

VERY WELL APPROXIMABLE MATRICES ARE SINGULAR ON AVERAGE

GAURAV AGGARWAL

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we establish upper bounds on the dimension of sets of singular-on-average and ω -singular affine forms in singly metric settings, where either the matrix or the shift is fixed. These results partially address open questions posed by Das, Fishman, Simmons, and Urbański, as well as Kleinbock and Wadleigh. Furthermore, we extend our results to the generalized weighted setup and derive bounds for the intersection of these sets with a wide class of fractals. Combined with the results of Chow, Ghosh, Guan, Marnat, and Simmons, our results shows that very well approximable matrices are singular on average.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Notation I	8
3. Dimension bound in Generalized Setup I	11
4. Final Proof I	17
5. Notation II	19
6. Dimension Bound in Generalized Setup II	20
7. Height Function	21
8. Final Proof II	24
References	27

1. INTRODUCTION

Fix $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a = (a_1, \dots, a_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $b = (b_1, \dots, b_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$a_1 \geq a_2 \geq \dots \geq a_m > 0, \quad b_1 \geq b_2 \geq \dots \geq b_n > 0, \quad (1)$$

$$a_1 + \dots + a_m = 1, \quad b_1 + \dots + b_n = 1. \quad (2)$$

Let $d = m + n$. We define a *quasi-norm* $\|\cdot\|_a$ on \mathbb{R}^m as $\|x\|_a = \max_i |x_i|^{1/a_i}$ for all $x = (x_1, \dots, x_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Similarly, define *quasi-norm* $\|\cdot\|_b$ on \mathbb{R}^n as $\|y\|_b = \max_j |y_j|^{1/b_j}$ for all $y = (y_1, \dots, y_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Let $\theta \in M_{m \times n}(\mathbb{R})$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^m$. We define the inhomogeneous (a, b) -exponent of (θ, ξ) , denoted by $\omega(\theta, \xi, a, b)$, as the supremum of all real numbers ω for which there exist arbitrarily

2020 MSC. 11J13, 11J83, 37A17.

Key words and phrases. Diophantine approximation, ergodic theory, Hausdorff dimension, flows on homogeneous spaces.

G. Aggarwal gratefully acknowledge a grant from the Department of Atomic Energy, Government of India, under project 12 – R&D – TFR – 5.01 – 0500.

large T such that the inequalities

$$\|\theta q + p + \xi\|_a \leq \frac{1}{T^{1+\omega}}, \quad (3)$$

$$\|q\|_b \leq T, \quad (4)$$

has an integral solution $(p, q) \in \mathbb{Z}^m \times (\mathbb{Z}^n \setminus \{0\})$. If $\xi = 0$, we will simply denote $\omega(\theta, 0, a, b)$ by $\omega(\theta, a, b)$. The set of (a, b) -very well approximable matrices, denoted by $\text{VWA}^0(a, b)$, is defined as set of all matrices $\theta \in M_{m \times n}(\mathbb{R})$ with $\omega(\theta, a, b) > 0$.

The inhomogeneous uniform (a, b) -exponent of (θ, ξ) , denoted by $\hat{\omega}(\theta, \xi, a, b)$, is defined as the supremum of all real numbers ω for which the inequalities (3), (4) have an integral solution $(p, q) \in \mathbb{Z}^m \times (\mathbb{Z}^n \setminus \{0\})$ for all sufficiently large T . Again for $\xi = 0$, we will simply denote $\hat{\omega}(\theta, 0, a, b)$ by $\hat{\omega}(\theta, a, b)$. The set of all (a, b) -very singular affine forms, denoted by $\text{VSing}(a, b)$, is defined as the set of all $(\theta, \xi) \in M_{m \times n}(\mathbb{R}) \times \mathbb{R}^m$ such that $\hat{\omega}(\theta, \xi, a, b) > 0$. We also define $\text{Sing}(a, b, \omega)$ as set of all $(\theta, \xi) \in M_{m \times n}(\mathbb{R}) \times \mathbb{R}^m$ such that $\hat{\omega}(\theta, \xi, a, b) \geq \omega$.

Remark 1.1. The concept of exponents in Diophantine approximation was originally introduced by Khintchine [17] and Jarník [14]. For further details, see also [5], [8], and [12].

Remark 1.2. We remark that the usual irrationality exponent defined in [5] is $\frac{n}{m}(1 + \hat{\omega}(\theta, a, b))$, whereas in [8], it is $1 + \hat{\omega}(\theta, a, b)$.

Remark 1.3. It is easy to see that

$$\omega(\theta, \xi, a, b) \geq \hat{\omega}(\theta, \xi, a, b)$$

for all (θ, ξ) . Also using a simple application of Minkowski's convex body Theorem, it is easy to see that $\hat{\omega}(\theta, a, b) \geq 0$ for all θ .

We now define the set of (a, b) -singular affine forms, denoted by $\text{Sing}(a, b)$ as set of all $(\theta, \xi) \in M_{m \times n}(\mathbb{R}) \times \mathbb{R}^m$ such that for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $T_\epsilon > 0$ such that for all $T > T_\epsilon$, there exists $(p, q) \in \mathbb{Z}^m \times (\mathbb{Z}^n \setminus \{0\})$ satisfying the following

$$\begin{aligned} \|p + q\theta + \xi\|_a &\leq \frac{\epsilon}{T}, \\ \|q\|_b &\leq T. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 1.4. It is easy to see that for all $\omega > 0$, $\text{Sing}(a, b, \omega) \subset \text{Sing}(a, b)$. In particular, we have $\text{VSing}(a, b) \subset \text{Sing}(a, b)$.

We now introduce some notation before proceeding with further definitions. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{X}} = \text{SL}_d(\mathbb{R}) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^d / \text{SL}_d(\mathbb{Z}) \times \mathbb{Z}^d$, which can be identified with the set of all unimodular affine lattices in \mathbb{R}^d via the map

$$[A, b] \text{SL}_d(\mathbb{Z}) \times \mathbb{Z}^d \mapsto AZ^d + b =: [A, b] \mathbb{Z}^d.$$

For $\theta \in M_{m \times n}(\mathbb{R})$, $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^m$, and $t > 0$, we define:

$$g_t = \begin{pmatrix} t^{a_1} & & & & & \\ & \ddots & & & & \\ & & t^{a_m} & & & \\ & & & t^{-b_1} & & \\ & & & & \ddots & \\ & & & & & t^{-b_n} \end{pmatrix}, \quad u(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} I_m & \theta \\ & I_n \end{pmatrix}, \quad v(\xi) = \begin{pmatrix} \xi \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

By Dani's correspondence, the Diophantine properties of (θ, ξ) correspond to the behavior of the diagonal orbit $(g_t[u(\theta), v(\xi)]\mathbb{Z}^d)_{t \geq 1} \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}$. In particular, as shown in Lemma 8.1, the set of (a, b) -singular affine forms corresponds to the set of (θ, ξ) satisfying

$$\lambda_0(g_t[u(\theta), v(\xi)]\mathbb{Z}^d) \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty,$$

where $\lambda_0(y)$ denotes the length of the shortest non-zero vector in the affine lattice y . A different way of quantifying the notion of singularity is the notion of singularity on average introduced in [15], see also [9].

For $0 < q \leq 1$, we define $\text{Div}(a, b, q)$ as the set of $(\theta, \xi) \in M_{m \times n}(\mathbb{R}) \times \mathbb{R}^m$ such that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \delta_{g_{e^t}u(\theta), v(\xi)]\mathbb{Z}^d}(\{y \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}} : \lambda_0(y) \leq \varepsilon\}) \geq q.$$

The set $\text{Div}(a, b, 1)$ is often referred to as (a, b) -singular on average affine forms and it is easy to see that $\text{Sing}(a, b) \subset \text{Div}(a, b, 1)$. The set of (a, b) -singular on average matrices, denoted by $\text{Div}^0(a, b, 1)$, is defined as the set of all $\theta \in M_{m \times n}(\mathbb{R})$ such that $(\theta, 0) \in \text{Div}(a, b, 1)$.

For $\theta \in M_{m \times n}(\mathbb{R})$, we also define the lower and upper escape of mass of the trajectory $(g_t u(\theta)\mathbb{Z}^d)_{t \geq 1}$:

$$\underline{\text{EMass}}(\theta) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \delta_{g_{e^t}u(\theta)\mathbb{Z}^d}(\{y \in \mathcal{X} : \lambda_0(y) \leq \varepsilon\}), \quad (5)$$

$$\overline{\text{EMass}}(\theta) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \delta_{g_{e^t}u(\theta)\mathbb{Z}^d}(\{y \in \mathcal{X} : \lambda_0(y) \leq \varepsilon\}). \quad (6)$$

Finally for a fixed $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^m$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Sing}^\xi(a, b) &= \{\theta \in M_{m \times n}(\mathbb{R}) : (\theta, \xi) \in \text{Sing}(a, b)\}, \\ \text{VSing}^\xi(a, b) &= \{\theta \in M_{m \times n}(\mathbb{R}) : (\theta, \xi) \in \text{VSing}(a, b)\}, \\ \text{Sing}^\xi(a, b, \omega) &= \{\theta \in M_{m \times n}(\mathbb{R}) : (\theta, \xi) \in \text{Sing}(a, b, \omega)\}, \\ \text{Div}^\xi(a, b, q) &= \{\theta \in M_{m \times n}(\mathbb{R}) : (\theta, \xi) \in \text{Div}(a, b, q)\}, \end{aligned}$$

and for fixed $\theta \in M_{m \times n}(\mathbb{R})$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Sing}_\theta(a, b) &= \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^m : (\theta, \xi) \in \text{Sing}(a, b)\}, \\ \text{VSing}_\theta(a, b) &= \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^m : (\theta, \xi) \in \text{VSing}(a, b)\}, \\ \text{Sing}_\theta(a, b, \omega) &= \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^m : (\theta, \xi) \in \text{Sing}(a, b, \omega)\}, \\ \text{Div}_\theta(a, b, q) &= \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^m : (\theta, \xi) \in \text{Div}(a, b, q)\}. \end{aligned}$$

The first main theorem of this paper is

Theorem 1.5. *The set of (a, b) -very well approximable matrices is a subset of the set of (a, b) -singular on average matrices, i.e.,*

$$\text{VWA}^0(a, b) \subset \text{Div}^0(a, b, 1).$$

Moreover for all $\theta \notin \text{Div}^0(a, b, 1)$, we have

$$\text{VSing}_\theta(a, b) \subset \theta\mathbb{Z}^n + \mathbb{Z}^m.$$

Remark 1.6. Note that $\theta \in \text{VWA}^0(a, b)$ corresponds to the trajectory $(g_t u(\theta) \mathbb{Z}^d)_{t \geq 1}$ satisfying the shrinking target property. In other words, $\theta \in \text{VWA}^0(a, b)$ if and only if there exists an infinite set of times $t > 1$ such that $g_t u(\theta) \mathbb{Z}^d$ enters a cusp neighbourhood corresponding to t . Based on this, it seems plausible that θ could be a very well approximable matrix without being singular on average, by exhibiting alternating behaviour for the trajectory $(g_t u(\theta) \mathbb{Z}^d)_{t \geq 1}$: spending some time in a compact set, then moving towards the cusp neighbourhoods, revisiting the compact set for a while, and so on. While the collection of such θ would necessarily have Lebesgue measure zero and form an extremely small set, it is not immediately evident why this set must be empty. Theorem 1.5, therefore, provides an intriguing result by establishing that no such θ exists, thereby revealing a profound connection between these two notions.

As we will demonstrate, the proof of Theorem 1.5 follows directly from the dimension estimates of (a, b) -singular affine forms for a fixed $\theta \notin \text{Div}^0(a, b, 1)$. A crucial input for this immediate implication is the work of Chow, Ghosh, Guan, Marnat, and Simmons [8], which generalizes results originally established by Bugeaud and Laurent [5] in the unweighted setting; see also [12].

The study of inhomogeneous Diophantine approximation has a rich history; see, for example, [2] for a historical review. In recent years, significant progress has been made, particularly in the area of *uniform* inhomogeneous Diophantine approximation. Kleinbock and Wadleigh [21] proved an inhomogeneous ψ -Dirichlet theorem and, in Section 7 of their paper, posed questions regarding the zero-one law and the Hausdorff dimension of ψ -Dirichlet improvable systems of affine forms in singly metric cases, i.e., when either θ or ξ is fixed. Kim and Kim [19] partially addressed these questions by proving a zero-one law for the s -dimensional Hausdorff measure of the *complement* of the set of ψ -Dirichlet improvable systems of affine forms, both in the doubly metric case and in the singly metric case for fixed $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$. See also [3] for further results.

In joint work with A. Ghosh [2], the authors partially answered the measure-theoretic question of Kleinbock and Wadleigh for a wide class of measures, including natural measures on self-similar fractals and manifolds, corresponding to $\psi(t) = t^{-\omega}$. For $m = n = 1$, the dimension question was addressed by Kim and Liao [18], in the case where the real number θ is fixed. However, for $(m, n) \neq (1, 1)$, the problem of dimension estimates for ψ -Dirichlet improvable systems of affine forms, even for $\psi(t) = t^{-\omega}$ with $\omega > 1$ in the singly metric case, remains open.

