \epsilon$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq j_0$ , then*

$$\sum_{j=1}^{j_0} \pi(\text{Ad}_{\eta_j^-}(\mathfrak{n}^+)) = \mathfrak{a} \oplus \mathfrak{m}.$$

We can now state the LNIC appropriate to our setting. Given any pair of inverse branches  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{H}^m$  for some  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , define the map  $\text{BP}_{\alpha, \beta} : \Delta_0 \times \Delta_0 \rightarrow AM$  by

$$\text{BP}_{\alpha, \beta}(x, y) = \mathcal{G}^m(\alpha x, \infty)^{-1} \mathcal{G}^m(\alpha y, \infty) \mathcal{G}^m(\beta y, \infty)^{-1} \mathcal{G}^m(\beta x, \infty)$$

for all  $x, y \in \Delta_0$ .

**Proposition 5.8** (LNIC). *There exist  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ ,  $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $j_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ , such that for all  $m \geq m_0$ , there exist  $\{\alpha_j\}_{j=0}^{j_0} \subset \mathcal{H}^m$  such that for all  $x \in \Delta_0$  and  $\omega \in \mathfrak{a} \oplus \mathfrak{m}$  with  $\|\omega\| = 1$ , there exist  $1 \leq j \leq j_0$  and  $Z \in \mathbb{T}_x(\Delta_0)$  with  $\|Z\| = 1$  such that*

$$|\langle (d\text{BP}_{j,x})_x(Z), \omega \rangle| \geq \epsilon$$

where we denote  $\text{BP}_j := \text{BP}_{\alpha_0, \alpha_j}$  and  $\text{BP}_{j,x} := \text{BP}_j(x, \cdot)$  for all  $x \in \Delta_0$  and  $1 \leq j \leq j_0$ .

Proposition 5.8 will be derived from Proposition 5.9.

**Proposition 5.9.** *There exist  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ ,  $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $j_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ , and an open neighborhood  $U \subset \Delta_0$  of  $x_0$  such that for all  $m \geq m_0$ , there exist  $\{\alpha_j\}_{j=0}^{j_0} \subset \mathcal{H}^m$  such that for all  $x \in U$  and  $\omega \in \mathfrak{a} \oplus \mathfrak{m}$  with  $\|\omega\| = 1$ , there exist  $1 \leq j \leq j_0$  and  $Z \in \mathbb{T}_x(U)$  with  $\|Z\| = 1$  such that*

$$|\langle (d\text{BP}_{j,x})_x(Z), \omega \rangle| \geq \epsilon$$

using the same notation as in Proposition 5.9.

Proposition 5.9 can be proven as in [SW21, Proposition 6.5] using Lemmas 5.6 and 5.7 with only notational changes. Lemma 5.2 is also required as a replacement for the topological mixing property of the Markov section.

We need the following lemma.

**Lemma 5.10.** *Let  $U \subset \Delta_0$  be an open subset with  $U \cap \Lambda_\Gamma \neq \emptyset$ . There exists  $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for all integers  $m \geq m_0$ , there exists  $\gamma \in \mathcal{H}^m$  such that  $\gamma\Delta_0 \subset U$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $U \subset \Delta_0$  be an open subset with  $U \cap \Lambda_\Gamma \neq \emptyset$ . Let  $x \in U \cap \Lambda_\Gamma$  and  $\epsilon > 0$  such that  $B(x, 2\epsilon) \subset U$ . Note that  $\mu(B(x, \epsilon)) > 0$ . Fix  $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\lambda^{m_0} \text{diam}(\Delta_0) < \epsilon$ . Let  $m \geq m_0$  be an integer. Since  $\mu(\Delta_0) = \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}^n} \mu(\gamma\Delta_0)$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exists  $\gamma \in \mathcal{H}^m$  such that  $B(x, \epsilon) \cap \gamma\Delta_0 \neq \emptyset$ . By Property (3) in Proposition 3.1, we also have  $\text{diam}(\gamma\Delta_0) \leq \lambda^m \text{diam}(\Delta_0) \leq \lambda^{m_0} \text{diam}(\Delta_0) < \epsilon$  and hence  $\gamma\Delta_0 \subset B(x, 2\epsilon) \subset U$ .  $\blacksquare$

*Proof that Proposition 5.9 implies Proposition 5.8.* Let  $\tilde{\epsilon}$ ,  $\tilde{m}_0$ ,  $j_0$ , and  $U$  be the  $\epsilon$ ,  $m_0$ ,  $j_0$ , and  $U$  from Proposition 5.9. By Lemma 5.10, we can fix some  $\gamma \in \mathcal{H}^n$  for some  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\gamma\Delta_0 \subset U$ . Fix  $\epsilon \in (0, \tilde{\epsilon} \cdot \inf\{\|(d\gamma)_x\| : x \in \Delta_0\})$  which is possible due to Property (4) in Proposition 3.1. Fix  $m_0 = \tilde{m}_0 + n$ . Let  $m \geq m_0$  be an integer. Let  $\tilde{m} = m - n \geq \tilde{m}_0$ . Let  $\{\tilde{\alpha}_j\}_{j=0}^{j_0}$  be the inverse branches provided by Proposition 5.9 and  $\{\alpha_j\}_{j=0}^{j_0} = \{\tilde{\alpha}_j\gamma\}_{j=0}^{j_0}$ . Denote  $\widetilde{\text{BP}}_j := \text{BP}_{\tilde{\alpha}_0, \tilde{\alpha}_j}$  and  $\text{BP}_j := \text{BP}_{\alpha_0, \alpha_j}$ . Denote by  $C_g : G \rightarrow G$  the conjugation map by  $g \in G$ . For all  $1 \leq j \leq j_0$ , using definitions and the fact that the group  $A$  commutes with the group  $AM$ , we calculate that

$$\text{BP}_j(x, x') = C_{\mathcal{H}^n(\gamma x, \infty)^{-1}}(\widetilde{\text{BP}}_j(\gamma x, \gamma x')) \quad \text{for all } x, x' \in \Delta_0,$$

so taking the differential gives

$$(d\text{BP}_{j,x})_x = \text{Ad}_{\mathcal{H}^n(\gamma x, \infty)^{-1}} \circ (d\widetilde{\text{BP}}_{j, \gamma x})_{\gamma x} \circ (d\gamma)_x \quad \text{for all } x \in \Delta_0.$$

Let  $x \in \Delta_0$  and  $\omega \in \mathfrak{a} \oplus \mathfrak{m}$  with  $\|\omega\| = 1$ , and take  $\tilde{\omega} = \text{Ad}_{\mathcal{H}^n(\gamma x, \infty)^{-1}}(\omega)$ . Note that we still have  $\|\tilde{\omega}\| = 1$  since the inner product on  $\mathfrak{g}$  is left  $\text{Ad}_K$ -invariant. Using  $\tilde{x} := \gamma x \in \gamma\Delta_0 \subset U$  and Proposition 5.9, there exist  $1 \leq \tilde{j} \leq j_0$  and  $\tilde{Z} \in T_{\tilde{x}}(U)$  with  $\|\tilde{Z}\| = 1$  such that

$$|\langle (d\widetilde{\text{BP}}_{\tilde{j}, \tilde{x}})_{\tilde{x}}(\tilde{Z}), \tilde{\omega} \rangle| \geq \tilde{\epsilon}.$$

Thus, taking  $j = \tilde{j}$  and  $Z = \frac{(dT^n)_{\tilde{x}}(\tilde{Z})}{\|(dT^n)_{\tilde{x}}(\tilde{Z})\|}$ , we calculate that

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle (d\text{BP}_{j,x})_x(Z), \omega \rangle| &= |\langle (d\widetilde{\text{BP}}_{j, \gamma x})_{\gamma x}((d\gamma)_x(Z)), \text{Ad}_{\mathcal{H}^n(\gamma x, \infty)^{-1}}(\omega) \rangle| \\ &= \|(d\gamma)_x(Z)\| \cdot |\langle (d\widetilde{\text{BP}}_{\tilde{j}, \tilde{x}})_{\tilde{x}}(\tilde{Z}), \tilde{\omega} \rangle| \\ &\geq \tilde{\epsilon} \cdot \inf\{\|(d\gamma)_x\| : x \in \Delta_0\} > \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

$\blacksquare$

Fix  $\epsilon_2 \in (0, 1)$ ,  $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ , and  $j_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  to be the  $\epsilon$ ,  $m_0$ , and  $j_0$  provided by Proposition 5.8 for the rest of the paper.

We finish this section with an approximation lemma which will be used in Section 8. Fix  $\delta_{AM} > 0$  such that any pair of points in  $B_{AM}(e, \delta_{AM}) \subset AM$  has a unique geodesic through them. Fix a constant  $C_{\text{BP}} > 0$  such that

$$C_{\text{BP}} \geq \sup\{\|(d\text{BP}_{j,x})_y\|_{\text{op}} : x, y \in \Delta_0, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, j_0\}\}$$

for any  $m \geq m_0$  and corresponding maps  $\{\text{BP}_j\}_{j=1}^{j_0}$  provided by Proposition 5.8. It can be checked from the proofs of Propositions 5.8 and 5.9 (see [SW21, Proposition 6.5], in particular, [SW21, Eq. (6)]) that  $C_{\text{BP}}$  can be chosen independently of the inverse branches and their length provided by Proposition 5.8. Lemma 5.11 can be proved as in [SW21, Lemma 7.1].

**Lemma 5.11.** *Let  $m \geq m_0$  and  $\{\text{BP}_j\}_{j=1}^{j_0}$  be the corresponding maps provided by Proposition 5.8. Then there exists  $C_{\text{exp,BP}} > 0$  such that for all  $1 \leq j \leq j_0$  and  $x, y \in \Delta_0$  with  $\|x - y\| < \frac{\delta_{AM}}{C_{\text{BP}}}$ , we have*

$$d_{AM}(\text{exp}(Z), \text{BP}_j(x, y)) \leq C_{\text{exp,BP}} \|x - y\|^2$$

where  $Z = (d\text{BP}_{j,x})_x(y - x)$ .

## 6. NON-CONCENTRATION PROPERTY

In this section we establish the second key property called the *non-concentration property (NCP)*. The main result, Proposition 6.1, is the appropriate generalization of NCP in [SW21, Proposition 6.6] for geometrically finite hyperbolic manifolds with cusps.

We start with some notations. Recall the choice of reference vector  $v_o \in \mathbb{T}^1(\mathbb{H}^{d+1})$  from Subsection 2.1. With this choice,  $a_t$  acts on  $\mathbb{H}^{d+1} \subset \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$  simply by scaling by a factor of  $e^{-t}$  for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ . We parametrize the unstable horospherical subgroup

$$N^+ = \{n_x^+ : x \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$$

so that for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , we have the forward endpoint  $(n_x^+)^+ = x$ . Define the map  $u_\bullet : \Delta_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^1(X)$  by  $u_x = \pi \circ \tilde{\Phi}(x, \infty, 0)$  for all  $x \in \Delta_0$ , where  $\tilde{\Phi}$  is the embedding defined as in Eq. (11) and  $\pi$  is the projection from  $\partial^2(\mathbb{H}^{d+1}) \times \mathbb{R} \cong \mathbb{T}^1(\mathbb{H}^{d+1})$  to  $\mathbb{T}^1(X)$ . Note that  $u_{\Delta_0}$  is then the immersion of a subset of the horosphere corresponding to  $\Delta_0 \times \{\infty\} \times \{0\}$ . Recalling Eq. (9), we define the compact region

$$\Omega_R \subset \mathbb{T}^1(X) \tag{18}$$

to be the closed  $(R + \log(C_{\Delta_0}))$ -neighborhood of  $u_{\Delta_0}$ .

**Proposition 6.1 (NCP).** *Let  $R > 0$ . There exists  $\eta \in (0, 1)$  such that for all  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ ,  $x \in \Lambda_\Gamma \cap \Delta_0 - \overline{B(\partial\Delta_0, \epsilon)}$  with  $u_x a_{-\log(\epsilon)} \in \Omega_R$ , and  $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$  with  $\|w\| = 1$ , there exists  $y \in \Lambda_\Gamma \cap B(x, \epsilon) \subset \Delta_0$  such that  $|\langle y - x, w \rangle| \geq \epsilon\eta$ .*

*Proof.* To obtain a contradiction, suppose the proposition is false. Then there exists  $R > 0$  such that for all  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , taking  $\eta_j = \frac{1}{j}$ , there exist  $\epsilon_j \in (0, 1)$ ,  $x_j \in \Lambda_\Gamma \cap \Delta_0 - \overline{B(\partial\Delta_0, \epsilon_j)}$  with  $u_{x_j} a_{-\log(\epsilon_j)} \in \Omega_R$ , and  $w_j \in \mathbb{R}^d$  with  $\|w_j\| = 1$ , such that  $|\langle y - x_j, w_j \rangle| \leq \epsilon_j \eta_j = \frac{\epsilon_j}{j}$  for all  $y \in \Lambda_\Gamma \cap B(x_j, \epsilon_j)$ . Hence, we can rewrite this as

$$\Lambda_\Gamma \cap B(x_j, \epsilon_j) \subset \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R}^d : |\langle y - x_j, w_j \rangle| \leq \frac{\epsilon_j}{j} \right\} \quad \text{for all } j \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{19}$$

We want to use the self-similarity property of the fractal set  $\Lambda_\Gamma$ . We have  $\Gamma n_{x_j}^+ M = u_{x_j} \in u_{\Delta_0}$ . For all  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , setting  $t_j = -\log(\epsilon_j)$  we have  $\Gamma n_{x_j}^+ a_{t_j} M = u_{x_j} a_{t_j} \in \Omega_R$  by hypothesis and hence  $n_{x_j}^+ a_{t_j} \in \Gamma \tilde{\Omega}_R$  where  $\tilde{\Omega}_R$  is some  $M$ -invariant lift of  $\Omega_R$  which we note is compact. Thus, for all  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exist  $\beta_j \in \Gamma$  and  $g_j \in \tilde{\Omega}_R$  such that  $n_{x_j}^+ a_{t_j} = \beta_j g_j$ . Now for all  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have  $g_j a_{-t_j} n_{-x_j}^+ = \beta_j^{-1}$ . Hence, the action of  $g_j a_{-t_j} n_{-x_j}^+$  on  $\partial_\infty(\mathbb{H}^{d+1})$  preserves  $\Lambda_\Gamma$ .

Now, applying  $g_j a_{-t_j} n_{-x_j}^+$  in Eq. (19) gives

$$\Lambda_\Gamma \cap g_j B(0, 1) \subset g_j \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R}^d : |\langle y, w_j \rangle| \leq \frac{1}{j} \right\} \quad \text{for all } j \in \mathbb{N}.$$

By compactness, we can pass to subsequences so that  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} w_j = w \in \mathbb{R}^d$  with  $\|w\| = 1$  and  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} g_j = g \in \tilde{\Omega}_R$ . Then in the limit  $j \rightarrow \infty$ , we have  $\Lambda_\Gamma \cap gB(0, 1) \subset g \{y \in \mathbb{R}^d : \langle y, w \rangle = 0\}$ . This contradicts [Win15, Proposition 3.12] since  $\Gamma < G$  is Zariski dense.  $\blacksquare$

It can also be deduced from the structure of cusps (see Subsection 2.3) and the geometry of  $\partial\mathbb{H}^{d+1}$  that NCP is true without the condition involving the compact subset  $\Omega_R \subset \mathbb{T}^1(X)$  if and only if all the cusps are of maximal rank (cf. [DFSU21, Theorem 3.15] and its proof). That is, the condition involving the compact subset  $\Omega_R \subset \mathbb{T}^1(X)$  is necessary in the presence of cusps of non-maximal rank. We end this section with an example below which demonstrates the latter by elaborating on the comments after [DFSU21, Theorem 3.15]. As a result, the difficulty is that in Dolgopyat's method, we cannot obtain cancellations on *every* set in the partition  $\mathcal{P}_{(b, \rho)}$  of  $\Delta_0$  (see Lemma 8.5 and Proposition 8.8).

**Example 6.2.** Suppose  $\Gamma < G$  is a geometrically finite subgroup with parabolic elements and  $p \in \partial\mathbb{H}^{d+1} - \{\infty\}$  is a rank 1 parabolic fixed point for the  $\Gamma$ -action on  $\partial\mathbb{H}^{d+1}$ . Let  $g \in G$  be an element such that  $gp = \infty$ . Define  $\tilde{\Gamma} = g\Gamma g^{-1} < G$  which is isomorphic to  $\Gamma$ . Then,  $\infty \in \partial\mathbb{H}^{d+1}$  is a rank 1 parabolic fixed point for the  $\tilde{\Gamma}$ -action on  $\partial\mathbb{H}^{d+1}$ . Recalling Subsection 2.3 and the notations there, we have a corresponding fundamental domain  $\Delta_\infty := B_Y(C_\infty) \times \Delta'_\infty$ .

Let  $\Delta_Y \subset Y \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  be an open  $(d-1)$ -dimensional parallelotope containing  $B_Y(C_\infty)$ . By Eq. (3), we have

$$\Lambda_{\tilde{\Gamma}} - \{\infty\} \subset \bigcup_{\gamma \in \tilde{\Gamma}_\infty} \gamma(\overline{\Delta_Y \times \Delta'_\infty}),$$

where  $\tilde{\Gamma}_\infty < \text{Stab}_{\tilde{\Gamma}}(\infty)$  is the finite index subgroup provided by Lemma 2.1. Let  $\{F_{j,k} : j \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}, k \in \{1, 2\}\}$  be the set of  $(d-1)$ -dimensional generalized affine subspaces in  $\mathbb{R}^d \cup \{\infty\}$  which contain the corresponding  $(d-1)$ -dimensional faces of  $\Delta_Y \times \Delta'_\infty$ . The set is ordered such that  $F_{j,1}$  and  $F_{j,2}$  are parallel for all  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$ , and  $F_{d,1}$  and  $F_{d,2}$  are orthogonal to the 1-dimensional subspace  $Z \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ . This set of generalized affine subspaces determine a corresponding set  $\{H_{j,k} : j \in \{1, 2, \dots, d-1\}, k \in \{1, 2\}\}$  of open half spaces not containing  $\Lambda_{\tilde{\Gamma}}$ .

Using  $g^{-1}$ , we conclude that  $\{g^{-1}F_{j,k} : j \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}, k \in \{1, 2\}\}$  consists of  $(d-1)$ -dimensional spheres such that  $g^{-1}F_{j,1}$  and  $g^{-1}F_{j,2}$  are mutually tangent to each other at  $p$  for all  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$ . Moreover,  $g^{-1}F_{j,1}$  is the boundary of the open ball  $g^{-1}H_{j,k}$  for all  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, d-1\}$  and  $k \in \{1, 2\}$ . In fact, we have

$$\Lambda_\Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^d \cup \{\infty\} - \bigcup_{\substack{j \in \{1, 2, \dots, d-1\}, \\ k \in \{1, 2\}}} g^{-1}H_{j,k}.$$

Choose  $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$  to be any unit vector based at  $p$  and orthogonal to both  $g^{-1}F_{j,1}$  and  $g^{-1}F_{j,2}$  for any choice of  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, d-1\}$ . Note that  $w$  is then automatically tangent to both  $g^{-1}F_{d,1}$  and  $g^{-1}F_{d,2}$ . Then NCP as stated in [SW21, Proposition 6.6] fails at  $p$  for the direction  $w$ , i.e., the following is *false*: there exists  $\eta \in (0, 1)$  such that for all  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ , there exists  $y \in \Lambda_\Gamma \cap B(p, \epsilon)$  such that  $|\langle y - p, w \rangle| \geq \epsilon\eta$ .




FIGURE 3. An illustration of a rank 1 parabolic fixed point in  $\partial\mathbb{H}^3$ . The limit sets are contained in the shaded regions.

## 7. LARGE DEVIATION PROPERTY

In this section we establish the third key property called the *large deviation property (LDP)*.

Recall the measures  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  from Subsections 2.4 and 3.1, respectively, and also Eq. (6).

For all  $t > 0$  and  $R > 0$ , we define  $\Omega^\dagger(t, R)$  to be the set consisting of maximal cylinders  $\mathbf{C} \subset \Delta_0$  satisfying

$$e^{-R-t} \leq \text{diam}(\mathbf{C}) \leq e^{R-t}.$$

Define

$$\Omega(t, R) = \bigcup_{\mathbf{C} \in \Omega^\dagger(t, R)} \mathbf{C} \subset \Delta_0.$$

The following is the relation between  $\Omega(t, R) \subset \Delta_0$  and the compact subset  $\Omega_R \subset T^1(X)$  defined in Eq. (18).

**Lemma 7.1.** *Let  $t > 0$  and  $R > 0$ . For all  $x \in \Omega(t, R)$ , we have  $u_x a_t \in \Omega_R$ .*

To prove Lemma 7.1, we need a quick estimate which follows from Lemma 3.5.

**Lemma 7.2.** *Let  $t > 0$  and  $R > 0$ . For any cylinder  $\mathbf{C} \in \Omega^\dagger(t, R)$ , write  $\mathbf{C} = \gamma \Delta_0$  with  $\gamma \in \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{H}^n$ . We have*

$$C_{\Delta_0}^{-1} e^{-R-t} \leq \|d\gamma\| \leq C_{\Delta_0} e^{R-t}.$$

*Proof of Lemma 7.1.* Let  $t > 0$  and  $R > 0$ . Let  $x \in \Omega(t, R)$ . Take the cylinder  $\mathbf{C} = \gamma \Delta_0 \in \Omega^\dagger(t, R)$  containing  $x$  and let  $n$  be its length. Recall that

$$\mathcal{R}_n(x) = \log \|(dT^n)_x\| = -\log \|(d\gamma)_{x'}\|$$

with  $x = \gamma x'$ . Using Lemma 7.2 and Eq. (7), we have

$$\mathcal{R}_n(x) \in [t - (R + \log(C_{\Delta_0})), t + (R + \log(C_{\Delta_0}))].$$

Since  $u_x a_{\mathcal{R}_n(x)} \in u_{\Delta_0}$ , we obtain  $u_x a_t \in \Omega_R$ . ■



The following proposition is the required LDP. We will show in Subsection 7.2 that it follows from Proposition 7.9.

**Proposition 7.3** (LDP). *There exist  $R_0 > 0$  and  $\kappa \in (0, 1)$  such that the following holds. For all  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $t > 0$ , we have*

$$\nu\{x \in \Lambda_+ : \#\{j \in \mathbb{N} : j \leq n, T^{jm}(x) \in \Omega(t, R_0)\} < \kappa n\} \leq e^{-\kappa n}.$$

Here the parameter  $m$  is the step length. For the sake of simplicity, readers may take  $m = 1$  on first read of this section.

Proposition 7.3 is a uniform version of a classical LDP in the sense that it is proved for  $\Omega(t, R_0)$  with rate  $\kappa$  which is uniform over all  $t > 0$ . The idea of its proof is similar to the proof of LDP for an i.i.d. coin flipping process (see [DZ10, Section 3.1]). The main proposition is an estimate for the probability that  $\ell$  fixed bad events occur in  $n$  events, which we prove is less than  $e^{-\epsilon \ell}$ . Then we count the number of ways  $\ell$  bad events occur in  $n$  events and take the sum of the probabilities. We are interested in the  $\ell$ 's satisfying  $\ell \geq n - \kappa n$ , so by taking the parameter  $\kappa$  sufficiently small, we obtain the desired LDP. Proposition 7.3 indicates that we need to study whether  $T^{jm}(x)$  is in  $\Omega(t, R_0)$ , and by Lemma 7.1, it is roughly equivalent to study whether the geodesic ray  $\{u_{T^{jm}(x)}a_t \in \mathbb{T}^1(X) : t > 0\}$  is in some cusp, which corresponds to a bad event for our dynamical system. The difficulty is that we need to further partition the  $\ell$  bad events into a certain union of consecutive bad events, whose geometric picture is that the geodesic trajectory  $u_x a_t$  remains in the same cusp without coming back to the compact part. Proposition 7.9 is the estimate for such consecutive bad events. We need some preparation before stating Proposition 7.9.

