

# DIMENSION OF BERNOULLI CONVOLUTIONS IN $\mathbb{R}^d$

ARIEL RAPAPORT AND HAOJIE REN

ABSTRACT. For  $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d) = \lambda \in (0, 1)^d$  with  $\lambda_1 > \dots > \lambda_d$ , denote by  $\mu_\lambda$  the Bernoulli convolution associated to  $\lambda$ . That is,  $\mu_\lambda$  is the distribution of the random vector  $\sum_{n \geq 0} \pm (\lambda_1^n, \dots, \lambda_d^n)$ , where the  $\pm$  signs are chosen independently and with equal weight. Assuming for each  $1 \leq j \leq d$  that  $\lambda_j$  is not a root of a polynomial with coefficients  $\pm 1, 0$ , we prove that the dimension of  $\mu_\lambda$  equals  $\min\{\dim_L \mu_\lambda, d\}$ , where  $\dim_L \mu_\lambda$  is the Lyapunov dimension. More generally, we obtain this result in the context of homogeneous diagonal self-affine systems on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with rational translations.

The proof extends to higher dimensions the works of Breuillard and Varjú and Varjú regarding Bernoulli convolutions on the real line. The main novelty and contribution of the present work lies in an extension of an entropy increase result, due to Varjú, in which the amount of increase in entropy is given explicitly. The extension of this result to the higher-dimensional non-conformal case requires significant new ideas.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

**1.1. Main result for Bernoulli convolutions.** Let  $d \geq 1$  be an integer and let  $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d) = \lambda \in (0, 1)^d$  be such that  $\lambda_1 > \dots > \lambda_d$ . Denote by  $\mu_\lambda$  the distribution of the random vector  $\sum_{n \geq 0} \pm (\lambda_1^n, \dots, \lambda_d^n)$ , where the  $\pm$  signs are chosen independently and with equal weight. The measure  $\mu_\lambda$  is called the Bernoulli convolution associated to  $\lambda$ . Bernoulli convolutions were studied by many authors over the years, especially in the case  $d = 1$ . In higher dimensions, they are perhaps the most basic example of non-conformal stationary fractal measures.

One of the most natural and studied questions regarding Bernoulli convolutions is to determine their dimension. A Borel probability measure  $\theta$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  is said to be exact dimensional if there exists a number  $\dim \theta$  such that

$$\lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \frac{\log \theta(B(x, \delta))}{\log \delta} = \dim \theta \text{ for } \theta\text{-a.e. } x,$$

where  $B(x, \delta)$  is the closed ball with centre  $x$  and radius  $\delta$ . By the work of Feng and Hu [14], it follows that  $\mu_\lambda$  is always exact dimensional.

The dimension of  $\mu_\lambda$  has a natural upper bound. It is called the Lyapunov dimension and is denoted by  $\dim_L \mu_\lambda$ . Setting

$$m := \max \{0 \leq k \leq d : \prod_{j=1}^k \lambda_j \geq 1/2\},$$

---

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 28A80, 37C45.

*Key words and phrases.* Bernoulli convolution, self-affine set, self-affine measure, dimension, entropy.

This research was supported by the Israel Science Foundation (grant No. 619/22). AR received support from the Horev Fellowship at the Technion – Israel Institute of Technology.

the Lyapunov dimension is defined as follows:

$$\dim_L \mu_\lambda := \begin{cases} m + \frac{\log 2 + \sum_{j=1}^m \log \lambda_j}{-\log \lambda_{m+1}} & , \text{ if } m < d \\ d - \frac{\log 2}{-\sum_{j=1}^d \log \lambda_j} & , \text{ if } m = d \end{cases}.$$

It always holds that

$$(1.1) \quad \dim \mu_\lambda \leq \min \{ \dim_L \mu_\lambda, d \},$$

and it is expected equality occurs in the absence of algebraic obstructions.

Suppose next that  $d = 1$ , in which case  $\lambda$  is a real number in the interval  $(0, 1)$ . When  $0 < \lambda < 1/2$ , it holds that  $\mu_\lambda$  is a strongly separated self-similar measure, and so it is easy to see that  $\dim \mu_\lambda = \dim_L \mu_\lambda = \frac{\log 2}{-\log \lambda}$ . When  $1/2 \leq \lambda < 1$  is algebraic but not a root of a nonzero polynomial with coefficients  $\pm 1, 0$ , it follows by the work of Hochman [17] that  $\dim \mu_\lambda = 1$ . When  $1/2 < \lambda < 1$  is transcendental, the equality  $\dim \mu_\lambda = 1$  was established by Varjú [37]. By the works of Erdős [10] and Garsia [16], it follows that  $\dim \mu_\lambda < 1$  whenever  $1/2 < \lambda < 1$  is a reciprocal of a Pisot number<sup>1</sup>. It is an open problem whether the inequality  $\dim \mu_\lambda < 1$  for  $1/2 < \lambda < 1$  implies that  $\lambda^{-1}$  is Pisot.

Next, assume that  $d = 2$ . When  $\lambda_1 < 1/2$ , it is again easy to see that  $\dim \mu_\lambda = \dim_L \mu_\lambda$ . Przytycki and Urbański [29] considered the situation in which  $\lambda_2 = 1/2$ . They established that  $\dim \mu_{(\lambda_1, 1/2)} = \dim_L \mu_{(\lambda_1, 1/2)}$  whenever  $\mu_{\lambda_1}$  is absolutely continuous (which, according to Solomyak [34], holds for Lebesgue a.e.  $\lambda_1 \in (1/2, 1)$ ). A statement of the same spirit has been obtained in [28]. It is also shown in [29] that strict inequality occurs in (1.1) when  $\lambda_2 = 1/2$  and  $\lambda_1^{-1}$  is Pisot. In the case  $\lambda_2 > 1/2$ , Shmerkin [33] established that the Hausdorff dimension of the support of  $\mu_\lambda$  equals the Lyapunov dimension for Lebesgue a.e.  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$  with  $\lambda_1 \lambda_2 < 1/2 < \lambda_2$ .

For general  $d \geq 1$ , in [30] the first author extended Hochman's work [17] and proved that equality holds in (1.1) whenever  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d$  are algebraic but not roots of polynomials with coefficients  $\pm 1, 0$ . By extending Varjú's work [37], in this paper we are able to remove the restrictive algebraicity assumption. The following theorem is our main result for Bernoulli convolutions.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$  and  $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d) = \lambda \in (0, 1)^d$  be with  $\lambda_1 > \dots > \lambda_d$ , and suppose that  $P(\lambda_j) \neq 0$  for every  $1 \leq j \leq d$  and nonzero polynomial  $P$  with coefficients  $\pm 1, 0$ . Then  $\dim \mu_\lambda = \min \{ \dim_L \mu_\lambda, d \}$ .*

In the next subsection, we present our results in the more general setup of homogeneous diagonal self-affine systems with rational translations.

**1.2. Main result in the general setup.** Fix  $d \geq 1$  and let  $\Phi = \{ \varphi_i(x) = A_i x + a_i \}_{i \in \Lambda}$  be a finite collection of invertible affine contractions of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Such a collection is called an affine iterated function system (IFS). It is well known (see [20]) that there exists a unique nonempty compact  $K_\Phi \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  with  $K_\Phi = \cup_{i \in \Lambda} \varphi_i(K_\Phi)$ . It is called the attractor or self-affine set corresponding to  $\Phi$ .

Certain natural measures are supported on  $K_\Phi$ . Fixing a probability vector  $p = (p_i)_{i \in \Lambda}$ , there exists a unique Borel probability measure  $\mu$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  which satisfies the relation  $\mu = \sum_{i \in \Lambda} p_i \cdot \varphi_i \mu$  (again, see [20]), where  $\varphi_i \mu$  is the push-forward of  $\mu$

<sup>1</sup>Recall that a Pisot number is a positive algebraic integer all of whose Galois conjugates are inside the open unit disk.

via  $\varphi_i$ . It is supported on  $K_\Phi$ , and is called the self-affine measure corresponding to  $\Phi$  and  $p$ . It is known that self-affine measures are always exact dimensional (see [14, 4, 12]).

Many mathematical problems surround self-affine sets and measures, but perhaps the most natural one is to determine their dimension. It has been studied by many authors, and its computation is one of the major open problems in fractal geometry. In what follows, we denote the Hausdorff dimension of  $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  by  $\dim_H E$ .

In the 1980s, Falconer [11] introduced a natural upper bound for the dimension of  $K_\Phi$ , which is called the affinity dimension. It is denoted by  $\dim_A \Phi$  and depends only on the linear parts  $\{A_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ . Falconer has shown that when  $\|A_i\|_{\text{op}} < 1/2$  for  $i \in \Lambda$ , and under a natural randomisation of the translations  $\{a_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ , the equality

$$(1.2) \quad \dim_H K_\Phi = \min \{d, \dim_A \Phi\}$$

holds almost surely<sup>2</sup>.

Similarly, there exists a natural upper bound for the dimension of  $\mu$ . It is denoted by  $\dim_L(\Phi, p)$ , is called the Lyapunov dimension corresponding to  $\Phi$  and  $p$ , and depends only on the entropy of  $p$  and the Lyapunov exponents corresponding to  $\{A_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$  and  $p$ . It has been shown by Jordan, Pollicott and Simon [21] that, under the same conditions as in Falconer's result, the equality

$$(1.3) \quad \dim \mu = \min \{d, \dim_L(\Phi, p)\}$$

holds almost surely. The definition of the Lyapunov dimension is given in Section 2.2.

The last results show that (1.2) and (1.3) hold typically, but do not provide any explicit examples. It is of course desirable to find explicit and verifiable conditions under which these equalities hold. In recent years, and while assuming the collection  $\{A_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$  is strongly irreducible, such conditions have been obtained when  $d = 2$  (see [3, 19, 27]) and  $d = 3$  (see [26, 31]).

An important subclass of self-affine systems, which is in a sense opposite to the strongly irreducible case, is the one in which the linear parts  $\{A_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$  are all diagonal. In this paper, we always assume that we are in the diagonal situation. We further assume that  $\Phi$  is homogeneous, which means that  $A_{i_1} = A_{i_2}$  for  $i_1, i_2 \in \Lambda$ . Thus, suppose that there exist  $1 > \lambda_1 > \dots > \lambda_d > 0$  such that for each  $i \in \Lambda$

$$(1.4) \quad \varphi_i(x) = (\lambda_1 x_1 + a_{i,1}, \dots, \lambda_d x_d + a_{i,d}) \text{ for } (x_1, \dots, x_d) = x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

where  $a_{i,1}, \dots, a_{i,d} \in \mathbb{R}$ . Note that  $\Phi_j := \{t \rightarrow \lambda_j t + a_{i,j}\}_{i \in \Lambda}$  is a homogeneous affine IFS on  $\mathbb{R}$  for each  $1 \leq j \leq d$ .

**Definition.** A homogeneous affine IFS  $\Psi := \{\psi_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$  on  $\mathbb{R}$  is said to be exponentially separated if there exists  $c > 0$  such that  $|\psi_{u_1}(0) - \psi_{u_2}(0)| \geq c^n$  for all  $n \geq 1$  and distinct  $u_1, u_2 \in \Lambda^n$ , where  $\psi_u := \psi_{i_1} \circ \dots \circ \psi_{i_n}$  for  $i_1 \dots i_n = u \in \Lambda^n$ .

In [30], the first author has shown that (1.2) and (1.3) hold whenever  $\Phi_1, \dots, \Phi_d$  are exponentially separated. In this paper, we show that when the numbers  $a_{i,j}$  are rational, the exponential separation assumption can be relaxed considerably.

**Definition.** We say that an affine IFS  $\Psi := \{\psi_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$  on  $\mathbb{R}$  has no exact overlaps if its elements generate a free semigroup. That is, if  $\psi_{u_1} \neq \psi_{u_2}$  for all distinct  $u_1, u_2 \in \Lambda^*$ , where  $\Lambda^*$  is the set of finite words over  $\Lambda$ .

<sup>2</sup>In fact, Falconer proved this with  $1/3$  as the upper bound on the norms; it was subsequently shown by Solomyak [35] that  $1/2$  suffices.

*Remark.* A homogeneous IFS  $\Psi$  clearly has no exact overlaps whenever it is exponentially separated. When  $\Psi$  is defined by algebraic parameters, the converse also holds true. In general, as shown by examples constructed in [1, 5], exponential separation is a more restrictive condition than the absence of exact overlaps.

We can now state our main result, which is the following statement.

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let  $\Phi = \{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$  be a homogeneous diagonal affine IFS on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with rational translations. More precisely, suppose that there exist  $1 > \lambda_1 > \dots > \lambda_d > 0$  and  $\{a_{i,j} : i \in \Lambda \text{ and } 1 \leq j \leq d\} \subset \mathbb{Q}$  such that  $\varphi_i$  is of the form (1.4) for each  $i \in \Lambda$ . Let  $p = (p_i)_{i \in \Lambda}$  be a probability vector and let  $\mu$  be the self-affine measure associated to  $\Phi$  and  $p$ . Then, assuming  $\Phi_j := \{t \rightarrow \lambda_j t + a_{i,j}\}_{i \in \Lambda}$  has no exact overlaps for each  $1 \leq j \leq d$ , we have  $\dim_H K_\Phi = \min\{d, \dim_A \Phi\}$  and  $\dim \mu = \min\{d, \dim_L(\Phi, p)\}$ .*

*Remark.* When  $d = 1$ , Theorem 1.2 has been established in [32, Appendix A] by directly extending [37]. In [13], it has been recently shown that for  $d = 1$  the theorem also holds with algebraic translations. It is expected that this extension should be possible for general  $d \geq 1$ , but we do not pursue it here.

*Remark.* Note that Theorem 1.1 follows directly from Theorem 1.2 by considering the IFS

$$\{(x_1, \dots, x_d) \rightarrow (\lambda_1 x_1, \dots, \lambda_d x_d) \pm (1, \dots, 1)\}$$

and probability vector  $(1/2, 1/2)$ .

As demonstrated by various carpet-like examples (see e.g. [2, 6, 15, 23, 25]), it is necessary to assume that the systems  $\Phi_j$  have no exact overlaps. On the other hand, it is reasonable to expect Theorem 1.2 to remain true without assuming the translations  $a_{i,j}$  are rational (or algebraic). Unfortunately, at this point, this is well beyond our reach. Indeed, this has not been achieved even when  $d = 1$ , in which case the validity of such a statement is considered one of the major open problems in fractal geometry (see [18, 38]).

**1.3. About the proof.** In this subsection, we present the general outline of the proof of Theorem 1.2. For the rest of the paper, fix a finite nonempty index set  $\Lambda$  and an integer  $d \geq 1$ . The proof is carried out by induction on  $d$ . Thus, assume that the theorem holds whenever the dimension of the ambient space is strictly less than  $d$ .

By rescaling the IFS if necessary, in order to prove Theorem 1.2, it suffices to consider the case in which the translations are integers. Thus, from now on, fix

$$\{a_{i,j} : i \in \Lambda \text{ and } 1 \leq j \leq d\} \subset \mathbb{Z}.$$

We also fix a probability vector  $p = (p_i)_{i \in \Lambda}$ .

Write

$$\Omega := \{(\eta_1, \dots, \eta_d) \in (0, 1)^d : \eta_1 > \dots > \eta_d\},$$

and for each  $(\eta_1, \dots, \eta_d) = \eta \in \Omega$  let  $\Phi^\eta$  be the homogeneous diagonal affine IFS on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with translations  $a_i := (a_{i,1}, \dots, a_{i,d})$  and linear part  $\text{diag}(\eta_1, \dots, \eta_d)$ . That is,

$$\Phi^\eta := \{\varphi_i^\eta(x) = (\eta_1 x_1 + a_{i,1}, \dots, \eta_d x_d + a_{i,d})\}_{i \in \Lambda}.$$

Fix  $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d) = \lambda \in \Omega$  such that  $\Phi_j^\lambda := \{t \rightarrow \lambda_j t + a_{i,j}\}_{i \in \Lambda}$  has no exact overlaps for each  $1 \leq j \leq d$ , and let  $\mu_\lambda$  be the self-affine measure associated to  $\Phi^\lambda$  and  $p$ .

