

HARMONICITY OF GIBBS MEASURES

CHRIS CONNELL[†] AND ROMAN MUCHNIK[‡]

ABSTRACT. In this paper we extend the construction of random walks with a prescribed Poisson boundary found in [CM04] to the case of measures in the class of a generalized Gibbs state. The price for dropping the α -quasiconformal assumptions is that we must restrict our attention to $\text{CAT}(-\kappa)$ groups. Apart from the new estimates required, we prove a new approximation scheme to provide a positive basis for positive functions in a metric measure space.

1. INTRODUCTION.

In recently years a number of authors, and most notably V. Kaimanovich, have successfully shown for various classes of “large” groups, that most random walks have an associated Poisson boundary that is at least as large as its geometric boundary (e.g. [KV83],[Kaï94, Kaï00, Kaï03],[KM96, KM98]).

We are interested in the converse question of whether or not a given measure on the geometric boundary can possibly arise as the Poisson boundary of some random walk. Early on, Furstenberg ([Fur63, Fur67, Fur71]) first answered this question affirmatively for the Haar measure on the Furstenberg boundary G/P of a certain class of semisimple Lie groups G , where the random walk occurs on a lattice in G .

In the current paper, we answer this question affirmatively for a large class of natural measures on the geodesic boundary of a negatively curved group. This mostly completes one direction of the work begun in [CM04], where we answered the same question for the case of measures in the class of α -quasiconformal densities on the boundary of a group acting on a Gromov hyperbolic space. The most famous example these measures, arising for a particular α , are the Patterson-Sullivan classes. (In this generality, the Patterson-Sullivan measures may possibly refer to several distinct measure classes arising from different choices in their construction.) We will presently treat a much larger family of measures which include the quasiconformal ones, but in return we must restrict the class of groups we consider.

We restrict to the case of a group G acting cocompactly by isometries on a $\text{CAT}(-\kappa)$ space H . The measure classes we consider are represented by the *Gibbs streams* and arise as certain conditional measures for the classical Gibbs states. These classes include most of the known ergodic measures on ∂H . The concept of the Gibbs state was imported into the theory of dynamical systems directly from statistical mechanics. Gibbs streams for negatively curved manifolds have been studied extensively in several contexts (see [Bow75] or [Rue78] for a list of early references).

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 60J50;20F67;37A35;41A65.

[†] The author is supported in part by NSF grant DMS-0306594.

[‡] The author is supported in part by an NSF postdoctoral fellowship.

We briefly mention one way in which they appear in the case when H is a negatively curved manifold and $G < \text{Isom}(H)$ acts cocompactly. Let \mathcal{M} be the space of G invariant Borel probability measure on SH which are invariant under the geodesic flow. Let h_ν denote the metric entropy of the measure $\nu \in \mathcal{M}$. If Φ is a G invariant Borel function on the unit tangent bundle SH , then the *pressure of Φ* is given by

$$P(\Phi) = \sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{M}} \left\{ h_\nu - \int_{SH} \Phi d\nu \right\}.$$
¹

A measure ν such that $P(\Phi) = h_\nu - \nu(\Phi)$ is called an *equilibrium state for Φ* . If Φ is also Hölder continuous, then there is a unique equilibrium state for Φ which is denoted by ν^Φ . Since the geodesic flow on a closed negatively curved manifold is Anosov, Bowen showed ([Bow75]) that the equilibrium state coincides with the Gibbs state which appears in thermodynamic formalism as the eigenmeasure of the transfer operator corresponding to Φ . This measure has several important dynamical properties.

There is a natural identification $SH = (\partial H \times \partial H) \setminus \Delta$ where Δ is the diagonal. We can decompose ν^Φ into conditional measures $\{\nu_p^\Phi\}_{p \in H}$ on ∂H (see [Kai90]). These measures form what is called the *Gibbs stream for Φ* .

In Section 4, we will exploit a construction of U. Hamenstädt ([Ham97]) which allows Gibbs streams to be viewed as generalizations of α -quasiconformal measures in a hitherto new way. This allows us to easily generalize the Gibbs construction to the $\text{CAT}(-1)$ setting.

In what follows, let H be a $\text{CAT}(-1)$ space and let $G < \text{Isom}(H)$ be a group of isometries acting cocompactly on H . We further assume that H has bounded flip (see Definition B.6). This condition is satisfied for the common examples of $\text{CAT}(-1)$ spaces: negatively curved manifolds, buildings and infinite trees.

Define the *unit tangent space SH* to be the space of all unit speed geodesics in H . There is a natural metric dist on SH given by

$$\text{dist}(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d(\gamma_1(t), \gamma_2(t)) e^{-|t|} dt,$$

In this generality distinct geodesics can share common segments, and it will be necessary to restrict our attention to the family, \mathcal{H} , of those Hölder functions Φ satisfying $\Phi(\gamma_1) = \Phi(\gamma_2)$ if $\gamma_1([0, \epsilon]) = \gamma_2([0, \epsilon])$ for any $\epsilon > 0$.

Now we can state our main result.

Theorem 1.1. *Let H, G and $\Phi \in \mathcal{H}$ be as above. For every $p \in H$ there exists a measure $\mu_p \in P(G)$ such that $\mu_p \star \nu_p^\Phi = \nu_p^\Phi$ and $(\partial H, \nu_p^\Phi)$ is the Poisson boundary for (G, μ_p) .*

The above theorem is an immediate consequence of the following more general theorem.

Theorem 1.2. *Let H, G and $\Phi \in \mathcal{H}$ be as above. For every $p \in H$ and positive Hölder function f on ∂H , there exists a measure $\mu_p \in P(G)$ such that $\mu_p \star f \nu_p^\Phi = f \nu_p^\Phi$ and $(\partial H, f \nu_p^\Phi)$ is the Poisson boundary for (G, μ_p) .*

¹The pressure of Φ was historically defined as $P(-\Phi)$, but this choice of sign convention seems to have become more popular and we will also follow this choice since it leads to a more convenient normalization.

Some applications of this theorem will be explored in [BM05]. As an example, we indicate a consequence of a stronger version of the above theorem which we actually prove. For each $p, q \in G$ We may construct a mapping from $L^1(\partial G, \nu_*)$ to $l^1(G)$ given by taking $f \mapsto \{\lambda_g^f(p, q)\}_{g \in G}$ where $f = \sum_{g \in G} \lambda_g^f(p, q) \frac{d\nu_{pg}^\Phi}{d\nu_q^\Phi}$. The important properties of this mapping are that it is an embedding, sends positive lower semicontinuous functions to positive sequences, and that for the standard unitary representation $g_*f = f \circ g^{-1}$ we have $\lambda_{\sigma^*}^{g_*f}(p, q) = \lambda_\sigma^f(gp, gq)$ for all $g, \sigma \in G$.

Note that here we have used that the right and left actions of G on itself commute. So μ_p above is not $\sum_{g \in G} \lambda_g^1(p, p) \delta_{gp}$ since we use $\frac{d\nu_{pg}^\Phi}{d\nu_p^\Phi}$ in defining $\lambda_g^1(p, p)$ instead of the terms $\frac{d\nu_{gp}^\Phi}{d\nu_p^\Phi}$ arising in the terms of the convolution derivative, $\frac{d\mu_p * \nu_p^\Phi}{d\nu_p^\Phi} = 1$.

Lastly, we would like to remark that for G a δ -hyperbolic group, I. Mineyev has discovered a metric (quasi-isometric to the original one) which mimics that of a CAT(-1) space (for instance $d_p(x, y) = e^{-\epsilon(x \cdot y)_p}$ is a metric for some $\epsilon > 0$). We have employed a number of estimates which depend on the interior (as opposed to asymptotic) geometry. Nevertheless, using this new metric we suspect that it may be possible to push the main result over to the δ -hyperbolic setting. However, we did not attempt this.

2. REGULARITY OF MEASURES AND COVERS

We first present some necessary notation. Recall that on a set X , a nonnegative function $d : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called a *quasimetric* (or *quasidistance*) if d is symmetric, zero precisely along the diagonal, and satisfies the quasitriangle inequality:

$$d(x, y) \leq C(d(x, z) + d(z, y))$$

for some $C \geq 1$ and all $x, y, z \in X$.

2.1. Doubling and related properties. Let X be a compact space equipped with a probability measure ν . The symbol $\|\cdot\|$ will denote the $L^1(X, \nu)$ -norm.

From now on, d will denote either a metric or a quasi-metric on X , as the context demands. Moreover, $\pi : X \times X \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ will always denote a nonnegative continuous function which is zero precisely on the diagonal and nowhere else. We will sometimes call such a function a distance, even though it may not be symmetric or satisfy the triangle inequality.

Let $\Pi(x, r) = \{y \in X : \pi(y, x) < r \text{ and } \pi(x, y) < r\}$ be called an *open ball* with respect to such a distance, and let $B(x, r) = \{y \in X : d(y, x) < r\}$ denote an open ball with respect to a metric (or quasi-metric) on X .

Definition 2.1. We say that the function $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ is *almost decreasing* if there exists $\delta > 0$ and $C > 0$ such that

- (1) $f(x) \geq f(y)$ if $x + \delta \leq y$
- (2) $Cf(x) \geq f(y)$ otherwise.

Definition 2.2. We say that an almost decreasing function

$$G : X \times X \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$$

is *niceily decaying with respect to the measure ν* if there exists a constant C_G and $\alpha_G, \beta_G \geq 0$ such that

$$\sup_{x \in X} \int_{X - \Pi(x, r)} G(x, y, s) d\nu(y) \leq C_G \frac{e^{-\alpha_G s}}{\max\{e^{s r}, 1\}^{\beta_G}}$$

for every $s \geq 0$ and $r \geq 0$

2.2. Hölder constants. Recall that a map $f : X \rightarrow Y$ between metric spaces X and Y is locally Lipschitz if for every $r > 0$ and $x \in X$ we have,

$$\sup_{\substack{y \in B(x, r) \\ y \neq x}} \frac{d_Y(f(x), f(y))}{d_X(x, y)} < \infty.$$

The other extant definitions of this notion agree when X is proper. We now recall the definition of the Hölder constant on a given scale.

Definition 2.3. As in the usual metric case, we shall say that a map $f : X \rightarrow Y$ between distance spaces X and Y is *locally α -Hölder* if for every $r > 0$ and $x \in X$ we have,

$$\sup_{\substack{y \in \Pi(x, r) \\ y \neq x}} \frac{\pi_Y(f(x), f(y))}{\pi_X(x, y)^\alpha} < \infty.$$

For such a map, we define the *Hölder constant at x of scale r and of order a* to be the quantity,

$$D_r^a f(x) = \sup_{\substack{y \in B(x, r) \\ y \neq x}} \frac{\pi_Y(f(x), f(y))}{\pi_X(x, y)^a}.$$

Remark: It is clear that if f is locally a -Hölder and $s \leq r$ then $D_s^a f(x) \leq D_r^a f(x)$. And for $b \leq a$ with $r \leq 1$ we have $D_r^b f(x) \leq D_r^a f(x)$

In the case of locally a -Hölder functions to \mathbb{R} , we summarize any arithmetic relations we may need in the following lemma. These will be mainly used in the proof of Theorem 5.1. Each case may be verified by a simple (and omitted) computation based on the definition.

Lemma 2.4. *If F, G are two locally a -Hölder functions on X , then $F + G$ and FG are locally a -Hölder. Moreover,*

- (1) $D_r^a(F + G)(x) \leq D_r^a F(x) + D_r^a G(x)$,
- (2) $D_r^a(FG)(x) \leq \left(\sup_{d(x, y) \leq r} |F(y)| \right) D_r^a G(x) + \left(\sup_{d(x, y) \leq r} |G(y)| \right) D_r^a F(x)$.
- (3) *If $G(x) \neq 0$ for all $x \in X$, then $\frac{1}{G}$ is locally Hölder and*

$$D_r \left(\frac{1}{G} \right) (x) \leq \frac{D_r^a G(x)}{|G(x)| \left(\inf_{d(x, y) \leq r} |G(y)| \right)}.$$

- (4) *If $H : Y \rightarrow X$ is locally Lipschitz, then $F \circ H$*

$$D_r^a(F \circ H)(x) \leq D_{r * D_r(H)(x)}^a(F)(H(x)) * [D_r(H)(x)]^a.$$

3. SPIKES

To keep the discussion as general as possible, in this section we assume that our measure is not a single atom and has support X . We will measure X with respect to distance function π .

Definition 3.1. Assume $\mathbf{G} : X \times X \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ is a nicely decaying function (with respect to the measure ν and constants $C_{\mathbf{G}}$ and $\alpha_{\mathbf{G}}$). A 5-tuple $(h(x), r, a, s, C)$ where $h(x)$ is positive function on X , $r, C > 1, a \in X$, is called a \mathbf{G} -spike if

$$(1) \quad h(x) \geq \|h\|_{L^\infty} / C \text{ on } \Pi(a, r),$$

$$(2) \quad \text{for each } x \in B(a, r)^c \text{ we have}$$

$$0 < h(x) \leq C h(a) e^{\alpha_{\mathbf{G}} s} \int_{\Pi(a, r)} \mathbf{G}(x, y, s) d\nu(y), \quad \text{and}$$

$$(3) \quad \text{if } y, y' \in X \text{ satisfy } \pi(y, y') \leq r, \text{ then } h(y') \leq C h(y).$$

If $h(x)$ is a continuous function we call $(h(x), r, a, s, C)$ a *continuous spike*. Also if $h(a) = 1$ we will call $(h(x), r, a, s, C)$ a *unit spike*. Lastly we will often denote the spike by the function $h(x)$ alone with the other constants implicit.

Definition 3.2. If in addition a \mathbf{G} -spike $(h(x), r, a, s, C)$ has $h(x)$ locally q -Hölder with

$$D_r^q h(x) \leq \frac{C h(x)}{r^q}$$

for all $x \in X$, then we call h a q -Hölder \mathbf{G} -spike.

The following two observations are immediate from the definitions.

Lemma 3.3. *Assume $h(x)$ is a -Hölder and*

$$D_r^a h(x) \leq \frac{C h(x)}{r^a},$$

then for all $r_1 \leq r$ we have

$$D_{r_1}^a h(x) \leq \frac{C h(x)}{r_1^a}.$$

Also a positive multiple of a spike is a spike.

Lemma 3.4. *Assume $(h(x), r, a, s, C)$ is a \mathbf{G} -spike. If $\alpha_1 h(x) \leq f(x) \leq \alpha_2 h(x)$ for some $\alpha_2 \geq \alpha_1 > 0$, then $(f(x), r, a, s, C \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1})$ is a \mathbf{G} -spike. In particular, for every $\alpha > 0$, $(\alpha h(x), r, a, s, C)$ is still a \mathbf{G} -spike.*

Proof. The proof is easy and is omitted (see [CM04]). ■

4. GIBBS STREAMS AND SPIKES

Let H be a CAT(-1)-space with metric d and ∂H its geodesic boundary. The unit tangent space, SH , mentioned in the introduction is usually defined to be $SH = ((\partial H \times \partial H) \setminus \Delta) \times \mathbb{R}$ where Δ is the diagonal subset. While SH is not a fiber bundle in general, it is homeomorphic to the unit tangent bundle when H is also a manifold. In fact, for any fixed point $p \in H$, the homeomorphism from SH to the space of unit tangent vectors to geodesics is given by taking $(\xi, \zeta, t) \mapsto \gamma'(0)$ where γ is the unique unit speed geodesic with forward endpoint $\gamma(\infty) = \xi$, backward endpoint $\gamma(-\infty) = \zeta$ and such that $\gamma(-t)$ is the closet point on γ to the point p . (By convexity of the metric, there is a unique closest point.) For any CAT(-1) space and choice of $p \in H$, the map carrying $(\xi, \zeta, t) \mapsto \gamma$, with γ defined as above, gives a bijection between SH and the space of parameterized unit speed geodesics in H . Because of this, we may sometimes write $\gamma \in SH$ to indicate a parameterized (bi-infinite) geodesic in H .

From now on p, q, r will denote points in H and x, y, z will denote points in $H \cup \partial H$. Similarly, ζ, ξ , and ν will denote points in ∂H .

There is a natural flow \mathbf{g}^t defined on SH given by $\mathbf{g}^t(\xi, \zeta, s) = (\xi, \zeta, s + t)$. Equivalently, $\mathbf{g}^t\gamma$ is the same geodesic as γ except with starting point shifted by t so that $\mathbf{g}^t\gamma(0) = \gamma(t)$.

We recall from the introduction, the metric dist given by

$$\text{dist}(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d(\gamma_1(t), \gamma_2(t)) e^{-|t|} dt.$$

It is relatively easy to verify that the topology induced by dist is the product topology on $((\partial H \times \partial H) \setminus \Delta) \times \mathbb{R}$. By using the same formula, we may extend the definition of dist to the space TH of all (non-unit speed) geodesics in H , including constant geodesics which we denote simply by their single point image.

