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# DIOPHANTINE SETS AND DIRICHLET IMPROVABILITY 

ANTOINE MARNAT<br>MOSCOW CENTER OF FUNDAMENTAL AND APPLIED MATHEMATICS


#### Abstract

This note pushes further the discussion about relations between Dirichlet improvable, badly approximable and singular points held in 1 by considering Diophantine sets extending the notion of badly approximability.


## 1. Introduction

The aim of this paper is to extend slightly the main result of [1] questioning relations between Dirichlet improvability, badly approximability and singularity. We first provide a short description of this setting and definitions.

For $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we denote $\langle x\rangle:=\min \{|x-z| \mid z \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ the distance from $x$ to a nearest integer. For $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$, we denote $\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y}:=x_{1} y_{1}+\cdots+x_{n} y_{n}$ the usual scalar product.

The celebrated Dirichlet's Theorem, root of Diophantine approximation, reads as follows.
Theorem 1.1 (Dirichlet, 1842). Let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$. For every $Q>1$ there exists $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n}$ such that

$$
0<|\mathbf{q}| \leqslant Q \quad \text { and } \quad\langle\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{q}\rangle \leqslant Q^{-n} .
$$

A main interest in Diophantine approximation is to question when and how Dirichlet's theorem can be improved. This lead Davenport and Schmidt [6] to call a given $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ Dirichlet improvable if there exists $\varepsilon \in(0,1)$ such that for all sufficiently large $Q$, there exists $\mathbf{q}$ with

$$
\begin{equation*}
0<|\mathbf{q}| \leqslant Q \quad \text { and } \quad\langle\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{q}\rangle \leqslant \varepsilon Q^{-n} . \tag{DI}
\end{equation*}
$$

We denote by $\mathbf{D I}_{n}(\varepsilon)$ the set of $\mathbf{x}$ satisfying (DI), so that the set of Dirichlet improvable numbers is

$$
\mathbf{D I}_{n}=\bigcup_{\varepsilon \in(0,1)} \mathbf{D I}_{n}(\varepsilon) .
$$

Furthermore, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ is called singular if it is in $\mathbf{D I}_{n}(\varepsilon)$ for $\varepsilon$ arbitrarily small. Denote

$$
\mathbf{S i n g}_{n}:=\bigcap_{\varepsilon \in(0,1)} \mathbf{D I}_{n}(\varepsilon) .
$$

On the opposite, we say that $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ is badly approximable if there exists $\varepsilon=\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}) \in(0,1)$ such that

$$
\langle\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{x}\rangle \geqslant \varepsilon|\mathbf{q}|^{-n}
$$

for all $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$. We denote the set of badly approximable numbers $\mathbf{B a d}_{n}$.

[^0]A very natural question is the size and relation between these sets. Regarding sizes, it is well known that $\mathbf{D I}_{n}, \operatorname{Bad}_{n}$ and $\mathbf{S i n g}_{n}$ have 0 Lebesgue measure. The set $\mathbf{B a d}_{n}$ has full Hausdorff dimension, hence $\mathbf{D I}_{n}$ as well:

$$
\operatorname{dim}_{H}\left(\mathbf{B a d}_{n}\right)=\operatorname{dim}_{H}\left(\mathbf{D} \mathbf{I}_{n}\right)=n .
$$

For $\mathbf{S i n g}_{m}$, the study of the Hausdorff dimension is much more involved. The result requires the powerful variational principle in parametric geometry of numbers by Das, Fishman, Simmons and Urbański [7), extending to a wider setting (including ours: approximation to a linear form) a brillant result by Cheung and Chevallier [4] for simultaneous approximation.

$$
\operatorname{dim}_{H}\left(\boldsymbol{\operatorname { S i n g }}_{n}\right)=\frac{n^{2}}{n+1}, \quad \text { for } n \geqslant 2
$$

