DIOPHANTINE PROPERTY OF MATRICES AND ATTRACTORS OF PROJECTIVE ITERATED FUNCTION SYSTEMS IN \mathbb{RP}^1

BORIS SOLOMYAK AND YUKI TAKAHASHI

ABSTRACT. We prove that almost every finite collection of matrices in $GL_d(\mathbb{R})$ and $SL_d(\mathbb{R})$ with positive entries is Diophantine. Next we restrict ourselves to the case d = 2. A finite set of $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$ matrices induces a (generalized) iterated function system on the projective line \mathbb{RP}^1 . Assuming uniform hyperbolicity and the Diophantine property, we show that the dimension of the attractor equals the minimum of 1 and the critical exponent.

1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULTS

1.1. **Diophantine property of matrices.** Recently there has been interest in Diophantine properties in non-Abelian groups. The following is a variant of [15, Definition 4.2].

Definition 1.1. Let $\mathcal{A} = \{A_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ be a finite subset of a semi-simple Lie group G equipped with a metric ϱ . Write $A_{\mathbf{i}} = A_{i_1} \cdots A_{i_n}$ for $\mathbf{i} = i_1 \dots i_n$. We say that the set \mathcal{A} is Diophantine if there exists a constant c > 0 such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

(1.1)
$$\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \Lambda^n, \ A_{\mathbf{i}} \neq A_{\mathbf{j}} \implies \varrho(A_{\mathbf{i}}, A_{\mathbf{j}}) > c^n.$$

The set \mathcal{A} is strongly Diophantine if there exists c > 0 such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

(1.2)
$$\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \Lambda^n, \ \mathbf{i} \neq \mathbf{j} \implies \varrho(A_{\mathbf{i}}, A_{\mathbf{j}}) > c^n$$

It is enough to check (1.1) for all n sufficiently large, since for a finite number of n's it always holds with some constant c > 0. Clearly, \mathcal{A} is strongly Diophantine if and only if it is Diophantine and generates a free semigroup; thus it also suffices to check (1.2) for all n sufficiently large.

Gamburd, Jakobson, and Sarnak [15, Definition 4.2] gave a definition of a Diophantine set, which is similar to ours, except that they considered words in the alphabet $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}^{-1} = \mathcal{A} \cup \{A_i^{-1}\}_{i \in \Lambda}$. Diophantine-type questions in groups arise in connection with spectral gap estimates, see [15, 8].

Date: October 18, 2019.

Both authors were supported by the Israel Science Foundation grant 396/15 (PI. B. Solomyak).

See [1, 2] for a recent discussion of Diophantine properties in groups and related problems. There, the definition is more general, replacing the separation in (1.1) with a negative power of the cardinality of the *n*-ball in the word metric in the group generated by \mathcal{A} . In [2] a semi-simple Lie group G is called Diophantine, if almost every k elements of G, chosen independently at random according to the Haar measure, together with their inverses, form a Diophantine set in G. Gamburd et al. [15] conjectured that $SU_2(\mathbb{R})$ is Diophantine. More generally, it is conjectured that semi-simple Lie groups are Diophantine. Kaloshin and Rodnianski [20] proved a weaker Diophantine-type property: for a.e. $(A, B) \in SO_3(\mathbb{R}) \times SO_3(\mathbb{R})$, there exists c > 0 such that for any $n \ge 1$ and any two distinct words W_1, W_2 over the set $\mathcal{A} = \{A, B, A^{-1}, B^{-1}\}$ of length n,

$$\|W_1 - W_2\| \ge c^{n^2}.$$

It is stated in [20] that their method is general, and applies to $SU_2(\mathbb{R})$ as well, and also to *m*-tuples of matrices for any $m \ge 2$. In [2, pp. 9-10] it is mentioned that the same method works for other semi-simple Lie groups. Breuillard [10, Cor.1.11] showed that a closely related weak form of Diophantine property holds for every *m*-tuple generating a dense subgroup of $SU_2(\mathbb{R})$.

Next we state our first result. For any collection of linearly independent vectors v_1, \ldots, v_d in \mathbb{R}^d consider the simplicial cone

(1.3)
$$\Sigma = \Sigma_{v_1, \dots, v_d} = \{ x_1 v_1 + \dots + x_d v_d : x_1, \dots, x_d \ge 0 \}$$

If a matrix $A \in GL_d(\mathbb{R})$ satisfies

$$A(\Sigma \smallsetminus \{0\}) \subset \Sigma^{\circ},$$

we say that Σ is strictly invariant for A. Given a cone $\Sigma = \Sigma_{v_1,...,v_d}$, denote by $\mathcal{X}_{\Sigma,m}$ (respectively, $\mathcal{Y}_{\Sigma,m}$) the set of all $GL_d(\mathbb{R})$ (respectively, $SL_d(\mathbb{R})$) *m*-tuples of matrices for which Σ is strictly invariant. We consider $\mathcal{X}_{\Sigma,m}$ as an open subset of \mathbb{R}^{d^2m} and $\mathcal{Y}_{\Sigma,m}$ as a $(d^2-1)m$ -dimensional submanifold.

Theorem 1.2. Let $\Sigma = \Sigma_{v_1,...,v_d}$ be a simplicial cone in \mathbb{R}^d and $m \ge 2$.

(i) For a.e. $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{X}_{\Sigma,m}$, the m-tuple \mathcal{A} is strongly Diophantine. In particular, a.e. m-tuple of positive $GL_d(\mathbb{R})$ matrices is strongly Diophantine.

(ii) For a.e. $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{Y}_{\Sigma,m}$, the m-tuple \mathcal{A} is strongly Diophantine. In particular, a.e. m-tuple of positive $SL_d(\mathbb{R})$ matrices is strongly Diophantine.

Remark 1.3. 1. Unfortunately, our results do not cover any example of a symmetric set, since the strict invariance property cannot hold for a matrix A and A^{-1} simultaneously.

2. Every *m*-tuple of matrices with algebraic entries is Diophantine (but not necessarily strongly Diophantine), see, e.g., [15, Prop. 4.3].

 $\mathbf{2}$

3. It is well-known that Diophantine numbers in \mathbb{R} form a set of full measure, which is, however, meagre in Baire category sense (its complement contains a dense G_{δ} set). Baire category genericity of non-Diophantine *m*-tuples in $SU_2(\mathbb{R})$ has been pointed out in [15]. In $G = SL_d(\mathbb{R})$ the situation is different, since there are, for example, open sets of *m*-tuples in $G \times G$ which satisfy (1.2). For instance, if \mathbb{R}^d_+ is mapped by A, B into closed cones that are disjoint, except at the origin, then (1.2) holds for $\{A, B\}$. On the other hand, there are open sets in $(SL_d(\mathbb{R}))^m$ in which non-Diophantine *m*-tuples are dense. For instance, the set of elliptic matrices in $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$ is open, and a standard argument shows that a generic *m*-tuple that contains an elliptic matrix is not Diophantine.

The scheme of the proof of Theorem 1.2 is as follows. We consider the induced action of the matrices on the projective space, and show that, given a non-degenerate family of m-tuples strictly preserving an open set, depending on a parameter realanalytically, for all parameters outside an exceptional set of zero Hausdorff dimension, the induced iterated function system (IFS) satisfies a version of the *exponential separation condition*. This property implies the strong Diophantine condition for the matrices. We then locally foliate the space of m-tuples of matrices and apply Fubini's Theorem. The result on the zero-Hausdorff dimensional set of exceptions uses the notion of order-k transversality, which is a modified version of that which appeared in the work of Hochman [16, 17]. The strict open set preservation property is needed to ensure that the induced IFS is contracting.

1.2. **Projective IFS and linear cocycles.** Let $\mathcal{A} = \{A_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ be a finite collection of $GL_d(\mathbb{R})$ matrices. The linear action of $GL_d(\mathbb{R})$ on \mathbb{R}^d induces an action on the projective space \mathbb{RP}^{d-1} , and thus \mathcal{A} defines an IFS $\Phi_{\mathcal{A}} = \{\varphi_A\}_{A \in \mathcal{A}}$ on \mathbb{RP}^{d-1} , called a *(real) projective IFS*. Such IFS were studied by Barnsley and Vince [4], and by De Leo [12, 11]. Following [4], we say that the IFS $\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}$ has an attractor K if for every nonempty compact set B in a neighborhood of K, we have $\lim_{k\to\infty} \Phi^k_{\mathcal{A}}(B) = K$ in the Hausdorff metric, where $\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}(B) = \bigcup_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \varphi_A(B)$. It is shown in [4] that the attractor is necessarily unique. Assume, for simplicity, that matrices in \mathcal{A} are orientation-preserving, that is, $\mathcal{A} \subset GL^+_d(\mathbb{R}) = \{A \in GL_d(\mathbb{R}) : \det(A) > 0\}$. The action of $GL^+_d(\mathbb{R})$ factors through the $SL_d(\mathbb{R})$ action, via $A \mapsto |\det A|^{-1/d} \cdot A$; thus, it is often enough to work with families of $SL_d(\mathbb{R})$ matrices.

An alternative, but closely related viewpoint, is to consider the linear cocycle $A : \Lambda^{\mathbb{Z}} \to SL_d(\mathbb{R})$ over the shift on $\Lambda^{\mathbb{Z}}$, defined by $A(\mathbf{i}) = A_{i_1}$, see [6]. Here we restrict ourselves to the case of d = 2, which was investigated in great detail by Yoccoz [29] and Avila, Bochi, and Yoccoz [3].

Definition 1.4 (De Leo [12]). A finite set of $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$ matrices $\mathcal{A} = \{A_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ is called hyperbolic if there exist c > 0 and $\lambda > 1$ such that

(1.4)
$$||A_{\mathbf{i}}|| \ge c\lambda^n \text{ for all } \mathbf{i} \in \Lambda^n, \ n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Recall that $A \in SL_2(\mathbb{R})$ is elliptic, parabolic, or hyperbolic if trace(A) is, respectively, in (-2, 2), $\{-2, 2\}$, or $\mathbb{R} \setminus [-2, 2]$. Definition 1.4 is consistent with this, in the sense that $A \in SL_2(\mathbb{R})$ is hyperbolic if and only if $\{A\}$ is a hyperbolic set of matrices. The property (1.4) was used in [29, 3] as a criterion (necessary and sufficient) for uniform hyperbolicity of the cocycle. (We do not need the original definition of a uniformly hyperbolic cocycle, referring the reader to [29].)

There is a natural identification between $[0, \pi)$ and the projective space \mathbb{RP}^1 . Below we use this identification freely, and whenever necessary we view $[0, \pi)$ as $\mathbb{R}/\pi\mathbb{Z}$. For $A \in GL_2(\mathbb{R})$ denote the action of A on $[0, \pi) \cong \mathbb{RP}^1$ by the symbol φ_A . Denote by $d_{\mathbb{P}}$ the metric on \mathbb{RP}^1 induced from the identification with $\mathbb{R}/\pi\mathbb{Z}$.

