

Construction of subspaces with known Diophantine exponents for the last angle

Gaétan GUILLOT

Abstract

Schmidt generalized in 1967 the theory of classical Diophantine approximation to subspaces of \mathbb{R}^n . We consider Diophantine exponents for linear subspaces of \mathbb{R}^n which generalize the irrationality measure for real numbers. Using geometry of numbers, we construct subspaces of \mathbb{R}^n for which we are able to compute the associated exponents for the last angle.

1 Introduction

Classical Diophantine approximation deals with how closely real numbers (or points in \mathbb{R}^n) can be approximated by rational numbers (or rational points). In 1967, Schmidt [9] proposed a broader version of this problem, focusing on the approximation of subspaces of \mathbb{R}^n by rational subspaces. In this context, we will briefly outline the key concepts needed for this study, according to the definitions and notation from [9], [4], [5], and [6]. The result presented in this article comes from the Ph.D thesis of the author, see [2, Chapter 9].

A subspace of \mathbb{R}^n is rational if it admits a basis of vectors in \mathbb{Q}^n . The set of all rational subspaces of dimension e in \mathbb{R}^n is denoted by $\mathcal{R}_n(e)$. To such a rational subspace B , we can associate a point $\eta = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_N) \in \mathbb{P}^N(\mathbb{R})$ with $N = \binom{n}{e}$ known as the Grassmann (or Plücker) coordinates of B . We can select a representative vector η with coprime integer coordinates and we define $H(B) = \|\eta\|$ where $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the Euclidean norm on \mathbb{R}^N . Note that if X_1, \dots, X_e is a \mathbb{Z} -basis of $B \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$, then $H(B) = \|X_1 \wedge \dots \wedge X_e\|$. Further details on the height can be found in [9] and [10]. Let us fix $n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$. For $d, e \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket^2$ such that $d + e \leq n$ and $j \in \llbracket 1, \min(d, e) \rrbracket$ we say that a subspace A of dimension d of \mathbb{R}^n is (e, j) -irrational if $\forall B \in \mathcal{R}_n(e)$, $\dim(A \cap B) < j$. We denote by $\mathcal{I}_n(d, e, j)$ the set of all (e, j) -irrational subspaces A of dimension d of \mathbb{R}^n .

We now introduce the concept of proximity between two subspaces. Let $X, Y \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$, and define

$$\omega(X, Y) = \frac{\|X \wedge Y\|}{\|X\| \cdot \|Y\|},$$

where $X \wedge Y$ represents the exterior product of X and Y . Geometrically, $\omega(X, Y)$ denotes the absolute value of the sine of the angle between X and Y . Consider two subspaces A and B of \mathbb{R}^n with dimensions d and e respectively. As in [9], we construct by induction $t = \min(d, e)$ angles between A and B . Let us define

$$\psi_1(A, B) = \min_{\substack{X \in A \setminus \{0\} \\ Y \in B \setminus \{0\}}} \omega(X, Y),$$

and choose $(X_1, Y_1) \in A \times B$ be such that $\omega(X_1, Y_1) = \psi_1(A, B)$. Assume that $\psi_1(A, B), \dots, \psi_j(A, B)$ and $(X_1, Y_1), \dots, (X_j, Y_j)$ have been constructed for $j \in \llbracket 1, t-1 \rrbracket$. Let A_j and B_j be respectively the orthogonal complements of $\text{Span}(X_1, \dots, X_j)$ in A and $\text{Span}(Y_1, \dots, Y_j)$ in B .

We define

$$\psi_{j+1}(A, B) = \min_{\substack{X \in A_j \setminus \{0\} \\ Y \in B_j \setminus \{0\}}} \omega(X, Y),$$

and let $(X_{j+1}, Y_{j+1}) \in A \times B$ such that $\omega(X_{j+1}, Y_{j+1}) = \psi_{j+1}(A, B)$.

We now have all the tools to define the Diophantine exponents studied in this paper.

Definition 1.1. Let $(d, e) \in \llbracket 1, n-1 \rrbracket^2$ be such that $d + e \leq n$ and $j \in \llbracket 1, \min(d, e) \rrbracket$, and $A \in \mathcal{I}_n(d, e)_j$. We define $\mu_n(A|e)_j$ as the supremum of the set of all $\mu > 0$ such that there exist infinitely many $B \in \mathcal{R}_n(e)$ such that

$$\psi_j(A, B) \leq H(B)^{-\mu}.$$

The angle corresponding with $j = \min(d, e)$ is the most natural to study. Indeed, $\psi_{\min(d, e)}$ is "almost" a distance in the sense:

$$\psi_{\min(d, e)}(A, B) = 0 \iff A \subset B \text{ or } B \subset A.$$

In particular, if $d = e$, then ψ_d is a distance on the Grassmannian of d -dimensional vector subspaces of \mathbb{R}^n . In [8], de Saxcé describes the image of $\mathcal{I}_n(d, e)_{\min(d, e)}$ by $\mu_n(\cdot|e)_{\min(d, e)}$. In this article we study the joint spectrum associated to the last angle, that is to say the image of the tuple of functions $(\mu_n(\cdot|1)_{\min(d, 1)}, \dots, \mu_n(\cdot|n-d)_{\min(d, n-d)})$ on $\bigcap_{e=1}^{n-d} \mathcal{I}_n(d, e)_{\min(d, e)}$. We prove here the following theorem.

Theorem 1.2. Let $(d, q) \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^2$. We set $n = (q+1)d$. There exists an explicit constant C_d such that for any $\alpha \geq C_d$, there exists a subspace A of \mathbb{R}^n of dimension d such that $A \in \bigcap_{e=1}^{n-d} \mathcal{I}_n(d, e)_{\min(d, e)}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \forall e \in \llbracket d, n-d \rrbracket, \quad \mu_n(A|e)_d &= \frac{\alpha^{q_e+1}}{r_e + (d-r_e)\alpha}, \\ \forall e \in \llbracket 1, d-1 \rrbracket, \quad \mu_n(A|e)_e &= \frac{\alpha}{r_e} = \frac{\alpha}{e}, \end{aligned}$$

where q_e and r_e are the quotient and the remainder of the Euclidean division of e by d .

In the case $d = 1$, the image of $(\mu_n(\cdot|1)_1, \dots, \mu_n(\cdot|n-1)_1)$ has been determined by Roy [7]. In the case $d > 1$, the determination of the joint spectrum remains an open problem. In [3], assuming that d divides n , the author provides examples of points in this image (see Theorem 1.8) and, in particular, identifies a non-empty open subset within it (see the proof of Theorem 1.5). While in [3], one explicitly identifies the rational subspaces of best approximations of a subspace A to compute $\mu_n(A|e)_{\min(d, e)}$, here we employ tools of geometry of numbers (mainly Minkowski's theorem on convex bodies) to find specific vectors with integer coordinates in the best approximations. Theorem 1.2 provides us with values taken by the tuple of functions $(\mu_n(\cdot|1)_{\min(d, 1)}, \dots, \mu_n(\cdot|n-d)_{\min(d, n-d)})$ which we are able to compute using the method developed here.

The definition of C_d and the construction of the subspace A are carried out in Section 2. Section 3 is devoted to the study of rational vectors and rational subspaces that shall give good approximations of A . To prove Theorem 1.2, we consider two cases depending on whether $e < d$ or $e \geq d$.

In both cases, the lower bound of the exponent $\mu_n(A|e)_{\min(d, e)}$ is shown by presenting a family of rational subspaces that approximate A well (see Lemmas 4.4 and 5.2). For $e \geq d$, we get that the "best" subspaces C approximating A contain a certain rational subspace B_{N+1, q_e} (Lemma 4.6). We can then bound the height of the subspace C from below (Lemma 4.5), and we conclude that $\mu_n(A|e)_d$ cannot be too large, thanks to Lemma 4.7. For $e < d$, we show that the "best" subspaces C approximating A intersect non-trivially a certain rational subspace $D_{N, d}$ (Lemma 5.3). We achieve the upper bound of $\mu_n(A|e)_e$ in Lemma 5.4 by bounding $\psi_1(C \cap D_{N, d}, A)$ from below and thus, a fortiori, $\psi_e(C, A)$.

Lemma 4.7 and Lemma 5.3 represent the most challenging aspects of the proof of Theorem 1.2, and they crucially involve the geometry of numbers.

2 Construction of the subspace A

We define the constant C_d as the smallest real number such that for any $\alpha \geq C_d$, we have:

$$-\alpha^2 + \alpha(2d+2) - d \leq 0 \tag{2.1}$$

$$-\frac{\alpha}{2} + d(d-1) + 1 \leq 0 \tag{2.2}$$

$$-\alpha^2 + (1+2d)\alpha - d \leq 0, \tag{2.3}$$

and for any $e \in \llbracket d, qd \rrbracket$:

$$dr_e - (d - r_e)\alpha \leq 0 \quad (2.4)$$

$$\frac{\alpha^{q_e}}{d - r_e + \frac{1}{2}} - \frac{\alpha^{q_e+1}}{r_e + (d - r_e)\alpha} + 1 \leq 0 \quad (2.5)$$

where q_e and r_e are the quotient and the remainder of the Euclidean division of e by d . Elementary computations show that $2 < C_d \leq 3d(d+4)$, see [2, Lemma 9.3].

We fix $\alpha \geq C_d$. Recall that $n = (q+1)d$ and therefore $qd = n - d$. Here, we construct the subspace A from Theorem 1.2. Let θ be a prime number greater than or equal to 5. For $j \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket$, define $\phi_j : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \llbracket 0, qd - 1 \rrbracket$ by:

$$\phi_j(k) = k + (j - 1)q \bmod (qd)$$

where $x \bmod (qd)$ is the remainder of the Euclidean division of x by qd .

Throughout this paper, we denote $\sigma_{i,j} = \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \frac{u_k^{(i,j)}}{\theta^{\lfloor \alpha^k \rfloor}}$ for $i \in \llbracket 0, qd - 1 \rrbracket$ and $j \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket$, with sequences $u^{(i,j)}$ that we will chose using the following lemma. Using the fact that $\alpha \geq 2$, Roth's theoreme implies that $\sigma_{i,j}$ is transcendental, see [1] for further details on the number constructed here.

Lemma 2.1. There exist sequences $u^{(0,1)}, \dots, u^{(qd-1,1)}, \dots, u^{(0,d)}, \dots, u^{(qd-1,d)}$ satisfying $\forall i \in \llbracket 0, qd - 1 \rrbracket$, $\forall j \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket$, $\forall k \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$u_k^{(i,j)} \begin{cases} \in \{2, 3\} & \text{if } i = k + (j - 1)q \bmod (qd) \\ = 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (2.6)$$

and such that the family $(\sigma_{0,1}, \dots, \sigma_{qd-1,1}, \dots, \sigma_{0,d}, \dots, \sigma_{qd-1,d})$ is algebraically independent over \mathbb{Q} .

Proof. Let $\sigma_{0,1}, \dots, \sigma_{qd-1,1}, \dots, \sigma_{0,d}, \dots, \sigma_{qd-1,d}$ be arbitrarily ordered and denoted by $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{d(n-d)}$, and let us reason by induction on $t \in \llbracket 1, d(n-d) \rrbracket$. We denote the sequences $u_k^{(i,j)}$ associated with $\sigma_{i,j}$ by $u_k^1, \dots, u_k^{d(n-d)}$.

The set of algebraic numbers over \mathbb{Q} is countable and the set of sequences (u_k^1) satisfying (2.6) is uncountable. Therefore, we choose a sequence such that σ_1 is transcendental over \mathbb{Q} .

Now, suppose that we have constructed $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_t$ as an algebraically independent family over \mathbb{Q} with $t \in \llbracket 1, d(n-d) - 1 \rrbracket$. The set of algebraic numbers over $\mathbb{Q}(\mathcal{R}, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_t)$ is countable, but the set of sequences $(u_k^{t+1})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfying (2.6) is uncountable. Therefore, we can choose a sequence such that σ_{t+1} is transcendental over $\mathbb{Q}(\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_t)$, completing the induction. \square

From now on, we assume that the sequences $(u_k^{(i,j)})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\sigma_{i,j}$ for $i \in \llbracket 0, qd - 1 \rrbracket$ and $j \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket$ satisfy the conclusion of Lemma 2.1.

Remark 2.2. For fixed k and j , the integer $i = k + (j - 1)q \bmod (qd)$ is the unique integer in $\llbracket 0, qd - 1 \rrbracket$ such that $u_k^{(i,j)} \neq 0$.

Before defining the subspace A , we state a lemma in order to study more precisely the sequences $(u_k^{(i,j)})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$.

Lemma 2.3. Let $i \in \llbracket 0, qd - 1 \rrbracket$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$. There exists a unique pair $(k, j) \in \llbracket 0, q - 1 \rrbracket \times \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket$ such that $u_{N+k}^{(i,j)} \neq 0$.

Proof. • Uniqueness: Suppose there exist $\ell_1, \ell_2 \in \llbracket 0, q - 1 \rrbracket$ and $j_1, j_2 \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket$ such that $u_{N+\ell_1}^{(i,j_1)} \neq 0$ and $u_{N+\ell_2}^{(i,j_2)} \neq 0$. By the definition of $u_k^{(i,j)}$, we have:

$$N + \ell_1 + (j_1 - 1)q \equiv N + \ell_2 + (j_2 - 1)q \bmod (qd).$$

By the uniqueness of Euclidean division by q , since $\ell_1, \ell_2 \in \llbracket 0, q - 1 \rrbracket$, we have $\ell_1 = \ell_2$. Thus, $(j_1 - 1)q \equiv (j_2 - 1)q \bmod (qd)$ and hence $(j_1 - j_2)q \equiv 0 \bmod (qd)$. Since $j_1, j_2 \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket$, we have $j_1 = j_2$.

