

# FOURIER DECAY FOR HOMOGENEOUS SELF-AFFINE MEASURES

BORIS SOLOMYAK

ABSTRACT. We show that for Lebesgue almost all  $d$ -tuples  $(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_d)$ , with  $|\theta_j| > 1$ , any self-affine measure for a homogeneous non-degenerate iterated function system  $\{Ax + a_j\}_{j=1}^m$  in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , where  $A^{-1}$  is a diagonal matrix with the entries  $(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_d)$ , has power Fourier decay at infinity.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

For a finite positive Borel measure  $\mu$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , consider the Fourier transform

$$\hat{\mu}(\xi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-2\pi i \langle \xi, x \rangle} d\mu(x).$$

We are interested in the decay properties of  $\hat{\mu}$  at infinity. The measure  $\mu$  is called *Rajchman* if

$$\lim_{|\xi| \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\mu}(\xi) = 0,$$

where  $|\xi|$  is a norm (say, the Euclidean norm) of  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Whereas absolutely continuous measures are Rajchman by the Riemann-Lebesgue Lemma, it is a subtle question to decide which singular measures are such, see, e.g., the survey of Lyons [14]. A much stronger property, useful for many applications is the following.

**Definition 1.1.** For  $\alpha > 0$  let

$$\mathcal{D}_d(\alpha) = \{ \nu \text{ finite positive measure on } \mathbb{R}^d : |\hat{\nu}(t)| = O_\nu(|t|^{-\alpha}), |t| \rightarrow \infty \},$$

and denote  $\mathcal{D}_d = \bigcup_{\alpha > 0} \mathcal{D}_d(\alpha)$ . A measure  $\nu$  is said to have *power Fourier decay* if  $\nu \in \mathcal{D}_d$ .

Many recent papers have been devoted to the question of Fourier decay for classes of “fractal” measures, see e.g., [2, 9, 11, 12, 13, 18, 23, 3, 1, 25, 17]. Here we continue this line of research, focusing on the class of *homogeneous self-affine measures* in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . A measure  $\mu$  is called self-affine if it is the invariant measure for a self-affine iterated function system (IFS)  $\{f_j\}_{j=1}^m$ , with  $m \geq 2$ , where  $f_j(x) = A_j x + a_j$ , the matrices  $A_j : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  are invertible linear contractions (in some norm) and  $a_j \in \mathbb{R}^d$  are “digit” vectors. This means that for some probability vector  $\mathbf{p} = (p_j)_{j \leq m}$  holds

$$(1.1) \quad \mu = \sum_{j=1}^m p_j (\mu \circ f_j^{-1}).$$

---

*Date:* June 10, 2021.

Supported in part by the Israel Science Foundation grant 911/19.

It is well-known that this equation defines a unique probability Borel measure. The self-affine IFS is *homogeneous* if all  $A_j$  are equal to each other:  $A = A_j$  for  $j \leq m$ . Denote the digit set by  $\mathcal{D} := \{a_1, \dots, a_m\}$  and the corresponding self-affine measure by  $\mu(A, \mathcal{D}, \mathbf{p})$ . We will write  $\mathbf{p} > 0$  if all  $p_j > 0$ . Following [8], we say that the IFS is *affinely irreducible* if the attractor is not contained in a proper affine subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . It is easy to see that this is a necessary condition for the self-affine measure to be Rajchman, so this will always be our assumption. By a conjugation with a translation, we can always assume that  $0 \in \mathcal{D}$ . In this case affine irreducibility is equivalent to the digit set  $\mathcal{D}$  being a *cyclic family* for  $A$ , that is,  $\mathbb{R}^d$  being the smallest  $A$ -invariant subspace containing  $\mathcal{D}$ .

The IFS is *self-similar* if all  $A_j$  are contracting similitudes, that is,  $A_j = \lambda_j \mathcal{O}_j$  for some  $\lambda_j \in (0, 1)$  and orthogonal matrices  $\mathcal{O}_j$ . In many aspects, “genuine” (i.e., non-self-similar) self-affine and self-similar IFS are very different; of course, the distinction exists only for  $d \geq 2$ .

Every homogeneous self-affine measure can be expressed as an infinite convolution product

$$(1.2) \quad \mu(A, \mathcal{D}, \mathbf{p}) = \left( * \prod_{n=0}^{\infty} \right) \sum_{j=1}^m p_j \delta_{A^n a_j},$$

and for every  $\mathbf{p} > 0$  it is supported on the attractor (self-affine set)

$$K_{A, \mathcal{D}} := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d : x = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} A^n b_n, b_n \in \mathcal{D} \right\}.$$

By the definition of the self-affine measure,

$$\hat{\mu}(\xi) = \sum_{j=1}^m p_j \int e^{-2\pi i \langle \xi, Ax + a_j \rangle} d\mu = \left( \sum_{j=1}^m p_j e^{-2\pi i \langle \xi, a_j \rangle} \right) \hat{\mu}(A^t \xi),$$

where  $A^t$  is the matrix transpose of  $A$ . Iterating we obtain

$$(1.3) \quad \hat{\mu}(\xi) = \prod_{n=0}^{\infty} \left( \sum_{j=1}^m p_j e^{-2\pi i \langle (A^t)^n \xi, a_j \rangle} \right) = \prod_{n=0}^{\infty} \left( \sum_{j=1}^m p_j e^{-2\pi i \langle \xi, A^n a_j \rangle} \right),$$

where the infinite product converges, since  $\|A^n\| \rightarrow 0$  exponentially fast.

