

LOCAL SPECTRAL ESTIMATES AND QUANTITATIVE WEAK MIXING FOR SUBSTITUTION \mathbb{Z} -ACTIONS

ALEXANDER I. BUFETOV, JUAN MARSHALL-MALDONADO, AND BORIS SOLOMYAK

ABSTRACT. The paper investigates Hölder and log-Hölder regularity of spectral measures for weakly mixing substitutions and the related question of quantitative weak mixing. It is assumed that the substitution is primitive, aperiodic, and its substitution matrix is irreducible over the rationals. In the case when there are no eigenvalues of the substitution matrix on the unit circle, Theorem 2.2 says that a weakly mixing substitution \mathbb{Z} -action has uniformly log-Hölder regular spectral measures, and hence admits power-logarithmic bounds for the rate of weak mixing. In the more delicate Salem substitution case, Theorem 2.5 says that Hölder regularity holds for spectral parameters from the respective number field, but the Hölder exponent cannot be chosen uniformly.

1. INTRODUCTION

The paper is devoted to the spectral theory of substitution \mathbb{Z} -actions (automorphisms). Substitutions provide a rich class of measure-preserving transformations, intermediate between periodic and random. They also serve as models and test cases for more complicated systems, such as interval exchange transformations, finite rank systems, etc. Substitutions have links with combinatorics, number theory, theoretical computer science (finite state automata), harmonic analysis, and physics/material science (quasicrystals), see [15]. Although dynamical systems arising from substitutions have been studied for a long time, their spectral properties are still far from being completely understood.

Here we continue the investigation of local spectral properties for substitution automorphisms, started in [4, 6] and [27]. and obtain estimates of the decay rate of the spectral measure of a small neighborhood of a point, when the radius tends to zero. We need to assume that the spectral measure has no point masses, or in other words, that the system is weakly mixing. It is also known that *uniform* local spectral estimates (for test functions of zero mean) are closely related to rates of *quantitative weak mixing*, see e.g., [22].

Date: June 19, 2024.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 37A30, 37B10, 47A11.

Key words and phrases. Substitution dynamical system; spectral measure; log-Hölder estimate.

The research of J. M. and B. S. was supported by the Israel Science Foundation grant #1647/23.

We proceed with a brief summary of our main results. In Theorem 2.2 we prove that for a primitive aperiodic substitution with a substitution matrix irreducible over \mathbb{Q} substitution matrix and having no eigenvalues on the unit circle, there is a dichotomy: either the substitution \mathbb{Z} -action has non-trivial discrete spectrum, or spectral measures of cylindrical functions of zero mean are uniformly log-Hölder regular. The log-Hölder estimates yield logarithmic decay rates of quantitative weak mixing, cf. Theorem 2.3. Uniformity here means uniform estimates for all points on the unit circle.

Our second main result concerns substitutions for which the substitution matrix S is still irreducible over the rationals, but now the Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue of S is a Salem numbers α , that is, all the remaining eigenvalues of S are of modulus ≤ 1 , but *there are* eigenvalues on the unit circle. It is proven that at spectral parameters from the field $\mathbb{Q}(\alpha)$, spectral measures of cylindrical functions satisfy Hölder bounds. On the other hand, we show that the Hölder exponent cannot be chosen uniformly over all algebraic spectral parameters.

The key difference between this paper and [4, 6, 27] is that here we obtain spectral estimates for substitution \mathbb{Z} -actions, whereas in those papers we were mainly concerned with suspension flows over them, especially for *self-similar* substitution \mathbb{R} -actions. It is well-known that spectral properties may change drastically under Kakutani equivalence, that is, time change, or when passing to a suspension; in particular, the conditions for weak mixing are different. Although our basic approach, via the spectral cocycle, does goes back to those earlier papers, there are additional complications in the case of \mathbb{Z} -actions. Some of the techniques we use are inspired by the vector Erdős-Kahane method from [8]. Note also that the content of Section 5, where we prove lower bounds on the rates of quantitative weak mixing for Salem substitutions, is based on an entirely new idea.

2. STATEMENT OF RESULTS

2.1. Background. The standard references for the basic facts on substitution dynamical systems are [32, 15]. Consider an alphabet of $d \geq 2$ symbols $\mathcal{A} = \{0, \dots, d-1\}$. Let \mathcal{A}^+ be the set of nonempty words with letters in \mathcal{A} . A *substitution* is a map $\zeta : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^+$, extended to \mathcal{A}^+ and $\mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{N}}$ by concatenation. The *substitution space* is defined as the set of bi-infinite sequences $x \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ such that any word in x appears as a subword of $\zeta^n(a)$ for some $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The *substitution dynamical system* is the left shift on $\mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ restricted to X_ζ , which we denote by T .

The *substitution matrix* $S = S_\zeta = (S(i, j))$ is the $d \times d$ matrix, such that $S(i, j)$ is the number of symbols i in $\zeta(j)$. The substitution is *primitive* if S_ζ^n has all entries strictly positive for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. It is well-known that primitive substitution \mathbb{Z} -actions are minimal and uniquely ergodic, see [32]. We assume that the substitution is primitive and *non-periodic*, which in the primitive case is equivalent to the space X_ζ being infinite. The length of a word u is denoted by $|u|$. The

substitution ζ is said to be of *constant length* q if $|\zeta(a)| = q$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$, otherwise, it is of *non-constant length*.

Recall that for $f, g \in L^2(X_\zeta, \mu)$ the (complex) spectral measure $\sigma_{f,g}$ is determined by the equations

$$\widehat{\sigma}_{f,g}(-k) = \int_0^1 e^{2\pi i k \omega} d\sigma_{f,g}(\omega) = \langle f \circ T^k, g \rangle, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z},$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the scalar product in L^2 . We write $\sigma_f = \sigma_{f,f}$. Spectral measures “live” on the torus \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} , which we identify with $[0, 1)$. It is known that $\sigma_{\mathbf{1}} = \delta_0$, where $\mathbf{1}$ is the constant-1 function and δ_0 is the Dirac point mass at 0. Thus, the “interesting part” of the spectrum is generated by functions f orthogonal to constants. We say that a function $f \in L^2(X_\zeta, \mu)$ is *cylindrical of level 0* if it depends only on x_0 , the 0-th term of the sequence $x \in X_\zeta$. Cylindrical functions of level 0 form a d -dimensional vector space, with a basis $\{\mathbf{1}_{[a]} : a \in \mathcal{A}\}$. Denote by $\text{Cyl}(X_\zeta)$ the space of cylindrical functions of level 0.

2.2. Log-Hölder regularity and quantitative weak mixing. We need to recall the criterion for $e^{2\pi i \omega}$ to be an eigenvalue of the substitution \mathbb{Z} -action (X_ζ, T, μ) . The criterion is due to Host [21], with an algebraic characterization given in [14]. Partial results were obtained in [25, 34]. For us the most convenient reference is [12], which contains a criterion for eigenvalues of a 1-dimensional tiling dynamical system (suspension flow). It is known that the suspension \mathbb{R} -action with a constant roof function has essentially the same spectral properties as the \mathbb{Z} -action (see [18, 3]).

A word $v \in \mathcal{A}^+$ is called a *return word* for ζ if v starts with a letter c for some $c \in \mathcal{A}$ and vc is admissible for the language of X_ζ . Denote by $\ell(v) = [\ell(v)_j]_{j \leq d}$ the *population vector* of $v \in \mathcal{A}^+$, where $\ell(v)_j$ is the number of letters j in v .

Theorem 2.1 (Host [21], see also [12]). *Let ζ be a primitive aperiodic substitution with the incidence matrix \mathbf{S} . Then $e^{2\pi i \omega}$, $\omega \in (0, 1)$, is an eigenvalue for the substitution \mathbb{Z} -action (X_ζ, T, μ) if and only if for all return words v ,*

$$\omega \langle \mathbf{S}^n \ell(v), \mathbf{1} \rangle \rightarrow 0 \pmod{1} \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

If ω is an eigenvalue, then there exists a cylindrical function f such that σ_f has a point mass at ω and hence no meaningful estimates of the modulus continuity for σ_f at ω are possible. Our goal is to show that under some natural assumptions on the substitution, weak mixing implies uniform log-Hölder estimates.

Theorem 2.2. *Let ζ be a primitive aperiodic substitution, such that the substitution matrix $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{S}_\zeta$ has an irreducible characteristic polynomial over \mathbb{Q} and there are no eigenvalues of \mathbf{S} on the unit circle. Then either (X_ζ, T, μ) has a non-trivial discrete spectrum, or there exist $C_\zeta, r_0, \gamma > 0$,*

depending only on ζ , such that for any cylindrical function f with $\int f d\mu = 0$, for all $\omega \in [0, 1)$ holds

$$(2.1) \quad \sigma_f(B_r(\omega)) \leq C_\zeta \|f\|_\infty^2 \cdot (\log(1/r))^{-\gamma}, \quad \text{for all } r \in (0, r_0).$$

It is important that in this theorem the estimate is uniform in ω . Theorem 2.2 implies a result on quantitative weak mixing.

Theorem 2.3. *Let ζ be as in the last theorem, such that (X_ζ, T, μ) is weakly mixing. Then there are constants $K_\zeta, \gamma > 0$ such that for any cylindrical function f with $\int f d\mu = 0$ and any $g \in L^2(X_\zeta, \mu)$, holds*

$$(2.2) \quad \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} |\langle U^k f, g \rangle|^2 \leq K_\zeta \|f\|_\infty^2 \cdot \|g\|_2^2 \cdot (\log N)^{-\gamma}.$$

The derivation of (2.2) from (2.1) is well-known; see e.g., [6, 16, 2, 28]. It essentially goes back to the work of Strichartz [35], see [22, Theorem 3.6]. The paper of Knill [22] contains additional background on quantitative weak mixing. From another point of view, quantitative weak mixing was recently studied in [31].

Remark 2.4. (i) We restrict ourselves to the case of cylindrical functions of level 0 for simplicity. It is not difficult to extend the results to the case of cylindrical functions of any level, and then to Lipschitz functions by approximation. Cylindrical functions of level $\ell \geq 1$ can be handled either in the framework of suspension flows (with a constant roof function) and Lip-cylindrical functions, as we do in [5, Section 3.5 and Proposition 7.1] and [8], or directly in the setting of substitution \mathbb{Z} -actions, as was done in [28, Section 6]. Then arbitrary Lipschitz functions on the substitution spaces can be treated by approximation, as in [5, Section 9] or [28, Section 9]. Similar considerations are found in [2].

(ii) For self-similar suspension flows we proved an analogous result in [4, Theorem 5.1]. Note, however, that the conditions on the substitution are not the same. There we required that the Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue θ of S has at least one Galois conjugate outside the unit circle. For substitution \mathbb{Z} -actions, the presence of such a Galois conjugate is not sufficient for weak mixing, see [34, 14]. On the other hand, here we require irreducibility of the characteristic polynomial over \mathbb{Q} , which was not needed in [4, Theorem 5.1].

(iii) Nelson Moll [28] recently investigated the speed of weak mixing for the Chacon map, which is conjugate to a primitive substitution $\zeta : 0 \mapsto 0012, 1 \mapsto 12, 2 \mapsto 012$. Note that its substitution matrix has an eigenvalue 1. He obtained power-logarithmic upper bounds for the spectral measures and corresponding estimates for the speed of weak mixing, for Lipschitz observables. His method extends to substitutions other than the one conjugate to Chacon, but

seems to be limited to substitutions whose incidence matrix has an eigenvalue ± 1 , with the corresponding eigenvector having a non-trivial projection on the vector $\mathbf{1}$. This is, of course, very different from the Salem case. Moll [28] also obtains power-logarithmic lower bounds for the speed of weak mixing for which he uses more specific properties of the Chacon map, proved in [31].

2.3. Substitutions of Salem type. The case when the substitution matrix S_ζ has an eigenvalue of the unit circle is more difficult. Here we consider substitutions of Salem type, that is, we assume that S_ζ has an irreducible characteristic polynomial and its Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue is a Salem number. Recall that an algebraic integer $\alpha > 1$ is a Salem number if it has a conjugate on the unit circle. As is well-known, then the degree of α is even, it has one conjugate α^{-1} inside the unit circle, and all the rest are non-real complex conjugate pairs of modulus 1. In [27] the second-named author obtained Hölder spectral estimates for the self-similar suspension flow over an arbitrary substitution of Salem type, however, not everywhere but only at the points in $\mathbb{Q}(\alpha)$. (In fact, we show that uniform Hölder bounds cannot hold for such flows.) Here we obtain an analogous result for substitution \mathbb{Z} -actions.

