

Bounds for the random walk speed in terms of the Teichmüller distance

Aitor Azemar*

Abstract

Consider a closed surface S with negative Euler characteristic, and an admissible probability measure on the fundamental group of S with finite first moment with respect to some hyperbolic metric on S . Corresponding to each point in Teichmüller space there is an associated random walk on the hyperbolic plane. Azemar–Gadre–Gouëzel–Haettel–Lessa–Uyanik prove that the drift of this random walk is a proper function on Teichmüller space, and that this drift grows at least linearly with respect to the Teichmüller distance. In this paper we refine the result. On the one hand, by considering Jenkins–Strebel directions we show that the linear lower bound is sharp. On the other hand, we show that for Lebesgue typical Teichmüller geodesics, the drift grows exponentially. We also exhibit Teichmüller geodesics for which the growth oscillates between almost linear and exponential. Furthermore, we show that the drift is a quasiconvex function up to a multiplicative constant.

1 Introduction

Let S be a closed oriented surface with negative Euler characteristic and let $p \in S$ be a basepoint. Furthermore, let $\Gamma = \pi_1(S, p)$ and let μ be a probability measure on Γ that is admissible, i.e., the semigroup generated by the support of μ is equal to Γ . For each hyperbolic metric ρ on S we can define the length of an element $g \in \Gamma$ as the minimal ρ -length of the free loops within the homotopy class of g , which we denote $|g|_\rho$. Assume then that μ has finite first moment with respect to ρ (and hence, with respect to any other hyperbolic metric ρ' , see Section 2 for details). Consider a random walk $Z_n^\mu = g_1 \cdots g_n$ where g_i are i.i.d. elements of Γ with distribution μ . The *drift (or speed)* of the random walk on Γ driven by μ with respect to ρ is defined as

$$\text{Drift}_\mu(\rho) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|Z_n^\mu|_\rho}{n}$$

The limit above exists and has constant value almost surely. That is, the drift is a well-defined property of the random walk, depending only on Γ , μ and ρ .

Denote as $\mathcal{T}(S)$ the Teichmüller space of S . It has been proven by Azemar–Gadre–Gouëzel–Haettel–Lessa–Uyanik [AGG⁺nt, Theorem B] that the function $\text{Drift} : \mathcal{T}(S) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ grows at least linearly with respect to the Teichmüller distance. In this paper we give more details about this relation.

There is a natural identification between the set $Q^1(o)$ of unit area quadratic differentials q under the conformal structure defined by a basepoint $o \in \mathcal{T}(S)$ and the set of Teichmüller geodesic rays starting at o . For a given $q \in Q^1(o)$ we shall denote by $\mathcal{R}(q; \cdot) : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(S)$ the associated geodesic. We find that whenever the quadratic differential is Jenkins–Strebel the linear lower bound of the growth is sharp. More precisely, we show the following.

Theorem 1.1. *Let μ be an admissible measure on $\pi_1(S, p)$ with finite first moment. Furthermore, let $o \in \mathcal{T}(S)$ be a basepoint, and let $q \in Q^1(o)$ be Jenkins–Strebel. Then, there are constants $c(o), C(q, o) > 0$ such that, along the geodesic ray $\mathcal{R}(q; \cdot)$,*

$$c(o)t \leq \text{Drift}_\mu(\mathcal{R}(q; t)) \leq C(q, o)t$$

*Aitor.Azemar@glasgow.ac.uk, Mathematics & Statistics, University of Glasgow G128QQ, UK

for all $t \geq 1$.

Furthermore, we find that this is not the typical behaviour. As long as the measure on the set of directions satisfies a thickness property, we get that along typical geodesics the drift grows exponentially. For example, we find the following.

Theorem 1.2. *Let μ be an admissible measure on $\pi_1(S, p)$ with finite first moment. Furthermore, let $o \in \mathcal{T}(S)$ be a basepoint, $\theta < 1$ and λ be the Lebesgue measure on $Q^1(o)$. Then, for λ -almost all directions $q \in Q^1(o)$ we have*

$$e^{\theta t} < \text{Drift}_\mu(\mathcal{R}(q; t)) < e^{\frac{1}{\theta} t},$$

for any $t > t(q)$, where $t(q)$ is some finite time depending on q .

See Theorem 4.7 for a more general version of the previous result, which also applies to harmonic measures on $Q^1(o)$ arising from random walks on the mapping class group with finite first moments. We also find that these two behaviours are not the only ones, and in fact there are many intermediate behaviours. Precisely, we find the following.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $o \in \mathcal{T}(S)$ be a fixed basepoint. There is a constant $c(o) > 0$ such that, for any increasing diverging function $f : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ there is some $q \in Q^1(o)$ and diverging increasing sequences (t_n) , (s_n) such that*

$$\text{Drift}_\mu(\mathcal{R}(q; t_n)) > c(o)e^{t_n}$$

and

$$\text{Drift}_\mu(\mathcal{R}(q; s_n)) < f(s_n)s_n.$$

That is, there are directions along which the growth of the drift is exponential along one subsequence, while almost linear along another.

We also show that the quasiconvexity of hyperbolic lengths along Teichmüller geodesics proven by Lenzhen–Rafi [LR11] can be adapted to the drift.

