

# EXACT UNIFORM APPROXIMATION AND DIRICHLET SPECTRUM IN DIMENSION AT LEAST TWO

JOHANNES SCHLEISCHITZ

ABSTRACT. For  $m \geq 2$ , we determine the Dirichlet spectrum in  $\mathbb{R}^m$  with respect to simultaneous approximation and the maximum norm as the entire interval  $[0, 1]$ . This complements previous work of several authors, especially Akhunzhanov and Moshchevitin, who considered  $m = 2$  and Euclidean norm. We construct explicit examples of real Liouville vectors realizing any value in the unit interval. In particular, for positive values, they are neither badly approximable nor singular. Thereby we obtain a constructive proof of the main claim in a recent paper by Beresnevich, Guan, Marnat, Ramírez and Velani, who obtained a countable partition of  $[0, 1]$  into intervals with each having non-empty intersection with the Dirichlet spectrum. Our construction is flexible enough to show that the according set of vectors with prescribed Dirichlet constant has large packing dimension and rather large Hausdorff dimension as well. We establish a more general result on exact uniform approximation, applicable to a wide class of approximating functions. Our constructive proofs are considerably shorter and less involved than previous work on the topic. By minor twists of our proof, we infer similar, slightly weaker results when restricting to a certain class of classical fractal sets or other norms. In an Appendix we address the situation of a linear form.

*Keywords:* Dirichlet spectrum, Cantor set

Math Subject Classification 2020: 11J06, 11J13

## 1. DIRICHLET SPECTRUM

Let  $\|x\|$  be the distance of  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  to the nearest integer and for  $\underline{x} \in \mathbb{R}^m$  let  $\|\underline{x}\| = \max\{\|x_1\|, \dots, \|x_m\|\}$ . Given  $\underline{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ , define the non-increasing, piecewise constant, right-continuous function

$$\psi_{\underline{\xi}}(Q) = \min_{1 \leq q \leq Q} \|q\underline{\xi}\|, \quad Q \geq 1,$$

where  $q$  ranges over the positive integers up to  $Q$ . Let us then call

$$(1) \quad \Theta(\underline{\xi}) := \limsup_{Q \rightarrow \infty} Q^{1/m} \psi_{\underline{\xi}}(Q),$$

the Dirichlet constant of  $\underline{\xi}$ , which is thereby considered with respect to simultaneous approximation and the maximum norm. Define the Dirichlet spectrum  $\mathbb{D}_m$  as the set of all values that the Dirichlet constant takes, i.e.

$$\mathbb{D}_m = \{\Theta(\underline{\xi}) : \underline{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^m\}.$$

---

Middle East Technical University, Northern Cyprus Campus, Kalkanli, Güzelyurt  
johannes@metu.edu.tr ; jschleischitz@outlook.com.

(Note: Occasionally, as in [2], [3], the  $m$ -th power of  $\Theta(\underline{\xi})$  is taken, leading to an accordingly altered Dirichlet spectrum  $\mathbb{D}_m^m$ ). For the accordingly defined Lagrange spectrum when considering the lower limit in (1) instead, see [1] for a very general result. The set  $\mathbb{D}_m$  is contained in the interval  $[0, 1]$  by Dirichlet's Theorem. It was proved in [10] that  $\Theta(\underline{\xi}) = 1$  for Lebesgue almost all  $\underline{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ , see also the very recent paper by Kleinbock, Strömbergsson, Yu [22] for a considerably refined result and further references. For  $m = 1$ , the Dirichlet spectrum is a rather complicated, well-studied object, see [2] for a wealth of references. In particular, it is known that  $\mathbb{D}_1$  is not an interval, and contained in  $\{0\} \cup [1/2, 1]$  by a result of Khintchine [18]. See further for example [13], [15], [16], [23] for refined metrical claims when restricting to  $\underline{\xi}$  with  $\Theta(\underline{\xi}) = 1$  when  $m = 1$ . It is worth mentioning that for  $m = 1$ , Davenport and Schmidt [11] showed that, besides rational numbers, precisely numbers with bounded partial quotients induce  $\Theta(\xi) < 1$ . These coincide with the set of badly approximable numbers for which  $\liminf_{Q \rightarrow \infty} Q\psi_{\underline{\xi}}(Q) > 0$ . The claim is no longer true for any  $m > 1$  and accordingly defined set of badly approximable vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^m$  inducing  $\liminf_{Q \rightarrow \infty} Q^{1/m}\psi_{\underline{\xi}}(Q) > 0$ . However, any badly approximable vector is Dirichlet improvable in any dimension, again a result due to Davenport and Schmidt [10, Theorem 2].

For  $m \geq 2$ , the set of vectors that satisfy  $\Theta(\underline{\xi}) = 0$ , commonly referred to as singular vectors, has Hausdorff dimension  $m^2/(m+1)$ , see [7]. Moreover, it is easy to see that the  $(m-1)$ -dimensional set of vectors that are  $\mathbb{Q}$ -linearly dependent together with  $\{1\}$  shares this property. Hence  $\{0, 1\} \subseteq \mathbb{D}_m$  for any  $m \geq 2$ . For  $m = 2$  and with respect to the Euclidean norm, results on the Dirichlet spectrum were obtained by Akhunzhanov and Shatskov [3] and Akhunzhanov and Moshchevitin [2]. In [3] it is shown that this Dirichlet spectrum is an interval which in some natural sense is as large as it can be. For arbitrary norms, very recently structural results for  $\mathbb{D}_2$  were obtained by Kleinbock and Rao [20], see also [21]. For  $m \geq 2$  and in the dual setting of a linear form in  $m$  variables, some results on the Dirichlet spectrum are immediate from [4, 24], see Theorem 11.2 in the Appendix. Also from [7] some metrical information can be inferred. None of these results however implies the existence of any non-empty interval where the Dirichlet spectrum with respect to some norm is dense, when  $m \geq 3$ . In Corollary 4 we provide an interval contained in the Dirichlet spectrum, for a wide class of norms on  $\mathbb{R}^m$ .

## 2. DETERMINATION OF DIRICHLET SPECTRUM IN $\mathbb{R}^m$

We show that if  $m \geq 2$ , there exist (Liouville) vectors with any prescribed Dirichlet constant in  $[0, 1]$ . In fact this set is rather large in some metrical sense.

**Theorem 2.1.** *Let  $m \geq 2$ . For any  $c \in [0, 1]$ , there exists a set  $\mathcal{A}_{m,c} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$  of packing dimension  $m - 1$  consisting of  $\underline{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^m$  satisfying*

$$(2) \quad \Theta(\underline{\xi}) = c$$

and for every  $N$  we have

$$(3) \quad \liminf_{Q \rightarrow \infty} Q^N \psi_{\underline{\xi}}(Q) = 0.$$

In particular  $\mathbb{D}_m = [0, 1]$ .

The claim is very much in line with the result for  $m = 2$  and the Euclidean norm quoted in § 1. Note that on the other hand that property (3) forces the Hausdorff dimension of  $\mathcal{A}_{m,c}$  to be 0 by Jarník-Besicovich Theorem [17]. See however Theorems 2.3, 2.4 below for non-trivial Hausdorff dimension results when we drop hypothesis (3). Theorem 2.1 is an immediate corollary of the more general Theorem 2.2 below for a much larger class of uniform approximating functions.

**Definition 1.** For  $m \geq 2$  a fixed integer and  $\Phi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow (0, 1)$  any function, we define decay properties (d1), (d2), (d3) and for  $\gamma > 0$  the property (d4( $\gamma$ )) as follows.

(d1) Assume

$$\Phi(t) < t^{-1/m}, \quad t \geq t_0.$$

(d2) Assume

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^{\frac{1}{m-1}} \Phi(t) = \infty.$$

(d3) Assume

$$\liminf_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^+} \liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Phi(\alpha t)}{\Phi(t)} \geq 1, \quad \text{if } m \geq 3,$$

and

$$\liminf_{\alpha \rightarrow 1} \liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Phi(\alpha t)}{\Phi(t)} \geq 1, \quad \text{if } m = 2,$$

where  $t$  and  $\alpha t$  are considered integers so that the expression is well-defined.

(d4( $\gamma$ )) Assume for given  $\gamma > 0$  and some  $\eta > 0$ , we have

$$\Phi(t) > \eta t^{-\gamma}, \quad t \geq t_0.$$

An alternative formulation of (d3) is that for every  $\epsilon_0 > 0$  there is  $\epsilon_1 > 0$ ,  $t_0 > 0$  such that for any  $\alpha \in (1, 1 + \epsilon_1)$  (resp.  $\alpha \in (1 - \epsilon_1, 1 + \epsilon_1)$  when  $m = 2$ ) and  $t \geq t_0$  we have

$$\frac{\Phi(\alpha t)}{\Phi(t)} \geq 1 - \epsilon_0.$$

Our more general result reads as follows.

**Theorem 2.2.** *Let  $m \geq 2$  an integer and  $\Phi$  satisfy (d1), (d2), (d3). Then there exist uncountably many  $\underline{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^m$  for which the claims (C1), (C2), (C3) below hold:*

(C1) *We have*

$$\psi_{\underline{\xi}}(Q) < \Phi(Q), \quad Q \geq Q_0.$$

(C2) *For any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we have*

$$\psi_{\underline{\xi}}(Q) > (1 - \varepsilon)\Phi(Q)$$

*for certain arbitrarily large  $Q$ .*

(C3) *Property (3) holds for any given  $N$ .*

*If for some  $\gamma > 0$  the function  $\Phi$  satisfies (d4( $\gamma$ )), then the packing dimension of the set of  $\underline{\xi}$  as above is at least  $m(1 - \gamma)$ .*

We can always choose  $\gamma = 1/(m-1)$  by (d2), however we require  $\gamma \geq 1/m$  by (d1), so the bound always lies in the short interval  $[m-1 - \frac{1}{m-1}, m-1]$ . It is rather satisfactory and seems to exhaust the method, it coincides with the estimate in [29, Theorem 2.1] where the larger sets of points singular of order at least  $\gamma$  are studied. If we assume  $\Phi$  is decreasing, then we may relax (d4( $\gamma$ )) by requiring its inequality only for certain arbitrarily large  $t$ . Theorem 2.1 represents the special case  $\Phi(t) = ct^{-1/m}$  if  $c \in (0, 1)$ , which clearly satisfies (d1), (d2), (d3), (d4( $1/m$ )), and slightly altered functions in the special cases  $c \in \{0, 1\}$ . If we admit a factor  $1 + \varepsilon$  in the right hand side of (C1) and are given an explicit rate of divergence in (d2), from our proof we may give a rate for  $Q$  in terms of  $\varepsilon$  for which (C1), (C2) hold. We prefer to omit the details but point out that similar results have been obtained by Akhunzhanov [1] for ordinary approximation, i.e. demanding (C1) only for certain arbitrarily large  $Q$  but (C2) for all large  $Q$ , and omitting (C3).

We discuss the assumptions on  $\Phi$ . Note that we do not require  $\Phi$  to be decreasing. Property (d1) is very natural and necessary by Dirichlet's Theorem. Conversely, condition (d2) implies that  $\Phi$  does not decay too fast. It does not make sense to replace the exponent  $1/(m-1)$  by a value larger than 1 in view of Khintchine's result [18] quoted in §1. Property (d3) is very mild and in particular satisfied for all functions  $\Phi(t) = ct^{-\tau}$ , with  $\tau > 0, c > 0$ . It ensures that  $\Phi$  does not decay (and not rise when  $m = 2$ ) very fast in short intervals. From (d1), (d3) we see that in fact the lower limit for  $\alpha$  in (d3) must equal 1. As observed above, (d2) implies (d4( $\frac{1}{m-1}$ )). We further remark that claim (C2) and property (d2) imply that the coordinates of  $\underline{\xi}$  in Theorem 2.2 together with  $\{1\}$  are linearly independent over  $\mathbb{Q}$ , in other words  $\underline{\xi}$  is totally irrational. We go on to comment on potential relaxations/removal of the conditions (d2), (d3) in § 5.4.

Denote by  $Bad_m$  the set of badly approximable vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^m$  as introduced in § 1. Our claim (3) means that  $\underline{\xi}$  in Theorem 2.2 are Liouville vectors and hence clearly not badly approximable. Write

$$Di_m(c) = \{\underline{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^m : \psi_{\underline{\xi}}(Q) \leq cQ^{-1/m}, Q \geq Q_0\} \subseteq \{\underline{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^m : \Theta(\underline{\xi}) \leq c\},$$

so that  $Di_m = \cup_{c < 1} Di_m(c)$  is the set of  $m$ -dimensional Dirichlet improvable vectors. Further denote by  $Sing_m$  the set of singular vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^m$ , defined via the property  $\lim_{Q \rightarrow \infty} Q^{1/m} \psi_{\underline{\xi}}(Q) = 0$ , or equivalently  $\cap_{c > 0} Di_m(c)$ . The next corollary of Theorem 2.2 slightly refines Theorem 2.1.

**Corollary 1.** *Let  $m \geq 2$  be an integer. For any  $c \in (0, 1]$ , the set*

$$Di_m(c) \setminus (\cup_{\epsilon > 0} Di_m(c - \epsilon) \cup Bad_m)$$

*has packing dimension at least  $m - 1$ . In particular, the same applies to the set*

$$\mathbf{FS}_m := Di_m \setminus (Bad_m \cup Sing_m).$$

The latter claim extends the main result from [4] in two directions. Firstly, we also give a metrical result instead of only proving uncountability, thereby contributing towards the metrical problem of determining the Hausdorff dimension of  $\mathbf{FS}_m$  formulated in [4, § 3.4]. Asymptotically as  $c \rightarrow 0$ , our metrical bound is probably sharp up to an additive error  $O(m^{-1})$  in view of claims by Cheung and Chevallier [7] implying that the set  $Di_m(c)$

has Hausdorff dimension  $m - 1 + \frac{1}{m+1} + o(1)$  as  $c \rightarrow 0$ , with positive error term for any  $c > 0$ . In fact the same conclusion holds for the set  $Di_m(c) \setminus Di_m(\delta)$  with some explicitly computable  $\delta = \delta(c) \in (0, c)$  and  $c$  small enough, however results from [7] do not allow for taking  $\delta$  arbitrarily close to  $c$ . The same should be expected for packing dimension as well, as suggested by the results in [8, 9]. Note also that as follows from Kleinbock and Mirzadeh [19, Theorem 1.5], the set  $Di_m(c)$  has Hausdorff dimension less than  $m$  for any  $c < 1$ . On the other hand, it is conjectured in [4, Problem 3.1] that  $\mathbf{FS}_m$  has full Hausdorff dimension.

Secondly, we emphasize that by the first claim we can also prescribe an exact Dirichlet constant (in the simultaneous approximation setting). Note that in [4, 24] the deep, unconstructive result of Roy [25] on parametric geometry of numbers was used. As a consequence of this setup, from [4, Theorem 1.5] and [24], one can only provide a countable partition of  $[0, 1]$  into intervals with each having non-empty intersection with  $\mathbb{D}_m$ , see the Appendix of the paper. We should however remark that additional specifications on various exponents of approximation within these sets  $\mathbf{FS}_m$  can be made according to [4, 24]. We should also note that the dual setting of a linear form in  $m$  variables is treated in [4]. On the other hand, our constructive proof of Theorem 2.2 is elementary and rather short, based on ideas from the proof of [26, Theorem 2.5], with some twists.

We further provide a considerably weaker bound regarding Hausdorff dimension, which we will denote by  $\dim_H$ , however still of order  $\gg m$ . We consider slightly larger sets than in Corollary 1, namely for  $m \geq 2$  an integer and  $c \in [0, 1]$ , our focus is now on the sets

$$\mathbf{F}_{m,c} := \bigcap_{\epsilon > 0} (Di_m(c + \epsilon) \setminus Di_m(c - \epsilon)) \setminus Bad_m = \{\underline{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^m : \Theta(\underline{\xi}) = c\} \setminus Bad_m \subseteq \mathbf{FS}_m.$$

We show

**Theorem 2.3.** *For any  $m \geq 2$  and  $c \in [0, 1]$ , we have*

$$(4) \quad \dim_H(\mathbf{F}_{m,c}) \geq \frac{\sqrt{m(m^2 - m + 1)}}{\left(\frac{m + \sqrt{m(m^2 - m + 1)}}{m-1}\right)^2 + \left(m - \frac{1}{m}\right) \left(\frac{m + \sqrt{m(m^2 - m + 1)}}{m-1}\right) - 1} > 0.$$

*Asymptotically as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ , uniformly in  $c \in (0, 1]$  we have the stronger lower bound*

$$(5) \quad \dim_H(\mathbf{F}_{m,c}) \geq \frac{3}{8}m - o(m).$$

The estimate (4) is only of order  $1 - o(1)$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ , so the latter asymptotical bound (5) is indeed significantly stronger. It is natural to expect that  $c \mapsto \dim_H(\mathbf{F}_{m,c})$  decays, which is not reflected in our result. In contrast to Theorem 2.2, our estimates (4), (5) are probably far from the true value no matter how small  $c > 0$  is chosen. Indeed, it is reasonable to conjecture  $\dim_H(\mathbf{F}_{m,c}) = \dim_H(Di_m(c))$  for any  $c \in (0, 1]$ , in particular

$$\dim_H(\mathbf{F}_{m,c}) = m - 1 + \frac{1}{m+1} + o(1), \quad \text{as } c \rightarrow 0,$$

and

$$\dim_H(\mathbf{F}_{m,c}) = m - o(1), \quad \text{as } c \rightarrow 1,$$

see the comments below Corollary 1. See further [29, Theorem 2.2] for a stronger bound of order  $m - 4 + O(m^{-1})$  for the Hausdorff dimension of the larger set of (inhomogeneously) singular vectors obtained from essentially the same method in a simplified setting. Recall there was no such discrepancy to [29] for the packing dimension result, as remarked below Theorem 2.2. Theorem 2.3 can be generalized to the situation of  $\Phi(t)$  as in Theorem 2.2 satisfying  $(d1)$ ,  $(d2)$ ,  $(d3)$ ,  $(d4(\gamma))$  for some  $\gamma > 0$ , we do not explicitly state it.