Theorem 2.5. *Let ζ be an aperiodic primitive substitution of Salem type, such that its substitution matrix has an irreducible characteristic polynomial over \mathbb{Q} . Let α be the Perron Frobenius eigenvalue. For every $\omega \in (0, 1) \cap \mathbb{Q}(\alpha)$ there exists $C > 0$ only depending on the substitution, $r_0 = r_0(\omega) > 0$ and $\vartheta = \vartheta(\omega) > 0$ such that*

$$(2.3) \quad \sigma_f(B_r(\omega)) \leq Cr^\vartheta, \quad \text{for all } r < r_0 \text{ and } f \in \text{Cyl}(X_\zeta).$$

Remark 2.6. The dependence of Hölder exponent ϑ on ω can be made explicit, in terms of $|\omega|$, $|\sigma_0(\omega)|$ and $L \geq 1$, where L is the denominator of ω , written in minimal form:

$$\omega = \frac{l_0 + \dots + l_{d-1}\alpha^{d-1}}{L}, \quad \gcd(l_0, \dots, l_{d-1}, L) = 1.$$

By a consequence of an “approximation theorem,” see e.g., [29, Theorem 3.4], it follows that there exists $\vartheta > 0$ such that (2.3) holds simultaneously for a dense set of algebraic ω . On the other hand, the dependence of r_0 on ω is not explicit, whereas in Theorem 2.2 r_0 does not depend on ω at all. In the Salem case, the existence of r_0 is derived from the convergence of a certain series (see equation 5.6) for which we do not understand well the speed of convergence. A lower bound for r_0 in the Salem case with $\deg(\alpha) = 4$ was obtained in [27], Proposition 6.4.

It turns out that the Hölder exponent ϑ in (2.3) cannot be chosen uniformly over all algebraic $\omega \in (0, 1)$ and, as a consequence, Salem substitution systems do not have the property of quantitative weak mixing with a power rate. The next theorem is most conveniently stated in terms of the local dimension of spectral measures. Recall that for a positive finite measure ν on \mathbb{R} the lower local dimension of ν at $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$\underline{d}(\nu, \omega) = \liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\log \nu(B_r(\omega))}{\log r}.$$

In the next theorem when we write “for almost every $f \in \text{Cyl}(X_\zeta)$ ” the meaning is that $f = \sum_{j=1}^d b_j \mathbb{1}_{[j]}$ for Lebesgue-a.e. (b_1, \dots, b_d) .

Theorem 2.7. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 2.5, we have for almost every $f \in \text{Cyl}(X_\zeta)$:*

(i)

$$\inf \{ \underline{d}(\sigma_f, \omega) : \omega \in \mathbb{Z}[\alpha] \cap (0, 1) \} = 0;$$

(ii) *For almost every $f \in \text{Cyl}(X_\zeta)$ of mean zero the following holds: for any $\vartheta > 0$ and any $C > 0$ there exists a sequence $N_i \rightarrow \infty$ such that*

$$\frac{1}{N_i} \sum_{k=0}^{N_i-1} |\langle U^k f, f \rangle|^2 \geq C N_i^{-\vartheta}.$$

Remark 2.8. An analogous result holds for self-similar Salem substitution flows (\mathbb{R} -actions), studied in [27].

2.4. Scheme of the proofs. Local estimates for the spectral measure are deduced from growth estimates of *twisted Birkhoff sums* using the following standard lemma; see e.g., [20] and [4, Lemma 3.1] for a short proof. Let (X, T, μ) be a measure-preserving system. For $f \in L^2(X, \mu)$ let σ_f be the corresponding spectral measure on $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \cong [0, 1)$. For $x \in X$ and $f \in L^2(X, \mu)$ let

$$S_N^x(f, \omega) = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} e^{-2\pi i n \omega} f(T^n x) \quad \text{and} \quad G_N(f, \omega) = N^{-1} \int_X |S_N^x(f, \omega)|^2 d\mu(x).$$

Lemma 2.9. *For all $\omega \in [0, 1)$ and $r \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$ we have*

$$(2.4) \quad \sigma_f(B(\omega, r)) \leq \frac{\pi^2}{4N} G_N(f, \omega), \quad \text{with } N = \lfloor (2r)^{-1} \rfloor.$$

In the setting of Theorem 2.2 we actually obtain estimates of twisted Birkhoff sums for the substitution system (X_ζ, T, μ) that are uniform in $x \in X_\zeta$:

$$|S_N^x(f, \omega)| \leq C_f(\omega) \cdot N(\log N)^{-\gamma}, \quad \omega \neq 0, \quad N \geq N_0(\omega),$$

and then the lemma yields

$$(2.5) \quad \sigma_f(B(\omega, r)) \leq C'_f(\omega) (\log(1/r))^{-2\gamma} \quad \omega \neq 0, \quad r \leq r_0(\omega).$$

For $\omega = 0$ stronger, Hölder bounds hold, which follow from well-known estimates of the usual Birkhoff sums, essentially due to [1], and then (2.1) is obtained by “gluing” it with the one in (2.5), which requires explicit control of $r_0(\omega)$ and $C'_f(\omega)$.

Growth estimates for twisted Birkhoff sums are proved by a variant of the method applied in [4, Section 5] to self-similar flows. It also uses considerations of Diophantine nature, but is more geometric.

In the setting of Theorem 2.5, given $\omega \in (0, 1) \cap \mathbb{Q}(\alpha)$, we show uniform in x bounds

$$(2.6) \quad |S_N^x(f, \omega)| \leq \tilde{C}_f(\omega) \cdot N^{\tilde{\vartheta}}, \quad \tilde{\vartheta} \in (0, 1), \quad n \geq N_0(\omega),$$

which imply, via Lemma 2.9, the bound

$$\sigma_f(B(\omega, r)) \leq \tilde{C}'_f(\omega) \cdot r^{2(1-\tilde{\vartheta})}, \quad r \leq r_0(\omega).$$

The estimate (2.6) is proven by a variant of the method used in [27] for self-similar Salem type flows; however, the extension is not automatic. Additional effort is needed to make the dependence of $\tilde{\vartheta}$ on ω *effective*: we say that a constant depending on some parameters is effective if this dependence can be made explicit.

The proof of Theorem 2.7(i) uses several ingredients: a choice of $\omega \in \mathbb{Z}[\alpha]$ with some specific Diophantine properties, a lemma on the lower bound of the norm of a matrix product, when every matrix is a small perturbation of a fixed primitive matrix, and a result from [7], relating the lower local dimension of the spectral measure to the pointwise upper Lyapunov exponent of the spectral cocycle. Part (ii) follows from part (i) immediately, by [22, Theorem 3.7], which is a general version of Last's theorem [24, Theorem 3.1].

3. APPROXIMATION OF TORAL AUTOMORPHISMS ORBITS BY LATTICE POINTS

Let $A \in GL_d(\mathbb{Z})$, $\omega \in (0, 1)$, $\mathbf{1} = (1, \dots, 1)^\top$, and $L < \mathbb{Z}^d$ a lattice, such that $AL \subset L$. Consider

$$A^n \omega \mathbf{1} = \mathbf{p}_n + \varepsilon_n, \quad n \geq 0.$$

where $\mathbf{p}_n \in L$ is the nearest lattice point to $A^n \omega \mathbf{1}$ in the norm $\|\cdot\|_\infty$. Below we will use ℓ^∞ metric and matrix norm, unless stated otherwise. Clearly, \mathbf{p}_n and ε_n depend on ω ; we keep this in mind, but do not indicate explicitly in our notation.

Let $a_L > 0$ be the minimal distance between distinct points in L and let $b_L > 0$ be such that the union of balls of radius b_L with centers in L covers \mathbb{R}^d . Thus we have

$$\|\varepsilon_n\| \leq b_L, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Observe that $b_L \geq \frac{1}{2}$, with equality for $L = \mathbb{Z}^d$. Define

$$\mathbf{z}_0 := -\mathbf{p}_0, \quad \mathbf{z}_n := A\mathbf{p}_{n-1} - \mathbf{p}_n, \quad n \geq 1.$$

Note that $A(\mathbf{p}_{n-1} + \varepsilon_{n-1}) = \mathbf{p}_n + \varepsilon_n$, hence

$$(3.1) \quad \mathbf{z}_n = A\mathbf{p}_{n-1} - \mathbf{p}_n = \varepsilon_n - A\varepsilon_{n-1} \in L, \quad n \geq 1.$$

Thus we immediately obtain:

Lemma 3.1. (i) *We have*

$$\|\mathbf{z}_n\| \leq (1 + \|A\|) \cdot b_L \quad \text{for all } n \geq 0,$$

hence there exists a finite set $F \subset L$ such that $\mathbf{z}_n \in F$ for $n \geq 0$.

(ii) If

$$\max\{\|\varepsilon_{n-1}\|, \|\varepsilon_n\|\} < \frac{a_L}{4\|A\|},$$

then $\mathbf{z}_n = \mathbf{0}$ and $\varepsilon_n = A\varepsilon_{n-1}$.

In part (i) the inequality holds for $n = 0$ since $\|\mathbf{z}_0\| = |\omega| < 1 < 2b_L$.

Now let us assume that A has an irreducible characteristic polynomial over \mathbb{Q} ; denote it by $p(x)$. Then the eigenvalues of A are all simple; they are algebraic integers conjugate to each other. We also assume that A is primitive, so that there is a dominant PF eigenvalue $\theta_1 > 1$. Enumerate the eigenvalues by magnitude:

$$\theta_1 > |\theta_2| \geq \dots$$

We assume that there are $\kappa \geq 2$ eigenvalues strictly greater than 1 in absolute value. Denote by $\{\mathbf{e}_j^*\}_{j \leq d}$ a basis consisting of eigenvectors for the transpose matrix A^\top . We can choose \mathbf{e}_j^* to be vectors with all components in the ring $\mathbb{Z}[\bar{\theta}_j]$, that is, $\mathbf{e}_j^* \in (\mathbb{Z}[\bar{\theta}_j])^d$. The Galois group of an irreducible integer polynomial is transitive; let τ_j be an automorphism of the splitting field of $p(x)$ mapping θ_1 to θ_j . Then $\bar{\tau}_j(\theta_1) = \bar{\theta}_j$ and

$$\bar{\tau}_j(\mathbf{e}_1^*) = \mathbf{e}_j^*.$$

Thus, for any $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ there exists a polynomial $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ of degree $\leq d - 1$, such that

$$(3.2) \quad \langle \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{e}_j^* \rangle = \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{z}}(\theta_j), \quad j \leq d.$$

Notice that $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{z}}$ does not depend on j , since

$$(3.3) \quad \tau_j(\langle \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{e}_1^* \rangle) = \langle \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{e}_j^* \rangle.$$

We can write for $n \geq 1$:

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_n = \mathbf{z}_n + A\varepsilon_{n-1} &= \mathbf{z}_n + A(\mathbf{z}_{n-1} + A\varepsilon_{n-2}) \\ &= \mathbf{z}_n + A\mathbf{z}_{n-1} + A^2\varepsilon_{n-2} = \dots \\ &= \mathbf{z}_n + A\mathbf{z}_{n-1} + \dots + A^{n-1}\mathbf{z}_1 + A^n\varepsilon_0. \end{aligned}$$

Denote $b_n^{(j)} := \langle \mathbf{z}_n, \mathbf{e}_j^* \rangle$ for $n \geq 0$; then we obtain for all $j \leq d$:

$$(3.4) \quad \langle \varepsilon_n, \mathbf{e}_j^* \rangle = b_n^{(j)} + \theta_j b_{n-1}^{(j)} + \dots + \theta_j^{n-1} b_1^{(j)} + \theta_j^n \langle \varepsilon_0, \mathbf{e}_j^* \rangle.$$

Similarly, for $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $j \leq d$ we have

$$\langle \varepsilon_{n+k}, \mathbf{e}_j^* \rangle = b_{n+k}^{(j)} + \theta_j b_{n+k-1}^{(j)} + \dots + \theta_j^{k-1} b_{n+1}^{(j)} + \theta_j^k \langle \varepsilon_n, \mathbf{e}_j^* \rangle.$$

Observe that

$$|\langle \varepsilon_{n+k}, \mathbf{e}_j^* \rangle| \leq \|\mathbf{e}_j^*\|_1 \cdot b_L,$$

hence we obtain the following

Lemma 3.2. *Either not all of $\mathbf{z}_{n+1}, \dots, \mathbf{z}_{n+k}$ are equal to zero, or*

$$|\langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_n, \mathbf{e}_j^* \rangle| \leq |\theta_j|^{-k} \|\mathbf{e}_j^*\|_1 \cdot b_L.$$

Since $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_0 = \omega \mathbf{1} - \mathbf{p}_0 = \omega \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{z}_0$, equation (3.4) implies for all $j \leq d$:

$$(3.5) \quad \omega \langle \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{e}_j^* \rangle = -b_0^{(j)} - \frac{b_1^{(j)}}{\theta_j} - \frac{b_2^{(j)}}{\theta_j^2} - \dots - \frac{b_n^{(j)}}{\theta_j^n} + \frac{\langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_n, \mathbf{e}_j^* \rangle}{\theta_j^n} =: Q_n(1/\theta_j) + \frac{\langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_n, \mathbf{e}_j^* \rangle}{\theta_j^n},$$

for some polynomial $Q_n \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$. Let us define Q_n precisely. Observe that $\mathbb{Z}[\theta_1] \subseteq \mathbb{Z}[1/\theta_1]$, since θ_1 is an algebraic integer. It follows that for any polynomial $p \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$ of degree $\leq d-1$ there exists a polynomial $\tilde{p} \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$ of degree $\leq d-1$, such that $\tilde{p}(1/\theta_1) = p(\theta_1)$, and then

$$\tilde{p}(1/\theta_j) = p(\theta_j), \quad j \leq d.$$

Now we define

$$Q_n(x) = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\mathbf{z}_0}(x) + \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\mathbf{z}_1}(x)x + \dots + \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\mathbf{z}_n}(x)x^n$$

and note that (3.5) holds for $j \leq \kappa$. Observe that $\deg(Q_n) \leq n + d - 1$, and since $\mathbf{z}_j \in F$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$, it is easy to see that all the coefficients of Q_n belong to a finite set, independent of n .

