THE FUNDAMENTAL INEQUALITY FOR COCOMPACT FUCHSIAN GROUPS

PETR KOSENKO AND GIULIO TIOZZO

ABSTRACT. We prove that the hitting measure is singular with respect to Lebesgue measure for random walks driven by finitely supported measures on cocompact, hyperelliptic Fuchsian groups. Moreover, the Hausdorff dimension of the hitting measure is strictly less than one. Equivalently, the inequality between entropy and drift is strict. A similar statement is proven for Coxeter groups.

Let $G < SL_2(\mathbb{R})$ be a countable group, and μ be a finitely supported, generating probability measure on G. We consider the random walk

$$w_n := g_1 g_2 \dots g_n$$

where each (g_i) is i.i.d. with distribution μ. Let us fix a base point $o \in \mathbb{H}^2$. Then the *hitting measure* ν of the random walk on $S^1 = \partial\mathbb{D}$ is

$$\nu(A) := \mathbb{P}\left(\lim_{n\to\infty} w_n o \in A\right)$$

for any Borel set $A \subseteq \partial\mathbb{D}$. The hitting measure is also the unique μ-*harmonic*, or μ-*stationary*, measure, as it satisfies the convolution equation $\nu = \mu \star \nu$. On the other hand, the boundary circle $\partial\mathbb{D} = S^1$ also carries the *Lebesgue* measure, which is the unique rotationally invariant measure on S^1.

In the 1970's, Furstenberg [Fu71] proved that for any discrete subgroup of $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$ there exists a measure μ such that the hitting measure of the corresponding random walk is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure. This was the first step to produce boundary maps, eventually leading to rigidity results. However, such measures μ are inherently infinitely supported, as they arise from discretization of Brownian motion (see also [LS84]). Another construction of absolutely continuous hitting measures, still infinitely supported, on general hyperbolic groups is given by [CM07].

For finitely supported measures, though, the situation is quite different. For any finitely supported measure μ on $SL_2(\mathbb{Z})$, it is known since Guivarc'h-LeJan [GL90] that the hitting measure is singular. Kaimanovich-LePrince [KP11] produced on any countable Zariski dense subgroup of $SL_d(\mathbb{R})$ examples of finitely supported measures with singular hitting measure.

They also formulated the following *singularity conjecture*.

Date: December 21, 2021.

Conjecture 1 ([KP11], page 259)**.** *For any finitely supported measure μ on $SL_d(\mathbb{R})$, whose support generates a discrete subgroup, the hitting measure for the random walk driven by μ is singular with respect to Lebesgue measure.*

This conjecture has been mentioned several times, see also [GMM18, Remark 1.1], [HS17, page 817], and [BQ18, Question (vi)]. In this paper, we focus on the case $d = 2$. Let $G < SL_2(\mathbb{R})$ be the subgroup generated by the support of μ. Recall that a discrete subgroup of $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$ is called a *Fuchsian group*, and is *cocompact* if the quotient $\Sigma = \mathbb{D}/G$ is compact.

If G is discrete, but not cocompact (which includes the case $G = SL_2(\mathbb{Z})$), the conjecture is known; in fact, there are many approaches to this result, and several generalizations in many contexts with different proofs ([GL90], [BHM11], [DKN09], [KP11], [Gad14], [GMT15], [DG18], [RT19]), all of which exploit in various ways the fact that the cusp subgroup is highly distorted in G.

Note that if one drops the hypothesis that G be discrete, then Conjecture 1 no longer holds: there exist finitely supported measures on $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$ for which the hitting measure is absolutely continuous ([Bo12], [BPS12]), but the group generated by their support is not discrete (see also [KP11, Footnote 1]).

Thus, the only case still open is when G is a cocompact Fuchsian group. In this case the hyperbolic metric and the word metric on G are quasi-isometric to each other, hence distortion arguments do not work. So far, the only known examples are the recent ones from [Ko20] and [CLP21], where singularity of hitting measure is proven for cocompact Fuchsian groups whose fundamental domain is a *regular* polygon (except for a finite number of cases with few sides). These examples form a countable family.

In this paper, we prove Conjecture 1 for any hyperelliptic, cocompact Fuchsian group, for measures supported on the canonical generating set.

Recall a *hyperelliptic surface* is a Riemann surface Σ with a holomorphic involution $j : \Sigma \to \Sigma$. Any hyperelliptic surface can be uniformized as the quotient $\Sigma = \mathbb{D}/G$, where G is a Fuchsian group with fundamental domain a centrally symmetric hyperbolic polygon P, and generators of G are given by hyperbolic translations joining opposite sides of P (see e.g. [Ga79]). We call such G a *hyperelliptic Fuchsian group*, and such a generating set the *canonical generating set* of G. In order for G to be discrete, P needs to satisfy the *cycle condition* from Poincaré's theorem (see Definition 12). The space of hyperelliptic Fuchsian groups of genus g is a complex variety of dimension $2g - 1$. Our main result is the following.

Theorem 2. *Let P be a centrally symmetric hyperbolic polygon in the Poincaré disk $\mathbb{D}$, with $2m$ sides, satisfying the cycle condition, and let $S := \{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{2m}\}$ be the hyperbolic translations which identify opposite sides of P. Then, for any measure μ supported on the set S, the hitting measure ν on $S^1 = \partial\mathbb{D}$ is singular with respect to Lebesgue measure. Moreover the Hausdorff dimension of ν is strictly less than 1.*



FIGURE 1. A symmetric hyperbolic octagon. Sides of the same color are identified by the Fuchsian group G.

If m is even, the above construction yields the standard presentation of a hyperelliptic Fuchsian group of genus $g = \frac{m}{2}$; if m is odd, we also obtain a discrete cocompact group of genus $g = \frac{m-1}{2}$.

Finally, if one replaces the random walk with a Brownian motion, then absolute continuity of harmonic measure only holds if the underlying manifold is highly homogeneous: to be precise, on a negatively curved surface, the hitting measure is absolutely continuous if and only if the curvature is constant ([Le90], [Le95]).

The fundamental inequality. This problem is closely related to the following "numerical characteristics" of random walks. Recall that the *entropy* [Av72] of μ is defined as

$$h := \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{-\sum_{g\in G} \mu^n(g) \log \mu^n(g)}{n}$$

and the *drift*, or *rate of escape*, is

$$\ell := \frac{d_{\mathbb{H}}(o, w_n o)}{n},$$

where $d_{\mathbb{H}}$ denotes the hyperbolic metric and the limit exists almost surely. The drift also equals the classical Lyapunov exponent for random matrix products [FK60]. Finally, the *volume growth* of G is

$$v := \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \#\{g \in G \ : \ d_{\mathbb{H}}(o, go) \leq n\}.$$

The inequality

$$h \leq \ell v \tag{1}$$

has been established by Guivarc'h [Gu80] and is called the *fundamental inequality* by Vershik [Ve00]. Several authors (e.g. [Ve00, Question A]) have asked:

Question 3. *Under which conditions is inequality* (1) *an equality?*

For discrete, cocompact actions, Question 3 is equivalent to Conjecture 1: indeed, by [BHM11] (see also [GMM18] and Theorem 8), inequality (1) is strict if and only if the hitting measure is singular with respect to Lebesgue measure.