Let $-\gamma \in SH$ denote the flip of the geodesic γ , i.e., $-\gamma(t) = \gamma(-t)$. We now establish some convenient properties of dist .

Lemma 4.1. *The function dist on SH satisfies the following properties*

- (1) *dist is a left invariant metric on SH ,*
- (2) *for all $\gamma \in SH$ we have $\text{dist}(\gamma, -\gamma) = 1$,*
- (3) *for all $\gamma \in SH$ and $s \in \mathbb{R}$ we have $\text{dist}(\gamma, \mathbf{g}^s\gamma) = |s|$,*
- (4) *for all $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in SH$ we have $\text{dist}(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) = \text{dist}(-\gamma_1, -\gamma_2)$.*

Proof. The first item follows directly from the fact that d is a left invariant metric and $e^{-|t|}$ is positive. For 2) we have

$$\text{dist}(\gamma, -\gamma) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d(\gamma(t), \gamma(-t)) e^{-|t|} dt = \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} t e^{-|t|} dt = 1.$$

For 3) we have

$$\text{dist}(\mathbf{g}^s\gamma, \gamma) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d(\gamma(t), \gamma(t+s)) e^{-|t|} dt = \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} s e^{-|t|} dt = s.$$

Finally, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d(\gamma_1(t), \gamma_2(t)) e^{-|t|} dt = \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d(\gamma_1(-t), \gamma_2(-t)) e^{-|t|} dt \\ &= \text{dist}(-\gamma_1, -\gamma_2). \end{aligned}$$

■

As before, let Φ be a bounded Hölder function on (SH, dist) . We will say Φ is *tempered* if whenever γ_1 and γ_2 are geodesics passing through first p and then a distinct point $q \in H$, we have $\Phi(\mathbf{g}^t \gamma_1) = \Phi(\mathbf{g}^t \gamma_2)$ for all $0 \leq t \leq d(p, q)$. Note that such a pair of geodesics must share a common segment between p and q , and therefore the lift to SH of a Hölder function on H is always a tempered Hölder function. However, note that in general geodesics which intersect in a point need not have the same Φ value. This definition coincides with the one given in the introduction, and we denote by \mathcal{H} the space of tempered Hölder functions.

For each distinct pair $p, q \in H$ we will denote by $\Gamma_{p,q} \subset SH$ the set of all geodesics $\gamma_{p,q}$ such that $\gamma_{p,q}(0) = p$ and $\gamma_{p,q}(d(p, q)) = q$. When H is a manifold $\Gamma_{p,q}$ is a single element while $\Gamma_{p,q}$ is uncountable when H is a tree, for instance. It is easy to observe that $\gamma_{p,q}((p \cdot x)_q) = \gamma_{q,p}((q \cdot x)_p)$.

If Φ is tempered, then we can define a new distance on H by

$$d^\Phi(p, q) = \int_0^{d(p,q)} \Phi(\mathbf{g}^t \gamma_{p,q}) dt.$$

4.1. Results about d^Φ .

Lemma 4.2. *Choose $\Phi \in \mathcal{H}$ with Hölder constant L and exponent β . Then there exists a function $\widehat{D} : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (depending on L and β), such that for any two geodesics γ_1, γ_2 such that $\gamma_1(0) = \gamma_2(0) = p$ and $d(\gamma_1(T), \gamma_2(T)) \leq r$ we have*

$$|d^\Phi(p, \gamma_1(T)) - d^\Phi(p, \gamma_2(T))| \leq \widehat{D}(r).$$

Proof. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} |d^\Phi(p, \gamma_1(T)) - d^\Phi(p, \gamma_2(T))| &= \left| \int_0^T \Phi(\mathbf{g}^s \gamma_1) - \Phi(\mathbf{g}^s \gamma_2) ds \right| \leq \int_0^T |\Phi(\mathbf{g}^s \gamma_1) - \Phi(\mathbf{g}^s \gamma_2)| ds \\ &\leq \int_0^T L \text{dist}(\mathbf{g}^s \gamma_1, \mathbf{g}^s \gamma_2)^\beta ds \end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma A.6 in Appendix A we obtain that the previous line is

$$\leq L \left(\frac{5}{\beta} + r^{1+\beta} \right).$$

$$\text{Set } \widehat{D}(r) = L \left(\frac{5}{\beta} + r^{1+\beta} \right). \quad \blacksquare$$

Lemma 4.3. *Let Φ be a bounded function with maximum L . For any geodesic γ we have*

$$|d^\Phi(\gamma(0), \gamma(t_2)) - d^\Phi(\gamma(0), \gamma(t_1))| \leq L |t_2 - t_1|$$

Proof. Without loss of generality assume $t_2 \geq t_1$

$$|d^\Phi(\gamma(0), \gamma(t_2)) - d^\Phi(\gamma(0), \gamma(t_1))| = \left| \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \Phi(\mathbf{g}^s \gamma) ds \right| \leq \int_{t_1}^{t_2} L ds = L(t_2 - t_1). \quad \blacksquare$$

Corollary 4.4. *Let Φ be a bounded Hölder function with Hölder constant and maximum L . Then for any two geodesics γ_1, γ_2 such that $\gamma_1(0) = \gamma_2(0) = p$ and $d(\gamma_1(t_1), \gamma_2(t_2)) \leq r$ for some $t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{R}$, we have*

$$|d^\Phi(p, \gamma_1(t_1)) - d^\Phi(p, \gamma_2(t_2))| \leq \widehat{D}(2r) + Lr.$$

Proof. Without loss of generality assume that $t_1 \geq t_2$ then we have

$$|d^\Phi(p, \gamma_1(t_1)) - d^\Phi(p, \gamma_2(t_2))| \leq |d^\Phi(p, \gamma_1(t_2)) - d^\Phi(p, \gamma_2(t_2))| + |d^\Phi(\gamma_1(t_2), \gamma_1(t_1))|.$$

By convexity of the metric, $|t_1 - t_2| \leq r$ and therefore

$$d(\gamma_1(t_2), \gamma_2(t_2)) \leq d(\gamma_1(t_1), \gamma_2(t_2)) + d(\gamma_1(t_1), \gamma_1(t_2)) \leq 2r.$$

And so we have

$$|d^\Phi(p, \gamma_1(t_1)) - d^\Phi(p, \gamma_2(t_2))| \leq \widehat{D}(2r) + Lr. \quad \blacksquare$$

Corollary 4.5. *Let Φ and $\widehat{\Phi}$ be Hölder functions with Hölder constants and maximum L . There exists a function $D : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, such that for any two geodesics γ_1 and γ_2 with $d(\gamma_1(0), \gamma_2(0)) \leq r$ and $d(\gamma_1(t_1), \gamma_2(t_2)) \leq r$ for some $t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ we have*

$$|d^\Phi(\gamma_1(0), \gamma_1(t_1)) - d^\Phi(\gamma_2(0), \gamma_2(t_2))| \leq D(r).$$

Proof. Let γ_3 be a geodesic such that $\gamma_3(0) = \gamma_1(0)$ and $\gamma_3(t_3) = \gamma_2(t_2)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & |d^\Phi(\gamma_1(0), \gamma_1(t_1)) - d^\Phi(\gamma_2(0), \gamma_2(t_2))| \leq \\ & \leq |d^\Phi(\gamma_1(0), \gamma_1(t_1)) - d^\Phi(\gamma_3(0), \gamma_3(t_3))| + |d^\Phi(\gamma_3(0), \gamma_3(t_3)) - d^\Phi(\gamma_2(0), \gamma_2(t_2))| \end{aligned}$$

Since $d^\Phi(p, q) = d^{\widehat{\Phi}}(q, p)$, $\gamma_3(0) = \gamma_1(0)$ and $\gamma_3(t_3) = \gamma_2(t_2)$, we have

$$|d^\Phi(\gamma_1(0), \gamma_1(t_1)) - d^\Phi(\gamma_2(0), \gamma_2(t_2))| \leq 2 \left(\widehat{D}(2r) + Lr \right).$$

Set $D(r) = 2\widehat{D}(2r) + 2Lr$. \blacksquare

4.2. Φ -Busemann function. For any Hölder function Φ we define its corresponding Φ -Busemann function as follows. For fixed $p, q \in H$, we have

$$\rho_x^\Phi(p, q) = \lim_{z \rightarrow x} (d^\Phi(q, z) - d^\Phi(p, z)).$$

If Φ is symmetric we have $\rho_x^\Phi(p, q) = -\rho_x^\Phi(q, p)$. When $\Phi \equiv 1$ then d^Φ is the original metric d and hence $\rho_x^\Phi = \rho_x^1$ is just the ordinary Busemann function, which we may sometimes denote by ρ_x .

Recall that the Gromov-product is defined as

$$(x \cdot y)_p = \frac{1}{2}(d(x, p) + d(y, p) - d(x, y)),$$

where in the case when either $x \in \partial H$ or $y \in \partial H$, we take the corresponding limits (see [Coo93]). It is easy to observe that

$$2(q \cdot \xi)_p = \rho_\xi(q, p) + d(p, q).$$

Recall that any $CAT(-1)$ -space is δ -hyperbolic for a sufficiently small value of δ .

Lemma 4.6. *Choose δ so that H is δ -hyperbolic. For any bounded Hölder function Φ , we have*

$$|\rho_x^\Phi(p, q) + d^\Phi(p, \gamma_{q,p}((q \cdot x)_p)) - d^\Phi(q, \gamma_{p,q}((p \cdot x)_q))| \leq 3D(\delta).$$

Proof. Recall that for any triangle p, q, x in δ -hyperbolic space we have

$$\text{diam} \{ \gamma_{p,q}((q \cdot x)_p), \gamma_{p,x}((q \cdot x)_p), \gamma_{q,x}((p \cdot x)_q) \} \leq \delta.$$

So

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \rho_x^\Phi(p, q) + d^\Phi(p, \gamma_{q,p}((q \cdot x)_p)) - d^\Phi(q, \gamma_{p,q}((p \cdot x)_q)) \right| \\ &= \left| \lim_{z \rightarrow x} (d^\Phi(q, z) - d^\Phi(p, z)) + d^\Phi(p, \gamma_{q,p}((q \cdot x)_p)) - d^\Phi(q, \gamma_{p,q}((p \cdot x)_q)) \right| \\ &= \left| \lim_{z \rightarrow x} d^\Phi(\gamma_{q,x}((p \cdot x)_p), z) - d^\Phi(\gamma_{p,x}((q \cdot x)_p), z) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (d^\Phi(p, \gamma_{q,p}((q \cdot x)_p)) - d^\Phi(p, \gamma_{p,x}((q \cdot x)_p))) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (d^\Phi(q, \gamma_{q,x}((p \cdot x)_p)) - d^\Phi(q, \gamma_{p,q}((p \cdot x)_q))) \right| \\ &\leq 3D(\delta). \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows from Corollary 4.5. ■

4.3. Patterson-Sullivan construction. Let G be a subgroup of $\text{Isom}(H)$. Recall that the *Poincaré series* associated to G is

$$S^\Phi(\lambda) = \sum_{g \in G} e^{-d^\Phi(p, gp) - \lambda d(p, gp)},$$

for a choice of fixed point $p \in H$. Define the *critical exponent* for Φ as

$$\lambda_\Phi = \sup_\lambda \{ \lambda : S^\Phi(\lambda) = \infty \} = \inf_\lambda \{ \lambda : S^\Phi(\lambda) < \infty \}.$$

This is independent of the choice of p . It is easy to observe that for any constant C we have $\lambda_{\Phi+C} = \lambda_\Phi - C$ and $\mu_p^{\Phi+C} = \mu_p^\Phi$.

In the event that $S^\Phi(\lambda_\Phi) < \infty$, we can repeat the above construction with

$$S^\Phi(\lambda) = \sum_{g \in G} h(d^\Phi(p, gp) + \lambda d(p, gp)) e^{-d^\Phi(p, gp) - \lambda d(p, gp)},$$

where $h : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is a suitable subexponentially increasing function. Patterson [Pat76] showed that h can be chosen so that the critical exponent for the modified Dirichlet series remains λ_Φ and S^Φ diverges at $\lambda = \lambda_\Phi$. Note that this is a general statement about series of real numbers of the form $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} h(x_i) e^{-x_i}$ for a positive sequence $\{x_i\}$.

For any $q \in H$, the measure μ_q^Φ is the *weak** limit of the normalized measures

$$\frac{1}{S^\Phi(\lambda)} \sum_{g \in G} h(d^\Phi(p, gp) + \lambda d(p, gp)) e^{-d^\Phi(q, gq) - \lambda d(q, gq)} \delta_{gq},$$

as $\lambda \searrow \lambda_\Phi$. Since G acts cocompactly on H , the measure μ_q^Φ is independent of the choice of limiting sequence in λ . The proof is the same as that for the uniqueness of conformal densities in CAT(-1) spaces (see [CP95]). By construction μ_q^Φ is a finite measure supported on ∂H . It is a probability measure when $q = p$, but in general it is only finite for other points q .

From now on $\widehat{\Phi}$ denotes the flip of Φ . Also define $Sym(\Phi) = \frac{\Phi + \widehat{\Phi}}{2}$.

Lemma 4.7. *If Φ is G -invariant, then*

$$\lambda_\Phi = \lambda_{\widehat{\Phi}} \geq \lambda_{Sym(\Phi)}.$$

Proof. It is easy to observe that

$$\begin{aligned} d^\Phi(p, gp) &= \int_0^{d(p, gp)} \Phi(\mathbf{g}^t \gamma_{p, gp}) dt = \\ &= \int_0^{d(p, gp)} \Phi(\mathbf{g}^t \gamma_{g^{-1}p, p}) dt = \int_0^{d(p, gp)} \widehat{\Phi}(\mathbf{g}^t \gamma_{p, g^{-1}p}) dt = d^{\widehat{\Phi}}(p, g^{-1}p). \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $\lambda_\Phi = \lambda_{\widehat{\Phi}}$. Also applying the inequality $a^2 + b^2 \geq 2ab$ to $a = e^{-d^\Phi(p, gp)}$ and $b = e^{-d^{\widehat{\Phi}}(p, g^{-1}p)}$, we obtain

$$S^\Phi(\lambda) + S^{\widehat{\Phi}}(\lambda) \geq 2S^{Sym(\Phi)}(\lambda).$$

So we obtain $\lambda_\Phi = \lambda_{\widehat{\Phi}} \geq \lambda_{Sym(\Phi)}$. ■

Define $\Delta(\Phi) = \lambda_{Sym(\Phi)} - \lambda_\Phi \leq 0$, so that $\lambda_\Phi = \lambda_{Sym(\Phi) + \Delta(\Phi)}$.

The next proposition appears in [Kai04] as Proposition 3.5 for the case of manifolds. However, the measures, ν_p^Φ , that the author defines relate to the ones we define, μ_p^Φ , by $\nu_p^\Phi = \mu_p^{-\Phi}$. We choose this normalization for convenience later on. For the general CAT(-1) case, the proof is a simple calculation from the above formula for μ_p and is identical to the original case found in [Sul79].

Proposition 4.8. *For $G < \text{Isom}(H)$ and any G -invariant Hölder function Φ on SH , there exists a family of finite positive measures $\{\mu_p^\Phi\}_{p \in \partial H}$ parametrized by points $p \in H$ with the following two properties:*

- (1) *The family $\{\mu_p^\Phi\}$ is G -equivariant, i.e., $\mu_{gp}^\Phi = g\mu_p^\Phi$ for any $p \in H$ and $g \in G$;*
- (2) *The measures μ_p^Φ are pairwise equivalent and*

$$\frac{d\mu_q^\Phi}{d\mu_p^\Phi}(\xi) = e^{-\rho_\xi^\Phi(p, q) - \lambda_\Phi \rho_\xi(p, q)}.$$

The family $\{\mu_p^\Phi\}$ with these properties is unique up to global constant multiple.

Remark 4.9. As remarked in the introduction, the critical exponent λ_Φ coincides with the topological pressure of Φ (see Kaimanovich [Kai04], but note that he is using $P(-\Phi)$ for $P(\Phi)$). For instance, when $\Phi = C$, the formula for λ_Φ given earlier, above implies that its pressure is $\lambda_C = \lambda_0 - C$ where λ_0 is the ordinary critical exponent of the group G relative to the metric d . On the other hand, the variational formula for the pressure of 0, implies that λ_0 is the topological entropy of the geodesic flow. At least in the case when H is a manifold and G acts cocompactly, the pressure functional defined in the introduction also agrees with the Bowen-Ruelle definition arising from thermodynamic formalism (see Ruelle [Rue78]).

4.4. **The Function G.** We now continue our analysis of d^Φ .

Definition 4.10. For $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}$ and a point $p \in H$, we say that a function Φ has *geodesic average at least ϵ at p* if there is a constant $T \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$d^\Phi(p, \gamma_{p,\xi}(s)) \geq s\epsilon - T,$$

for all $s \geq 0$ and $\xi \in \partial H$.

