

# THE DISTRIBUTION OF SPACINGS OF REAL-VALUED LACUNARY SEQUENCES MODULO ONE

SNEHA CHAUBEY AND NADAV YESHA

ABSTRACT. Let  $(a_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$  be a lacunary sequence of positive real numbers. Rudnick and Technau showed that for almost all  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ , the pair correlation of  $(\alpha a_n)_{n=1}^{\infty} \bmod 1$  is Poissonian. We show that all higher correlations and hence the nearest-neighbour spacing distribution are Poissonian as well, thereby extending a result of Rudnick and Zaharescu to real-valued sequences.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

A sequence  $(a_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$  of real numbers is said to be *uniformly distributed modulo one* (u.d. mod 1), if the fractional parts of the sequence are equidistributed in the unit interval, i.e., for every interval  $I \subseteq [0, 1)$  we have

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \# \{1 \leq n \leq N : \{a_n\} \in I\} = |I|.$$

Questions about u.d. mod 1 have been studied for more than a century now, going back to the pioneering work of Weyl [14]. Interestingly, from a metric point of view, the conditions for u.d. mod 1 are quite modest: as was shown by Weyl [14], if  $(a_n)$  is any sequence of *distinct integers*, then the sequence  $(\alpha a_n)$  is u.d. mod 1 for almost all  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ . It is also well-known (see, e.g., [5, Corollary 4.3]) that if  $(a_n)$  is *real-valued* and is sufficiently well-spaced in the sense that there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that  $|a_n - a_m| \geq \delta$  for all  $n \neq m$ , then  $(\alpha a_n)$  is u.d. mod 1 for almost all  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ . The latter condition clearly holds when  $(a_n)$  is a *lacunary* sequence of positive real numbers, i.e., when there exists  $c > 1$  such that  $a_{n+1}/a_n \geq c$  for all  $n \geq 1$ .

While very useful, the notion of u.d. mod 1 cannot explain the finer aspects of sequences modulo one, such as the *pseudo-randomness* of a sequence. Indeed, there is a growing interest in studying *fine-scale* statistics of sequences modulo one in the scale of the mean gap  $1/N$ ; one can test for pseudo-randomness by comparing these statistics to those of random, uniformly distributed independent points in the unit interval (Poisson statistics). A most natural statistic, which is very easy to visualize, is the *nearest-neighbour spacing distribution* (or gap distribution), which is defined as follows: consider the *ordered* fractional parts

---

SC is supported by the Science and Engineering Research Board, Department of Science and Technology, Government of India under grant SB/S2/RJN-053/2018. NY is supported by the ISRAEL SCIENCE FOUNDATION (grant No. 1881/20).

$\{a_n\}$  of the first  $N$  elements of the sequence, which we denote by

$$a_{(1)}^N \leq a_{(2)}^N \leq \dots \leq a_{(N)}^N,$$

and denote  $a_{(N+1)}^N := 1 + a_{(1)}^N$ . Let the normalized gaps be defined by

$$\delta_n^N := N \left( a_{(n+1)}^N - a_{(n)}^N \right);$$

we say that nearest-neighbour spacing distribution is Poissonian if for any  $I \subseteq [0, \infty)$ ,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \# \left\{ 1 \leq n \leq N : \delta_n^N \in I \right\} = \int_I e^{-s} ds,$$

i.e., if the limit distribution agrees with the random model.

There are very few examples of sequences modulo one where a Poissonian nearest-neighbour spacing distribution can be rigorously proved. Rudnick and Zaharescu proved [12] that if  $(a_n)$  is a lacunary sequence of *integers*, then the nearest-neighbour spacing distribution of  $(\alpha a_n)$  is Poissonian for almost all  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ ; as will be detailed below, the main goal of this note is to show an analogous result for *real-valued* lacunary sequences. Another natural question about real-valued lacunary sequences with a different notion of randomization (which dramatically changes the problem) is whether the sequence  $(\alpha^n)$  has a Poissonian nearest-neighbour spacing distribution for almost all  $\alpha > 1$  – this was recently answered positively in [1], as a special case of a more general family of sequences (which include some sub-lacunary sequences as well) having this property. For polynomially growing sequences very little is known. Rudnick and Sarnak conjectured [8] that for any  $d \geq 2$  and any  $\alpha$  which cannot be approximated too well by rationals, the sequence  $(\alpha n^d)$  has a Poissonian nearest-neighbour spacing distribution; while numerical experiments are supportive of the conjecture (and of Poisson statistics for many other natural examples of sequences), it remains open until today.