- **Existence:** We write the Euclidean divisions of i and N by q , $i = qu + v$ and $N = qu' + v'$ with $v, v' \in \llbracket 0, q-1 \rrbracket$. If $v \geq v'$, we set $k = v - v' \in \llbracket 0, q-1 \rrbracket$ and $j = (u - u' \bmod d) + 1 \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket$. We then verify that $i = N + k + (j-1)q \bmod (qd)$:

$$N + k + (j-1)q \bmod (qd) = qu' + v' + v - v' + q(u - u') \bmod (qd) = qu + v \bmod (qd) = i.$$

If $v < v'$, we set $k = v - v' + q \in \llbracket 0, q-1 \rrbracket$ and $j = (u - u' - 1 \bmod d) + 1 \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket$. We then verify that $i = N + k + (j-1)q \bmod (qd)$:

$$N + k + (j-1)q \bmod (qd) = qu' + v' + v - v' + q + q(u - u' - 1) \bmod (qd) = qu + v \bmod (qd) = i.$$

□

We define for $j \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket$, the vector Y_j in \mathbb{R}^n as:

$$Y_j = (0 \quad \cdots \quad 0 \quad 1 \quad 0 \quad \cdots \quad 0 \quad \sigma_{0,j} \quad \cdots \quad \sigma_{qd-1,j})^\top$$

where the j -th coordinate is equal to 1, the last $n-d$ are $\sigma_{0,j}, \dots, \sigma_{qd-1,j}$ and the others are zero. We then define the subspace A from Theorem 1.2 as $A = \text{Span}(Y_1, \dots, Y_d)$. By considering the first d coefficients of the vectors Y_j , it is clear that $\dim(A) = d$.

Lemma 2.4. Let $e \in \llbracket 1, n-d \rrbracket$, then the subspace A is $(n-d, \min(d, e))$ -irrational.

Proof. Let B be a rational subspace of dimension e . Suppose by contradiction that $\dim(A \cap B) \geq \min(d, e)$. Let us distinguish between two cases, depending on whether $d \geq e$ or $d \leq e$.

- If $d \geq e$ then $A \cap B = B$. So there exists $X \in A \cap \mathbb{Q}^n \setminus \{0\}$ of the form $X = \lambda_1 Y_1 + \dots + \lambda_d Y_d$. By looking at the first d coordinates of X we have $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d) \in \mathbb{Q}^n$. For $i \in \llbracket 0, qd-1 \rrbracket$, we have a \mathbb{Q} -linear relation between $1, \sigma_{i,1}, \dots, \sigma_{i,d}$ by looking at the $(d+1+i)$ -th coordinate of X which leads to a contradiction.
- If $d \leq e$ then $A \cap B = A$. In particular, we then have $Y_1 \in B$. Denoting by Z_1, \dots, Z_{n-d} a rational basis of B , we have $Y_1 \wedge Z_1 \wedge \dots \wedge Z_{n-d} = 0$. This equality implies the nullity of any minor of size $n-d+1$ of the matrix $(Y_1 \quad Z_1 \quad \cdots \quad Z_{n-d}) \in \mathcal{M}_{n, n-d+1}(\mathbb{R})$. Every such minor is polynomial with rational coefficients in the coefficients of Y_1 , as the Z_i are rational. We can also view each determinant as a polynomial in $\mathbb{Q}[X_0, \dots, X_{n-d-1}]$ evaluated at the $\sigma_{i,1}$. Since these coefficients form an algebraically independent family over \mathbb{Q} , then each polynomial is identically zero. Thus, we can replace the coefficients $\sigma_{i,1}$ of Y_1 by any real family, and the determinant will be zero. Using this, we shall show that any minor of size $n-d$ of the matrix $Q = (Z_1 \quad \cdots \quad Z_{n-d})$ vanishes. Let Δ be a submatrix of size $(n-d) \times (n-d)$ of Q , we denote by $\text{Ind}(\Delta)$ the set of indices $1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_{n-d} \leq n$ of the rows of Q from which Δ is extracted. We distinguish between two cases.

- ◊ If $1 \notin \text{Ind}(\Delta)$, then we set $\sigma_{0,j} = \dots = \sigma_{qd-1,0} = 0$ and we compute the minor of size $n-d+1$ of the matrix $(Y_1 \quad Z_1 \quad \cdots \quad Z_{n-d})$ corresponding to the rows 1 and $\text{Ind}(\Delta)$. This minor is equal to $\pm \det(\Delta)$ and is zero, so $\det(\Delta)$ vanishes.
- ◊ If $1 \in \text{Ind}(\Delta)$, let us fix $i \in \llbracket 0, qd-1 \rrbracket$ such that $d+i+1 \notin \text{Ind}(\Delta)$. We set $\sigma_{i,1} = 1$ and $\sigma_{k,1} = 0$ for $k \in \llbracket 0, qd-1 \rrbracket \setminus \{i\}$. We compute the minor of size $n-d+1$ of the matrix $(Y_1 \quad Z_1 \quad \cdots \quad Z_{n-d})$ corresponding to the rows $d+i+1$ and $\text{Ind}(\Delta)$; it is equal to:

$$\pm \det(\Delta) + \det(\Delta')$$

where Δ' is a submatrix of $(n-d) \times (n-d)$ of Q with $1 \notin \text{Ind}(\Delta') = \text{Ind}(\Delta) \setminus \{1\}$. Using the first case, we have $\det(\Delta') = 0$ and so $\det(\Delta) = 0$.

We have thus shown that every minor of size $n-d$ of Q vanishes. In particular, $\text{rank}(Q) < n-d$ which is contradictory since Z_1, \dots, Z_{n-d} form a basis of B .

□

Remark 2.5. We can actually prove that $A \in \mathcal{I}_n(d, n-d)_1 = \bigcap_{e=1}^{n-d} \mathcal{I}_n(d, e)_1$, see [2, Lemma 9.6].

3 Rational subspaces of good approximation

In this section we define rational subspaces. We will show later that these subspaces achieve good approximations of A .

For $i \in \llbracket 0, qd - 1 \rrbracket$, $j \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket$, and $N \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$, we define the truncated sum: $\sigma_{i,j,N} = \sum_{k=0}^N \frac{u_k^{(i,j)}}{\theta^{\lfloor \alpha^k \rfloor}} \in \frac{1}{\theta^{\lfloor \alpha^N \rfloor}} \mathbb{Z}$.

Now, for $j \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket$, we define the vector in \mathbb{Z}^n :

$$X_N^j = \theta^{\lfloor \alpha^N \rfloor} (0 \quad \dots \quad 0 \quad 1 \quad 0 \quad \dots \quad 0 \quad \sigma_{0,j,N} \quad \dots \quad \sigma_{qd-1,j,N})^\top$$

where the j -th coordinate is equal to 1, the last $n - d$ are $\sigma_{0,j,N}, \dots, \sigma_{qd-1,j,N}$ and the others are zero.

Next, we denote for N and v two positive integers:

$$B_{N,v} = \text{Span}(X_N^1, X_{N+1}^1, \dots, X_{N+v-1}^1, X_N^2, \dots, X_{N+v-1}^2, \dots, X_N^d, \dots, X_{N+v-1}^d) \quad (3.1)$$

which is a rational subspace by definition. For $j \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket$, we note that:

$$X_{N+1}^j = \theta^{\lfloor \alpha^{N+1} \rfloor - \lfloor \alpha^N \rfloor} X_N^j + U_{N+1}^j \text{ with } U_{N+1}^j = \left(0 \quad \dots \quad 0 \quad u_{N+1}^{(0,j)} \quad \dots \quad u_{N+1}^{(qd-1,j)} \right)^\top. \quad (3.2)$$

We set $V_N^j = \frac{U_N^j}{\|U_N^j\|} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ because the vectors U_N^j have a unique non-zero coordinate according to the construction in (2.6). The vectors V_N^j are thus vectors of the canonical basis of \mathbb{R}^n . We also introduce the vectors:

$$Z_N^j = \frac{1}{\theta^{\lfloor \alpha^N \rfloor}} X_N^j \quad (3.3)$$

and we note that $Z_N^j \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} Y_j$ so we deduce that there exist constants c_1 and c_2 independent of N such that for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$c_1 \theta^{\alpha^N} \leq \|X_N^j\| \leq c_2 \theta^{\alpha^N}. \quad (3.4)$$

More precisely for $j \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket$, we have:

$$\psi_1(\text{Span}(Y_j), \text{Span}(X_N^j)) = \omega(Y_j, Z_N^j) \leq \frac{\|Y_j - Z_N^j\|}{\|Y_j\|} \leq c_3 \theta^{-\alpha^{N+1}} \quad (3.5)$$

with $c_3 > 0$ independent of N .

Lemma 3.1. Let $v \in \llbracket 1, q \rrbracket$. Then the subspace $B_{N,v}$ has dimension dv . Moreover, the vectors $(X_N^j)_{j \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket} \cup (V_k^j)_{j \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket, k \in \llbracket N+1, N+v-1 \rrbracket}$ form a \mathbb{Z} -basis of $B_{N,v} \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$.

Proof. By induction on v and using (3.2), we have:

$$B_{N,v} = \text{Span}(X_N^1, V_{N+1}^1, \dots, V_{N+v-1}^1, X_N^2, V_{N+1}^2, \dots, V_{N+v-1}^2, \dots, X_N^d, V_{N+1}^d, \dots, V_{N+v-1}^d).$$

Remark 2.2 allows us to assert that the V_k^j considered here are all different. Furthermore, we recall that these are vectors of the canonical basis. We deduce in particular that $(X_N^j)_{j \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket} \cup (V_k^j)_{j \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket, k \in \llbracket N+1, N+v-1 \rrbracket}$ form a free family since the j -th coefficient of X_N^j is $\theta^{\lfloor \alpha^N \rfloor}$ while the j -th coefficient of the other vectors of the family is zero for any $j \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket$.

We first prove the lemma for $v = q$. Let $(a_{j,k})_{j \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket, k \in \llbracket 0, q-1 \rrbracket} \in [0, 1]^{qd}$ be such that:

$$U = \sum_{j=1}^d a_{j,0} X_N^j + \sum_{k=1}^{q-1} \sum_{j=1}^d a_{j,k} V_{N+k}^j \in \mathbb{Z}^n \quad (3.6)$$

By examining the first d coordinates of U , we find that $a_{j,0} \theta^{\lfloor \alpha^N \rfloor} \in \mathbb{Z}$ for all $j \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket$. We can write $a_{j,0} = \frac{x_j}{y_j}$ with $y_j \mid \theta^{\lfloor \alpha^N \rfloor}$ and $\gcd(x_j, \theta) = 1$ for all $j \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket$. Let $j_{\max} \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket$ be such that $\max_{j=1}^d y_j = y_{j_{\max}}$.

Now consider the integer $i = N + q(j_{\max} - 1) \pmod{qd} \in \llbracket 0, qd - 1 \rrbracket$. By the definition of $u_k^{(i,j)}$ in (2.6), we have $u_N^{(i,j_{\max})} \neq 0$ and therefore $\forall k \in \llbracket 1, q - 1 \rrbracket, \forall j \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket, u_{N+k}^{(i,j)} = 0$ according to Lemma 2.3. By the definition of U_{N+k} in (3.2) and $V_{N+k} = \frac{U_{N+k}}{\|U_{N+k}\|}$, the $(d+i)$ -th coordinate of the vector $\sum_{k=1}^{q-1} \sum_{j=1}^d a_{j,k} V_{N+k}^j$ is therefore zero. Hence, according to (3.6) $\sum_{j=1}^d a_{j,0} \theta^{\lfloor \alpha^N \rfloor} \sigma_{i,j,N} = \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{x_j}{y_j} \theta^{\lfloor \alpha^N \rfloor} \sigma_{i,j,N} \in \mathbb{Z}$. Since the y_j are powers of θ and $\max_{j=1}^d y_j = y_{j_{\max}}$, we have $\frac{y_{j_{\max}}}{y_j} \in \mathbb{Z}$ and:

$$\sum_{j=1}^d x_j \frac{y_{j_{\max}}}{y_j} \theta^{\lfloor \alpha^N \rfloor} \sigma_{i,j,N} \in y_{j_{\max}} \mathbb{Z}. \quad (3.7)$$

Now we notice that for $j \neq j_{\max}$, we have $i \not\equiv N + 1 + q(j - 1) \pmod{qd}$ and thus $u_N^{(i,j)} = 0$ in this case. Since $\lfloor \alpha^{N-1} \rfloor < \lfloor \alpha^N \rfloor$, we have for all $j \neq j_{\max}$, $\theta \mid \theta^{\lfloor \alpha^N \rfloor} \sigma_{i,j,N} = \theta^{\lfloor \alpha^N \rfloor} \sum_{k=0}^N \frac{u_k^{(i,j)}}{\theta^{\lfloor \alpha^k \rfloor}}$. If $\theta \mid y_{j_{\max}}$, then using (3.7) $\theta \mid x_{j_{\max}} \theta^{\lfloor \alpha^N \rfloor} \sigma_{i,j_{\max},N}$. Since $u_n^{(i,j_{\max})}$ is non-zero and coprime with θ , we have $\gcd(\theta^{\lfloor \alpha^N \rfloor} \sigma_{i,j_{\max},N}, \theta) = 1$. We finally deduce that $\theta \mid x_{j_{\max}}$, which is contradictory to $\gcd(x_{j_{\max}}, \theta) = 1$. All y_j are therefore equal to 1, and thus all $a_{j,0}$ are integers. Returning to (3.6), we find $\sum_{k=1}^{q-1} \sum_{j=1}^d a_{j,k} V_{N+k}^j \in \mathbb{Z}^n$. Since all the vectors V_{N+k}^j are distinct and come from the canonical basis, $a_{j,k}$ is an integer for all $j \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket$ and $k \in \llbracket 0, q - 1 \rrbracket$. This shows that $(X_N^j)_{j \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket} \cup (V_k^j)_{j \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket, k \in \llbracket N+1, N+q-1 \rrbracket}$ forms a \mathbb{Z} -basis of $B_{N,q} \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$, and in particular that $\dim(B_{N,q}) = qd$.

