

# EFFECTIVE VERSION OF RATNER'S EQUIDISTRIBUTION THEOREM FOR $SL(3, \mathbb{R})$

LEI YANG

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we will prove an effective version of Ratner's equidistribution theorem for unipotent orbits in  $SL(3, \mathbb{R})/SL(3, \mathbb{Z})$  with a natural Diophantine condition.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

**1.1. Ratner's theorem and its effective versions.** In 1991, Ratner [Rat91b] proved the following fundamental theorem on equidistribution of unipotent orbits in homogeneous spaces:

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $G$  be a Lie group and  $\Gamma$  be a lattice in  $G$ , namely, the homogeneous space  $X = G/\Gamma$  admits a  $G$ -invariant probability measure. Let  $U = \{u(r) : r \in \mathbb{R}\}$  be a one-parameter subgroup of  $G$ . For any  $x \in X$ , the closure of the  $U$ -orbit  $Ux$  of  $x$  is a closed  $L$ -orbit  $Lx$  for some Lie subgroup  $L \subset G$ . Moreover,  $Ux$  is equidistributed in  $Lx$  with respect to the unique  $L$ -invariant probability measure  $\mu_L$ , namely, for any  $f \in C_c^\infty(X)$  (where  $C_c^\infty(X)$  denotes the space of smooth functions on  $X$  with compact support),*

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T f(u(r)x) dr = \int_{Lx} f d\mu_L.$$

Since Ratner's proof relies on her measure classification theorem (cf. [Rat90a], [Rat90b], [Rat91a]) which proves Raghunathan's conjecture, it does not tell how fast it tends to equidistribution. Therefore, a natural question is whether we can make the equidistribution effective, namely, giving an explicit upper bound on the difference

$$\left| \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T f(u(r)x) dr - \int_{Lx} f d\mu_L \right|$$

for given  $T > 0$ . Moreover, effective versions of equidistribution of  $U$ -orbits have many applications to number theory, see [LM14], [EM22], [LM21], [LMW22], [Ven10], [NV21], [EMV09], [CY19], [BV16] and references therein for details. As a result, proving effective versions of Ratner's theorem has attracted much attention and has been a major challenge in homogeneous dynamics.

In recent years, people have made significant progress in establishing effective equidistribution results. For  $G$  being nilpotent, effective version of Ratner's theorem was established by Green and Tao [GT12]. For  $G = SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ ,

---

*Key words and phrases.* homogeneous dynamics, unipotent orbits, equidistribution, effective Ratner's theorem.

since the one-parameter unipotent subgroup is horospherical with respect to the diagonal subgroup, one can apply the thickening argument developed in Margulis's thesis (cf. [Mar04], [KM12]) and spectral gap results for unitary representations of semisimple groups to establish effective equidistribution. See [Sar82], [Bur90], [FF03], [SU15] and [Str04] for works in this setting. In fact, equidistribution for this case was proved before Ratner's theorem, see [Fur73], [DS84]. Using similar argument one can also establish effective equidistribution results for horospherical unipotent orbits in homogeneous spaces. See [KM12], [Edw21] for result in this setting. Using techniques from Fourier analysis, Strombergsson [Str15] established the effective equidistribution for  $G/\Gamma = \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \times \mathbb{R}^2 / \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{Z}) \times \mathbb{Z}^2$  and  $U$  being a one-parameter unipotent (and horospherical) subgroup in the semisimple part. Building on Strombergsson's result, Chow and the author [CY19] proved an effective equidistribution result for a special family of one-parameter unipotent orbits in  $G/\Gamma = \mathrm{SL}(3, \mathbb{R}) / \mathrm{SL}(3, \mathbb{Z})$ . As an application, we proved that Gallagher's theorem in multiplicative Diophantine approximation holds for almost every point on any given planar straight line. The reader is also referred to [BV16] for a similar effective equidistribution result which has applications to number theory. Strombergsson's result was recently generalized by Kim [Kim21] to  $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{R}) \times \mathbb{R}^n / \mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{Z}) \times \mathbb{Z}^n$  with the unipotent subgroup being horospherical in the semisimple part. Recently, Lindenstrauss, Mohammadi and Wang [LMW22] established effective Ratner's theorem for unipotent orbits in  $G/\Gamma$  where  $G = \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \times \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$  and  $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ . The reader is referred to [EMV09] and [EMMV20] for effective equidistribution of closed orbits of maximal semisimple subgroups which can be regarded as an effective version of a result by Mozes and Shah [MS95].

Concerning effective density, there are also significant results. Lindenstrauss and Margulis proved [LM14] an effective density result for unipotent orbits in  $\mathrm{SL}(3, \mathbb{R}) / \mathrm{SL}(3, \mathbb{Z})$  and applied it to prove an effective version of Oppenheim's conjecture. Recently, Lindenstrauss and Mohammadi [LM21] established an optimal effective density result for unipotent orbits in  $G/\Gamma$  for  $G = \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \times \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$  and  $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ .

**1.2. Notation.** Throughout this paper we will fix the following notation.

Given a vector space  $V$  and  $r > 0$ , let  $B_V(r)$  denote the set of vectors in  $V$  with norm  $\leq r$ . Given a Lie group  $J$  and  $r > 0$ , let  $B^J(r)$  denote the  $r$ -neighborhood of the identity in  $J$ . Given a quantity  $\mathcal{A}$ , let  $O(\mathcal{A})$  denote a quantity whose absolute value is  $\leq C\mathcal{A}$  where  $C > 0$  is an absolute constant. For an interval  $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ , let  $|I|$  denote the length of  $I$ . For  $L > 0$ , let  $[L]$  denote the interval  $[-L/2, L/2]$ .

**1.3. Main results.** In this paper we will focus on the following special case: Let  $G = \mathrm{SL}(3, \mathbb{R})$ ,  $\Gamma = \mathrm{SL}(3, \mathbb{Z})$ ,  $X = G/\Gamma$ . Let  $U = \{u(r) : r \in \mathbb{R}\}$  be a

one-parameter unipotent subgroup of  $G$  defined as follows:

$$u(r) := \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & r \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (1.1)$$

Let  $\mu_G$  denote the unique  $G$ -invariant probability measure on  $X$ .

For  $\beta > 0$ , let us define

$$X_\beta := \{x = g\Gamma \in X : \|g\mathbf{v}\| \geq \beta \text{ for any } \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{Z}^3 \text{ or } \bigwedge^2 \mathbb{Z}^3.\} \quad (1.2)$$

By Mahler's criterion, every compact subset of  $X$  is contained in  $X_\beta$ .

For  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , let us denote

$$a_0(t) := \begin{bmatrix} e^{t/3} & & \\ & e^{-t/6} & \\ & & e^{-t/6} \end{bmatrix} \in G, \quad (1.3)$$

and

$$a(t) := \begin{bmatrix} 1 & & \\ & e^{t/2} & \\ & & e^{-t/2} \end{bmatrix} \in G. \quad (1.4)$$

We will prove the following result concerning effective equidistribution of  $U$ -orbit:

**Theorem 1.2.** *There exist  $C > 0$ ,  $\eta > 0$  and  $t_0 > 1$  such that for any  $t \geq t_0$  and any  $x \in X$ , at least one of the following holds:*

(1) *For any  $f \in C_c^\infty(X)$  we have*

$$\left| \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} f(u(re^t)x) dr - \int f d\mu_G \right| \leq Ce^{-\eta t} \|f\|_S,$$

where  $\|\cdot\|_S$  denotes a fixed Sobolev norm;

(2)  $a(-t)a_0(\ell + \ell)x \notin X_{e^{-|\ell|/3}}$  for some  $0 \leq \ell' \leq t$  and  $0.9t \leq |\ell| \leq t$ .

Proving Theorem 1.2 is equivalent to proving the following theorem:

**Theorem 1.3.** *For any  $x \in G/\Gamma$ , one of the following holds:*

(1)

$$\left| \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} f(a(t)u(r)x) dr - \int f d\mu_G \right| \leq Ce^{-\eta t} \|f\|_S;$$

(2)  $a_0(\ell' + \ell)x \notin K_{e^{-|\ell|/3}}$  for some  $0 \leq \ell' \leq t$  and  $0.9t \leq |\ell| \leq t$ .

In fact, it follows from the following equality:

$$\int_{-1/2}^{1/2} f(a(t)u(r)x) dr = \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} f(u(re^t)y) dr,$$

where  $y = a(t)x$ .

Using Theorem 1.2, we can easily prove the following two corollaries on effective equidistribution of expanding curves under translates of diagonal subgroups:

**Corollary 1.4.** *Let us denote  $a_1(t) := a(t)a_0(t)$ . Let  $\mathbf{w} = (w_1, w_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$  be a vector with Diophantine exponent  $\omega(\mathbf{w}) = \kappa \leq 1/2 + 1/10$ , namely, for any positive integer  $q \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ , we have*

$$\max\{\langle qw_1 \rangle, \langle qw_2 \rangle\} \geq q^{-\kappa},$$

where  $\langle \cdot \rangle$  denotes the distance to the nearest integer. For  $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, v_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$  let us denote

$$n(\mathbf{v}) := \begin{bmatrix} 1 & & v_2 \\ & 1 & v_1 \\ & & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let us define

$$\varphi : [-1/2, 1/2] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$$

by  $\varphi(r) := (w_1 r + w_2, r)$ . Then there exist  $C, \eta, t_0 > 0$  such that for any  $t \geq t_0$  and any  $f \in C_c^\infty(X)$  we have

$$\left| \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} f(a_1(t)n(\varphi(r))\Gamma) dr - \int f d\mu_G \right| \leq C e^{-\eta t} \|f\|_S.$$

*Proof assuming Theorem 1.3.* Note that

$$a_1(t)n(\varphi(r)) = z(w_1)a(t)u(r)a_0(t)n^*(-w_1, w_2),$$

where

$$z(w_1) := \begin{bmatrix} 1 & w_1 & \\ & 1 & \\ & & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

and

$$n^*(-w_1, w_2) := \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -w_1 & w_2 \\ & 1 & \\ & & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then for any  $f \in C_c^\infty(X)$  with zero integral, we have that

$$\int_{-1/2}^{1/2} f(a_1(t)n(\varphi(r))\Gamma) dr = \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} f_{w_1}(a(t)u(r)a_0(t)n^*(-w_1, w_2)\Gamma) dr,$$

where  $f_{w_1}(x) = f(z(w_1)x)$ . Note that since  $\mu_G$  is  $G$ -invariant,  $f_{w_1}$  also has zero integral.

Let  $x = a_0(t)n^*(-w_1, w_2)\Gamma$ . Note that the Diophantine condition on  $\mathbf{w}$  ensures that  $a(\ell + \ell')x \in X_{e^{-|\ell|/3}}$  for any  $0 \leq \ell' \leq t$  and  $0.9t \leq |\ell| \leq t$ . Applying Theorem 1.3 with  $x = a_0(t)n^*(-w_1, w_2)\Gamma$  and  $f_{w_1}$ , we have that

$$\left| \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} f_{w_1}(a(t)u(r)a_0(t)n^*(-w_1, w_2)\Gamma) dr \right| \leq C e^{-\eta t} \|f_{w_1}\|_S.$$

Noting that  $\|f_{w_1}\|_S \ll \|f\|_S$ ,

□

*Remark 1.5.* An ineffectively version of Corollary 1.4 was proved in [KdSSY21] for  $\omega(\mathbf{w}) \leq 2$  using Ratner's theorem. The authors also proved that the equidistribution does not hold for  $\omega(\mathbf{w}) > 2$ . By analyzing the Diophantine condition in Theorem 1.3 more carefully, one can easily get a better upper bound on  $\omega(\mathbf{w})$  which ensures effective equidistribution. It is an interesting problem if one can get effective equidistribution for  $\omega(\mathbf{w}) \leq 2$ .