The interest in dimension estimates in inhomogeneous Diophantine approximation for singly metric cases was also raised by Das, Fishman, Simmons, and Urbański. In §5.8 of [9], they noted: “It would be of interest to investigate analogues of our results in the frameworks of inhomogeneous approximation,” and further, “It is also natural to study the inhomogeneous approximation frameworks where we fix one coordinate of the pair (θ, ξ) and let the other vary.”

In this paper, we provide an upper bound on the dimension of singular-on-average and ω -singular affine forms in both singly metric cases. Furthermore, we work in the generalized setting of weighted Diophantine approximation and provide estimates when these sets are intersected with a wide class of fractals.

We now state our results.

Theorem 1.7. *Assume the notations as above. Then for any $\theta \in M_{m \times n}(\mathbb{R})$ and $0 < q \leq 1$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \dim_H(\text{Div}_\theta(a, b, q)) &\leq \min_{1 \leq k \leq m} \frac{1}{a_k} \sum_{i=1}^m (\max\{a_i, a_k\} - a_i q + a_i \underline{EMass}(\theta)), \\ \dim_P(\text{Div}_\theta(a, b, q)) &\leq \min_{1 \leq k \leq m} \frac{1}{a_k} \sum_{i=1}^m (\max\{a_i, a_k\} - a_i q + a_i \overline{EMass}(\theta)). \end{aligned}$$

Corollary 1.8. *For all $\theta \in M_{m \times n}(\mathbb{R})$ satisfying $\overline{EMass}(\theta) = 0$, we have*

$$\dim_H(\text{Sing}_\theta(a, b)) = \dim_P(\text{Sing}_\theta(a, b)) = 0.$$

Corollary 1.9. *For all $\theta \in M_{m \times n}(\mathbb{R})$ which is not (a, b) -singular on average matrices, i.e., $\theta \notin \text{Div}^0(a, b, 1)$, the set $\text{Sing}_\theta(a, b)$ have zero Lebesgue measure. Infact the Hausdorff dimension of $\text{Sing}_\theta(a, b)$ is strictly less than m .*

Remark 1.10. Note that for $a_1 = \dots = a_m = 1/m$ and $b_1 = \dots = b_n = 1/n$, there are a wide class of examples of measures other than the Lebesgue measure which gives full measure to the set of points satisfying the condition $\overline{EMass}(\theta) = 0$, and consequently, to the set of non (a, b) -singular on average matrices. The example includes the natural measures defined on limit sets of IFS defined as in [27], e.g. Cantor set or Koch snowflake, or the natural measure on the non-degenerate curves in $M_{m \times n}(\mathbb{R})$ defined as in [28], or natural measure on various affine subspaces satisfying certain conditions as in [25]. For a discussion of the unequal weight case, see [23].

Given Theorem 1.7, the next natural question to ask is to study the dimensions of intersection of $\text{Div}_\theta(a, b, q)$ with lines or planes in \mathbb{R}^m . More generally, we may ask the the dimensions of intersection of $\text{Div}_\theta(a, b, q)$ with self-similar fractals in \mathbb{R}^m . Our next result generalizes theorem 1.7 and answers the same.

Theorem 1.11. *Assume the notations as above. Suppose $r_1, \dots, r_l \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $r_1 + \dots + r_l = m$ and $a_i = a_j$ for all i, j such that there exist $1 \leq k \leq l$ satisfying $r_1 + \dots + r_{k-1} < i \leq j \leq r_1 + \dots + r_k$. For $1 \leq i \leq l$, we let w_i denote the common value of a_j for $r_1 + \dots + r_{i-1} < j \leq r_1 + \dots + r_i$.*

For each $1 \leq i \leq l$, let Φ_i be an iterated function system (IFS) consisting of contracting similarities on \mathbb{R}^{r_i} with equal contraction ratios, satisfying the open set condition. Let \mathcal{K}_i be the limit set of Φ_i , and define

$$\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{K}_l \subset \mathbb{R}^m.$$

Then for any $\theta \in M_{m \times n}(\mathbb{R})$ and $0 < q \leq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \dim_H(\text{Div}_\theta(a, b, q) \cap \mathcal{K}) &\leq \min_{1 \leq l \leq k} \left(\frac{1}{w_k} \sum_i s_i (\max\{w_i, w_k\} - w_i q' + w_i \underline{EMass}(\theta)) \right), \\ \dim_P(\text{Div}_\theta(a, b, q) \cap \mathcal{K}) &\leq \min_{1 \leq l \leq k} \left(\frac{1}{w_k} \sum_i s_i (\max\{w_i, w_k\} - w_i q' + w_i \overline{EMass}(\theta)) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Remark 1.12. Note that in Theorem 1.11, we do not require $\dim_H(\mathcal{K}_i) > 0$ for any i . However, if $\dim_H(\mathcal{K}_i) = 0$ for all i , the theorem holds trivially. Furthermore, we do not require r_1, \dots, r_l to be maximal. For instance, in the equal weight case, i.e., $a_1 = \dots = a_m$, one could choose

$l = m$ with $r_1 = \dots = r_m = 1$, or $l = 1$ with $r_1 = m$, or any other intermediate choice. This flexibility, particularly in the equal weight case, allows us to simultaneously study the sets $\text{Div}_\theta(a, b, q) \cap \mathcal{K}$ when \mathcal{K} is, for example, a single fractal such as a line, a plane, or the Sierpiński carpet, or a product of fractals such as product of middle-third Cantor set with middle-fifth Cantor set.

The next natural question is to explore the singly metric case, where the shift ξ is fixed, and the matrix θ varies. For $\xi = 0$, this problem has been extensively studied, particularly in the equal weight case, $a = (1/m, \dots, 1/m)$ and $b = (1/n, \dots, 1/n)$.

A landmark result in this direction was obtained by Y. Cheung [6], who showed that the Hausdorff dimension of $\text{Sing}^0((1/2, 1/2), 1) \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is $4/3$. This result was subsequently generalized to \mathbb{R}^m by Cheung and Chevallier [7]. A sharp upper bound for the broader set of *singular on average* $m \times n$ matrices was later established by Kadyrov, Kleinbock, Lindenstrauss, and Margulis in [15], using techniques from homogeneous dynamics. The complementary lower bound was proven by Das, Fishman, Simmons, and Urbański [9], employing methods from the parametric geometry of numbers. For additional results in this direction, see also [29]. In [16], Khalil provided an upper bound on the Hausdorff dimension of singular vectors lying on self-similar fractals in \mathbb{R}^m that satisfy the open set condition. Shah and Yang [25] obtained dimension bounds for certain singular vectors lying on affine subspaces. However, in the unequal weight setting, the literature remains sparse. For $(m, n) = (2, 1)$, the Hausdorff dimension of (a, b) -singular vectors was computed by Liao, Shi, Solan, and Tamam in [22]. In [20], Kim and Park derived a lower bound for (a, b) -singular vectors in the case $n = 1$. In joint work with A. Ghosh [1], the author obtained an upper bound for (a, b) -singular vectors in $M_{m \times n}(\mathbb{R})$ and on products of self-similar fractals in \mathbb{R} satisfying the open set condition.

For general $\xi \neq 0$, progress has been limited. The only known result in this setting is due to Schleischitz [24], who established *lower bounds* on the packing dimension of singular vectors lying on a specific class of fractals in the equal weight case with $n = 1$.

We now state our main result.

Theorem 1.13. *Assume the notations as above. For $1 \leq l \leq d - 1$, define w_l as follows:*

$$w_l = \begin{cases} a_m + \dots + a_{m+1-l}, & \text{if } l \leq m, \\ 1 - (b_1 + \dots + b_{l-m}), & \text{if } l > m. \end{cases}$$

For each $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $1 \leq j \leq n$, let Φ_{ij} be an iterated function system (IFS) consisting of contracting similarities on \mathbb{R} with equal contraction ratios, satisfying the open set condition. Let \mathcal{K}_{ij} be the limit set of Φ_{ij} , and define

$$\mathcal{K} = \{\theta \in M_{m \times n}(\mathbb{R}) : \theta_{ij} \in \mathcal{K}_{ij} \text{ for all } i, j\}.$$

Assume that $\dim_H(\mathcal{K}_{ij}) > 0$ for all i, j . Then there exist constants $\eta_1, \dots, \eta_{m+n-1} > 0$ (depending only on \mathcal{K}) such that the following results hold for any $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^m$:

- For any $0 < q \leq 1$, the packing dimension of $\text{Div}^\xi(a, b, q) \cap \mathcal{K}$ satisfies:

$$\dim_P(\text{Div}^\xi(a, b, q) \cap \mathcal{K}) \leq \dim_P(\mathcal{K}) - \frac{q}{a_1 + b_1} \left(\min_{1 \leq l \leq d-1} \eta_l w_l \right). \quad (7)$$

- For any $\omega > 0$, the packing dimension of $\text{Sing}^\xi(a, b, \omega) \cap \mathcal{K}$ satisfies:

$$\dim_P(\text{Sing}^\xi(a, b, \omega) \cap \mathcal{K}) \leq \dim_P(\mathcal{K}) - \frac{1}{a_1 + b_1} \left(\min_{1 \leq l \leq d-1} \eta_l w_l + \frac{\eta_1 a_m b_n \omega}{a_m + b_n + a_m \omega} \right). \quad (8)$$

Moreover, the constants $\eta_1, \dots, \eta_{m+n-1}$ can be explicitly chosen in the following cases:

(1) If $\mathcal{K} = M_{m \times n}([0, 1])$, we can take:

$$\eta_l = \begin{cases} \frac{m}{l}, & \text{if } l \leq m, \\ \frac{n}{m+n-l}, & \text{if } l > m. \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

(2) If $n = 1$, we can take:

$$\eta_l = \frac{m}{l} \min_{1 \leq i \leq m} \dim_H(\mathcal{K}_{i1}). \quad (10)$$

(3) If $m = 1$, we can take:

$$\eta_l = \frac{n}{1+n-l} \min_{1 \leq i \leq m} \dim_H(\mathcal{K}_{i1}). \quad (11)$$

Remark 1.14. For $\xi = 0$, the set of ω -singular matrices has been previously studied. In the unweighted setting, ω -singular matrices have been investigated by Bugeaud, Cheung, and Chevallier [4], Das, Fishman, Simmons, and Urbański [9], and Schleisitz [24]. In the weighted setting, to the best of the authors' knowledge, the only relevant work is the joint work of the author with A. Ghosh [1], which also provides a detailed historical review of the results.

Remark 1.15. Since the result of Theorem 1.13 for $\xi \in \mathbb{Z}^m$ is already proved in [1], we assume that $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^m \setminus \mathbb{Z}^m$ throughout the proof.

Remark 1.16. Using [26], it is easy to see that $\dim_H(\text{Sing}^\xi(a, b, \omega)) = 1$ for all $\omega < 0$. See [19] for the dimension of the complement of $\text{Sing}^\xi(a, b, \omega)$ for $\omega < 0$.

Corollary 1.17. *Suppose $a_1 = \dots = a_m = 1/m$ and $b_1 = \dots = b_n = 1/n$. Then for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $\omega > 0$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \dim_P(\text{Sing}^\xi(a, b)) &\leq mn - \frac{mn}{m+n} \\ \dim_H(\text{Sing}^\xi(a, b, \omega)) &\leq mn - \frac{mn}{m+n} \left(1 + \frac{m\omega}{m+n+n\omega} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Corollary 1.18. *Suppose $n = 1$ and $a_1 = \dots = a_m = 1/m$. Suppose $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ equals the m -fold product of middle third Cantor sets. Then for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $\omega > 0$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \dim_P(\text{Sing}^\xi(a, b)) &\leq \frac{\log 2}{\log 3} \left(m - \frac{m}{m+1} \right) \\ \dim_H(\text{Sing}^\xi(a, b, \omega)) &\leq \frac{\log 2}{\log 3} \left(m - \frac{m}{m+1} \left(1 + \frac{m\omega}{m+1+\omega} \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

1.1. Outline of the Proof. The proof of Theorem 1.11 relies on the following simple yet fundamental observation: Let Λ be a homogeneous lattice in \mathbb{R}^d whose shortest non-zero vector has length at least ϵ . Suppose $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfies $\|x_1 - x_2\| < \epsilon/2$, and both affine lattices $\Lambda + x_1$ and $\Lambda + x_2$ contain a vector of length less than $\delta < \epsilon/4$. Then it must follow that $\|x_1 - x_2\| < 2\delta$. The proof proceeds by the iterative application of this elementary observation. Specifically, the observation is used to construct a sequence of coverings for $\text{Sing}_\theta(a, b)$. These coverings improve iteratively, in the sense that fewer balls are required relative to their size, whenever the trajectory $(g_t u(\theta)\mathbb{Z}^d)_{t \geq 1}$ returns to a fixed compact set. While this iterative procedure is relatively simpler in the real case, it becomes significantly more delicate when dealing with fractals. Using Lemma 2.1, these coverings ultimately yield the dimension as stated in the theorem.