Corollary 1.4. *Let μ be an admissible measure on $\pi_1(S, p)$ with finite first moment. There exists a constant $K' > 0$ such that for any Teichmüller geodesic G and points $x, y, z \in \mathcal{T}(S)$ appearing in that order along G , we have*

$$\text{Drift}_\mu(y) \leq K' \max(\text{Drift}_\mu(x), \text{Drift}_\mu(z)).$$

The drift of the random walk is closely related with the dimension of the hitting measure. Let \mathbb{H} be the hyperbolic plane. Each metric ρ can be interpreted as a representation $\rho : \pi_1(S, p) \rightarrow \text{Isom}_+(\mathbb{H})$, which can then be extended to an action of $\pi_1(S, p)$ on the Gromov boundary $\partial\mathbb{H}$. We then define the measure μ_ρ on $\text{Isom}_+(\mathbb{H})$ as the pushforward measure of μ by ρ . A measure $\nu \in \partial\mathbb{H}$ is μ_ρ -stationary if for every measurable $A \subset \partial\mathbb{H}$ we have

$$\nu(A) = \sum_{g \in \rho(\pi_1(S, p))} \mu(\rho^{-1}(g))\nu(g^{-1}A).$$

The measure ν can also be interpreted as the hitting measure of a random walk on \mathbb{H} driven by μ_ρ . Each μ_ρ has a unique stationary measure, which we denote by ν_ρ . Let $\dim(\nu_\rho) \in [0, 1]$ denote the Hausdorff dimension of ν_ρ . Deroin–Kleptsyn–Navas [DKN09, Conjecture 1.21], and Karlsson–Ledrappier [KL11] more generally, conjectured that the dimension is bounded away from 1 whenever the support of μ is finite. Kosenko–Tiozzo [KT22] and Azemar–Gadre–Gouëzel–Haettel–Lessa–Uyani [AGG⁺nt] recently made some partial progress regarding this conjecture, but it is still open.

Tanaka [Tan19] shows that

$$\dim(\nu_\rho) = \frac{h}{\text{Drift}_\mu(\rho)},$$

where h is the entropy of the random walk, a value depending only on the measure μ . In view of this relation, each result regarding the value of the drift can be translated to a result regarding the dimension of the stationary measure. For example, from Theorem 1.2 we have the following.

Corollary 1.5. *Let μ be an admissible measure on $\pi_1(S, p)$ with finite first moment and finite entropy. Furthermore, let $o \in \mathcal{T}(S)$ be a basepoint, $0 < \theta < 1$ and λ be the Lebesgue measure on $Q^1(o)$. Then, for λ -almost all directions $q \in Q^1(o)$ we have*

$$e^{-\frac{1}{\theta}t} < \dim(\nu_{\mathcal{R}(q;t)}) < e^{-\theta t},$$

for any $t > t(q)$, where $t(q)$ is some finite time depending on q .

1.1 Proof overview

Azemar–Gadre–Gouëzel–Haettel–Lessa–Uyani [AGG⁺nt] proved that the drift of the random walk is, up to a multiplicative constant, greater than the maximum length of a fixed finite filling set of curves. The driving observation of this paper is that this inequality can be improved to an equality up to a constant multiple. That is, we first prove the following result.

Theorem 1.6. *Let μ be an admissible measure on $\pi_1(S, p)$ with finite first moment. Furthermore, let F be a finite filling set of curves in S and let M_ρ^F be the maximum hyperbolic length among the curves with respect to the hyperbolic metric ρ . Then there is some $K < \infty$ depending solely on μ and F such that*

$$\frac{1}{K}M_\rho^F \leq \text{Drift}_\mu(\rho) \leq KM_\rho^F.$$

Many properties already known about the behaviour of hyperbolic lengths can then be translated directly to the behaviour of the drift. Of particular relevance are the works of Masur [Mas82], Choi–Rafi [CR07] and Lenzhen–Rafi [LR11], who, respectively, find values for the growth of the hyperbolic lengths along Jenkins–Strebel directions, show relations for the length of hyperbolic curves between thick parts of Teichmüller space, and prove the quasiconvexity of the hyperbolic length up to a constant.

Choi–Rafi’s estimates of the hyperbolic lengths in the thick part, combined with Lenzhen–Rafi’s quasiconvexity can be used to obtain exponential growth along the whole geodesic, provided the said geodesic does not spend too much proportional continuous time outside the thick part, relative to the total time from the start. The control on the continuous time spent outside the thick part by a common geodesic is given by estimates of Dowdall–Duchin–Masur [DDM14] in the case of many Lebesgue-like measures, and of Azemar–Gadre–Jeffreys [AGJ22] for harmonic measures arising from random walks on the mapping class group with finite first moments.

Finally, we use that both Jenkins–Strebel and recurrent directions are dense to build a geodesic which alternates between approaching the linear growth of Jenkins–Strebel directions and the exponential growth of recurrent directions.

Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank Maxime Fortier Bourque and Vaibhav Gadre for many helpful discussions and corrections.

2 Background

2.1 Teichmüller space

In this section we fix the notation and introduce some concepts needed for the rest of the paper. A detailed introduction to Teichmüller theory can be found, among others places, in the work of Farb–Margalit [FM12] or Gardiner [GL00]. Let S be a closed surface with negative Euler characteristic. The *Teichmüller space* of S is defined as the set of equivalence classes of pairs (X, f) where X is a Riemann surface and $f : S \rightarrow X$ is an orientation preserving homeomorphism. Two pairs (X, f) and (Y, g) are equivalent if there is a conformal diffeomorphism $h : X \rightarrow Y$ such that $g^{-1} \circ h \circ f$ is isotopic to the identity.

The *Teichmüller distance* between two points $[(X, f)], [(Y, g)] \in \mathcal{T}(S)$ is defined by $d_{\text{Teich}}([(X, f)], [(Y, g)]) = \frac{1}{2} \log \inf K$, where the infimum is taken over all $K \geq 1$ such that there exists a K -quasiconformal homeomorphism $h : X \rightarrow Y$ with $g^{-1} \circ h \circ f$ isotopic to the identity. There is a quasiconformal map realizing the infimum.

Let γ be an isotopy class of an essential curve in S and $[(X, f)] \in \mathcal{T}(S)$. We shall usually refer to curves when we actually mean their isotopy classes. By the uniformization theorem there is a unique hyperbolic metric on X . We define the hyperbolic length of γ in $[(X, f)]$ as the shortest length of the isotopy class $f(\gamma)$ in the unique hyperbolic metric on X . We shall denote this value as $\text{Hyp}_{[(X, f)]}(\gamma)$.

Given an $\varepsilon > 0$ the ε -*thick* part of Teichmüller space $\mathcal{T}_\varepsilon(S) \subset \mathcal{T}(S)$ is the subset of marked hyperbolic metrics where all essential closed curves have hyperbolic length at least ε .

