

Fourier decay, Renewal theorem and Spectral gaps for random walks on split semisimple Lie groups

Jialun LI

Abstract

We establish an exponential error term for the renewal theorem in the context of products of random matrices, which is surprising compared with classical abelian cases. A key tool is the Fourier decay of the Furstenberg measures on the projective spaces, which is a higher dimensional generalization of a recent work of Bourgain-Dyatlov.

Résumé: On établit un terme d'erreur exponentiel dans le théorème de renouvellement dans le cadre de produits de matrices aléatoires, qui est inattendu par rapport au cas classique abélien. L'outil clef est le décroissance de Fourier de mesures de Furstenberg sur les espaces projectifs, qui est une généralisation en dimension supérieure d'un travail récent de Bourgain-Dyatlov.

1 Introduction

Let V be a nontrivial finite-dimensional irreducible real algebraic representation of a \mathbb{R} -split semisimple algebraic real Lie group G (for example $G = \mathrm{SL}_{m+1}(\mathbb{R})$ and $V = \mathbb{R}^{m+1}$ with $m \geq 1$). Let μ be a Borel probability measure on G and let Γ_μ be the subgroup generated by the support of μ . We call μ Zariski dense if Γ_μ is a Zariski dense subgroup of G . This means that the measure μ does not concentrate on any proper algebraic subgroup of G . We also need the hypothesis of finite exponential moment. If V is a faithful representation of G , the definition of exponential moment is that there exists ϵ positive such that

$$\int_G \|g\|^\epsilon d\mu(g) < \infty,$$

where $\|g\|$ is the operator norm of g acting on V . For the general case, please see Definition 2.50. From now on, we always suppose that the measure μ is Zariski dense with a finite exponential moment.

For any natural number n , let μ^{*n} be the n -times convolution of the measure μ . Let X_1, \dots, X_n be i.i.d. random variables in G with the same distribution μ , then μ^{*n} is the distribution of the product $X_1 X_2 \cdots X_n$. People are interested in generalising results about sum of random variables, such as the law of large numbers or the central limit theorem, to the norms or coefficients of products of random matrices. The pioneers of the study of products of random matrices are Furstenberg, Kesten, Guivarc'h,.... For example, Furstenberg proved the law of large numbers, which states that there exists a Lyapunov constant $\sigma_{V,\mu} > 0$ such that almost surely

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \|X_1 \cdots X_n\| = \sigma_{V,\mu}.$$

Renewal theorem

Our first result is about exponential error term in the renewal theorem. The renewal theorem was first introduced in sum of random variables by Blackwell and in products of random matrices by Kesten [Kes73] [Kes74], where he applied the renewal theorem to study the solution of random

differential equations. The renewal theorem has also applications outside probability theory, for example its application to the decay of correlation by Sarig [Sar02] and its application to the asymptotic analysis of certain counting functions arising in the geometry of discrete groups by Lalley [Lal89].

Let $\|\cdot\|$ be a good norm¹ on V . Recall that for g in G , we define $\|g\|$ to be its operator norm on V . For a compactly supported continuous function f on \mathbb{R} and a real number t , we define the renewal sum for norms by

$$R_P f(t) := \sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} \int_G f(\log \|g\| - t) d\mu^{*n}(g).$$

If f is positive, this sum is obviously well defined. In fact, using the positiveness of the Lyapunov constant and the Large deviation principle, we can show that this sum is always well defined.

Let $X = \mathbb{P}V$ be the real projective space of V , which is the set of lines of V . Then we have a group action of G on X . We define the cocycle function $\sigma : G \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by, for $x = \mathbb{R}v$ in X and g in G ,

$$\sigma(g, x) = \log \frac{\|gv\|}{\|v\|}. \quad (1.1)$$

For a compactly supported continuous f on \mathbb{R} , the renewal sum for cocycles is defined by

$$Rf(x, t) := \sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} \int_G f(\sigma(g, x) - t) d\mu^{*n}(g), \text{ for } x \in X \text{ and } t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

The limit law for norms and the limit law for cocycles are closely related.

The renewal theorem gives us a phenomenon of equidistribution when the time t is large enough. The main result (due to Guivarc'h and Le Page [GLP16]) is that for a compactly supported continuous function f when the time t tends to infinite, the renewal sum $Rf(x, t)$ tends to $\frac{1}{\sigma_{V, \mu}} \int f$, where $\sigma_{V, \mu}$ is the Lyapunov constant.

Here is one of our main results.

Theorem 1.1. *Let \mathbf{G} be a connected semisimple algebraic group defined and split over \mathbb{R} and let $G = \mathbf{G}(\mathbb{R})$ be its group of real points. Let μ be a Zariski dense Borel probability measure on G with a finite exponential moment. Let V be a nontrivial finite-dimensional irreducible real algebraic representation of G with a good norm. There exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that for $f \in C_c^2(\mathbb{R})$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$, we have*

$$Rf(x, t) = \frac{1}{\sigma_{V, \mu}} \int_{-t}^{\infty} f(u) d\text{Leb}(u) + O_f(e^{-\epsilon|t|}),$$

and

$$R_P f(t) = \frac{1}{\sigma_{V, \mu}} \int_{-t}^{\infty} f(u) d\text{Leb}(u) + O_f(e^{-\epsilon|t|}),$$

where O_f depends on the support and some Sobolev norm of f .

Remark 1.2. *We should compare this result with the renewal theorem on \mathbb{R} (the classical abelian case). If λ is a measure on \mathbb{R} whose support is finite, then the error term in the renewal theorem for the real random walk induced by λ is never exponential. So Theorem 1.1 says that the behaviour of products of random matrices is more regular.*

One application of Theorem 1.1 is the Fourier decay of self-affine measures in [LS19], where the exponential error term is crucially used to obtain a polynomial rate in the decay of Fourier transform.

Our result is an improvement of a result of Boyer [Boy16], where the error term is polynomial on t .

¹When $G = \text{SL}_{m+1}(\mathbb{R})$ and $V = \mathbb{R}^{m+1}$, any euclidean norm on \mathbb{R}^{m+1} is a good norm. For the definition, please see Definition 2.8.

We hope this type of result and its idea of proof will be helpful to obtain some exponential error terms in the orbital counting problems of higher rank. For instance in [Lal89], [Qui05] and [Sam15], they are interested in the asymptotic growth of $\#\{\gamma \in \Gamma \mid d(\gamma o, o) \leq R\}$, where o is the base point in $\mathrm{SL}_{m+1}(\mathbb{R})/\mathrm{SO}(m+1)$ and Γ is a discrete subgroup of $\mathrm{SL}_{m+1}(\mathbb{R})$. In [GMR19], they relate the number of integer solutions of Markoff-Hurwitz equations to a counting problem of discrete subsemigroup of $\mathrm{SL}_{m+1}(\mathbb{R})$, whose limit set is known as the Rauzy gasket.

This type of error term is usually proved using some spectral gap property.

Spectral gap

Equip $\mathbb{P}V$ with a Riemannian distance. For γ positive, let $C^\gamma(\mathbb{P}V)$ be the space of γ -Hölder functions on $\mathbb{P}V$. We introduce the transfer operator, which is an analogue of the characteristic function for real random variables.

Definition. For z in \mathbb{C} with the real part $|\Re z|$ small enough, let P_z be the operator on the space of continuous functions on $\mathbb{P}V$, which is given by

$$P_z f(x) = \int_G e^{z\sigma(g,x)} f(gx) d\mu(g), \text{ for } x \in \mathbb{P}V,$$

where the cocycle $\sigma(g, x)$ is defined in (1.1).

We keep the assumption that μ is a Zariski dense Borel probability measure on G with a finite exponential moment. The use of this transfer operator on the products of random matrices has been introduced by Guivarc'h and Le Page. Due to the property of exponential moment, when $|\Re z|$ is small enough, the operator P_z preserves the Banach space $C^\gamma(\mathbb{P}V)$ for $\gamma > 0$ small enough. Due to the contracting action of G on X , for z in a small ball centred at 0, the spectral radius of P_z on $C^\gamma(\mathbb{P}V)$ is less than 1 except at 0. Due to the non-arithmeticity of Γ_μ , on the imaginary line, the operator P_z also has spectral radius less than 1 except at 0. These were used to give limit theorems for products of random matrices by Guivarc'h and Le Page (Please see [LP82] and [BQ16]). We will prove a uniform spectral gap of the transfer operator with parameter z near the imaginary line.

Theorem 1.3. Under the same assumptions as in Theorem 1.1, for every $\gamma > 0$ small enough, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for all $|b| > 1$ and $|a|$ small enough the spectral radius of P_{a+ib} acting on $C^\gamma(\mathbb{P}V)$ satisfies

$$\rho(P_{a+ib}) < 1 - \delta.$$

Even in the case $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$, the result is new and only known in some special cases; when μ is supported on a finite number of elements of $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ and these elements generate a Schottky semigroup, this result is due to Naud [Nau05]. When μ is absolutely continuous with respect to the Haar measure on $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$, this result can be obtained directly using high oscillations.

This result should be compared with similar results for random walks on \mathbb{R} . Let λ be a Borel probability measure on \mathbb{R} with finite support. Then

$$\liminf_{|b| \rightarrow \infty} |1 - \hat{\lambda}(ib)| = 0,$$

which is totally different from our case and where $\hat{\lambda}(z)$ is the Laplace transform of the measure λ , given by

$$\hat{\lambda}(z) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{zx} d\lambda(x).$$

The proof is direct. Let $\{x_1, \dots, x_l\}$ be the support of λ . Then $\hat{\lambda}(ib) = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq l} \lambda(x_j) e^{ibx_j}$, and we only need to find b such that all the terms are uniformly near 1. Using the fact that $\liminf_{b \rightarrow \infty} d_{\mathbb{R}^l}(b(x_1, \dots, x_l), 2\pi\mathbb{Z}^l) = 0$, we have the claim.

An analogous result is valid if we replace the projective space $\mathbb{P}V$ by the flag variety \mathcal{P} . Let \mathcal{P} be the full flag variety of G and let \mathfrak{a} be a Cartan subspace of the Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} of G . For $g \in G$ and $\eta \in \mathcal{P}$, let $\sigma(g, \eta)$ be the Iwasawa cocycle, which takes values in \mathfrak{a} . We fix a Riemannian distance on \mathcal{P} . We can similarly define the space of γ -Hölder functions $C^\gamma(\mathcal{P})$. Let ϖ, ϑ be in \mathfrak{a}^* . For a continuous function f on \mathcal{P} and $|\varpi|$ small enough, the transfer operator $P_{\varpi+i\vartheta}$ on the flag variety is defined by

$$P_{\varpi+i\vartheta}f(\eta) = \int_G e^{(\varpi+i\vartheta)\sigma(g,\eta)} f(g\eta) d\mu(g).$$

We will prove that

Theorem 1.4 (Spectral gap). *Let \mathbf{G} be a connected semisimple algebraic group defined and split over \mathbb{R} and let $G = \mathbf{G}(\mathbb{R})$ be its group of real points. Let μ be a Zariski dense Borel probability measure on G with finite exponential moment. For every $\gamma > 0$ small enough, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for all ϑ, ϖ in \mathfrak{a}^* with $|\vartheta| > 1$ and $|\varpi|$ small enough the spectral radius of $P_{\varpi+i\vartheta}$ acting on $C^\gamma(\mathcal{P})$ satisfies*

$$\rho(P_{\varpi+i\vartheta}) < 1 - \delta.$$

This is a higher dimensional generalisation of Theorem 1.3, because the parameter ϑ is in \mathfrak{a}^* , whose dimension is equal to the real rank of G . It seems possible that this result implies a version of local limit theorem with exponentially shrinking targets in the Cartan subspace \mathfrak{a} , similar to the work of Petkov and Stoyanov [PS12], where they used the spectral gap of transfer operator to obtain an asymptotic counting of lengths of closed geodesics lying in an exponentially shrinking targets. This will be done in a joint work in progress with Cagri Sert.

Fourier decay

The key ingredient in the proof of Theorem 1.3 and 1.4 is the following Fourier decay property of the μ -stationary measure on the flag variety \mathcal{P} .

On the space $X = \mathcal{P}$, a Borel probability measure ν is μ -stationary if we have

$$\nu = \mu * \nu := \int_G g_* \nu d\mu(g),$$

where $g_* \nu$ is the pushforward of ν by the action of g on X . By a theorem of Furstenberg, under Zariski dense condition there is a unique μ -stationary probability measure ν on X and it is also called the Furstenberg measure. This measure was introduced by Furstenberg when he established the law of large numbers for products of random matrices. The properties of the μ -stationary measure are also important in other limit theorems for products of random matrices.

For a γ -Hölder function f on X , we define $c_\gamma(f) = \sup_{x \neq x'} \frac{|f(x) - f(x')|}{d(x, x')^\gamma}$. We start with the case $G = \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$.

Theorem 1.5. *Let μ be a Zariski dense Borel probability measure on $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ with a finite exponential moment. Let $X = \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and let ν be the μ -stationary measure on X .*

For every $\gamma > 0$, there exist $\epsilon_0 > 0, \epsilon_1 > 0$ depending on μ such that the following holds. For $\xi > 0$ large enough and any pair of real functions $\varphi \in C^2(X)$, $r \in C^\gamma(X)$ such that $|\varphi'| \geq \xi^{-\epsilon_0}$ on the support of r , $\|r\|_\infty \leq 1$ and

$$\|\varphi\|_{C^2} + c_\gamma(r) \leq \xi^{\epsilon_0},$$

then

$$\left| \int e^{i\xi\varphi(x)} r(x) d\nu(x) \right| \leq \xi^{-\epsilon_1}.$$

Remark 1.6. As a corollary of Theorem 1.5, we obtain a polynomial decay of the Fourier coefficients of ν , that is

$$|\hat{\nu}(k)| = O(|k|^{-\epsilon_1}).$$

This generalizes the recent work of Bourgain-Dyatlov [BD17] on Patterson-Sullivan measures and a work of myself in [LI18a], where a qualitative version is proved. For more background on the decay of Fourier coefficients see [LI18a].

Theorem 1.5 is a particular case of a more general result: Theorem 1.7 below. In order to state the Fourier decay on the flag variety, we need to introduce a special condition. Let r be a continuous function on \mathcal{P} and let $C > 1$. For a C^2 function φ on \mathcal{P} , we say that φ is (C, r) good if it satisfies some assumptions on the Lipschitz norm and derivatives, which will be defined later (Definition 4.1). Due to some technical problem, we will only prove a simply connected case in Section 4. (For example the group \mathbf{SL}_{m+1} is simply connected but \mathbf{PGL}_{m+1} is not.) The general case will be proved in Appendix 5.1 by a covering argument.

Theorem 1.7 (Fourier decay). *Let \mathbf{G} be a connected \mathbb{R} -split reductive \mathbb{R} -group whose semisimple part is simply connected and let $G = \mathbf{G}(\mathbb{R})$ be its group of real points. Let μ be Zariski dense Borel probability measure on G with finite exponential moment. Let ν be the μ -stationary measure on the flag variety \mathcal{P} .*

For every $\gamma > 0$, there exist $\epsilon_0 > 0, \epsilon_1 > 0$ depending on μ such that the following holds. For $\xi > 0$ large enough and any pair of real functions $\varphi \in C^2(\mathcal{P})$, $r \in C^\gamma(\mathcal{P})$ such that φ is (ξ^{ϵ_0}, r) good, $\|r\|_\infty \leq 1$ and $c_\gamma(r) \leq \xi^{\epsilon_0}$, then

$$\left| \int_{\mathcal{P}} e^{i\xi\varphi(\eta)} r(\eta) d\nu(\eta) \right| \leq \xi^{-\epsilon_1}. \quad (1.2)$$

Remark 1.8. *The decay rate only depends on the constants in the large deviation principles and the regularity of stationary measures. This should be compared with [BD17], where the spectral gap and the decay rate only depend on the dimension of the Patterson-Sullivan measure.*

A similar Fourier decay for the Lie group $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ is established in [LNP19] for Patterson-Sullivan measures, which cannot be treated by our method due to the non splitness of $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})$. It would also be interesting to establish a similar Fourier decay for the group $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ and the stationary measure on $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{Q}_p}^1$.

When $G = \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$, the (C, r) goodness is exactly the assumption of φ in Theorem 1.5, which is natural for having a Fourier decay. Theorem 1.7 clearly implies Theorem 1.5.

It is interesting that the three objects, the polynomial rate in Fourier decay, the exponential error term in the renewal theorem and the spectral gap are roughly equivalent. In [LI18a], we use the renewal theorem to prove the Fourier decay. But in this manuscript, we use the polynomial rate in Fourier decay to prove the spectral gap, and then use the spectral gap to prove the exponential error term in the renewal theorem. In a highly related setting, convex cocompact surfaces, we can compare our three objects with more geometric objects. The Fourier decay was recently studied by Bourgain-Dyatlov; the spectral gap can be interpreted as the zero free region of the Selberg zeta function or the gap of the eigenvalues of the Laplace operator on the surface; the renewal theorem is replaced by the counting problem of the lattice points or the primitive closed geodesics. For the relation between these three objects of convex cocompact surfaces, see Borthwick [Bor07] and the references there.

Paper organization

In Section 2, we will study the action of the group on the tangent bundle of the flag variety. In our higher rank case, the action is not conformal and we need to understand the contraction or the dilatation rate in different directions, which is a difficulty compared with rank one case. We will also recall basic properties of random walks on Lie groups.

Section 3 is devoted to the study of non-concentration condition, which is the main input for the use of discretized sum-product estimates (Proposition 3.16, a generalized version of a result of Bourgain [Bou10]). We need to verify certain measures on \mathbb{R}^m are not concentrated on any affine subspaces of \mathbb{R}^m . The key idea is to use linear algebra to transfer the problem to an estimate of volume, which gives non-concentration for all affine subspaces simultaneously (Corollary 3.6). Then we apply representation theory and the Guivarc'h regularity to establish the non-concentration condition.

In Section 4, our main results are proved. The proof of Theorem 1.7 follows the similar strategy as in [BD17], but we are in higher rank case and we need to use almost all the preparations in previous sections. Then we use some idea of Dolgopyat to derive Theorem 1.3 and 1.4 from Theorem 1.7. Finally, Theorem 1.1 will be obtained by using Theorem 1.3 rather straight forward.

In Appendix, we explain how to obtain the Fourier decay for semisimple groups from Theorem 1.7, which only holds for groups with simply connected semisimple part.

Notation

We will make use of some classical notation: for two real functions f and g , we write $f = O(g)$, $f \ll g$ or $g \gg f$ if there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that $|f| \leq Cg$, where C only depends on the ambient group G and the measure μ . We write $f \asymp g$ if $f \ll g$ and $g \ll f$. We write $f = O_\epsilon(g)$, $f \ll_\epsilon g$ or $g \gg_\epsilon f$ if the constant C depends on an extra parameter $\epsilon > 0$.

We always use $0 < \delta < 1$ to denote an error term and $0 < \beta < 1$ to denote the magnitude. We will use δ^{C_0} with C_0 only depends the group G and measure μ , this constant C_0 may change from line to line, while still being denoted the same. If $\delta^{C_0} f \leq g \leq \delta^{-C_0} f$, then we say that f and g are of the same size.

Acknowledgement

This is part of the author's Ph.D. thesis, written under the supervision of Jean-François Quint at the University of Bordeaux. The author gratefully acknowledges the many helpful suggestions and stimulating conversations of Jean-François Quint during the preparation of the article.

The author would also like to thank the referee for many helpful comments and corrections which greatly improve the readability of this article.

2 Random walks on Reductive groups

The representation theory of algebraic groups is more clear than the representation theory of Lie groups. We will use the vocabulary of algebraic groups. In this manuscript, we always assume that \mathbf{G} is a connected \mathbb{R} -split reductive \mathbb{R} -group. We are interested in two particular cases:

- the semisimple part is simply connected in algebraic group sense,
- the group \mathbf{G} is actually semisimple.

If we need these further assumptions, we will say it at the beginning of the section or in the statement. Please see [Hel79], [Bor90] and [BQ16] for more details.

We write \mathbf{G} for an algebraic group, and $G = \mathbf{G}(\mathbb{R})$ for its group of real points, equipped with the Lie group topology (analytical topology). All the representations are nontrivial finite-dimensional real algebraic and with a good norm.

2.1 Reductive groups and representations

Reductive groups

Let \mathbf{G} be a connected \mathbb{R} -split reductive \mathbb{R} -group. Let \mathbf{A} be a maximal \mathbb{R} -split torus in \mathbf{G} . Because \mathbf{G} is \mathbb{R} -split, the group \mathbf{A} is also the maximal torus of \mathbf{G} and the centralizer of \mathbf{A} in \mathbf{G} is \mathbf{A} . Let \mathbf{C} be the connected component of the centre of \mathbf{G} , which is contained in the maximal torus \mathbf{A} . The semisimple part of \mathbf{G} is the derived group $\mathscr{D}\mathbf{G} = [\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{G}]$. Let \mathbf{B} be the subtorus of \mathbf{A} given by $\mathbf{A} \cap \mathscr{D}\mathbf{G}$. The dimension of \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} are called the reductive rank and the semisimple rank of \mathbf{G} , respectively. We write r and m for the reductive rank and the semisimple rank.

Because we are dealing with real groups, we will use transcendental methods to describe the structure of \mathbf{G} . Let G, A, B and C be the group of real points of $\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}$ and \mathbf{C} . Let θ be a Cartan involution of G which satisfies $\theta(A) = A$ and such that the set of fixed points $K = \{g \in G \mid \theta(g) = g\}$ is a maximal compact subgroup of G . Let $\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{k}, \mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}$ and \mathfrak{c} be the Lie algebra of G, K, A, B and C , respectively. Then $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{b} \oplus \mathfrak{c}$ due to $\mathfrak{g} = \mathscr{D}\mathfrak{g} \oplus \mathfrak{c}$. We write \exp for the exponential map from \mathfrak{a} to A . We also write θ for the differential of the Cartan involution, whose set of fixed points is \mathfrak{k} and which equals $-id$ on \mathfrak{a} .

For X, Y in \mathfrak{g} , the Killing form is defined as

$$K(X, Y) = tr(adXadY).$$

The Killing form is positive definite on \mathfrak{b} and negative definite on \mathfrak{k} . Endowed with the Killing form, the Lie algebra \mathfrak{b} and its dual \mathfrak{b}^* become Euclidean spaces.

Root systems and the Weyl group

The spaces \mathfrak{b}^* and \mathfrak{c}^* are seen as subspaces of \mathfrak{a}^* , which takes value zero on \mathfrak{c} and \mathfrak{b} , respectively. Let R be the root system of \mathfrak{g} with respect to \mathfrak{a} , that is the set of nontrivial weights of the adjoint action of \mathfrak{a} on \mathfrak{g} . It is actually a subset of \mathfrak{b}^* . Because \mathfrak{c} is in the centre of \mathfrak{g} , its adjoint action on \mathfrak{g} is trivial. Fix a choice of positive roots R^+ . Let Π be the collection of primitive simple roots of R^+ . Let \mathfrak{a}^+ be the Weyl chamber defined by $\{X \in \mathfrak{a} \mid \alpha(X) \geq 0, \forall \alpha \in \Pi\}$. Let \mathfrak{a}^{++} be the interior of the Weyl chamber defined by $\{X \in \mathfrak{a} \mid \alpha(X) > 0, \forall \alpha \in \Pi\}$. Using the root system, we have a decomposition of \mathfrak{g} into eigenspaces of \mathfrak{a} ,

$$\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{z} \oplus \bigoplus_{\alpha \in R} \mathfrak{g}^\alpha,$$

where \mathfrak{z} is the centralizer of \mathfrak{a} and \mathfrak{g}^α is the eigenspace given by

$$\mathfrak{g}^\alpha = \{X \in \mathfrak{g} \mid [Y, X] = \alpha(Y)X \text{ for all } Y \in \mathfrak{a}\}.$$

Since the group \mathbf{G} is split, we know that $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{z}$ and that \mathfrak{g}^α are of dimension 1.

Recall that for every root α in R , there is an orthogonal symmetry s_α which preserves R and $s_\alpha(\alpha) = -\alpha$. For $\alpha \in R$, let H_α be the unique element in \mathfrak{b} such that $s_\alpha(\alpha') = \alpha' - \alpha'(H_\alpha)\alpha$ for $\alpha' \in \mathfrak{b}^*$. The set $\{H_\alpha \mid \alpha \in R\}$ is called the set of dual roots in \mathfrak{b} . Since the Cartan involution θ equals $-id$ on \mathfrak{a} , this implies $\theta\mathfrak{g}^\alpha = \mathfrak{g}^{-\alpha}$ for $\alpha \in R$. Using the Killing form, we can prove that $[\mathfrak{g}^\alpha, \mathfrak{g}^{-\alpha}] = \mathbb{R}H_\alpha$ (See [Ser66, Cha. 4, Theorem 2] for more details). Hence, there is a unique choice (up to sign) $X_\alpha \in \mathfrak{g}^\alpha, Y_\alpha \in \mathfrak{g}^{-\alpha}$ for α positive such that

$$[X_\alpha, Y_\alpha] = H_\alpha \text{ and } \theta(X_\alpha) = -Y_\alpha.$$

Let $K_\alpha = X_\alpha - Y_\alpha$. Due to $\theta K_\alpha = K_\alpha$, the element K_α is in \mathfrak{k} .

Let W be the Weyl group of R . Then the group W acts simply transitively on the set of Weyl chambers. Let w_0 be the unique element in W which sends the Weyl chamber \mathfrak{a}^+ to the

Weyl chamber $-\mathfrak{a}^+$. Let $\iota = -w_0$ be the opposition involution. The Weyl group also acts on \mathfrak{a}^* by the dual action. Let $N_G(A)$ be the normalizer of A in G . An element in $N_G(A)/A$ induces an automorphism on the tangent space \mathfrak{a} . This gives an isomorphism from $N_G(A)/A$ to the Weyl group W . Hence w_0 can be realized as an element in G/A and its action on \mathfrak{a} is given by conjugation.

The Iwasawa cocycle

Let $\mathfrak{n} = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in R^+} \mathfrak{g}^\alpha$ and $\mathfrak{n}^- = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in R^+} \mathfrak{g}^{-\alpha}$. They are nilpotent Lie algebras. Let \mathbf{N} be the connected algebraic subgroup of \mathbf{G} with Lie algebra \mathfrak{n} . The group \mathbf{N} is normalized by \mathbf{A} . Let $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{A} \ltimes \mathbf{N}$ be a minimal parabolic subgroup. The flag variety \mathcal{P} is defined to be the set of conjugacy classes of P under the action of G . Since the normalizer of P in G is itself, we obtain an isomorphism

$$G/P \rightarrow \mathcal{P}.$$

We write η_o for the subgroup P seen as a point in \mathcal{P} . Let M be the subgroup of A , whose elements have order at most two. Since A is isomorphic to $(\mathbb{R}^*)^r$, we know that $M \simeq (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^r$ and $A = M \times A_e$, where $A_e = \exp(\mathfrak{a})$ is the analytical connected component of A and $A_e \simeq (\mathbb{R}_{>0})^r$.

For a real Lie group L , let L^o be the analytical connected component of the identity element in L .

Lemma 2.1. *We have $K = K^o M$.*

Proof. On the one hand, by Matsumoto's theorem [Mat64] ([BT65, Théorème 14.4]), we have $G = G^o A = G^o M$. Hence the group M intersects each connected component of G . The set $K^o M$ intersects each connected component of G and its intersection with G^o contains K^o . By definition of K , we know that $K \subset K^o M$.

On the other hand, we know that $K \supset K^o M$, because the group M equals to $A \cap K$ due to [Ben05, Lemme 4.2]. This lemma can also be proved directly by considering the action of the Cartan involution on M . The proof is complete. \square

We have an Iwasawa decomposition of G given by

$$G = KAN.$$

The action of K on \mathcal{P} is transitive. Hence \mathcal{P} is a compact manifold. By Lemma 2.1, we have $G = KA_e M N = KA_e N$. This is a bijection between G and $K \times A_e \times N$. Then we can define the Iwasawa cocycle σ from $G \times \mathcal{P}$ to \mathfrak{a} . Let η be in \mathcal{P} and g be in G . By the transitivity of K , there exists $k \in K$ such that $\eta = k\eta_o$. By the Iwasawa decomposition, there exists a unique element $\sigma(g, \eta)$ in \mathfrak{a} such that

$$gk \in K \exp(\sigma(g, \eta))N.$$

We can verify that this is well defined and σ is an additive cocycle, that is for g, h in G and η in \mathcal{P}

$$\sigma(gh, \eta) = \sigma(g, h\eta) + \sigma(h, \eta).$$

Due to the direct sum $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{b} \oplus \mathfrak{c}$, we can decompose the Iwasawa cocycle into the semisimple part and the central part of the cocycle, that is

$$\sigma(g, \eta) = \sigma_{ss}(g, \eta) + c(g),$$

where σ_{ss} is in \mathfrak{b} and $c(g)$ in \mathfrak{c} . The central part $c(g)$ does not depend on η , because the map

$$G \rightarrow G/\mathcal{D}G$$

kills the semisimple part and the restriction of this map to $C_e = \exp(\mathfrak{c})$ is injective. Moreover, since the Iwasawa cocycle is additive, the central part is also additive. That is for g, h in G

$$c(gh) = c(g) + c(h).$$

The Cartan decomposition

The Cartan decomposition says that $G = KA^+K$, where A^+ is the image of the Weyl chamber \mathfrak{a}^+ under the exponential map. For g in G , by Cartan decomposition, we can write $g = k_g a_g \ell_g$ with k_g, ℓ_g in K and a_g in A^+ . The element a_g is unique and there is a unique element $\kappa(g)$ in \mathfrak{a}^+ such that $a_g = \exp(\kappa(g))$. We call $\kappa(g)$ the Cartan projection of g . Then $\kappa(g^{-1}) = \iota\kappa(g)$, where ι is the opposition involution. Since A is contained in P , we can define $\zeta_o = w_0\eta_o$, where the element w_0 in the Weyl group is seen as an element in G/A (As an element in \mathcal{P} , ζ_o is the opposite parabolic group with respect to P and A). Let $\eta_g^M = k_g\eta_o$ and $\zeta_g^m = \ell_g^{-1}\zeta_o$. When $\kappa(g)$ is in \mathfrak{a}^{++} , it is uniquely defined, independently of the choice of k_g and ℓ_g .

We can also define a unique decomposition of $\kappa(g)$ into semisimple part and central part. Due to $\kappa(g) = \sigma(g, \ell_g^{-1}\eta_o) = \sigma_{ss}(g, \ell_g^{-1}\eta_o) + c(g)$, we have

$$\kappa(g) = \kappa_{ss}(g) + c(g).$$

Dominant weights

Let $X(\mathbf{A})$ and $X(\mathbf{B})$ be the character groups of \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} , respectively. We will identify $X(\mathbf{A})$ and $X(\mathbf{B})$ as discrete subgroups of \mathfrak{a}^* and \mathfrak{b}^* by taking differential. The elements of \mathfrak{a}^* in $X(\mathbf{A})$ are called weights. All the roots are weights, because they come from adjoint action of A on \mathfrak{g}^α .

Since $\{H_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Pi}$ is a basis of \mathfrak{b} , let $\{\tilde{\omega}_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Pi}$ be the dual basis, they are called the fundamental weights.

For the general case: we only know that $X(\mathbf{B})$ is a finite index subgroup of $\bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Pi} \mathbb{Z}\tilde{\omega}_\alpha$. Let

$$\tilde{\chi}_\alpha = n_\alpha \tilde{\omega}_\alpha,$$

where n_α is the smallest positive natural number such that $n_\alpha \tilde{\omega}_\alpha$ is in $X(\mathbf{B})$. Since \mathbf{B} is a closed subgroup of a split torus \mathbf{A} , every character on \mathbf{B} extends to a character on \mathbf{A} . Let χ_α be an extension of $\tilde{\chi}_\alpha$ to \mathbf{A} . We fix this choice. For semisimple case, we know that $\chi_\alpha = \tilde{\chi}_\alpha$.

If the derived group $\mathcal{D}\mathbf{G}$ is simply connected, we have

$$X(\mathbf{B}) = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Pi} \mathbb{Z}\tilde{\omega}_\alpha.$$

Hence for $\alpha \in \Pi$, we have

$$\chi_\alpha \in X(\mathbf{A}) \text{ and } \chi_\alpha|_{\mathfrak{b}} = \tilde{\omega}_\alpha.$$

We write ω_α for the element in \mathfrak{a}^* which is another extension of $\tilde{\omega}_\alpha$ and vanishes on \mathfrak{c} , that is

$$\omega_\alpha|_{\mathfrak{b}} = \tilde{\omega}_\alpha \text{ and } \omega_\alpha|_{\mathfrak{c}} = 0.$$

Recall that a weight is a dominant weight, if for every w in the Weyl group W , the difference $\chi - w(\chi)$ is a sum of positive roots.

Lemma 2.2. *For every $\alpha \in \Pi$, the weight χ_α is a dominant weight.*

Proof. The action of the Weyl group on \mathfrak{c}^* , the space of linear functionals which vanish on \mathfrak{b} , is trivial. We know that

$$\chi_\alpha - w(\chi_\alpha) \in \mathfrak{b}^*.$$

Because $\tilde{\omega}_\alpha$ is a fundamental weight, we have $\chi_\alpha - w(\chi_\alpha)|_{\mathfrak{b}} = n_\alpha(\tilde{\omega}_\alpha - w(\tilde{\omega}_\alpha))$ equals a sum of positive roots. \square

Representations and highest weights

Let (ρ, V) be a representation of G . The set of restricted weights $\Sigma(\rho)$ of the representation is the set of elements ω in \mathfrak{a}^* such that the eigenspace

$$V^\omega = \{v \in V \mid \forall X \in \mathfrak{a}, d\rho(X)v = \omega(X)v\}$$

is nonzero, where $d\rho$ is the tangent map of ρ from \mathfrak{g} to $End(V)$. By definition, we see that ω is the differential of a character on \mathbf{A} , which is a weight. We define a partial order on the restricted weights: For ω_1, ω_2 in $\Sigma(\rho)$,

$$\omega_1 \geq \omega_2 \Leftrightarrow \omega_1 - \omega_2 \text{ is a sum of positive roots.}$$

If ω is in $\Sigma(\rho)$, then we say that ω is a weight of V and a vector v in V^ω is said to have weight ω . We call ρ proximal if there exists χ in $\Sigma(\rho)$ which is greater than the other weights and such that V^χ is of dimension 1. We should pay attention that a proximal representation is not supposed to be irreducible. An advantage of the splitness of G is that all the irreducible representations are proximal, which will be extensively used later on.