A related class of important fine-scale statistics consists of the  $k$ -level correlations ( $k \geq 2$ ). Given a compactly supported, real valued, smooth function  $f : \mathbb{R}^{k-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we define the  $k$ -level correlation sum to be

$$R_k(f, (a_n), N) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}^{k-1}} \sum_{\substack{x=(x_1, \dots, x_k) \\ 1 \leq x_1, \dots, x_k \leq N \\ x_1, \dots, x_k \text{ distinct}}} f \left( N \left( \Delta_{(a_n)}(x) - m \right) \right),$$

where

$$\Delta_{(a_n)}(x) := (a_{x_1} - a_{x_2}, a_{x_2} - a_{x_3}, \dots, a_{x_{k-1}} - a_{x_k}).$$

We say that  $(a_n)$  has Poissonian  $k$ -level correlation, if for any compactly supported, real valued, smooth function  $f : \mathbb{R}^{k-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  we have

$$(1) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} R_k(f, (a_n), N) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{k-1}} f(x) dx,$$

which again agrees with the random model. It is well-known (see, e.g., [6, Appendix A]), that Poissonian  $k$ -level correlations for all  $k \geq 2$  implies Poissonian nearest-neighbour spacing distribution (it also implies Poissonian behaviour for other statistics, such as the

second-to-nearest-neighbour spacing distribution, joint nearest-neighbour spacing distribution, etc.).

In many instances, although one fails to obtain information on the triple and higher correlations of a sequence, one can still study the pair correlation ( $k = 2$ ), and prove a Poissonian limit. Rudnick and Sarnak showed [8] that for any  $d \geq 2$ , the sequence  $(\alpha n^d)$  has Poissonian pair correlation for almost all  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ . Recently, a significant progress was made in the study of the sequences  $(\alpha n^\theta)$  where  $\theta$  is non-integer: Aistleitner, El-Baz and Munsch proved [2] Poissonian pair correlation for any fixed  $\theta > 1$  and almost  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ ; this was recently extended by Rudnick and Technau [10] to all fixed  $\theta < 1$  and almost all  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ . As for non-metric results, El-Baz, Marklof and Vinogradov showed [3] Poissonian pair correlation for the sequence  $(\sqrt{n})_{\sqrt{n} \notin \mathbb{Z}}$  (the nearest-neighbour spacing distribution of this sequence is *non-Poissonian*, see [4]); recently, Lutsko, Sourmelidis and Technau proved [7] Poissonian pair correlation for the sequence  $(\alpha n^\theta)$  for all fixed  $\alpha \neq 0$  and  $\theta < 14/41 = 0.341\dots$

In [9], Rudnick and Technau proved that for any *real-valued*, positive lacunary sequence  $(a_n)$ , the pair correlation of  $(\alpha a_n)$  is Poissonian for almost all  $\alpha > 1$ , extending a result of Rudnick and Zaharescu [11] holding only for *integer-valued* sequences. Our goal is to show metric Poisson behaviour for the higher-level correlations ( $k \geq 3$ ) of this sequence.

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $(a_n)$  be a real-valued, positive, lacunary sequence. For almost all  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ , the  $k$ -level correlation of  $(\alpha a_n)$  is Poissonian for all  $k \geq 2$ .*

In particular, we conclude that for almost all  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ , the nearest-neighbour spacing distribution (and all other statistics determined by the correlations) of  $(\alpha a_n)$  is Poissonian.

**1.1. Outline of the proof.** In Section 2 we give a combinatorial counting argument which closely follows the argument for integer-valued sequences from [12, Section 2], with several adaptations required to extend the proof to real-valued sequences. In Section 3 we use the bound from the previous section to prove a polynomial decay for the variance of the  $k$ -level correlation sum, which by a standard argument gives the claimed almost sure convergence.

**1.2. Notation.** Throughout this note, we will interchangeably use the Bachmann-Landau  $O$  notation and the Vinogradov notation  $\ll$ , where for readability reasons the implied constants will be omitted, and may depend on  $a_1$  (the first element of the sequence), the constant  $c$  defined below, the parameters  $r, k, \epsilon, \eta, R$  and the functions  $f, \rho$ .

## 2. A COUNTING ARGUMENT

Let  $(a_n)_{n=1}^\infty$  be a lacunary sequence of positive *real* numbers, i.e.,  $a_1 > 0$ , and there exists a constant  $c > 1$  such that

$$(2) \quad a_{n+1} \geq ca_n$$

for all integers  $n \geq 1$ .

Our goal in this section is to prove the following proposition:

**Proposition 2.** *Let  $k \geq 2$ ,  $N \geq 1$ ,  $\epsilon > 0$ . The number of*

$$n = (n_1, \dots, n_{k-1}) \in \mathbb{Z}^{k-1}, m = (m_1, \dots, m_{k-1}) \in \mathbb{Z}^{k-1},$$

$$w = (w_1, \dots, w_k) \in \mathbb{Z}^k, w' = (w'_1, \dots, w'_k) \in \mathbb{Z}^k$$

*such that  $1 \leq w_1, \dots, w_k \leq N$  are distinct,  $1 \leq w'_1, \dots, w'_k \leq N$  are distinct,*

$$1 \leq \|n\|_\infty \leq N^{1+\epsilon}, 1 \leq \|m\|_\infty \leq N^{1+\epsilon},$$

*and*

$$|n \cdot \Delta_{(a_n)}(w) - m \cdot \Delta_{(a_n)}(w')| \leq N^\epsilon$$

*is  $O(N^{2k-1+4k\epsilon})$ .*

We will begin with an auxiliary lemma.