Definition 1.5. A multicone is a proper nonempty open subset U of \mathbb{RP}^1 , having finitely many connected components with disjoint closures.

In the following theorem we extracted the results relevant for us from [3, 4] (note that [4] considers real projective IFS of any dimension).

Theorem 1.6 ([3, 4]). Let $\mathcal{A} = \{A_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ be a family of $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$ matrices and let $\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}$ be the associated IFS on \mathbb{RP}^1 . The following are equivalent:

(i) the IFS $\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}$ has an attractor $K \neq \mathbb{RP}^1$;

(ii) the set of matrices \mathcal{A} is hyperbolic;

(iii) there is a multicone U, such that $\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}(\overline{U}) \subset U$;

(iv) there is a nonempty open set $V \subset \mathbb{RP}^1$ such that $\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}$ is contractive on \overline{V} , with respect to a metric equivalent to $d_{\mathbb{P}}$.

By the classical Hutchinson's Theorem [19], for a contractive IFS on \overline{V} , the attractor K is the unique non-empty compact invariant subset of \overline{V} . A contraction φ_A on \overline{V} has a unique fixed point, which is called the *attracting fixed point*. The attracting fixed points of all φ_A 's belong to the attractor K. Thus the attractor is not a singleton if and only if at least two of the attracting fixed points are distinct. In the latter case, as is well-known, K is perfect, i.e., it has no isolated points.

We will call a multicone U satisfying $\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}(\overline{U}) \subset U$, a strictly invariant multicone for the family of matrices and for the IFS. There are examples, see [3], which show that one may need a multicone having k components, for any given $k \ge 2$, even for a hyperbolic pair of $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$ matrices. Our next result concerns the dimension of the attractor. Following De Leo [12], consider the ζ -function

$$\zeta_{\mathcal{A}}(t) = \sum_{n \ge 1} \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \Lambda^n} \|A_{\mathbf{i}}\|^{-t},$$

and define the *critical exponent* of \mathcal{A} by

(1.5)
$$s_{\mathcal{A}} = \sup_{t \ge 0} \{t : \zeta_{\mathcal{A}}(t) = \infty\}.$$

Theorem 1.7. Let $\mathcal{A} = \{A_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ be a finite set of $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$ matrices which has a strictly invariant multicone (or satisfies any of the equivalent conditions from Theorem 1.6), and let K be the attractor of the associated IFS $\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}$ on \mathbb{RP}^1 . Assume that the attractor K is not a singleton. If \mathcal{A} is strongly Diophantine, then $\dim_H(K) = \min\{1, \frac{1}{2}s_{\mathcal{A}}\}$, where $s_{\mathcal{A}}$ is the critical exponent (1.5).

In the special case when the IFS $\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}$ satisfies the Open Set Condition, this result is due to De Leo [12, Th.4]. Recall that the strong Diophantine condition holds, in particular, when \mathcal{A} generates a free semigroup and all the entries of A_i are algebraic.

Remark 1.8. It is further shown in [12] that for \mathcal{A} hyperbolic (and in some parabolic cases),

$$s_{\mathcal{A}} = \lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{\log N_{\mathcal{A}}(r)}{\log r},$$

where $N_{\mathcal{A}}(r)$ is the number of elements of norm $\leq r$ of the semigroup generated by \mathcal{A} . An analogy is pointed out with the classical results on Kleinian and Fuchsian groups, see, e.g., [28].

Let $\Phi = \Phi_{\mathcal{A}}$. An alternative way to express the dimension, and one we actually use in the proof, is in terms of *Bowen's pressure formula*

$$(1.6) P_{\Phi}(s) = 0,$$

where $P_{\Phi}(\cdot)$ is the pressure function associated with the IFS Φ . Throughout the paper we use the notation

$$\varphi_{\mathbf{i}} = \varphi_{i_1} \dots \varphi_{i_n}, \text{ where } \varphi_i = \varphi_{A_i}.$$

The pressure is defined by

(1.7)
$$P_{\Phi}(t) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \Lambda^n} \|\varphi_{\mathbf{i}}'\|^t$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ is the supremum norm on \overline{U} . As will be clear from the Bounded Distortion Property, the definition of $P_{\Phi}(t)$ does not depend on the choice of strictly invariant multicone U, and moreover,

$$(1.8) 2s = s_{\mathcal{A}}.$$

It is a classical result, going back to Bowen [9] and Ruelle [24], see also [13], that if $\{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ is a hyperbolic IFS on \mathbb{R} of smoothness $C^{1+\varepsilon}$, satisfying the Open Set Condition, then the dimension of the attractor K is given by Bowen's equation. In the case that the maps φ_i are affine, s > 0 is the unique solution of

$$\sum_{i \in \Lambda} r_i^s = 1,$$

where $r_i \in (0, 1)$ is the contraction ratio of φ_i . For an IFS with overlaps this is not necessarily true. In [26], Simon, Solomyak, and Urbański showed that for a one-parameter family of nonlinear IFS with overlaps (hyperbolic and some parabolic) satisfying the *order-1 transversality condition*, for Lebesgue-a.e. parameter the dimension of the attractor is given by

(1.9)
$$\dim_H(K) = \min\{1, s\},\$$

where s is the solution of Bowen's equation (1.6) (the solution is unique in the hyperbolic case; in the parabolic cases considered in [26] one needs to take the minimal solution). More recently, starting with [16], (a version of) the following condition appeared in the literature.

Definition 1.9. Let $\mathcal{F} = \{f_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ be an IFS on a metric space (X, ϱ) , that is, $f_i : X \to X$. We say that \mathcal{F} satisfies the exponential separation condition on a set $X' \subseteq X$ if there exists c > 0 such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ sufficiently large we have

(1.10)
$$\sup_{x \in X'} \varrho(f_{\mathbf{i}}(x), f_{\mathbf{j}}(x)) > c^{n}, \text{ for all } \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \Lambda^{n} \text{ with } f_{\mathbf{i}} \neq f_{\mathbf{j}}.$$

If, in addition, the semigroup generated by \mathcal{F} is free, that is, $f_{\mathbf{i}} \equiv f_{\mathbf{j}} \iff \mathbf{i} = \mathbf{j}$, we say that \mathcal{F} satisfies the strong exponential separation condition. If these properties hold for infinitely many n, then we say that \mathcal{F} satisfies the (strong) exponential separation condition on X' along a subsequence.

We prove in Proposition 2.4 below that the (strong) exponential separation condition on a non-empty set for the projective IFS on \mathbb{RP}^{d-1} implies the (strong) Diophantine condition for an *m*-tuple of $GL_d(\mathbb{R})$ matrices.

In [16, Cor. 1.2], Hochman proved (1.9) for an affine IFS $\mathcal{F} = \{f_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ on \mathbb{R} , satisfying the strong exponential separation condition along a subsequence on the set $X' = \{0\}$. (In fact, it follows from [16] that strong exponential separation along a subsequence on any finite subset of \mathbb{R} implies the same conclusion.) Thus our Theorem 1.7 is, in a sense, a generalization of Hochman's result to the case of contractive projective IFS. 1.3. **IFS of linear fractional transformations.** It is well-known that the action of $GL_2(\mathbb{R})$ on \mathbb{RP}^1 can be expressed in terms of linear fractional transformations. For

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in GL_2(\mathbb{R}),$$

let $f_A(x) = (ax + b)/(cx + d)$, and define $\psi : [0, \pi) \to \mathbb{R}^*$ by $\psi(\theta) = \cos \theta / \sin \theta$, where $\mathbb{R}^* = \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$. It is easy to see that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{c} [0,\pi) & \xrightarrow{\varphi_A} & [0,\pi) \\ \psi & & \psi \\ \mathbb{R}^* & \xrightarrow{f_A} & \mathbb{R}^* \end{array}$$

Observe that ψ is smooth, and on any compact subset of $(0, \pi)$ the derivatives of ψ and ψ^{-1} are bounded. The following is then an immediate corollary of Theorem 1.7, in view of Proposition 2.4 below.

Corollary 1.10. Let $\mathcal{F} = \{f_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ be a finite collection of linear fractional transformations with real coefficients. Assume that there exists $U \subset \mathbb{R}$, a finite union of bounded open intervals with disjoint closures, such that $f_i(\overline{U}) \subset U$ for all $i \in \Lambda$. Let K be the attractor of the IFS \mathcal{F} , and assume that K is not a singleton. If \mathcal{F} satisfies the strong exponential separation condition on a non-empty subset of \overline{U} , then $\dim_H(K) = \min\{1, s\}$, where s > 0 is the unique zero of the pressure function $P_{\mathcal{F}}$.

1.4. Furstenberg measure. Let $\mathcal{A} = \{A_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ be a finite collection of $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$ matrices, and let $p = (p_i)_{i \in \Lambda}$ be a probability vector. Assume that $p_i > 0$ for all $i \in \Lambda$ (we always assume this for any probability vector). We consider the finitely supported probability measure μ on $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$:

(1.11)
$$\mu = \sum_{i \in \Lambda} p_i \delta_{A_i}$$

Our standing assumption is that \mathcal{A} generates an unbounded and totally irreducible subgroup (i.e., does not preserve any finite set in \mathbb{RP}^1). Then there exists a unique probability measure ν on \mathbb{RP}^1 satisfying $\mu \cdot \nu = \nu$, that is,

(1.12)
$$\nu = \sum_{i \in \Lambda} p_i A_i \nu,$$

where $A_i\nu$ is the push-forward of ν under the action of A_i , see [14]. The measure ν is the stationary measure, or the Furstenberg measure, for the random matrix product $A_{i_n} \cdots A_{i_1}$ where the matrices are chosen i.i.d. from \mathcal{A} according to the probability vector p.

The properties of the Furstenberg measure for $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$ random matrix products, such as absolute continuity, singularity, Hausdorff dimension, etc., were studied by many authors, including [21, 7]. In [23, 22, 27] this investigation was linked with the study of IFS consisting of linear fractional transformations. The reader is referred to [18] for a discussion of more recent applications. We will recall the main result of [18], since it will be the main tool in proving Theorem 1.7.