Suppose that (ρ, V) is an irreducible representation. Let $\chi \in \mathfrak{a}^*$ be the highest weight of (ρ, V) . We write $V_{\chi, \eta} = \rho(g)V^\chi$ for $\eta = g\eta_o$, which is well defined because the parabolic subgroup P fixes the subspace V^χ . This gives a map from \mathcal{P} to $\mathbb{P}V$ by

$$\mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}V, \eta \mapsto V_{\chi, \eta}. \quad (2.1)$$

In the case of split reductive groups, for a character χ on \mathbf{A} , there exists an irreducible algebraic representation with highest weight χ if and only if χ is a dominant weight [Tit71]. Let

$$\Theta_\rho = \{\alpha \in \Pi : \chi - \alpha \text{ is a weight of } \rho\}.$$

By Lemma 2.2, we have

Lemma 2.3. *Let $(\rho_\alpha, V_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \Pi}$ be a family of representations such that the highest weight of ρ_α is χ_α . Then we have $\Theta_{\rho_\alpha} = \{\alpha\}$ and the product of the maps given by (2.1)*

$$\mathcal{P} \longrightarrow \prod_{\alpha \in \Pi} \mathbb{P}V_\alpha, \eta \mapsto (V_{\chi_\alpha, \eta})_{\alpha \in \Pi},$$

is an embedding of \mathcal{P} into the product of projective spaces.

Lemma 2.4. *Let (ρ, V) be an irreducible representation of G with highest weight χ . Then $\Theta_\rho = \{\alpha\}$ is equivalent to say that $\chi(H_\alpha) > 0$ for only one simple root α .*

Proof. Consider the representation of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha = \langle H_\alpha, X_\alpha, Y_\alpha \rangle$ on v of highest weight. By the classification of the representations of \mathfrak{sl}_2 , we know that $Y_\alpha v \neq 0$ if and only if $\chi(H_\alpha) > 0$. The vector $Y_\alpha v$ is the only way to obtain a vector of weight $\chi - \alpha$ by [Ser66, Chapter 7, Proposition 2]. The proof is complete. \square

Definition 2.5 (Super proximal representation). *Let (ρ, V) be an irreducible representation of G with highest weight χ . We call V super proximal if the exterior square $\wedge^2 V$ is also proximal. This is equivalent to $\Theta_\rho = \{\alpha\}$, and $V^{\chi - \alpha}$ is of dimension 1 for some simple root α .*

Lemma 2.6. *If the highest weight χ of an irreducible representation satisfies $\chi(H_\alpha) > 0$ for only one simple root α , then this representation is super proximal.*

Proof. Because the central part of G preserves eigenspaces of A . It is also an irreducible representation of the semisimple part. It will be thus sufficient to prove the semisimple case.

Let α be the simple root. Let v be a nonzero vector with highest weight χ . By [Ser66, Chapter 7, Proposition 2], the representation V is generated by vectors $Y_{\beta_1} \cdots Y_{\beta_k} v$, where β_1, \dots, β_k are positive roots. Hence a vector of weight $\chi - \alpha$ can only be obtained by $Y_\alpha v$. The dimension of $V^{\chi - \alpha}$ is no greater than 1. Since $\chi - \alpha$ is a weight due to Lemma 2.4, the proof is complete. \square

For $\chi \in \mathfrak{a}^*$, if it is a weight, we will use χ^\sharp to denote its corresponding algebraic character in $X(\mathbf{A})$. By the definition of eigenspace V^χ , we have

Lemma 2.7. *Let (ρ, V) be an irreducible representation of G . Let χ^\sharp be an algebraic character of A . For a in A and $v \in V^\chi$, we have*

$$\rho(a)v = \chi^\sharp(a)v.$$

This lemma will be used to determine the sign in Section 2.5.

Representations and good norms

Definition 2.8. *Let $\|\cdot\|$ be an euclidean norm on a representation (ρ, V) of G . We call $\|\cdot\|$ a good norm if $\rho(A)$ is symmetric and $\rho(K)$ preserves the norm.*

By [Hel79], [BQ16, Lemma 6.33], good norms exist on every representation of G . One advantage of good norm is that for v, u in V and g in G

$$\langle \rho(g)v, u \rangle = \langle v, \rho(\theta(g^{-1})u) \rangle,$$

where θ is the Cartan involution. The above equation is true because it is true for g in A and K . This means that for good norm we have

$${}^t\rho(g) = \rho(\theta(g^{-1})). \quad (2.2)$$

The application (2.1) enables us to get information on \mathcal{P} from the representations. For an element g in $GL(V)$, let $\|g\|$ be its operator norm.

Lemma 2.9. *Let G be a connected reductive \mathbb{R} -group. Let (ρ, V) be an irreducible linear representation of G with good norm. Let χ be the highest weight of V . For η in \mathcal{P} and a non-zero vector $v \in V_{\chi, \eta}$, we have*

$$\frac{\|\rho(g)v\|}{\|v\|} = \exp(\chi\sigma(g, \eta)), \quad (2.3)$$

$$\|\rho(g)\| = \exp(\chi\kappa(g)). \quad (2.4)$$

Please see [BQ16, Lemma 8.17] for the proof.

Examples

For the group \mathbf{GL}_{m+1} , the maximal torus A can be taken as the diagonal subgroup and the Lie algebra \mathfrak{a} is the set of diagonal matrices. The Lie algebra \mathfrak{b} is the subset of \mathfrak{a} with trace zero. For X in \mathfrak{a} , we write $X = \text{diag}(x_1, \dots, x_{m+1})$ with $x_i \in \mathbb{R}$. The Lie algebra $\mathfrak{c} = \{X \in \mathfrak{a} \mid x_1 = x_2 = \dots = x_{m+1}\}$. Let λ_i in \mathfrak{a}^* be the linear map given by $\lambda_i(X) = x_i$. The root system R is given by

$$R = \{\lambda_i - \lambda_j \mid i \neq j, \text{ and } i, j \in \{1, \dots, m+1\}\}.$$

A choice of positive roots is $\lambda_i - \lambda_j$ with $i < j$. The set of simple roots is $\Pi = \{\lambda_i - \lambda_{i+1} | i = 1, \dots, m\}$. Let $\alpha_i = \lambda_i - \lambda_{i+1}$. The Weyl chamber is

$$\mathfrak{a}^+ = \{X \in \mathfrak{a} | x_1 \geq x_2 \geq \dots \geq x_{m+1}\}.$$

The fundamental weights are $\tilde{\omega}_{\alpha_i} = \lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$ on \mathfrak{b} . The weight χ_{α_i} has the same form as $\tilde{\omega}_{\alpha_i}$ in \mathfrak{a} . The weight ω_{α_i} is equal to $\chi_{\alpha_i} - \frac{i}{m+1}(\lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_{m+1})$. The representations V_{α_i} are given by $V_{\alpha_i} = \wedge^i \mathbb{R}^{m+1}$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$. The maximal compact subgroup K is $O(m+1)$ and the parabolic group P is the upper triangular subgroup and N is the subgroup of P with all the diagonal entries equal to 1. The flag variety \mathcal{P} is the set of all flags

$$W_1 \subset W_2 \subset \dots \subset W_m,$$

where W_i is a subspace of \mathbb{R}^{m+1} of dimension i .

Let $\epsilon_{i,j}$ be the square matrix of dimension $m+1$ with the only nonzero entry at the i -th row and j -th column, which equals 1. The element H_{α_i} is $\epsilon_{i,i} - \epsilon_{i+1,i+1}$. The element $X_{\alpha_i}, Y_{\alpha_i}$ are given by $\epsilon_{i,i+1}, \epsilon_{i+1,i}$. The Cartan involution θ is the additive inverse of the transpose, that is $\theta(X) = -{}^t X$ for X in \mathfrak{a} .

The Weyl group W is isomorphic to the symmetric group \mathcal{S}_{m+1} . The action on \mathfrak{a} is simply given by the permutation of coordinates and the element w_0 sends $X = \text{diag}(x_1, \dots, x_{m+1})$ to $w_0 X = \text{diag}(x_{m+1}, \dots, x_1)$.

2.2 Linear actions on vector spaces

Let V be a vector space with an euclidean norm. Then we have an induced norm on its dual space V^* , tensor products $\otimes^j V$ and exterior powers $\wedge^j V$.

For $x = \mathbb{R}v, x' = \mathbb{R}v'$ in $\mathbb{P}V$, we define the distance between x, x' by

$$d(x, x') = \frac{\|v \wedge v'\|}{\|v\| \|v'\|}. \quad (2.5)$$

This distance has the advantage that it behaves well under the action of $GL(V)$. See for example Lemma 2.11. For $y = \mathbb{R}f$ in $\mathbb{P}V^*$, let $y^\perp = \mathbb{P}(\ker f) \subset \mathbb{P}V$ be a hyperplane in $\mathbb{P}V$. For $x = \mathbb{R}v$ in $\mathbb{P}V$, we define the distance of x to y^\perp by

$$\delta(x, y) = \frac{|f(v)|}{\|f\| \|v\|},$$

which is explained by $\delta(x, y) = d(x, y^\perp) = \min_{x' \in y^\perp} d(x, x')$. Let K_V be the compact group of $GL(V)$ which preserves the norm. Let A_V^+ be the set of diagonal elements such that $\{a = \text{diag}(a_1, \dots, a_d) | a_1 \geq a_2 \geq \dots \geq a_d\}$, under the basis $\{e_1, \dots, e_d\}$. Let A_V^{++} be the interior of A_V^+ . For g in $GL(V)$, by the Cartan decomposition we can choose

$$g = k_g a_g \ell_g, \text{ where } a_g \in A_V^+ \text{ and } k_g, \ell_g \in K_V. \quad (2.6)$$

Let e_i^* be the dual basis. Let $x_g^M = \mathbb{R}k_g e_1$ and $y_g^m = \mathbb{R}{}^t \ell_g e_1^*$ be the density points of g on $\mathbb{P}V$ and ${}^t g$ on $\mathbb{P}V^*$, which is unique and independent of the choice of basis when a_g is in A_V^{++} . For $r > 0$ and g in $GL(V)$, let

$$\begin{aligned} b_{V,g}^M(r) &= \{x \in \mathbb{P}V | d(x, x_g^M) \leq r\}, \\ B_{V,g}^m(r) &= \{x \in \mathbb{P}V | \delta(x, y_g^m) \geq r\}. \end{aligned}$$

These two sets play an important role when we want to get some ping-pong property. The elements in the set $B_{V,g}^m(r)$ have distance at least r to the hyperplane determined by y_g^m .

Distance and norm

We start with a general g in $GL(V)$, where V is a finite-dimensional vector space with euclidean norm. We need some technical distance control. These are quantitative versions of the same controls in [Qui02, Lemma 2.5, 4.3, 6.5].

For g in $GL(V)$ and $x = \mathbb{R}v \in \mathbb{P}V$, we define an additive cocycle $\sigma_V : GL(V) \times \mathbb{P}V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\sigma_V(g, x) = \log \frac{\|gv\|}{\|v\|}. \quad (2.7)$$

This is called a cocycle, because for g, h in G we have

$$\sigma_V(gh, x) = \sigma_V(g, hx) + \sigma_V(h, x).$$

Lemma 2.10 (Lemma 14.2 in [BQ16]). *For any g in $GL(V)$ and x in $\mathbb{P}V$, we have*

$$\delta(x, y_g^m) \leq \frac{\|gv\|}{\|g\|\|v\|} \leq 1. \quad (2.8)$$

For g in $GL(V)$, let $\gamma_{1,2}(g) := \frac{\|\wedge^2 g\|}{\|g\|^2}$.

Lemma 2.11. *Let $\delta > 0$. For g in $GL(V)$, if $\beta = \gamma_{1,2}(g) \leq \delta^2$, then*

- the action of g on $B_{V,g}^m(\delta)$ is $\beta\delta^{-2}$ -Lipschitz and

$$gB_{V,g}^m(\delta) \subset b_{V,g}^M(\beta\delta^{-1}) \subset b_{V,g}^M(\delta),$$

- the restriction of the real valued function $\sigma_V(g, \cdot)$ on $B_{V,g}^m(\delta)$ is $2\delta^{-1}$ -Lipschitz.

Proof. Due to [BQ16, Lem 14.2],

$$d(gx, x_g^M)\delta(x, y_g^m) \leq \gamma_{1,2}(g) = \beta.$$

Hence

$$d(gx, x_g^M) \leq \beta\delta(x, y_g^m)^{-1} \leq \beta\delta^{-1},$$

which implies the inclusion.

For $x = \mathbb{R}v$ and $x' = \mathbb{R}v'$ in $B_{V,g}^m(\delta)$, by (2.8), we have

$$d(gx, gx') = \frac{\|gv \wedge gv'\|}{\|v \wedge v'\|} \frac{\|v \wedge v'\|}{\|v\|\|v'\|} \frac{\|v\|\|v'\|}{\|gv\|\|gv'\|} \leq \gamma_{1,2}(g)d(x, x')\delta^{-2},$$

which implies the Lipschitz property of g .

For the Lipschitz property of $\sigma_V(g, \cdot)$, please see [BQ16, Lemma 17.11]. \square

For two different points $x = \mathbb{R}v$ and $x' = \mathbb{R}v'$ in $\mathbb{P}V$, we write $x \wedge x' = \mathbb{R}(v \wedge v') \in \mathbb{P}(\wedge^2 V)$.

Lemma 2.12. *For any g in $GL(V)$ and two different points $x = \mathbb{R}v, x' = \mathbb{R}v'$ in $\mathbb{P}V$, we have*

$$\gamma_{1,2}(g)\delta(x \wedge x', y_{\wedge^2 g}^m) \leq \frac{d(gx, gx')}{d(x, x')}. \quad (2.9)$$

Proof. By definition and (2.8), we have

$$d(gx, gx') = \frac{\|gv \wedge gv'\|}{\|v \wedge v'\|} \frac{\|v \wedge v'\|}{\|v\|\|v'\|} \frac{\|v\|\|v'\|}{\|gv\|\|gv'\|} \geq \gamma_{1,2}(g)\delta(x \wedge x', y_{\wedge^2 g}^m)d(x, x').$$

The proof is complete. \square

2.3 Actions on Flag varieties

Representations and Density points

Now, suppose that V is a representation of G with a good norm. Recall that V^χ is the eigenspace of the highest weight χ . Let V^* be the dual space of V . The representation of G on V^* is the dual representation given by: for $g \in G$ and $f \in V^*$, let $\rho^*(g)f = {}^t\rho(g^{-1})f$. This definition gives

$$\rho^*(g)f(\rho(g)v) = {}^t\rho(g^{-1})f(\rho(g)v) = f(v), \quad (2.10)$$

for f in V^* and v in V . Then the highest weight of V^* is $\iota\chi$. The following results explain the relation between different definitions by using combinatorial information on root systems and representations.

Lemma 2.13. *For an irreducible representation V of G with highest weight χ ,*

$$V_{\chi, \zeta_o} = V^{w_0\chi}. \quad (2.11)$$

Proof. This can be verified as follows: For X in \mathfrak{a} and v in V^χ ,

$$d\rho(X)\rho(w_0)v = \rho(w_0)d\rho(w_0X)v = \chi(w_0X)\rho(w_0)v = (w_0\chi)(X)\rho(w_0)v.$$

The proof is complete. \square

Lemma 2.14. *Let V be a proximal representation of G with highest weight χ . Then we have*

$$x_{\rho(g)}^M = \rho(k_g)V^\chi \text{ and } y_{\rho(g)}^m = {}^t\rho(\ell_g)(V^*)^{-\chi}. \quad (2.12)$$

If V is irreducible, then we have

$$x_{\rho(g)}^M = V_{\chi, \eta_g^M} \text{ and } y_{\rho(g)}^m = V_{\iota\chi, \zeta_g^m}^*.$$

Proof. Let $\{e_1, \dots, e_d\}$ be an orthonormal basis of V composed of eigenvectors of $\rho(A)$ such that $e_1 \in V^\chi$. Then $\rho(A)$ is diagonal. For $\exp(X) \in A^+$, since χ is the highest weight, we have

$$a_1 = \exp(\chi(X)) \geq a_2, \dots, a_d.$$

By the definition of a good norm, $\rho(K)$ preserves the norm. Hence for g in G , the formula $\rho(g) = \rho(k_g)\rho(a_g)\rho(\ell_g)$ is a decomposition which satisfies (2.6) in the previous paragraph with some permutation of $\{e_2, \dots, e_d\}$. But these permutations do not change the density points. Hence we have $x_{\rho(g)}^M = \mathbb{R}\rho(k_g)e_1 = \rho(k_g)V^\chi$. If V is irreducible we have $x_{\rho(g)}^M = V_{\chi, \eta_g^M}$.

In the dual space, we can verify that e_1^* has weight $-\chi$, which is the lowest weight in weights of V^* . By the same argument as in $\mathbb{P}V$, we have

$$y_{\rho(g)}^m = \mathbb{R}{}^t\rho(\ell_g)e_1^* = {}^t\rho(\ell_g)(V^*)^{-\chi}.$$

We also have a map from \mathcal{P} to $\mathbb{P}V^*$. Hence by (2.11) with representation V^* and weight $\iota\chi$, we know $V_{\iota\chi, \zeta_o}^* = (V^*)^{w_0\iota\chi} = (V^*)^{-\chi}$. For $\zeta = g\zeta_o$ in \mathcal{P} , by definition,

$$V_{\iota\chi, \zeta}^* = gV_{\iota\chi, \zeta_o}^* = g(V^*)^{-\chi}. \quad (2.13)$$

Since V is irreducible, by (2.13) we have $y_{\rho(g)}^m = {}^t\rho(\ell_g)(V^*)^{-\chi} = \rho^*(\ell_g^{-1})(V^*)^{-\chi} = V_{\iota\chi, \zeta_g^m}^*$. \square

Distance on Flag varieties

For α in Π , we abbreviate $V_{\chi_\alpha, \eta}, V_{\iota\chi_\alpha, \zeta}$ to $V_{\alpha, \eta}, V_{\alpha, \zeta}$. For g in G , by Lemma 2.14, we find $x_{\rho_\alpha(g)}^M = V_{\alpha, \eta_g^M}$ and $y_{\rho_\alpha(g)}^m = V_{\alpha, \zeta_g^m}$. For η, η' in \mathcal{P} , let

$$d_\alpha(\eta, \eta') = d(V_{\alpha, \eta}, V_{\alpha, \eta'})$$

be its distance between their images in $\mathbb{P}V_\alpha$. We define a distance on the flag variety. It is the maximal distance induced by projections,

$$d(\eta, \eta') = \max_{\alpha \in \Pi} d(V_{\alpha, \eta}, V_{\alpha, \eta'}). \quad (2.14)$$

We have another embedding of the flag variety

$$\mathcal{P} \rightarrow \prod_{\alpha \in \Pi} \mathbb{P}(V_\alpha^*).$$

For $\zeta = k\zeta_o \in \mathcal{P}$, by definition, we have $V_{\alpha, \zeta}^* = kV_{\alpha, \zeta_o}^*$. For $\eta \in \mathcal{P}$ and $\zeta \in \mathcal{P}$, we set

$$\delta(\eta, \zeta) = \min_{\alpha \in \Pi} \delta(V_{\alpha, \eta}, V_{\alpha, \zeta}^*).$$

In particular, because the images of η_o, ζ_o in $\mathbb{P}V_\alpha, \mathbb{P}V_\alpha^*$ are $V^{\chi_\alpha}, (V^*)^{-\chi_\alpha}$, we know $\delta(V_{\alpha, \eta_o}, V_{\alpha, \zeta_o}^*) = \delta(V^{\chi_\alpha}, (V^*)^{-\chi_\alpha}) = 1$, and then

$$\delta(\eta_o, \zeta_o) = 1. \quad (2.15)$$

We write

$$\begin{aligned} b_{V_\alpha, g}^M(r) &= \{x \in \mathbb{P}V_\alpha \mid d(x, x_{\rho_\alpha(g)}^M) \leq r\}, \\ B_{V_\alpha, g}^m(r) &= \{x \in \mathbb{P}V_\alpha \mid \delta(x, y_{\rho_\alpha(g)}^m) \geq r\}. \end{aligned}$$

They are subsets of $\mathbb{P}V_\alpha$. Write

$$\begin{aligned} b_g^M(r) &= \{\eta \in \mathcal{P} \mid \forall \alpha \in \Pi, V_{\alpha, \eta} \in b_{V_\alpha, g}^M(r)\} = \{\eta \in \mathcal{P} \mid d(\eta, \eta_g^M) \leq r\}, \\ B_g^m(r) &= \{\eta \in \mathcal{P} \mid \forall \alpha \in \Pi, V_{\alpha, \eta} \in B_{V_\alpha, g}^m(r)\} = \{\eta \in \mathcal{P} \mid \delta(\eta, \zeta_g^m) \geq r\}. \end{aligned}$$

They are subsets of \mathcal{P} .

Distance and norm

We need a multidimensional version of the lemmas in Section 2.2. They are about the similar quantities on flag varieties. The idea is to use all the representations ρ_α . There exists $C_1 > 0$ such that for any element X in \mathfrak{b} , we have

$$\frac{1}{C_1} \sup_{\alpha \in \Pi} |\chi_\alpha(X)| \leq \|X\| \leq C_1 \sup_{\alpha \in \Pi} |\chi_\alpha(X)|. \quad (2.16)$$

Using Lemma 2.9, (2.16) and $\sigma(g, \eta) - \kappa(g) \in \mathfrak{b}$, we deduce the following two lemmas from Lemma 2.10 and Lemma 2.11

Lemma 2.15. *For g in G and η in \mathcal{P} ,*

$$\|\sigma(g, \eta) - \kappa(g)\| \leq C_1 |\log \delta(\eta, \zeta_g^m)|.$$

For g in G and $\alpha \in \Pi$, by Lemma 2.9,

$$\gamma_{1,2}(\rho_\alpha(g)) = \frac{\|\wedge^2 \rho_\alpha(g)\|}{\|\rho_\alpha(g)\|^2} = e^{(2\chi_\alpha - \alpha - 2\chi_\alpha)\kappa(g)} = e^{-\alpha\kappa(g)}.$$

Let

$$\gamma(g) = \sup_{\alpha \in \Pi} e^{-\alpha\kappa(g)}. \quad (2.17)$$

We call it the gap of g .

Lemma 2.16. *Let $\delta > 0$. For g in G , if $\beta = \gamma(g) \leq \delta^2$, then*

- *the action of g on $B_g^m(\delta)$ is $\beta\delta^{-2}$ -Lipschitz and*

$$gB_g^m(\delta) \subset b_g^M(\beta\delta^{-1}) \subset b_g^M(\delta),$$

- *the restriction of the \mathfrak{a} -valued function $\sigma(g, \cdot)$ on $B_g^m(\delta)$ is $O(\delta^{-1})$ -Lipschitz.*

These properties tell us that the action of an element g on a large set of the flag variety \mathcal{P} behaves like uniformly contracting map.

We also need to compare the distance on the projective space and the flag variety. Recall that the map from \mathcal{P} to $\mathbb{P}V$ is defined in (2.1).

Lemma 2.17. *Let (ρ, V) be an irreducible representation of G with highest weight χ . There exists a constant $C > 0$ depending on the chosen norm such that for η, η' in \mathcal{P} ,*

$$d(V_{\chi, \eta}, V_{\chi, \eta'}) \leq Cd(\eta, \eta'). \quad (2.18)$$

The intuition is that a differentiable map between two compact Riemannian manifolds is Lipschitz. For more details, please see Lemma 5.8 in Appendix 5.2.

2.4 Actions on the tangent bundle of the Flag variety

In this section, we will study the action of G on the tangent bundle of \mathcal{P} . Recall that $\mathcal{P} \simeq G/P$ is the flag variety and $P = AN$ is a parabolic subgroup.

We first study the tangent bundle of the homogeneous space

$$\mathcal{P}_0 = G/A_eN.$$

Recall that A_e is the analytical connected component of A , given by $\exp(\mathfrak{a})$. Note that the left action of K on \mathcal{P}_0 is simply transitive (due to the Iwasawa decomposition in split case). Let z_o be the base point A_eN in \mathcal{P}_0 . We can identify the left K -invariant vector fields as

$$T_{z_o}\mathcal{P}_0 = T_{z_o}(G/A_eN) \simeq \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{p}.$$

Hence the tangent bundle of \mathcal{P}_0 has an isomorphism

$$T\mathcal{P}_0 \simeq \mathcal{P}_0 \times \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{p},$$

that is because we can identify the tangent space at z_o and $z = kz_o$ by the left action of k . We denote by (z, Y) a point of $T\mathcal{P}_0$ where z is in \mathcal{P}_0 and Y is in $\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{p}$. We use elements in $\mathfrak{n}^- = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in R^+} \mathfrak{g}^{-\alpha}$ as representative elements in $\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{p}$.

Then we describe the left action of G on $T\mathcal{P}_0$. Take Y in $\mathfrak{g}^{-\alpha}$ and $z = kz_o$ in \mathcal{P}_0 . For g in G , by the Iwasawa decomposition we have a unique k' in K and a unique $\sigma(g, k)$ in \mathfrak{a} such that $gk = k'p \in k' \exp(\sigma(g, k))N$, where $p \in A_eN$. Here $\sigma(g, k)$ is understood as $\sigma(g, k\eta_o)$. Due to

$$gk \exp(tY)z_o = k'p \exp(tY)z_o = k' \exp(t\text{Ad}_p Y)z_o,$$

by taking derivative at $t = 0$, the left action of g on the tangent vector (z, Y) satisfies

$$L_g(z, Y) = (z', \text{Ad}_p Y),$$

where $z' = k'\eta_o$ and Ad is the adjoint action of P on $\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{p}$.

Now we restrict our attention to simple roots. Let α be a **simple root**. Due to $Y \in \mathfrak{g}^{-\alpha}$, we have $\text{Ad}_N Y \subset Y + \mathfrak{a} + \mathfrak{n}$, which implies that the unipotent part N acts trivially on $(\mathfrak{g}^{-\alpha} + \mathfrak{p})/\mathfrak{p}$. Due to $p \in \exp(\sigma(g, k))N$, we have

$$\text{Ad}_p Y = \exp(-\alpha\sigma(g, k))Y \text{ on } (\mathfrak{g}^{-\alpha} + \mathfrak{p})/\mathfrak{p}. \quad (2.19)$$

This means that the line bundle $\mathcal{P}_0 \times \mathfrak{g}^{-\alpha}$ is stable under the left action of G , and we call it the α -bundle.

The flag variety \mathcal{P} is a quotient of \mathcal{P}_0 by the right action of group M , due to $A = MA_e$. We use π to denote the quotient map. The right action of M also induces an action on the tangent bundle. For (z, Y) in $T\mathcal{P}_0$ and m in M , by $k \exp(tY)mz_o = km \exp(t\text{Ad}_{m^{-1}}Y)z_o$, we have

$$R_m(kz_o, Y) = (kmz_o, \text{Ad}_{m^{-1}}Y). \quad (2.20)$$

Descending to the quotient implies that the tangent bundle of \mathcal{P} satisfies

$$T\mathcal{P} \simeq \mathcal{P}_0 \times_M \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{p},$$

which is the quotient space of $\mathcal{P}_0 \times \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{p}$ by the equivalence relation generated by the action of M , (2.20). As M is a subgroup of A , its adjoint action preserves the line $\mathfrak{g}^{-\alpha}$ in $\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{p}$. Hence the α -bundle on \mathcal{P}_0 descends to a line bundle on \mathcal{P} . The integral curves of the α -bundle on \mathcal{P}_0 are closed, and we call them α -circles on \mathcal{P}_0 . At a point $z = kz_o$ in \mathcal{P}_0 , it is given by

$$\gamma_\alpha : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_0, \quad t \mapsto k \exp(tK_\alpha)z_o. \quad (2.21)$$

This can be verified directly, because the tangent vector of the curve at time t is $(\dot{\gamma}_\alpha(t), K_\alpha) = (\dot{\gamma}_\alpha(t), Y_\alpha)$, due to the definition of $\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{p}$, which belongs to the α -bundle. The one parameter subgroup $\{\exp(tK_\alpha) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ is a compact subgroup of G , which is isomorphic to $SO(2)$. We call it O_α .

Under the right action of M , the α -circles on \mathcal{P}_0 descend to the α -circles on \mathcal{P} .

Lemma 2.18. *Let χ be a dominant weight such that $\chi(H_\alpha) = 0$ and let (ρ, V) be an irreducible representation with highest weight χ . Then the image of an α -circle in $\mathbb{P}V$ is a point.*

Suppose in addition that the semisimple part of \mathbf{G} is simply connected. The image of the α -circle containing $\eta = k\eta_o$ in $\mathbb{P}V_\alpha$ is the projective line generated by $\rho_\alpha(k)V^{\chi_\alpha}$ and $\rho_\alpha(k)V^{\chi_\alpha - \alpha}$.

Proof. Since the α -bundle is left K -invariant, the set of α -circles are also left K -invariant. It is sufficient to consider the α -circle containing η_o . By (2.21) and (2.1), the image of α -circle is given by $\rho(O_\alpha)V^\chi$.

Consider the Lie algebra \mathfrak{s}_α generated by $H_\alpha, X_\alpha, Y_\alpha$, which is isomorphic to \mathfrak{sl}_2 . For v in V^χ , we have $d\rho(H_\alpha)v = \chi(H_\alpha)v$. Due to the classification of the irreducible representation of \mathfrak{sl}_2 , the irreducible representation V_1 of \mathfrak{s}_α generated by V^χ is of dimension $\chi(H_\alpha) + 1$.

When χ satisfies $\chi(H_\alpha) = 0$, the above argument implies that V_1 is a trivial representation and $\rho(O_\alpha)$ acts trivially on V_1 . Hence the image of the α -circle is a point.

For simply connected case, by $\chi_\alpha(H_\alpha) = \tilde{\omega}_\alpha(H_\alpha) = 1$, the same argument implies that V_1 is of dimension 2. Another eigenspace of V_1 is $V^{\chi_\alpha - \alpha}$. The group $\rho(O_\alpha)$ acts as $SO(2)$ on V_1 , which implies the result. \square

Remark 2.19. *If the reader knows the partial flag variety $\mathcal{P}_{\Pi - \{\alpha\}}$, then the α -circle is simply the fibre of the quotient map $\mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_{\Pi - \{\alpha\}}$. This point of view also implies Lemma 2.18.*

Generally, the α -bundle on \mathcal{P} is non trivial in the sense of line bundle.

Example 2.20. *Let G be $SL_3(\mathbb{R})$. Recall that*

$$\mathfrak{a} = \{X = \text{diag}(x_1, x_2, x_3) \mid x_1 + x_2 + x_3 = 0, \quad x_1, x_2, x_3 \in \mathbb{R}\},$$

and α_1, α_2 are two simple roots given by $\alpha_1 = \lambda_1 - \lambda_2$ and $\alpha_2 = \lambda_2 - \lambda_3$. The group M is $\{e, \text{diag}(1, -1, -1), \text{diag}(-1, 1, -1), \text{diag}(-1, -1, 1)\} \simeq (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^2$. We have

$$\text{Ad}_{\text{diag}(1, -1, -1)}Y_{\alpha_1} = \alpha_1^\sharp(\text{diag}(1, -1, -1))Y_{\alpha_1} = -Y_{\alpha_1}.$$

In this case the action of M is nontrivial and it is not a normal subgroup of $K = SO(3)$. The α -bundle on \mathcal{P} restricted to an α -circle is roughly a Möbius band.

In this case, α_1 -circles are given by $\{W_1 \subset W_2\}$, where W_2 is a fixed two dimensional subspace of \mathbb{R}^3 and W_1 varies in one-dimensional subspaces of W_2 . On the contrary, α_2 -circles are given by $\{W_1 \subset W_2\}$ with W_1 fixed and W_2 varying in two planes which contain W_1 . From this description, we can easily see the G -invariance of the set of α -circles.

It is better to work on \mathcal{P}_0 , where the α -bundle is trivial. One difficulty is that in the covering space \mathcal{P}_0 , we need to capture the missing information of the group M . More precisely, for h in G and z, z' in \mathcal{P}_0 if $h\pi(z), h\pi(z')$ are close, we do not know whether hz, hz' are close or not. This will be answered at the end of Section 2.5.

Remark 2.21. In an abstract language as in [BQ14, Lemma 4.8], we have a principal bundle $M \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$, where the action of M on \mathcal{P}_0 is a right action. We also have a left action of a semigroup Γ in G on \mathcal{P}_0 and \mathcal{P} (Γ will be taken as Γ_μ in our case). Suppose that we have a Γ -minimal set Λ_Γ in \mathcal{P} . The lifting of Λ_Γ to \mathcal{P}_0 has different possibilities. Let η be a point in Λ_Γ and $z = kz_0$ be a lifting of η in \mathcal{P}_0 . Let $M_z = \{m \in M | \overline{\Gamma k m} = \overline{\Gamma k}\}$, where the closure is taken in \mathcal{P}_0 . Then we have a bijection between two sets

$$\{\Gamma - \text{minimal orbit in } \mathcal{P}_0\} \longleftrightarrow M_z \backslash M.$$

In particular, if Γ is a semigroup of matrices of positive entries in $SL_{m+1}(\mathbb{R})$, then $M_z = \{e\}$ and Γ has the maximal number of minimal orbits in \mathcal{P}_0 .

2.5 The sign group

Suppose the semisimple part of \mathbf{G} is simply connected. Recall the notation for reductive groups and Lie algebras. Let N^- be the subgroup with Lie algebra \mathfrak{n}^- . We have a Bruhat decomposition of the reductive group G ([Bor90, 21.15]), where the main part is given by

$$N^- \times M \times A_e \times N \rightarrow G.$$

The image U is a Zariski open subset of G and the map is injective. For elements in U , we can define a map m to the group M , mapping an element g to the part of M in the Bruhat decomposition.

A part of M is given by the different analytical connected components of G . Let

$$M_0 = M \cap G^o \text{ and } M_1 = M/M_0$$

be the quotient group. Let $\pi_0(X)$ be the set of connected components of a topological space X and let $\#\pi_0(X)$ be its number of elements.

Lemma 2.22. We have $M \cap B = M_0$.

Proof. Recall that $B = A \cap \mathcal{D}G$. Due to $\mathcal{D}G \supset K^o$,

$$M \cap B = M \cap (A \cap \mathcal{D}G) = M \cap \mathcal{D}G \supset M \cap K^o.$$

Since M is a subset of K , we see that $M_0 = M \cap G^o = M \cap K \cap G^o = M \cap K^o$. At the same time, since $\mathcal{D}G$ is simply connected, the group of real points $\mathcal{D}G$ is connected in the Lie group topology. Therefore

$$M \cap K^o = M_0 = M \cap G^o \supset M \cap \mathcal{D}G = M \cap B.$$

The proof is complete. □

Let $\mathcal{P}_1 = G/A_eBN$.

Lemma 2.23. *The homogeneous space \mathcal{P}_1 has the same number of connected components as \mathcal{P}_0 , that is $\#\pi_0(\mathcal{P}_0) = \#\pi_0(\mathcal{P}_1) = \#\pi_0(M_1)$, and each connected component of \mathcal{P}_1 is isomorphic to \mathcal{P} as topological spaces.*

Proof. Since $\mathcal{D}G$ is connected, we know $A_eBN \subset A_e\mathcal{D}G \subset G^\circ$. The number of connected components of \mathcal{P}_1 equals to $\#\pi_0(G) = \#\pi_0(\mathcal{P}_0)$.