Note that the notion of geodesic average is stronger than the ordinary time average along a geodesic since we assume T is a fixed value instead of a sublinear function in s .

Now we define $G^\Phi : \partial H \times \partial H \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ as follows

$$(4.1) \quad G^\Phi(x, y, s) = \begin{cases} e^{-2d^\Phi(\gamma_{p,y}((x \cdot y)_p), \gamma_{p,y}(s))} & \text{if } s \geq (x \cdot y)_p \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Let μ_p be Patterson-Sullivan measure at the point p , i.e., the Gibbs stream based at p for the function $\Phi = 0$ with corresponding critical constant λ_0 .

Lemma 4.11. *Assume that $\Phi - \lambda_\Phi$ has positive geodesic average ϵ at p for $\epsilon > 0$. Then*

$$\int_{\{y : (x \cdot y) \geq a\}} G^\Phi(x, y, s) d\mu_p(y) \leq C_{\mu_p} e^{-\lambda_0 s} \min\{e^{-\epsilon(s-a)}, 1\}.$$

Proof. By compactness, we may assume $|\Phi| \leq L$ where L is the Hölder constant for Φ . Let $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_{n+1} = \min(a, s)$ such that $t_{i+1} - t_i = 1$. Let $\Pi_i = \{y \in \partial H : t_i \leq (x \cdot y)_p \leq t_{i+1}\}$. By Lemma 4.3 for all s, t such that $|s - t| \leq 1$ we have $|2d^{Sym(\Phi)}(\gamma_{p,x}(s), \gamma_{p,x}(t))| \leq 2L$.

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\cup \Pi_i} G^\Phi(x, y, s) d\mu_p(y) &\leq \sum_{i=0}^n \int_{\Pi_i} e^{-2d^\Phi(\gamma_{p,y}((x \cdot y)_p), \gamma_{p,y}(s))} d\mu_p(y) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=0}^n \int_{\Pi_i} e^{2L} e^{-2d^\Phi(\gamma_{p,y}(t_i), \gamma_{p,y}(s))} d\mu_p(y) \end{aligned}$$

Since $2d^f = d^{f-g} + d^{f+g}$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \sum_{i=0}^n \int_{\Pi_i} e^{2L} e^{-d^{\Phi-\lambda_\Phi}(\gamma_{p,y}(t_i), \gamma_{p,y}(s))} e^{-d^{\Phi+\lambda_\Phi}(\gamma_{p,y}(t_i), \gamma_{p,y}(s))} d\mu_p(y) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=0}^n e^{2L} e^{-\epsilon(s-t_i)} \int_{\Pi_i} e^{-d^{\Phi+\lambda_\Phi}(\gamma_{p,y}(t_i), \gamma_{p,y}(s))} d\mu_p(y) \end{aligned}$$

since $\rho_\xi^0(p, \gamma_{p,x}(t_i)) \leq -t_i + 1 + 2\delta$, for all ξ such that $(\xi \cdot x)_p \geq t_i$ where ∂H is δ -hyperbolic space. Hence $\frac{d\mu_{\gamma_{p,x}(t_i)}}{d\mu_p}(\xi) = e^{-\lambda_0 \rho_\xi^0(p, \gamma_{p,y}(t_i))} \geq e^{\lambda_0(t_i - 1 - 2\delta)}$, yielding

$$\leq \sum_{i=0}^n e^{2L} e^{-\epsilon(s-t_i)} \int_{\Pi_i} e^{-d^{\Phi+\lambda_\Phi}(\gamma_{p,y}(t_i), \gamma_{p,y}(s))} e^{-\lambda_0(t_i - 1 - 2\delta)} d\mu_{\gamma_{p,x}(t_i)}(y)$$

since $d(\gamma_{p,x}(t_i), \gamma_{p,y}(t_i)) \leq \delta + 2$, because $t_i + 1 \geq (x \cdot y)_p \geq t_i$. So we have $d(\gamma_{\gamma_{p,x}(t_i), y}(s - t_i), \gamma_{p,y}(s)) \leq 2 + 2\delta$. From this estimate we obtain the bound, $|d^\Phi(\gamma_{p,x}(t_i), \gamma_{p,y}(s)) - d^\Phi(\gamma_{p,x}(t_i), \gamma_{\gamma_{p,x}(t_i), y}(s - t_i))| \leq D(2 + 2\delta)$. Now by Corollary 4.5 we can continue from the previous inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \sum_{i=0}^n e^{2L} e^{-\lambda_0(t_i+1+2\delta)} e^{-\epsilon(s-t_i)} \\ &\quad \cdot \int_{\partial H} e^{-d^{\Phi+\lambda_\Phi}(\gamma_{p,x}(t_i), \gamma_{\gamma_{p,x}(t_i), y}(s-t_i)) + D(2+2\delta)} d\mu_{\gamma_{p,x}(t_i)}(y) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=0}^n e^{2L+D(2+2\delta)} e^{-\lambda_0(t_i+1+2\delta)} e^{-\epsilon(s-t_i)} e^{-\lambda_0(s-t_i)} \\ &\leq C' e^{-\lambda_0 s} e^{-\epsilon(s-\min(s,a))} \end{aligned}$$

To complete the above estimate we need to show that for all $q \in H$, for all Hölder functions Φ and $s \geq 0$, we have

$$\int_{\partial H} e^{-d^{\Phi+\lambda_\Phi}(q, \gamma_{q,\xi}(s))} d\mu_q(\xi) \leq e^{-\lambda_0 s}.$$

This is precisely the statement of Corollary C.3 in the Appendix C, since $\lambda_{\Phi+\lambda_\Phi} = 0$. If $a \leq s$ then the proof is done. In case of $a \geq s$ observe that $\{y \in \partial H : s \leq (x \cdot y)_p \leq a\} \subset \{y \in \partial H : s \leq (x \cdot y)_p < \infty\} = \Pi_\infty$ and

$$\int_{\Pi_\infty} \mathbf{G}^\Phi(x, y, s) d\mu_p(y) \leq \mu_p(\Pi_\infty) \leq C'' e^{-\lambda_0 s}.$$

■

We now recall the definition of “nicely decaying” from 2.2.

Corollary 4.12. *If $\Phi - \lambda_\Phi$ has a positive geodesic average ϵ at p , then the function \mathbf{G}^Φ is nicely decaying with respect to the Patterson-Sullivan measure μ_p with constants $\alpha_G = \lambda_0$ and $\beta_G = \epsilon$.*

Since $\Phi + C - \lambda_{\Phi+C} = \Phi - \lambda_\Phi + 2C$, we may always arrange, without changing ν_p^Φ , that $\Phi - \lambda_\Phi$ have positive geodesic average by simply adding a sufficiently large constant to Φ . Moreover, in the case when G acts cocompactly, Proposition C.5 in Appendix C shows that when Φ is normalized to have zero pressure it will automatically have a uniformly positive average along all geodesics.

4.5. Derivatives are $\mathbf{G}^{\text{Sym}(\Phi)}$ -spikes. For the purpose of this section we take L to be a number larger than the Hölder constants for Φ and $\hat{\Phi}$ and the upper bound for $|\Phi|$. As a reminder in what follows, recall that $\gamma_{p,q}$ represents *any* ray which extends the oriented geodesic segment from p to q . All results are independent of this choice, when there is a choice.

Lemma 4.13. *Assume $\Phi \in \mathcal{H}$ has positive geodesic average (with constants $\epsilon > 0$ and T) at some $p \in H$. There exists a constant C_Φ such that for all $q \in H$, the 5-tuple*

$$\left(e^{-2d^\Phi(\gamma_{p,q}((\xi \cdot q)_p), q)}, \gamma_{p,q}(\infty), e^{-d(p,q)}, d(p,q), C_\Phi \right)$$

is a \mathbf{G}^Φ -spike with respect to the symmetric distance $\pi_p(x, y) = e^{-(x \cdot y)_p}$ (actually a metric after possibly rescaling d).

Proof. Set $h(\xi) = e^{-2d^\Phi(\gamma_{p,q}((\xi \cdot q)_p), q)}$. It is clear that $h(\gamma_{p,q}(\infty)) = 1 \geq \max(h)e^{-2T}$.

Observe that, for all $\xi, \zeta \in \partial H$ such that $(\xi \cdot \zeta)_p \geq d(p, q)$, we have $|(\xi \cdot q)_p - (\zeta \cdot q)_p| \leq \delta$. Thus

$$\frac{h(\xi)}{h(\zeta)} = e^{2d^\Phi(\gamma_{p,q}((\zeta \cdot q)_p), q) - 2d^\Phi(\gamma_{p,q}((\xi \cdot q)_p), q)} \leq e^{|2d^\Phi(\gamma_{p,q}((\zeta \cdot q)_p), q) - 2d^\Phi(\gamma_{p,q}((\xi \cdot q)_p), q)|} \leq e^{2L\delta}.$$

Recall that $\Pi(\gamma_{p,q}(\infty), e^{-d(p,q)}) = \{y \in \partial H : (y \cdot \gamma_{p,q}(\infty))_p \geq d(p, q)\}$. Also $\mu_p(\Pi(\gamma_{p,q}(\infty), e^{-d(p,q)})) \geq \frac{1}{K}e^{-\lambda^0 d(p,q)}$. So we have

$$\begin{aligned} h(x) &= \frac{1}{\mu_p(\Pi(\gamma_{p,q}(\infty), e^{-d(p,q)}))} \int_{\Pi(\gamma_{p,q}(\infty), e^{-d(p,q)})} h(x) d\mu_p(y) \\ &\leq h(\gamma_{p,q}(\infty)) K e^{\lambda^0 d(p,q)} \int_{\Pi(\gamma_{p,q}(\infty), e^{-d(p,q)})} h(x) d\mu_p(y). \end{aligned}$$

To finish the proof, we need to show that $\frac{h(x)}{G(x, y, d(p, q))}$ is uniformly bounded for every $y \in \Pi(\gamma_{p,q}(\infty), e^{-d(p,q)})$. We need to consider 2 cases:

Case 1) (Easy Case) $d(p, q) \leq (x \cdot y)_p$. Then $h(x) \leq e^{2T} \leq e^{2T} G(x, y, d(p, q))$.

Case 2) $d(p, q) \geq (x \cdot y)_p$. In this case $G(x, y, d(p, q)) = e^{-2d^\Phi(\gamma_{p,y}((x \cdot y)_p), \gamma_{p,y}(d(p, q)))}$.

Since $(y \cdot \gamma_{p,q}(\infty))_p \geq d(p, q)$, we have $(y \cdot q)_p \geq d(p, q) - \delta$. So

$$(x \cdot y)_p \geq \min((x \cdot q)_p, (y \cdot q)_p) - \delta \geq \min((x \cdot q)_p, d(p, q) - \delta) - \delta \geq (x \cdot q)_p - 2\delta.$$

On the other hand,

$$(x \cdot q)_p \geq \min((x \cdot y)_p, (y \cdot q)_p) - \delta \geq \min((x \cdot y)_p, d(p, q) - \delta) - \delta \geq (x \cdot y)_p - 2\delta.$$

We obtain $|(x \cdot y)_p - (x \cdot q)_p| \leq 2\delta$.

Since $(y \cdot \gamma_{p,q}(\infty))_p \geq d(p, q)$, for every $0 \leq t \leq d(p, q)$, we have that $d(\gamma_{p,q}(t), \gamma_{p,y}(t)) \leq \delta$. (This actually holds for all $0 \leq t \leq (y \cdot \gamma_{p,q}(\infty))_p$.) Now

$$|d^\Phi(\gamma_{p,y}((x \cdot y)_p), \gamma_{p,y}(d(p, q))) - d^\Phi(\gamma_{p,q}((x \cdot q)_p), q)| \leq D(3\delta).$$

This finishes the proof. \blacksquare

Corollary 4.14. *Assume $\Phi \in \mathcal{H}$ has 0 pressure and $G < \text{Isom}(H)$ acts cocompactly. Fix $p \in H$. Then there exists a constant C_Φ such that for all $q \in H$, the 5-tuple.*

$$\left(\frac{d\mu_q^\Phi}{d\mu_p^\Phi}, \gamma_{p,q}(\infty), e^{-d(p,q)}, d(p, q), C_\Phi \right)$$

is a $G^{\text{Sym}(\Phi)}$ -spike.

Proof. By assumption $\lambda_\Phi = 0$, so by Proposition C.5, Φ has positive geodesic average at all p . Multiply the $G^{\text{Sym}(\Phi)}$ -spike $(e^{-2d^{\text{Sym}(\Phi)}(\gamma_{p,q}((\xi \cdot q)_p), q)}, \gamma_{p,q}(\infty), e^{-d(p,q)}, d(p, q), C_{\text{Sym}(\Phi)})$ by $e^{d^\Phi(p, \gamma_{p,q}((\xi \cdot q)_p))}$. By Lemma 3.4

$$(e^{d^\Phi(p, \gamma_{p,q}((\xi \cdot q)_p)) - d^\Phi(q, \gamma_{p,q}((\xi \cdot q)_p))}, \gamma_{p,q}(\infty), e^{-d(p,q)}, d(p, q), C_{\text{Sym}(\Phi)})$$

is a $G^{\text{Sym}(\Phi)}$ -spike. By Lemma 4.6 and Lemma 3.4

$$\left(\frac{d\mu_q^\Phi}{d\mu_p^\Phi}(\xi) = e^{-\rho_\xi^\Phi(p, q)}, \gamma_{p,q}(\infty), e^{-d(p,q)}, d(p, q), e^{6D(\delta)} C_{\text{Sym}(\Phi)} \right)$$

is a $G^{\text{Sym}(\Phi)}$ -spike. Set $C_\Phi = e^{6D(\delta)} C_{\text{Sym}(\Phi)}$. \blacksquare

5. BASIS THEOREM.

In this section we prove an approximation theorem about \mathbf{G} -spikes. On first glance, it may seem disconnected from our stated goal in the introduction, but it plays the lead role in the whole construction.

Theorem 5.1. *Let (X, d, ν) be a probability metric space. Assume $\mathbf{G} : X \times X \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is an almost decreasing nicely decaying function with respect to ν with constants $C_{\mathbf{G}}, \alpha_{\mathbf{G}}, \beta_{\mathbf{G}}$. Assume $\mathcal{F} = \{(f_{\alpha}, r_{\alpha}, a_{\alpha}, s_{\alpha}, C_{\alpha})\}_{\alpha \in I}$ is a family of continuous unit \mathbf{G} -spikes.*

Let $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be some non-increasing function such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} h(t) = 0$. Assume that there exist constants $B \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\delta > 0$ (we assume that δ and R are the constants for \mathbf{G} from the definition of almost decreasing) such that for every $D > 0$ and some $S \geq 0$ there exists a countable subcollection $\{(f_i, r_i, a_i, s_i, C_i)\}_{i=1}^{\infty} \subset \mathcal{F}$ such that

- $r_i \leq h(S)$ and $s_i \geq S$ and $C_i \leq D$,
- $\#\{i : x \in \Pi(a_i, r_i)\} \leq B$ for every $x \in X$,
- $|s_i - s_j| \leq \delta$ for all i, j ,
- $\nu(X - \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \Pi(a_i, r_i)) \leq h(D)$,

- (1) *Then for every continuous uniformly positive function F there exists a countable set $\{\alpha_i\} \subset I$ and constants $\lambda_{\alpha_i} \geq 0$ such that*

$$F = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{\alpha_i} f_{\alpha_i},$$

with convergence in $L^1(X, \nu)$.

- (2) *Moreover, if there exists one such $D > 0$ and positive constants m, δ and a such that for every S we can choose a finite subcollection $\{(f_i, r_i, a_i, s_i, C_i)\}_{i=1}^k \subset \mathcal{F}$ with $C_i < D$ and the extra conditions*

- $me^{-S} \leq r_i \leq e^{-S}$, and $S \leq s_i \leq S + \delta$,
- $X = \bigcup_{i=1}^k \Pi(a_i, r_i)$, and
- f_i are a -Hölder \mathbf{G} -spikes,

then for every positive Hölder function F we can find a countable subset of indices $\{\alpha_i\} \subset I$ such that

$$F = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{\alpha_i} f_{\alpha_i},$$

with convergence both pointwise and uniformly, and

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{\alpha_i} \|f_{\alpha_i}\|_{1, X} s_{\alpha_i} \leq \infty.$$

First, we will need to prove a Key Proposition.

Proposition 5.2. *Let (X, d, ν) be a probability metric space. Assume $\mathbf{G} : X \times X \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is almost decreasing nicely decaying with respect to ν function with constants $C_{\mathbf{G}}$. For every uniformly positive function F we set*

$$t_{\infty}(F) = \sup \left\{ \frac{F(y)}{F(x)} : x \in X, y \in Y \right\}$$

and

$$t_\infty(F) \geq t_\epsilon = \sup \left\{ \frac{F(y)}{F(x)} : x \in X, y \in Y, \pi(x, y) \leq \epsilon \right\} \geq 1,$$

Choose $\epsilon > 0$ and S such that $t_\infty e^{-\beta_G S} \leq \epsilon^{\beta_G} t_\epsilon$.