If one replaces the hyperbolic metric $d_{\mathbb{H}}$ with a *word metric* d_w on G, then [GMM18] prove that the inequality is strict unless the group G is virtually free. Observe that cocompact Fuchsian groups are not virtually free; however, the drift for $d_{\mathbb{H}}$ and the drift for d_w are not the same (in fact, one has $\ell_{d_{\mathbb{H}}} < \ell_{d_w}$), hence the result from [GMM18] does not settle Question 3 or Conjecture 1. Note that for a cocompact Fuchsian group it is well-known that $v = 1$ (see e.g. [PR94]).

Our result also has consequences on the Hausdorff dimension of the hitting measure. Recall that the Hausdorff dimension of a measure ν on a metric space is the infimum of the Hausdorff dimensions of subsets of full measure. Moreover, by [Le83], [Ta19], [HS17], for cocompact Fuchsian groups the Hausdorff dimension $\dim_H(\nu)$ of the hitting measure satisfies, for almost every $x \in S^1$,

$$\dim_H(\nu) = \lim_{r \to 0^+} \frac{\log \nu(B(x,r))}{\log r} = \frac{h}{\ell}$$

where $B(x,r)$ is a ball of center x and radius r. Thus, Theorem 2 implies:

Corollary 4. *Under the hypotheses of Theorem 2, the inequality $h < \ell$ is strict. Hence, the hitting measure ν has Hausdorff dimension strictly less than one.*

A geometric inequality. The approach of this paper is based on the fact that cocompactness forces at least some of the generators to have long enough translation lengths (this is related to the *collar lemma*: two intersecting closed geodesics cannot be both short at the same time; also, the quotient Riemann surface has a definite positive area). Indeed, in Theorem 11 we prove a criterion for singularity in terms of the translation lengths of the generators, and then we show the following purely geometric inequality.

Theorem 5. *Let P be a centrally symmetric polygon with $2m$ sides, satisfying the cycle condition, and let $S := \{g_1, \dots, g_{2m}\}$ be the set of hyperbolic translations identifying opposite sides of P. Then we have*

$$\sum_{g \in S} \frac{1}{1 + e^{\ell(g)}} < 1, \tag{2}$$

where $\ell(g)$ denotes the translation length of g in the hyperbolic metric.

Interestingly, our geometric inequality has exactly the same form as the main inequalities of [CS92], [ACCS96] for free Kleinian groups. However, it is not a consequence of theirs; see Section 3.

Coxeter groups. We also prove the following version of Theorem 2 for reflection groups.

Theorem 6. *Let P be a centrally symmetric, hyperbolic polygon with $2m$ sides and interior angles $\frac{\pi}{k_i}$, with $k_i \in \mathbb{N}^+$ for $1 \leq i \leq 2m$. Let μ be a probability measure supported on the set $R := \{r_1, \dots, r_{2m}\}$ of hyperbolic reflections on the sides of P, with $\mu(r_i) = \mu(r_{i+m})$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$. Then the hitting measure for the random walk driven by μ is singular with respect to Lebesgue measure. Moreover, the inequality $h < \ell$ is strict, and the hitting measure ν has Hausdorff dimension strictly less than one.*

Acknowledgements. This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. DMS-1928930 while the second named author participated in a program hosted by the Mathematical Sciences Research Institute in Berkeley, California, during the Fall 2020 semester. The second named author is also partially supported by NSERC, the Sloan Foundation, and an Ontario Early Researcher Award "Entropy in dynamics, geometry, and probability". We thank R. Canary, B. Forghani, I. Gekhtman, C. McMullen and G. Panti for useful comments on the first draft.

1. Preliminary results

Let μ be a probability measure on a countable group G. We assume that μ is *generating*, i.e. the semigroup generated by the support of μ equals G. We define the *step space* as $(G^{\mathbb{N}}, \mu^{\mathbb{N}})$, and the map $\pi : G^{\mathbb{N}} \to G^{\mathbb{N}}$ as $\pi((g_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}) := (w_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, with for any n

$$w_n := g_1 g_2 \dots g_n.$$

The target space of π is denoted by Ω and called the *path space*; as a set, it equals $G^{\mathbb{N}}$, and is equipped with the measure $\mathbb{P}_\mu := \pi_\star(\mu^{\mathbb{N}})$.

Then, we define the *first-passage function* $F_\mu(x, y)$ as

$$F_\mu(x, y) := \mathbb{P}_\mu(\exists n \ : \ w_n x = y)$$

for any $x, y \in G$, and the *Green metric* d_μ on G, introduced in [BB07], as

$$d_\mu(x, y) := -\log F_\mu(x, y).$$

The following fact is well-known.

Lemma 7. *Let $p : G \to H$ be a group homomorphism, let μ be a probability measure on G, and let $\overline{\mu} := p_\star\mu$. Then, for any $x, y \in G$,*

$$d_{\overline{\mu}}(p(x), p(y)) \leq d_\mu(x, y).$$

Proof. Since p induces a map from paths in G to paths in H, we have $\overline{\mu}^n(p(g)) \geq \mu^n(g)$ for any $g \in G$, any $n \geq 0$. Hence

$$\mathbb{P}_{\overline{\mu}}(p(x), p(y)) \geq \mathbb{P}_\mu(x, y)$$

for any $x, y \in G$, from which the claim follows. $\square$

We shall use the following criterion, which relates the absolute continuity of the hitting measure to the fundamental inequality. Recall that a group action is *geometric* if it is isometric, properly discontinuous, and cocompact.

Theorem 8. ([BHM11, Corollary 1.4, Theorem 1.5], [Ta19], [GT20]) *Let Γ be a non-elementary hyperbolic group acting geometrically on $\mathbb{H}^2$, endowed with the geometric distance $d = d_{\mathbb{H}}$ induced from the action. Consider a generating probability measure μ on Γ with finite support. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

(1) *The equality $h = \ell v$ holds.*
(2) *The Hausdorff dimension of the hitting measure ν on S^1 is equal to 1.*
(3) *The measure ν is equivalent to the Lebesgue measure on S^1.*
(4) *For any $o \in \mathbb{H}^2$, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for any $g \in \Gamma$ we have*
$$|d_\mu(1, g) - d_{\mathbb{H}}(o, go)| \leq C.$$

For each $g \in G$, let $\ell(g)$ denote its translation length, namely
$$\ell(g) := \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{d_{\mathbb{H}}(o, g^n o)}{n}.$$
Equivalently, $\ell(g)$ is the length of the corresponding closed geodesic on the quotient surface. The mechanism to utilize Theorem 8 is through the following lemma, similar to the one from [Ko20].

Lemma 9. *Suppose that the hitting measure is absolutely continuous. Then for any $g \in G$ we have*
$$\ell(g) \leq d_\mu(1, g).$$

Proof. If not, then $\ell(g) > d_\mu(1, g) \geq 0$, hence g is loxodromic. Let us pick some $o \in \mathbb{H}^2$ which lies on the axis of g, so that $d_{\mathbb{H}}(o, g^k o) = \ell(g^k) = k\ell(g)$ for any k. Moreover, by the triangle inequality for the Green metric one has $d_\mu(1, g^k) \leq k d_\mu(1, g)$, hence
$$d_{\mathbb{H}}(o, g^k o) - d_\mu(1, g^k) \geq k\ell(g) - k d_\mu(1, g) = k(\ell(g) - d_\mu(1, g))$$
thus, since $\ell(g) - d_\mu(e, g) > 0$,
$$\sup_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \left| d_{\mathbb{H}}(o, g^k o) - d_\mu(1, g^k) \right| = +\infty,$$
which contradicts Theorem 8. □

Let F be a free group, freely generated by a finite set S. Recall the (hyperbolic) *boundary* ∂F of F is the set of infinite, reduced words in the alphabet $S \cup S^{-1}$. Given a finite, reduced word g, we denote as $C(g) \subseteq \partial F$ the *cylinder* determined by g, namely the set of infinite, reduced words which start with g.