Note that $\langle \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{e}_j^* \rangle \neq 0$, since the matrix is irreducible over \mathbb{Q} and hence components of eigenvectors are rationally independent. Thus, for all $j \leq d$,

$$(3.6) \quad \omega = \frac{Q_n(1/\theta_j)}{\langle \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{e}_j^* \rangle} + \frac{\langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_n, \mathbf{e}_j^* \rangle}{\theta_j^n \langle \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{e}_j^* \rangle} =: P_n(1/\theta_j) + \delta_j^{(n)},$$

for some polynomial $P_n \in \mathbb{Q}[X]$, and

$$(3.7) \quad \delta_j^{(n)} = \frac{\langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_n, \mathbf{e}_j^* \rangle}{\theta_j^n \langle \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{e}_j^* \rangle}.$$

In fact, $\langle \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{e}_j^* \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}[\theta_j]$, hence $1/\langle \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{e}_j^* \rangle = \mathcal{Q}(1/\theta_j)$ for some polynomial $\mathcal{Q} \in \mathbb{Q}[X]$, since non-zero elements of $\mathbb{Q}[\theta_j]$ are invertible. The polynomial P_n is obtained as a product of $Q_n \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ and a fixed rational polynomial \mathcal{Q} , hence there exists $q \in \mathbb{N}$, depending only on A , such that

$$(3.8) \quad qP_n \in \mathbb{Z}[X], \quad n \in \mathbb{N},$$

that is, the coefficients of P_n are in $q^{-1}\mathbb{Z}$. Moreover, the polynomials P_n have coefficients from a bounded set independent of n , and $\deg(P_n) \leq n + 2(d-1)$.

Until now, we worked with an arbitrary $j \leq d$, but from now on we restrict ourselves to $j \leq \kappa$, so that $\delta_j^{(n)} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Equation (3.6) implies that for $2 \leq j \leq \kappa$,

$$(3.9) \quad P_n(1/\theta_j) - P_n(1/\theta_1) = \delta_1^{(n)} - \delta_j^{(n)}.$$

The following is a standard fact; for a proof see [19, Lemma 5.10].

Lemma 3.3. *Let E be a finite set of algebraic numbers over \mathbb{Q} . Then there exists $s \in (0, 1)$ such that for any polynomial expression x of degree n in the elements of E , either $x = 0$ or $|x| \geq s^n$.*

Remark 3.4. The constant s can be made explicit: any integer polynomial expression on a finite set of algebraic numbers might be turned into an integer polynomial evaluated at a primitive element of the extension field generated by the algebraic numbers, and a primitive element can always be computed (see for example, [30]). In summary, in our case the constant will depend only on the substitution.

Thus we obtain from (3.9) that

$$(3.10) \quad \text{for all } j = 2, \dots, \kappa, \text{ either } \delta_1^{(n)} = \delta_j^{(n)}, \text{ or } |\delta_1^{(n)} - \delta_j^{(n)}| \geq s^n,$$

where s depends only on the matrix A . Fix $K \in \mathbb{N}$ (which depends only on A) such that

$$(3.11) \quad |\theta_j|^{-(K+1)n+2} < \frac{s^n}{\|\mathbf{e}_j^*\|_1 \cdot b_L} \text{ for all } j \leq \kappa \text{ and for all } n \geq 1.$$

Lemma 3.5. *For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, either $\delta_1^{(n)} = \delta_j^{(n)}$ for all $j \leq \kappa$, or*

$$\max\{\|\mathbf{z}_{n+1}\|, \dots, \|\mathbf{z}_{n+Kn-2}\|\} > 0.$$

Proof. Suppose that there exists $1 < j \leq \kappa$ such that $\delta_1^{(n)} \neq \delta_j^{(n)}$. Then $\max\{|\delta_1^{(n)}|, |\delta_j^{(n)}|\} \geq s^n$ by (3.10). In view of (3.7) and (3.11), we obtain

$$|\langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_n, \mathbf{e}_j^* \rangle| \geq s^n |\theta_j|^n > |\theta_j|^{-Kn+2} \cdot \|\mathbf{e}_j^*\|_1 \cdot b_L.$$

Then Lemma 3.2 implies that one of the numbers $\mathbf{z}_{n+1}, \dots, \mathbf{z}_{n+Kn-2}$ is non-zero. \square

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.2

Proof. It is known since [21] that if $|\theta_2| < 1$ (the ‘‘Pisot case’’), then the discrete component of the spectrum is non-trivial, so we can assume that $\kappa \geq 2$.

Consider the Abelian group Γ (a subgroup of \mathbb{Z}^d) generated by the population vectors $\ell(v)$, where v are return words for X_ζ . We have $S\Gamma \subset \Gamma$, where $S = S_\zeta$ is the substitution matrix, and since $\Gamma < \mathbb{Z}^d$ and S is irreducible, it follows that Γ has full rank, hence it is a lattice.

Consider the *twisted Birkhoff sum*

$$S_N^x(f, \omega) = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} e^{-2\pi i n \omega} f(T^n x),$$

where T is the left shift on X_ζ and $x \in X_\zeta$. Recall that v is called a *good return word* for the substitution ζ if v starts with some letter $c \in \mathcal{A}$ and vc occurs as a subword in $\zeta(b)$ for every $b \in \mathcal{A}$. The set of good return words is obviously finite; denote it by $GR(\zeta)$. The following is an immediate corollary of [4, Proposition 3.5]. Recall that $\theta = \theta_1$.

Proposition 4.1 ([4]). *Let ζ be a primitive aperiodic substitution on \mathcal{A} . There exist $C_2, c_3, C_4 > 0$ depending only on ζ such that for any cylindrical function $f : X_\zeta \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ of level zero, any $x \in X_\zeta$, any $\omega \in (0, 1)$, and any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, holds*

$$|S_N^x(f, \omega)| \leq C_4 \|f\|_\infty \cdot N \cdot \prod_{n=0}^{\lfloor \log_\theta N - C_2 \rfloor} (1 - c_3 \cdot \max_{v \in GR(\zeta)} \|\omega|\zeta^n(v)\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}^2).$$

Here $\|x\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}$ denotes the distance from $x \in \mathbb{R}$ to the nearest integer. Passing to a power of ζ , we can make sure that all return words of less than certain length are good, and then choose $v_1, \dots, v_k \in GR(\zeta)$ such that $\mathbb{Z}[\ell(v_1), \dots, \ell(v_k)] = \Gamma$. Note, however, that $\{\ell(v_1), \dots, \ell(v_k)\}$ is not necessarily a basis for the lattice; we may have $k > d$. We have

$$|\zeta^n(v)| = \langle \mathbf{1}, S^n \ell(v) \rangle = \langle (S^\top)^n \mathbf{1}, \ell(v) \rangle,$$

and an elementary lemma implies that

$$(4.1) \quad \max_{j \leq k} \|\omega|\zeta^n(v_j)\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} = \max_{j \leq k} |\langle (S^\top)^n \omega \mathbf{1}, \ell(v_j) \rangle| \asymp \| (S^\top)^n \omega \mathbf{1} \|_{\mathbb{R}^d / \Gamma^*},$$

where

$$\Gamma^* := \{ \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{z} \rangle \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ for all } \mathbf{z} \in \Gamma \}$$

is the dual lattice for Γ .

Lemma 4.2. *Let $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k]$ be a full-rank lattice in \mathbb{R}^d , with $k \geq d$, and let Γ^* be the dual lattice. Then*

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbb{R}^d / \Gamma^*} \asymp \max_{j \leq k} \|\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}_j \rangle\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}},$$

where the implied constants are allowed to depend on \mathbf{x}_j (and not just on Γ).

Proof. By definition, $\|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbb{R}^d / \Gamma^*} = \min\{\|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}\| : \mathbf{v} \in \Gamma^*\}$. For any $\mathbf{v} \in \Gamma^*$ and $j \leq k$, we have $\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x}_j \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}$, hence

$$\|\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}_j \rangle\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \leq |\langle \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x}_j \rangle| \leq \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}\| \cdot \|\mathbf{x}_j\|_1.$$

Thus,

$$\max_{j \leq k} \|\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}_j \rangle\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \leq (\max_{j \leq k} \|\mathbf{x}_j\|_1) \cdot \|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbb{R}^d / \Gamma^*}.$$

In order to obtain an estimate in the other direction, choose a subset of $\{\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m\}$, which is linearly independent and whose linear \mathbb{R} -span equals \mathbb{R}^d . Without loss of generality we can assume that $\text{Span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_d\} = \mathbb{R}^d$. Then $\Gamma \supseteq \mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_d]$, hence $\Gamma^* \subseteq (\mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_d])^*$. For each $j \leq d$ let $b_j \in \mathbb{Z}$ be the nearest integer to $\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}_j \rangle$, so that $\|\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}_j \rangle\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} = |\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}_j \rangle - b_j|$. Let $\{\mathbf{y}_k\}_{k \leq d}$ be the dual basis of \mathbb{R}^d for $\{\mathbf{x}_j\}_{j \leq d}$, that is, $\langle \mathbf{y}_k, \mathbf{x}_j \rangle = \delta_{kj}$. Then $\mathbf{v} = \sum_{j=1}^d b_j \mathbf{y}_j \in (\mathbb{Z}[\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_d])^*$, hence $\|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbb{R}^d / \Gamma^*} \leq \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}\|$. The set $\{\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_d\}$ is also an \mathbb{R} -basis for \mathbb{R}^d , hence there exist $c_j \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\mathbf{u} = \sum_{j=1}^d c_j \mathbf{y}_j$. We have

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbb{R}^d / \Gamma^*} \leq \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}\| \leq d \cdot (\max_{j \leq d} |c_j - b_j|) \cdot \max_{j \leq d} \|\mathbf{y}_j\|.$$

But $c_j = \langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}_j \rangle$ and $b_j \in \mathbb{Z}$, so $|c_j - b_j| \leq \|\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}_j \rangle\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}$, and the proof is finished. \square

Thus, by (4.1) and Proposition 4.1,

$$(4.2) \quad |S_N^x(f, \omega)| \leq C_4 \|f\|_\infty \cdot N \cdot \prod_{n=0}^{\lfloor \log_\theta N - C_2 \rfloor} (1 - \tilde{c}_3 \cdot \|(S^\top)^n \omega \mathbf{1}\|_{\mathbb{R}^d/\Gamma^*}^2),$$

where $\tilde{c}_3 > 0$ also depends only on ζ .

We will run the argument from Section 3 with ω , $A = S^\top$, and $L = \Gamma^*$, that is,

$$(S^\top)^n \omega \mathbf{1} = \mathbf{p}_n + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_n,$$

and $\|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_n\| = \|(S^\top)^n \omega \mathbf{1}\|_{\mathbb{R}^d/\Gamma^*}$ by the definition of the norm.