Now let $v \in \llbracket 1, q-1 \rrbracket$. We have $(X_N^j)_{j \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket} \cup (V_k^j)_{j \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket, k \in \llbracket N+1, N+v-1 \rrbracket} \subset (X_N^j)_{j \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket} \cup (V_k^j)_{j \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket, k \in \llbracket N+1, N+q-1 \rrbracket}$. Since it is contained in a \mathbb{Z} -basis, the family $(X_N^j)_{j \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket} \cup (V_k^j)_{j \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket, k \in \llbracket N+1, N+v-1 \rrbracket}$ forms a \mathbb{Z} -basis of the \mathbb{Z} -module it generates. This \mathbb{Z} -module is $B_{N,v} \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ and the lemma is proved. \square

Using this lemma, we can compute the height of some specific rational subspaces in Lemmas 4.2, 4.5, 4.7 and 5.1.

4 Computation of the exponent in the case $e \geq d$

In this section, we consider $e \in \llbracket d, qd \rrbracket$. Recall that $e = q_e d + r_e$ is the Euclidean division of e by d . In particular, we have $1 \leq q_e \leq q$. The goal of this section is to compute $\mu_n(A|e)_d$.

4.1 Lower bound on the exponent

In this section, we introduce a sequence of rational subspaces of dimension e that approximate A well, which allows us to bound $\mu_n(A|e)_d$ from below. Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$. We define the subspace $C_{N,e}$ by:

$$\begin{aligned} C_{N,e} &= \text{Span}(X_{N+1}^1, \dots, X_{N+q_e}^1, \dots, X_{N+1}^d, \dots, X_{N+q_e}^d) \bigoplus \text{Span}(X_N^1, \dots, X_N^{r_e}) \\ &= B_{N+1,q_e} \bigoplus \text{Span}(X_N^1, \dots, X_N^{r_e}) \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

which is a rational subspace. Using (3.2) and reasoning by induction for each $j \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} C_{N,e} &= \text{Span}(X_N^1, V_{N+1}^1, \dots, V_{N+q_e}^1, \dots, X_N^{r_e}, V_{N+1}^{r_e}, \dots, V_{N+q_e}^{r_e}) \\ &\quad \bigoplus \text{Span}(X_{N+1}^{r_e+1}, V_{N+2}^{r_e+1}, \dots, V_{N+q_e}^{r_e+1}, \dots, X_{N+1}^d, V_{N+2}^d, \dots, V_{N+q_e}^d). \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

Remark 4.1. Note that in the case where $r_e = 0$, by the definition in (4.1), we have $C_{N,e} = B_{N+1,q_e}$. In all cases, we have $B_{N+1,q_e} \subset C_{N,e} \subset B_{N,q_e+1}$.

Lemma 4.2. We have $\dim(C_{N,e}) = e$. Moreover, there exist constants $c_4 > 0$ and $c_5 > 0$ independent of N such that

$$c_4 \theta^{r_e \alpha^N + (d-r_e) \alpha^{N+1}} \leq H(C_{N,e}) \leq c_5 \theta^{r_e \alpha^N + (d-r_e) \alpha^{N+1}}.$$

Proof. If $q_e = q$, then $C_{N,e} = B_{N+1,q}$ because $e = qd$ and $r_e = 0$; otherwise $q_e < q$ and in this case $C_{N,e} \subset B_{N,q}$. In each case, Lemma 3.1 states that the vectors considered in (4.2) come from a \mathbb{Z} -basis of $B_{N+1,q} \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ or $B_{N,q} \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ respectively. The relation (4.2) gives directly $\dim(C_{N,e}) = (q_e + 1)r_e + (d - r_e)q_e = q_e d + r_e = e$. These vectors thus form a \mathbb{Z} -basis of $C_{N,e} \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$. Taking up the notation $Z_N^j = \frac{1}{\theta^{\lfloor \alpha^N \rfloor}} X_N^j$, we have:

$$H(C_{N,e}) = \theta^{r_e \lfloor \alpha^N \rfloor + (d-r_e) \lfloor \alpha^{N+1} \rfloor} \|H_N\| \leq \theta^{r_e \alpha^N + (d-r_e) \alpha^{N+1}} \|H_N\| \quad (4.3)$$

where H_N is the exterior product of the vectors

$$(Z_N^j)_{j \in \llbracket 1, r_e \rrbracket} \cup (Z_{N+1}^j)_{j \in \llbracket r_e+1, d \rrbracket} \cup (V_{N+k}^j)_{j \in \llbracket 1, r_e \rrbracket, k \in \llbracket 1, q_e \rrbracket} \cup (V_{N+k}^j)_{j \in \llbracket r_e+1, d \rrbracket, k \in \llbracket 2, q_e \rrbracket}. \quad (4.4)$$

We can bound this norm from above by $\|H_N\| \leq \|Z_N^1 \wedge \dots \wedge Z_N^{r_e} \wedge Z_{N+1}^{r_e+1} \wedge \dots \wedge Z_{N+1}^d\|$ since the norms of the vectors V_k^j are equal to 1. Now the quantity $\|Z_N^1 \wedge \dots \wedge Z_N^{r_e} \wedge Z_{N+1}^{r_e+1} \wedge \dots \wedge Z_{N+1}^d\|$ converges to $\|Y_1 \wedge \dots \wedge Y_d\|$ as N tends to infinity and is therefore bounded independently of N . There exists $c_5 > 0$, independent of N , such that:

$$\|H_N\| \leq c_5. \quad (4.5)$$

Furthermore, let us define the matrix M whose column vectors are the vectors of (4.4). Then, by taking up the construction of the vectors V_N^j in (3.2), M takes the form $M = \begin{pmatrix} I_d & 0 \\ \Sigma_N & V_N \end{pmatrix}$ where Σ_N is a matrix whose coefficients are $\sigma_{i,j,N}$ or $\sigma_{i,j,N+1}$, and V_N is a matrix of $\mathcal{M}_{qd,e-d}(\mathbb{Z})$ of rank $e - d$ since its columns are $e - d$ distinct vectors from the canonical basis.

Let Δ be a non-zero minor of V_N of size $e - d$. We can then extract a square matrix M' of size e from M by selecting the first d rows and $e - d$ among the last ones, corresponding to the minor Δ . The determinant of M' is an integer because it is the product of $\det(I_d) = 1$ and Δ which is a minor of a matrix in $M_{e-d}(\mathbb{Z})$. Hence, we have $|\det(M')| \geq 1$. Now $\det(M')$ is a minor of size e of M , so we have $\|H_N\| \geq |\det(M')| \geq 1$. By combining this with (4.3) and (4.5), we obtain:

$$c_4 \theta^{r_e \alpha^N + (d-r_e) \alpha^{N+1}} \leq \theta^{r_e \lfloor \alpha^N \rfloor + (d-r_e) \lfloor \alpha^{N+1} \rfloor} \leq H(C_{N,e}) \leq c_5 \theta^{r_e \alpha^N + (d-r_e) \alpha^{N+1}}$$

by setting $c_4 = \theta^{-d}$. □

We now focus on the angle $\psi_d(A, C_{N,e})$. To do this, we first study the angle $\psi_1(\text{Span}(Y_1), C_{N,e})$.

Lemma 4.3. There exists a constant $c_6 > 0$ independent of N such that:

$$\psi_1(\text{Span}(Y_1), C_{N,e}) \geq c_6 \theta^{-\alpha^N + q_e + 1}.$$

Proof. Let $X \in C_{N,e} \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\psi_1(\text{Span}(Y_1), C_{N,e}) = \omega(Y_1, X)$. We use the basis of $C_{N,e}$ as explicitly detailed in (4.2), and we denote $(a_{k,j})$ a family of real numbers such that X can be written as:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{r_e} a_{0,j} \theta^{-\lfloor \alpha^N \rfloor} X_N^j + \sum_{j=r_e+1}^d a_{0,j} \theta^{-\lfloor \alpha^{N+1} \rfloor} X_{N+1}^j + \sum_{j=1}^{r_e} \sum_{k=1}^{q_e} a_{k,j} V_{N+k}^j + \sum_{j=r_e+1}^d \sum_{k=1}^{q_e-1} a_{k,j} V_{N+k+1}^j.$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{r_e} a_{0,j}^2 + \sum_{j=r_e+1}^d a_{0,j}^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{r_e} \sum_{k=1}^{q_e} a_{k,j}^2 + \sum_{j=r_e+1}^d \sum_{k=1}^{q_e-1} a_{k,j}^2 = 1. \quad (4.6)$$

The norms of the vectors $\theta^{-\lfloor \alpha^N \rfloor} X_N^j$ and V_{N+k}^j are bounded by a constant independent of N , and we have $\omega(Y_1, X) = \frac{\|Y_1 \wedge X\|}{\|Y_1\| \|X\|}$. Therefore, it suffices to show that if N is large enough:

$$\|Y_1 \wedge X\| \geq c_6 \theta^{-\lfloor \alpha^{N+q_e+1} \rfloor} \geq c_6 \theta^{-\alpha^{N+q_e+1}}. \quad (4.7)$$

Recall that $Y_1 = (1 \ 0 \ \cdots \ 0 \ \sigma_{0,1} \ \cdots \ \sigma_{qd-1,1})^\top$ and let us explicit X as:

$$\begin{pmatrix} a_{0,1} \\ \vdots \\ a_{0,d} \\ \sum_{j=1}^{r_e} a_{0,j} \sigma_{0,j,N} + \sum_{j=r_e+1}^d a_{0,j} \sigma_{0,j,N+1} + \sum_{j=1}^{r_e} \sum_{k=1}^{q_e} a_{k,j} v_{N+k,0}^j + \sum_{j=r_e+1}^d \sum_{k=1}^{q_e-1} a_{k,j} v_{N+k+1,0}^j \\ \vdots \\ \sum_{j=1}^{r_e} a_{0,j} \sigma_{qd-1,j,N} + \sum_{j=r_e+1}^d a_{0,j} \sigma_{qd-1,j,N+1} + \sum_{j=1}^{r_e} \sum_{k=1}^{q_e} a_{k,j} v_{N+k,qd-1}^j + \sum_{j=r_e+1}^d \sum_{k=1}^{q_e-1} a_{k,j} v_{N+k+1,qd-1}^j \end{pmatrix}$$

with $V_{N+k}^j = (0 \ \cdots \ 0 \ v_{N+k,0}^j \ \cdots \ v_{N+k,qd-1}^j)^\top$. We then prove (4.7) by considering different cases. Let $\sigma \geq 1$ be an upper bound on the $\sigma_{i,j}$, especially for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $\sigma \geq \sigma_{i,j,N}$.

• **First case:** If there exists $j \in \llbracket 2, d \rrbracket$ such that $|a_{0,j}| \geq \frac{\theta^{-\lfloor \alpha^{N+q_e+1} \rfloor}}{(\sigma qd)^2}$ then, by bounding $\|X \wedge Y_1\|$ from below by the minor of $(Y_1|X)$ corresponding to the first row and the j -th row, we find $\|X \wedge Y_1\| \geq \left| \det \begin{pmatrix} 1 & a_{0,1} \\ 0 & a_{0,j} \end{pmatrix} \right| \geq |a_{0,j}| \geq \frac{\theta^{-\lfloor \alpha^{N+q_e+1} \rfloor}}{(\sigma qd)^2}$ which yields (4.7).

