

GLOBAL RIGIDITY OF CODIMENSION ONE ACTIONS

CAMILO AROSEMENA SERRATO

ABSTRACT. Consider a smooth, locally free, codimension-one action of a higher-rank, simple, split Lie group G on a closed manifold M . Let P be a minimal parabolic subgroup of G . If the action admits a P -invariant probability measure that is mixing, then the action is either equivariantly diffeomorphic to the suspension of a codimension one, locally free action on a closed manifold of a parabolic subgroup of G ; or, it is finitely and equivariantly covered by $G \curvearrowright G/\Gamma \times S^1$, where $G \curvearrowright G/\Gamma$ is the coset action, and $G \curvearrowright S^1$ is the trivial action. We prove this by doing a jointly integration argument of stable and center unstable Pesin manifolds. This is a smooth version of results by Nevo and Zimmer.

1. INTRODUCTION

An essential part of the Zimmer program, laid out by Robert Zimmer in his 1986 ICM address, see [Zim87], is to classify actions of semisimple, higher rank Lie groups on closed manifolds. Let G be such a Lie group, and P a minimal parabolic subgroup of G . A significant result in this vein is the Theorem of Nevo and Zimmer, see [NZ99], which proves that for any measurable action of G on a compact metric space X for which there exists a P -mixing measure λ on X , either λ is G -invariant, or there exists a parabolic subgroup Q of G such that the original action of G on X is the suspension action of a measurable, measure preserving action of Q on a probability space (see Definition 7.4 for the notion of suspension space). The authors weaken the hypothesis of this result in their subsequent work, see [NZ02, Theorem 3], by only assuming there exists a P -invariant probability measure for which an specific finite set of lines of A are ergodic with respect to this measure, where A is any maximal torus of G contained in P .

This theorem by Nevo and Zimmer does not answer the question of whether a continuous (or smooth) action of G on a metric space (or smooth manifold) is the suspension action of a continuous (or smooth action) of a parabolic subgroup of G on some metric space (or smooth manifold), when the action has no invariant probability measure. In this paper, we answer this question for an important class of such actions, namely, for locally free, codimension one actions of G . Let G be a simple, higher rank and split Lie group; P a minimal parabolic subgroup of G ; A a maximal torus of G contained in P ; and Π_P the set of simple roots of (G, A) with respect to P . The following theorem is the main result of this paper:

Date: November 28 2025.

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose G acts locally freely and in a C^2 manner on a closed connected manifold M , with codimension 1 orbits. Suppose there exists a P -invariant probability measure μ^P on M such that $\ker(\alpha) \curvearrowright (M, \mu^P)$ is ergodic, for all $\alpha \in \Pi_P$. Then exactly one of the following holds:*

- (1) *M has an invariant probability measure for the action $G \curvearrowright M$. Furthermore, M is equivariantly and finitely covered by the diagonal action $G \curvearrowright G/\Gamma \times S^1$, for some uniform lattice $\Gamma \leq G$, where $G \curvearrowright S^1$ is the trivial action;*
- (2) *There exists a proper parabolic subgroup $Q \leq G$ and an equivariant smooth map $\pi : M \rightarrow G/Q$. Furthermore, M is equivariantly diffeomorphic to the suspension space $G \times_Q N$, where $N = \pi^{-1}(\{Q\}) \subseteq M$ is an embedded submanifold invariant under the action of Q , and $\dim(N) = \dim(Q) + 1$.*

One crucial idea in the proof of this result is an integrability argument of foliations by C^2 manifolds, whose transversal regularity is only measurable, see Lemma 6.5. Such integration arguments in dynamical systems are challenging tasks, and are the center of a lot of current research, see the work of Katz [Kat23], and the recent work of Brown, Eskin, Filip, and Rodríguez-Hertz, see [BEFH25].

Another essential tool for the proof of this result are topological dynamical arguments appearing in the recent work of Deroin and Hurtado, see [DH20], that adapt constructions and results of smooth dynamical systems, to the context of dynamical systems of continuous functions.

Important motivation for this result has been the recent celebrated work, in the Zimmer program, on the resolution of several important cases of Zimmer's Conjecture, on classification of actions of lattices of higher rank Lie groups on manifolds of small dimension with respect to the Lie group, by Brown, Fisher and Hurtado, see [BFH22]; and the aforementioned recent proof of Deroin and Hurtado of the non-left-orderability of this class of lattices, see [DH20]. Locally free actions play a pivotal role in these results via the suspended action construction (for this notion, see Definition 7.4), which yields a locally free action of the Lie group encoding the original lattice action; a main feature of these results is using the algebraic structure of the Lie group, and the geometric structure of the induced action, to apply tools from dynamical systems and geometry to prove properties of the suspended action, which then correspond to properties of the original lattice action.

Locally free actions give rise to a foliation of the acted upon manifold, with leaves the orbits of this action. A notable class of foliations, for which a lot of work in foliation theory has been done, are those whose leaves have codimension one in the manifold, i.e., codimension one foliations. Thus, an important class of locally free actions of Lie groups is that for which their orbits are of codimension one in the manifold. The study of this kind of actions has had various important results, as we illustrate below.

An important early observation on the rigidity of locally free actions of codimension one is the fact that the only orientable closed surface admitting a one-dimensional smooth flow without singularities, is the torus, because of the Hopf-Poincaré index theorem. In the early seventies, the work of Rosenberg, Roussarie, and D. Weil, and then the work of Chatelet and Rosenberg, see [RRW70] and [CR74], proves that the only closed oriented manifolds of dimension n admitting a locally free action of \mathbb{R}^{n-1} are fiber bundles over \mathbb{T}^k with fiber \mathbb{T}^{n-k} .

In his 1979 PhD thesis Ghys, see [Ghy85], proves that all smooth actions of the group AG, of orientation preserving affine transformations of the real line (which is the only non-abelian two-dimensional Lie group), on 3-manifolds, are smoothly conjugate to a homogeneous action, whenever there is a continuous volume form invariant under the action. Later, Asaoka, see [Asa10], proved that all smooth actions of AG are smoothly orbit equivalent to a homogeneous action; and later that there are such actions that are not smoothly conjugate to a homogeneous action, see [Asa12].

For semisimple Lie groups G with property (T), Stuck and Zimmer proved that any locally free, C^2 action $G \curvearrowright M$, with codimension one orbits, having a G -invariant probability measure, is finitely and equivariantly covered by the diagonal action $G \curvearrowright G/\Gamma \times S^1$, where $G \curvearrowright G/\Gamma$ is the coset action and $G \curvearrowright S^1$ is the trivial action, see [SZ94] and Theorem 2.11. The assumption on the existence of such invariant probability measures is quite strong as G is not amenable. For instance, showing such invariant measures exist, for the corresponding suspension space, is the main argument in the theorem by Ghys on finiteness of smooth actions of lattices of higher rank semisimple Lie groups on the circle, see [Ghy99].

Our main result, Theorem 1.1, improves the results of Stuck-Zimmer, in the sense that we need a much weaker hypothesis, and we prove that all the actions of the same class are of algebraic origin.

1.1. Outline of the proof. The first item of the conclusion of Theorem 1.1 follows from the Theorem by Stuck and Zimmer, see Theorem 2.11. Hence, to prove Theorem 1.1, we need only prove the second item of it by assuming the indicated action $G \curvearrowright M$, satisfying the hypothesis of this theorem, has no invariant probability measure.

Fix $P \leq G$ minimal parabolic, and A a maximal torus of G with $A \leq P$. The first step in proving Theorem 1.1 is to prove, under the assumption that $G \curvearrowright M$ has no invariant probability measures, that the convex set of all P -invariant, Borel, probability measures on M has only finitely many extremal points, see Proposition 3.8. This is done by applying the main result of the paper [DK07] of Deroin and Kleptsyn on harmonic probability measures of foliations with codimension one leaves; then showing that stationary measures with respect to the locally free action $G \curvearrowright M^{\dim(G)+1}$ are harmonic measures for the foliation of M whose leaves are the orbits of this action, and then applying the classical work of Furstenberg, see [Fur63a], yielding

a convex bijection between stationary and P -invariant probability measures for G -actions.

Fix μ^P a P -invariant measure satisfying the ergodic hypothesis of our main result, Theorem 1.1, so that in particular it is A -ergodic.

By the higher rank Osedelets' Theorem, see [BRW23, Theorem 2.4], there exists a Lyapunov exponent with respect to μ^P , whose corresponding Osedelets' distribution is, μ^P -almost surely, transversal to the G -orbits. We denote this Lyapunov exponent, which is an element of A^* , by $\lambda_{\mu^P}^T$. In section 5, we show that $\lambda_{\mu^P}^T$ is less than all roots of (G, A) , in the interior of the Weyl chamber of A associated to P , see Proposition 5.11. This yields, for μ^P almost every x , a one-dimensional C^2 , injectively immersed, Pesin submanifold, which we denote by $\mathcal{W}^T(x)$, transverse to the G -orbit $G \cdot x$ at x , for μ^P -a.e. x .

Denote by Q the stabilizer subgroup of μ^P , that is,

$$Q = \{g \in G : g_*\mu^P = \mu^P\},$$

where $g_*\mu^P$ is the pushforward measure of μ^P under the diffeomorphism of M given by the action of g , i.e., the map $M \ni x \mapsto gx$.

In section 6 we prove, when G is not locally isomorphic to $\mathrm{SL}(3, \mathbb{R})$, that for μ^P -a.e. x the submanifold $\mathcal{W}^T(x)$ is Haar_Q almost everywhere equivariant with respect to the action $Q \curvearrowright M$, see Proposition 6.1. This property is used to show that

$$Q \cdot \mathcal{W}^T(x) = \{qy : q \in Q, y \in \mathcal{W}^T(x)\}$$

is an injectively immersed smooth submanifold of M of dimension $\dim(Q) + 1$, which we denote by N . N does not depend on any x in a subset of M of full μ^P measure. By construction, the restriction of the original action to Q yields a locally free action of this subgroup on N .

When G is locally isomorphic to $\mathrm{SL}(3, \mathbb{R})$, the same construction as above can be made, see Section 6.5, yielding an injectively immersed submanifold as well, by showing μ^P disintegrates, along the family $\{\mathcal{W}^T(x)\}_{x \in \Lambda}$, for some $\Lambda \subseteq M$ with $\mu^P(\Lambda) = 1$, into measures that are equivalent to the Riemannian volume on $\mathcal{W}^T(x)$, with strictly positive corresponding C^1 Radon-Nikodym derivatives, see Proposition 6.10; then, the construction of the corresponding N is shown to be an injectively immersed submanifold by using the absolute continuity property of the holonomy maps between G -orbits, along the family $\{\mathcal{W}^T(x)\}_{x \in \Lambda}$, see Section 6.5.

We construct the G -equivariant map $M \rightarrow G/Q$ in Theorem 1.1, by showing the following properties about the submanifold N :

- (1) N intersects all the orbits of the action $G \curvearrowright M$;
- (2) for all $x \in M$, $G \cdot x \cap N = gQ \cdot x$, for a unique $gQ \in G/Q$.

These two properties are shown in Section 7, see Lemma 7.1, by using a fact we call “Topological Measure Rigidity”, proved in Section 4, see Proposition

4.8, motivated by the recent work of Deroin and Hurtado, see [DH20, Theorem 8.2]. The “Topological Measure Rigidity” property for μ^P , says that in a set of full measure of μ^P , Λ , we have that if for some $x \in \Lambda$, $ux \in \text{supp}(\mu^P)$ for some $u \in G^{-\beta} \setminus \{e\}$, for any β root of G with respect to the torus A , positive with respect to P , then μ^P is $G^{-\beta}$ -invariant. For the proof of this fact, the ergodic assumption in Theorem 1.1 on μ^P is essential.

The “Topological Measure Rigidity” property implies property (2) above, see Proposition 6.6; it implies property (1) by showing $P \curvearrowright M$ is actually uniquely ergodic, using that there are finitely many extremal points in the set of P -invariant probability measures, see the Proof of Proposition 7.1, at the end of Section 7.1.

From properties (1) and (2), we finish the proof of Theorem 1.1 by showing M is equivariantly diffeomorphic to the suspension space $G \times_Q N$, see the proof of Theorem 1.1 in Subsection 7.2, and see Definition 7.4 for the notion of suspension space.

1.2. Acknowledgments. This work is part of the author’s PhD thesis.

The author thanks Sebastián Hurtado for all his feedback, suggestions, and enthusiasm for this project, as well as for visits to Yale University; his help was essential to this project. The author thanks his advisor, David Fisher, for his unwavering guidance and support throughout this project, as well as for the discussions, suggestions, and feedback that informed the ideas presented in this work. The author also thanks Aaron Brown, Ralf Spatzier, and Kurt Vinhage for their many helpful suggestions, discussions, and feedback, as well as for visits to their institutions. The author would also like to thank Rose Elliot Smith and Miguel Pineda for helpful suggestions and discussions.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
1.1. Outline of the proof	3
1.2. Acknowledgments	5
2. Preliminaries	6
2.1. Lyapunov exponents and Pesin manifolds	6
2.2. Entropy and The Ledrappier-Young theorem	7
2.3. Smooth ergodic theory of higher rank abelian actions	10
2.4. The Theorem of Stuck and Zimmer for codimension one actions	11
2.5. Invariance from entropy considerations	12
2.6. Smooth ergodic theory of nonuniform partially hyperbolic diffeomorphisms	13
3. Harmonic measures, unique P -ergodicity and G -invariant measures	14
3.1. Transversely Invariant and Harmonic measures	15
3.2. Harmonic measures and P -invariant measures	17
4. Topological measure rigidity	19

4.1. Topological measure rigidity	22
4.2. Entropy measure rigidity	22
4.3. Extension of a nonuniform partially hyperbolic system by the center	24
4.4. Almost everywhere continuity of Birkhoff averages	25
4.5. Proof of Topological Measure Rigidity	27
5. Lyapunov Exponent Transverse to Orbits and Resonance	28
5.1. Negativity of transversal Lyapunov exponent in $\text{Int}(\mathcal{W}^P)$	29
5.2. Maximal negativity of transversal Lyapunov exponent	31
6. Construction of immersed submanifold	39
6.1. Essential P -equivariance of transverse Pesin manifold	40
6.2. Construction of immersed submanifold N_x	40
6.3. N_x is injectively immersed	41
6.4. Intersections of N_x with G -orbits	42
6.5. Construction of submanifold when $r(G) = 2$	44
6.6. Independence of N_x on x	45
7. Construction of smooth equivariant map $M \rightarrow G/Q$	46
7.1. N intersects all G -orbits	46
7.2. Construction of smooth equivariant map	48
References	49

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.0.1. *The theorem of Pugh and Shub on \mathbb{R}^k ergodic measures.* We have the following theorem which proves that for a probability measure ergodic under the action of \mathbb{R}^k , for any $k \geq 1$, almost all lines in \mathbb{R}^k going through the origin act ergodically as well.

Theorem 2.1. *[PS71, Theorem 1] If \mathbb{R}^k acts ergodically on (M, μ) , $\mu(M) < \infty$, and $L^2(M, \mu)$ is separable, then all elements in \mathbb{R}^k off a countable family of hyperplanes act μ -ergodically on M .*

2.1. Lyapunov exponents and Pesin manifolds.

2.1.1. *Osedelec's multiplicative ergodic theorem and Lyapunov exponents.* For any C^1 diffeomorphism $f : M \rightarrow M$, and any f -ergodic probability measure μ on M we have Osedelec's theorem, see [Ose68], and also [Bro+19, Theorem 7.1].

Theorem 2.2 (Osedelec [Ose68]). *There are:*

- (1) a measurable set Λ with $\mu(\Lambda) = 1$;
- (2) real numbers $\lambda^1 > \dots > \lambda^p$;
- (3) a μ -measurable, Df -invariant splitting $T_x M = \bigoplus_{i=1}^r E^i(x)$, for all $x \in \Lambda$,

such that for all $x \in \Lambda$ and all $v \in E^i(x) \setminus \{0\}$ we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \pm\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \|D_x f^n(v)\| = \lambda^i.$$

The real numbers λ^i are called *Lyapunov exponents*, and the spaces $E^i(x)$ are called Oseledec's distributions. We call the μ -almost surely value $m^i := \dim E^i(x)$ the multiplicity of λ^i , for μ -a.e. x .

2.1.2. Unstable Pesin manifolds. Recall that given a compact manifold M , a C^2 diffeomorphism $f : M \rightarrow M$, and a f -ergodic probability measure μ , with corresponding Lyapunov exponents $\lambda^1 > \dots > \lambda^d$; there are associated global j th unstable manifolds, which are C^2 injectively immersed submanifolds given by

$$(1) \quad \mathcal{W}^j(x) = \left\{ y \in M : \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log d(f^{-n}(x), f^{-n}(y)) \leq -\lambda^j \right\}$$

whenever $\lambda^i > 0$, for μ -a.e. x . These manifolds satisfy $T_x \mathcal{W}^j(x) = \bigoplus_{\lambda^j \leq \lambda^i} E^i(x)$ for μ -a.e. x .

The set

$$\mathcal{W}^u(x) = \left\{ y \in M : \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log d(f^{-n}(x), f^{-n}(y)) < 0 \right\}$$

is equal to the r_0 th unstable manifold, where $1 \leq r_0 \leq p$ is such that $\lambda_{r_0} < 0$, but $\lambda_{r_0+1} \geq 0$, if it exists, so that $\mathcal{W}^u(x)$ is a C^2 injectively immersed submanifold, for μ -a.e. x , called *the unstable Pesin manifold* at x . It satisfies $T_x \mathcal{W}^u(x) = \bigoplus_{\lambda^i < 0} E^i(x) =: E^u(x)$, for μ -a.e. x .

We denote by \mathscr{W}^j and \mathscr{W}^u the corresponding partitions by Pesin manifolds.

There are also corresponding stable and central distributions $E^s(x) := \bigoplus_{\lambda^i < 0} E^i(x)$, $E^0(x) := \bigoplus_{\lambda^i = 0} E^i(x)$, only the former has Pesin manifolds $\mathcal{W}^s(x)$ tangent to $E^s(x)$.

2.2. Entropy and The Ledrappier-Young theorem. In this subsection we follow [Bro+19, Section 8].

Let f be a diffeomorphism of a closed manifold M . Let μ be an ergodic, f -invariant, probability measure on M . The metric entropy of f with respect to μ , denoted by $h_\mu(f)$, is equal to the entropy conditional to any measurable increasing partition ξ of M , subordinate to \mathscr{W}^u , this value is defined in [Bro+19, Section 8.1.2], such measurable partitions always exists, and this value is independent of the measurable partition satisfying this properties, see [Bro+19, Section 8.3].

For the f -ergodic probability measure μ , consider corresponding Lyapunov exponents $\lambda^1 > \dots > \lambda^p$, along with distributions $E^i(-)$ corresponding to λ^i , for $1 \leq i \leq p$, as in Oseledec's Theorem, see Theorem 2.2. Denote by m^i the μ -almost surely value $\dim E^i(x)$.

We have the following theorems relating the metric entropy of f with respect to μ , and the μ -almost surely constant values given by Osedelec's Theorem.

Theorem 2.3 (Ruelle-Margulis inequality).

$$h_\mu(f) \leq \sum_{\lambda^i > 0} m^i \lambda^i$$

The f -ergodic probability measure μ is called an SRB measure, if for any measurable partition ξ of M subordinate to \mathcal{W}^u , we have that for μ -a.e. x , the conditional measure μ_x^ξ is absolutely continuous with respect to the Riemannian volume on $\mathcal{W}^u(x)$.

The Ledrappier-Young Theorem, see [LY85a, Theorem A] says that the f -ergodic probability measures μ having an equality in Theorem 2.3, are exactly the SRB measures. That SRB measures have such an equality was first proved by Ledrappier and Strelcyn, see [LS82]. Furthermore, in case of such equality, the corresponding Radon-Nikodym densities are C^1 and strictly positive, see the remark after [LY85a, Theorem A].

Theorem 2.4 (Ledrappier-Young theorem, [LY85a]). *We have that*

$$h_\mu(f) = \sum_{\lambda^i > 0} m^i \lambda^i,$$

if and only if for any measurable partition ξ subordinate to \mathcal{W}^u we have that μ_x^ξ is equivalent to the Riemannian volume on $\mathcal{W}^u(x)$, for μ -a.e. x . Furthermore, the corresponding densities are positive C^1 functions.

2.2.1. Entropy conditional on measurable foliations. Let $f : M \rightarrow M$ be a C^2 diffeomorphism, and μ an ergodic f -invariant probability measure on M .

Let us consider measurable f -invariant foliations \mathcal{F} of M by C^2 leaves, which are *tame measurable foliations*, that is, \mathcal{F} is a partition of M by C^2 manifolds, such that restricting the foliation to sets of large measure, \mathcal{F} has the structure of a continuous family of C^2 disks. Examples of such partitions are the partition into Pesin manifolds, \mathcal{W}^j and \mathcal{W}^u constructed above, see [BP23, Chapter 7].

