

LIMIT THEOREMS FOR A STRONGLY IRREDUCIBLE PRODUCT OF INDEPENDENT RANDOM MATRICES UNDER OPTIMAL MOMENT ASSUMPTIONS

AXEL PÉNEAU

ABSTRACT. Let ν be a probability distribution over the semi-group of square matrices of size $d \geq 2$. We assume that ν is proximal, strongly irreducible and that $\nu^{*n}\{0\} = 0$ for all integers $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We consider the sequence $\bar{\gamma}_n := \gamma_0 \cdots \gamma_{n-1}$ for $(\gamma_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ independent of distribution law ν . We denote by $\text{sqz}(\bar{\gamma}_n)$ the logarithm of the ratio of the two top singular values of $\bar{\gamma}_n$. We show that $(\text{sqz}(\bar{\gamma}_n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ escapes to infinity linearly and satisfies exponential large deviations inequalities below its escape rate. We also show that the image of a generic line by $\bar{\gamma}_n$ as well as its eigenspace of its maximal eigenvalue both converge to the same random line l^∞ at an exponential speed. This is an extension of results by Guivarc'h and Raugi.

If we moreover assume that the push-forward distribution $N_*\nu$ is L^p for $N : g \mapsto \log(\|g\| \|g^{-1}\|)$ and for some $p \geq 1$, then we show that $-\log d(l^\infty, H)$ is uniformly L^p for all proper subspace $H \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. Moreover the logarithm of each coefficient of $\bar{\gamma}_n$ is almost surely equivalent to the logarithm of the norm. This is an extension of results by Benoist and Quint which were themselves quantitative versions of results by Furstenberg and Kesten.

To prove these results, we do not rely on the existence of the stationary measure nor on the existence of the Lyapunov exponent. Instead we describe an effective way to group the i.i.d. factors into i.i.d. random words that are aligned in the Cartan decomposition. We moreover have an explicit control over the moments.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Preliminaries. Let $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$ be the field of real number endowed with the usual absolute value $|\cdot|$. Let $d \geq 2$ be an integer. Let $\text{End}(\mathbb{K}^d) \simeq \text{Mat}_{d \times d}(\mathbb{K})$ be the set of square matrices which we identify with the semi-group of linear maps from \mathbb{K}^d to itself. Let ν be a probability distribution on $\text{End}(\mathbb{K}^d)$ and let $(\gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sim \nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$ be a random i.i.d.¹ sequence of matrices. We will denote by $(\bar{\gamma}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} := (\gamma_0 \cdots \gamma_{n-1})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ the random walk of step ν .

Given g a square $d \times d$ matrix, let $\rho_1(g) \geq \rho_2(g) \geq \cdots \geq \rho_d(g)$ be the moduli of its eigenvalues. If g is not nilpotent, we define the spectral gap or quantitative proximality of g as:

$$(1) \quad \text{prox}(g) := \log \left(\frac{\rho_1(g)}{\rho_2(g)} \right).$$

If g is nilpotent, we define $\text{sqz}(g) = 0$. We will always consider measures that are strongly irreducible and proximal in the following sense.

Definition 1.1 (Proximality). *Let E be a vector space and let ν be a probability distribution on $\text{End}(E)$. We say that ν is proximal if both of the following conditions are satisfied:*

$$(2) \quad \exists n \in \mathbb{N}, \nu^{*n}\{\gamma \in \text{End}(E) \mid \text{prox}(\gamma) > 0\} > 0.$$

$$(3) \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \nu^{*n}\{0\} = 0.$$

Definition 1.2 (Strong irreducibility). *Let E be a vector space and let ν be a probability distribution on $\text{End}(E)$. We say that ν is irreducible if:*

$$(4) \quad \forall f \in E^* \setminus \{0\}, \forall v \in E \setminus \{0\}, \exists n \in \mathbb{N}, \nu^{*n}\{\gamma \in \text{End}(E) \mid f\gamma v \neq 0\} > 0.$$

Date: August 22, 2024.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 60B20, 60F10, 37H15, 60B15, 60F15, 60F25.

¹The abbreviation "i.i.d" is short for "independent and identically distributed" but we will prefer to write $\sim \nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$ as it allows us to specify the distribution in question as well as the set of indices of the sequence.

We say that ν is strongly irreducible if:

$$\forall N \in \mathbb{N}, \forall (f_1, \dots, f_N) \in (E^* \setminus \{0\})^N, \forall v \in E \setminus \{0\}, \exists n \in \mathbb{N}, \nu^{*n} \left\{ \gamma \in \text{End}(E) \left| \prod_{i=1}^N f_i \gamma v \neq 0 \right. \right\} > 0,$$

and $\forall N \in \mathbb{N}, \forall f \in E^* \setminus \{0\}, \forall (v_1, \dots, v_N) \in (E \setminus \{0\})^N, \exists n \in \mathbb{N}, \nu^{*n} \left\{ \gamma \in \text{End}(E) \left| \prod_{j=1}^N f \gamma v_j \neq 0 \right. \right\} > 0.$

We will work with real valued matrices but all the results still hold for complex valued matrices or for matrices with coefficients in a ultra-metric locally compact field with the same proofs. We simply need to replace the Euclidean norm with a Hermitian norm or a ultra-metric norm.

Without making any moments assumptions, we will study the behaviour of the projective class $[\overline{\gamma}_n]$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and not only asymptotically.

All the following results are corollaries of Theorem 1.10, which is the main theorem of this article. In fact Theorem 1.10 follows from Lemma 3.18 and Theorem 4.1.

1.2. Regularity results with optimal moment assumptions. Let $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$. Given two Euclidean spaces $(E, \|\cdot\|)$ and $(F, \|\cdot\|)$, we write $\text{Hom}(E, F)$ for the vector space of linear maps from E to F , we endow it with the operator norm $h \mapsto \|h\| := \max_{x \in E \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\|hx\|}{\|x\|}$. Given E a Euclidean space, we define $E^* := \text{Hom}(E, \mathbb{K})$ to be the dual space of E . Given a matrix $h \in \text{Hom}(E, F)$, we write $h^* \in \text{Hom}(F^*, E^*)$ for the composition by h on the right. Let $h \in \text{End}(E) := \text{Hom}(E, E)$. Denote by $\rho_1(h)$ the limit of $\|h^n\|^{\frac{1}{n}}$, we call $\rho_1(h)$ the spectral radius of h . Note that it is the modulus of the maximal eigenvalue of h . We denote by $\text{GL}(E)$ the group of isomorphisms of E . Given $g \in \text{GL}(E)$, we write $N(g) := \log \|g\| + \log \|g^{-1}\|$.

Let ν be a probability measure on $\text{GL}(E)$ and let $(\gamma_n) \sim \nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$.

A long standing question is whether the sequence of rescaled entries $\left(|(\overline{\gamma}_n)_{i,j}|^{\frac{1}{n}} \right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges almost surely for all $1 \leq i, j \leq d$. We know from [FK60] that if $\mathbb{E}(\log \|\gamma_0\|) < +\infty$, and without any other assumptions, then the sequence of norms $\left(\|\overline{\gamma}_n\|^{\frac{1}{n}} \right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges almost surely to a finite non-random limit that we denote by $\rho_1(\nu)$. Furstenberg and Kesten also show that $\rho_1(\nu) > 1$ when ν is strongly irreducible and supported on the group $\text{SL}(E)$. With the above assumptions and when moreover $\mathbb{E}(N(\gamma_0)^2) < +\infty$ Xiao, Grama and Liu prove in [XGL21] that the random sequence of rescaled entries $\left(|(\overline{\gamma}_n)_{i,j}|^{\frac{1}{n}} \right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges almost surely to $\rho_1(\nu)$ for all i, j . The following theorem allows us to get rid of the assumption $\mathbb{E}(N(\gamma_0)^2) < +\infty$.

Theorem 1.3 (Strong law of large numbers for the coefficients and for the spectral radius). *Let E be a Euclidean vector space. Let ν be a strongly irreducible and proximal probability measure on $\text{GL}(E)$. There exist constants $C, \beta > 0$ such that for all $f \in E^* \setminus \{0\}$, all $v \in E \setminus \{0\}$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and for $\overline{\gamma}_n \sim \nu^{*n}$, we have for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$:*

$$(5) \quad \mathbb{P} \left(\log \frac{\|f\| \|\overline{\gamma}_n\| \|v\|}{|f \overline{\gamma}_n v|} \geq t \right) \leq C \exp(-\beta n) + \sum_{k=1}^{+\infty} C \exp(-\beta k) N_* \nu \left(\frac{t}{k}, +\infty \right).$$

Moreover:

$$(6) \quad \forall t \geq 0, \mathbb{P} \left(\log \frac{\|\overline{\gamma}_n\|}{\rho_1(\overline{\gamma}_n)} \geq t \right) \leq \sum_{k=1}^{+\infty} C \exp(-\beta k) N_* \nu \left(\frac{t}{k}, +\infty \right).$$

We prove this result in Section 5.5 Note that (5) implies that for all non-random sequence $\alpha_n \rightarrow 0$ and for all $1 \leq i, j \leq \dim(E)$, the sequence $\left(\frac{|(\overline{\gamma}_n)_{i,j}|^{\alpha_n}}{\|\overline{\gamma}_n\|^{\alpha_n}} \right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly in distribution to the Dirac measure at 1, without any moment assumption.

Given $C, \beta > 0$ and ν a probability measure on $\text{GL}(E)$, we denote by $\zeta_\nu^{C,\beta}$ the probability distribution on $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ characterized by:

$$(7) \quad \forall t \geq 0, \zeta_\nu^{C,\beta}(t, +\infty) := \min \left\{ 1, \sum_{k=1}^{+\infty} C \exp(-\beta k) N_* \nu \left(\frac{t}{k}, +\infty \right) \right\}.$$

Corollary 1.4 (Almost sure convergence of the coefficients). *Let E be a Euclidean space and let ν be a strongly irreducible and proximal probability measure on $\text{GL}(E)$. Let $(\gamma_n) \sim \nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$. Assume that $\mathbb{E}(\log \|\gamma_0\|)$ and $\mathbb{E}(\log \|\gamma_0^{-1}\|)$ are both finite. Then for all $f \in E^* \setminus \{0\}$ and all $v \in E \setminus \{0\}$, we have almost surely:*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log |f \overline{\gamma}_n v|}{n} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \|\overline{\gamma}_n\|}{n} = \log(\rho_1(\nu)).$$

Proof. By Lemma A.20, for all $p \in (0, +\infty)$, there exist a constant D_p such that $M_p(\zeta_\nu^{C,\beta}) \leq D_p M_p(N_*\nu)$, where M_p is the p -th moment of a measure. Therefore, if we assume that $M_1(N_*\nu) < +\infty$, then $M_1(\zeta_\nu^{C,\beta}) < +\infty$. Then by Theorem 1.3, for all $\varepsilon > 0$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{P}(\log(\|f\| \|\overline{\gamma}_n\| \|v\|) - \log(|f\overline{\gamma}_n v|) \geq n\varepsilon) &\leq \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} C \exp(-\beta n) + \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \zeta_\nu^{(C,\beta)}(n\varepsilon, +\infty) \\ &\leq \frac{C}{\beta} + \varepsilon^{-1} M_1(\zeta_\nu^{C,\beta}) < +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Then by Borel-Cantelli's Lemma, we have $n^{-1} \log \frac{\|f\| \|\overline{\gamma}_n\| \|v\|}{|f\overline{\gamma}_n v|} \rightarrow 0$ almost surely. Then we can apply [FK60, Theorem 1] which tells us that $n^{-1} \log \|\overline{\gamma}_n\| \rightarrow \log(\rho_1(\nu))$. \square

The following Corollary is about the regularity of the stationary measure. The formulation (9) is analogous to the regularity result for the stationary measure on hyperbolic groups [BQ16c, Proposition 5.1]. This is also an improvement of [BQ16b, Proposition 4.5].

Let E be a Euclidean space and $V \subset E$ be a proper subspace and let $0 < r \leq 1$. We define $\mathcal{N}_r(V) := \{l \in \mathbf{P}(E) \mid \exists v \in V \setminus \{0\}, d([v], l) < r\}$. The weak and strong polynomial moments are defined in Definition A.12.

Corollary 1.5 (Regularity of the measure). *Let E be a Euclidean vector space. Let ν be a strongly irreducible and proximal probability measure on $\mathrm{GL}(E)$. Let C, β be as in Theorem 1.3 and let ξ_ν^∞ be the ν -stationary measure as in Theorem 5.6. Then we have:*

$$(8) \quad \forall V \in \mathrm{Gr}(E) \setminus \{E\}, \forall 0 < r \leq 1, \xi_\nu^\infty(\mathcal{N}_r(V)) \leq \zeta_\nu^{C,\beta}(|\log(r)|, +\infty)$$

Let $p > 0$. If we assume that $N_*\nu$ has finite strong L^p moment, then there exists a constant C' such that:

$$(9) \quad \forall V \in \mathrm{Gr}(E) \setminus \{E\}, \int_{l \in \mathbf{P}(E)} |\log d(\mathbf{P}(V), l)|^p d\xi_\nu^\infty(l) \leq C'.$$

If we assume that $N_*\nu$ has finite weak L^p moment, then there exists a constant C' such that:

$$(10) \quad \forall V \in \mathrm{Gr}(E) \setminus \{E\}, \forall 0 < r < 1, \xi_\nu^\infty(\mathcal{N}_r(V)) \leq C' |\log(r)|^{-p}.$$

Note that by Lemma A.20, the probability distribution $\zeta_\nu^{C,\beta}$ is in the same integrability class as $N_*\nu$. Inequalities (9) and (10) follow directly from that observation and from (8). We prove Theorem 1.3 and (8) from Corollary 1.5 in Section 5.5.

1.3. Contraction results without moment assumptions. Let E be a Euclidean vector space, and let $1 \leq k \leq \dim(E)$ be an integer. We denote by $\bigwedge^k E$ the k -th exterior product of E , *i.e.*, the minimal-up-to-isomorphism space that factorises all alternate k -linear maps. It naturally comes with a k -linear alternate map $E^k \rightarrow \bigwedge^k E; (v_1, \dots, v_k) \mapsto v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge v_k$. We endow $\bigwedge^k E$ with the canonical Euclidean metric, which is characterized by the fact that for all family $(v_1, \dots, v_k) \in E^k$, one has $\|v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge v_k\| \leq \|v_1\| \cdots \|v_k\|$, with equality when the family (v_1, \dots, v_k) is orthogonal.

Let E and F be Euclidean spaces and let $h \in \mathrm{Hom}(E, F)$. We define the squeeze coefficient or logarithmic singular gap of h as follows:

$$(11) \quad \mathrm{sqz}(h) := \log \left(\frac{\|h\| \|h\|}{\|h \wedge h\|} \right).$$

It is the logarithm of the ratio between the first and second largest singular values (counted with multiplicity). Note that then by the spectral theorem, for all square matrix h which is not nilpotent, we have $\frac{\mathrm{sqz}(h^n)}{n} \rightarrow \mathrm{prox}(h)$.

Theorem 1.6 (Quantitative estimate of the escape speed). *Let E be a Euclidean space and let ν be a proximal and strongly irreducible probability distribution on $\mathrm{End}(E)$. Let $(\gamma_n) \sim \nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$. Write $\overline{\gamma}_n := \gamma_0 \cdots \gamma_{n-1}$ for all n . Then there exists a positive constant $\sigma(\nu) \in (0, +\infty]$ such that almost surely $\frac{\mathrm{sqz}(\overline{\gamma}_n)}{n} \rightarrow \sigma(\nu)$. Moreover, we have the following large deviations inequalities:*

$$(12) \quad \forall \alpha < \sigma(\nu), \exists C, \beta > 0, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \mathbb{P}(\mathrm{sqz}(\overline{\gamma}_n) \leq \alpha n \cup \mathrm{prox}(\overline{\gamma}_n) \leq \alpha n) \leq C \exp(-\beta n).$$

Let ν be a probability measure on $\mathrm{GL}(E)$. Let $(\gamma_n) \sim \nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$. Assume that $\mathbb{E}(\log \|\gamma_0\|) < +\infty$. Then we know from sub-additivity [FK60] that $\frac{\log \|\overline{\gamma}_n\|}{n} \rightarrow \log(\rho_1(\nu))$. Let $\log(\rho_2(\nu))$ be the second Lyapunov exponent of ν . Again by sub-additivity, $\frac{\log \|\overline{\gamma}_n \wedge \overline{\gamma}_n\|}{n} \rightarrow \log(\rho_1(\nu)) + \log(\rho_2(\nu))$. Hence $\frac{\mathrm{sqz}(\overline{\gamma}_n)}{n} \rightarrow \log(\rho_1(\nu)) - \log(\rho_2(\nu))$, which is therefore equal to $\sigma(\nu)$ from Theorem 1.6. A celebrated result by Guivarc'h and Raugi [GR86] asserts that this difference is positive when ν is strongly irreducible

and proximal. Without the first moment assumption, the Lyapunov coefficients $\rho_1(\nu)$ and $\rho_2(\nu)$ do not make sense and in general, the sequence $\|\overline{\gamma}_n\|^{\frac{1}{n}}$ does not converge almost surely. Still Theorem 1.6 above shows that the limit $\sigma(\nu) = \lim \frac{\text{sqz}(\overline{\gamma}_n)}{n}$ still exists and is a positive constant. In that sense, the first part of the above theorem is an extension of Guivarc'h and Raugi's theorem to all strongly irreducible and proximal probability measures. Moreover, the quantitative estimates (12) are new even in the setting of [GR86]. In fact they are key to our approach. We deduce the qualitative convergence from the strong quantitative estimates.

We denote by $\mathbf{P}(E)$ the projective space associated to E *i.e.*, the set of vector lines in E . Write $[\cdot] : E \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbf{P}(E)$ for the projection map. We endow $\mathbf{P}(E)$ with the metric:

$$(13) \quad d : ([x], [y]) \mapsto \frac{\|x \wedge y\|}{\|x\| \|y\|}.$$

Let h be a square matrix such that $\text{prox}(h) > 0$. Then the top eigenvalue of h is simple and real. We write $E^+(h)$ for the associated eigenspace which is a real line.

Theorem 1.7 (Quantitative convergence of the image). *Let ν be a strongly irreducible and proximal probability distribution on $\text{End}(E)$. Let $(\gamma_n) \sim \nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$. There exists a random line $l^\infty \in \mathbf{P}(E)$ such that for all $\alpha < \sigma(\nu)$, there exist constants $C, \beta > 0$, such that:*

$$(14) \quad \forall v \in E \setminus \{0\}, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \mathbb{P}(d([\overline{\gamma}_n v], l^\infty) \geq \exp(-\alpha n) \mid \overline{\gamma}_n v \neq 0) \leq C \exp(-\beta n),$$

$$(15) \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \mathbb{P}(\text{prox}(\overline{\gamma}_n) = 0 \cup d(E^+(\overline{\gamma}_n), l^\infty) \geq \exp(-\alpha n)) \leq C \exp(-\beta n)$$

We moreover show in Proposition 3.7 that the set of vectors $v \in E$ such that $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{P}(\overline{\gamma}_n v = 0) > 0$ is a countable union of proper subspaces of E . We denote this set by $\underline{\ker}(\nu)$. In this proposition, we also show that $\mathbb{P}(\overline{\gamma}_n v = 0)$ is bounded away from 1, uniformly in $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $v \in E \setminus \{0\}$.

Note that if two random lines l^∞ and l'^∞ satisfy (14) then we have $l^\infty = l'^\infty$ almost surely. We define ξ_ν^∞ to be the distribution of l^∞ . Then ξ_ν^∞ is the only ν -stationary measure on $\mathbf{P}(E)$ in the sense that $\nu * \xi_\nu^\infty = \xi_\nu^\infty$. Moreover, we have the following exponential mixing property.

Corollary 1.8 (Proximality implies exponential mixing). *Let ν be any strongly irreducible and proximal distribution on $\text{End}(E)$. There is a unique ν -stationary probability distribution ξ_ν^∞ on $\mathbf{P}(E)$. Moreover, there exist constants C, β such that for all probability distribution ξ on $\mathbf{P}(E) \setminus \underline{\ker}(\nu)$ and for all Lipschitz function $f : \mathbf{P}(E) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with Lipschitz constant $\lambda(f)$, we have:*

$$(16) \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \left| \int_{\mathbf{P}(E)} f d\xi_\nu^\infty - \int_{\mathbf{P}(E)} f d\nu^{*n} * \xi \right| \leq \lambda(f) C \exp(-\beta n).$$

Note that saying that ξ is supported on $\mathbf{P}(E) \setminus \underline{\ker}(\nu)$ is not very restrictive because any measure that gives measure 0 to all hyperplanes would satisfy that condition. However, ξ_ν^∞ itself may give positive measure to some hyperplanes. For example if ν is the barycentre of the Haar measure on the group of isometries and a Dirac mass δ_π at a projection endomorphism π , then ξ_ν^∞ is the average of the isometry-invariant measure and of the Dirac mass on the image of π . In particular ξ_ν^∞ gives positive measure to any hyperplane that contains the image of π .

Note that if ν is supported on $\text{GL}(E)$, then $\underline{\ker}(\nu) = \{0\}$. The existence and uniqueness of the stationary measure are well known in this case. This was in fact the first step towards the formalization of boundary theory by Furstenberg [Fur73]. Even in this case, with the pivoting technique, we get regularity results for the stationary measure which are better than the ones obtained using ergodic theory.

Let $p \in (0, +\infty)$ and let η be a probability measure on $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. We say that η is strongly L^p if $M_p(\eta) := \int_{t=0}^{+\infty} t^{p-1} \eta(t, +\infty) dt < +\infty$ and we say that η is weakly L^p if $W_p(\eta) := \sup_{t \geq 0} t^p \eta(t, +\infty) < +\infty$.

Given E a vector space and $k \leq \dim(E)$, we denote by $\text{Gr}_k(E)$ the set of k -dimensional subspaces of E .

1.4. Alignment and pivotal extraction. An important tool that we will use is the notion of alignment of matrices that we define as follows:

Definition 1.9 (Coarse alignment of matrices). *Let g, h be two matrices whose product is well defined. Let $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$, we say that g is ε -coarsely aligned to h and we write $g \mathbb{A}^\varepsilon h$ if we have:*

$$(17) \quad \|gh\| \geq \varepsilon \|g\| \|h\|.$$

An important observation is that (17) (together with the sub-multiplicativity of the norm on $\bigwedge^2 E$) implies that $\text{sqz}(gh) \geq \text{sqz}(g) + \text{sqz}(h) - 2|\log(\varepsilon)|$ (see Lemma 2.8).

Using the pivoting technique, we will prove theorem 1.10 below. To give a precise statement we need to introduce some notations.

Let $\Gamma = \text{GL}(E)$ or $\Gamma = \text{End}(E)$. We will write $\tilde{\Gamma}$ for the semi-group of words with letters in Γ *i.e.*, the set of all tuples $\bigsqcup_{l \in \mathbb{N}} \Gamma^l$, (where Γ^l is identified with $\Gamma^{\{0, \dots, l-1\}}$ and endowed with the product σ -algebra for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$) that we endow with the concatenation product

$$\odot : \begin{array}{ccc} \tilde{\Gamma} \times \tilde{\Gamma} & \longrightarrow & \tilde{\Gamma} \\ ((\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_{k-1}), (\gamma'_0, \dots, \gamma'_{l-1})) \in \Gamma^k \times \Gamma^l & \longmapsto & (\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_{k-1}, \gamma'_0, \dots, \gamma'_{l-1}) \in \Gamma^{k+l}. \end{array}$$

We also define the length functor:

$$L : \tilde{\Gamma} \longrightarrow \mathbb{N}; (\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_{k-1}) \longmapsto k,$$

and the product functor:

$$\Pi : \tilde{\Gamma} \longrightarrow \Gamma; (\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_{k-1}) \longmapsto \gamma_0 \cdots \gamma_{k-1}.$$

Moreover, for all $0 \leq k < l$, we define $\chi_k^l : \Gamma^l \rightarrow \Gamma$ to be the k -th coordinate projection.

Let I be a countable set, let $(\zeta_i)_{i \in I}$ be a family of probability distributions on $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Let η be a probability distribution on $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. We say that η dominates the family $(\zeta_i)_{i \in I}$ if there exists a constant C such that $\zeta_i(t, +\infty) \leq C\eta(t/C - C, +\infty)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and all $i \in I$.

Let $(\eta_i)_{i \in I}$ be a family of probability distribution on $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. We say that (η_i) has a bounded exponential moment if there exist constants $C, \beta > 0$ such that $\eta_i(t, +\infty) \leq C \exp(-\beta t)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $i \in I$. Note that saying that a family $(\eta_i)_{i \in I}$ has a bounded exponential moment is not the same as saying that each η_i has a finite exponential moment because the exponent β and the constant C may depend on the index $i \in I$. We say that a family of random variables has a bounded exponential moment if the family of their distributions have.

Given A a measurable event *i.e.*, a measurable subset of a measurable space X , we write $\mathbb{1}_A$ for the indicator function of A , it is the measurable function that takes value 1 on A and value 0 on $X \setminus A$.

Theorem 1.10 (Pivotal extraction). *Let E be a Euclidean vector space. Let $\Gamma \in \{\text{End}(E), \text{GL}(E)\}$ and let N be a continuous map defined on Γ . Let ν be a strongly irreducible and proximal probability distribution over Γ . Let $\rho < 1$ and let $K \in \mathbb{N}$. There exist $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$ and three probability distributions $(\tilde{\kappa}_0, \tilde{\kappa}_1, \tilde{\kappa}_2)$ supported on $\tilde{\Gamma}$ that satisfy conditions (1) to (6). For all $i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$, we write $\kappa_i := \Pi_* \tilde{\kappa}_i$.*

- (1) *We have $\tilde{\kappa}_0 \odot (\tilde{\kappa}_1 \odot \tilde{\kappa}_2)^{\odot \mathbb{N}} = \nu^{\odot \mathbb{N}}$, we say that $\tilde{\kappa}_0 \otimes (\tilde{\kappa}_1 \otimes \tilde{\kappa}_2)^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$ is an extraction of $\nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$.*
- (2) *The push-forward measures $L_* \tilde{\kappa}_0$ and $L_* \tilde{\kappa}_2$ have a bounded exponential moment and $L_* \tilde{\kappa}_1 = \delta_m$ is the Dirac mass at a positive integer denoted by m .*
- (3) *The measure $\tilde{\kappa}_1$ has compact support in $\tilde{\Gamma}$ and $\kappa_1 \{\gamma \in \Gamma \mid \text{sqz}(\gamma) \geq K |\log(\varepsilon)| + K \log(2)\} = 1$.*
- (4) *Given $(g_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sim \kappa_0 \otimes (\kappa_1 \otimes \kappa_2)^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$, and $0 \leq i < j < k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $g_i \cdots g_{j-1} \mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{4}} g_j \cdots g_{k-1}$ almost surely.*
- (5) *For all $g \in \Gamma$, we have $\kappa_1 \{\gamma \in \Gamma \mid g \mathbb{A}^{\varepsilon} \gamma\} \geq 1 - \rho$ and $\kappa_1 \{\gamma \in \Gamma \mid \gamma \mathbb{A}^{\varepsilon} g\} \geq 1 - \rho$.*
- (6) *Let $i \in \{0, 2\}$ and let $k < l$ be integers such that $L_* \tilde{\kappa}_i \{l\} > 0$. Let:*

$$\zeta_{i,k,l} := N_*(\chi_k^l)_* \frac{(\mathbb{1}_{L=l}) \tilde{\kappa}_i}{L_* \tilde{\kappa}_i \{l\}}$$

be the push-forward by N of the conditional distribution of the k -th marginal of $\tilde{\kappa}_i$ relatively to the event $L(\tilde{g}) = l$. Then the family $(\zeta_{i,k,l})$ is dominated by the push-forward measure $N_ \nu$.*

Only points (1) to (5) are used in the proofs of Theorems 1.6 and 1.7 and point (6) is more technical and is only used in the proof of Theorem 1.3.

Note that if we moreover assume that N is sub-additive, then points (6) and (2) imply that for $i \in \{0, 2\}$ the distribution $N_* \kappa_i$ is virtually dominated by $N_* \nu$, in the sense that there exist constants $C, \beta > 0$ such that $N_* \kappa_i(t, +\infty) \leq \sum_{k=1}^{+\infty} C \exp(-\beta k) N_* \nu(t/(Ck) - C, +\infty)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. This is a consequence of Lemmas A.18 and Lemma A.19. Then by Lemma A.20, it means that if $N_* \nu$ has finite p -th moment, then $N_* \kappa_i$ also has.

Note also that if $N_* \nu$ has a finite exponential moment, then $N_* \kappa_i$ also has for all $i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$. However, this is not a consequence of (6) but a consequence of (2) and of Lemma A.3.

1.5. Background. The study of products of random matrices bloomed with the eponym article [FK60] where Furstenberg and Kesten construct an escape speed for the logarithm of the norm using the sub-additivity. This proof was generalized by Kingman's sub-additive ergodic Theorem [Kin68]. This article followed the works of Bellman [Bel54] who showed the almost sure convergence of the rescaled logarithms of coefficients as well as a central limit theorem for one specific example. In [FK60] Furstenberg and Kesten show that we have a law of large numbers for the norm under a strong L^1 moment condition for $\log \|\cdot\|$. For matrices that have positive entries and under an L^∞ moment condition, they show that moreover, we have a law of large numbers for the coefficients (entries) and under an additional $L^{2+\delta}$ moment assumption, they show that we have a central limit Theorem. These works on matrices inspired the theory of measurable boundary theory for random walks on groups [Fur73]. In [BL85], Bougerol and Lacroix give an overview of the field of study with applications to quantum physics.

In [GR86], Guivarc'h and Raugi show a qualitative version of Theorem 1.6: in the case when ν is proximal and strongly irreducible, the two top Lyapunov exponents are distinct. In [GR89] the same authors show that we have almost sure convergence of the limit flag for totally strongly irreducible distributions. In [GM89] Goldsheid and Margulis show that the distribution ν is proximal and totally strongly irreducible when the support of ν generates a Zariski-dense sub-group of $SL(E)$.

In [BQ16a] Yves Benoist and Jean-François Quint give an extensive state of the art overview of the field of study with an emphasis on the algebraic properties of semi-groups. Later, in [XGL21] Xiao, Grama and Liu use [BQ16b] to show that coefficients satisfy a law of large numbers under some technical L^2 moment assumption. We can also mention [GQX20] and [XGL22] that give other probabilistic estimates for the distribution of the coefficients. The strong law of large numbers and central limit-theorem for the spectral radius were proven by Aoun and Sert in [Aou20] and in [AS21] under an L^2 moment assumption.

The importance of alignment of matrices was first noted in [AMS95] along with the importance of Schottky sets. Those notions were then used by Aoun in [Aou11] where he uses it to show that independent draws of an irreducible random walk that has finite exponential moment generate a free group outside of an exponentially rare event (note that the pivoting technique allows us to drop the finite exponential moment assumption). In [CDJ16] and [CDM17], Cuny, Dedecker, Jan and Merlevède give KMT estimates for the behaviour of $(\log \|\overline{\gamma}_n\|)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ under L^p moment assumptions for $p > 2$.

The main difference between these previous works and this paper is that the measure ν has to be supported on the General Linear group $GL(E)$ for the above methods to work. Indeed, they rely of the existence of the stationary measure ξ_ν^∞ on $\mathbf{P}(E)$, which is a consequence of the fact that $GL(E)$ acts continuously on $\mathbf{P}(E)$, which is compact. Some work has been done to study non-invertible matrices in the specific case of matrices that have real positive coefficients. In [FK60], Furstenberg and Kesten show limit laws for the coefficients under an L^∞ moment assumption, in [Muk87] and [KS84] Mukherjea, Kesten and Spitzer show some limit theorems for matrices with non-negative entries that are later improved by Hennion in [Hen97] and more recently improved by Cuny, Dedecker and Merlevède in [CDM23].

In [LP82], Le Page shows the exponential mixing property by exhibiting a spectral gap for the action of ν on the projective space under some moments assumptions on ν . The large deviations inequalities were already known for the norm in the specific case of distributions having finite exponential moment by the works of Sert [Ser18].

1.6. Method used. To prove the results, we use Markovian extractions. The idea is to adapt the following "toy model" construction to the case of matrices.

Let $G = \langle a, b, c | a^2 = b^2 = c^2 = \mathbf{1}_G \rangle$ be the free right angle Coxeter group with 3 generators. One can see the elements of G as reduced words in $\{a, b, c\}$, *i.e.*, finite sequences of letters of type (x_1, \dots, x_n) without double letters in the sense that $x_i \neq x_{i+1}$ for all $1 \leq i < n$. We write $\Sigma := \{a, b, c\}^{(\mathbb{N})}$ for the set of words in the alphabet $\{a, b, c\}$. We write $\mathbf{1}_\Sigma$ for the empty word, which is the identity element of Σ . We write \odot for the concatenation product on Σ and $\Pi : \Sigma \rightarrow G$ the word reduction map which is a monoid morphism.

We consider the simple random walk on the 3-tree, seen as the Cayley graph of G . Draw a random independent uniformly distributed sequence of letters $(l_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \{a, b, c\}^{\mathbb{N}}$. Then for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, write $g_n := l_0 \cdots l_{n-1} \in G$ for the position of the random walk at step n and $\tilde{g}_n := (l_0, \dots, l_{n-1})$ the word encoding the trajectory of the random walk up to step n . Then we know that (g_n) almost surely escapes to a point in ∂G , the set of infinite simple words. To prove it, we can show, using Markov's inequality, that $\mathbb{P}(g_n = \mathbf{1}_G) \leq \left(\frac{8}{9}\right)^{n/2}$. Indeed, given $n \in \mathbb{N}$, if $|g_n| \geq 1$, then $|g_{n+1}| = |g_n| + 1$ with probability $\frac{2}{3}$ and $|g_{n+1}| = |g_n| - 1$ with probability $\frac{1}{3}$ and if $|g_n| = 0$, then $|g_{n+1}| = |g_n| + 1$ with probability 1. It

implies that:


$$(18) \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \mathbb{E} \left(\sqrt{2}^{-|g_{n+1}|} \right) \leq \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{3} \mathbb{E} \left(\sqrt{2}^{-|g_n|} \right). \quad \text{Hence} \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \mathbb{E} \left(\sqrt{2}^{-|g_n|} \right) \leq \left(\frac{8}{9} \right)^{n/2}.$$

Therefore (g_n) visits $\mathbf{1}_G$ only finitely many times. After that it gets trapped in a branch (the set of simple words starting with a given letter $x_1 \in \{a, b, c\}$). Then using the same argument, (g_n) visits the first node of this branch only finitely many times and then escapes along the branch starting with $x_1 x_2$ for some $x_2 \neq x_1$ and by induction, one can show that (g_n) escapes along a branch (x_1, x_2, \dots) (i.e., an infinite reduced word).

By symmetry, one can show that for all $k > 1$, the distribution of the letter x_k knowing x_1, \dots, x_{k-1} is the uniform distribution on $\{a, b, c\} \setminus \{x_{k-1}\}$. For all $k \geq 1$, we define the k -th pivotal time of the sequence (l_n) as $t_k := \min\{t \in \mathbb{N} \mid \forall j \geq t, |g_j| \geq k\}$. For example $t_0 = 0$ and t_1 is the first time after the last visit in $\mathbf{1}_G$. Then for $k \geq 2$, the time t_k follows the time of last visit in the closed ball of radius $k - 1$. An interesting observation is that for all $k \geq 1$, we have $x_k = l_{t_{k-1}} = l_{t_{k-1}} l_{t_{k-1}+1} \cdots l_{t_k-1}$.

Then instead of drawing the sequence $(l_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of letters, we can draw the limit $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ first and then the letters $(l_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ as follows.


Write $X = \{a, b, c, s\}$, (s like "start") and endow X with a transition kernel p such that $p(i, j) = \frac{1}{2}$ for all $i \neq j \in \{a, b, c\}$ and $p(s, i) = \frac{1}{3}$ for $i \in \{a, b, c\}$.



Let $x_0 = s$ and draw a Markov chain $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in (X, p) . It means that we have:

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \forall l \in X, \mathbb{P}(x_{n+1} = l \mid x_0, \dots, x_n) = p(x_n, l).$$

Then the sequence $(x_k)_{k \geq 1}$ has the same distribution as the sequence $l_{t_{k-1}}$ defined above. Moreover, the distribution of the word $(l_{t_k}, \dots, l_{t_{k+1}-1})$ only depends on x_k and x_{k+1} and not on the time $k \geq 1$. Write $\tilde{\nu}_{a,b}$ for the distribution of $(l_{t_k}, \dots, l_{t_{k+1}-1})$ knowing that $l_{t_k-1} = a$ and $l_{t_{k+1}-1} = b$ and write $\tilde{\nu}_{s,a}$ for the distribution of the word (l_0, \dots, l_{t_1-1}) knowing that $l_{t_1-1} = a$. Both are probability distributions on Σ . In the same fashion, we define the whole decoration:



Then instead of drawing the (l_n) 's uniformly and independently, one can simply draw a random sequence of words (\tilde{w}_k) with distribution $\otimes \tilde{\nu}_{x_k, x_{k+1}}$ relatively to (x_n) . Then for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the random word \tilde{w}_k has the distribution of $(l_{t_k}, \dots, l_{t_{k+1}-1})$ and the infinite word $W = \odot_{k=0}^{\infty} \tilde{w}_k \in \{a, b, c\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ has the distribution of the infinite word $L = (l_0, l_1, l_2, \dots)$. Note also that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, one has $\Pi \tilde{w}_k = x_{k+1}$ and \tilde{w}_k has no prefix whose product is x_k .

Now, we consider a filtration $(\mathcal{F}_k)_{k \geq 0}$ such that x_k and \tilde{w}_{k-1} are \mathcal{F}_k -measurable for all $k \geq 1$, the distribution of x_{k+1} knowing \mathcal{F}_k is $p(x_k, \cdot)$ and the distribution of \tilde{w}_k knowing \mathcal{F}_k and x_{k+1} is $\tilde{\nu}_{x_k, x_{k+1}}$. Now the fact that a time t is pivotal or not is decided as soon as $\tilde{w}_0 \odot \cdots \odot \tilde{w}_{k-1}$ has length at least t . In particular the event (t is a pivotal time) is \mathcal{F}_t -measurable. However, given $(\mathcal{C}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ the cylinder filtration associated to the random sequence $(l_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, the event (t is a pivotal time) is never \mathcal{C}_n -measurable whatever the choice of $n, t \in \mathbb{N}$.

This construction gives a proof of the exponential large deviations inequalities for the random walk (g_n) . This is not the simplest proof but it shows how and why we want to use the setting of Markovian extractions.

$$(19) \quad \exists \sigma > 0, \forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists C, \beta > 0, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \mathbb{P}(|g_n| - n\sigma \geq \varepsilon n) \leq C \exp(-\beta n).$$

Proof. Let $(l_0, l_1, l_2, \dots) = \tilde{w}_0 \odot \tilde{w}_1 \odot \tilde{w}_2 \odot \dots$ be as above. We associate to every integer $n \in \mathbb{N}$ a pair of indices $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $r \in \{0, \dots, |\tilde{w}_k| - 1\}$ such that $n = |\tilde{w}_0| + \dots + |\tilde{w}_{k-1}| + r$. This means that l_{n-1} is the r -th letter of \tilde{w}_k and then by triangular inequality, we have $k - r \leq |g_n| \leq k + r$ because $k = |x_1 \cdots x_k|$ and $r \geq |l_{n-r} \cdots l_{n-1}|$.

Then note that the lengths $(|\tilde{w}_k|)_{k \geq 1}$ are independent, identically distributed random variables that are independent of $|\tilde{w}_0|$. Moreover, they all have a finite exponential moment by (18). By Lemma A.1, r also has an exponential moment which is uniformly bounded in n .

Let $\sigma := \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}(|\tilde{w}_1|)} = \frac{1}{3}$ and let $\varepsilon > 0$. Then by the classical large deviations inequalities (see Lemma A.5 and Lemma A.10 (6)), we have: $\mathbb{P}(|k - n\sigma| \geq n\varepsilon/2) \leq C \exp(-\beta'n)$ for some $C, \beta' > 0$ and for all n . Now note that $||g_n| - n\sigma| \leq |k - n\sigma| + r$ so we have (19) by Lemma A.10 (1). \square

1.7. About the pivoting technique. In the second part of this article we mainly use the tools introduced in [Gou22], some of them having been introduced or used in former works like [BMSS20] where Adrien Boulanger, Pierre Mathieu, Cagri Sert and Alessandro Sisto state large deviations inequalities from below for random walks in discrete hyperbolic groups or [MS20] where Mathieu and Sisto show some bi-lateral large deviations inequalities in the context of distributions that have a finite exponential moment. In [Gou22] Sébastien Gouëzel uses the pivoting technique in the setting of hyperbolic groups to get large deviations estimates below the escape speed and to show the continuity of the escape speed. For us, the most interesting part of Gouëzel's work is the "toy model" described in section 2. In [Cho22] Inhyeok Choi applies the pivoting technique to show results that are analogous to the ones of Gouëzel for the mapping class group of an hyperbolic surface. In [CFFT22], Chawla, Forghani, Frisch and Tiozzo use another view of the pivoting technique and the results of [Gou22] to show that the Poisson boundary of random walk with finite entropy on a group that has an acylindrical action on an hyperbolic space is in fact the Gromov Boundary of said space. I believe that similar method can be used to describe the Poisson boundary of a totally strongly irreducible random walk that has finite entropy, in the sense of Conjecture 5.12.

1.8. Structure of this paper. In Section 2 of this article, we state some local-to-global properties for alignment of matrices. In Section 3, we state some preliminary results about random products of non-invertible matrices. In section 4 Theorem 4.1, we state an abstract version of the construction of the pivoting extraction using the pivoting technique as in [Gou22, section 2] and prove Theorem 1.10 as a corollary of that statement. Then in Section 5 we give complete proofs of Theorems 1.6, 1.7 and 5.13 using the pivoting technique and Theorem 1.10. Section A is an appendix where we prove classical results for real valued random variables, we state these lemmas in a convenient way to be able to use them through this paper.

2. LOCAL-TO-GLOBAL PROPERTIES FOR THE ALIGNMENT OF MATRICES

In this section, we describe the geometry of the monoid $\Gamma := \text{End}(E)$ for E a Euclidean space. We can think of $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$ but all the proofs work the same when $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$ or when \mathbb{K} is a ultra-metric field.

Given E a \mathbb{K} -vector space, we will identify E with $\text{Hom}(\mathbb{K}, E)$. Note that up to choosing a canonical basis for all Euclidean spaces, linear maps between Euclidean spaces can be seen as matrices. Moreover, vectors and linear form can also be seen as matrices.

We want to translate ideas of hyperbolic geometry into the language of products of endomorphisms. The idea is to exhibit a local-to global property in the same fashion as [Can, Theorem 4]. That way we can adapt the arguments of [Gou22] to the setting of products of random matrices.

2.1. Alignment and squeezing coefficients. We remind the definition of the singular gap and of the distance in the projective space. Note that given x, y two vectors, we have the characterization $\|x \wedge y\| = \min_{a \in \mathbb{K}} \|x - ya\| \|y\|$. Therefore, given $h \in \text{Hom}(E, F)$, we have $\|h \wedge h\| = \max_{x, y} \min_{a \in \mathbb{K}} \frac{\|h(x-ya)\| \|h(y)\|}{\|x\| \|y\|}$.