**Lemma 3.** *Let  $I \subseteq (0, \infty)$  be a finite interval. Then*

$$(3) \quad \#\{n \geq 1 : a_n \in I\} \leq C|I| + 1,$$

*where  $C := \left(a_1 \left(1 - \frac{1}{c}\right)\right)^{-1}$ .*

*Proof.* By (2), we have

$$a_{n+1} - a_n = a_{n+1} \left(1 - \frac{a_n}{a_{n+1}}\right) \geq a_{n+1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{c}\right) \geq a_1 \left(1 - \frac{1}{c}\right),$$

and (3) follows.  $\square$

In the rest of this section, we will follow the strategy of [12, Section 2], adapted to real-valued sequences.

**Lemma 4.** *Let  $r \geq 1$  be an integer,  $C \geq 1$ ,  $A_1 > A_2 > \dots > A_r > 0$  real numbers and  $b \in \mathbb{R}$ . For any  $M \geq 1$ , the number of vectors  $y = (y_1, \dots, y_r) \in \mathbb{Z}^r$  with  $|y_1|, \dots, |y_r| \leq M$  such that*

$$(4) \quad |y_1 A_1 + \dots + y_r A_r + b| \leq C A_1$$

*is  $O(CM^{r-1})$ .*

*Proof.* The variables  $y_2, \dots, y_r$  can take at most  $O(M^{r-1})$  values. Fix  $y_2, \dots, y_r$  and denote

$$\alpha := \frac{y_2 A_2 + \dots + y_r A_r + b}{A_1}.$$

Then,  $y_1 \in [\alpha - C, \alpha + C]$ , and therefore  $y_1$  can take at most  $O(C)$  values.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.** *Let  $r \geq 2$  be an integer,  $C \geq 1$ ,  $z_1 > z_2 > \dots > z_r > 0$  integers and  $b \in \mathbb{R}$ . For any  $M \geq 1$ ,  $d \in \mathbb{Z}$ , the number of vectors  $y = (y_1, \dots, y_r) \in \mathbb{Z}^r$  with  $|y_1|, \dots, |y_r| \leq M$  such that*

$$(5) \quad \begin{aligned} |y_1 a_{z_1} + \dots + y_r a_{z_r} + b| &\leq C a_{z_1} \\ y_1 + \dots + y_r &= d \end{aligned}$$

*is  $O(CM^{r-2})$ .*

*Proof.* We argue as in [12, Lemma 2.2] (where  $(a_n)$  is assumed to be an integer valued lacunary sequence and  $b$  is assumed to be integer): by substituting the constraint  $y_1 + \dots + y_r = d$  in the inequality (5), we conclude that we have to bound the number of integer points in the region

$$|y_1(a_{z_1} - a_{z_r}) + \dots + y_{r-1}(a_{z_{r-1}} - a_{z_r}) + b + da_{z_r}| \leq Ca_{z_1};$$

since  $a_{z_1} - a_{z_r} \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{c}\right)a_{z_1}$ , we can apply Lemma 4 with  $A_i = a_{z_i} - a_{z_r}$  and with the constant on the right-hand-side of (4) being equal to  $C \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1}{c}\right)^{-1}$ .  $\square$

We will now adapt [12, Lemma 2.3] to our setting.

**Lemma 6.** *Let  $r \geq 1$  be an integer. For any  $M \geq 1$ ,  $K \geq 1$ ,  $\epsilon > 0$ , the number of  $(y_1, \dots, y_r, z_1, \dots, z_r) \in \mathbb{Z}^{2r}$  with*

$$(6) \quad \begin{aligned} |y_1|, \dots, |y_r| &\leq M, \\ 1 \leq z_1, \dots, z_r &\leq M \quad \text{distinct} \\ (y_1, \dots, y_r) &\neq (0, \dots, 0) \end{aligned}$$

such that

$$(7) \quad \begin{aligned} |y_1 a_{z_1} + \dots + y_r a_{z_r}| &\leq K \\ y_1 + \dots + y_r &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

is  $O(K^r M^{r-1+\epsilon})$ .

*Proof.* We prove the lemma by induction on  $r$ . Clearly, for  $r = 1$  there are no vectors satisfying both (6), (7) (“admissible vectors”), so that the statement of the lemma trivially holds in this case.

We now assume that the statement holds for  $r - 1$ , and prove it for  $r$ . When counting admissible vectors  $(y_1, \dots, y_r, z_1, \dots, z_r) \in \mathbb{Z}^{2r}$ , we can assume that  $y_i \neq 0$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq r$ . Indeed, if there exists  $i$  such that  $y_i = 0$ , then

$$(y_1, \dots, y_{i-1}, y_{i+1}, \dots, y_r, z_1, \dots, z_{i-1}, z_{i+1}, \dots, z_r) \in \mathbb{Z}^{2(r-1)}$$

are admissible vectors for  $r - 1$ , and therefore by the induction hypothesis the number of possible  $(y_1, \dots, y_{i-1}, y_{i+1}, \dots, y_r, z_1, \dots, z_{i-1}, z_{i+1}, \dots, z_r)$  is  $O(K^{r-1} M^{r-2+\epsilon})$ ; since  $z_i$  can take  $O(M)$  values, the number of admissible vectors  $(y_1, \dots, y_r, z_1, \dots, z_r)$  with  $y_i = 0$  is  $O(K^{r-1} M^{r-1+\epsilon})$ .