The degree of the covering $\mathcal{P}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$ equals to

$$\#(A/A_eB) = \#(M/M \cap B).$$

By Lemma 2.22, we have $M \cap B = M_0$. Hence

$$\#(A/A_eB) = \#(M/M_0) = \#\pi_0(M_1) = \#\pi_0(G) = \#\pi_0(\mathcal{P}_1).$$

Since \mathcal{P} is connected, the result follows. \square

Hence, the M_1 part of $m(g)$ can be determined by seeing in which connected component of G the element g is. We want to know for two near elements g, g' in G , whether we have $m(g) = m(g')$ or not.

In order to study the M_0 part, we will use representations defined in Lemma 2.3 to give another description of the sign group. This is in the same spirit as the treatment of the sign group M in [Ben05]. Let v_α be a non-zero eigenvector with highest weight χ_α in V_α . Let sg be the sign function on \mathbb{R} .

Lemma 2.24. *For g in U , we have*

$$\text{sg}\langle v_\alpha, \rho_\alpha(g)v_\alpha \rangle = \chi_\alpha^\sharp(m(g)),$$

where χ_α^\sharp is the corresponding algebraic character on A of the weight χ_α .

Proof. Since v_α is N -invariant and the Cartan involution θ maps N^- to N , by (2.2)

$$\begin{aligned} \langle v_\alpha, \rho_\alpha(N^-MA_eN)v_\alpha \rangle &= \langle {}^t\rho_\alpha(N^-)v_\alpha, \rho_\alpha(MA_eN)v_\alpha \rangle = \langle \rho_\alpha(\theta(N^-))v_\alpha, \rho_\alpha(MA_eN)v_\alpha \rangle \\ &= \langle \rho_\alpha(N)v_\alpha, \rho_\alpha(MA_eN)v_\alpha \rangle = \langle v_\alpha, \rho_\alpha(MA_e)v_\alpha \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

The action of A_e does not change the sign, hence by Lemma 2.7 we have

$$\text{sg}\langle v_\alpha, \rho_\alpha(g)v_\alpha \rangle = \text{sg}\langle v_\alpha, \rho_\alpha(m(g))v_\alpha \rangle = \chi_\alpha^\sharp(m(g)).$$

The proof is complete. \square

We are in the simply connected case and we have $X(\mathbf{B}) = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Pi} \mathbb{Z}\tilde{\omega}_\alpha$. Due to $M_0 = M \cap B$, we know that $\chi_\alpha^\sharp(m) = \tilde{\omega}_\alpha^\sharp(m)$ for m in M_0 . By $B \simeq (\mathbb{R}^*)^{\#\Pi}$, the common kernel of all the characters is the neutral element. Therefore

Lemma 2.25. *The function $\prod_{\alpha \in \Pi} \chi_\alpha^\sharp : M_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\#\Pi}$ given by*

$$\prod_{\alpha \in \Pi} \chi_\alpha^\sharp(m) = (\chi_\alpha^\sharp(m))_{\alpha \in \Pi} \quad \text{for } m \in M_0,$$

is injective.

Definition 2.26. *We define the sign function from $G \times G$ to $M \cup \{0\}$ by*

$$m(g, g') = \begin{cases} m(\theta(g^{-1})g') & \text{if } \theta(g^{-1})g' \in U, \\ 0 & \text{if not,} \end{cases}$$

where g, g' are in G and θ is the Cartan involution.

This definition exploits the relation between g and g' . More precisely, for u, v in V_α we have $\langle v, \rho_\alpha(\theta(g^{-1})g')u \rangle = \langle \rho_\alpha gv, \rho_\alpha g'u \rangle$, which explains the definition. Due to $\theta(N) = N^-$, the sign function is factors through $G/A_e N \times G/A_e N = \mathcal{P}_0 \times \mathcal{P}_0$.

We now explain the sign function for the case $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{R})$. We only need to consider the representation of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ on \mathbb{R}^2 . Let $v_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$ be a vector with highest weight in \mathbb{R}^2 . Then

$$\langle v_0, \theta(g^{-1})g'v_0 \rangle = \langle gv_0, g'v_0 \rangle,$$

which is the inner product of the first column of g and g' . The sign function is used to determine whether these two vectors $gv_0, g'v_0$ have an acute angle and whether g and g' are in the same connected component.

By the Bruhat decomposition, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 2.27. *For g, g' in G and m in M , we have*

$$m(g, g'm) = m(gm, g') = m(g, g')m.$$

Lemma 2.28. *Take a Cartan decomposition of g , that is $g = k_g a_g \ell_g \in KA^+K$. Then for h in G ,*

$$m(k_g, gh) = m(\ell_g^{-1}, h).$$

The key observation here is that the sign function is locally constant. Recall that ζ_o is point in \mathcal{P} and its image in $\mathbb{P}V_\alpha^*$ is the linear functional on V_α which vanishes on the hyperplane perpendicular to V^{χ_α} . Recall that $\delta(\eta, \zeta) = \min_{\alpha \in \Pi} \delta(V_{\alpha, \eta}, V_{\alpha, \zeta}^*)$ and $d(\eta, \eta') = \max_{\alpha \in \Pi} d(V_{\alpha, \eta}, V_{\alpha, \eta'})$.

Lemma 2.29. *For $g \in G - U$, we have*

$$\delta(g\eta_o, \zeta_o) = 0 \text{ and } d(g\eta_o, \eta_o) = 1.$$

Proof. By Bruhat's decomposition, we know that $g \in N^- A_e w N$ for some non-trivial element w in the Weyl group. Then the action of w on \mathfrak{b}^* is non-trivial, there exists a simple root α such that $w(\chi_\alpha) \neq \chi_\alpha$.

Then $\rho_\alpha(g)v_\alpha = \rho_\alpha(N^- M A_e(g))\rho_\alpha(w)v_\alpha$, where $N^- M A_e(g)$ is the corresponding part of g in the Bruhat decomposition. The vector $\rho_\alpha(w)v_\alpha$ is of weight $w(\chi_\alpha) < \chi_\alpha$ by the definition of highest weight and $\rho_\alpha(N^- M A_e(g))\rho_\alpha(w)v_\alpha$ is a linear combination of vectors of weight less than or equal to $w(\chi_\alpha)$. Since vectors of different weights are orthogonal, we obtain

$$\delta(V_{\alpha, g\eta_o}, V_{\alpha, \zeta_o}^*) = \langle v_\alpha, \rho_\alpha(g)v_\alpha \rangle = 0$$

and

$$d(V_{\alpha, g\eta_o}, V_{\alpha, \eta_o}) = \frac{\|\rho_\alpha(g)(v_\alpha) \wedge v_\alpha\|}{\|\rho_\alpha(g)v_\alpha\| \|v_\alpha\|} = 1.$$

The proof is complete. □

Lemma 2.30. *For k_1, k_2, k_3 in K , if $\delta(k_2\eta_o, k_1\zeta_o) > d(k_2\eta_o, k_3\eta_o)$, then*

$$m(k_1, k_2) = m(k_1, k_3)m(k_2, k_3).$$

Proof. By Lemma 2.27, it is sufficient to consider $k_i \in K^o$. By definition and (2.10), we have $\delta(k_2\eta_o, k_1\zeta_o) = \delta(k_1^{-1}k_2\eta_o, \zeta_o)$ and $m(k_1, k_2) = m(id, k_1^{-1}k_2)$. Hence, we can suppose that $k_1 = e$, the identity element in K . By $d(k_3^{-1}k_2\eta_o, \eta_o) = d(k_2\eta_o, k_3\eta_o) < 1$ and Lemma 2.29, we




Figure 1: Angle

have $m(k_2, k_3) \in M$. Lemma 2.24 and Lemma 2.25 imply that it is sufficient to prove that if $\delta(k_2\eta_o, \zeta_o) > d(k_2\eta_o, k_3\eta_o)$ and $m(k_2, k_3) = e$, then for every simple root α we have

$$\text{sg}\langle v_\alpha, \rho_\alpha(k_2)v_\alpha \rangle = \text{sg}\langle v_\alpha, \rho_\alpha(k_3)v_\alpha \rangle.$$

Fix a simple root α in Π . Abbreviate $v_\alpha, \rho_\alpha(k_2)v_\alpha, \rho_\alpha(k_3)v_\alpha$ to v_1, v_2, v_3 . Let ϑ_1 be the angle between the vector v_2 and the hyperplane v_1^\perp and let ϑ_2 be the angle between v_2 and v_3 . Due to $m(k_2, k_3) = e$, by Lemma 2.24 this implies

$$0 < \langle v_1, k_2^{-1}k_3v_1 \rangle = \langle k_2v_1, k_3v_1 \rangle = \langle v_2, v_3 \rangle,$$

hence the angle ϑ_2 is acute. The image of ζ_o in $\mathbb{P}V_\alpha^*$ is given by $\mathbb{R}\langle v_1, \cdot \rangle$. The hypothesis $\delta(k_2\eta_o, \zeta_o) > d(k_2\eta_o, k_3\eta_o)$ implies that

$$\sin \vartheta_1 = \langle v_1, v_2 \rangle > \|v_2 \wedge v_3\| = \sin \vartheta_2.$$

Hence $\vartheta_2 < \vartheta_1$ and v_2, v_3 are in the same side of the hyperplane v_1^\perp , which implies $\text{sg}\langle v_1, v_2 \rangle = \text{sg}\langle v_1, v_3 \rangle$. Please see figure 1. \square

We state a consequence of Lemma 2.30 which will be used in Section 4.2 to get independence of certain measures λ_j .

Lemma 2.31. *Let $\delta < 1/2$, let g, h be in G and k, k' in K . If h, k, k' satisfy*

$$d(k\eta_o, k'\eta_o) < \delta, \quad k\eta_o, k'\eta_o \in B_h^m(\delta), \quad \eta_h^M \in B_g^m(3\delta) \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma(h) < \delta^2,$$

then

$$m(k_g, ghk) = m(\ell_g^{-1}, hk')m(k, k').$$

Proof. By Lemma 2.27, it is sufficient to prove the case $m(k, k') = e$ and k, k' in K^o . By Lemma 2.28,

$$m(k_g, ghk) = m(\ell_g^{-1}, hk). \tag{2.22}$$

Denote $k\eta_o, k'\eta_o$ by η, η' . Then by Lemma 2.16, we have $h\eta, h\eta' \in b_h^M(\delta) \subset B_g^m(2\delta)$. Hence by $d(h\eta, h\eta') < 2\delta \leq \delta(h\eta, \zeta_g^m) = \delta(h\eta, \ell_g^{-1}\zeta_o)$ and Lemma 2.30, we have

$$m(\ell_g^{-1}, hk) = m(\ell_g^{-1}, hk')m(hk, hk'). \quad (2.23)$$

The main point here is to use the following lemma.

Lemma 2.32. *Under the same assumption as in Lemma 2.31, we have*

$$m(hk, hk') = m(k, k').$$

Combined with (2.22) and (2.23), the proof is complete. \square

Proof of Lemma 2.32. Without loss of generality, suppose that $m(k, k') = e$. Due to $k\eta_o \in B_h^m(\delta)$, we can chose a ℓ_h in the Cartan decomposition $h = k_h a_h \ell_h$ such that $m(\ell_h^{-1}, k) = e$. By Lemma 2.30, the hypothesis that $\delta(k\eta_o, \ell_h^{-1}\zeta_o) > \delta > d(k\eta_o, k'\eta_o)$ implies $m(\ell_h^{-1}, k') = m(\ell_h^{-1}, k) = e$. By Lemma 2.28, we conclude that $e = m(k_h, hk) = m(\ell_h^{-1}, k) = m(\ell_h^{-1}, k') = m(k_h, hk')$. Here we need a distance d_0 on \mathcal{P}_0 , which is defined in Appendix 5.2. Let $z = kz_o$ and $z' = k'z_o$. By Lemma 5.9 with $z_h = k_h z_o$

$$d_0(hz, hz') \leq d_0(hz, z_h) + d_0(z_h, hz') \leq d(hk\eta_o, \eta_h^M) + d(\eta_h^M, hk'\eta_o). \quad (2.24)$$

Hence by (2.24), we have $d_0(hz, hz') \leq 2\delta < 1$, which implies $m(hk, hk') = e$ due to Lemma 5.9. \square

The proof of Lemma 2.32 also says that if z, z' are close and away from the bad subvariety defined by h , and if the gap of h is large, then hz, hz' are also close.

2.6 Derivative

Suppose in addition that the semisimple part of \mathbf{G} is simply connected except Lemma 2.38. Let φ be a C^1 function on \mathcal{P}_0 . We will give some property of the directional derivative of φ . We write $\partial_\alpha \varphi$ for the directional derivative $\partial_{Y_\alpha} \varphi$, where α is a simple root.

Definition 2.33 (Arc length). *Let z_1, z_2 be two points in the same α -circle in \mathcal{P}_0 . If $m(z_1, z_2) = e$, we define the arc length distance between z_1, z_2 by*

$$d_A(z_1, z_2) := \arcsin d(\pi z_1, \pi z_2).$$

Remark 2.34. *This is a restriction of the left K -invariant distance, which can be induced by the K -invariant Riemann metric d_1 in the appendix.*

Lemma 2.35 (The Newton-Leibniz formula). *Let z_1, z_2 be two points in the same α -circle on \mathcal{P}_0 such that $m(z_1, z_2) = e$. Let $u = d_A(z_1, z_2)$ and let $\gamma : [0, u] \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_0$ be the curve in the α -circle connecting z_1, z_2 with unit speed (in the sense of arc length). Then for g in G*

$$\varphi(gz_1) - \varphi(gz_2) = \pm \int_0^u \partial_\alpha \varphi_{g\gamma(s)} e^{-\alpha\sigma(g, \gamma(s))} ds, \quad (2.25)$$

where the sign only depends on the direction of γ .

Remark 2.36. *The α -circle already has an orientation given by Y_α . The sign is negative if the curve γ is negatively oriented.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, suppose that γ is positively oriented. Recall that $K_\alpha = Y_\alpha - X_\alpha$ for $\alpha \in \Pi$. The images of K_α and Y_α coincide in $\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{p}$. Then $k_2 = k_1 \exp(uK_\alpha)$ and $\gamma(s) = k_1 \exp(sK_\alpha)z_o$ for $s \in [0, u]$. By the Newton-Leibniz formula and (2.19) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(gz_2) - \varphi(gz_1) &= \int_0^u d\varphi_{g\gamma(s)} dg_{\gamma(s)} K_\alpha ds = \int_0^u d\varphi_{g\gamma(s)} dg_{\gamma(s)} Y_\alpha ds \\ &= \int_0^u d\varphi_{g\gamma(s)} \exp(-\alpha\sigma(g, \gamma(s))) Y_\alpha ds = \int_0^u \partial_\alpha \varphi_{g\gamma(s)} e^{-\alpha\sigma(g, \gamma(s))} ds. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is complete. \square

For m in M and α in Π , by Lemma 2.7 with the adjoint representation of G on \mathfrak{g} , due to $Y_\alpha \in \mathfrak{g}^{-\alpha}$, we have $\text{Ad}_m Y_\alpha = (-\alpha)^\sharp(m) Y_\alpha = \alpha^\sharp(m)^{-1} Y_\alpha = \alpha^\sharp(m) Y_\alpha$. The last equality is due to $\alpha^\sharp(m) \in \{\pm 1\}$. Thanks to (2.20), we have

Lemma 2.37. *Let m be in M and let φ be a C^1 function on \mathcal{P}_0 which is right M -invariant. We have for $z = kz_o$ in \mathcal{P}_0*

$$\partial_\alpha \varphi_{kmz_o} = \alpha^\sharp(m) \partial_\alpha \varphi_z.$$

We say a function φ on \mathcal{P}_0 is the lift of a function on $\mathbb{P}V_\alpha$, if there exists a function φ_1 on $\mathbb{P}V_\alpha$ such that for $z = kz_o \in \mathcal{P}_0$

$$\varphi(z) = \varphi_1(V_{\alpha, k\eta_o}).$$

By Lemma 2.18, we have

Lemma 2.38. *Suppose \mathbf{G} is a connected \mathbb{R} -split reductive \mathbb{R} -group. If φ is a C^1 function on \mathcal{P}_0 , which is the lift of a C^1 function on $\mathbb{P}V_\alpha$, then*

$$\partial_{\alpha'} \varphi = 0 \text{ for } \alpha' \neq \alpha, \alpha' \in \Pi.$$

2.7 Changing Flags

Suppose in addition that the semisimple part of \mathbf{G} is simply connected. This part is trivial for $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$, where the flag variety $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ is a single α -orbit. In this section, we suppose that the semisimple rank m is no less than two.

On the flag variety, we have many directions in the tangent space. Roughly speaking, the action of g is contracting and the contraction speed on Y_α is given by $e^{-\alpha\kappa(g)}$, $\alpha \in R^+$. Due to $\kappa(g)$ being in the Weyl chamber \mathfrak{a}^+ , the slowest directions are given by simple roots. Other directions are negligible. The main result Lemma 2.46 is a quantitative version of this intuition.

We have already seen that if two points η, η' are in the same α -circle, then we have a nice formula for the difference of the value of a real function φ at $g\eta$ and $g\eta'$, where $g \in G$. We want to compute this for η, η' in general position. This is a new difficulty in higher rank.

If we are on the euclidean space \mathbf{E}^n and we are only allowed to move along the directions of coordinate vectors, for any two points x, x' , we can walk from x to x' with at most n moves. But this is not true for the flag variety \mathcal{P} . Suppose that we are only allowed to move along α circles with $\alpha \in \Pi$. Then for two general points η, η' in \mathcal{P} , it takes more than $m = \#\Pi$ moves to walk from one point to the other point. We try to move in each α circle at most one time and to make the resulting points as close as possible.

Recall that V is a finite-dimensional vector space with euclidean norm. Let $l = \mathbb{R}(v_1 \wedge v_2)$ be a point in $\mathbb{P}(\wedge^2 V)$, which is also a projective line in $\mathbb{P}V$.

Lemma 2.39. *Let $x = \mathbb{R}w_1$ be a point in $\mathbb{P}V$ and $l = \mathbb{R}(v_1 \wedge v_2)$ be a projective line in $\mathbb{P}V$. Then we have*

$$d(l, x) := \min_{x' \in l} d(x', x) = \frac{\|v_1 \wedge v_2 \wedge w_1\|}{\|v_1 \wedge v_2\| \|w_1\|}.$$

Proof. The geometric meaning of $\|v_1 \wedge v_2 \wedge w_1\|$ is the volume of the parallelepiped generated by three vectors v_1, v_2, w_1 . This volume can also be calculated as the product of the area of the parallelogram generated by v_1 and v_2 , that is $\|v_1 \wedge v_2\|$, and the distance of w_1 to the plane generated by v_1 and v_2 , that is $d(w_1, \text{Span}(v_1, v_2))$. Hence, we have the formula

$$\|v_1 \wedge v_2 \wedge w_1\| = \|v_1 \wedge v_2\|d(w_1, \text{Span}(v_1, v_2)). \quad (2.26)$$

The distance $d(w_1, \text{Span}(v_1, v_2))$ equals $\|w_1\|d(l, x)$, because the geometric sense of $d(l, x)$ is the sine of the angle between the vector w_1 and the plane $\text{Span}(v_1, v_2)$. Together with (2.26), we have the result. \square

Lemma 2.40. *Let x be a point in $\mathbb{P}V$ and l be a projective line in $\mathbb{P}V$. If $g \in GL(V)$ satisfies that $\delta(x, y_g^m), \delta(l, y_{\wedge^2 g}^m) > \delta$, then*

$$d(gl, gx) \leq \delta^{-2} \gamma_{1,3}(g)d(l, x),$$

where $\gamma_{1,3}(g) = \frac{\|\wedge^3 g\|}{\|\wedge^2 g\|\|g\|}$.

Compared with Lemma 2.12, we see that with more degree of freedom the contracting speed is significantly greater.

Proof. By definition and the fact that $l = \mathbb{R}(v_1 \wedge v_2), x = \mathbb{R}w_1$, we have

$$d(gl, gx) = \frac{\|\wedge^2 g(v_1 \wedge v_2) \wedge gw_1\|}{\|\wedge^2 g(v_1 \wedge v_2)\|\|gw_1\|} \leq \frac{\|\wedge^3 g\|\|v_1 \wedge v_2 \wedge w_1\|}{\|\wedge^2 g(v_1 \wedge v_2)\|\|gw_1\|},$$

Then by Lemma 2.10, we have

$$d(gl, gx) \leq \frac{\|\wedge^3 g\|\|v_1 \wedge v_2 \wedge w_1\|}{\delta^2 \|\wedge^2 g\|\|v_1 \wedge v_2\|\|g\|\|w_1\|} = \frac{\|\wedge^3 g\|}{\delta^2 \|\wedge^2 g\|\|g\|} d(l, x).$$

The proof is complete. \square

We can also prove Lemma 2.40 by finding a point $x' = \mathbb{R}v' \in l$ such that $v' \wedge w_1$ is orthogonal to the vector of highest weight in $\wedge^2 V$. Then the distance between gx' and gx will be roughly $\gamma_{1,3}(g)$.

We will start to change the flags. Recall that for $\alpha \in \Pi$ and η, η' in \mathcal{P} , the function $d_\alpha(\eta, \eta')$ is the distance between the images of η and η' in $\mathbb{P}V_\alpha$. If one wants to change a flag in the α -circle in \mathcal{P} , there are some constraints from the structure of flags. We introduce the following definition which explains the constraint.

By Lemma 2.18, we have

Lemma 2.41. *The image of the α -circle of η in $\mathbb{P}V_\alpha$ is a projective line and we call it $l_{\alpha, \eta}$. Seen as an element in $\mathbb{P}(\wedge^2 V_\alpha)$, the element $l_{\alpha, \eta}$ is actually in $\mathbb{P}V_{2\chi_\alpha - \alpha} \subset \mathbb{P}(\wedge^2 V_\alpha)$.*

Example 2.42. *If $G = \text{SL}_{m+1}(\mathbb{R})$. Let*

$$\eta = \{W_1 \subset W_2 \subset \cdots \subset W_{m+1} = \mathbb{R}^{m+1}\}$$

be a flag in \mathcal{P} . Recall that W_r is a r -dimensional subspace of \mathbb{R}^{m+1} . Take $W_0 = \{0\}$. Let i_r be the natural embedding of the Grassmannian to projective spaces, that is $\mathbb{G}_r(\mathbb{R}^{m+1}) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(\wedge^r \mathbb{R}^{m+1})$. In this case, we see that

$$l_{\alpha_r, \eta} = i_r(W_{r+1} \supset W'_r \supset W_{r-1}),$$

as a projective line in $\mathbb{P}(\wedge^r \mathbb{R}^{m+1})$, which is the image of all the r -dimensional subspace W'_r of \mathbb{R}^{m+1} such that $W_{r-1} \subset W'_r \subset W_{r+1}$.

Definition 2.43. Let $(\eta_0, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_k)$ be a sequence of points in \mathcal{P} . We call it a chain if any consecutive elements η_i, η_{i+1} are in the same α -circle for some $\alpha \in \Pi$, and we write $\alpha(\eta_i, \eta_{i+1})$ for this simple root. Let $\Pi(\eta_0, \dots, \eta_k)$ be the set of simple roots appearing in the chain, that is

$$\Pi(\eta_0, \dots, \eta_k) = \{\alpha \in \Pi \mid \exists i, \alpha(\eta_i, \eta_{i+1}) = \alpha\}.$$

Lemma 2.44. Let (η_0, \dots, η_l) be a chain and let α be a simple root such that $\alpha \notin \Pi(\eta_0, \dots, \eta_l)$. Then the image of the chain in $\mathbb{P}V_\alpha$ is a single point, that is

$$V_{\alpha, \eta_j} = V_{\alpha, \eta_0}, \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, l.$$

If for any $\alpha' \in \Pi(\eta_0, \dots, \eta_l)$, we have that $\alpha + \alpha'$ is not a root, then

$$l_{\alpha, \eta_j} = l_{\alpha, \eta_0}, \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, l.$$

Proof. The first equality is direct consequence of Lemma 2.18 and the relation $\chi_\alpha(H_{\alpha'}) = \delta_{\alpha\alpha'}$.

For the second equality, let α' be a simple root in $\Pi(\eta_0, \dots, \eta_l)$. The projective line $l_{\alpha, \eta}$ in $\mathbb{P}V_\alpha$ is uniquely determined by the image of η in $\mathbb{P}V_{2\chi_\alpha - \alpha}$. Hence we only need to understand the image of α' -circle in $\mathbb{P}V_{2\chi_\alpha - \alpha}$. By definition,

$$(2\chi_\alpha - \alpha)(H_{\alpha'}) = 2\delta_{\alpha\alpha'} - \alpha(H_{\alpha'}).$$

Since $\alpha + \alpha'$ is not a root, we know $\alpha(H_{\alpha'}) = 0$ and $(2\chi_\alpha - \alpha)(H_{\alpha'}) = 0$. By Lemma 2.18, the image of α' -circle in $\mathbb{P}V_{2\chi_\alpha - \alpha}$ is point. Hence $l_{\alpha, \eta_0} = l_{\alpha, \eta_1} = \dots = l_{\alpha, \eta_l}$. \square

The Coxeter diagram of an irreducible root system is a tree, modulo the multiplicities of edges. We can find a disjoint union Π_1 and Π_2 of vertices such that there is no edge whose two endpoints are in the same Π_i . In the Coxeter diagram, two simple roots α, α' are connected by an edge if and only if $\alpha + \alpha'$ is a root. Hence, we have

Lemma 2.45. We can separate Π into a disjoint union Π_1 and Π_2 such that for α, α' in the same atom Π_j ,

$$\alpha + \alpha' \text{ is not a root.}$$

Let $l_1 = \#\Pi_1$ and $l_2 = \#\Pi_2$. Now, we state our main result of this part, which will be used in the main approximation (Proposition 4.12).

Lemma 2.46. Let η, η' be two points in \mathcal{P} and let g be in G . If for $\alpha \in \Pi_1$,

$$\delta(V_{\alpha, \eta'}, y_{\rho_\alpha(g)}^m), \delta(l_{\alpha, \eta}, y_{\wedge^2 \rho_\alpha(g)}^m) > \delta,$$

for $\alpha \in \Pi_2$,

$$\delta(V_{\alpha, \eta}, y_{\rho_\alpha(g)}^m), \delta(l_{\alpha, \eta'}, y_{\wedge^2 \rho_\alpha(g)}^m) > \delta,$$

then we can find two chains $(\eta = \eta_0, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_{l_1})$ and $(\eta' = \eta'_0, \eta'_1, \dots, \eta'_{l_2})$ such that

$$d(g\eta_j, g\eta_{j+1}) = d_\alpha(g\eta_j, g\eta_{j+1}) = d_\alpha(g\eta, g\eta') + O(\delta^{-2}\beta e^{-\alpha\kappa(g)}), \quad (2.27)$$

where $\alpha = \alpha(\eta_j, \eta_{j+1}) \in \Pi_1$ and different j correspond to different roots; similarly for η' with Π_2 .

We also have that for all $\alpha \in \Pi$

$$d_\alpha(g\eta_{l_1}, g\eta'_{l_2}) \leq \beta e^{-\alpha\kappa(g)} \delta^{-2}, \quad (2.28)$$

where β is the gap of g , that is $\beta = \gamma(g) = \max_{\alpha \in \Pi} \{e^{-\alpha\kappa(g)}\}$.




Figure 2: Changing Flag for $SL_3(\mathbb{R})$

The point is that the contraction speed β implies that the term $\delta^{-2}\beta e^{-\alpha\kappa(g)}$ is of smaller magnitude than $e^{-\alpha\kappa(g)}$. The objective is to walk from $g\eta$ to $g\eta'$ only through α circles and to preserve information of distance. Since we can neglect error term, it is simpler to walk from $g\eta$ to $g\eta_{l_1}$ through some α circles and to walk from $g\eta'$ to $g\eta'_{l_2}$ through the other α circles, which means the corresponding simple roots are different from the one for the first walk. After this operation, the distance between $g\eta_{l_1}$ and $g\eta'_{l_2}$ is negligible, due to (2.28). The distance of the move in the α circle is approximately the distance between the images of $g\eta$ and $g\eta'$ in $\mathbb{P}V_\alpha$, due to (2.27).

Proof of Lemma 2.46. If we have already found (η_0, \dots, η_j) and $j < l_1$, we want to find η_{j+1} . Let $\alpha \in \Pi_1$ be not in $\Pi(\eta_0, \dots, \eta_j)$. Hence by Lemma 2.44,

$$V_{\alpha, \eta_j} = V_{\alpha, \eta_0} = V_{\alpha, \eta}. \quad (2.29)$$

Due to Lemma 2.45 and Lemma 2.44, we have further

$$l_{\alpha, \eta_j} = l_{\alpha, \eta_0} = l_{\alpha, \eta}. \quad (2.30)$$

We are in the situation of Lemma 2.40 with $V = V_\alpha$, $x = V_{\alpha, \eta'}$ and $l = l_{\alpha, \eta}$. Due to the hypothesis, Lemma 2.40 and Lemma 2.41, we can find η_{j+1} in the same α -circle of η_j such that

$$d_\alpha(g\eta_{j+1}, g\eta') = d(\rho_\alpha g V_{\alpha, \eta_{j+1}}, \rho_\alpha g V_{\alpha, \eta'}) \leq \delta^{-2} \gamma_{1,3}(\rho_\alpha g) \leq \delta^{-2} \beta e^{-\alpha\kappa(g)}. \quad (2.31)$$

Hence by (2.29) and (2.31),

$$d_\alpha(g\eta_{j+1}, g\eta_j) = d_\alpha(g\eta_{j+1}, g\eta) = d_\alpha(g\eta, g\eta') + O(\delta^{-2} \beta e^{-\alpha\kappa(g)}),$$

which is (2.27). Please see Figure 2, where an element in the flag variety is represented by a line with a point.

We need to verify the distance between $g\eta_{l_1}$ and $g\eta'_{l_2}$. Without loss of generality, suppose that $\alpha \in \Pi_1$. Then by Lemma 2.44, the construction and (2.31),

$$d_\alpha(g\eta_{l_1}, g\eta'_{l_2}) = d_\alpha(g\eta_{l_1}, g\eta') = d_\alpha(g\eta_{j+1}, g\eta') \leq \delta^{-2} \beta e^{-\alpha\kappa(g)},$$

where j is the unique number such that $\alpha(\eta_j, \eta_{j+1}) = \alpha$. □

Remark 2.47. In the case $\mathrm{SL}_3(\mathbb{R})$, we know that $\wedge^2 V_{\alpha_1}$ and $\wedge^2 V_{\alpha_2}$ are isomorphic to V_{α_2} and V_{α_1} , respectively. The condition in Lemma 2.46 is equivalent to η, η' in $B_g^m(\delta)$.

In the case $\mathrm{SL}_{m+1}(\mathbb{R})$, the representations $V_r = \wedge^r \mathbb{R}^{m+1}$ are fundamental representations. Since $\mathrm{SL}_{m+1}(\mathbb{R})$ is split, $\wedge^2 V_r$ is again proximal, but may not be irreducible. In Lemma 2.66, we will proceed to give a control on $y_{\wedge^2(\wedge^r g)}^m$.

The condition of Lemma 2.46 is not really important, what we need is that the condition is true with a loss of exponentially small measure when we consider the random walks on G .

Lemma 2.48. Under the same assumptions and constructions as in Lemma 2.46, if we also have $\eta, \eta' \in B_g^m(\delta)$, then $g\eta_j, g\eta'_l$ are in $b_g^M(C\beta\delta^{-2})$ for $1 \leq j \leq l_1$ and $1 \leq l \leq l_2$, where $C > 0$ is a constant only depends on the group \mathbf{G} .

Proof. By hypothesis, Lemma 2.16 implies that $g\eta, g\eta' \in b_g^M(\beta\delta^{-1})$. By (2.27),

$$d(g\eta_j, g\eta_{j+1}) \leq 2\beta\delta^{-1} + O(\delta^{-2}\beta e^{-\alpha\kappa(g)}) = O(\beta\delta^{-2}).$$

Hence by induction, we have $g\eta_j \in b_g^M(C\beta\delta^{-2})$ for all j . Similarly the result holds for $g\eta'_l$. \square

2.8 Random walks and Large deviation principles

The study of random walks on projective spaces and flag varieties are connected by representation theory.

Let X be \mathcal{P} or $\mathbb{P}V$, where V is an irreducible representation of G . There is a natural group action of G on X . Let μ be a Borel probability measure on G . Then a Borel probability measure ν on X is called μ -stationary if

$$\nu = \mu * \nu := \int_G g_* \nu d\mu(g),$$

where $g_* \nu$ is the pushforward measure of ν under the action of g on X .

Lemma 2.49 (Furstenberg). *Let μ be a Zariski dense Borel probability measure on G . There exists a unique μ -stationary probability measure ν on the flag variety and its images in the projective spaces $\mathbb{P}V$ are the unique μ -stationary probability measures when V is an irreducible representation of G .*

See [Fur73], [BQ16, Proposition 10.1] for more details. In order to distinguish stationary measures on different spaces, we use ν_V to denote a μ -stationary measure on $\mathbb{P}V$.

Definition 2.50. *Let μ be a Zariski dense Borel probability measure on G . The measure μ has a finite exponential moment if there exists $t_0 > 0$ such that*

$$\int_G e^{t_0 \|\kappa(g)\|} d\mu(g) < \infty.$$

Remark. *This definition coincides with the definition given in the introduction for matrix groups, because in that case $\log \|g\| = \chi \kappa(g)$ where χ is the highest weight of a faithful representation. This weight χ is in the dual cone of \mathfrak{a}^+ and $\chi(X) \gg \|X\|$ for X in \mathfrak{a}^+ .*

Definition 2.51. *Let μ be a Zariski dense Borel probability measure with finite exponential moment on G . The Lyapunov vector σ_μ is defined as the average of the Iwasawa cocycle*

$$\sigma_\mu := \int_{G \times \mathcal{P}} \sigma(g, \eta) d\mu(g) d\nu(\eta).$$

Lemma 2.52. *Let μ be a Zariski dense Borel probability measure with finite exponential moment on G . Then the Lyapunov vector σ_μ is in \mathfrak{a}^{++} , the interior of the Weyl chamber. Equivalently, for any simple root α , we have $\alpha(\sigma_\mu) > 0$.*

The maximal positivity of Lyapunov vector in Lemma 2.52 is due to Guivarc'h-Raugi [GR85] and Goldsheid-Margulis [GM89]. See [BQ16, Corollary 10.15] for more details. Lemma 2.52 will be used to show that the action of G on \mathcal{P} is contracting in Section 4.2, where the contraction speed is given by $\beta = \sup_{\alpha \in \Pi} \{e^{-\alpha\sigma_\mu}\}$.

