

# Simultaneous Diophantine approximation to points on the Veronese curve

Dmitry Badziahin

May 7, 2024

## Abstract

We compute the Hausdorff dimension of the set of simultaneously  $q^{-\lambda}$ -well approximable points on the Veronese curve in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  for  $\lambda$  between  $\frac{1}{n}$  and  $\frac{2}{2n-1}$ . For  $n = 3$ , the same result is given for a wider range of  $\lambda$  between  $\frac{1}{3}$  and  $\frac{1}{2}$ . We also provide a nontrivial upper bound for this Hausdorff dimension in the case  $\lambda \leq \frac{2}{n}$ . In the course of the proof we establish that the number of cubic polynomials of height at most  $H$  and non-zero discriminant at most  $D$  is bounded from above by  $c(\epsilon)H^{2/3+\epsilon}D^{5/6}$ .

*Keywords:* Diophantine exponents, simultaneously well approximable points, Veronese curve, Hausdorff dimension, simultaneous Diophantine approximation on manifolds, cubic polynomials of bounded discriminant

Math Subject Classification 2020: 11J13, 11J54, 11J82, 11K55

## 1 Introduction

For a positive real number  $\lambda$  the set  $S_n(\lambda)$  of  $q^{-\lambda}$ -well approximable points in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is defined as follows:

$$S_n(\lambda) := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|q\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{p}\|_\infty < q^{-\lambda} \text{ for i.m. } (q, \mathbf{p}) \in \mathbb{Z}^{n+1}\}.$$

One of the topical problems in the metric theory of Diophantine approximation is to understand the structure of the intersection of  $S_n(\lambda)$  with a suitable manifold  $\mathcal{M}$ , see for example [15, 4, 7] where this problem is investigated. In the landmark paper [15] Kleinbock and Margulis established that for all so-called nondegenerate manifolds  $\mathcal{M}$  and all  $\lambda > 1/n$ , the set  $S_n(\lambda) \cap \mathcal{M}$  has zero Lebesgue measure. But regarding its Hausdorff dimension, much less is known. Beresnevich [4] showed that for  $\lambda$  close enough to  $1/n$  and nondegenerate  $\mathcal{M}$ ,

$$\dim(S_n(\lambda) \cap \mathcal{M}) \geq \dim \frac{n+1}{\lambda+1} - \text{codim } \mathcal{M}.$$

For the case when  $\mathcal{M}$  is a nondegenerate curve, the above inequality is achieved for  $\frac{1}{n} \leq \lambda \leq \frac{3}{2n-1}$ . Later, Beresnevich and Yang [7] proved that this bound is sharp for  $\lambda$  in close proximity of  $1/n$ , much closer than  $\frac{3}{2n-1}$ . The last improvement of their bound on  $\lambda$  can be found in [16]. With respect to curves, it states as follows. Suppose that  $\mathcal{C}$  is parametrised by  $n$  times continuously differentiable function  $\mathbf{f} : J \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  such that its derivatives up to degree  $n$  at any  $x \in J$  span  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Then

$$\dim(S_n(\lambda) \cap \mathcal{C}) = \frac{2 - (n-1)\lambda}{1 + \lambda} \quad \forall \lambda \in \left[ \frac{1}{n}, \frac{1}{n} + \frac{n+1}{n(2n-1)(n^2+n+1)} \right). \quad (1)$$

For larger values of  $\lambda$  the structure of the set  $S_n(\lambda) \cap \mathcal{M}$  is mostly unknown. However we know for sure that for large enough  $\lambda$  it substantially depends on a manifold  $\mathcal{M}$ . For

example, consider the circle  $\mathcal{C} := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x_1^2 + x_2^2 = 3\}$ . It is not too difficult to verify that for  $\lambda > 1$  and  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C}$ , the inequality  $\|q\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{p}\|_\infty < q^{-\lambda}$ ,  $(q, \mathbf{p}) \in \mathbb{Z}^3 \setminus \mathbf{0}$  for large  $q$  implies that  $\mathbf{p}/q \in \mathcal{C}$ . Then we immediately deduce that  $S_2(\lambda) \cap \mathcal{C} = \emptyset$ . On the other hand, for the Veronese curve  $\mathcal{V}_n := \{(x, x^2, \dots, x^n) : x \in \mathbb{R}\}$  and all  $\lambda > 1$  Schleisnitz [17] showed that  $\dim(S_n(\lambda) \cap \mathcal{V}_n) = \frac{2}{n(1+\lambda)}$ , in sharp contrast with the previous example.

In this paper, we investigate the Hausdorff dimension of  $S_n(\lambda) \cap \mathcal{V}_n$ . In the literature, this set is often considered from a different perspective. For  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , by  $n$ 'th simultaneous Diophantine exponent  $\lambda_n(x)$  we define the supremum of all  $\lambda$  such that the inequality

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \|qx^i\| \leq q^{-\lambda}$$

has infinitely many solutions  $q \in \mathbb{Z}$ . We refer to [10] for an overview of the known results about the exponents  $\lambda_n(x)$ . One can easily see that the set of  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  with  $\lambda_n(x) \geq \lambda$  coincides with the projection of  $S_n(\lambda) \cap \mathcal{V}_n$  to the first coordinate axis. Therefore the Hausdorff dimensions of  $S_n(\lambda) \cap \mathcal{V}_n$  and  $\{x \in \mathbb{R} : \lambda_n(x) \geq \lambda\}$  coincide. In this paper, we will often work with the latter set. In particular, for an open interval  $I \subset \mathbb{R}$  we define

$$S_n(I, \lambda) := \{x \in I : \lambda_n(x) > \lambda\}.$$

One can define analogues of  $S_n(I, \lambda)$  for general curves  $\mathcal{C}$ . Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be two times continuously differentiable. By permuting the coordinates in  $\mathcal{C}$  if needed, locally it can be parametrised as  $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{f}(x) := (x, f_2(x), \dots, f_n(x))$ ,  $x \in J \subset \mathbb{R}$  where  $f_i(x) \in C^2(J)$ . For the moment, we only put the additional condition that  $f_i(x) \neq 0$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq n$  and almost all  $x \in J$  in terms of the Lebesgue measure. Later, we will impose more conditions on  $\mathbf{f}$ . For  $x \in J$ , we define the Diophantine exponent  $\lambda^{\mathbf{f}}(x)$  as the supremum of all  $\lambda$  such that the inequality  $\|q\mathbf{f}(x) - \mathbf{p}\|_\infty \leq q^{-\lambda}$  has infinitely many solutions  $(q, \mathbf{p}) \in \mathbb{Z}^{n+1}$ . Next, for  $I \subset J$  we define

$$S_n^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda) := \{x \in I : \lambda^{\mathbf{f}}(x) > \lambda\}.$$

Then, as for  $S_n(I, \lambda)$ , the set  $S_n^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda)$  is the projection of  $S_n(\lambda) \cap \mathcal{C}_I$  to the first coordinate axis, where  $\mathcal{C}_I$  is the curve  $\mathcal{C}$  restricted to the domain  $I$ . Hence we have  $\dim S_n^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda) = \dim(S_n(\lambda) \cap \mathcal{C}_I)$ .

By fixing an appropriate subinterval  $I \subset J$ , without loss of generality we assume

$$\max_{x \in I} \{\|\mathbf{f}(x)\|_\infty, \|\mathbf{f}'(x)\|_\infty, \|\mathbf{f}''(x)\|_\infty\} \ll 1, \quad (2)$$

where the implied constant may depend on  $\mathbf{f}$  and  $I$  but does not depend on  $x$ . Also without loss of generality, we may assume that  $I$  is separated from zeroes of  $f_i$ , i.e. for all  $x \in I$ ,  $0 \leq i \leq n$ ,  $|f_i(x)| \gg 1$ . In that case, for any integer point  $(q, \mathbf{p}) \in \mathbb{Z}^{n+1}$  with  $q$  large enough such that  $\|q\mathbf{f}(x) - \mathbf{p}\|_\infty \leq q^{-\lambda}$ , we have  $|q| \gg \|(q, \mathbf{p})\|_\infty$ . Notice that in the case of the Veronese curve this condition means that  $I$  is separated from 0.

The sets  $S_n(I, \lambda)$  were extensively investigated. But despite all the efforts, their Hausdorff dimension is only completely known for  $n = 1$  and 2. Namely, the classical theorem of Jarnik and Besicovich states that

$$\dim S_1(I, \lambda) = \frac{2}{1+\lambda} \quad \forall \lambda \geq 1.$$

In the case  $n = 2$  the result is more complicated and is achieved by joint efforts of Beresnevich, Dickinson, Schleisnitz, Vaughan and Velani [6, 19, 17]:

$$\dim S_2(I, \lambda) = \begin{cases} \frac{2-\lambda}{1+\lambda} & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} \leq \lambda \leq 1; \\ \frac{1}{1+\lambda} & \text{if } \lambda > 1. \end{cases}$$

In fact, the first part of this formula for  $\frac{1}{2} \leq \lambda \leq 1$  was verified for all sets  $S_2^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda)$  with  $\mathbf{f}$  having non-vanishing curvature. The second part of the result is specific to  $S_2(I, \lambda)$ .

For  $n \geq 3$ , the Hausdorff dimension of  $S_n(I, \lambda)$  is only known for values of  $\lambda$  in the close proximity of  $1/n$ , as was already mentioned in (1), and for relatively large  $\lambda$ , due to the work of the author and Bugeaud [1]. Namely, for  $\lambda \geq \frac{n+4}{3n}$ ,

$$\dim S_n(I, \lambda) = \frac{2}{n(1 + \lambda)}.$$

This result is a corollary of a more general upper and lower bounds on  $\dim S_n(I, \lambda)$  that cover a bigger range of  $\lambda$ :

**Theorem BB (Badziahin, Bugeaud, 2020)** *For all  $0 \leq k \leq n - 1$  and  $\lambda \geq 1/n$  one has*

$$\dim(S_n(I, \lambda)) \geq \frac{(k + 2)(1 - k\lambda)}{(n - k)(1 + \lambda)}.$$

*On the other hand, let  $\lambda \geq \lfloor \frac{n+1}{2} \rfloor^{-1}$ . Setting,  $m = \lfloor 1/\lambda \rfloor$ , one has*

$$\dim(S_n(I, \lambda)) \leq \max_{0 \leq k \leq m} \frac{(k + 2)(1 - k\lambda)}{(n - 2k)(1 + \lambda)}.$$

The essence of this theorem is that  $\dim(S_n(I, \lambda))$  is sandwiched between two piecewise rational functions, where the upper bound is only provided for relatively large  $\lambda$ . Those two bounds coincide for  $\lambda \geq (n + 4)/(3n)$ .

The exact value of  $\dim(S_n(I, \lambda))$  for intermediate values of  $\lambda$  remains a mystery. It is believed to be a piecewise rational function but there is no even a guess regarding its precise formula.

In this paper we provide tighter upper bounds for  $\dim(S_n(I, \lambda))$ . The first result in some sense complements Theorem BB for  $\lambda < \lfloor \frac{n+1}{2} \rfloor^{-1}$ . To the best of the author's knowledge, no other non-trivial upper bounds for  $\lambda$  in this range and outside of the interval from (1) were known before.

**Theorem 1** *Let  $m = \lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor$ . For all  $\frac{1}{n} \leq \lambda \leq \frac{2}{n}$  and  $0 \leq k \leq m$  one has*

$$\dim(S_n(I, \lambda)) \leq \frac{(n - k + 1)(1 - k\lambda)}{(n - 2k)(1 + \lambda)}. \quad (3)$$

The second result significantly extends the interval for  $\lambda$  from [16] where  $\dim(S_n(I, \lambda))$  is given by (1).

**Theorem 2** *For all  $\lambda$  between  $\frac{1}{n}$  and  $\frac{2}{2n-1}$  one has*

$$\dim S_n(I, \lambda) = \frac{2 - (n - 1)\lambda}{1 + \lambda}.$$

*For  $n = 3$  the range for  $\lambda$  can be extended to  $\frac{1}{3} \leq \lambda \leq \frac{1}{2}$ .*

Notice that in (1) the upper bound for  $\lambda$  is of the form  $\frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{2n^3} + O(n^{-4})$ , while in our result it is  $\frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{2n^2} + O(n^{-3})$ .

For  $n = 3$  and  $\frac{1}{2} \leq \lambda \leq \frac{3}{5}$  we can significantly improve the upper bound in Theorem 1.

**Theorem 3** For all  $\lambda$  between  $\frac{1}{2}$  and  $\frac{3}{5}$  one has

$$\dim S_3(I, \lambda) \leq \frac{4 - 2\lambda}{3(1 + \lambda)}.$$

**Remark.** The upper bound in Theorem 3 is not sharp. With more delicate estimates in some of the cases of the proof in Section 3, it can be improved. However we decide not to make already tedious proof even more complicated and leave the bound in its present form.

The proofs of Theorem 2 for  $n = 3$  and Theorem 3 rely on counting cubic polynomials of bounded heights and discriminants. Here by the height of a polynomial  $P$ , denoted by  $H(P)$ , we understand its naive height, i.e. the supremum norm of its coefficient vector. We also denote the discriminant of  $P$  by  $D(P)$ . In this paper, we prove the following result which is of independent interest:

**Theorem 4** For any  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists a constant  $c = c(\epsilon)$  such that the number  $N(H, D)$  of polynomials  $P$  with  $H(P) \leq H$  and  $0 < |D(P)| \leq D$  is bounded from above by

$$N(H, D) \leq cH^{2/3+\epsilon}D^{5/6}. \quad (4)$$

**Remark.** We believe that by using more delicate arguments than in this paper, one can remove the term  $\epsilon$  in the upper bound (4). However, this is not important for our main aim and will only make the paper more complicated.

If we take  $D = H^{4-2v}$  the bound (4) transforms to  $N(H, D) \leq cH^{4-\frac{5}{3}v+\epsilon}$ . On the other hand, Beresnevich, Bernik and Götze [5] verified that  $N(H, \gamma H^{4-2v}) \gg H^{4-\frac{5}{3}v}$  for a suitable absolute constant  $\gamma > 0$ . Therefore our upper bound is sharp (or rather almost sharp as we have an additional small term  $H^\epsilon$ ). It is worth mentioning that several similar upper bounds were achieved in the last two decades, see [14, 9]. However, all of them have restrictions on heights and discriminants, while our result works for all possible pairs  $(H, D)$ .

Wherever possible, while proving the results of this paper we will deal with the more general sets  $S_n^f(I, \lambda)$  and only consider  $S_n(I, \lambda)$  if we use some specific properties of the Veronese curve.

## 2 Dual sets of well approximable points

One of the ideas in this paper is to transfer the problem about simultaneously well approximable points to the one about dually well approximable points. Namely, a point  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is called dually  $q^{-w}$ -well approximable if the following inequality

$$|\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{x} - p| \leq \|\mathbf{q}\|_\infty^{-w}$$

has infinitely many solutions  $(\mathbf{q}, p) \in \mathbb{Z}^{n+1}$ . By  $D_n(w)$  we denote the set of dually  $q^{-w}$ -well approximable points. For many manifolds  $\mathcal{M}$  the sets  $D_n(w) \cap \mathcal{M}$  are better understood compared to  $S_n(\lambda) \cap \mathcal{M}$ . For example, this is the case for  $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{V}_n$  where the exact value of  $\dim(D_n(w) \cap \mathcal{V}_n)$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\lambda \geq n$  was computed by Bernik [8]:

$$\dim(D_n(w) \cap \mathcal{V}_n) = \frac{n+1}{w+1}. \quad (5)$$

As in the simultaneous case, we locally parametrise the curve  $\mathcal{C}$  by  $\mathbf{f}$  and consider the following set:

$$D_n^f(I, w) := \{x \in I : |\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{f}(x) - p| \leq \|\mathbf{q}\|_\infty^{-w} \text{ for i.m. } (\mathbf{q}, p) \in \mathbb{Z}^{n+1}\}.$$

In the case of the Veronese curve we omit the superscript  $\mathbf{f}$  and write  $D_n(I, w)$ .

We demonstrate the idea by proving the following result. It gives a weaker upper bound compared to Theorem 1 but it is satisfied for all curves  $\mathcal{C}$  under mild conditions on  $\mathbf{f}$ .

**Theorem 5** *Suppose that for any rational hyperplane  $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ ,  $\dim((1, \mathbf{f}(I)) \cap \mathcal{H}) = 0$ . Then*

$$\dim S_n^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda) \leq \dim D_n^{\mathbf{f}}(I, n(1 + \lambda) - 1).$$

**Remark.** Notice that in Theorem 5 the condition on the curve  $\mathbf{f}(I)$  is weaker than the property of nondegeneracy as was defined in the work of Kleinbock and Margulis [15]. Recall that a curve  $\mathbf{f}(I)$  is called nondegenerate at  $x \in I$  if it is enough times continuously differentiable and all partial derivatives of  $\mathbf{f}$  span  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Then one can check that as soon as the Hausdorff dimension of points  $x \in I$  where the curve is degenerate equals zero, the conditions of Theorem 5 are satisfied. On the other hand, affine lines with  $f_i(x) = a_i x + b_i$  where the numbers  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n$  are linearly independent over  $\mathbb{Q}$ , is degenerate at every points, while it still satisfies the conditions of Theorem 5.