**1.1. Background.** We start with the known results on Fourier decay for classical Bernoulli convolutions  $\nu_\lambda$ , namely, self-similar measures on the line, corresponding to the IFS  $\{\lambda x, \lambda x + 1\}$ , with  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$  and probabilities  $(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$  (often the digits  $\pm 1$  are used instead; it is easy to see that taking any two distinct digits results in the same measure, up to an affine change of variable). Erdős [5] proved that  $\hat{\nu}_\lambda(t) \rightarrow 0$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  when  $\theta = 1/\lambda$  is a *Pisot number*. Recall that a Pisot number is an algebraic integer greater than one, whose algebraic (Galois) conjugates are all less than one in modulus. Salem [19] showed that if  $1/\lambda$  is not a Pisot number, then  $\hat{\nu}_\lambda$  is a Rajchman measure. In the other direction, Erdős [6] proved that for any  $[a, b] \subset (0, 1)$  there exists  $\alpha > 0$  such that  $\nu_\lambda \in \mathcal{D}_1(\alpha)$  for a.e.  $\lambda \in [a, b]$ . Later, Kahane [10] indicated that Erdős’ argument actually gives

that  $\nu_\lambda \in \mathcal{D}_1$  for all  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$  outside a set of zero Hausdorff dimension. (We should mention that very few specific  $\lambda$  are known, for which  $\nu_\lambda$  has power Fourier decay, see Dai, Feng, and Wang [4].) In the original papers of Erdős and Kahane there were no explicit quantitative bounds; this was done in the survey [15], where the expression “Erdős-Kahane argument” was used first. The general case of a homogeneous self-similar measure on the line is treated analogously to Bernoulli convolutions: the self-similar measure is still an infinite convolution and the Erdős-Kahane argument on power Fourier decay goes through with minor modifications, see [4, 22]. Although one of the main motivations for the study of the Fourier transform has been the question of absolute continuity/singularity of  $\nu_\lambda$ , here we do not discuss it but refer the reader to the recent survey [24].

Next we turn to the non-homogeneous case on the line. Li and Sahlsten [12] proved that if  $\mu$  is a self-similar measure on the line with contraction ratios  $\{r_i\}_{i=1}^m$  and there exist  $i \neq j$  such that  $\log r_i / \log r_j$  is irrational, then  $\mu$  is Rajchman. Moreover, they showed logarithmic decay of the Fourier transform under a Diophantine condition. A related result for self-conformal measures was recently obtained by Algom, Rodriguez Hertz, and Wang [1]. Brémont [3] obtained an (almost) complete characterization of (non)-Rajchman self-similar measures in the case when  $r_j = \lambda^{n_j}$  for  $j \leq m$ . To be non-Rajchman, it is necessary for  $1/\lambda$  to be Pisot. For “generic” choices of the probability vector  $\mathbf{p}$ , assuming that  $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathbb{Q}(\lambda)$  after an affine conjugation, this is also sufficient, but there are some exceptional cases of positive co-dimension. Varjú and Yu [25] proved logarithmic decay of the Fourier transform in the case when  $r_j = \lambda^{n_j}$  for  $j \leq m$  and  $1/\lambda$  is algebraic, but not a Pisot or Salem number. In [23] we showed that outside a zero Hausdorff dimension exceptional set of parameters, all self-similar measures on  $\mathbb{R}$  belong to  $\mathcal{D}_1$ ; however, the exceptional set is not explicit.

Turning to higher dimensions, we mention the recent paper by Rapaport [17], where he gives an algebraic characterization of self-similar IFS for which there exists a probability vector yielding a non-Rajchman self-similar measure. Li and Sahlsten [13] investigated self-affine measures in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and obtained power Fourier decay under some algebraic conditions, which never hold for a homogeneous self-affine IFS. Their main assumptions are total irreducibility of the closed group generated by the contraction linear maps  $A_j$  and non-compactness of the projection of this group to  $PGL(d, \mathbb{R})$ . For  $d = 2, 3$  they showed that this is sufficient.

**1.2. Statement of results.** We assume that  $A$  is a matrix diagonalizable over  $\mathbb{R}$ . Then we can reduce the IFS, via a linear change of variable, to one where  $A$  is a diagonal matrix with real entries. Given  $A = \text{Diag}[\theta_1^{-1}, \dots, \theta_d^{-1}]$ , with  $|\theta_j| > 1$ , a set of digits  $\mathcal{D} = \{a_1, \dots, a_m\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ , and a probability vector  $\mathbf{p}$ , we write  $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_d)$  and denote by  $\mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathcal{D}, \mathbf{p})$  the self-affine measure defined by (1.1). Our main motivation is the class of measures which can be viewed as “self-affine Bernoulli convolutions”, with  $A = \text{Diag}[\theta_1^{-1}, \dots, \theta_d^{-1}]$  a diagonal matrix with distinct real entries and  $\mathcal{D} = \{0, (1, \dots, 1)\}$ . In this special case we denote the self-affine measure by  $\mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{p})$ .

**Theorem 1.2.** *There exists an exceptional set  $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ , with  $\mathcal{L}^d(E) = 0$ , such that for all  $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus E$ , with  $\min_j |\theta_j| > 1$ , for all sets of digits  $\mathcal{D}$ , such that the IFS is affinely irreducible, and all  $\mathbf{p} > 0$ , holds  $\mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathcal{D}, \mathbf{p}) \in \mathcal{D}_d$ .*

The theorem is a consequence of a more quantitative statement.