Assume that $\{(f_i, r_i, a_i, s_i, C_i)\}_{i=1}^\infty$ is a set of \mathbf{G} -spikes such that

- $r_i \leq \epsilon$ and $s_i \geq S$ and $C_i \leq D$,
- $\#\{i : x \in \Pi(a_i, r_i)\} \leq B$ for every $x \in X$,
- $|s_i - s_j| \leq \delta$ for all i, j ,

and denote $Y = \bigcup_{i=1}^\infty \Pi(a_i, r_i)$.

Then there exists constants $0 \leq \lambda_i = \frac{F(a_i)}{2DC_G t_\epsilon^2 B}$ such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^\infty \lambda_i f_i(x) \leq F(x) \text{ for all } x \in X,$$

and

$$\sum_{i=1}^\infty \lambda_i f_i(x) \geq \frac{F(x)}{2D^2 C_G t_\epsilon^3 B} \text{ for all } x \in Y,$$

Proof. Let $\hat{s} = \sup(s_i) \geq S$. Let us estimate $\sum_{i=1}^\infty F(a_i) f_i(x)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^\infty F(a_i) f_i(x) &\leq \sum_{i=1}^\infty F(a_i) D e^{\alpha_G s_i} \int_{\Pi(a_i, r_i)} \mathbf{G}^\Phi(x, y, s_i) d\nu(y) \\ &\leq D \sum_{i=1}^\infty e^{\alpha_G \hat{s}} \int_{\Pi(a_i, r_i)} F(a_i) C_G \mathbf{G}^\Phi(x, y, \hat{s}) d\nu(y) \\ &\leq DC_G \sum_{i=1}^\infty e^{\alpha_G \hat{s}} \int_{\Pi(a_i, r_i)} F(y) \mathbf{G}^\Phi(x, y, \hat{s}) d\nu(y) \\ &\leq DC_G t_\epsilon B e^{\alpha_G \hat{s}} \int_Y F(y) \mathbf{G}^\Phi(x, y, \hat{s}) d\nu(y) \\ &\leq DC_G t_\epsilon B e^{\alpha_G \hat{s}} \left(\int_{\Pi(x, \epsilon)} F(y) \mathbf{G}^\Phi(x, y, \hat{s}) d\nu(y) + \int_{Y - \Pi(x, \epsilon)} F(y) \mathbf{G}^\Phi(x, y, \hat{s}) d\nu(y) \right) \\ &\leq DC_G t_\epsilon B e^{\alpha_G \hat{s}} \left(\int_{\Pi(x, \epsilon)} t_\epsilon F(x) \mathbf{G}^\Phi(x, y, \hat{s}) d\nu(y) + \int_{Y - \Pi(x, \epsilon)} F(x) t_\infty \mathbf{G}^\Phi(x, y, \hat{s}) d\nu(y) \right) \\ &\leq DC_G t_\epsilon B e^{\alpha_G \hat{s}} F(x) \left(t_\epsilon e^{-\alpha_G \hat{s}} + t_\infty e^{-\alpha_G \hat{s}} \frac{e^{-\beta_G \hat{s}}}{\epsilon^{\beta_G}} \right) = 2DC_G t_\epsilon^2 B F(x) \end{aligned}$$

Also observe that for all $y \in Y$ such that $\pi(x, a_j) \leq r_i \leq \epsilon$ we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^\infty F(a_i) f_i(x) \geq F(a_j) \frac{f(a_j)}{D} \geq \frac{F(a_j)}{D} \geq \frac{F(x)}{D t_\delta}.$$

Dividing by $2DC_G t_\epsilon^2 B$ we obtain the proposition. \blacksquare

Now we can prove Theorem 5.1.

Proof. Let us describe the inductive procedure, how we approximate F . Fix $\ell > 1$. Take a sequence $D_n \geq 1$ such that $h(D_n) \rightarrow 0$ but $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{D_n^2} = \infty$. Also fix any bounded sequences $\tau_n > 1$ (from above) and $\gamma \leq \gamma_n < 1$ (we can easily assume that $\tau_n = 2$ and $\gamma_n = 1/2$). Set $R_0 = F$ and $\epsilon_{-1} = 1$. Assume we have a continuous function R_n with respect to the distance π .

We set $g(x) = mx$. Construction steps: For every step we will have $t_{\epsilon_n} \leq \ell$.

- (1) Find ϵ_n such that $t_{\epsilon_n}(R_n) \leq \ell$. In the case 2 i.e., when R_n is a -Hölder set $\epsilon_n^a = \inf \left\{ \frac{(\ell-1) \inf_{x \in X} R_n(x)}{\sup_{y \in X} D_{g(\epsilon_{n-1})}^a R_n(y)}, g(\epsilon_{n-1})^a \right\}$.
- (2) Set S_n to be a number such that $h(S_n) \leq \epsilon_n$ and $t_{\infty}(R_n)e^{-\beta_G S_n} \leq \epsilon_n^{\beta_G} \ell$. In case $h(s) \leq e^{-s}$ second inequality implies the first one so we can actually set $e^{-S_n} = \epsilon_n \left(\frac{\ell}{t_{\infty}(R_n)} \right)^{\frac{1}{\beta_G}}$.
- (3) Find a set of spikes satisfying the conditions of Theorem 5.1 for D_n and S_n , i.e., a set of spikes $\{(f_{\alpha_i^{(n)}}, r_{\alpha_i^{(n)}}, a_{\alpha_i^{(n)}}, s_{\alpha_i^{(n)}}, C_{\alpha_i^{(n)}})\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ such that
 - $r_{\alpha_i^{(n)}} \leq h(S_n)$ and $s_{\alpha_i^{(n)}} \geq S_n$ and $C_{\alpha_i^{(n)}} \leq D_n$,
 - $\#\{i : x \in \Pi(a_{\alpha_i^{(n)}}, r_{\alpha_i^{(n)}})\} \leq B$ for every $x \in X$,
 - $|s_{\alpha_i^{(n)}} - s_{\alpha_j^{(n)}}| \leq \delta$ for all i, j , (in the second case $S_n \leq s_i \leq S_n + \delta$)
 - $\nu(X - \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \Pi(a_{\alpha_i^{(n)}}, r_{\alpha_i^{(n)}})) \leq h(D_n)$,
- (4) Find a finite number k_n such that $\nu(X - \bigcup_{i=1}^{k_n} \Pi(a_{\alpha_i^{(n)}}, r_{\alpha_i^{(n)}})) \leq \tau_n h(D_n)$, and set $Y_n = \bigcup_{i=1}^{k_n} \Pi(a_{\alpha_i^{(n)}}, r_{\alpha_i^{(n)}})$. In the second case this is automatic and $Y_n = X$.
- (5) By Proposition 5.2 there exists a function $h_n(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{k_n} \lambda_{\alpha_i^{(n)}} f_{\alpha_i^{(n)}}(x)$ such that $\lambda_i > 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} h_n(x) &\leq F(x) && \forall x \in X \\ h_n(x) &\geq \frac{F(x)}{2D_n^2 \ell^3 C_G B} && \forall y \in Y_n \end{aligned}$$

- (6) Set $R_{n+1} = R_n - \gamma_n h_n$. From step 5 and since $\gamma_n < 1$, we have R_{n+1} is uniformly positive and continuous.

Now we estimate the L^1 -norm of R_{n+1} (Here $\|\cdot\|_{p,A}$ defines $L^p(A, \nu)$ -norm for $1 \leq p \leq \infty$):

$$\begin{aligned} \|R_{n+1}\|_{1,X} &= \|R_n - \gamma_n h_n\|_{1,X} \leq \|R_n - \gamma_n h_n\|_{1,Y_n} + \|R_n - \gamma_n h_n\|_{1,X-Y_n} \\ &\leq \left(1 - \frac{\gamma_n}{2D_n^2 \ell^3 C_G B}\right) \|R_n\|_{1,Y_n} + \nu(X - Y_n) \|R_n\|_{\infty, X-Y_n} \\ &\leq \left(1 - \frac{\gamma_n}{2D_n^2 \ell^3 C_G B}\right) \|R_n\|_{1,X} + \tau_n h(D_n) \|F\|_{\infty, X} \end{aligned}$$

Since $\tau_n h(D_n) \rightarrow 0$ and $\prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(1 - \frac{\gamma_n}{2D_n^2 \ell^3 C_G B}\right) = 0$ we obtain (by Lemma 5.12 of [CM04], for instance) that $\|R_n\|_{L^1(X, \nu)} \rightarrow 0$. From construction we have

$$F(x) = R_0(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \gamma_n h_n(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \gamma_n \sum_{i=1}^{k_n} \lambda_{\alpha_i^{(n)}} f_{\alpha_i^{(n)}}(x) \text{ in } L^1(X, \nu).$$

In the second 2 we have

$$\begin{aligned} R_{n+1}(x) &= R_n(x) - \gamma_n h_n(x) \leq \left(1 - \frac{\gamma_n}{2D_n^2 \ell^3 C_{GB}}\right) R_n(x) \\ &\leq \prod_{i=0}^n \left(1 - \frac{\gamma_i}{2D_i^2 \ell^3 C_{GB}}\right) F(x). \end{aligned}$$

This proves that

$$F(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \gamma_n h_n(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \gamma_n \sum_{i=1}^{k_n} \lambda_{\alpha_i^{(n)}} f_{\alpha_i^{(n)}}(x) \text{ with uniform convergence.}$$

Now let us prove the second estimate in case 2. First few of trivial observations:

-
- $$\sum_{i=1}^{k_n} \lambda_{\alpha_i^{(n)}} \|f_{\alpha_i^{(n)}}\|_{1,X} = \|h_n\|_{1,X} \leq \|R_n\|_{1,X} \leq \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \left(1 - \frac{\gamma_i}{2D_i^2 \ell^3 C_{GB}}\right) \|F(x)\|_{1,X}.$$
-

$$\begin{aligned} t_{\infty}(R_{n+1}) &= \sup_{x,y \in X} \frac{R_{n+1}(x)}{R_{n+1}(y)} = \sup_{x,y \in X} \frac{R_n(x) - \gamma_n h_n(x)}{R_n(y) - \gamma_n h_n(y)} \\ &\leq \sup_{x,y \in X} \frac{\left(1 - \frac{\gamma_n}{2D_n^2 \ell^3 C_{GB}}\right) R_n(x)}{(1 - \gamma_n) R_n(y)} = \frac{\left(1 - \frac{\gamma_n}{2D_n^2 \ell^3 C_{GB}}\right)}{1 - \gamma_n} t_{\infty}(R_n). \end{aligned}$$

- For all $x, y \in X$ such that $\pi(x, y) \leq \epsilon_n$ with ϵ_n as defined we have

$$\begin{aligned} t_{\epsilon_n}(R_n) &= \sup_{\substack{y \neq x \\ \pi(x,y) \leq \epsilon_n}} \frac{R_n(x)}{R_n(y)} = \sup_{\substack{y \neq x \\ \pi(x,y) \leq \epsilon_n}} \frac{|R_n(x) - R_n(y)|}{R_n(y)} + 1 \\ &\leq \sup_{\substack{y \neq x \\ \pi(x,y) \leq \epsilon_n}} \frac{|R_n(x) - R_n(y)|}{\pi(y, x)^a} \cdot \frac{\epsilon^a}{\inf_{y \in X} R_n(y)} + 1 \\ &\leq D_{\epsilon_n}^a(R_n) \frac{\ell - 1}{\sup_{y \in X} D_{\epsilon_{n-1}}^a R_n(y)} + 1 \leq \ell \end{aligned}$$

since $\epsilon_n \leq \epsilon_{n-1}$.

In view of this we will estimate $D_{g(\epsilon_n)}^a R_{n+1}(x)$.

$$D_{g(\epsilon_n)}^a h_n(x) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k_n} \lambda_{\alpha_i^{(n)}} D_{g(\epsilon_n)}^a f_{\alpha_i^{(n)}}(x) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k_n} \lambda_{\alpha_i^{(n)}} D_n \frac{f_{\alpha_i^{(n)}}(x)}{g(\epsilon_n)^a} = D_n \frac{h_n(x)}{g(\epsilon_n)^a}.$$

Since $g(\epsilon_n) \leq \epsilon_n \leq g(\epsilon_{n-1})$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_{g(\epsilon_n)}^a R_{n+1}(x) &= D_{g(\epsilon_n)}^a R_n(x) + \gamma_n D_{g(\epsilon_n)}^a h_n(x) \leq D_{g(\epsilon_{n-1})}^a R_n(x) + \gamma_n D_n \frac{h_n(x)}{g(\epsilon_n)^a} \\ &\leq \frac{(\ell - 1) \inf_{x \in X} R_n(x)}{\epsilon_n^a} + \gamma_n D_n \frac{h_n(x)}{g(\epsilon_n)^a} \\ &\leq \max(\ell - 1, D_n) \left(\frac{R_n(x)}{\epsilon_n^a} + \gamma_n \frac{h_n(x)}{g(\epsilon_n)^a} \right) = (\ell + D_n) \frac{R_{n+1}(x)}{g(\epsilon_n)^a} \end{aligned}$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned}
\epsilon_{n+1}^a &= \inf \left(\frac{(\ell-1) \inf_{x \in X} R_{n+1}(x)}{\sup_{y \in X} D_{g(\epsilon_n)}^a R_{n+1}(y)}, g(\epsilon_n)^a \right) \\
&\geq \inf \left(\frac{(\ell-1) \inf_{x \in X} R_{n+1}(x)}{(\ell+D_n) \sup_{x \in X} R_{n+1}(x)} g(\epsilon_n)^a, g(\epsilon_n)^a \right) \\
&= \frac{(\ell-1) \inf_{x \in X} R_{n+1}(x)}{(\ell+D_n) \sup_{x \in X} R_{n+1}(x)} g(\epsilon_n)^a = \frac{\ell-1}{\ell+D_n} \frac{g(\epsilon_n)^a}{t_\infty(R_{n+1})} \\
&\geq \frac{(\ell-1)m}{(\ell-1+D_n)} \frac{\epsilon_n^a}{t_\infty(R_{n+1})}.
\end{aligned}$$

Simple induction proves that

$$\epsilon_{n+1}^a \geq \left(\frac{(\ell-1)m}{\ell+D_n} \right)^n \frac{\epsilon_0^a}{\prod_{i=1}^{n+1} t_\infty(R_i)}$$

Recall that $D_n \leq D$ and we set $\gamma_n = \gamma$ to be a number such that $\frac{(1 - \frac{\gamma_n}{2D^2 \ell^3 C_{GB}})}{1 - \gamma_n} = K \geq 1$. Thus we have $t_\infty(R_n) \leq K^n t_\infty(R_0)$. And so

$$\epsilon_{n+1}^a \geq \left(\frac{(\ell-1)m}{\ell+D_n} \right)^n \frac{\epsilon_0^a}{\prod_{i=1}^{n+1} K^i t_\infty(R_0)} \geq \left(\frac{(\ell-1)m}{\ell+D} \right)^n \frac{K^{-\frac{(n+1)(n+2)}{2}}}{t_\infty(R_0)^{n+1}}.$$

Now

$$e^{-a S_n} = e^a \left(\frac{\ell}{t_\infty(R_n)} \right)^{\frac{a}{\beta_G}} \geq \left(\frac{(\ell-1)m}{\ell+D} \right)^n \frac{K^{-\frac{(n+1)(n+2)}{2}}}{t_\infty(R_0)^{n+1}} \left(\frac{\ell}{K^n t_\infty(R_0)} \right)^{\frac{a}{\beta_G}}$$

Now we have

$$s_{\alpha_i^{(n)}} \leq S_n + \delta \leq p(n),$$

where $p(x)$ is a polynomial of degree 2. Now

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{k_n} \lambda_{\alpha_i^{(n)}} \|f_{\alpha_i^{(n)}}\|_{1,X} s_{\alpha_i^{(n)}} \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (S_n + \delta) \left(1 - \frac{\gamma}{2D^2 \ell^3 C_{GB}} \right)^n \|R_0\|_{1,X} < \infty,$$

as S_n grow polynomially. ■

Proof of Theorem 1.2. We wish to apply the above theorem by setting $F = f$, $X = \partial H$, $\nu = \nu_p^\Phi$, and the index set I to be the group G . Under the hypotheses, the radon Nikodym derivatives, $\hat{f}_g = g_* F \frac{dg_* \nu}{d\nu}$ are $\mathbb{G}^{\text{Sym}(\Phi)}$ -spikes by Corollary 4.14 and Lemma 3.4. We make them unit spikes by dividing by $\hat{f}_g(\gamma_{p,gp}(\infty)) = F(\gamma_{g^{-1}p,p}(\infty)) e^{d_\Phi(p,gp)}$ to obtain unit spikes f_g . Under the assumptions of the theorem, H has bounded flip. Therefore, we may apply Proposition B.9 to show that $\frac{dg_* \nu}{d\nu}$ is Hölder with $D_{r_g}^\epsilon \frac{dg_* \nu}{d\nu} \leq \frac{C}{r_g^\epsilon}$. On the other hand, the action of g is conformal and Lipschitz with respect to π_p with $D_r g(\zeta) = \sup_{\xi \in \Pi(\zeta, r) \setminus \zeta} e^{-B_\epsilon(p,gp)} \leq e^{d(p,gp)}$. Hence by Lemma 2.4, applying the chain rule and product rule we have that $D_{r_g}^\epsilon f_g \leq \frac{C}{r_g^\epsilon}$ with C independent of g . Hence the f_g form a family of ϵ -Hölder G -spikes. Moreover, the spike constants are related by $r_g = e^{-s_g} = e^{-d(p,gp)}$ and hence for any $S > 0$ and $\delta > \text{diam}(H/G)$ the family of shadows $\Pi(a_g, r_g)$ for $S \leq s_g \leq S + \delta$ cover all of ∂H .