**Corollary 1.6.** *Let us use the same notation as in Corollary 1.4. Let  $\psi : [-1/2, 1/2] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  be a smooth non-degenerate curve in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , namely, derivatives of  $\psi$  span the whole space  $\mathbb{R}^2$  at every  $r \in [-1/2, 1/2]$ . Then there exist  $C, \eta, t_0$  such that for any  $t \geq t_0$  and any  $f \in C_c^\infty(X)$  we have*

$$\left| \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} f(a_1(t)n(\psi(r))\Gamma)dr - \int f d\mu_G \right| \leq Ce^{-\eta t} \|f\|_S.$$

*Proof.* Let us denote  $\psi(r) = (r, \psi_2(r))$ . Let us divide  $[0, 1]$  into small pieces of size  $e^{-t/2}$ . Let us fix a small piece  $\Delta(r_0) = [r_0 - 1/2e^{-t/2}, r_0 + 1/2e^{-t/2}]$ . Then

$$\{a_1(t)n(\psi(r))\Gamma : r \in \Delta(r_0)\}$$

can be approximated by

$$\{z(\psi'_2(r_0))a(t/2)u(r)x : r \in [-1/2, 1/2]\}$$

where

$$z(\psi'_2(r_0)) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \psi'_2(r_0) & \\ & 1 & \\ & & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

as defined in Corollary 1.4, and

$$x = a_0(t/2)a_1(t/2)z(-\psi'_2(r_0))n(\psi(r_0))\Gamma.$$

Then if we can show that

$$\{a(t/2)u(r)x : r \in [-1/2, 1/2]\}$$

effectively equidistributed, we will get that

$$\{a_1(t)n(\psi(r)) : r \in \Delta(r_0)\}$$

is effectively equidistributed. By Theorem 1.3, if we can prove that for any  $0 \leq \ell' \leq t/2$  and any  $0.495t \leq |\ell| \leq t/2$ ,

$$a_0(\ell + \ell')a_0(t/2)a_1(t/2)z(-\psi'_2(r_0))n(\psi(r_0))\Gamma \in X_{e^{-t/10}},$$

then we are done. Now for a fixed  $\ell'' \in [-t/2, t]$ , let us estimate the measure of

$$\mathbf{m}_{\ell''} := \{r \in [-1/2, 1/2] : a_0(\ell'')a_0(t/2)a_1(t/2)z(-\psi'_2(r_0))n(\psi(r_0))\Gamma \notin X_{e^{-t/10}}\}.$$

By [BKM01, Theorem 1.4], we have that  $|\mathbf{m}_{\ell''}| = O(e^{-\alpha_2 t})$  for some constant  $\alpha_2 > 0$  independent of  $\ell''$ . Let us remove all  $\mathbf{m}_{\ell''}$  from  $[-1/2, 1/2]$  and get a subset  $\mathbf{m} \subset [-1/2, 1/2]$ . Then we have that

$$|[-1/2, 1/2] \setminus \mathbf{m}| = O(te^{-\alpha_2 t}),$$

and for any  $r_0 \in \mathfrak{m}$ ,

$$\{a_1(t)n(\psi(r))\Gamma : r \in \Delta(r_0)\}$$

is effectively equidistributed in  $X$ . Combining these two facts we conclude that the whole orbit

$$\{a_1(t)n(\psi(r))\Gamma : r \in [-1/2, 1/2]\}$$

is effectively equidistributed. This completes the proof.  $\square$

*Remark 1.7.* The ineffective version of Corollary 1.6 was proved in [Sha09] using Ratner's theorem.

**Acknowledgements.** The author thanks Wen Huang, Elon Lindenstrauss, Ralf Spatzier, Zhiren Wang and Barak Weiss for valuable discussions and Victor Beresnevich for valuable comments on an earlier version of the paper. The author is supported in part by NSFC grant No. 12171338.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section we recall some basic facts on  $\mathrm{SL}(3, \mathbb{R})$  and its Lie algebra which will be used in the proof of our main theorem.

Let  $G = \mathrm{SL}(3, \mathbb{R})$ , and  $H \subset G$  be the following subgroup of  $G$ :

$$H := \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} 1 & & \\ & h & \\ & & 1 \end{bmatrix} \in G : h \in \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \right\}. \quad (2.1)$$

Clearly  $H$  is isomorphic to  $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ .

Let  $\mathfrak{g}$  and  $\mathfrak{h}$  denote the Lie algebras of  $G$  and  $H$ , respectively.

Consider the adjoint action of  $H$  on  $\mathfrak{g}$ , we have the following decomposition:

$$\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{h} + \mathfrak{r}_0 + \mathfrak{r}_1 + \mathfrak{r}_2, \quad (2.2)$$

where  $\mathfrak{r}_0, \mathfrak{r}_1, \mathfrak{r}_2$  are invariant subspaces with respect to the adjoint action of  $H$ , and  $\dim \mathfrak{r}_1 = \dim \mathfrak{r}_2 = 2$ ,  $\dim \mathfrak{r}_0 = 1$ . In particular,  $\mathfrak{r}_0 = \mathbb{R}\mathfrak{a}_0$  where

$$\mathfrak{a}_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 1/3 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1/6 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1/6 \end{bmatrix};$$

$\mathfrak{r}_1 = \mathbb{R}\mathfrak{v}_1 + \mathbb{R}\mathfrak{v}_2$  where

$$\mathfrak{v}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

and

$$\mathfrak{v}_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix};$$

$\mathfrak{r}_2 = \mathbb{R}\mathbf{w}_1 + \mathbb{R}\mathbf{w}_2$  where

$$\mathbf{w}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

and

$$\mathbf{w}_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The adjoint action of  $H$  on  $\mathfrak{r}_1$  and  $\mathfrak{r}_2$  are given as follows: the adjoint action of  $H$  on  $\mathfrak{r}_1$  is the same as the standard action of  $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$  on  $\mathbb{R}^2$  if we choose  $\{\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2\}$  as the basis; for  $h$  corresponding to  $\begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix}$  and  $\mathbf{w} = x_1\mathbf{w}_1 + x_2\mathbf{w}_2$ ,

$$\mathrm{Ad}(h)\mathbf{w} = (ax_1 - bx_2)\mathbf{w}_1 + (-cx_1 + dx_2)\mathbf{w}_2.$$

Let  $\{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}^*\}$  denote the standard basis of  $\mathfrak{h}$ , where  $\mathbf{a}$  corresponds to

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1/2 & 0 \\ 0 & -1/2 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{R}),$$

$\mathbf{u}$  corresponds to

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{R}),$$

and  $\mathbf{u}^*$  corresponds to

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{R}).$$

Let us denote

$$A := \{a(t) = \exp(t\mathbf{a}) : t \in \mathbb{R}\} \subset H,$$

$$U := \{u(r) := \exp(r\mathbf{u}) : r \in \mathbb{R}\} \subset H,$$

and

$$U^* := \{u^*(t) = \exp(t\mathbf{u}^*) : t \in \mathbb{R}\} \subset H.$$

Note that  $a_0(t) := \exp(t\mathbf{a}_0)$ , then the adjoint action of  $a_0(t)$  on  $\mathfrak{g}$  is as follows:

$$\mathrm{Ad}(a_0(t))\mathbf{h} = \mathbf{h}, \text{ for } \mathbf{h} \in \mathfrak{h},$$

$$\mathrm{Ad}(a_0(t))\mathbf{v} = e^{-t/2}\mathbf{v}, \text{ for } \mathbf{v} \in \mathfrak{r}_1,$$

and

$$\mathrm{Ad}(a_0(t))\mathbf{w} = e^{t/2}\mathbf{w}, \text{ for } \mathbf{w} \in \mathfrak{r}_2.$$

Let us denote

$$b(t) := a(t)a_0(-t) = \begin{bmatrix} e^{-t/3} & & \\ & e^{2t/3} & \\ & & e^{-t/3} \end{bmatrix} \in G, \quad (2.3)$$

and

$$a_1(t) := a(t)a_0(t) = \begin{bmatrix} e^{t/3} & & \\ & e^{t/3} & \\ & & e^{-2t/3} \end{bmatrix} \in G. \quad (2.4)$$

Let us denote by  $p_{1,2} : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{r}_1 + \mathfrak{r}_2$  the projection of  $\mathfrak{g}$  to  $\mathfrak{r}_1 + \mathfrak{r}_2$ . For  $i = 0, 1, 2$ , let  $p_i : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{r}_i$  denote the projection from  $\mathfrak{g}$  to  $\mathfrak{r}_i$ . Let  $p_+, p_-, p_{\mathbf{w}_1}, p_{\mathbf{v}_1}$  and  $p_{\mathbf{u}^*}$  denote the projection to  $\mathbb{R}\mathbf{w}_1 + \mathbb{R}\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbb{R}\mathbf{w}_2 + \mathbb{R}\mathbf{v}_2, \mathbb{R}\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbb{R}\mathbf{v}_1$  and  $\mathbb{R}\mathbf{u}^*$ , respectively.

**2.1. Outline of the proof.** In this subsection we will give the outline of the proof.

The proof is inspired by Ratner's original proof of her measure rigidity theorem [Rat90a] and recent papers by Lindenstrauss, Mohammadi and Wang [LM21, LMW22]. However, compared with previous works, we take a quite different approach in this paper.

We will start with  $\mathcal{F}_0 = a(s)u([1])x$  for  $s = t - \delta_2 t$  and analyze the dimension in directions transversal to the  $H$ -orbit direction.

In §5.2, we will show that  $\mathcal{F}_0$  has certain dimension control in the transversal direction unless condition (2) in Theorem 1.3 holds. Here we are allowed to remove an exponentially small proportion from  $\mathcal{F}_0$ . At this step quantitative non-divergence results we prove in §4 are needed. This is the starting point of our proof. The argument in this part is similar to the corresponding parts in [LM21, LMW22].

§5.3 is the crucial part. In that subsection, we will construct a sequence  $\{\mathcal{F}_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$  of  $U$ -orbits starting from  $\mathcal{F}_0$  where  $\mathcal{F}_{i+1} = a(s_i)\mathcal{F}_i$  for each  $i \geq 0$ . We will prove that  $\mathcal{F}_{i+1}$  has a better dimension control compared with  $\mathcal{F}_i$  (at a larger scale as a cost). To prove this, we introduce a Keakeya-type model to study the divergence of nearby  $U$ -orbits and calculate the weighted intersection number of the Keakeya-type model. The outcome of the calculation is the following, either  $\mathcal{F}_{i+1}$  has a better dimension control, or the whole orbit is close to a closed orbit of a subgroup isomorphic to  $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \times \mathbb{R}^2$ . If the former happens we will continue and if latter happens we will stop. At each step we are allowed to remove an exponentially small proportion. This part is novel compared with previous works.