Let TX be the tangent bundle over X . A *quadratic differential* of a Riemann surface X is a map $q : TX \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that $q(\lambda v) = \lambda^2 q(v)$ for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ and $v \in TX$. We denote by $Q([(X, f)])$ the holomorphic quadratic differentials with finite area under the conformal structure of $[(X, f)]$. There is a natural identification between $Q([(X, f)])$ and the cotangent space at $[(X, f)]$, so for each $q \in Q([(X, f)])$ we denote as $\mathcal{R}(q; \cdot) : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(S)$ the geodesic associated to q . If we restrict to quadratic differentials of area 1, which we denote as $Q^1([(X, f)])$, the associated geodesics have speed 1. That is, for $q \in Q^1([(X, f)])$, $d_{\text{Teich}}(\mathcal{R}(q; t), \mathcal{R}(q; s)) = |t - s|$. Given a quadratic differential q we can define its vertical foliation $V(q)$ as the measured foliation defined by the smooth paths γ such that $q(\gamma'(t)) < 0$ for every t in the interior of the domain, as well as the transverse measure given by $|\text{Re} \sqrt{q}|$. If each non critical trajectory is a closed curve the quadratic differential is called *Jenkins–Strebel*. The set of Jenkins–Strebel quadratic differentials is dense within the set of differentials.

By considering the sphere of radius one around the point o we get an embedding of $Q^1(o)$ into $\mathcal{T}(S)$, so we can endow $Q^1(o)$ with a Lebesgue measure. On the other hand, Kaimonovich–Masur [KM96, Theorem 2.2.4] proved that for non-elementary random walks on the mapping class group, typical sample paths converge to the Thurston boundary of Teichmüller space and that resulting stationary measure is supported on uniquely ergodic measured geodesics. As proven by Masur [Mas82] differentials in $Q^1(o)$ with uniquely ergodic vertical foliations converge to the projective class of that foliation in the Thurston boundary. Hence, the stationary measure can be pulled back to get another measure on $Q^1(o)$.

2.2 Random walks

Let Γ be a group and μ a probability measure on Γ . We say that μ is *admissible* if the semi group generated by its support is equal to Γ . We shall always assume that μ is admissible. The random walk on Γ determined by μ is the sequence of random variables $(Z_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ defined by

$$Z_n = g_1 g_2 \dots g_n,$$

where g_i are *i.i.d.* elements of Γ with distribution μ .

Let (\mathbb{H}, d) be the hyperbolic plane, and $G = \text{Isom}_+(\mathbb{H})$ be the group of orientation preserving isometries of \mathbb{H} . Furthermore, let $\Gamma = \pi_1(S, p)$ be the fundamental group of S based at p and let $\rho : \Gamma \rightarrow G$ be a discrete faithful representation. The length of an element $g \in \Gamma$ with respect to ρ is defined $|g|_\rho = \inf_{x \in \mathbb{H}} d(x, \rho(g)x)$. Equivalently, $|g|_\rho$ is the length of the core curve of the hyperbolic cylinder $\mathbb{H}/\rho(g)$, or the minimal length within the isotopy class of curves associated to $\rho(g)$ in $\mathbb{H}/\rho(\Gamma)$. We say μ has *finite first moment* with respect to ρ if $\sum_{g \in \Gamma} |g|_\rho \mu(g) < \infty$. We shall always assume that μ has finite first moment with respect to some ρ . The *linear drift* of the random walk is then defined as

$$\text{Drift}_\mu(\rho) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|Z_n|_\rho}{n}.$$

By Kingman’s subadditive ergodic theorem the drift is well-defined, and since the measure has finite first moment with respect to ρ , it is finite.

For each point $[(X, f)] \in \mathcal{T}(S)$ we can choose a faithful representation $\rho : \Gamma \rightarrow G$ such that $\mathbb{H}/\rho(\Gamma) = X$ and $\rho(\gamma)$ is the deck transformation associated to $f(\gamma)$. While such assignment is not unique, the length of

an element $\gamma \in \Gamma$ is a well defined function of this assignment, and hence so is $\text{Drift}_\mu(\rho)$. Indeed, for suitably chosen representation the curve associated to $\rho(\gamma)$ is $f(\gamma)$, so $|\gamma|_\rho = \text{Hyp}_{[(X,f)]}(\gamma)$. Therefore the elements of $\mathcal{T}(S)$ can be seen as classes of discrete faithful representations $\rho : \Gamma \rightarrow G$. By a slight abuse of notation we shall treat the elements of $\mathcal{T}(S)$ as any choice from each class, as the properties we shall deal with are invariant within the class.

Let F be a fixed finite filling set of closed curves on S . Even though we are asking that the support of μ generates Γ as a semigroup, it might be that F is not contained entirely in the support of μ^k for any $k \geq 1$, as the elements of the support of μ^k are formed by concatenating precisely k elements from the support of μ . To avoid this we add the neutral element to the support of μ as follows. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and let $\mu_\varepsilon = (1 - \varepsilon)\mu + \varepsilon\delta_e$ be a relaxation of μ , where we introduce a slight probability of the random walk not moving at each step. For any $\rho \in \mathcal{T}(S)$ we have $\text{Drift}_{\mu_\varepsilon}(\rho) = (1 - \varepsilon)\text{Drift}_\mu(\rho)$. Furthermore, since μ is admissible, there is some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the curves associated to the group elements of $\text{supp}(\mu_\varepsilon^k)$ contain F . Then, $\text{Drift}_{\mu_\varepsilon^k}(\rho) = k(1 - \varepsilon)\text{Drift}_\mu(\rho)$. Since all the results in this paper regarding the drift are true up to multiplicative constants we will assume that $\text{supp}(\mu)$ already contains F . Denote $M_\rho^F = \max_{\gamma \in F}(\text{Hyp}_\rho(\gamma))$. We shall first prove the following well known result. The proof is similar to the one done by Minsky [Min93, Lemma 4.7]