Lemma 10. *Consider a random walk on the free group*

$$F_m = \left\langle s_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, s_m^{\pm 1} \right\rangle,$$

defined by a probability measure μ on the generators. If we denote $x_i := F_\mu(1, s_i)$, $\check{x}_i := F_\mu(1, s_i^{-1})$, and the hitting measure on the boundary of F_m by ν, then

$$\nu(C(s_i)) = \frac{x_i(1-\check{x}_i)}{1-x_i\check{x}_i}.$$

A similar lemma is stated in [La18, Exercise 5.14].

Proof. For any infinite word $w = s_{j_1}s_{j_2}s_{j_3}\dots$ there exist two possibilities:

1. There exists a subword $s_{j_1}\dots s_{j_k}$ such that it equals s_i in F_m
2. No subword $s_{j_1}\dots s_{j_k}$ equals s_i, so it belongs to the set of paths which never hit s_i.

In the first case we denote this subword by w_1, and we consider $w_1^{-1}w$ and we apply the same procedure, but replacing s_i with s_i^{-1} at each subsequent step. This procedure yields the equality

$$\begin{aligned}\nu(C(s_i)) &= \mathbb{P}(1 \to s_i \not\to 1) + \mathbb{P}(1 \to s_i \to 1 \to s_i \not\to 1) + \dots = \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} F_\mu(1,s_i)^{n+1} F_\mu(1,s_i^{-1})^n (1 - F_\mu(1,s_i^{-1})) \\ &= F_\mu(1,s_i)(1-F_\mu(1,s_i^{-1}))\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\left(F_\mu(1,s_i)F_\mu(1,s_i^{-1})\right)^n = \frac{x_i(1-\check{x}_i)}{1-x_i\check{x}_i}.\end{aligned}$$

□

2. A criterion for singularity

Theorem 11. *Let μ be a finitely supported measure on a cocompact Fuchsian group, and let S be the support of μ. Suppose that*

$$\sum_{g\in S} \frac{1}{1+e^{\ell(g)}} < 1. \tag{3}$$

Then the hitting measure ν on $\partial\mathbb{D}$ is singular with respect to Lebesgue measure.

Proof. Let F be a free group of rank m, with generators $(h_i)_{i=1}^m$, and let $\widetilde{\mu}$ be a measure on F with $\widetilde{\mu}(h_i^{\pm}) = \mu(g_i^{\pm})$. Moreover, let us denote

$$\begin{aligned} x_i &:= F_{\widetilde{\mu}}(1,h_i) = \mathbb{P}_{\widetilde{\mu}}(\exists n \ : \ w_n = h_i) \\ \check{x}_i &:= F_{\widetilde{\mu}}(1,h_i^{-1}).\end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{x_i(1-\check{x}_i)}{1-x_i\check{x}_i} + \frac{\check{x}_i(1-x_i)}{1-x_i\check{x}_i} = 1. \tag{4}$$

Indeed, if $\widetilde{\nu}$ is the hitting measure on ∂F, by Lemma 10 the measure of the cylinder $C(h_i)$ starting with h_i is

$$\widetilde{\nu}(C(h_i)) = \frac{x_i(1-\check{x}_i)}{1-x_i\check{x}_i}, \qquad \widetilde{\nu}(C(h_i^{-1})) = \frac{\check{x}_i(1-x_i)}{1-x_i\check{x}_i}$$

from which, since the cylinders are disjoint and cover the boundary, (4) follows.

Then, by equation (3), there exists an index i such that

$$\frac{2}{1+e^{\ell(g_i)}} < \frac{x_i(1-\check{x}_i)}{1-x_i\check{x}_i} + \frac{\check{x}_i(1-x_i)}{1-x_i\check{x}_i}$$

which is equivalent to

$$e^{\ell(g_i)} > \frac{2-x_i-\check{x}_i}{x_i+\check{x}_i-2x_i\check{x}_i}$$

Finally, an algebraic computation yields

$$\frac{2-x_i-\check{x}_i}{x_i+\check{x}_i-2x_i\check{x}_i} \geq \min\left\{\frac{1}{x_i}, \frac{1}{\check{x}_i}\right\}$$

thus we obtain

$$\ell(g_i) > \inf\{-\log x_i, -\log \check{x}_i\}. \tag{5}$$

If the hitting measure ν on $S^1 = \partial\mathbb{D}$ is absolutely continuous, then by Lemma 9 and Lemma 7 we get

$$\ell(g_i) \leq d_\mu(1, g_i) \leq d_{\widetilde{\mu}}(1, h_i) = -\log x_i$$

for any i. If we apply the same inequality to g_i^{-1}, we also have

$$\ell(g_i) = \ell(g_i^{-1}) \leq d_\mu(1, g_i^{-1}) \leq d_{\widetilde{\mu}}(1, h_i^{-1}) = -\log \check{x}_i$$

hence

$$\ell(g_i) \leq \inf\{-\log x_i, -\log \check{x}_i\}$$

which contradicts (5), showing that ν is singular with respect to Lebesgue measure. □

3. Parameterization of the space of polygons

Let P be a convex, compact polygon in the hyperbolic disk $\mathbb{D}$, with $2m$ sides and interior angles $\{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{2m}\}$.

We say that P is *centrally symmetric* if there exists a point $o \in \mathbb{D}$ so that P is invariant under reflection across o. This clearly implies that opposite sides have equal length, and opposite angles are equal.

Poincaré's theorem provides conditions to ensure that the group generated by side pairings is discrete (see [Ma71]). In particular, one needs a condition on the angles, which in our setting can be formulated as follows.

Definition 12. *A centrally symmetric polygon P satisfies the* cycle condition *if there exists an integer $k \geq 1$ such that*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} \gamma_{2i} = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \gamma_{2i-1} = \frac{2\pi}{k}.$$

Let $S := \{g_1, \ldots, g_{2m}\}$ be the set of hyperbolic translations identifying opposite sides of P. By Poincaré's theorem [Ma71], if the polygon P satisfies the cycle condition, then the group G generated by S is discrete[1].

The following is our main geometric inequality.

Theorem 13. *Let P be a centrally symmetric, hyperbolic polygon satisfying the cycle condition, with $2m$ sides, and let $S := \{g_1, \ldots, g_{2m}\}$ be the set of hyperbolic translations identifying opposite sides of P. Then we have*

$$\sum_{g \in S} \frac{1}{1 + e^{\ell(g)}} < 1. \tag{6}$$



FIGURE 2. Angles at the center and at the vertices of a symmetric hyperbolic octagon.

Remarks.

The inequality (6) has the same form as the main inequality in [ACCS96] and [CS92] for free Kleinian groups; more recently, a stronger version for free Fuchsian groups has been obtained in [He19], while generalizations in variable curvature (and any dimension) are due to [Ho01], [BM21].