Therefore we obtain both conclusions of Theorem 5.1. Setting $\mu_p(g) = \lambda_g \|f_g\|_1 = \lambda_g e^{-d_\Phi(p, gp)}$, the first statement of the theorem states that $\mu \star f\nu = f\nu$. The second part states that first moment is finite, $\sum_{g \in G} \mu_p(g) \log d(p, gp) < \infty$. We may write the entropy of μ_p as $-\sum_{g \in G} \mu_p(g) \log \mu_p(g) = \sum_{g \in G} \mu_p(g) d_\Phi(p, gp) - \sum_{g \in G} \lambda_g e^{-d_\Phi(p, gp)} \log \lambda_g$. Since $d_\Phi \leq \|\Phi\|_\infty d$, this is finite if and only if $\sum_{g \in G} \lambda_g e^{-d_\Phi(p, gp)} \log \frac{1}{\lambda_g} < \infty$. On the other hand, $\sum_{g \in G} \lambda_g e^{-d_\Phi(p, gp)} d(p, gp) < \infty$. So the former sum converges unless possibly for some subsequence $g_i \in G$ $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{-\log \lambda_{g_i}}{d(p, g_i p)} \rightarrow \infty$. However, for any such subsequence the sum $-\sum_i \lambda_{g_i} \log \lambda_{g_i}$ is bounded since the number of elements with $d(p, gp)$ fixed grows at most exponentially while λ_{g_i} decays super-exponentially in $d(p, gp)$. Hence the entropy of μ_p is finite. By the criterion of Kaimanovich in [Kai00], the measure $f\nu_p^\Phi$ is a Poisson boundary for μ_p . ■

Remark 5.3. By following the procedure found in [CM04], we can vary the λ_g at each stage in the construction in Theorem 5.1. This allows us to produce an infinite dimensional space of measures μ (random walks) on G each with the same Poisson Boundary $(\partial H, f\nu_p^\Phi)$.

APPENDIX A. UNIT TANGENT SPACES

We recall the notations from Section 4.

Lemma A.1. *Assume H is $CAT(-1)$ -space. Let $p \in H$ and $\gamma_1(t)$ and $\gamma_2(t)$ be two geodesics such that $\gamma_1(0) = \gamma_2(0) = p$. Then for all $0 \leq s \leq S$ and $0 \leq t \leq T$ we have,*

$$\frac{\cosh(d(\gamma_1(s), \gamma_2(t))) - \cosh(t-s)}{\cosh(t) \cosh(s) - \cosh(t-s)} \leq \frac{\cosh(d(\gamma_1(S), \gamma_2(T))) - \cosh(T-S)}{\cosh(T) \cosh(S) - \cosh(T-S)},$$

and if $s = t$ and $S = T$ we have

$$d(\gamma_1(t), \gamma_2(t)) \leq 2 \operatorname{arcsinh} \left(\sinh \left(\frac{d(\gamma_1(T), \gamma_2(T))}{2} \right) \frac{\sinh(t)}{\sinh(T)} \right).$$

In particular, $d(\gamma_1(t), \gamma_2(t)) \leq 2 \sinh \left(\frac{d(\gamma_1(T), \gamma_2(T))}{2} \right) e^{t-T}$. This is accurate when $T \gg t + \frac{1}{2}d(\gamma_1(T), \gamma_2(T))$. Similarly, when t and $d(\gamma_1(T), \gamma_2(T))$ are large, we have the estimate $\frac{d(\gamma_1(T), \gamma_2(T)) - d(\gamma_1(t), \gamma_2(t))}{T-t} \geq 2 - O(\max\{e^{-t}, e^{-d(\gamma_1(T), \gamma_2(T))}\})$.

Proof. 1) We use the law of cosines for the hyperbolic plane of curvature -1 : for a triangle with sides a, b, c we have

$$\begin{aligned} \cosh(c) &= \cosh(a) \cosh(b) - \sinh(a) \sinh(b) \cos(\theta) \\ &= \cosh(a-b) + \sinh(a) \sinh(b) (1 - \cos(\theta)), \end{aligned}$$

where θ is an angle between sides a and b .

Now suppose σ_1 and σ_2 are unit speed geodesics in \mathbb{H}^2 with $\sigma_1(0) = \sigma_2(0)$ and $d_{\mathbb{H}^2}(\sigma_1(S), \sigma_2(T)) = d(\gamma_1(S), \gamma_2(T))$. The triangles $[\sigma_1(0), \sigma_1(s), \sigma_2(t)]$ and $[\sigma_1(0), \sigma_1(S), \sigma_2(T)]$ in \mathbb{H}^2 share the same angle at $\sigma_1(0)$. Therefore, if $a = s, b = t$ and $c(s, t) = d_{\mathbb{H}^2}(\sigma_1(s), \sigma_2(t))$ in the law of cosines, then we have

$$\frac{\cosh(c(s, t)) - \cosh(s) \cosh(t)}{\cosh(c(S, T)) - \cosh(S) \cosh(T)} = \frac{\sinh(s) \sinh(t)}{\sinh(S) \sinh(T)} = \frac{\cosh(t) \cosh(s) - \cosh(t-s)}{\cosh(T) \cosh(S) - \cosh(T-S)}.$$

By the comparison property for the $CAT(-1)$ space H for a triangle with side lengths S, T , and $d(\gamma_1(S), \gamma_2(T))$, we have that $d(\gamma_1(s), \gamma_2(t))$ is not more than the same distance measured in the hyperbolic triangle with the same side lengths. Since \cosh is increasing we obtain the first estimate. For the second we take $s = t$ and $S = T$ to obtain,

$$\cosh(d(\gamma_1(t), \gamma_2(t))) - 1 \leq (\cosh(d(\gamma_1(T), \gamma_2(T))) - 1) \left(\frac{\sinh(t)}{\sinh(T)} \right)^2.$$

Since $\cosh(x) - 1 = 2 \sinh(x/2)^2$ we obtain the second estimate. Using $\sinh(x) \geq x$ for $x \geq 0$, this implies

$$\frac{d(\gamma_1(t), \gamma_2(t))^2}{2} \leq 2 \sinh \left(\frac{d(\gamma_1(T), \gamma_2(T))}{2} \right)^2 \leq 2 \sinh \left(\frac{d(\gamma_1(T), \gamma_2(T))}{2} \right)^2 \left(\frac{\sinh(t)}{\sinh(T)} \right)^2.$$

Taking the square root and using the remark gives the second estimate. The last statement follows by expanding the sharp estimate by a power series in e^{-t} and $e^{-d(\gamma_1(T), \gamma_2(T))}$ and using the fact that $2T \geq d(\gamma_1(T), \gamma_2(T))$ and $T \geq t$. \blacksquare

We will sometimes distinguish a geodesic in SH which starts at $x \in H$ by the notation γ_x and a geodesic starting at x and passing through $y \in \overline{H}$ by $\gamma_{x,y}$. One of the principal differences between $CAT(-1)$ spaces and negatively curved manifolds is that while in both cases the geodesic segment between x and y is unique, in the former case there may be an infinite number of geodesics passing through any two points.

Corollary A.2. *Assume that H is $CAT(-1)$ -space. Let γ_1 and γ_2 be two geodesics such that $\gamma_1(\infty) = \gamma_2(\infty) = \zeta \in \partial H$. Setting $d = d(\gamma_1(0), \gamma_2(0))$ and $\rho = \rho_\zeta^0(\gamma_1(0), \gamma_2(0))$, we have*

$$d(\gamma_1(s), \gamma_2(t)) \leq \cosh^{-1} \left(\frac{\cosh(d) - \cosh(\rho)}{e^{t+s}} + \cosh(\rho + s - t) \right).$$

Assume $\rho_\zeta^0(\gamma_1(0), \gamma_2(0)) = 0$ and $s = t$, Then

$$d(\gamma_1(t), \gamma_2(t)) \leq 2 \sinh^{-1} (\sinh(d/2)e^{-t}) \leq \begin{cases} d - \frac{2}{d}(e^{-d} + d - 1)t & 0 \leq t \leq \frac{d}{2} \\ 2 \sinh\left(\frac{d}{2}\right)e^{-t} & t > \frac{d}{2} \end{cases}.$$

Proof. Let $\gamma_1(0) = p, \gamma_2(0) = q$. Choose a point z_T such that $d(p, z_T) = d(q, z_T) = T$. Then

$$d(\gamma_{p,z_T}(t), \gamma_{q,z_T}(s)) = d(\gamma_{z_T,p}(T + c - t), \gamma_{z_T,q}(T - s))$$

Note that $z_T \rightarrow \zeta$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$ and so $\gamma_{p,z_T}(t)$ and $\gamma_{q,z_T}(t)$ tend to $\gamma_{p,\zeta}(t)$ and $\gamma_{q,\zeta}(t)$ respectively. Using the first estimate of the previous lemma, and noting that $\frac{\sinh(T+\rho-t)\sinh(T-s)}{\sinh(T+\rho)\sinh(T)}$ tends to e^{-t-s} as $S, T \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain the first inequality.

For the second inequality, take $\rho = 0$ and $s = t$. In this case, the distance reduces (after applying identities) to $2 \sinh^{-1}(\sinh(d/2)e^{-t})$. Note that this function has positive second derivative in t . Therefore by convexity, the line between the initial value at $t = 0$ and the upper estimate $2 \sinh\left(\frac{d}{2}\right)e^{-t}$ at $t = \frac{d}{2}$ is an upper bound. ■

Lemma A.3. *Assume that H is $CAT(-1)$ -space. Let γ_1 and γ_2 be two geodesics with $\gamma_1(0) = \gamma_2(0) = p$. If $c_+ = (\gamma_1(\infty) \cdot \gamma_2(\infty))_p$, then for any $s \geq 0$ we have*

$$d(\gamma_1(s), \gamma_2(t)) \leq \cosh^{-1} (e^{-c_+} \sinh(s) \sinh(t) + \cosh(t - s)),$$

and if $s = t$, then

$$d(\gamma_1(t), \gamma_2(t)) \leq 2 \sinh^{-1} (e^{-c_+} \sinh(t)) \leq \begin{cases} 2e^{-c_+} \sinh(t) & t \leq c_+ \\ 2(t - c_+) + 2e^{-t} \sinh(c_+) & t > c_+ \end{cases}.$$

Proof. First observe that in the formula from Lemma A.1, we may replace $\frac{1}{2}d(\gamma_1(T), \gamma_2(T))$ by $T - c_+$ as we take $S = T \rightarrow \infty$. Taking this limit we obtain

$$\frac{\cosh(d(\gamma_1(S), \gamma_2(T))) - \cosh(T - S)}{\cosh(T) \cosh(S) - \cosh(T - S)} \rightarrow e^{-c_+}.$$

Then rearranging terms on the left hand side we obtain the first inequality. Setting $s = t$ and using standard identities we obtain

$$d(\gamma_1(s), \gamma_2(t)) \leq 2 \sinh^{-1}(e^{-c_+} \sinh(t)).$$

Since $\sinh^{-1}(t) = t - \frac{t^3}{6} + O(t^4)$ and $\sinh^{-1}(1) < 1$, we have $\sinh^{-1}(t) \leq t$ for $0 \leq t \leq 1$. So $d(\gamma_1(t), \gamma_2(t)) \leq 2e^{-c_+} \sinh(t)$ for $0 \leq t \leq \sinh^{-1}(e^{c_+})$. On the other hand, setting $f(t, c_+) = 2(t - c_+) + 2e^{-t} \sinh(c_+) - 2 \sinh^{-1}(e^{-c_+} \sinh(t))$, we have

$$\frac{df(t, c_+)}{dc_+} = 2 \left(-1 + e^{-t} \cosh(c_+) + \left(1 + \frac{e^{2c_+}}{\sinh(t)^2} \right)^{-1/2} \right)$$

which is strictly positive. Since $f(t, 0) = 0$, we have

$$d(\gamma_1(t), \gamma_2(t)) \leq 2(t - c_+) + 2e^{-t} \sinh(c_+)$$

for all $t, c_+ \geq 0$. However, the former estimate is more accurate when $t < c_+$. \blacksquare

Lemma A.4. *Assume that H is $CAT(-1)$ -space. Let γ_1 and γ_2 be two geodesics with $\gamma_1(0) = \gamma_2(0) = p$. If $c_+ = (\gamma_1(\infty) \cdot \gamma_2(\infty))_p$, then for any $s \geq 0$ we have*

$$\int_0^\infty d(\gamma_1(t), \gamma_2(t)) e^{-|t-s|} dt \leq 4 \max\{s - c_+, 0\} + e^{-|c_+ - s|} (|c_+ - s| + 3) - (s + 1)e^{-c_+ - s}.$$

Proof. Now assume $s \geq c_+$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^\infty d(\gamma_1(t), \gamma_2(t)) e^{-|t-s|} dt \\ &= \int_0^{c_+} d(\gamma_1(t), \gamma_2(t)) e^{t-s} dt + \int_{c_+}^s d(\gamma_1(t), \gamma_2(t)) e^{-t+s} dt + \int_s^\infty d(\gamma_1(t), \gamma_2(t)) e^{-t+s} dt \end{aligned}$$

Using the estimate of the previous lemma we can integrate each of these to obtain

$$\int_0^\infty d(\gamma_1(t), \gamma_2(t)) e^{-|t-s|} dt \leq e^{s-c_+} (s - c_+ + 3) - (s + 1)e^{-c_+ - s} + 4(s - c_+).$$

For $s \leq c_+$ we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^\infty d(\gamma_1(t), \gamma_2(t)) e^{-|t-s|} dt \\ &= \int_0^s d(\gamma_1(t), \gamma_2(t)) e^{t-s} dt + \int_s^{c_+} d(\gamma_1(t), \gamma_2(t)) e^{-t+s} dt + \int_{c_+}^\infty d(\gamma_1(t), \gamma_2(t)) e^{-t+s} dt \\ &\leq e^{c_+ - s} (c_+ - s + 3) - (s + 1)e^{-c_+ - s}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining both of these cases together completes the proof. \blacksquare

Lemma A.5. *Let H be $CAT(-1)$ -space. Let γ_1 and γ_2 are two geodesics, such that $\gamma_1(0) = \gamma_2(0) = p$. Let $c_+ = (\gamma_1(\infty) \cdot \gamma_2(\infty))_p$ and $c_- = (\gamma_1(-\infty) \cdot \gamma_2(-\infty))_p$. Then for all $s > 0$ we have*

$$\text{dist}(\mathbf{g}^s(\gamma_1), \mathbf{g}^s(\gamma_2)) \leq 2 \max\{s - c_+, 0\} + \frac{(|c_+ - s| + 3)}{2e^{|c_+ - s|}} - \frac{(s + 1)}{2e^{s+c_+}} + \frac{(c_- + 2)}{2e^{s+c_-}}.$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(\mathbf{g}^s \gamma_1, \mathbf{g}^s \gamma_2) &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^\infty d(\gamma_1(t+s), \gamma_2(t+s)) e^{-|t|} dt = \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^\infty d(\gamma_1(t), \gamma_2(t)) e^{-|t-s|} dt \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^0 d(\gamma_1(t), \gamma_2(t)) e^{t-s} dt + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty d(\gamma_1(t), \gamma_2(t)) e^{-|t-s|} dt \end{aligned}$$

Now for $t \leq 0$ we use simple substitution $t = -t$ to get

$$\int_{-\infty}^0 d(\gamma_1(t), \gamma_2(t)) e^{t-s} dt \leq e^{-s} \int_0^{\infty} d(\gamma_1(-t), \gamma_2(-t)) e^{-t} dt$$

Now using the previous lemma,

$$\leq e^{-s} e^{-c_-} (c_- + 2).$$

Again by the previous lemma,

$$\int_0^{\infty} d(\gamma_1(t), \gamma_2(t)) e^{-|t-s|} dt \leq 4 \max\{s - c_+, 0\} + e^{-|c_+ - s|} (|c_+ - s| + 3) - (s+1) e^{-c_+ - s}.$$

■

Lemma A.6. *Let H be $CAT(-1)$ -space. Let γ_1 and γ_2 are two geodesics, such that $\gamma_1(0) = \gamma_2(0) = p$. Let $c_+ = (\gamma_1(\infty) \cdot \gamma_2(\infty))_p$, $c_- = (\gamma_1(-\infty) \cdot \gamma_2(-\infty))_p$ and $0 < \beta \leq 1$. Then for all $T > 0$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \text{dist}(\mathbf{g}^s \gamma_1, \mathbf{g}^s \gamma_2)^\beta ds &\leq \left(\frac{1}{\beta} + \frac{c_-}{2} \right) (e^{-\beta c_-} - e^{-\beta T - \beta c_-}) + \frac{2}{\beta} \left(1 + \text{sgn}(T - c_+) (1 - e^{-\beta |T - c_+|}) \right) \\ &\quad - \left(\frac{2}{\beta} + \frac{c_+}{2} \right) e^{-\beta c_+} - \frac{T - c_+}{2} e^{-\beta |T - c_+|} + \frac{2^\beta \max\{(T - c_+), 0\}^{1+\beta}}{1 + \beta} \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1}{\beta} + \frac{c_-}{2} \right) e^{-\beta c_-} + \frac{2}{\beta} \min\{2, e^{\beta(T - c_+)}\} - \left(\frac{2}{\beta} + \frac{c_+}{2} \right) e^{-\beta c_+} \\ &\quad - \frac{T - c_+}{2} e^{-\beta |T - c_+|} + \frac{2^\beta \max\{(T - c_+), 0\}^{1+\beta}}{1 + \beta} \\ &\leq \frac{5}{\beta} + \max\{(T - c_+), 0\}^{1+\beta}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Since $0 < \beta \leq 1$, we use $(x+y)^\beta \leq x^\beta + y^\beta$ for $x, y > 0$ and $(a+x)^\beta \leq a + \beta x$ for $a \geq 1$ to obtain

$$\text{dist}(\mathbf{g}^s \gamma_1, \mathbf{g}^s \gamma_2)^\beta \leq \frac{2 + \beta c_-}{2 e^{\beta(c_- + s)}} + \frac{(3 + \beta |c_+ - s|)}{2 e^{\beta |s - c_+|}} + 2^\beta \max\{|s - c_+|, 0\}^\beta.$$

Integrating we obtain the first estimate.