We say \mathcal{F} is *expanding* if $\mathcal{F}(x) \subseteq \mathcal{W}^u(x)$ for μ -a.e. x .

For any ξ measurable partition subordinate to an expanding tame measurable foliation \mathcal{F} , we define the entropy of f with respect to μ conditional on \mathcal{F} to be

$$h_\mu(f \mid \mathcal{F}) := h_\mu(f \mid \xi),$$

and such measurable partitions always exist, and the value above does not depend on the particular measurable partition subordinate to \mathcal{F} .

If \mathcal{F} is a tame measurable foliation, we set

$$h_\mu(f, \mathcal{F}) = h_\mu(f, \mathcal{F}^u),$$

where \mathcal{F}^u is the expanding, tame measurable partition given by

$$\mathcal{F}^u := \mathcal{F} \vee \mathcal{W}^u := \{A \cap B : A \in \mathcal{F}, B \in \mathcal{W}^u\}.$$

2.2.2. Conditional entropy along measurable partitions and the Ledrappier-Young Theorem. We follow [BRW23, Section 4, Section 7].

We have the following version of the Ledrappier-Young inequality for conditional entropies, see [BRW23, Theorem 7.2] and [LY85a, Corollary 6.1.4]. Define the multiplicity of λ^i relative to \mathcal{F} to be the μ -almost surely constant value of

$$m_i(\mathcal{F}) := \dim(E^i(x) \cap T_x[\mathcal{F}(x)])$$

Theorem 2.5. *We have*

$$h_\mu(f|\mathcal{F}) \leq \sum_{1 \leq i \leq r} \lambda_i m_i(\mathcal{F}).$$

Moreover, equality holds if and only if for any measurable partition ξ subordinate to \mathcal{F}^u we have that μ_x^ξ is equivalent to the Riemannian volume on $\mathcal{F}^u(x)$, for μ -a.e. x . Furthermore, the corresponding densities are positive C^1 functions.

2.2.3. Geometric characterization of the defect in the entropy formula. We follow [BRW23, Chapter 7]. Let $f : M \rightarrow M$ be a C^2 diffeomorphism, and μ an ergodic, f -invariant probability measure on M . Let $\lambda^1 > \dots > \lambda^p$ be the

Let η be any measurable partition of (M, μ) . For $1 \leq i \leq r$, let ξ^i be a measurable partition subordinate to the partition associated to the i th unstable Pesin manifolds, i.e., \mathcal{W}^i . We define the i th upper and lower pointwise dimensions of μ relative to η at x to be the limits

$$\overline{\dim}^i(\mu, x|\eta) := \limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\log \left(\mu_x^{\xi^i \vee \eta}(B(x, \delta)) \right)}{\log \delta}, \quad \underline{\dim}^i(\mu, x|\eta) := \liminf_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\log \left(\mu_x^{\xi^i \vee \eta}(B(x, \delta)) \right)}{\log \delta},$$

where $B(x, \delta)$ is the ball of radius δ centered at x of a Riemannian metric on M , these values are independent of such a metric, and of the chosen measurable partitions. These values are constant μ -almost surely, and we denote, respectively, these values by $\overline{\dim}^i(\mu | \eta)$ and $\underline{\dim}^i(\mu | \eta)$

For the partition $\eta^+ := \bigvee_{i=0}^{\infty} f^i \eta$, the values $\overline{\dim}^i(\mu | \eta^+)$ and $\underline{\dim}^i(\mu | \eta^+)$ coincide, see [BRW23, Proposition 7.4].

Set $\dim^0(\mu | \eta^+) = 0$. For $1 \leq i \leq r$ the i th transverse dimension of μ relative to η^+ is

$$\gamma^i(\mu | \eta^+) := \dim^i(\mu | \eta^+) - \dim^{i-1}(\mu | \eta^+).$$

The i th transverse dimension is not bigger than the multiplicity m_i of the Osedeltec's distributions E^i , see [BRW23, Claim 7.5].

Using the pointwise transverse dimensions above we can indicate the exact failure for equality to hold in the Ruelle-Margulis inequality (2.3), this was proved by Ledrappier and Young.

Theorem 2.6. [LY85b] *Let η be any measurable partition of (M, μ) . Then*

$$h_\mu(f \mid \eta) = \sum_{\lambda_i > 0} \lambda_i \gamma^i(\mu \mid \eta^+).$$

2.3. Smooth ergodic theory of higher rank abelian actions. In this subsection we follow [BRW23].

2.3.1. Higher-rank Osedec's Theorem. Let M be a closed manifold and $\alpha : \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \text{Diff}^1(M)$ be an action. Let μ be an invariant and α -ergodic probability measure.

Theorem 2.7 (Higher Rank Osedec's Theorem). [BRW23, Theorem 2.4] *There exist*

- (1) *an α -invariant measurable set $\Lambda \subseteq M$ such that $\mu(\Lambda) = 1$;*
- (2) *linear functionals $\lambda^1, \dots, \lambda^p : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$;*
- (3) *a μ -measurable, $D\alpha$ invariant splitting $T_x M = \bigoplus_{i=1}^p E^i(x)$, defined for μ -a.e. x ;*
- (4) *for μ -a.e. x we have that for every $v \in E^i(x) \setminus \{0\}$,*

$$\lim_{|n| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \|D_x \alpha(n)(v)\| - \lambda^i(n)}{|n|} = 0$$

We call the functionals $\lambda^1, \dots, \lambda^p$ the Lyapunov exponents of $\alpha : \mathbb{Z}^d \curvearrowright (M, \mu)$; E^i the Osedec's distribution or vector space associated to λ^i ; along with the almost surely constant multiplicity of λ^i , given by $m_i := \dim E^i(x)$, for μ -a.e. x .

2.3.2. Global unstable Pesin manifolds in higher rank actions. Let $\alpha : \mathbb{Z}^d \times (M, \mu) \rightarrow (M, \mu)$ be an ergodic action on a finite measure space. Let $\mathcal{L} = \{\lambda_i : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : 1 \leq i \leq p\}$ be the set of corresponding Lyapunov exponents of this action. Given any $\vec{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ there is a permutation $\Delta(\vec{n})$ of $\{1, \dots, p\}$ and $u(\vec{n})$ in this set so that

$$\lambda_{\Delta(\vec{n})(1)}(\vec{n}) \geq \lambda_{\Delta(\vec{n})(2)}(\vec{n}) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_{\Delta(\vec{n})(u(\vec{n}))}(\vec{n}) > 0 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_{\Delta(\vec{n})(p)}(\vec{n}).$$

Definition 2.8. For any $x \in M$ and any $\vec{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, and $1 \leq i \leq u(\vec{n})$, define the i th unstable manifold through x for $\alpha(\vec{n})$ as the set

$$W_{\vec{n}}^{u,i}(x) = \left\{ y \in M \mid \limsup_{k \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{1}{k} \log d(\alpha(k\vec{n}, x), \alpha(k\vec{n}, y)) \leq -\lambda_{\Delta(\vec{n})(i)}(\vec{n}) \right\}.$$

The unstable manifold through x for $\alpha(\vec{n})$ is the set

$$W_{\vec{n}}^u(x) := \left\{ y \in M \mid \limsup_{k \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{1}{k} \log d(\alpha(k\vec{n}, x), \alpha(k\vec{n}, y)) < 0 \right\}.$$

It can be shown that the unstable manifold $W_{\vec{n}}^u(x)$ with respect to the diffeomorphism $\alpha(\vec{n})$ coincides with $\mathcal{W}_{\vec{n}}^{u,u(\vec{n})}(x)$ for μ -a.e. x . The manifold $W_{\vec{n}}^{u,i}(x)$ is tangent to $\bigoplus_{1 \leq j \leq i} E_{\lambda_{\Delta(\vec{n})(j)}}(x)$.

We have the following uniqueness property for the i th unstable manifolds defined above.

Lemma 2.9. [BRW23, Lemma 4.7] Let $\vec{n}_1, \vec{n}_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ have the following property: for some $1 \leq i \leq \min\{u(\vec{n}_1), u(\vec{n}_2)\}$

- (1) $\{\Delta(\vec{n}_1)(j) : 1 \leq j \leq i\} = \{\Delta(\vec{n}_2)(j) : 1 \leq j \leq i\}$,
- (2) $\lambda_{\Delta(\vec{n}_1)(i)}(\vec{n}_1) > \lambda_{\Delta(\vec{n}_1)(i+1)}(\vec{n}_1)$, and
- (3) $\lambda_{\Delta(\vec{n}_2)(i)}(\vec{n}_2) > \lambda_{\Delta(\vec{n}_2)(i+1)}(\vec{n}_2)$.

Then $\mathcal{W}_{\vec{n}_1}^{u,i} \stackrel{\circ}{=} \mathcal{W}_{\vec{n}_2}^{u,i}$.

For two tame measurable foliations \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} , the relation $\mathcal{F} \stackrel{\circ}{=} \mathcal{G}$ means that $\mathcal{F}(x) = \mathcal{G}(x)$ for μ -a.e. x .

2.3.3. Coarse Lyapunov exponents and coarse Pesin manifolds. For the α -invariant and ergodic probability measure μ , consider its set of Lyapunov exponents $\mathcal{L} := \{\lambda^i\}_{i=0}^p$. Two such Lyapunov exponents, λ^i and λ^j , are *coarsely equivalent*, if there exists some $c > 0$ such that $\lambda^i = c\lambda^j$. The corresponding equivalence classes are called *coarse equivalent classes*, and we denote the corresponding set of equivalence classes by $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$.

Given $\chi \in \hat{\mathcal{L}}$, with $\chi \neq \{0\}$ (here 0 is the zero element of A^*), the *coarse Lyapunov exponent* corresponding to χ is given by

$$\mathcal{W}^\chi := \bigvee_{\{\vec{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d : \chi(\vec{n}) > 0\}} \mathcal{W}_{\vec{n}}^u.$$

With corresponding leaves denoted by $\mathcal{W}^\chi(x)$. \mathcal{W}^χ is a tame measurable foliation.

2.3.4. Product structure of entropy for higher rank actions. We have the following product structure theorem for higher rank actions.

Theorem 2.10. [BRW23, Corollary 13.2] For any $\vec{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ we have

$$h_\mu(\alpha(\vec{n})) = \sum_{\{\chi \in \hat{\mathcal{L}} : \chi(\vec{n}) > 0\}} h_\mu(\alpha(\vec{n})|_{\mathcal{W}^\chi})$$

2.4. The Theorem of Stuck and Zimmer for codimension one actions. The following result by Nevo and Zimmer yields the first item for our main result, Theorem 1.1.

Theorem 2.11. [SZ94, Theorem 5.1] Let G be a higher rank, connected, simple, Lie group, with finite center. Suppose G acts locally freely and in a C^2 manner on a closed connected manifold M , with codimension 1 orbits. Assume there is a probability measure on M invariant under this action.

Then there exist a cocompact lattice Γ in G and a finite cover \tilde{M} of M such that \tilde{M} is G -equivariantly diffeomorphic to $G/\Gamma \times S^1$.

Remark 2.12. The proof of this theorem uses the existence of the Borel invariant probability measure to show that there exists a holonomy invariant measure on M , with respect to the foliation by G orbits; this is used to show there is a closed orbit of the action, and from this it is concluded using the Reeb-Thurston theorem that M , and the fact that lattices of $\mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{R})$ with $n \geq 3$ have property (T), must have a finite cover of the indicated form.

2.5. Invariance from entropy considerations. Here we follow [EL10, § 6], [Bro+19], and [BRW22].

Let G be a Lie group, and suppose G acts, to the left, smoothly and locally freely on a closed manifold M . Suppose $H \leq G$ is a closed subgroup, and suppose $s \in G$ normalizes H . Let μ be an ergodic, s -invariant probability measure on M (we mean ergodicity and invariance with respect to the diffeomorphism of M given by $x \mapsto sx$). Suppose the orbit $H \cdot x$ is contained in the unstable manifold $\mathcal{W}^u(x; s)$ for μ -a.e. x . A measurable partition η of M is *subordinate to the H -orbits of M* if for μ -almost every x we have that $\eta(x)$ is contained in $H \cdot x$; and contains a neighborhood of x in the orbit $H \cdot x$.

Since the action is locally free, we can pushforward (any positive multiple of) the left Haar measure on H to the orbit $H \cdot x$, via the map $h \mapsto h \cdot x$.

Lemma 2.13. [Bro+19, Theorem 9.4] *μ is H -invariant if and only if for any measurable partition ξ subordinate to the partition into H -orbits, and for μ -a.e. x the conditional measure μ_x^ξ coincides (up to normalization) with the restriction of the left-Haar measure on $H \cdot x$ to $\xi(x)$.*

We define the entropy of s , seen as an element of $\text{Diff}(M)$, conditioned on H -orbits, as the entropy conditioned on any measurable partition ξ subordinate to the H -orbits, denoted by $h_\mu(s \mid H)$, namely,

$$h_\mu(s \mid H) := h_\mu(s \mid \xi).$$

Let λ^i , $E^i(x)$, and m^i be as in 2.2 for the dynamics of s and the measure μ . We define the *multiplicity of λ^i relative to H* to be (the almost surely constant value of)

$$m^{i,H} = \dim(E^i(x) \cap T_x(H \cdot x)).$$

We have the following version of the Ledrappier-Young Theorem, see [LY85a], characterizing H -invariant measures.

Lemma 2.14. [Bro+19, Theorem 9.5] *The following are equivalent:*

- (1) $h_\mu(f \mid H) = \sum_{\lambda^i > 0} \lambda^i m^{i,H}$;
- (2) μ is H -invariant.

To any Borel probability measure μ on M , there is a family $\{\mu_x^H\}_{x \in M}$ of measures of H , called *leafwise measures along the orbits of the action $H \curvearrowright M$* , see [EL10, Section 6], having the following property: for any measurable partition η of (M, μ) subordinate to the H -orbits, there exists a measurable function $c^\eta : X \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ such that if $\{\mu_x^\eta\}_{x \in M}$ is a family of conditional measures on (M, μ) associated with η , then

$$\mu_x^\eta = c^\eta(x) (h \mapsto h \cdot x)_* (\mu_x^H) \upharpoonright_{\eta(x)}.$$

We have the following immediate consequence of the previous lemma:

Proposition 2.15. [EL10, Problem 6.28] *A probability measure μ on M is H -invariant if and only if μ_x^H coincides with the (positive proportionally class of the) left Haar measure on H for μ -almost every x .*

2.6. Smooth ergodic theory of nonuniform partially hyperbolic diffeomorphisms. We follow [BP23] and [BP02]. Let f be a C^1 diffeomorphism of a closed manifold M .

2.6.1. *Nonuniformly partially hyperbolic sets.*

Definition 2.16. We call an f -invariant nonempty measurable subset $Z \subset M$ *nonuniformly partially hyperbolic* if there are a number $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, measurable functions $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \mu_1, \mu_2, C, K : Z \rightarrow (0, \infty)$, and $\varepsilon : Z \rightarrow [0, \varepsilon_0]$, and subspaces $E^s(x)$, $E^u(x)$, and $E^0(x)$, which depend measurably on $x \in Z$, such that the following *partial hyperbolicity conditions* hold:

- (1) the functions $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \mu_1, \mu_2, \varepsilon$ are f -invariant and satisfy for $x \in Z$

$$\lambda_1(x)e^{\varepsilon(x)} < \lambda_2(x)e^{-\varepsilon(x)} < 1 < \mu_2(x)e^{\varepsilon(x)} < \mu_1(x)e^{-\varepsilon(x)};$$

- (2) for $m \in \mathbb{Z}$

$$C(f^m(x)) \leq C(x)e^{\varepsilon(x)|m|}, K(f^m(x)) \geq K(x)e^{-\varepsilon(x)|m|}$$

- (3) $T_x M = E^s(x) \oplus E^0(x) \oplus E^u(x)$ and for $a = s, u, 0$,

$$d_x f E^a(x) = E^a(f(x));$$

- (4) for $v \in E^s(x)$, $w \in E^u(x)$, and $n \geq 0$ we have

$$\|d_x f^n v\| \leq C(x)\lambda_1(x)^n e^{\varepsilon(x)n} \|v\|, \|d_x f^{-n} w\| \leq C(x)\mu_1(x)^{-n} e^{\varepsilon(x)n} \|w\|$$

- (5) for $v \in E^0(x)$

$$C(x)^{-1}\lambda_2(x)^n e^{-\varepsilon(x)n} \|v\| \leq \|d_x f^n v\| \leq C(x)\mu_2(x)^n e^{\varepsilon(x)n} \|v\|, \quad n \geq 0,$$

$$C(x)^{-1}\mu_2(x)^n e^{\varepsilon(x)n} \|v\| \leq \|d_x f^n v\| \leq C(x)\lambda_2(x)^n e^{-\varepsilon(x)n} \|v\|, \quad n \leq 0;$$

- (6) the angles satisfy $\angle(E^a(x), E^b(x)) \geq K(x)$ where $a, b \in \{s, u, 0\}$ and $a \neq b$.

Remark 2.17. For an ergodic action α of \mathbb{Z}^d on (M, μ) , μ a Borel probability measure on M , from [BRW23, Proposition 2.6], it follows that for any $\vec{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ the $\alpha(\vec{n})$ invariant subset Λ appearing in Theorem 2.7 is a nonuniformly partially hyperbolic subset of M with respect to $\alpha(\vec{n})$.

For a nonuniformly partially hyperbolic set $Z \subseteq M$ with respect to f we have the existence of stable manifolds. We have that $Z = \bigcup_{l \in \mathbb{N}} Z_l$, where each Z_l is compact, and where the functions $Z \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ appearing in Definition 2.16 are all continuous.

2.6.2. *Local stable manifolds.* For each regular Z^l , we have the existence of stable manifolds.

Theorem 2.18. [BP23, Theorem 7.1, Section 7.3.5] *For every $x \in Z_l$ there exists a local stable manifold $V^s(x)$ such that $x \in V^s(x)$, $T_x V^s(x) = E^s(x)$, and for every $y \in V^s(x)$ and $n \geq 0$,*

$$\rho(f^n(x), f^n(y)) \leq T(x)(\lambda')^n \rho(x, y),$$

where ρ is the distance in M induced by the Riemannian metric, λ' is a number satisfying $0 < \lambda e^\varepsilon < \lambda' < 1$, and $T : \Lambda_\varepsilon \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ is a Borel function satisfying

$$T(f^m(x)) \leq T(x)e^{10\varepsilon|m|}, \quad m \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Furthermore, $f^m(V^s(x)) \subset V^s(f^m(x))$ for every $m \in \mathbb{Z}$; and $\mathcal{W}_{\text{loc}}^s(x)$ depends uniformly continuously on $x \in Z^l$.

Remark 2.19. In fact, for every $x \in Z^l$,

$$\mathcal{W}_{\text{loc}}^s(x) = \exp_x\{(v, \psi_x^s(x)) : v \in B^s(r)\},$$

where $B^s(r)$ is the ball of radius r , for some $r \geq r^l$, of the vector subspace $E^s(x)$ of $T_x M$, and $\psi_x^s : B^s(r) \rightarrow E^u(x)$ is a smooth map satisfying $\psi_x^s(0) = 0$ and $d_0 \psi_x^s = 0$.

2.6.3. Absolute continuity along stable manifolds. Given $x \in \mathcal{R}^l$, consider the union

$$(2) \quad \mathcal{Q}^l(x) = \bigcup_{w \in \mathcal{R}^l \cap B_{r^l}^M(x)} \mathcal{W}_{\text{loc}}^s(w)$$

of the family of local stable manifolds

$$(3) \quad \mathcal{L}^l(x) = \{\mathcal{W}_{\text{loc}}^s(w) : w \in \mathcal{R}^l \cap B_{r^l}^M(x)\}.$$

A *local smooth submanifold* of M is the graph of a smooth injective function $\mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow M$. A *local transversal* to the family \mathcal{L}^l is a local smooth submanifold which is uniformly transverse to every manifold in this family, i.e., the angle between T and $\mathcal{W}_{\text{loc}}^s(w)$ is uniformly away from zero for every $w \in \mathcal{R}^l \cap B_{r^l}^M(x)$. For any T^1 and T^2 local transversals to $\mathcal{L}^l(x)$, we have a corresponding holonomy map

$$(4) \quad \mathcal{Q}^l(x) \cap T^1 \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}^l(x) \cap T^2,$$

by setting $\mathcal{W}_{\text{loc}}^s(w) \cap T^1 = z_1 \mapsto z_2 = \mathcal{W}_{\text{loc}}^s(w) \cap T^2$, for every $w \in \mathcal{R}^l \cap B_{r^l}^M(x)$.

For such transverse submanifolds T to the family $\mathcal{L}^l(x)$, we denote by ν_T the volume measure on T inherited from the restriction of the Riemannian metric of M to W .