[1]Note that in the usual formulation of Poincaré's theorem there are two cases: if m is even, all vertices of P are identified by G; if m is odd, there are two elliptic cycles, corresponding to alternate vertices of P. If m is even and $k = 1$, the polygon P does not satisfy the classical version of Poincaré's theorem, but if P is symmetric, the group generated is still discrete, so all our arguments still apply.

Equation (6) is also reminiscent of McShane's identity [McS98], where one obtains the equality by taking the infinite sum over all group elements of a punctured torus group. Our inequality, however, does not follow from any of them; in fact, it is in a way stronger than these, as a cocompact surface group can be deformed to a finite covolume group and then to a Schottky (hence free) group by increasing the translation lengths of the generators.

It is interesting to point out that the above inequalities have an interpretation in terms of hitting measures of stochastic processes (see e.g. [LT18]). Here, we go along the opposite route: we prove the geometric inequality (6) and then we use it to conclude properties about the hitting measure.

Finally, there are generating sets of G for which (6) fails. Indeed, the mechanism behind the inequality is that, since all curves corresponding to $(g_i)_{i=1}^m$ intersect each other, by the collar lemma, at most one of them can be short. In general, on a surface of genus g one can choose a configuration of $3g-3$ short curves, and construct a Dirichlet domain for which the corresponding side pairing does not satisfy (6).

Proof. The proof of this inequality will take up most of the paper, until Section 5. To begin with, let us note that a way to parameterize the space of all symmetric hyperbolic polygons is to write, by [Bu10, Example 2.2.7],

$$\cos(\gamma_i) = -\cosh(a_i)\cosh(a_{i+1})\cos(\alpha_i) + \sinh(a_i)\sinh(a_{i+1}) \tag{7}$$

with $i = 1, \dots, m$, where (a_i) are the distances between the base point and the ith side, (α_i) are the angles at the origin and (γ_i) are the angles at the vertices. Since $\ell(g_i) \geq 2a_i$, it is enough to show

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{1}{1+e^{2a_i}} < \frac{1}{2}$$

under the constraints $\sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i = \pi$ and $\sum_{i=1}^m \gamma_i = \pi$.

The fundamental geometric idea in our approach to Theorem 13 is that two intersecting curves cannot be both short, as a consequence of the *collar lemma* [Bu78]. For instance, we get:

Lemma 14. *Suppose that there exists a_i such that $\sinh(a_i) \leq \frac{2(m-1)}{m(m-2)}$. Then the hitting measure is singular.*

Proof. From the collar lemma [Bu78] we have

$$\sinh(a_i)\sinh(a_j) \geq 1$$

for all $i \neq j$. Recall that

$$\frac{2}{1+e^{2a}} = 1 - \tanh(a)$$

hence, if we set $s := \sinh(a_1)$, we obtain for $i \neq 1$ that $\sinh(a_i) \geq \frac{1}{s}$ thus

$$\tanh(a_i) = \frac{\sinh(a_i)}{\sqrt{1+\sinh(a_i)^2}} \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+s^2}}$$

hence

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} \tanh(a_i) \geq \frac{s}{\sqrt{1+s^2}} + \frac{m-1}{\sqrt{1+s^2}} > m-1$$

if and only if $s < \frac{2(m-1)}{m(m-2)}$. □

To actually prove Theorem 13, however, we need an improvement on the previous estimate. Let us rewrite equation (7) above as

$$\cos(\alpha_i) = \tanh(a_i)\tanh(a_{i+1}) - \frac{\cos(\gamma_i)}{\cosh(a_i)\cosh(a_{i+1})}$$

and, recalling that

$$\tanh^2(x) + \frac{1}{\cosh^2(x)} = 1$$

we obtain, by setting $z_i = \tanh(a_i)$,

$$\cos(\alpha_i) = z_i z_{i+1} - \cos(\gamma_i)\sqrt{1-z_i^2}\sqrt{1-z_{i+1}^2} \tag{8}$$

with $0 \leq z_i \leq 1$. Finally, we want to show

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{1}{1+e^{2a_i}} = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{1-z_i}{2} \overset{?}{<} \frac{1}{2},$$

which is equivalent to

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} z_i \overset{?}{>} m-1. \tag{9}$$

Now, let us first assume that $\gamma_i \leq \pi/2$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$. Then (8) yields

$$\cos(\alpha_i) \leq z_i z_{i+1}$$

hence the constraint becomes

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} \arccos(z_i z_{i+1}) \leq \pi. \tag{10}$$

Note that $z_1 \to 0$ implies $\cos\alpha_1 \leq z_1 z_2 \to 0$ thus $\alpha_1 \to \frac{\pi}{2}$ and $\cos\alpha_m \leq z_m z_1 \to 0$ thus $\alpha_m \to \frac{\pi}{2}$, hence also $\alpha_2, \alpha_3, \ldots, \alpha_{m-1} \to 0$, which implies $z_2, z_3, \ldots, z_m \to 1$.

4. An optimization problem

By the above discussion, we reduced the proof of Theorem 13 (at least in the case all angles of P are acute) to the following optimization problem.

Theorem 15. *Let $m \geq 3$ and $0 \leq x_i \leq 1$ with $\sum_{i=1}^{m} x_i = m-1$. Then*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} \arccos(x_i x_{i+1}) \geq \pi.$$



FIGURE 3. The graph of $f(x) := \sum_{i=1}^{3} \arccos((1-x_i)(1-x_{i+1}))$ subject to the constraint $\sum_{i=1}^{3} x_i = 1$, compared with the constant function at height π.The lack of convexity (or concavity) of f makes the proof of Theorem 15 trickier.

Moreover, equality holds if and only if there exists an index i such that $x_i = 0$ and $x_j = 1$ for all $j \neq i$.

In the statement of Theorem 15 and elsewhere from now on, all indices i are meant modulo m. The next is the main technical lemma.

Lemma 16. *Let $m \geq 3$ and $0 \leq x_i \leq 1$ with $\sum_{i=1}^{m} x_i = 1$. Then*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} \sqrt{x_i + x_{i+1} - x_i x_{i+1}} \geq \sqrt{4 + 3\sum_{i=1}^{m} x_i x_{i+1}}.$$

Proof. Set $\Delta_i := x_i + x_{i+1} - x_i x_{i+1}$. Note that

$$\Delta_i \geq \max\{x_i, x_{i+1}\}$$

hence

$$\sqrt{\Delta_i}\sqrt{\Delta_{i+1}} \geq x_{i+1}. \tag{11}$$

Moreover, since $m \geq 2$, we have $x_{i+1} + x_{i+2} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{m} x_i = 1$, hence if we multiply by $(x_{i+1} + x_{i+2})$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_i &= x_i + x_{i+1} - x_i x_{i+1} \\ &\geq (x_i + x_{i+1})(x_{i+1} + x_{i+2}) - x_i x_{i+1} \\ &\geq x_{i+1}^2 + x_{i+1} x_{i+2}.\end{aligned}$$

Similary, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_{i+2} &= x_{i+2} + x_{i+3} - x_{i+2}x_{i+3} \\ &\geq (x_{i+2} + x_{i+3})(x_{i+1} + x_{i+2}) - x_{i+2}x_{i+3} \\ &\geq x_{i+2}^2 + x_{i+1}x_{i+2}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, Cauchy-Schwarz yields

$$\sqrt{\Delta_i}\sqrt{\Delta_{i+2}} \geq \sqrt{x_{i+1}^2 + x_{i+1}x_{i+2}}\sqrt{x_{i+2}^2 + x_{i+1}x_{i+2}} \geq 2x_{i+1}x_{i+2}. \tag{12}$$