Lemma 2.1. *Let F be a finite filling set of curves in S and let $o \in \mathcal{T}(S)$ be a fixed basepoint. Then, there is a constant K such that, for any $\rho \in \mathcal{T}(S)$ and free curve γ in S we have,*

$$\text{Hyp}_\rho(\gamma) \leq KM_\rho^F \text{Hyp}_o(\gamma).$$

Proof. Let D_ρ be the maximum diameter of the polygons formed by the distance minimizing configuration of the curves F , and ∂D_ρ its perimeter. Since the curves of F cut S into polygons, the value of $\text{Hyp}_\rho(\gamma)$ is bounded by the number of intersections of the curve γ with F multiplied by the maximum diameter of the polygons. That is,

$$\text{Hyp}_\rho(\gamma) \leq D_\rho \sum_{\alpha \in F} i(\gamma, \alpha) \leq \partial D_\rho \sum_{\alpha \in F} i(\gamma, \alpha).$$

Under the metric defined by o , for any closed curve α we can isometrically embed an annulus around α of thickness $\delta_o(\alpha) > 0$. Then, for any other curve γ we have $i(\alpha, \gamma)\delta_o(\alpha) \leq \text{Hyp}_o(\gamma)$. Hence,

$$\text{Hyp}_\rho(\gamma) \leq \partial D_\rho \sum_{\alpha \in F} \frac{1}{\delta(\alpha)} \text{Hyp}_o(\gamma).$$

Finally, the maximum perimeter of the polygons is smaller than twice the sum of the lengths of all the curves in F , so, denoting by $|F|$ the cardinality of F ,

$$\partial D_\rho \leq 2 \sum_{\alpha \in F} \text{Hyp}_\rho(\alpha) \leq M_\rho^F 2|F|.$$

We get the result by setting $K = 2|F| \sum_{\alpha \in F} \frac{1}{\delta(\alpha)}$. □

Since the number of curves in F is finite, M_ρ^F is finite for all $\rho \in \mathcal{T}(S)$. Hence, for any other $\rho \in \mathcal{T}(S)$ we have

$$\sum_{g \in \Gamma} |g|_\rho \mu(g) \leq KM_\rho^F \sum_{g \in \Gamma} |g|_o \mu(g) < \infty.$$

Therefore, if μ has finite first moment with respect to some basepoint $o \in \mathcal{T}(S)$, it has finite first moment for all $\rho \in \mathcal{T}(S)$. That is, it makes sense to say that the measure μ has finite first moment if it has finite first moment with respect to at least one point in $\mathcal{T}(S)$.

We have the following lower bound.

Theorem 2.2 (Azemar–Gadre–Gouëzel–Haettel–Lessa–Uyani [AGG⁺nt, Theorem 3.3]). *Let μ be an admissible measure on $\pi_1(S, p)$ with finite first moment, and let F be a finite filling set of curves in S . There exists a constant $c > 0$ such that $\text{Drift}_\mu(\rho) \geq cM_\rho^F$ for all $[\rho] \in \mathcal{T}(S)$.*

Using Lemma 2.1 it is relatively straightforward to check that the value M_ρ^F also serves to give an upper bound.

Proof of Theorem 1.6. By Theorem 2.2 there is $c > 0$ such that $\text{Drift}_\mu(\rho) \geq cM_\rho^F$, so we only have to prove the upper bound. Fix some basepoint $o \in \mathcal{T}(S)$. By Lemma 2.1 there is some $C < \infty$ such that $|Z_n|_\rho \leq CM_p|Z_n|_o$. Therefore,

$$\text{Drift}_\mu(\rho) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|Z_n|_\rho}{n} \leq CM_p \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|Z_n|_o}{n} = CM_p \text{Drift}_\mu(o),$$

so the result follows from setting $K = \max(C \text{Drift}_\mu(o), \frac{1}{c})$ □

3 Linear growth

We recall that the growth has to be at least linear.

Theorem 3.1 (Azemar–Gadre–Gouëzel–Haettel–Lessa–Uyani). *Given a basepoint $o \in \mathcal{T}(S)$ there exists some constant c such that $\text{Drift}_\mu(\rho) \geq cd_{\text{Teich}}(\rho, o)$.*

In this section we prove that this bound is sharp. The main ingredient is the following result, established by Masur [Mas82, End of the proof of Theorem 1.1], which finds limiting values for hyperbolic lengths along Jenkins–Strebel quadratic differentials.

Theorem 3.2 (Masur). *Let q be a unit area Jenkins–Strebel quadratic differential and let $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$ be its core curves. Then, for any sequence $(\rho_n) \subset \mathcal{T}(S)$ converging to q in the visual compactification and any curve γ in S we have*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{Hyp}_{\rho_n}(\gamma)}{4d_{\text{Teich}}(o, \rho_n)} = \sum_{i=1}^k i(\alpha_i, \gamma).$$

Proof of Theorem 1.1. By Theorem 3.1 we only have to prove the upper bound. Let $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$ be the core curves of the vertical foliation of q and let $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_l$ be the curves within the filling set F . Let $\delta > 0$. Then, by Theorem 3.2 for each γ_j we have a t_j such that, for all $t > t_j$, we have

$$\text{Hyp}_{\mathcal{R}(q;t)}(\gamma_j) < 4 \left(\sum_{i=1}^k i(\alpha_i, \gamma_j) + \delta \right) t.$$

Hence we can take $C(q, j)$ big enough so $\text{Hyp}_{\mathcal{R}(q;t)}(\gamma_j) < C(q, j)t$ for all $t \geq 1$. The theorem follows by setting $C(q) = K \max_{j \leq k} C(q, j)$, where K is the constant given by Theorem 1.6. □

4 Exponential growth

The goal of this section is to prove that the standard behaviour of the drift is exponential growth with respect to the Teichmüller distance. We begin by observing that as a direct result of Wolpert’s Lemma, the growth can not be higher than exponential.