Theorem 1.5 follows directly from Corollary 1.9 when combined with results from [5] and [8], which are consolidated in Theorem 4.1.

The proof of Theorem 1.13 closely follows the approach in [1], which was itself inspired by the methods of [15] and [16]. The central idea is to construct a height function whose divergent trajectories correspond precisely to $\text{Sing}^\xi(a, b)$. The construction of such a height function is motivated by the work in [26]. Once the height function is constructed, the upper bound on the dimension follows directly from [[1], Thm 6.5].

1.2. Structure of the paper. The paper is divided into two parts. The first part assumes that θ is fixed and proves Theorems 1.5 and 1.11, while the second part assumes that ξ is fixed and proves Theorem 1.13.

The first part begins with Section 2, which introduces the notation that will be used throughout the paper. Section 3 establishes a generalized dynamical version of Theorem 1.11. Section 4 proves Theorem 1.11, presents results from [8], and derives Theorem 1.5. This concludes the first part of the paper.

The second part starts with Section 5, which introduces additional notation required for the proof of Theorem 1.13. Section 6 briefly recalls relevant results from [1]. Section 7 is devoted to the construction of a height function, with divergent trajectories corresponding precisely to singular-on-average affine forms. Finally, Section 8 combines the results from the preceding sections to prove Theorem 1.13.

1.3. Acknowledgements. The author would like to thank Anish Ghosh for suggesting the problem and for numerous discussions throughout the development of this paper.

2. NOTATION I

The following notation will be used throughout the paper.

2.1. Hausdorff and Packing Dimensions. The i -dimensional Hausdorff measure of a set $F \subset \mathbb{R}^l$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{H}^i(F) = \sup_{\epsilon > 0} \inf \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (\text{diam}(U_j))^i : \begin{array}{l} (U_j)_{j=1}^{\infty} \text{ is a countable cover of } F \\ \text{with } \text{diam}(U_j) \leq \epsilon \text{ for all } i. \end{array} \right\} \quad (12)$$

The Hausdorff dimension of a set $F \subset \mathbb{R}^l$ is defined as

$$\dim_H(F) = \inf\{i : \mathcal{H}^i(F) = 0\} = \sup\{i : \mathcal{H}^i(F) = \infty\}. \quad (13)$$

2.3. Iterated Function Systems. A contracting similarity is a map $\mathbb{R}^l \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^l$ of the form $x \mapsto cOx + y$ where $c \in (0, 1)$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^l$ and O is a $l \times l$ special orthogonal matrix. A *finite similarity Iterated Function System* with constant ratio (IFS) on \mathbb{R}^l is a collection of contracting similarities $\Phi = (\phi_e : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R})_{e \in E}$ indexed by a finite set E , called the alphabet, such that there exists a constant $c \in (0, 1)$ independent of e so that

$$\phi_e(x) = cO_e x + w_e,$$

for all $e \in E$.

Let $B = E^{\mathbb{N}}$. The coding map of an IFS Φ is the map $\sigma : B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by the formula

$$\sigma(b) = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \phi_{b_1} \circ \dots \circ \phi_{b_l}(0). \quad (20)$$

It is well known that the limit in (20) exists and that the coding map is continuous. The image of B under the coding map called the limit set of Φ , is a compact subset of \mathbb{R} , which we denote by $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}(\Phi)$. We define for $\tilde{e} = (e_1, \dots, e_l) \in E^l$,

$$\mathcal{K}_{\tilde{e}} = \phi_{e_1} \circ \dots \circ \phi_{e_l}(\mathcal{K}), \quad \text{and set } \mathcal{F}(l) = \{\mathcal{K}_{\tilde{e}} : \tilde{e} \in E^l\}. \quad (21)$$

We will say that Φ satisfies the *open set condition* (OSC for short) if there exists a non-empty open subset $U \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that the following holds

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_e(U) &\subset U \text{ for every } e \in E \\ \phi_e(U) \cap \phi_{e'}(U) &= \emptyset, \text{ for every } e \neq e' \in E. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\text{Prob}(E)$ denote the space of probability measures on E . For each $\nu \in \text{Prob}(E)$ we can consider the measure $\sigma_* \nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$ under the coding map. A measure of the form $\sigma_* \nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$ is called a *Bernoulli measure*.

The following proposition is well known (see for eg [[13], Prop. 5.1(4), Thm. 5.3(1)] for a proof).

Proposition 2.2. *Suppose $\Phi = \{\phi_e : e \in E\}$ is an IFS satisfying the open set condition with the limit set \mathcal{K} . Let c denote the common contraction ratio of $(\phi_e)_{e \in E}$ and $p = \#E$. Then the Hausdorff and packing dimension of \mathcal{K} both equals $s := -\log p / \log c$. Also, the s -dimensional Hausdorff measure H^s satisfies $0 < H^s(\mathcal{K}) < \infty$. Moreover if μ denotes the normalised restriction of H^s to \mathcal{K} , then μ is a Bernoulli measure and equals $\eta_* \nu^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$, where ν is the uniform measure on E , i.e., $\nu(F) = \#F / \#E$ for all $F \subset E$. Additionally, for every $l \in \mathbb{N}$ and distinct sequences $\tilde{e}_1 \neq \tilde{e}_2 \in E^l$, we have $\mu(\mathcal{K}_{\tilde{e}_1} \cap \mathcal{K}_{\tilde{e}_2}) = 0$. Furthermore, there exists a constant $\lambda > 0$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $y > 0$, we have*

$$\mu(B(x, y)) \leq \lambda y^s. \quad (22)$$

We will also need the following lemma.

Lemma 2.3. *Suppose $\Phi = \{\phi_e : e \in E\}$ is an IFS satisfying the open set condition with limit set $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^l$. Assume that $\dim_H(\mathcal{K}) > 0$. Let α denote the diameter of \mathcal{K} and let c denote the common contraction ratio of $(\phi_e)_{e \in E}$. Then there exists $L \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the following holds: For every ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}^l$ of radius $\beta > 0$, there exist at most L elements in $\mathcal{F}(k_\beta)$ that intersect B , where k_β is the unique integer such that*

$$c^{k_\beta+1} \alpha < \beta \leq c^{k_\beta} \alpha,$$

and $\mathcal{F}(\cdot)$ is defined as in (21).

Proof. Suppose the Hausdorff dimension of \mathcal{K} equals s and μ is the normalized restriction of H^s to \mathcal{K} . Let $\lambda > 0$ be such that (22) holds for μ . Fix $L \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $L > \lambda(2c^{-1})^s$. Suppose B is a ball of radius $\beta > 0$ and center x . Let k_β be defined as above. Define \tilde{B} as a ball of size $2c^{-1}\beta$ with center x . Then, for all $R \in \mathcal{F}(k_\beta)$ such that $R \cap B \neq \emptyset$, we have $R \subset \tilde{B}$. To see this, let $z \in R \cap B$ be arbitrary. Then, for all $y \in R$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|x - z\| &\leq \|x - y\| + \|y - z\| \leq \beta + c^{k_\beta} \alpha \\ &\leq \beta + c^{-1}\beta < 2c^{-1}\beta, \end{aligned}$$

which immediately implies $R \subset \tilde{B}$. Now we have

$$\begin{aligned} \#\{R \in \mathcal{F}(k_\beta) : R \cap B \neq \emptyset\} &\leq \frac{1}{c^{k_\beta s}} \sum_{\substack{R \in \mathcal{F}(k_\beta) \\ R \cap B \neq \emptyset}} \mu(R) \leq \frac{1}{c^{k_\beta s}} \mu(\tilde{B}) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{c^{k_\beta s}} \lambda(2c^{-1}\delta)^s \leq \lambda(2c^{-1})^s \\ &< L. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the claim. □

3. DIMENSION BOUND IN GENERALIZED SETUP I

Definition 3.1. With a slight abuse of notation, for $x \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\text{EMass}}(x) &= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \delta_{g_{e^t} x} \{y \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}} : \lambda_0(\pi(y)) \leq \epsilon\}, \\ \overline{\text{EMass}}(x) &= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \delta_{g_{e^t} x} \{y \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}} : \lambda_0(\pi(y)) \leq \epsilon\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda_0(y)$ denotes the length of the shortest non-zero vector in y . The significance of $\underline{\text{EMass}}(x)$ and $\overline{\text{EMass}}(x)$ is that any subsequential limit of measures $\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \delta_{g_{e^t} u(\theta)x}$, say μ_x satisfies $1 - \overline{\text{EMass}}(x) \leq \mu_x(\tilde{\mathcal{X}}) \leq 1 - \underline{\text{EMass}}(x)$.

Lemma 3.2. For any $x \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}$, let us define for $t > 1$ and $\epsilon > 0$, the sets

$$\begin{aligned} I(t, \epsilon) &= \{k \in \mathbb{N} : \lambda_0(\pi(g_t^k x)) \leq \epsilon\}, \\ I(t, \epsilon, N) &= I(t, \epsilon) \cap [1, N]. \end{aligned}$$

Then for $t > 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \#I(t, \epsilon, N) &= \underline{\text{EMass}}(x) \\ \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \#I(t, \epsilon, N) &= \overline{\text{EMass}}(x) \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Fix $t > 1$. For $\epsilon > 0$, let $K_\epsilon = \{y \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}} : \lambda_1(\pi(x)) \leq \epsilon\}$ and $K'_\epsilon = \cap_{s=t-1}^t g_s K_\epsilon$, $K''_\epsilon = \cup_{s=t-1}^t g_s K_\epsilon$.

For $T > 0$, define N_T such that $t^{N_T} \leq e^T < t^{N_T+1}$. Then it is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \delta_{g_{e^s x}}(K_\epsilon) ds &= \frac{1}{T} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{N_T} \int_{-\log t}^0 \delta_{g_t^j g_s x}(K_\epsilon) ds + \int_{N_T \log t}^T \delta_{g_s x}(K_\epsilon) ds \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{N_T \log t} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{N_T} \delta_{g_t^j x}(K'_\epsilon) \log t + (T - N_T \log t) \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{N_T} (\#I(t, t\epsilon, N_T) + 1). \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

Also, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \delta_{g_{e^s x}}(K_\epsilon) ds &= \frac{1}{T} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{N_T} \int_{-\log t}^0 \delta_{g_t^j g_s x}(K_\epsilon) ds + \int_{N_T \log t}^T \delta_{g_s x}(K_\epsilon) ds \right) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{(N_T + 1) \log t} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{N_T} \delta_{g_t^j x}(K'_\epsilon) \log t \right) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{N_T + 1} (\#I(t, \epsilon t^{-1}, N_T)). \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

From equations (23) and (24), we get that

$$\liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N_T + 1} (\#I(t, \epsilon t^{-1}, N_T)) \leq \liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \delta_{g_{e^s x}}(K_\epsilon) ds \leq \liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N_T} (\#I(t, t\epsilon, N_T) + 1), \tag{25}$$

$$\limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N_T + 1} (\#I(t, \epsilon t^{-1}, N_T)) \leq \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \delta_{g_{e^s x}}(K_\epsilon) ds \leq \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N_T} (\#I(t, t\epsilon, N_T) + 1). \tag{26}$$

Taking limit as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ in (25) and (26) proves the lemma. Hence proved. \square

Definition 3.3. Given $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $0 < p \leq 1$, we define $\widetilde{\text{Div}}(x, p, a, b) \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ as the set of all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \delta_{g_{e^t}[I_d, v(\xi)]x} \{y \in \widetilde{\mathcal{X}} : \lambda_0(y) \leq \epsilon\} \geq p.$$

Theorem 3.4. Suppose $r_1, \dots, r_l \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $r_1 + \dots + r_l = m$ and $a_i = a_j$ for all i, j such that there exist $1 \leq k \leq l$ satisfying $r_1 + \dots + r_{k-1} < i \leq j \leq r_1 + \dots + r_k$. For $1 \leq i \leq l$, we let w_i denote the common value of a_j for $r_1 + \dots + r_{i-1} < j \leq r_1 + \dots + r_i$.