PROOF. Consider  $x \in S_n^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda)$ . By removing the set of zero Hausdorff dimension, we make sure that  $(1, \mathbf{f}(x))$  does not lie on any rational hyperplane in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ . Then by definition, there are infinitely many points  $\mathbf{q} = (q, \mathbf{p}) \in \mathbb{Z}^{n+1}$  that satisfy  $\|q\mathbf{f}(x) - \mathbf{p}\|_{\infty} \leq q^{-\lambda}$ . Fix one such point  $\mathbf{q}$  with large enough  $q$ . By the Minkowski theorem, there exists  $\mathbf{a} \in \langle \mathbf{q} \rangle^{\perp}$  such that  $\|\mathbf{a}\|_{\infty} \leq \|\mathbf{q}\|_{\infty}^{1/n}$ .

Now recall that by the choice of  $I$ ,  $|q| \asymp \|\mathbf{q}\|_{\infty}$  and compute

$$|\mathbf{a} \cdot (1, \mathbf{f}(x))| = |q^{-1}(\mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{q} + a_1(qf_1(x) - p_1) + \dots + a_n(qf_n(x) - p_n))| \ll \frac{\|\mathbf{a}\|_{\infty}}{\|\mathbf{q}\|_{\infty}^{1+\lambda}}. \quad (6)$$

This immediately implies that  $|\mathbf{a} \cdot (1, \mathbf{f}(x))| \ll \|\mathbf{a}\|_{\infty}^{1-n(1+\lambda)}$ . Since the left hand side of (6) can not be equal to 0, this inequality can not be satisfied for a fixed  $\mathbf{a}$  and infinitely many different  $\mathbf{q}$ . Hence we must have the inequality  $|\mathbf{a} \cdot (1, \mathbf{f}(x))| \ll \|\mathbf{a}\|_{\infty}^{1-n(1+\lambda)}$  for infinitely many  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n+1}$  which immediately implies that  $x \in D_n^{\mathbf{f}}(I, n(1 + \lambda) - 1)$ . The statement of the theorem follows immediately. \(\square\)

For the set  $S_n(I, \lambda)$ , in view of Bernik's result (5), Theorem 5 gives an upper bound

$$\dim S_n(\mathcal{V}_n, I, \lambda) \leq \frac{n+1}{n(1+\lambda)},$$

which is the case  $k = 0$  in Theorem 1. To get the upper bounds (3) for bigger  $k$ , we need to use specific properties of the Veronese curve.

Given a vector  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Z}^{m+1}$  where  $m \leq n$ , by  $L_{\mathbf{a}}$  we define an  $m$ -dimensional subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  defined by the following linear equations:

$$a_0 x_j + a_1 x_{j+1} + \dots + a_m x_{j+m} = 0, \quad 0 \leq j \leq n - m. \quad (7)$$

We say that a vector  $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n+1}$  is of type  $h \leq n/2$  if  $h$  is the largest number such that the rank of the matrix

$$M_{h,n}(\mathbf{q}) := \begin{pmatrix} q_0 & q_1 & \cdots & q_{n-h} \\ q_1 & q_2 & \cdots & q_{n-h+1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ q_h & q_{h+1} & \cdots & q_n \end{pmatrix}$$

is  $h + 1$ , i.e. it is full. For example, for points  $\mathbf{q}$  on the Veronese curve, i.e.  $\mathbf{q} = (u^n, u^{n-1}v, \dots, v^n)$ , their type equals zero.

**Proof of Theorem 1.** Write  $S_n(I, \lambda)$  as a union of  $\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor + 1$  subsets  $S_n^h(I, \lambda)$ ,  $0 \leq h \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$  such that

$$S_n^h(I, \lambda) := \{x \in \mathbb{R} : \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |q_0 x^i - q_i| \leq q_0^{-\lambda} \text{ for i.m. } \mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n+1} \text{ of type } h\}.$$

Clearly, as  $h$  varies, the sets  $S_n^h(I, \lambda)$  may have nonempty intersection but the important point is that

$$\dim S_n(I, \lambda) = \max_{0 \leq h \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} \dim S_n^h(I, \lambda).$$

In [1, Section 4] the authors show that<sup>1</sup> for  $h < n/2$

$$\dim S_n^h(I, \lambda) \leq \frac{(h+2)(1-h\lambda)}{(n-2h)(1+\lambda)}. \quad (8)$$

Here we prove a different upper bound for  $\dim S_n^h(I, \lambda)$ :

**Proposition 1** For all  $0 \leq k \leq \min\{h, \frac{n-1}{2}\}$ , one has

$$\dim S_n^h(I, \lambda) \leq \frac{(n-k+1)(1-k\lambda)}{(n-2k)(1+\lambda)}.$$

PROOF. We proceed in a similar way as in Theorem 5. Fix  $k$  between 0 and  $\min\{h, \frac{n-1}{2}\}$ . For a given point  $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n+1}$  denote by  $\mathbf{q}_i^{n-k}$  the vector  $(q_i, q_{i+1}, \dots, q_{i+n-k})$ . Consider a point  $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n+1}$  of type  $h$  that approximates the number  $x \in S_n^h(I, \lambda)$ . Let  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{q}}^k$  be the lattice generated by vectors  $\mathbf{q}_0^{n-k}, \dots, \mathbf{q}_k^{n-k}$ . By the definition of the type of  $\mathbf{q}$ , all these vectors are linearly independent and therefore the covolume of  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{q}}^k$  is  $\|\mathbf{q}_0^{n-k} \wedge \dots \wedge \mathbf{q}_k^{n-k}\|_2$ . By [1, Proposition 4.3], the absolute value of every Plücker coordinate of this product is bounded from above by  $q_0^{1-k\lambda}$  multiplied by a some absolute constant.

Since the covolumes of a lattice and its dual counterparts coincide, we get

$$\text{covol}(\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{q}}^h)^\perp \ll q_0^{1-k\lambda}.$$

Its dimension is  $n - 2k$ . By Khintchine's theorem, this implies that there exists an integer vector  $\mathbf{a} \in \langle \mathbf{q}_0^{n-k}, \dots, \mathbf{q}_k^{n-k} \rangle^\perp$  of length

$$\|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty \ll q_0^{\frac{1-k\lambda}{n-2k}},$$

i.e.  $\mathbf{q} \in L_{\mathbf{a}}$ .

Now, as in the proof of Theorem 5, we have  $|q_0| \asymp \|\mathbf{q}\|_\infty$  and compute

$$|\mathbf{a} \cdot (1, x, x^2, \dots, x^{n-k})| \ll \frac{\|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty}{\|\mathbf{q}\|_\infty^{1+\lambda}} \ll \|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty^{1 - \frac{(n-2k)(1+\lambda)}{1-k\lambda}}.$$

Finally, we derive that

$$S_n^h(I, \lambda) \subset D_{n-k} \left( I, \frac{(n-2k)(1+\lambda)}{1-k\lambda} - 1 \right)$$

<sup>1</sup>In fact, the value  $h$  in [1] equals  $h + 1$  in this paper, hence the formula looks slightly different.

and Bernik's equation (5) completes the proof. \(\square\)

Notice that for all  $h < k \leq \frac{n-1}{2}$  one has

$$h + 2 \leq \frac{n+3}{2} \leq n - k + 1.$$

On top of that, for  $\lambda \leq \frac{2}{n}$ , the expression  $\frac{1-k\lambda}{n-2k}$  as a function of  $k$ , is monotonically increasing. Therefore,

$$\frac{(h+2)(1-h\lambda)}{(n-2h)(1+\lambda)} \leq \min_{h < k \leq \frac{n-1}{2}} \left\{ \frac{(n-k+1)(1-k\lambda)}{(n-2k)(1+\lambda)} \right\}.$$

and hence in view of (8),  $\dim(S_n^h(I, \lambda))$  satisfies the same upper bounds (3) for all  $0 \leq k \leq \frac{n-1}{2}$ . This finishes the proof of Theorem 1.

### 3 Cutting the curve into pieces

From now on we focus on Theorem 2. By  $Q_n^f(I, \lambda)$  we denote the set of all  $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n+1}$  such that there exists  $x \in I$  with

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |q_0 f_i(x) - q_i| < \|\mathbf{q}\|_\infty^{-\lambda}. \quad (9)$$

Sometimes it is convenient to write  $\mathbf{q}$  as a pair  $(q_0, \mathbf{q}^+) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}^n$ . Then (9) can be rewritten as  $\|q_0 \mathbf{f}(x) - \mathbf{q}^+\|_\infty \ll \|\mathbf{q}\|_\infty^{-\lambda}$ . By  $R^f(\mathbf{q})$  we denote the set of  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  that satisfy (9) for a given  $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n+1}$ . Surely, one has  $\text{diam } R^f(\mathbf{q}) \ll \|\mathbf{q}\|_\infty^{-1-\lambda}$ . Notice that  $S_n^f(I, \lambda)$  can be interpreted as the set of all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  such that the inequality (9) is satisfied for infinitely many  $\mathbf{q} \in Q_n^f(I, \lambda)$ . As with  $S_n(I, \lambda)$ , we omit the superscripts in  $Q_n(I, \lambda)$  and  $R(\mathbf{q})$  when  $\mathcal{C}$  is the Veronese curve.

We split  $Q_n^f(I, \lambda)$  into subsets  $Q_n^f(I, \lambda, k)$  where  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and

$$Q_n^f(I, \lambda, k) := \{\mathbf{q} \in Q_n^f(I, \lambda) : 2^k \leq \|\mathbf{q}\|_\infty < 2^{k+1}\}.$$

We also define

$$S_n^f(I, \lambda, k) := \bigcup_{\mathbf{q} \in Q_n^f(I, \lambda, k)} R^f(\mathbf{q}).$$

Notice that it is possible for  $S_n^f(I, \lambda, k)$  to contain points from outside  $I$ . On the other hand, every term  $R^f(\mathbf{q})$  in the union  $S_n^f(I, \lambda, k)$  has a non-empty intersection with  $I$ . Since their diameter tend to zero as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , any  $x \notin I$  can belong to at most finitely many sets  $S_n^f(I, \lambda, k)$ . Because of that and since each  $Q_n^f(I, \lambda, k)$  contains finitely many elements, we can write  $S_n^f(I, \lambda)$  as a limsup set:

$$S_n^f(I, \lambda) = \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} S_n^f(I, \lambda, k).$$

We further split the sets  $Q_n^f(I, \lambda, k)$  into smaller subsets. But before doing that, we need the following

**Lemma 1** *Let  $Q \in \mathbb{R}^+$ ,  $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  and  $x \in I$  be such that  $Q \leq \|\mathbf{q}\|_\infty < 2Q$  and*

$$\|q_0 \mathbf{f}(x) - \mathbf{q}^+\|_\infty \leq \|\mathbf{q}\|_\infty^{-\lambda}.$$

Then for all  $x_0 \in I \cap B(x, Q^{-\frac{1+\lambda}{2}})$  one has

$$\begin{cases} |q_0| \ll Q \\ |q_0 x_0 - q_1| \ll Q^{\frac{1-\lambda}{2}}; \\ |q_0(f_i(x_0) - x_0 f'_i(x_0)) + q_1 f'_i(x_0) - q_i| \ll Q^{-\lambda}, \quad 2 \leq i \leq n. \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

Here the implied constants only depend on the map  $\mathbf{f}$  and the interval  $I$ .

PROOF. The first two inequalities immediately follow from the relations between  $\mathbf{q}$  and  $Q$  and the inclusion  $x_0 \in B(x, Q^{-\frac{1+\lambda}{2}})$ . For the last set of inequalities we compute

$$\begin{aligned} Q^{-\lambda} &\gg |q_0 f_i(x) - q_i| = \left| q_0 \left( f_i(x_0) + (x - x_0) f'_i(x_0) + \frac{1}{2} (x - x_0)^2 f''_i(\xi) \right) - q_i \right| \\ &\geq |q_0(f_i(x_0) - x_0 f'_i(x_0)) + q_1 f'_i(x_0) - q_i| - |(q_1 - q_0 x) f'_i(x_0)| - \left| \frac{1}{2} q_0 (x - x_0)^2 f''_i(\xi) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

One can easily check that the last two terms are  $\ll Q^{-\lambda}$  and hence verify (10).  $\square$

Given  $x_0 \in I$  and  $Q \in \mathbb{R}^+$ , we denote the box of all  $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  that satisfy (10) by  $\Delta(x_0, Q)$ . An easy computation reveals

$$\text{Vol}(\Delta(x_0, Q)) \asymp Q^{1 + \frac{1-\lambda}{2} - (n-1)\lambda} = Q^{\frac{3-(2n-1)\lambda}{2}}.$$

Therefore for  $\lambda < \frac{3}{2n-1}$  this volume tends to infinity as  $Q \rightarrow \infty$ .

By Lemma 1, a neighbourhood of  $\mathbf{f}(x)$ ,  $x \in I$  can be split into the boxes  $\Delta(x_1, 2^k), \dots, \Delta(x_d, 2^k)$  where  $d \ll 2^{\frac{1+\lambda}{2}k}$  such that  $Q_n^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda, k)$  is contained in the union of sets  $Q_n^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda, k, m)$ ,  $1 \leq m \leq d$  such that

$$Q_n^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda, k, m) := \Delta(x_m, 2^k) \cap \mathbb{Z}^{n+1}.$$

Let  $\tau_1(m), \tau_2(m), \dots, \tau_{n+1}(m)$  be the successive minima of  $\Delta_m := \Delta(x_m, 2^k)$  on  $\mathbb{Z}^{n+1}$ . By Minkowski's second theorem, we know that

$$\tau_1(m) \tau_2(m) \cdots \tau_{n+1}(m) \asymp \frac{\text{Vol}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}/\mathbb{Z}^{n+1})}{\text{Vol} \Delta_m} \asymp 2^{\frac{(2n-1)\lambda-3}{2}k}. \quad (11)$$

We also know that if  $\tau_{n+1}(m) < 1$ , i.e.  $\Delta_m$  contains  $n+1$  linearly independent integer vectors, then

$$\#Q_n^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda, k, m) := \#(\Delta_m \cap \mathbb{Z}^{n+1}) \ll 2^{\frac{3-(2n-1)\lambda}{2}k}. \quad (12)$$

By  $\#^*Q_n^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda, k, m)$  we denote the number of primitive points in  $Q_n^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda, k, m)$ , i.e. points  $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n+1}$  such that  $q_0 > 0$  and  $\gcd(q_0, q_1, \dots, q_n) = 1$ . We split the set  $Q_n^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda, k)$  into two subsets  $Q_{n,1}^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda, k)$  and  $Q_{n,2}^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda, k)$  where

$$Q_{n,1}^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda, k) := \{\mathbf{q} \in Q_n^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda, k) : \exists m \in \mathbb{N}, \mathbf{q} \in Q_n^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda, k, m) \text{ s.t. } \#^*Q_n^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda, k, m) \ll 2^{\frac{3-(2n-1)\lambda}{2}k}\}$$

and  $Q_{n,2}^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda, k)$  consists of all the remaining vectors  $\mathbf{q}$  from  $Q_n^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda, k)$ . We call the corresponding sets  $Q_n^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda, k, m)$  that contain more than  $2^{\frac{3-(2n-1)\lambda}{2}k}$  primitive integer points the sets of type two.

Respectively, we split  $S_n^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda)$  into the subsets  $S_{n,i}^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda)$ ,  $i \in \{1, 2\}$  where

$$S_{n,i}^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda) = \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} S_{n,i}^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda, k) := \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \bigcup_{\mathbf{q} \in Q_{n,i}^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda, k)} R^{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{q}).$$



**Lemma 2** *One has*

$$\dim(S_{n,1}^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda)) \leq \frac{2 - (n-1)\lambda}{1 + \lambda}.$$

PROOF. We consider the natural cover of the set  $S_{n,1}^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda)$  by  $R^{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{q})$  where  $\mathbf{q} \in Q_{n,1}^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda, k)$  for  $k \geq K_0$  sufficiently large. In view of  $\text{diam } \mathbf{R}^{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{q}) \ll \|\mathbf{q}\|_{\infty}^{1-\lambda}$ , we get that the value of the corresponding Hausdorff  $s$ -sum tends to zero as  $K_0 \rightarrow \infty$  as soon as the series

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in Q_{n,1}^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda, k)} 2^{-(1+\lambda)sk}$$

converges.