**7.1. From cusp to bounds on residual waiting time.** We first recall some constants and Lipschitz bounds which will be used often in the rest of the section. By Proposition 3.1, for any  $z, z' \in \Delta_0$  and  $\gamma \in \mathcal{H}$ , we have

$$\|\gamma z - \gamma z'\| \leq \lambda \|z - z'\| \quad (20)$$

and also (see Eq. (41)), for all  $z, z' \in \Delta_0$ ,  $l \in \mathbb{N}$ , and  $\gamma \in \mathcal{H}^l$ , we have

$$|\mathcal{R}_l(\gamma z) - \mathcal{R}_l(\gamma z')| \leq C_2 \|z - z'\|, \quad (21)$$

recalling the constant from Eq. (16). Fix

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_0 &= \inf\{\mathcal{R}(x) : x \in \Delta_\square\}, \\ C_3 &= \max\{C_2, C_2 \text{diam}(\Delta_0) + |\log(\text{diam}(\Delta_0))|\}. \end{aligned}$$

**Definition 7.4** (Stopping time, Residual waiting time). For all  $(y, t) \in \Lambda_+ \times \mathbb{R}^+$ , its *stopping time* is the unique  $l = l(y, t) \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\mathcal{R}_l(y) \leq t < \mathcal{R}_{l+1}(y)$ , and its *residual waiting time* is the difference  $\mathcal{R}_{l+1}(y) - t$ .

When there is no confusion about the pair  $(y, t)$ , we will often write  $l$  to simplify the notation.

We give the geometric intuition of this notion. Proposition 7.9, one of the main estimates, is about studying points  $y$  of the form  $T^{im}x$ . We want to investigate whether the point  $y$  is in  $\Omega(t, R)$ , and by Lemma 7.1, it is roughly equivalent to see whether  $u_y a_t$  is in some cusp. The observation is that we can roughly identify  $u_y a_t$  with  $u_{T^n y} a_{t - \mathcal{R}_n(y)}$ : it follows from the construction of the coding that  $u_y a_{\mathcal{R}_n(y)}$  is bounded away from  $u_{T^n y}$  and they are in the same stable leaf; hence the distance between  $u_y a_t$  and  $u_{T^n y} a_{t - \mathcal{R}_n(y)}$  are uniformly bounded for  $t \geq \mathcal{R}_n(y)$ . The stopping

time  $l = l(y, t)$  is the maximal possible value of  $n$  satisfying  $t \geq \mathcal{R}_n(y)$ . The remaining time  $t - \mathcal{R}_l(y)$  and the next return time  $\mathcal{R}(T^l y)$  together tell us whether the point  $u_y a_t$  is in some cusp or not. The following lemma is a quantitative version of this observation. See Fig. 4 for illustration.




FIGURE 4. This is a timeline. For a time of the form  $\mathcal{R}_j(y)$ , we add a point  $T^j y$  below, which can be regarded as a point in the geodesic trajectory  $u_y a_{\mathcal{R}_j(y)} \approx u_{T^j y}$ . The blue segment is of length  $t$ . The red segment is the interval of time  $s$  whose corresponding point  $u_y a_s$  is inside the cusp region.

**Lemma 7.5.** *For all  $y \notin \Omega(t, R)$ ,  $t > 0$ , and  $R > 2C_3$ , we have a stronger inequality*

$$\mathcal{R}_l(y) + (R - C_3) < t < \mathcal{R}_{l+1}(y) - (R - C_3).$$

*Proof.* Suppose  $y = \gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_l z \notin \Omega(t, R)$  with  $z \in \Delta_0$  and  $\gamma_j \in \mathcal{H}$ . Let  $t > 0$ , and  $R > 2C_3$ . Then by Eq. (21), for  $x \in \Delta_0$  we have

$$\|(d\gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_l)_x\| = \exp(-\mathcal{R}_l(\gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_l x)) \in \exp(-\mathcal{R}_l(y)) [e^{-C_2 \|x-z\|}, e^{C_2 \|x-z\|}].$$

Therefore, by Lemma 3.5

$$\text{diam}(\gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_l \Delta_0) \in \exp(-\mathcal{R}_l(y)) [e^{-C_3}, e^{C_3}].$$

Since  $y \notin \Omega(t, R)$ , we have

$$\text{diam}(\gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_l \Delta_0) \notin \exp(-t) [e^{-R}, e^R].$$

Hence, it is impossible that the second interval is contained in the first interval. By the definition of stopping time and the assumption of the lemma, we have  $\mathcal{R}_l(y) + C_3 \leq t + R$ . Therefore,

$$-\mathcal{R}_l(y) + C_3 > -t + R,$$

which implies  $t > \mathcal{R}_l(y) + R - C_3$ . For the other side, the proof is similar.  $\blacksquare$

Given two points  $T^i y, T^r y \notin \Omega(t, R)$ , we can regard  $u_{T^i y} a_t$  and  $u_{T^r y} a_t$  as points on the geodesic trajectory  $\{u_y a_s \in T^1(X) : s > 0\}$ . We introduce the following definition to detect whether they are in the same cusp.

**Definition 7.6** (Equivalent). Let  $y \in \Lambda_+$ ,  $t > 0$ , and  $R > 0$ . For two points  $(T^i y, t)$  and  $(T^r y, t)$  with  $T^i y, T^r y \notin \Omega(t, R)$  for some  $i, r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ , we say that they are *equivalent* if

$$l(T^i y, t) + i = l(T^r y, t) + r,$$

and we use  $[(T^i y, t)]$  to denote its equivalence class. Another characterization is that  $\mathcal{R}_{i+l_i}(y) < t + \mathcal{R}_r(y) < \mathcal{R}_{i+l_i+1}(y)$  with  $l_i = l(T^i y, t)$  (see Fig. 5). From this characterization, we deduce that the set of  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $(T^k y, t)$  is equivalent to  $(T^i y, t)$  is an interval containing  $i$  and  $r$ .

**Lemma 7.7.** *Let  $y \in \Lambda_+$ ,  $t > 0$ , and  $R > 2C_3$ . If  $(T^i y, t)$  and  $(T^r y, t)$  are equivalent with  $0 \leq i \leq r$ , then for the stopping time  $l = l(T^i y, t)$ , the residual waiting time satisfies*

$$\mathcal{R}_{l+1}(T^i y) - t > \frac{R}{2} + f\lambda_0,$$

with  $f = r - i$ .

*Proof.* Assume the hypotheses of the lemma. By applying Lemma 7.5 to  $T^r y$ , due to the fact that  $l + i = l(T^r y, t) + r$ , we have

$$\mathcal{R}_{l+1-(r-i)}(T^r y) - R > t - C_3.$$

This implies

$$\mathcal{R}_{l+1}(T^i y) = \mathcal{R}_{l+1-(r-i)}(T^r y) + \mathcal{R}_{(r-i)}(T^i y) > t + (R - C_3) + (r - i)\lambda_0.$$

The proof is complete.  $\blacksquare$




FIGURE 5. The points  $(T^i y, t)$  and  $(T^r y, t)$  are equivalent. Here  $l_i = l(T^i y, t)$ ,  $l_r = l(T^r y, t)$ , and  $i + l_i = r + l_r$ . The blue segments are of length  $t$ . The red segment is the interval of time  $s$  whose corresponding point  $u_y a_s$  is inside the cusp region.

**7.2. Reduction to combinatorial words.** Let  $\mathbf{n} := \{1, \dots, n\}$ . A word  $w$  is a subset of  $\mathbf{n}$ . Let  $\ell(w)$  be the number of elements in  $w$ . For a word  $w$ , we will partition it into (discrete) subintervals of the form

$$w = \bigcup_{j=1}^{\mathbf{j}+1} I_j = \{i_1, \dots, r_1\} \cup \dots \cup \{i_{\mathbf{j}+1}, \dots, r_{\mathbf{j}+1}\},$$

with  $\mathbf{j} + 1 \leq n$ , and  $i_j \leq r_j < i_{j+1}$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq \mathbf{j}$ , and  $I_j = \{i_j, i_j + 1, \dots, r_j\}$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq \mathbf{j} + 1$ . Here  $\mathbf{j} + 1$  is called the number of subintervals in  $w$ . We denote  $I := \{I_j : 1 \leq j \leq \mathbf{j} + 1\}$ . We use the pair  $(w, I)$  to denote the word  $w$  and its partition. For example, if we take  $n = 6$ , then  $w = I_1 \cup I_2 = \{1, 2\} \cup \{4, 5, 6\}$  is a word of  $\mathbf{n} = \{1, \dots, 6\}$ . Both this partition and the ones like  $w = \{1, 2\} \cup \{4, 5\} \cup \{6\}$  are the kind of partitions of  $w$  we will study.

**Definition 7.8** (Type). Let  $R > 0$ . Given a triple  $(w, t, m)$  with  $w \subset \mathbf{n}$ ,  $t > 0$ , and  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , a point  $x \in \Lambda_+$  is of *type*  $(w, t, m)$  if

$$w = \{k \in \mathbf{n} : T^{km} x \notin \Omega(t, R)\}. \quad (22)$$

Given a quadruple  $(w, I, t, m)$  with  $w \subset \mathbf{n}$ , a partition  $I$  of  $w$ ,  $t > 0$ , and  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , a point  $x \in \Lambda_+$  is of *type*  $(w, I, t, m)$  if  $x$  is of type  $(w, t, m)$  and the partition  $I$

of  $w$  is determined by the equivalence classes of the points in  $\{(T^{km}x, t) : k \in w\}$  according to Definition 7.6, i.e., for all  $1 \leq j \leq \mathbf{j} + 1$ , there exists  $k_j \in w$  such that

$$I_j = \{k \in w : (T^{km}x, t) \in [(T^{k_j m}x, t)]\}.$$

For each quadruple  $(w, I, t, m)$ , we estimate the measure of the set of  $x \in \Lambda_+$  of type  $(w, I, t, m)$  using cusp excursion. The main proposition is as follows.

**Proposition 7.9.** *There exists  $\epsilon > 0$  such that for all  $R > 0$  sufficiently large,  $t > 0$ , and  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ , the following holds. For all quadruple  $(w, I, t, m)$  with  $w$  a word in  $\mathbf{n}$  and a partition  $I$  of  $w$ , we have*

$$\nu\{x \in \Lambda_+ : x \text{ is of type } (w, I, t, m)\} \leq e^{-\epsilon((\mathbf{j}+1)R + \ell(w) - \mathbf{j} - 1)}.$$

*Proof that Proposition 7.9 implies Proposition 7.3.* Fix  $\epsilon > 0$  provided by Proposition 7.9. Let  $R > 0$ ,  $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ ,  $t > 0$ , and  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ . Due to Definition 7.6, for each point  $x \in \Lambda_+$  of type  $(w, t, m)$ , there exists a partition  $I$  of  $w$  such that  $x$  is of type  $(w, I, t, m)$ . For each word  $w$ , the number ways of diving  $w$  into  $k$  subintervals is less than  $\binom{\ell(w)}{k-1}$  for  $k \leq \ell(w)$ . Therefore by Proposition 7.9,

$$\begin{aligned} \nu\{x \in \Lambda_+ : x \text{ is of type } (w, t, m)\} &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{\ell(w)} \binom{\ell(w)}{k-1} e^{-\epsilon(kR + \ell(w) - k)} \\ &\leq e^{-\epsilon\ell(w)} (1 + e^{-\epsilon(R-1)})^{\ell(w)}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking  $R$  sufficiently large depending on  $\epsilon$ , we obtain

$$\nu\{x \in \Lambda_+ : x \text{ is of type } (w, t, m)\} \leq e^{-\epsilon\ell(w)/2}. \quad (23)$$

A word  $w$  is called *bad* if its length satisfies  $\ell(w) \geq \lfloor (1 - \kappa)n \rfloor$ . For each bad word  $w$  we have the estimate of Eq. (23). To get the large deviation estimate in Proposition 7.3, it remains to sum over bad words. The number of bad words is bounded by short sum of binomial coefficients: for any  $\ell \leq n$ , we have

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\ell} \binom{n}{k} \leq \sum_{k=0}^{\ell} \frac{n^k}{k!} = \sum_{k=0}^{\ell} \frac{\ell^k}{k!} \left(\frac{n}{\ell}\right)^k \leq e^{\ell} \left(\frac{n}{\ell}\right)^{\ell}.$$

Therefore by taking  $\ell = n - \lfloor (1 - \kappa)n \rfloor$ , we obtain

$$\sum_{k=\lfloor (1-\kappa)n \rfloor}^n \binom{n}{k} = \sum_{k=0}^{n-\lfloor (1-\kappa)n \rfloor} \binom{n}{k} \leq e^{(\kappa + |\log \kappa| \kappa)n}.$$

Combined with Eq. (23), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\nu\{x \in \Lambda_+ : \#\{1 \leq j \leq n, T^{jm}x \notin \Omega(t, R)\} \geq (1 - \kappa)n\} \\ &\leq e^{-\epsilon(1-\kappa)n/2} e^{(\kappa + |\log \kappa| \kappa)n}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking  $\kappa > 0$  sufficiently small finishes the proof. ■

The aim of the rest of the section is to prove Proposition 7.9.

**7.3. Measure estimate of large residual waiting time.** Recall that for any  $(x, t) \in \Lambda_+ \times \mathbb{R}^+$ , we denote by  $l = l(x, t)$  the stopping time for  $(x, t)$  such that  $\mathcal{R}_l(x) \leq t < \mathcal{R}_{l+1}(x)$ . The difference  $\mathcal{R}_{l+1}(x) - t$  is called the residual waiting time.

**Proposition 7.10.** *There exists  $\epsilon > 0$  such that for all  $R > 0$  sufficiently large and  $t > R$ , we have*

$$\nu\{x \in \Lambda_+ : \mathcal{R}_{l+1}(x) - t > R\} \leq e^{-\epsilon R}.$$

The proof of the above proposition will be given in Subsection 7.5. Let us give a direct consequence of the exponential tail property (see Property (5) in Proposition 3.1).

**Proposition 7.11.** *There exists  $\epsilon > 0$  such that for all  $R > 0$  sufficiently large, we have*

$$\nu\{x \in \Lambda_+ : \mathcal{R}(x) > R\} \leq e^{-\epsilon R}.$$

*Proof.* By Chebyshev's inequality

$$\nu\{x \in \Lambda_+ : \mathcal{R}(x) > R\} \leq e^{-\epsilon_0 R} \int_{\Lambda_+} e^{\epsilon_0 \mathcal{R}(x)} d\nu(x) \quad \text{for all } R > 0.$$

Taking  $R$  sufficiently large finishes the proof.  $\blacksquare$

**Proposition 7.12.** *There exists  $\epsilon > 0$  such that for all  $R > 0$  sufficiently large,  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ , and  $t > 0$ , we have*

$$\nu\{x \in \Lambda_+ : \mathcal{R}_{l+1}(T^i x) - t > R\} \leq e^{-\epsilon R},$$

where  $l = l(T^i x, t)$  is the stopping time for  $(T^i x, t)$ .

*Proof.* Since the measure  $\nu$  is  $T$ -invariant, we only need to consider the case when  $i = 0$ .

We divide into two cases: when the time  $t$  is large, we use Proposition 7.10; when the time  $t$  is small, we use Proposition 7.11. Fix  $\epsilon > 0$  to be the minimum of the  $\epsilon$ 's provided by the propositions and let  $R > 0$  be sufficiently large so that both the proportions hold.

If  $t > R$ , we can apply Proposition 7.10 to obtain the desired bound.

Otherwise  $t \leq R$ . Note that if  $t \geq \mathcal{R}_l(x)$  and  $\mathcal{R}_{l+1}(x) - t > R$ , then  $\mathcal{R}(T^{l+1}x) > R$ . For a fixed  $l$ , we can use Proposition 7.11 and  $T$ -invariance of  $\nu$  to obtain that

$$\nu\{x \in \Lambda_+ : \mathcal{R}(T^{l+1}x) > R\} = \nu\{x \in \Lambda_+ : \mathcal{R}(x) > R\} \leq e^{-\epsilon R}. \quad (24)$$

Due to  $\inf\{\mathcal{R}(y) : y \in \Lambda_+\} > \lambda_0$  and  $R \geq t \geq \mathcal{R}_l(x)$ , the number of possible choices of such  $l$  is bounded by  $R$ . Combined with Eq. (24), we obtain

$$\nu\{x \in \Lambda_+ : \mathcal{R}_{l+1}(x) - t > R\} \leq R e^{-\epsilon R} \leq e^{-\epsilon R/2}$$

which completes the proof by adjusting  $\epsilon$ .  $\blacksquare$

**Corollary 7.13** (Single cusp-excursion). *There exists  $\epsilon > 0$  such that for all  $R > 0$  sufficiently large,  $t > 0$ , and  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have*

$$\nu\{x \in \Lambda_+ : (x, t) \text{ and } (T^{nm}x, t) \text{ are equivalent}\} \leq e^{-\epsilon(nm\lambda_0 + R)}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $R, t, n$ , and  $m$  be as in the corollary. Let  $x \in \Lambda_+$ . By Lemma 7.7, if  $(x, t)$  and  $(T^{nm}x, t)$  are equivalent, we obtain

$$\mathcal{R}_{l+1}(x) - t > \frac{R}{2} + (nm - 0)\lambda_0.$$

We finish the proof by using Proposition 7.12.  $\blacksquare$

**7.4. Conditional probability.** The way we attain the estimate of multiple cusp-excursions, which is Proposition 7.9, from Proposition 7.12 is inspired by the language of conditional probability.

Given any  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $t > 0$ , we consider the quadruple  $(w, I, t, m)$  with  $w$  a word in  $\mathbf{n}$  and  $I = \{I_j : 1 \leq j \leq \mathbf{j} + 1\}$  a partition of  $w$ :

$$w = \bigcup_{j=1}^{\mathbf{j}+1} I_j = \{i_1, \dots, r_1\} \cup \dots \cup \{i_{\mathbf{j}+1}, \dots, r_{\mathbf{j}+1}\}$$

with  $i_j \leq r_j < i_{j+1}$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq \mathbf{j}$ . The proof of Proposition 7.9 will use induction on the number of subintervals  $\mathbf{j} + 1$ .

Given a point  $x \in \Lambda_+$  of type  $(w, I, t, m)$ , let  $l_j := l(T^{i_j m} x, t)$  be the stopping time for  $(T^{i_j m} x, t)$ . For each  $1 \leq j \leq \mathbf{j}$ , as  $(T^{i_j m} x, t)$  and  $(T^{i_{j+1} m} x, t)$  are not equivalent, we have

$$l_j + i_j m < l_{j+1} + i_{j+1} m. \quad (25)$$

For each  $1 \leq j \leq \mathbf{j} + 1$  and all  $i \in I_j$ , the points  $(T^{im} x, t)$  are equivalent. Hence, when  $\mathbf{j} + 1 = 1$ , Proposition 7.9 is Corollary 7.13.

To explain the idea of the proof of Proposition 7.9, we describe the probability model of the proposition for comparison. The pair  $(\Lambda_+, \nu)$  is a probability space. The  $j$ -th event happens at a point  $x$  if  $T^{im} x \notin \Omega(t, R)$  for all  $i \in I_j$  and  $(T^{im} x, t)$  are equivalent (Definition 7.6) for all  $i \in I_j$ . The difference of our model is the definition of *all*  $\mathbf{j} + 1$  events happening at a point  $x \in \Lambda_+$  which requires that  $x$  satisfies all  $j$ -th event for  $1 \leq j \leq \mathbf{j} + 1$ , and *additionally*  $(T^{im} x, t)$  are not equivalent for  $i$  in the different intervals  $I_j$ 's.

In order to do induction, we introduce the following definition, which extracts all the information we need from  $x$  of type  $(w, I, t, m)$ . This definition is weaker than Definition 7.6, which helps to do induction.

**Definition 7.14.** Given  $i, f, m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $R > 0$ , and  $t > 0$ , we say that  $x \in \Lambda_+$  satisfies  $(i, t, m, R, f)$  if the stopping time  $l = l(T^{im} x, t)$  satisfies

$$\mathcal{R}_l(T^{im} x) + R \leq t < \mathcal{R}_{l+1}(T^{im} x) - (R + mf\lambda_0). \quad (26)$$

Given any  $x \in \Lambda_+$ , we know that the expanding map  $T^n$  is defined at  $x$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , and is of the form  $T^n x = \gamma^{-1} x$  for some  $\gamma \in \mathcal{H}^n$ . We call the element  $\gamma$  the inverse branch of  $x$  of length  $n$ .

**Lemma 7.15.** *Given  $i, f, m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $R \geq C_3$ , and  $t > 0$ , suppose  $x \in \Lambda_+$  satisfies  $(i, t, m, R, f)$ . Let  $l$  be the stopping time for  $(T^{im} x, t)$ . Take the inverse branch  $\gamma$  of  $x$  of length  $k \geq im + l + 1$ . Then, for all  $y \in \gamma\Delta_0$ , the stopping time satisfies  $l(T^{im} y, t) = l(T^{im} x, t)$ . Moreover, the point  $y$  satisfies  $(i, t, m, R - C_3\lambda^{k-(im+l+1)}, f)$ .*

*Proof.* Assume the hypotheses of the lemma. Take  $l = l(T^{im} x, t)$ . As  $\gamma$  is the inverse branch of  $x$  of length  $k$ , we can write  $x = \gamma z$ ,  $y = \gamma z'$ . Due to Eqs. (20) and (21), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{R}_l(T^{im} y) - \mathcal{R}_l(T^{im} x)| &= |\mathcal{R}_l(T^{im}(\gamma z)) - \mathcal{R}_l(T^{im}(\gamma z'))| \\ &\leq C_2 \|T^{im+l}(\gamma z) - T^{im+l}(\gamma z')\| \leq C_3 \lambda^{k-(im+l)}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$|\mathcal{R}_{l+1}(T^{im} y) - \mathcal{R}_{l+1}(T^{im} x)| \leq C_3 \lambda^{k-(im+l+1)}.$$

By noticing Eq. (26) for the stopping time  $l(T^{im}x, t)$ , we have that  $y$  satisfies Eq. (26) with  $R$  replaced by  $R - C_3\lambda^{k-(im+l+1)}$ , which automatically implies that  $l(T^{im}x, t) = l(T^{im}y, t)$ .  $\blacksquare$

*Proof of Proposition 7.9.* Let  $R, t, n$ , and  $m$  be as in the proposition. Take any quadruple  $(w, I, t, m)$ . We do induction on the number  $j + 1$  of intervals of  $I$ .

For  $j + 1 = 1$ , it is exactly Corollary 7.13. The constant  $\lambda_0$  is absorbed into  $\epsilon$  and notice that  $\ell(w) = \sum_{j=1}^{j+1} (f_j + 1) = f_1 + 1$ .

For  $j + 1 > 1$ , let  $R_1 = R/2$  and  $f_j = r_j - i_j$ . Let

$$\mathcal{S}_1 := \{x \in \Lambda_+ : x \text{ is of type } (w, I, t, m)\}.$$

For the rest of the proof, we will denote by  $l_j(x)$  the stopping time  $l(T^{i_j m}x, t)$ . Let

$$\mathcal{S}_2 := \left\{ \begin{array}{l} x \in \Lambda_+ : i_j m + l_j(x) > i_{j-1} m + l_{j-1}(x) \text{ and} \\ x \text{ satisfies } (i_j, t, m, R_1, f_j) \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, j+1 \end{array} \right\}. \quad (27)$$

By Lemmas 7.5 and 7.7, Eq. (25) and the definition of type  $(w, I, t, m)$ , we have  $\mathcal{S}_1 \subset \mathcal{S}_2$ . So we only need to bound  $\nu(\mathcal{S}_2)$ .

We want to compute the measure of the set given in Eq. (27) using the language of conditional probability. We first fix the events for  $j = 1, \dots, j$  by fixing the inverse branch of  $x$  and then compute the conditional probability of the last event  $j = j + 1$ .