By considering  $p$  with equal weights, (1.2) follows from (1.3). Thus, in order to prove the theorem, we aim to show that  $\dim \mu_\lambda = \min \{d, \dim_L(\Phi^\lambda, p)\}$ . Assume by contradiction that this is not the case. Hence, by [30, Theorem 1.7], it must hold that  $\lambda_{j_0}$  is transcendental for some  $1 \leq j_0 \leq d$ .

Write  $[d] = \{1, \dots, d\}$ , and for each  $\emptyset \neq J \subset [d]$  denote by  $\pi_J$  the orthogonal projection onto  $\text{span}\{e_j\}_{j \in J}$ , where  $\{e_j\}_{j \in [d]}$  is the standard basis of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Note that  $\pi_J \mu_\lambda := \mu_\lambda \circ \pi_J^{-1}$  is (an embedded copy of) a self-affine measure associated to  $p$  and an affine IFS on  $\mathbb{R}^{|J|}$  for which the conditions of Theorem 1.2 are also satisfied. From this observation, by the induction assumption, and by applying the Ledrappier–Young formula for diagonal self-affine measures (obtained in [14]), it can be shown that  $\dim \mu_\lambda = \dim_L(\Phi^\lambda, p)$  whenever  $\dim \pi_J \mu_\lambda < |J|$  for some proper subset  $J$  of  $[d]$ . Thus, it must hold that  $\dim \pi_J \mu_\lambda = |J|$  for each  $\emptyset \neq J \subsetneq [d]$ .

From this point, we try to follow the argument of Varjú [37], which roughly speaking relies on three main components. The first component is the work of Hochman [17] regarding exponentially separated systems on the real line. Extending this work to higher dimensions requires significant new ideas, but this was already achieved in [30]. By applying results from [30], we are able to show that, under our assumptions of dimension drop and full dimensionality of projections, the parameters  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d$  can be approximated by algebraic numbers, of controllable degree and height, with high precision at all scales (see Proposition 5.2).

The second component is the connection, obtained by Breuillard and Varjú [9], between random walk entropy and Mahler measure. For an affine IFS  $\Psi = \{\psi_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ , we write  $h_{RW}(\Psi, p)$  for the entropy of the random walk generated by  $\Psi$  and  $p$  (see Section 2.4.4). The definition of the Mahler measure of an algebraic number is provided in Section 5.1. For  $(\eta_1, \dots, \eta_d) = \eta \in \Omega$  such that  $\eta_{j_0}$  is algebraic, it follows from the results of [9] that  $h_{RW}(\Phi_{j_0}^\eta, p)$  is close to its maximal possible value  $H(p)$  whenever the Mahler measure of  $\eta_{j_0}$  is sufficiently large (see Theorem 5.1). Here,  $\Phi_{j_0}^\eta := \{t \rightarrow \eta_{j_0} t + a_{i, j_0}\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ . Since  $h_{RW}(\Phi^\eta, p)$  is always at least as large as  $h_{RW}(\Phi_{j_0}^\eta, p)$ , we are able to use this result without any adaptation needed.

The third component is the work [8] of Breuillard and Varjú regarding Bernoulli convolutions on  $\mathbb{R}$ , in which they establish that parameters with dimension drop can be approximated extremely well, at infinitely many scales, by controllable algebraic parameters that also have dimension drop. Most of the present paper is dedicated to extending this result to higher dimensions, which is the content of the following statement. Set

$$L_0 := \max \{a_{i_1, j} - a_{i_2, j} : i_1, i_2 \in \Lambda \text{ and } 1 \leq j \leq d\},$$

and for  $n \geq 1$  let  $\mathcal{P}_{L_0}^{(n)} \subset \mathbb{Z}[X]$  be the set of polynomials of degree strictly less than  $n$  with integer coefficients bounded in absolute value by  $L_0$ . For  $1 \leq j \leq d$  write  $\chi_j := -\log \lambda_j$ , and set

$$\kappa := \chi_d \dim \mu_\lambda - \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} (\chi_d - \chi_j).$$

**Theorem 1.3.** *Suppose that  $\dim \mu_\lambda < \min \{d, \dim_L(\Phi^\lambda, p)\}$ ,  $\dim \pi_J \mu_\lambda = |J|$  for each proper subset  $J$  of  $[d]$ , and  $\lambda_{j_0}$  is transcendental for some  $1 \leq j_0 \leq d$ . Then for every  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $N \geq 1$  there exist  $n \geq N$  and  $(\eta_1, \dots, \eta_d) = \eta \in \Omega$  such that,*

- (1) *for each  $1 \leq j \leq d$  there exists  $0 \neq P_j \in \mathcal{P}_{L_0}^{(n)}$  with  $P_j(\eta_j) = 0$ ;*

- (2)  $h_{RW}(\Phi^\eta, p) < \kappa + \epsilon;$   
 (3)  $|\lambda - \eta| \leq \exp(-n^{1/\epsilon}).$

*Remark.* The assumption regarding  $\lambda_{j_0}$  being transcendental for some  $1 \leq j_0 \leq d$  is not really necessary. It simplifies the proof slightly by enabling us to ignore the case of algebraic parameters, which is treated in [30].

*Remark.* In [8], the inequality  $h_{RW}(\Phi^\eta, p) < \kappa + \epsilon$  is replaced with  $\dim \mu_\eta < \dim \mu_\lambda + \epsilon$ , where  $\mu_\eta$  is the Bernoulli convolution associated to  $\eta$ . When  $d = 1$  and  $\dim \mu_\lambda + \epsilon/\chi_1 < 1$ , it follows by the work of Hochman that these inequalities are equivalent (see [9, Section 3.4]). The intuition behind the value  $\kappa$  is best explained by [30, Lemma 4.1], in which it is shown that  $\kappa$  equals the limit of the normalized entropies  $\frac{1}{n}H(\mu_\lambda, \mathcal{E}_n)$ , where  $\mathcal{E}_n$  is the level- $n$  non-conformal partition of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  determined by  $\lambda$  (see Section 2.6).

Once we have the aforementioned three components at our disposal, we can complete the proof of Theorem 1.2 by following the proof of [32, Theorem A.1], which handles the case  $d = 1$  and is a modification of the argument found in [37].

Let us next discuss the proof of Theorem 1.3. The key ingredient of the proof is an entropy increase statement, in which the amount of increase in entropy is explicit. For the case  $d = 1$ , such a statement was obtained by Varjú [36, Theorem 3], and it plays a key role in the proof of the main result of [8].

In order to state our entropy increase result, we need some preparations. Given a discrete random vector  $Y$ , its Shannon entropy is denoted by  $H(Y)$ . For a bounded random vector  $X = (X_1, \dots, X_d)$  in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and  $(r_1, \dots, r_d) = r \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^d$ , we set

$$(1.5) \quad H(X; r) := \int_{[0,1]^d} H(\lfloor X_1/r_1 + x_1 \rfloor, \dots, \lfloor X_d/r_d + x_d \rfloor) dx_1 \dots dx_d.$$

We refer to  $H(X; r)$  as the average entropy of  $X$  at scale  $r$ . Given  $r' \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^d$ , we also set

$$H(X; r \mid r') := H(X; r) - H(X; r').$$

If  $\mu$  is the distribution of  $X$ , we write  $H(\mu; r)$  and  $H(\mu; r \mid r')$  in place of  $H(X; r)$  and  $H(X; r \mid r')$ . These quantities originate in the work of Wang [39], and in the case  $d = 1$  they play an important role in the papers [36, 8]. The disappearance of certain error terms, which are present without the averaging in (1.5), is the main advantage of using the notion of average entropy.

In order to state the entropy increase result, we also need the following definition. As noted above, for  $n \geq 0$  we denote by  $\mathcal{E}_n$  the level- $n$  non-conformal partition determined by  $\lambda$ . That is,  $\mathcal{E}_n$  is a partition of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  into rectangles with side lengths roughly  $\lambda_1^n, \dots, \lambda_d^n$ . We write  $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  for the collection of compactly supported Borel probability measures on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Given  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and Borel partitions  $\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}$  of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , the conditional entropy of  $\mathcal{C}$  given  $\mathcal{D}$  with respect to  $\mu$  is denoted by  $H(\mu, \mathcal{C} \mid \mathcal{D})$  (see Section 2.4.1).

**Definition 1.4.** Given  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $m \geq 1$ , we say that  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  is  $(\epsilon, m)$ -non-saturated across the principal directions at all scales, or simply  $(\epsilon, m)$ -non-saturated, if for all  $1 \leq j \leq d$  and  $n \geq 0$ ,

$$\frac{1}{m}H\left(\mu, \mathcal{E}_{n+m} \mid \mathcal{E}_n \vee \pi_{[d] \setminus \{j\}}^{-1} \mathcal{E}_{n+m}\right) < \chi_j - \epsilon.$$

*Remark.* Given  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $n \geq 0$  and  $E \in \mathcal{E}_n$ , we refer to  $\mu_E := \frac{1}{\mu(E)}\mu|_E$  as a (non-conformal)  $n$ -component of  $\mu$ . It follows from basic properties of entropy that for  $m \geq 1$  and  $1 \leq j \leq d$ ,

$$\frac{1}{m}H\left(\mu_E, \mathcal{E}_{n+m} \mid \pi_{[d] \setminus \{j\}}^{-1} \mathcal{E}_{n+m}\right) \leq \chi_j + O\left(\frac{1}{m}\right).$$

Thus, roughly speaking, the assumption of  $\mu$  being  $(\epsilon, m)$ -non-saturated means that for all  $1 \leq j \leq d$  and all scales  $n \geq 0$ , for a non-negligible proportion of  $n$ -components  $\mu_E$ , the entropy along narrow rectangular tubes in direction  $e_j \mathbb{R}$  is not full.

We can now state our entropy increase result. For  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , we write  $\lambda^t := (\lambda_1^t, \dots, \lambda_d^t)$ .

**Theorem 1.5.** *For each  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $M \geq 1$ , there exists  $C = C(\lambda, \epsilon, M) > 1$  such that the following holds. Let  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  be  $(\epsilon, m)$ -non-saturated for all  $m \geq M$ , and let  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $0 < \beta < 1/2$ , and  $t_2 > t_1 > 0$  be with  $\frac{1}{t_2 - t_1}H(\nu; \lambda^{t_2} \mid \lambda^{t_1}) > \beta$ . Then,*

$$H(\nu * \mu; \lambda^{t_2} \mid \lambda^{t_1}) \geq H(\mu; \lambda^{t_2} \mid \lambda^{t_1}) + C^{-1}\beta(\log \beta^{-1})^{-1}(t_2 - t_1) - C.$$

*Remark.* It is easy to see that by replacing  $H(\cdot; \lambda^{t_2} \mid \lambda^{t_1})$  with  $H(\cdot, \mathcal{E}_{\lfloor t_2 \rfloor} \mid \mathcal{E}_{\lfloor t_1 \rfloor})$  in the last theorem, one gets a formally equivalent statement. On the other hand, the use of average entropy is crucial to the proof of Theorem 1.5, and also to the proof of Theorem 1.3 in which Theorem 1.5 is applied repeatedly. This is due to the aforementioned disappearance of error terms caused by the averaging procedure.

*Remark.* Since the IFS  $\Phi^\lambda$  is homogeneous, the measures  $\mu_\lambda$  can be represented as an infinite convolution (see Section 4.1). Assuming  $\dim \mu_\lambda < d$  and  $\dim \pi_J \mu_\lambda = |J|$  for each proper subset  $J$  of  $[d]$ , we shall show in Section 4.2 that there exist  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $M \geq 1$  such that  $\mu_\lambda$  and its convolution factors are all  $(\epsilon, m)$ -non-saturated for all  $m \geq M$ . This enables the repeated application of Theorem 1.5 in the proof of Theorem 1.3.

Given that we have Theorem 1.5 at our disposal, the proof of Theorem 1.3 is similar to the proof of [32, Theorem A.2], which is a modification of the argument in [8]. On the other hand, the proof of Theorem 1.5, which is an extension of the proof of [36, Theorem 3] to higher dimensions, requires new ideas and is probably the main technical contribution of this paper.

We say that  $\zeta \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  is a Bernoulli measure if it is of the form  $\zeta = \frac{1}{2}(\delta_x + \delta_y)$  for some distinct  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . The proof of [36, Theorem 3], which is motivated by the work of Bourgain [7], consists of three steps. In the first step, given a scale  $t > 0$  and  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R})$ , a decomposition of  $\nu$  is obtained as a convex combination of probability measures in which a non-negligible part of the mass, in a manner depending on  $t$  and  $\nu$ , is captured by Bernoulli measures of diameter roughly  $t$ . In the second step, entropy increase is obtained for the convolution of a non-saturated measure with a Bernoulli measure. More precisely, given  $t > 0$  and  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R})$ , it is shown that

$$(1.6) \quad H(\zeta * \mu; r_2 \mid r_1) > H(\mu; r_2 \mid r_1) + \delta,$$

where  $\zeta \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R})$  is Bernoulli,  $\text{diam}(\text{supp}(\zeta))$  and  $0 < r_2 < r_1$  are comparable with  $t$ , and the increase  $\delta > 0$  depends quantitatively on the non-saturation of  $\mu$  at

scale  $t$ . Finally, in the third step, the first two steps are applied repeatedly while averaging over the scale, thus obtaining the desired entropy increase.

Extending the third step to higher dimensions requires minimal changes. The extension of the first step requires some work, but the core idea remains the same. On the other hand, the argument given in [36] for the second step fails completely in higher dimensions, and a new approach is needed.

Our approach for extending the second step involves using ideas from [30], which rely on the Berry-Esseen theorem and extend the proof of Hochman’s inverse theorem from [17] to the higher dimensional non-conformal setup. These ideas will enable us to obtain entropy increase for convolutions with repeated self-convolutions of a Bernoulli measure. In order to deduce from this entropy increase for convolutions with a Bernoulli measure, we establish a version for average entropy of a classical lemma due to Kaimanovich and Vershik [22] (see Lemma 2.7 below). This version, which crucially has no error term, follows from a connection between average and differential entropies (see Lemma 2.1), and from an entropy submodularity inequality due to Madiman [24]. The inequality also plays an important role in the earlier works [36, 9, 8], but the average entropy version of the Kaimanovich–Vershik lemma seems to be new.

**Structure of the paper.** The rest of the paper is organised as follows. In Section 2 we introduce some notations, define necessary concepts, and develop basic properties of average entropy in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Section 3 is devoted to the proof of the entropy increase result, Theorem 1.5. In Section 4 we establish the algebraic approximation statement, Theorem 1.3. We prove our main result, Theorem 1.2, in Section 5.

**Acknowledgment.** We would like to thank Péter Varjú for his comments on an early version of this paper.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

**2.1. Basic notations.** Throughout the paper, the base of the log and exp functions is always 2. For an integer  $k \geq 0$  we write  $[k]$  to represent the set  $\{1, \dots, k\}$ , with the convention that  $[0] = \emptyset$ . Given a metric space  $X$ , denote by  $\mathcal{M}(X)$  the collection of compactly supported Borel probability measures on  $X$ . For  $n, l \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ , let  $\mathcal{P}_l^{(n)} \subset \mathbb{Z}[X]$  be the set of polynomials of degree strictly less than  $n$  with integer coefficients bounded in absolute value by  $l$ .

Given  $R_1, R_2 \in \mathbb{R}$  with  $R_1, R_2 \geq 1$ , we write  $R_1 \ll R_2$  in order to indicate that  $R_2$  is large with respect to  $R_1$ . Formally, this means that  $R_2 \geq f(R_1)$ , where  $f$  is an unspecified function from  $[1, \infty)$  into itself. The values attained by  $f$  are assumed to be sufficiently large in a manner depending on the specific context.

Similarly, given  $0 < \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 < 1$  we write  $R_1 \ll \epsilon_1^{-1}$ ,  $\epsilon_2^{-1} \ll R_2$ , and  $\epsilon_1^{-1} \ll \epsilon_2^{-1}$  to respectively indicate that  $\epsilon_1$  is small with respect to  $R_1$ ,  $R_2$  is large with respect to  $\epsilon_2$ , and  $\epsilon_2$  is small with respect to  $\epsilon_1$ .