Notice that the number of boxes  $\Delta_j$  that correspond to each  $Q_{n,1}^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda, k)$  is bounded from above by  $\ll 2^{\frac{1+\lambda}{2}k}$  and the number of elements  $\mathbf{q}$  inside each  $\Delta_j$  is  $\ll 2^{\frac{3-(2n-1)\lambda}{2}k}$ . In total, we get the series

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^{\left(\frac{1+\lambda}{2} + \frac{3-(2n-1)\lambda}{2} - (1+\lambda)s\right)k}$$

This series converges as soon as

$$\frac{1 + \lambda}{2} + \frac{3 - (2n - 1)\lambda}{2} - (1 + \lambda)s < 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad s > \frac{2 - (n - 1)\lambda}{1 + \lambda}.$$

□

Now we focus on the sets  $Q_{n,2}^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda, k)$ . Consider the set  $Q_n^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda, k, m)$  of type 2. By (12), we then must have  $\tau_{n+1}(m) > 1$ , i.e. this set belongs to a proper subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ . By the height of a rational subspace  $\mathcal{S}$  we define the volume of the fundamental domain of the lattice  $\mathcal{S} \cap \mathbb{Z}^{n+1}$ . In other words, if the lattice  $\mathcal{S}$  is generated by  $\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_d$  then  $H(\mathcal{S}) := \|\mathbf{v}_1 \wedge \mathbf{v}_2 \wedge \dots \wedge \mathbf{v}_d\|_2$ . We refer the reader to [18, Chapter 1, §5] for more details about this notion.

**Lemma 3** *Let  $Q_n^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda, k, m)$  be of type two. Suppose that the dimension of  $\text{span}(Q_n^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda, k, m))$  is  $d$ . Then*

$$H(\text{span}(Q_n^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda, k, m))) \ll 2^{(n-d+1)\lambda k}.$$

Moreover, if  $\tau_{n+1}(m) = 2^{\delta k}$  then  $\text{span}(Q_n^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda, k, m))$  belongs to an  $n$ -dimensional rational subspace of height  $\ll 2^{(\lambda-\delta)k}$ .

PROOF. Since  $Q_n^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda, k, m)$  is of type two, we must have at least one of the successive minima  $\tau_i(m)$  bigger than 1. Suppose  $d$  of them are at most 1 ( $d < n+1$ ), i.e.  $\tau_1(m) \leq \dots \leq \tau_d(m) \leq 1 < \tau_{d+1}(m) \leq \dots \leq \tau_{n+1}(m)$ . Obviously,  $d > 1$  because otherwise all integer points  $\mathbf{q} \in Q_n^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda, k, m)$  are scalar multiples of one point  $\mathbf{q}_0$  and therefore  $Q_n^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda, k, m)$  is not of type 2. Denote by  $\mathbf{v}_i$  the shortest vector that corresponds to the successive minimum  $\tau_i(m)$ . Then  $Q_n^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda, k, m)$  lies in a  $d$ -dimensional rational subspace which contains the lattice with generators  $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_d$ .

From Minkowski's second theorem we get that  $\tau_1(m) \cdots \tau_d(m) \ll 2^{\frac{(2n-1)\lambda-3}{2}k}$ . We also have

$$\text{Vol}(\text{span}(Q_n^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda, k, m)) \cap \Delta_m) \ll 2^k \cdot 2^{\frac{1-\lambda}{2}k} \cdot 2^{-(d-2)\lambda k} = 2^{\frac{3-(2d-3)\lambda}{2}k}.$$

Therefore

$$\left\| \bigwedge_{i=1}^d \mathbf{v}_i \right\|_2 \ll \prod_{i=1}^d \tau_i(m) \cdot \text{Vol}(\text{span}(Q_n^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda, k, m)) \cap \Delta_m) \ll 2^{(n-d+1)\lambda k}.$$

To get the second statement of the lemma, we consider the span of  $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n$  and notice that

$$\tau_1(m) \cdots \tau_n(m) \asymp 2^{\left(\frac{(2n-1)\lambda-3}{2}-\delta\right)k}.$$

Then proceeding as above, we get  $\|\mathbf{v}_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \mathbf{v}_n\|_2 \ll 2^{(\lambda-\delta)k}$ . Finally, the observation that the span( $Q_n^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda, k, m)$ ) belongs to the span of  $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n$  finishes the proof.  $\square$

Given the box  $\Delta_m$ , denote by  $\delta(m)$  the value that satisfies  $\tau_{n+1}(m) = 2^{\delta(m)k}$ . Note that for the boxes  $Q_n^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda, k, m)$  of type two,  $\delta(m) > 0$ .

**Lemma 4** *The number of points in  $\Delta_m \cap \mathbb{Z}^{n+1}$  satisfies*

$$\#(\Delta_m \cap \mathbb{Z}^{n+1}) \ll 2^{\left(\frac{3-(2n-1)\lambda}{2}+(n-1)\delta(m)\right)k}$$

PROOF. We estimate the number of integer points in  $\Delta_m \cap \mathbb{Z}^{n+1}$  as

$$\#(\Delta_m \cap \mathbb{Z}^{n+1}) \asymp \prod_{\tau_i(m) < 1} \tau_i^{-1}(m) \stackrel{(11)}{\asymp} 2^{\frac{3-(2n-1)\lambda}{2}k} \prod_{\tau_i(m) \geq 1} \tau_i(m).$$

To finish the proof, we notice that there are at most  $n-1$  successive minima  $\tau_i(m)$  which are at least 1 and that for all  $1 \leq i \leq n+1$ ,  $\tau_i(m) \leq \tau_{n+1}(m)$ .  $\square$

Denote by  $\mathcal{P}(m)$  a hyperplane of the smallest possible height that contains all integer points from  $\Delta_m$  and denote its equation by  $\mathbf{a}(m) \cdot \mathbf{x} = 0$ . Let  $\sigma(m)$  be such that  $H(\mathcal{P}(m)) = 2^{(\lambda-\sigma(m))k}$ . Lemma 3 tells us that  $\sigma(m) \geq \delta(m)$ , however in some cases it can be made substantially bigger. For a fixed  $\sigma > 0$ , denote by  $Q_{n,2}^{\mathbf{f},\sigma}(I, \lambda, k)$  the set of  $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n+1}$  from all the boxes  $Q_n^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda, k, m)$  of type 2 such that  $\sigma(m) \geq \sigma$ . Also define

$$S_{n,2}^{\mathbf{f},\sigma}(I, \lambda) = \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} S_{n,2}^{\mathbf{f},\sigma}(I, \lambda, k) := \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \bigcup_{\mathbf{q} \in Q_{n,2}^{\mathbf{f},\sigma}(I, \lambda, k)} R^{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{q}).$$

**Proposition 2** *Suppose that for any rational hyperplane  $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ ,  $\dim((1, \mathbf{f}(I)) \cap \mathcal{H}) = 0$ . Then*

$$\dim S_{n,2}^{\mathbf{f},\sigma}(I, \lambda) \leq \dim D_n^{\mathbf{f}} \left( I, \frac{1+\lambda}{\lambda-\sigma} - 1 \right).$$

PROOF. We proceed as in the proof of Theorem 1. By definition, all points  $\mathbf{q} \in Q_n^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda, k, m)$  for  $m$  such that  $Q_n^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda, k, m) \subset Q_{n,2}^{\mathbf{f},\sigma}(I, \lambda, k)$ , lie on a hyperplane  $\mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{x} = 0$  with  $\|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty \ll 2^{(\lambda-\sigma)k} \asymp \|\mathbf{q}\|_\infty^{\lambda-\sigma}$ . Then by analogy with the inequality (6), for any  $\mathbf{q} \in Q_n^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda, k, m)$  and any  $x \in R^{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{q})$  we get

$$|\mathbf{a} \cdot (1, \mathbf{f}(x))| \ll \|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty^{1-\frac{1+\lambda}{\lambda-\sigma}}. \quad (13)$$

Now consider  $x \in S_{n,2}^{\mathbf{f},\sigma}(I, \lambda)$ . We have shown that such  $x$  must satisfy (13) infinitely often. By removing the set of the Hausdorff dimension zero, we make sure that (13) is satisfied for

infinitely many distinct vectors  $\mathbf{a}$ . That implies that  $S_{n,2}^{\mathbf{f},\sigma}(I, \lambda) \subset D_n^{\mathbf{f}}\left(I, \frac{1+\lambda}{\lambda-\sigma} - 1\right)$  and the proposition follows immediately.  $\square$

Set  $\sigma_0 = \frac{2(n\lambda-1)}{n+1}$ . Assuming that  $\dim D_n^{\mathbf{f}}(I, w) \leq \frac{n+1}{w+1}$ , which is the case for the Veronese curve, Proposition 2 implies

$$\dim S_{n,2}^{\mathbf{f},\sigma_0}(I, \lambda) \leq \frac{2 - (n-1)\lambda}{1 + \lambda}.$$

We say that the box  $Q_n^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda, k, m)$  is of type 3 if it is of type 2 and satisfies  $\sigma(m) < \sigma_0$ . Analogously as for  $S_{n,2}^{\mathbf{f},\sigma}(I, \lambda)$ , we define the set  $S_{n,3}^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda)$  as the set of  $x \in I$  that lie in  $R^{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{q})$  for infinitely many  $\mathbf{q}$  from the boxes of type 3.

For a given box  $\Delta_m$  consider  $\eta \geq 0$  such that there exists a smaller box inside  $\Delta_m$  defined by the inequalities

$$\Delta^*(x, 2^k) := \left\{ \mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : \begin{array}{l} |q_0| \ll 2^k; \\ |q_0x - q_1| \ll 2^{(\frac{1-\lambda}{2}-\eta)k}; \\ |q_0(f_i(x) - xf'_i(x)) + q_1f'_i(x) - q_i| \ll 2^{-\lambda k} \end{array} \right\}$$

which contains all integer points of  $\Delta_m$ . By  $\eta^*(m)$  we define the supremum of  $\eta$  with this property. Here the implied constants in the inequalities are the same as in (10). Then the same computations as in Lemma 3 imply

$$\|\mathbf{a}\|_{\infty} \ll 2^{(\lambda-\eta^*(m)-\delta(m))k}. \quad (14)$$

In particular, for boxes of type 3 we must have  $\eta^*(m) + \delta(m) \leq \sigma_0$ .

**Lemma 5** *Suppose that  $Q_n^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda, k, m)$  is of type 3. Then there exists an interval  $J = J(m) \subset B(x_m, 2^{-\frac{1+\lambda}{2}k})$  such that*

$$|J| \asymp 2^{(-\frac{1+\lambda}{2}-\eta^*(m))k}. \quad (15)$$

and that for all  $x \in J$ ,

$$|\mathbf{a}(m) \cdot (1, \mathbf{f}(x))| \ll \|\mathbf{a}(m)\|_{\infty} 2^{-(1+\lambda)k}. \quad (16)$$

Moreover, for all  $\mathbf{q} \in Q_n^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda, k, m)$  we have  $R^{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{q}) \subset J$ .

This lemma tells us that for boxes  $Q_n^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda, k, m)$  of type 3 we must have a linear form which takes very small values on unusually long intervals. Such a phenomenon is usually quite rare so the next idea will be to provide an upper bound for the number of its occurrences.

**PROOF.** By the definition of type 2 (and hence type 3) box, there exists  $\mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{P}(m) \cap \Delta_m$  with  $q_0 \geq 2^{k-1}$ . Also by definition of  $\eta^*(m)$ , taking  $x = q_1/q_0$ , there exist two points  $\pm \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}(m) \cap \Delta_m$  such that  $|u_0x - u_1| \gg 2^{(\frac{1-\lambda}{2}-\eta^*(m))k}$ . Since  $\mathcal{P}(m) \cap \Delta_m$  is convex, the whole triangle with vertices  $-\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{q}$  belongs to  $\mathcal{P}(m) \cap \Delta_m$ . Next, at least one of the midpoints  $\mathbf{p}$  of the segments  $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{q}$  and  $-\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{q}$  satisfy  $p_0 \geq 2^{k-2}$ . Fix that midpoint  $\mathbf{p}$  and consider the intersection of the triangle  $-\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{q}$  with the hyperplane given by the equation  $x_0 = p_0$  and call the resulting segment by  $S$ . Let  $T$  be a triangle with one of the sides  $S$  and the opposite vertex  $\mathbf{q}$ .

Consider

$$J := \left\{ \frac{x_1}{x_0} : \mathbf{x} \in T \right\}.$$

Since  $T$  is a connected set,  $J$  is an interval. By construction, we have  $x \in J$ ,  $p_1/p_0 \in J$  and  $|p_0x - p_1| \gg 2^{(\frac{1-\lambda}{2}-\eta^*(m))k}$ . Since  $p_0 \geq 2^k$ , the length of  $J$  is bounded from below by (15). It

is also not hard to check that all  $y = x_1/x_0 \in J$  satisfy  $|x_0 f_i(y) - x_i| \ll 2^{-\lambda k}$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Finally, by construction of  $T$ ,  $\mathbf{x} \in T$  implies  $\mathbf{a}(m) \cdot \mathbf{x} = 0$ , therefore

$$|x_0(\mathbf{a} \cdot (1, \mathbf{f}(y)))| = |a_1(x_0 f_1(y) - x_1) + a_2(x_0 f_2(y) - x_2) + \dots + a_n(x_0 f_n(y) - x_n)| \ll \|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty 2^{-\lambda k},$$

where  $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{a}(m) = (a_0, a_1, \dots, a_n)$ . Dividing by  $x_0 \gg 2^k$  gives (16).

If needed, we extend the interval  $J$  so that it contains all neighbourhoods  $R^{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{q})$  for  $\mathbf{q} \in Q_n^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda, k, m)$ . By the definition of  $\eta^*(m)$ , we have  $|J| \ll 2^{(-\frac{1+\lambda}{2} - \eta^*(m))k}$  and hence  $|J|$  is bounded from above by (15) as well.  $\square$

Denote by  $J^{\mathbf{f}}(m)$  the largest interval that contains  $J$  from Lemma 5 such that for all  $x \in J^{\mathbf{f}}(m)$ , the inequality (16) is satisfied with the same implied constant. Define  $\eta(m)$  from the equation

$$|J^{\mathbf{f}}(m)| = 2^{(-\frac{1+\lambda}{2} - \eta(m))k}.$$

From Lemma 5 and construction of boxes of type 3, we get that  $\eta(m) \leq \eta^*(m) \leq \sigma_0 - \delta(m)$ . On the other hand,  $\eta(m)$  may be negative. In that case we have several consecutive boxes  $Q_n^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda, k, m)$  that share the same hyperplane  $\mathcal{P}(m)$ . The number of such boxes is bounded from above by  $\ll 2^{-\eta(m)k}$ .

Let  $\epsilon > 0$  be an arbitrarily small but fixed value. Consider all intervals  $J^{\mathbf{f}}(m)$  that correspond to boxes  $Q_n^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda, k, m)$  of type 3. Group them into families  $L_n^{\mathbf{f}, \eta}(I, \lambda, k)$ , where  $\eta$  takes the values  $-M\epsilon, -(M-1)\epsilon, \dots, 0, \epsilon, \dots, N\epsilon$ , such that for every interval  $J^{\mathbf{f}}(m)$  in  $L_n^{\mathbf{f}, \eta}(I, \lambda, k)$ , its corresponding value  $\eta(m)$  satisfies  $\eta - \epsilon < \eta(m) \leq \eta$ . Then we can write the set  $S_{n,3}^{\mathbf{f}, \eta}(I, \lambda)$  as the union of the subsets  $S_{n,3}^{\mathbf{f}, \eta}(I, \lambda)$  where each  $x \in S_{n,3}^{\mathbf{f}, \eta}(I, \lambda)$  belongs to intervals from  $L_n^{\mathbf{f}, \eta}(I, \lambda, k)$  for infinitely many values  $k$ .

Notice that  $\eta(m) \leq \sigma_0$  therefore we can take  $N = \sigma_0 \epsilon^{-1}$ . On the other hand, we surely have  $|J(m)| \leq |I| \asymp 1$  therefore  $\eta(m) \geq -\frac{1+\lambda}{2}$  and we can take  $M = \frac{1+\lambda}{2\epsilon}$ . We conclude that the number of families  $L_n^{\mathbf{f}, \eta}(I, \lambda, k)$  is bounded from above by a value which is independent of  $k$ .

Let  $c_1, c_2, c_3 > 0$  be some arbitrary but fixed constants which may only depend on  $I$  and  $\mathbf{f}$  but not on  $k$ . Denote by  $A_n^{\mathbf{f}, \eta}(I, \lambda, k)$  the set of integer vectors  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n+1}$  such that  $\|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty \leq c_1 2^{(\lambda - \eta + \epsilon)k}$  for  $\eta > 0$  and  $\|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty \leq c_1 2^{\lambda k}$  for  $\eta \leq 0$  and there exists an interval  $J \subset I$  that satisfies the following conditions:

- For all  $x \in J$ ,  $|\mathbf{a} \cdot (1, \mathbf{f}(x))| \leq c_2 \|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty 2^{-(1+\lambda)k}$ ;
- $|J| \geq c_3 2^{-(\frac{1+\lambda}{2} + \eta)k}$ ;
- $J$  can not be extended to the interval of length  $c_3 2^{-(\frac{1+\lambda}{2} + \eta - \epsilon)k}$  so that the first property from this list is satisfied.

