

On the growth of nonuniform lattices in pinched negatively curved manifolds

Françoise Dal'Bo-Milonet, Marc Peigné, Jean-Claude Picaud, Andrea Sambusetti

▶ **To cite this version:**

Françoise Dal'Bo-Milonet, Marc Peigné, Jean-Claude Picaud, Andrea Sambusetti. On the growth of nonuniform lattices in pinched negatively curved manifolds. Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik, 2009, 2009 (627), pp.31-52. 10.1515/CRELLE.2009.010 . hal-00360859

HAL Id: hal-00360859
https://hal.science/hal-00360859

Submitted on 12 Feb 2009

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

On the growth of nonuniform lattices in pinched negatively curved manifolds

Françoise Dal'bo [1],
Marc Peigné & Jean-Claude Picaud [2],
Andrea Sambusetti [3]

1. Introduction

We study the relation between the exponential growth rate of volume in a pinched negatively curved manifold and the critical exponent of its lattices. These objects have a long and interesting story and are closely related to the geometry and the dynamical properties of the geodesic flow of the manifold (see e.g. [**4**], [**9**],[**20**] and references therein).

Throughout this paper, X will denote a complete and simply connected Riemannian manifold of dimension $N \geq 2$ and we will assume that X has *pinched negative curvature*, that is its sectional curvature K_X is bounded between two negative constants $-b^2 \leq -a^2 < 0$. A *Kleinian group* of X is a torsion free and discrete subgroup Γ of $Is(X)$; then, Γ operates freely and properly discontinuously on X and the quotient manifold $M := X/\Gamma$ has a fundamental group which can be identified with Γ. The group Γ is called a *lattice* when the volume of M is finite; the lattice is said to be *uniform* if M is compact.

Recall that the exponential growth rate of X, also known as the *volume entropy* of X, is defined as

$$\omega(X) = \limsup_{R\to+\infty} \frac{1}{R} \ln v_X(\mathbf{x}, R)$$

where $v_X(\mathbf{x}, R)$ is the volume of the open ball $B_X(\mathbf{x}, R)$ of X, centered at the point $\mathbf{x}$ and with radius R. By the triangular inequality, this quantity does not depend on the base point $\mathbf{x}$; furthermore, under our pinching assumption, Bishop-Gunther's comparison theorem (see [**14**]) implies

$$(N-1)a \leq \omega(X) \leq (N-1)b. \tag{1}$$

The invariant $\omega(X)$ has been intensively studied when $Is(X)$ admits a *uniform* lattice Γ. It turns out that, in this case, $\omega(X)$ is a true limit and equals the topological entropy of the geodesic flow of the compact manifold M

[1]Françoise Dal'bo, IRMAR, Université de Rennes-I, Campus de Beaulieu, 35042 Rennes Cedex. mail : francoise.dalbo@univ-rennes1.fr

[2]Marc Peigné & Jean-Claude Picaud LMPT, UMR 6083, Faculté des Sciences etTechniques, Parc de Grandmont, 37200 Tours. mail : peigne@univ-tours.fr, jean-claude.picaud@univ-tours.fr

[3]Andrea Sambusetti Istituto di Matematica G. Castelnuovo Universita' "La Sapienza" di Roma P.le Aldo Moro 5 - 00185 Roma. mail : sambuset@mat.uniroma1.it

(see [**17**]). Furthermore, with a suitable normalization on the volume of M, it is a complete invariant of locally symmetric metrics on M (see [**4**]).

The second object of our interest in this paper is the *Poincaré series* $P_\Gamma(s, \mathbf{x})$ of a Kleinian group Γ, defined by

$$P_\Gamma(s, \mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} e^{-sd(\mathbf{x}, \gamma \mathbf{x})},$$

for $\mathbf{x} \in X$ and $s \in \mathbb{R}$. Its abscissa of convergence, called the *critical exponent of* Γ, is equal to

$$\delta(\Gamma) = \limsup_{R \to \infty} \frac{1}{R} \ln v_\Gamma(\mathbf{x}, R),$$

where $v_\Gamma(\mathbf{x}, R)$ is the cardinality of the "ball" $B_\Gamma(\mathbf{x}, R) := \{\gamma \in \Gamma / d(\mathbf{x}, \gamma \mathbf{x}) \leq R\}$; again, by the triangular inequality, $\delta(\Gamma)$ does not depend on $\mathbf{x}$.

A way to understand the dynamic significance of the volume entropy $\omega(X)$ and its relation with $\delta(\Gamma)$ is to consider the Laplace transform of the Γ-invariant volume form dv_X on X, namely

$$I_X(s) = \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-sr} v_X(\mathbf{x}, r) \mathrm{d}r.$$

The abscissa of convergence of $I_X(s)$ coincides with $\omega(X)$.

By a Fubini type argument, we also have $I_X(s) = \dfrac{1}{s} \displaystyle\int_X e^{-sd(\mathbf{x}, y)} dv_X(y)$. If D is a Borel fundamental domain for the action of Γ on X, we get, by invariance of dv_X :

$$sI_X(s) = \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \int_{\gamma D} e^{-sd(\mathbf{x}, y)} dv_X(y) = \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \int_D e^{-sd(\gamma^{-1} \mathbf{x}, y)} dv_X(y)$$

which, in turns, yields :

$$P_\Gamma(s, \mathbf{x}) \int_D e^{-sd(\mathbf{x}, y)} dv_X(y) \leq sI_X(s) \leq P_\Gamma(s, \mathbf{x}) \int_D e^{sd(\mathbf{x}, y)} dv_X(y) \tag{2}$$

From the left-hand side of (2) it immediately follows that we always have

$$\delta(\Gamma) \leq \omega(X). \tag{3}$$

Moreover, from the right-hand side of (2), we have $\delta(\Gamma) = \omega(X)$ when Γ is a uniform lattice.

In this paper we shall investigate the case where X *admits a non-uniform lattice* Γ. Let us emphasize that, under this assumption, if X also admits a uniform lattice Γ_0 then X is a symmetric space of non compact type (and rank 1). Actually, as the curvature does not vanish, the manifold X is not a Riemannian product ; then (by [**11**], Corollary 9.2.2), either X is symmetric or the isometry group of X is discrete. But, in this last case, Γ_0 would have finite index in $Is(X)$ (see [**11**] 1.9.34) and, if φ is a parabolic isometry of X, then φ^n would belong to Γ_0 for some $n \geq 1$, which contradicts the fact that a uniform lattice contains only axial elements.

Somewhat surprisingly, the equality $\delta(\Gamma) = \omega(X)$ may fail for a non uniform lattice Γ ; actually, in the last section of this paper, we shall prove

THEOREM 1.1. *There exists a complete and simply connected Riemannian surface X with pinched negative curvature which admits a non uniform lattice Γ such that*

$$\delta(\Gamma) < \omega(X).$$

Our construction extends to any dimension. To explain it, recall that to each cuspidal end of the quotient manifold X/Γ corresponds a maximal parabolic subgroup $\mathcal{P} \subset \Gamma$, which has a *lower critical exponent* :

$$\delta^-(\mathcal{P}) = \liminf_{R\to\infty} \frac{1}{R} \ln v_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{x}, R).$$

In strictly negative curvature, this exponent is nonzero, despite the fact that $\mathcal{P}$ is virtually nilpotent (see [**6**]). The key point is that, in the variable curvature setting, $\delta^-(\mathcal{P})$ may be distinct from $\delta(\mathcal{P})$, as was suggested a long time ago to the second author by B. Bowditch ; in contrast, it is well known that the critical exponent of any non elementary Kleinian group always is a true limit [**19**]. We shall show in Section 5 that the inequality $\omega(X) > \delta(\Gamma)$ may appear as soon as $\delta^-(\mathcal{P}) < \delta(\mathcal{P})/2$.

On the other hand, our example induces us to introduce a notion of pinching for non uniform lattices which ensures that $\omega(X) = \delta(\Gamma)$. Namely, we say that Γ is *parabolically* $1/2$*-pinched* if for any maximal parabolic subgroup $\mathcal{P} \subset \Gamma$, we have

$$\frac{\delta(\mathcal{P})}{\delta^-(\mathcal{P})} \leq 2 \tag{4}$$

We will prove

THEOREM 1.2. *Let X be a complete, simply connected Riemannian manifold with pinched negative curvature. Then for any lattice $\Gamma \subset Is(X)$ which is parabolically $1/2$-pinched, we have $\delta(\Gamma) = \omega(X)$.*

Moreover, we notice that, under the assumptions of this theorem, the invariant $\omega(X)$ is a true limit ; this follows from Corollary 4.5, combined with the fact that $\delta(\Gamma)$ is a limit.

We shall see that Theorem 1.2 covers the case of lattices in any $1/4$-pinched negatively curved manifold (i.e. $\frac{b^2}{a^2} \leq 4$). As far as we know, even in the classical case of Riemannian negatively curved symmetric spaces of rank one (which are $1/4$-pinched, cp. [**15**]), there does not exist an elementary proof of this result. Nevertheless, for those spaces, the equality $\omega(X) = \delta(\Gamma)$ can be easily deduced from a general and deep result of A. Eskin and C. McMullen in [**13**] on lattices of affine symmetric spaces, obtained by algebraic methods. In contrast, the context of variable negative curvature forces us to use only elementary geometric arguments.

The equality $\omega(X) = \delta(\Gamma)$ actually holds under a milder geometric assumption than $1/4$-pinched curvature. Namely, we will say that a manifold $M = X/\Gamma$ has *asymptotically* $1/4$*-pinched curvature* when, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a compact set $C_\epsilon \subset M$, such that the metric is $(\frac{1}{4+\epsilon})$-pinched on $M \setminus C_\epsilon$. A direct consequence of Theorem 1.2 is

COROLLARY 1.3. *Let X be a complete, simply connected Riemannian manifold with pinched negative curvature and let Γ be a lattice of X. If $M := X/\Gamma$ has asymptotically $1/4$-pinched curvature, then $\delta(\Gamma) = \omega(X)$.*

We remark that the pinching constant $\frac{1}{4}$ is optimal because, for every $\epsilon > 0$, the example we construct in Theorem 1.1 can be chosen so that the curvature is $\frac{1}{4+\epsilon}$-pinched.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 deals with elementary geometrical estimates inside horoballs. In Section 3, we relate the volume growth of balls inside a horoball $\mathcal{H}$ with the critical exponent of ample parabolic subgroups preserving $\mathcal{H}$. In section 4, we first give an elementary proof of the equality $\omega(X) = \delta(\Gamma)$ for $\frac{1}{4}$-pinched manifolds; this is of interest since the main idea about the behavior of a ball intersecting a horoball appears clearly in the proof. The proofs of Theorem 1.2 and Corollary 1.3 will follow. Section 5 is devoted to the construction of the example of Theorem 1.1; this relies on pretty technical results about convex functions, postponed to the Appendix.