In order to motivate what happens next, let us describe informally the rest of the proof. If for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ sufficiently large there exists $j \leq \kappa$, with $\delta_1^{(n)} \neq \delta_j^{(n)}$, then Lemma 3.5, together with Lemma 3.1(ii) and Proposition 4.1 in the form (4.2), easily imply

$$|S_N^x(f, \omega)| \leq C(\omega) \cdot \|f\|_\infty \cdot N(\log N)^{-\gamma}, \quad N \geq N_0(\omega),$$

for some $\gamma > 0$. In order to control $C(\omega)$ and $N_0(\omega)$, we need to specify the meaning of ‘‘sufficiently large’’. It is clear that we have to quantify the distance of ω to 0, since if ω is very small, then $P_n \equiv 0$ for small n , and then trivially $\delta_j^{(n)} = \omega$ for all $j \leq d$. However, for technical reasons we will also need to control the distance of ω to $q^{-1}\mathbb{Z}$, where q is from (3.8). Indeed, if $\delta_j^{(n)} = \omega$ for all $j \leq \kappa$, for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $P_n(1/\theta_j) = P_n(1/\theta_1)$, $j \leq \kappa$. Then a simple argument going back to [34], which was motivated by [25, 26], shows that $\exp[2\pi i q P_n(1/\theta_1)]$ is an eigenvalue for the substitution \mathbb{Z} -action. However, we need this eigenvalue to be nontrivial, that is, $P_n(1/\theta_1) \notin q^{-1}\mathbb{Z}$. Since $\delta_1^{(n)} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, the equation (3.6) shows the need to quantify the distance of ω to $q^{-1}\mathbb{Z}$. Next we realize this scheme carefully.

Case 1. Suppose first that $\omega \notin q^{-1}\mathbb{Z}$ and let $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that

$$(4.3) \quad \text{dist}(\omega, q^{-1}\mathbb{Z}) > c_1 \theta_1^{-n_0}, \quad \text{where } c_1 = \frac{b_L \|\mathbf{e}_1^*\|_1}{|\langle \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{e}_1^* \rangle|}.$$

Case 1a. Suppose further that for all $n \geq n_0$ there exists $j \in \{2, \dots, \kappa\}$ such that $\delta_1^{(n)} \neq \delta_j^{(n)}$. Then by Lemma 3.5 for all $n \geq n_0$ we have $\max\{|\mathbf{z}_{n+1}|, \dots, |\mathbf{z}_{n+K-2}|\} > 0$. By Lemma 3.1(ii), it follows that

$$(4.4) \quad \max\{\|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n+1}\|, \dots, \|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n+K-1}\|\} \geq \rho := \frac{a_L}{4\|\mathbf{S}\|} \quad \text{for all } n \geq n_0.$$

Thus (4.2) implies

$$(4.5) \quad N \geq \theta^{C_2 + n_0(K+1)^\ell} \implies |S_N^x(f, \omega)| \leq C_4 \|f\|_\infty \cdot N \cdot (1 - \tilde{c}_3 \rho^2)^\ell, \quad \text{for all } \ell \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Together with (4.3) this yields by simple algebraic manipulations that there exist $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and \tilde{C}_4 , depending only on ζ , such that

$$(4.6) \quad |S_N^x(f, \omega)| \leq \tilde{C}_4 \|f\|_\infty \cdot N(\log N)^{-\gamma} \cdot \log \left(\frac{1}{\text{dist}(\omega, q^{-1}\mathbb{Z})} \right)^\gamma, \quad N \geq N_0,$$

where

$$(4.7) \quad \gamma = \frac{-\log(1 - \tilde{c}_3 \rho^2)}{K + 1}.$$

We should emphasize that the formula for γ can be made explicit, depending only on ζ , in view of (3.11), (4.2), and (4.4).

Case 1b. The remaining case is that there exists $n_1 \geq n_0$, where n_0 is from (4.3), such that $\delta_j^{(n_1)} = \delta_1^{(n_1)}$ for all $j \leq \kappa$. Then

$$|\delta_1^{(n_1)}| \leq \frac{\|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n_1+1}\| \cdot \|\mathbf{e}_1^*\|_1}{\theta_1^{n_1} \|\langle \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{e}_1^* \rangle\|} \leq \frac{b_L \|\mathbf{e}_1^*\|_1}{\theta_1^{n_1} |\langle \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{e}_1^* \rangle|} = c_1 \theta_1^{-n_1}$$

by (3.6), and it follows from (4.3) and (3.6) that $P_{n_1}(1/\theta_1) \notin q^{-1}\mathbb{Z}$. Recall that by definition (see (3.6)) $qP_n \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$ for some $q \in \mathbb{N}$, where q is independent of n . Let

$$\alpha := qP_{n_1}(1/\theta_j), \quad j \leq \kappa.$$

We have that $\alpha \notin \mathbb{Z}$, and we will show that $e^{2\pi i \alpha}$ is an eigenvalue for the system (X_ζ, T, μ) , similarly to [34]. By Theorem 2.1, it suffices to show that $\alpha L_n^v \rightarrow 0 \pmod{1}$, where $L_n^v = \langle S^n \ell(v), \mathbf{1} \rangle$, for all return words v . More generally, we will prove this convergence for an arbitrary integer recurrence sequence L_n with characteristic polynomial $p(x)$, equal to that of the matrix S . As it is well-known, we can write

$$L_n = \sum_{j=1}^d c_j \theta_j^n, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Let $qP_{n_1}(x) = a_0 + a_1 x + \cdots + a_\ell x^\ell$ for some $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a_i \in \mathbb{Z}$. Consider the following sequence of integers, for $n > \ell$:

$$\begin{aligned} K_n &:= a_0 L_n + a_1 L_{n-1} + \cdots + a_\ell L_{n-\ell} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^d c_j \theta_j^n \cdot (qP_{n_1})(1/\theta_j) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{\kappa} c_j \theta_j^n \cdot \alpha + \sum_{j=\kappa+1}^d c_j \theta_j^n \cdot (qP_{n_1})(1/\theta_j) \\ &= \alpha L_n + \sum_{j=\kappa+1}^d c_j \theta_j^n \cdot [(qP_{n_1})(1/\theta_j) - \alpha]. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\max_{j \geq \kappa+1} |\theta_j| < 1$, it follows that $\alpha L_n - K_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and hence $\alpha L_n \rightarrow 0 \pmod{1}$, as desired.

Case 2. Now suppose that $\omega \in q^{-1}\mathbb{Z}$. Recall that $\omega \in (0, 1)$. Let $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that

$$(4.8) \quad q^{-1} > c_1 \theta_1^{-n_0}, \quad \text{where } c_1 = \frac{b_L \|\mathbf{e}_1^*\|_1}{|\langle \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{e}_1^* \rangle|}.$$

Case 2a. Suppose that for all $n \geq n_0$ there exists $j \in \{2, \dots, \kappa\}$ such that $\delta_1^{(n)} \neq \delta_j^{(n)}$. Then we proceed exactly as in Case 1a to obtain

$$(4.9) \quad |S_N^x(f, \omega)| \leq C'_4 \|f\|_\infty \cdot N(\log N)^{-\gamma}, \quad N \geq N_0,$$

for some other constant C'_4 with γ from (4.7)

Case 2b. The remaining case is that there exists $n \geq n_0$, where n_0 is from (4.8), such that $\delta_j^{(n)} = \delta_1^{(n)}$ for all $j \leq \kappa$. If $\alpha := qP_n(1/\theta_j) \notin \mathbb{Z}$, we obtain that $e^{2\pi i \alpha}$ is an eigenvalue, exactly as in Case 1b. If on the other hand, we have $\alpha = qP_n(1/\theta_j) \in \mathbb{Z}$, for $j \leq \kappa$, then we obtain that $\alpha = qP_n(1/\theta_j)$ for all $j \leq d$ (applying the corresponding automorphism τ_j). It follows from (4.8) that $\delta_1^{(n)} = 0$, and then $\delta_j^{(n)} = 0$ for all $j \leq d$ and hence $\varepsilon_n = 0$. But then $A^{n+k}\omega \mathbf{1} \in L \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ for all $k \geq 1$, and we obtain that $e^{2\pi i \omega}$ is an eigenvalue for the system (X_ζ, T, μ) .

Combining Lemma 2.9 with our estimates (4.6) and (4.9), we immediately obtain the following.

Proposition 4.3. *Suppose that ζ is a primitive aperiodic substitution with an irreducible over \mathbb{Q} substitution matrix \mathbf{S} and no eigenvalues of \mathbf{S} on the unit circle. Suppose furthermore that the substitution \mathbb{Z} -action is weakly mixing. Let θ be the Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue of \mathbf{S} , and let \mathbf{e}_1^* be the Perron-Frobenius eigenvector for \mathbf{S}^\top , such that its entries belong to $\mathbb{Z}[\theta]$. Let $q \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $\langle \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{e}_1^* \rangle^{-1} \in q^{-1}\mathbb{Z}[\theta]$. Then there exists $r_0 > 0$ and $C_5 > 0$, depending only on the substitution ζ , such that for any cylindrical function f the following holds:*

(i) *If $\omega \notin q^{-1}\mathbb{Z}$, then*

$$(4.10) \quad \sigma_f(B_r(\omega)) \leq C_5 \|f\|_\infty^2 \cdot (\log(1/r))^{-2\gamma} \cdot \log \left(\frac{1}{\text{dist}(\omega, q^{-1}\mathbb{Z})} \right)^{2\gamma}, \quad \text{for all } r \in (0, r_0).$$

(ii) *If $\omega \in q^{-1}\mathbb{Z} \cap (0, 1)$, then*

$$(4.11) \quad \sigma_f(B_r(\omega)) \leq C_5 \|f\|_\infty^2 \cdot (\log(1/r))^{-2\gamma}, \quad \text{for all } r \in (0, r_0).$$

For $\omega = 0$ we need to assume that $\int f d\mu = 0$. Then we obtain by [1] and Lemma 2.9 that

$$(4.12) \quad \sigma_f(B_r(0)) \leq \text{const} \cdot \|f\|_\infty^2 \cdot r^{\log|\theta_2|/\log\theta} \leq C_5 \|f\|_\infty^2 \cdot (\log(1/r))^{-2\gamma}, \quad \text{for all } r \in (0, r_0),$$

where θ_2 is the second largest in modulus eigenvalue of \mathbf{S} and C_5 is adjusted appropriately. (Recall that $|\theta_2| > 1$ by assumption.)

Note that the estimate (4.10) “blows up” at the points in $q^{-1}\mathbb{Z}$, but “gluing” it with (4.11), (4.12) will achieve the uniform bound (2.1). Combining (4.11) and (4.12) yields the same inequality for all $\omega \in q^{-1}\mathbb{Z}$ (note that $\omega = 1$ is identified with $\omega = 0$ on the circle). We can assume that $r_0 < \frac{1}{2q}$. Let $\omega_0 \in q^{-1}\mathbb{Z}$ be such that $|\omega - \omega_0| = \text{dist}(\omega, q^{-1}\mathbb{Z})$. If

$$\log \frac{1}{|\omega - \omega_0|} \leq \left(\log \frac{1}{r} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

which means $r \ll |\omega - \omega_0|$, then (4.10) yields

$$\sigma_f(B_r(\omega)) \leq C_5 \|f\|_\infty^2 \cdot (\log(1/r))^{-\gamma}.$$

If $\log \frac{1}{|\omega - \omega_0|} > \sqrt{\log \frac{1}{r}}$ and $r \leq |\omega - \omega_0|$, then $B(\omega, r) \subset B(\omega_0, 2|\omega - \omega_0|)$, and we obtain from (4.11) or (4.12):

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_f(B_r(\omega)) &\leq C_5 \|f\|_\infty^2 \cdot \left(\log \frac{1}{2|\omega - \omega_0|} \right)^{-2\gamma} \leq \tilde{C}_5 \|f\|_\infty^2 \cdot \left(\log \frac{1}{|\omega - \omega_0|} \right)^{-2\gamma} \\ &\leq \tilde{C}_5 \|f\|_\infty^2 \cdot (\log(1/r))^{-\gamma}. \end{aligned}$$

If $r > |\omega - \omega_0|$, then $B(\omega, r) \subset B(\omega_0, 2r)$, and we obtain from (4.11) or (4.12):

$$\sigma_f(B_r(\omega)) \leq C_5 \|f\|_\infty^2 \cdot (\log(1/2r))^{-2\gamma} \leq \tilde{C}_5 \|f\|_\infty^2 \cdot (\log(1/r))^{-2\gamma}.$$

Combining the last three inequalities implies (2.1), completing the proof. \square

5. THE SALEM CASE

5.1. Dynamics of Salem automorphisms. In this section we will focus on the case when the substitution matrix has eigenvalues on the unit circle; more specifically, that it is a Salem matrix. Just as in Section 3, we will first prove a general result on the dynamics of a vector of the form $\omega \mathbf{1}$, where now we assume $\omega \in (0, 1) \cap \mathbb{Q}(\alpha)$, under the action of a toral automorphism defined by an irreducible matrix such that its characteristic polynomial is the minimal polynomial of a Salem number. We set the notation in what follows.

