

SUPER APPROXIMATION FOR $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}/q\mathbb{Z}) \times \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}/q\mathbb{Z})$

JINCHENG TANG AND XIN ZHANG

ABSTRACT. Let $S \subset \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \times \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ be finite symmetric and assume S generates a group G which is Zariski-dense in $\mathrm{SL}_2 \times \mathrm{SL}_2$. We prove that the Cayley graphs

$$\{\mathrm{Cay}(G(\bmod q), S(\bmod q))\}_{q \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$$

form a family of expanders.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $G = \langle S \rangle$ be a subgroup of $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z})$ with a finite symmetric generating set S . For a positive integer q , let $G_q = G(\bmod q)$ and h_q be the Cheeger constant of the Cayley graph $\mathrm{Cay}(G_q, S(\bmod q))$ given by

$$h_q := \min \left\{ \frac{|\partial A|}{|A|} : A \subset G_q, 0 < A \leq \frac{1}{2}|G_q| \right\},$$

where ∂A is the set of edges in $\mathrm{Cay}(G_q, S(\bmod q))$ connecting one vertex in A and one vertex in $G_q - A$. For a set \mathcal{A} of positive integers, we say G has *super approximation* with respect to \mathcal{A} if there is $\epsilon > 0$ such that $h_q > \epsilon$, $\forall q \in \mathcal{A}$. It is well known that this property is independent of the choice of the finite generating set S . If $\mathcal{A} = \mathbb{Z}_+$, we simply say G has super approximation.

It has been known for decades that a large class of lattices in $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z})$ satisfy the super approximation property, a discovery due to Margulis [Mar73], but the techniques could not be carried over to deal with a non-lattice discrete group. A breakthrough came in 2008, when Bourgain and Gamburd developed an analytic-combinatorial tool which is now called the ‘‘Bourgain-Gamburd expansion machine’’, which allows them to prove the super approximation property for any Zariski-dense subgroup of $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ with respect to prime moduli [BG08b]. A critical ingredient is Helfgott’s triple product theorem [Hel08]. Since then, there has been a series of papers extending Bourgain-Gamburd’s Theorem to more general groups with respect to more general moduli [BG08a], [BG09], [BGS10], [GV12], [Var12], [BV12], [Gol19].

In [GV12] Salehi-Golsefidy and Varjú conjectures:

Conjecture 1.1 (Question 2, [GV12]). *Let $G < \mathrm{SL}_n(\mathbb{Z})$ be finitely generated, then G has the super approximation property with respect to all positive integers if and only if the identity component \mathbb{G}_0 of the Zariski closure \mathbb{G} of G is perfect, i.e. $[\mathbb{G}_0, \mathbb{G}_0] = \mathbb{G}_0$.*

Date: September 12, 2023.

Tang and Zhang are supported by ECS grant 27307320, GRF grant 17317222 and NSFC grant 12001457 from the second author.

In the same paper [GV12], Salehi-Golsefidy-Varjú proved that G has super approximation with respect to square free numbers if \mathbb{G}_0 is perfect. Later Salehi-Golsefidy generalizes to bounded powers of square free numbers:

Theorem A. (Salehi-Golsefidy)[Gol19] *Let $G < SL_n(\mathbb{Z})$ be finitely generated, then G has the super approximation property with respect to bounded powers of square free integers if and only if the identity component \mathbb{G}_0 of the Zariski closure \mathbb{G} of G is perfect, i.e. $[\mathbb{G}_0, \mathbb{G}_0] = \mathbb{G}_0$.*

The full generality of Conjecture 1.1, despite abundant evidence, has still remained a technical challenge. In many of the aforementioned works, a critical ingredient is an appropriate sum-product theorem. In the paper [Gol20], for the purpose of proving Conjecture 1.1 in general, Salehi-Golsefidy conjectured a sum-product phenomenon over finite quotients of rings of algebraic integers. In a separate paper [TZ23], we proved this conjecture:

Theorem B (Tang-Zhang, 2023). *Suppose $0 < \delta \ll 1$, d is a positive integer, and $N_0 \gg_{d,\delta} 1$ is a positive integer. Then there are $0 < \varepsilon := \varepsilon(\delta, d)$ and positive integers $C_1 = C_1(\delta, d), C_2 = C_2(\delta, d), C_3 = C_3(\delta, d)$ such that for any number field K of degree at most d the following holds: Let \mathcal{O} be the ring of integers of K . Suppose \mathfrak{a} is an ideal of \mathcal{O} such that $N(\mathfrak{a}) := |\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{a}| \geq N_0$, and suppose $A \subseteq \mathcal{O}$ such that*

$$|\pi_{\mathfrak{a}}(A)| \geq |\pi_{\mathfrak{a}}(\mathcal{O})|^\delta.$$

Then there are an ideal \mathfrak{a}' of \mathcal{O} , and $a \in \mathcal{O}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{a}^{C_1} &\subseteq \mathfrak{a}', \\ \pi_{\mathfrak{a}'}(\mathbb{Z}a) &\subset \pi_{\mathfrak{a}'}\left(\sum_{C_3} A^{C_2} - \sum_{C_3} A^{C_2}\right), \\ |\pi_{\mathfrak{a}'}(\mathbb{Z}a)| &\geq N(\mathfrak{a})^\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Here, $\pi_{\mathfrak{a}}$ (resp. $\pi_{\mathfrak{a}'}$) is the reduction map $\mathcal{O} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{a}$ (resp. $\mathcal{O} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{a}'$), the set A^{C_2} is the C_2 -fold product of the set A , and the set $\sum_{C_3} A^{C_2}$ is the C_3 -fold sum of the set A^{C_2} .

With this extra ingredient, we can prove our main theorem in this paper:

Theorem 1.2. *Let $S \subset SL_2(\mathbb{Z}) \times SL_2(\mathbb{Z})$ be a finite symmetric set, and assume that it generates a group G which is Zariski-dense in $SL_2 \times SL_2$, then G has the super approximation property with respect to all positive integers.*

We will use Theorem A in the special case $\mathbb{G}_0 = SL_2 \times SL_2$ as a blackbox.

Remark 1.3. In [BV12] Bourgain-Varjú borrowed an extra ingredient from homogeneous dynamics [BFLM11] to get around proving a sum-product theorem, which allowed them to prove Conjecture 1.1 for the case that the Zariski closure of G is SL_d [BV12]. This is the first result without modulus restriction for a general discrete group with a given Zariski-closure. Because of some limitation of the tool from [BFLM11], Bourgain-Varjú could only deal with groups with closure SL_d . Very recently He and De Saxcé extended this tool [HdS19] and managed to prove Conjecture 1.1 if the Zariski closure of G is simple [HdS21].

Remark 1.4. Theorem 1.2 gives the first known case of Conjecture 1.1 without modulus restriction when the Zariski closure of the group is non-simple. Our work here is the first time that a sum-product theorem is implemented to prove an arbitrary modulus case. This requires a modulus gluing process, which is new compared to previous works. Our method can glue different simple factors of the group as well as coprime moduli from a same simple factor.

Remark 1.5. With virtually no modification of the proof, a more general version of Theorem 1.2 can be obtained: Assume $S \subset \mathrm{SL}_2(\frac{1}{q_0}\mathbb{Z}) \times \mathrm{SL}_2(\frac{1}{q_0}\mathbb{Z})$ finite symmetric and generates a group G which is Zariski dense in $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Q}) \times \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Q})$, then G has super approximation with respect to all positive integers coprime to q_0 . In this setting, under the reduction of a modulus q , a rational number $\frac{m}{n}$, $\gcd(n, q) = 1$ is interpreted as $m\bar{n}$ in $\mathbb{Z}/q\mathbb{Z}$ where \bar{n} is the multiplicative inverse of n in $\mathbb{Z}/q\mathbb{Z}$. Such a statement allowing denominators seems not approachable by the method in [BV12] and [HdS21].

Acknowledgements

We thank Zeev Rudnick, Nicolas de Saxcé, He Weikun for comments/suggestions on previous versions of this paper.

2. NOTATION, INITIAL REDUCTION AND SKETCH OF PROOF

We introduce the following notation which we use throughout this paper.

The unit of any multiplicatively written group is denoted by 1. Occasionally, if a ring structure is present, we denote the additive unit by 0. For given two subsets A and B , we denote their product set by $A \cdot B = \{ab | a \in A, b \in B\}$, and their sum set by $A + B = \{a + b | a \in A, b \in B\}$. The k -fold product of A is denoted by A^k , and the k -fold sum of A is denoted by $\sum_k A$.

If f and g are two complex valued functions on a discrete group G , we denote by $f * g$ their convolution

$$f * g(x) = \sum_{y \in G} f(y)g(xy^{-1}).$$

We write $f^{(l)}$ for the k -fold convolution of f with itself.

For a prime p , we write $p^n || q$ if $p^n | q$ but $p^{n+1} \nmid q$. For two integers q_1 and q_2 , we write $q_1 || q_2$ if for every $p^n || q_1$, we also have $p^n || q_2$. The exact division “ $||$ ” can be extended to ideals in a natural way. For a prime ideal \mathcal{P} and a general ideal \mathfrak{a} of a ring \mathcal{O} , we write $\mathcal{P}^n || \mathfrak{a}$ if $\mathcal{P} \supset \mathfrak{a}$ but $\mathcal{P}^{n+1} \not\supset \mathfrak{a}$. Similarly, for two ideals $\mathcal{Q}_1 \supset \mathcal{Q}_2$, we write $\mathcal{Q}_1 || \mathcal{Q}_2$ if for all $\mathcal{P}^n || \mathcal{Q}_1$, we also have $\mathcal{P}^n || \mathcal{Q}_2$.

For $q = \prod_i p_i^{n_i} \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and α a real positive number, we let $q^{\{\alpha\}} = \prod_i p_i^{\lfloor n_i \alpha \rfloor}$, where $\lfloor n_i \alpha \rfloor$ is the integer part of $n_i \alpha$.

Let $\pi_q : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow q\mathbb{Z}$ be the residue map, which induces residue maps in various other contexts, and we denote them by π_q as well.

Let $\Gamma = \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \times \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ and $\Lambda = \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$, $\Gamma_q = \Gamma(\mathrm{mod} q)$ and $\Gamma(q)$ be the kernel of the reduction map $\pi_q : \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma_q$. Same meanings for $\Lambda(q)$ and Λ_q . We denote by $\mathbb{P}_i (i = 1, 2)$ the

projection of $\Lambda \times \Lambda$ to its i^{th} factor. Sometimes we need to reduce the two factors of $\Lambda \times \Lambda$ by two different moduli and we denote by π_{q_1, q_2} the reduction map $\Lambda \times \Lambda \rightarrow \Lambda_{q_1} \times \Lambda_{q_2}$.

For convenience we sometimes adopt Bourgain's notation: we write $f(q) < q^{c+}$ to mean $f(q) < q^{c+\epsilon}$ for arbitrarily small ϵ when q large. Similarly, $f(q) > q^{c-}$ to mean $f(q) > q^{c-\epsilon}$ for arbitrarily small ϵ when q large.

Let χ_S be the normalized uniform counting measure supported on S , i.e., for $A \subset \Lambda \times \Lambda$, $\chi_S(A) = \frac{|A \cap S|}{|S|}$. Let $\pi_q[\chi_S]$ be the pushforward of χ_S under the residue map π_q . Let T_q be the convolution operator by $\pi_q[\chi_S]$, i.e., For $f \in l^2(G_q)$,

$$T_q(f) = \pi_q[\chi_S] * f. \quad (2.1)$$

Then T_q is a self adjoint operator on $l^2(G_q)$ with an invariant subspace $l_0^2(G_q)$ consisting of functions with average 0. Denote the set of eigenvalues of T_q on $l_0^2(G_q)$ by E_q . It follows from Alon and Milman [AM85] that G has super approximation with respect to \mathbb{Z}_+ if and only if there is some constant $c < 1$ independent of q such that $\lambda < c$ for all eigenvalues $\lambda \in E_q$. Then following the argument in [BV12] (Proof of Theorem 1, Page 156-158), Theorem 1.2 can be derived from the following proposition:

Proposition 2.2. *Let $S \subset \Gamma$ be symmetric, and assume that it generates a group G which is Zariski-dense in $\text{SL}_2 \times \text{SL}_2$. Then for any $\epsilon > 0$ there is a $\delta > 0$ such that the following holds. If $q \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ sufficiently large, $A \subset \Gamma$ symmetric, and some integer l satisfying*

$$\chi_S^{(l)}(A) > q^{-\delta}, \quad l > \delta^{-1} \log q \quad \text{and} \quad |\pi_q(A)| < |\Gamma_q|^{1-\epsilon}, \quad (2.3)$$

then

$$|\pi_q(A \cdot A \cdot A)| > |\pi_q(A)|^{1+\delta}. \quad (2.4)$$

It is noted that the reduction in [BV12] uses multiplicity bounds of nontrivial irreducible representations appearing in the regular representation of $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}/q\mathbb{Z})$, which can be extended to $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}/q\mathbb{Z}) \times \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}/q\mathbb{Z})$ as well.

