

ON DIVERGENT ON AVERAGE TRAJECTORIES FOR HIGHER RANK ACTIONS

WOOYEON KIM

ABSTRACT. For $d \geq 3$ we first show that the Hausdorff dimension of the set of A -divergent on average points in the $(d-1)$ -dimensional closed horosphere in the space of d -dimensional Euclidean lattices, where A is the group of positive diagonal matrices, is at most $\frac{d-1}{2}$. In particular, this upper bound is sharp for $d = 3$.

We apply this to compute the Hausdorff dimension of the set of exceptions to the inhomogeneous uniform version of Littlewood conjecture. We say that a pair $(\xi_1, \xi_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ satisfies the inhomogeneous Littlewood conjecture if

$$\liminf_{q \rightarrow \infty} q \|q\xi_1 - \theta_1\|_{\mathbb{Z}} \|q\xi_2 - \theta_2\|_{\mathbb{Z}} = 0$$

for all $(\theta_1, \theta_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, where $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{Z}}$ denotes the distance to the nearest integer. We prove that the Hausdorff dimension of the set of pairs $(\xi_1, \xi_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ not satisfying the inhomogeneous Littlewood conjecture is 1, which is equal to the Hausdorff dimension of the conjectural set of exceptions.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. 1-dimensional diagonal flows. For $d \geq 3$, let $G = \mathrm{SL}_d(\mathbb{R})$, $\Gamma = \mathrm{SL}_d(\mathbb{Z})$, and $X = G/\Gamma$. Let $\{g_t\} < G$ be a 1-parameter diagonal subgroup $\mathrm{diag}(e^t, \dots, e^t, e^{-(d-1)t})$.

Definition 1.1. Let $x \in X$.

- (1) We say that x is g_t -divergent if for any compact set $K \subset X$ there exists $T(K) > 0$ such that $g_t x \notin K$ for all $t \geq T(K)$.
- (2) We say that x is g_t -divergent on average if

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \#\{t \in \{1, \dots, N\} : g_t x \in K\} = 0$$

for any compact set $K \subset X$.

Let U be the (unstable) horospherical subgroup for g_t , i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} U &= \{g \in G : g_t g g_{-t} \rightarrow e \text{ as } t \rightarrow -\infty\} \\ &= \left\{ u(\xi) := \begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{Id}_{d-1} & \xi \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \in G : \xi \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

It is well known from the Dani correspondence that Diophantine properties of a vector $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ are characterized by dynamical properties of the g_t -orbit of the point $u(\xi)\Gamma$ on the submanifold $U\Gamma$ of X [Dan85, KM98]. In particular, $u(\xi)\Gamma$ is g_t -divergent if and only if ξ is *singular*, i.e. for every $\epsilon > 0$ there exists T_0 such that for all $T > T_0$ the system of inequalities

$$\|q\xi\|_{\mathbb{Z}} < \epsilon T^{-\frac{1}{d}} \quad \text{and} \quad 0 < q < T$$

admits an integral solution $q \in \mathbb{N}$ [Dan85, Theorem 2.14]. Similarly, $u(\boldsymbol{\xi})\Gamma$ is g_t -divergent on average if and only if $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ is *singular on average*, i.e. for every $\epsilon > 0$

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \left| \left\{ l \in \{1, \dots, N\} : \exists q \in \mathbb{N} \text{ s.t. } \|q\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{\mathbb{Z}} < \epsilon 2^{-l} \text{ and } 0 < q < 2^l \right\} \right| = 1.$$

It is natural to ask about the set of singular (or singular on average) vectors, or equivalently the set of g_t -divergent (or divergent on average) points in the space of lattices. In the last decade the Hausdorff dimension of these sets has been calculated by several authors: [Che11] proved that

$$\begin{aligned} \dim_H \left\{ \boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} : \boldsymbol{\xi} \text{ is singular} \right\} &= \dim_H \{x \in U\Gamma : x \text{ is } g_t\text{-divergent}\} \\ &= d - 1 - \frac{d-1}{d} \end{aligned}$$

for $d = 3$, and [CC16] extended this result for all $d \geq 3$. For the set of singular on average vectors, [EK12] showed that

$$\begin{aligned} \dim_H \left\{ \boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} : \boldsymbol{\xi} \text{ is singular on average} \right\} &= \dim_H \{x \in U\Gamma : x \text{ is } g_t\text{-divergent on average}\} \\ &= d - 1 - \frac{d-1}{d} \end{aligned}$$

for $d = 3$, and [KKLM17] extended this for all $d \geq 3$. More generally, [KKLM17] considered the set of singular (or singular on average) linear forms and gave an upper bound of the Hausdorff dimension, and [DFSU19] later proved that this upper bound is indeed sharp. See also [LSST19, Sol21, KP22] for the results for weighted 1-dimensional diagonal flows on the space of lattices, and [GS20, AGMS21] for the results on more general homogeneous spaces.

1.2. Higher rank diagonal actions. We now turn to higher-rank diagonal actions. We denote

$$a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} := \text{diag} \left(e^{\tau_1}, \dots, e^{\tau_{d-1}}, e^{-(\tau_1 + \dots + \tau_{d-1})} \right)$$

for $\boldsymbol{\tau} = (\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{d-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$. Let $A < G$ denote the group of $d \times d$ positive diagonal matrices, i.e. $A = \{a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} : \boldsymbol{\tau} \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}\}$. We also denote $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^{d-1}$ the set of vectors with positive entries, and let A^+ be the subsemigroup $\{a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} : \boldsymbol{\tau} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{d-1}\}$ of A . Note that A^+ consists of the diagonal elements in A expanding the horospherical subgroup U . As we defined for 1-dimensional diagonal subgroups, let us define the notion of divergent (divergent on average) trajectories for higher-rank diagonal actions.

Definition 1.2. Let $x \in X$.

- (1) We say that x is A^+ -divergent if for any compact set $K \subset X$ there exists $T(K) > 0$ such that $a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}x \notin K$ for all $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ with $\min_{1 \leq i \leq d-1} \tau_i \geq T(K)$.
- (2) We say that x is A^+ -divergent on average if

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^{d-1}} \# \left\{ \boldsymbol{\tau} \in \{1, \dots, N\}^{d-1} : a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}x \in K \right\} = 0$$

for any compact set $K \subset X$.

The set of divergent trajectories for higher-rank actions can be characterized algebraically. Margulis showed that $u(\boldsymbol{\xi})\Gamma$ is A^+ -divergent if and only if $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathbb{Q}^{d-1}$. In general homogeneous spaces of reductive real algebraic groups, [TW03, ST23] showed that every divergent trajectory

of a real torus diverges due to a purely algebraic reason if the dimension of the torus is at least the \mathbb{Q} -rank of the lattice subgroup.

In contrast to the set of divergent trajectories, not much has been known about the set of divergent on average trajectories for higher-rank actions. The first main result of this paper is an upper bound of the Hausdorff dimension of the set of A^+ -divergent on average points on the closed horosphere $U\Gamma$.

Theorem 1.3. *We have*

$$\dim_H \{x \in U\Gamma : x \text{ is } A^+ \text{-divergent on average}\} \leq \frac{d-1}{2}.$$

We remark that the upper bound in Theorem 1.3 is indeed sharp for $d = 3$. Let us denote by \mathcal{R}_d the set of $(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{d-1}) \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}$ such that

$$\dim_{\text{span}_{\mathbb{Q}}}(1, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_{d-1}) \leq 2.$$

Since \mathcal{R}_d is a countable union of rational lines, we have $\dim_H \mathcal{R}_d = 1$ for all $d \geq 3$.

Theorem 1.4. *For any $\xi \in \mathcal{R}_d$, $u(\xi)\Gamma$ is A^+ -divergent on average.*

Combining Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.4 we have

$$(1.1) \quad 1 \leq \dim_H \{x \in U\Gamma : x \text{ is } A^+ \text{-divergent on average}\} \leq \frac{d-1}{2},$$

hence for $d = 3$ the Hausdorff dimension is exactly 1.

1.3. An application: Inhomogeneous uniform version of Littlewood conjecture. Theorem 1.3 also has number theoretic consequences, in particular in Diophantine approximation. Around 1930, Littlewood conjectured that

$$(1.2) \quad \liminf_{q \rightarrow \infty} q \|q\xi_1\|_{\mathbb{Z}} \|q\xi_2\|_{\mathbb{Z}} = 0$$

for any $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in \mathbb{R}$. Although Littlewood conjecture still remains open, [EKL06] established that the set of exceptions to Littlewood conjecture has Hausdorff dimension zero.

The Littlewood conjecture can be extended in a natural way to inhomogeneous Diophantine approximation. Shapira [Sha11] proved that almost every pair of real numbers (ξ_1, ξ_2) satisfies the following inhomogeneous uniform version of Littlewood conjecture:

$$(1.3) \quad \forall \theta_1, \theta_2 \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \liminf_{q \rightarrow \infty} q \|q\xi_1 - \theta_1\|_{\mathbb{Z}} \|q\xi_2 - \theta_2\|_{\mathbb{Z}} = 0,$$

answering a question of Cassels [Cas72, p.307]. Furthermore, [Sha11] also proved that (1.3) holds if $1, \xi_1, \xi_2$ forms a basis of a real cubic field, and does not hold if $(\xi_1, \xi_2) \in \mathcal{R}_3$, i.e. $1, \xi_1, \xi_2$ are linearly dependent over \mathbb{Q} . In [GV17], Gorodnik and Vishe obtained a quantitative refinement of (1.3) by a factor of $(\log \log \log \log \log q)^\lambda$ for almost every pair, for some constant $\lambda > 0$. Recently, in [CT23] Chow and Technau established an inhomogeneous analog of Gallagher's theorem, i.e. a quantitative refinement of (1.3) by a factor of $(\log q)^2$ for almost every pair.

Motivated by the results in [Sha11], Bugeaud asked the following question:

Question 1.5. [Bug14, Problem 24] *Is it true that, we have (1.3) for all $(\xi_1, \xi_2) \notin \mathcal{R}_3$?*

Theorem 1.3, as well as its refinement which will be described in §5, has the following implication toward Question 1.5, in the sense of the Hausdorff dimension of the set of exceptions.

Theorem 1.6. For $d \geq 3$, let Ξ be the set of $(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{d-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ such that

$$(1.4) \quad \forall \theta_1, \dots, \theta_{d-1} \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \liminf_{q \rightarrow \infty} q \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \|q\xi_i - \theta_i\|_{\mathbb{Z}} = 0$$

fails. Then we have $1 \leq \dim_H \Xi \leq \frac{d-1}{2}$.

In particular, for $d = 3$ the Hausdorff dimension of the set of exceptions to the inhomogeneous uniform version of Littlewood conjecture is 1, which is equal to the Hausdorff dimension of the conjectural set of exceptions \mathcal{R}_3 .

1.4. Discussion of the proofs. Throughout this paper, we denote by $\{\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_{d-1}\}$ the standard basis of \mathbb{R}^{d-1} . For $1 \leq i \leq d-1$ we let

$$A_i := \{a_{t\mathbf{e}_i} \in G : t \in \mathbb{R}\}, \quad U_i := \{u(s\mathbf{e}_i) \in G : s \in \mathbb{R}\}.$$

We also denote by U_i^\perp the orthogonal complement of U_i in U , and H_i the $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ -copy in G containing A_i and U_i .

The main tools for the proofs of Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.6 are various height functions and their contraction hypotheses. In §2 we construct height functions for one-dimensional diagonal subgroups and establish contraction hypotheses for those height functions. Let us fix $0 < \lambda < 1$ sufficiently close to 1, and sufficiently large t depending on λ . Then for each $1 \leq i \leq d-1$ the Benoist-Quint height function $\alpha_i : X \rightarrow [1, \infty]$ satisfies

(1) (Contraction hypothesis) For any $x \in X$,

$$\int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \alpha_i(a_{t\mathbf{e}_i} u_i(s)x) ds \leq e^{-\lambda t} \alpha_i(x) + C,$$

(2) (Log-Lipschitz property) For any $g \in B^{H_i}(\mathrm{id}, 1)$ and $x \in X$,

$$C^{-1} \alpha_i(x) \leq \alpha_i(gx) \leq C \alpha_i(x),$$

where $C > 1$ is a constant depending only on λ and t [BQ12, Shi20, Kha20]. We emphasize that the log-Lipschitz property for α_i holds only for the subgroup H_i . This is not strong enough for our needs, so we define modified height functions $\tilde{\alpha}_i : X' \rightarrow [1, \infty]$ for $1 \leq i \leq d-1$, where $X' = A^+ U \Gamma$. These functions are defined only on a subset X' of X , but the log-Lipschitz property for $\tilde{\alpha}_i$ holds not only for H_i , but also for U . Then we construct *dynamical height functions* $\beta_{N, \delta, i, \mathbf{h}} : X' \rightarrow [1, \infty]$ for $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 < \delta < 1$, $1 \leq i \leq d-1$, and $\mathbf{h} \geq 1$. Roughly speaking, $\beta_{N, \delta, i, \mathbf{h}}$ detects the averaged behavior of A_i -trajectories toward the cusp. More precisely, $\beta_{N, \delta, i, \mathbf{h}}(x)$ is positive only if the trajectory $\{a_{t\mathbf{e}_i} x, \dots, a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i} x\}$ stays most of time (parametrized by δ for which the escape of mass is $1 - \delta$) close to the cusp (parametrized by a cut-off height \mathbf{h} with respect to $\tilde{\alpha}_i$). In particular, if x is A_i -divergent on average, then

$$(1.5) \quad x \in \bigcap_{\delta > 0} \bigcap_{\mathbf{h} > 1} \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathrm{Supp} \beta_{N, \delta, i, \mathbf{h}}.$$

The following contraction hypothesis for $\beta_{N, \delta, i, \mathbf{h}}$ (Proposition 2.7) is derived from the above contraction hypothesis for α_i (or for $\tilde{\alpha}_i$): if \mathbf{h} is sufficiently large, then

$$(1.6) \quad \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \beta_{N, \delta, i, \mathbf{h}}(u_i(s)x) ds \leq e^{-(\lambda^2 - o(1))Nt} \tilde{\alpha}_i(x).$$

The proof of Proposition 2.7 is inspired by the proof of [KKLM17, Theorem 1.5]. The above inequality (1.6) gives a covering number estimate for the sets $\text{Supp}(\xi \mapsto \beta_{N,\delta,i,h}(u(\xi)x))$, and in view of (1.5), this indeed implies that the Hausdorff dimension of the set of A_i -divergent on average points on Ux is at most $\dim U - \frac{1}{2}$.

In §3 we introduce a dynamical height function $\psi_{N,\delta,h}$ for A^+ , and establish contraction hypothesis for $\psi_{N,\delta,h}$. As $\beta_{N,\delta,i,h}$ is defined, $\psi_{N,\delta,h}$ detects the averaged behavior of A^+ -trajectories toward the cusp, and $\psi_{N,\delta,h}(x)$ is positive only if the A^+ -trajectory $\{a_\tau x : \tau \in \{t, \dots, dNt\}^{d-1}\}$ stays most of time close to the cusp. Moreover, if $\{a_\tau x : \tau \in \{t, \dots, dNt\}^{d-1}\}$ has escape of mass more than $1 - \delta$, then there exists $\sigma_N \in (t\mathbb{N})^{d-1}$ with $\|\sigma_N\| = O(\delta Nt)$ such that $\{a_{\sigma_N + t\mathbf{e}_i} x, \dots, a_{\sigma_N + dNt\mathbf{e}_i} x\}$ also has escape of mass $1 - O(\delta)$ for every $1 \leq i \leq d-1$. To sum up, for fixed $x \in X'$ if $u(\xi)x$ is A^+ -divergent then

$$(1.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \xi &\in \bigcap_{\delta > 0} \bigcap_{h > 1} \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \text{Supp}(\xi \mapsto \psi_{N,\delta,h}(u(\xi)x)) \\ &\subseteq \bigcap_{\delta > 0} \bigcap_{h > 1} \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \bigcap_{i=1}^{d-1} \text{Supp}(\xi \mapsto \beta_{dN,\delta,i,h}(a_{\sigma_N} u(\xi)x)). \end{aligned}$$

In other words, in order to calculate the Hausdorff dimension of A^+ -divergent on average points on Ux it is sufficient to estimate

$$\mathbb{Q} := \int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \beta_{dN,\delta,i,h}(a_{\sigma_N} u(\xi)x) d\xi.$$

For a moment let us assume that the maps $\xi \mapsto \beta_{dN,\delta,i,h}(a_{\sigma_N} u(\xi)x)$ for $1 \leq i \leq d-1$ are independent. In combination with (1.6) one can deduce that

$$\mathbb{Q} = \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \beta_{dN,\delta,i,h}(a_{\sigma_N} u(\xi)x) d\xi \ll e^{-d(d-1)(\lambda^2 - o(1))Nt} \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \tilde{\alpha}_i(x).$$

This in turn implies that for $x \in X'$ the Hausdorff dimension of the set of A^+ -divergent on average points on Ux is at most $\dim U - \frac{d-1}{2} = \frac{d-1}{2}$. Therefore, the proof of Theorem 1.3 is reduced to verify certain independence between the maps $\xi \mapsto \beta_{dN,\delta,i,h}(a_{\sigma_N} u(\xi)x)$, and this is the technical heart of §3. The key observation for the proof of Proposition 3.4 is that different one-dimensional subgroups in A^+ expand each direction in U with different expanding rates, namely, a diagonal element $a_{t\mathbf{e}_i}$ in A_i expands U_j with the rate e^{2t} if $i = j$, and with the rate e^t otherwise. With this observation we approximate $\text{Supp}(\xi \mapsto \beta_{dN,\delta,i,h}(a_{\sigma_N} u(\xi)x))$ by the union of boxes in U for which the length along U_j is e^{-2dNt} if $i = j$ and e^{-dNt} otherwise. Then the intersection of these approximating sets over $1 \leq i \leq d-1$ is described as the union of cubes of length e^{-2dNt} , and the volume computation for the intersection yields the optimal contraction rate. The proof of Theorem 1.3 of the Hausdorff dimension from this optimal contraction rate is provided in §4.

We now discuss the proof of Theorem 1.6. For the proof of Theorem 1.6 we identify $\widehat{X} = \text{ASL}_d(\mathbb{R})/\text{ASL}_d(\mathbb{Z})$ with the space of unimodular affine lattices in \mathbb{Z}^d , and mainly use a measure rigidity theorem from [EL18] for higher rank diagonal actions on this space.

For $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ and $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ we denote by $\widehat{x}_{\xi,\theta} \in \widehat{X}$ the corresponding affine lattice $u(\xi)\mathbb{Z}^d - \theta$.

By Dani's correspondence on the space of affine lattices (Lemma 6.1), if $\liminf_{q \rightarrow \infty} q \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \|q\xi_i - \theta_i\|_{\mathbb{Z}} > 0$

for some $\boldsymbol{\xi} = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{d-1})$ satisfying Littelwood's conjecture and $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{d-1})$, then there exist $\epsilon > 0$ such that $a_\tau \widehat{x}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\theta}} \subseteq \mathcal{L}_\epsilon$ for any sufficiently large $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{d-1}$, where

$$\mathcal{L}_\epsilon := \left\{ \Lambda \in \widehat{X} : \Lambda \cap B^{\mathbb{R}^d}(0, \epsilon) = \emptyset \right\}.$$

Remark that the set \mathcal{L}_ϵ is not compact for any $\epsilon > 0$, while in the setting of homogeneous Diophantine approximation the analogous sets $\left\{ \Lambda \in X : \Lambda \cap B^{\mathbb{R}^d}(0, \epsilon) = \{0\} \right\}$ in the space of lattices are compact by Mahler's compactness criterion. This is the principal reason why we need more careful treatment on the escape of mass in the setting of the inhomogeneous Diophantine approximation.

For the sake of contradiction suppose that $\dim_H \Xi > \frac{d-1}{2}$. Theorem 1.3 implies that most of the points in the set Ξ are not A^+ -divergent on average. Considering A^+ -orbits of such points and taking the limit to infinity, one can construct a measure an A -invariant measure μ on \widehat{X} supported on \mathcal{L}_ϵ for some $\epsilon > 0$. Moreover, μ is nonzero since the measure is constructed from the points that are not A^+ -divergent on average. This measure construction procedure is similar in spirit to [EKL06, LSS19, KKL].

In Lemma 6.4 we show that for any $\epsilon > 0$ there is no A -invariant homogeneous measure on \widehat{X} supported on \mathcal{L}_ϵ . This contradicts the measure rigidity theorem [EL18, Theorem 1.3], hence we conclude that $\dim_H \Xi \leq \frac{d-1}{2}$.

However, since the measure rigidity theorem requires a positive entropy assumption, in order to apply [EL18, Theorem 1.3] we need to verify that $h_\mu(a) > 0$ for some $a \in A$. For this purpose, in §5 we strengthen the results from §2 and §3. More precisely, instead of analyzing the behavior of trajectories toward the cusp, we will construct dynamical height functions that detect the behavior of trajectories toward another given trajectory. Then the contraction hypotheses for those dynamical height functions ensure that the measure μ has not only a positive mass on \widehat{X} but also has a positive entropy for some diagonal element $a \in A$. Hence, we are now able to apply the measure rigidity theorem and deduce the desired dimension bound.

1.5. Structure of paper. This paper is organized as follows.

In Section 2 we modify the Benoist-Qunit height function constructed in [BQ12]. Then we construct *dynamical height functions* for one-dimensional diagonal subgroups using the modified Benoist-Qunit height functions and also establish the contraction hypotheses for those dynamical height functions (Proposition 2.7). The proof of Proposition 2.7 is inspired by [KKLM17, Proof of Theorem 1.5].

In Section 3 we introduce dynamical height functions for higher-rank actions and establish the contraction hypothesis for higher-rank actions (Proposition 3.4).

In Section 4 we show the upper bound of the Hausdorff dimension of A^+ -divergent on average trajectories (Theorem 1.3) using Proposition 3.4. On the other hand, we also show the lower bound (Theorem 1.4) by utilising Dani's correspondence on Diophantine approximation.

In Section 5 we discuss some variants of the dynamical height functions defined in Section 2 and Section 3. The contraction hypotheses for those dynamical height functions of a given trajectory will be established in Proposition 5.5.

In Section 6 we deduce Theorem 1.6 from several ingredients: Dani's correspondence on the space of affine lattices (Lemma 6.1), a measure rigidity result in [EL18] for higher rank diagonal actions on the space of affine lattices, and Theorem 1.3. We also make use of Proposition 5.5 to verify the positive entropy assumption of the measure rigidity theorem [EL18, Theorem 1.3].

Acknowledgments. I would like to express my deep gratitude to Manfred Einsiedler for numerous enlightening discussions and continuous encouragement on this work. I also thank Pengyu Yang for valuable conversations on height functions.

2. HEIGHT FUNCTIONS FOR ONE-DIMENSIONAL ACTIONS

In this section, we construct and modify various height functions for one-dimensional diagonal subgroups in order to control the recurrence to compact subsets.

2.1. Notations. We shall use the standard notation $A \ll B$ or $A = O(B)$ to mean that $A \leq CB$ for some constant $C > 0$ that depends only on d , unless other dependencies are explicitly stated. We shall also write $A \asymp B$ to mean both $A \ll B$ and $B \ll A$.

We use the notation C_1, C_2, \dots to denote positive constants that depend only on the dimensions d . In the course of the proofs, we will introduce an auxiliary parameter $0 < \lambda < 1$ for which we will take $\lambda \rightarrow 1$ in the end. The notation $E_{1,\lambda}, E_{2,\lambda}, \dots$ will denote positive constants that depend only on d and λ .

Throughout this paper, we denote by $\{\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_{d-1}\}$ the standard basis of \mathbb{R}^{d-1} . For $1 \leq i \leq d-1$ we let

$$A_i := \{a_{t\mathbf{e}_i} \in G : t \in \mathbb{R}\}, \quad U_i := \{u(s\mathbf{e}_i) \in G : s \in \mathbb{R}\}.$$

We also denote by U_i^\perp the orthogonal complement of U_i in U , and H_i the $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ -copy in G containing A_i and U_i .

Let \mathbf{d}_G be a right-invariant metric on G . By multiplying a constant if necessary, we may assume that

$$\mathbf{d}_G(\mathrm{id}, a_{\mathbf{e}_i}) \leq 1, \quad \mathbf{d}_G(\mathrm{id}, u(\mathbf{e}_i)) \leq 1$$

for any $1 \leq i \leq d-1$. Given a Lie subgroup S of G , we denote by \mathbf{d}_S the metric on S induced by \mathbf{d}_G , and denote by $B^S(g, r)$ be the open r -ball around g with respect to the metric \mathbf{d}_S for $g \in S$ and $r > 0$.

2.2. Benoist-Quint height function. We first recall the construction of the height function in [BQ12]. We decompose $\bigoplus_{k=1}^{d-1} \bigwedge^k \mathbb{R}^d$ into the direct sum of irreducible sub-representations of H_i . For the standard basis $\{\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_d\}$ of \mathbb{R}^d denote by W_i the subspace of \mathbb{R}^d spanned by $\{\mathbf{e}_i, \mathbf{e}_d\}$ and W_i^\perp be the subspace of \mathbb{R}^d spanned by $\{\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_{d-1}\} \setminus \{\mathbf{e}_i\}$. For $1 \leq i \leq d-1$, the projections from \mathbb{R}^{d-1} to W_i^\perp will be denoted by π_i^\perp .

Note that $\bigwedge^j W_i = 0$ for any $j > 2$. It follows that for any $1 \leq k \leq d-1$, $\bigwedge^k \mathbb{R}^d$ is the direct sum of $\bigwedge^k W_i^\perp$, $W_i \wedge (\bigwedge^{k-1} W_i^\perp)$, and $(\bigwedge^2 W_i) \wedge (\bigwedge^{k-2} W_i^\perp)$, where the last one appears only if $k \geq 2$. Let us denote

$$(2.1) \quad V_{i,k,0} := \bigwedge^k W_i^\perp \oplus \left((\bigwedge^2 W_i) \wedge (\bigwedge^{k-2} W_i^\perp) \right), \quad V_{i,k,1} := \left(\bigwedge^{k-1} W_i \right) \wedge W_i^\perp.$$

As H_i acts on W_i and $\bigwedge^2 W_i^\perp$ trivially, H_i acts on $V_{i,k,0}$ trivially. Also, $V_{i,k,1}$ is the direct sum of all irreducible sub-representations of $\bigwedge^k \mathbb{R}^d$ whose highest weight is 1 as the highest weight of W_i^\perp is 1. We denote by $\pi_{i,k,0}$ and $\pi_{i,k,1}$ the projections onto $V_{i,k,0}$ and $V_{i,k,1}$, respectively.