Let $\chi_{\mathcal{A},p}$ be the Lyapunov exponent, which is the almost sure value of the limit

(1.13)
$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \|A_{i_1 \cdots i_n}\|,$$

where $i_1, i_2, \dots \in \Lambda$ is a sequence chosen randomly according to the probability vector $p = (p_i)_{i \in \Lambda}$. The Lyapunov exponent is usually defined as the almost sure value of the limit

(1.14)
$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \|A_{i_n \cdots i_1}\|,$$

but it is well-known that (1.13) and (1.14) define the same value, since $A_{i_1\cdots i_n}$ and $A_{i_n\cdots i_1}$ have the same distribution. Under the standing assumptions, the limit exists almost surely and is positive [14]. The Hausdorff dimension of a measure ν is defined by

$$\dim_H(\nu) = \inf\{\dim_H(E): \nu(E^c) = 0\}.$$

For a probability vector $p = (p_i)_{i \in \Lambda}$, we denote the *entropy* H(p) by

$$H(p) = -\sum_{i \in \Lambda} p_i \log p_i.$$

Theorem 1.11 ([18]). Let $\mathcal{A} = \{A_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ be a finite collection of $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$ matrices. Assume that \mathcal{A} is strongly Diophantine and generates an unbounded and totally irreducible subgroup. Let $p = (p_i)_{i \in \Lambda}$ be a probability vector, and let ν be the associated Furstenberg measure. Then we have

(1.15)
$$\dim_H(\nu) = \min\left\{1, \frac{H(p)}{2\chi_{\mathcal{A},p}}\right\}$$

Theorem 1.2 implies, in particular, that the dimension formula (1.15) holds for the Furstenberg measure associated with a.e. finite family of positive matrices (independent of the probability vector).

Next we address the question: what is the Hausdorff dimension of the support of the Furstenberg measure? Sometimes, the support is all of \mathbb{RP}^1 , in which case the answer is trivially one. The definition (1.12) implies that the support is invariant under the IFS Φ induced by \mathcal{A} .

Corollary 1.12. Let $\mathcal{A} = \{A_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ be a strongly Diophantine set of $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$ matrices which has a strictly invariant multicone and generates a totally irreducible subgroup. Let μ be a finitely supported measure on \mathcal{A} defined by (1.11), and ν the

associated Furstenberg measure. Then $\dim_H(\operatorname{supp} \nu) = \min\{1, \frac{1}{2}s_{\mathcal{A}}\}$, where $s_{\mathcal{A}}$ is the critical exponent of \mathcal{A} .

The corollary immediately follows from Theorem 1.7. Indeed, having a strictly invariant multicone implies that the subgroup generated by \mathcal{A} is unbounded, and together with total irreducibility this implies that the stationary measure ν is unique. Its support is a compact set, invariant for the IFS $\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}$, hence it is the attractor, which is unique under our assumption. The attractor is not a singleton by total irreducibility.

Denote by \mathcal{H}_m the set of *m*-tuples in $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$ which have a strictly invariant multicone. Proposition 6, attributed to a personal communication from Avila, which appeared, with a proof, in the paper by Yoccoz [29], asserts that the interior of the complement of \mathcal{H}_m in $(SL_2(\mathbb{R}))^m$ is \mathcal{E}_m , the set of *m*-tuples which generate a semigroup containing an elliptic matrix. Observe that if an elliptic matrix is conjugate to an irrational rotation, then certainly the invariant set (support of the Furstenberg measure) is all of \mathbb{RP}^1 . On the other hand, if it is conjugate to a rational rotation, then the semigroup generated by \mathcal{A} contains the identity and the strong Diophantine property fails. We expect that our methods can be extended to cover strongly Diophantine families on the boundary of \mathcal{H}_m , which include parabolic systems.

1.5. **Structure of the paper.** The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In the next section we prove Theorem 1.2. In Section 3 we consider projective IFS and prove Theorem 1.7. Finally, in Section 4 we include proofs of some standard technical results for the reader's convenience.

2. Diophantine property of $GL_{d+1}(\mathbb{R})$ and $SL_{d+1}(\mathbb{R})$ matrices

For notational reasons it is convenient to consider $GL_{d+1}(\mathbb{R})$ instead of $GL_d(\mathbb{R})$.

2.1. $GL_{d+1}(\mathbb{R})$ actions. Let $A \in GL_{d+1}(\mathbb{R})$ be a matrix that strictly preserves a cone $\Sigma = \Sigma_{v_1,\ldots,v_{d+1}} \subset \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$. Without loss of generality, by a change of coordinates, we can assume that $\Sigma \setminus \{0\}$ is contained in the halfspace $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} : x_{d+1} > 0\}$. It is convenient to represent the induced action of A on \mathbb{RP}^d on the affine hyperplane $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} : x_{d+1} = 1\}$, and consider the corresponding action on \mathbb{R}^d . To be precise, for $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we consider $(x, 1) = (x_1, \ldots, x_d, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ and let

$$f_A(x) = P_d\left(\frac{A(x,1)}{A(x,1)_{d+1}}\right)$$
, when $A(x,1)_{d+1} \neq 0$,

where P_d is the projection onto the first *d* coordinates. The components of f_A are rational functions, which are, of course, real-analytic on their domain. Consider

$$\overline{V} := \mathcal{P}_d(\Sigma \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} : x_{d+1} = 1\}).$$

By assumption, f_A is well-defined on \overline{V} , and we have $f_A(\overline{V}) \subset V$.

We will also consider the action of A on the unit sphere, given by

$$\varphi_A(x) := A \cdot x = \frac{Ax}{\|Ax\|},$$

for a unit vector $x \in \mathbb{S}^d$. Consider \overline{U} , the intersection of Σ with the upper hemisphere. We have $\varphi_A(\overline{U}) \subset U$. Lines through the origin provide a 1-to-1 correspondence between \overline{U} and \overline{V} , which is bi-Lipschitz in view of the assumption $\Sigma \setminus \{0\} \subset \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} : x_{d+1} > 0\}.$

It is well-known [5] (see also [4, Section 9]) that strictly preserving a cone implies that φ_A is a strict contraction in the Hilbert metric on \overline{U} , which is by-Lipschitz with the round metric. We thus obtain the following:

Lemma 2.1. Suppose that the finite family $\mathcal{A} = \{A_i\}_{i \in \Lambda} \subset GL_d(\mathbb{R})$ strictly preserves a simplicial cone $\Sigma = \Sigma_{v_1,...,v_{d+1}} \subset \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} : x_{d+1} > 0\} \cup \{0\}$. Then the associated IFS $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}} = \{f_A\}_{A \in \mathcal{A}}$ is real-analytic and uniformly hyperbolic on $\overline{V} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, in the sense that there exist C > 0 and $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\max_{x \in \overline{V}} \|f'_{\mathbf{i}}(x)\| \leqslant C\gamma^n, \text{ for all } \mathbf{i} \in \Lambda^n,$$

where $f_{\mathbf{i}} = f_{A_{i_1}} \circ \cdots \circ f_{A_{i_n}}$ and $||f'_{\mathbf{i}}(x)||$ is the operator norm of the differential at the point x.

2.2. From exponential separation to the Diophantine property. Recall the strong exponential separation condition (Definition 1.9). For technical reasons it is convenient to weaken it slightly.

Definition 2.2. Let $\mathcal{F} = \{f_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ be an IFS on a metric space (X, ϱ) . We say that \mathcal{F} satisfies the SESDC condition on $X' \subseteq X$ if there exists c > 0 such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ sufficiently large we have

(2.1)
$$\sup_{x \in X'} \varrho(f_{\mathbf{i}}(x), f_{\mathbf{j}}(x)) > c^n, \text{ for all } \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \Lambda^n \text{ with } i_1 \neq j_1.$$

The abbreviation "SESDC" stands for "strong exponential separation on distinct (first order) cylinders".

Remark 2.3. For an IFS $\{f_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ on an interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$, such that

$$\inf_{x \in I, i \in \Lambda} |f_i'(x)| \ge r_{\min} > 0,$$

with $r_{\min} \in (0, 1)$, requiring $i_1 \neq j_1$ in (2.1) does not weaken the exponential separation condition (1.10); it only affects the constant c. This follows from the estimate

$$|f_{\mathbf{i}}(x) - f_{\mathbf{j}}(x)| = |f_{(\mathbf{i}\wedge\mathbf{j})\mathbf{u}}(x) - f_{(\mathbf{i}\wedge\mathbf{j})\mathbf{v}}(x)| \ge r_{\min}^n |f_{\mathbf{u}}(x) - f_{\mathbf{v}}(x)|, \quad \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \Lambda^n,$$

10

where $\mathbf{i} \wedge \mathbf{j}$ is the common initial segment of \mathbf{i} and \mathbf{j} , so that $u_1 \neq v_1$. However, in higher dimensions it is sometimes easier to check the SESDC than the strong exponential separation condition.

Proposition 2.4. Let \mathcal{A} be a finite family of $GL_{d+1}(\mathbb{R})$ matrices, and let $\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}$ be the induced IFS on \mathbb{S}^d . If $\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}$ satisfies the SESDC condition on a non-empty set, then \mathcal{A} is strongly Diophantine.

Proof. Let $C_1 = \max_{i \in \Lambda} \{1, ||A_i||\}$ and $C_2 = \max_{i \in \Lambda} \{1, ||A_i^{-1}||\}$. Suppose that $\mathbf{i} \neq \mathbf{j}$ in Λ^n . Let us write

$$\mathbf{i} = (\mathbf{i} \wedge \mathbf{j})\mathbf{u}, \ \mathbf{j} = (\mathbf{i} \wedge \mathbf{j})\mathbf{v},$$

where $\mathbf{i} \wedge \mathbf{j}$ is the common initial segment of \mathbf{i} and \mathbf{j} , so that $\mathbf{u} = u_1 \dots u_k$, $\mathbf{v} = v_1 \dots v_k$ for some $k \leq n$, with $u_1 \neq v_1$. We have

(2.2)
$$||A_{\mathbf{i}} - A_{\mathbf{j}}|| \ge ||A_{\mathbf{i}\wedge\mathbf{j}}^{-1}||^{-1} ||A_{\mathbf{u}} - A_{\mathbf{v}}|| \ge C_2^{-n} ||A_{\mathbf{u}} - A_{\mathbf{v}}||.$$

Lemma 2.5. For any $A, B \in GL_{d+1}(\mathbb{R})$ and any unit vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$, we have

$$|A \cdot x - B \cdot x|| \leq ||A^{-1}|| (1 + ||B|| ||B^{-1}||) \cdot ||A - B||.$$

Proof. We have

$$\|A \cdot x - B \cdot x\| = \left\|\frac{Ax}{\|Ax\|} - \frac{Bx}{\|Bx\|}\right\|$$

$$\leq \left\|\frac{Ax}{\|Ax\|} - \frac{Bx}{\|Ax\|}\right\| + \left\|\frac{Bx}{\|Ax\|} - \frac{Bx}{\|Bx\|}\right\| =: R_1 + R_2.$$

Since

$$1 = \|A^{-1}(Ax)\| \le \|A^{-1}\| \|Ax\|,$$

we have $||Ax||^{-1} \leq ||A^{-1}||$. Therefore,

$$R_1 \leqslant ||A - B|| \cdot ||A^{-1}||.$$

Similarly,

$$R_{2} \leq ||B|| \cdot ||Ax|| - ||Bx||| \cdot ||Ax||^{-1} ||Bx||^{-1}$$
$$\leq ||B|| \cdot ||A - B|| \cdot ||A^{-1}|| ||B^{-1}||,$$

and the desired estimate follows.