The inductive construction given as above will provide a  $\mathcal{F}_n$  which either has nice dimension control along all directions transversal to  $H$ -orbit direction, or is close to a closed  $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \times \mathbb{R}^2$ -orbit and has nice dimension control along directions in the closed orbit and transversal to  $H$ -orbit direction. Then we can apply Proposition 3.1, 3.2 or 3.3 we give in §3 to conclude effective equidistribution. All these propositions can be proved by following a Van der Corput argument due to Venkatesh (see [Ven10, §3] and [LM21, Proposition 4.2] for details).

### 3. HIGH TRANSVERSAL DIMENSION TO EQUIDISTRIBUTION

Later in the paper, let us fix  $\beta = e^{-\varepsilon^2 s}$  where  $\varepsilon > 0$  denotes a constant which will be determined later.

We will need the following results to get effective equidistribution from high transversal dimension:



**Proposition 3.1.** *There exist constants  $\varepsilon, \theta, C, \eta > 0$  such that for any  $s > 0$ , any Borel probability measure  $\rho$  on  $[\beta]^2$  with dimension larger than  $2 - \theta$  at scale  $s$ , that is, for any interval  $I \subset [\beta]^2$  of length  $\beta e^{-s}$ , we have*

$$\rho(I) \leq |I|^{2-\theta},$$

any function  $f \in C_c^\infty(X)$ , and any  $x \in X$ , we have

$$\left| \int_{[1]^2} \int_{[1]} f(a(2s)u(r) \exp(\beta w_1 \mathbf{w}_1 + \beta v_1 \mathbf{v}_1)x) dr d\rho(w_1, v_1) - \int f d\mu_G \right| \leq C e^{-\eta s} \|f\|_s.$$

*Proof.* The proof can be completed by following the proof of [LM21, Proposition 4.2] step by step.  $\square$

For  $a_1(s)$  and  $b(s)$ , we have similar results:

**Proposition 3.2.** *There exist constants  $\varepsilon, \theta, C, \eta > 0$  such that for any  $s > 0$ , any Borel probability measure  $\rho$  on  $[\beta]$  with dimension larger than  $1 - \theta$  at scale  $s$ , that is, for any interval  $I \subset [\beta]$  of length  $\beta e^{-s}$ , we have*

$$\rho(I) \leq |I|^{1-\theta},$$

any function  $f \in C_c^\infty(X)$ , and any  $x \in X$ , we have

$$\left| \int_{[1]} \int_{[1]} f(a_1(s)u(r) \exp(\beta y \mathbf{w}_1)x) dr d\rho(y) - \int f d\mu_G \right| \leq C e^{-\eta s} \|f\|_s.$$

**Proposition 3.3.** *There exist constants  $\varepsilon, \theta, C, \eta > 0$  such that for any  $s > 0$ , any Borel probability measure  $\rho$  on  $[\beta]$  with dimension larger than  $1 - \theta$  at scale  $s$ , that is, for any interval  $I \subset [\beta]$  of length  $\beta e^{-s}$ , we have*

$$\rho(I) \leq |I|^{1-\theta},$$

any function  $f \in C_c^\infty(X)$ , and any  $x \in X$ , we have

$$\left| \int_{[1]} \int_{[1]} f(b(s)u(r) \exp(\beta y \mathbf{v}_1)x) dr d\rho(y) - \int f d\mu_G \right| \leq C e^{-\eta s} \|f\|_s.$$

#### 4. QUANTITATIVE NON-DIVERGENCE

This section is devoted to proving the following quantitative non-divergence result:

**Proposition 4.1.** *There exist constants  $\alpha_1, C_1 > 0$  such that for any  $0 < s \leq t$ , if  $x \in X$  satisfies that  $a_0(-s)x, a_0(s)x \notin X_{e^{-s/3}}$ , then for any  $\beta > 0$ ,*

$$|\{r \in [1] : a(s)u(r)x \notin X_\beta\}| \leq C_1 \beta^{\alpha_1}.$$

*Proof.* Let us denote  $x = g\Gamma$ . By the Kleinbock-Margulis quantitative non-divergence theorem (cf. [Kle08, Theorem 2.2], [KM98, Theorem 5.2]), if the statement does not hold then there exists  $\mathbf{v} \in \bigwedge^i \mathbb{Z}^3$  (where  $i = 1$  or  $2$ ), such that

$$\max_{r \in [1]} \|a(s)u(r)g\mathbf{v}\| \leq 1.$$

**Case 1.**  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ : Let us denote  $\mathbf{v}' = a(s)g\mathbf{v} = (v'_1, v'_2, v'_3)$ . Then

$$a(s)u(r)g\mathbf{v} = u(re^s)\mathbf{v}' = (v'_1, v'_2 + re^s v'_3, v'_3).$$

Then  $\|a(s)u(r)g\mathbf{v}\| \leq 1$  implies that  $|v'_1| \leq 1$ ,  $|v'_2 + re^s v'_3| \leq 1$  for any  $r \in [1]$ . The latter easily implies that  $|v'_2| \leq 1$  and  $|v'_3| \leq e^{-s}$ . This implies that  $\|a_1(-s)\mathbf{v}'\| \leq e^{-s/3}$ . Noting that  $a_1(s) = a(s)a_0(s)$ , we complete the proof for **Case 1**.

**Case 2.**  $\mathbf{v} \in \bigwedge^2 \mathbb{Z}^3$ : Let us denote  $\mathbf{v}' = a(s)g\mathbf{v} = (v'_1, v'_2, v'_3)$  where we use the coordinates with respect to the basis  $\{\mathbf{e}_2 \wedge \mathbf{e}_3, \mathbf{e}_1 \wedge \mathbf{e}_3, \mathbf{e}_1 \wedge \mathbf{e}_2\}$ . Then

$$a(s)u(r)g\mathbf{v} = u(re^s)\mathbf{v}' = (v'_1, v'_2, v'_3 + re^s v'_2).$$

By repeating the same argument as in Case 1, we have  $|v'_1|, |v'_3| \leq 1$  and  $|v'_2| \leq e^{-s}$  which implies that  $\|b(-s)\mathbf{v}'\| \leq e^{-s/3}$ . Noting that  $b(s) = a(s)a_0(-s)$ , we complete the proof for **Case 2**. □

Note that for any  $\beta > 0$  small enough and any  $x \in X_{\beta^{1/4}}$ ,  $B^G(\beta)x$  embeds into  $X$  injectively.

We will need the following lemma:

**Lemma 4.2.** *For any  $\beta > 0$ , any  $\ell > 1$  large enough (depending on  $\beta$ ), and any  $x \in X$  with  $a(-\ell)x \in X_{\beta^{1/4}}$ , if*

$$\exp(r_1 e^\ell \mathbf{u} + r_2 e^{\ell/2} \mathbf{v}_1 + r_3 e^{\ell/2} \mathbf{w}_1)x = \exp(\mathbf{v})x$$

where  $r_1, r_2, r_3 \in [\beta]$ ,  $\|(r_1, r_2, r_3)\| \geq \beta/4$ , and  $\mathbf{v} \in B_{\mathfrak{g}}(\beta)$ . Let us write

$$\mathbf{v} = u\mathbf{u} + u^*\mathbf{u}^* + a\mathbf{a} + a_0\mathbf{a}_0 + \sum_{i=1}^2 w_i \mathbf{w}_i + v_i \mathbf{v}_i.$$

if we have  $|u^*| < \beta e^{-\ell}$ , then  $\|(v_2, w_2)\| \geq \beta e^{-\ell/2}$ .

*Proof.* For a contradiction, let us assume that  $|u^*| < \beta e^{-\ell}$ ,  $|v_2, w_2| < \beta e^{-\ell/2}$ . Let us denote  $x = g\Gamma$ . Then

$$\exp(r_1 e^\ell \mathbf{u} + r_2 e^{\ell/2} \mathbf{v}_1 + r_3 e^{\ell/2} \mathbf{w}_1)g = \exp(\mathbf{v})g\gamma,$$

for some  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ . For  $\ell > 1$  large enough, we have  $\gamma \neq e$ . Then we have

$$\exp(-\mathbf{v})\exp(r_1 e^\ell \mathbf{u} + r_2 e^{\ell/2} \mathbf{v}_1 + r_3 e^{\ell/2} \mathbf{w}_1) = g\gamma g^{-1}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} a(-\ell)g\gamma g^{-1}a(\ell) &= a(-\ell)\exp(-\mathbf{v})\exp(r_1 e^\ell \mathbf{u} + r_2 e^{\ell/2} \mathbf{w}_1)a(\ell) \\ &= \exp(-\text{Ad}(a(-\ell))\mathbf{v})\exp(r_1 \mathbf{u} + r_2 \mathbf{v}_1 + r_3 \mathbf{w}_1). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $|u^*| < \beta e^{-\ell}$ ,  $|v_2, w_2| < \beta e^{-\ell/2}$ , we have  $\|\text{Ad}(a(-\ell))\mathbf{v}\| < \beta$ . This implies that

$$a(-\ell)g\gamma g^{-1}a(\ell) \in B^G(\beta),$$

which means that  $B^G(\beta)a(-\ell)x$  does not embed into  $X$  injectively. This contradicts to that  $a(-\ell)x \in X_{\beta^{1/4}}$ . This completes the proof. □

## 5. DIMENSION CONTROL

**5.1. Initial construction of transversal sets.** We first introduce some notation.

For  $\ell > 1$  and a subspace  $V \subset \mathfrak{g}$  generated by some vectors from the canonical basis of  $\mathfrak{g}$ , namely,  $\{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{u}^*, \mathbf{a}_0, \mathbf{v}_{1,2}, \mathbf{w}_{1,2}\}$ , let us define

$$Q(V, \ell) := \{\exp(\mathbf{w}) : \mathbf{w} \in B_{\mathfrak{g}}(\beta), \|p_V(\mathbf{w})\| \leq e^{-\ell}\beta\}, \quad (5.1)$$

where  $p_V$  denotes the projection to  $V$  with respect to the canonical basis.

Let us denote

$$Q^H(\ell) := \{h = \exp(\mathbf{h}) \in B^H(\beta), \|p_{\mathbf{u}^*}(\mathbf{h})\| \leq \beta e^{-\ell}\}, \quad (5.2)$$

and

$$R^H(\ell) := \{h = \exp(\mathbf{h}) \in B^H(\beta), \|p_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{h})\| \leq \beta e^{-\ell}\}. \quad (5.3)$$

For  $s_1, s_2 > 0$ , let us denote

$$Q_{s_2}^{s_1} := \{\exp(\mathbf{w}) : \mathbf{w} \in \mathfrak{r}_1 + \mathfrak{r}_2 : \|p_+(\mathbf{w})\| \leq \beta e^{-s_1}, \|p_-(\mathbf{w})\| \leq \beta e^{-s_2}\}, \quad (5.4)$$

and  $Q_s := Q_s^s$ .