For any $1 \leq i, k \leq d-1$ and $\epsilon > 0$ we define $\varphi_{i,k,\epsilon} : \bigwedge^k \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ by

$$\varphi_{i,k,\epsilon}(v) = \begin{cases} \epsilon^{k(d-k)} \|\pi_{i,k,1}(v)\|^{-\lambda} & \text{if } \|\pi_{i,k,0}(v)\| < \epsilon^{k(d-k)}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for $v \in \bigwedge^k \mathbb{R}^d$.

For $x \in X$, we may identify x with a unimodular lattice in \mathbb{R}^d and denote by $P(x)$ the set of all primitive subgroups of the lattice x . A non-zero monomial $v_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge v_k \in \bigwedge^k \mathbb{R}^d$ is said to be x -integral if the subgroup generated by v_1, \dots, v_k belongs to $P(x)$. We define $\alpha_{i,\epsilon} : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ by

$$\alpha_{i,\epsilon}(x) := \max \varphi_{i,k,\epsilon}(v),$$

where the maximum is taken over all the non-zero x -integral monomial $v \in \bigwedge^k \mathbb{R}^d$ for some $1 \leq k \leq d-1$. The following properties of the Benoist-Quint height function were first proved by [BQ12] and further refined by [Shi20] and [Kha20].

Proposition 2.1. *There exists $C_1 > 1$ such that for any $0 < \lambda < 1$, there exists $T_\lambda > 0$ such that the following holds. For any $t \geq T_\lambda$ there exist $\epsilon_{\lambda,t} > 0$ and $C_{\lambda,t} > 1$ such that for each $1 \leq i \leq d-1$ the function $\alpha_{i,\lambda,t} := \alpha_{i,\epsilon_{\lambda,t}}$ is a proper lower semi-continuous function with the following properties:*

(1) For any $x \in X$

$$(2.2) \quad \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \alpha_{i,\lambda,t}(a_{te_i} u_i(s)x) ds \leq e^{-\lambda t} \alpha_{i,\lambda,t}(x) + C_{\lambda,t},$$

(2) For any $g \in B^{H_i}(\text{id}, 1)$ and $x \in X$

$$(2.3) \quad C_1^{-1} \alpha_{i,\lambda,t}(x) \leq \alpha_{i,\lambda,t}(gx) \leq C_1 \alpha_{i,\lambda,t}(x).$$

Proof. This proposition is a special case of [Shi20, Lemma 4.1] with $L = \text{SL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ and $G = H_i$. The range of λ is optimized in [Kha20, Theorem 12.3]. \square

We denote

$$\bar{a}_t := \begin{pmatrix} e^t & \\ & e^{-t} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \bar{u}(s) := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & s \\ & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

for $s, t \in \mathbb{R}$. For $0 < \lambda < 1$ we also define a height function $\text{ht}_\lambda : \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})/\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow [1, \infty)$ by

$$\text{ht}_\lambda(x) := \sup_{v \in g\mathbb{Z}^2} \|v\|^{-\lambda}$$

for $x = g\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ with $g \in \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$.

Lemma 2.2. *The function ht_λ is a proper continuous function. There exists $C_2 > 1$ such that for any $0 < \lambda < 1$, there exists $T'_\lambda > 0$ such that the following holds. For any $t \geq T'_\lambda$ there exists $C'_{\lambda,t} > 1$ such that ht_λ satisfies the following properties:*

(1) For any $x \in \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})/\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$

$$(2.4) \quad \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \text{ht}_\lambda(\bar{a}_t \bar{u}(s)z) ds \leq e^{-\lambda t} \text{ht}_\lambda(x) + C'_{\lambda,t},$$

(2) For any $g \in B^{\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})}(\text{id}, 1)$ and $x \in X$

$$(2.5) \quad C_2^{-1} \text{ht}_\lambda(x) \leq \text{ht}_\lambda(gx) \leq C_2 \text{ht}_\lambda(x).$$

Proof. As in Proposition 2.1, this proposition is a special case of [Shi20, Lemma 4.1] with $L = G = \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$. The range of λ is optimized in [Kha20, Theorem 12.3]. \square

2.3. Modification of Benoist-Quint height function. The Benoist-Quint height functions in Proposition 2.1 satisfies the log-Lipschitz condition (2.3) along directions inside the subgroup H_i , but might also behave wildly along directions outside H_i . In this subsection, we shall modify the Benoist-Quint height functions so that the modified functions have certain control even along directions outside H_i .

Let $X' := A^+U\Gamma \subset X$. Note that any element in Y can be uniquely parameterized in form of $a_\tau u(\xi)\Gamma$, where $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{d-1}$ and $\xi \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}$. For each $1 \leq i \leq d-1$ define $\kappa_i : X' \rightarrow [1, \infty)$ and $\phi_i : X' \rightarrow Z$ by

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa_i(a_\tau u(\xi)\Gamma) &= e^{(\tau_1 + \dots + \tau_{d-1}) - \tau_i}, \\ \phi_i(a_\tau u(\xi)\Gamma) &= \bar{a}_{\tau_1 + \dots + \tau_{d-1}} \bar{u}(\xi_i) \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}),\end{aligned}$$

where $\tau = (\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{d-1}) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{d-1}$ and $\xi = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{d-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$. Note that κ_i is invariant under A_i^+ and U , and there exists a constant $C_3 > 1$ such that

$$(2.6) \quad C_3^{-1} \kappa_i(x) \leq \kappa_i(gx) \leq C_3 \kappa_i(x)$$

for any $1 \leq i \leq d-1$, $g \in B^{A^+U}(\text{id}, 1)$, and $x \in X'$. We also define $\kappa : X' \rightarrow [1, \infty)$ by

$$\kappa(x) := \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \kappa_i(x).$$

For each $1 \leq i \leq d-1$ and $0 < \lambda < 1$ we define an auxiliary height function $\alpha'_{i,\lambda} : X' \rightarrow [1, \infty)$ by

$$\alpha'_{i,\lambda}(x) = \kappa_i(x) \text{ht}_\lambda(\phi_i(x)).$$

Proposition 2.3. *Let $1 \leq i \leq d-1$ and $0 < \lambda < 1$. There exists $C_4 > 1$ such that the function $\alpha'_{i,\lambda}$ is a proper function with the following properties:*

(1) For any $x \in X'$

$$(2.7) \quad \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \alpha'_{i,\lambda}(a_{t\mathbf{e}_i} u_i(s)x) ds \leq e^{-\lambda t} \alpha'_{i,\lambda}(x) + C'_{\lambda,t} \kappa_i(x),$$

(2) For any $g \in B^{A^+U}(\text{id}, 1)$ and $x \in X'$

$$(2.8) \quad C_4^{-1} \alpha'_{i,\lambda}(x) \leq \alpha'_{i,\lambda}(gx) \leq C_4 \alpha'_{i,\lambda}(x).$$

(3) For any $g \in U_i^\perp$ and $x \in X'$, $\alpha'_{i,\lambda}(gx) = \alpha'_{i,\lambda}(x)$.

Proof. We first show that $\alpha'_{i,\lambda}$ is proper. By Mahler's compactness criterion, it suffices to prove the following claim:

Claim. Let $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{d-1}$, $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$, and $\mathbf{h} \geq 1$. If $\alpha'_{i,\lambda}(a_\tau u(\xi)\Gamma) \leq \mathbf{h}$ then $\|v\| \geq \mathbf{h}^{-\frac{1}{\lambda}}$ for any $v \in a_\tau u(\xi)\mathbb{Z}^d$.

Proof of Claim. If $\alpha'_{i,\lambda}(a_\tau u(\xi)\Gamma) \leq \mathbf{h}$, then $\text{ht}_\lambda(\phi_i(a_\tau u(\xi)\Gamma)) \leq \kappa_i(x)^{-1} \mathbf{h}$. Note that the nonzero vectors in $\phi_i(a_\tau u(\xi)\Gamma)$ can be written as $\begin{pmatrix} e^{\tau_1 + \dots + \tau_{d-1}}(m + n\xi_i) \\ e^{-(\tau_1 + \dots + \tau_{d-1})}n \end{pmatrix}$, where $(m, n) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus \{0\}$. It follows that for any $(m, n) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus \{0\}$,

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} e^{\tau_1 + \dots + \tau_{d-1}}(m + n\xi_i) \\ e^{-(\tau_1 + \dots + \tau_{d-1})}n \end{pmatrix} \right\| \geq (\kappa_i(x)^{-1} \mathbf{h})^{-\frac{1}{\lambda}} \geq (e^{-(\tau_1 + \dots + \tau_{d-1}) + \tau_i} \mathbf{h})^{-\frac{1}{\lambda}},$$

hence

$$(2.9) \quad \left\| \begin{pmatrix} e^{\tau_i}(m + n\xi_i) \\ e^{-(\tau_1 + \dots + \tau_{d-1})}n \end{pmatrix} \right\| \geq e^{-(\tau_1 + \dots + \tau_{d-1}) + \tau_i} \left\| \begin{pmatrix} e^{\tau_1 + \dots + \tau_{d-1}}(m + n\xi_i) \\ e^{-(\tau_1 + \dots + \tau_{d-1})}n \end{pmatrix} \right\| \geq \mathfrak{h}^{-\frac{1}{\lambda}}.$$

Observe that any nonzero vector in $a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}u(\boldsymbol{\xi})\mathbb{Z}^d$ can be written as

$$v_{(m_1, \dots, m_d)} = \begin{pmatrix} e^{\tau_1}(m_1 + m_d\xi_1) \\ \vdots \\ e^{\tau_{d-1}}(m_{d-1} + m_d\xi_{d-1}) \\ e^{-(\tau_1 + \dots + \tau_{d-1})}m_d \end{pmatrix}$$

for some $(m_1, \dots, m_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}$. If $m_d = 0$, then we have $\|v_{(m_1, \dots, m_d)}\| \geq 1$. If $m_d \neq 0$, then

$$\|v_{(m_1, \dots, m_d)}\| \geq \left\| \begin{pmatrix} e^{\tau_i}(m_i + m_d\xi_i) \\ e^{-(\tau_1 + \dots + \tau_{d-1})}m_d \end{pmatrix} \right\| \geq \mathfrak{h}^{-\frac{1}{\lambda}}$$

by (2.9). We thus conclude that $\|v\| \geq \mathfrak{h}^{-\frac{1}{\lambda}}$ for any $v \in a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}u(\boldsymbol{\xi})\mathbb{Z}^d$. \square

We now verify the properties (1)-(3).

(1) It follows from the definition of α'_i and (2.4):

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \alpha'_{i,\lambda}(a_{t\mathbf{e}_i}u_i(s)x)ds &= \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \kappa_i(a_{t\mathbf{e}_i}u_i(s)x) \text{ht}_{\lambda}(\phi_i(a_{t\mathbf{e}_i}u_i(s)x))ds \\ &= \kappa_i(x) \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \text{ht}_{\lambda}(\phi_i(a_{t\mathbf{e}_i}u_i(s)x))ds \\ &\leq \kappa_i(x)(e^{-\lambda t} \text{ht}_{\lambda}(\phi_i(x)) + C'_{\lambda,t}) \\ &= e^{-\lambda t} \alpha'_{i,\lambda}(x) + C'_{\lambda,t} \kappa_i(x). \end{aligned}$$

(2) This is a direct consequence of (2.5) and (2.6).

(3) One can easily check that both κ_i and ϕ_i are invariant under U_i^{\perp} . \square

The following lemma gives an estimate between the height functions $\alpha_{i,\lambda,t}$ and $\alpha'_{i,\lambda}$.

Lemma 2.4. *For any $1 \leq i \leq d-1$, $0 < \lambda < 1$, $t \geq T_{\lambda}$ and $x \in X^i$ we have*

$$\alpha_{i,\lambda,t}(x) \geq \epsilon_{\lambda,t}^{d-1} \kappa_i(x)^{-2} \alpha'_{i,\lambda}(x).$$

Proof. By definition of $\alpha_{i,\lambda,t}$ it suffices to prove that

$$\varphi_{i,d-1,\epsilon_{\lambda,t}}(x) \geq \epsilon_{\lambda,t}^{d-1} \kappa_i(x)^{-2} \alpha'_{i,\lambda}(x).$$

For $1 \leq i \leq d$ let us write $\widehat{\mathbf{e}}_i = \bigwedge_{j \neq i} \mathbf{e}_j$. It follows from (2.1) that $V_{i,d-1,0}$ is the $(d-2)$ -dimensional subspace of $\bigwedge^{d-1} \mathbb{R}^d$ spanned by $\{\widehat{\mathbf{e}}_1, \dots, \widehat{\mathbf{e}}_{d-1}\} \setminus \{\widehat{\mathbf{e}}_i\}$ and $V_{i,d-1,1}$ is the 2-dimensional subspace of $\bigwedge^{d-1} \mathbb{R}^d$ spanned by $\{\widehat{\mathbf{e}}_i, \widehat{\mathbf{e}}_d\}$.

Let $x = a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}u(\boldsymbol{\xi})\Gamma$ with $\boldsymbol{\tau} = (\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{d-1}) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{d-1}$ and $\boldsymbol{\xi} = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{d-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$. By straightforward matrix calculation one can check that any non-zero x -integral monomial in $\bigwedge^{d-1} \mathbb{R}^d$ is a \mathbb{Z} -linear combination of

$$\{e^{-\tau_1} \widehat{\mathbf{e}}_1 + e^{\tau_1 + \dots + \tau_{d-1}} \widehat{\mathbf{e}}_d, \dots, e^{-\tau_{d-1}} \widehat{\mathbf{e}}_{d-1} + e^{\tau_1 + \dots + \tau_{d-1}} \widehat{\mathbf{e}}_d, e^{\tau_1 + \dots + \tau_{d-1}} \widehat{\mathbf{e}}_d\},$$

hence can be written as

$$\widehat{v}_{(m_1, \dots, m_d)} = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-\tau_1} m_1 \\ \vdots \\ e^{-\tau_{d-1}} m_{d-1} \\ e^{\tau_1 + \dots + \tau_{d-1}} (m_d + \xi_1 m_1 + \dots + \xi_{d-1} m_{d-1}) \end{pmatrix}$$

with respect to the basis $\{\widehat{\mathbf{e}}_1, \dots, \widehat{\mathbf{e}}_d\}$. Note that $\pi_{i,d-1,0}(\widehat{v}_{(m_1, \dots, m_d)}) = 0$ if $m_j = 0$ for all $j \neq i, d$. It follows that

$$\varphi_{i,d-1,\epsilon_{\lambda,t}}(x) \geq \epsilon_{\lambda,t}^{d-1} \sup \|\pi_{i,d-1,1}(\widehat{v}_{(m_1, \dots, m_d)})\|^{-\lambda}$$

where the supremum is taken over all $(m_1, \dots, m_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}$ with $m_j = 0$ for all $j \neq i, d$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{i,d-1,\epsilon_{\lambda,t}}(x) &\geq \epsilon_{\lambda,t}^{d-1} \sup_{(m_i, m_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus \{0\}} \left\| \begin{pmatrix} e^{-\tau_i} m_i \\ e^{\tau_1 + \dots + \tau_{d-1}} (m_d + \xi_i m_i) \end{pmatrix} \right\|^{-\lambda} \\ &\geq \epsilon_{\lambda,t}^{d-1} \sup_{(m_i, m_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus \{0\}} \left\| e^{(\tau_1 + \dots + \tau_{d-1}) - \tau_i} \begin{pmatrix} e^{-(\tau_1 + \dots + \tau_{d-1})} m_i \\ e^{\tau_1 + \dots + \tau_{d-1}} (m_d + \xi_i m_i) \end{pmatrix} \right\|^{-\lambda} \\ &= \epsilon_{\lambda,t}^{d-1} e^{-\lambda \{(\tau_1 + \dots + \tau_{d-1}) - \tau_i\}} \text{ht}_\lambda(\bar{a}_{\tau_1 + \dots + \tau_{d-1}} \bar{u}(\xi_i) \Gamma) \\ &\geq \epsilon_{\lambda,t}^{d-1} \kappa_i(x)^{-1} \text{ht}_\lambda(\phi_i(x)) = \epsilon_{\lambda,t}^{d-1} \kappa_i(x)^{-2} \alpha'_{i,\lambda}(x), \end{aligned}$$

completing the proof. \square

We are now ready to construct modified Benoist-Qunit functions. Let $C_5 := \max\{C_1, C_2\}$, $t_\lambda := \lceil \max\left\{T_\lambda, T'_\lambda, \frac{\log(10C_5)}{\lambda - \lambda^2}\right\} \rceil$, and $E_{1,\lambda} := \max\left\{5C_{\lambda,t_\lambda}, 5C'_{\lambda,t_\lambda}, \epsilon_{\lambda,t_\lambda}^{-(d-1)}\right\}$. For $0 < \lambda < 1$ and $1 \leq i \leq d-1$ we define $\tilde{\alpha}_{i,\lambda} : X' \rightarrow [1, \infty)$ by

$$(2.10) \quad \tilde{\alpha}_{i,\lambda}(x) = \begin{cases} \max\{\alpha_{i,\lambda,t_\lambda}(x), 1\} & \text{if } \alpha_{i,\lambda,t_\lambda}(x) \leq \kappa_i(x) E_{1,\lambda}, \\ \min\{\alpha_{i,\lambda,t_\lambda}(x), \alpha'_{i,\lambda}(x)\} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proposition 2.5. *Let $0 < \lambda < 1$, $1 \leq i \leq d-1$, and $t \in t_\lambda \mathbb{N}$. The function $\tilde{\alpha}_{i,\lambda}$ is a proper lower semi-continuous function with the following properties:*

(1) For any $x \in X'$

$$(2.11) \quad \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{\alpha}_{i,\lambda}(a_{t\mathbf{e}_i} u_i(s)x) ds \leq E_{1,\lambda} \tilde{\alpha}_{i,\lambda}(x).$$

(2) For any $x \in X'$ with $\tilde{\alpha}_{i,\lambda}(x) \geq E_{1,\lambda} e^t$,

$$(2.12) \quad \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{\alpha}_{i,\lambda}(a_{t\mathbf{e}_i} u_i(s)x) ds \leq 2e^{-\lambda^2 t} \tilde{\alpha}_{i,\lambda}(x).$$

(3) For any $g \in B^{A_i^\dagger U_i}(\text{id}, 1)$ and $x \in X'$

$$(2.13) \quad C_5^{-1} \tilde{\alpha}_{i,\lambda}(x) \leq \tilde{\alpha}_{i,\lambda}(gx) \leq C_5 \tilde{\alpha}_{i,\lambda}(x).$$

(4) For any $g \in U_i^\perp$ and $x \in X'$,

$$(2.14) \quad (E_{1,\lambda} \kappa_i(x)^2)^{-1} \tilde{\alpha}_{i,\lambda}(x) \leq \tilde{\alpha}_{i,\lambda}(gx) \leq E_{1,\lambda} \kappa_i(x)^2 \tilde{\alpha}_{i,\lambda}(x).$$

Proof. For any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we may cover $[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$ by disjoint intervals $I_1, \dots, I_{\lceil e^{2t\lambda m} \rceil}$ of length $e^{-2t\lambda m}$, where $s_k = -\frac{1}{2} + (k - \frac{1}{2})e^{-2t\lambda m}$ and $I_k = [s_k - \frac{e^{-2t\lambda m}}{2}, s_k + \frac{e^{-2t\lambda m}}{2}]$ for $1 \leq k \leq \lceil e^{2t\lambda m} \rceil$.

Then by Proposition 2.1 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \alpha_{i,\lambda,t\lambda}(a_{(m+1)t\lambda \mathbf{e}_i} u_i(s)x) ds &\leq e^{-2t\lambda m} \sum_{k=1}^{\lceil e^{2t\lambda m} \rceil} \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \alpha_{i,\lambda,t\lambda}(a_{t\lambda} u(s) a_{mt\lambda \mathbf{e}_i} u_i(s_k)x) ds \\
(2.15) \qquad &\leq e^{-2t\lambda m} \sum_{k=1}^{\lceil e^{2t\lambda m} \rceil} (e^{-\lambda t\lambda} \alpha_{i,\lambda,t\lambda}(a_{mt\lambda \mathbf{e}_i} u_i(s_k)x) + C_{\lambda,t\lambda}) \\
&\leq 2C_1 e^{-\lambda t\lambda} \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \alpha_{i,\lambda,t\lambda}(a_{mt\lambda \mathbf{e}_i} u_i(s)x) ds + 2C_{\lambda,t\lambda}.
\end{aligned}$$

Applying (2.15) repeatedly for $m = 0, 1, \dots, \frac{t}{t\lambda} - 1$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \alpha_{i,\lambda,t\lambda}(a_{t\mathbf{e}_i} u_i(s)x) ds &\leq (2C_1 e^{-\lambda t\lambda})^{\frac{t}{t\lambda}} \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \alpha_{i,\lambda,t\lambda}(u_i(s)x) ds + 2C_{\lambda,t\lambda} \sum_{m=0}^{\frac{t}{t\lambda}-1} (2C_1 e^{-\lambda t\lambda})^{-m} \\
&\leq C_1 (2C_1 e^{-\lambda t\lambda})^{\frac{t}{t\lambda}} \alpha_{i,\lambda,t\lambda}(x) + \frac{2C_{\lambda,t\lambda}}{1 - 2C_1 e^{-\lambda t\lambda}} \\
&\leq e^{-\lambda^2 t} \alpha_{i,\lambda,t\lambda}(x) + 4C_{\lambda,t\lambda}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, by Proposition 2.3 we also have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \alpha'_{i,\lambda}(a_{(m+1)t\lambda \mathbf{e}_i} u_i(s)x) ds &\leq e^{-2t\lambda m} \sum_{k=1}^{\lceil e^{2t\lambda m} \rceil} \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \alpha'_{i,\lambda}(a_{t\lambda} u(s) a_{mt\lambda \mathbf{e}_i} u_i(s_k)x) ds \\
(2.17) \qquad &\leq e^{-2t\lambda m} \sum_{k=1}^{\lceil e^{2t\lambda m} \rceil} (e^{-\lambda t\lambda} \alpha'_{i,\lambda}(a_{mt\lambda \mathbf{e}_i} u_i(s_k)x) + C'_{\lambda,t\lambda} \kappa_i(x)) \\
&\leq 2C_4 e^{-\lambda t\lambda} \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \alpha'_{i,\lambda}(a_{mt\lambda \mathbf{e}_i} u_i(s)x) ds + 2C'_{\lambda,t\lambda} \kappa_i(x).
\end{aligned}$$

Applying (2.17) repeatedly for $m = 0, 1, \dots, \frac{t}{t\lambda} - 1$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \alpha'_{i,\lambda}(a_{t\mathbf{e}_i} u_i(s)x) ds &\leq C_1 (2C_1 e^{-\lambda t\lambda})^{\frac{t}{t\lambda}} \alpha'_{i,\lambda}(x) + \frac{2C'_{\lambda,t\lambda} \kappa_i(x)}{1 - 2C_1 e^{-\lambda t\lambda}} \\
(2.18) \qquad &\leq e^{-\lambda^2 t} \alpha'_{i,\lambda}(x) + 4C'_{\lambda,t\lambda} \kappa_i(x).
\end{aligned}$$

(1) If $\tilde{\alpha}_{i,\lambda,t\lambda}(x) = \max\{\alpha_{i,\lambda,t\lambda}(x), 1\}$, then by (2.16) we have

$$\int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \alpha_{i,\lambda,t\lambda}(a_{t\mathbf{e}_i} u_i(s)x) ds \leq e^{-\lambda^2 t} \alpha_{i,\lambda,t\lambda}(x) + 4C_{\lambda,t\lambda} \leq 5C_{\lambda,t\lambda} \tilde{\alpha}_{i,\lambda}(x),$$

hence

$$\int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{\alpha}_{i,\lambda}(a_{t\mathbf{e}_i} u_i(s)x) ds \leq E_{1,\lambda} \tilde{\alpha}_{i,\lambda}(x).$$

Otherwise we have $\tilde{\alpha}_{i,\lambda,t_\lambda}(x) = \alpha'_{i,\lambda}(x)$, then we use (2.18) and get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{\alpha}_{i,\lambda}(a_{t\mathbf{e}_i} u_i(s)x) ds &\leq \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \alpha'_{i,\lambda}(a_{t\mathbf{e}_i} u_i(s)x) ds \\ &\leq e^{-\lambda^2 t} \alpha'_{i,\lambda}(x) + 4C'_{\lambda,t_\lambda} \kappa_i(x) \\ &\leq (e^{-\lambda^2 t} + 4C'_{\lambda,t_\lambda}) \alpha'_{i,\lambda}(x) \leq E_{1,\lambda} \alpha'_{i,\lambda}(x). \end{aligned}$$

(2) In this case $\tilde{\alpha}_{i,\lambda}(x)$ is either $\alpha_{i,\lambda,t_\lambda}(x)$ or $\alpha'_{i,\lambda}(x)$ by definition of $\tilde{\alpha}_{i,\lambda}$. If $\alpha_{i,\lambda,t_\lambda}(x) = \tilde{\alpha}_{i,\lambda}(x) \geq E_{1,\lambda} e^t \geq 4\tilde{C}_{\lambda,t_\lambda} e^t$, then (2.16) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{\alpha}_{i,\lambda}(a_{t\mathbf{e}_i} u_i(s)x) ds &\leq \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \alpha_{i,\lambda,t_\lambda}(a_{t\mathbf{e}_i} u_i(s)x) ds \\ &\leq e^{-\lambda^2 t} \alpha_{i,\lambda,t_\lambda}(x) + 4C_{\lambda,t_\lambda} < 2e^{-\lambda^2 t} \alpha_{i,\lambda,t_\lambda}(x). \end{aligned}$$

Otherwise we may assume that

$$\tilde{\alpha}_{i,\lambda}(x) = \alpha'_{i,\lambda}(x) > \alpha_{i,\lambda,t_\lambda}(x) > 4\tilde{C}_{\lambda,t_\lambda} e^t \kappa_i(x).$$

In this case (2.18) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{\alpha}_{i,\lambda}(a_{t\mathbf{e}_i} u_i(s)x) ds &\leq \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \alpha'_{i,\lambda}(a_{t\mathbf{e}_i} u_i(s)x) ds \\ &\leq e^{-\lambda^2 t} \alpha'_{i,\lambda}(x) + 4C'_{\lambda,t_\lambda} \kappa_i(x) < 2e^{-\lambda^2 t} \alpha'_{i,\lambda}(x). \end{aligned}$$

(3) It directly follows from (2.3) and (2.8).

(4) By Lemma 2.4 we have

$$\epsilon_{\lambda,t_\lambda}^{d-1} \kappa_i(x)^{-2} \alpha'_{i,\lambda}(x) \leq \tilde{\alpha}_{i,\lambda,t}(x) \leq \alpha'_{i,\lambda}(x)$$

for any $x \in X'$. Combining with (3) of Proposition 2.3 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\alpha}_{i,\lambda,t}(gx) &\leq \alpha'_{i,\lambda}(gx) = \alpha'_{i,\lambda}(x) \leq (\epsilon_{\lambda,t_\lambda}^{d-1} \kappa_i(x)^{-2})^{-1} \tilde{\alpha}_{i,\lambda,t}(x), \\ (\epsilon_{\lambda,t_\lambda}^{d-1} \kappa_i(x)^{-2})^{-1} \tilde{\alpha}_{i,\lambda,t}(gx) &\geq \alpha'_{i,\lambda}(gx) = \alpha'_{i,\lambda}(x) \geq \tilde{\alpha}_{i,\lambda,t}(x) \end{aligned}$$

for any $g \in U_i^\perp$ and $x \in X$. □

We also record the following property from the fact that $\tilde{\alpha}_i$'s are proper.