The relation  $\ll$  is clearly transitive. That is, if  $R_1 \ll R_2$  and for  $R_3 \geq 1$  we have  $R_2 \ll R_3$ , then also  $R_1 \ll R_3$ . For instance, the sentence ‘Let  $m \geq 1$ ,  $k \geq K(m) \geq 1$  and  $n \geq N(m, k) \geq 1$  be given’ is equivalent to ‘Let  $m, k, n \geq 1$  be with  $m \ll k \ll n$ ’.



**2.2. Setup and related notations.** Recall from Section 1.3 that throughout the paper we fix  $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ , a finite nonempty index set  $\Lambda$ , a probability vector  $p = (p_i)_{i \in \Lambda}$ , and integers

$$\{a_{i,j} : i \in \Lambda \text{ and } 1 \leq j \leq d\}.$$

Set

$$a_i := (a_{i,1}, \dots, a_{i,d}) \text{ for } i \in \Lambda,$$

and recall that

$$(2.1) \quad L_0 := \max \{a_{i_1,j} - a_{i_2,j} : i_1, i_2 \in \Lambda \text{ and } 1 \leq j \leq d\}.$$

Write

$$\Omega := \{(\eta_1, \dots, \eta_d) \in (0, 1)^d : \eta_1 > \dots > \eta_d\},$$

and for  $(\eta_1, \dots, \eta_d) = \eta \in \Omega$ ,  $i \in \Lambda$  and  $1 \leq j \leq d$ , let  $\varphi_{i,j}^\eta : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be defined by  $\varphi_{i,j}^\eta(t) = \eta_j t + a_{i,j}$ . Given  $\emptyset \neq J \subset [d]$  denote by  $\Phi_J^\eta$  the IFS  $\{\varphi_{i,j}^\eta\}_{i \in \Lambda}$  on  $\mathbb{R}^J$ , where

$$\varphi_{i,J}^\eta(x) = (\varphi_{i,j}^\eta(x_j))_{j \in J} \text{ for } i \in \Lambda \text{ and } (x_j)_{j \in J} = x \in \mathbb{R}^J.$$

For  $1 \leq j \leq d$  we write  $\Phi_j^\eta$  in place of  $\Phi_{\{j\}}^\eta$ . We also write  $\Phi^\eta$  in place of  $\Phi_{[d]}^\eta$ , and  $\varphi_i^\eta$  in place of  $\varphi_{i,[d]}^\eta$  for  $i \in \Lambda$ .

Let  $\mu_\eta \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  denote the self-affine measure generated by  $\Phi^\eta$  and  $p$ . For  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$  set

$$\mu_\eta^{(n)} := \sum_{u \in \Lambda^n} p_u \delta_{\varphi_u^\eta(0)} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d),$$

where  $p_u := p_{i_1} \dots p_{i_n}$  and  $\varphi_u^\eta := \varphi_{i_1}^\eta \circ \dots \circ \varphi_{i_n}^\eta$  for  $i_1 \dots i_n = u \in \Lambda^n$ . The measure  $\mu_\eta^{(n)}$  may be thought of as the discrete level- $n$  approximation of  $\mu_\eta$ .

From now on, we fix  $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d) = \lambda \in \Omega$  for the rest of the paper. Since  $\lambda$  is fixed, we sometimes do not explicitly indicate the dependence on  $\lambda$  of various parameters. Similarly, we also do not explicitly indicate dependence on  $\{a_{i,j}\}$  and  $p$ .

For  $1 \leq j \leq d$  set  $\chi_j := -\log \lambda_j$ , and let  $H(p) := -\sum_{i \in \Lambda} p_i \log p_i$  denote the entropy of  $p$ . Setting

$$m = m(\lambda, p) := \max \{0 \leq j \leq d : \chi_1 + \dots + \chi_j \leq H(p)\},$$

the Lyapunov dimension corresponding to  $\Phi^\lambda$  and  $p$  is defined by

$$\dim_L(\Phi^\lambda, p) := \begin{cases} m + \frac{H(p) - \chi_1 - \dots - \chi_m}{\chi_{m+1}} & , \text{ if } m < d \\ d \frac{H(p)}{\chi_1 + \dots + \chi_d} & , \text{ if } m = d \end{cases}.$$

For brevity, we use the notation

$$\gamma := \min \{d, \dim_L(\Phi^\lambda, p)\} \text{ and } \kappa := \chi_d \dim \mu_\lambda - \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} (\chi_d - \chi_j).$$

It is easy to verify that for each  $0 \leq j < d$ ,

$$(2.2) \quad \gamma \leq j + \frac{H(p) - \chi_1 - \dots - \chi_j}{\chi_{j+1}}.$$

**2.3. Algebraic notations.** Let  $\{e_1, \dots, e_d\}$  be the standard basis of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Given  $J \subset [d]$  denote by  $\pi_J$  the orthogonal projection onto  $\text{span}\{e_j : j \in J\}$ . Thus,

$$\pi_J(x) = \sum_{j \in J} \langle e_j, x \rangle e_j \text{ for } x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

and  $\pi_{[0]}$  is identically 0. We write  $\pi_j$  in place of  $\pi_{\{j\}}$  for  $1 \leq j \leq d$ . Given  $\eta \in \Omega$  and  $\emptyset \neq J \subset [d]$ , note that  $\pi_J \mu_\eta$  is (an embedded copy of) the self-affine measure corresponding to  $\Phi_J^\eta$  and  $p$ , where  $\pi_J \mu_\eta := \mu_\eta \circ \pi_J^{-1}$  is the push-forward of  $\mu_\eta$  via  $\pi_J$ . In particular,  $\pi_J \mu_\eta$  is exact dimensional.

Let  $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$  be the group of positive real numbers. For  $r = (r_1, \dots, r_d)$  and  $r' = (r'_1, \dots, r'_d)$  in  $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^d$ , set

$$rr' := (r_1 r'_1, \dots, r_d r'_d) \text{ and } r^{-1} := (r_1^{-1}, \dots, r_d^{-1}),$$

which makes  $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^d$  into a multiplicative group. We write  $r' \leq r$  whenever  $r'_j \leq r_j$  for each  $1 \leq j \leq d$ , thereby defining a partial order on  $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^d$ .

For  $(x_1, \dots, x_d) = x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  set  $rx := (r_1 x_1, \dots, r_d x_d)$ , which defines an action of  $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^d$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . We sometimes write  $xr$  in place of  $rx$ . Let  $S_r : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  be defined by  $S_r(x) := rx$ . We often write  $\det r$  instead of  $\det S_r$ . Additionally, we often write  $r'/r$  and  $x/r$  in place of  $r^{-1}r'$  and  $r^{-1}x$ .

Set

$$\lfloor x \rfloor := (\lfloor x_1 \rfloor, \dots, \lfloor x_d \rfloor) \text{ and } r^t := (r_1^t, \dots, r_d^t) \text{ for } t \in \mathbb{R},$$

where  $\lfloor t \rfloor$  is the integral part of  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ . We denote by  $|r|$  and  $|x|$  the Euclidean norms of  $r$  and  $x$ . That is,  $|r| := (r_1^2 + \dots + r_d^2)^{1/2}$  and similarly for  $|x|$ . For  $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$  we set  $T_x(y) := x + y$ .

## 2.4. Notions of entropy.

**2.4.1. Entropy of a partition.** Let  $(S, \mathcal{F})$  be a measurable space. Given a probability measure  $\theta$  on  $S$  and a countable partition  $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{F}$  of  $S$ , the entropy of  $\theta$  with respect to  $\mathcal{D}$  is defined by

$$H(\theta, \mathcal{D}) := - \sum_{D \in \mathcal{D}} \theta(D) \log \theta(D).$$

If  $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{F}$  is another countable partition of  $S$ , the conditional entropy given  $\mathcal{E}$  is defined as follows:

$$H(\theta, \mathcal{D} \mid \mathcal{E}) := \sum_{E \in \mathcal{E}} \theta(E) \cdot H(\theta_E, \mathcal{D}),$$

where  $\theta_E := \theta(E)^{-1} \theta|_E$  for  $E \in \mathcal{E}$  with  $\theta(E) > 0$ .

For basic properties of entropy and conditional entropy of a partition, we refer the reader to [17, Section 3.1]. These basic properties will often be used without further reference.

**2.4.2. Average entropy.** For a bounded random vector  $X$  in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and  $r \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^d$  we set

$$(2.3) \quad H(X; r) := \int_{[0,1]^d} H(\lfloor X/r + x \rfloor) dx,$$

where  $H(\lfloor X/r + x \rfloor)$  denotes the Shannon entropy of the discrete random variable  $\lfloor X/r + x \rfloor$ . We call  $H(X; r)$  the average entropy of  $X$  at scale  $r$ . Given  $r' \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^d$ , we also set

$$H(X; r \mid r') := H(X; r) - H(X; r').$$

If  $\mu$  is the distribution of  $X$ , we write  $H(\mu; r)$  and  $H(\mu; r | r')$  in place of  $H(X; r)$  and  $H(X; r | r')$ . Basic properties of average entropy are provided in Section 2.7.

2.4.3. *Differential entropy.* Let  $F : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be defined by  $F(t) = -t \log t$  for  $t > 0$  and  $F(0) = 0$ . If  $X$  is an absolutely continuous random vector in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with density  $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ , we write  $H(X)$  for its differential entropy. That is,

$$H(X) := \int F(f(x)) dx.$$

Note that,

$$(2.4) \quad H(x + rX) = H(X) + \log \det r \quad \text{for } r \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^d \text{ and } x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

2.4.4. *Random walk entropy.* For an affine IFS  $\Psi = \{\psi_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ , write  $h_{RW}(\Psi, p)$  for the entropy of the random walk generated by  $\Psi$  and  $p$ . That is,

$$h_{RW}(\Psi, p) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H \left( \sum_{u \in \Lambda^n} p_u \delta_{\psi_u} \right),$$

where  $H(\cdot)$  denotes Shannon entropy of a discrete measure and the limit exists by subadditivity. Note that by subadditivity we in fact have,

$$(2.5) \quad h_{RW}(\Psi, p) = \inf_{n \geq 1} \frac{1}{n} H \left( \sum_{u \in \Lambda^n} p_u \delta_{\psi_u} \right).$$

2.5. **Sequences with integral ratios.** In order to avoid certain error terms, which our arguments are unable to tolerate, it will often be preferable to consider average conditional entropies of the form  $H(\mu; r | Nr)$ , where  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $r \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^d$  and  $N \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}^d$ . For that reason, in this subsection, we introduce elements  $\{s_n\}_{n \geq 0} \subset \mathbb{R}_{>0}^d$  with

$$s_n/s_{n+1} \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}^d \text{ and } |s_n/\lambda^n|, |\lambda^n/s_n| = O(1) \text{ for all } n \geq 0.$$

For each  $1 \leq j \leq d$ , let us define by induction a sequence  $\{s_{n,j}\}_{n \geq 0} \subset (0, 1]$  such that  $s_{n,j} \geq \lambda_j^n$  for  $n \geq 0$ . Let  $1 \leq j \leq d$  be given, and set  $s_{0,j} := 1$ . Let  $n \geq 0$  and suppose that  $s_{n,j}$  has already been chosen. Let  $b_{n+1,j}$  be the unique positive integer with

$$\frac{s_{n,j}}{b_{n+1,j}} \geq \lambda_j^{n+1} > \frac{s_{n,j}}{1 + b_{n+1,j}},$$

and set  $s_{n+1,j} = s_{n,j}/b_{n+1,j}$ . This completes the inductive construction of  $\{s_{n,j}\}_{n \geq 0}$ .

For  $n \geq 0$  we set,

$$(2.6) \quad s_n := (s_{n,1}, \dots, s_{n,d}).$$

By construction,  $s_n/s_{n'} \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}^d$  for integers  $n' \geq n \geq 0$ . Moreover,

$$\lambda_j^n \leq \frac{s_{n-1,j}}{b_{n,j}} \leq 2 \frac{s_{n-1,j}}{b_{n,j} + 1} < 2\lambda_j^n,$$

which gives

$$(2.7) \quad \lambda_j^n \leq s_{n,j} < 2\lambda_j^n \text{ for } 1 \leq j \leq d \text{ and } n \geq 0.$$

**2.6. Non-conformal partitions.** For  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$  let  $\mathcal{D}_n^{\mathbb{R}}$  denote the level- $n$  dyadic partition of  $\mathbb{R}$ . That is,

$$\mathcal{D}_n^{\mathbb{R}} := \left\{ \left[ \frac{k}{2^n}, \frac{k+1}{2^n} \right) : k \in \mathbb{Z} \right\}.$$

Given  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , we write  $\mathcal{D}_t^{\mathbb{R}}$  in place of  $\mathcal{D}_{\lfloor t \rfloor}^{\mathbb{R}}$ .

Recall that  $\chi_j := -\log \lambda_j$  for  $1 \leq j \leq d$ . For each  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$  define the following non-conformal partition of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$\mathcal{E}_n := \left\{ D_1 \times \dots \times D_d : D_j \in \mathcal{D}_{\chi_j n}^{\mathbb{R}} \text{ for } 1 \leq j \leq d \right\}.$$

The partitions  $\mathcal{E}_n$  play a key role in [30].

Given  $C \geq 1$ , we say that two Borel partitions  $\mathcal{D}$  and  $\mathcal{E}$  of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  are  $C$ -commensurable if for each  $D \in \mathcal{D}$  and  $E \in \mathcal{E}$ ,

$$\# \{E' \in \mathcal{E} : E' \cap D \neq \emptyset\} \leq C \text{ and } \# \{D' \in \mathcal{D} : D' \cap E \neq \emptyset\} \leq C.$$

In this situation,

$$|H(\mu, \mathcal{D}) - H(\mu, \mathcal{E})| = O(\log C) \text{ for } \mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

It is easy to verify that for  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $J \subset [d]$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$(2.8) \quad T_x^{-1} \pi_J^{-1} \mathcal{E}_n \text{ and } \pi_J^{-1} \mathcal{E}_n \text{ are } O(1)\text{-commensurable.}$$

Additionally, for  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,

$$(2.9) \quad S_{\lambda^k} \pi_J^{-1} \mathcal{E}_n \text{ and } \pi_J^{-1} \mathcal{E}_{n+k} \text{ are } O(1)\text{-commensurable.}$$

Similarly, by (2.7) we get that for  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ ,

$$(2.10) \quad S_{s_k} \pi_J^{-1} \mathcal{E}_n \text{ and } \pi_J^{-1} \mathcal{E}_{n+k} \text{ are } O(1)\text{-commensurable.}$$

**2.7. Basic properties of average entropy.** Let  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  be given. It follows from (2.7) that for  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ ,

$$(2.11) \quad H(\mu, \mathcal{E}_k) = H(\mu; \lambda^k) + O(1) = H(\mu; s_k) + O(1).$$

From (2.3) it is immediate that for  $r, r' \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^d$ ,

$$(2.12) \quad H(\mu; r) = H(S_{r'} \mu; r' r).$$

From (2.3) it is also easy to deduce that for  $N \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}^d$

$$H(\mu; N^{-1} r | r) = \int_{[0,1]^d} H(\lfloor N(X/r+x) \rfloor | \lfloor X/r+x \rfloor) dx,$$

where  $X$  is a random vector with distribution  $\mu$ . This gives,

$$(2.13) \quad 0 \leq H(\mu; N^{-1} r | r) \leq \log(\det N).$$

The following lemma establishes a connection between average and differential entropies. Its proof is similar to the proof of [36, Lemma 5] and is therefore omitted.

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $X$  be a bounded random vector in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Then for all  $(r_1, \dots, r_d) = r \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^d$ , we have*

$$H(X; r) = H(X + I_r) - \log \det r,$$

where  $I_r$  is a uniform random vector in  $[0, r_1] \times \dots \times [0, r_d]$  independent of  $X$ .

From Lemma 2.1 and (2.4) we get that,

$$(2.14) \quad H(T_x \mu; r) = H(\mu; r) \text{ for all } \mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d), r \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^d \text{ and } x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

When the ratio of scales is non-integral, we have the following version of (2.13).