Acknowledgements. *We thank P. Eberlein who explained us the structure of $Is(X)$ and G. Courtois for various helpfull discussions about volume entropy.*

We fix here once and for all some notation about asymptotic behavior of functions :

Notations. We shall write $f \overset{c}{\preceq} g$ *(or simply $f \preceq g$) when $f(R) \leq cg(R)$ for some constant $c > 0$ and R large enough. The notation $f \overset{c}{\asymp} g$ (or simply $f \asymp g$) means $f \overset{c}{\preceq} g \overset{c}{\preceq} f$.*
Analogously, we whall write $f \overset{c}{\sim} g$ (or simply $f \sim g$) when $|f(R) - g(R)| \leq c$ for some constant $c > 0$ and R large enough.
The upper and lower exponential growth rates of a function f are denoted by $\omega^+(f)$ (or simpler $\omega(f)$) and $\omega^-(f)$ respectively; namely we have

$$\omega^-(f) := \liminf_{R\to+\infty} \frac{\ln f(R)}{R} \quad \text{and} \quad \omega^+(f) = \omega(f) := \limsup_{R\to+\infty} \frac{\ln f(R)}{R}.$$

Finally, if f and g are two real functions, we denote by $f * g$ the discrete convolution of f with g, defined by $f * g(R) = \sum_{n=0}^{[R]} f(n)g(R-n)$ for any $R \geq 0$.

2. Radial flow and geometry of horoballs

As the curvature is bounded from above by $-a^2 < 0$, we have the following classical inequality :

LEMMA 2.1. *Let T be a geodesic triangle with different vertices $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z} \in X$ and angle at $\mathbf{y}$ greater than $\alpha > 0$. Then there is a constant $D = D(\alpha, a)$ such that*

$$d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) \geq d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) + d(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) - D.$$

Proof. See [**8**].

□

Let $X(\infty)$ be the boundary at infinity of X. Fix a point ξ in $X(\infty)$ and consider its associated *radial semi-flow*, $(\psi_{\xi,t})_{t\geq 0}$ defined as follows : for any $\mathbf{x}\in X$, the point $\psi_{\xi,t}(\mathbf{x})$ lies on the geodesic ray $[\mathbf{x},\xi)$ at distance t from $\mathbf{x}$. For any horosphere $\partial\mathcal{H}$ centered at ξ, we set $\partial\mathcal{H}(t)=\psi_{\xi,t}(\partial\mathcal{H})$, and we let d_t be the distance induced by d on the horosphere $\partial\mathcal{H}(t)$. For any points $x,y\in\partial\mathcal{H}(t)$, we have (see [**16**])

$$\frac{2}{a}\sinh\Big(\frac{a}{2}d(x,y)\Big)\leq d_t(x,y)\leq\frac{2}{b}\sinh\Big(\frac{b}{2}d(x,y)\Big). \tag{5}$$

By [**16**], the differential of the map $\psi_{\xi,t}:\partial\mathcal{H}\to\partial\mathcal{H}(t)$ satisfies, for any vector $v\in T(\partial\mathcal{H})$ and any $t\geq 0$

$$e^{-bt}||v||\leq||d\psi_{\xi,t}(v)||\leq e^{-at}||v||. \tag{6}$$

This readily implies the estimates

$$e^{-b(N-1)t}\leq|Jac(\psi_{\xi,t})|\leq e^{-a(N-1)t}. \tag{7}$$

In particular, if μ_t is the Riemannian measure induced on $\partial\mathcal{H}(t)$ by the metric on X, we have, for any Borel set $A\subset\partial\mathcal{H}$

$$e^{-b(N-1)t}\mu_0(A)\leq\mu_t(\psi_{\xi,t}(A))=\int_A|Jac(\psi_{\xi,t})|(x)d\mu_0(x)\leq e^{-a(N-1)t}\mu_0(A). \tag{8}$$

If the points $\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}$ belong to the horosphere $\partial\mathcal{H}$, we set

$$t_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}=\inf\{t\geq 0/d_t(\psi_{\xi,t}(\mathbf{x}),\psi_{\xi,t}(\mathbf{y}))\leq 1\}.$$

The next lemma, which precises Lemma 4 in [**9**], will be of major importance in the following.

LEMMA 2.2. *There exists a constant $c=c(a,b)>0$, only depending on the bounds on the curvature, such that, for any horosphere $\partial\mathcal{H}$ and any $\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}\in\partial\mathcal{H}$, the arc $\gamma_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}$ which is the ordered union of the three geodesic segments $[\mathbf{x},\psi_{\xi,t_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}}(\mathbf{x})]$, $[\,\psi_{\xi,t_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}}(\mathbf{x}),\psi_{\xi,t_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}}(\mathbf{y})]$ and $[\psi_{\xi,t_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}}(\mathbf{y}),\mathbf{y}]$ is a $(1,c)$-quasigeodesic. Furthermore, for any $s,t\geq 0$, we have*

$$d(\psi_{\xi,s}(\mathbf{x}),\psi_{\xi,t}(\mathbf{x}))\overset{c}{\sim}\varphi(s,t)$$

where φ is the function defined on $\mathbb{R}_+\times\mathbb{R}_+$ by

$$\varphi(s,t)=\begin{cases}2t_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}-s-t & \text{when}\quad s,t\leq t_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}\\ |s-t| & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases}$$

In particular, we have $d(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\overset{c}{\sim}2t_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}$.

Proof. If $d_0(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\leq 1$, the arc $\gamma_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}$ is the geodesic segment $[\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}]$ and the lemma is obvious in this case. We now assume $d_0(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})>1$. Let $x=\psi_{\xi,t_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}}(\mathbf{x})$ and $y=\psi_{\xi,t_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}}(\mathbf{y})$. From the right hand side of (5), the distance $d(x,y)$ is bounded from below by $b':=\frac{2}{b}\sinh^{-1}\frac{b}{2}$.

Let us now fix a point ξ' on the boundary at infinity of the space $\mathbb{H}^N_a$ of constant curvature $-a^2$, and two points x',y' on the same horosphere centered at ξ', and at distance b' each from the other on this space; comparing the triangles $x\ y\ \xi$ and $x'\ y'\ \xi'$ we deduce that $\widehat{x\ y\ \xi}\leq\widehat{x'\ y'\ \xi'}\leq\frac{\pi}{2}-\theta$, for some constant $\theta>0$ depending only on a and b. Since $\widehat{\mathbf{x}\ x\ y}\geq\pi/2$, we have $\widehat{x\ y\ \mathbf{x}}\leq\pi/2$ and so $\widehat{\mathbf{x}\ y\ \mathbf{y}}\geq\theta$. Applying Lemma 2.1 successively to the triangles $\mathbf{x}\ x\ y$

(with $\alpha \geq \pi/2$) and $\mathbf{x}\ y\ \mathbf{y}$ (with $\alpha \geq \theta$) we obtain $d(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) \sim d(\mathbf{x},x) + d(y,\mathbf{y})$. The second point follows from the first one, computing the distance between $\psi_{\xi,s}(\mathbf{x})$ and $\psi_{\xi,t}(\mathbf{y})$ along $\gamma_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}$. □

Applying this lemma, we obtain the

PROPOSITION 2.3. *There exists a constant $c = c(a,b) > 0$ such that for any point ξ in $X(\infty)$, any horoball $\mathcal{H}$ centered at ξ and any $\mathbf{x} \in \partial\mathcal{H}$ and $R > 0$ we have*

$$B_X(\psi_{\xi,R/2}(\mathbf{x}), R/2) \subset B_X(\mathbf{x},R) \cap \mathcal{H} \subset B_X(\psi_{\xi,R/2}(\mathbf{x}), R/2 + c).$$

Proof. We need only to prove the second inclusion, the first one being obvious. For $\mathbf{z} \in B_X(\mathbf{x},R) \cap \mathcal{H}$, denote by $\mathbf{y}$ the projection of $\mathbf{z}$ on $\partial\mathcal{H}$ and by $\mathbf{z}_0$ the intersection of the horosphere centered at ξ and containing $\mathbf{z}$ with the geodesic ray $[\mathbf{x},\xi)$.

Assume first $t_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}} \leq \max\{R/2, d(\mathbf{y},\mathbf{z})\}$; setting $s = R/2$ and $t = d(\mathbf{y},\mathbf{z})$ in the previous lemma, we get $d(\psi_{\xi,R/2}(\mathbf{x}),\mathbf{z}) \sim |s-t| = d(\psi_{\xi,R/2}(\mathbf{x}),\mathbf{z}_0) \leq R/2$ (the last inequality following from the fact that $d(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{z}_0) \leq d(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{z}) \leq R$).