Lemma 2.6. *For each $h \geq 1$ there exists $D > h$ such that the following holds. For any $1 \leq i \leq d-1$, $g \in B^U(\text{id}, 1)$, and $x \in X'$ with $\tilde{\alpha}_i(x) \leq h$, $\tilde{\alpha}_i(gx) \leq D$ holds.*

Proof. This is a consequence of the fact that $\tilde{\alpha}_i$'s are proper. □

By Lemma 2.6 we define a monotone increasing function $D : [1, \infty) \rightarrow [1, \infty)$ such that $D(h) > h$ satisfies the property of Lemma 2.6.

2.4. Dynamical height functions for rank one actions. The aim of this subsection is to construct dynamical height functions describing the behavior of trajectories towards the cusp under one-dimensional diagonal flows.

Let $0 < \lambda < 1$ be given, and let $\tilde{\alpha}_{i,\lambda}$'s be as in (2.10) for $1 \leq i \leq d-1$. From now on the parameter λ will be regarded as fixed until the end of the proof of Theorem 1.3, so we may drop the subscripts λ from $\tilde{\alpha}_{i,\lambda}$ and t_λ and write $\tilde{\alpha}_i$ and t . For $x \in X$ and $\mathfrak{h} \geq 1$ we denote by $J_{i,\mathfrak{h}}(x) \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ the set of $j \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying $\tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{jte_i}x) \geq \mathfrak{h}$. For $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 \leq \delta \leq 1$, $1 \leq i \leq d-1$, and $\mathfrak{h} \geq 1$ we define a proper lower semi-continuous function $\beta_{N,\delta,i,\mathfrak{h}} : X' \rightarrow [1, \infty)$ as follows:

$$\beta_{N,\delta,i,\mathfrak{h}}(x) = \begin{cases} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{Nte_i}x) & \text{if } \#(J_{i,\mathfrak{h}}(x) \cap \{1, \dots, N\}) \geq (1-\delta)N, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Loosely speaking, $x \in \text{Supp } \beta_{N,\delta,i,\mathfrak{h}}$ only if the trajectory $\{a_{te_i}x, \dots, a_{Nte_i}x\}$ stays most of time outside the compact set $K_{\mathfrak{h}}$. The following proposition can be thought as the contraction hypothesis of the dynamical height functions. The idea of the proof is inspired by [KKLM17, Proof of Theorem 1.5].

Proposition 2.7. *For any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 < \delta < 1$, $1 \leq i \leq d-1$, $\mathfrak{h} \geq E_{1,\lambda}e^t$, and $x \in X'$,*

$$(2.19) \quad \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \beta_{N,\delta,i,\mathfrak{h}}(u_i(s)x) ds \leq (8C_5)^N e^{-(\lambda^2 - C_6\delta)Nt} \tilde{\alpha}_i(x)$$

for some constant $C_6 > 1$.

Proof. Let $\Theta_{N,\delta}$ be the family of subsets of $\{1, \dots, N\}$ containing at least $(1-\delta)N$ elements. For each $J \in \Theta_{N,\delta}$ we denote by $I_J(x)$ the set of $s \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$ such that $J_{i,\mathfrak{h}}(u_i(s)x) \cap \{1, \dots, N\} = J$. Then

$$\int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \beta_{N,\delta,i,\mathfrak{h}}(u_i(s)x) ds = \sum_{J \in \Theta_{N,\delta}} \int_{I_J(x)} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{Nte_i}u_i(s)x) ds$$

by definition of $\beta_{N,\delta,i,\mathfrak{h}}$. For $1 \leq n \leq N$ we also define

$$I_{J,n}(x) = \left\{ s \in \left[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right] : \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{jte_i}u_i(s)x) \geq \mathfrak{h} \text{ for all } j \in J \cap \{1, \dots, n\} \right\}$$

and set $I_{J,0}(x) = [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$. Clearly we have

$$I_J(x) = I_{J,N}(x) \subseteq I_{J,N-1}(x) \subseteq \dots \subseteq I_{J,0}(x) = \left[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right].$$

We choose a maximal $\frac{1}{2}e^{-2nt}$ -separated subset $\{s_1, \dots, s_M\}$ of $I_{J,n}$. Then $I_{J,n}$ is covered by the intervals $[s_k - \frac{1}{2}e^{-2nt}, s_k + \frac{1}{2}e^{-2nt}]$ for $1 \leq k \leq M$. Note that

$$\tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{nte_i}u_i(s_k + s')x) = \tilde{\alpha}_i(u_i(e^{2nt}s')a_{nte_i}u_i(s_k)x) \geq C_5^{-1} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{nte_i}u_i(s_k)x)$$

for any $1 \leq k \leq M$ and $s' \in [-\frac{1}{2}e^{-2nt}, \frac{1}{2}e^{-2nt}]$. We also observe that the intervals $[s_k - \frac{1}{2}e^{-2nt}, s_k + \frac{1}{2}e^{-2nt}]$ can be overlapped at most twice by the separateness of s_1, \dots, s_M . Thus, we have

$$(2.20) \quad \sum_{k=1}^M \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{nte_i}u_i(s_k)x) \leq 2C_5 \int_{I_{J,n}(x)} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{nte_i}u_i(s)x) ds.$$

Note that $\tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{nte_i}u_i(s)x) \geq h \geq E_{1,\lambda}e^t$ for any $n \in J$. It follows from (2.12) that for any $n \in J$

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.21) \quad \int_{I_{J,n+1}(x)} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{(n+1)t\mathbf{e}_i}u_i(s)x)ds &\leq \int_{I_{J,n}(x)} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{(n+1)t\mathbf{e}_i}u_i(s)x)ds \\
&\leq \sum_{k=1}^M \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{(n+1)t\mathbf{e}_i}u_i(s_k + e^{-2nt}s')x)ds'ds \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^M \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{t\mathbf{e}_i}u_i(s')a_{nte_i}u_i(s_k)x)ds' \\
&\leq 2e^{-\lambda^2t} \sum_{k=1}^M \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{nte_i}u_i(s_k)x).
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (2.20) and (2.21), we get

$$(2.22) \quad \int_{I_{J,n+1}(x)} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{(n+1)t\mathbf{e}_i}u_i(s)x)ds \leq 4C_5e^{-\lambda^2t} \int_{I_{J,n}(x)} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{nte_i}u_i(s)x)ds.$$

On the other hand, for any $n \notin J$ we have $\tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{(n+1)t\mathbf{e}_i}u_i(s)x) \leq C_5^t \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{nte_i}u_i(s)x)$ by (2.13), hence

$$(2.23) \quad \int_{I_{J,n+1}(x)} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{(n+1)t\mathbf{e}_i}u_i(s)x)ds \leq e^{t \log C_5} \int_{I_{J,n}(x)} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{nte_i}u_i(s)x)ds.$$

Applying (2.22) and (2.23) inductively, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.24) \quad \int_{I_J(x)} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i}u_i(s)x)ds &\leq (4C_5e^{-\lambda^2t})^{|J|} e^{(N-|J|)t \log C_5} \tilde{\alpha}_i(x) \\
&\leq (4C_5)^N e^{-\{\lambda^2 - (1 + \log C_5)\delta\}Nt} \tilde{\alpha}_i(x).
\end{aligned}$$

Since the cardinality of $\Theta_{N,\delta}$ is at most 2^N , we finally get

$$\int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \beta_{N,\delta,i,h}(u_i(s)x)ds \leq (8C_5)^N e^{-\{\lambda^2 - C_6\delta\}Nt} \tilde{\alpha}_i(x)$$

for $C_6 := 1 + \log C_5$. □

3. DYNAMICAL HEIGHT FUNCTIONS FOR HIGHER RANK ACTIONS


The purpose of this section is to construct dynamical height functions for higher-rank actions, and prove their properties such as the contraction hypothesis.

3.1. Construction of dynamical height functions for higher rank actions. As in the previous subsection, we fix $0 < \lambda < 1$ and set $t = t_\lambda$. For $N \in \mathbb{N}$ let us define

$$(3.1) \quad \mathcal{D}_N := \left\{ (\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{d-1}) \in (t\mathbb{N})^{d-1} : \max_{1 \leq j \leq d-1} \tau_j + \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} \tau_j \leq 2dNt \right\}.$$

Then \mathcal{D}_N is the intersection of $(t\mathbb{N})^{d-1}$ and the convex hull of the set

$$\{0, dNt\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, dNt\mathbf{e}_{d-1}, 2Nt(\mathbf{e}_1 + \dots + \mathbf{e}_{d-1})\}.$$

FIGURE 1. \mathcal{D}_N for $d = 3$

Note that $a_\tau u_i(s) a_{-\tau} = u_i(e^{\tau_i + \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} \tau_j} s)$ for any $1 \leq i \leq d-1$, $s \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\tau = (\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{d-1})$. It follows that

$$(3.2) \quad a_\tau B^U(\text{id}, r) a_{-\tau} \subseteq B^U(\text{id}, e^{2dNt} r) = g_{2Nt} B^U(\text{id}, r) g_{-2Nt}$$

for any $\tau \in \mathcal{D}_N$ and $r > 0$.

For $0 < \delta < 1$ and $1 \leq i \leq d-1$ we also define

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{N,\delta,i} &:= \{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_N : \|\tau - dNt\mathbf{e}_i\| \leq \delta Nt\}, \\ \widehat{\mathcal{E}}_{N,\delta,i} &:= \left\{ \tau = (\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{d-1}) \in \mathcal{D}_N : \left(\frac{d}{2} - \delta\right) Nt < \tau_i \leq \left(d - \frac{\delta}{2}\right) Nt, \|\tau - \tau_i \mathbf{e}_i\| \leq \frac{\delta}{d} Nt \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly there exists $C_7 > 1$ such that

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{aligned} C_7^{-1} \delta^d \#\mathcal{D}_N &< \#\mathcal{E}_{N,\delta,i} < C_7 \delta^d \#\mathcal{D}_N, \\ C_7^{-1} \delta^{d-1} \#\mathcal{D}_N &< \#\widehat{\mathcal{E}}_{N,\delta,i} < C_7 \delta^{d-1} \#\mathcal{D}_N \end{aligned}$$

holds for any N, i , and δ .

For $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $h > \max\{E_{1,\lambda} e^t, 1\}$, and $x \in X$ let us define

$$(3.5) \quad \Omega(N, h, x) := \left\{ \tau \in \mathcal{D}_N : \min_{1 \leq i \leq d-1} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_\tau x) \geq h \right\}.$$

We also define $\psi_{N,\delta,h} : X \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ by

$$(3.6) \quad \psi_{N,\delta,h}(x) := \begin{cases} \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \min_{\tau \in \mathcal{E}_{N,\delta,i} \cap \Omega(N,h,x)} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_\tau x) & \text{if } \frac{\#\Omega(N,h,x)}{\#\mathcal{D}_N} \geq \left(1 - \frac{\delta^d}{4C_7}\right), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Loosely speaking, $x \in \text{Supp } \psi_{N,\delta,h}$ only if the truncated orbit $\{a_\tau x : \tau \in \mathcal{D}_N\}$ stays most of time outside the compact set K_h .

Lemma 3.1. *For each $x \in X$ with $\psi_{2N,\delta,h}(x) > 0$, there exist $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{d-1}$ such that*

- (1) $\tau_i \in \mathcal{E}_{N,2\delta,i} \cap \Omega(N, h, x)$ for $1 \leq i \leq d-1$,

$$(2) \quad \psi_{2N,\delta,h}(x) \leq \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \beta_{dN,\delta,i,h}(a_{\tau_i}x).$$

Proof. By (3.6), $\psi_{2N,t,\delta,h}(x) > 0$ implies $\#\Omega(2N, \mathbf{h}, x) \geq (1 - \frac{\delta^d}{4C_7})\#\mathcal{D}_{2N}$. It follows from (3.4) that

$$\#(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}_{2N,\delta,i} \setminus \Omega(2N, \mathbf{h}, x)) \leq \frac{\delta^d}{4C_7}\#\mathcal{D}_{2N} < \frac{\delta}{4}\#\widehat{\mathcal{E}}_{2N,\delta,i}$$

for any $1 \leq i \leq d-1$. Note that the set $\widehat{\mathcal{E}}_{2N,\delta,i}$ can be expressed by

$$(3.7) \quad \widehat{\mathcal{E}}_{2N,\delta,i} = \left\{ \boldsymbol{\tau} + k t \mathbf{e}_i : \boldsymbol{\tau} = (\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{d-1}) \in \mathcal{D}_N, \tau_i = \lfloor (d-2\delta)N \rfloor t, \right. \\ \left. \|\boldsymbol{\tau} - \tau_i \mathbf{e}_i\| \leq \frac{2\delta}{d} N t, 1 \leq k \leq \lfloor (d+\delta)N \rfloor \right\}.$$

It follows that for each i we can find $\boldsymbol{\tau}'_i \in \mathcal{E}_{N,2\delta,i}$ such that the i -th coordinate of $\boldsymbol{\tau}'_i$ is $\lfloor (d-2\delta)N \rfloor t$ and

$$(3.8) \quad \#(\{\boldsymbol{\tau}'_i + k t \mathbf{e}_i : 1 \leq k \leq \lfloor (d+\delta)N \rfloor\} \setminus \Omega(2N, \mathbf{h}, x)) < \frac{\delta}{4}N.$$

Let us denote

$$\mathcal{K}_i := \{1 \leq k \leq \lfloor \delta N \rfloor : \boldsymbol{\tau}'_i + k t \mathbf{e}_i \in \Omega(2N, \mathbf{h}, x)\}, \\ \mathcal{K}'_i := \{1 \leq k \leq \lfloor \delta N \rfloor : \boldsymbol{\tau}'_i + dN t \mathbf{e}_i + k t \mathbf{e}_i \in \Omega(2N, \mathbf{h}, x)\}.$$

Then (3.8) implies that

$$\#(\{1, \dots, \lfloor \delta N \rfloor\} \setminus \mathcal{K}_i) < \frac{\delta}{4}N, \quad \#(\{1, \dots, \lfloor \delta N \rfloor\} \setminus \mathcal{K}'_i) < \frac{\delta}{4}N,$$

hence for each i there exists some $\boldsymbol{\tau}_i \in \{\boldsymbol{\tau}'_i, \boldsymbol{\tau}'_i + t \mathbf{e}_i, \dots, \boldsymbol{\tau}'_i + \lfloor \delta d N \rfloor t \mathbf{e}_i\}$ such that $\boldsymbol{\tau}_i \in \mathcal{K}_i \cap \mathcal{K}'_i$. Let $\boldsymbol{\tau}_i = \boldsymbol{\tau}'_i + k_i t \mathbf{e}_i$, where $1 \leq k_i \leq \lfloor \delta d N \rfloor$. We have $\boldsymbol{\tau}_i \in \mathcal{E}_{N,2\delta,i}$ since the i -th coordinate of $\boldsymbol{\tau}_i$ is between $(d-2\delta)N$ and $(d-\delta)N$, and $\boldsymbol{\tau}_i + dN t \mathbf{e}_i \in \mathcal{E}_{2N,\delta,i}$ since the i -th coordinate of $\boldsymbol{\tau}_i + dN t$ is between $(2d-2\delta)N$ and $(2d-\delta)N$. Thus, we obtain

$$(3.9) \quad \boldsymbol{\tau}_i \in \mathcal{E}_{N,2\delta,i} \cap \Omega(2N, \mathbf{h}, x) = \mathcal{E}_{N,2\delta,i} \cap \Omega(N, \mathbf{h}, x),$$

hence (1) is proved.

We now show (2). Note that (3.9) implies $\boldsymbol{\tau}_i + dN t \mathbf{e}_i \in \mathcal{E}_{2N,\delta,i} \cap \Omega(2N, \mathbf{h}, x)$, hence

$$(3.10) \quad \min_{\boldsymbol{\tau} \in \mathcal{E}_{2N,\delta,i} \cap \Omega(2N, \mathbf{h}, x)} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}x) \leq \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}_i + dN t \mathbf{e}_i}x).$$

On the other hand, (3.8) implies that

$$\#(\{1 \leq k \leq \lfloor (d+\delta)N \rfloor : \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{k t \mathbf{e}_i} a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}'_i} x) < \mathbf{h}\}) < \frac{\delta}{4}N.$$

It follows that

$$\#(\{1 \leq k \leq dN : \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{k t \mathbf{e}_i} a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}_i} x) < \mathbf{h}\}) < \delta N,$$

hence $\#(J_i(a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}_i}x) \cap \{1, \dots, dN\}) \geq (d-\delta)N$. Thus, we obtain

$$(3.11) \quad \beta_{dN,\delta,i,h}(a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}_i}x) = \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{dN t \mathbf{e}_i} a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}_i}x) = \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}_i + dN t \mathbf{e}_i}x)$$

from the definition of $\beta_{dN,\delta,i,h}$. Combining (3.10) and (3.11), we get

$$(3.12) \quad \min_{\boldsymbol{\tau} \in \mathcal{E}_{2N,\delta,i} \cap \Omega(2N, \mathbf{h}, x)} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}x) \leq \beta_{dN,\delta,i,h}(a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}_i}x)$$

for all $1 \leq i \leq d-1$. Therefore,

$$\psi_{2N,\delta,h}(x) = \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \min_{\tau \in \mathcal{E}_{2N,\delta,i} \cap \Omega(2N,h,x)} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_\tau x) \leq \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \beta_{dN,\delta,i,h}(a_{\tau_i} x).$$

□

3.2. Approximation of height functions. In this subsection, we shall approximate the dynamical height functions on horospherical orbits by characteristic functions on the union of certain boxes. We begin with approximating $\psi_{N,\delta,D(h)}$ on horospherical orbits.

Lemma 3.2. *For $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 < \delta < 1$, $h > E_{1,\lambda} e^t$, and $x \in X'$, let us define $F : [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $F(\xi) = \psi_{N,\delta,D(h)}(u(\xi)x)$, where $D(h)$ is as in Lemma 2.6, and let $\{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_M\} \subset [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}$ be a maximal $e^{-(2d+4\delta)Nt}$ -separated set of $\text{Supp } F$. Then we have*

$$(1) \quad 0 \leq F(\xi) \leq E_{2,\lambda}^{d-1} e^{d(d-1)\delta Nt} \kappa(x)^2 \sum_{k=1}^M F(\xi_k) \mathbf{1}_{B(\xi_k, e^{-(2d+4\delta)Nt})}(\xi) \text{ for any } \xi \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1},$$

$$(2) \quad \sum_{k=1}^M F(\xi_k) \leq E_{2,\lambda}^{d-1} e^{\{2d(d-1)+5d^2\delta\}Nt} \kappa(x)^2 \int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \psi_{N,\delta,h}(u(\xi)x) d\xi, \text{ where } E_{2,\lambda} := C_5 \epsilon_{\lambda,t}^{-(d-1)}.$$

Proof. For any $\xi \in \text{Supp } F$ there exists $1 \leq k \leq M$ such that $\xi \in B(\xi_k, e^{-(2d+4\delta)Nt})$. By (3.2), we have $a_\tau u(\xi - \xi_k) a_{-\tau} \in B^U(\text{id}, 1)$ for any $1 \leq i \leq d-1$ and $\tau \in \mathcal{D}_N$. It follows from Lemma 2.6 that

$$(3.13) \quad \begin{aligned} \Omega(N, D(h), u(\xi)x) &\subseteq \Omega(N, h, u(\xi_k)x), \\ \Omega(N, h, u(\xi)x) &\subseteq \Omega(N, D(h), u(\xi_k)x). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, using (2.13) and (2.14) we obtain

$$(3.14) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_\tau u(\xi)x) &= \tilde{\alpha}_i((a_\tau u(\xi - \xi_k) a_{-\tau}) a_\tau u(\xi_k)x) \\ &\leq C_5 \alpha_i((a_\tau u(\pi_i^\perp(\xi - \xi_k)) a_{-\tau}) a_\tau u(\xi_k)x) \\ &\leq C_5 \epsilon_{\lambda,t}^{-(d-1)} \kappa_i(a_\tau u(\xi_k)x)^2 \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_\tau u(\xi_k)x) \\ &= E_{2,\lambda} \kappa_i(a_\tau x)^2 \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_\tau u(\xi_k)x), \end{aligned}$$

and similarly, we also have

$$(3.15) \quad \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_\tau u(\xi_k)x) \geq E_{2,\lambda} \kappa_i(x)^2 \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_\tau u(\xi)x)$$

for all $1 \leq i \leq d-1$. Combining (3.13) and (3.14),

$$\min_{\tau \in \mathcal{E}_{N,\delta,i} \cap \Omega(N,D(h),u(\xi)x)} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_\tau u(\xi)x) \leq E_{2,\lambda} \min_{\tau \in \mathcal{E}_{N,\delta,i} \cap \Omega(N,h,u(\xi_k)x)} (\kappa_i(a_\tau x)^2 \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_\tau u(\xi_k)x))$$

holds for all $1 \leq i \leq d-1$. Note that for any $\tau \in \mathcal{E}_{N,\delta,i}$

$$(3.16) \quad \kappa_i(a_\tau x) \leq e^{d\delta Nt} \kappa_i(a_{dNt e_i} x) = e^{d\delta Nt} \kappa_i(x)$$

since $\|\tau - dNt e_i\| \leq \delta Nt$. It follows that

$$\min_{\tau \in \mathcal{E}_{N,\delta,i} \cap \Omega(N,D(h),u(\xi)x)} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_\tau u(\xi)x) \leq E_{2,\lambda} e^{2d\delta Nt} \kappa_i(x)^2 \min_{\tau \in \mathcal{E}_{N,\delta,i} \cap \Omega(N,h,u(\xi_k)x)} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_\tau u(\xi_k)x).$$

for all $1 \leq i \leq d-1$. Thus, if $F(\boldsymbol{\xi}) > 0$ then

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.17) \quad F(\boldsymbol{\xi}) &= \psi_{N,\delta,D(\mathbf{h})}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x) = \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \min_{\tau \in \mathcal{E}_{N,\delta,i} \cap \Omega(N,D(\mathbf{h}),u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x)} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_\tau u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x) \\
&\leq E_{2,\lambda}^{d-1} e^{d(d-1)\delta Nt} \kappa(x)^2 \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \min_{\tau \in \mathcal{E}_{N,\delta,i} \cap \Omega(N,\mathbf{h},u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k)x)} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_\tau u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k)x) \\
&\leq E_{2,\lambda}^{d-1} e^{d(d-1)\delta Nt} \kappa(x)^2 \psi_{N,\delta,\mathbf{h}}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k)x),
\end{aligned}$$

so (1) is proved.

We now verify (2). As in (3.17), we obtain from (3.13) and (3.15) that

$$F(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k) = \psi_{N,\delta,D(\mathbf{h})}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k)x) \leq E_{2,\lambda}^{d-1} e^{d(d-1)\delta Nt} \kappa(x)^2 \psi_{N,\delta,\mathbf{h}}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k)x)$$

for any $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in B(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k, e^{-(2d+4\delta)Nt})$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
(2e^{-(2d+4\delta)Nt})^{d-1} \sum_{k=1}^M F(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k) &= \sum_{k=1}^M \int_{B(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k, e^{-(2d+4\delta)Nt})} F(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k) d\boldsymbol{\xi} \\
&\leq E_{2,\lambda}^{d-1} e^{d(d-1)\delta Nt} \kappa(x)^2 \sum_{k=1}^M \int_{B(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k, e^{-(2d+4\delta)Nt})} \psi_{N,\delta,\mathbf{h}}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x) d\boldsymbol{\xi} \\
&\leq 2^{d-1} E_{2,\lambda}^{d-1} e^{d(d-1)\delta Nt} \kappa(x)^2 \int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \psi_{N,\delta,\mathbf{h}}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x) d\boldsymbol{\xi}.
\end{aligned}$$

In the last line, we are using a fact from the maximality that $B(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k, e^{-(2d+4\delta)Nt})$ can be overlapped at most 2^{d-1} times. It completes the proof. \square

We now approximate $\beta_{dN,\delta,i,\mathbf{h}}$ on certain expanding translates of horospherical orbits. For $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $1 \leq i \leq d-1$, we denote by $\mathbf{B}_{N,i} \subset \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ the box centered at 0 with side-length $2e^{-2dNt}$ along the direction of \mathbf{e}_i , and side-length 2 along the other $d-2$ directions.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 < \delta < 1$, $\mathbf{h} > E_{1,\lambda} e^t$, and $x \in X'$. Suppose that $\tau_i \in \mathcal{E}_{N,2\delta,i}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d-1$. For each $1 \leq i \leq d-1$ let us define $f_i : [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $f_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = \beta_{dN,\delta,i,D(\mathbf{h})}(a_{\tau_i} u(e^{-(2d+4\delta)Nt} \boldsymbol{\xi})x)$. Then there exist $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,1}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,M_i} \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned}
(1) \quad 0 &\leq f_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}) \leq E_{2,\lambda} e^{2d\delta Nt} \kappa_i(x)^2 \sum_{k=1}^{M_i} f_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k}) \mathbb{1}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k} + \mathbf{B}_{N,i}}(\boldsymbol{\xi}) \text{ for any } \boldsymbol{\xi} \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}, \\
(2) \quad \sum_{k=1}^{M_i} f_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k}) &\leq E_{2,\lambda} e^{2d(1+\delta)Nt} \kappa_i(x)^2 \int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \beta_{dN,\delta,i,\mathbf{h}}(a_{\tau_i} u(e^{-(2d+4\delta)Nt} \boldsymbol{\xi})x) d\boldsymbol{\xi}.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let $\{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,1}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,M_i}\}$ be a maximal $\mathbf{B}_{N,i}$ -set of $\text{Supp } f_i$, i.e. $\{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k}\}_{k=1}^{M_i}$ is a maximal set such that the boxes $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k} + \mathbf{B}_{N,i}$'s are disjoint. Then for any $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \text{Supp } f_i$, there exist $1 \leq k \leq M_i$ such that $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k} + \mathbf{B}_{N,i}$. Then for any $1 \leq j \leq dN$

$$a_{j\tau_i} a_{\tau_i} u(e^{-(2d+4\delta)Nt}(\boldsymbol{\xi} - \boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k})) a_{-\tau_i} a_{-j\tau_i} \in a_{\tau_i} a_{dN\tau_i} u(e^{-(2d+4\delta)Nt} \mathbf{B}_{N,i}) a_{-dN\tau_i} a_{-\tau_i}.$$

Note that $u(e^{-(2d+4\delta)Nt} \mathbf{B}_{N,i})$ is the box centered at $\text{id} \in U$ with side-length $e^{-(4d+4\delta)Nt}$ along the direction of $u(\mathbf{e}_i)$ and side-length $e^{-(2d+4\delta)\delta Nt}$ along the other $d-2$ directions. It follows that the box $a_{dN\tau_i} u(e^{-(2d+4\delta)Nt} \mathbf{B}_{N,i}) a_{-dN\tau_i}$ has side-length $e^{-(2d+4\delta)Nt}$ along the direction of $u(\mathbf{e}_i)$

and side-length $e^{-(d+4\delta)Nt}$ along the other directions, hence the box $a_{\tau_i} a_{dNt e_i} u(e^{-(2d+4\delta)Nt} \mathbf{B}_{N,i}) a_{-dNt e_i} a_{-\tau_i}$ is contained in $B^U(\text{id}, 1)$.