Applying the lemma to $A_{\mathbf{u}}$ and $A_{\mathbf{v}}$ yields, in view of $||A_{\mathbf{w}}|| \leq C_1^n$, $||A_{\mathbf{w}}^{-1}|| \leq C_2^n$ for any $\mathbf{w} \in \Lambda^k$, $k \leq n$:

(2.3)
$$||A_{\mathbf{u}} - A_{\mathbf{v}}|| \ge 2^{-n} C_1^{-n} C_2^{-2n} ||A_{\mathbf{u}} \cdot x - A_{\mathbf{v}} \cdot x||.$$

Now we continue with the proof of the proposition. By assumption, $\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}$ satisfies the SESDC condition on a non-empty set. Let $c \in (0, 1)$ be the constant from the definition (2.1). It follows that for all $n \ge n_0$ there exists $x \in \mathbb{S}^d$ such that

$$\|A_{\mathbf{u}} \cdot x - A_{\mathbf{v}} \cdot x\| \ge c^k \ge c^n$$

for all $n \ge n_0$. Combining this inequality with (2.3) and (2.2) yields

$$\|A_{\mathbf{i}} - A_{\mathbf{j}}\| \ge 2^{-n} C_1^{-n} C_2^{-3n} c^n, \quad n \ge n_0,$$

confirming the strong Diophantine property.

2.3. Dimension of exceptions for one-parameter real-analytic families. We consider a one-parameter family of real-analytic IFS on a compact subset of \mathbb{R}^d , and show that under some mild assumptions it satisfies the SESDC condition on a single point, for parameters outside of a Hausdorff dimension zero set. This section is based on [16, Section 5.4], but we had to make a substantial number of modifications in the definitions and proofs.

Let \mathcal{J} be a compact interval in \mathbb{R} and V a bounded open set in \mathbb{R}^d . Let Λ be a finite set, $|\Lambda| \ge 2$, and suppose that for each $i \in \Lambda$ we are given a real-analytic function

$$f_i: \overline{V} \times \mathcal{J} \to V.$$

This means that it is real-analytic on some neighborhood of $\overline{V} \times \mathcal{J}$. We will sometimes write this function as

$$f_{i,t}(x) = f_i(x,t), \quad x \in \overline{V}, \quad t \in \mathcal{J}.$$

Denote $\mathcal{F}_t = \{f_{i,t}\}_{i \in \Lambda}$. This is a real-analytic IFS on \overline{V} , depending on the parameter $t \in \mathcal{J}$ real-analytically. For $\mathbf{i} = i_1 \dots i_n$ we write $f_{\mathbf{i},t} = f_{i_1,t} \circ \cdots \circ f_{i_n,t}$.

Further, assume that this family of IFS is uniformly hyperbolic in the following sense: there exist C > 0 and $0 < \gamma < 1$, such that

(2.4)
$$||f'_{\mathbf{i},t}(x)|| \leq C\gamma^n$$
, for all $\mathbf{i} \in \Lambda^n$, $x \in \overline{V}$, $t \in \mathcal{J}$.

Here in the left-hand side is the norm of differential with respect to $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Fix $x_0 \in V$. For any finite sequence $\mathbf{i} \in \Lambda^n$ we define

$$F_{\mathbf{i}}(t) = f_{\mathbf{i},t}(x_0).$$

Of course, this depends on x_0 , but we suppress it from notation. For $\mathbf{i} \in \Lambda^{\mathbb{N}}$ we have

(2.5)
$$\Pi_t(\mathbf{i}) = F_{\mathbf{i}}(t) := \lim_{n \to \infty} F_{\mathbf{i}|_n}(t),$$

where $\Pi_t : \Lambda^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathbb{R}^d$ is the natural projection corresponding to the IFS \mathcal{F}_t and $\mathbf{i}|_n = i_1 \dots i_n$. Notice that this limit is well-defined, independent of x_0 , and is uniform in $t \in \mathcal{J}$, by uniform hyperbolicity (2.4).

Lemma 2.6. The function $F_{\mathbf{i}}(\cdot)$ is real-analytic on \mathcal{J} , for any $\mathbf{i} \in \Lambda^{\mathbb{N}}$. Moreover, $F_{\mathbf{i}|_n}(\cdot) \to F_{\mathbf{i}}(\cdot)$ uniformly on \mathcal{J} for all $\mathbf{i} \in \Lambda^{\mathbb{N}}$, together with derivatives of all orders.

Proof. By assumption, for every $\mathbf{i} \in \Lambda^n$, the function $F_{\mathbf{i}}$ extends to a holomorphic function in a complex neighborhood of \mathcal{J} , and we are going to prove that for all $\mathbf{i} \in \Lambda^{\mathbb{N}}$ the sequence $F_{\mathbf{i}|_n}$ converges to $F_{\mathbf{i}}$ on a sufficiently small neighborhood uniformly. In order to achieve this, note that since $f_i(x,t) : \overline{V} \times \mathcal{J} \to V$ is realanalytic, it can be extended to a holomorphic (complex-analytic) function $\tilde{f}_i(z,\tau)$, defined on a neighborhood of $\overline{V} \times \mathcal{J}$ in $\mathbb{C}^d \times \mathbb{C}$. Denote by $[\overline{V}]^{\delta}$ the closed δ neighborhood of \overline{V} in \mathbb{C}^d and let $\tilde{f}_{i,\tau} = \tilde{f}_i(\cdot,\tau)$. Choose $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $C\gamma^{\ell} < 1/2$. Then $\|f'_{\mathbf{i},t}(x)\| < 1/2$ for $\mathbf{i} \in \Lambda^{\ell}$, and $x \in \overline{V}$. By continuity, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $\tilde{f}_{\mathbf{i},t}$, with $\mathbf{i} \in \Lambda^{\ell}$, is holomorphic on $[\overline{V}]^{\delta}$ and

(2.6)
$$\|\widetilde{f}'_{\mathbf{i},t}(z)\| < 1/2, \text{ for all } \mathbf{i} \in \Lambda^{\ell}, \ z \in [\overline{V}]^{\delta}, \ t \in \mathcal{J}.$$

Here in the left-hand side is the norm of the differential with respect to $z \in \mathbb{C}^d$. Thus, each $\tilde{f}_{\mathbf{i},t}$, with $\mathbf{i} \in \Lambda^\ell$, is a strict contraction on $[\overline{V}]^{\delta}$, and since $\tilde{f}_{\mathbf{i},t}(\overline{V}) = f_{\mathbf{i},t}(\overline{V}) \subset V$, we obtain that $[\overline{V}]^{\delta}$ is mapped into its interior by $\tilde{f}_{\mathbf{i},t}$, for $t \in \mathcal{J}$. Then the same must be true for all τ in a sufficiently small complex neighborhood of \mathcal{J} , which we denote by \mathcal{O} . We can find a constant L > 1 such that

(2.7) $\|\widetilde{f}'_{\mathbf{j},\tau}(z)\| \leqslant L$, for all \mathbf{j} such that $|\mathbf{j}| \leqslant \ell - 1, \ z \in [\overline{V}]^{\delta}, \ \tau \in \mathcal{O},$

since there are finitely many holomorphic functions involved.

Now, it follows from (2.6) and (2.7) that the function $\widetilde{f}_{\mathbf{j},t}$, for all $\mathbf{j} \in \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \Lambda^n$ and $t \in \mathcal{J}$, is well-defined and holomorphic in the interior of $\mathcal{W} := [\overline{V}]^{\delta/L}$, and moreover, it maps \mathcal{W} into $[\overline{V}]^{\delta}$. In addition, $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\tau}^{\ell} = \{\widetilde{f}_{\mathbf{i},\tau}\}_{\mathbf{i}\in\Lambda^{\ell}}$ is a strictly contracting IFS on \mathcal{W} , depending on $\tau \in \mathcal{O}$ holomorphically. It follows that the finite iterates $\tau \mapsto \widetilde{f}_{\mathbf{i}|n,\tau}(x_0)$ converge to $\Pi_{\tau}(\mathbf{i})$, the natural projection for $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\tau}$, as $n \to \infty$, uniformly for $\tau \in \mathcal{O}$. The uniform limit of holomorphic functions in an open set in \mathbb{C} is holomorphic, and since $F_{\mathbf{i}}(t) = \Pi_t(\mathbf{i})$ is the restriction of a holomorphic map to an interval on the real line, it is real-analytic. The uniform convergence of holomorphic functions implies uniform convergence of their derivatives as well.

Next, for $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \Lambda^n$, let

$$\Delta_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}}(t) = F_{\mathbf{i}}(t) - F_{\mathbf{j}}(t) : \mathcal{J} \to \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Recall that this depends on x_0 : $\Delta_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}}(t) = f_{\mathbf{i},t}(x_0) - f_{\mathbf{j},t}(x_0)$. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, let

$$E_{\varepsilon} = \bigcap_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n>N} \left(\bigcup_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}\in\Lambda^{n}, i_{1}\neq j_{1}} (\Delta_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}})^{-1} B_{\varepsilon^{n}} \right)$$

and define the exceptional set $E = E(x_0)$ by

(2.8)
$$E = \bigcap_{\varepsilon > 0} E_{\varepsilon}$$

where $B_{\varepsilon^n} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|x\| \leq \varepsilon^n\}$ is the Euclidean ball in \mathbb{R}^d .

Lemma 2.7. If $t \notin E = E(x_0)$, then \mathcal{F}_t satisfies the SESDC condition on $\{x_0\} \subset \overline{V}$.

Proof. Observe that $t \notin E$ implies $t \notin E_{\varepsilon}$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$, hence $|f_{\mathbf{i},t}(x_0) - f_{\mathbf{j},t}(x_0)| \ge \varepsilon^n$, for all $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \Lambda^n$ with $i_1 \neq j_1$, for all n sufficiently large. \Box

Remark 2.8. In [16, 17] Hochman considered the case where \mathcal{F}_t is an affine IFS. He defined the sets E'_{ε} and E' as follows:

$$E_{\varepsilon}' = \bigcup_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{n>N} \left(\bigcup_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}\in\Lambda^n, \mathbf{i}\neq\mathbf{j}} (\Delta_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}})^{-1} B_{\varepsilon^n} \right)$$

and

(2.9)
$$E' = \bigcap_{\varepsilon > 0} E'_{\varepsilon}$$

If $t \notin E'$ then \mathcal{F}_t satisfies the strong exponential separation condition on $\{x_0\}$ along a subsequence.

Denote by $[w]_q$ the q-th component of a vector $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $1 \leq q \leq d$.