For a given  $\mathbf{a} \in A_n^{\mathbf{f}, \eta}(I, \lambda, k)$ , we denote the correspondent interval by  $J^{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{a}, k)$ . Next, define  $J_n^{\mathbf{f}, \eta}(I, \lambda, k) := \{J^{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{a}, k) : \mathbf{a} \in A_n^{\mathbf{f}, \eta}(I, \lambda, k)\}$ . Finally, denote by  $D_n^{\mathbf{f}, \eta}(I, \lambda)$  the following limsup set:

$$D_n^{\mathbf{f}, \eta}(I, \lambda) = \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} D_n^{\mathbf{f}, \eta}(I, \lambda, k) := \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \bigcup_{J \in J_n^{\mathbf{f}, \eta}(I, \lambda, k)} J.$$

If  $c_1, c_2, c_3$  in the inequalities for  $\|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty$ ,  $|\mathbf{a} \cdot (1, \mathbf{f}(x))|$  and  $|J|$  are the same as the implied constants in (14), (15), (16) respectively then Lemma 5 implies that  $S_{n,3}^{\mathbf{f}, \eta}(I, \lambda) \subset D_n^{\mathbf{f}, \eta}(I, \lambda)$ . In the coming sections we will compute an upper bound for  $\#A_n^{\mathbf{f}, \eta}(I, \lambda, k)$ . In particular, it

will provide an upper bound for the Hausdorff dimension of  $D_n^{\mathbf{f},\eta}(I, \lambda)$ . That bound will be the same for any triple  $c_1, c_2, c_3 > 0$ . Hence that will give us an upper bound for  $\dim S_{n,3}^{\mathbf{f},\eta}(I, \lambda)$ .

When proving Theorem 2 for  $n = 3$ , we further group the families  $L_n^{\mathbf{f},\eta}(I, \lambda, k)$  into sub-families  $L_n^{\mathbf{f},\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda, k)$ , where  $\delta$  takes values  $0, \epsilon, \dots, K\epsilon$ , such that the corresponding interval  $J^{\mathbf{f}}(m)$  in  $L_n^{\mathbf{f},\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda, k)$  satisfies  $\delta < \delta(m) \leq \delta + \epsilon$ . If several values of  $m$  share the same interval  $J^{\mathbf{f}}(m)$  (that is the case when  $\eta(m) < 0$ ), we ask that the maximum of all correspondent values  $\delta(m)$  lies between  $\delta$  and  $\delta + \epsilon$ . Since  $\delta(m) \leq \sigma_0$  we can take  $K = \sigma_0 \epsilon^{-1}$ . We also write the set  $S_{n,3}^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda)$  as the union of subsets  $S_{n,3}^{\mathbf{f},\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda)$  in the same way as before. Denote

$$A_n^{\mathbf{f},\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda, k) := \{\mathbf{a} \in A_n^{\mathbf{f},\eta}(I, \lambda, k) : \|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty \leq c_1 2^{(\lambda - \eta - \delta + \epsilon)k}\}.$$

Finally, for a given  $J \in L_n^{\mathbf{f},\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda, k)$  Lemma 4 implies that the number of rational points from  $\bigcup_m Q_n^{\mathbf{f}}(I, \lambda, k, m)$  such that  $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{q}) \in J$  is bounded from above by

$$\ll \begin{cases} 2^{\left(\frac{3-(2n-1)\lambda}{2} + (n-1)\delta + (n-1)\epsilon\right)k} & \text{if } \eta \geq 0, \\ 2^{\left(\frac{3-(2n-1)\lambda}{2} + (n-1)\delta - \eta + n\epsilon\right)k} & \text{if } \eta < 0. \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

## 4 Preliminary results for polynomials

Now we will focus on the Veronese curve, i.e.  $\mathbf{f} = (x, x^2, \dots, x^n)$ . The behaviour of rational points and linear forms near it is much better understood than for a generic curve. As was discussed before, for all the notions associated with this curve we omit the superscript  $\mathbf{f}$ .

We start by adapting the arguments of R. Baker [3, Lemma 4] to show that without loss of generality one can assume for all  $\mathbf{a} \in A_n^\eta(I, \lambda, k)$  (respectively for all  $\mathbf{a} \in A_n^{\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda, k)$ ) that  $\|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty = a_n$ .

Define

$$A_n^{*,\eta}(I, \lambda, k) := \{\mathbf{a} \in A_n^\eta(I, \lambda, k) : \|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty = a_n\}$$

The set  $A_n^{*,\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda, k)$  is defined similarly. Let  $J_n^{*,\eta}(I, \lambda, k)$  be the corresponding subset of  $J_n^\eta(I, \lambda, k)$  and  $D_n^{*,\eta}(I, \lambda)$  be the corresponding limsup set.

**Lemma 6** *Suppose that for any interval  $I$  such that  $\mathbf{dist}(I, 0) \gg 1$ , and any  $c_1, c_2, c_3 > 0$  one has  $\dim D_n^{*,\eta}(I, \lambda) \leq d$ . Then  $\dim D_n^\eta(I, \lambda) \leq d$ .*

*If there exists a function  $a(\lambda, k, \eta)$  such that  $\#A_n^{*,\eta}(I, \lambda, k) \ll_{I, c_1, c_2, c_3} a(\lambda, k, \eta)$  then we also have  $\#A_n^\eta(I, \lambda, k) \ll_{I, c_1, c_2, c_3} a(\lambda, k, \eta)$ . Analogously, if there exists a function  $a(\lambda, k, \eta, \delta)$  such that  $\#A_n^{*,\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda, k) \ll_{I, c_1, c_2, c_3} a(\lambda, k, \eta, \delta)$  then  $\#A_n^{\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda, k) \ll_{I, c_1, c_2, c_3} a(\lambda, k, \eta, \delta)$ .*

**PROOF.** Consider  $\mathbf{a} \in A_n^\eta(I, \lambda, k)$  and the corresponding interval  $J = J(\mathbf{a}, k)$ . Then  $\mathbf{a} \cdot (1, \mathbf{f}(x))$  is a polynomial  $P_{\mathbf{a}}(x)$ . By [2, Lemma 1], there exists  $j \in \{0, \dots, n\}$  such that  $P_{\mathbf{a}}(j) \asymp \|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty$ . Consider  $Q(x) := P_{\mathbf{a}}(x + j)$ . Notice that  $H(Q) \asymp \|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty$  and  $Q(y) \ll H(Q) \cdot 2^{-(1+\lambda)k}$  for all  $y \in J - j := \{x - j : x \in J\}$ . On the other hand, we have that  $|Q(0)| \asymp H(Q)$  therefore  $\mathbf{dist}(J - j, 0) \gg 1$  for  $k$  large enough. Finally, notice that  $|J - j| = |J|$ .

Now consider  $C = (n + 1)^{n+3} 2^n \asymp 1$  and let  $R(x) = (Cx)^n Q((Cx)^{-1})$ . As shown in [3, Lemma 4],  $H(R)$  equals the leading coefficient of  $R$ . We also have  $H(R) \asymp \|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty$  and

$$R(z) \ll H(R) 2^{-(1+\lambda)k} \quad \text{for all } z = \frac{1}{Cy} \in \frac{1}{C(J - j)} := \left\{ \frac{1}{C(x - j)} : x \in J \right\}.$$

By construction, we also have that  $\mathbf{dist}(1/(C(J - j)), 0) \gg 1$  and  $|1/(C(J - j))| \asymp |J|$ . We conclude that the coefficient vector  $\mathbf{b}$  of  $R(x)$  belongs to  $A_n^{*,\eta}(1/(C(J - j)), \lambda, k)$  where the

constants  $c_1^*, c_2^*, c_3^*$  arising from the definition of  $A_n^{*,\eta}$  satisfy  $c_1^* \asymp c_1$ ,  $c_2^* \asymp c_2$  and  $c_3^* \asymp c_3$ . From here we immediately have

$$\#A_n^\eta(I, \lambda, k) \ll \sum_{i=0}^n \#A_n^{*,\eta}(1/(C(J-j)), \lambda, k) \ll_{I, c_1, c_2, c_3} a(\lambda, k, \eta, \delta).$$

The bound for  $\#A_n^{\eta, \delta}(I, \lambda, k)$  is achieved analogously.

Let  $x \in D_n^\eta(I, \lambda)$ . Then there exists  $j \in \{0, \dots, n\}$  which corresponds to infinitely many vectors  $\mathbf{a} \in A_n^\eta(I, \lambda)$  such that  $x \in J(\mathbf{a}, k)$ . That in turn implies that  $1/(C(x-j)) \in D_n^{*,\eta}(1/(C(I-j)), \lambda)$ .

Define  $f_j(z) := (Cz)^{-1} + j$ . We get that

$$D_n^\eta(I, \lambda) \subset \bigcup_{j=0}^n f_j(D_n^{*,\eta}(1/C(I-j), \lambda)).$$

Then the statement of the lemma immediately follows.  $\square$

For the rest of the paper we will be dealing with sets  $A_n^{*,\eta}(I, \lambda, k)$ ,  $A_n^{*,\eta, \delta}(I, \lambda, k)$  and  $D_n^{*,\eta}(I, \lambda)$ . However, for the sake of convenience we will omit the stars in their notations. That is, we now state that for any  $\mathbf{a} \in A_n^\eta(I, \lambda)$  the product  $\mathbf{a} \cdot (1, \mathbf{f}(x))$  is a polynomial  $P_{\mathbf{a}}(x) = a_n x^n + \dots + a_1 x + a_0$  such that  $H(P_{\mathbf{a}}) = a_n$ . To shorten the notation, we set  $Q := 2^k$ . Then for all  $\mathbf{a} \in A_n^\eta(I, \lambda, k)$  we can write

$$\|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty = a_n \ll \begin{cases} Q^{\lambda - \eta + \epsilon} & \text{if } \eta \geq 0, \\ Q^\lambda & \text{if } \eta < 0, \end{cases}$$

$$|P_{\mathbf{a}}(x)| \ll a_n Q^{-1-\lambda}, \quad \forall x \in J(\mathbf{a}, k) \quad (18)$$

and

$$|J(\mathbf{a}, k)| \gg Q^{-\frac{1+\lambda}{2} - \eta}. \quad (19)$$

Notice that  $P_{\mathbf{a}}$  has exactly  $n$  roots (counting multiplicities)  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$ . Since the leading coefficient of  $P_{\mathbf{a}}$  has the largest absolute value, it is well known that all of them satisfy  $|x_i| \ll 1$ . We will also use the fact that the discriminant of the polynomial

$$D(P) := a_n^{2n-2} \prod_{i \neq j} (x_i - x_j)^2$$

is an integer number. For a given  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , we order the roots  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$  in such a way that

$$|x - x_1| \leq |x - x_2| \leq \dots \leq |x - x_n|.$$

We also denote  $|x - x_i| =: Q^{-\kappa_i} = Q^{-\kappa_i(x)}$  and  $|x_i - x_j| =: Q^{-\mu_{i,j}}$ . Notice that for  $i < j$ ,  $Q^{-\mu_{i,j}} \leq 2Q^{-\kappa_j}$ . We will write  $\alpha \lesssim \beta$ ,  $\alpha \approx \beta$  and  $\alpha \gtrsim \beta$  if  $Q^\alpha \ll Q^\beta$ ,  $Q^\alpha \asymp Q^\beta$  and  $Q^\alpha \gg Q^\beta$  respectively. Then with this notation we have  $\mu_{i,j} \gtrsim 0$ ,  $\mu_{i,j} \gtrsim \kappa_j$ .

**Lemma 7** *Suppose that for a given polynomial  $P_{\mathbf{a}}$  with  $\|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty = a_n$  there exists  $w \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $w > 0$  and  $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $-\frac{w}{2} < \eta < \frac{w}{2}$  and the interval  $J$  of length  $|J| \gg Q^{-\frac{w}{2} - \eta}$  such that  $\forall x \in J$ ,  $P_{\mathbf{a}}(x) < a_n Q^{-w}$ . Then the discriminant of  $P_{\mathbf{a}}$  satisfies*

$$D(P_{\mathbf{a}}) \ll a_n^{2n-2} Q^{-w+2\eta}. \quad (20)$$

PROOF. Fix a point  $x_0 \in J$  and consider any  $x \in J$ . We get

$$P_{\mathbf{a}}(x) = P_{\mathbf{a}}(x_0) + (x - x_0)P'_{\mathbf{a}}(x_0) + \dots + \frac{1}{n!}(x - x_0)^n P_{\mathbf{a}}^{(n)}(x_0).$$

Let  $y_1, y_2, \dots, y_{n+1} \in J$  be such that  $y_2 - y_1 = \dots = y_{n+1} - y_n$ ,  $y_1$  and  $y_{n+1}$  are the endpoints of  $J$ . That immediately implies  $|y_{i+1} - y_i| = |J|/n \asymp |J|$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Also denote  $b_i = \frac{P_{\mathbf{a}}^{(i)}(x_0)}{i!}$ . Then the values  $b_i$  are the solutions of the following matrix equation

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & y_1 - x_0 & (y_1 - x_0)^2 & \cdots & (y_1 - x_0)^n \\ 1 & y_2 - x_0 & (y_2 - x_0)^2 & \cdots & (y_2 - x_0)^n \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & y_{n+1} - x_0 & \cdots & \cdots & (y_{n+1} - x_0)^n \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} b_0 \\ b_1 \\ \vdots \\ b_n \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} P_{\mathbf{a}}(y_1) \\ P_{\mathbf{a}}(y_2) \\ \vdots \\ P_{\mathbf{a}}(y_{n+1}) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Notice that on the left hand side we have a Vandermonde matrix. Let's call it  $V$ . Since  $|y_j - y_i| \gg Q^{-\frac{w}{2} - \eta}$  for all  $1 \leq i < j \leq n + 1$ , its determinant is

$$\det V \gg \left( Q^{-\frac{w}{2} - \eta} \right)^{\frac{n(n+1)}{2}}.$$

Then Cramer's rule gives for  $2 \leq i \leq n$

$$|P_{\mathbf{a}}(x_0)| \asymp |b_0| \ll a_n Q^{-w}; \quad |P'_{\mathbf{a}}(x_0)| \asymp |b_1| \ll a_n Q^{-\frac{w}{2} + \eta}; \quad |P_{\mathbf{a}}^{(i)}(x_0)| \ll a_n Q^{-\frac{2-i}{2}w + i\eta}. \quad (21)$$

Let  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$  be the roots of  $P_{\mathbf{a}}$  such that  $|x_1 - x_0| \leq |x_2 - x_0| \leq \dots \leq |x_n - x_0|$ . Notice that for all  $x$  in the segment between  $x_1$  and  $x_0$  and all  $2 \leq i \leq n$  we get  $|x - x_i| \ll |x_0 - x_i|$ . Together with (21), that implies

$$a_n Q^{-\frac{w}{2} + \eta} \gg |P'_{\mathbf{a}}(x_0)| \gg |P'_{\mathbf{a}}(x_1)| = a_n |(x_1 - x_2) \cdots (x_1 - x_n)|.$$

Therefore  $\mu_{12} + \mu_{13} + \dots + \mu_{1n} \gtrsim \frac{w}{2} - \eta$ . Taking into account that for all other values  $\mu_{ij}$  we have  $\mu_{ij} \gtrsim 0$ , we end up with

$$D(P_{\mathbf{a}}) = a_n^{2n-2} Q^{-\sum_{i \neq j} 2\mu_{ij}} \ll a_n^{2n-2} Q^{-w+2\eta}.$$

⊠

Applied to vectors  $\mathbf{a} \in A_n^\eta(I, \lambda, k)$ , Lemma 7 immediately implies that

$$D(P_{\mathbf{a}}) \ll a_n^{2n-2} Q^{-1-\lambda+2\eta} \ll \begin{cases} a_n^{2n-2-\frac{1+\lambda-2\eta}{\lambda-\eta+\epsilon}} & \text{if } \eta > 0, \\ a_n^{2n-2-\frac{1+\lambda-2\eta}{\lambda}} & \text{if } \eta \leq 0. \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

The next step is to find an upper bound for the cardinality  $\#A_n^\eta(I, \lambda, k)$ . As the inequality (22) suggests, it will follow from an upper bound for the number of polynomials of bounded degree and discriminant. It is well known that polynomials of a given degree  $n$  come in equivalence classes where  $P \approx Q$  if there exists a Möbius transform  $\mu(x) = \frac{ax+b}{cx+d}$  with the determinant  $ad - bc = \pm 1$  such that  $Q(x) = (cx + d)^n P \circ \mu(x)$ . It is also well known that all the polynomials in the same equivalence class share the same discriminant. Therefore one can first estimate the number of equivalence classes which share a given discriminant and then the number of representatives of bounded height in a given equivalence class and finally sum over discriminants up to a given bound.