In the rest of the paper we will focus on proving Proposition 2.2. We give a sketch here.

2.1. Sketch of proof for Proposition 2.2. Write $q = q_s q_l$, where q_s is the product of all exact prime power divisors of q with small exponents, and $q_l = q/q_s$.

If q_l is very small, then Theorem A implies that Condition (2.3) is a void condition, so Proposition 2.2 automatically holds.

If q_l is not so small, then we assume a set A satisfies all the assumptions in (2.3) but fails the conclusion (2.4) and tries to arrive at a contradiction. On the first stage, we show that there is a large exact divisor q' of q and some constant C such that $\mathbb{P}_1(A^C)$ (or $\mathbb{P}_2(A^C)$) contains a large congruence subgroup of $\Lambda_{q'}$ (Proposition 5.6). For this we follow closely the method in [BG08a] and [BG09]. The following steps are interpreted under the reduction of appropriate divisors of q_l .

- (1) Apply Helfgott's argument to find a large set \mathcal{A} of commuting elements.
- (2) Find an element ζ from $\mathbb{P}_1(A)$ not commutative with \mathcal{A} .

- (3) Taking commutator of ζ with \mathcal{A} reveals a sum-product structure. Apply Theorem [B](#) to produce a one parameter group \mathcal{P} .
- (4) Find elements to conjugate \mathcal{P} to other directions, then \mathcal{P} and these conjugates will generate a congruence subgroup \mathcal{B} modulo a small divisor of q' .
- (5) Take $\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_2$ of appropriate levels that can be generated from Step 4 and take commutator of $\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_2$ iteratively, one can generate the desired large congruence subgroup mod q' .

On the second stage, we try to glue local pieces together. Proposition [6.1](#) is the main gluing tool. To illustrate the idea, let us suppose a set $B \subset \Lambda_{q_1} \times \Lambda_{q_2}$ such that $\mathbb{P}_1(B), \mathbb{P}_2(B)$ are very large subsets of $\Lambda_{q_1}, \Lambda_{q_2}$ for two exact and not necessarily coprime divisors q_1, q_2 of q . Let's just say $\mathbb{P}_1(B) = \Lambda_{q_1}$ and $\mathbb{P}_2(B) = \Lambda_{q_2}$. We claim we can find a large exact divisor q_3 of q_2 such that a product set of $A \cup B$ can cover a very large subset of $\Lambda_{q_1} \times \Lambda_{q_3}$ modulo (q_1, q_3) . For this, we consider a connecting map

$$\psi : \Lambda_{q_1} \rightarrow B$$

such that $\mathbb{P}_1 \circ \psi$ is identity. Take a small parameter $0 < \theta < 1$. According to a dichotomy ([Proposition 3.1](#)), there are two scenarios:

- (1) There exists a large exact divisor q_3 of q_2 , and $x, y \in \Lambda_{q_1}$ such that for any $p^n || q_3$, $\psi(xy) \neq \psi(x)\psi(y) \pmod{p^{n\theta}}$.
- (2) There exists a large exact divisor \tilde{q}_3 of q_2 , and a large subset S of Λ_{q_1} such that for any $x, y \in S$, any $p^n || q_3$, $\psi(xy) = \psi(x)\psi(y) \pmod{p^{n\theta}}$.

In the first scenario, one can conjugate the element $\psi(xy)\psi(x)^{-1}\psi(y)^{-1}$ by B and created a large subset with first component 1, from which claim easily follows.

In the second scenario, we consider two subcases. If for a large exact divisor q_3 of \tilde{q}_3 such that $\pi_{q_3^{\{\theta\}}} \circ \mathbb{P}_2 \circ \psi = 1$, then by taking commutator of $\psi(\Lambda_{q_1})$ iteratively one can recover a large set with second component 1, from which the claim follows.

If for a large exact divisor q_3 of \tilde{q}_3 such that for any $p^n || q_3$, we have $\pi_{q_3^{\{\theta/2\}}} \circ \mathbb{P}_2 \circ \psi \neq 1$, then one can construct a one-parameter group \mathcal{P} that captures all the prime divisors of q_1 and q_3 . Then one can prove the claim by following Step 4 and 5 on the first stage.

The idea of considering the connecting map ψ comes from Bourgain's gluing scheme for \mathbb{Z}_q (See Lemma 6.71 of [\[Bou08\]](#)). But compared to \mathbb{Z}_q which has two algebraic operations, we are dealing with a nonabelian group with only one operation. As a compensation, we need extra help from the set A . otherwise, a simple counter example can be found.

Once the claim is established, one can apply the claim iteratively to create a large subset of Γ_q , which forces [\(2.4\)](#) to hold afterall.

3. PRELIMINARIES ON COMBINATORICS

The first ingredient is a generalization of Corollary 6.9 in [\[Bou08\]](#) which proved the case G_1, G_2 abelian and $\gcd(|G_1|, |G_2|) = 1$.

Proposition 3.1. *Let G_1, G_2 be two finite multiplicative groups and let $\psi : G_1 \rightarrow G_2$ some map. Then for $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{1}{1600}$ we have either*

$$|\{(x, y) \in G_1 \times G_1 \mid \psi(xy) = \psi(x)\psi(y)\}| < (1 - \varepsilon) |G_1|^2, \text{ or} \quad (3.2)$$

there exists a subset $S \subset G_1$ with $|S| > (1 - \sqrt{\varepsilon})|G_1|$ and a group homomorphism $f : G_1 \rightarrow G_2$ such that

$$f|_S = \psi|_S. \quad (3.3)$$

Remark. If $\gcd(|G_1|, |G_2|) = 1$, then (3.3) implies

$$|\{x \in G_1 \mid \psi(x) \neq 1\}| < \sqrt{\varepsilon} |G_1|.$$

Proposition 3.1 relies on the following Lemma 3.4 and Theorem 3.5.

Lemma 3.4. *Let A be a finite subset of a multiplicative group Z and $\mathcal{G} \subset A \times A$, $0 < \varepsilon < 1/4$, such that*

$$|\mathcal{G}| > (1 - \varepsilon)|A|^2$$

Then there exists a subset A' of A satisfying

$$|A'| > (1 - \sqrt{\varepsilon})|A|$$

and

$$|A'A'| < \frac{|A \overset{\mathcal{G}}{\cdot} A|^4}{(1 - \sqrt{\varepsilon})(1 - 2\sqrt{\varepsilon})^2 |A|^3},$$

where $A \overset{\mathcal{G}}{\cdot} A := \{ab \mid (a, b) \in \mathcal{G}\}$.

Proof of Lemma 3.4. The proof was stated in [BGS] for an additive group Z . The same proof works for an arbitrary group as well.

Theorem 3.5 (Noncommutative Freiman-Kneser theorem for small doubling). *Let $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$, and let $S \subset G$ be a finite non-empty subset of a multiplicative group G such that $|A \cdot S| \leq (2 - \varepsilon)|S|$ for some finite set A of cardinality $|A|$ at least $|S|$, where $A \cdot S := \{as \mid a \in A, s \in S\}$ is the product set of A and S . Then there exists a finite subgroup H of G with cardinality $|H| \leq C(\varepsilon)|S|$, such that S is covered by at most $C'(\varepsilon)$ right-cosets $H \cdot x$ of H , where one can take $C(\varepsilon), C'(\varepsilon) \leq \frac{2}{\varepsilon} - 1$.*

Remark 3.6. Theorem 3.5 is due to Hamidoune. For a proof of Theorem 3.5, See the article ‘‘Hamidoune’s Freiman-Kneser theorem for nonabelian groups’’ in Terence Tao’s blog which gives a concise proof.

Proof of Lemma 3.1. We follow the ideas of Bourgain in his proof of Corollary 6.9 in [Bou08]. Suppose (3.2) fails, so that

$$\mathcal{G} = \{(x, y) \in G_1 \times G_1 \mid \psi(xy) = \psi(x)\psi(y)\}$$

satisfies

$$|\mathcal{G}| \geq (1 - \varepsilon) |G_1|^2.$$

Denote

$$A = \{(x, \psi(x)) \mid x \in G_1\} \subset G_1 \times G_2$$

and consider \mathcal{G} as a graph on A . Obviously, $A \overset{\mathcal{G}}{\cdot} A := \{ab \mid (a, b) \in \mathcal{G}\} \subset A$; hence

$$|G_1| = |A| \geq |A \overset{\mathcal{G}}{\cdot} A|. \quad (3.7)$$

Apply Lemma 3.4 with $Z = G_1 \times G_2$. We obtain a subset $A' \subset A$ satisfying

$$|A'| > (1 - \sqrt{\varepsilon}) |G_1| \quad (3.8)$$

and

$$|A'A'| < \frac{|G_1|}{(1 - \sqrt{\varepsilon})(1 - 2\sqrt{\varepsilon})^2} < (1 + 10\sqrt{\varepsilon}) |A'| < \frac{5}{4} |A'|. \quad (3.9)$$

Next, apply Theorem 3.5 to $A' \subset G_1 \times G_2$. There is a subgroup H of $G_1 \times G_2$ and $(x_1, x_2) \in G_1 \times G_2$ such that

$$A' \subset (x_1, x_2) \cdot H \quad (3.10)$$

$$|H| < \frac{5}{3} |A'| \quad (3.11)$$

Let \mathbb{P}_1 be the projection map $G_1 \times G_2 \rightarrow G_1$. The set relation (3.10) implies $\psi(y) = x_2 f(x_1^{-1}y)$ for all $y \in \mathbb{P}_1(A')$.

Let $H_1 = \mathbb{P}_1(H)$. We have

$$|H_1| \geq |\mathbb{P}_1(A')| = |A'| \stackrel{(3.8)}{>} (1 - \sqrt{\varepsilon}) |G_1| > \frac{1}{2} |G_1|,$$

implying that $H_1 = G_1$. Then for any $x \in G_1$, there exists $f(x) \in G_2$ such that $(x, f(x)) \in H$. Assume there exists $(y, z_1), (y, z_2) \in H$ with $z_1 \neq z_2$. Then for any $x \in G_1$, $(x, f(x)z_1z_2^{-1}) \in H$ with $(x, f(x)z_1z_2^{-1}) \neq (x, f(x))$. So $|H| \geq 2|G_1| \geq 2|A'|$. Contradiction. Hence the choice of $f(x)$ is unique for all x . Since H is a subgroup, we get $(1, 1) \in H$ so $f(1) = 1$. Also we see $(y_1, f(y_1))(y_2^{-1}, f(y_2^{-1})) = (y_1y_2^{-1}, f(y_1)f(y_2^{-1})) = (y_1y_2^{-1}, f(y_1y_2^{-1}))$, so f is a group homomorphism.

Since

$$|\mathbb{P}_1(A')| = |A'| > (1 - \sqrt{\varepsilon}) |G_1|,$$

we deduce

$$|\mathcal{G} \cap (\mathbb{P}_1(A') \times \mathbb{P}_1(A'))| \geq |\mathcal{G}| + |\mathbb{P}_1(A') \times \mathbb{P}_1(A')| - |G_1|^2 > (1 - 2\sqrt{\varepsilon}) |G_1|^2$$

by inclusion-exclusion; and hence

$$\left| \mathbb{P}_1(A') \overset{\mathcal{G}}{\cdot} \mathbb{P}_1(A') \right| \geq \frac{|\mathcal{G} \cap (\mathbb{P}_1(A') \times \mathbb{P}_1(A'))|}{|G_1|} > (1 - 2\sqrt{\varepsilon}) |G_1|.$$

Therefore, $\mathbb{P}_1(A') \cap \left[\mathbb{P}_1(A') \overset{\mathcal{G}}{\cdot} \mathbb{P}_1(A') \right] \neq \emptyset$; and for $(y_1, y_2) \in \mathcal{G} \cap (\mathbb{P}_1(A') \times \mathbb{P}_1(A'))$ with $y_1y_2 \in \mathbb{P}_1(A')$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} x_2 f(x_1^{-1}y_1y_2) &= \psi(y_1y_2) = \psi(y_1)\psi(y_2) = x_2 f(x_1^{-1}y_1)x_2 f(x_1^{-1}y_2). \\ &\Rightarrow f(x_1) = x_2 \Rightarrow (x_1, x_2) \in H \Rightarrow A' \subset H. \end{aligned}$$

We finish the proof by taking $S = \mathbb{P}_1(A')$.

We also need the following bounded generation result over $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \times \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$.

Proposition 3.12. *For any $0 < \delta < \frac{1}{25}$ there exists $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(\delta) > 0$ and an absolute constant $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the following holds:*

Let $A \subset \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}/q_1\mathbb{Z}) \times \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}/q_2\mathbb{Z})$ be symmetric and $|A| > (q_1q_2)^{3-\delta}$. Then there exists $q'_1|q_1, q'_2|q_2, q'_1q'_2 < (q_1q_2)^{40\delta}$ such that

$$A^{2880} \supset \Lambda(q'_1)/\Lambda(q_1) \times \Lambda(q'_2)/\Lambda(q_2).$$

In [Hel08] Helfgott proved that given $A \subset \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{F}_p)$ with $|A| > p^{\frac{8}{3}}$, then $A \cdot A \cdot A = \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{F}_p)$ for a sufficiently large prime p . Helfgott's result can be obtained in an elegant way by a representation theoretical approach due to Gowers [Gow08]. There seems limitation when applying Gowers' approach to deal with composite modulus except prime powers. We adopt ideas from Helfgott's original approach for the proof of Proposition 3.12.