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let  $X$  be a bounded random vector in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , and let  $r = (r_1, \dots, r_d)$  and  $r' = (r'_1, \dots, r'_d)$  be in  $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^d$  with  $r \leq r'$ . Then,*

$$0 \leq H(X; r | r') \leq \sum_{j=1}^d \log \lceil r'_j / r_j \rceil.$$

*Proof.* The proof of the inequality  $H(X; r | r') \geq 0$  is similar to the proof given in [36, Lemma 8] for the case  $d = 1$  and is therefore omitted. In order to prove the second inequality, set  $N := (\lceil r'_1 / r_1 \rceil, \dots, \lceil r'_d / r_d \rceil)$ . By the first inequality and since  $Nr \geq r'$ , we have  $H(X; r | r') \leq H(X; r | Nr)$ . The lemma now follows directly from (2.13).  $\square$

The following lemma shows that average entropy is continuous in its first argument. Its proof is similar to the proof of [36, Lemma 7] and is therefore omitted.

**Lemma 2.3.** *There exists  $C > 1$ , which depends only on  $d$ , so that the following holds. Let  $R_1, R_2 \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  be with  $R_1 \leq C^{-1}R_2$ , let  $X, Y$  be bounded random vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  so that  $|X - Y| \leq R_1$  almost surely, and let  $(r_1, \dots, r_d) = r \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^d$  be with  $r_j \geq R_2$  for  $1 \leq j \leq d$ . Then,*

$$|H(X; r) - H(Y; r)| \leq C \frac{R_1}{R_2} \log(R_2/R_1).$$

For  $r, r' \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^d$  and a nonnegative compactly supported Borel measure  $\theta$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  of total mass  $c > 0$ , we write  $H(\theta; r)$  and  $H(\theta; r | r')$  in place of  $cH(c^{-1}\theta; r)$  and  $cH(c^{-1}\theta; r | r')$ . The proof of the following lemma is similar to the proof of [36, Lemma 10] and is therefore omitted.

**Lemma 2.4.** *Let  $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k$  be nonnegative compactly supported Borel measures on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , and let  $r, r' \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^d$  be with  $r'/r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}^d$ . Then,*

$$H(\mu_1 + \dots + \mu_k; r | r') \geq H(\mu_1; r | r') + \dots + H(\mu_k; r | r').$$

**2.8. Submodularity inequality and applications.** We shall need the following result from [24, Theorem 1] (see also [9, Theorem 10]).

**Theorem 2.5** (Submodularity inequality). *Let  $X, Y, Z$  be independent random vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Suppose that  $Y, X+Y, Y+Z$  and  $X+Y+Z$  are absolutely continuous with finite differential entropy. Then,*

$$H(X+Y+Z) + H(Y) \leq H(X+Y) + H(Y+Z).$$

The following lemma shows that, in the case of integral ratio of scales, average conditional entropy does not decrease under convolution. Its proof, which relies on Theorem 2.5, is similar to the proof of [36, Lemma 6] and is therefore omitted.

**Lemma 2.6.** *For  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $r, r' \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^d$  with  $r'/r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}^d$ , we have  $H(\mu * \nu; r | r') \geq H(\mu; r | r')$ .*

The following statement is a version for average entropy of a classical lemma due to Kaimanovich and Vershik [22]. Given  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $k \geq 1$ , we write  $\nu^{*k}$  for the  $k$ -fold convolution of  $\nu$  with itself.

**Lemma 2.7.** *Let  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $(r_1, \dots, r_d) = r \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^d$  be given. Then for each  $k \geq 1$ ,*

$$H(\mu * \nu^{*k}; r) - H(\mu; r) \leq k(H(\mu * \nu; r) - H(\mu; r)).$$

*Proof.* For  $k \geq 1$  set,

$$\delta_k := H(\mu * \nu^{*k}; r) - H(\mu * \nu^{*(k-1)}; r).$$

In order to prove the lemma, it suffices to show that  $\delta_{k+1} \leq \delta_k$  for each  $k \geq 1$ . Fix  $k \geq 1$ , let  $X$  be a random vector with distribution  $\mu$ , let  $Y_1, \dots, Y_{k+1}$  be random vectors distributed according to  $\nu$ , and let  $I_r$  be a uniform random vector in  $[0, r_1] \times \dots \times [0, r_d]$ . Suppose that  $X, Y_1, \dots, Y_{k+1}, I_r$  are all independent. Setting  $Z := I_r + X + Y_1 + \dots + Y_{k-1}$ , it follows from Lemma 2.1 that

$$\delta_k = H(Z + Y_{k+1}) - H(Z) \quad \text{and} \quad \delta_{k+1} = H(Z + Y_k + Y_{k+1}) - H(Z + Y_k).$$

Together with Theorem 2.5 this gives  $\delta_{k+1} \leq \delta_k$ , which completes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

### 3. AN ENTROPY INCREASE RESULT

The purpose of this section is to prove Theorem 1.5. The general strategy follows the proof of [36, Theorem 3], but, as explained in Section 1.3, there are substantial differences in the argument. In Section 3.1, decompositions of elements of  $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  are constructed in which a non-negligible part of the mass is captured by Bernoulli measures of a certain scale. In Section 3.2, entropy increase is obtained for convolutions with Bernoulli measures. In Section 3.3, we use these results in order to complete the proof of Theorem 1.5.

**3.1. Measure decomposition.** The following proposition, which extends [36, Proposition 21], is the main result of this subsection. Given a nonnegative measure  $\theta$ , we write  $\|\theta\|$  for its total mass. Recall the sequence  $\{s_n\}_{n \geq 0} \subset \mathbb{R}_{>0}^d$  defined in Section 2.5.

**Proposition 3.1.** *For all  $N \geq N(\lambda) \geq 1$  there exists  $\epsilon = \epsilon(\lambda, N) > 0$  such that the following holds. Let  $n \geq N$  and let  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  be finitely supported and with,*

$$H(\nu; s_{n+N} \mid s_n) \leq \frac{3}{2}H(\nu; s_n \mid s_{n-N}).$$

*Then  $\nu = \theta + \zeta_1 + \dots + \zeta_L$ , where  $\theta, \zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_L$  are nonnegative measures,*

$$\|\zeta_1\| + \dots + \|\zeta_L\| \geq \epsilon \frac{H(\nu; s_n \mid s_{n-N})}{\max\{1, -\log H(\nu; s_n \mid s_{n-N})\}},$$

*and for each  $1 \leq i \leq L$  there exist  $x_i, y_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$  so that  $\zeta_i = \frac{\|\zeta_i\|}{2}(\delta_{x_i} + \delta_{y_i})$  and  $\epsilon \leq |s_n^{-1}(x_i - y_i)| \leq \epsilon^{-1}$ .*

The proof of the proposition requires some preparations.

**Lemma 3.2.** *For all  $N \geq N(\lambda) \geq 1$ ,  $\theta \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  with  $\text{diam}(\text{supp}(\theta)) \leq 1/3$ , and  $n \geq N$ , we have*

$$H\left(\theta; \frac{s_{n+N}}{s_{n+2N}} \mid \frac{s_n}{s_{n+2N}}\right) \geq 2H\left(\theta; \frac{s_n}{s_{n+2N}} \mid \frac{s_{n-N}}{s_{n+2N}}\right).$$

*Proof.* Let  $\theta \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  be with  $\text{diam}(\text{supp}(\theta)) \leq 1/3$ . By (2.14) we may assume that  $\text{supp}(\theta) \subset (-1, 0)^d$ . Let  $X = (X_1, \dots, X_d)$  be a random vector with distribution  $\theta$ . For  $1 \leq j \leq d$  and  $t \geq 0$  define the events,

$$E_{j,t}^- := \{X_j + t < 0\} \text{ and } E_{j,t}^+ := \{X_j + t \geq 0\}.$$

Let  $(r_1, \dots, r_d) = r \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^d$  be with  $r_j > 1$  for  $1 \leq j \leq d$ . Given  $1 \leq j \leq d$  and  $0 \leq t \leq r_j$  it follows from  $\text{supp}(\theta) \subset (-1, 0)^d$  that almost surely  $\lfloor (X_j + t)/r_j \rfloor = -1$  on  $E_{j,t}^-$  and  $\lfloor (X_j + t)/r_j \rfloor = 0$  on  $E_{j,t}^+$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} H(\theta; r) &= \frac{1}{\det r} \int_{\times_{j=1}^d [0, r_j)} H(\lfloor (X + y)/r \rfloor) dy \\ (3.1) \quad &= \frac{1}{\det r} \int_{\times_{j=1}^d [0, r_j)} \sum_{u \in \{-, +\}^d} F\left(\mathbb{P}\left(\cap_{j=1}^d E_{j, y_j}^{u_j}\right)\right) dy, \end{aligned}$$

where recall that  $F(t) = -t \log t$ .

For  $1 \leq j \leq d$  set  $I_0^j := [0, 1)$  and  $I_1^j := [1, r_j)$ . Note that,

$$(3.2) \quad \mathbb{P}(E_{j,t}^+) = 1 \text{ for } 1 \leq j \leq d \text{ and } t \in I_1^j.$$

Write  $\bar{\mathbf{1}}$  in place of  $(1, \dots, 1) \in \{0, 1\}^d$ . For  $(v_1, \dots, v_d) = v \in \{0, 1\}^d \setminus \{\bar{\mathbf{1}}\}$  set  $l_v := \#\{1 \leq j \leq d : v_j = 0\}$ , let  $1 \leq j_{v,1} < \dots < j_{v,l_v} \leq d$  be with  $v_{j_{v,k}} = 0$  for  $1 \leq k \leq l_v$ , set  $J_v := [d] \setminus \{j_{v,1}, \dots, j_{v,l_v}\}$ , and write

$$C_v := \int_{[0,1)^{l_v}} \sum_{u \in \{-, +\}^{l_v}} F\left(\mathbb{P}\left(\cap_{k=1}^{l_v} E_{j_{v,k}, y_k}^{u_k}\right)\right) dy_1 \dots dy_{l_v}.$$

Note that  $C_v$  does not depend on  $r$ . By (3.2)

$$\frac{1}{\det r} \int_{\times_{j=1}^d I_v^j} \sum_{u \in \{-, +\}^d} F\left(\mathbb{P}\left(\cap_{j=1}^d E_{j, y_j}^{u_j}\right)\right) dy = C_v \prod_{1 \leq k \leq l_v} r_{j_{v,k}}^{-1} \prod_{j \in J_v} (1 - r_j^{-1}),$$

and

$$\frac{1}{\det r} \int_{\times_{j=1}^d I_1^j} \sum_{u \in \{-, +\}^d} F\left(\mathbb{P}\left(\cap_{j=1}^d E_{j, y_j}^{u_j}\right)\right) dy = 0.$$

Thus, from (3.1)

$$(3.3) \quad H(\theta; r) = \sum_{v \in \{0,1\}^d \setminus \{\bar{\mathbf{1}}\}} C_v \prod_{1 \leq k \leq l_v} r_{j_{v,k}}^{-1} \prod_{j \in J_v} (1 - r_j^{-1}).$$

Recall that by (2.7) we have  $\lambda_j^n \leq s_{n,j} < 2\lambda_j^n$  for  $1 \leq j \leq d$  and  $n \geq 0$ . From this and since (3.3) holds for all  $(r_1, \dots, r_d) = r \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^d$  with  $r_j > 1$  for  $1 \leq j \leq d$ , it follows that for all sufficiently large  $N \geq 1$  and all  $n \geq 0$ ,

$$H\left(\theta; \frac{s_n}{s_{n+N}}\right) = \Theta \left( \sum_{v \in \{0,1\}^d \setminus \{\bar{\mathbf{1}}\}} C_v \prod_{1 \leq k \leq l_v} \lambda_{j_{v,k}}^N \right).$$

Now the lemma follows directly by choosing  $N$  to be sufficiently large.  $\square$

The proof of the following lemma is similar to the proof of [36, Lemma 25] and is therefore omitted. Recall that we write  $|r|$  for the Euclidean norm of  $r \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^d$ .

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $r, r' \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^d$  and let  $B_1, \dots, B_k \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  be closed balls such that  $\text{dist}(B_{i_1}, B_{i_2}) > |r|, |r'|$  for all  $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 \leq k$ . Then  $H(\theta; r | r') = \sum_{i=1}^k H(\theta|_{B_i}; r | r')$  for all  $\theta \in \mathcal{M}(\cup_{i=1}^k B_i)$ .*

The proof of the following lemma is similar to the proof of [36, Lemma 26] and is therefore omitted.

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and let  $\theta, \zeta$  be nonnegative Borel measures with  $\nu = \theta + \zeta$  and  $\|\zeta\| < 1/2$ . Then for all  $r \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^d$  and  $N \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}^d$ ,*

$$H(\theta; r | Nr) \leq H(\nu; r | Nr) \leq H(\theta; r | Nr) + 2\|\zeta\| \log(\|\zeta\|^{-1} \det N).$$

*Proof of Proposition 3.1.* Let  $N \geq 1$  be large with respect to  $\lambda$ , let  $n \geq N$ , and let  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  be finitely supported and with

$$(3.4) \quad H(\nu; s_{n+N} | s_n) \leq \frac{3}{2} H(\nu; s_n | s_{n-N}).$$

Set  $R := 2\lceil \lambda^{-3N} \rceil$ . Let  $S_{s_{n+2N}}^{-1} \nu = \theta + \zeta_1 + \dots + \zeta_L$  be a decomposition of  $S_{s_{n+2N}}^{-1} \nu$  such that  $\theta, \zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_L$  are nonnegative measures, for each  $1 \leq i \leq L$  there exist  $x_i, y_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$  so that  $\zeta_i = \frac{\|\zeta_i\|}{2}(\delta_{x_i} + \delta_{y_i})$  and  $1/6 \leq |x_i - y_i| \leq R$ , and  $\|\theta\|$  is minimal among all such decompositions. Since  $\nu$  is finitely supported, the minimum clearly exists.

Let  $0 < \epsilon < 1$  be small with respect to  $\lambda$  and  $N$ , and set  $\delta := 1 - \|\theta\|$ . By (2.7) we have  $\lambda_d^{2N}/12 \leq |s_n^{-1} s_{n+2N}(x_i - y_i)| \leq R$  for  $1 \leq i \leq L$ . Thus, in order to prove the proposition it suffices to show that

$$(3.5) \quad \delta \geq \epsilon \frac{H(\nu; s_n | s_{n-N})}{\max\{1, -\log H(\nu; s_n | s_{n-N})\}}.$$

From (2.7) and (2.13),

$$H(\nu; s_n | s_{n-N}) \leq \det(s_{n-N}/s_n) \leq 2^d \lambda_d^{-dN}.$$

Hence we may assume that  $\delta < \epsilon^{1/2}$ , otherwise (3.5) holds whenever  $\epsilon$  is sufficiently small with respect to  $\lambda$  and  $N$ .