Let  $x \in X$  be such that (2) in Theorem 1.3 does not hold. Let us start with the normalized measure on  $\mathcal{E} = a(s)u([0, 1])x$  where  $s = (1 - \delta_1)t > 0$  (with  $\delta_1 > 0$  small) will be determined later. This is a  $U$ -orbit of length  $e^s$ . Let us define  $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{E}$  as follows:

**Definition 5.1.**  $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{E}$  is defined by removing from  $\mathcal{E}$  points  $y = a(s)u(r)x \in \mathcal{E}$  satisfying  $a_0(\ell')a(-\ell)y \notin X_{\beta^{1/4}}$  for some  $0 \leq \ell \leq \delta_2 t$  and  $0 \leq \ell' \leq t$  where  $\delta_2 = 0.0001$  is a fixed small constant. Let  $\mu_{\mathcal{F}}$  denote the normalized  $U$ -orbit measure on  $\mathcal{F}$ .

By Proposition 4.1 and our assumption on  $x$ , it is easy to show that the removed proportion is  $O(s^2\beta^{\alpha_1/4})$ . Therefore,

$$\mu_{\mathcal{E}} = \mu_{\mathcal{F}} + O(s^2\beta^{\alpha_1/4}), \quad (5.5)$$

where  $\mu_{\mathcal{E}}$  denotes the normalized  $U$ -invariant measure on  $\mathcal{E}$ .

**5.2. Initial dimension bound.** We shall prove the following proposition:

**Proposition 5.2.** *There exist  $\alpha, \delta_3 > 0$  such that for any  $\ell \in [\delta_3 s, s]$ , and any  $x_0 \in \mathcal{F}$ , we have*

$$\mu_{\mathcal{F}}(Q_{\ell} B^{A_0 H}(\beta)x_0) \leq e^{-\alpha\ell}.$$

*Proof.* For a contradiction, let us assume that the statement does not hold for some  $\ell \in [\delta_3 s, s]$  and  $x_0 \in \mathcal{F}$ . Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $\ell = s$ . In fact, for any  $\ell$ , we can cut the whole orbit into small pieces of length  $e^{\ell}$ , get the estimate for each piece and combine them.

Let us choose a small constant  $\eta_1 > \alpha$  which will be determined later. Let us cut  $\mathcal{F}$  into small pieces  $\mathcal{F}'$  of length  $e^{\eta_1 s}$ . We will show that for each  $\mathcal{F}'$  the estimate holds with  $\mathcal{F}$  replaced by  $\mathcal{F}'$ .

For this given  $\eta_1 > 0$ , there exists a constant  $\eta_2 > 0$  such that we can find at least  $e^{\eta_2 s}$  many  $x \in \mathcal{F}' \cap Q_s B^{A_0 H}(\beta)x_0$ ,  $r_x \in [1]$  such that

$$u(r_x e^{\alpha s})x = \exp(\mathbf{v}_x) a_0^x h_x x,$$

where  $a_0^x \in B^{A_0}(\beta)$ ,  $h_x \in B^H(\beta)$ , and  $\mathbf{v}_x \in B_{\mathbf{r}_1 + \mathbf{r}_2}(\beta e^{-s})$ . We can assume that  $\alpha < \delta_2$ . Then  $x$  satisfies  $x \in X_{\beta^{1/4}}$  and  $a(-\alpha s)x \in X_{\beta^{1/4}}$ . By Lemma 4.2, if we write  $h_x = \exp(\mathbf{h}_x)$ , we have the  $\mathbf{u}^*$  coordinate of  $\mathbf{h}_x$  is  $\geq \beta e^{-\alpha s}$ .

Let us write  $x = u_x x_0$  where  $u_x = u(r e^{\eta_1 s})$  for some  $r \in [1]$ . Let us fix a representative  $g_0 \in G$  of  $x_0$ , then we have

$$u(r_x e^{\alpha s})u_x g_0 = \exp(\mathbf{v}_x) a_0^x h_x u_x g_0 \gamma_x,$$

for some  $\gamma_x \in \Gamma$ . The above equality is equivalent to

$$g_0 \gamma_x g_0^{-1} = (a_0^x h_x u_x)^{-1} \exp(-\mathbf{v}_x) u(r_x e^{\alpha s}) u_x. \quad (5.6)$$

Without loss of generality, we can assume that for different  $x$  and  $x'$  as above,  $|u_{x'}^{-1} u_x| \geq e^{5\alpha s}$ .

For each  $x$  we get  $\gamma_x \in \Gamma$ . We claim that those  $\gamma_x$ 's are different. In fact, if there exist  $x, x'$  such that  $\gamma_x = \gamma_{x'}$ , then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & (a_0^x h_x u_x)^{-1} \exp(-\mathbf{v}_x) u(r_x e^{\alpha s}) u_x \\ &= (a_0^{x'} h_{x'} u_{x'})^{-1} \exp(-\mathbf{v}_{x'}) u(r_{x'} e^{\alpha s}) u_{x'}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \exp(\mathbf{v}'_x) (a_0^x)^{-1} u_x^{-1} h_x^{-1} u_x u(r_x e^{\alpha s}) \\ &= \exp(\mathbf{v}'_{x'}) (a_0^{x'})^{-1} u_{x'}^{-1} h_{x'}^{-1} u_{x'} u(r_{x'} e^{\alpha s}), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbf{v}'_x = -\text{Ad}((a_0^x h_x u_x)^{-1}) \mathbf{v}_x$  and  $\mathbf{v}'_{x'}$  denotes the same expression with  $x$  replaced by  $x'$ . By comparing the  $\mathbf{r}_1 + \mathbf{r}_2$ ,  $A_0$  and  $H$  components of both sides, we have  $\exp(\mathbf{v}'_x) = \exp(\mathbf{v}'_{x'})$ ,  $a_0^x = a_0^{x'}$  and

$$u_x^{-1} h_x^{-1} u_x u(r_x e^{\alpha s}) = u_{x'}^{-1} h_{x'}^{-1} u_{x'} u(r_{x'} e^{\alpha s}).$$

This implies that

$$u(-L) h_x u(L) = u(r e^{\alpha s}) h_{x'}, \quad (5.7)$$

where  $u(L) = u_x u_{x'}^{-1}$  and  $r = r_x - r'_{x'}$ . Note that  $|r| \leq 1$  and  $|L| \geq e^{5\alpha s}$ .  $|r| \leq 1$  implies that the norm of the right hand side is  $\leq e^{\alpha s}$ . On the other hand, the left hand side is equal to

$$\exp(\text{Ad}(u(-L))\mathbf{h}) = \exp(\text{Ad}(u(-L))(a_0 \mathbf{a} + a_1 \mathbf{u} + a_2 \mathbf{u}^*))$$

whose  $\mathbf{u}$  coordinate is  $a_1 + a_0 L + a_2 L^2$ . Since  $|a_2| \geq \beta e^{-\alpha s}$  and  $|L| \geq e^{5\alpha s}$ , we have that

$$|a_1 + a_0 L + a_2 L^2| \geq \beta e^{9\alpha s}.$$

Therefore, we have that the equality (5.7) is impossible to hold and conclude the claim.

Let us consider the adjoint action of  $G$  on  $\bigoplus_{i=1}^8 \wedge^i \mathfrak{g}$  and denote

$$v_H = \mathbf{a} \wedge \mathbf{u} \wedge \mathbf{u}^*.$$

Then the stabilizer of  $v_H$

$$\text{Stab}(v_H) = A_0H.$$

Then (5.6) implies that

$$\gamma_x g_0^{-1} v_H = \exp(\text{Ad}(g_0^{-1})\mathbf{v}'_x) g_0^{-1} v_H.$$

The norm of  $g_0^{-1} v_H$  is  $\leq \|g_0^{-1}\|^{D_1}$  for some absolute constant  $D_1 > 0$ . Let us estimate the norm of  $\mathbf{v}'_x$ . Note that  $\|u_x\| \leq e^{\eta_1 s}$ , we have that the norm of  $(a_0^x h_x u_x)^{-1}$  is bounded by  $2e^{\eta_1 s}$ . Therefore,  $\|\mathbf{v}'_x\| \leq e^{-s+\eta_1 s}$ . Let us denote  $v_0 = g_0^{-1} v_H / \|g_0^{-1} v_H\|$ , then we have

$$\|\gamma_x v_0 - v_0\| \leq \|\mathbf{v}'_x\|^{\kappa_1} \leq e^{-\kappa_1(1-\eta_1)s}.$$

for some absolute constant  $\kappa_1 > 0$ .

Considering the group generated by  $\gamma_x$ 's, we have the following two cases:

**Case 1:**  $\langle \gamma_x \rangle$  is abelian.

**Case 2:**  $\langle \gamma_x \rangle$  is not abelian.

For **Case 1**, we claim that there exists  $\gamma_x$  whose unipotent part is not trivial. In fact, if every  $\gamma_x$  is diagonalizable, then they belong to a maximal torus in  $G$ . Note that  $\|\gamma_x\| \leq e^{\eta_1 s}$ , we have that there are at most  $s^{100}$  different  $\gamma_x$ 's which contradicts to the fact that there are  $e^{\eta_2 s}$  different  $\gamma_x$ 's. Note that  $\gamma_x \in \text{SL}(3, \mathbb{Z})$ , if  $\gamma_x$  has nontrivial unipotent part, it must be unipotent. By repeating the same argument as in [EMV09], we can find  $g' \in G$  satisfying that  $\gamma_x g'^{-1} v_H = g'^{-1} v_H$  and

$$\|g' - g_0\| \leq \|\gamma_x v_0 - v_0\| \|\gamma_x\|^{D_2} \leq e^{-\kappa_1(1-\eta_1)s} e^{D_2 \eta_1 s},$$

where  $D_2 > 0$  is an absolute constant. By choosing  $\eta_1$  small enough we get

$$\|g' - g_0\| \leq e^{-\kappa_2 s} \text{ for some constant } \kappa_2 > 0.$$

Then  $g' \gamma_x g'^{-1} \in A_1 H$ . Since  $\gamma_x$  is unipotent, we have  $g' \gamma_x g'^{-1} \in H$ . We claim that the lattice  $g' \mathbb{Z}^3$  contains a nonzero vector  $\mathbf{p}$  satisfying  $\|\mathbf{p}\| \leq e^{2\eta_1 s}$  and  $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}\mathbf{e}_2 + \mathbb{R}\mathbf{e}_3$ . In fact, we can find a basis  $\{\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2, \mathbf{p}_3\}$  of  $g' \mathbb{Z}^3$  such that  $\|\mathbf{p}_i\| \leq \|g'\| \leq 2\|g_0\| \leq 2\beta^{-1}$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ . Since  $g' \gamma_x g'^{-1}$  is a unipotent element in  $H$ , its fixing vectors

$$V(g' \gamma_x g'^{-1}) := \{\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^3 : g' \gamma_x g'^{-1} \mathbf{p} = \mathbf{p}\}$$

has dimension 2. Therefore,  $g' \gamma_x g'^{-1} \mathbf{p}_i \neq \mathbf{p}_i$  for some  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ . On the other hand, we have  $g' \gamma_x g'^{-1} \mathbf{p}_i \in g' \mathbb{Z}^3$ . Thus,

$$g' \gamma_x g'^{-1} \mathbf{p}_i - \mathbf{p}_i \in g' \mathbb{Z}^3.$$

Moreover, since  $g' \gamma_x g'^{-1} \in H$ , it is easy to see that  $\mathbf{p} := g' \gamma_x g'^{-1} \mathbf{p}_i - \mathbf{p}_i \in \mathbb{R}\mathbf{e}_2 + \mathbb{R}\mathbf{e}_3$ . Its norm is bounded by

$$\|\mathbf{p}\| \leq \|\mathbf{p}_i\| + \|g' \gamma_x g'^{-1}\| \|\mathbf{p}_i\| \leq \|\mathbf{p}_i\| + \|g'\| \|\gamma_x\| \|g'^{-1}\| \|\mathbf{p}_i\| \leq 2\beta^{-1} + e^{\eta_1 s} \beta^{-10} \leq e^{2\eta_1 s}.$$

Then for any  $\eta_3 > 0$ ,

$$\|a_0(\eta_3 s) \mathbf{p}\| = e^{-\eta_3 s/6} \|\mathbf{p}\| \leq e^{-(\eta_3/6 - 2\eta_1)s}.$$

We can choose  $\eta_3$  such that

$$\|a_0(\eta_3 s) g' - a_0(\eta_3 s) g_0\| \leq 1.$$

Then we can choose  $\eta_1 > 0$  small enough such that  $a_0(\eta_3 s)g'\Gamma \notin X_{e^{-\eta_3 s/12}}$ . This implies that  $a_0(\eta_3 s)g_0 \notin X_{\beta^{1/4}}$  which leads to a contradiction.