Definition 2.1 (Singular gap). *Let E, F be Euclidean vector spaces and $h \in \text{Hom}(E, F) \setminus \{0\}$. We define the first (logarithmic) singular gap, or squeeze coefficient of h as:*

$$\text{sqz}(h) := \log \left(\frac{\|h\|^2}{\|h \wedge h\|} \right) \in [0, +\infty].$$

Definition 2.2 (Distance between projective classes). *Let E be a Euclidean space. We denote by $\mathbf{P}(E)$ the projective space of E i.e., the set of lines in E , endowed with the distance map d which is characterized by:*

$$(20) \quad \forall x, y \in E \setminus \{0\}, d([x], [y]) = \frac{\|x \wedge y\|}{\|x\| \|y\|} = \min_{a \in \mathbb{K}} \frac{\|x - ya\|}{\|x\|}.$$

Lemma 2.3 (Lipschitz property for the norm cocycle). *Let E and F be Euclidean spaces and let $f \in \text{Hom}(E, F) \setminus \{0\}$. Let $x, y \in E \setminus \{0\}$, we have:*

$$(21) \quad \left| \frac{\|fx\|}{\|f\|\|x\|} - \frac{\|fy\|}{\|f\|\|y\|} \right| \leq d([x], [y]).$$

Proof. Let $f \in \text{Hom}(E, F)$ and let $x, y \in E$ be unit i.e., $\|f\| = \|x\| = \|y\| = 1$. We show that $\|fx\| \leq \|fy\| + d([x], [y])$ and conclude by homogeneity and by symmetry. Let $c \in \mathbb{K}$ be such that $\|x - yc\| = \min_{a \in \mathbb{K}} \|x - ya\|$. Then by Definition 2.2, we have $d([x], [y]) = \|x - yc\|$. Moreover $|c| \leq 1$ by property of the orthogonal projection. By triangular inequality and by definition of the norm, we have:

$$\|fx\| \leq \|fyc\| + \|f(x - yc)\| \leq \|fy\||c| + \|f\|\|x - yc\| \leq \|fy\| + d([x], [y]). \quad \square$$

We remind that given g and h two matrices such that the product gh is well defined and given $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$, we write $g\mathbb{A}^\varepsilon h$ when $\|gh\| \geq \varepsilon\|g\|\|h\|$. We also remind that given $h \in \text{Hom}(E, F)$, we write $h^* \in \text{Hom}(F^*, E^*)$ for the map $f \mapsto fh$, we call it the transpose of h .

Definition 2.4. *Let E, F be Euclidean spaces and $h \in \text{Hom}(E, F) \setminus \{0\}$. Let $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$. We define $V^\varepsilon(h) := \{x \in E; \|hx\| \geq \varepsilon\|h\|\|x\|\}$ and $U^\varepsilon(h) := h(V^\varepsilon(h))$ and $W^\varepsilon(h) := U^\varepsilon(h^*)$.*

Note that the families $(V^\varepsilon(h))_{0 < \varepsilon \leq 1}$, $(U^\varepsilon(h))_{0 < \varepsilon \leq 1}$ and $(W^\varepsilon(h))_{0 < \varepsilon \leq 1}$, are decreasing for the inclusion order.

Note also that for h an endomorphism of rank one, and for all $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$, the cone $U^\varepsilon(h)$ is the image of h so it has diameter 0 in the projective space.

The idea to have in mind is that given h a matrix that has a large singular gap $U^\varepsilon(h)$ will have a small diameter in the following sense.

Lemma 2.5. *Let E, F be Euclidean spaces, let $h \in \text{Hom}(E, F) \setminus \{0\}$ and let $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$. Let $u \in U^1(h) \setminus \{0\}$ and let $u' \in U^\varepsilon(h) \setminus \{0\}$. Then we have:*

$$(22) \quad d([u], [u']) \leq \frac{\exp(-\text{sqz}(h))}{\varepsilon}.$$

Proof. Let $v \in V^1(h)$ and let $v' \in V^\varepsilon(h)$ be such that $u = hv$ and $u' = hv'$. Then we have $u \wedge u' = \bigwedge^2 h(v \wedge v')$ so:

$$\|u \wedge u'\| \leq \left\| \bigwedge^2 h \right\| \|v \wedge v'\|.$$

Now saying that $v \in V^1(h)$ and $v' \in V^\varepsilon(h)$, means that $\|u\| = \|h\|\|v\|$ and $\|u'\| \geq \varepsilon\|h\|\|v'\|$. Hence:

$$\|u\|\|u'\| \geq \varepsilon\|h\|^2\|v\|\|v'\|.$$

Then by taking the quotient, we have:

$$\frac{\|u \wedge u'\|}{\|u\|\|u'\|} \leq \frac{\left\| \bigwedge^2 h \right\| \|v \wedge v'\|}{\varepsilon\|h\|^2 \|v\|\|v'\|} \leq \frac{\left\| \bigwedge^2 h \right\|}{\varepsilon\|h\|^2}.$$

By definition, the term on the left is $d([u], [u'])$ and the term on the right is $\frac{\exp(-\text{sqz}(h))}{\varepsilon}$. \square

Lemma 2.5 tells us that the projective image of $U^\varepsilon(h)$ has diameter at most ε as long as $\text{sqz}(h) \geq 2|\log(\varepsilon)| + \log(2)$. With the toy model analogy, the condition $\text{sqz}(h) \geq 2|\log(\varepsilon)| + \log(2)$ will play the role of the condition for word to be non-trivial. We will extensively use the following simple remarks.

Lemma 2.6. *Let g and h be non-zero matrices such that the product gh is well defined and let $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$. We have $g\mathbb{A}^\varepsilon h$ if and only if $h^*\mathbb{A}^\varepsilon g^*$. Moreover $\text{sqz}(h^*) = \text{sqz}(h)$.*

Proof. This is a consequence of three well known facts. One is that we have $\|h\| = \|h^*\|$ for all homomorphism h . One way of seeing that is to notice that the operator norm admits the following (obviously symmetric) characterization:

$$\forall E, \forall F, \forall h \in \text{Hom}(E, F), \|h\| = \max_{\substack{f \in F^* \setminus \{0\} \\ v \in E \setminus \{0\}}} \frac{|fhv|}{\|f\|\|v\|}.$$

The second fact is that $(gh)^* = h^*g^*$. It implies that for all non trivial g, h , we have $\frac{\|gh\|}{\|g\|\|h\|} = \frac{\|h^*g^*\|}{\|h^*\|\|g^*\|}$. The third fact is that $h^* \wedge h^* = (h \wedge h)^*$. It implies that $\text{sqz}(h^*) = \text{sqz}(h)$. \square

Lemma 2.7. *Let g and h be non-zero matrices such that the product gh is well defined and let $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$. If there exist $u \in U^1(h) \setminus \{0\}$ and $w \in W^1(g) \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\frac{|wu|}{\|u\|\|w\|} \geq \varepsilon$, then $g\mathbb{A}^\varepsilon h$. If $g\mathbb{A}^\varepsilon h$, then there exist $u \in U^\varepsilon(h) \setminus \{0\}$ and $w \in W^\varepsilon(g) \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\frac{|wu|}{\|w\|\|u\|} \geq \varepsilon$ and $\frac{\|gu\|}{\|g\|\|u\|} \geq \varepsilon$ and $\frac{\|wh\|}{\|w\|\|h\|} \geq \varepsilon$.*

Proof. Let $u \in U^1(h) \setminus \{0\}$ and $w \in W^1(g) \setminus \{0\}$. Assume that $\frac{|wu|}{\|u\|\|w\|} \geq \varepsilon$. Let $f \in V^1(g^*)$ and let $v \in V^1(h)$ be such that $w = fg$ and $u = hv$. We have $\frac{|fghv|}{\|fg\|\|hv\|} \geq \varepsilon$, therefore $\frac{|fghv|}{\|f\|\|g\|\|h\|\|v\|} \geq \varepsilon$, so $\frac{\|gh\|}{\|g\|\|h\|} \geq \varepsilon$, which means that $g\mathbb{A}^\varepsilon h$. This proves the first implication of Lemma 2.7.

Now assume that $g\mathbb{A}^\varepsilon h$. Let $f \in E^* \setminus \{0\}$ and let $v \in E \setminus \{0\}$ be such that $|fghv| = \|f\|\|gh\|\|v\|$. Then $\frac{|fghv|}{\|f\|\|g\|\|h\|\|v\|} \geq \varepsilon$. Let $u := hv$ and let $w := fg$. Then we have:

$$\varepsilon \leq \frac{|fghv|}{\|f\|\|g\|\|h\|\|v\|} = \frac{|wu|}{\|w\|\|u\|} \frac{\|fg\|}{\|f\|\|g\|} \frac{\|hv\|}{\|h\|\|v\|} = \frac{|fgu|}{\|f\|\|g\|\|u\|} \frac{\|hv\|}{\|h\|\|v\|} = \frac{\|fg\|}{\|f\|\|g\|} \frac{|whv|}{\|w\|\|h\|\|v\|}.$$

All factors are in $[0, 1]$ so $\frac{|wu|}{\|w\|\|u\|} \geq \varepsilon$ and $\frac{\|gu\|}{\|g\|\|u\|} \geq \frac{|fgu|}{\|f\|\|g\|\|u\|} \geq \varepsilon$ and $\frac{\|wh\|}{\|w\|\|h\|} \geq \frac{|whv|}{\|w\|\|h\|\|v\|} \geq \varepsilon$. Moreover $\frac{\|hv\|}{\|h\|\|v\|} \geq \varepsilon$ so $v \in V^\varepsilon(h)$ and therefore $u \in U^\varepsilon(h)$. We also have $\frac{\|fg\|}{\|f\|\|g\|} \geq \varepsilon$ so $w \in W^\varepsilon(g)$. This proves the second implication of Lemma 2.7. \square

Lemma 2.8. *Let g and h be non-zero matrices such that the product gh is well defined and let $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$. Assume that $g\mathbb{A}^\varepsilon h$. Then one has:*

$$(23) \quad \text{sqz}(gh) \geq \text{sqz}(g) + \text{sqz}(h) - 2|\log(\varepsilon)|.$$

Moreover, for every non-zero vectors $u \in U^1(g) \setminus \{0\}$, and $u' \in U^1(gh) \setminus \{0\}$, we have:

$$(24) \quad d([u], [u']) \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \exp(-\text{sqz}(g)).$$

Proof. Note that the norm of the \wedge product is sub-multiplicative because it is a norm so:

$$(25) \quad \|gh \wedge gh\| \leq \|g \wedge g\| \|h \wedge h\|.$$

So if we do $2 \log(17) - \log(25)$ we find (23).

Now to prove (24), we only need to show that $U^1(gh) \subset U^\varepsilon(g)$ and use (22) from Lemma 2.5. Indeed, consider $v \in V^1(gh)$, then one has $\|ghv\| \geq \varepsilon \|g\|\|h\|\|v\| \geq \varepsilon \|g\|\|hv\|$ which means that $hv \in V^\varepsilon(g)$, therefore $ghv \in U^\varepsilon(g)$ and we can apply Lemma 2.5. \square

Lemma 2.9. *Let f , g and h be non-zero matrices such that the product fgh is well defined and let $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$. Assume that $f\mathbb{A}^\varepsilon g\mathbb{A}^\varepsilon h$ and that $\text{sqz}(g) \geq 2|\log(\varepsilon)| + 2\log(2)$. Then $\text{sqz}(fgh) \geq \text{sqz}(g) - 4|\log(\varepsilon)| - 2\log(2)$.*

Proof. Let $u \in U^\varepsilon(g) \setminus \{0\}$, let $u' \in U^1(gh) \setminus \{0\}$ and let $u'' \in U^1(g) \setminus \{0\}$ be non-trivial vectors. By Lemma 2.5, we have $d([u], [u'']) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{4}$. By Lemma 2.8, we have $d([u''], [u']) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{4}$. So by triangular inequality, we have $d([u], [u']) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$.

Let $v \in V^1(fg) \setminus \{0\}$. We have $\|fgv\| = \|fg\|\|v\| \geq \varepsilon \|f\|\|g\|\|v\|$. Hence $v \in V^\varepsilon(g) \setminus \{0\}$ therefore $gv \in U^\varepsilon(g) \setminus \{0\}$. Let $v' \in V^1(gh) \setminus \{0\}$. Assume that $u = gv$ and that $u' = ghv'$. Then by Lemma 2.3, we have $\frac{\|fu'\|}{\|f\|\|u'\|} \geq \frac{\|fu\|}{\|f\|\|u\|} - d([u], [u']) \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$. Therefore, we have $\|fghv'\| \geq \|f\|\|gh\|\|v'\| \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ so $\|fgh\| \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \|f\|\|gh\|$. Moreover, we have $g\mathbb{A}^\varepsilon h$, therefore $\|fgh\| \geq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} \|f\|\|g\|\|h\|$. Now using the formula $\text{sqz}(\gamma) = \log\left(\frac{\|\gamma\|^2}{\|\gamma \wedge \gamma\|}\right)$, we get:

$$\text{sqz}(fgh) \geq \text{sqz}(f) + \text{sqz}(g) + \text{sqz}(h) - 4|\log(\varepsilon)| - 2\log(2). \quad \square$$

Lemma 2.10 (Heredity of the alignment). *Let f, g, h be non-zero matrices such that the product fgh is well defined and let $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$. Assume that $\text{sqz}(g) \geq 2|\log(\varepsilon)| + 3\log(2)$ and that $f\mathbb{A}^\varepsilon g\mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} h$. Then $f\mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} gh$.*

Proof. Let $u \in U^1(gh) \setminus \{0\}$, let $u' \in U^\varepsilon(g) \setminus \{0\}$ and let $u'' \in U^1(g) \setminus \{0\}$. By Lemma 2.5, we have $d([u'], [u'']) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{8}$ and by Lemma 2.8, we have $d([u], [u'']) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{4}$. Then by triangular inequality, we have $d([u], [u']) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$.

Now let $v \in V^1(fg) \setminus \{0\}$. Then we have $\|fgv\| \geq \|f\|\|g\|\|v\|\varepsilon$ so $gv \in U^\varepsilon(g) \setminus \{0\}$ and by the above argument, we have $d([u], [gv]) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$. Then by Lemma 2.3, we have $\frac{\|fu\|}{\|f\|\|u\|} \geq \frac{\|fgv\|}{\|f\|\|gv\|} - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$. Moreover $\|f\|\|gv\| \leq \|f\|\|g\|\|v\| \leq \|fgv\|/\varepsilon$, therefore $\frac{\|fu\|}{\|f\|\|u\|} \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ and $u \in U^1(gh)$ hence $f\mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} gh$. \square

Remark 2.11 (The ultra-metric case is easier). *Let $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$, let \mathbb{K} be a ultra-metric locally compact field and let f, g, h be matrices with entries in \mathbb{K} such that the product f, g, h is well defined. If we assume that $f\mathbb{A}^\varepsilon g\mathbb{A}^\varepsilon h$, and that $\text{sqz}(g) > 2|\log(\varepsilon)|$, then $f\mathbb{A}^\varepsilon gh$. Therefore, in the ultra-metric case, we get rid of all the $+k\log(2)$ constants.*

Lemma 2.12 (Contraction property for aligned chains). *Let E be a Euclidean vector space, let $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$ let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let g_0, \dots, g_n be non-zero matrices such that the product $g_0 \cdots g_n$ is well defined. Assume that for all $k \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$, we have $\text{sqz}(g_k) \geq 2|\log(\varepsilon)| + 3\log(2)$ and $g_k\mathbb{A}^\varepsilon g_{k+1}$. Then one has:*

$$(26) \quad \|g_0 \cdots g_n\| \geq \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right)^n \prod_{j=0}^n \|g_j\|$$

$$(27) \quad \text{sqz}(g_0 \cdots g_n) \geq \sum_{j=0}^n \text{sqz}(g_j) - 2n(|\log(\varepsilon)| + \log(2)).$$

Moreover, for every non-zero vectors $u \in U^1(g_0) \setminus \{0\}$, and $u' \in U^1(g_0 \cdots g_n) \setminus \{0\}$, we have:

$$(28) \quad d([u], [u']) \leq \frac{2}{\varepsilon} \exp(-\text{sqz}(g_0)).$$

Proof. The lemma is trivial when $n = 0$. Assume $n \geq 1$. We claim that for all $0 \leq k < n$, we have $g_k\mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}g_{k+1} \cdots g_n$. For $k = n-1$, we assumed $g_{n-1}\mathbb{A}^\varepsilon g_n$ so $g_{n-1}\mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}g_n$. Let $0 < k < n$ and assume that $g_k\mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}g_{k+1} \cdots g_n$. Then by Lemma 2.10 with $f = g_{k-1}$, $g := g_k$ and $h := g_{k+1} \cdots g_n$, we have $g_{k-1}\mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}g_k \cdots g_n$. Hence, we have $g_0\mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}g_1 \cdots g_n$ so by (24) in Lemma 2.8, we have (28).

For all $0 < k < n$, we have $\|g_k \cdots g_n\| \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \|g_k\| \|g_{k+1} \cdots g_n\|$ by definition of $\mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}$. Then by induction on k , we have $\|g_k \cdots g_n\| \geq \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right)^{n-k} \|g_k\| \|g_{k+1}\| \cdots \|g_n\|$, for $k = 0$, we have (26).

Now by (23), we have $\text{sqz}(g_k \cdots g_n) \geq \text{sqz}(g_k) + \text{sqz}(g_{k+1} \cdots g_n) - 2(|\log(\varepsilon)| + \log(2))$ for all $0 \leq k < n$. Then by induction, we have $\text{sqz}(g_k \cdots g_n) \geq \sum_{j=k}^n \text{sqz}(g_j) - 2(n-k)(|\log(\varepsilon)| + \log(2))$ for all $0 \leq k < n$, therefore we have (27). \square

Lemma 2.13 (Alignment of partial products). *Let g_0, \dots, g_n be non-zero matrices such that the product $g_0 \cdots g_n$ is well defined. Let $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$. Assume that for every $k \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ we have $\text{sqz}(g_i) \geq 2|\log(\varepsilon)| + 4\log(2)$. Assume also that $g_0\mathbb{A}^\varepsilon g_1\mathbb{A}^\varepsilon \cdots \mathbb{A}^\varepsilon g_n$ i.e., for all $k \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$, we have $g_k\mathbb{A}^\varepsilon g_{k+1}$. Then for all $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, we have $(g_0 \cdots g_{k-1})\mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}(g_k \cdots g_n)$.*

Proof. Let $k \in \{2, \dots, n-1\}$. Let $u \in U^1(g_k \cdots g_n) \setminus \{0\}$, let $u' \in U^\varepsilon(g_k) \setminus \{0\}$, let $w \in W^1(g_0 \cdots g_{k-1}) \setminus \{0\}$ and let $w' \in W^\varepsilon(g_{k-1}) \setminus \{0\}$. By Lemma 2.12 applied to the sequence g_k, \dots, g_n , and by Lemma 2.5 applied to g_k and by triangular inequality, we have $d([u], [u']) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{8} + \frac{\varepsilon}{16} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{4}$. By Lemma 2.12 applied to the sequence g_{k-1}^*, \dots, g_0^* and by the above argument, we have $d([w], [w']) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{4}$.

Now since $g_{k-1}\mathbb{A}^\varepsilon g_k$ and by Lemma 2.7, there exist $w' \in W^\varepsilon(g_{k-1}) \setminus \{0\}$ and $u' \in U^\varepsilon(g_k) \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\frac{|w'u|}{\|w'\| \|u\|} \geq \varepsilon$. Assume that $\frac{|w'u|}{\|w'\| \|u\|} \geq \varepsilon$. Then by Lemma 2.3, we have $\frac{|w'u|}{\|w'\| \|u\|} \geq \frac{3\varepsilon}{4}$ and by duality, we have $\frac{|wu|}{\|w\| \|u\|} \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$, hence $(g_0 \cdots g_{k-1})\mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}(g_k \cdots g_n)$. \square

Corollary 2.14. *Let $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$, let E be a Euclidean space and let $(\gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in $\text{End}(E)$. Assume that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, one has $\gamma_n\mathbb{A}^\varepsilon \gamma_{n+1}$ and $\text{sqz}(\gamma_{n+1}) \geq 2|\log(\varepsilon)| + 3\log(2)$. Then there is a limit line $l^\infty \in \mathbf{P}(E)$ such that:*

$$(29) \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \forall u_n \in U^1(\gamma_0 \cdots \gamma_{n-1}) \setminus \{0\}, d([u_n], l^\infty) \leq \frac{2}{\varepsilon} \exp(-\text{sqz}(\gamma_0 \cdots \gamma_{n-1})).$$

Proof. Let $m \leq n$ be integers and let $u_n \in U^1(\gamma_0 \cdots \gamma_{n-1}) \setminus \{0\}$ and $u_m \in U^1(\gamma_0 \cdots \gamma_{m-1}) \setminus \{0\}$. By Lemma 2.13, we have $(\gamma_0 \cdots \gamma_{n-1})\mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}(\gamma_n \cdots \gamma_{m-1})$, then by Lemma 2.8, we have:

$$(30) \quad d([u_n], [u_m]) \leq \frac{2}{\varepsilon} \exp(-\text{sqz}(\gamma_0 \cdots \gamma_{n-1})).$$

By Lemma 2.12, we have $\text{sqz}(\gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_{n-1}) \geq (n-1)\log(2) + 2|\log(\varepsilon)| + 3\log(2)$ and by Lemma 2.8, we have $\text{sqz}(\gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_{n-1}) \geq n\log(2)$. So for any sequence $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \prod_{n=0}^{+\infty} (U^1(\gamma_0 \cdots \gamma_{n-1}) \setminus \{0\})$, the sequence $([u_n])$ is a Cauchy sequence in $\mathbf{P}(E)$, therefore it has a limit. Moreover, the diameter of $\mathbf{P}U^1(\gamma_0 \cdots \gamma_{n-1})$ goes to 0 by the above argument so the limit l^∞ does not depend on the choice of the u_n 's.

Now we take the limit of (30) for $m \rightarrow +\infty$ and we get (29). \square

Lemma 2.15. *Let $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$ and let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let h and g_0, \dots, g_n be matrices such that the product $hg_0 \cdots g_n$ is well defined. Assume that for all $i \in \{0, \dots, n\}$, we have $\text{sqz}(g_i) \geq 2|\log(\varepsilon)| + 4\log(2)$. Assume also that we have $h\mathbb{A}^\varepsilon g_0$ and that $g_i\mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}g_{i+1}$ for all $i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$. Then we have $h\mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}(g_0 \cdots g_n)$.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.12 (27), we have $\text{sqz}(g_0 \cdots g_n) \geq \text{sqz}(g_0) + \sum_{j=1}^n (\text{sqz}(g_j) - 2|\log(\varepsilon)| - 2\log(2)) \geq \text{sqz}(g_0)$. Let $u \in U^1(g_0) \setminus \{0\}$ and let $u' \in U^1(g_0 \cdots g_n) \setminus \{0\}$. By (28) in Lemma 2.12, we have $d([u], [u']) \leq \frac{4\varepsilon}{16}$. Let $v \in V^\varepsilon(h) \cap U^\varepsilon(g_0) \setminus \{0\}$, which is not empty by Lemma 2.7. Then by Lemma 2.5, we have $d([v], [u]) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{16}$. Hence $d([u'], [v]) \leq \frac{5\varepsilon}{16}$ so by Lemma 2.3, we have $\frac{\|hu'\|}{\|h\| \|u'\|} \geq \frac{11\varepsilon}{16} \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$. Hence, we have $h\mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}(g_0 \cdots g_n)$. \square

Now we prove a tricky lemma that is essential for the pivoting technique.

Lemma 2.16. *Let $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$ and let $n \in \mathbb{N}_1$. Let $\gamma_{-1}, \gamma_0, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{2n}$ be non-zero matrices and assume that the product $\gamma_{-1} \cdots \gamma_{2n}$ is well defined. Assume that for all $i \in \{0, 1, 3, 5, \dots, 2n-1\}$, we have $\text{sqz}(\gamma_i) \geq 4|\log(\varepsilon)| + 7\log(2)$ and that for all $0 \leq i < n$, we have:*

$$(31) \quad (\gamma_0 \cdots \gamma_{2i})\mathbb{A}^\varepsilon \gamma_{2i+1}\mathbb{A}^\varepsilon \gamma_{2i+2}$$

and that $\gamma_{-1}\mathbb{A}^\varepsilon \gamma_0$. Then $\gamma_{-1}\mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}(\gamma_0 \cdots \gamma_{2n})$.

Proof. Let $i \in \{0, \dots, n\}$. By Lemma 2.10 applied to $f = \gamma_0 \cdots \gamma_{2i}$, $g = \gamma_{2i+1}$ and $h = \gamma_{2i+2}$, we have $(\gamma_0 \cdots \gamma_{2i})\mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}(\gamma_{2i+1}\gamma_{2i+2})$ and by (23) in Lemma 2.8, we have $\text{sqz}(\gamma_{2i+1}\gamma_{2i+2}) \geq 2|\log(\varepsilon)| + 7\log(2)$. We moreover claim that for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$, we have $(\gamma_{2i-1}\gamma_{2i})\mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{4}}(\gamma_{2i+1}\gamma_{2i+2})$. Let $i \in \{2, \dots, n-1\}$, let $w \in W^1(\gamma_{2i-1}\gamma_{2i}) \setminus \{0\}$ and let $w' \in W^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}(\gamma_0 \cdots \gamma_{2i}) \setminus \{0\}$ and let $w'' \in W^1(\gamma_0 \cdots \gamma_{2i}) \setminus \{0\}$. We have $\text{sqz}(\gamma_{2i+1}\gamma_{2i+2}) \geq 2|\log(\varepsilon)| + 7\log(2)$ so by Lemma 2.5, we have $d([w'], [w'']) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{64}$. Moreover, $\gamma_0 \cdots \gamma_{2i-2}\mathbb{A}^{\varepsilon/2}(\gamma_{2i-1}\gamma_{2i})$ so by 2.8, we have $d([w], [w'']) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{64}$. Then by triangular inequality, we have $d([w], [w']) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{4}$ so by Lemma 2.3, we have:

$$\frac{\|w\gamma_{2i+1}\gamma_{2i+2}\|}{\|w\|\|\gamma_{2i+1}\gamma_{2i+2}\|} \geq \frac{\|w'\gamma_{2i+1}\gamma_{2i+2}\|}{\|w'\|\|\gamma_{2i+1}\gamma_{2i+2}\|} - \frac{\varepsilon}{4}$$

Moreover, we have $(\gamma_0 \cdots \gamma_{2i})\mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}(\gamma_{2i+1}\gamma_{2i+2})$ so there exists a linear form $w' \in W^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}(\gamma_0 \cdots \gamma_{2i}) \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\frac{\|w'\gamma_{2i+1}\gamma_{2i+2}\|}{\|w'\|\|\gamma_{2i+1}\gamma_{2i+2}\|} \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$. Hence we have $\frac{\|w\gamma_{2i+1}\gamma_{2i+2}\|}{\|w\|\|\gamma_{2i+1}\gamma_{2i+2}\|} \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{4}$, which proves the claim.

Now we have $\gamma_0\mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{4}}(\gamma_1\gamma_2)\mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{4}} \cdots \mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{4}}(\gamma_{2i-n}\gamma_{2n})$. Let $u \in U^1(\gamma_0 \cdots \gamma_{2n}) \setminus \{0\}$ and let $u' \in U^\varepsilon(\gamma_0) \setminus \{0\}$ and let $u'' \in U^1(\gamma_0) \setminus \{0\}$. By Lemma 2.12 applied to $g_0 = \gamma_0$ and $g_i = \gamma_{2i-1}\gamma_{2i}$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $\varepsilon' = \frac{\varepsilon}{4}$, we have $d([u], [u'']) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{16}$. Moreover, by Lemma 2.5, we have $d([u'], [u'']) \leq \frac{\varepsilon^3}{128}$. Then by triangular inequality, we have $d([u], [u']) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$. Now we may assume that $\frac{\|\gamma_{-1}u\|}{\|\gamma_{-1}\| \|u\|} \geq \varepsilon$ because $\gamma_{-1}\mathbb{A}^\varepsilon \gamma_0$. Then by Lemma 2.3, we have $\frac{\|\gamma_{-1}u\|}{\|\gamma_{-1}\| \|u\|} \geq \varepsilon$ so $\gamma_{-1}\mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}(\gamma_0 \cdots \gamma_{2n})$. \square

2.2. Link between singular values and eigenvalues. In this short section, we prove the following lemma. We will use the following notations. Let g be an endomorphism such that $\text{prox}(g) > 0$. We write $E^+(g)$ for the eigenspace associated to the maximal eigenvalue of g , it is a line because $\text{prox}(g) > 0$. A basic fact is that $g(E^+(g)) = E^+(g)$ and there is a g -stable supplementary $E^-(g)$ i.e., such that $g(E^-(g)) \subset E^-(g)$ and $E = E^+(g) \oplus E^-(g)$.

Lemma 2.17. *Let E be a Euclidean space and let $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$. Let g be an endomorphism such that $\text{sqz}(g) \geq 2|\log(\varepsilon)| + 4\log(2)$ and $g\mathbb{A}^\varepsilon g$. Then g is proximal and we have the following:*

$$(32) \quad \rho_1(g) \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \|h\|$$

$$(33) \quad \text{prox}(g) \geq \text{sqz}(g) - 2|\log(\varepsilon)| - 2\log(2)$$

$$(34) \quad \forall u \in U^1(g), d([u], E^+(g)) \leq \frac{2}{\varepsilon} \exp(-\text{sqz}(g))$$

Proof. Consider $(g_k)_{k \geq 0}$ to be the sequence of copies of g . First, we apply Lemma 2.13 and we get that $\text{sqz}(g^n) \geq n(\text{sqz}(g) - 2|\log(\varepsilon)| - 2\log(2))$, then going to the limit $n \rightarrow +\infty$, we get that $\liminf \frac{\text{sqz}(g^n)}{n} \geq \text{sqz}(g) - 2|\log(\varepsilon)| - 2\log(2)$. Moreover, we know that this inferior limit is in fact an honest limit and it is $\text{prox}(g)$, which proves (33). The proof of (32) goes the same but using (26). Note that (33) implies that $\text{prox}(g) > 0$ so $E^+(g)$ is a line.

To get (34), we apply Corollary 2.14. We get a line l^∞ such that for any $u_n \in U^1(g^n) \setminus \{0\}$, we have $[u_n] \rightarrow l^\infty$. Moreover, we have $d([u], l^\infty) \leq \frac{2 \exp(-\text{sqz}(g))}{\varepsilon}$. Now we only need to show that $l^\infty = E^+(g)$. Let $e \in E^+(g)$. Then we have $\|ge\| = \rho_1(g)\|e\|$ so by (32), $e \in V^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}(g)$. Moreover, e is an eigenvector associated to a simple eigenvalue so $e \in \mathbb{K}ge$ and as a consequence $e \in U^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}(g)$. Now this reasoning holds for all positive power of g so we have $e \in U^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}(g^n)$. Moreover, $\text{sqz}(g^n) \rightarrow +\infty$ by (33) so by Lemma 2.5, the projective diameter of $U^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}(g^n)$ goes to zero so $[u_n] \rightarrow [e]$, so $l^\infty = [e]$. \square

2.3. Finite description of the alignment. In this section, we construct a finitely described alignment relation that allows us to use the tools described in the toy model of paragraph 1.6, even though we are not working on locally finite groups.

Definition 2.18. Let \mathbb{A} be a measurable binary relation on a measurable set Γ i.e., an $\mathcal{A}_\Gamma \otimes \mathcal{A}_\Gamma$ measurable subset of $\Gamma \times \Gamma$. We say that \mathbb{A} is finitely described if there exist an integer $M \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$ and two families of measurable subsets $(L_i)_{1 \leq i \leq M} \in \mathcal{A}_\Gamma^M$ and $(R_j)_{1 \leq j \leq M} \in \mathcal{A}_\Gamma^M$ such that:

$$\Gamma = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^M L_i = \bigsqcup_{j=1}^M R_j$$

and a subset $A \subset \{1, \dots, M\}^2$ such that:

$$\mathbb{A} = \bigsqcup_{(i,j) \in A} L_i \times R_j.$$

Lemma 2.19 (Discrete descriptions of alignment relations). *Let E be an Euclidean vector space and $0 < \varepsilon_1 < \varepsilon_2 \leq 1$. There exists a discrete binary relation \mathbb{A} on $\text{End}(E)$ that satisfies the inclusions $\mathbb{A}^{\varepsilon_2} \subset \mathbb{A} \subset \mathbb{A}^{\varepsilon_1}$ i.e., for any given $g, h \in \text{End}(E)$, we have $g\mathbb{A}^{\varepsilon_2}h \Rightarrow g\mathbb{A}h \Rightarrow g\mathbb{A}^{\varepsilon_1}h$.*

Proof. Let $\varepsilon := \frac{\varepsilon_2 - \varepsilon_1}{4}$. Let $N := \lfloor \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \rfloor$. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $(u_1, \dots, u_k) \subset E \setminus \{0\}$ be such that:

$$\forall v \in E \setminus \{0\}, \exists i \in \{1, \dots, k\}, d([v], [u_i]) \leq \varepsilon.$$

Such a family exists because $\mathbf{P}(E)$ is compact. Now let $(w_1, \dots, w_k) \subset E^* \setminus \{0\}$ be such that:

$$\forall f \in E^* \setminus \{0\}, \exists i \in \{1, \dots, k\}, d([f], [w_i]) \leq \varepsilon.$$

Such a family exists because E^* is isometric to E . Now let $h \in \text{End}(E) \setminus \{0\}$ and let $n \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, we define:

$$(35) \quad \phi_n(h) := \{i \in \{1, \dots, k\} \mid w_i \in W^{n\varepsilon}(h)\} \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_n(h) := \{i \in \{1, \dots, k\} \mid u_i \in U^{n\varepsilon}(h)\}.$$

Now let:

$$\mathbb{A} := \left\{ (g, h) \in \text{End}(E) \setminus \{0\} \mid \exists n_1, n_2 \in \{1, \dots, N\}, \exists i \in \phi_{n_1}(g), \exists j \in \psi_{n_2}(h), \frac{|w_i u_j|}{\|w_i\| \|u_j\|} n_1 n_2 \varepsilon^2 \geq \varepsilon_1 \right\} \\ \sqcup ((\text{End}(E) \setminus \{0\}) \times \{0\}) \sqcup (\{0\} \times (\text{End}(E) \setminus \{0\})) \sqcup (\{0\} \times \{0\}).$$

First we claim that $\mathbb{A} \subset \mathbb{A}^{\varepsilon_1}$. Let $g\mathbb{A}h$. If $g = 0$ or $h = 0$, then we have $g\mathbb{A}^{\varepsilon_1}h$ trivially. Assume that $g \neq 0$ and $h \neq 0$. Let $n_1, n_2 \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, let $i \in \phi_{n_1}(g)$ and let $j \in \psi_{n_2}(h)$ be such that $\frac{|w_i u_j|}{\|w_i\| \|u_j\|} n_1 n_2 \varepsilon^2 \geq \varepsilon_1$. Let $f \in V^{n_1 \varepsilon}(g^*)$ be such that $fg = w_i$ and let $v \in V^{n_2 \varepsilon}(h)$ be such that $hv = u_j$. Such f, v exist because $w_i \in W^{n_1 \varepsilon}(g)$ and $u_j \in U^{n_2 \varepsilon}(h)$, moreover, they are not trivial. Then, we have $\frac{|fghv|}{\|f\| \|g\| \|h\| \|v\|} = \frac{|w_i u_j|}{\|w_i\| \|u_j\|}$ and $\frac{\|fg\|}{\|f\| \|g\|} \geq n_1 \varepsilon$ and $\frac{\|hv\|}{\|h\| \|v\|} \geq n_2 \varepsilon$. Hence, we have $\frac{|fghv|}{\|f\| \|g\| \|h\| \|v\|} \geq \varepsilon_1$ so $\|gh\| \geq \varepsilon_1 \|g\| \|h\|$, which proves the claim.

Now we claim that $\mathbb{A}^{\varepsilon_2} \subset \mathbb{A}$. Let $g\mathbb{A}^{\varepsilon_2}h$. Assume that $g \neq 0$ and $h \neq 0$. Let $f \in E^* \setminus \{0\}$ and $v \in E \setminus \{0\}$ be such that $|fghv| = \|f\| \|gh\| \|v\| \geq \varepsilon_2 \|f\| \|g\| \|h\| \|v\|$. let $n_1 := \lfloor \frac{\|fg\|}{\|f\| \|g\| \varepsilon} \rfloor$ and let $n_2 := \lfloor \frac{\|hv\|}{\|h\| \|v\| \varepsilon} \rfloor$. Then we have $n_1 \varepsilon \geq \frac{\|fg\|}{\|f\| \|g\|} - \varepsilon$ and $n_2 \varepsilon \geq \frac{\|hv\|}{\|h\| \|v\|} - \varepsilon$. Let $i, j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ be such that $d([w_i], [fg]) \leq \varepsilon$ and $d([u_j], [hv]) \leq \varepsilon$. Then by Lemma 2.3, we have $\frac{|w_i u_j|}{\|w_i\| \|u_j\|} \geq \frac{|fghv|}{\|f\| \|g\| \|h\| \|v\|} - 2\varepsilon$. Hence:

$$\frac{|w_i u_j|}{\|w_i\| \|u_j\|} n_1 n_2 \varepsilon^2 \geq \left(\frac{|fghv|}{\|f\| \|g\| \|h\| \|v\|} - 2\varepsilon \right) \left(\frac{\|fg\|}{\|f\| \|g\|} - \varepsilon \right) \left(\frac{\|hv\|}{\|h\| \|v\|} - \varepsilon \right)$$

Moreover all three factors are in $[0, 1]$ so if we develop, we get:

$$\frac{|w_i u_j|}{\|w_i\| \|u_j\|} n_1 n_2 \varepsilon^2 \geq \left(\frac{|fghv|}{\|f\| \|g\| \|h\| \|v\|} \right) \left(\frac{\|fg\|}{\|f\| \|g\|} - \varepsilon \right) \left(\frac{\|hv\|}{\|h\| \|v\|} - \varepsilon \right) - 2\varepsilon \\ \geq \left(\frac{|fghv|}{\|f\| \|g\| \|h\| \|v\|} \right) \left(\frac{\|fg\|}{\|f\| \|g\|} \right) \left(\frac{\|hv\|}{\|h\| \|v\|} \right) - 4\varepsilon \\ \geq \frac{|fghv|}{\|f\| \|g\| \|h\| \|v\|} - 4\varepsilon \geq \varepsilon_2 - 4\varepsilon = \varepsilon_1.$$

Therefore, we have $g\mathbb{A}h$, which proves the claim.

Now we claim that \mathbb{A} is discrete. This follows directly from the fact that given g and h two matrices, the condition $g\mathbb{A}h$ is expressed in terms of $(\phi_1(g), \dots, \phi_N(g))$ and $(\psi_1(h), \dots, \psi_N(h))$, which take only finitely many values. \square

Note that the same proof may be used to construct discrete alignment relations on $\text{Hom}(E, F) \times \text{Hom}(H, E)$ for E, F and H , three given Euclidean spaces.

3. RANDOM PRODUCTS AND EXTRACTIONS

3.1. Notations for extractions. In the two following sections, we will denote by Γ an abstract measurable semi-group *i.e.*, a second countable measurable space endowed with an associative and measurable composition map $\cdot : \Gamma \times \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma$. We will assume that Γ has an identity element that we denote by $\mathbf{1}_\Gamma$. The measurable semi-group Γ can be $(\mathbb{N}, +)$, $\text{End}(E)$ or a semi-group of words. The semi-group \mathbb{N} will always be endowed with the addition map.

Let us recall the notations introduced in Paragraph 1.4. We write $\tilde{\Gamma}$ for the semi-group of words with letters in Γ *i.e.*, the set of all tuples $\bigsqcup_{l \in \mathbb{N}} \Gamma^l$, (where Γ^l is identified with $\Gamma^{\{0, \dots, l-1\}}$ and endowed with the product σ -algebra for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$) that we endow with the concatenation product

$$\begin{aligned} \odot : \quad & \tilde{\Gamma} \times \tilde{\Gamma} \longrightarrow \tilde{\Gamma} \\ & ((\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_{k-1}), (\gamma'_0, \dots, \gamma'_{l-1})) \in \Gamma^k \times \Gamma^l \longmapsto (\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_{k-1}, \gamma'_0, \dots, \gamma'_{l-1}) \in \Gamma^{k+l}. \end{aligned}$$

We also define the length functor:

$$L : \tilde{\Gamma} \longrightarrow \mathbb{N}; (\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_{k-1}) \longmapsto k,$$

and the product functor:

$$\Pi : \tilde{\Gamma} \longrightarrow \Gamma; (\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_{k-1}) \longmapsto \gamma_0 \cdots \gamma_{k-1}.$$

Given $(\tilde{\gamma}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \tilde{\Gamma}^{\mathbb{N}}$, we write $\odot_{n=0}^{+\infty} \tilde{\gamma}_n \in \Gamma^{\mathbb{N}}$ for the left to right concatenation of all the $\tilde{\gamma}_k$'s and we write $\odot^\infty : \tilde{\Gamma}^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \Gamma^{\mathbb{N}}; (\tilde{\gamma}_n) \mapsto \odot_{n=0}^{+\infty} \tilde{\gamma}_n$. In other words, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $0 \leq k < L(\tilde{\gamma}_n)$, and for $m := L(\tilde{\gamma}_0 \odot \cdots \odot \tilde{\gamma}_{n-1}) + k$, the m -th element, *i.e.*, the projection on the m -indexed coordinate, of the sequence $\odot_{n=0}^{+\infty} \tilde{\gamma}_n$ is the k -th letter of $\tilde{\gamma}_n$, *i.e.*, the projection on the k -indexed coordinate. Note that all the above defined maps \odot , L , Π and \odot^∞ are measurable.

Definition 3.1 (Grouping of factors). *Let Γ be a semi-group. Let $\gamma := (\gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \Gamma^{\mathbb{N}}$ and let $w := (w_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ be non-random sequences. For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, define $\bar{w}_n := w_0 + \cdots + w_{n-1}$. We denote by $\tilde{\gamma}^w \in \tilde{\Gamma}^{\mathbb{N}}$ the sequence of w -groups of γ which we define by:*

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \tilde{\gamma}_n^w := (\gamma_{\bar{w}_n+k})_{0 \leq k < w_n} = (\gamma_{\bar{w}_n}, \dots, \gamma_{\bar{w}_n+w_n-1}).$$

We denote by γ^w the sequence of w -products of γ defined as $\gamma^w := \Pi \circ \tilde{\gamma}^w \in \Gamma^{\mathbb{N}}$ *i.e.*, $\gamma_n^w = \gamma_{\bar{w}_n} \cdots \gamma_{\bar{w}_n+w_n-1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

We denote by $\bar{\gamma} \in \Gamma^{\mathbb{N}}$ the left to right product associated to γ , defined as $\bar{\gamma}_n := \gamma_0 \cdots \gamma_{n-1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and we denote by $\bar{\gamma}^w \in \Gamma^{\mathbb{N}}$ the left to-right product associated to γ^w defined as $\bar{\gamma}_n^w := \gamma_0^w \cdots \gamma_{n-1}^w = \bar{\gamma}_{\bar{w}_n}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Let $(\tilde{g}_n) \in \tilde{\Gamma}^{\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence which is not stationary to the trivial word, note that the map $(\odot^\infty, L^{\otimes \mathbb{N}})$, that sends (\tilde{g}_n) to the pair $(\odot_{n=0}^{+\infty} \tilde{g}_n, (L(\tilde{g}_n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}) \in \Gamma^{\mathbb{N}} \times \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$, is one-to-one. Indeed, to get back to the sequence \tilde{g} , write $\gamma := \odot_{n=0}^{+\infty} \tilde{g}_n$ and $w_n := (L(\tilde{g}_n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, then $\tilde{g} = \tilde{\gamma}^w$. Given $\tilde{\mu}$ a probability distribution on $\tilde{\Gamma}^{\mathbb{N}}$, we will write $(\tilde{\gamma}_n^w) \sim \tilde{\mu}$ to introduce a random sequence $(\gamma_n) \in \Gamma^{\mathbb{N}}$ and a random sequence $(w_n) \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$, defined on the same probability space and such that $(\tilde{\gamma}_n^w) \sim \tilde{\mu}$.