Theorem 2.20. [BP23, Theorem 8.2, Remark 8.19] *If in (4) $\nu_{T^1}(T^1 \cap \mathcal{Q}^l(x)) > 0$, the holonomy map (4) is absolutely continuous, with respect to the volume measures ν_{T^1} and ν_{T^2} .*

3. HARMONIC MEASURES, UNIQUE P -ERGODICITY AND G -INVARIANT MEASURES

In this subsection we follow [DK07] and [Can03].

We first discuss the notion of harmonic measures for foliations of compact manifolds. We then study the relationship of these measures with measures of actions of semisimple Lie groups invariant under Borel subgroups.

3.0.1. *Harmonic functions on Lie groups.* Let G be a Lie group, and K a compact subgroup, and X is the symmetric space G/K . A function f in X (or a left K -invariant function on G) is harmonic if $Df = 0$ for all differential operators D on X which vanish all constant functions and it is left G -invariant, see [God52]. Since this is a local property, it also makes sense on G/Γ . The following lemma gives a global sufficient condition for such functions.

Theorem 3.1. [God52, Main Theorem] *A left K -invariant function f on G is harmonic if it is locally integrable and*

$$f(g) = \int_K f(xkg) dk,$$

for all $g, x \in G$.

3.1. Transversely Invariant and Harmonic measures.

3.1.1. *Foliations and harmonic measures.* Suppose \mathcal{F} is a foliation of a compact manifold M , with C^3 leaves, depending C^1 transversely. Then there exists a finite family of foliation boxes $D_i \times T_i$ covering M , where T_i is transverse to the leaves. Recall that the change of coordinates from $D_i \times T_i$ to $D_j \times T_j$ are of the form

$$(x_i, t_i) \mapsto (x_j = x_j(x_i, t_i), t_j(t_i)).$$

The maps $t_j(t_i)$ generate a pseudo-group on the union $T = \cup_i T_i$, called the holonomy pseudo-group. A measure on T which is invariant under the holonomy pseudo-group is called a transversely invariant measure.

In [Gar83], Lucy Garnett defined the notion of harmonic probability measures for C^1 -transversely compact foliated spaces, such that each leaf is endowed with a Riemannian metric. In her work she showed these measures always exists, unlike holonomy invariant measures. In the setting of locally free actions of Lie groups on compact manifolds, it is not hard to see that invariant probability measures exist if and only if holonomy invariant measures exist, see [Pla75, Theorem 9.1] and Remark 2.12.

Suppose (M, \mathcal{F}) is a transversely C^1 and leafwise C^3 foliated space, endowed with Riemannian metrics along each leaf. Then there is a Laplace operator Δ associated to this foliation, which acts on measurable functions f on M which are twice differentiable along the leaves of the foliation by $\Delta f(x) = \Delta_L(f \upharpoonright L)(x)$, where L is the leaf of (M, \mathcal{F}) containing x , and Δ_L is the Laplacian of the Riemannian metric associated to L .

Associated to the above Laplace operator we have for each $t \geq 0$ a diffusion operator $D^t : C^0(M) \rightarrow C^0(M)$ given by $D^t(f) := F(t, -)$, where F is the solution of the heat equation

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial t} = \Delta F,$$

with initial condition $F(0, x) = f(x)$.

If m is a measure on M , we can consider for any $t \geq 0$ the measure $D^t m$ given by

$$\int f d(D^t m) := \int D^t(f) dm.$$

A probability measure m on M is *harmonic*, if $D^t m = m$ for all $t \geq 0$. Such a measure is *ergodic*, if it cannot be written as a convex combination of other harmonic measures.

The following result gives a local characterization of harmonic measures:

Theorem 3.2. *[Gar83, Theorem 1.c][Can03, Proposition 5.2] A measure m is harmonic if and only if m locally (in a distinguished foliation coordinate system) disintegrates into a transversal sum of leaf measures, where almost every leaf measure is a positive harmonic function times the Riemannian leaf measure*

The following result of Deroin and Kleptsyn regarding the existence of *transversely invariant* probability measures, that is, a measure invariant under the holonomy pseudo-group, for codimension one foliations of compact manifolds, is essential for this paper.

Let (M, \mathcal{F}) be a codimension one foliation of a closed manifold, C^3 leaf-wise, and C^1 transversely.

Theorem 3.3. *[DK07, Theorem 1.1.d] If (M, \mathcal{F}) has no holonomy invariant probability measure, then there exist $\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_r$ minimal subsets of (M, \mathcal{F}) such that*

- (1) $(\mathcal{M}_i, \mathcal{F}|_{\mathcal{M}_i})$ has a unique harmonic measure μ_i ;
- (2) When t goes to infinity, the diffusions $D^t f$ of a continuous function $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ converge uniformly to the function $\sum_j c_j p_j$, where $c_j = \int f d\mu_j$.

This implies the following.

Corollary 3.4. *The measures μ_1, \dots, μ_r are the extremal points of the convex set of harmonic probability measures on M .*

Proof. Let m be any harmonic probability measure on M . Then

$$\int D^t(f) dm = \int f d(D^t m) = \int f dm,$$

so that by (3) in the previous Theorem it follows that

$$\int f dm = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \int D^t f dm = \int \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} D^t f dm = \sum_j c_j \int p_j dm = \sum_j h_j \int f d\mu_j,$$

where we can exchange the limit and the integral by uniform convergence, and $h_j = \int p_j dm$, thus $m = \sum_j h_j \mu_j$. Therefore, the convex hull of the measures μ_1, \dots, μ_r is the set of harmonic probability measures on M ; that they are extremal points of this set follows from (1) in the previous Theorem. \square

3.2. Harmonic measures and P -invariant measures. Let G be a semisimple Lie group with finite center; K a maximal subgroup of it; and P a minimal parabolic of it. Let μ be an absolutely continuous probability measure on G with C^∞ density.

From Theorem 3.3 we prove a dichotomy between the existence of invariant measures for locally free actions of G on compact manifolds $M^{\dim(G)+1}$, and having finitely many extremal points for the set of P -invariant probability measures on M .

To do this, we show that for any absolutely continuous and K -bi-invariant probability measure μ on G , any μ -stationary probability measure is in fact harmonic with respect to the foliation induced by the G -orbits of the action, by using classic work of Furstenberg [Fur63a]. This fact appears in [Can07], without proof.

A Borel probability measure ν on M is called *stationary* if $\mu * \nu := \int g_* \nu d\mu(g) = \nu$. We denote by $\mathcal{M}_\mu^1(M)$ the set of all such measures; and the set of P -invariant probability measures on M by $\mathcal{M}_P^1(M)$.

We have the following classical theorems of Furstenberg.

Theorem 3.5. [Fur63b, Theorem 2.3][NZ99, Proposition 1.3] *Let $Q \leq G$ be a parabolic subgroup. Then G/Q has a unique μ -stationary measure. This measure is in the class of the smooth measure. If μ is left K -invariant, then this measure is the unique K -invariant measure on G/Q .*

Theorem 3.6. [Fur63b, Theorem 2.1][NZ99, Theorem 1.4.2] *Let G be a connected non-compact semisimple Lie group with finite center. Let $\tilde{\nu}_0$ be any probability measure on G which under the canonical $p : G \rightarrow G/P$ satisfies $p_* \tilde{\nu}_0 = \nu_0$, where ν_0 is the unique μ -stationary measure on G/P . Then the assignment $\lambda \mapsto \tilde{\nu}_0 * \lambda$ is a convex bijection from $\mathcal{M}_P^1(M)$ onto $\mathcal{M}_\mu^1(M)$.*

The following fact appears without proof in [Can07].

Proposition 3.7. *Any probability measure on M which is μ -stationary, is harmonic for the foliation of M induced by the G -orbits.*

Proof. Let ν be a μ -stationary probability measure.

Recall that since $G \curvearrowright M^{\dim(G)+1}$ is locally free, its leaves yield a codimension one foliation of M , which we denote by \mathcal{F}_G .

Since $\nu = \mu * \nu$ and since μ is absolutely continuous on G with smooth density, we get that the leafwise measures of ν with respect to the action G , denoted by $[\nu_x^G]$, are absolutely continuous with respect to the volume measure of the orbits of the action $G \curvearrowright M$, with smooth density.

Let $B \simeq U \times [-1, 1]$ be any foliation box of (M, \mathcal{F}_G) , where $U \simeq \mathbb{R}^{\dim G}$. By identifying the plaques of B and using Rokhlin's disintegration, the previous paragraph implies that the restriction of the measure ν to B disintegrates as

$$\nu|_B = \int h_t d\text{Vol}_{L_t} d\gamma(t),$$

where γ is a finite measure supported on $[-1, 1]$, L_t is the G -orbit associated to the plaque corresponding to t , for γ -a.e. t , and h_t is a non-negative function supported on the plaque associated to t , for γ -a.e. t . As foliation boxes intersect in open sets, M can be covered by a finite number of such boxes, and because of the uniqueness statements in both the Radon-Nikodym and the Rokhlin disintegration theorems, it follows that we can extend each h_t to a global function on the whole G -orbit containing the plaque associated to t , for γ -a.e. t . Denote this global function by $\overline{h_t}$.

Let η be the Haar measure on K of total measure 1, which can be seen as a measure on G , as K is in particular a closed subset of G . It satisfies $\eta * \eta = \eta$. If $p : G \rightarrow G/P$ is the canonical projection, then $p_*\eta$ is the μ -stationary probability measure on G/P , by Theorem 3.5. Applying Theorem 3.6, there exists a P -invariant measure λ on M such that $\nu = \eta * \lambda$.

Since by hypothesis we have $\mu * \nu = \nu$, we get from the construction of $\overline{h_t}$ that

$$(5) \quad \overline{h_t}(x) = \int \overline{h_t}(gx) d\mu(g)$$

for all $x \in L_t$, and γ -a.e. t . Let \hat{h}_t be the lift of $\overline{h_t}$ to G , by taking a G -equivariant diffeomorphism $G/\Gamma_t \rightarrow L_t$, $\Gamma_t \leq G$ discrete subgroup, i.e., $\hat{h}_t(g) = \overline{h_t}(g\Gamma_t)$ for all $g \in G$. Then from (5) we get that

$$(6) \quad \hat{h}_t(h) = \int \hat{h}_t(gh) d\mu(g)$$

for all $h \in G$.

The argument in the first paragraph of the proof in [Fur63a, theorem 5.6] shows that the function

$$(7) \quad g \mapsto \int \hat{h}_t(gkg_1) d\eta(k)$$

is constant, for all $g_1 \in G$, using (6). For this, we may assume, without loss of generality, that μ is of class B_∞ , as defined in [Fur63a, Section 5.5].

We also have that

$$(8) \quad \int \hat{h}_t(kg_1) dk = \hat{h}_t(g_1),$$

for all $g_1 \in G$. This follows from the fact that $\eta * \nu = \nu$, as $\nu = \eta * \lambda$ and $\eta * \eta = \eta$.

From (7) and (8) we obtain that

$$(9) \quad \int \hat{h}_t(gkg_1) dk = \hat{h}_t(g_1)$$

for all $g, g_1 \in G$, and γ -a.e. t .

Finally, as η is the Haar measure on K , and K is unimodular, as it is compact, we get that $k_*\eta = \eta$, and this in turn implies \hat{h}_t is left K -invariant. Hence, from Theorem 3.1 and , we get that for γ -a.e. t , \hat{h}_t is left K -invariant. This, along with (9) and Theorem 3.1, implies that \hat{h}_t is annihilated by all

differential operators on G which are right G -invariant and annihilate all constant functions on G ; since this is a local property, the same is true for h_t , for γ -a.e. t , i.e., h_t is harmonic, and we are done by Theorem 3.2. \square

Together, Proposition 3.7 and Theorem 3.3 have the following consequence.

Proposition 3.8. *Let G be a connected, non-compact, semisimple Lie group with finite center, having property (T), and acting locally freely and in a C^1 manner on a closed manifold M of dimension $\dim(G) + 1$. Let $P \leq G$ be a minimal parabolic subgroup. Suppose $G \curvearrowright M$ has no invariant probability measure. Then, there are minimal subsets $\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_r$ of the action $G \curvearrowright M$ such that:*

- (1) *The restricted action $P \curvearrowright \mathcal{M}_j$ is uniquely ergodic, for all $j = 1, \dots, r$, denote by μ_j the corresponding P -invariant probability measure on \mathcal{M}_j ;*
- (2) *The set of P -invariant probability measures on M is the convex hull of the measures $\{\mu_j\}_{j=1}^r$, and these measures are the extremal points of this set.*

Proof. Suppose \mathcal{M} is a minimal subset of $G \curvearrowright M$ with no invariant measure. Then \mathcal{M} does not have a holonomy invariant measure, for otherwise M would have a holonomy invariant measure supported on \mathcal{M} , since \mathcal{M} is closed; and then, by the Remark 2.12, M would have a finite cover equivariantly diffeomorphic to $G/\Gamma \times S^1$, such a cover has a G -invariant measure, as all its orbits are closed, and from this measure a transversely invariant measure can be built, see [Pla75, Theorem 9.1] and [SZ94, Theorem 5.1], yielding a contradiction.

We can apply Theorem 3.3 in this case, as the orbits of the action $G \curvearrowright M$ carry an analytic differentiable structure, that depends transversely in a C^1 manner, coming from G . From this theorem we get that the foliation induced by the locally free action $G \curvearrowright \mathcal{M}$ has a unique harmonic measure. Let λ be a P -invariant probability measure on \mathcal{M} , which exists as P is amenable and \mathcal{M} is compact. λ is also a probability measure on M . Then from theorems 3.6 and 3.7 we get that $\tilde{\nu} * \lambda$ is harmonic on M , recall $\tilde{\nu}$ is the extension to G of the normalized Haar measure of K . However, as λ is supported on \mathcal{M} , we get from the definition of convolutions that $\tilde{\nu} * \lambda$ is also supported on \mathcal{M} , and it is a harmonic probability measure. Thus, because of theorem 3.6, we get that λ is the unique P -invariant probability measure on \mathcal{M} . \square

4. TOPOLOGICAL MEASURE RIGIDITY

Let G be a non-compact split simple Lie group with finite center. Throughout this section we consider a locally free action of G on a closed manifold M .

For the rest of this section, fix a maximal torus $A \leq G$, along with a minimal parabolic subgroup $P \leq G$ such that $A \leq P$. We denote by Π_P the set of all simple positive roots, with respect to (G, A) , of P .

Throughout this section, fix a locally free action $G \curvearrowright M$, on a closed manifold M . In this section we give conditions under which a P -invariant probability measure on M is $G^{-\alpha}$ -invariant, for $\alpha \in \Pi_P$.

4.0.1. Some Lie group preliminaries. Fix a maximal compact subgroup K of G . We fix a right G -invariant, bi- K -invariant metric d_G on G . For a semisimple element a of G we consider the following subgroups of G :

$$(10) \quad \begin{aligned} N_a &:= \{g \in G : \lim_{n \rightarrow -\infty} d_G(a^n g a^{-n}, e) = 0\} \\ L_a &:= \{g \in G : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d_G(a^n g a^{-n}, e) = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

We denote by C_a the center of a in G . If $a \neq e$, denote by Q_a the proper parabolic subgroup of G generated by P and C_a .

For any closed subgroup H of G and any $\delta > 0$, we set

$$H^{<\delta} = \{h \in H : d_G(h, e) < \delta\}.$$

Remark 4.1. C_a normalizes both N_a and L_a .

Remark 4.2. Since the given action $G \curvearrowright M$ is locally free and M is compact, there exists some $\delta > 0$ such that for any $n \in N_a \setminus \{e\}$ we have $nx \neq x$. Indeed, if $n \in N_a$ and $x \in M$ with $nx = x$, then for some large $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we have that $d(e, a^k n a^{-k}) < \delta$, however $a^k x = a^k n x = a^k n a^{-k} a^k x$, which by our choice of δ implies that $a^k n a^{-k} = e$, i.e., $n = e$. Therefore, for any $x \in M$ the map $N_a \ni n \mapsto nx$ is injective. The same holds for L_a .

Lemma 4.3. *The maps $C_a \times N_a \rightarrow Q_a$ and $L_a \times C_a \times N_a \rightarrow G$ given by $(c, n) \mapsto cn$ and $(l, c, n) \mapsto lcn$ are diffeomorphisms of a neighborhood of the identity of $C_a \times N_a$ and $L_a \times C_a \times N_a$, respectively, onto a neighborhood of the identity of Q_a and G , respectively*

Proof. This follows by showing the Jacobian of each of the maps above has full rank, as $\text{Lie}(G) = \text{Lie}(L_a) \oplus \text{Lie}(C_a) \oplus \text{Lie}(N_a)$ and $\text{Lie}(Q_a) = \text{Lie}(C_a) \oplus \text{Lie}(N_a)$, by using the root space decomposition of $\text{Lie}(G)$ with respect to A . \square

4.0.2. Deodhar's lemma on Weyl wall reflections. Given a root $\alpha \in A^*$, the reflection in A of the hyperplane $\ker(\alpha)$, which we denote by w_α , is uniquely represented by an element of the Weyl group $N_G(A)/C_G(A)$ of G (here $N_G(A)$ denotes the normalizer of A in G). We can get representatives in $N_G(A)$ of such reflections that can be expressed as a product of specific unitary elements. More precisely we have the following lemma by Deodhar, which uses the split hypothesis on G .

Lemma 4.4. *[Deo78, Lemma 1.3] Given any $u \in U^{-\alpha} \setminus \{e\}$, there are $u_1 \in U^{-\alpha}$ and $v_1 \in U^\alpha$ such that the product $w = u_1 v_1 u$ belongs to $N_G(A)$; and acts on A as w_α , i.e., $w_\alpha w^{-1} \in C_G(A)$.*

4.0.3. *Birkhoff ergodic theorem and measures invariant under unstable subgroup.* We need the following observation about s -ergodic measures that are also invariant under the unstable subgroup of s in G . See also [DH20, Proposition 8.4].

Lemma 4.5. *Let $a \in A$, and suppose μ is a N_a -invariant and a -ergodic probability measure on M . For μ -a.e. x and a.e. $n \in N_a$, the Birkhoff ergodic theorem holds for nx with respect to μ and a .*

Proof. Since N_a is by construction the unstable subgroup of a in G , we obtain from proposition 2.15 that the Birkhoff ergodic theorem holds for ux with respect to μ and a , for μ -a.e. x and Haar $_{N_a}$ -a.e. u , since this theorem holds for μ -a.e. x . \square

4.0.4. *a -ergodic measures and transverse Lyapunov exponents.* Take $a \in A$. Any a -ergodic probability measure on M has a corresponding Osedelets' decomposition of TM , on a subset of full measure of M , along with corresponding Lyapunov exponents. Notice that we have canonical Lyapunov exponents, i.e. roots of the maximal torus containing a , coming from the Cartan flow of the locally free action $G \curvearrowright M$.

Definition 4.6. Given an a -ergodic probability measure ν on M , we consider the set $\Lambda_\nu^T(a)$ of *transverse Lyapunov exponents* of ν to be the set, consisting of real numbers, of all Lyapunov exponents of a with respect to ν whose corresponding associated Lyapunov subspaces of TM are not tangent to the orbits of $G \curvearrowright M$.

We prove that there is no positive entropy for μ^P along the G^β -orbit partition for all $\beta \in \Delta_{Q_0}^c$. Compare this with [BRW22, Section 5.3]; as in this reference, we will rely on the high entropy method, see [EK05] and [EL10].

4.0.5. *The high entropy method.* Let G be a semisimple split Lie group, $A \leq G$ a maximal subtorus, and denote by $\Delta := \Delta_{(G,A)}$ the corresponding root system.

The following proposition follows by combining the decomposition theorem in [EK05, Theorem 8.4] with the invariance argument appearing in [EK03, Proposition 7.1], using that there are points in the interiors of all the Weyl chambers of A for which μ is ergodic, because of theorem 2.1. In the following statement we make no assumption on the dimension of M .

Proposition 4.7. *Suppose we have a locally freely action $G \curvearrowright M$, M closed. Let μ be an A -invariant and ergodic measure on M . Let $\alpha, \beta \in \Delta$ be such that $\alpha + \beta \in \Delta$. If for μ -a.e. x both leafwise measures $\mu_x^{G^\alpha}$ and $\mu_x^{G^\beta}$ are non-atomic, then μ is $G^{\alpha+\beta}$ -invariant.*

4.1. Topological measure rigidity. The main result of this section is the following proposition, which is heavily inspired by the work of Katok and Spatzier, and Deroin and Hurtado, see [KS96, Corollary 5.2] and [DH20, Lemma 8.2]. Let α be a root of (G, A) .