Assume then that  $(y_1, \dots, y_r, z_1, \dots, z_r) \in \mathbb{Z}^{2r}$  is an admissible vector such that  $y_i \neq 0$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq r$ ; we can also assume that  $z_1 > z_2 > \dots > z_r$ . We will partition the index set  $\{1, \dots, r\}$  to a disjoint union of sets  $B_1, \dots, B_l$  where each set  $B_i$  will consist of indices of close-by elements  $z_j$  in the following sense:  $B_1$  will consist of  $j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$  such that  $z_j \in \left[z_1 - \frac{\log M}{\log c}, z_1\right]$ ; if we denote by  $j_2$  the smallest  $j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$  not contained in  $B_1$ , then  $B_2$  will consist of  $j \in \{j_2, \dots, r\}$  such that  $z_j \in \left[z_{j_2} - \frac{\log M}{\log c}, z_{j_2}\right]$  and so on. If

we label by  $1 = j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_l$  the smallest elements of  $B_1, B_2, \dots, B_l$ , then for each  $1 \leq k \leq l-1$  we have

$$(8) \quad \begin{aligned} z_{j_k}, \dots, z_{j_{k+1}-1} &\in \left[ z_{j_k} - \frac{\log M}{\log c}, z_{j_k} \right] \\ z_{j_{k+1}} &< z_{j_k} - \frac{\log M}{\log c} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$z_{j_l}, \dots, z_r \in \left[ z_{j_l} - \frac{\log M}{\log c}, z_{j_l} \right].$$

Since the number of possible partitions of  $\{1, \dots, r\}$  into  $l$  subsets is  $O(1)$ , it is enough to count the number of admissible vectors which correspond to a given partition. We distinguish between two cases:  $\#B_l \geq 2$  and  $\#B_l = 1$ .

Assume first that  $\#B_l \geq 2$ . If we fix  $z_{j_1}, z_{j_2}, \dots, z_{j_l}$ , then each of the remaining numbers  $z_j$  (there are  $r-l$  of them) belongs to one of the intervals  $\left[ z_{j_k} - \frac{\log M}{\log c}, z_{j_k} \right]$ , and hence can take at most  $O\left(\frac{\log M}{\log c}\right)$  values. Thus,  $z_1, z_2, \dots, z_r$  can take at most  $O\left(M^{l+\epsilon}\right)$  values; if we fix  $z_1, z_2, \dots, z_r$ , it is enough to show that the number of admissible  $y_1, \dots, y_r$  is  $O\left(K^{r-1}M^{r-l-1}\right)$ . Note that by (8) and the lacunarity of the sequence  $(a_n)$ , we have

$$(9) \quad a_{z_{j_k}}/a_{z_{j_{k+1}}} \geq c^{z_{j_k}-z_{j_{k+1}}} > M.$$

Fix  $z_1, \dots, z_r$  and assume that  $y_1, \dots, y_r$  are admissible. We have

$$\left| \sum_{j \in B_1} y_j a_{z_j} \right| \leq \left| \sum_{j \geq j_2} y_j a_{z_j} \right| + K \leq r M a_{z_{j_2}} + K < r a_{z_1} + K \ll K a_{z_1},$$

where in the first inequality we used (7), and in the third inequality we used (9). By Lemma 4, we conclude that  $y_1, \dots, y_{j_2-1}$  can take at most  $O\left(KM^{\#B_1-1}\right)$  values. Now fix  $y_1, \dots, y_{j_2-1}$ , and set  $b = \sum_{j < j_2} y_j a_{z_j}$ . We have

$$\left| b + \sum_{j \in B_2} y_j a_{z_j} \right| \leq \left| \sum_{j \geq j_3} y_j a_{z_j} \right| + K \leq r M a_{z_{j_3}} + K < r a_{z_{j_2}} + K \ll K a_{z_{j_2}},$$

so that by Lemma 4,  $y_{j_2}, \dots, y_{j_3-1}$  can take at most  $O\left(KM^{\#B_2-1}\right)$  values. We repeat this process, and see that  $y_1, \dots, y_{j_l-1}$  can take at most  $O\left(K^{l-1}M^{(\#B_1-1)+\dots+(\#B_{l-1}-1)}\right)$  values, and if we keep them fixed and denote  $b = \sum_{j < j_l} y_j a_{z_j}$ ,  $d = -\sum_{j < j_l} y_j = \sum_{j \in B_l} y_j$ , then

$$\left| b + \sum_{j \in B_l} y_j a_{z_j} \right| \ll K a_{z_{j_l}}$$

and therefore by Lemma 5 (recall that  $\#B_l \geq 2$ ),  $y_{j_1}, \dots, y_r$  can take at most  $O(KM^{\#B_l-2})$  values. We see that  $y_1, \dots, y_r$  can take at most

$$O\left(K^l M^{(\#B_1-1)+\dots+(\#B_{l-1}-1)+(\#B_l-2)}\right) = O\left(K^{r-1} M^{r-l-1}\right)$$

values.