**Theorem 1.3.** *Fix  $1 < b_1 < b_2 < \infty$  and  $c_1, \varepsilon > 0$ . Then there exist  $\alpha > 0$  and  $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ , depending on these parameters, such that  $\mathcal{L}^d(\mathcal{E}) = 0$  and for all  $\boldsymbol{\theta} \notin \mathcal{E}$  satisfying*

$$b_1 \leq \min_j |\theta_j| < \max_j |\theta_j| \leq b_2 \quad \text{and} \quad |\theta_i - \theta_j| \geq c_1, \quad i \neq j,$$

for all digit sets  $\mathcal{D}$  such that the IFS is affinely irreducible, and all  $\mathbf{p}$  such that  $\min_j p_j \geq \varepsilon$ , we have  $\mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathcal{D}, \mathbf{p}) \in \mathcal{D}_d(\alpha)$ .

*Reduction of Theorem 1.2 to Theorem 1.3.* For  $M \in \mathbb{N}$  let  $\mathcal{E}^{(M)}$  be the exceptional set obtained from Theorem 1.3 with  $b_1 = 1 + M^{-1}$ ,  $b_2 = M$ , and  $\varepsilon = c_1 = M^{-1}$ . Then the set

$$E = \bigcup_{M=2}^{\infty} \mathcal{E}^{(M)} \cup \{\boldsymbol{\theta} : \exists i \neq j, \theta_i = \theta_j\}.$$

has the desired properties. □

The proof of Theorem 1.3 uses a version of the Erdős-Kahane technique. We follow the general scheme of [15, 22], but this is not a trivial extension.

In view of the convolution structure, Theorem 1.3 yields some information on absolute continuity of self-affine measures, by a standard argument.

**Corollary 1.4.** *Fix  $1 < b_1 < b_2 < \infty$  and  $c_1, \varepsilon > 0$ . Then there exist a sequence  $n_k \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ , depending on these parameters, such that  $\mathcal{L}^d(\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k) = 0$  and for all  $\boldsymbol{\theta} \notin \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k$  satisfying*

$$b_1 \leq \min_j |\theta_j^{n_k}| < \max_j |\theta_j^{n_k}| \leq b_2 \quad \text{and} \quad |\theta_i^{n_k} - \theta_j^{n_k}| \geq c_1, \quad i \neq j,$$

for all digit sets  $\mathcal{D}$  such that the IFS is affinely irreducible, and all  $\mathbf{p}$  such that  $\min_j p_j \geq \varepsilon$ , the measure  $\mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathcal{D}, \mathbf{p})$  is absolutely continuous with respect to  $\mathcal{L}^d$ , with a Radon-Nikodym derivative in  $C^k(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $k \geq 0$ .

*Proof (derivation).* Let  $n \geq 2$ . It follows from (1.2) that

$$\mu(A, \mathcal{D}, \mathbf{p}) = \mu(A^n, \mathcal{D}, \mathbf{p}) * \mu(A^n, A\mathcal{D}, \mathbf{p}) \dots * \mu(A^n, A^{n-1}\mathcal{D}, \mathbf{p}).$$

It is easy to see that if the original IFS is affinely irreducible, then so are the IFS associated with  $(A^n, A^j\mathcal{D})$ , and moreover, these IFS are all affine conjugate to each other. Therefore, if  $\mu(A^n, \mathcal{D}, \mathbf{p}) \in \mathcal{D}_d(\alpha)$ , then  $\mu(A, \mathcal{D}, \mathbf{p}) \in \mathcal{D}_d(n\alpha)$ . As is well-known,

$$\mu \in \mathcal{D}_d(\beta), \quad \beta > d + k \implies \frac{d\mu}{d\mathcal{L}^d} \in C^k(\mathbb{R}^d),$$

so we can take  $n_k$  such that  $n_k\alpha > d + k$ , and  $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k = \{\boldsymbol{\theta} : \boldsymbol{\theta}^{n_k} \in \mathcal{E}\}$ , where  $\alpha$  and  $\mathcal{E}$  are from Theorem 1.3.  $\square$

**Remark 1.5.** (a) In general, the power decay cannot hold for all  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ ; for instance, it is easy to see that the measure  $\mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{p})$  is not Rajchman if at least one of  $\theta_k$  is a Pisot number. Thus in the most basic case with two digits, the exceptional set has Hausdorff dimension at least  $d - 1$ .

(b) It is natural to ask what happens if  $A$  is not diagonalizable over  $\mathbb{R}$ . A complex eigenvalue of  $A$  corresponds to a 2-dimensional homogeneous self-similar IFS with rotation, or an IFS of the form  $\{\lambda z + a_j\}_{j=1}^m$ , with  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ ,  $|\lambda| < 1$ , and  $a_j \in \mathbb{C}$ . In [21] it was shown that for all  $\lambda$  outside a set of Hausdorff dimension zero, the corresponding self-similar measure belongs to  $\mathcal{D}_2$ . It may be possible to combine the methods of [21] with those of the current paper to obtain power Fourier decay for a typical  $A$  diagonalizable over  $\mathbb{C}$ . It would also be interesting to consider the case of non-diagonalizable  $A$ , starting with a single Jordan block.

(c) In the special case of  $d = 2$  and  $m = 2$ , our system reduces to a planar self-affine IFS, conjugate to  $\{(\lambda x, \gamma y) \pm (-1, 1)\}$  for  $0 < \gamma < \lambda < 1$ . This system has been studied by many authors, especially the dimension and topological properties of its attractor, see [7] and the references therein. For our work, the most relevant is the paper by Shmerkin [20]. Among other results, he proved absolute continuity with a density in  $L^2$  of the self-affine measure (with some fixed probabilities) almost everywhere in some region, in particular, in some explicit neighborhood of  $(1, 1)$ . He also showed that if  $(\lambda^{-1}, \gamma^{-1})$  for a *Pisot pair*, then the measure is not Rajchman and hence singular.