Definition 2.9. We say that the family of IFS \mathcal{F}_t , $t \in \mathcal{J}$, as above, is nondegenerate in q-th component for some $1 \leq q \leq d$ if

(2.10)
$$[\Delta_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}}(\cdot)]_q \neq 0 \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{i},\mathbf{j} \in \Lambda^{\mathbb{N}} \text{ with } i_1 \neq j_1.$$

In [16] an IFS family on \mathbb{R} is called non-degenerate if $\Delta_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}} \equiv 0 \iff \mathbf{i} = \mathbf{j}$. This condition is equivalent to (2.10) for d = 1 when the maps of the IFS are injective.

We next prove the following:

Theorem 2.10. Suppose that the family of IFS \mathcal{F}_t , $t \in \mathcal{J}$, is non-degenerate in q-th component for some $1 \leq q \leq d$. Then the set E from (2.8) has Hausdorff dimension zero, and therefore, \mathcal{F}_t satisfies the SESDC condition on $\{x_0\}$ for all parameters $t \in \mathcal{J}$ outside of an exceptional set of Hausdorff dimension zero.

Hochman [16, 17] proved, for a non-degenerate family of affine IFS, with a realanalytic dependence on parameter, that the set E' from (2.9) has zero *packing dimension*.

Corollary 2.11. For a family of IFS \mathcal{F}_t , $t \in \mathcal{J}$, as above, assume that there exist $t_0 \in \mathcal{J}$ and $q, 1 \leq q \leq d$, such that the sets $\pi_q(f_{i,t_0}(\overline{V}))$ are pairwise disjoint for $i \in \Lambda$, where $\pi_q : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ is the orthogonal projection to the q-th coordinate. Then (2.10) holds, and hence the set E from (2.8) has Hausdorff dimension zero.

To deduce the corollary from Theorem 2.10, it suffices to note that $[F_{\mathbf{i}}(t_0)]_q \in \pi_q(f_{i_1,t_0}(\overline{V}))$ whence $\Delta_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}}(t_0) \neq 0$ whenever $i_1 \neq j_1$.

For any smooth function $F: \mathcal{J} \to \mathbb{R}^d$, denote $F^{(p)}(t) = \frac{d^p}{dt^p}F(t)$.

Definition 2.12. The family $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t\in\mathcal{J}}$ is said to be transverse of order k in q-th component for some q, $1 \leq q \leq d$, if there exists c > 0 such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \Lambda^n$, with $i_1 \neq j_1$, we have

$$\forall t \in \mathcal{J}, \exists p \in \{0, \cdots, k\} \ s.t. \ \left| \left[\Delta_{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}}^{(p)}(t) \right]_q \right| > c$$

Lemma 2.13. Suppose that the non-degeneracy in q-th component (2.10) holds. Then $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t\in\mathcal{T}}$ is transverse of order k in q-th component for some $k\in\mathbb{N}$.

Proof. Suppose that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ the family $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \in \mathcal{J}}$ is not transverse of order k in q-th component. Then by assumption, for $\{c_k\}$ with $c_k < 1/k$, we can choose n(k), $\mathbf{i}^{(k)}, \mathbf{j}^{(k)} \in \Lambda^{n(k)}$, with $i_1^{(k)} \neq j_1^{(k)}$ and a point $t_k \in \mathcal{J}$ such that

$$\left| \left[\Delta_{\mathbf{i}^{(k)}, \mathbf{j}^{(k)}}^{(p)}(t_k) \right]_q \right| < c_k$$

for $0 \leq p \leq k$. Since Λ is finite, passing to a subsequence $\{k_l\}$, we can assume that $t_{k_l} \to t_0 \in \mathcal{J}$, $\mathbf{i}^{(k_l)} \to \mathbf{i} \in \Lambda^{\mathbb{N}}$ and $\mathbf{j}^{(k_l)} \to \mathbf{j} \in \Lambda^{\mathbb{N}}$, with $i_1 \neq j_1$. By Lemma 2.6, the complex extension of $\Delta_{\mathbf{i}^{(k_l)},\mathbf{j}^{(k_l)}}$ converges to the complex extension of $\Delta_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}}$ uniformly on a complex neighborhood of \mathcal{J} , and hence the same holds for *p*-th derivatives. Thus for all $p \geq 0$, we have

$$\left[\Delta_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}}^{(p)}(t_0)\right]_q = \lim_{l \to \infty} \left[\Delta_{\mathbf{i}^{(k_l)},\mathbf{j}^{(k_l)}}^{(p)}(t_{k_l})\right]_q = 0.$$

Since $[\Delta_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}}]_q$ is real-analytic, the vanishing of its derivatives implies $[\Delta_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}}]_q \equiv 0$ on \mathcal{J} , contradicting (2.10), since $i_1 \neq j_1$ by construction.

For a C^k -smooth function $F: J \to \mathbb{C}$, where $J \subset \mathbb{R}$ is a compact interval, write

$$||F||_{J,k} = \max_{p \in \{0, \cdots, k\}} \sup_{t \in J} |F^{(p)}(t)|, \quad ||F||_J = ||F||_{J,0},$$

and similarly for vector-functions.

Lemma 2.14 (Lemma 5.8 in [16]). Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $F : J \to \mathbb{R}$ be a k times continuously differentiable function on a compact interval $J \subset \mathbb{R}$. Let $M = ||F||_{J,k}$, and let 0 < b < 1 be such that for every $t \in J$ there is $p \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ with $|F^{(p)}(t)| > b$. Then there exists a constant $C = C_{b,M,|J|} \ge 1$ such that for every $0 < \rho < (b/2)^{2^k}$, the set $F^{-1}(-\rho, \rho) \subset J$ can be covered by C^k intervals of length $\le 2(\rho/b)^{1/2^k}$ each.

Lemma 2.15. If the family of IFS $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t\in\mathcal{J}}$ is transverse of order $k \ge 1$ in q-th component, for some $q, 1 \le q \le d$, on the compact interval \mathcal{J} , then the set E from (2.8) has Hausdorff dimension zero.

Proof. Extending the real-analytic functions to the complex plane, as in Lemma 2.6, since

$$\sup_{n} \sup_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j} \in \Lambda^{n}, i_{1} \neq j_{1}} \|\Delta_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}}\|_{\mathcal{O}} < \infty$$

on a neighborhood \mathcal{O} of \mathcal{J} , and $\Delta_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}}(\cdot)$ is holomorphic on \mathcal{O} for all $\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j} \in \Lambda^n$, we have

(2.11)
$$M := \sup_{n} \sup_{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \Lambda^{n}, i_{1} \neq j_{1}} \|\Delta_{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}}\|_{\mathcal{J}, k} < \infty.$$

Let

(2.12)
$$E_{\varepsilon,n} = \bigcup_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}\in\Lambda^n, i_1\neq j_1} (\Delta_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}})^{-1} (B_{\varepsilon^n}).$$

Then

(2.13)
$$E_{\varepsilon} = \bigcap_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n>N} E_{\varepsilon,n}$$

Let $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \Lambda^n$, with $i_1 \neq j_1$. Since the family is transverse in q-th component, we can apply Lemma 2.14 to $[\Delta_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}}]_q$, to obtain that for ε sufficiently small, the set

$$(\Delta_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}})^{-1}(B_{\varepsilon^n}) \subseteq [\Delta_{\mathbf{i},\mathbf{j}}]_q^{-1}([-\varepsilon^n,\varepsilon^n])$$

may be covered by C^k intervals of length $\leq 2(\varepsilon^n \cdot c^{-1})^{1/2^k}$. It follows that the set $E_{\varepsilon,n}$ from (2.12) may be covered by $O(|\Lambda|^{2n} \cdot C^k)$ intervals of length $\leq 2(\varepsilon^n \cdot c^{-1})^{1/2^k}$. Fix s > 0 and choose $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $|\Lambda|^2 \varepsilon^{s/2^k} < 1$. Writing \mathcal{H}^s for the s-dimensional Hausdorff measure, we obtain from (2.13) that

$$\mathcal{H}^{s}(E_{\varepsilon}) \leqslant O(1) \cdot \sum_{n \ge 1} |\Lambda|^{2n} C^{k} \left(\varepsilon^{n} \cdot c^{-1}\right)^{s/2^{k}} < \infty.$$

It follows that $\mathcal{H}^s(E_{\varepsilon}) < \infty$ whence $\dim_H(E) \leq \dim_H(E_{\varepsilon}) \leq s$, and since s > 0 was arbitrary we obtain $\dim_H(E) = 0$.

Proof of Theorem 2.10. This is now immediate from Lemmas 2.13 and 2.15. \Box

2.4. **Proof of Theorem 1.2.** The next lemma follows by an application of Fubini's Theorem.

Lemma 2.16. Let $F \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and let $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be a nonzero vector. Assume that for every $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the set $\{x_0 + tv : t \in \mathbb{R}\} \cap F$ has 1-dimensional Lebesgue measure 0. Then the set F has n-dimensional Lebesgue measure 0.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. (i) Let $\Sigma = \Sigma_{v_1,\ldots,v_{d+1}}$ be a simplicial cone in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} . By a coordinate change, we can assume without loss of generality, that $\Sigma \setminus \{0\}$ is contained in the subspace $x_{d+1} > 0$. Let $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{X}_{\Sigma,m}$ be a small open set in $(GL_{d+1}(\mathbb{R}))^m$ of *m*-tuples of matrices for which Σ is strictly invariant. Choose

16

vectors $w_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ $(i \in \Lambda)$, such that $[w_i]_{d+1} = 1$ for all *i* and for some fixed *q*, $1 \leq q \leq d$, the components $[w_i]_q$, for $i \in \Lambda$, are all distinct, in such a way that

(2.14)
$$w_i \in \Sigma_{A_i v_1, \dots, A_i v_{d+1}}$$
 for all $(A_i)_{i \in \Lambda} \in \mathcal{U}$

This is possible when \mathcal{U} is sufficiently small. (In fact, there is no difficulty in ensuring that all components of w_i are distinct since the cones have nonempty interior.) Let $(A_i)_{i \in \Lambda} \in \mathcal{U}$, and for each $t \ge 0$ and $i \in \Lambda$ let $A_{i,t}$ be such that

$$A_{i,t}v_j = A_iv_j + tw_i, \ j = 1, \dots, d+1.$$

Condition (2.14) guarantees that $\{A_{i,t}v_j\}_{j=1}^{d+1}$ is linearly independent, and hence $A_{i,t} \in GL_{d+1}(\mathbb{R})$ for all $t \ge 0$. This is a consequence of the following elementary claim.

Claim. Let $y_1, \ldots, y_{d+1} \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ be linearly independent, and suppose that $w = \sum_{k=1}^{d+1} a_k y_k$ for some $a_k \ge 0$. Then the family $\{y_1 + w, \ldots, y_{d+1} + w\}$ is linearly independent as well.