• **Second case:** Otherwise $\forall j \in \llbracket 2, d \rrbracket$, $|a_{0,j}| < \frac{\theta^{-\lfloor \alpha^{N+q_e+1} \rfloor}}{(\sigma qd)^2}$. According to (4.6), we have:

$$a_{0,1}^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{r_e} \sum_{k=1}^{q_e} a_{k,j}^2 + \sum_{j=r_e+1}^d \sum_{k=1}^{q_e-1} a_{k,j}^2 \geq 1 - (d-1) \left(\frac{\theta^{-\lfloor \alpha^{N+q_e+1} \rfloor}}{(\sigma qd)^2} \right)^2.$$

In particular, if N is large enough, there exists (j', k') such that $|a_{k',j'}| \geq \frac{1}{qd}$ with $k' > 0$ or $(k' = 0$ and $j' = 1)$. First, let us consider the case $k' > 0$. We then set $i = N + k' + (j' - 1)q \bmod (qd)$. By definition of $u_{N+k}^{(i,j)}$ (and thus of $v_{N+k,i}^j$) in (2.6), we have:

$$v_{N+k',i}^{j'} = 1 \text{ and } \forall (j, k) \neq (j', k'), \quad v_{N+k,i}^j = 0.$$

By bounding $\|X \wedge Y_1\|$ from below by the minor of $(Y_1|X)$ corresponding to the first row and the $(i+1+d)$ -th row, we find:

$$\begin{aligned} \|X \wedge Y_1\| &\geq \left| \det \begin{pmatrix} 1 & & & a_{0,1} \\ \sigma_{i,1} & \sum_{j=1}^{r_e} a_{0,j} \sigma_{i,j,N} + \sum_{j=r_e+1}^d a_{0,j} \sigma_{i,j,N+1} + a_{k',j'} v_{N+k',i}^{j'} & & \end{pmatrix} \right| \\ &= \left| a_{0,1}(\sigma_{i,1,N} - \sigma_{i,1}) + \sum_{j=2}^{r_e} a_{0,j} \sigma_{i,j,N} + \sum_{j=r_e+1}^d a_{0,j} \sigma_{i,j,N+1} + a_{k',j'} v_{N+k',i}^{j'} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Now, $|\sigma_{i,1,N} - \sigma_{i,1}| = \sum_{k=N+1}^{+\infty} \frac{u_k^{(i,1)}}{\theta^{\lfloor \alpha^k \rfloor}} \leq 4\theta^{-\lfloor \alpha^{N+1} \rfloor}$ if N is large enough. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \|X \wedge Y_1\| &\geq |a_{j',k'} v_{N+k',i}^{j'}| - |a_{0,1}(\sigma_{i,1,N} - \sigma_{i,1})| - \left| \sum_{j=2}^{r_e} a_{0,j} \sigma_{i,j,N} \right| - \left| \sum_{j=r_e+1}^d a_{0,j} \sigma_{i,j,N+1} \right| \\ &\geq \frac{1}{qd} - 4\theta^{-\lfloor \alpha^{N+1} \rfloor} - d\sigma \left(\frac{\theta^{-\lfloor \alpha^{N+q_e+1} \rfloor}}{(\sigma qd)^2} \right) \\ &\geq \theta^{-\lfloor \alpha^{N+q_e+1} \rfloor} \end{aligned}$$

if N is large enough, which proves (4.7). Now, let us suppose that $k' = 0$ and $j' = 1$, so $|a_{0,1}| \geq \frac{1}{qd}$. We set $i = N + q_e + 1 \pmod{qd}$. By definition of $u_{N+k}^{(i,j)}$ in (2.6), we have $\forall k \in \llbracket 1, q_e \rrbracket, \forall j \in \llbracket 2, d \rrbracket, v_{N+k,i}^j = 0$ and $u_{N+1}^{(i,1)} = \dots = u_{N+q_e}^{(i,1)} = 0$ and $u_{N+q_e+1}^{(i,1)} \in \{2, 3\}$. In particular, $\sigma_{i,1,N} = \sum_{k=0}^N \frac{u_k^{(i,1)}}{\theta^{\lfloor \alpha^k \rfloor}} = \sum_{k=0}^{N+q_e} \frac{u_k^{(i,1)}}{\theta^{\lfloor \alpha^k \rfloor}} = \sigma_{i,1,N+q_e}$ and $\sum_{j=1}^{r_e} \sum_{k=1}^{q_e} a_{k,j} v_{N+k,i}^j + \sum_{j=r_e+1}^d \sum_{k=1}^{q_e-1} a_{k,j} v_{N+k+1,i}^j = 0$. By bounding $\|X \wedge Y_1\|$ from below by the minor of $(X|Y_1)$ corresponding to the first row and the $(i+1+d)$ -th row, we find:

$$\begin{aligned} \|X \wedge Y_1\| &\geq \left| \det \begin{pmatrix} 1 & & a_{0,1} \\ \sigma_{i,1} & \sum_{j=1}^{r_e} a_{0,j} \sigma_{i,j,N} + \sum_{j=r_e+1}^d a_{0,j} \sigma_{i,j,N+1} \end{pmatrix} \right| \\ &= \left| a_{0,1}(\sigma_{i,1,N} - \sigma_{i,1}) + \sum_{j=2}^{r_e} a_{0,j} \sigma_{i,j,N} + \sum_{j=r_e+1}^d a_{0,j} \sigma_{i,j,N+1} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Now, $|\sigma_{i,1,N} - \sigma_{i,1}| = |\sigma_{i,1,N+q_e} - \sigma_{i,1}| = \sum_{k=N+q_e+1}^{+\infty} \frac{u_k^{(i,1)}}{\theta^{\lfloor \alpha^k \rfloor}} \geq \frac{u_{N+q_e+1}^{(i,1)}}{\theta^{\lfloor \alpha^{N+q_e+1} \rfloor}} \geq 2\theta^{-\lfloor \alpha^{N+q_e+1} \rfloor}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \|X \wedge Y_1\| &\geq |a_{0,1}(\sigma_{i,1,N} - \sigma_{i,1})| - \left| \sum_{j=2}^{r_e} a_{0,j} \sigma_{i,j,N} \right| - \left| \sum_{j=r_e+1}^d a_{0,j} \sigma_{i,j,N+1} \right| \\ &\geq \frac{2\theta^{-\lfloor \alpha^{N+q_e+1} \rfloor}}{qd} - d\sigma \left(\frac{\theta^{-\lfloor \alpha^{N+q_e+1} \rfloor}}{(\sigma qd)^2} \right) \\ &\geq \frac{\theta^{-\lfloor \alpha^{N+q_e+1} \rfloor}}{qd} \end{aligned}$$

which proves (4.7). Therefore, (4.7) holds in all cases, which concludes the proof of the lemma. \square

We can now estimate the last angle (corresponding to $j = d$) between A and $C_{N,e}$.

Lemma 4.4. There exist constants $c_7 > 0$ and $c_8 > 0$ independent of N such that

$$c_7 H(C_{N,e})^{\frac{-\alpha^{q_e+1}}{r_e+(d-r_e)\alpha}} \leq \psi_d(A, C_{N,e}) \leq c_8 H(C_{N,e})^{\frac{-\alpha^{q_e+1}}{r_e+(d-r_e)\alpha}}.$$

Proof. Recall that for $j \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $\psi_1(\text{Span}(Y_j), \text{Span}(X_{N+q_e}^j)) \leq c_3 \theta^{-\alpha^{N+q_e+1}}$ according to (3.5). By construction of $C_{N,e}$, we have $\text{Span}(X_{N+q_e}^1, \dots, X_{N+q_e}^d) \subset C_{N,e}$ and thus

$$\psi_d(A, C_{N,e}) \leq \psi_d(A, \text{Span}(X_{N+q_e}^1, \dots, X_{N+q_e}^d))$$

by the corollary of Lemma 12 of [9]. According to Theorem 1.2 of [6], we have:

$$\psi_d(A, \text{Span}(X_{N+q_e}^1, \dots, X_{N+q_e}^d)) \leq c_9 \sum_{j=1}^d \psi_1(\text{Span}(Y_j), \text{Span}(X_{N+q_e}^j))$$

where c_9 depends on Y_1, \dots, Y_d and n . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_d(A, \text{Span}(X_{N+q_e}^1, \dots, X_{N+q_e}^d)) &\leq c_9 c_3 d \theta^{-\alpha^{N+q_e+1}} \\ &\leq c_9 c_3 d c_5^{\frac{\alpha^{N+q_e+1}}{r_e \alpha^N + (d-r_e) \alpha^{N+1}}} H(C_{N,e})^{\frac{-\alpha^{N+q_e+1}}{r_e \alpha^N + (d-r_e) \alpha^{N+1}}} \\ &= c_8 H(C_{N,e})^{\frac{-\alpha^{q_e+1}}{r_e+(d-r_e)\alpha}} \end{aligned}$$

since $H(C_{N,e}) \leq c_5 \theta^{r_e \alpha^N + (d-r_e) \alpha^{N+1}}$ by Lemma 4.2. This proves the upper bound of the lemma with $c_8 = c_9 c_3 d c_5^{\frac{\alpha^{qe+1}}{r_e + (d-r_e)\alpha}}$.

To establish the lower bound, we use the fact that $\psi_d(A, C_{N,e}) \geq \psi_1(\text{Span}(Y_1), C_{N,e})$ according to Lemma 2.3 of [6]. Lemma 4.3 then gives $\psi_d(A, C_{N,e}) \geq c_6 \theta^{-\alpha^{N+qe+1}}$. Since $H(C_{N,e}) \geq c_4 \theta^{r_e \alpha^N + (d-r_e) \alpha^{N+1}}$ according to Lemma 4.2, we have the lower bound

$$\psi_d(A, C_{N,e}) \geq c_6 c_4^{\frac{\alpha^{N+qe+1}}{r_e \alpha^N + (d-r_e) \alpha^{N+1}}} H(C_{N,e})^{\frac{-\alpha^{N+qe+1}}{r_e \alpha^N + (d-r_e) \alpha^{N+1}}} = c_7 H(C_{N,e})^{\frac{-\alpha^{qe+1}}{r_e + (d-r_e)\alpha}}$$

where $c_7 = c_6 c_4^{\frac{\alpha^{qe+1}}{r_e + (d-r_e)\alpha}}$, proving the lower bound of the lemma. \square

We have thus constructed an infinite family of rational subspaces $C_{N,e}$ of dimension e such that $\psi_d(A, C_{N,e}) \leq c_8 H(C_{N,e})^{\frac{-\alpha^{qe+1}}{r_e + (d-r_e)\alpha}}$ which implies in particular that $\mu_n(A|e)_d \geq \frac{\alpha^{qe+1}}{r_e + (d-r_e)\alpha}$.

4.2 Upper bound on the exponent

We shall now show that the lower bound found in the previous section is optimal, meaning that we will bound $\mu_n(A|e)_d$ from above by $\frac{\alpha^{qe+1}}{r_e + (d-r_e)\alpha}$. We state a first technical lemma which will be useful in the proof of the upper bound. This lemma actually generalizes the lower bound of Lemma 4.2.

Recall that for N and v two positive integers, we have defined:

$$B_{N,v} = \text{Span}(X_N^1, X_{N+1}^1, \dots, X_{N+v-1}^1, X_N^2, \dots, X_{N+v-1}^2, \dots, X_N^d, \dots, X_{N+v-1}^d).$$

Lemma 4.5. Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $v \in \llbracket 1, q-1 \rrbracket$, and $r \in \llbracket 0, d-1 \rrbracket$. For W a rational subspace of $\text{Span}(X_N^1, \dots, X_N^d)$ of dimension r , we have:

$$H(B_{N+1,v} \oplus W) \geq c_{10} \theta^{r \alpha^N + (d-r) \alpha^{N+1}}$$

where $c_{10} > 0$ is independent of N and W .

Proof. We fix U_1, \dots, U_r be a \mathbb{Z} -basis of $W \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$. Since $W \subset \text{Span}(X_N^1, \dots, X_N^d)$ and these vectors form a \mathbb{Z} -basis of $\text{Span}(X_N^1, \dots, X_N^d) \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$, we can write for $i \in \llbracket 1, r \rrbracket$:

$$U_i = \sum_{j=1}^d a_{i,j} X_N^j \tag{4.8}$$

with $a_{i,j} \in \mathbb{Z}$. We note that $B_{N+1,v} \oplus W$ is a direct sum and has dimension $\dim(B_{N+1,v}) + r = vd + r$ according to Lemma 3.1. The same lemma states also that the vectors $(X_{N+1}^j)_{j \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket} \cup (V_k^j)_{j \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket, k \in \llbracket N+2, N+v \rrbracket}$ form a \mathbb{Z} -basis of $B_{N+1,v} \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$. By concatenating this base of $B_{N+1,v}$ with the chosen basis (U_1, \dots, U_r) of W , we form a basis of the real vector subspace $B_{N+1,v} \oplus W$ (but not necessarily of the \mathbb{Z} -module $(B_{N+1,v} \oplus W) \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$). Moreover, since the vectors of this basis have integers coordinates, the formula (7) stated in [9, section 3] gives the height of $B_{N+1,v} \oplus W$:

$$H(B_{N+1,v} \oplus W) = \frac{\left\| \left(\bigwedge_{j=1}^d X_{N+1}^j \right) \wedge \left(\bigwedge_{k=N+2}^{N+v} (V_k^1 \wedge \dots \wedge V_k^d) \right) \wedge U_1 \wedge \dots \wedge U_r \right\|}{N(I)} \tag{4.9}$$

where $N(I)$ is the norm of the ideal I generated by the Grassmannian coordinates associated with this basis, which, as a reminder, are the minors of size $vd + r$ of the matrix associated with the vectors $(X_{N+1}^j)_{j \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket} \cup (V_k^j)_{j \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket, k \in \llbracket N+2, N+v \rrbracket} \cup (U_i)_{i \in \llbracket 1, r \rrbracket}$. According to (4.8) we have for $i \in \llbracket 1, r \rrbracket$:

$$U_i = \sum_{j=1}^d a_{i,j} X_N^j = \sum_{j=1}^d a_{i,j} \frac{X_{N+1}^j - U_{N+1}^j}{\theta^{\lfloor \alpha^{N+1} \rfloor - \lfloor \alpha^N \rfloor}}$$

using also the formula (3.2). Thus:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \left(\bigwedge_{j=1}^d X_{N+1}^j \right) \wedge \left(\bigwedge_{k=N+2}^{N+v} (V_k^1 \wedge \dots \wedge V_k^d) \right) \wedge U_1 \wedge \dots \wedge U_r \right\| \\
&= \left(\frac{1}{\theta^{\lfloor \alpha^{N+1} \rfloor - \lfloor \alpha^N \rfloor}} \right)^r \left\| \left(\bigwedge_{j=1}^d X_{N+1}^j \right) \wedge \left(\bigwedge_{k=N+2}^{N+v} (V_k^1 \wedge \dots \wedge V_k^d) \right) \wedge \sum_{j=1}^d a_{1,j} U_{N+1}^j \wedge \dots \wedge \sum_{j=1}^d a_{r,j} U_{N+1}^j \right\| \\
&= \theta^{r \lfloor \alpha^N \rfloor + (d-r) \lfloor \alpha^{N+1} \rfloor} \left\| \left(\bigwedge_{j=1}^d Z_{N+1}^j \right) \wedge \left(\bigwedge_{k=N+2}^{N+v} (V_k^1 \wedge \dots \wedge V_k^d) \right) \wedge \sum_{j=1}^d a_{1,j} U_{N+1}^j \wedge \dots \wedge \sum_{j=1}^d a_{r,j} U_{N+1}^j \right\|
\end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

with $Z_{N+1}^j = \frac{1}{\theta^{\lfloor \alpha^{N+1} \rfloor}} X_{N+1}^j$. Now the norm of the exterior product that appears in (4.10) can be bounded below by the absolute value of any minor of size $dv + r$ of the matrix M whose columns are the vectors $(Z_{N+1}^j)_{j \in [1,d]} \cup (V_k^j)_{j \in [1,d], k \in [N+2, N+v]} \cup (\sum_{j=1}^d a_{i,j} U_{N+1}^j)_{i \in [1,r]}$. We have $M = \begin{pmatrix} I_d & \\ \Sigma_{N+1} & A \end{pmatrix} \in M_{n, dv+r}(\mathbb{R})$ where $\Sigma_{N+1} = (\sigma_{i,j}^{N+1})_{i \in [0, qd-1], j \in [1,d]}$ and $A \in M_{n, d(v-1)+r}(\mathbb{R})$ whose columns are the vectors $(V_k^j)_{j \in [1,d], k \in [N+2, N+v]} \cup (\sum_{j=1}^d a_{i,j} U_{N+1}^j)_{i \in [1,r]}$. According to the construction of the vectors V_k^j and U_{N+1}^j in (3.2) and since $a_{i,j} \in \mathbb{Z}$, there exists $A' \in M_{n-d, d(v-1)+r}(\mathbb{Z})$ a matrix with integer coefficients such that:

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} I_d & \\ \Sigma_{N+1} & A \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} I_d & 0 \\ \Sigma_{N+1} & A' \end{pmatrix}.$$

Moreover, the matrix A' has rank $d(v-1) + r$ because $\text{rank}(M) = dv + r$ since the columns of M are vectors from a basis. Thus, we can extract a minor from $\begin{pmatrix} I_d & 0 \\ \Sigma_{N+1} & A' \end{pmatrix}$ that is non-zero and integer. In particular, it is bounded below in absolute value by 1, and by referring to (4.10) we have:

$$\left\| \left(\bigwedge_{j=1}^d X_{N+1}^j \right) \wedge \left(\bigwedge_{k=N+2}^{N+v} (V_k^1 \wedge \dots \wedge V_k^d) \right) \wedge U_1 \wedge \dots \wedge U_r \right\| \geq \theta^{r \lfloor \alpha^N \rfloor + (d-r) \lfloor \alpha^{N+1} \rfloor}. \tag{4.11}$$

According to (4.9), it remains to show that $N(I)$ is bounded by a constant depending only on A . For this, we show that the family $(X_{N+1}^j)_{j \in [1,d]} \cup (V_k^j)_{j \in [1,d], k \in [N+2, N+v]} \cup (U_i)_{i \in [1,r]}$ forms "almost" a \mathbb{Z} -basis of $(B_{N+1, v} \oplus W) \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$. With this aim in mind, let $(u_j)_{j \in [1,d]} \cup (w_{j,k})_{j \in [1,d], k \in [N+2, N+v]} \cup (v_i)_{i \in [1,r]} \in [0, 1]^{r+vd}$ such that:

$$X = \sum_{j=1}^d u_j X_{N+1}^j + \sum_{\substack{k \in [N+2, N+v] \\ j \in [1,d]}} w_{j,k} V_k^j + \sum_{i=1}^r v_i U_i \in \mathbb{Z}^n. \tag{4.12}$$

We decompose X in the \mathbb{Z} -basis of $B_{N, v+1} \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ explicitly described in Lemma 3.1. We have $U_i = \sum_{j=1}^d a_{i,j} X_N^j$ according to (4.8), and $X_{N+1}^j = \theta^{\lfloor \alpha^{N+1} \rfloor - \lfloor \alpha^N \rfloor} X_N^j + \|U_{N+1}^j\| V_{N+1}^j$ using the formula (3.2). For $k \in [N+2, N+v]$, the V_k^j do not appear in the decomposition of U_i and X_{N+1}^j . By definition of a \mathbb{Z} -basis we then have $\forall j \in [1, d], \forall k \in [N+2, N+v], w_{j,k} \in \mathbb{Z}$. In particular, $\sum_{\substack{k \in [N+2, N+v] \\ j \in [1, d]}} w_{j,k} V_k^j \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ and the

relation (4.12) then gives $\sum_{j=1}^d u_j \left(\theta^{\lfloor \alpha^{N+1} \rfloor - \lfloor \alpha^N \rfloor} X_N^j + \|U_{N+1}^j\| V_{N+1}^j \right) + \sum_{j=1}^d \left(\sum_{i=1}^r v_i a_{i,j} \right) X_N^j \in \mathbb{Z}^n$. According to Lemma 3.1, the V_{N+1}^j and X_N^j form a \mathbb{Z} -basis of $V \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$, where V is the real vector subspace generated by these vectors. So we have for all $j \in [1, d]$:

$$u_j \|U_{N+1}^j\| \in \mathbb{Z}, \tag{4.13}$$

$$u_j \theta^{\lfloor \alpha^{N+1} \rfloor - \lfloor \alpha^N \rfloor} + \sum_{i=1}^r v_i a_{i,j} \in \mathbb{Z}. \tag{4.14}$$

Since $\|U_{N+1}^j\| = 2$ or 3 , the relation (4.13) gives $6u_j \in \mathbb{Z}$ for all $j \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket$. By the second relation (4.14), we then have $\sum_{i=1}^r 6v_i a_{i,j} \in \mathbb{Z}$ for all $j \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket$. Finally: $\sum_{i=1}^r 6v_i U_i = \sum_{j=1}^d \left(\sum_{i=1}^r 6v_i a_{i,j} \right) X_N^j \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ and as U_1, \dots, U_r form a \mathbb{Z} -basis of $W \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ we find $6v_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ for all $i \in \llbracket 1, r \rrbracket$. So we finally have:

$$\begin{aligned} w_{j,k} &\in \mathbb{Z} \text{ for } (j, k) \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket \times \llbracket N+2, N+v \rrbracket, \\ 6u_j &\in \mathbb{Z} \text{ for } j \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket, \\ 6v_i &\in \mathbb{Z} \text{ for } i \in \llbracket 1, r \rrbracket. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, this gives $N(I) \leq 6^{d+r} \leq 6^{2d}$. By combining this with (4.11) in (4.9) we find $H(B_{N+1, v} \oplus W) \geq 6^{-2d} \theta^{r[\alpha^N] + (d-r)[\alpha^{N+1}]} \geq c_{10} \theta^{r\alpha^N + (d-r)\alpha^{N+1}}$. This is the expected result with $c_{10} = 6^{-2d} \theta^{-d}$. \square

We can now bound from below the d -th angle that A forms with any rational subspace of dimension e . We first show that any good approximation of A contains a subspace B_{N+1, q_e} for a specific $N \in \mathbb{N}$.

Lemma 4.6. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and C be a rational subspace of dimension e such that $\psi_d(A, C) \leq H(C)^{-\frac{\alpha^{qe+1}}{r_e + (d-r_e)\alpha} - \varepsilon}$. Assume $H(C)$ is sufficiently large, and let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that:

$$\theta^{\alpha^{N+qe}} \leq H(C)^{\frac{\alpha^{qe+1}}{r_e + (d-r_e)\alpha} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} - 1} < \theta^{\alpha^{N+qe+1}}. \quad (4.15)$$

Then $B_{N+1, q_e} \subset C$.

Proof. Let N be the unique integer satisfying (4.15). Let Z_1, \dots, Z_e be a \mathbb{Z} -basis of $C \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$. For $j \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket$, we study $\mathcal{D}_{j,k} = \|X_{N+k}^j \wedge Z_1 \wedge \dots \wedge Z_e\|$ for $k \in \llbracket 1, q_e \rrbracket$. Given a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and a subspace $V \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, we denote by $p_V(x)$ the orthogonal projection of x onto V . One has $\mathcal{D}_{j,k} = \|p_{B^\perp}(X_{N+k}^j)\| \|Z_1 \wedge \dots \wedge Z_e\| = \psi_1(\text{Span}(X_{N+k}^j), C) \|X_{N+k}^j\| H(C)$. We then have $\mathcal{D}_{j,k} \leq c_2 \theta^{\alpha^{N+k}} H(C) \left(\omega(X_{N+k}^j, Y_j) + \psi_1(\text{Span}(Y_j), C) \right)$ because $\|X_{N+k}^j\| \leq c_2 \theta^{\alpha^{N+k}}$ from (3.4), and $\psi_1(\text{Span}(X_{N+k}^j), C) \leq \omega(X_{N+k}^j, Y_j) + \psi_1(\text{Span}(Y_j), C)$ by the triangle inequality (see [9, section 8]). Now $\psi_1(Y_j, C) \leq \psi_d(A, C)$ by Lemma 2.3 of [6] since $e \geq d$, and $\omega(X_{N+k}^j, Y_j) \leq c_3 \theta^{-\alpha^{N+k+1}}$ from (3.5), thus:

$$\mathcal{D}_{j,k} \leq c_{11} \theta^{\alpha^{N+k}} H(C) \left(\theta^{-\alpha^{N+k+1}} + H(C)^{\frac{-\alpha^{qe+1}}{r_e + (d-r_e)\alpha} - \varepsilon} \right)$$

where $c_{11} > 0$ is independent of N . Furthermore, $\theta^{\alpha^{N+k}} \leq \theta^{\alpha^{N+qe}} \leq H(C)^{\frac{\alpha^{qe+1}}{r_e + (d-r_e)\alpha} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} - 1}$ from the choice of N in (4.15), hence $\mathcal{D}_{j,k} \leq c_{11} \theta^{\alpha^{N+k} - \alpha^{N+k+1}} H(C) + c_{11} H(C)^{-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}$. Moreover, $H(C)^{\frac{\alpha^{qe+1}}{r_e + (d-r_e)\alpha} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} - 1} \leq \theta^{\alpha^{N+qe+1}}$ from (4.15), hence $\theta \geq H(C)^{\frac{\frac{\alpha^{qe+1}}{r_e + (d-r_e)\alpha} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} - 1}{\alpha^{N+qe+1}}}$. Thus, we obtain the upper bound:

$$\mathcal{D}_{j,k} \leq c_{11} H(C)^{1 + \frac{(\alpha^{N+k} - \alpha^{N+k+1}) \left(\frac{\alpha^{qe+1}}{r_e + (d-r_e)\alpha} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} - 1 \right)}{\alpha^{N+qe+1}}} + c_{11} H(C)^{-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}. \quad (4.16)$$

We examine the exponent, and since $k \geq 1$:

$$\begin{aligned} 1 + \frac{(\alpha^{N+k} - \alpha^{N+k+1}) \left(\frac{\alpha^{qe+1}}{r_e + (d-r_e)\alpha} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} - 1 \right)}{\alpha^{N+qe+1}} &\leq 1 + \frac{(\alpha^{N+1} - \alpha^{N+2}) \left(\frac{\alpha^{qe+1}}{r_e + (d-r_e)\alpha} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} - 1 \right)}{\alpha^{N+qe+1}} \\ &= 1 + \frac{(1 - \alpha) \left(\frac{\alpha^{qe+1}}{r_e + (d-r_e)\alpha} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} - 1 \right)}{\alpha^{qe}} \\ &\leq \frac{\alpha^{qe} + (1 - \alpha) \left(\frac{\alpha^{qe}}{d} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} - 1 \right)}{\alpha^{qe}} \end{aligned}$$

because $\frac{\alpha^{qe+1}}{r_e + (d-r_e)\alpha} \geq \frac{\alpha^{qe}}{d} \geq 1$ and $1 - \alpha < -1$. Moreover,

$$\alpha^{qe} + (1 - \alpha) \left(\frac{\alpha^{qe}}{d} - 1 \right) \leq \frac{1}{d} (-\alpha^{qe+1} + \alpha^{qe}(d+1) + d(\alpha-1)) \leq \frac{1}{d} (-\alpha^2 + \alpha(2d+2) - d)$$

since $e \geq d$, hence $q_e \geq 1$. By inequality (2.1), we have $-\alpha^2 + \alpha(2d+2) - d \leq 0$. Then, $\frac{\alpha^{q_e + (1-\alpha)(\frac{\alpha q_e}{d} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} - 1)}}{\alpha^{q_e}} \leq \frac{(1-\alpha)\varepsilon}{2\alpha^{q_e}} \leq \frac{-\varepsilon}{2\alpha^q}$ because $1 - \alpha < -1$ and $q_e \leq q$. Thus, by revisiting (4.16):

$$\mathcal{D}_{j,k} \leq c_{11} H(C)^{-\frac{\varepsilon}{2\alpha^q}} + c_{11} H(C)^{-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} \leq 2c_{11} H(C)^{-\frac{\varepsilon}{2\alpha^q}}.$$

For $H(C)$ sufficiently large depending on ε, α, n , and c_{11} , we have $\mathcal{D}_{j,k} < 1$ for all $j \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket$ and $k \in \llbracket 1, q_e \rrbracket$. It implies that for such (j, k) the infinite norm $\|X_{N+k}^j \wedge Z_1 \wedge \dots \wedge Z_e\|_\infty$ vanishes since it is an integer bounded from above by $\mathcal{D}_{j,k}$. Thus, we have a linear relation between the vectors $X_{N+k}^j, Z_1, \dots, Z_e$ that gives $\forall j \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket, \forall k \in \llbracket 1, q_e \rrbracket, X_{N+k}^j \in C$. These vectors generate B_{N+1, q_e} , hence $B_{N+1, q_e} \subset C$. \square

Lemma 4.7. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. For all but a finite number of rational subspaces C of dimension e , we have

$$\psi_d(A, C) > H(C)^{-\frac{\alpha^{q_e+1}}{r_e + (d-r_e)\alpha} - \varepsilon}.$$

Proof. Assume the contrary. Then, for some $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist infinitely many rational subspaces C of dimension e satisfying:

$$\psi_d(A, C) \leq H(C)^{-\frac{\alpha^{q_e+1}}{r_e + (d-r_e)\alpha} - \varepsilon}. \quad (4.17)$$

According to Lemma 4.6, if such a C has sufficiently large height, which we can assume this there infinitely many such C , then $B_{N+1, q_e} \subset C$ with N satisfying (4.15). We divide the proof into two cases depending on the value of r_e .