We need the following before continuing the proof of the proposition. Let  $k_j(x) := i_j m + l_j(x) + 1$ . Let

$$\mathcal{H}(w, I, t, m) := \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \gamma \in \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{H}^n : \exists x \in \mathcal{S}_2 \text{ such that} \\ \text{the inverse branch of } x \text{ of length } k_j(x) \text{ is } \gamma \end{array} \right\}. \quad (28)$$

**Lemma 7.16.** *The set  $\{\gamma \Delta_0 : \gamma \in \mathcal{H}(w, I, t, m)\}$  consists of mutually disjoint cylinders, i.e., there are no  $\gamma, \gamma' \in \mathcal{H}(w, I, t, m)$  such that  $\gamma = \gamma' \gamma''$  for some  $\gamma'' \in \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{H}^n$ .*

*Proof.* For the sake of contradiction, suppose the lemma is false. Then, we have  $\gamma = \gamma' \gamma''$  for some  $\gamma, \gamma' \in \mathcal{H}(w, I, t, m)$  and  $\gamma'' \in \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{H}^n$ . By definition,  $\gamma$  (resp.  $\gamma'$ ) is the inverse branch of some  $x \in \mathcal{S}_2$  (resp.  $x' \in \mathcal{S}_2$ ) of length

$$k_j(x) = i_j m + l_j(x) + 1 \quad (\text{resp. } k_j(x') = i_j m + l_j(x') + 1).$$

We denote by  $l_j$  (resp.  $l'_j$ ) the stopping time  $l_j(x)$  (resp.  $l_j(x')$ ). Also due to  $x$  and  $x'$  satisfying  $(i_j, t, R_1, f_j)$ , we have

$$\mathcal{R}_{l_j}(T^{i_j m}x) \leq t - R_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{R}_{l'_j+1}(T^{i_j m}x') - t > R_1 + f_j \lambda_0.$$

But by hypothesis  $\gamma = \gamma' \gamma''$ , and so we have  $l'_j + 1 \leq l_j$ . Note that  $x = \gamma z = \gamma' \gamma'' z$  and  $x' = \gamma' z'$ . Therefore

$$\mathcal{R}_{l'_j+1}(T^{i_j m} \gamma' z') \leq \mathcal{R}_{l'_j+1}(T^{i_j m} \gamma' \gamma'' z) + C_3 \leq \mathcal{R}_{l_j}(T^{i_j m} \gamma z) + C_3 \leq t - R_1 + C_3,$$

where the first inequality is due to Eq. (21). This is a contradiction.  $\blacksquare$

Then by definition and Lemma 7.16,

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(\mathcal{S}_2) &= \nu \left\{ \begin{array}{l} x \in \Lambda_+ : i_j m + l_j(x) > i_{j-1} m + l_{j-1}(x) \text{ and} \\ x \text{ satisfies } (i_j, t, m, R_1, f_j) \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, j+1 \end{array} \right\} \\ &\leq \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}(w, I, t, m)} \nu \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \gamma z \in \gamma \Lambda_+ : i_{j+1} m + l_{j+1}(\gamma z) > i_j m + l_j(\gamma z) \\ \text{and } \gamma z \text{ satisfies } (i_{j+1}, t, m, R_1, f_{j+1}) \end{array} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

From here we can see that in order to estimate  $\nu(\mathcal{S}_2)$ , we need to estimate the following quantities:

I. the probability of the first  $\mathbf{j}$  events:

$$\sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}(w, I, t, m)} \nu(\gamma \Delta_0);$$

II. the conditional probability when the first  $\mathbf{j}$  events happen:

$$\frac{1}{\nu(\gamma \Delta_0)} \cdot \nu \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \gamma z \in \gamma \Lambda_+ : i_{j+1}m + l_{j+1}(\gamma z) > i_j m + l_j(\gamma z) \\ \text{and } \gamma z \text{ satisfies } (i_{j+1}, t, m, R_1, f_{j+1}) \end{array} \right\}. \quad (29)$$

7.4.1. **Estimate of I.** Take  $\gamma \in \mathcal{H}(w, I, t, m)$ . There exists  $x' = \gamma z' \in \mathcal{S}_2$ . By Lemma 7.15, for all  $x = \gamma z$  with  $z \in \Lambda_+$ , its stopping time is  $l_j(x) = l_j(x')$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq \mathbf{j}$ . Such  $x$  belongs to the set

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} x \in \gamma \Lambda_+ : i_j m + l_j(x) > i_{j-1} m + l_{j-1}(x) \text{ and} \\ x \text{ satisfies } (i_j, t, m, R_1 - C_3 \lambda^{k_j - (i_j m + l_j + 1)}, f_j) \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, \mathbf{j} \end{array} \right\}. \quad (30)$$

Therefore, by Eq. (30) and Lemma 7.16,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}(w, I, t, m)} \nu(\gamma \Delta_0) \\ & \leq \nu \left\{ \begin{array}{l} x \in \Lambda_+ : i_j m + l_j(x) > i_{j-1} m + l_{j-1}(x) \text{ and} \\ x \text{ satisfies } (i_j, t, m, R_1 - C_3 \lambda^{k_j - (i_j m + l_j + 1)}, f_j) \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, \mathbf{j} \end{array} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

7.4.2. **Estimate of II.** Now we estimate the ‘‘conditional probability under  $\gamma$ ’’. Let us be more precise. Let  $\gamma \in \mathcal{H}(w, I, t, m)$ . For any  $x = \gamma z$  with  $z \in \Lambda_+$  satisfying the condition given in Eq. (29), we rewrite the condition in terms of  $z \in \Lambda_+$ ; then we can apply Proposition 7.12. Note that there exists  $x' \in \gamma z' \in \mathcal{S}_2$ . By Lemma 7.15, for all  $x = \gamma z$  with  $z \in \Lambda_+$ , the stopping time  $l_j(x)$  equals to  $l_j(x')$  for  $1 \leq j \leq \mathbf{j}$ . We will denote the common number  $l_j(x)$  by  $l_j$ . Recall that  $k_j = i_j m + l_j + 1$  is the length of  $\gamma$ .

- (i) If  $k_j \leq i_{j+1}m$ , then  $T^{i_{j+1}m} \gamma z = T^{i_{j+1}m - k_j} z$ . Hence, the point  $z$  satisfies  $\left( \frac{i_{j+1}m - k_j}{m}, t, m, R_1, f_{j+1} \right)$ . Here we abuse notation. Although  $\frac{i_{j+1}m - k_j}{m}$  may not be an integer,  $\left( \frac{i_{j+1}m - k_j}{m}, t, m, R_1, f_{j+1} \right)$  makes sense under Definition 7.14.
- (ii) If  $k_j > i_{j+1}m$ , let  $l' = i_{j+1}m + l_{j+1} - k_j$ . Since  $i_{j+1}m + l_{j+1} > i_j m + l_j$ , we know  $l' \geq 0$ . First fix  $z_0 \in \Lambda_+$  and let  $t_\gamma = t - \mathcal{R}_{k_j - i_{j+1}m}(T^{i_{j+1}m} \gamma z_0)$ . We will verify that  $l'$  is the new stopping time for  $(z = T^{k_j} x, t_\gamma)$  and  $z$  satisfies  $(0, t_\gamma, m, R_1 - C_3, f_{j+1})$ .

Due to the fact that

$$\mathcal{R}_{l_{j+1}+1}(T^{i_{j+1}m} \gamma z) = \mathcal{R}_{l'+1}(z) + \mathcal{R}_{k_j - i_{j+1}m}(T^{i_{j+1}m} \gamma z),$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{R}_{l'+1}(z) - t_\gamma \\ & = \mathcal{R}_{l_{j+1}+1}(T^{i_{j+1}m} \gamma z) - t - (\mathcal{R}_{k_j - i_{j+1}m}(T^{i_{j+1}m} \gamma z) - \mathcal{R}_{k_j - i_{j+1}m}(T^{i_{j+1}m} \gamma z_0)) \\ & \geq R_1 + f_{j+1} \lambda_0 - C_3, \end{aligned}$$



where the last inequality is due to Eq. (21) and the fact that  $x$  satisfies  $(i_{j+1}, t, m, R_1, f_{j+1})$ . Similarly,

$$\mathcal{R}_{\nu'}(z) + R_1 - C_3 < t_\gamma.$$




FIGURE 6. Case (i) of estimate of II. It is similar to Fig. 4. To simplify the notation, we only write the points  $T^i x$ , which also represents  $\mathcal{R}_i(x)$  in the timeline. The blue segment is of length  $t$ .




FIGURE 7. Case (ii) of estimate of II. The brown line is of length approximately  $\mathcal{R}_{k_j-i_{j+1}}(T^{i_{j+1}}\gamma z_0)$  and the orange line is of length approximately  $t_\gamma = t - \mathcal{R}_{k_j-i_{j+1}}(T^{i_{j+1}}\gamma z_0)$ .

If the length of  $\gamma$  satisfies case (ii), then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \nu \left\{ \begin{array}{l} x = \gamma z \in \gamma\Lambda_+ : x \text{ satisfies } (i_{j+1}, t, R_1, f_{j+1}) \\ \text{and } i_{j+1}m + l_{j+1} > i_jm + l_j \end{array} \right\} \\ & \leq \nu(\{x = \gamma z \in \gamma\Lambda_+, z \text{ satisfies } (0, t_\gamma, R_1 - C_3, f_{j+1})\}) \\ & \leq C_{\text{cyl}} \|d\gamma\|^\delta \nu(\{z \in \Lambda_+ : z \text{ satisfies } (0, t_\gamma, R_1 - C_3, f_{j+1})\}) \quad (\text{by Lemma 3.5}) \\ & \leq C_{\text{cyl}} \|d\gamma\|^\delta e^{-\epsilon(R_1 - C_3 + f_{j+1}m\lambda_0)} \quad (\text{by Proposition 7.12}) \\ & \leq C_4 \nu(\gamma\Lambda_+) e^{-\epsilon(R_1 - C_3 + f_{j+1}m\lambda_0)} \quad (\text{by Lemma 3.5}), \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

with  $C_4 = C_{\text{cyl}}^2$ .

If the length of  $\gamma$  satisfies case (i), then the second equation above is for  $z$  which satisfies  $\left(\frac{i_{j+1}m - k_j}{m}, t, m, R_1, f_{j+1}\right)$ . By the same estimate as above, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \nu \left\{ \begin{array}{l} x = \gamma z \in \gamma\Lambda_+ : x \text{ satisfies } (i_{j+1}, t, R_1, f_{j+1}) \\ \text{and } i_{j+1}m + l_{j+1} > i_jm + l_j \end{array} \right\} \\ & \leq C_4 \nu(\gamma\Lambda_+) e^{-\epsilon(R_1 + f_{j+1}m\lambda_0)}. \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

7.4.3. *Completing the estimate of  $\nu(\mathcal{S}_2)$ .* Summing over all  $\gamma \in \mathcal{H}(w, I, t, m)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(\mathcal{S}_2) &= \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}(w, I, t, m)} \nu \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \gamma z \in \gamma \Lambda_+ : \gamma z \text{ satisfies } (i_{j+1}, t, m, R_1, f_{j+1}) \\ \text{and } i_{j+1}m + l_{j+1} > i_jm + l_j \end{array} \right\} \\ &\leq \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}(w, I, t, m)} \nu(\gamma \Lambda_+) (C_4 e^{-\epsilon(R_1 - C_3 + f_{j+1}m\lambda_0)}) \quad (\text{by Eqs. (32) and (33)}) \\ &\leq \nu \left\{ \begin{array}{l} x \in \Lambda_+ : x \text{ satisfies } (i_j, t, m, R_1 - C_3 \lambda^{k_j - (i_jm + l_j + 1)}, f_j) \text{ and} \\ i_jm + l_j(x) > i_{j-1}m + l_{j-1}(x) \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, j \end{array} \right\} \\ &\quad \times (C_4 e^{-\epsilon(R_1 - C_2 + f_{j+1}m\lambda_0)}) \quad (\text{by Eq. (31)}). \end{aligned}$$

For the first term in the last equation, we use induction to estimate it. We repeat the process and reduce the number  $j$ . At each step, we will get a term similar to the second term of the last equation. The subtlety is that after the first step, the number  $R_1$  for events  $j = 1, \dots, j$  changes, and the error is of the form  $C_3 \lambda^{k_j - (i_jm + l_j + 1)}$ . Due to  $\lambda < 1$ , for a fixed  $j$ , after  $j + 1 - j$  steps, the number  $R_1$  is replaced by

$$R_1 - C_3 \sum_{r=j}^j \lambda^{k_r - (i_jm + l_j + 1)},$$

which is greater than  $R_1 - C_3/(1 - \lambda)$ , where  $k_r$ 's are mutually distinct due to the hypothesis that  $i_r m + l_r > i_{r-1} m + l_{r-1}$ . Then, we use the argument of conditional probability to compute the measure of the  $j$ -th event. Altogether, we obtain

$$\nu(\mathcal{S}_2) \leq \prod_{j=1}^{j+1} C_4 e^{-\epsilon(f_j m \lambda_0 + R_1 - C_3(1 + \frac{1}{1-\lambda}))}.$$

Recall that  $\ell(w) = \sum_{j=1}^{j+1} (f_j + 1) = \sum_{j=1}^{j+1} f_j + (j + 1)$ . Finally, we obtain Proposition 7.9 by using  $m \geq 1$ , decreasing  $\epsilon$  to  $\epsilon \lambda_0 / 2$ , and choosing  $R_1 = R/2$  sufficiently large to absorb the constants  $C_3, C_4$ .  $\blacksquare$

**7.5. Renewal theorem.** In this section, we will prove Proposition 7.10. For references of the renewal theorem, see for example [Woo82] and [Fel71]. We define a ‘‘random walk’’ from  $\Lambda_+ \times \mathbb{R}$  to  $\Lambda_+ \times \mathbb{R}$ : starting from a point  $(x, t) \in \Lambda_+ \times \mathbb{R}$ , the probability to reach the next point  $(y, t + \mathcal{R}(y))$  with  $Ty = x$  is  $e^{-\delta \mathcal{R}(y)}$ . Then the integral form of the renewal theorem for this ‘‘random walk’’ is given in Theorem 7.17. This kind of renewal theorem can be obtained through the classical method of using transfer operators and Laplace transforms. In order to obtain an exponential error term in Proposition 7.10, we need a spectral gap result from [LP22].

Proposition 7.10 is for estimating the measure of the set of  $x \in \Lambda_+$  whose residual waiting time satisfies  $\mathcal{R}_{l+1}(x) - t > R$  where  $l = l(x, t)$  is the stopping time. In Lemma 7.19, we use a classical computation to relate the residual waiting time to the integral of the renewal sum in Eq. (34) which appears in Theorem 7.17, the integral form of the renewal theorem. This enables us to derive Proposition 7.10 from Theorem 7.17.

Only for this subsection, denote  $L_s := \mathcal{L}_{(\delta+s)\mathcal{R}}$  for  $s \in \mathbb{C}$  with  $\Re s > -\epsilon_0$ , which is the unnormalized transfer operator on  $\text{Lip}(\Lambda_+, \mathbb{C})$  defined in Section 4. We also use the measure  $\mu_E$  which satisfies  $L_0^*(\mu_E) = \mu_E$ . Recall  $h_0 \in \text{Lip}(\Lambda_+, \mathbb{R})$  is the

eigenfunction of the transfer operator  $L_0$  with eigenvalue 1 and  $\int_{\Lambda_+} h_0 d\mu_E = 1$ . Let  $\sigma_0 := \bar{\mathcal{R}} = \hat{\nu}(\mathcal{R}) = \int_{\Lambda_+} \mathcal{R} h_0 d\mu_E$  be the Lyapunov exponent.

For any compactly supported function  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $x \in \Lambda_+$ , and  $t > 0$ , we introduce the renewal sum

$$\mathcal{R}f(x, t) := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}^n} e^{-\delta \mathcal{R}_n(\gamma x)} f(\mathcal{R}_n(\gamma x) - t) \quad (34)$$

which converges. We denote by  $\|\cdot\|_1$  the  $L^1$  norm.

**Theorem 7.17** (Renewal theorem). *There exists  $\epsilon > 0$  such that for all  $f \in C_c^2(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ ,  $x \in \Lambda_+$ , and  $t > 0$ , we have*

$$\mathcal{R}f(x, t) = \frac{h_0(x)}{\sigma_0} \int_{-t}^{\infty} f dm^{\text{Leb}} + O(e^{-\epsilon t} e^{\epsilon m^{\text{Leb}}(\text{supp } f)} (\|f''\|_1 + \|f\|_1))$$

as  $t \rightarrow +\infty$ .

By Lemma A.1, we know that  $s \mapsto L_s$  is analytic on  $\{s \in \mathbb{C} : \Re s > -\frac{\epsilon_0}{2}\}$ , where  $\epsilon_0$  comes from the exponential tail property in Proposition 3.1. We need a lemma about the operator  $(\text{Id} - L_s)^{-1} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} L_s^n$ . The proof is similar to the case of finite symbolic coding; see for example [Lal89, Propositions 7.2 and 7.3]. Lemma 7.18 is stronger than the results in [Lal89] because we obtain a meromorphic extension to a half plane  $\{s \in \mathbb{C} : \Re s > -\eta\}$  and the estimate of the norm of  $U(s)$  is uniform up to a polynomial term in  $s$ .

**Lemma 7.18.** *We have a meromorphic extension of the map  $s \mapsto (\text{Id} - L_s)^{-1}$ , which we denote by the same symbol, from the domain  $\{s \in \mathbb{C} : \Re s > 0\}$  to the domain  $\{s \in \mathbb{C} : \Re s > -\eta\}$  for some  $\eta \in (0, \frac{\epsilon_0}{2})$ . Moreover, we have the decomposition*

$$(\text{Id} - L_s)^{-1} = \frac{N(0)}{\sigma_0 s} + U(s) \quad \text{for all } |\Re s| < \eta, \quad (35)$$

where  $N(0)\phi = \mu_E(\phi)h_0$  for all  $\phi \in \text{Lip}(\Lambda_+, \mathbb{C})$  and  $s \mapsto U(s)$  is analytic and satisfies

$$\|U(s)\|_{\text{op}} \leq C(1 + |\Im s|)^2 \quad \text{for all } |\Re s| < \eta. \quad (36)$$

*Proof.* First, we deal with  $s \in \mathbb{C}$  with small  $|s|$ . It follows from the characterization of the spectrum of  $L_0$  (see Section 4) and its spectral decomposition that it is quasi-compact (see [Kat95, Chapter 3]). By further using perturbation theory of operators (see [Kat95, Chapter 7]), we obtain

$$L_s = \lambda_s N(s) + Q(s) \quad \text{for all } s \in \mathcal{O},$$

for some open ball  $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathbb{C}$  centered at 0 and analytic maps  $s \mapsto \lambda_s$ ,  $s \mapsto N(s)$ , and  $s \mapsto Q(s)$ . Here,  $\lambda_s$  is the maximal simple eigenvalue of  $L_s$  and the operators satisfy  $N(s)Q(s) = Q(s)N(s) = 0$ ,  $N(s)^2 = N(s)$  (i.e., a projection), and  $\|Q(s)\|_{\text{op}} \leq \rho < 1$ . Therefore,

$$(\text{Id} - L_s)^{-1} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} L_s^n = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (\lambda_s^n N(s) + Q(s)^n) = \frac{N(s)}{1 - \lambda_s} + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} Q(s)^n.$$

In order to obtain Eq. (35), we need to compute  $\partial_s \lambda_s|_{s=0}$  (cf. [PP90, Proposition 4.10] and [AGY06, Lemma 7.22]). Let  $h_s \in \text{Lip}(\Lambda_+, \mathbb{C})$  be the eigenfunction of  $L_s$  with eigenvalue  $\lambda_s$  and  $\int_{\Lambda_+} h_s d\mu_E = 1$  so that  $s \mapsto h_s$  is analytic. In the following

computation, we use  $\dot{L}_s$  and  $\dot{\lambda}_s$  to denote their derivatives with respect to the variable  $s$ . By taking the derivative of  $\lambda_s h_s = L_s h_s$  and integrating, we have

$$\int_{\Lambda_+} (\dot{\lambda}_s h_s + \lambda_s \dot{h}_s) d\mu_E = \int_{\Lambda_+} (\dot{L}_s h_s + L_s \dot{h}_s) d\mu_E.$$

Then set  $s = 0$  in the above formula. Since  $L_0^*(\mu_E) = \mu_E$ , we have  $\int_{\Lambda_+} \dot{h}_0 d\mu_E = \int_{\Lambda_+} L_0 \dot{h}_0 d\mu_E$ , and so we obtain

$$\partial_s \lambda_s|_{s=0} = \dot{\lambda}_0 = \int_{\Lambda_+} \dot{L}_0 h_0 d\mu_E = - \int_{\Lambda_+} L_0(\mathcal{R}h_0) d\mu_E = -\sigma_0.$$

Hence, the map  $s \mapsto N(s)/(1 - \lambda_s)$  has a simple pole at 0 and

$$s \mapsto \frac{N(s)}{1 - \lambda_s} - \frac{N(0)}{\sigma_0 s}$$

is analytic on  $\mathcal{O}$ . Thus,  $s \mapsto U(s) := (\text{Id} - L_s)^{-1} - N(0)/(\sigma_0 s)$  is analytic and Eq. (35) holds on  $\mathcal{O}$ . Equation (36) is trivial.

Now, we deal with  $s \in \mathbb{C}$  with bounded  $|\Re s|$  and large  $|\Im s|$ . Using the spectral bounds provided by [LP22, Proposition 7.3] and an argument similar to the one after [Nau05, Proposition 5.3] or the proof of [AGY06, Proposition 7.16], we obtain the following: there exist  $C > 0$ ,  $\eta \in (0, \text{diam}(\mathcal{O})/2)$ ,  $b_0 > 0$ , and  $\rho \in (0, 1)$  such that

$$\|L_s^n\|_{\text{op}} \leq C(1 + |\Im s|)^2 \rho^n \quad \text{on } \{s \in \mathbb{C} : |\Re s| < \eta, |\Im s| > b_0\}.$$

This implies that  $\text{Id} - L_s$  is invertible and  $s \mapsto (\text{Id} - L_s)^{-1}$  is analytic on  $\{s \in \mathbb{C} : |\Re s| < \eta, |\Im s| > b_0\}$ , and its norm satisfies

$$\|(\text{Id} - L_s)^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} \leq C \frac{(1 + |\Im s|)^2}{1 - \rho}.$$

Therefore,  $s \mapsto U(s) := (\text{Id} - L_s)^{-1} - N(0)/(\sigma_0 s)$  is analytic and Eqs. (35) and (36) hold on  $\{s \in \mathbb{C} : |\Re s| < \eta, |\Im s| > b_0\}$ .

For the rest of the region in  $\{s \in \mathbb{C} : |\Re s| < \eta\}$  which is bounded away from 0 and  $\infty$ , by the same argument as in [Lal89, Proposition 7.3] and [AGY06, Lemma 7.21], the spectral radius of the operator  $L_s$  is less than 1 and  $s \mapsto (\text{Id} - L_s)^{-1}$  is analytic, which finishes the proof.  $\blacksquare$

*Proof of Theorem 7.17.* Let  $f$ ,  $x$ , and  $t$  be as in the lemma. Using Eq. (34), the Fourier transform, and the dominated convergence theorem, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}f(x, t) &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}^n} e^{-\delta \mathcal{R}_n(\gamma x)} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{i\xi(\mathcal{R}_n(\gamma x) - t)} \hat{f}(\xi) d\xi \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{-it\xi} \hat{f}(\xi) L_{-i\xi}^n(\chi_{\Lambda_+})(x) d\xi \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{-it\xi} \hat{f}(\xi) (\text{Id} - L_{-i\xi})^{-1}(\chi_{\Lambda_+})(x) d\xi. \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 7.18, we continue as in [Li22, Proposition 4.27], which is a version of the classical Paley–Wiener theorem, which finishes the proof.  $\blacksquare$

Before we begin the proof of Proposition 7.10, we need a lemma which relates the residual waiting time to the integral of the renewal sum.

**Lemma 7.19.** *For all  $R > 0$  and  $t > 0$ , we have*

$$\mu_{\mathbb{E}}\{x \in \Lambda_+ : \mathcal{R}_{l+1}(x) - t > R\} = \int_{\Lambda_+} \mathcal{R}f_x(x, t) d\mu_{\mathbb{E}}(x),$$

where  $f_x := \chi_{\{s \in \mathbb{R} : R - \mathcal{R}(x) < s \leq 0\}}$  for all  $x \in \Lambda_+$ .