**1.3. Rajchman self-affine measures.** The question “when is  $\mu(A, \mathcal{D}, \mathbf{p})$  is Rajchman?” is not addressed here. Recently Rapaport [17] obtained an (almost) complete characterization of *self-similar* Rajchman measures in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Of course, our situation is vastly simplified by the assumption that the IFS is homogeneous, but still it is not completely straightforward. The key notion here is the following.

**Definition 1.6.** A collection of numbers  $(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_m)$  (real or complex) is called a Pisot family or a P.V.  $m$ -tuple if

- (i)  $|\theta_j| > 1$  for all  $j \leq m$  and
- (ii) there is a monic integer polynomial  $P(t)$ , such that  $P(\theta_j) = 0$  for all  $j \leq m$ , whereas every other root  $\theta'$  of  $P(t)$  satisfies  $|\theta'| < 1$ .

It is not difficult to show, using the classical techniques of Pisot [16] and Salem [19], as well as some ideas from [17, Section 5] that

- If  $\mu(A, \mathcal{D}, \mathbf{p})$  is not a Rajchman measure and the IFS is affinely irreducible, then the spectrum  $\text{Spec}(A^{-1})$  contains a Pisot family;
- if  $\text{Spec}(A^{-1})$  contains a Pisot family, then for a “generic” choice of  $\mathcal{D}$ , with  $m \geq 3$ , the measure  $\mu(A, \mathcal{D}, \mathbf{p})$  is Rajchman; however,

- if  $\text{Spec}(A^{-1})$  contains a Pisot family, then under appropriate conditions the measure  $\mu(A, \mathcal{D}, \mathbf{p})$  is not Rajchman. For instance, this holds if there is at least one conjugate of the elements of the Pisot family less than 1 in absolute value,  $m = 2$ , and  $A$  is diagonalizable over  $\mathbb{R}$ .

We omit the details.

## 2. PROOFS

The following is an elementary inequality.

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, \dots, p_m) > 0$  be a probability vector and  $\alpha_1 = 0$ ,  $\alpha_j \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $j = 2, \dots, m$ . Denote  $\varepsilon = \min_j p_j$  and write  $\|x\| = \text{dist}(x, \mathbb{Z})$ . Then for any  $k \leq m$ ,*

$$(2.1) \quad \left| \sum_{j=1}^m p_j e^{-2\pi i \alpha_j} \right| \leq 1 - 2\pi \varepsilon \|\alpha_k\|^2.$$

*Proof.* Fix  $k \in \{2, \dots, m\}$ . We can estimate

$$\left| \sum_{j=1}^m p_j e^{-2\pi i \alpha_j} \right| = \left| p_1 + \sum_{j=2}^m p_j e^{-2\pi i \alpha_j} \right| \leq |p_1 + p_k e^{-2\pi i \alpha_k}| + (1 - p_1 - p_k).$$

Assume that  $p_1 \geq p_k$ , otherwise, write  $|p_1 + p_k e^{-2\pi i \alpha_k}| = |p_1 e^{2\pi i \alpha_k} + p_k|$  and repeat the argument. Then observe that  $|p_1 + p_k e^{-2\pi i \alpha_k}| \leq (p_1 - p_k) + p_k |1 + e^{-2\pi i \alpha_k}|$  and  $|1 + e^{-2\pi i \alpha_k}| = 2|\cos(\pi \alpha_k)| \leq 2(1 - \pi \|\alpha_k\|^2)$ . This implies the desired inequality.  $\square$

Recall (1.3):

$$\hat{\mu}(\xi) = \prod_{n=0}^{\infty} \left( \sum_{j=1}^m p_j e^{-2\pi i \langle \xi, A^n a_j \rangle} \right).$$

For  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , with  $\|\xi\|_{\infty} \geq 1$ , let  $\eta(\xi) = (A^t)^{N(\xi)} \xi$ , where  $N(\xi) \geq 0$  is maximal, such that  $\|\eta(\xi)\|_{\infty} \geq 1$ . Then  $\|\eta(\xi)\|_{\infty} \in [1, \|A^t\|_{\infty}]$  and (1.3) implies

$$(2.2) \quad \hat{\mu}(\xi) = \hat{\mu}(\eta(\xi)) \cdot \prod_{n=1}^{N(\xi)} \left( \sum_{j=1}^m p_j e^{-2\pi i \langle \eta(\xi), A^{-n} a_j \rangle} \right).$$

**2.1. Proof of Theorem 1.3.** First we show that the case of a general digit set may be reduced to  $\mathcal{D} = \{0, (1, \dots, 1)\}$ . We start with the formula (2.2), which under the current assumptions becomes

$$\hat{\mu}(\xi) = \hat{\mu}(\eta(\xi)) \cdot \prod_{n=1}^{N(\xi)} \left( \sum_{j=1}^m p_j \exp \left[ -2\pi i \sum_{k=1}^d \eta_k a_j^{(k)} \theta_k^n \right] \right),$$

where  $a_j = (a_j^{(k)})_{k=1}^d$  and  $\eta(\xi) = (\eta_k)_{k=1}^d$ . Note that  $\|\eta(\xi)\|_\infty \in [1, \max_j |\theta_j|]$ . Assume without loss of generality that  $a_1 = 0$ , then we have by (2.1), for any fixed  $j \in \{2, \dots, m\}$ :

$$|\widehat{\mu}(\xi)| \leq \prod_{n=1}^{N(\xi)} \left( 1 - 2\pi\varepsilon \left\| \sum_{k=1}^d \eta_k a_j^{(k)} \theta_k^n \right\|^2 \right),$$