Proposition 4.8 (Topological Measure Rigidity). *Suppose $s \in \ker(\alpha) \setminus \{e\}$. Let μ be an s -ergodic and $C_G(A) \ltimes \langle N_s, G^\alpha \rangle$ -invariant probability measure on M such that all elements in $\Lambda_\mu^T(s)$ are negative. For μ -a.e. x we have that if $ux \in \text{supp}(\mu)$ for some $u \in G^{-\alpha} \setminus \{e\}$, then μ is $G^{-\alpha}$ -invariant.*

The main goal of this section is to prove this proposition. Compare this result with the aforementioned facts, [KS96, Corollary 5.2] and [DH20, Lemma 8.2]. In particular, the proof of proposition 4.8 is motivated by the one of the latter paper which is itself a modification of the Hopf argument and uses accessibility coming from a factor map of a suspension space onto G/Γ , for Γ a lattice, by exploiting the ergodicity of singular elements of A on G/Γ , with the Haar measure. Here, we use Proposition 4.4 coming from [Deo78] to get accessibility. The idea of using [Deo78] to get accessibility appears for instance in [DSVX25].

Unlike in proposition 4.8, for the following proposition we do not need any hypothesis on the transverse Lyapunov exponents.

The following fact is a direct consequence of proposition 4.8 under the hypothesis of this fact, which justifies its name; compare the statement below with [KS96, Corollary 5.2]. However, we shall prove this statement in a more general setting, more precisely, we do not make the assumption that the transverse Lyapunov exponents associated to the ergodic measure are negative.

Proposition 4.9 (Entropic measure rigidity). *Let $s \in \ker(\alpha) \setminus \{e\}$ and suppose μ is an s -ergodic and $C_G(A) \ltimes \langle N_s, G^\alpha \rangle$ -invariant probability measure on M . If $\mu_x^{G^{-\alpha}}$ is non-atomic for μ -a.e. x , then μ is $G^{-\alpha}$ -invariant.*

Proof of Proposition 4.9 when all elements in $\Lambda_\mu^T(s)$ are negative: Let x be generic enough for μ so that for $\mu_x^{G^{-\alpha}}$ -a.e. u we have $ux \in \text{supp}(\mu)$; and $\mu_x^{G^{-\alpha}}$ is nonatomic, which can be done by hypothesis. Then there exists $u \in G^{-\alpha} \setminus \{e\}$ such that $ux \in \text{supp}(\mu)$. Therefore, by proposition 4.8 we get that μ is $G^{-\alpha}$ -invariant. \square

4.2. Entropy measure rigidity. We now give the general proof of proposition 4.9, without using proposition 4.9. Although we will not use this general version in the proof of the main result of this paper, we give a proof of the general case, as some of the ideas appearing in the proof of Proposition 4.8 will appear in the following argument.

Proof of Proposition 4.9: We just need to show that

$$(w_\alpha)_*\mu = \mu,$$

since $(w_\alpha)_*\mu$ is $G^{-\alpha}$ -invariant, as μ is G^α -invariant by hypothesis.

Since s and w_α commute, we get that $(w_\alpha)_*\mu$ is s -ergodic as well.

For μ -a.e. x we have the following:

- (1) the Birkoff ergodic theorem holds for $u'uvx$ with respect to s and μ for $\mu_x^{G^{-\alpha}}$ -a.e. v , Haar_{G^α} -a.e. u , and Haar_{N_s} -a.e. u' ;
- (2) the Birkhoff ergodic theorem holds for $u'ux_0$ with respect to s and μ for Haar_{N_s} -a.e. u' and Haar_{G^α} -a.e. u .

Both properties hold as μ is s -ergodic and $\langle N_s, G^\alpha \rangle$ -invariant.

This can be done since μ is s -ergodic and P -invariant. Fix an x_0 along with some $v_0 \in G^{-\alpha} \setminus \{e\}$ satisfying property (2) above, which can be done as $\mu_x^{G^{-\alpha}}$ is non-atomic.

By proposition 4.4 we get that there are $u_1 \in G^\alpha$ and $v_1 \in G^{-\alpha}$ such that $w_\alpha = v_1 u_1 v_0 c$ for some $c \in C_G(A)$; however, μ is invariant under c , thus, to prove $w_\alpha \mu = \mu$, we need only prove $(v_1 u_1 v_0)_* \mu = \mu$, since

$$(w_\alpha)_* \mu = (v_1 u_1 v_0 c)_* \mu = (v_1 u_1 v_0)_* \mu.$$

Pick any $f \in C^0(M)$ and $\epsilon > 0$. Since M is compact, f is uniformly continuous on M , hence there exists $\delta_0 > 0$ such that $|f(gx) - f(x)| < \epsilon$ whenever $g \in G^{<\delta_0}$.

Using the second map indicated in lemma 4.3 for s , and property (2) above, we get that for all $g \in G^{\leq \delta_0}$ we have

$$(11) \quad \left| \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} f(s^j g u_1 v_0 y) - \int f d\mu \right| < \epsilon,$$

as any $g \in G^{<\delta_0}$ can be written as lcu for some $l \in L_s$, $c \in C_s^{\leq \delta_0}$ and $u \in N_s$ and because of our choice of δ_0 .

As $(w_\alpha)_* \mu = (v_1 u_1 v_0)_* \mu$ we get that the Birkhoff ergodic theorem holds for $u' v v_1 u_1 v_0 x_0$ with respect to s and $(w_\alpha)_* \mu$ for a.e. $u' \in N_s$ and a.e. $v \in G^{-\alpha}$, because of our choice of x_0 with respect to property (1), and since $w_\alpha G^{-\alpha} w_\alpha^{-1} = G^\alpha$. Thus, for $\text{Haar}_{G^{-\alpha}}$ -a.e. $v \in G^{-\alpha}$ and Haar_G -a.e. $g \in G^{<\delta_0}$ we have

$$(12) \quad \left| \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} f(s^j g v v_1 u_1 v_0 x_0) - \int f d(w_\alpha)_* \mu \right| < \epsilon,$$

by decomposing elements in $G^{<\delta_0}$ using lemma 4.3, and applying Fubini's Theorem.

We can pick v arbitrarily close to v_1^{-1} so that this property holds for a.e. $u' \in N_s$, and $vv_1 u_1 v_0 x_0$ is close enough to $u_1 v_0 x_0$ in such a way that $G^{<\delta_0} \cdot vv_1 u_1 v_0 x_0$ intersects $G^{<\delta_0} \cdot u_1 v_0 x_0$, and this intersection is open in the immersed topology of the orbit $G \cdot x_0$. Hence, we can take a point in this intersection that satisfies both inequalities (11) and (12), this implies

$$\left| \int f d(w_\alpha)_* \mu - \int f d\mu \right| < 2\epsilon,$$

and since $\epsilon > 0$ and $f \in C^0(M)$ were chosen arbitrarily, this proves $(w_\alpha)_*\mu = \mu$. \square

4.3. Extension of a nonuniform partially hyperbolic system by the center. Let $a \in A$ and μ be an a -ergodic probability measure on M . For such measures the multiplicative ergodic theorem implies the existence of a nonuniform partially hyperbolic subset Z , with respect to a seen as a diffeomorphism of M , of full μ measure, see [BP23, Remark 5.9, Section 5.4]. In the following lemma we prove that such subsets can be extended along orbits of the centralizer of a to obtain a nonuniform partially hyperbolic subset with respect to a .

Lemma 4.10. *Take any $a \in A \setminus \{e\}$. Let μ be an a -ergodic probability measure on M . Then there exists a nonuniform partially hyperbolic subset \mathcal{R} with respect to a , of full μ measure, which is invariant under multiplication by elements of C_a . Furthermore, for all $x \in \mathcal{R}$ we have*

$$(13) \quad D_x c E^\sigma(x) = E^\sigma(cx)$$

for all $c \in C_a$, and $\sigma \in \{s, u, 0\}$; and

$$(14) \quad c \cdot \mathcal{W}^\sigma(x) = \mathcal{W}^\sigma(cx),$$

for $\sigma \in \{s, u, cu\}$.

Proof. By ergodicity of μ , we can choose an a -invariant nonuniform partially hyperbolic subset \mathcal{S} , such that the functions $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \mu_1, \mu_2, \varepsilon : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ appearing in the definition of nonuniform partially hyperbolicity in [BP23, Section 5.4] are all constant.

Consider the set

$$C_a \cdot \mathcal{S} = \{c \cdot x : c \in C_a, x \in \mathcal{S}\}.$$

If we define the corresponding subspaces $E^\sigma(cx)$ for $\sigma \in \{s, u, 0\}$ by the formula indicated in the lemma, it follows that these subspaces are a -equivariant as $c \in C_a$.

By using the corresponding functions $C, K : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ for the nonuniform partially hyperbolic subset \mathcal{S} as in [BP23, Section 5.4], we can construct corresponding measurable functions $C, K : C_a \cdot \mathcal{S} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$, which satisfy the properties indicated in the definition given in [BP23, Section 5.4], with respect to the positive real numbers $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \mu_1, \mu_2, \varepsilon$ indicated above.

Finally, the last equality of the lemma follows from compactness of M and the definition of unstable manifold. \square

Remark 4.11. If μ and s satisfy the hypothesis of proposition 4.8, then, by considering the Cartan flow coming from the action $G \curvearrowright M$, we obtain that for μ -a.e. x the stable manifold $\mathcal{W}^s(x, s)$ exists, then for such x the center unstable manifold with respect to s at x exists, in fact $\mathcal{W}^{cu}(x, s) = Q_s \cdot x$, where Q_s is the subgroup of G generated by N_s and C_s , which follows from the assumption that all elements in $\Lambda_\mu^T(s)$ are negative.

Remark 4.12. By using the last equality of lemma 4.10 and the previous remark we get that since $Q_s = \langle N_s, C_s \rangle$, then for μ -a.e. x and Haar_{Q_s} -a.e. $q \in Q_s$ the central unstable manifold $\mathcal{W}^{cu}(qx; s)$ exists and equals $Q_s \cdot qx$.

4.4. Almost everywhere continuity of Birkhoff averages. The following fact yields a “continuity property” for the class of measures appearing in proposition 4.8.

Let $s \in A$, and let μ be an s -ergodic, $\langle s \rangle \ltimes N_s$ -invariant probability measure on M .

Proposition 4.13. *For μ -a.e. x we have that for any, $f \in C^0(M)$, $\eta > 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta = \delta(\mu, x, f, \eta, \epsilon) > 0$ such that for any y with $d(x, y) < \delta$, the set*

$$\left\{ q \in Q_s^{<\eta} : \left| \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} f(s^j qy) - \int f d\mu \right| < \epsilon \right\},$$

has positive Haar_{Q_s} measure.

Proof. Choose x_0 satisfying the following properties:

- (i) For Haar_{N_s} -a.e. u the Birkhoff ergodic theorem holds for ux_0 with respect to μ and s . This is generic for μ by N_s -invariant.
- (ii) For Q_s -a.e. q , qx_0 has both local stable and unstable manifolds $\mathcal{W}_{\text{loc}}^s(qx_0; s)$ and $\mathcal{W}_{\text{loc}}^{cu}(qx_0; s)$, respectively, and the latter manifold equals $Q_s \cdot qx_0$. This is generic for μ as this measure is N_s -invariant, $Q_s = \langle C_s, N_s \rangle$, and because of remark 4.12.

Take $0 < \eta_1 < \eta$ small enough so that for any $g \in G^{<\eta_1}$ we have that $|f(gx) - f(x)| < \epsilon$ for all $x \in M$, which can be done as f is uniformly continuous on M .

Let \mathcal{R} be the nonuniformly partially hyperbolic set given by Lemma 4.10, and let $\mathcal{R} = \bigcup_{l \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{R}^l$ be an exhaustion into regular sets as in Section 2.6. Since \mathcal{R} has full μ measure, we may assume, without loss of generality, that $x_0, qx_0 \in \mathcal{R}$ for Haar_{Q_s} -a.e. q .

There exists some $L_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the set

$$Q_1 := \{q \in Q_s^{<\eta_1} : qx_0 \in \mathcal{R}^{L_0}\}$$

has positive Haar_{Q_s} measure.

Since for Haar_{Q_s} -a.e. q we have that $Q_s \cdot qx_0$ is tangent to $E^s(qx_0)$ and $E^0(qx_0)$ (for the distributions of \mathcal{R}) at qx_0 , and this manifold is transversal to the stable manifold $\mathcal{W}_{\text{loc}}^s(qx, s)$, for Haar_{Q_s} -a.e. $q \in Q_s^{<\eta_1}$, and hence since $\mathcal{W}_{\text{loc}}^s(-)$ is uniformly continuous on \mathcal{R}^{L_0} , it follows that $Q_s^{<\eta_1} \cdot x_0$ is a local transversal to the family $\mathcal{L}^{L_0}(x)$ defined in Section 2.6.3. Furthermore, it follows that there exists some $\delta > 0$ such that $Q_s^{<\eta_1} \cdot y$ is a local transversal to the family $\mathcal{L}^{L_0}(x)$, for all $y \in M$ such that $d(x, y) < \delta$, using again the uniform continuity of $\mathcal{W}_{\text{loc}}^s$ on \mathcal{R}^{L_0} .

Hence, for such y , the holonomy map along the family of local stable manifolds $\mathcal{L}^{L_0}(x)$,

$$\psi : Q_1 \cdot x_0 \rightarrow Q_s^{<\eta_1} \cdot y$$

is an injection, where defined, and both itself and its inverse are absolutely continuous by theorem 2.20. We may choose δ small enough, so that ψ above is defined in a subset of Q_1 of positive Haar_{Q_s} measure.

Thus if $Q_2 \subseteq Q_s^{<\eta_1}$ is such that $\psi[Q_1 \cdot x_0] = Q_2 \cdot y$, then Q_2 has positive Haar_{Q_s} measure. Furthermore, for all $q \in Q_2$, we have that $qy \in \mathcal{W}_{\text{loc}}^s(\psi^{-1}(qy); s)$, and if q_1 is the element of Q_1 such that $\psi(q_1 x_0) = qy$, then

$$(15) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} f(s^j qy) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} f(s^j q_1 x_0),$$

by definition of stable manifold.

We may assume η_1 was chosen small enough so that $Q^{<\eta_1}$ is in the image of a neighborhood of (e, e) in $C_s \times N_s$ on which the first map of lemma 4.3 restricted to this neighborhood is a diffeomorphism onto its image. Since $Q_1 \subseteq Q^{<\eta_1}$ has positive Haar_{Q_s} measure we may assume $q_1 = c_1 n_1$, where n_1 satisfies condition (i) with respect to x_0 .

$$\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} |f(s^j q_1 x_0) - f(s^j n_1 x_0)| < \epsilon,$$

as $s^j q_1 = c_1 s^j n_1$, $c_1 \in C_s^{<\eta_1}$, and because of our choice of η_1 above with respect to f and ϵ . This inequality implies

$$\left| \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} f(s^j q_1 x_0) - \int f d\mu \right| < \epsilon$$

for Haar_{Q_s} -a.e. $q_1 \in Q_1$. Hence, from (15), we obtain the result, since $Q_1 \subseteq Q_s^{<\eta_1} \subseteq Q_s^{<\eta}$. \square

We also have the following slightly more general version of 4.13. Let α be a root of (G, A) with $\alpha(s) = 0$.

Proposition 4.14. *Take μ as in Proposition 4.13. For μ -a.e. x we have that for any $u \in G^\alpha$, $f \in C^0(M)$, $\eta > 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta = \delta(x, u, f, \eta, \epsilon) > 0$ such that for any y with $d(ux, y) < \delta$, the set*

$$\left\{ q \in Q_s^{<\eta} : \left| \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} f(s^j q u y) - \int f d\mu \right| < \epsilon \right\},$$

has positive Haar_{Q_s} measure.

Proof. Suppose x_0 is such that Proposition 4.13 holds for ux_0 , for Haar_{G^α} -a.e. u , which can be done as μ is G^α -invariant. Pick such a u_1 , with $d_G(u, u_1) < \eta/3$.

If $y \in M$ is close enough to ux , then $u_1u^{-1}y$ is close to u_1x , and thus for such y we have that since $u_1u^{-1} \in Q_s$ and $d_G(u, u_1) < \eta/3$, it follows that the set of $q \in Q_s^{<\eta/3}$ satisfying the inequality of this proposition for the point u_1y has positive Haar_{Q_s} measure. Therefore, the set of $q \in Q_s^{<\eta}$ satisfying the inequality of this proposition for the point uy has positive Haar_{Q_s} measure, and thus, we obtain the result. \square

4.5. Proof of Topological Measure Rigidity. We now prove Proposition 4.8.

Proof of Proposition 4.8: Suppose x is μ generic enough for Proposition 4.14 to hold with respect to s and μ .

By hypothesis there exists $u_0 \in (G^{-\alpha}) \setminus \{e\}$ with $u_0x_0 \in \text{supp}(\mu)$. By lemma 4.4, there are $u_1 \in G^{-\alpha}$, $v_1 \in G^\alpha$, and $c_0 \in C_G(A)$ such that $w_\alpha = u_1v_1u_0c_0$. Since μ is invariant under c_0 , let us assume x_0 is such that Birkhoff's ergodic Theorem holds for x_0 and μ with respect to s , which implies the same is true for c_0x_0 , as μ^P is $C_G(A)$ invariant; hence, we may assume, without loss of generality, that $c_0 = e_G$.

Let $f \in C^0(M)$ and $\epsilon > 0$ be arbitrary. Choose $\delta_1 > 0$ such that $|f(gx) - f(x)| < \epsilon$, whenever $g \in G^{<\delta_1}$, for all $x \in M$.

Let us assume x_0 is generic enough for Proposition 4.13 to hold for this point with respect to s , μ and α ; so that this proposition holds for $w_\alpha x_0$ with respect to s , $(w_\alpha)_*\mu$ and $-\alpha$.

Take $\delta_2 = \delta_2(w_\alpha x, u_1^{-1}, f, \eta, \epsilon)$, as in Proposition 4.13, we may assume that $\delta_2 \leq \delta_1$. Choose y close enough to u_0x_0 such that $d(v_1y, u_1^{-1}w_\alpha x_0) < \delta_2$, which can be done as $u_1^{-1}w_\alpha = v_1u_0$; and such that for some $v_2 \in G^\alpha$ with $d(v_2y, u_1^{-1}w_\alpha x_0) < \delta_2$ we have that

$$(16) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} f(s^j u v_2 y) = \int f d\mu,$$

for Haar_{N_s} -a.e. u , this holds as $u_0x_0 \in \text{supp}(\mu)$, and as μ is both G^α and N_s invariant. Since $d(v_2y, u_1^{-1}w_\alpha x_0) < \delta_2$, it follows from Proposition 4.14 that the set of all $q \in Q_s^{<\delta_2}$ such that

$$(17) \quad \left| \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} f(s^j q v_2 y) - \int f d(w_\alpha)_*\mu \right| < \epsilon$$

has positive Haar_{Q_s} measure. However, if δ_2 is small enough, Haar_{Q_s} -a.e. $q \in Q_s^{<\delta_2}$ factor uniquely as cu , for some $c \in C_s^{<\delta_2}$ and $u \in N_s$. Hence, there exist $c_2 \in C_s^{<\delta_2}$ and $u_2 \in N_s$ such that u_2 satisfies (16) and $q_2 := c_2 u_2$ satisfies (17). By our choice of δ_2 we have

$$\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} |f(s^j q_2 v_2 x_0) - f(s^j u_2 v_2 x_0)| < \epsilon;$$

combining this with (16) and (17) gives

$$\left| \int f d\mu - \int f d(w_\alpha)_* \mu \right| < 2\epsilon.$$

Since f and ϵ were arbitrary, the result follows. \square

5. LYAPUNOV EXPONENT TRANSVERSE TO ORBITS AND RESONANCE

Fix a higher rank, connected, simple, split Lie group G , along with a maximal torus $A \leq G$ and a minimal parabolic subgroup $P \leq G$ such that $A \leq P$. Recall we denote by Δ_P the set of positive roots with respect to P , and its set of simple positive roots by Π_P .

In this section we begin the proof of theorem 1.1. We will prove theorem 1.1 by making the following assumption from this section on, as the first item of Theorem 1.1 follows from the Theorem of Stuck and Zimmer, see Theorem 2.11.

Assumption 5.1. *Suppose there exists a C^3 closed manifold M of dimension $\dim(G) + 1$, along with a C^3 locally free action $G \curvearrowright M$ having a P -invariant probability measure μ^P on M , such that the following conditions hold*

- (1) *for every $\alpha \in \Pi_P$ there exists some $s \in \ker(\alpha) \setminus \{e\}$ such that μ^P is s -ergodic, i.e., $\ker(\alpha) \curvearrowright (M, \mu^P)$ is ergodic for all $\alpha \in \Pi_P$, because of Theorem 2.1;*
- (2) *M has no invariant probability measure under the action $G \curvearrowright M$.*

The assumption on ergodicity by singular elements of A appears in the work of Katok-Spatzier [KS96, Section 5]; and the work of Nevo and Zimmer, see [NZ99, Theorem A] [NZ02, Theorem 3].