Proof of the Claim. We have

$$\sum_{j=1}^{d+1} c_j \left(y_j + \sum_{k=1}^{d+1} a_k y_k \right) = 0 \implies \sum_{j=1}^{d+1} \left(c_j + a_j \sum_{k=1}^{d+1} c_k \right) y_j = 0,$$

hence $c_j + a_j \sum_{k=1}^{d+1} c_k = 0$ for all j. If $\sum_{k=1}^{d+1} c_k \neq 0$, we obtain a contradiction, in view of $a_j \ge 0$, $j = 1, \ldots, d+1$; thus $c_j = 0$, $j = 1, \ldots, d+1$, as claimed.

Let $\mathcal{A}_t = \{A_{i,t}\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ be the family of matrices defined above, for $t \ge 0$, and let $\mathcal{F}_t = \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}_t}$ be the corresponding one-parameter family of IFS on the set $\overline{V} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ obtained by projection of $\Sigma \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} : x_{d+1} = 1\}$ onto \mathbb{R}^d . Notice that the cone Σ is strictly preserved by all $\mathcal{A}_t, t \ge 0$, by construction, hence by Lemma 2.1, these IFS are all uniformly hyperbolic. Both the IFS and their dependence on t are real-analytic, since the IFS are given by rational functions. Condition (2.4) holds for $t \in [0, M]$, for any $M < \infty$, by uniform hyperbolicity and compactness. Finally, observe that, given $\varepsilon > 0$, for t sufficiently large, we have

$$\pi_q(f_{i,t}(\overline{V})) \subset B_{\varepsilon}([w_i]_q).$$

By construction, $[w_i]_q$ are all distinct, hence Corollary 2.11 applies for $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small. We obtain that for all $t \in [0, \infty)$ outside a set of Hausdorff dimension zero, the IFS \mathcal{F}_t satisfies the SESDC condition on a non-empty set, and then Proposition 2.4 implies that the *m*-tuple of matrices $(A_{i,t})_{i \in \Lambda}$ is Diophantine for all t outside of a zero-dimensional set, so certainly for Lebesgue-a.e. t. Now Lemma 2.16 yields the desired claim.

(ii) We consider $(SL_{d+1}(\mathbb{R}))^m$ as a codimension-*m* submanifold of $(GL_{d+1}(\mathbb{R}))^m \subset \mathbb{R}^{(d+1)^2m}$. In the proof of part (i) we showed that for a.e. $(A_i)_{i\in\Lambda} \in \mathcal{X}_{\Sigma,m}$, the induced IFS on a subset of \mathbb{R}^d satisfies the SESDC condition on a non-empty set. Suppose that there is a positive measure subset $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{Y}_{\Sigma,m}$ for which the strong Diophantine condition is violated. Then for every $(A_i)_{i\in\Lambda} \in \mathcal{E}$, the induced IFS Φ does not satisfy the SESDC on a non-empty set by Proposition 2.4. However, $(A_i)_{i\in\Lambda} \in \mathcal{Y}_{\Sigma,m}$ and $(c_iA_i)_{i\in\Lambda} \in \mathcal{X}_{\Sigma,m}$, for any $c_i > 0$, induce the same IFS on the projective space, and we get a set of positive measure in $\mathcal{X}_{\Sigma,m}$ for which the SESDC condition on a non-empty set does not hold. This is a contradiction, and the theorem is proved completely.

3. DIMENSION OF THE ATTRACTOR

Let $A \in SL_2(\mathbb{R})$ be a hyperbolic matrix. Then A^*A has distinct eigenvalues $||A||^2 > ||A||^{-2}$. Let $(\cos t_A, \sin t_A)^t$ be the unit eigenvector corresponding to the eigenvalue $||A||^{-2}$, where $t_A \in [0, \pi)$. We recall some basic properties of the map φ_A , the induced action of A on $\mathbb{RP}^1 \cong [0, \pi)$. For more details see sections 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4 in [18]. Below we use the Euclidean metric on $[0, \pi)$ and denote by |F| the Lebesgue measure of a measurable $F \subset [0, \pi)$. The following simple lemma is [18, Section 2.4].

Lemma 3.1. Let $A \in SL_2(\mathbb{R})$. Then $||A||^{-2} \leq |\varphi'_A(x)| \leq ||A||^2$ for all $x \in [0, \pi)$. Furthermore, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $C_{\varepsilon} > 1$ such that $|\varphi'_A(x)| \leq C_{\varepsilon} ||A||^{-2}$ for all $x \in [0, \pi) \setminus (t_A - \varepsilon, t_A + \varepsilon)$.

The following lemma is now immediate.

Lemma 3.2. Let $U \subset [0,\pi)$ be an open set, with $|U| < \pi$. Then, for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $C_{\varepsilon} > 1$ such that for any $A \in SL_2(\mathbb{R})$ with $(t_A - \varepsilon, t_A + \varepsilon) \subset U$, we have

$$\pi - C_{\varepsilon} \|A\|^{-2} < |\varphi_A(U)| < \pi.$$

Let $\mathcal{A} = \{A_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ be a finite collection of $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$ matrices and let $\Phi = \{\varphi_A\}_{A \in \mathcal{A}}$ be the corresponding IFS on $[0, \pi) \cong \mathbb{RP}^1$. We continue to use the notation:

$$\Phi(E) = \bigcup_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \varphi_A(E).$$

Recall that a strictly invariant multicone $U \subset [0, \pi)$ is a nonempty open set having finitely many connected components with disjoint closures, such that $\overline{U} \neq \mathbb{RP}^1$ and $\Phi(\overline{U}) \subset U$. By Theorem 1.6, the set \mathcal{A} is hyperbolic, which means that there exist c > 0 and $\lambda > 1$ such that

(3.1)
$$||A_{\mathbf{i}}|| \ge c\lambda^n \text{ for all } \mathbf{i} \in \Lambda^n, \ n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

18

Lemma 3.3. Let U be a strictly invariant multicone for the IFS Φ . Then there exists a constant $C_1 > 1$ such that

(i) we have

(3.2)
$$||A_{\mathbf{i}}||^{-2} \leq |\varphi'_{\mathbf{i}}(x)| \leq C_1 ||A_{\mathbf{i}}||^{-2}, \text{ for all } x \in \overline{U}, \mathbf{i} \in \Lambda^n, n \in \mathbb{N};$$

(ii) the Bounded Distortion Property holds for Φ on U:

(3.3)
$$\frac{1}{C_1} \leqslant \frac{|\varphi'_{\mathbf{i}}(x)|}{|\varphi'_{\mathbf{i}}(y)|} \leqslant C_1 \quad for \ all \quad x, y \in \overline{U}, \ \mathbf{i} \in \Lambda^n, \ n \in \mathbb{N};$$

(iii) we have

(3.4)
$$r_1^n \leq |\varphi'_{\mathbf{i}}(x)| \leq C_2 \lambda^{-2n}, \text{ for all } x \in \overline{U}, \mathbf{i} \in \Lambda^n, n \in \mathbb{N},$$

where $C_2 = C_1/c^2$, with c > 0 and $\lambda > 1$ from (3.1), and $r_1 = (\max_{A \in \mathcal{A}} ||A||)^{-2}$; (iv) we have

$$s = s_{\mathcal{A}}/2,$$

where s is the unique solution of Bowen's equation $P_{\Phi}(s) = 0$, with the pressure given by (1.7) and $s_{\mathcal{A}}$ is the critical exponent, given by (1.5).

Proof. (i) In view of Lemma 3.1, we only need to check the right inequality in (3.2). By Lemma 3.2 and strict invariance of U, we have for every $A_{\mathbf{i}}$, with $\mathbf{i} \in \Lambda^n$ and n sufficiently large, that $t_{A_{\mathbf{i}}} \notin U$. Since $\Phi(\overline{U}) \subset U$, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$(t_{A_{\mathbf{i}}} - \varepsilon, t_{A_{\mathbf{i}}} + \varepsilon) \cap \Phi(\overline{U}) = \emptyset$$
, for all $\mathbf{i} \in \Lambda^n$, $n \ge n_0$

For every $\mathbf{i} = i_1 \dots i_n$, with $n \ge n_0$, and every $x \in \overline{U}$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\varphi'_{\mathbf{i}}(x)| &\leqslant |\varphi'_{i_{1}\dots i_{n-1}}(\varphi_{i_{n}}(x))| \cdot |\varphi'_{i_{n}}(x)| \\ &\leqslant C_{\varepsilon} \|A_{i_{1}\dots i_{n-1}}\|^{-2} \|A_{i_{n}}\|^{2} \qquad \text{by Lemma 3.1} \\ &\leqslant C_{\varepsilon} (\max_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \|A\|)^{4} \|A_{\mathbf{i}}\|^{-2}. \end{aligned}$$

This confirms (3.2) for $n \ge n_0$, with $C_1 := C_{\varepsilon}(\max_{A \in \mathcal{A}} ||A||)^4$, and for the first finitely many n it trivially holds with some constant.

(ii) is immediate from (i).

(iii) the left inequality follows from Lemma 3.1, and the right is a consequence of (i) and (3.1);

(iv) easily follows from (1.7) and (1.5).

Let $p = (p_i)_{i \in \Lambda}$ be a probability vector, and let $x_0 \in U$. Let $\chi_{\Phi,p}$ be the almost sure value of the limit

(3.5)
$$\lim_{n \to \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log |(\varphi_{i_1 \cdots i_n})'(x_0)|,$$

where $i_1, i_2, \dots \in \Lambda$ is a sequence chosen randomly according to the probability vector $p = (p_i)_{i \in \Lambda}$. The equations (3.2) and (1.13) imply

(3.6)
$$\chi_{\Phi,p} = 2\chi_{\mathcal{A},p}.$$

Consider the symbolic space $\Lambda^{\mathbb{N}}$ with the measure $\mu = p^{\mathbb{N}}$, and the shift transformation $\sigma : \mathbf{i} = i_1 i_2 i_3 \ldots \mapsto i_2 i_3 \ldots$, which is μ -invariant and ergodic. The natural projection $\Pi : \Lambda^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathbb{RP}^1$ is defined by

$$\Pi(\mathbf{i}) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \varphi_{i_1 \dots i_n}(x_0), \quad x_0 \in \overline{U},$$

where the limit exists and is independent of x_0 by contraction properties of the IFS. Observe that

(3.7)
$$\varphi_{i_1}(\Pi(\sigma \mathbf{i})) = \Pi(\mathbf{i}) \text{ for all } \mathbf{i} \in \Lambda^{\mathbb{N}}.$$

Consider the function $h: \Lambda^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$h(\mathbf{i}) = -\log |\varphi'_{i_1}(\Pi(\sigma \mathbf{i}))|, \ \mathbf{i} \in \Lambda^{\mathbb{N}}.$$

Since $|\varphi'_A|$ is bounded away from 0 and ∞ on \overline{U} , we have that h is integrable with respect to μ . The following lemma is standard, but we include the proof for completeness.