## 5 Polynomials from the same equivalence class

In this section we investigate how do the coefficients of equivalent polynomials link with each other. In principle, to prove the main result we only need a part of Proposition 4 but we find the machinery of propagating rational points near the Veronese curve interesting enough on its own. Therefore here we provide more details than actually required.

Consider

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in M_{2,2}(\mathbb{Z}).$$

We construct a map  $\phi_n : M_{2,2}(\mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow M_{n+1,n+1}(\mathbb{Z})$  in the following way:  $\phi_n(B) = A = (\alpha_{i,j})_{0 \leq i,j \leq n}$  where the entry  $\alpha_{i,j}$  equals the coefficient at  $x^j$  of the polynomial  $(ax+b)^i(cx+d)^{n-i}$ . The formula for  $\alpha_{ij}$  is then

$$\alpha_{ij} = \sum_{h=0}^n \binom{i}{h} \binom{n-i}{j-h} a^h b^{i-h} c^{j-h} d^{n-i-j+h}, \quad (23)$$

where we set all binomial coefficients  $\binom{n}{m}$  equal zero for  $m < 0$  or  $m > n$ . If one of the terms  $a, b, c, d$  equals zero then we still set the corresponding terms in the sum to be zero where  $a, b, c$  or  $d$  is taken to the negative power.

The important property of this map is the following

**Proposition 3**  $\phi_n$  is a monoid homomorphism from  $M_{2,2}(\mathbb{Z})$  to  $M_{n+1,n+1}(\mathbb{Z})$ . Restricted to  $SL_2(\mathbb{Z})$ , it is also a group homomorphism from  $SL_2(\mathbb{Z})$  to  $SL_{n+1}(\mathbb{Z})$ .

PROOF. Let

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}, \quad C_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad C_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad C_3 = \begin{pmatrix} e & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Consider the entry  $(i, j)$  of  $\phi_n(BC_1)$ . By (23), it equals

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{h=0}^n \binom{i}{h} \binom{n-i}{j-h} (a+b)^h b^{i-h} (c+d)^{j-h} d^{n-i-j+h}, \\ &= \sum_{h=0}^n \binom{i}{h} \binom{n-i}{j-h} \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{h}{k} a^k b^{i-k} \sum_{r=0}^n \binom{j-h}{r-k} c^{r-k} d^{n-i-r+k} \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^n a^k b^{i-k} \sum_{h=0}^n \sum_{r=0}^n \binom{i}{h} \binom{n-i}{j-h} \binom{h}{k} \binom{j-h}{r-k} c^{r-k} d^{n-i-r+k} \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{i}{k} a^k b^{i-k} \sum_{r=0}^n \binom{n-i}{r-k} \sum_{h=0}^n \binom{i-k}{h-k} \binom{n-i-r+k}{j-h-r+k} c^{r-k} d^{n-i-r+k} \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{i}{k} a^k b^{i-k} \sum_{r=0}^n \binom{n-i}{r-k} \binom{n-r}{j-r} c^{r-k} d^{n-i-r+k}. \end{aligned}$$

For the last two equalities we use the following relations between binomial coefficients, that can be easily verified:  $\binom{i}{h} \binom{h}{k} = \binom{i}{k} \binom{i-k}{h-k}$  and

$$\sum_{h=0}^{m+n} \binom{m}{h} \binom{n}{a-h} = \binom{m+n}{a}.$$



Next, a direct computation gives that the entry  $(i, j)$  of  $\phi_n(C_1)$  equals  $\binom{n-i}{j-i}$ . Therefore the entry  $(i, j)$  of  $\phi_n(B)\phi_n(C_1)$  is

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{r=0}^n \sum_{h=0}^n \binom{i}{h} \binom{n-i}{r-h} a^h b^{i-h} c^{r-h} d^{n-i-r+h} \cdot \binom{n-r}{j-r} \\ &= \sum_{h=0}^n \binom{i}{h} a^h b^{i-h} \sum_{r=0}^n \binom{n-i}{r-h} \binom{n-r}{j-r} c^{r-h} d^{n-i-r+h}. \end{aligned}$$

We verify that all the entries of  $\phi_n(BC_1)$  and  $\phi_n(B)\phi_n(C_1)$  are the same, thus  $\phi_n(BC_1) = \phi_n(B)\phi_n(C_1)$ . Next, one can easily verify that  $Id_{n+1} = \phi_n(Id_2)$ . For  $B = C_1^{-1}$  we then get that  $Id_{n+1} = \phi_n(Id_2) = \phi_n(C_1^{-1})\phi_n(C_1)$  which immediately implies  $\phi_n(C_1^{-1}) = \phi_n(C_1)^{-1}$  and  $\phi_n(BC_1^{-1}) = \phi_n(B)\phi_n(C_1^{-1})$ .

The verification of  $\phi_n(BC_2) = \phi_n(B)\phi_n(C_2)$  is straightforward. Since  $SL_2(\mathbb{Z})$  is generated by matrices  $C_1$  and  $C_2$ , we immediately derive that  $\phi_n$  is a homomorphism from  $SL_2(\mathbb{Z})$  to  $SL_{n+1}(\mathbb{Z})$ .

The monoid  $M_{n+1, n+1}(\mathbb{Z})$  is generated by matrices  $C_1, C_2$  and  $C_3$  with arbitrary  $e$ . The equation  $\phi_n(BC_3) = \phi_n(B)\phi_n(C_3)$  is also rather straightforward and then the first statement of the proposition follows.  $\square$

**Lemma 8** *Let  $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n+1}$  be a good rational approximation to  $\mathbf{f}(\xi) := (\xi, \xi^2, \dots, \xi^n)$ . Then  $\mathbf{q} := \phi_n \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{p}$  is a good rational approximation to  $\mathbf{f} \left( \frac{a\xi+b}{c\xi+d} \right)$ . More precisely, if*

$$\max_{i \leq 1 \leq n} |p_0 \xi^i - p_i| \leq p_0^{-\lambda}$$

then

$$\|q_0\| \ll |c\xi + d|^n p_0 + \|B\|^n p_0^{-\lambda} \quad \text{and} \quad \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left| q_0 \left( \frac{a\xi + b}{c\xi + d} \right)^i - q_i \right| \ll \|B\|^n p_0^{-\lambda}.$$

PROOF. We are given that  $p_0 \xi^i - p_i =: \delta_i$  with  $|\delta_i| \ll p_0^{-\lambda}$ . Therefore  $\mathbf{p} = p_0 \boldsymbol{\xi} + \boldsymbol{\delta}$  where  $\boldsymbol{\xi} = (1, \xi, \dots, \xi^n)$  and  $\|\boldsymbol{\delta}\| \ll p_0^{-\lambda}$ . By the construction of  $\phi_n$  we have

$$\phi_n \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} p_0 \boldsymbol{\xi} = \begin{pmatrix} p_0 (c\xi + d)^n \\ p_0 (c\xi + d)^{n-1} (a\xi + b) \\ \dots \dots \dots \\ p_0 (a\xi + b)^n \end{pmatrix} =: \mathbf{q}^*$$

and  $q_0^* \left( \frac{a\xi+b}{c\xi+d} \right)^i - q_i^* = 0$ . Let  $\mathbf{q} = \phi_n(B)\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{q}^* + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$  where  $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} = \phi(B)\boldsymbol{\delta}$ . Then

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left| q_0 \left( \frac{a\xi + b}{c\xi + d} \right)^i - q_i \right| = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left| \epsilon_0 \left( \frac{a\xi + b}{c\xi + d} \right)^i - \epsilon_i \right| \ll \|B\|^n \|\boldsymbol{\delta}\|_\infty \ll \|B\|^n p_0^{-\lambda}.$$

Now we estimate  $q_0$ :  $|q_0| \ll |p_0 (c\xi + d)^n| + \|B\|^n \|\boldsymbol{\delta}\|_\infty \ll |c\xi + d|^n p_0 + \|B\|^n p_0^{-\lambda}$ .  $\square$

From the last Lemma we see that smaller the expression  $(c\xi + d)$  in terms of  $\|B\|$  is, closer the point  $\phi_n(B)\mathbf{p}$  to the Veronese curve is. In particular, if  $-d/c$  is a convergent to  $\xi$  and  $\|B\| \asymp |c| \ll p_0^{\frac{1+\lambda}{2n}}$  then we have

$$q_0 \ll p_0 \|B\|^{-n}, \quad \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left| q_0 \left( \frac{a\xi + b}{c\xi + d} \right)^i - q_i \right| \ll \|B\|^{(1-\lambda)n} q_0^{-\lambda}.$$

Another simple application of the above lemma is the following

**Corollary 1** *For any  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{Z}$  with  $ad \neq bc$ , one has*

$$\lambda_n(\xi) = \lambda_n \left( \frac{a\xi + b}{c\xi + d} \right).^2$$

While this corollary is not deep, the author did not see it anywhere in the literature.

As the next step, we investigate what happens with linear subspaces under the map  $\phi_n$ . Let  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Z}^{h+1}$ . Consider a subspace  $L_{\mathbf{a}} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  defined by the equations (7).

**Proposition 4** *Let  $B$  be an invertible matrix in  $M_{2,2}(\mathbb{Z})$ . Then we have the following equation*

$$\phi_n(B)L_{\mathbf{a}} = L_{(\phi_h(B^{-1}))^T \mathbf{a}}. \quad (24)$$

PROOF. Since  $B$  is invertible, by Proposition 3 we get that  $\phi_n(B)$  is also an invertible matrix. Therefore  $\phi_n(B)L_{\mathbf{a}}$  is a linear subspace of the same dimension as  $L_{\mathbf{a}}$ , i.e. its dimension is  $h$ .

We extend the Veronese curve  $\mathcal{V}_n$  to the complex space  $\mathbb{C}^n$ . We also convert  $\mathbb{C}^{n+1}$  to a projective space and embed it in  $\mathbb{C}^n$  in the standard way:

$$\tau(\mathbf{x}) := \left( \frac{x_1}{x_0}, \frac{x_2}{x_0}, \dots, \frac{x_n}{x_0} \right).$$

Then there are exactly  $h$  points of intersection of  $\mathcal{V}_n$  with  $\tau(L_{\mathbf{a}})$ , counting multiplicities. They are all of the form  $\mathbf{f}(\xi)$ , where  $\xi$  are roots of the polynomial  $P_{\mathbf{a}}(x) := a_0 + a_1x + \dots + a_hx^h$ .

Denote  $\boldsymbol{\xi} := (1, \xi, \dots, \xi^n)^T$ . Notice that

$$\phi_n(B)\boldsymbol{\xi} = ((c\xi + d)^n, (c\xi + d)^{n-1}(a\xi + b), \dots, (a\xi + b)^n),$$

therefore  $\tau(\phi_n(B)\boldsymbol{\xi}) = \mathbf{f}(\eta)$ , where  $\eta = \frac{a\xi + b}{c\xi + d}$ . We get that  $\mathcal{V}_n$  intersects  $\tau(\phi_n(B)L_{\mathbf{a}})$  at at least  $h$  points  $\mathbf{f}(\eta)$ , counting multiplicities. On the other hand, there is an  $h$ -dimensional subspace  $L_{\mathbf{b}}$  such that  $\tau(L_{\mathbf{b}})$  intersects  $\mathcal{V}_n$  at the same points. It corresponds to a polynomial  $P_{\mathbf{b}}(x)$  whose roots are  $\eta$ .

Finally, we compute  $\mathbf{b}$ . We need to have

$$\sum_{i=0}^h b_i (a\xi + b)^i (c\xi + d)^{h-i} = 0.$$

By expanding the brackets and collecting terms at each power of  $\xi$ , we get the following system of linear equations

$$(\phi_h(B))^T \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{a} \iff \mathbf{b} = (\phi_h(B)^{-1})^T \mathbf{a} = (\phi_h(B^{-1}))^T \mathbf{a}.$$

---

<sup>2</sup>If the reader is familiar with the notion of the uniform Diophantine exponent  $\hat{\lambda}_n(\xi)$  they can also verify the corollary for it as well.

□

One of the important outcomes of the above proof is that if  $\xi$  is a root of the polynomial  $P_{\mathbf{a}}$  of degree  $n$  then  $\frac{a\xi+b}{c\xi+d}$  is a root of the polynomial  $P_{\phi_n(B^{-1})\tau_{\mathbf{a}}}$ . In the case  $\det B = ad-bc = \pm 1$ , this expression can be slightly simplified:  $P_{\phi_n(B^*)\tau_{\mathbf{a}}}$ , where  $B^* := \begin{pmatrix} d & -b \\ -c & a \end{pmatrix}$ .

## 6 Counting polynomials with bounded height and discriminant

Now we focus on the case  $n = 3$ . For a given polynomial  $P(x) = c_0 + c_1x + c_2x^2 + c_3x^3$  we introduce the following height:

$$H_d(P) := \max\{|c_2|, |c_3|, |c_1c_2|^{1/2}, |c_0c_2^3|^{1/4}, |c_0c_3|^{1/2}, |c_1^3c_3|^{1/4}, |c_0c_1c_2c_3|^{1/4}\}.$$

Let  $x$  be any root of  $P$ . If either  $|c_3|$  or  $|c_2|$  has the largest absolute value among all the coefficients of  $P$  then we use Cauchy's inequality to get  $|x| \ll H_d(P)/|c_3|$ . If  $|c_1|$  has the largest absolute value then we compute

$$\left|\frac{c_0}{c_3}\right|^{1/3} \leq \left|\frac{c_1}{c_3}\right|^{1/3} < \left|\frac{c_1}{c_3}\right|^{1/2} < \frac{|c_1^3c_3|^{1/4}}{|c_3|} \leq \frac{H_d(P)}{|c_3|}.$$

Finally, if  $|c_0|$  has the maximal absolute value then

$$\max\left\{\left|\frac{c_0}{c_3}\right|^{1/3}, \left|\frac{c_1}{c_3}\right|^{1/2}\right\} \leq \left|\frac{c_0}{c_3}\right|^{1/2} = \frac{|c_0c_3|^{1/2}}{|c_3|} \leq \frac{H_d(P)}{|c_3|}.$$

In the last two cases we use Lagrange-Zassenhaus inequality [20, Lecture VI, Lemma 5] to compute the upper bound

$$|x| \leq 2 \max\left\{\left|\frac{c_2}{c_3}\right|, \left|\frac{c_1}{c_3}\right|^{1/2}, \left|\frac{c_0}{c_3}\right|^{1/3}\right\} \ll \frac{H_d(P)}{|c_3|}.$$

We conclude that in all cases one has

$$|x| \ll \frac{H_d(P)}{|c_3|}. \tag{25}$$

By examining the formula for  $D(P) = c_1^2c_2^2 - 4c_0^3c_2 - 4c_1c_3^3 - 27c_0^2c_3^2 + 18c_0c_1c_2c_3$ , one verifies that  $D(P) \ll H_d^4(P)$ .

For a fixed  $\mathbf{a}$  we consider all polynomials  $P$  that are equivalent to  $P_{\mathbf{a}}$ , i.e. all polynomials whose roots are  $\mu_B(\xi)$  where  $\xi$  are the roots of  $P_{\mathbf{a}}$  and  $\mu_B(x) = \frac{cx+d}{ax+b}$ ,  $\det B = \pm 1$ . Denote by  $R_{\mathbf{a}}$  the polynomial in this equivalence class of the minimal possible height  $H_d$ .

**Lemma 9** *Suppose that the discriminant of  $P_{\mathbf{a}}$  is not zero. Then there exists an absolute constant  $\epsilon > 0$  such that the distance between any two roots  $x_1, x_2$  of  $R_{\mathbf{a}}$  is bigger than  $\epsilon$ .*

PROOF. Let  $x_1, x_2, x_3$  be the roots of  $R_{\mathbf{a}}$  and  $c_0, c_1, c_2, c_3$  be its coefficients. Suppose the contrary:  $|x_1 - x_2| < \epsilon$  for some small enough  $\epsilon > 0$ . If at least one of  $x_1, x_2$  is real then without loss of generality we can assume that  $x_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ . Otherwise,  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  are conjugates to each other. Notice that by Lagrange's bound on the roots,  $|x_3 - x_1| < \frac{H_d(R_{\mathbf{a}})}{|c_3|}$ .