Assume now $t_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}} \geq \max\{R/2, d(\mathbf{y},\mathbf{z})\}$; applying twice the previous lemma, we get in this case

$$\begin{cases} d(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{z}) \sim 2t_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}} - d(\mathbf{z},\mathbf{y}) & (\text{setting } s = 0 \text{ and } t = d(\mathbf{y},\mathbf{z})) \\ d(\psi_{\xi,R/2}(\mathbf{x}),\mathbf{z}) \sim 2t_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}} - d(\mathbf{z},\mathbf{y}) - R/2 & (\text{setting } s = R/2 \text{ and } t = d(\mathbf{y},\mathbf{z})). \end{cases}$$

Since $\mathbf{z} \in B_X(\mathbf{x},R)$ there, thus exists $c > 0$ such that $d(\psi_{\xi,R/2}(\mathbf{x}),\mathbf{z}) \leq R/2 + c$. □

In the next section, we will consider discrete parabolic subgroups of $Is(X)$; any such group fixes one point $\xi \in X(\infty)$ and preserves any horoball $\mathcal{H}$ centered at ξ. We shall investigate the relation between the critical exponent of $\mathcal{P}$ and the volume growth of X. Here we shall limit ourselves to remark :

COROLLARY 2.4. *If X is homogeneous, then for any discrete parabolic subgroup $\mathcal{P}$ of $Is(X)$, we have*

$$\delta(\mathcal{P}) \leq \omega(X)/2.$$

This fact is well known when X is a rank one symmetric space ; Proposition 2.3 allows to understand the geometrical reason of this inequality. Actually, let $\mathcal{H}$ be an horoball preserved by $\mathcal{P}$ and let $\mathbf{x} \in \partial\mathcal{H}$. As $\mathcal{P}$ is discrete, we have $d := \frac{1}{2}\inf_{p\in\mathcal{P}} d(\mathbf{x},p\mathbf{x}) > 0$, then

$$\bigsqcup_{p/d(\mathbf{x},p\mathbf{x})\leq R} B_X(p\mathbf{x},d) \times [0,1] \ \subset\ B_X(\mathbf{x}, R+d+1) \cap \mathcal{H}.$$

By Proposition 2.3, we deduce $v_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{x},R) \preceq \sup_{\mathbf{y}\in\mathcal{H}} v_X\Big(\mathbf{y}, \dfrac{R+d+1}{2} + c\Big)$. As X is homogeneous, for any $\epsilon > 0$, we have $v_X(\mathbf{y},r) \preceq e^{(\omega(X)+\epsilon)r}$ uniformly in $\mathbf{y}$. The Corollary follows. □

3. Growth of ample parabolic subgroups

Let be $\mathcal{P}$ a parabolic subgroup of $Is(X)$ fixing $\xi \in X(\infty)$. We shall say that $\mathcal{P}$ is **ample** if it acts cocompactly on every horoball $\partial\mathcal{H}$ centered at ξ. This holds in particular when $\mathcal{P}$ is a maximal parabolic subgroup of a non uniform lattice of $Is(X)$.

We then fix a (relatively compact) Borel fundamental domain $\mathcal{C} \subset \partial\mathcal{H}$ for the action of $\mathcal{P}$ on $\partial\mathcal{H}$. For any $t \geq 0$, the set $\mathcal{C}_t := \psi_{\xi,t}(\mathcal{C})$ is a fundamental domain for the action of $\mathcal{P}$ on $\partial\mathcal{H}(t)$; in the same way, the set $\mathcal{E} := \cup_{t\geq 0}\mathcal{C}_t$, which is canonically homeomorphic to $\mathcal{C} \times \mathbb{R}^+$, is a fundamental domain for the action of $\mathcal{P}$ on the horoball $\mathcal{H}$.

We now associate to any ample parabolic group $\mathcal{P}$ a function $\mathcal{A}_\mathcal{P}$ which will play a crucial role in this paper :

Definition 3.1. The **horospherical area** of $\mathcal{P}$ is the function $\mathcal{A}_\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ defined by

$$\forall\, \mathbf{x} \in \partial\mathcal{H}, \forall\, t \geq 0 \qquad \mathcal{A}_\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{x}, t) := \mu_t(\psi_{\xi,t}(\mathcal{C})).$$

The function $t \mapsto \mathcal{A}_\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ is decreasing and does not depend on the choice of the fundamental domain $\mathcal{C}$; furthermore, by inequalities (8), for any R and $R_0 > 0$, we have

$$e^{-(N-1)bR_0} \leq \frac{\mathcal{A}_\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{x}, R + R_0)}{\mathcal{A}_\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{x}, R)} \leq e^{-(N-1)aR_0}. \tag{9}$$

The following proposition stresses the relation between the function $\mathcal{A}_\mathcal{P}$ and the orbital counting function $v_\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{x}, R)$ of $\mathcal{P}$.

Proposition 3.2. *There exists a constant $c = c(a, b, diam(\mathcal{C})) > 0$ such that for any $\mathbf{x} \in X$*

$$v_\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{x}, R) \overset{c}{\asymp} \frac{1}{\mathcal{A}_\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{x}, \frac{R}{2})}.$$

In particular, we have

$$\delta(\mathcal{P}) = \omega\Big(\frac{1}{\mathcal{A}_\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{x}, \frac{R}{2})}\Big) \quad \textit{and} \quad \delta^-(\mathcal{P}) = \omega^-\Big(\frac{1}{\mathcal{A}_\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{x}, \frac{R}{2})}\Big). \tag{10}$$

Proof. We recall that d_t denotes the horospherical distance on the horosphere $\partial\mathcal{H}(t)$. We let c be the constant of Lemma 2.2 such that $d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \overset{c}{\sim} 2t_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}}$ for $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}$ on $\partial\mathcal{H}$. If $d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = R$, as $t_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}} \overset{c/2}{\sim} \frac{R}{2}$, we deduce

$$d_{\frac{R+c}{2}}\Big(\mathbf{x}(\frac{R+c}{2}), \mathbf{y}(\frac{R+c}{2})\Big) \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad d_{\frac{R-c}{2}}\Big(\mathbf{x}(\frac{R-c}{2}), \mathbf{y}(\frac{R-c}{2})\Big) \geq 1.$$

This implies that $\psi_{\frac{R+c}{2}}(B_X(\mathbf{x}, R) \cap \partial\mathcal{H}) \subset B_1$ and $\psi_{\frac{R-c}{2}}(B_X(\mathbf{x}, R) \cap \partial\mathcal{H}) \subset B_2$ with

$$B_1 := B_{\partial\mathcal{H}(\frac{R+c}{2})}\Big(\mathbf{x}(\frac{R+c}{2}), 1\Big) \quad \text{and} \quad B_2 := B_{\partial\mathcal{H}(\frac{R-c}{2})}\Big(\mathbf{x}(\frac{R-c}{2}), 1\Big).$$

Gauss equation implies that the sectional curvature of all horospheres for the induced metric is in between $a^2 - b^2$ and $2b(b-a)$ (see ([**7**], section 1.4, example (iii)). Therefore, there exist positive constants $v^- = v^-(a, b, \mathbf{x})$ and $v^+ = v^+(a, b, \mathbf{x})$ such that $v^- \leq vol(B_i) \leq v^+$ for the induced volume form on the horospheres and $i = 1, 2$.

Now, there are at most $v_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{x}, R)$ distinct fundamental domains $p(\mathcal{C})$ included in $B_X(\mathbf{x}, R) \cap \partial\mathcal{H}$ and since the radial semi-flow $(\psi_{\xi,t})_{t\geq 0}$ is equivariant with respect to the action of $\mathcal{P}$ on the horospheres $\partial\mathcal{H}(t)$, there are also at most $v_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{x}, R)$ distinct fundamental domains $p(\mathcal{C}(\frac{R+c}{2}))$ included in $\psi_{\frac{R+c}{2}}(B_X(\mathbf{x}, R) \cap \partial\mathcal{H})$. Therefore, we have $v_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{x}, R) \leq \dfrac{v^+}{\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{x}, \frac{R+c}{2})}$ and by (9), this leads to

$$v_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{x}, R) \preceq \frac{1}{\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{x}, \frac{R}{2})}.$$

On the other hand, we can cover the set $B_X(\mathbf{x}, R) \cap \partial\mathcal{H}$ with $v_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{x}, R + d)$ distinct fundamental domains $p(\mathcal{C})$; by the equivariance of $(\psi_{\xi,t})_t$ we deduce again that $\psi_{\frac{R-c}{2}}(B_X(\mathbf{x}, R) \cap \mathcal{H})$ can be covered by $v_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{x}, R + d))$ fundamental domains as well. Therefore, using (9) again

$$v_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{x}, R) \geq \frac{v^-}{\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{x}, \frac{R-c-d}{2})} \succeq \frac{1}{\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{x}, \frac{R}{2})}.$$

□

We now estimate the volume of a ball of radius R, inside the horoball $\mathcal{H}$. We have

PROPOSITION 3.3. *There exists a constant $c = c(a, b, diam(\mathcal{C})) > 0$ such that*

$$vol(B_X(\mathbf{x}, R) \cap \mathcal{H}) \overset{c}{\succeq} \int_0^R \frac{\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{x}, t)}{\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{x}, \frac{t+R}{2})} dt.$$

To get this result, we need the following refinement of Proposition 2.3.

LEMMA 3.4. *There exists a constant $\Delta = \Delta(a, b, diam(\mathcal{C}))$ such that*

$$p(\mathcal{C}) \times \Big[(2t_p - R + \Delta)^+, (R - \Delta)^+\Big[\subset \Big(p(\mathcal{E}) \cap B_X(\mathbf{x}, R)\Big) \subset p(\mathcal{C}) \times \Big[(2t_p - R - \Delta)^+, R\Big].$$

Proof. Let $\Delta = c + diam(\mathcal{C})$, where c is the constant of Lemma 2.2. We first prove the right hand side inclusion. Let $\mathbf{z} = (\mathbf{z}_0, t) \in p(\mathcal{C}) \times \mathbb{R}^+$ and assume that this point belongs to $B_X(\mathbf{x}, R)$. Clearly $t \leq R$ as $t = B_\xi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) \leq d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) \leq R$. If $t_p \leq \frac{R+\Delta}{2}$ there is nothing left to prove ; on the other hand, if $t_p > \frac{R+\Delta}{2}$, then $2t_p - t \overset{c}{\sim} d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) < R$ hence $t \in [(2t_p - R + \Delta)^+, R]$. Let us now consider the case where $\mathbf{z} \in p(\mathcal{C}) \times [(2t_p - R + \Delta)^+, (R - \Delta)^+]$. We may assume that $R \geq \Delta$ and $t_p \leq R - \Delta$, otherwise there is nothing to prove. If $t \geq t_p$ we have $d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) \overset{c}{\sim} t \leq R - \Delta$, otherwise we have $d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) \overset{c}{\sim} 2t_p - t \leq 2t_p - (2t_p - R + \Delta)^+$; therefore, in both cases $\mathbf{z} \in B_X(\mathbf{x}, R)$. □