where  $\|\cdot\|$  denotes the distance to the nearest integer. Further, we can assume that all the coordinates of  $a_j$  are non-zero; otherwise, we can work in the subspace

$$\mathcal{H} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : x_k = 0 \iff a_j^{(k)} = 0\}$$

and with the corresponding variables  $\theta_k$ , and then get the exceptional set of zero  $\mathcal{L}^d$  measure as a product of a set of zero measure in  $\mathcal{H}$  and the entire  $\mathcal{H}^\perp$ . Finally, apply a linear change of variables, so that  $a_j^{(k)} = 1$  for all  $k$ , to obtain:

$$(2.3) \quad |\widehat{\mu}(\xi)| \leq \prod_{n=1}^{N(\xi)} \left( 1 - 2\pi\varepsilon \left\| \sum_{k=1}^d \eta_k \theta_k^n \right\|^2 \right).$$

This is exactly the situation corresponding to the measure  $\mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{p})$ , and we will be showing (typical) power decay for the right-hand side of (2.3). This completes the reduction.

Next we use a variant of the Erdős-Kahane argument, see e.g. [15, 22] for other versions of it. Intuitively, we will get power decay if  $\left\| \sum_{k=1}^d \eta_k \theta_k^n \right\|$  is uniformly bounded away from zero for a set of  $n$ 's of positive lower density, uniformly in  $\eta$ .

Fix  $c_1 > 0$  and  $1 < b_1 < b_2 < \infty$ , and consider the compact set

$$H = \{\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_d) \in ([-b_2, -b_1] \cup [b_1, b_2])^d : |\theta_i - \theta_j| \geq c_1, i \neq j\}.$$

We will use the notation  $[N] = \{1, \dots, N\}$ ,  $[n, N] = \{n, \dots, N\}$ . For  $\rho, \delta > 0$  we define the “bad set” at scale  $N$ :

$$(2.4) \quad E_{H,N}(\delta, \rho) = \left\{ \boldsymbol{\theta} \in H : \max_{\eta: 1 \leq \|\eta\|_\infty \leq b_2} \frac{1}{N} \left| \left\{ n \in [N] : \left\| \sum_{k=1}^d \eta_k \theta_k^n \right\| < \rho \right\} \right| > 1 - \delta \right\}.$$

Now we can define the exceptional set:

$$\mathcal{E}_H(\delta, \rho) := \bigcap_{N_0=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{N=N_0}^{\infty} E_{H,N}(\delta, \rho).$$

Theorem 1.3 will immediately follow from the next two propositions.

**Proposition 2.2.** *For any positive  $\rho$  and  $\delta$ , we have  $\mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{p}) \in \mathcal{D}_d(\alpha)$  whenever  $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in H \setminus \mathcal{E}_H(\delta, \rho)$ , where  $\alpha$  depends only on  $\delta, \rho, H$ , and  $\varepsilon = \min\{p, 1 - p\}$ .*

**Proposition 2.3.** *There exist  $\rho = \rho_H > 0$  and  $\delta = \delta_H > 0$  such that  $\mathcal{L}^d(\mathcal{E}_H(\delta, \rho)) = 0$ .*

*Proof of Proposition 2.2.* Suppose that  $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in H \setminus \mathcal{E}_H(\delta, \rho)$ . This implies that there is  $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\boldsymbol{\theta} \notin E_{H,N}(\delta, \rho)$  for all  $N \geq N_0$ . Let  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$  be such that  $\|\xi\|_\infty > b_2^{N_0}$ . Then  $N = N(\xi) \geq N_0$ , where  $\eta = \eta(\xi) = A^{N(\xi)}\xi$  and  $N(\xi)$  is maximal with  $\|\eta\|_\infty \geq 1$ . From the fact that  $\boldsymbol{\theta} \notin E_{H,N}(\delta, \rho)$  it follows that

$$\frac{1}{N} \left| \left\{ n \in [N] : \left\| \sum_{k=1}^d \eta_k \theta_k^n \right\| < \rho \right\} \right| \leq 1 - \delta.$$

Then by (2.3),

$$|\widehat{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{p})(\xi)| \leq (1 - 2\pi\varepsilon\rho^2)^{\lfloor \delta N \rfloor}.$$

By the definition of  $N = N(\xi)$  we have

$$\|\xi\|_\infty \leq b_2^{N+1}.$$

It follows that

$$|\widehat{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{p})(\xi)| = O_{H,\varepsilon}(1) \cdot \|\xi\|_\infty^{-\alpha},$$

for  $\alpha = -\delta \log(1 - 2\pi\varepsilon\rho^2) / \log b_2$ , and the proof is complete.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 2.3.* It is convenient to express the exceptional set as a union, according to a dominant coordinate of  $\eta$  (which may be non-unique, of course):  $E_{H,N}(\delta, \rho) = \bigcup_{j=1}^d E_{H,N,j}(\delta, \rho)$ , where

$$(2.5) \quad E_{H,N,j}(\delta, \rho) := \left\{ \boldsymbol{\theta} \in H : \exists \eta, 1 \leq |\eta_j| = \|\eta\|_\infty \leq b_2, \frac{1}{N} \left| \left\{ n \in [N] : \left\| \sum_{k=1}^d \eta_k \theta_k^n \right\| < \rho \right\} \right| > 1 - \delta \right\}.$$

It is easy to see that  $E_{H,N,j}(\delta, \rho)$  is measurable. Observe that

$$\mathcal{E}_H(\delta, \rho) := \bigcup_{j=1}^d \mathcal{E}_{H,j}(\delta, \rho), \quad \text{where} \quad \mathcal{E}_{H,j}(\delta, \rho) := \bigcap_{N_0=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{N=N_0}^{\infty} E_{H,N,j}(\delta, \rho).$$