It follows from Lemma 2.6 that

$$(3.18) \quad \begin{aligned} J_{i,D(\mathfrak{h})}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x) &\subseteq J_{i,\mathfrak{h}}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k)x), \\ J_{i,D(\mathfrak{h})}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k)x) &\subseteq J_{i,\mathfrak{h}}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, using (2.13) and (2.14) we obtain

$$(3.19) \quad \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{dNt e_i} a_{\tau_i} u(e^{-(2d+4\delta)Nt} \boldsymbol{\xi})x) \leq E_{2,\lambda} \kappa_i(a_{\tau_i} x)^2 \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{dNt e_i} a_{\tau_i} u(e^{-(2d+4\delta)Nt} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k})x),$$

$$(3.20) \quad \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{dNt e_i} a_{\tau_i} u(e^{-(2d+4\delta)Nt} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k})x) \leq E_{2,\lambda} \kappa_i(a_{\tau_i} x)^2 \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{dNt e_i} a_{\tau_i} u(e^{-(2d+4\delta)Nt} \boldsymbol{\xi})x)$$

for any $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k} + \mathbf{B}_{N,i}$. Recall (3.16) that $\kappa_i(a_{\tau} x) \leq e^{d\delta Nt} \kappa_i(x)$ for any $\tau \in \mathcal{E}_{N,\delta,i}$. Combining this with (3.18) and (3.19) we get

$$(3.21) \quad \begin{aligned} f_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}) &= \beta_{dN,\delta,i,D(\mathfrak{h})}(a_{\tau_i} u(e^{-(2d+4\delta)Nt} \boldsymbol{\xi})x) \\ &= \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{dNt e_i} a_{\tau_i} u(e^{-(2d+4\delta)Nt} \boldsymbol{\xi})x) \\ &= E_{2,\lambda} \kappa_i(a_{\tau_i} x)^2 \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{dNt e_i} a_{\tau_i} u(e^{-(2d+4\delta)Nt} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k})x) \\ &\leq E_{2,\lambda} e^{2d\delta Nt} \kappa_i(x)^2 \beta_{dN,\delta,i,\mathfrak{h}}(a_{\tau_i} u(e^{-(2d+4\delta)Nt} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k})x), \end{aligned}$$

so (1) is proved.

We now verify (2). As in (3.21), we obtain from (3.18) and (3.20) that

$$\begin{aligned} f_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k}) &= \beta_{dN,\delta,i,\mathfrak{h}}(a_{\tau_i} u(e^{-(2d+4\delta)Nt} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k})x) \\ &\leq E_{2,\lambda} e^{2d\delta Nt} \kappa_i(x)^2 \beta_{dN,\delta,i,\mathfrak{h}}(a_{\tau_i} u(e^{-(2d+4\delta)Nt} \boldsymbol{\xi})x) \end{aligned}$$

for any $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k} + \mathbf{B}_{N,i}$. Note that the volume of $\mathbf{B}_{N,i}$ is $2^{d-1} e^{-2dNt}$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} 2^{d-1} e^{-2dNt} \sum_{k=1}^{M_i} f_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k}) &= \sum_{k=1}^{M_i} \int_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k} + \mathbf{B}_{N,i}} f_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k}) d\boldsymbol{\xi} \\ &\leq E_{2,\lambda} e^{2d\delta Nt} \kappa_i(x)^2 \sum_{k=1}^{M_i} \int_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k} + \mathbf{B}_{N,i}} \beta_{dN,\delta,i,\mathfrak{h}}(a_{\tau_i} u(e^{-(2d+4\delta)Nt} \boldsymbol{\xi})x) d\boldsymbol{\xi} \\ &\leq 2^{d-1} E_{2,\lambda} e^{2d\delta Nt} \kappa_i(x)^2 \int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \beta_{dN,\delta,i,\mathfrak{h}}(a_{\tau_i} u(e^{-(2d+4\delta)Nt} \boldsymbol{\xi})x) d\boldsymbol{\xi}. \end{aligned}$$

In the last line, we are using a fact from the maximality that $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k} + \mathbf{B}_{N,i}$ can be overlapped at most 2^{d-1} times. It completes the proof. \square

3.3. The contraction hypothesis for higher rank actions. We are now ready to prove the contraction hypothesis of the dynamical height functions for higher-rank actions.

Proposition 3.4. *For any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 < \delta < 2^{-(d-1)}$, $\mathfrak{h} > E_{1,\lambda} e^t$, and $x \in X'$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \psi_{2N,\delta,D(\mathfrak{h})}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x) d\boldsymbol{\xi} &\leq E_{3,\lambda} N^{d^2} (8C_5)^{d(d-1)N} e^{-\{d(d-1)\lambda^2 - C_8\delta\}Nt} \\ &\quad \times \kappa(x)^8 \int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \psi_{N,2^{d-1}\delta,\mathfrak{h}}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x) d\boldsymbol{\xi}, \end{aligned}$$

for some constants $E_{3,\lambda}, C_8 > 0$.

Proof. Since $\mathcal{D}_N \setminus \Omega(N, \mathbf{h}, x) \subseteq \mathcal{D}_{2N} \setminus \Omega(2N, \mathbf{h}, x)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \frac{\#\Omega(N, \mathbf{h}, x)}{\#\mathcal{D}_N} &\leq \frac{\#(\mathcal{D}_{2N} \setminus \Omega(2N, \mathbf{h}, x))}{\#\mathcal{D}_N} \\ &= 2^{d-1} \frac{\#(\mathcal{D}_{2N} \setminus \Omega(2N, \mathbf{h}, x))}{\#\mathcal{D}_{2N}} = 2^{d-1} \left(1 - \frac{\#\Omega(2N, \mathbf{h}, x)}{\#\mathcal{D}_{2N}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

for any $x \in X'$, hence $\text{Supp } \psi_{2N, \delta, D(\mathbf{h})} \subseteq \text{Supp } \psi_{N, 2^{d-1}\delta, D(\mathbf{h})}$.

Let $F : [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the function defined by $F(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = \psi_{N, 2^{d-1}\delta, D(\mathbf{h})}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x)$, and $\{\boldsymbol{\xi}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_M\}$ be a maximal $e^{-(2d+4\delta)Nt}$ -separated set of $\text{Supp } F$ as in Lemma 3.2. Note that

$$(3.22) \quad \text{Supp } F \subseteq \bigcup_{k=1}^M B(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k, e^{-(2d+4\delta)Nt}).$$

By Lemma 3.1, for each $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \text{Supp } F$ we can find some

$$(\boldsymbol{\tau}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\tau}_{d-1}) \in \mathcal{E}_{N, 2\delta, 1} \times \dots \times \mathcal{E}_{N, 2\delta, d-1}$$

such that $\boldsymbol{\tau}_i \in \Omega(N, \epsilon, \mathbf{h}, u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x)$ for all i and

$$\psi_{2N, \delta, \mathbf{h}}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x) \leq \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \beta_{dN, \delta, i, \mathbf{h}}(a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}_i} u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x).$$

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (3.23) \quad &\int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \psi_{2N, \delta, D(\mathbf{h})}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x) d\boldsymbol{\xi} \leq \sum_{k=1}^M \int_{B(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k, e^{-(2d+4\delta)Nt})} \psi_{2N, \delta, D(\mathbf{h})}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x) d\boldsymbol{\xi} \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^M \sum_{\boldsymbol{\tau}_1 \in \mathcal{E}_{N, 2\delta, 1}} \dots \sum_{\boldsymbol{\tau}_{d-1} \in \mathcal{E}_{N, 2\delta, d-1}} \int_{B(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k, e^{-(2d+4\delta)Nt})} \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \beta_{dN, \delta, i, D(\mathbf{h})}(a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}_i} u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x) d\boldsymbol{\xi} \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^M \sum_{\boldsymbol{\tau}_1 \in \mathcal{E}_{N, 2\delta, 1}} \dots \sum_{\boldsymbol{\tau}_{d-1} \in \mathcal{E}_{N, 2\delta, d-1}} e^{-(2d+4\delta)(d-1)Nt} \\ &\quad \times \int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \beta_{dN, \delta, i, D(\mathbf{h})} \left(a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}_i} u(e^{-(2d+4\delta)Nt} \boldsymbol{\xi}) u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k)x \right) d\boldsymbol{\xi}. \end{aligned}$$

We now estimate the integral of the last line for each fixed $1 \leq k \leq M$ and $(\boldsymbol{\tau}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\tau}_{d-1}) \in \mathcal{E}_{N, 2\delta, 1} \times \dots \times \mathcal{E}_{N, 2\delta, d-1}$. For each $1 \leq i \leq d-1$ let us define $f_i : [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $f_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = \beta_{dN, \delta, i, \mathbf{h}}(a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}_i} u(e^{-(2d+4\delta)Nt} \boldsymbol{\xi}) u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k)x)$ and let $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,1}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{i, M_i} \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}$ be as in Lemma 3.3. Recall that we have

$$0 \leq f_i \leq E_{2, \lambda} e^{2d\delta Nt} \kappa_i(x)^2 \sum_{k=1}^{M_i} f_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k}) \mathbb{1}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{k,i} + \mathbf{B}_{N,i}}$$

by (1) of Lemma 3.3. It follows that

$$(3.24) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \beta_{dN, \delta, i, h} \left(a_{\tau_i} u(e^{-(2d+4\delta)Nt} \boldsymbol{\xi}) u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k) x \right) d\boldsymbol{\xi} = \int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} f_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}) d\boldsymbol{\xi} \\ & \leq E_{2, \lambda}^{d-1} e^{2d(d-1)\delta Nt} \kappa(x)^2 \sum_{k_1=1}^{M_1} \cdots \sum_{k_{d-1}=1}^{M_{d-1}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^{d-1} f_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i, k_i}) \right) \int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \mathbb{1}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{k_i, i} + \mathbf{B}_{N, i}}(\boldsymbol{\xi}) d\boldsymbol{\xi}. \end{aligned}$$

We observe that for any k_1, \dots, k_{d-1} , $\bigcap_{i=1}^{d-1} (\boldsymbol{\xi}_{k_i, i} + \mathbf{B}_{N, i})$ is always contained in a box with side-length $2e^{-2dNt}$ since each $\mathbf{B}_{N, i}$ has side-length $2e^{-2dNt}$ along the direction of \mathbf{e}_i . We also have

$$\sum_{k_i=1}^{M_i} f_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i, k_i}) \leq E_{2, \lambda} e^{2d(1+\delta)Nt} \kappa_i(x)^2 \int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \beta_{dN, \delta, i, h} \left(a_{\tau_i} u(e^{-(2d+4\delta)Nt} \boldsymbol{\xi}) u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k) x \right) d\boldsymbol{\xi}$$

for all $1 \leq i \leq d-1$ by (2) of Lemma 3.3. It follows that (3.24) is bounded by

$$(3.25) \quad \begin{aligned} & \leq E_{2, \lambda}^{d-1} e^{2d(d-1)\delta Nt} \kappa(x)^2 (2e^{-2dNt})^{d-1} \sum_{k_1=1}^{M_1} \cdots \sum_{k_{d-1}=1}^{M_{d-1}} \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} f_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i, k_i}) \\ & \leq 2^{d-1} E_{2, \lambda}^{2(d-1)} e^{4d(d-1)\delta Nt} \kappa(x)^4 \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \beta_{dN, \delta, i, h} \left(a_{\tau_i} u(e^{-(2d+4\delta)Nt} \boldsymbol{\xi}) u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k) x \right) d\boldsymbol{\xi}. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that by Proposition 2.7 we have

$$\int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \beta_{dN, \delta, i, h}(u_i(s)x) ds \leq (8C_5)^{dN} e^{-(\lambda^2 - C_6\delta)dNt} \alpha_i(x)$$

for any $1 \leq i \leq d-1$ and $x \in X'$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \beta_{dN, \delta, i, h} \left(a_{\tau_i} u(e^{-(2d+4\delta)Nt} \boldsymbol{\xi}) u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k) x \right) d\boldsymbol{\xi} \\ & = \int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \beta_{dN, \delta, i, h} \left(a_{\tau_i} u_i(e^{-(2d+4\delta)Nt} s) u(e^{-(2d+4\delta)Nt} \pi_i^\perp(\boldsymbol{\xi})) u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k) x \right) ds d\boldsymbol{\xi} \\ & \leq e^{8\delta Nt} \int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \beta_{dN, \delta, i, h} \left(u_i(s) a_{\tau_i} u(e^{-(2d+4\delta)Nt} \pi_i^\perp(\boldsymbol{\xi})) u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k) x \right) ds d\boldsymbol{\xi} \\ & \leq (8C_5)^{dN} e^{-\{d\lambda^2 - (dC_6 + 8)\delta\}Nt} \int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{\tau_i} u(e^{-(2d+4\delta)Nt} \pi_i^\perp(\boldsymbol{\xi})) u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k) x) d\boldsymbol{\xi}. \end{aligned}$$

for any $1 \leq i \leq d-1$. By (2.14) one has

$$\tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{\tau_i} u(e^{-(2d+4\delta)Nt} \pi_i^\perp(\boldsymbol{\xi})) u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k) x) \leq \epsilon_{\lambda, t}^{-(d-1)} \kappa_i(x)^2 \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{\tau_i} u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k) x),$$

hence for any $1 \leq i \leq d-1$

$$(3.26) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \beta_{dN, \delta, i, h} \left(a_{\tau_i} u(e^{-(2d+4\delta)Nt} \boldsymbol{\xi}) u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k) x \right) d\boldsymbol{\xi} \\ & \leq \epsilon_{\lambda, t}^{-(d-1)} (8C_5)^{dN} e^{-(d\lambda^2 - 9dC_6\delta)Nt} \kappa_i(x)^2 \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{\tau_i} u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k) x). \end{aligned}$$

Combining (3.24), (3.25), and (3.26) together, we get

$$(3.27) \quad \int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \beta_{dN, \delta, i, h} \left(a_{\tau_i} u(e^{-(2d+4\delta)Nt} \boldsymbol{\xi}) u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k) x \right) d\boldsymbol{\xi} \\ \leq E_{4, \lambda}^{-(d-1)^2} (8C_5)^{d(d-1)N} e^{-d(d-1)(\lambda^2 - 13C_6^\delta)Nt} \kappa(x)^6 \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{\tau_i} u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k) x),$$

where $E_{4, \lambda} := 2^{d-1} E_{2, \lambda}^{2(d-1)} \epsilon_{\lambda, t}^{-(d-1)^2}$.

Since $\boldsymbol{\xi}_k \in \text{Supp } F$, we have

$$\psi_{N, 2^{d-1}\delta, D(h)}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k) x) \geq \psi_{N, 2^{d-1}\delta, D(h)}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k) x) > 0.$$

By definition of $\psi_{N, 2^{d-1}\delta, D(h)}$ it implies that there exist $\tau_1(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k), \dots, \tau_{d-1}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k)$ such that

$$\tau_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k) \in \mathcal{E}_{N, 2^{d-1}\delta, i} \cap \Omega(N, D(h), u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k) x)$$

for all $1 \leq i \leq d-1$ and

$$\psi_{N, 2^{d-1}\delta, D(h)}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k) x) = \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{\tau_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k)} u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k) x).$$

Since $\|\tau_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k) - \tau_i\| \leq 2^d \delta N t$ for all i , it follows that

$$(3.28) \quad \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{\tau_i} u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k) x) \leq C_5^{d2^d \delta N t} \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{\tau_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k)} u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k) x) \\ = e^{C_9 \delta N t} \psi_{N, 2^{d-1}\delta, D(h)}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k) x),$$

where $C_9 := d2^d \log C_5$. Combining (3.23), (3.27), and (3.28), we obtain

$$\int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \psi_{2N, \delta, D(h)}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi}) x) d\boldsymbol{\xi} \leq \sum_{k=1}^M \sum_{\tau_1 \in \mathcal{E}_{N, 2\delta, 1}} \dots \sum_{\tau_{d-1} \in \mathcal{E}_{N, 2\delta, d-1}} e^{-(2d+4\delta)(d-1)Nt} \\ \times E_{4, \lambda} (8C_5)^{d(d-1)N} e^{-\{d(d-1)\lambda^2 - C_{10}^\delta\}Nt} \kappa(x)^6 \psi_{N, 2^{d-1}\delta, D(h)}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k) x),$$

where $C_{10} := 13d(d-1)C_6 + C_9$. Since $\#\mathcal{E}_{N, 2\delta, i} \leq \#\mathcal{D}_{dN} \leq (dN)^{d-1}$ for all i , we have

$$(3.29) \quad \#(\mathcal{E}_{N, 2\delta, 1} \times \dots \times \mathcal{E}_{N, 2\delta, d-1}) \leq (dN)^{(d-1)^2}.$$

It follows that

$$(3.30) \quad \int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \psi_{2N, \delta, h}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi}) x) d\boldsymbol{\xi} \leq E_{4, \lambda} \epsilon_{\lambda, t}^{-(d-1)^2} (dN)^{(d-1)^2} (8C_5)^{d(d-1)N} e^{-\{d(d-1)\lambda^2 - C_{10}^\delta\}Nt} \\ \times e^{-(2d+4\delta)(d-1)Nt} \kappa(x)^6 \sum_{k=1}^M F(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k).$$

On the other hand, by (2) of Lemma 3.2 we have

$$(3.31) \quad \sum_{k=1}^M F(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k) \leq E_{2, \lambda}^{d-1} e^{\{2d(d-1) + 5d^2\delta\}Nt} \kappa(x)^2 \int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \psi_{N, 2^{d-1}\delta, h}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi}) x) d\boldsymbol{\xi}.$$

Therefore, combining (3.30) and (3.31), we obtain the desired inequality for

$$E_{3,\lambda} := E_{2,\lambda}^{d-1} d^{(d-1)^2} E_{4,\lambda}, \quad C_8 := C_{10} + 5d^2 - 4(d-1).$$

□

4. HAUSDORFF DIMENSION OF DIVERGENT ON AVERAGE TRAJECTORIES

The goal of this section is to prove Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.4.

4.1. Upper bound. We shall prove Theorem 1.3 by employing the higher rank height functions we developed in the previous sections. For $x \in X'$ we denote

$$M_i(x) := \max \left\{ \sup_{\boldsymbol{\xi} \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \tilde{\alpha}_i(u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x), E_{1,\lambda} e^t \right\}$$

for $1 \leq i \leq d-1$ and $M(x) := \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} M_i(x)$. The upper bound of the Hausdorff dimension follows from the following proposition which will be proved via applying Proposition 3.4 repeatedly.

Proposition 4.1. *For any $l, N \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 < \delta < 2^{-(d-1)l}$, $h > D^{(l)}(E_{1,\lambda} e^t)$ and $x \in X'$, we have*

$$\int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \psi_{2^l N, \delta, h}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x) d\boldsymbol{\xi} \leq E_{1,\lambda} (2E_{3,\lambda})^{d^2 l^2} N^{d^2 l} (8C_5)^{d(d-1)2^l N} \\ \times e^{-\{d(d-1)(2^l-1)\lambda^2 - (C_8 2^{dl} \delta + C_{11})\} Nt} M(x).$$

To show Proposition 4.1 we will also need the following estimate.

Lemma 4.2. *(Trivial bound) For any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 < \delta < 1$, $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_{t,\lambda}$, $h \geq 1$, and $x \in X'$ we have*

$$(4.1) \quad \int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \psi_{N, \delta, h}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x) d\boldsymbol{\xi} \leq E_{1,\lambda} e^{C_{11} Nt} M(x)$$

for some constant $C_{11} > 0$.

Proof. For any $\boldsymbol{\tau} \in \mathcal{D}_N$ and $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}$, we have $a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} \in B^A(\text{id}, 2dNt)$. It follows from (2.8) that

$$\alpha'_i(a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x) \leq C_4^{2dNt} \alpha'_i(u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x)$$

for any $1 \leq i \leq d-1$. Since $\kappa_i(a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x) \leq e^{2dNt}$, we have

$$\tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x) \leq \max \left\{ E_{1,\lambda} e^t \kappa_i(a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x), \alpha'_i(a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x) \right\} \\ \leq \max \left\{ E_{1,\lambda} e^{(2dN+1)t}, C_4^{2dNt} M_i(x) \right\} \leq E_{1,\lambda} (\max \{e^2, C_4\})^{2dNt} M_i(x)$$

for any $1 \leq i \leq d-1$. By definition of $\psi_{N, \delta, h}$ we clearly have a trivial estimate

$$\psi_{N, \delta, h}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x) \leq (\max \{e, C_4\})^{2d(d-1)Nt} M(x)$$

for any $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}$, hence

$$\int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \psi_{N, \delta, h}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x) d\boldsymbol{\xi} \leq E_{1,\lambda} e^{C_{11} Nt} M(x),$$

where $C_{11} := 2d(d-1) \max \{2, \log C_4\}$. □

Proof of Proposition 4.1. For the sake of simplicity let us write

$$\mathbf{Q}_j := \int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \psi_{2^{l-j}N, 2^{(d-1)j}\delta, D^{(l-j)}(\mathbf{h})}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x) d\boldsymbol{\xi},$$

where $0 \leq j \leq l$. We apply Proposition 3.4 with $2^{l-j-1}N \in \mathbb{N}$, $2^{(d-1)j}\delta$, and $D^{(l-j-1)}(\mathbf{h})$, where $0 \leq j \leq l-1$. Then we have

$$(4.2) \quad \mathbf{Q}_j \leq E_{3,\lambda}(2^{l-j-1}N)^{d^2} (8C_5)^{d(d-1)2^{l-j-1}N} e^{-\{d(d-1)\lambda^2 - C_8 2^{(d-1)j}\delta\}2^{l-j-1}Nt} \mathbf{Q}_{j+1}$$

for any $0 \leq j \leq l-1$. By Lemma 4.2 we also have

$$(4.3) \quad \mathbf{Q}_l \leq E_{1,\lambda} e^{C_{11}Nt} \mathbf{M}(x).$$

Multiplying all the inequalities (4.2) for $0 \leq j \leq l-1$ and (4.3), we get

$$\mathbf{Q}_0 \leq E_{1,\lambda} (2E_{3,\lambda})^{d^2 l^2} N^{d^2 l} (8C_5)^{d(d-1)2^l N} e^{-\{d(d-1)(2^l-1)\lambda^2 - (C_8 2^{dl}\delta + C_{11})\}Nt} \mathbf{M}(x).$$

□

Proof of Theorem 1.3. For $x \in X'$ we denote by Z_x the set of all $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}$ such that $u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x$ is A^+ -divergent on average. We first consider $0 < \lambda < 1$, $t = t_\lambda$, and $l \in \mathbb{N}$ as fixed. For $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 < \delta < 2^{-(d-1)l}$, $0 < \epsilon < 2^{-4l}\epsilon_{\lambda,t}$ and a compact set $K \subset X$ we denote by $Z_x(N, \delta, K)$ the set

$$\left\{ \boldsymbol{\xi} \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1} : \frac{1}{\#\mathcal{D}_N} |\{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_N : a_\tau u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x \notin K\}| \geq 1 - \frac{\delta^d}{4C_7} \right\}.$$

We claim that

$$(4.4) \quad Z_x \subset \bigcup_{N_0 \geq 1} \bigcap_{N \geq N_0} Z_x(N, \delta, K)$$

for any δ and K . To see this, suppose that $\boldsymbol{\xi} \notin \bigcup_{N_0 \geq 1} \bigcap_{N \geq N_0} Z_x(N, \delta, K)$. Then we have

$$(4.5) \quad \frac{1}{\#\mathcal{D}_N} |\{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_N : a_\tau u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x \notin K\}| < 1 - \frac{\delta^d}{4C_7}$$

for infinitely many N . It follows that

$$(4.6) \quad \frac{1}{(dN)^{d-1}} |\{\tau \in \{t, 2t, \dots, dNt\}^{d-1} : a_\tau u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x \notin K\}| < 1 - \frac{\delta^d}{4d^{d-1}C_7}$$

for infinitely many N since $\{t, 2t, \dots, Nt\}^{d-1} \subseteq \mathcal{D}_N \subseteq \{t, 2t, \dots, dNt\}^{d-1}$. We can find a compact set $\tilde{K} \subset X$ such that $a_\tau y \subset \tilde{K}$ for any $\tau \in [-t, t]^{d-1}$ and $y \in K$. Then (4.6) implies that

$$(4.7) \quad \frac{1}{(dNt)^{d-1}} |\{\tau \in \{1, 2, \dots, dNt\}^{d-1} : a_\tau u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x \notin \tilde{K}\}| < 1 - \frac{\delta^d}{4d^{d-1}C_7}$$

for infinitely many N , hence $u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x$ is not A^+ -divergent on average. This proves the claim.