We start with a few lemmas.

Lemma 3.13. *Let $0 < \gamma < \frac{1}{4}$ and let $A, B \in \mathbb{Z}/q\mathbb{Z}$ with $|A|, |B| > q^{1-\gamma}$, then there exists $q'|q, q' < q^{\frac{12\gamma}{5}}$ such that*

$$q'\mathbb{Z}/q\mathbb{Z} \subset \sum_{24} AB - AB.$$

Remark 3.14. The proof is the same as the proof of Corollary A.13 in [TZ23a] up to minor modification.

We need a dimension-2 analog of Lemma 3.13.

Lemma 3.15. *Let $0 < \delta < \frac{1}{8}$. Let $q_1, q_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ and A, B be subsets of $\mathbb{Z}/q_1\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/q_2\mathbb{Z}$ such that $|A|, |B| > (q_1q_2)^{1-\delta}$. Then there exists $q'_1|q_1, q'_2|q_2, q'_1q'_2 < (q_1q_2)^{10\delta}$, such that*

$$\sum_{96} AB - AB \supset q'_1\mathbb{Z}/q_1\mathbb{Z} \times q'_2\mathbb{Z}/q_2\mathbb{Z}. \quad (3.16)$$

Proof. Let $\mathbb{P}_i, i = 1, 2$ be the projection from $\mathbb{Z}/q_1\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/q_2\mathbb{Z}$ to the i -th component. Without loss of generality we assume $q_1 = q_2^\alpha$ for some $0 < \alpha \leq 1$. Since $|A| > (q_1q_2)^{1-\delta}$, there is $x_0 \in A$ such that

$$|\{x \in A : \mathbb{P}_1(x) = x_0\}| > (q_1q_2)^{1-\delta}/q_1 > q_2^{1-\delta-\alpha\delta},$$

which implies there is $A' \subset A - A, |A'| > (q_1q_2)^{1-\delta}/q_1 > q_2^{1-\delta-\alpha\delta}, \mathbb{P}_1(A) = \{0\}$. Similarly, there is $B' \subset B - B, |B'| > (q_1q_2)^{1-\delta}/q_1 > q_2^{1-\delta-\alpha\delta}, \mathbb{P}_1(B) = 0$. Applying Lemma 3.13, we obtain $q'_2|q_2, q'_2 < q_2^{\frac{12(\delta+\alpha\delta)}{5}}$ such that

$$\sum_{48} (AB - AB) \supset \sum_{24} (A'B' - A'B') \supset q_1\mathbb{Z}/q_1\mathbb{Z} \times q'_2\mathbb{Z}/q_2\mathbb{Z}. \quad (3.17)$$

If $\alpha < 5\delta$, then one can take $q'_1 = q_1$ and we have $q'_1q'_2 < q_2^{10\delta}$. If $\alpha > 5\delta$, then there exists $A'' \subset A - A, B'' \subset B - B$, such that $|A''|, |B''| > q_1^{1-\delta-\frac{\delta}{\alpha}}, \mathbb{P}_2(A'') = \mathbb{P}_2(B'') = \{0\}$. The

exponent $1 - \delta - \delta/\alpha$ exceeds $3/4$, so applying Lemma 3.13, we obtain $q'_1 |q_1$, $q'_1 < q_1^{\frac{12(\delta + \frac{\delta}{\alpha})}{5}}$, such that

$$\sum_{48} (AB - AB) \supset \sum_{24} (A''B'' - A''B'') \supset q'_1 \mathbb{Z}/q_1 \mathbb{Z} \times q_2 \mathbb{Z}/q_2 \mathbb{Z}. \quad (3.18)$$

Adding (3.17) and (3.18), we obtain 3.16, with

$$q'_1 q'_2 < q_1^{\frac{12(\delta + \frac{\delta}{\alpha})}{5}} q_2^{\frac{12(\delta + \alpha\delta)}{5}} = (q_1 q_2)^{\frac{24\delta}{5}}.$$

□

Proof of Proposition 3.12. Since $|A| > (q_1 q_2)^{3-\delta}$, by the pigeon hole principle, there exists $\vec{v} \in (\mathbb{Z}/q_1 \mathbb{Z})^2, \vec{w} \in (\mathbb{Z}/q_2 \mathbb{Z})^2$, such that the cardinality of the set

$$\{(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) : \gamma_1 \text{ has lower row } \vec{v}, \gamma_2 \text{ has lower row } \vec{w}\}$$

exceeds $(q_1 q_2)^{1-\delta}$. This implies the cardinality of the set

$$A_1 := A \cdot A^{-1} \cap \left\{ \left(\begin{pmatrix} 1 & m \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & n \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right) : m \in \mathbb{Z}/q_1 \mathbb{Z}, n \in \mathbb{Z}/q_2 \mathbb{Z} \right\}$$

exceeds $(q_1 q_2)^{1-\delta}$.

Similarly, if we let

$$A_2 := A \cdot A^{-1} \cap \left\{ \left(\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ m & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ n & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right) : m \in \mathbb{Z}/q_1 \mathbb{Z}, n \in \mathbb{Z}/q_2 \mathbb{Z} \right\}.$$

Then, $|A_2| > (q_1 q_2)^{1-\delta}$.

Define an equivalence relation \sim on $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}/q_1 \mathbb{Z}) \times \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}/q_2 \mathbb{Z})$ as:

$$(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \sim (\gamma'_1, \gamma'_2)$$

if and only if the second rows of γ_1, γ'_1 are up to a scalar in $(\mathbb{Z}/q_1 \mathbb{Z})^*$, and the second rows of γ_2, γ'_2 are up to a scalar in $(\mathbb{Z}/q_2 \mathbb{Z})^*$. There are at most $q_1 q_2$ many such classes. By pigeon hole, there exists one class which contains at least $(q_1 q_2)^{2-\delta}$ many elements from A . This implies the set

$$H_0 = A \cdot A^{-1} \cap \left\{ \left(\begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & x \\ 0 & \lambda_1^{-1} \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_2 & y \\ 0 & \lambda_2^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \right) : \lambda_1 \in (\mathbb{Z}/q_1 \mathbb{Z})^*, x \in \mathbb{Z}/q_1 \mathbb{Z}, \lambda_2 \in (\mathbb{Z}/q_2 \mathbb{Z})^*, y \in \mathbb{Z}/q_2 \mathbb{Z} \right\}$$

has cardinality $> (q_1 q_2)^{2-\delta}$. By pigeon hole again, there exists $m_0 \in \mathbb{Z}/q_1 \mathbb{Z}, n_0 \in \mathbb{Z}/q_2 \mathbb{Z}$ such that

$$H = A \cdot A^{-1} \cap \left\{ \left(\begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & x_0 \\ 0 & \lambda_1^{-1} \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_2 & y_0 \\ 0 & \lambda_2^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \right) : \lambda_1 \in (\mathbb{Z}/q_1 \mathbb{Z})^*, \lambda_2 \in (\mathbb{Z}/q_2 \mathbb{Z})^* \right\}$$

has cardinality $> (q_1 q_2)^{1-\delta}$.

By the elementary computation

$$\begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & x_0 \\ 0 & \lambda_1^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & m \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & x_0 \\ 0 & \lambda_1^{-1} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \lambda_1^2 m \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

and similarly

$$\begin{pmatrix} \lambda_2 & y_0 \\ 0 & \lambda_2^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & n \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_2 & y_0 \\ 0 & \lambda_2^{-1} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \lambda_2^2 n \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

Applying Lemma 3.15 to the set

$$\left\{ (\lambda_1^2, \lambda_2^2) : \left(\begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & x_0 \\ 0 & \lambda_1^{-1} \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_2 & y_0 \\ 0 & \lambda_2^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \right) \in H \right\}$$

and $\left\{ (m, n) : \left(\begin{pmatrix} 1 & m \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & n \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right) \in A_1 \right\}$ with exponent $1-2\delta$, then we obtain $Q_1|q_1, Q_2|q_2$, $Q_1Q_2 < (q_1q_2)^{20\delta}$ such that

$$(A \cdot A^{-1})^{288} \supset \left\{ \left(\begin{pmatrix} 1 & Q_1\mathbb{Z}/q_1\mathbb{Z} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & Q_2\mathbb{Z}/q_2\mathbb{Z} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right) \right\}$$

Similarly, we can obtain $Q'_1|q_1, Q'_2|q_2, Q'_1Q'_2 < (q_1q_2)^{20\delta}$ such that

$$(A \cdot A^{-1})^{288} \supset \left\{ \left(\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ Q'_1\mathbb{Z}/q_1\mathbb{Z} & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ Q'_2\mathbb{Z}/q_2\mathbb{Z} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right) \right\}$$

Let $Q_1^* = \text{lcm}(Q_1, Q'_1)$, $Q_2^* = \text{lcm}(Q_2, Q'_2)$. It is an elementary exercise to check that for $m < n$, any element of the group

$$\left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) : a, d \equiv 1 \pmod{p^{\min\{2m, n\}}}, b, c \equiv 0 \pmod{p^{\min\{2m, n\}}} \right\}$$

can be written as a $a_1b_1a_2b_2a_3$, where $a_1, a_2, a_3 \in \begin{pmatrix} 1 & p^m\mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ and $b_1, b_2 \in \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ p^m\mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z} & 1 \end{pmatrix}$.

From this it follows that if we let $q'_1 = \text{gcd}((Q_1^*)^2, q_1)$, $q'_2 = \text{gcd}((Q_2^*)^2, q_2)$, then

$$(A \cdot A^{-1})^{1440} \supset \Lambda(q'_1)/\Lambda(q_1) \times \Lambda(q'_2)/\Lambda(q_2).$$

4. PRELIMINARIES ON RANDOM WALKS

Recall that S be a finitely symmetric set on $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \times \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ such that $\langle S \rangle$ is Zariski-dense, and χ_S be the uniform probability measure supported on S . The following lemmas are quantitative statements about non-concentration of self-convolutions of χ_S in proper subvarieties.

For the discussion in the following in this section, we prefix a primitive linear form

$$L \left(\left(\begin{pmatrix} x_1 & y_1 \\ z_1 & w_1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} x_2 & y_2 \\ z_2 & w_2 \end{pmatrix} \right) \right) = X_1x_1 + Y_1y_1 + Z_1z_1 + W_1w_1 + X_2x_2 + Y_2y_2 + Z_2z_2 + W_2w_2,$$

i.e., $\text{gcd}(X_1, Y_1, Z_1, W_1, X_2, Y_2, Z_2, W_2) = 1$.

Proposition 4.1. *Let S be a finitely symmetric set on $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \times \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ such that $\langle S \rangle$ is Zariski-dense in $\text{SL}_2 \times \text{SL}_2$. Let χ_S be the uniform probability measure supported on S . There is a constant $c > 0$ such that for $Q \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, for any $l > \log Q$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have*

$$\pi_Q^*[\chi_S^{(l)}] (\{g \in \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \times \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) | L(g) \equiv n \pmod{Q}\}) < Q^{-c}.$$

Proposition 4.2. *There is a constant c such that the following holds. Let $Q \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ large enough and $\xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2), \eta = (\eta_1, \eta_2) \in Mat_2(\mathbb{Z}) \times Mat_2(\mathbb{Z})$ satisfy*

$$Tr(\xi_1) = Tr(\xi_2) = Tr(\eta_1) = Tr(\eta_2) = 0 \quad (4.3)$$

$$\pi_p(\xi_1), \pi_p(\xi_2), \pi_p(\eta_1), \pi_p(\eta_2) \neq 0 \text{ for every } p|Q, \quad (4.4)$$

Then for $l > \log Q$,

$$\chi_S^{(l)}(\{(g_1, g_2) \in SL_2(\mathbb{Z}) | Tr(g_1 \xi_1 g_1^{-1} \eta_1) + Tr(g_2 \xi_2 g_2^{-1} \eta_2) \equiv 0 \pmod{Q}\}) < Q^{-c}.$$

We focus on proving Proposition 4.1; Proposition 4.2 follows in a similar way. We first show that Proposition 4.1 follow from

Lemma 4.5. *There are constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ depending only on S such that for any $Q \in \mathbb{Z}_+, n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and for $l \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ with $1 \ll_S l < c_1 \log Q$, we have*

$$\chi_S^{(l)}(\{g \in SL_2(\mathbb{Z}) \times SL_2(\mathbb{Z}) | L(g) \equiv n \pmod{Q}\}) < e^{-c_2 l}. \quad (4.6)$$

Proof of Proposition 4.1 assuming Lemma 4.5. Let c_1, c_2 be the constants given by Lemma 4.5.