We next derive a theorem that contains information on ordinary approximation as well, very much in the spirit of [4, 24]. Let  $\lambda(\underline{\xi})$  denote the ordinary exponent of simultaneous rational approximation to  $\underline{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ , defined as the supremum of  $\lambda > 0$  such that

$$\liminf_{Q \rightarrow \infty} Q^\lambda \psi_{\underline{\xi}}(Q) = \liminf_{q \rightarrow \infty} q^\lambda \|q\underline{\xi}\| < \infty.$$

Then  $\lambda(\underline{\xi}) \in [1/m, \infty]$  for any  $\underline{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^m$  by Dirichlet's Theorem. Denote by

$$\mathcal{W}_m(\lambda) = \{\underline{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^m : \lambda(\underline{\xi}) = \lambda\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$$

the pairwise disjoint levelsets of vectors with precise ordinary exponent  $\lambda \in [1/m, \infty]$ . Note that  $Bad_m \subseteq \mathcal{W}_m(\frac{1}{m})$ . Let  $\beta = \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$  be the golden ratio.

**Theorem 2.4.** *Let  $m \geq 2$  be an integer, and  $c \in (0, 1)$  and  $\lambda \in (\beta, \infty)$ . Then the Hausdorff dimension of the set*

$$(6) \quad \mathcal{W}_m(\lambda) \cap \mathbf{F}_{m,c} \subseteq \mathcal{W}_m(\lambda) \cap \mathbf{FS}_m$$

*is positive and a lower bound independent of  $c$  is explicitly computable. Asymptotically as  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ , i.e. for  $\lambda \geq \lambda_0(m)$ , it is of order*

$$\dim_H(\mathcal{W}_m(\lambda) \cap \mathbf{F}_{m,c}) \geq \frac{m}{2\lambda} - O(\lambda^{-1}),$$

*where the implied constant is effectively computable and does not depend on  $m, c, \lambda$ .*

By Jarník-Besicovich Theorem [17], we have  $\dim_H(\mathcal{W}_m(\lambda)) = (m + 1)/(\lambda + 1)$ , so for large  $m$  our asymptotical bound is basically sharp up to a factor 2.

We may again extend the claim to a setup involving in place of  $\mathbf{F}_{m,c}$  sets derived from more general uniform approximation functions  $\Phi$  via imposing  $(C1)$ ,  $(C2)$ . Besides, with small modifications in the proof below, we can prescribe the order of ordinary approximation more exactly up to an asymptotical factor  $1 + o(1)$  as  $Q \rightarrow \infty$ . More precisely, take any function  $\Psi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow (0, 1)$  of decay  $o(t^{-\beta-\epsilon})$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  for some  $\epsilon > 0$ , and conversely satisfying  $(d4(\gamma))$  for some  $\gamma > 0$ . Derive  $\mathcal{W}_m(\Psi)$  the set of  $\underline{\zeta} \in \mathbb{R}^m$  satisfying

$$\liminf_{Q \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\psi_{\underline{\zeta}}(Q)}{\Psi(Q)} = \liminf_{q \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|q\underline{\zeta}\|}{\Psi(q)} = 1.$$

Then  $\mathcal{W}_m(\Psi) \cap \mathbf{F}_{m,c}$  has positive Hausdorff dimension, effective lower bounds can be given subject to the decay rate of  $\Psi$ . The special case  $\Psi(t) = \Psi_{a,\lambda}(t) := at^{-\lambda}$  for  $\lambda > \beta$  and  $a > 0$  parameters turns out to result in the same bounds as Theorem 2.4 (see § 8.4), thereby refining it since  $\mathcal{W}_m(\Psi_{a,\lambda}) \subsetneq \mathcal{W}_m(\lambda)$ . We sketch the proof of this generalized claim in § 8.4, but want to compare this version of Theorem 2.4 to [24]. There it was

shown that there is some explicitly computable  $\kappa_m \in (0, 1)$ , so that for any  $\lambda > 1/m$  and fixed  $c \in (0, 1]$ , the set of  $\underline{\zeta} \in \mathbb{R}^m$  inducing simultaneously

$$\liminf_{Q \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\psi_{\underline{\zeta}}(Q)}{\Psi_{a,\lambda}(Q)} \in [\kappa_m, 1], \quad \limsup_{Q \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\psi_{\underline{\zeta}}(Q)}{cQ^{-1/m}} \in [\kappa_m, 1],$$

is uncountable. Our claim allows for prescribing the order of both ordinary and uniform approximation considerably more precisely, provides a metric claim, and permits more flexibility in the choice of functions  $\Psi$  locally, for the cost of requiring a faster decay rate for  $\Psi$ .

The lower bound  $\beta$  for  $\lambda$  can in fact be improved to  $\lambda > 1$  with a rather technical argument, we prefer to only sketch the proof in § 8.4 below. However, that seems to be the limit of the method. On the other hand, we strongly expect the Hausdorff dimension of the sets in (6) to decay as a function of  $\lambda \geq 1/m$  (and of  $c$  as well). The above remarks on more general  $\Psi$  still apply for any  $\Psi(t) = o(t^{-1-\epsilon})$ .

### 3. CANTOR SETS AND OTHER NORMS

**3.1. Dirichlet spectrum for Cantor sets.** For  $b \geq 2$  an integer and  $R \in (0, 1)$  parameters, we define a modified decay property ( $d3'(b, R)$ ) and a Diophantine property ( $D(b)$ ) on functions  $\Phi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow (0, 1)$ .

**Definition 2.** Let  $b \geq 2$  an integer and  $R \in (0, 1)$ . We define

( $d3'(b, R)$ ) We have

$$\Phi(bt) > R\Phi(t), \quad t \geq t_0.$$

( $D(b)$ ) For any fixed  $\epsilon > 0$ , the inequalities

$$(1 - \epsilon)\Phi(b^B) < b^{-A} < \Phi(b^B)$$

hold for certain arbitrarily large pairs of positive integers  $A, B$ .

Property ( $d3'(b, R)$ ) relaxes ( $d3$ ). The Diophantine property ( $D(b)$ ) is rather mild and applies to most reasonable functions, however with the unfortunate exception of functions  $\Phi(t) = ct^{-r/s}$  for a rational number  $r/s$  and  $c > 0$ .

For  $b \geq 2$  an integer and  $W \subseteq \{0, 1, \dots, b-1\}$  of cardinality  $|W| \geq 2$ , define the Cantor set  $C_{b,W}$  as the set of all real numbers that admit a base  $b$  representation

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} w_j b^{-j}, \quad w_j \in W.$$

The Cantor middle third set just becomes  $C_{3,\{0,2\}}$ . Let  $W_1, \dots, W_m$  be arbitrary sets  $W$  as above to a uniformly chosen base  $b$ , and define the Cartesian product set

$$K = \prod_{i=1}^m C_{b,W_i}.$$

In the special case  $\{0, 1\} \subseteq W_i$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq m$  we say  $K$  is good. We claim that in the assertions of § 2, we may restrict to  $\underline{\zeta} \in K$  upon taking a smaller, fixed multiplicative

constant  $R < 1$  in (C2) and adjusting the metrical claims. Assuming some Diophantine condition, we even get a precise analogue of Theorem 2.2. Let us first define some more properties. Denote by  $\Gamma_b = \text{lcm}(1, 2, \dots, b-1)$  the least common multiple of the positive integers up to  $b-1$  and by  $\dim(K) = \sum_{i=1}^m \log |W_i| / \log b$  the Hausdorff (or packing) dimension of  $K$ .

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $m \geq 2$  and  $K$  be any set as above. Assume  $\Phi$  satisfies (d1), (d2).*

(i) *Assume  $\Phi$  also satisfies (d3'(b, R)) for some given  $R \in (0, 1)$ . Let*

$$\Omega = \Omega(b, R) = \begin{cases} R, & \text{if } K \text{ is good,} \\ R^{b+2}(b-1)^{-3}\Gamma_b^{-1}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

*Then there exist uncountably many  $\underline{\xi} \in K$  for which we have (C1), (C3) and (C2') We have*

$$\psi_{\underline{\xi}}(Q) > \Omega\Phi(Q)$$

*for certain arbitrarily large  $Q$ .*

(ii) *Assume  $\Phi$  satisfies (D(b)) as well and  $K$  is good. Then there exist uncountably many  $\underline{\xi} \in K$  satisfying (C1), (C2) and (C3).*

*If  $K = C_{b, \{0,1\}}^m$  and for some  $\gamma > 0$  the function  $\Phi$  satisfies (d4( $\gamma$ )), then the packing dimension of the set of  $\underline{\xi}$  in (i), (ii) is at least  $\dim(K)(1 - \gamma) = m(1 - \gamma) \log 2 / \log b$ . Moreover, the set of vectors satisfying (C1') and (C2') resp. (C1') and (C2) in (i) resp. (ii), has positive Hausdorff dimension, where (C1') is (C1) upon admitting an additional factor  $1 + \varepsilon$ .*

**Remark 1.** As  $b \rightarrow \infty$ , we have  $\Gamma_b = e^{(1+o(1))(b-1)}$  by Prime Number Theorem. It thus follows from our proof that the bound for  $\Omega$  can be improved asymptotically as  $b \rightarrow \infty$  by replacing numerator in the ‘‘otherwise’’ formula by  $R^{b/\log b + O(1)}$ . Moreover,  $\Omega$  can be significantly improved when  $m$  is small compared to  $b$ . In particular we can always replace  $\Gamma_b$  by the maximum number that appears as *lcm* of any  $m$  positive integers at most  $b-1$ , hence a crude upper estimate is given by  $(b-1)^m$ .

We will show that when  $\Phi(q) = cq^{-1/m}$ , property (d3'(b, R)) holds for  $R = b^{-1/m}$ . Hence we get the following variant of Corollary 1.

**Corollary 2.** *Let  $m \geq 2$  and  $K$  as above. Let*

$$\sigma = \sigma(m, b) = \begin{cases} b^{-1/m}, & \text{if } K \text{ is good,} \\ b^{-(b+2)/m}(b-1)^{-3}\Gamma_b^{-1}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

*Then  $\sigma \in (0, 1)$  and for any  $c \in (0, 1]$  the set*

$$K \cap (Di_m(c) \setminus (Di_m(\sigma c) \cup Bad_m)) \subseteq K \cap \mathbf{FS}_m$$

*is uncountable. If  $K = C_{b, \{0,1\}}^m$  it has packing dimension at least  $\dim(K)(1 - 1/m) = (m-1) \log 2 / \log b$  and positive Hausdorff dimension. In particular the same holds for  $K \cap \mathbf{FS}_m$ .*



We may calculate an effective positive lower bound for the Hausdorff dimension as well with the method of § 8.2, however the expression becomes rather cumbersome. Moreover, a variant of Theorem 2.4 can be derived, we do not state it. Corollary 2 induces a countable partition of  $[0, 1]$  into intervals that each have non-empty intersection with  $\mathbb{D}_m \cap K$ , similar as in [4, 24] (or [7]), see Theorem 11.2 in the Appendix of the paper, but restricting to fractal sets. We present a class of functions that satisfy  $(D(b))$  for any  $b \geq 2$  and thus the stronger claim of Theorem 3.1 for good  $K$ .

**Corollary 3.** *Assume  $K$  is good. Let  $\Phi(q) = cq^{-\tau}$  for irrational  $\tau \in (\frac{1}{m}, \frac{1}{m-1})$  and any  $c > 0$ . Then  $\Phi$  satisfies  $(d1), (d2), (D(b))$  and thus the set of vectors  $\underline{\xi} \in K$  satisfying  $(C1), (C2)$  and  $(C3)$  has packing dimension at least  $\dim(K)(1 - \tau) = \sum_{i=1}^m \log |W_i|(1 - \tau)/\log b$ , and if we drop  $(C3)$  also positive Hausdorff dimension.*

Unfortunately, the function  $\Phi(t) = ct^{-1/m}$  does not satisfy hypothesis  $(D(b))$  for any  $b \geq 2$ , therefore we cannot conclude that  $\mathbb{D}_m \cap K = [0, 1]$ . We want to remark that for ordinary simultaneous approximation and fast enough decaying  $\Phi$ , similar results on exact approximation to successive powers of elements of Cantor sets  $C_{b,W}$ , thereby restricting to the Veronese curve, have been obtained in [27, §2.2].

The sets  $K$  in this section can be obtained as the attractor of an iterated function system (IFS) consisting of a finite set of contracting maps  $f_j(\underline{x}) = \underline{x}/b + \underline{u}_j/b$  on  $\mathbb{R}^m$  with integer vectors  $\underline{u}_j \in \mathbb{Z}^m$ . We ask whether our results extend to more general situations.

**Problem 1.** Let  $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$  be any uncountable attractor of an IFS. Is the set  $K \cap \mathbf{FS}_m$  non-empty? Is it at least true for any IFS consisting of contracting functions of the form  $f_j(\underline{x}) = A_j \underline{x} + \underline{b}_j$  with  $A_j \in \mathbb{Q}^{m \times m}, \underline{b}_j \in \mathbb{Q}^m$ ?

**3.2. Other norms.** Let us call a norm  $|\cdot|$  on  $\mathbb{R}^m$  expanding if  $|\underline{x}| \geq |\pi_j(\underline{x})|$  for all  $\underline{x} \in \mathbb{R}^m$  and  $1 \leq j \leq m$ , where  $\pi_j$  are the orthogonal projections to the coordinate axes. Then

**Corollary 4.** *Let  $|\cdot|$  be any expanding norm on  $\mathbb{R}^m$ . Let  $\underline{e}_i = (0, 0, \dots, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq m$ , be the canonical base vectors and let  $\chi := \min_{1 \leq i \leq m} |\underline{e}_i| > 0$ . Then  $[0, \chi] \subseteq \mathbb{D}_m^{|\cdot|}$  where  $\mathbb{D}_m^{|\cdot|}$  is the Dirichlet spectrum with respect to  $|\cdot|$ .*

The result in particular applies to any  $p$ -norm  $|\underline{x}|_p = (\sum |x_i|^p)^{1/p}$  and shows that the interval  $[0, 1]$  is contained in the according Dirichlet spectrum. This may be compared with the results for  $m = 2$  and Euclidean norm  $p = 2$  by Akhunzhanov, Shatoskov [3] and Akhunzhanov, Moshchevitin [2] recalled in § 1. The deduction of Corollary 4 relies on the fact that for the real vectors  $\underline{\xi}$  constructed in § 5.2, for any  $Q$  inducing large values of  $Q^{1/m} \psi_{\underline{\xi}}(Q)$  we may choose  $q < Q$  so that some component  $\|q\xi_i\|$  of our choice induces a small value of  $\|q\underline{\xi}\|$  and significantly outweighs all the other  $\|q\xi_j\|, j \neq i$ . This will give us any desired upper bound in  $[0, \chi]$  for the Dirichlet constant. The reverse lower bound will be immediate from the assumption of the norm being expanding and our results for the maximum norm. We provide more details in § 5.3.

## 4. SOME REMARKS AND FORTHCOMING WORK

Our results can be interpreted as prescribing extremal values (primarily maxima, but also minima in Theorem 2.4) of the first successive minimum of some classical parametric lattice point problem, see for example [30], in particular [30, Theorem 1.4]. Our method relies heavily on ideas from the proof of [26, Theorem 2.5], which contains a considerably good description of higher successive minima functions as well. Thus it seems plausible that similar results on extremal values of the according parametric higher successive minima functions can be obtained when combining our proofs below with some more ingredients from the proof of [26, Theorem 2.5].