For $\mathbf{h} > D^{(l)}(E_{1,\lambda}e^t)$, let

$$K_{\mathbf{h}} = \left\{ x \in X : \max_{1 \leq i \leq d-1} \tilde{\alpha}_i(x) \leq \mathbf{h} \right\}.$$

Since $\tilde{\alpha}_i$'s are proper, K_h is compact. Let $N' = 2^l N$. By Lemma 2.6 we have $B(\xi, e^{-2dN't}) \subset K_h$ for any $\xi \in K_{D(h)}$. Thus, if $\xi \in Z_x(N', \delta, K_{D(h)})$ then for any $\xi' \in B(\xi, e^{-2dN't})$ we have $\xi' \in Z_x(N', \delta, K_h)$, hence

$$\frac{\#\Omega(N', h, u(\xi')x)}{\#\mathcal{D}_{N'}} = \frac{|\{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_{N'} : a_\tau u(\xi')x \notin K_h\}|}{\#\mathcal{D}_{N'}} \geq 1 - \frac{\delta^d}{4C_7}.$$

It follows that

$$(4.8) \quad \psi_{N', \delta, h}(u(\xi')x) = \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \min_{\tau \in \mathcal{E}_{N', \delta, i} \cap \Omega(N', h, x)} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_\tau u(\xi')x) \geq h^{d-1}.$$

Let $\{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_M(N)\}$ be a maximal $e^{-2dN't}$ -separated subset of $Z_x(N', \delta, K_{D(h)})$. Then $Z_x(N', \delta, K_{D(h)})$ is covered with $M = M(N', \delta, K_{D(h)})$ balls of length $e^{-2dN't}$. By (4.8) we have $\psi_{N', \delta, \epsilon, h}(u(\xi')x) \geq h^{d-1}$ for any $1 \leq k \leq M$ and $\xi' \in B(\xi_k, \frac{1}{2}e^{-2dN't})$. Note that the balls $B(\xi_k, \frac{1}{2}e^{-2dN't})$ are disjoint since ξ_k 's are $e^{-2dN't}$ -separated. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \psi_{N', \delta, h}(u(\xi)x) d\xi &\geq \sum_{k=1}^M \int_{B(\xi_k, \frac{1}{2}e^{-2dN't})} \psi_{N', \delta, h}(u(\xi)x) d\xi \\ &\geq M \left(\frac{h}{2}\right)^{d-1} e^{-2d(d-1)N't}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, using Proposition 4.1 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} M(N', \delta, K_{D(h)}) &\leq (2E_{3, \lambda})^{d^2 l^2} M(x) N^{d^2 l} (8C_5)^{d(d-1)2^l N} \\ &\quad \times e^{\{d(d-1)(2^{l+1} - 2^l \lambda^2 + \lambda^2) + (C_8 2^{dl} \delta + C_{11})\} Nt}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the constants $C_5, E_{3, \lambda}$ and $M(\lambda)$ are independent of N, l , and δ while they might depend on t and λ . Therefore, for any $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, $l \in \mathbb{N}$, and $0 < \delta < 2^{-(d-1)l}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \dim_H \left(\bigcap_{N \geq N_0} Z_x(2^l N, \delta, K_{D(h)}) \right) &\leq \overline{\dim}_{\text{box}} \left(\bigcap_{N \geq N_0} Z_x(2^l N, \delta, K_{D(h)}) \right) \\ &\leq \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log M(N', \delta, K_{D(h)})}{-\log(e^{-2dN't})} \\ &\leq \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{d^2 l \log N + d(d-1)2^l N \log(8C_5)}{2^{l+1} d N t} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{\{d(d-1)(2^{l+1} - 2^l \lambda^2 + \lambda^2) + (C_8 2^{dl} \delta + C_{11})\} N t}{2^{l+1} d N t} \right) \\ &= \frac{(d-1) \log(8C_5)}{2t} + \frac{(d-1)(2^{l+1} - 2^l \lambda^2 + \lambda^2)}{2^{l+1}} + \frac{C_8 2^{dl} \delta + C_{11}}{2^{l+1} d}. \end{aligned}$$

Using (4.4) and taking $\delta \rightarrow 0$, $l \rightarrow \infty$ we have

$$\dim_H Z_x \leq \frac{(d-1) \log(8C_5)}{2t} + \frac{(d-1)(2 - \lambda^2)}{2}.$$

Since this estimate holds for any $0 < \lambda < 1$ and $t = t_\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ as $\lambda \rightarrow 1$, we finally obtain

$$\dim_H Z_x \leq \frac{d-1}{2}.$$

□

4.2. Lower bound. In this subsection we prove Theorem 1.4, which directly implies that

$$\dim_H \{x \in U\Gamma : x \text{ is } A^+\text{-divergent on average}\} \geq 1.$$

Recall that $u(\boldsymbol{\xi})\Gamma$ is g_t -divergent (divergent on average) if and only if $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ is singular (singular on average). We may define the analogous notion of singular (singular on average) vector for higher rank actions, and make use of this to show Theorem 1.4.

Definition 4.3. Let $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$.

- (1) We say that $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ is *multiplicatively singular* if for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $T(\epsilon) > 0$ such that for any $n_1, \dots, n_{d-1} \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n_1 + \dots + n_{d-1} > T(\epsilon)$ there exists $q \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$(4.9) \quad \|q\xi_i\|_{\mathbb{Z}} \leq \epsilon e^{-n_i} \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq d-1 \text{ and } 0 < q < \epsilon e^{\sum n_i}.$$

- (2) We say that $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ is *multiplicatively singular on average* if

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^{d-1}} \left| \left\{ (n_1, \dots, n_{d-1}) \in \{1, \dots, N\}^{d-1} : \exists q \in \mathbb{Z}^{d-1} \text{ s.t. (4.9) holds} \right\} \right| = 1$$

for any $\epsilon > 0$.

The following lemma is a version of Dani's correspondence between divergent on average trajectories for higher rank actions and multiplicatively singular on average vectors.

Lemma 4.4. For any $\boldsymbol{\xi} = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{d-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$, $u(\boldsymbol{\xi})\Gamma$ is A^+ -divergent on average if and only if $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ is multiplicatively singular on average.

Proof. Suppose that $u(\boldsymbol{\xi})\Gamma$ is A^+ -divergent on average. Then for any $\epsilon > 0$ we have

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^{d-1}} \# \left\{ \boldsymbol{\tau} \in \{1, \dots, N\}^{d-1} : a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} u(\boldsymbol{\xi})\Gamma \notin K_{\epsilon} \right\} = 1.$$

For $\boldsymbol{\tau} = (n_1, \dots, n_{d-1})$ the condition $a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} u(\boldsymbol{\xi})\Gamma \notin K_{\epsilon}$ implies that there exists a vector $(m_1, \dots, m_{d-1}, q) \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}$ such that

$$v_{(m_1, \dots, m_{d-1}, q)} = \begin{pmatrix} e^{n_1}(m_1 + q\xi_1) \\ \vdots \\ e^{n_{d-1}}(m_{d-1} + q\xi_{d-1}) \\ e^{-(n_1 + \dots + n_{d-1})}q \end{pmatrix}$$

satisfies $\|v_{(m_1, \dots, m_{d-1}, q)}\| < \epsilon$, hence also implies the condition (4.9) for $\boldsymbol{\tau} = (n_1, \dots, n_{d-1})$. Thus $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ is multiplicatively singular on average. The proof of the converse direction is similar. □

Proof of Theorem 1.4. If $\dim \text{span}_{\mathbb{Q}}(1, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_{d-1}) \leq 2$, then there exists $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for any $1 \leq i \leq d-1$ there exist $a_i, b_i \in \mathbb{Q}$ satisfying $\xi_i = a_i\xi + b_i$. Let D be the l.c.m of $a_1, \dots, a_{d-1}, b_1, \dots, b_{d-1}$ and write $a_i = \frac{a'_i}{D}$ and $b_i = \frac{b'_i}{D}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d-1$.

We claim that for any $\epsilon > 0$ if (n_1, \dots, n_{d-1}) satisfies

$$(4.10) \quad \max_{1 \leq i \leq d-1} n_i \leq \sum_{1 \leq i \leq d-1} n_i - \log \left(\frac{1}{2\epsilon^2} \max_{1 \leq i \leq d-1} Da'_i \right),$$

then (n_1, \dots, n_{d-1}) also satisfies (4.9). To see this, let $T = \sum_i n_i$ and $Q = \lfloor \frac{\epsilon e^T}{D} \rfloor$. By Dirichlet's theorem, there exists $1 \leq q \leq Q$ such that $\|q\xi\|_{\mathbb{Z}} \leq \frac{1}{Q}$. It follows that for any $1 \leq i \leq d-1$ we have $\|(Dq)\xi_i\|_{\mathbb{Z}} \leq \frac{a'_i}{Q}$. Assuming (4.10) for (n_1, \dots, n_{d-1}) , we have

$$\|(Dq)\xi_i\|_{\mathbb{Z}} \leq \frac{a'_i}{Q} \leq \frac{\max_{1 \leq i \leq d-1} Da'_i}{\epsilon e^{T+1}} \leq \epsilon e^{-n_i}$$

for any i . Then (4.9) holds for (n_1, \dots, n_{d-1}) since $Dq \leq DQ \leq \epsilon e^T$. Hence the claim is proved.

For any $\epsilon > 0$, the density of the set of $(n_1, \dots, n_{d-1}) \in \mathbb{N}^{d-1}$ satisfying (4.10) is 1. By Lemma 4.4 and the above claim, $u(\xi)\Gamma$ is A^+ -divergent on average. \square

5. DYNAMICAL HEIGHT FUNCTIONS OF GIVEN TRAJECTORY

5.1. Injectivity radius. For $x \in X$ we denote by $\text{inj}(x)$ the maximal injectivity radius at $x \in X$, which is the supremum of $r > 0$ such that the map $g \mapsto gx$ is injective on the ball $B^G(\text{id}, r)$. By [KM12, Proposition 3.5] there exists a constant $C_{12} > 1$ such that the following holds: for any $x \in X$ there exists a nonzero x -integral vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\|v\| < C_{12} \text{inj}(x)^{\frac{1}{d}}$.

Let $0 < \lambda < 1$ be given, let $\tilde{\alpha}_i := \tilde{\alpha}_{i,\lambda,t_\lambda}$'s be as in (2.10).

Lemma 5.1. *For any $1 \leq i \leq d-1$ and $x \in X'$ with $\text{inj}(x) \leq C_{12}^{-d} \epsilon_{\lambda,t_\lambda}^{d(d-1)}$,*

$$\tilde{\alpha}_i(x) > C_{12}^{-1} \epsilon_{\lambda,t_\lambda}^{d-1} \text{inj}(x)^{-\frac{\lambda}{d}}.$$

Proof. If $\text{inj}(x) \leq C_{12}^{-d} \epsilon_{\lambda,t_\lambda}^{d(d-1)}$, there exists an x -integral vector v such that $\|v\| < C_{12} \text{inj}(x)^{\frac{1}{d}} \leq \epsilon_{\lambda,t_\lambda}^{d-1}$, hence $\|\pi_{i,1,0}(v)\| \leq \|v\| < \epsilon_{\lambda,t_\lambda}^{d-1}$. It follows that

$$\varphi_{i,1,\epsilon_{\lambda,t_\lambda}}(v) = \epsilon_{\lambda,t_\lambda}^{d-1} \|\pi_{i,1,1}(v)\|^{-\lambda} \geq \epsilon_{\lambda,t_\lambda}^{d-1} \|v\|^{-\lambda} > C_{12}^{-1} \epsilon_{\lambda,t_\lambda}^{d-1} \text{inj}(x)^{-\frac{\lambda}{d}}.$$

By definition of $\alpha_{i,\lambda,t_0} = \alpha_{i,\epsilon_{\lambda,t_\lambda}}$ we have

$$\alpha_{i,\lambda,t_0}(x) \geq \varphi_{i,1,\epsilon_{\lambda,t_\lambda}}(v) > C_{12}^{-1} \epsilon_{\lambda,t_\lambda}^{d-1} \text{inj}(x)^{-\frac{\lambda}{d}}.$$

On the other hand, the **Claim** in the proof of Proposition 2.3 implies

$$\alpha'_{i,\lambda}(x) \geq \|v\|^{-\lambda} > C_{12}^{-1} \text{inj}(x)^{-\frac{\lambda}{d}}.$$

Since $\tilde{\alpha}_i(x) \geq \min\{\alpha_{i,\lambda,t_0}(x), \alpha'_{i,\lambda}(x)\}$, we obtain $\tilde{\alpha}_i(x) > C_{12}^{-1} \epsilon_{\lambda,t_\lambda}^{d-1} \text{inj}(x)^{-\frac{\lambda}{d}}$. \square

5.2. Dynamical height function of given trajectory. This subsection aims to construct dynamical height functions of a given trajectory for rank one diagonal actions and establish the contraction hypotheses of the height functions.

Given $0 < \lambda < 1$ let us choose and fix $l_\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $1 - 2^{-l_\lambda+1} > \lambda$. For $t \in t_\lambda \mathbb{N}$ we write

$$\mathbf{h}_\lambda(t) := D^{(l_\lambda)}(E_{1,\lambda}(3C_5)^t).$$

Denote by Q the parabolic subgroup

$$\left\{ \begin{pmatrix} g' & 0 \\ v & \tau \end{pmatrix} \in G : g' \in \text{GL}_{d-1}(\mathbb{R}), v \in \mathbb{R}^{d-2}, \tau \in \mathbb{R} \right\}$$

of G , and for $t \in t_\lambda \mathbb{N}$ and $0 < \eta \leq 1$ define boxes

$$(5.1) \quad \mathbf{B}_{t,\eta} := B^U(\text{id}, \eta e^{-2t}) B^Q(\text{id}, \eta e^{-\frac{t}{2}}), \quad \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_{t,\eta} := B^U(\text{id}, \eta e^{-\frac{t}{2}}) B^Q(\text{id}, \eta e^{-\frac{t}{2}}).$$

Observe that the boxes $\mathbf{B}_{t,\eta}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_{t,\eta}$ are open sets in G and satisfy the following property: for any $1 \leq i \leq d-1$ and $g_1, g_2 \in G$, the set $\{s \in \mathbb{R} : u_i(s)g_1 \in \mathbf{B}_{t,\eta}g_2\}$ is either the empty set or an interval of length ηe^{-2t} , and similarly, the set $\{s \in \mathbb{R} : u_i(s)g_1 \in \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_{t,\eta}g_2\}$ is either the empty set or an interval of length $\eta e^{-\frac{t}{2}}$. Note that it also implies the analogous property for $x_1, x_2 \in X$ with $\text{inj}(x_1), \text{inj}(x_2) > \eta e^{-\frac{t}{2}}$ in the place of $g_1, g_2 \in G$.

For $1 \leq i \leq d-1$, $t \in t_\lambda \mathbb{N}$, and $y \in X$ let us consider the following three sets:

$$J_{i,t,\text{low}}(y) := \left\{ j \in \mathbb{N} : \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{jte_i}y) \leq e^{\frac{t}{3d}} \right\},$$

$$J_{i,t,\text{mid}}(y) := \left\{ j \in \mathbb{N} : e^{\frac{t}{3d}} < \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{jte_i}y) \leq \mathbf{h}_\lambda(t) \right\},$$

$$J_{i,t,\text{high}}(y) := \left\{ j \in \mathbb{N} : \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{jte_i}y) > \mathbf{h}_\lambda(t) \right\}.$$

For $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 < \eta \leq 1$, and $0 \leq l \leq l_\lambda$ we denote by $\Upsilon_{N,i,t,\eta,l}(y) \subseteq X$ the set of $x \in X$ such that

$$a_{jte_i}x \in \mathbf{B}_{t,\eta}a_{jte_i}y \text{ for all } j \in J_{i,t,\text{low}}(y) \cap \{1, \dots, N\},$$

$$\tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{jte_i}x) > D^{(l)}(E_{1,\lambda}(3C_5)^t) \text{ for all } j \in J_{i,t,\text{high}}(y) \cap \{1, \dots, N\}.$$

We now define a proper lower semi-continuous function $\beta'_{N,i,t,l}(\cdot; y) : X' \rightarrow [1, \infty)$ by

$$\beta'_{N,i,t,l}(x; y) = \begin{cases} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{Nte_i}x) & \text{if } x \in \Upsilon_{N,i,t,l}(y), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The following proposition is the contraction hypothesis for $\beta'_{N,i,t,l}$.

Proposition 5.2. *For any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $1 \leq i \leq d-1$, $t \in t_\lambda \mathbb{N}$, $0 \leq l \leq l_\lambda$, $y \in X$ and $x \in X'$,*

$$(5.2) \quad \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \beta'_{N,i,t,l}(u_i(s)x; y) ds \leq 2C_5 E_{1,\lambda} e^t (3C_5 E_{1,\lambda})^{|\{1, \dots, N\} \cap J_{i,t,\text{mid}}(y)|t} e^{-\lambda^2 N t} \tilde{\alpha}_i(x).$$

Proof. We may assume $l = 0$. It suffices to prove the following claim:

Claim. The support of the map $s \mapsto \beta'_{N,i,t,l}(u_i(s)x; y)$ is covered by M_N intervals $I_{N,1}, \dots, I_{N,M_N}$, where

$$I_{N,k} = [s_{N,k} - \frac{1}{2}e^{-2(N+\varpi(N))t}, s_{N,k} + \frac{1}{2}e^{-2(N+\varpi(N))t}]$$

with $\frac{1}{2}e^{-2(N+\varpi(N))t}$ -separated $s_{N,k} \in I$ for $1 \leq k \leq M_N$, such that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{M_N} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{Nte_i}u_i(s_{N,k})x) e^{-2(N+\varpi(N))t} \leq 2E_{1,\lambda} e^t (3C_5 E_{1,\lambda})^{|\{1, \dots, N\} \cap J_{i,t,\text{mid}}(y)|t} e^{-\lambda^2 N t} \tilde{\alpha}_i(x).$$

Here, $\varpi(N) = 0$ if $N \in J_{i,t,\text{mid}}(y) \cup J_{i,t,\text{high}}(y)$ and $\varpi(N) = 1$ if $N \in J_{i,t,\text{low}}(y)$.

Indeed, **Claim** directly implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \beta'_{N,i,t,l}(u_i(s)x; y) ds &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{M_N} \int_{I_{N,k}} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{Nte_i}u_i(s)x) ds \\ &\leq C_5 \sum_{k=1}^{M_N} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{Nte_i}u_i(s_{N,k})x) e^{-2(N+\varpi(N))t} \\ &\leq 2C_5 E_{1,\lambda} e^t (3C_5 E_{1,\lambda})^{|\{1, \dots, N\} \cap J_{i,t,\text{mid}}(y)|t} e^{-\lambda^2 N t} \tilde{\alpha}_i(x). \end{aligned}$$

From now on, we shall prove **Claim** by induction on N .

We first verify **Claim** for $N = 1$. We may choose intervals $I_{1,1}, \dots, I_{1,M_1}$ of length $e^{-2(1+\varpi(1))t}$ so that the centers of $I_{1,k}$'s are $\frac{1}{2}e^{-2(1+\varpi(1))t}$ -separated. Then at most 2 intervals can overlap, hence by (2.11) we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^{M_1} \int_{I_{1,k}} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{te_i} u_i(s)x) ds \leq 2 \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{te_i} u_i(s)x) ds \leq 2E_{1,\lambda} \tilde{\alpha}_i(x).$$

We now suppose that **Claim** holds for N and prove **Claim** for $N + 1$. The support of the map $s \mapsto \beta'_{N+1,i,t}(u_i(s)x; y)$ is contained in $\bigcup_{k=1}^{M_N} I_{N,k}$. For each $1 \leq k \leq M_N$, by (2.11) we have

$$(5.3) \quad \int_{I_{N,k}} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{(N+1)te_i} u_i(s)x) ds \leq E_{1,\lambda} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{Nte_i} u_i(s_{N,k})x).$$

Moreover, if $\tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{Nte_i} u_i(s_{N,k})x) \geq E_{1,\lambda} e^t$, then by (2.12)

$$(5.4) \quad \int_{I_{N,k}} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{(N+1)te_i} u_i(s)x) ds \leq 2e^{-\lambda^2 t} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{Nte_i} u_i(s_{N,k})x).$$

Case 1. $N + 1 \in J_{i,t,\text{low}}(y)$.

In this case N is either in $J_{i,t,\text{low}}(y)$ or $J_{i,t,\text{mid}}(y)$. Indeed, $N + 1 \in J_{i,t,\text{low}}(y)$ implies that

$$\tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{Nte_i} y) \leq C_5^t \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{(N+1)te_i} y) \leq C_5^t e^{\frac{t}{3d}} \leq E_{1,\lambda} (3C_5)^t,$$

hence $N \in J_{i,t,\text{low}}(y) \cup J_{i,t,\text{mid}}(y)$. Let us denote by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T} &:= \left\{ s \in \left[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right] : a_{(N+1)te_i} u_i(s)x \in \mathbf{B}_t a_{(N+1)te_i} y \right\}, \\ \tilde{\mathcal{T}} &:= \left\{ s \in \left[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right] : a_{(N+1)te_i} u_i(s)x \in \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_{t,\epsilon} a_{(N+1)te_i} y \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that \mathcal{T} is a union of disjoint intervals of length $e^{-2t} \cdot e^{-2(N+1)t}$, and $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ is a union of disjoint intervals of length $e^{-\frac{t}{2}} \cdot e^{-2(N+1)t}$. Moreover, each subinterval of \mathcal{T} is contained in exactly one subinterval of $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$. It follows from (2.13) that for any $1 \leq k \leq M_N$

$$(5.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{I_{N,k} \cap \mathcal{T}} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{(N+1)te_i} u_i(s)x) ds &\leq C_5 e^{-\frac{3t}{2}} \int_{I_{N,k} \cap \mathcal{T}'} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{(N+1)te_i} u_i(s)x) ds \\ &\leq C_5 e^{-\frac{3t}{2}} \int_{I_{N,k}} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{(N+1)te_i} u_i(s)x) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Subcase 1-1. $N \in J_{i,t,\text{low}}(y)$.

In this subcase $I_{k,N}$ is an interval of length $e^{-2(N+\varpi(N))t} = e^{-2(N+1)t}$. We first show that

$$(5.6) \quad \int_{I_{N,k} \cap \mathcal{T}} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{(N+1)te_i} u_i(s)x) ds \leq C_5^3 e^{-(\frac{3}{2} - \frac{1}{3d})t} |I_{N,k}|$$

for any $1 \leq k \leq M_N$. We may assume that $I_{N,k} \cap \mathcal{T} \neq \emptyset$. Then there exists $s'_{N,k} \in I_{N,k}$ such that

$$a_{(N+1)te_i} u_i(s'_{N,k})x \in \mathbf{B}_t a_{(N+1)te_i} y,$$

hence

$$\tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{(N+1)te_i} u_i(s)x) \leq C_5 \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{(N+1)te_i} y) \leq C_5 e^{\frac{t}{3d}}.$$

It follows that

$$\int_{I_{N,k}} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{(N+1)t\mathbf{e}_i} u_i(s)x) ds \leq C_5 \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{(N+1)t\mathbf{e}_i} u_i(s'_{N,k})x) |I_{N,k}| \leq C_5^2 e^{\frac{t}{3d}} |I_{N,k}|.$$

Thus, combining with (5.5) we get (5.6).

Note that each connected component of $I_{N,k} \cap \mathcal{T}$ is an interval of length at most $e^{-2(N+2)t} = e^{-2(N+1+\varpi(N+1))t}$. Let us define $I_{N+1,1}, \dots, I_{N+1,M_{N+1}}$ so that each $I_{N+1,l}$ for $1 \leq l \leq M_{N+1}$ is of length $e^{-2(N+2)t}$ and contains exactly one connected component of $\bigcup_{k=1}^{M_k} I_{N,k} \cap \mathcal{T}$. Then using (5.6) and the inductive hypothesis,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{l=1}^{M_{N+1}} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{(N+1)t\mathbf{e}_i} u_i(s_{N+1,l})x) e^{-2(N+2)t} &\leq C_5 \sum_{l=1}^{M_{N+1}} \int_{I_{N+1,l}} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{(N+1)t\mathbf{e}_i} u_i(s)x) ds \\ &\leq C_5 \sum_{k=1}^{M_N} \int_{I_{N,k} \cap \mathcal{T}} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{(N+1)t\mathbf{e}_i} u_i(s)x) ds \\ &\leq C_5^4 e^{-(\frac{3}{2}-\frac{1}{3d})t} \sum_{k=1}^{M_N} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i} u_i(s_k)x) e^{-2(N+1)t} \\ &\leq e^{-t} (3C_5 E_{1,\lambda})^{|\{1,\dots,N\} \cap J_{i,t,\text{mid}}(y)|} t e^{-\lambda^2 N t} \tilde{\alpha}_i(x) \\ &\leq (3C_5 E_{1,\lambda})^{|\{1,\dots,N+1\} \cap J_{i,t,\text{mid}}(y)|} t e^{-\lambda^2 (N+1)t} \tilde{\alpha}_i(x). \end{aligned}$$

Subcase 1-2. $N \in J_{i,t,\text{mid}}(y)$.

In this subcase $I_{k,N}$ is an interval of length $e^{-2(N+\varpi(N))t} = e^{-2Nt}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{I_{N,k}} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{(N+1)t\mathbf{e}_i} u_i(s)x) ds &= |I_{N,k}| \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{t\mathbf{e}_i} u_i(s) a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i} u_i(s_k)x) ds \\ &\leq E_{1,\lambda} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i} u_i(s_k)x) |I_{N,k}|. \end{aligned}$$

by (2.11). Combining with (5.5) we get

$$(5.7) \quad \int_{I_{N,k} \cap \mathcal{T}} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{(N+1)t\mathbf{e}_i} u_i(s)x) ds \leq C_5 E_{1,\lambda} e^{-\frac{3}{2}t} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i} u_i(s_k)x) |I_{N,k}|.$$

The rest of the argument is similar to **Subcase 1-1**. We define $I_{N+1,1}, \dots, I_{N+1,M_{N+1}}$ so that each $I_{N+1,l}$ for $1 \leq l \leq M_{N+1}$ is of length $e^{-2(N+2)t}$ and contains exactly one connected component of $\bigcup_{k=1}^{M_k} I_{N,k} \cap \mathcal{T}$. Then using (5.7) and the inductive hypothesis,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{l=1}^{M_{N+1}} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{(N+1)t\mathbf{e}_i} u_i(s_{N+1,l})x) e^{-2(N+2)t} &\leq C_5 \sum_{l=1}^{M_{N+1}} \int_{I_{N+1,l}} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{(N+1)t\mathbf{e}_i} u_i(s)x) ds \\ &\leq C_5 \sum_{k=1}^{M_N} \int_{I_{N,k} \cap \mathcal{T}} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{(N+1)t\mathbf{e}_i} u_i(s)x) ds \\ &\leq C_5^2 E_{1,\lambda} e^{-\frac{3}{2}t} \sum_{k=1}^{M_N} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i} u_i(s_k)x) e^{-2Nt} \\ &\leq e^{-t} C_5^{|\{1,\dots,N\} \cap J_{i,t,\text{mid}}(y)|} t e^{-\lambda^2 N t} \tilde{\alpha}_i(x) \leq C_5^{|\{1,\dots,N+1\} \cap J_{i,t,\text{mid}}(y)|} t e^{-\lambda^2 (N+1)t} \tilde{\alpha}_i(x). \end{aligned}$$

Case 2. $N + 1 \in J_{i,t,\text{mid}}(y)$.

Subcase 2-1. $N \in J_{i,t,\text{low}}(y)$.

In this subcase $I_{k,N}$ is an interval of length $e^{-2(N+\varpi(N))t} = e^{-2(N+1)t} = e^{-2(N+1+\varpi(N+1))t}$ for any $1 \leq k \leq M_N$. We set $M_{N+1} = M_N$ and define $I_{N+1,k} = I_{N,k}$ for $1 \leq k \leq M_N$. It follows from (2.13) and the inductive hypothesis that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^{M_{N+1}} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{(N+1)t\mathbf{e}_i} u_i(s_{N+1,k})x) e^{-2(N+1)t} &= \sum_{k=1}^{M_N} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{(N+1)t\mathbf{e}_i} u_i(s_{N,k})x) e^{-2(N+\varpi(N))t} \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{M_N} C_5^t \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i} u_i(s_{N,k})x) e^{-2(N+\varpi(N))t} \\ &\leq C_5^t (3C_5 E_{1,\lambda})^{|\{1,\dots,N\} \cap J_{i,t,\text{mid}}(y)|t} e^{-\lambda^2 N t} \tilde{\alpha}_i(x) \\ &\leq (3C_5)^{|\{1,\dots,N+1\} \cap J_{i,t,\text{mid}}(y)|t} e^{-\lambda^2 (N+1)t} \tilde{\alpha}_i(x). \end{aligned}$$

Subcase 2-2. $N \in J_{i,t,\text{mid}}(y) \cup J_{i,t,\text{high}}(y)$.