For each $1 \leq i \leq l$, let Φ_i be an iterated function system (IFS) consisting of contracting similarities on \mathbb{R}^{r_i} with equal contraction ratios, satisfying the open set condition. Let \mathcal{K}_i be the limit set of Φ_i , and define

$$\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{K}_l \subset \mathbb{R}^m.$$

Fix $x \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}$ and $0 < q \leq 1$. Then the dimension of $\widetilde{\text{Div}}(x, q, a, b)$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \dim_H(\widetilde{\text{Div}}(x, q, a, b) \cap \mathcal{K}) &\leq \min_{1 \leq l \leq k} \left(\frac{1}{w_k} \sum_i s_i (\max\{w_i, w_k\} - w_i q' + w_i \underline{\text{EMass}}(x)) \right), \\ \dim_P(\widetilde{\text{Div}}(x, q, a, b) \cap \mathcal{K}) &\leq \min_{1 \leq l \leq k} \left(\frac{1}{w_k} \sum_i s_i (\max\{w_i, w_k\} - w_i q' + w_i \overline{\text{EMass}}(x)) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Fix $x \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}$, $q \in (0, 1]$. Fix $t > 1$ and assume that $t > c_i^{-1}$ for all i . Fix $\epsilon > 0$ and $\delta > 0$ such that $\delta < \epsilon c_i t^{-w_i}/2$ for all i . For notational simplicity, we will denote g_t by g throughout the proof. Let us define

$$\begin{aligned} I(t, \epsilon) &= \{k \in \mathbb{N} : \lambda_1(\pi(g_t^k x)) \leq 2\epsilon\}, \\ I(t, \epsilon, N) &= I(t, \epsilon) \cap [1, N], \\ \overline{\text{EM}}(x, \epsilon, t) &= \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \#I(t, \epsilon, N), \\ \underline{\text{EM}}(x, \epsilon, t) &= \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \#I(t, \epsilon, N). \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 3.2, it is clear that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \overline{\text{EM}}(x, \epsilon, t) = \overline{\text{EMass}}(x), \quad (27)$$

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \underline{\text{EM}}(x, \epsilon, t) = \underline{\text{EMass}}(x). \quad (28)$$

Let us now briefly recall some notation related to the fractal \mathcal{K} . For $1 \leq i \leq l$, the set \mathcal{K}_i is the limit set of the IFS $\Phi_{i,j} = \{\phi_{i,e} : e \in E_i\}$, with a common contraction ratio c_i and cardinality $p_i = \#E_i$. The dimension of \mathcal{K}_i is given by $s_i = -\frac{\log p_i}{\log c_i}$. The set $\mathcal{K} = \prod_i \mathcal{K}_i \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ has dimension $s = \sum_i s_i$. Let μ_i denote the normalized restriction of H^{s_i} to \mathcal{K}_i , and define the measure μ on \mathcal{K} as $\mu = \otimes_i \mu_i$. Also, let α_i denote the diameter of \mathcal{K}_i for $1 \leq i \leq l$. Clearly, $\alpha_i > 0$ if the dimension of \mathcal{K}_i is not zero.

Note that if $\dim_H(\mathcal{K}_i) = 0$ for all i , then the theorem holds trivially. Hence, we may assume that $\dim_H(\mathcal{K}_i) \neq 0$ for some i . Let S denote the set of all $1 \leq i \leq l$ such that $\dim_H(\mathcal{K}_i) = 0$ and set $S^c = \{1, \dots, l\} \setminus S$. For all $i \in S^c$, let L_i be as defined in Lemma 2.3 and define $L = \prod_i L_i$, where we set $L_i = 1$ for $i \in S$.

For all $i \in S^c$, let us also define $P_i(j) \in \mathbb{N}$ as the unique integer satisfying

$$\alpha_i c_i^{P_i(j)+1} < 2\delta t^{-j w_i} \leq \alpha_i c_i^{P_i(j)},$$

and set $P_i(j) = 1$ for $i \in S$. Finally, for $j \geq 1$, we define $\mathcal{F}(j) = \prod_i \mathcal{F}_i(P_j(i))$.

Fix $1 \leq k \leq l$. For $1 \leq i \leq l$, let $\rho_i : \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n = \mathbb{R}^{r_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{R}^{r_l} \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{r_i}$ denote the natural projection map. Also define $\rho'_i : \mathbb{R}^m = \mathbb{R}^{r_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{R}^{r_l} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{r_i}$ denote the natural projection map, for all $1 \leq i \leq l$.

Fix $0 < q' < q$. Note that

$$\widetilde{\text{Div}}(x, q, a, b) \cap \mathcal{K} \subset \bigcup_{M \in \mathbb{N}} Z(M), \quad (29)$$

where $Z(M)$ equals set of all $\xi \in \mathcal{K}$ such that for all $N \geq M$, we have

$$\frac{1}{N} \#\{k \in [1, N] \cap \mathbb{N} : \lambda_0(g^k[I_d, v(\xi)]x) < \delta\} > q'.$$

Also note that for all $N > M$, we have

$$Z(M) \subset \bigcup_Q Z(M, N, Q), \quad (30)$$

where sum is taken over all subsets $Q \subset \{1, \dots, N\}$ such that $\#Q > q'N$ and $Z(M, N, Q)$ equals the set of all $\xi \in Z(M)$ such that for all $1 \leq k \leq N$, we have $\lambda_0(g^k[I_d, v(\xi)]x) < \delta$ if and only if $k \in Q$. Before proceeding further, let us make some easy observations:

Observation 1: Let $1 < M < N$ and $Q \subset \{1, \dots, N\}$ be such that $\#Q > q'N$. Assume that $1 \leq j \leq N$ and $R \in \mathcal{F}(j-1)$ are such that $R \cap Z(M, N, Q) \neq \emptyset$ and $j \in Q \setminus I(t, \epsilon)$. Then $R \cap Z(M, N, Q)$ is contained in a set of the form $B_1 \times \dots \times B_l$, where each B_i is a ball of radius $t^{jw_i}2\delta$.

Explanation: For $1 \leq i \leq l$, let

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_i : \mathbb{R}^d &= \mathbb{R}^{r_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{R}^{r_l} \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{r_i}, \\ \rho_0 : \mathbb{R}^d &= \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n, \\ \rho'_i : \mathbb{R}^m &= \mathbb{R}^{r_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{R}^{r_l} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{r_i}, \end{aligned}$$

denote the natural projection maps. Suppose $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in R \cap Z(M, N, Q)$ are arbitrary. Since $j \in Q$, both affine lattices $g^j[I_d, v(\xi_1)]x$ and $g^j[I_d, v(\xi_2)]x$ contain a vector of size less than δ , say $(v_1 + g^jv(\xi_1))$ and $(v_2 + g^jv(\xi_2))$, respectively. This implies that for all $1 \leq i \leq l$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\rho_i(v_1 - v_2)\| &\leq \|\rho_i(v_1 + g^jv(\xi_1))\| + \|\rho_i(v_2 + g^jv(\xi_2))\| + \|\rho_i(g^jv(\xi_1) - g^jv(\xi_2))\| \\ &\leq 2\delta + t^{jw_i} \text{diam}(R) \\ &\leq 2\delta + t^{jw_i} \alpha_i c_i^{P_i(j-1)} \\ &\leq 2\delta + t^{jw_i} c_i^{-1} 2\delta t^{-(j-1)w_i} \\ &\leq (2 + t^{w_i} c_i^{-1} 2) \epsilon c_i t^{-w_i} / 2 \\ &\leq \epsilon + \epsilon = 2\epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|\rho_0(v_1 - v_2)\| &\leq \|\rho_0(v_1 + g^jv(\xi_1))\| + \|\rho_0(v_2 + g^jv(\xi_2))\| \\ &\leq 2\delta \leq 2\epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\|v_1 - v_2\| \leq 2\epsilon$. Note that $v_1 - v_2$ is an element of $\pi(g^jx)$, and since $j \notin I(t, \epsilon)$, we have $\lambda_1(\pi(g^jx)) > 2\epsilon$. This implies $v_1 - v_2$ must be the zero vector.

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\rho'_i(\xi_1 - \xi_2)\| &\leq t^{jw_i} \|\rho_i(v(\xi_1) - v(\xi_2))\| \\ &\leq t^{jw_i} \|\rho_i(v_1 + v(\xi_1)) - \rho_i(v_2 - v(\xi_2))\| \\ &\leq t^{jw_i} \|\rho_i(v_1 + v(\xi_1))\| + \|\rho_i(v_2 - v(\xi_2))\| \\ &\leq t^{jw_i} 2\delta. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the observation follows.

Observation 2: Fix $1 < M < N$ and $Q \subset \{1, \dots, N\}$ satisfying $\#Q > q'N$. Then for all $1 < j \leq N$, we have

$$\sum_{\substack{R \in \mathcal{F}(j) \\ R \cap Z(M, N, Q) \neq \emptyset}} \mu(R) \leq \begin{cases} L \left(\prod_i c_i^{s_i(P_i(j) - P_i(j-1))} \right) \sum_{\substack{R \in \mathcal{F}(j-1) \\ R \cap Z(M, N, Q) \neq \emptyset}} \mu(R) & \text{if } j \in Q \setminus I(t, \epsilon), \\ \sum_{\substack{R \in \mathcal{F}(j-1) \\ R \cap Z(M, N, Q) \neq \emptyset}} \mu(R) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (31)$$

Explanation: First assume that $j \in Q \setminus I(t, \epsilon)$. Fix $R \in \mathcal{F}(j-1)$ such that $R \cap Z(M, N, Q) \neq \emptyset$. Then by Observation 1, we have $R \cap Z(M, N, Q)$ is contained in a set of form $B_1 \times \dots \times B_l$, where each B_i is a ball of radius $t^{jw_j} 2\delta$. By definition of L and $\mathcal{F}(j)$, it is clear that there are at most L -many elements in $\mathcal{F}(j)$ which intersects $B_1 \times \dots \times B_l$. Thus, we have that number of $R' \in \mathcal{F}(j)$ such that $R' \subset R$ and $R \cap Z(M, N, Q)$ is at most L . Since $\mu(R) = \prod_i c_i^{s_i P_i(j-1)}$ and $\mu(R') = \prod_i c_i^{s_i P_i(j)}$ for any $R' \in \mathcal{F}(j)$, we get that

$$\sum_{\substack{R' \in \mathcal{F}(j) \\ R' \subset R, R \cap Z(M, N, Q) \neq \emptyset}} \mu(R') \leq L \left(\prod_i c_i^{s_i P_i(j)} \right) \leq L \left(\prod_i c_i^{s_i(P_i(j) - P_i(j-1))} \right) \mu(R) \quad (32)$$

The first case of (31) now follows from (32). The second case of (31) is trivial.

Observation 3: Fix $1 < M < N$ and $Q \subset \{1, \dots, N\}$ satisfying $\#Q > q'N$. Then

$$\sum_{\substack{R \in \mathcal{F}(N) \\ R \cap Z(M, N, Q) \neq \emptyset}} \mu(R) \leq L^N \left(\prod p_i \right)^N \left(\prod_i t^{-s_i w_i} \right)^{q'N - \#I(t, \epsilon, N_\gamma)}. \quad (33)$$

Explanation: Note that by iteratively use of (31), we have

$$\sum_{\substack{R \in \mathcal{F}(N) \\ R \cap Z(M, N, Q) \neq \emptyset}} \mu(R) \leq L^N \left(\prod_{j \in Q \setminus I(t, \epsilon)} \prod_i c_i^{s_i(P_i(j) - P_i(j-1))} \right). \quad (34)$$

Also note that by definition of $P_i(j)$, for $i \in S^c$, we have

$$c_i^{P_i(j)} \leq \frac{2\delta}{\alpha_i c_i} t^{-jw_i}, \quad \text{and} \quad c_i^{-P_i(j-1)} \leq \frac{\alpha_i}{2\delta} t^{(j-1)w_i},$$

and $P_i(j) = P_i(j-1) = 1$ for $i \in S$. Plugging this into (34) gives that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{R \in \mathcal{F}(N) \\ R \cap Z(M, N, Q) \neq \emptyset}} \mu(R) &\leq L^N \left(\prod_{j \in Q \setminus I(t, \epsilon)} \prod_i t^{-s_i w_i} c_i^{-s_i} \right) \\ &\leq L^N \left(\prod_i c_i^{-s_i} \right)^N \left(\prod_i t^{-s_i w_i} \right)^{\#(Q \setminus I(t, \epsilon))} \\ &\leq L^N \left(\prod p_i \right)^N \left(\prod_i t^{-s_i w_i} \right)^{q'N - \#I(t, \epsilon, N_\gamma)}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus the observation follows.

Observation 4: For all $1 < M \leq N$, we have

$$\sum_{\substack{R \in \mathcal{F}(N) \\ R \cap Z(M) \neq \emptyset}} \mu(R) \leq 2^N L^N \left(\prod p_i \right)^N \left(\prod_i t^{-s_i w_i} \right)^{q'N - \#I(t, \epsilon, N_\gamma)}. \quad (35)$$

Explanation: Note that $Z(M)$ is union of $Z(M, N, Q)$ satisfying $\# > q'N$ and there are atmost 2^N choices of Q . Therefore the observation follows directly from (33).

Observation 5: Fix $1 \leq k \leq l$. For all $\gamma > 0$, define $N_\gamma \in \mathbb{N}$ as the unique integer satisfying $2\delta t^{-N_\gamma w_k} \leq \gamma < 2\delta t^{-(N_\gamma - 1)w_k}$. Then for all $M > 1$ and sufficiently small γ , we have:

$$\frac{\log C_\gamma(Z(M))}{-\log \gamma} \leq \frac{\log(D) + N_\gamma \log(B) + \sum_i \left[s_i N_\gamma \max\{w_i, w_k\} - s_i w_i q' N_\gamma + s_i w_i \#I(t, \epsilon, N_\gamma) \right] \log t}{-\log(2\delta) + (N_\gamma - 1)w_k \log t}, \quad (36)$$

where $C_\gamma(Z(M))$ denotes the smallest number of sets of diameter at most γ that cover $Z(M)$, $D = \left(\prod_{i \in S^c} \left(\frac{\alpha_i}{2\delta c_i} \right)^{s_i} \right)$ and $B = 2L \left(\prod p_i \right)$.