By transference inequalities, it is possible to derive from our Theorem 2.1 some information on the Dirichlet spectrum of a linear form in  $m$  variables as investigated in [4, 24]. We give details and compare our result with [4, 24] in the Appendix of the paper.

Analogous results of Theorems 2.1, 2.2 for (a)  $p$ -adic approximation, (b) weighted approximation and/or (c) systems of linear forms, seem in reach by refinements and generalizations of the method presented below. Verification of (a), (b), (c) seems increasingly challenging, in particular the impression of the author is that some non-trivial new concepts need to be introduced for (c). The question of a weighted version for linear forms, i.e. (b) and (c) together, was raised in [4, Problem 4.1]. The author plans subsequent work on these topics.

5. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.2 FOR  $m \geq 3$ : EXISTENCE CLAIM

**5.1. Construction of suitable vectors  $\xi$ .** Define an increasing sequence of positive integers recursively as follows: For the initial terms, observe that by (d2), there is an integer  $H$  so that for any  $Q \geq H$  we have  $\Phi(Q) > Q^{-1/(m-1)}$ . Define the initial  $m$  terms by  $a_j = H^j$  for  $1 \leq j \leq m$ . For  $n \geq 1$ , having constructed the first  $mn$  terms  $a_1, \dots, a_{mn}$ , let the next  $m$  terms be given by the recursion

$$(7) \quad a_{mn+1} = a_{mn}^{M_n}$$

and

$$(8) \quad a_{mn+2} = a_{mn+1}^2, \quad a_{mn+3} = a_{mn+1}^3, \quad \dots, \quad a_{mn+m-1} = a_{mn+1}^{m-1},$$

and finally

$$a_{mn+m} = a_{m(n+1)} = L_n \cdot a_{mn+m-1} \in (a_{mn+m-1}, a_{mn+1}^m]$$

with integers  $M_n \rightarrow \infty$  that tend to infinity fast enough, to be made precise below, and the integer  $L_n$  defined as

$$L_n = \max\{z \in \mathbb{N} : a_{mn+1}^{-1} < \Phi(Q), 1 \leq Q \leq za_{mn+m-1}\}.$$

By (d1) we have  $\Phi(t) \rightarrow 0$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  and hence  $L_n$  is well-defined. In fact (d1) implies

$$(9) \quad L_n \leq a_{mn+1}, \quad n \geq 1,$$

so that indeed  $a_{mn+m} \leq a_{mn+1}^m$  for  $n \geq 1$ . Conversely, by assumption (d2) and our choice of initial terms, we have  $L_n \geq 1$  for all  $n \geq 1$  and

$$(10) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} L_n = \infty.$$

In particular indeed  $(a_j)_{j \geq 1}$  is strictly increasing. We observe further that

$$(11) \quad a_j | a_{j+1}, \quad j \geq 1.$$

Define the components  $\xi_i$  of  $\underline{\xi}$  via

$$(12) \quad \xi_i = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{a_{mn+i}}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq m,$$

that is we sum the reciprocals over the indices congruent to  $i$  modulo  $m$ . We claim that all assertions (C1), (C2), (C3) of the theorem hold for  $\underline{\xi} = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_m)$  if we choose  $M_n$  suitably large in each step. We remark that taking a power of  $a_{mn}$  in (7) is just for convenience, it suffices to let  $a_{mn+1} = M'_n a_{mn}$  for large enough  $M'_n$ . We will assume the latter occasionally. We conclude this section with a very elementary observation to be applied below.

**Proposition 5.1.** *Let  $u/v \in \mathbb{Q}$  be reduced. Then for any integers  $m \geq 2, L \geq 1, M \geq 2$ , the fraction*

$$\frac{u}{v} + \frac{1}{(v^{m-1}L)^M} = \frac{uL^M v^{(m-1)M-1} + 1}{L^M v^{(m-1)M}}$$

*is reduced as well.*

Obviously the numerator is congruent to 1 modulo any prime divisor of  $Lv$ , and the claim follows.

**5.2. Proof of (C1), (C2), (C3).** Proof of (C3): Take  $Q = q = a_{mn}$  for  $n$  large. By (11) all  $qa_j^{-1}$  for  $j \leq mn$  are integers. Hence  $\|q\underline{\xi}\| = \|q\underline{\xi}_1\| = a_{mn}(a_{mn+1}^{-1} + a_{m(n+1)+1}^{-1} + \dots)$ . The main contribution clearly comes from the first term  $a_{mn}/a_{mn+1}$ , indeed we may estimate

$$(13) \quad \|q\underline{\xi}\| = \|q\underline{\xi}_1\| \leq 2 \frac{a_{mn}}{a_{mn+1}} = 2a_{mn}^{-M_n+1} = 2Q^{-M_n+1}.$$

Since we assume  $M_n \rightarrow \infty$  it suffices to take  $n$  large enough for given  $N$ .

Proof of (C1): For simplicity write

$$d_n = a_{mn+1}, \quad n \geq 1.$$

Let  $Q > 1$  be an arbitrary large number and  $k$  be the index with  $a_k \leq Q < a_{k+1}$ . Write  $k = mf + g - 1$  for integers  $f \geq 0$  and  $g \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ . We consider three cases.

Case 1: Assume  $g = 1$ . This means  $a_{mf} \leq Q < a_{mf+1}$ . Let  $q = a_k = a_{mf} \leq Q$ . Then very similar as in (13) we see

$$\|q\underline{\xi}\| = \|q\underline{\xi}_1\| \leq 2 \frac{a_{mf}}{a_{mf+1}} = 2a_{mf}^{-M_f+1} = 2q^{-M_f+1} \leq 2Q^{-\frac{M_f-1}{M_f}} = 2Q^{-1+\frac{1}{M_f}}.$$

Now since we can assume  $M_f \geq 3$ , from (d2) we easily see that the right hand side is less than  $\Phi(Q)$  for sufficiently large  $Q \geq Q_0$  or equivalently  $f \geq f_0$ . Thus  $\psi_{\underline{\xi}}(Q) < \Phi(Q)$  for  $Q$  in these intervals.

Case 2: Assume  $2 \leq g \leq m-1$ . Then  $Q < a_{k+1} \leq a_{mf+m-1} = d_f^{m-1}$  and  $a_{k+1}/a_k = d_f$ . Let  $q = a_{mf+1} = d_f \leq Q$ . Isolating the first term  $a_k/a_{k+1} = d_f^{-1}$  in  $q\xi_2$ , we easily verify

$$(14) \quad \|q\underline{\xi}\| = \|q\xi_2\| \leq \frac{1}{d_f} + O(d_{f+1}^{-1}) \leq 2Q^{-1/(m-1)} < \Phi(Q)$$

for  $Q \geq Q_0$  or equivalently  $f$  large enough by property (d2). This again implies  $\psi_{\underline{\xi}}(Q) < \Phi(Q)$  for the  $Q$  in question.

Case 3: Now assume  $g = m$  or equivalently  $k \equiv -1 \pmod{m}$ . By construction of  $L_f$  and since  $a_{k+1} = a_{m(f+1)} = L_f a_{mf+1} = L_f d_f$ , we have

$$d_f^{-1} < \Phi(Q), \quad 1 \leq Q \leq a_{k+1}.$$

With  $q = d_f \leq Q$  again, as in (14) we have

$$(15) \quad \|q\underline{\xi}\| = \|q\xi_2\| \leq \frac{1}{d_f} + O(d_{f+1}^{-1}).$$

Combining, we derive the estimate

$$\|q\underline{\xi}\| = \|q\xi_2\| < \Phi(Q)$$

as well if we choose  $M_{f+1}$  and hence  $d_{f+1} = a_{m(f+1)+1}$  in the next step large enough that the error term in (15) is small enough. Again  $\psi_{\underline{\xi}}(Q) < \Phi(Q)$  for  $Q$  in these intervals follows. Since we covered all large numbers with our cases, (C1) follows.

**Remark 2.** Note that Case 3 is the critical point where we needed the assumption  $m > 2$ . Indeed, for  $m = 2$  we would not have  $a_{2(f+1)} = a_{2f+2} = a_{2f+1}^2$  but rather  $a_{2f+2} = L_f a_{2f+1}$ , and for  $\Phi$  slowly decaying, like  $\Phi(t) = ct^{-1/2}$ , the outcome  $\|q\underline{\xi}\| = \|q\xi_2\| \leq 1/L_f + O(d_{f+1}^{-1})$  would be larger than the bound in (15). We further remark that in Case 2 we could take  $q = a_k$  instead and obtain  $\|q\underline{\xi}\| = \|q\xi_g\| \leq d_f^{-1} + O(d_{f+1}^{-1})$ .

Proof of (C2): For some large integer  $f$  let

$$(16) \quad Q = Q_f = a_{m(f+1)} - 1.$$

Let  $1 \leq q \leq Q$  be any integer and  $s = s(q)$  be the maximum index with  $a_s$  divides  $q$ , and take  $s = 0$  and let  $a_0 = 1$  if no such  $s$  exists. Recall  $d_f = a_{mf+1}$ . We claim that

$$(17) \quad \|q\underline{\xi}\| \geq \frac{1}{d_f} + O(Qd_{f+1}^{-1}).$$

We again distinguish two cases.

Case I: We have  $s \leq mf$ , or equivalently  $a_s \leq a_{mf}$ . Then we claim

$$(18) \quad \|q\underline{\xi}\| \geq \|q\xi_1\| \geq d_f^{-1} + O(Qd_{f+1}^{-1}).$$

Write  $e_s = e_s(q) = a_{s+1}/a_s \in \mathbb{Z}$  for simplicity, which is an integer by (11). By assumption we have  $q = B \cdot a_s$  with some integer  $B = B_q$  with  $e_s \nmid B$  and  $B = q/a_s \leq Q/a_s < a_{k+1}/a_s$ . We split  $q\xi_1 = U_q + V_q$  with

$$V_q = Ba_s \sum_{j=1}^f a_{jm+1}^{-1} = Ba_s \frac{D}{a_{fm+1}}, \quad U_q = Ba_s \sum_{j=f+1}^{\infty} a_{jm+1}^{-1}.$$

where

$$D = a_{fm+1} \sum_{j=1}^f a_{jm+1}^{-1} \in \mathbb{Z}$$

is an integer by (11). By Proposition 5.1 applied to

$$u/v = \sum_{j=1}^{f-1} a_{mj+1}^{-1}, \quad M = M_{f-1}, \quad L = L_{f-1},$$

and an inductive argument, we see that  $(D, a_{mf+1}) = 1$ . Note hereby that in the base case  $f = 1$  of the induction, the hypothesis is easily checked. On the other hand, since  $e_s \nmid B$  we have  $B/e_s = Ba_s/a_{s+1}$  is not an integer. Thus also  $Ba_s/a_{mf+1} = (B/e_s) \cdot (a_{s+1}/a_{mf+1}) \notin \mathbb{Z}$  since by assumption of Case I we have  $mf + 1 \geq s + 1$  and thus  $a_{s+1} | a_{mf+1}$  by (11). Combining, we see that  $V_q \notin \mathbb{Z}$ . Since the denominator in reduced form divides  $a_{mf+1}$ , it has distance at least  $a_{mf+1}^{-1} = d_f^{-1}$  from any integer. Finally we can estimate

$$|U_q| \leq Ba_s \cdot 2a_{m(f+1)+1}^{-1} = 2Qd_{f+1}^{-1},$$

and the claim (18) and thus (17) follows.

Case II: Assume  $s > mf$ . Then by (16) we may write  $s = mf + h - 1$  with an integer  $h \in \{2, 3, \dots, m\}$ . Case IIa: First assume  $h \neq m$ . Write again  $e_s = a_{s+1}/a_s \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $q = B \cdot a_s$  with some integer  $B$  with  $e_s \nmid B$  and  $B = q/a_s \leq Q/a_s < a_{k+1}/a_s$ . Now observe that by assumption  $h \neq m$  from (8) we infer

$$(19) \quad e_s = d_f.$$

Hence if we split  $q\xi_h = Y_q + Z_q$  with

$$Y_q = Ba_s \sum_{j=nm+h, j \leq s} a_j^{-1} = B \sum_{j=nm+h, j \leq s} \frac{a_s}{a_j} \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad Z_q = Ba_s \sum_{j=nm+h, j > s} a_j^{-1}$$

then  $Y_q \in \mathbb{Z}$  by (11), and separating the first term  $Ba_s/a_{s+1}$  from the sum of  $Z_q$  we may write

$$Z_q = q\xi_h - Y_q = \frac{Ba_s}{a_{s+1}} + Ba_s \cdot O(a_{s+1+m}^{-1}) = \frac{B}{e_s} + O(Qd_{f+1}^{-1}).$$

Now again since  $e_s \nmid B$ , the term  $B/e_s$  is not an integer and thus has distance at least  $1/e_s$  from any integer. So indeed by (19) we see

$$\|q\xi_h\| \geq \|q\xi_h\| = \|Z_q\| \geq e_s^{-1} - O(Qd_{f+1}^{-1}) = d_f^{-1} - O(Qd_{f+1}^{-1}).$$

Case IIb: Finally assume  $h = m$ , or equivalently  $s = k$ . Then note that (9) implies

$$e_s = \frac{a_{s+1}}{a_s} = \frac{a_{mf+m}}{a_{mf+m-1}} = L_f \leq a_{mf+1} = d_f,$$

hence  $e_s \leq d_f$  again. Hence again the same argument as in Case IIa yields

$$(20) \quad \|q\underline{\xi}\| \geq \|q\xi_m\| \geq \frac{1}{e_s} - O(Qd_{f+1}^{-1}) \geq \frac{1}{d_f} - O(Qd_{f+1}^{-1}),$$

thus again (17) holds. The claim is proved in every case.

Now since  $Q < a_{mf+m} = a_{mf+1}^m$  and  $d_{f+1} = a_{mf+m}^{M_{f+1}} > a_{mf+1}^{M_{f+1}}$ , the remainder term in (17) can be bounded via

$$(21) \quad Qd_{f+1}^{-1} \leq a_{mf+m}d_{f+1}^{-1} = a_{mf+1}^m d_{f+1}^{-1} = a_{mf+1}^{m-M_{f+1}}.$$

Choosing  $M_{f+1}$  sufficiently large in the next step, this will be arbitrarily small. On the other hand, by construction of  $L_f$  for some  $L_f a_{mf+m-1} \leq Q' \leq (L_f + 1)a_{mf+m-1}$  we have

$$d_f^{-1} \geq \Phi(Q'),$$

hence

$$(22) \quad d_f^{-1} \geq \Phi(Q') = \Phi(\alpha_f \cdot L_f a_{mf+m-1}), \quad 1 \leq \alpha_f = \frac{Q'}{L_f a_{mf+m-1}} \leq \frac{L_f + 1}{L_f}.$$

In view of (21) and (17), again for given  $\epsilon_1 > 0$  a suitably large choice of  $M_{f+1}$  in the next step will ensure that

$$\|q\underline{\xi}\| > (1 - \epsilon_1)\Phi(Q'),$$

uniformly in  $1 \leq q \leq Q$ . Now by (10) we have  $\alpha_f \rightarrow 1^+$  as  $f \rightarrow \infty$ , hence for  $\epsilon_2 > 0$  and  $f \geq f_0(\epsilon_2)$  by property (d3) we infer

$$\|q\underline{\xi}\| > (1 - \epsilon_2) \cdot (1 - \epsilon_1)\Phi(L_f a_{mf+m-1}).$$

Since  $L_f a_{mf+m-1}/Q = a_{m(f+1)}/Q > 1$  is arbitrarily close to 1 when  $f$  is large enough by (16), for arbitrarily small  $\epsilon_3 > 0$  again from (d3) we infer

$$\|q\underline{\xi}\| > (1 - \epsilon_2)(1 - \epsilon_1) \cdot (1 - \epsilon_3)\Phi(Q) = (1 - \epsilon_4)\Phi(Q), \quad \epsilon_4 = (1 - \epsilon_1)(1 - \epsilon_2)(1 - \epsilon_3).$$

Since  $q \leq Q$  was arbitrary, this means  $\psi_{\underline{\xi}}(Q) > (1 - \epsilon_4)Q$ . We may make  $\epsilon_4$  arbitrarily small by choosing  $f$  large enough and consequently  $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \epsilon_3$  small enough. Now we may let the according  $\epsilon_4 = \epsilon_4(n)$  of the  $n$ -th step of the construction tend to 0 as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , and claim (C2) follows for the induced  $\underline{\xi}$ .

Since we can choose infinitely many distinct  $M_n$  and thus  $a_{mn+1}$  in each step of the construction in § 5.1, our method gives rise to a continuum of  $\underline{\xi}$  with the properties of the theorem. We prove the stronger metrical assertion in § 6 below.