In the following proposition, we give the large deviation principle for the Cartan projection. We keep the assumption that μ is a **Zariski dense Borel probability measure on G with a finite exponential moment**.

Proposition 2.53. *For every $\epsilon > 0$ there exist $C, c > 0$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have*

$$\mu^{*n} \{g \in G \mid \|\kappa(g) - n\sigma_\mu\| \geq n\epsilon\} \leq Ce^{-cen}, \quad (2.32)$$

See [BQ16, Thm 13.17] for more details.

Proposition 2.54. *If (ρ, V) is an irreducible representation of G , then for every $\epsilon > 0$ there exist C, c such that for all x in $\mathbb{P}V$ and y in $\mathbb{P}V^*$ and $n \geq 1$ we have*

$$\mu^{*n} \{g \in G \mid \delta(x, y_g^m) \leq e^{-n\epsilon}\} \leq Ce^{-cen}, \quad (2.33)$$

$$\mu^{*n} \{g \in G \mid \delta(x_g^M, y) \leq e^{-n\epsilon}\} \leq Ce^{-cen}.$$

See [BQ16, Prop 14.3] for more details. We need ρ to be proximal in Proposition 2.54, but the representation is automatically proximal due to the splitness of G .

Proposition 2.55. *For every $\epsilon > 0$ there exist C, c such that for all η, ζ in \mathcal{P} and $n \geq 1$ we have*

$$\mu^{*n} \{g \in G \mid \delta(\eta_g^M, \zeta) \leq e^{-n\epsilon}\} \leq Ce^{-cen}, \quad (2.34)$$

$$\mu^{*n} \{g \in G \mid \delta(\eta, \zeta_g^m) \leq e^{-n\epsilon}\} \leq Ce^{-cen}, \quad (2.35)$$

Proposition 2.55 is a multidimensional version of Proposition 2.54.

Proposition 2.56 (Hölder regularity). *If (ρ, V) is an irreducible representation of G , then there exist constants $C > 0, c > 0$ such that for every y in $\mathbb{P}V^*$ and $r > 0$ we have*

$$\nu_V(\{x \in \mathbb{P}V \mid \delta(x, y) \leq r\}) \leq Cr^c. \quad (2.36)$$

The proximality of the representation is also needed in Proposition 2.56. This result is due to Guivarc'h [Gui90]. See [BQ16, Thm 14.1] for more details. As a corollary of Proposition 2.56, we have the following.

Corollary 2.57. *If (ρ, V) is an irreducible representation of G with highest weight χ , then there exist constants $C > 0, c > 0$ such that for every y in $\mathbb{P}V^*$ and $r > 0$ we have*

$$\nu(\{\eta \in \mathcal{P} \mid \delta(V_{\chi, \eta}, y) \leq r\}) \leq Cr^c. \quad (2.37)$$

Proof. By Lemma 2.49, we have

$$\nu(\{\eta \in \mathcal{P} \mid \delta(V_{\chi, \eta}, y) \leq r\}) = \nu_V(\{x \in \mathbb{P}V \mid \delta(x, y) \leq r\}).$$

Hence Corollary 2.57 follows from Proposition 2.56. \square

For later convenience, we introduce the following definition. Let $C'_1 > 0$ be a constant such that $|\alpha(X)| \leq C_1 \|X\|$ for all simple root α and $X \in \mathfrak{b}$. Let $C_A = 3C_1 + C'_1$, where C_1 is defined in (2.16).

Definition 2.58 (Good element). For $n \in \mathbb{N}, \epsilon > 0$ and $\eta, \zeta \in \mathcal{P}$, we say that an element h is $(n, \epsilon, \eta, \zeta)$ good if

$$\|\kappa(h) - n\sigma_\mu\| \leq \epsilon n / C_A \text{ and } \delta(\eta, \zeta_h^m), \delta(\eta_h^M, \zeta) > 2e^{-\epsilon n / C_A}. \quad (2.38)$$

Lemma 2.59. We have that h is $(n, \epsilon, \eta, \zeta)$ good outside an exponentially small set, that is to say there exist $C > 0, c > 0$ such that

$$\mu^{*n}\{h \text{ is not } (n, \epsilon, \eta, \zeta) \text{ good.}\} \leq Ce^{-c\epsilon n}.$$

Proof. This is due to the large deviation principle (2.32), (2.34) and (2.35). \square

Lemma 2.60. Let $\delta = e^{-\epsilon n}$ and $\beta = \max_{\alpha \in \Pi} e^{-\alpha \sigma_\mu n}$. Suppose that ϵ is small enough such that $\beta < \delta^3$. If h is $(n, \epsilon, \eta, \zeta_g^m)$ good, then

$$\gamma(h) \leq \beta \delta^{-1} \leq \delta^2 \text{ and } \|\sigma(gh, \eta) - \kappa(g) - n\sigma_\mu\| \leq \epsilon n.$$

Proof. By hypothesis and $\alpha(n\sigma_\mu - \kappa(h)) \leq C_1' \|n\sigma_\mu - \kappa(h)\| \leq \epsilon n$, we have

$$\gamma(h) = \max_{\alpha \in \Pi} e^{-\alpha \kappa(h)} = \max_{\alpha \in \Pi} e^{-\alpha n \sigma_\mu} e^{\alpha(n\sigma_\mu - \kappa(h))} \leq \beta \delta^{-1}.$$

By Lemma 2.16, we have $h\eta \in b_h^M(\gamma(h)/\delta) \subset b_h^M(\delta) \subset B_g^m(\delta)$. Hence by Lemma 2.15

$$\begin{aligned} \|\sigma(gh, \eta) - \kappa(g) - n\sigma_\mu\| &= \|\sigma(g, h\eta) - \kappa(g) + \sigma(h, \eta) - n\sigma_\mu\| \\ &\leq C_1 |\log \delta(h\eta, \zeta_g^m)| + C_1 |\log \delta(\eta, \zeta_h^m)| + \|\kappa(h) - n\sigma_\mu\| \leq \epsilon n. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is complete. \square

For later usage in Section 3, we will define another notion of goodness.

Definition 2.61. For $n \in \mathbb{N}, \epsilon > 0$ and $\zeta \in \mathcal{P}$, we say that an element h is (n, ϵ, ζ) good if

$$\|\kappa(h) - n\sigma_\mu\| \leq \epsilon n / C_A \text{ and } \delta(\eta_h^M, \zeta) > 2e^{-\epsilon n / C_A}. \quad (2.39)$$

Lemma 2.62. Suppose the semisimple part of \mathbf{G} is simply connected. Let $\delta = e^{-\epsilon n}$ and $\beta = \max_{\alpha \in \Pi} e^{-\alpha \sigma_\mu n}$. There exists a flag η_α in \mathcal{P} which is different from η_o only in its image in $\mathbb{P}V_\alpha$ and

$$V_{\alpha, \eta_\alpha} = V^{\chi_\alpha - \alpha}. \quad (2.40)$$

If h is (n, ϵ, ζ_g^m) good, then for $\eta = l_h^{-1} \eta_\alpha$, we have

$$e^{\omega_{\alpha'}(\sigma(gh, \eta) - \kappa(g) - n\sigma_\mu)} \in [\delta, \delta^{-1}] \text{ for } \alpha' \neq \alpha \text{ and } e^{\omega_\alpha(\sigma(gh, \eta) - \kappa(g) - n\sigma_\mu)} \leq \beta \delta^{-1}. \quad (2.41)$$

Proof. The existence of η_α is guaranteed by Lemma 2.18. In the α circle of η_o , there exists a point η_α whose image in $\mathbb{P}V_\alpha$ is exactly $V^{\chi_\alpha - \alpha}$. This is the η_α that we are looking for.

Without loss of generality, we can suppose that $l_h = e$. The image of η_α in $\mathbb{P}V_{\alpha'}$ is the same as η_o if $\alpha' \neq \alpha$. Hence by (2.3), we have $\omega_{\alpha'} \sigma(gh, \eta_\alpha) = \omega_{\alpha'} \sigma(gh, \eta_o)$ for $\alpha' \neq \alpha$. By (2.15), that is $\delta(\eta_o, \zeta_o) = 1$, the element h is $(n, \epsilon, \eta_o, \zeta_g^m)$ good. By Lemma 2.60, we obtain the first part of (2.41).

The image of η_α in $\mathbb{P}V_\alpha$ is $V^{\chi_\alpha - \alpha}$, whose weight is $\chi_\alpha - \alpha$. Hence by (2.3), for $v \in V^{\chi_\alpha - \alpha}$

$$\chi_\alpha \sigma(h, \eta_\alpha) = \log \frac{\|hv\|}{\|v\|} = \log \frac{\|\exp(\kappa(h))v\|}{\|v\|} = (\chi_\alpha - \alpha) \kappa(h). \quad (2.42)$$

By (2.3) and (2.4), we have $\chi_\alpha(\sigma(g, h\eta) - \kappa(g)) \leq 0$. Together with (2.42),

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_\alpha(\sigma(gh, \eta) - \kappa(g) - n\sigma_\mu) &= \chi_\alpha(\sigma(g, h\eta) - \kappa(g)) + \chi_\alpha(\sigma(h, \eta) - n\sigma_\mu) \\ &\leq (\chi_\alpha - \alpha) \kappa(h) - n\chi_\alpha \sigma_\mu = -n\alpha \sigma_\mu + (\chi_\alpha - \alpha)(\kappa(h) - n\sigma_\mu). \end{aligned}$$

By (2.39) and $\chi_\alpha - \omega_\alpha \in \mathfrak{c}^*$, the proof is complete. \square

Example 2.63. In the case $\mathrm{SL}_{m+1}(\mathbb{R})$,

$$\eta_{\alpha_d} = \{\mathbb{R}e_1 \subset \cdots \subset \mathbb{R}e_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathbb{R}e_{d-1} \subset \mathbb{R}e_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathbb{R}e_{d-1} \oplus \mathbb{R}e_{d+1} \subset \cdots\},$$

and its image in $\wedge^d(\mathbb{R}^{m+1})$ is $\mathbb{R}(v_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge v_{d-1} \wedge v_{d+1})$.

Let V be a representation of G . Let $\mathbb{G}_2(V) := \{2\text{-planes in } V\}$ be the Grassmannian variety of V . Let $q_\lambda : \wedge^2 V \rightarrow \wedge^2 V$ be the G -equivariant projection to the sum of all the irreducible subrepresentations of $\wedge^2 V$ with highest weight equal to λ .

Lemma 2.64. Let V be an irreducible representation of G with highest weight χ . For a simple root α , let $q_{2\chi-\alpha}$ be the G -equivariant projection from $\wedge^2 V$ to $\wedge^2 V$. There exists $c > 0$ such that for all v, v' in V ,

$$\sum_{\alpha \in \Pi} \|q_{2\chi-\alpha}(v \wedge v')\| \geq c \|v \wedge v'\|.$$

For the proof we need a lemma similar to [BQ12, Lemma 3.3].

Lemma 2.65. Under the same assumptions as in Lemma 2.64, then $\bigcap_{\alpha \in \Pi} \ker(q_{2\chi-\alpha})$ does not contain any pure wedge.

Proof. Let W' be the intersection of all the kernels, that is $W' = \bigcap_{\alpha \in \Pi} \ker(q_{2\chi-\alpha})$. The two sets $\mathbb{G}_2(V)$ and $\mathbb{P}W'$ are closed subvarieties of $\mathbb{P}(\wedge^2 V)$ and G -invariant. Therefore their intersection is again a G -invariant closed subvariety which is complete. Let B be the Borel subgroup of G , which is solvable. By [Bor90, Thm.10.4], the action of a solvable algebraic connected group on a complete variety has fixed points. We claim that the fixed points of B on $\mathbb{G}_2(V)$ are the lines with the highest weight. Then the result follows by the fact that these lines do not belong to W' .

Suppose that there exist v, u in V such that $v \wedge u$ is B -invariant. We can decompose v, u as a sum $v = \sum_\lambda v_\lambda$ and $u = \sum_\lambda u_\lambda$. Since we can replace v, u by bv, bu for b in B , which augments the weight, we can suppose that the component of highest weight v_χ is non-zero. Since the dimension of V^χ is 1, we can suppose that $u_\chi = 0$. Let $\rho \neq \chi$ be a highest weight such that u_ρ is nonzero. The B -invariance of $\mathbb{R}(v \wedge u)$ also implies that the action of X_α , for α simple roots, fixes the line. Hence $X_\alpha(v \wedge u) = X_\alpha v \wedge u + v \wedge X_\alpha u \in \mathbb{R}v \wedge u$. The weight $\chi + \rho + \alpha$ is higher than all the weights appearing in $v \wedge u$, hence $v_\chi \wedge X_\alpha u_\rho = 0$ for all simple roots α . This implies that $\rho = \chi - \alpha$ for some simple root α . Therefore $v \wedge u$ contains $v_\chi \wedge u_{\chi-\alpha}$. Since $v \wedge u$ is also A -invariant, all the components in the weight decomposition have the same weight. Hence $v \wedge u = v_\chi \wedge u_{\chi-\alpha}$, which is a vector of highest weight in $\wedge^2 V$. \square

Proof of Lemma 2.64. By Lemma 2.65, we know that $\frac{\sum_{\alpha \in \Pi} \|q_{2\chi-\alpha}(v \wedge v')\|}{\|v \wedge v'\|} : \mathbb{G}_2(V) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is a positive continuous function. Since $\mathbb{G}_2(V)$ is a compact space, on which a positive continuous function has a lower bound, the result follows. \square

We want to prove a large deviation principle for a special reducible representation. This lemma will be used in Lemma 4.11 to control $y_{\lambda^2 g}^m$ in Lemma 2.12 and Lemma 2.46.

Lemma 2.66. Let V be a super proximal representation of G (Definition 2.5). For $\epsilon > 0$ there exist $C, c > 0$ such that the following holds. For $x = \mathbb{R}v, x' = \mathbb{R}v' \in \mathbb{P}V$ with $x \neq x'$, we have

$$\mu^{*n} \{g \in G \mid \delta(x \wedge x', y_{\lambda^2 \rho(g)}^m) < e^{-cn}\} \leq C e^{-cen}.$$

Due to Definition 2.5, there is only one simple root α such that $q_{2\chi-\alpha}(\wedge^2 V)$ is non-zero. Write $\wedge^2 V = W \oplus W'$, where W is the irreducible representation generated by the vector corresponding to the highest weight in $\wedge^2 V$, and W' is the G -invariant complementary subspace. Then $q_{2\chi-\alpha}(\wedge^2 V) = W$, and we write $Pr_W = q_{2\chi-\alpha}$.

Proof of Lemma 2.66. By (2.12), we see that a non-zero vector in $y_{\wedge^2 g}^m$ vanishes on W' and $y_{\wedge^2 g}^m$ can be seen as an element in $\mathbb{P}W^*$. We only need to consider the projection of $v \wedge v'$ onto W and use the large deviation principle (2.33). By Lemma 2.64,

$$\delta(x \wedge x', y_{\wedge^2 g}^m) = \frac{|f(v \wedge v')|}{\|v \wedge v'\|} = \frac{|f(\text{Pr}_W(v \wedge v'))|}{\|\text{Pr}_W(v \wedge v')\|} \frac{\|\text{Pr}_W(v \wedge v')\|}{\|v \wedge v'\|} \geq c\delta(\text{Pr}_W(x \wedge x'), y_{\wedge^2 g}^m),$$

where f is a unit vector in $y_{\wedge^2 g}^m$. The proof is complete. \square

3 Non-concentration condition

We want to verify the main input for the sum-product estimate, the non-concentration condition, in this section. The semisimple part of \mathbf{G} is supposed to be simply connected.

For the first time, the reader can neglect g in the left of h and think of the semisimple case $\text{SL}_{m+1}(\mathbb{R})$. The main idea of the proof is already there. Adding g is a technical step, which is needed in its application. (We only need an additional condition on η_h^M to control $\kappa(gh)$.)

3.1 Projective, Weak and Strong non-concentration

Recall that m is the semisimple rank of G and χ_1, \dots, χ_m are fixed weights, where we change the subscript from $\alpha \in \Pi$ to $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. The set $\{\omega_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq m}$ are the extension of fundamental weights $\tilde{\omega}_i$ to \mathfrak{a} which vanishes on \mathfrak{c} and the restriction of ω_i and χ_i to \mathfrak{b} coincide with $\tilde{\omega}_i$. Recall that $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m$ are the simple roots of \mathfrak{a}^* . For two vectors $x = (x_1, \dots, x_m)$ and $x' = (x'_1, \dots, x'_m)$ in \mathbb{R}^m , we write xx' for their product $(x_1x'_1, \dots, x_mx'_m)$ and $\langle x, x' \rangle = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq m} x_jx'_j$ for their inner product.

In order to distinguish different objects, we will use capital letter X to denote functions or random variables and use small letter x to denote vectors or indeterminates.

Let L be the $m \times m$ square matrix which changes the basis $(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_m)$ of \mathfrak{b}^* to the basis $(-\alpha_1, \dots, -\alpha_m)$, that is $L_{ij} = -\alpha_i(H_j)$. Then L is an integer matrix. Hence, we can define E_d , a rational map from $(\mathbb{R}^*)^m$ to $(\mathbb{R}^*)^d$ with $1 \leq d \leq m$, which is given by $y = E_d(x)$ for $x \in (\mathbb{R}^*)^m$ where

$$y_i = \prod_{1 \leq j \leq m} x_j^{L_{ij}}.$$

Fix an element g in G . Let

$$\begin{aligned} X_g(n, h, \eta) &= (e^{\omega_1(\sigma(gh, \eta) - \kappa(g) - n\sigma_\mu)}, \dots, e^{\omega_m(\sigma(gh, \eta) - \kappa(g) - n\sigma_\mu)}), \\ Y_g^n(h, \eta) &= (e^{-\alpha_1(\sigma(gh, \eta) - \kappa(g) - n\sigma_\mu)}, \dots, e^{-\alpha_m(\sigma(gh, \eta) - \kappa(g) - n\sigma_\mu)}) \end{aligned}$$

for η in \mathcal{P} and h in G . By definition, $E_d X_g(n, h, \eta)$ is the vector which is composed of the first d components of $Y_g^n(h, \eta)$, that is

$$p_d Y_g^n(h, \eta) = E_d X_g(n, h, \eta), \quad (3.1)$$

where $p_d : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is the map which takes a vector x of \mathbb{R}^m to the vector of \mathbb{R}^d composed of the first d components of x . In the following argument g is fixed or g equals identity. Hence we will abbreviate X_g, Y_g^n, Y_e^n to X, Y^n, Y_0^n .

We define an affine determinant A_d on $(\mathbb{R}^d)^{d+1}$. For $d+1$ vectors y^1, \dots, y^{d+1} in \mathbb{R}^d , let A_d be the determinant of the $(d+1) \times (d+1)$ matrix $\begin{pmatrix} y^1 & \dots & y^{d+1} \\ 1 & \dots & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, which is the volume of the $d+1$ -dimensional parallelogram generated by vectors $(y^i, 1)$ for $i = 1, \dots, d+1$. Let e_i be the vector in \mathbb{R}^d with only i -th coordinate non-zero and equal to 1. By identifying $e_1 \wedge \dots \wedge e_d$ with number 1, we can also define A_d by

$$A_d(y^1, \dots, y^{d+1}) = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq d+1} (-1)^{i+d+1} y^1 \wedge \dots \wedge \widehat{y^i} \wedge \dots \wedge y^{d+1}.$$

For $d + 1$ vectors x^1, \dots, x^{d+1} in \mathbb{R}^m , let B_d be the rational function defined by

$$B_d(x^1, \dots, x^{d+1}) = A_d(E_d x^1, \dots, E_d x^{d+1}).$$

We introduce the notation

$$\mathbf{h}_{d+1} = (h_1, \dots, h_{d+1}),$$

which is an element in $G^{(d+1)}$. Let

$$A_d^n(\mathbf{h}_{d+1}, \eta) := B_d(X(n, h_1, \eta), \dots, X(n, h_{d+1}, \eta)).$$

Definition 3.1. We say that μ satisfies the projective non-concentration (PNC) on dimension d , if for every $\epsilon > 0$ there exist $c, C > 0$ such that for all n in \mathbb{N} , η in \mathcal{P} and g in G

$$\sup_{a \in \mathbb{R}, v \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \mu^{*n} \{h \in G \mid |\langle v, Y^n(h, \eta) \rangle - a| \leq e^{-\epsilon n}\} \leq C e^{-c\epsilon n},$$

where v is regarded as a vector in $\mathbb{R}^d \times \{0\}^{m-d} \subset \mathbb{R}^m$.

More geometrically, this is equivalent to say that the probability of $Y^n(h, \eta)$ being close to an affine hyperplane is exponentially small.

Definition 3.2. We say that μ satisfies the weak non-concentration (WNC) on dimension d , if for every $\epsilon > 0$ there exist $c, C > 0$ such that for all n in \mathbb{N} , η in \mathcal{P} and g in G

$$(\mu^{*n})^{\otimes(d+2)} \{(\mathbf{h}_{d+1}, \ell) \in G^{(d+2)} \mid |A_d^n(\mathbf{h}_{d+1}, \ell \eta)| \leq e^{-\epsilon n}\} \leq C e^{-c\epsilon n}.$$

Definition 3.3. We say that μ satisfies the strong non-concentration (SNC) on dimension d , if for every $\epsilon > 0$ there exist $c, C > 0$ such that for all n in \mathbb{N} , η in \mathcal{P} and g in G

$$(\mu^{*n})^{\otimes(d+1)} \{\mathbf{h}_{d+1} \in G^{(d+1)} \mid |A_d^n(\mathbf{h}_{d+1}, \eta)| \leq e^{-\epsilon n}\} \leq C e^{-c\epsilon n}.$$

We will proceed by induction. When $d = 0$, we make the convention that $A_0^d = 1$ and it is trivial that SNC holds. Then

- SNC on dimension $d \Rightarrow$ WNC on dimension d (By definition)
- PNC on dimension $d \Leftrightarrow$ SNC on dimension d (Lemma 3.7)
- WNC on dimension $d \Rightarrow$ PNC on dimension d (Lemma 3.9)
- SNC on dimension $d - 1 \Rightarrow$ WNC on dimension d (Lemma 3.10).

In the above implications, the constants C, c will change. We can conclude:

Proposition 3.4. Let μ be a Zariski dense Borel probability measure on G with exponential moment. Then μ satisfies PNC on dimension m .

3.2 Away from affine hyperplanes

We need a lemma of linear algebra, which relates different non-concentrations. This lemma is already known from [EMO05, Lemma 7.5]. For two subsets A, B of a metric space (X, d) , the distance between A and B is defined as

$$d(A, B) = \inf_{x \in A, y \in B} d(x, y).$$

Lemma 3.5. Let $C > 0, c > 0$. Let u_1, \dots, u_{d+1} be vectors in \mathbb{R}^d with length less than C . Consider the following conditions:

i. There exists an affine hyperplane l such that for $i = 1, \dots, d+1$,

$$d(u_i, l) \leq c.$$

ii. We have

$$\left\| \sum_{1 \leq i \leq d+1} (-1)^i u_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \widehat{u}_i \wedge \dots \wedge u_{d+1} \right\| \leq c,$$

where \widehat{u}_i means this term is not in the wedge product.

iii. There exists i in $\{1, \dots, d\}$ such that

$$d(u_i, \text{Span}_{\text{aff}}(u_{d+1}, u_1, \dots, u_{i-1})) \leq c,$$

where Span_{aff} is the affine subspace generated by the elements in the bracket.

Then $i(c) \Rightarrow ii(2^{d+1}C^{d-1}c)$, $ii(c) \Rightarrow iii(c^{1/d})$ and $iii(c) \Rightarrow i(c)$.

Proof. We first transfer the affine problem to a linear problem. Let $v_i = u_i - u_{d+1}$ for $i = 1, \dots, d$. Then v_i are vectors with length less than $2C$. The above three conditions are equivalent to (with change of constants in i)

i'. There exists a linear subspace l of codimension 1 such that for $i = 1, \dots, d$

$$d(v_i, l) \leq c.$$

ii'. We have

$$\|v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge v_d\| \leq c.$$

iii'. There exists i such that

$$d(v_i, \text{Span}(v_1, \dots, v_{i-1})) \leq c,$$

where Span is the linear subspace generated by the elements in the bracket.

$iii'(c) \Rightarrow i'(c)$: Let the hyperplane l be $\text{Span}(v_1, \dots, \widehat{v}_i, \dots, v_d)$. Then $i'(c)$ follows from $iii'(c)$.

$i'(c) \Rightarrow ii'(2^d C^{d-1} c)$: Due to i' , the volume of the parallelogram generated by $\{v_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq d}$ is less than $(2C)^{d-1} 2c$, which is ii' .

$ii'(c) \Rightarrow iii'(c^{1/d})$: Due to the same argument as in Lemma 2.39, we have a formula for the volume,

$$\|v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge v_d\| = \Pi_{1 \leq i \leq d} d(v_i, \text{Span}(v_1, \dots, v_{i-1})),$$

from which the result follows. \square

As a corollary, we have the following, which is general and deals with random variables.

Corollary 3.6. *Let X_1, \dots, X_{d+1} be i.i.d. random vectors in \mathbb{R}^d bounded by $C > 0$. Let l be an affine hyperplane in \mathbb{R}^d . Then for any $c > 0$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\{d(X_1, l) < c\}^{d+1} \leq \mathbb{P}\left\{\left\| \sum (-1)^i X_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \widehat{X}_i \wedge \dots \wedge X_{d+1} \right\| < 2^{d+1} C^{d-1} c\right\}, \quad (3.2)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left\{\left\| \sum (-1)^i X_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \widehat{X}_i \wedge \dots \wedge X_{d+1} \right\| < c\right\} \\ & \leq \sum_{1 \leq i \leq d} \mathbb{P}\{d(X_i, \text{Span}_{\text{aff}}(X_{d+1}, X_1, \dots, X_{i-1})) < c^{1/d}\}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

Lemma 3.7. *PNC on dimension d is equivalent to SNC on dimension d .*

Proof. Let $X_i = E_d X(n, h_i, \eta)$ for $i = 1, \dots, d+1$, where h_i has distribution μ^{*n} . Due to Lemma 2.60, with a loss of exponentially small measure, we can suppose that the X_i are bounded by $C = e^{\epsilon_2 n}$, where $\epsilon_2 = \epsilon/(2d)$.

Due to (3.1), we have $\langle v, Y^n(h_i, \eta) \rangle = \langle p_d v, E_d X(n, h_i, \eta) \rangle = \langle p_d v, X_i \rangle$. PNC asks exactly that the probability that X_i is close to a hyperplane is small. SNC means that

$$|A_d^n(\mathbf{h}_{d+1}, \eta)| = |A_d(X_1, \dots, X_{d+1})| = \left\| \sum (-1)^i X_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \hat{X}_i \wedge \dots \wedge X_{d+1} \right\|$$

is small. By (3.2), PNC on dimension d follows from SNC on dimension d .

By (3.3), SNC on dimension d follows from PNC on dimension d . \square

Remark 3.8. *We explain that SNC implies the stronger form of SNC, which will be used later. Let $O(d)$ be the orthogonal group in dimension d . The stronger form of SNC says that for any $(\rho_1, \dots, \rho_{d+1}) \in O(d)^{\times(d+1)}$, we have*

$$(\mu^{*n})^{\otimes(d+1)} \{ \mathbf{h}_{d+1} \in G^{(d+1)} \mid |A_d(\rho_1 E_d X(n, h_1, \eta), \dots, \rho_{d+1} E_d X(n, h_{d+1}, \eta)| \leq e^{-cn} \} \leq C e^{-cen}.$$

By Lemma 3.7, SNC implies PNC. We adopt the notation in the proof of Lemma 3.7. By Lemma 3.5 and the fact that $O(d)$ preserves the distance,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left\{ \left\| \sum (-1)^i \rho_1 X_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \widehat{\rho_i X_i} \wedge \dots \wedge \rho_{d+1} X_{d+1} \right\| < c \right\} \\ & \leq \sum_{1 \leq i \leq d} \mathbb{P} \{ d(\rho_i X_i, l_i) < c^{1/d} \} = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq d} \mathbb{P} \{ d(X_i, \rho_i^{-1} l_i) < c^{1/d} \}, \end{aligned}$$

where $l_i = \text{Span}_{\text{aff}}(\rho_{d+1} X_{d+1}, \rho_1 X_1, \dots, \rho_{i-1} X_{i-1})$. Therefore SNC implies the stronger form of SNC.

WNC is weaker than SNC, because WNC takes an extra average over ℓ with respect to measure μ^{*n} .

Lemma 3.9. *WNC on dimension d implies PNC on dimension d .*

Proof. Let $\delta = e^{-cn}$. We first prove the result for $2n$. Recall that h is a random variable which takes values in G with the distribution μ^{*2n} . Let $h = \ell_1 \ell$ such that ℓ_1 and ℓ both have distribution μ^{*n} . Then the cocycle property implies $Y^{2n}(h, \eta) = Y^{2n}(\ell_1 \ell, \eta) = Y^n(\ell_1, \ell \eta) Y_0^n(\ell, \eta)$. Fubini's theorem implies

$$\begin{aligned} E & := \sup_{a, v} \mu^{*2n} \{ h \mid \langle v, Y^{2n}(h, \eta) \rangle \in B(a, \delta) \} \\ & \leq \int_G \sup_{a, v} \mu^{*n} \{ \ell_1 \mid \langle v, Y^n(\ell_1, \ell \eta) Y_0^n(\ell, \eta) \rangle \in B(a, \delta) \} d\mu^{*n}(\ell). \end{aligned}$$

The cocycle property is crucial here. Fix ℓ and fix a, v . We can write

$$\langle v, Y^n(\ell_1, \ell \eta) Y_0^n(\ell, \eta) \rangle = R \langle v', Y^n(\ell_1, \ell \eta) \rangle,$$

where $R = \|v Y_0^n(\ell, \eta)\| \geq \min_{1 \leq j \leq d} |Y_0^n(\ell, \eta)_j|$. Here v' is a vector of norm 1, defined by $v' = v \cdot Y_0^n(\ell, \eta)/R$, depending on v, ℓ and η . By Lemma 2.59 and Lemma 2.60, for ℓ outside an exponentially small set independent of a, v , we have $R \geq \delta^{1/2}$. Therefore the condition becomes $\langle v', Y^n(\ell_1, \ell \eta) \rangle \in R^{-1} B(a, \delta) \subset B(a/R, \delta^{1/2})$ and we have

$$E \leq \int_G \sup_{a, v} \mu^{*n} \{ \ell_1 \mid \langle v, Y^n(\ell_1, \ell \eta) \rangle \in B(a, \delta^{1/2}) \} d\mu^{*n}(\ell) + O_\epsilon(\delta^c), \quad (3.4)$$

where $c > 0$ comes from the large deviation principle (Lemma 2.59). By Hölder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_G \sup_{a,v} \mu^{*n} \{ \ell_1 | \langle v, Y^n(\ell_1, \ell\eta) \rangle \in B(a, \delta^{1/2}) \} d\mu^{*n}(\ell) \\ & \leq \left(\int (\sup_{a,v} \mu^{*n} \{ \ell_1 | \langle v, Y^n(\ell_1, \ell\eta) \rangle \in B(a, \delta^{1/2}) \})^{d+1} d\mu^{*n}(\ell) \right)^{1/(d+1)}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

By the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 3.7

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{a,v} \mu^{*n} \{ \ell_1 | \langle v, Y^n(\ell_1, \ell\eta) \rangle \in B(a, \delta^{1/2}) \}^{d+1} \\ & \leq (\mu^{*n})^{\otimes(d+1)} \{ (\mathbf{h}_{d+1}, \ell) | |A_d^n(\mathbf{h}_{d+1}, \ell\eta)| \leq 2\delta^{1/4} \} + O_\epsilon(\delta^c). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by (3.4) and (3.5), we have

$$E^{d+1} \leq (\mu^{*n})^{\otimes(d+1)} \otimes \mu^{*n} \{ (\mathbf{h}_{d+1}, \ell) | |A_d^n(\mathbf{h}_{d+1}, \ell\eta)| \leq 2\delta^{1/4} \} + O_\epsilon(\delta^c).$$

The proof for $2n$ is complete.

It remains to prove the same result for $2n + 1$. Let $h = \ell_1 \ell$ such that ℓ has distribution $\mu^{*(n+1)}$ and ℓ_1 has distribution μ^{*n} . Following the same argument, we have

$$E^{d+1} \leq (\mu^{*n})^{\otimes(d+1)} \otimes \mu^{*(n+1)} \{ (\mathbf{h}_{d+1}, \ell) | |A_d^n(\mathbf{h}_{d+1}, \ell\eta)| \leq 2\delta^{1/4} \} + O_\epsilon(\delta^c).$$

Since ℓ only changes the position η , the uniformity of WNC implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & (\mu^{*n})^{\otimes(d+1)} \otimes \mu^{*(n+1)} \{ (\mathbf{h}_{d+1}, \ell) | |A_d^n(\mathbf{h}_{d+1}, \ell\eta)| \leq 2\delta^{1/4} \} \\ & = \int_{\ell_3 \in G} (\mu^{*n})^{\otimes(d+1)} \otimes \mu^{*n} \{ (\mathbf{h}_{d+1}, \ell_2) | |A_d^n(\mathbf{h}_{d+1}, \ell_2(\ell_3\eta))| \leq 2\delta^{1/4} \} d\mu(\ell_3) \ll_\epsilon \delta^c. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is complete. \square

3.3 Hölder regularity

In this section, we will prove

Lemma 3.10. *SNC on dimension $d - 1$ implies WNC on dimension d .*

Using other representations, we can get more information on the Iwasawa cocycle. This idea has already been used in [Aou13] for problem concerning transience of algebraic subvariety of split real Lie groups. It is also used in the work of Bourgain-Gamburd on the spectral gap of dense subgroups in $SU(n)$, for establishing transience of subgroups.

The key tool is the following estimate. See [BQ16, Proposition 14.3] or [Gui90] for example.

Lemma 3.11. *Let V be an irreducible representation of G . Let μ be a Zariski dense Borel probability measure on G with exponential moment. For every $\epsilon > 0$ there exist $c, C > 0$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, v in V and f in V^* we have*

$$\mu^{*n} \{ \ell \in G | |f(\ell v)| \leq \|f\| \| \ell v \| e^{-\epsilon n} \} \leq C e^{-c\epsilon n}.$$

In this part, we write $V_j = V_{\alpha_j}$ for the fixed representation in Lemma 2.3 and we write $V_{j,\eta}$ for the image of $\eta \in \mathcal{P}$ in $\mathbb{P}V_j$ for $j = 1, \dots, m$. Let v^j be a nonzero vector in $V_{j,\eta}$. For ℓ in G , we abbreviate $\rho_j(\ell)v^j$ to ℓv^j . Since v^j lives in V_j , we use the same symbol $\| \cdot \|$ for norms on different V_j , which makes no confusion. For a vector x in \mathbb{R}^m , we denote by x_i the i -th coordinate. We use upper script to denote different vectors. We want to replace ω_j by χ_j , because $\chi_j \sigma(g, \eta)$ has a nice interpretation using representations (2.4). Let $\chi_j^c = \chi_j - \omega_j$, which vanishes on \mathfrak{b} .