Let $l_0 = [c_1 \log Q]$ and write $\chi_S^{(l)} = \chi_S^{l_0} * \chi_S^{(l-l_0)}$. For any g' in the support of $\chi_S^{l-l_0}$, let $L_{g'}(g) = L(gg')$. Clearly, $L_{g'}$ is also primitive, so Lemma 4.5 is applicable to $L_{g'}$. Therefore,

$$\pi_Q^*[\chi_S^{(l)}](\{g \in SL_2(\mathbb{Z}) \times SL_2(\mathbb{Z}) | L(g) \equiv n \pmod{Q}\}) \quad (4.7)$$

$$= \sum_{g' \in \Gamma} \pi_Q^*[\chi_S^{(l_0)}](\{g \in SL_2(\mathbb{Z}) \times SL_2(\mathbb{Z}) | L_{(g')^{-1}}(g) \equiv n \pmod{Q}\}) \chi_S^{(l-l_0)}(g') \quad (4.8)$$

$$\leq Q^{-c_1 c_2} \quad (4.9)$$

Proposition 4.1 is proved by taking $c = c_1 c_2$. \square

Now we focus on proving Lemma 4.5.

Lemma 4.10 (Non-concentration at Archimedean place). *There is a constant $c = c(S) > 0$ such that for any $l \gg_S 1$, we have*

$$\chi_S^{(l)}(\{g \in SL_2(\mathbb{Z}) \times SL_2(\mathbb{Z}) : L(g) = n\}) < e^{-cl}.$$

Proof. By Theorem A, there exists an absolute constant $0 < \lambda < 1$ which is the upper bound for all eigenvalues of the family of the operators $T_p : l_0^2(\Gamma) \rightarrow l_0^2(\Gamma)$ defined at (2.1). So

$$\|\chi_S^{(l)} - \frac{1}{|\pi_p(\Gamma)|} \mathbf{1}_{\pi_p(\Gamma)}\|_2 \leq \lambda^l \quad (4.11)$$

for all prime p . Then since $|\pi_p(\Gamma)| \approx p^6$, if $l > \frac{6 \log p}{(\log 1/\lambda)}$,

$$\chi_S^{(l)}(g) < \frac{2}{|\pi_p(\Gamma)|} \quad (4.12)$$

for any $g \in \pi_p(\Gamma)$. Therefore,

$$\chi_S^{(l)}\{g \in SL_2(\mathbb{Z}) \times SL_2(\mathbb{Z}) : L(g) = n\}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \chi_S^{(l)} \{g \in \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \times \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) : L(g) \equiv n \pmod{p}\} \\ &< \frac{4}{p} \end{aligned}$$

by counting points in the subvariety of codimension 1 determined by the primitive linear equation. So we are done by picking any prime $p \in [e^{\frac{l}{8} \log \frac{1}{\lambda}}, e^{\frac{l}{7} \log \frac{1}{\lambda}}]$, which exists by the Prime Number Theorem when l is sufficiently large. This finishes the proof of Lemma 4.10. \square

We follow the idea of proof from Bourgain and Gamburd [BG09] to prove Lemma 4.5. The proof requires the Effective Bézout Identity [BY91]. For readers' convenience, we record it here:

Theorem C (The Effective Bézout Identity). *Let $\mathcal{P}_1, \dots, \mathcal{P}_N \in \mathbb{Z}[z_1, \dots, z_n]$ without common zeros in \mathbb{C}^n with $n \geq 2$, $\deg \mathcal{P}_j \leq d$, $d \geq 3$, $h(\mathcal{P}_j) \leq h$. Here $h(\mathcal{P}) = \log \max_i |a_i|$ for $\mathcal{P}(x) = a_0 + a_1x + a_2x^2 + \dots + a_nx^n$ is the logarithm height function of polynomials. Then there is an integer $D \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, polynomials $\mathcal{Q}_1, \dots, \mathcal{Q}_N \in \mathbb{Z}[z_1, \dots, z_n]$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_1 \mathcal{Q}_1 + \dots + \mathcal{P}_N \mathcal{Q}_N &= D, \\ \deg \mathcal{Q}_j &\leq n(2n+1)d^n, \\ h(\mathcal{Q}_j) &\leq \mathfrak{X}(n)d^{8n+3}(h + \log N + d \log d), \\ \log D &\leq \mathfrak{X}(n)d^{8n+3}(h + \log N + d \log d), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathfrak{X}(n)$ is an effective constant which only depends on n and can be computed explicitly.

Proof of Lemma 4.5. Write $Q = \prod_{i \in I} p_i^{n_i}$. We divide our proof into two cases $n = 0$ and $n \neq 0$. We first deal with the case $n = 0$.

By the primitivity of L , for each $p|Q$, at least one of

$$t \in \mathcal{A} := \{X_1, Y_1, Z_1, W_1, X_2, Y_2, Z_2, W_2\}$$

must be invertible mod p . For each $t \in \mathcal{A}$, let

$$Q_t = \prod_{\substack{p_i|Q \\ \gcd(p_i, t)=1}} p_i^{n_i}$$

Since $\prod_{t \in \mathcal{A}} Q_t \geq Q$, there exists $t \in \mathcal{A}$ such that

$$Q' := Q_t \geq Q^{\frac{1}{8}}.$$

Assume $t = X_1$ without loss of generality. Other cases are similar. Then $Q' || Q$ and $(Q', X_1) = 1$.

Now let

$$\|(g_1, g_2)\| = \max\{\text{absolute values of coefficients of } g_1 \text{ and } g_2\}.$$

Let C_1 be an upper bound of $\|g\|$ for all $g \in \text{supp } \chi_S$. Define

$$\mathcal{G} = \left\{ g \in \prod_l \text{supp } [\chi_S] \mid L(g) \equiv 0 \pmod{Q'} \right\}.$$

To show (4.6), it suffices to show

$$\chi_S^{(l)}(\mathcal{G}) < e^{-cl}.$$

For each $\gamma = \left(\begin{pmatrix} x_1 & y_1 \\ z_1 & w_1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} x_2 & y_2 \\ z_2 & w_2 \end{pmatrix} \right) \in \mathcal{G}$ we introduce a linear polynomial $f_\gamma(\tilde{Y}_1, \tilde{Z}_1, \tilde{W}_1, \tilde{X}_2, \tilde{Y}_2, \tilde{Z}_2, \tilde{W}_2) \in \mathbb{Q}[\tilde{Y}_1, \tilde{Z}_1, \tilde{W}_1, \tilde{X}_2, \tilde{Y}_2, \tilde{Z}_2, \tilde{W}_2]$ as follows:

$$f_\gamma(\tilde{Y}_1, \tilde{Z}_1, \tilde{W}_1, \tilde{X}_2, \tilde{Y}_2, \tilde{Z}_2, \tilde{W}_2) = x_1 + \tilde{Y}_1 y_1 + \tilde{Z}_1 z_1 + \tilde{W}_1 w_1 + \tilde{X}_2 x_2 + \tilde{Y}_2 y_2 + \tilde{Z}_2 z_2 + \tilde{W}_2 w_2 \quad (4.13)$$

Then we get

$$X_1 f_\gamma(Y_1 \bar{X}_1, Z_1 \bar{X}_1, W_1 \bar{X}_1, X_2 \bar{X}_1, Y_2 \bar{X}_1, Z_2 \bar{X}_1, W_2 \bar{X}_1) \equiv 0 \pmod{Q'} \text{ for all } \gamma \in \mathcal{G}. \quad (4.14)$$

Here \bar{X}_1 is the multiplicative inverse of $X_1 \pmod{Q'}$.

Also, by definition of \mathcal{G} , the coefficients of f_γ , namely entries of γ , are bounded by C_1^l . Hence,

$$h(f_g) < l \log C_1,$$

We claim that there is a common zero $(\tilde{Y}, \tilde{Z}, \tilde{W}, \tilde{A}, \tilde{B}, \tilde{C}, \tilde{D}) \in \mathbb{C}^7$ to the following system of equations:

$$f_\gamma(Y, Z, W, A, B, C, D) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \gamma \in \mathcal{G}, \quad (4.15)$$

so that we lift the problem to \mathbb{C} by showing that \mathcal{G} is contained in some proper subvariety of $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \times \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$. Note that (4.15) is essentially $N \leq (2k)^l$ linear polynomials F_1, \dots, F_N .

Assume the claim fails to hold. We invoke Theorem C with $n = 7, d = 3, h = l \log C_1$. It follows that there is an integer $M \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and polynomials $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_N \in \mathbb{Z}[X, Y]$ of degree at most $b = 7 \times 15 \times 3^7$ satisfying

$$M = \sum_{l=1}^N F_l \varphi_l \quad (4.16)$$

with

$$0 < \log M, h(\varphi_l) < \mathfrak{X}(7) 3^{59} ((\log C_1 + \log(|S|))l + 3 \log 3) < C'_S l \quad (4.17)$$

where $C'_S = 3^{60} \mathfrak{X}(7) \log C_1 |S|$.

Now we take $(Y', Z', W', A', B', C', D') \in \mathbb{Z}^7$ such that

$$(Y', Z', W', A', B', C', D') \equiv (Y_1 \bar{X}_1, Z_1 \bar{X}_1, W_1 \bar{X}_1, X_2 \bar{X}_1, Y_2 \bar{X}_1, Z_2 \bar{X}_1, W_2 \bar{X}_1) \pmod{Q'}.$$

It follows that

$$M \equiv \sum_{l=1}^N F_l \varphi_l \Big|_{(Y', Z', W', A', B', C', D')} \equiv 0 \pmod{Q'},$$

Therefore, since $M \neq 0$, by (4.17) we deduce $\frac{1}{8} \log Q \leq \log Q' \leq \log M < C'_S l$, which contradicts the restriction $l < c_1 \log Q$ by taking $c_1 = \frac{1}{8C'_S} > 0$. This proves the claim. Since the linear system (4.15) admits a solution and the coefficients of f_γ are all integral, it must admit a rational solution $(\tilde{Y}, \tilde{Z}, \tilde{W}, \tilde{A}, \tilde{B}, \tilde{C}, \tilde{D})$. In other words,

$$x_1 + \tilde{Y} y_1 + \tilde{Z} z_1 + \tilde{W} w_1 + \tilde{A} x_2 + \tilde{B} y_2 + \tilde{C} z_2 + \tilde{D} w_2 = 0$$

Rescaling to get rid of the common denominator, we obtain $(\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{Y}_1, \tilde{Z}_1, \tilde{W}_1, \tilde{X}_2, \tilde{Y}_2, \tilde{Z}_2, \tilde{W}_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^8$ such that $\gcd(\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{Y}_1, \tilde{Z}_1, \tilde{W}_1, \tilde{X}_2, \tilde{Y}_2, \tilde{Z}_2, \tilde{W}_2) = 1$, and for all $\left(\begin{pmatrix} x_1 & y_1 \\ z_1 & w_1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x_2 & y_2 \\ z_2 & w_2 \end{pmatrix} \right) \in \mathcal{G}$, we have

$$\tilde{X}_1 x_1 + \tilde{Y}_1 y_1 + \tilde{Z}_1 z_1 + \tilde{W}_1 w_1 + \tilde{X}_2 x_2 + \tilde{Y}_2 y_2 + \tilde{Z}_2 z_2 + \tilde{W}_2 w_2 = 0$$

We finish the proof of Lemma 4.5 of the case $n = 0$ by applying Lemma 4.10 to the linear form \tilde{L} determined by the constants $\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{Y}_1, \tilde{Z}_1, \tilde{W}_1, \tilde{X}_2, \tilde{Y}_2, \tilde{Z}_2, \tilde{W}_2$. For $1 \ll_S l < c_1 \log Q$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \chi_S^{(l)}(\{g \in \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \times \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \mid L(g) \equiv 0 \pmod{Q}\}) \\ & \leq \chi_S^{(l)}(\{g \in \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \times \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \mid L(g) \equiv 0 \pmod{Q'}\}) \\ & = \chi_S^{(l)}(\mathcal{G}) \\ & \leq \chi_S^{(l)}(\{\gamma \in \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \times \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \mid \tilde{L}(\gamma) = 0\}) \\ & < e^{-c_2 l}. \end{aligned}$$

where c_2 is the constant c given in Lemma 4.10.

The case $n \neq 0$ is simpler. We can define

$$f_\gamma(X, Y, Z, W, A, B, C, D) = xX + yY + zZ + wW + aA + bB + cD + dD - n$$

for $\gamma = \left(\begin{pmatrix} x & y \\ z & w \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \right)$, and proceed the analysis in an analogous way as the $n = 0$ case. The reason in the $n = 0$ case we do not define f_γ in this way is that we need ensure a solution to $f_\gamma = 0$ that we find is nonzero. But if $n \neq 0$, $f_\gamma = 0$ never admits a zero solution. \square

5. BOUNDED GENERATION

Let $q = \prod_{i \in I} p_i^{n_i}$, $q_s = \prod_{i \in I: n_i \leq L} p_i^{n_i}$, $q_l = \prod_{i \in I: n_i > L} p_i^{n_i}$ for some L to be specified later. In this section we assume

$$q_l > q^{\epsilon/2}.$$

We let $c_0 = c_0(L)$ be the implied constant from Theorem A for the power bound L . We fix c_1, c_2 to be the implied constant c from Proposition 4.1 and Proposition 4.2 respectively. We assume all the assumptions in Proposition 2.2 but the conclusion fails, i.e.,

$$|\pi_q(A \cdot A \cdot A)| \leq |\pi_q(A)|^{1+\delta}, \quad (5.1)$$

We will eventually obtain a contradiction to (5.1) when δ is taken sufficiently small.