By squaring both sides, our desired inequality is equivalent to

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \Delta_i + 2\sum_{1\leq i<j\leq m} \sqrt{\Delta_i}\sqrt{\Delta_j} \geq 4 + 3\sum_{i=1}^m x_i x_{i+1},$$

thus, using $\sum_{i=1}^m \Delta_i = 2 - \sum_{i=1}^m x_i x_{i+1}$, it is enough to prove

$$\sum_{1\leq i<j\leq m} \sqrt{\Delta_i}\sqrt{\Delta_j} \geq 1 + 2\sum_{i=1}^m x_i x_{i+1}. \tag{13}$$

Now, note that

$$\sum_{1\leq i<j\leq m} \sqrt{\Delta_i}\sqrt{\Delta_j} = \sum_{i=1}^m \sqrt{\Delta_i}\sqrt{\Delta_{i+1}} + M$$

with

$$M = 0 \qquad \text{if } m = 3 \tag{14}$$

$$M = \sum_{i=1}^2 \sqrt{\Delta_i}\sqrt{\Delta_{i+2}} \qquad \text{if } m = 4 \tag{15}$$

$$M \geq \sum_{i=1}^m \sqrt{\Delta_i}\sqrt{\Delta_{i+2}} \qquad \text{if } m \geq 5. \tag{16}$$

Thus, for $m \geq 5$ we have, using (16), (11) and (12),

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{1\leq i<j\leq m} \sqrt{\Delta_i}\sqrt{\Delta_j} &\geq \sum_{i=1}^m \sqrt{\Delta_i}\sqrt{\Delta_{i+1}} + \sum_{i=1}^m \sqrt{\Delta_i}\sqrt{\Delta_{i+2}} \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^m x_{i+1} + 2\sum_{i=1}^m x_{i+1}x_{i+2} \\ &\geq 1 + 2\sum_{i=1}^m x_{i+1}x_{i+2}\end{aligned}$$

which yields (13), hence completes our proof. The cases $m = 3$ and $m = 4$ need to be dealt with separately. If $m = 3$, we obtain, by multiplying by

$\sum_{i=1}^3 x_i = 1$,

$$\Delta_i = x_i^2 + x_{i+1}^2 + \sum_{i=1}^3 x_i x_{i+1}$$

so by Cauchy-Schwarz we get

$$\sqrt{\Delta_i}\sqrt{\Delta_{i+1}} \geq x_{i+1}^2 + x_i x_{i+2} + \sum_{i=1}^3 x_i x_{i+1}$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1}^3 \sqrt{\Delta_i}\sqrt{\Delta_{i+1}} &\geq \sum_{i=1}^3 x_i^2 + 4\sum_{i=1}^3 x_i x_{i+1} \\ &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^3 x_i\right)^2 + 2\sum_{i=1}^3 x_i x_{i+1} \\ &= 1 + 2\sum_{i=1}^3 x_i x_{i+1}\end{aligned}$$

which yields (13), as desired. Finally, if $m = 4$, then we note

$$\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq 4} \sqrt{\Delta_i}\sqrt{\Delta_j} = \sum_{i=1}^4 \sqrt{\Delta_i}\sqrt{\Delta_{i+1}} + \sum_{i=1}^2 \sqrt{\Delta_i}\sqrt{\Delta_{i+2}}$$

and, again by Cauchy-Schwarz,

$$\sqrt{\Delta_1}\sqrt{\Delta_3} \geq \sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_1x_4 + x_2x_3}\sqrt{x_3^2 + x_4^2 + x_1x_4 + x_2x_3} \geq 2x_1x_4 + 2x_2x_3$$

and similarly

$$\sqrt{\Delta_2}\sqrt{\Delta_4} \geq 2x_1x_2 + 2x_3x_4$$

thus, using (11),

$$\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq 4} \sqrt{\Delta_i}\sqrt{\Delta_j} \geq \sum_{i=1}^4 x_i + 2\sum_{i=1}^4 x_i x_{i+1} = 1 + 2\sum_{i=1}^4 x_i x_{i+1}$$

which is again (13). This completes the proof. □

Lemma 17. *For $0 \leq x \leq 1$ we have the inequalities:*

(1)
$$\frac{2}{\pi}\arccos(1-x) \geq \frac{2}{3}\sqrt{x} + \frac{1}{3}x$$
with equality if and only if $x = 0$ or $x = 1$;

(2)
$$\frac{2}{3}\sqrt{4+3x} + \frac{2-x}{3} \geq 2$$
with equality if and only if $x = 0$.

Proof. For the first inequality, let $f(x) := \frac{2}{\pi}\arccos(1-x^2) - \frac{2}{3}x - \frac{1}{3}x^2$. One checks that $f(0) = f(1) = 0$ and $f(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}) = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3} > 0$; moreover, $f'(x)$ has a unique zero in $[0,1]$. Hence, $f(x) \geq 0$ for all $0 \leq x \leq 1$, which implies (1).

To prove (2), let $g(x) := \frac{2}{3}\sqrt{4+3x} + \frac{2-x}{3}$. Then one checks $g(0) = 2$ and $g'(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{4+3x}} - \frac{1}{3} > 0$ for $0 \leq x \leq 1$, which implies $g(x) \geq 2$ for all $0 \leq x \leq 1$. □

Proof of Theorem 15. By replacing x_i by $1-x_i$ and setting $f(x) := \frac{2}{\pi}\arccos(1-x)$, our claim is equivalent to

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} f(x_i + x_{i+1} - x_i x_{i+1}) \geq 2$$

under the constraint $\sum_{i=1}^{m} x_i = 1$, with $m \geq 3$ and $0 \leq x_i \leq 1$.

Let us set $\Delta_i := x_i + x_{i+1} - x_i x_{i+1}$ and $\sigma := \sum_{i=1}^{m} x_i x_{i+1}$. Observe that $2\sigma \leq (\sum_{i=1}^{m} x_i)^2 = 1$. Then we have by Lemma 17

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} f(\Delta_i) \geq \frac{2}{3}\sum_{i=1}^{m}\sqrt{\Delta_i} + \frac{1}{3}\sum_{i=1}^{m}\Delta_i$$

and using Lemma 16 and the fact $\sum_{i=1}^{m}\Delta_i = 2-\sigma$, we obtain

$$\geq \frac{2}{3}\sqrt{4+3\sigma} + \frac{1}{3}(2-\sigma) \geq 2$$

where in the last step we apply Lemma 17 (2). This completes the proof of the inequality. By Lemma 17 (1), equality implies that $\Delta_i = 0, 1$ for every i, which in turn implies that $x_i = 0, 1$ for all i. Since $\sum_{i=1}^{m} x_i = 1$, this can only happen if $x_i = 1$ for exactly one index i. □

5. The obtuse angle case

The proof in the previous section works as long as all angles γ_i are less or equal than $\pi/2$. If one of them is obtuse, we have a geometric argument to reduce ourselves to that case.

5.1. Neutralizing pairs.

We call a *neutralizing pair* for P a pair $\{\gamma_i, \gamma_{i+1}\}$ of adjacent interior angles of P with $\gamma_i + \gamma_{i+1} \leq \pi$. Whenever we have a neutralizing pair, we can apply the following lemma.