In this subcase $I_{N,k}$ is an interval of length $e^{-2(N+\varpi(N))t} = e^{-2Nt}$. We cover each $I_{N,k}$ by $\lceil e^{2t} \rceil$ disjoint intervals of length $e^{-2(N+1)t}$. We collect such intervals of length $e^{-2(N+1)t}$ over $1 \leq k \leq M_N$ and define $I_{N+1,1}, \dots, I_{N+1,M_{N+1}}$ by reordering them. Note that any point in $[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$ can be contained in at most 2 intervals among $I_{N,1}, \dots, I_{N,M_N}$, hence among $I_{N+1,1}, \dots, I_{N+1,M_{N+1}}$. It follows from (2.11) and the inductive hypothesis that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^{M_{N+1}} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{(N+1)t\mathbf{e}_i} u_i(s_{N+1,k})x) e^{-2(N+1)t} &\leq 2C_5 \sum_{k=1}^{M_N} \int_{I_{N,k}} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{(N+1)t\mathbf{e}_i} u_i(s)x) ds \\ &\leq 2C_5 e^{-2Nt} \sum_{k=1}^{M_N} \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{t\mathbf{e}_i} u_i(s) a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i} u_i(s_{N,k})x) ds \\ &\leq 2C_5 E_{1,\lambda} e^{-2Nt} \sum_{k=1}^{M_N} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i} u_i(s_{N,k})x) \\ &\leq 2C_5 E_{1,\lambda} (3C_5 E_{1,\lambda})^{|\{1,\dots,N\} \cap J_{i,t,\text{mid}}(y)|t} e^{-\lambda^2 N t} \tilde{\alpha}_i(x) \\ &\leq (3C_5 E_{1,\lambda})^{|\{1,\dots,N+1\} \cap J_{i,t,\text{mid}}(y)|t} e^{-\lambda^2 (N+1)t} \tilde{\alpha}_i(x). \end{aligned}$$

Case 3. $N + 1 \in J_{i,t,\text{high}}(y)$.

In this case we first observe that $\tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i} y) \geq C_5^{-t} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{(N+1)t\mathbf{e}_i} y) \geq C_5^2 E_{1,\lambda} e^t$ holds by (2.13). Hence $N \in J_{i,t,\text{mid}}(y) \cup J_{i,t,\text{high}}(y)$ and the length of $I_{k,N}$ is e^{-2Nt} for all $1 \leq k \leq M_N$.

As in **Subcase 2-2**, we cover each $I_{N,k}$ by $\lceil e^{2t} \rceil$ disjoint intervals of length $e^{-2(N+1)t}$. We collect such intervals of length $e^{-2(N+1)t}$ over $1 \leq k \leq M_N$ and define $I_{N+1,1}, \dots, I_{N+1,M_{N+1}}$ by reordering them.

We may assume that for each $1 \leq k \leq M_N$ there exists $s \in I_{N,k}$ such that

$$\tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i} u_i(s)x) \geq C_5^{-1} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i} u_i(s)y) \geq C_5 E_{1,\lambda} e^t,$$

whence $\tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i}u_i(s_{N,k})x) \geq E_{1,\lambda}e^t$ for all $1 \leq k \leq M_N$. It follows from (2.12) that for all $1 \leq k \leq M_N$

$$(5.8) \quad \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{t\mathbf{e}_i}u_i(s)a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i}u_i(s_{N,k})x)ds \leq 2e^{-\lambda^2 t} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i}u_i(s_{N,k})x).$$

We then deduce from (5.8) and the inductive hypothesis that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^{M_{N+1}} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{(N+1)t\mathbf{e}_i}u_i(s_{N+1,k})x)e^{-2(N+1)t} &\leq 2C_5 \sum_{k=1}^{M_N} \int_{I_{N,k}} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{(N+1)t\mathbf{e}_i}u_i(s)x)ds \\ &\leq 2C_5 e^{-2Nt} \sum_{k=1}^{M_N} \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{t\mathbf{e}_i}u_i(s)a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i}u_i(s_{N,k})x)ds \\ &\leq 2C_5 e^{-\lambda^2 t} e^{-2Nt} \sum_{k=1}^{M_N} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i}u_i(s_{N,k})x) \\ &\leq 2C_5 e^{-\lambda^2 t} (3C_5 E_{1,\lambda})^{|\{1,\dots,N\} \cap J_{i,t,\text{mid}}(y)|} e^{-\lambda^2 Nt} \tilde{\alpha}_i(x) \\ &\leq (3C_5 E_{1,\lambda})^{|\{1,\dots,N+1\} \cap J_{i,t,\text{mid}}(y)|} e^{-\lambda^2 (N+1)t} \tilde{\alpha}_i(x). \end{aligned}$$

□

The estimate in Proposition 5.2 is not yet sufficient for our purpose due to the additional factor $(3C_5 E_{1,\lambda})^{|\{1,\dots,N\} \cap J_{i,t,\text{mid}}(y)|} t$. Although it is not easy to control this additional factor for each t , we may overcome this issue by considering sufficiently many different time scales.

Let $m(\lambda) := \lfloor \frac{100 \log(3C_5 E_{1,\lambda})}{\lambda^2 - \lambda^3} \rfloor$. We can find a sequence $t_1, \dots, t_{m(\lambda)} \in t_\lambda \mathbb{N}$ so that $t_1 = t_\lambda$, $t_m | t_{m+1}$, and $e^{\frac{t_{m+1}}{10d}} > C_5^{t_m} E_{1,\lambda}(t_m)$ for all $1 \leq m \leq m(\lambda) - 1$.

Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $1 \leq i \leq d-1$, $0 < \eta \leq 1$, $0 \leq l \leq l_\lambda$, and $y \in X$. We now define a proper lower semi-continuous function $\tilde{\beta}_{N,i,\eta,l}(\cdot; y) : X' \rightarrow [1, \infty)$ as follows:

$$\tilde{\beta}_{N,i,\eta,l}(x; y) = \begin{cases} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{Nt_m \mathbf{e}_i} x) & \text{if } x \in \bigcap_{m=1}^{m(\lambda)} \Upsilon_{N^{\frac{t_m(\lambda)}{t_m}}, i, t_m, \eta, l}(y), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Note that we clearly have

$$\tilde{\beta}_{N,i,\eta,l}(x; y) \leq \beta'_{N^{\frac{t_m(\lambda)}{t_m}}, i, t_l, l}(x; y)$$

for any $1 \leq m \leq m(\lambda)$ and $x \in X'$. The following proposition establishes the contraction hypothesis for $\tilde{\beta}_{N,i,\eta,l}$.

Proposition 5.3. *For any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $1 \leq i \leq d-1$, $0 < \eta \leq 1$, $0 \leq l \leq l_\lambda$, $y \in X$ and $x \in X'$,*

$$(5.9) \quad \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{\beta}_{N,i,\eta,l}(u_i(s)x; y)ds \leq \tilde{h}_\lambda e^{-\lambda^3 N t_m(\lambda)} \tilde{\alpha}_i(x).$$

Proof. For $t \in t_\lambda \mathbb{N}$ and $1 \leq m \leq m(\lambda)$ let us first define

$$\tilde{J}_l(y) := \left\{ j \in \mathbb{N} : e^{\frac{t_m}{10d}} < \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{jt_\lambda \mathbf{e}_i} y) \leq C_5^{t_m} h_\lambda(t) \right\}.$$

Note that by the choice of t_m 's, the sets $\tilde{J}_1(y), \dots, \tilde{J}_{m(\lambda)}(y)$ are disjoint and satisfy that for all $1 \leq m \leq m(\lambda)$ and sufficiently large $N \in \mathbb{N}$

$$|\{1, \dots, N\} \cap \tilde{J}_l(y)| \geq \frac{t_\lambda}{100t_m} \left| \left\{ 1, \dots, N \frac{t_m}{t_\lambda} \right\} \cap J_{i,t_m,\text{mid}}(y) \right|.$$

Since $\tilde{J}_1(y), \dots, \tilde{J}_{m(\lambda)}(y)$ are disjoint, there exists m_0 such that for sufficiently large $N \in \mathbb{N}$

$$|\{1, \dots, N\} \cap \tilde{J}_{m_0}(y)| \leq \frac{N}{m(\lambda)},$$

whence $|\{1, \dots, N\} \cap J_{i,t_{m_0},\text{mid}}(y)| < \frac{100N}{m(\lambda)} < \frac{\lambda^2 - \lambda^3}{\log(3C_5 E_{1,\lambda})} N$. Applying Proposition 5.2 with $t = t_{m_0}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \beta'_{N,i,t_{m_0},l}(u_i(s)x; y) ds &\leq 2C_5 E_{1,\lambda} e^{t_{m_0}} (3C_5 E_{1,\lambda})^{|\{1, \dots, N\} \cap J_{i,t_{m_0},\text{mid}}(y)| t_{m_0}} e^{-\lambda^2 N t_{m_0}} \tilde{\alpha}_i(x) \\ &\leq \tilde{h}_\lambda e^{(\lambda^2 - \lambda^3) N t_{m_0}} e^{-\lambda^2 N t_{m_0}} \tilde{\alpha}_i(x) \\ &\leq \tilde{h}_\lambda e^{-\lambda^3 N t_{m_0}} \tilde{\alpha}_i(x). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we obtain

$$\int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{\beta}_{N,i,\eta,l}(u_i(s)x; y) ds \leq \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \beta'_{N \frac{t_m(\lambda)}{t_{m_0}}, i, t_{m_0}, l}(u_i(s)x; y) ds \leq \tilde{h}_\lambda e^{-\lambda^3 N t_{m(\lambda)}} \tilde{\alpha}_i(x).$$

□

As we did for $\beta_{dN,\delta,i,h}$ in Lemma 3.3, we approximate $\tilde{\beta}_{N,i,\eta,l}$ on certain expanding translates of horospherical orbits by characteristic functions on the union of certain boxes. For $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 < \eta \leq 1$ and $1 \leq i \leq d-1$, we denote by $\mathbf{B}_{N,i,\eta} \subset \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ the box centered at 0 with side-length $2\eta e^{-2(N+1)t}$ along the direction of \mathbf{e}_i , and side-lengths $2\eta e^{-2t}$ along the other $d-2$ directions. We also write $t = t_{m(\lambda)}$ for simplicity.

Lemma 5.4. *Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 < \eta \leq 1$, $1 \leq l \leq l_\lambda - 1$, $y \in X$, and $x \in X'$. For each $1 \leq i \leq d-1$ let us define $f_i : [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $f_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = \tilde{\beta}_{N,i,\eta,l}(a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i} u(e^{-2Nt}\boldsymbol{\xi})x; y)$. Then there exist $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,1}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,M_i} \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}$ such that the followings holds.*

- (1) $0 \leq f_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}) \leq E_{2,\lambda} \kappa_i(x)^2 \sum_{k=1}^{M_i} f_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k}) \mathbb{1}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k} + \mathbf{B}_{N,i,\eta}}(\boldsymbol{\xi})$ for any $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}$,
- (2) $\sum_{k=1}^{M_i} f_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k}) \leq E_{2,\lambda} \eta^{-(d-1)} e^{2(N+1)t} \kappa_i(x)^2 \int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \tilde{\beta}_{N,i,2\eta,l-1}(a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i} u(e^{-2Nt}\boldsymbol{\xi})x; y) d\boldsymbol{\xi}$.

Proof. Let $\{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,1}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,M_i}\}$ be a maximal $\mathbf{B}_{N,i,\eta}$ -set of $\text{Supp } f_i$, i.e. $\{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k}\}_{k=1}^{M_i}$ is a maximal set such that the boxes $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k} + \mathbf{B}_{N,i,\eta}$'s are disjoint. Then for any $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \text{Supp } f_i$, there exist $1 \leq k \leq M_i$ such that $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k} + \mathbf{B}_{N,i,\eta}$. Then for any $1 \leq m \leq m(\lambda)$ and $1 \leq j \leq \frac{t}{t_m} N$,

(5.10)

$$a_{j t_m \mathbf{e}_i} a_{N t \mathbf{e}_i} u(e^{-2dNt}(\boldsymbol{\xi} - \boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k})) a_{-N t \mathbf{e}_i} a_{-j t_m \mathbf{e}_i} \in a_{2N t \mathbf{e}_i} u(e^{-2Nt} \mathbf{B}_{N,i,\eta}) a_{-2N t \mathbf{e}_i} \subseteq B^U(\text{id}, \eta e^{-2t}).$$

We have $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k} \in \text{Supp } f_i$ for any $1 \leq i \leq d-1$ and $1 \leq k \leq M_i$. It follows that

$$a_{N t \mathbf{e}_i} u(e^{-2Nt} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k}) x \in \Upsilon_{\frac{t}{t_m} N, i, t_m, \eta, l}(y)$$

for all $1 \leq m \leq m(\lambda)$, i.e.

$$a_{jt_m \mathbf{e}_i} a_{Nt \mathbf{e}_i} u(e^{-2Nt} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k}) x \in \mathbf{B}_{t_m, \eta} a_{jt_m \mathbf{e}_i} y \text{ for all } j \in J_{i, t_m, \text{low}}(y) \cap \left\{1, \dots, \frac{t}{t_m} N\right\},$$

$$\tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{jt_m \mathbf{e}_i} a_{Nt \mathbf{e}_i} u(e^{-2Nt} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k}) x) > D^{(l)}((3C_5)^t E_{1, \lambda}) \text{ for all } j \in J_{i, t_m, \text{high}}(y) \cap \left\{1, \dots, \frac{t}{t_m} N\right\}.$$

Combining this with (5.10) and Lemma 2.6 we have

$$a_{jt_m \mathbf{e}_i} a_{Nt \mathbf{e}_i} u(e^{-2Nt} \boldsymbol{\xi}) x \in \mathbf{B}_{t_m, 2\eta} a_{jt_m \mathbf{e}_i} y \text{ for all } j \in J_{i, t_m, \text{low}}(y) \cap \left\{1, \dots, \frac{t}{t_m} N\right\},$$

$$\tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{jt_m \mathbf{e}_i} a_{Nt \mathbf{e}_i} u(e^{-2Nt} \boldsymbol{\xi}) x) > D^{(l-1)}((3C_5)^t E_{1, \lambda}) \text{ for all } j \in J_{i, t_m, \text{high}}(y) \cap \left\{1, \dots, \frac{t}{t_m} N\right\}$$

for all $1 \leq m \leq m(\lambda)$. Here, we are using $B^U(\text{id}, \eta e^{-2t}) \mathbf{B}_{t_m, \eta} \subseteq \mathbf{B}_{t_m, 2\eta}$ for $j \in J_{i, t_m, \text{low}}(y)$. It follows that

$$u(\boldsymbol{\xi}) x \in \bigcap_{l=1}^{m(\lambda)} \Upsilon_{N \frac{t}{t_m}, i, t_m, 2\eta, l-1}(y),$$

hence $f_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = \tilde{\beta}_{N, i, 2\eta, l-1}(a_{Nt \mathbf{e}_i} u(e^{-2Nt} \boldsymbol{\xi}) x; y) > 0$ for any $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k} + \mathbf{B}_{N, i, \eta}$. Moreover, using (2.13) and (2.14) we obtain

$$(5.11) \quad \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{Nt \mathbf{e}_i} u(e^{-2Nt} \boldsymbol{\xi}) x) \leq E_{2, \lambda} \kappa_i(x)^2 \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{Nt \mathbf{e}_i} u(e^{-2Nt} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k}) x),$$

$$(5.12) \quad \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{Nt \mathbf{e}_i} u(e^{-2Nt} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k}) x) \leq E_{2, \lambda} \kappa_i(x)^2 \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{Nt \mathbf{e}_i} u(e^{-2Nt} \boldsymbol{\xi}) x)$$

for any $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k} + \mathbf{B}_{N, i, \eta}$. Hence we get

$$(5.13) \quad \begin{aligned} f_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}) &= \tilde{\beta}_{N, i, \eta, l}(a_{Nt \mathbf{e}_i} u(e^{-2Nt} \boldsymbol{\xi}) x; y) \\ &= \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{Nt \mathbf{e}_i} u(e^{-2Nt} \boldsymbol{\xi}) x) \\ &= E_{2, \lambda} \kappa_i(x)^2 \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{Nt \mathbf{e}_i} u(e^{-2Nt} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k}) x) \\ &\leq E_{2, \lambda} \kappa_i(x)^2 f_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k}) \end{aligned}$$

for each $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k} + \mathbf{B}_{N, i, \eta}$, so (1) is proved.

We now verify (2). As in (5.13), we obtain from (5.12) that

$$f_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k}) = \tilde{\beta}_{N, i, \eta, l}(a_{Nt \mathbf{e}_i} u(e^{-2Nt} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k}) x) \leq E_{2, \lambda} \kappa_i(x)^2 \tilde{\beta}_{N, i, 2\eta, l-1}(a_{Nt \mathbf{e}_i} u(e^{-2Nt} \boldsymbol{\xi}) x)$$

for any $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k} + \mathbf{B}_{N, i, \eta}$. Note that the volume of $\mathbf{B}_{N, i, \eta}$ is $(2\eta)^{d-1} e^{-2(N+1)t}$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} (2\eta)^{d-1} e^{-2(N+1)t} \sum_{k=1}^{M_i} f_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k}) &= \sum_{k=1}^{M_i} \int_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k} + \mathbf{B}_{N, i, \eta}} f_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k}) d\boldsymbol{\xi} \\ &\leq E_{2, \lambda} \kappa_i(x)^2 \sum_{k=1}^{M_i} \int_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k} + \mathbf{B}_{N, i, \eta}} \tilde{\beta}_{N, i, 2\eta, l-1}(a_{Nt \mathbf{e}_i} u(e^{-2Nt} \boldsymbol{\xi}) x) d\boldsymbol{\xi} \\ &\leq 2^{d-1} E_{2, \lambda} \kappa_i(x)^2 \int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \tilde{\beta}_{N, i, 2\eta, l-1}(a_{Nt \mathbf{e}_i} u(e^{-2Nt} \boldsymbol{\xi}) x) d\boldsymbol{\xi}. \end{aligned}$$

In the last line, we are using a fact from the maximality that $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k} + \mathbf{B}_{N, i, \eta}$ can be overlapped at most 2^{d-1} times. It completes the proof. \square

5.3. Dynamical height function of given trajectory for higher rank actions. In this subsection, we construct dynamical height functions of a given trajectory for higher-rank actions and establish the contraction hypothesis, which is analogous to Proposition 4.1. We define $\tilde{\psi}_{N,\eta,l}(\cdot; y) : X \rightarrow [1, \infty]$ by

$$(5.14) \quad \tilde{\psi}_{N,\eta,l}(x; y) := \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \tilde{\beta}_{N,i,\eta,l}(x; y)$$

for $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 < \eta \leq 1$, $0 \leq l \leq l_\lambda$ and $y \in X$.

In the rest of this section, we show the following contraction hypothesis for $\tilde{\psi}_{N,\eta,l}$.

Proposition 5.5. *For any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 \leq l \leq l_\lambda$, $0 < \eta \leq 2^{-l}$, $y \in X$, and $x \in X'$ we have*

$$\int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \tilde{\psi}_{2^l N, \eta, l}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x; y) d\boldsymbol{\xi} \leq E_{2,\lambda}^{d-1} (E_{5,\lambda} \eta^{-d} \kappa(x)^8)^l e^{-\lambda^3 (d-1)(2^l-1)Nt_m(\lambda)} \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \tilde{\alpha}_i(x).$$

The proof of Proposition 5.5 is analogous to the procedure we carried out in §3 and §4.1 in order to show Proposition 4.1, but we include the proof for the completeness. We begin with the following approximation lemma, which is similar to Lemma 3.3.

Lemma 5.6. *For $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 < \eta \leq 1$, $1 \leq l \leq l_\lambda$, $y \in X$, and $x \in X'$, let us define $F : [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $F(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = \tilde{\psi}_{N,\eta,l}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x; y)$. Then there exist $\boldsymbol{\xi}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_M \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}$ such that*

$$(1) \quad 0 \leq F(\boldsymbol{\xi}) \leq E_{2,\lambda}^{d-1} \kappa(x)^2 \sum_{k=1}^M F(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k) \mathbb{1}_{B(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k, e^{-2Nt})}(\boldsymbol{\xi}) \text{ for any } \boldsymbol{\xi} \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1},$$

$$(2) \quad \sum_{k=1}^M F(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k) \leq E_{2,\lambda}^{d-1} \eta^{-2(d-1)} \kappa(x)^2 e^{2(d-1)Nt} \int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \tilde{\psi}_{N,2\eta,l-1}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x; y) d\boldsymbol{\xi}.$$

Proof. Let $\{\boldsymbol{\xi}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_M\} \subset [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}$ be a maximal $\eta e^{-2(N+1)t}$ -separated set of $\text{Supp } F$. For any $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \text{Supp } F$ there exists $1 \leq k \leq M_\eta$ such that $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in B(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k, \eta e^{-2(N+1)t})$. Then for any $1 \leq i \leq d-1$, $1 \leq m \leq m(\lambda)$, and $1 \leq j \leq \frac{t}{t_m} N$,

$$(5.15) \quad a_{j t_m \mathbf{e}_i} u(\boldsymbol{\xi} - \boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k}) a_{-j t_m \mathbf{e}_i} \in a_{N t \mathbf{e}_i} u(B(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k, \eta e^{-2(N+1)t})) a_{-N t \mathbf{e}_i} \subseteq B^U(\text{id}, \eta e^{-2t}).$$

We have $\boldsymbol{\xi}_k \in \text{Supp } F$ for any $1 \leq k \leq M_i$. It follows that

$$u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k)x \in \Upsilon_{\frac{t}{t_m} N, i, t_m, \eta, l}(y)$$

for all $1 \leq m \leq m(\lambda)$, i.e.

$$a_{j t_m \mathbf{e}_i} u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k) \in B_{t_m, \eta} a_{j t_m \mathbf{e}_i} y \text{ for all } j \in J_{i, t_m, \text{low}}(y) \cap \left\{1, \dots, \frac{t}{t_m} N\right\},$$

$$\tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{j t_m \mathbf{e}_i} u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k)x) > D^{(l)}((3C_5)^t E_{1,\lambda}) \text{ for all } j \in J_{i, t_m, \text{high}}(y) \cap \left\{1, \dots, \frac{t}{t_m} N\right\}.$$

Combining this with (5.15) and Lemma 2.6 we have

$$a_{j t_m \mathbf{e}_i} u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x \in B_{t_m, 2\eta} a_{j t_m \mathbf{e}_i} y \text{ for all } j \in J_{i, t_m, \text{low}}(y) \cap \left\{1, \dots, \frac{t}{t_m} N\right\},$$

$$\tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{j t_m \mathbf{e}_i} u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x) > D^{(l-1)}((3C_5)^t E_{1,\lambda}) \text{ for all } j \in J_{i, t_m, \text{high}}(y) \cap \left\{1, \dots, \frac{t}{t_m} N\right\}$$

for all $1 \leq i \leq d-1$ and $1 \leq m \leq m(\lambda)$. It follows that $u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x \in \Upsilon_{N\frac{t}{m}, i, t_m, 2\eta, l-1}(y)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d-1$ and $1 \leq m \leq m(\lambda)$, hence

$$F(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \tilde{\beta}_{N, i, 2\eta, l-1}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x; y) > 0$$

for any $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in B(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k, \eta e^{-2(N+1)t})$. Moreover, Using (2.13) and (2.14) we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i}u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x) &= \tilde{\alpha}_i((a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i}u(\boldsymbol{\xi} - \boldsymbol{\xi}_k)a_{-Nt\mathbf{e}_i})a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i}u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k)x) \\ &\leq C_5 \alpha_i((a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i}u(\pi_i^\perp(\boldsymbol{\xi} - \boldsymbol{\xi}_k))a_{-Nt\mathbf{e}_i})a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i}u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k)x) \\ (5.16) \quad &\leq C_5 \eta_{\lambda, t}^{-(d-1)} \kappa_i(a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i}u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k)x)^2 \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i}u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k)x) \\ &= E_{2, \lambda} \kappa_i(x)^2 \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i}u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k)x), \end{aligned}$$

and similarly, we also have

$$(5.17) \quad \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i}u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k)x) \geq E_{2, \lambda} \kappa_i(x)^2 \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i}u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x).$$

for all $1 \leq i \leq d-1$. Thus, for any $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in B(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k, \eta e^{-2(N+1)t})$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} F(\boldsymbol{\xi}) &= \tilde{\psi}_{N, \eta, l}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x) = \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i}u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x) \\ (5.18) \quad &\leq E_{2, \lambda}^{d-1} \kappa(x)^2 \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i}u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k)x) \\ &\leq E_{2, \lambda}^{d-1} \kappa(x)^2 \tilde{\psi}_{N, \eta, l}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k)x; y), \end{aligned}$$

so (1) is proved.

We now verify (2). As in (5.18), we obtain from (5.17) that

$$F(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k) = \tilde{\psi}_{N, 2\eta, l-1}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k)x; y) \leq E_{2, \lambda}^{d-1} \kappa(x)^2 \tilde{\psi}_{N, 2\eta, l-1}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x; y)$$

for any $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in B(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k, \eta e^{-2Nt})$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} (2\eta e^{-2Nt})^{d-1} \sum_{k=1}^M F(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k) &= \sum_{k=1}^M \int_{B(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k, \eta e^{-2Nt})} F(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k) d\boldsymbol{\xi} \\ &\leq E_{2, \lambda}^{d-1} \kappa(x)^2 \sum_{k=1}^M \int_{B(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k, \eta e^{-2Nt})} \tilde{\psi}_{N, 2\eta, l-1}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x; y) d\boldsymbol{\xi} \\ &\leq 2^{d-1} E_{2, \lambda}^{d-1} \kappa(x)^2 \int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \tilde{\psi}_{N, 2\eta, l-1}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x; y) d\boldsymbol{\xi}. \end{aligned}$$

In the last line, we are using a fact from the maximality that $B(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k, \eta e^{-2(N+1)t})$ can be overlapped at most 2^{d-1} times. It completes the proof. \square

The following proposition is parallel to Proposition 3.4.