Given $\tilde{\eta}$ and $\tilde{\kappa}$ two probability measures on $\tilde{\Gamma}$, we write $\tilde{\eta} \odot \tilde{\kappa} := \odot_*(\tilde{\eta} \otimes \tilde{\kappa})$ for the convolution of $\tilde{\eta}$ and $\tilde{\kappa}$ *i.e.*, the push-forward by \odot of the product measure $\tilde{\eta} \otimes \tilde{\kappa}$. Then $\tilde{\eta} \odot \tilde{\kappa}$ is the distribution of the concatenation of two independent random words of respective distribution $\tilde{\eta}$ and $\tilde{\kappa}$. Given $(\tilde{\eta}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ a sequence of probability measures, we write $\odot_{n=0}^{+\infty} \tilde{\eta}_n$ for the push forward of $\odot_*^\infty \left(\otimes_{n=0}^{+\infty} \tilde{\eta}_n \right)$. Given $\tilde{\eta}$ a probability measure on $\tilde{\Gamma}$, we write $\tilde{\eta}^{\odot \mathbb{N}}$ for $\odot_{n=0}^{+\infty} \tilde{\eta}$.

Definition 3.2 (Extraction). *Let Γ be a semi-group, let μ be a probability measure on $\Gamma^{\mathbb{N}}$ and let $\tilde{\mu}$ be a probability measure on $\tilde{\Gamma}^{\mathbb{N}}$. We say that $\tilde{\mu}$ is an extraction of μ if $\mu = \odot_*^\infty \tilde{\mu}$ and if there exist constants $C, \beta > 0$ such that for $(\tilde{g}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sim \tilde{\mu}$ and for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have almost surely:*

$$\mathbb{E}(\exp(\beta L(\tilde{g}_n)) | (\tilde{g}_k)_{k < n}) \leq C.$$

3.2. Rank and essential kernel of a probability distribution. In this section, we describe the probabilistic behaviour of the kernel of a product of i.i.d. random matrices. For that we do not use the tools from Section 2.1, in particular, we do not care about the Euclidean structure of the space. Given h a linear map, we denote by $\mathbf{rk}(h)$ the rank of h i.e., the dimension of the image of h . We say that a probability measure ν is supported on a set S if $\nu(S) = 1$, it is weaker than saying that S is the support of ν because we do not assume that S is closed nor minimal. Note that given E a vector space a measure ν may be supported on $\mathrm{GL}(E)$

Definition 3.3 (Rank of a distribution). *Let E be a vector space and let ν be a step distribution on $\mathrm{End}(E)$. We define the eventual rank of ν as the largest integer $\underline{\mathbf{rk}}(\nu)$ such that:*

$$(36) \quad \forall n \geq 0, \nu^{*n} \{ \gamma \in \mathrm{End}(E) \mid \mathbf{rk}(\gamma) < \underline{\mathbf{rk}}(\nu) \} = 0.$$

Lemma 3.4 (Eventual rank of a distribution). *Let E be a Euclidean space and let $\Gamma := \mathrm{End}(E)$. Let ν be a probability measure on Γ . There is a probability measure $\tilde{\kappa}$ on $\tilde{\Gamma}$ such that $\tilde{\kappa}^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$ is an extraction of $\nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$ and $\Pi_* \tilde{\kappa}$ is supported on the set of endomorphisms of rank $\underline{\mathbf{rk}}(\nu)$.*

Proof. Given a non-random sequence $\gamma = (\gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, the sequence $(\mathbf{rk}(\overline{\gamma}_n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a non-increasing sequence of non-negative integers so it is stationary. Write r_γ for the limit of $(\mathbf{rk}(\overline{\gamma}_n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. Then there is an integer $n' \geq 1$ such that $\mathbf{rk}(\overline{\gamma}_n) = r_\gamma$ for all $n \geq n'$. Write n_γ for the minimal such n' . Note that $\gamma \mapsto r_\gamma$ and $\gamma \mapsto n_\gamma$ are measurable maps.

Now let $(\gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sim \nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$ be a random sequence. We define $\tilde{\kappa}$ to be the distribution of $(\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_{n_\gamma-1})$. Note that n_γ is a stopping time for $(\overline{\gamma}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ so the conditional distribution of $(\gamma_{n+n_\gamma})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ relatively to $(\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_{n_\gamma-1})$ is $\nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$. Hence, we have $\tilde{\kappa} \odot \nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}} = \nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$, so $\tilde{\kappa}^{\odot k} \odot \nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}} = \nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and by construction $\tilde{\kappa}$ is non-trivial so $\tilde{\kappa}^{\odot \mathbb{N}} = \nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$. Therefore, the measure $\tilde{\kappa}^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$ is an extraction of $\nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$.

Moreover $\Pi_* \tilde{\kappa}$ is the distribution of $\overline{\gamma}_{n_\gamma}$ which has rank r_γ and $L_* \tilde{\kappa}$ is the distribution of n_γ . Therefore, we only need to show that r_γ is almost surely constant and that n_γ has finite exponential moment.

Let r_0 be the essential lower bound of r_γ i.e., the largest integer such that $\mathbb{P}(r_\gamma \geq r_0) = 1$. Let $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{rk}(\overline{\gamma}_{n_0}) = r_0) > 0$ and write $\alpha := \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{rk}(\overline{\gamma}_{n_0}) = r_0)$. We claim that such an integer n_0 exists. Indeed, by minimality, we have $\mathbb{P}(r_\gamma > r_0) < 1$ so $\mathbb{P}(r_\gamma = r_0) > 0$, which means that $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{rk}(\overline{\gamma}_{n_\gamma}) = r_0) > 0$. Let n_0 to be such that $\mathbb{P}(n_\gamma \leq n_0 \cap r_\gamma = r_0) > 0$. Such an n_0 exists, otherwise n_0 would be almost surely infinite, which is absurd.

Now since the sequence (γ_n) is i.i.d, we have $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{rk}(\gamma_{kn_0} \cdots \gamma_{(k+1)n_0-1}) = r_0) > 0$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover these events are independents so for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have:

$$\mathbb{P}(\forall k' < k, \mathbf{rk}(\gamma_{k'n_0} \cdots \gamma_{(k'+1)n_0-1}) > r_0) = (1 - \alpha)^k.$$

Now note that the rank of a product is bounded above by the rank on each of its factor so:

$$\begin{aligned} \forall k \in \mathbb{N}, \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{rk}(\overline{\gamma}_{kn_0}) > r_0) &\leq (1 - \alpha)^k \\ \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \mathbb{P}\left(\mathbf{rk}(\overline{\gamma}_{\lfloor \frac{n}{n_0} \rfloor n_0}) > r_0\right) &\leq (1 - \alpha)^{\lfloor \frac{n}{n_0} \rfloor} \end{aligned}$$

Now note that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $\lfloor \frac{n}{n_0} \rfloor \geq \frac{n}{n_0} - 1$ and $\lfloor \frac{n}{n_0} \rfloor n_0 \leq n$ so:

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{rk}(\overline{\gamma}_n) > r_0) \leq (1 - \alpha)^{\frac{n}{n_0} - 1}.$$

Let $C = \frac{1}{1-\alpha}$ and $\beta = \frac{-\log(1-\alpha)}{n_0} > 0$. Then we have $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{rk}(\overline{\gamma}_n) > r_0) \leq C \exp(-\beta n)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\beta > 0$. Note that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{rk}(\overline{\gamma}_n) > r_0) \geq \mathbb{P}(r_\gamma > r_0)$ so $\mathbb{P}(r_\gamma > r_0) = 0$, which means that $r_0 = r_\gamma$. Hence $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{rk}(\overline{\gamma}_n) > r_0) = \mathbb{P}(n < n_\gamma)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, so $\mathbb{P}(n_\gamma > n) \leq C \exp(-\beta n)$, which means that n_γ has finite exponential moment. \square

Definition 3.5 (Essential kernel). *Let E be a Euclidean space of dimension $d \geq 2$ and let ν be a probability distribution on $\mathrm{End}(E)$. We define the essential kernel of ν as:*

$$(37) \quad \underline{\mathbf{ker}}(\nu) := \{v \in E \mid \exists n \in \mathbb{N}, \nu^{*n} \{h \in \mathrm{End}(E) \mid hv = 0\} > 0\}.$$

Lemma 3.6. *Let E be a Euclidean space of dimension $d \geq 2$ and let ν be a probability distribution on $\mathrm{End}(E)$. There is a probability distribution κ on $\mathrm{End}(E)$ which is supported on the set of rank $\underline{\mathbf{rk}}(\nu)$ endomorphisms and such that:*

$$(38) \quad \underline{\mathbf{ker}}(\nu) = \underline{\mathbf{ker}}(\kappa) = \{v \in E \mid \kappa \{h \in \mathrm{End}(E) \mid hv = 0\} > 0\}$$

$$(39) \quad \forall v \in E, \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \nu^{*n} \{h \mid hv = 0\} = \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \nu^{*n} \{h \mid hv = 0\} = \kappa \{h \mid hv = 0\}.$$

Moreover, there exists a constant $\alpha < 1$ such that:

$$(40) \quad \forall v \in E, \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \nu^{*n} \{h \in \text{End}(E) \mid hv = 0\} \in [0, \alpha] \cup \{1\}.$$

Moreover, the set:

$$(41) \quad \ker(\nu) := \left\{ v \in E \mid \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \nu^{*n} \{h \in \text{End}(E) \mid hv = 0\} = 1 \right\}$$

is a subspace of E which is ν -almost surely invariant.

Proof. Let $(\gamma_n) \sim \nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$. We define the random integer:

$$n_0 := \min \{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid \mathbf{rk}(\gamma_{n-1} \cdots \gamma_0) = \mathbf{rk}(\nu)\}.$$

Let $g := \gamma_{n_0-1} \cdots \gamma_0$ and let κ be the distribution of g . Then by Lemma 3.4 applied to the transpose of ν , the random integer n_0 has finite exponential moment. Now let $v \in E$, and let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, one has:

$$(42) \quad \nu^{*n} \{h \in \text{End}(E) \mid hv = 0\} = \mathbb{P}(\gamma_{n-1} \cdots \gamma_0 v = 0) \leq \mathbb{P}(gv = 0)$$

Indeed if $n \leq n_0$ and $\gamma_{n-1} \cdots \gamma_0 = 0$, then $gv = 0$ and if $n \geq n_0$ then $\mathbf{rk}(\gamma_{n-1} \cdots \gamma_0) = \mathbf{rk}(g)$ therefore $\ker(\gamma_{n-1} \cdots \gamma_0) \cap \text{im}(g) = \{0\}$. So $\gamma_{n-1} \cdots \gamma_0 = 0 \Rightarrow gv = 0$. The inequality (42) is true for all n , this implies that:

$$(43) \quad \underline{\ker}(\nu) \subset \{v \in E \mid \kappa \{h \in \text{End}(E) \mid hv = 0\} > 0\}.$$

Now let v be such that $\mathbb{P}(gv = 0) > 0$, then for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have:

$$\mathbb{P}(\gamma_{n-1} \cdots \gamma_0 v = 0) \geq \mathbb{P}(gv = 0) - \mathbb{P}(n_0 > n).$$

Moreover $\mathbb{P}(n_0 > n) \rightarrow 0$, so we have (39) by (42) and (43). Therefore, there exists an integer $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathbb{P}(\gamma_{n-1} \cdots \gamma_0 v = 0) > 0$. This proves (38) by double inclusion.

Let us prove (40). Let V be the largest subspace of E such that $g(V) = \{0\}$ almost surely. Let

$$(44) \quad \alpha := \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}, v \in E \setminus V} \nu^{*n} \{h \in \text{End}(E) \mid hv = 0\}.$$

Assume by contradiction that $\alpha = 1$. Let (v_n) be a non-random sequence in $E \setminus V$ such that $\mathbb{P}(gv_n = 0) \geq 1 - 2^{-n}$. Then we have $\sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} \mathbb{P}(gv_n \neq 0) < +\infty$. Therefore, by Borel-Cantelli's Lemma, the set $\{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid gv_n \neq 0\}$ is almost surely finite. Let $V' := \bigcap_{m \rightarrow +\infty} \langle (v_n)_{n \geq m} \rangle$. Then since E is finite dimensional, there is an integer $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $v_n \in V'$ for all $n \geq m$. Moreover $g(V') = \{0\}$ almost surely, so $V' \subset V$, which is absurd. This proves (40) by contradiction.

Let us prove (41). Assume by contradiction that $\mathbb{P}(\gamma_0(V) = V) \neq 1$. Let $v \in V$ be such that $\mathbb{P}(\gamma_0 v \notin V) > 0$. Then for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have:

$$\mathbb{P}(\gamma_n \cdots \gamma_0 v \neq 0) \geq \mathbb{P}(\gamma_0 v \notin V) \mathbb{P}(\gamma_n \cdots \gamma_1 \gamma_0 v \neq 0 \mid \gamma_0 v \notin V) \geq \mathbb{P}(\gamma_0 v \notin V)(1 - \alpha) > 0,$$

which is absurd because $\mathbb{P}(\gamma_n \cdots \gamma_0 v \neq 0) \rightarrow 0$. \square

Proposition 3.7. *Let ν be a probability distribution on $\text{End}(E)$. The set $\underline{\ker}(\nu)$ is a countable union of subspaces of E that each have dimension at most $\dim(E) - \mathbf{rk}(\nu)$.*

Proof. Let $d' := \dim(E) - \mathbf{rk}(\nu)$. For all $k \in \{0, \dots, \dim(E)\}$, we denote by $\text{Gr}_k(E)$ the set of subspaces of E of dimension k . Let κ be as in Lemma 3.6 First we show that $\underline{\ker}(\nu)$ is included in a countable union of subspaces of dimension exactly d' . Given $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha > 0$, we define:

$$K_\alpha := \{x \in E \mid \kappa \{h \in \text{End}(E) \mid hx = 0\} \geq \alpha\}$$

Note that we have:

$$\underline{\ker}(\nu) = \bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} K_{2^{-m}},$$

so we only need to show that $K_{2^{-m}}$ is included in a countable union of subspaces for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we claim that $K_{2^{-m}}$ is included in a union of at most $\binom{d' + 2^m}{d'}$ subspaces of E of dimension d' . Let $g \sim \kappa$, write $\alpha := 2^{-m}$ and assume that $K_\alpha \neq \{0\}$.

Let N be an integer and let $(x_1, \dots, x_N) \in K_\alpha$. Assume that for all $1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_k \leq N$ with $k \leq d' + 1$, the space $\langle x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_k} \rangle$ has dimension exactly k . In this case, we say that the family $(x_i)_{1 \leq i \leq N}$ is in general position up to d' . We claim that in this case:

$$(45) \quad N \leq \frac{d'}{\alpha}.$$

To all index $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, we associate a random integer variable $a_i := \mathbf{1}_{g x_i = 0} \in \{0, 1\}$ i.e., such that $a_i = 1$ when $g(x_i) = 0$ and $a_i = 0$ otherwise. Note that $\ker(g)$ has dimension at most d' almost surely.

As a consequence, for all $1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_{d'+1} \leq N$, we have $\dim \langle x_{i_j} \rangle_{1 \leq j \leq d'+1} > \dim(\ker(g))$ almost surely. Hence $\mathbb{P}(\langle x_{i_j} \rangle \subset \ker(g)) = 0$ so $gx_{i_j} \neq 0$ for at least one index j . This means that, with probability 1, the random set of indices $\{1 \leq i \leq N \mid gx_i = 0\}$ does not admit any subset of size $d' + 1$ so it has cardinal at most d' . In other words, $\sum_{i=1}^N a_i \leq d'$ almost surely. Now, note that by definition of \mathbb{K}_α , we have $\mathbb{E}(a_i) = \mathbb{P}(gx_i = 0) \geq \alpha$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$. Hence $N\alpha \leq \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}(a_i) \leq d'$, which proves (45).

Now we want to construct a family $(x_1, \dots, x_N) \in K_\alpha$ that is in general position up to d' and such that:

$$(46) \quad K_\alpha \subset \bigcup_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_{d'} \leq N} \langle x_{i_j} \rangle_{1 \leq j \leq d'}.$$

We do it by induction. Since we assumed that $K_\alpha \neq \{0\}$, there is a non-zero vector $x_1 \in K_\alpha$. Now let $j \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$. Assume that we have constructed a sequence $(x_1, \dots, x_j) \in K_\alpha$ that is in general position up to d' . If we have:

$$K_\alpha \subset \bigcup_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_{d'} \leq j} \langle x_{i_j} \rangle_{1 \leq j \leq d'},$$

then we write $N := j$ and the algorithm ends as (46) is satisfied. Otherwise, we take:

$$x_{j+1} \in K_\alpha \setminus \left(\bigcup_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_{d'} \leq j} \langle x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{d'}} \rangle \right).$$

Then we have constructed a family $(x_1, \dots, x_{j+1}) \in K_\alpha$ that is in general position up to d' . This process terminates after at most $\left\lfloor \frac{d'}{\alpha} \right\rfloor$ steps by (45). Then we conclude by noting that for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$, the set of multi-indices $\{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_{d'} \leq N\}$ has cardinality $\binom{N}{d'}$.

Now for all m we choose a family $(V_1^m, \dots, V_{\binom{d'2^m}{d'}}^m) \in \text{Gr}_{d'}(E)^{\binom{d'2^m}{d'}}$ such that $K_{2^{-m}} \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^{\binom{d'2^m}{d'}} V_j^{m,n}$ and we have:

$$\underline{\ker}(\nu) \subset \bigcup_{\substack{m \in \mathbb{N}, j \in \mathbb{N}, \\ 1 \leq j \leq \binom{d'2^m}{d'}}} V_j^m.$$

This proves that $\underline{\ker}(\nu)$ is included in a countable union of subspaces of dimension exactly d' .

Now we will show that $\underline{\ker}(\nu)$ is in fact equal to a countable union of subspaces. Let $g \sim \kappa$ and let $K := \underline{\ker}(\nu)$. Let $(V_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \in \text{Gr}_{d'}(E)^{\mathbb{N}}$ be such that $K \subset \bigcup V_k$. We will construct a family $(V_{k_0, \dots, k_j})_{\substack{0 \leq j \leq d', \\ (k_0, \dots, k_j) \in \mathbb{N}^{j+1}}}$ such that $(V_{k_0})_{k_0 \in \mathbb{N}} = (V_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, and such that for all $j \in \{1, \dots, d'\}$, we have:

$$(47) \quad K \subset \bigcup_{(k_0, \dots, k_j) \in \mathbb{N}^{j+1}} V_{k_0, \dots, k_j},$$

and for all multi-index $(k_0, \dots, k_j) \in \mathbb{N}^{j+1}$, we have $V_{k_0, \dots, k_j} \subset V_{k_0, \dots, k_{j-1}}$, with equality if and only if $V_{k_0, \dots, k_{j-1}} \subset K$. Then we have:

$$(48) \quad K = \bigcup_{(k_0, \dots, k_{d'}) \in \mathbb{N}^{d'+1}} V_{k_0, \dots, k_{d'+1}}.$$

Indeed, for all $(k_0, \dots, k_{d'}) \in \mathbb{N}^{d'+1}$, we either have $V_{k_0, \dots, k_{d'}} \subset K$ or $V_{k_0} \not\supset V_{k_0, k_1} \not\supset \dots \not\supset V_{k_0, \dots, k_{d'}}$. In the second case, we have $\dim(V_{k_0, \dots, k_{d'}}) \leq \dim(V_{k_0}) - d'$ so $V_{k_1, \dots, k_{d'}} = \{0\}$, which is a contradiction because $0 \in K$ by definition.

We do it by induction. Let $0 \leq c \leq d'$. Assume that we have constructed a family $(V_{k_0, \dots, k_j})_{\substack{0 \leq j \leq c, \\ (k_0, \dots, k_j) \in \mathbb{N}^{j+1}}}$, such that for all $j \in \{0, \dots, c\}$, we have:

$$(49) \quad K \subset \bigcup_{(k_0, \dots, k_j) \in \mathbb{N}^j} V_{k_1, \dots, k_j},$$

and such that for all $j \in \{1, c\}$ and all $(k_0, \dots, k_j) \in \mathbb{N}^{j+1}$, we have $V_{k_0, \dots, k_j} \subset V_{k_0, \dots, k_{j-1}}$, with equality if and only if $V_{k_0, \dots, k_{j-1}} \subset K$.

Let $(k_0, \dots, k_c) \in \mathbb{N}^{c+1}$ be a multi-index such that $V_{k_1, \dots, k_c} \not\subset K$. Then we have almost surely $g(V_{k_0, \dots, k_c}) \neq \{0\}$ so the restriction of h to V_{k_0, \dots, k_c} has rank at least 1 almost surely. By the previous argument, the set:

$$K \cap V_{k_0, \dots, k_c} = \{x \in V_{k_0, \dots, k_c} \mid \mathbb{P}(hx = 0) > 0\}$$

is included in the union of a countable family of subspaces of V_{k_0, \dots, k_c} that have dimension $\dim(V_{k_0, \dots, k_c}) - 1$. For all multi-index $(k_0, \dots, k_c) \in \mathbb{N}^{c+1}$ such that $V_{k_1, \dots, k_c} \not\subset K$, we define $(V_{k_0, \dots, k_{c+1}})_{k_{c+1} \in \mathbb{N}}$ to be such a family. For every other multi-index $(k_0, \dots, k_c) \in \mathbb{N}^{c+1}$, we define $V_{k_0, \dots, k_{c+1}} := V_{k_0, \dots, k_c}$ for all $k_c \in \mathbb{N}$. \square

Remark 3.8. *Let ν be a probability distribution over $\text{End}(E)$ and (γ_n) be a random sequence of distribution $\nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$. Then for every $x \in E$, the sequence $\mathbb{P}(\overline{\gamma}_n x = 0)$ is non-decreasing and its limit is positive if and only if $x \in \underline{\ker}(\nu)$.*

3.3. Rank one boundary of a semi-group. Given a subset A of a topological space X , we denote by $\text{cl}_X(A)$ the closure of A in X . Note that saying that an endomorphism has rank one is equivalent to saying that it is the product of a non-trivial vector on the left by a non-trivial linear form on the right.

Given a probability measure ν on a topological space X , we denote by $\text{supp}_X(\nu)$ or simply $\text{supp}(\nu)$ the smallest closed subset of X on which ν is supported. Then $\text{supp}(\nu)$ is characterized by the fact that it is closed and for all open $\mathcal{U} \subset X$, we have $\nu(\mathcal{U}) > 0$ if and only if $\mathcal{U} \cap \text{supp}(\nu) \neq \emptyset$.

We remind that given E a vector space and $u \in E \setminus \{0\}$, we denote by $[u]$ the projective class of u and we denote by $\mathbf{P}(E)$ the projective space of E . Given $X \subset \mathbf{P}(E)$, we will write "Let $[u] \in X$ " for "Let u be a non-zero vector such that $[u] \in X$ ".

Definition 3.9 (Rank one boundary). *Let E be a Euclidean space and let $\Gamma < \text{End}(E)$ be a sub-semi-group. Let $\overline{\Gamma} := \text{cl}_{\text{End}(E)}(\mathbb{K}\Gamma)$. We denote by $\partial\Gamma$ the rank-one boundary of Γ , defined as:*

$$(50) \quad \partial\Gamma := \{[\gamma] \mid \gamma \in \overline{\Gamma}, \text{rk}(\gamma) = 1\}$$

We define the left and right boundaries of Γ as:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_u\Gamma &:= \{[hv] \mid [h] \in \partial\Gamma, v \in E \setminus \ker(h)\} \subset \mathbf{P}(E) \\ \partial_w\Gamma &:= \{[fh] \mid [h] \in \partial\Gamma, f \in E^* \setminus \ker(h^*)\} \subset \mathbf{P}(E^*). \end{aligned}$$

Definition 3.10 (Range and boundary of a distribution). *Let E be a Euclidean space and let ν be a probability measure on $\text{End}(E)$. We denote by Γ_ν the range of ν defined as the smallest closed sub-semi-group of $\text{End}(E)$ that has measure 1 for ν . We define $\partial\nu := \partial\Gamma_\nu$ and $\partial_u\nu := \partial_u\Gamma_\nu$ and $\partial_w\nu := \partial_w\Gamma_\nu$.*

Lemma 3.11 (Invariant subspaces and irreducibility). *Let E be a Euclidean space. Let ν be a probability measure on $\text{End}(E)$. Let $S := \text{supp}(\nu)$. Let $V \subset E$ be a proper non-trivial subspace. If $SV \subset V$ then ν is not irreducible.*

Let $N \geq 1$ and let $V_1, \dots, V_N \subset E$ be proper non-trivial subspaces. If $\bigcup_{i=1}^N S \cdot V_i \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^N V_i$ then Γ is not strongly irreducible.

Proof. Let $\Gamma = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} S^n = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \Pi(S^n)$ be the semi-group generated by S . Note that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, one has $\nu^{*n}(\Gamma) = 1$. Let $V \subset E$ be a proper non-trivial subspace such that $SV \subset V$. The fact that V is a proper subspace implies that there is a linear form $f \in E^* \setminus \{0\}$ such that $V \subset \ker(f)$. The fact that V is not trivial implies that there is a vector $v \in V \setminus \{0\}$. Let f and v be as above. We have $\Gamma \cdot v \subset V$, hence $f\gamma v = 0$ for all $\gamma \in \Gamma$ so ν is not irreducible.

Let $N \geq 1$ and let $V_1, \dots, V_N \subset E$ be a family of proper non-trivial subspaces such that $\bigcup_{i=1}^N S \cdot V_i \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^N V_i$. Let $f_1, \dots, f_N \in E^* \setminus \{0\}$ be such that $V_i \subset \ker(f_i)$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$. Let $v \in V_1 \setminus \{0\}$. Then one has $\Gamma \cdot v \subset \bigcup V_i$, hence $\prod_{i=1}^N f_i \gamma v = 0$ for all $\gamma \in \Gamma$ so ν is not strongly irreducible. \square

We call irreducible semi-group a semi-group $\Gamma \subset \text{End}(E)$ such that for all $v \in E \setminus \{0\}$ and all $f \in E^* \setminus \{0\}$, there is an element $\gamma \in \Gamma$ such that $f\gamma v \neq 0$.

Lemma 3.12. *Let E be a Euclidean space and let $\Gamma < \text{End}(E)$ be an irreducible semi-group. Then we have a factorization:*

$$(51) \quad \partial\Gamma = \{[uw] \mid [u] \in \partial_u\Gamma, [w] \in \partial_w\Gamma\}.$$

Proof. Note that the space $\mathbf{P}(\text{End}(E))$ is metrizable so the closure is characterized by sequences. Let π be a rank one endomorphism. Saying that $[\pi] \in \partial\Gamma$ is equivalent to saying that there is a sequence $(\gamma_n) \in (\Gamma \setminus \{0\})^{\mathbb{N}}$ such that $[\gamma_n] \rightarrow [\pi]$. Note also that the product map is continuous so $\overline{\Gamma}$ is a semi-group. Therefore, for all $[\pi_1], [\pi_2] \in \partial\Gamma$, and for all $\gamma \in \Gamma$ such that $\pi_1\gamma\pi_2 \neq 0$, we have $[\pi_1\gamma\pi_2] \in \partial\Gamma$.

Let $v_1 \in \partial_u\Gamma$ and let $f_2 \in \partial_w\Gamma$. Let $v_2 \in E$ and $f_1 \in E^*$ be such that $[v_1 f_1] \in \partial\Gamma$ and $[v_2 f_2] \in \partial\Gamma$. By definition of the irreducibility, there is an element $\gamma \in \Gamma$ such that $f_1\gamma v_2 \neq 0$. Let γ be such an element. Then we have $v_1 f_1 \gamma v_2 f_2 \neq 0$ hence $[v_1 f_1 \gamma v_2 f_2] \in \partial\Gamma$. Moreover $[v_1 f_1 \gamma v_2 f_2] = [v_1 f_2]$ because $f_1 \gamma v_2$ is a scalar, therefore $[v_1 f_2] \in \partial\Gamma$. \square

Lemma 3.13 (Characterisation of proximality). *Let E be a Euclidean space and let ν be a probability measure on $\text{End}(E)$. Let $(\gamma_n) \sim \nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$. Assume that ν is irreducible and that $\underline{\text{rk}}(\nu) \geq 1$. Then the following assertions are equivalent:*

- (1) ν is not proximal (in the sense of Definition 1.1).
- (2) There is a constant B such that $\text{sqz}(\overline{\gamma}_n) \leq B$ almost surely and for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.
- (3) $\partial\nu = \emptyset$.

Proof. We assume (2) and we claim that we have (3). Note that sqz is a continuous map over $\text{End}(E) \setminus \{0\}$ and it only depends on the projective class so for B as in (2), we have $\text{sqz}(h) \leq B$ for all $h \in \overline{\Gamma}_\nu \setminus \{0\}$. It implies that there is no rank one endomorphism in $\overline{\Gamma}_\nu$. Therefore $\partial\nu = \emptyset$.

Now we prove the converse by contraposition. Assume that $(\text{sqz}(\overline{\gamma}_n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is not almost surely bounded. It means that for all B , there is an integer n such that $\mathbb{P}(\text{sqz}(\overline{\gamma}_n) > B) > 0$ or equivalently, there is a matrix $h \in \text{supp}(\nu^{*n})$ such that $\text{sqz}(h) > B$. Then there is a sequence $(h_k) \in \Gamma_\nu^{\mathbb{N}}$ such that $\text{sqz}(h_k) \rightarrow +\infty$. The space $\mathbf{P}(\text{End}(E))$ is compact so the sequence $[h_k]$ has a limit point. Let $[\pi]$ be such a limit point, then we have $\text{sqz}(\pi) = +\infty$ so π has rank one, hence $[\pi] \in \partial\nu$.

We assume that ν is proximal and show that (2) is false. The map prox is not continuous on $\text{End}(E) \setminus \{0\}$ but it is on the set of proximal matrices. That means that given a matrix h such that $\text{prox}(h) > 0$, there is a neighbourhood \mathcal{N} of h such that $\text{prox}(h') \geq \frac{1}{2}\text{prox}(h)$ for all $h' \in \mathcal{N}$. Let n be an integer such that $\mathbb{P}(\text{prox}(\overline{\gamma}_n) > 0) > 0$, then there is a matrix $h \in \text{supp}(\nu^{*n})$ such that $\text{prox}(h) > 0$, it means that $\text{sqz}(h^m) \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} +\infty$. Moreover, for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $h^m \in \text{supp}(\nu^{*nm})$, hence $\mathbb{P}(\text{sqz}(\overline{\gamma}_{nm}) \geq \text{sqz}(h^m) - 1) > 0$, which contradicts (2).

Now we assume that $\partial\nu \neq \emptyset$ and show that ν is proximal. First we prove that there is $[\pi] \in \partial\nu$ such that $\text{prox}(\pi) = +\infty$, which simply means that $\pi^2 \neq 0$. Let $[w] \in \partial_w\nu$. Let $[u] \in \partial_u\nu$ be such that $wu \neq 0$. Such a u exists because $\overline{\Gamma}_\nu$ is invariant by left multiplication by Γ_ν . Therefore the set $\{0\} \cup \{u \in E \mid [u] \in \partial_u\nu\}$ is invariant by the action of Γ_ν , which is irreducible, hence it is not included in $\ker(w)$ by Lemma 3.11. Then by Lemma 3.12, we have $[uw] \in \partial\nu$ and since $wu \neq 0$, we have $(uw)^2 \neq 0$. Let \mathcal{N} be an open neighbourhood of uw such that $\text{prox}(h') \geq 1$ for all $h' \in \mathcal{N}$. This neighbourhood intersects $\overline{\Gamma}_\nu$ so $\mathbb{K}\mathcal{N}$ intersects $\text{supp}(\nu^{*n})$ for some n , which means that ν is proximal. \square

3.4. Construction of the Schottky measure. Remind that a measurable binary relation over a measurable space Γ is a subset $\mathbb{A} \subset \Gamma \times \Gamma$ that is measurable for the product σ -algebra. Given $g, h \in \Gamma$, we write $g\mathbb{A}h$ to say that $(g, h) \in \mathbb{A}$. Given $S, T \subset \Gamma$, we write $S\mathbb{A}T$ to say that $S \times T \subset \mathbb{A}$. Given $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(g_0, \dots, g_n) \in \Gamma^{n+1}$, we write $g_0\mathbb{A} \dots \mathbb{A}g_n$ to say that $g_i\mathbb{A}g_{i+1}$ for all $i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$.

Definition 3.14. *Let Γ be a measurable space, let \mathbb{A} be a measurable binary relation on Γ and let $0 \leq \rho < 1$. Let ν_s be a probability measure on Γ . We say that ν_s is ρ -Schottky for \mathbb{A} if:*

$$\forall h \in \Gamma, \nu_s\{\gamma \in \Gamma \mid h\mathbb{A}\gamma\} \geq 1 - \rho \quad \text{and} \quad \nu_s\{\gamma \in \Gamma \mid \gamma\mathbb{A}h\} \geq 1 - \rho.$$

Remark 3.15. *Let Γ be a measurable space, let $\mathbb{A} \subset \mathbb{A}'$ be measurable binary relation on Γ and let $0 \leq \rho \leq \rho' < 1$. Let ν be a probability measure on Γ that is ρ -Schottky for \mathbb{A} . Then ν_s is also ρ' -Schottky for \mathbb{A}' .*

We recall that the alignment \mathbb{A}^ε has been defined in Definition 1.9. Given $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$ and g, h two matrices, we write $g\mathbb{A}^\varepsilon h$ when $\|gh\| \geq \varepsilon\|g\|\|h\|$.

Lemma 3.16. *Let E be a Euclidean space, let $\Gamma < \text{End}(E)$ be a strongly irreducible semi-group and let $0 < \rho \leq 1$. There exist an integer $N \in \mathbb{N}$, a constant $\varepsilon > 0$ and a family $([\pi_1], \dots, [\pi_N]) \in \partial\Gamma^N$ such that:*

$$\forall h \in \text{End}(E) \setminus \{0\}, \#\{k \mid \pi_k\mathbb{A}^\varepsilon h\} \geq (1 - \rho)N \quad \text{and} \quad \#\{k \mid h\mathbb{A}^\varepsilon \pi_k\} \geq (1 - \rho)N.$$

Proof. Let $d := \dim(E)$. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Assume that we have constructed a family $([u_1], \dots, [u_m]) \in \partial_u\Gamma^m$ that is in general position in the sense that for all $k \leq d$, and for all $1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_k \leq m$, we have $\dim(\langle u_{i_1}, \dots, u_{i_k} \rangle) = k$. Let:

$$u_{m+1} \in \{u \in E \mid [u] \in \partial_u\Gamma\} \setminus \bigcup_{\substack{k \leq d-1, \\ 1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_k \leq m}} \langle u_{i_j} \rangle_{1 \leq j \leq k}.$$

Such a u_{m+1} exists because $\{u \in E \mid [u] \in \partial_u\Gamma\} \cup \{0\}$ is Γ -invariant and it is not $\{0\}$ by Lemma 3.13. Hence $\{u \in E \mid [u] \in \partial_u\Gamma\}$ can not be included in $\bigcup_{i_1 < \dots < i_k} \langle u_{i_j} \rangle_{1 \leq j \leq k}$, which is a finite union of hyperplanes. Then $[u_{m+1}] \in \partial\Gamma$ and we can easily check that $([u_1], \dots, [u_{m+1}])$ is in general position.

let $M := \left\lceil \frac{d-1}{\rho} \right\rceil$. Let $([u_1], \dots, [u_M]) \in \partial_u \Gamma^M$ be in general position. We can construct such a family by induction using the above argument. Let $([w_1], \dots, [w_M]) \in \partial_w \Gamma^M$ be in general position. By the above argument applied to $\Gamma^* := \{\gamma^* \mid \gamma \in \Gamma\} \subset \text{End}(E^*)$, which is also strongly irreducible, we can construct such a family.

Let $N := M^2$. Given $i, j \in \{1, \dots, M\}$, we define $\pi_{Mi+j} := u_i w_j$. Then $([\pi_1], \dots, [\pi_N]) \in \partial \Gamma^N$ by Lemma 3.12. Note also that given $g, h \in \text{End}(E)$, saying that $g \mathbb{A}^\varepsilon h$ is equivalent to saying that $\frac{\|gh\|}{\|g\|\|h\|} \geq \varepsilon$.

Let $h \in \text{End}(E) \setminus \{0\}$. Let $I^h := \{i \mid u_i \in \ker(h)\}$. Since the family $([u_1], \dots, [u_M])$ is in general position and $\langle u_i \rangle_{i \in I} \subset \ker(h)$, we have $\#I \leq d-1$. Let $J^h := \{j \mid w_j \in \ker(h^*)\}$. By the same argument, we have $\#J^h \leq d-1$. Now let:

$$\psi(h) := \max_{\substack{I, J \subset \{1, \dots, M\}, \\ \#I \leq d-1, \#J \leq d-1}} \min \left\{ \min_{i \notin I} \frac{\|hu_i\|}{\|h\|\|u_i\|}, \min_{j \notin J} \frac{\|w_j h\|}{\|w_j\|\|h\|} \right\}.$$

By the previous argument, one has $\psi(h) > 0$ for all h . Moreover the maps $h \mapsto \frac{\|hv\|}{\|h\|\|v\|}$ and $\frac{\|fh\|}{\|f\|\|h\|}$ are continuous for all $v \in E \setminus \{0\}$ and all $f \in E^* \setminus \{0\}$. Hence ψ is continuous. Moreover, ψ is invariant by scalar multiplication so there is a continuous map $\phi : \mathbf{P}(\text{End}(E)) \rightarrow (0, 1]$ such that $\phi([h]) = \psi(h)$ for all $h \in \text{End}(E) \setminus \{0\}$. The projective space $\mathbf{P}(\text{End}(E))$ is compact so $\phi(\mathbf{P}(\text{End}(E)))$ is compact. Let ε be its lower bound.

Now let $h \in \text{End}(E) \setminus \{0\}$. The set of indices $\{k \mid \pi_k \mathbb{A}^\varepsilon h\}$ is $\{Mi+j \mid i, j \in \{1, \dots, M\}, w_j \mathbb{A}^\varepsilon h\}$, which has cardinality at least $M(M-d+1)$. Indeed, since $\psi(h) \geq \varepsilon$, a sufficient condition to have $w_j \mathbb{A}^\varepsilon h$ is for j not to be included in a set J that realises the maximum in the definition of $\psi(h)$. Moreover we have $M\rho \geq d-1$ so $M(M-d+1) \geq (1-\rho)N$. By the same argument $\#\{k \mid h \mathbb{A}^\varepsilon \pi_k\} \geq (1-\rho)N$. \square

Corollary 3.17. *Let E be a Euclidean space, let ν be a strongly irreducible and proximal probability measure on $\text{End}(E)$, let $0 < \rho \leq 1$ and let $K \geq 8$. There exist an integer N , two constants $\alpha', \varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, a family $(n_k)_{1 \leq k \leq N} \in \mathbb{N}^N$ and a family $(S'_k)_{1 \leq k \leq N}$ of measurable subsets of Γ such that $\nu^{*n_k}(S'_k) \geq \alpha'$ for all $1 \leq k \leq N$ and such that:*

$$(52) \quad \forall h \in \text{End}(E), \#\{k \mid S'_k \mathbb{A}^{2\varepsilon} h\} \geq (1-\rho)N \text{ and } \#\{k \mid h \mathbb{A}^{2\varepsilon} S'_k\} \geq (1-\rho)N,$$

$$(53) \quad \forall j \in \{1, \dots, N\}, \#\{k \mid S'_k \mathbb{A}^\varepsilon S'_j\} \geq (1-\rho)N \text{ and } \#\{k \mid S'_j \mathbb{A}^\varepsilon S'_k\} \geq (1-\rho)N,$$

$$(54) \quad \forall h \in \bigcup_{k=1}^N S'_k, \text{sqz}(h) \geq K|\log(\varepsilon)| + K \log(2).$$

Proof. Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\varepsilon > 0$ and let $([\pi_1], \dots, [\pi_N]) \in \partial \nu^N$ be such that:

$$\forall h \in \text{End}(E) \setminus \{0\}, \#\{k \mid \pi_k \mathbb{A}^{3\varepsilon} h\} \geq (1-\rho)N \text{ and } \#\{k \mid h \mathbb{A}^{3\varepsilon} \pi_k\} \geq (1-\rho)N.$$

Such a family exists by Lemma 3.16. To all $k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, we associate the open set:

$$S'_k := \left\{ h \in \text{End}(E) \setminus \{0\} \mid \varepsilon > \left\| \frac{h}{\|h\|} - \frac{\pi_k}{\|\pi_k\|} \right\|, \text{sqz}(h) > K|\log(\varepsilon)| + K \log(2) \right\}.$$

Now let $k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ and $h \in \text{End}(E) \setminus \{0\}$. Assume that $h \mathbb{A}^{3\varepsilon} \pi_k$, then we claim that for all $h' \in S'_k$, we have $h \mathbb{A}^{2\varepsilon} h'$. Note that the right multiplication by h' is $\|h'\|$ -Lipschitz so $\left\| \frac{hh'}{\|h\|} - \frac{\pi_k h'}{\|\pi_k\|} \right\| \leq \varepsilon \|h'\|$. We assumed $h \mathbb{A}^{3\varepsilon} \pi_k$, which means that $\left\| \frac{\pi_k h'}{\|\pi_k\|} \right\| \geq 3\varepsilon \|h'\|$, hence by triangular inequality, we have $\left\| \frac{hh'}{\|h\|} \right\| \geq 2\varepsilon \|h'\|$. The same reasoning works the same for the left alignment and we have:

$$\forall h \in \text{End}(E) \setminus \{0\}, \#\{k \mid S'_k \mathbb{A}^{2\varepsilon} h\} \geq (1-\rho)N \text{ and } \#\{k \mid h \mathbb{A}^{2\varepsilon} S'_k\} \geq (1-\rho)N.$$

Now let $j, k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ be such that $\pi_j \mathbb{A}^{3\varepsilon} \pi_k$ and let $h \in S'_j$ and $h' \in S'_k$. Then by the above argument, we have $h \mathbb{A}^{2\varepsilon} \pi_k$ and by the same argument, we have $h \mathbb{A}^\varepsilon h'$. Hence:

$$\forall j \in \{1, \dots, N\}, \#\{k \mid S'_k \mathbb{A}^\varepsilon S'_j\} \geq (1-\rho)N \text{ and } \#\{k \mid S'_j \mathbb{A}^\varepsilon S'_k\} \geq (1-\rho)N.$$

Let $k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$. The interior of S'_k contain π_k . It means that the interior of S'_k intersects $\bar{\Gamma}_\nu = \text{cl} \left(\bigcup_{n=0}^\infty \mathbb{K} \text{supp}(\nu^{*n}) \right)$. Hence, there is an integer n_k such that the interior of S'_k intersects $\mathbb{R} \text{supp}(\nu^{*n_k})$ and then S'_k intersects $\text{supp}(\nu^{*n_k})$ because it is a cone and $\nu^{*n_k}(S'_k) > 0$ by characterization of the support. Let $(n_k) \in \mathbb{N}^N$ be such that $\nu^{*n_k}(S'_k) > 0$ for all $k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$. Let $\alpha' := \min_k \nu^{*n_k}(S'_k)$. \square

Lemma 3.18. *Let E be a Euclidean space, let ν be a strongly irreducible and proximal probability measure on $\text{End}(E)$, let $0 < \rho < 1$ and let $K \geq 8$. There exist an integer N , two constants $\alpha, \varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, an integer*

m and a family $(S_k)_{1 \leq k \leq N}$ of measurable subsets of $\text{End}(E)$ such that $\nu^{*m}(S_k) \geq \alpha$ for all $1 \leq k \leq N$ and such that:

$$(55) \quad \forall h \in \text{End}(E), \#\{k \mid S_k \mathbb{A}^\varepsilon h\} \geq (1 - \rho)N \text{ and } \#\{k \mid h \mathbb{A}^\varepsilon S_k\} \geq (1 - \rho)N,$$

$$(56) \quad \forall h \in \bigcup_{k=1}^N S_k, \text{sqz}(h) \geq K|\log(\varepsilon)| + K \log(2).$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\rho < \frac{1}{3}$. Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\alpha', \varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, let (n_k) and (S'_k) be as in Corollary 3.17. To all index $k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, we associate two indices $i_k, j_k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ such that $S'_k \mathbb{A}^\varepsilon S'_{i_k}$ and $S'_{i_k} \mathbb{A}^\varepsilon S'_k$ and $S'_k \mathbb{A}^\varepsilon S'_{j_k}$. By (53), such indices i_k, j_k exist because:

$$\#\{(i, j) \mid S'_i \mathbb{A}^\varepsilon S'_k \mathbb{A}^\varepsilon S'_i \mathbb{A}^\varepsilon S'_j \mathbb{A}^\varepsilon S'_k \mathbb{A}^\varepsilon S'_j\} \geq (1 - 2\rho)N(1 - 3\rho)N > 0.$$

Hence the set of all possible values for i_k, j_k is non-empty. Now let m' be the smallest common multiple of $\{n_k + n_{i_k} \mid 1 \leq k \leq N\}$, let m'' be the smallest common multiple of $\{n_k + n_{j_k} \mid 1 \leq k \leq N\}$ and let $m = m' + m''$. Let $k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$. We define $p_k := \frac{m'}{n_k + n_{i_k}}$ and $q_k := \frac{m''}{n_k + n_{j_k}}$ and:

$$S_k := (S'_k \cdot S'_{i_k})^{p_k} \cdot (S'_{j_k} \cdot S'_k)^{q_k} = \Pi((S'_k \times S'_{j_k})^{p_k} \times (S'_{i_k} \times S'_k)^{q_k}).$$

Then we have $\nu^{*m}(S_k) \geq (\nu^{n_k}(S'_k) \nu^{n_{i_k}}(S'_{i_k}))^{p_k} (\nu^{n_{j_k}}(S'_{j_k}) \nu^{n_k}(S'_k))^{q_k} \geq \alpha'^{2p_k + 2q_k} \geq \alpha'^{2m} =: \alpha$.