Let us consider **Case 2**. Let us take  $\gamma = \gamma_x$  and  $\gamma' = \gamma_{x'}$  not commuting. Using the same argument as in **Case 1** (again using the argument in [EMV09]), we can find we can find  $g' \in G$  satisfying that  $\gamma g'^{-1}v_H = g'^{-1}v_H$ ,  $\gamma' g'^{-1}v_H = g'^{-1}v_H$  and

$$\|g' - g_0\| \leq e^{-\kappa_1(1-\eta_1)s} e^{D_2\eta_1 s}.$$

This implies that  $g'\gamma g'^{-1}, g'\gamma' g'^{-1} \in A_1 H$ . Then their commutator

$$g'\gamma\gamma'\gamma^{-1}\gamma'^{-1}g'^{-1} \in H.$$

Then we can use the same argument as in **Case 1** to deduce that  $a_0(\eta_3 s)g_0 \notin X_{\beta^{1/4}}$  leading to the same contradiction.

This completes the proof of Proposition 5.2.  $\square$

**5.3. Dimension Improvement.** This subsection is devoted to dimension improvement under the action of  $a(t)$ .

Let us first introduce some definition:

**Definition 5.3.** Given a probability measure  $\mu$  on  $X$ , we say that  $\mu$  is good in dimension  $d$  control at scale  $[\ell_1, \ell_2]$  if for any  $x_0 \in X$ , and any  $\ell \in [\ell_1, \ell_2]$ ,

$$\mu(Q_\ell B^{A_0 H}(\beta)x_0) \leq e^{-d\ell}.$$

Given a subspace  $V$  of  $\mathfrak{r}_1 + \mathfrak{r}_2$  generated by elements from the standard basis of  $\mathfrak{r}_1 + \mathfrak{r}_2$ , namely,  $\{\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2\}$ , we say that  $\mu$  is good in dimension  $d$  control along  $V$  at scale  $[\ell_1, \ell_2]$ , if for any  $x_0 \in X$ , and any  $\ell \in [\ell_1, \ell_2]$ ,

$$\mu(Q(V, \ell)x_0) \leq e^{-d\ell}.$$

According to this definition, Proposition 5.2 says that  $\mu_{\mathcal{F}}$  is good in dimension  $\alpha$  control at scale  $[\delta_3 s, s]$ . Similarly to Definition 5.1, by removing an exponentially small proportion, we can assume that for any  $x \in \text{supp}\mu_{\mathcal{F}_i}$

Starting from  $\mathcal{F}_0 = \mathcal{F}$ , we will construct a sequence  $\{\mathcal{F}_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$  such that every  $\mathcal{F}_{i+1}$  is constructed by removing a small proportion from  $a(s_i)\mathcal{F}_i$  for some  $s_i$  which will be determined later.

In this subsection, we will prove that we can construct a sequence  $\{\mathcal{F}_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$  such that  $\mu_{\mathcal{F}_{i+1}}$  has better dimension control compared with  $\mu_{\mathcal{F}_i}$ . Similarly to Definition 5.1, by removing an exponentially small proportion, we can assume that for any  $x \in \text{supp}\mu_{\mathcal{F}_i}$ , any  $0 \leq \ell \leq \delta_2 t$  and  $0 \leq \ell' \leq t$ ,  $a_0(\ell')a(-\ell)x \in X_{\beta^{1/4}}$ . By repeating the proof of Proposition 5.2, we have that  $\mu_{\mathcal{F}_i}$  is good in dimension  $\alpha$  control at scale  $[\delta_3 s, s]$ .

Before stating the main statement of this subsection, let us introduce some notation.

For notational simplicity, for  $s' > 0$ , let us denote

$$\Sigma_{s'} := Q_{s'}^{-s'} B^{A_0}(\beta) Q^H(2s'), \quad (5.8)$$

$$\Omega_{s'} := Q_{3s'}^{s'} B^{A_0}(\beta) Q^H(2s'), \quad (5.9)$$

and

$$\Theta_{s'} := Q_{s'} B^{A_0}(\beta) Q^H(2s'). \quad (5.10)$$

We then introduce a Keakeya-type model to analyze the dimension change along  $U$ -orbits.

**Definition 5.4.** Let  $s' > 0$  and  $\mu$  be a probability measure on  $X$  defined by taking the normalized measure on a subset of a  $U$ -orbit consisting of a union of  $U$ -orbits of length  $e^{2s'}$ . For  $\Sigma(x) = \Sigma_{s'}x \subset X$ , let us cut  $\Sigma(x)$  into small pieces each of which is of the form  $\Omega(y) = \Omega_{s'}y$ . For each piece  $\Omega(y)$ , let us write

$$y = \exp(\mathbf{w}_y^-) \exp(\mathbf{w}_y^+) a_0(y) \exp(\mathbf{h}_y) x,$$

where  $\mathbf{w}_y^- = v_{2,y} \mathbf{v}_2 + w_{2,y} \mathbf{w}_2$  and  $\mathbf{w}_y^+ = v_{1,y} \mathbf{v}_1 + w_{1,y} \mathbf{w}_1$ . Then we assign  $\Omega(y)$  with a finite curve:

$$\mathcal{L}(y) := \{(t, f_{v,y}(t), f_{w,y}(t)) : t \in [e^{2s'}]\},$$

where  $f_{v,y}$  and  $f_{w,y}$  are given as follows: Let us define a linear map

$$J : \mathbb{R}\mathbf{v}_2 + \mathbb{R}\mathbf{w}_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\mathbf{v}_1 + \mathbb{R}\mathbf{w}_1$$

by  $J(\mathbf{v}_2) := \mathbf{v}_1$  and  $J(\mathbf{w}_2) = -\mathbf{w}_1$ . Then it is easy to see that

$$u(t) \exp(\mathbf{w}_y^-) u(-t) = \exp(\mathbf{w}_y^- + tJ(\mathbf{w}_y^-)).$$

We then write

$$\exp(\mathbf{w}_y^- + tJ(\mathbf{w}_y^-)) \exp(\mathbf{w}_y^+) = \exp(\mathbf{f}_{-,y}(t)) \exp(\mathbf{f}_{+,y}(t)),$$

where  $\mathbf{f}_{-,y}(t) \in \mathbb{R}\mathbf{v}_2 + \mathbb{R}\mathbf{w}_2$  and  $\mathbf{f}_{+,y}(t) \in \mathbb{R}\mathbf{v}_1 + \mathbb{R}\mathbf{w}_1$ . Then  $f_{v,y}$  and  $f_{w,y}$  are  $\mathbf{v}_1$  and  $\mathbf{w}_1$ , respectively, coordinates of  $\mathbf{f}_{+,y}$ .

Let  $\mathcal{T}(y)$  denote the  $\beta e^{-s'}$ -neighborhood of  $\mathcal{L}(y)$ . We then assign  $\mathcal{T}(y)$  with a weight

$$\mathcal{W}(y) = \mu(\Omega(y)).$$

For  $\mathcal{T}(y_1)$  and  $\mathcal{T}(y_2)$ , let us denote

$$\Delta(y_1, y_2) = (v_{2,y_1} - v_{2,y_2}, w_{2,y_2} - w_{2,y_1}).$$

Let us the collection of tubes  $\{\mathcal{T}(y)\}$  with weights  $\{\mathcal{W}(y)\}$  the Keakeya-type model for  $(\mu, \Sigma(x))$ .

The following lemma tells the connection between the dimension change along  $U$ -orbits and the Keakeya-type model:

**Lemma 5.5.** *Let us fix  $\mu$ ,  $s' > 0$  and  $\Sigma(x) = \Sigma_{s'}x$  as above. Then for any  $\Omega(y_1)$  and  $\Omega(y_2)$  from  $\Sigma(x)$ , the following two statements are equivalent:*

(1). *There exist  $L_1, L_2 \in [e^{2s'}]$  with  $|L_1 - L_2| \leq \beta|L_1|$  such that  $u(L_1)\Omega(y_1)$  and  $u(L_2)\Omega(y_2)$  are contained in the same neighborhood of the form  $\Theta_{s'}z$ ;*

(2).  *$\mathcal{T}(y_1)$  intersects  $\mathcal{T}(y_2)$  at  $t = L$  where  $|L - L_1| \leq \beta|L_1|$ .*

*Moreover, if one of the above holds, then for any  $|L'_1| \leq e^{s'} \|\Delta(y_1, y_2)\|^{-1}$ , there exists  $L'_2$  with  $|L'_1 - L'_2| \leq \beta|L'_1|$  such that  $u(L_1 + L'_1)\Omega(y_1)$  and  $u(L_2 + L'_2)\Omega(y_2)$  are contained in the same neighborhood of the form  $\Theta_{s'}z'$ .*

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, we can assume that  $y_1 = x$  and denote  $y_2$  by  $y$ .

Then

$$y = \exp(\mathbf{w}_y^-) \exp(\mathbf{w}_y^+) a_0(y) \exp(\mathbf{h}_y) x.$$

Suppose statement (1) holds for  $L_1, L_2$ . Let us consider  $u(L_2)y$ :

$$\begin{aligned} u(L_2)y &= u(L_2) \exp(\mathbf{w}_y^-) \exp(\mathbf{w}_y^+) a_0(y) \exp(\mathbf{h}_y) x \\ &= u(L_2) \exp(\mathbf{w}_y^-) \exp(\mathbf{w}_y^+) a_0(y) \exp(\mathbf{h}_y) u(-L_2) u(L_2) x \\ &= \exp(\mathbf{f}_{-,y}(L_2)) \exp(\mathbf{f}_{+,y}(L_2)) a_0(y) \exp(\text{Ad}_{u(L_2)}(\mathbf{h}_y)) u(L_2) y_1. \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\|\mathbf{f}_{-,y}(L_2)\| \leq \beta e^{-s'}.$$

We then have

$$\|\mathbf{f}_{+,y}(L_2)\| \leq \beta e^{-s'}$$

which implies  $\mathcal{T}(y)$  and  $\mathcal{T}(x)$  intersect at  $t = L_2$ . This proves that statement (2) holds.