Regarding relations, we have the inclusion of the disjoint union $\mathbf{B a d}_{n} \sqcup \mathbf{S i n g}_{n} \subset \mathbf{D I}_{n}$. When $n=1$, singular reals are the rationals and the last inclusion is an equality. In higher dimension, one can ask about the set

$$
\mathcal{F} \mathcal{S}_{n}:=\mathbf{D I}_{n} \backslash\left(\operatorname{Bad}_{n} \sqcup \mathbf{S i n g}_{n}\right) .
$$

This set is studied in [1], where it is proved to be uncountable. However, it is probably far from the truth and one conjectures

Conjecture 1.2. $\operatorname{dim}_{H}\left(\mathcal{F} \mathcal{S}_{n}\right)=n$.
Actually, in [1] the result is finer than just uncountability. This requires the definition of exponents of Diophantine approximation. Namely, for $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{m}$, we define $\omega(\mathbf{x})$ as the supremum of positive reals $w$ such that

$$
0<|\mathbf{q}| \leqslant Q, \quad\langle\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{x}\rangle \leqslant Q^{-w}
$$

has integer solution $\mathbf{q}$ for arbitrarily large $Q$.
This exponent is usually referred to as exponent of Diophantine approximation to a linear form. It can take any value in the interval $[n, \infty]$. The main result in [1] asserts that there are uncountably many $\mathrm{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ in

$$
\left(\mathbf{D I}_{n}(\varepsilon) \backslash \mathbf{D I}_{n}\left(c_{n} \varepsilon\right)\right) \backslash\left(\mathbf{B a d}_{n} \sqcup \mathbf{S i n g}_{n}\right)
$$

with prescribed exponent $\omega(\mathbf{x}) \in[n, \infty]$. Here $c_{n}$ is an explicit constant. The exclusion of $\operatorname{Sing}_{n}$ is already included in the exclusion of $\mathbf{D I}_{n}\left(c_{n} \varepsilon\right)$, but we express this set to enlighten its link to $\mathcal{F} \mathcal{S}_{n}$.
The motivation of this paper is the obvious observation that $\mathbf{x} \notin \mathbf{B a d}_{n}$ if $\omega(\mathbf{x})>n$. This leads to consider the following notion : fix dimension $n$ and let $\varepsilon \in(0,1)$ and finite $w \geqslant n$. We define the $(\varepsilon, w)$-Diophantine set

$$
\mathcal{D}_{w}(\varepsilon):=\left\{\left.\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n}|\langle\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{x}\rangle \geqslant \varepsilon| \mathbf{q}\right|^{-w}>0, \quad \text { for all } \mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{N}^{n}\right\}
$$

and denote $\mathcal{D}_{w}:=\bigcup_{\varepsilon \in(0,1)} \mathcal{D}_{w}(\varepsilon)$. One can see that $\mathcal{D}_{n}=\operatorname{Bad}_{n}$.
These Diophantine sets play a role in dynamical systems. For example they describe the Diophantine condition in small divisors problems with applications to KAM theory, AubryMather theory, conjugation of circle diffeomorphisms, and so on (see [2, [5, 10, 13, 20]).

Our main theorem reads as follows.

Theorem 1.3. Fix the dimension $n \geqslant 2$, a finite exponent $w>n$, parameters $\varepsilon, \nu \in(0,1)$ and the constants $c_{n}=e^{-20(n+1)^{3}(n+10)}$ and $c_{n}^{\prime}=e^{-20(n+1)^{2}(w+1)(n+10)}$. Then

- there exists uncountably many

$$
\mathbf{x} \in\left(\mathbf{D I}_{n}(\varepsilon) \backslash \mathbf{D I}_{n}\left(c_{n} \varepsilon\right)\right) \backslash \mathcal{D}_{w}
$$

with $\omega(\mathbf{x})=w$,

- there exists uncountably many

$$
\mathbf{x} \in\left(\mathbf{D I}_{n}(\varepsilon) \backslash \mathbf{D I}_{n}\left(c_{n} \varepsilon\right)\right) \cap\left(\mathcal{D}_{w}(\nu) \backslash \mathcal{D}_{w}\left(c_{n}^{\prime} \nu\right)\right)
$$