Now let $h \in \text{End}(E) \setminus \{0\}$ and let $k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$. Assume that $h \mathbb{A}^{2\varepsilon} S'_k$, then by Lemma 2.15, we have $h \mathbb{A}^\varepsilon S_k$. If we instead assume that $S'_k \mathbb{A}^{2\varepsilon} h$, then by the same argument applied to the transpose, we have $S_k \mathbb{A}^\varepsilon h$. Lemma 2.15 also implies that $\min \text{sqz}(S_k) \geq \min \text{sqz}(S'_k)$ for all k . \square

Corollary 3.19. *Let E be a Euclidean space, let $\Gamma \in \{\text{End}(E), \text{GL}(E)\}$ and let ν be a strongly irreducible and proximal probability measure on Γ , let $0 < \rho < 1$ and let $K \geq 8$. There exist an integer m , two constants $\alpha, \varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and a probability measure $\tilde{\nu}_s$ on Γ^m such that:*

- (1) *The measure $\Pi_* \tilde{\nu}_s$ is ρ -Schottky for \mathbb{A}^ε .*
- (2) *The measure $\tilde{\nu}_s$ is absolutely continuous with respect to $\nu^{\otimes m}$ in the sense that $\alpha \tilde{\nu}_s \leq \nu^{\otimes m}$.*
- (3) *We have $\text{sqz}_* \Pi_* \tilde{\nu}_s [K|\log(\varepsilon)| + K \log(2), +\infty] = 1$ i.e., for all (h_1, \dots, h_m) in the support of $\tilde{\nu}_s$, we have $\text{sqz}(h_1 \cdots h_m) \geq K|\log(\varepsilon)| + K \log(2)$.*
- (4) *The support of $\tilde{\nu}_s$ is compact in Γ^m .*

Proof. Let $m, N \in \mathbb{N}$, $\alpha, \varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $(S_k)_{1 \leq k \leq N}$ be as in Lemma 3.18. Define $f : \Gamma^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ as:

$$f := \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{\mathbb{1}_{S_k} \circ \Pi}{\nu^{*m}(S_k)}.$$

Then $f \leq \frac{N}{\alpha}$ because we assumed that $\nu^{*m}(S_k) \geq \alpha$ for all k . Moreover, we can check that $\int_{\Gamma^m} f d\nu^{\otimes m} = N$ and for all $k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ we have $\int_{\Pi^{-1}(S_k)} f d\nu^{\otimes m} \geq 1$. Let:

$$\tilde{\nu}_s := \frac{f \nu^{\otimes m}}{\int_{\Gamma^m} f d\nu^{\otimes m}} \quad \text{and} \quad \nu_s := \Pi_* \tilde{\nu}_s.$$

Then $\frac{\alpha}{N} \nu_s \leq \nu^{*m}$ by definition. Moreover, for all $I \subset \{1, \dots, N\}$, we have $\nu_s(\bigcup_{i \in I} S_i) \geq \frac{\#I}{N}$. Hence ν_s is ρ -Schottky by (55). Moreover ν_s is supported on $\bigcup S_k$ and $\text{sqz}(S_k) \subset [K|\log(\varepsilon)| + K \log(2), +\infty]$ for all k so $\text{sqz}_* \nu_s [K|\log(\varepsilon)| + K \log(2), +\infty] = 1$.

Now we only need to show that we can moreover assume that $\tilde{\nu}_s$ has compact support. Let $\beta \in (0, 1)$. There is a compact $\mathbf{C} \subset \Gamma^m$ such that $\tilde{\nu}_s(\mathbf{C}) > 1 - \beta$. Let $\tilde{\nu}_s^{\mathbf{C}} := \frac{\mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{C}} \tilde{\nu}_s}{\tilde{\nu}_s(\mathbf{C})}$. Let $\nu_s^{\mathbf{C}} := \Pi_* \tilde{\nu}_s^{\mathbf{C}}$. Then $\nu_s^{\mathbf{C}}(\bigcup_{i \in I} S_i) \geq \frac{1}{N} - \beta$ for all $I \subset \{1, \dots, N\}$. Hence $\nu_s^{\mathbf{C}}$ is $(\rho + \beta)$ -Schottky. Moreover $\alpha(1 - \beta) \tilde{\nu}_s \leq \nu^{\otimes m}$. This is true for all $0 < \beta < \frac{1}{3} - \rho$ so $\rho + \beta$ can take any value in $(0, 1)$ and we always have $\alpha(1 - \beta) > 0$. \square

4. PIVOTING TECHNIQUE

4.1. Statement of the result and motivation. In this section, we denote by Γ a measurable semi-group that we endow with a binary relation \mathbb{A} and a subset $S \subset \Gamma$. The idea is to think of Γ as $\text{End}(E)$ or $\text{GL}(E)$, think of \mathbb{A} as \mathbb{A}^ε and think of S as a compact subset of Γ such that $\min \text{sqz}(S) \geq K|\log(\varepsilon)| + K \log(2)$.

We denote by $\tilde{\Gamma}$ the associated semi-group of words. We define the semi-binary relation $\tilde{\mathbb{A}}^S \subset \Gamma \times \tilde{\Gamma}$ recursively. Let $g \in \Gamma$ and let $\tilde{\gamma} \in \tilde{\Gamma}$. We write $g \tilde{\mathbb{A}}^S \tilde{\gamma}$ if $g \in S$ and one of the following conditions holds:

- There exist words $\tilde{g}_0, \tilde{g}_1, \tilde{g}_2 \in \tilde{\Gamma}$ such that $\tilde{\gamma} = \tilde{g}_0 \odot \tilde{g}_1 \odot \tilde{g}_2$, and $\Pi(\tilde{g}_1) \in S$ and $\Pi(\tilde{g}_0) \mathbb{A} \Pi(\tilde{g}_1) \mathbb{A} \Pi(\tilde{g}_2)$ and $g \mathbb{A} \Pi(\tilde{\gamma})$.

- There exist words $\tilde{g}_0, \tilde{g}_1, \tilde{g}_2 \in \tilde{\Gamma}$ such that $\tilde{\gamma} = \tilde{g}_0 \odot \tilde{g}_1 \odot \tilde{g}_2$, and $\Pi(\tilde{g}_1) \in S$ and $g\tilde{\mathbb{A}}^S\tilde{g}_0$ and $\Pi(\tilde{g}_0)\mathbb{A}\Pi(\tilde{g}_1)\mathbb{A}\Pi(\tilde{g}_2)$.

Given $0 \leq k < n \in \mathbb{N}$, we write $\chi_k^n : \Gamma^{\{0, \dots, n-1\}} \rightarrow \Gamma$; $(\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_{n-1}) \mapsto \gamma_k$ for the k -th coordinate projection, in the same way, we define $\chi_k^\infty : \Gamma^\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \Gamma$. We sometimes omit the total length $l \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ and write χ_k instead of χ_k^l . Given $\gamma \in \tilde{\Gamma}$, and $k < L(\tilde{\gamma})$, we call $\chi_k(\tilde{\gamma})$ the k -th character of $\tilde{\gamma}$.

Theorem 4.1 (Pivotal extraction). *Let Γ be a measurable semi-group, let \mathbb{A} be a binary relation on Γ and let $S \subset \Gamma$ be measurable. Let ν be a probability measure on Γ , let $0 < \alpha < 1$, let $0 < \rho < \frac{1}{5}$ and let $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\tilde{\nu}_s$ be a probability measure on Γ^m such that $\alpha\tilde{\nu}_s \leq \nu^{\otimes m}$ and let $\nu_s := \Pi_*\tilde{\nu}_s$. Assume that ν_s is supported on S and ρ -Schottky for \mathbb{A} . Then there exist constants $C, \beta > 0$ that only depend on (α, ρ, m) and an extraction $\tilde{\mu}$ of $\nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$ such that for $(\tilde{g}_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sim \tilde{\mu}$, for $(\gamma_n) = \bigodot_{m=0}^\infty \tilde{g}_k \sim \nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$, all the following conditions hold:*

- (1) For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $\Pi(\tilde{g}_{2k})\mathbb{A}\Pi(\tilde{g}_{2k+1})\tilde{\mathbb{A}}^S\tilde{g}_{2k+2}$ almost surely.
- (2) For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $L(\tilde{g}_{2k+1}) = m$ almost surely and the conditional distribution of \tilde{g}_{2k+1} relatively to $(\tilde{g}_j)_{j \neq 2k+1}$ is almost surely bounded above by $\frac{\tilde{\nu}_s}{1-2\rho}$ i.e., for all measurable $A \subset \Gamma^m$, we have almost surely:

$$(57) \quad \mathbb{P}(\tilde{g}_{2k+1} \in A \mid (\tilde{g}_j)_{j \neq 2k+1}) \leq \frac{\tilde{\nu}_s(A)}{1-2\rho}$$

- (3) For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have almost surely:

$$(58) \quad \forall l \in \mathbb{N}, \mathbb{P}(L(\tilde{g}_k) > l \mid (\tilde{g}_j)_{j \neq k}) \leq C \exp(-\beta l).$$

- (4) For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and for all measurable $A \subset \Gamma \setminus \bigcup_{k=0}^{m-1} \chi_k^m(\text{supp}(\tilde{\nu}_s))$, we have:

$$(59) \quad \mathbb{P}(\gamma_n \in A \mid (L(\tilde{g}_{2k}))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}) \leq \frac{\nu(A)}{1-\alpha}.$$

Sections 4.2 and 4.3 are devoted to the proof of Theorem 4.1. In section 4.2, we construct a preliminary extraction that gives us a sequence of independent random matrices alternating between an unknown distribution and the Schottky distribution ν_s of Theorem 4.1. Then from this ping-pong extraction, we construct an extraction for which the unknown words now have a large squeeze coefficient. We do not claim that the words in this preliminary extraction are aligned.

In section 4.3, we implement the pivoting technique to construct an extraction which is aligned. This means that we look at the sequence of words that we have constructed in section 4.2 from past to future. All oddly indexed words are candidate pivotal times. The pivoting technique is an inductive way to eliminate pivotal times so that the word indexed by each selected pivotal time is aligned with its neighbours i.e., aligned on the left with the product of everything until the previous selected pivotal time and aligned on the right with the product of everything until the next candidate or selected pivotal time.

We move forward and select the current candidate pivotal time when the $\tilde{\nu}_s$ -distributed word is aligned with both its neighbours. Otherwise we eliminate the candidate pivotal time and move backwards i.e., concatenate everything together and look at the last candidate pivotal time. We then use a version of (57) which holds all over the inductive construction to show that the probability of backtracking each step is at most $\frac{\rho}{1-2\rho}$ and we get an exponential control over the size of the backtrack. The issue is that the algorithm does not guarantee proper alignment but alignment in the sense of $\tilde{\mathbb{A}}^S$. Indeed the selected pivotal time that guarantees us the alignment satisfies three alignment conditions, hence (57) does not hold any more for this time, therefore we have to discard it. Then by induction we show that the previous candidate pivotal time is $\tilde{\mathbb{A}}^S$ -aligned with the concatenation of all the words we have just concatenated together. Hence the inductive and non-symmetric definition of $\tilde{\mathbb{A}}^S$.

Note that in concrete applications the alignment $\tilde{\mathbb{A}}^S$ implies genuine alignment as testified by the next two results.

Remark 4.2 (Rigidity of the alignment in the toy model). *Let $\Gamma = \langle a, b, c \mid a^2 = b^2 = c^2 = \mathbf{1} \rangle$. Let $\mathbb{A} := \{(g, h); |g \cdot h| = |g| + |h|\}$ and let $S := \Gamma \setminus \{\mathbf{1}\}$. Let $\gamma\tilde{\mathbb{A}}^S\tilde{g}$ and let $g = \Pi(\tilde{g})$. Then we have $\gamma\mathbb{A}g$ and $g \in S$.*

Proposition 4.3 (Rigidity of the alignment of matrices). *Let E be a Euclidean vector space. Let $\Gamma = \text{End}(E)$, let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. Let $\mathbb{A} \subset \mathbb{A}^\varepsilon$ and let $S \subset \{\gamma \in \Gamma \mid \text{sqz}(\gamma) \geq 8|\log(\varepsilon)| + 10\log(2)\}$ be measurable. Let $(\tilde{\gamma}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \tilde{\Gamma}^\mathbb{N}$ and let $(\gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} := (\Pi(\tilde{\gamma}_n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. Assume that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have:*

$$\gamma_{2n+1} \in S \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_{2n}\mathbb{A}\gamma_{2n+1}\tilde{\mathbb{A}}^S\tilde{\gamma}_{2n+2}.$$

Then we have $\gamma_{2n+1}\mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}\gamma_{2n+2}$ and $\text{sqz}(\gamma_{2n+2}) \geq 4|\log(\varepsilon)| + 7\log(2)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\gamma_i \cdots \gamma_{j-1}\mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{4}}\gamma_j \cdots \gamma_{k-1}$ for all $0 \leq i \leq j \leq k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We want to show that $\gamma_{2n+1}\mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}\gamma_{2n+2}$ and $\text{sqz}(\gamma_{2n+2}) \geq 4|\log(\varepsilon)| + 7\log(2)$. Let $\tilde{g}_0, \tilde{g}_1, \tilde{g}_2 \in \tilde{\Gamma}$ be such that $\tilde{\gamma}_2 = \tilde{g}_0 \odot \tilde{g}_1 \odot \tilde{g}_2$ and for all $i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$, let $g_i = \Pi(\tilde{g}_i)$. Assume that $g_0\mathbb{A}g_1\mathbb{A}g_2$ and $g_1 \in S$. Then by Lemma 2.9, we have $\text{sqz}(\gamma_{2k+2}) \geq 4|\log(\varepsilon)| + 7\log(2)$. If we assume that $\gamma_{2n+1}\mathbb{A}(g_0g_1g_2)$, then trivially $\gamma_{2n+1}\mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}\gamma_{2n+2}$. Otherwise, we assume that $\gamma_{2n+1}\mathbb{A}^S\tilde{g}_0$.

We claim that for all $\gamma\mathbb{A}^S\tilde{g}$, there is an integer $l \leq L(\tilde{g})$ and a family $h_0, \dots, h_{2l} \in \text{End}(E)$ such that $h_0 \cdots h_{2l} = g$, and $\gamma\mathbb{A}h_0$ and $\text{sqz}(h_0) \geq 4|\log(\varepsilon)| + 7\log(2)$ and for all $0 \leq i < l$, we have $h_0 \cdots h_{2i}\mathbb{A}h_{2i+1}\mathbb{A}h_{2i+2}$ and $h_{2i+1} \in S$. We prove the claim by induction on the length of \tilde{g} . Consider a decomposition $\tilde{g} = \tilde{g}_0 \odot \tilde{g}_1 \odot \tilde{g}_2$ with $g_1 \in S$. Since $g_1 \in S$, the word \tilde{g}_1 has positive length, therefore $L(\tilde{g}_0) < L(\tilde{g})$. If $\gamma\mathbb{A}g$, then we simply set $l := 0$ and $h := g$. Note that if $L(\tilde{g}) = 1$, then $\gamma\mathbb{A}g$. If we do not have $\gamma\mathbb{A}g$, then we are in the second case of the definition of \mathbb{A}^S and therefore we assume that $\gamma\mathbb{A}^S\tilde{g}_0$. By induction hypothesis there is an integer $l' \leq L(\tilde{g}_0)$ and a family $h_0, \dots, h_{2l'}$ such that $h_0 \cdots h_{2l'} = g_0$, and $\gamma\mathbb{A}h_0$ and $\text{sqz}(h_0) \geq 4|\log(\varepsilon)| + 7\log(2)$ and for all $0 \leq i < l'$, we have $h_0 \cdots h_{2i}\mathbb{A}h_{2i+1}\mathbb{A}h_{2i+2}$ and $h_{2i+1} \in S$. Let $l := l' + 1 \leq L(\tilde{g})$, let $h_{2l-1} := g_1$ and let $h_{2l} := g_2$. Then the family (h_0, \dots, h_{2l}) satisfies the claim.

We have constructed a family h_0, \dots, h_{2l} such that $h_0 \cdots h_{2l} = \gamma_{2n+2}$, and $\gamma_{2n+1}\mathbb{A}^\varepsilon h_0$ and $\text{sqz}(h_0) \geq 4|\log(\varepsilon)| + 5|\log(2)|$ and for all $0 \leq i < l$, we have $h_0 \cdots h_{2i}\mathbb{A}^\varepsilon h_{2i+1}\mathbb{A}^\varepsilon h_{2i+2}$ and $\text{sqz}(h_{2i+1}) \geq 4|\log(\varepsilon)| + 7\log(2)$. Then by lemma 2.16, we have $\gamma_{2n+1}\mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}\gamma_{2n+2}$.

Let $0 \leq i \leq j \leq k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $\gamma_i\mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} \dots \mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}\gamma_{k-1}$ and $\text{sqz}(\gamma_n) \geq 4|\log(\varepsilon)| + 7\log(2) \geq 2|\log(\varepsilon/2)| + 3\log(2)$ so by Lemma 2.13, we have $\gamma_i \cdots \gamma_{j-1}\mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{4}}\gamma_j \cdots \gamma_{k-1}$. \square

4.2. Construction of the ping-pong extraction. Let $0 < \alpha < 1$. We write \mathcal{G}_α for the geometric probability measure of scale factor α defined by $\mathcal{G}_\alpha\{k\} := \alpha^k(1 - \alpha)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that \mathcal{G}_α has a finite exponential moment. We write \mathcal{B}_α for the Bernoulli measure of parameter α , i.e., the probability measure which gives mass α to 1 and mass $1 - \alpha$ to 0.

Given ν a probability distribution over a measurable semi-group, given η a probability distribution on \mathbb{N} and given $(w, (\gamma_k)) \sim \eta \otimes \nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$, we write $\nu^{*\eta}$ for the distribution of $\gamma_0 \cdots \gamma_{w-1}$ and $\nu^{\otimes \eta}$ for the distribution of $(\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_{w-1})$. When $\tilde{\nu}$ is defined on a semi-group of words, we write $\tilde{\nu}^{\otimes \eta}$ instead of $\tilde{\nu}^{*\eta}$.

Given η be a probability distribution on \mathbb{Z} , given $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ and given $w \sim \eta$, we write $m +_* \eta$ for the distribution of $m + w$, and we write $m \times_* \eta$ for the distribution of $m \times w$. Given $\tilde{\kappa}$ a probability distribution on $\tilde{\Gamma}$, we write $\tilde{\kappa}^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$ for the distribution $\odot_*^{\otimes \mathbb{N}} \tilde{\kappa}^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$, which is defined on $\Gamma^{\mathbb{N}}$. The distribution $\tilde{\kappa}^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$ is defined on $\tilde{\Gamma}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and $\tilde{\kappa}^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$ is defined on $\Gamma^{\mathbb{N}}$.

The following lemma comes from basic probability theory, we give a complete proof as a warm up.

Lemma 4.4. *Let Γ be a measurable semi-group. Let ν be a probability measure on Γ , let $0 < \alpha < 1$, and let $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\tilde{\nu}_s$ be a probability measure on Γ^m such that $\alpha\nu_s \leq \nu^{\otimes m}$. Let $\tilde{\kappa} := \left(\frac{\nu^{\otimes m} - \alpha\tilde{\nu}_s}{1 - \alpha}\right)^{\odot \mathcal{G}_{1-\alpha}}$. Then $(\tilde{\kappa} \otimes \tilde{\nu}_s)^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$ is an extraction of $\nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$. Moreover, for all $A \subset \Gamma$, and for $\tilde{g} \sim \tilde{\kappa}$, we have:*

$$(60) \quad \forall l \in m\mathbb{N}, \forall 0 \leq k < l, \mathbb{P}(\chi_k^l(\tilde{g}) \in A \mid L(\tilde{g}) = l) \leq \frac{\nu(A)}{1 - \alpha}.$$

Proof. Let $(x_n) \sim (\alpha\delta_1^{\otimes m} + (1 - \alpha)\delta_0^{\otimes m})^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$ i.e., $x_{km+r} = x_{km}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $0 \leq r < m$ and $(x_{km})_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sim \mathcal{B}_\alpha^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$. Let $(g_n) \sim \tilde{\nu}_s^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$ and let $(h_n) \sim \left(\frac{\nu^{\otimes m} - \alpha\tilde{\nu}_s}{1 - \alpha}\right)^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$. Assume that x, g, h are independent. Let $(\gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} := (g_n^{x_n} h_n^{1-x_n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ i.e., $\gamma_n = g_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $x_n = 1$ and $\gamma_n = h_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $x_n = 0$. Then the sequence $((\gamma_{km}, \dots, \gamma_{(k+1)m-1}))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is i.i.d. because the random sequence $((x_{km}, \dots, x_{(k+1)m-1}, g_{km}, \dots, g_{(k+1)m-1}, h_{km}, \dots, h_{(k+1)m-1}))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is. Moreover, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the distribution of $(\gamma_{km}, \dots, \gamma_{(k+1)m-1})$ is $\alpha\tilde{\nu}_s + (1 - \alpha)\frac{\nu^{\otimes m} - \alpha\tilde{\nu}_s}{1 - \alpha} = \nu^{\otimes m}$. Hence $(\gamma_n) \sim \nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$.

Now let $(w'_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a random sequence of integers such that for all $j \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$, the integer \overline{w}'_j is almost surely the j -th smallest element of $\{k \geq 1 \mid x_{km-1} = 1\}$. With that definition, $(w'_k - 1)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is the sequence of number of failures between consecutive successes of a Bernoulli process of parameter α so $w'_j \sim (1 +_* \mathcal{G}_{1-\alpha})^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$. Let (w_k) be the random sequence of integers such that $w_{2k+1} = m$ and $w_{2k} = m'(w'_k - 1)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $\tilde{\gamma}_{2k+1}^w = \tilde{g}_{2k+1}^w$ and $\tilde{\gamma}_{2k}^w = \tilde{h}_{2k}^w$. Moreover, the sequences w, g and h are independent so $\tilde{\gamma}_{2k}^w$ is independent of $\tilde{\gamma}_{2k+1}^w$ for all k and $(\tilde{\gamma}_{2k}^w, \tilde{\gamma}_{2k+1}^w)$ is i.i.d.

Given $j, k \in \mathbb{N}$ the event $(j = \overline{w}'_{k+1})$, implies that $\tilde{\gamma}_{2k+1}^w = (g_{mj-m}, \dots, g_{mj-1})$. Moreover, the value of $(g_{mj-m}, \dots, g_{mj-1})$ is independent of (x_n) so it is independent of \overline{w}'_{k+1} . Therefore, we have $\tilde{\gamma}_{2k+1}^w \sim \tilde{\nu}_s$ conditionally to the event $(j = \overline{w}'_{k+1})$ so $\tilde{\gamma}_{2k+1}^w \sim \tilde{\nu}_s$. Given $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and given $j := \overline{w}'_k$, we

have $\tilde{\gamma}_{2k}^w = (h_{jm}, \dots, h_{(j+w'_k-1)m-1})$ and $w'_k - 1 \sim \mathcal{G}_{1-\alpha}$ and it is independent of the random sequence h so $\tilde{\gamma}_{2k}^w \sim \left(\frac{\nu^{\otimes m - \alpha \tilde{\nu}_s}}{1-\alpha} \right)^{\odot \mathcal{G}_{1-\alpha}}$.

We have shown that the distribution of $(\tilde{\gamma}_k^w)$ is $(\tilde{\kappa} \otimes \tilde{\nu}_s)^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$. We also proved in the previous paragraph that $(\gamma_n) \sim \nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$. We also note that the w_k 's all have a bounded exponential moment. Therefore $(\tilde{\kappa} \otimes \tilde{\nu}_s)^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$ is an extraction of $\nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$ in the sense of Definition 3.2.

Now we show (60). Note that $\frac{\nu^{\otimes m - \alpha \tilde{\nu}_s}}{1-\alpha} \leq \frac{\nu^{\otimes m}}{1-\alpha}$ so for all $j < m$, we have $(\chi_j^m)_* \left(\frac{\nu^{\otimes m - \alpha \tilde{\nu}_s}}{1-\alpha} \right) \leq \frac{\nu}{1-\alpha}$. Moreover, given $\tilde{g} \sim \tilde{\kappa}$, given $l \in \mathbb{N}$ and given $k < lm$, the distribution of \tilde{g} conditioned to $(L(\tilde{g}) = lm)$ is $\left(\frac{\nu^{\otimes m - \alpha \tilde{\nu}_s}}{1-\alpha} \right)^{\otimes l}$. Therefore, the conditional distribution of $\chi_k^l(\tilde{g})$ is $\left(\chi_{k-m \lfloor \frac{k}{m} \rfloor}^m \right)_* \left(\frac{\nu^{\otimes m - \alpha \tilde{\nu}_s}}{1-\alpha} \right) \leq \frac{\nu}{1-\alpha}$. \square

Lemma 4.5. *Let Γ be a measurable semi-group, let \mathbb{A} be a binary relation on Γ and let $S \subset \Gamma$ be measurable. Let ν be a probability measure on Γ , let $0 < \alpha < 1$, let $0 < \rho < \frac{1}{5}$ and let $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\tilde{\nu}_s$ be a probability measure on Γ^m such that $\alpha \nu_s \leq \nu^{\otimes m}$ and let $\nu_s := \Pi_* \tilde{\nu}_s$. Assume that ν_s is supported on S and ρ -Schottky for \mathbb{A} . Then there exists a distribution $\tilde{\kappa}$ on $\tilde{\Gamma}$ such that $(\tilde{\kappa} \otimes \tilde{\nu}_s)^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$ is an extraction of ν and $L_* \tilde{\kappa} \{k\} = m +_* m \times_* (1 +_* \mathcal{G}(1-\alpha))^{*(1+_* \mathcal{G}(2\rho))}$. Moreover, for $\tilde{\kappa}$ almost all $\tilde{g} \in \tilde{\Gamma}$, there exist $\tilde{g}_1, \tilde{g}_2, \tilde{g}_3 \in \tilde{\Gamma}$ such that $\tilde{g} = \tilde{g}_1 \odot \tilde{g}_2 \odot \tilde{g}_3$ and $\Pi(\tilde{g}_2) \in S$ and $\Pi(\tilde{g}_1) \mathbb{A} \Pi(\tilde{g}_2) \mathbb{A} \Pi(\tilde{g}_3)$ and for all measurable $A \subset \Gamma \setminus \bigcup_{k=0}^{m-1} \chi_k^m(\text{supp}(\tilde{\nu}_s))$, we have almost surely:*

$$(61) \quad \forall l \in m\mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}, \forall 0 \leq n < l, \mathbb{P}(\chi_n^l(\tilde{g}) \in A \mid L(\tilde{g}) = l) \leq \frac{\nu(A)}{1-\alpha}.$$

Proof. Let $\tilde{\kappa}_0 := \left(\frac{\nu^{\otimes m - \alpha \tilde{\nu}_s}}{1-\alpha} \right)^{\odot \mathcal{G}_{1-\alpha}}$ be as in Lemma 4.4. Let $(\gamma_n) \sim \nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$ and let $(w_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a random sequence of integers on the same probability space such that $(\tilde{\gamma}_k^w) \sim (\tilde{\kappa}_0 \otimes \tilde{\nu}_s)^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$. Let $\mathcal{U}_{[0,1]}$ be the uniform probability measure on the interval $[0, 1]$ and let $(\tau_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \sim \mathcal{U}_{[0,1]}^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$. Assume that the random sequences $\tilde{\gamma}^w$ and τ are independent. We define the penalty function:

$$P_{\nu_s} : \Gamma^3 \longrightarrow [0, 1]; (f, g, h) \longmapsto \frac{\mathbb{1}_{f \mathbb{A} g \mathbb{A} h}}{\nu_s \{ \gamma \in \Gamma \mid f \mathbb{A} \gamma \mathbb{A} h \}} (1 - 2\rho).$$

We check that $P_{\nu_s} \leq 1$ because ν_s is ρ -Schottky for \mathbb{A} . Note also that for $\gamma \sim \nu_s$ and for all non random $g, h \in \Gamma$, one has $\mathbb{E}(P_{\nu_s}(f, \gamma, h)) = 1 - 2\rho$. Hence, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, for all random $f, h \in \Gamma$ that are independent of $(\tau_k, \gamma_{2k+1}^w)$, we have $\mathbb{P}(\tau_k < P_{\nu_s}(f, \gamma_{2k+1}^w, h)) = 1 - 2\rho$ by definition of P_{ν_s} . Moreover $\tau_k < P_{\nu_s}(f, \gamma_{2k+1}^w, h) \Rightarrow f \mathbb{A} \gamma_{2k+1}^w \mathbb{A} h$. Now we define:

$$k_{\gamma, w}^\tau := \min \{ k \in \mathbb{N} \mid \tau_k < P_{\nu_s}(\tilde{\gamma}_{2k+1}^w, \gamma_{2k+1}^w, \gamma_{2k+2}^w) \}.$$

Then for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have:

$$\mathbb{P}(k_{\gamma, w}^\tau = k \mid (\tilde{\gamma}_{2k'}^w)_{k' \in \mathbb{N}}, k_{\gamma, w}^\tau \geq k) = \mathbb{E}(P_{\nu_s}(\tilde{\gamma}_{2k+1}^w, \gamma_{2k+1}^w, \gamma_{2k+2}^w) \mid (\tilde{\gamma}_{2k'}^w)_{k' \in \mathbb{N}}) = 1 - 2\rho.$$

Therefore $k_{\gamma, w}^\tau \sim \mathcal{G}(2\rho)$ and $k_{\gamma, w}^\tau$ is independent of $(\tilde{\gamma}_{2k}^w)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$. Let $j_{\gamma, w}^\tau := \overline{w}_{2k_{\gamma, w}^\tau + 3}$. Then $j_{\gamma, w}^\tau \sim m +_* m \times_* (1 +_* \mathcal{G}(1-\alpha))^{*(1+_* \mathcal{G}(2\rho))}$ so $j_{\gamma, w}^\tau$ has finite exponential moment by Lemma A.3. Let $\tilde{\kappa}$ be the distribution law of $\tilde{g}_{\gamma, w}^\tau := (\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_{j_{\gamma, w}^\tau - 1})$. It follows from the definition that $\tilde{g}_{\gamma, w}^\tau = (\odot_{i=0}^{2k} \tilde{\gamma}_i^w) \odot \tilde{\gamma}_{2k+1}^w \odot \tilde{\gamma}_{2k+2}^w$ and $\Pi(\odot_{i=0}^{2k} \tilde{\gamma}_i^w) \mathbb{A} \Pi(\tilde{\gamma}_{2k+1}^w) \mathbb{A} \Pi(\tilde{\gamma}_{2k+2}^w)$ for $k = k_{\gamma, w}^\tau$. Moreover $\Pi(\tilde{\gamma}_{2k+1}^w) \sim \nu_s$ so $\Pi(\tilde{\gamma}_{2k+1}^w) \in S$ almost surely.

Note also that $k_{\gamma, w}^\tau$ is constructed as a stopping time for the sequence $(\tau_k, \gamma_{2k+1}^w)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and it is independent of $(\gamma_{2k}^w)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, so the conditional distribution of the random sequence $\left(\tilde{\gamma}_{k+2k_{\gamma, w}^\tau + 3}^w \right)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ knowing $\tilde{g}_{\gamma, w}^\tau$ is $(\tilde{\nu}_s \otimes \tilde{\kappa}_0)^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$. Hence, we have $\tilde{\kappa} \odot \tilde{\nu}_s \odot (\tilde{\kappa}_0 \odot \tilde{\nu}_s)^{\otimes \mathbb{N}} = (\tilde{\kappa}_0 \odot \tilde{\nu}_s)^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$ so $(\tilde{\kappa} \odot \tilde{\nu}_s)^{\otimes \mathbb{N}} = (\tilde{\kappa}_0 \odot \tilde{\nu}_s)^{\otimes \mathbb{N}} = \nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$.

Now let $A \subset \Gamma \setminus \bigcup_{k=0}^{m-1} \chi_k^m(\text{supp}(\tilde{\nu}_s))$ be measurable and let $l \in m\mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$. Let $q \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $x_0, \dots, x_{q+1} \in m\mathbb{N}$ be such that $qm + \sum_{i=0}^{q+1} x_i = l$. Now we work on the sub-probability space (Ω', \mathbb{P}') , (where \mathbb{P}' is short for $\mathbb{P}^{(l, q, (x_i))}$), defined as $\Omega' := (j_{\gamma, w}^\tau = l) \cap (k_{\gamma, w}^\tau = q) \cap \bigcap_{i=0}^{q+1} (w_{2i} = x_i)$ and $\mathbb{P}' := \frac{\mathbb{P}}{\mathbb{P}(\Omega')}$. Let $n < l$. We claim that $\mathbb{P}'(\gamma_n \in A) \leq \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \nu(A)$. If there exists an integer $k \leq q$ such that $\overline{w}_{2k+1} \leq n < \overline{w}_{2k+2}$, then $\mathbb{P}'(\gamma_n \in A) = 0$. Otherwise, let $k \leq q+1$ be such that $\overline{w}_{2k} \leq n < \overline{w}_{2k+1}$, then we have \mathbb{P}' almost surely $\gamma_n = \chi_{n - \overline{w}_{2k}}^{x_k}(\tilde{\gamma}_{2k}^w)$ and $k_{\gamma, w}^\tau$ is independent of $(\tilde{\gamma}_{2j}^w)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$, so the distribution of γ_n for \mathbb{P}' is bounded by $\frac{\nu}{1-\alpha}$ by (60) in Lemma 4.4. Then we have $\mathbb{P}(\gamma_n \in A \mid j_{\gamma, w}^\tau = l) \leq \max_{q, (x_i)} \mathbb{P}'(A) \leq \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \nu(A)$ and this is true for all $l \in m\mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$. Therefore, we have (61). \square

4.3. Construction of the aligned extraction. The following definition describes the pivot algorithm. Starting from an already merged sequence $(\tilde{\gamma}_n^w)$, we will merge some words recursively. At each step j , we only look at $(\gamma_0^w, \gamma_1^w, \dots, \gamma_{2j}^w)$ and merge some of them together. We will denote by $(p_k^j)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ the sequence of waiting times (or lengths) at step j , starting with $p^0 = w$. We will denote by $2m_j + 1$ the number of words left after merging $(\gamma_0^w, \gamma_1^w, \dots, \gamma_{2j}^w)$. At each step, we make sure that $(\tilde{\gamma}_k^{p^j})_{k \leq m_j}$ satisfies Theorem 4.1. It means that every oddly indexed block is a single oddly indexed word and that its distribution relatively to the merging process is still a Schottky distribution. The merging process consists in backtracking when the right alignment conditions are satisfied.

Definition 4.6 (Weighted Pivot algorithm). *Let Γ be a measurable semi-group endowed with a measurable relation \mathbb{A} . Let ν_s be a probability distribution on Γ that is ρ -Schottky for \mathbb{A} . We define the ν_s penalty functions.*

$$P_{\nu_s} : \Gamma^3 \longrightarrow [0, 1]; (f, g, h) \longmapsto \frac{\mathbb{1}_{f \mathbb{A} g \mathbb{A} h}}{\nu_s \{ \gamma \in \Gamma \mid f \mathbb{A} \gamma \mathbb{A} h \}} (1 - 2\rho),$$

$$P'_{\nu_s} : \Gamma^4 \longrightarrow [0, 1]; (f, g, h, h') \longmapsto \frac{\mathbb{1}_{f \mathbb{A} g \mathbb{A} h} \mathbb{1}_{g \mathbb{A} h'}}{\nu_s \{ \gamma \in \Gamma \mid f \mathbb{A} \gamma \mathbb{A} h \text{ and } \gamma \mathbb{A} h' \}} (1 - 3\rho).$$

Let $(\gamma_n) \in \Gamma^{\mathbb{N}}$, let $(w_k) \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and let $(\tau_k) \in [0, 1]^{\mathbb{N}}$ be non-random sequences. Let $(p_k^j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}, k \in \mathbb{N}} \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}^{\mathbb{N}^2}$. Assume that for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$, there is an even integer m_j such that $\bar{p}_{2m_j+1}^k := \sum_{k=0}^{2m_j} p_k^j = \bar{w}_{2j+1}$ and let $(m_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ be such a sequence. Given $j, k \in \mathbb{N}$, we write $l_k^j := \max \{ l \leq j \mid m_l \leq k \}$. For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we write $l_k := \sup \{ l \in \mathbb{N} \mid m_l \leq k \}$ for the time of the last visit in k . We say that (p_k^j) is the family of length of the pivotal blocks associated to the sequence $(\tilde{\gamma}_k^w)$ with weights (τ_k) if:

- (1) For all $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $(p_{k+2m_j+1}^j)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} = (w_{k+2j+1})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\{ \bar{p}_k^{j+1} \mid k \in \mathbb{N} \} \subset \{ \bar{p}_k^j \mid k \in \mathbb{N} \}$. Note that it implies that $m_0 = 0$ and that $p_k^0 = w_k$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.
- (2) For all $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $(p_k^{j+1})_{k \in \mathbb{N}} = (p_k^j)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $m_{j+1} = m_j + 1$ if and only if:

$$\tau_j < P_{\nu_s} \left(\gamma_{2m_j}^{p^j}, \gamma_{2m_j+1}^{p^j}, \gamma_{2m_j+2}^{p^j} \right).$$

- (3) For all $j \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(p_k^{j+1})_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \neq (p_k^j)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, we have $(p_k^{j+1})_{0 \leq k < 2m_j+1} = (p_k^j)_{0 \leq k < 2m_j+1}$ and

$$(62) \quad m_{j+1} = \max \left(\left\{ k < m_j \mid \tau_{l_k^j} < P'_{\nu_s} \left(\gamma_{2k}^{p^j}, \gamma_{2k+1}^{p^j}, \gamma_{2l_k^j+2}^w, \gamma_{2k+2}^{p^j} \cdots \gamma_{2m_j}^{p^j} \right) \right\} \cup \{0\} \right).$$

If p_k^j converges to a limit p_k for all k , as $j \rightarrow +\infty$, then we say that $(p_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is the sequence of pivotal times associated to $\tilde{\gamma}^w$ with weights τ .

Let us illustrate the first steps of the algorithm on an example. Initially, the letters are grouped into blocks of length $p_0^0 = w_0, p_1^0 = w_1, p_2^0 = w_2, \dots$. For simplicity, we will take all w_k equal to 1 in our example. With our previous construction, this happens when $\nu_s = \nu$, note also that the identity must be aligned with everyone. The important thing to note is that in that case, all words are in S . That way, for all $0 \leq k \leq j$, we have $\bar{p}_{2k+1}^j = 2l_k^j + 1$. We will describe the construction for $j \in \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$. For that construction, we only look at the first 11 words that all have a single letter, which is an element of a semi-group (a semi-group of matrices in our case):

$$(\gamma_0); [\gamma_1], (\gamma_2), [\gamma_3], (\gamma_4), [\gamma_5], (\gamma_6), [\gamma_7], (\gamma_8), [\gamma_9], (\gamma_{10}).$$

We mark with brackets (instead of the usual parenthesis for words) the candidate pivotal times, at step $j = 0$ they are all the oddly indexed times. At all times, the word within brackets will have a single letter. We mark with a semi column, our position. At all time, all the words that are on the left of this semi-column are aligned and the oddly indexed ones are candidate pivotal times, there are m_j of them. At step $j = 0$, we will add γ_1 and γ_2 . We check whether $\tau_0 < P_{\nu_s}(\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2)$, which is a proxy for $\gamma_0 \mathbb{A} \gamma_1 \mathbb{A} \gamma_2$ but with a controlled conditional probability, constant and equal to $1 - 2\rho$.