Lemma 18. *Let $ABCDE$ be a hyperbolic pentagon, with right angles $\widehat{B}$ and $\widehat{E}$, and suppose that $\widehat{C} < \pi/2$ and $\widehat{C} + \widehat{D} \leq \pi$. Let P be the midpoint of $\overline{CD}$, and let $\widehat{F}$ be the foot of the orthogonal projection of P to $\overline{BC}$. Let $\widehat{G}$ be the intersection of the lines $\overline{FP}$ and $\overline{ED}$. Then the angle $\delta = D\widehat{G}F$ satisfies $\delta \leq \pi/2$.*

Proof. Let F' be the symmetric point to F with respect to P. Then CFP and DPF' are equal triangles. Hence $E\widehat{D}F' = E\widehat{D}P + P\widehat{D}F' = E\widehat{D}C +$



FIGURE 4. The hyperbolic pentagon of Lemma 18.

$B\widehat{C}D \leq \pi$, hence F' lies on the segment $\overline{PG}$. Moreover, $D\widehat{F'}P = C\widehat{F}P = \pi/2$, hence $\delta = D\widehat{G}P \leq \pi/2$. □

We say that P has *disjoint neutralizing pairs* if every obtuse angle of P belongs to a neutralizing pair, and all such neutralizing pairs are disjoint. Let us use the notation

$$\varphi(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_m) := \sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{1}{1 + e^{2x_i}}.$$

Proposition 19. *Let P be a centrally symmetric hyperbolic polygon with $2m$ sides and center o, and let $\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_m$ be the distances between o and the midpoints of the sides. If P has disjoint neutralizing pairs, there exists a* *centrally symmetric hyperbolic $2m$-gon P' with no obtuse angles and such that*

$$\varphi(\ell_1, \ell_2, \dots, \ell_m) \le \varphi(d'_1, d'_2, \dots, d'_m)$$

where d'_i is the distance between o and the ith side of P'.

Proof. Let us denote as d_i the distance between o and the ith side of P. Note that by definition $d_i \le \ell_i$ for all i.

If the polygon P only has acute angles, we take $P = P'$ and note that by definition $d'_i = d_i \le \ell_i$, which yields the claim.

Suppose now that the hyperbolic polygon P has one obtuse angle, say γ_1, which belongs to a neutralizing pair, and let ℓ_1 correspond to the side adjacent to the obtuse angle and the other angle, say γ_2, in the neutralizing pair. Consistently with this choice, let us denote as $s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{2m}$ the sides of P.

Let us now consider the hyperbolic pentagon delimited by s_{2m}, s_1, s_2, and the orthogonal projections from o to s_2 and s_{2m}. Let us call this pentagon $ABCDE$, where $o = A$, the side s_1 is denoted $\overline{DC}$, the orthogonal projection from o to s_2 is B, and the orthogonal projection from o to s_{2m} is E.

Using Lemma 18, let us replace P by a new polygon P' obtained substituting the pentagon $ABCDE$ by the pentagon $ABFGE$, which satisfies $\widehat{F} = \pi/2$ and $\widehat{G} \le \pi/2$. If we denote by d'_1 the distance between $o = A$ and $\overline{FG}$, then we have

$$d'_1 = d(A, \overline{FG}) \le d(A, P) = \ell_1.$$

On the other hand, note that for $i = 2, \dots, m$ the distance between o and the ith side is the same for P and P'. That is, $d_i = d'_i$ for $i = 2, \dots, m$. Hence,

$$\varphi(\ell_1, \ell_2, \dots, \ell_m) \le \varphi(\ell_1, d_2, \dots, d_m) \le \varphi(d'_1, d_2, \dots, d_m) = \varphi(d'_1, d'_2, \dots, d'_m).$$

If there are more than one neutralizing pairs, we can analogously replace each side adjacent to the pair by rotating it around its midpoint. This proves the claim. □

5.2. **The general case.** Let $(p_i)_{i=1}^{2m}$ denote the vertices of P and $(q_i)_{i=1}^{2m}$ denote the midpoints of the sides, indexed so that q_i lies between p_{i-1} and p_i. Let o denote the center of symmetry of P. Let $\alpha_i = q_i \widehat{o} q_{i+1}$ be the angles at the origin, and $\gamma_i = q_i \widehat{p}_i q_{i+1}$ the angles at the vertices of P. By the cycle condition and symmetry we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} \alpha_i = \pi, \qquad \sum_{i=1}^{m} \gamma_i = \frac{2\pi}{k},$$

where $k \ge 1$ is an integer. Note that if $k \ge 2$, at most one of the γ_i is obtuse, hence P has disjoint neutralizing pairs. However, if $k = 1$, P need not have disjoint neutralizing pairs; in particular, it may have three consecutive obtuse angles. In order to deal with this case, we need the notion of *dual polygon*.



FIGURE 5. On the left: the polygon P, in blue. On the right: the dual polygon $\widehat{P}$, in red. The highlighted quadrilaterals can be rearranged as shown to form the dual polygon.

5.3. **Dual polygons.** Given a centrally symmetric polygon P with center o, we construct its *dual polygon* $\widehat{P}$ as follows.

Let Q_i be the quadrilateral delimited by o, q_i, p_i, q_{i+1}. As in Figure 5, we can cut and rearrange the Q_i's with $1 \leq i \leq m$ by gluing all vertices p_i to a single point, which we now denote as v. Since the sum of all angles at p_i is 2π, this creates a new polygon with sides of lengths $2\ell_1, \dots, 2\ell_m$. The angles of $\widehat{P}$ are $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m$, hence their sum is π. We define the pair $(\widehat{P}, v)$ to be the dual polygon to (P, o).

The duality relation

$$(P, o) \leftrightarrow (\widehat{P}, v)$$

defines a bijective correspondence between centrally symmetric $2m$-gons with sum of angles 4π and m-gons with sum of angles π together with a choice of a point inside them.

Given a polygon P with $2m$ sides and a point o inside P, we define

$$\Sigma(P) := \sum_{i=1}^{2m} \frac{1}{1 + e^{2\ell_i}}$$

where ℓ_i are the segments connecting o and the midpoint of the *ith* side. Let us also define

$$\widehat{\Sigma}(P) := \sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{1}{1 + e^{s_i}}$$

where s_i are the lengths of the sides of P. Then note that we have

$$\Sigma(P) = \widehat{\Sigma}(\widehat{P}).$$

In particular, $\Sigma(P)$ does *not* depend on v but only on $\widehat{P}$.

Lemma 20. *Let P be a centrally symmetric hyperbolic polygon with $2m$ sides and total sum of its interior angles 4π. Then there exists a centrally symmetric hyperbolic polygon P' with the same number of sides, so that $\Sigma(P) = \Sigma(P')$ and so that P' has at most four obtuse angles, which belong to disjoint neutralizing pairs.*

Proof. Let $\widehat{P}$ be the dual polygon to P, as defined above. We claim that we can pick another point v' inside $\widehat{P}$ so that at most two of the angles at v' are obtuse. This is just because we can pick two non-adjacent sides of $\widehat{P}$ and join their midpoints by a segment. Now, let us pick v' on that segment and connect it to all midpoints of the sides of $\widehat{P}$.