It is, of course, sufficient to show that  $\mathcal{L}^d(\mathcal{E}_{H,j}(\delta, \rho)) = 0$  for every  $j \in [d]$ , for some  $\delta, \rho > 0$ . Without loss of generality, assume that  $j = d$ . Since  $\mathcal{E}_{H,d}(\delta, \rho)$  is measurable, the desired claim will follow if we prove that every slice of  $\mathcal{E}_{H,d}(\delta, \rho)$  in the direction of the  $x_d$ -axis has zero  $\mathcal{L}^1$  measure. Namely, for fixed  $\boldsymbol{\theta}' = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{d-1})$  let

$$\mathcal{E}_{H,d}(\delta, \rho, \boldsymbol{\theta}') := \{\theta_d : (\boldsymbol{\theta}', \theta_d) \in \mathcal{E}_{H,d}(\delta, \rho)\}.$$

We want to show that  $\mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{E}_{H,d}(\delta, \rho, \boldsymbol{\theta}')) = 0$  for all  $\boldsymbol{\theta}'$ . Clearly,

$$\mathcal{E}_{H,d}(\delta, \rho, \boldsymbol{\theta}') := \bigcap_{N_0=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{N=N_0}^{\infty} E_{H,N,d}(\delta, \rho, \boldsymbol{\theta}'),$$



where

$$(2.6) \quad E_{H,N,d}(\delta, \rho, \boldsymbol{\theta}') = \left\{ \theta_d : (\boldsymbol{\theta}', \theta_d) \in H : \max_{\substack{\eta: 1 \leq |\eta_d| \leq b_2 \\ \|\eta\|_\infty = |\eta_d|}} \frac{1}{N} \left| \left\{ n \in [N] : \left\| \sum_{k=1}^d \eta_k \theta_k^n \right\| < \rho \right\} \right| > 1 - \delta \right\}$$

**Lemma 2.4.** *There exists a constant  $\rho > 0$  such that, for any  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ , the set  $E_{H,N,d}(\delta, \rho, \boldsymbol{\theta}')$  can be covered by  $\exp(O_H(\delta \log(1/\delta)N))$  intervals of length  $b_1^{-N}$ .*

We first complete the proof of the proposition, assuming the lemma. By Lemma 2.4,

$$\mathcal{L}^1 \left( \bigcup_{N=N_0}^{\infty} E_{H,N,d}(\delta, \rho, \boldsymbol{\theta}') \right) \leq \sum_{N=N_0}^{\infty} \exp(O_H(\delta \log(1/\delta)N)) \cdot b_1^{-N} \rightarrow 0, \quad N_0 \rightarrow \infty,$$

provided  $\delta > 0$  is so small that  $\log b_1 > O_H(\delta \log(1/\delta))$ . Thus  $\mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{E}_{H,d}(\delta, \rho, \boldsymbol{\theta}')) = 0$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 2.4.* Fix  $\boldsymbol{\theta}'$  in the projection of  $H$  to the first  $(d-1)$  coordinates and  $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , with  $1 \leq |\eta_d| = \|\eta\|_\infty \leq b_2$ . Below all the constants implicit in the  $O(\cdot)$  notation are allowed to depend on  $H$  and  $d$ . Let  $\theta_d$  be such that  $(\boldsymbol{\theta}', \theta_d) \in H$  and write

$$\sum_{k=1}^d \eta_k \theta_k^n = K_n + \varepsilon_n, \quad n \geq 0,$$

where  $K_n \in \mathbb{Z}$  is the nearest integer to the expression in the left-hand side, so that  $|\varepsilon_n| \leq \frac{1}{2}$ . We emphasize that  $K_n$  depends on  $\eta$  and on  $\theta_d$ . Define  $A_n^{(0)} = K_n$ ,  $\tilde{A}_n^{(0)} = K_n + \varepsilon_n$ , and then for all  $n$  inductively:

$$(2.7) \quad A_n^{(j)} = A_{n+1}^{(j-1)} - \theta_j A_n^{(j-1)}; \quad \tilde{A}_n^{(j)} = \tilde{A}_{n+1}^{(j-1)} - \theta_j \tilde{A}_n^{(j-1)}, \quad j = 1, \dots, d-1.$$

It is easy to check by induction that

$$\tilde{A}_n^{(j)} = \sum_{i=j+1}^d \eta_i \prod_{k=1}^j (\theta_i - \theta_k) \theta_i^n, \quad j = 1, \dots, d-1,$$

hence

$$(2.8) \quad \tilde{A}_n^{(d-1)} = \eta_d \prod_{k=1}^{d-1} (\theta_d - \theta_k) \theta_d^n; \quad \theta_d = \frac{\tilde{A}_{n+1}^{(d-1)}}{\tilde{A}_n^{(d-1)}}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

We have  $\|\eta\|_\infty \leq b_2$  and  $|\tilde{A}_n^{(0)} - A_n^{(0)}| \leq |\varepsilon_n|$ , and then by induction, by (2.7),

$$(2.9) \quad |\tilde{A}_n^{(j)} - A_n^{(j)}| \leq (1 + b_2)^j \max\{|\varepsilon_n|, \dots, |\varepsilon_{n+j}|\}, \quad j = 1, \dots, d-1.$$

Another easy calculation gives

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.10) \quad K_{n+d+1} &= \theta_1 K_{n+d} + A_{n+d}^{(1)} = \cdots \\
&= [\theta_1 K_{n+d} + \theta_2 A_{n+d-1}^{(1)} + \cdots + \theta_{d-1} A_{n+2}^{(d-2)}] + A_{n+2}^{(d-1)}
\end{aligned}$$