If this condition fails (which is always the case when the above alignment condition is not satisfied), then we merge $(\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2)$ into a single word. Then, there is nothing more to check because there is no candidate $k < m_1$ for m_1 to satisfy (3). In this case, $m_1 = 0$, so there are no candidate pivotal times left of the semi-column and the newly merged sequence is the following:

$$(\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2); [\gamma_3], (\gamma_4), [\gamma_5], (\gamma_6), [\gamma_7], (\gamma_8), [\gamma_9], (\gamma_{10}), \dots$$

Then at step $j = 1$, we check whether $\tau_1 < P_{\nu_s}(\gamma_0\gamma_1\gamma_2, \gamma_3, \gamma_4)$. Assume that this condition holds. This implies that we have the alignment $\gamma_0\gamma_1\gamma_2\mathbb{A}\gamma_3\mathbb{A}\gamma_4$. Then we do not merge any block and move to $m_2 = 1$: In this case, we have $p_0^2 = 3, p_1^2 = 1, p_2^2 = 1, p_3^2 = 1, p_4^2 = 1, \dots$ and the new sequence is the following:

$$(\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2), [\gamma_3], (\gamma_4); [\gamma_5], (\gamma_6), [\gamma_7], (\gamma_8), [\gamma_9], (\gamma_{10}), \dots$$

Note that it is useless to specify that $p_1^2 = 1$ and $p_3^2 = 1$ or that $p_{2k+1}^2 = 1$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, because the oddly indexed blocks are the ones in brackets and they always have length 1. It is also useless to mention that $p_4^2 = 1$, because it is the length of the block (γ_6) , which we have not yet considered. At step $j = 2$, we check whether $\tau_2 < P_{\nu_s}(\gamma_4, \gamma_5, \gamma_6)$. Assume that this holds. Then $m_3 = 2$ and the new sequence is:

$$(\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2), [\gamma_3], (\gamma_4), [\gamma_5], (\gamma_6); [\gamma_7], (\gamma_8), [\gamma_9], (\gamma_{10}), \dots$$

By construction, we have $\gamma_0\gamma_1\gamma_2\mathbb{A}\gamma_3\mathbb{A}\gamma_4\mathbb{A}\gamma_5\mathbb{A}\gamma_6$. At step $j = 3$, we check whether $\tau_3 < P_{\nu_s}(\gamma_6, \gamma_7, \gamma_8)$. Assume that this time, that condition fails. Then we have to backtrack to the previous candidate pivotal time: $\gamma_{2m_3-1}^3$, which is simply γ_5 . In other words, we look at the definition of m_{j+1} (62) with $k = 3$ and $l_k^j = 5$. We check whether $\tau_2 < P'_{\nu_s}(\gamma_4, \gamma_5, \gamma_6, \gamma_6\gamma_7\gamma_8)$, which is a proxy for $\gamma_5\mathbb{A}\gamma_6\gamma_7\gamma_8$ but with a controlled conditional probability constant and equal to $\frac{1-3\rho}{1-2\rho}$. Indeed, we already know that $\tau_2 < P_{\nu_s}(\gamma_4, \gamma_5, \gamma_6)$ from the previous step of the construction. Assume that this holds. By (3), this means that $m_4 = 1$ and the only candidate pivotal time left is $[\gamma_3]$. The newly merged sequence becomes:

$$(\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2), [\gamma_3], (\gamma_4, \gamma_5, \gamma_6, \gamma_7, \gamma_8); [\gamma_9], (\gamma_{10}), \dots$$

Note that $\gamma_3\mathbb{A}\gamma_4\mathbb{A}\gamma_5\mathbb{A}\gamma_6\gamma_7\gamma_8$ and $\gamma_4 \in S$, so $\gamma_3\tilde{\mathbb{A}}^S(\gamma_4)$ and $\gamma_5 \in S$ so $\gamma_3\tilde{\mathbb{A}}^S(\gamma_4, \gamma_5, \gamma_6, \gamma_7, \gamma_8)$. Moreover, we still have $\gamma_0\gamma_1\gamma_3\mathbb{A}\gamma_3$.

At the next step ($j = 4$), we check whether $\tau_4 < P_{\nu_s}(\gamma_4\gamma_5\gamma_6\gamma_7\gamma_8, \gamma_9, \gamma_{10})$, which is a proxy for $\gamma_4\gamma_5\gamma_6\gamma_7\gamma_8\mathbb{A}\gamma_9\mathbb{A}\gamma_{10}$. Assume that this holds. Then $m_5 = 2$ the newly merged sequence is

$$(\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2), [\gamma_3], (\gamma_4, \gamma_5, \gamma_6, \gamma_7, \gamma_8), [\gamma_9], (\gamma_{10}); \dots$$

It feels a bit frustrating to lose two pivotal times instead of only one, because we had the alignment $\gamma_4\mathbb{A}\gamma_5\mathbb{A}\gamma_6\gamma_7\gamma_8$ so why not keep $[\gamma_5]$ as a pivotal time. The issue with that is that we do not have any control over $\gamma_6\gamma_7\gamma_8$. For example, it may be the identity, which is aligned with everyone. In that case the alignment condition $\gamma_5\mathbb{A}\gamma_6\gamma_7\gamma_8\mathbb{A}\gamma_9$ is trivial and does not tell us anything about the product $\gamma_5\gamma_6\gamma_7\gamma_8\gamma_9$, which may again be the identity. Therefore, we really need to discard this pivotal time in order to be able to use Proposition 4.3.

The other issue is that even if we somehow get rid of that problem, then $[\gamma_5]$ would not have the same probabilistic behaviour as the other pivotal times. Indeed, knowing the construction up to step 4, it satisfies 3 alignment conditions. Note also that the first block $(\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2)$ has a particular status because we do not have any informations on its structure and only know that its product is aligned with γ_3 .

We need the index l_k^j in (62) because if we ever backtrack to $[\gamma_3] = \tilde{\gamma}_1^{p_5^1}$ for example, then the alignment condition on γ_3 is not with the merged word $(\gamma_4, \gamma_5, \gamma_6, \gamma_7, \gamma_8)$ but only with the first sub-word, namely (γ_4) , so we need to keep track of its index, this is the role of $2l_0^5 + 2 = 4$ and $l_0^5 = 1$ is indeed the last step at which we had $m_j = m_1 = 1$.

Let us recap in the next remark basic properties of the algorithm that follow readily from its definition.

Remark 4.7. *Let $(\gamma_n) \in \Gamma^{\mathbb{N}}$, let $(w_k) \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and let $(\tau_k) \in [0, 1]^{\mathbb{N}}$ be non-random sequences. Note that, the family of lengths of the pivotal blocks (p_k^j) in the sense of Definition 4.6 is unique and we can construct it by induction. Moreover that the map $((\gamma_n), (w_k), (\tau_k)) \mapsto (p_k^j)$ is measurable. Let (p_k^j) be the family of lengths of the pivotal blocks, and let $(m_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(l_k^j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}, 0 \leq k \leq m_j}$ be as in Definition 4.6. By induction, we can easily check that the following facts hold:*

- (1) For all $j \leq j' \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $l_{j'}^j = j$.
- (2) For all $j \in \mathbb{N}$, and for all $0 \leq k < m_j$, we have $\gamma_{2k}^{p_k^j} \mathbb{A} \gamma_{2k+1}^{p_k^j} \mathbb{A} \gamma_{2k+2}^{p_k^j}$ (because $m_{l_k^j+1} > m_{l_k^j}$ by definition of l_k^j).
- (3) For all $j \in \mathbb{N}$, and for all $0 \leq k < m_j$, we have $\tilde{\gamma}_{k'}^{p_k^j} = \tilde{\gamma}_{k'}^{p_{k'}^{j'}}$ for all $l_k^j \leq j' \leq j$ and all $0 \leq k' \leq 2k + 1$.
- (4) For all $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $\gamma_{2m_j+2}^{p_j^j} = \gamma_{2j+2}^w$. Hence, for all $k < m_j$, we have $\gamma_{2k+2}^{p_k^j} = \gamma_{2l_k^j+2}^w$.
- (5) For all $j \in \mathbb{N}$, and for all $0 \leq k < m_j$, we have $\gamma_{2k}^{p_k^j} \mathbb{A} \gamma_{2k+1}^{p_k^j} \mathbb{A} \gamma_{2l_k^j+2}^w$.
- (6) The family $(l_k^j)_{j,k}$ is determined by the data of the sequence $(m_j)_j$.

(7) The family $(p_k^j)_{j,k}$ is determined by the data of the sequences $(m_j)_j$ and $(w_k)_k$.

Lemma 4.8. Let $(\gamma_n) \in \Gamma^{\mathbb{N}}$, let $(w_k) \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and let $(\tau_k) \in [0, 1]^{\mathbb{N}}$ be non-random sequences. Let \mathbb{A} be a binary relation on Γ and let $S \subset \Gamma$. Assume that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there exist three sub-words $(\tilde{g}_0, \tilde{g}_1, \tilde{g}_2)$ such that $\tilde{\gamma}_{2k+2}^w = \tilde{g}_0 \odot \tilde{g}_1 \odot \tilde{g}_2$ and $\Pi(\tilde{g}_0)\mathbb{A}\Pi(\tilde{g}_1)\mathbb{A}\Pi(\tilde{g}_2)$ and $\Pi(\tilde{g}_1) \in S$ and $\gamma_{2k+1}^w \in S$. Let $(p_k^j)_{j,k}$ be the family of lengths of the pivotal blocks in the sense of Definition 4.6 and let $(m_j)_j$ be as in Definition 4.6. For all $j \in \mathbb{N}$, and for all $0 \leq k < m_j$, we have $\gamma_{2k+1}^{p^j} \tilde{\mathbb{A}}^S \tilde{\gamma}_{2k+2}^{p^j}$.

Proof. We prove the claim by induction. Assume that for all $j' \leq j$, and for all $0 \leq k < m_{j'}$, we have $\gamma_{2k+1}^{p^{j'}} \tilde{\mathbb{A}}^S \tilde{\gamma}_{2k+2}^{p^{j'}}$. If $m_{j+1} = m_j + 1$, then $\tau_j < P_{\nu_s}(\gamma_{2m_j}^{p^j}, \gamma_{2m_{j+1}}^{p^j}, \gamma_{2m_{j+2}}^{p^j})$. Therefore $\gamma_{2m_j}^{p^j} \mathbb{A} \gamma_{2m_{j+1}}^{p^j} \mathbb{A} \gamma_{2m_{j+2}}^{p^j}$, so we have $\gamma_{2m_{j+1}}^{p^j} \tilde{\mathbb{A}}^S \tilde{\gamma}_{2m_{j+2}}^{p^j}$. For smaller values of k , we use the induction hypothesis. If $0 < m_{j+1} < m_j$ we have $\gamma_{2m_{j+1}}^{p^j} \mathbb{A} \gamma_{2m_{j+1}+1}^{p^j} \mathbb{A} \gamma_{2k+2}^{p^j} \cdots \gamma_{2m_j+2}^{p^j}$ and by induction hypothesis, we have $\gamma_{2m_{j+1}-1}^{p^j} \tilde{\mathbb{A}}^S \gamma_{2m_{j+1}+1}^{p^j}$ and $\gamma_{2m_{j+1}-1}^{p^{j+1}} = \gamma_{2m_{j+1}-1}^{p^j}$ and $\tilde{\gamma}_{2m_{j+1}}^{p^{j+1}} = \tilde{\gamma}_{2m_{j+1}}^{p^j} \odot \tilde{\gamma}_{2m_{j+1}+1}^{p^j} \odot \tilde{\gamma}_{2k+2}^{p^j} \cdots \gamma_{2m_j+2}^{p^j}$. Moreover $\gamma_{2m_{j+1}+1}^{p^j}$ is equal to one of the γ_{2k+1}^w for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$, therefore $\gamma_{2m_{j+1}+1}^{p^j} \in S$ by assumption so $\gamma_{2m_{j+1}-1}^{p^j} \tilde{\mathbb{A}}^S \tilde{\gamma}_{2m_{j+1}}^{p^{j+1}}$ by definition of $\tilde{\mathbb{A}}^S$. \square

Lemma 4.9. Let Γ be a measurable semi-group endowed with a measurable relation \mathbb{A} . Let ν_s be a probability distribution on Γ that is ρ -Schottky for \mathbb{A} and let $S := \text{supp}(\nu_s)$. Let $(\tilde{\gamma}_n^w)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \tilde{\Gamma}^{\mathbb{N}}$, and let $(\tau_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \sim \mathcal{U}_{[0,1]}^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$ be independent random sequences defined on the same probability space. Assume that $(w_{2k+1})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is almost surely equal to a non-random constant. Assume also that the sequences $(\tilde{\gamma}_{2k}^w)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(\tilde{\gamma}_{2k+1}^w)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ are independent. Assume that $(\gamma_{2k+1}^w)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sim \nu_s^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$. Let (p_k^j) be the random family of lengths of the pivotal blocks associated to $\tilde{\gamma}^w$ with weights τ and let (l_k^j) and (m_j) be as in Definition 4.6. Then for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$, and for all $0 \leq k \leq m_j - 1$, we have:

$$(63) \quad \mathbb{P}(m_{j+1} = m_j + 1 \mid (\tilde{\gamma}_{2k}^w)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}, (m_{j'})_{j' \leq j}) = 1 - 2\rho,$$

$$(64) \quad \mathbb{P}(m_{j+1} < m_j - k \mid (\tilde{\gamma}_{2k}^w)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}, (m_{j'})_{j' \leq j}) = 2\rho \left(\frac{\rho}{1 - 2\rho} \right)^k.$$

Proof. First note that for all f, g, h, h' , we have $0 \leq P'_{\nu_s}(f, g, h, h') \leq P_{\nu_s}(f, g, h) \leq 1$. Moreover, given a random $\gamma \sim \nu_s$ and given $g, h, h' \in \Gamma$ non-random or independent of γ , we have $\mathbb{E}(P_{\nu_s}(f, \gamma, h)) = 1 - 2\rho$ and $\mathbb{E}(P'_{\nu_s}(f, \gamma, h, h')) = 1 - 3\rho$.

Let $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $k < m_j$. We have:

$$(65) \quad \tau_{l_k^j} < P_{\nu_s}(\gamma_{2k}^{p^j}, \gamma_{2k+1}^{p^j}, \gamma_{2l_k^j+2}^w).$$

Indeed, by definition of l_k^j , we have $m_{l_k^j+1} > m_{l_k^j}$. Therefore:

$$\tau_{l_k^j} < P_{\nu_s}(\gamma_{2k}^{p^{l_k^j}}, \gamma_{2k+1}^{p^{l_k^j}}, \gamma_{2k+2}^{p^{l_k^j}}).$$

Moreover, for all $l_k^j < j' \leq j$, we have $m_{j'} > k$ so $(\tilde{\gamma}_{k'}^{p^{j'}})_{k' \leq 2k+1} = (\tilde{\gamma}_{k'}^{p^{l_k^j}})_{k' \leq 2k+1}$. Hence, we have

$$\gamma_{2k}^{p^{l_k^j}} = \gamma_{2k}^{p^j} \text{ and } \gamma_{2k+1}^{p^{l_k^j}} = \gamma_{2k+1}^{p^j}. \text{ Moreover, we have } \gamma_{2k+i}^{p^{l_k^j}} = \gamma_{2l_k^j+i}^w \text{ for all } i \geq 1.$$

Now Let γ, w, τ be random sequences as in Lemma 4.9. Given $j \in \mathbb{N}$, let \mathcal{P}_j be the σ -algebra generated by $(p_k^{j'})_{k \in \mathbb{N}, j' \leq j}$ and $(\tilde{\gamma}_{2k}^{p^j})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$. Then $(\mathcal{P}_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a filtration.

Let $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$, we claim that the conditional distribution of $\gamma_{2m_j+2i+1}^{p^j}$ relatively to \mathcal{P}_j is almost surely ν_s . We prove the claim by induction. For $j = 0$, we assumed that $(\gamma_{2k+1}^w)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sim \nu_s^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$, and that $(\gamma_{2k+1}^w)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is independent of $(\tilde{\gamma}_{2k}^w)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, now since (w_{2k+1}) is non-random, the sequence $(\tilde{\gamma}_{2k}^w)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ determines $(p_k^0) = (w_k)$, hence it generates \mathcal{P}_0 which proves the claim. Given $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $(\gamma_{2m_{j+1}+2i+1}^{p^{j+1}})_i = (\gamma_{2m_j+2i+3}^{p^j})_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ and the construction of $(p_k^{j+1})_k$ from $(p_k^j)_k$ does not depend on $(\gamma_{2m_j+2i+3}^{p^j})_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$. Therefore, by induction on j , we have $(\gamma_{2m_j+2i+1}^{p^j})_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \sim \nu_s^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$. By the same argument, we show by induction on j that conditionally to \mathcal{P}_j , we have:

$$(66) \quad \forall j \in \mathbb{N}, \left((\gamma_{2m_j+2i+1}^{p^j}, \tau_{2j+2i+1}) \right)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \sim (\nu_s \otimes \mathcal{U}_{[0,1]})^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}.$$

Taking $i = 0$, we have $\mathbb{P}\left(\tau_{2j+1} < P_{\nu_s}\left(\gamma_{2m_j}^{p_j}, \gamma_{2m_j+1}^{p_j}, \gamma_{2m_j+2}^{p_j}\right) \middle| \mathcal{P}_j\right) = 1 - 2\rho$. Hence we have (63).

Now let $j \in \mathbb{N}$ be fixed, and let $q : \Omega \rightarrow \{0, \dots, m_j - 1\}$ be a \mathcal{P}_j -measurable random variable. Then, we have almost surely $\mathbb{1}_{\gamma_{2q}^{p_j} \mathbb{A} \gamma_{2q+1}^{p_j} \mathbb{A} \gamma_{2l_q^j+2}^{p_j}}$ the conditional distribution of $\gamma_{2q+1}^{p_j}$ relatively to \mathcal{P}_j is exactly the rescaled restriction of ν_s to $\left\{\gamma \in \Gamma \middle| \gamma_{2q}^{p_j} \mathbb{A} \gamma \mathbb{A} \gamma_{2l_q^j+2}^{p_j}\right\}$. It means that for all $A : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_\Gamma$ which is \mathcal{P}_j -measurable, we have:

$$(67) \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\gamma_{2q+1}^{p_j} \in A \middle| \mathcal{P}_j\right) = \frac{\nu_s\left(A \cap \left\{\gamma \in \Gamma \middle| \gamma_{2q}^{p_j} \mathbb{A} \gamma \mathbb{A} \gamma_{2l_q^j+2}^{p_j}\right\}\right)}{\nu_s\left\{\gamma \in \Gamma \middle| \gamma_{2q}^{p_j} \mathbb{A} \gamma \mathbb{A} \gamma_{2l_q^j+2}^{p_j}\right\}}.$$

Let $h' : \Omega \rightarrow \Gamma$, be a random variable which is independent of $\gamma_{2q+1}^{p_j}$ relatively to \mathcal{P}_j . Then by (67), and because $\mathbb{1}_{\gamma_{2q}^{p_j} \mathbb{A} \gamma_{2q+1}^{p_j} \mathbb{A} \gamma_{2l_q^j+2}^{p_j}} = 1$ almost surely, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left(P'_{\nu_s}\left(\gamma_{2q}^{p_j}, \gamma_{2q+1}^{p_j}, \gamma_{2l_q^j+2}^{p_j}, h'\right) \middle| \mathcal{P}_j, h'\right) &= \frac{(1 - 3\rho)\mathbb{1}_{\gamma_{2q+1}^{p_j} \mathbb{A} h'}}{\nu_s\left\{\gamma \in \Gamma \middle| \gamma_{2q}^{p_j} \mathbb{A} \gamma \mathbb{A} \gamma_{2l_q^j+2}^{p_j} \text{ and } \gamma \mathbb{A} h'\right\}} \\ &= \frac{(1 - 3\rho)\mathbb{P}\left(\gamma_{2q+1}^{p_j} \mathbb{A} h' \middle| \mathcal{P}_j, h'\right)}{\nu_s\left\{\gamma \in \Gamma \middle| \gamma_{2q}^{p_j} \mathbb{A} \gamma \mathbb{A} \gamma_{2l_q^j+2}^{p_j} \text{ and } \gamma \mathbb{A} h'\right\}} \\ &= \frac{1 - 3\rho}{\nu_s\left\{\gamma \in \Gamma \middle| \gamma_{2q}^{p_j} \mathbb{A} \gamma \mathbb{A} \gamma_{2l_q^j+2}^{p_j}\right\}} \\ &= \frac{1 - 3\rho}{1 - 2\rho} P_{\nu_s}\left(\gamma_{2q}^{p_j}, \gamma_{2q+1}^{p_j}, \gamma_{2l_q^j+2}^{p_j}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Note that even though $\gamma_{2q+1}^{p_j}$ is not \mathcal{P}_j measurable, its only role in the computation of $P_{\nu_s}\left(\gamma_{2q}^{p_j}, \gamma_{2q+1}^{p_j}, \gamma_{2l_q^j+2}^{p_j}\right)$ is through a 0 – 1 indicator function that we know to be equal to 1. So $P_{\nu_s}\left(\gamma_{2q}^{p_j}, \gamma_{2q+1}^{p_j}, \gamma_{2l_q^j+2}^{p_j}\right)$ is indeed a \mathcal{P}_j measurable quantity. Moreover, the conditional distribution of $\tau_{l_q^j}$ with respect to \mathcal{P}_j and $\gamma_{2q+1}^{p_j}$ is almost surely uniform in $\left[0, P_{\nu_s}\left(\gamma_{2q}^{p_j}, \gamma_{2q+1}^{p_j}, \gamma_{2l_q^j+2}^{p_j}\right)\right]$. Indeed, for all $l \leq j$ and for all constant $k \leq l$, the conditions to have $l_k^j = l$ are:

- (1) We have $m_l = k$. Note that this event only depends on $(\gamma_{k'}^w)_{0 \leq k' \leq 2l}$ and $(\tau_{l'})_{0 \leq l' < l}$, hence it is independent of $(\tilde{\gamma}_{2l+1}^w, \pi)$.
- (2) For all $l < j' \leq j$, we have $m_{j'} > k$. Note that this event only depends on $(\gamma_{k'}^w)_{2l+2 \leq k' \leq 2j+2}$ and $(\tau_{l'})_{l < l' \leq j}$, hence it is independent of $(\tilde{\gamma}_{2l+1}^w, \pi)$.
- (3) We have $\tau_l < P_{\nu_s}\left(\gamma_{2m_l}^{p_l}, \gamma_{2l+1}^w, \gamma_{2l+2}^w\right)$. In particular $0 < P_{\nu_s}\left(\gamma_{2m_l}^{p_l}, \gamma_{2l+1}^w, \gamma_{2l+2}^w\right)$, therefore, we have $\gamma_{2k}^{p_j} \mathbb{A} \gamma_{2k+1}^{p_j} \mathbb{A} \gamma_{2l_k^j+2}^w$. Moreover τ_l and $\tilde{\gamma}_{2l+1}^w$ are independent so the distribution of γ_{2l+1}^w knowing $\tau_l < P_{\nu_s}\left(\gamma_{2m_l}^{p_l}, \gamma_{2l+1}^w, \gamma_{2l+2}^w\right)$ is the restriction of ν_s to $\left\{\gamma \in \Gamma \middle| \gamma_{2k}^{p_j} \mathbb{A} \gamma \mathbb{A} \gamma_{2l_k^j+2}^w\right\}$ and τ_l and $\tilde{\gamma}_{2l+1}^w$ are still independent.

The above argument implies moreover that the family $\left((\tau_{l_k^j}, \gamma_{2k+1}^{p_j})\right)_{0 \leq k < m_j}$ is independent with respect to \mathcal{P}_j i.e., there is a \mathcal{P}_j measurable family of distribution $(\eta_k, \kappa_k)_{0 \leq k < m_j} \in \text{Prob}(\mathbb{R}) \times \text{Prob}(\mathbb{R})$ such that:

$$\left((\tau_{l_k^j}, \gamma_{2k+1}^{p_j})\right)_{0 \leq k < m_j} \sim \int_{\Omega} \bigotimes_{k=0}^{m_j-1} (\eta_k \otimes \kappa_k) d\mathbb{P}.$$

Therefore, for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and for all $k \leq m_j$, we have:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\tau_{l_k^j} < P'_{\nu_s}\left(\gamma_{2k}^{p_j}, \gamma_{2k+1}^{p_j}, \gamma_{2l_k^j+2}^w, \gamma_{2k+2}^{p_j}, \dots, \gamma_{2m_j+2}^{p_j}\right) \middle| \mathcal{P}_j, \left((\tau_{l_{k'}^j}, \gamma_{2k'+1}^{p_j})\right)_{k < k' < m_j}\right) = \frac{1 - 3\rho}{1 - 2\rho}.$$

By induction on k , we have (64). \square

²We say that two events are independent relatively to a σ -algebra if the conditional probability of their intersection is almost surely equal to the product of their conditional probability. We say that two random variables are relatively independent if their level sets are. By Bayes formula, it implies that the conditional distribution of one with respect to the other and said σ -algebra is almost surely equal to its conditional distribution with respect to the σ -algebra alone.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Let γ be a measurable semi-group, let \mathbb{A} be a measurable binary relation Γ and let $S \subset \Gamma$ be measurable. Let $0 < \alpha < 1$, let $0 < \rho < \frac{1}{5}$ and let $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\tilde{\nu}_s$ be a probability distribution on Γ^m and let $\nu_s := \Pi_* \nu_s$. Assume that ν_s is ρ -Schottky for \mathbb{A} and supported on S . Let $\tilde{\kappa}$ be as in Lemma 4.5, let (Ω, \mathbb{P}) be a probability space and let $((\tilde{\gamma}_n^w)_n, (\tau_k)_k) \sim (\tilde{\kappa} \otimes \tilde{\nu}_s)^{\otimes \mathbb{N}} \otimes \mathcal{U}_{[0,1]}^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$. Let $(p_k^j)_{j,k}$ be the random family of lengths of the pivotal blocks associated to $\tilde{\gamma}^w$ with weights τ and let (m_j) and (l_j^k) be as in Definition 4.6

Let $j \in \mathbb{N}$. By Lemma 4.9, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(m_{j+1} \mid (m_{j'})_{j' \leq j}) &= m_j + (1 - 2\rho) - 2\rho \sum_{k=0}^{m_j-1} \left(\frac{\rho}{1 - 2\rho} \right) \\ &= m_j + (1 - 2\rho) - 2\rho \frac{1 - 2\rho}{1 - 3\rho} + 2\rho \frac{1 - 2\rho}{1 - 3\rho} \left(\frac{\rho}{1 - 2\rho} \right)^{m_j} \\ &= m_j + (1 - 2\rho) \frac{1 - 5\rho}{1 - 3\rho} + 2\rho \frac{1 - 2\rho}{1 - 3\rho} \left(\frac{\rho}{1 - 2\rho} \right)^{m_j} \end{aligned}$$

Note that $(1 - 2\rho) \frac{1 - 5\rho}{1 - 3\rho} > 0$. By Lemma A.5 applied to $(m_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$, there are constants $C, \beta > 0$ such that $\mathbb{P}(m_j \leq 0) \leq C \exp(-\beta j)$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence l_0 is almost surely finite and has finite exponential moment because $\mathbb{P}(l_0 = j) \leq C \exp(-\beta j)$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Now let $0 \leq q \leq l \in \mathbb{N}$ be fixed and let $j \geq l$. We claim that:

$$(68) \quad \mathbb{E}(m_{j+1} \mid (m_{j'})_{j' \leq j}, l_q = l) \geq \mathbb{E}(m_{j+1} \mid (m_{j'})_{j' \leq j}).$$

Indeed, if we assume the values of $(m_{j'})_{j' \leq j}$ to be fixed and that $l_q^j = l$. Then $l_q = l$ if and only if there is no $j' > j$ such that $m_{j'} = 0$. We claim that:

$$(69) \quad \forall k \leq k', \mathbb{P}(l_q = l_q^j \mid (m_{j'})_{j' \leq j}, m_{j+1} = k) \leq \mathbb{P}(l_q = l_q^j \mid (m_{j'})_{j' \leq j}, m_{j+1} = k').$$

Note that (69) implies that $\mathbb{P}(m_{j+1} \geq k \mid (m_{j'})_{j' \leq j}, l_q = l) \geq \mathbb{P}(m_{j+1} \geq k \mid (m_{j'})_{j' \leq j})$ almost surely and for all k , hence we have (68). Now we prove (69). Let η be the probability measure on \mathbb{Z} such that $\eta\{1\} = 1 - 2\rho$ and $\eta\{-k\} = 2\rho \frac{1 - 3\rho}{1 - 2\rho} \left(\frac{\rho}{1 - 2\rho} \right)^{k-1}$ for all $k \geq 1$. Let $(r_j) \sim \eta^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$. Let $(r_j) \sim \eta^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$ be a random sequence defined on a probability space (Ω', \mathbb{P}') . Define (m'_j) by induction taking $m_0 = 0$ and $m'_{j+1} := \max\{0, m'_j + r_j\}$ for all j . With that construction, all the formerly defined random variables are defined on the coupling of (Ω', \mathbb{P}') and (Ω, \mathbb{P}) relatively to $m' = m$. From now on we work on that coupling. Then for all $q \leq j \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $l_q = l_q^j$ if and only if $\sum_{k=j}^{j'-1} r_k \geq 1 + q - m_j$ for all $j' > j$. Hence, for all $0 < k \leq j \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $l_q = l_q^j$ and $m_{j+1} = k$ if and only if $\sum_{k=j+1}^{j'-1} r_k \geq 1 - k$ and $m_{j+1} = k$. Moreover, the events $(\forall j' > j + 1, \sum_{k=j+1}^{j'-1} r_k \geq 1 + q - k)$ and $m_{j+1} = k$ are independent so:

$$\mathbb{P}(l_q = l_q^j \mid (m_{j'})_{j' \leq j}, m_{j+1} = k) = \mathbb{P}\left(\forall j' > j + 1, \sum_{k'=j+1}^{j'-1} r_{k'} \geq 1 + q - k\right).$$

This makes (69) obvious. Then by lemma A.5 applied to (m_j) , there exist constants $C, \beta > 0$ such that $\mathbb{P}(l_{q+1} - l_q = j) \leq C \exp(-\beta j)$ for all j and for all q . Moreover, the distribution of $l_{q+1} - l_q$ does not depend on q and the family $(l_{q+1} - l_q)_{q \in \mathbb{N}}$ is i.i.d. and independent of l_0 . Now let $v_0 := l_0$ and for all $q \in \mathbb{N}$, let $v_{2q+2} := 2(l_{q+1} - l_q) - 1$ and let $v_{2q+1} = 1$. Let $p = w^v$. Then note that $p^j \xrightarrow{j \rightarrow +\infty} p$ almost surely for the simple convergence topology. By Lemma 4.9, the random sequence (v_q) is independent of (w_k) so the sequences (p_{2k+1}) and (p_{2k+2}) are i.i.d. and independent of each other and of p_0 . Moreover, by Lemma A.3, each p_k has finite exponential moment. Let $\tilde{\mu}$ be the distribution of $\tilde{\gamma}^p$. We have just proven (58).

Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we want to show (57) in Theorem 1.10, which states that the conditional distribution of $\tilde{\gamma}_{2k+1}^p$ relatively to $(\tilde{\gamma}_{k'}^p)_{k' \neq 2k+1}$ is bounded above by $\frac{\nu_s}{1 - \alpha}$. Let $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Saying that $l_k = j$ is equivalent to saying that $\tau_j < P_{\nu_s}(\gamma_{2k}^p, \gamma_{2j+1}^w, \gamma_{2j+2}^w)$, that $m_j = k$ and that $m_{j'} > k$ for all $j' > j$. Once we assume that $\tau_j < P_{\nu_s}(\gamma_{2k}^p, \gamma_{2j+1}^w, \gamma_{2j+2}^w)$, the conditions $m_j = k$ and $m_{j'} > k$ for all $j' > j$ can be expressed in terms of $(\tilde{\gamma}_{k'}^w)_{k' \neq 2j+1}$. Moreover, once we assume that $l_k = j$, the random sequence $(\tilde{\gamma}_{k'}^p)_{k' \neq 2k+1}$ is the image of the random sequence $(\tilde{\gamma}_{k'}^w)_{k' \neq 2j+1}$ by a measurable function (which is defined on the set $l_k = j$). Hence, the distribution of $\tilde{\gamma}_{2k+1}^p$ knowing $l_k = j$ and $(w_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(\tilde{\gamma}_{k'}^p)_{k' \neq 2k+1}$ is $\frac{\mathbb{1}_{\Pi^{-1}(A')}}{\nu_s(A')} \nu_s$ for $A' := \{g \in \Gamma \mid \gamma_{2k}^p \mathbb{A} g \mathbb{A} \gamma_{2j+2}^w\}$. By the Schottky property, we have $\nu_s(A') \geq 1 - 2\rho$. This proves (57).

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $q := \max\{k \in \mathbb{N} \mid \bar{w}_k \leq n\}$ and let $r := n - \bar{w}_q$. We claim that the conditional distribution of γ_n knowing $(p_k^j)_{k,j}$ and knowing that q is even is $(\chi_r^{w_q})_* \tilde{\kappa}$. We prove by induction on $j' \in \mathbb{N}$ that the conditional distribution of γ_n knowing $(p_k^j)_{k,j \leq j'}$ and knowing that q is even is $(\chi_r^{w_q})_* \tilde{\kappa}$. For $j' = 0$, this comes from the definition of the random sequence γ^w . For larger $j' \in \mathbb{N}$, note that the construction of $(p_k^j)_{k,j \leq j'+1}$ from $(p_k^j)_{k,j \leq j'}$ only depends on events that are independent of $(\tilde{\gamma}_{2k}^w)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and therefore independent of $\gamma_n = \chi_r^{w_q}(\tilde{\gamma}_q^w)$. Hence the conditional distribution of γ_n knowing $(p_k^j)_{k,j \leq j'+1}$ and knowing that q is even is the conditional distribution of γ_n knowing $(p_k^j)_{k,j \leq j'}$ and knowing that q is even.

Now let $A \subset \Gamma \setminus \bigcup_{k=0}^{m-1} \chi_k^m(\text{supp}(\tilde{\nu}_s))$. We have $\mathbb{P}(\gamma_n \in A \mid q \in 2\mathbb{N}) = 0$ and knowing that q is odd, the conditional probability of $(\gamma_n \in A)$ is $(\chi_r^{w_q})_* \tilde{\kappa}(A)$, which is bounded above by $\frac{\nu(A)}{1-\alpha}$ by (61). This proves (59) and concludes the proof of Theorem 4.1. \square

4.4. Facts about ping-pong sequences. Given $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}_\Omega)$, and $(\Gamma, \mathcal{A}_\Gamma)$ two measurable spaces, and $\gamma : \Omega \rightarrow \Gamma$ a measurable map, we write $\langle \gamma \rangle_\sigma := \gamma^* \mathcal{A}_\Gamma \subset \mathcal{A}_\Omega$ for the σ -algebra generated by γ .

Definition 4.10 (Ping-pong sequence). *Let Γ be a semi-group, let \mathbb{A} be a measurable binary relation on Γ and let $\rho \in (0, 1)$. Let $N \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{+\infty\}$ and let $(\gamma_k)_{0 \leq k < N}$ be a random sequence. We say that (γ_k) is ρ -ping-pong for \mathbb{A} if for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $0 \leq 2k + 1 < N$, the conditional distribution of γ_{2k+1} relatively to $(\gamma_{k'})_{k' \neq 2k+1}$ is almost surely ρ -Schottky for \mathbb{A} . Then we say that the distribution of $(\gamma_k)_{0 \leq k \leq N}$ is ρ -ping-pong for \mathbb{A} .*

Lemma 4.11 (Pivoting technique). *Let Γ be a semi-group, let \mathbb{A} be a measurable binary relation on Γ and let $\rho \in (0, 1)$. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and let μ be a probability distribution on $\Gamma^{\{0, \dots, 2n\}}$ that is ρ -ping-pong for \mathbb{A} . There exists a probability space (Ω, \mathbb{P}) a random sequence $(\gamma_k)_{0 \leq k \leq 2n} \sim \mu$ and a random integer $r \sim \mathcal{G}_\rho$ such that $\gamma_{2n-2r-1} \mathbb{A}(\gamma_{2n-2r} \cdots \gamma_{2n})$ or $n \leq r$ and r and $(\gamma_{2k})_{0 \leq k \leq n}$ are independent.*

Proof. Let $((\gamma_k)_{0 \leq k \leq 2n}, (\tau_j)_{0 \leq j}) \sim \mu \otimes \mathcal{U}_{[0,1]}^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$. Given $j \geq n$, we define $P_j := 1 - \rho$. Given $0 \leq j < n$, we define:

$$P_j := \frac{(1 - \rho) \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{A}}(\gamma_{2n-2j-1}, \gamma_{2n-2j} \cdots \gamma_{2n})}{\mathbb{P}(\gamma_{2n-2j-1} \mathbb{A}(\gamma_{2n-2j} \cdots \gamma_{2n}) \mid (\gamma_k)_{k \neq 2n-2j-1})}.$$

Note that $0 \leq P_j \leq 1$ almost surely because (γ_k) is ρ -ping pong. Moreover $\mathbb{E}(P_j \mid (\gamma_k)_{k \neq 2n-2j-1}) = 1 - \rho$ almost surely and P_j is independent of $(\tau_{j'})_{j' \in \mathbb{N}}$. Therefore, we have:

$$\forall j \in \mathbb{N}, \mathbb{P}(\tau_j < P_j \mid (\gamma_k)_{k \neq 2n-2j-1}, (\tau_{j'})_{j' \neq j}) = 1 - \rho.$$

Moreover, for all $j' < j \in \mathbb{N}$, the random variable $P_{j'}$ is measurable for $\langle (\gamma_k)_{k \geq 2n-2j'-2} \rangle$, hence it is measurable for $\langle (\gamma_k)_{k \neq 2n-2j-1} \rangle$. Therefore:

$$(70) \quad \forall j \in \mathbb{N}, \mathbb{P}(\tau_j < P_j \mid (\gamma_{2k})_{0 \leq k \leq n}, \forall j' < j, \tau_{j'} \geq P_{j'}) = 1 - \rho.$$

Let $r := \min\{j \in \mathbb{N} \mid \tau_j < P_j\}$. Assume that $r < n$, then $P_r > 0$ so $\gamma_{2n-2r-1} \mathbb{A}(\gamma_{2n-2r} \cdots \gamma_{2n})$. Then by (70), we have $\mathbb{P}(r \geq j \mid (\gamma_{2k})_{0 \leq k \leq n}) = \rho^j$, almost surely and for all j . Hence $r \sim \mathcal{G}_\rho$ and r is independent of $(\gamma_{2k})_{0 \leq k \leq n}$. \square

Given $N \in \mathbb{N}$, given Γ a semi-group, given $\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_N$ a finite sequence in Γ and given $0 \leq j < i \leq N$, we write $\gamma_i \cdots \gamma_j$ for $\gamma_i \cdots \gamma_N \gamma_0 \cdots \gamma_j$.

Lemma 4.12 (Cyclical pivoting technique). *Let Γ be a semi-group, let \mathbb{A} be a measurable binary relation on Γ and let $\rho \in (0, 1)$. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and let μ be a probability distribution on $\Gamma^{\{0, \dots, 2n\}}$ that is ρ -ping-pong for \mathbb{A} . There exist a probability space (Ω, \mathbb{P}) , a random sequence $(\gamma_k)_{0 \leq k \leq 2n} \sim \mu$ and an integer $c \sim \mathcal{G}_{2\rho}$ such that $\gamma_{2n-2c-1} \mathbb{A}(\gamma_{2n-2c} \cdots \gamma_{2c})$ and $(\gamma_{2n-2c-2} \cdots \gamma_{2c}) \mathbb{A} \gamma_{2c+1}$ or $n \leq 2c - 1$ and c and $(\gamma_{2k})_{0 \leq k \leq n}$ are independent.*

Proof. Let $(\Omega, \mathbb{P}) := (\Gamma^{2n+1} \times [0, 1]^{\mathbb{N}}, \mu \otimes \mathcal{U}_{[0,1]}^{\otimes \mathbb{N}})$. Let $((\gamma_k)_{0 \leq k \leq 2n}, (\tau_j)_{0 \leq j}) \sim \mu \otimes \mathcal{U}_{[0,1]}^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$. Given $j \geq n/2$, we define $P_j := 1 - 2\rho$. Given $0 \leq j < n/2$, we define:

$$P_j := \frac{(1 - 2\rho) \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{A}}(\gamma_{2n-2j-1}, \gamma_{2n-2j} \cdots \gamma_{2j}) \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{A}}(\gamma_{2n-2j-2} \cdots \gamma_{2j}, \gamma_{2j+1})}{\mathbb{P}(\gamma_{2n-2j-1} \mathbb{A}(\gamma_{2n-2j} \cdots \gamma_{2j}) \cap (\gamma_{2n-2j-2} \cdots \gamma_{2j}) \mathbb{A} \gamma_{2j+1} \mid (\gamma_k)_{k \notin \{2n-2j-1, 2j+1\}})}.$$

Note that $0 \leq P_j \leq 1$ and $\mathbb{E}(P_j \mid (\gamma_k)_{k \notin \{2n-2j-1, 2j+1\}}) = 1 - 2\rho$. Let $c := \min\{j \in \mathbb{N} \mid \tau_j < P_j\}$. Then $r \sim \mathcal{G}_{2\rho}$ and c is independent of $(\gamma_{2k})_{0 \leq k \leq n}$. \square

Remark 4.13. Let Γ be a semi-group, let \mathbb{A} be a binary relation on Γ and let $S \subset \Gamma$. Let $(\tilde{\gamma}_k)_{0 \leq k \leq 2n} \in \tilde{\Gamma}^{2n+1}$ and let $\gamma_k := \Pi(\tilde{\gamma}_k)$ for all $0 \leq k \leq 2n$. Assume for the sake of the argument that the identity of Γ is aligned with everyone and not in S . Assume that for all $0 \leq k \leq n$, we have: $\gamma_{2k} \mathbb{A} \gamma_{2k+1} \tilde{\mathbb{A}}^S \tilde{\gamma}_{2k+2}$.

In Lemma 4.12, we want to have $\gamma_{2n-2c-2} \cdots \gamma_{2c} \mathbb{A} \gamma_{2c+1}$ instead of just $\gamma_{2n-2c} \cdots \gamma_{2c} \mathbb{A} \gamma_{2c+1}$ because we have no control over the product $\gamma_{2n-2c} \cdots \gamma_{2c}$ (it may be the identity for example and the alignment would be meaningless). We however have control over the product $\gamma_{2n-2c-2} \cdots \gamma_{2c}$. Indeed, if $c < n/2$ is such that $\gamma_{2n-2c-1} \mathbb{A} (\gamma_{2n-2c} \cdots \gamma_{2c})$, then $\gamma_{2n-2c-3} \tilde{\mathbb{A}}^S \tilde{\gamma}_{2n-2c-2} \odot \cdots \odot \tilde{\gamma}_{2c}$. In concrete cases, we have shown in Proposition 4.3 that this implies a genuine alignment.

4.5. Factorization of the pivotal extraction. In this section, we prove Theorem 1.10. Given X and Y two measurable sets, we write $\chi_{\tilde{\Gamma}} : Y \times X \rightarrow Y$ and $\chi_X : Y \times X \rightarrow X$ for the first and second coordinate projections.