By Lemma 2.2 from [Hel08], (5.1) implies for any $l \geq 3$,

$$|\pi_q(\prod_l A)| \leq \left(\frac{|\pi_q(A \cdot A \cdot A)|}{|\pi_q(A)|} \right)^{l-2} |\pi_q(A)| \quad (5.2)$$

$$< |\pi_q(A)|^{1+\delta(l-2)}. \quad (5.3)$$

Let $A_0 = A \cdot A \cap \Gamma(q_0)$, where $q_0 = \prod_{p|q} p$. Then

$$\chi_S^{2l}(A_0) > q^{-2\delta} q_0^{-12} > q^{-3\delta} \quad (5.4)$$

if we let

$$L > \frac{12}{\delta}. \quad (5.5)$$

Let \mathbb{P}_1 (\mathbb{P}_2 , resp.) be the projection map from $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \times \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ to its first component (second component, resp.).

The goal of this section is to prove

Proposition 5.6. *There are constants $c > 0$ depending only on the generating set S and ϵ , in particular, independent of δ , and $\rho = \rho(\delta) > 0$, $C = C(\delta) \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, with $\rho(\delta) \rightarrow 0$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$, such that*

$$\Lambda((q')^{[\rho]})/\Lambda(q') \subset (\mathbb{P}_i A_0)^C, i = 1, 2,$$

where $q' || q_i$ for $L > \frac{12}{\delta}$ and $q' \geq q_i^c$.

Without loss of generality, we work on $i = 1$. Let ν_1 be the push forward of χ_S under the projection map \mathbb{P}_1 and let

$$A_1 = \mathbb{P}_1(A_0).$$

5.1. A large set of commuting elements. We use Helfgott's argument to create commuting elements.

For each fixed $Q|q_i$, let

$$\mathcal{E}_1(Q) = \{\gamma \in \Lambda : \mathrm{tr}(\gamma)^2 - 4 \equiv 0 \pmod{Q}\},$$

$$\mathcal{E}_2(Q) = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in \Lambda : c \equiv 0 \pmod{Q} \right\}.$$

By Proposition 4.1,

$$\nu_1^{(2l)}(\mathcal{E}_1(Q)), \nu_1^{(2l)}(\mathcal{E}_2(Q)) < Q^{-c_1}$$

Therefore, if we let

$$A_2 = A_1 - \cup_{\substack{Q|q_i \\ Q \geq q_i^{\rho_1}}} (\mathcal{E}_1(Q) \cup \mathcal{E}_2(Q)),$$

since the number of divisors of q is bounded by q^{0+} , it follows that

$$\nu_1^{(2l)}(A_2) > q^{-4\delta},$$

if we let

$$\frac{\delta}{\epsilon} < \frac{\rho_1 c_1}{8}. \quad (5.7)$$

Now for each $\gamma \in A_2$, a simple argument by contradiction (using the definition of A_2) shows that there exists $q_\gamma || q$, $q_\gamma > (q)^{1/2}$, such that for any $p^n || q_\gamma$,

$$\text{tr}(\gamma)^2 - 4 \neq 0(p^{[4\rho_1 n]}) \quad (5.8)$$

$$\gamma_{21} \neq 0(\text{mod } p^{[4\rho_1 n]}) \quad (5.9)$$

Since again the number of divisors of q is bounded by q^{0+} , there exists $q_1 || q$ and a set $A_3 \subset A_2$, with

$$\nu_1^{(2l)}(A_3) > q^{-3\delta}, \quad (5.10)$$

such that for any $\gamma \in A_3$, any $p^n || q_1$,

$$\gamma_{21} \neq 0(\text{mod } p^{[4\rho_1 n]}), \quad (5.11)$$

$$\text{tr}(\gamma)^2 - 4 \neq 0(\text{mod } p^{[4\rho_1 n]}). \quad (5.12)$$

It follows from (5.12) that the two eigenvalues of γ (in an extended field) must be distinct mod $p^{[4\rho_1 n]}$.

Let

$$Q_1 = q_1^{\{\rho_2\}},$$

where we will take $\rho_2 \gg \rho_1$.

Let

$$W(n) := \{\gamma \in \Lambda : \text{tr}(\gamma) = n(\text{mod } Q_1)\}.$$

By Proposition 4.1, for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\nu_1^{2l}(W(n)) < Q_1^{-c_1}. \quad (5.13)$$

The equations (5.10) and (5.13) imply, if we let

$$\frac{\delta}{\epsilon} < \frac{\rho_2 c_1}{24}, \quad (5.14)$$

that there exists a set $A_4 \subset A_3$, such that

$$|A_4(\text{mod } Q_1)| > Q_1^{c_1/2} \quad (5.15)$$

$$\forall \gamma_1 \neq \gamma_2 \in A_4, \text{tr}(\gamma_1) \neq \text{tr}(\gamma_2)(\text{mod } Q_1) \quad (5.16)$$

It follows from Proposition 4.1 that for any $\gamma_0 \in \Gamma_q$,

$$\nu_1^{(2l)}\{\gamma \in \Gamma : \gamma \equiv \gamma_0(\text{mod } Q_1)\} < Q_1^{-c_1}.$$

From this, we conclude that

$$|\pi_{Q_1}(A_1)| > Q_1^{c_1} q^{-\delta} > Q_1^{\frac{c_1}{2}}.$$

Now we return to (5.1). Small expansion for A implies a similar property holds for A_1 :

$$|\pi_q(A_1 \cdot A_1 \cdot A_1)| < |\pi_q(A_1)|^{1 + \frac{8\delta}{\rho_2 c_1}}. \quad (5.17)$$

To see this, suppose not, then

$$\begin{aligned} |\pi_q(A^4)| &\geq |\pi_{Q_1}(A_1 \cdot A_1 \cdot A_1)| \cdot \max_{\gamma_0 \in \Gamma_{Q_1}} |\pi_{Q_1}(A_1) \cap \{(\gamma_0, \gamma) : \gamma \in \Gamma_q\}| \\ &\geq |\pi_{Q_1}(A_1)|^{1 + \frac{8\delta}{\rho_2 c_1}} \cdot \max_{\gamma_0 \in \Gamma_{Q_1}} |\pi_{Q_1}(A) \cap \{(\gamma_0, \gamma) : \gamma \in \Gamma_q\}| \\ &\geq |\pi_{Q_1}(A_1)|^{\frac{8\delta}{\rho_2 c_1}} \cdot |\pi_q(A)| \\ &> |\pi_q(A)|^{1 + \delta} \end{aligned} \quad (5.18)$$

which contradicts (5.3).

For each $\alpha \in A_4$, let $C_\alpha = \{\gamma\alpha\gamma^{-1} : \gamma \in A_1\}$. Then $\{\pi_{Q_1}(C_\alpha)\}_{\alpha \in A_4}$ are mutually disjoint. Therefore,

$$\sum_{\alpha \in A_4} |\pi_{Q_1}(C_\alpha)| = |\cup_{\alpha \in A_4} \pi_{Q_1}(C_\alpha)| < |\pi_{Q_1}(A_1^3)| < |\pi_{Q_1}(A_1)|^{1 + \frac{8\delta}{\rho_2 c_1}}.$$

Thus, for some $\alpha_0 = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{11} & \alpha_{12} \\ \alpha_{21} & \alpha_{22} \end{pmatrix} \in A_4$,

$$|\pi_{Q_1}(C_{\alpha_0})| \leq |\pi_{Q_1}(A)|^{1 + \frac{8\delta}{\rho_2 c_1}} Q_1^{-c_1/2} < |\pi_{Q_1}(A)| Q_1^{-\frac{c_1}{4}}. \quad (5.19)$$

provided that

$$\delta < \frac{\rho_2 c_1^2}{168} \quad (5.20)$$

To proceed, we first diagonalise α_0 in an extended number field, i.e., let

$$\lambda_1 = \frac{\text{tr}(\alpha_0) + \sqrt{\text{tr}(\alpha_0)^2 - 4}}{2}, \quad \lambda_2 = \frac{\text{tr}(\alpha_0) - \sqrt{\text{tr}(\alpha_0)^2 - 4}}{2}$$

be the two eigenvalues of α_0 . Let $K = \mathbb{Q}[\lambda_1]$, and so $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_K = \mathbb{Z}[\lambda_1]$. Let $M = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 - D_0 & \lambda_2 - D_0 \\ C_0 & C_0 \end{pmatrix}$. Then

$$M^{-1} \alpha_0 M = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since α_0 satisfies the condition (5.12) for γ , the two eigenvalues

$$\lambda_1 \not\equiv \lambda_2 \pmod{p^{[4\rho_1 n]}} \quad (5.21)$$

for any $p^n || q_1$.

From (5.19), there exists $x_0 \in A_4$ and

$$A_5 := \{x \in A : x\alpha_0 x^{-1} = x_0 \alpha_0 x_0^{-1} \pmod{Q_1}\}, \quad (5.22)$$

such that

$$|\pi_{Q_1}(A_5)| > Q_1^{\frac{c_1}{4}}. \quad (5.23)$$

Therefore, $A_5 \cdot x_0^{-1}$ commute with $\alpha_0 \pmod{\alpha_0}$ and

$$|\pi_{Q_1}(A_5 \cdot x_0^{-1})| > Q_1^{\frac{c_1}{4}} \quad (5.24)$$

Fix a small constant $0 < \kappa < 1$. The condition (5.24) implies that there exists $v \in [\frac{c_1}{24}, \frac{1}{2}]$, such that

$$|\pi_{Q_1^{\{(1+\kappa)v\}}}(A_5)| > |\pi_{Q_1^{\{v\}}}(A_5)| Q_1^{\frac{\kappa v c_1}{8}}. \quad (5.25)$$

If we let $A_6 = (A_5 \cdot x_0^{-1} \cdot (A_5 \cdot x_0^{-1})^{-1}) \cap \Lambda(Q_1^{\{v\}}) = A_5 A_5^{-1} \cap \Lambda(Q_1^{\{v\}})$, then

$$|\pi_{Q_1^{\{(1+\kappa)v\}}}(A_6)| > Q_1^{\frac{\kappa v c_1}{8}}. \quad (5.26)$$

Let

$$Q_2 := q_1^{\{\rho_2 v - 9\rho_1\}}.$$

Since $\text{Det}(M) = C_0 \sqrt{\text{tr}(\alpha_0)^2 - 4}$, from (5.11), (5.12), we have

$$p^{[6\rho_1 n]} \nmid \text{Det}(M), \forall p^n \parallel q_1. \quad (5.27)$$

Combining (5.27) with (5.21), we conclude that the matrix M conjugate every matrix σ in A_6 to a matrix in $\text{SL}_2(\mathcal{O})$ which is congruent to identity mod Q_2 and diagonal mod Q_2^2 . In other words, there exists $a_\sigma \in \mathcal{O}_K$ and $a_\sigma \equiv 1 \pmod{Q_2}$ such that

$$M\sigma M^{-1} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} a_\sigma & 0 \\ 0 & a_\sigma^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \pmod{Q_2^2}. \quad (5.28)$$

It also follows from (5.26) that

$$|\pi_{Q_2^{\{1+\kappa\}}}(A_6)| > Q_2^{\frac{\kappa c_1}{16}}. \quad (5.29)$$

if

$$\rho_1 < \frac{\kappa v c_1}{480(1+\kappa)} \rho_2, \quad (5.30)$$

which is guaranteed if

$$\rho_1 < \frac{\kappa c_1^2}{12000(1+\kappa)} \rho_2. \quad (5.31)$$

5.2. Applying sum-product. Let $H = \{\frac{1}{Q_2}(a_\sigma - a_\sigma^{-1}) : \sigma \in A_6\} \subset \mathcal{O}$, where a_σ is as given in (5.28). Since the map $a_\sigma \mapsto a_\sigma - a_\sigma^{-1}$ is bounded to one, we have

$$|H| > Q_2^{\frac{\kappa c_1}{20}}. \quad (5.32)$$

Recall \mathcal{O} is a degree 2 extension of \mathbb{Z} .