As discussed in [1], the constants $c_{n}$ and $c_{n}^{\prime}$ are not optimized.
So far, we considered only approximation to a linear form. An analogous argumentation applies for simultaneous approximation, where we replace (DI) by

$$
0<q<Q \text { and }\|q \mathbf{x}\| \leqslant \varepsilon Q^{-1 / m}
$$

and $\mathcal{D}_{w}(\varepsilon)$ by

$$
\mathcal{D}_{\lambda}(\varepsilon):=\left\{\left.\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{m}|\|q \mathbf{x}\| \geqslant \varepsilon| q\right|^{-\lambda}>0\right\}
$$

where $\|$.$\| is the distance to a nearest integer point. We get uncountably many points \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{m}$ in

$$
\mathbf{x} \in\left(\mathbf{D} \mathbf{I}_{n}(\varepsilon) \backslash \mathbf{D I}_{n}\left(c_{n} \varepsilon\right)\right) \backslash \mathcal{D}_{\lambda}
$$

with exponent of simultaneous approximation $\lambda$ and uncountably many $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{m}$ in the intersection

$$
\mathbf{x} \in\left(\mathbf{D I}_{n}(\varepsilon) \backslash \mathbf{D I}_{n}\left(c_{n} \varepsilon\right)\right) \cap\left(\mathcal{D}_{\lambda}(\nu) \backslash \mathcal{D}_{\lambda}\left(c_{n}^{\prime} \nu\right)\right)
$$

One could also consider approximation by rational subspaces of dimension exactly $d$, for $0 \leqslant d<n$, as introduced by Laurent [9] following Schmidt [14]. However, their usual study via compounds convex bodies involves constants depending on $\mathbf{x}$ (See [12, Proposition 3.1] or [3, §4]) that seem to break our proof. See [1] for more discussion about the sets $\mathbf{D I}_{n}$, $\mathbf{B a d}_{n}$ and $\mathbf{S i n g}_{n}$ related to these approximation settings.

The proof of Theorem 1.3 relies on the parametric geometry of numbers and Roy's fundamental theorem [11]. We provide a short introduction to parametric geometry of numbers in Section 2, and prove our main theorem in Section 3 ,

## 2. Parametric geometry of numbers

Parametric geometry of numbers was developped by Schmidt and Summerer [18, 19, answering a question of Schmidt [15. It was pushed by a fundamental theorem of Roy [11, that was quantified and extended to a matrix setting by Das, Fishman, Simmons and Urbański [7.

Fix dimension $n>1$ and $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$. Consider the convex body with parameter $q \geqslant 0$

$$
\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{x}}\left(e^{q}\right):=\left\{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}| | y_{i}|\leqslant 1,| \mathbf{y} \cdot(1, \mathbf{x}) \leqslant e^{-q}\right\}
$$

and its $d$ th successive minima

$$
\lambda_{\mathbf{x}, d}(q):=\lambda_{d}\left(\mathbb{Z}^{n+1}, \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{x}}\left(e^{q}\right)\right)
$$

for any $d$ between 1 and $n+1$. Following Schmidt and Summerer, we consider the successive minima map consisting of their logs

$$
\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{x}}:[0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n+1}: q \mapsto \mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{x}}(q):=\left(L_{\mathbf{x}, 1}(q), \ldots, L_{\mathbf{x}, n+1}(q)\right)
$$

where $L_{\mathbf{x}, d}(q):=\log \lambda_{\mathbf{x}, d}(q)$. It appears that the map $\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{x}}$ encodes Diophantine properties of x .

Proposition 2.1. Fix dimension $n$ and $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$.