Lemma 4.14 (Factorization of the pivotal extraction). *Let Γ be a measurable semi-group and let $S \subset \Gamma$ be measurable. Let $M \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $(L_i)_{1 \leq i \leq M}$ and $(R_j)_{1 \leq j \leq M}$ be two non-random families of disjoint measurable subsets of Γ . Let $A \subset \{1, \dots, M\}^2$ and let $\mathbb{A} := \bigsqcup_{(i,j) \in A} L_i \times R_j$. Let ν be a probability measure on Γ , let $0 < \alpha < 1$, let $0 < \rho < \frac{1}{5}$ and let $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\tilde{\nu}_s$ be a probability measure on Γ^m such that $\alpha \nu_s \leq \nu^{\otimes m}$ and let $\nu_s := \Pi_* \tilde{\nu}_s$. Assume that ν_s is supported on S and ρ -Schottky for \mathbb{A} . Let $\tilde{\mu}$ be as in Theorem 1.10 and let $(\tilde{\gamma}^w) \sim \tilde{\mu}$. Then there exists a Markov chain (x_n) on $X \subset \{0, \dots, 2M\}$, with $x_0 = 0$, and a family $(\tilde{\nu}'_x)_{x \in X} \in \text{Prob}(\tilde{\Gamma} \times X)^X$ such that:*

- (1) For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the pair $(\tilde{\gamma}_n^w, x_{n+1})$ has distribution law $\tilde{\nu}'_{x_n}$ conditionally to $(\tilde{\gamma}_k^w)_{k < n}$ and $(x_k)_{k \leq n}$.
- (2) For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, one has $x_{2k+1} \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ and $x_{2k+2} \in \{M+1, \dots, 2M\}$.
- (3) For all $i \in \{1, \dots, M\} \cap X$ and all $j \in \{M+1, \dots, 2M\} \cap X$, one has $\tilde{\nu}'_i(\tilde{\Gamma} \times \{j\}) > 0$.
- (4) For all $i \in \{1, \dots, M\} \cap X$ and all $j \in \{M+1, \dots, 2M\} \cap X$, the distribution:

$$\nu_{i,j} := \Pi_*(\chi_{\tilde{\Gamma}})_* \left(\frac{\mathbb{1}_{(\chi_X=j)} \tilde{\nu}'_i}{(\chi_X)_* \tilde{\nu}'_i \{j\}} \right)$$

is $\frac{\rho}{1-2\rho}$ -Schottky.

Let $(x_n), (\tilde{\gamma}_n^w)$ be as in Lemma 4.14. Note that items (2) and (3) imply that the supports of x_{2k+2} and x_{2k+3} do not depend on k . However, the support of x_1 may differ from the support of x_3 . With that in mind, for all $i \in \{1, \dots, M\} \cap X$ and all $j \in \{M+1, \dots, 2M\} \cap X$, the distribution $\nu_{i,j}$ is the distribution of γ_k^w knowing that $x_k = i$ and $x_{k+1} = j$ for any $k \in \{1, 3, \dots\}$ such that $\mathbb{P}(x_k = i) > 0$.

Proof. Let $\tilde{\kappa}$ be as in Lemma 4.5. Let $((\tilde{\gamma}_n^w), (\tau_k)) \sim (\tilde{\kappa} \otimes \tilde{\nu}_s)^{\otimes \mathbb{N}} \otimes \mathcal{U}_{[0,1]}^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$ and let $(p_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the associated random sequence of pivotal times and let $(l_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be as in definition 4.6. Let $\phi_L, \phi_R : \Gamma \rightarrow \{1, \dots, M\}$ be such that $L_i = \phi_L^{-1}\{i\}$ and $R_i = \phi_R^{-1}\{i\}$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, M\}$.

We define $x_0 := 0$ and we write $\tilde{\nu}'_0$ for the distribution of $(\tilde{\gamma}_0^p, \phi_L(\gamma_0^p))$. Given $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we define:

$$x_{2k+1} := \phi_L(\gamma_{2k}^p) \quad \text{and} \quad x_{2k+2} := M + \phi_R(\gamma_{2l_{k+1}}^w).$$

Note that for all $g \in \Gamma$, the set $\{h \in \Gamma \mid g \mathbb{A} h\}$ is determined by $\phi_L(\gamma)$ and the set $\{h \in \Gamma \mid h \mathbb{A} g\}$ is determined by $\phi_R(\gamma)$.

Note also that by construction, for all integer k , the conditional distribution of $(\tilde{\gamma}_{k'}^p)_{k' \geq 2k+1}$ relatively to $(\tilde{\gamma}_{k'}^p)_{k' \leq 2k}$ and $(\tau_{l'})_{l' < l_k}$ only depends on x_{2k+1} and not on k . However the distribution of x_{2k+1} itself may depend on k . Given $x \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ a possible value for x_k , write $\tilde{\nu}'_x$ for the distribution of $(\tilde{\gamma}_{2k+1}^w, x_{2k+2})$ knowing $x_{2k+1} = x$. Note that by construction, this distribution does not depend on k .

For all integer k , the distribution of $(\tilde{\gamma}_{k'}^p)_{k' \geq 2k+2}$ relatively to $(\tilde{\gamma}_{k'}^p)_{k' \leq 2k+1}$ and $(\tau_{l'})_{l' < l_k}$ only depends on x_{2k+2} and not on k . Given $x \in \{M+1, \dots, 2M\}$ a possible value for x_k , write $\tilde{\nu}'_x$ for the distribution of $(\tilde{\gamma}_{2k+2}^w, x_{2k+3})$ knowing $x_{2k+2} = x$. Again this distribution does not depend on k .

Then for all $i \in \{1, \dots, M\} \cap X$ and all $j \in \{M+1, \dots, 2M\} \cap X$, the distribution $\nu_{i,j}$ is the distribution of γ_{2k+1}^p knowing that $\phi_L(\gamma_{2k}^p) = i$ and $M + \phi_R(\gamma_{2l_{k+1}}^w) = j$. This distribution is bounded above by $\frac{\nu}{\alpha}$ by (57) in Theorem 4.1. \square

Now we can prove 1.10 by taking an extraction.

Proof of Theorem 1.10. Let $\rho \in (0, 1/3)$ and let $\rho' := \frac{\rho}{1+2\rho} \in (0, 1/5)$. Let $K \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $K' = 2K$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $K \geq 8$. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$, let $0 < \epsilon', \alpha < 1$ and let $\tilde{\nu}_s$ be as in Corollary 3.19 applied to ν, ρ', K' and let $\nu_s := \Pi \tilde{\nu}_s$. Then $\tilde{\nu}_s$ is compactly supported, and

bounded above by $\frac{\nu^{\otimes m}}{\alpha}$. Moreover ν_s is ρ' -Schottky for $\mathbb{A}^{\varepsilon'}$ and $\text{sqz}_* \Pi_* \tilde{\nu}_s [K' |\log(\varepsilon')| + K' \log(2)]$. Let $\varepsilon := \frac{\varepsilon'}{2}$ and let $\mathbb{A}^{\varepsilon'} \subset \mathbb{A} \subset \mathbb{A}^\varepsilon$ be a finitely described binary relation. Then $K' |\log(\varepsilon')| + K' \log(2) = 2K |\log(\varepsilon)| + K \log(2) \geq K |\log(\varepsilon)| + K \log(2)$ and ν_s is ρ' -Schottky for \mathbb{A} .

Let $M \in \mathbb{N}$, $X \subset \{0, \dots, 2M + 1\}$, $\tilde{\mu}$ and $(\tilde{\nu}'_x)_{x \in X}$ be as in Lemma 4.14. Let $(\tilde{\gamma}_k^p) \sim \tilde{\mu}$ and let (x_n) be the underlying Markov chain. Let $i, j \in X$ be such that $0 < i \leq M < j \leq 2M$. Let $q_0 := \min\{q \in \mathbb{N} \mid (x_q, x_{q+1}) = (i, j)\}$, and define by induction $q_{2k+1} = 1$ and:

$$q_{2k+2} := \min\{q \geq \bar{q}_{2k+2} \mid (x_q, x_{q+1}) = (i, j)\} - \bar{q}_{2k+2}$$

for all k . Let $\tilde{\kappa}_0$ be the distribution of $\tilde{\gamma}_0^{p^q}$, let $\tilde{\kappa}_1$ be the distribution of $\tilde{\gamma}_1^{p^q}$ and let $\tilde{\kappa}_2$ be the distribution of $\tilde{\gamma}_2^{p^q}$. By the factorization property, we have $(\tilde{\gamma}_k^{p^q}) \sim \tilde{\kappa}_0 \otimes (\tilde{\kappa}_1 \otimes \tilde{\kappa}_2)^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$, which proves point (1). Then each q_k has bounded exponential moment because it is the hitting time of a finite Markov chain.

Moreover each p_k has finite exponential moment so p_k^q has finite exponential moment for all q , therefore $L_* \tilde{\kappa}_i$ has finite exponential moment for all i , this proves point (2).

By Proposition 4.3, we have $\gamma_i^{p^q} \cdots \gamma_{j-1}^{p^q} \mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{4}} \gamma_j^{p^q} \cdots \gamma_{k-1}^{p^q}$ for all $0 \leq i \leq j \leq k$, which proves (4).

Note also that $\tilde{\kappa}_1$ is the restriction of $\tilde{\nu}_s$ to $\{\gamma \in \Gamma \mid L_i \mathbb{A} \gamma \mathbb{A} R_j\}$, which has measure at least $1 - 2\rho$, hence κ_1 is $\frac{\rho'}{1-2\rho}$ -Schottky for \mathbb{A} , hence it is ρ -Schottky for \mathbb{A}^ε .

Let $i, j \in X$ that do not satisfy $0 < i \leq M < j \leq 2M$ and such that $(\chi_X)_* \tilde{\nu}'_i \{j\} > 0$. The distribution $\tilde{\nu}_{i,j} := (\chi_\Gamma)_* \frac{1_{\Gamma \times \{i\}}}{\nu'_i(\Gamma \times \{j\})} \tilde{\nu}'_i$ is absolutely continuous with respect to the distribution of $(\chi_{2k}^\circ)_* \tilde{\mu}$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathbb{P}(x_{2k} = i) > 0$. Therefore, by (59) there is a constant C such that for all $A \in \Gamma \setminus \bigcup_{k=0}^{m-1} \chi_k^m \text{supp}(\tilde{\nu}_s)$, we have:

$$(71) \quad \forall k \leq l, \forall i \in \{0, 2\}, \tilde{\kappa}_i (L^{-1}\{l\} \cap (\chi_k^l)^{-1}(A)) \leq C \nu(A) L_* \tilde{\kappa}_i \{l\}.$$

Now assume that $\Gamma = \text{GL}(E)$. The set $\bigcup_{k=0}^{m-1} \chi_k^m \text{supp}(\tilde{\nu}_s)$ is compact and N is a continuous function on Γ . Let $B = \max N(\bigcup_{k=0}^{m-1} \chi_k^m \text{supp}(\tilde{\nu}_s))$. Then with the notations of Definitions A.13 and A.14 the distributions $(\zeta_{i,k,l})$ defined in Theorem 1.10 are uniformly bounded by $B \wedge [CN_* \nu]$. When ν is not supported on $\text{GL}(E)$, we have $N_* \nu \{+\infty\} > 0$, therefore $N_* \nu$ dominates any probability distribution and point (6) is trivial. However C can not be expressed in terms of (α, ρ, m) because we did not give an explicit formula for the distribution of the sequence (q_k) . \square

5. PROOF OF THE RESULTS

In this section, we use Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 1.10 together with Lemmas 4.11 and 4.12 to prove the results stated in the introduction. Most of the proofs are straightforward application of Theorem 4.1 and Lemma 4.11, for the probabilistic estimates on the coefficients, on the sqz coefficient and on the speed of convergence to the invariant measure; and Lemma 4.12 for the estimates on the spectral radius, on the spectral gap and on the dominant eigenspace. Unexpectedly³, the trickiest part is to show the almost sure convergence result in Theorem 1.6, namely that $\text{sqz}(\bar{\gamma}_n)/n \rightarrow \sigma(\nu)$. This is also the only reason why we need Lemma 4.14. The question whether $\text{prox}(\bar{\gamma}_n)/n$ converges almost surely (or even in probability) without moment conditions remains open.

5.1. Law of large numbers and large deviations inequalities for the singular gap. In this section, we define the escape speed of a random product of matrices using Theorem 1.10 but not the moment estimate (6). We will use usual ergodic theory but only for the proof of the almost sure convergence. Given (x_n) a random sequence of real numbers and $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$, we say that the sequence (x_n) satisfies (exponential) large deviations inequalities below the speed σ if for all $\alpha < \sigma$, we have $\limsup \frac{1}{n} \log(\mathbb{P}(x_n \leq \sigma n)) < 0$. Note that if the distribution of (x_n) is a Dirac measure then it satisfies large deviations inequalities below the speed σ if and only if $\liminf \frac{x_n}{n} \geq \sigma$. In Lemma A.10 in appendix, we show that the notion of large deviations behaves well when taking the sum (1) (4), maximum (3) or minimum (2) of finitely many random sequences and also when composing random sequences of integers (5).

Lemma 5.1 (Escape speed and large deviations inequalities for self-aligned measures). *Let E be a Euclidean vector space and let $0 < \varepsilon < 1$. Let κ be a probability distribution on $\text{End}(E)$ and let $(g_k) \sim \kappa^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$. Assume that almost surely and for all $0 \leq i \leq j \leq k$, we have $g_i \cdots g_{k-1} \mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{4}} g_j \cdots g_{k-1}$. Assume*

³This result is well known in the L^1 case without any algebraic assumption on the support of the measure.

also that almost surely and for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $\bar{g}_n \neq 0$. Then there is a limit $\sigma(\kappa) \in [0, +\infty]$ such that $\frac{\text{sqz}(\bar{g}_n)}{n} \rightarrow \sigma(\kappa)$ almost surely and:

$$(72) \quad \forall \alpha < \sigma(\kappa), \exists C, \beta > 0, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \mathbb{P}(\text{sqz}(\bar{g}_n) \leq \alpha n) \leq C \exp(-\beta n).$$

If we moreover assume that $\mathbb{E}(\text{sqz}_* \kappa) > 2|\log(\varepsilon)| + 4\log(2)$, then $\sigma(\kappa) > 0$.

Proof. Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\sigma_N := \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E}(\text{sqz}_* \kappa^{*N}) = \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E}(\text{sqz}(\bar{g}_N))$. For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $x_k^N := \text{sqz}(g_{kN} \cdots g_{(k+1)N-1})$. Then (x_n^N) is i.i.d. and takes positive values and $\mathbb{E}(x_n^N) = N\sigma_N$ for all n . Then by Corollary A.6, the sequence $(\bar{x}_k^N)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfies large deviations inequalities under the speed $N\sigma_N$. Moreover, by (23) in Lemma 2.8 applied to $\bar{g}_{kN} \mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{4}} g_{kN} \cdots g_{(k+1)N-1}$ for all $0 \leq k < \frac{n}{N}$ and then to $\bar{g}_{N\lfloor \frac{n}{N} \rfloor} \mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{4}} g_{N\lfloor \frac{n}{N} \rfloor} \cdots g_{n-1}$, we have:

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \text{sqz}(\bar{g}_n) \geq x_{\lfloor \frac{n}{N} \rfloor}^N - n \frac{2|\log(\varepsilon)| + 4\log(2)}{N}.$$

Hence, by (4) applied to $(x_{\lfloor \frac{n}{N} \rfloor}^N)$ summed with $(n \frac{2|\log(\varepsilon)| + 4\log(2)}{N})$ and (5) applied to (x_n) composed with $(\lfloor \frac{n}{N} \rfloor)$ in Lemma A.10, the sequence $\text{sqz}(\bar{g}_n)$ satisfies large deviations inequalities below the speed $\sigma_N - \frac{2|\log(\varepsilon)| + 4\log(2)}{N}$. This is true for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$ so $\text{sqz}(\bar{g}_n)$ satisfies large deviations inequalities below the speed $\sigma(\kappa) := \limsup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \sigma_N$.

Let $T : \Gamma^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \Gamma^{\mathbb{N}}; (\gamma_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mapsto (\gamma_{k+1})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$. The transformation T is ergodic for the measure $\mu := \kappa^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$. For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $f_n : (\gamma_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mapsto 2|\log(\varepsilon)| + 4\log(2) - \text{sqz}(\bar{\gamma}_n)$. Then f_n is bounded above so $\mathbb{E}_\mu(f_n) \leq 2|\log(\varepsilon)| + 4\log(2)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let m, n be integers, then by (23) in Lemma 2.8, we have almost surely for $g \sim \mu$:

$$\text{sqz}(g_0 \cdots g_{n+m-1}) \geq \text{sqz}(g_0 \cdots g_{n-1}) + \text{sqz}(g_n \cdots g_{n+m-1}) - 2|\log(\varepsilon)| - 4\log(2)$$

Hence $f_{n+m}(g) \leq f_n(g) + f_m \circ T^n(g)$. So by Kingman's sub-additive ergodic Theorem [Kin68], the sequence $\frac{f_n}{n}$ converges μ -almost everywhere to $\liminf \frac{\mathbb{E}(f_N * \mu)}{N} = \liminf \frac{2|\log(\varepsilon)| + 4\log(2)}{N} - \sigma_N$ and this inferior limit is actually a limit by classical sub-additivity. Therefore $\frac{\text{sqz}(\bar{g}_n)}{n} \rightarrow \sigma(\kappa)$ and $\sigma(\kappa) \geq \mathbb{E}(\text{sqz}_* \kappa) - 2|\log(\varepsilon)| - 4\log(2)$ almost surely by sub-additivity. \square

Theorem 5.2 (Large deviations inequalities for the singular gap). *Let E be a Euclidean vector space and let ν be a strongly irreducible and proximal probability distribution on $\text{End}(E)$. Let $\tilde{\kappa}_0, \tilde{\kappa}_1, \tilde{\kappa}_2$ be as in Theorem 1.10 for $\rho = \frac{1}{4}$ and $K = 10$. Let $\tilde{\kappa} := \tilde{\kappa}_1 \odot \tilde{\kappa}_2$ and let $\kappa := \Pi_* \tilde{\kappa}$. Let $\sigma := \sigma(\kappa) / \mathbb{E}(L_* \tilde{\kappa})$. Let $(\gamma_n) \sim \nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$. Then the random sequence $(\text{sqz}(\bar{\gamma}_n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfies large deviations inequalities below the speed σ in the sense of Definition A.7 i.e.,*

$$(73) \quad \forall \alpha < \sigma, \exists C, \beta > 0, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \mathbb{P}(\text{sqz}(\bar{\gamma}_n) \leq \alpha n) \leq C \exp(-\beta n).$$

Proof. Let $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$ be as in Theorem 1.10. Let $(\tilde{\gamma}_k^w) \sim \tilde{\kappa}_0 \otimes (\tilde{\kappa}_1 \otimes \tilde{\kappa}_2)$. To all integer $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we associate $q_n =: \max\{q \in \mathbb{N} \mid \bar{w}_{2q} \leq n\}$ and a random integer r_n such that $\gamma_{2q_n - 2r_n - 1}^w \mathbb{A}^\varepsilon (\gamma_{\bar{w}_{2q_n - 2r_n}} \cdots \gamma_{n-1})$ or $r_n \geq q_n$. Note that the conditional distribution of the sequence $\gamma_0^w, \gamma_1^w, \dots, \gamma_{2q_n - 1}^w, \gamma_{\bar{w}_{2q_n}} \cdots \gamma_{n-1}$ relatively to q_n is $\frac{1}{4}$ -ping-pong for all values of q_n . Hence, we may assume that $r_n \sim \mathcal{G}_{\frac{1}{4}}$ for all n , by Lemma 4.11.

The distribution $L_* \tilde{\kappa}_i$ has finite exponential moment and is supported on $\mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$ for all i . By Corollary A.6, the random sequence $(\bar{w}_{2m} - w_0)_m$ satisfies large deviations inequalities around the speed $\mathbb{E}(L_* \tilde{\kappa}) \in (0, +\infty)$. Then by (1) in Lemma A.10, the random sequence $(\bar{w}_{2m})_m$ also does. By (6) in Lemma A.10, the random sequence $(q_n)_n$ satisfies large deviations inequalities around the speed $\mathbb{E}(L_* \tilde{\kappa})^{-1}$ and by (1) in Lemma A.10, $(q_n - r_n - 1)$ also does. Then by Lemma 5.1, and by composition (5) in Lemma A.10, the sequence $(\text{sqz}(\gamma_1^w \cdots \gamma_{2q_n - 2r_n - 2}^w))_n$ satisfies large deviations inequalities below the speed σ .

Now by (4) in Theorem 1.10, we have $\gamma_0^w \mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{4}} \gamma_1^w \cdots \gamma_{2q_n - 2r_n - 2}^w$, so by (23) in Lemma 2.8, the sequence $(\text{sqz}(\gamma_0^w \cdots \gamma_{2q_n - 2r_n - 2}^w))_n$ satisfies large deviations inequalities below the speed σ . Moreover, we have:

$$\gamma_0^w \cdots \gamma_{2q_n - 2r_n - 2}^w \mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{4}} \gamma_{2q_n - 2r_n - 1}^w \mathbb{A}^\varepsilon (\gamma_{\bar{w}_{2q_n - 2r_n}} \cdots \gamma_{n-1})$$

and $\text{sqz}(\gamma_{2q_n - 2r_n - 1}^w) \geq K|\log(\varepsilon)| + K\log(2) \geq 2|\log(\varepsilon/2)| + 3\log(2)$ so by the transpose of Lemma 2.10, we have:

$$\gamma_0^w \cdots \gamma_{2q_n - 2r_n - 1}^w \mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{4}} (\gamma_{\bar{w}_{2q_n - 2r_n}} \cdots \gamma_{n-1}).$$

Hence $(\text{sqz}(\bar{\gamma}_n))_n$ satisfies large deviations inequalities below the speed σ \square

Note that in Theorem 5.2, we do not claim that $\frac{\text{sqz}(\bar{\gamma}_n)}{n} \rightarrow \sigma$ almost surely. We do however claim that in Theorem 1.6. The remaining part of this paragraph is dedicated to the proof of that claim. The usual proof using Lyapunov coefficients does not work in our case because σ may be finite even when

ν has infinite first moment. Kingman's theorem can not be used either because sqz is not sub-additive nor super-additive. In fact, we will really use the strong irreducibility of ν to prove it with the following trick.

Lemma 5.3. *Let E be a Euclidean vector space and let ν be a strongly irreducible and proximal probability distribution on $\text{End}(E)$. Let $(\gamma_n) \sim \nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$. Let ε be as in Theorem 1.10 for $\rho = \frac{1}{4}$ and $K = 10$. There exist $l_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $0 < \beta < 1$ such that:*

$$(74) \quad \forall g \in \Gamma, \mathbb{P}(\forall n \geq l_0, g \mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{4}} \overline{\gamma}_n) > \beta.$$

Proof. We use the notations of the proof of Theorem 5.2. Let $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$ and $\tilde{\kappa}_0, \tilde{\kappa}_1, \tilde{\kappa}_2$ be as in Theorem 1.10 for $\rho = \frac{1}{4}$ and $K = 10$. Let $(\tilde{\gamma}_k^w) \sim \tilde{\kappa}_0 \otimes (\tilde{\kappa}_1 \otimes \tilde{\kappa}_2)$. For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $q_n =: \max\{q \in \mathbb{N} \mid \overline{w}_{2q} \leq n\}$ and let r_n be the smallest integer such that $\gamma_{2q_n - 2r_n - 1}^w \mathbb{A}^\varepsilon (\gamma_{\overline{w}_{2q_n - 2r_n}} \cdots \gamma_{n-1})$ or $r_n \geq q_n$. By Lemma 4.11, r_n has a bounded exponential moment that does not depend on n . Note that if $r_n < q_n - 1$, then by (4) in Theorem 1.10, we have:

$$\gamma_0 \gamma_1 \mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{4}} \gamma_2^w \cdots \gamma_{2q_n - 2r_n - 2}^w \mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{4}} \gamma_{2q_n - 2r_n - 1}^w \mathbb{A}^\varepsilon \gamma_{\overline{w}_{2q_n - 2r_n}} \cdots \gamma_{n-1}$$

so we have $\gamma_0 \gamma_1 \mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{8}} \gamma_{\overline{w}_2} \cdots \gamma_{n-1}$ by Lemma 2.10. By Lemma 4.11, we may assume that $(q_n - r_n)$ satisfies large deviations inequalities below the speed $\mathbb{E}(L_* \tilde{\kappa})^{-1} > 0$. Let l'_0 be such that $\mathbb{P}(\forall n \geq l'_0, r_n < q_n) \geq \frac{1}{2}$. Now let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha > 0$ be as in Corollary 3.19 for $\rho = \frac{1}{4}$ and $K = 10$. Let $\gamma_{-m}, \dots, \gamma_{-1} \sim \nu^{\otimes m}$ be independent of $(\tilde{\gamma}_k^w)$. Then we have:

$$(75) \quad \mathbb{P}(g \mathbb{A}^\varepsilon \gamma_{-m} \cdots \gamma_{-1} \mathbb{A}^\varepsilon (\gamma_0^w \gamma_1^w) \cap \text{sqz}(\gamma_{-m} \cdots \gamma_{-1}) \geq K |\log(\varepsilon)| + K \log(2)) \geq \alpha(1 - 2\rho) \geq \frac{\alpha}{3}.$$

Now if we assume that:

$$g \mathbb{A}^\varepsilon \gamma_{-m} \cdots \gamma_{-1} \mathbb{A}^\varepsilon \gamma_0^w \gamma_1^w \mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{8}} \gamma_{\overline{w}_2} \cdots \gamma_{n-1}$$

Then by Lemma 2.10, we have $g \mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{4}} \gamma_{-m} \cdots \gamma_{n-1}$. Now note that (75) holds for the conditional distribution relatively to $(\gamma_n)_{n \geq 0}$. Hence, we have:

$$(76) \quad \mathbb{P}(\forall n \geq l'_0, g \mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{4}} \gamma_{-m} \cdots \gamma_{n-1}) \geq \frac{\alpha}{6}.$$

Moreover $(\gamma_{k-m})_{k \geq 0} \sim \nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$, therefore, we have (74) for $l_0 = l'_0 + m$. \square

Now we will use Lemma 5.3 to deduce the almost sure convergence result in Theorem 1.6 from the almost sure convergence result in Lemma 5.1.

Lemma 5.4 (Almost sure convergence). *Let E be a Euclidean vector space, let $\Gamma = \text{End}(E)$, let ν be a strongly irreducible and proximal probability distribution on Γ . Let $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ and let $\tilde{\kappa}_0, \tilde{\kappa}_1, \tilde{\kappa}_2$ be as in Theorem 1.10 for $\rho = \frac{1}{4}$ and $K = 10$. Let $\tilde{\kappa} := \tilde{\kappa}_1 \odot \tilde{\kappa}_2$ and let $\kappa := \Pi_* \tilde{\kappa}$. Let $\sigma := \sigma(\kappa) / \mathbb{E}(L_* \tilde{\kappa})$. Let $(\gamma_n) \sim \nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$. Then $\frac{\text{sqz}(\gamma_n)}{n} \rightarrow \sigma$ almost surely and $\sigma > 0$.*

Proof. Let $(\tilde{\gamma}_k^w) \sim \tilde{\kappa}_0 \otimes (\tilde{\kappa}_1 \otimes \tilde{\kappa}_2)^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$. Then $(\gamma_n) \sim \nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$ by (1) in Theorem 1.10. By Theorem 5.2, $(\text{sqz}(\gamma_n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfies large deviations inequalities, below the speed σ . Hence $\liminf \frac{\text{sqz}(\gamma_n)}{n} \geq \sigma$ almost surely. Therefore, we only need to show that $\limsup \frac{\text{sqz}(\gamma_n)}{n} \leq \sigma$ almost surely. Note that $\sigma > 0$ by Lemma 5.1.

Assume by contradiction that $\sigma < +\infty$ and $\mathbb{P}\left(\limsup \frac{\text{sqz}(\gamma_n)}{n} > \sigma\right) > 0$. Let $\delta > 0$ be such that $\mathbb{P}\left(\limsup \frac{\text{sqz}(\gamma_n)}{n} \geq (1 + 2\delta)\sigma\right) \geq \delta$. Then for all integer $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, we have:

$$(77) \quad \mathbb{P}(\exists n \geq n_0, \text{sqz}(\gamma_n) \geq n(1 + \delta)\sigma) \geq \delta.$$

Let $l_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $0 < \beta < 1$ be as in Lemma 5.3. Assume that they also satisfy (74) for the transpose of ν (which is strongly irreducible and proximal). Then, for all $g \in \text{End}(E)$, and for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have:

$$(78) \quad \mathbb{P}(\forall l_0 \leq l \leq n, \gamma_{n-l} \cdots \gamma_{n-1} \mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{4}} g) \geq \beta.$$

Note that (78) also works when g is a random endomorphism which is independent of the word $(\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_{n-1})$.

Let $a_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ be the smallest integer such that $\mathbb{P}(w_0 > a_0) \leq \frac{\beta^2 \delta}{4}$ and let $a_1 := a_0 + l_0$. We use the convention $\min \emptyset = +\infty$. Let $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$. Let n_0 be the smallest integer such that $\mathbb{P}(\overline{w}_{2m_0+1} \geq n_0 + a_1 + l_0) \leq \frac{\beta^2 \delta}{3}$. We define:

$$n_1 := \min \{n \geq n_0 \mid \text{sqz}(\gamma_{a_1} \cdots \gamma_{a_1+n}) \geq n(1 + \delta)\sigma\}.$$

Then $\mathbb{P}(n_1 \neq +\infty) \geq \delta$. Moreover, n_1 is a stopping time so the random word $(\gamma_{a_1}, \dots, \gamma_{a_1+n_1})$ is independent of the random sequence $(\gamma_{a_1+n_1+k+1})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$. Both are also independent of the word $(\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_{a_1-1})$ by construction. Let $(\gamma_n)_{n < 0} \sim \nu^{\otimes \mathbb{Z}_-}$ be independent of $(\gamma_n)_{n \geq 0}$. Then by Lemma 5.3 applied to

$g = \gamma_{a_1} \cdots \gamma_{a_1+n_1}$ and to the random sequence $(\gamma_{a_1+n_1+k+1})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ on the right ($k \geq a_1 + n_1 + l_0$) and by (78) on the left ($j \leq a_0$), we have the following:

$$\mathbb{P}(n_1 < +\infty \cap \forall j \leq a_0, \forall k \geq a_1 + n_1 + l_0, \gamma_j \cdots \gamma_{a_1-1} \mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{4}} \gamma_{a_1} \cdots \gamma_{a_1+n_1-1} \mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{4}} \gamma_{a_1+n_1} \cdots \gamma_{k-1}) \geq \beta^2 \delta.$$

Let $D := 4|\log(\varepsilon)| + 10\log(2)$. Then by Lemma 2.9, we have:

$$(79) \quad \mathbb{P}(n_1 < +\infty \cap \forall j \leq a_1, \forall k \geq a_1 + n_1 + l_0, \text{sqz}(\gamma_j \cdots \gamma_{k-1}) \geq n_1(1+\delta)\sigma - D) \geq \beta^2 \delta.$$

Now we define the random integer:

$$m_1 := \min \{k \in \mathbb{N} \mid \bar{w}_{2k+1} > a_1 + n_1 + l_0\}.$$

Then by (79) with $k = \bar{w}_{2m_1+1} - 1 \geq a_1 + n_1 + l_0$ we have:

$$\mathbb{P}(m_1 < +\infty \cap \forall j \leq a_1, \text{sqz}(\gamma_j \cdots \gamma_{\bar{w}_{2m_1+1}-1}) \geq n_1(1+\delta)\sigma - D) \geq \beta^2 \delta.$$

Note also that with probability at least $1 - \frac{\beta^2 \delta}{3}$, we have $w_0 \leq a_1$, therefore:

$$\mathbb{P}(m_1 < +\infty \cap \text{sqz}(\gamma_{w_0} \cdots \gamma_{\bar{w}_{2m_1+1}-1}) \geq n_1(1+\delta)\sigma - D) \geq \beta^2 \delta.$$

Note also that by minimality of m_1 , we have $\bar{w}_{2m_1-1} - a_1 - l_0 \leq n_1$. Moreover, with our notations, we have $\gamma_{w_0} \cdots \gamma_{\bar{w}_{2m_1+1}-1} = \gamma_1^w \cdots \gamma_{2m_1}^w$. Hence, we have:

$$\mathbb{P}(m_1 < +\infty \cap \text{sqz}(\gamma_{w_0} \cdots \gamma_{\bar{w}_{2m_1+1}-1}) \geq (\bar{w}_{2m_1-1} - a_1 - l_0)(1+\delta)\sigma - D) \geq \beta^2 \delta - \frac{\beta^2 \delta}{3}.$$

Moreover, $\mathbb{P}(m_1 < m_0) \leq \frac{\beta^2 \delta}{3}$ by construction, so we have:

$$\mathbb{P}(m_0 \leq m_1 < +\infty \cap \text{sqz}(\gamma_{w_0} \cdots \gamma_{\bar{w}_{2m_1+1}-1}) \geq (\bar{w}_{2m_1-1} - a_1 - l_0)(1+\delta)\sigma - D) \geq \beta^2 \delta - 2\frac{\beta^2 \delta}{3}.$$

Hence, by taking $k = m_1$, we have:

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists k \geq m_0, \text{sqz}(\gamma_{w_0} \cdots \gamma_{\bar{w}_{2k+1}-1}) \geq (\bar{w}_{2k-1} - a_1 - l_0)(1+\delta)\sigma - D) \geq \frac{\beta^2 \delta}{3}.$$

The above is true for all m_0 , therefore:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\limsup_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\text{sqz}(\gamma_1^w \cdots \gamma_{2k}^w) + D}{\bar{w}_{2k-1} - a_1 - l_0} \geq (1+\delta)\sigma\right) \geq \frac{\beta^2 \delta}{3}.$$

Moreover $\bar{w}_{2k-1} \geq 2k - 1$ for all k so we can get rid of the constants in the limsup and we have:

$$(80) \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\limsup_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\text{sqz}(\gamma_1^w \cdots \gamma_{2k}^w)}{\bar{w}_{2k-1}} \geq (1+\delta)\sigma\right) \geq \frac{\beta^2 \delta}{3}.$$

Now it remains to show that (80) is in contradiction with Lemma 5.1. We know that $\frac{\text{sqz}(\gamma_1^w \cdots \gamma_{2k}^w)}{k} \rightarrow \sigma(\kappa) > 0$ almost surely by Lemma 5.1. Moreover $\frac{w_1 + \cdots + w_{2k-2}}{k-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{E}(L_* \tilde{\kappa}) > 0$ almost surely by the law of large numbers, hence $\frac{\bar{w}_{2k-1}}{k} = \frac{w_0 + \cdots + w_{2k-2}}{k} \rightarrow \mathbb{E}(L_* \tilde{\kappa})$.

$$(81) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\text{sqz}(\gamma_1^w \cdots \gamma_{2k}^w)}{\bar{w}_{2k-1}} = \frac{\sigma(\kappa)}{\mathbb{E}(L_* \tilde{\kappa})} = \sigma.$$

which contradicts (80). Hence $\limsup \frac{\text{sqz}(\gamma_n)}{n} \leq \sigma$ almost surely, which concludes the proof. \square

5.2. Contraction property. In this paragraph, we prove the following theorem. Given ν a strongly irreducible and proximal probability measure, we write $\sigma(\nu)$ for the quantity σ defined in Lemma 5.4.

Definition 5.5. Let E be a Euclidean vector space, let $\Gamma = \text{End}(E)$. We define the set of contracting sequences:

$$\Omega'(E) := \left\{ (\gamma_n) \in \Gamma^{\mathbb{N}} \left| \begin{array}{l} \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \bar{\gamma}_n \neq \{0\} \quad \text{and} \\ \forall k \in \mathbb{N}, \forall \varepsilon \in (0, 1), \\ \limsup_{m, n \rightarrow +\infty} \max_{\substack{u \in U^\varepsilon(\gamma_k \cdots \gamma_n) \setminus \{0\}, \\ u' \in U^\varepsilon(\gamma_k \cdots \gamma_m) \setminus \{0\}}} d([u], [u']) = 0 \end{array} \right. \right\}.$$

We define $T := \Gamma^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \Gamma^{\mathbb{N}}$ to be the Bernoulli shift and we define $l^\infty : \Omega'(E) \rightarrow \mathbf{P}(E)$ to be the only map such that:

$$\forall (\gamma_n) \in \Omega'(E), \limsup_{m, n \rightarrow +\infty} \max_{u \in U^\varepsilon(\gamma_0 \cdots \gamma_{n-1}) \setminus \{0\}} d([u], l^\infty(\gamma)) = 0.$$

Let:

$$\Omega'(E) := \{ \gamma \in \Omega(E) \mid \forall k \in \mathbb{N}, \gamma_k l^\infty(T^{k+1}\gamma) = l^\infty(T^k\gamma) \}.$$

Note that given E a Euclidean vector space, the space $\Omega(E)$ defined in Definition 5.5 is measurable and T -invariant. Moreover l^∞ is T -equivariant on $\Omega(E)$ in the sense that $l^\infty(\gamma) = \gamma_0 l^\infty(T\gamma)$.

Note also that $\Omega'(E) \neq \Omega(E)$. For example let $E = \mathbb{R}^2$, and let π_1 and π_2 be the orthogonal projections onto the first and second coordinates. If $\gamma_0 = \pi_1$ and $\gamma_k = \pi_1 + 2\pi_2$ for all $k \geq 1$, then $\bar{\gamma}_n = \pi_1$ for all $n \geq 1$ and $[\gamma_k \cdots \gamma_n] \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} [\pi_2]$ for all $k \geq 1$. So $l^\infty(\gamma)$ is the first coordinate axis and $l^\infty(T\gamma)$ is the second coordinate axis. Hence $\gamma_0 l^\infty(T\gamma) = [0] \neq l^\infty(\gamma)$ so $\gamma \in \Omega'(E) \setminus \Omega(E)$.

Theorem 5.6. *Let E be a Euclidean vector space, let $\Gamma = \text{End}(E)$, let ν be a strongly irreducible and proximal probability distribution on Γ . Let $\gamma = (\gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sim \nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$. Then $\gamma \in \Omega(E)$ almost surely. Let $\alpha < \sigma(\nu)$. There exist constants $C, \beta > 0$ such that:*

$$(82) \quad \mathbb{P}(\exists u \in U^1(\bar{\gamma}_n) \setminus \{0\}, d([u], l^\infty(\gamma)) \geq \exp(-\alpha n)) \leq C \exp(-\beta n).$$

Moreover, for all $v \in E$, we have:

$$(83) \quad \mathbb{P}(d([\bar{\gamma}_n v], l^\infty(\gamma)) \geq \exp(-\alpha n) \mid \bar{\gamma}_n v \neq 0) \leq C \exp(-\beta n).$$

Proof. Let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and let $\tilde{\kappa}_0, \tilde{\kappa}_1, \tilde{\kappa}_2$ be as in Theorem 1.10 for $\rho = \frac{1}{4}$ and $K = 10$. Let $(\tilde{\gamma}_k^w) \sim \tilde{\kappa}_0 \otimes (\tilde{\kappa}_1 \otimes \tilde{\kappa}_2)^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$. By Corollary 2.14, there is a limit line l^∞ such that:

$$\forall m \in \mathbb{N}, \forall u \in U^1(\tilde{\gamma}_m^w) \setminus \{0\}, d([u], l^\infty) \leq \frac{4}{\varepsilon} \exp(-\text{sqz}(\tilde{\gamma}_m^w)).$$

Then we necessarily have $l^\infty = l^\infty(\gamma)$ whenever $\gamma \in \Omega(E)$. To all integer $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we associate $q_n =: \max\{q \in \mathbb{N} \mid \bar{w}_{2q} \leq n\}$ and a random integer $r_n \sim \mathcal{G}_\rho$ such that $\gamma_{2q_n - 2r_n - 1}^w \mathbb{A}^\varepsilon(\gamma_{\bar{w}_{2q_n - 2r_n}} \cdots \gamma_{n-1})$ or $r_n \geq q_n$. Then by Lemma 2.10, if we assume that $r_n < q_n$, then $\bar{\gamma}_{2q_n - 2r_n}^w \mathbb{A}^\varepsilon(\gamma_{\bar{w}_{2q_n - 2r_n}} \cdots \gamma_{n-1})$, hence by Lemma 2.8, we have:

$$\forall u \in U^1(\bar{\gamma}_n) \setminus \{0\}, \forall u' \in U^1(\bar{\gamma}_{2q_n - 2r_n}^w) \setminus \{0\}, d([u], [u']) \leq \frac{4}{\varepsilon} \exp(-\text{sqz}(\bar{\gamma}_{2q_n - 2r_n}^w)).$$

In this case, by triangular inequality:

$$\forall u \in U^1(\bar{\gamma}_n) \setminus \{0\}, d([u], l^\infty) \leq \frac{8}{\varepsilon} \exp(-\text{sqz}(\bar{\gamma}_{2q_n - 2r_n}^w)).$$

By Corollary A.2, and by Lemma A.3 applied to the sequence (w_k) , the random variable $(\bar{w}_{q_n - r_n} - n)$ have a bounded exponential moment that does not depend on n . Therefore, by (1) Lemma A.10, the random sequence $(\bar{w}_{q_n - r_n})$ satisfies large deviation inequalities around the speed 1. Then $(\text{sqz}(\bar{\gamma}_{2q_n - 2r_n}^w))_n$ satisfies large deviations inequalities below the speed $\sigma(\nu)$ by Theorem 5.2 and by (5) in Lemma A.10. Hence we have (82). The above reasoning also works for $T^k \gamma$ for all k therefore $\gamma \in \Omega'(E)$ almost surely.

Now to show (83), we use the same reasoning. We identify E with $\text{Hom}(\mathbb{K}, E)$. Let $v \in E \setminus \{0\}$. Note that $U^1(\bar{\gamma}_n v) = \bar{\gamma}_n v \mathbb{K}$. For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we define a random integer r_n^v such that $\gamma_{2q_n - 2r_n^v - 1}^w \mathbb{A}^\varepsilon(\gamma_{\bar{w}_{2q_n - 2r_n^v}} \cdots \gamma_{n-1} v)$ or $r_n^v \geq q_n$. Then by the same reasoning as for the proof of (82), for all n such that $r_n^v < q_n$ and $\bar{\gamma}_n v \neq 0$, we have:

$$d([\bar{\gamma}_n v], l^\infty) \leq \frac{8}{\varepsilon} \exp(-\text{sqz}(\bar{\gamma}_{2q_n - 2r_n^v}^w)).$$

Note moreover that $(\mathbb{P}(\bar{\gamma}_n v = 0))_{n \in \mathbb{N}, v \neq 0}$ is bounded above by a constant by Lemma 3.6. Hence we have (83).

Let $v \in E \setminus \ker(\nu)$. The above reasoning implies that $l^\infty = \lim[\bar{\gamma}_n v]$ almost surely so $l^\infty(\gamma) = \gamma_0 l^\infty(T\gamma)$ almost surely. Moreover, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the random sequence $T^k \gamma$ has distribution $\nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$, so we also have $l^\infty(T^k \gamma) = \gamma_k l^\infty(T^{k+1} \gamma)$. Therefore $\gamma \in \Omega(E)$ almost surely. \square

Given $g \in \text{End}(E)$ and $v \in E$, we write $g[v]$ or $[g][v]$ for $[gv]$, this is an element of $\mathbf{P}(E) \sqcup \{[0]\}$. That way we have a measurable (but not everywhere continuous) semi-group action $\text{End}(E) \curvearrowright \mathbf{P}(E) \sqcup \{[0]\}$, and a convolution product $\text{Prob}(\text{End}(E)) \times \text{Prob}(\mathbf{P}(E) \sqcup \{[0]\}) \rightarrow \text{Prob}(\mathbf{P}(E) \sqcup \{[0]\})$. Note that given $g \in \text{End}(E) \setminus \{0\}$ and $v \in E \setminus \{0\}$, such that $gv \neq 0$, the map $([h], [x]) \mapsto [hx]$ is continuous at $([g], [v])$.