Proof of Proposition 3.3 . We simply write $\mathcal{A}(R) = \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{x}, R)$. Recall that

$$B_X(\mathbf{x}, R) \cap \mathcal{H} = \bigsqcup_{p \in \mathcal{P}} B_X(\mathbf{x}, R) \cap p(\mathcal{E}).$$

By Lemma 3.4, we have $B_X(\mathbf{x},R)\cap p(\mathcal{E})\subset p(\mathcal{C})\times[(2t_p-R-\Delta)^+,R]$. Then, we find

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}} vol\Big(B_X(\mathbf{x},R)\cap p(\mathcal{E})\Big) &= \sum_{t_p\leq R+\frac{\Delta}{2}}\int_{(2t_p-R-\Delta)^+}^{R}\mathcal{A}(t)dt\\ &= \sum_{t_p\leq R+\frac{\Delta}{2}}\int_{0}^{R}\mathcal{A}(t)1_{[(2t_p-R-\Delta)^+,+\infty[}(t)dt\end{aligned}$$

Now, as $d(\mathbf{x},p\mathbf{x})\overset{c}{\sim}2t_p\leq c\leq\Delta$, for every fixed $t\in[0,R]$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sharp\Big\{p\in\mathcal{P}/t_p\leq R+\frac{\Delta}{2}\text{ and }2t_p-R-\Delta\leq t\Big\} &\leq v_{\mathcal{P}}\Big(\mathbf{x},\frac{t+R+\Delta}{2}+\Delta\Big)\\ &\leq \frac{v^+}{\mathcal{A}(\frac{t+R+3\Delta}{2})}\\ &\preceq \frac{1}{\mathcal{A}(\frac{R+t}{2})},\end{aligned}$$

where we have successively used Proposition 3.2 and (9). This yields

$$vol(B_X(\mathbf{x},R)\cap\mathcal{H})\preceq\int_0^R\frac{\mathcal{A}(t)}{\mathcal{A}(\frac{t+R}{2})}dt.$$

We now prove the converse inequality. Again, by Proposition 3.4, we deduce

$$B_X(\mathbf{x},R)\cap p(\mathcal{E})\supset p(\mathcal{C})\times[(2t_p-R+\Delta)^+,R-\Delta].$$

We only consider those p's such that $\frac{R-\Delta}{2}\leq t_p\leq R-\Delta$; summing over these p's, we find

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\frac{R-\Delta}{2}\leq t_p\leq R-\Delta} vol\Big(B_X(\mathbf{x},R)\cap p(\mathcal{E})\Big) &= \sum_{\frac{R-\Delta}{2}\leq t_p\leq R-\Delta}\int_{2t_p-R-\Delta}^{R-\Delta}\mathcal{A}(t)dt\\ &\geq \sum_{\frac{R-\Delta}{2}\leq t_p\leq R-\Delta}\int_{R_0}^{R-\Delta}\mathcal{A}(t)1_{[2t_p-R+\Delta,R-\Delta]}(t)dt\end{aligned}$$

for any $R_0\geq 0$. Now, for every fixed $t\in[R_0,R-\Delta]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sharp\Big\{p\in\mathcal{P}/\frac{R-\Delta}{2}\leq t_p\leq R-\Delta\text{ and }2t_p-R+\Delta\leq t\Big\} &\geq v_{\mathcal{P}}\Big(\mathbf{x},t+R-2\Delta\Big)-v_{\mathcal{P}}\Big(\mathbf{x},R\Big)\\ &\geq \frac{v^-}{\mathcal{A}(\frac{t+R-2\Delta}{2})}-\frac{v^+}{\mathcal{A}(\frac{R}{2})}\\ &\geq \frac{1}{\mathcal{A}(\frac{t+R}{2})}\Big(v^-\frac{\mathcal{A}(\frac{t+R}{2})}{\mathcal{A}(\frac{t+R-2\Delta}{2})}-v^+\frac{\mathcal{A}(\frac{t+R}{2})}{\mathcal{A}(\frac{R}{2})}\Big)\\ &\geq \frac{1}{\mathcal{A}(\frac{t+R}{2})}\Big(v^-e^{-b(N-1)\Delta}-v^+e^{-a(N-1)R_0/2}\Big)\end{aligned}$$

by Proposition 3.2 and (9). Therefore, if R_0 is large enough, we find

$$vol\Big(B_X(\mathbf{x},R)\cap\mathcal{H}\Big)\succeq\int_{R_0}^{R-\Delta}\frac{\mathcal{A}(t)}{\mathcal{A}(\frac{t+R}{2})}dt.$$

We can replace this last integral by $\int_0^R \frac{\mathcal{A}(t)}{\mathcal{A}(\frac{t+R}{2})}dt$ since, $\int_{R-\Delta}^R \frac{\mathcal{A}(t)}{\mathcal{A}(\frac{t+R}{2})}dt$ is bounded in terms of a, b and Δ and for R large enough

$$\int_{R_0}^{R-\Delta} \frac{\mathcal{A}(t)}{\mathcal{A}(\frac{t+R}{2})}dt \geq \int_{R_0}^{2R_0} \frac{\mathcal{A}(t)}{\mathcal{A}(\frac{t+R}{2})}dt \asymp \frac{1}{\mathcal{A}(R/2)} \asymp \int_0^{R_0} \frac{\mathcal{A}(t)}{\mathcal{A}(\frac{t+R}{2})}dt.$$

□

As a direct consequence of Propositions 3.2 and 3.3, we obtain

COROLLARY 3.5. *For any $\epsilon > 0$ and $\mathbf{x} \in \partial\mathcal{H}$, we have*
i) if $\delta(\mathcal{P}) \geq 2\delta^-(\mathcal{P})$ then

$$e^{(\delta^-(\mathcal{P})-\epsilon)R} \preceq vol\Big(B_X(\mathbf{x}, R) \cap \mathcal{H})\Big) \preceq e^{2\Big(\delta(\mathcal{P})-\delta^-(\mathcal{P})+\epsilon\Big)R}$$

ii) if $\delta(\mathcal{P}) < 2\delta^-(\mathcal{P})$ then

$$e^{(\delta^-(\mathcal{P})-\epsilon)R} \preceq vol\Big(B_X(\mathbf{x}, R) \cap \mathcal{H})\Big) \preceq e^{2\Big(\delta(\mathcal{P})+\epsilon\Big)R}.$$

4. Growth of nonuniform lattices

We suppose now that the manifold X admits a nonuniform lattice Γ. Let us recall some well known geometrical properties of Γ proved in the general context of geometrically finite groups in ([**5**]). Since the volume of $M = X/\Gamma$ is finite, the *limit set* of Γ equals $X(\infty)$ and is the disjoint union of its *radial* subset and of finitely many orbits $\Gamma\xi_1, \ldots, \Gamma\xi_l$ of points, called *bounded parabolic fixed points*. By definition, a point ξ_i corresponds to a end of the manifold M and is fixed by a parabolic subgroup of Γ. Denote $\mathcal{P}_i$ the maximal parabolic subgroup fixing the point ξ_i. This group preserves any horoball $\mathcal{H}$ centered at ξ_i and acts cocompactly on the horosphere $\partial\mathcal{H}$. By Margulis' lemma (see [**20**]), there exist closed horoballs $\mathcal{H}_{\xi_1}, \ldots, \mathcal{H}_{\xi_l}$ centered respectively at $\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_l$, such that all the horoballs $\gamma.\mathcal{H}_{\xi_i}$, for $1 \leq i \leq l$ and $\gamma \in \Gamma$, are disjoint or coincide. We fix an origin $\mathbf{o} \in X$ and a convex Borel fundamental domain $\mathcal{D}$ in X for the action of Γ, containing the geodesic rays $[\mathbf{o}, \xi_1)$..., $[\mathbf{o}, \xi_l)$. For each $1 \leq i \leq l$, we set $\mathcal{E}_i = \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{H}_{\xi_i}$ and $\mathcal{C}_i = \mathcal{D} \cap \partial\mathcal{H}_{\xi_i}$. Those both sets are fundamental domains for the action of the group $\mathcal{P}_i$ respectively on $\mathcal{H}_{\xi_i}$ and $\partial\mathcal{H}_{\xi_i}$. Moreover, the set $\mathcal{C}_0 = \mathcal{D} \setminus \big(\cup_{i=1}^l \mathcal{E}_i\big)$, and hence each $\mathcal{C}_i$, is relatively compact. We may assume that $\mathbf{o}$ belongs to the interior of $\mathcal{C}_0$.

The quotient manifold M is therefore decomposed into the disjoint union of a relatively compact set C_0 and finitely many ends of finite volume $E_i = \mathcal{H}_{\xi_i}/\mathcal{P}_i$, which are the projections on M of the domains $\mathcal{C}_0$ and $\mathcal{E}_i$ respectively.

We first precise some bounds on the critical exponent $\delta(\Gamma)$ in terms of bounds on the curvature of X.

LEMMA 4.1. *We have $(N-1)a \leq \delta(\Gamma) \leq (N-1)b$.*

In particular, when X is the real hyperbolic space $\mathbb{H}_a^N$ of constant curvature $-a^2$, we have $\delta(\Gamma) = (N-1)a$ and hence $\delta(\Gamma) = \omega(\mathbb{H}_a^N)$.