Let $A \in GL(d, \mathbb{Z})$ be an irreducible (over \mathbb{Q}) matrix whose eigenvalues are $\alpha_1 = \alpha > 1$, a Salem number of degree $d = 2m + 2$, a single real conjugate $\alpha_2 = \alpha^{-1}$, and complex conjugates of α given by $\alpha_3 = \overline{\alpha_4} = e^{2\pi i \theta_1}, \dots, \alpha_{d-1} = \overline{\alpha_d} = e^{2\pi i \theta_m}$. Denote by $\sigma_j : \mathbb{Q}(\alpha) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ the Galois embedding sending α to $e^{2\pi i \theta_j}$, for $j = 1, \dots, m$.

Let $\omega \in (0, 1) \cap \mathbb{Q}(\alpha)$. Decompose the vector $\mathbf{1}$ with respect to an eigenbasis $\{\mathbf{e}_k\}_{k=1}^d$ of A (which is diagonalizable over \mathbb{C} by the irreducibility of the characteristic polynomial), where each $\mathbf{e}_k \in \mathbb{Q}(\alpha_k)^d$, $k = 1, \dots, d$, is the eigenvector associated to α_k . Furthermore, we may take

$\mathbf{e}_k = \overline{\mathbf{e}_{k+1}}$ for $k = 3, 5, \dots, d-1$, and $\mathbf{e}_{2j+1} = \sigma_j(\mathbf{e}_1)$, $j = 1, \dots, m$, where the embedding is applied coordinate-wise. We get

$$\omega A^n \mathbf{1} = \omega C_1 \alpha^n \mathbf{e}_1 + \omega C_2 \alpha^{-n} \mathbf{e}_2 + \omega \sum_{k=3}^d C_k \alpha_k^n \mathbf{e}_k.$$

Consider $\{\mathbf{e}_k^*\}_{k=1}^d$, a dual basis of $\{\mathbf{e}_k\}_{k=1}^d$ consisting of eigenvectors of A^\top , that is, $A^\top \mathbf{e}_k^* = \overline{\alpha_k} \mathbf{e}_k^*$ and

$$\langle \mathbf{e}_j, \mathbf{e}_k^* \rangle = \delta_{jk}.$$

Note that $\mathbf{e}_k^* \in \mathbb{Q}(\overline{\alpha_k})^d = \mathbb{Q}(\alpha_k)^d$ (the non-real conjugates are of modulus one, hence $\overline{\alpha_k} = \alpha_k^{-1}$) and that we can take $\mathbf{e}_k^* = \overline{\mathbf{e}_{k+1}^*}$ for $k = 3, 5, \dots, d-1$. Now we can express the coefficients as

$$C_k = \frac{\langle \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{e}_k^* \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{e}_k, \mathbf{e}_k^* \rangle} = \langle \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{e}_k^* \rangle.$$

Observe that $C_k = \overline{C_{k+1}}$ for $k = 3, 5, \dots, d-1$. The coefficient $C_1 \in \mathbb{Q}(\alpha)$ does not vanish, since A is irreducible. This implies that each C_k is not zero since each $\mathbf{e}_k^* = \sigma(\mathbf{e}_1^*)$ for a suitable embedding σ . In fact, $C_{2j+1} = \sigma_j(C_1)$ for $j = 1, \dots, m$, and $C_2 = \sigma_0(C_1)$, where σ_0 is the Galois embedding of $\mathbb{Q}(\alpha)$ sending α to α^{-1} .

Let $\Gamma < \mathbb{Z}^d$ be an integer lattice such that $A\Gamma \subset \Gamma$, which is generated by $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_r$. We will be interested in the distribution of $\langle \omega A^n \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{v}_i \rangle$ modulo \mathbb{Z} . By irreducibility of A , $\langle \mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{v}_i \rangle$ is not zero for any $i = 1, \dots, r$. Let \mathbf{v} be any of the \mathbf{v}_i , then

$$\langle \omega A^n \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{v} \rangle = \underbrace{\omega C_1 \langle \mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{v} \rangle}_{=: \eta^{\mathbf{v}} \in \mathbb{Q}(\alpha)} \alpha^n + \omega C_2 \langle \mathbf{e}_2, \mathbf{v} \rangle \alpha^{-n} + \omega \sum_{k=3}^d C_k \langle \mathbf{e}_k, \mathbf{v} \rangle \alpha_k^n,$$

and $\eta^{\mathbf{v}} \neq 0$. We can write $\langle \mathbf{e}_k, \mathbf{v} \rangle = Q^{\mathbf{v}}(\alpha_k)$ for some non-trivial polynomial $Q^{\mathbf{v}} \in \mathbb{Q}[X]$ of degree at most $d-1$: since $\langle \mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{v} \rangle$ is not zero, for any embedding σ , as before, we have $\langle \mathbf{e}_k, \mathbf{v} \rangle = \sigma(\langle \mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{v} \rangle) \neq 0$. Then the last formula can be written as

$$(5.1) \quad \langle \omega A^n \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{v} \rangle = \eta^{\mathbf{v}} \alpha^n + \omega \sigma_0(C_1) Q^{\mathbf{v}}(\alpha_2) \alpha^{-n} + \omega \sum_{j=1}^m 2\operatorname{Re} [\sigma_j(C_1) Q^{\mathbf{v}}(\alpha_{2j+1}) \alpha_{2j+1}^n],$$

where

$$\eta^{\mathbf{v}} = \omega C_1 Q^{\mathbf{v}}(\alpha) = \omega \langle \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{e}_1^* \rangle \langle \mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{v} \rangle \in \mathbb{Q}(\alpha).$$

Let

$$\eta^{\mathbf{v}} = \frac{l_0 + l_1 \alpha + \dots + l_{d-1} \alpha^{d-1}}{L},$$

where $l_j \in \mathbb{Z}$, $L \geq 1$ and $\gcd(l_0, \dots, l_{d-1}, L) = 1$. Note that L does not depend on the vector \mathbf{v} , since the latter is an integer vector. Then,

$$(5.2) \quad \mathbb{Z} \ni \operatorname{Tr}(L \eta^{\mathbf{v}} \alpha^n) = L \eta^{\mathbf{v}} \alpha^n + L \sigma_0(\eta^{\mathbf{v}}) \alpha^{-n} + L \sum_{j=1}^m 2\operatorname{Re} [\sigma_j(\eta^{\mathbf{v}}) \alpha_{2j+1}^n].$$

Observe that

$$\sigma_0(\eta^{\mathbf{v}}) = \sigma_0(\omega)\sigma_0(C_1)Q^{\mathbf{v}}(\alpha^{-1}), \quad \sigma_j(\eta^{\mathbf{v}}) = \sigma_j(\omega)\sigma_j(C_1)Q^{\mathbf{v}}(\alpha_{2j+1}), \quad j = 1, \dots, m.$$

It follows from (5.1) and (5.2) that

$$\begin{aligned} L\langle \omega A^n \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{v} \rangle &= \operatorname{Tr}(L\eta^{\mathbf{v}}\alpha^n) + L(\omega - \sigma_0(\omega))Q^{\mathbf{v}}(\alpha_2)\alpha^{-n} \\ &\quad + 2L \sum_{j=1}^m \operatorname{Re} [(\omega - \sigma_j(\omega))\sigma_j(C_1)Q^{\mathbf{v}}(\alpha_{2j+1})\alpha_{2j+1}^n] \\ (5.3) \quad &= \operatorname{Tr}(L\eta^{\mathbf{v}}\alpha^n) + L(\omega - \sigma_0(\omega))Q^{\mathbf{v}}(\alpha_2)\alpha^{-n} + L \sum_{j=1}^m \mathfrak{H}_j \cos(2\pi\theta_j + \phi_j), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(5.4) \quad \mathfrak{H}_j = 2|(\omega - \sigma_j(\omega))\sigma_j(C_1)Q^{\mathbf{v}}(\alpha_{2j+1})| \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_j = \arg((\omega - \sigma_j(\omega))\sigma_j(C_1)Q^{\mathbf{v}}(\alpha_{2j+1})).$$

Observe that $(\operatorname{Tr}(L\eta^{\mathbf{v}}\alpha^n))_{n \geq 0}$ is an integer sequence satisfying a linear recurrence with a characteristic polynomial equal to the minimal polynomial of α (and the characteristic polynomial of A). It is proved in [27, Proposition 4.1], similarly to [13], that $(\operatorname{Tr}(L\eta^{\mathbf{v}}\alpha^n) \pmod{L})_{n \geq 0}$ is a strictly periodic sequence of some period $1 \leq P \leq L^d$. Let

$$R_n = \sum_{j=1}^m \mathfrak{H}_j \cos(2\pi n\theta_j + \phi_j).$$

We obtain from (5.3) that there exists $1 \leq P \leq L^d$, a positive integer, such that for every $0 \leq p \leq P-1$ there is an integer $0 \leq a_p^{\mathbf{v}} \leq L-1$, such that for all $n \geq 0$,

$$(5.5) \quad \langle \omega A^n \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{v} \rangle \pmod{1} = \frac{a_p^{\mathbf{v}}}{L} + (\omega - \sigma_0(\omega))Q^{\mathbf{v}}(\alpha_2)\alpha^{-n} + R_n \pmod{1}, \quad \text{for } n \equiv p \pmod{P}.$$

We are interested in the distribution of the sequence in the last equation. Given an interval $J \subset [0, 1]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \#\{n \leq N : \langle \omega A^n \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{v} \rangle \pmod{1} \in J\} \\ &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{P} \sum_{p=0}^{P-1} \frac{1}{N/P} \#\{n \leq N, n \equiv p \pmod{P} : \langle \omega A^n \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{v} \rangle \pmod{1} \in J\} \\ &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{P} \sum_{p=0}^{P-1} \frac{1}{N/P} \#\left\{n \leq N, n \equiv p \pmod{P} : \frac{a_p^{\mathbf{v}}}{L} + R_n \pmod{1} \in J\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Denoting by $\mathbb{1}_J$ the \mathbb{Z} -periodic extension of the indicator of an interval $J \subset [0, 1]$ we conclude that

$$(5.6) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \#\{n \leq N : \langle \omega A^n \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{v} \rangle \pmod{1} \in J\} = \frac{1}{P} \sum_{p=0}^{P-1} \int_{(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^m} \mathbb{1}_J \left(\frac{a_p^{\mathbf{v}}}{L} + \mathfrak{R}(\vec{x}) \right) d\vec{x},$$

where

$$\mathfrak{R}(\vec{x}) = \sum_{j=1}^m \mathfrak{H}_j \cos(2\pi x_j),$$

since $((n\theta_1, \dots, n\theta_m))_{n \geq 1}$ is uniformly distributed modulo \mathbb{Z}^m , see [11, Lemma 3.8], and the sequences involved have continuous distribution functions. This integral is similar to the one treated in [27]. However, unlike in [27], it is not obvious that $\mathfrak{R}(\vec{x}) \not\equiv 0$. Recall that our construction depends on the vector \mathbf{v} , so we will write $R_n(\mathbf{v}), \mathfrak{R}_{\mathbf{v}}(\vec{x}), \mathfrak{H}_j(\mathbf{v})$ below. Let

$$\mathfrak{H}(\mathbf{v}) = \max_{\vec{x} \in \mathbb{R}^m} |\mathfrak{R}_{\mathbf{v}}(\vec{x})| = \sum_{j=1}^m \mathfrak{H}_j(\mathbf{v}).$$

Lemma 5.1. *If $\omega \notin \mathbb{Q}$, then $\mathfrak{H}(\mathbf{v}_i) \neq 0$ for any \mathbf{v}_i from the set of free generators of the lattice $\Gamma < \mathbb{R}^d$.*

Proof. We argue by contradiction. If $\mathfrak{H}(\mathbf{v}_i) = 0$ for some i , then $R_n(\mathbf{v}_i) = 0$ for all n . Hence, in view of (5.5),

$$\langle \omega A^n \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{v}_i \rangle \pmod{1} = \frac{a_p^{\mathbf{v}_i}}{L} + (\omega - \sigma_0(\omega)) Q^{\mathbf{v}_i} (\alpha_2) \alpha^{-n} \pmod{1} \longrightarrow \frac{a_p^{\mathbf{v}_i}}{L},$$

as $n \equiv p \pmod{P}$ goes to infinity. Therefore,

$$(5.7) \quad \langle L\omega A^n \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{v}_i \rangle \pmod{1} \longrightarrow 0, \quad n \rightarrow \infty.$$

By [23, Lemma 2], equation (5.7) implies

$$L\omega \mathbf{1} = \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{s}, \quad \mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Q}^d, \quad \mathbf{s} \in \text{Span}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbf{e}_2).$$

But this means $\mathbf{s} = \mathbf{0}$, since otherwise there exists $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ different from zero such that $\lambda \mathbf{e}_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, which is absurd, since \mathbf{e}_2 has rationally independent entries by the irreducibility of the matrix. \square

The main technical ingredient of the proof of Theorem 2.5 is the next estimate. Recall that the periodic extension of the indicator function of an interval $J \subset [0, 1]$ is denoted by $\mathbb{1}_J$. For $0 < \delta < 1/2$, we will denote by $J(\delta)$ the interval $[\delta, 1 - \delta]$.