Then, out of the angles $\gamma_i' := q_i\widehat{v'}q_{i+1}$ with $1 \leq i \leq m$, at most two of them can be obtuse. Then we define P' to be the dual of $(\widehat{P}, v')$. Since P and P' have the same dual, we have $\Sigma(P) = \Sigma(P')$. Thus, in P' there are at most 4 obtuse angles γ_i', and for all of them there exists another adjacent angle $\gamma_{i\pm1}'$ so that $\gamma_i' + \gamma_{i\pm1}' < \pi$. Hence, P' has neutralizing pairs. □

By putting together these reductions we can complete the proof of Theorem 13. Let us see the details.

Proof of Theorem 13. Let us first suppose that $\gamma_i \leq \pi/2$ for all i. We know by (10) that $\sum_{i=1}^m \arccos(z_i z_{i+1}) \leq \pi$ with $0 < z_i < 1$. Then we need to show that $\sum_{i=1}^m z_i > m - 1$. Suppose not, then there exists z_i with $\sum_{i=1}^m z_i \leq m - 1$. Then there exists $(z_i')_{i=1}^m$ with $0 \leq z_i \leq z_i' \leq 1$ for all i, so that $\sum z_i' = m - 1$. Then we have, by Theorem 15, $\pi \leq \sum_{i=1}^m \arccos(z_i' z_{i+1}') \leq \sum_{i=1}^m \arccos(z_i z_{i+1}) \leq \pi$, hence $\sum_{i=1}^m \arccos(z_i' z_{i+1}') = \pi$, which by the second part of Theorem 15 implies $z_i' = 0$ for some i, hence also $z_i = 0$, which is a contradiction.

In the general case, we first apply Lemma 20 to reduce to the case where P has disjoint neutralizing pairs. Then, by applying Proposition 19, we reduce to the case of P having no obtuse angles, which we can deal with as above. This completes the proof. □

Proof of Theorem 2. Theorem 13 shows that the criterion of Theorem 11 holds, proving the singularity of hitting measure. □

6. Coxeter groups

Let P be a centrally symmetric convex polygon with $2m$ sides in $\mathbb{H}^2$, with each angle γ_i at the vertices being equal to $\frac{\pi}{k_i}$ for some natural $k_i > 1$, for $1 \leq i \leq 2m$. Then, due to [Dav08, Theorem 6.4.3], the group of isometries generated by hyperbolic reflections $R := \{r_1, \ldots, r_{2m}\}$ with respect to the sides of P acts geometrically on $\mathbb{H}^2$. Therefore, it is a hyperbolic group, so Theorem 8 can be applied to it. Such groups are referred to as *hyperbolic Coxeter groups.*

Below we will show that Theorem 2 can be quickly generalized to hyperbolic Coxeter groups.

Lemma 21. *Let $m > 1$. Consider a random walk on the free product of $2m$ copies of $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$*

$$F'_{2m} = \left\langle s_1, \dots, s_{2m} \mid s_i^2 = 1 \right\rangle,$$

defined by a probability measure μ on the generators. If we denote $x_i := F_\mu(1, s_i)$ for $1 \le i \le 2m$, and the hitting measure on the boundary of F'_{2m} by ν, then

$$\nu(C(s_i)) = \frac{x_i}{1 + x_i}.$$

Proof. The proof of this lemma can be obtained in a similar way to the proof of Lemma 10 for F_m, because the Cayley graphs for F_m and F'_{2m} are isometric.

More precisely, a sample path converges to the boundary of the cylinder $C(s_i)$ if and only if it crosses the edge s_i an odd number of times. This leads to the following computation:

$$\begin{aligned}\nu(C(s_i)) &= \mathbb{P}(1 \to s_i \not\to 1) + \mathbb{P}(1 \to s_i \to 1 \to s_i \not\to 1) + \dots = \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} F_\mu(1, s_i)^{2n+1}(1 - F_\mu(1, s_i)) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (-1)^{k+1} x_i^k = \frac{x_i}{1 + x_i}.\end{aligned}$$

□

A measure μ on the set $R = \{r_1, \dots, r_{2m}\}$ of reflections through the sides of P is called *geometrically symmetric* if $\mu(r_i) = \mu(r_{i+m})$ for each $1 \le i \le m$.

Theorem 22. *Let μ denote a geometrically symmetric measure supported on the generators $R = \{r_1, \dots, r_{2m}\}$ of a hyperbolic Coxeter group. Suppose that*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{1}{1 + e^{\ell(r_i r_{i+m})/2}} < \frac{1}{2}. \tag{17}$$

Then the hitting measure ν in $\partial\mathbb{D}$ is singular with respect to Lebesgue measure.

Proof. The proof of this theorem is quite similar to the proof of Theorem 11. We consider a measure $\tilde{\mu}$ on a free product $\left\langle h_1, \dots, h_{2m} \mid h_i^2 = 1 \right\rangle$ of $2m$ copies of $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ uniquely defined by $\tilde{\mu}(h_i) = \mu(r_i)$.

If ν were to be absolutely continuous, then a similar argument would yield that

$$\begin{aligned}\ell(r_i r_{i+m}) &\le d_\mu(1, r_i r_{i+m}) \le d_\mu(1, r_i) + d_\mu(1, r_{i+m}) \\ &\le d_{\tilde{\mu}}(1, h_i) + d_{\tilde{\mu}}(1, h_{i+m}) = 2 d_{\tilde{\mu}}(1, h_i) = -2 \log x_i.\end{aligned}$$

Keep in mind that $d_{\tilde{\mu}}(1, h_i) = d_{\tilde{\mu}}(1, h_{i+m})$ due to $\tilde{\mu}$ being geometrically symmetric as well. Therefore,

$$\frac{x_i}{1 + x_i} \le \frac{1}{1 + e^{\ell(r_i r_{i+m})/2}}$$

and due to Lemma 21 we obtain

$$1 = \sum_{i=1}^{2m} \frac{x_i}{1+x_i} \leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{1}{1+e^{\ell(r_i r_{i+m})/2}} < 1,$$

which delivers a contradiction. □

Theorem 23. *The hitting measure of a nearest-neighbour random walk generated by a geometrically symmetric measure on a Coxeter group associated with a centrally symmetric polygon is singular with respect to Lebesgue measure on $\partial\mathbb{D}$.*

Proof. Let us recall that $(g_i)_{i=1}^m$ denotes the translations identifying the opposite sides of P. It is easily seen that $\ell(r_i r_{i+m}) = 2\ell(g_i) = 2\ell(g_{i+m})$ for every $1 \leq i \leq m$. However, we can apply Theorem 13 because there are no obtuse angles, to get

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{2}{1+e^{\ell(r_i r_{i+m})/2}} = \sum_{g\in S} \frac{1}{1+e^{\ell(g)}} < 1.$$

We conclude the proof by applying Theorem 22. □

References

[ACCS96] James Anderson, Richard Canary, Marc Culler, and Peter Shalen, *Free Kleinian groups and volumes of hyperbolic 3-manifolds*, J. Differential Geom. 44 (1996), 738–782.

[Av72] André Avez, *Entropie des groupes de type fini*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A-B, 275 (1972), A1363–A1366.

[BM21] Florent Balacheff and Louis Merlin, *A curvature-free* $\log(2k-1)$ *theorem*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., accepted (2021), e-print `arXiv:1909.06124`.

[BPS12] Balasz Bárány, Mark Pollicott, and Karoly Simon, *Stationary measures for projective transformations: the Blackwell and Furstenberg measures*, J. Stat. Phys. 148 (2012), 393–421.