Proof. The inequality $\delta(\Gamma) \leq (N-1)b$ follows from (3) and (1). It remains to prove the left hand side inequality of the Lemma

If $\delta(\Gamma) = \omega(X)$, the inequality follows from(1). Assume now $\delta(\Gamma) < \omega(X)$ and consider $s \in]\delta(\Gamma), \omega(X)[$. Inequality (2) implies

$$\int_{\mathcal{D}} e^{sd(\mathbf{o},\mathbf{x})} dv_X(\mathbf{x}) = +\infty$$

which, by the decomposition $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{C}_0 \cup \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{l} \mathcal{E}_i \right)$, is equivalent to

$$\max_{i\in\{1,\cdots,l\}} \int_{\mathcal{E}_i} e^{sd(\mathbf{o},\mathbf{x})} dv_X(\mathbf{x}) = +\infty. \tag{11}$$

Note now that for $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{E}_i$, we have $B_{\xi_i}(\mathbf{o},\mathbf{x}) \leq d(\mathbf{o},\mathbf{x}) \leq B_{\xi_i}(\mathbf{o},\mathbf{x}) + diam(\mathcal{C}_i)$ where $B_{\xi_i}(.,.)$ denotes the Busemann function centered at ξ_i. Therefore the integrals $\int_{\mathcal{E}_i} e^{sd(\mathbf{o},\mathbf{x})} dv_X(\mathbf{x})$ and $\int_{\mathcal{E}_i} e^{sB_{\xi_i}(\mathbf{o},\mathbf{x})} dv_X(\mathbf{x})$ are of the same nature.

By (8), we have

$$\int_{\mathcal{E}_i} e^{sB_{\xi_i}(\mathbf{o},\mathbf{x})} dv_X(\mathbf{x}) = \int_{d(\mathbf{o},\mathcal{C}_i)}^{+\infty} e^{st} \mu_t(\psi_{\xi_i,t}(\mathcal{C}_i)) dt \leq \mu_0(\mathcal{C}_i) \int_0^{+\infty} e^{t[s-(N-1)a]} \mathrm{d}t$$

and the last integral must be divergent for all $s \in]\delta(\Gamma), \omega(X)[$, so $\delta(\Gamma) \geq (N-1)a$. □

Recall that $v_X(\mathbf{o}, R)$ denotes the volume of the open ball $B_X(\mathbf{o}, R)$ and that $v_\Gamma(\mathbf{o}, R)$ represents the cardinality of the intersection of this ball with $\Gamma(\mathbf{o})$. The following estimate will be used to obtain a upper bound for $\delta(\Gamma)$.

PROPOSITION 4.2. *There exists a constant $\Delta = \Delta(a, b, diam(\mathcal{C}_0)) > 0$ such that, for all $R > 0$, we have*

$$v_X(\mathbf{o}, R-\Delta) \preceq v_\Gamma(\mathbf{o}, R) + \sum_{i=1}^{l} \sum_{n=0}^{[R]} v_\Gamma(\mathbf{o}, n+1) \times vol\Big(B_X(\mathbf{x}_i, R-n+\Delta) \cap \mathcal{H}_{\xi_i} \Big) \tag{12}$$

where $\mathbf{x}_i$ denotes the intersection of the geodesic ray $[\mathbf{o}, \xi_\mathbf{i})$ with the horosphere $\partial\mathcal{H}_{\xi_i}$.

Proof. Set $d_0 = diam(\mathcal{C}_0)$.We have

$$B_X(\mathbf{o}, R) = \Big(B_X(\mathbf{o}, R) \cap \Gamma.\mathcal{C}_0 \Big) \bigcup \left(\bigcup_{1\leq i\leq l} \Big(B_X(\mathbf{o}, R) \cap \Gamma.\mathcal{H}_{\xi_i} \Big) \right) \tag{13}$$

whence

$$B_X(\mathbf{o}, R) \cap \Gamma.\mathcal{C}_0 \quad \subset \bigcup_{\gamma\in B_\Gamma(\mathbf{o}, R+d_0)} \gamma(\mathcal{C}_0)$$

and

$$vol\Big(B_X(\mathbf{o}, R) \cap \Gamma.\mathcal{C}_0 \Big) \preceq v_\Gamma(R + d_0).$$

Now, for each $i \in \{1, ..., l\}$ we define a map on Γ as follows : for any $\gamma \in \Gamma$, let $x_{\gamma,i}$ be the intersection of the ray $[\mathbf{o}, \gamma(\xi_i))$ with the horosphere $\gamma(\partial\mathcal{H}_{\xi_i})$. Since $\mathcal{C}_i$ is a fundamental domain for the action of $\mathcal{P}_i$ on $\partial\mathcal{H}_{\xi_i}$ there exist a finite number of elements $\bar{\gamma}$ in $\gamma\mathcal{P}_i$ such that $x_{\gamma,i} \in \bar{\gamma}(\mathcal{C}_i)$. Choose one of those

elements and denote it by $\bar{\gamma}_i$. Let $\bar{\Gamma}_i$ be the set of all $\bar{\gamma}_i$ for γ in Γ. Since $d(x_{\gamma,i}, \bar{\gamma}_i \mathbf{o}) \leq d_0$, and since the angle at $x_{\gamma,i}$ between the geodesic segments $[x_{\gamma,i}, \mathbf{o}]$ and $[x_{\gamma,i}, x]$ is greater than $\pi/2$, by lemma 2.1 there exists a constant $d_1 > 0$ such that for every $\gamma \in \Gamma$ and $x \in \gamma \mathcal{H}_{\xi_i} \cap B_X(\mathbf{o}, R)$, we have :

$$d(\mathbf{o}, \bar{\gamma}_i \mathbf{o}) + d(\bar{\gamma}_i \mathbf{o}, x) - d_1 \leq d(\mathbf{o}, x).$$

We have by (13)

$$B_X(\mathbf{o}, R) \cap \Gamma.\mathcal{H}_{\xi_i} \subset \left(\bigcup_{0 \leq n \leq [R+d_0]} \bigcup_{\substack{\overline{\gamma} \in \overline{\Gamma}_i \\ n \leq d(\mathbf{o}, \overline{\gamma}\mathbf{o}) < n+1}} B_X(\overline{\gamma}\mathbf{o}, R - n + d_1) \cap \overline{\gamma}.\mathcal{H}_{\xi_i} \right).$$

For each i denote $\mathbf{x}_i$ the intersection of the geodesic ray $[\mathbf{o}, \xi_\mathbf{i})$ with the horosphere $\partial \mathcal{H}_{\xi_i}$. One has

$$vol\Big(B_X(\overline{\gamma}\mathbf{o}, R - n + d_1) \cap \overline{\gamma}.\mathcal{H}_{\xi_i}\Big) \leq vol\Big(B_X(\mathbf{x}_i, R - n + d_1 + d_0) \cap \mathcal{H}_{\xi_i}\Big),$$

while

$$\sharp\{\bar{\gamma} \in \bar{\Gamma}_i / n \leq d(\mathbf{o}, \bar{\gamma}.\mathbf{o}) < n + 1\} \leq v_\Gamma(\mathbf{o}, n + 1),$$

so

$$v_X(\mathbf{o}, R - d_0) \preceq v_\Gamma(\mathbf{o}, R) + \sum_{i=1}^{l} \sum_{n=0}^{[R]} v_\Gamma(\mathbf{o}, n+1) \times vol\Big(B_X(\mathbf{x}_i, R - n + d_1) \cap \mathcal{H}_{\xi_i}\Big).$$

The lemma follows with $\Delta \geq \max(d_0, d_1)$. □

Proposition 4.2 is crucial to establish Theorem 1.2 ; we first give an elementary proof of this result, in the case where X is 1/4-pinched.

4.1. Proof of Theorem 1.2 : the $\frac{1}{4}-$pinched curvature case. We prove here that if (X, g) is a complete, simply connected Riemannian manifold with 1/4-pinched negative curvature, then for any lattice $\Gamma \subset Is(X)$, we have $\delta(\Gamma) = \omega(X)$.

We use the notations of Proposition 4.2.

By (3), we need only to show that $\omega(X) \leq \delta(\Gamma)$. By Proposition 2.3, we know that for $r > 0$ the set $B_X(\mathbf{x}_i, r) \cap \mathcal{H}_{\xi_i}$ is included in the ball of radius $r/2 + c$ centered at the point $\psi_{\xi_i, r/2}(\mathbf{x}_i)$. Then, (12) leads to the following inequality

(14)

$$v_X(\mathbf{o}, R - \Delta) \preceq v_\Gamma(\mathbf{o}, R) + \sum_{n=0}^{[R]} v_\Gamma(\mathbf{o}, n+1) \times \sup_{\mathbf{x} / B_X(\mathbf{x}, \frac{R-n+\Delta}{2}) \subset \Theta} vol\Big(B_X\Big(\mathbf{x}, \frac{R - n + \Delta}{2}\Big)\Big).$$

From Bishop Gunther's theorem and the fact that $b^2 \leq 4a^2$, we have

$$vol\Big(B_X(\mathbf{x}, r) \cap \Theta\Big) \leq v_X(\mathbf{x}, r) \preceq e^{b(N-1)r} \preceq e^{2a(N-1)r},$$

for any $\mathbf{x} \in X$ and $r > 0$. We conclude that $\omega(X) \leq (N-1)a \leq \delta(\Gamma)$ using Lemma 4.1. □

Remark - The above proof uses in a crucial way Lemma 4.1 and it still works if we relax the pinching assumption as follows :

For any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a compact set $C_\epsilon \subset M$ such that the curvature on $M \setminus C_\epsilon$ belongs to $[-(4+\epsilon)a^2, -a^2]$.

However, this condition is much stronger than the $\left(\frac{1}{4+\epsilon}\right)$-pinching assumption and the proof of Corollary 1.3 requires the more precise estimates of the volume of balls obtained in the previous section.

4.2. Proof of Theorem 1.2 : the general case. We fix here a non uniform lattice $\Gamma \subset Is(X)$ and apply the results of Section 3 to each maximal parabolic subgroup $\mathcal{P}_i$ of Γ. We first set the

DEFINITION 4.3. Let $M = X/\Gamma$ be a complete Riemannian manifold of finite volume with $-b^2 \leq K_X \leq -a^2 < 0$ and with ends $E_1, ..., E_l$. For $1 \leq i \leq l$, the **cuspidal function** $\mathcal{F}_i$ associated with E_i is defined by

$$\forall \mathbf{x} \in X, \forall R > 0 \qquad \mathcal{F}_i(\mathbf{x}, R) = \int_0^R \frac{\mathcal{A}_i(\mathbf{x}, t)}{\mathcal{A}_i\Big(\mathbf{x}, \frac{t+R}{2}\Big)} dt$$

where $\mathcal{A}_i(\mathbf{x}, t)$ is the horospherical area function associated with E_i.