Proposition 4.1. *Given a basepoint $o \in \mathcal{T}(S)$, there exists some constant $C(o)$ such that $\text{Drift}_\mu(\rho) \leq \text{Drift}_\mu(o)e^{2d_{\text{Teich}}(\rho, o)}$.*

Proof. As proven by Wolpert [Wol79, Lema 3.1] for any two points $o, \rho \in \mathcal{T}(S)$ and loop γ we have

$$\text{Hyp}_\rho(\gamma) \leq e^{2d_{\text{Teich}}(o, \rho)} \text{Hyp}_o(\gamma).$$

Therefore,

$$\text{Drift}_\mu(\rho) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{Hyp}_\rho(Z_n)}{n} \leq e^{2d_{\text{Teich}}(o, \rho)} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{Hyp}_o(Z_n)}{n} = e^{2d_{\text{Teich}}(o, \rho)} \text{Drift}_\mu(o).$$

□

The following result by Choi–Rafi [CR07, Theorem B] allows us to improve the previous upper bound, as well as get a lower bound for the growth of the drift for points in the thick part of Teichmüller space. Recall that $\mathcal{T}_\varepsilon(S)$ denotes the ε -thick part of Teichmüller space.

Theorem 4.2 (Choi–Rafi). *Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and $o \in \mathcal{T}_\varepsilon(S)$. There is a finite filling set of closed curves G and a constant $D > 0$ such that, for any $\rho \in \mathcal{T}_\varepsilon(S)$ we have*

$$\left| d_{\text{Teich}}(\rho, o) - \log \left(\max_{\alpha \in G} \frac{\text{Hyp}_\rho(\alpha)}{\text{Hyp}_o(\alpha)} \right) \right| \leq D.$$

Proposition 4.3. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and let $o \in \mathcal{T}_\varepsilon(S)$. Then, there exists constants $c, C > 0$ such that for any $\rho \in \mathcal{T}_\varepsilon(S)$ we have*

$$ce^{d_{\text{Teich}}(\rho, o)} \leq \text{Drift}_\mu(\rho) \leq Ce^{d_{\text{Teich}}(\rho, o)}.$$

Proof. Let G be the filling set of curves from Theorem 4.2. For any curve $\gamma \in G$ we have

$$\text{Hyp}_\rho(\gamma) = \text{Hyp}_o(\gamma) \frac{\text{Hyp}_\rho(\gamma)}{\text{Hyp}_o(\gamma)} \leq \text{Hyp}_o(\gamma) \max_{\alpha \in G} \frac{\text{Hyp}_\rho(\alpha)}{\text{Hyp}_o(\alpha)}.$$

Then, taking the maximum among all $\gamma \in G$ in the previous inequality we have, by Theorem 1.6, some $K > 0$ such that

$$\text{Drift}_\mu(\rho) \leq K \max_{\alpha \in G} \text{Hyp}_\rho(\alpha) \leq K \max_{\alpha \in G} \text{Hyp}_o(\alpha) e^D e^{d_{\text{Teich}}(\rho, o)},$$

where the last inequality follows from applying Theorem 4.2. On the other hand,

$$\frac{\max_{\alpha \in G} \text{Hyp}_\rho(\alpha)}{\min_{\alpha \in G} \text{Hyp}_o(\alpha)} \geq \max_{\alpha \in G} \frac{\text{Hyp}_\rho(\alpha)}{\text{Hyp}_o(\alpha)},$$

so similarly we have

$$\text{Drift}_\mu(\rho) \geq \frac{1}{K} \max_{\alpha \in G} \text{Hyp}_\rho(\alpha) \geq \frac{1}{K} \min_{\alpha \in G} \text{Hyp}_o(\alpha) e^{-D} e^{d_{\text{Teich}}(\rho, o)}.$$

Hence, the result follows from setting $c = \frac{1}{K} \min_{\alpha \in G} (\text{Hyp}_o(\alpha)) e^{-D}$ and $C = K \max_{\alpha \in G} (\text{Hyp}_o(\alpha)) e^D$. \square

By Mumford’s compactness the preimage of every bounded subset of moduli space is contained in some ε -thick part of Teichmüller space for ε small enough. Hence we have the following result.

Corollary 4.4. *Let $\gamma : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(S)$ be a Teichmüller ray such that its image is bounded in moduli space. Then, there is $c, C > 0$ such that*

$$ce^t \leq \text{Drift}_\mu(\gamma(t)) \leq Ce^t.$$

To prove that for almost all directions the growth is exponential we first observe that the growth of the drift is, up to a constant, not lost for big enough times. The main ingredient we shall use in the proof is the following.

Theorem 4.5 (Lenzhen–Rafi [LR11, Theorem A]). *There exists a constant $K > 0$ such that for every closed curve γ , any Teichmüller geodesic G and points $x, y, z \in \mathcal{T}(S)$ appearing in that order along G , we have*

$$\text{Hyp}_y(\gamma) \leq K \max(\text{Hyp}_x(\gamma), \text{Hyp}_z(\gamma)).$$

By Theorem 1.6 Lenzhen–Rafi’s result translates directly to the drift. That is, we have Corollary 1.4.

Proof of Corollary 1.4. By Theorems 1.6 and 4.5 there are constants $C, K > 0$ such that

$$\text{Drift}_\mu(y) \leq C \max_{\gamma \in F} \text{Hyp}_y(\gamma) \leq KC \max_{\gamma \in F} (\max(\text{Hyp}_x(\gamma), \text{Hyp}_z(\gamma)))$$

Switching the order of the maximums we have

$$\text{Drift}_\mu(y) \leq KC \max \left(\max_{\gamma \in F} \text{Hyp}_x(\gamma), \max_{\gamma \in F} \text{Hyp}_z(\gamma) \right) \leq KC^2 \max(\text{Drift}_\mu(x), \text{Drift}_\mu(z)).$$

\square

Furthermore, the drift is a proper function, so along any Teichmüller ray $\mathcal{R}(q; \cdot)$, the value of $\text{Drift}_\mu(\mathcal{R}(q; t))$ is eventually larger than $\text{Drift}_\mu(\mathcal{R}(q; 0))$. Hence, we have the following.

