

Theorem on best Diophantine approximations for linear forms. *

Oleg N. German, Nikolay G. Moshchevitin

*Dedicated to Professor Viktor Antonovich Sadovnichiy,
member of RAS,
in occasion of his 70-th birthday.*

Abstract

We prove a new quantitative result on the degeneracy of the dimension of the subspace spanned by the best Diophantine approximations for a linear form.

1 Best approximations.

Let $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r$ be real numbers. Suppose that $1, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r$ are linearly independent over the rationals. For an integer point $m = (m_0, m_1, \dots, m_r) \in \mathbb{Z}^r$ we define

$$\zeta(m) = m_0 + m_1\alpha_1 + \dots + m_r\alpha_r.$$

A point $m = (m_0, m_1, \dots, m_r) \in \mathbb{Z}^{r+1} \setminus \{0\}$ is defined to be a *best approximation (in the sense of linear form)* (briefly *b.a.*) if

$$\zeta(m) = \min_n \|\zeta(n)\|, \quad (1)$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the distance to the nearest integer and the minimum is taken over all the integer vectors $n = (n_0, n_1, \dots, n_r) \in \mathbb{Z}^r$ such that

$$0 < \max_{1 \leq j \leq r} |n_j| \leq \max_{1 \leq j \leq r} |m_j|.$$

All the best approximations form a sequence of points $m_\nu = (m_{0,\nu}, m_{1,\nu}, \dots, m_{r,\nu})$ with increasing $\max_{1 \leq j \leq r} |m_{j,\nu}|$. It should be noticed that sometimes the points $-m_\nu$ are also called best approximations. From this point of view, as can be seen from (1), in each pair $\pm m_\nu$ we chose as m_ν the point with positive $\zeta(m_\nu)$.

Let us denote

$$\zeta_\nu = \zeta(m_\nu), \quad M_\nu = \max_{1 \leq j \leq r} |m_{j,\nu}|. \quad (2)$$

Then

$$\zeta_1 > \zeta_2 > \dots > \zeta_\nu > \zeta_{\nu+1} > \dots$$

*The research was supported by RFBR (grant N° 06-01-00518). The first author was also supported by the grant of the President of Russian Federation N° MK-4466.2008.1. The Russian version of this paper is submitted to the Proceedings of the Department of Mathematics and Mechanics, Moscow State University.

and

$$M_1 < M_2 < \cdots < M_\nu < M_{\nu+1} < \cdots .$$

It follows from the Minkowski convex body theorem that $\zeta_\nu M_{\nu+1}^r \leq 1$. Define Δ_ν^r to be the determinant of the matrix formed by the coefficients of $r + 1$ consecutive best approximations:

$$\Delta_\nu^r = \begin{vmatrix} m_{0,\nu} & m_{1,\nu} & \cdots & m_{r,\nu} \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ m_{0,\nu+r} & m_{1,\nu+r} & \cdots & m_{r,\nu+r} \end{vmatrix} .$$

In the case $r = 1$ one can easily see from the theory of continued fractions that $\Delta_\nu^1 = (-1)^{\nu-1}$ for every ν .

H. Davenport and W. M. Schmidt were the first to prove that in the case $n = 2$ there are infinitely many values of ν , for which $\Delta_\nu^2 \neq 0$ (see Lemma 3 from [2]). This result follows from the Minkowski convex body theorem.

N. G. Moshchevitin [6],[7] obtained the following result. Given $r \geq 3$, there is an uncountable set of r -tuples $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r)$ of real numbers, linearly independent with the unit over the rationals, such that for each r -tuple in this set all the points m_ν of the corresponding sequence of best approximations, starting with some ν , lie in a certain three-dimensional sublattice $\Lambda(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r)$ of the lattice \mathbb{Z}^{r+1} . In this paper we prove a more precise version of this result:

Theorem 1. *Suppose that points*

$$m_\nu = (m_{0,\nu}, m_{1,\nu}, \dots, m_{r,\nu}) \in \mathbb{Z}^{r+1}, \quad \nu = 1, 2, 3, \dots$$

form the sequence of b.a. for $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r$. Take an integer $k \geq 1$ and consider the integer points

$$m_\nu^* = (m_{0,\nu}, m_{1,\nu}, \dots, m_{r,\nu}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_k) \in \mathbb{Z}^{r+k+1}, \quad \nu = 1, 2, 3, \dots \quad (3)$$

Suppose that the series

$$\sum_{\nu=1}^{\infty} M_{\nu+1}^{r+k} (\log M_{\nu+1})^{\delta_k} \zeta_\nu, \quad \delta_k = \begin{cases} 1, & k = 1 \\ 0, & k \geq 2 \end{cases}, \quad (4)$$

(where M_ν and ζ_ν are defined by (2)) converges. Then for almost all $(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_k) \in \mathbb{R}^k$ (in the sense of Lebesgue measure) the sequence of best approximations to the $(r + k)$ -tuple $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_k)$ differs from the sequence m_ν^ by at most a finite set of integer points.*

It is shown in the next section that in the case $r \geq 2$ the series (4) may converge, indeed. Thus it follows from Theorem 1 with $r = 2$ that there is a $(k + 2)$ -tuple $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_k)$ and an integer ν_0 such that all the b.a. $m_\nu^*, \nu \geq \nu_0$ lie in a three-dimensional subspace. The proof of Theorem 1 is close to the proof of Lemma 3 from [3]. We prove Theorem 1 in Section 3.