By the minimality of  $\|\theta\|$ , for each  $x, y \in \text{supp}(\theta)$  we have  $|x - y| < 1/6$  or  $|x - y| > R$ . Thus, it is easy to see that there exist closed balls  $B_1, \dots, B_k \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  so that  $\text{diam}(B_i) < 1/3$  for  $1 \leq i \leq k$ ,  $\text{dist}(B_{i_1}, B_{i_2}) > R$  for  $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 \leq k$ , and  $\text{supp}(\theta) \subset \cup_{i=1}^k B_i$ . By (2.7) and the choice of  $R$ ,

$$\left| \frac{s_{n+N}}{s_{n+2N}} \right|, \left| \frac{s_n}{s_{n+2N}} \right|, \left| \frac{s_{n-N}}{s_{n+2N}} \right| \leq R.$$

Thus, by Lemmata 3.2 and 3.3,

$$H\left(\theta; \frac{s_{n+N}}{s_{n+2N}} \mid \frac{s_n}{s_{n+2N}}\right) \geq 2H\left(\theta; \frac{s_n}{s_{n+2N}} \mid \frac{s_{n-N}}{s_{n+2N}}\right).$$

Together with (2.12) this gives,

$$(3.6) \quad H(S_{s_{n+2N}} \theta; s_{n+N} | s_n) \geq 2H(S_{s_{n+2N}} \theta; s_n | s_{n-N}).$$

From Lemma 3.4,  $\delta < \epsilon^{1/2} < 1/2$  and  $\det(s_{n-N}/s_n) \leq 2^d \lambda_d^{-dN}$ , we get

$$H(\nu; s_{n+N} | s_n) \geq H(S_{s_{n+2N}} \theta; s_{n+N} | s_n)$$

and

$$H(S_{s_{n+2N}} \theta; s_n | s_{n-N}) \geq H(\nu; s_n | s_{n-N}) - 2\delta \log(\delta^{-1} 2^d \lambda_d^{-dN}).$$



Together with (3.6) and  $\delta < \epsilon^{1/2} < 2^{-d} \lambda_d^{dN}$ , these inequalities yield

$$H(\nu; s_{n+N} \mid s_n) \geq 2H(\nu; s_n \mid s_{n-N}) + 8\delta \log \delta.$$

Hence, by (3.4),

$$(3.7) \quad \delta \log \delta^{-1} \geq \frac{1}{16} H(\nu; s_n \mid s_{n-N}).$$

Now assume by contradiction that (3.5) does not hold, and set  $h := H(\nu; s_n \mid s_{n-N})$ . From  $\delta < \epsilon^{1/2}$  and (3.7), and by assuming that  $\epsilon$  is sufficiently small, we get  $h < 1/2$ . Thus, since (3.5) does not hold, we have  $\delta < \frac{\epsilon h}{-\log h}$ . From this, since  $t \rightarrow t \log t^{-1}$  is increasing on a right neighbourhood of 0, and by assuming that  $\epsilon$  is sufficiently small, we obtain

$$\delta \log \delta^{-1} < \frac{\epsilon h}{-\log h} \log(\epsilon^{-1} h^{-1} \log h^{-1}) \leq h/16.$$

But this contradicts (3.7), which completes the proof of the proposition.  $\square$

**3.2. Entropy increase for convolutions with Bernoulli measures.** The following proposition is the main result of this subsection. Recall that the notion of an  $(\epsilon, m)$ -non-saturated measure is defined in Definition 1.4.

**Proposition 3.5.** *For each  $0 < \epsilon < 1$  and  $M \geq 1$  there exists  $\delta = \delta(\lambda, \epsilon, M) > 0$  such that for all  $N \geq N(\lambda, \epsilon, M) \geq 1$  and  $n \geq N$  the following holds. Let  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  be  $(\epsilon, m)$ -non-saturated for all  $m \geq M$ , let  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$  be with  $\epsilon \leq |s_n^{-1}(x - y)| \leq \epsilon^{-1}$ , and set  $\zeta := \frac{1}{2}(\delta_x + \delta_y)$ . Then,*

$$H(\mu * \zeta; s_n \mid s_{n-N}) \geq H(\mu; s_n \mid s_{n-N}) + \delta.$$

**3.2.1. Entropy of repeated self-convolutions of Bernoulli measures.** For  $1 \leq j \leq d$  and  $\sigma \in \mathcal{M}(e_j \mathbb{R})$ , we write  $\text{Var}(\sigma)$  to denote the variance of  $\sigma'$ , where  $\sigma' \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R})$  is the push-forward of  $\sigma$  via the map sending  $te_j$  to  $t$ . Recall that in Section 2.1 we describe how we use the relation  $\ll$ . The following lemma, whose proof relies on the Berry-Esseen theorem, is established in [30, Lemma 3.2].

**Lemma 3.6.** *Let  $0 < \epsilon < 1$  and  $m, l, k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$  be with  $\epsilon^{-1} \ll m \ll l \ll k$ , and let  $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_k \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  be with  $\text{diam}(\text{supp}(\theta_i)) \leq \epsilon^{-1}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq k$ . Set  $\sigma := \theta_1 * \dots * \theta_k$ , and suppose that there exists  $1 \leq j \leq d$  so that  $\text{Var}(\pi_j \sigma) \geq \epsilon k$  and  $\text{Var}(\pi_{j'} \sigma) \leq \epsilon^{-1}$  for  $1 \leq j' < j$ . Then for  $a := \lfloor \frac{1}{2\chi_j} \log k \rfloor$ ,*

$$\frac{1}{m} H\left(\sigma, \mathcal{E}_{l-a+m} \mid \mathcal{E}_{l-a} \vee \pi_{[d] \setminus \{j\}}^{-1} \mathcal{E}_{l-a+m}\right) > \chi_j - \epsilon.$$

**Corollary 3.7.** *Let  $0 < \epsilon < 1$  and  $m_1, \dots, m_d, l_1, \dots, l_d, k_1, \dots, k_d \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$  be such that  $\epsilon^{-1} \ll m_d, m_j \ll l_j \ll k_j$  for  $1 \leq j \leq d$ , and  $k_{j+1} \ll m_j$  for  $1 \leq j < d$ . Let  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$  be with  $\epsilon \leq |x - y| \leq \epsilon^{-1}$ , and set  $\zeta := \frac{1}{2}(\delta_x + \delta_y)$ . Then there exists  $1 \leq j \leq d$  so that for  $a := \lfloor \frac{1}{2\chi_j} \log k_j \rfloor$ ,*

$$\frac{1}{m_j} H\left(\zeta^{*k_j}, \mathcal{E}_{l_j-a+m_j} \mid \mathcal{E}_{l_j-a} \vee \pi_{[d] \setminus \{j\}}^{-1} \mathcal{E}_{l_j-a+m_j}\right) > \chi_j - \epsilon.$$

*Proof.* Set  $\epsilon_d := \epsilon^2/(4d)$  and for  $1 \leq j < d$  set  $\epsilon_j := k_{j+1}^{-1}$ . We have,

$$4 \sum_{j=1}^d \text{Var}(\pi_j \zeta) = \sum_{j=1}^d |\pi_j x - \pi_j y|^2 = |x - y|^2 \geq \epsilon^2.$$

Thus, there exists  $1 \leq j \leq d$ , which we fix, so that  $\text{Var}(\pi_j \zeta) \geq \epsilon_j$  and  $\text{Var}(\pi_{j'} \zeta) < \epsilon_{j'}$  for  $1 \leq j' < j$ . Setting  $\sigma := \zeta^{*k_j}$ , it holds that  $\text{Var}(\pi_{j'} \sigma) = k_j \text{Var}(\pi_{j'} \zeta)$  for  $1 \leq j' \leq d$ . Hence,  $\text{Var}(\pi_j \sigma) \geq k_j \epsilon_j$  and  $\text{Var}(\pi_{j'} \sigma) < k_j \epsilon_{j'} \leq 1$  for  $1 \leq j' < j$ . Now the lemma follows directly from Lemma 3.6.  $\square$

### 3.2.2. Proof of the proposition.

*Proof of Proposition 3.5.* Let  $0 < \epsilon < 1$  and  $M, N, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$  be with  $\epsilon^{-1}, M \ll N$  and  $n \geq N$ , let  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  be  $(\epsilon, m)$ -non-saturated for all  $m \geq M$ , let  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$  be with  $\epsilon \leq |s_n^{-1}(x - y)| \leq \epsilon^{-1}$ , and set  $\zeta := \frac{1}{2}(\delta_x + \delta_y)$ .

Let  $m_1, \dots, m_d, l_1, \dots, l_d, k_1, \dots, k_d \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$  be such that  $\epsilon^{-1}, M \ll m_d, k_1 \ll N, m_j \ll l_j \ll k_j$  for  $1 \leq j \leq d$ , and  $k_{j+1} \ll m_j$  for  $1 \leq j < d$ . By Corollary 3.7 there exists  $1 \leq j \leq d$  so that for  $a := \lfloor \frac{1}{2\chi_j} \log k_j \rfloor$ ,

$$\frac{1}{m_j} H \left( (S_{s_n}^{-1} \zeta)^{*k_j}, \mathcal{E}_{l_j - a + m_j} \mid \mathcal{E}_{l_j - a} \vee \pi_{[d] \setminus \{j\}}^{-1} \mathcal{E}_{l_j - a + m_j} \right) > \chi_j - \epsilon/4.$$

Thus, setting  $n' := n + l_j - a$  and  $\mathcal{C} := \mathcal{E}_{n'} \vee \pi_{[d] \setminus \{j\}}^{-1} \mathcal{E}_{n' + m_j}$ , it follows from  $\epsilon^{-1} \ll m_d$  and (2.10) that

$$\frac{1}{m_j} H \left( \zeta^{*k_j}, \mathcal{E}_{n' + m_j} \mid \mathcal{C} \right) > \chi_j - \epsilon/3.$$

From this, since  $\mu$  is  $(\epsilon, m_j)$ -non-saturated, and by (2.8) combined with the concavity of conditional entropy,

$$\frac{1}{m_j} H \left( \mu * \zeta^{*k_j}, \mathcal{E}_{n' + m_j} \mid \mathcal{C} \right) > \frac{1}{m_j} H \left( \mu, \mathcal{E}_{n' + m_j} \mid \mathcal{C} \right) + \epsilon/2.$$

By (2.8) and concavity it also follows that,

$$\frac{1}{m_j} H \left( \mu * \zeta^{*k_j}, \pi_{[d] \setminus \{j\}}^{-1} \mathcal{E}_{n' + m_j} \mid \mathcal{E}_{n'} \right) \geq \frac{1}{m_j} H \left( \mu, \pi_{[d] \setminus \{j\}}^{-1} \mathcal{E}_{n' + m_j} \mid \mathcal{E}_{n'} \right) - \epsilon/6.$$

From the last two inequalities together with the conditional entropy formula,

$$\frac{1}{m_j} H \left( \mu * \zeta^{*k_j}, \mathcal{E}_{n' + m_j} \mid \mathcal{E}_{n'} \right) \geq \frac{1}{m_j} H \left( \mu, \mathcal{E}_{n' + m_j} \mid \mathcal{E}_{n'} \right) + \epsilon/3.$$

Since  $m_j, l_j \ll k_j$ , we have  $n' + m_j \leq n$ . Thus, by the last inequality and concavity,

$$\begin{aligned} & H \left( \mu * \zeta^{*k_j}, \mathcal{E}_n \right) \\ &= H \left( \mu * \zeta^{*k_j}, \mathcal{E}_n \mid \mathcal{E}_{n' + m_j} \right) + H \left( \mu * \zeta^{*k_j}, \mathcal{E}_{n' + m_j} \mid \mathcal{E}_{n'} \right) + H \left( \mu * \zeta^{*k_j}, \mathcal{E}_{n'} \right) \\ &\geq H \left( \mu, \mathcal{E}_n \mid \mathcal{E}_{n' + m_j} \right) + H \left( \mu, \mathcal{E}_{n' + m_j} \mid \mathcal{E}_{n'} \right) + H \left( \mu, \mathcal{E}_{n'} \right) + (m_j \epsilon)/3 - O(1) \\ &\geq H \left( \mu, \mathcal{E}_n \right) + (m_j \epsilon)/4. \end{aligned}$$

Together with (2.11) this gives,

$$H \left( \mu * \zeta^{*k_j}, s_n \right) \geq H \left( \mu, s_n \right) + (m_j \epsilon)/5.$$

Hence by Lemma 2.7,

$$(3.8) \quad H \left( \mu * \zeta, s_n \right) \geq H \left( \mu, s_n \right) + \frac{m_j \epsilon}{5k_j}.$$

Let  $X$  and  $Z$  be independent random vectors with distributions  $S_{s_n - N}^{-1} \mu$  and  $S_{s_n - N}^{-1} \zeta$  respectively, and set  $Y := X + Z$ . From  $|s_n^{-1}(x - y)| \leq \epsilon^{-1}$  and (2.7) it

follows that  $|s_{n-N}^{-1}x + X - Y| \leq 2d\epsilon^{-1}\lambda_1^N$  almost surely. Thus, by Lemma 2.3 and (2.14),

$$\left| H\left(X; 1_{\mathbb{R}_{>0}^d}\right) - H\left(Y; 1_{\mathbb{R}_{>0}^d}\right) \right| = O\left(-\epsilon^{-1}\lambda_1^N \log\left(\epsilon^{-1}\lambda_1^N\right)\right),$$

where  $1_{\mathbb{R}_{>0}^d}$  is the identity of  $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^d$ . From this, by (2.12) and since  $\epsilon^{-1}, m_j, k_j \ll N$ , we may assume that

$$|H(\mu; s_{n-N}) - H(\mu * \zeta; s_{n-N})| \leq \frac{m_j \epsilon}{10k_j}.$$

By combining this with (3.8) we get

$$H(\mu * \zeta, s_n | s_{n-N}) \geq H(\mu, s_n | s_{n-N}) + \frac{m_j \epsilon}{10k_j},$$

which completes the proof of the proposition with  $\delta := (m_j \epsilon)/(10k_j)$ .  $\square$

**3.3. Proof of Theorem 1.5.** For the proof of the theorem we shall need the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.8.** *For all  $N \geq 1$  there exists  $C = C(\lambda, N) > 1$  such that the following holds. Let  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $0 < \beta < 1/2$  and  $t_2 > t_1 > 0$  be with  $t_2 - t_1 > 3N - \frac{1}{\log \lambda_1}$  and  $\frac{1}{t_2 - t_1} H(\nu; \lambda^{t_2} | \lambda^{t_1}) > \beta$ . Set  $\tau_1 := \left\lceil \frac{t_1}{N} + 1 - \frac{1}{N \log \lambda_1} \right\rceil$  and  $\tau_2 := \lfloor \frac{t_2}{N} \rfloor$ , and let  $\mathcal{N}$  be the set of all integers  $\tau_1 \leq n < \tau_2$  so that,*

$$H(\nu; s_{Nn} | s_{Nn-N}) \geq \max \left\{ \frac{2}{3} H(\nu; s_{Nn+N} | s_{Nn}), \frac{\beta}{6} \right\}.$$

Then,

$$\sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} H(\nu; s_{Nn} | s_{Nn-N}) \geq \frac{\beta}{6} (t_2 - t_1) - C.$$

*Proof.* Let  $N \geq 1$  be given, and let  $\nu, \beta, t_1, t_2, \tau_1, \tau_2$  and  $\mathcal{N}$  be as in the statement of the lemma. For each  $\tau_1 \leq n \leq \tau_2$  set  $\alpha_n := H(\nu; s_{Nn} | s_{Nn-N})$ . Let  $\mathcal{N}'$  be the set of all integers  $\tau_1 \leq n < \tau_2$  so that  $\alpha_n \geq \frac{2}{3}\alpha_{n+1}$ . Let  $n_1 < n_2 < \dots < n_{k-1}$  be an enumeration of  $\mathcal{N}'$ , and set  $n_0 := \tau_1 - 1$  and  $n_k := \tau_2$ . For  $1 \leq q \leq k$  and  $n_{q-1} < n < n_q$  we have  $\alpha_n \leq \frac{2}{3}\alpha_{n+1}$ , which by induction gives  $\alpha_n \leq (2/3)^{n_q - n} \alpha_{n_q}$ . Thus,

$$\sum_{n=n_{q-1}+1}^{n_q} \alpha_n \leq 3\alpha_{n_q} \text{ for } 1 \leq q \leq k.$$

By (2.7) and Lemma 2.2,

$$H(\nu; s_{N\tau_1-N} | \lambda^{t_1}), H(\nu; \lambda^{t_2} | s_{N\tau_2}), \alpha_{n_k} = O_{\lambda, N}(1).$$

Additionally,

$$H(\nu; \lambda^{t_2} | \lambda^{t_1}) = H(\nu; \lambda^{t_2} | s_{N\tau_2}) + H(\nu; s_{N\tau_1-N} | \lambda^{t_1}) + \sum_{q=1}^k \sum_{n=n_{q-1}+1}^{n_q} \alpha_n.$$

By combining all of this together with  $\frac{1}{t_2 - t_1} H(\nu; \lambda^{t_2} | \lambda^{t_1}) > \beta$ , we obtain

$$\beta(t_2 - t_1) < 3 \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}'} \alpha_n + O_{\lambda, N}(1).$$

Moreover, by the definition of  $\mathcal{N}$ ,

$$\sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}' \setminus \mathcal{N}} \alpha_n \leq \frac{\beta}{6} |\mathcal{N}'| \leq \frac{\beta}{6} (t_2 - t_1).$$

Now, from the last two inequalities

$$\frac{1}{2} \beta (t_2 - t_1) < 3 \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \alpha_n + O_{\lambda, N}(1),$$

which completes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

We can now prove Theorem 1.5, which is the following statement.