[BQ18] Yves Benoist and Jean-François Quint, *On the regularity of stationary measures*, Isr. J. Math. 226 (2018), 1–14.

[BB07] Sébastien Blachère and Sara Brofferio, *Internal diffusion limited aggregation on discrete groups having exponential growth*, Probab. Theory Related Fields 137 (2007), no. 3-4, 323–343.

[BHM11] Sébastien Blachère, Peter Haïssinsky, and Pierre Mathieu, *Harmonic measures versus quasiconformal measures for hyperbolic groups*, Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4) 44 (2011), no. 4, 683–721.

[Bo12] Jean Bourgain, *Finitely supported measures on* $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$ *which are absolutely continuous at infinity*, in: B. Klartag, S. Mendelson, V. Milman (eds), *Geometric Aspects of Functional Analysis*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 2050 (2012), Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.

[Bu78] Peter Buser, *The collar theorem and examples*, Manuscripta Math. 25 (1978), no. 4, 349–357.

[Bu10] Peter Buser, *Geometry and Spectra of Compact Riemann Surfaces*, Birkhäuser Basel, 2010.

[CLP21] Matias Carrasco, Pablo Lessa, and Elliot Paquette, *On the speed of distance?stationary sequences* ALEA, Lat. Am. J. Probab. Math. Stat. 18 (2021), 829–854.

[CM07] Chris Connell and Roman Muchnik, *Harmonicity of quasiconformal measures and Poisson boundaries of hyperbolic spaces*, Geom. Funct. Anal. 17 (2007), 707–769.

[CS92] Marc Culler and Peter Shalen, *Paradoxical decompositions, 2-generator Kleinian groups, and volumes of hyperbolic 3-manifolds*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. 5 (1992), no. 2, 231–288.

[Dav08] Michael W. Davis, *The geometry and topology of Coxeter groups*, London Mathematical Society Monographs Series, 32. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2008. xvi+584 pp. ISBN: 978-0-691-13138-2; 0-691-13138-4 20F55 (05B45 05C25 51-02 57M07)

[DKN09] Bertrand Deroin, Victor Kleptsyn, and Andrés Navas, *On the question of ergodicity for minimal group actions on the circle*, Mosc. Math. J. 9 (2009), no. 2, 263–303.

[DG18] Matthieu Dussaule and Ilya Gekhtman, *Entropy and drift for word metric on relatively hyperbolic groups*, to appear, Groups Geom. Dyn., e-print `arXiv:1811.10849` (2018).

[Fu04] Louis Funar, *Lectures on Fuchsian groups and their moduli*, Lecture notes for the Summer School *Géométries à courbure négative ou nulle, groupes discrets et rigidités*, Institut Fourier, Université de Grenoble, June-July 2004.

[Fu71] Harry Furstenberg, *Random walks and discrete subgroups of Lie groups*, in *Advances in Probability and Related Topics*, vol. 1, 1–63, Dekker, New York (1971).

[FK60] Harry Furstenberg and Harry Kesten, *Products of random matrices*, Ann. Math. Statist. 31 (1960), no. 2, 457–469.

[Gad14] Vaibhav Gadre, *Harmonic measures for distributions with finite support on the mapping class group are singular*, Duke Math. J. 163 (2014), no. 2, 309–368.

[GMT15] Vaibhav Gadre, Joseph Maher, and Giulio Tiozzo, *Word length statistics and Lyapunov exponents for Fuchsian groups with cusps*, New York J. Math. 21 (2015), 511–531.

[Ga79] Daniel Gallo, *Uniformization of hyperelliptic surfaces*, Ph.D thesis, SUNY at Stony Brook, 1979.

[GT20] Ilya Gekhtman and Giulio Tiozzo, *Entropy and drift for Gibbs measures on geometrically finite manifolds*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 373 (2020), no. 4, 2949–2980.

[GMM18] Sébastien Gouëzel, Frédéric Mathéus, and François Maucourant, *Entropy and drift in word hyperbolic groups*, Invent. Math. 211 (2018), no. 3, 1201–1255.

[Gu80] Yves Guivarc'h, *Sur la loi des grands nombres et le rayon spectral d'une marche aléatoire*, Astérisque 74 (1980), no. 3.

[GL90] Yves Guivarc'h and Yves Le Jan, *Sur l'enroulement du flot géodésique*, C. R. Acad. Sci., Paris, Ser. I 311 (1990), no. 10, 645–648.

[He19] Yan Mary He, *On the displacement of generators of free Fuchsian groups*, Geom. Dedicata 200 (2019), 255–264.

[Ho01] Yong Hou, *Critical exponent and displacement of negatively curved free groups*, J. Diff. Geom. 57 (2001), 173–193.

[HS17] Michael Hochman and Boris Solomyak, *On the dimension of Furstenberg measure for $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$ random matrix products*, Invent. Math. 210 (2017), 815–875.

[KP11] Vadim Kaimanovich and Vincent Le Prince, *Matrix random products with singular harmonic measure*, Geom. Dedicata 150 (2011), no. 1, 257–279.

[Ko20] Petr Kosenko, *Fundamental inequality for hyperbolic Coxeter and Fuchsian groups equipped with geometric distances*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN (2020), rnaa213.

[LT18] François Labourie and Ser Peow Tan, *The probabilistic nature of McShane's identity: planar tree coding of simple loops*, Geom. Dedicata 192 (2018), 245–266.

[La18] Steven P. Lalley, *Random walks on infinite discrete groups*, Lecture Notes for the Northwestern Summer School in Probability, July 2018, available at `https://sites.math.northwestern.edu/~auffing/SNAP/rw-northwestern.pdf`.

[Le83] François Ledrappier, *Une relation entre entropie, dimension et exposant pour certaines marches alatoires*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math. 296(8) (1983), 369–372.

[Le90] François Ledrappier, *Harmonic measures and Bowen-Margulis measures*, Israel J. Math. 71 (1990), no. 3, 275–287.

[Le95] François Ledrappier, *Applications of dynamics to compact manifolds of negative curvature*, in *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians*, Vol. 1, 2 (Zürich, 1994), Birkhäuser, Basel, 1995, 1195–1202.

[LS84] Terry Lyons and Dennis Sullivan, *Function theory, random paths and covering spaces*, J. Differential Geom. 19 (1984), no. 2, 299–323.

[Ma71] Bernard Maskit, *On Poincaré's theorem for fundamental polygons*, Adv. Math. 7 (1971), 219–230.

[McS98] Greg McShane, *Simple geodesics and a series constant over Teichmüller space*, Invent. Math. 132 (1998), no. 3, 607–632.

[PR94] Ralph Phillips and Zeev Rudnick, *The Circle Problem in the Hyperbolic Plane*, J. Funct. Anal. 121 (1994), no. 1, 78–116.

[RT19] Anja Randecker and Giulio Tiozzo, *Cusp excursion in hyperbolic manifolds and singularity of harmonic measure*, J. Mod. Dyn., accepted (2021).

[Ta19] Ryokichi Tanaka, *Dimension of harmonic measures in hyperbolic spaces*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems 39 (2019), no. 2, 474–499.

[Ve00] Anatoly Vershik, *Numerical characteristics of groups and corresponding relations*, Journal of Mathematical Sciences 107 (2000).

University of Toronto, Canada

Higher School of Economics, Russia
E-mail address: petr.kosenko@mail.utoronto.ca

University of Toronto, Canada
E-mail address: tiozzo@math.utoronto.ca