2 Khintchine's ψ -singular linear forms.

Suppose that $\psi(y) = o(y^{-r})$, $y \rightarrow +\infty$. An r -tuple $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r)$ is said to be ψ -singular (in the sense of linear form) if for every $T > 1$ the Diophantine inequalities

$$\|m_1\alpha_1 + \cdots + m_r\alpha_r\| < \psi(T), \quad 0 < \max_{1 \leq j \leq r} |m_j| \leq T$$

have a solution in integer r -tuple $m = (m_1, \dots, m_r)$. For $r \geq 2$ A. Khintchine [4] (see also Ch. 5, §7 of [1]) proved the existence of ψ -singular r -tuples for an arbitrary function ψ .

It is easy to verify that an r -tuple $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r)$ of real numbers, linearly independent with the unit over \mathbb{Q} , is ψ -singular if and only if for all positive integer ν the following inequality is valid

$$\zeta_\nu \leq \psi(M_{\nu+1}). \quad (5)$$

Theorem 1 leads immediately to the following result.

Theorem 2. *Let $r \geq 2$ and let $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r$ form a ψ -singular r -tuple. Suppose that the series*

$$\sum_{\nu=1}^{\infty} M_\nu^{r+k} (\log M_\nu)^{\delta_k} \psi(M_\nu) \quad (6)$$

converges. Then for almost all $(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_k) \in \mathbb{R}^k$ the sequence of all the best approximations to the $(r+k)$ -tuple $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_k)$ differs from the sequence (3) by at most a finite set of integer points.

Now we discuss the convergence of the series (4).

Lemma 1. *For any r -tuple $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r)$ of real numbers, linearly independent with the unit over \mathbb{Q} , and for any positive integer ν one has*

$$M_{\nu+2^{2r+1}-2^{r+1}} \geq 2M_\nu. \quad (7)$$

We prove Lemma 1 in Section 4. The proof is close to that of a similar statement for the simultaneous approximations (see Theorem 2.2 from [5] or Lemma 1 from [8]). It is based on the pigeon hole principle. Lemma 1 shows that the coefficients of the best approximations increase exponentially and hence for any positive ε the series

$$\sum_{\nu=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(\log M_\nu)^{1+\varepsilon}}$$

converges. So we have the following

Corollary 1. *Let $r \geq 2$ and*

$$\psi(y) = \frac{1}{y^{r+k} (\log y)^{\delta_k + 1 + \varepsilon}}$$

with some positive ε . Let an r -tuple $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r)$ be ψ -singular. Then for almost all $(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_k) \in \mathbb{R}^k$ the sequence of best approximations for the $(r+k)$ -tuple $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_k)$ differs from the sequence (3) by at most a finite set of integer points.

One may ask if the inequality (7) can be essentially improved for ψ -singular r -tuples expecting a-priori that for example under certain conditions on ψ the series

$$\sum_{\nu=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\log M_\nu} \quad (8)$$

should converge in the case of a ψ -singular r -tuple $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r)$. This is however not the case, for the methods of the paper [7] allow to prove the following

Proposition 1. *Suppose that $r \geq 2$. Then, given an arbitrary function $\psi(y) = o(y^{-r})$, there is a ψ -singular r -tuple $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r)$ such that the series (8) diverges.*

But those same methods allow to prove that there are some special ψ -singular r -tuples for which it is possible to improve Corollary 1.

Proposition 2. *Suppose that $r \geq 2$. Then, given an arbitrary function $\psi(y) = o(y^{-r})$, there is a ψ -singular r -tuple $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r)$ such that for every ν the vectors $m_\nu, m_{\nu+1}, \dots, m_{\nu+r}$ are linearly independent.*

Corollary 2. *Suppose that*

$$\psi(y) = \frac{1}{y^{r+k}(\log y)^{\delta_k}(\log \log y)^{1+\varepsilon}} \quad (9)$$

with some positive ε . Suppose also that a ψ -singular r -tuple $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r)$ satisfies the condition that every ν vectors $m_\nu, m_{\nu+1}, \dots, m_{\nu+r}$ are linearly independent. Then for almost all $(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_k) \in \mathbb{R}^k$ the sequence of best approximations for the $(r+k)$ -tuple $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_k)$ differs from the sequence (3) by at most a finite set of integer points.