**Theorem.** *For each  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $M \geq 1$ , there exists  $C = C(\lambda, \epsilon, M) > 1$  such that the following holds. Let  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  be  $(\epsilon, m)$ -non-saturated for all  $m \geq M$ , and let  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $0 < \beta < 1/2$  and  $t_2 > t_1 > 0$  be with  $\frac{1}{t_2 - t_1} H(\nu; \lambda^{t_2} | \lambda^{t_1}) > \beta$ . Then,*

$$H(\nu * \mu; \lambda^{t_2} | \lambda^{t_1}) \geq H(\mu; \lambda^{t_2} | \lambda^{t_1}) + C^{-1} \beta (\log \beta^{-1})^{-1} (t_2 - t_1) - C.$$

*Proof.* Let  $0 < \epsilon < 1$  and  $M \geq 1$  be given, and let  $N_1, N_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$  and  $0 < \delta < 1$  be with  $N_2/N_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$  and

$$(3.9) \quad \epsilon^{-1}, M \ll N_1 \ll \delta^{-1} \ll N_2.$$

Suppose also that  $N_1$  is large with respect to  $\lambda$ . Let  $\mu, \nu, \beta, t_1, t_2$  be as in the statement of the theorem.

By Lemma 2.3 we may assume that  $\nu$  is finitely supported. Additionally, by Lemma 2.2 we may assume that  $t_2 - t_1 > 3N_1 - \frac{1}{\log \lambda_1}$ . Set  $\tau_1 := \left\lceil \frac{t_1}{N_1} + 1 - \frac{1}{N_1 \log \lambda_1} \right\rceil$  and  $\tau_2 := \left\lfloor \frac{t_2}{N_1} \right\rfloor$ , and let  $\mathcal{N}$  be the set of all integers  $\tau_1 \leq n < \tau_2$  so that,

$$H(\nu; s_{N_1 n} | s_{N_1 n - N_1}) \geq \max \left\{ \frac{2}{3} H(\nu; s_{N_1 n + N_1} | s_{N_1 n}), \frac{\beta}{6} \right\}.$$

For an integer  $0 \leq q < N_2/N_1$  let  $\mathcal{N}_q$  be the set of all  $n \in \mathcal{N}$  so that  $n \geq \tau_1 + N_2/N_1$  and  $n = q \pmod{N_2/N_1}$ . By Lemma 3.8 there exists  $0 \leq q < N_2/N_1$ , which we fix for the rest of the proof, so that

$$(3.10) \quad \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}_q} H(\nu; s_{N_1 n} | s_{N_1 n - N_1}) \geq \frac{N_1 \beta}{6 N_2} (t_2 - t_1) - O_{\lambda, N_1, N_2}(1).$$

Let  $n \in \mathcal{N}_q$  be given. Since  $\nu$  is finitely supported and by Proposition 3.1, there exist nonnegative measures  $\theta_n, \zeta_{n,1}, \dots, \zeta_{n, L_n}$  so that  $\nu = \theta_n + \zeta_{n,1} + \dots + \zeta_{n, L_n}$ ,

$$(3.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{L_n} \|\zeta_{n,i}\| &\geq \delta \frac{H(\nu; s_{N_1 n} | s_{N_1 n - N_1})}{\max\{1, -\log H(\nu; s_{N_1 n} | s_{N_1 n - N_1})\}} \\ &\geq \delta \frac{H(\nu; s_{N_1 n} | s_{N_1 n - N_1})}{-4 \log \beta}, \end{aligned}$$

and for each  $1 \leq i \leq L_n$  there exist  $x_{n,i}, y_{n,i} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  with  $\zeta_{n,i} = \frac{\|\zeta_{n,i}\|}{2} (\delta_{x_{n,i}} + \delta_{y_{n,i}})$  and  $\delta \leq |s_{N_1 n}^{-1}(x_{n,i} - y_{n,i})| \leq \delta^{-1}$ . Since  $\mu$  is  $(\epsilon, m)$ -non-saturated for  $m \geq M$ , from (3.9), and by Proposition 3.5, for  $1 \leq i \leq L_n$  we have

$$H(\mu * \zeta_{n,i}; s_{N_1 n} | s_{N_1 n - N_2}) \geq \|\zeta_{n,i}\| \left( H(\mu; s_{N_1 n} | s_{N_1 n - N_2}) + N_2^{-1} \right).$$

From this, by Lemmata 2.4 and 2.6, and from (3.11),  
 (3.12)

$$H(\mu * \nu; s_{N_1 n} | s_{N_1 n - N_2}) \geq H(\mu; s_{N_1 n} | s_{N_1 n - N_2}) + \delta \frac{H(\nu; s_{N_1 n} | s_{N_1 n - N_1})}{-4N_2 \log \beta}.$$

Let  $n_1 < \dots < n_k$  be an enumeration of  $\mathcal{N}_q$ . By the definition of  $\mathcal{N}_q$  we have  $n_1 - N_2/N_1 \geq \tau_1$ ,  $n_k < \tau_2$  and  $n_{i+1} - N_2/N_1 \geq n_i$  for  $1 \leq i < k$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} H(\nu * \mu; s_{N_1 \tau_2} | s_{N_1 \tau_1}) &= H(\nu * \mu; s_{N_1 \tau_2} | s_{N_1 n_k}) + H(\nu * \mu; s_{N_1 n_1 - N_2} | s_{N_1 \tau_1}) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^k H(\nu * \mu; s_{N_1 n_i} | s_{N_1 n_i - N_2}) + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} H(\nu * \mu; s_{N_1 n_{i+1} - N_2} | s_{N_1 n_i}). \end{aligned}$$

From this, since (3.12) holds for all  $n \in \mathcal{N}_q$ , and by Lemma 2.6,

$$H(\nu * \mu; s_{N_1 \tau_2} | s_{N_1 \tau_1}) \geq H(\mu; s_{N_1 \tau_2} | s_{N_1 \tau_1}) + \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}_q} \delta \frac{H(\nu; s_{N_1 n} | s_{N_1 n - N_1})}{-4N_2 \log \beta}.$$

Together with (3.10), the last inequality gives

$$\begin{aligned} H(\nu * \mu; s_{N_1 \tau_2} | s_{N_1 \tau_1}) &\geq H(\mu; s_{N_1 \tau_2} | s_{N_1 \tau_1}) \\ &\quad + \frac{\delta N_1 \beta}{24N_2^2 \log \beta^{-1}} (t_2 - t_1) - O_{\lambda, N_1, N_2}(1). \end{aligned}$$

This, together with (2.7) and Lemma 2.2, completes the proof of the theorem.  $\square$

#### 4. ALGEBRAIC APPROXIMATION FOR PARAMETERS WITH DIMENSION DROP

The purpose of this section is to establish Theorem 1.3. The proof is similar to the proof of [32, Theorem A.2], which is a modification of the argument in [8].

In Section 4.1, we introduce notation for convolution factors of  $\mu_\lambda$  and state some basic properties. In Section 4.2, we establish non-saturation of  $\mu_\lambda$  and its convolution factors. In Section 4.3, we state a result from [8], which relies on Theorem 1.5 and plays a key role in the argument. In Section 4.4, we provide two necessary Diophantine statements. In Section 4.5, we complete the proof of the theorem.

**4.1. Convolution factors of  $\mu_\lambda$  and basic properties.** Let  $\{\xi_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$  be a sequence of  $\Lambda$ -valued i.i.d. random elements with  $\mathbb{P}\{\xi_0 = i\} = p_i$  for  $i \in \Lambda$ . For a bounded subset  $I$  of  $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ , we denote by  $\mu_\lambda^I \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  the law of random vector

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}: \lambda_1^n \in I} a_{\xi_n} \lambda^n,$$

where recall from Section 2.2 that  $a_i := (a_{i,1}, \dots, a_{i,d})$  for  $i \in \Lambda$ . Note that,

$$(4.1) \quad \mu_\lambda^{\lambda_1^k I} = S_{\lambda^k} \mu_\lambda^I \text{ for } k \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Also note that  $\mu_\lambda^{(0,1]} = \mu_\lambda$ , and so  $\mu_\lambda^I$  is a convolution factor of  $\mu_\lambda$  when  $I \subset (0, 1]$ . That is, there exists  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  such that  $\mu_\lambda = \nu * \mu_\lambda^I$ .

For  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$  we have  $\mu_\lambda^{(n)} = \mu_\lambda^{(\lambda_1^n, 1]}$ , where  $\mu_\lambda^{(n)}$  is defined in Section 2.2. By an argument similar to the one given in the proof of [30, Lemma 6.4],

$$(4.2) \quad H(\mu_\lambda^{(n')}, \mathcal{E}_n) = H(\mu_\lambda, \mathcal{E}_n) + O(1) \text{ for } n' \geq n \geq 1.$$

For  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  we write

$$H(\mu; t_1) := H\left(\mu; \lambda^{-\frac{1}{x_1} \log t_1}\right) \text{ and } H(\mu; t_1 | t_2) := H(\mu; t_1) - H(\mu; t_2),$$

where recall that  $\lambda^t = (\lambda_1^t, \dots, \lambda_d^t)$  for  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ . By Lemma 2.2

$$(4.3) \quad H(\mu; t_2) \leq H(\mu; t_1) \quad \text{whenever } t_2 \geq t_1,$$

and there exists a constant  $C = C(\lambda) > 0$  such that

$$(4.4) \quad H(\mu; t_1 | t_2) \leq C \log(t_2/t_1) \quad \text{whenever } t_2/t_1 \geq 2.$$

From (4.3) we obtain,

$$(4.5) \quad H(\mu; t_1 | t_2) \leq H(\mu; t'_1 | t'_2) \text{ for intervals } (t_1, t_2) \subset (t'_1, t'_2) \subset \mathbb{R}_{>0}.$$

By (4.1) and (2.12), for every bounded  $I \subset \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  and  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,

$$(4.6) \quad H\left(\mu_\lambda^{\lambda_1^k I}; \lambda_1^k t_1 | \lambda_1^k t_2\right) = H(\mu_\lambda^I; t_1 | t_2).$$

We shall need the following lemma, which extends [8, equation (2.8)] to higher dimensions.

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $I_1 \subset I_2$  be bounded subsets of  $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ , and let  $t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  be with  $t_2/t_1 \geq 2$ . Then,*

$$H\left(\mu_\lambda^{I_2}; t_1 | t_2\right) \geq \frac{1}{2} H\left(\mu_\lambda^{I_1}; t_1 | t_2\right).$$

*Proof.* For  $i = 1, 2$  and  $1 \leq j \leq d$  set  $r_{i,j} := \lambda_j^{-\frac{1}{x_1} \log t_i}$  and write  $r_i := (r_{i,1}, \dots, r_{i,d})$ . The condition  $t_2/t_1 \geq 2$  implies that

$$(4.7) \quad N_j := \lfloor r_{2,j}/r_{1,j} \rfloor \geq 2 \text{ for each } 1 \leq j \leq d.$$

Setting

$$r'_1 := (r_{1,1}N_1, \dots, r_{1,d}N_d) \text{ and } r'_2 := (r_{2,1}/N_1, \dots, r_{2,d}/N_d),$$

it follows easily from (4.7) that  $r_1 \leq r'_2 \leq r'_1 \leq r_2$ . Thus by Lemma 2.2,

$$H\left(\mu_\lambda^{I_1}; r_1 | r'_1\right) + H\left(\mu_\lambda^{I_1}; r'_2 | r_2\right) \geq H\left(\mu_\lambda^{I_1}; r_1 | r_2\right) = H\left(\mu_\lambda^{I_1}; t_1 | t_2\right).$$

The last inequality implies that there exist  $r, r' \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^d$ , with  $r'/r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}^d$ , so that

$$\lambda^{-\frac{1}{x_1} \log t_1} \leq r \leq r' \leq \lambda^{-\frac{1}{x_1} \log t_2} \text{ and } H\left(\mu_\lambda^{I_1}; r | r'\right) \geq \frac{1}{2} H\left(\mu_\lambda^{I_1}; t_1 | t_2\right).$$

Hence by Lemmas 2.2 and 2.6,

$$H\left(\mu_\lambda^{I_2}; t_1 | t_2\right) \geq H\left(\mu_\lambda^{I_2}; r | r'\right) \geq H\left(\mu_\lambda^{I_1}; r | r'\right) \geq \frac{1}{2} H\left(\mu_\lambda^{I_1}; t_1 | t_2\right),$$

which completes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

**4.2. Non saturation of convolution factors.** The following proposition is the main result of this subsection.

**Proposition 4.2.** *Suppose that  $\dim \mu_\lambda < d$  and  $\dim \pi_J \mu_\lambda = |J|$  for each proper subset  $J$  of  $[d]$ . Then there exist  $\epsilon = \epsilon(\lambda) > 0$  and  $M = M(\lambda) \geq 1$  such that  $\mu_\lambda^I$  is  $(\epsilon, m)$ -non-saturated for all  $m \geq M$  and bounded  $I \subset \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ .*

The proof requires some preparations. Recall the definition of  $\kappa$  from section 2.2. The following lemma is established in [30, Lemma 4.1].

**Lemma 4.3.** *Suppose that  $\dim \pi_{[d-1]} \mu_\lambda = d - 1$ . Then,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H(\mu_\lambda, \mathcal{E}_n) = \kappa.$$

We use this to prove the following statement.

**Lemma 4.4.** *Suppose that  $\dim \mu_\lambda < d$  and  $\dim \pi_{[d-1]} \mu_\lambda = d - 1$ . Then there exists  $\epsilon = \epsilon(\lambda) > 0$  so that for all  $m \geq M(\lambda) \geq 1$  and  $n \geq 0$ ,*

$$(4.8) \quad \frac{1}{m} H(\mu_\lambda, \mathcal{E}_{n+m} \mid \mathcal{E}_n) < \sum_{j=1}^d \chi_j - \epsilon.$$

*Proof.* By the definition of  $\kappa$  and since  $\dim \mu_\lambda < d$  we have  $\sum_{j=1}^d \chi_j > \kappa$ . Let  $0 < \epsilon < \frac{1}{3} \left( \sum_{j=1}^d \chi_j - \kappa \right)$ , let  $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$  be large with respect to  $\epsilon$ , and let  $n \geq 0$  be given. Assume by contradiction that (4.8) fails to hold. Thus, from the concavity of conditional entropy, by (4.1) and (2.9), and since  $\mu_\lambda = \mu_\lambda^{(0,1]}$ , it follows that for each  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{m} H(\mu_\lambda, \mathcal{E}_{n+(k+1)m} \mid \mathcal{E}_{n+km}) &\geq \frac{1}{m} H\left(\mu_\lambda^{(0, \lambda_1^{km}]}, \mathcal{E}_{n+(k+1)m} \mid \mathcal{E}_{n+km}\right) + O\left(\frac{1}{m}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{m} H(\mu_\lambda, \mathcal{E}_{n+m} \mid \mathcal{E}_n) + O\left(\frac{1}{m}\right) \geq \sum_{j=1}^d \chi_j - 2\epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with Lemma 4.3, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa &= \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\ell m} H(\mu_\lambda, \mathcal{E}_{\ell m}) = \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\ell m} H(\mu_\lambda, \mathcal{E}_{\ell m+n} \mid \mathcal{E}_n) \\ &= \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\ell} \sum_{k=0}^{\ell-1} \frac{1}{m} H(\mu_\lambda, \mathcal{E}_{n+(k+1)m} \mid \mathcal{E}_{n+km}) \geq \sum_{j=1}^d \chi_j - 2\epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

This contradicts the choice of  $\epsilon$ , which completes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

We also need the following lemma, which is established in [30, Lemma 1.14].