Since  $\frac{A_{n+2}^{(d-1)}}{A_{n+1}^{(d-1)}} \approx \frac{\tilde{A}_{n+1}^{(d-1)}}{\tilde{A}_n^{(d-1)}} = \theta_d$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.11) \quad K_{n+d+1} &\approx [\theta_1 K_{n+d} + \theta_2 A_{n+d-1}^{(1)} + \cdots + \theta_{d-1} A_{n+2}^{(d-2)}] + \frac{(A_{n+1}^{(d-1)})^2}{A_n^{(d-1)}} \\
&=: R_{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{d-1}}(K_n, \dots, K_{n+d}),
\end{aligned}$$

where  $R_{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{d-1}}(K_n, \dots, K_{n+d})$  is a rational function, depending on the (fixed) parameters  $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{d-1}$ . To make the approximate equality precise, note that by (2.8) and our assumptions,

$$|\tilde{A}_n^{(d-1)}| \geq c_1^{d-1} b_1^n,$$

where  $b_1 > 1$ , and  $|\tilde{A}_n^{(d-1)} - A_n^{(d-1)}| \leq (1 + b_2)^{d-1}/2$  by (2.9). Hence

$$(2.12) \quad |A_n^{(d-1)}| \geq c_1^{d-1} b_1^n / 2 \quad \text{for } n \geq n_0 = n_0(H),$$

and so

$$|A_{n+1}^{(d-1)} / A_n^{(d-1)}| \leq O(1), \quad n \geq n_0.$$

In the next estimates we assume that  $n \geq n_0(H)$ . In view of the above, especially (2.9) for  $j = d - 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \frac{A_{n+1}^{(d-1)}}{A_n^{(d-1)}} - \theta_d \right| &= \left| \frac{A_{n+1}^{(d-1)}}{A_n^{(d-1)}} - \frac{\tilde{A}_{n+1}^{(d-1)}}{\tilde{A}_n^{(d-1)}} \right| \\
&\leq \left| \frac{A_{n+1}^{(d-1)} - \tilde{A}_{n+1}^{(d-1)}}{A_n^{(d-1)}} \right| + \left| \tilde{A}_{n+1}^{(d-1)} \right| \cdot \left| \frac{1}{A_n^{(d-1)}} - \frac{1}{\tilde{A}_n^{(d-1)}} \right| \\
&\leq O(1) \cdot \max\{|\varepsilon_n|, \dots, |\varepsilon_{n+d}|\} \cdot |A_n^{(d-1)}|^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that, on the one hand,

$$(2.13) \quad \left| \frac{A_{n+1}^{(d-1)}}{A_n^{(d-1)}} - \theta_d \right| \leq O(1) \cdot b_1^{-n};$$

and on the other hand,

$$(2.14) \quad \left| \frac{(A_{n+1}^{(d-1)})^2}{A_n^{(d-1)}} - A_{n+2}^{(d-1)} \right| \leq O(1) \cdot \max\{|\varepsilon_n|, \dots, |\varepsilon_{n+d+1}|\}.$$

Note that  $A_n^{(j)}$ , for  $j \in [d-1]$ , is a linear combination of  $K_n, K_{n+1}, \dots, K_{n+j}$  with coefficients that are polynomials in the (fixed) parameters  $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{d-1}$ , hence the inequality (2.13) shows that

$$(2.15) \quad \boxed{\text{given } K_n, \dots, K_{n+d}, \text{ we have an } O(1) \cdot b_1^{-n}\text{-approximation of } \theta_d.}$$

The inequality (2.14) yields, using (2.11) and (2.10), that, for  $n \geq n_0$ ,

$$|K_{n+d+1} - R_{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{d-1}}(K_n, \dots, K_{n+d})| \leq O(1) \cdot \max\{|\varepsilon_n|, \dots, |\varepsilon_{n+d+1}|\}.$$

Thus we have:

- (i) Given  $K_n, \dots, K_{n+d}$ , there are at most  $O(1)$  possible values for  $K_{n+d+1}$ , uniformly in  $\eta$  and  $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{d-1}$ . There are also  $O(1)$  possible values for  $K_1, \dots, K_{n_0}$  since  $\|\eta\|_\infty$  and  $\|\theta\|$  are bounded above by  $b_2$ .
- (ii) There is a constant  $\rho = \rho(H) > 0$  such that if  $\max\{|\varepsilon_n|, \dots, |\varepsilon_{n+d+1}|\} < \rho$ , then  $K_n, \dots, K_{n+d}$  uniquely determine  $K_{n+d+1}$ , as the nearest integer to  $R_{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{d-1}}(K_n, \dots, K_{n+d})$ , again independently of  $\eta$  and  $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{d-1}$ .

Fix an  $N$  sufficiently large. We claim that for each fixed set  $J \subset [N]$  with  $|J| \geq (1-\delta)N$ , the set

$$\left\{ (K_n)_{n \in [N]} : \varepsilon_n = \left\| \sum_{k=1}^d \eta_k \theta_k^n \right\| < \rho \text{ for some } \theta_d, \eta \text{ and all } n \in J \right\}$$

has cardinality  $\exp(O(\delta N))$ . Indeed, fix such a  $J$  and let

$$\tilde{J} = \{i \in [n_0 + (d+1), N] : i, i-1, \dots, i-(d+1) \in J\}.$$

We have  $|\tilde{J}| \geq (1 - (d+2)\delta)N - n_0 - (d+1)$ . If we set

$$\Lambda_j = (K_i)_{i \in [j]},$$

then (i), (ii) above show that  $|\Lambda_{j+1}| = |\Lambda_j|$  if  $j \in \tilde{J}$  and  $|\Lambda_{j+1}| = O(|\Lambda_j|)$  otherwise. Thus  $|\Lambda_N| \leq O(1)^{(d+2)\delta N}$ , as claimed.