Theorem 5.2 ([27]). *Let G_1, \dots, G_m be non-negative real numbers, such that $\sum_{i=1}^m G_i \geq \Delta$ for some constant $\Delta > 0$. Then there exists an effective $\delta = \delta(\Delta) > 0$ such that for any $s_0 \geq 0$,*

$$\int_{(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^m} \mathbb{1}_{J(\delta)} \left(s_0 + \sum_{j=1}^m G_j \cos(2\pi x_j) \right) dx_1 \dots dx_m \geq \frac{1}{2}.$$

In [27] the theorem is proved in Lemmas 4.3 and 4.4-4.7, with the constant s_0 equal to ℓ/L for some integer ℓ (the only case needed here as well), but this does not change the proof. Now, at least for $\omega \notin \mathbb{Q}$, we can immediately apply Theorem 5.2 to the functions $\frac{a_{\mathbf{v}}}{L} + \mathfrak{R}_{\mathbf{v}_i}(\vec{x})$, for $p \in \{0, \dots, P-1\}$, appearing in (5.6), with

$$\Delta = \mathfrak{H}(\mathbf{v}_i) = \sum_{j=1}^m |(\omega - \sigma_j(\omega))\sigma_j(C_1)Q^{\mathbf{v}_i}(\alpha_{2j+1})| > 0, \text{ if } \omega \notin \mathbb{Q},$$

in view of (5.4) and Lemma 5.1. However, we do not have a good control on the size of $|\omega - \sigma_j(\omega)|$. We would like to make our estimates effective, similarly to [27]. To this end, we separate the analysis into cases, according to size of the constant $\max_{i=1, \dots, r} \mathfrak{H}(\mathbf{v}_i) =: \mathfrak{H}(\Gamma)$.

Case 1: $\omega \in \mathbb{Q}$, i.e, $\mathfrak{H}(\Gamma) = 0$. Put $\omega = l/L$, for $1 \leq l \leq L$. Since the orbit under the toral automorphism defined by A of $\omega \mathbf{1}$ is periodic, for any integer vector \mathbf{v} , the sequence $(\langle \omega A^n \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{v} \rangle \pmod{1})_{n \geq 0}$ is purely periodic of period $P \leq L^d$. If this sequence is the null sequence for every \mathbf{v}_i , then by definition $\omega \mathbf{1} \in \Gamma^*$. Otherwise we conclude that for some \mathbf{v}_i and $p \in \{0, \dots, P-1\}$,

$$\|\langle \omega A^{Pn+p} \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{v}_i \rangle\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \geq 1/L, \text{ for all } n \geq 0.$$

It follows that

$$(5.8) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \#\{n \leq N : \langle \omega A^n \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{v}_i \rangle \pmod{1} \in J(1/L)\} \geq \frac{1}{L^d}.$$

From now on we suppose $\omega \notin \mathbb{Q}$. Recall Lemma 4.2, which implies that

$$(5.9) \quad \max_{i=1, \dots, r} \|\langle \omega A^n \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{v}_i \rangle\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \geq C_{\Gamma}^{-1} \|\omega A^n \mathbf{1}\|_{\mathbb{R}/\Gamma^*},$$

for some explicit constant $C_{\Gamma} > 1$ depending only on the lattice (and the choice of generators). We will denote $B = A^P$, and its eigenvalues by $\beta_j = \alpha_j^P$. Fix $p \in \{0, \dots, P-1\}$ and write, similarly to Section 3:

$$(5.10) \quad \omega B^n A^p \mathbf{1} = \mathbf{p}_n + \varepsilon_n,$$

with \mathbf{p}_n being the nearest element in Γ^* . It follows from Lemma 3.1(ii) and (5.9) that for an appropriate explicit constant $c = c_{\Gamma}$ holds the implication

$$\max_{i=1, \dots, r} \|\langle \omega A^n \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{v}_i \rangle\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} < c \implies \varepsilon_{n+1} = B\varepsilon_n.$$

Case 2: $0 < \mathfrak{H}(\Gamma) < c$ and $a_p^{\mathbf{v}_i} = 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, r$. Let \mathbf{v} be any of the generators \mathbf{v}_i . Then (5.5) implies, in view of $\mathfrak{H}(\mathbf{v}) \geq |R_n(\mathbf{v})|$, that

$$(5.11) \quad \varepsilon_{n_1+n} = B^n \varepsilon_{n_1},$$

for all $n \geq 0$, for some n_1 (depending on $|\omega|$ and $|\sigma_0(\omega)|$). Now, equation (3.5) becomes, for $k \leq d$:

$$\omega \langle \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{e}_k^* \rangle = \underbrace{\langle \mathbf{p}_0, \mathbf{e}_k^* \rangle - \frac{b_1^{(k)}}{\beta_k} - \dots - \frac{b_{n_1}^k}{\beta_k^{n_1}}}_{=:\langle \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{e}_k^* \rangle P_{n_1}(1/\beta_k)} + \underbrace{\frac{\langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n_1}, \mathbf{e}_k^* \rangle}{\beta_k^{n_1}}}_{=:\langle \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{e}_k^* \rangle \delta_k^{(n_1)}}.$$

Repeating the steps after equation (3.5), we get an analog of (3.9):

$$(5.12) \quad P_{n_1}(1/\beta_k) - P_{n_1}(1/\beta) = \delta_1^{(n_1)} - \delta_k^{(n_1)} = -\delta_k^{(n_1)},$$

since we claim that $\delta_1^{(n_1)} = 0$. Indeed, for any $n \geq 0$ we have by (5.11):

$$\begin{aligned} \beta^n |\langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n_1}, \mathbf{e}_1^* \rangle| &= |\langle B^n \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n_1}, \mathbf{e}_1^* \rangle| \\ &= |\langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n_1+n}, \mathbf{e}_1^* \rangle| \\ &\leq \|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n_1+n}\|_2 \cdot \|\mathbf{e}_1^*\|_2, \end{aligned}$$

which leads to a contradiction if $\delta_1^{(n_1)} \neq 0$, as n goes to infinity.

Decomposing $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n_1}$ with respect to the eigenbasis of B (the same one as for A), we obtain

$$\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n_1+n} = D_1(\omega, n) \beta^n \mathbf{e}_1 + D_2(\omega, n_1) \beta^{-n} \mathbf{e}_2 + \sum_{j=1}^m 2\operatorname{Re} \left(D_j(\omega, n_1) e^{2\pi i n P \theta_j} \mathbf{e}_{2j+1} \right).$$

Note that $D_1(\omega, n_1) = \langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n_1}, \mathbf{e}_1^* \rangle = 0$ as we showed above. We obtain that for all $n \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n_1+n}, \mathbf{v} \rangle \pmod{1} \\ &= D_2(\omega, n_1) \langle \mathbf{e}_2, \mathbf{v} \rangle \beta^{-n} + \sum_{j=1}^m 2\operatorname{Re} \left(D_j(\omega, n_1) \langle \mathbf{e}_{2j+1}, \mathbf{v} \rangle \beta_j^n \right) \pmod{1} \\ &= D_2(\omega, n_1) \langle \mathbf{e}_2, \mathbf{v} \rangle \beta^{-n} + 2 \sum_{j=1}^m |D_j(\omega, n_1)| \cdot |\langle \mathbf{e}_{2j+1}, \mathbf{v} \rangle| \cos(2\pi n P \theta_j + \xi_j) \pmod{1}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\xi_j \in \mathbb{R}$. By (5.10), for all $n \geq 0$,

$$\langle \omega B^{n_1+n} A^P \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{v} \rangle \pmod{1} = \langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n_1+n}, \mathbf{v} \rangle \pmod{1}.$$

Comparing this equality with (5.5) we can deduce that

$$\mathfrak{H}_j(\mathbf{v}) = |D_j(\omega, n_1)| \cdot |\langle \mathbf{e}_{2j+1}, \mathbf{v} \rangle| = |\langle \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{e}_k^* \rangle \delta_{2j+1}^{(n_1)}| |\langle \mathbf{e}_{2j+1}, \mathbf{v} \rangle|,$$

since the amplitudes of asymptotically equal oscillating sums must match.

Since $\mathfrak{H}(\mathbf{v}) \neq 0$, the last equation shows that some $\delta_{2j+1}^{(n_1)}$ is not equal to zero by Lemma 5.1. In view of (5.12), we have an explicit lower bound in terms of β , $|\omega|$ and $|\sigma_0(\omega)|$ for $|\delta_{2j+1}^{(n_1)}|$, which

gives us a lower bound for $\mathfrak{H}_j(\mathbf{v})$: by Lemma 3.3, there exists a constant $s > 0$ only depending on β such that

$$|P_{n_1}(1/\beta_k) - P_{n_1}(1/\beta)| \geq s^{n_1}.$$

In other words, for some constant $t = t(A, \mathbf{v}) > 0$,

$$\mathfrak{H}_j(\mathbf{v}) \geq ts^{n_1}.$$

Since $\beta = \alpha^P$ and $1 \leq P \leq L^d$, the dependence on β may be changed to a dependence on α and L . To summarize, we may use Theorem 5.2 with $\Delta = \Delta(|\omega|, |\sigma_0(\omega)|, L) = ts^{n_1}$.

Case 3: $0 < \mathfrak{H}(\Gamma) < c$ and $a_p^{\mathbf{v}_i} \neq 0$, for some \mathbf{v}_i . We may suppose $\mathfrak{H}(\Gamma)$ is smaller than $1/2L$, otherwise we conclude using Theorem 5.2 with $\Delta = 1/2L$. Recall that $\mathfrak{H}(\mathbf{v}_i) = \max_{\vec{x} \in [0,1]^d} |\mathfrak{R}_{\mathbf{v}_i}(\vec{x})|$. In this case,

$$\frac{1}{4L} \leq \frac{-1/2 + 1}{L} \leq \frac{-\mathfrak{R}_{\mathbf{v}_i}(\vec{x}) + a_p}{L} \leq \frac{1/2 + L - 1}{L} \leq 1 - \frac{1}{4L}.$$

That is, the integral of equation (5.6) is equal to one for the interval $J(\delta)$ with $\delta = 1/4L$.

Case 4: $\mathfrak{H}(\Gamma) \geq c$. In this case we can apply Theorem 5.2 with $\Delta = c$, which is independent of ω .

Having analyzed all cases, from these facts we deduce in particular, by means of Theorem 5.2 and equation (5.6), the next result analogous to [27, Theorem 1.4]. Notice that for $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}^d$, we have $\Gamma^* = \mathbb{Z}^d$.

Theorem 5.3. *Let $A \in GL(d, \mathbb{Z})$ be an irreducible matrix such that its characteristic polynomial is the minimal polynomial of a Salem number α , and an irrational $\omega \in (0, 1) \cap \mathbb{Q}(\alpha)$. Then, there exists an effective $\delta = \delta(\omega) > 0$ such that*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \#\{n \leq N : \|\omega A^n \mathbf{1}\|_{\mathbb{R}^d / \mathbb{Z}^d} \geq \delta\} \geq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Moreover, δ only depends on $|\omega|$, $|\sigma_0(\omega)|$ and L , the denominator of ω in minimal form.