- First case $r_e = 0$: In this case, we have $e = q_e d$ and $\frac{\alpha^{q_e+1}}{r_e + (d-r_e)\alpha} = \frac{\alpha^{q_e}}{d}$. We already have $B_{N+1, q_e} \subset C$; by equality of dimensions and since $r_e = 0$, we have $C = B_{N+1, q_e} = C_{N, e}$ by Remark 4.1. Thus, $H(C) = H(C_{N, e})$ and by Lemma 4.4 we have $c_7 H(C)^{-\frac{\alpha^{q_e+1}}{r_e + (d-r_e)\alpha}} \leq \psi_d(A, C_{N, e}) = \psi_d(A, C) \leq H(C)^{-\frac{\alpha^{q_e+1}}{r_e + (d-r_e)\alpha} - \varepsilon}$. This implies $\frac{\alpha^{q_e+1}}{r_e + (d-r_e)\alpha} \geq \frac{\alpha^{q_e+1}}{r_e + (d-r_e)\alpha} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ since we can make $H(C)$ tend to $+\infty$. Thus, we obtain $\frac{\varepsilon}{2} \leq 0$, which is a contradiction.

- Second case $r_e \neq 0$: In this case, $e = q_e d + r_e$ and in particular $1 \leq q_e \leq q - 1$. Let us prove that $\text{Span}(X_N^1, \dots, X_N^d) \cap C$ has dimension greater than or equal to r_e by showing by induction on $r \in \llbracket 0, r_e - 1 \rrbracket$ that there exist $r + 1$ linearly independent integer vectors in $\text{Span}(X_N^1, \dots, X_N^d) \cap C$. Let $r \in \llbracket 0, r_e - 1 \rrbracket$. Suppose there exist U_1, \dots, U_r linearly independent integer vectors in $\text{Span}(X_N^1, \dots, X_N^d) \cap C$; if $r = 0$, this assumption is vacuous and thus true. Let us show that there exists $U_{r+1} \in \text{Span}(X_N^1, \dots, X_N^d) \cap C \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ such that U_1, \dots, U_{r+1} are linearly independent.

As $q_e \leq q - 1$ and the family of vectors involved in the definition of B_{N+1, q_e} in (3.1) is free, we have $B_{N+1, q_e} \cap \text{Span}(X_N^1, \dots, X_N^d) = \{0\}$, and therefore, according to Lemma 3.1, $\dim(B_{N+1, q_e} \oplus \text{Span}(U_1, \dots, U_r)) = dq_e + r$. We denote $G_r = B_{N+1, q_e} \oplus \text{Span}(U_1, \dots, U_r)$ and $D_r = G_r^\perp \cap C$ the orthogonal complement of G_r in C . We have $\dim(D_r) = e - dq_e - r = r_e - r \geq 1$. Let $\pi_r : C \rightarrow D_r$ be the orthogonal projection onto D_r . We define $\Delta_r = \pi_r(C \cap \mathbb{Z}^n)$. Then Δ_r is a Euclidean lattice of D_r with determinant $d(\Delta_r) = \frac{H(C)}{H(G_r)}$; this result can be found in the proof of Theorem 2 of [9]. According to Minkowski's theorem (see [10, Lemma 4B]), there exists $X'_r \in \Delta_r \setminus \{0\} \subset D_r \cap \mathbb{Q}^n$ such that:

$$\|X'_r\| \leq c_{12} d(\Delta_r)^{\frac{1}{\dim(D_r)}} \leq c_{12} \left(\frac{H(C)}{H(G_r)} \right)^{\frac{1}{r_e - r}} \quad (4.18)$$

with $c_{12} > 0$ a constant depending only on e . Since $X'_r \in \Delta_r$, there exists $X_r \in C \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ such that $\pi_r(X_r) = X'_r$; we have $X_r \notin G_r$ so that $X_r \notin B_{N+1, q_e}$. We define E_r as the exterior product of the vectors $(X_{N+k}^j)_{j \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket, k \in \llbracket 0, q_e \rrbracket}$ and X_r . We aim to show that $E_r = 0$ and for this, we examine its norm. We have:

$$\|E_r\| = \|X_r \wedge \bigwedge_{k=0}^{q_e} (X_{N+k}^1 \wedge \dots \wedge X_{N+k}^d)\| = \|\pi_r(X_r) \wedge \bigwedge_{k=0}^{q_e} (X_{N+k}^1 \wedge \dots \wedge X_{N+k}^d)\|$$

since $X_r - \pi_r(X_r) \in G_r \subset B_{N, q_e+1}$. Now $\|\pi_r(X_r)\| = \|X'_r\| \leq c_{12} \left(\frac{H(C)}{H(G_r)} \right)^{\frac{1}{r-r_e}}$ according to (4.18) and thus $\|E_r\|$ is bounded from above by

$$\|\pi_r(X_r)\| \cdot \left\| \bigwedge_{k=0}^{q_e} (X_{N+k}^1 \wedge \dots \wedge X_{N+k}^d) \right\| \leq c_{12} \left(\frac{H(C)}{H(G_r)} \right)^{\frac{1}{r-r_e}} \left\| (X_N^1 \wedge \dots \wedge X_N^d) \wedge \bigwedge_{k=1}^{q_e} (U_{N+k}^1 \wedge \dots \wedge U_{N+k}^d) \right\|$$

using the formula (3.2) on the X_N^j with $U_{N+k}^j = \left(0 \ \dots \ 0 \ u_{N+k}^{(0,j)} \ \dots \ u_{N+k}^{(qd-1,j)} \right)^\top$. According to the construction of the $u_k^{(i,j)}$ in (2.6) we have $\|U_k^j\| \leq 3$ for all k and j . This yields:

$$\begin{aligned} \|E_r\| &\leq c_{12} \left(\frac{H(C)}{H(G_r)} \right)^{\frac{1}{r-r_e}} \|X_N^1 \wedge \dots \wedge X_N^d\| \prod_{k=1}^{q_e} (\|U_{N+k}^1\| \dots \|U_{N+k}^d\|) \\ &\leq 3^{dq} c_{12} \left(\frac{H(C)}{H(G_r)} \right)^{\frac{1}{r-r_e}} \|X_N^1 \wedge \dots \wedge X_N^d\|. \end{aligned}$$

Now $\text{Span}(X_N^1, \dots, X_N^d) = B_{N,1}$ according to the construction in (3.1). According to Lemma 3.1 X_N^1, \dots, X_N^d form a \mathbb{Z} -basis of $B_{N,1} \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ and thus $H(B_{N,1}) = \|X_N^1 \wedge \dots \wedge X_N^d\|$. Now since $B_{N,v} = C_{N-1, dv}$ for $v \in \llbracket 1, q \rrbracket$, Lemma 4.2 gives $H(B_{N,1}) \leq c_5 \theta^{d\alpha^N}$ and thus $\|X_N^1 \wedge \dots \wedge X_N^d\| \leq c_5 \theta^{d\alpha^N}$. On the other hand, Lemma 4.5 yields $H(G_r) = H(B_{N+1, q_e} \oplus \text{Span}(U_1, \dots, U_r)) \geq c_{10} \theta^{r\alpha^N + (d-r)\alpha^{N+1}}$. Thus we have:

$$\|E_r\| \leq 3^{dq} c_{12} c_{10}^{\frac{-1}{r_e-r}} c_5 \theta^{d\alpha^N - \frac{r\alpha^N + (d-r)\alpha^{N+1}}{r_e-r}} H(C)^{\frac{1}{r_e-r}} = 3^{dq} c_{12} c_{10}^{\frac{-1}{r_e-r}} c_5 \theta^{\frac{\alpha^N(d(r_e-r)-r-(d-r)\alpha)}{r_e-r}} H(C)^{\frac{1}{r_e-r}}.$$

Now $d(r_e - r) - r - (d - r)\alpha \leq dr_e - (d - r_e)\alpha \leq 0$ according to the inequality (2.4), and the choice of N in (4.15) gives $H(C)^{\frac{\alpha^{q_e}}{\alpha^{N+q_e+1}(d-r_e+\frac{1}{2})}} \leq H(C)^{\frac{\frac{\alpha^{q_e+1}}{r_e+(d-r_e)\alpha} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} - 1}{\alpha^{N+q_e+1}}} \leq \theta$ because $\frac{\alpha^{q_e}}{d-r_e+\frac{1}{2}} \leq \frac{\alpha^{q_e+1}}{r_e+(d-r_e)\alpha} - 1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ according to the inequality (2.5). The previous inequality then becomes:

$$\|E_r\| \leq 3^{dq} c_{12} c_{10}^{\frac{-1}{r_e-r}} c_5 H(C)^{\frac{\alpha^N \alpha^{q_e} (d(r_e-r)-r-(d-r)\alpha)}{\alpha^{N+q_e+1}(r_e-r)(d-r_e+\frac{1}{2})} + \frac{1}{r_e-r}} = 3^{dq} c_{12} c_{10}^{\frac{-1}{r_e-r}} c_5 H(C)^{\frac{(d(r_e-r)-r-(d-r)\alpha) + \alpha(d-r_e+\frac{1}{2})}{\alpha(r_e-r)(d-r_e+\frac{1}{2})}}.$$

We study the exponent denoted by $\delta = \frac{(d(r_e-r)-r-(d-r)\alpha) + \alpha(d-r_e+\frac{1}{2})}{\alpha(r_e-r)(d-r_e+\frac{1}{2})}$, and we can then bound it from above as follows:

$$\delta = \frac{1}{\alpha(r_e-r)(d-r_e+\frac{1}{2})} \left(-\alpha(r_e-r-\frac{1}{2}) + d(r_e-r)-r \right) \leq \frac{1}{\alpha(r_e-r)(d-r_e+\frac{1}{2})} \left(-\frac{\alpha}{2} + d(d-1) \right)$$

because $0 \leq r \leq r_e - 1$ and $1 \leq r_e - r \leq d - 1$. Finally, according to inequality (2.2), we have $-\frac{\alpha}{2} + d(d-1) \leq -1$, thus $\delta \leq \frac{-1}{\alpha(r_e-r)(d-r_e+\frac{1}{2})}$ and $\|E_r\| \leq 3^{dq} c_{12} c_{10}^{\frac{-1}{r_e-r}} c_5 H(C)^{\frac{-1}{\alpha(r_e-r)(d-r_e+\frac{1}{2})}}$. In particular, if $H(C)$ is large enough, we have $\|E_r\| < 1$. Now, since the vectors considered in the exterior product $E_r = X_r \wedge \bigwedge_{k=0}^{q_e} (X_{N+k}^1 \wedge \dots \wedge X_{N+k}^d)$ belong to \mathbb{Z}^n , this exterior product vanishes.

This implies the existence of $U_{r+1} \in (B_{N+1, q_e} \oplus \text{Span}(X_r)) \cap \text{Span}(X_N^1, \dots, X_N^d) \setminus \{0\}$. Recall that $X_r \notin B_{N+1, q_e}$ and since the subspaces under consideration are rational, we can take $U_{r+1} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$. As $(B_{N+1, q_e} \oplus \text{Span}(X_r)) \subset C$, we also have $U_{r+1} \in C$.

Let us now show that the vectors U_1, \dots, U_{r+1} are linearly independent over \mathbb{R} . Suppose $\sum_{k=1}^{r+1} \lambda_k U_k = 0$ is a linear dependency relation. We apply π_r , the orthogonal projection onto $D_r = (B_{N+1, q_e} \oplus \text{Span}(U_1, \dots, U_r))^\perp \cap C$, yielding:

$$0 = \pi_r \left(\sum_{k=1}^{r+1} \lambda_k U_k \right) = \sum_{k=1}^{r+1} \lambda_k \pi_r(U_k) = \lambda_{r+1} \pi_r(U_{r+1}). \quad (4.19)$$

Now, $U_{r+1} = Z + \mu X_r$ with $Z \in B_{N+1, q_e}$ and $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$. Also, since $U_{r+1} \in \text{Span}(X_N^1, \dots, X_N^d)$ and $\text{Span}(X_N^1, \dots, X_N^d) \cap B_{N+1, q_e} = \{0\}$, we have $\mu \neq 0$. Hence $\pi_r(U_{r+1}) = \mu X_r' \neq 0$, implying $\lambda_{r+1} = 0$ using (4.19). Finally, we find $\lambda_1 = \dots = \lambda_r = 0$ using the induction hypothesis that U_1, \dots, U_r are linearly independent, which concludes the induction.