**5.3. Proof of Corollary 4.** Choose  $\underline{\xi}$  as in § 5.1 for  $\Phi(t) = ct^{-1/m}$ ,  $c \in (0, 1)$ . Let  $\Omega := \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} |\underline{e}_i|$ . By relabelling indices if necessary, we may assume  $|\underline{e}_2| = \min_{1 \leq i \leq m} |\underline{e}_i| = \chi$ . We show  $\underline{\xi}$  has Dirichlet constant  $\Theta^{|\cdot|}(\underline{\xi}) = c\chi$  with respect to  $|\cdot|$ . For simplicity write  $\eta_i = \eta_i(q) := \|q\underline{\xi}_i\| > 0$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq m$ , so that  $\|q\underline{\xi}\| = |\sum \eta_i \underline{e}_i|$ . The proof of (C1) in Case 1 with  $Q = q = a_{mf}$  yields again negligibly small values by

$$|\eta_i \underline{e}_i| = \eta_i \cdot |\underline{e}_i| \leq \eta_i \cdot \Omega < q^{-1 + \frac{1}{M_n}} \Omega = o(Q^{-1/m}), \quad 1 \leq i \leq m,$$

independent of the norm. In Cases 2 and 3, for  $Q = q = a_{mf+1}$  we see that

$$|\eta_2 \underline{e}_2| = (d_f^{-1} + o(d_f^{-1}))|\underline{e}_2| = cQ^{-1/m}(1 + o(1))\chi$$

whereas for  $i \neq 2$  we get

$$|\eta_i \underline{e}_i| \leq d_f^{-2}(1 + o(1))|\underline{e}_i| \leq d_f^{-2}(1 + o(1))\Omega = o(d_f^{-1}) = o(Q^{-1/m}).$$

Since  $\|q\underline{\xi}\| \leq \sum |\eta_i \underline{e}_i|$  by triangle inequality, we conclude in all cases  $\Theta^{|\cdot|}(\underline{\xi}) \leq c\chi$ . The reverse inequality  $\Theta^{|\cdot|}(\underline{\xi}) \geq c\chi$  follows from

$$\|q\underline{\xi}\| \geq \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} |\eta_i \underline{e}_i| \geq \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} \eta_i \min_{1 \leq i \leq m} |\underline{e}_i| > c(1 - \varepsilon)Q^{-1/m} \min_{1 \leq i \leq m} |\underline{e}_i| = c(1 - \varepsilon)\chi Q^{-1/m}$$

for any  $q < Q$ , where we used that  $|\cdot|$  is expanding and property (C2).

**5.4. On relaxing conditions (d2), (d3).** We believe that for  $m \geq 3$ , the order in (d2) can be significantly relaxed. Our proof above followed the main outline from the proof of [26, Theorem 2.5] with the special choice  $\eta_1 = \eta_2 = \dots = \eta_m = 1/m$  (letter  $k$  was used in place of  $m$  in [26]). Choosing  $\eta_i$  differently, which essentially means altering (8), depending on a rough given decay rate of  $\Phi$ , a similar approach may ideally allow for replacing (d2) by the weaker, natural condition that  $t\Phi(t) \rightarrow \infty$  (which coincides with the exact condition (d2) when  $m = 2$ ). However, some technical obstacles have to be mastered. Recall that for any  $\underline{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^m \setminus \mathbb{Q}^m$  we have  $\limsup_{Q \rightarrow \infty} Q\psi_{\underline{\xi}}(Q) \geq 1/2$ , as mentioned in § 1.

Similarly, we believe that (d3) can be dropped. Notice that we have a free choice of  $M_f$  in every step, so it suffices to find some  $M_f$  for which for given  $\varepsilon > 0$  the induced  $L_f$  satisfies  $\Phi((L_f + 1)a_{mf+1}) > (1 - \varepsilon)\Phi(L_f a_{mf+1})$ . Now given  $\varepsilon > 0$ , for small enough  $\delta = \delta(m, \varepsilon) > 1$  there are arbitrarily large  $T$  so that  $\Phi(\delta T) > (1 - \varepsilon)\Phi(T)$ , otherwise it is easy to see that (d2) cannot hold. It remains however unclear to us if we can choose  $T$  of the given form  $L_f a_{mf+1}$ . In this matter it may be helpful that, as remarked in § 5.1, we can relax (7) by asking  $a_{mf+1} = M'_n a_{mf}$  for large enough  $M'_n$ .

## 6. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.2 FOR $m \geq 3$ : METRICAL CLAIM

**6.1. Special case  $a_n = 2^{c_n}$ .** Assume for simplicity first the  $a_n$  constructed in § 5.1 are of the form  $a_n = 2^{c_n}$  for every  $n$  with an increasing sequence  $c_n$ , so that the binary expansion of the  $\xi_i$  becomes

$$\xi_i = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^{-c_{mn+i}}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq m.$$

The proof is done in two steps. The first key observation is that for given  $\Phi$ , we have some freedom in the construction of  $\underline{\xi}$  in § 5.1. We will find a Cantor type set consisting of  $\underline{\zeta} \in \mathbb{R}^m$  sharing the same properties. Then in the second step we use a very similar strategy as in the proof of [29, Theorem 2.1] based on a result of Tricot [31] to find the claimed lower bound for the packing dimension of this set.

Step 1: It is clear that the binary digits of all  $\xi_i$  as above at positions  $c_{mn} + 1, c_{mn} + 2, \dots, c_{mn+1} - 1$  are 0 (whereas  $\xi_m$  resp.  $\xi_1$  has digit 1 at  $c_{mn}$  resp.  $c_{mn+1}$ ). Let small  $\varepsilon > 0$  be given and  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  as in the theorem. Let  $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}(\gamma) \subseteq [0, 1]^m$  be the set of real vectors  $\underline{\zeta} = (\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n)$  whose coordinates have binary expansion  $\zeta_i = \sum_{j \geq 1} g_{i,j} 2^{-j}$

derived from the binary expansion of  $\xi_i$ , for  $1 \leq i \leq m$ , by altering its digit from 0 to an arbitrary digit  $g_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\}$  at places  $j$  in the intervals

$$I_n = \{ \lfloor c_{mn+1}(\gamma + \epsilon) \rfloor + 1, \lfloor c_{mn+1}(\gamma + \epsilon) \rfloor + 2, \dots, c_{mn+1} - 1 \}, \quad n \geq 0.$$

Note that still  $g_{i,j} = 0$  at places  $j \in [c_{mn} + 1, \lfloor c_{mn+1}(\gamma + \epsilon) \rfloor] \cap \mathbb{Z}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq m$ ,  $n \geq 1$ .

Then for any  $\underline{\zeta} \in \mathcal{S}$ , the proof of (C2) is analogous, upon some twists that we explain now. Since we include certain terms  $2^{-j}$  for  $j \in \cup I_n$  to the partial sums defining the  $\zeta_i$ , we need to slightly redefine the integer  $D = D(\underline{\zeta})$  in Case I resp.  $Y_q = Y_q(\underline{\zeta})$  and  $Z = Z_q(\underline{\zeta})$  in Case II, depending on the choice of  $\underline{\zeta}$ . The coprimality condition in Case I is further guaranteed since at position  $j = c_{mf+1}$  the digit of any  $\zeta_1$  still equals  $g_{1,c_{mf+1}} = 1$  since  $c_{mf+1} \notin \cup I_n$ , so any  $D(\underline{\zeta})$  is odd but  $a_{mf+1} = 2^{c_{mf+1}}$  is a power of 2. Similarly, the first, main term of  $Z_q$  obtained from truncating the binary expansion of  $\zeta_h$  after position  $j = c_{s+1}$ , is still bounded from below by  $d_f^{-1}$ . Indeed, it may be written  $qr_s = Ba_s \cdot r_s$  with the rational numbers  $r_s = r_s(\zeta_h) := \sum_{j=c_s}^{c_{s+1}} g_{h,j}(\zeta_h) 2^{-j}$  where  $g_{h,j}(\zeta_h)$  is the binary digit of  $\zeta_h$  at position  $j$ , depending on the choice of  $\underline{\zeta}$ . But we have  $g_{h,c_{s+1}}(\zeta_h) = g_{h,c_{mf+h}}(\zeta_h) = 1$  for any  $\underline{\zeta} \in \mathcal{S}$ , since by  $c_{mf+h} \notin \cup I_n$  we have not changed the digit of  $\xi_h$  there. So  $r_s = v_s/2^{c_{s+1}} = v_s/a_{s+1}$  with some odd integer numerator  $v_s$ . Finally, since  $v_s$  is odd and  $B \nmid (a_{s+1}/a_s)$  as well by assumption,  $qr_s = Bv_s a_s/a_{s+1}$  is not an integer and thus has distance at least  $2^{-(c_{s+1}-c_s)} = a_s/a_{s+1} = d_f^{-1}$  from any integer.

Moreover, we have chosen the left interval endpoints of the  $I_n$  large enough that we also satisfy (C3) and Case 1 of (C1) with the same choice  $q = a_{mn} = 2^{c_{mn}}$ , for any  $\underline{\zeta} \in \mathcal{S}$ . Indeed, the latter can be verified via

$$\|q\underline{\zeta}\| \ll 2^{-(\gamma+\epsilon)c_{mn+1}+c_{mn}} < (2^{c_{mn+1}})^{-\gamma} = a_{mn+1}^{-\gamma} < Q^{-\gamma} < \Phi(Q), \quad Q < a_{mn+1},$$

where we used  $c_{mn+1}/c_{mn} \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , which we may assume (since  $c_j = \log_2 a_j$  this is a little stronger than our original assumption  $M'_n = a_{mn+1}/a_{mn} \rightarrow \infty$ ), and property (d4( $\gamma$ )). The proofs of the remaining cases of (C1) for any  $\underline{\zeta} \in \mathcal{S}$  are again unchanged. Hence all  $\underline{\zeta} \in \mathcal{S}$  satisfy the claims of Theorem 2.2.

Step 2: Now we show that  $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}(\gamma)$  has packing dimension at least  $m(1 - \gamma)$ . This works similar as in the proof of [29, Theorem 2.1]. Let  $\mu = \gamma^{-1} - 1$ . First we claim that we can write any given real vector  $\underline{y} \in \mathbb{R}^m$  as the sum of an element of  $\mathcal{S}$  and a vector with ordinary exponent of binary approximation (to be defined below) at least  $\mu - \epsilon$ , for small  $\epsilon > 0$  that tends to 0 as  $\epsilon$  does. More precisely, if we let

$$\mathcal{V}_m^{(2)}(\lambda) = \{ \underline{x} \in \mathbb{R}^m : \liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} (2^t)^\lambda \psi_{\underline{x}}(2^t) < \infty \} \subseteq \bigcup_{\tau \geq \lambda} \mathcal{W}_m(\tau), \quad \lambda > 0,$$

then for some small  $\epsilon > 0$  we claim

$$(23) \quad \mathcal{V}_m^{(2)}(\mu - \epsilon) + \mathcal{S} = \mathbb{R}^m.$$

Given  $\underline{y} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ , we construct a representation  $\underline{x} + \underline{\zeta} = \underline{y}$  for  $\underline{x} \in \mathcal{V}_m^{(2)}(\mu - \epsilon)$ ,  $\underline{\zeta} \in \mathcal{S}$ . We define  $\underline{\zeta} \in \mathbb{R}^m$  as any vector in  $\mathcal{S}$  whose coordinates  $\zeta_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq m$ , have the same binary digit as the corresponding component  $y_i$  of  $\underline{y}$  within the intervals  $I_n$ . This is possible by the construction of  $\mathcal{S}$ . Then we let  $\underline{x} = \underline{y} - \underline{\zeta}$ . Consequently the coordinates of  $\underline{x} \in \mathbb{R}^m$  all have binary digits 0 in the entire intervals  $I_n$ . Hence by construction of  $I_n$ , it is easy



to check that  $\underline{x} \in \mathcal{V}_m^{(2)}(\mu - \varepsilon)$  for small enough  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Indeed, by taking  $q = 2^{\lfloor c_{mn+1}(\gamma+\epsilon) \rfloor}$  and our choice of  $\mu$ , for small enough  $\varepsilon > 0$  depending on  $\epsilon$  we have

$$\|q\underline{x}\| \ll 2^{-|I_n|} \ll 2^{-(1-\gamma-\epsilon)c_{mn+1}} \ll q^{-(\mu-\varepsilon)}.$$

The construction is complete and the claim is proved.

Write  $\dim_H$  and  $\dim_P$  for Hausdorff and packing dimension, respectively. For simplicity set  $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}_m^{(2)}(\mu - \varepsilon)$ . Next we claim that

$$(24) \quad \dim_H(\mathcal{V}) \leq \frac{m}{\mu - \varepsilon + 1} = m\gamma + O(m\varepsilon),$$

where the implied constant depends on  $\gamma$  only. This can be done by a standard covering argument and was already observed in a more general form in [29, Lemma 5.6]. See next paragraph for an alternative proof using Lemma 6.1. Combining (23), (24) with a result by Tricot [31] and the well-known property that the Hausdorff dimension of a set does not increase under a Lipschitz map, we conclude

$$\dim_P(\mathcal{S}) \geq \dim_H(\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{V}) - \dim_H(\mathcal{V}) \geq \dim_H(\mathcal{S} + \mathcal{V}) - \dim_H(\mathcal{V}) \geq m - m\gamma - O(m\varepsilon),$$

and since  $\epsilon$  and thus  $\varepsilon$  can be arbitrarily small, the claim of the theorem.

**Remark 3.** In the light of the short proof of Corollary 2 in § 10 below, the above already implies the weaker claim that  $Di_m(c) \setminus (Di_m(2^{-1/m}c) \cup Bad_m) \subseteq \mathbf{FS}_m$  has packing dimension at least  $m - m\gamma$  for any  $c \in (0, 1]$ . More generally, for  $\Phi$  as in Theorem 2.2, analogous claims hold upon replacing the factor  $(1 - \varepsilon)$  in (C2) by  $2^{-1/m}$ .

**6.2. General case.** Unfortunately, as indicated in Remark 3, we cannot guarantee that  $a_n$  are not powers of 2 in general, without losing information on the exact Dirichlet constant. Here we explain how to alter the construction to the general case, however omit a few technical details. Given any integer sequence  $k_j$  satisfying (11), i.e.  $k_j | k_{j+1}$ , it is not hard to verify that any number in  $[0, 1)$  can be expressed as  $\sum_{j \geq 1} g_j / k_j$  with integers  $g_j \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, k_{j+1}/k_j - 1\}$ , via some kind of greedy expansion. Call  $k_j$  bases and  $g_j$  digits. If  $k_{j+1}/k_j = b$  for  $j \geq 1$  then this becomes just the usual  $b$ -ary expansion. Now we choose  $a_{mn+1} = 2^Z a_{mn}$  for some integer  $Z = Z_n$  so that  $M'_n = 2^{Z_n}$  in the notation of § 5.1, and apply the above construction to the digits  $g_{i,j}$  of  $\xi_i$  in this setting, in place of the binary digits. Concretely, we choose any  $a_j$  as a base integer and call these main bases. At every main base integer  $k_j = a_u$ , for  $i \equiv u \pmod m$  with  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$  we choose the digit of  $\xi_i$  as  $g_{i,j} = 1$ , and put  $g_{i,j} = 0$  for the other  $i \not\equiv u \pmod m$ , very similar to the binary digit construction above. We further define additional intermediate bases within intervals  $(a_{mn}, a_{mn+1})$  as follows. Let  $Y = Y_n < Z_n$  be an integer so that  $2^Y a_{mn} = a_{mn+1}^{\gamma+\epsilon}$  with small  $\epsilon > 0$ , which is clearly possible since the approximation can be made precise up to a factor 2. Now within any interval  $(a_{mn}, a_{mn+1})$ , we choose the intermediate bases  $2^Y a_{mn}, 2^{Y+1} a_{mn}, 2^{Y+2} a_{mn}, \dots, 2^{Z-1} a_{mn} = a_{mn+1}/2$ . We define our sequence of bases  $(k_j)_{j \geq 1}$  as the increasingly ordered union of all main and intermediate bases. By a similar argument as in the binary construction § 6.1, again we can choose the digits  $g_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\}$  of any component  $\zeta_i$  with respect to the intermediate bases  $2^Y a_{mn}, 2^{Y+1} a_{mn}, \dots, 2^{Z-1} a_{mn}$  freely without violating (C1), (C2), (C3). Call  $\mathcal{S}^* \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$  the according set of real vectors

$\underline{\zeta}$  induced by the above digit restrictions. Since the good approximations are not powers of 2, we need a slightly different argument than in § 6.1 for the optimal result.

**Lemma 6.1.** *Let  $e = (e_j)_{j \geq 1}$  be any strictly increasing sequence of positive integers (that thus tends to infinity) and  $\tau > 0$ . Then the set  $\mathcal{V}_{m,e}(\tau)$  of vectors  $\underline{x} \in \mathbb{R}^m$  satisfying*

$$(25) \quad \|e_j \underline{x}\| \leq e_j^{-\tau}, \quad j \geq 1$$

has Hausdorff dimension at most  $m/(\tau + 1)$ .