Before proving Lemma 3.10, we introduce some linear algebra. We want to construct a linear form. Recall that E_d is a rational map, A_d is the affine determinant, B_d is the composition of A_d and E_d and

$$A_d^n(\mathbf{h}_{d+1}, \eta) := B_d(X(n, h_1, \eta), \dots, X(n, h_{d+1}, \eta)),$$

where

$$X(n, h, \eta) = (e^{\omega_j(\sigma(gh, \eta) - \kappa(g) - n\sigma_\mu)})_{1 \leq j \leq m} = \left(\frac{e^{\chi_j^c(-c(h) + n\sigma_\mu)} \|ghv^j\|}{e^{\chi_j^c(\kappa(g) + n\sigma_\mu)} \|v^j\|} \right)_{1 \leq j \leq m}, \quad (3.6)$$

and the second equality is due to (2.3) and

$$\chi_j^c(\sigma(gh, \eta) - \kappa(g) - n\sigma_\mu) = \chi_j^c(c(gh) - c(g) - n\sigma_\mu) = \chi_j^c(c(h) - n\sigma_\mu).$$

Let

$$X^i(n, \eta) := X(n, h_i, \eta). \quad (3.7)$$

In order to use Lemma 3.11, we need to linearise some function related to $A_d^n(\mathbf{h}_{d+1}, \eta)$ with \mathbf{h}_{d+1} fixed. We will multiply B_d by its denominator and all the Galois conjugates to get a polynomial on $\|X_j^i\|^2$, which can be realized as a linear functional.

The function B_d can be seen as a rational function of

$$(\underline{x}) := (x^1, \dots, x^{d+1}) = (x_j^i)_{1 \leq i \leq d+1, 1 \leq j \leq m}, \text{ where } x^i = X^i(n, \eta).$$

By definition, B_d has a special form. Each term in B_d can be expressed as a quotient of two monomials. Let D_d be the lowest common denominator of B_d such that $D_d B_d$ is a polynomial on (\underline{x}) . In other words, suppose that

$$B_d(x^1, \dots, x^{d+1}) = \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^{m(d+1)}} b_{\mathbf{n}} \prod_{1 \leq j \leq m, 1 \leq i \leq d+1} (x_j^i)^{n_{ij}},$$

where \mathbf{n} is a multi index and $b_{\mathbf{n}}$ is the coefficient. Let $q_{ij} = \sup_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^{m(d+1)}} \{-n_{ij}, 0\}$ for $1 \leq j \leq m, 1 \leq i \leq d+1$. Then $D_d(\underline{x}) = \prod_{1 \leq j \leq m, 1 \leq i \leq d+1} (x_j^i)^{q_{ij}}$.

Definition 3.12. Let F be a polynomial on (x^1, \dots, x^k) where x^1, \dots, x^k are vectors in \mathbb{R}^n . Then we call F a multi-homogeneous polynomial of degree $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, \dots, q_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$ if for ξ in $(\mathbb{R}^*)^n$ we have

$$F(\xi x^1, \dots, \xi x^k) = \xi^{\mathbf{q}} F(x^1, \dots, x^k),$$

where $\xi^{\mathbf{q}} = \prod_{1 \leq j \leq n} \xi_j^{q_j}$.

Let Γ be the finite group $(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^{d(d+1)}$ which acts on $\mathbb{R}^{d(d+1)}$ by changing the sign. Let $(\underline{y}) := (y^1, \dots, y^{d+1}) = (y_j^i)_{1 \leq i \leq d+1, 1 \leq j \leq d} \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^{d+1}$. For $\rho \in \Gamma$, we write $\rho(\underline{y})$ for the action on the coefficient y_j^i , which is of dimension $d(d+1)$. Due to the definition of Γ , the product $\prod_{\rho \in \Gamma} A_d \rho(y^1, \dots, y^{d+1})$ is invariant under the action Γ , hence it is a polynomial on $(y_j^i)^2$. Let

$$F_d(x^1, \dots, x^{d+1}) := \prod_{\rho \in \Gamma} D_d(\underline{x}) A_d \rho(E_d x^1, \dots, E_d x^{d+1}), \quad (3.8)$$

then

Lemma 3.13. F_d is a multi-homogeneous polynomial on $((x^1)^2, \dots, (x^{d+1})^2)$ with degree $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, \dots, q_m) \in \mathbb{N}^m$ such that $\xi^{\mathbf{q}} = (\det(E_d(\xi)) D_d(\xi, \dots, \xi))^{2^{d(d+1)}}$.

Proof. We only need to verify that F_d is a multi-homogeneous polynomial. The fact that the determinant is a multilinear function implies that for λ and y^i in \mathbb{R}^d

$$A_d(\lambda y^1, \dots, \lambda y^{d+1}) = \det(\lambda) A_d(y^1, \dots, y^{d+1}), \quad (3.9)$$

where $\det(\lambda) = \lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_d$. The functions E_d and D_d are group morphisms due to definition. Hence we have

$$E_d(\xi x) = E_d(\xi) E_d(x) \text{ and } D_d(\xi x^1, \dots, \xi x^{d+1}) = D_d(\xi, \dots, \xi) D_d(x^1, \dots, x^{d+1}). \quad (3.10)$$

Therefore by (3.8), (3.9) and (3.10), for ξ and x^i in \mathbb{R}^m ,

$$\begin{aligned} F_d(\xi x^1, \dots, \xi x^{d+1}) &= \prod_{\rho \in \Gamma} D_d(\xi x^1, \dots, \xi x^{d+1}) A_d \rho(E_d(\xi x^1), \dots, E_d(\xi x^{d+1})) \\ &= \prod_{\rho \in \Gamma} D_d(\xi x^1, \dots, \xi x^{d+1}) A_d \rho(E_d(\xi) E_d(x^1), \dots, E_d(\xi) E_d(x^{d+1})) \\ &= \prod_{\rho \in \Gamma} D_d(\underline{x}) A_d \rho(E_d(x^1), \dots, E_d(x^{d+1})) \det(E_d(\xi)) D_d(\xi, \dots, \xi) \\ &= \xi^{\mathbf{q}} F_d(x^1, \dots, x^{d+1}), \end{aligned}$$

where \mathbf{q} is a vector in \mathbb{N}^m such that $\xi^{\mathbf{q}} = (\det(E_d(\xi)) D_d(\xi, \dots, \xi))^{\lceil \Gamma \rceil}$. □

For $\mathbf{h}_{d+1} \in G^{(d+1)}$ and η in \mathcal{P} , we write

$$F(\mathbf{h}_{d+1}, \eta) = F_d(X^1(n, \eta), \dots, X^{d+1}(n, \eta)).$$

Fix \mathbf{h}_{d+1} . By (3.6) and (3.7), F is a function on v^j for $1 \leq j \leq m$. Recall that v^j are vectors in $V_{j, \eta}$. Let

$$F_0(v^1, \dots, v^m) = F(\mathbf{h}_{d+1}, \eta) \prod_{1 \leq j \leq m} \|v^j\|^{2q_j}.$$

Now, we want to explain how to realize F_0 as a linear functional.

Lemma 3.14. *There exists a linear functional F_1 on the space $V_0 = \bigotimes_{1 \leq j \leq m} (\text{Sym}^2 V_j)^{\otimes q_j}$ such that*

$$F_1(\bigotimes_j ((v^j)^2)^{\otimes q_j}) = F_0(v^1, \dots, v^m).$$

Proof. Since F_d is a multi-homogeneous polynomial (Lemma 3.13), it is sufficient to prove that every monomial in F_d has the same property. By Definition 3.12, a monomial of F_d is of the form

$$\prod_{1 \leq j \leq m} \prod_{1 \leq i \leq d+1} (x_j^i)^{2n_{ij}},$$

with $n_{ij} \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\sum_{1 \leq i \leq d+1} n_{ij} = q_j$. The term $\prod \|v^j\|^{2q_j}$ is used to compensate $\|v^j\|$ in the denominator of X_j^i in (3.6). Now, by multiplying $\|v^j\|$, we can view X_j^i as $\|gh_i v^j\|$ with some coefficient. By (3.6) and $\|gh v^j\|^2 = \langle gh v^j, gh v^j \rangle$, the function $(X_j^i)^2$ is a linear functional on $\text{Sym}^2 V_j$. Hence $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq d+1} (X_j^i)^{2n_{ij}}$ is a linear functional on $(\text{Sym}^2 V_j)^{\otimes q_j}$. This is because if we have two linear functionals f_1 and f_2 on W_1 and W_2 , then $f_1 f_2$ is the linear functional on $W_1 \otimes W_2$ given by $f_1 f_2(w_1 \otimes w_2) = f_1(w_1) f_2(w_2)$. Then by the same reason, the monomial $\prod_{i,j} (X_j^i)^{2n_{ij}}$ is a linear functional on V_0 . In order to express the linearity of F_0 , we rewrite

$$F_1(\bigotimes_j ((v^j)^2)^{\otimes q_j}) := F_0(v^1, \dots, v^m),$$

where v^j is in $V_{j, \eta}$ and F_1 is understood as a linear functional on V_0 . □

Proof of Lemma 3.10. Recall $\beta = \max_{\alpha \in \Pi} e^{-\alpha \sigma \mu^n}$. Let $\delta = e^{-\epsilon_2 n}$, where the constant ϵ_2 will be determined later depending on ϵ . We suppose that n is large enough such that $\delta \leq 1/2$, because for small n , WNC can be obtained by enlarging the constant C .

Step 1: We take into account of measures. We want to reduce the condition of WNC on A_d^n to F , which is essentially a linear functional.

For this purpose, we will bound the measure of small A_d^n by the measure of small F . In order to control $F/A_d^n(\mathbf{h}_{d+1}, \eta)$, we take \mathbf{h}_{d+1} which is η good, that means for every i in $\{1, \dots, d+1\}$, the group element h_i is $(n, \epsilon_2, \eta, \zeta_g^m)$ good (Definition 2.58). By Lemma 2.60 and (3.6), for $1 \leq i \leq d+1, 1 \leq j \leq m$

$$|X_j^i| \leq \delta^{-1}.$$

Since F/A_d^n is a polynomial on X_j^i , for \mathbf{h}_{d+1} which is η good, we have

$$F/A_d^n = D_d \prod_{\rho \in \Gamma, \rho \neq e} D_d A_d^n \rho \leq \delta^{-C_0}. \quad (3.11)$$

Hence by (3.11) and Lemma 2.59, we have

$$\begin{aligned} M &:= (\mu^{*n})^{\otimes(d+1)} \otimes \mu^{*n} \{(\mathbf{h}_{d+1}, \ell) \mid |A_d^n(\mathbf{h}_{d+1}, \ell \eta)| \leq e^{-\epsilon n}\} \\ &\leq (\mu^{*n})^{\otimes(d+1)} \otimes \mu^{*n} \{\mathbf{h}_{d+1} \text{ is } \ell \eta \text{ good, } \ell \in G \mid |A_d^n(\mathbf{h}_{d+1}, \ell \eta)| \leq e^{-\epsilon n}\} + O_{\epsilon_2}(\delta^c) \\ &\leq (\mu^{*n})^{\otimes(d+1)} \otimes \mu^{*n} \{\mathbf{h}_{d+1} \text{ is } \ell \eta \text{ good, } \ell \in G \mid |F(\mathbf{h}_{d+1}, \ell \eta)| \leq e^{-\epsilon n} \delta^{-C_0}\} + O_{\epsilon_2}(\delta^c) \\ &\leq (\mu^{*n})^{\otimes(d+1)} \otimes \mu^{*n} \{(\mathbf{h}_{d+1}, \ell) \mid |F(\mathbf{h}_{d+1}, \ell \eta)| \leq e^{-\epsilon n} \delta^{-C_0}\} + O_{\epsilon_2}(\delta^c). \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

Step 2: Lemma 3.14 tells us that

$$F(\mathbf{h}_{d+1}, \eta) = F_1(\otimes_j ((v^j)^2)^{\otimes q_j}) / \Pi \|v_j\|^{2q_j},$$

where F_1 is a linear functional on $V_0 = \bigotimes_j (\text{Sym}^2 V_j)^{\otimes q_j}$. To be more precise, F_1 will be restricted to a linear form on W , the unique irreducible representation of V_0 with maximal weight. (This is specific for real split Lie groups)

It remains to show that for most \mathbf{h}_{d+1} in $G^{(d+1)}$, the norm of F_1 is relatively large. It is sufficient to find one η such that $|F(\mathbf{h}_{d+1}, \eta)|$ is large. We will prove that $|D_d A_d \rho|$ is large for each ρ in Γ , which implies that $|F(\mathbf{h}_{d+1}, \eta)|$ is large.

Using the $(d+1)$ -th column expansion of the matrix $\begin{pmatrix} y^1 & \dots & y^{d+1} \\ 1 & \dots & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} A_d(y^1, \dots, y^{d+1}) &= -A_{d-1}(r_d y^1, \dots, r_d y^d) y_d^{d+1} + \text{other terms} \\ &= \sum_{1 \leq j \leq d} (-1)^{j+d+1} A_{d-1}(r_j y^1, \dots, r_j y^d) y_j^{d+1} + \det(y^1, \dots, y^d), \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

where $r_j : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ is the map forgetting the j -th coordinate. Replacing y^i by $E_d x^i$, due to $r_d E_d x^i = E_{d-1} x^i$, we obtain

$$A_d(E_d x^1, \dots, E_d x^{d+1}) = -A_{d-1}(E_{d-1} x^1, \dots, E_{d-1} x^d) (E_d x^{d+1})_d + \text{other terms}. \quad (3.14)$$

Using SNC on dimension $d-1$, we are able to give a lower bound of $A_{d-1}(E_{d-1} X^1, \dots, E_{d-1} X^d)$ with a loss of exponentially small probability of \mathbf{h}_{d+1} . But the problem is in other similar terms. Due to $y_j^{d+1} = \prod_{1 \leq i \leq m} (x_i^{d+1})^{-\alpha_j(H_i)}$ and the structure of the root system, the degree of x_i^{d+1} in $y_j^{d+1} = (E_d x^{d+1})_j$ is

$$-\alpha_d(H_d) = -2 \text{ and } -\alpha_j(H_d) \geq 0 \text{ for } j < d. \quad (3.15)$$

Hence, we will find an η with $X_d^{d+1} \leq \beta$, which makes the first term in (3.13) greater than $\delta^{C_0} \beta^{-2}$, and the other terms are less than δ^{-C_0} .

Now, here is the precise proof. Take h_{d+1} good, that means h_{d+1} is $(n, \epsilon_2, \zeta_g^m)$ good (Definition 2.61). We take

$$\eta = \ell_{h_{d+1}}^{-1} \eta_{\alpha_d} \quad (3.16)$$

as in Lemma 2.62. By Lemma 2.62

$$X_j^{d+1} \in [\delta, \delta^{-1}] \text{ for } j \neq d \text{ and } X_d^{d+1} \leq \beta \delta^{-1}. \quad (3.17)$$

Let $\Gamma_{d-1} = (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^{(d-1)d}$, seen as a subgroup of Γ , which acts on $\mathbb{R}^{(d-1)d}$. Then we demand that \mathbf{h}_d satisfies

$$|A_{d-1}^n \rho(\mathbf{h}_d, \eta)| \geq \delta \text{ for all } \rho \in \Gamma_{d-1} \text{ and } \mathbf{h}_d \text{ is } \eta \text{ good.} \quad (3.18)$$

Recall that \mathbf{h}_d is η good means that h_i is $(n, \epsilon_2, \eta, \zeta_g^m)$ good for $1 \leq i \leq d$ and by Lemma 2.60 and (3.6), this implies

$$X_j^i(\eta) \in [\delta, \delta^{-1}], \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq d, 1 \leq j \leq m. \quad (3.19)$$

Recall that W is the unique irreducible subrepresentation of V_0 with the highest weight.

Lemma 3.15. *If h_{d+1} is good $((n, \epsilon_2, \zeta_g^m)$ good), η is taken as in (3.16) and the assumption (3.18) is satisfied for \mathbf{h}_d , then the operator norm satisfies*

$$\|F_1|_W\| \geq \delta^{C_0}.$$

Proof of Lemma 3.15. As we have already explained, it is sufficient to prove that, for ρ in Γ , we have

$$|D_d A_d^n \rho(\mathbf{h}_d, \eta)| \geq \delta^{C_0}.$$

The proof is similar for an arbitrary ρ in Γ , we will only prove the case $\rho = e$.

By (3.13) and (3.14)

$$\begin{aligned} D_d(\underline{x}) A_d(E_d x^1, \dots, E_d x^{d+1}) &= -A_{d-1}(E_{d-1} x^1, \dots, E_{d-1} x^d) D_d(\underline{x})(E_d x^{d+1})_d \\ &+ \sum_{1 \leq j < d} (-1)^{j+d+1} A_{d-1}(r_j E_d x^1, \dots, r_j E_d x^d) D_d(\underline{x})(E_d x^{d+1})_j + D_d(\underline{x}) \det(E_d x^1, \dots, E_d x^d) \end{aligned} \quad (3.20)$$

where $r_j : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ is the map forgetting the j -th coordinate. Since x_d^{d+1} only appears in $E_d x^{d+1}$, by (3.15), we know that the degree of x_d^{d+1} in D_d equals $\alpha_d(H_d) = 2$, which implies that

$$D_d(X^1, \dots, X^{d+1}) \leq \delta^{-C_0} \beta^2.$$

Hence by (3.17)-(3.19) and the property (3.15) that the degree of X_d^{d+1} in $(E_d X^{d+1})_d$ is -2 , the degree in $(E_d X^{d+1})_j$ is non negative for $j < d$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_d(E_d X^{d+1})_d &\geq \delta^{C_0}, \quad |A_{d-1}(E_{d-1} X^1, \dots, E_{d-1} X^d)| \geq \delta^{C_0}, \\ D_d(E_d X^{d+1})_j &\leq \delta^{-C_0} \beta^2, \quad |A_{d-1}(r_j E_d X^1, \dots, r_j E_d X^d)| \leq \delta^{-C_0} \text{ for } 1 \leq j < d \\ \text{and } D_d \det(E_d X^1, \dots, E_d X^d) &\leq \delta^{-C_0} \beta^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.21)$$

By (3.20) and (3.21), we have

$$|D_d A_d^n| \geq \delta^{C_0} - \delta^{-C_0} \beta^2 \geq \delta^{C_0}.$$

The proof is complete by a good choice of ϵ . □

Step 3. We return to the proof of Lemma 3.10. We write ℓv for the vector $\otimes_j (\ell(v^j)^2)^{\otimes q_j}$ in V_0 . Then $\mathbb{R}\ell v$ is exactly the image of $\ell\eta$ in $\mathbb{P}W$. Using the Fubini theorem and (3.12), we have

$$M \leq \int d\mu^{*n}(h_{d+1}) \int d(\mu^{*n})^{\otimes(d-1)}(\mathbf{h}_d) \mu^{*n} \left\{ \ell \left| \frac{|F_1(\ell v)|}{\|F_1|_W\| \|\ell v\|} \leq e^{-\epsilon n} \delta^{-C_0} \|F_1|_W\|^{-1} \right. \right\} + O_{\epsilon_2}(\delta^\epsilon).$$

Using SNC on dimension $d-1$, for all $\rho \in \Gamma_{d-1}$, we have $(\mu^{*n})^{\otimes(d-1)}\{(\mathbf{h}_d) \|A_{d-1}^n \rho(\mathbf{h}_d, \eta)\| \leq \delta\} = O_{\epsilon_2}(\delta^\epsilon)$. (This is a stronger form of SNC on dimension $d-1$. Due to $\Gamma_{d-1} \in O(d-1)^{\times d}$, it follows from Remark 3.8 that SNC implies this stronger form.) By Lemma 2.59, the set where h_{d+1} is not $(n, \epsilon_2, \zeta_g^m)$ good and \mathbf{h}_d is not η good have exponentially small measure. Hence

$$M \leq \int_{\text{good}} d\mu^{*n}(h_{d+1}) \int_{\mathbf{h}_d \text{ satisfying (3.18)}} d(\mu^{*n})^{\otimes(d-1)}(\mathbf{h}_d) \mu^{*n} \left\{ \ell \left| \frac{|F_1(\ell v)|}{\|F_1|_W\| \|\ell v\|} \leq e^{-\epsilon n} \delta^{-C_0} \|F_1|_W\|^{-1} \right. \right\} + O_{\epsilon_2}(\delta^\epsilon). \quad (3.22)$$

Due to Lemma 3.15, when ϵ_2 is small enough with respect to ϵ , we have $(\delta = e^{-\epsilon_2 n}$ and $\|F_1|_W\| \geq \delta^{C_0})$

$$e^{-\epsilon n} \delta^{-C_0} \|F_1|_W\|^{-1} \leq e^{-\epsilon n} \delta^{-C_0} \leq e^{-\epsilon n/2}.$$

Using Lemma 3.11 with $V = W$, due to ℓv in W we conclude that, under the condition of Lemma 3.15,

$$\mu^{*n} \left\{ \ell \left| \frac{|F_1(\ell v)|}{\|F_1|_W\| \|\ell v\|} \leq e^{-\epsilon n} \delta^{-C_0} \|F_1|_W\|^{-1} \right. \right\} \leq_\epsilon e^{-c\epsilon n}. \quad (3.23)$$

By (3.22) and (3.23), the proof is complete. \square

3.4 Combinatoric tool

Proposition 3.16. *Fix $\kappa_1 > 0$. Let $C_0 > 0$. Then there exist $\epsilon_3, k \in \mathbb{N}$ depending only on κ_1 such that the following holds for τ large enough depending on C_0 . Let $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k$ be Borel measures on $([-\tau^{\epsilon_4}, -\tau^{-\epsilon_4}] \cup [\tau^{-\epsilon_4}, \tau^{\epsilon_4}])^m \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ where $\epsilon_4 = \min\{\epsilon_3, \epsilon_3 \kappa_1\}/10k$, with total mass less than 1. Assume that for all $\rho \in [\tau^{-2}, \tau^{-\epsilon_3}]$ and $j = 1, \dots, k$*

$$\sup_{a \in \mathbb{R}, v \in \mathbb{S}^{m-1}} (\pi_v)_* \lambda_j(B_{\mathbb{R}}(a, \rho)) = \sup_{a, v} \lambda_j\{x | \langle v, x \rangle \in B_{\mathbb{R}}(a, \rho)\} \leq C_0 \rho^{\kappa_1}. \quad (3.24)$$

Then for all $\varsigma \in \mathbb{R}^m, \|\varsigma\| \in [\tau^{3/4}, \tau^{5/4}]$ we have

$$\left| \int \exp(i\langle \varsigma, x_1 \cdots x_k \rangle) d\lambda_1(x_1) \cdots d\lambda_k(x_k) \right| \leq \tau^{-\epsilon_3}.$$

This is proved in [LI18b], based on a discretized sum-product estimate by He-de Saxcé [HdS18]. When $m = 1$, this is due to Bourgain in [Bou10].

3.5 Application to measures induced by the random walk

From Proposition 3.4, we fix $\epsilon_2 < \frac{1}{10} \min_{\alpha \in \Pi} \{\alpha \sigma_\mu\}$ and we can find c_1 such that PNC holds. Let $(\epsilon_2/2, c')$ be the constants in Lemma 2.59. Take

$$\kappa_0 = \frac{1}{10} \min\{c_1, c'\}.$$

Using Proposition 3.16 with $\kappa_1 = \kappa_0$, we get two constants ϵ_3, ϵ_4 .

For g, h in G and η in \mathcal{P} , recall that $Y^n(h, \eta) = (e^{-\alpha(\sigma(gh, \eta) - \kappa(g) - n\sigma_\mu)})_{\alpha \in \Pi} \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Let $\lambda_{g, \eta}$ be a pushforward measure on \mathbb{R}^m of μ^{*n} restricted on a subset $G_{n, g, \eta}$ of G , which is defined by

$$\lambda_{g, \eta}(E) = \mu^{*n}\{h \in G_{n, g, \eta} | Y^n(h, \eta) \in E\}$$

for any Borel subset E of \mathbb{R}^m , where

$$G_{n, g, \eta} = \{h \in G | h \text{ is } (n, \epsilon, \eta, \zeta_g^m) \text{ good}\} \quad (3.25)$$

and where the constant $\epsilon > 0$ will be determined later.

PNC is only at one scale, we need to verify all the scales needed in the sum-product estimate. The idea is to separate the random variable and try to use PNC in some other scale, where we need the cocycle property to change scale.

Proposition 3.17 (Change scale). *With ϵ small enough depending on $\epsilon_4 \epsilon_2$, there exists C_0 independent of n such that the measure $\lambda_{g, \eta}$ satisfies the conditions in Proposition 3.16 with constant $\tau = e^{\epsilon_2 n}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. We abbreviate $\lambda_{g, \eta}$ to λ . By taking ϵ small depending on $\epsilon_4 \epsilon_2$, Lemma 2.60 implies that the support of λ is contained in the cube $[\tau^{-\epsilon_4}, \tau^{\epsilon_4}]^m$.

Then we verify (3.24). Let $\rho \in [\tau^{-2}, \tau^{-\epsilon_3}]$. Let $n_1 = \lfloor \frac{|\log \rho|}{2\epsilon_2} \rfloor$ and $n_2 = n - n_1$. Then n_1 lies in $[\epsilon_3 n/2, n]$. We separate $h = h_1 h_2$ such that h_1, h_2 have distributions μ^{*n_1}, μ^{*n_2} , respectively. We have

$$Y^n(h, \eta) = Y^{n_1}(h_1, h_2 \eta) Y_0^{n_2}(h_2, \eta). \quad (3.26)$$

We will use this cocycle property and the support of Y to change the scale.

For (3.24), due to the fact that the support of λ is contained in $[\tau^{-\epsilon_4}, \tau^{\epsilon_4}]^m$, for $w \in \mathbb{S}^{m-1}$

$$(\pi_w)_* \lambda(B(a, \rho)) \leq \sup_{h_2, v} \mu^{*n_1}\{h_1 | \langle v, Y^{n_1}(h_1, h_2 \eta) \rangle \in R^{-1} B(a, \rho), Y^n(h_1 h_2, \eta) \in [\tau^{-\epsilon_4}, \tau^{\epsilon_4}]^m\}, \quad (3.27)$$

where $R = \|w Y_0^{n_2}(h_2, \eta)\|$ depends on h_2 .

- If $R \geq \rho^{1/2}$, then $\rho R^{-1} \leq \rho^{1/2} \leq e^{-\epsilon_2 n_1}$. It follows by PNC at scale n_1 that

$$\mu^{*n_1}\{h_1 | \langle v, Y^{n_1}(h_1, h_2 \eta) \rangle \in B(a/R, e^{-\epsilon_2 n_1})\} \ll_{\epsilon_2} e^{-c_1 \epsilon_2 n_1} \leq \rho^{\kappa_0}. \quad (3.28)$$

- If $R \leq \rho^{1/2}$. There exists one coordinate α such that $|Y_0^{n_2}(h_2, \eta)_\alpha| \leq \rho^{1/2}$, which implies that $Y^{n_1}(h_1, h_2 \eta)_\alpha = Y^n(h, \eta)_\alpha / Y_0^{n_2}(h_2, \eta)_\alpha \geq \tau^{-\epsilon_4} \rho^{-1/2}$. Due to $n_1 \geq \epsilon_3 n/2$ and $\epsilon_3 \geq 10\epsilon_4$, we have

$$\tau^{-\epsilon_4} \rho^{-1/2} \geq e^{\epsilon_2(n_1 - \epsilon_4 n)} \geq e^{\epsilon_2(n_1/2 + \epsilon_3 n/4 - \epsilon_4 n)} \geq e^{\epsilon_2 n_1/2}.$$

For such h_2 , we have

$$\mu^{*n_1}\{h_1 | Y^{n_1}(h_1, h_2 \eta) \in [\tau^{-\epsilon_4}, \tau^{\epsilon_4}]^m\} \leq \sum_{\alpha \in \Pi} \mu^{*n_1}\{h_1 | Y^{n_1}(h_1, h_2 \eta)_\alpha \geq e^{\epsilon_2 n_1/2}\}. \quad (3.29)$$

It follows from Lemma 2.60 that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mu^{*n_1}\{h_1 | Y^{n_1}(h_1, h_2 \eta)_\alpha \geq e^{\epsilon_2 n_1/2}\} \\ & \leq \mu^{*n_1}\{h_1 | \|\sigma(gh_1, h_2 \eta) - \kappa(g) - n_1 \sigma_\mu\| \geq \epsilon_2 n_1/2\} \ll_{\epsilon_2} e^{-c' \epsilon_2 n_1} \leq \rho^{\kappa_0}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.30)$$

By (3.27)-(3.30), for $\rho \in [\tau^{-2}, \tau^{-\epsilon_3}]$ we have

$$(\pi_w)_* \lambda(B(a, \rho)) \ll_{\epsilon_2} \rho^{\kappa_0}.$$

The proof is complete. \square

4 Proof of the main theorems

In this section, we will use the results of Section 2 and Section 3 to give the proofs of the main theorems. In Section 4.2, we will prove Theorem 1.7, the simply connected case. For non simply connected case, please see Theorem 5.4 in Appendix 5.1. Then in Section 4.3-4.4, we will work on semisimple case and we prove all the other theorems in the introduction from Theorem 5.4.

We will add many assumptions on the elements of G and \mathcal{P} . The assumptions seem complicated. In fact, the exact form is not really important. They are assumed to make the result work outside a set of exponentially small measure. These assumptions usually ask that the elements are away from certain closed subvarieties of G or that they are not too far from the expected average value.

4.1 (C, r) good function

For a C^1 function φ on the flag variety \mathcal{P} , we first lift it to $\mathcal{P}_0 = G/A_e N$. Let $\partial_\alpha \varphi = \partial_{Y_\alpha} \varphi$ be the directional derivative on \mathcal{P}_0 . By Lemma 2.37 the action of the group M only changes the sign of the directional derivative $\partial_\alpha \varphi$, hence $|\partial_\alpha \varphi|$ is actually a function on \mathcal{P} . Although $\partial_\alpha \varphi$ is not well-defined on \mathcal{P} , we can fix a local trivialization of the line bundle with fibre $\mathbb{R}Y_\alpha$ and define the directional derivative. This local definition will be used in G3.

Recall that for η, η' in \mathcal{P} and a simple root α , we have defined $d_\alpha(\eta, \eta') = d(V_{\alpha, \eta}, V_{\alpha, \eta'})$ and $d(\eta, \eta') = \sup_{\alpha \in \Pi} d_\alpha(\eta, \eta')$.

Definition 4.1. *Let r be a continuous function on \mathcal{P} and $C > 1$. Let J be the open set in \mathcal{P} , which is the $1/C$ -neighbourhood of the support of r . Let φ be a C^2 function on \mathcal{P} . For a simple root α , let $v_\alpha = \sup_{\eta \in \text{suppr}} |\partial_\alpha \varphi(\eta)|$. We say that φ is (C, r) good if:*

(G1) *For η, η' in J such that $d(\eta, \eta') \leq 1/C$,*

$$|\varphi(\eta) - \varphi(\eta')| \leq C \sum_{\alpha \in \Pi} d_\alpha(\eta, \eta') v_\alpha, \quad (4.1)$$

(G2) *For every simple root α and for every η in the support of r , we have*

$$|\partial_\alpha \varphi(\eta)| \geq \frac{1}{C} v_\alpha, \quad (4.2)$$

(G3) *For η, η' in J with $d(\eta, \eta') \leq 1/C$,*

$$|\partial_\alpha \varphi(\eta) - \partial_\alpha \varphi(\eta')| \leq C d(\eta, \eta') v_\alpha. \quad (4.3)$$

(G4)

$$\sup_{\alpha \in \Pi} v_\alpha \in [1/C, C]. \quad (4.4)$$

Remark 4.2. *The distance d_α depends on the representation V_α . But for two different representation $(\rho, V), (\rho', V')$ such that $\Theta(\rho) = \Theta(\rho') = \{\alpha\}$, by Lemma 5.7, when C is large enough, two distances $d_V, d_{V'}$ are equivalent.*

In the above definition, the G3 assumption (4.3) is equivalent to the inequality on \mathcal{P}_0 , that is

$$|\partial_\alpha \varphi(z) - \partial_\alpha \varphi(z')| \leq C d_0(z, z') v_\alpha, \quad (4.5)$$

for z, z' in $\pi^{-1}(J)$ with $d(z, z') \leq 1/C$.

The G1 assumption is trivial for $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$, so it is new in higher dimension. The G2 and the G3 assumptions are natural generalizations of the case $m = 1, \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$. The G4 assumption is used to normalize the function.

The role of J is to simplify the verification of (C, r) goodness. With this definition, we only need to verify assumptions on a neighbourhood of the support of r .

4.2 From sum-product estimates to Fourier decay

In this subsection we will prove Theorem 1.7, an estimate of Fourier decay, by using the results established in Section 2 and Section 3.

Recall that in Section 3.5 we have fixed (ϵ_2, c_1) for Proposition 3.4, the constant $(\epsilon_2/2, c')$ in Lemma 2.59, which means that (ϵ, c) in Lemma 2.59 equals $(\epsilon_2/2, c')$, and

$$\kappa_0 = \frac{1}{10} \min\{c_1, c'\}.$$

Take $k, \epsilon_3, \epsilon_4$ from Proposition 3.16 with this κ_0 . Let ϵ be a positive number to be determined later (the only constant which is not fixed yet). The constant ϵ_0 in the hypothesis of Theorem 1.7 is defined as

$$\epsilon_0 = \frac{\epsilon}{\max_{\alpha \in \Pi} \{(2k+1)\alpha\sigma_\mu + \epsilon_2\} + \epsilon} \quad (4.6)$$

which will be fixed once ϵ is fixed.