Thus, we have shown that there exists a rational subspace $W \subset \text{Span}(X_N^1, \dots, X_N^d) \cap C$ of dimension r_e . Since $B_{N+1, q_e} \subset C$ and $\text{Span}(X_N^1, \dots, X_N^d) \cap B_{N+1, q_e} = \{0\}$, we have $C = B_{N+1, q_e} \oplus W$ by equality of dimensions. Lemma 4.5 then gives:

$$H(C) \geq c_{10} \theta^{r_e \alpha^N + (d-r_e) \alpha^{N+1}}. \quad (4.20)$$

Furthermore, $C = B_{N+1, q_e} \oplus W \subset C_{N-1, (q_e+1)d}$, and applying Lemma 4.3 with $N' = N-1$ and $e' = q_e d$ where $q_{e'} = q_e + 1$, we get:

$$\psi_1(\text{Span}(Y_1), C_{N-1, (q_e+1)d}) \geq c_6 \theta^{-\alpha^{N'+q_{e'}}} = c_6 \theta^{-\alpha^{N+q_e+1}} \quad (4.21)$$

Now, using Lemma 2.3 of [6], since $Y_1 \in A \setminus \{0\}$ and $\dim(A) = d$, we have:

$$\psi_d(A, C) \geq \psi_d(A, C_{N-1, (q_e+1)d}) \geq \psi_1(\text{Span}(Y_1), C_{N-1, (q_e+1)d}). \quad (4.22)$$

Combining inequalities (4.20), (4.21), and (4.22), we get the existence of a constant $c_{13} > 0$ independent of C , such that $\psi_d(A, C) \geq c_{13} H(C)^{\frac{-\alpha^{N+q_e+1}}{r_e \alpha^N + (d-r_e) \alpha^{N+1}}} = c_{13} H(C)^{\frac{-\alpha^{q_e+1}}{r_e + (d-r_e) \alpha}}$. Recalling the assumption made in (4.17), we have $c_{13} H(C)^{\frac{-\alpha^{q_e+1}}{r_e + (d-r_e) \alpha}} \leq H(C)^{\frac{-\alpha^{q_e+1}}{r_e + (d-r_e) \alpha} - \varepsilon}$. In particular, for all C with sufficiently large $H(C)$, we have $c_{13} \leq H(C)^{-\varepsilon}$, and thus $c_{13} = 0$. This is contradictory and concludes the proof of the lemma. \square

Lemma 4.7 yields $\mu_n(A|C)_d \leq \frac{\alpha^{q_e+1}}{r_e + (d-r_e) \alpha}$. Since the other inequality has been proven in section 4.1, this completes the proof of theorem 1.2 in the case $d \leq e$.

5 Computation of the exponent in the case $e < d$

In this section, we show that $\mu_n(A|e)_e = \frac{\alpha}{e}$ for $e \in \llbracket 1, d-1 \rrbracket$. It is worth noting that in the case where $e = d$, this equality also holds; indeed, we proved Theorem 1.2 in this case. Since this case also appears in the proofs of subsequent sections, we will reprove that $\mu_n(A|d)_d = \frac{\alpha}{d}$. Throughout the following, we fix $e \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket$.

5.1 Lower bound on the exponent

The lower bound on the exponent $\mu_n(A|e)_e$ follows the same ideas as in the case $e \geq d$. Here, we introduce a sequence of subspaces that approximate A very well. For $N \in \mathbb{N}$, we define:

$$D_{N,e} = \text{Span}(X_N^1, \dots, X_N^e) \quad (5.1)$$

which is a rational subspace of dimension e since $X_N^i \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ for all i .

Lemma 5.1. The vectors X_N^1, \dots, X_N^e form a \mathbb{Z} -basis of $D_{N,e} \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ and

$$c_{14} \theta^{e \alpha^N} \leq H(D_{N,e}) \leq c_{15} \theta^{e \alpha^N}$$

with $c_{14} > 0$ and $c_{15} > 0$ independent of N .

Proof. By Lemma 3.1, the vectors X_N^1, \dots, X_N^e are vectors of a \mathbb{Z} -basis of $B_{N,v} \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ introduced in (3.1). They thus form in particular a \mathbb{Z} -basis of $W \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ where W is the subspace they generate, namely $D_{N,e}$. By definition of the height, we have $H(D_{N,e}) = \|X_N^1 \wedge \dots \wedge X_N^e\|$.

We recall the notation $Z_N^j = \frac{1}{\theta^{\lfloor \alpha^N \rfloor}} X_N^j$ for $i \in \llbracket 1, e \rrbracket$ and we have $Z_N^j \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} Y_j$. In particular, we have $\|Z_N^1 \wedge \dots \wedge Z_N^e\| \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} \|Y_1 \wedge \dots \wedge Y_e\| \neq 0$. This implies

$$\theta^{-e \lfloor \alpha^N \rfloor} \|X_N^1 \wedge \dots \wedge X_N^e\| = \|Z_N^1 \wedge \dots \wedge Z_N^e\| \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} \|Y_1 \wedge \dots \wedge Y_e\| \neq 0.$$

Thus, there exist $c_{16} > 0$ and $c_{17} > 0$ such that for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $c_{16} \theta^{e \lfloor \alpha^N \rfloor} \leq H(D_{N,e}) \leq c_{17} \theta^{e \lfloor \alpha^N \rfloor}$ which allows us to conclude since $\theta^{e \alpha^N - e} \leq \theta^{e \lfloor \alpha^N \rfloor} \leq \theta^{e \alpha^N}$. \square

Lemma 5.2. There exists a constant $c_{18} > 0$ independent of N such that:

$$\psi_e(A, D_{N,e}) \leq c_{18} H(D_{N,e})^{-\alpha/e}$$

for any N sufficiently large.

Proof. We recall that for $j \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $\psi_1(\text{Span}(Y_j), \text{Span}(X_N^j)) \leq c_3 \theta^{-\alpha^{N+1}}$ according to (3.5). Since $\text{Span}(Y_1, \dots, Y_e) \subset A$, it follows that $\psi_e(A, D_{N,e}) \leq \psi_e(\text{Span}(Y_1, \dots, Y_e), D_{N,e})$ and according to Lemma 6.1 of [5] we have $\psi_e(\text{Span}(Y_1, \dots, Y_e), D_{N,e}) \leq c_{19} \sum_{j=1}^e \psi_1(\text{Span}(Y_j), \text{Span}(X_N^j))$ with $c_{19} > 0$ depending only on Y_1, \dots, Y_e and n . Thus,

$$\psi_e(A, D_{N,e}) \leq c_{19} c_3 e \theta^{-\alpha^{N+1}} \leq c_{19} c_3 d c_{15}^{\frac{\alpha^{N+1}}{e \alpha^N}} H(D_{N,e})^{-\frac{\alpha^{N+1}}{e \alpha^N}} = c_{18} H(D_{N,e})^{-\alpha/e}$$

where $c_{18} = c_{19} c_3 d c_{15}^{\alpha/e}$ and because $H(D_{N,e}) \leq c_{15} \theta^{e \alpha^N}$ according to Lemma 5.1. \square

Therefore, we have constructed an infinite sequence of rational subspaces $D_{N,e}$ of dimension e such that $\psi_e(A, D_{N,e}) \leq c_{18} H(D_{N,e})^{-\alpha/e}$; this implies in particular $\mu_n(A|e)_e \geq \frac{\alpha}{e}$.

5.2 Upper bound of the exponent

The aim of this section is to establish an upper bound on $\mu_n(A|e)_e$. We first give a necessary condition on the subspaces of best approximation of A .

Lemma 5.3. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and C be a rational subspace of dimension e such that $\psi_e(A, C) \leq H(C)^{-\frac{\alpha}{e} - \varepsilon}$. Then, if $H(C)$ is large enough, there exist $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $Z \in \mathbb{Z}^n \setminus \{0\}$ such that $Z \in C \cap D_{N,d}$ and

$$\|Z\| \leq c_{20} H(C)^{1/e}$$

with $c_{20} > 0$ independent of Z and N .

Proof. According to Minkowski's theorem (see [10, Lemma 4B]), there exists $Z \in C \cap \mathbb{Z}^n \setminus \{0\}$ such that:

$$\|Z\| \leq c_{21} H(C)^{1/e} \tag{5.2}$$

with $c_{21} > 0$ a constant independent of Z . It remains to show that there exists some N such that $Z \in D_{N,d} = \text{Span}(X_N^1, \dots, X_N^d)$. Let Z^A be the orthogonal projection of Z onto A . We introduce $a_1, \dots, a_d \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $Z^A = \sum_{j=1}^d a_j Y_j$. We seek to show that there exists N such that $\|Z \wedge X_N^1 \wedge \dots \wedge X_N^d\|$ vanishes.

Since X_N^1, \dots, X_N^d form a \mathbb{Z} -basis of $D_{N,d} \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ by Lemma 5.1, we have, for $N \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \|Z \wedge X_N^1 \wedge \dots \wedge X_N^d\| &= \psi_1(\text{Span}(Z), D_{N,d}) H(D_{N,d}) \|Z\| \\ &\leq \omega(Z, \sum_{j=1}^d a_j X_N^j) H(D_{N,d}) \|Z\| \\ &\leq \left(\omega(Z, Z^A) + \omega(Z^A, \sum_{j=1}^d a_j X_N^j) \right) H(D_{N,d}) \|Z\|. \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

Recalling the notation $Z_N^j = \theta^{-\lfloor \alpha^N \rfloor} X_N^j$, we have:

$$\omega(Z^A, \sum_{j=1}^d a_j X_N^j) = \omega(Z^A, \sum_{j=1}^d a_j Z_N^j) \leq \frac{\left\| Z^A - \sum_{j=1}^d a_j Z_N^j \right\|}{\|Z^A\|} \leq \left\| \sum_{j=1}^d a_j Y_j \right\|^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^d |a_j| \|Y_j - Z_N^j\|.$$

By construction of the Y_j , we have $\left\| \sum_{j=1}^d a_j Y_j \right\| \geq \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^d |a_j|^2} \geq \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{|a_j|}{d}$. Indeed, for $i \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket$, the i -th coordinate of Y_j is equal to 1 if $i = j$ and 0 otherwise. Furthermore, we have $\|Y_j - Z_N^j\| \leq \|Y_j\| c_3 \theta^{-\alpha^{N+1}}$ by (3.5). Therefore, we have:

$$\omega(Z^A, \sum_{j=1}^d a_j X_N^j) \leq c_{22} \theta^{-\alpha^{N+1}} \quad (5.4)$$

with $c_{22} = c_3 d \max_{j \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket} \|Y_j\| > 0$. On the other hand, using Lemma 2.3 of [6] since $Y_1 \in A \setminus \{0\}$ and $\dim(C) = e$, we have $\omega(Z, Z^A) = \psi_1(\text{Span}(Z), A) \leq \psi_e(C, A)$. The hypothesis of the lemma then gives:

$$\omega(Z, Z^A) \leq H(C)^{-\frac{\alpha}{e} - \varepsilon}. \quad (5.5)$$

Combining (5.4) and (5.5) with (5.3), we get: $\|Z \wedge X_N^1 \wedge \dots \wedge X_N^d\| \leq \left(H(C)^{-\frac{\alpha}{e} - \varepsilon} + c_{22} \theta^{-\alpha^{N+1}} \right) H(D_{N,d}) \|Z\|$. Additionally, by Lemma 5.1, we know that $H(D_{N,d}) \leq c_{15} \theta^{d\alpha^N}$ and by (5.2), we have $\|Z\| \leq c_{21} H(C)^{\frac{1}{e}}$. Thus, for $N \in \mathbb{N}$, we get:

$$\|Z \wedge X_N^1 \wedge \dots \wedge X_N^d\| \leq \left(H(C)^{-\frac{\alpha}{e} - \varepsilon} + c_{22} \theta^{-\alpha^{N+1}} \right) c_{15} \theta^{d\alpha^N} c_{21} H(C)^{\frac{1}{e}} \leq c_{23} \left(H(C)^{-\frac{\alpha-1}{e} - \varepsilon} \theta^{d\alpha^N} + \theta^{\alpha^N(d-\alpha)} H(C)^{\frac{1}{e}} \right)$$

with $c_{23} = c_{15} c_{21} \max(1, c_{22}) > 0$ independent of C and N . We now choose N as the integer such that:

$$\theta^{d\alpha^N} \leq H(C)^{\frac{\alpha-1}{e} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}} < \theta^{d\alpha^{N+1}}. \quad (5.6)$$

This gives $\theta^{d\alpha^N} \leq H(C)^{\frac{\alpha-1}{e} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}}$ and $\theta > H(C)^{\frac{\alpha-1}{d\alpha^{N+1}} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}}$ hence, since $\alpha > d$:

$$\begin{aligned} \|Z \wedge X_N^1 \wedge \dots \wedge X_N^d\| &\leq c_{23} \left(H(C)^{-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} + H(C)^{\alpha^N(d-\alpha) \left(\frac{\alpha-1}{d\alpha^{N+1}} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right) + \frac{1}{e}} \right) \\ &\leq c_{23} \left(H(C)^{-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} + H(C)^{\frac{(d-\alpha)(2\alpha-2+\varepsilon)+2d\alpha}{2e d \alpha}} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

We now study the exponent of the second term: $\frac{(d-\alpha)(2\alpha-2+\varepsilon)+2d\alpha}{2e d \alpha} = \frac{1}{e d \alpha} (-\alpha^2 + (1+2d)\alpha - d) - \frac{\alpha-d}{2d\alpha} \varepsilon$. According to inequality (2.3), we have $-\alpha^2 + (1+2d)\alpha - d \leq 0$, and thus $\frac{(d-\alpha)(2\alpha-2+\varepsilon)+2d\alpha}{2e d \alpha} \leq -c_{24} \varepsilon$ with $c_{24} = \frac{\alpha-d}{2d\alpha} > 0$ since $\alpha > d$. Thus, inequality (5.7) becomes $\|Z \wedge X_N^1 \wedge \dots \wedge X_N^d\| \leq c_{23} \left(H(C)^{-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} + H(C)^{-c_{24} \varepsilon} \right)$ with c_{23} and c_{24} independent of C . For sufficiently large $H(C)$, we have $\|Z \wedge X_N^1 \wedge \dots \wedge X_N^d\|_\infty \leq \|Z \wedge X_N^1 \wedge \dots \wedge X_N^d\| < 1$ and then

$$Z \in \text{Span}(X_N^1, \dots, X_N^d) = D_{N,d}$$

for N satisfying (5.6), which completes the proof. \square

We can now prove the result that allows us to provide a lower bound for the exponent.