*Proof.* The set  $\mathcal{V}_{m,e}(\tau)$  is clearly contained in the set of  $\underline{x}$  for which estimate (25) has infinitely many solutions for any given subsequence  $(e_{j_k})_{k \geq 1}$  of the  $e_j$ . By the convergence case of Jarník-Besicovich Theorem [17] in a setup involving approximations functions (no monotonicity is required since  $m > 1$ ), choosing the approximation function  $\Psi$  with support only on the  $e_{j_k}$  and there equal to  $\Psi(e_{j_k}) = e_{j_k}^{-\tau}$ , the latter set has Hausdorff  $\nu$ -measure 0 if the sum of  $e_{j_k}^{m-\nu(\tau+1)}$  over  $k \geq 1$  converges. As soon as  $\nu > m/(\tau + 1)$ , by choosing a sparse enough subsequence  $e_{j_k}$  of the  $e_j$ , the criterion obviously holds. This means the Hausdorff dimension the latter set is at most  $m/(\tau + 1)$ , thus of our original set  $\mathcal{V}_{m,e}(\tau)$  as well.  $\square$

By a similar argument as in § 6.1, we can write given  $\underline{y} \in \mathbb{R}^m$  as a sum  $\underline{x} + \underline{\zeta}$  where  $\underline{\zeta} \in \mathcal{S}^*$  and  $\underline{x}$  has the property that  $\|q\underline{x}\| \ll q^{-(\mu-\varepsilon)}$  at the places  $q = 2^{Y_n} a_{mn}$  for  $n \geq 1$ . So we may apply Lemma 6.1 to  $e_j = 2^{Y_j} a_{mj}$  and  $\tau = \mu - \varepsilon$ , which shows that the according set  $\mathcal{V}_{m,e}(\tau)$  of  $\underline{x}$  has Hausdorff dimension at most  $m/(\mu - \varepsilon + 1)$  again. The estimate for the packing dimension of  $\mathcal{S}^*$  follows now analogously to § 6.1 from Tricot's result.

**Remark 4.** It can be shown with aid of [12, Example 4.6, 4.7] that Lemma 6.1 states the precise Hausdorff dimension of  $\mathcal{V}_{m,e}(\tau)$ , hence we cannot hope for an improvement by some refined treatment of this set. The proofs of Theorems 2.3, 2.4 below are based on this strategy.

## 7. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.2 FOR $m = 2$

For  $m = 2$ , we have to alter our sequence  $(a_n)_{n \geq 1}$ . Define  $a_1$  and  $a_2 = a_1^2$ , and for  $n \geq 1$  recursively we set

$$a_{2n+1} = a_{2n}^{M_n}, \quad a_{2n+2} = \tilde{L}_n a_{2n+1}$$

where again  $M_n$  is a fast growing sequence of integers, but now

$$\tilde{L}_n = \{\min z \in \mathbb{N} : z^{-1} < \Phi(Q) : 1 \leq Q \leq z a_{2n+1}\}.$$

By (d2) this is a well-defined finite number. Note that this is slightly different than  $L_f$  in § 5.1. Indeed, now the reverse inequality  $\tilde{L}_n > d_n := a_{2n+1}$  holds by (d1) for all  $n \geq 1$ , and clearly  $\tilde{L}_n \rightarrow \infty$  follows. Then again define  $\xi_i$  as in (12).

The proof of (C3) is identical to § 5.1 by considering  $Q = q = a_{2n}$  for large  $n$ . For (C1) we again let  $Q$  be large and  $k$  the index with  $a_k \leq Q < a_{k+1}$ . We consider the same cases again. Case 1 is very similarly inferred from (d2), and again leads to

$\|q\underline{\xi}\| = \|q\xi_1\| < \Phi(Q)$ . Case 2 of (C1) is empty. In Case 3 of (C1), we now instead of (14) get a bound

$$(26) \quad \|q\underline{\xi}\| = \|q\xi_2\| \leq \frac{1}{\tilde{L}_f} + O(Qd_{f+1}^{-1}).$$

By definition of  $\tilde{L}_f$  and since we can choose  $M_{f+1}$  in the next step arbitrarily large, we again see  $\|q\underline{\xi}\| = \|q\xi_2\| < \Phi(Q)$  for any  $Q < a_{2n+2}$ .

We follow the proof of (C2) as in § 5.2. Again we let  $Q = a_{2f+2} - 1$  for large  $f$  and consider the same cases I, II. In Case I we get the same estimate (18) by the same argument. However, since now  $\tilde{L}_f > d_f$  we have  $d_f^{-1} > \tilde{L}_f^{-1}$ . In case IIa we again get a lower bound  $\|q\underline{\xi}\| \geq e_s^{-1} - O(Qd_{f+1}^{-1})$  but now  $e_s = \tilde{L}_f$ . Case IIb also gives the same bound  $e_s^{-1} - O(Qd_{f+1}^{-1})$ . Since we noticed  $1/\tilde{L}_f < 1/d_f$ , in any case we get

$$(27) \quad \|q\underline{\xi}\| \geq \frac{1}{\tilde{L}_f} + O(Qd_{f+1}^{-1}).$$

The error term can be made  $o(\tilde{L}_f^{-1})$  if we choose  $M_{f+1}$  large enough in every step. Moreover,  $(\tilde{L}_f - 1)^{-1} \geq \Phi(Q')$  for some  $Q' \in [(\tilde{L}_f - 1)a_{2f+1}, a_{2f+2})$  by definition of  $\tilde{L}_f$ , hence

$$\|q\underline{\xi}\| \geq (1 - \epsilon_1)\Phi(Q') = (1 - \epsilon_1)\Phi(\tilde{\alpha}_f \tilde{L}_f a_{2f+1}), \quad \tilde{\alpha}_f = \frac{Q'}{\tilde{L}_f a_{2f+1}} \geq \frac{\tilde{L}_f - 1}{\tilde{L}_f}.$$

Now  $\tilde{\alpha}_f \rightarrow 1^-$ , so we can use the latter condition in (d3) to conclude very similarly as in § 5.2 (note that we again require the condition on the right-sided lower limit  $\alpha \rightarrow 1^+$  as well for the final step of the argument, or some similar property). The metrical claim also follows analogously to § 6.1. We omit the details.

**Remark 5.** For general  $m \geq 2$ , defining again  $a_{mn+1} = a_{mn}^{M_n}$  and constant quotients  $a_{mn+j+1}/a_{mn+j} = \tilde{L}_n$  for  $1 \leq j \leq m - 1$  with

$$\tilde{L}_n = \{\min z \in \mathbb{N} : z^{-1} < \Phi(Q) : 1 \leq Q \leq z^{m-1} a_{2n+1}\},$$

analogous arguments would lead to an alternative, slightly shorter proof of Theorem 2.2 upon assuming the latter condition in (d3). We preferred to include the longer proof for  $m \geq 3$  since when adapting the alternative above construction to Cantor sets as in § 3.1, without additional argument the bound in Theorem 3.1 would become weaker.

## 8. PROOF OF HAUSDORFF DIMENSION ESTIMATES

**8.1. Metric preliminaries.** To prove Theorem 2.3 resp. Theorem 2.4, similar as in § 6, in short, we construct a Cantor type subset of the corresponding set  $\mathbf{F}_{m,c}$  resp.  $\mathbf{F}_{m,c} \cap \mathcal{W}_m(\lambda)$  whose Hausdorff dimension can be estimated/evaluated. The fractal set will be as in the following lemma, for optimized parameters  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2$  under certain side conditions. The notation  $A \asymp B$  means  $A \ll B \ll A$  in the sequel.

**Lemma 8.1.** *Let  $m \geq 2$  an integer and  $\gamma_2 \geq \gamma_1 > 1$  be real numbers. Assume  $(c_n)_{n \geq 1}$  is an increasing sequence of integers and let  $h_n = c_{mn}$  and  $H_n = 2^{h_n}$  for  $n \geq 1$ . Assume*

$$(28) \quad H_n \asymp H_{n-1}^{\gamma_2 m}, \quad n \geq 2.$$

*Let a sequence  $(\delta_n)_{n \geq 1}$  satisfy  $\delta_n > \gamma_1$  for  $n \geq 1$  and  $\delta_n = \gamma_2 + o(1)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . For  $1 \leq i \leq m$ , let  $\mathcal{Q}_i \subseteq [0, 1)$  be the set of real numbers  $\zeta_i$  whose binary expansion  $\zeta_i = \sum_{j \geq 1} g_{i,j} 2^{-j}$  has an arbitrary digit  $g_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\}$  at places of the form*

- (i) *For  $1 \leq i \leq m$  in intervals  $j \in [\gamma_1 h_n, \delta_n h_n - 1] \cap \mathbb{Z}$*
- (ii) *For  $3 \leq i \leq m - 1$ , in intervals  $j \in [2\delta_n h_n + 1, i\delta_n h_n - 1] \cap \mathbb{Z}$*
- (iii) *For  $i = m$ , in intervals  $j \in [2\delta_n h_n + 1, h_{n+1} - 1] \cap \mathbb{Z}$*

*for all  $n \geq 1$ , and a prescribed digit  $g_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\}$  elsewhere. Then their Cartesian product  $\prod \mathcal{Q}_i$  has Hausdorff dimension at least*

$$(29) \quad \dim_H \left( \prod_{i=1}^m \mathcal{Q}_i \right) \geq 2 \frac{\gamma_2 - \gamma_1}{\gamma_1(\gamma_2 m - 1)} + \sum_{i=3}^m \min \left\{ \frac{m(\gamma_2 - \gamma_1) + i - 2}{2(m\gamma_2 - 1)}, \frac{(i-1)\gamma_2 - \gamma_1}{\gamma_1(m\gamma_2 - 1)} \right\},$$

*and alternatively*

$$(30) \quad \dim_H \left( \prod_{i=1}^m \mathcal{Q}_i \right) \geq m \cdot \frac{\gamma_2 - \gamma_1}{\gamma_1(\gamma_2 m - 1)}.$$

We prove Lemma 8.1. Our sets  $\mathcal{Q}_i$  can be interpreted as a special case of a construction from Falconer's book [12, Example 4.6].

**Proposition 8.2** (Falconer). *Let  $[0, 1] = E_0 \supseteq E_1 \supseteq E_2 \supseteq \dots$  be a decreasing sequence of sets, with each  $E_n$  a union of a finite number of disjoint closed intervals (called  $n$ -th level basic intervals), with each interval of  $E_{n-1}$  containing  $P_n \geq 2$  intervals of  $E_n$ , which are separated by gaps of length at least  $\epsilon_n$ , with  $0 < \epsilon_{n+1} < \epsilon_n$  for each  $n$ , which tend to 0 as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Then the set*

$$F = \bigcap_{i \geq 1} E_i$$

*satisfies*

$$\dim_H(F) \geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(P_1 P_2 \dots P_{n-1})}{-\log(P_n \epsilon_n)}.$$

From our setup it can be seen that  $F = \mathcal{Q}_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq m$  from Lemma 8.1 meet the requirements of Proposition 8.2 with parameters

$$(31) \quad P_n \asymp H_n^{\delta_n - \gamma_1} = H_n^{\gamma_2 - \gamma_1 - o(1)}, \quad \epsilon_n \asymp H_n^{-\delta_n} = H_n^{-\gamma_2 + o(1)}$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq m$ , and alternatively with

$$(32) \quad P_{2n} \asymp H_n^{\gamma_2 - \gamma_1 + o(1)}, \quad \epsilon_{2n} \asymp H_n^{-\gamma_2 + o(1)}, \quad P_{2n+1} \asymp H_n^{(i-2)\gamma_2 + o(1)}, \quad \epsilon_{2n+1} \asymp H_n^{-i\gamma_2 + o(1)},$$

for  $3 \leq i \leq m$ . We provide more details. Assume the interval construction is done up to level  $2n - 1$  which prescribes digits up to position  $\lceil \gamma_1 h_n \rceil - 1$ . Then the free binary digit choice within  $j \in [\gamma_1 h_n, \delta_n h_n) = [\gamma_1 h_n, (\gamma_2 + o(1))h_n)$  means that we split each interval given after step  $2n - 1$  in the next step into  $2^{\delta_n h_n - 1 - \lceil \gamma_1 h_n \rceil} = 2^{(\gamma_2 - \gamma_1 + o(1))h_n} = H_n^{\gamma_2 - \gamma_1 + o(1)}$

subintervals, each of length  $\asymp 2^{-\gamma_1 h_{n+1}} = H_{n+1}^{-\gamma_1}$  due to the subsequent digits vanishing until position  $j = \lfloor \gamma_1 h_{n+1} \rfloor$ , and two neighboring intervals roughly at distance  $\epsilon_{2n} \asymp 2^{-\delta_n h_n} - 2^{-\gamma_1 h_{n+1}} = H_n^{-\gamma_2 + o(1)} - H_{n+1}^{-\gamma_1} = H_n^{-\gamma_2 + o(1)}$  apart. A very similar idea applies in the next step to estimate  $P_{2n+1}, \epsilon_{2n+1}$ , where we distinguish between various  $i$  and for  $i > 2$  use that for  $i = m$  we also have  $H_{n+1} = H_n^{i\gamma_2(1+o(1))}$  by (28). Inserting (32), (28) in Proposition 8.2 we may omit lower order terms and obtain for  $3 \leq i \leq m$  that

$$\begin{aligned} \dim_H(\mathcal{Q}_i) &\geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(P_1 P_2 \dots P_{n-1})}{-\log(P_n \epsilon_n)} \\ &= \min \left\{ \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(P_1 P_2 \dots P_{2n})}{-\log(P_{2n+1} \epsilon_{2n+1})}, \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(P_1 P_2 \dots P_{2n-1})}{-\log(P_{2n} \epsilon_{2n})} \right\} \\ &= \min \left\{ \frac{\left( \gamma_2 - \gamma_1 + \frac{(i-2)\gamma_2}{\gamma_2 m} \right) \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (\gamma_2 m)^{-j} \log H_n}{2\gamma_2 \log H_n}, \frac{\frac{(i-2)\gamma_2 + \gamma_2 - \gamma_1}{\gamma_2 m} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (\gamma_2 m)^{-j} \log H_n}{\gamma_1 \log H_n} \right\} \\ &= \min \left\{ \frac{m(\gamma_2 - \gamma_1) + i - 2}{2(\gamma_2 m - 1)}, \frac{(i-1)\gamma_2 - \gamma_1}{\gamma_1(\gamma_2 m - 1)} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last identity requires short computations involving the geometric sum formula. Similarly, for any  $1 \leq i \leq m$  from (31), (28) and Proposition 8.2 we get

$$\dim_H(\mathcal{Q}_i) \geq \frac{(\gamma_2 - \gamma_1) \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (\gamma_2 m)^{-j} \log H_n}{\gamma_1 \log H_n} = \frac{(\gamma_2 - \gamma_1) \frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{\gamma_2 m}}}{m\gamma_1 \gamma_2} = \frac{\gamma_2 - \gamma_1}{\gamma_1(\gamma_2 m - 1)}.$$

Combining the respective estimates with the general fact  $\dim_H(\prod A_i) \geq \sum \dim_H(A_i)$  for any  $A_1, \dots, A_m \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ , see [12], with  $A_i = \mathcal{Q}_i$  proves the claims of the lemma.

**8.2. Proof of Theorem 2.3.** We assume  $m \geq 3$  here, for  $m = 2$  the proof works very similarly. We show how to derive Theorem 2.3 from Lemma 8.1. Assume the real parameters  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2$  satisfy the stronger hypothesis

$$(33) \quad m(\gamma_1 - 1) > \gamma_2 \geq \gamma_1 > 1 + \frac{1}{m}.$$

In fact the setup (33) automatically requires  $\gamma_1 > 1 + \frac{1}{m-1}$ . Take  $(a_n)_{n \geq 1}$  the sequence constructed in § 5.1 with the specialization  $\Phi(t) = ct^{-1/m}$  and assume for the moment  $a_n = 2^{c_n}$  for integers  $c_n$ . Take  $M'_n \asymp a_{mn}^{\gamma_2 - 1}$  the integer power of 2 closest to  $a_{mn}^{\gamma_2 - 1}$  for  $n \geq 1$ , so that we have

$$(34) \quad a_{mn+1} = M'_n a_{mn} \asymp a_{mn}^{\gamma_2} = 2^{c_{mn}\gamma_2}, \quad n \geq 1,$$

and let for  $n \geq 1$  further

$$H_n = a_{mn}, \quad h_n = c_{mn}.$$

Note that our particular case  $\Phi(t) = ct^{-1/m}$  implies (28). Indeed then  $L_n \asymp a_{mn+1}$  and  $H_{n+1} = a_{m(n+1)} = L_n a_{mn+1}^{m-1} \asymp a_{mn+1}^m \asymp a_{mn}^{\gamma_2 m} = H_n^{\gamma_2 m}$ . (For general  $\Phi$  under (d4( $\gamma$ )) we would get  $H_{n-1}^{\gamma_2 m} \gg H_n \gg H_{n-1}^{\gamma_2/\gamma}$ .) Let  $\delta_n > 0$  be defined by

$$a_{mn+1} = a_{mn}^{\delta_n}, \quad n \geq 1,$$

which satisfies  $\delta_n = \gamma_2 + o(1)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  by (34), more precisely  $H_n^{\delta_n} \asymp H_n^{\gamma_2}$ . (The definition of  $\delta_n$  agrees with  $M_n$  in § 5.1, however since we do not assume it is an integer here, we prefer to change notation for clarity.)