**Lemma 4.5.** *Let  $J \subset [d]$  be with  $\dim \pi_J \mu_\lambda = |J|$ . Then for all  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $m \geq M(\lambda, \epsilon) \geq 1$  and  $n \geq 0$ ,*

$$\frac{1}{m} H(\mu_\lambda, \pi_J^{-1} \mathcal{E}_{n+m} \mid \mathcal{E}_n) \geq \sum_{j \in J} \chi_j - \epsilon.$$

*Proof of Proposition 4.2.* Let  $\epsilon > 0$  be as obtained in Lemma 4.4, let  $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$  be large with respect to  $\epsilon$ , and let  $1 \leq j \leq d$  and  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  be given. Since  $\dim \pi_{[d] \setminus \{j\}} \mu_\lambda = d - 1$  and by Lemma 4.5,

$$\frac{1}{m} H \left( \mu_\lambda, \pi_{[d] \setminus \{j\}}^{-1} \mathcal{E}_{n+m} \mid \mathcal{E}_n \right) \geq \sum_{l=1}^d \chi_l - \chi_j - \epsilon/2.$$

From this and by Lemma 4.4,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{m} H \left( \mu_\lambda, \mathcal{E}_{n+m} \mid \mathcal{E}_n \vee \pi_{[d] \setminus \{j\}}^{-1} \mathcal{E}_{n+m} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{m} H \left( \mu_\lambda, \mathcal{E}_{n+m} \mid \mathcal{E}_n \right) - \frac{1}{m} H \left( \mu_\lambda, \pi_{[d] \setminus \{j\}}^{-1} \mathcal{E}_{n+m} \mid \mathcal{E}_n \right) \leq \chi_j - \epsilon/2. \end{aligned}$$

From the last inequality and by concavity,

$$\frac{1}{m} H \left( \mu_\lambda^I, \mathcal{E}_{n+m} \mid \mathcal{E}_n \vee \pi_{[d] \setminus \{j\}}^{-1} \mathcal{E}_{n+m} \right) \leq \chi_j - \epsilon/2 \text{ for all } I \subset (0, 1] \text{ and } n \geq 0.$$

Note that given a bounded  $I \subset \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ , there exist  $k \geq 1$  and  $I' \subset (0, 1]$  so that  $I = \lambda_1^{-k} I'$ . The proposition now follows from this, from the last formula, and by (4.1) and (2.9).  $\square$

We end this subsection with the following corollary, which follows directly from Theorem 1.5 and Proposition 4.2.

**Corollary 4.6.** *Suppose that  $\dim \mu_\lambda < d$  and  $\dim \pi_J \mu_\lambda = |J|$  for each proper subset  $J$  of  $[d]$ . Then there exists  $C = C(\lambda) > 1$  such that the following holds. Let  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $0 < \beta < 1/2$  and  $t_2 > t_1 > 0$  be with  $\frac{1}{t_2 - t_1} H(\nu; 2^{-t_2} \mid 2^{-t_1}) > \beta$ . Then for all bounded  $I \subset \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ ,*

$$H(\nu * \mu_\lambda^I; 2^{-t_2} \mid 2^{-t_1}) \geq H(\mu_\lambda^I; 2^{-t_2} \mid 2^{-t_1}) + C^{-1} \beta (\log \beta^{-1})^{-1} (t_2 - t_1) - C.$$

**4.3. Increasing entropy of convolutions.** The following proposition plays a key role in the proof of Theorem 1.3. We have Corollary 4.6, properties (4.4), (4.5), and (4.6), and Lemma 4.1 at our disposal. With these, the proof of the proposition is almost identical to the proof of [8, Proposition 30], which deals with the case  $d = 1$ . Therefore, the proof is omitted.

**Proposition 4.7.** *Suppose that  $\dim \mu_\lambda < d$  and  $\dim \pi_J \mu_\lambda = |J|$  for each proper subset  $J$  of  $[d]$ . Then for all  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists  $C = C(\lambda, \epsilon) > 1$  such that the following holds. Let  $N \geq 1$ ,  $\{n_j\}_{j=1}^N \subset \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$  and  $\{K_j\}_{j=1}^N \subset [10, \infty)$  be given. Suppose that  $\lambda_1^{-n_1} \geq \max\{2, \lambda_1^{-2}\}$  and,*

- (1)  $n_{j+1} \geq K_j n_j$  for all  $1 \leq j < N$ ;
- (2)  $H \left( \mu_\lambda^{(n_j)}; \lambda_1^{K_j n_j} \mid \lambda_1^{10 n_j} \right) \geq \epsilon n_j$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq N$ ;
- (3)  $n_j \geq C (\log K_j)^2$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq N$ .

Then,

$$\sum_{j=1}^N \frac{1}{\log K_j \log \log K_j} \leq C \left( 1 + \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{j=1}^N \log K_j \right).$$

*Remark 4.8.* In [8, Proposition 30], in the case  $d = 1$ , it is assumed that there exists  $\alpha > 0$  such that  $H(\mu_\lambda; t \mid 2t) \leq 1 - \alpha$  for all  $t > 0$ . This assumption is needed only to apply [8, Theorem 8], a version of Theorem 1.5 for the case  $d = 1$ , to convolution



factors of  $\mu_\lambda$ . Since we already have Corollary 4.6, this assumption is not required here.

**4.4. Diophantine considerations.** The following two propositions will be required during the proof of Theorem 1.3. Recall the definition of  $L_0$  from (2.1).

**Proposition 4.9.** *There exists  $C = C(\lambda) > 1$  such that the following holds for all  $n \geq N(\lambda) \geq 1$ . Let  $0 < t < n^{-Cn}$ , and suppose that  $\frac{1}{n}H(\mu_\lambda^{(n)}; t) < H(p)$ . Then there exists  $(\eta_1, \dots, \eta_d) = \eta \in \Omega$  so that  $\eta_j$  is a root of a nonzero polynomial in  $\mathcal{P}_{L_0}^{(n)}$  for each  $1 \leq j \leq d$ ,  $|\lambda - \eta| < t^{1/C}$ , and*

$$H(\mu_\eta^{(n)}) \leq H(\mu_\lambda^{(n)}; t).$$

*Proof.* Let  $C > 1$  be large with respect to  $\lambda$ , let  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$  be with  $C \ll n$ , and let  $0 < t < n^{-Cn}$  be such that  $\frac{1}{n}H(\mu_\lambda^{(n)}; t) < H(p)$ . There exists  $x \in [0, 1]^d$  so that

$$(4.9) \quad H\left(\left[\lambda^{\frac{1}{x_1} \log t} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} a_{\xi_k} \lambda^k + x\right]\right) \leq H(\mu_\lambda^{(n)}; t) < nH(p),$$

where  $\{\xi_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is as in Section 4.1.

For each  $1 \leq j \leq d$  set

$$r_j = \lambda_j^{-\frac{1}{x_1} \log t} \text{ and } D_j := \{a_{i_1, j} - a_{i_2, j} : i_1, i_2 \in \Lambda\},$$

and let  $\mathcal{A}_j$  be the set of all nonzero polynomials  $P(X) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} d_k X^k \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$  with  $d_0, \dots, d_{k-1} \in D_j$  and  $|P(\lambda_j)| \leq r_j$ . Note that  $\mathcal{A}_j \subset \mathcal{P}_{L_0}^{(n)}$ , and that by (4.9) it follows that  $\mathcal{A}_j$  is nonempty. From this, since  $r_j \leq t$ , and by an argument appearing in the proof of [32, Proposition A.5], it follows that there exists  $\eta_j \in (0, 1)$  such that  $|\lambda_j - \eta_j| < r_j^{1/C}/d$  and  $P(\eta_j) = 0$  for each  $P \in \mathcal{A}_j$ .

Setting  $\eta := (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_d)$  we have  $|\lambda - \eta| < t^{1/C} < n^{-n}$ . By assuming that  $n$  is sufficiently large and since  $\lambda \in \Omega$ , we obtain  $\eta \in \Omega$ . Moreover, from (4.9) and by the definition of the sets  $\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_d$ , we get  $H(\mu_\eta^{(n)}) \leq H(\mu_\lambda^{(n)}; r)$ . This completes the proof of the proposition.  $\square$

The proof of the following statement, which relies on Proposition 4.9, is similar to the proof of [32, Proposition A.7] and is therefore omitted.

**Proposition 4.10.** *There exists  $C = C(\lambda) > 1$  such that the following holds for all  $n \geq N(\lambda) \geq 1$ . Suppose that there exists  $(\eta_1, \dots, \eta_d) = \eta \in \Omega$  such that  $|\lambda - \eta| < n^{-Cn}$  and  $\eta_j$  is a root of a nonzero polynomial in  $\mathcal{P}_{L_0}^{(n)}$  for each  $1 \leq j \leq d$ . Then  $\frac{1}{n}H(\mu_\lambda^{(n)}; t) = H(p)$  for all  $0 < t \leq |\lambda - \eta|^C$ .*

**4.5. Proof of Theorem 1.3.** We shall need the following statement, which follows directly from [30, Theorem 6.3] and (2.11).

**Theorem 4.11.** *Suppose that  $\dim \mu_\lambda < d$  and that  $\dim \pi_J \mu_\lambda = |J|$  for each proper subset  $J$  of  $[d]$ . Then for any  $q > 1$ ,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H(\mu_\lambda^{(n)}; \lambda_1^{qn} | \lambda_1^n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H(\mu_\lambda^{(n)}, \mathcal{E}_{qn} | \mathcal{E}_n) = 0.$$

Next, we prove Theorem 1.3, which is the following statement.

**Theorem.** *Suppose that  $\dim \mu_\lambda < \gamma$ ,  $\dim \pi_J \mu_\lambda = |J|$  for each proper subset  $J$  of  $[d]$ , and  $\lambda_{j_0}$  is transcendental for some  $1 \leq j_0 \leq d$ . Then for every  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $N \geq 1$  there exist  $n \geq N$  and  $(\eta_1, \dots, \eta_d) = \eta \in \Omega$  such that,*

- (1) *for each  $1 \leq j \leq d$  there exists  $0 \neq P_j \in \mathcal{P}_{L_0}^{(n)}$  with  $P_j(\eta_j) = 0$ ;*
- (2)  *$h_{RW}(\Phi^\eta, p) < \kappa + \epsilon$ ;*
- (3)  *$|\lambda - \eta| \leq \exp(-n^{1/\epsilon})$ .*

*Proof.* By  $\dim \mu_\lambda < \gamma$  and (2.2) with  $m = d - 1$ , we have  $\kappa < H(p)$ . Let

$$0 < \epsilon < \frac{1}{3} \min \{1, H(p) - \kappa\}$$

be given. For each  $n \geq 1$  let  $E^{(n)}$  be the set of all  $(\eta_1, \dots, \eta_d) = \eta \in \Omega$  such that  $h_{RW}(\Phi^\eta, p) < \kappa + 2\epsilon$  and for each  $1 \leq j \leq d$  there exists  $0 \neq P_j \in \mathcal{P}_{L_0}^{(n)}$  with  $P_j(\eta_j) = 0$ . Assume by contradiction that,

$$(4.10) \quad |\lambda - \eta| > \exp(-n^{1/\epsilon}) \text{ for all } n \geq \epsilon^{-1} \text{ and } \eta \in E^{(n)}.$$

Let  $C > 1$  and  $n_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$  be with  $\epsilon^{-1} \ll C \ll n_0$ , and suppose also that  $C$  is large with respect to  $\lambda$ . We next define by induction a sequence  $n_0 < n_1 < n_2 < \dots$  of positive integers so that for each  $j \geq 0$

$$(4.11) \quad \left\lceil \frac{C n_j \log n_j}{\log 1/\lambda_1} \right\rceil \leq n_{j+1} < n_j^{2/\epsilon},$$

and

$$(4.12) \quad H\left(\mu_\lambda^{(n_{j+1})}; n_{j+1}^{-C n_{j+1}} \mid \lambda_1^{10 n_{j+1}}\right) \geq \epsilon n_{j+1}.$$

Let  $j \geq 0$ , assume  $n_j$  has been chosen, and set  $q = \left\lceil \frac{C n_j \log n_j}{\log 1/\lambda_1} \right\rceil$ . Since  $\lambda_1^{-1}, \epsilon^{-1} \ll C \ll n_0$ , we may assume that  $q < n_j^2$ .

Suppose first that

$$(4.13) \quad H\left(\mu_\lambda^{(q)}; q^{-Cq}\right) \geq q(\kappa + 2\epsilon),$$

in which case we set  $n_{j+1} = q$ . From Lemma 4.3, from (4.2) and (2.11), and by Theorem 4.11,

$$(4.14) \quad H\left(\mu_\lambda^{(n)}; \lambda_1^{10n}\right) \leq n(\kappa + \epsilon) \text{ for all } n \geq q.$$

Hence, by (4.13) it follows that (4.12) is satisfied. Additionally, note that  $n_{j+1} = q < n_j^2 < n_j^{2/\epsilon}$  and so (4.11) also holds.

Next suppose that  $H\left(\mu_\lambda^{(q)}; q^{-Cq}\right) < q(\kappa + 2\epsilon)$ , which implies  $\frac{1}{q} H\left(\mu_\lambda^{(q)}; q^{-Cq}\right) < H(p)$ . By Proposition 4.9, there exists  $(\eta_1, \dots, \eta_d) = \eta \in \Omega$  so that  $\eta_j$  is a root of a nonzero polynomial in  $\mathcal{P}_{L_0}^{(q)}$  for each  $1 \leq j \leq d$ ,  $|\lambda - \eta| < q^{-C^{1/2}q}$ , and

$$H(\mu_\eta^{(q)}) \leq H\left(\mu_\lambda^{(q)}; q^{-Cq}\right) < q(\kappa + 2\epsilon).$$

Together with (2.5), the last inequality implies  $h_{RW}(\Phi^\eta, p) \leq \kappa + 2\epsilon$ , and so  $\eta \in E^{(q)}$ .

By assumption  $\lambda_{j_0}$  is transcendental for some  $1 \leq j_0 \leq d$ , and so  $\lambda \neq \eta$ . We choose  $n_{j+1}$  to be the largest  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$  so that  $|\lambda - \eta| < n^{-C^{1/2}}$ . Since  $|\lambda - \eta| < q^{-C^{1/2}q}$  we have  $n_{j+1} \geq q$ . From

$$(n_{j+1} + 1)^{-C^{1/2}(n_{j+1}+1)} \leq |\lambda - \eta| < n_{j+1}^{-C^{1/2}n_{j+1}}$$

and by Proposition 4.10, we obtain

$$H\left(\mu_\lambda^{(n_{j+1})}; (n_{j+1} + 1)^{-C(n_{j+1}+1)}\right) = n_{j+1}H(p) > n_{j+1}(\kappa + 3\epsilon).$$

From this, from (4.14), and by Lemma 2.2, we get that (4.12) also holds in the present case.

From (4.10) and since  $\eta \in E^{(q)}$ , we get  $|\lambda - \eta| > \exp(-q^{1/\epsilon})$ . Also recall that  $q < n_j^2$ . By combining these facts together with  $|\lambda - \eta| < n_{j+1}^{-C^{1/2}n_{j+1}}$ , we obtain

$$(4.15) \quad n_{j+1} < \log\left(n_{j+1}^{C^{1/2}n_{j+1}}\right) < -\log|\lambda - \eta| < q^{1/\epsilon} < n_j^{2/\epsilon}.$$

Thus, (4.11) is satisfied once more, completing the inductive construction of  $\{n_j\}_{j \geq 0}$ .