Lemma 4.6. *There is some constant $K > 0$ such that, for any basepoint $o \in \mathcal{T}(S)$ there is some time t_o for which*

$$\text{Drift}_\mu(\mathcal{R}(q; s)) \leq K \text{Drift}_\mu(\mathcal{R}(q; t))$$

for any $t > t_o$, $t > s > 0$ and $q \in Q^1(o)$.

Proof. Let t_o be big enough so $\text{Drift}_\mu(\rho) > \text{Drift}_\mu(o)$ for any ρ such that $d_{\text{Teich}}(\rho, o) > t_o$. By Theorem 3.1 such a t_o exists. Then, for any quadratic differential q based at o , $t > t_o$ and $t > s > 0$ we have, by Corollary 1.4,

$$\text{Drift}_\mu(\mathcal{R}(q; s)) \leq K \max(\text{Drift}_\mu(\mathcal{R}(q; 0), \text{Drift}_\mu(\mathcal{R}(q; t)))) = K \text{Drift}_\mu(\mathcal{R}(q; t))$$

□

Lemma 4.6, combined with Proposition 4.3, gives upper and lower bound on the growth of the drift along a geodesic provided said geodesic does not spend too much continued time outside the thick part. For a given geodesic $\mathcal{R}(q; \cdot)$, $\varepsilon > 0$ and $t > 0$, we aim to find some control on the largest $s_q^{\text{bot}}(t) \leq t$ and lowest $s_q^{\text{top}}(t) \geq t$ such that $\mathcal{R}(q; s_q^{\text{bot}}(t)), \mathcal{R}(q; s_q^{\text{top}}(t)) \in \mathcal{T}_\varepsilon(S)$. Given a geodesic ray $\gamma : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(S)$, define the proportion of the amount of time spent in the thick part up to time t as

$$\text{Thick}_\varepsilon^\%(\gamma, t) := \frac{|\{0 \leq s \leq t : \gamma(s) \in \mathcal{T}_\varepsilon(S)\}|}{t}.$$

Theorem 4.7. *Let $o \in \mathcal{T}(S)$ be a basepoint in Teichmüller space. Furthermore, let σ be a measure on $Q^1(o)$ such that for all $0 < \xi < 1$ there is some $\varepsilon(\xi) > 0$ such that for σ -almost every q there is $t_q^\xi < \infty$ such that*

$$\text{Thick}_{\varepsilon(\xi)}^\%(\mathcal{R}(q; \cdot), t) \geq \xi$$

for all $t \geq t_q^\xi$.

Fix then $0 < \theta < 1$. For σ -almost all directions $q \in Q^1(o)$ there is $t(q, \theta) < \infty$ such that

$$e^{\theta t} < \text{Drift}_\mu(\mathcal{R}(q; t)) < e^{\frac{1}{\theta} t}$$

for all $t > t(q, \theta)$.

Proof. Given $0 < \theta < 1$, let $\xi = \frac{1+\theta}{2}$. For a given $q \in Q^1(o)$ and $t > 0$ let $s_q^{\text{top}}(t) \geq t$ be the smallest time larger than t such that $\mathcal{R}(q; s_q^{\text{top}}(t)) \in \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon(\xi)}(S)$. The time spent outside $\mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon(\xi)}(S)$ directly after t is $s_q^{\text{top}}(t) - t$. Hence, $\frac{s_q^{\text{top}}(t) - (s_q^{\text{top}}(t) - t)}{s_q^{\text{top}}(t)} > \xi$. Therefore, $s_q^{\text{top}}(t) < \frac{1}{\xi} t$. Hence, By Lemma 4.6 we have $K, t_o > 0$ such that, for all $t > t_o$,

$$\text{Drift}_\mu(\mathcal{R}(q; t)) \leq K \text{Drift}_\mu(\mathcal{R}(q; s_q^{\text{top}}(t))).$$

Since $\mathcal{R}(q; s_q^{\text{top}}(t))$ is in the ε -thick part of Teichmüller space we have, by Proposition 4.3,

$$\text{Drift}_\mu(\mathcal{R}(q; t)) \leq K \text{Drift}_\mu(\mathcal{R}(q; s_q^{\text{top}}(t))) \leq CK e^{s_q^{\text{top}}(t)} \leq CK e^{\frac{1}{\xi} t}.$$

Similarly, denoting $s_q^{\text{bot}}(t)$ the largest time smaller than t such that $\mathcal{R}(q; s_q^{\text{bot}}(t)) \in \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon(\xi)}(S)$ we get $s_q^{\text{bot}}(t) > \xi t$. Following the same reasoning we get

$$\text{Drift}_\mu(\mathcal{R}(q; t)) \geq \frac{1}{K} \text{Drift}_\mu(\mathcal{R}(q; s_q^{\text{bot}}(t))) \geq \frac{c}{K} e^{s_q^{\text{bot}}(t)} \geq \frac{c}{K} e^{\xi t}.$$

Since $\xi < \theta < 1$ there is some t_θ such that $e^{\theta t} > \frac{c}{K} e^{\xi t}$ and $e^{\frac{1}{\theta} t} < CK e^{\frac{1}{\xi} t}$ for all $t \geq t_\theta$. Hence, the theorem follows from setting $t(q, \theta) = \max(t_q, t_\theta, t_o)$. □

It follows from Dowdall–Duchin–Masur [DDM14, Proposition 5.5] that the hypothesis of Theorem 4.7 is satisfied a wide variety of Lebesgue-class measures, giving us a proof of Theorem 1.2. Furthermore, from Azemar–Gadre–Jeffreys [AGJ22, Proposition 3.3] the property is also satisfied for harmonic measures generated by non-elementary measures on the mapping class group with finite first moment.