By Proposition 4, the polynomial  $Q = (c - ax)^3 R_{\mathbf{a}} \circ \mu_B^{-1}$  with roots  $\mu_B(x_1), \mu_B(x_2)$  and  $\mu_B(x_3)$  has coefficients

$$\begin{aligned} c_0(\mu) &= c^3 c_0 - c^2 d c_1 + c d^2 c_2 - d^3 c_3, \\ c_1(\mu) &= -3ac^2 c_0 + (2acd + bc^2)c_1 - (2bcd + ad^2)c_2 + 3bd^2 c_3, \\ c_2(\mu) &= 3a^2 c c_0 - (2abc + a^2 d)c_1 + (2abd + b^2 c)c_2 - 3b^2 d c_3, \\ c_3(\mu) &= -a^3 c_0 + a^2 b c_1 - ab^2 c_2 + b^3 c_3. \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

let  $-b/a$  be the convergent of  $\text{Re}(x_1)$  where  $a$  is the largest possible denominator that satisfies  $a \leq \epsilon^{-1/2}$ . Then  $|x_1 + b/a| \leq 2\epsilon^{1/2} a^{-1}$  which in turn implies  $|x_2 + b/a| \ll \epsilon^{1/2} a^{-1}$ . Next, we have  $\epsilon^{1/2} a^{-1} < 1 \leq \frac{H_d(R_{\mathbf{a}})}{|c_3|}$  and therefore

$$|R'_{\mathbf{a}}(-b/a)| \ll |c_3| \epsilon^{1/2} a^{-1} (|x_3 + b/a| + \epsilon^{1/2} a^{-1}) \stackrel{(25)}{\ll} \epsilon^{1/2} a^{-1} H_d(R_{\mathbf{a}}).$$

Let  $-d/c$  be the previous convergent of  $\text{Re}(x_1)$  before  $-b/a$ . The same calculations as before lead to

$$\left| x_1 + \frac{d}{c} \right| \leq (ac)^{-1}, \quad \left| x_2 + \frac{d}{c} \right| \ll (ac)^{-1}, \quad |R'_{\mathbf{a}}(-d/c)| \ll (ac)^{-1} H_d(R_{\mathbf{a}}).$$

Now we are ready to estimate the coefficients of  $Q$ :

$$\begin{aligned} |c_3(\mu)| &= a^3 |c_3| \left| \frac{b}{a} + x_1 \right| \left| \frac{b}{a} + x_2 \right| \left| \frac{b}{a} + x_3 \right| \ll a \epsilon H_d(R_{\mathbf{a}}) < \epsilon^{1/2} H_d(R_{\mathbf{a}}); \\ |c_2(\mu)| &= \left| -3a^2 c R_{\mathbf{a}} \left( -\frac{b}{a} \right) + (ad - bc) a R'_{\mathbf{a}} \left( -\frac{b}{a} \right) \right| \ll \epsilon^{1/2} H_d(R_{\mathbf{a}}). \end{aligned}$$

Analogous computations for the other two coefficients give  $|c_1(\mu)| \ll H_d(R_{\mathbf{a}})$  and  $|c_0(\mu)| \ll H_d(R_{\mathbf{a}})$ . Finally, straightforward computations verify that  $H_d(Q) \ll \epsilon^{1/8} H_d(R_{\mathbf{a}})$ . But that contradicts the choice of  $R_{\mathbf{a}}$  for  $\epsilon$  small enough.  $\square$

Without loss of generality suppose that the distance between  $x_2$  and  $x_3$  is the largest among the distances between three roots  $x_1, x_2, x_3$  or  $R_{\mathbf{a}}$ . Then at least one of the other distances will be larger than  $\frac{1}{2}|x_2 - x_3|$ . Without loss of generality, let the shortest distance between this numbers be  $|x_1 - x_2| \asymp 2^d$ ,  $d \geq 0$ . More exactly, if  $|x_1 - x_2| < 1$  we define  $d = 0$ . Otherwise let  $d$  be such that  $2^d \leq |x_1 - x_2| < 2^{d+1}$ . Then Lemma 9 implies that

$$|D(R_{\mathbf{a}})| \gg 2^{2d} |c_3(x_2 - x_3)|^4. \tag{27}$$

The same inequality is obviously true for all other pairs of roots  $x_i$  and  $x_j$ ,  $i \neq j$ ,  $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ .

**Proposition 5** *For any  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists a constant  $c = c(\epsilon)$  such that for any cubic polynomial  $P_{\mathbf{a}}$ , the cardinality  $N(P_{\mathbf{a}}, H)$  of the set*

$$\{P \in \mathbb{Z}[x] : P \approx P_{\mathbf{a}}, \quad H(P) \leq H\}$$

*satisfies*

$$N(P_{\mathbf{a}}, H) \leq c H^{2/3+\epsilon} |D(P_{\mathbf{a}})|^{-1/6}. \tag{28}$$

**Remark.** Notice that here we do not impose any restrictions on  $P_{\mathbf{a}}$ . In particular, it can be reducible. If  $D(P_{\mathbf{a}}) = 0$  then the upper bound in (28) becomes infinity, i.e. in this case the proposition is trivial.

PROOF. Let  $R_{\mathbf{a}} = c_0 + c_1x + c_2x^2 + c_3x^3$  be the polynomial with the minimal height  $H_d$  among all polynomials in the equivalence class of  $P_{\mathbf{a}}$ . Let  $x_1, x_2, x_3$  be its roots. Then Lemma 9 implies that  $|x_i - x_j| \gg 1$ , for all  $i \neq j; i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ . In particular, we have  $|D(P_{\mathbf{a}})| = |D(R_{\mathbf{a}})| \gg |c_3|^4$ . The aim is to compute an upper bound for the number of Möbius transforms  $\mu$  such that  $H((c - ax)^3 R_{\mathbf{a}} \circ \mu) \leq H$ .

Notice that there are only finitely many Möbius transforms  $\mu_B$  with  $\det B = \det \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} = \pm 1$  such that  $|a| \geq |c|$  and  $|b| < |d|$ . Also, Möbius transforms come in pairs  $\mu_B$  and  $\mu_{\tilde{B}}$  where  $\tilde{B} = \begin{pmatrix} c & d \\ a & b \end{pmatrix}$ . Therefore without loss of generality we may assume that  $\mu(x) = \frac{cx+d}{ax+b}$  where  $|a| \geq |c|$  and  $|b| \geq |d|$ . Then for each pair  $a, b$  there exist at most 4 Möbius transforms with all the required properties and fixed entries  $a, b$ . Therefore it is sufficient to compute an upper bound for the number of pairs  $a, b$  that may lead to a polynomial  $P$  with  $H(P) \leq H$ . Denote the set of such pairs by  $M(P_{\mathbf{a}}, H) = M$ .

Given  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $Q \in \mathbb{R}^+$  and  $0 \leq t < 2$ , recall that the number  $N(Q, t)$  of pairs  $a, b$  such that  $|a| \leq Q, |ax - b| < a^{1-t}$  satisfies

$$N(Q, t) \ll Q^{2-t},$$

while for  $t = 2$ ,  $N(Q, t) \ll \log Q$ . Indeed, for  $t = 2$ , all such solutions  $b/a$  come from convergents or semiconvergents of  $x$ . While for  $t < 2$  one notices that the distance between two solutions of the inequality  $|b_1/a_1 - b_2/a_2|$  is at least  $1/Q^2$ . Hence the number of such solutions with  $Q/2 \leq a$  is bounded from above by

$$2 \left( \frac{Q}{2} \right)^{-t} / Q^{-2} = 2^{1+t} Q^{2-t} \ll Q^{2-t}.$$

Iterating this process for  $Q/2, Q/4, \dots$  proves the claim.

Fix  $1 > \epsilon > 0$ ,  $2 \geq t \geq 0$  and consider the set  $S(t, \epsilon)$  of points  $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}^2$  such that

$$|a|^{-t-\epsilon} < \left| x_1 + \frac{b}{a} \right| \leq |a|^{-t}$$

for the closest root  $x_1$  of  $R_{\mathbf{a}}$  to  $-b/a$ . Since all the roots of  $R_{\mathbf{a}}$  are placed far apart from each other, we must have  $|x_j + b/a| \gg 1$ ,  $j \in \{2, 3\}$  for the other two roots. Then from (26) we compute

$$|c_3(\mu)| = |a^3 R_{\mathbf{a}}(-b/a)| \gg |a^3 c_3 (x_1 - x_2)(x_1 - x_3)(x_2 - x_3)| \cdot \frac{|x_1 + b/a|}{|x_2 - x_3|} \gg \left| \frac{a^{3-t-\epsilon} |D(P_{\mathbf{a}})|^{1/2}}{c_3(x_2 - x_3)} \right|.$$

Since we must have  $|c_3(\mu)| \leq H$ , this establishes an upper bound on the size  $|a|$ :

$$|a| \ll \left( \frac{H |c_3(x_2 - x_3)|}{|D(P_{\mathbf{a}})|^{1/2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{3-t-\epsilon}} \stackrel{(27)}{\ll} \left( \frac{H}{|2d/2 D(P_{\mathbf{a}})|^{1/4}} \right)^{\frac{1}{3-t-\epsilon}}. \quad (29)$$

Finally, we get that for  $t < 2$  the number of points  $(a, b)$  in  $S(t, \epsilon)$  that satisfy  $H((c - ax)^3 R_{\mathbf{a}} \circ \mu) \leq H$  is bounded from above by

$$a(t, \epsilon) \ll \left( \frac{H}{|D(P_{\mathbf{a}})|^{1/4}} \right)^{\frac{2-t}{3-t-\epsilon}} \ll H^{\frac{2}{3}+\epsilon_1} |D(P_{\mathbf{a}})|^{-1/6},$$

where  $\epsilon_1 = \frac{2}{3-\epsilon} - \frac{2}{3}$ .

Next, consider the set  $S(2, 1/2)$ . In this case, the values  $a$  are bounded from above by  $(H|D(P_{\mathbf{a}})|^{-1/4})^2$ . Hence the number of points  $(a, b)$  in this set that satisfy  $H((c - ax)^3 R_{\mathbf{a}} \circ \mu) \leq H$  is bounded from above by

$$a(2, 1/2) \ll \max \left\{ 1, \log \left( \frac{H}{|D(P_{\mathbf{a}})|^{1/4}} \right) \right\}.$$

Notice that for  $N(P_{\mathbf{a}}, H)$  to be nonzero, we must have  $H \gg |D(P_{\mathbf{a}})|^{1/4}$  because all the polynomials of height at most  $H$  have the discriminant at most  $54H^4$ . Under these conditions we have that  $a(2, 1/2) \ll H^{2/3} D(P_{\mathbf{a}})^{-1/6}$ .

Consider the pairs  $a, b$  such that

$$\left| x_1 + \frac{b}{a} \right| \leq |a|^{-5/2}.$$

From Roth's theorem we know that the number of such pairs  $a, b$  is finite. Moreover, [12, Theorem 1] gives the following upper bound for the number of such pairs:

$$a(5/2) \ll \log \log H \ll H^{2/3} D(P_{\mathbf{a}})^{-1/6}.$$

Denote the set of the pairs  $(a, b)$  with this property and such that  $H((c - ax)^3 R_{\mathbf{a}} \circ \mu) \leq H$  by  $S(5/2)$ .

The remaining pairs  $a, b$  satisfy  $|x_i + a/b| > 1$  for all  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ . Split them into subsets  $S_0(k)$  where every  $(a, b) \in S_0(k)$  satisfies

$$2^k \leq \left| x_i + \frac{b}{a} \right| < 2^{k+1}.$$

The number of pairs in this set with  $|a| < Q$  equals  $\asymp 2^k Q^2$ . First consider  $k \leq d$ . In this case the analogous inequality to (29) for  $a \in S_0(k) \cap M$  is

$$|a| \ll \left( \frac{H}{2^{k+d/2} |D(P_{\mathbf{a}})|^{1/4}} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}}.$$

This implies

$$\#(S_0(k) \cap M) \ll 2^{\frac{k-d}{3}} H^{\frac{2}{3}} |D(P_{\mathbf{a}})|^{-1/6}.$$

Next, let  $d < k \leq D$  where the largest distance between the roots  $x_1, x_2, x_3$  is  $\asymp 2^D$ . Then we have that  $|x_1 - x_2| \asymp 2^d$ ,  $|x_1 - x_3| \asymp |x_2 - x_3| \asymp 2^D$  and  $D(P_{\mathbf{a}}) \asymp c_3^4 2^{4D+2d}$ . If  $x_1$  or  $x_2$  is the closest root to  $-b/a$  then

$$|c_3(\mu)| \asymp |a^3 c_3 2^{2k+D}| \asymp |a^3 D(P_{\mathbf{a}})^{1/4} 2^{2k-d/2}|$$

and

$$|a| \ll \left( \frac{H}{2^{2k-d/2} |D(P_{\mathbf{a}})|^{1/4}} \right)^{1/3} \implies \#(S_0(k) \cap M) \ll 2^{\frac{d-k}{3}} H^{\frac{2}{3}} |D(P_{\mathbf{a}})|^{-1/6}.$$

If  $x_3$  is the closest root to  $-b/a$  then analogous computations give

$$|c_3(\mu)| \asymp |a^3 c_3 2^{2D+k}| \asymp |a^3 D(P_{\mathbf{a}})^{1/4} 2^{k+D-d/2}| \geq |a^3 D(P_{\mathbf{a}})^{1/4} 2^{2k-d/2}|$$

and the same bound for  $\#(S_0(k) \cap M)$  holds. Finally, for  $k > D$ ,  $|c_3(\mu)| \asymp |a^3 D(P_{\mathbf{a}})^{1/4} 2^{3k-D-d/2}| \geq |a^3 D(P_{\mathbf{a}})^{1/4} 2^{2k-d/2}|$  and hence we get the same inequality for  $\#(S_0(k) \cap M)$ .

To finish the proof of the proposition, we split the interval  $[0, 2]$  into  $N$  subintervals of equal length  $\epsilon$ . Then we split the set  $M(P_{\mathbf{a}}, H)$  into subsets

$$\bigcup_{i=0}^N (S(i\epsilon, \epsilon) \cap M) \bigcup (S(2, 1/2) \cap M) \bigcup (S(5/2) \cap M) \bigcup_{k=0}^{\infty} (S_0(k) \cap M).$$

By the estimates from above, the total number of points in this union is bounded from above by

$$3 \left( N + 2 + 2 \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^{-k/3} \right) H^{\frac{2}{3} + \epsilon_1} D(P_{\mathbf{a}})^{-1/6}.$$

Here  $\epsilon_1$  can be taken arbitrary small and  $N = 2\epsilon^{-1}$ .

□

Note that Proposition 5 strengthens the result [13] of Davenport from 1961, where he got  $N(P_{\mathbf{a}}, H) \ll HD(P_{\mathbf{a}})^{-1/4}$  for irreducible polynomials  $P_{\mathbf{a}}$ . Now we are ready to prove Theorem 4.

PROOF OF THEOREM 4. Let  $h(d)$  be the number of equivalence classes of cubic polynomials that share the discriminant  $d \neq 0$ . For convenience of notation we set  $h(0) = 0$ . Davenport [11] showed that

$$\sum_{d=-D}^D h(d) \asymp D.$$

By Proposition 5, for any given polynomial  $P$  of discriminant  $d$  we have at most  $c(\epsilon)H^{\frac{2}{3} + \epsilon}d^{-1/6}$  polynomials that are equivalent to  $P$  and have the height at most  $H$ . Summing over all such polynomials, we get that

$$N(H, D) \leq cH^{\frac{2}{3} + \epsilon} \sum_{d=-D}^D h(d)d^{-\frac{1}{6}}.$$

Using Abel's summation formula finishes the proof.

□

## 7 Theorems 2 and 3 for $n = 3$

Now we are ready to compute an upper bound for  $\dim S_{3,3}^{\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda)$ . We split the set  $A_3^{\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda, k)$  into two subsets:  $A_3^{1,\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda, k)$  consists of all vectors  $\mathbf{a} \in A_3^{\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda, k)$  such that  $D(P_{\mathbf{a}}) \neq 0$ .  $A_3^{2,\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda, k)$  in turn consists of all remaining elements of  $A_3^{\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda, k)$ . Then the sets  $J_3^{\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda, k)$  and  $S_3^{\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda)$  also split into two subsets  $J_3^{1,\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda, k)$ ,  $J_3^{2,\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda, k)$  and  $S_{3,3}^{1,\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda)$ ,  $S_{3,3}^{2,\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda)$  respectively.

We first focus on the set  $S_{3,3}^{1,\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda)$ . Assume that  $\eta \geq 0$ . By definition, we have that all  $\mathbf{a} \in A_3^{\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda, k)$  satisfy  $H(P_{\mathbf{a}}) \ll H = Q^{\lambda - \eta - \delta + \epsilon}$ . On top of that, (22) implies  $D(P_{\mathbf{a}}) \ll H(P_{\mathbf{a}})^4 Q^{-1 - \lambda + 2\eta}$ . Then by Theorem 4 the number of such polynomials and therefore  $\#A_3^{1,\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda, k)$  is bounded from above by

$$H^{\frac{2}{3} + \epsilon} \cdot (H^4 Q^{-1 - \lambda + 2\eta})^{\frac{5}{6}} = H^{4 + \epsilon} Q^{-\frac{5}{6}(1 + \lambda - 2\eta)}. \quad (30)$$

Recall that  $Q = 2^k$ ,  $H = Q^{\lambda-\eta-\delta+\epsilon} = 2^{(\lambda-\eta-\delta+\epsilon)k}$ . Then one can easily check that the notion (30), as a function of  $\eta$ , maximises at  $\eta = 0$  and equals  $Q^{\frac{19\lambda-5}{6}-4\delta+\epsilon_1}$  where  $\epsilon_1 \rightarrow 0$  as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ .

On the other hand, there is also a natural upper bound  $Q^{\frac{1+\lambda}{2}}$  for  $\#A_3^{1,\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda, k)$  (basically, it is the range for variable  $m$  in sets  $Q_3(I, \lambda, k, m)$ ). One can easily check that this bound is smaller than (30) for

$$\delta < \frac{2\lambda - 1}{3} + \frac{\epsilon_1}{4}.$$

Recall that for any  $J \in L_3^{\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda, k)$  the number of rational points  $\mathbf{q}$  from the union of all type 3 sets  $Q_3(I, \lambda, k, m)$  such that  $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{a}) \subset J$  is bounded from above by (17). Let

$$Q_3^{\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda, k) := \{\mathbf{q} \in Q_3(I, \lambda, k) : \exists J \in L_3^{1,\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda, k) \text{ s.t. } \mathbf{R}(\mathbf{q}) \in J\}.$$

Then we have

$$S_{3,3}^{1,\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda) = \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \bigcup_{\mathbf{q} \in Q_3^{\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda, k)} \mathbf{R}(\mathbf{q}).$$

Then the Hausdorff  $s$ -series that corresponds to the standard cover of this limsup set is

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^{(\frac{19\lambda-5}{6}-4\delta+\epsilon_1)k + (\frac{3-5\lambda}{2}+2\delta+2\epsilon)k - (1+\lambda)ks} \quad \text{if } \delta \geq \frac{2\lambda-1}{3} + \frac{\epsilon_1}{4}$$

and

$$2^{\frac{1+\lambda}{2}k + (\frac{3-5\lambda}{2}+2\delta+2\epsilon)k - (1+\lambda)ks} \quad \text{if } \delta < \frac{2\lambda-1}{3} + \frac{\epsilon_1}{4}.$$

This series converges as soon as the degrees of each power of 2 are negative, i.e.

$$s > \begin{cases} \frac{\frac{2\lambda+2}{3} - 2\delta + \epsilon_2}{1 + \lambda} & \text{if } \delta \geq \frac{2\lambda-1}{3} + \frac{\epsilon_1}{4} \\ \frac{2 - 2\lambda + 2\delta + 2\epsilon}{1 + \lambda} & \text{if } \delta < \frac{2\lambda-1}{3} + \frac{\epsilon_1}{4}, \end{cases}$$

where  $\epsilon_2$  tends to zero as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ . Notice that the first expression, as a function of  $\delta$ , monotonically decreases, while the second one monotonically increases. We also observe that for  $\lambda < \frac{1}{2}$  the second case never happens, therefore the bound for  $s$  maximises when  $\delta = 0$  and we have, by letting  $\epsilon$  arbitrarily small, that  $\dim S_{3,3}^{1,\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda) \leq \frac{2}{3}$ . It is smaller than  $\frac{2-2\lambda}{1+\lambda}$  for  $\lambda \leq \frac{1}{2}$ .

For  $\lambda > \frac{1}{2}$ , the bound for  $s$  maximises when  $\delta = \frac{2\lambda-1}{3} + \frac{\epsilon_1}{4}$ . In this case we have

$$s > \frac{4 - 2\lambda}{3(1 + \lambda)} + \epsilon_2.$$

Finally, in this case we get that

$$\dim S_{3,3}^{1,\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda) \leq \frac{4 - 2\lambda}{3(1 + \lambda)}. \quad (31)$$

Consider the case  $\eta < 0$ . Then all  $\mathbf{a} \in A_3^{\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda, k)$  satisfy  $H(P_{\mathbf{a}}) \ll H = Q^{\lambda-\delta}$ . The cardinality of  $A_3^{1,\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda, k)$  still satisfies (30). Let  $J \in L_3^{1,\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda, k)$ . The number of values  $m$  such that  $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{q})$  can intersect an interval  $J$ , where  $\mathbf{q} \in Q_3(I, \lambda, k, m)$ , is bounded from



above by  $Q^{-\eta}$ . Therefore, the number of values of  $m$ , such that  $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{q})$  intersect with one of the intervals  $J \in L_3^{1,\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda, k)$  is bounded from above by

$$H^{4+\epsilon} Q^{-\frac{5}{6}(1+\lambda-2\eta)-\eta} \ll Q^{(\lambda-\delta)(4+\epsilon)-\frac{5}{6}(1+\lambda)+\frac{2}{3}\eta}$$

Notice that this bound monotonically increases with  $\eta$  therefore it maximises at  $\eta = 0$ . This case has already been investigated before and gives (31).

Consider the last case of  $S_{3,3}^{2,\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda)$ . For all vectors  $\mathbf{a} \in A_3^{2,\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda, k)$  the polynomials  $P_{\mathbf{a}}$  have zero discriminant which means that they are of the form  $P_{\mathbf{a}}(x) = (ax - b)^2(cx - d) =: P_1(x)^2 P_2(x)$  for some integer  $a, b, c, d$ .

If  $x \in J$  for some  $J \in J_3^{2,\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda, k)$  then (18) implies

$$|P_{\mathbf{a}}(x)| \ll \|\mathbf{a}\|_{\infty} Q^{-1-\lambda} \ll \|\mathbf{a}\|_{\infty}^{1-\frac{1+\lambda}{\lambda-\delta}}.$$

Since by the Gel'fond lemma we have  $H(P_{\mathbf{a}}) \asymp (H(P_1))^2 H(P_2)$  and  $|P_{\mathbf{a}}(x)| = |P_1(x)|^2 |P_2(x)|$ , there must be  $i \in \{1, 2\}$  such that

$$|P_i(x)| \ll H(P_i)^{1-\frac{1+\lambda}{\lambda-\delta}}. \quad (32)$$

If for some  $x \in D_3^{2,\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda)$  there exist infinitely many polynomials  $P$  that satisfy (32) then  $x \in D_1(I, \frac{1+\lambda}{\lambda-\delta} - 1)$ . Otherwise there must be infinitely many vectors  $\mathbf{a} \in A_3^{2,\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda)$  such that

$$P_{\mathbf{a}}(x) = (Q_{\mathbf{a}})^2 P(x) \quad \text{or} \quad P_{\mathbf{a}}(x) = P(x)^2 Q_{\mathbf{a}}(x)$$

where the polynomial  $P(x)$  is fixed and satisfies (32). In this case, by letting  $k$  in  $A_3^{2,\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda, k)$  to infinity, we get infinitely many polynomials  $Q_{\mathbf{a}}(x)$  that satisfy

$$Q_{\mathbf{a}}(x) < H(Q_{\mathbf{a}})^{1-\frac{1+\lambda}{\lambda-\delta}+\epsilon}.$$

where  $\epsilon$  can be made arbitrarily small. We conclude that in all cases,

$$D_3^{2,\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda) \subset D_1\left(I, \frac{1+\lambda}{\lambda-\delta} - 1 - \epsilon\right).$$

Finally, by Jarnik-Besicovich theorem,

$$\dim S_{3,3}^{2,\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda) \leq \dim D_3^{2,\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda) \leq \dim D_1\left(I, \frac{1+\lambda}{\lambda-\delta} - 1 - \epsilon\right) = \frac{2(\lambda-\delta)}{1+\lambda} + \epsilon_3,$$

where  $\epsilon_3 \rightarrow 0$  as  $\epsilon$  tends to zero. Since we can make  $\epsilon$  arbitrarily small, the Hausdorff dimension of  $S_{3,3}^{2,\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda)$  is not bigger than  $\frac{4-2\lambda}{3(1+\lambda)}$  for all  $\delta \geq \frac{4\lambda-2}{3}$ . Also notice that for  $\lambda \leq \frac{1}{2}$  this expression is smaller than  $\frac{2-2\lambda}{1+\lambda}$  hence we prove the last case of Theorem 2 for  $n = 3$ .

In the remaining part of this section we assume that  $\lambda > \frac{1}{2}$  and  $\delta \leq \sigma_1 := \frac{4\lambda-2}{3}$ . Consider  $J \in J_3^{2,\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda, k)$ . We must have either  $d/c \in J$  or  $b/a \in J$  where, as mentioned before,  $b/a$  and  $d/c$  are the zeroes of  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  respectively. Suppose first that  $d/c \in J$  but  $b/a \notin J$ . by examining the derivative  $P'_{\mathbf{a}}(x)$  we find that the largest value of  $|P_{\mathbf{a}}(x)|$  for  $x$  between  $b/a$  and  $c/d$  is for  $x_0 = \frac{b}{3a} + \frac{2d}{3c}$ , which does not belong to  $J$ . Since  $|x_0 - b/a| \asymp |d/c - b/a|$ , there exists  $x \in J$  such that

$$\left|x - \frac{d}{c}\right| \gg Q^{-\frac{1+\lambda}{2}-\eta} \quad \text{and} \quad \left|x - \frac{b}{a}\right| \asymp \left|\frac{d}{c} - \frac{b}{a}\right|.$$

We have  $|P_{\mathbf{a}}(x)| = H(P_{\mathbf{a}})|x - c/d||x - b/a|^2 < H(P_{\mathbf{a}})Q^{-1-\lambda}$  therefore the above bounds imply that

$$\left| \frac{b}{a} - \frac{d}{c} \right| \ll Q^{-\frac{1+\lambda-2\eta}{4}}. \quad (33)$$

Recall that  $H(P_{\mathbf{a}}) = a^2c$ . If  $c \leq H^{1/3}$ , where  $H$  is an upper bound for  $H(P_{\mathbf{a}})$ , then the number of fractions  $d/c \in J$  and hence the number of corresponding intervals  $J$  is bounded from above by  $\ll H^{2/3}$ . Now suppose the contrary  $c > H^{1/3}$ . Then we have  $a \leq (H/c)^{1/2} \leq H^{1/3}$ . For a fixed rational number  $b/a$ , the value of  $c$  can change from 1 to  $H/a^2$ . Therefore the number of fractions  $d/c$  that satisfy (33) is bounded from above by  $\ll \max\{1, H^2a^{-4}Q^{-\frac{1+\lambda-2\eta}{4}}\}$ . Summing over all rational fractions with denominator  $a$  and then over all  $a$ , we end up with the following bound for the number of interval  $J \in J_3^{2,\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda, k)$  which satisfy  $d/c \in J, b/a \notin J, c > H^{1/3}$ :

$$\sum_{a=1}^{H^{1/3}} \sum_b \max \left\{ 1, \frac{H^2}{a^4} Q^{-\frac{1+\lambda-2\eta}{4}} \right\} \ll H^{2/3} + H^2 Q^{-\frac{1+\lambda-2\eta}{4}}.$$

In the case when  $b/a \in J$  and  $d/c \in J$  we have either  $a \leq H^{1/3}$  or  $c \leq H^{1/3}$ , hence the number of such intervals  $J \in J_3^{2,\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda, k)$  is bounded from above by  $\ll H^{2/3}$ .

For the remaining intervals  $J \in J_3^{2,\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda, k)$  we have  $b/a \in J$  but  $d/c \notin J$ . If  $a \leq H^{1/3}$  then the number of corresponding intervals  $J$  is again  $\ll H^{2/3}$ . Hence assume that  $a > H^{1/3}$ . Since we have  $a^2 \leq H$  and the number of possible numerators  $b$  such that  $b/a \in I$  is  $\ll a$ , we have at most  $\ll H$  such intervals  $J$ . We also have that for  $|x - \frac{b}{a}| \leq Q^{-\frac{1+\lambda}{2}}$ ,  $|P_{\mathbf{a}}(x)| \leq HQ^{-1-\lambda}$  therefore in this case we must have  $\eta \leq 0$ . On the other hand, the bound (21) for  $x_0 = b/a$  gives

$$H^{-2/3} \leq \frac{a}{H} \leq \frac{1}{ac} \leq \left| \frac{d}{c} - \frac{b}{a} \right| \asymp \frac{|P_{\mathbf{a}}''(x_0)|}{H(P_{\mathbf{a}})} \ll Q^{2\eta}.$$

Since for  $\eta \leq 0$  one has  $H \ll Q^{\lambda-\delta}$ , we derive that  $\eta \gtrsim -\frac{\lambda-\delta}{3}$  or for large enough  $k$ ,  $\eta > -\frac{\lambda-\delta}{3} - \epsilon$ . If one does not impose any conditions on which of  $b/a, d/c$  belong to  $J$  then we can still get a lower bound for  $\eta$  but a weaker one. Indeed, for any  $x \in J$  inequalities (21) give

$$H(P_{\mathbf{a}}) \asymp P'''(x) \ll H(P_{\mathbf{a}})Q^{\frac{1+\lambda}{2}+3\eta},$$

therefore  $\eta \geq -\frac{1+\lambda}{6} - \epsilon$ .

We conclude that  $\#A_3^{2,\eta,\delta}$  is bounded from above by

$$H^{2/3} + H^2 Q^{-\frac{1}{4}(1+\lambda-2\eta)} + H \cdot \chi_{[-\frac{\lambda+\delta}{3}-\epsilon, 0]}(\eta), \quad (34)$$

where  $\chi_I(\eta)$  is the characteristic function of an interval  $I$ .

Now we proceed as in the case of  $S_{3,3}^{1,\eta,\delta}$ . For  $\eta \geq 0$  we have that (34) is maximised for  $\eta = 0$ . Then the Hausdorff  $s$ -series for the standard cover of  $S_{3,3}^{2,\eta,\delta}$  is

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left( 2^{\left(\frac{2}{3}(\lambda-\delta)\right)k} + 2^{\left(2\lambda-2\delta-\frac{1+\lambda}{4}\right)k} \right) 2^{\left(\frac{3-5\lambda}{2}+2\delta+2\epsilon\right)k-(1+\lambda)sk}.$$

This series converges as soon as

$$s > \max \left\{ \frac{9-11\lambda+8\delta}{6(1+\lambda)} + \epsilon_3, \frac{5-3\lambda}{4(1+\lambda)} + \epsilon_3 \right\} \stackrel{\delta \leq \sigma_1}{=} \max \left\{ \frac{11-\lambda}{18(1+\lambda)}, \frac{5-3\lambda}{4(1+\lambda)} \right\} + \epsilon_3.$$

Notice that both expressions in the maximum are smaller than  $\frac{4-2\lambda}{3(1+\lambda)}$  for  $\lambda < \frac{13}{11}$ , hence in this case we conclude

$$\dim S_{3,3}^{2,\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda) \leq \frac{4-2\lambda}{3(1+\lambda)}.$$

Now consider  $\eta < 0$ . Then the number of values of  $m$ , such that  $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{q})$ ,  $\mathbf{q} \in Q_3(I, \lambda, k, m)$  intersects with one of the intervals  $J \in L_3^{2,\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda, k)$  is bounded from above by

$$H^{2/3}Q^{-\eta} + H^2Q^{-\frac{1}{4}(1+\lambda-2\eta)-\eta} + HQ^{-\eta} \cdot \chi_{[-\frac{\lambda+\delta}{3}-\epsilon, 0]}(\eta).$$

This expression decreases with  $\eta$  hence it is maximised when  $\eta$  is the smallest possible, i.e.  $\eta = -\frac{1+\lambda}{6} - \epsilon$  for the first two terms and  $\eta = -\frac{\lambda+\delta}{3} - \epsilon$  for the last one. Then the Hausdorff  $s$ -series for  $S_{3,3}^{2,\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda)$  is

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left( 2^{\left(\frac{2}{3}(\lambda-\delta) + \frac{1+\lambda}{6} + \epsilon\right)k} + 2^{\left(2\lambda-2\delta - \frac{1+\lambda}{6} + \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right)k} + 2^{\left(\lambda-\delta + \frac{\lambda-\delta}{3} + \epsilon\right)k} \right) 2^{\left(\frac{3-5\lambda}{2} + 2\delta + 2\epsilon\right)k - (1+\lambda)sk}.$$

This series converges as soon as

$$s > \max \left\{ \frac{5-5\lambda+4\delta}{3(1+\lambda)} + \epsilon_4, \frac{4-2\lambda}{3(1+\lambda)} + \epsilon_4, \frac{9-7\lambda+4\delta}{6(1+\lambda)} + \epsilon_4 \right\}$$

$$\stackrel{\delta \leq \sigma_1}{=} \max \left\{ \frac{7+\lambda}{9(1+\lambda)}, \frac{4-2\lambda}{3(1+\lambda)}, \frac{19-5\lambda}{18(1+\lambda)} \right\} + \epsilon_4.$$

One can check that all terms in the maximum are at most  $\frac{4-2\lambda}{3(1+\lambda)}$  as soon as  $\lambda \leq \frac{5}{7}$ .

We now exhaust all of the cases. By letting  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ , we finally conclude that  $\dim S_{3,3}^{2,\eta,\delta}(I, \lambda) \leq \frac{4-2\lambda}{3(1+\lambda)}$ . This confirms Theorem 3.