Let Q_0 be the stabilizer of μ^P in G , i.e., the set $\{g \in G : g_* \mu^P = \mu^P\}$. Then Q_0 is a proper, because of our assumption, Assumption 5.1, parabolic subgroup of G as $P \leq Q_0$. Denote by Δ_{Q_0} the set of all nonzero roots $\beta \in A^*$ such that the associated unipotent group G^β is contained in Q_0 in G ; and denote its compliment in the set of all roots of (G, A) by $\Delta_{Q_0}^c$.

Remark 5.2. Since in particular μ^P is s -ergodic by an element of $A \leq P$, it follows that μ^P is both A and P -ergodic. Since we are assuming $G \curvearrowright M$ has no G -invariant probability measure, it follows from proposition 3.8 that μ^P has to be supported on a minimal subset \mathcal{M} of M , and that it is the unique P -invariant measure supported on this minimal set.

We have the following immediate consequence of the Theorem of Pugh and Shub, Theorem 2.1:

Corollary 5.3. *All elements off a countable family of hyperplanes in A act μ^P -ergodically on M .*

Definition 5.4. As μ^P is A -ergodic, there is a corresponding decomposition of $T_x M$ into Osedelets' distributions $\bigoplus_{j=1}^m E^{\lambda_j}(x)$, for μ -a.e. x , where

$\lambda_j \in A^*$ for all $j = 1, \dots, m$. Because of our codimension one hypothesis, there exists exactly one Lyapunov exponent in this decomposition whose corresponding Oseledec's distribution is not tangent to the G -orbits, which we denote by $\lambda_{\mu^P}^T$.

Remark 5.5. We have fixed a choice of a minimal parabolic subgroup of G ; however, for any other minimal parabolic P' in G with respect to A , we denote by $\mu^{P'}$ the unique P' -invariant probability measure on \mathcal{M} , where uniqueness follows from our assumption 5.1 and proposition 3.8; so that if μ^P is also P' -invariant, then $\mu^P = \mu^{P'}$.

In this section we first prove that for any $a \in A$ such that its unstable subgroup, N_a , is contained in Q_0 , the Lyapunov exponent $\lambda_{\mu^P}^T(a)$ of the A -ergodic probability measure μ^P satisfies the inequality $\lambda_{\mu^P}^T(a) < \beta(a)$ for all $\beta \in \Delta$. It will then follow that the Lyapunov exponent $\lambda_{\mu^P}^T(a)$ will be the lowest Lyapunov exponent of the a -ergodic probability measure μ^P . This will imply that the Oseledec's distributions with respect to the transverse Lyapunov exponent $\lambda_{\mu^P}^T(a)$ will integrate to a one dimensional Pesin manifolds, transverse to the G -orbits of the given action, which we shall call *transverse Pesin manifolds with respect to a* , and denote by $\mathcal{W}^T(x; a)$, for μ^P -a.e. x for which such Pesin manifold exists. We note that even though μ^P is supported on the minimal set \mathcal{M} , the transverse Pesin manifolds will not be contained in this set, unless the action $G \curvearrowright M$ is minimal.

5.0.1. *Invariance of ergodic components of μ^P .* Let $a \in \mathcal{W}^P$ be nontrivial, and let $\mu^P = \int \nu_x d\mu^P(x)$ be the a -ergodic decomposition of μ^P . Recall we denote by N_a the unstable subgroup of a in G , see (10). The following fact uses the Hopf argument, and is inspired by [DH20][Proposition 8.4]

Lemma 5.6. *For μ^P -a.e. x we have that ν_x is N_s -invariant.*

Proof. For any measurable partition ξ of M subordinate to the P -orbits the conditional measure of μ^P along $\xi(x)$ is equivalent to the Riemannian volume on the H -orbit $H \cdot x$, by 2.13, for μ^P -a.e. x . Because of the Hopf argument, see [Bro+19, Proposition 8.12], the partition into unstable manifolds with respect to a refines the ergodic decomposition of μ^P . Thus, for μ^P -a.e. x , the conditional measure of ν_x along $\xi(y)$ is equal to the conditional measure of μ^P for this element, for ν_x -a.e. y . Hence, applying 2.13, it follows that ν_x is N_a -invariant for μ^P -a.e. x . \square

5.1. Negativity of transversal Lyapunov exponent in $\text{Int}(\mathcal{W}^P)$.

5.1.1. *Minimal resonant codimension.* We make use of the notion of minimal resonant codimension of G defined in [BRW22]. Unlike in [BRW22], we do not need to consider coarse roots of G since we are assuming G is split.

Definition 5.7. The *minimal resonant codimension* of G , which we denote by $r(G)$, is the minimal dimension of the manifold G/Q , for all proper parabolic subgroups $Q \leq G$.

Since G is higher rank, we have that $r(G) \geq 2$, see [BRW22, Example 1.3].

5.1.2. *Kernel of transverse Lyapunov exponent does not intersect \mathcal{W}^P .* The following lemma is inspired by ideas appearing in [BFH22] and [BRW22] to construct G -invariant measures on suspension spaces of actions of lattices on manifolds. This lemma uses the higher rank hypothesis on G .

Lemma 5.8. $\ker(\lambda_{\mu^P}^T) \cap \text{Int}(\mathcal{W}^P) = \{0\}$.

Proof. Suppose, to get a contradiction, that the intersection $\ker(\lambda_{\mu^P}^T) \cap \text{Int}(\mathcal{W}^P)$ is not trivial. Pick $a \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{W}^P)$ such that μ^P is a -ergodic, which can be done by Corollary 5.3. Let us show μ^P is $G^{-\beta}$ invariant for all $\beta \in \Delta_P$. This will imply that the stabilizer of μ^P , Q_0 , has resonant codimension at most 1, which contradicts the fact that $r(G) \geq 2$.

We have

$$\sum_{\beta \in \Delta_P} \beta(a) \geq h_{\mu^P}(a^{-1}) = h_{\mu^P}(a) = \sum_{\beta \in \Delta_P^+} \beta(a),$$

where the first inequality follows from the Margulis-Ruelle inequality, see Theorem 2.3, and the last equality follows from lemma 2.14 and P -invariance of μ^P ; hence, $h_{\mu^P}(a^{-1}) = \sum_{\beta \in \Delta_P} \beta(a)$, and therefore μ^P is invariant under $G^{-\beta}$ for all $\beta \in \Delta_P$, so μ^P is G -invariant, which contradicts Assumption 5.1.

Using that $r(G) \geq 2$ and the previous argument, we get that $\ker(\lambda_{\mu^P}^T)$ does not intersect the interiors of the codimension one faces of $\overline{\mathcal{W}^P}$.

Lemma 5.9. *For each $\alpha \in \Pi_P$ we have $\ker(\lambda_{\mu^P}^T) \cap \text{Int}(\ker(\alpha) \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}^P}) = \emptyset$.*

Proof. Otherwise, if there is an element s in this intersection, let ν_x be a generic s -ergodic component of μ^P , so that ν_x is G^β invariant for all $\beta \in \Delta_P \setminus \{\alpha\}$, by Lemma 5.6, as $\beta(s) > 0$; an entropy argument as the one in the proof of the previous lemma implies ν_x is $G^{-\beta}$ invariant for all $\beta \in \Delta_P \setminus \{\alpha\}$. As $r(G) \geq 2$, this implies ν_x is G -invariant, and hence so is μ^P , contradicting Assumption 5.1. \square

\square

Recall we denote by w_α the element in the Weyl group $W_{(G,A)}$ corresponding to the reflection of A about the hyperplane $\ker(\alpha)$. For the proof of proposition 4.9 we use our ergodic assumption for singular elements in 5.1.

5.1.3. *Non-multiple roots and minimal parabolics for split groups.* We drop our fixed conventions in this subsubsection to prove the following fact about semisimple Lie groups.

Let G be a semisimple Lie group; $A \leq G$ be a maximal torus. Let Q be a parabolic subgroup of G containing A . Let us denote by Δ_Q the set of roots of (G, A) appearing in the root decomposition of Q . We have the following

observation following from the Levi decomposition of such parabolics, see [Kna02, Theorem B.2].

Lemma 5.10. *For any $\alpha \in \Delta_Q$, there exists a minimal parabolic P such that $\alpha \in \Delta_P$.*

Proof. If G^α is contained in the unipotent radical of Q , then in this case $\alpha \in \Delta_P$ for any minimal parabolic $P \leq Q$.

If G^α is contained in the semisimple part of Q , there is a minimal parabolic of the corresponding simple factor of this semisimple part containing G^α , which yields a minimal parabolic of Q with the required property. \square

5.2. Maximal negativity of transversal Lyapunov exponent. The following proposition is one of the main tools of the whole paper, it is the main ingredient for the construction of the embedded submanifold in section 6. The proof of this proposition, under our assumption 5.1, uses the higher rank and split hypothesis on G . It also uses the assumption that μ^P is ergodic for $\ker(\alpha)$ for all $\alpha \in \Pi_P$.

Proposition 5.11. *For any $a \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{W}^P)$ we have*

$$(18) \quad \beta(a) < \lambda_{\mu^P}^T(a^{-1})$$

for all $\beta \in \Delta_P$

Recall $r(G)$ denotes the resonant codimension of G . When $r(G) \geq 3$ we also have the following property which will be quite instrumental in section 6 to construct the smooth factor map. Recall $Q_0 = \text{Stab}(\mu^P)$.

Proposition 5.12. *Suppose $|\Delta \setminus \Delta_{Q_0}| \geq 3$. Let $\alpha \in \Pi_P$. Then for any $s \in \text{Int}(\ker(\alpha) \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}^P})$ we have*

$$(19) \quad \beta(s) < \lambda_{\mu^P}^T(s^{-1})$$

for all $\beta \in \Delta_P$.

We will give a proof of proposition 5.11 only when $r(G) = 2$. In the case $r(G) \geq 3$, proposition 5.11 follows immediately from proposition 5.12. Indeed, in this case $|\Delta \setminus \Delta_Q| \geq 3$ holds for any parabolic $Q \leq G$ by definition of $r(G)$; and $\text{Int}(\mathcal{W}^P)$ is contained in the convex hull of the codimension one faces of $\overline{\mathcal{W}^P}$.

Remark 5.13. The constructions and all the properties listed in the entirety of the paper will also hold in the case $r(G) = 2$ if the given action satisfies proposition 5.12, as every application of the assumption $|\Delta \setminus \Delta_{Q_0}| \geq 3$ in the whole paper is done via this proposition.

Example 5.14. We need G to be higher rank for the propositions above to hold. Indeed, if $G = \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$, and Γ is a torsion free uniform lattice of G , and P is the subgroup of upper triangular matrices, consider the canonical diagonal action $G \curvearrowright M := G/\Gamma \times G/P$, which is smooth, locally free, and with codimension one orbits. Then, $P \curvearrowright M$ is uniquely ergodic, with

corresponding invariant probability measure, $\mu := \text{Haar}_{G/\Gamma} \times \delta_{eP}$, where eP is the identity coset of G/P . This measure is $\ker(\alpha)$ -ergodic for all roots α , by the Howe-Moore Theorem, but its transverse Lyapunov is the zero functional.

5.2.1. Negativity of transverse Lyapunov exponent. Let us make the following observation, under the assumption that $\lambda_{\mu^P}^T$ is resonant with some positive root with respect to P . Given any root $\beta \in \Delta$ we denote by \mathcal{W}^β the partition of M given by the G^β orbits.

Lemma 5.15. *If $\lambda_{\mu^P}^T$ is resonant to some $\beta \in \Delta_P$, then the coarse Lyapunov exponent, denoted by χ , of $\lambda_{\mu^P}^T$ equals $\{\beta, \lambda_{\mu^P}^T\}$ and $h_{\mu^P}(a|\mathcal{W}^\chi) \geq \beta(a)$ for all $a \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{W}^P)$.*

Proof. The first statement follows from the fact that G acts locally freely with leaves of codimension one combined with the assumption that G is split.

For the second statement, it is enough to prove it for all $a \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{W}^P)$ such that μ^P is a -ergodic because of theorem 2.1, and since $h_{\mu^P}(-|\mathcal{W}^P)$ is linear on $\text{Int}(\mathcal{W}^P)$, as no coarse Lyapunov exponent changes sign in this open cone by the hypothesis, because of theorem 2.6.

We have $\lambda_{\mu^P}^T = c\beta$ for some $c > 0$.

If $c \leq 1$, then from Theorem 2.6 we have that $h_{\mu^P}(a|\mathcal{W}^\chi) \geq \gamma(\mu^P|W^\beta)\beta(a)$, where $\gamma(\mu^P|W^\beta)$ is the Hausdorff dimension of μ^P with respect to the partition by G^β orbits. If $0 < c < 1$, then from Theorem 2.6, we get the equality immediately, as μ^P is G^β invariant.

If $c = 1$, the inequality follows from Theorem 2.6, as $\gamma(\mu^P|\mathcal{W}^\chi) \geq 1$, since \mathcal{W}^χ it is refined by the partition into G^β -orbits.

If $c > 1$, then applying theorem 2.6 again,

$$\begin{aligned} h_{\mu^P}(a|\mathcal{W}^\chi) &= \lambda_{\mu^P}^T(a)\gamma_2(\mu^P|\mathcal{W}^\chi) + \beta(a)\gamma_1(\mu^P|\mathcal{W}^\chi) \\ &> \beta(a)[\gamma_2(\mu^P|\mathcal{W}^\chi) + \gamma_1(\mu^P|\mathcal{W}^\chi)] \end{aligned}$$

and $\gamma_2(\mu^P|\mathcal{W}^\chi) + \gamma_1(\mu^P|\mathcal{W}^\chi)$ equals the Hausdorff dimension of μ^P along \mathcal{W}^χ , which is at least 1, hence we obtain the lemma in this case as well. \square

In the next lemma we prove that the transversal Lyapunov exponent is negative in the interior of the Weyl chamber corresponding to P .

Lemma 5.16. *For any $a \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{W}^P)$ we have $\lambda_{\mu^P}^T(a) < 0$.*

Proof. It is enough to prove this for all $a \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{W}^P)$ for which μ^P is a -ergodic, since all such points are dense in $\text{Int}(\mathcal{W}^P)$, because of theorem 2.1. Fix such an a .

Suppose, to get a contradiction, that $\lambda_{\mu^P}^T(a) \geq 0$. There are two cases, depending on whether $\lambda_{\mu^P}^T$ is resonant to a root or not. Denote by χ the coarse Lyapunov exponent of $\lambda_{\mu^P}^T$.

Case 1. $\lambda_{\mu^P}^T$ is not resonant to a root. We then have that $\chi = \{\lambda_{\mu^P}^T\}$, and using theorem 2.10

$$(20) \quad h_{\mu^P}(a) = h_{\mu^P}(a|\mathcal{W}^\chi) + \sum_{\beta \in \Delta_P} h_{\mu^P}(a|\mathcal{W}^\beta) = h_{\mu^P}(a|\mathcal{W}^\chi) + \sum_{\beta \in \Delta_P} \beta(a),$$

where the last equality follows as μ^P is P invariant. Applying theorem 2.10 again, we get

$$h_{\mu^P}(a^{-1}) = \sum_{\beta \in \Delta_P} h_{\mu^P}(a^{-1}|\mathcal{W}^{-\beta}).$$

As $h_{\mu^P}(a) = h_{\mu^P}(a^{-1})$, using (20) and the previous equality, canceling accordingly, we obtain that

$$(21) \quad h_{\mu^P}(a|\mathcal{W}^\chi) + \sum_{\substack{\beta \in \Delta_P \\ -\beta \in \Delta_{Q_0}^c}} \beta(a) = \sum_{\substack{\beta \in \Delta_P \\ -\beta \in \Delta_{Q_0}^c}} h_{\mu^P}(a^{-1}|\mathcal{W}^{-\beta}),$$

as for each $\beta \in \Delta_P$ such that $-\beta \in \Delta_{Q_0}$ we have that

$$h_{\mu^P}(a|\mathcal{W}^\beta) = \beta(a) = (-\beta)(a^{-1}) = h_{\mu^P}(a^{-1}|\mathcal{W}^{-\beta}),$$

as μ^P is invariant by both G^β and $G^{-\beta}$, by construction of Q_0 ; and theorem 2.5. From (21) we have that

$$\sum_{\substack{\beta \in \Delta_P \\ -\beta \in \Delta_{Q_0}^c}} h_{\mu^P}(a^{-1}|\mathcal{W}^{-\beta}) \geq \sum_{\substack{\beta \in \Delta_P \\ -\beta \in \Delta_{Q_0}^c}} \beta(a),$$

however, from theorem 2.5, $h_{\mu^P}(a^{-1}|\mathcal{W}^{-\beta}) \leq \beta(a)$ for all $\beta \in \Delta_P$, and thus $h_{\mu^P}(a^{-1}|\mathcal{W}^{-\beta}) = \beta(a)$ for all $\beta \in \Delta_P$ such that $-\beta \notin \Delta_{Q_0}$, which implies by theorem 2.5 that μ^P is $G^{-\beta}$ invariant for all such β 's, contradicting the definition of Q_0 .

Case 2. $\lambda_{\mu^P}^T$ is resonant to a root β_0 . In this case we have $\chi = \{\lambda_{\mu^P}^T, \beta_0\}$, because of the codimension one hypothesis on the orbits of $G \curvearrowright M$, and as G is a split group. Note that $\beta_0 \in \Delta_P$, as we are assuming $\lambda_{\mu^P}^T$ is nonnegative in a point of the interior of the Weyl chamber \mathcal{W}^P . As $\lambda_{\mu^P}^T(a) \geq 0$, from theorem 2.10 we get

$$h_{\mu^P}(a) = h_{\mu^P}(a|\mathcal{W}^\chi) + \sum_{\substack{\beta \in \Delta_P \\ \beta \neq \beta_0}} h_{\mu^P}(a|\mathcal{W}^\beta) = h_{\mu^P}(a|\mathcal{W}^\chi) + \sum_{\substack{\beta \in \Delta_P \\ \beta \neq \beta_0}} \beta(a)$$

and

$$h_{\mu^P}(a^{-1}) = \sum_{\beta \in \Delta_P} h_{\mu^P}(a^{-1}|\mathcal{W}^{-\beta});$$

and thus using that $h_{\mu^P}(a) = h_{\mu^P}(a^{-1})$ we obtain, arguing similarly as in the previous case, that

$$(22) \quad h_{\mu^P}(a|\mathcal{W}^\chi) + \sum_{\substack{\beta \in \Delta_P \\ \beta \neq \beta_0, -\beta \in \Delta_{Q_0}^c}} \beta(a) = \sum_{\substack{\beta \in \Delta_P \\ \beta \neq \beta_0, -\beta \in \Delta_{Q_0}^c}} h_{\mu^P}(a^{-1}|\mathcal{W}^{-\beta}) + h_{\mu^P}(a^{-1}|\mathcal{W}^{-\beta_0}).$$

From lemma 5.15 we have $h_{\mu^P}(a|\mathcal{W}^\chi) \geq \beta_0(a)$; we have $\beta_0(a) \geq h_{\mu^P}(a^{-1}|\mathcal{W}^{-\beta_0})$ as well, hence, from the previous equality we get

$$(23) \quad \sum_{\substack{\beta \in \Delta_P \\ \beta \neq \beta_0, -\beta \in \Delta_{Q_0}^c}} \beta(a) \leq \sum_{\substack{\beta \in \Delta_P \\ \beta \neq \beta_0, -\beta \in \Delta_{Q_0}^c}} h_{\mu^P}(a^{-1}|\mathcal{W}^{-\beta})$$

Both sums will be non-vacuous if we prove that $\{\beta \in \Delta_P : \beta \neq \beta_0, -\beta \in \Delta_{Q_0}^c\}$ is not empty. Suppose it is. Then we would have $-\beta \in \Delta_{Q_0}$ for all $\beta \in \Delta_P \setminus \{\beta_0\}$, and thus $\Delta \setminus \{\beta_0\} \subseteq \Delta_{Q_0}$. However, as the resonant codimension of G is at least 2, see section 5.1.1, we would get that $Q_0 = G$, and thus μ^P would be G -invariant, which contradicts assumption 5.1.

However, because of theorem 2.5, we get from (23) that $h_{\mu^P}(a^{-1}|\mathcal{W}^{-\beta}) = \beta(a)$ for all β indexed by the sums in (23), and since this index set is not empty, using theorem 2.5, μ^P is $G^{-\beta}$ invariant for some $\beta \in \Delta_P$ such that $-\beta \notin \Delta_{Q_0}$, contradicting the construction of Q_0 .

Therefore, we must have $\lambda_{\mu^P}^T(a) < 0$ in this case as well.

□

Remark 5.17. Note that if $\lambda_{\mu^P}^T$ is resonant with some root, by the previous lemma, it must belong to $\Delta_{Q_0}^c$, for if it were resonant to some $\beta_0 \in \Delta_{Q_0}$, there would exist some minimal parabolic P' of G contained in Q_0 such that $G^{\beta_0} \leq P'$, by using the Levi decomposition of Q_0 , so that $\mu^P = \mu^{P'}$ by remark 5.5, and by considering any $a \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{W}^{P'})$, we would get a contradiction using the previous lemma.