Explanation: Fix $M > 1$ and $\gamma > 0$. Assume that γ is small enough so that $N_\gamma > M$. For $i \in S^c$ and $j \in \mathbb{N}$, define $K_i(j)$ as the unique integer satisfying

$$\alpha_i c_i^{K_i(j)} < 2\delta t^{-j \max\{w_k, w_i\}} \leq \alpha_i c_i^{K_i(j)-1},$$

and set $K_i(j) = 1$ for $i \in S$. Clearly then for all $R \in \prod_i \mathcal{F}_i(K_i(N_\gamma))$, the diameter of R is than γ . Also note that $K_i(j) \geq P_i(j)$ for all $i \geq k$.

To cover $Z(M)$ by sets of diameter less than or equal to γ , we select sets from $\prod_i \mathcal{F}_i(K_i(N_\gamma))$ that intersect $Z(M)$. The total number of elements in $\prod_i \mathcal{F}_i(K_i(N_\gamma))$ is:

$$\prod_i p_i^{K_i(N_\gamma)} = \prod_i c_i^{-s_i K_i(N_\gamma)} \leq \prod_{i \in S^c} \left(\frac{\alpha_i}{2\delta c_i} t^{N_\gamma \max\{w_k, w_i\}} \right)^{s_i}.$$

Each element has an equal μ -measure. Therefore, the number of sets covering $Z(M)$ satisfies:

$$\begin{aligned} \#\{R \in \prod_i \mathcal{F}_i(K_i(N_\gamma)) : R \cap Z(M) \neq \emptyset\} &\leq \prod_{i \in S^c} \left(\frac{\alpha_i}{2\delta c_i} t^{N_\gamma \max\{w_k, w_i\}} \right)^{s_i} \sum_{\substack{R \in \mathcal{F}(N_\gamma) \\ R \cap Z(M) \neq \emptyset}} \mu(R) \\ &\leq \prod_{i \in S^c} \left(\frac{\alpha_i}{2\delta c_i} t^{N_\gamma \max\{w_k, w_i\}} \right)^{s_i} \cdot \left(\sum_{\substack{R \in \mathcal{F}(N_\gamma) \\ R \cap Z(M) \neq \emptyset}} \mu(R) \right), \\ &\leq \prod_{i \in S^c} \left(\frac{\alpha_i}{2\delta c_i} t^{N_\gamma \max\{w_k, w_i\}} \right)^{s_i} \cdot 2^{N_\gamma} L^{N_\gamma} \left(\prod p_i \right)^{N_\gamma} \left(\prod_i t^{-s_i w_i} \right)^{q'N_\gamma - \#I(t, \epsilon, N_\gamma)} \\ &\leq DB^{N_\gamma} \prod_i t^{s_i N_\gamma \max\{w_i, w_k\} - s_i w_i q' N_\gamma + s_i w_i \#I(t, \epsilon, N_\gamma)}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $Z(M)$ can be covered by at most:

$$DB^{N_\gamma} \prod_i t^{s_i N_\gamma \max\{w_i, w_k\} - s_i w_i q' N_\gamma + s_i w_i \#I(t, \epsilon, N_\gamma)}$$

sets of diameter at most γ . Since $\gamma < 2\delta t^{-(N_\gamma - 1)w_k}$, the observation follows.

Note that $N_\gamma \rightarrow \infty$ as $\gamma \rightarrow 0$. Therefore on taking \liminf and \limsup as $\gamma \rightarrow 0$ in (36), we get from Lemma 2.1 that

$$\dim_P(Z(M)) \leq \frac{\log B + \sum_i (s_i \max\{w_i, w_k\} - s_i w_i q' + s_i w_i \overline{\text{EM}}(x, \epsilon, t)) \log(t)}{w_k \log t}, \quad (37)$$

$$\dim_H(Z(M)) \leq \frac{\log B + \sum_i (s_i \max\{w_i, w_k\} - s_i w_i q' + s_i w_i \underline{\text{EM}}(x, \epsilon, t)) \log(t)}{w_k \log t}. \quad (38)$$

Note that $\dim_P(\cup_i J_i) = \sup_i \dim_P(J_i)$ and $\dim_H(\cup_i J_i) = \sup_i \dim_H(J_i)$ for any countable collection of Borel sets J_i . Thus, from (29) and (37), (38), we get that

$$\dim_H(\widetilde{\text{Div}}(x, q, a, b)) \leq \frac{\log B + \sum_i (s_i \max\{w_i, w_k\} - s_i w_i q' + s_i w_i \underline{\text{EM}}(x, \epsilon, t)) \log(t)}{w_k \log t}, \quad (39)$$

$$\dim_P(\widetilde{\text{Div}}(x, q, a, b)) \leq \frac{\log B + \sum_i (s_i \max\{w_i, w_k\} - s_i w_i q' + s_i w_i \overline{\text{EM}}(x, \epsilon, t)) \log(t)}{w_k \log t}. \quad (40)$$

Since B is independent of q' , t and ϵ , first take limit as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ in (39) and (40), and then take limit as $t \rightarrow \infty$ and $q' \rightarrow q$ to get that

$$\dim_H(\widetilde{\text{Div}}(x, q, a, b)) \leq \frac{1}{w_k} \sum_i s_i (\max\{w_i, w_k\} - w_i q' + w_i \underline{\text{EMass}}),$$

$$\dim_P(\widetilde{\text{Div}}(x, q, a, b)) \leq \frac{1}{w_k} \sum_i s_i (\max\{w_i, w_k\} - w_i q' + w_i \overline{\text{EMass}}).$$

Since $1 \leq k \leq l$ is arbitrary, the theorem is proved. \square

4. FINAL PROOF I

Proof of Theorem 1.11. Note that in notation of Theorem 3.4, we have

$$\underline{\text{EMass}}(\theta) = \underline{\text{EMass}}([u_\theta, 0]\mathbb{Z}^d),$$

$$\overline{\text{EMass}}(\theta) = \overline{\text{EMass}}([u_\theta, 0]\mathbb{Z}^d),$$

$$\text{Div}_\theta(a, b, q) = \widetilde{\text{Div}}([u_\theta, 0]\mathbb{Z}^d, a, b, q),$$

for all $0 < q \leq 1$. Thus, the theorem follows directly from Theorem 3.4. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.7. The theorem follows directly from theorem 1.11 by choosing $l = m$, $r_1 = \dots = r_l = 1$, $\mathcal{K}_i = [0, 1]$ for all i . \square

Proof of Corollary 1.8. If $\overline{\text{EMass}}(\theta) = 0$, then $\underline{\text{EMass}}(\theta) = 0$ as well. Now the corollary follows from Theorem 1.7 by computing the upper bound on dimensions of $\text{Div}_\theta(a, b, 1)$ corresponding to the value $k = m$, which equals zero, along with Lemma 8.1, which gives $\text{Sing}_\theta(a, b) \subset \text{Div}_\theta(a, b, 1)$. \square

Proof of Corollary 1.9. Note that if $\theta \notin \text{Div}^0(a, b, 1)$, then $\underline{\text{EMass}}(\theta) < 1$. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\dim_H(\text{Sing}_\theta(a, b)) &\leq \dim_H(\text{Div}_\theta(a, b, 1)) \quad \text{using Lemma 8.1} \\
&\leq \min_{1 \leq k \leq m} \frac{1}{a_k} \sum_{i=1}^m (\max\{a_i, a_k\} - a_i + a_i \underline{\text{EMass}}(\theta)) \quad \text{using Theorem 1.7} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{a_1} \sum_{i=1}^m (\max\{a_i, a_1\} - a_i + a_i \underline{\text{EMass}}(\theta)) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^m \left(1 - \frac{a_i}{a_m} (1 - \underline{\text{EMass}}(\theta)) \right) \\
&< \sum_{i=1}^m 1 = m.
\end{aligned}$$

The corollary now follows. \square

Before proceeding further, we will need the following theorem. The results are borrowed from [8], [5].

Theorem 4.1. *For any $\theta \in M_{m \times n}(\mathbb{R})$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^m \setminus (\theta\mathbb{Z}^m + \mathbb{Z}^n)$, we have*

$$\frac{1}{1 + \omega(\theta^t, b, a)} \leq 1 + \hat{\omega}(\theta, \xi, a, b) \leq 1 + \omega(\theta, a, b). \quad (41)$$

Moreover, for any fixed θ , the left inequality in (41) is an equality for Lebesgue almost every $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Furthermore, $\hat{\omega}(\theta^t, b, a) = 0$ if and only if $\hat{\omega}(\theta, a, b) = 0$.

Proof. The fact that for any $\theta \in M_{m \times n}(\mathbb{R})$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^m \setminus (\theta\mathbb{Z}^m + \mathbb{Z}^n)$, we have

$$\frac{1}{1 + \omega(\theta^t, b, a)} \leq 1 + \hat{\omega}(\theta, \xi, a, b),$$

with equality for Lebesgue almost every ξ follows directly from [[8], Thm. 1.9]. Also, the fact that $\hat{\omega}(\theta^t, b, a) = 0$ if and only if $\hat{\omega}(\theta, a, b) = 0$ follows directly from [[8], Thm. 1.6]. Note that the unweighted version of these results has been proved earlier in [5].

The fact that $\hat{\omega}(\theta, \xi, a, b) \leq \omega(\theta, a, b)$ is well known. The proof for $m = n = 1$ is given in [5] and the same proof can be easily generalized to higher dimensions and is therefore skipped. The theorem now follows. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.5. Fix $\theta \notin \text{Div}^0(a, b, 1)$. By Corollary 1.9, $\text{Sing}_\theta(a, b)$ has zero Lebesgue measure. Consequently, $\hat{\omega}(\theta, \xi, a, b) = 0$ for Lebesgue almost every $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Using the fact that the left inequality in (41) holds as an equality for Lebesgue almost every ξ , we deduce that $\omega(\theta^t, b, a) = 0$. Applying Theorem 4.1, it follows that $\omega(\theta, a, b) = 0$, implying $\theta \notin \text{VWA}^0(a, b)$. Since $\theta \notin \text{Div}^0(a, b, 1)$ was arbitrary, we conclude that

$$\text{VWA}^0(a, b) \subset \text{Div}^0(a, b, 1).$$

Using (41), the condition $\omega(\theta^t, b, a) = \omega(\theta, a, b) = 0$ implies that $\hat{\omega}(\theta, \xi, a, b) = 0$ for all $\xi \notin \theta\mathbb{Z}^m + \mathbb{Z}^n$. Therefore,

$$\text{VSing}_\theta(a, b) \subset \theta\mathbb{Z}^m + \mathbb{Z}^n$$

for all $\theta \notin \text{Div}^0(a, b, 1)$. Hence, the theorem follows. \square

5. NOTATION II

The following notation will be used throughout the paper.

5.1. Iterated Function Systems. For the rest of the paper, we fix for all $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $1 \leq j \leq n$, an IFS $\Phi_{ij} = \{\phi_{ij,e} : e \in E_{ij}\}$ satisfying the open set condition, with common contraction ratio c_{ij} and the limit set \mathcal{K}_{ij} . Let $p_{ij} = \#E_{ij}$ and $s_{ij} = -\log p_{ij} / \log c_{ij} > 0$. Let us define $\mathcal{K} = \{\theta \in M_{m \times n}(\mathbb{R}) : \theta_{ij} \in \mathcal{K}_{ij}\}$ and $s = \sum_{ij} s_{ij}$. Let μ_{ij} denote the normalised restriction of $H^{s_{ij}}$ to \mathcal{K}_{ij} and define the measure $\mu = \otimes_{ij} \mu_{ij}$ on \mathcal{K} .

Let $\Xi \subset M_{m \times n}(\mathbb{R})$ be defined as $\Xi = \{r \in M_{m \times n}(\mathbb{R}) : r_{ij} \in [c_{ij}, c_{ij}^{-1}]\}$. For all $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $1 \leq j \leq n$, we define $\mu^{(r)}_{ij}$ as the measure on \mathbb{R} obtained by pushing forward the measure μ_{ij} under map $x \mapsto r_{ij}x$. We also define $\mu^{(r)} = \prod_{ij} \mu^{(r)}_{ij}$, viewed as measure on $M_{m \times n}(\mathbb{R})$.