Consider the real numbers  $\xi_i$  as in § 5.1 when  $a_n = 2^{c_n}$  as above, i.e.  $\xi_i = \sum_{n \geq 0} 2^{-c_{mn+i}}$ . Then in the binary expansion the digit of  $\xi_i$  is 1 at places  $c_{mn+i}$ ,  $n \geq 0$ , and 0 elsewhere. Then we consider the sets  $\mathcal{Q}_i = \mathcal{Q}_i(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq m$ , as in Lemma 8.1 consisting of the real numbers  $\zeta_i = \sum g_{i,j} 2^{-j}$ , where  $g_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\}$  depends on  $\zeta_i$ , obtained from the  $\xi_i$  when we change the binary digit  $g_{i,j}$  of  $\xi_i$  from 0 to an arbitrary digit in  $\{0, 1\}$  in the intervals of type (i), (ii), (iii). Then, any  $\zeta_i = \sum_{j \geq 1} g_{i,j} 2^{-j} \in \mathcal{Q}_i$  still has binary digit  $g_{i,j} = 0$  at places  $j$  within the following intervals for all  $n \geq 1$ :

(i\*) For  $1 \leq i \leq m - 1$ , within intervals

$$j \in [\max\{i, 2\} \delta_{n-1} c_{m(n-1)} + 1, \gamma_1 c_{mn}) \cap \mathbb{Z} = [\max\{i, 2\} \delta_{n-1} h_{n-1} + 1, \gamma_1 h_n) \cap \mathbb{Z},$$

which contains  $[h_n + 1, \gamma_1 h_n) \cap \mathbb{Z}$ .

(ii\*) For  $i = m$ , within intervals

$$j \in [c_{mn} + 1, \gamma_1 c_{mn}) \cap \mathbb{Z} = [h_n + 1, \gamma_1 h_n) \cap \mathbb{Z}.$$

(iii\*) For  $i = 2$ , within intervals

$$j \in [c_{mn+1} + 1, 2c_{mn+1} - 1] \cap \mathbb{Z} = [\delta_n h_n + 1, 2\delta_n h_n - 1] \cap \mathbb{Z}.$$

(iv\*) For  $i = 1$  and  $3 \leq i \leq m$ , within intervals

$$j \in [c_{mn+1} + 1, 2c_{mn+1}] \cap \mathbb{Z} = [\delta_n h_n + 1, 2\delta_n h_n] \cap \mathbb{Z}.$$

Note that  $i\delta_n h_n = ic_{mn+1} = c_{mn+i}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq m - 1$  and  $n \geq 1$  by (8). We claim

**Lemma 8.3.** *Any  $\underline{\zeta} \in \prod \mathcal{Q}_i$  as above satisfies*

$$\limsup_{Q \rightarrow \infty} Q^{1/m} \psi_{\underline{\zeta}}(Q) = c,$$

i.e. (C1'), (C2) for  $\Phi(t) = ct^{-1/m}$ , where (C1') is (C1) up to admitting a factor  $1 + \varepsilon$  in the right hand side.

*Proof of Lemma 8.3.* Take  $\underline{\zeta} \in \prod \mathcal{Q}_i$ . We first verify (C1'). Assume we are in Cases 2, 3 of the proof of (C1) in § 5.2. We again consider integers  $q = a_{mf+1} = 2^{c_{mf+1}} = H_f^{\delta_f} \asymp H_f^{\gamma_2}$  that satisfy  $q < Q < a_{m(f+1)} \leq a_{mf+1}^m$ . By (iii\*), we have essentially the same estimates for  $\|q\underline{\zeta}_2\|$  as in § 5.2 and by (iv\*) the other  $\|q\underline{\zeta}_i\|$ ,  $i \neq 2$ , take smaller values, so

$$\|q\underline{\zeta}\| = \|q\underline{\zeta}_2\| \leq a_{mf+1}^{-1} + O(a_{mf+1} a_{m(f+1)+1}^{-1}), \quad \underline{\zeta} \in \prod \mathcal{Q}_i.$$

As in the proof in § 5.2, by construction  $a_{mf+1}^{-1} = d_f^{-1} < \Phi(Q) = cQ^{-1/m}$  for any  $Q < a_{m(f+1)}$ . Hence, upon admitting a factor  $1 + \varepsilon$  coming from the lower order error term (which however we cannot control as freely here in view of (34)), we satisfy in (C1). In Case 1 of the proof of (C1) in § 5.2, we use (i\*), (ii\*) and  $\gamma_1 - 1 > \gamma_2/m$  from (33) when

$\Phi(t) = ct^{-1/m}$  (under  $(d4(\gamma))$  in general  $\gamma_1 - 1 > \gamma_2\gamma$ ) to guarantee the same estimate. Indeed, for  $q = a_{mf} = 2^{h_f} = H_f$  and any  $Q < a_{mf+1} = H_f^{\delta_n} \leq H_f^{\gamma_2+o(1)}$  we calculate

$$\|q\underline{\zeta}\| \ll 2^{-\gamma_1 h_f + h_f} = H_f^{-(\gamma_1-1)} \ll a_{mf+1}^{-\frac{\gamma_1-1}{\gamma_2}+o(1)} = o(a_{mf+1}^{-1/m}), \quad \text{as } f \rightarrow \infty, \quad \underline{\zeta} \in \prod \mathcal{Q}_i.$$

Hence  $\|q\underline{\zeta}\| < cQ^{-1/m} = \Phi(Q)$  for  $f \geq f_0$ . The proof of (C2) is almost analogous to the classical case in § 5.2, with two minor changes. Firstly, we again use  $\gamma_1 > 1 + 1/m$  from (33) and  $(i^*), (ii^*)$  for the error term  $O(Qd_{f+1}^{-1}) = O(a_{m(f+1)}a_{m(f+1)+1}^{-1})$  to be negligible. Indeed, by  $\gamma_1 > 1 + 1/m$  from (33) and  $(i^*), (ii^*)$ , the error term can be estimated  $\ll a_{m(f+1)}^{1-\gamma_1} = o(a_{m(f+1)}^{-1/m})$ , while by construction the main term is just slightly smaller than  $\Phi(a_{m(f+1)}) = ca_{m(f+1)}^{-1/m}$ . (In general under condition  $(d4(\gamma))$  on  $\Phi$ , we require  $\gamma_1 > 1 + \gamma$  for the same conclusion.) Secondly our digital variations from (i) resp. (ii) induce slightly different integers  $D = D(\underline{\zeta})$  in Case I resp.  $Y_q = Y_q(\underline{\zeta})$  and  $Z_q = Z_q(\underline{\zeta})$  in Case II, now depending on the choice of  $\underline{\zeta} \in \prod \mathcal{Q}_i$ . The according crucial properties hold again for similar reasons as in § 6.1. Note that the remainder terms are essentially unaffected in view of  $(i^*), (ii^*)$ . Hence our claim is proved.  $\square$

By Lemma 8.3, and since  $\lambda(\underline{\zeta}) \geq 1 > 1/m$  for any  $\underline{\zeta} \in \prod \mathcal{Q}_i$  is easy to see by choosing integers  $q = a_{mn+1} = \delta_n h_n$  in view of  $(iii^*), (iv^*)$ , see also § 8.3 below, the set  $\mathbf{F}_{m,c}$  contains  $\prod \mathcal{Q}_i$ . Thus we may apply Lemma 8.1 to bound its Hausdorff dimension from below as in (29). For the asymptotical bound as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ , note that for any pair  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2$  with  $\gamma_1 > \gamma_2/m + 1$  and  $\gamma_2 > 1 + \frac{1}{m-1}$  the assumption (33) holds. The bound (29) clearly decays in  $\gamma_1$ . So basically we want to maximize (29) over  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2$  satisfying  $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2/m + 1$  and  $\gamma_2 > 1 + \frac{1}{m-1}$ . To give an asymptotical estimate, we choose  $\gamma_1$  just slightly larger than  $\gamma_2/m + 1$  and let  $\gamma_2 = m^\beta$  for fixed  $\beta \in (0, 1)$ . Then  $\gamma_1 = 1 + O(m^{\beta-1})$  is just slightly larger than 1, so it is asymptotically negligible in (29). We may further omit the small positive first expression  $2(\gamma_2 - \gamma_1)/(\gamma_1(m\gamma_2 - 1))$ . For large  $m$  then we check that the left expression in the minimum of (29) is of order  $1/2 + o(1)$  while the right is of order  $i/m + o(m)$ . Hence the minimum in (29) equals roughly  $i/m$  for  $3 \leq i \leq m/2 + o(m)$  and  $1/2 + o(1)$  for  $m/2 + o(m) \leq i \leq m$ . Thus as  $m \rightarrow \infty$  we bound the sum in (29) from below by

$$\left( \sum_{i=3}^{m/2} \frac{i}{m} - o(m) \right) + \left( \sum_{i=m/2}^m \frac{1}{2} - o(m) \right) = \frac{m}{8} + \frac{m}{4} - o(m) = \frac{3}{8}m - o(m),$$

the claimed asymptotical estimate (5).

Alternatively by Lemma 8.1 and Lemma 8.3 the Hausdorff dimension of  $\mathbf{F}_{m,c}$  can be estimated from below by (30). We now prove (4) by optimizing the parameters  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2$ . We already noticed that the expression in (30) decreases in  $\gamma_1$ . Hence in view of (33) we again take parameters related by the identity  $\gamma_1 = \frac{\gamma_2}{m} + 1 + \epsilon$  with small  $\epsilon > 0$  and bare in mind that we require  $\gamma_2 > 1 + \frac{1}{m-1}$  for the conditions (33) to be satisfied. Since  $\epsilon > 0$

can be arbitrarily small, we want to maximize the function

$$\gamma_2 \mapsto m \frac{\frac{m-1}{m}\gamma_2 - 1}{\left(\frac{\gamma_2}{m} + 1\right)(m\gamma_2 - 1)} = \frac{(m-1)\gamma_2 - m}{\gamma_2^2 + \left(m - \frac{1}{m}\right)\gamma_2 - 1}$$

over  $\gamma_2 > 1 + \frac{1}{m-1}$ . By differentiation we verify that the maximum is attained at

$$\gamma_2 = \frac{m + \sqrt{m(m^2 - m + 1)}}{m - 1} > 1 + \frac{1}{m - 1}$$

the positive solution of  $(m-1)x^2 - 2mx + m(1-m) = 0$ . Inserting in the function gives the desired estimate (4) after a short simplification.

Finally, we may generalize Lemma 8.1 to the situation where  $H_n$  are not powers of 2, and consequently drop the assumption  $a_n = 2^{c_n}$ , essentially by the argument explained in detail in § 6.2. We omit recalling the strategy.

**8.3. Proof of Theorem 2.4.** Assume  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2$  satisfy (33) and also

$$(35) \quad (\gamma_1 - 1)^2 > \gamma_2.$$

We again assume for simplicity that  $a_n = 2^{c_n}$  for integers  $c_n$ , the general case can be obtained as in § 6.2. Recall the sets  $\mathcal{Q}_i$  induced by  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2$ , constructed in § 8.2 from freely altering binary digits of  $\underline{\xi}$  from § 5.1 in intervals of type (i), (ii), (iii). We slightly alter  $\mathcal{Q}_1$  by imposing the additional condition (iv) that any  $\zeta_1 \in \mathcal{Q}_1$  has binary digit  $g_{1,j} = 1$  at position  $j = \lfloor \gamma_1 h_n \rfloor$ , for  $n \geq 1$ . Denote this set by  $\mathcal{Q}_1^* \subseteq \mathcal{Q}_1$ . We claim

**Lemma 8.4.** *For any  $\underline{\zeta} \in \mathcal{Q}_1^* \times \prod_{i=2}^m \mathcal{Q}_i$  as above we have*

$$\lambda(\underline{\zeta}) = \gamma_1 - 1.$$

We believe that in fact  $\lambda(\underline{\zeta}) = \max\{\gamma_1 - 1, 1\}$  for generic  $\underline{\zeta} \in \prod_{i=1}^m \mathcal{Q}_i$  whenever  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2$  are related by (33), however we are unable to prove it. The lower bound 1 hereby comes from (iii\*), (iv\*). The proof of Lemma 8.4 relies on the following standard result on rational approximation to a single real number.

**Proposition 8.5.** *Let  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ . Assume for a reduced fraction  $p/q \in \mathbb{Q}$  and  $\tau > 2$  we have*

$$\left|x - \frac{p}{q}\right| = q^{-\tau}.$$

*Then for any rational  $\tilde{p}/\tilde{q} \neq p/q$  with  $q \leq \tilde{q} \ll q^{\tau-1}$  for a sufficiently small absolute implied constant, we have  $|x - \tilde{p}/\tilde{q}| \geq \tilde{q}^{-2}/2$  or equivalently  $\|\tilde{q}x\| \geq \tilde{q}^{-1}/2$ .*

Proposition 8.5 follows from Legendre Theorem stating that  $|r/s - x| < s^{-2}/2$  implies that  $r/s$  (after reduction) must be a convergent of the continued fraction expansion of  $x$ , and the relation  $s_{k+1} \asymp |s_k x - r_k|^{-1}$  between two consecutive convergents  $r_k/s_k$  and  $r_{k+1}/s_{k+1}$ . See [28, Proposition 4.2] for a short proof of the latter fact. Alternatively, Minkowski's Second Convex Body Theorem directly implies Proposition 8.5, see also [18].



*Proof of Lemma 8.4.* Let  $\underline{\zeta} \in \mathcal{Q}_1^* \times \prod_{i=2}^m \mathcal{Q}_i$  be given. By properties  $(i^*), (ii^*)$  from § 8.2, the integers  $H_n = 2^{h_n} = a_{mn}$  induce an estimate

$$(36) \quad \|H_n \underline{\zeta}\| \asymp \|H_n \xi_1\| \asymp 2^{-h_n \gamma_1 + h_n} = H_n^{-(\gamma_1 - 1)}, \quad n \geq 1.$$

For the lower bound we have used the non-zero digit assumption (iii). The lower estimate  $\lambda(\underline{\zeta}) \geq \gamma_1 - 1$  follows directly from (36). Assume now conversely to the claim of the lemma that we have strict inequality  $\lambda(\underline{\zeta}) > \gamma_1 - 1$ . Then for some  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there are arbitrarily large integers  $q > 0$  with the property

$$(37) \quad \|q \underline{\zeta}\| < q^{-(\gamma_1 - 1) - \varepsilon}.$$

Let  $q$  be such an integer and let  $f$  be the index with  $H_f \leq q < H_{f+1}$ . Recall that  $H_f = a_{mf}$  and  $H_{f+1} = a_{m(f+1)}$  and the notation  $d_n = a_{mn+1} = a_{mn}^{\delta_n} = H_n^{\delta_n}$  for any  $n \geq 1$ . The proof of (C2) in § 5.2 (or § 8.2) shows that for any  $q < H_{f+1}$  we have

$$(38) \quad \|q \underline{\zeta}\| \geq d_f^{-1} + O(H_{f+1} d_{f+1}^{-1}) = H_f^{-\delta_f} + O(H_{f+1} d_{f+1}^{-1}).$$

We verify that the error term is of smaller order the main term. Indeed,  $\delta_f = \gamma_2 + o(1)$  as  $f \rightarrow \infty$  implies  $d_{f+1} = H_{f+1}^{\delta_{f+1}} = H_{f+1}^{\gamma_2 + o(1)} = H_f^{m\gamma_2 + o(1)}$ , and since  $m\gamma_2 - m > \gamma_2$  by  $\gamma_2 > \gamma_1 > (3 + \sqrt{5})/2 > 1 + 1/(m-1)$  for  $m \geq 2$ , the claim follows. Hence, combining (38) with (37) and using  $\delta_f = \gamma_2 + o(1)$  as  $f \rightarrow \infty$  and (35), we conclude

$$q < H_f^{\frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_1 - 1} + o(1)} < H_f^{\gamma_1 - 1}, \quad f \geq f_0.$$