Assume now that  $\#B_l = 1$ , so that  $j_l = r$ . By the above argument  $z_1, \dots, z_{r-1}$  can take at most  $O(M^{l-1+\epsilon})$  values. We keep  $z_1, \dots, z_{r-1}$  fixed, and again, by the argument above  $y_1, \dots, y_{r-1}$  can take at most

$$O\left(K^{l-1} M^{(\#B_1-1)+\dots+(\#B_{l-1}-1)}\right) = O\left(K^{l-1} M^{r-l}\right)$$

values. Assume that  $y_1, \dots, y_{r-1}, z_1, \dots, z_{r-1}$  are fixed. Then  $y_r = -y_1 - \dots - y_{r-1}$  is uniquely determined, and since by our assumption it is non-zero and integer it satisfies  $|y_r| \geq 1$ . Let us bound the number of possible values of  $z_r$ : denote

$$\alpha := \frac{-y_1 a_{z_1} - \dots - y_{r-1} a_{z_{r-1}}}{y_r}.$$

Then

$$|a_{z_r} - \alpha| \leq \frac{K}{|y_r|} \leq K$$

so that

$$a_{z_r} \in [\alpha - K, \alpha + K].$$

Hence, by Lemma 3,  $z_r$  can take at most  $O(K)$  values, and hence the number of admissible  $y_1, \dots, y_r, z_1, \dots, z_r$  is  $O(K^r M^{r-1+\epsilon})$ .  $\square$

We would like to prove a generalization of Lemma 6 to vectors  $(y_1, \dots, y_r, z_1, \dots, z_r) \in \mathbb{Z}^{2r}$  consisting of non-distinct  $z_1, \dots, z_r$ . We will require a non-degeneracy condition that we now describe.

Given a vector  $v = (y_1, \dots, y_r, z_1, \dots, z_r) \in \mathbb{Z}^{2r}$ , for any  $1 \leq i \leq r$  we let  $A(i) := \{1 \leq j \leq r : z_j = z_i\}$ . We say that the vector  $v$  is degenerate if for any  $1 \leq i \leq r$  we have  $\sum_{j \in A(i)} y_j = 0$ , and we say that  $v$  is non-degenerate otherwise.

**Lemma 7.** *Let  $r \geq 1$  be an integer. For any  $M \geq 1$ ,  $K \geq 1$ ,  $\epsilon > 0$ , the number of non-degenerate  $(y_1, \dots, y_r, z_1, \dots, z_r) \in \mathbb{Z}^{2r}$  with*

$$(10) \quad \begin{aligned} |y_1|, \dots, |y_r| &\leq M, \\ 1 \leq z_1, \dots, z_r &\leq M \end{aligned}$$

such that

$$(11) \quad \begin{aligned} |y_1 a_{z_1} + \dots + y_r a_{z_r}| &\leq K \\ y_1 + \dots + y_r &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

is  $O(K^r M^{r-1+\epsilon})$ .

*Proof.* For each vector  $v = (y_1, \dots, y_r, z_1, \dots, z_r) \in \mathbb{Z}^{2r}$  satisfying (10), (11) (“admissible vector”), the corresponding sets  $A(1), \dots, A(r)$  induce a partition of the index set  $\{1, \dots, r\}$  into disjoint union of sets  $A_1, \dots, A_l$  (which are exactly the sets  $A(1), \dots, A(r)$  without repetitions). Since the total number of partitions of  $\{1, \dots, r\}$  into  $l$  subsets is  $O(1)$ , we can count only admissible vectors corresponding to a given partition.

For each  $1 \leq i \leq l$ , let  $\tilde{y}_i = \sum_{j \in A_i} y_j$  and let  $\tilde{z}_i = z_j$  for  $j \in A_i$ . Then  $|\tilde{y}_1|, \dots, |\tilde{y}_l| \ll M$ ,  $\tilde{y}_1 + \dots + \tilde{y}_l = 0$ , by the non-degeneracy condition  $(\tilde{y}_1, \dots, \tilde{y}_l) \neq (0, \dots, 0)$ ,  $1 \leq \tilde{z}_1, \dots, \tilde{z}_l \leq M$  are distinct, and  $|\tilde{y}_1 a_{\tilde{z}_1} + \dots + \tilde{y}_l a_{\tilde{z}_l}| \leq K$ . Hence we can apply Lemma 6 and deduce that  $\tilde{y}_1, \dots, \tilde{y}_l, \tilde{z}_1, \dots, \tilde{z}_l$  can take at most  $O(K^l M^{l-1+\epsilon})$  values.

We now fix  $\tilde{v} = (\tilde{y}_1, \dots, \tilde{y}_l, \tilde{z}_1, \dots, \tilde{z}_l)$ , and count the number of possible values of  $y_1, \dots, y_r, z_1, \dots, z_r$  which map to  $\tilde{v}$ . For each  $1 \leq i \leq l$ , all values of  $z_j, j \in A_i$  are equal to  $\tilde{z}_i$ , so  $z_1, \dots, z_r$  are completely determined by  $\tilde{v}$ . Moreover, for each  $1 \leq i \leq l$  we have  $\tilde{y}_i = \sum_{j \in A_i} y_j$ , and for fixed  $\tilde{y}_i$  the number of solutions to this equation is  $O(M^{\#A_i-1})$ . Hence  $y_1, \dots, y_r$  can take at most  $O(M^{(\#A_1-1)+\dots+(\#A_l-1)}) = O(M^{r-l})$  values. We conclude that  $v$  can take at most  $O(K^r M^{r-1+\epsilon})$  values as claimed.  $\square$

We are now in the position to prove Proposition 2.