The number of subsets  $A$  of  $[N]$  of size  $\geq (1-\delta)N$  is bounded by  $\exp(O(\delta \log(1/\delta)N))$  (using e.g. Stirling's formula), so we conclude that there are

$$\exp(O(\delta \log(1/\delta)N)) \cdot \exp(O(\delta N)) = \exp(O(\delta \log(1/\delta)N))$$

sequences  $K_1, \dots, K_N$  such that  $|\varepsilon_n| < \rho$  for at least  $(1-\delta)N$  values of  $n \in [N]$ . Hence by (2.15) the set (2.6) can be covered by  $\exp(O_H(\delta \log(1/\delta)N))$  intervals of radius  $b_1^{-N}$ , as desired.  $\square$

The proof of Theorem 1.3 is now complete.

**Acknowledgement.** Thanks to Ariel Rapaport for corrections and helpful comments on a preliminary version.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Amir Algom, Federico Rodriguez Hertz, and Zhiren Wang. Pointwise normality and Fourier decay for self-conformal measures. *arXiv e-prints*, December 2020. arXiv:2012.06529.
- [2] Jean Bourgain and Semyon Dyatlov. Fourier dimension and spectral gaps for hyperbolic surfaces. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 27(4):744–771, 2017.
- [3] Julien Brémont. Self-similar measures and the Rajchman property. *arXiv e-prints*, October 2019. arXiv:1910.03463.
- [4] Xin-Rong Dai, De-Jun Feng, and Yang Wang. Refinable functions with non-integer dilations. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 250(1):1–20, 2007.
- [5] Paul Erdős. On a family of symmetric Bernoulli convolutions. *Amer. J. Math.*, 61:974–976, 1939.
- [6] Paul Erdős. On the smoothness properties of a family of Bernoulli convolutions. *Amer. J. Math.*, 62:180–186, 1940.
- [7] Kevin G. Hare and Nikita Sidorov. On a family of self-affine sets: topology, uniqueness, simultaneous expansions. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 37(1):193–227, 2017.
- [8] Michael Hochman. On self-similar sets with overlaps and inverse theorems for entropy in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . *arXiv e-prints, Memoirs of the AMS, to appear*, page arXiv:1503.09043, March 2015.
- [9] Thomas Jordan and Tuomas Sahlsten. Fourier transforms of Gibbs measures for the Gauss map. *Math. Ann.*, 364(3-4):983–1023, 2016.
- [10] J.-P. Kahane. Sur la distribution de certaines séries aléatoires. *Bull. Soc. Math. France, Mém. No. 25, Soc. Math. France Paris*, pages 119–122, 1971.
- [11] Jialun Li. Decrease of Fourier coefficients of stationary measures. *Math. Ann.*, 372(3-4):1189–1238, 2018.
- [12] Jialun Li and Tuomas Sahlsten. Trigonometric series and self-similar sets. *arXiv e-prints*, Feb 2019. arXiv:1902.00426.
- [13] Jialun Li and Tuomas Sahlsten. Fourier transform of self-affine measures. *Adv. Math.*, 374:107349, 2020.
- [14] Russell Lyons. Seventy years of Rajchman measures. *J. Fourier Anal. Appl.*, pages 363–377, 1995.
- [15] Yuval Peres, Wilhelm Schlag, and Boris Solomyak. Sixty years of Bernoulli convolutions. In *Fractal geometry and stochastics, II (Greifswald/Koserow, 1998)*, volume 46 of *Progr. Probab.*, pages 39–65. Birkhäuser, Basel, 2000.
- [16] Charles Pisot. La répartition modulo 1 et les nombres algébriques. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (2)*, 7(3-4):205–248, 1938.
- [17] Ariel Rapaport. On the Rajchman property for self-similar measures on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . *arXiv e-prints*, April 2021. arXiv:2104.03955.
- [18] Tuomas Sahlsten and Connor Stevens. Fourier decay in nonlinear dynamics. *arXiv e-prints*, Oct 2018. arXiv:1810.01378.
- [19] Raphael Salem. Sets of uniqueness and sets of multiplicity. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 54:218–228, 1943.
- [20] Pablo Shmerkin. Overlapping self-affine sets. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 55(4):1291–1331, 2006.
- [21] Pablo Shmerkin and Boris Solomyak. Absolute continuity of complex Bernoulli convolutions. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 161(3):435–453, 2016.
- [22] Pablo Shmerkin and Boris Solomyak. Absolute continuity of self-similar measures, their projections and convolutions. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 368(7):5125–5151, 2016.
- [23] Boris Solomyak. Fourier decay for self-similar measures. *arXiv e-prints, Proc. of the AMS, to appear*, June 2019. arXiv:1906.12164.

- [24] Péter P. Varjú. Recent progress on Bernoulli convolutions. In *European Congress of Mathematics*, pages 847–867. Eur. Math. Soc., Zürich, 2018.
- [25] Péter P. Varjú and Han Yu. Fourier decay of self-similar measures and self-similar sets of uniqueness. *arXiv e-prints*, April 2020. arXiv:2004.09358.

BORIS SOLOMYAK, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BAR-ILAN UNIVERSITY, RAMAT GAN, 5290002 ISRAEL  
*Email address:* bsolom3@gmail.com