Let us now prove Corollary 1.8, which says that given E a Euclidean vector space and ν a strongly irreducible and proximal probability distribution on $\text{End}(E)$, we have a unique ν -stationary probability measure ξ_ν^∞ on $\mathbf{P}(E)$. Moreover, for all probability measure ξ on $\mathbf{P}(E) \setminus \ker(\nu)$, the sequence $(\nu^{*n} * \xi)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges exponentially fast to ξ_ν^∞ for the dual of the Lipschitz norm.

Proof of Corollary 1.8. Let ν be any strongly irreducible and proximal distribution on $\text{End}(E)$. Let ξ_ν^∞ be the distribution of $l_*^\infty(\nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}})$. Let $(\gamma_n) \sim \nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$. Let $l := l^\infty(\gamma)$ and let $l' := l^\infty \circ T(\gamma)$. Then by (83) in Theorem 5.6 applied to a vector $v \in E \setminus \ker(\nu)$, we have $l = \gamma_0 l'$ almost surely. Moreover, l and l' both have distribution ξ_ν^∞ and γ_0 and l' are independent so ξ_ν^∞ is ν -stationary.

Let ξ be a probability measure on $\mathbf{P}(E)$ that is supported on $\mathbf{P}(E) \setminus \ker(\nu)$, let $\lambda \geq 0$ and let $f : \mathbf{P}(E) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be λ -Lipschitz. Let $(l, (\gamma_n)) \sim \xi \otimes \nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$ and let $l^\infty := l^\infty(\gamma)$. Let $0 < \alpha < \sigma(\nu)$ and let $C, \beta > 0$ be as in Theorem 5.6. Note also that such β, C do not depend on ξ . Then note that $\mathbf{P}(E)$ has diameter 1. Therefore, for all $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have:

$$(84) \quad |\mathbb{E}(f(l^\infty)) - \mathbb{E}(f(\overline{\gamma}_n l))| \leq \mathbb{E}(|f(l^\infty) - f(\overline{\gamma}_n l)|) \leq \lambda \mathbb{E}(d(l^\infty, \overline{\gamma}_n l) \leq \lambda \mathbb{P}(d(l^\infty, \overline{\gamma}_n l) \geq \delta) + \lambda \delta.$$

Moreover, since l is independent of γ , we know that $\mathbb{P}(d(l^\infty, \overline{\gamma}_n l) \geq \exp(-\alpha n)) \leq C \exp(-\beta n)$ for all n by (83) in Theorem 5.6. So by (84) applied to all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, with $\delta = \exp(-\alpha n)$, we have:

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, |\mathbb{E}(f(l^\infty)) - \mathbb{E}(f(\overline{\gamma}_n l))| \leq \lambda C \exp(-\beta n) + \lambda \exp(-\alpha n) \leq \lambda(C + 1) \exp(-\min\{\alpha, \beta\}n).$$

To conclude, note that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the random variable $\overline{\gamma}_n l$ has distribution law $\nu^{*n} * \xi$. \square

5.3. Asymptotic estimates for the spectral gap and dominant eigenspace. We use exactly the same strategy as for the proofs of Theorems 5.2 and 5.6 but we use Lemma 4.12 instead of Lemma 4.11. Note that given E a vector space and $g, h \in \text{End}(E)$, then $\text{prox}(gh) = \text{prox}(hg)$ so gh is proximal if and only if hg is and in this case, $E^+(gh) = gE^+(hg)$.

Note that given $g \in \text{End}(E)$ a proximal matrix, the constant sequence $\gamma : n \mapsto g$ is in $\Omega(E)$ and $l^\infty(\gamma) = E^+(g)$. In this section we use Lemma 4.12 applied to the extraction constructed in Theorem 4.1. We could use the extraction constructed in Theorem 1.10 because we do not care about moments or independence. However need the notion of inductive alignment $\tilde{\mathbb{A}}^S$ as defined in the beginning of Section 4 to be able to use Lemma 4.12 as we explained in Remark 4.13.

Theorem 5.7. *Let ν be a strongly irreducible and proximal probability distribution over $\text{End}(E)$. Let $(\gamma_n) \sim \nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$ and let $l^\infty := l^\infty(\gamma)$. Then we have:*

$$(85) \quad \forall \alpha < \sigma(\nu), \exists C, \beta > 0, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \mathbb{P}(\text{prox}(\overline{\gamma}_n) \leq \alpha n) \leq C \exp(-\beta n),$$

$$(86) \quad \forall \alpha < \sigma(\nu), \exists C, \beta > 0, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \mathbb{P}(d(E^+(\overline{\gamma}_n), l^\infty) \geq \exp(-\alpha n)) \leq C \exp(-\beta n).$$

Proof. Let $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq 1$ and $\tilde{\nu}_s$ be as in Corollary 3.19 applied to ν with $\rho = \frac{1}{4}$ and $K = 10$. Let $\tilde{\mu}$ be as in Theorem 4.1 applied to ν and $\tilde{\nu}_s$ with $S = \text{supp}(\Pi_* \tilde{\nu}_s)$ and $\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{A}^\varepsilon$. Let $(\tilde{\gamma}_k^w) \sim \tilde{\mu}$. To all integer $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we associate $q_n =: \max\{q \in \mathbb{N} \mid \overline{w}_{2q} \leq n\}$ and c_n the smallest integer such that:

$$\gamma_{2q_n - 2c_n - 1}^w \mathbb{A} (\gamma_{\overline{w}_{2q_n - 2c_n}} \cdots \gamma_{n-1} \gamma_0 \cdots \gamma_{\overline{w}_{2c_n}}) \quad \text{and} \quad (\tilde{\gamma}_{\overline{w}_{2q_n - 2c_n - 2}} \cdots \gamma_{n-1} \gamma_0 \cdots \gamma_{\overline{w}_{2c_n}}) \mathbb{A} \gamma_{2c_n}^w$$

or $2c_n \geq q_n$. By Lemma 4.12, c_n has a bounded exponential moment that does not depend on n . Moreover $\gamma_{2q_n - 2c_n - 3}^w \tilde{\mathbb{A}}^S \tilde{\gamma}_{2q_n - 2c_n - 2}^w$ and $\gamma_{2q_n - 2c_n - 2}^w \mathbb{A} \gamma_{2q_n - 2c_n - 1}^w$. Therefore, we have

$$\gamma_{2q_n - 2c_n - 3}^w \tilde{\mathbb{A}}^S (\tilde{\gamma}_{\overline{w}_{2q_n - 2c_n - 2}}, \dots, \gamma_{n-1}, \gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_{\overline{w}_{2c_n}})$$

By Proposition 4.3, we have:

$$\gamma_{2q_n - 2c_n - 3}^w \mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} (\tilde{\gamma}_{\overline{w}_{2q_n - 2c_n - 2}} \cdots \gamma_{n-1} \gamma_0 \cdots \gamma_{\overline{w}_{2c_n}}).$$

By definition of c_n and by Theorem 4.1 and Proposition 4.3 applied to $(\gamma_k^w)_{2c_n < k < 2q_n - 2c_n}$, which satisfies (1) in Theorem 4.1, we also have:

$$(\tilde{\gamma}_{\overline{w}_{2q_n - 2c_n - 2}} \cdots \gamma_{n-1} \gamma_0 \cdots \gamma_{\overline{w}_{2c_n}}) \mathbb{A}^\varepsilon \gamma_{2c_n + 1}^w \mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} \gamma_{2c_n + 2}^w \mathbb{A}^\varepsilon \cdots \mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} \gamma_{2q_n - 2c_n - 4}^w \mathbb{A}^\varepsilon \gamma_{2q_n - 2c_n - 3}^w$$

Moreover, each of these matrices have a squeeze coefficient larger than $4|\log(\varepsilon)| + 7|\log(2)|$ by Proposition 4.3 again. Let $a_n := \overline{w}_{2q_n - 2c_n - 3}$ and let $h_n := \gamma_{a_n} \cdots \gamma_{n-1} \gamma_0 \cdots \gamma_{a_n - 1}$. Then by Lemma 2.13 we have $h_n \mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{4}} h_n$ and $\overline{\gamma}_{a_n} \mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{4}} h_n$ when $2c_n + 2 \leq q_n$. Hence by Lemma 2.17, we have:

$$(87) \quad \text{prox}(h_n) \geq \text{sqz}(h_n) - 2|\log(\varepsilon)| - 6 \log(2)$$

Moreover, we have $(\gamma_{2c_n + 1}^w \cdots \gamma_{2q_n - 2c_n - 3}^w) \mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{4}} (\tilde{\gamma}_{\overline{w}_{2q_n - 2c_n - 2}} \cdots \gamma_{n-1} \gamma_0 \cdots \gamma_{\overline{w}_{2c_n}})$, so by (23) in Lemma 2.8, we have:

$$(88) \quad \text{sqz}(h_n) \geq \text{sqz}(\gamma_{2c_n + 1}^w \cdots \gamma_{2q_n - 2c_n - 3}^w) - 2|\log(\varepsilon)| - 4 \log(2).$$

Now we claim that $(\text{sqz}(\gamma_{2c_n + 1}^w \cdots \gamma_{2q_n - 2c_n - 3}^w))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfies large deviations inequalities below the speed $\sigma(\nu)$. Note that this implies that we have (85) because $\text{prox}(h_n) = \text{prox}(\overline{\gamma}_n)$ by conjugation. Let $\alpha < \sigma$ and let $0 < \delta < 1/2$ be such that $\frac{\alpha}{1 - 2\delta} < \sigma$. By Theorem 5.2, there are constants $C, \beta > 0$ such that:

$$\forall i < j, \mathbb{P}\left(\text{sqz}(\gamma_i \cdots \gamma_{j-1}) \leq (j - i) \frac{\alpha}{1 - 2\delta}\right) \leq C \exp(-\beta(j - i)).$$

Write $C' := C(1 - \exp(-\beta))^{-2}$ and $\beta' := \beta(1 - 2\delta) > 0$, then we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\exists i \leq \delta n, \exists j \geq n - \delta n, \text{sqz}(\gamma_i \cdots \gamma_{j-1}) \leq (j-i) \frac{\alpha}{1-2\delta}\right) &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor \delta n \rfloor} \sum_{j=\lceil n-\delta n \rceil}^n C \exp(-\beta(j-i)) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\lfloor \delta n \rfloor} \sum_{j=\lceil n-\delta n \rceil}^{+\infty} C \exp(-\beta(j-i)) \\ &\leq C' \exp(-\beta' n). \end{aligned}$$

Note that, if we take $i = \bar{w}_{2c_n+1}$ and $j = \bar{w}_{2q_n-2c_n-2}$, then $\gamma_i \cdots \gamma_{j-1} = \gamma_{2c_n+1}^w \cdots \gamma_{2q_n-2c_n-3}^w$. Hence we have:

$$(89) \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\text{sqz}(\gamma_{2c_n+1}^w \cdots \gamma_{2q_n-2c_n-3}^w) \leq \alpha n\right) \leq \mathbb{P}(\delta n < \bar{w}_{2c_n+1}) + \mathbb{P}(\bar{w}_{2q_n-2c_n-2} < (1-\delta)n) \\ + \mathbb{P}\left(\exists i \leq \delta n, \exists j \geq n - \delta n, \text{sqz}(\gamma_i \cdots \gamma_{j-1}) \leq (j-i) \frac{\alpha}{1-2\delta}\right)$$

Moreover \bar{w}_{2c_n+1} has finite exponential moment so $(\mathbb{P}(\delta n < \bar{w}_{2c_n+1}))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ decreases exponentially fast. Moreover, by (5) applied to (\bar{w}_m) and (q_n) and (1) applied to (c_n) in Lemma A.10, the random sequence $(\bar{w}_{2q_n-2c_n-3})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfies large deviations inequalities below the speed 1 so $(\mathbb{P}(\bar{w}_{2q_n-2c_n-2} < (1-\delta)n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ decreases exponentially fast. Hence, by (89), the sequence $(\mathbb{P}(\text{sqz}(\gamma_{2c_n+1}^w \cdots \gamma_{2q_n-2c_n-3}^w) \leq \alpha n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ decreases exponentially fast in n , which proves the claim so we have (85).

Now we prove (86). By Lemma 2.17 applied to $h_n \mathbb{A}^\varepsilon h_n$, we have:

$$(90) \quad \forall u \in U^{\frac{\varepsilon}{4}}(h_n) \setminus \{0\}, d(E^+(h_n), [u]) \leq \frac{16}{\varepsilon} \exp(-\text{sqz}(h_n)).$$

Let e_n be a random non-zero vector such that $e_n \in E^+(h_n)$ when $2c_n + 2 \leq q_n$. By (88) and by the above reasoning, $(\text{sqz}(h_n))_n$ satisfies large deviations inequalities below the speed $\sigma(\nu) > 0$. Hence there exist constants $C, \beta > 0$ such that:

$$(91) \quad 1 - C \exp(-\beta n) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\forall u \in U^{\frac{\varepsilon}{4}}(h_n) \setminus \{0\}, d(E^+(h_n), [u]) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{8}\right) \leq \mathbb{P}(\bar{\gamma}_{a_n} \mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{8}} e_n).$$

Moreover, By Lemma 2.10 and by the above reasoning, we have $\bar{\gamma}_{a_n} \mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{4}} h_n$. Hence by lemma 2.3, we have:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\forall u \in U^{\frac{\varepsilon}{4}}(h_n) \setminus \{0\}, d(E^+(h_n), [u]) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{8}\right) \leq \mathbb{P}(\bar{\gamma}_{a_n} \mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{8}} e_n)$$

Moreover, when $\bar{\gamma}_{a_n} \mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{8}} e_n$, then by Lemma 2.8, we have:

$$\forall u \in U^1(\bar{\gamma}_{a_n}) \setminus \{0\}, d([\bar{\gamma}_{a_n} e_n], [u]) \leq \frac{8}{\varepsilon} \exp(-\text{sqz}(\bar{\gamma}_{a_n})).$$

Then by Corollary 2.14 and by triangular inequality, we have:

$$d([\bar{\gamma}_{a_n} e_n], l^\infty(\gamma)) \leq \frac{12}{\varepsilon} \exp(-\text{sqz}(\bar{\gamma}_{a_n})).$$

By conjugacy, we have $\bar{\gamma}_{a_n} e_n \mathbb{K} = E^+(\bar{\gamma}_n)$. Moreover, the random sequence (a_n) satisfies large deviations inequalities below the speed 1 so by Theorem 5.2 and by (5) in Lemma A.10, the random sequence $(\text{sqz}(\bar{\gamma}_{a_n}))_n$ satisfies large deviations inequalities below the speed $\sigma(\nu)$. This proves (86). \square

Proof of Theorems 1.6 and 1.7. Let E be a Euclidean space. Let ν be a strongly irreducible and proximal probability distribution over $\text{End}(E)$. Let $(\gamma_n) \sim \nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$. Let $\sigma(\nu) := \lim \frac{\text{sqz}(\bar{\gamma}_n)}{n}$ be as in Lemma 5.4. Then $\sigma(\nu) > 0$ by Theorem 5.2. Then (12) in Theorem 1.6 is a direct consequence of (73) in Theorem 5.2 and (85) in Theorem 5.7. The above proves Theorem 1.6. Moreover (14) is (83) and (15) is (86) which proves Theorem 1.7. \square

5.4. Limit flag for totally strongly irreducible distributions. Now we can give the following corollary which is a reformulation of the former results, written in a way that should remind of Oseledets' multiplicative ergodic Theorem.

Let E be a Euclidean vector space and let ν be a probability distribution on $\text{End}(E)$. We say that ν is totally strongly irreducible if for all $k \in \{1, \dots, \dim(E) - 1\}$ the measure $\bigwedge_*^k \nu$ is strongly irreducible.

Let ν be a strongly irreducible probability distribution and let $(\gamma_n) \sim \nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$. If ν is not proximal, we define $\sigma(\nu) := 0$, note that then by 3.13, we have $\frac{\text{sqz}(\bar{\gamma}_n)}{n} \rightarrow 0$ almost surely. If ν is proximal, we define $\sigma(\nu)$ as in Theorem 5.2.

Definition 5.8. Let ν be a distribution on $\text{End}(E)$ that is totally strongly irreducible. For all $1 \leq j \leq \mathbf{rk}(\nu)$, we define $\sigma_j(\nu) := \sigma\left(\bigwedge_*^j \nu\right)$. We define:

$$(92) \quad \Theta(\nu) := \{1 \leq j \leq \mathbf{rk}(\nu) \mid \sigma_j(\nu) \neq 0\}$$

Given h a matrix and $j \leq \mathbf{rk}(h)$, we define $\text{sqz}_j(h) := \log\left(\frac{\|\bigwedge^j h\|^2}{\|\bigwedge^{j-1} h\| \|\bigwedge^{j+1} h\|}\right) = \text{sqz}(\bigwedge^j h)$, for $j > \mathbf{rk}(h)$, we use the convention $\text{sqz}_j(h) = 0$ and for all $j \geq 1$, we define: $\text{prox}_j(h) := \text{prox}\left(\bigwedge^j h\right) = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\text{sqz}_j(h^n)}{n}$.

Theorem 5.9 (Convergence of the Cartan projection with large deviations). Let E be a Euclidean spaces and let ν be a totally strongly irreducible probability distribution on $\text{End}(E)$ of rank at least $\dim(E) - 1$. Let $(\gamma_n) \sim \nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$. For all $1 \leq j \leq d-1$ we have almost surely $\frac{\text{sqz}_j(\overline{\gamma}_n)}{n} \rightarrow \sigma_j(\nu)$. Moreover, for all $j \in \Theta(\nu)$ and for all $\alpha_j < \sigma_j(\nu)$, there exist constants $C, \beta > 0$ such that:

$$(93) \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \mathbb{P}\left(\text{sqz}_j(\overline{\gamma}_n) \leq \alpha_j n\right) \leq C \exp(-\beta n).$$

$$(94) \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \mathbb{P}\left(\text{prox}_j(\overline{\gamma}_n) \leq \alpha_j n\right) \leq C \exp(-\beta n).$$

Proof. If we assume that $j \in \Theta(\nu)$, then (93) is a reformulation of Theorem 5.2 for $\bigwedge_*^j \nu$ and 94 is a reformulation of Theorem 5.7. Otherwise $\sigma_j(\nu) = 0$. We know from Lemma 3.12 that there is a constant B such that $\text{sqz}_j(\overline{\gamma}_n) \leq B$ almost surely and for all n so $\frac{\text{sqz}_j(\overline{\gamma}_n)}{n} \rightarrow 0 = \sigma_j(\nu)$. \square

Let E be a Euclidean space of dimension $d \geq 2$. We denote by $\text{Gr}(E)$ the set of vector subspaces of E . Given $0 \leq k \leq d$, we denote by $\text{Gr}_k(E)$ the set of subspaces of E that have dimension k i.e., $(\text{Gr}_k(E))_{1 \leq k \leq d}$ are the level sets of the function $\dim : \text{Gr}(E) \rightarrow \{0, \dots, d\}$. Note that for all k , the set $\text{Gr}_k(E)$ naturally embeds into $\mathbf{P}(\bigwedge^k E)$ by the map $V \mapsto [v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge v_k]$ for $v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge v_k$ any basis of V . Note that the image of $\text{Gr}_k(E)$ by this embedding is a compact subset, we will abusively denote by $\text{Gr}_k(E)$ the image of $\text{Gr}_k(E)$ in $\mathbf{P}(\bigwedge^k E)$. We write d for the distance map on $\text{Gr}_k(E)$ pulled back from the distance on $\mathbf{P}(\bigwedge^k E)$ associated to the Euclidean metric on $\bigwedge^k E$.

We call flag in E a totally ordered set of subspaces of E i.e., for all $V, W \in F$, we have $V \subset W$ or $W \subset V$. We write $\text{Fl}(E)$ for the space of flags in E . Given $\Theta \subset \{1, \dots, d-1\}$, we denote by $\text{Fl}_\Theta(E)$ the space of flags $F \in \text{Fl}(E)$ such that $\dim(F) = \Theta$. Given $k \in \Theta \subset \{1, \dots, d-1\}$ and given $F \in \text{Fl}(E)$, we write F_k for the single element of the set $F \cap \text{Gr}_k(E)$.

Note that $\text{End}(E)$ naturally acts on the left on $\text{Fl}(E)$. Moreover, for all $\Theta \subset \{1, \dots, d-1\}$, the group $\text{GL}(E)$ acts continuously on $\text{Fl}_\Theta(E)$. We remind that we denote by T the Bernoulli shift.

Definition 5.10. Let E be a Euclidean vector space and let $\Theta \subset \{1, \dots, \dim(E)\}$ We define:

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega'_\Theta(E) &:= \bigcap_{k \in \Theta \setminus \{0\}} \left(\left(\bigwedge^k \right)^{\otimes \mathbb{N}} \right)^{-1} \Omega\left(\bigwedge^k E\right), \\ \Omega_\Theta(E) &:= \left\{ \gamma \in \Omega'_\Theta(E) \mid \forall k \in \Theta, l^\infty \circ \left(\bigwedge^k \right)^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}(\gamma) \in \text{Gr}_k(E) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

We also define the T -equivariant measurable map:

$$F_\Theta^\infty = (F_k^\infty)_{k \in \Theta} : \Omega_\Theta(E) \longrightarrow \text{Fl}_\Theta(E),$$

with $F_k^\infty = l^\infty \circ \left(\bigwedge^k \right)^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$ for all k .

Using the Cartan decomposition on the exterior product, we can show that in fact $\Omega'_\Theta(E) = \Omega_\Theta(E)$ but that is not the purpose of this article.

Theorem 5.11 (Convergence to the limit flag). Let E be a Euclidean vector space. Let $d := \dim(E)$, assume that $d \geq 2$. Let ν be a totally strongly irreducible probability distribution on $\text{GL}(E)$. Let $\Theta := \Theta(\nu)$ and let $\gamma \sim \nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$. Then $\gamma \in \Omega_\Theta(E)$ almost surely. Let $(\alpha_k)_{k \in \Theta} \in \prod_{k \in \Theta} (0, \sigma_k(\nu))$ be a non-random family of real numbers. Then there exist constants $C, \beta > 0$ such that for all non-random flag $F \in \text{Fl}_\Theta$, we have:

$$(95) \quad \mathbb{P}(\exists k \in \Theta, d(F_k^\infty(\gamma), \overline{\gamma}_n F_k) \geq \exp(-\alpha_k n)) \leq C \exp(-\beta n).$$

Proof. This is a reformulation of Theorem 5.6 in terms of flags. Let ν be a totally strongly irreducible probability measure on $\text{GL}(E)$ and let $k \in \Theta(\nu)$. Then $\bigwedge_*^k \nu$ is strongly irreducible and proximal. Let $(\gamma_n) \sim \nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$. By Theorem 5.6 applied to $(\bigwedge^k \gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, we have $(\bigwedge^k)^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}(\gamma) \in \Omega\left(\bigwedge^k E\right)$. Then we claim that $l^\infty \circ \left(\bigwedge^k \right)^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}(\gamma) \in \text{Gr}_k(E)$ almost surely. Hence $\gamma \in \Omega'_\Theta(E)$ almost surely.

Let $(v_1, \dots, v_k) \in E^k$ be a non-random free family. By Theorem 5.6, we have: $\bigwedge^k \bar{\gamma}_n(v_1, \dots, v_k) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} l^\infty \circ (\bigwedge^k)^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}(\gamma)$ almost surely. Moreover, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $\bigwedge^k \bar{\gamma}_n[v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge v_k] = [\bar{\gamma}_n v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \bar{\gamma}_n v_k] \in \text{Gr}_k(E)$, and $\text{Gr}_k(E)$ is closed in $\mathbf{P}(\bigwedge^k E)$. Hence $l^\infty \circ (\bigwedge^k)^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}(\gamma) \in \text{Gr}_k(E)$. Hence $\gamma \in \Omega_\Theta(E)$ almost surely. To conclude, note that (95) is simply the reformulation of (83) for all the measures $\bigwedge_*^k \nu$ with $k \in \Theta$. \square

Note that in the case of ν an totally strongly irreducible probability distribution on $\text{SL}(E)$, one can actually take the pivotal extraction to be aligned in all Cartan projections. With a correct adaptation of the works of [CFFT22], one should be able to prove the following.

Conjecture 5.12 (Poisson boundary). *Let E be a Euclidean space of dimension $d \geq 3$. Let ν be an totally strongly irreducible probability distribution supported on a discrete subgroup of $\text{SL}(E)$. Assume that ν has finite entropy then the Poisson boundary of ν is isomorphic to $\text{Fl}_{\Theta(\nu)}(E)$ endowed with the ν -stationary probability distribution $F_*^\infty \nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$.*

It follows directly from [CFFT22] when $E = \mathbb{R}^2$ because any discrete subgroup in $\text{SL}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ is either non-elementary hyperbolic and therefore we can apply [CFFT22], or virtually cyclic and therefore not strongly irreducible or finite.

5.5. Law of large numbers for the coefficients and for the spectral radius. We remind that in Corollary 3.19, we have shown that given ν a strongly irreducible and proximal probability distribution on $\text{GL}(E)$ and given $0 < \rho < \frac{1}{5}$, there is an integer $m \in \mathbb{N}$, a constant $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ and a probability distribution $\tilde{\nu}_s$ that is absolutely continuous with respect to $\nu^{\otimes m}$, has compact support and whose product is ρ -Schottky for \mathbb{A}^ε .

We use the notations of Definitions A.13 and A.15 for the trunking $[\cdot]$ and the coarse convolution \cdot^\dagger . We formulate Theorems 5.13 and 5.14 in the following technical way to explicit the dependency of the constants C and β in Theorem 1.3 in terms of ν . In particular, we can note that the lower bound of all β , so that Theorem 1.3 is satisfied (for $C = \beta^{-1}$), is given by a function of ν that is lower semi-continuous for the weak-* topology on the space of strongly irreducible and proximal probability distributions on $\text{GL}(E)$.

Theorem 5.13 (Strong law of large numbers for the coefficients). *Let E be a Euclidean vector space and let ν be a probability measure on $\text{GL}(E)$. Let $(\gamma_n) \sim \nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$. Let $\alpha, \varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, let $\rho \in (0, 1/5)$ and let $\tilde{\nu}_s$ be a compactly supported probability distribution on $\text{GL}(E)^m$ such that $\Pi_* \tilde{\nu}_s$ is ρ -Schottky for \mathbb{A}^ε and supported on the set $\{\text{sqz} \geq 10 |\log(\varepsilon/2)|\}$ and $\alpha \tilde{\nu}_s \leq \nu^{\otimes m}$. Let $B := \max_k \max N \circ \chi_k^m(\text{supp}(\tilde{\nu}_s))$. Then there exist constants $C, \beta > 0$ that depend only on α, ρ, m and such that:*

$$(96) \quad \forall f \in E^* \setminus \{0\}, \forall v \in E \setminus \{0\}, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \forall t \geq 0, \mathbb{P} \left(\log \frac{\|f\| \|\bar{\gamma}_n\| \|v\|}{|f \bar{\gamma}_n v|} > t \right) \\ \leq C \exp(-\beta n) + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} C \exp(-\beta k) \left[\frac{B \vee N_* \nu}{1 - \alpha} \right]^{\dagger k} (t - 2 |\log(\varepsilon)| - 3 \log(2), +\infty).$$

Proof. Let $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$ and $\tilde{\nu}_s$ be as in Corollary 3.19 for $K = 10$ and $\rho = \frac{1}{4}$. Let $\tilde{\mu}$ be as in Theorem 4.1 for $\Gamma := \text{GL}(E)$, for $\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{A}^\varepsilon$ and $S = \{\text{sqz} \geq 10 |\log(\varepsilon/2)|\}$. Let $(\tilde{\gamma}^w) \sim \tilde{\mu}$. By Proposition 4.3, we have $\gamma_{2k}^w \mathbb{A}^\varepsilon \gamma_{2k+1}^w \mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} \gamma_{2k+2}^w$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be fixed. Let $q_n := \max\{q \in \mathbb{N} | \bar{w}_{2q} \leq n\}$. Then by (57) in Theorem 4.1, the sequence $f \gamma_0^w, \gamma_1^w, \dots, \gamma_{2q_n-1}^w, \gamma_{\bar{w}_{2q_n}} \dots \gamma_{n-1} v$ is ρ -ping-pong. By Lemma 4.11 applied to that sequence, we construct a random integer $r_n \sim \mathcal{G}_\rho$ that is independent of $(\tilde{\gamma}_{2k}^w)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and such that $r_n \geq q_n$ or:

$$\gamma_{2q_n-2r_n-1}^w \mathbb{A}^\varepsilon (\gamma_{\bar{w}_{2q_n-2r_n}} \dots \gamma_{n-1} v).$$

By the transpose of Lemma 4.11, we construct a random integer $l \sim \mathcal{G}_\rho$ that is independent of $(\tilde{\gamma}_{2k}^w)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and such that :

$$(f \gamma_0^w \dots \gamma_{2l}^w) \mathbb{A}^\varepsilon \gamma_{2l+1}^w.$$

Note that if $l + r_n < q_n$, then:

$$(f \gamma_0^w \dots \gamma_{2l}^w) \mathbb{A}^\varepsilon \gamma_{2l+1}^w \mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} \dots \mathbb{A}^\varepsilon \gamma_{2q_n-2r_n-1}^w \mathbb{A}^\varepsilon (\gamma_{\bar{w}_{2q_n-2r_n}} \dots \gamma_{n-1} v).$$

Hence, by lemma 2.15, we have:

$$(f \gamma_0^w \dots \gamma_{2l}^w) \mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} (\gamma_{2l+1}^w \dots \gamma_{2q_n-2r_n-1}^w) \mathbb{A}^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} (\gamma_{\bar{w}_{2q_n-2r_n}} \dots \gamma_{n-1} v).$$

Hence by Lemma 2.9:

$$|f\bar{\gamma}_n v| \geq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{8} \|f\gamma_0^w \cdots \gamma_{2l}^w\| \|\gamma_{2l+1}^w \cdots \gamma_{2q_n-2r_n-1}^w\| \|\gamma_{\bar{w}_{2q_n-2r_n}} \cdots \gamma_{n-1} v\|.$$

Moreover by sub-multiplicativity:

$$\|\bar{\gamma}_n\| \leq \|\gamma_0^w \cdots \gamma_{2l}^w\| \|\gamma_{2l+1}^w \cdots \gamma_{2q_n-2r_n-1}^w\| \|\gamma_{\bar{w}_{2q_n-2r_n}} \cdots \gamma_{n-1}\|.$$

By definition of N , and by sub-additivity, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \log \|\gamma_0^w \cdots \gamma_{2l}^w\| + \log \|f\| - \log \|f\gamma_0^w \cdots \gamma_{2l}^w\| &\leq \log (\|\gamma_0^w\| \cdots \|\gamma_{2l}^w\|) - \log \left(\|\gamma_0^{w-1}\| \cdots \|\gamma_{2l}^{w-1}\| \right) \\ &\leq N(\gamma_0^w \cdots \gamma_{2l}^w) \leq \sum_{k=0}^{\bar{w}_{2l+1}-1} N(\gamma_k) \end{aligned}$$

and by the same argument:

$$\log \|\gamma_{\bar{w}_{2q_n-2r_n}} \cdots \gamma_{n-1}\| + \log \|v\| - \log \|\gamma_{\bar{w}_{2q_n-2r_n}} \cdots \gamma_{n-1} v\| \leq \sum_{k=\bar{w}_{2q_n-2r_n}}^{n-1} N(\gamma_k).$$

Therefore:

$$\log \|\bar{\gamma}_n\| - \log |f\bar{\gamma}_n v| \leq \sum_{k=0}^{\bar{w}_{2l+1}-1} N(\gamma_k) + \sum_{k=\bar{w}_{2q_n-2r_n}}^{n-1} N(\gamma_k) + 2|\log(\varepsilon)| + 3\log(2).$$

Moreover, for all $t \geq B$, and for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, by (59) in Theorem 4.1 with $A = \{N > t\}$, one has:

$$\mathbb{P}(N(\gamma_k) > t \mid (w_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}) \leq \frac{N_* \nu(t, +\infty)}{1 - \alpha}.$$

Note that, q_n only depends on $(w_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$, moreover l and r_n are independent of $(\tilde{\gamma}_{2j}^w)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$. Note also that when the sequence $(w_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ is so that the index k appears in an oddly indexed group (*i.e.*, there exists $j \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\bar{w}_{2j+1} \leq k < \bar{w}_{2j+2}$), then $N(\gamma_k) \leq B$ so $\mathbb{P}(N(\gamma_k) > t \mid (w_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}) = 0$ on that set and trivially, we also have $\mathbb{P}(N(\gamma_k) > t \mid (w_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}, l, r_n) = 0$ on that set and for all values of l and r_n . Therefore, we have:

$$\mathbb{P}(N(\gamma_k) > t \mid l, q_n, r_n) \leq \frac{N_* \nu(t, +\infty)}{1 - \alpha}.$$

By Corollary A.2, $n - \bar{w}_{2q_n}$ has a bounded exponential moment, with a bound that depends only on (α, ρ, m) and not on n . By Lemma A.3, the random variables $n - \bar{w}_{2q_n-2r_n}$ and \bar{w}_{2l+1} both have bounded exponential moment, with a bound that depends only on (α, ρ, m) . In other words, there are constants $C, \beta > 0$ that only depend on (α, ρ, m) by construction and such that:

$$\forall k \in \mathbb{N}, \mathbb{P}(n - \bar{w}_{2q_n-2r_n} + \bar{w}_{2l+1} = k \cap r_n \leq q_n) \leq C \exp(-\beta k).$$

Moreover by Lemma A.3, the random variable \bar{w}_{2l+2r_n} also has bounded exponential moment so we may also assume that:

$$\mathbb{P}(l + r_n \geq q_n) = \mathbb{P}(n \leq \bar{w}_{2l+2r_n}) \leq C \exp(-\beta n).$$

Hence, by Lemma A.18, we have for all $t \geq 0$:

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\log \frac{\|f\| \|\bar{\gamma}_n\| \|v\|}{|f\bar{\gamma}_n v|} > t \mid l + r_n < q_n \right) \leq \sum_{k=1}^n C \exp(-\beta k) \left[\frac{B \vee N_* \nu}{1 - \alpha} \right]^{\uparrow k} (t - 2|\log(\varepsilon)| - 3\log(2), +\infty).$$

This proves (96). \square

Theorem 5.14 (Strong law of large numbers for the spectral gap). *Let E be a Euclidean vector space and let ν be a probability measure on $\mathrm{GL}(E)$. Let $(\gamma_n) \sim \nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$. Let $\alpha, \varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, let $\rho \in (0, 1/5)$ and let $\tilde{\nu}_s$ be a compactly supported probability distribution on $\mathrm{GL}(E)^m$ such that $\Pi_* \tilde{\nu}_s$ is ρ -Schottky for \mathbb{A}^ε and supported on the set $\{\mathrm{sqz} \geq 10|\log(\varepsilon/2)|\}$ and $\alpha \tilde{\nu}_s \leq \nu^{\otimes m}$. Let $B := \max_k \max N \circ \chi_k^m(\mathrm{supp}(\tilde{\nu}_s))$. Then there exist constants $C, \beta > 0$ that depend only on α, ρ, m and such that:*

$$(97) \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \forall t \geq 0, \mathbb{P} \left(\log \frac{\|\bar{\gamma}_n\|}{\rho_1(\bar{\gamma}_n)} > t \right) \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} C \exp(-\beta k) \left[\frac{B \vee N_* \nu}{1 - \alpha} \right]^{\uparrow k} (t - 2|\log(\varepsilon)| - 5\log(2), +\infty).$$

Proof. Let $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$ and $\tilde{\nu}_s$ be as in Corollary 3.19 for $K = 10$ and $\rho = \frac{1}{4}$. Let $\tilde{\mu}$ be as in Theorem 4.1 for $\Gamma := \mathrm{GL}(E)$, for $\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{A}^\varepsilon$ and $S = \{\mathrm{sqz} \geq 10|\log(\varepsilon/2)|\}$. Let $(\tilde{\gamma}^w) \sim \tilde{\mu}$. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $q_n := \max\{k \in \mathbb{N} \mid \overline{w}_{2k} \leq n\}$. Let c_n be as in Lemma 4.12 applied to the pivotal sequence $(\gamma_0^w, \gamma_1^w, \dots, \gamma_{2q_n-1}^w, \gamma_{2q_n}^w \cdots \gamma_{n-1}^w)$. Then c_n has a finite exponential moment and is independent of $(\gamma_0^w, \gamma_1^w, \dots, \gamma_{2q_n-2}^w, \gamma_{2q_n}^w \cdots \gamma_{n-1}^w)$. By the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 5.7, using (32) in Lemma 2.17, we have:

$$(98) \quad \rho_1(\overline{\gamma}_n) \geq \|\gamma_{\overline{w}_{2q_n-2c_n-2}} \cdots \gamma_{n-1} \gamma_0 \overline{\gamma}_{2c_n+1} - 1\| \|\gamma_{2c_n+1}^w \cdots \gamma_{2q_n-2c_n-3}^w\| \frac{\varepsilon^2}{32}$$

Hence, with the same reasoning as in the proof of Theorem 5.13, we have:

$$(99) \quad \log \|\overline{\gamma}_n\| - \log(\rho_1(\overline{\gamma}_n)) \leq \sum_{k=\overline{w}_{2q_n-2c_n-2}}^{n-1} N(\gamma_k) + \sum_{k=0}^{\overline{w}_{2c_n+1}-1} N(\gamma_k) + 2|\log(\varepsilon)| + 5\log(2)$$

However (99) holds without conditions on c_n (with the convention $\overline{w}_{-k} = 0$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$), because:

$$(100) \quad \log \|\overline{\gamma}_n\| - \log(\rho_1(\overline{\gamma}_n)) \leq \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} N(\gamma_k).$$

Moreover, for all $t \geq B$, and for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, one has:

$$\mathbb{P}(N(\gamma_k) > t \mid c_n, q_n) \leq \frac{N_* \nu(t, +\infty)}{1 - \alpha}.$$

Moreover by Lemma A.3 and Theorem 4.1; $\overline{w}_{2c_n+1} + n - \overline{w}_{2q_n-2c_n-2}$ has a bounded exponential moment with a bound that depends only on (α, ρ, m) . \square

Theorems 5.13 and 5.14

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Let E be a Euclidean vector space, let ν be a strongly irreducible and proximal probability measure on $\mathrm{GL}(E)$ and let $(\gamma_n) \sim \nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$. Let $\rho = \frac{1}{4}$ and $K = 10$ and let $\alpha, \varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ be as in Corollary 3.19. Let $B, C, \beta > 0$ be as in Theorem 5.13. Up to taking the minimal β and the maximal C , we may assume that $B, C, \beta > 0$ also satisfy the conclusions of 5.13. Let $D := 2|\log(\varepsilon)| + 5\log(2)$. Note that if $N_* \nu = \delta_0$, then $N_* \nu^* m = \delta_0$ for all k by sub-additivity of N . Moreover $\mathrm{prox} \leq N$ on $\mathrm{GL}(E)$ so $N_* \nu \neq \delta_0$ by proximality of ν . Let C_0, β_0 be as in Lemma A.19 for $\eta = N_* \nu$. Then for all $t \geq 0$, we have:

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} C \exp(-\beta k) \left[\frac{B \vee N_* \nu}{1 - \alpha} \right]^{\uparrow k} (t - 2|\log(\varepsilon)| - 5\log(2), +\infty) \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} C_0 \exp(-\beta_0 k) N_* \nu(t, +\infty)$$

Therefore (96) implies (5) and (97) implies (6). \square

Proof of Corollary 1.5. Let V be a proper subspace of E , let $0 < r \leq 1$. Let $v \in E \setminus \{0\}$ and let $f \in E^* \setminus \{0\}$ be such that $f(V) = \{0\}$. Let $(\gamma_n) \sim \nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$ and let $l^\infty = l^\infty(\gamma)$. We claim that:

$$(101) \quad \mathbb{P}(l^\infty \in \mathcal{N}_r(V)) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{P}(|f \overline{\gamma}_n v| < r \|f\| \|\overline{\gamma}_n\| \|v\|)$$

Indeed, if $l^\infty \in \mathcal{N}_r(V)$, then by Theorem 5.6, we construct a random integer n_0 which has finite exponential moment and such that $[\overline{\gamma}_n v] \in \mathcal{N}_r(V)$ for all $n \geq n_0$. Note also that if $[\overline{\gamma}_n v] \in \mathcal{N}_r(V)$, then by Lemma 2.3 $|f \overline{\gamma}_n v| < r \|f\| \|\overline{\gamma}_n\| \|v\|$. Hence, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have:

$$\mathbb{P}(|f \overline{\gamma}_n v| < r \|f\| \|\overline{\gamma}_n\| \|v\|) \geq \mathbb{P}(l^\infty \in \mathcal{N}_r(V)) - \mathbb{P}(n \leq n_0).$$

Moreover $\mathbb{P}(n \leq n_0) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} 0$, hence we have (101). So by Theorem 5.13, we have (8). \square

We said in the introduction that 1.5 is an amelioration of a result by Benoist and Quint in [BQ16b, Proposition 4.5]. We show that the polynomial regularity of the invariant measure in Corollary 1.5 is actually optimal. Let $E = \mathbb{R}^d$ and let $\nu := \nu_A * \nu_K$ where ν_K is the Haar measure on the (compact) group of isometries $\mathrm{O}(E)$ and A is the distribution of the matrix

$$M := \begin{pmatrix} \exp(T) & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

Where T is any non-negative, real valued random variable. Then ν is strongly irreducible and proximal and it actually has full support in $\mathrm{PGL}(E)$. Then write ξ_ν^∞ for the invariant distribution on $\mathbf{P}(E)$ and

write e_1 for the first base vector. Then we have $\xi^\infty := \nu_A * \xi_K$ for ξ_K the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbf{P}(E)$. Indeed $\nu_K * \xi = \xi_K$ for all ξ , by property of the Haar measure. As a consequence, we have for all $r \geq 0$:

$$(102) \quad \frac{1}{d} \mathbb{P}(T \geq \log(d) - \log(r)) \leq \xi_\nu^\infty(\mathcal{B}(e_1, r)).$$

Indeed a random variable of distribution law ξ_K has first coordinate larger than $1/d$ with probability at least $1/d$. Note also that $T = N_* \nu$ and (102) implies that the distribution $\log_* d(e_1, \cdot)_* \xi_\nu^\infty$ is at least in the same polynomial integrability class as T .

Another interesting question that is asked in [BQ16a, p 231] is whether Corollary 1.4 still works if we drop the proximality assumption and replace it by a total strong irreducibility assumption. Indeed theorem 5.11 tells us that if we take a distribution ν and write $p(\nu)$ its proximality rank *i.e.*, $p(\nu) := \min \Theta(\nu)$ for $\Theta(\nu)$ as in Definition 5.8, then we can construct a random limit space of dimension $p(\nu)$. Then with the same trick as in the proof of 5.13, we can show that the coefficient $w \overline{\gamma}_n u$ is up to an exponentially small error the product of a linear form w' and a vector u' whose norms are controlled in law by the same $\zeta_\nu^{C, \beta}$. However, the fact that the kernel of w' cuts orthogonally the $p(\nu)$ -dimensional limit space that contains u' does not give a lower bound on the product $\frac{|w' u'|}{\|w'\| \|u'\|}$.