On the other hand, by (36) for  $n = f$  and Proposition 8.5, we get the contradictory claim  $q \gg H_f^{\gamma_1 - 1 + \varepsilon} > H_f^{\gamma_1 - 1}$ , unless  $q = PH_f$ ,  $P \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$  is a multiple of  $H_f = a_{mf}$ . In fact, in the latter case if  $\|H_f \zeta_1\| = |H_f \zeta_1 - p_1|$  and  $\|q \zeta_1\| = |q \zeta_1 - r_1|$  for integers  $p_1, r_1$ , then we must have  $q/H_f = r_1/p_1 = P$ , i.e.  $P(H_f, p_1) = (q, r_1)$ . But then from (36) we get

$$\|q \underline{\zeta}\| \geq \|q \zeta_1\| = P \|H_f \zeta_1\| \geq \|H_f \zeta_1\| \gg H_f^{-(\gamma_1 - 1)} \geq q^{-(\gamma_1 - 1)},$$

contradicting again (37) for large  $f$  (or equivalently  $q$ ).  $\square$

Recall  $\beta = \frac{1 + \sqrt{5}}{2}$  and let  $\lambda \in (\beta, \infty)$  be given. Let

$$\gamma_1 = \lambda + 1, \quad \gamma_2 \in (\lambda + 1, \min\{m\lambda, \lambda^2\}) \neq \emptyset.$$

Then (33), (35) hold. Consider the derived sets  $\mathcal{Q}_i$  and  $\mathcal{Q}_1^*$ , and let  $\mathcal{Q} := \mathcal{Q}_1^* \times \prod_{i=2}^m \mathcal{Q}_i \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$  for simplicity. By Lemma 8.4 we have  $\mathcal{Q} \subseteq \mathcal{W}_m(\lambda)$  and by Lemma 8.3 and since  $\mathcal{Q} \subseteq \prod_{i=1}^m \mathcal{Q}_i$  we have  $\mathcal{Q} \subseteq \mathbf{F}_{m,c}$  again. It is further clear from the proof of Theorem 2.3 that for  $\mathcal{Q}$  the bounds (29), (30) still apply, as condition (iv) is metrically negligible. Hence, we get a positive Hausdorff dimension of our set (6). For the asymptotical estimate as  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ , for  $\gamma_2$  we may ignore the larger bound  $\lambda^2$  and let  $\gamma_2 = m\lambda - o(1)$ . Inserting in (29) we observe that for large  $\lambda$  the right term in the minimum is smaller, and identifying main terms and estimating lower order terms gives  $i/(\lambda m) - m^{-1} \lambda^{-1} (1 + o(1))$  as a lower estimate for  $3 \leq i \leq m$ , which sums up to  $m/(2\lambda) - O(\lambda^{-1})$ , the claimed asymptotical bound. Theorem 2.4 is proved.

**8.4. Generalizations.** We sketch how to modify the construction of § 6.2 to get the refined claims on the exact order of ordinary approximation indicated below Theorem 2.4. Let  $\Psi(t)$  be any approximation function of decay  $o(t^{-\beta-\epsilon})$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . We alter (iv) from § 8.3 by prescribing at step  $n$  simultaneously the binary digits  $g_{i,j} = g_j$  of all  $\xi_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq m$ , at positions  $j \in J_n := \{\lceil \gamma_1(n)h_n \rceil, \lceil \gamma_1(n)h_n \rceil + 1, \dots, \lceil \gamma_1(n)h_n \rceil + n\}$ , where we put

$$\gamma_1(n) = \left\lfloor \frac{\log \Psi(H_n)}{\log H_n} \right\rfloor + 1, \quad \gamma_2(n) \in (\gamma_1(n), \min\{m(\gamma_1(n) - 1), (\gamma_1(n) - 1)^2\}) \neq \emptyset.$$

Thereby we obtain a subset  $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}$  of  $\prod \mathcal{Q}_i$  from § 8.1 again, but with parameters  $\gamma_i$  depending on  $n$ . Because of  $|J_n| = n$ , we can prescribe  $\|H_n \zeta\|/\Psi(H_n)$  up to a factor  $1 + 2^{-n+1}$  at step  $n$  by choosing digits  $g_{i,j}$  suitably (mimicking the binary expansion of  $\Psi(H_n)$  in  $J_n$ ), so as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  indeed we get a factor  $1 + o(1)$ . The arguments from proof of Lemma 8.4 further show that these values represent the local minima of  $\psi_\zeta(Q)/\Psi(Q)$ . Thus  $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}$  is contained in  $\mathcal{W}_m(\Psi) \cap \mathbf{F}_{m,c}$ . Moreover, the intervals  $J_n$  are short enough not to affect the asymptotics (31), (32) for every  $n$  and  $\gamma_i(n)$ . Given explicit lower and upper bounds for  $-\log \Psi(t)/\log t$ , we obtain intervals for  $\gamma_i(n)$  uniformly for  $n \geq 1$ , and may again infer metrical claims with some “dynamical variant” of Lemma 8.1. Assuming  $\Psi(t) = t^{-\lambda+o(1)}$  for some  $\lambda \in (\beta, \infty)$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , the exact same estimates (29), (30) can be deduced and we choose  $\gamma_1 = \lambda + 1$ ,  $\gamma_2 = m\gamma_1 - o(1)$  again for optimization. We leave the details to the reader.

Finally we sketch how to argue when  $1 < \lambda \leq \beta$ . We let  $\gamma_1 = \lambda + 1 > 2$  again and  $\gamma_2 > \gamma_1$  sufficiently close to  $\gamma_1$ . Then we fix the last coordinate

$$\zeta_m = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{-h_n} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{-\lceil \gamma_1 h_n \rceil},$$

and take the other  $\zeta_i \in \mathcal{Q}_i = \mathcal{Q}_i(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq m-1$ , as defined above with binary digit 0 in intervals of types (i), (ii), (iii). Note that  $q = H_n = 2^{h_n}$  and  $q = 2^{\lceil \gamma_1 h_n \rceil} \asymp H_n^{\gamma_1}$  induce small values  $\|q\zeta_m\|$ . Conversely, it can be deduced from the “Folding Lemma” by the same line of arguments as in [5] that we can only have  $\|q\zeta_m\| < q^{-(\gamma_1-1)-\epsilon}$  and hence (37), if  $q$  is a multiple of integers of these forms. To exclude these cases, we can use a similar strategy as in the proof of (C2) in § 5.2 involving some case distinctions, assuming  $\gamma_2 > \gamma_1$  was chosen sufficiently close to  $\gamma_1 = \lambda + 1$ . For the Hausdorff dimensions of our Cantor type sets of  $\zeta \in \mathbf{F}_{m,c} \cap \mathcal{W}_m(\lambda)$  we get a lower bound  $\dim_H(\prod_{i=1}^{m-1} \mathcal{Q}_i \times \{\zeta_m\}) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \dim_H(\mathcal{Q}_i) > 0$ . We omit the technical details again.

## 9. PROOF OF THEOREM 3.1

**9.1. The case of good  $K$ .** We restrict to  $m \geq 3$ , for  $m = 2$  we alter accordingly to § 7. If  $K$  is good, then very similarly as in § 6.1 we can take  $a_j = b^{c_j}$  for an increasing sequence of integers  $c_j$  in the construction in § 5.1, up to redefining  $L_n = b^{\ell_n}$  as the smallest power of  $b$  so that  $a_{mn+1}^{-1} < \Phi(Q')$  for any  $Q' \leq b^{\ell_n} a_{mn+1}$ . The analogue of Proposition 5.1 is easily checked as well in our setting. The proof of (C3), (C1) works identically as for Theorem 2.2. The proof of claim (17) further works analogously as Theorem 2.2 up to

(22). Below, now we have to take  $Q' \leq bL_f a_{mf+m-1}$  in place of  $Q' \leq (L_f + 1)a_{mf+m-1}$ . Hence  $\alpha_f \leq bL_f/L_f = b$ . Then the decay condition  $(d3'(b, R))$  yields a factor  $R$  in place of  $1 - \epsilon_2$  and (i) follows with  $\Omega = R$ .

For (ii), first recall that we may relax assumption (7) to  $a_{mn+1}$  being just a large enough multiple, in place of power, of  $a_{mn}$ . This corresponds to  $c_{mn} < c_{mn+1}$  in place of  $c_{mn}|c_{mn+1}$ , so that we can choose  $A, B$  in  $(D(b))$  freely. As remarked above, an according variant of Proposition 5.1 holds in our setting  $a_j = b^{c_j}$  as well. Then with large  $A, B$  as in  $(D(b))$  we may choose  $c_{mn+1} = A_n = A$  and  $c_{mn+m-1} + \ell_n = B_n = B$ , i.e.  $\ell_n = B_n - A_n$ , in step  $n$  so that the quotient  $\Phi(b^B)/b^{-A} > 1$  is arbitrarily close to 1 again. Hence we may choose  $\alpha_f = Q'/(L_f a_{mf+m-1}) > 1$  arbitrarily close to 1 again, and consequently get the same result as in Theorem 2.2.

The bound on the packing dimension for  $K = C_{b,\{0,1\}}^m$  follows similarly as for  $\mathbb{R}^m$ . We now instead have that the sumset  $(K \cap \mathcal{V}) + (K \cap \mathcal{S})$  with  $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}_m^{(b)}(\mu - \varepsilon)$  as in § 6.1 but for general  $b \geq 2$  contains  $K$ , and we conclude with Tricot's estimate again. Here we use the general version of [29, Lemma 5.6] to bound the Hausdorff dimension of  $K \cap \mathcal{V}$  from above. See also the very similar proof of [29, Theorem 4.1]. A positive lower bound for the Hausdorff dimension follows from very similar arguments as in § 8.1. We need to replace  $P_n$  in (31) resp. (32) by  $P_n \asymp H_n^{(\gamma_2 - \gamma_1) \log 2 / \log b}$  resp.  $P_{2n} \asymp H_n^{(\gamma_2 - \gamma_1) \log 2 / \log b}$  and  $P_{2n+1} \asymp H_n^{(i-2)\gamma_2 \log 2 / \log b}$  and keep  $\epsilon_n$  unchanged, we omit the slightly cumbersome calculation.

**9.2. General case.** We may assume  $|W_i| = 2$  for  $1 \leq i \leq m$ . Then we have the identity of sets

$$(39) \quad C_{b,W_i} = w_{i,1}C_{b,\{0,1\}} + \frac{w_{i,2}}{b-1}$$

for  $w_{i,1} \geq 1, w_{i,2} \geq 0$  integers with  $w_{i,1} + w_{i,2} \leq b - 1$ , where  $W_i = \{w_{i,2}, w_{i,1} + w_{i,2}\}$ . We use this identity to reduce the general case to the special case of good  $K$ .

Let  $\Phi$  be any function satisfying  $(d1), (d2), (d3'(b, R))$  for some  $R \in (0, 1)$ . From  $(d1)$  we get the weaker condition

$$\Phi(t) < (b-1)^2 R^{-1} \cdot t^{-1/m}, \quad t \geq t_0.$$

Define the auxiliary function

$$\tilde{\Phi}(t) = (b-1)^{-2} R \cdot \Phi(t),$$

which by construction satisfies  $(d1), (d2), (d3'(b, R))$ , the assumptions of Theorem 3.1. Start with  $Q^* > 1$  an arbitrary, large number and let  $Q = Q^*/b$ . Now, in § 9.1 we showed there exists  $\underline{\theta} = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_m) \in \tilde{K} := C_{b,\{0,1\}}^m$  that satisfies (i) of Theorem 3.1 with respect to the good  $\tilde{K}$  and  $\tilde{\Phi}$ . In particular the system

$$(40) \quad |q\theta_i - p_i| \leq \tilde{\Phi}(Q), \quad 1 \leq i \leq m, \quad 1 \leq q \leq Q,$$

has a solution in integers  $q, p_i$ . Then, according to (39), write

$$(41) \quad \xi_i = w_{i,1}\theta_i + \frac{w_{i,2}}{b-1}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq m,$$

so that  $\underline{\xi} = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_m) \in K$ . We claim it satisfies the properties (C1), (C2), (C3) with respect to  $\Phi$ . From (40) we see that with

$$q^* = (b-1)q, \quad p_i^* = (b-1)p_i + qw_{i,2}$$

we have

$$|q^*\xi_i - p_i^*| \leq (b-1)w_{i,1}\tilde{\Phi}(Q) \leq (b-1)^2\tilde{\Phi}(Q), \quad 1 \leq i \leq m.$$

Since  $Q^* = (b-1)Q$ , from  $(d3'(b, R))$  applied to  $Q^*/b$  and since  $\tilde{\Phi}$  decays we see

$$\tilde{\Phi}(Q) = \tilde{\Phi}(Q^*/(b-1)) \leq \tilde{\Phi}(Q^*/b) \leq R^{-1}\tilde{\Phi}(Q^*)$$

and combining we have a solution to

$$1 \leq q^* \leq Q^*, \quad \|q^*\underline{\xi}\| \leq (b-1)^2R^{-1}\tilde{\Phi}(Q^*) = \Phi(Q^*).$$

Note that  $Q^* > 1$  was arbitrary, so (C1) holds for  $\underline{\xi} \in K$ .

Now define another function  $\Psi(t) = v\tilde{\Phi}(t)$  for  $v > 0$  be to determined later. Assume conversely that  $\underline{\xi}$  as in (41) satisfies

$$(42) \quad 1 \leq q^* \leq Q^*, \quad |q^*\xi_i - p_i^*| \leq \Psi(Q^*), \quad 1 \leq i \leq m,$$

holds for some large  $Q^*$ . From (41) we see that for

$$(43) \quad q_i = (b-1)w_{i,1}q^*, \quad p_i = (b-1)p_i^* - q^*w_{i,2}$$

we have

$$(44) \quad |q_i\xi_i - p_i| \leq (b-1)\Psi(Q^*), \quad 1 \leq i \leq m.$$

We take  $q$  the lowest common multiple of the  $q_i$ , for which since  $w_{i,1} \leq b-1$  an estimate is given by

$$(45) \quad q \leq \Gamma_b(b-1)q^*, \quad \Gamma_b = \text{lcm}(1, 2, \dots, b-1).$$

Note that we may sharpen this by taking the maximum least common multiple of any  $m$  integers at most  $b-1$ , as claimed in Remark 1. Now for  $\tilde{p}_i = (q/q_i)p_i \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $Q = (b-1)\Gamma_b Q^*$ , we have  $1 \leq q \leq Q$  and combining (44), (45) and (43) we infer

$$\begin{aligned} |q\theta_i - \tilde{p}_i| &= \frac{q}{q_i}|q_i\theta_i - p_i| \leq \frac{q}{q_i}(b-1)\Psi(Q^*) \leq \Gamma_b(b-1)^2\frac{q^*}{q_i}\Psi(Q^*) \\ &\leq \Gamma_b(b-1)w_{i,1}^{-1}\Psi(Q^*) \leq \Gamma_b(b-1)\Psi(Q^*). \end{aligned}$$

Now since  $\Psi$  satisfies  $(d3'(b, R))$  as well, estimating trivially  $(b-1)\Gamma_b \leq b^b$  (see Remark 1 for asymptotical improvements) and repeated application and monotonicity of  $\Psi$  shows

$$\Psi(Q) \geq \Psi(b^b Q^*) \geq R^b \Psi(Q^*).$$

Inserting, for  $1 \leq i \leq m$  we have

$$1 \leq q \leq Q, \quad |q\theta_i - \tilde{p}_i| \leq (\Gamma_b(b-1)R^{-b})\Psi(Q) = (\Gamma_b(b-1)R^{-b})\tilde{\Phi}(Q),$$

in other words

$$1 \leq q \leq Q, \quad \|q\underline{\theta}\| < (\Gamma_b(b-1)R^{-b}) \cdot \tilde{\Phi}(Q).$$

On the other hand, by assumption our  $\underline{\theta} \in \tilde{K}$  satisfies (C2') of Theorem 3.1 with respect to  $\tilde{\Phi}$  and  $\Omega = R$ . In other words, for certain  $Q^*$  and the induced  $Q = \Gamma_b Q^*$ , we have

$\|q\theta\| > R\tilde{\Phi}(Q)$  for all  $1 \leq q \leq Q$ . If  $v < \Gamma_b^{-1}(b-1)^{-1}R^{b+1}$  we get a contradiction. Hence the assumption (42) was false and for these  $Q^*, v$  and for all  $1 \leq q^* \leq Q^*$  we have

$$\|q^*\underline{\xi}\| > \Psi(Q^*) = v\tilde{\Phi}(Q^*) = \frac{R}{(b-1)^2}v\Phi(Q^*),$$

for any  $1 \leq q^* \leq Q^*$ . Inserting the bound for  $v$ , this means  $\underline{\xi}$  satisfies (C2') for

$$\Omega(b, R) = \Gamma_b^{-1}(b-1)^{-1}R^{b+1} \cdot \frac{R}{(b-1)^2} = \frac{R^{b+2}}{(b-1)^3\Gamma_b}.$$

Finally (C3) for  $\underline{\xi}$  clearly follows from (41) as well when considering integers  $(b-1)q$  for  $q$  inducing the same property (C3) for  $\underline{\theta}$ .