5.2.2. Maximal negativity of transversal Lyapunov exponent. For the minimal parabolic $P \leq G$, let Π_P be the set of simple roots of the set of positive roots associated to P , Δ_P . Denote by β_P^H the *highest root* with respect to P , given by the sum of all elements of Δ_P^+ , then β_P^H is greater than or equal to all elements in Δ_P^+ , i.e., for any $\beta \in \Delta_P^+$, $\beta_P^H - \beta$ is the sum of elements in Δ_P , with coefficients equal to either 0 or 1, as G is a split simple Lie group.

Remark 5.18. We must have that $-\beta_P^H \in \Delta_{Q_0}^c$. For otherwise, μ^P would be invariant under $G^{-\beta_P^H}$, but this would imply μ^P would be invariant under $G^{-\beta}$ for all $\beta \in \Delta_P$, as any such β is either β_P^H itself or can be written as $\beta_P^H - \alpha$ for some $\alpha \in \Delta_P$, which implies $[G^{-\beta_P^H}, G^\alpha] = G^{-\beta}$, which would yield $G^{-\beta}$ invariance as μ^P is G^α invariant as well. Since μ^P is already P -invariant, this would mean μ^P is G -invariant, which would contradict assumption 5.1.

Remark 5.19. Suppose $\lambda_{\mu^P}^T$ is resonant to $-\beta_P^H$. Then for this case we must have that $\text{Stab}(\mu^P) = P$, i.e., $Q_0 = P$. For otherwise, μ^P would equal μ^{P_1} for some minimal parabolic P_1 with respect to A different to P , because of lemma 5.10, and then μ^P would be invariant by the element of the Weyl group sending the Weyl chamber \mathcal{W}^P to \mathcal{W}^{P_2} , but such an element must send β_P^H to $\beta_{P_2}^H$, which are different roots, a contradiction.

Recall that since G is a split simple Lie group and $\dim(M) = \dim(G) + 1$, if $\lambda_{\mu^P}^T$ is resonant to a root β_0 , denote by $\chi = \{\lambda_{\mu^P}^T, \beta_0\}$ its coarse Lyapunov exponent. In this setup we have the following fact.

Lemma 5.20. *For all $s \in \overline{\mathcal{W}^P}$ we have*

$$\lambda_{\mu^P}^T(s^{-1}) + \beta_0(s^{-1}) > h_{\mu^P}(s^{-1}|\mathcal{W}^\chi).$$

Proof. Recall $\lambda_{\mu^P}^T(s) < 0$ for all $s \in \mathcal{W}^P$ by theorem 5.16, i.e., $\chi(s) < 0$.

By Ruelle's inequality, we have $\lambda_{\mu^P}^T(s^{-1}) + \beta_0(s^{-1}) \geq h_{\mu^P}(s^{-1}|\mathcal{W}^\chi)$. Suppose, to get a contradiction, that we have equality.

We may assume, without loss of generality, throughout the proof, that μ^P is a generic enough s -ergodic component of itself, which can be done as $h_-(s^{-1}|\mathcal{W}^\chi)$ is a convex function.

Let x_0 be a generic enough point of μ^P . Since the action $G \curvearrowright M$ is at least C^2 , it follows that the coarse Pesin manifold $\mathcal{W}^\chi(x_0)$ is an injectively immersed C^2 submanifold of M of dimension 2 such that for any $y \in M$, the injectively immersed submanifold $G^{\beta_0} \cdot y$ is contained in $\mathcal{W}^\chi(x_0)$.

There exists a diffeomorphism $\phi : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{W}^\chi(x_0)$ with the following properties:

- (1) $\phi(0) = x_0$;
- (2) for every $y \in \mathbb{R}$, $\phi(y, -) : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow U$ is a diffeomorphism onto the connected component of the intersection $G^{\beta_0} \cdot \phi(y, 0) \cap U$ containing $\phi(y, 0)$.

Since $h_{\mu^P}(s^{-1}|\mathcal{W}^\chi) = \lambda_{\mu^P}^T(s^{-1}) + \beta_0(s^{-1})$, we get by theorem 2.5 that the conditional measure of μ^P along \mathcal{W}^χ , $(\mu^P)_{x_0}^{\mathcal{W}^\chi}$, is absolutely continuous. As ϕ is a C^1 diffeomorphism, we can apply Fubini's theorem and obtain a disintegration of $(\mu^P)_{x_0}^{\mathcal{W}^\chi}$ along the partition of \mathcal{W}^χ by its G^{β_0} orbits such that for $(\mu^P)_{x_0}^{\mathcal{W}^\chi}$ -a.e. y we have that $[(\mu^P)_{x_0}^{\mathcal{W}^\chi}]_y^{\mathcal{W}^{\beta_0}}$ is absolutely continuous. Since x_0 was chosen to be generic enough for μ^P , the above implies that the decomposition of μ^P along the G^{β_0} orbits is absolutely continuous. This implies that μ^P is G^{β_0} -invariant by proposition 2.15, and therefore, since x_0 was arbitrarily μ^P generic, it follows that μ^P is G^{β_0} invariant, so $\beta_0 \in \Delta_{Q_0}$, which contradicts remark 5.17. \square

As indicated before, we prove proposition 5.11 only in the case $r(G) = 2$, i.e., when G is locally isomorphic to $\text{SL}(3, \mathbb{R})$.

Proof of Proposition 5.11 when $r(G) = 2$: We take P to be the closed subgroup of G corresponding to the Lie subalgebra of $\text{Lie}(G) = \mathfrak{sl}(3, \mathbb{R})$ corresponding to the upper triangular matrices of $\text{SL}(3, \mathbb{R})$. Denote by $\beta_{i,j}$, $i, j = 1, 2, 3$, its corresponding roots, with respect to the subgroup of diagonal matrices.

The leafwise measure $(\mu^P)_x^{G^{\beta_{3,1}}}$ is atomic for μ^P -a.e. x by applying theorem 4.7, indeed, since μ^P is in particular P , this theorem would imply μ^P to be invariant under both $G^{\beta_{2,1}}$ and $G^{\beta_{3,2}}$, so $\text{Stab}(\mu^P)$ would be a parabolic subgroup of G containing both P and the group $\langle G^{2,1}, G^{3,2} \rangle$, which is impossible since the minimal codimension dimension of G , $r(G)$, is 2.

There are two cases.

Case 1. $\lambda_{\mu^P}^T$ is resonant to a root.

As in this case G is locally isomorphic to $\text{SL}(3, \mathbb{R})$, we have that $\beta^{3,1}$ is the only root such that $\lambda_{\mu^P}^T$ can be resonant to, because of both lemmas 5.8 and 5.16. Thus, the coarse Lyapunov exponent of $\lambda_{\mu^P}^T$ equals $\chi = \{\lambda_{\mu^P}^T, \beta^{3,1}\}$. In this case $Q_0 = \text{Stab}(\mu^P) = P$ by remark 5.19, and thus $|\Delta \setminus \Delta_{Q_0}| = 3$. Thus, in this case, the proposition follows from proposition 5.12

Case 2. $\lambda_{\mu^P}^T$ is not resonant to a root.

In this case, because of lemma 5.8, $\ker(\lambda_{\mu^P}^T)$ intersects the interior of one of the two adjacent Weyl chambers to $\text{Int}(\mathcal{W}^P)$. Let us assume, without loss of generality, that this adjacent Weyl chamber has $\ker(\beta_{1,2})$ as a face, the other case is analogous, and denote by P_1 its corresponding minimal parabolic, so that $\Delta_{P_1} = \{\beta_{2,1}, \beta_{1,3}, \beta_{2,3}\}$.

Choose $b \in \ker \lambda_{\mu^P}^T$ such that $\beta_{1,3}(b) > 0$.

We claim that $h_{\mu^P}(b|W^{\beta_{2,1}}) = 0$. Suppose not. Then $h_{\mu^P}(b^{-1}|\mathcal{W}^{\beta_{3,2}}) = 0$, for otherwise we would get by theorem 4.7 that μ^P would be $G^{\beta_{3,1}}$ invariant and this is impossible by 5.18. Then by theorem 2.10,

$$h_{\mu^P}(b) = h_{\mu^P}(b|\mathcal{W}^{\beta_{2,1}}) + \beta_{1,3}(b) + \beta_{2,3}(b), \quad h_{\mu^P}(b^{-1}) = \beta_{1,2}(b^{-1}),$$

since $h_{\mu^P}(b) = h_{\mu^P}(b^{-1})$ this implies

$$h_{\mu^P}(b|\mathcal{W}^{\beta_{2,1}}) + \beta_{1,3}(b) + \beta_{2,3}(b) + \beta_{1,2}(b) = 0,$$

which is a contradiction since $\beta_{2,3} + \beta_{1,2} = \beta_{1,3}$ and $\beta_{1,3}(b) \neq 0$. Therefore $h_{\mu^P}(b|\mathcal{W}^{\beta_{2,1}}) = 0$.

Thus, for any $a \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{W}^P)$ such that μ^P is a -ergodic, we have by theorem 2.10, since $\lambda_{\mu^P}^T$ is not resonant to a root and by lemma 5.16, that

$$h_{\mu^P}(a^{-1}) = h_{\mu^P}(a^{-1}|\mathcal{W}^{\lambda_{\mu^P}^T}) + h_{\mu^P}(a^{-1}|\mathcal{W}^{G^{\beta_{3,2}}}),$$

and as $h_{\mu^P}(a^{-1}) = h_{\mu^P}(a) = (\beta_{1,2} + \beta_{1,3} + \beta_{2,3})(a)$ we get

$$h_{\mu^P}(a^{-1}|\mathcal{W}^{\lambda_{\mu^P}^T}) \geq (\beta_{1,2} + \beta_{1,3})(a)$$

as $h_{\mu^P}(a^{-1}|\mathcal{W}^{\beta_{3,2}}) \leq \beta_{2,3}(a)$.

Thus, as $\beta_{1,2}(a) \neq 0$, we obtain that $\lambda_{\mu^P}^T(a^{-1}) > \beta_{1,3}(a)$, and as $\beta_{1,3}$ is the highest root with respect to P , we are done. \square

For the proof of Proposition 5.12 we need the following observation. The following proposition is the first part of the proof of our main result, Theorem 1.1, where we use the ergodic hypothesis appearing in it.

Lemma 5.21. *For all $\beta \in \Delta$ such that $\beta \notin \Delta_{Q_0}$, the leafwise measure $[\mu^P]_x^{G^\beta}$ is atomic for μ^P -a.e. x .*

Proof. Take $s \in \ker(\alpha) \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}^P}$ for which μ^P is s -ergodic, which can be done by Assumption 5.1. Since μ^P is not $G^{-\beta}$ -invariant, it follows from Proposition 4.9 that \square

We need the following observation about higher rank, simple Lie algebras, which follows immediately as in this case, β_P^H cannot be a simple root.

Lemma 5.22. *The sum of all elements of $\Delta_P \setminus \{\beta_P^H\}$ is bigger than or equal to β_P^H on $\text{Int}(\mathcal{W}^P)$.*

Proof of Proposition 5.12: Let $\alpha \in \Pi_P$ and s be as in the hypothesis of the proposition. We have $\lambda_{\mu^P}^T(s) < 0$ by lemma 5.9.

Case 1. $\lambda_{\mu^P}^T$ is not resonant to a root.

We have by theorem 2.10 that

$$h_{\mu^P}(s) = \sum_{\beta \in \Delta_P \setminus \{\alpha\}} \beta(s), \quad h_{\mu^P}(s^{-1}) = \sum_{\substack{\beta \in \Delta_P \setminus \{\alpha\} \\ -\beta \in \Delta_{Q_0}}} \beta(s) + h_{\mu^P}(s^{-1}|\mathcal{W}^{\lambda_{\mu^P}^T})$$

as

$$h_{\mu^P}(s^{-1}|\mathcal{W}^{-\beta}) = \begin{cases} \beta(s) & \text{if } -\beta \in \Delta_{Q_0} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for all $\beta \in \Delta_P \setminus \{\alpha\}$, by lemma 5.21. Since $h_{\mu^P}(s) = h_{\mu^P}(s^{-1})$ it follows that

$$h_{\mu^P}(s^{-1}|\mathcal{W}^{\lambda_{\mu^P}^T}) = \sum_{\substack{\beta \in \Delta_P \setminus \{\alpha\} \\ -\beta \notin \Delta_{Q_0}}} \beta(s);$$

we then have

$$\lambda_{\mu^P}^T(s^{-1}) \geq h_{\mu^P}(s^{-1}|\mathcal{W}^{\lambda_{\mu^P}^T}) = \sum_{\substack{\beta \in \Delta_P \setminus \{\alpha\} \\ -\beta \notin \Delta_{Q_0}}} \beta(s);$$

but as $|\Delta \setminus \Delta_{Q_0}| \geq 3$, there exists some positive root with respect to P different to both β_P^H and α , and since $s \in \text{Int}(\ker(\alpha) \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}^P})$, we get that $\lambda_{\mu^P}^T(s^{-1}) > \beta_P^H(s)$, which implies the inequality of the proposition.

Remark 5.23. The last argument is the only place in the whole proof of proposition 5.12 where we use that $|\Delta \setminus \Delta_{Q_0}| \geq 3$.

Case 2. $\lambda_{\mu^P}^T$ is resonant to $-\beta_P^H$.

We proved this case of this proposition in the proof of proposition 5.11 when $r(G) = 2$, so we assume for this case that $r(G) \geq 3$.

In this case we have $Q_0 = \text{Stab}(\mu^P) = P$ by remark 5.19. We also have that the coarse Lyapunov exponent of $\lambda_{\mu^P}^T$ equals $\chi = \{\lambda_{\mu^P}^T, -\beta_P^H\}$.

We have by lemma 5.21 that

$$h_{\mu^P}(s) = \sum_{\beta \in \Delta_P} \beta(s), \quad h_{\mu^P}(s^{-1}) = h_{\mu^P}(s^{-1}|\mathcal{W}^\chi);$$

from lemma 5.20 we obtain

$$\lambda_{\mu^P}^T(s^{-1}) + \beta_P^H(s) > h_{\mu^P}(s^{-1}|\mathcal{W}^\chi) = \sum_{\beta \in \Delta_P} \beta(s);$$

thus by canceling accordingly in the previous inequality, we obtain

$$\lambda_{\mu^P}^T(s^{-1}) > \sum_{\beta \in \Delta_P \setminus \{\beta_P^H\}} \beta(s),$$

however by lemma 5.22 the right hand side of this inequality is greater than or equal to $\beta_P^H(s)$, hence $\lambda_{\mu^P}^T(s^{-1}) > \beta_P^H(s)$, and as β_P^H is the highest root with respect to P , we obtain the result in this case.

Case 3. $\lambda_{\mu^P}^T$ is resonant to a root different than $-\beta_P^H$.

Denote by β_0 the root $\lambda_{\mu^P}^T$ is resonant to, then $-\beta_0 \in \Delta_P$ because of lemma 5.8, and $\beta_0 \notin \Delta_{Q_0}$ by Remark 5.17. We have by theorem 2.10 and lemma 5.21 that

$$h_{\mu^P}(s) = \sum_{\beta \in \Delta_P} \beta(s), \quad h_{\mu^P}(s^{-1}) = \sum_{\substack{\beta \in \Delta_P \\ -\beta \in \Delta_{Q_0}}} \beta(s) + h_{\mu^P}(s^{-1}|\mathcal{W}^\chi),$$

hence, since $h_{\mu^P}(s) = h_{\mu^P}(s^{-1})$ we obtain that

$$h_{\mu^P}(s^{-1}|\mathcal{W}^\chi) = \sum_{\substack{\beta \in \Delta_P \\ -\beta \notin \Delta_{Q_0}}} \beta(s);$$

by lemma 5.20 we obtain

$$\lambda_{\mu^P}^T(s^{-1}) + \beta_0(s^{-1}) > h_{\mu^P}(s^{-1}|\mathcal{W}^\chi) = \sum_{\substack{\beta \in \Delta_P \\ -\beta \notin \Delta_{Q_0}}} \beta(s);$$

thus

$$\lambda_{\mu^P}^T(s^{-1}) > \sum_{\substack{\beta \in \Delta_P \setminus \{-\beta_0\} \\ -\beta \notin \Delta_{Q_0}}} \beta(s),$$

however, $\beta_H^P \neq -\beta_0$ by hypothesis; $\beta_H^P \neq \alpha$ by lemma 5.8; $-\beta_P^H \notin \Delta_{Q_0}$ because of remark 5.18, and thus the right hand side of the last inequality has $\beta_P^H(s)$ as a summand, which implies $\lambda_{\mu^P}^T(s^{-1}) > \beta_P^H(s)$, and since β_P^H is the highest root with respect to P , we obtain the proposition in this case. \square

Definition 5.24. By propositions 5.11 and 5.12 we have that $\lambda_{\mu^P}^T(a^{-1}) > \beta(a)$ for all $a \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{W}^P)$ and all $\beta \in \Delta_P^+$. From we get that for μ^P -a.e. x there exists a one-dimensional global Pesin manifold associated to the Lyapunov exponent $\lambda_{\mu^P}^T$, which equals the first unstable Pesin manifold with respect to a^{-1} , $\mathcal{W}^{u,1}(x; a)$ for all $a \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{W}^P)$, see definition 2.8; which we denote by $\mathcal{W}^T(x)$ and call *transverse Pesin manifold at x* .

The name in the previous definition comes from the observation that $\mathcal{W}^T(x)$ is transversal to the G -orbits of the action $G \curvearrowright M$ at x , because of the description of the Lyapunov exponent $\lambda_{\mu^P}^T$ of μ^P . Observe that $\mathcal{W}^T(x)$ might not be contained in \mathcal{M} , unless the original given locally free action $G \curvearrowright M$ is minimal, even though μ^P is supported on this minimal set.

Remark 5.25. If $|\Delta \setminus \Delta_{Q_0}| \geq 3$, then for any α , any $s \in \text{Int}(\ker(\alpha) \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}^P})$ and any $a \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{W}^P)$, the first unstable manifold $\mathcal{W}^{u,1}(x; s)$ exists and equals $\mathcal{W}^{u,1}(x; a)$, i.e. $\mathcal{W}^T(x)$, for μ^P -a.e. x , because of lemma 2.9 and proposition 5.12.

6. CONSTRUCTION OF IMMERSED SUBMANIFOLD

Recall Q_0 is the parabolic subgroup of G equal to the stabilizer of μ^P . In this section we show that, when $|\Delta \setminus \Delta_{Q_0}| \geq 3$, there exists an injectively immersed submanifold N of M , of the same regularity as M , with the following properties:

- (i) For μ^P -a.e. x the transverse Pesin manifold $\mathcal{W}^T(x)$ is contained in N ;
- (ii) N is Q_0 invariant;
- (iii) $\dim(N) = \dim(Q_0) + 1$;
- (iv) N is an injectively immersed submanifold of M ;
- (v) N intersects injectively immersed G -orbits transversely in M ;
- (vi) If $x \in M$ and $G \cdot x \cap N \neq \emptyset$, this intersection equals $gQ \cdot x$ for some $g \in G$;
- (vii) for any $g' \in G$ we have that $g'Q \cdot x \cap gQ \cdot x \neq \emptyset$ implies $gQ = g'Q$.

We will make a different construction in the case $r(G) = 2$ in Section 6.5.

For each μ^P generic enough x , we construct an injectively immersed closed submanifold of M containing x , which we denote by N_x , obtained by taking the Q_0 orbit of the transverse Pesin manifold $\mathcal{W}^T(x)$; we then prove that, in a set of full μ^P measure, this construction yields the same manifold, which we denote N ; and we will show N satisfies the conditions listed above.

In Section 7 we prove N is in fact a closed embedded submanifold, which is equivalent to the existence of a smooth G -equivariant map $M \rightarrow G/Q$.

6.1. Essential P -equivariance of transverse Pesin manifold. In this section we prove the following assertion, under the assumption that $|\Delta \setminus \Delta_{Q_0}| \geq 3$. Recall we are working under assumption 5.1.

Proposition 6.1. *Suppose $|\Delta \setminus \Delta_{Q_0}| \geq 3$. For μ^P -a.e. x and Haar $_P$ -a.e. p we have*

$$p \cdot \mathcal{W}^T(x) = \mathcal{W}^T(px).$$

Proof. Fix $a \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{W}^P)$ such that μ^P is a -ergodic. For each $\alpha \in \Pi_P$ fix some $s_\alpha \in \text{Int}(\ker(\alpha) \cap \mathcal{W}^P)$ such that μ^P is s_α -ergodic, which exists by Assumption 5.1.