Using similar argument, we can prove that (2) implies (1) and the second part of the lemma.  $\square$

Let us introduce the following structure-randomness decomposition of a measure  $\mu$ :

**Definition 5.6.** Let  $s' > 0$  and  $\mu$  be a probability measure on  $X$  defined by taking the normalized measure on a subset of a  $U$ -orbit consisting of a union of  $U$ -orbits of length  $e^{2s'}$ . For a neighborhood  $\Sigma(x) = \Sigma_{s'} x$ , let us consider its Kakeya-type model. To handle our case, let us assume that the weight of  $\mathcal{T}(y)$  satisfies that  $\mathcal{W}(y) \leq e^{-2d_i s'} e^{-2s'}$  for every tube  $\mathcal{T}(y)$ . Then every neighborhood  $\Theta(z) = \Theta_{s'} z \subset \Sigma(x)$  corresponds to a collection of tubes passing through  $\mathbf{p}_y = (0, v_{1,y}, w_{1,y})$ . Let us fix a constant  $C_1 \geq 1$  which will be determined later. For a fixed tube  $\mathcal{T}(z)$  and a point  $\mathbf{p}_y$ , all tubes passing through  $\mathbf{p}_y$  and intersecting  $\mathcal{T}(z)$  determine a surface, denoted by  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{T}(z), y)$ . Moreover, there is a corresponding curve  $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{T}(z), y)$  in  $\mathbb{R}\mathbf{v}_2 + \mathbb{R}\mathbf{w}_2 = \mathbb{R}^2$  such that if  $\mathbf{w}^- \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{T}(z), y)$ , then  $\mathcal{T}(\exp(\mathbf{w}^-)y) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{T}(z), y)$ . It is easy to see that the sum of weights of tubes passing through  $\mathbf{p}_y$  and intersecting  $\mathcal{T}(z)$  is at most

$$e^{2s'} e^{-2d_i s'} e^{-2s'} = e^{-2d_i s'}.$$

A surface  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{T}(z), y)$  is called highly concentrated if the sum of weights of tubes passing through  $\mathbf{p}_y$  and intersecting  $\mathcal{T}(z)$  is at least  $e^{(2-7C_1\varepsilon_1)s'} e^{-2d_i s'} e^{-2s'}$ . Let us take all orbits corresponding to tubes contained in highly concentrated surfaces and define a measure  $\mu_{\mathcal{P}}$ . Then  $\mu$  admits the following decomposition:

$$\mu = \nu_{\tau} \mu_{\tau} + \nu_{\mathcal{P}} \mu_{\mathcal{P}}.$$

Let us call  $\mu_{\tau}$  the random component of  $\mu$  and  $\mu_{\mathcal{P}}$  the structured component of  $\mu$ .



Recall that starting from  $\mathcal{F}_0 = \mathcal{F}$ , we want to construct a sequence  $\{(\mathcal{F}_i, s_i)\}$  such that  $\mathcal{F}_{i+1}$  is a subset of  $a(s_i)\mathcal{F}_i$  with a better dimension control.

The following proposition is the goal of this subsection:

**Proposition 5.7.** *Suppose that  $\mathcal{F}_i$  has been constructed with parameters  $s_i, d_i > 0$  such that any  $\mu_{\mathcal{F}_i}$  is good in dimension  $d_i$  control at scale  $s_i$ . Then there exist an absolute constant  $\varepsilon_1 > 0$  and a decomposition of  $\mu = \mu_{a(s_i)\mathcal{F}_i}$ :*

$$\mu = \nu_{\mathcal{R}_i}\mu_{\mathcal{R}_i} + \nu_{\mathcal{F}_{i+1}}\mu_{\mathcal{F}_{i+1}} + \nu_{\mathcal{P}}\mu_{\mathcal{P}},$$

where  $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{F}_i$  with proportion  $O(\beta)$ ,  $\mu_{\mathcal{P}}$  is the structured part of  $\mu$  as in Definition 5.6, and  $\mu_{\mathcal{F}_{i+1}}$  is good in dimension  $d_i + \varepsilon_1$  control at scale  $s_{i+1} = s_i/2$ .

*Proof.* Let us denote  $s' = s_{i+1}$ . Then our hypotheses on  $\mathcal{F}_i$  implies that for any  $\Omega(x) = \Omega_{s_i}x$ , we have  $\mu(\Omega(x)) \leq e^{-2s'}e^{-2d_i s'}$ .

Let us write

$$\mu = \nu_{\tau}\mu_{\tau} + \nu_{\mathcal{P}}\mu_{\mathcal{P}},$$

as in Definition 5.6. Then we can let

For  $\nu_{\tau}\mu_{\tau}$ , there are two cases:

**Case 1.**  $\nu_{\tau} < \beta$ ;

**Case 2.**  $\nu_{\tau} \geq \beta$ .

For **Case 1**, we can put

$$\mathcal{R}_i = \text{supp}\mu_{\tau} \text{ and } \mathcal{F}_{i+1} = \emptyset,$$

and we are done.

Now let us handle **Case 2**, namely,  $\nu_{\tau} \geq \beta$ . In this case, by the definition of  $\mu_{\tau}$ , we have that for any neighborhood  $\Sigma(x) = \Sigma_{s'}x$ , its corresponding Kekeya-type model does not have any highly concentrated surfaces.

For every neighborhood  $\Theta(z) = \Theta_{s'}z$ , we call it a small neighborhood if

$$\mu_{\tau}(\Theta(z)) \leq e^{-2s'}e^{-(d_i + \varepsilon_1)s'},$$

otherwise we call it a big neighborhood.

Let us define  $\mathcal{F}_{i+1}$  the union of all orbits contained in small neighborhoods, and define  $\mathcal{R}_i$  to be the rest. Then it suffices to show that  $\mu_{\tau}(\mathcal{R}_i) < \beta$ .

For contradiction, we assume that  $\mu_{\tau}(\mathcal{R}_i) \geq \beta$ .

For every  $y \in \mathcal{R}_i$ , if

$$|u([e^{2s'}]y) \cap \mathcal{R}_i| \geq \beta^2 e^{2s'},$$

we will call it a good point, otherwise we call it a bad point. Then it is easy to see that the collection of bad points has  $\mu_{\tau}$ -measure  $\leq \beta^2$ . Therefore, the collection of good points, denoted by  $\mathcal{R}'_i$ , has  $\mu_{\tau}$ -measure  $\geq \beta$ .

Now let us cut  $X$  into small pieces each of which is of the form

$$\Sigma(x) := \Sigma_{s'}x.$$

We call a piece  $\Sigma(x)$  good if

$$\mu_{\tau}(\Sigma(x)) \geq \beta^{100}e^{-2s'},$$

and

$$\mu_\tau(\mathcal{R}'_i \cap \Sigma(x)) \geq \beta^2 \mu_\tau(\Sigma(x)),$$

otherwise we called it bad.

Now let us fix a good  $\Sigma(x)$ . Let us consider its corresponding Keakeya-type model and calculate the following weighted intersection number: We take the sum of  $\mathcal{W}(y_1)\mathcal{W}(y_2)$  for all pairs  $\mathcal{T}(y_1)$  and  $\mathcal{T}(y_2)$  intersecting each other and  $y_1 \in \mathcal{R}'_i$  or  $y_2 \in \mathcal{R}'_i$  and denote it by  $\mathcal{S}(\Sigma(x))$ .

Now for a fixed  $\mathcal{T}(y)$  with  $y \in \mathcal{R}'_i$ , we have that

$$|u([e^{2s'}])y \cap \mathcal{R}'_i| \geq \beta^2 e^{2s'}.$$

For every  $\tilde{y} \in u([e^{2s'}])y \cap \text{supp}\mu$ , we have

$$\mu(\Theta_{s'}\tilde{y}) \geq e^{-2s'} e^{-(d_i+\varepsilon_1)s'}.$$

By Lemma 5.5, every  $\Omega_{s'}\tilde{z} \subset \Theta_{s'}\tilde{y}$  corresponds to some  $\Omega_{s'}z$  from  $\Sigma(x)$  with  $\mathcal{T}(z)$  intersecting  $\mathcal{T}(y)$ . For now let us assume that there exists an absolute constant  $C_1 \geq 1$  such that

$$\|\Delta(y, z)\| \geq e^{-(1+C_1\varepsilon_1)s'}. \quad (5.11)$$

We will explain how to remove this assumption in Remark 5.8. Let this  $C_1$  be the constant in Definition 5.6.

Noting that  $\Omega_{s'}\tilde{z}$  and  $\Omega_{s'}z$  has the same  $\mu_\tau$ -measure, by running over all  $\Omega_{s'}\tilde{z} \subset \Theta_{s'}\tilde{y}$ , we have that the contribution from  $\Theta_{s'}\tilde{y}$  to  $\mathcal{S}(\Sigma(x))$  is at least

$$\mathcal{W}(y)e^{-2s'} e^{-(d_i+\varepsilon_1)s'}.$$

By assumption (5.11), each such intersection can cover at most  $e^{C_1\varepsilon_1s'}$  of the whole  $u([e^{2s'}])y$  orbit. Therefore, from the orbit we can find at least  $\beta^2 e^{(2-C_1\varepsilon_1)s'} \geq e^{(2-2C_1\varepsilon_1)s'}$  different  $\tilde{y}$ 's. Therefore, we have that the contribution from the whole orbit  $u([e^{2s'}])y$  to  $\mathcal{S}(\Sigma(x))$  is at least

$$\mathcal{W}(y)e^{-2s'} e^{-(d_i+\varepsilon_1)s'} e^{(2-2C_1\varepsilon_1)s'} = \mathcal{W}(y)e^{-(d_i+3C_1\varepsilon_1)s'}.$$

By running over all  $y \in \mathcal{R}'_i \cap \Sigma(x)$ , we get

$$\mathcal{S}(\Sigma(x)) \geq \tilde{\mathfrak{m}} e^{-4C_1\varepsilon_1s'} e^{-d_i s'},$$

where  $\tilde{\mathfrak{m}} = \mu_\tau(\Sigma(x))$ .

On the other hand, let us get an upper bound on  $\mathcal{S}(\Sigma(x))$ .