Proposition 5.7. *For any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 < \eta \leq \frac{1}{2}$, $1 \leq l \leq l_\lambda$, $y \in X$, and $x \in X'$, we have*

$$\int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \tilde{\psi}_{2N, \eta, l}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x; y) d\boldsymbol{\xi} \leq E_{5, \lambda} \eta^{-(d-1)} e^{-\lambda^3(d-1)Nt} \kappa(x)^8 \int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \tilde{\psi}_{N, 2\eta, l-1}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x; y) d\boldsymbol{\xi}$$

for some constant $E_{5,\lambda} > 0$.

Proof. Let $F : [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the function defined by $F(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = \tilde{\psi}_{2N,\eta,l}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x; y)$, and $\{\boldsymbol{\xi}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_M\}$ be a maximal ηe^{-2Nt} -separated set of $\text{Supp } F$ as in Lemma 5.6. Note that

$$(5.19) \quad \text{Supp } F \subseteq \bigcup_{k=1}^M B(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k, \eta e^{-2Nt}).$$

We also observe that

$$\tilde{\psi}_{2N,\eta,l}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x; y) = \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \tilde{\beta}_{2N,i,\eta,l}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x; y) \leq \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \tilde{\beta}_{N,i,\eta,l}(a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i}u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x; a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i}y).$$

Hence, we have

$$(5.20) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \tilde{\psi}_{2N,\eta,l}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x; y) d\boldsymbol{\xi} \leq \sum_{k=1}^M \int_{B(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k, \eta e^{-2Nt})} \tilde{\psi}_{2N,\eta,l}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x; y) d\boldsymbol{\xi} \\ & \leq \sum_{k=1}^M \int_{B(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k, \eta e^{-2Nt})} \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \tilde{\beta}_{N,i,\eta,l}(a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i}u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x; a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i}y) d\boldsymbol{\xi} \\ & = \sum_{k=1}^M \int_{[-\eta, \eta]^{d-1}} \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \tilde{\beta}_{N,i,\eta,l}(a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i}u(e^{-2Nt}\boldsymbol{\xi})u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k)x; a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i}y) d\boldsymbol{\xi}. \end{aligned}$$

We now estimate the integral of the last line for each fixed $1 \leq k \leq M$. For each $1 \leq i \leq d-1$ let us define $f_i : [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$f_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = \tilde{\beta}_{N,i,\eta,l}(a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i}u(e^{-2Nt}\boldsymbol{\xi})u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k)x; a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i}y)$$

and let $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,1}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,M_i} \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}$ be as in Lemma 5.4. Recall that we have

$$0 \leq f_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}) \leq E_{2,\lambda} \kappa_i(x)^2 \sum_{k=1}^{M_i} f_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k}) \mathbf{1}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k} + \mathbf{B}_{N,i}}(\boldsymbol{\xi})$$

by (1) of Lemma 5.4. It follows that

$$(5.21) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \tilde{\beta}_{N,i,\eta,l}(a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i}u(e^{-2Nt}\boldsymbol{\xi})u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k)x; a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i}y) d\boldsymbol{\xi} \\ & = \int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} f_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}) d\boldsymbol{\xi} \\ & \leq E_{2,\lambda}^{d-1} \kappa(x)^2 \sum_{k_1=1}^{M_1} \cdots \sum_{k_{d-1}=1}^{M_{d-1}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^{d-1} f_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k_i}) \right) \int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \mathbf{1}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{k_i,i} + \mathbf{B}_{N,i}}(\boldsymbol{\xi}) d\boldsymbol{\xi}. \end{aligned}$$

We observe that for any k_1, \dots, k_{d-1} , $\bigcap_{i=1}^{d-1} (\boldsymbol{\xi}_{k_i,i} + \mathbf{B}_{N,i})$ is always contained in a box with side-length $2e^{-2(N+1)t}$ since each $\mathbf{B}_{N,i}$ has sidelength $2e^{-2(N+1)t}$ along the direction of \mathbf{e}_i . We also

have

$$\sum_{k_i=1}^{M_i} f_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k_i}) \leq E_{2,\lambda} \kappa_i(x)^2 \int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \tilde{\beta}_{N,i,2\eta,l-1}(a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i} u(e^{-2Nt}\boldsymbol{\xi})u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k)x; a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i}y) d\boldsymbol{\xi}$$

for all $1 \leq i \leq d-1$ by (2) of Lemma 5.4. It follows that (5.21) is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq E_{2,\lambda}^{d-1} \kappa(x)^{2(d-1)} (2e^{-2Nt})^{d-1} \sum_{k_1=1}^{M_1} \cdots \sum_{k_{d-1}=1}^{M_{d-1}} \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} f_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,k_i}) \\ (5.22) \quad &\leq 2^{d-1} E_{2,\lambda}^{2(d-1)} \kappa(x)^4 \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \tilde{\beta}_{N,i,2\eta,l-1}(a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i} u(e^{-2Nt}\boldsymbol{\xi})u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k)x; a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i}y) d\boldsymbol{\xi}. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that by Proposition 5.3 we have

$$\int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{\beta}_{N,i,2\eta,l-1}(u_i(s)x; y) ds \leq \tilde{h}_\lambda e^{-\lambda^3 Nt} \alpha_i(x)$$

for any $1 \leq i \leq d-1$, $0 < \eta \leq \frac{1}{2}$, $h > \tilde{h}_\lambda$, $y \in X$ and $x \in X'$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \tilde{\beta}_{N,i,2\eta,l-1}(a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i} u(e^{-2Nt}\boldsymbol{\xi})u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k)x; a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i}y) d\boldsymbol{\xi} \\ &= \int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{\beta}_{N,i,2\eta,l-1}(a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i} u_i(e^{-2Nt}s)u(e^{-2Nt}\pi_i^\perp(\boldsymbol{\xi}))u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k)x; a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i}y) ds d\boldsymbol{\xi} \\ &\leq \int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{\beta}_{N,i,2\eta,l-1}(u_i(s)a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i} u(e^{-2Nt}\pi_i^\perp(\boldsymbol{\xi}))u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k)x; a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i}y) ds d\boldsymbol{\xi} \\ &\leq \tilde{h}_\lambda e^{-\lambda^3 Nt} \int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i} u(e^{-2Nt}\pi_i^\perp(\boldsymbol{\xi}))u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k)x; a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i}y) d\boldsymbol{\xi}. \end{aligned}$$

for any $1 \leq i \leq d-1$. By (2.14) one has

$$\tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i} u(e^{-2Nt}\pi_i^\perp(\boldsymbol{\xi}))u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k)x) \leq \eta_{\lambda,t}^{-(d-1)} \kappa_i(x)^2 \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i} u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k)x),$$

hence for any $1 \leq i \leq d-1$

$$\begin{aligned} (5.23) \quad &\int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \tilde{\beta}_{N,i,2\eta,l-1}(a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i} u(e^{-2Nt}\boldsymbol{\xi})u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k)x; a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i}y) d\boldsymbol{\xi} \\ &\leq \epsilon_{\lambda,t}^{-(d-1)} \tilde{h}_\lambda e^{-\lambda^3 dNt} \kappa_i(x)^2 \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i} u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k)x). \end{aligned}$$

Combining (5.21), (5.22), and (5.23) together, we get

$$\begin{aligned} (5.24) \quad &\int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \tilde{\beta}_{N,i,\eta,l}(a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i} u(e^{-2Nt}\boldsymbol{\xi})u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k)x; a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i}y) d\boldsymbol{\xi} \\ &\leq E_{6,\lambda} e^{-\lambda^3(d-1)Nt} \kappa(x)^6 \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i} u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k)x), \end{aligned}$$

where $E_{6,\lambda} := 2^{d-1} E_{2,\lambda}^{3(d-1)} \epsilon_{\lambda,t}^{-(d-1)} \tilde{h}_\lambda$.

Since $\boldsymbol{\xi}_k \in \text{Supp } F$ we have $\tilde{\psi}_{N,\eta,l}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k)x; y) > 0$, hence

$$(5.25) \quad \tilde{\psi}_{N,\eta,l}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k)x; y) = \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{Nt\mathbf{e}_i} u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k)x).$$

Combining (5.20), (5.24), and (5.25), we obtain

$$\int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \tilde{\psi}_{2N,\eta,l}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x; y) d\boldsymbol{\xi} \leq \sum_{k=1}^M e^{-2(d-1)Nt} E_{6,\lambda} e^{-\lambda^3(d-1)Nt} \kappa(x)^6 \tilde{\psi}_{N,\eta,l}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k)x).$$

It follows that

$$(5.26) \quad \int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \tilde{\psi}_{2N,\eta,l}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x; y) d\boldsymbol{\xi} \leq E_{6,\lambda} e^{-\lambda^3(d-1)Nt} e^{-2(d-1)Nt} \kappa(x)^6 \sum_{k=1}^M F(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k).$$

On the other hand, by (2) of Lemma 5.6 we have

$$(5.27) \quad \eta^{d-1} e^{-2(d-1)Nt} \sum_{k=1}^M F(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k) \leq E_{2,\lambda}^{d-1} \kappa(x)^2 \int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \tilde{\psi}_{N,2\eta,l-1}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x; y) d\boldsymbol{\xi}.$$

Therefore, combining (5.26) and (5.27), we obtain the desired inequality for $E_{5,\lambda} := E_{2,\lambda}^{d-1} E_{6,\lambda}$. \square

In addition to Proposition 5.7 we also need the following trivial estimate.

Lemma 5.8. (Trivial bound) For any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 < \eta \leq 1$, $0 \leq l \leq l_\lambda$, $y \in X$, and $x \in X'$ we have

$$(5.28) \quad \int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \tilde{\psi}_{N,\eta,l}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x; y) d\boldsymbol{\xi} \leq E_{2,\lambda}^{d-1} \kappa(x)^2 \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \tilde{\alpha}_i(x).$$

Proof. For any $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}$ and $1 \leq i \leq d-1$ we have

$$\tilde{\alpha}_i(u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x) \leq C_5 \epsilon_{\lambda,t_\lambda}^{-(d-1)} \kappa_i(x)^2 \tilde{\alpha}_i(x) = E_{2,\lambda} \kappa_i(x)^2 \tilde{\alpha}_i(x)$$

by (2.13) and (2.14). It follows that for any $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}$

$$\tilde{\psi}_{N,\eta,l}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x; y) \leq \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \tilde{\alpha}_i(u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x) \leq E_{2,\lambda}^{d-1} \kappa(x)^2 \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \tilde{\alpha}_i(x),$$

hence we obtain (5.28). \square

Proof of Proposition 5.5. For the sake of simplicity let us write

$$Q_j := \int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \tilde{\psi}_{2^{l-j}N, 2^j\eta, l-j}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x; y) d\boldsymbol{\xi},$$

where $0 \leq j \leq l$. We apply Proposition 5.7 with $2^{l-j-1}N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $2^j\eta$, where $0 \leq j \leq l-1$. Then we have

$$(5.29) \quad Q_j \leq E_{5,\lambda} (2^j\eta)^{-(d-1)} e^{-\lambda^3(d-1)2^{l-j-1}Nt} \kappa(x)^8 Q_{j+1}$$

for any $0 \leq j \leq l-1$. By Lemma 5.8 we also have

$$(5.30) \quad Q_l \leq E_{2,\lambda}^{d-1} \kappa(x)^2 \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \tilde{\alpha}_i(x).$$

Multiplying all the inequalities (5.29) for $0 \leq j \leq l-1$ and (5.30), we obtain

$$\mathbf{Q}_0 \leq E_{2,\lambda}^{d-1} (E_{5,\lambda} \eta^{-d} \kappa(x)^8)^l e^{-\lambda^3 (d-1)(2^l-1)Nt} \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \tilde{\alpha}_i(x).$$

□

6. THE SET OF EXCEPTIONS TO THE INHOMOGENEOUS LITTLEWOOD CONJECTURE

6.1. The space of grids and Dani correspondence. In this subsection, we introduce the space of grids and give a dynamical reformulation of the inhomogeneous Diophantine approximation problem.

Let us denote by $\hat{G} = \mathrm{SL}_d(\mathbb{R}) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^d$ the group of volume-preserving affine transformations and denote by $\hat{\Gamma} = \mathrm{SL}_d(\mathbb{Z}) \ltimes \mathbb{Z}^d = \mathrm{Stab}_{\hat{G}}(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ the stabilizer of the standard lattice \mathbb{Z}^d . We view \hat{G} as a subgroup of $\mathrm{SL}_{d+1}(\mathbb{R})$ by $\hat{G} = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} g & v \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} : g \in G, v \in \mathbb{R}^d \right\}$. We also view G as a subgroup of \hat{G} and take a lift of the element $g \in G$ to $\hat{G} \subset \mathrm{SL}_{d+1}(\mathbb{R})$ by $g \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} g & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, denoted again by g .

Let $\hat{X} = \hat{G}/\hat{\Gamma}$ and denote by $\pi : \hat{X} \rightarrow X$ the canonical projection from \hat{X} to X . One can view the homogeneous space \hat{X} as the space of unimodular *grids* in \mathbb{R}^d , i.e. unimodular lattices translated by a vector in \mathbb{R}^d . More explicitly, for $\hat{x} = \begin{pmatrix} g & v \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \hat{\Gamma} \in \hat{X}$ with $g \in G$ and $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we identify \hat{x} to the corresponding unimodular grid $\Lambda_{\hat{x}} := g\mathbb{Z}^d + v$ in \mathbb{R}^d .

For $\boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ we denote

$$x_{\boldsymbol{\xi}} := \begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{Id}_{d-1} & \boldsymbol{\xi} \\ & 1 \end{pmatrix} \Gamma \in X, \quad \hat{x}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\theta}} := \begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{Id}_{d-1} & \boldsymbol{\xi} & -\boldsymbol{\theta} \\ & 1 & 0 \\ & & 1 \end{pmatrix} \hat{\Gamma} \in \hat{X}.$$

Note that $\Lambda_{\hat{x}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\theta}}} = u(\boldsymbol{\xi})\mathbb{Z}^d - (\boldsymbol{\theta}, 0)$. As in the classical Dani correspondence for homogeneous Diophantine approximation, inhomogeneous Diophantine properties of $(\boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ are characterized by dynamical properties of the orbits of $\hat{x}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\theta}}$ in the space \hat{X} .

We say that a pair $(\boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \times \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ is *rational* if there exist some $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d-1}$ and $q \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $q\boldsymbol{\xi} - \boldsymbol{\theta} + \mathbf{p} = 0$, and *irrational* otherwise. Let us define $A_{\geq T}^+ := \{a_{(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{d-1})} \in A : \tau_1, \dots, \tau_{d-1} \geq T\}$ for $T > 0$, and $\mathcal{L}_\epsilon := \left\{ \hat{x} \in \hat{X} : \Lambda_{\hat{x}} \cap B^{\mathbb{R}^d}(0, \epsilon) = \emptyset \right\}$ for $\epsilon > 0$.

Lemma 6.1. *Suppose that $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ satisfies Littlewood's conjecture, i.e. (1.2) holds. Let $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$. If $\liminf_{q \rightarrow \infty} q \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \|q\xi_i - \theta_i\|_{\mathbb{Z}} > 0$, then there exists $T > 0$ such that $A_{\geq T}^+ \hat{x}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\theta}} \subseteq \mathcal{L}_\epsilon$.*

Proof. We first consider the case of $(\boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ is rational. Then there exist $\mathbf{p}_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^{d-1}$ and $q_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $q_0\boldsymbol{\xi} - \boldsymbol{\theta} + \mathbf{p}_0 = 0$. It follows that

$$\liminf_{q \rightarrow \infty} q \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \|q\xi_i - \theta_i\|_{\mathbb{Z}} = \liminf_{q \rightarrow \infty} q \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \|(q - q_0)\xi_i\|_{\mathbb{Z}} = \liminf_{q \rightarrow \infty} q \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \|q\xi_i\|_{\mathbb{Z}} = 0,$$

as we are assuming that $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ satisfies Littlewood's conjecture.

We now suppose that $(\boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ is irrational, and for any $\epsilon > 0$ and $T > 0$ there exists $\tau \in A_{\geq T}^+$ such that $a_\tau \widehat{x}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\theta}} \notin \mathcal{L}_\epsilon$. By a matrix calculation, it implies that there exists a vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\|v\|_\infty \leq \epsilon$ of the form

$$v = (e^{\tau_1}(q\xi_1 - \theta_1 - p_1), \dots, e^{\tau_{d-1}}(q\xi_{d-1} - \theta_{d-1} - p_{d-1}), e^{-(\tau_1 + \dots + \tau_{d-1})}q),$$

where $(p_1, \dots, p_{d-1}) \in \mathbb{Z}^{d-1}$ and $q \in \mathbb{Z}$. It follows that $\|q\xi_i - \theta_i\| \leq \epsilon e^{-\tau_i}$ for $1 \leq i \leq d-1$ and $|q| \leq \epsilon e^{\tau_1 + \dots + \tau_{d-1}}$, hence $q \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \|q\xi_i - \theta_i\|_{\mathbb{Z}} \leq \epsilon^d$. Since $(\boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ is irrational, the q satisfying $\|q\xi - \boldsymbol{\theta}\|_{\mathbb{Z}} \leq \epsilon e^{-T}$ is unbounded as $T \rightarrow \infty$. Thus we get $\liminf_{q \rightarrow \infty} q \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \|q\xi_i - \theta_i\|_{\mathbb{Z}} \leq \epsilon^d$, and conclude that $\liminf_{q \rightarrow \infty} q \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \|q\xi_i - \theta_i\|_{\mathbb{Z}} = 0$ as ϵ is arbitrary. \square

6.2. Measure classification for A -invariant measures. The following measure classification theorem is a special case of [EL18, Theorem 1.3].

Theorem 6.2. [EL18, Theorem 1.3] *Let μ be an A -invariant and ergodic measure on \widehat{X} and $\bar{\mu} = \pi_*\mu$. If $h_{\bar{\mu}}(a) > 0$ for some $a \in A$, then μ is homogeneous.*

For any $d \geq 2$ and $k|d$, we denote

$$L_{d,k} := \left(\prod_{i=1}^k \text{GL}_{d/k}(\mathbb{R}) \right) \cap \text{SL}_d(\mathbb{R}).$$

Lemma 6.3. [LW01, §6] *Let $\bar{\mu}$ be an A -invariant homogeneous measure on X with $h_{\bar{\mu}}(a) > 0$ for some $a \in A$. Then $\bar{\mu}$ is supported on a single orbit $L_{d,k}x$ for some $k|d$ and $k < d$. In particular, Lx is non-compact.*

Proposition 6.4. *Let μ be an A -invariant homogeneous measure on \widehat{X} with $h_{\bar{\mu}}(a) > 0$ for some $a \in A$. Then $\text{Supp } \mu$ is not contained in \mathcal{L}_ϵ for any $\epsilon > 0$.*

Proof. By Theorem 6.2 and Lemma 6.3, μ is supported on a single orbit Lx such that $\pi(L) = L_{d,k}$ for some $k|d$ and $k < d$. Furthermore, [EL18, §5] classified which homogeneous measures may occur in the positive base entropy case. Either $L = L_{d,k} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ or π is injective on L .

If $L = L_{d,k} \times \mathbb{R}^d$, then μ is supported on $\pi^{-1}(L_{d,k}x)$. In this case, $\text{Supp } \mu$ is not contained in \mathcal{L}_ϵ for any $\epsilon > 0$, since any points in $L_{d,k}x$ are contained in $\pi^{-1}(L_{d,k}x)$ but not in \mathcal{L}_ϵ .

If π is injective on L then we claim that

$$\text{Supp } \mu = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} g & gv \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \widehat{\Gamma} \in \widehat{X} : g\Gamma \in Lx, v \in \frac{1}{q}\mathbb{Z}_{\text{prim}}^d \right\}$$

for some $q \in \mathbb{N}$. Indeed, for any $g\Gamma \in \text{Supp } \bar{\mu}$ the fiber $\pi^{-1}(g\Gamma)$ is identified with the torus \mathbb{T}^d , so we may consider $\text{Supp } \mu \cap \pi^{-1}(g\Gamma)$ as a subset of the torus. Then $\text{Supp } \mu \cap \pi^{-1}(g\Gamma)$ is a $gL_{d,k}g^{-1} \cap \Gamma$ -invariant subset of the torus, hence it is the whole torus or a finite set of rational points. Since π is injective, the set $\text{Supp } \mu \cap \pi^{-1}(g\Gamma)$ is a finite set of rational points. Thus the claim is proved.

Since Lx is non-compact in X , for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $g_0\Gamma \in Lx$ such that $g_0\mathbb{Z}^d$ contains non-zero vector of length less than $\frac{\epsilon}{2}$. It follows that there exists $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\text{prim}}^d$ with $\|g_0\mathbf{m}\| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. Observe that we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} g_0 & \frac{1}{q}g_0\mathbf{m} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \widehat{\Gamma} \in \text{Supp } \mu$$

but the corresponding unimodular grid $g_0(\mathbb{Z}^d + \frac{\mathbf{m}}{q})$ contains a vector $g_0(\mathbf{m} + \frac{\mathbf{m}}{q})$ of length less than $(1 + \frac{1}{q})\|g_0\mathbf{m}\| < \epsilon$. We thus conclude that $\text{Supp } \mu$ is not contained in \mathcal{L}_ϵ for any $\epsilon > 0$. \square

6.3. Partitions of X . In this subsection we construct a finite partition \mathcal{Q} of X , which will be useful in the later entropy computation. Let $0 < \lambda < 1$ be given. Recall that $l_\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$ is chosen so that $1 - 2^{-l_\lambda+1} > \lambda$. We set $l = l_\lambda$, $\eta = 2^{-l}$. For each $1 \leq i \leq d-1$, $t \in t_\lambda \mathbb{N}$ we can find a finite partition

$$\mathcal{P}_{i,t} = \left\{ P_{i,t,1}, \dots, P_{i,t,M_i(t)}, \tilde{\alpha}_i^{-1}(e^{\frac{t}{3d}}, \mathbf{h}_\lambda(t)], \tilde{\alpha}_i^{-1}(\mathbf{h}_\lambda(t), \infty) \right\}$$

of X such that for $1 \leq k \leq M_i(t)$ each $P_{i,t,k}$ has diameter less than $\eta e^{-2t} = 2^{-l} e^{-2t}$.

Let us define a finite partition \mathcal{Q} of X by

$$\mathcal{Q} := \bigvee_{i=1}^{d-1} \bigvee_{m=1}^{m(\lambda)} \bigvee_{j=1}^{\frac{t_m(\lambda)}{t_m}} a_{-j t_m \mathbf{e}_i} \mathcal{P}_{i,t_m}.$$

For $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $1 \leq i \leq d-1$ we denote

$$\mathcal{Q}^{(N,i)} := \bigvee_{j=1}^N a_{-j t_{m(\lambda)} \mathbf{e}_i} \mathcal{Q}, \quad \mathcal{Q}^{(N)} := \bigvee_{i=1}^{d-1} \mathcal{Q}^{(N,i)}.$$

For any partition \mathcal{P} of X and $y \in X$ we denote by $[y]_{\mathcal{P}}$ the atom of \mathcal{P} containing y . The following lemma relates the atoms of the partition $\mathcal{Q}^{(N)}$ to the supports of the dynamical height functions for higher rank actions constructed in Section 5.

Lemma 6.5. *Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $x \in X'$, $y \in X$, and $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}$. If $u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x \in [y]_{\mathcal{Q}^{(N)}}$ then $\tilde{\psi}_{N,2^{-l_\lambda}, l_\lambda}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x, y) \geq 1$.*

Proof. If $u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x \in [y]_{\mathcal{Q}^{(N)}}$ then for any $1 \leq i \leq d-1$ and $1 \leq j \leq N$ two points $a_{j t_{m(\lambda)} \mathbf{e}_i} u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x$ and $a_{j t_{m(\lambda)} \mathbf{e}_i} y$ are in the same atom of \mathcal{Q} . It follows that for any $1 \leq i \leq d-1$, $1 \leq m \leq m(\lambda)$, and $1 \leq j \leq \frac{t_m(\lambda)}{t_m} N$ two points $a_{j t_m \mathbf{e}_i} u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x$ and $a_{j t_m \mathbf{e}_i} y$ are in the same atom of \mathcal{P}_{i,t_m} .

We now show that $u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x \in \Upsilon_{\frac{t_m(\lambda)}{t_m} N, i, t_m, 2^{-l_\lambda}, l_\lambda}(y)$ for any $1 \leq m \leq m(\lambda)$.

If $j \in J_{i,t_m, \text{high}}(y) \cap \left\{ 1, \dots, \frac{t_m(\lambda)}{t_m} N \right\}$ then $a_{j t_m \mathbf{e}_i} y \in \tilde{\alpha}_i^{-1}(\mathbf{h}_\lambda(t), \infty)$. Since $a_{j t_m \mathbf{e}_i} u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x$ and $a_{j t_m \mathbf{e}_i} y$ are in the same atom of \mathcal{P}_{i,t_m} , we have $\tilde{\alpha}_i(a_{j t_m \mathbf{e}_i} u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x) > \mathbf{h}_\lambda(t) > D^{(l_\lambda)}((3C_5)^t E_{1,\lambda})$.

If $j \in J_{i,t_m, \text{low}}(y) \cap \left\{ 1, \dots, \frac{t_m(\lambda)}{t_m} N \right\}$ then $a_{j t_m \mathbf{e}_i} y \in P_{i,t_m,k}$ for some $1 \leq k \leq M_i(t)$. Then $a_{j t_m \mathbf{e}_i} u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x$ is also in $P_{i,t_m,k}$, and the diameter of $P_{i,t_m,k}$ is less than $2^{-l} e^{-2t}$. It implies that $a_{j t_m \mathbf{e}_i} u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x \in B_{t, 2^{-l_\lambda}} a_{j t_m \mathbf{e}_i} y$.

Hence, we verified that $u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x \in \Upsilon_{\frac{t_m(\lambda)}{t_m} N, i, t_m, 2^{-l_\lambda}, l_\lambda}(y)$ for any $1 \leq m \leq m(\lambda)$. It follows from the definition of $\tilde{\beta}_{N,i,2^{-l_\lambda}, l_\lambda}$ that $\tilde{\beta}_{N,i,2^{-l_\lambda}, l_\lambda}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x, y) \geq 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d-1$. We thus conclude that

$$\tilde{\psi}_{N,2^{-l_\lambda}, l_\lambda}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x, y) \geq \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \tilde{\beta}_{N,i,2^{-l_\lambda}, l_\lambda}(u(\boldsymbol{\xi})x, y) \geq 1.$$

\square

6.4. Construction of A -invariant measure. In this subsection, we prove Theorem 1.6. We argue by contradiction, so we suppose that $\dim_H \Xi > \frac{d-1}{2}$ throughout this subsection.