For the second inequality, we use $1 + \text{sgn}(x)(1 - e^{-|x|}) \leq \min\{2, e^x\}$. For the third inequality, we overestimate the last term using that $2^\beta \leq 1 + \beta$ for $\beta \in [0, 1]$. Note that $\left(\frac{1}{\beta} + \frac{c_-}{2}\right) (1 - e^{-\beta T}) e^{-\beta c_-} \leq \frac{1}{\beta}$. So the worst case occurs in the first four terms by taking $T \rightarrow \infty$, in which case we recover the given value. ■

In Particular, we have the following special case.

Corollary A.7. *Let γ_1, γ_2 are 2 geodesics in H , such that $\gamma_1(0) = \gamma_2(0) = p$ and $c_\pm = (\gamma_1(\pm\infty) \cdot \gamma_2(\pm\infty))_p$. Then for any $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$,*

$$\int_0^{\alpha c_+} \text{dist}(\mathbf{g}^s \gamma_1, \mathbf{g}^s \gamma_2)^\beta ds \leq \min \left\{ \frac{1}{\beta}, \alpha c_+ \right\} \left(\left(1 + \frac{\beta c_-}{2} \right) e^{-\beta c_-} + 2e^{-\beta(1-\alpha)c_+} \right) - \frac{c_+}{2} e^{-\beta c_+} + \frac{(1-\alpha)c_+}{2} e^{-\beta(1-\alpha)c_+}.$$

If in addition we assume $c_- \geq (1-\alpha)c_+$, then we have

$$\int_0^{\alpha c_+} \text{dist}(\mathbf{g}^s \gamma_1, \mathbf{g}^s \gamma_2)^\beta ds \leq e^{-\beta(1-\alpha)c_+} \left(\frac{3}{\beta} + (1-\alpha)c_+ \right).$$

Proof. We use the first estimate of the previous Lemma with $T = \alpha c_+$. We then note that $1 - e^{-\beta x} \leq \min \{1, \beta x\}$ to obtain the first estimate. Using $c_- = (1-\alpha)c_+$ and dropping the $-\frac{c_+}{2}e^{-\beta c_+}$ term we obtain the second estimate. ■

We finish this section with a simple lemma that we will use later.

Lemma A.8. *Let H be $CAT(-1)$ space. Assume that $\gamma_1(0) = \gamma_2(0) = p$. Then for all $a \geq 0$ and $t \geq 0$ we have*

$$d(\gamma_1(a), \gamma_2(a)) \leq d(\gamma_1(a), \gamma_2(a+t)).$$

Proof. Using the comparison triangle we have

$$\cosh(d(\gamma_1(a), \gamma_2(a+t))) \geq \cosh(a) \cosh(a+t) - \sinh(a) \sinh(a+t) \cos(\angle_p(\gamma_1, \gamma_2))$$

Differentiating with respect t we have

$$\frac{d(\cosh(d(\gamma_1(a), \gamma_2(a+t))))}{dt} \geq \cosh(a) \sinh(a+t) - \sinh(a) \cosh(a+t) \cos(\angle_p(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)) \geq 0,$$

for $t \geq 0$ as $\frac{\cosh(x)}{\sinh(x)}$ is a decreasing function. ■

APPENDIX B. $c_\gamma^\Phi(x, y)$ IS HÖLDER.

We recall the notations from Section 4. We let Φ be a tempered Hölder function on SH with Hölder exponent $0 < \beta \leq 1$ and global Hölder constant K .

Lemma B.1. *Let $p \in H$. Assume γ_1, γ_2 are two geodesics, such that $\gamma_1(0) = \gamma_2(0) = p$ and $c_+ = (\gamma_1(\infty) \cdot \gamma_2(\infty))_p$. Then for all $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$ we have*

$$|d^\Phi(p, \gamma_1(\alpha c_+)) - d^\Phi(p, \gamma_2(\alpha c_+))| \leq K \left(\left(\frac{1}{\beta} + \frac{c_-}{2} \right) e^{-\beta c_-} + \left(\frac{2}{\beta} + \frac{(1-\alpha)c_+}{2} \right) e^{-\beta(1-\alpha)c_+} \right).$$

Proof. We have,

$$\begin{aligned} |d^\Phi(p, \gamma_1(\alpha c_+)) - d^\Phi(p, \gamma_2(\alpha c_+))| &= \left| \int_0^{\alpha c_+} \Phi(\mathbf{g}^t \gamma_1) - \Phi(\mathbf{g}^t \gamma_2) dt \right| \\ &\leq K \int_0^{\alpha c_+} \text{dist}(\mathbf{g}^t \gamma_1, \mathbf{g}^t \gamma_2)^\beta dt. \end{aligned}$$

Now apply Corollary A.7. ■

Lemma B.2. *Assume γ_1 and γ_2 are two geodesics with $\gamma_1(\infty) = \gamma_2(\infty) = \zeta$ for some $\zeta \in \partial H$. Assume that $\rho_\zeta(\gamma_1(0), \gamma_2(0)) = 0$ (i.e., $\gamma_1(0)$ and $\gamma_2(0)$ lie on the same horosphere around ζ). Then*

$$\text{dist}(\mathbf{g}^s \gamma_1, \mathbf{g}^s \gamma_2) \leq \begin{cases} 1 + d - 2s + \frac{s}{d} & s \leq \frac{d}{2} \\ e^{(\frac{d}{2}-s)} \left(\frac{3}{2} + \frac{s}{2} - \frac{d}{4} \right) & s > \frac{d}{2} \end{cases}.$$

Proof. By Corollary A.2, we have

$$d(\gamma_1(t), \gamma_2(t)) \leq 2 \sinh^{-1} \left(\sinh \left(\frac{d}{2} \right) e^{-t} \right).$$

Moreover,

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d(\mathbf{g}^s \gamma_1(t), \mathbf{g}^s \gamma_2(t)) e^{-|t|} dt = \int_0^{\infty} d(\gamma_1(t), \gamma_2(t)) e^{-|t-s|} dt + e^{-s} \int_{-\infty}^0 d(\gamma_1(t), \gamma_2(t)) e^t dt.$$

As before, the second integral is less than

$$(2 + c_- + d) e^{-c_- - s} \leq (2 + d) e^{-s},$$

where $c_- = (\gamma_1(-\infty) \cdot \gamma_2(-\infty))_{\gamma_1(0)}$ and $d = d(\gamma_1(0), \gamma_2(0))$.

Adding the first integral which can be evaluated in closed form, we obtain the upper bound,

$$\begin{aligned} &2e^{-s} + 4 \operatorname{csch}^{-1} \left(e^s \operatorname{csch} \left(\frac{d}{2} \right) \right) - 2e^s \operatorname{csch} \left(\frac{d}{2} \right) \left(-1 + \sqrt{1 + \frac{\sinh \left(\frac{d}{2} \right)^2}{e^{2s}}} \right) + \\ &\frac{2}{e^s} \left(s + \log \left(\frac{2 + \sqrt{4 - 2e^{-2s} + 2e^{-2s} \cosh(d)}}{2 + \sqrt{2 + 2 \cosh(d)}} \right) \right) \sinh \left(\frac{d}{2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

If we denote the above by $f(s)$, then $f''(s)$ is positive for $s \geq 0$. Therefore we can overestimate f for $0 \leq s \leq \frac{d}{2}$ by the line between its endpoints in this region.

Taking a power series of $g(s) = e^{s-d/2} f(s) - (1 - e^{-d}) s$ at $s = \infty$ we find that $g(s)$ decreases monotonically to the constant

$$\frac{2 + \left(3 + \log(16) - 2 \log(2 + \sqrt{2 + 2 \cosh(d)})\right) \sinh\left(\frac{d}{2}\right)}{e^{\frac{d}{2}}}.$$

In particular, $g(s)$, and hence $e^{s-d/2} f(s) - s$, attains its maximum at $s = \frac{d}{2}$. So we can overestimate $f(s)$ for $s > \frac{d}{2}$ by $e^{\frac{d}{2}-s} \left(s - \frac{d}{2} + f\left(\frac{d}{2}\right)\right)$ in this region. On the other hand $f\left(\frac{d}{2}\right)$ is monotonically increasing in d , so we can overestimate it by its limit as $d \rightarrow \infty$ which is $4 - 2\sqrt{5} + 4 \sinh^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) + \sinh^{-1}(2) = 4 - 2\sqrt{5} + \log\left(\frac{29+13\sqrt{5}}{2}\right)$.

Putting these estimates together have:

$$2 \operatorname{dist}(\mathbf{g}^s \gamma_1, \mathbf{g}^s \gamma_2) \leq \begin{cases} 2 \left(1 + d - 2s + \frac{s(2 - 2\sqrt{5} + \log\left(\frac{29+13\sqrt{5}}{2}\right))}{d}\right) & s \leq \frac{d}{2} \\ e^{\frac{d}{2}-s} \left(s - \frac{d}{2} + 4 - 2\sqrt{5} + \log\left(\frac{29+13\sqrt{5}}{2}\right)\right) & s > \frac{d}{2} \end{cases}.$$

This can be further overestimated by

$$\operatorname{dist}(\mathbf{g}^s \gamma_1, \mathbf{g}^s \gamma_2) \leq \begin{cases} 1 + d - 2s + \frac{s}{d} & s \leq \frac{d}{2} \\ e^{\left(\frac{d}{2}-s\right)} \left(\frac{3}{2} + \frac{s}{2} - \frac{d}{4}\right) & s > \frac{d}{2} \end{cases}.$$

■

Corollary B.3. *Let $x, y \in H$ and $\zeta \in \partial H$. Assume that $\rho_\zeta(x, y) = 0$ (i.e., x, y lie on the same horoball around ζ) and set $d = d(x, y)$. Then*

$$\int_T^\infty \operatorname{dist}(\mathbf{g}^s \gamma_{x,\zeta}, \mathbf{g}^s \gamma_{y,\zeta})^\beta ds = \begin{cases} \left(\frac{d}{2} - T\right) \left(\frac{\beta}{2} + \frac{\beta d}{2} + 1\right) + \frac{2}{\beta} & T \leq \frac{d}{2} \\ e^{\beta\left(\frac{d}{2}-T\right)} \left(\frac{2}{\beta} + \frac{T}{2} - \frac{d}{4}\right) & T > \frac{d}{2} \end{cases}.$$

Proof. Set $\gamma_1 = \gamma_{x,\zeta}$ and $\gamma_2 = \gamma_{y,\zeta}$. Using $(a+x)^\beta \leq a + \beta x$ for $a \geq 1$, we estimate,

$$\operatorname{dist}(\mathbf{g}^s \gamma_1, \mathbf{g}^s \gamma_2)^\beta \leq \begin{cases} 1 + \beta \left(d - 2s + \frac{s}{d}\right) & s \leq \frac{d}{2} \\ e^{\beta\left(\frac{d}{2}-s\right)} \left(\frac{3}{2} + \frac{\beta s}{2} - \frac{\beta d}{4}\right) & s > \frac{d}{2} \end{cases}.$$

This yields

$$\int_T^{\frac{d}{2}} \operatorname{dist}(\mathbf{g}^s \gamma_1, \mathbf{g}^s \gamma_2)^\beta ds = \frac{(d - 2T) (2\beta d^2 + 2\beta T + d(4 + \beta - 4\beta T))}{8d},$$

and for $T > \frac{d}{2}$,

$$\int_T^\infty \operatorname{dist}(\mathbf{g}^s \gamma_1, \mathbf{g}^s \gamma_2)^\beta ds = e^{\beta\left(\frac{d}{2}-T\right)} \frac{4 + \beta\left(T - \frac{d}{2}\right)}{2\beta}.$$

After overestimating the first expression, we obtain

$$\int_T^\infty \operatorname{dist}(\mathbf{g}^s \gamma_1, \mathbf{g}^s \gamma_2)^\beta ds = \begin{cases} \left(\frac{d}{2} - T\right) \left(\frac{\beta}{2} (1 + d) + 1\right) + \frac{2}{\beta} & T \leq \frac{d}{2} \\ e^{\beta\left(\frac{d}{2}-T\right)} \frac{4 + \beta\left(T - \frac{d}{2}\right)}{2\beta} & T > \frac{d}{2} \end{cases}.$$

■

Lemma B.4. *Let $x, y \in H$ and $\zeta \in \partial H$. Assume that $\rho_\zeta(x, y) = 0$ (i.e., x, y lie on the same horoball around ζ). Assume Φ is a Hölder function, with Hölder constant K . Then for all $s \geq 0$,*

$$|\rho_\zeta^\Phi(\gamma_{x,\zeta}(s), \gamma_{y,\zeta}(s))| \leq K \begin{cases} \left(\frac{d}{2} - s\right) \left(\frac{\beta}{2} + \frac{\beta d}{2} + 1\right) + \frac{2}{\beta} & s \leq \frac{d}{2} \\ e^{\beta(\frac{d}{2}-s)} \left(\frac{2}{\beta} + \frac{s}{2} - \frac{d}{4}\right) & s > \frac{d}{2} \end{cases}.$$

Proof. Since $\rho_\zeta(x, y) = 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\rho_\zeta^\Phi(\gamma_{x,\zeta}(s), \gamma_{y,\zeta}(s))| &= \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} |d^\Phi(\gamma_{y,\zeta}(s), \gamma_{y,\zeta}(T)) - d^\Phi(\gamma_{x,\zeta}(s), \gamma_{x,\zeta}(T))| = \\ &= \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \int_s^T |\Phi(\mathbf{g}^t \gamma_{y,\zeta}) - \Phi(\mathbf{g}^t \gamma_{x,\zeta})| dt \\ &\leq K \int_s^\infty \text{dist}(\mathbf{g}^t \gamma_{y,\zeta}, \mathbf{g}^t \gamma_{x,\zeta})^\beta dt. \end{aligned}$$

■

For any two points $x \in H$ and $\xi \in \partial H$, let $\gamma_{x,\xi}(t)$ be a geodesic connecting x and ξ , i.e., $\gamma_{x,\xi}(0) = x$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_{x,\xi}(t) = \xi$.

Now recall that any $\text{CAT}(-\kappa)$ space is 2δ -hyperbolic for some $\delta > 0$ depending only on κ . For the remainder of this section, let δ be the smallest such constant for H .