*Proof.* Let  $R > 0$  and  $t > 0$ . Using  $L_0^*(\mu_{\mathbb{E}}) = \mu_{\mathbb{E}}$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mu_{\mathbb{E}}\{x \in \Lambda_+ : \mathcal{R}_{l+1}(x) - t > R\} \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \int_{\Lambda_+} \chi_{\{y \in \Lambda_+ : \mathcal{R}_n(y) \leq t < \mathcal{R}_{n+1}(y) - R\}}(x) d\mu_{\mathbb{E}}(x) \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \int_{\Lambda_+} L_0^n(\chi_{\{y \in \Lambda_+ : \mathcal{R}_n(y) \leq t < \mathcal{R}_{n+1}(y) - R\}})(x) d\mu_{\mathbb{E}}(x) \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \int_{\Lambda_+} \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}^n} e^{-\delta \mathcal{R}_n(\gamma x)} \chi_{\{y \in \Lambda_+ : R - \mathcal{R}(T^n y) < \mathcal{R}_n(y) - t \leq 0\}}(\gamma x) d\mu_{\mathbb{E}}(x) \\ &= \int_{\Lambda_+} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}^n} e^{-\delta \mathcal{R}_n(\gamma x)} f_x(\mathcal{R}_n(\gamma x) - t) d\mu_{\mathbb{E}}(x). \end{aligned}$$

The proof is complete by Eq. (34).  $\blacksquare$

*Proof of Proposition 7.10.* Fix  $\epsilon > 0$  to be the minimum of the  $\epsilon$ 's provided by Propositions 3.1 and 7.11 and Theorem 7.17. Let  $R > 1$  and  $t > R$ . By Lemma 7.19, we would like to apply Theorem 7.17 to  $\mathcal{R}f_x$ , where  $f_x$  is as in the lemma. Since  $f_x$  is not  $C^2$ , we take a smooth function which is greater than  $f_x$ .

Let  $s_x = \max\{-t/2, R - \mathcal{R}(x)\}$ . If  $s_x \leq 0$ , let  $g_x$  be a smooth bump function supported on  $[s_x - 1, 1]$  and equal to 1 on  $[s_x, 0]$ . Otherwise, let  $g_x = 0$ . Then,  $m^{\text{Leb}}(\text{supp } g_x) \leq \min\{t/2 + 2, \mathcal{R}(x) - R + 2\}$  and  $\|g_x''\|_1, \|g_x\|_1 \leq t$ . By Theorem 7.17, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Lambda_+} \mathcal{R}g_x(x, t) d\mu_{\mathbb{E}}(x) &= \int_{\Lambda_+} \left( \frac{h_0(x)}{\sigma_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}} g_x dm^{\text{Leb}} + O(e^{-\epsilon t/2}) \right) d\mu_{\mathbb{E}}(x) \\ &\ll \int_{\{y \in \Lambda_+ : \mathcal{R}(y) > R\}} (\mathcal{R}(x) - R + 2) d\mu_{\mathbb{E}}(x) + e^{-\epsilon t/4} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\epsilon_0} \int_{\Lambda_+} e^{\epsilon_0(\mathcal{R}(x) - R + 2)} d\mu_{\mathbb{E}}(x) + e^{-\epsilon t/4} \\ &\ll e^{-\epsilon R/4} \end{aligned}$$

due to the exponential tail property (see Property (5) in Proposition 3.1).

Now, we can bound  $\int_{\Lambda_+} \mathcal{R}f_x d\mu_{\mathbb{E}}$ . If  $\mathcal{R}(x) < R + t/2$ , then we have  $f_x \leq g_x$  due to the construction of  $g_x$ . Therefore

$$\int_{\{y \in \Lambda_+ : \mathcal{R}(y) < R + t/2\}} \mathcal{R}f_x(x, t) d\mu_{\mathbb{E}}(x) \leq \int_{\Lambda_+} \mathcal{R}g_x(x, t) d\mu_{\mathbb{E}}(x) \ll e^{-\epsilon R/4}. \quad (37)$$

By the exponential tail property in the form of Proposition 7.11,

$$\mu_{\mathbb{E}}\{x \in \Lambda_+ : \mathcal{R}(x) \geq R + t/2\} \ll e^{-\epsilon(R+t/2)}.$$

For the renewal sum  $\mathcal{R}f_x$  defined in Eq. (34), if  $n \geq t/\lambda_0$ , then  $\mathcal{R}_n(y) - t > 0$ , so  $f_x(\mathcal{R}_n(y) - t) = 0$ . We only need to sum over integers  $0 \leq n \leq t/\lambda_0$ . Then due to

the fact that  $f_x \leq 1 \ll h_0$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}f_x(x, t) &= \sum_{n=0}^{\lfloor t/\lambda_0 \rfloor} \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}^n} e^{-\delta \mathcal{R}_n(\gamma x)} f_x(\mathcal{R}_n(\gamma x) - t) \ll \sum_{n=0}^{\lfloor t/\lambda_0 \rfloor} \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}^n} e^{-\delta \mathcal{R}_n(\gamma x)} h_0(\gamma x) \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{\lfloor t/\lambda_0 \rfloor} L_0^n(h_0)(x) \leq \frac{t}{\lambda_0} h_0(x) \ll t. \end{aligned}$$

So we have

$$\int_{\{y \in \Lambda_+ : \mathcal{R}(y) \geq R+t/2\}} \mathcal{R}f_x(x, t) d\mu_{\mathbb{E}}(x) \ll e^{-\epsilon(R+t/2)} t \ll e^{-\epsilon R}. \quad (38)$$

We obtain the desired inequality for  $\mu_{\mathbb{E}}$  by combining Eqs. (37) and (38). We finish the proof by first recalling that  $\nu$  is absolutely continuous with respect to  $\mu_{\mathbb{E}}$  with bounded density, and then by adjusting  $\epsilon$  and taking  $R > 0$  sufficiently large depending on  $\epsilon$  to absorb the accumulated implicit constants.  $\blacksquare$

*Remark 7.20.* With a more precise estimate, we can obtain an asymptotic formula

$$\mu_{\mathbb{E}}\{x : \mathcal{R}_{l+1}(x) - t > R\} = \int_{\{y \in \Lambda_+ : \mathcal{R}(y) > R\}} h_0(x)(\mathcal{R}(x) - R) d\mu_{\mathbb{E}}(x) + O(e^{-\epsilon t})$$

for all  $R > 0$  sufficiently large and  $t > R$ . We only need an upper bound in Proposition 7.10 and so we do not give the proof of this more precise formula.

*Remark 7.21.* In the proof of Proposition 7.12, we see that we only need a weaker version of Proposition 7.10, that is, for all  $t > e^{\epsilon R/2}$ . As a consequence, a version of Theorem 7.17 with a polynomial error is sufficient for the argument. The current version of Theorem 7.17 may be of independent interest, so we present this stronger version here.

## 8. DOLGOPYAT'S METHOD

As outlined in the introduction, in this section, we will perform a version of Dolgopyat's method which is a combination of the works of Stoyanov [Sto11], Sarkar–Winter [SW21], and Tsujii–Zhang [TZ23]. Our goal is to prove Theorem 8.1.

We start with some notations. Let  $(V, \|\cdot\|)$  be any normed vector space over  $\mathbb{R}$  or  $\mathbb{C}$ . Let  $d$  be any distance function on  $\Delta_0$ ; in particular,  $d = d_{\mathbb{E}}$  or  $d = D$ . Let  $H : \Lambda_+ \rightarrow V$  be any function. Following Dolgopyat [Dol98], define a family of equivalent norms

$$\|H\|_{1,b} = \|H\|_{\infty} + \frac{1}{\max\{1, |b|\}} \text{Lip}_d(H), \quad b \in \mathbb{R}.$$

The Lipschitz norm is then simply  $\|H\|_{\text{Lip}(d)} = \|H\|_{1,1}$ . Recall the measure  $\nu$  from Subsection 3.1. If  $H$  is measurable, denote

$$\|H\|_2 = \left( \int_{\Lambda_+} \|H(x)\|^2 d\nu(x) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

We also define the function  $\|H\| : \Lambda_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$\|H\|(x) = \|H(x)\| \quad \text{for all } x \in \Lambda_+.$$

**Theorem 8.1.** *There exist  $\eta > 0$ ,  $C > 0$ ,  $a_0 > 0$ , and  $b_0 > 0$  such that for all  $\xi = a + ib \in \mathbb{C}$  with  $|a| < a_0$ , if  $(b, \rho) \in \widehat{M}_0(b_0)$ , then for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $H \in \text{Lip}(\Lambda_+, V_\rho^{\oplus \dim(\rho)})$ , we have*

$$\|\mathcal{M}_{\xi, \rho}^k(H)\|_2 \leq Ce^{-\eta k} \|H\|_{1, \|\rho_b\|}.$$

For all  $(b, \rho) \in \widehat{M}_0(b_0)$ , recall  $\Omega(\log \|\rho_b\|, R_0) \subset \Delta_0$  from Section 7.

**Theorem 8.2.** *There exist  $\eta \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ ,  $a_0 > 0$ ,  $b_0 > 0$ ,  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , and a continuous function  $\zeta : [-a_0, a_0] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with  $\zeta(0) = 1$  such that the following holds. For all  $\xi = a + ib \in \mathbb{C}$  with  $|a| < a_0$ , if  $(b, \rho) \in \widehat{M}_0(b_0)$ , then for all  $H \in \text{Lip}(\Lambda_+, V_\rho^{\oplus \dim(\rho)})$ , there exist a sequence of positive functions  $\{h_n\}_{n=0}^\infty \subset \text{Lip}_D(\Lambda_+, \mathbb{R})$  with  $h_0 = \|H\|_{1, \|\rho_b\|}$  and a sequence of closed subsets  $\{\Omega_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  of  $\Omega(\log \|\rho_b\|, R_0)$  such that:*

(1) *for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have*

$$\|\mathcal{M}_{\xi, \rho}^{nm}(H)(x)\|_2 \leq h_n(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in \Lambda_+;$$

(2) *for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have*

$$h_n^2(x) \leq \begin{cases} \eta \mathcal{L}_0^m(h_{n-1}^2)(x), & x \in \Omega_n, \\ \zeta(a) \mathcal{L}_0^m(h_{n-1}^2)(x), & x \in \Lambda_+ - \Omega_n; \end{cases}$$

(3) *for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have*

$$\nu\{x \in \Lambda_+ : \#\{j \in \mathbb{N} : 1 \leq j \leq n, T^{jm}x \in \Omega_j\} < \kappa n\} < 2e^{-\kappa n}.$$

The following proof is inspired by [TZ23, Proposition 3.15] but we use the language of transfer operators instead.

*Proof that Theorem 8.2 implies Theorem 8.1.* Denote by  $\tilde{\eta}$ ,  $\kappa$ ,  $\tilde{a}_0$ ,  $b_0$ ,  $m$ , and  $\zeta$  the constants and function provided by Theorem 8.2. Fix  $\eta = \frac{1}{4} \min\{\kappa, -\kappa \log(\tilde{\eta})\}$  and  $a_0 \in (0, \tilde{a}_0)$  such that  $\sup\{|\log(\zeta(a))| : a \in [-a_0, a_0]\} \leq \eta$ . Fix

$$C_0 = \sup\{\|\mathcal{M}_{\xi, \rho}\|_{\text{op}}^{2m} : |a| \leq a_0, \rho \in \widehat{M}\} \leq \sup\{\|\mathcal{L}_\xi\|_{\text{op}}^{2m} : |a| \leq a_0\},$$

$$C = \sqrt{3C_0},$$

viewing the transfer operators as operators on  $L^2(\Lambda_+, V_\rho^{\oplus \dim(\rho)})$  and  $L^2(\Lambda_+, \mathbb{R})$  respectively. Let  $\xi = a + ib \in \mathbb{C}$  with  $|a| < a_0$ . Suppose  $(b, \rho) \in \widehat{M}_0(b_0)$ . Let  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and write  $k = nm + l$  for some integers  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  and  $0 \leq l < m$ . Let  $H \in \text{Lip}(\Lambda_+, V_\rho^{\oplus \dim(\rho)})$ . We then obtain corresponding sequences  $\{h_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$  and  $\{\Omega_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  provided by Theorem 8.2.

We define the sequence of functions  $\{G_j : \Lambda_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}_{j=0}^\infty$  recursively by

$$G_0 = h_0^2,$$

$$G_j(x) = \begin{cases} \tilde{\eta} G_{j-1}(x), & x \in T^{-jm}(\Omega_j), \\ \zeta(a) G_{j-1}(x), & x \in \Lambda_+ - T^{-jm}(\Omega_j), \end{cases} \quad \text{for all } j \in \mathbb{N}.$$

We will first show by induction that they satisfy

$$\mathcal{L}_0^{jm}(G_j) \geq h_j^2 \quad \text{for all } j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}. \quad (39)$$

The base case  $j = 0$  is trivial. Now let  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  and assume Eq. (39) holds for  $j - 1$ . It is immediate from definitions that for all  $\gamma \in \mathcal{H}^m$ , we have

$$\mathcal{L}_0^{(j-1)m}(G_j)(\gamma x) = \begin{cases} \tilde{\eta} \mathcal{L}_0^{(j-1)m}(G_{j-1})(\gamma x), & \text{for all } x \in \Omega_j \\ \zeta(a) \mathcal{L}_0^{(j-1)m}(G_{j-1})(\gamma x), & \text{for all } x \in \Lambda_+ - \Omega_j. \end{cases} \quad (40)$$

For all  $x \in \Omega_j$ , we use Eq. (40), the induction hypothesis, and Property (2) in Theorem 8.2, to get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_0^{jm}(G_j)(x) &= \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}^m} e^{\mathcal{F}_m^{(0)}(\gamma x)} \mathcal{L}_0^{(j-1)m}(G_j)(\gamma x) \\ &= \tilde{\eta} \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}^m} e^{\mathcal{F}_m^{(0)}(\gamma x)} \mathcal{L}_0^{(j-1)m}(G_{j-1})(\gamma x) \\ &\geq \tilde{\eta} \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}^m} e^{\mathcal{F}_m^{(0)}(\gamma x)} h_{j-1}^2(\gamma x) = \tilde{\eta} \mathcal{L}_0^m(h_{j-1}^2)(x) \geq h_j^2(x). \end{aligned}$$

For all  $x \in \Lambda_+ - \Omega_j$ , a similar calculation gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_0^{jm}(G_j)(x) &= \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}^m} e^{\mathcal{F}_m^{(0)}(\gamma x)} \mathcal{L}_0^{(j-1)m}(G_j)(\gamma x) \\ &= \zeta(a) \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}^m} e^{\mathcal{F}_m^{(0)}(\gamma x)} \mathcal{L}_0^{(j-1)m}(G_{j-1})(\gamma x) \\ &\geq \zeta(a) \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}^m} e^{\mathcal{F}_m^{(0)}(\gamma x)} h_{j-1}^2(\gamma x) = \zeta(a) \mathcal{L}_0^m(h_{j-1}^2)(x) \geq h_j^2(x). \end{aligned}$$

This establishes Eq. (39).

Now, using Property (1) in Theorem 8.2, Eq. (39), and  $\mathcal{L}_0^*(\nu) = \nu$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{M}_{\xi, \rho}^k(H)\|_2^2 &\leq C_0 \|\mathcal{M}_{\xi, \rho}^{nm}(H)\|_2^2 \leq C_0 \|h_n\|_2^2 \\ &\leq C_0 \int_{\Lambda_+} \mathcal{L}_0^{nm}(G_n) d\nu \\ &= C_0 \int_{\Lambda_+} G_n d\nu. \end{aligned}$$

Using  $\zeta(a) > \tilde{\eta}$ , for all  $x \in \{y \in \Lambda_+ : \#\{j \in \mathbb{N} : j \leq n, T^{jm}y \in \Omega_j\} \geq \kappa n\}$ , we have the bound

$$G_n(x) \leq \zeta(a)^{n - \lceil \kappa n \rceil} \tilde{\eta}^{\lceil \kappa n \rceil} G_0(x) \leq e^{\eta n} \tilde{\eta}^{\kappa n} h_0^2(x)$$

while for all  $x \in \{y \in \Lambda_+ : \#\{j \in \mathbb{N} : j \leq n, T^{jm}y \in \Omega_j\} < \kappa n\}$ , we have the trivial bound

$$G_n(x) \leq \zeta(a)^n G_0(x) \leq e^{\eta n} h_0^2(x).$$

Using Property (3) in Theorem 8.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{M}_{\xi, \rho}^k(H)\|_2^2 &\leq C_0 \int_{\Lambda_+} G_n d\nu \\ &\leq C_0 e^{\eta n} (\tilde{\eta}^{\kappa n} \cdot (1 - 2e^{-\kappa n}) + 2e^{-\kappa n}) \|h_0\|_\infty^2 \\ &\leq C^2 e^{-2\eta n} \|H\|_{1, \|\rho_b\|}^2. \end{aligned}$$

■



Our goal for the rest of this section is to prove Theorem 8.2. Lemmas 8.3–8.5 are preparatory lemmas.

The following is a Lasota–Yorke type lemma. Many similar lemmas can be found in the literature. But as we are dealing with a countably infinite coding and  $V_\rho^{\oplus \dim(\rho)}$ -valued functions, we give a proof analogous to that of [SW21, Lemma 7.3] and [Sto11, Appendix].

**Lemma 8.3.** *Let  $d$  be any distance function on  $\Delta_0$  such that  $d_{\mathbb{E}}(x, y) \leq d(x, y)$  for all  $x, y \in \Lambda_+$  (e.g.,  $d = d_{\mathbb{E}}$  or  $d = D$ ). There exists  $A_0 > 1$  such that for all  $\xi = a + ib \in \mathbb{C}$  with  $|a| < a'_0$ , if  $(b, \rho) \in \widehat{M}_0(1)$ , then for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have:*

(1) *if  $h \in \text{Lip}_d(\Lambda_+, \mathbb{R})$  and  $B > 0$  satisfy*

$$|h(x) - h(x')| \leq Bh(x)d(x, x')$$

*for all  $x, x' \in \Lambda_+$ , then we have*

$$|\mathcal{L}_a^k(h)(x) - \mathcal{L}_a^k(h)(x')| \leq A_0(B\lambda^k + 1)\mathcal{L}_a^k(h)(x)d(x, x')$$

*for all  $x, x' \in \Lambda_+$ .*

(2) *if  $H \in \text{Lip}(\Lambda_+, V_\rho^{\oplus \dim(\rho)})$ ,  $h \in \text{Lip}_d(\Lambda_+, \mathbb{R})$  and  $B > 0$  satisfy*

$$\|H(x) - H(x')\|_2 \leq Bh(x)d(x, x')$$

*for all  $x, x' \in \Lambda_+$ , then we have*

$$\|\mathcal{M}_{\xi, \rho}^k(H)(x) - \mathcal{M}_{\xi, \rho}^k(H)(x')\|_2 \leq A_0 (B\lambda^k \mathcal{L}_a^k(h)(x) + \|\rho_b\| \mathcal{L}_a^k\|H\|(x)) d(x, x')$$

*for all  $x, x' \in \Lambda_+$ .*

*Proof.* Recalling Eqs. (13) and (16), fix  $A_0 > 4e^{C_2 \text{diam}(\Delta_0)} \frac{C_2}{\delta_{1,e}}$ . Let  $\xi = a + ib \in \mathbb{C}$  with  $|a| < a'_0$  and suppose  $(b, \rho) \in \widehat{M}_0(1)$ . Let  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $x, x' \in \Lambda_+$ .

First we derive some bounds. For any  $\gamma \in \mathcal{H}^k$ , by Proposition 3.1, we have  $d(T^l(\gamma x), T^l(\gamma x')) \leq \lambda^{k-l}d(x, x')$  for all integers  $0 \leq l \leq k$ . Using  $\text{Lip}^e(\mathcal{F}^{(a)}) \leq C'_1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{F}_k^{(a)}(\gamma x) - \mathcal{F}_k^{(a)}(\gamma x')| &\leq \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} |\mathcal{F}^{(a)}(T^l(\gamma x)) - \mathcal{F}^{(a)}(T^l(\gamma x'))| \\ &\leq \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} C'_1 \lambda^{k-l} d(x, x') \leq C_2 d(x, x'). \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

Along with the inequality that  $|1 - e^z| \leq e^{\Re z} |z|$  for all  $z \in \mathbb{C}$ , we obtain

$$\left| 1 - e^{\mathcal{F}_k^{(a)}(\gamma x') - \mathcal{F}_k^{(a)}(\gamma x)} \right| \leq e^{C_2 d(x, x')} C_2 d(x, x') \leq \frac{A_0}{2} \delta_{1,e} d(x, x'). \quad (42)$$

To prove Property (1), suppose  $h \in \text{Lip}_d(\Lambda_+, \mathbb{R})$  and  $B > 0$  are as in the lemma. Using Eqs. (41) and (42), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \mathcal{L}_a^k(h)(x) - \mathcal{L}_a^k(h)(x') \right| \\
& \leq \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}^k} \left| e^{\mathcal{F}_k^{(a)}(\gamma x)} h(\gamma x) - e^{\mathcal{F}_k^{(a)}(\gamma x')} h(\gamma x') \right| \\
& \leq \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}^k} \left( \left| 1 - e^{\mathcal{F}_k^{(a)}(\gamma x') - \mathcal{F}_k^{(a)}(\gamma x)} \right| e^{\mathcal{F}_k^{(a)}(\gamma x)} h(\gamma x) + e^{\mathcal{F}_k^{(a)}(\gamma x')} |h(\gamma x) - h(\gamma x')| \right) \\
& \leq \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}^k} \left( A_0 d(x, x') e^{\mathcal{F}_k^{(a)}(\gamma x)} h(\gamma x) + A_0 e^{\mathcal{F}_k^{(a)}(\gamma x)} B h(\gamma x) d(\gamma x, \gamma x') \right) \\
& \leq (A_0 + A_0 B \lambda^k) d(x, x') \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}^k} e^{\mathcal{F}_k^{(a)}(\gamma x)} h(\gamma x) \\
& = A_0 (B \lambda^k + 1) \mathcal{L}_a^k(h)(x) d(x, x')
\end{aligned}$$

where all the sums converge due to the exponential tail property (see Property (5) in Proposition 3.1).

To prove Property (2), suppose  $H \in \text{Lip}(\Lambda_+, V_\rho^{\oplus \dim(\rho)})$ ,  $h \in \text{Lip}_d(\Lambda_+, \mathbb{R})$ , and  $B > 0$  are as in the lemma. A similar but more involved calculation as in Eq. (41) using  $\text{Lip}^e(\mathcal{G}) \leq C'_1$  (see [Sar22b, Lemma 5.2.3]) gives that for any  $\gamma \in \mathcal{H}^k$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\| \rho_b(\mathcal{G}^k(\gamma x)^{-1}) - \rho_b(\mathcal{G}^k(\gamma x')^{-1}) \|_{\text{op}} & \leq \| \rho_b \| d_{AM}(\mathcal{G}^k(\gamma x), \mathcal{G}^k(\gamma x')) \\
& \leq 2C_2 \| \rho_b \| d(x, x').
\end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

Thus, using Eqs. (41)–(43), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \mathcal{M}_{\xi, \rho}^k(H)(x) - \mathcal{M}_{\xi, \rho}^k(H)(x') \right\|_2 \\
& \leq \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}^k} \left\| e^{\mathcal{F}_k^{(a)}(\gamma x)} \rho_b(\mathcal{G}^k(\gamma x)^{-1}) H(\gamma x) - e^{\mathcal{F}_k^{(a)}(\gamma x')} \rho_b(\mathcal{G}^k(\gamma x')^{-1}) H(\gamma x') \right\|_2 \\
& \leq \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}^k} \left( \left| 1 - e^{\mathcal{F}_k^{(a)}(\gamma x') - \mathcal{F}_k^{(a)}(\gamma x)} \right| e^{\mathcal{F}_k^{(a)}(\gamma x)} \| \rho_b(\mathcal{G}^k(\gamma x)^{-1}) H(\gamma x) \|_2 \right. \\
& \quad + e^{\mathcal{F}_k^{(a)}(\gamma x')} \| (\rho_b(\mathcal{G}^k(\gamma x)^{-1}) - \rho_b(\mathcal{G}^k(\gamma x')^{-1})) H(\gamma x) \|_2 \\
& \quad \left. + e^{\mathcal{F}_k^{(a)}(\gamma x')} \| \rho_b(\mathcal{G}^k(\gamma x')^{-1}) (H(\gamma x) - H(\gamma x')) \|_2 \right) \\
& \leq \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}^k} \left( \frac{A_0}{2} \delta_{1, \varrho} d(x, x') e^{\mathcal{F}_k^{(a)}(\gamma x)} \| H(\gamma x) \|_2 \right. \\
& \quad + 2C_2 e^{\mathcal{F}_k^{(a)}(\gamma x')} \| \rho_b \| d(x, x') \| H(\gamma x) \|_2 \\
& \quad \left. + e^{\mathcal{F}_k^{(a)}(\gamma x')} \| H(\gamma x) - H(\gamma x') \|_2 \right) \\
& \leq \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}^k} \left( \frac{A_0}{2} \| \rho_b \| d(x, x') e^{\mathcal{F}_k^{(a)}(\gamma x)} \| H(\gamma x) \|_2 + \frac{A_0}{2} \| \rho_b \| e^{\mathcal{F}_k^{(a)}(\gamma x)} d(x, x') \| H(\gamma x) \|_2 \right. \\
& \quad \left. + A_0 B \lambda^k e^{\mathcal{F}_k^{(a)}(\gamma x)} h(\gamma x) d(x, x') \right) \\
& \leq A_0 (B \lambda^k \mathcal{L}_a^k(h)(x) + \| \rho_b \| \mathcal{L}_a^k \| H \| (x)) d(x, x').
\end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

■

We also need the following lemma.