As μ^P is G^α -invariant, because of proposition 2.15, we obtain that for μ^P -a.e. x and Haar $_{G^\alpha}$ -a.e. u , the transverse Pesin manifolds $\mathcal{W}^T(x; a)$ and $\mathcal{W}^T(ux; a)$ exists; because of remark 5.25 they equal the manifolds $\mathcal{W}^T(x; s_\alpha)$ and $\mathcal{W}^T(ux; s_\alpha)$, respectively; however, u and s_α commute, this implies

$$u\mathcal{W}^T(x; s_\alpha) = u\mathcal{W}^{u,1}(x; s_\alpha) = \mathcal{W}^{u,1}(ux; s_\alpha) = \mathcal{W}^T(ux; s_\alpha),$$

by definition of the first unstable manifold and of transverse Pesin manifold, and hence

$$u\mathcal{W}^T(x; a) = u\mathcal{W}^T(x; s_\alpha) = \mathcal{W}^T(ux; s_\alpha) = \mathcal{W}^T(ux; a).$$

Since every root in Δ_P is the sum of elements of Π_P , we can use the fact that $[G^\alpha, G^\beta] = G^{\alpha+\beta}$, for all roots α and β in Δ_P such that $\alpha + \beta$ is a root, and thus belonging to Δ_P . Since G is split, and G^γ is a one dimensional non-compact group, it follows that if $A \subseteq G^\alpha$ and $B \subseteq G^\beta$ have full Haar measure, in the respective groups, any $u \in G^{\alpha+\beta}$ can be expressed as $u = [g, h]$ for some $g \in A$ and $h \in B$. Hence, since $\mathcal{W}^T(ux; a)$ exists for μ^P -a.e. x and Haar $_{G^\alpha}$ -a.e. u , we get that $u \cdot \mathcal{W}^T(x; a) = \mathcal{W}^T(ux; a)$ for μ^P -a.e. x and Haar $_{G^\alpha}$ -a.e. u , for all $\alpha \in \Delta_P$, as μ is G^α -invariant for such α .

Therefore, since $\mathcal{W}^T(-; a)$ is A -invariant, combining everything we have done with an ordering of the positive roots of P , along with Fubini's theorem, we obtain the proposition. \square

6.2. Construction of immersed submanifold N_x . We want to prove first that for any transverse Pesin manifold of a μ^P generic enough point, the Q_0 saturation of this manifold, is an immersed submanifold. This is easily achieved once the following property is shown.

Lemma 6.2. *For μ^P -a.e. x , $\mathcal{W}^T(x)$ intersects each G -orbit transversely.*

Proof. Pick a such that μ^P is a -ergodic. Suppose Birkhoff ergodic theorem holds for x with respect to a and μ^P .

There exists $\Lambda \subseteq M$ of positive μ^P measure such that for some $r > 0$ we have that for every $y \in \Lambda$ the following holds:

- (1) $\mathcal{W}^T(y)$ exists;
- (2) the closed ball of radius r in $\mathcal{W}^T(y)$ centered at y is an embedded submanifold that is transversal to the G -orbits.

The latter property holds in a set of positive μ^P measure as for μ^P -a.e. y , $\mathcal{W}^T(y)$ is transversal to $G \cdot y$ at y ,

Suppose, to get a contradiction, that $\mathcal{W}^T(x)$ intersects a G -orbit non-transversely. Let z be a point of $\mathcal{W}^T(x)$ for which this submanifold is not transnversal to $G \cdot z$ at z . As the Birkhoff ergodic theorem holds for x with respect to a and μ^P , we get that there exists a large enough $N > 0$ such that $a^N x \in \Lambda$ and $d(a^N x, a^N z) < r$. Then the ball of radius r of $\mathcal{W}^T(a^N x; a)$ centered at $a^N x$ intersects $G \cdot a^N z$ non-transversely, which contradicts (2) above. \square

Definition 6.3. For any x as in proposition 6.1, consider the set

$$N_x := Q_0 \cdot \mathcal{W}^T(x) := \{qy : q \in Q_0, y \in \mathcal{W}^T(x)\}.$$

The transversality property yields the following property.

Lemma 6.4. For μ^P -a.e. x , N_x can be given the structure of an immersed submanifold of M of dimension $\dim(Q_0) + 1$.

Proof. Let x be μ^P generic for lemma 6.2 to hold. Take any $y \in \mathcal{W}^T(x)$ and $q \in Q_0$.

Since q is a diffeomorphism $M \rightarrow M$ preserving the G -orbits foliation, and $\mathcal{W}^T(x)$ is transversal to $G \cdot y$ at y , we obtain that $D_y q[T_y \mathcal{W}^T(x)] + T_{qy} G \cdot qy$ is a vector subspace of $T_{qy} M$ of dimension $\dim(Q_0) + 1$. Hence, there exists some J , precompact neighborhood of y in $\mathcal{W}^T(x)$ diffeomorphic to $[-1, 1]$, along with some $\delta > 0$ such that the map $Q_0^{<\delta} \times J \rightarrow M$ given by $(q, z) \mapsto qz$ is an embedding onto its image.

All such embeddings endow N_x with an immersed submanifold structure as a subset of M . \square

6.3. N_x is injectively immersed. We use the equivariance property given by proposition 6.1 to show N_x is injectively immersed in M .

Lemma 6.5. For μ^P -a.e. x , N_x is an injectively immersed submanifold of M , of dimension $\dim(Q_0) + 1$.

Proof. Let x be μ^P -generic enough for Definition 6.3 to hold. Suppose that for some $q_0 \in Q_0$ and some $z_0, z_1 \in \mathcal{W}^T(x)$ we have $q_0 z_0 = z_1$. The injectively immersed submanifolds $\mathcal{W}^T(x)$ and $q_0 \cdot \mathcal{W}^T(x)$ intersect at $z_1 = q_0 z_0$. By proposition 6.1 there exists some $q_1 \in Q$ such that both $\mathcal{W}^T(q_1 x)$ and $\mathcal{W}^T(q_1 q_0 x)$ exist and

$$(24) \quad \mathcal{W}^T(q_1 x) = q_1 \mathcal{W}^T(x), \mathcal{W}^T(q_1 q_0 x) = q_1 q_0 \mathcal{W}^T(x).$$

Then $q_1 z_1 = q_1 q_0 z_0$ belongs to both $\mathcal{W}^T(q_1 x)$ and $\mathcal{W}^T(q_1 q_0 x)$, hence these two submanifolds are equal, and in particular by (24) this implies $\mathcal{W}^T(x) = q_0 \mathcal{W}^T(x)$.

As $N_x = Q_0 \cdot \mathcal{W}^T(x)$, this argument implies the immersed submanifold N_x of M has no self-intersections, i.e., this submanifold is injectively immersed.

By the construction of N_x , and as it is an injectively immersed submanifold, it follows that the sets $U \cdot V$, where U is an open set of G and V is an open set of $\mathcal{W}^T(x)$ are a basis for the immersed topology of N_x , and hence, the dimensional assertion follows. \square

6.4. Intersections of N_x with G -orbits. The following proposition will be the most important tool to prove the properties indicated at the beginning of this section, and will also yield independence of N_x with respect to x .

Proposition 6.6. *For μ^P -a.e. x_1 and x_2 we have that if there is $z \in \mathcal{W}^T(x_1)$ such that $gz \in \mathcal{W}^T(x_2)$ for some $g \in G$, then $g \in Q$.*

Before proving this proposition, we need some lemmas and definitions.

6.4.1. Perturbations by generic elements of P and big cell of G/P .

Lemma 6.7. *For any $g \in G$ we have that for Haar $_P$ -a.e. p , $pg = up'$ for unique $u \in U(P^{\text{op}})$ and $p' \in P$. Furthermore, the Haar $_P$ -a.e. defined function $p \mapsto p'$ is absolutely continuous.*

Sketch of Proof: We do the proof only for $G = \text{SL}(n, \mathbb{R})$, the proof being similar for the other simple split Lie groups. The elements of the Weyl group W of (G, A) can be represented as column permutation matrices. Fix any $w \in W$. It can easily be verified that for a generic $p \in P$, where in this case P is the subgroup of upper triangular matrices of $\text{SL}(n, \mathbb{R})$, for each $1 \leq k \leq n$ we have $\det(pw)_k \neq 0$, where $(pw)_k$ is the upper left-hand corner $k \times k$ submatrix of pw , as pw is obtained from p by permuting its columns. Therefore, the lemma is true for all the elements of the Weyl group, by the existence theorem for LU factorization.

From the above and using the Bruhat decomposition of G with respect to P , we obtain the result. \square

Definition 6.8. Suppose α is a root of (G, A) such that $\alpha \in \Delta_P$. We say $g \in G$ has nontrivial $G^{-\alpha}$ component with respect to P if g can be factored as up , where $p \in P$ and $u \in P^{\text{op}}$ is such that if v is the element of $\text{Lie}(P^{\text{op}})$ such that $u = \exp(v)$, and v has non trivial $\mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha}$ component in the decomposition $\text{Lie}(P^{\text{op}}) = \bigoplus_{\beta \in \Delta_P} \mathfrak{g}_{-\beta}$.

Lemma 6.9. *Let $P \leq Q \leq G$ be a proper parabolic. Suppose $g \in G \setminus Q$. Then there exists a simple positive root $\alpha \in \Pi_P \setminus \Delta_Q$ such that if $pg = up'$, as in lemma 6.7, then u has nontrivial $G^{-\alpha}$ component for Haar $_P$ -a.e. p .*

Proof. By lemma 6.7, choose $p_0 \in P$ such that $p_0 g = u_1 p_1$ for some $u_1 \in U(P^{\text{op}})$ and $p_1 \in P$. Since $g \notin Q$, it follows that $u_1 \in U(P^{\text{op}}) \setminus \{e\}$, as $g \notin Q$.

Then u_1 has non-trivial $G^{-\alpha}$ component for some $\alpha \in \Delta_P$, choose such an α minimal with respect to the ordering on the roots of (G, A) with respect

to P . Choose $\gamma \in \Delta_P \cup \{0\}$, with $\alpha + \gamma \in \Pi_P$. By using commutators, it follows that for all $p \in P$, $pu_1 = u_2p_2$, for some $u_2 \in U(P^{\text{op}})$; furthermore, u_2 will have non-trivial $G^{-\alpha-\gamma}$ component for Haar $_P$ -a.e. p , in fact, the set of all $p \in P$ not satisfying this is a proper algebraic subset of P of lower dimension, and hence of Haar $_P$ measure zero.

Therefore, as $pp_0g = pu_1p_1 = u_2p_2p_1$, we obtain the result. \square

Proof of Proposition 6.6: Throughout the proof we indicate how generic, with respect to μ^P , x_1 and x_2 have to be. For each $\alpha \in \Pi_P \setminus \Delta_{Q_0}$, pick some $s_\alpha \in \text{Int}(\ker(\alpha) \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}^P})$ such that μ^P is s_α -ergodic, recall we are working under assumption 5.1.

Suppose x_1 is such that for all $\alpha \in \Pi_P$ and for Haar $_P$ -a.e. p we have the following properties:

- (i) proposition 4.8 holds for μ^P and px_1 with respect to s_α and α , for a.e. $p \in P$, which can be done as μ^P is $C_G(A) \ltimes \langle N_{s_\alpha}, G^\alpha \rangle$ -invariant, as $P = C_G(A)U(P)$ and $\langle N_{s_\alpha}, G^\alpha \rangle = U(P)$, because of our choice of s_α with respect to $\ker(\alpha)$ and \mathcal{W}^P , and because of proposition 2.15.
- (ii) Birkhoff's ergodic theorem holds for px_1 with respect to s_α and μ^P .

Suppose to get a contradiction that $g \notin Q$. Choose $p_0 \in P$ such that the following holds:

- (1) $p_0g = u_1p_1$ for some $u_1 \in U(P^{\text{op}})$ and $p_1 \in P$, such that for some $\alpha \in \Pi_P$ with $-\alpha \notin \Delta_{Q_0}$, we have that u_1 has nontrivial $G^{-\alpha}$ component, which can be done by lemma 6.9;
- (2) p_1 satisfies properties (i) and (ii) above with respect to x_1 , this can be done by the last part of lemma 6.9;
- (3) $p_0x_2 \in \text{supp}(\mu^P)$;
- (4) $p_0\mathcal{W}^T(x_2) = \mathcal{W}^T(p_0x_2)$, which can be done because of remark 5.25, and proposition 6.1.

For α as in (1), denote s_α by s to ease notation.

As $x_1 \in \text{supp}(\mu^P)$, so that $p_1x_1 \in \text{supp}(\mu^P)$; and because of (2) and (ii), it follows that there exists an increasing sequence of natural numbers $\{n_k\}_k$ such that $s^{n_k}p_1x_1$ converges to p_1x_1 as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

We have that u_1 has nontrivial $G^{-\alpha}$ component, which implies $s^{n_k}u_1s^{-n_k}$ converges to some $v_1 \in G^{-\alpha} \setminus \{e\}$.

However, by both lemmas 5.8 and 5.16 we have that $\lambda_{\mu^P}(s) < 0$, since $s \in \text{Int}(\ker(\alpha) \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}^P})$, by remark 5.25 we get that since $z \in \mathcal{W}^T(x_1) = \mathcal{W}^T(x_1; s)(z$ as in our hypothesis),

$$d(s^{n_k}p_1z, s^{n_k}p_1x_1) \rightarrow 0$$

which implies $s^{n_k}p_1z \rightarrow p_1x_1$, as $s^{n_k}p_1x_1 \rightarrow p_1x_1$, which in turn implies

$$(25) \quad s^{n_k}u_1p_1z = (s^{n_k}u_1s^{-n_k})s^{n_k}p_1z \rightarrow v_1p_1x_1.$$

However, $u_1p_1z = p_0gz \in p_0\mathcal{W}^T(x_2)$, hence, by (4), we obtain $u_1p_1z \in \mathcal{W}^T(p_0x_2) = \mathcal{W}^T(p_0x_2, s)$; so that by definition of transverse Pesin manifold

it follows that

$$d(s^n u_1 p_1 z, s^n p_0 x_2) \rightarrow 0;$$

this, along with (25), implies $s^{n_k} p_0 x_2 \rightarrow v_1 p_1 x_1$; this in turn proves that $v_1 p_1 x_1 \in \text{supp}(\mu^P) = \text{supp}(\mu^P)$, as $p_0 x_2 \in \text{supp}(\mu^P)$ by (3), and hence $s^n p_0 x_2 \in \text{supp}(\mu^P)$ for all n , as μ^P is P -invariant.

Therefore, by (2) and (i), and recalling Proposition 4.8, we get that μ^P is $G^{-\alpha}$ -invariant, which is a contradiction, as $-\alpha \notin \Delta_{Q_0}$, because of (1), and as $Q_0 = \text{Stab}(\mu^P)$.

This contradiction proves $g \in Q$, which finishes the proof. \square

6.5. Construction of submanifold when $r(G) = 2$. This is the case when G has Lie algebra $\mathfrak{sl}(3, \mathbb{R})$. We take P to be the closed subgroup of G corresponding to the Lie subalgebra of $\text{Lie}(G) = \mathfrak{sl}(3, \mathbb{R})$ corresponding to the upper triangular matrices of $\text{SL}(3, \mathbb{R})$. If proposition 5.12 fails, then by remark 5.13, we must have that Q_0 is a maximal parabolic subgroup of G containing P . We may assume without loss of generality that Q_0 is the Lie subgroup of G generated by $G^{\beta_{2,1}}$ and P .

If proposition 5.12 holds for μ^P in this case, we are done by remark 5.13. Let us assume this is not the case for the rest of the section.

By assumption 5.1 and theorem 2.1 there exists $s \in \ker(\beta_{2,3}) \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}^P} \setminus \{e\}$ such that μ^P is s -ergodic.

As $Q_0 = \langle G^{\beta_{2,1}}, P \rangle$, and since proposition 5.12 fails for μ^P , it follows from our choice of s that

$$(26) \quad h_{\mu^P}(s) = (\beta_{1,3} + \beta_{1,2})(s) \text{ and } h_{\mu^P}(s^{-1}) = \beta_{2,1}(s^{-1}) + h_{\mu^P}(s^{-1} | \mathcal{W}^{\lambda_{\mu^P}^T}),$$

where both equalities follow from Q_0 -invariance of μ^P ; and the last equality follows from theorem 2.10, along with the fact that, in this case, because of lemma 5.8, $\lambda_{\mu^P}^T$ can only be resonant to $-\beta_P^H = \beta_{3,1}$, for otherwise, Q_0 would be P because of remark 5.19, which would contradict that $\lambda_{\mu^P}^T$ is not resonant to a root. As $h_{\mu^P}(s) = h_{\mu^P}(s^{-1})$ and $\beta_{1,2}(s) = \beta_{2,1}(s^{-1})$, we obtain

$$h_{\mu^P}(s^{-1} | \mathcal{W}^{\lambda_{\mu^P}^T}) = \beta_{1,3}(s)$$

Since we are assuming proposition 5.12 is false on $\ker(\beta_{2,3})$, we get that $\lambda_{\mu^P}^T(s^{-1}) \leq \beta_{1,3}(s)$, however

$$\beta_{1,3}(s) = h_{\mu^P}(s^{-1} | \mathcal{W}^{\lambda_{\mu^P}^T}) \leq \lambda_{\mu^P}^T(s^{-1}) \leq \beta_{1,3}(s),$$

which implies

$$(27) \quad h_{\mu^P}(s^{-1} | \mathcal{W}^{\lambda_{\mu^P}^T}) = \lambda_{\mu^P}^T(s^{-1})$$

We have thus proved the following:

Proposition 6.10. *If $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}(3, \mathbb{R})$ and the inequality in proposition 5.12 fails, then μ^P is equivalent to the Riemannian volume along the Pesin partition $\mathcal{W}_{\mu^P}^{\lambda_T^P}$, with nowhere vanishing smooth Radon-Nikodym derivative.*

Proof. This is a consequence of (27) along with the Ledrappier-Young Theorem, see [LY85a, Theorem A] and the remark after it. \square

Now we prove proposition 6.6 in the case $r(G) = 2$.

Proof of Proposition 6.6 when $r(G) = 2$: Let x_1 and x_2 be μ^P generic enough. Suppose there are $z \in \mathcal{W}^T(x_1)$ and $g \in G$ such that $gz \in \mathcal{W}^T(x_2)$. Suppose, to get a contradiction, that $g \notin Q_0$.

By proposition 6.10 we may take z_1 as close to z as necessary in $\mathcal{W}^T(x_1)$ so that there exists $g_1 \in G \setminus Q_0$ with $g_1 z_1 \in \mathcal{W}^T(x_2)$, and z_1 is generic for μ^P .

Take $p_0 \in P$ such that $p_0 g_1 = u_2 p_2$ for some $u_2 \in U(P^{\text{op}})$ and $p_2 \in P$ such that the following holds:

- (1) $p_2 z_1$ is μ^P generic enough, in particular, such that $p_2 z_1 \in \text{supp}(\mu^P)$ by Proposition 6.10 and Lemma 6.7.
- (2) u_2 has nontrivial $G^{-\alpha}$ -component for some $\alpha \in \Pi_P$ with $-\alpha \notin \Delta_{Q_0}$, because of lemma 6.9.

As $g_1 z_1 \in \mathcal{W}^T(x_2)$, by applying proposition 6.10, we obtain $g_1 z_1 \in \text{supp}(\mu^P)$, and hence $p_0 g_1 z_1 \in \text{supp}(\mu^P)$ by P -invariance of μ^P .

Take $s \in \ker(\alpha) \cap \mathcal{W}^P$ such that μ^P is s -ergodic, which can be done by assumption 5.1.

By (1) above and Birkhoff's ergodic theorem, there exists an increasing sequence $\{n_k\}_k$ such that

$$d(s^{n_k} p_2 z_1, p_2 z_1) \rightarrow 0,$$

which implies $v_2 p_2 z_1 \in \text{supp}(\mu^P)$, where

$$v_2 := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s^n u_2 s^{-n}$$

is such that $v_2 \in G^{-\alpha} \setminus \{e\}$, by (2), and since $u_2 p_2 z_1 = p_0 g_1 z_1 \in \text{supp}(\mu^P)$.

By proposition 4.8, we obtain μ^P is $G^{-\alpha}$ -invariant, which contradicts $-\alpha \notin \Delta_{Q_0}$ because of (2). Therefore we obtain the result. \square

6.6. Independence of N_x on x . Proposition 6.6 yields that N_x does not depend on any μ^P generic enough x .

Proposition 6.11. *For μ^P -a.e. x_1 and x_2 we have $N_{x_1} = N_{x_2}$.*

Proof. Fix $a \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{W}^P)$ such that μ^P is a -ergodic.

Take any open precompact subset I_j of x_j in the immersed topology of $\mathcal{W}^T(x_j) = \mathcal{W}^{u,1}(x_j; a)$ diffeomorphic to $[-1, 1]$, for $j = 1, 2$.