Here, we define and give relations of different constants. Let v be the vector in \mathbb{R}^m whose components are $v_\alpha = \sup_{\eta \in \text{suppr}} |\partial_\alpha \varphi(\eta)|$, for $\alpha \in \Pi$. Recall that $\xi > 1$. Then by the G4 assumption (4.4), we have

$$\sup_{\alpha \in \Pi} v_\alpha \in [\xi^{-\epsilon_0}, \xi^{\epsilon_0}]. \quad (4.7)$$

Let n be the minimal integer such that

$$e^{\epsilon_2 n} \geq \xi \max_{\alpha \in \Pi} \{v_\alpha e^{-(2k+1)\alpha\sigma_\mu n}\}. \quad (4.8)$$

The existence is guaranteed by the positivity of Lyapunov constant, that is $\alpha\sigma_\mu > 0$ for $\alpha \in \Pi$ (Lemma 2.52). Let the regularity scale δ be given by

$$\delta = e^{-\epsilon n} < 1/2,$$

where we take ξ large enough depending on ϵ so that n is large enough. Let the contraction scale β be given by

$$\beta_\alpha = e^{-\alpha\sigma_\mu n}, \beta = \max_{\alpha \in \Pi} \{\beta_\alpha\}.$$

The point is that the contraction speed β decides the magnitude of a term and δ is only an error term, much larger than β . We can take ϵ small so that

$$\beta \leq \delta^{10}. \quad (4.9)$$

Let the frequency τ be defined by $\tau = e^{\epsilon_2 n}$. By (4.8), we have

$$\tau \geq \xi \max_{\alpha \in \Pi} \{v_\alpha \beta_\alpha^{2k+1}\} \geq C_{\epsilon_2} \tau, \quad (4.10)$$

where $C_{\epsilon_2} = e^{-\epsilon_2} \min_{\alpha \in \Pi} \{e^{-(2k+1)\alpha\sigma_\mu}\}$. By (4.7), there exists α_o in Π such that $v_{\alpha_o} \geq \xi^{-\epsilon_0}$. Then (4.10) and (4.6) imply that

$$\xi \leq \tau v_{\alpha_o}^{-1} \beta_{\alpha_o}^{-2k-1} \leq \xi^{\epsilon_0} \tau \beta_{\alpha_o}^{-(2k+1)} \leq \xi^{\epsilon_0} e^{n\epsilon \frac{1-\epsilon_0}{\epsilon_0}}.$$

Hence the regularity scale satisfies

$$\xi^{\epsilon_0} \leq e^{\epsilon n} = \delta^{-1}. \quad (4.11)$$

Notation: We introduce some notation which will be used throughout Section 4.2.

- Let $\mathbf{g} = (g_0, \dots, g_k)$ be an element in $G^{(k+1)}$.
- Let $\mathbf{h} = (h_1, \dots, h_k)$ be an element in G^k .

- We write $\mathbf{g} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{h} = g_0 h_1 \cdots h_k g_k \in G$ for the product of \mathbf{g}, \mathbf{h} .
- We write $T\mathbf{g} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{h} = g_0 h_1 \cdots g_{k-1} h_k \in G$.
- For $l \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mu_{l,n}$ be the product measure on G^l given by $\mu_{l,n} = (\mu^{*n})^{\otimes l}$.
- Recall that for g, h in G and η in \mathcal{P} , we define $Y_g^n(h, \eta)_\alpha = \exp(-\alpha(\sigma(gh, \eta) - \kappa(g) - n\sigma_\mu))$ and $Y_g^n(h, \eta) = (Y_g^n(h, \eta)_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \Pi} \in \mathbb{R}^m$.
- For z in \mathcal{P}_0 , let $\tilde{Y}_g^n(h, z)_\alpha = \alpha^\sharp(\mathfrak{m}(\ell_g^{-1}, hz)) Y_g^n(h, \eta)_\alpha$, where α^\sharp is the corresponding algebraic character of the simple root α and we make a choice of ℓ_g and $\eta = \pi(z)$.
- For g in G , z in \mathcal{P}_0 and $\eta = \pi(z)$, let $\tilde{\lambda}_{g,z}$ be the pushforward measure on \mathbb{R}^m of μ^{*n} restricted to a subset $G_{n,g,\eta}$ under the map $\tilde{Y}_g^n(\cdot, z)$. In other words, for a Borel set E ,

$$\tilde{\lambda}_{g,z}(E) = \mu^{*n}\{h \in G_{n,g,\eta} | \tilde{Y}_g^n(h, z) \in E\}.$$

Recall that the set $G_{n,g,\eta}$ is defined by $G_{n,g,\eta} = \{h \in G | h \text{ is } (n, \epsilon, \eta, \zeta_g^m) \text{ good}\}$.

- After fixing \mathbf{g} , we will also fix a choice of k_{g_j}, ℓ_{g_j} for g_j and let $z_{g_j} = k_{g_j} z_o$, $m_j(h) = \mathfrak{m}(\ell_{g_j}^{-1}, h k_{g_j})$ and $\lambda_j = \tilde{\lambda}_{g_j^{-1}, z_{g_j}}$, for $j = 1, \dots, k$.

Lemma 4.3. *The measure $\tilde{\lambda}_{g,z}$ satisfies the same property (3.24) as $\lambda_{g,\eta}$ with C_0 replaced by $2^m C_0$, where $\eta = \pi(z)$.*

Proof. Since the difference is only in the sign, we have

$$(\pi v)_* \tilde{\lambda}_{g,z}(B_{\mathbb{R}}(a, \rho)) \leq \sum_{f \in (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^m} (\pi f v)_* \lambda_{g,\eta}(B_{\mathbb{R}}(a, \rho)),$$

where we identify $(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^m$ with $\{-1, 1\}^m \subset \mathbb{R}^m$. The result follows from this inequality. \square

First step: For η, η' in \mathcal{P} , let

$$f(\eta, \eta') = \int_G e^{i\xi(\varphi(g\eta) - \varphi(g\eta'))} r(g\eta) r(g\eta') d\mu^{*(2k+1)n}(g). \quad (4.12)$$

Lemma 4.4. *We have*

$$\left| \int_{\mathcal{P}} e^{i\xi\varphi(\eta)} r(\eta) d\nu(\eta) \right|^2 \leq \int_{\mathcal{P}^2} f(\eta, \eta') d\nu(\eta) d\nu(\eta'). \quad (4.13)$$

Proof. By the definition of μ -stationary measure and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\mathcal{P}} e^{i\xi\varphi(\eta)} r(\eta) d\nu(\eta) \right|^2 \\ &= \left| \int_{\mathcal{P} \times G} e^{i\xi\varphi(g\eta)} r(g\eta) d\mu^{*(2k+1)n}(g) d\nu(\eta) \right|^2 \leq \int_G \left| \int_{\mathcal{P}} e^{i\xi\varphi(g\eta)} r(g\eta) d\nu(\eta) \right|^2 d\mu^{*(2k+1)n}(g) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{P}^2} \int_G e^{i\xi(\varphi(g\eta) - \varphi(g\eta'))} r(g\eta) r(g\eta') d\mu^{*(2k+1)n}(g) d\nu(\eta) d\nu(\eta'). \end{aligned}$$

The proof is complete. \square

Recall that for η, η' in \mathcal{P} , we write $V_{\alpha,\eta}, V_{\alpha,\eta'}$ for their images in $\mathbb{P}V_\alpha$ and $d_\alpha(\eta, \eta') = d(V_{\alpha,\eta}, V_{\alpha,\eta'})$.

Definition 4.5 (Good Position). *Let η, η' be in \mathcal{P} . We say that they are in good position if*

$$\forall \alpha \in \Pi, d_\alpha(\eta, \eta') \geq \delta.$$

We fix η, η' in good position, which means that η, η' are far in all $\mathbb{P}V_\alpha$. We rewrite the formula.

Lemma 4.6. *We have*

$$\left| \int_{\mathcal{P}} e^{i\xi\varphi(\eta)} r(\eta) d\nu(\eta) \right|^2 \leq \int_{\eta, \eta' \text{ good}} f(\eta, \eta') d\nu(\eta) d\nu(\eta') + O(\delta^c). \quad (4.14)$$

Proof. By the regularity of stationary measure (2.37), we have

$$\nu\{\eta' \in \mathcal{P} | d_\alpha(\eta, \eta') \leq \delta\} = \nu\{\eta' \in \mathcal{P} | d(V_{\alpha, \eta}, V_{\alpha, \eta'}) \leq \delta\} \leq C\delta^c. \quad (4.15)$$

Therefore by (4.15) and Fubini's theorem,

$$\nu \otimes \nu\{(\eta, \eta') \in \mathcal{P}^2 | d_\alpha(\eta', \eta) < \delta\} = \int_{\eta \in \mathcal{P}} \nu\{\eta' \in \mathcal{P} | d_\alpha(\eta, \eta') \leq \delta\} d\nu(\eta) \ll \delta^c.$$

Summing over simple roots α , we obtain the result by $\|r\|_\infty \leq 1$. \square

Second step: The purpose of this part is to prove that the Schottky type property is almost preserved by iteration, on the complement of an exponentially small set.

We fix g_j for $j = 0, \dots, k-1$ which satisfies

$$\|\kappa(g_j) - n\sigma_\mu\| \leq \epsilon n / C_A. \quad (4.16)$$

Recall that C_A is a constant in Definition 2.58. We also demand that

$$h_{j+1} \text{ is } (n, \epsilon, \eta_{g_{j+1}}^M, \zeta_{g_j}^m) \text{ good.} \quad (4.17)$$

Recall that the Cartan subspace \mathfrak{a} is equipped with the norm induced by the Killing form, and with this norm \mathfrak{a} is isomorphic to the euclidean space \mathbb{R}^r .

Lemma 4.7. *Suppose that \mathbf{g}, \mathbf{h} satisfy the above conditions (4.16) and (4.17). Then the action of $T\mathbf{g} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{h}$ on $b_{V_{\alpha, g_k}}^M(\delta)$ is $\beta_\alpha^{2k} \delta^{-C_0}$ Lipschitz and*

$$e^{-\alpha\sigma(g_0 h_1, x_{g_1}^M)} \dots e^{-\alpha\sigma(g_{k-1} h_k, x_{g_k}^M)} \leq \beta_\alpha^{2k} \delta^{-C_0}, \quad (4.18)$$

for every α in Π . For $t \in b_{g_k}^M(\delta)$, let $t_j = g_j h_{j+1} \dots h_k t$ for $j = 0, \dots, k$, where we let $t_k = t$. Then

$$t_j \in b_{g_j}^M(\beta\delta^{-2}) \subset b_{g_j}^M(\delta), \quad (4.19)$$

$$\|\sigma(g_j h_{j+1}, t_{j+1}) - \sigma(g_j h_{j+1}, \eta_{g_{j+1}}^M)\| \leq \beta\delta^{-C_0}. \quad (4.20)$$

Remark 4.8. *In (4.19), we need $\beta < \delta^3$, which is true due to (4.9). The contraction constant β here is a little different from the gap $\gamma(g_j)$, but $\gamma(g_j)/\beta$ is in the interval $[\delta^{C_0}, \delta^{-C_0}]$ by Lemma 2.60. Hence they are of the same size and we will not distinguish them.*

The intuition here is that by controlling $\kappa(g), \eta_g^M, \zeta_g^m$, all the other positions or lengths will also be controlled, which is similar to what happened in hyperbolic dynamics.

Proof of Lemma 4.7. By Lemma 2.60, we have (4.18) from (4.17) for all α in Π at the same time.

We use induction to prove the inclusion. For $j = k$, it is due to the hypothesis of Lemma 4.7. Suppose that the property holds for $j + 1$. By definition, $t_j = g_j h_{j+1} t_{j+1}$. We abbreviate $g_j, h_{j+1}, t_{j+1}, \eta_{g_{j+1}}^M$ to g, h, η, η' . The condition becomes

$$d(\eta, \eta') \leq \delta, \|\kappa(g) - n\sigma_\mu\| \leq \epsilon n / C_A \text{ and } h \text{ is } (n, \epsilon, \eta', \zeta_g^m) \text{ good.}$$

By Lemma 2.60, we have $\gamma(h) \leq \beta\delta^{-1}$. By Lemma 2.16, due to $\eta \in B(\eta', \delta) \subset B_h^m(\delta)$, we have $h\eta \in b_h^M(\beta/\delta^2) \subset B_g^m(\delta)$. Therefore $gh\eta \in b_g^M(\beta/\delta^2)$, which is the inclusion condition.

The Lipschitz property for simple root can be obtained by using Lemma 2.11 $2k$ times, first the inclusion, then the Lipschitz property.

Then we prove (4.20) and we keep the notation g, h, η, η' . We have

$$\|\sigma(gh, \eta) - \sigma(gh, \eta')\| \ll \|\sigma(g, h\eta) - \sigma(g, h\eta')\| + \|\sigma(h, \eta) - \sigma(h, \eta')\|.$$

By the same argument, due to Lemma 2.16 and $\eta, \eta' \in B(\eta', \beta/\delta^2) \subset B_h^m(\delta)$, we have $h\eta, h\eta' \in b_h^M(\beta/\delta^2) \subset B_g^m(\delta)$. Therefore by the Lipschitz property of Lemma 2.16

$$\|\sigma(gh, \eta) - \sigma(gh, \eta')\| \ll (d(\eta, \eta') + d(h\eta, h\eta'))\delta^{-1} \leq (2\beta/\delta^2) \times \delta^{-1} = 2\beta/\delta^3.$$

The proof is complete. \square

Lemma 4.9. *Suppose that \mathbf{g}, \mathbf{h} satisfy the conditions (4.16) and (4.17). Let s be in $\{z \in \mathcal{P}_0 \mid d_0(z, z_{g_k}) \leq \delta\}$ (the distance d_0 is defined in Appendix 5.2). Let $s_j = g_j h_{j+1} \cdots h_k s$ for $j = 0, \dots, k$, where we let $s_k = s$. We have*

$$m(s_0, k_{g_0}) = \Pi_{1 \leq j \leq k} m(\ell_{g_{j-1}}^{-1}, h_j k_{g_j}) = \Pi_{1 \leq j \leq k} m_j(h_j). \quad (4.21)$$

Proof. We let $\eta = \pi(s)$, then η is in $b_{g_k}^M(\delta)$. By (4.19) with $j = 1$ and (4.17) with $j = 0$, Lemma 2.31 implies

$$m(s_0, k_{g_0}) = m(k_{g_0}, g_0 h_1 s_1) = m(\ell_{g_0}^{-1}, h_1 k_{g_1}) m(s_1, k_{g_1}).$$

Iterating this formula, we obtain the result. \square

Third step: Here we mimic the proof of [BD17], where they heavily use the properties of Schottky groups and symbolic dynamics. But in our case, the group is much more complicated from the point of view of dynamics. We use the large deviation principle to get a similar formula.

By a very careful control of g_l , with a loss of an exponentially small measure, we are able to rewrite the formula in a form to use the sum-product estimate. The key point is that by controlling the Cartan projection and the position of $\eta_{g_l}^M$ and $\zeta_{g_l}^m$ of each g_l , we are able to get a good control of their product $\mathbf{g} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{h}$.

We should notice that the element g_j will be fixed, and we will integrate first with respect to h_j . This gives the independence of the cocycle $\sigma(g_{j-1} h_j, \eta_{g_j}^M)$, that is for different j they are independent, which is an important point to apply sum-product estimates.

We return to (4.14). We call \mathbf{g} “good” with respect to η, η' if

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{g} \text{ satisfies (4.16), } g_k \text{ satisfies the conditions in Lemma 2.46, } \eta_{g_0}^M \in \text{suppr} \\ &\text{and } \delta(\eta, \zeta_{g_k}^m), \delta(\eta', \zeta_{g_k}^m), \delta(V_{\alpha, \eta} \wedge V_{\alpha, \eta'}, y_{\wedge^2 \rho_{\alpha, g_k}}^m) \geq 4\delta. \end{aligned} \quad (4.22)$$

Lemma 4.10. *If η and η' are in good position and \mathbf{g} is “good”, then $g_k \eta, g_k \eta'$ are in $b_{g_k}^M(\delta)$, and for $\alpha \in \Pi$ the d_α distance between $g_k \eta$ and $g_k \eta'$ is almost β_α , that is*

$$d_\alpha(g_k \eta, g_k \eta') \in \beta_\alpha [\delta^{C_0}, \delta^{-C_0}].$$

Proof. The inclusion is due to Lemma 2.16. Since g is good (4.22), by (2.9) we have the lower bound and by the Lipschitz property in Lemma 2.11 we have the upper bound. \square

For η, η' in \mathcal{P} , we can rewrite the formula of $f(\eta, \eta')$ as

$$f(\eta, \eta') = \int e^{i\xi(\varphi(\mathbf{g} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{h}\eta) - \varphi(\mathbf{g} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{h}\eta'))} r(\mathbf{g} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{h}\eta) r(\mathbf{g} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{h}\eta') d\mu_{k,n}(\mathbf{h}) d\mu_{k+1,n}(\mathbf{g}). \quad (4.23)$$

We say that \mathbf{h} is \mathbf{g} -regular if \mathbf{h} satisfies (4.17). Let

$$f_{\mathbf{g}}(\eta, \eta') = \int_{\mathbf{g}\text{-regular}} e^{i\xi(\varphi(\mathbf{g} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{h}\eta) - \varphi(\mathbf{g} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{h}\eta'))} d\mu_{k,n}(\mathbf{h}).$$

Lemma 4.11. *There exists c depending on ϵ , such that For η, η' in \mathcal{P}*

$$|f(\eta, \eta')| \leq \int_{\mathbf{g}^{\text{"good"}}} |f_{\mathbf{g}}(\eta, \eta')| d\mu_{k+1,n}(\mathbf{g}) + O_{\epsilon}(\delta^c), \quad (4.24)$$

if ϵ is small enough with respect to γ , that is $\epsilon \leq \min_{\alpha \in \Pi} \{\alpha \sigma_{\mu} \gamma / (2 + 2\gamma)\}$.

Proof. Let

$$\tilde{f}_{\mathbf{g}}(\eta, \eta') = \int_{\mathbf{g}\text{-regular}} e^{i\xi(\varphi(\mathbf{g} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{h}\eta) - \varphi(\mathbf{g} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{h}\eta'))} r(\mathbf{g} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{h}\eta) r(\mathbf{g} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{h}\eta') d\mu_{k,n}(\mathbf{h}).$$

We call \mathbf{g} “semi-good” if \mathbf{g} satisfies (4.22) except the assumption of $\eta_{g_0}^M \in \text{suppr}$ in (4.22). By large deviation principle (Proposition 2.53, Proposition 2.55, Lemma 2.66), we conclude that

$$\mu_{k+1,n} \{ \mathbf{g} \text{ not “semi-good” } \} \leq O_{\epsilon}(\delta^c). \quad (4.25)$$

Then by (4.23), Lemma 2.59 and (4.25),

$$|f(\eta, \eta')| \leq \int_{\mathbf{g}} |\tilde{f}_{\mathbf{g}}(\eta, \eta')| d\mu_{k+1,n}(\mathbf{g}) + O_{\epsilon}(\delta^c) \leq \int_{\mathbf{g}^{\text{"semi-good"}}} |\tilde{f}_{\mathbf{g}}(\eta, \eta')| d\mu_{k+1,n}(\mathbf{g}) + O_{\epsilon}(\delta^c). \quad (4.26)$$

By Lemma 4.10, (4.19) with $j = 0$ and $c_{\gamma}(r) \leq \xi^{\epsilon_0} \leq \delta^{-1}$,

$$|r(\eta_{g_0}^M)^2 - r(\mathbf{g} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{h}\eta) r(\mathbf{g} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{h}\eta')| \leq 2\|r\|_{\infty} c_{\gamma}(r) (\beta\delta^{-2})^{\gamma} \leq 2\beta^{\gamma} \delta^{-1-2\gamma} \leq 2\delta,$$

if ϵ is small enough with respect to γ . Hence

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{f}_{\mathbf{g}}(\eta, \eta')| &\leq \left| \int_{\mathbf{g}\text{-regular}} e^{i\xi(\varphi(\mathbf{g} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{h}\eta) - \varphi(\mathbf{g} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{h}\eta'))} r(\eta_{g_0}^M)^2 d\mu_{k,n}(\mathbf{h}) \right| + O(\delta^c) \\ &\leq r(\eta_{g_0}^M)^2 |f_{\mathbf{g}}(\eta, \eta')| + O(\delta^c). \end{aligned} \quad (4.27)$$

If $r(\eta_{g_0}^M) \neq 0$, then that \mathbf{g} is “semi-good” implies \mathbf{g} is “good”. Combined with (4.26) and (4.27), by $\|r\|_{\infty} \leq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |f(\eta, \eta')| &\leq \int_{\mathbf{g}^{\text{"semi-good"}}} (r(\eta_{g_0}^M)^2 |f_{\mathbf{g}}(\eta, \eta')| + O(\delta^c)) d\mu_{k+1,n}(\mathbf{g}) + O_{\epsilon}(\delta^c) \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbf{g}^{\text{"good"}}} |f_{\mathbf{g}}(\eta, \eta')| d\mu_{k+1,n}(\mathbf{g}) + O_{\epsilon}(\delta^c). \end{aligned}$$

The proof is complete. \square

Recall that β is the magnitude which is really small, δ is only an error term and τ is the frequency for applying the sum-product estimate, which lies between δ^{-1} and β^{-1} .

Proposition 4.12. *Let $I_{\tau} = [\tau^{3/4}, \tau^{5/4}]$. The following formula is true for η, η' in good position and \mathbf{g} “good”,*

$$|f_{\mathbf{g}}(\eta, \eta')| \leq \sup_{\|\zeta\| \in I_{\tau}} \left| \int e^{i\langle \zeta, x_1 \cdots x_k \rangle} d\lambda_1(x_1) \cdots d\lambda_k(x_k) \right| + O(\beta\delta^{-C_0}\tau), \quad (4.28)$$

when ϵ is small enough with respect to ϵ_2 .

Remark 4.13. *This is the most complicated step, where the difficulty comes from higher rank. We need to use the technique of changing flags to find the direction of slowest contraction speed, where we can use Newton-Leibniz’s formula. Since the action of the sign group M is non trivial on the slowest directions, we also carefully treat the sign.*

Proof. The element η, η' and \mathbf{g} are already fixed. Since g_k satisfies the conditions in Lemma 2.46, we obtain two chains $(\eta = \eta_0, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_{l_1})$ and $(\eta' = \eta'_0, \eta'_1, \dots, \eta'_{l_2})$ as in Lemma 2.46. Then we write

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(\mathbf{g} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{h}\eta) - \varphi(\mathbf{g} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{h}\eta') &= \sum_{0 \leq j \leq l_1 - 1} (\varphi(\mathbf{g} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{h}\eta_j) - \varphi(\mathbf{g} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{h}\eta_{j+1})) \\ &- \sum_{0 \leq j \leq l_2 - 1} (\varphi(\mathbf{g} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{h}\eta'_j) - \varphi(\mathbf{g} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{h}\eta'_{j+1})) + (\varphi(\mathbf{g} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{h}\eta_{l_1}) - \varphi(\mathbf{g} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{h}\eta'_{l_2})), \end{aligned} \quad (4.29)$$

The terms for different j and for η, η' are similar. We fix j and we simplify $\alpha(\eta_j, \eta_{j+1})$ to α .

We compute the term $\varphi(\mathbf{g} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{h}\eta_j) - \varphi(\mathbf{g} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{h}\eta_{j+1})$. In order to treat the sign, we will work on $\mathcal{P}_0 = G/A_e N$. Recall that $\pi : \mathcal{P}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$ is the projection and we use $z = kz_o$ to denote the element $kA_e N$ in \mathcal{P}_0 .

By Lemma 2.48 and (4.22), we know that $g_k \eta_j, g_k \eta_{j+1}$ are in $b_{g_k}^M(\delta)$, then they satisfy the condition of Lemma 4.7. Let z_0, z_1 be preimages of $g_k \eta_j$ and $g_k \eta_{j+1}$ in \mathcal{P}_0 such that $m(z_0, z_1) = e$. Notice that z_0, z_1 are in the same α -circle. By Lemma 2.46 (2.27) and Lemma 4.10

$$d(g_k \eta_j, g_k \eta_{j+1}) = d_\alpha(g_k \eta_j, g_k \eta_{j+1}) + O(\beta e^{-\alpha \kappa(g_k)} \delta^{-C_0}) \in \beta_\alpha[\delta^{C_0}, \delta^{-C_0}].$$

Due to $m(z_0, z_1) = e$, the arc-length distance also satisfies

$$d_A(z_0, z_1) = \arcsin d(g_k \eta_j, g_k \eta_{j+1}) \in \beta_\alpha[\delta^{C_0}, \delta^{-C_0}]. \quad (4.30)$$

Now, we lift φ to \mathcal{P}_0 , becoming a right M -invariant function. By abuse of notation, we also use φ to denote the lifted function. Let γ be an arc connecting z_0, z_1 with unit speed in the α -circle with length less than $\pi/2$. Without loss of generality, we suppose that γ is in the positive direction (If not, we add a minus sign on the right hand side of (4.31)). The sign only depends on z_0, z_1 , which is independent of \mathbf{h}). By Newton-Leibniz's formula (2.25), we have

$$\varphi(T\mathbf{g} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{h}z_0) - \varphi(T\mathbf{g} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{h}z_1) = \int_0^u \partial_\alpha \varphi(T\mathbf{g} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{h}\gamma(t)) e^{-\alpha \sigma(T\mathbf{g} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{h}, \gamma(t))} dt, \quad (4.31)$$

where $u = d_A(z_0, z_1)$. Fix a time t in $[0, u]$, let $s_j = g_j h_{j+1} \cdots h_k \gamma(t)$. Then $\pi(\gamma(t))$ is in $b_{g_k}^M(\delta)$, because $g_k \eta_j$ and $g_k \eta_{j+1}$ are in $b_{g_k}^M(\delta)$ and by (4.30). By (4.19), the element $\pi(s_0)$, the image of $s_0 = T\mathbf{g} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{h}\gamma(t)$ in \mathcal{P} , is in $b_{g_0}^M(\beta \delta^{-C_0})$.

Recall that we have made a choice of the Cartan decomposition of every g_j for $0 \leq j \leq k$. In particular, k_{g_0} is given in the decomposition of $g_0 = k_{g_0} a_{g_0} \ell_{g_0} \in KA^+K$. Let $m_0 = m(s_0, k_{g_0})$ and $\underline{s}_0 = s_0 m_0$, then $m(\underline{s}_0, k_{g_0}) = e$. By Lemma 2.37,

$$\partial_\alpha \varphi_{s_0} = \partial_\alpha \varphi_{s_0 m_0} = \alpha^\sharp(m_0) \partial_\alpha \varphi_{\underline{s}_0}. \quad (4.32)$$

By Lemma 5.9 and $\pi(s_0), \pi(z_{g_0}) = \eta_{g_0}^M$ in $b_{g_0}^M(\beta \delta^{-C_0})$, we have

$$d_0(\underline{s}_0, z_{g_0}) \leq d(\pi(s_0), \pi(z_{g_0})) < \beta \delta^{-C_0}. \quad (4.33)$$

Due to \mathbf{g} good (4.22), we have $\eta_{g_0}^M \in \text{suppr}$. By the G2 assumption (4.2), we have $|\partial_\alpha \varphi(z_{g_0})| \geq \delta v_\alpha$. By (4.33), the point $\pi(s_0)$ is in J , the δ neighbourhood of suppr . By the G3 assumption (4.3), $|\partial_\alpha \varphi(\underline{s}_0) - \partial_\alpha \varphi(z_{g_0})| \leq \delta^{-1} v_\alpha d_0(\underline{s}_0, z_{g_0})$, which implies

$$\partial_\alpha \varphi(\underline{s}_0) / \partial_\alpha \varphi(z_{g_0}) \in [1 - \beta \delta^{-C_0}, 1 + \beta \delta^{-C_0}].$$

By Lemma 4.7 (4.20), we have

$$(1 - \beta \delta^{-C_0}) e^{-O(\beta/\delta)} \leq \frac{\partial_\alpha \varphi(\underline{s}_0) e^{-\alpha \sigma(g_0 h_1, s_1)} \cdots e^{-\alpha \sigma(g_{k-1} h_k, s_k)}}{\partial_\alpha \varphi(z_{g_0}) e^{-\alpha \sigma(g_0 h_1, x_{g_0}^M)} \cdots e^{-\alpha \sigma(g_{k-1} h_k, x_{g_k}^M)}} \leq (1 + \beta \delta^{-C_0}) e^{O(\beta/\delta)}. \quad (4.34)$$

By (4.18), we have

$$B_\alpha := e^{-\alpha\sigma(g_0 h_1, x_{g_1}^M)} \dots e^{-\alpha\sigma(g_{k-1} h_k, x_{g_k}^M)} \leq \beta_\alpha^{2k} \delta^{-C_0}.$$

Together with (4.30)-(4.34)

$$|\varphi(\mathbf{g} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{h}\eta_j) - \varphi(\mathbf{g} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{h}\eta_{j+1}) - d_A(z_0, z_1) \alpha^\sharp(m_0) \partial_\alpha \varphi(z_{g_0}) B_\alpha| \leq \beta \beta_\alpha^{2k+1} \delta^{-C_0} v_\alpha. \quad (4.35)$$

We deal with the error term which comes from the process of changing flags.

By Lemma 2.46 (2.28) and (4.16), we have

$$d_\alpha(g_k \eta_{l_1}, g_k \eta'_{l_2}) \leq \max_{\alpha' \in \Pi} \{e^{-\alpha' \kappa(g_k)}\} e^{-\alpha \kappa(g_k)} \delta^{-2} \leq \beta_\alpha \beta \delta^{-C_0}.$$

Then the Lipschitz property in Lemma 4.7 implies that

$$d_\alpha(\mathbf{g} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{h}\eta_{l_1}, \mathbf{g} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{h}\eta'_{l_2}) \leq \beta_\alpha^{2k} \delta^{-C_0} d_\alpha(g_k \eta_{l_1}, g_k \eta'_{l_2}) \leq \beta_\alpha^{2k+1} \beta \delta^{-C_0},$$

Due to (4.19) in Lemma 4.7 and Lemma 2.48, the two points $\mathbf{g} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{h}\eta_{l_1}, \mathbf{g} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{h}\eta'_{l_2}$ are in J , the δ neighbourhood of suppr . Due to the G1 assumption (4.1),

$$|\varphi(\mathbf{g} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{h}\eta_{l_1}) - \varphi(\mathbf{g} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{h}\eta'_{l_2})| \leq \delta^{-1} \sum_\alpha v_\alpha d_\alpha(\mathbf{g} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{h}\eta_{l_1}, \mathbf{g} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{h}\eta'_{l_2}).$$

Therefore

$$|\varphi(\mathbf{g} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{h}\eta_{l_1}) - \varphi(\mathbf{g} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{h}\eta'_{l_2})| \leq \delta^{-C_0} \beta \sum_\alpha v_\alpha \beta_\alpha^{2k+1}. \quad (4.36)$$

We collect information for different simple roots. Recall that for a fixed g in G and for $h \in G, z \in \mathcal{P}_0$, we have defined $\tilde{Y}_g^n(h, z)_\alpha = e^{-\alpha(\sigma(gh, z) - \kappa(g) - n\sigma_\mu)} \alpha^\sharp(m(\ell_g, hk))$. Let

$$\varsigma_\alpha := \frac{\xi d_A(z_0, z_1) \alpha^\sharp(m_0) \partial_\alpha \varphi(z_{g_0}) B_\alpha}{\prod_{l=1}^k \tilde{Y}_{g_{l-1}}^n(h_l, z_{g_l})_\alpha}.$$

Let $\varsigma = (\varsigma_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \Pi} \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Hence by (4.29), (4.35), (4.36) and (4.10)

$$|\xi(\varphi(\mathbf{g} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{h}x) - \varphi(\mathbf{g} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{h}x')) - \langle \varsigma, \prod_{l=1}^k \tilde{Y}_{g_{l-1}}^n(h_l, z_{g_l}) \rangle| \leq \beta \delta^{-C_0} \sum_\alpha \beta_\alpha^{2k+1} v_\alpha \xi \ll \beta \delta^{-C_0} \tau. \quad (4.37)$$

We want to verify that $\|\varsigma\| \in I_\tau$. By (4.21), we have

$$\varsigma_\alpha = \xi d_A(z_0, z_1) \partial_\alpha \varphi(z_{g_0}) \beta_\alpha^k e^{-\alpha \kappa(g_0) - \dots - \alpha \kappa(g_{k-1})}.$$

By (4.16), (4.30), (4.22) and (4.2) we have $|\varsigma_\alpha| \in \xi v_\alpha \beta_\alpha^{2k+1} [\delta^{C_0}, \delta^{-C_0}]$. Therefore by (4.10),

$$\|\varsigma\| \in \sup_\alpha \xi v_\alpha \beta_\alpha^{2k+1} [\delta^{C_0}, \delta^{-C_0}] \in \tau [\delta^{C_0}, \delta^{-C_0}] \subset [\tau^{3/4}, \tau^{5/4}] = I_\tau.$$

By definition, the distribution of $\tilde{Y}_{g_{l-1}}^n(h_l, z_{g_l})$, where h_l satisfies (4.17) with distribution μ^{*n} , is the measure λ_l . Finally, due to $|e^{ix} - e^{iy}| \leq |x - y|$ for $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$, inequality (4.37) implies (4.28). \square

Fourth step: We are able to apply sum-product estimates.

Proof of Theorem 1.7. For $l = 1, 2, \dots, k$, Proposition 3.17 and Lemma 4.3 tell us that with ϵ small enough depending on $\epsilon_4 \epsilon_2$, there exists C_0 such that the measures λ_l satisfy the assumptions in Proposition 3.16 with τ .

Proposition 3.16 implies that for τ large enough,

$$\left| \int \exp(i \langle \varsigma, x_1 \cdots x_k \rangle) d\lambda_1(x_1) \dots d\lambda_k(x_k) \right| \leq \tau^{-\epsilon_3}.$$

Then by (4.14), (4.24) and (4.28), we have

$$\left| \int e^{i \xi \varphi(\eta)} r(\eta) d\nu(\eta) \right|^2 \leq O_\epsilon(\delta^c) + O(\beta \delta^{-C_0} \tau) + \tau^{-\epsilon_3}.$$

Due to $\beta \delta^{-C_0} \tau = \max_{\alpha \in \Pi} e^{(-\alpha \sigma_\mu + O(1)\epsilon + \epsilon_2)n}$, take ϵ small enough. The proof is complete. \square

4.3 From Fourier decay to spectral gap

From now on, we will only consider algebraic \mathbb{R} -split semisimple groups without simply connected condition. In this section, we will prove Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.4 by using Theorem 5.4.

Derivative of the cocycle

This part is devoted to the derivative of the cocycle. The results of this part imply that for most g, h in G , the difference of the Iwasawa cocycle $\sigma(g, \cdot) - \sigma(h, \cdot)$ satisfies the (C, r) good condition in Definition 4.1 (See Lemma 4.24). Since the α -bundle is trivial on \mathcal{P}_0 , we will work on \mathcal{P}_0 . We need to lift the Iwasawa cocycle σ to \mathcal{P}_0 and we use the same notation σ .

Let (ρ, V) be an irreducible representation of G with highest weight χ . Let α be a simple root. Let e_1 be a unit vector of highest weight in V and let $e_2 = Y_\alpha e_1$. The cocycle σ_V is defined on $\mathbb{P}V$. After lifting to \mathcal{P}_0 , we have $\sigma_V(g, z) = \frac{\|\rho(g)v\|}{\|v\|}$ for g in G and $z = kz_o$ in \mathcal{P}_0 with $v = \rho(k)e_1$. We will abbreviate ρg to g in the proof, because (ρ, V) is the only representation to be studied in this part.