By (9), the growth rates $\omega^{\pm}(\mathcal{F}_i(\mathbf{x}, .))$ depend only on the ends E_i of M as for any points $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in X$ and any $R_0 > 0$ fixed, we have $\mathcal{F}_i(\mathbf{x}, R) \asymp \mathcal{F}_i(\mathbf{y}, R)$. Those functions are of major importance in order to estimate $v_X(\mathbf{x}, R)$; namely, we have the

PROPOSITION 4.4. *There exists $\Delta = \Delta(a, b, diam(\mathcal{C}_0)) > 0$ such that*

(i) $\quad v_X(\bullet, R + \Delta) \succeq v_\Gamma(\bullet, R) + \sum_{i=1}^{l} \mathcal{F}_i(\bullet, R)$

(ii) $\quad v_X(\bullet, R + \Delta) \preceq v_\Gamma(\bullet, R) + \sum_{i=1}^{l} v_\Gamma(\bullet, .) * \mathcal{F}_i(\bullet, .)(R)$

which leads to the

COROLLARY 4.5. *We have $\omega^{\pm}(X) = \max\Big(\delta(\Gamma), \omega^{\pm}(\mathcal{F}_1), ..., \omega^{\pm}(\mathcal{F}_l)\Big)$.*

Proof of Proposition 4.4. *Part (i).* We have

$$B_X(\mathbf{o}, R) \supset \bigsqcup_{\gamma \in B_\Gamma(\mathbf{o}, R-d_0)} \gamma(\mathcal{C}_0) \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{l} \left(B_X(\mathbf{o}, R) \cap \mathcal{H}_i\right).$$

On the other hand $B_X(\mathbf{o}, R) \cap \mathcal{H}_i \supset B_X(\mathbf{x}_i, R - d_0) \cap \mathcal{H}_i$, and by Proposition 3.3, we have

$$v_X(\mathbf{o}, R) \succeq v_\Gamma(\mathbf{o}, R - d_0) + \sum_{i=1}^{l} \mathcal{F}_i(\mathbf{x}_i, R)$$

with $\mathcal{F}_i(\mathbf{x}_i, R) \asymp \mathcal{F}_i(\mathbf{o}, R)$; the first inequality follows.

Part (ii) follows by plugging Proposition 3.3 in (12). □

Proof of Theorem 1.2 By Corollary 4.5, it is enough to show that $\omega(\mathcal{F}_i) \leq \delta(\Gamma)$ for $1 \leq i \leq l$. By Proposition 3.2, we have, for any $\epsilon > 0$:

$$\mathcal{A}_i(t) \preceq e^{-(2\delta^-(\mathcal{P})-\epsilon)t} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{A}_i\Big(\frac{t+R}{2}\Big) \succeq e^{-(\delta(\mathcal{P})+\epsilon)(t+R)}.$$

So, we obtain $\mathcal{F}_i(t) \preceq e^{(\delta(\mathcal{P})+\epsilon)R} \displaystyle\int_0^R e^{(\delta(\mathcal{P})-2\delta^-(\mathcal{P})+2\epsilon)t} dt \preceq e^{(\delta(\mathcal{P})+3\epsilon)R}$ as $\delta(\mathcal{P}) - 2\delta^-(\mathcal{P}) \leq 0$, therefore $\omega(\mathcal{F}_i) \leq \delta(\mathcal{P}) \leq \delta(\Gamma)$. □.

Proof of Corollary 1.3 Assume that $M = X/\Gamma$ is asymptotically $\frac{1}{4}$-pinched. Then, for any fixed $\epsilon > 0$ we know that outside a compact subset C_ϵ the curvature of M is between $-\beta^2$ and $-\alpha^2$, with $\beta^2 \leq (4+\epsilon)\alpha^2$. Therefore we have

$$e^{-\beta(N-1)t} \preceq \mathcal{A}_i(t) \preceq e^{-\alpha(N-1)t}$$

hence, by Proposition 3.2, we deduce that

$$\frac{\delta(\mathcal{P})}{\delta^-(\mathcal{P})} \leq \frac{\beta}{\alpha} \leq 2+\epsilon$$

for every maximal parabolic subgroup of Γ. As ϵ is arbitrary, we deduce that M is parabolically $\frac{1}{4}$-pinched, and we conclude by Theorem 1.2. □

Remark. We have seen that, under the assumptions of Theorem 1.2, we have $\omega(\mathcal{F}_i) \leq \delta(\Gamma)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq l$; in particular, $\omega(X)$ is a limit in this case.

5. An end with the leading role

We shall construct in this section a pinched, negatively curved surface $S = X/\Gamma$ of finite volume such that $\omega(X) > \delta(\Gamma)$. The surface we exhibit is homeomorphic to a 3-punctured sphere, and we shall deform a hyperbolic metric on one end E of S.
Our construction rests on two main ideas :

i) we can deform the metric in the end E varying the sectional curvature from α^2 to β^2 on different bands of E, in order that the function $\mathcal{F}$ associated to E satisfies $\omega(\mathcal{F}) > \delta(\mathcal{P})$.

ii) we set $\epsilon := \omega(\mathcal{F}) - \delta(\mathcal{P})$ and we show that the above deformation of the metric can be performed in such a way that $\delta(\Gamma) < \delta(\mathcal{P}) + \epsilon$ also.

By Corollary 4.5 we conclude that $\omega(X) > \delta(\Gamma)$.

Fix positive real numbers α and β such that $\beta > 2\alpha$. We can construct sequences of disjoint intervals $[p_n, q_n]$, $[r_n, s_n]$ included in $[\Delta^{n-1}, \Delta^n]$ (for some $\Delta > 1$), and a C^2 convex, decreasing function $\mathcal{A}(t)$ on $[\Delta, +\infty[$ whose restrictions to $[p_n, q_n]$ and $[r_n, s_n]$ coincide respectively with $e^{-\alpha t}$ and $e^{-\beta t}$. More precisely, we can arrange the points p_n, q_n, r_n and s_n in order that $q_n \geq p_n + 1$ and $t \in [p_n, q_n] \Leftrightarrow \frac{t+\Delta^n}{2} \in [r_n, s_n]$, and we can choose $\mathcal{A}$ such that $e^{-\beta t} \leq \mathcal{A}(t) \leq e^{-\beta t}$ and $\frac{\mathcal{A}''(t)}{\mathcal{A}(t)} \in [\alpha^2 - \eta, \beta^2 + \eta]$ for all $t \in [\Delta, +\infty[$ and some $\eta > 0$. The existence of such intervals and of the function $\mathcal{A}$ is rather technical and we postponed the details of proof to the Appendix (Section 6).

By construction, the function $\mathcal{F}(R) := \int_0^R \frac{\mathcal{A}(t)}{\mathcal{A}(\frac{t+R}{2})}\mathrm{d}t$ satisfies :

$$\omega(\mathcal{F}) \geq \limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{\Delta^n} \ln \int_{p_n}^{q_n} \frac{\mathcal{A}(t)}{\mathcal{A}(\frac{t+\Delta^n}{2})}\mathrm{d}t > \beta/2.$$

We can now construct the surface of Theorem 1.1. Start from a 3-punctured sphere S with a metric g_0 of finite volume and constant curvature $-\alpha^2$. Let $\Gamma = \pi_1(S)$ and let $\mathcal{P}$ be the maximal parabolic subgroup associated with the end E of S. Consider the horospherical parametrization $\sigma : [0,1[\times\mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathcal{E}$ of $\mathcal{E}$; with respect to these coordinates, the hyperbolic metric writes $g = e^{-2\alpha t}dx^2 + dt^2$. We now perturb g on $E_n = \sigma([0,1[\times[p_n, +\infty[)$ to obtain a new C^2-metric g_n such that $g_n = \mathcal{A}^2(t)dx^2 + dt^2$ on E_n, for $\mathcal{A}$ defined above. We shall denote by d and d_n the distances on X associated respectively to g and g_n and we let $\delta_n(\Gamma)$, $\delta_n(\mathcal{P})$ be the critical exponents of Γ and $\mathcal{P}$ relatively to the new metric g_n. Notice that $K_X = -\dfrac{\mathcal{A}''}{\mathcal{A}}$ is pinched between $-\beta^2-\eta$ and $-\alpha^2+\eta$; furthermore $\mathcal{A}(R)$ is precisely the horospherical area (length) function of $\mathcal{P}$, with respect to g_n, so $\delta_n(\mathcal{P}) = \beta/2$ for all n, by Proposition 3.2 (while $\delta_n^-(\mathcal{P}) \leq \alpha/2$). Since we know that $\omega(\mathcal{F}) = \beta/2 + \epsilon$ for some $\epsilon > 0$, it will be enough to show that :

PROPOSITION 5.1. *For n large enough, we have $\delta_n(\Gamma) \in]\delta_n(\mathcal{P}), \delta_n(\mathcal{P}) + \epsilon[$.*

Proof. Let p be a generator of $\mathcal{P}$ and choose another parabolic element $q \in \Gamma$ such that Γ is the free non abelian group over p and q. Fix $N \geq 2$; each element $\gamma \in \Gamma \setminus \{id\}$ can be written in a unique way as

$$\gamma = p^{l_1}q^{m_1}\cdots p^{l_k}q^{m_k}, \tag{15}$$

where $l_i, m_i \in \mathbb{Z}^*$ except for l_1 and m_k which may be zero. Given this decomposition, we select those l_i such that $|l_i| \geq N$, say $l_{i_1}, \cdots l_{i_r}$, and write

$$\gamma = Q_1 p^{l_{i_1}} Q_2 \cdots p^{l_{i_r}} Q_r \tag{16}$$

where each Q_i is a subword of the expression (15), containing powers of q and powers of p not exceeding N in absolute value. Note that decomposition (16) is still unique. We denote by $\mathcal{Q}_N$ the subset of elements $\gamma \in \Gamma$ which write simply $\gamma = Q_1$ in (16).