*Proof of Proposition 2.* Let  $r = 2k$ , and let

$$\begin{aligned} z_1 &= w_1, \dots, z_k = w_k, \\ z_{k+1} &= w'_1, \dots, z_{2k} = w'_k, \\ y_1 &= n_1, y_2 = n_2 - n_1, \dots, y_{k-1} = n_{k-1} - n_{k-2}, y_k = -n_{k-1}, \\ y_{k+1} &= -m_1, y_{k+2} = m_1 - m_2, \dots, y_{2k-1} = m_{k-2} - m_{k-1}, y_{2k} = m_{k-1}. \end{aligned}$$

We see that if  $n = (n_1, \dots, n_{k-1}), m = (m_1, \dots, m_{k-1}), w = (w_1, \dots, w_k), w' = (w'_1, \dots, w'_k)$  satisfy the conditions of Proposition 2, then the vector  $v = (y_1, \dots, y_r, z_1, \dots, z_r)$  satisfies (10), (11) with  $M = 2N^{1+\epsilon}, K = N^\epsilon$  together with the additional conditions

$$\begin{aligned} (y_1, \dots, y_k) &\neq (0, \dots, 0), \\ (y_{k+1}, \dots, y_{2k}) &\neq (0, \dots, 0), \\ y_1 + \dots + y_k &= 0, \\ z_1, \dots, z_k &\text{ distinct}, \\ z_{k+1}, \dots, z_{2k} &\text{ distinct}. \end{aligned}$$

It is therefore sufficient to bound the number of such “admissible” vectors  $v$ .

By Lemma 7, for any  $\eta > 0$ , the number of non-degenerate admissible vectors is  $O(K^r M^{r-1+\eta})$ , which upon taking  $\eta$  sufficiently small is also  $O(N^{2k-1+4k\epsilon})$ . It remains to count the number of degenerate admissible vectors.

Assume that  $v$  is degenerate, and denote by  $s$  the number of variables among  $z_1, \dots, z_k$  which are equal to one of the variables  $z_{k+1}, \dots, z_{2k}$  (clearly  $s \geq 1$ , since  $v$  is degenerate and  $(y_1, \dots, y_r) \neq (0, \dots, 0)$ ). To simplify the notation, we can assume that  $z_1 = z_{k+1}, \dots, z_s =$



$z_{k+s}$ . Hence, the sets  $A_1, \dots, A_l$  defined in the proof of Lemma 7 are exactly

$$\{1, k+1\}, \dots, \{s, k+s\}, \{s+1\}, \dots, \{k\}, \{k+s+1\}, \dots, \{2k\},$$

so that  $l = 2k - s$ . Since  $v$  is degenerate, we have

$$(12) \quad \begin{cases} y_i + y_{k+i} = 0 & 1 \leq i \leq s \\ y_i = 0 & s+1 \leq i \leq k, k+s+1 \leq i \leq 2k. \end{cases}$$

Given a partition  $A_1, \dots, A_l$  (which can be assumed to be fixed), there are exactly  $l = 2k - s$  distinct variables  $z_i$ , and hence  $z_1, \dots, z_k$  can take at most  $M^{2k-s}$  values. Given  $y_2, \dots, y_s$ , the variables

$$y_{k+2}, \dots, y_{k+s}, y_{s+1}, \dots, y_k, y_{k+s+1}, \dots, y_{2k}$$

are determined by (12), whereas  $y_1$  is determined by the condition  $y_1 + \dots + y_k = 0$ , and then  $y_{k+1}$  is determined by (12). Hence, the variables  $y_1, \dots, y_{2k}$  can take at most  $O(M^{s-1})$  values, and the total number of degenerate vectors  $v$  is at most  $O(M^{2k-1}) = O(N^{2k-1+2k\epsilon})$ .  $\square$

### 3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Fix  $k \geq 2$ . We will now turn to prove our main theorem, estimating the variance of the  $k$ -level correlation sums

$$R_k(f, N)(\alpha) := R_k(f, (\alpha a_n), N)$$

using Proposition 2. It will be technically easier to work with smooth averages; we therefore fix a smooth, compactly supported, non-negative weight function  $\rho : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .

**3.1. Variance.** We would like to show that the variance of  $R_k(f, N)(\alpha)$  w.r.t.  $\alpha$  is small. The fact that the expectation of  $R_k(f, N)(\alpha)$  is asymptotic to  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{k-1}} f(x) dx$  can be shown in a similar way; we omit the proof since it is not required for the proof of Theorem 1.

Let

$$V(R_k(f, N), \rho) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| R_k(f, N)(\alpha) - C_k(N) \int_{\mathbb{R}^{k-1}} f(x) dx \right|^2 \rho(\alpha) d\alpha$$

denote the variance of  $R_k(f, N)(\alpha)$ , where

$$C_k(N) := \left(1 - \frac{1}{N}\right) \cdots \left(1 - \frac{k-1}{N}\right) = 1 + O\left(\frac{1}{N}\right).$$

**Proposition 8.** *We have*

$$(13) \quad V(R_k(f, N), \rho) = O(N^{-1+\eta})$$

for all  $\eta > 0$ .