Lemma 3.4. We have

$$\chi_{\Phi,p} = -\int_{\Lambda^{\mathbb{N}}} \log \left| \varphi_{i_1}'(\Pi(\sigma \mathbf{i})) \right| d\mu(\mathbf{i}).$$

Proof. In view of the bounded distortion (3.3), for μ -a.e. i,

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_{\Phi,p} &= \lim_{n \to \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log |(\varphi_{i_1 \cdots i_n})'(x_0)| \\ &= \lim_{n \to \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log \left| (\varphi_{i_1 \cdots i_n})'(\Pi(\sigma^n \mathbf{i})) \right| \\ &= \lim_{n \to \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} h(\sigma^k \mathbf{i}). \end{aligned}$$

using the chain rule and (3.7) in the last step. The proof is finished by an application of the Birkhoff Ergodic Theorem.

In order to apply Theorem 1.11 we need the assumption of total irreducibility. It is achieved with the help of the following lemma.

Lemma 3.5. Let \mathcal{A} be a finite set of $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$ matrices having a strictly invariant multicone U, and let $\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}$ be the associated IFS on U. If the attractor of $\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}$ is not a singleton (equivalently, not all attracting fixed points of φ_A , $A \in \mathcal{A}$, coincide), then either

(a) the group generated by A is totally irreducible, or

(b) \mathcal{A} is conjugate in $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$ to a finite subset of upper triangular matrices with the upper-left entry of absolute value less than one. In the latter case the IFS $\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}$ is conjugate, via a linear-fractional transformation, to a linear contracting IFS (an IFS of contracting affine linear maps) on \mathbb{R} .

Proof. By assumption, the attractor of $\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}$ is not a singleton, hence it contains at least two distinct fixed points of some φ_{A_1} and φ_{A_2} , and then it is perfect. Suppose that the group generated by \mathcal{A} is not totally irreducible. Then there is a finite invariant subset F for $\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}$. If F intersects \overline{U} , we get a contradiction, since the forward orbit of any point in \overline{U} under the semigroup generated by $\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}$ is dense in the attractor. Thus F is contained in the complement \overline{U}^c . However, notice that the IFS $\Phi_{\mathcal{A}^{-1}}$, generated by the inverses of the matrices from \mathcal{A} , is contracting on U^c (this is because $f(\overline{U}) \subset U$ implies $f^{-1}(U^c) \subset \overline{U}^c$). By the previous argument, since F is finite, it must be a singleton. Hence all the attracting points of $\varphi_{\mathcal{A}^{-1}}$, that is, all the repelling points of φ_A , $A \in \mathcal{A}$, coincide. However, the latter implies that we can conjugate the set of matrices are upper-triangular, with the upperleft entry of absolute value less than one. The corresponding IFS on \mathbb{R}^* has the repelling point at ∞ , which means that we get a contracting linear IFS on \mathbb{R} . \Box

Proof of Theorem 1.7. Recall that \mathcal{A} is a finite set of $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$ matrices satisfying the strong Diophantine condition and having a strictly invariant multicone U, and $\Phi = \Phi_{\mathcal{A}}$ is the associated IFS on U. Then Φ has a compact attractor K (not a singleton by assumption), and our goal is to show that $\dim_H(K) = \min\{1, s\}$, where s is the unique solution of Bowen's equation (1.7). We have two cases to consider. Note that both the assumption and the conclusion of the theorem are invariant under conjugacy. If we are in the case (b) of Lemma 3.5, then applying Hochman's Theorem [16, Cor 1.2] on the dimension of self-similar sets in \mathbb{R} , yields the result. One only needs to note that the strong Diophantine condition on the set of $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$ matrices described in case (b) implies the strong exponential separation condition on a finite subset of \mathbb{R} . We postpone the proof of this fact to Lemma 4.1 in the Appendix. In the case (a) of Lemma 3.5, the group generated by \mathcal{A} is totally irreducible, and we will assume this for the rest of the proof.

It is known that

$$\dim_H(K) \leqslant \min\{1, s\}$$

see the appendix for a short proof. Let us show the opposite inequality.

Let $d_n > 0$ be the solution of the equation

$$\sum_{\mathbf{i}\in\Lambda^n}|U_{\mathbf{i}}|^{d_n}=1,$$

where $U_{\mathbf{i}} = \varphi_{\mathbf{i}}(U)$. It is not hard to see that

(3.9)
$$\lim_{n \to \infty} d_n = s.$$

For convenience of the reader, we include the proof in the appendix, following [25]. Let $p^{(n)} = (p_{\mathbf{i}}^{(n)})_{\mathbf{i} \in \Lambda^n}$ be the probability vector such that $p_{\mathbf{i}}^{(n)} = |U_{\mathbf{i}}|^{d_n}$. Denote

$$\Phi^n = \{ \varphi_{\mathbf{i}} : \mathbf{i} \in \Lambda^n \}, \ n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Let $\eta^{(n)}$ be the invariant probability measure for the IFS Φ^n on \overline{U} , corresponding to $p^{(n)}$. Since $\eta^{(n)}$ is supported on K, we have dim $\eta^{(n)} \leq \dim_H(K)$.

Note that \mathcal{A} satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 1.11. Indeed, the existence of a strictly invariant multicone implies that all the matrices in \mathcal{A} are hyperbolic, hence the group generated by \mathcal{A} is unbounded, and we are now under the total irreducibility assumption. Thus the Furstenberg measure for $(\mathcal{A}^n, p^{(n)})$ is unique, and it coincides with $\eta^{(n)}$. Since \mathcal{A} is strongly Diophantine, we have that \mathcal{A}^n is strongly Diophantine as well. Now, by Theorem 1.11 and (3.6) we have

$$\min\left\{1, \frac{H(p^{(n)})}{\chi_{\Phi^n, p^{(n)}}}\right\} \leqslant \dim_H(K).$$

We claim that there exists C > 0 such that

(3.10)
$$\chi_{\Phi^n, p^{(n)}} \leqslant -\sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \Lambda^n} |U_{\mathbf{i}}|^{d_n} \log |U_{\mathbf{i}}| + C \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Indeed, by Lemma 3.4,

$$\chi_{\Phi^n, p^{(n)}} \leqslant \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \Lambda^n} \mu^{(n)}([\mathbf{i}]) \cdot \log \left[\left(\min_{x \in \overline{U}} |\varphi'_{\mathbf{i}}(x)| \right)^{-1} \right],$$

where $[\mathbf{i}]$ is the cylinder set of sequences starting with \mathbf{i} . Here $\mu^{(n)}$ is the Bernoulli measure on $(\Lambda^n)^{\mathbb{N}}$, with $\mu^{(n)}([\mathbf{i}]) = |U_{\mathbf{i}}|^{d_n}$ for $\mathbf{i} \in \Lambda^n$. We have

(3.11)
$$|U_{\mathbf{i}}| \leq |U| \cdot \max_{x \in \overline{U}} |\varphi'_{\mathbf{i}}(x)| \leq C_{1} |U| \cdot \min_{x \in \overline{U}} |\varphi'_{\mathbf{i}}(x)|,$$

by the Bounded Distortion Property (3.3). Therefore,

$$\chi_{\Phi^n, p^{(n)}} \leq \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \Lambda^n} |U_{\mathbf{i}}|^{d_n} \log\left(\frac{C_1|U|}{|U_{\mathbf{i}}|}\right)$$
$$= -\sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \Lambda^n} |U_{\mathbf{i}}|^{d_n} \log|U_{\mathbf{i}}| + \log(C_1|U|),$$

confirming (3.10). Now we can estimate

$$\frac{H(p^{(n)})}{\chi_{\Phi^n,p^{(n)}}} \geqslant \frac{-\sum_{\mathbf{i}\in\Lambda^n} |U_{\mathbf{i}}|^{d_n}\log\left(|U_{\mathbf{i}}|^{d_n}\right)}{-\sum_{\mathbf{i}\in\Lambda^n} |U_{\mathbf{i}}|^{d_n}\log|U_{\mathbf{i}}| + C} \\
= d_n \left(1 + \frac{C}{-\sum_{\mathbf{i}\in\Lambda^n} |U_{\mathbf{i}}|^{d_n}\log|U_{\mathbf{i}}|}\right)^{-1}.$$

22

Since $\lim_{n\to\infty} d_n = s$ and

$$\begin{aligned} &-\sum_{\mathbf{i}\in\Lambda^n} |U_{\mathbf{i}}|^{d_n} \log |U_{\mathbf{i}}| & \geqslant \quad \sum_{\mathbf{i}\in\Lambda^n} |U_{\mathbf{i}}|^{d_n} \cdot \left(-\log |U| - \log C_2 + 2n\log\lambda\right) \\ &= \quad -\log |U| - \log C_2 + 2n\log\lambda \to \infty, \ n \to \infty, \end{aligned}$$

by (3.11) and Lemma 3.3(iii), we obtain $\min\{1, s\} \leq \dim_H(K)$, as desired. Finally, $s = s_A/2$ by Lemma 3.3(iv).

4. Appendix: miscellaneous proofs

4.1. **Proof of (3.9)** [25]. We have a projective IFS $\Phi = {\varphi_i}_{i \in \Lambda}$ on a strictly invariant multicone U. Observe that

$$P_{\Phi}(t) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \Lambda^n} \|\varphi'_{\mathbf{i}}\|^t = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \Lambda^n} |U_{\mathbf{i}}|^t,$$

by the Bounded Distortion Property (3.3). Let

$$Q_n = \frac{1}{n} \log \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \Lambda^n} |U_{\mathbf{i}}|^s$$

Since $P_{\Phi}(s) = 0$, we have $\lim_{n \to \infty} Q_n = 0$. Recall (3.4), which says that

$$r_1^n \leqslant \|\varphi_{\mathbf{i}}'\|_{\overline{U}} \leqslant C_2 \lambda^{-2n}$$

for $r_1 \in (0,1), C'_2 > 0$, and $\lambda > 1$. Then $r_1^n |U| \leq |U_i| \leq C_2 \lambda^{-2n} |U|$ for $i \in \Lambda^n$, and hence we have

$$|U_{\mathbf{i}}|^{s} \in |U_{\mathbf{i}}|^{d_{n}} \cdot \left[(r_{1}^{n}|U|)^{s-d_{n}}, (C_{2}\lambda^{-2n})^{s-d_{n}} \right],$$

where we use the convention that [a, b] = [b, a] if a > b. In view of $\sum_{i \in \Lambda^n} |U_i|^{d_n} = 1$, we have

$$Q_n \in (d_n - s) \cdot \left[2 \log \lambda - \frac{\log C_2}{n}, -\log r_1 - \frac{\log |U|}{n} \right],$$

whence for n sufficiently large,

$$d_n - s \in Q_n \cdot \left[\left(-\log r_1 - \frac{\log |U|}{n} \right)^{-1}, \left(2\log \lambda - \frac{\log C_2}{n} \right)^{-1} \right],$$

which implies $d_n \to s$, as desired.