5.2. Representation Theory. For all $1 \leq l \leq d$, define

$$V_l = \bigwedge^l \mathbb{R}^d, \quad V = \bigoplus_{l=1}^d V_l.$$

Define action of G on V (resp. V_l) via the map $g \mapsto \bigoplus_{l=1}^d \bigwedge^l g$ (resp. $g \mapsto \bigwedge^l g$). Suppose $\{e_1, \dots, e_d\}$ denote the standard basis of \mathbb{R}^d . For each index set $I = \{i_1 < \dots < i_l\} \subset \{1, \dots, d\}$, we define

$$e_I := e_{i_1} \wedge \dots \wedge e_{i_l}. \quad (42)$$

The collection of monomials e_I with $\#I = l$, gives a basis of $V_l = \bigwedge^l \mathbb{R}^d$ for each $1 \leq l \leq d$. For $v \in V$ and each index set I , we denote by $v_I \in \mathbb{R}$, the unique value so that $v = \sum_J v_J e_J$, where the sum is taken over all index sets J . We define *norm* $\|\cdot\|$ on each of V as

$$\|v\| = \max_I |v_I|, \quad (43)$$

where the maximum is taken over all index sets I . For $g \in G$, we define

$$\|g\| := \sup \{\|gv\| : v \in V, \|v\| = 1\}. \quad (44)$$

Also, for any compact subset $Q \subset G$, we define

$$\|Q\| = \sup \{\|g\|, \|g^{-1}\| : g \in Q\}, \quad (45)$$

For $1 \leq l \leq d$, we define V_l^+ to be the subspace of V_l spanned by e_I , where I varies over the index sets satisfying $\#(I \cap \{1, \dots, m\}) = \min\{l, m\}$. Similarly, define V_l^- to be the subspace of V_l spanned by e_I , where I varies over the index sets satisfying $\#(I \cap \{1, \dots, m\}) \neq \min\{l, m\}$. Also define π_{l+} (resp. π_{l-}) as the natural projection map from V_l onto V_l^+ (resp. V_l^-). Note that for all $\theta \in M_{m \times n}(\mathbb{R})$, we have $u(\theta)$ act trivially on V_l^+ , i.e., $u(\theta)|_{V_l^+} = \text{Id}_{V_l^+}$. We also define for $1 \leq l \leq d-1$, w_l as least $w > 0$ such that the subspace $V_{l,w}^+ = \{v \in V_l^+ : g_t v = t^w v\}$ is non-empty. It is easy to see that

$$w_l = \begin{cases} a_m + \dots + a_{m-l+1} & \text{if } l \leq m \\ 1 - (b_1 + \dots + b_{l-m}) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (46)$$

5.3. Covolume of Lattice. For a discrete subgroup Λ of \mathbb{R}^{m+1} of rank $l \geq 1$, we define $v_\Lambda \in V_l/\{\pm 1\}$ as $v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge v_l$, where v_1, \dots, v_l is a \mathbb{Z} -basis of Λ . Note that the definition of v_Λ is independent of the choice of basis v_1, \dots, v_l . We define $\|\Lambda\|$ as

$$\|\Lambda\| = \|v_\Lambda\|, \quad (47)$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ on V_l is defined as in (43). We also define $\|\{0\}\| = 1$.

For $\Lambda \in \mathcal{X}$, we define $P(\Lambda)$ as the set of all **primitive** subgroups of the lattice Λ , i.e, the subgroups L of the lattice Λ satisfying $L = \Lambda \cap \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}(L)$, where $\text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}(L)$ is the smallest vector subspace of \mathbb{R}^d containing L .

Lemma 5.1 ([10], Lem. 5.6). *There exists a constant $D > 0$ such that the following inequality holds. For all $\Lambda \in \mathcal{X}$ and for all $\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2 \in P(\Lambda)$, we have:*

$$\|\Lambda_1 \cap \Lambda_2\| \|\Lambda_1 + \Lambda_2\| \leq D \|\Lambda_1\| \|\Lambda_2\|. \quad (48)$$

Remark 5.2. In [10], inequality (48) is established with $D = 1$, but the norm $\|\Lambda\|$ is defined differently. There, $\|\Lambda\|$ is taken as $\|v_\Lambda\|$, where $\|\cdot\|$ on $V_l = \wedge^l \mathbb{R}^d$ is the norm induced by the Euclidean norm on \mathbb{R}^d . Since any two norms on a finite-dimensional vector space are equivalent, it follows that (48) holds for some sufficiently large D under our current definition of $\|\Lambda\|$.

6. DIMENSION BOUND IN GENERALIZED SETUP II

The following section is taken from [1].

Definition 6.1 (The Contraction Hypothesis). Suppose Y is a metric space equipped with an action of G . Given a collection of functions $\{f_\tau : Y \rightarrow (0, \infty] : \tau \in S\}$ for some unbounded set $S \subset (0, \infty)$ and $\beta > 0$, we say that μ satisfies the $((f_\tau)_\tau, \beta)$ -**contraction hypothesis** on Y if the following properties hold:

- (1) The set $Y_f = \{y \in Y : f_\tau(y) = \infty\}$ is independent of τ and is G -invariant.
- (2) For every $\tau \in S$, f_τ is uniformly log-Lipschitz with respect to the G -action. That is, for every bounded neighborhood \mathcal{O} of the identity in G , there exists a constant $C_{\mathcal{O}} \geq 1$ such that for all $g \in \mathcal{O}$, $y \in Y$, and $\tau \in S$,

$$C_{\mathcal{O}}^{-1} f_\tau(y) \leq f_\tau(gy) \leq C_{\mathcal{O}} f_\tau(y). \quad (49)$$

- (3) There exists a constant $c \geq 1$ such that the following holds: for every $\tau \in S$, there exists $T > 0$ such that for all $y \in Y$, $r \in \Xi$, and $f_\tau(y) > T$,

$$\int_{M_{m \times n}(\mathbb{R})} f_\tau(g_\tau u(x)y) d\mu^{(r)}(x) \leq c f_\tau(y) \tau^{-\beta}. \quad (50)$$

The functions f_τ will be referred to as **height functions**.

Definition 6.2. Suppose Y is a locally compact second countable metric space equipped with a continuous G action. Given a closed G -invariant subset $Y' \subset Y$, $0 < p \leq 1$ and $y \in Y \setminus Y'$, we define $\text{Divergent}(y, Y', p)$ as set of all $x \in M_{m \times n}(\mathbb{R})$ such that

$$\liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \delta_{g_{et}u(x)y}(Y \setminus K) dt \geq p,$$

for all compact subsets $K \subset Y \setminus Y'$.

We have the following theorem.

Theorem 6.3 ([1], Thm. 6.5). *Let Y be a locally compact second countable metric space equipped with a continuous action of G . Assume that there exists a collection of functions $\{f_\tau : Y \rightarrow (0, \infty] : \tau \in S\}$ for some unbounded set $S \subset (0, \infty)$ and $0 < \beta < (a_1 + b_1)s$, such that μ satisfies the $(\{f_\tau\}_{\tau \in S}, \beta)$ -contraction hypothesis on Y . Assume that $Y_f = \{y \in Y : f_\tau(y) = \infty\}$, which is independent of τ and is G -invariant. Then for all $y \in Y \setminus Y_f$ and $0 < p \leq 1$,*

$$\dim_P(\text{Divergent}(y, Y_f, p) \cap \mathcal{K}) \leq s - \frac{p\beta}{a_1 + b_1}. \quad (51)$$

Also, for any sequence $(c_\tau)_{\tau \in S}$ of positive real numbers and $0 < a \leq (a_1 + b_1)s - \beta$, we have

$$\dim_P\left(x \in \mathcal{K} : \text{for all } \tau \in S, \text{ the following holds for all sufficiently large } t\right) \leq s - \frac{a + \beta}{a_1 + b_1}. \quad (52)$$

$$f_\tau(a_t u(x)y) \geq c_\tau t^a$$

7. HEIGHT FUNCTION

The section is devoted towards the construction of a family of height functions $\{f_\tau\}$ on $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$ such that the set $\{f_\tau = \infty\}$ equals $\mathcal{X} \subset \tilde{\mathcal{X}}$.

Definition 7.1. For each $1 \leq l \leq d - 1$, we define the l -th critical exponent $\zeta_l(\mu)$ of the measure μ as the supremum of all $\gamma \geq 0$ for which there exists a constant $C'_{\gamma, l} > 0$ such that, for every $v = v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge v_l \in V_l$ with $\|v\| = 1$ and $r \in \Xi$, the following inequality holds:

$$\int_{M_{m \times n}(\mathbb{R})} \frac{1}{\|\pi_{l+}(u(\theta)v)\|^\gamma} d\mu^{(r)}(\theta) < C'_{\gamma, l}. \quad (53)$$

We will need the following result from [1].

Proposition 7.2 ([1], Prop. 3.1, Lemma 4.1, 4.4 and 4.5). *For all $1 \leq l \leq d - 1$, we have $\zeta_l(\mu) > 0$. Moreover, the critical exponent $\zeta_l(\mu)$ satisfies the following lower bound in the following special cases:*

- If $\mathcal{K} = M_{m \times n}([0, 1])$, then

$$\eta_l(\mu) \geq \begin{cases} \frac{m}{l} & \text{if } l \leq m, \\ \frac{n}{m+n-l} & \text{if } m < l \leq d - 1. \end{cases}$$

- If $n = 1$, then

$$\zeta_l(\mu) \geq \min\left\{\sum_{i \in I} s_{i1} : \#I = d - l\right\}$$

- If $m = 1$, then

$$\zeta_l(\mu) \geq \min\left\{\sum_{i \in I} s_{1i} : \#I = l\right\}.$$

For the remainder of this section, we fix a sequence $\eta_1, \dots, \eta_{d-1} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that the following holds:

$$0 < \eta_i < \zeta_i(\mu), \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq d - 1,$$

$$\frac{1}{\eta_{i-j}} + \frac{1}{\eta_{i+j}} < \frac{2}{\eta_i}, \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq i \leq d - 1 \text{ and } j \leq \min\{i, d - i\},$$

where we define $\frac{1}{\eta_0} = \frac{1}{\eta_d} := 0$. Additionally, we define the following:

$$\begin{aligned}\eta &= \min_{1 \leq l \leq d} w_l \eta_l, \\ \eta &= (\eta, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_{d-1}), \\ C_\eta &= \max_{1 \leq l \leq d-1} C'_{\eta, l}.\end{aligned}$$

The constants chosen above satisfy the following.

Proposition 7.3 ([1], Prop. 5.1). *For all $1 \leq l \leq d-1$, $r \in \Xi$, $t > 1$ and $v = v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge v_l \in V_l \setminus \{0\}$, the following holds*

$$\int_{M_{m \times n}(\mathbb{R})} \|g_t u(x)v\|^{-\eta} d\mu^{(r)}(x) \leq C_\eta t^{-\eta} \|v\|^{-\eta}. \quad (54)$$

For every $0 \leq l \leq d$, we define $\varphi_l : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$\varphi_l(\Lambda) = \max\{\|\Lambda_l\|^{-1} : \Lambda_l \in P(\Lambda), \text{rank}(\Lambda_l) = l\}, \quad (55)$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ is defined as in (47). Also, for $0 \leq l \leq d$, define $\tilde{\varphi}_l : \tilde{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow [1, \infty)$ as $\tilde{\varphi}_l = \varphi_l \circ \pi$. Then it is easy to see that $\tilde{\varphi}_1 \equiv \tilde{\varphi}_d \equiv 1$. We also define $\psi : \tilde{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow (0, \infty]$ as

$$\psi(\tilde{\Lambda}) = \min_{v \in \tilde{\Lambda}} \|v\|^{-1} = \min\{v \in \mathbb{R}^d : \tilde{\Lambda} = [I_{d+1}, v]\pi(\tilde{\Lambda})\}, \quad (56)$$

for all $\tilde{\Lambda} \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}$. Note that $\psi(\tilde{\Lambda}) = \infty$ if and only if $\tilde{\Lambda} \in \mathcal{X}$.

Proposition 7.4. *For all $t > 1$, there exists $\xi(t) \geq 1$, such that the following holds for all $r \in \Xi$ and $\tilde{\Lambda} \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}$,*

$$\int_{M_{m \times n}(\mathbb{R})} \psi^{\eta_l}(g_t u(x)\tilde{\Lambda}) d\mu^{(r)}(x) \leq C_\eta t^{-\eta} \psi^{\eta_l}(\tilde{\Lambda}) + \xi(t) \tilde{\varphi}_1^{\eta_l}(\tilde{\Lambda}).$$

Proof. Fix $t > 1$ and $\tilde{\Lambda} \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}$. Let $\xi'(t) = 2\|\{g_t u(x) : x \in \bigcup_{r \in \Xi} \text{supp}(\mu^{(r)})\}\|$. Let $v_0 \in \tilde{\Lambda}$ be the vector in $\tilde{\Lambda}$ such that $\psi(\tilde{\Lambda}) = \|v_0\|^{-1}$. Claim that for all $x \in \bigcup_{r \in \Xi} \text{supp}(\mu^{(r)})$

$$\psi(g_t u(x)\tilde{\Lambda}) \leq \max\left\{\frac{1}{\|g_t u(x)v_0\|}, \xi'(t)\tilde{\varphi}_1(\tilde{\Lambda})\right\}. \quad (57)$$

To see this claim, note that for any $x \in \bigcup_{r \in \Xi} \text{supp}(\mu^{(r)})$, if $\psi(g_t u(x)\tilde{\Lambda}) > \xi'(t)\tilde{\varphi}_1(\tilde{\Lambda})$, then there exists a vector $v_x \in \tilde{\Lambda}$ such that $\|g_t u(x)v_x\|^{-1} = \psi(g_t u(x)\tilde{\Lambda})$. The vector v_x satisfy

$$\|v_x\| \leq \|g_t u(x)\| \cdot \|g_t u(x)v_x\| < \frac{\xi'(t)}{2} \frac{1}{\xi'(t)\tilde{\varphi}_1(\tilde{\Lambda})} = \frac{1}{2\tilde{\varphi}_1(\tilde{\Lambda})}.$$

This means that v_x is a vector in $\tilde{\Lambda}$, whose length is strictly less than half the length of the shortest vector in $\pi(\tilde{\Lambda})$. This implies that v_x is the shortest vector of $\tilde{\Lambda}$, hence equal v_0 . Thus $\psi(g_t u(x)\tilde{\Lambda}) = \|g_t u(x)v_0\|^{-1}$. This proves the claim.