Proof. Observe that under the conditions of Proposition 2 we have the inequality

$$\zeta_\nu \geq \frac{1}{(r+1)!M_{\nu+r}^r} \quad (10)$$

for every ν . Indeed, consider the parallelepiped

$$\Pi = \left\{ (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_r) \in \mathbb{R}^{r+1} \mid \max_{1 \leq j \leq r} |x_j| \leq M_{\nu+r}, |x_0 + x_1\alpha_1 + \dots + x_r\alpha_r| \leq \zeta_\nu \right\}.$$

Observe that

$$m_\nu, m_{\nu+1}, \dots, m_{\nu+r} \in \Pi.$$

The convex hull

$$\mathcal{O} = \text{conv}(\pm m_\nu, \pm m_{\nu+1}, \dots, \pm m_{\nu+r}) \subset \Pi$$

is an integer $(r+1)$ -dimensional polytope. For its $(r+1)$ -dimensional measure we have the following upper bound:

$$\mu\mathcal{O} \leq \mu\Pi = 2^{r+1}\zeta_\nu M_{\nu+r}^r. \quad (11)$$

Since \mathcal{O} is a lattice polytope,

$$\mu\mathcal{O} \geq \frac{2^{r+1}}{(r+1)!}. \quad (12)$$

Combining (11) and (12) we get (10).

Now (10) together with (5) and the special choice of ψ by (9) leads to the estimate

$$\frac{1}{(r+1)!M_{\nu+r}^r} \leq \zeta_\nu \leq \psi(M_{\nu+1}) = \frac{1}{M_{\nu+1}^{r+k}(\log M_{\nu+1})^{\delta_k}(\log \log M_{\nu+1})^{1+\varepsilon}}.$$

So, for ν large enough ($\nu \geq \nu_0 = \nu_0(k, r)$) we have

$$M_{\nu+r} \geq M_{\nu+1}^{1+\frac{k}{r}}.$$

Hence

$$\log \log M_\nu \geq c\nu$$

with some positive $c = c(k, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r)$, which implies the convergence of the series (6). The statement of the Corollary now follows from Theorem 2. \square

3 Proof of Theorem 1.

It is sufficient to prove that for almost every $(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_k) \in [0, 1]^k$ there is a ν_0 such that for all $\nu \geq \nu_0$ one has

$$\min |m_0 + m_1\alpha_1 + \dots + m_r\alpha_r + m_{r+1}\beta_1 + \dots + m_{r+k}\beta_k| \geq \zeta_\nu \quad (13)$$

where the minimum is taken over all the integer points $(m_0, m_1, \dots, m_{r+k})$ such that

$$\max_{1 \leq j \leq r+k} |m_j| \leq M_{\nu+1}, \quad |m_{r+1}| + \dots + |m_{r+k}| \neq 0.$$

This condition (13) is equivalent to the fact that for all integers m_0, \dots, m_{r+k} such that

$$\max_{1 \leq j \leq r} |m_j| \leq M_{\nu+1}, \quad 0 < \max_{r+1 \leq j \leq r+k} |m_j| \leq M_{\nu+1} \quad (14)$$

one has

$$m_{r+1}\beta_1 + \dots + m_{r+k}\beta_k \notin J_\nu(m_0, m_1, \dots, m_r) \quad (15)$$

where

$$J_\nu(m_0, m_1, \dots, m_r) = (-m_0 - m_1\alpha_1 - \dots - m_r\alpha_r - \zeta_\nu, -m_0 - m_1\alpha_1 - \dots - m_r\alpha_r + \zeta_\nu)$$

is an interval of length $2\zeta_\nu$. The condition (15) in its turn means that the distance between the point $(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_k) \in [0, 1]^k$ and the subspace

$$\left\{ (x_1, \dots, x_k) \in \mathbb{R}^k \mid m_{r+1}x_1 + \dots + m_{r+k}x_k = -m_0 - m_1\alpha_1 - \dots - m_r\alpha_r \right\}$$

is not less than $\zeta_\nu(m_{r+1}^2 + \dots + m_{r+k}^2)^{-1/2}$. Put

$$\Omega_\nu(m_0, \dots, m_{r+k}) = \left\{ (x_1, \dots, x_k) \in [0, 1]^k \mid m_{r+1}x_1 + \dots + m_{r+k}x_k \in J_\nu(m_0, m_1, \dots, m_r) \right\}.$$

We thus must prove that for almost every $(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_k) \in [0, 1]^k$ there is a ν_0 such that

$$(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_k) \notin \bigcup_{\nu \geq \nu_0} \left(\bigcup_m \Omega_\nu(m_0, \dots, m_{r+k}) \right)$$

where the inner union is taken over all the integers m_0, m_1, \dots, m_{r+k} satisfying the condition (14) and the inequality $|m_0| \leq (r+k+1)M_{\nu+1}$.