**Lemma 8.4.** *For all  $r > 0$ , there exists  $c > 0$  such that for all  $x \in \Lambda_\Gamma \cap \Delta_0$ , there exists a cylinder  $\mathbb{C} \subset B(x, r)$  with  $\text{diam}(\mathbb{C}) > c$  and  $\nu(\mathbb{C}) > c$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $r > 0$ . By compactness of  $\Lambda_\Gamma \cap \overline{\Delta_0}$ , it has a finite cover  $\{B(x_j, r/2)\}_{j=1}^n$  for some  $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^n \subset \Lambda_\Gamma \cap \Delta_0$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . By Lemma 5.10,  $B(x_j, r/2)$  contains a cylinder  $\mathbb{C}_j$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq n$ . Fix  $c = \min_{1 \leq j \leq n} \min\{\text{diam}(\mathbb{C}_j), \nu(\mathbb{C}_j)\}$ . Then the lemma follows because for any  $x \in \Lambda_\Gamma \cap \Delta_0$ , the ball  $B(x, r)$  covers  $B(x_j, r/2)$  for some  $1 \leq j \leq n$ .  $\blacksquare$

We now fix several fundamental constants for Dolgopyat's method. Recall the reference point  $x_0 \in \Lambda_+ \subset \Delta_0$  from Subsection 3.3. Fix  $\delta_0 > 0$  such that

$$B(x_0, 2\delta_0) \subset \Delta_0. \quad (45)$$

Recall  $\varepsilon_1$  from Lemma 4.2 and  $\varepsilon_2$  fixed after Proposition 5.8. Fix  $R_0 > 0$  provided by Proposition 7.3. Corresponding to  $R_0$ , fix  $\varepsilon_3 \in (0, 1)$  to be the  $\eta$  provided by Proposition 6.1. Fix positive constants

$$b_0 = 1, \quad (46)$$

$$E > \frac{2A_0}{\delta_{1,\varrho}}, \quad (47)$$

$$\delta_1 < \frac{\varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2 \varepsilon_3}{14} < \varepsilon_3, \quad (48)$$

$$\varepsilon_1 < \min \left\{ \delta_0 C_{\text{cyl}}^{-1} C_{\Delta_0}^{-1} e^{-R_0}, \delta_1^{-1} \delta_0 \cdot 8A_0 C_{\text{cyl}} C_{\Delta_0} e^{R_0}, \frac{1}{\delta_1}, \frac{\delta_1}{C_{\text{BP}}^2}, \frac{\delta_1 \delta_{1,\varrho}}{C_{\text{exp,BP}}} \right\}. \quad (49)$$

Fix

$$c_0 > 0 \quad (50)$$

to be the constant provided by Lemma 8.4 corresponding to  $r = \frac{\delta_1 \varepsilon_1}{8A_0 C_{\text{cyl}} C_{\Delta_0} e^{R_0}}$ .

Fix

$$c = c_0 C_{\text{cyl}}^{-1} C_{\Delta_0}^{-1}. \quad (51)$$

Fix

$$m \geq m_0 \text{ such that } \lambda^m < \max \left\{ c e^{-2R_0}, \frac{1}{8A_0}, \frac{1}{8E\varepsilon_1}, \frac{\delta_1}{32E} \right\}. \quad (52)$$

Fix  $\{\alpha_j\}_{j=0}^{j_0} \subset \mathcal{H}^m$  and the corresponding maps  $\{\text{BP}_j : \Delta_0 \times \Delta_0 \rightarrow AM\}_{j=1}^{j_0}$  provided by Proposition 5.8. Also fix positive constants

$$T_0 = \max \left\{ \sup \left\{ \|\mathcal{F}_m^{(a)}|_{\alpha_j \Delta_0}\|_\infty : |a| \leq a'_0 \right\} : j \in \{0, 1, \dots, j_0\} \right\}, \quad (53)$$

$$\tau < \min \left\{ \frac{1}{4}, 2E e^{-R_0} c C_{\text{cyl}}^{-1} \min_{j \in \{0, 1, \dots, j_0\}} \|d\alpha_j\|, \frac{\arccos \left( 1 - \frac{(\delta_1 \varepsilon_1)^2}{2} \right)^2}{16 \cdot 16 e^{2T_0}} \right\}. \quad (54)$$

The following lemma provides the necessary cancellations for Dolgopyat's method. It is proved as in [SW21, Lemma 8.1] by combining Proposition 5.8 (LNIC), Proposition 6.1 (NCP), and the lower bound in Lemma 4.2. However, notice that it is not true for all  $x \in \Delta_0$  and an additional constraint coming from NCP is required. Consequently, cancellations only occur on balls centered at such  $x$  or its partner point  $y$ .

**Lemma 8.5.** For all  $(b, \rho) \in \widehat{M}_0(b_0)$ ,  $x \in \Lambda_\Gamma \cap \Delta_0 - \overline{B\left(\partial\Delta_0, \frac{\epsilon_1}{\|\rho_b\|}\right)}$  with  $u_x a_{\log\|\rho_b\|} \in \Omega_{R_0}$ , and  $\omega \in V_\rho^{\oplus \dim(\rho)}$  with  $\|\omega\|_2 = 1$ , there exist  $1 \leq j \leq j_0$  and  $y \in \Lambda_\Gamma \cap B\left(x, \frac{\epsilon_1}{\|\rho_b\|}\right) - B\left(x, \frac{\delta_1 \epsilon_1}{\|\rho_b\|}\right)$  such that

$$\|d\rho_b(d(\text{BP}_{j,x})_x(y-x))(\omega)\|_2 > 7\delta_1 \epsilon_1.$$

### 8.1. Good partitions and Dolgopyat operators.

**Definition 8.6** (Partition, Atom, Finer, Coarser). A  $\nu$ -measurable partition  $\mathcal{P}$  of  $\Delta_0$  is a set of mutually disjoint Borel subsets  $\mathbf{C} \subset \Delta_0$  such that

$$\nu\left(\bigcup_{\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbf{C}\right) = \nu(\Delta_0).$$

For any point  $x \in \Delta_0$ , its *atom* is the unique element denoted by  $\mathcal{P}(x) \in \mathcal{P}$  which contains  $x$ ; if no such element of  $\mathcal{P}$  exists, define  $\mathcal{P}(x) = \emptyset$ . For two  $\nu$ -measurable partitions  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{Q}$ , we say  $\mathcal{Q}$  is *finer* than  $\mathcal{P}$  or  $\mathcal{P}$  is *coarser* than  $\mathcal{Q}$ , denoted by  $\mathcal{Q} \succeq \mathcal{P}$ , if for all  $\mathbf{D} \in \mathcal{Q}$ , there exists  $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{P}$  such that  $\mathbf{D} \subset \mathbf{C}$ .

For all  $(b, \rho) \in \widehat{M}_0(b_0)$ , let  $\mathcal{P}_{(b,\rho)}$  be the  $\nu$ -measurable partition of  $\Delta_0$  consisting of maximal cylinders  $\mathbf{C} \subset \Delta_0$  with  $\text{diam}(\mathbf{C}) \leq \frac{e^{R_0}}{\|\rho_b\|}$ . From definitions (see Section 7), we have

$$\Omega^\dagger(\log\|\rho_b\|, R_0) = \left\{ \mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{P}_{(b,\rho)} : \text{diam}(\mathbf{C}) \geq \frac{e^{-R_0}}{\|\rho_b\|} \right\} \quad (55)$$

**Lemma 8.7.** For all  $(b, \rho) \in \widehat{M}_0(b_0)$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have  $T^{-n}(\mathcal{P}_{(b,\rho)}) \succeq \mathcal{P}_{(b,\rho)}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $(b, \rho) \in \widehat{M}_0(b_0)$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $\mathbf{C} \in T^{-n}(\mathcal{P}_{(b,\rho)})$ . Then  $T^n(\mathbf{C}) \in \mathcal{P}_{(b,\rho)}$  and so by the expanding property, we have

$$\text{diam}(\mathbf{C}) \leq \text{diam}(T^n(\mathbf{C})) \leq \frac{e^{R_0}}{\|\rho_b\|}.$$

Thus, by definition of  $\mathcal{P}_{(b,\rho)}$ , there exists a cylinder  $\mathbf{D} \in \mathcal{P}_{(b,\rho)}$  containing  $\mathbf{C}$ .  $\blacksquare$

Proposition 8.8 will introduce the sub-cylinders where cancellations can take place.

**Proposition 8.8.** Let  $(b, \rho) \in \widehat{M}_0(b_0)$  and  $\mathbf{J} \in \Omega^\dagger(\log\|\rho_b\|, R_0)$ . There exists  $x_1 \in \mathbf{J} \cap \Lambda_+$  such that  $B\left(x_1, \frac{\epsilon_1}{\|\rho_b\|}\right) \subset \mathbf{J}$  and for all  $\omega \in V_\rho^{\oplus \dim(\rho)}$  with  $\|\omega\|_2 = 1$ , there exist  $1 \leq j \leq j_0$  and  $x_2 \in \Lambda_+ \cap B\left(x_1, \frac{\epsilon_1}{\|\rho_b\|}\right) - B\left(x_1, \frac{\delta_1 \epsilon_1}{\|\rho_b\|}\right)$  such that

- (1)  $\|d\rho_b(d(\text{BP}_{j,x_1})_{x_1}(x_2-x_1))(\omega)\|_2 \geq 7\delta_1 \epsilon_1$ ;
- (2) for all  $k \in \{1, 2\}$ , there exists a  $T^{-m}(\mathcal{P}_{(b,\rho)})$ -measurable subset  $\mathbf{J}_k \subset \mathbf{J}$  and

$$B\left(x_k, \frac{\delta_1 \epsilon_1}{4A_0 \|\rho_b\|}\right) \text{ such that}$$

$$\text{diam}(\mathbf{J}_k) > c \text{diam}(\mathbf{J}), \quad \nu(\mathbf{J}_k) > c\nu(\mathbf{J}).$$

*Proof.* Let  $(b, \rho)$  and  $\mathbf{J}$  be as in the proposition. Write  $\mathbf{J} = \gamma\Delta_0$  for some  $\gamma \in \mathcal{H}^n$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . By Eq. (55) and Lemma 7.2, we have

$$C_{\Delta_0}^{-1} e^{-R_0} \|\rho_b\|^{-1} \leq \|d\gamma\| \leq C_{\Delta_0} e^{R_0} \|\rho_b\|^{-1}. \quad (56)$$

Take  $x_1 = \gamma x_0 \in \mathbf{J} \cap \Lambda_+$ . Recall that  $B(x_0, 2\delta_0) \subset \Delta_0$  from Eq. (45). For  $\delta'_0 := \frac{\delta_0}{C_{\text{cyl}} C_{\Delta_0} e^{R_0}}$ , we have

$$B\left(x_1, \frac{\epsilon_1}{\|\rho_b\|}\right) \subset B\left(x_1, \frac{\delta'_0}{\|\rho_b\|}\right) \subset \gamma B(x_0, \delta_0) \subset \mathbf{J}$$

by Eq. (56), a similar argument as in Lemma 3.5, and inequality  $\epsilon_1 < \delta'_0$  (see Eq. (49)). As  $x_1 \in \Omega(\log \|\rho_b\|, R_0)$ , Lemma 7.1 gives  $u_{x_1} a_{\log \|\rho_b\|} \in \Omega_{R_0}$ . Let  $\omega$  be as in the proposition. Using Lemma 8.5 and the fact that  $\Lambda_+ \subset \Delta_0$  is of full measure, we obtain a point  $x_2$  such that

$$x_2 \in \Lambda_+ \cap B\left(x_1, \frac{\epsilon_1}{\|\rho_b\|}\right) - B\left(x_1, \frac{\delta_1 \epsilon_1}{\|\rho_b\|}\right) \subset \mathbf{J} \cap \Lambda_+$$

and Property (1) holds.

Let  $k \in \{1, 2\}$ . By Lemma 8.4 and Eq. (50), there exists a cylinder  $\mathbf{J}'_k \subset B\left(\gamma^{-1} x_k, \frac{\delta_1 \epsilon_1}{8A_0 C_{\text{cyl}} C_{\Delta_0} e^{R_0}}\right)$  with  $\text{diam}(\mathbf{J}'_k) > c_0$  and  $\nu(\mathbf{J}'_k) > c_0$ . Take  $\mathbf{J}_k = \gamma \mathbf{J}'_k \subset B\left(x_k, \frac{\delta_1 \epsilon_1}{4A_0 \|\rho_b\|}\right)$  where we derive the containment using Eq. (56) and Lemma 3.5. Again using Lemma 3.5 and Eq. (51), we have

$$\text{diam}(\mathbf{J}_k) \geq C_{\text{cyl}}^{-1} \|d\gamma\| \text{diam}(\mathbf{J}'_k) > c_0 C_{\text{cyl}}^{-1} C_{\Delta_0}^{-1} \text{diam}(\mathbf{J}) = c \text{diam}(\mathbf{J}), \quad (57)$$

$$\nu(\mathbf{J}_k) \geq C_{\text{cyl}}^{-1} \|d\gamma\|^\delta \nu(\mathbf{J}'_k) > c_0 C_{\text{cyl}}^{-1} C_{\Delta_0}^{-1} \nu(\mathbf{J}) = c \nu(\mathbf{J}). \quad (58)$$

Using Eq. (52), we have

$$\text{diam}(T^m(\mathbf{J}_k)) \geq \lambda^{-m} \text{diam}(\mathbf{J}_k) > c \lambda^{-m} \text{diam}(\mathbf{J}) \geq \frac{c \lambda^{-m}}{e^{R_0} \|\rho_b\|} > \frac{\epsilon^{R_0}}{\|\rho_b\|}$$

which implies  $T^m(\mathbf{J}_k)$  is  $\mathcal{P}_{(b, \rho)}$ -measurable.  $\blacksquare$

We construct a function indicating at which sub-cylinders we gain decay. Let  $(b, \rho) \in \widehat{M}_0(b_0)$ ,  $\mathbf{J} \in \Omega^\dagger(\log \|\rho_b\|, R_0)$ , and  $H \in \text{Lip}(\Lambda_+, V_\rho^{\oplus \dim(\rho)})$ . We introduce the following notations:

- denote by  $x_1^{\mathbf{J}, H} \in \mathbf{J}$  the  $x_1$  provided by Proposition 8.8 and apply the same proposition to the unit vector

$$\omega = \frac{\rho_b (\mathcal{G}^m (\alpha_0 x_1^{\mathbf{J}, H})^{-1}) H (\alpha_0 x_1^{\mathbf{J}, H})}{\|H(\alpha_0 x_1^{\mathbf{J}, H})\|_2} \in V_\rho^{\oplus \dim(\rho)}, \quad (59)$$

- denote by

$$x_2^{\mathbf{J}, H} \in \Lambda_+ \cap B\left(x_1^{\mathbf{J}, H}, \frac{\epsilon_1}{\|\rho_b\|}\right) \subset \mathbf{J} \cap \Lambda_+, \quad (60)$$

$$1 \leq j^{\mathbf{J}, H} \leq j_0, \quad (61)$$

$$\mathbf{J}_k^H \subset \mathbf{J} \cap B\left(x_k^{\mathbf{J}, H}, \frac{\delta_1 \epsilon_1}{4A_0 \|\rho_b\|}\right), \quad (62)$$

the corresponding  $x_2$ ,  $j$ , and  $\mathbf{J}_k$  provided by Proposition 8.8 for all  $k \in \{1, 2\}$ ;

- define  $\Xi(b, \rho) = \Omega^\dagger(\log \|\rho_b\|, R_0) \times \{1, 2\} \times \{1, 2\}$ ;
- define  $\Omega_J^H = \bigcup_{(j, k, l) \in J} \mathbf{J}_k^H$  for all  $J \subset \Xi(b, \rho)$ ;
- define  $\mathbf{J}_{k,1}^H = \alpha_0 \mathbf{J}_k^H$  and  $\mathbf{J}_{k,2}^H = \alpha_{j^{\mathbf{J}, H}} \mathbf{J}_k^H$  for all  $k \in \{1, 2\}$ ;

- define the following function on  $\Lambda_+$ :

$$\beta_J^H = \chi_{\Lambda_+} - \tau \sum_{(j,k,l) \in J} \chi_{J_{k,l}^H}, \quad (63)$$

where we view the characteristic functions  $\chi_{J_{k,l}^H}$  as functions on  $\Lambda_+$ .

Note that  $x_1^{J,H}$  and  $J_1^H$  do not depend on  $H$ . Although  $\beta_J^H$  is defined using characteristic functions, it is indeed Lipschitz with respect to  $D$ , which is the advantage of the distance function  $D$ . More precisely, using Lemma 3.5, we obtain the following lemma.

**Lemma 8.9.** *Let  $(b, \rho) \in \widehat{M}_0(b_0)$ ,  $J \subset \Xi(b, \rho)$ , and  $H \in \text{Lip}(\Lambda_+, V_\rho^{\oplus \dim(\rho)})$ . We have  $\beta_J^H \in \text{Lip}_D(\Lambda_+, \mathbb{R})$  with*

$$\text{Lip}_D(\beta_J^H) \leq \frac{\tau \|\rho_b\| e^{R_0}}{c C_{\text{cyl}}^{-1} \min_{j \in \{0,1,\dots,j_0\}} \|d\alpha_j\|}. \quad (64)$$




FIGURE 8. An illustration of the construction of  $\beta_J^H$ . The shapes and sizes of the cylinders are for simplicity.

**Definition 8.10** (Dolgopyat operator). For all  $\xi = a + ib \in \mathbb{C}$  with  $|a| < a'_0$ , if  $(b, \rho) \in \widehat{M}_0(b_0)$ , then for all  $J \subset \Xi(b, \rho)$  and  $H \in \text{Lip}(\Lambda_+, V_\rho^{\oplus \dim(\rho)})$ , we define the Dolgopyat operator  $\mathcal{N}_{a,J}^H : \text{Lip}_D(\Lambda_+, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \text{Lip}_D(\Lambda_+, \mathbb{R})$  by

$$\mathcal{N}_{a,J}^H(h) = \mathcal{L}_a^m(\beta_J^H h) \quad \text{for all } h \in \text{Lip}_D(\Lambda_+, \mathbb{R}).$$

Actually, the fact that  $\mathcal{N}_{a,J}^H(h)$  is Lipschitz with respect to  $D$  for any  $h \in \text{Lip}_D(\Lambda_+, \mathbb{R})$  can be proved similar to Lemma 8.3.

**Lemma 8.11.** *There exist  $a_0 > 0$ ,  $\eta \in (0, 1)$ , and  $C > 0$  such that for all  $\xi = a + ib \in \mathbb{C}$  with  $|a| < a_0$ , if  $(b, \rho) \in \widehat{M}_0(b_0)$ , then for all  $J \subset \Xi(b, \rho)$  and  $(H, h) \in \text{Lip}(\Lambda_+, V_\rho^{\oplus \dim(\rho)}) \times \text{Lip}_D(\Lambda_+, \mathbb{R})$ , we have*

$$\mathcal{N}_{a,J}^H(h)^2(x) \leq \begin{cases} \eta \mathcal{L}_0^m(h^2)(x), & x \in \Omega_J^H \\ \zeta(a) \mathcal{L}_0^m(h^2)(x), & x \in \Lambda_+ - \Omega_J^H, \end{cases}$$

where  $\zeta : [-a_0, a_0] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a continuous function with  $\zeta(0) = 1$ .

*Proof.* Recall the constant  $T_0$  from Eq. (53). Fix  $\eta = \sqrt{1 - \tau e^{-T_0}}$ . We introduce the function  $\zeta : [-a'_0, a'_0] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined by

$$\zeta(a) = (\lambda_a^{-2} \lambda_{2a})^m \left\| \frac{h_0}{h_a} \right\|_\infty \left\| \frac{h_a}{h_0} \right\|_\infty \left\| \frac{h_a}{h_{2a}} \right\|_\infty \left\| \frac{h_{2a}}{h_a} \right\|_\infty$$

whose purpose will become clear shortly. Since  $\zeta$  is continuous and  $\zeta(0) = 1$ , we can fix a sufficiently small  $a_0 \in (0, a'_0/2)$  such that  $\eta\zeta(a) \leq 1$  for all  $|a| < a_0$ . Let  $\xi$ ,  $(b, \rho)$ ,  $J$ , and  $(H, h)$  be as in the lemma. By the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}_{a,J}^H(h)^2 &= \left( \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}^m} e^{\mathcal{F}_m^{(a)}(\gamma x)} \beta_J^H(\gamma x) h(\gamma x) \right)^2 \\ &\leq \left( \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}^m} e^{(\mathcal{F}_m^{(a)} - a\mathcal{R}_m)(\gamma x)} \beta_J^H(\gamma x)^2 \right) \left( \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}^m} e^{(\mathcal{F}_m^{(a)} + a\mathcal{R}_m)(\gamma x)} h(\gamma x)^2 \right) \\ &\leq \zeta(a) \mathcal{L}_{2a}^m((\beta_J^H)^2) \mathcal{L}_0^m(h^2). \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $\mathcal{L}_{2a}^m(\chi_{\Lambda_+}) = \chi_{\Lambda_+}$  by virtue of the normalization of the transfer operators. Hence,  $\mathcal{L}_{2a}^m((\beta_J^H)^2) \leq 1$  which gives the trivial bound  $\mathcal{N}_{a,J}^H(h)^2 \leq \zeta(a) \mathcal{L}_0^m(h^2)$ . Now, let  $x \in \Omega_J^H$ . Then  $x \in J_k^H$  for some  $(J, k, l) \in J$ . Using  $(\beta_J^H)^2 \leq \chi_{\Lambda_+} - \tau \chi_{J_{k,l}^H}$  and Eq. (53), we have

$$\mathcal{L}_{2a}^m((\beta_J^H)^2)(x) \leq \mathcal{L}_{2a}^m(\chi_{\Lambda_+})(x) - \tau \mathcal{L}_{2a}^m(\chi_{J_{k,l}^H})(x) \leq 1 - \tau e^{-T_0} = \eta^2.$$

Thus, using this in the previous inequality gives

$$\mathcal{N}_{a,J}^H(h)^2(x) \leq \eta^2 \zeta(a) \mathcal{L}_0^m(h^2)(x) \leq \eta \mathcal{L}_0^m(h^2)(x). \quad \blacksquare$$

**8.2. Invariance of cone.** First we introduce the following two related notions of density following Tsujii–Zhang [TZ23] and Dolgopyat [Dol98].