Now let $\mathbf{o} \in X$ and $\mathcal{D}$ be the Dirichlet domain for the action of Γ, centered at $\mathbf{o}$. Roughly speaking, the union of the geodesic segments

$$[\mathbf{o}, Q_1(\mathbf{o})], [Q_1(\mathbf{o}), Q_1 p^{l_{i_1}}(\mathbf{o})], \ \cdots\ , \ [Q_1 ... p^{l_{i_r}}(\mathbf{o}), \gamma(\mathbf{o})]$$

represents a quasigeodesic which stays close to $[\mathbf{o}, \gamma(\mathbf{o})]$ and each of its subsegments corresponds to the excursion of the geodesic loop γ alternatively outside or inside the cusp E. We now precise this argument.

As $K_X \leq -\alpha^2 + \eta$, there exits a minimal angle $\theta_0 > 0$ such that for all $\mathbf{x} \in p^{\pm 2}(\mathcal{D})$ and all $\mathbf{y} \in q^{\pm 1}(\mathcal{D})$, we have $\widehat{\mathbf{x}\,\mathbf{o}\,\mathbf{y}} \geq \theta_0$. Then, when $Q_1 \neq id$ in (16), by a ping-pong argument we deduce that $\angle_{\mathbf{o}}(Q_1^{-1}\mathbf{o}, p^{l_{i_1}}Q_2\cdots Q_r\mathbf{o}) \geq \theta_0$, as $l_{i_1} \geq N \geq 2$. Therefore, by Lemma 2.1, there exists a constant $d = d(\alpha, \theta_0) > 0$ such that

$$d_n(\mathbf{o}, \gamma(\mathbf{o})) \geq d_n(\mathbf{o}, Q_1(\mathbf{o})) + d_n(\mathbf{o}, p^{l_{i_1}}Q_2\cdots p^{l_{i_{r-1}}}Q_r(\mathbf{o})) - d$$

Repeating this argument yields

$$d_n(\mathbf{o},\gamma(\mathbf{o})) \geq \sum_{i=0}^{r} d_n(\mathbf{o},Q_i(\mathbf{o})) + \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} d_n(\mathbf{o},p^{l_{ij}}(\mathbf{o})) - 2rd.$$

Consequently
(17)

$$\sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma} e^{-sd_n(\mathbf{o},\gamma(\mathbf{o}))} \leq \sum_{\gamma\in\mathcal{Q}_N} e^{-sd_n(\mathbf{o},\gamma(\mathbf{o}))} + \sum_{r\geq 1} \left(e^{2sd} \sum_{|k|\geq N} e^{-sd_n(\mathbf{o},p^k(\mathbf{o}))} \sum_{\gamma\in\mathcal{Q}_N} e^{-sd_n(\mathbf{o},\gamma(\mathbf{o}))} \right)^r$$

If n is large enough with respect to N, every element of $\mathcal{Q}_N$ correspond to a geodesic loop staying in the part of S where the curvature is constant equal to $-\alpha^2$. For that choice of n anf for $s = \frac{\beta+\epsilon}{2}$, we have

$$\sum_{\gamma\in\mathcal{Q}_N} e^{-sd_n(\mathbf{o},\gamma\mathbf{o})} \leq \sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma} e^{-sd(\mathbf{o},\gamma\mathbf{o})} := A.$$

The latter series converges because the value of the critical exponent of any lattice in the space of constant curvature case $-\alpha^2$ is α and $\alpha < s$.
Furthermore

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{|k|\geq N} e^{-sd(\mathbf{o},p^k(\mathbf{o}))} &\preceq \sum_{m\geq d(\mathbf{o},p^N(\mathbf{o}))} v_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{o},m) e^{-sm} \\
&\preceq \sum_{m\geq d(\mathbf{o},p^N(\mathbf{o}))} \frac{e^{-sm}}{\mathcal{A}(\frac{m}{2})} \\
&\preceq \sum_{m\geq d(\mathbf{o},p^N(\mathbf{o}))} e^{-(s-\frac{\beta}{2})m} = \sum_{m\geq d(\mathbf{o},p^N(\mathbf{o}))} e^{-\epsilon m/2}
\end{aligned}$$

so that $\sum_{|k|\geq N} e^{-sd(\mathbf{o},p^k(\mathbf{o}))} \to 0$ when $N \to +\infty$. Then, we can choose N and n such that

$$\sum_{\gamma\in\mathcal{Q}_N} e^{-sd(\mathbf{o},\gamma(\mathbf{o}))} \leq A < +\infty \qquad \text{and} \qquad \left(e^{2sd} \sum_{|k|\geq N} e^{-sd(\mathbf{o},p^k(\mathbf{o}))} A \right) < 1.$$

For that choice, (17) implies that the Poincaré series associated with Γ converges at s and consequently : $\delta(\Gamma) \leq s < \delta(\Gamma) + \epsilon$.

Remark. Notice that the curvature of S is not asymptotically $\frac{1}{4}$-pinched as $\beta > 2\alpha$; but, letting $\alpha \to \beta/2$ and $\eta \to 0$, the metric can be choosen so that K_S is asymptotically $(\frac{1}{4+\epsilon})$-pinched, for any $\epsilon > 0$.

□

6. Appendix

Let t_0, t_1, t_2, t_3 be four real numbers satisfying $t_0 < t_1 < t_2 < t_3$. Denote by φ_1 a C^2 convex and decreasing function on $[t_0, t_1]$ and φ_2 a C^2 convex

and decreasing function on $[t_2, t_3]$. A straightforward geometric argument on epigraphs of φ_1 and φ_2 shows that the following inequalities :

$$\varphi_1'(t_1)(t_2 - t_1) \underset{(a)}{<} \varphi_2(t_2) - \varphi_1(t_1) \underset{(b)}{<} \varphi_2'(t_2)(t_2 - t_1) \tag{18}$$

are necessary and sufficient for the existence of a C^2 convex decreasing function ψ on $[t_0, t_3]$ such that $\psi_{|[t_0,t_1]} \equiv \varphi_1$ and $\psi_{|[t_2,t_3]} \equiv \varphi_2$.

LEMMA 6.1. *Let α, β two positive reals such that $\alpha < \beta$.*
(I) *Inequalities (18) are satisfied for $\varphi_1(t) = e^{-\alpha t}$ and $\varphi_2(t) = e^{-\beta t}$ when $t_2 - t_1 > \frac{1}{\alpha}$.*
(II) *Inequalities (18) are satisfied for $\varphi_1(t) = e^{-\beta t}$ and $\varphi_2(t) = e^{-\alpha t}$ when $t_2 > (\frac{\beta}{\alpha} + \epsilon)t_1$ for any $\epsilon > 0$.*

Proof. Case **(I)** :

$$(a) \Leftrightarrow e^{-\beta t_2 + \alpha t_1} + \alpha(t_2 - t_1) > 1$$

and the second inequality is satisfied when $t_2 - t_1 > \frac{1}{\alpha}$. Note that this condition is optimal if we want such an inequality to be satisfied for arbitrary large t_1 because with $u = t_2 - t_1$, this inequality becomes

$$e^{(\alpha-\beta)t_1 - \beta u} + \alpha u > 1$$

and this inequality cant be satisfied for small u when t_1 is too large.
With the previous notations,

$$(b) \Leftrightarrow e^{\beta u} e^{(\beta-\alpha)t_1} - \beta u - 1 > 0$$

and the latter inequality is always satisfied because $e^x - x - 1 > 0$ for all $x > 0$.

Case **(II)** :

$$(a) \Leftrightarrow e^{-\alpha t_2 + \beta t_1} + \beta(t_2 - t_1) > 1$$

and this second inequality is satisfied when $t_2 - t_1 > \frac{1}{\beta}$. The same remark as in the case (I).
With the previous notations too,

$$(b) \Leftrightarrow e^{\alpha u} e^{(\alpha-\beta)t_1} - \alpha u - 1 > 0$$

with $u = t_2 - t_1$. If we set $t_2 = (1 + x)t_1 + f(t_1)$ and substitute in the last term, a necessary condition in order to realise (b) is $(x + 1) \geq \frac{\beta}{\alpha}$ and if we set $(x + 1) = \frac{\beta}{\alpha}$ and replace, we get $e^{\alpha f(t_1)} - (\beta - \alpha)t_1 - f(t_1) - 1 > 0$. The conclusion follows.

□

LEMMA 6.2. *Let $t_0 < t_1 < t_2 < t_3$ and $\eta > 0$. There exists $A = A(\eta, \alpha, \beta) > 0$ and $B = B(\alpha, \beta) > 0$ such that if $t_2 > A.t_1$ and $t_0 > B$,*
(I) *There exists a C^2 convex and decreasing function ψ on $[t_0, t_3]$ satisfying :*

$$(\mathbf{C_1}) \begin{cases} \forall\, t \in [t_0, t_1], & \psi(t) = e^{-\alpha t} \\ \forall\, t \in [t_2, t_3], & \psi(t) = e^{-\beta t} \\ \forall\, t \in [t_0, t_3], & \alpha^2 - \eta \leq \frac{\psi''(t)}{\psi(t)} \leq \beta^2 - \eta \quad \text{and} \quad \psi(t) \geq e^{-\beta t} \end{cases}$$

(II) *There exists a C^2 convex and decreasing function ψ on $[t_0, t_3]$ such that we have*

$$(\mathbf{C_2}) \begin{cases} \forall\, t \in [t_0, t_1], & \psi(t) = e^{-\beta t} \\ \forall\, t \in [t_2, t_3], & \psi(t) = e^{-\alpha t} \\ \forall\, t \in [t_0, t_3], & \alpha^2 - \eta \leq \frac{\psi''(t)}{\psi(t)} \leq \beta^2 + \eta \quad \textit{and} \quad \psi(t) \geq e^{-\beta t} \end{cases}$$