We apply Theorem B to the set H with $\mathfrak{a} = Q_2^{[\kappa]}$ and $\delta = \frac{c_1}{20}$. It is important that δ in the context of Theorem B only depends on c_1 . Let C_1, C_2, C_3 be the implied constants of Theorem B. Theorem B then produces some $\xi \in \mathcal{O}$, $\mathfrak{a}' \supset \mathfrak{a}$, $c_3 = c_3(c_1) > 0$ such that

$$\sum_{C_3} H^{C_2} \supset \mathbb{Z}\xi(\text{mod } \mathfrak{a}'), \quad (5.33)$$

and

$$|\mathbb{Z}\xi(\text{mod } \mathfrak{a}')| > N(\mathfrak{a})^{c_3} > N(\mathfrak{a}^{C_1})^{\frac{c_3}{C_1}} > q_1^{2\rho_2\nu\kappa c_3 n}. \quad (5.34)$$

We pass (5.34) to a local property. From (5.34), it follows from a standard probabilistic argument that there exists $q_2 || q_1$, $q_2 > q_1^{\frac{c_3}{2C_1}}$, such that for any $p^n || q_2$, if we localize \mathfrak{a}' to the modulus p^n , i.e., letting $\bar{\mathfrak{a}}_p = \langle \mathfrak{a}', p^n \rangle$, the ideal of \mathcal{O} generated by \mathfrak{a}' and p^n , then we have

$$|\mathbb{Z}\xi(\text{mod } \bar{\mathfrak{a}}_p)| > p^{\rho_2\nu\kappa c_3 n}.$$

Since there are at most two prime ideals $\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2$ of \mathcal{O} that lies above (p) , i.e., $\bar{\mathfrak{a}}_p = \mathcal{P}_1^{m_1} \mathcal{P}_2^{m_2}$, there exists $i \in \{1, 2\}$ such that

$$|\mathbb{Z}\xi(\text{mod } \mathcal{P}_i^{m_i})| > p^{\frac{\rho_2\nu\kappa c_3}{2} n}. \quad (5.35)$$

which in particular implies that

$$m_i > \frac{\rho_2\nu\kappa c_3}{2}. \quad (5.36)$$

Let

$$\mathfrak{p} = \mathcal{P}_i, \mathfrak{a}_p = \mathcal{P}_i^{m_i}, \mathfrak{a}'' = \prod_{p|q_2} \mathfrak{a}_p, \mathfrak{q}_2 = \prod_{p|q_2} \mathcal{P}_i^{n_i}. \quad (5.37)$$

For simplicity, we assume each \mathcal{P}_i is unramified. The argument works for general case with minor change.

5.3. Constructing an appropriate element ζ . We need choose $\zeta = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}$ from a product set of A_1 with appropriate depth of approximation to identity described by two parameters ρ_3 and v' , and ζ not commutative with $\alpha_0 = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{11} & \alpha_{12} \\ \alpha_{21} & \alpha_{22} \end{pmatrix} \text{ mod divisors of } q_2$. If the 2-1 entry of $\alpha_0\zeta - \zeta\alpha_0$, which is equal to $\alpha_{21}a + \alpha_{22}b - \alpha_{11}c - \alpha_{12}d$ is non-zero, this

certainly implies that ζ and α_0 are not commutative. This leads us to work with the linear form

$$\mathcal{L}_1 \left(\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \right) = \alpha_{21}a + \alpha_{22}b - \alpha_{11}c - \alpha_{12}d.$$

Let

$$\mathcal{E}_3(Q) = \{\gamma \in \Lambda : \mathcal{L}_1(\gamma) \equiv 0(Q)\}.$$

By Proposition 4.1, for any $Q|q_2$,

$$\nu_1^{(2l)}(\mathcal{E}_3(Q)) < Q^{-c_1}. \quad (5.38)$$

Define

$$A_7 = A_1 - \bigcup_{\substack{Q|q_2 \\ Q > q_2^{2^1}}} \mathcal{E}_1(Q) \cup \mathcal{E}_2(Q) \cup \mathcal{E}_3(Q).$$

Recall $\nu_1^{(2l)}(A_1) > q^{-3\delta}$ and $q_2 > q_1^{\frac{c_3}{2C_1}} > q^{\frac{c_3\epsilon}{8C_1}}$. Then

$$\nu_1^{(2l)}(A_7) > q^{-4\delta}$$

if $q_2^{-\rho_1 c_1} < q^{-4\delta}$, or

$$\frac{\delta}{\epsilon} < \frac{c_3 \rho_1}{32C_1}. \quad (5.39)$$

Then we produce some $q_3|q_2$, $q_3 > q_2^{\frac{1}{2}}$, $\bar{\zeta} \in A$ such that for any $p^n|q_3$,

$$\bar{\zeta}_{21} \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p^{[6\rho_1 n]}}, \quad (5.40)$$

$$\text{tr}(\bar{\zeta})^2 - 4 \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p^{[6\rho_1 n]}}, \quad (5.41)$$

$$L(\bar{\zeta}) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p^{[6\rho_1 n]}}. \quad (5.42)$$

We run the arguments in the previous section for producing α_0 and A_6 , with q replaced by q_l . Then we can produce ρ_3 in the role of ρ_2 , some $v' \in [\frac{c_1}{24}, \frac{1}{2}]$ in the role of v , and some κ' depending on κ , and a set $A_8 \subset A_1 \cdot A_1$ such that

$$A_8 \subset \Lambda(q_3^{\{\rho_3 v'\}}) \quad (5.43)$$

$$|\pi_{q_3^{\{\rho_3 v'(1+\kappa')\}}}(A_8)| > q_3^{\rho_3 v' \kappa' \cdot \frac{c_1}{8}} \quad (5.44)$$

$$A_8 \text{ commutes with } \bar{\zeta} \pmod{q_3^{\{\rho_3 v'(1+\kappa')\}}}, \quad (5.45)$$

provided that

$$\frac{\delta}{\epsilon} < \frac{\rho_1 c_1 c_3}{32C_1}, \quad (5.46)$$

$$\frac{\delta}{\epsilon} < \frac{\rho_3 c_1 c_3}{96C_1}, \quad (5.47)$$

$$\rho_1 < \frac{\kappa' c_1^2}{12000(1+\kappa')} \rho_3, \quad (5.48)$$

$$\frac{\delta}{\epsilon} < \frac{c_3^2 \rho_1}{128C_1}. \quad (5.49)$$

Condition (5.44) imply there is $q_4 || q_3$, $q_4 > q_3^{\frac{c_1}{32}}$ and $\zeta \in A_8$ such that for any $p^n || q_4$,

$$\zeta \not\equiv 1 \pmod{p^{[n(\rho_3\nu' + \rho_3\nu'\kappa'(1 - \frac{c_1}{32}))]}}. \quad (5.50)$$

We next deduce a quantitative statement about the non-commutativity of α_0 and ζ , from the commutativity of ζ and $\bar{\zeta}$ and the non-commutativity of $\bar{\zeta}$ and α_0 .

Take a matrix M' (same role as M) to diagonalise $\bar{\zeta}$ so that

$$M' \bar{\zeta} M'^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda'_1 & \\ & \lambda'_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

with the denominator of M'^{-1} at most $p^{[9\rho_1 n]}$ for each $p^n || q_4$. Since $\bar{\zeta}$ and ζ are commutative mod $p^{[\rho_3\nu'(1+\kappa)n]}$, we have

$$M' \zeta M'^{-1} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & \\ & \lambda_2 \end{pmatrix} \pmod{p^{[n(\rho_3\nu'(1+\kappa') - 9\rho_1)]}}$$

From (5.50), we have $\lambda_1 \not\equiv \lambda_2 \pmod{p^{[n(\rho_3\nu' + \rho_3\nu'\kappa'(1 - \frac{c_1}{32}) + 9\rho_1)]}}$.

Since $\bar{\zeta}$ is not commutative with $\alpha_0 \pmod{p^{[6\rho_1 n]}}$, we have $M' \alpha_0 M'^{-1}$ is not diagonal mod $\pmod{p^{[15\rho_1 n]}}$, and so

$$M' \zeta M'^{-1} \text{ does not commute with } M' \alpha_0 M'^{-1} \pmod{p^{[n(\rho_3\nu' + \rho_3\nu'\kappa'(1 - \frac{c_1}{32}) + 24\rho_1)]}},$$

which implies

$$\zeta \text{ does not commute with } \alpha_0 \pmod{p^{[n(\rho_3\nu' + \rho_3\nu'\kappa'(1 - \frac{c_1}{32}) + 33\rho_1)]}}, \quad (5.51)$$

and so that

$$M \zeta M^{-1} \text{ does not commute with } M \alpha_0 M^{-1} \pmod{p^{[n(\rho_3\nu' + \rho_3\nu'\kappa'(1 - \frac{c_1}{32}) + 42\rho_1)]}}$$

5.4. Creating a line. Let

$$\left\{ \vec{e} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \vec{f} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \vec{h} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \right\}$$

be the standard basis of $\text{Lie}(SL_2)(\mathbb{Z})$.

Recall the definition for \mathfrak{q}_2 at (5.37). We further localize \mathfrak{q}_2 to q_4 , i.e., let $\mathfrak{q}_4 = \langle \mathfrak{a}'', q_4 \rangle$ be the ideal generated by \mathfrak{q}_2 and q_4 . For each $\mathcal{P}^n || \mathfrak{q}_4$, since ζ and α_0 are real, one can replace p by \mathcal{P} for the modulus in the equation (5.51), from which we then have

$$M^{-1} \zeta M \text{ does not commute with } M \alpha_0 M^{-1} \pmod{\mathcal{P}^{[n(\rho_3\nu' + \rho_3\nu'\kappa'(1 - \frac{c_1}{32}) + 42\rho_1)]}}.$$

To proceed, we recall the following well known identity.

Lemma 5.52. *Let $m, m' \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, and let $x, y \in SL_2(\mathcal{O})$, $x \equiv 1 \pmod{\mathcal{P}^m}$, $y \equiv 1 \pmod{\mathcal{P}^{m'}}$. Then,*

$$xyx^{-1}y^{-1} \equiv 1 + xy - yx \pmod{\mathcal{P}^{m+m'+\min\{m, m'\}}}$$

Lemma 5.52 has an obvious generalization to a general ideal by multiplicativity. To apply Lemma 5.52, we take $x = M^{-1}\sigma M$ given at (5.28) and $y = M^{-1}\zeta M$, with corresponding moduli $\mathfrak{q}_4^{\{\rho_2 v - 9\rho_1\}}$ and $\mathfrak{q}_4^{\{\rho_3 v' - 9\rho_1\}}$ in replace of \mathcal{P}^m and $\mathcal{P}^{m'}$.

Then

$$M^{-1}\sigma\zeta\sigma^{-1}\zeta^{-1}M \equiv 1 \pmod{\mathfrak{q}_4^{\{\rho_2 v + \rho_3 v' - 18\rho_1\}}} \quad (5.53)$$

and

$$M^{-1}\sigma\zeta\sigma^{-1}\zeta^{-1}M \equiv 1 + (a_\sigma - a_\sigma^{-1})\zeta_{21}\vec{e} - (a_\sigma - a_\sigma^{-1})\zeta_{12}\vec{f} \pmod{\mathfrak{q}_4^{\{2\rho_2 v + \rho_3 v' - 27\rho_1\}}} \quad (5.54)$$

with the understanding that

$$\rho_3 v' > \rho_2 v,$$

which is guaranteed if

$$\frac{\rho_3 c_1}{24} \geq \rho_2. \quad (5.55)$$

Applying Lemma 5.52 iteratively, for any $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_{C_3} \in A_6$, we have

$$M^{-1}[\sigma_{C_3}, \dots [\sigma_2, [\sigma_1, \eta]] \dots]M \equiv I \pmod{(\mathfrak{q}_4^{C_3 \rho_2 v + \rho_3 v' - 9(C_3+1)\rho_1})} \quad (5.56)$$

and

$$M^{-1}[\sigma_{C_3}, \dots [\sigma_2, [\sigma_1, \eta]] \dots]M \equiv I + \left(\prod_{i=1}^{C_3} (a_{\sigma_i} - a_{\sigma_i}^{-1}) \right) X \pmod{(\mathfrak{q}_4^{(C_3+1)\rho_2 v + \rho_3 v' - 9(C_3+2)\rho_1})} \quad (5.57)$$

The sum structure is clear. For any $\sigma_{11}, \dots, \sigma_{C_2 C_3} \in A_6$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & M^{-1}[\sigma_{1C_3}, \dots [\sigma_{12}, [\sigma_{11}, \eta]]M \dots M^{-1}[\sigma_{C_2 C_3}, \dots [\sigma_{C_2 2}, [\sigma_{C_2 1}, \eta]] \dots]M \\ & \equiv I + \sum_{i=1}^{C_2} \left(\prod_{j=1}^{C_3} (a_{\sigma_{i,j}} - a_{\sigma_{i,j}}^{-1}) \right) X \pmod{(\mathfrak{q}_4^{C_3 \rho_2 v + \rho_3 v' - 9(C_3+1)\rho_1})} \end{aligned} \quad (5.58)$$

Recall $\mathfrak{a} = Q_2^{[\kappa]}$, we need to have

$$C_1 \rho_2 \kappa < \rho_2 v - 9\rho_1 \quad (5.59)$$

which is guaranteed if

$$C_1 \rho_2 \kappa < \frac{c_1}{24} \rho_2 - 9\rho_1. \quad (5.60)$$

so that $(\mathfrak{a}^m)^{C_1} \supset \mathfrak{q}_4^{\{\rho_2 v - 9\rho_1\}}$ and so there is room to apply (5.33).