Lemma 4.14. *For $z = kz_o$ in \mathcal{P}_0 , we have*

$$\partial_\alpha \sigma_V(g, z) = \frac{\langle \rho g v, \rho g u \rangle}{\|\rho g v\|^2},$$

where $v = ke_1$ and $u = ke_2$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we suppose that $z = z_o$. By definition, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{Y_\alpha} \sigma_V(g, z_o) &= \partial_t \sigma_V(g, \exp(tY_\alpha)z_o)|_{t=0} = \partial_t \left(\log \frac{\|g \exp(tY_\alpha)e_1\|}{\|\exp(tY_\alpha)e_1\|} \right) \Big|_{t=0} \\ &= \frac{\langle ge_1, gY_\alpha e_1 \rangle}{\|ge_1\|^2} - \frac{\langle e_1, Y_\alpha e_1 \rangle}{\|e_1\|^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since the norm is good, eigenvectors of different weights are orthogonal, hence we have $\langle e_1, Y_\alpha e_1 \rangle = 0$. The result follows. \square

From this lemma, we know that the derivative of the cocycle σ_V in the direction Y_α is nonzero only if $\chi - \alpha$ is a weight of V . We fix the distance d_0 on \mathcal{P}_0 , which is defined in Appendix 5.2.

Lemma 4.15. *Let $\delta < 1/2$. Let $\widetilde{B_{V,g}^m(\delta)}$ be the preimage of $B_{V,g}^m(\delta) \subset \mathbb{P}V$ in \mathcal{P}_0 . For $z = kz_o \in \widetilde{B_{V,g}^m(\delta)}$,*

$$|\partial_\alpha \sigma_V(g, z)| \leq \delta^{-C_0}.$$

We also have

$$\text{Lip}_{\mathcal{P}_0}(\partial_\alpha \sigma_V(g, \cdot)|_{\widetilde{B_{V,g}^m(\delta)}}) \leq \delta^{-C_0}.$$

Proof. By Lemma 4.14, the hypothesis that $\mathbb{R}ke_1 \in B_{V,g}^m(\delta)$ and (2.8),

$$|\partial_\alpha \sigma_V(g, z)| = \left| \frac{\langle gke_1, gke_2 \rangle}{\|gke_1\|^2} \right| \leq \frac{\|Y_\alpha\| \|g\|^2 \|e_1\|^2}{\|g\|^2 \delta^2 \|e_1\|^2}.$$

Since the operator norm of Y_α is bounded, we have

$$|\partial_\alpha \sigma_V(g, z)| \leq \delta^{-C_0}.$$

The estimate of the Lipschitz norm is more complicated. Let $v = ke_1, v' = k'e_1, u = ke_2, u' = k'e_2$. We have

$$|\partial_\alpha \sigma_V(g, z) - \partial_\alpha \sigma_V(g, z')| = \frac{|\langle gv, gu \rangle \|gv'\|^2 - \langle gv', gu' \rangle \|gv\|^2|}{\|gv\|^2 \|gv'\|^2}.$$

By the same argument, due to $\mathbb{R}v = \mathbb{R}ke_1 \in B_{V,g}^m(\delta)$, we use (2.8) to give a lower bound of the denominator, that is

$$\|gv\|^2 \|gv'\|^2 \geq \delta^4 \|g\|^4 \|v\|^2 \|v'\|^2 = \delta^4 \|g\|^4 \|e_1\|^4.$$

Use the difference to give an upper bound of the numerator, that is

$$\begin{aligned} & |\langle gv, gu \rangle \|gv'\|^2 - \langle gv', gu' \rangle \|gv\|^2| \\ & \ll \|g\|^3 \|e_1\|^3 (\|gv - gv'\| + \|gu - gu'\|) \ll \|g\|^4 \|v\|^3 (\|v - v'\| + \|u - u'\|). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we have

$$|\partial_\alpha \sigma_V(g, z) - \partial_\alpha \sigma_V(g, z')| \ll \delta^{-C_0} (\|ke_1 - k'e_1\| + \|ke_2 - k'e_2\|).$$

Then by Lemma 5.6, the proof is complete. \square

Let $\wedge^2 Sym^2 V$ be the exterior square of the symmetric square of V . It is a linear space generated by vectors of the form $v_1 v_2 \wedge v_3 v_4$ where v_i is in V , for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$. For g, h in $GL(V)$, let $F_{g,h}$ be the linear functional on $\wedge^2 Sym^2 V$, whose action on the vector $v_1 v_2 \wedge w_1 w_2$ is defined by

$$F_{g,h}(v_1 v_2 \wedge w_1 w_2) = \langle hv_1, hv_2 \rangle \langle gw_1, gw_2 \rangle - \langle gv_1, gv_2 \rangle \langle hw_1, hw_2 \rangle.$$

This formula is well defined because v_1, v_2 and w_1, w_2 are symmetric, respectively. We also have $F_{g,h}(v_1 v_2 \wedge w_1 w_2) = -F_{g,h}(w_1 w_2 \wedge v_1 v_2)$. Since the vectors of form $v_1 v_2 \wedge w_1 w_2$ generate the space $\wedge^2 Sym^2 V$, the linear form $F_{g,h}$ is uniquely defined.

Suppose that V is a super proximal representation of G with highest weight χ (Definition 2.5). Let α be the unique simple root such that $\chi - \alpha$ is a weight of V . The space $\wedge^2 Sym^2 V$ may be reducible. The two highest weights of $Sym^2 V$ are $2\chi, 2\chi - \alpha$, whose eigenspaces have dimension 1. Hence, the highest weight of $\wedge^2 Sym^2 V$ is $4\chi - \alpha$, and the eigenspace has dimension 1. Let W be the irreducible subrepresentation of $\wedge^2 Sym^2 V$ with the highest weight $\chi_1 := 4\chi - \alpha$. Recall that $V_{\chi_1, \eta}$ is the image of $\eta \in \mathcal{P}$ in $\mathbb{P}W$. In the following lemma, we abbreviate $\rho(g), \rho(h)$ to g, h .

Lemma 4.16. *Let $\delta < 1/2$. Let V be a super proximal representation of G and let α be the unique simple root such that $\chi - \alpha$ is a weight of V . If g, h in G and $z = kz_o \in \mathcal{P}_0, \eta = \pi(z)$ satisfy*

- (1) $\ell_h^{-1} V^\chi, \ell_h^{-1} V^{\chi-\alpha} \in B_{V,g}^m(\delta), \gamma_{1,2}(g) \leq \delta^3,$
- (2) $\delta(V_{\chi_1, \eta}, F_{g,h}|_W) > \delta$ and $V_{\chi, \eta} \in B_{V,g}^m(\delta) \cap B_{V,h}^m(\delta),$

then

$$|\partial_\alpha(\sigma_V(g, z) - \sigma_V(h, z))| \geq \delta^{C_0}.$$

Remark 4.17. *This is similar to the non local integrability property as defined in [Dol98] [Nau05] and [Sto11]. Although the above two conditions are complicated, we will see later that outside a set of exponentially small measure, all pairs g, h satisfy these conditions.*

The key idea here is to use other representations to linearise polynomial functions on V . As long as the function is linear, we will have a good control of it. Another point is that the image of \mathcal{P} stays in the same irreducible subrepresentation.

Proof of Lemma 4.16. By Lemma 4.14, let

$$L := \partial_\alpha(\sigma_V(g, z) - \sigma_V(h, z)) = \frac{F_{g,h}(v^2 \wedge vu)}{\|gv\|^2 \|hv\|^2}, \quad (4.38)$$

where $v = ke_1$ and $u = kY_\alpha e_1$ as in Lemma 4.14.

Lemma 4.18. *If g, h satisfy assumption (1), then the operator norm satisfies*

$$\|F_{g,h}|_W\| \geq \delta^{C_0} \|g\|^2 \|h\|^2.$$

Proof. Using the Cartan decomposition and good norm, we can suppose that h is diagonal and $h = \text{diag}(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)$ with $a_1 \geq a_2 \geq \dots \geq a_n$. By Definition 2.5, we know that $he_1 = a_1 e_1$ and $he_2 = a_2 e_2$. Assumption (1) becomes

$$\delta(\mathbb{R}e_1, y_g^m), \delta(\mathbb{R}e_2, y_h^m) > \delta, \gamma_{1,2}(g) \leq \delta^3. \quad (4.39)$$

In (4.38), let $z = z_0$, then $v = e_1, u = e_2$, which make

$$\langle hv, hu \rangle = \langle a_1 e_1, a_2 e_2 \rangle = 0.$$

Therefore, due to

$$\langle v_1, v_2 \rangle \geq \|v_1\| \|v_2\| - \|v_1 \wedge v_2\|,$$

for v_1, v_2 in V , we have

$$F_{g,h}(e_1^2 \wedge e_1 e_2) = a_1^2 \langle ge_1, ge_2 \rangle \geq a_1^2 (\|ge_1\| \|ge_2\| - \|ge_1 \wedge ge_2\|).$$

Then (2.8) and (4.39) imply

$$F_{g,h}(e_1^2 \wedge e_1 e_2) \geq \|h\|^2 \|g\|^2 (\delta^2 - \gamma_{1,2}(g)).$$

The proof is complete. \square

By Definition 2.5, the representation $\wedge^2 \text{Sym}^2 V$ is a proximal representation. Due to $\mathbb{R}(v^2 \wedge vu) = \mathbb{R}k(e_1^2 \wedge e_1 e_2) = kV^{\chi_1}$, the line $\mathbb{R}(v^2 \wedge vu)$ is contained in the K -orbit of the subspace of highest weight V^{χ_1} . Since V^{χ_1} is in W , we see that $v^2 \wedge vu$ is also in W . By (4.38),

$$L = \frac{F_{g,h}(v^2 \wedge vu)}{\|F_{g,h}|_W\|} \frac{\|g\|^2 \|h\|^2}{\|gv\|^2 \|hv\|^2} \frac{\|F_{g,h}|_W\|}{\|g\|^2 \|h\|^2}.$$

When η satisfies assumption (2), Lemma 4.16 follows by applying (2.8) to $\|gv\|^2, \|hv\|^2$ and by Lemma 4.18. \square

Proof of the spectral gap

Here we will prove the theorem of uniform spectral gap. The first part is classic, where we use some ideas of Dolgopyat [Dol98] to transform the problem to an effective estimate in Proposition 4.23, see also [Nau05] and [Sto11]. The key observation is that this effective estimate (Proposition 4.23) can be obtained by the Fourier decay, regarding the difference of cocycle as a function on \mathcal{P} . The intuition here is from Lemma 4.16. When g, h are in general position and η not too close to ζ_g^m, ζ_h^m , the difference $\varphi(\eta) = \sigma(g, \eta) - \sigma(h, \eta)$ will be (C, r) good (Definition 4.1). But in order to accomplish this, we need some sophisticated cutoff, which makes the proof complicated.

Recall the family of representations $\{V_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Pi}$ defined in Lemma 2.3. This family is super proximal by Lemma 2.6 and with highest weight χ_α equal to a multiple of fundamental weight

$\tilde{\omega}_\alpha$. We are in semisimple case and we know that $\mathfrak{b}^* = \mathfrak{a}^*$. We can write ϑ in \mathfrak{a}^* as a linear combination of weights, $\{\chi_\alpha | \alpha \in \Pi\}$, that is

$$\vartheta = \sum_{\alpha \in \Pi} \vartheta_\alpha \chi_\alpha.$$

Set $|\vartheta| = \max_{\alpha \in \Pi} |\vartheta_\alpha|$.

We want to treat the spectral gap on the flag variety \mathcal{P} and the projective space $\mathbb{P}V$ at the same time, where V is an irreducible representation of G . Let X be \mathcal{P} or $\mathbb{P}V$. Let $\sigma : G \times X \rightarrow E$ be the cocycle, which is

- given by the Iwasawa cocycle σ and $E = \mathfrak{a}$ when $X = \mathcal{P}$,
- given by σ_V (defined in (2.7)) and $E = \mathbb{R}$ when $X = \mathbb{P}V$.

Let $E_{\mathbb{C}} = E \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{C}$ and $E_{\mathbb{C}}^*$ be the dual space of $E_{\mathbb{C}}$. For $z \in E_{\mathbb{C}}^*$, write $z = \varpi + i\vartheta$, where ϖ, ϑ are elements in E^* . Recall that the transfer operator P_z is defined as follows: for $|\varpi|$ small enough and for f in $C^0(X)$, x in X

$$P_z f(x) = \int_G e^{z\sigma(g,x)} f(gx) d\mu(g),$$

where $z = \varpi + i\vartheta$. Recall that for f in $C^\gamma(X)$ we defined $c_\gamma(f) = \sup_{x \neq x'} \frac{|f(x) - f(x')|}{d(x,x')^\gamma}$ and $|f|_\gamma = |f|_\infty + c_\gamma(f)$.

We state our main result of this section

Theorem 4.19. *Let μ be a Zariski dense Borel probability measure on G with a finite exponential moment. For $\gamma > 0$ small enough, there exist $\rho < 1, C > 1$ such that for all ϑ and ϖ in E^* with $|\vartheta|$ large enough, $|\varpi|$ small enough and f in $C^\gamma(X)$, n in \mathbb{N} we have*

$$|P_{\varpi+i\vartheta}^n f|_\gamma \leq C |\vartheta|^{2\gamma} \rho^n |f|_\gamma.$$

Remark 4.20. *Here we should be careful that the distances on $\mathbb{P}V$ and \mathcal{P} are defined in (2.5) and (2.14). They are not the Riemannian distances defined in the introduction. But on a compact Riemannian manifold, different Riemannian distances are equivalent. In particular, every Riemannian distance on \mathcal{P} is equivalent to the K -invariant Riemannian distance on \mathcal{P} . By Lemma 5.8, we know it is equivalent to the distances defined in (2.14). The case of the projective space $\mathbb{P}V$ is similar. Hence, the norms $|\cdot|_\gamma$ induced by different distances are equivalent.*

Remark 4.21. *We explain here that the result holds for any norm.*

If we have another norm $\|\cdot\|_1$ on V . Let σ_1 be the new cocycle defined with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|_1$. Let $\psi(x) = \log \frac{\|v\|_1}{\|v\|}$ for $x = \mathbb{R}v$ in $\mathbb{P}V$. Then

$$\sigma_1(g, x) = \sigma_V(g, x) + \psi(gx) - \psi(x),$$

which means the difference of two cocycles is a coboundary. This function ψ is Lipschitz, due to equivalence of norms on finite-dimensional vector spaces. Let $T_z f(x) = e^{z\psi(x)} f(x)$. By Lipschitz property of ψ , we have

$$|T_z f|_\gamma \leq C e^{C|\varpi|} |z|^\gamma |f|_\gamma,$$

where C depends on $|\psi|_{Lip}$. We know that

$$P_{z\sigma_1} = T_z^{-1} P_{z\sigma_V} T_z,$$

hence the same spectral gap property also holds for the norm $\|\cdot\|_1$ with different constants.

Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.4 follow directly from Theorem 4.19.

We start with standard *a priori* estimates. When $z = 0$, we will write P for P_0 .

Proposition 4.22. *For every $\gamma > 0$ small enough, there exist $C > 0$ and $0 < \rho < 1$ such that for all f in $C^\gamma(X)$, $|\varpi|$ small enough and $n \in \mathbb{N}$*

$$|P_z^n f|_\infty \leq C^{|\varpi|^n} |f|_\infty, \quad (4.40)$$

$$|P^n f|_\infty \leq \left| \int_X f d\nu \right| + C\rho^n |f|_\gamma, \quad (4.41)$$

$$c_\gamma(P_z^n f) \leq C(C^{|\varpi|^n} |\vartheta|^\gamma |f|_\infty + \rho^n c_\gamma(f)). \quad (4.42)$$

Inequality (4.40) is a consequence of exponential moment and the Hölder inequality. For (4.41), please see [BL85, V, Thm.2.5] and [BQ16, Prop 11.10, Lem.13.5] for more details. This inequality (4.41) is a consequence of the fact that the action of G on X is contracting. The third inequality (4.42) is called the Lasota-Yorke inequality, whose proof is classic.

We reduce Theorem 4.19 to Proposition 4.23. The reduction is standard, using Proposition 4.22. Please see [Dol98] for more details. For f in $C^\gamma(X)$, we define another norm $|f|_{\gamma, \vartheta} = |f|_\infty + c_\gamma(f)/|\vartheta|^\gamma$ for $\vartheta \neq 0$.

Proposition 4.23. *For every $\gamma > 0$ small enough, for $|\vartheta|$ large enough and $|\varpi|$ small enough, there exist $\epsilon_2, C_2 > 0$ such that for f in $C^\gamma(X)$ and $|f|_{\gamma, \vartheta} \leq 1$, we have*

$$\int \left| P_{\frac{C_2 \ln |\vartheta|}{\varpi + i\vartheta}} f \right|^2 d\nu \leq e^{-\epsilon_2 \ln |\vartheta|}. \quad (4.43)$$

Now we will distinguish two cases. **We claim that the case $\mathbb{P}V$ is a corollary of the case \mathcal{P} up to a constant.** Recall that the stationary measure on $\mathbb{P}V$ is written as ν_V . Let f be a function in $C^\gamma(\mathbb{P}V)$ and $|f|_{\gamma, \vartheta} \leq 1$. The estimate only depends on the value of f on the support of the stationary measure ν_V . By Lemma 2.49, the stationary measure on $\mathbb{P}V$ is the pushforward measure of the stationary measure ν on \mathcal{P} . Hence we can define the function \tilde{f} on \mathcal{P} by

$$\tilde{f}(\eta) = f(V_{\chi, \eta}),$$

where χ is the highest weight of V . Then by $\sigma_V(g, V_{\chi, \eta}) = \chi\sigma(g, \eta)$ (see (2.3)),

$$\int \left| P_{\frac{C_2 \ln |\vartheta|}{\varpi + i\vartheta}} f \right|^2 d\nu_V = \int \left| P_{\frac{C_2 \ln |\vartheta|}{(\varpi + i\vartheta)\chi}} \tilde{f} \right|^2 d\nu.$$

We will verify that \tilde{f} satisfies $|\tilde{f}|_{\gamma, \vartheta} \ll 1$. By (2.18), for two distinct points η, η' in \mathcal{P} we have

$$\frac{|\tilde{f}(\eta) - \tilde{f}(\eta')|}{d(\eta, \eta')^\gamma} = \frac{|\tilde{f}(\eta) - \tilde{f}(\eta')|}{d(V_{\chi, \eta}, V_{\chi, \eta'})^\gamma} \frac{d(V_{\chi, \eta}, V_{\chi, \eta'})^\gamma}{d(\eta, \eta')^\gamma} \ll \frac{|f(V_{\chi, \eta}) - f(V_{\chi, \eta'})|}{d(V_{\chi, \eta}, V_{\chi, \eta'})^\gamma} = |f|_\gamma.$$

Hence with different constants, we can deduce the case $\mathbb{P}V$ from the case \mathcal{P} .

We only need to prove Proposition 4.23 for the case \mathcal{P} .

From Fourier decay to Proposition 4.23. We need to reduce (4.43) to Fourier decay (Theorem 5.4). Let

$$n = [C_2 \log |\vartheta|] \text{ and } \delta = e^{-\epsilon n} \quad (4.44)$$

(with $C_2 \geq \max_{\alpha \in \Pi} \{1/\alpha\sigma_\mu\} + 1$ and $\epsilon > 0$ to be determined later), and let $G_{n, \epsilon, \alpha}$ be the subset of $G \times G$ defined as the set of couples which satisfy Lemma 4.16 (1) with $V = V_\alpha$. Let

$$G_{n, \epsilon} = \{g \in G \mid \|\kappa(g) - n\sigma_\mu\| \leq n\epsilon\}^2 \cap (\cap_{\alpha \in \Pi} G_{n, \epsilon, \alpha}) \subset G \times G.$$

Let

$$A_{g,h} := \int_X e^{z\sigma(g,\eta) + \bar{z}\sigma(h,\eta)} f(g\eta) \bar{f}(h\eta) d\nu(\eta).$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \int |P_z^n f|^2 d\nu &= \int e^{z\sigma(g,\eta) + \bar{z}\sigma(h,\eta)} f(g\eta) \bar{f}(h\eta) d\nu(\eta) d\mu^{*n}(g) d\mu^{*n}(h) \\ &= \int_{G_{n,\epsilon}} A_{g,h} d\mu^{*n}(g) d\mu^{*n}(h) + \int_{G_{n,\epsilon}^c} A_{g,h} d\mu^{*n}(g) d\mu^{*n}(h). \end{aligned} \quad (4.45)$$

We first compute the term with (g, h) outside of $G_{n,\epsilon}$, where the behaviour is singular. By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\left| \int_{G_{n,\epsilon}^c} A_{g,h} d\mu^{*n}(g) d\mu^{*n}(h) \right|^2 \leq \mu^{*n} \otimes \mu^{*n}(G_{n,\epsilon}^c) \int |A_{g,h}|^2 d\mu^{*n}(g) d\mu^{*n}(h). \quad (4.46)$$

By large deviation principle (Proposition 2.53, Proposition 2.54), the set $G_{n,\epsilon}^c$ has exponentially small $\mu^{*n} \otimes \mu^{*n}$ measure, that is

$$\mu^{*n} \otimes \mu^{*n}(G_{n,\epsilon}^c) \ll_{\epsilon} \delta^c. \quad (4.47)$$

By $\|f\|_{\infty} \leq 1$ and (4.40), we have

$$\int |A_{g,h}|^2 d\mu^{*n}(g) d\mu^{*n}(h) \leq |P_{2\varpi}^n \mathbb{1}|_{\infty}^2 \leq C^{4n|\varpi|}. \quad (4.48)$$

When $|\varpi|$ is small enough depending on ϵ , by (4.46), (4.47) and (4.48)

$$\int_{G_{n,\epsilon}^c} A_{g,h} d\mu^{*n}(g) d\mu^{*n}(h) \ll_{\epsilon} \delta^{c/2} \leq |\vartheta|^{-c\epsilon/(2C_2)}. \quad (4.49)$$

We compute the major term, that is (g, h) in $G_{n,\epsilon}$. We want to use Theorem 5.4 to control this part with $\varphi = |\vartheta|^{-1}\vartheta(\sigma(g, \eta) - \sigma(h, \eta))$ and a suitable r . In order to apply Theorem 5.4, we need that φ is (C, r) good, which will be accomplished by multiplying by a smooth cutoff. The most important is the G2 assumption (4.2), which will be verified with the help of Lemma 4.16. Hence we want that r vanishes when η does not satisfy Lemma 4.16 (2).

Let $X_{g,h,\alpha}$ be the subset of \mathcal{P} , defined as the set of elements which satisfy Lemma 4.16 (2) with $V = V_{\alpha}$. Let $X_{g,h} = \bigcap_{\alpha \in \Pi} X_{g,h,\alpha}$. Let τ be a smooth function on \mathbb{R} such that $\tau|_{[0,\infty)} = 1$, τ takes values in $[0, 1]$, $\text{supp}\tau \subset [-1, \infty)$ and $|\tau'| \leq 2$. Set $\tau_{\delta}(x) = \tau(x/\delta)$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $\sigma_{\alpha} := \sigma_{V_{\alpha}} = \chi_{\alpha}\sigma$,

$$\varphi(\eta) = |\vartheta|^{-1}\vartheta(\sigma(g, \eta) - \sigma(h, \eta)) = |\vartheta|^{-1} \sum_{\alpha \in \Pi} \vartheta_{\alpha}(\sigma_{\alpha}(g, \eta) - \sigma_{\alpha}(h, \eta)) \quad (4.50)$$

and

$$r(\eta) = f(g\eta) \bar{f}(h\eta) e^{\varpi(\sigma(g,\eta) + \sigma(h,\eta))} \prod_{\alpha \in \Pi} \tau_{\alpha}(\eta), \quad (4.51)$$

where

$$\tau_{\alpha}(\eta) = \tau_{\delta}(4\delta_{\alpha}(\eta, \zeta_g^m) - 4\delta) \tau_{\delta}(4\delta_{\alpha}(\eta, \zeta_h^m) - 4\delta) \tau_{\delta}(4\delta(V_{4\chi_{\alpha} - \alpha, \eta}, F_{\rho_{\alpha}g, \rho_{\alpha}h}) - 4\delta),$$

where δ_{α} is defined to be

$$\delta_{\alpha}(\eta, \zeta_g^m) = \delta(V_{\alpha, \eta}, y_{\rho_{\alpha}(g)}^m).$$

The choice of τ_{α} is sophisticated. We only need to keep in mind that they come from Lemma 4.16. Then $e^{i|\vartheta|\varphi} r(\eta)$ equals $e^{z\sigma(g,\eta) + \bar{z}\sigma(h,\eta)} f(g\eta) \bar{f}(h\eta)$ on $X_{g,h}$.

Lemma 4.24. *Let ϵ_0, ϵ_1 be given by Theorem 5.4. Let (g, h) be in $G_{n, \epsilon}$. With ϵ small enough depending on ϵ_0 and $|\varpi|$ small enough depending on ϵ and ϵ_1 , for φ, r defined in (4.50) and (4.51) we have that φ is $(|\vartheta|^{\epsilon_0}, r)$ good and $c_\gamma(r) \leq |\vartheta|^{\epsilon_0}, |r|_\infty \leq |\vartheta|^{\epsilon_1/2}$.*

By Lemma 4.24, we can fix a value of ϵ and functions φ and $r|\vartheta|^{-\epsilon_1/2}$ satisfying the condition in Theorem 5.4. (Theorem 5.4 still holds when r is a complex function) Hence Theorem 5.4 implies

$$\left| \int e^{i|\vartheta|\varphi(\eta)} r(\eta) d\nu(\eta) \right| \leq |\vartheta|^{-\epsilon_1} \|r\|_\infty \leq |\vartheta|^{-\epsilon_1/2}. \quad (4.52)$$

Due to the definition of $G_{n, \epsilon}$, the difference between $A_{g, h}$ and $\int e^{i|\vartheta|\varphi(\eta)} r(\eta) d\nu(\eta)$ is bounded by

$$\nu(X_{g, h}^c) e^{|\varpi|(\|\kappa(g)\| + \|\kappa(h)\|)} \leq e^{2n|\varpi|(\|\sigma_\mu\| + \epsilon)} \sum_{\alpha \in \Pi} \nu(X_{g, h, \alpha}^c) \leq |\vartheta|^{c\epsilon/2C_2} \sum_{\alpha \in \Pi} \nu(X_{g, h, \alpha}^c), \quad (4.53)$$

if $|\varpi|$ is small enough. Using the regularity of stationary measure (2.37) with $V = W_\alpha$, the irreducible subrepresentation of $\wedge^2 \text{Sym}^2 V_\alpha$ with the highest weight, we have

$$\nu\{\eta \in \mathcal{P} | \delta(V_{4\chi_\alpha - \alpha, \eta}, F_{\rho_\alpha g, \rho_\alpha h}) < \delta\} \ll_\epsilon e^{-c\epsilon n}. \quad (4.54)$$

Using the regularity of stationary measure (2.37) with $V = V_\alpha$, we obtain

$$\nu\{\eta \in \mathcal{P} | V_{\alpha, \eta} \in B_h^m(\delta) \cup B_g^m(\delta)\} \ll_\epsilon e^{-c\epsilon n}. \quad (4.55)$$

Hence by (4.53)-(4.55), we have

$$\nu(X_{g, h}^c) \ll_\epsilon e^{-c\epsilon n} = |\vartheta|^{-c\epsilon/C_2}. \quad (4.56)$$

For (g, h) in $G_{n, \epsilon}$, by (4.52), (4.53) and (4.56)

$$A_{g, h} \ll |\vartheta|^{-\epsilon_1/2} + |\vartheta|^{-c\epsilon/2C_2}.$$

Combined with (4.45) and (4.49), the proof is complete by setting $\epsilon_2 = \min\{\frac{\epsilon_1}{2}, \frac{c\epsilon}{4C_2}\}$. \square

It remains to prove Lemma 4.24.

Proof of Lemma 4.24. We first verify that φ is $(|\vartheta|^{\epsilon_0}, r)$ good. Since ϵ will be taken small enough, we can suppose $|\vartheta|^{-\epsilon_0} \leq \delta/4$. Let J be the $|\vartheta|^{-\epsilon_0}$ neighbourhood of suppr . Then for $\eta \in J$, we have $\delta_\alpha(\eta, \zeta_g^m) \geq \delta/2$ for α in Π .

The function φ is a sum of functions, each one is the lift of a function on $\mathbb{P}V_\alpha$ for some simple root α . We write $\varphi = \sum_{\alpha \in \Pi} \varphi_\alpha$ where $\varphi_\alpha(\eta) = |\vartheta|^{-1} \vartheta_\alpha(\sigma_\alpha(g, \eta) - \sigma_\alpha(h, \eta))$. By Lemma 2.38, that is $\partial_{\alpha'} \varphi_\alpha = 0$ for $\alpha' \neq \alpha$, in order to verify the $(|\vartheta|^{\epsilon_0}, r)$ good condition, it is enough to verify G1-G3 assumptions (4.1)-(4.3) for φ_α and the G4 assumption (4.4) for φ . Since G1-G3 are linear, we can forget the coefficients $|\vartheta|^{-1} \vartheta_\alpha$ in φ_α .

Now, we verify G1-G3 assumptions. We fix a simple root α and consider $\varphi = \varphi_\alpha = \sigma_\alpha(g, \cdot) - \sigma_\alpha(h, \cdot)$. Recall that $v_\alpha = \sup_{\eta \in \text{suppr}} |\partial_\alpha \varphi(\eta)|$. Since J satisfies the hypothesis of Lemma 4.15 with $V = V_\alpha$, we have

$$v_\alpha, \text{Lip}_{\mathcal{P}_0}(\partial_\alpha \varphi|_{\pi^{-1}J}) < \delta^{-C_0}. \quad (4.57)$$

Since $(g, h) \in G_{n, \epsilon}$ satisfies Lemma 4.16(1) and the support of r satisfies Lemma 4.16(2), for η in the support of r , by Lemma 4.16,

$$|\partial_\alpha \varphi(\eta)| > \delta^{C_0} \geq \delta^{C_0} v_\alpha$$

which is the G2 assumption (4.2). This also implies

$$v_\alpha > \delta^{C_0}, \quad (4.58)$$

the G4 assumption (4.4). By (4.57), we have the G3 assumption (4.3). Let

$$\varphi_1(x) = \sigma_{V_\alpha}(\rho_\alpha(g), x) - \sigma_{V_\alpha}(\rho_\alpha(h), x)$$

be a function on $\mathbb{P}V_\alpha$, then $\varphi_1(V_{\alpha,\eta}) = \varphi(\eta)$. Since J satisfies the hypothesis of Lemma 2.11, this Lemma implies

$$\frac{|\varphi(\eta) - \varphi(\eta')|}{d_\alpha(\eta, \eta')} = \frac{|\varphi_1(V_{\alpha,\eta}) - \varphi_1(V_{\alpha,\eta'})|}{d(V_{\alpha,\eta}, V_{\alpha,\eta'})} \leq |Lip_{\mathbb{P}V_\alpha} \varphi_1| < \delta^{-C_0} \leq \delta^{-C_0} v_\alpha,$$

which is the G1 assumption (4.1).

For general φ , it remains to verify the G4 assumption (4.4). There exists a simple root α such that $|\vartheta_\alpha| = |\vartheta|$. Since φ_α satisfies the G4 assumption and due to Lemma 2.38 we have $|\partial_\alpha \varphi| = |\partial_\alpha \varphi_\alpha|$, the function φ also satisfies the G4 assumption.

Finally, we verify the terms $c_\gamma(r)$ and $|r|_\infty$.

Lemma 4.25. *For $0 < \gamma \leq 1$, let f, τ be two γ -Hölder functions on a compact metric space X . Then*

$$c_\gamma(\tau f) \leq c_\gamma(\tau) \|f|_{\text{supp} \tau}\|_\infty + |\tau|_\infty c_\gamma(f|_{\text{supp} \tau}).$$

The proof of Lemma 4.25 is elementary. Recall that

$$r(\eta) = f(g\eta) \bar{f}(h\eta) e^{\varpi(\sigma(g,\eta) + \sigma(h,\eta))} \prod_{\alpha \in \Pi} \tau_\alpha(\eta).$$

For the infinity norm, due to $(g, h) \in G_{n,\epsilon}$, we have

$$|r| \leq e^{|\varpi|(\|\kappa(g)\| + \|\kappa(h)\|)} \leq e^{|\varpi|(2\|\sigma_\mu\| + 2\epsilon)n} \leq |\vartheta|^{|\varpi|C_2(2\|\sigma_\mu\| + 2\epsilon)}.$$

Take $|\varpi|$ small enough, then $|r|_\infty \leq |\vartheta|^{\epsilon_1/2}$.

For the term $c_\gamma(r)$, we only need to verify that each term in the formula of r has a bounded c_γ value. Due to Lemma 4.25, we only need to verify the c_γ value on $X_{g,h}$.

- Since the action of g on $X_{g,h}$ is contracting, by Lemma 2.16, we have

$$c_\gamma(f(g \cdot)|_{X_{g,h}}) \leq c_\gamma(f)(Lip g|_{X_{g,h}})^\gamma \leq (|\vartheta|\beta\delta^{-2})^\gamma.$$

Due to (4.44), we have $\log \beta = -n \min_{\alpha \in \Pi} \alpha \sigma_\mu < -n/C_2 \leq -\log |\vartheta|$. Therefore $c_\gamma(f(g \cdot)|_{X_{g,h}}) \leq \delta^{-C_0}$.

- Due to

$$|e^a - e^b| \leq \max\{e^a, e^b\} |a - b|^\gamma$$

for all a, b in \mathbb{R} and $0 \leq \gamma \leq 1$, by Lemma 2.16,

$$c_\gamma(e^{\varpi\sigma(g,\cdot)}|_{X_{g,h}}) \leq e^{|\varpi|\|\kappa(g)\|} (Lip \varpi\sigma(g, \cdot)|_{X_{g,h}})^\gamma \leq e^{|\varpi|(\|\sigma_\mu\| + \epsilon)n} |\varpi|^\gamma \delta^{-\gamma}.$$

Hence when $|\varpi|$ is small enough depending on σ_μ , we obtain $c_\gamma(e^{\varpi\sigma(g,\cdot)}|_{X_{g,h}}) \leq \delta^{-C_0}$.

- In $c_\gamma(\tau_\alpha)$, the only term we need to be careful about is $\tau_\delta(4\delta(V_{4\chi_\alpha - \alpha, \eta}, F_{\rho_\alpha g, \rho_\alpha h}) - 4\delta)$. By Lemma 2.17, we have $d(V_{4\chi_\alpha - \alpha, \eta}, V_{4\chi_\alpha - \alpha, \eta'}) \ll d(\eta, \eta')$. Hence the c_γ value of this term is also bounded by δ^{-C_0} .