- $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{D I}_{n}(\varepsilon)$ if and only if for all sufficiently large $q$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{q}{n+1}-L_{\mathbf{x}, 1}(q) \geqslant-\frac{\log (\varepsilon)}{n+1} \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

- $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}_{w}(\varepsilon)$ if and only if for all sufficiently large $q$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{q}{w+1}-L_{\mathbf{x}, 1}(q) \leqslant-\frac{\log (\varepsilon)}{w+1} \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

- $\liminf _{q \rightarrow \infty} \frac{L_{\mathbf{x}, 1}(q)}{q}=\frac{1}{1+\omega(\mathbf{x})}$

See [12, Proposition 3.1] and [1, Lemma 2.1] for proofs.
The following notion of system was introduced by Roy [12, Definition 4.5]. The latter approach exactly the familly of successive minima maps.
Definition 2.2. Be $I$ a subinterval of $[0, \infty]$ with nonempty interior. A system on $I$ is a continuous linear map $\mathbf{P}=\left(P_{1}, \ldots, P_{n+1}\right): I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ with the following properties.
(i) For each $q \in I, 0 \leqslant P_{1}(q) \leqslant P_{2}(q) \leqslant \cdots \leqslant P_{n+1}(q)$ and $P_{1}(q)+P_{2}(q)+\cdots+P_{n+1}(q)=$ $q$.
(ii) If $I^{\prime} \subset I$ is a nonempty open subinterval on which $\mathbf{P}$ is differentiable, then there exists integers $r_{1}, r_{2}$ with $1 \leqslant r_{1} \leqslant r_{2} \leqslant n+1$ such that $P_{r_{1}}, \ldots, P_{r_{2}}$ coincide on $I^{\prime}$ and have slope $\frac{1}{r_{2}-r_{1}+1}$ while all other component $P_{i}$ are constant on $I^{\prime}$.
(iii) If $q$ is an interior point of $I$ at which $\mathbf{P}$ is not differentiable, and if $r_{1}, r_{2}, s_{1}, s_{2}$ are integers such that

$$
P_{i}^{\prime}\left(q^{-}\right)=\frac{1}{r_{2}-r_{1}+1} \quad\left(r_{1} \leqslant i \leqslant r_{2}\right) \text { and } P_{j}^{\prime}\left(q^{+}\right)=\frac{1}{s_{2}-s_{1}+1} \quad\left(s_{1} \leqslant j \leqslant s_{2}\right)
$$

and if $r_{1} \leqslant s_{2}$ then $P_{r_{1}}(q)=\cdots=P_{s_{2}}(q)$
Roy's fundamental theorem reads as follows [12, Corollary 4.7], [11, Theorems $1.3 \& 1.8]$.
Theorem 2.3 (Roy, 2015). Fix dimension $n \geqslant 1$ and $q_{0} \geqslant 0$. For each $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$, there exists a system $\mathbf{P}:\left[q_{0}, \infty\right) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ such that $L_{\mathbf{x}}-\mathbf{P}$ is bounded on $\left[q_{0}, \infty\right)$. Conversely, for each system $\mathbf{P}:\left[q_{0}, \infty\right) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, there exists a $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ such that $L_{\mathbf{x}}-\mathbf{P}$ is bounded. In particular, for each $q \geqslant q_{0}$ and a constant $R_{n}$

$$
\left|L_{\mathbf{x}}-\mathbf{P}\right| \leqslant R_{n}
$$

The constant $R_{n}$ induces the constants $c_{n}=e^{4(n+1) R_{n}}$ and $c_{n}^{\prime}=e^{4(w+1) R_{n}}$ in Theorem 1.3 .