**Definition 8.12** (Dense). Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a  $\nu$ -measurable partition of  $\Delta_0$ . A subset  $B \subset \Delta_0$  is said to be  $\mathcal{P}$ -measurable if  $\nu(B \triangle \bigcup_{x \in B} \mathcal{P}(x)) = 0$ . Furthermore, we say that a  $\nu$ -measurable subset  $A \subset B$  is  $(\mathcal{P}, c)$ -dense in  $B$  for some  $c > 0$  if

$$\nu(A \cap \mathcal{P}(x)) > c\nu(\mathcal{P}(x)) \quad \text{for } \nu\text{-almost all } x \in B.$$

**Definition 8.13** (Dense index set). Let  $(b, \rho) \in \widehat{M}_0(b_0)$ . We say that  $J \subset \Xi(b, \rho)$  is a *dense index set*, if for all  $J \in \Omega^\dagger(\log \|\rho_b\|, R_0)$ , there exists  $(k, l) \in \{1, 2\} \times \{1, 2\}$  such that  $(J, k, l) \in J$ .

For all  $(b, \rho) \in \widehat{M}_0(b_0)$ , if  $J \subset \Xi(b, \rho)$  is a dense index set, then by Proposition 8.8, we have that  $\Omega_J^H$  is  $(\mathcal{P}_{(b,\rho)}, c)$ -dense in  $\Omega(\log \|\rho_b\|, R_0)$  for all  $H \in \text{Lip}(\Lambda_+, V_\rho^{\oplus \dim(\rho)})$ .

Define  $\mathcal{J}(b, \rho) = \{J \subset \Xi(b, \rho) : J \text{ is a dense index set}\}$ . In this subsection we introduce a cone and prove that it is preserved by a pair consisting of a transfer operator with holonomy and a Dolgopyat operator for some  $J \in \mathcal{J}(b, \rho)$ . This is the heart of the Dolgopyat’s method where we obtain cancellations of the summands of the transfer operator with holonomy via Proposition 8.8 whose source is Proposition 5.8 (LNIC), Proposition 6.1 (NCP), and the lower bound in Lemma 4.2.

For all  $(b, \rho) \in \widehat{M}_0(b_0)$ , define the cone

$$\mathcal{C}_{(b, \rho)}(\Lambda_+) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (H, h) \in \text{Lip}(\Lambda_+, V_\rho^{\oplus \dim(\rho)}) \times \text{Lip}_D(\Lambda_+, \mathbb{R}) : \\ (1) \quad h > 0, \\ (2) \quad |h(x) - h(x')| \leq E \|\rho_b\| h(x) D(x, x') \text{ for all } x, x' \in \Lambda_+, \\ (3) \quad \|H(x)\|_2 \leq h(x) \text{ for all } x \in \Lambda_+, \\ (4) \quad \|H(x) - H(x')\|_2 \leq E \|\rho_b\| h(x) D(x, x') \text{ for all } x, x' \in \Lambda_+ \end{array} \right\} \quad (65)$$

using the constant  $E$  defined in Eq. (47).

**Proposition 8.14.** *Let  $\xi = a + ib \in \mathbb{C}$  with  $|a| < a'_0$  and suppose  $(b, \rho) \in \widehat{M}_0(b_0)$ . For all  $(H, h) \in \mathcal{C}_{(b, \rho)}(\Lambda_+)$ , there exists  $J \in \mathcal{J}(b, \rho)$  such that  $(\mathcal{M}_{\xi, \rho}^m(H), \mathcal{N}_{a, J}^H(h)) \in \mathcal{C}_{(b, \rho)}(\Lambda_+)$ .*

The goal of the rest of the subsection is to prove Proposition 8.14. Preservation of Property (1) in Eq. (65) is trivial. Preservation of Properties (2) and (4) in Eq. (65) follow from the following two lemmas. The proofs are similar to [SW21, Lemmas 9.1 and 9.2]. They are analogous to the original [Dol98, Proposition 6 and Lemma 11]. Preservation of Property (3) will be given later.

**Lemma 8.15.** *For all  $\xi = a + ib \in \mathbb{C}$  with  $|a| < a'_0$ , if  $(b, \rho) \in \widehat{M}_0(b_0)$ , and if  $h \in \text{Lip}_D(\Lambda_+, \mathbb{R})$  satisfies Property (2) in Eq. (65), then for all  $J \subset \Xi(b, \rho)$  and  $H \in \text{Lip}(\Lambda_+, V_\rho^{\oplus \dim(\rho)})$ ,  $\mathcal{N}_{a, J}^H(h)$  also satisfies Property (2) in Eq. (65).*

*Proof.* Let  $\xi$ ,  $(b, \rho)$ ,  $h$ ,  $J$ , and  $H$  be as in the lemma. Let  $x, x' \in \Lambda_+$ . Using Eqs. (54) and (64), and  $\beta_J^H \geq 1 - \tau$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |(\beta_J^H h)(x) - (\beta_J^H h)(x')| \leq |h(x) - h(x')| + h(x) |\beta_J^H(x) - \beta_J^H(x')| \\ & \leq E \|\rho_b\| h(x) D(x, x') + h(x) \cdot \frac{\tau \|\rho_b\| e^{R_0}}{\mathfrak{c} C_{\text{cyl}}^{-1} \min_{j \in \{0, 1, \dots, j_0\}} \|d\alpha_j\|} \cdot D(x, x') \\ & \leq 3E \|\rho_b\| \cdot \frac{\beta_J^H(x)}{1 - \tau} \cdot h(x) D(x, x') \\ & \leq 4E \|\rho_b\| (\beta_J^H h)(x) D(x, x'). \end{aligned}$$

Now applying Lemma 8.3 and Eqs. (47) and (52), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{N}_{a, J}^H(h)(x) - \mathcal{N}_{a, J}^H(h)(x')| &= |\mathcal{L}_a^m(\beta_J^H h)(x) - \mathcal{L}_a^m(\beta_J^H h)(x')| \\ &\leq A_0(4E \|\rho_b\| \lambda^m + 1) \mathcal{L}_a^m(\beta_J^H h)(x) D(x, x') \\ &= E \|\rho_b\| \mathcal{N}_{a, J}^H(h)(x) D(x, x'). \end{aligned}$$

■

**Lemma 8.16.** *For all  $\xi = a + ib \in \mathbb{C}$  with  $|a| < a'_0$ , if  $(b, \rho) \in \widehat{M}_0(b_0)$ , and if  $(H, h) \in \text{Lip}(\Lambda_+, V_\rho^{\oplus \dim(\rho)}) \times \text{Lip}_D(\Lambda_+, \mathbb{R})$  satisfies Properties (3) and (4) in Eq. (65), then for all  $J \subset \Xi(b, \rho)$ ,  $(\mathcal{M}_{\xi, \rho}^m(H), \mathcal{N}_{a, J}^H(h))$  also satisfies Property (4) in Eq. (65).*



*Proof.* Let  $\xi$ ,  $(b, \rho)$ ,  $(H, h)$ , and  $J$  be as in the lemma. Let  $x, x' \in \Lambda_+$ . Applying Lemma 8.3 and Eqs. (47), (52), and (54), and  $\beta_J^H \geq 1 - \tau$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\mathcal{M}_{\xi, \rho}^m(H)(x) - \mathcal{M}_{\xi, \rho}^m(H)(x')\|_2 \\
& \leq A_0 (E\|\rho_b\|\lambda^m \mathcal{L}_a^m(h)(x) + \|\rho_b\| \mathcal{L}_a^m(\|H\|_2)(x)) D(x, x') \\
& \leq A_0 \left( \frac{E\|\rho_b\|}{8A_0} + \frac{E\|\rho_b\|}{2A_0} \right) \mathcal{L}_a^m(h)(x) D(x, x') \\
& \leq \left( \frac{E\|\rho_b\|}{8(1-\tau)} + \frac{E\|\rho_b\|}{2(1-\tau)} \right) \mathcal{L}_a^m(\beta_J^H h)(x) D(x, x') \\
& \leq E\|\rho_b\| \mathcal{N}_{a, J}^H(h)(x) D(x, x').
\end{aligned}$$

■

The preservation of Property (3) in Eq. (65) is crucial and this is where the aforementioned cancellations occur. It follows from the next four lemmas. For all  $\xi = a+ib \in \mathbb{C}$  with  $|a| < a'_0$ , if  $(b, \rho) \in \widehat{M}_0(b_0)$ , then for all  $(H, h) \in \text{Lip}(\Lambda_+, V_\rho^{\oplus \dim(\rho)}) \times \text{Lip}_D(\Lambda_+, \mathbb{R})$ , and  $1 \leq j \leq j_0$ , we define the functions  $\chi_{j,1}^{[\xi, \rho, H, h]}, \chi_{j,2}^{[\xi, \rho, H, h]} : \Lambda_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$\begin{aligned}
& \chi_{j,1}^{[\xi, \rho, H, h]}(x) \\
& = \frac{\|e^{\mathcal{F}_m^{(a)}(\alpha_0 x)} \rho_b(\mathcal{G}^m(\alpha_0 x)^{-1}) H(\alpha_0 x) + e^{\mathcal{F}_m^{(a)}(\alpha_j x)} \rho_b(\mathcal{G}^m(\alpha_j x)^{-1}) H(\alpha_j x)\|_2}{(1-\tau)e^{\mathcal{F}_m^{(a)}(\alpha_0 x)} h(\alpha_0 x) + e^{\mathcal{F}_m^{(a)}(\alpha_j x)} h(\alpha_j x)}, \\
& \chi_{j,2}^{[\xi, \rho, H, h]}(x) \\
& = \frac{\|e^{\mathcal{F}_m^{(a)}(\alpha_0 x)} \rho_b(\mathcal{G}^m(\alpha_0 x)^{-1}) H(\alpha_0 x) + e^{\mathcal{F}_m^{(a)}(\alpha_j x)} \rho_b(\mathcal{G}^m(\alpha_j x)^{-1}) H(\alpha_j x)\|_2}{e^{\mathcal{F}_m^{(a)}(\alpha_0 x)} h(\alpha_0 x) + (1-\tau)e^{\mathcal{F}_m^{(a)}(\alpha_j x)} h(\alpha_j x)}
\end{aligned}$$

for all  $x \in \Lambda_+$ . These function are for encoding that when they are at most 1, cancellations occur among the vectors in the numerator. The second subscript is to indicate for which of the two inverse branches  $\alpha_0$  or  $\alpha_j$  the cancellations occur.

The following lemma can be proved similar to [SW21, Lemma 9.8]. It is analogous to the original [Dol98, Lemma 14].

**Lemma 8.17.** *Let  $(b, \rho) \in \widehat{M}_0(b_0)$ . Suppose  $(H, h) \in \mathcal{C}_{(b, \rho)}(\Lambda_+)$ . Then, for all  $(J, k, l) \in \Xi(b, \rho)$ , letting  $j = 0$  if  $l = 1$  and  $j = j^{J, H}$  if  $l = 2$ , we have*

$$\frac{1}{2} \leq \frac{h(\alpha_j x)}{h(\alpha_j x')} \leq 2 \quad \text{for all } x, x' \in J_k^H$$

and also either of the alternatives

- (1)  $\|H(\alpha_j x)\|_2 \leq \frac{3}{4} h(\alpha_j x)$  for all  $x \in J_k^H$ ;
- (2)  $\|H(\alpha_j x)\|_2 \geq \frac{1}{4} h(\alpha_j x)$  for all  $x \in J_k^H$ .

For any  $k \geq 2$ , denote by  $\Theta(w_1, w_2) = \arccos\left(\frac{\langle w_1, w_2 \rangle}{\|w_1\| \|w_2\|}\right) \in [0, \pi]$  the angle between  $w_1, w_2 \in \mathbb{R}^k - \{0\}$ , where we use the standard inner product and norm. The following is a basic lemma in Euclidean geometry (see [Sar22b, Lemma 5.4.9] for a proof).

**Lemma 8.18.** *Let  $k \geq 2$ . If  $w_1, w_2 \in \mathbb{R}^k - \{0\}$  such that  $\Theta(w_1, w_2) \geq \alpha$  and  $\frac{\|w_1\|}{\|w_2\|} \leq L$  for some  $\alpha \in [0, \pi]$  and  $L \geq 1$ , then we have*

$$\|w_1 + w_2\| \leq \left(1 - \frac{\alpha^2}{16L}\right) \|w_1\| + \|w_2\|.$$

Recall from Eqs. (60)–(62) that the index  $1 \leq j^{J,H} \leq j_0$  indicates that for  $H \in \text{Lip}(\Delta_0, V_\rho^{\oplus \dim(\rho)})$ , the inverse branches  $\alpha_0$  and  $\alpha_{j^{J,H}}$  should be compared in order to obtain cancellations inside  $J$  which occur for either  $J_1^H$  or  $J_2^H$ .

**Lemma 8.19.** *Let  $\xi = a + ib \in \mathbb{C}$  with  $|a| < a'_0$  and  $(b, \rho) \in \widehat{M}_0(b_0)$ . Suppose  $(H, h) \in \mathcal{C}_{(b, \rho)}(\Lambda_+)$ . For all  $J \in \Omega^\dagger(\log \|\rho_b\|, R_0)$ , denoting  $j = j^{J,H}$ , there exists  $(k, l) \in \{1, 2\} \times \{1, 2\}$  such that  $\chi_{j,l}^{[\xi, \rho, H, h]}(x) \leq 1$  for all  $x \in J_k^H \cap \Lambda_+$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\xi$ ,  $(b, \rho)$ ,  $(H, h)$ , and  $J$  be as in the lemma. To simplify notation, we write  $x_k$  for  $x_k^{J,H}$  for all  $k \in \{1, 2\}$  and  $j$  for  $j^{J,H}$ .

Now, if Alternative (1) in Lemma 8.17 holds for  $(J, k, l) \in \Xi(b, \rho)$  for some  $(k, l) \in \{1, 2\} \times \{1, 2\}$ , then it can be checked that  $\chi_{j,l}^{[\xi, \rho, H, h]}(x) \leq 1$  for all  $x \in J_k^H \cap \Lambda_+$ . Otherwise, Alternative (2) in Lemma 8.17 holds for  $(J, 1, 1)$ ,  $(J, 1, 2)$ ,  $(J, 2, 1)$ ,  $(J, 2, 2) \in \Xi(b, \rho)$ . We would like to use Lemma 8.18 but first we need to establish bounds on relative angle and relative size. We start with the former.

Define  $\omega_\ell(x) = \frac{H(\alpha_\ell x)}{\|H(\alpha_\ell x)\|_2}$  and  $\phi_\ell(x) = \mathcal{G}^m(\alpha_\ell x)$  for all  $x \in \Lambda_+$  and  $\ell \in \{0, j\}$ . Let  $\ell \in \{0, j\}$ . For any two points  $y, z \in (J_1^H \sqcup J_2^H) \cap \Lambda_+$ , without loss of generality, we may assume  $\|H(\alpha_\ell y)\|_2 \leq \|H(\alpha_\ell z)\|_2$ . Using the sine law, Alternative (2) in Lemma 8.17, and Eqs. (52), (60), and (65), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sin(\Theta(\omega_\ell(y), \omega_\ell(z))) &\leq \frac{\|H(\alpha_\ell y) - H(\alpha_\ell z)\|_2}{\max\{\|H(\alpha_\ell y)\|_2, \|H(\alpha_\ell z)\|_2\}} \\ &\leq \frac{E\|\rho_b\| h(\alpha_\ell z) D(\alpha_\ell y, \alpha_\ell z)}{\|H(\alpha_\ell z)\|_2} \\ &\leq 4E\|\rho_b\| \cdot \frac{\epsilon_1 \lambda^m}{\|\rho_b\|} \\ &\leq 4E\epsilon_1 \lambda^m \in (0, 1/2), \end{aligned}$$

Using the cosine law and Eqs. (49) and (52), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\omega_\ell(y) - \omega_\ell(z)\| &= \sqrt{2 - 2 \cos(\Theta(\omega_\ell(y), \omega_\ell(z)))} \\ &= \sqrt{2 - 2\sqrt{1 - \sin^2(\Theta(\omega_\ell(y), \omega_\ell(z)))}} \\ &\leq \sqrt{2 - 2\sqrt{1 - (4E\epsilon_1 \lambda^m)^2}} \\ &\leq \frac{\delta_1 \epsilon_1}{4}. \end{aligned} \tag{66}$$

For all  $x \in \Lambda_+$  and  $\ell \in \{0, j\}$ , define

$$\begin{aligned} V_\ell(x) &= e^{\mathcal{F}_m^{(a)}(\alpha_\ell x)} \rho_b(\phi_\ell(x)^{-1}) H(\alpha_\ell x), \\ \hat{V}_\ell(x) &= \frac{V_\ell(x)}{\|V_\ell(x)\|_2} = \rho_b(\phi_\ell(x)^{-1}) \omega_\ell(x). \end{aligned}$$

Using Eq. (66), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\hat{V}_0(x_2) - \hat{V}_j(x_2)\|_2 \\
&= \|\rho_b(\phi_0(x_2)^{-1})\omega_0(x_2) - \rho_b(\phi_j(x_2)^{-1})\omega_j(x_2)\|_2 \\
&= \|\rho_b(\phi_j(x_2)\phi_0(x_2)^{-1})\omega_0(x_2) - \omega_j(x_2)\|_2 \\
&\geq \|\rho_b(\phi_j(x_2)\phi_0(x_2)^{-1})\omega_0(x_1) - \omega_j(x_1)\|_2 \\
&\quad - \|\rho_b(\phi_j(x_2)\phi_0(x_2)^{-1})\omega_0(x_2) - \rho_b(\phi_j(x_2)\phi_0(x_2)^{-1})\omega_0(x_1)\|_2 \\
&\quad - \|\omega_j(x_2) - \omega_j(x_1)\|_2 \\
&= \|\rho_b(\phi_j(x_2)\phi_0(x_2)^{-1})\omega_0(x_1) - \omega_j(x_1)\|_2 - \|\omega_0(x_2) - \omega_0(x_1)\|_2 \\
&\quad - \|\omega_j(x_2) - \omega_j(x_1)\|_2 \\
&\geq \|\rho_b(\phi_j(x_2)\phi_0(x_2)^{-1})\omega_0(x_1) - \rho_b(\phi_j(x_1)\phi_0(x_1)^{-1})\omega_0(x_1)\|_2 \\
&\quad - \|\rho_b(\phi_j(x_1)\phi_0(x_1)^{-1})\omega_0(x_1) - \omega_j(x_1)\|_2 - \delta_1\epsilon_1 \\
&= \|\rho_b(\phi_0(x_1)^{-1})\omega_0(x_1) - \rho_b(\phi_0(x_1)^{-1}\phi_0(x_2)\phi_j(x_2)^{-1}\phi_j(x_1)\phi_0(x_1)^{-1})\omega_0(x_1)\|_2 \\
&\quad - \|\rho_b(\phi_0(x_1)^{-1})\omega_0(x_1) - \rho_b(\phi_j(x_1)^{-1})\omega_j(x_1)\|_2 - \delta_1\epsilon_1 \\
&\geq \|\rho_b(\phi_0(x_1)^{-1})\omega_0(x_1) - \rho_b(\text{BP}_j(x_1, x_2))\rho_b(\phi_0(x_1)^{-1})\omega_0(x_1)\|_2 \\
&\quad - \|\hat{V}_0(x_1) - \hat{V}_j(x_1)\|_2 - \delta_1\epsilon_1.
\end{aligned}$$

Recall that we applied Proposition 8.8 to the unit vector  $\omega = \rho_b(\phi_0(x_1)^{-1})\omega_0(x_1)$  in Eq. (59). Let  $Z = d(\text{BP}_{j,x_1})_{x_1}(x_2 - x_1)$ . Continuing to bound the first term above, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\omega - \rho_b(\text{BP}_j(x_1, x_2))(\omega)\|_2 \\
&\geq \|\omega - \rho_b(\exp(Z))(\omega)\|_2 - \|\rho_b(\exp(Z))(\omega) - \rho_b(\text{BP}_j(x_1, x_2))(\omega)\|_2 \\
&\geq \|\omega - \exp(d\rho_b(Z))(\omega)\|_2 - \|\rho_b\| \cdot d_{AM}(\exp(Z), \text{BP}_j(x_1, x_2)) \\
&\geq \|d\rho_b(Z)(\omega)\|_2 - \|\rho_b\|^2\|Z\|^2 - \|\rho_b\| \cdot d_{AM}(\exp(Z), \text{BP}_j(x_1, x_2)) \\
&\geq \|d\rho_b(Z)(\omega)\|_2 - \|\rho_b\|^2 C_{\text{BP}}^2 d(x_1, x_2)^2 - C_{\text{exp, BP}} \cdot \|\rho_b\| \cdot d(x_1, x_2)^2 \quad (\text{Lemma 5.11}) \\
&\geq 7\delta_1\epsilon_1 - \delta_1\epsilon_1 - \delta_1\epsilon_1 \geq 5\delta_1\epsilon_1. \quad (\text{by Proposition 8.8 and Eq. (49) )
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$\|\hat{V}_0(x_1) - \hat{V}_j(x_1)\|_2 + \|\hat{V}_0(x_2) - \hat{V}_j(x_2)\|_2 \geq 4\delta_1\epsilon_1.$$

This implies that there exists  $k \in \{1, 2\}$  such that

$$\|\hat{V}_0(x_k) - \hat{V}_j(x_k)\|_2 \geq 2\delta_1\epsilon_1.$$

For any  $x \in \mathcal{J}_k^H \cap \Lambda_+$  and  $\ell \in \{0, j\}$ , using estimates from Eqs. (43), (49), and (66), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\hat{V}_\ell(x_k) - \hat{V}_\ell(x)\|_2 \\
&\leq \|\rho_b(\phi_\ell(x_k)^{-1}) - \rho_b(\phi_\ell(x)^{-1})\omega_\ell(x)\|_2 + \|\rho_b(\phi_\ell(x)^{-1})(\omega_\ell(x_k) - \omega_\ell(x))\|_2 \\
&\leq A_0\|\rho_b\| \cdot \|x - x_k\| + \|\omega_\ell(x_k) - \omega_\ell(x)\|_2 \\
&\leq A_0\|\rho_b\| \cdot \frac{\delta_1\epsilon_1}{4A_0\|\rho_b\|} + \frac{\delta_1\epsilon_1}{4} \\
&= \frac{\delta_1\epsilon_1}{2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence for all  $x \in \mathbb{J}_k^H \cap \Lambda_+$ , we have

$$\|\hat{V}_0(x) - \hat{V}_j(x)\|_2 \geq \delta_1 \epsilon_1 \in (0, 1).$$

Then using the cosine law, the required bound for relative angle is

$$\Theta(V_0(x), V_j(x)) = \Theta(\hat{V}_0(x), \hat{V}_j(x)) \geq \arccos\left(1 - \frac{(\delta_1 \epsilon_1)^2}{2}\right) \in (0, \pi).$$

We prove the bound on relative size. Choose any  $y_0 \in \mathbb{J}_k^H \cap \Lambda_+$ . We have either  $h(\alpha_0 y_0) \leq h(\alpha_j y_0)$  or  $h(\alpha_j y_0) \leq h(\alpha_0 y_0)$ . Let  $(\ell, \ell') = (0, j)$  and  $l = 1$  for the first case and  $(\ell, \ell') = (j, 0)$  and  $l = 2$  for the second case. Recalling that  $\rho_b$  is a unitary representation, by Lemma 8.17, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\|V_\ell(x)\|_2}{\|V_{\ell'}(x)\|_2} &= \frac{e^{\mathcal{F}_m^{(a)}(\alpha_\ell x)} \|H(\alpha_\ell x)\|_2}{e^{\mathcal{F}_m^{(a)}(\alpha_{\ell'} x)} \|H(\alpha_{\ell'} x)\|_2} \leq \frac{4e^{\mathcal{F}_m^{(a)}(\alpha_\ell x) - \mathcal{F}_m^{(a)}(\alpha_{\ell'} x)} h(\alpha_\ell x)}{h(\alpha_{\ell'} x)} \\ &\leq \frac{16e^{2T_0} h(\alpha_\ell y_0)}{h(\alpha_{\ell'} y_0)} \leq 16e^{2T_0} \end{aligned}$$

for all  $x \in \mathbb{J}_k^H \cap \Lambda_+$ , which is the required bound on relative size. Now using Lemma 8.18, Eq. (54), and  $\|H\| \leq h$  for  $\|V_0(x) + V_j(x)\|_2$  gives

$$\chi_{j,l}^{[\xi, \rho, H, h]}(x) \leq 1 \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{J}_k^H \cap \Lambda_+.$$

■

For each  $J \in \Omega^\dagger(\log \|\rho_b\|, R_0)$ , we use Lemma 8.19 to find  $(k, l)$ , whose union gives  $J \in \mathcal{J}(b, \rho)$  for  $(H, h)$ . A straightforward derivation using definitions and Lemma 8.19 gives the following lemma (see the proof of [Sto11, Lemma 5.3] and [SW21, Lemma 9.11]).