For any  $\mathcal{T}(z)$  and  $\Theta_{s'}y$  with  $y \in \mathcal{R}'_i$ , let us consider all  $\mathcal{T}(y')$  passing through  $\mathbf{p}_y$  (cf. Definition 5.6) and intersecting  $\mathcal{T}(z)$ . Note that all such  $\mathcal{T}(y')$ 's determine a surface  $\mathcal{P}$  containing  $\mathbf{p}_y$  and  $\mathcal{L}(z)$ . Since  $\mu_\tau$  does not have any highly concentrated surfaces, we have that the contribution to  $\mathcal{S}(\Sigma(x))$  from  $\mathcal{T}(z)$  and all such  $\mathcal{T}(y')$  is

$$\leq \mathcal{W}(z)e^{(2-7C_1\varepsilon_1)s'} e^{-2d_i s'} e^{-2s'} = \mathcal{W}(z)e^{-7C_1\varepsilon_1s'} e^{-2d_i s'}.$$

Since  $y \in \mathcal{R}'_i$ , the  $\mu_\tau$ -measure of each  $\Theta_{s'}y$  is at least  $e^{-(d_i+\varepsilon_1)s'} e^{-2s'}$  and the measure of  $\Sigma(x)$  is at most  $e^{-2s'}$ , we have that there are at most  $e^{d_i s'} e^{\varepsilon_1 s'}$

different  $\Theta_{s'}y$  from  $\Sigma(x)$ . Thus the total contribution to  $\mathcal{S}(\Sigma(x))$  with a fixed  $\mathcal{T}(z)$  and all possible  $\Theta_{s'}y$  is at most

$$\mathcal{W}(z)e^{-7C_1\varepsilon_1s'}e^{-2d_iss'}e^{d_iss'}e^{\varepsilon_1s'} = \mathcal{W}(z)e^{-6C_1\varepsilon_1s'}e^{-d_iss'}.$$

By running over all  $\mathcal{W}(z)$ , we get

$$\mathcal{S}(\Sigma(x)) \leq \tilde{\mathfrak{m}}e^{-6C_1\varepsilon_1s'}e^{-d_iss'}.$$

This implies that

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{m}}e^{-4C_1\varepsilon_1s'}e^{-d_iss'} \leq \tilde{\mathfrak{m}}e^{-6C_1\varepsilon_1s'}e^{-d_iss'},$$

which leads to a contradiction. This completes the proof.  $\square$

*Remark 5.8.* Now let us explain how to remove assumption (5.11).

For contradiction, let us assume that there exists  $\xi \geq C_1\varepsilon_1$  such that we can find a subset  $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_i \subset \mathcal{R}_i$  with proportion  $\geq \beta^2$  such that for each  $\Theta(y) \subset \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_i$ , the union of  $\Omega(z) \subset \Theta(y)$  with  $\|\Delta(y, z)\| \in [e^{-(1+\xi)s'}, 2e^{-(1+\xi)s'}]$  has measure  $\geq e^{-2s'}e^{-(d_i+\varepsilon_1)s'}$ . Let us denote the union by  $\Xi(y)$ .

Now in the definition of the summation  $\mathcal{S}(\Sigma(x))$ , let us add one more condition:

$$\|\Delta(y, z)\| \in [e^{-(1+\xi)s'}, 2e^{-(1+\xi)s'}]. \quad (5.12)$$

Repeating the argument in the proof of Proposition 5.7, we have that

$$\mathcal{S}(\Sigma(x)) \geq \tilde{\mathfrak{m}}e^{-(\xi+\varepsilon_1)s'}e^{-d_iss'}.$$

On the other hand, let us get an upper bound on  $\mathcal{S}(\Sigma(x))$ . In fact, for a fixed  $\mathcal{T}(z)$ , any  $\mathcal{T}(y)$  intersecting  $\mathcal{T}(z)$  with condition (5.12) is from some  $\Xi(y')$  which is contained in

$$\Psi(z) := Q_{(1+\xi)s'}^{-s'+\xi s'} B^{A_0}(\beta) Q^H(2s')z.$$

Applying Proposition 5.2 to  $\mathcal{F}_i$ , we have

$$\mu_{\mathfrak{r}}(\Psi(z)) \leq e^{-2s'}e^{-\xi\alpha s'}.$$

Noting that each  $\Xi(y')$  has measure  $\geq e^{-2s'}e^{-(d_i+\varepsilon_1)s'}$ , we get there are at most

$$e^{-2s'}e^{-\xi\alpha s'}(e^{-2s'}e^{-(d_i+\varepsilon_1)s'})^{-1} = e^{d_iss'}e^{-(\alpha\xi-\varepsilon_1)s'}$$

possible  $\Xi(y')$ 's. For each  $\Xi(y')$ , there are at most  $e^{(2-\xi)s'}$  different  $\mathcal{T}(y)$ 's intersecting  $\mathcal{T}(z)$ . Therefore, by running all possible  $\mathcal{T}(z)$ 's, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}(\Sigma(x)) &\leq \tilde{\mathfrak{m}}e^{(2-\xi)s'}e^{-2s'}e^{-2d_iss'}e^{d_iss'}e^{-(\alpha\xi-\varepsilon_1)s'} \\ &= \tilde{\mathfrak{m}}e^{-(\xi+\alpha\xi-\varepsilon_1)s'}e^{-d_iss'}. \end{aligned}$$

The upper bound will be smaller than the lower bound if  $C_1 \geq 10\alpha^{-1}$  which leads to a contradiction.

This shows that it is enough to consider intersections satisfying (5.11) with  $C_1 = 10\alpha^{-1}$ .

## 6. STRUCTURED COMPONENT

This section is devoted to the study of the structured component  $\mu_{\mathcal{P}}$  of  $\mu$ .

First note that by repeating the argument in the proof of Proposition 5.7, we can easily prove that (without assuming the absence of highly concentrated surfaces)  $\mu_{\mathcal{T}}$  and  $\mu_{\mathcal{P}}$  are good in dimension  $d_i - \varepsilon_1$  control at scale  $s' = s_{i+1}$ . In fact, we can replace  $\varepsilon_1$  with any  $\varepsilon' > 1000\varepsilon$ . Therefore, if we have that  $\mu_{\mathcal{F}_i}$  is good in dimension  $d_i + 2\varepsilon_1$  control at scale  $2s' = s_i$ , then we have done. Thus, later in this paper, we can assume that for any  $x \in \text{supp}\mu_{\mathcal{F}_i}$ ,

$$\mu_{\mathcal{F}_i}(Q_{s_i}B^{A_0H}(\beta)x) \geq e^{-(d_i+2\varepsilon_1)s_i}. \quad (6.1)$$

Under this assumption, we have that for any  $x \in \text{supp}\mu$ ,

$$\mu(\Omega_{s'}x) \geq e^{-2s'} e^{-(d_i+2\varepsilon_1)2s'}, \quad (6.2)$$

and for any  $x \in X$ ,

$$\mu(\Theta_{s'}x) \leq e^{-2s'} e^{-(d_i-\varepsilon_1)s'}. \quad (6.3)$$

where  $s' = s_{i+1}$ . Thus, if  $d_i < 2 - 7C_1\varepsilon_1$ , then we will not have any highly concentrated surfaces. Therefore, later in this paper, we can assume that

$$d_i \geq 2 - 7C_1\varepsilon_1. \quad (6.4)$$

For  $\mu_{\mathcal{P}}$ , we have the following statement:

**Proposition 6.1.** *If  $d_i \geq 2 + 7C_1\varepsilon_1$ , then  $\mu_{\mathcal{P}}$  is good in dimension  $d_i + \varepsilon_1$  control.*

*If  $d_i \in [2 - 7C_1\varepsilon_1, 2 + 7C_1\varepsilon_1]$ , then  $\mu_{\mathcal{P}}$  can be decomposed as*

$$\mu_{\mathcal{P}} = \nu_1\mu_{\mathcal{P},1} + \nu_2\mu_{\mathcal{P},2},$$

*where  $\mu_{\mathcal{P},1}$  is good in dimension  $d_i + \varepsilon_1$  control at scale  $s'$ , and  $a(2s')_*\mu_{\mathcal{P},2}$  is effectively equidistributed in  $X$ .*

We first define the following property for highly concentrated surfaces:

**Definition 6.2.** Given a tube  $\mathcal{T}(z)$  and  $\Theta(y)$ , the surface  $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{T}(z), y)$  is called integrable if we can find at least  $e^{(2-60C_1\varepsilon_1)s'}$  difference  $z'$ 's such that for each  $z'$ , we can find at least  $e^{(2-60C_1\varepsilon_1)s'}$  different tubes  $\mathcal{T}(z'')$  from  $\Theta(z')$  contained in  $\mathcal{P}$ .

We will need the following lemma about the structure of the Lie algebra of  $\text{SL}(3, \mathbb{R})$ . We will omit its proof.

**Lemma 6.3.** *The only possible integrable surface is of the forms*

$$\mathcal{P}_1 := \{(t, 0, s) : (t, s) \in \mathbb{R}^2\},$$

and

$$\mathcal{P}_2 := \{(t, s, 0) : (t, s) \in \mathbb{R}^2\}.$$

Now we have equipped to prove Proposition 6.1

*Proof of Proposition 6.1.* Let us first consider the case  $d_i \geq 2 + 7C_1\varepsilon_1$ . For this case we can ignore the contribution of integrable surfaces and assume that there is no integrable surfaces.

For contradiction, let us assume that there is a subset  $\mathcal{R} \subset \text{supp}\mu_{\mathcal{P}}$  with measure  $\geq \beta$  such that for each  $x \in \mathcal{R}$ ,

$$\mu_{\mathcal{P}}(\Theta(x)) \geq e^{-2s'} e^{-(d_i + \varepsilon_1)s'}.$$

By repeating the argument in the proof of Proposition 5.7, we have that to avoid a contradiction, there must be at least

$$e^{d_i 2s'} e^{d_i s'} e^{-14C_1\varepsilon_1 s'}$$

highly concentrated surfaces, counting multiplicity. Therefore, for almost every  $\Theta(y)$ , counting multiplicity, there are at least  $e^{d_i 2s'} e^{-15C_1\varepsilon_1 s'}$  highly concentrated surfaces passing through  $\mathbf{p}_y$ . By our assumption, have that every highly concentrated surface can be counted for at most  $e^{4s' - 60C_1\varepsilon_1 s'}$  times. Therefore, there are at least

$$e^{d_i 2s'} e^{-15C_1\varepsilon_1 s'} e^{-4s' + 60C_1\varepsilon_1 s'} = e^{(d_i - 2)2s'} e^{45C_1\varepsilon_1 s'}$$

different highly concentrated surfaces passing through  $\mathbf{p}_y$ . Every highly concentrated surface gives a corresponding curve in  $\mathbb{R}\mathbf{w}_2 + \mathbb{R}\mathbf{v}_2$ . Note that every curve covers at least  $e^{2s' - 15C_1\varepsilon_1 s'}$  different  $\Omega(z)$ 's. Therefore, counting multiplicity, they cover at least

$$e^{2(d_i - 1)s'} e^{30C_1\varepsilon_1 s'}$$

$\Omega(z)$ 's. We claim that they cover at least

$$e^{d_i s'} e^{7C_1\varepsilon_1 s'}$$

different  $\Omega(z)$ 's. In fact, if every  $\Omega(z)$  is covered by at most

$$e^{(d_i - 2)s'} e^{23C_1\varepsilon_1 s'}$$

different highly concentrated curves, then we are done. Now we assume that some  $\Omega(z)$  is covered by at least

$$e^{(d_i - 2)s'} e^{23C_1\varepsilon_1 s'}$$

different curves. Note that these curves can cover at least

$$e^{2s' - 15C_1\varepsilon_1 s'} e^{(d_i - 2)s'} e^{23C_1\varepsilon_1 s'} = e^{d_i s'} e^{8C_1\varepsilon_1 s'}$$

different  $\Omega(z')$ s. This proves the claim.