We call two systems $\mathbf{P}_{1}$ and $\mathbf{P}_{2}$ non-equivalent if there exists $q$ such that $\left|\mathbf{P}_{1}(q)-\mathbf{P}_{2}(q)\right|>$ $2 C_{n}$. No point in $\mathbb{R}^{n}$ has successive minima map close to two non-equivalent systems in the sense of Theorem 2.3

## 3. Proof of Theorem 1.3

Fix dimension $n>1$, exponent $w>n$ and $\varepsilon, \nu \in(0,1)$. In view of Theorem 2.3 and Proposition 2.1, the proof of Theorem 1.3 reduces to the construction of uncountably many non-equivalent systems satisfying

- $\liminf _{q \rightarrow \infty} \frac{P_{1}(q)}{q}=\frac{1}{1+w}$,
- $\liminf _{q \rightarrow \infty}\left(\frac{q}{n+1}-P_{1}(q)\right)=-\frac{\log (\varepsilon)}{n+1}+2 R_{n}$,
- Either $\lim \sup _{q \rightarrow \infty}\left(\frac{q}{w+1}-P_{1}(q)\right)=\left(-\frac{\log (\nu)}{w+1}+2 R_{n}\right)$
or $\lim \sup _{q \rightarrow \infty}\left(\frac{q}{w+1}-P_{1}(q)\right)=\infty$.
Note that the second and third inequalities provide the definition of the constants $c_{n}:=$ $e^{4(n+1) R_{n}}$ and $c_{n}^{\prime}=e^{4(w+1) R_{n}}$.

Choose a parameter $\delta \in(0,1)$ that will provide uncountability. We first construct elementary systems $\mathbf{P}_{k}^{\delta}$ on intervals $\left[q_{k}, q_{k+1}\right]$. Denote $\alpha:=-\frac{\log (\varepsilon)}{n+1}+2 R_{n}$ and $\beta_{k}:=\left(-\frac{\log (\nu)}{w+1}+2 R_{n}\right)$ or $\log q_{k}$. Figure $\mathbb{1}$ illustrates the construction.

At $q_{k}$, we fix $P_{1}\left(q_{k}\right)=\cdots=P_{n}\left(q_{k}\right)=\frac{q_{k}}{n+1}-\alpha$ and $P_{n+1}\left(q_{k}\right)=\frac{q_{k}}{n+1}+n \alpha$.
Define

$$
\begin{aligned}
p_{k} & =q_{k} \frac{w+1}{n+1}-(w+1)\left(\alpha-\beta_{k}\right), & q_{k+1} & =\frac{w}{n} q_{k}+\frac{(w-1)(n+1)}{n}\left(\alpha-\beta_{k}\right), \\
r_{k} & =q_{k}+\left(n^{2}-1\right) \alpha, & u_{k} & =p_{k}-(n+1) \alpha,, \\
s_{k}^{M} & =r_{k}+n \log q_{k}, & s_{k}^{m} & =r_{k}+\log q_{k}, \\
s_{k} & =\delta s_{k}^{m}+(1-\delta) s_{k}^{M} \in\left[s_{k}^{m}, s_{k}^{M}\right] & t_{k} & =s_{k}+(n-1)\left(s_{k}-r_{k}\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