5.2. Application to Salem substitutions. Let ζ be an aperiodic primitive substitution such that its substitution matrix is irreducible and its Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue is a Salem number α . As in Section 4, we can assume without loss of generality that all return words for ζ of less than certain length are good return words. Let Γ be the lattice generated by population vectors of return words. Then $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}[\ell(v_1), \dots, \ell(v_k)]$ for some return words v_1, \dots, v_k , with $k \geq d$.

Now it is easy to conclude the proof of Theorem 2.5, similarly to Section 4. Let $\omega \in (0, 1) \cap \mathbb{Q}(\alpha)$ and $A = S_\zeta^\top$. If $\omega \in \mathbb{Q}$, then we cannot have $(\langle \omega A^n \mathbf{1}, \ell(v_i) \rangle \pmod{1})_{n \geq 0}$ identically equal to zero

for every v_i , since in that case the same is true for an arbitrary return word, which would imply that ω is an eigenvalue of (X_ζ, T, μ) by Theorem 2.1. This is impossible since Salem substitution \mathbb{Z} -actions are weakly-mixing.

We claim that there exists v_i such that for all N sufficiently large holds

$$(5.13) \quad \frac{1}{N} \#\{n \leq N : \langle \omega A^n \mathbf{1}, \ell(v_i) \rangle \pmod{1} \in J(\delta)\} \geq \frac{1}{3L^d}.$$

We apply the argument from the last subsection to Γ and A . If we are in Case 1, then this claim is immediate from (5.8). Otherwise, following Cases 2-4 and applying Theorem 5.2, we can find $\delta = \delta(|\omega|, |\sigma_0(\omega)|, L) > 0$ such that all the integrals from equation (5.6) are greater or equal to $1/2$, and then (5.13) follows, since $P \leq L^d$.

Then, by the product bound on the twisted Birkhoff sum in Proposition 4.1, for any cylindrical function f and any $x \in X_\zeta$,

$$\begin{aligned} |S_N^x(f, \omega)| &\leq O(1) \cdot \|f\|_\infty \cdot N(1 - c_3\delta^2)^{\log_\alpha(N)/3L^d} \\ &= O(1) \cdot \|f\|_\infty \cdot N(\alpha^{\log_\alpha(1-c_3\delta^2)})^{\log_\alpha(N)/3L^d} \\ &= O(1) \cdot \|f\|_\infty \cdot N^{1+\log_\alpha(1-c_3\delta^2)/3L^d} \\ &= O(1) \cdot \|f\|_\infty \cdot N^{\tilde{\vartheta}}, \quad \tilde{\vartheta} \in (0, 1). \end{aligned}$$

From this we conclude as indicated in Section 2.4 after (2.6).

6. NON-UNIFORMITY OF THE HÖLDER EXPONENT AND THE PROOF OF THEOREM 2.7

Both in Theorem 2.5 and Theorem 1.1 of [27] we find a Hölder exponent for the spectral measures at parameters which belong to the dense set $\mathbb{Q}(\alpha)$. This Hölder exponent depends on ω . In this section we show that is not possible to get a uniform exponent for all $\omega \in \mathbb{Q}(\alpha)$ for the \mathbb{Z} -action. In fact, the same proof works for the self-similar \mathbb{R} -action, which is a consequence of the next well-known property of Salem numbers.

Proposition 6.1 (see [11], Theorem 3.9). *Let α be a Salem number and $\varepsilon > 0$. Then there exists $\eta \in \mathbb{Q}(\alpha)$ different from zero such that*

$$\|\eta\alpha^n\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} < \varepsilon,$$

for all $n \geq 0$.

For the \mathbb{Z} -action we need a multi-dimensional version of the last proposition.

Lemma 6.2. *Let $A \in GL(d, \mathbb{Z})$ be an irreducible matrix such that its characteristic polynomial is a minimal polynomial of a Salem number α , and let $\varepsilon > 0$. There exists $\eta \in \mathbb{Z}[\alpha] \cap (0, 1)$ such that*

$$\|\eta A^n \mathbf{1}\|_{\mathbb{R}^d / \mathbb{Z}^d} < \varepsilon,$$

for all $n \geq 0$.

We continue with the set-up of Section 5. Namely, $\alpha_1 = \alpha > 1$ is a Salem number of degree $d = 2m + 2$, with a single real conjugate $\alpha_2 = \alpha^{-1}$, and complex conjugates of α given by $\alpha_3 = \overline{\alpha_4} = e^{2\pi i \theta_1}, \dots, \alpha_{d-1} = \overline{\alpha_d} = e^{2\pi i \theta_m}$. The symbol $\sigma_j : \mathbb{Q}(\alpha) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ denotes the Galois embedding sending α to $e^{2\pi i \theta_j}$, for $j = 1, \dots, m$, and $\sigma_0 : \mathbb{Q}(\alpha) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the Galois embedding sending α to α^{-1} .

Proof of Lemma 6.2. The proof is similar to that of Proposition 6.1. By equations (5.3) and (5.4), in which $\ell(v)$ can be replaced by an arbitrary integer vector, it suffices to show that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\eta \in \mathbb{Z}[\alpha]$ such that for all $j = 0, \dots, m$,

$$(6.1) \quad |\eta - \sigma_j(\eta)| < \varepsilon.$$

Consider the following embedding of $\mathbb{Q}(\alpha)$ into $\mathbb{R}^2 \oplus \mathbb{C}^m \simeq \mathbb{R}^d$ (we identify \mathbb{C} with $\mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}$):

$$\begin{aligned} \tau : \omega &\mapsto \left(\omega, \omega - \sigma_0(\omega), \omega - \sigma_1(\omega), \omega - \sigma_3(\omega), \dots, \omega - \sigma_{d-1}(\omega) \right) \\ &\simeq \left(\omega, \omega - \sigma_0(\omega), \operatorname{Re}(\omega - \sigma_1(\omega)), \operatorname{Im}(\omega - \sigma_1(\omega)), \dots, \operatorname{Im}(\omega - \sigma_{d-1}(\omega)) \right) \end{aligned}$$

The image of $\mathbb{Z}[\alpha]$ under this map is a full-rank lattice in \mathbb{R}^d . Indeed, we just need to verify that for a basis of $\mathbb{Z}[\alpha]$, its image is a basis for \mathbb{R}^d . We may use the power basis given by $\{1, \alpha, \dots, \alpha^{d-1}\}$. It suffices to show that the determinant of the next square real matrix of dimension d is different from zero:

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \alpha & \alpha - \alpha^{-1} & \operatorname{Re}(\alpha - \alpha_3) & \operatorname{Im}(\alpha - \alpha_3) & \dots & \operatorname{Im}(\alpha - \alpha_{d-1}) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \alpha^{d-1} & \alpha^{d-1} - \alpha^{1-d} & \operatorname{Re}(\alpha^{d-1} - \alpha_3^{d-1}) & \operatorname{Im}(\alpha^{d-1} - \alpha_3^{d-1}) & \dots & \operatorname{Im}(\alpha^{d-1} - \alpha_{d-1}^{d-1}) \end{pmatrix}$$

(this is just the identification of the matrix $(\tau(1), \tau(\alpha), \dots, \tau(\alpha^{d-1}))^\top$). By elementary operations on the columns (which we can perform as vectors in \mathbb{C}^d , and it does not have an effect on whether the determinant vanishes or not), we obtain the complex matrix

$$\widetilde{M} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & \dots & 1 \\ \alpha & \alpha^{-1} & \alpha_3 & \alpha_4 & \dots & \alpha_d \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \alpha^{d-1} & \alpha^{1-d} & \alpha_3^{d-1} & \alpha_4^{d-1} & \dots & \alpha_d^{d-1} \end{pmatrix},$$

whose determinant is not equal to zero, since it is the Vandermonde matrix of different numbers.

For any $\varepsilon > 0$, let $E > 0$ which will be set later. Consider the system of inequalities in the variables n_i , where $\tau_j(\omega) = \omega - \sigma_j(\omega)$, $j = 0, 1, \dots, m$.

$$\left| \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} n_i \alpha^i \right| < E, \quad \left| \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} n_i \tau_j(\alpha^i) \right| < \varepsilon, \quad \text{for } j = 0, 1, \dots, m.$$

By ‘‘Minkowski’s first theorem’’ (see [10], Theorem B.1), if $E > 0$ is big enough (depending on $\varepsilon > 0$, of course), we can ensure the existence of a non-trivial integer solution $(n_i)_{0 \leq i \leq d-1}$ to the latter system. For such a solution, set $\tilde{\eta} = \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} n_i \alpha^i$ and $\eta = \{\tilde{\eta}\}$ (the fractional part), which satisfies (6.1) and the conclusion of the lemma. \square

To prove that it is impossible to obtain a uniform Hölder exponent in the Salem case, we will use the next lemma.

Let A be a primitive matrix with a simple spectrum, having the Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue θ and the second in modulus eigenvalue θ_2 . Let \mathbf{u} be the Perron-Frobenius eigenvector of norm 1, so that $A\mathbf{u} = \theta\mathbf{u}$, and let \mathcal{H}_2 be the (real) A -invariant subspace complementary to $\text{Span}\{\mathbf{u}\}$. We can define a norm $\|\cdot\|$ in \mathbb{R}^d adjusted to the matrix A , namely, $\|\mathbf{x}\| = \|c_1\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}\| = \max(|c_1|, \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathcal{H}_2})$, where $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{H}_2$ and $\|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}$ is a norm in \mathcal{H}_2 such that

$$(6.2) \quad \|A\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathcal{H}_2} \leq |\theta_2| \cdot \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}.$$

Lemma 6.3. *Let A be a matrix as above, and let $\varepsilon > 0$ be such that $|\theta_2| + \varepsilon < \theta$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Let ΔA be a (complex) matrix such that*

$$(6.3) \quad \|\Delta A\| < \min\{\varepsilon, \delta(\theta - |\theta_2| - \varepsilon)\}.$$

Then for any $\mathbf{x} = c_1\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}$, with $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{H}_2$ and $\|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathcal{H}_2} \leq \delta c_1$ we have

$$(6.4) \quad (A + \Delta A)\mathbf{x} = c_2\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{w}, \quad \text{with } c_2 > c_1(\theta - \varepsilon), \mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{H}_2, \|\mathbf{w}\|_{\mathcal{H}_2} < c_2\delta.$$

Proof. We have

$$A\mathbf{x} = c_1\theta\mathbf{u} + A\mathbf{v}, \quad A\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{H}_2, \quad \|A\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathcal{H}_2} \leq |\theta_2| \cdot \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}.$$

Denote by $\text{Proj}_{\mathbf{u}}$ the projection onto \mathbf{u} parallel to \mathcal{H}_2 and by Proj_2 the projection onto \mathcal{H}_2 parallel to \mathbf{u} . Observe that using our adjusted norm we have $\|\text{Proj}_{\mathbf{u}}\| = \|\text{Proj}_2\| = 1$. Now,

$$c_2\mathbf{u} = \text{Proj}_{\mathbf{u}}((A + \Delta A)\mathbf{x}) = c_1\theta\mathbf{u} + \text{Proj}_{\mathbf{u}}(\Delta A\mathbf{x}),$$

hence

$$c_2 \geq c_1\theta - \|\text{Proj}_{\mathbf{u}}\| \cdot \|\Delta A\| \cdot \|\mathbf{x}\| = c_1(\theta - \|\Delta A\|),$$

because by our assumption, $\text{Proj}_2\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{v}$ and $\|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathcal{H}_2} \leq \delta c_1$, where $\delta \in (0, 1)$, hence $\|\mathbf{x}\| = c_1$. Thus from $\|\Delta A\| < \varepsilon$ in (6.3) we obtain $c_2 > c_1(\theta - \varepsilon)$ in (6.4). Further,

$$\mathbf{w} = A\mathbf{v} + \text{Proj}_2(\Delta A\mathbf{x}),$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|\mathbf{w}\|_{\mathcal{H}_2} &\leq |\theta_2| \cdot \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathcal{H}_2} + \|\text{Proj}_2\| \cdot \|\Delta A\| \cdot \|\mathbf{x}\| \\
 &\leq |\theta_2| \cdot c_1 \delta + c_1 \|\Delta A\| \\
 &\leq c_1 \delta |\theta_2| + c_1 \delta (\theta - |\theta_2| - \varepsilon) \\
 &\leq c_1 \delta (\theta - \varepsilon) \\
 &\leq c_2 \delta
 \end{aligned}$$

as desired, where we used (6.3) in the third line. \square

To finish the proof of Theorem 2.7, we will iterate Lemma 6.3 starting with $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{u}$. To see why this is enough, we recall that a formula for the lower local dimension of spectral measures is given by the result below. First we recall the definition of the *spectral cocycle* defined in [7].