The proof is complete. □

4.4 Exponential error term

In this section, we will prove Theorem 1.1 that the speed of convergence in the renewal theorem is exponential using our result on the spectral gap (Theorem 4.19). Recall that $X = \mathbb{P}V$, where (ρ, V) is an irreducible representation of G with highest weight χ . We have defined a renewal operator R as follows: For a positive bounded Borel function f on \mathbb{R} , a point x in X and a real number t , we set

$$Rf(x, t) = \sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} \int_G f(\sigma_V(\rho(g), x) - t) d\mu^{*n}(g)$$

and

$$R_P f(x, t) = \sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} \int_G f(\log \|\rho(g)\| - t) d\mu^{*n}(g).$$

Recall P_z is the transfer operator defined by $P_z f(x) = \int_G e^{z\sigma_V(\rho(g), x)} f(gx) d\mu(g)$. For $\eta > 0$, let $\mathbb{C}_\eta = \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid |\Re z| < \eta\}$. Using the analytical Fredholm theorem, we summarize the property of P_z .

Proposition 4.26. *Under the same assumptions as in Theorem 1.1, for any $\gamma > 0$ small enough, there exists $\eta > 0$ such that on \mathbb{C}_η the transfer operator P_z is a bounded operator on $C^\gamma(X)$ and depends analytically on z . Moreover there exists an analytic operator $U(z)$ on \mathbb{C}_η such that the following holds on \mathbb{C}_η*

$$(I - P_z)^{-1} = \frac{1}{\sigma_{V,\mu} z} N_0 + U(z),$$

where N_0 is the operator defined by $N_0 f = \int_X f d\nu_V$ and $\sigma_{V,\mu} = \chi\sigma_\mu > 0$ is the Lyapunov constant. There exists $C > 0$ such that for $z \in \mathbb{C}_\eta$

$$\|U(z)\|_{C^\gamma \rightarrow C^\gamma} \leq C(1 + |\Im z|)^{2\gamma}. \quad (4.59)$$

This is a generalization of [LI18a, Prop. 4.1] and [Boy16, Theorem 4.1], and the proof is exactly the same. The main difference is that the spectral radius of P_z is bounded below 1 on \mathbb{C}_η (except at 0), due to Theorem 4.19. From this we have the analytic continuation of $U(z)$ to \mathbb{C}_η and the bound on the operator norm of $U(z)$.

Now, we give the precise statement and the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Proposition 4.27. *Under the same assumptions as in Theorem 1.1, there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that for $f \in C_c^2(\mathbb{R})$, we have*

$$Rf(x, t) = \frac{1}{\sigma_{V,\mu}} \int_{-t}^{\infty} f(u) du + e^{-\epsilon|t|} O(e^{\epsilon|\text{supp}f|} (|f''|_{L^1} + |f|_{L^1})),$$

where $|\text{supp}f|$ is the supremum of the absolute value of x in $\text{supp}f$.

Proof. By the same computation as in [LI18a, Lemma 4.5] and [Boy16, Prop. 4.14], we have

$$Rf(x, t) = \frac{1}{\sigma_{V,\mu}} \int_{-t}^{\infty} f(u) du + \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{2\pi} \int e^{-it\xi} \hat{f}(\xi) U(s + i\xi) \mathbb{1}(x) d\xi,$$

where $\mathbb{1}(x)$ is the constant function with value 1 on X and \hat{f} is the Fourier transform of f given by $\hat{f}(\xi) = \int e^{i\xi u} f(u) du$. Hence, we only need to control the error term.

By Proposition 4.26, we know that $U(z)$ is analytical on \mathbb{C}_η and uniformly bounded by $(1 + |\Im z|)^{2\gamma}$. Since f is a compactly supported smooth function, the Fourier transform \hat{f} is an

analytic function on \mathbb{C} . As $|\hat{f}(\pm i\epsilon + \xi)| \leq e^{\epsilon|\text{supp}f|} \frac{1}{|\xi|^2} |f''|_{L^1}$, and $|\hat{f}(\pm i\epsilon + \xi)| \leq e^{\epsilon|\text{supp}f|} |f|_{L^1}$ for $\epsilon > 0$ and ξ in \mathbb{R} , we have

$$|\hat{f}(\pm i\epsilon + \xi)| \leq e^{\epsilon|\text{supp}f|} \frac{1}{1 + |\xi|^2} (|f''|_{L^1} + |f|_{L^1}). \quad (4.60)$$

By (4.59), (4.60) and the dominant convergence theorem, we have

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{2\pi} \int e^{-it\xi} \hat{f}(\xi) U(s + i\xi) \mathbb{1}(x) d\xi = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int e^{-it\xi} \hat{f}(\xi) U(i\xi) \mathbb{1}(x) d\xi. \quad (4.61)$$

Lemma 4.28. [RS75, Thm.IX14] *If T is in $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$, the space of tempered distributions, the distribution T has analytic continuation to $|\Im \xi| < a$ and $\sup_{|b| < a} \int |T(ib + y)| dy < \infty$, then \check{T} , the inverse Fourier transform of T , is a continuous function. For all $b < a$, let $C_b = \max \int |T(\pm ib + y)| dy$. We have*

$$|\check{T}(t)| \leq C_b e^{-b|t|}.$$

Using Lemma 4.28 with $T(\xi) = \hat{f}(\xi) U(i\xi) \mathbb{1}(x)$, we have

$$\left| \int \hat{f}(\xi) U(i\xi) \mathbb{1}(x) e^{-it\xi} d\xi \right| = |\check{T}(t)| \leq e^{-\epsilon|t|} \max |T(\pm i\epsilon + \xi)|_{L^1(\xi)}. \quad (4.62)$$

for $\epsilon < \eta$. By (4.59) and (4.60), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \max |T(\pm i\epsilon + \xi)|_{L^1(\xi)} &\leq e^{\epsilon|\text{supp}f|} \int \frac{1}{1 + |\xi|^2} (|f''|_{L^1} + |f|_{L^1}) |U(\mp\epsilon + i\xi) \mathbb{1}(x)| d\xi \\ &\ll_{\gamma} e^{\epsilon|\text{supp}f|} (|f''|_{L^1} + |f|_{L^1}). \end{aligned} \quad (4.63)$$

Combining (4.61), (4.62) and (4.63), we obtain the result. \square

Proposition 4.29. *Under the same assumptions as in Theorem 1.1, there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that for $f \in C_c^2(\mathbb{R})$, we have*

$$R_P f(x, t) = \frac{1}{\sigma_{V,\mu}} \int_{-t}^{\infty} f(u) du + e^{-\epsilon|t|} O(e^{\epsilon|\text{supp}f|} (|f''|_{L^1} + |f|_{L^1})).$$

Proof. The ideal of the proof is the same as [LI18a, Lemma 4.11 or Proposition 4.28], where we only need to replace the error term by the error term in the above Proposition 4.27.

We summarize the main idea here. By the large deviation principle, the main contribution of the renewal sum is given by n in a small interval containing $t/\sigma_{V,\mu}$. Since the norm is good, we have the interpretation of the norm by the Cartan projection (2.4). Then we use [BQ16, Lemma 17.8] to replace the norm by the cocycle σ_V for each n in the small interval. The proof is complete by applying Proposition 4.27. \square

5 Appendix

5.1 Non simply connected case

We explain here how to get Theorem 5.4 for connected algebraic semisimple Lie groups defined and split over \mathbb{R} from Theorem 1.7 for connected \mathbb{R} -split reductive \mathbb{R} -groups whose semisimple part is simply connected, which is proved in Section 4.

See [Mar91] and [Bor90, §22] for more facts about algebraic groups and the central isogeny.

Lemma 5.1. *Let \mathbf{G}' be a connected algebraic semisimple Lie groups defined over \mathbb{R} . Then there exist a connected reductive \mathbb{R} -group \mathbf{G} with simply connected derived group $\mathcal{D}\mathbf{G}$ and an algebraic group morphism $\psi : \mathbf{G} \rightarrow \mathbf{G}'$ which is surjective between real points. Moreover, the restriction of ψ to $\mathcal{D}\mathbf{G}$ gives a central isogeny from $\mathcal{D}\mathbf{G}$ to \mathbf{G}' and the connected centre of \mathbf{G} is \mathbb{R} -split.*

Proof. Let \mathbf{A}' be a maximal \mathbb{R} -split torus of \mathbf{G}' . Let \mathbf{G}_1 be a cover of \mathbf{G}' which is simply connected and let f be the isogeny map from \mathbf{G}_1 to \mathbf{G}' . Let \mathbf{A}_1 be the preimage of \mathbf{A}' in \mathbf{G}_1 , which is a maximal \mathbb{R} -split torus of \mathbf{G}_1 [Bor90, Theorem 22.6 (ii)]. Let $\mathbf{N} = \ker f \cap \mathbf{A}_1$, then \mathbf{A}' is isomorphic to \mathbf{A}_1/\mathbf{N} as torus. Consider the action of \mathbf{A}_1 on \mathbf{G}_1 via conjugation, that is for $s \in \mathbf{A}_1$ and $g \in \mathbf{G}_1$ we define $\text{Int}_s(g) = s^{-1}gs$. Since the kernel of f is in the centre of \mathbf{G}_1 , the conjugation action of \mathbf{N} on \mathbf{G}_1 is trivial. By [Bor90, Corollary 6.10], the quotient group $\mathbf{A}' \simeq \mathbf{A}_1/\mathbf{N}$ acts \mathbb{R} -morphically on \mathbf{G}_1 .

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathbf{A}_1 \times \mathbf{G}_1 & \xrightarrow{\text{Int}} & \mathbf{G}_1 \\
f \times \text{Id} \downarrow & \nearrow & \downarrow f \\
\mathbf{A}' \times \mathbf{G}_1 & & \\
\text{Id} \times f \downarrow & & \\
\mathbf{A}' \times \mathbf{G}' & \xrightarrow{\text{Int}} & \mathbf{G}'
\end{array}$$

Hence, we can define the semidirect product $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{A}' \ltimes \mathbf{G}_1$, given by the action of \mathbf{A}' on \mathbf{G}_1 . The derived group $[\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{G}]$ equals \mathbf{G}_1 , which is simply connected. The group \mathbf{G} is defined over \mathbb{R} , because $\mathbf{A}', \mathbf{G}_1$ and ψ are also. The restriction of the action of \mathbf{A}' on \mathbf{A}_1 is trivial and $\mathbf{A}' \times \mathbf{A}_1$ is a maximal \mathbb{R} -split torus of \mathbf{G} . Hence the group \mathbf{G} is a connected reductive \mathbb{R} -group.

We only need to find the surjective morphism ψ . Let $\mathbf{A}' \ltimes \mathbf{G}'$ be the semidirect product given by the conjugation action of \mathbf{A}' on \mathbf{G}' . As \mathbf{A}' is a subgroup of \mathbf{G}' , this semidirect product is a product. Hence $(s, g) \mapsto sg$ from $\mathbf{A}' \ltimes \mathbf{G}'$ to \mathbf{G}' is a group morphism. We have a group morphism

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{A}' \ltimes \mathbf{G}_1 &\rightarrow \mathbf{A}' \ltimes \mathbf{G}' \rightarrow \mathbf{G}' \\
\psi : (s, g) &\mapsto (s, f(g)) \mapsto sf(g).
\end{aligned}$$

It is well-known that the real part of a semisimple simply connected group G_1 is connected in the analytic topology. (See for example [Ste68]) Let $(G')^o$ be the analytic connected component of the identity element in G' . Then the image of real points of \mathbf{G} under ψ is $\mathbf{A}'(G')^o$, which is equal to G' by a theorem of Matsumoto [Mat64] ([BT65, Théorème 14.4]). \square

Example 5.2. When $\mathbf{G}' = \mathbf{PGL}_2$, the above construction gives $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{GL}_2 = \mathbf{GL}_1 \ltimes \mathbf{SL}_2$ and the map ψ is the quotient map from \mathbf{GL}_2 to \mathbf{PGL}_2 .

Let $G' = \mathbf{G}'(\mathbb{R})$ be the group of real points of a connected algebraic semisimple Lie groups defined and split over \mathbb{R} . Recall that μ is a Zariski dense Borel probability measure on G' with a finite exponential moment. If \mathbf{G}' is simply connected, then Theorem 1.7 holds for \mathbf{G}' . If not, let $G = \mathbf{G}(\mathbb{R})$ be as in Lemma 5.1. Recall that ψ is a group morphism from G to G' ,

Lemma 5.3. *There exists a Zariski dense Borel probability measure $\tilde{\mu}$ on G with a finite exponential moment such that*

$$\psi_* \tilde{\mu} = \mu. \quad (5.1)$$

The proof of Lemma 5.3 will be given at the end this section. We will explain why the result also holds for G' and μ . We state the non simply connected version of Theorem 1.7 here.

Theorem 5.4 (Fourier decay). *Let \mathbf{G}' be a connected algebraic semisimple Lie group defined and split over \mathbb{R} and let $G' = \mathbf{G}'(\mathbb{R})$ be its group of real points. Let μ be Zariski dense Borel probability measure on G' with finite exponential moment. Let ν be the μ -stationary measure on the flag variety \mathcal{P} .*

For every $\gamma > 0$, there exist $\epsilon_0 > 0, \epsilon_1 > 0$ depending on μ such that the following holds. For any pair of real functions $\varphi \in C^2(\mathcal{P})$, $r \in C^\gamma(\mathcal{P})$ and $\xi > 0$ such that φ is (ξ^{ϵ_0}, r) good, $\|r\|_\infty \leq 1$ and $c_\gamma(r) \leq \xi^{\epsilon_0}$, then

$$\left| \int e^{i\xi\varphi(\eta)} r(\eta) d\nu(\eta) \right| \leq \xi^{-\epsilon_1} \quad \text{for all } \xi \text{ large enough.}$$

Proof. We only need to prove that the flag varieties of G and G' are isomorphic. By Lemma 5.1, since \mathbf{G}' is \mathbb{R} -split, \mathbf{G} is also \mathbb{R} -split. By Remark 4.2, the distance d_α on \mathcal{P} for \mathbf{G} and \mathbf{G}' are equivalent. By Lemma 5.3, we obtain that ν is also the $\tilde{\mu}$ -stationary measure and we can apply Theorem 1.7 to $G, \tilde{\mu}$.

Now we will prove that the flag varieties of G and G' are isomorphic. By [Bor90, Prop.20.5], we know that $(\mathbf{G}_2/\mathbf{P}_2)(\mathbb{R}) = \mathbf{G}_2(\mathbb{R})/\mathbf{P}_2(\mathbb{R})$ for any connected reductive \mathbb{R} -group \mathbf{G}_2 and its parabolic \mathbb{R} -subgroup \mathbf{P}_2 . Hence it is sufficient to prove for a minimal parabolic \mathbb{R} -subgroup \mathbf{P} of \mathbf{G} and \mathbf{P}' its image in \mathbf{G}' that

$$\mathbf{G}/\mathbf{P} \simeq \mathbf{G}'/\mathbf{P}'. \quad (5.2)$$

As if (5.2) holds, then \mathbf{P}' is also a parabolic subgroup by definition and it is minimal because \mathbf{P} is. Due to [Bor90, Thm.11.16], the normalizer of a parabolic subgroup is itself. Then the centre of \mathbf{G} is contained in the parabolic group \mathbf{P} . It suffices to prove that $\ker \psi$ is in the centre, then

$$\mathbf{G}/\mathbf{P} \simeq (\mathbf{G}/\ker \psi)/(\mathbf{P}/\ker \psi) \simeq \mathbf{G}'/\mathbf{P}'.$$

By [Bor90, Prop.14.2], we know that $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{C} \cdot \mathcal{D}\mathbf{G}$, where \mathbf{C} is the connected centre and $\mathbf{C} \cap \mathcal{D}\mathbf{G}$ is finite. Since \mathbf{G}' is semisimple, the connected centre \mathbf{C} is in $\ker \psi$. As the restriction of ψ on $\mathcal{D}\mathbf{G}$ to \mathbf{G}' is a central isogeny, hence $\ker \psi \cap \mathcal{D}\mathbf{G}$ is in the centre of $\mathcal{D}\mathbf{G}$, which is also in the centre of \mathbf{G} . Therefore the kernel of ψ is in the centre of \mathbf{G} . The proof is complete. \square

It remains to prove Lemma 5.3.

Proof of Lemma 5.3. We will first construct a measure $\tilde{\mu}_1$ which has a finite exponential moment. In the construction of Lemma 5.1, there exists a finite subgroup F of A' such that ψ from $F \times G_1$ to G' is already surjective. Let F_1 be the kernel of this covering, which is finite. Then there exists a Borel probability measure $\tilde{\mu}_1$ on the subgroup $F \times G_1$ of G which is F_1 -left invariant and the pushforward measure is μ .

The moment condition is also satisfied. Because ψ induce an isomorphism between \mathfrak{a}_1 to \mathfrak{a}' (Recall the notation in Section 2) and this isomorphism identifies the Cartan projections $\kappa(g)$ and $\kappa(\psi(g))$. Let mg be an element in $F \times G_1$ with $m \in F$ and $g \in G_1$, then by the subadditivity of the Cartan projection ([BQ16, Corollary 8.20]),

$$\|\kappa(mg)\| \leq \|\kappa(m)\| + \|\kappa(g)\| = \|\kappa(m)\| + \|\kappa(\psi(g))\| \leq \|\kappa(m)\| + \|\kappa(\psi(m))\| + \|\kappa(\psi(mg))\|.$$

Hence

$$\int_G e^{\epsilon \|\kappa(g)\|} d\tilde{\mu}_1(g) \ll \int_G e^{\epsilon \|\kappa(\psi(g))\|} d\tilde{\mu}_1(g) = \int_{G'} e^{\epsilon \|\kappa(g')\|} d\mu(g').$$

In order to get a Zariski dense measure $\tilde{\mu}$, we replace the above measure $\tilde{\mu}_1$ by $\tilde{\mu} = \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{\mu}_1 + c_*\tilde{\mu}_1)$, where c is an element in the connected centre C such that the group $C_1 = \langle c \rangle$ generated by c is Zariski dense in C . Due to $d\psi|_c = 0$, the connected centre C is in the kernel of ψ . Hence $\psi_*(c_*\tilde{\mu}_1) = \psi_*\tilde{\mu}_1$. This measure $\tilde{\mu}$ satisfies (5.1) and has a finite exponential moment. We will prove that it is also Zariski dense.

Let \mathbf{H} be the Zariski closure of $\Gamma_{\tilde{\mu}}$, the group generated by the support of $\tilde{\mu}$. Let \mathfrak{h} be the Lie algebra of H . Since the group \mathbf{G} is a connected \mathbb{R} -group, it is sufficient to prove that $\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{g}$. Recall that $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{c} \oplus \mathcal{D}\mathfrak{g}$. Due to c in H , the Zariski closure of C_1 is also in H . Hence $\mathfrak{h} \supset \mathfrak{c}$. For the semisimple part, consider the adjoint action of $\Gamma_{\tilde{\mu}}$ on $\mathcal{D}\mathfrak{g}$. Because the group Γ_μ is Zariski dense in \mathbf{G}' , the adjoint action of Γ_μ on \mathfrak{g}' is irreducible. The map $d\psi|_{\mathcal{D}\mathfrak{g}} : \mathcal{D}\mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}'$ is an isomorphism of Lie algebras. By

$$d\psi(\text{Ad}_g X) = \text{Ad}_{\psi(g)} d\psi X \text{ for } X \in \mathcal{D}\mathfrak{g},$$

we obtain that the action of $\Gamma_{\tilde{\mu}}$ on $\mathcal{D}\mathfrak{g}$ is irreducible. Since $\mathfrak{h} \cap \mathcal{D}\mathfrak{g}$ is nonzero and $\Gamma_{\tilde{\mu}}$ -invariant, we know that $\mathfrak{h} \cap \mathcal{D}\mathfrak{g} = \mathcal{D}\mathfrak{g}$. Therefore $\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{g}$. The proof is complete. \square

5.2 Equivalence of distances

We consider connected \mathbb{R} -split reductive \mathbb{R} -groups.

Definition 5.5. *Let (X, d) be a metric space. Let d' be another metric on X . We say that d, d' are equivalent if there exist $c, C > 0$ such that for all x_1, x_2 in X*

$$cd(x_1, x_2) \leq d'(x_1, x_2) \leq Cd(x_1, x_2).$$

Recall that \mathcal{P}_0 is the homogeneous space G/A_eN , on which the compact group K acts simply transitively. Recall that $\{V_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Pi}$ is the family of representations fixed in Lemma 2.3. We will define three distances on \mathcal{P}_0 . Due to the fact that \mathcal{P}_0 is homeomorphic to K , a distance on \mathcal{P}_0 is also a distance on K and we will continue our argument on K . Let k, k' be two points in K . If they are not in the same connected component, we define their distance as 1. From now on, we always suppose that k, k' are in the connected component K^o .

- $d_0(k, k') = \sup_{\alpha \in \Pi} \|kv_\alpha - k'v_\alpha\|/\sqrt{2}$, where v_α is a unit vector in V_α with highest weight. This is also the distance induced by the embedding of \mathcal{P}_0 into $\prod_{\alpha \in \Pi} SV_\alpha$.
- $d_1(k, k')$ is the distance induced by the bi-invariant Riemannian metric on K .

We can easily verify that they are distances.

Lemma 5.6. *The two distances d_0 and d_1 on \mathcal{P}_0 are equivalent.*

Before proving Lemma 5.6, we need a lemma.

Lemma 5.7. *Let (ρ, V) be an irreducible representation with highest weight χ , which satisfies $\chi(H_\alpha) > 0$ for only one simple root α . Then there exists $t_0 > 0$ such that the following holds. Let Z be a unit vector in \mathfrak{k} , given by $Z = \sum_{\alpha \in R^+} c_\alpha K_\alpha$. Let*

$$Z_\alpha = \sum_{\beta \geq \alpha, \beta \in R^+} c_\beta K_\beta.$$

Then for $0 < t < t_0$, $k = \exp(tZ)$ and a unit vector v with highest weight, we have

$$\|kv - v\| \asymp t\|Z_\alpha\|.$$

Proof. For a positive root β , let

$$A_\beta := d\rho(K_\beta)v = d\rho(Y_\beta)v.$$

Consider the representation of $\mathfrak{s}_\beta = \{Y_\beta, X_\beta, H_\beta\} \simeq \mathfrak{sl}_2$. Due to the classification of the representations of \mathfrak{sl}_2 , the vector A_β is non-zero if and only if $\chi(H_\beta) > 0$.

Fix an inner product (\cdot, \cdot) on \mathfrak{a}^* which is invariant under the Weyl group, then we can identify H_β with $2\frac{\beta}{(\beta, \beta)}$, that is (see [Ser66, V. 5] for example)

$$\chi(H_\beta) = (\chi, 2\frac{\beta}{(\beta, \beta)}).$$

By hypothesis, $(\chi, \alpha) > 0$ for only one simple root α , this implies that $\chi(H_\beta) = 2(\chi, \beta)/(\beta, \beta) > 0$ if and only if $\beta \geq \alpha$ and β is a positive root. Therefore only the vectors $\{A_\beta\}_{\beta \geq \alpha, \beta \in R^+}$ are non-zero. They are also orthogonal since they are of different weights. When t is small enough, by Lipschitz's property we conclude

$$\|kv - v\| = \|\exp(tZ)v - v\| \asymp t\|d\rho(Z)v\| = t\left\|\sum_{\beta \geq \alpha, \beta \in R^+} c_\beta A_\beta\right\| \asymp t\|Z_\alpha\|.$$

The proof is complete. □

Proof of Lemma 5.6. Due to the embedding \mathcal{P}_0 to $\Pi_{\alpha \in \Pi} \mathbb{S}V_{\alpha}$ and since the Riemannian metric on $\Pi_{\alpha \in \Pi} \mathbb{S}V_{\alpha}$ induces a metric on \mathcal{P}_0 which is equivalent to d_0 , we know that for any x_1, x_2 in \mathcal{P}_0 ,

$$d_0(x_1, x_2) \ll d_1(x_1, x_2).$$

We observe that the two distances are left K -invariant. It is sufficient to prove the equivalence for k' equal to the identity e .

Fix ϵ small depending on K . Let B_{ϵ} be the neighbourhood of e given by $\{k \in K \mid d_1(k, e) < \epsilon\}$. Then B_{ϵ}^c is a compact subset of K . Consider the function $f(k) = \frac{d_0(k, e)}{d_1(k, e)}$ for $k \in B_{\epsilon}^c$. Then f is a positive continuous function on B_{ϵ}^c . The compactness of B_{ϵ}^c implies that it has positive minimum on B_{ϵ}^c . Hence there exists $c > 0$ such that for k outside of B_{ϵ}

$$d_0(k, e) \geq cd_1(k, e).$$

Finally, we only need to consider a small neighbourhood of the identity. We take ϵ small such that the exponential map at e is bi-Lipschitz. Suppose that $k = \exp(tZ)$ with Z a unit vector in \mathfrak{k} and $t > 0$. We can decompose Z as in Lemma 5.7. There exists $\alpha \in \Pi$ such that $\|Z_{\alpha}\| \gg 1$. By Lemma 5.7, we have

$$\|kv_{\alpha} - v_{\alpha}\| \asymp t\|Z_{\alpha}\| \gg t.$$

Then we have $d_0(k, e) \gg d_1(k, e)$. The proof is complete. \square

Lemma 5.8. *The K -invariant Riemannian distance on \mathcal{P} is equivalent to the distance defined in (2.14).*

Proof. By $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_0/M$ and since the group M is a subgroup of K which preserves the distance, let d_1 also be the quotient Riemannian distance on \mathcal{P} . By the same argument of the proof as in Lemma 5.6, it is sufficient to prove a small neighbourhood of η_0 . For any two points η, η' in this small neighbourhood, we can find z, z' in \mathcal{P}_0 such that $\pi(z) = \eta, \pi(z') = \eta'$ and $d_1(z, z') = d_1(\eta, \eta')$. Due to $d_1(z, z')$ small, we see that $d_0(z, z')$ is less than 1. Hence by

$$\|v_1 - v_2\| \asymp \|v_1 \wedge v_2\|$$

for two unit vectors v_1, v_2 with $\|v_1 - v_2\| < \sqrt{2}$, we have

$$d(\eta, \eta') \asymp d_0(z, z').$$

By Lemma 5.6, we have $d_0(z, z') \asymp d_1(z, z') = d_1(\eta, \eta')$. The proof is complete. \square

Recall the definition of the sign function m in Section 2.5.

Lemma 5.9. *Suppose in addition that semisimple part of the group \mathbf{G} is simply connected. Let $z = kz_o, z' = k'z_o$ be two points in \mathcal{P}_0 , then*

$$\sqrt{2}d_0(z, z') \geq d(\pi(z), \pi(z')).$$

We have

$$m(z, z') = e \iff d_0(z, z') < 1.$$

If $m(z, z') = e$, then

$$d(\pi(z), \pi(z')) \geq d_0(z, z').$$

Proof. Suppose that the angle between kv_{α} and $k'v_{\alpha}$ is $\vartheta \in [0, \pi)$, then $\|kv_{\alpha} - k'v_{\alpha}\| = 2 \sin \frac{\vartheta}{2}$ and $d(V_{\alpha, k\eta_o}, V_{\alpha, k'\eta_o}) = \|kv_{\alpha} \wedge k'v_{\alpha}\| = \sin \vartheta = 2 \sin \frac{\vartheta}{2} \cos \frac{\vartheta}{2} \leq 2 \sin \frac{\vartheta}{2}$, which implies the first inequality.

The assumption $d_0(z, z') < 1$ is equivalent to that for every simple root α , the angle ϑ is less than $\pi/2$, which is equivalent to $m(z, z') = e$ due to Lemma 2.24.

If $m(z, z') = e$, then for every simple root α , the angle ϑ is less than $\pi/2$. Hence $\sin \vartheta = 2 \sin \frac{\vartheta}{2} \cos \frac{\vartheta}{2} \geq \sqrt{2} \sin \frac{\vartheta}{2}$, which implies the result. \square

References

- [Aou13] Richard Aoun. Transience of algebraic varieties in linear groups-applications to generic zariski density. In *Annales de l'institut Fourier*, volume 63, pages 2049–2080, 2013.
- [BD17] Jean Bourgain and Semyon Dyatlov. Fourier dimension and spectral gaps for hyperbolic surfaces. *Geometric and Functional Analysis*, 27(4):744–771, 2017.
- [Ben05] Yves Benoist. Convexes divisibles iii. In *Annales Scientifiques de l'École Normale Supérieure*, volume 38, pages 793–832. Elsevier, 2005.
- [BL85] Philippe Bougerol and Jean Lacroix. *Products of random matrices with applications to Schrödinger operators*, volume 8. Springer Science & Business Media, 1985.
- [Bor90] Armand Borel. *Linear algebraic groups*. Springer-Verlag, John Wiley & Sons, 1990.
- [Bor07] David Borthwick. *Spectral theory of infinite-area hyperbolic surfaces*. Springer, 2007.
- [Bou10] Jean Bourgain. The discretized sum-product and projection theorems. *Journal d'Analyse Mathématique*, 112(1):193–236, 2010.
- [Boy16] Jean-Baptiste Boyer. The rate of convergence for the renewal theorem in \mathbb{R}^d . *arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.07214*, 2016.
- [BQ12] Yves Benoist and Jean-Francois Quint. Random walks on finite volume homogeneous spaces. *Invent. Math.*, 187(1):37–59, 2012.
- [BQ14] Yves Benoist and Jean-Francois Quint. Random walks on projective spaces. *Compositio Mathematica*, 150:1579–1606, 9 2014.
- [BQ16] Yves Benoist and Jean-François Quint. *Random Walks on Reductive Groups*, volume 62. Springer, 2016.
- [BT65] Armand Borel and Jacques Tits. Groupes réductifs. *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.*, (27):55–150, 1965.
- [Dol98] Dmitry Dolgopyat. On decay of correlations in Anosov flows. *Annals of mathematics*, pages 357–390, 1998.
- [EMO05] Alex Eskin, Shahar Mozes, and Hee Oh. On uniform exponential growth for linear groups. *Invent. Math.*, 160(1):1–30, 2005.
- [Fur73] Harry Furstenberg. Boundary theory and stochastic processes on homogeneous spaces. In *Harmonic analysis on homogeneous spaces (Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., Vol. XXVI, Williams Coll., Williamstown, Mass., 1972)*, pages 193–229. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R.I., 1973.
- [GLP16] Yves Guivarc'h and Émile Le Page. Spectral gap properties for linear random walks and Pareto's asymptotics for affine stochastic recursions. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, 52(2):503–574, 2016.
- [GM89] I Ya Gol'dsheid and Grigorii Aleksandrovich Margulis. Lyapunov indices of a product of random matrices. *Russian mathematical surveys*, 44(5):11–71, 1989.
- [GMR19] Alexander Gamburd, Michael Magee, and Ryan Ronan, An asymptotic formula for integer points on Markoff-Hurwitz varieties. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, vol. 190, no. 3, pp. 751–809, 2019, doi: 10.4007/annals.2019.190.3.2.

- [GR85] Yves Guivarc’h and Albert Raugi. Frontiere de Furstenberg, propriétés de contraction et théoremes de convergence. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 69(2):187–242, 1985.
- [Gui90] Yves Guivarc’h. Produits de matrices aléatoires et applications aux propriétés géométriques des sous-groupes du groupe linéaire. *Ergodic theory and dynamical systems*, 10(03):483–512, 1990.
- [HdS18] Weikun He and Nicolas de Saxcé. Sum-product for real Lie groups. to appear in *Journal of the European Mathematical Society*
- [Hel79] Sigurdur Helgason. *Differential geometry, Lie groups, and symmetric spaces*, volume 80. Academic press, 1979.
- [Kes73] Harry Kesten. Random difference equations and Renewal theory for products of random matrices. *Acta Mathematica*, vol. 131, no. 0, pp. 207–248, 1973, doi: 10.1007/BF02392040
- [Kes74] Harry Kesten. Renewal theory for functionals of a Markov chain with general state space. *The Annals of Probability*, pages 355–386, 1974.
- [Lal89] Steven P Lalley. Renewal theorems in symbolic dynamics, with applications to geodesic flows, noneuclidean tessellations and their fractal limits. *Acta mathematica*, 163(1):1–55, 1989.
- [LNP19] Jialun LI, Frédéric Naud and Wenyu Pan. Kleinian Schottky groups, Patterson-Sullivan measures, and Fourier decay. 2019.
- [LI18a] Jialun LI. Decrease of Fourier coefficients of stationary measures. *Math. Ann.*, (2018) 372:1189–1238
- [LI18b] Jialun LI. Discretized Sum-product and Fourier decay in \mathbb{R}^n . to appear in *Journal d’Analyse Mathématique*
- [LS19] Jialun LI and Tuomas Sahlsten. Fourier transform of self-affine measures 2019.
- [LP82] Émile Le Page. Théorèmes limites pour les produits de matrices aléatoires. In *Probability measures on groups (Oberwolfach, 1981)*, volume 928 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 258–303. Springer, Berlin-New York, 1982.
- [Mar91] Gregory Margulis. *Discrete subgroups of semisimple Lie groups*, volume 17 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (3) [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas (3)]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1991.
- [Mat64] Hideya Matsumoto. Quelques remarques sur les groupes algébriques réels. *Proc. Japan Acad.*, 40:4–7, 1964.
- [Nau05] Frédéric Naud. Expanding maps on Cantor sets and analytic continuation of zeta functions. In *Annales scientifiques de l’Ecole normale supérieure*, volume 38, pages 116–153, 2005.
- [Qui02] Jean-Francois Quint. Mesures de Patterson—Sullivan en rang supérieur. *Geometric & Functional Analysis GFA*, 12(4):776–809, 2002.
- [Qui05] Jean-François Quint. Groupes de Schottky et comptage. In *Annales de l’institut Fourier*, volume 55, pages 373–429, 2005.

- [RS75] Michael Reed and Barry Simon. *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics: Vol.: 2.: Fourier Analysis, Self-Adjointness*. Academic Press, 1975.
- [PS12] Vesselin Petkov and Luchezar Stoyanov. Distribution of periods of closed trajectories in exponentially shrinking intervals. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, vol. 310, no. 3, pp. 675–704, 2012, doi: 10.1007/s00220-012-1419-x.
- [Sam15] Andrés Sambarino. The orbital counting problem for hyperconvex representations. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, 65(4):1755–1797, 2015.
- [Sar02] Omri Sarig. Subexponential decay of correlations. *Invent. Math.*, vol. 150, no. 3, pp. 629–653, 2002, doi: 10.1007/s00222-002-0248-5.
- [Ser66] Jean-Pierre Serre. *Algèbres de Lie semi-simples complexes*. W. A. Benjamin, inc., New York-Amsterdam, 1966.
- [Ste68] Robert Steinberg. *Endomorphisms of linear algebraic groups*. Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society, No. 80. American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1968.
- [Sto11] Luchezar Stoyanov. Spectra of Ruelle transfer operators for Axiom A flows. *Nonlinearity*, 24(4):1089, 2011.
- [Tit71] Jacques Tits. Représentations linéaires irréductibles d’un groupe réductif sur un corps quelconque. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 247:196–220, 1971.

Jialun LI
 Universität Zürich
 jialun.li@math.uzh.ch