We next aim to apply Proposition 4.7 in order to derive the desired contradiction. Set

$$j_0 := \lceil \log^{(2)} n_0 \rceil \text{ and } N := \left\lceil \exp^{(2)}\left(\log^{(2)}(j_0 + 1) + C^2\right) \right\rceil,$$

where  $\log^{(2)}$  stands for the composition of the log function with itself, and similarly for  $\exp^{(2)}$ . Additionally, for each  $1 \leq j \leq N$  set  $K_j := \frac{C \log n_j}{\log \lambda_1^{-1}}$ . By (4.12),

$$H\left(\mu_\lambda^{(n_j)}; \lambda_1^{K_j n_j} \mid \lambda_1^{10n_j}\right) \geq \epsilon n_j.$$

Moreover, by (4.11) and since  $C \ll n_0 \leq n_j$ , we also have  $\lambda_1^{-n_1} \geq \max\{2, \lambda_1^{-2}\}$ ,  $n_j \geq C(\log K_j)^2$  and

$$n_{j+1} \geq \left\lceil \frac{C n_j \log n_j}{\log \lambda_1^{-1}} \right\rceil \geq K_j n_j.$$

Thus, by Proposition 4.7,

$$(4.16) \quad \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{1}{\log K_j \log \log K_j} \leq C \left(1 + \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{j=1}^N \log K_j\right).$$

Note that by applying (4.11) successively, we get  $n_j \leq n_0^{2^j \epsilon^{-j}}$  for each  $j \geq 1$ . From this, since  $\epsilon^{-1} \ll C \ll n_0$ , and by the estimates carried out at the end of [32, Section 7.3, proof of Theorem 3.1], it follows that

$$\sum_{j=1}^N \frac{1}{\log K_j \log \log K_j} \geq \frac{\epsilon}{12} C^2 \text{ and } \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{j=1}^N \log K_j \leq 1.$$

This together with (4.16) contradicts  $\epsilon^{-1} \ll C$ , which completes the proof of the theorem.  $\square$

## 5. PROOF OF MAIN RESULT

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.2. Sections 5.1, 5.2, and 5.3 contain necessary preparations. The proof of the theorem, which is an extension of the argument given in [37] and its modification found in [32, Appendix A], is carried out in Section 5.4.

**5.1. Mahler measure and a lower bound on random walk entropy.** Let  $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$  be an algebraic number with minimal polynomial

$$P(X) = b(X - \alpha_1) \dots (X - \alpha_n) \in \mathbb{Z}[X],$$

so that  $b$  is the leading coefficient and  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$  are the roots (including  $\alpha$ ). The Mahler measure of  $\alpha$  is defined by,

$$M(\alpha) := |b| \prod_{k=1}^n \max\{1, |\alpha_k|\}.$$

The following theorem follows directly from [9, Proposition 13]. For the details, we refer to the proof of [37, Theorem 9]. For  $\eta \in \Omega$  and  $1 \leq j \leq d$ , recall the notation  $\Phi_j^\eta$  from Section 2.2.

**Theorem 5.1.** *Let  $1 \leq j_0 \leq d$  and  $h \in (0, H(p))$  be given. Then there exists  $M > 1$ , depending only on  $h$ ,  $\{a_{i,j_0}\}_{i \in \Lambda}$  and  $p$ , so that  $h_{RW}(\Phi_{j_0}^\eta, p) > h$  for all  $(\eta_1, \dots, \eta_d) = \eta \in \Omega$  such that  $\eta_{j_0}$  is algebraic with  $M(\eta_{j_0}) \geq M$ .*

**5.2. A consequence of dimension drop.**

**Proposition 5.2.** *Suppose that  $\dim \mu_\lambda < \gamma$  and  $\dim \pi_J \mu_\lambda = |J|$  for each proper subset  $J$  of  $[d]$ . Then for every  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists  $N \geq 1$ , such that for every  $n \geq N$  and  $1 \leq j \leq d$  there exists  $0 \neq P_j \in \mathcal{P}_{L_0}^{(n)}$  with  $|P_j(\lambda_j)| < \epsilon^n$ .*

*Proof.* Assume by contradiction that the proposition is false. Then there exist  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq d$ , and an increasing sequence  $\{n_k\}_{k \geq 1} \subset \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ , such that  $|P(\lambda_j)| \geq \epsilon^{n_k}$  for all  $0 \neq P \in \mathcal{P}_{L_0}^{(n_k)}$ . From this it follows easily that there exists  $q > 1$  so that

$$\frac{1}{n_k} \left( \mu_\lambda^{(n_k)}, \mathcal{E}_{qn_k} \right) = H(p) \text{ for each } k \geq 1,$$

where  $\mu_\lambda^{(n_k)}$  is defined in Section 2.2. On the other hand, by Lemma 4.3, (4.2), and Theorem 4.11,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n_k} H \left( \mu_\lambda^{(n_k)}, \mathcal{E}_{qn_k} \right) = \kappa.$$

Hence  $\kappa = H(p)$ , which, by (2.2) with  $j = d - 1$ , implies that  $\dim \mu_\lambda = \gamma$ . But this contradicts our assumption, thus completing the proof of the proposition.  $\square$

**5.3. Number theoretic results.** We shall need the following two lemmas from [32].

**Lemma 5.3** ([32, Lemma 4.2]). *There is a function  $r : \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \rightarrow (0, 1)$  such that  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} r(k) = 1$  and the following holds. Let  $l, n \geq 1$  and  $0 \neq P \in \mathcal{P}_l^{(n)}$  be given. Then there are at most  $k \left( 1 + \frac{\log l}{\log(k+1)} \right)$  nonzero roots of  $P$  of absolute value less than  $r(k)$ .*

The next lemma and its proof were communicated to the authors of [32] by Vesselin Dimitrov.

**Lemma 5.4** ([32, Lemma 4.6]). *Let  $\xi, \eta \in [0, 1]$  and  $n, n', l, k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ . Let  $0 \neq P \in \mathcal{P}_l^{(n')}$ . Let  $\alpha$  be a number that satisfies*

$$\log \alpha > \frac{(n(k+1) + (k+2)) \log n' + (n+1) \log l + \log 2}{n'}.$$

Assume that  $\eta \neq \xi$  and that  $\eta$  is algebraic of degree at most  $n$ . Assume that

$$(\alpha M(\eta))^{n'/k} |P(\xi)|^{1/k} \leq |\xi - \eta| \leq (\alpha M(\eta))^{-n'}.$$

Then  $\eta$  is a zero of  $P$  of order at least  $k$ .

**5.4. Proof of Theorem 1.2.** Recall that  $K_{\Phi^\lambda}$  denotes the attractor of  $\Phi^\lambda$ . Note that, by the definitions of the affinity dimension (see [11]) and Lyapunov dimension (see Section 2.2), in order to show that  $\dim_H K_{\Phi^\lambda} = \min\{d, \dim_A \Phi^\lambda\}$ , it suffices to prove  $\dim \mu_\lambda = \min\{d, \dim_L(\Phi^\lambda, p)\}$  for  $p$  with equal weights. Moreover, by rescaling the IFS if necessary, it suffices to prove Theorem 1.2 in the case of integral translations. Thus we need to establish the following statement.

**Theorem.** *Suppose that  $\Phi_j^\lambda$  has no exact overlaps for each  $1 \leq j \leq d$ . Then  $\dim \mu_\lambda = \gamma$ .*

*Proof.* The proof is carried out by induction on  $d$ . Thus, assume that the theorem holds whenever the dimension of the ambient space is strictly less than  $d$ . Since  $\dim_L(\Phi^\lambda, p)$  is always an upper bound for  $\dim \mu_\lambda$ , we only need to show that  $\dim \mu_\lambda \geq \gamma$ .

As shown in [30, Section 6.4, proof of Theorem 1.7], by the induction hypothesis and the Ledrappier–Young formula, it follows that  $\dim \mu_\lambda = \dim_L(\Phi^\lambda, p)$  whenever  $\dim \pi_J \mu_\lambda < |J|$  for some proper subset  $J$  of  $[d]$ . Thus, we may assume that  $\dim \pi_J \mu_\lambda = |J|$  for each  $J \subsetneq [d]$ . Moreover, by [30, Theorem 1.7] we may suppose that  $\lambda_{j_0}$  is transcendental for some  $1 \leq j_0 \leq d$ .

Assume by contradiction that  $\dim \mu_\lambda < \gamma$ . From this and by (2.2) with  $j = d-1$ , it follows that  $\kappa < H(p)$ . Let

$$0 < \epsilon < \frac{H(p) - \kappa}{2},$$

let  $M \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$  be large with respect to  $\{a_{i,j}\}$ ,  $p$ ,  $\lambda$  and  $\epsilon$ , and let  $q_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$  be with  $M \ll q_0$ .

By Theorem 1.3, there exist an integer  $q \geq q_0$  and  $(\eta_1, \dots, \eta_d) = \eta \in \Omega$  such that  $\eta_j$  is algebraic with  $\deg \eta_j < q$  for each  $1 \leq j \leq d$ ,

$$(5.1) \quad h_{RW}(\Phi^\eta, p) < \kappa + \epsilon < H(p) - \epsilon,$$

and  $|\lambda - \eta| < 2^{-q^2}$ . From (5.1) it clearly follows that  $h_{RW}(\Phi_{j_0}^\eta, p) < H(p) - \epsilon$ . Thus by Theorem 5.1 we may assume that  $M(\eta_{j_0}) < M$ .

Since  $\lambda_{j_0}$  is transcendental, we have  $\lambda_{j_0} \neq \eta_{j_0}$ . Let  $n \geq 1$  be with,

$$(2M)^{-n-1} \leq |\lambda_{j_0} - \eta_{j_0}| < (2M)^{-n}.$$

We have,

$$(n+1) \log(2M) \geq -\log |\lambda_{j_0} - \eta_{j_0}| > q^2.$$

Hence, we may assume that

$$(5.2) \quad \frac{1}{n} ((q(M+1) + (M+2)) \log n + (q+1) \log L_0 + 1) < 1,$$

where  $L_0$  is defined in (2.1).

By Proposition 5.2 and since  $n$  is arbitrarily large with respect to  $M$ , there exists  $0 \neq P \in \mathcal{P}_{L_0}^{(n)}$  such that  $|P(\lambda_{j_0})| \leq (2M)^{-3Mn}$ , which gives,

$$|\lambda_{j_0} - \eta_{j_0}| \geq (2M)^{-n-1} \geq (2M)^n |P(\lambda_{j_0})|^{1/M}.$$

From this,  $|\lambda_{j_0} - \eta_{j_0}| < (2M)^{-n}$ ,  $\deg \eta_{j_0} < q$ , the inequality (5.2), and Lemma 5.4, it follows that  $\eta_{j_0}$  is a zero of  $P$  of order at least  $M$ . Now, by assuming  $\eta_{j_0} < (1 + \lambda_{j_0})/2$  and that  $M$  is sufficiently large with respect to  $L_0$  and  $\lambda_{j_0}$ , we get a contradiction with Lemma 5.3. This completes the proof of the theorem.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] S. Baker. Iterated function systems with super-exponentially close cylinders. *Adv. Math.*, 379:107548, 2021.
- [2] K. Barański. Hausdorff dimension of the limit sets of some planar geometric constructions. *Adv. Math.*, 210(1):215–245, 2007.
- [3] B. Bárány, M. Hochman, and A. Rapaport. Hausdorff dimension of planar self-affine sets and measures. *Invent. Math.*, 216(3):601–659, 2019.
- [4] B. Bárány and A. Käenmäki. Ledrappier–Young formula and exact dimensionality of self-affine measures. *Adv. Math.*, 318:88–129, 2017.
- [5] B. Bárány and A. Käenmäki. Super-exponential condensation without exact overlaps. *Adv. Math.*, 379:Paper No. 107549, 22, 2021.
- [6] T. Bedford. The box dimension of self-affine graphs and repellers. *Nonlinearity*, 2(1):53–71, 1989.
- [7] J. Bourgain. The discretized sum-product and projection theorems. *J. Anal. Math.*, 112:193–236, 2010.
- [8] E. Breuillard and P. Varjú. On the dimension of Bernoulli convolutions. *Ann. Probab.*, 47(4):2582–2617, 2019.
- [9] E. Breuillard and P. Varjú. Entropy of Bernoulli convolutions and uniform exponential growth for linear groups. *J. Anal. Math.*, 140(2):443–481, 2020.
- [10] P. Erdős. On a family of symmetric Bernoulli convolutions. *Amer. J. Math.*, 61(4):974–976, 1939.
- [11] K. J. Falconer. The Hausdorff dimension of self-affine fractals. *Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.*, 103(2):339–350, 1988.
- [12] D.-J. Feng. Dimension of invariant measures for affine iterated function systems. *Duke Math. J.*, 172(4):701–774, 2023.
- [13] D.-J. Feng and Z. Feng. Dimension of homogeneous iterated function systems with algebraic translations, 2024. arXiv:2405.03124.
- [14] D.-J. Feng and H. Hu. Dimension theory of iterated function systems. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 62(11):1435–1500, 2009.
- [15] J. M. Fraser. On the packing dimension of box-like self-affine sets in the plane. *Nonlinearity*, 25(7):2075–2092, 2012.
- [16] Adriano M. Garsia. Entropy and singularity of infinite convolutions. *Pacific J. Math.*, 13:1159–1169, 1963.
- [17] M. Hochman. On self-similar sets with overlaps and inverse theorems for entropy. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 180(2):773–822, 2014.
- [18] M. Hochman. Dimension theory of self-similar sets and measures. In *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians—Rio de Janeiro 2018. Vol. III. Invited lectures*, pages 1949–1972. World Sci. Publ., Hackensack, NJ, 2018.
- [19] M. Hochman and A. Rapaport. Hausdorff dimension of planar self-affine sets and measures with overlaps. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 24(7):2361–2441, 2022.
- [20] J. E. Hutchinson. Fractals and self-similarity. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 30(5):713–747, 1981.
- [21] T. Jordan, M. Pollicott, and K. Simon. Hausdorff dimension for randomly perturbed self affine attractors. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 270(2):519–544, 2007.
- [22] V. A. Kaĭmanovich and A. M. Vershik. Random walks on discrete groups: boundary and entropy. *Ann. Probab.*, 11(3):457–490, 1983.
- [23] S. P. Lalley and D. Gatzouras. Hausdorff and box dimensions of certain self-affine fractals. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 41(2):533–568, 1992.
- [24] M. Madiman. On the entropy of sums. In *2008 IEEE Information Theory Workshop*, pages 303–307. IEEE, 2008.
- [25] C. McMullen. The Hausdorff dimension of general Sierpiński carpets. *Nagoya Math. J.*, 96:1–9, 1984.

- [26] I. D. Morris and C. Sert. A variational principle relating self-affine measures to self-affine sets, 2023. arXiv:2303.03437.
- [27] I. D. Morris and P. Shmerkin. On equality of Hausdorff and affinity dimensions, via self-affine measures on positive subsystems. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 371(3):1547–1582, 2019.
- [28] M. Pollicott and H. Weiss. The dimensions of some self-affine limit sets in the plane and hyperbolic sets. *J. Statist. Phys.*, 77(3-4):841–866, 1994.
- [29] F. Przytycki and M. Urbański. On the Hausdorff dimension of some fractal sets. *Studia Math.*, 93(2):155–186, 1989.
- [30] A. Rapaport. Dimension of diagonal self-affine sets and measures via non-conformal partitions, 2023. arXiv:2309.03985.
- [31] A. Rapaport. On self-affine measures associated to strongly irreducible and proximal systems. *Adv. Math.*, 449:Paper No. 109734, 2024.
- [32] A. Rapaport and P. Varjú. Self-similar measures associated to a homogeneous system of three maps. *Duke Math. J.*, 173(3):513–602, 2024.
- [33] P. Shmerkin. Overlapping self-affine sets. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 55(4):1291–1331, 2006.
- [34] B. Solomyak. On the random series  $\sum \pm \lambda^n$  (an Erdős problem). *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 142(3):611–625, 1995.
- [35] B. Solomyak. Measure and dimension for some fractal families. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 124(3):531–546, 1998.
- [36] P. Varjú. Absolute continuity of Bernoulli convolutions for algebraic parameters. *J. Am. Math. Soc.*, 32(2):351–397, 2019.
- [37] P. Varjú. On the dimension of Bernoulli convolutions for all transcendental parameters. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 189(3):1001–1011, 2019.
- [38] P. Varjú. Self-similar sets and measures on the line. In *ICM—International Congress of Mathematicians. Vol. 5. Sections 9–11*, pages 3610–3634. EMS Press, Berlin, [2023] ©2023.
- [39] Z. Wang. Quantitative density under higher rank abelian algebraic toral actions. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (16):3744–3821, 2011.

ARIEL RAPAPORT, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, TECHNION, HAIFA, ISRAEL  
*E-mail:* arapaport@technion.ac.il

HAOJIE REN, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, TECHNION, HAIFA, ISRAEL  
*E-mail:* hjren@campus.technion.ac.il