Definition 6.4. Let $\zeta(a) = w_1 \dots w_{k_a}$ and $e(x) = e^{-2\pi i x}$. The spectral cocycle is the cocycle over $\mathbb{T}^d = (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^d$ with $(a, b) \in \mathcal{A}^2$ entry given by

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{C}_\zeta(\xi, 1)(a, b) &= \sum_{j=1}^{k_a} \delta_{w_j, b} e(\xi_{w_1} + \dots + \xi_{w_{j-1}}), \quad \xi \in \mathbb{T}^d; \\
 \mathcal{C}_\zeta(\xi, n) &= \mathcal{C}_\zeta((\mathbf{S}_\zeta^\top)^{n-1} \xi, 1) \dots \mathcal{C}_\zeta(\xi, 1).
 \end{aligned}$$

The local upper Lyapunov exponent of the cocycle at the point $\xi \in \mathbb{T}^d$ is defined by

$$\chi^+(\xi) = \chi_\zeta^+(\xi) := \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \|\mathcal{C}_\zeta(\xi, n)\|.$$

Remark 6.5. Note that for $\mathbf{0} = (0, \dots, 0)^\top$ we have $\mathcal{C}_\zeta(\mathbf{0}, 1) = \mathbf{S}_\zeta^\top$ and $\mathcal{C}_\zeta(\omega \mathbf{1}, n) = \mathcal{C}_\zeta(\omega (\mathbf{S}_\zeta^\top)^{n-1} \mathbf{1}, 1)$.

Proposition 6.6. Let ζ be a primitive aperiodic substitution on \mathcal{A} , and let σ_f be the spectral measure on $[0, 1) \cong \mathbb{T}$, corresponding to $f = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{A}} b_j \mathbb{1}_{[j]}$, a cylindrical function of level 0 on X_ζ . Then for any $\omega \in (0, 1)$, such that $\chi^+(\omega \mathbf{1}) > 0$, for Lebesgue-a.e. (b_1, \dots, b_d) holds

$$(6.5) \quad \underline{d}(\sigma_f, \omega) = 2 - \frac{2\chi^+(\omega \mathbf{1})}{\log \theta},$$

where θ is the PF eigenvalue of the substitution matrix \mathbf{S}_ζ .

Proof. Consider the suspension flow with a constant-one roof function over the substitution automorphism, acting on $X_\zeta \times [0, 1]$, and consider $F(x, t) = f(x)$, a simple cylindrical function on this space. For the suspension \mathbb{R} -action there is a spectral measure on \mathbb{R} , corresponding to F , which we denote by σ_F . By [3, Lemma 5.6], there is a simple relation between σ_F and the spectral measure σ_f on $\mathbb{T} \cong [0, 1)$:

$$d\sigma_F(\omega) = \left(\frac{\sin(\pi\omega)}{\pi\omega} \right)^2 \cdot d\sigma_f(\omega), \quad \omega \in (0, 1),$$

extended 1-periodically to $\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Z}$. Corollary 4.4(ii) in [7], restricted to the special case of a single substitution and the constant-one roof function, asserts that for any $\omega \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Z}$, for Lebesgue-a.e. (b_1, \dots, b_d) , such that $\chi^+(\omega \mathbf{1}) > 0$, holds

$$\underline{d}(\sigma_F, \omega) = 2 - \frac{2\chi^+(\omega \mathbf{1})}{\log \theta},$$

and (6.5) follows. \square

Let us say that a cylindrical function $f = \sum_{j=1}^d b_j \mathbb{1}_{[j]}$ is *admissible* if (6.5) holds for all $\omega \in \mathbb{Z}[\alpha] \setminus \{0\}$. Clearly, a.e. $f \in \text{Cyl}(X_\zeta)$ is admissible. Moreover, since $\sigma_{f+c\mathbb{1}}$ is absolutely continuous with respect to $\sigma_f + \sigma_{\mathbb{1}} = \sigma_f + \delta_0$, see [32, Corollary 2.1], we have

$$\underline{d}(\sigma_{f+c\mathbb{1}}, \omega) = \underline{d}(\sigma_f, \omega) \quad \text{for all } \omega \in (0, 1),$$

and hence a.e. $f \in \text{Cyl}(X_\zeta)$ of mean zero is admissible as well.

Proof of Theorem 2.7. (i) Let f be an admissible cylindrical function. Suppose by contradiction there exists a uniform $\vartheta > 0$ such that for all $\omega \in (0, 1)$ we have

$$\sigma_f(B_r(\omega)) \leq Cr^\vartheta, \quad \forall r < r_0.$$

In other words, for all $\omega \in (0, 1)$ we have $\underline{d}(\sigma_f, \omega) \geq \vartheta$. Consider $\omega = \eta$ from Lemma 6.2 for an arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$. By Remark 6.5 and Proposition 6.1, we have that

$$\|\mathbb{S}_\zeta^\top - \mathcal{E}_\zeta(\omega(\mathbb{S}_\zeta^\top)^{n-1} \mathbf{1}, 1)\| < \varepsilon, \quad \text{for all } n \geq 1.$$

This means we can apply Lemma 6.3 with $A = \mathbb{S}_\zeta^\top$, $\Delta A = \mathbb{S}_\zeta^\top - \mathcal{E}_\zeta(\omega \mathbf{1}, n)$ and $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{u}$. After n iterations of the lemma, we obtain

$$\|\mathcal{E}_\zeta(\omega \mathbf{1}, n)\| \geq (\theta - \varepsilon)^n,$$

hence

$$\chi^+(\omega \mathbf{1}) \geq \log(\theta - \varepsilon).$$

But this yields $2 - \frac{2\log(\theta - \varepsilon)}{\log \theta} \geq 2 - \frac{2\chi^+(\omega \mathbf{1})}{\log \theta} = \underline{d}(\sigma_f, \omega) \geq \vartheta > 0$, in view of (6.5), which leads to a contradiction for $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough.

(ii) This follows from part (i) immediately, by [22, Theorem 3.7], which is a general version of Last's theorem [24, Theorem 3.1]. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] Adamczewski, Boris. Symbolic discrepancy and self-similar dynamics. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)* **54** (2004), no. 7, 2201–2234.
- [2] Avila, Artur; Forni, Giovanni; Safaee, Pedram. Quantitative weak mixing for interval exchange transformations. *Geom. Funct. Anal.* **33** (2023), no. 1, 1–56.
- [3] Berlinkov, Artemi; Solomyak, Boris. Singular substitutions of constant length. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems* **39** (2019), 2384–2402.
- [4] Bufetov, Alexander I.; Solomyak, Boris. On the modulus of continuity for spectral measures in substitution dynamics. *Adv. Math.* **260** (2014), 84–129.
- [5] Bufetov, Alexander I.; Solomyak, Boris. The Hölder property for the spectrum of translation flows in genus two. *Israel J. Math.* **223** (2018), no. 1, 205–259.
- [6] Bufetov, Alexander I.; Solomyak, Boris. On ergodic averages for parabolic product flows. *Bull. Soc. Math. France* **146** (2018), no. 4, 675–690.
- [7] Bufetov, Alexander I.; Solomyak, Boris. A spectral cocycle for substitution systems and translation flows. *Journal d'analyse mathématique* **141** (2020), no. 1, 165–205.
- [8] Bufetov, Alexander I.; Solomyak, Boris. Hölder regularity for the spectrum of translation flows. *J. Éc. polytech. Math.* **8** (2021), 279–310.
- [9] Bufetov, Alexander I.; Solomyak, Boris. On substitution automorphisms with pure singular spectrum. *Math. Z.* **301** (2022), no. 2, 1315–1331.
- [10] Bugeaud, Yann. *Approximation by algebraic numbers*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004.
- [11] Bugeaud, Yann. *Distribution modulo one and Diophantine approximation*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012.
- [12] Clark, Alex; Sadun, Lorenzo. When size matters: subshifts and their related tiling spaces. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems* **23** (2003), 1043–1057.
- [13] Dubickas, Artūras. There are infinitely many limit points of the fractional parts of powers. *Proc. Indian Acad. Sci. Math. Sci.* **115** (2005), no. 4, 391–397.
- [14] S. Ferenczi, C. Mauduit, A. Nogueira, Substitution dynamical systems: algebraic characterization of eigenvalues. *Annales scientifiques de l'École Normale Supérieure, Sér. 4*, **29** no. 4 (1996), 519–533.
- [15] Pytheas N. Fogg, *Substitutions in dynamics, arithmetics and combinatorics*, Edited by V. Berthé, S. Ferenczi, C. Mauduit and A. Siegel. Lecture Notes in Math., 1794, Springer, Berlin, 2002.
- [16] Forni, Giovanni. Twisted translation flows and effective weak mixing. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)* **24** (2022), no. 12, 4225–4276.
- [17] Garsia, Adriano M. Arithmetic properties of Bernoulli convolutions. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* **102** (1962), no. 3, 409–432.
- [18] Goldberg, Richard. Restrictions of Fourier transforms and extension of Fourier sequences. *J. Approximation Theory* **3** (1970), 149–155.
- [19] Hochman, Michael. On self-similar sets with overlaps and inverse theorems for entropy. *Ann. of Math. (2)* **180** (2014), no. 2, 773–822.
- [20] Hof, Albertus. On scaling in relation to singular spectrum. *Comm. Math. Physics* **184** (1997), 567–577.
- [21] Host, Bernard. Valeurs propres des systèmes dynamiques définis par des substitutions de longueur variable. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems* **6** (1986), 529–540.
- [22] Knill, Oliver. Singular continuous spectrum and quantitative rates of mixing. *Discrete Cont. Dynam. Syst.* **4** (1998), 33–42.

- [23] Kwapisz, Jaroslaw. A dynamical proof of Pisot's Theorem. *Canadian Mathematical Bulletin* **49**, Cambridge University Press, (2006), 108–112.
- [24] Last, Yoram. Quantum dynamics and decompositions of singular continuous spectra. *J. Funct. Anal.* **142** (1996), no. 2, 406–445.
- [25] Livshits, Alexander N. Sufficient conditions for weak mixing of substitutions and of stationary adic transformations. (Russian) *Mat. Zametki* **44** (1988), no. 6, 785–793, 862; translation in *Math. Notes* **44** (1988), no. 5–6, 920–925 (1989).
- [26] Livshits, Alexander N. Some examples of adic transformations and automorphisms of substitutions. Selected translations *Selecta Math. Soviet.* **11** (1992), no. 1, 83–104.
- [27] Marshall-Maldonado, Juan. Modulus of continuity for spectral measures of suspension flows over Salem type substitutions. *Israel Math. J.* (2024), 1–36.
- [28] Moll, Nelson. Speed of Weak Mixing for the Chacon Map, Preprint arXiv:2308.00823.
- [29] Neukirch, Jürgen. *Algebraic number theory*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg vol. 322, 1999.
- [30] Noro, Masayuki; Takeshima, Taku; Yokoyama, Kazuhiro. Computing primitive elements of extension fields. *Journal of symbolic computation* **8** (1989), no. 6, 553–580.
- [31] Park, Jiyeon, Park, Kangrae. Size of exceptional sets in weakly mixing systems. Preprint arXiv:2301.09786.
- [32] Queffelec, Martine. *Substitution Dynamical Systems - Spectral Analysis*. Second edition. Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 1294, Springer, Berlin, 2010.
- [33] Salem, Raphael. *Algebraic Numbers and Fourier analysis*. D. C. Heath and Co., 1963.
- [34] Solomyak, Boris. On the spectral theory of adic transformations. Representation theory and dynamical systems, 217–230, *Adv. Soviet Math.*, **9**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1992.
- [35] Strichartz, Robert S. Fourier asymptotics of fractal measures. *J. Funct. Anal.* **89** (1990), no. 1, 154–187.

ALEXANDER I. BUFETOV, STEKLOV MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE OF RAS, MOSCOW

AIX-MARSEILLE UNIVERSITÉ, CNRS, CENTRALE MARSEILLE, I2M, UMR 7373, 39 RUE F. JOLIOT CURIE
MARSEILLE FRANCE

INSTITUTE FOR INFORMATION TRANSMISSION PROBLEMS, MOSCOW

Email address: alexander.bufetov@univ-amu.fr, bufetov@mi.ras.ru

JUAN MARSHALL-MALDONADO, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BAR-ILAN UNIVERSITY, RAMAT-GAN, ISRAEL

Email address: jgmarshall121@gmail.com

BORIS SOLOMYAK, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BAR-ILAN UNIVERSITY, RAMAT-GAN, ISRAEL

Email address: bsolom3@gmail.com