Lemma B.5. *Suppose $p, q \in H$ and $\zeta, \nu \in \partial H$ are chosen so that $(\zeta \cdot \nu)_p \geq d(p, q)$ and $\rho_\zeta(p, q) \geq 0$, then*

$$\begin{aligned} d(\gamma_{p,\zeta}((\zeta \cdot \nu)_p), \gamma_{p,\nu}((\zeta \cdot \nu)_p)) &\leq 2\delta, \\ d(\gamma_{q,\zeta}((\zeta \cdot \nu)_p + \rho_\zeta(p, q)), \gamma_{q,\nu}((\zeta \cdot \nu)_p + \rho_\nu(p, q))) &\leq 4\delta, \\ \max\{d(p, \gamma_{q,\zeta}(\rho_\zeta(p, q))), d(p, \gamma_{q,\nu}(\rho_\nu(p, q)))\} &\leq d(p, q) + 2\delta \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The first inequality follows directly from writing down the conditions for δ -hyperbolicity. For $(\zeta \cdot \nu)_p \geq d(p, q)$ we have $|\rho_\zeta(p, q) - \rho_\nu(p, q)| \leq 2\delta$.

Since $\rho_\zeta(p, q) \geq 0$, we therefore have $\rho_\nu(p, q) \geq -2\delta$. By Lemma A.8, $d(p, \gamma_{q,\zeta}(\rho_\zeta(p, q))) \leq d(p, q)$ and hence $d(p, \gamma_{q,\nu}(\rho_\nu(p, q))) \leq d(p, q) + 2\delta$ giving the second inequality.

Finally, observe that

$$\max\{(\zeta \cdot \nu)_p + \rho_\zeta(p, q), (\zeta \cdot \nu)_p + \rho_\nu(p, q)\} \leq (\zeta \cdot \nu)_p + \frac{\rho_\zeta(p, q) + \rho_\nu(p, q)}{2} + \delta = (\zeta \cdot \nu)_p + \delta$$

Thus we have

$$d(\gamma_{q,\zeta}((\zeta \cdot \nu)_p + \rho_\zeta(p, q)), \gamma_{q,\nu}((\zeta \cdot \nu)_p + \rho_\nu(p, q))) \leq d(\gamma_{q,\zeta}((\zeta \cdot \nu)_q), \gamma_{q,\nu}((\zeta \cdot \nu)_q)) + 2\delta \leq 4\delta.$$

■

At this point we need to make an assumption about the way we extend geodesics backwards.

Definition B.6. We say that H has *bounded flip* if there exist positive constants R_1 and R_2 such that for all $\zeta, \nu \in \partial H$ and $p \in H$, it is possible to choose two geodesics γ_1 and γ_2 such that $\gamma_1^+ = \zeta$, $\gamma_2^+ = \nu$, $\gamma_1(0) = p = \gamma_2(0)$ and we have

$$(\gamma_1^- \cdot \gamma_2^-)_{\gamma_1(0)} \geq R_1(\gamma_1^+ \cdot \gamma_2^+)_{\gamma_1(0)} - R_2.$$

Remark B.7. Observe that the Cayley graphs of free groups have this property (with $R_1 > 0$ arbitrary) since the backward endpoints of geodesics through p can be chosen independently of the forward points. For a simply connected manifold M with pinched negative curvature between -1 and $-b^2$, we have $b(\gamma_1^- \cdot \gamma_2^-)_{\gamma_1(0)} \geq (\gamma_1^+ \cdot \gamma_2^+)_{\gamma_1(0)}$. In particular, M has bounded flip. On the other hand, it is easy to construct simply connected manifolds with unbounded negative curvature less than -1 which do not possess bounded flip. Simply take a geodesic γ through p whose forward ray passes through a region of curvature -1 , but whose backward ray has the property that every 2-plane tangent to $\gamma'(-t)$ has sectional curvature $-e^{2t}$. Therefore for any sequence of geodesics γ_i through p with $\gamma_i \rightarrow \gamma$ we have $\frac{(\gamma_i^+ \cdot \gamma^+)_p}{(\gamma_i^- \cdot \gamma^-)_p} \rightarrow \infty$.

The next proposition shows that CAT(-1) spaces which are either tree like or have pinched curvatures in a weak sense and admit a cocompact group of isometries have bounded flip. This family includes other important examples such as hyperbolic buildings. Conjecturally this any CAT(-1) space with a cocompact group of isometries has bounded flip. However, we were not able to show this.

Proposition B.8. *Suppose G acts cocompactly on H , and there is a $K < -1$ such that every triangle with two endpoints in ∂H either*

- (1) *has both sides meeting the interior vertex along a common segment, or*
- (2) *is fatter than its comparison triangle in \mathbb{H}_K^2 the plane of constant curvature K .*

Then H has bounded flip.

Proof. Since the assumptions imply that H is a proper metric space, even if it is not geodesically complete, any Cauchy sequence of geodesic segments with respect to Hausdorff distance is convergent. This implies that ∂H is complete, and hence compact, with respect to the quasimetric $\pi_p(\zeta, \nu) = e^{-(\zeta, \nu)_p}$. In particular, a sequence of geodesic rays through a fixed point has a subsequence which converges to a ray.

Therefore if H does not have bounded flip, then we may assume there is a fixed geodesic γ and a sequence of geodesics γ_i with $\gamma_i(0) = \gamma(0)$ and $\gamma_i \rightarrow \gamma$ such that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(\gamma_i^+ \cdot \gamma^+)_{\gamma(0)}}{(\gamma_i^- \cdot \gamma^-)_{\gamma(0)}} \rightarrow \infty$ where $(\sigma^- \cdot \gamma^-)_{\gamma(0)} \leq (\gamma_i^- \cdot \gamma^-)_{\gamma(0)}$ for any other geodesic σ satisfying $\sigma(0) = \gamma(0)$ and $\sigma^+ = \gamma_i^+$.

For triangles of the first type the geodesics from $\gamma(0)$ to γ_i^+ and γ^+ can be extended in the opposite direction by a common geodesic, so that there is no constraint imposed on the choice of constant R_1 .

For a triangle in the hyperbolic plane of constant curvature $K = -k^2$ with one point at $p \in \mathbb{H}^2$ and the other two vertices at $\xi, \zeta \in \partial \mathbb{H}^2$, the angle θ at p is given by $\theta = \arcsin(2e^{-k(\xi, \zeta)_p})$. Therefore, the second assumption implies that $(\gamma_i^-, \sigma^-)_{\sigma(0)} \geq \frac{1}{k}(\gamma_i^+, \sigma^+)_{\sigma(0)}$. So that R_1 may be chosen to be $\frac{1}{k}$. ■

Proposition B.9. *Assume H has bounded flip. For $p \in H$ we define $\pi_p(\xi, \zeta) = e^{-(\xi, \zeta)_p}$. There exists $\epsilon > 0$ and constant D_Φ depending only on Φ such that for any $q \in H$ we have*

$$\sup_{\pi_p(\zeta, \nu) \leq e^{-d(p, q)}} \frac{|\rho_\zeta^\Phi(p, q) - \rho_\nu^\Phi(p, q)|}{\pi_p(\zeta, \nu)^\epsilon} < D_\Phi e^{\epsilon d(p, q)}.$$

Proof. Let $f(p, q)$ be the left hand side of the expression. Even though, $\rho_\zeta^\Phi(p, q) = -\rho_\zeta^\Phi(q, p)$ for all $\zeta \in \partial H$, we may still have $f(p, q) \neq f(q, p)$ since $(\zeta \cdot \nu)_p = (\zeta \cdot \nu)_q + \frac{1}{2}(\rho_\zeta(q, p) + \rho_\nu(q, p))$. However, by cocompactness of Γ , there is a $\gamma \in \Gamma$ such that $d(\gamma p, q) < \text{diam}(H/\Gamma)$ and $\pi_p(\zeta, \nu) = \pi_{\gamma p}(\gamma \zeta, \gamma \nu)$. The lower semi-continuity of $f(p, q)$ implies that $f(p, q) \leq f(q, p)e^{2\epsilon \text{diam}(H/\Gamma)}$. Therefore, without loss of generality we assume that $\rho_\zeta(p, q) \geq 0$.

Set $r = \pi_p(\zeta, \nu) \leq e^{-d(p, q)}$ and $c_+ = (\zeta \cdot \nu)_p = -\log(r) \geq d(p, q)$ (so $e^{-c_+} = r$).

From the definition of ρ^Φ , for all $x, y \in H$ and $\xi \in \partial H$ and $t_1, t_2 \geq 0$, we have

$$\rho_\xi^\Phi(x, y) = \rho_\xi^\Phi(\gamma_{x, \xi}(t_1), \gamma_{y, \xi}(t_2)) + d^\Phi(y, \gamma_{y, \xi}(t_2)) - d^\Phi(x, \gamma_{x, \xi}(t_1)).$$

And points p and $\gamma_{q, \xi}(\rho_\zeta(p, q))$ lie on the same horoball for all $p, q \in H$ $\xi \in \partial H$.

Now let us estimate $|\rho_\zeta^\Phi(x, y) - \rho_\nu^\Phi(x, y)|$. Let $a \in (0, 1)$ be a parameter which we will specify later.

We will concentrate on 4 points

$$\gamma_{p, \zeta}(\alpha c_+), \gamma_{q, \zeta}(\alpha c_+ + \rho_\zeta(p, q)), \text{ and } \gamma_{p, \nu}(\alpha c_+), \gamma_{q, \nu}(\alpha c_+ + \rho_\nu(p, q)).$$

It is not difficult to see that the first two points and the last two points lie on the same horoball.

Now we can make the following estimate.

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_\zeta^\Phi(p, q) - \rho_\nu^\Phi(p, q) &= \rho_\zeta^\Phi(\gamma_{p, \zeta}(\alpha c_+), \gamma_{q, \zeta}(\alpha c_+ + \rho_\zeta(p, q))) - \rho_\nu^\Phi(\gamma_{p, \nu}(\alpha c_+), \gamma_{q, \nu}(\alpha c_+ + \rho_\nu(p, q))) \\ &\quad + d^\Phi(q, \gamma_{q, \zeta}(\alpha c_+ + \rho_\zeta(p, q))) - d^\Phi(q, \gamma_{q, \nu}(\alpha c_+ + \rho_\nu(p, q))) \\ &\quad - d^\Phi(p, \gamma_{p, \zeta}(\alpha c_+)) + d^\Phi(p, \gamma_{p, \nu}(aT)) \end{aligned}$$

We will estimate each line separately. However, we will do the estimates in the order they appear.

The estimates of each ρ^Φ term are similar and we will consider them together. While Lemma B.5 tells us that $d(p, \gamma_{q, \zeta}(\rho_\zeta(p, q))) \leq d(p, q) + 2\delta$, we need a better bound when $d(p, q)$ is small. Using Corollary A.2, we can solve to also show that $d(p, \gamma_{q, \zeta}(\rho_\zeta(p, q))) \leq \cosh^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{2}(\cosh(d(p, q))^2 + 1)\right)$. Since $f(t) = \frac{\cosh^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{2}(\cosh(t)^2 + 1)\right)}{t}$ is monotone and $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} f(t) = 1$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} f(t) = 2$, we have $\frac{d(p, \gamma_{q, \zeta}(\rho_\zeta(p, q)))}{d(p, q)} \leq \min\left\{f(d(p, q)), 1 + \frac{2\delta}{d(p, q)}\right\} \leq C_0$, where $C_0 \in (1, 2)$ is a constant depending only on δ .

Since $c_+ > d(p, q)$, if we choose any $1 > a > \frac{C_0}{2}$ then $ac_+ > \frac{d(p, \gamma_{q, \zeta}(\rho_\zeta(p, q)))}{2}$ and by symmetry, $ac_+ > \frac{d(p, \gamma_{q, \nu}(\rho_\nu(p, q)))}{2}$. Therefore by Lemma B.4 we have,

$$\begin{aligned} &\max\left\{|\rho_\zeta^\Phi(\gamma_{p, \zeta}(\alpha c_+), \gamma_{q, \zeta}(\alpha c_+ + \rho_\zeta(p, q)))|, |\rho_\nu^\Phi(\gamma_{p, \nu}(\alpha c_+), \gamma_{q, \nu}(\alpha c_+ + \rho_\nu(p, q)))|\right\} \\ &\leq 2Ke^{-\beta \alpha c_+} \max\left\{e^{\beta\left(\frac{d(p, \gamma_{q, \zeta}(\rho_\zeta(p, q)))}{2}\right)}, e^{\beta\left(\frac{d(p, \gamma_{q, \nu}(\rho_\nu(p, q)))}{2}\right)}\right\} \left(\frac{ac_+}{2} + \frac{2}{\beta}\right) \\ &\leq Ke^{\beta \alpha c_+} e^{\beta\left(\frac{d(p, q)}{2} + \delta\right)} \left(\frac{\alpha c_+}{2} + \frac{2}{\beta}\right) \leq \frac{2Ke^{\beta\left(\frac{d(p, q)}{2} + \delta\right)}}{\beta} e^{-\frac{3}{4}\beta \alpha c_+} \\ &\leq \frac{2Ke^{\beta \delta}}{\beta} e^{\frac{\beta}{2}c_+} r^{\frac{3}{4}\beta \alpha} = \frac{2Ke^{\beta \delta}}{\beta} r^{\beta\left(\frac{3}{4}\alpha - \frac{1}{2}\right)}. \end{aligned}$$

Here we have used the fact that $e^{-x}(A + Bx) \leq Ae^{-(1-\frac{B}{A})x}$, for $x \geq 0$.

Observe that $\gamma_{p,\zeta}(0) = \gamma_{p,\nu}(0) = p$, so we can apply Lemma B.1

$$\begin{aligned} & |d^\Phi(p, \gamma_{p,\zeta}(\alpha c_+)) - d^\Phi(p, \gamma_{p,\nu}(\alpha c_+))| \\ & \leq K \left(\left(\frac{2}{\beta} + \frac{c_-}{2} \right) e^{-\beta c_-} + \left(\frac{2}{\beta} + \frac{(1-\alpha)c_+}{2} \right) e^{-\beta(1-\alpha)c_+} \right) \\ & \leq \frac{2K}{\beta} \left(e^{-\frac{3}{4}\beta c_-} + e^{-\frac{3}{4}\beta(1-\alpha)c_+} \right) \end{aligned}$$

recalling that $c_- \geq R_1 c_+ - R_2$ yields,

$$\begin{aligned} & \leq \frac{2K}{\beta} \left(e^{-\frac{3}{4}\beta(R_1 c_+ - R_2)} + e^{-\frac{3}{4}\beta(1-\alpha)c_+} \right) \\ & = \frac{2K}{\beta} \left(e^{\frac{3}{4}\beta R_2} r^{\frac{3}{4}\beta R_1} + r^{\frac{3}{4}\beta(1-\alpha)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Now we will repeat this to the second estimate at the point q .

$$\begin{aligned} & |d^\Phi(q, \gamma_{q,\zeta}(\alpha c_+ + \rho_\zeta(p, q))) - d^\Phi(q, \gamma_{q,\nu}(\alpha c_+ + \rho_\nu(p, q)))| \\ & \leq |d^\Phi(q, \gamma_{q,\zeta}(\alpha c_+ + \rho_\zeta(p, q))) - d^\Phi(q, \gamma_{q,\nu}(\alpha c_+ + \rho_\zeta(p, q)))| \\ & \quad + |d^\Phi(\gamma_{q,\nu}(\alpha c_+ + \rho_\zeta(p, q)), \gamma_{q,\nu}(\alpha c_+ + \rho_\nu(p, q)))| \end{aligned}$$

Note that $(\zeta \cdot \nu)_q = c_+ + \frac{1}{2}(\rho_\zeta(p, q) + \rho_\nu(p, q))$, so $|c_+ + \rho_\zeta(p, q) - (\zeta \cdot \nu)_q| \leq 2\delta$. We use Lemma B.1 (with $(\zeta \cdot \nu)_q$ in place of c_+) again to estimate the first term, and estimating the second term explicitly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \leq \frac{2K}{\beta} \left(e^{-\frac{3}{4}\beta(\gamma_{q,\zeta}(-\infty) \cdot \gamma_{q,\nu}(-\infty))_q} + e^{-\frac{3}{4}\beta(1-\alpha(1+\frac{2\delta}{(\zeta \cdot \nu)_q})-(1-\alpha)\frac{\rho_\zeta(p,q)}{(\zeta \cdot \nu)_q})(\zeta \cdot \nu)_q} \right) \\ & \quad + K |\rho_\zeta(p, q) - \rho_\nu(p, q)| \\ & \leq \frac{2K}{\beta} \left(e^{-\frac{3}{4}\beta(R_1 c_+ - R_2)} + e^{\frac{3}{2}\beta\delta} e^{-\frac{3}{4}\beta(1-\alpha)((\zeta \cdot \nu)_q - \rho_\zeta(p, q))} \right) \\ & \quad + K |\rho_\zeta(p, q) - \rho_\nu(p, q)| \\ & \leq \frac{2K}{\beta} \left(e^{\frac{3}{4}\beta R_2} r^{\frac{3}{4}\beta R_1} + e^{3\beta\delta} r^{\frac{3}{4}\beta(1-\alpha)} \right) + K |\rho_\zeta(p, q) - \rho_\nu(p, q)|. \end{aligned}$$

Now let us specify ϵ and a . Suppose ϵ_0 is the least upper bound of ϵ for which π_p^ϵ is a metric. In a moment we will need to choose ϵ so that

$$\epsilon \leq \min \left(\epsilon_0, \frac{3}{4}\beta\alpha, \frac{3}{4}\beta R_1, \frac{3}{4}\beta(1-\alpha), \frac{3}{4}\beta\alpha - \frac{\beta}{2} \right).$$

Recall $1 > a > \frac{C_0}{2} > \frac{1}{2}$. So the best upper bound for ϵ will be when $\frac{3}{4}(1-\alpha) = \frac{3}{4}\alpha - \frac{1}{2}$ or $\alpha = \frac{5}{6}$, assuming this is larger than C_0 . This is the case when δ is chosen for a CAT(-1) space. This yields an upper bound of $\epsilon < \min \left\{ \epsilon_0, \frac{3}{4}\beta R_1, \frac{\beta}{8} \right\}$.