## 8 Theorem 4 for arbitrary $n$ : dealing with resultants

Here we prove Theorem 4. Split the set  $A_n^\eta(I, \lambda, k)$  into two subsets:  $A_n^{1,\eta}(I, \lambda, k)$  consists of all  $\mathbf{a}$  such that  $P_{\mathbf{a}}$  is an irreducible polynomial of degree  $n$ ; and  $A_n^{2,\eta}(I, \lambda, k)$  consists of all remaining vectors. The sets  $J_n^\eta(I, \lambda, k)$  and  $D_n^\eta(I, \lambda)$  split into two corresponding subsets as well.

For all vectors  $\mathbf{a} \in A_n^{2,\eta}(I, \lambda, k)$  the polynomials  $P_{\mathbf{a}}$  can be written as  $P_{\mathbf{a}} = P_1P_2$  where  $\deg P_1$  and  $\deg P_2$  are at most  $n-1$ . Then proceeding in the same way as for polynomials with zero discriminant in the case  $n=3$ , we derive

$$D_n^{2,\eta}(I, \lambda) \subset D_{n-1} \left( I, \frac{1+\lambda}{\lambda} - 1 \right).$$

The Jarnik-Besicovich theorem then implies

$$\dim D_n^{2,\eta}(I, \lambda) \leq \frac{n\lambda}{1+\lambda}$$

which is smaller than  $\frac{2-(n-1)\lambda}{1+\lambda}$  for all  $\lambda \leq \frac{2}{2n-1}$ .

Consider now an arbitrary  $\mathbf{a} \in A_n^{1,\eta}(I, \lambda, k)$ . Recall that for  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  the values  $\kappa_i(x)$  are defined as  $|x - x_i| = Q^{-\kappa_i}$ , where  $x_i$  are the roots of  $P_{\mathbf{a}}$  and  $\kappa_1 \geq \kappa_2 \geq \dots \geq \kappa_n$ . Let  $x$  be the centre of the interval  $J(\mathbf{a}, k)$  and  $x_0$  be the real part of  $x_1$ . Notice that for all  $i \in \{2, \dots, n\}$  and  $y$  between  $x$  and  $x_0$  one has  $|y - x_i| \leq 2|x - x_i|$  and  $|y - x_1| \leq |x - x_1|$ . Therefore,

by increasing the upper bound (18) of  $|P_{\mathbf{a}}(x)|$  in the definition of  $A_n^\eta(I, \lambda, k)$  by an absolute constant, we can assume that  $x_0 \in J(\mathbf{a}, k)$ .

Split each set  $A_n^{1,\eta}(I, \lambda, k)$  into finitely many subsets  $A_n^\eta(I, \lambda, k, \boldsymbol{\kappa})$  where  $\boldsymbol{\kappa} = (\kappa_0, \dots, \kappa_n)$  such that one has

$$\kappa_i - \epsilon < \kappa_i(x_0) \leq \kappa_i.$$

If  $x_1$  is real, i.e.  $x_0 = x_1$  then for any  $2 \leq i \leq n$  one has  $|x_1 - x_i| = Q^{-\kappa_i(x_0)} \gg Q^{-\kappa_i}$ . The inequality (21) then implies

$$a_n Q^{-\frac{1+\lambda}{2} + \eta} \gg |P'_{\mathbf{a}}(x_1)| \gg a_n Q^{-\sum_{i=2}^n \kappa_i}$$

or in other words

$$\sum_{i=2}^n \kappa_i \gtrsim \frac{1+\lambda}{2} - \eta. \quad (35)$$

If  $x_1$  is not real, then  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  are complex conjugates and  $\kappa_1(x_0) = \kappa_2(x_0)$ , i.e. we must have  $\kappa_1 = \kappa_2$ . Then the inequalities

$$a_n Q^{-1-\lambda+2\eta} \gg |P_{\mathbf{a}}(x_0)| \gg a_n Q^{-\sum_{i=1}^n \kappa_i}$$

imply that

$$2\kappa_2 + \kappa_3 + \dots + \kappa_n \geq 1 + \lambda - 2\eta.$$

In view of the inequalities  $\kappa_i \gtrsim 0$ , (35) follows again.

Consider two vectors  $\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2 \in A_n^\eta(I, \lambda, k, \boldsymbol{\kappa})$ . We want to find a suitable lower bound for  $|x_0(\mathbf{a}_1) - x_0(\mathbf{a}_2)|$ . We call the corresponding roots of  $P_{\mathbf{a}_1}$  by  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  and set  $x_0 := x_0(\mathbf{a}_1)$ . Respectively, we call the corresponding roots of  $P_{\mathbf{a}_2}$  by  $y_1, \dots, y_2$  and set  $y_0 := x_0(\mathbf{a}_2)$ .

If  $|x_0 - y_0| = Q^{-\delta} \leq Q^{-\kappa_2 + \epsilon}$  then for all  $1 \leq i, j \leq n$  we get  $|x_i - y_j| \ll Q^{-\kappa_l + \epsilon}$  where  $l := \max\{2, i, j\}$ . This together with  $|x_i - y_j| \ll 1$  leads to

$$\prod_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} |x_i - y_j| \ll Q^{-4 \sum_{i=2}^n \kappa_i + 4n\epsilon}.$$

Now since  $P_{\mathbf{a}_1}$  and  $P_{\mathbf{a}_2}$  are distinct irreducible polynomials with integer coefficients, we must have  $\text{Res}(P_{\mathbf{a}_1}, P_{\mathbf{a}_2}) \geq 1$ . This implies that  $\|\mathbf{a}_1\|_\infty^n \|\mathbf{a}_2\|_\infty^n Q^{-4 \sum_{i=2}^n \kappa_i + 4n\epsilon} \gg 1$ . For  $\eta \geq 0$  we use an upper bound  $\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_\infty \ll Q^{\lambda - \eta + \epsilon}$ ,  $i \in \{1, 2\}$  and (35) to derive

$$0 \lesssim 2n(\lambda - \eta + \epsilon) - 4 \left( \frac{1+\lambda}{2} - \eta \right) + 4n\epsilon \leq 2(n-1)\lambda - 2 + \epsilon_5.$$

For  $\eta < 0$  we have  $\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_\infty \ll Q^\lambda$ , hence the same inequality can be achieved. Finally, we notice that for  $\lambda < \frac{1}{n-1}$  and  $\epsilon_5$  small enough that inequality is impossible and hence we get a contradiction.

We derive that  $|x_0 - y_0| = Q^{-\delta} \geq Q^{-\kappa_2 + \epsilon}$ . In this case we have

$$\max\{|x_0 - y_1|, |x_0 - y_2|\} \ll Q^{-\delta}.$$

We compute for  $i \in \{1, 2\}$

$$|P_{\mathbf{a}_1}(y_i)| = \left| \sum_{j=0}^n \frac{(y_i - x_0)^j}{j!} P_{\mathbf{a}_1}^{(j)}(x_0) \right| \stackrel{(21)}{\ll} \|\mathbf{a}_1\|_\infty \left( \sum_{j=0}^n \min\{Q^{-j\delta}, Q^{-j\delta - \frac{2-j}{2}(1+\lambda) + j\eta}\} \right). \quad (36)$$

Notice that for  $\delta \geq \frac{1+\lambda}{2} + \eta$  all the terms on the right hand side are not bigger than  $\|\mathbf{a}_1\|_\infty Q^{-1-\lambda}$ . Then we compute

$$1 \leq |\text{Res}(P_{\mathbf{a}_1}, P_{\mathbf{a}_2})| \ll \|\mathbf{a}_1\|_\infty^{n-2} \|\mathbf{a}_2\|_\infty^n |P_{\mathbf{a}_1}(y_1)| |P_{\mathbf{a}_1}(y_2)| \ll Q^{2n\lambda-2-2\lambda}$$

Notice that the last inequality is not possible for  $\lambda < 1/(n-1)$ . We conclude that one must have  $\delta < \frac{1+\lambda}{2} + \eta$ . Under this condition, the second term in the minimum (36) increases as a function of  $j$ , while the first term always decreases.

Fix  $1 \leq j \leq n$  and consider the case

$$\frac{(1-j)(1+\lambda)}{2(j+1)} \leq \eta < \frac{(2-j)(1+\lambda)}{2j}. \quad (37)$$

Then the largest term in the sum on the right hand side of (36) is either

$$Q^{-j\delta - \frac{2-j}{2}(1+\lambda) + j\eta} \quad \text{or} \quad Q^{-(j+1)\delta}. \quad (38)$$

Notice that the first term is bigger than the second one if  $\delta \gtrsim \frac{2-j}{2}(1+\lambda) - j\eta$ .

Consider the case  $j = 1$ . It corresponds to  $\eta \geq 0$  and hence  $\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_\infty \ll Q^{\lambda-\eta+\epsilon}$ . If the first term in (38) is the largest one we compute

$$1 \leq |\text{Res}(P_{\mathbf{a}_1}, P_{\mathbf{a}_2})| \ll Q^{2n(\lambda-\eta+\epsilon)-2\delta-1-\lambda+2\eta}.$$

From here we derive

$$\delta \lesssim \frac{(2n-1)\lambda - 1 - 2(n-1)\eta + 2n\epsilon}{2}.$$

However, this inequality is incompatible with  $\delta \gtrsim \frac{1+\lambda}{2} - \eta$  for  $\lambda < \frac{1}{n-1}$ ,  $n > 2$  and  $\epsilon$  small enough. Therefore we get that the second bound in (38) should take place. Now analogous computations for the resultant of  $P_{\mathbf{a}_1}$  and  $P_{\mathbf{a}_2}$  give

$$1 \ll Q^{2n(\lambda-\eta+\epsilon)-4\delta} \implies \delta \lesssim \frac{n(\lambda-\eta+\epsilon)}{2} \implies |x_0 - y_0| \gg Q^{-\frac{n(\lambda-\eta+\epsilon)}{2}}.$$

Since this inequality must be satisfied for all pairs  $\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2 \in A_n^\eta(I, \lambda, k, \boldsymbol{\kappa})$ , we have  $\#A_n^\eta(I, \lambda, k, \boldsymbol{\kappa}) \ll Q^{\frac{n(\lambda-\eta+\epsilon)}{2}}$ . Compute the  $s$ -Hausdorff series that corresponds to the standard cover of  $\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} J_n^\eta(I, \lambda, k, \boldsymbol{\kappa})$ :

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^{\frac{n\lambda-n\eta+n\epsilon}{2}k} 2^{-\left(\frac{1+\lambda}{2}+\eta-\epsilon\right)sk}.$$

It converges for

$$s > \frac{n\lambda - n\eta}{1 + \lambda + 2\eta} + \epsilon_6.$$

The right hand side is maximised for  $\eta = 0$ . Taking into account that  $\epsilon_6$  can be made arbitrarily small, we finally get that

$$\dim \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} J_n^\eta(I, \lambda, k, \boldsymbol{\kappa}) \leq \frac{n\lambda}{1 + \lambda}. \quad (39)$$

This value is smaller than  $\frac{2-(n-1)\lambda}{1+\lambda}$  for  $\lambda < \frac{2}{2n-1}$ .

Suppose now that  $\eta$  satisfies (37) for  $j > 1$ . This automatically means that  $\eta < 0$ , hence  $\|\mathbf{a}_i\|_\infty \ll Q^\lambda$ . We first assume that the first inequality in (38) is satisfied.

Estimating the resultant in the same way as before leads to

$$1 \ll Q^{2n\lambda - 2j\delta - (2-j)(1+\lambda) + 2j\eta} \implies \delta \lesssim \delta_0 := \frac{(2n-2)\lambda - 2 + j(1+\lambda) + 2j\eta}{2j}.$$

As in the previous case, we get  $\#A_n^\eta(I, \lambda, k, \kappa) \ll Q^{\delta_0}$  and the correspondent  $s$ -Hausdorff series for  $\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} J_n^\eta(I, \lambda, k, \kappa)$  is

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^{\frac{(2n-2)\lambda - 2 + j(1+\lambda) + 2j\eta}{2j} k} 2^{-\left(\frac{1+\lambda}{2} + \eta - \epsilon\right) sk}.$$

which converges as soon as

$$s > \frac{(2n-2)\lambda - 2 + j(1+\lambda) + 2j\eta}{j(1+\lambda+2\eta)} + \epsilon_7.$$

One can check that for  $\lambda < \frac{1}{n-1}$ , the last expression monotonically increases with  $\eta$ , hence it attains its maximal value for  $\eta = \frac{(2-j)(1+\lambda)}{2j}$ . Substituting this into the above inequality gives  $s > \frac{n\lambda}{1+\lambda} + \epsilon_7$  which leads to (39).

Finally, assume that the second bound in (38) is valid. Then the same computations lead to

$$1 \ll Q^{2n\lambda - 2(j+1)\delta} \implies \delta \lesssim \frac{n\lambda}{j+1}.$$

The correspondent  $s$ -Hausdorff series for  $\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \#A_n^\eta(I, \lambda, k, \kappa)$  converges for

$$s > \frac{n\lambda}{2(j+1)(1+\lambda+2\eta)} + \epsilon_8$$

This value monotonically decreases with  $\eta$  therefore it attains its maximum for  $\eta = \frac{(1-j)(1+\lambda)}{2(j+1)}$  which implies the same lower bound on  $s$  as in the previous case. Again, we derive (39).

We now exhausted all possible subsets of  $D_n^\eta(I, \lambda)$ . In each case, for  $\lambda \leq \frac{2}{2n-1}$  the Hausdorff dimension of those sets is at most  $\frac{2-(n-1)\lambda}{1+\lambda}$ . Hence, Theorem 2 is verified.

## References

- [1] D. Badziahin, Y. Bugeaud. On simultaneous rational approximation to a real number and its integral powers, II. *New York J. Math.* 26 (2020), 362–377.
- [2] A. Baker. On a theorem of Sprindžuk. *Proc. Roy. Soc. A.* 292 (1966), 92–104.
- [3] R. C. Baker. Sprindzuk’s theorem and Hausdorff dimension. *Mathematika* 23 (1976), no. 2, 184–197.
- [4] V. Beresnevich. Rational points near manifolds and metric Diophantine approximation. *Ann. of Math.* (2) 175 (2012), 187–235.
- [5] V. Beresnevich, V. I. Bernik, F. Götze. Integral polynomials with small discriminants and resultants. *Adv. Math.* 298 (2016), 393–412.
- [6] V. Beresnevich, D. Dickinson, S. L. Velani. Diophantine approximation on planar curves and the distribution of rational points, with an appendix by R.C. Vaughan: ‘Sums of two squares near perfect squares’. *Ann. of Math.* 166 (2007), 367–426.

- [7] V. Beresnevich, L. Yang. Khintchine’s theorem and Diophantine approximation on manifolds. *Acta Math.* 231 (2023), 1–30.
- [8] V. I. Bernik. Application of the Hausdorff dimension in the theory of Diophantine approximations. *Acta Arith.* 42 (1983), 219–253 (in Russian). English transl. in *Amer. Math. Soc. Transl.* 140 (1988), 15–44.
- [9] V. Bernik, N. Budarina, F. Götze. Exact upper bounds for the number of the polynomials with given discriminants. *Lith. Math. J.* 57 (2017), 283–293.
- [10] Y. Bugeaud, *Exponents of Diophantine approximation*. In: Dynamics and Analytic Number Theory. Proceedings of the Durham Easter School 2014. Edited by D. Badziahin, A. Gorodnik, N. Peyerimhoff.
- [11] H. Davenport. On the class-number of binary cubic forms. I. II. *J. London Math. Soc.* 26 (1951), 183–198.
- [12] H. Davenport, K. F. Roth. Rational approximations to algebraic numbers. *Mathematika* 2 (1955), 160–167.
- [13] H. Davenport. A note on binary cubic forms. *Mathematika* 8 (1961), 58–62.
- [14] Dz. Kaliada, F. Götze, O. Kukso. The asymptotic number of integral polynomials with bounded heights and discriminants. *Lith. Math. J.* 54 (2014), no.2, 150–165.
- [15] D. Kleinbock, and G. Margulis. Flows on homogeneous spaces and Diophantine approximation on manifolds. *Annals of Math.* (1998), 339–360.
- [16] D. Schindler, R. Srivastava, N. Technau. Rational Points Near Manifolds, Homogeneous Dynamics, and Oscillatory Integrals. *Preprint* <https://browse.arxiv.org/pdf/2310.03867>
- [17] J. Schleischitz, On the spectrum of Diophantine approximation constants, *Mathematika* 62 (2016), 79–100.
- [18] W. M. Schmidt, *Diophantine Approximations and Diophantine Equations*, Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 1467, Springer-Verlag, 1991.
- [19] R. C. Vaughan, S. Velani. Diophantine approximation on planar curves: the convergence theory. *Invent. Math.* 166 (2006), 103–124.
- [20] C.-K. Yap. *Fundamental Problems of Algorithmic Algebra*, Oxford University Press, 1999.

Dzmitry Badziahin  
The University of Sydney  
Camperdown 2006, NSW (Australia)  
dzmitry.badziahin@sydney.edu.au