Corollary 4.8. *Let σ be a measure on $Q^1(o)$ satisfying the hypothesis of Theorem 4.7. Then, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ we have, for σ -almost every $q \in Q^1(o)$,*

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{Drift}_\mu(\mathcal{R}(q; t))}{e^{(1-\varepsilon)t}} = \infty$$

and

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{Drift}_\mu(\mathcal{R}(q; t))}{e^{(1+\varepsilon)t}} = 0.$$

Furthermore, there is σ -almost surely some $0 < c(q) < \infty$ such that

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{Drift}_\mu(\mathcal{R}(q; t))}{e^t} \leq c(q) \leq \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{Drift}_\mu(\mathcal{R}(q; t))}{e^t}.$$

Proof. Let $\theta = 1 - \varepsilon$. Then, by Theorem 1.2 there is some $c > 0$ such that σ -almost every $q \in Q^1(o)$ we have

$$\text{Drift}_\mu(\mathcal{R}(q; t)) \geq e^{(1-\varepsilon)t}$$

for all t big enough. Hence, the first relation follows. Similarly for $\theta = \frac{1}{1+\varepsilon}$ we get the second relation. The last relation follows from taking a diverging sequence of times (t_n) such that $\mathcal{R}(q; t_n) \in \mathcal{T}_\varepsilon(S)$ and applying Proposition 4.3. \square

5 Variable growth

In this section we prove that there is some geodesic along which we have variable growth. The basic idea of the proof is alternating Proposition 4.3 and Theorem 1.1, using the fact that both results apply to dense sets of directions.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Fix $\delta, \varepsilon > 0$ such that the basepoint $o \in \mathcal{T}(S)$ is in the ε -thick part of Teichmüller space. We shall build inductively a sequence of quadratic differentials (j_k) , as well as sequences of times (s_k) , (t_k) such that, $\text{Drift}_\mu(\mathcal{R}(j_k; s_i)) < (f(s_i) - \delta 2^{-2(k-i)}) s_i$ for each $i \leq k$ and each $\mathcal{R}(j_k; t_i)$ is at most at distance $\delta(2 - 2^{-2(k-i)})$ from \mathcal{T}_ε for each $i \leq k$. The theorem will follow by taking an accumulation point of such sequence.

For $k = 0$ let $j_0 \in Q^1(o)$ be a Jenkins-Strebel quadratic differential. By Theorem 1.1 there are constants $C(j_0), t(j_0)$ such that $\text{Drift}_\mu(\mathcal{R}(j_0; t)) < C(j_0)t$ for all $t > t(j_0)$. Let s_0 be big enough such that $f(s_0) > C(j_0) + \delta$ and $s_0 > t(j_0)$. Finally, let $t_0 = 0$.

Assume then we have the sequence up to k . The set of recurrent directions to \mathcal{T}_ε is dense, so we can take a sequence of quadratic differentials $(q^n) \subset Q^1(o)$ spawning recurrent geodesics and converging to j_k . Since $q^n \rightarrow j_k$, the geodesics $\mathcal{R}(q^n; \cdot)$ converge to the geodesic $\mathcal{R}(j_k; \cdot)$ pointwise. The drift is a continuous function with respect to Teichmüller space, so $\text{Drift}_\mu(\mathcal{R}(q^n; s_i)) \rightarrow \text{Drift}_\mu(\mathcal{R}(j_k; s_i)) \leq (f(s_i) - \delta 2^{-2(k-i)}) s_i$ for each $i \leq k$. Let q be the first element of the sequence (q^n) such that

$$\text{Drift}_\mu(\mathcal{R}(q; s_i)) < (f(s_i) - \delta 2^{-(2(k-i)+1)}) s_i$$

and

$$d_{\text{Teich}}(\mathcal{R}(q; t_i), \mathcal{R}(j_k; t_i)) < \delta 2^{-(2(k-i)+1)}$$

for all $i \leq k$. The geodesic $\mathcal{R}(q; \cdot)$ is recurrent, so we can fix $t_{k+1} > s_k + 1$ such that $\mathcal{R}(q; t_{k+1}) \in \mathcal{T}_\varepsilon$.

The set of Jenkins–Strebel directions is dense, so we can take a sequence (j^n) converging to q . As before, the convergence within the sequences is pointwise, so $\text{Drift}_\mu(\mathcal{R}(j^n; s_i)) \rightarrow \text{Drift}_\mu(\mathcal{R}(q; s_i)) \leq (f(s_i) - \delta 2^{-(2(k-i)+1)})_{s_i}$ for each $i \leq k$. Let j_{k+1} be the first element of the sequence (j^n) such that

$$\text{Drift}_\mu(\mathcal{R}(j_{k+1}; s_i)) \leq (f(s_i) - \delta 2^{-2(k+1-i)})_{s_i}$$

and

$$d_{\text{Teich}}(\mathcal{R}(j_{k+1}; t_i), \mathcal{R}(q; t_i)) < \delta 2^{-2(k+1-i)}$$

for all $i \leq k+1$. As before, there is some $C(j_{k+1})$ such that $\text{Drift}_\mu(\mathcal{R}(j_{k+1}; t)) < C(j_{k+1})t$, so let s_{k+1} be the first time larger than t_{k+1} such that $f(s_{k+1}) > C(s_{k+1}) + \delta$. Furthermore, for $i \leq k$

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\text{Teich}}(\mathcal{R}(j_{k+1}; t_i), \mathcal{T}_\varepsilon) &\leq d_{\text{Teich}}(\mathcal{R}(j_{k+1}; t_i), \mathcal{R}(q; t_i)) + d_{\text{Teich}}(\mathcal{R}(q; t_i), \mathcal{R}(j_k; t_i)) + d_{\text{Teich}}(\mathcal{R}(j_k; t_i), \mathcal{T}_\varepsilon) \\ &< \delta \left(2^{-(2(k-i)+1)} + 2^{-2(k+1-i)} + 2 - 2^{-(2(k-i))} \right) = \delta \left(2 - 2^{-2(k+1-i)} \right) \end{aligned}$$

and for $i = k+1$ we have, since $\mathcal{R}(q_{k+1}; t_{k+1}) \in \mathcal{T}_\varepsilon$,

$$d_{\text{Teich}}(\mathcal{R}(j_{k+1}; t_{k+1}), \mathcal{T}_\varepsilon) \leq d_{\text{Teich}}(\mathcal{R}(j_{k+1}; t_{k+1}), \mathcal{R}(q_{k+1}; t_{k+1})) < \delta.$$

Hence, we have completed the induction step.