### 10. PROOF OF COROLLARY 2 AND COROLLARY 3

We verify property  $(d3'(b, R))$  for  $R = b^{-1/m}$  for the Cantor set setting.

**Lemma 10.1.** *Let  $m \geq 2, b \geq 2$  be integers and  $c \in (0, 1)$ . Then for any  $\epsilon > 0$  there exist arbitrarily large integers  $A, B$  with*

$$cb^{-B/m}b^{-1/m} \leq b^{-A} < cb^{-B/m}.$$

*Proof.* It suffices to take  $B$  the largest integer with  $b^{-A} < cb^{-B/m}$ . By maximality of  $B$  the other inequality holds as well.  $\square$

The lemma states that  $\Phi(q) = cq^{-1/m}$  satisfies  $(d3'(b, R))$  for any pair  $(b, R)$  with an integer  $b \geq 2$  and  $R = b^{-1/m}$ , and Corollary 2 follows from part (i) of Theorem 3.1.

**Lemma 10.2.** *Let  $m \geq 2, b \geq 2$  be integers,  $c \in (0, 1)$  and  $\tau > 0$  irrational. Then for any  $\epsilon > 0$  there exist arbitrarily large integers  $A, B$  with*

$$(1 - \epsilon)cb^{-B\tau} < b^{-A} \leq cb^{-B\tau}.$$

*Proof.* Taking logarithms the claim becomes

$$0 < (A - B\tau) \log b - \log c < -\log(1 - \epsilon).$$

Since  $\tau$  is irrational, the set of values of  $A - \tau B$  and thus also of  $(A - B\tau) \log b - \log c$  when taking all integer pairs  $A, B$  are dense in  $\mathbb{R}$ . The claim follows.  $\square$

From the lemma we see that  $\Phi(q) = cq^{-\tau}$  for  $\tau$  irrational satisfies  $(D(b))$  for any integer  $b \geq 2$ , and part (ii) of Theorem 3.1 implies Corollary 3.

Assume we are given an effective upper bound for the irrationality exponent of  $\tau$ . Then, using a result on uniform inhomogeneous approximation due to Bugeaud and Laurent [6], we could state upper bounds for the smallest  $A, B$  satisfying the hypothesis of Lemma 10.2 in terms of  $\epsilon$ , independent from  $c$ . Similar to the remark below Theorem 2.2, this in turn implies an effective rate at which we can let  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$  in terms of  $Q$  in Corollary 3, if we admit a factor  $1 + \epsilon$  in condition (C1). We do not make this explicit here.

## 11. APPENDIX: THE LINEAR FORM PROBLEM

Let  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  be the standard scalar product on  $\mathbb{R}^m$  and for  $\underline{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m$  denote by  $|\underline{y}|_\infty = \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} |y_i|$  the maximum norm. Recall further the notation  $\|\cdot\|$  introduced in § 1. For  $c^* \in (0, 1]$ , let  $Di_m^*(c^*)$  be the set of  $\underline{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^m$  for which the system

$$(46) \quad 0 < |\underline{y}|_\infty \leq Q^*, \quad \|\langle \underline{y}, \underline{\xi} \rangle\| \leq c^* Q^{*-m}$$

has a solution in an integer vector  $\underline{y}$ , for all large parameters  $Q^*$ . By a variant of Dirichlet's Theorem we have  $Di_m^*(1) = \mathbb{R}^m$  for any  $m \geq 1$ . Let again  $Di_m^* = \cup_{c < 1} Di_m^*(c)$ . Let  $Bad_m^*$  be the set of badly approximable linear forms, its defining property being that for some  $c^* > 0$  and all  $Q^*$  there is no integer vector solution to (46). For completeness further define accordingly  $Sing_m^* = \cap_{c > 0} Di_m^*(c)$  and  $\mathbf{FS}_m^* = Di_m^* \setminus (Bad_m^* \cup Sing_m^*)$ . We point out the well-known identities

$$Di_m = Di_m^*, \quad Sing_m = Sing_m^*, \quad Bad_m = Bad_m^*, \quad \mathbf{FS}_m = \mathbf{FS}_m^*.$$

Note however that the sets  $Di_m(c)$  and  $Di_m^*(c)$  do not coincide for the same parameter  $c < 1$ . We expect analogous results to § 2, in particular counterparts of Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.3, for the linear form setting. From Corollary 1 and a transference result phrased below, we obtain the following more modest claim.

**Theorem 11.1.** *For  $m \geq 2$  an integer and any  $c^* \in (0, 1]$ , if we let*

$$\omega = \omega(m, c^*) := (m+1)^{-m^2-m} (c^*)^{m^2} \in (0, c^*),$$

*then the set*

$$Di_m^*(c^*) \setminus (Di_m^*(\omega) \cup Bad_m^*) \subseteq \mathbf{FS}_m^*$$

*has packing dimension at least  $m-1$  and Hausdorff dimension at least as in Theorem 2.3.*

As  $m \rightarrow \infty$ , the value  $\omega(m, c^*)$  asymptotically satisfies

$$\omega(m, c^*) > (c^*)^{m^2} e^{-m^2 \log m - o(m^2 \log m)}.$$

Our result should be compared with the following partial claim of [4, Theorem 1.5] (see also [24]) obtained from a very different, unconstructive method.

**Theorem 11.2** (Beresnevich, Guan, Marnat, Ramírez, Velani). *Let  $m \geq 2$  an integer and*

$$\kappa_m = e^{-20(m+1)^3(m+10)}.$$

*Then the set*

$$Di_m^*(c^*) \setminus (Di_m^*(\kappa_m c^*) \cup Bad_m) \subseteq \mathbf{FS}_m^*$$

*is uncountable.*

We should remark that in the statement we suppressed some more information on other exponents of approximation given in [4, Theorem 1.5]. Moreover, the exact shape of the polynomial in the exponent of  $\kappa_m$ , in particular the leading coefficient 20, can be readily optimized with sharper estimates at certain places in [4]. Note that in contrast to our result, the value  $\kappa_m$  in Theorem 11.2 is independent from  $c^*$ . We see that for large  $m$  and large enough  $c^* \in (0, 1]$ , roughly as soon as  $c^* > e^{-m^2}$ , our bound from Theorem 11.1

is stronger. For  $c^*$  very close to 1, we basically can reduce the quartic polynomial in  $m$  within the exponent in  $\kappa_m$  to a quadratic polynomial.

For the deduction of Theorem 11.1 it is convenient to apply a transference result by German [14] based on geometry of numbers, which improves on previous results by Mahler. Concretely, we use the following special cases of [14, Theorem 7], where we implicitly include the upper estimate  $\Delta_d^{-1} \leq d^{1/2}$  from [14, § 2] for the quantity  $\Delta_d$  defined there, where  $d = m + 1$  in our situation.

**Theorem 11.3** (German). *Let  $m \geq 1$  and  $\underline{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ . Let  $X, U$  be positive parameters.*

(i) *Let  $x \in \mathbb{Z}$  and assume*

$$0 < |x| \leq X, \quad \|\underline{\xi}x\| \leq U.$$

*Then there exists  $\underline{y}^* \in \mathbb{Z}^m$  so that*

$$0 < |\underline{y}^*|_\infty \leq Y, \quad \|\langle \underline{y}^*, \underline{\xi} \rangle\| \leq V,$$

*where*

$$Y = (m + 1)^{1/(2m)} X^{1/m}, \quad V = (m + 1)^{1/(2m)} X^{1/m-1} U.$$

(ii) *Let  $\underline{y} \in \mathbb{Z}^m$  and assume*

$$0 < |\underline{y}|_\infty \leq X, \quad \|\langle \underline{y}, \underline{\xi} \rangle\| \leq U.$$

*Then there exists  $x' \in \mathbb{Z}$  so that*

$$0 < |x'| \leq Y', \quad \|x'\underline{\xi}\| \leq V'$$

*where*

$$Y' = (m + 1)^{1/(2m)} X U^{1/m-1}, \quad V' = (m + 1)^{1/(2m)} U^{1/m}.$$

We now prove our claim.

*Proof of Theorem 11.1.* Let  $c \in (0, 1]$  to be chosen later. By Corollary 1 and Theorem 2.3, the set  $Di_m(c) \setminus (\cup_{\epsilon>0} Di_m(c - \epsilon) \cup Bad_m) = Di_m(c) \setminus (\cup_{\epsilon>0} Di_m(c - \epsilon) \cup Bad_m^*)$  has the stated metrical properties. Take any  $\underline{\xi}$  in this set. Take arbitrary, large  $Y$  and put  $X = (Y(m+1)^{-1/(2m)})^m$ , which is also large. Now the hypothesis of (i) from Theorem 11.3 holds when we take

$$U = cX^{-1/m}.$$

From the conclusion we get  $\underline{y}^* \in \mathbb{Z}^m$  that satisfies

$$0 < |\underline{y}^*|_\infty \leq Y = (m + 1)^{1/(2m)} X^{1/m}$$

and

$$\|\langle \underline{y}^*, \underline{\xi} \rangle\| \leq V = (m + 1)^{1/(2m)} X^{1/m-1} U = c(m + 1)^{1/(2m)} X^{-1} = c^* Y^{-m},$$

where

$$(47) \quad c^* = c(m + 1)^{1/2+1/(2m)}.$$

Observe this holds for all large  $Y$ , so  $\underline{\xi} \in Di_m^*(c^*)$ .

Now assume that for some  $\tilde{c} \in (0, 1)$  we have  $\underline{\xi} \in Di_m^*(\tilde{c})$ . That means for all large  $X$  we may take

$$U = \tilde{c}X^{-m}$$

and the hypothesis of (ii) from Theorem 11.3 is satisfied for some  $\underline{y} \in \mathbb{Z}^m$ . From the conclusion we get the existence of a positive integer  $x'$  satisfying

$$0 < |x'| \leq Y' = (m+1)^{1/(2m)} XU^{1/m-1} = (m+1)^{1/(2m)} \tilde{c}^{1/m-1} X^m$$

and

$$\|x'\underline{\xi}\| \leq V' = (m+1)^{1/(2m)} U^{1/m} = (m+1)^{1/(2m)} \tilde{c}^{1/m} X^{-1} = \tilde{C} Y'^{-1/m},$$

where

$$(48) \quad \tilde{C} = (m+1)^{1/2+1/(2m)} \tilde{c}^{1/m^2}.$$

Now, since  $Y'$  can be any large number by choosing  $X$  suitably, we infer  $\underline{\xi} \in Di_m(\tilde{C})$ . If  $\tilde{C} < c$  and assuming  $c \leq 1$ , this contradicts our choice of  $\underline{\xi}$ . By (47), the latter condition  $c \leq 1$  clearly holds as soon as  $c^* \leq 1$ , so we require  $\tilde{C} \geq c$ , which by (48) and (47) leads to

$$\tilde{c} \geq ((m+1)^{-1/2-1/(2m)} c)^{m^2} = (m+1)^{-m^2/2-m/2} c^{m^2} = (m+1)^{-m^2-m} c^{*m^2}.$$

Combining our results we see that  $\underline{\xi} \in Di_m^*(c^*) \setminus (Di_m^*((m+1)^{-m^2-m} c^{*m^2}) \cup Bad_m^*)$ .  $\square$

It may be possible to derive similar, possibly stronger, effective results when combining Corollary 1 with the essential method of Davenport and Schmidt [10], however in reverse direction (we need the conclusion from simultaneous approximation to linear form instead of the other way round), instead of [14]. We also want to refer to [4, § 4], in particular [4, Lemma 4.9], in this context.

*The author thanks Mumtaz Hussain for pointing out Example 4.6 in Falconer's book as a tool to estimate the Hausdorff dimension in Theorems 2.3, 2.4.*

## REFERENCES

- [1] R. K. Akhunzhanov. Vectors of a given Diophantine type. II. (Russian. Russian summary) *Mat. Sb.* 204 (2013), no. 4, 3–24; translation in *Sb. Math.* 204 (2013), no. 3–4, 463–484.
- [2] R. K. Akhunzhanov, N. G. Moshchevitin. A note on Dirichlet spectrum. *arXiv: 2111.12259*.
- [3] R. K. Akhunzhanov, D. O. Shatskov. On Dirichlet spectrum for two-dimensional simultaneous Diophantine approximation. *Mosc. J. Comb. Number Theory* 3 (2013), no. 3–4, 5–23.
- [4] V. Beresnevich, L. Guan, A. Marnat, F. Ramírez, S. Velani. Dirichlet is not just Bad and Singular. *arXiv: 2008.04043*.
- [5] Y. Bugeaud. Diophantine approximation and Cantor sets. *Math. Ann.* 341 (2008), no. 3, 677–684.
- [6] Y. Bugeaud, M. Laurent. On exponents of homogeneous and inhomogeneous Diophantine approximation. *Mosc. Math. J.* 5 (2005), no. 4, 747–766, 972.
- [7] Y. Cheung, N. Chevallier. Hausdorff dimension of singular vectors. *Duke Math. J.* 165 (2016), no. 12, 2273–2329.
- [8] T. Das, L. Fishman, D. Simmons, M. Urbański. A variational principle in the parametric geometry of numbers, with applications to metric Diophantine approximation. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris* 355 (2017), no. 8, 835–846.
- [9] T. Das, L. Fishman, D. Simmons, M. Urbański. A variational principle in the parametric geometry of numbers. *arXiv: 1901.06602*.



- [10] H. Davenport, H., W. M. Schmidt. Dirichlet's theorem on diophantine approximation. II. *Acta Arith.* 16 (1969/70), 413–424.
- [11] H. Davenport, W. M. Schmidt. Dirichlet's theorem on diophantine approximation. 1970 Symposia Mathematica, Vol. IV (INDAM, Rome, 1968/69) pp. 113–132.
- [12] K. Falconer. Fractal geometry. Mathematical foundations and applications. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Chichester, 1990. xxii+288 pp.
- [13] J. Feng, J. Xu. Sets of Dirichlet non-improvable numbers with certain order in the theory of continued fractions. *Nonlinearity* 34 (2021), no. 3, 1598–1611.
- [14] O. German. On Diophantine exponents and Khintchine's transference principle. *Mosc. J. Comb. Number Theory* 2 (2012), no. 2, 22–51.
- [15] J. Huang, J. Wu. Uniformly non-improvable Dirichlet set via continued fractions. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 147 (2019), no. 11, 4617–4624.
- [16] M. Hussain, D. Y. Kleinbock, N. Wadleigh, B.-W. Wang. Hausdorff measure of sets of Dirichlet non-improvable numbers. *Mathematika* 64 (2018), no. 2, 502–518.
- [17] V. Jarník. Über die simultanen diophantischen Approximationen. *Math. Z.* 33 (1931), 505–543.
- [18] A. Y. Khintchine. Über eine Klasse linearer diophantischer Approximationen. *Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo* 50 (1926), 706–714.
- [19] D. Y. Kleinbock, S. Mirzadeh. On the dimension drop conjecture for diagonal flows on the space of lattices. *arXiv: 2010.14065*.
- [20] D. Y. Kleinbock, A. Rao. Abundance of Dirichlet improvable pairs with respect to arbitrary norm. *arXiv: 2107.10298*.
- [21] D. Y. Kleinbock, A. Rao. Weighted uniform Diophantine approximation of systems of linear forms. *arXiv: 2111.07115*.
- [22] D. Y. Kleinbock, A. Strömbergsson, S. Yu. A measure estimate in geometry of numbers and improvements to Dirichlet's theorem. *arXiv: 2108.04638*.
- [23] D. Y. Kleinbock, N. Wadleigh. A zero-one law for improvements to Dirichlet's Theorem. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 146 (2018), no. 5, 1833–1844.
- [24] A. Marnat. Diophantine sets and Dirichlet improvability. *arXiv: 2201.11093*.
- [25] D. Roy. On Schmidt and Summerer parametric geometry of numbers. *Ann. of Math.* (2) 182 (2015), no. 2, 739–786.
- [26] J. Schleischitz. Diophantine approximation and special Liouville numbers. *Commun. Math.* 21 (2013), no. 1, 39–76.
- [27] J. Schleischitz. Generalizations of a result of Jarník on simultaneous approximation. *Mosc. J. Comb. Number Theory* 6 (2016), no. 2-3, 253–287.
- [28] J. Schleischitz. Cartesian product sets in Diophantine approximation with large Hausdorff dimension. *arXiv: 2002.08228*.
- [29] J. Schleischitz. Metric results on inhomogeneously singular vectors. *arXiv: 2201.01527*.
- [30] W. M. Schmidt, L. Summerer. Parametric geometry of numbers and applications. *Acta Arith.* 140 (2009), no. 1, 67–91.
- [31] C. Tricot Jr. Two definitions of fractional dimension. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* 91 (1982), no. 1, 57–74.