Lemma 5.4. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. For all but a finite number of rational subspaces C of dimension e , we have:

$$\psi_e(A, C) > H(C)^{-\frac{\alpha}{e} - \varepsilon}.$$

Proof. We argue by contradiction and assume that there exists infinitely many rational subspaces C of dimension e such that:

$$\psi_e(A, C) \leq H(C)^{-\frac{\alpha}{e} - \varepsilon}. \quad (5.8)$$

Let C be such a subspace. Lemma 5.3 then gives $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $Z \in \mathbb{Z}^n \setminus \{0\}$ such that $Z \in C \cap D_{N,d}$ with $\|Z\| \leq c_{20}H(C)^{\frac{1}{e}}$. Since $Z \in D_{N,d} \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$, we can write $Z = \sum_{j=1}^d v_j X_N^j$ with $v_j \in \mathbb{Z}$ because the X_N^j form a \mathbb{Z} -basis of $D_{N,d} \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ according to Lemma 5.1. For $j \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket$, let $z_j = \theta^{\lfloor \alpha^N \rfloor} v_j$, which gives $Z = \sum_{j=1}^d z_j Z_N^j$. We now bound $\psi_1(Z, A)$ from below. Recall the notation Z^A for the orthogonal projection of Z onto A . We introduce $a_1, \dots, a_d \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $Z^A = \sum_{j=1}^d a_j Y_j$. We also define $\Delta = Z^A - \sum_{j=1}^d z_j Y_j$, and $\omega = \|Z^A - Z\|$. Since the Z_N^j and Y_j have their i -th coordinate equal to 1 if $i = j$ and 0 otherwise, this gives:

$$Z^A - Z = (a_1 - z_1 \quad \dots \quad a_d - z_d \quad \star \quad \dots \quad \star)^T.$$

We then have $\omega^2 \geq \sum_{j=1}^d (a_j - z_j)^2$, and thus for all $j \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket$, $|a_j - z_j| \leq \omega$. This gives us in particular:

$$\|\Delta\| = \left\| \sum_{j=1}^d (a_j - z_j) Y_j \right\| \leq c_{25} \omega \quad (5.9)$$

with $c_{25} = d \max_{j \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket} \|Y_j\| > 0$. We can compute $\|Z \wedge Z^A\| = \|Z \wedge \left(\sum_{j=1}^d z_j Y_j + Z^A - \sum_{j=1}^d z_j Y_j \right)\|$ and then bound it from below:

$$\|Z \wedge Z^A\| = \|Z \wedge \sum_{j=1}^d z_j Y_j + Z \wedge \Delta\| \geq \|Z \wedge \sum_{j=1}^d z_j Y_j\| - \|Z \wedge \Delta\|. \quad (5.10)$$

On the one hand, for all $j_0 \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket$ and $i \in \llbracket 0, qd - 1 \rrbracket$, recalling the definitions of Y_j and $\sigma_{i,j}$ given in section 2 and considering the j_0 -th and $(d+i)$ -th rows of the matrix $\left(Z \mid \sum_{j=1}^d z_j Y_j \right)$, we have $\|Z \wedge \sum_{j=1}^d z_j Y_j\| =$

$$\left\| \sum_{j=1}^d z_j Z_N^j \wedge \sum_{j=1}^d z_j Y_j \right\| \geq \left| \det \begin{pmatrix} z_{j_0} & z_{j_0} \\ \sum_{j=1}^d z_j \sigma_{i,j}^N & \sum_{j=1}^d z_j \sigma_{i,j} \end{pmatrix} \right| \text{ and thus :}$$

$$\|Z \wedge \sum_{j=1}^d z_j Y_j\| \geq |z_{j_0}| \left| \sum_{j=1}^d z_j (\sigma_{i,j} - \sigma_{i,j}^N) \right| = |z_{j_0}| \left| \sum_{j=1}^d z_j \sum_{k=N+1}^{+\infty} \frac{u_k^{(i,j)}}{\theta^{\lfloor \alpha^k \rfloor}} \right|.$$

We choose j_0 such that $|z_{j_0}| = \max_{j=1}^d |z_j| \neq 0$; such a j_0 exists because $Z \neq 0$. In particular, we have $|z_{j_0}| = \theta^{\lfloor \alpha^N \rfloor} |v_{j_0}| \geq \theta^{\lfloor \alpha^N \rfloor}$ since $v_{j_0} \in \mathbb{Z}$. We choose i such that $u_{N+1}^{(i,j_0)} \neq 0$, that is $i = \phi_{j_0}(N+1)$ using the

notations from section 2. Then, we have $u_{N+1}^{(i,j_0)} \geq 2$ and $u_{N+1}^{(i,j)} = 0$ for all $j \neq j_0$, hence:

$$\begin{aligned} \|Z \wedge \sum_{j=1}^d z_j Y_j\| &\geq |z_{j_0}| \left| \sum_{j=1}^d z_j \sum_{k=N+1}^{+\infty} \frac{u_k^{(i,j)}}{\theta^{\lfloor \alpha^k \rfloor}} \right| \\ &\geq |z_{j_0}| \left| z_{j_0} \frac{u_{N+1}^{(i,j_0)}}{\theta^{\lfloor \alpha^{N+1} \rfloor}} + \sum_{j=1}^d z_j \sum_{k=N+2}^{+\infty} \frac{u_k^{(i,j)}}{\theta^{\lfloor \alpha^k \rfloor}} \right| \\ &\geq |z_{j_0}| \left(|z_{j_0}| \frac{2}{\theta^{\lfloor \alpha^{N+1} \rfloor}} - d |z_{j_0}| \sum_{k=N+2}^{+\infty} \frac{u_k^{(i,j)}}{\theta^{\lfloor \alpha^k \rfloor}} \right) \\ &\geq |z_{j_0}|^2 \frac{1}{\theta^{\lfloor \alpha^{N+1} \rfloor}} \end{aligned}$$

since if N is large enough, we have $d \sum_{k=N+2}^{+\infty} \frac{u_k^{(i,j)}}{\theta^{\lfloor \alpha^k \rfloor}} \leq \frac{1}{\theta^{\lfloor \alpha^{N+1} \rfloor}}$. We deduce that:

$$\|Z \wedge \sum_{j=1}^d z_j Y_j\| \geq \frac{\theta^{2\lfloor \alpha^N \rfloor}}{\theta^{\lfloor \alpha^{N+1} \rfloor}}. \quad (5.11)$$

On the other hand, according to (5.9), we have:

$$\|Z \wedge \Delta\| \leq \|Z\| \|\Delta\| \leq c_{25} \omega \|Z\|. \quad (5.12)$$

Combining (5.10) with (5.11) and (5.12), we find $\|Z \wedge Z^A\| \geq \frac{\theta^{2\lfloor \alpha^N \rfloor}}{\theta^{\lfloor \alpha^{N+1} \rfloor}} - c_{25} \omega \|Z\|$. We have $\omega = \|Z^A - Z\| = \|Z\| \omega(Z^A, Z)$ and thus, since $\|Z^A\| \leq \|Z\|$, we get:

$$\omega = \|Z\| \frac{\|Z^A \wedge Z\|}{\|Z\| \cdot \|Z^A\|} \geq \frac{\|Z^A \wedge Z\|}{\|Z\|} \geq \frac{\theta^{2\lfloor \alpha^N \rfloor}}{\|Z\| \theta^{\lfloor \alpha^{N+1} \rfloor}} - c_{25} \omega.$$

Finally, we have $\omega \geq \frac{c_{26}}{\|Z\| \theta^{\lfloor \alpha^{N+1} \rfloor - 2\lfloor \alpha^N \rfloor}}$ with $c_{26} = (1 + c_{25})^{-1} > 0$. We also have $\omega(Z, Z^A) = \frac{\omega}{\|Z\|} \geq \frac{c_{26}}{\|Z\|^2 \theta^{\lfloor \alpha^{N+1} \rfloor - 2\lfloor \alpha^N \rfloor}}$, where $c_{26} > 0$ is independent of N and Z . Recalling that $Z \in C$, and thus $\omega(Z, Z^A) = \psi_1(\text{Span}(Z), A) \leq \psi_e(C, A)$, by (5.8) we have:

$$\frac{c_{26}}{\|Z\|^2 \theta^{\lfloor \alpha^{N+1} \rfloor - 2\lfloor \alpha^N \rfloor}} \leq H(C)^{-\frac{\alpha}{e} - \varepsilon}. \quad (5.13)$$

Moreover, we have chosen Z such that $\|Z\| \leq c_{20} H(C)^{1/e}$. Hence, inequality (5.13) becomes

$\frac{c_{26}}{c_{20}^{\alpha + e\varepsilon} \|Z\|^2 \theta^{\lfloor \alpha^{N+1} \rfloor - 2\lfloor \alpha^N \rfloor}} \leq \|Z\|^{-\alpha - e\varepsilon}$. In particular, we have:

$$\frac{c_{27}}{\|Z\|^2 \theta^{\lfloor \alpha^{N+1} \rfloor - 2\lfloor \alpha^N \rfloor}} \leq \|Z\|^{-\alpha - e\varepsilon} \quad (5.14)$$

with $c_{27} = c_{26} c_{20}^{-\alpha - e\varepsilon} > 0$. On the other hand, by the construction of Z_N^j , we have: $\forall j \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket, \|Z\| \geq |z_j|$. Indeed, for $i \in \llbracket 1, d \rrbracket$, the i -th coordinate of Z_N^j is equal to 1 if $i = j$ and 0 otherwise. In particular, we have $\|Z\| \geq |z_{j_0}| \geq \theta^{\lfloor \alpha^N \rfloor}$ since $z_{j_0} \neq 0$. Combining this with (5.14), we find $c_{27} \leq \theta^{-\lfloor \alpha^N \rfloor (\alpha + e\varepsilon - 2) + \lfloor \alpha^{N+1} \rfloor - 2\lfloor \alpha^N \rfloor}$ with, as a reminder, $c_{27} > 0$ being a constant independent of N . We have:

$$-\lfloor \alpha^N \rfloor (\alpha + e\varepsilon - 2) + \lfloor \alpha^{N+1} \rfloor - 2\lfloor \alpha^N \rfloor = \lfloor \alpha^{N+1} \rfloor - \lfloor \alpha^N \rfloor (\alpha + e\varepsilon) \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} -\infty.$$

If $H(C)$ is large, then N is also large by (4.15). Therefore, as $H(C)$ tends to $+\infty$, we find $c_{27} = 0$, which is contradictory and completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Lemma 5.4 then yields for $e \in \llbracket 1, d-1 \rrbracket$, $\mu_n(A|C)_e \leq \frac{\alpha}{e}$. Thus, we have proven Theorem 1.2 in the case where $e < d$.

Acknowledgements: I warmly thank Stéphane Fischler for his reading and comments of this paper.

References

- [1] Y. BUGEAUD – “Diophantine approximation and Cantor sets”, *Mathematische Annalen* **341** (2008), p. 677–684.
- [2] G. GUILLOT – “Approximation de sous-espaces vectoriels de \mathbb{R}^n par des sous-espaces rationnels”, Ph.D thesis, Université Paris-Saclay, June 2024, Available on <https://theses.hal.science/tel-04617352v1>.
- [3] — , “Independence of the diophantine exponents associated with linear subspaces”, available on <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.07082>, 2024.
- [4] E. JOSEPH – “Approximation rationnelle de sous-espaces vectoriels”, Ph.D thesis, Université Paris-Saclay, May 2021, Available on <https://theses.hal.science/tel-03353114>.
- [5] — , “On the approximation exponents for subspaces of \mathbb{R}^m ”, *Moscow Journal of Combinatorics and Number Theory* **11** (2022), p. 21–35.
- [6] — , “Upper bounds and spectrum for approximation exponents for subspaces of \mathbb{R}^m ”, *Journal de théorie des nombres de Bordeaux* **34** (2022), no. 3, p. 827–850.
- [7] D. ROY – “Spectrum of the exponents of best rational approximation”, *Math. Z* **283** (2016), p. 143–155.
- [8] N. DE SAXCÉ – “Approximation diophantienne sur la grassmannienne”, available on <https://www.math.univ-paris13.fr/~desaxce/>, 2022.
- [9] W. SCHMIDT – “On heights of algebraic subspaces and Diophantine approximations”, *Annals of Math.* **85** (1967), p. 430–472.
- [10] — , *Diophantine approximations and diophantine equations*, 1st ed., Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1467, Springer, 1991.

Gaétan Guillot, Université Paris-Saclay, CNRS, Laboratoire de mathématiques d’Orsay, 91405 Orsay, France.

Email adress: guillotgaetan1@gmail.com

MSC: 11J13, 11H25