4.2. **Proof of (3.8).** Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Then for sufficiently large *n* we have $d_n < s + \varepsilon/2$, and

$$\sum_{\mathbf{i}\in\Lambda^n} |U_{\mathbf{i}}|^{s+\varepsilon} \leqslant \sum_{\mathbf{i}\in\Lambda^n} |U_{\mathbf{i}}|^{d_n+\varepsilon/2} \leqslant (C_2\lambda^{-2n}|U|)^{\varepsilon/2} \to 0, \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

Therefore, the $(s+\varepsilon)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure of K is zero. By the definition of the Hausdorff dimension, this proves (3.8).

4.3. From the Diophantine property to exponential separation.

Lemma 4.1. Suppose that \mathcal{A} is a finite strongly Diophantine set of upper-triangular $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$ matrices with the upper-left entry of absolute value less than one. Then the associated IFS satisfies the strong exponential separation condition on the set $\{0, 1\}$.

Instead of $\{0, 1\}$ one can take any two distinct points in \mathbb{R} . We start with the following general elementary claim.

Claim. Let G be a matrix group, and $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, \ldots, A_m\} \subset G$ is a finite strongly Diophantine set. Suppose that $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}} = \{\widetilde{A}_1, \ldots, \widetilde{A}_m\}$ is such that $\widetilde{A}_j = \pm A_j$ for all $j \leq m$. Then $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}$ is strongly Diophantine as well.

Proof of the claim. We argue by contradiction and assume that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbf{i} \neq \mathbf{j}$ in Λ^n such that

$$\|\widetilde{A}_{\mathbf{i}} - \widetilde{A}_{\mathbf{j}}\| = \|A_{\mathbf{i}} \pm A_{\mathbf{j}}\| \leqslant \varepsilon^n$$

For $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, $||A_{\mathbf{i}} - A_{\mathbf{j}}|| \leq \varepsilon^n$ is impossible, thus $||A_{\mathbf{i}} + A_{\mathbf{j}}|| \leq \varepsilon^n$. But then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|A_{\mathbf{i}\mathbf{i}} - A_{\mathbf{j}\mathbf{j}}\| &= \|A_{\mathbf{i}}^2 - A_{\mathbf{j}}^2\| &= \|(A_{\mathbf{i}} + A_{\mathbf{j}})A_{\mathbf{i}} - A_{\mathbf{j}}(A_{\mathbf{i}} + A_{\mathbf{j}})\| \\ &\leqslant \quad \varepsilon^n (\|A_{\mathbf{i}}\| + \|A_{\mathbf{j}}\|) \leqslant 2C^n \varepsilon^n, \end{aligned}$$

where $C = \max_{A \in \mathcal{A}} ||A||$. This contradicts the strong Diophantine property of \mathcal{A} for $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small.

Proof of the lemma. Observe that A and -A act identically on \mathbb{RP}^1 . In view of the Claim, we can assume that the matrices of \mathcal{A} have the form

$$A_j = \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{\lambda_j} & a_j / \sqrt{\lambda_j} \\ 0 & 1 / \sqrt{\lambda_j} \end{bmatrix}, \text{ with } \lambda_j \in (0, 1), a_j \in \mathbb{R}.$$

All matrices of the semigroup generated by \mathcal{A} have a similar upper-triangular form:

$$A_{\mathbf{j}} = \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{\lambda_{\mathbf{j}}} & a_{\mathbf{j}}/\sqrt{\lambda_{\mathbf{j}}} \\ 0 & 1/\sqrt{\lambda_{\mathbf{j}}} \end{bmatrix}, \text{ with } \mathbf{j} \in \Lambda^n, \ \lambda_{\mathbf{j}} = \lambda_{j_1} \cdots \lambda_{j_n}, \ a_{\mathbf{j}} \in \mathbb{R}.$$

The matrices of \mathcal{A} act on $\mathbb{RP}^1 \approx \mathbb{R}^*$ by $A_j \cdot x = \lambda_j x + a_j$. Assume that $\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}$ does not satisfy the strong exponential separation condition on $\{0, 1\}$. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbf{i} \neq \mathbf{j}$ in Λ^n such that $|a_{\mathbf{i}} - a_{\mathbf{j}}| \leq \varepsilon^n$ and

$$|(\lambda_{\mathbf{i}} + a_{\mathbf{i}}) - (\lambda_{\mathbf{j}} + a_{\mathbf{j}})| \leqslant \varepsilon^n \implies |\lambda_{\mathbf{i}} - \lambda_{\mathbf{j}}| \leqslant 2\varepsilon^n.$$

It follows that

$$|\sqrt{\lambda_{\mathbf{i}}} - \sqrt{\lambda_{\mathbf{j}}}| = \frac{|\lambda_{\mathbf{i}} - \lambda_{\mathbf{j}}|}{\sqrt{\lambda_{\mathbf{i}}} + \sqrt{\lambda_{\mathbf{j}}}} \leqslant \frac{2\varepsilon^n}{2\min_{\mathbf{j}\in\Lambda^n}\sqrt{\lambda_j}} \leqslant \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\min_{j\in\Lambda}\sqrt{\lambda_j}}\right)^n.$$

In a similar elementary way one can estimate from above the expressions $|1/\sqrt{\lambda_i} - 1/\sqrt{\lambda_j}|$ and $|a_i\sqrt{\lambda_i} - a_j/\sqrt{\lambda_j}|$ to conclude

$$\|A_{\mathbf{i}} - A_{\mathbf{j}}\| \leqslant (C'\varepsilon)^n,$$

for some C' > 0, depending only on $\mathcal{A} = \{A_j\}_{j \in \Lambda}$. This contradicts the strong Diophantine property of \mathcal{A} .

Acknowledgements

Thanks to Balazs Barany for helpful discussions and for telling us about the papers [3, 6]. We are deeply grateful to the referees for many helpful comments and suggestions, as well as pointing out several gaps in the original proofs.

References

- Menny Aka, Emmanuel Breuillard, Lior Rosenzweig, and Nicolas de Saxcé. Diophantine properties of nilpotent Lie groups. *Compos. Math.*, 151(6):1157–1188, 2015.
- [2] Menny Aka, Emmanuel Breuillard, Lior Rosenzweig, and Nicolas de Saxcé. Diophantine approximation on matrices and Lie groups. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 28(1):1–57, 2018.
- [3] Artur Avila, Jairo Bochi, and Jean-Christophe Yoccoz. Uniformly hyperbolic finite-valued SL(2, R)-cocycles. Comment. Math. Helv., 85(4):813–884, 2010.
- [4] Michael F. Barnsley and Andrew Vince. Real projective iterated function systems. J. Geom. Anal., 22(4):1137–1172, 2012.
- [5] Garrett Birkhoff. Extensions of Jentzsch's theorem. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 85:219–227, 1957.
- [6] Jairo Bochi and Nicolas Gourmelon. Some characterizations of domination. Math. Z., 263(1):221–231, 2009.
- [7] Philippe Bougerol and Jean Lacroix. Products of random matrices with applications to Schrödinger operators, volume 8 of Progress in Probability and Statistics. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1985.
- [8] Jean Bourgain. An application of group expansion to the Anderson-Bernoulli model. Geom. Funct. Anal., 24(1):49–62, 2014.
- [9] Rufus Bowen. Hausdorff dimension of quasicircles. Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math., 50:11-25, 1979.
- [10] Emmanuel Breuillard. Heights on SL₂ and free subgroups. In *Geometry, rigidity, and group actions*, Chicago Lectures in Math., pages 455–493. Univ. Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, 2011.
- [11] Roberto De Leo. A conjecture on the Hausdorff dimension of attractors of real self-projective iterated function systems. *Exp. Math.*, 24(3):270–288, 2015.
- [12] Roberto De Leo. On the exponential growth of norms in semigroups of linear endomorphisms and the Hausdorff dimension of attractors of projective iterated function systems. J. Geom. Anal., 25(3):1798–1827, 2015.
- [13] Kenneth Falconer. Techniques in fractal geometry. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Chichester, 1997.
- [14] Harry Furstenberg. Noncommuting random products. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 108:377–428, 1963.
- [15] Alex Gamburd, Dmitry Jakobson, and Peter Sarnak. Spectra of elements in the group ring of SU(2). J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS), 1(1):51–85, 1999.

- [16] Michael Hochman. On self-similar sets with overlaps and inverse theorems for entropy. Ann. of Math. (2), 180(2):773–822, 2014.
- [17] Michael Hochman. On self-similar sets with overlaps and inverse theorems for entropy in R^d. To appear in Memoirs of the Amer. Math. Soc., 2015. http://arxiv.org/abs/1503.09043.
- [18] Michael Hochman and Boris Solomyak. On the dimension of Furstenberg measure for $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$ random matrix products. *Invent. Math.*, 210(3):815–875, 2017.
- [19] John E. Hutchinson. Fractals and self-similarity. Indiana Univ. Math. J., 30(5):713–747, 1981.
- [20] Vadim Kaloshin and Igor Rodnianski. Diophantine properties of elements of SO(3). Geom. Funct. Anal., 11(5):953–970, 2001.
- [21] François Ledrappier. Une relation entre entropie, dimension et exposant pour certaines marches aléatoires. C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math., 296(8):369–372, 1983.
- [22] Russell Lyons. Singularity of some random continued fractions. J. Theoret. Probab., 13(2):535–545, 2000.
- [23] Steve Pincus. Singular stationary measures are not always fractal. J. Theoret. Probab., 7(1):199-208, 1994.
- [24] David Ruelle. Repellers for real analytic maps. Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems, 2(1):99–107, 1982.
- [25] Károly Simon and Boris Solomyak. Iterated function systems with overlaps. Preprint, 1999. Unpublished.
- [26] Károly Simon, Boris Solomyak, and Mariusz Urbański. Hausdorff dimension of limit sets for parabolic IFS with overlaps. *Pacific J. Math.*, 201(2):441–478, 2001.
- [27] Károly Simon, Boris Solomyak, and Mariusz Urbański. Invariant measures for parabolic IFS with overlaps and random continued fractions. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 353(12):5145–5164, 2001.
- [28] Dennis Sullivan. Entropy, Hausdorff measures old and new, and limit sets of geometrically finite Kleinian groups. Acta Math., 153(3-4):259–277, 1984.
- [29] Jean-Christophe Yoccoz. Some questions and remarks about SL(2, ℝ) cocycles. In Modern dynamical systems and applications, pages 447–458. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2004.

Yuki Takahashi, Department of Mathematics, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat Gan, Is-

Current address: Advanced Institute for Materials Research, Tohoku University, Sendai, Japan E-mail address: yuki.takahashi.e6@tohoku.ac.jp

BORIS SOLOMYAK, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BAR-ILAN UNIVERSITY, RAMAT GAN, IS-RAEL

E-mail address: bsolom3@gmail.com