This implies that

$$\mu_{\mathcal{P}}(\Theta(x)) \geq e^{-2s'} e^{-(d_i - 7C_1\varepsilon_1)s'},$$

which contradicts to (6.3). This finishes the proof for case  $d_i \geq 2 + 7C_1\varepsilon_1$ .

Now let us consider the case  $d_i \leq 2 + 7C_1\varepsilon_1$ . For this case we can decompose  $\mu_{\mathcal{P}}$  as

$$\mu_{\mathcal{P}} = \nu_{\text{int}}\mu_{\text{int}} + \nu_{\text{non-int}}\mu_{\text{non-int}},$$

where  $\mu_{\text{int}}$  denotes the component supported on integrable surfaces, and  $\mu_{\text{non-int}}$  denotes the rest.

For  $\mu_{\text{non-int}}$ , we can use the same argument as above to conclude that  $\mu_{\mathcal{P}}$  is good in dimension  $d_i + \varepsilon_1$  control.

For  $\mu_{\text{int}}$ , first note that  $\mu_{\text{int}}$  can be further decomposed as

$$\mu_{\text{int}} = \sum_i \nu_{\text{int},i} \mu_{\text{int},i},$$

where each  $\mu_{\text{int},i}$  is either supported on  $\mathcal{P}_1$  or  $\mathcal{P}_2$ .

Let us fix  $\bar{\mu}_i = \mu_{\text{int},i}$ . Without loss of generality, let us assume that it is supported on  $\mathcal{P}_1$ .

Let us cut  $X$  into small pieces each of which is of the form

$$\Upsilon(x) := Q_{s'}^0 B^{A_0} Q^H(2s')x.$$

Then for any  $x \in \text{supp } \bar{\mu}_i$ , the restriction of  $\bar{\mu}_i$  to  $\Upsilon(x)$ , denoted by  $\bar{\mu}_{i,x}$ , is supported on

$$\Xi(x) := Q(V, s') B^{A_0}(\beta) Q^H(2s')x,$$

where  $V = \mathbb{R}\mathbf{v}_1 + \mathbb{R}\mathbf{v}_2 + \mathbb{R}\mathbf{w}_2$ .

We call  $\Xi(x)$  a good neighborhood if  $\bar{\mu}_i(\Xi(x)) \geq e^{-(1-15C_1\varepsilon_1)s'}$ , otherwise we call it a bad neighborhood. Then by the definition of integrable surfaces, we have that the total measure of the union of bad neighborhoods is  $\leq \beta$ . Therefore we can remove all bad neighborhoods and assume that  $\Xi(x)$  is good. Then for any  $\Theta(z) \subset \Xi(x)$ ,

$$\bar{\mu}_{i,x}(\Theta(z)) \leq e^{-(1-75C_1\varepsilon_1)s'}.$$

Note that the action of  $a(2s')$  on  $\Xi(x)$  is  $\beta$ -close to the action of  $a_1(s')$ . Then we can apply Proposition 3.2 to conclude that  $a(2s')_* \bar{\mu}_{i,x}$  is effectively equidistributed in  $X$ . If  $\mu_{i,x}$  is supported on  $\mathcal{P}_2$ , then we can apply Proposition 3.3 with  $b(s')$  to conclude the same statement. Repeating this argument to every  $x$  and  $i$ , we conclude that  $a(2s')_* \mu_{\text{int}}$  is effectively equidistributed.

Letting  $\mu_{\mathcal{P},1} = \mu_{\text{non-int}}$  and  $\mu_{\mathcal{P},2} = \mu_{\text{int}}$ , we complete the proof.  $\square$

## 7. PROOF OF THE MAIN THEOREM

We are equipped to prove Theorem 1.3.

*Proof of Theorem 1.3.* Let us fix some  $s_0 = \delta t$ . Let  $s = t - 2s_0$  and  $\mathcal{F}_0 = a(s)u([1])x$ . Then by Proposition 5.2, we have that  $\mu_{\mathcal{F}_0}$  is good in dimension  $d_0 = \alpha$  control at scale  $s_0$ . Applying Proposition 5.7 and 6.1, we get that for  $d_i \leq 2 - 7C_1\varepsilon_1$  and  $d_i \geq 2 + 7C_1\varepsilon_1$ ,  $\mu_{\mathcal{F}_{i+1}} = a(s_i)_* \mu_{\mathcal{F}_i}$  is, modulo removing an exponentially small proportion, good in dimension  $d_{i+1} = d_i + \varepsilon_1$  control at scale  $s_{i+1} = s_i/2$ . For  $d_i \in [2 - 7C_1\varepsilon_1, 2 + 7C_1\varepsilon_1]$ , by Proposition 6.1,  $\mu_{\mathcal{F}_i}$  might admit a structured component  $\mu_{i,\text{int}}$  such that  $a(s_i)_* \mu_{i,\text{int}}$  is effectively equidistributed. Noting that  $\mu_{i,\text{int}}$  is a component of  $a(t - s_i)u([1])x$ , we are done for this part. For the random part, we can proceed this inductive construction until  $d_i \geq 4 - \varepsilon_1$ . Then by applying Proposition 3.1, we have that  $a(2s_i)_* \mu_{\mathcal{F}_i}$  is effectively equidistributed. Noting that  $\mu_{\mathcal{F}_i}$  is a component of  $a(t - 2s_i)u([1])x$ , we get desired result for this part.

This completes the proof.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [BKM01] V Bernik, D Kleinbock, and Grigoriy A Margulis. Khintchine-type theorems on manifolds: the convergence case for standard and multiplicative versions. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, 2001(9):453–486, 2001.
- [Bur90] Marc Burger. Horocycle flow on geometrically finite surfaces. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 61(3):779–803, 1990.
- [BV16] Tim Browning and Ilya Vinogradov. Effective Ratner theorem for  $SL(2, \mathbb{R}) \times \mathbb{R}^2$  and gaps in  $\sqrt{n}$  modulo 1. *Journal of the London Mathematical Society*, 94(1):61–84, 2016.
- [CY19] Sam Chow and Lei Yang. An effective ratner equidistribution theorem for multiplicative diophantine approximation on planar lines. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.06081*, 2019.
- [DS84] Shrikrishna G Dani and John Smillie. Uniform distribution of horocycle orbits for fuchsian groups. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 51(1):185–194, 1984.
- [Edw21] Samuel Edwards. On the rate of equidistribution of expanding translates of horospheres in  $\Gamma \backslash G$ . *Commentarii Mathematici Helvetici*, 96(2):275–337, 2021.
- [EM22] M Einsiedler and A Mohammadi. Effective arguments in unipotent dynamics. *Dynamics, geometry, number theory: the impact of margulis on modern mathematics*, 2022.
- [EMMV20] Einsiedler, Margulis, Mohammadi, and Venkatesh. Effective equidistribution and property  $(\tau)$ . *Journal of the AMS*, 33(1), 2020.
- [EMV09] Manfred Einsiedler, Gregory Margulis, and Akshay Venkatesh. Effective equidistribution for closed orbits of semisimple groups on homogeneous spaces. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 177(1):137–212, 2009.
- [FF03] Livio Flaminio and Giovanni Forni. Invariant distributions and time averages for horocycle flows. *Duke Math. J.*, 119(3):465–526, 2003.
- [Fur73] Harry Furstenberg. The unique ergodicity of the horocycle flow. In *Recent advances in topological dynamics*, pages 95–115. Springer, 1973.
- [GT12] Ben Green and Terence Tao. The quantitative behaviour of polynomial orbits on nilmanifolds. *Annals of Mathematics*, 175(2):465–540, 2012.
- [KdSSSY21] Dmitry Kleinbock, Nicolas de Saxcé, Nimish A Shah, and Pengyu Yang. Equidistribution in the space of 3-lattices and dirichlet-improvable vectors on planar lines. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.08860*, 2021.
- [Kim21] Wooyeon Kim. Effective equidistribution of expanding translates in the space of affine lattices. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.00706*, 2021.
- [Kle08] Dmitry Kleinbock. An extension of quantitative nondivergence and applications to diophantine exponents. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 360(12):6497–6523, 2008.
- [KM98] Dmitry Kleinbock and Gregory Margulis. Flows on homogeneous spaces and diophantine approximation on manifolds. *Annals of Mathematics*, pages 339–360, 1998.
- [KM12] Dmitry Kleinbock and Gregory Margulis. *On effective equidistribution of expanding translates of certain orbits in the space of lattices*, pages 385–396. Springer, Boston, MA, 2012.
- [LM14] Elon Lindenstrauss and Gregory Margulis. Effective estimates on indefinite ternary forms. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 203(1):445–499, 2014.
- [LM21] Elon Lindenstrauss and Amir Mohammadi. Polynomial effective density in quotients of  $H^3$  and  $H^2 \times H^2$ . *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.14562*, 2021.
- [LMW22] Elon Lindenstrauss, Amir Mohammadi, and Zhiren Wang. Polynomial effective equidistribution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.11815*, 2022.

- [Mar04] Gregori Aleksandrovitsch Margulis. On some aspects of the theory of anosov systems. In *On Some Aspects of the Theory of Anosov Systems*, pages 1–71. Springer, 2004.
- [MS95] Shahar Mozes and Nimish Shah. On the space of ergodic invariant measures of unipotent flows. *Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems*, 15(01):149–159, 1995.
- [NV21] P. Nelson and A. Venkatesh. The orbit method and analysis of automorphic forms. *Acta Mathematica*, 226(1), 2021.
- [Rat90a] Marina Ratner. On measure rigidity of unipotent subgroups of semisimple groups. *Acta mathematica*, 165:229–309, 1990.
- [Rat90b] Marina Ratner. Strict measure rigidity for unipotent subgroups of solvable groups. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 101(1):449–482, 1990.
- [Rat91a] Marina Ratner. On Raghunathan’s measure conjecture. *Annals of Mathematics*, pages 545–607, 1991.
- [Rat91b] Marina Ratner. Raghunathan’s topological conjecture and distributions of unipotent flows. *Duke Math. J.*, 63(1):235–280, 1991.
- [Sar82] Peter Sarnak. Asymptotic behavior of periodic orbits of the horocycle flow and eisenstein series. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 34(6):719–739, 1982.
- [Sha09] Nimish A Shah. Equidistribution of expanding translates of curves and Dirichlet’s theorem on diophantine approximation. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 177(3):509–532, 2009.
- [Str04] Andreas Strömbergsson. On the uniform equidistribution of long closed horocycles. *Duke Math. J.*, 123(3):507–547, 06 2004.
- [Str15] Andreas Strömbergsson. An effective Ratner equidistribution result for  $SL(2, \mathbb{R}) \times \mathbb{R}^2$ . *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 164(5):843–902, 04 2015.
- [SU15] Peter Sarnak and Adrián Ubis. The horocycle flow at prime times. *Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées*, 103(2):575–618, 2015.
- [Ven10] A. Venkatesh. Sparse equidistribution problems, period bounds and subconvexity. *Annals of Mathematics*, 172:989–1094, 2010.

LEI YANG, COLLEGE OF MATHEMATICS, SICHUAN UNIVERSITY, CHENGDU, SICHUAN, 610000, CHINA

*Email address:* lyang861028@gmail.com