Let $X = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \zeta_{12}(-1)^{C_3} \\ \zeta_{21} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. From (5.33), we obtain

$$1 + \mathbb{Z}\xi X \subset M^{-1}(H \cup \{\zeta\})^{C_2 C_3} M \pmod{\mathfrak{q}_4^{\{(C_3+1)\rho_2 v + \rho_3 v' - 9(C_3+2)\rho_1\}}} \quad (5.61)$$

with

$$\xi X = 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{q}_4^{\{C_3\rho_2v + \rho_3v' - 9(C_3+1)\rho_1\}}} \quad (5.62)$$

and

$$\xi X \neq 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{q}_4^{\{(C_3+1)\rho_2v + \rho_3v' - 9(C_3+2)\rho_1 - \frac{\rho_2\nu\kappa c_3}{2}\}}} \quad (5.63)$$

if

$$\rho_3v'\kappa'(1 - \frac{c_1}{32}) + 51\rho_1 < \frac{\rho_2\nu\kappa c_3}{2}, \quad (5.64)$$

which is ensured if

$$\rho_3\kappa'(1 - \frac{c_1}{32}) + 51\rho_1 < \frac{\rho_2\kappa c_1 c_3}{48}, \quad (5.65)$$

Conjugating (5.61), (5.62), (5.63) back by M , and replacing \mathfrak{q}_4 by q_4 due to the realness of products of A . We obtain $Q_3|Q_4|q_4$, a primitive matrix $\tilde{X} \in \mathrm{Lie}(\mathrm{SL}_2)(\mathbb{Z})$, such that

$$1 + Q_3\mathbb{Z}\tilde{X} \subset (A_6 \cup \{\zeta\})^{4C_32^{C_2}} \pmod{Q_4}$$

where for each $p^n||q_4$, writing $p^{m_1}||Q_3, p^{m_2}||Q_4$, we have

$$(C_3\rho_2v + \rho_3v' - 9C_3\rho_1)n < m_1 < \left((C_3 + 1)\rho_2v + \rho_3v' - 9(C_3 + 3)\rho_1 - \frac{\rho_2\nu\kappa c_3}{2} \right) n,$$

$$\left(\frac{\rho_2\nu\kappa c_3}{2} - 9\rho_1 \right) n < m_2 - m_1 < (\rho_2v - 9\rho_1)n.$$

5.5. Creating a segment. The goal of this section is to find $g_1, g_2 \in A_1^l$ so that under a proper modulus $q_6||q_4$, the $\mathbb{Z}/(q_6)$ -span of $\tilde{X}, g_1\tilde{X}g_1^{-1}, g_2\tilde{X}g_2^{-1}$ is almost $(\mathbb{Z}/(q_6))^3$.

Identify $\mathrm{Lie}(\mathrm{SL}_2)(\mathbb{Z})$ with \mathbb{Z}^3 by $\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & -a \end{pmatrix} \mapsto (a, b, c)^t$. Under this identification, write $\tilde{X} = (X_1, X_2, X_3)$.

Choose an element $T_1 \in \mathrm{SL}_3(\mathbb{Z})$ so that $T_1(X_1, X_2, X_3)^t = (1, 0, 0)$. Let $L_1 : \mathbb{Z}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ be the linear form getting the second component. Then $L_1 \circ T_1$ is a primitive linear form on \mathbb{Z}^3 .

Applying Proposition 4.2, for any $Q > q_4^{\rho_1}$, we have

$$\nu_1^{(l)}(\{g \in \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) | L_1 \circ T_1(g\tilde{X}g^{-1}) \equiv 0 \pmod{Q}\}) < Q^{-c_2},$$

which then implies there is $q_5||q_4$, $q_5 > (q_4)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, and $g_1 \in A_1$ such that for any $p^n||q_5$, $L_1 \circ T_1(g_1X_0g_1^{-1}) \neq 0 \pmod{p^{[2\rho_1n]}}$, if

$$\frac{\delta}{\epsilon} < \frac{c_1c_2c_3\rho_1}{512C_1}. \quad (5.66)$$

Let $\tilde{X}_1 = g_1\tilde{X}g_1^{-1}$, then $\tilde{X}_1 \equiv a(1, 0, 0) + b\vec{v} \pmod{q_5}$, where $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$, and b satisfies, for any $p^n||q_5$, $p^{[2\rho_1n]} \nmid b$, and \vec{v} is a primitive vector in the span of $(0, 1, 0)$ and $(0, 0, 1)$.

Next, we choose an element $T_2 \in \mathrm{SL}_3(\mathbb{Z})$ such that $T_2(\tilde{X}) = (1, 0, 0)$ and $T_2(\tilde{X}_1) = (0, b, 0)$. Let $L_2 : \mathbb{Z}^3 \mapsto \mathbb{Z}$ be the linear form getting the third component. Then $L_2 \circ T_2$ is a primitive linear form on \mathbb{Z}^3 . Applying Proposition 4.2 again, for any $Q > q_5^{\rho_1}$, we have

$$\nu_1^{(l)}(\{g \in \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) | L_2 \circ T_2(g\tilde{X}g^{-1}) \equiv 0 \pmod{Q}\}) < Q^{-c_2},$$

which then implies there is $q_6 | q_5$, $q_6 > (q_5)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, and $g_2 \in A^l$ such that for any $p^n | q_6$, $L_2 \circ T_2(g_2 X_0 g_2^{-1}) \neq 0 \pmod{p^{[2\rho_1 n]}}$, if

$$\frac{\delta}{\epsilon} < \frac{c_1 c_2 c_3 \rho_1}{1024 C_1}. \quad (5.67)$$

Denoting $V = \mathrm{Lie}(\mathrm{SL}_2)(\mathbb{Z})$, It follows that

Lemma 5.68. *There are $Q_5 | Q_6 | q_6$, such that*

$$1 + Q_5 \mathbb{Z}V \subset (A_6 \cup \{\zeta\})^{4C_3 2^{C_2}} g_1 (A_6 \cup \{\zeta\})^{4C_3 2^{C_2}} g_1^{-1} g_2 (A_6 \cup \{\zeta\})^{4C_3 2^{C_2}} g_2^{-1} \pmod{Q_6},$$

where for each $p^n | q_6$, writing $p^{m_5} | Q_5, p^{m_6} | Q_6$, we have

$$(C_3 \rho_2 v + \rho_3 v' - 9C_3 \rho_1) n < m_5 < \left((C_3 + 1) \rho_2 v + \rho_3 v' - 9(C_3 + 3) \rho_1 - \frac{\rho_2 v \kappa c_3}{2} \right) n \quad (5.69)$$

$$\left(\frac{\rho_2 v \kappa c_3}{2} - 11 \rho_1 \right) n < m_6 - m_5 < (\rho_2 v - 9 \rho_1) n. \quad (5.70)$$

Finally, we fix some constants. We take all the implied constants $c_1, c_2, c_3 \leq 1$. To ensure (5.31), (5.48), (5.55), (5.60), (5.65), we can take

$$\kappa = \frac{c_1}{48 C_1}, \quad (5.71)$$

$$\kappa' = \frac{c_1^2 c_3}{1200} \kappa, \quad (5.72)$$

$$\rho_1 = \frac{\kappa c_1^2 c_3}{18000} \rho_2, \quad (5.73)$$

$$\rho_3 = \frac{24}{c_1} \rho_2. \quad (5.74)$$

To ensure the inequalities (5.7), (5.14), (5.20), (5.39), (5.46), (5.47), (5.49), (5.66), (5.67) involving $\frac{\delta}{\epsilon}$, we will take

$$\frac{\delta}{\epsilon} < \frac{c_1^4 c_2 c_3^3}{10^9 C_1^2} \rho_2. \quad (5.75)$$

The bounds for m_5 at $m_6 - m_5$ at (5.69), (5.70) can then be given in terms of ρ_2 , and then Lemma 5.68 can be rephrased as

Lemma 5.76. *There are $Q_5 | Q_6 | q_6$, such that*

$$1 + Q_5 \mathbb{Z}V \subset A^{50 C_3 2^{C_2}} \pmod{Q_6},$$

where for each $p^n || q_6$, writing $p^{m_5} || Q_5, p^{m_6} || Q_6$, we have

$$\left(\frac{C_3 c_1}{30} + 1\right) \rho_2 < m_5 < \left(C_3 + \frac{25}{c_1}\right) \rho_2, \quad (5.77)$$

$$\frac{c_1^2 c_3}{2500 C_1} \rho_2 < m_6 - m_5 < \rho_2. \quad (5.78)$$

if

$$\frac{\delta}{\epsilon} < \frac{c_1^4 c_2 c_3^3}{10^9 C_1^2 C_3} \rho_2. \quad (5.79)$$

5.6. Proof of Proposition 5.6. Recall

$$q_6 > q_5^{\frac{1}{2}} > q_4^{\frac{1}{4}} > q_3^{\frac{c_1}{128}} > q_2^{\frac{c_1}{256}} > q_1^{\frac{c_1 c_3}{512 C_1}} > q_l^{\frac{c_1 c_3}{1024 C_1}} > q^{\frac{c_1 c_3}{2048 C_1} \epsilon}.$$

We need to run the previous arguments in this section, with the modulus q_l replaced by q_6 . Then we obtain

Lemma 5.80. *There is $q_7 || q_6$, $q_7 > q_6^{\frac{c_1 c_3}{1024 C_1}}$ and $Q_7 | Q_8 | q_7$, such that*

$$1 + Q_7 \mathbb{Z}V \subset A^{50 C_3 2^{C_2}} \pmod{Q_8},$$

where for each $p^n || q_7$, writing $p^{m_7} || Q_5, p^{m_8} || Q_6$, we have

$$\left(\frac{C_3 c_1}{30} + 1\right) \rho'_2 < m_7 < \left(C_3 + \frac{25}{c_1}\right) \rho'_2, \quad (5.81)$$

$$\frac{c_1^2 c_3}{2500 C_1} \rho'_2 < m_8 - m_7 < \rho'_2. \quad (5.82)$$

if

$$\frac{\delta}{\epsilon \cdot \frac{c_1 c_3}{1024 C_1}} < \frac{c_1^4 c_2 c_3^3}{10^9 C_1^2} \rho'_2. \quad (5.83)$$

We need the elementary lemma whose proof we leave as an exercise:

Lemma 5.84. *Let $H_1, H_2 \subset SL_2(\mathbb{Z})$ and let p be a prime. Suppose $1 + p^{m_1} V \pmod{p^{m_2}} \subset H_1 \pmod{p^{m_2}}$ and $1 + p^{n_1} V \pmod{p^{n_2}} \subset H_1 \pmod{p^{n_2}}$ with $1 \leq m_1 \leq m_2 \leq 2m_1$ and $1 \leq n_1 \leq n_2 \leq 2n_1$. Then*

$$1 + p^{m_1+n_1} V \subset (H_1 H_2)^4 \pmod{p^{m_2+n_2}}.$$

We take

$$\rho'_2 = \frac{c_1^3 c_3}{70000 C_1 C_3} \rho_2.$$

We apply Lemma 5.84 with $H_1 = 1 + Q_5 \mathbb{Z}V$ $H_2 = 1 + Q_7 \mathbb{Z}V$ obtained from Lemma 5.76 and Lemma 5.80. Then we obtain

$$1 + Q_5 Q_7 \mathbb{Z}V \subset A^{400 C_3 2^{C_2}} \pmod{Q_6 Q_8}.$$

Apply Lemma 5.84 iteratively with $H_1 = 1 + Q_5 \mathbb{Z}V$ fixed and H_2 replaced by a newly generated congruence set from previous step. We obtain

$$1 + q_7^{\{(C_3 + \frac{25}{c_1})\rho_2\}} V \subset A_1^C \pmod{q_7}$$

for

$$C = 100C_3 2^{C_2} 8^{\lceil \frac{7000C_1 C_3}{c_1^3 c_3 \rho_2} \rceil}. \quad (5.85)$$

Next, we take care of the inequalities involving $\frac{\delta}{\epsilon}$. We take

$$\frac{\delta}{\epsilon} = \frac{c_1^8 c_2 c_3^5}{10^{17} C_1^4 C_3} \rho_2,$$

so that (5.83) is satisfied, which implies all other inequalities involving $\frac{\delta}{\epsilon}$ are satisfied.

Proposition (5.6) is thus proved with

$$c = \frac{c_1^2 c_3^2}{1024^2 C_1^2}, \rho = \frac{3 \times 10^{18} C_1^4 C_3^2 \delta}{c_1^9 c_2 c_3^5 \epsilon}, C = C_3 2^{C_2} 8^{\lceil \frac{C_1^5 C_3^3}{c_1^4 c_2 c_3^5 \delta} \rceil}. \quad (5.86)$$

6. GLUING MODULI

The proof of Proposition 2.2 requires a gluing process, and the following proposition is the main gluing tool.