For the measure of $\Omega_\nu(m_0, \dots, m_{r+k})$ we have

$$\mu\Omega_\nu(m_0, \dots, m_{r+k}) \leq \frac{2(k+r+1)k^{k/2}\zeta_\nu}{\sqrt{m_{r+1}^2 + \dots + m_{r+k}^2}}.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} & \mu \left(\bigcup_m \Omega_\nu(m_0, \dots, m_{r+k}) \right) \leq \\ & \leq 2(k+r+1)k^{k/2}\zeta_\nu \times (2M_{\nu+1} + 1)^{r+1} \times \sum_{0 < \max_{1 \leq j \leq k} |m_{r+j}| \leq M_{\nu+1}} (m_{r+1}^2 + \dots + m_{r+k}^2)^{-1/2} \leq \\ & \leq cM_{\nu+1}^{r+k} (\log M_{\nu+1})^{\delta_k} \zeta_\nu \end{aligned}$$

with some positive $c = c(k, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r)$. The series (4) converges, so it remains to apply the Borel-Cantelli lemma.

4 Proof of Lemma 1.

Suppose that (7) is not true for some ν . Then all the best approximations m_j , $\nu \leq j \leq \nu + 2^{2r+1} - 2^{r+1}$ lie in the set

$$\Pi = \left\{ (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_r) \in \mathbb{R}^{r+1} \mid M_\nu \leq \max_{1 \leq j \leq r} |x_j| < 2M_\nu, |x_0 + x_1\alpha_1 + \dots + x_r\alpha_r| \leq \zeta_\nu \right\}.$$

This set can be covered by $2^{2r+1} - 2^{r+1}$ half-open parallelepipeds of the form

$$\left\{ (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_r) \in \mathbb{R}^{r+1} \mid M_\nu/2 < x_j - x_j^* \leq M_\nu/2, j = 1, \dots, r, \right. \\ \left. \eta \cdot (x_0 + x_1\alpha_1 + \dots + x_r\alpha_r) \in [0, \zeta_\nu] \right\}$$

with some $(x_0^*, \dots, x_r^*) \in \mathbb{R}^{r+1}$ and $\eta \in \{-1, +1\}$. By the pigeon hole principle one of these parallelepipeds contains at least two distinct points m_i and m_j . Hence

$$m_j - m_i \in \left\{ (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_r) \in \mathbb{R}^{r+1} \mid \max_{1 \leq j \leq r} |x_j| < M_\nu, |x_0 + x_1\alpha_1 + \dots + x_r\alpha_r| \leq \zeta_\nu \right\},$$

which contradicts the fact that m_ν is a best approximation and proves the Lemma.

References

- [1] J. W. S. CASSELS, *An introduction to Diophantine approximations*. Cambridge University Press (1957).
- [2] H. DAVENPORT, W. M. SCHMIDT, *Approximation to real numbers by quadratic irrationals*. Acta Arithmetica, **13** (1967), 169–176.
- [3] H. DAVENPORT, W. M. SCHMIDT, *A theorem on linear forms* Acta Arithmetica, **14** (1968), 209–223.
- [4] A. Y. KHINCHIN, *Über eine klasse linear Diophantine Approximationen*. Rendiconti Circ. Math. Palermo, **50** 1926, 170–195.
- [5] J. S. LAGARIAS, *Best simultaneous Diophantine approximation I. Growth rates of best approximation denominators*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **272**:2 (1982), 545–554.
- [6] N. G. MOSHCHEVITIN, *Geometry of the best approximations*. Doklady Mathematics, **57**:2 (1998), 261–263.
- [7] N. G. MOSHCHEVITIN, *Best Diophantine approximations: the phenomenon of degenerate dimension*. London Mathematical Society, Lecture Note Series, **338** (2007), 158–182.
- [8] N. G. MOSHCHEVITIN, *On the best two-dimensional joint Diophantine approximations in the sup-norm* Moscow Univ. Math. Bull. 60 (2005) no.6. 29 – 32 (2006).

Oleg N. GERMAN
Moscow Lomonosov State University
Vorobiovy Gory, GSP-1
119991 Moscow, RUSSIA
E-mail: german@mech.math.msu.su, german.oleg@gmail.com

Nikolay G. MOSHCHEVITIN
Moscow Lomonosov State University
Vorobiovy Gory, GSP-1
119991 Moscow, RUSSIA
E-mail: moshchevitin@mech.math.msu.su, moshchevitin@rambler.ru