**Lemma 8.20.** *For all  $\xi = a + ib \in \mathbb{C}$  with  $|a| < a'_0$ , if  $(b, \rho) \in \widehat{M}_0(b_0)$ , and if  $(H, h) \in \mathcal{C}_{(b, \rho)}(\Lambda_+)$ , then there exists  $J \in \mathcal{J}(b, \rho)$  such that  $(\mathcal{M}_{\xi, \rho}^m(H), \mathcal{N}_{a, J}^H(h))$  also satisfies Property (3) in Eq. (65).*

Combining Lemmas 8.15, 8.16, and 8.20 completes the proof of Proposition 8.14.

**8.3. Stochastic dominance and the proof of Theorem 8.2.** In this subsection we put together the various components to finish proving Theorem 8.2. Property (3) in Theorem 8.2 is derived from Proposition 7.3 but the proof also requires the stochastic dominance technique of Tsujii–Zhang [TZ23, Section 14].

Let us begin the proof of Theorem 8.2 by fixing for the rest of this subsection,  $\eta$  and  $a_0$  provided by Lemma 8.11, and  $\tilde{\kappa}$  to be the  $\kappa$  corresponding to  $R_0$  provided by Proposition 7.3. We defer fixing  $\kappa$  of Theorem 8.2 to end of this subsection. Also let  $(b, \rho) \in \widehat{M}_0(b_0)$  and  $H \in \text{Lip}(\Lambda_+, V_\rho^{\oplus \dim(\rho)})$  for the rest of this subsection. We then inductively define

$$\begin{aligned} (H_0, h_0) &= (H, \|H\|_{1, \|\rho_b\|} \cdot \chi_{\Lambda_+}) \in \mathcal{C}_{(b, \rho)}(\Lambda_+), \\ (H_j, h_j) &= (\mathcal{M}_{\xi, \rho}^m(H_{j-1}), \mathcal{N}_{a, J_{j-1}}^{H_{j-1}}(h_{j-1})) \in \mathcal{C}_{(b, \rho)}(\Lambda_+) \quad \text{for all } j \in \mathbb{N}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $J_{j-1} \in \mathcal{J}(b, \rho)$  is inductively provided by Proposition 8.14 corresponding to  $(H_{j-1}, h_{j-1}) \in \mathcal{C}_{(b, \rho)}(\Lambda_+)$  for all  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ . Fix  $\Omega_j = \Omega_{J_{j-1}}^{H_{j-1}}$  for all  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ . Properties (1) and (2) in Theorem 8.2 then follow from Lemma 8.11 and Proposition 8.14 respectively.

It remains to prove Property (3) in Theorem 8.2. We present an adaptation of [TZ23, Section 14] for our setting. To ease notation, set  $\mathcal{P} := \mathcal{P}_{(b,\rho)}$ ,  $\mathcal{P}' := T^{-m}(\mathcal{P}) \supseteq \mathcal{P}$ , and the  $\mathcal{P}$ -measurable set  $\tilde{\Omega} := \Omega(\log \|\rho_b\|, R_0)$ . By Proposition 8.8, for all  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , the set  $\Omega_j \subset \tilde{\Omega}$  is  $\mathcal{P}'$ -measurable and  $(\mathcal{P}, \mathfrak{c})$ -dense. To proceed further, we need Lemma 8.21. Define

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(x) &= \inf\{j \in \mathbb{N} : T^{jm}(x) \in \tilde{\Omega}\}, \\ \sigma(x) &= T^{\tau(x)m}(x), \end{aligned} \quad \text{for all } x \in \Lambda_+,$$

and use similar notation as in Eq. (10). Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ , and  $\kappa' \in (0, 1)$  be arbitrary. We introduce the sets

$$\begin{aligned} A_{n,\kappa} &= \{x \in \Lambda_+ : \#\{j \in \mathbb{N} : j \leq n, T^{jm}(x) \in \Omega_j\} < \kappa n\} \subset \Lambda_+, \\ B_{n,\kappa} &= \{x \in \Lambda_+ : \#\{j \in \mathbb{N} : j \leq n, T^{jm}(x) \in \tilde{\Omega}\} < \kappa n\} \subset A_{n,\kappa}, \\ C_{n,\kappa} &= \{x \in \Lambda_+ : \#\{j \in \mathbb{N} : j \leq n, \sigma^j(x) \in \Omega_{\tau_j(x)}\} < \kappa n\} \subset \Lambda_+. \end{aligned}$$

We first derive Eq. (67), which is a useful relationship between these sets. For all  $x \in \Lambda_+ - B_{n,\kappa}$ , we have  $\sigma^j(x) = T^{\tau_j(x)m}(x) \in \tilde{\Omega}$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq \lceil \kappa n \rceil$  but  $\tau_{\lceil \kappa n \rceil}(x) \leq n$ . Consequently, for all  $x \in A_{n,\kappa\kappa'} - B_{n,\kappa}$ , we have

$$\#\{j \in \mathbb{N} : j \leq \lceil \kappa n \rceil, \sigma^j(x) \in \Omega_{\tau_j(x)}\} \leq \#\{j \in \mathbb{N} : j \leq n, T^{jm}(x) \in \Omega_j\} < \kappa\kappa'n.$$

Thus, we obtain

$$A_{n,\kappa\kappa'} - B_{n,\kappa} \subset C_{\lceil \kappa n \rceil, \kappa'}. \quad (67)$$

Now, Property (3) in Theorem 8.2 amounts to obtaining appropriate control of  $\nu(A_{n,\kappa\kappa'})$ . Since we can already control  $\nu(B_{n,\kappa})$  by Proposition 7.3, it suffices to gain control of  $\nu(C_{\lceil \kappa n \rceil, \kappa'})$ . This is the content of the following lemma.

**Lemma 8.21.** *There exists  $\kappa \in (0, 1)$  such that  $\nu(C_{n,\kappa}) < e^{-\kappa n}$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .*

*Proof.* Fix  $\kappa = \frac{\mathfrak{c}}{C_{\text{cyl}}^2}$ . Define the set  $\Upsilon_k = \{x \in \Delta_0 : \sigma^k(x) \in \Omega_{\tau_k(x)}\}$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and the partition  $\mathcal{Q}_k = \sigma^{-k}(\mathcal{P})$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ . We first argue that  $\Upsilon_k$  is  $\mathcal{Q}_{k+1}$ -measurable for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . For any atom  $\mathcal{Q}_k(x)$ , for some  $x \in \Delta_0$ , there exists an inverse branch  $\gamma \in \mathcal{H}^{\tau_k(x)}$  and  $x' \in \Delta_0$  such that  $\mathcal{Q}_k(x) = \gamma\mathcal{Q}_0(x')$ . Note that  $\tau_k$  is constant on  $\mathcal{Q}_k(x)$ . Thus, we have  $\Upsilon_k \cap \mathcal{Q}_k(x) = \gamma(\Omega_{\tau_k(x)} \cap \mathcal{Q}_0(x'))$  where  $\Omega_{\tau_k(x)} \cap \mathcal{Q}_0(x')$  is  $\mathcal{P}'$ -measurable as desired. Since  $\Omega_{\tau_k(x)}$  is  $(\mathcal{Q}_0, \mathfrak{c})$ -dense, using Lemma 3.5, we estimate the expected value

$$\mathbb{E}(\chi_{\Upsilon_k} | \mathcal{Q}_k)(x) = \frac{\nu(\Upsilon_k \cap \mathcal{Q}_k(x))}{\nu(\mathcal{Q}_k(x))} \geq \frac{\nu(\Omega_{\tau_k(x)} \cap \mathcal{Q}_0(x'))}{C_{\text{cyl}}^2 \nu(\mathcal{Q}_0(x'))} > \frac{\mathfrak{c}}{C_{\text{cyl}}^2} = \kappa.$$

Thus our stochastic process is dominated by an i.i.d. coin flipping process (which is a Markov chain) with rate  $\kappa$  which is known to satisfy LDP again by transfer operator techniques (see [DZ10, Section 3.1]).  $\blacksquare$

Fix  $\tilde{\kappa}'$  to be the  $\kappa$  provided by Lemma 8.21. Fix  $\kappa = \tilde{\kappa}\tilde{\kappa}'$  for Theorem 8.2. Then, using Eq. (67) and LDP in Proposition 7.3 and Lemma 8.21, we have

$$\nu(A_{n,\kappa}) = \nu(A_{n,\tilde{\kappa}\tilde{\kappa}'}) \leq \nu(B_{n,\tilde{\kappa}}) + \nu(C_{\lceil \tilde{\kappa}n \rceil, \tilde{\kappa}'} < e^{-\tilde{\kappa}n} + e^{-\tilde{\kappa}'n} \leq 2e^{-\kappa n}$$

which completes the proof of Property (3) in Theorem 8.2.

## 9. EXPONENTIAL MIXING OF THE FRAME FLOW

With Corollary 3.10 available, we use a convolution argument using a bump function as in the proofs of [LP22, Theorem 3.1] and [Sar22b, Theorem 3.1.4] to obtain Theorem 1.1 from the exponential mixing of the semiflow  $\{\hat{T}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  on  $\Lambda^{\mathcal{R}} \times M$  with respect to the measure  $\hat{\nu}^{\mathcal{R}} \otimes m^{\text{Haar}}$ . By integrating out the strong stable direction as in [AGY06, Section 8.2] or [SW21, Section 10.3], it suffices to prove exponential mixing for the semiflow  $\{T_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  on  $\Lambda_+^{\mathcal{R}} \times M$ . More precisely, we first define the space

$$\Lambda_+^{\mathcal{R}} \times M = \{(x, m, s) \in \Lambda_+ \times M \times \mathbb{R} : 0 \leq s < \mathcal{R}(x)\}.$$

Since the holonomy map  $\mathcal{H} : \Delta_{\square} \times \Lambda_- \rightarrow M$  is independent of the contracting direction by Lemma 3.8, we can regard  $\mathcal{H}$  as a map on  $\Delta_{\square}$ . Define the semiflow  $\{T_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  by

$$T_t(x, m, s) = (T^n x, \mathcal{H}^n(x)m, s + t - \mathcal{R}_n(x))$$

for all  $(x, m, s) \in \Lambda_+^{\mathcal{R}} \times M$ , where  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  such that  $0 \leq s + t - \mathcal{R}_n(x) < \mathcal{R}(T^n x)$ . Recall that we equipped  $\Lambda^{\mathcal{R}} \times M$  with the measure  $d(\hat{\nu}^{\mathcal{R}} \otimes m^{\text{Haar}}) := d\hat{\nu} dm dm^{\text{Leb}}/\bar{\mathcal{R}}$ , where  $m^{\text{Leb}}$  is the Lebesgue measure and  $\bar{\mathcal{R}} = \hat{\nu}(\mathcal{R})$ . Similarly, on  $\Lambda_+^{\mathcal{R}} \times M$ , we consider the measure  $\nu^{\mathcal{R}} \otimes m^{\text{Haar}}$  defined by  $d(\nu^{\mathcal{R}} \otimes m^{\text{Haar}}) := d\nu dm dm^{\text{Leb}}/\bar{\mathcal{R}}$ . Compared to the symbolic frame flow model  $(\Lambda^{\mathcal{R}}, \{\hat{T}_t\}_{t \geq 0}, \hat{\nu}^{\mathcal{R}})$ , the dynamical system  $(\Lambda_+^{\mathcal{R}}, \{T_t\}_{t \geq 0}, \nu^{\mathcal{R}})$  is to forget the contracting direction.

We introduce some norms. Denote by  $\nabla_M$  the Levi-Civita connection on  $M$ . For a function  $\phi : \Lambda_+^{\mathcal{R}} \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  differentiable in the  $\mathbb{R}$  and  $M$  coordinates, we define the norms

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi\|_{C_M^r} &= \sup\{\|\nabla_M^k \phi\|_{\infty} : 0 \leq k \leq r\}, \\ \|\phi\|_{C_M^r C_{\mathbb{R}}^1} &= \sup\{\|\nabla_M^k \partial_t \phi\|_{\infty} + \|\nabla_M^k \phi\|_{\infty} : 0 \leq k \leq r\}. \end{aligned}$$

For any function  $\psi : \Lambda_+^{\mathcal{R}} \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we define the Lipschitz norm

$$\|\psi\|_{\text{Lip}} = \|\psi\|_{\infty} + \sup\left\{\frac{|\psi(x, m, t) - \psi(x', m', t')|}{d_E(x, x') + d_M(m, m') + |t - t'|} : (x, m, t) \neq (x', m', t')\right\}.$$

**Theorem 9.1.** *There exist  $C > 0$ ,  $\eta > 0$ , and  $r \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for all functions  $\phi, \psi : \Lambda_+^{\mathcal{R}} \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with bounded  $C_M^r C_{\mathbb{R}}^1$  norm and bounded Lipschitz norm respectively, and  $t > 0$ , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\Lambda_+^{\mathcal{R}} \times M} (\phi \circ T_t) \cdot \psi d(\nu^{\mathcal{R}} \otimes m^{\text{Haar}}) - (\nu^{\mathcal{R}} \otimes m^{\text{Haar}})(\phi) \cdot (\nu^{\mathcal{R}} \otimes m^{\text{Haar}})(\psi) \right| \\ \leq C e^{-\eta t} \|\phi\|_{C_M^r C_{\mathbb{R}}^1} \|\psi\|_{\text{Lip}}. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is similar to [SW21, Lemma 10.3], and the main difference is that we utilize an infinite symbolic coding with an unbounded return time map and the function is only Lipschitz in the direction  $\Lambda_+$ . We write only the required modifications in detail.

Let  $\phi \in C(\Lambda_+^{\mathcal{R}} \times M, \mathbb{R})$  and  $\xi \in \mathbb{C}$ . Define  $\hat{\phi}_{\xi} \in B(\Lambda_+, L^2(M, \mathbb{C}))$  by

$$\hat{\phi}_{\xi}(x)(m) = \int_0^{\mathcal{R}(x)} \phi(x, m, t) e^{-\xi t} dm^{\text{Leb}}(t) \quad \text{for all } m \in M \text{ and } x \in \Lambda_+.$$

We can decompose it further as  $\hat{\phi}_\xi(x) = \sum_{\rho \in \widehat{M}} \hat{\phi}_{\xi, \rho}(x) \in \widehat{\bigoplus}_{\rho \in \widehat{M}} V_\rho^{\oplus \dim(\rho)}$  for all  $x \in \Lambda_+$ . Let  $\rho \in \widehat{M}$ . Defining  $\phi_\rho \in C(\Lambda_+^{\mathcal{R}} \times M, \mathbb{R})$  by the projection  $\phi_\rho(x, \cdot, t) = [\phi(x, \cdot, t)]_\rho \in V_\rho^{\oplus \dim(\rho)}$  for all  $x \in \Lambda_+$  and  $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ , we have

$$\hat{\phi}_{\xi, \rho}(x)(m) = \int_0^{\mathcal{R}(x)} \phi_\rho(x, m, t) e^{-\xi t} dm^{\text{Leb}}(t) \quad \text{for all } m \in M \text{ and } x \in \Lambda_+.$$

The following lemma serves as [SW21, Lemma 10.2] in our setting.

**Lemma 9.2.** *There exist  $C > 0$  and  $a_0 > 0$  such that for all  $\rho \in \widehat{M}$ , functions  $\phi, \psi : \Lambda_+^{\mathcal{R}} \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with bounded  $C_M^r C_{\mathbb{R}}^1$  norm and bounded Lipschitz norm respectively, and  $\xi = a + ib \in \mathbb{C}$  with  $|a| \leq a_0$ , we have*

$$\left( \int_{\Lambda_+} \|\hat{\phi}_\xi(x)\|_{C_M^r}^2 d\nu(x) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C \frac{\|\phi\|_{C_M^r C_{\mathbb{R}}^1}}{\max\{1, |b|\}},$$

$$\|\mathcal{M}_{\xi, \rho}(\hat{\psi}_{-\xi, \rho})\|_{1, \|\rho_b\|} \leq C \frac{\|\psi\|_{\text{Lip}}}{\max\{1, |b|\}}.$$

*Proof.* Recall the constants  $C_2 > 0$  from Eq. (16) and  $A_0 > 0$  from Lemma 8.3. Fix  $C_5 = \frac{9 \max\{1, C_2\}}{a_0^2} \int_{\Lambda_+} e^{(\epsilon_0/2)\mathcal{R}(x)} d\nu(x) < \infty$  and  $C = 2C_5(1 + A_0)$ . Let  $a_0 = \epsilon_0/8$ .

We show the first inequality. If  $|b| \leq 1$ , from the definition of  $\hat{\phi}_\xi(x)$  we have

$$\int_{\Lambda_+} \|\hat{\phi}_\xi(x)\|_{C_M^r}^2 d\nu(x) \leq \int_{\Lambda_+} e^{a_0 \mathcal{R}(x)} \|\phi(x)\|_{C_M^r}^2 d\nu(x) \leq C_5 \|\phi\|_{C_M^r C_{\mathbb{R}}^1}^2.$$

If  $|b| \geq 1$ , integrating by parts gives

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_M^k \hat{\phi}_\xi(x) &= \int_0^{\mathcal{R}(x)} \nabla_M^k \phi(x, \cdot, t) e^{-\xi t} dm^{\text{Leb}}(t) \\ &= \left[ -\frac{1}{\xi} \nabla_M^k \phi(x, \cdot, t) e^{-\xi t} \right]_{t=0}^{t=\mathcal{R}(x)} + \frac{1}{\xi} \int_0^{\mathcal{R}(x)} \frac{d}{dt'} \Big|_{t'=t} \nabla_M^k \phi(x, \cdot, t') \cdot e^{-\xi t} dm^{\text{Leb}}(t) \end{aligned}$$

for all  $x \in \Lambda_+$  and  $0 \leq k \leq r$ . Hence using the exponential tail property (see Property (5) in Proposition 3.1),

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\Lambda_+} \|\hat{\phi}_\xi(x)\|_{C_M^r}^2 d\nu(x) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{|b|^2} \int_{\Lambda_+} \left( 2\|\phi(x)\|_{C_M^r} e^{a_0 \mathcal{R}(x)} + \|\phi(x)\|_{C_M^r C_{\mathbb{R}}^1} e^{a_0 \mathcal{R}(x)} \right)^2 d\nu(x) \\ &\leq C_5 \frac{\|\phi\|_{C_M^r C_{\mathbb{R}}^1}^2}{|b|^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we show the second inequality.

$$\mathcal{M}_{\xi, \rho}(\hat{\psi}_{-\xi, \rho})(x) = \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}} e^{\mathcal{F}^{(a)}(\gamma x)} \rho_b(\mathcal{G}(\gamma x)^{-1}) \hat{\psi}_{-\xi, \rho}(\gamma x)$$

for all  $x \in \Lambda_+$ . We first bound the  $L^\infty$  norm. Using similar estimates as for the first proven inequality, we have

$$\|\hat{\psi}_{-\xi, \rho}(x)\|_2 \leq \|\hat{\psi}_{-\xi}(x)\|_2 \leq \|\hat{\psi}_{-\xi}(x)\|_\infty \leq \frac{\max\{1, \mathcal{R}(x)\} e^{a_0 \mathcal{R}(x)} \|\psi\|_{\text{Lip}}}{\max\{1, |b|\}}. \quad (68)$$

So, as  $\rho_b$  is a unitary representation, we have

$$\|\mathcal{M}_{\xi,\rho}(\hat{\psi}_{-\xi,\rho})\|_\infty \leq \frac{\|\psi\|_{\text{Lip}}}{\max\{1, |b|\}} \mathcal{L}_a(e^{2a_0\mathcal{R}}) \leq \frac{\|\psi\|_{\text{Lip}}}{\max\{1, |b|\}} \mathcal{L}_{a-2a_0}(\chi_{\Lambda_+}).$$

Again by the exponential tail property,

$$\|\mathcal{M}_{\xi,\rho}(\hat{\psi}_{-\xi,\rho})\|_\infty \leq C_5 \frac{\|\psi\|_{\text{Lip}}}{\max\{1, |b|\}}.$$

Next, we deal with the Lipschitz norm. By the same computation as in the proof of Property (2) in Lemma 8.3 for  $H = \hat{\psi}_{-\xi,\rho}$ , we obtain Eq. (44) and we show how to estimate the three terms in the last but two equation. Similar to the previous estimate, in the first two terms, we can use Eq. (68) to estimate  $\|H(\gamma x)\|_2$  and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}} \left( \frac{A_0}{2} \delta_{1,\varrho} d_E(x, x') e^{\mathcal{F}^{(a)}(\gamma x)} \|H(\gamma x)\|_2 + 2C_2 e^{\mathcal{F}^{(a)}(\gamma x')} \|\rho_b\| d_E(x, x') \|H(\gamma x)\|_2 \right) \\ & \leq A_0 \cdot \frac{1 + \|\rho_b\|}{\max\{1, |b|\}} \cdot \|\psi\|_{\text{Lip}} \cdot d_E(x, x') \mathcal{L}_{a-2a_0}(\chi_{\Lambda_+}) \\ & \leq C_5 A_0 \cdot \frac{1 + \|\rho_b\|}{\max\{1, |b|\}} \cdot \|\psi\|_{\text{Lip}} \cdot d_E(x, x'). \end{aligned}$$

For the last term, we first need to estimate  $\|H(\gamma x) - H(\gamma x')\|_2$ . Without loss of generality, we may assume  $\mathcal{R}(\gamma x) \leq \mathcal{R}(\gamma x')$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|H(\gamma x) - H(\gamma x')\|_2 &= \left\| \hat{\psi}_{-\xi,\rho}(\gamma x) - \hat{\psi}_{-\xi,\rho}(\gamma x') \right\|_2 \\ &\leq |\mathcal{R}(\gamma x) - \mathcal{R}(\gamma x')| \cdot \|\psi_\rho\|_2 e^{a_0 \mathcal{R}(\gamma x)} \\ &\quad + \int_0^{\mathcal{R}(\gamma x)} \|\psi_\rho(\gamma x, t) - \psi_\rho(\gamma x', t)\|_2 e^{a_0 t} dm^{\text{Leb}}(t) \\ &\leq (C_2 e^{a_0 \mathcal{R}(\gamma x')} + \mathcal{R}(\gamma x) e^{a_0 \mathcal{R}(\gamma x)}) \|\psi\|_{\text{Lip}} d_E(x, x'), \end{aligned}$$

by an estimate as in Eq. (41). Thus, by a similar calculation as above, we have

$$\sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}} e^{\mathcal{F}^{(a)}(\gamma x)} \|H(\gamma x) - H(\gamma x')\|_2 \leq C_5 \|\psi\|_{\text{Lip}} d_E(x, x')$$

Summing all the terms, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{\max\{1, \|\rho_b\|\}} \text{Lip} \left( \mathcal{M}_{\xi,\rho} \left( \hat{\psi}_{-\xi,\rho} \right) \right) \leq C_5 (1 + 2A_0) \frac{\|\psi\|_{\text{Lip}}}{\max\{1, |b|\}}.$$

The proof is completed by using the definition of  $\|\cdot\|_{1, \|\rho_b\|}$  and Lemma 4.1.  $\blacksquare$

We can prove an analog of [SW21, Lemma 10.3] by replacing  $\sup_{u \in U} \|\hat{\phi}_\xi(u)\|_{C_M^r}$  with  $\left( \int_{\Lambda_+} \|\hat{\phi}_\xi(x)\|_{C_M^r}^2 d\nu(x) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$  and following the same argument. This gives exponential mixing of the semiflow, i.e., Theorem 9.1.