*Proof.* By the Poisson summation formula, the  $k$ -level correlation sum is

$$(14) \quad R_k(f, N)(\alpha) = C_k(N) \hat{f}(0) + \frac{1}{N^k} \sum_{0_{k-1} \neq n \in \mathbb{Z}^{k-1}} \hat{f}\left(\frac{n}{N}\right) \sum_{\substack{x=(x_1, \dots, x_k) \\ 1 \leq x_1, \dots, x_k \leq N \\ x_1, \dots, x_k \text{ distinct}}} e(n\alpha \cdot \Delta_{(a_n)}(x)),$$

where we use the standard notation  $e(z) = e^{2\pi iz}$ .

Using (14), we have

(15)

$$V(R_k(f, N), \rho) = \frac{1}{N^{2k}} \sum_{0_{k-1} \neq n, m \in \mathbb{Z}^{k-1}} \hat{f}\left(\frac{n}{N}\right) \overline{\hat{f}\left(\frac{m}{N}\right)} \sum_{x, y}^* \hat{\rho}(n \cdot \Delta_{(a_n)}(x) - m \cdot \Delta_{(a_n)}(y)),$$

where the summation in  $\sum^*$  is over  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_k), y = (y_1, \dots, y_k)$  such that  $1 \leq x_1, \dots, x_k \leq N$  are distinct, and  $1 \leq y_1, \dots, y_k \leq N$  are distinct.

Fix  $\epsilon > 0$ . We break the sums over  $n$  and  $m$  into ranges  $\max\{\|n\|_\infty, \|m\|_\infty\} > N^{1+\epsilon}$  and  $\max\{\|n\|_\infty, \|m\|_\infty\} \leq N^{1+\epsilon}$ . We assume  $\max\{\|n\|_\infty, \|m\|_\infty\} = \|n\|_\infty$ , since the other case follows similarly. In the range  $0 < \|n\|_\infty \leq N^{1+\epsilon}$ , we use the bound  $\hat{f} \ll 1$ , and in the range  $\|n\|_\infty > N^{1+\epsilon}$ , we use  $\hat{f}(x) \ll \|x\|_\infty^{-R}$  for arbitrarily large  $R > 0$  and  $\rho \ll 1$ . This gives that (15) is bounded by

$$(16) \quad \frac{1}{N^{2k}} \sum_{\substack{0 < \|m\|_\infty \leq N^{1+\epsilon} \\ \|n\|_\infty > N^{1+\epsilon}}} \left\| \frac{n}{N} \right\|_\infty^{-R} \sum_{x, y}^* 1 + \frac{1}{N^{2k}} \sum_{\|n\|_\infty, \|m\|_\infty > N^{1+\epsilon}} \left\| \frac{n}{N} \right\|_\infty^{-R} \left\| \frac{m}{N} \right\|_\infty^{-R} \sum_{x, y}^* 1 \\ + \frac{1}{N^{2k}} \sum_{0 < \|n\|_\infty, \|m\|_\infty \leq N^{1+\epsilon}} \sum_{x, y}^* \left| \hat{\rho}(n \cdot \Delta_{(a_n)}(x) - m \cdot \Delta_{(a_n)}(y)) \right|.$$

The second term in (16) is at most  $O(N^{2(k-1)(1+\epsilon)-2\epsilon R})$ . Similarly, the first term in (16) is  $O(N^{2(k-1)(1+\epsilon)-\epsilon R})$ . In order to estimate the third term in (16), we further break the sum into the ranges  $|n \cdot \Delta_{(a_n)}(x) - m \cdot \Delta_{(a_n)}(y)| \leq N^\epsilon$ , and  $|n \cdot \Delta_{(a_n)}(x) - m \cdot \Delta_{(a_n)}(y)| > N^\epsilon$ . Using the bound  $\hat{\rho} \ll 1$ , the total contribution of the third term in (16) restricted to  $|n \cdot \Delta_{(a_n)}(x) - m \cdot \Delta_{(a_n)}(y)| \leq N^\epsilon$  is  $\ll \frac{1}{N^{2k}} A(N, \epsilon)$ , where

$$A(N, \epsilon) = \#\{1 \leq \|n\|_\infty, \|m\|_\infty \leq N^{1+\epsilon}, x = (x_1, \dots, x_k), 1 \leq x_i \leq N \text{ distinct}, \\ y = (y_1, \dots, y_k), 1 \leq y_i \leq N \text{ distinct}, |n \cdot \Delta_{(a_n)}(x) - m \cdot \Delta_{(a_n)}(y)| \leq N^\epsilon\}.$$

Taking  $w = x, w' = y$  in Proposition 2, we get that

$$\frac{1}{N^{2k}} A(N, \epsilon) \ll N^{-1+4k\epsilon}.$$

For the second range  $|n \cdot \Delta_{(a_n)}(x) - m \cdot \Delta_{(a_n)}(y)| > N^\epsilon$ , we have

$$|\hat{\rho}(n \cdot \Delta_{(a_n)}(x) - m \cdot \Delta_{(a_n)}(y))| \ll |n \cdot \Delta_{(a_n)}(x) - m \cdot \Delta_{(a_n)}(y)|^{-R} < N^{-\epsilon R}$$

for arbitrarily large  $R > 0$ . This gives that contribution of the third term of (16) restricted to this range is at most

$$\sum_{0 < \|n\|_\infty, \|m\|_\infty \leq N^{1+\epsilon}} N^{-\epsilon R} \leq N^{2(k-1)(1+\epsilon)-\epsilon R}.$$