and note that $q_{k+1}$ does not depend on $\delta$.
On the interval $\left[q_{k}, r_{k}\right]$, the $n-1$ components $P_{2}=\cdots=P_{n}$ coincide and have slope $\frac{1}{n-1}$ while $P_{1}$ and $P_{n+1}$ are constant. By definition of $r_{k}, P_{2}\left(r_{k}\right)=P_{n+1}\left(r_{k}\right)$.
On the interval $\left[r_{k}, s_{k}\right], P_{n+1}$ has slope 1 while all other component $P_{i}$ are constant and on [ $s_{k}, t_{k}$ ] the $n-1$ components $P_{2}=\cdots=P_{n}$ coincide and have slope $\frac{1}{n-1}$ while $P_{1}$ and $P_{n+1}$ are constant. By definition of $t_{k}, P_{n+1}\left(t_{k}\right)=P_{2}\left(t_{k}\right)$.
On the interval $\left[t_{k}, u_{k}\right]$, the $n$ components $P_{2}=\cdots=P_{n+1}$ coincide and have slope $1 / n$, while $P_{1}$ is constant.
On the interval $\left[u_{k}, p_{k}\right], P_{n+1}$ has slope 1 while all other component $P_{i}$ are constant. By definition of $u_{k}$ and $p_{k}$, at $p_{k}$ we have $P_{n+1}\left(p_{k}\right)-P_{n}\left(p_{k}\right)=(n+1) \alpha$ and $P_{1}\left(p_{k}\right)=\frac{p_{k}}{w+1}-\beta_{k}$. On the interval $\left[p_{k}, q_{k+1}\right], P_{1}$ has slope 1 while all other components are constant. By definition of $q_{k+1}$ we have $P_{1}\left(q_{k+1}\right)=\cdots=P_{n}\left(q_{k+1}\right)=\frac{q_{k+1}}{n+1}-\alpha$ and $P_{n+1}\left(q_{k+1}\right)=\frac{q_{k}}{n+1}+n \alpha$.


Figure 1. Generic system $\mathbf{P}_{k}^{\delta}$, dotted are the extremal cases $\delta=0$ and 1.
Choose $q_{1}$ large enough so that $t_{1}<u_{1}$. Since $w>n$, the inductive sequence $\left(q_{k}\right)_{k \geqslant 1}$ tends to infinity and we define $\mathbf{P}^{\delta}=\bigcup_{k \geqslant 1} \mathbf{P}_{k}^{\delta}$ the concatenation of the systems $\mathbf{P}_{k}^{\delta}$. It is a system, as properties (i) - (iii) holds, in particular at $q_{k}$.

By construction,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\liminf _{q \rightarrow \infty} \frac{P_{1}^{\delta}(q)}{q} & =\liminf _{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{P_{1}^{\delta}\left(p_{k}\right)}{p_{k}}=\frac{1}{1+w} \\
\min _{\left[q_{k}, q_{k+1}\right]} \frac{q}{n+1}-P_{1}^{\delta}(q) & =\alpha=-\frac{\log (\varepsilon)}{n+1}+2 R_{n} \\
\limsup _{q \rightarrow \infty}\left(\frac{q}{w+1}-P_{1}^{\delta}(q)\right) & =\limsup _{k \rightarrow \infty}\left(\frac{p_{k}}{w+1}-P_{1}^{\delta}\left(p_{k}\right)\right)=\limsup _{k \rightarrow \infty} \beta_{k}
\end{aligned}
$$

and the requested properties hold. Furthermore, $P_{1}^{\delta}\left(s_{k}^{M}\right)=P_{n+1}\left(q_{k}\right)+\delta \log q_{k}$, so that

$$
\left\|\mathbf{P}^{\delta}-\mathbf{P}^{\delta^{\prime}}\right\| \geqslant\left|\mathbf{P}^{\delta}\left(s_{k}^{M}\right)-\mathbf{P}^{\delta^{\prime}}\left(s_{k}^{M}\right)\right|=\left|\delta-\delta^{\prime}\right| \log q_{k} .
$$

Hence, for $\delta \neq \delta^{\prime}$ the systems $\mathbf{P}^{\delta}$ and $\mathbf{P}^{\delta^{\prime}}$ are non-equivalent. Uncountability follows.
For simultaneous approximation, we rather use the setting and notation of Schmidt and Summerer for parametric geometry of numbers, studying the convex body

$$
\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{x}}^{\prime}(q):=\left\{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{m+1}| | y_{1}\left|\leqslant e^{m q}, \max _{1<i \leqslant n}\right| y_{1} x_{i}-y_{i+1} \mid \leqslant e^{-q}\right\}
$$

See for example [18, 19, 16, 17. The analogous proof relies on the construction of dual systems depicted by Figure 2 .


Figure 2. Generic system for simultaneous approximation.
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