Let us denote

$$\mathcal{Y} := \left\{ \boldsymbol{\xi} \in \left[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right]^{d-1} : \liminf_{q \rightarrow \infty} q \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \|q\xi_i\|_{\mathbb{Z}} = 0 \right\},$$

$$\mathcal{W} := \left\{ \boldsymbol{\xi} \in \left[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right]^{d-1} : u(\boldsymbol{\xi})\Gamma \text{ is } A^+ \text{-divergent on average} \right\}.$$

Recall that we have $\dim_H \mathcal{Y} = 0$ by [EKL06, Theorem 1.5] and $\dim_H \mathcal{W} \leq \frac{d-1}{2}$ by Theorem 1.3. Let us choose and fix $0 < \lambda < 1$ sufficiently close to 1 so that

$$\dim_H (\Xi \setminus (\mathcal{Y} \cup \mathcal{W})) = \dim_H \Xi > (2 - \lambda^6) \frac{d-1}{2},$$

and set $t = 2^{l_\lambda - 1} t_{m(\lambda)}$, where $l_\lambda, m(\lambda) \in \mathbb{N}$ are as defined in Section 5.

For any compact set $K \subset X$, $\delta > 0$, and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ let us define

$$\mathcal{Z}_{K,\delta} := \left\{ \boldsymbol{\xi} \in \left[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right]^{d-1} : \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^{d-1}} \# \left\{ \boldsymbol{\tau} \in \{t, \dots, Nt\}^{d-1} : a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} u(\boldsymbol{\xi})\Gamma \in K \right\} \geq \delta \right\},$$

$$\mathcal{Z}_{K,\delta,m} := \left\{ \boldsymbol{\xi} \in \left[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right]^{d-1} : \frac{1}{m^{d-1}} \# \left\{ \boldsymbol{\tau} \in \{t, \dots, mt\}^{d-1} : a_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} u(\boldsymbol{\xi})\Gamma \in K \right\} \geq \delta \right\}.$$

Then we may write

$$(6.1) \quad \left[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right]^{d-1} \setminus \mathcal{W} = \bigcup_{K \subset X} \bigcup_{\delta > 0} \mathcal{Z}_{K,\delta}.$$

For any $\epsilon > 0$ and $T \in \mathbb{N}$ we also define

$$\Xi_\epsilon := \left\{ \boldsymbol{\xi} \in \left[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right]^{d-1} : \exists \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}, \text{ such that } q \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \|q\xi_i - \theta_i\|_{\mathbb{Z}} \geq \epsilon \right\},$$

$$\Xi_{\epsilon,T} := \left\{ \boldsymbol{\xi} \in \left[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right]^{d-1} : \exists \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \text{ such that } a_{\hat{x}_{\boldsymbol{\xi},\boldsymbol{\theta}}} \in \mathcal{L}_\epsilon \text{ for all } a \in A_{\geq T}^+ \right\}.$$

Then Lemma 6.1 implies that

$$(6.2) \quad \Xi \setminus \mathcal{Y} = \bigcup_{\epsilon > 0} (\Xi_\epsilon \setminus \mathcal{Y}) \subseteq \bigcup_{\epsilon > 0} \bigcup_{T \in \mathbb{N}} \Xi_{\epsilon,T}.$$

Combining (6.1) and (6.2) we have

$$\Xi \setminus (\mathcal{Y} \cup \mathcal{W}) = \left(\left[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right]^{d-1} \setminus \mathcal{W} \right) \cap (\Xi \setminus \mathcal{Y}) \subseteq \bigcup_{K \subset X} \bigcup_{\delta > 0} \bigcup_{\epsilon > 0} \bigcup_{T \in \mathbb{N}} (\Xi_{\epsilon,T} \cap \mathcal{Z}_{K,\delta}).$$

It follows that there exist $\delta, \epsilon > 0$, $T \in \mathbb{N}$, and a compact set $K \subset X$ such that

$$\dim_H (\Xi_{\epsilon,T} \cap \mathcal{Z}_{K,\delta}) > (2 - \lambda^6) \frac{d-1}{2}.$$

Note that $\mathcal{Z}_{K,\delta} = \bigcap_{M_0 \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcup_{m \geq M_0} \mathcal{Z}_{K,\delta,m}$. Thus, we can also find infinitely many m 's such that

$$(6.3) \quad \dim_H (\Xi_{\epsilon,T} \cap \mathcal{Z}_{K,\delta,m}) > (2 - \lambda^6) \frac{d-1}{2}.$$

Let $\{m_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of m 's satisfying (6.3). For any $j \in \mathbb{N}$, let S_j be a maximal e^{-2m_j} -separated set of $\Xi_{\epsilon, T} \cap \mathcal{Z}_{K, \delta, m_j}$. Then (6.3) implies that $\#S_j \gg e^{(d-1)(2-\lambda^6)m_j}$. By definition of $\Xi_{\epsilon, T}$, for each $\xi \in S_j$ there exists $\theta(\xi) \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ such that $a\hat{x}_{\xi, \theta(\xi)} \in \mathcal{L}_\epsilon$ for any $a \in A_{\geq T}^+$. We define $Y_j := \{\hat{x}_{\xi, \theta(\xi)} \in \hat{X} : \xi \in S_j\}$ and for $j \in \mathbb{N}$ let

$$\nu_j := \frac{1}{\#S_j} \sum_{\hat{x} \in Y_j} \delta_{\hat{x}} = \frac{1}{\#S_j} \sum_{\xi \in S_j} \delta_{\hat{x}_{\xi, \theta(\xi)}}$$

be the normalized counting measure on the set $Y_j \subset \hat{X}$. We also denote

$$\bar{\nu}_j := \frac{1}{\#S_j} \sum_{x \in \pi_* Y_j} \delta_x = \frac{1}{\#S_j} \sum_{\xi \in S_j} \delta_{x_\xi}$$

so that $\bar{\nu}_j := \pi_* \nu_j$ for $j \in \mathbb{N}$. By extracting a subsequence if necessary, there exists a probability measure μ on $\hat{X} \cup \{\infty\}$ such that

$$\mu_j := \frac{1}{m_j^{d-1}} \sum_{\tau \in \{t, \dots, m_j t\}^{d-1}} (a_\tau)_* \nu_j \xrightarrow{w^*} \mu,$$

and also define $\bar{\mu}_j := \pi_* \mu_j$ for $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\bar{\mu} := \pi_* \mu$. Then clearly $\bar{\mu}_j$ weakly converges to $\bar{\mu}$.

Proposition 6.6. *Let μ be the probability measure on $\hat{X} \cup \{\infty\}$ constructed as above, under the assumption $\dim_H \Xi > \frac{d-1}{2}$. The measure μ satisfies the following properties:*

- (1) μ is a_τ -invariant for any $\tau \in (t\mathbb{Z})^{d-1}$,
- (2) $\mu(\hat{X}) \geq \delta$,
- (3) $\text{Supp } \mu \subseteq \mathcal{L}_\epsilon \cup \{\infty\}$,
- (4) $\sum_{i=1}^{d-1} h_{\bar{\mu}}(a_{t\mathbf{e}_i}) > 0$.

Indeed, it is straightforward to deduce Theorem 1.6 from Proposition 6.6:

Proof of Theorem 1.6 assuming Proposition 6.6. Suppose $\dim_H \Xi > \frac{d-1}{2}$ for the sake of contradiction. Then the probability measure μ on $\hat{X} \cup \{\infty\}$ satisfies the properties (1)-(4) of Proposition 6.6. Since $\mu(\hat{X}) \geq \delta$, we may write $\mu = \eta\mu' + (1-\eta)\delta_\infty$ for some $\eta \geq \delta$ and a probability measure μ' on \hat{X} , where δ_∞ denotes the Dirac delta measure on $\{\infty\}$. Then μ' is a_τ -invariant for any $\tau \in (t\mathbb{Z})^{d-1}$, $\text{Supp } \mu' \subseteq \mathcal{L}_\epsilon$, and $\sum_{i=1}^{d-1} h_{\pi_* \mu'}(a_{t\mathbf{e}_i}) > 0$. Let us define a probability measure μ^0 on \hat{X} by

$$\mu^0 := \frac{1}{t^{d-1}} \int_{[0, t]^{d-1}} (a_\tau)_* \mu' d\tau.$$

Then μ^0 is A -invariant, $\text{Supp } \mu^0 \subseteq \mathcal{L}_{e^{-t\epsilon}}$, and $\sum_{i=1}^{d-1} h_{\pi_* \mu^0}(a_{t\mathbf{e}_i}) > 0$. Choosing an ergodic component of μ^0 , we may assume that μ^0 is ergodic. Then μ^0 is homogeneous by Theorem 6.2, however it contradicts Lemma 6.4 since $\text{Supp } \mu^0 \subseteq \mathcal{L}_{e^{-t\epsilon}}$. Therefore, we obtain $\dim_H \Xi \leq \frac{d-1}{2}$. \square

The rest of the section will be devoted to proving Proposition 6.6. Let us choose a small positive constant $\sigma > 0$ such that

$$(2 - \lambda^4 + 20dl_\lambda\sigma)(1 - \sigma) > 2 - \lambda^5,$$

and denote $\mathcal{D}_j^* := \{t, \dots, \lfloor \sigma m_j \rfloor t\}^{d-1}$. For each $j \in \mathbb{N}$ we denote $m'_j := \lfloor (1 - \sigma)m_j \rfloor$.

Lemma 6.7. For any $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $\tau \in \mathcal{D}_j^*$, $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$, and $1 \leq i \leq d-1$ we have

$$\kappa_i(a_\tau u(\xi)\Gamma) \leq e^{(d-1)\sigma m_j t}, \quad \alpha_i(a_\tau u(\xi)\Gamma) \leq E_{1,\lambda} e^{2(d-1)\sigma m_j t}.$$

Proof. By definition of κ_i we have $\kappa_i(a_\tau u(\xi)\Gamma) \leq e^{\tau_1 + \dots + \tau_{d-1}} \leq e^{(d-1)\sigma m_j t}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d-1$. It follows that

$$\alpha'_{i,\lambda}(a_\tau u(\xi)\Gamma) = \kappa_i(a_\tau u(\xi)\Gamma) \text{ht}_\lambda(\bar{a}_{\tau_1 + \dots + \tau_{d-1}} \bar{u}(\xi)\Gamma) \leq e^{2(\tau_1 + \dots + \tau_{d-1})} \leq e^{2(d-1)\sigma m_j t}$$

for all $1 \leq i \leq d-1$. The definition (2.10) of $\tilde{\alpha}_{i,\lambda}$ implies that $\tilde{\alpha}_{i,\lambda}(x) \leq \max\{\kappa_i(x)E_{1,\lambda}, \alpha'_{i,\lambda}(x)\}$ for any $x \in X'$. Hence we obtain $\tilde{\alpha}_{i,\lambda}(a_\tau u(\xi)\Gamma) \leq E_{1,\lambda} e^{2(d-1)\sigma m_j t}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d-1$. \square

Lemma 6.8. For any $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $\tau \in \mathcal{D}_j^*$, and $y \in X$ we have

$$((a_\tau)_* \bar{\nu}_j)([y]_{\mathcal{Q}(m'_j)}) \leq E_{7,\lambda} e^{-(\lambda^5 - \lambda^6)(d-1)m_j t}$$

for some constant $E_{7,\lambda} > 0$.

Proof. Since $(a_\tau)_* \bar{\nu}_j$ is the normalized counting measure on the set $\{a_\tau u(\xi)\Gamma : \xi \in S_j\}$, we have

$$((a_\tau)_* \bar{\nu}_j)([y]_{\mathcal{Q}(m'_j)}) = \frac{1}{\#S_j} \# \left\{ \xi \in S_j : a_\tau u(\xi)\Gamma \in [y]_{\mathcal{Q}(m'_j)} \right\}.$$

Let us define $F : [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $F(\xi) = \tilde{\psi}_{m'_j, 2^{-l_\lambda}, l_\lambda}(a_\tau u(\xi)\Gamma; y)$. Observe that

$$(6.4) \quad \# \left\{ \xi \in S_j : a_\tau u(\xi)\Gamma \in [y]_{\mathcal{Q}(m'_j)} \right\} \leq \sum_{\xi \in S_j} F(\xi)$$

by Lemma 6.5. By a similar argument to (2) of Lemma 5.6 we obtain

$$(6.5) \quad \sum_{\xi \in S_j} F(\xi) \leq E_{2,\lambda}^{d-1} 2^{2(d-1)l_\lambda} \kappa(a_\tau \Gamma)^2 e^{2(d-1)m'_j t} \int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \tilde{\psi}_{m'_j, 2^{-l_\lambda+1}, l_\lambda-1}(a_\tau u(\xi)\Gamma; y) d\xi.$$

Let $\{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_M\}$ be a maximal $\frac{1}{2}e^{-2(1-\sigma)m'_j t}$ -separated set so that $[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}$ is covered by $B(\xi_k, \frac{1}{2}e^{-2(1-\sigma)m'_j t})$, and $M \ll e^{2(d-1)\sigma m'_j t}$. Then we have

$$(6.6) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \tilde{\psi}_{m'_j, 2^{-l_\lambda+1}, l_\lambda-1}(a_\tau u(\xi)\Gamma; y) d\xi \\ & \leq \sum_{k=1}^M \int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \tilde{\psi}_{m'_j, 2^{-l_\lambda+1}, l_\lambda-1}(u(\xi)a_\tau u(\xi_k)\Gamma; y) d\xi. \end{aligned}$$

For each $1 \leq k \leq M$ we apply Proposition 5.5 with $N = \frac{m'_j}{2^{l_\lambda-1}}$, $l = l_\lambda - 1$, $\eta = 2^{-l_\lambda+1}$, and $x = a_\tau u(\xi_k)\Gamma$. Then we have

$$(6.7) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^{d-1}} \tilde{\psi}_{m'_j, 2^{-l_\lambda+1}, l_\lambda-1}(u(\xi)a_\tau u(\xi_k)\Gamma; y) d\xi \\ & \leq E_{8,\lambda} \kappa(a_\tau u(\xi_k)\Gamma)^{8l_\lambda} e^{-\lambda^4(d-1)m'_j t} \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \tilde{\alpha}_i(a_\tau u(\xi_k)\Gamma) \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $E_{8,\lambda} > 0$. Here we are using the fact from our choice of l_λ that

$$(2^{l_\lambda-1} - 1)N = (1 - 2^{-\lambda+1})m'_j \geq \lambda m'_j.$$

Combining (6.4), (6.5), (6.6), (6.7), and the estimates from Lemma 6.7 altogether we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \#\left\{\xi \in S_j : a_\tau u(\xi)\Gamma \in [y]_{\mathcal{Q}(m'_j)}\right\} &\leq E_{\mathbf{9},\lambda} e^{(2-\lambda^4+20dl_\lambda\sigma)(d-1)m'_j t} \\ &\leq E_{\mathbf{9},\lambda} e^{(2-\lambda^4+20dl_\lambda\sigma)(1-\sigma)(d-1)m_j t} \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $E_{\mathbf{9},\lambda} > 0$. Recall that σ is chosen so that

$$(2 - \lambda^4 + 20dl_\lambda\sigma)(1 - \sigma) > 2 - \lambda^5,$$

and $\#S_j \gg e^{(d-1)(2-\lambda^6)m_j}$. It follows that

$$((a_\tau)_*\overline{\nu_j})\left([y]_{\mathcal{Q}(m'_j)}\right) \leq \frac{1}{\#S_j} \sum_{\xi \in S_j} F(\xi) \ll \frac{e^{(2-\lambda^5)(d-1)m_j t}}{e^{-(\lambda^5-\lambda^6)(d-1)m_j t}} = e^{-(\lambda^5-\lambda^6)(d-1)m_j t},$$

where the implied constant depends only on d and λ . \square

We are now ready to show Proposition 6.6.

Proof of Proposition 6.6. (1) Since $(a_\tau)_*\mu_j - \mu_j$ goes to zero measure as $j \rightarrow \infty$, μ is a_τ -invariant for any $\tau \in (t\mathbb{Z})^{d-1}$.

(2) For any $\xi \in S_j$ we have

$$\frac{1}{m_j^{d-1}} \sum_{\tau \in \{1, \dots, m_j\}^{d-1}} \delta_{a_\tau \hat{x}_{\xi, \theta(\xi)}}(K) \geq \delta$$

since $\hat{x}_{\xi, \theta(\xi)} \in \mathcal{Z}_{K, \delta, m_j}$. It follows that

$$\mu_j(K) = \frac{1}{\#S_j} \sum_{\xi \in S_j} \frac{1}{m_j^{d-1}} \sum_{\tau \in \{1, \dots, m_j\}^{d-1}} \delta_{a_\tau \hat{x}_{\xi, \theta(\xi)}}(K) \geq \delta$$

for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus, $\mu(\hat{X}) \geq \delta$.

(3) We show that $\mu(\hat{X} \setminus \mathcal{L}_\epsilon) = 0$. Recall that $a\hat{x}_{\xi, \theta(\xi)} \in \mathcal{L}_\epsilon$ for any $\xi \in S_j$ and $a \in A_{\geq T}^+$. It follows that

$$\frac{1}{m_j^{d-1}} \sum_{\tau \in \{1, \dots, m_j\}^{d-1}} \delta_{a_\tau \hat{x}_{\xi, \theta(\xi)}}(\hat{X} \setminus \mathcal{L}_\epsilon) \leq \frac{dTm_j}{m_j^2} = \frac{dT}{m_j}$$

for any $\xi \in S_j$. It implies that

$$\mu_j(\hat{X} \setminus \mathcal{L}_\epsilon) = \frac{1}{\#S_j} \sum_{\xi \in S_j} \frac{1}{m_j^{d-1}} \sum_{\tau \in \{1, \dots, m_j\}^{d-1}} \delta_{a_\tau \hat{x}_{\xi, \theta(\xi)}}(\hat{X} \setminus \mathcal{L}_\epsilon) \leq \frac{dT}{m_j}$$

for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$, hence $\mu(\hat{X} \setminus \mathcal{L}_\epsilon) = 0$.

(4) For $\tau \in \mathcal{D}_j^*$ and $1 \leq i \leq d-1$ we define

$$\mu_{j, \tau, i} := \frac{1}{[(1-\sigma)m_j]} \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor (1-\sigma)m_j \rfloor} (a_{\tau+kte_i})_* \nu_j.$$

Then for any $1 \leq i \leq d-1$

$$(6.8) \quad \sigma^{d-1} \mu_j \leq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}_j^*|} \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_j^*} \mu_{j, \tau, i}.$$

By Proposition 6.8 we have

$$(6.9) \quad ((a_\tau)_* \bar{\nu}_j)([y]_{\mathcal{Q}(m'_j)}) \leq E_{7,\lambda} e^{-(\lambda^5 - \lambda^6)(d-1)m_j t}.$$

We refer the reader to [ELW, Chapter 1 & 2] for the definitions and basic properties of the entropy. For all sufficiently large $j \in \mathbb{N}$, (6.9) implies that

$$(6.10) \quad \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} H_{(a_\tau)_* \bar{\nu}_j}(\mathcal{Q}(m'_j, i)) \geq H_{(a_\tau)_* \bar{\nu}_j} \left(\bigvee_{i=1}^{d-1} \mathcal{Q}(m'_j, i) \right) \\ \geq (\lambda^5 - \lambda^6)(d-1)m_j t - \log E_{7,\lambda} \geq (\lambda^5 - \lambda^6)m_j t.$$

For $q \geq 1$ and large j , we write the Euclidean division of $m'_j - 1$ by q

$$m'_j - 1 = qm' + r, \text{ with } r \in \{0, \dots, q-1\}.$$

By subadditivity of the entropy with respect to the partition,

$$H_{(a_\tau)_* \bar{\nu}_j}(\mathcal{Q}(m'_j, i)) \leq \sum_{k=1}^{m'} H_{(a_{\tau+(kq+r)t\mathbf{e}_i})_* \bar{\nu}_j}(\mathcal{Q}(q, i)) + 2q \log |\mathcal{Q}|$$

for each $r \in \{0, \dots, q-1\}$. Summing those inequalities for $r = 0, \dots, q-1$, and using the concavity of entropy with respect to measure, we get

$$qH_{(a_\tau)_* \bar{\nu}_j}(\mathcal{Q}(m'_j, i)) \leq \sum_{k=0}^{m'_j-1} H_{(a_{\tau+kte_i})_* \bar{\nu}_j}(\mathcal{Q}(q, i)) + 2q^2 \log |\mathcal{Q}| \\ \leq m'_j H_{\pi_* \mu_{j,\tau,i}}(\mathcal{Q}(q, i)) + 2q^2 \log |\mathcal{Q}|.$$

It follows from (6.10) that for any $1 \leq i \leq d-1$ and $\tau \in \mathcal{D}_j^*$

$$\frac{1}{q} H_{\pi_* \mu_{j,\tau,i}}(\mathcal{Q}(q, i)) \geq \frac{1}{m'_j} H_{(a_\tau)_* \bar{\nu}_j}(\mathcal{Q}(m'_j, i)) - \frac{2q \log |\mathcal{P}|}{m'_j} \\ \geq (\lambda^5 - \lambda^6)t - \frac{2q \log |\mathcal{P}|}{m'_j}.$$

Using again the concavity of entropy with respect to measure and (6.8),

$$\sum_{i=1}^{d-1} \frac{1}{q} H_{\bar{\mu}_j}(\mathcal{Q}(q, i)) \geq \frac{\sigma^{d-1}}{|\mathcal{D}_j^*|} \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{D}_j^*} \frac{1}{q} H_{\pi_* \mu_{j,\tau,i}}(\mathcal{Q}(q, i)) + o(1) \\ \geq \sigma^{d-1} \left((\lambda^5 - \lambda^6)t - \frac{2q \log |\mathcal{P}|}{m'_j} \right).$$

In particular, by taking $j \rightarrow \infty$ and $q \rightarrow \infty$ we obtain the desired inequality

$$\sum_{i=1}^{d-1} h_{\bar{\mu}}(a_{t\mathbf{e}_i}) \geq \sigma^{d-1} (\lambda^5 - \lambda^6)t > 0.$$

□

REFERENCES

- [AGMS21] J. An, L. Guan, A. Marnat, R. Shi, *Divergent trajectories on products of homogeneous spaces*, Adv. Math. 390 (2021), Paper No. 107910, 33 pp.
- [Bug14] Y. Bugeaud, *Around the Littlewood conjecture in Diophantine approximation*, Publications mathématiques de Besançon. Algèbre et théorie des nombres, no. 1 (2014), pp. 5-18.
- [BQ12] Y. Benoist, J. F. Quint, *Random walks on finite volume homogeneous spaces*, Invent. math., 187, (2012), 37–59.
- [Cas72] J. W. S. Cassels, *An introduction to diophantine approximation*, Hafner Publishing Co., New York, 1972, Facsimile reprint of the 1957 edition, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics and Mathematical Physics, No. 45. MR 0349591
- [CC16] Y. Cheung, N. Chevallier, *Hausdorff dimension of singular vectors*, Duke Math. J., 165(12): 2273-2329, 2016
- [CT23] S. Chow, N. Technau, *Littlewood and Duffin–Schaeffer-type problems in diophantine approximation*, Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society, to appear.
- [Che11] Y. Cheung, *Hausdorff Dimension of the Set of Singular Pairs*, Ann. of Math. (2), 173, no. 1 (2011): 127-167.
- [Dan85] S. G. Dani, *Divergent trajectories of flows on homogeneous spaces and Diophantine approximation*, J. Reine Angew. Math. 359 (1985), 55–89. MR 794799
- [DFSU19] Tushar Das, Lior Fishman, David Simmons, Mariusz Urbański, *A variational principle in the parametric geometry of numbers*, arXiv:1901.06602
- [EK12] Manfred Einsiedler and Shirali Kadyrov, *Entropy and escape of mass for $SL_3(\mathbb{Z}) \backslash SL_3(\mathbb{R})$* , Israel J. Math. 190 (2012), 253–288.
- [EKL06] Manfred Einsiedler, Anatole Katok, Elon Lindenstrauss, *Invariant measures and the set of exceptions to Littlewood’s conjecture*, Ann. of Math. (2), 164(2):513–560, 2006.
- [EL18] M. Einsiedler, E. Lindenstrauss, *Symmetry of entropy in higher rank diagonalizable actions and measure classification*, J. Mod. Dyn. 13 (2018), 163–185.
- [ELW] M. Einsiedler, E. Lindenstrauss, and T. Ward, *Entropy in ergodic theory and homogeneous dynamics*, To appear. Preprint available at <http://www.personal.leeds.ac.uk/mattbw/entropy>.
- [GS20] L. Guan and R. Shi. *Hausdorff dimension of divergent trajectories on homogeneous spaces*, Compos. Math. 156.2 (2020), 340–359.
- [GV17] A. Gorodnik and P. Vishe, *Diophantine approximation for products of linear forms - logarithmic improvements*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 370 (2018), no. 1, 487-507.
- [Kha20] O. Khalil, *Bounded and divergent trajectories and expanding curves on homogeneous spaces*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 373 (2020), 7473-7525.
- [KKL] W. Kim, T. Kim, S. Lim, *Dimension estimates for badly approximable affine forms*, preprint, arXiv:2111.15410.
- [KKLM17] S. Kadyrov, D. Kleinbock, E. Lindenstrauss, and G. A. Margulis, *Singular systems of linear forms and non-escape of mass in the space of lattices*, J. Anal. Math. **133** (2017), 253—277.
- [KM98] D. Kleinbock and G. Margulis, *Flows on homogeneous spaces and Diophantine approximation on manifolds*, Ann. of Math. (2) 148 (1998), no. 1, 339–360. MR 1652916
- [KM12] D. Kleinbock and G. Margulis, *On effective equidistribution of expanding translates of certain orbits in the space of lattices*, Number theory, analysis and geometry, Springer, New York, 2012, pp. 385–396. MR 2867926
- [KP22] T. Kim and J. Park, *On a lower bound of Hausdorff dimension of weighted singular vectors*, arXiv:2207.07944
- [LSS19] S. Lim, N. de Saxcé, and U. Shapira, *Dimension bound for badly approximable grids*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN, (20) (2019), 6317–6346.
- [LSST19] L. Liao, R. Shi, O. N. Solan, and N. Tamam, *Hausdorff dimension of weighted singular vectors in \mathbb{R}^2* , J. Eur. Math. Soc. 22.3 (2019), 833–875.
- [LW01] E. Lindenstrauss and B. Weiss, *On sets invariant under the action of the diagonal group*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems 21 (2001), no. 5, 1481–1500. MR2002j:22009
- [Sha11] Uri Shapira. *A Solution to a Problem of Cassels and Diophantine Properties of Cubic Numbers*. Annals of Mathematics 173, no. 1 (2011): 543-557.
- [Shi20] R. Shi, *Pointwise equidistribution for one parameter diagonalizable group action on homogeneous space*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 373 (2020), no. 6, 4189–4221.

- [Sol21] O. N. Solan, *Parametric Geometry of Numbers with General Flow*, arXiv:2106.01707
- [ST23] O. N. Solan, N. Tamam, *On Topologically Big Divergent Trajectories*, Duke Math. J. (2023), to appear.
- [TW03] G. Tomanov, B. Weiss, *Closed Orbits for Actions of Maximal Tori on Homogeneous Spaces*, Duke Math. J. 119(2) (2003) 367–392.