Finally, the bound (13) follows from the above estimates upon taking  $\epsilon = \frac{\eta}{4k}$  and  $R$  sufficiently large.  $\square$

**3.2. Almost sure convergence.** Having proved the variance bound (13), the almost sure convergence of the  $k$ -level correlation sums to  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{k-1}} f(x) dx$  follows from a standard argument, as formulated in a general setting in the following proposition taken from [13].

**Proposition 9** ([13, Proposition 7.1]). *Fix  $k \geq 2$ ,  $J \subset \mathbb{R}$  a bounded interval, and a sequence  $c_k(N)$  such that  $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} c_k(N) = 1$ . Let  $(\vartheta_n(\alpha))_{n \geq 1}$  ( $\alpha \in J$ ) be a parametric family of sequences such that the map  $\alpha \mapsto \vartheta_n(\alpha)$  is continuous for each fixed  $n \geq 1$ . Assume that there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that for any compactly supported, real valued, smooth function  $f : \mathbb{R}^{k-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  we have*

$$(17) \quad \int_J \left| R_k(f, (\vartheta_n(\alpha)), N) - c_k(N) \int_{\mathbb{R}^{k-1}} f(x) dx \right|^2 d\alpha = O(N^{-\delta})$$

as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . Then for almost all  $\alpha \in J$ , the sequence  $(\vartheta_n(\alpha))_{n \geq 1}$  has Poissonian  $k$ -point correlation.

Indeed, we can clearly assume that  $\alpha \in J$  where  $J$  is a fixed finite interval and take  $\rho$  such that  $\rho \geq \mathbf{1}_J$ . Let  $\vartheta_n(\alpha) = \alpha a_n$  and  $c_k(N) = C_k(N)$ ; the bound (17) follows from (13), since

$$(18) \quad \int_J \left| R_k(f, (\vartheta_n(\alpha)), N) - c_k(N) \int_{\mathbb{R}^{k-1}} f(x) dx \right|^2 d\alpha \leq V(R_k(f, N), \rho).$$

Thus, Theorem 1 follows.

## REFERENCES

- [1] C. Aistleitner, S. Baker, N. Technau, N. Yesha, *Gap statistics and higher correlations for geometric progressions modulo one*. arXiv:2010.10355
- [2] C. Aistleitner, D. El-Baz, M. Munsch, *A pair correlation problem, and counting lattice points with the zeta function*. *Geom. Funct. Anal.* (2021), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00039-021-00564-6>
- [3] D. El-Baz, J. Marklof, I. Vinogradov, *The two-point correlation function of the fractional parts of  $\sqrt{n}$  is Poisson*. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **143** (2015), no. 7, 2815–2828.
- [4] N. D. Elkies, C. T. McMullen, *Gaps in  $\sqrt{n} \bmod 1$  and ergodic theory*. *Duke Math. J.* **123** (2004), no. 1, 95–139.
- [5] L. Kuipers, H. Niederreiter, *Uniform Distribution of Sequences*. Wiley, New York, 1974.
- [6] P. Kurlberg, Z. Rudnick, *The distribution of spacings between quadratic residues*. *Duke Math. J.* **100** (1999), no. 2, 211–242.
- [7] C. Lutsko, A. Sourmelidis, N. Technau, *Pair correlation of the fractional parts of  $\alpha n^\theta$* . arXiv:2106.09800
- [8] Z. Rudnick, P. Sarnak, *The pair correlation function of fractional parts of polynomials*. *Comm. in Math. Physics.* **194** (1998), 61–70.
- [9] Z. Rudnick, N. Technau, *The metric theory of the pair correlation function of real-valued lacunary sequences*. *Illinois Journal of Mathematics* **64** (2020), no. 4, 583–594.
- [10] Z. Rudnick, N. Technau, *The metric theory of the pair correlation function for small non-integer powers*. arXiv:2107.07092
- [11] Z. Rudnick, A. Zaharescu, *A metric result on the pair correlation of fractional parts of sequences*. *Acta Arithmetica* **LXXXIX** (1999), no. 3, 283–293.
- [12] Z. Rudnick, A. Zaharescu, *The distribution of spacings between fractional parts of lacunary sequences*. *Forum Math.* **14** (2002), no. 5, 691–712.
- [13] N. Technau, N. Yesha, *On the correlations of  $n^\alpha \bmod 1$* . arXiv:2006.16629
- [14] H. Weyl, *Über die Gleichverteilung von Zahlen mod. Eins*. *Math. Ann.* **77** (1916), no. 3, 313–352.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, INDRAPRASTHA INSTITUTE OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY, NEW DELHI 110020, INDIA

*Email address:* `sneha@iiitd.ac.in`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF HAIFA, HAIFA 3498838, ISRAEL

*Email address:* `nyesha@univ.haifa.ac.il`