## APPENDIX A. ANALYTICITY OF THE COMPLEX TRANSFER OPERATOR

Recall that for  $s \in \mathbb{C}$ , we introduced the complex transfer operator  $L_s := \mathcal{L}_{(\delta+s)\Re} : \text{Lip}(\Lambda_+, \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \text{Lip}(\Lambda_+, \mathbb{C})$  defined by, for  $u \in \text{Lip}(\Lambda_+, \mathbb{C})$  and  $x \in \Lambda_+$ ,

$$L_s(u)(x) = \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}} e^{-(\delta+s)\Re(\gamma x)} u(\gamma x).$$

An operator-valued map on a subset of  $\mathbb{C}$  is said to be analytic (or holomorphic) if it is Fréchet differentiable. In this appendix, we prove Lemma A.1. The proof is similar to [BQ16, Lemma 11.17], and we include it for completeness of the paper.

**Lemma A.1.** *For any  $s \in \mathbb{C}$  with  $\Re s > -\frac{\epsilon_0}{2}$ , the complex transfer operator  $L_s$  depends analytically on  $s$ .*

Note that Property (4) in Proposition 3.1 states that there exists  $C_1 > 0$  such that for any  $\gamma \in \mathcal{H}$  and for any  $x \in \Delta_0$ ,  $\|(d(\log \|d\gamma\|))_x\| < C_1$ . Note that  $\Re(\gamma x) = -\log \|(d\gamma)_x\|$ . As a result, there exists  $C_6 > 1$  such that for any  $\gamma \in \mathcal{H}$  and any  $x \in \Delta_0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{C_6} \|\Re \circ \gamma\|_\infty &\leq \Re(\gamma x) \leq C_6 \|\Re \circ \gamma\|_\infty, \\ \|\Re \circ \gamma\|_\infty - C_6 &\leq \Re(\gamma x) \leq \|\Re \circ \gamma\|_\infty + C_6. \end{aligned}$$

Also Property (5) in Proposition 3.1 states that there exists  $\epsilon_0 \in (0, 1)$  such that  $\int_{\Lambda_+} e^{\epsilon_0 \Re} < \infty$ . Using the quasi-invariant property of  $\mu$ , we have

$$\sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}} e^{-(\delta-\epsilon_0)\|\Re \circ \gamma\|_\infty} < \infty. \quad (69)$$

*Proof of Lemma A.1.* We fix  $s \in \mathbb{C}$  with  $\Re s > -\frac{\epsilon_0}{2}$ . Pick any  $\theta \in \mathbb{C}$  with  $C_6|\theta| < \frac{\epsilon_0}{2}$ .

For  $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ , we introduce the operator  $L_{s,\theta,m} : \text{Lip}(\Lambda_+, \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \text{Lip}(\Lambda_+, \mathbb{C})$  given by, for  $u \in \text{Lip}(\Lambda_+, \mathbb{C})$  and  $x \in \Lambda_+$ ,

$$L_{s,\theta,m}(u)(x) = \theta^m \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}} (-\Re(\gamma x))^m e^{-(\delta+s)\Re(\gamma x)} u(\gamma x).$$

Note that for  $m = 0$ , this operator is equal to  $L_s$ . Since for any  $\gamma \in \mathcal{H}$  and  $x \in \Lambda_+$ ,

$$e^{-(\delta+s+\theta)\Re(\gamma x)} = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m!} (-\theta \Re(\gamma x))^m e^{-(\delta+s)\Re(\gamma x)}, \quad (70)$$

to get the analyticity of  $L$  in a neighborhood of  $s$ , it suffices to check that for all  $u \in \text{Lip}(\Lambda_+, \mathbb{C})$ , we have

- (1)  $\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m!} L_{s,\theta,m}(u)(x)$  converges pointwise to  $L_{s+\theta}(u)(x)$  for any  $x \in \Lambda_+$ ;
- (2) the absolute convergence of the series

$$\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m!} \|L_{s,\theta,m}(u)\|_{\text{Lip}} \leq M \|u\|_{\text{Lip}}, \quad (71)$$

for some constant  $M$  independent of  $u$  and  $\theta$ .

We start with the claim: for any  $x \in \Lambda_+$ , the sum

$$\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}} \frac{1}{m!} |\theta|^m \Re(\gamma x)^m e^{-(\delta-\frac{\epsilon_0}{2})\Re(\gamma x)} \quad (72)$$

converges to  $\sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}} e^{-(\delta - \frac{\epsilon_0}{2} - |\theta|)\mathcal{R}(\gamma x)}$ .

We prove the claim. For any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we can switch the order of summation:

$$\sum_{m=0}^n \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}} \frac{1}{m!} |\theta|^m \mathcal{R}(\gamma x)^m e^{-(\delta - \frac{\epsilon_0}{2})\mathcal{R}(\gamma x)} = \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}} \sum_{m=0}^n \frac{1}{m!} |\theta|^m \mathcal{R}(\gamma x)^m e^{-(\delta - \frac{\epsilon_0}{2})\mathcal{R}(\gamma x)},$$

where the convergence of the series on the left can be deduced from Eqs. (69) and (70) and the assumption that  $C_6|\theta| < \frac{\epsilon_0}{2}$ . We estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}} \sum_{m=0}^n \frac{1}{m!} |\theta|^m \mathcal{R}(\gamma x)^m e^{-(\delta - \frac{\epsilon_0}{2})\mathcal{R}(\gamma x)} - \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}} e^{-(\delta - \frac{\epsilon_0}{2} - |\theta|)\mathcal{R}(\gamma x)} \right| \\ &= \left| \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}} \left( \sum_{m=0}^n \frac{1}{m!} |\theta|^m \mathcal{R}(\gamma x)^m - e^{|\theta|\mathcal{R}(\gamma x)} \right) e^{-(\delta - \frac{\epsilon_0}{2})\mathcal{R}(\gamma x)} \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (73)$$

Fix any  $\epsilon > 0$ . It follows from the exponential tail property (see Property (5) in Proposition 3.1) that there exists  $M > 1$  such that

$$\sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{R}(\gamma x) > M} e^{-(\delta - \frac{\epsilon_0}{2} - |\theta|)\mathcal{R}(\gamma x)} < \epsilon. \quad (74)$$

At the same time, note that for all sufficiently large  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have the uniform convergence

$$\left| \sum_{m=0}^n \frac{1}{m!} z^m - e^z \right| < \epsilon \quad (75)$$

for any  $z \in \mathbb{C}$  with  $|z| < M$ . Now we can see that

$$(73) \ll \epsilon$$

by dividing the sum  $\sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}}$  into  $\sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{R}(\gamma x) \leq M}$  and  $\sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{R}(\gamma x) > M}$  and applying Eqs. (74) and (75). This finishes the proof of the claim.

Coming back to statement (1), it can be shown as in the convergence of (72). Next, we show the absolute convergence in Eq. (71). We bound the sup norm: for any  $x \in \Lambda_+$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m!} L_{s,\theta,m}(u)(x) \right| &\leq \|u\|_{\infty} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m!} \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}} |\theta|^m \mathcal{R}(\gamma x)^m e^{-(\delta - \frac{\epsilon_0}{2})\mathcal{R}(\gamma x)} \\ &\ll \|u\|_{\infty} \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}} e^{-(\delta - \epsilon_0)\|\mathcal{R} \circ \gamma\|_{\infty}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $|\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m!} L_{s,\theta,m}(u)|_{\infty}$  is bounded by a uniform multiple of  $\|u\|_{\infty}$ . It remains to bound the Lipschitz seminorm. For any  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and any  $x, y \in \Lambda_+$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{L_{s,\theta,m}(u)(x) - L_{s,\theta,m}(u)(y)}{d_{\mathbb{E}}(x,y)} &= A_m + B_m + C_m, \text{ where} \\ A_m &= \theta^m \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}} \frac{(-\mathcal{R}(\gamma x))^m - (-\mathcal{R}(\gamma y))^m}{d_{\mathbb{E}}(x,y)} e^{-(\delta+s)\mathcal{R}(\gamma x)} u(\gamma x), \\ B_m &= \theta^m \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}} (-\mathcal{R}(\gamma y))^m \frac{e^{-(\delta+s)\mathcal{R}(\gamma x)} - e^{-(\delta+s)\mathcal{R}(\gamma y)}}{d_{\mathbb{E}}(x,y)} u(\gamma x), \\ C_m &= \theta^m \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}} (-\mathcal{R}(\gamma y))^m e^{-(\delta+s)\mathcal{R}(\gamma y)} \frac{u(\gamma x) - u(\gamma y)}{d_{\mathbb{E}}(x,y)}. \end{aligned}$$

Since for any  $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$ ,

$$|a^m - b^m| \leq m \max\{|a|, |b|\}^{m-1} |a - b|,$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned} |A_m| &\ll \|u\|_{\infty} |\theta|^m \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}} m (C_6 \|\mathcal{R} \circ \gamma\|_{\infty})^{m-1} \frac{|\mathcal{R}(\gamma x) - \mathcal{R}(\gamma y)|}{d_{\mathbb{E}}(x,y)} e^{-(\delta+\Re s)\|\mathcal{R} \circ \gamma\|_{\infty}} \\ &\ll \|u\|_{\infty} \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}} m |\theta|^m (C_6 \|\mathcal{R} \circ \gamma\|_{\infty})^{m-1} e^{-(\delta+\Re s)\|\mathcal{R} \circ \gamma\|_{\infty}}. \end{aligned}$$

To continue, we use the power series definition of the exponential function in the form of  $e^z = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{z^m}{m!}$  for any  $z \in \mathbb{C}$ . We get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m!} |A_m| &\ll \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}} \frac{m}{m!} |\theta|^m (C_6 \|\mathcal{R} \circ \gamma\|_{\infty})^{m-1} e^{-(\delta+\Re s)\|\mathcal{R} \circ \gamma\|_{\infty}} \|u\|_{\infty} \\ &\ll \|u\|_{\infty} \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}} e^{-(\delta+\Re s - C_6|\theta|)\|\mathcal{R} \circ \gamma\|_{\infty}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the equality is proved as in the convergence of (72). So, we have shown that the sum  $\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m!} A_m$  is bounded by a uniform multiple of  $\|u\|_{\infty}$ .

For  $B_m$ , we use the following inequality: for any  $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$ ,

$$|e^a - e^b| \leq \max\{e^{\Re a}, e^{\Re b}\} |a - b|.$$

We get

$$\begin{aligned} |B_m| &\ll |\theta|^m \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}} (\mathcal{R}(\gamma y))^m e^{-(\delta+\Re s)\|\mathcal{R} \circ \gamma\|_{\infty}} \frac{|(\delta+s)\mathcal{R}(\gamma x) - (\delta+s)\mathcal{R}(\gamma y)|}{d_{\mathbb{E}}(x,y)} \|u\|_{\infty} \\ &\ll \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}} |\theta|^m (C_6 \|\mathcal{R} \circ \gamma\|_{\infty})^m e^{-(\delta+\Re s)\|\mathcal{R} \circ \gamma\|_{\infty}} \|u\|_{\infty}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m!} |B_m| \ll \|u\|_{\infty} \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}} e^{-(\delta+\Re s - C_6|\theta|)\|\mathcal{R} \circ \gamma\|_{\infty}},$$

which bounds the sum on the left by a uniform multiple of  $\|u\|_{\infty}$ .

Finally, since each  $\gamma \in \mathcal{H}$  acts on  $\Lambda_+$  by contraction, we have

$$\frac{u(\gamma x) - u(\gamma y)}{d_{\mathbb{E}}(x, y)} = \frac{u(\gamma x) - u(\gamma y)}{d_{\mathbb{E}}(\gamma x, \gamma y)} \cdot \frac{d_{\mathbb{E}}(\gamma x, \gamma y)}{d_{\mathbb{E}}(x, y)} \leq \text{Lip}(u).$$

Hence,

$$|C_m| \ll |\theta|^m \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}} |C_6 \|\mathcal{R} \circ \gamma\|_{\infty}|^m e^{-(\delta + \Re s) \|\mathcal{R} \circ \gamma\|_{\infty}} \text{Lip}(u),$$

which implies

$$\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m!} |C_m| \leq \text{Lip}(u) \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{H}} e^{-(\delta + \Re s - C_6 |\theta|) \|\mathcal{R} \circ \gamma\|_{\infty}},$$

again bounding the sum on the left by a uniform multiple of  $\text{Lip}(u)$ .  $\blacksquare$

## REFERENCES

- [AM16] Vitor Araújo and Ian Melbourne. Exponential decay of correlations for nonuniformly hyperbolic flows with a  $C^{1+\alpha}$  stable foliation, including the classical Lorenz attractor. *Ann. Henri Poincaré*, 17(11):2975–3004, 2016. [5](#)
- [AG13] Artur Avila and Sébastien Gouëzel. Small eigenvalues of the Laplacian for algebraic measures in moduli space, and mixing properties of the Teichmüller flow. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 178(2):385–442, 2013. [4](#)
- [AGY06] Artur Avila, Sébastien Gouëzel, and Jean-Christophe Yoccoz. Exponential mixing for the Teichmüller flow. *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci.*, (104):143–211, 2006. [4](#), [5](#), [35](#), [36](#), [54](#)
- [Bab02] Martine Babillot. On the mixing property for hyperbolic systems. *Israel J. Math.*, 129:61–76, 2002. [2](#)
- [BV05] Viviane Baladi and Brigitte Vallée. Exponential decay of correlations for surface semi-flows without finite Markov partitions. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 133(3):865–874, 2005. [5](#)
- [BQ16] Yves Benoist and Jean-François Quint. *Random walks on reductive groups*, volume 62 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas. 3rd Series. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics]*. Springer, Cham, 2016. [57](#)
- [Bow93] B. H. Bowditch. Geometrical finiteness for hyperbolic groups. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 113(2):245–317, 1993. [8](#)
- [Bri82] M. Brin. Ergodic theory of frame flows. In *Ergodic theory and dynamical systems, II (College Park, Md., 1979/1980)*, volume 21 of *Progr. Math.*, pages 163–183. Birkhäuser, Boston, Mass., 1982. [19](#)
- [BG80] M. Brin and M. Gromov. On the ergodicity of frame flows. *Invent. Math.*, 60(1):1–7, 1980. [3](#)
- [BP74] M. I. Brin and Ja. B. Pesin. Partially hyperbolic dynamical systems. *Math. USSR Izv.*, 8:177–218, 1974. [2](#), [19](#)
- [BMMW17] Keith Burns, Howard Masur, Carlos Matheus, and Amie Wilkinson. Rates of mixing for the Weil-Petersson geodesic flow: exponential mixing in exceptional moduli spaces. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 27(2):240–288, 2017.
- [CLMS21] Mihajlo Cekić, Thibault Lefeuvre, Andrei Moroianu, and Uwe Semmelmann. On the ergodicity of the frame flow on even-dimensional manifolds. *arXiv.org*, November 2021. [3](#)
- [Che98] N. I. Chernov. Markov approximations and decay of correlations for Anosov flows. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 147(2):269–324, 1998. [5](#)
- [CS22] Michael Chow and Pratyush Sarkar. Exponential mixing of frame flows for convex cocompact locally symmetric spaces. *arXiv:2211.14737*, 2022. Preprint. [2](#), [4](#)
- [DFSU21] Tushar Das, Lior Fishman, David Simmons, and Mariusz Urbański. Extremality and dynamically defined measures, part II: measures from conformal dynamical systems. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 41(8):2311–2348, 2021. [3](#), [5](#), [23](#)

- [DZ10] Amir Dembo and Ofer Zeitouni. *Large deviations techniques and applications*, volume 38 of *Stochastic Modelling and Applied Probability*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2010. Corrected reprint of the second (1998) edition. [25](#), [53](#)
- [Dol98] Dmitry Dolgopyat. On decay of correlations in Anosov flows. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 147(2):357–390, 1998. [2](#), [5](#), [38](#), [47](#), [48](#), [49](#)
- [Dol02] Dmitry Dolgopyat. On mixing properties of compact group extensions of hyperbolic systems. *Israel J. Math.*, 130:157–205, 2002. [3](#), [5](#)
- [EO21] Sam Edwards and Hee Oh. Spectral gap and exponential mixing on geometrically finite hyperbolic manifolds. *Duke Math. J.*, 170(15):3417–3458, 2021. [2](#)
- [Edw22] Samuel C. Edwards. Effective equidistribution of the horocycle flow on geometrically finite hyperbolic surfaces. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (6):4040–4092, 2022. [4](#)
- [Fel71] William Feller. *An introduction to probability theory and its applications. Vol. II*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York-London-Sydney, second edition, 1971. [34](#)
- [FS90] L. Flaminio and R. J. Spatzier. Geometrically finite groups, Patterson-Sullivan measures and Ratner’s rigidity theorem. *Invent. Math.*, 99(3):601–626, 1990. [2](#)
- [FHP91] R. Froese, P. Hislop, and P. Perry. A Mourre estimate and related bounds for hyperbolic manifolds with cusps of nonmaximal rank. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 98(2):292–310, 1991. [5](#)
- [Gui06] Colin Guillarmou. Resonances on some geometrically finite hyperbolic manifolds. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 31(1-3):445–467, 2006. [5](#)
- [GK21] Colin Guillarmou and Benjamin Küster. Spectral theory of the frame flow on hyperbolic 3-manifolds. *Ann. Henri Poincaré*, 22(11):3565–3617, 2021. [3](#)
- [GM12] Colin Guillarmou and Rafe Mazzeo. Resolvent of the Laplacian on geometrically finite hyperbolic manifolds. *Invent. Math.*, 187(1):99–144, 2012. [5](#)
- [KL19] Michael Kapovich and Beibei Liu. Geometric finiteness in negatively pinched Hadamard manifolds. *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math.*, 44(2):841–875, 2019. [8](#)
- [Kat95] Tosio Kato. *Perturbation theory for linear operators*. Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1995. Reprint of the 1980 edition. [18](#), [35](#)
- [Kha21] Osama Khalil. Mixing, resonances, and spectral gaps on geometrically finite locally symmetric spaces. 2021. Preprint, <https://www.math.utah.edu/khalil/publications/mixing.pdf>. [2](#)
- [Lal89] Steven P. Lalley. Renewal theorems in symbolic dynamics, with applications to geodesic flows, non-Euclidean tessellations and their fractal limits. *Acta Math.*, 163(1-2):1–55, 1989. [35](#), [36](#)
- [LP03] F. Ledrappier and M. Pollicott. Ergodic properties of linear actions of  $(2 \times 2)$ -matrices. *Duke Math. J.*, 116(2):353–388, 2003.
- [Li22] Jialun Li. Fourier decay, renewal theorem and spectral gaps for random walks on split semisimple Lie groups. *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4)*, 55(6):1613–1686, 2022. [6](#), [36](#)
- [LP22] Jialun Li and Wenyu Pan. Exponential mixing of geodesic flows for geometrically finite hyperbolic manifolds with cusps. *Invent. Math.*, page 1–91, 2022. Advance online publication. [2](#), [4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [10](#), [11](#), [15](#), [18](#), [19](#), [34](#), [36](#), [54](#)
- [Lub10] Alexander Lubotzky. *Discrete groups, expanding graphs and invariant measures*. Modern Birkhäuser Classics. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2010. With an appendix by Jonathan D. Rogawski, Reprint of the 1994 edition. [17](#)
- [MMO14] Gregory Margulis, Amir Mohammadi, and Hee Oh. Closed geodesics and holonomies for Kleinian manifolds. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 24(5):1608–1636, 2014. [3](#)
- [MO15] Amir Mohammadi and Hee Oh. Matrix coefficients, counting and primes for orbits of geometrically finite groups. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 17(4):837–897, 2015. [2](#)
- [Moo87] Calvin C. Moore. Exponential decay of correlation coefficients for geodesic flows. In *Group representations, ergodic theory, operator algebras, and mathematical physics (Berkeley, Calif., 1984)*, volume 6 of *Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ.*, pages 163–181. Springer, New York, 1987. [2](#)
- [Nau05] F. Naud. Expanding maps on Cantor sets and analytic continuation of zeta functions. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)*, 38(1):116–153, 2005. [36](#)
- [OS13] Hee Oh and Nimish A. Shah. Equidistribution and counting for orbits of geometrically finite hyperbolic groups. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 26(2):511–562, 2013. [3](#)

- [OW16] Hee Oh and Dale Winter. Uniform exponential mixing and resonance free regions for convex cocompact congruence subgroups of  $SL_2(\mathbb{Z})$ . *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 29(4):1069–1115, 2016. [3](#), [4](#)
- [PP90] William Parry and Mark Pollicott. Zeta functions and the periodic orbit structure of hyperbolic dynamics. *Astérisque*, (187-188):268, 1990. [35](#)
- [Rat19] John G. Ratcliffe. *Foundations of hyperbolic manifolds*, volume 149 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer, Cham, [2019] ©2019. Third edition [of 1299730]. [8](#)
- [Rat87] Marina Ratner. The rate of mixing for geodesic and horocycle flows. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 7(2):267–288, 1987. [2](#)
- [Rob03] Thomas Roblin. Ergodicité et équidistribution en courbure négative. *Mém. Soc. Math. Fr. (N.S.)*, (95):vi+96, 2003. [3](#)
- [Rud82] Daniel J. Rudolph. Ergodic behaviour of Sullivan’s geometric measure on a geometrically finite hyperbolic manifold. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 2(3-4):491–512 (1983), 1982. [2](#)
- [Sar22a] Pratyush Sarkar. Generalization of Selberg’s 3/16 theorem for convex cocompact thin subgroups of  $SO(n, 1)$ . *Adv. Math.*, 409(part A):Paper No. 108610, 58, 2022. [4](#)
- [Sar22b] Pratyush Sarkar. *Uniform Exponential Mixing of Frame Flows for Congruence Covers of Convex Cocompact Hyperbolic Manifolds*. ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 2022. Thesis (Ph.D.)—Yale University. [42](#), [49](#), [54](#)
- [SW21] Pratyush Sarkar and Dale Winter. Exponential mixing of frame flows for convex cocompact hyperbolic manifolds. *Compos. Math.*, 157(12):2585–2634, 2021. [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [14](#), [16](#), [17](#), [19](#), [20](#), [21](#), [22](#), [23](#), [38](#), [41](#), [43](#), [48](#), [49](#), [52](#), [54](#), [55](#), [56](#)
- [Sid22] Salman Siddiqi. Decay of correlations for certain isometric extensions of Anosov flows. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, page 1–51, 2022. Advance online publication. [3](#)
- [Sto11] Luchezar Stoyanov. Spectra of Ruelle transfer operators for axiom A flows. *Nonlinearity*, 24(4):1089–1120, 2011. [2](#), [11](#), [38](#), [41](#), [52](#)
- [TW22] Nattalie Tamam and Jacqueline M. Warren. Effective equidistribution of horospherical flows in infinite volume rank-one homogeneous spaces. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, page 1–61, 2022. Advance online publication. [4](#), [5](#)
- [TZ23] Masato Tsujii and Zhiyuan Zhang. Smooth mixing Anosov flows in dimension three are exponentially mixing. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 197(1):65–158, 2023. [2](#), [6](#), [38](#), [39](#), [47](#), [52](#), [53](#)
- [Win15] Dale Winter. Mixing of frame flow for rank one locally symmetric spaces and measure classification. *Israel J. Math.*, 210(1):467–507, 2015. [2](#), [23](#)
- [Woo82] Michael Woodroffe. *Nonlinear renewal theory in sequential analysis*, volume 39 of *CBMS-NSF Regional Conference Series in Applied Mathematics*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, Pa., 1982. [34](#)
- [You98] Lai-Sang Young. Statistical properties of dynamical systems with some hyperbolicity. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 147(3):585–650, 1998. [11](#), [18](#)

INSTITUT FÜR MATHEMATIK, UNIVERSITÄT ZÜRICH, WINTERTHURERSTRASSE 190, CH-8057 ZÜRICH, SWITZERLAND; *Current*: CNRS-CENTRE DE MATHÉMATIQUES LAURENT SCHWARTZ, ÉCOLE POLYTECHNIQUE, 91128 PALAISEAU, FRANCE

*Email address*: [jialun.li@polytechnique.edu](mailto:jialun.li@polytechnique.edu)

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO, 40 ST GEORGE ST, TORONTO, ON M5S 2E4, CANADA

*Email address*: [wenyup.pan@utoronto.ca](mailto:wenyup.pan@utoronto.ca)

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UC SAN DIEGO, 9500 GILMAN DRIVE, SAN DIEGO, CA 92093, USA

*Email address*: [psarkar@ucsd.edu](mailto:psarkar@ucsd.edu)