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{| \rho_\zeta^\Phi(p, q) - \rho_\nu^\Phi(p, q) |}{r^\epsilon} \\ & \leq \frac{2K e^{\beta\delta}}{\beta} r^{\beta(\frac{3}{4}\alpha - \frac{1}{2}) - \epsilon} + \frac{2K}{\beta} \left(e^{\frac{3}{4}\beta R_2} r^{\frac{3}{4}\beta R_1 - \epsilon} + r^{\frac{3}{4}\beta(1-\alpha) - \epsilon} \right) \\ & \quad + \frac{2K}{\beta} \left(e^{\frac{3}{4}\beta R_2} r^{\frac{3}{4}\beta R_1 - \epsilon} + e^{3\beta\delta} r^{\frac{3}{4}\beta(1-\alpha) - \epsilon} \right) + K \frac{|\rho_\zeta(p, q) - \rho_\nu(p, q)|}{r^\epsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

The last term can be controlled since $\sup_{\pi_p(\zeta, \nu) \leq e^{-d(p,q)}} \frac{|\rho_\zeta(p,q) - \rho_\nu(p,q)|}{r^\epsilon} \leq C e^{\epsilon d(p,q)}$.
Since all powers of r are positive and $r \leq e^{-d(p,q)} \leq 1$ we have finished the proof. ■

APPENDIX C. DECAYING CONDITION.

Recall that $S_p(q, r) \in \partial H$ is the shadow of the ball $B(q, r) \subset H$ with respect to point $p \in H$.

Theorem C.1 (Shadow Lemma [Kai04]). *Assume G acts cocompactly on H . If $\{\mu_p^\Phi\}$ is a Gibbs stream associated to Φ , then for any $r > 0$ and $p \in H$ there exists $C_\Phi(r) > 0$ such that*

$$\frac{1}{C_\Phi(r)} e^{[-d^\Phi(p, q) - \lambda_\Phi d(p, q)]} \leq \mu_p^\Phi(S_p(q, r)) \leq C_\Phi(r) e^{[-d^\Phi(p, q) - \lambda_\Phi d(p, q)]},$$

for all $p, q \in H$.

Remark C.2. The proof of the above theorem shows a little more. If $G < \text{Isom}(H)$ is arbitrary, then the same conclusion holds but with C_Φ also depending on p and $d(q, G \cdot p)$.

Recall that under our assumptions on Φ , we have $\lambda_\Phi = 0$.

Let $\{m_p\}_{p \in H}$ be a Hausdorff stream, i.e., any Gibbs stream associated to $\Phi = 0$. Let λ_0 be its critical constant. We have the following

Corollary C.3. *There exists a constant K_Φ such that for any Φ satisfying the normalization $\lambda_\Phi = 0$,*

$$\frac{1}{K_\Phi} e^{-\lambda_0 s} \leq \int_{\partial H} e^{-d^\Phi(p, \gamma_{p, \xi}(s))} dm_p(\xi) \leq K_\Phi e^{-\lambda_0 s},$$

for every $s > 0$.

Proof. Fix $r > 0$. Take the largest non-intersecting collection of balls $\{B(q_i, r/2)\}_{i=1}^k$ such that $d(p, q_i) = s$.

Claim: *The collection of $\{S_p(q_i, r/4)\}_{i=1}^k$ is disjoint*

\triangle Assume that $\xi \in S_p(q_1, r/4) \cap S_p(q_2, r/4)$. Let $t_i, i = 1, 2$ are such that $\gamma_{p, \xi}(t_i) \in B(q_i, r/4)$, for $i = 1, 2$. It is clear that $s - r/4 < t_1, t_2 < s + r/4$. Thus $d(q_i, \gamma_{p, \xi}(s)) < r/2$ for $i = 1, 2$. Therefore, $B(q_1, r/2) \cap B(q_2, r/2) \neq \emptyset$. Contradiction. \blacktriangle

An easy argument shows that $\cup_{i=1}^k B(q_i, r)$ cover a sphere of radius s around p .

Claim: *$\{S_p(q_i, r)\}_{i=1}^k$ is a Besicovitch cover for ∂H with Lebesgue number $B_\Phi(r) = C_\Phi(9r/4)C_\Phi(r/4)$.*

\triangle Let $\xi \in \partial H$. Assume that $\xi \in S_p(q_i, r)$ then easy calculation shows that $d(q_i, \gamma_{p, \xi}(s)) \leq 2r$. Thus $B(q_i, r/4) \subset B(\gamma_{p, \xi}(s), 9r/4)$ and therefore,

$$S_p(q_i, r/4) \subset S_p(\gamma_{p, \xi}(s), 9r/4).$$

Since $\{S_p(q_i, r/4)\}$ are disjoint, by Theorem above there are at most $C_\Phi(9r/4)C_\Phi(r/4)$ Shadows that cover ξ . This proves the Claim. \blacktriangle

Let $\{S_p(q_i, r)\}_{i=1}^k$ be a Besicovitch cover as above. By choice of the q_i we have $c_+ = (\zeta \cdot \nu)_p \geq s - r$. By using the proof of lemma B.1 with the last estimate in Lemma A.6 (with $T = s = c_+ + r$) for any two points $\xi, \nu \in S_p(q, r)$ we have

$$|d^\Phi(p, \gamma_{p, \xi}(s)) - d^\Phi(p, \gamma_{p, \nu}(s))| \leq K \left(\frac{5}{\beta} + r^{1+\beta} \right),$$

where K and β are the Hölder constant and exponent of Φ respectively.

So

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\partial H} e^{-d^\Phi(p, \gamma_{p, \xi}(s))} dm_p(\xi) &\leq \sum_{i=1}^k \int_{S_p(q_i, r)} e^{-d^\Phi(p, \gamma_{p, \xi}(s))} dm_p(\xi) \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^k \int_{S_p(q_i, r)} e^{-d^\Phi(p, q_i)} e^{K(\frac{5}{\beta} + r^{1+\beta})} dm_p(\xi) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^k e^{-d^\Phi(p, q_i)} e^{K(\frac{5}{\beta} + r^{1+\beta})} m_p(S_p(q_i, r)) \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^k C_\Phi(r) \mu_p^\Phi(S_p(q_i, r)) e^{K(\frac{5}{\beta} + r^{1+\beta})} m_p(S_p(q_i, r)) \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^k C_\Phi(r) \mu_p^\Phi(S_p(q_i, r)) e^{K(\frac{5}{\beta} + r^{1+\beta})} C_0(r) e^{-\lambda_0 s} \\
&\leq e^{K(\frac{5}{\beta} + r^{1+\beta})} C_0(r) e^{-\lambda_0 s} B_\Phi C_\Phi(r)
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly we can obtain a lower bound

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\partial H} e^{-d^\Phi(p, \gamma_{p, \xi}(s))} dm_p(\xi) &\geq \frac{1}{B_\Phi} \sum_{i=1}^k \int_{S_p(q_i, r)} e^{-d^\Phi(p, \gamma_{p, \xi}(s))} dm_p(\xi) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{B_\Phi} \sum_{i=1}^k \int_{S_p(q_i, r)} e^{-d^\Phi(p, q_i)} e^{-K(\frac{5}{\beta} + r^{1+\beta})} dm_p(\xi) \\
&= \frac{1}{B_\Phi} \sum_{i=1}^k e^{-d^\Phi(p, q_i)} e^{-K(\frac{5}{\beta} + r^{1+\beta})} m_p(S_p(q_i, r)) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{B_\Phi} \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{C_\Phi(r)} \mu_p^\Phi(S_p(q_i, r)) e^{-K(\frac{5}{\beta} + r^{1+\beta})} m_p(S_p(q_i, r)) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{B_\Phi} \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{C_\Phi(r)} \mu_p^\Phi(S_p(q_i, r)) e^{-K(\frac{5}{\beta} + r^{1+\beta})} \frac{1}{C_0(r)} e^{-\lambda_0 s} \\
&\geq \frac{1}{B_\Phi} e^{-K(\frac{5}{\beta} + r^{1+\beta})} \frac{1}{C_0(r) C_\Phi(r)} e^{-\lambda_0 s}
\end{aligned}$$

Now since the integral does not depend on r we can find K_Φ satisfying the lemma. This proves the Lemma. \blacksquare

Remark C.4. While we will not need this, the above proof generalizes to show that there exists a constant $K = K_{\Phi_1, \Phi_2}$ such that for any Hölder functions Φ_1, Φ_2 , not necessarily normalized,

$$\frac{1}{K} \leq e^{(\lambda_{\Phi_1} + \lambda_{\Phi_2})s} \int_{\partial H} e^{-d^{\Phi_1}(p, \gamma_{p, \xi}(s))} d\mu_p^{\Phi_2}(\xi) \leq K,$$

for every $s > 0$.

Proposition C.5. *For any fixed $p \in H$, the function $\Phi + \lambda_\Phi$ has a positive geodesic average along any geodesic which stays within a fixed distance from the orbit $G \cdot p$. If G acts cocompactly on H , then for some $\epsilon > 0$, $\Phi + \lambda_\Phi$ has geodesic average ϵ at all $p \in H$.*

Proof. First observe that for any $p, q \in H$ and $U \in \partial H$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_q^\Phi(U) &= \int_U d\mu_q^\Phi(\xi) = \int_U \frac{d\mu_q^\Phi}{d\mu_p^\Phi}(\xi) d\mu_p^\Phi(\xi) \leq \int_U e^{(\|\Phi\|_\infty + \lambda_\Phi)d(p,q)} d\mu_p^\Phi(\xi) = \\ &= e^{(\|\Phi\|_\infty + \lambda_\Phi)d(p,q)} \mu_p^\Phi(U). \end{aligned}$$

By Theorem C.1 we have that for any fixed $R > 0$,

$$\frac{1}{C_\Phi(r)} e^{[-d^\Phi(p,q) - \lambda_\Phi d(p,q)]} \leq \mu_p^\Phi(S_p(q, r)) \leq C_\Phi(r) e^{[-d^\Phi(p,q) - \lambda_\Phi d(p,q)]},$$

for all q with $d(q, G \cdot p) < R$.

Fix r and set the constant $C_0 = C_\Phi(r)$. In particular, for any $K > 1$ and corresponding $\epsilon = \frac{1}{KC_0} > 0$, there exists T_p such that for all q with the property $d(p, q) \geq T_p$ and $d(q, G \cdot p) < R$, we have $\mu_p^\Phi(S_p(q, r)) \leq \epsilon$. This implies that

$$d^\Phi(p, q) + \lambda_\Phi d(p, q) \geq -\log(\epsilon) - \log(C_0) = \log(K) > 0.$$

This proves the first statement. Since it is not clear that ϵ varies continuously in p , we will have to do a little extra work for the stronger statement when G acts cocompactly.

For all p' such that $d(p, p') \leq \text{diam}(H/G)$, by corollary 4.5

$$|d^\Phi(p, q) - d^\Phi(p', q)| \leq D(\text{diam}(H/G)).$$

Thus for all q such that $d(p', p) \leq \text{diam}(H/G)$ and $d(p, q) \geq T_p$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} d^\Phi(p', q) + \lambda_\Phi d(p', q) &\geq d^\Phi(p, q) + \lambda_\Phi d(p, q) - D(\text{diam}(H/G)) - \lambda_\Phi d(p, p') \\ &\geq \log(K) - D(\text{diam}(H/G)) - \lambda_\Phi d(p, p'). \end{aligned}$$

Take K such that $a = \log(K) - D(\text{diam}(H/G)) - \lambda_\Phi d(p, p')$ is positive.

By G invariance we have proved that for all p, q such that $d(p, q) \geq T = T_p + \text{diam}(H/G)$ we have

$$d^\Phi(p, q) + \lambda_\Phi d(p, q) \geq a.$$

Now for every geodesic γ and $N \geq T$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^N \Phi(\dot{\gamma}(t)) dt + \lambda_\Phi N = \\ &= \left(\sum_{i=0}^{[N/T]-2} \int_{iT}^{(i+1)T} \Phi(\dot{\gamma}(t)) dt + \lambda_\Phi T \right) + \int_{[N/T]T-T}^N \Phi(\dot{\gamma}(t)) dt + \lambda_\Phi (N - [N/T]T - T) \\ &= \left(\sum_{i=0}^{[N/T]-2} d^\Phi(\gamma(it), \gamma((i+1)T)) + \lambda_\Phi d(\gamma(it), \gamma((i+1)T)) \right) \\ &\quad + d^\Phi(\gamma([N/T]T - T), \gamma(N)) + \lambda_\Phi d(\gamma([N/T]T - T), \gamma(N)) \\ &\geq ([N/T] - 1)a + a = [N/T]a \geq N \frac{a}{T} - a \end{aligned}$$

This shows uniformly positive average along all geodesics. ■

REFERENCES

- [BM05] U. Bader and R. Muchnik. Irreducible L^p representations of $\text{cat}(-1)$ groups. Preprint, 2005.
- [Bow75] Rufus Bowen. *Equilibrium states and the ergodic theory of Anosov diffeomorphisms*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1975. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 470.
- [CM04] C. Connell and R. Muchnik. Preprint, 2004.
- [Coo93] Michel Coornaert. Mesures de Patterson-Sullivan sur le bord d'un espace hyperbolique au sens de Gromov. *Pacific J. Math.*, 159(2):241–270, 1993.
- [CP95] Michel Coornaert and Athanase Papadopoulos. Sur une formule de transformation pour les densités conformes au bord des $\text{cat}(-1)$ -espaces. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.*, 320(10):1231–1236, 1995.
- [Fur63] Harry Furstenberg. A Poisson formula for semi-simple Lie groups. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 77:335–386, 1963.
- [Fur67] Harry Furstenberg. Poisson boundaries and envelopes of discrete groups. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 73:350–356, 1967.
- [Fur71] Harry Furstenberg. Random walks and discrete subgroups of Lie groups. In *Advances in Probability and Related Topics, Vol. 1*, pages 1–63. Dekker, New York, 1971.
- [Ham97] U. Hamenstädt. Harmonic measures for compact negatively curved manifolds. *Acta Math.*, 178(1):39–107, 1997.
- [Kaï90] V. A. Kaïmanovich. Invariant measures of the geodesic flow and measures at infinity on negatively curved manifolds. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Physique Théorique*, 53(4):361–393, 1990.
- [Kaï94] V. A. Kaïmanovich. The Poisson boundary of hyperbolic groups. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.*, 318(1):59–64, 1994.
- [Kaï00] V. A. Kaïmanovich. The Poisson formula for groups with hyperbolic properties. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 152(3):659–692, 2000.
- [Kaï03] V. A. Kaïmanovich. Poisson boundary of discrete groups. Unpublished Survey available at <http://name.math.univ-rennes1.fr/vadim.kaimanovich/>, 2003.
- [Kaï04] V. A. Kaïmanovich. Differentiability of gibbs states on negatively curved manifolds. Unpublished Survey available at <http://name.math.univ-rennes1.fr/vadim.kaimanovich/>, 2004.
- [KM96] V. A. Kaïmanovich and Howard Masur. The Poisson boundary of the mapping class group. *Invent. Math.*, 125(2):221–264, 1996.
- [KM98] V. A. Kaïmanovich and Howard Masur. The Poisson boundary of Teichmüller space. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 156(2):301–332, 1998.
- [KV83] V. A. Kaïmanovich and A. M. Vershik. Random walks on discrete groups: boundary and entropy. *Ann. Probab.*, 11(3):457–490, 1983.
- [Pat76] S. J. Patterson. The limit set of a Fuchsian group. *Acta Math.*, 136(3-4):241–273, 1976.
- [Rue78] David Ruelle. *Thermodynamic formalism*, volume 5 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Reading, Mass., 1978. The mathematical structures of classical equilibrium statistical mechanics, With a foreword by Giovanni Gallavotti and Gian-Carlo Rota.
- [Sul79] Dennis Sullivan. The density at infinity of a discrete group of hyperbolic motions. *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.*, (50):171–202, 1979.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY
E-mail address: `connell@indiana.edu`

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
E-mail address: `roma@math.uchicago.edu`