Proof. By the previous remark, if we choose $A > \frac{\beta}{\alpha}$ and $B > \frac{1}{\beta - \alpha}$, inequalities (18) are satisfied. In both cases, set

$$\psi(t) = e^{-t\varphi(t)} \quad t \in [t_0, t_3]$$

where φ is constant on $[t_0, t_1]$ and $[t_2, t_3]$ (depending in an obvious way on case I or II). Consider a C^2 function $\phi : [0,1] \to [\alpha, \beta]$; set $s = \lambda(t - t_1)$ where $\lambda = \frac{1}{t_2 - t_1}$ and put $\varphi(t) = \phi(s)$ for $t \in [t_1, t_2]$. A straightforward calculus gives, for $s \in [0,1]$:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\psi''(t)}{\psi(t)} &= \left((s\phi(s))' + \lambda t_1 \phi'(s)\right)^2 - \lambda\left(2\phi'(s) + (s + \lambda t_1)\phi''(s)\right) \\ &= (k'(s))^2 + \lambda t_1 (2k'(s)\phi'(s) + \lambda(t_1(\phi'(s))^2 - \phi''(s))) - \lambda(2\phi'(s) + s\phi''(s)) \\ &= (k'(s))^2 + \theta(\lambda) \end{aligned}$$

where $k(s) := s\phi(s)$ and θ is a function such that $\theta(\lambda) \to 0$ when $\lambda \to 0$.
Set $M_i = \sup_{s \in [0,1]} |\phi^{(i)}(s)|$ for $i = 1, 2$ (which depend only on (α, β)) and $C = \frac{1}{8(\beta+1)(M_1 + M_2 + \beta)}$. The previous equalities implie

$$(k'(s))^2 - \frac{\eta}{2} \leq \frac{\psi''(t)}{\psi(t)} \leq (k'(s))^2 + \frac{\eta}{2} \tag{19}$$

when $\lambda t_1 < C.\eta$ i.e. for $t_2 > (1 + \frac{1}{C.\eta})t_1 := A.t_1$. We show in both cases that we can choose a C^2 function ϕ with values in $[\alpha, \beta]$ such that for all $s \in [0,1]$:

$$\alpha - \frac{\eta}{4} \leq k'(s) \leq \beta + \frac{\eta}{4}. \tag{20}$$

Case **(I)** : choose $\phi : [0,1] \to [\alpha, \beta]$ non decreasing satisfying $\phi(0) = \alpha$, $\phi(1) = \beta$ and $\phi'(0) = \phi'(1) = \phi''(0) = \phi''(1) = 0$. Then, the function φ can be extend on $[t_0, t_3]$ in a C^2 manner and on $[0,1]$, we have $k'(s) = (s\phi(s))' = \phi(s) + s\phi'(s) \geq \alpha$ and $\phi(s) \leq \beta$ so that $\psi''/\psi \geq \alpha^2 - \eta$ and $\psi(t) \geq e^{-\beta t}$ are both satisfied on $[t_0, t_3]$. It implies in particular that the function ψ constructed is convex on $[t_0, t_3]$. Note that in this case, the inequality $\lambda.t_1 < C\eta$ must be satisfied, for, in the second expression of $\frac{\psi''}{\psi}$, the term $(t_1(\phi'(s))^2 - \phi''(s))$ is negative in the neighborhood of $s_0 = \inf\{s\,;\, \phi'(s) = 0\}$.
It is left to show that ϕ or equivalently k can be choosen so that $k'(s) = \phi(s) + s\phi'(s) \leq \beta + \frac{\eta}{4}$. The boundary conditions for ϕ up to the first order translate to $k(0) = 0$, $k(1) = \beta$, $k'(0) = \alpha$ and $k'(1) = \beta$. For $\epsilon_1 \in]0, 1[$, consider the C^0-piecewise affine function $\bar{k}$ defined on $[0, \epsilon_1]$ by $\bar{k}(t) = \alpha.t$, on $[1 - \epsilon_1, 1]$ by $\bar{k}(t) = \beta.t$ and affine on $[\epsilon_1, 1 - \epsilon_1]$. If we choose ϵ_1 small enough (depending on η and α), we can smooth $\bar{k}$ to obtain a C^2 function k on $[0,1]$ in such a way that the dérivative k' satisfies

$$\begin{cases} k'(s) = \alpha & s \in [0, \epsilon_1/2] \\ k'(s) \leq \beta + \eta/(4\beta) & s \in [\epsilon_1/2, 1 - \epsilon_1/2] \\ k'(s) = \beta & s \in [1 - \epsilon_1/2, 1] \end{cases}$$

so that $(k'(s))^2 \leq \beta^2 - \eta/2$.

Case **(II)** : this case is similar. We choose $\phi : [0,1] \to [\alpha, \beta]$ non increasing satisfying $\phi(0) = \beta$, $\phi(1) = \alpha$ and $\phi'(0) = \phi'(1) = \phi''(0) = \phi''(1) = 0$, or equivalently (up to the first order), we choose $k(s) = s\phi(s)$ satisfying $k(0) = 0$, $k(1) = \int_0^1 k'(s)ds = \alpha$, $k'(0) = \beta$ and $k'(1) = \alpha$. The construction is symmetric to the previous one. In both cases, the desired inequalities : (20), (19) and $e^{-\alpha t} \leq \psi(t) \leq e^{-\alpha t}$ are satisfied. □

Let us now construct the sequences of intervals $[p_n, q_n]$, $[r_n, s_n]$ and the function $\mathcal{A}$ we used in Section 4. Let $A > 1$ and $B > 0$ given by Lemma 6.2. We set

$$\begin{cases} p_n = (1-\lambda_0)\Delta^{n-1} + \lambda_0\Delta^n \quad and \quad r_n = \frac{p_n + \Delta^n}{2} \\ q_n = (1-\mu_0)\Delta^{n-1} + \mu_0\Delta^n \quad and \quad s_n = \frac{q_n + \Delta^n}{2} \end{cases}$$

for Δ, λ_0 and μ_0 to be defined.

Fix (λ_0, μ_0) in the (nonempty) set $]0,1[^2 \cap \{(\lambda, \mu) \ ; \ 1 + \lambda - 2A\mu > 0 \ \wedge \ \mu > \lambda\}$). The polynomial function $P(x) = 2\lambda_0 x^2 + ((2-A) - 2\lambda_0 - A\mu_0)x - A(1-\mu_0)$ tends to infinity as $x \to +\infty$; thus, we can choose a positive real number Δ such that both inequalities

$$\Delta > \frac{2A - 1 + \lambda_0 - 2A\mu_0}{1 + \lambda_0 - 2A\mu_0} \tag{21}$$

$$P(q_0) > 0 \tag{22}$$

are satisfied.

Inequality (21) insures that $r_n > Aq_n$ and inequality (22) insures that $p_{n+1} > As_n$. By Lemma 6.2, there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and a C^2-convex and decreasing function $\mathcal{A}$ on $[\Delta^{n_0 - 1}, +\infty[$ satisfying $\frac{\mathcal{A}''(t)}{\mathcal{A}(t)} \geq \alpha^2 - \eta$ and $\mathcal{A}(t) \geq e^{-\beta t}$ for all $t \in [\Delta^{n_0-1}, +\infty[$, and such that for $n \geq n_0$, we have :

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{A}(t) = e^{-\alpha t} & \forall\, t \in [p_n, q_n] \\ \mathcal{A}(t) = e^{-\beta t} & \forall\, t \in [r_n, s_n]. \end{cases}$$

Note that by construction $t \in [p_n, q_n] \Leftrightarrow \frac{t + R_n}{2} \in [r_n, s_n]$.

Bibliographie

[1] Babillot M., Feres R., Zeghib A. *Rigidité, groupe fondamental et dynamique*, Panorama et synthèse. **13** SMF (2002).

[2] Ballmann W., Gromov M., Schroeder V. *Manifolds of non positive curvature*, Progress in Math. **61** Birkhäuser, Boston (1985).

[3] Beardon A.F. *The exponent of convergence of Poincaré series*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) vol. 18 (1968), pp 461-483.

[4] Besson G., Courtois G., Gallot S. *Entropies et rigidités des espaces localement symétriques de courbure strictement négative*, Geometric and Functional Analysis, Vol. 5, n° 5 (1995), pp 732-799.

[5] Bowditch B.H. *Geometrical finiteness with variable negative curvature*, Duke Math. J. vol. 77 (1995), pp 229-274.

[6] Bowditch B.H. *Discrete parabolic groups*, J. Diff. Geometry 8, (1993), pp 559-583.

[7] Buser P., Karcher H. *Gromov's almost flat manifolds*, Astérisque 81, S.M.F. (1981).

[8] Corlette K., Iozzi A. *Limit sets of isometry groups of exotic hyperbolic spaces*, Trans. A. M. S.vol. 3511999), n. 4, pp 1507-1530.

[9] Dal'bo F., Otal J.P., Peigné M., *Séries de Poincaré des groupes géométriquement finis*, Israel Jour. Math. 118, (2000), pp 109-124.

[10] Eberlein P. *Surfaces of non positive curvature*, Memoirs AMS **218** (1979).

[11] Eberlein P. *Geometry of nonpositively curved manifolds*, Chicago Lectures in Mathematics.

[12] Eberlein P., O'Neill B. *Visibility manifolds*, Pac. J. Math. **46** (1973) pp 45-110.

[13] Eskin A., McMullen C. *Mixing, counting and equidistribution in Lie groups*, (1995) pp 181-209.

[14] Gallot S., Hulin D., Lafontaine J. *Riemannian Geometry*, Springer-Verlag Universitext 2nd Edition.

[15] Helgason S. *Differential geometry , Lie groups and Symmetric Spaces*, Graduate Studies in mathematics vol. 34 , (1978).

[16] Heinze E., Im Hof H.C. *Geometry of horospheres*, J. Diff. Geom. vol. 12, (1977) pp 481-491.

[17] Manning A. *Topological entropy for geodesic flows*, Annals of Mathematics, **110** (1979), pp 567-573.

[18] Otal J.P. ., Peigné M. *On some exotic kleinians groups*, Preprint.

[19] Roblin T. *Sur la fonction orbitale des groupes discrets en courbure négative*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **52** (2002) n°1, pp 145-151.

[20] Roblin T. *Ergodicité et équidistribution en courbure négative*, Mémoires S.M.F. n.95 (2003).

[21] Sullivan D. *The density at infinity of a discrete group of hyperbolic motions*, Publ. Math. IHES, vol. 50, (1979), pp 171-202.