Let $\xi(t) = (\xi'(t))^{\eta_1}$. Using (57), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{M_{m \times n}(\mathbb{R})} \psi^{\eta_1}(g_t u(x) \tilde{\Lambda}) d\mu^{(r)}(x) &\leq \int_{M_{m \times n}(\mathbb{R})} \frac{1}{\|g_t u(x) v_0\|^{\eta_1}} d\mu^{(r)}(x) + \xi(t) \tilde{\varphi}^{\eta_1}(\tilde{\Lambda}) \\ &\leq C_\eta t^{-\eta} \frac{1}{\|v_0\|^{\eta_1}} + \xi(t) \tilde{\varphi}^{\eta_1}(\tilde{\Lambda}) \\ &= C_\eta t^{-\eta} \psi^{\eta_1}(\tilde{\Lambda}) + \xi(t) \tilde{\varphi}^{\eta_1}(\tilde{\Lambda}), \end{aligned}$$

where penultimate inequality follows from Proposition 7.3. Hence, the proposition follows. \square

Proposition 7.5. *For all $t > 1$, there exists $\xi(t) \geq 1$, such that the following holds for all $1 \leq l \leq d-1$, $r \in \Xi$ and $\tilde{\Lambda} \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}$*

$$\int_{M_{m \times n}(\mathbb{R})} \tilde{\varphi}_l^{\eta_1}(g_t u(x) \tilde{\Lambda}) d\mu^{(r)}(x) \leq C_\eta t^{-\eta} \tilde{\varphi}_l^{\eta_1}(\tilde{\Lambda}) + \xi(t) \left(\max_{1 \leq j \leq \min\{l, d-l\}} \tilde{\varphi}_{l-j}(\tilde{\Lambda}) \tilde{\varphi}_{l+j}(\tilde{\Lambda}) \right)^{\eta_1/2}.$$

Proof. Using the fact that $\tilde{\varphi}_l^{\eta_1}(g_t u(x) \tilde{\Lambda}) = \varphi_l(g_t u(x) \Lambda)$, where $\Lambda = \pi(\tilde{\Lambda})$, the proposition follows immediately from [[1], Prop. 5.2]. \square

Let us define

$$\alpha_\eta = \min \left\{ 1 - \frac{\eta_i}{2} \left(\frac{1}{\eta_{i-j}} + \frac{1}{\eta_{i+j}} \right) : 1 \leq i \leq d-1, 1 \leq j \leq \min_{i, d-i} \right\},$$

where we set $1/\eta_0 = 1/\eta_d = 0$. For $0 < \epsilon < 1$, we define the function $f_{\epsilon, \eta} : \tilde{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$f_{\epsilon, \eta}(\Lambda) = \epsilon^{-2} + \epsilon^{-1} \left(\sum_{l=1}^d \tilde{\varphi}_l^{\eta_1}(\Lambda) \right) + \psi^{\eta_1}(\Lambda). \quad (58)$$

The definition of $f_{\epsilon, \eta}$ is motivated from [[26], Section 5].

Proposition 7.6. *For all $t > 1$, there exists $b = b(t, \eta) \geq 0$ and $0 < \epsilon = \epsilon(t, \eta) < 1$ such that the following holds for all $\tilde{\Lambda} \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}$ and $r \in \Xi$*

$$\int_{M_{m \times n}(\mathbb{R})} f_{\epsilon, \eta}(g_t u(x) \tilde{\Lambda}) d\mu^{(r)}(x) \leq 3C_\eta t^{-\eta} f_{\epsilon, \eta}(\Lambda) + b. \quad (59)$$

Proof. Fix $t > 1$. Let $\xi(t)$ be the maximum of the constants provided by Propositions 7.4 and 7.5. Let $0 < \epsilon < 1$ be a constant to be determined. Suppose $\tilde{\Lambda} \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}$ be arbitrary. Then using Propositions 7.4 and 7.5, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{M_{m \times n}(\mathbb{R})} f_{\epsilon, \eta}(g_t u(x) \tilde{\Lambda}) d\mu^{(r)}(x) \\ &= \epsilon^{-2} + \epsilon^{-1} \left(\int_{M_{m \times n}(\mathbb{R})} \sum_{l=1}^m \tilde{\varphi}_l^{\eta_1}(g_t u(x) \tilde{\Lambda}) d\mu^{(r)}(x) \right) + \int_{M_{m \times n}(\mathbb{R})} \psi^{\eta_1}(g_t u(x) \tilde{\Lambda}) d\mu^{(r)}(x) \\ &\leq \epsilon^{-2} + C_\eta t^{-\eta} \epsilon^{-1} \left(\sum_{l=1}^m \tilde{\varphi}_l^{\eta_1}(\tilde{\Lambda}) \right) + C_\eta t^{-\eta} \psi^{\eta_1}(\tilde{\Lambda}) \\ &+ \epsilon^{-1} \xi(t) \left(\sum_{l=1}^{d-1} \max_{1 \leq j \leq \min\{l, d-l\}} \left(\tilde{\varphi}_{l-j}(\tilde{\Lambda}) \tilde{\varphi}_{l+j}(\tilde{\Lambda}) \right)^{\eta_1/2} \right) + \xi(t) \tilde{\varphi}_1(\tilde{\Lambda}). \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

Note that

$$\tilde{\varphi}_1(\tilde{\Lambda}) \leq \epsilon f_{\epsilon, \eta}(\tilde{\Lambda}). \quad (61)$$

Also, note that

$$\tilde{\varphi}_{l-j}(\tilde{\Lambda}) \leq (\epsilon f_{\epsilon, \eta}(\tilde{\Lambda}))^{\frac{1}{\eta_{l-j}}}, \quad (62)$$

$$\tilde{\varphi}_{l+j}(\tilde{\Lambda}) \leq (\epsilon f_{\epsilon, \eta}(\tilde{\Lambda}))^{\frac{1}{\eta_{l+j}}}, \quad (63)$$

$$1 \leq \left(\epsilon^2 f_{\epsilon, \eta}(\tilde{\Lambda}) \right)^{1 - \frac{\eta_l}{2} \left(\frac{1}{\eta_{l-j}} + \frac{1}{\eta_{l+j}} \right)}. \quad (64)$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\tilde{\varphi}_{l-j}(\tilde{\Lambda}) \tilde{\varphi}_{l+j}(\tilde{\Lambda}) \right)^{\eta_l/2} &\leq \left((\epsilon f_{\epsilon, \eta}(\tilde{\Lambda}))^{\frac{1}{\eta_{l-j}}} (\epsilon f_{\epsilon, \eta}(\tilde{\Lambda}))^{\frac{1}{\eta_{l+j}}} \right)^{\eta_l/2} \quad \text{using (62), (63)} \\ &= (\epsilon f_{\epsilon, \eta}(\tilde{\Lambda}))^{\frac{\eta_l}{2} \left(\frac{1}{\eta_{l-j}} + \frac{1}{\eta_{l+j}} \right)} \\ &\leq (\epsilon f_{\epsilon, \eta}(\tilde{\Lambda}))^{\frac{\eta_l}{2} \left(\frac{1}{\eta_{l-j}} + \frac{1}{\eta_{l+j}} \right)} \left(\epsilon^2 f_{\epsilon, \eta}(\tilde{\Lambda}) \right)^{1 - \frac{\eta_l}{2} \left(\frac{1}{\eta_{l-j}} + \frac{1}{\eta_{l+j}} \right)} \quad \text{using (64)} \\ &\leq \epsilon^{1 + \alpha_\eta} f_{\epsilon, \eta}(\tilde{\Lambda}). \quad (65) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we get from (61), (60) and (65) that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{M_{m \times n}(\mathbb{R})} f_{\epsilon, \eta}(g_t u(x) \tilde{\Lambda}) d\mu^{(r)}(x) &\leq C_\eta t^{-\eta} f_{\epsilon, \eta}(\Lambda) + \epsilon^{-2} (1 - C_\eta t^{-\eta}) \\ &\quad + (d-1) \epsilon^{\alpha_\eta} \xi(t) f_{\epsilon, \eta}(\tilde{\Lambda}) + \epsilon \xi(t) f_{\epsilon, \eta}(\tilde{\Lambda}). \quad (66) \end{aligned}$$

Choose ϵ small enough so that $(d-1) \epsilon^{\alpha_\eta} \xi(t) \leq C_\eta t^{-\eta}$ and $\epsilon \xi(t) \leq C_\eta t^{-\eta}$. Also choose $b = \epsilon^{-1} (1 - C_\eta t^{-\eta})$. Then for this choice of ϵ, b , we get (59) follows from (66). This proves the proposition. \square

8. FINAL PROOF II

Lemma 8.1. *If $(\theta, \xi) \in \text{Sing}(a, b)$, then*

$$\psi(g_t[u(\theta), v(\xi)]\tilde{\Gamma}) \rightarrow \infty$$

as $t \rightarrow \infty$. As a result, $\text{Sing}(a, b) \subset \text{Div}(a, b, 1)$.

Proof. By definition, $(\theta, \xi) \in \text{Sing}(a, b)$ if, for every $\delta > 0$, there exists $T_\delta > 0$ such that for all $t > T_\delta$, there exist integers $(p, q) \in \mathbb{Z}^m \times (\mathbb{Z}^n \setminus \{0\})$ with the vector $z = (p + \theta q + \xi, q) \in u(\theta)\mathbb{Z}^d + v(\xi)$ satisfying:

$$\begin{aligned} |z_i|^{1/a_i} &\leq \frac{\delta}{t} \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq i \leq m, \\ |z_{j+m}|^{1/b_j} &\leq t \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq j \leq n. \end{aligned}$$

This means that for $\tau = \delta^{-a_m/(a_m+b_n)}t$, we have $g_\tau(u(\theta)\mathbb{Z}^d + v(\xi))$ contains the vector $g_\tau z = (z'_1, \dots, z'_d)$, which satisfies

$$|z'_i| = \delta^{-a_i a_m/(a_m+b_n)} t^{a_i} |z_i| \leq \delta^{-a_i a_m/(a_m+b_n)} t^{a_i} \delta^{a_i} t^{-a_i} \leq \delta^{a_m b_n/(a_m+b_n)} \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq i \leq m$$

$$|z'_{j+m}| = \delta^{b_j a_m/(a_m+b_n)} t^{-b_j} |z_{j+m}| \leq \delta^{-b_j a_m/(a_m+b_n)} t^{-b_j} t^{b_j} \leq \delta^{a_m b_n/(a_m+b_n)} \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq j \leq n,$$

where we used the fact that $a_m = \min_i a_i$ and $b_n = \min_j b_j$. This means that

$$\psi(g_\tau[u(\theta), v(\xi)]\tilde{\Gamma}) \geq \delta^{-a_m b_n/(a_m+b_n)}. \quad (67)$$

Note that (67) holds for all $\tau > T_\delta \delta^{-a_m/(a_m+b_n)}$. Since $\delta > 0$ is arbitrary, this lemma follows. \square

Lemma 8.2. *Let $0 < \omega < \omega'$. If $(\theta, \xi) \in \text{Sing}(a, b, \omega')$, then there exist $T_{(\theta, \xi)} := T_{(\theta, \xi)}(\omega)$ such that for all $\epsilon > 0$ and $t > T_{(\theta, \xi)}$, we have*

$$\psi(g_t[u(\theta), v(\xi)]\mathbb{Z}^d) > t^{\frac{a_m b_n \omega}{a_m + b_n + a_m \omega}}.$$

Proof. By definition, if $(\theta, \xi) \in \text{Sing}(a, b, \omega')$, then there exists $T_{(\theta, \xi)}$ such that for all $t > T_{(\theta, \xi)}$, there exists integers $(p, q) \in \mathbb{Z}^m \times (\mathbb{Z}^n \setminus \{0\})$, with the vector $z = (p + \theta q + \xi, q) \in [u(\theta), v(\xi)]\mathbb{Z}^d$ satisfying:

$$|z_i|^{1/a_i} \leq \frac{1}{t^{1+\omega}} \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq i \leq m$$

$$|z_{j+m}|^{1/b_j} \leq t \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq j \leq n.$$