We may assume x_j is μ^P generic enough so that $x_j \in \text{supp}(\mu^P)$ and Birkhoff ergodic theorem holds for x_j with respect to a and μ^P , for $j = 1, 2$, so that $\{a^n x_j\}_n$ returns arbitrarily close to x_j infinitely many times. Since

$\mathcal{W}^{u,1}(x_j; a)$ is contracted by a , it follows that for *every* $y \in \mathcal{W}^{u,1}(x_j, a)$ there exists $g \in G$ and $z \in I_j$ such that $gz = y$, and hence by definition 6.3, we get

$$(28) \quad N_{x_1} \subseteq G \cdot \mathcal{W}^T(x_2) \text{ and } N_{x_2} \subseteq G \cdot \mathcal{W}^T(x_1),$$

which along with proposition 6.6 yields the proposition. \square

We now can set the following notation.

Definition 6.12. Set N to be the injectively immersed submanifold $N_x = Q_0 \cdot \mathcal{W}^T(x)$, for any x generic enough with respect to μ^P to satisfy proposition 6.11.

7. CONSTRUCTION OF SMOOTH EQUIVARIANT MAP $M \rightarrow G/Q$

In this section we construct the smooth equivariant map $\pi : M \rightarrow G/Q$ of our main result, Theorem 1.1, under assumption 5.1. The main argument to doing this, appearing in this section, is showing that N intersects all orbits of $G \curvearrowright M$.

7.1. N intersects all G -orbits. The final tool required to construct the equivariant map $M \rightarrow G/Q$ is the following fact.

Lemma 7.1. *N intersects all G -orbits*

To prove this lemma we need some technical observations.

Let us denote by m_x^T the Riemannian volume on the injectively immersed submanifold $\mathcal{W}^T(x)$, for μ^P -a.e. x . Pick any $a \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{W}^P)$ such that μ^P is a -ergodic.

Lemma 7.2. *For μ^P -a.e. x we have that*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \delta_{a^j g y} = \mu^P$$

in the weak- \star topology, for m_x^T -a.e. y and a.e. $g \in G$.

Proof. There are two cases:

Case 1. $|\Delta \setminus \Delta_{Q_0}| \geq 3$.

In this case, we prove that in fact the lemma holds for *all* $y \in \mathcal{W}^T(x)$ for μ^P -a.e. x . Indeed, if x is μ^P generic enough for proposition 6.1 and Birkhoff's ergodic theorem to hold for px , with respect to μ^P and a , for Haar $_P$ -a.e. p , then for any $y \in \mathcal{W}^{u,1}(x; a)$ we have $py \in p \cdot \mathcal{W}^T(x) = \mathcal{W}^T(px) \subseteq \mathcal{W}^s(px; a)$ for Haar $_P$ -a.e. p , and thus

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} f(a^j p y) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} f(a^j p x) = \int f d\mu^P,$$

for all $f \in C^0(M)$, as such functions are uniformly continuous; which implies that for all $u \in U(P^{\text{op}})$ we have

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} f(a^j u p y) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} f(a^j p y) = \int f d\mu^P$$

for Haar $_P$ -a.e. p , as $U(P^{\text{op}}) \leq N_a$, since $a \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{W}^P)$.

Since Haar $_G$ -a.e. g can be written uniquely in the form up , for some $u \in U(P^{\text{op}})$ and $p \in P$ by taking the biggest cell in Bruhat's decomposition, see for instance [Zim84, Lemma 5.1.4], we get the lemma in this case by applying Fubini's theorem, as the map $g \mapsto p$, where $g = up$, is analytic where defined, and therefore absolutely continuous.

Case 2. $|\Delta \setminus \Delta_{Q_0}| = 2$.

In this case, if Proposition 6.1 holds in this case, then the lemma follows from the argument for the previous case, using Remark 5.13.

Suppose proposition 6.1 does not hold. Let us denote by $(\mu^P)_x^T$ the corresponding decomposition of μ^P along the partition \mathcal{W}^T ; by proposition 6.10, $(\mu^P)_x^T$ is equivalent to Riemannian volume on $\mathcal{W}^T(x)$ for μ^P -a.e. x with nowhere vanishing smooth Radon-Nikodym derivative. We may assume x is μ^P generic enough, so that Birkhoff's ergodic theorem holds for py with respect to μ^P and a , for $(\mu^P)_x^T$ -a.e. y , and Haar $_P$ -a.e. p , as μ^P is P -invariant. By making an analogous argument to the one for the previous case, we obtain that for all $f \in C^0(M)$,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} f(a^j g y) = \int f d\mu^P,$$

for Haar $_G$ -a.e. g , $(\mu^P)_x^T$ -a.e. y , and μ^P -a.e. x , which proves the lemma for this case. \square

Let $\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_r$ be the minimal subsets of $G \curvearrowright M$ appearing in proposition 3.8, along with corresponding unique P -invariant probability measures μ_1, \dots, μ_r on $\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_r$ respectively, and let us take $\mu^P = \mu^1$, because of assumption 5.1.

Lemma 7.3. *For any $x \in M$ there exists $j = 1, \dots, r$ such that for any $y \in \text{supp}(\mu_j)$ and any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $p \in P$ such that $d_M(px, y) < \epsilon$.*

Proof. Denote by λ_P a left invariant Haar measure on P . Let $\{F_n\}_n$ be a Følner sequence of P . By proposition 3.8, it follows that for any $x \in M$ there exists an increasing sequence $\{n_k\}_k$ such that

$$\frac{1}{\lambda_P(F_{n_k})} \int_{F_{n_k}} \delta_{px} d\lambda_P(p) \rightarrow \mu$$

in the weak- \star topology, for some P -invariant probability measure μ on M . There are ρ_1, \dots, ρ_r nonnegative real numbers such that $\rho_1 + \dots + \rho_r = 1$

and $\mu = \rho_1\mu_1 + \dots + \rho_r\mu_r$. If $j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ is such that $\rho_j \neq 0$, then for any $y \in \text{supp}(\mu_j)$ and any U neighborhood of y in M , we get that there exists $p \in P$ such that $px \in U$, because of the weak- \star limit above, and as $\mu_j(U) > 0$. Therefore, our assertion follows. \square

Proof of Proposition 7.1: Pick any $a \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{W}^P)$ such that μ_j is a -ergodic for all $j = 1, \dots, r$. Choose any x , that is μ^P generic enough, so that $N = Q_0 \cdot \mathcal{W}^T(x; a)$, because of Proposition 6.11, and $x \in \text{supp}(\mu^P)$. Set

$$X = \{x \in M : gx \in N, \text{ for some } g \in G\}$$

X is open by construction of N and lemma 6.2. We want to show X is closed as well, as M is connected, this will yield the result.

Take any $z \in \overline{X}$. Fix $j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ such that lemma 7.2 holds for z ; so in particular, by our choice of x , we have that for any $\delta > 0$ there is $p \in P$ such that $d(pz, x) < \delta$.

Fix any $y \in \text{supp}(\mu_j)$ generic enough for μ_j .

Take any $f \in C^0(M)$ and any $\epsilon > 0$. Choose $\delta = \delta(y, f, 1, \epsilon) > 0$ for proposition 4.13 to hold for the measure μ_j .

There exists $p \in P$ such that $d(pz, y) < \delta$. As $z \in \overline{X}$, there is $w \in \mathcal{W}^T(x)$ such that $d(G \cdot w, z) < \delta$, and w such that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} f(a^k gw) = \int f d\mu^P$$

for Haar $_G$ -a.e. $g \in G$ by Lemma 7.2.

By our choice of δ above we have that since $d(G \cdot w, y) < \delta$, it follows, using the argument in Case 1 in the proof of Lemma 7.2, that there exists an subset V of $G \cdot w$, of positive Haar $_G$ measure, such that for all $v \in V$ we have that

$$\left| \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} f(a^k vw) - \int f d\mu_j \right| < \epsilon.$$

Combining this inequality with the previous equality we obtain

$$\left| \int f d\mu^P - \int f d\mu_j \right| < \epsilon$$

Since $f \in C^0(M)$ and $\epsilon > 0$ were arbitrary, it follows that $\mu_j = \mu^P$. Hence, by our choice of μ_j , there exists $p \in P$ such that pz is close enough to x so that $G \cdot z$ intersects N , i.e., $z \in X$.

This shows X is a closed subset, so $X = M$ by connectedness of M , which finishes the proof. \square

7.2. Construction of smooth equivariant map. We now finish the proof of the main result of this paper, Theorem 1.1, that is, we show item (2) of this theorem. This will follow immediately once we show M is G -equivariantly diffeomorphic to $G \times_{Q_0} N$. Let us first define the latter object.

Definition 7.4. Suppose L is a Lie group, with $H \leq L$ a closed subgroup. Suppose $\alpha : H \curvearrowright M$ is a left C^r ($r \geq 0$) action on a C^r manifold. We have two actions

$$L \curvearrowright L \times M \curvearrowright H$$

given by $l \cdot (l', x) = (ll', x)$ and $h \cdot (l', x) = (l'h^{-1}, hx)$, for all $l \in L, h \in H$ and all $(l', x) \in L \times M$. These actions commute, and hence, when we take the quotient of the action by H , $M^\alpha := L \times M/H$, we obtain a C^r manifold, along with an C^r action $L \curvearrowright M^\alpha$. Furthermore, the canonical projection map $M^\alpha \rightarrow L/H$ is an equivariant smooth bundle, with fibers diffeomorphic to M .

Proof of Theorem 1.1: It is enough to show M is equivariantly diffeomorphic to $G \times_{Q_0} N$.

The map $j : G \times N \rightarrow M$ given by $(g, x) \mapsto gx$ is smooth, and onto M because of Lemma 7.1.

j is a submersion as $D_{(g,x)}j$ sends $T_g G \times \{0\} \subseteq T_{(g,x)}G \times N$ to $T_{gx}(G \cdot x)$, and sends $\{0\} \times T_x N$ to $D_x g[T_x N]$, which is transversal to $T_{gx}(G \cdot x)$, as g is a diffeomorphism preserving the G -orbits.

j descends to a map $\tilde{j} : G \times_{Q_0} N \rightarrow M$, as $j(gq^{-1}, qx) = j(g, x)$, still onto M as j and \tilde{j} have the same image. The same argument as above shows \tilde{j} is a submersion.

However, $\dim(G \times_{Q_0} N) = \dim(G/Q_0) + \dim(N) = \dim(G) - \dim(Q_0) + \dim(Q_0) + 1 = \dim(G) + 1 = \dim(M)$, and the tangent space of the orbit of x under the action $Q_0 \curvearrowright G \times N$ defining the suspension space $G \times_{Q_0} N$ is contained in $\ker D_{(g,x)}\tilde{j}$, this shows \tilde{j} is a local diffeomorphism.

If $(g_1, x_1), (g_2, x_2) \in G \times N$ are such that $g_1 x_1 = j(g_1, x_1) = j(g_2, x_2) = g_2 x_2$, then $g_2^{-1} g_1 x_1 = x_2$, which implies $g_2^{-1} g_1 \in Q_0$ by proposition 6.6, which implies $[(g_1, x_1)] = [(g_2, x_2)]$, and thus, \tilde{j} is injective, and therefore, \tilde{j} is a diffeomorphism. \square

REFERENCES

- [Asa10] Masayuki Asaoka. “Regular projectively Anosov flows on three-dimensional manifolds”. In: *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)* 60.5 (2010), pp. 1649–1684. ISSN: 0373-0956,1777-5310. DOI: 10.5802/aif.2569. URL: <https://doi-org.ezproxy.rice.edu/10.5802/aif.2569>.
- [Asa12] Masayuki Asaoka. “Nonhomogeneous locally free actions of the affine group”. In: *Ann. of Math. (2)* 175.1 (2012), pp. 1–21. DOI: 10.4007/annals.2012.175.1.1.
- [BP23] Luís Barreira and Yakov Pesin. *Introduction to smooth ergodic theory*. Vol. 231. Graduate Studies in Mathematics. Second edition [of 3076414]. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2023, pp. xv+336. ISBN: 9781470470654.

- [BP02] Luis Barreira and Yakov B. Pesin. *Lyapunov exponents and smooth ergodic theory*. Vol. 23. University Lecture Series. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2002, pp. xii+151. DOI: 10.1090/ulect/023.
- [BEFH25] Aaron Brown, Alex Eskin, Simion Filip, and Federico Rodriguez Hertz. *Measure rigidity for generalized u -Gibbs states and stationary measures via the factorization method*. 2025. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.14042>.
- [BFH22] Aaron Brown, David Fisher, and Sebastian Hurtado. “Zimmer’s conjecture: subexponential growth, measure rigidity, and strong property (T)”. In: *Ann. of Math. (2)* 196.3 (2022), pp. 891–940. DOI: 10.4007/annals.2022.196.3.1.
- [BRW22] Aaron Brown, Federico Rodriguez Hertz, and Zhiren Wang. “Invariant measures and measurable projective factors for actions of higher-rank lattices on manifolds”. In: *Ann. of Math. (2)* 196.3 (2022), pp. 941–981. DOI: 10.4007/annals.2022.196.3.2.
- [BRW23] Aaron Brown, Federico Rodriguez Hertz, and Zhiren Wang. “Smooth ergodic theory of \mathbb{Z}^d -actions”. In: *J. Mod. Dyn.* 19 (2023), pp. 455–540. DOI: 10.3934/jmd.2023014.
- [Bro+19] Aaron W. Brown, Sébastien Alvarez, Dominique Malicet, Davi Obata, Mario Roldán, Bruno Santiago, and Michele Triestino. *Entropy, Lyapunov exponents, and rigidity of group actions*. 2019. arXiv: 1809.09192 [math.DS]. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1809.09192>.
- [Can03] Alberto Candel. “The harmonic measures of Lucy Garnett”. In: *Adv. Math.* 176.2 (2003), pp. 187–247. ISSN: 0001-8708. DOI: 10.1016/S0001-8708(02)00036-1.
- [Can07] Alberto Candel. *On harmonic measures and group actions*. 2007. URL: https://www.csun.edu/~ac53971/research/talk_zaragoza_out.pdf (visited on 2025).
- [CR74] G. Chatelet and H. Rosenberg. “Manifolds which admit \mathbf{R}^n actions”. In: *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.* 43 (1974), pp. 245–260.
- [DSVX25] Danijela Damjanovic, Ralf Spatzier, Kurt Vinhage, and Disheng Xu. *The Zimmer Program for partially hyperbolic actions*. 2025. arXiv: 2211.08195 [math.DS]. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2211.08195>.
- [Deo78] Vinay V. Deodhar. “On central extensions of rational points of algebraic groups”. In: *Amer. J. Math.* 100.2 (1978), pp. 303–386. DOI: 10.2307/2373853. URL: <https://doi-org.ezproxy.rice.edu/10.2307/2373853>.
- [DH20] Bertrand Deroin and Sebastian Hurtado. *Non left-orderability of lattices in higher rank semi-simple Lie groups*. 2020. arXiv: 2008.10687 [math.GR].

- [DK07] Bertrand Deroin and Victor Kleptsyn. “Random conformal dynamical systems”. In: *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 17.4 (2007), pp. 1043–1105. DOI: 10.1007/s00039-007-0606-y.
- [EL10] M. Einsiedler and E. Lindenstrauss. “Diagonal actions on locally homogeneous spaces”. In: *Homogeneous flows, moduli spaces and arithmetic*. Vol. 10. Clay Math. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2010, pp. 155–241.
- [EK03] Manfred Einsiedler and Anatole Katok. “Invariant measures on G/Γ for split simple Lie groups G ”. In: vol. 56. 8. Dedicated to the memory of Jürgen K. Moser. 2003, pp. 1184–1221. DOI: 10.1002/cpa.10092. URL: <https://doi-org.ezproxy.rice.edu/10.1002/cpa.10092>.
- [EK05] Manfred Einsiedler and Anatole Katok. “Rigidity of measures—the high entropy case and non-commuting foliations”. In: vol. 148. Probability in mathematics. 2005, pp. 169–238. DOI: 10.1007/BF02775436. URL: <https://doi-org.ezproxy.rice.edu/10.1007/BF02775436>.
- [Fur63a] Harry Furstenberg. “A Poisson formula for semi-simple Lie groups”. In: *Ann. of Math. (2)* 77 (1963), pp. 335–386. ISSN: 0003-486X. DOI: 10.2307/1970220.
- [Fur63b] Harry Furstenberg. “Noncommuting random products”. In: *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 108 (1963), pp. 377–428. ISSN: 0002-9947. DOI: 10.2307/1993589. URL: <https://doi-org.ezproxy.rice.edu/10.2307/1993589>.
- [Gar83] Lucy Garnett. “Foliations, the ergodic theorem and Brownian motion”. In: *J. Functional Analysis* 51.3 (1983), pp. 285–311. DOI: 10.1016/0022-1236(83)90015-0.
- [Ghy85] Étienne Ghys. “Actions localement libres du groupe affine”. In: *Invent. Math.* 82.3 (1985), pp. 479–526. DOI: 10.1007/BF01388867.
- [Ghy99] Étienne Ghys. “Actions de réseaux sur le cercle”. In: *Invent. Math.* 137.1 (1999), pp. 199–231. DOI: 10.1007/s002220050329.
- [God52] Roger Godement. “Une généralisation du théorème de la moyenne pour les fonctions harmoniques”. In: *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris* 234 (1952), pp. 2137–2139. ISSN: 0001-4036.
- [KS96] A. Katok and R. J. Spatzier. “Invariant measures for higher-rank hyperbolic abelian actions”. In: *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems* 16.4 (1996), pp. 751–778. ISSN: 0143-3857. DOI: 10.1017/S0143385700009081.
- [Kat23] Asaf Katz. “Measure rigidity of Anosov flows via the factorization method”. In: *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 33.2 (2023), pp. 468–540. ISSN: 1016-443X. DOI: 10.1007/s00039-023-00629-8.
- [Kna02] Anthony W. Kna. *Lie groups beyond an introduction*. Second. Vol. 140. Progress in Mathematics. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2002, pp. xviii+812. ISBN: 0-8176-4259-5.

- [LY85a] F. Ledrappier and L.-S. Young. “The metric entropy of diffeomorphisms. I. Characterization of measures satisfying Pesin’s entropy formula”. In: *Ann. of Math. (2)* 122.3 (1985), pp. 509–539. ISSN: 0003-486X. DOI: 10.2307/1971328.
- [LY85b] F. Ledrappier and L.-S. Young. “The metric entropy of diffeomorphisms. II. Relations between entropy, exponents and dimension”. In: *Ann. of Math. (2)* 122.3 (1985), pp. 540–574. ISSN: 0003-486X. DOI: 10.2307/1971329.
- [LS82] François Ledrappier and Jean-Marie Strelcyn. “A proof of the estimation from below in Pesin’s entropy formula”. In: *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems* 2.2 (1982), 203–219 (1983). ISSN: 0143-3857. DOI: 10.1017/S0143385700001528.
- [NZ99] Amos Nevo and Robert J. Zimmer. “Homogenous projective factors for actions of semi-simple Lie groups”. In: *Invent. Math.* 138.2 (1999), pp. 229–252. DOI: 10.1007/s002220050377.
- [NZ02] Amos Nevo and Robert J. Zimmer. “A structure theorem for actions of semisimple Lie groups”. In: *Ann. of Math. (2)* 156.2 (2002), pp. 565–594. DOI: 10.2307/3597198.
- [Ose68] V. I. Oseledec. “A multiplicative ergodic theorem. Characteristic Ljapunov, exponents of dynamical systems”. In: *Trudy Moskov. Mat. Obšč.* 19 (1968), pp. 179–210. ISSN: 0134-8663.
- [Pla75] J. F. Plante. “Foliations with measure preserving holonomy”. In: *Ann. of Math. (2)* 102.2 (1975), pp. 327–361. ISSN: 0003-486X.
- [PS71] Charles Pugh and Michael Shub. “Ergodic elements of ergodic actions”. In: *Compositio Math.* 23 (1971), pp. 115–122. ISSN: 0010-437X.
- [RRW70] H. Rosenberg, R. Roussarie, and D. Weil. “A classification of closed orientable 3-manifolds of rank two”. In: *Ann. of Math. (2)* 91 (1970), pp. 449–464. DOI: 10.2307/1970633.
- [SZ94] Garrett Stuck and Robert J. Zimmer. “Stabilizers for ergodic actions of higher rank semisimple groups”. In: *Ann. of Math. (2)* 139.3 (1994), pp. 723–747. DOI: 10.2307/2118577.
- [Zim84] Robert J. Zimmer. *Ergodic theory and semisimple groups*. Vol. 81. Monographs in Mathematics. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1984, pp. x+209. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4684-9488-4.
- [Zim87] Robert J. Zimmer. “Actions of semisimple groups and discrete subgroups”. In: *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Vol. 1, 2 (Berkeley, Calif., 1986)*. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1987, pp. 1247–1258.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, RICE UNIVERSITY, HOUSTON, TX 77005
 Email address: ja102@rice.edu