Let q_f be an accumulation point of the sequence (j_k) . There is then a subsequence, relabeled (j_k) converging to q_f . By pointwise convergence, $\text{Drift}_\mu(\mathcal{R}(j_k; s_i)) \rightarrow \text{Drift}_\mu(\mathcal{R}(q_f; s_i))$, so $\text{Drift}_\mu(\mathcal{R}(q_f; s_i)) < f(s_i)_{s_i}$ for each i . Furthermore, $\mathcal{R}(j_k; t_i) \rightarrow \mathcal{R}(q_f; t_i)$, so for each i the points $\mathcal{R}(q_f; t_i)$ are at most at distance 2δ from the \mathcal{T}_ε . Therefore, there is some ε' such that $\mathcal{R}(q_f; t_i) \in \mathcal{T}_{\varepsilon'}$ for all i . Hence, by Proposition 4.3 there is some $c > 0$ such that $\text{Drift}_\mu(\mathcal{R}(q_f; t_i)) > ce^{t_i}$. Furthermore, $t_{k+1} > s_k + 1 > t_k + 1$, so the sequence (t_k) diverges to infinity, and so does (s_k) . Finally, the geodesic $\mathcal{R}(q_f; \cdot)$ is recurrent, so by Masur's criterion [Mas92, Theorem 1.1] the vertical foliation of q_f is uniquely ergodic. \square

6 Conclusions

Theorem 4.7 shows that along a typical geodesic the drift grows exponentially. However, it does not determine precisely the fluctuations within such exponential growth. Furthermore, Theorem 1.3 shows that the behaviour of the drift along a geodesic can vary wildly, so it is natural to ask whether there is some variation within a typical geodesic.

Question 6.1. *Let ν be a measure on $Q^1(o)$ satisfying the hypothesis of Theorem 4.7. Do we have*

$$0 < \liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{Drift}_\mu(\mathcal{R}(q; t))}{e^t} = \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{Drift}_\mu(\mathcal{R}(q; t))}{e^t} < \infty$$

ν -almost surely?

Note that by Corollary 4.8 we have $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{Drift}_\mu(\mathcal{R}(q; t))}{e^t} > 0$ and $\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{Drift}_\mu(\mathcal{R}(q; t))}{e^t} < \infty$. In the proof of Theorem 4.7 we have bounded the quotient between the drift and the exponential e^t by a function depending on the maximal continuous time spent in the thin part of Teichmüller space up to time t . The growth of these maximal departures may vary differently depending on the measure. On the one hand, following work of Gadre [Gad17, Lemma 5.5] it is reasonable to conjecture that the maximal departure grows slightly faster than $\log(t)$ for the Lebesgue measure. On the other hand, because of exponential decay of subsurface projections for harmonic measures, it may be expected (though this is still unproved) that the largest continuous time spent in the thin part for a harmonic typical Teichmüller geodesic is of the order of $\log(\log(t))$. Therefore, the answer to the previous question might be different for the Lebesgue and harmonic measures.

References

- [AGG⁺nt] Aitor Azemar, Vaibhav Gadre, Sébastien Gouëzel, Thomas Haettel, Pablo Lessa, and Caglar Uyanik. Random walk speed is a proper function on Teichmüller space, 2022, preprint.
- [AGJ22] Aitor Azemar, Vaibhav Gadre, and Luke Jeffreys. Statistical hyperbolicity for harmonic measure. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (8):6289–6309, 2022.
- [CR07] Young-Eun Choi and Kasra Rafi. Comparison between Teichmüller and Lipschitz metrics. *J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2)*, 76(3):739–756, 2007.
- [DDM14] Spencer Dowdall, Moon Duchin, and Howard Masur. Statistical hyperbolicity in Teichmüller space. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 24(3):748–795, 2014.
- [DKN09] Bertrand Deroin, Victor Kleptsyn, and Andrés Navas. On the question of ergodicity for minimal group actions on the circle. *Mosc. Math. J.*, 9(2):263–303, back matter, 2009.
- [FM12] Benson Farb and Dan Margalit. *A primer on mapping class groups*, volume 49 of *Princeton Mathematical Series*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2012.
- [Gad17] Vaibhav Gadre. Partial sums of excursions along random geodesics and volume asymptotics for thin parts of moduli spaces of quadratic differentials. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 19(10):3053–3089, 2017.
- [GL00] Frederick P. Gardiner and Nikola Lakic. *Quasiconformal Teichmüller theory*, volume 76 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2000.
- [KL11] Anders Karlsson and François Ledrappier. Noncommutative ergodic theorems. In *Geometry, rigidity, and group actions*, Chicago Lectures in Math., pages 396–418. Univ. Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, 2011.
- [KM96] Vadim A. Kaimanovich and Howard Masur. The Poisson boundary of the mapping class group. *Invent. Math.*, 125(2):221–264, 1996.
- [KT22] Petr Kosenko and Giulio Tiozzo. The fundamental inequality for cocompact Fuchsian groups. *Forum Math. Sigma*, 10:e102, 2022.
- [LR11] Anna Lenzhen and Kasra Rafi. Length of a curve is quasi-convex along a Teichmüller geodesic. *J. Differential Geom.*, 88(2):267–295, 2011.
- [Mas82] Howard Masur. Two boundaries of Teichmüller space. *Duke Math. J.*, 49(1):183–190, 1982.
- [Mas92] Howard Masur. Hausdorff dimension of the set of nonergodic foliations of a quadratic differential. *Duke Math. J.*, 66(3):387–442, 1992.
- [Min93] Yair N. Minsky. Teichmüller geodesics and ends of hyperbolic 3-manifolds. *Topology*, 32(3):625–647, 1993.
- [Tan19] Ryokichi Tanaka. Dimension of harmonic measures in hyperbolic spaces. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 39(2):474–499, 2019.
- [Wol79] Scott Wolpert. The length spectra as moduli for compact Riemann surfaces. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 109(2):323–351, 1979.