This means that for $\tau = t^{1+\frac{a_m \omega}{a_m+b_n}}$, we have $g_\tau u(\theta)\mathbb{Z}^d$ contains the vector $g_\tau z = (z'_1, \dots, z'_d)$, which satisfies

$$|z'_i| = t^{a_i(1+\frac{a_m \omega}{a_m+b_n})} |z_i| \leq \frac{t^{a_i(1+\frac{a_m \omega}{a_m+b_n})}}{t^{a_i+a_i \omega}} \leq t^{-\frac{a_m b_n \omega}{a_m+b_n}} \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq i \leq m$$

$$|z'_{j+m}| = t^{-b_j(1+\frac{a_m \omega}{a_m+b_n})} |z_{j+m}| \leq t^{-b_j(1+\frac{a_m \omega}{a_m+b_n})} t^{b_j} \leq t^{-\frac{a_m b_n \omega}{a_m+b_n}} \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq j \leq n,$$

where we used the fact that $a_m = \min_i a_i$ and $b_n = \min_j b_j$. This means that

$$\psi(g_\tau[u(\theta), v(\xi)]\mathbb{Z}^d) \geq t^{\frac{a_m b_n \omega}{a_m+b_n}} = \tau^{\frac{a_m b_n \omega}{a_m+b_n+a_m \omega}}. \quad (68)$$

Note that (68) holds for all $\tau > (T_\theta)^{1+a_m \omega/(a_m+b_n)}$. This proves the lemma. \square

Proposition 8.3. *Let $\eta, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_{d-1} \in \mathbb{R}$ be a sequence satisfying the following conditions:*

$$0 < \eta_i \leq \zeta_i(\mu) \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq i \leq d-1,$$

$$\frac{1}{\eta_{i-j}} + \frac{1}{\eta_{i+j}} \leq \frac{2}{\eta_i} \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq i \leq d-1, 1 \leq j \leq \min\{i, d-i\},$$

$$\eta = \min_{1 \leq i \leq d} w_i \eta_i,$$

where $1/\eta_0 = 1/\eta_d := 0$.

Then, the following bounds hold for all $0 < \gamma \leq (s(a_1 + b_1) - \eta)/\eta_1$, $0 < p \leq 1$ and $x \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}} \setminus \mathcal{X}$

$$\dim_P(\text{Divergent}(x, \mathcal{X}, p) \cap \mathcal{K}) \leq s - \frac{p\eta}{a_1 + b_1},$$

$$\dim_P(\{\theta \in \mathcal{K} : \text{there exists } T_\theta > 0 \text{ such that for all } t > T_\theta, \text{ we have } \psi(g_t u(\theta)) \geq t^\gamma\}) \leq s - \frac{1}{a_1 + b_1} (\eta + \eta_1 \gamma).$$

Proof. We divide the proof into two cases.

Case 1 In this case, we assume $\eta, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_{d-1}$ satisfies following strict inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_i &< \zeta_i(\mu) \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq i \leq d-1 \\ \frac{1}{\eta_{i-j}} + \frac{1}{\eta_{i+j}} &< \frac{2}{\eta_i} \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq i \leq d-1, 1 \leq j \leq \min\{i, d-i\}. \end{aligned}$$

In this case, using Proposition 7.6, for every $t > 1$, choose $\epsilon(t)$ and define the collection of height functions

$$\{f_t := f_{\epsilon(t), \eta} : t > 1\}.$$

Now it is easy to see that the action of G on \mathcal{X} satisfies $(\{f_t\}, \eta)$ -contraction hypothesis with respect to measure μ . Indeed, the first two properties of Definition 6.1 follow immediately from the definition of f_t . The third property follows from Proposition 7.6 and for $c = 4C_\eta$ and $T = bt^\eta/C_\eta$ corresponding to each t (note that the value of b also depends on t).

Thus, by Theorem 6.3 and the fact that

$$\{\theta \in \mathcal{K} : \text{there exists } T_\theta > 0 \text{ such that for all } t > T_\theta \text{ we have } \psi(g_t u(\theta)x) \geq t^\gamma\} \subset \{\theta \in \mathcal{K} : \text{there exists } T_\theta > 0 \text{ such that for all } t > T_\theta \text{ and } \tau > 1, \text{ we have } f_\tau(g_t u(\theta)x) \geq t^{\eta_1 \tau}\},$$

the proposition follows in this case.

Case 2 In this case, fix $\eta, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_{d-1}$, which satisfies the condition of the proposition but does not lie in Case 1.

To proceed further, fix a sequence q_1, \dots, q_{d-1} satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} q_i &> 0 \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq i \leq d-1 \\ 2q_i &> q_{i-j} + q_{i+j} \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq i \leq d-1, 1 \leq j \leq \min\{i, d-i\}, \end{aligned}$$

where we define $q_0 = q_d = 0$. The construction of such a sequence is easy.

For every $\delta > 0$, we define the sequence $\eta^{(\delta)}, \eta_1^{(\delta)}, \dots, \eta_{d-1}^{(\delta)}$ as

$$\eta_j^{(\delta)} = \frac{1}{\frac{1}{\eta_j} + \delta q_j}, \quad \eta^{(\delta)} = \min_{1 \leq l \leq d-1} w_l \eta_l^{(\delta)},$$

for all j . It is then clear that the sequence $\eta^\delta, \eta_1^\delta, \dots, \eta_{d-1}^\delta$ falls in Case 1, which gives

$$\dim_P(\text{Divergent}(x, \mathcal{X}, p) \cap \mathcal{K}) \leq s - \frac{p\eta^{(\delta)}}{a_1 + b_1},$$

$$\dim_P(\{\theta \in \mathcal{K} : \text{there exists } T_\theta > 0 \text{ such that for all } t > T_\theta \text{ we have } \psi(g_t u(\theta)x) \geq t^\gamma\}) \leq s - \frac{1}{a_1 + b_1} \left(\eta^{(\delta)} + \frac{\eta_1^{(\delta)} a_m b_n \omega}{a_m + b_n + a_m \omega} \right).$$

Now taking the limit as $\delta \rightarrow 0$, we get that proposition holds in this case as well. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.13. Fix $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Using Remark 1.15, we may assume that $\xi \notin \mathbb{Z}^m$. Then the element $x = [I_d, v(\xi)]\mathbb{Z}^d$ does not belong to \mathcal{X} and we have

$$\text{Div}^\xi(a, b, p) = \text{Divergent}(x, \mathcal{X}, p), \tag{69}$$

$$\text{Sing}^\xi(a, b, \omega) = \bigcap_{\omega' < \omega} \{\theta \in M_{m \times n}(\mathbb{R}) : \text{for all large } t, \text{ we have } \psi(g_t u(\theta)x) \leq t^{\frac{a_m b_n \omega'}{a_m + b_n + a_m \omega'}}\}, \tag{70}$$

where the latter equality follows by Lemma 8.2.

Also note that by Proposition 7.2, we know that $\zeta_l(\mu) > 0$ for all $1 \leq l \leq d-1$. Therefore, we can construct a sequence $\eta_1, \dots, \eta_{d-1}$ such that:

$$\eta_i \leq \zeta_i(\mu), \tag{71}$$

$$\frac{1}{\eta_{i-j}} + \frac{1}{\eta_{i+j}} \leq \frac{2}{\eta_i} \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq i \leq d-1, j \leq \min\{i, d-i\}, \tag{72}$$

where $1/\eta_0 = 1/\eta_d := 0$. For any such sequence, the results in (7) and (8) follow directly from (69), (70) and Proposition 8.3. This completes the proof of the first part of the theorem.

For the second part, observe that the Proposition 7.2 guarantees that the constants defined in (9), (10) and (11) satisfy the conditions in (71) and (72). Thus, the theorem follows. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] Gaurav Aggarwal and Anish Ghosh, *On the packing dimension of weighted singular matrices on fractals*, 2024.
- [2] ———, *Random walks, stationary measures, and inhomogeneous diophantine approximation*, 2024.
- [3] Ayreena Bakhtawar and David Simmons, *Generalised Hausdorff measure of sets of Dirichlet non-improvable matrices in higher dimensions*, Res. Number Theory **9** (2023), no. 3, Paper No. 54, 18. MR4611299
- [4] Yann Bugeaud, Yitwah Cheung, and Nicolas Chevallier, *Hausdorff dimension and uniform exponents in dimension two*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **167** (2019), no. 2, 249–284. MR3991371
- [5] Yann Bugeaud and Michel Laurent, *On exponents of homogeneous and inhomogeneous Diophantine approximation*, Mosc. Math. J. **5** (2005), no. 4, 747–766, 972. MR2266457
- [6] Yitwah Cheung, *Hausdorff dimension of the set of singular pairs*, Ann. of Math. (2) **173** (2011), no. 1, 127–167. MR2753601
- [7] Yitwah Cheung and Nicolas Chevallier, *Hausdorff dimension of singular vectors*, Duke Math. J. **165** (2016), no. 12, 2273–2329. MR3544282
- [8] S. Chow, A. Ghosh, L. Guan, A. Marnat, and D. Simmons, *Diophantine transference inequalities: weighted, inhomogeneous, and intermediate exponents*, Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, Classe di Scienze **XXI** (2020).
- [9] Tushar Das, Lior Fishman, David Simmons, and Mariusz Urbański, *A variational principle in the parametric geometry of numbers*, Adv. Math. **437** (2024), Paper No. 109435, 130. MR4671568
- [10] Alex Eskin, Gregory Margulis, and Shahar Mozes, *Upper bounds and asymptotics in a quantitative version of the Oppenheim conjecture*, Ann. of Math. (2) **147** (1998), no. 1, 93–141. MR1609447
- [11] Kenneth Falconer, *Fractal geometry*, Third, John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Chichester, 2014. Mathematical foundations and applications. MR3236784
- [12] Oleg N. German, *Transference theorems for Diophantine approximation with weights*, Mathematika **66** (2020), no. 2, 325–342. MR4130327
- [13] John E. Hutchinson, *Fractals and self-similarity*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **30** (1981), no. 5, 713–747. MR625600
- [14] Vojtěch Jarník, *Zum Khintchineschen "übertragungssatz"*, 1938 (German).
- [15] S. Kadyrov, D. Kleinbock, E. Lindenstrauss, and G. A. Margulis, *Singular systems of linear forms and non-escape of mass in the space of lattices*, J. Anal. Math. **133** (2017), 253–277. MR3736492
- [16] Osama Khalil, *Singular vectors on fractals and projections of self-similar measures*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **30** (2020), no. 2, 482–535. MR4108614
- [17] A. Khintchine, *Ein Satz über lineare diophantische Approximationen*, Math. Ann. **113** (1937), no. 1, 398–415. MR1513100
- [18] Dong Han Kim and Lingmin Liao, *Dirichlet uniformly well-approximated numbers*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN **24** (2019), 7691–7732. MR4043832
- [19] Taehyeong Kim and Wooyeon Kim, *Hausdorff measure of sets of Dirichlet non-improvable affine forms*, Adv. Math. **403** (2022), Paper No. 108353, 39. MR4404030
- [20] Taehyeong Kim and Jaemin Park, *On a lower bound of Hausdorff dimension of weighted singular vectors*, Mathematika **70** (2024), no. 3, Paper No. e12252, 31. MR4753868

- [21] Dmitry Kleinbock and Nick Wadleigh, *An inhomogeneous Dirichlet theorem via shrinking targets*, *Compos. Math.* **155** (2019), no. 7, 1402–1423. MR3975500
- [22] Lingmin Liao, Ronggang Shi, Omri Solan, and Nattalie Tamam, *Hausdorff dimension of weighted singular vectors in \mathbb{R}^2* , *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)* **22** (2020), no. 3, 833–875. MR4055990
- [23] Roland Prohaska, Cagri Sert, and Ronggang Shi, *Expanding measures: random walks and rigidity on homogeneous spaces*, *Forum Math. Sigma* **11** (2023), Paper No. e59, 61. MR4615460
- [24] Johannes Schleisitz, *Metric results on inhomogeneously singular vectors*, 2022.
- [25] Nimish Shah and Pengyu Yang, *An upper bound of the Hausdorff dimension of singular vectors on affine subspaces*, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. Ser. B* **11** (2024), 1249–1265. MR4819663
- [26] Ronggang Shi, *Pointwise equidistribution for one parameter diagonalizable group action on homogeneous space*, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **373** (2020), no. 6, 4189–4221. MR4105521
- [27] David Simmons and Barak Weiss, *Random walks on homogeneous spaces and Diophantine approximation on fractals*, *Invent. Math.* **216** (2019), no. 2, 337–394. MR3953505
- [28] Omri Solan and Andreas Wieser, *Birkhoff generic points on curves in horospheres*, 2023.
- [29] Omri Nisan Solan, *Parametric geometry of numbers with general flow*, 2021.

Gaurav Aggarwal, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, TATA INSTITUTE OF FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCH,
MUMBAI, INDIA 400005

Email address: gaurav@math.tifr.res.in