For example in dimension 2, we can take ν to be the law of a random rotation of angle $2^{-k} \pi$ with probability $\exp(-\exp(k))$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and the identity otherwise. Then the random walk $(\overline{\gamma}_n)$ is recurrent so if we take w and u such that $wu = 0$, then we almost surely have $|w \overline{\gamma}_n u| = 0$ for infinitely many times $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

The question remains open if we consider the conditional distribution of $\log \frac{|w \overline{\gamma}_n u|}{\|\overline{\gamma}_n\|}$ with respect to the event $(w \overline{\gamma}_n u \neq 0)$ or simply assume that $w \overline{\gamma}_n u \neq 0$ almost surely and for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

APPENDIX A. PROBABILISTIC TOOLS

In this appendix, we will give the proofs of some classical results about sums of independent random variables. We will use the following notations. By probability space, we mean a space Ω endowed with a σ -algebra \mathcal{A} , that is isomorphic to the Borel algebra of a compact metric space, and a probability measure \mathbb{P} that has no atoms. We call events or measurable subsets of Ω the elements of \mathcal{A} .

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$ be such a probability space. Given \mathcal{B} a subalgebra of \mathcal{A} , and ϕ an \mathcal{A} -measurable, real valued function such that $\mathbb{E}(\phi)$ is well defined (meaning that the positive part or the negative part of ϕ has finite expectation), we define $\mathbb{E}(\phi | \mathcal{B})$ as the equivalence class of all \mathcal{B} -measurable random variables ψ taking values in $\mathbb{R} \cup \{\mathbb{E}(\phi)\}$ such that for all $B \in \mathcal{B}$, we have $\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}_B \phi) = \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}_B \psi)$ where $\mathbb{1}_B$ is the indicator function of B . If \mathcal{B} is the σ -algebra generated by a measurable map $\gamma : \Omega \rightarrow \Gamma$, we also write $\mathbb{E}(\phi | \gamma)$ for $\mathbb{E}(\phi | \mathcal{B})$.

We call filtration over (Ω, \mathcal{A}) a nested sequence of sub- σ -algebras of \mathcal{A} *i.e.*, a sequence $(\mathcal{F}_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that for all k , we have $\mathcal{F}_k \subset \mathcal{F}_{k+1}$.

We will write $\mathbb{N} := \mathbb{N}_{\geq 0}$ for the set of non-negative integers and given a sequence $(w_m) \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$, we define the sequence of partial sums as $(\overline{w}_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}} := (w_0 + \dots + w_{m-1})_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$.

A.1. About exponential large deviations inequalities. In this section, we show that all the probabilistic constructions that we use in the main body of the article preserve the property of having a finite exponential moment. Note however that a product of two random variables that have a finite exponential moment may not have a finite exponential moment.

Lemma A.1 (Distribution of the current step). *Let (Ω, \mathbb{P}) be a probability space and let $(\mathcal{F}_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a filtration on Ω . Let $(w_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a random sequence of positive integers such that w_k is \mathcal{F}_{k+1} -measurable for all k . For all $n \geq 0$, we define $r_n := \max\{r \in \mathbb{N} | \overline{w}_{r_n} \leq n\}$. Let $h : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be a function. Assume that:*

$$\forall t \in \mathbb{N}, \forall k \geq 0, \mathbb{P}(w_k = t | \mathcal{F}_k) \leq h(t).$$

Then we have:

$$\forall t \in \mathbb{N}, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \mathbb{P}(w_{r_n} = t) \leq th(t).$$

Proof. Let t and n be two non-negative integers. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(w_{r_n} = t) &= \sum_{r=0}^{+\infty} \mathbb{P}((r = r_n) \cap (w_r = t)) \\ &= \sum_{r=0}^{+\infty} \mathbb{P}((n - t \leq \bar{w}_r < n) \cap (w_r = t)) \\ &= \sum_{r=0}^{+\infty} \sum_{u=0}^t \mathbb{P}(\bar{w}_r = n - u) \mathbb{P}(w_r = t \mid \bar{w}_r = n - u).\end{aligned}$$

Probabilities are non negative so the order of summation does not matter. hence:

$$\mathbb{P}(w_{r_n} = t) = \sum_{u=0}^t \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(\bar{w}_r = n - u) \mathbb{P}(w_r = t \mid \bar{w}_r = n - u)$$

For all $u \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $r \in \mathbb{N}$, the event $(\bar{w}_r = n - u)$ is in \mathcal{F}_r . So by hypothesis, we have $\mathbb{P}(w_r = t \mid \bar{w}_r = n - u) \leq h(t)$ for all t and all $r, u \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathbb{P}(\bar{w}_r = n - u) > 0$. Moreover, for all $u \in \mathbb{N}$, we have:

$$\sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(\bar{w}_r = n - u) = \mathbb{E}(\#\{r \in \mathbb{N} \mid \bar{w}_r = n - u\}) \leq 1,$$

because the map $r \mapsto \bar{w}_r$ is almost surely injective. Therefore, we have $\mathbb{P}(w_{r_n} = t) \leq th(t)$, which proves the claim. \square

Corollary A.2. *Let $(w_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a random sequence of positive integers and (\mathcal{F}_k) be a filtration such that w_k is \mathcal{F}_{k+1} -measurable for all k . Assume that for some $C, \beta > 0$, we have:*

$$\forall t \in \mathbb{N}, \forall k \geq 0, \mathbb{P}(w_k \geq t \mid \mathcal{F}_k) \leq C \exp(-\beta t).$$

For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, define the random integer $r_n := \max\{r \in \mathbb{N} \mid \bar{w}_{r_n} \leq n\}$. Then:

$$\forall t \geq 0, \forall n \geq 0, \mathbb{P}(w_{r_n} \geq t \mid \mathcal{F}_k) \leq \frac{C(1+t\beta)}{\beta^2} \exp(-\beta t).$$

Proof. Define $h(t) := C \exp(-\beta)t$ for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$. Then we have:

$$\forall t \in \mathbb{N}, \forall k \geq 0, \mathbb{P}(w_k = t \mid \mathcal{F}_k) \leq h(t).$$

So by Lemma A.1, for all $t, u \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $\mathbb{P}(w_{r_n} = u) \leq uh(u)$. Now let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in \mathbb{N}$. We have :

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(w_{r_n} \geq t) &= \sum_{u=t}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(w_{r_n} = u) \leq \sum_{u=t}^{\infty} uh(u) \\ &\leq \sum_{u=t}^{\infty} uC \exp(-\beta u) \\ &\leq C \exp(-\beta t) \left(\sum_{u=0}^{\infty} u \exp(-\beta u) + t \sum_{u=0}^{\infty} \exp(-\beta u) \right) \\ &\leq C \exp(-\beta t) \left(\left(\frac{1}{1 - \exp(-\beta)} \right)^2 + \frac{t}{1 - \exp(-\beta)} \right).\end{aligned}$$

Moreover $\beta \geq 1 - \exp(-\beta)$ by convexity. So we have $\mathbb{P}(w_{r_n} \geq t) \leq \frac{C(1+t\beta)}{\beta^2} \exp(-\beta t)$. \square

We now give a nice formulation of standard large deviations inequalities for sums of random variables.

Lemma A.3 (Sum of random variables that have finite exponential moment). *Let (Ω, \mathbb{P}) be a probability space endowed with a filtration $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. Let w be an \mathbb{N} -valued random variable. Let (x_n) be a random sequence of non-negative real numbers. Assume that x_n is (\mathcal{F}_{n+1}) -measurable for all n . Let $C, \beta > 0$ be non-random constants. Assume that:*

$$(103) \quad \mathbb{E}(\exp(\beta w)) \leq C$$

$$(104) \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \mathbb{E}(\exp(\beta x_n) \mid \mathcal{F}_n) \leq C.$$

Then the random variable $\bar{x}_w := \sum_{k=0}^{w-1} x_k$ has a finite exponential moment in the sense that:

$$(105) \quad \exists C', \beta' > 0, \forall t \geq 0, \mathbb{P}(\bar{x}_w \geq t) \leq C' \exp(-\beta' t).$$

Proof. First note that without loss of generality, we may assume that $C > 1$. Fix $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{\beta}{\log(C)}$. For every $j \in \mathbb{N}$, write $\bar{x}_j := \sum_{k=0}^{j-1} x_k$. Then for all non-random $t \geq 0$, one has:

$$(106) \quad \mathbb{P}(\bar{x}_w \geq t) \leq \mathbb{P}(w \geq t\varepsilon) + \mathbb{P}(\bar{x}_{\lfloor t\varepsilon \rfloor} \geq t).$$

For all $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we define $z_j := \exp(\beta \bar{x}_j)$. We claim that $\mathbb{E}(z_j) \leq C^j$. Indeed, $z_0 = 1$ and for all $j \geq 0$, the random variable z_j is \mathcal{F}_j measurable. Now by looking at the conditional expectation and using (104), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(z_{j+1}) &= \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}(z_{j+1} | \mathcal{F}_j)) \\ &= \mathbb{E}(z_j \mathbb{E}(\exp(\beta x_{j+1}) | \mathcal{F}_j)) \\ &\leq C \mathbb{E}(z_j). \end{aligned}$$

This proves the claim. By Markov's inequality, we have $\mathbb{P}(z_j \geq \exp(\beta t)) \leq \frac{C^j}{\exp(\beta t)}$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and for all $t > 0$. Let $t > 0$. By the above argument and because the x_n 's are non-negative, we have:

$$\mathbb{P}(\bar{x}_{\lfloor t\varepsilon \rfloor} \geq t) \leq C^{\lfloor t\varepsilon \rfloor} \exp(-\beta t) \leq C^{\varepsilon t} \exp(-\beta t) = \exp(-(\beta - \varepsilon \log(C))t).$$

By Markov's inequality, applied to (103), we have $\mathbb{P}(w \geq t\varepsilon) \leq C \exp(-\beta t)$. So if we write $\beta' := \beta - \varepsilon \log(C) > 0$ and $C' := C + 1$, then we have $\mathbb{P}(Y \geq t) \leq C' \exp(-\beta' t)$, which proves (105). \square

Lemma A.4 (Exponential moments approximate the expectation). *Let $M, \sigma, C, \beta > 0$. For all $\alpha < \sigma$, there is a constant $\beta_\alpha > 0$, that depends on $(M, \sigma, C, \beta, \alpha)$, such that for all random variable x , that satisfies $\mathbb{E}(\min\{x, M\}) \geq \sigma$ and $\mathbb{E}(\exp(-\beta x)) \leq C$, we have:*

$$\mathbb{E}(\exp(-\beta_\alpha x)) \leq \exp(-\beta_\alpha \alpha).$$

Proof. Let x be a random variable such that $\mathbb{E}(\exp(-\beta x)) \leq C$. Then $\mathbb{P}(x \leq t) \leq C \exp(\beta t)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. For all $0 < \beta' < \beta$ and for all $m \in \mathbb{R}$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(\exp(-\beta' x) \mathbf{1}(x \leq m)) &= \int_{\exp(-\beta' m)}^{+\infty} \mathbb{P}(\exp(-\beta' x) \geq t) dt \\ &\leq \int_{\exp(-\beta' m)}^{+\infty} C t^{-\frac{\beta}{\beta'}} dt \\ &\leq C \frac{\beta'}{\beta - \beta'} \exp((\beta - \beta')m) =: F(m, \beta') \end{aligned}$$

To all $0 < \beta \leq \frac{\beta'}{2}$, we associate the number $m_{\beta'} := \min\left\{0, 2\beta^{-1} \log\left(\frac{\beta' \beta}{2C}\right)\right\}$. Note that for all $0 < \beta \leq \frac{\beta'}{2}$, we have $\beta' - \beta \geq \beta/2$ and $m_{\beta'} \leq 0$, hence $(\beta - \beta')m_{\beta'} \leq \log\left(\frac{\beta' \beta}{2C}\right)$ and $C \frac{\beta'}{\beta - \beta'} \leq \frac{2C\beta'}{\beta}$. Therefore $F(m_{\beta'}, \beta') \leq \beta'^2$ for all $0 < \beta \leq \frac{\beta'}{2}$, hence $\frac{F(m_{\beta'}, \beta')}{\beta'} \xrightarrow{\beta' \rightarrow 0} 0$.

Now assume moreover that $\mathbb{E}(\min\{x, M\}) \geq \sigma$ and let $m \leq M$. Write $x' := \max\{m, \min\{x, M\}\}$. Then $m \leq x' \leq M$. Moreover, by convexity, we have for all $m \leq y \leq M$:

$$\begin{aligned} \exp(-\beta' y) &\leq \frac{y - m}{M - m} \exp(-\beta' M) + \frac{M - y}{M - m} \exp(-\beta' m) \\ &\leq \frac{M \exp(-\beta' m) - m \exp(-\beta' M)}{M - m} - \frac{\exp(-\beta' m) - \exp(-\beta' M)}{M - m} y. \end{aligned}$$

Note moreover that $\mathbb{E}(x') \geq \sigma$ and $\frac{\exp(-\beta' m) - \exp(-\beta' M)}{M - m} \geq 0$. Hence:

$$\mathbb{E}(\exp(-\beta' x')) \leq \frac{M \exp(-\beta' m) - m \exp(-\beta' M)}{M - m} - \frac{\exp(-\beta' m) - \exp(-\beta' M)}{M - m} \sigma =: L(m, \beta').$$

Moreover, $\beta' m_{\beta'} \xrightarrow{\beta' \rightarrow 0} 0$ and $\beta' M \xrightarrow{\beta' \rightarrow 0} 0$ so $\frac{M \exp(-\beta' m_{\beta'}) - m_{\beta'} \exp(-\beta' M)}{M - m_{\beta'}} \xrightarrow{\beta' \rightarrow 0} 1$. Moreover \exp is derivable at 0 so we have:

$$\frac{\exp(-\beta' m_{\beta'}) - \exp(-\beta' M)}{\beta'(M - m_{\beta'})} \xrightarrow{\beta' \rightarrow 0} 1.$$

Hence we have $\frac{L(m_{\beta'}, \beta') - 1}{\sigma \beta'} \xrightarrow{\beta' \rightarrow 0} 1$.

By the previous arguments, we have $\frac{L(m_{\beta'}, \beta') + F(m_{\beta'}, \beta') - 1}{\beta' \sigma} \xrightarrow{\beta' \rightarrow 0} 1$. Then for all $\alpha < \sigma$, there exists $0 < \beta' \leq \frac{\beta}{2}$ such that $\frac{L(m_{\beta_\alpha}, \beta_\alpha) + F(m_{\beta_\alpha}, \beta_\alpha) - 1}{\beta_\alpha \sigma} \geq \frac{\alpha}{\sigma}$ and therefore $L(m_{\beta'}, \beta') + F(m_{\beta'}, \beta') \geq 1 - \alpha \beta'$, let β_α

be the maximal such β' . Then for all $\alpha < \sigma$, we have $L(m_{\beta_\alpha}, \beta_\alpha) + F(m_{\beta_\alpha}, \beta_\alpha) \geq 1 - \alpha\beta_\alpha$ by continuity of F , m , and L . Let $\alpha < \sigma$. Then for all random variable x that satisfies the hypothesis of Lemma A.4, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(\exp(-\beta_\alpha x)) &\leq L(m_{\beta_\alpha}, \beta') + F(m_{\beta_\alpha}, \beta_\alpha) \\ &\leq 1 - \beta_\alpha \alpha \leq \exp(-\beta_\alpha \alpha). \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Lemma A.5 (Classical large deviations inequalities from below). *Let (Ω, \mathbb{P}) be a probability space endowed with a filtration $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. Let $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a random sequence of real numbers such that x_n is \mathcal{F}_{n+1} -measurable for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $C, \beta > 0$. Assume that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $\mathbb{E}(\exp(-\beta x_n) | \mathcal{F}_n) \leq C$. Let $(\sigma_M)_{M \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a non-random, real valued, non-decreasing sequence such that $\mathbb{E}(\min\{x_n, M\} | \mathcal{F}_n) \geq \sigma_M$ for all $M, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Write $\sigma := \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \sigma_t$. Then we have:*

$$\forall \alpha < \sigma, \exists \beta_\alpha > 0, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \mathbb{P}(\bar{x}_n \leq \alpha n) \leq \exp(-\beta_\alpha n).$$

Proof. Let $\alpha < \sigma$ and let $\alpha < \alpha' < \alpha'' < \sigma$. Let $M \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $\mathbb{E}(\min\{x_n, M\} | \mathcal{F}_n) \geq \alpha''$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then by Lemma A.4, there is a constant $\beta' > 0$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have:

$$\mathbb{E}(\exp(-\beta' x_n) | \mathcal{F}_n) \leq \exp(-\beta' \alpha').$$

Then by induction on n , we have $\mathbb{E}(\exp(-\beta' \bar{x}_n)) \leq \exp(-n\beta' \alpha')$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then by Markov's inequality, we get $\mathbb{P}(\bar{x}_n \leq \alpha n) \leq \exp(-n\beta'(\alpha' - \alpha))$, which proves the claim for $\beta_\alpha := \beta'(\alpha' - \alpha)$. \square

Note that the existence of the sequence (σ_M) such that $\mathbb{E}(\min\{x_n, M\} | \mathcal{F}_n) \geq \sigma_M$ for all $M, n \in \mathbb{N}$ is satisfied when (x_n) is i.i.d. and $\mathbb{E}(x_0) \geq \sigma$. However, if we only assumed that $\mathbb{E}(x_n | \mathcal{F}_n) \geq 1$ for all n , then we may assume that for all n , x_n takes value n^2 with probability n^{-2} and 0 otherwise and in this case $\mathbb{P}(\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \bar{x}_n = 0) = \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} (1 - n^{-2}) > 0$.

Corollary A.6. *Let $(x_n)_n$ be a random independent sequence of real numbers. Assume that there exists $\beta > 0$ such that $\mathbb{E}(\exp(-\beta x_0)) < +\infty$. Then the random sequence $(\bar{x}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfies large deviations inequalities below the speed $\mathbb{E}(x_0)$.*

Proof. Let $\beta > 0$ be such that $\mathbb{E}(\exp(-\beta x_0)) < +\infty$ and let $C = \mathbb{E}(\exp(-\beta x_0))$. For all $M \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\sigma_M := \mathbb{E}(\min\{x_0, M\})$. Let (\mathcal{F}_n) be the cylinder filtration associated to (x_n) . Then $\sigma_M \rightarrow \mathbb{E}(x_0)$ so by Lemma A.5, the random sequence $(\bar{x}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfies large deviations inequalities below the speed $\mathbb{E}(x_0)$. \square

Definition A.7 (Large deviations inequalities). *Let $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a random sequence of real numbers and let $\sigma \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ be a constant. We say that $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfies large deviations inequalities below the speed σ if we have:*

$$\forall \alpha < \sigma, \exists C, \beta > 0, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \mathbb{P}(x_n \leq \alpha n) \leq C \exp(-\beta n).$$

We say that $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfies large deviations inequalities above the speed $-\sigma$ if $(-x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfies large deviations inequalities below the speed σ .

Remark A.8. *Let (x_n) be a random sequence of real numbers and let $\sigma \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$. Assume that (x_n) satisfies large deviations inequalities below the speed σ . Then by Borel Cantelli's Lemma, we have almost surely $\liminf \frac{x_n}{n} \geq \alpha$ for all $\alpha < \sigma$ so $\liminf \frac{x_n}{n} \geq \sigma$ almost surely. If we moreover assume that σ is finite and if (x_n) satisfies large deviations inequalities above the same speed σ , then $\lim \frac{x_n}{n} = \sigma$ almost surely.*

Remark A.9 (Convenient reformulation of Definition A.7). *We call decreasing exponential function a function of type $n \mapsto C \exp(-\beta n)$ with $C > 0$ and $\beta > 0$.*

Note that saying that a random sequence (x_n) satisfies large deviations inequalities below a speed σ means that for all $\alpha < \sigma$, the function $n \mapsto \mathbb{P}(x_n < \alpha n)$ is bounded above by a decreasing exponential function. It is equivalent to saying that for all $\alpha < \sigma$, the function $n \mapsto \mathbb{P}(\exists m \geq n, x_m < \alpha n)$ is bounded above by a decreasing exponential function.

Note also that a sum of finitely many decreasing exponential functions is bounded above by a decreasing exponential function.

Now we show that random sequences that satisfy large deviations inequalities behave well under some compositions.

Lemma A.10. *Let (Ω, \mathbb{P}) be a probability space. Let $\sigma, \sigma' \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$. Let $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(x'_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be two random sequences of real numbers that satisfy large deviations inequalities below the speeds σ and σ' respectively. Let $(y_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a random sequence of real numbers. Let $C_y, \beta_y > 0$. Assume that*

$\mathbb{P}(y_n \leq -t) \leq C_y \exp(-\beta_y t)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $t \geq 0$. Let $(k_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a random non-decreasing sequence of non-negative integers and let $\kappa \in (0, +\infty)$. Then:

- (1) The shifted sequence $(x_n + y_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfies large deviations inequalities below the speed σ .
- (2) The minimum $(\min\{x_n, x'_n\})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfies large deviations inequalities below the speed $\min\{\sigma, \sigma'\}$.
- (3) The maximum $(\max\{x_n, x'_n\})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfies large deviations inequalities below the speed $\max\{\sigma, \sigma'\}$.
- (4) For all $\lambda, \lambda' \geq 0$, the sum $(\lambda x_n + \lambda' x'_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfies large deviations inequalities below the speed $\lambda\sigma + \lambda'\sigma'$.
- (5) Assume that $(k_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfies large deviations inequalities below the speed κ . Then the composition $(x_{k_n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfies large deviations inequalities below the speed $\kappa\sigma$.
- (6) Let $(r_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the reciprocal function of $(k_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, defined by $r_m := \max\{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid k_n \leq m\}$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Assume that $(k_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfies large deviations inequalities below the speed κ . Then $(r_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfies large deviations inequalities above the speed κ^{-1} .

Proof. We first prove (1). Let $\alpha < \alpha' < \sigma$. By assumption, there are two constants $C_x, \beta_x > 0$ such that $\mathbb{P}(x_n \leq \alpha'n) \leq C_x \exp(-\beta_x n)$. Write $\beta := \min\{\beta_x, \beta_y(\alpha' - \alpha)\}$ and $C := C_x + C_y$. Then we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \mathbb{P}(x_n + y_n \leq \alpha n) &\leq \mathbb{P}(x_n \leq \alpha'n) + \mathbb{P}(y \leq (\alpha - \alpha')n) \\ &\leq C_x \exp(-\beta_x n) + C_y \exp(-\beta_y(\alpha' - \alpha)n) \\ &\leq C \exp(-\beta n). \end{aligned}$$

In other words the function $n \mapsto \mathbb{P}(y_n + x_n \leq \alpha n)$ is bounded by the sum of the functions $n \mapsto \mathbb{P}(x_n \leq \alpha'n)$ and $n \mapsto \mathbb{P}(y \leq (\alpha - \alpha')n)$ which are themselves bounded by decreasing exponential functions so their sum also is by Remark A.9.

Now to prove (2) assume that $\sigma \leq \sigma'$. This is not restrictive since $(\sigma, (x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}})$ and $(\sigma', (x'_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}})$ play symmetric roles in Lemma A.10. Then for all $\alpha < \sigma$, we have:

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \mathbb{P}(\min\{x_n, x'_n\} \leq \alpha n) \leq \mathbb{P}(x_n \leq \alpha n) + \mathbb{P}(x'_n \leq \alpha n).$$

Both terms of the sum on the right are bounded above by decreasing exponential functions of n so $\mathbb{P}(\min\{x_n, x'_n\} \leq \alpha n)$ is bounded above by a decreasing exponential function of n .

To prove (3), we again assume that $\sigma \leq \sigma'$. Then for all $\alpha < \sigma'$, we have $\mathbb{P}(\max\{x_n, x'_n\} \leq \alpha n) \leq \mathbb{P}(x'_n \leq \alpha n)$ and by assumption $\mathbb{P}(x'_n \leq \alpha n)$ is bounded above by a decreasing exponential function of n .

Now we prove (4), let $\alpha_+ < \lambda\sigma + \lambda'\sigma'$. Let $\alpha < \sigma$ and $\alpha' < \sigma'$ be such that $\alpha_+ = \lambda\alpha + \lambda'\alpha'$. Such α, α' always exist. Now note that:

$$\mathbb{P}(\lambda x_n + \lambda' x'_n \leq \alpha_+ n) \leq \mathbb{P}(x_n \leq \alpha n) + \mathbb{P}(x'_n \leq \alpha' n)$$

and both terms are bounded by decreasing exponential functions, which proves (4).

Now we prove (5). Let $\alpha < \kappa\sigma$ and let $\alpha' < \sigma$ and $\alpha'' < \kappa$ be such that $\alpha = \alpha'\alpha''$. Now let $C_x, \beta_x > 0$ be such that $\mathbb{P}(x_n \leq \alpha'n) \leq C_x \exp(-\beta_x n)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and let C_k, β_k be such that $\mathbb{P}(k_n \leq \alpha''n) \leq C_k \exp(-\beta_k n)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Such $C_x, \beta_x, C_k, \beta_k$ exist by assumption. For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(x_{k_n} \leq \alpha n) &\leq \mathbb{P}(x_{k_n} \leq \alpha' k_n \cap k_n \geq \alpha'' n) + \mathbb{P}(k_n \leq \alpha'' n) \\ &\leq \sum_{k \geq \alpha'' n} \mathbb{P}(x_k \leq \alpha' k) + \mathbb{P}(k_n \leq \alpha'' n) \\ &\leq \sum_{k \geq \alpha'' n} C_x \exp(-\beta_x k) + C_k \exp(-\beta_k n) \\ &\leq \frac{C_x}{\beta_x} \exp(-\beta_x \alpha'' n) + C_k \exp(-\beta_k n) \\ &\leq \left(\frac{C_x}{\beta_x} + C_k \right) \exp(-\min\{\beta_x \alpha'', \beta_k\} m_0), \end{aligned}$$

Which proves (5).

To prove (6), we use a similar method. Let $\alpha < \kappa$ and $C, \beta > 0$ be such that $\mathbb{P}(k_n \leq \alpha n) \leq C \exp(-\beta n)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Such C, β exist for all $\alpha < \kappa$. Then for all $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(r_{m_0} \geq \alpha^{-1} m_0) &\leq \mathbb{P}(\exists m \geq m_0, r_m \geq \alpha^{-1} m) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(\exists m \geq m_0, \exists n \in \mathbb{N}, (n \geq \alpha^{-1} m) \wedge (k_n \leq m)) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(\exists n \geq \alpha^{-1} m_0, k_n \leq \alpha n) \\ &\leq \frac{C}{\beta} \exp(-\beta \alpha^{-1} n). \end{aligned}$$

Now note that for all $\alpha' > \kappa^{-1}$, we have $\alpha^{-1} < \kappa$. The above reasoning tells us that for all $\alpha' > \kappa^{-1}$, we have constants $C', \beta' > 0$ such that $\mathbb{P}(r_m \geq \alpha'_m) \leq C' \exp(-\beta' m')$ for all m (namely $C' = \frac{C}{\beta}$ and $\beta' = \beta \alpha^{-1}$ with C, β as above for $\alpha := \alpha'^{-1}$). \square

A.2. About moments. In this section, we prove useful results about sums of random variables that have a finite polynomial moment.

Remark A.11. Note that a probability distribution η on $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is characterized by the right-continuous and non-increasing map $t \mapsto \eta(t, +\infty)$.

Definition A.12 (L^p -integrability). Let $p \in (0, +\infty)$ and let η be a probability distribution on $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. We define the strong L^p moment of η as:

$$(strong-L^p) \quad M_p(\eta) := \int_0^{+\infty} t^{p-1} \eta(t, +\infty) dt.$$

We define the weak L^p moment of η as:

$$(weak-L^p) \quad W_p(\eta) := \sup_{t \geq 0} t^p \eta(t, +\infty) < +\infty.$$

We say that η is strongly L^p if $M_p(\eta) < +\infty$ and we say that η is weakly L^p if $W_p(\eta) < +\infty$.

Definition A.13 (Trunking). Let η be a non-negative measure on $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ that has finite total mass i.e., a non-negative multiple of a probability distribution. We call trunking of η the distribution $[\eta]$ characterized by:

$$\forall t \geq 0, [\eta](t, +\infty) = \min\{1, \eta'(t, +\infty)\}.$$

Note that if η has total mass less than one, then $[\eta] = \eta + (1 - \eta(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}))\delta_0$.

Definition A.14 (Push-up). Let η be a probability distribution on $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and let $B \geq 0$ be a constant. We define the push-up of η by B as the probability distribution $B \vee \eta$ on $\mathbb{R}_{\geq B}$ characterized by:

$$(107) \quad \forall t \geq B, (B \vee \eta)(t, +\infty) = \eta(t, +\infty).$$

In other words, for any random variable $x \sim \eta$, we have $\max\{x, B\} \sim B \vee \eta$.

Definition A.15 (Coarse convolution). Let η be a probability distribution on $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and let $k \geq 1$ be an integer. We define the coarse convolution $\eta^{\uparrow k}$ as:

$$\forall t \geq 0, \eta^{\uparrow k}(t, +\infty) := \min\left\{1, k\eta\left(\frac{t}{k}, +\infty\right)\right\}.$$

Lemma A.16. Let $k \geq 1$ be an integer, let η be a probability distribution on $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and let x_1, \dots, x_k be random variables such that:

$$(108) \quad \forall t \geq 0, \forall i \in \{1, \dots, k\}, \mathbb{P}(x_i > t) \leq \eta(t, +\infty).$$

Then we have:

$$(109) \quad \forall t \geq 0, \mathbb{P}(x_1 + \dots + x_k > t) \leq \eta^{\uparrow k}(t, +\infty).$$

Proof. Let $t \geq 0$. We have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(x_1 + \dots + x_k > t) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\exists i \in \{1, \dots, k\}, x_i > \frac{t}{k}\right) \\ &\leq k\eta\left(\frac{t}{k}, +\infty\right). \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Lemma A.17. Let η be a probability distribution on $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and let $k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$. We have:

$$(110) \quad W_p(\eta^{\uparrow k}) \leq k^{p+1} W_p(\eta)$$

$$(111) \quad M_p(\eta^{\uparrow k}) \leq k^{p+1} M_p(\eta)$$

Proof. For the weak moment, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} W_p(\eta^{\uparrow k}) &= \max t^p \eta^{\uparrow k}(t, +\infty) \\ &\leq \max t^p k \eta\left(\frac{t}{k}, +\infty\right) \\ &\leq \max (kt')^p k \eta(t', +\infty) \\ &\leq k^{p+1} W_p(\eta). \end{aligned}$$

This proves (110). For the strong moment, by integration by parts, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} M_p(\eta^{\uparrow k}) &= \int_0^{+\infty} t^{p-1} \eta^{\uparrow k}(t, +\infty) dt \\ &\leq \int_0^{+\infty} t^{p-1} k \eta\left(\frac{t}{k}, +\infty\right) dt. \end{aligned}$$

Then by the linear change of integration variable $t = ku$, we have:

$$\int t^{p-1} k \eta\left(\frac{t}{k}, +\infty\right) dt = \int u^{p-1} k^{p+1} \eta(u, +\infty) du = k^{p+1} M_p(\eta).$$

This proves (111). □

Lemma A.18. *Let n be a random integer and let x_1, \dots, x_n be non-negative real random variables. Let B, C_1 be such that:*

$$(112) \quad \forall t \geq B, \forall k \in \mathbb{N}, \forall m \leq k, \mathbb{P}(x_m \geq t | n = k) \leq C_1 \eta(t).$$

Let $C_2, \beta > 0$ be such that:

$$(113) \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}, \mathbb{P}(n = k) \leq C_2 \exp(-\beta k).$$

Then for $C := C_1 C_2$, we have:

$$\forall t \geq 0, \mathbb{P}(x_1 + \dots + x_n > t) \leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} C \exp(-\beta k) (B \vee \eta)^{\uparrow k}.$$

Proof. First note that (112) with Definition A.14 and Lemma A.16 implies that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have:

$$\forall t \geq 0, \mathbb{P}(x_1 + \dots + x_k > t | n = k) \leq C_1 (B \vee \eta)^{\uparrow k}(t, +\infty).$$

We do the computation, for all $t \geq 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(x_1 + \dots + x_n > t) &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(n = k) \mathbb{P}(x_1 + \dots + x_k > t | n = k) \\ &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} C_2 \exp(-\beta k) C_1 (B \vee \eta)^{\uparrow k}(t, +\infty). \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Lemma A.19. *Let η be a non-trivial probability distribution on $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ i.e., $\eta \neq \delta_0$. Then, for all $B, C, D, \beta > 0$, there are constants C_0, β_0 such that for all $t > 0$, we have:*

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} C \exp(-\beta k) (B \vee \eta)^{\uparrow k}(t - D, +\infty) \leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} C_0 \exp(-\beta_0 k) \eta(t/k, +\infty).$$

Proof. Note that $(B \vee \eta)^{\uparrow k}(t - D, +\infty) \leq k \eta(t/k - B - D, +\infty)$ for all t, B, D and for all $k > 0$. Let $B' = B + D$. Note that for all $\beta'' < \beta$, we have $\lim_k k \exp((\beta'' - \beta)k) = 0$ and $\exp((\beta - \beta'')k) \geq 1$ so for C'' large enough, we have $k \exp(-\beta k) \leq C'' \exp(-\beta'' k)$ for all k . Take such a $\beta'' > 0$ and such a C'' .

Now we re-index the sum by taking $k' = 2k$ and write $\beta' := \beta/2$ and $C' = CC''$, then we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} C \exp(-\beta k) (B \vee \eta)^{\uparrow k} (t - D, +\infty) &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} CC'' \exp(-\beta'' k) \eta(t/k - B', +\infty) \\
&\leq \sum_{k'=0}^{\infty} C' \exp(-\beta' k') \eta(2t/k' - B', +\infty) \\
&\leq \sum_{k'=0}^{\lceil t/B' \rceil - 1} C' \exp(-\beta' k') \eta(t/k', +\infty) + \sum_{k'=\lceil t/B' \rceil}^{\infty} C' \exp(-\beta' k') \\
&\leq \sum_{k'=0}^{+\infty} C' \exp(-\beta' k') \eta(t/k', +\infty) + \frac{C'}{\beta'} \exp(-\beta' t/B').
\end{aligned}$$

Now we use the fact that $\eta \neq \delta_0$ and take $a > 0$ such that $\eta(a, +\infty) > 0$. Then for all $t > 0$ and all $C_0 \geq 0$ and all $\beta_0 > 0$, we have:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} C_0 \exp(-\beta_0 k) \eta(t/k, +\infty) \geq C_0 \exp(-\beta_0 \lceil t/a \rceil) \eta\left(\frac{t}{\lceil t/a \rceil}, +\infty\right) \geq C_0 \exp(-\beta_0(t/a + 1)) \eta(a, +\infty).$$

Let $0 < \beta_0 \leq \beta'$ be small enough, so that $-\beta_0 \lceil t/a \rceil \leq \beta' t/B' + \log(2)$ for all $t \geq 0$. Then for all $C_0 > 0$, we have:

$$\frac{C'}{\beta'} \exp(-\beta' t/B') \leq \left(\frac{C'}{\beta' C_0 \eta(a, +\infty)} \right) \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} C_0 \exp(-\beta_0 k) \eta(t/k, +\infty)$$

Let $0 < C_0$ be large enough so that $\frac{C'}{C_0} + \frac{C'}{\beta' C_0 \eta(a, +\infty)} \leq 1$. Then we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k'=0}^{+\infty} C' \exp(-\beta' k') \eta(t/k', +\infty) + \frac{C'}{\beta'} \exp(-\beta' t/B') &\leq \left(\frac{C'}{C_0} + \frac{C'}{\beta' C_0 \eta(a, +\infty)} \right) \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} C_0 \exp(-\beta_0 k) \eta(t/k, +\infty) \\
&\leq \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} C_0 \exp(-\beta_0 k) \eta(t/k, +\infty)
\end{aligned}$$

Hence:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} C \exp(-\beta k) (B \vee \eta)^{\uparrow k} (t - D, +\infty) \leq \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} C_0 \exp(-\beta_0 k) \eta(t/k, +\infty).$$

□

Lemma A.20. *Let η and κ be probability distributions on $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Let $C, \beta > 0$ be constants. Assume that for all $t > 0$, we have*

$$\kappa(t, +\infty) \leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} C \exp(-\beta k) \eta(t/k, +\infty).$$

Let $p \in \mathbb{R}_{> 0}$. Assume that η is strongly or weakly L^p , then κ also is and we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
M_p(\kappa) &\leq M_p(\eta) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} C \exp(-\beta k) k^p \\
W_p(\kappa) &\leq W_p(\eta) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} C \exp(-\beta k) k^p.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let $p > 0$. We claim that $M_p(\kappa) \leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} C \exp(-\beta k) k^p M_p(\eta)$, which is finite when $M_p(\eta)$ is. To prove that claim, we simply compute the moments, using the fact that all the quantities we look at are

non-negative:

$$\begin{aligned}
M_p(\kappa) &= \int_0^\infty t^{p-1} \kappa(t, +\infty) dt \\
&\leq \int_0^\infty t^{p-1} \sum_{k=0}^\infty C \exp(-\beta k) \eta(t/k, +\infty) dt \\
&\leq \sum_{k=0}^\infty C \exp(-\beta k) \int_0^\infty t^{p-1} \eta(t/k, +\infty) dt \\
&\leq \sum_{k=0}^\infty C \exp(-\beta k) \int_0^\infty (ku)^{p-1} \eta(u, +\infty) k du \\
&\leq \sum_{k=0}^\infty C \exp(-\beta k) k^p M_p(\eta).
\end{aligned}$$

This proves the claim. We now claim that $W_p(\kappa) \leq \sum_{k=0}^\infty C \exp(-\beta k) k^p W_p(\eta)$. For that claim, we do the same computation:

$$\begin{aligned}
W_p(\kappa) &= \sup_{t>0} t^p \kappa(t, +\infty) \\
&\leq \sup_{t>0} \left(t^p \sum_{k=0}^\infty C \exp(-\beta k) \eta(t/k, +\infty) \right) \\
&\leq \sum_{k=0}^\infty C \exp(-\beta k) \sup_{t>0} t^p \eta(t/k, +\infty) \\
&\leq \sum_{k=0}^\infty C \exp(-\beta k) \sup_{t>0} (ku)^p \eta(u, +\infty) \\
&\leq \sum_{k=0}^\infty C \exp(-\beta k) k^p W_p(\eta).
\end{aligned}$$

This proves the claim, which concludes the proof of Lemma A.20. \square

REFERENCES

- [AMS95] H. Abels, G. A. Margulis, and G. A. Soifer. Semigroups containing proximal linear maps. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 91(1):1–30, 1995.
- [Aou11] Richard Aoun. Random subgroups of linear groups are free. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 160(1):117 – 173, 2011.
- [Aou20] Richard Aoun. The central limit theorem for eigenvalues, 2020.
- [AS21] Richard Aoun and Cagri Sert. Law of large numbers for the spectral radius of random matrix products, 2021.
- [Bel54] Richard Bellman. Limit theorems for non-commutative operations. I. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 21(3):491 – 500, 1954.
- [BL85] Philippe Bougerol and Jean Lacroix. *Products of random matrices with applications to Schrödinger operators*, volume 8 of *Prog. Probab. Stat.* Birkhäuser, Boston, MA, 1985.
- [BMSS20] Adrien Boulanger, Pierre Mathieu, Cagri Sert, and Alessandro Sisto. large deviations for random walks on gromov-hyperbolic spaces, 2020.
- [BQ16a] Yves Benoist and Jean-François Quint. *Random walks on reductive groups*, volume 62 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas. 3rd Series. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics]*. Springer, Cham, 2016.
- [BQ16b] Yves Benoist and Jean-François Quint. Central limit theorem for linear groups. *The Annals of Probability*, 44(2):1308 – 1340, 2016.
- [BQ16c] Yves Benoist and Jean-François Quint. Central limit theorem on hyperbolic groups. *Izvestiya: Mathematics*, 80:3 – 23, 2016.
- [Can] James W. Cannon. The combinatorial structure of cocompact discrete hyperbolic groups. 16:123–148.
- [CDJ16] Christophe Cuny, Jerome Dedecker, and Christophe Jan. Limit theorems for the left random walk on $\text{gld}(r)$, 2016.
- [CDM17] Christophe Cuny, Jérôme Dedecker, and Florence Merlevède. On the komlós, major and tusnády strong approximation for some classes of random iterates, 2017.
- [CDM23] C Cuny, J Dedecker, and F Merlevède. Limit theorems for iid products of positive matrices, 2023.
- [CFFT22] Kunal Chawla, Behrang Forghani, Joshua Frisch, and Giulio Tiozzo. The poisson boundary of hyperbolic groups without moment conditions, 2022.
- [Cho22] Inhyeok Choi. Limit laws on outer space, teichmüller space, and $\text{cat}(0)$ spaces. *Preprint*, 2022.
- [FK60] H. Furstenberg and H. Kesten. Products of random matrices. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 31(2):457–469, 1960.

- [Fur73] Harry Furstenberg. Boundary theory and stochastic processes on homogeneous spaces. *Harmonic analysis on homogeneous spaces*, 26:193–229, 1973.
- [GM89] Ilya Ya. Goldsheid and G. A. Margulis. Lyapunov indices of a product of random matrices. *Russian Mathematical Surveys*, 44:11–71, 1989.
- [Gou22] Sébastien Gouëzel. Exponential bounds for random walks on hyperbolic spaces without moment conditions. *Tunisian Journal of Mathematics*, 4(4):635–671, December 2022.
- [GQX20] Ion Grama, Jean-François Quint, and Hui Xiao. A zero-one law for invariant measures and a local limit theorem for coefficients of random walks on the general linear group, 2020.
- [GR86] Y. Guivarc’h and A. Raugi. Products of random matrices: convergence theorems. In *Random matrices and their applications (Brunswick, Maine, 1984)*, volume 50 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 31–54. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1986.
- [GR89] Yves Guivarc’h and Albert Raugi. Propriétés de contraction d’un semi-groupe de matrices inversibles. coefficients de liapunoff d’un produit de matrices aléatoires indépendantes. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 65(2):165–196, 1989.
- [Hen97] H. Hennion. Limit theorems for products of positive random matrices. *The Annals of Probability*, 25(4):1545 – 1587, 1997.
- [Kin68] J. F. C. Kingman. The ergodic theory of subadditive stochastic processes. *J. Roy. Statist. Soc. Ser. B*, 30:499–510, 1968.
- [KS84] Harry Kesten and Frank Spitzer. Convergence in distribution of products of random matrices. *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verwandte Gebiete*, 67(4):363–386, 1984.
- [LP82] Emile Le Page. Theoremes limites pour les produits de matrices aleatoires. In Herbert Heyer, editor, *Probability Measures on Groups*, pages 258–303, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1982. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [MS20] P. Mathieu and A. Sisto. Deviation inequalities for random walks. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 169(5), Apr 2020.
- [Muk87] Arunava Mukherjea. Convergence in distribution of products of random matrices: A semigroup approach. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 303(1):395–411, 1987.
- [Ser18] Cagri Sert. Large deviation principle for random matrix products, 2018.
- [XGL21] Hui Xiao, Ion Grama, and Quansheng Liu. Limit theorems for the coefficients of random walks on the general linear group, 2021.
- [XGL22] Hui Xiao, Ion Grama, and Quansheng Liu. Edgeworth expansion and large deviations for the coefficients of products of positive random matrices, 2022.