Proposition 6.1. *Suppose A satisfies (2.3) but fails (2.4). Let $0 < \theta < 10^{-12}$, and suppose*

$$\delta < \frac{c_2 \epsilon \theta}{2}. \quad (6.2)$$

where δ, ϵ be given as in Proposition 2.2.

Let $q_1, q_2 \mid q, q_3 \mid q_1$, $\gcd(q_1, q_3) = 1$, and $q_3 > q^{120\theta^{\frac{1}{2}}}$, where in the definition of q_1 we require $L > \frac{12}{\theta}$. Suppose for some set $B \subset \Gamma(q_0)$ where $q_0 = \prod_{p \mid q_1} p$, we have

$$|\pi_{q_1, q_2}(B)| > (q_1 q_2)^{3-\theta} \quad (6.3)$$

$$|\pi_{q_3, 1}(B)| > q_3^{3-\theta} \quad (6.4)$$

Then there exists $q_3^* \mid q_3$, $q_3^* > q_3^{\frac{1}{4} 10^{-4}}$, such that

$$|\pi_{q_1 q_3^*, q_2}(B \cup A)^{\lceil 200 \cdot 8^{\theta - \frac{1}{2}} \rceil}| > (q_1 q_2 q_3^*)^{3-300\theta^{\frac{1}{4}}}. \quad (6.5)$$

Remark 6.6. We need the help of the set A , otherwise the claim simply fails. For instance, let $q_1 = 1$, $q_2 = q_3$ and $B = \Gamma(q_0) \cap \{(\lambda, \lambda), \lambda \in \Lambda\}$. Then $B \cdot B = B$ so there is no hope to expand only by taking product of B .

Write

$$\Lambda_{q_1 q_3} \times \Lambda_{q_2} \cong (\Lambda_{q_1} \times \Lambda_{q_2}) \times (\Lambda_{q_3} \times 1).$$

Since B satisfies (6.3) and (6.4), by Proposition 3.12, there exists $q'_1|q_1, q'_2|q_2, q'_3|q_3, q'_1q'_2 < (q_1q_2)^{40\theta}, q'_3 < (q_3)^{40\theta}$, such that

$$\Lambda(q'_1)/\Lambda(q_1) \times \Lambda(q'_2)/\Lambda(q_2) \supset \pi_{q_1, q_2}(B^{2880}). \quad (6.7)$$

and

$$\Lambda(q'_3)/\Lambda(q_3) \supset \pi_{q_3, 1}(B^{2880}). \quad (6.8)$$

Write

$$G = \Lambda(q'_1)/\Lambda(q_1) \times \Lambda(q'_2)/\Lambda(q_2)$$

From (6.7), we can construct a map

$$\psi : G \rightarrow B^{2880},$$

such that

$$\pi_{q_1, q_2}(\psi(x)) = x. \quad (6.9)$$

From $q'_3 < q_3^{40\theta}$, there is $q_4|q_3, q_4 > q_3^{1-\theta\frac{1}{2}}$ such that for every $p^n||q_4$, we have $p^{[40\theta\frac{1}{2}n]} \nmid q'_3$.

Write $q_4 = \prod_{j \in J} p_j^{n_j}$. For each $p_j^{n_j}||q_4$, we consider $\psi_j = \pi_{p_j^{[n_j\theta\frac{1}{4}]}} \circ \mathbb{P}_1 \circ \psi$.

Write

$$\mathcal{G}_j = \{(x, y) \in G \times G \mid \psi_j(xy) \neq \psi_j(x)\psi_j(y)\}$$

According to Proposition 3.1, there are two scenarios:

(1)

$$|\mathcal{G}_j| > 10^{-4}|G|^2. \quad (6.10)$$

(2) There is a subset $S_j \in G$, $|S_j| \geq \frac{99}{100}|G|$ such that $\psi_j = h_j$ over S_j where h_j is a homomorphism from G to $\Gamma/\Gamma(p_j^{[n_j\theta\frac{1}{4}]})$.

Let $J = J_1 \sqcup J_2$ where J_1, J_2 is the collection of indices falling into Case (1) and Case (2), respectively. Write $q_4 = q'_4q''_4$, where

$$q'_4 = \prod_{j \in J_1} p_j^{n_j}, q''_4 = \prod_{j \in J_2} p_j^{n_j}.$$

We further write $q''_4 = q_5q'_5$, where

$$q_5 = \prod_{\substack{p_j^{n_j}||q''_4 \\ \pi_{p_j^{[\frac{\theta^{1/4}n_j}{2}]}} \circ h_j = 1}} p_j^{n_j},$$

and

$$q'_5 = \prod_{\substack{p_j^{n_j} \parallel q_4'' \\ \pi_{\lfloor \frac{\theta^{1/4} n_j}{2} \rfloor} \circ h_j \neq 1}} p_j^{n_j}.$$

We divide our analysis into three cases.

6.1. **The case** $q'_4 > q_4^{\frac{1}{2}}$. In this case we have

$$\sum_{j \in J_1} (\log p_j^{n_j}) |\mathcal{G}_j| > \log \left((q'_4)^{10^{-4}} \right) |G|^2 \quad (6.11)$$

The left side of (6.11) is equal to

$$\sum_{\substack{U \subset J_1 \\ U \neq \emptyset}} \log \left(\prod_{j \in U} p_j^{n_j} \right) |\cap_{j \in U} \mathcal{G}_j \cap \cap_{j \in J_1 - U} \mathcal{G}_j^c| \quad (6.12)$$

Since the number of subsets of J_1 is $< q_4^{0+}$, there exists $J'_1 \subset J_1$, $\tilde{q} = \prod_{i \in J_1} p_i^{n_i} > (q'_4)^{\frac{1}{2} 10^{-4}}$, such that

$$|\cap_{i \in J_1} \mathcal{G}_i| > q^{0-} |G|^2.$$

Take any $(g_1, g_2) \in \cap_{i \in J_1} \mathcal{G}_i$, and consider $\gamma_0 = \psi(g_1)\psi(g_2)\psi(g_1 g_2)^{-1}$. Then γ_0 satisfies,

$$\pi_{q_1, q_2}(\gamma_0) = 1,$$

and for any $p^n \parallel \tilde{q}$,

$$\pi_{p^{\lfloor n\theta^{\frac{1}{4}} \rfloor}} \circ \mathbb{P}_1(\gamma_0) \neq 1.$$

So

$$\gamma_0 \equiv 1 + \left(\prod_{p|q'_4} p^{m_p} \right) X \pmod{\prod_{p|q'_4} p^{2m_p}},$$

for some primitive $X \in V = \text{Lie}(\text{SL}_2)(\mathbb{Z})$ (i.e., the gcd of entries of X is 1) and $1 \leq m_p \leq \lfloor n\theta^{\frac{1}{4}} \rfloor$.

We need the following elementary lemma whose proof we leave as an exercise:

Lemma 6.13. *Given $q \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $\vec{v}, \vec{w} \in V$ primitive. Suppose for any $p|q$, \vec{v} and \vec{w} are linearly independent mod p . Then*

$$[v, V] + [w, V] \supset 2V \pmod{q}$$

We take two elements $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in B^{2880}$ so that

$$\mathbb{P}_1(\gamma_0 \gamma_1 \gamma_0^{-1} \gamma_1^{-1}) \equiv 1 + \tilde{q}^{\{2\theta^{\frac{1}{4}}\}} Y_1 \pmod{\tilde{q}^{\{4\theta^{\frac{1}{4}}\}}}$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}_1(\gamma_0 \gamma_2 \gamma_0^{-1} \gamma_2^{-1}) \equiv 1 + \tilde{q}^{\{2\theta^{\frac{1}{4}}\}} Y_2 \pmod{\tilde{q}^{\{4\theta^{\frac{1}{4}}\}}}$$

for some Y_1, Y_2 satisfying the hypothesis of \vec{v}, \vec{w} in Lemma 6.13 with q replaced by \tilde{q} . Importantly,

$$\pi_{q_1, q_2}(\gamma_0 \gamma_1 \gamma_0^{-1} \gamma_1^{-1}) = \pi_{q_1, q_2}(\gamma_0 \gamma_2 \gamma_0^{-1} \gamma_1^{-2}) = 1.$$

We also take

$$H_\rho = \{\gamma \in B^{2880}, \pi_{\tilde{q}^{\{2\rho\}}}(\gamma) = 1\}$$

for $\rho \in [\theta^{\frac{1}{4}}, \frac{1}{2}]$.

From (6.4) we know

$$\pi_{\tilde{q}^{\{2\rho\}}} \mathbb{P}_1(B^{2880}) \supset \Lambda(\tilde{q}^{\{\rho\}}) / \Lambda(\tilde{q}^{\{2\rho\}}).$$

Apply Lemma 6.13 to $\gamma_0 \gamma_1 \gamma_0^{-1} \gamma_1^{-1}, \gamma_0 \gamma_2 \gamma_0^{-1} \gamma_2^{-1}$ and H_ρ with appropriate choices of ρ , we obtain a set $F \subset B^{\lfloor \frac{17296}{\theta^{1/4}} \rfloor}$ such that

$$\pi_{q_1, q_2}(F) = 1, \tag{6.14}$$

$$\pi_{\tilde{q}, 1}(F) \supset \Lambda(\tilde{q}^{\{3\theta^{\frac{1}{4}}\}}) / \Lambda(\tilde{q}) \tag{6.15}$$

In this case, we take $q_3^* = \tilde{q}$, so

$$q_3^* > q_3^{\frac{1}{4} 10^{-4}},$$

and it follows from (6.7), (6.14), (6.15) that

$$|\pi_{q_1 q_3^*, q_2}(B^{\lfloor \frac{17296}{\theta^{1/4}} \rfloor})| > (q_1 q_2 q_3^*)^{3-9\theta^{\frac{1}{4}}}.$$

6.2. The case $q_4'' > q_4^{\frac{1}{2}}, q_5 > (q_4'')^{\frac{1}{2}}$. The local homomorphisms $h_j, j \in J_2$ can be lifted to a homomorphism

$$h : G \rightarrow \Lambda\left(\prod_{j \in J_2} p_j\right) / \Lambda((q_4'')^{\{\theta^{\frac{1}{4}}\}}).$$

Following the previous reasoning for obtaining J_1' , there is a set $J_2' \subset J_2$, such that

$$\bar{q} = \prod_{i \in J_2'} p_i^{n_i} > (q_4'')^{\frac{99}{200}},$$

$$|\cap_{i \in J_2} S_i| > (q_1 q_2)^{-\theta} |G|,$$

and $\psi \equiv h$ on $S = \cap_{i \in J_2} S_i$.

By Proposition 3.12, we have $S^{2880} \supset G' = \Lambda(q_1'') / \Lambda(q_1) \times \Lambda(q_2'') / \Lambda(q_2)$ for some $q_1'' | q_1, q_2'' | q_2, q_1'' q_2'' < (q_1 q_2)^{90\theta}$. This implies the existence of a subgroup G'' of G' of the form

$$G'' = \Lambda(\tilde{q}_1 (q_1^*)^{\{\theta^{\frac{1}{2}}\}}) / \Lambda(q_1) \times \Lambda(\tilde{q}_2 (q_2^*)^{\{\theta^{\frac{1}{2}}\}}) / \Lambda(q_2), \tag{6.16}$$

where

$$q_1 = \tilde{q}_1 q_1^*, q_2 = \tilde{q}_2 q_2^*, \tilde{q}_1, q_1^* | q_1, \tilde{q}_2, q_2^* | q_2, \tilde{q}_1 \tilde{q}_2 < (q_1 q_2)^{90\theta^{\frac{1}{2}}}. \tag{6.17}$$

Then we can define a map $\tilde{\psi} : G'' \rightarrow B^{2880^2}$ as, for any $x \in G''$, choose a word $s_1 s_2 \cdots s_{2880}$ and let

$$\tilde{\psi}(x) = \psi(s_1)\psi(s_2)\cdots\psi(s_{2880}). \quad (6.18)$$

Then we have $\pi_{(q_4'')^{\{\theta\frac{1}{4}\}}} \mathbb{P}_1 \tilde{\psi}(x) = h(x)$.

Since $q_5 > (q_4'')^{\frac{1}{2}}$, then by iteratively taking commutator of $\tilde{\psi}(G'')$ $[\frac{2}{\theta^{1/4}}]$ times, we obtain

$$\Lambda(\tilde{q}_1(q_1^*)^{\{2\theta\frac{1}{4}\}}q_5)/\Lambda(q_1q_5) \times \Lambda(\tilde{q}_2(q_2^*)^{\{2\theta\frac{1}{4}\}})/\Lambda(q_2) \supset B^{2880^2 \cdot (3 \cdot 2^{\lceil \theta^{-\frac{1}{4}} \rceil - 2})}. \quad (6.19)$$

In this case, we take $q_3^* = q_5$. We have

$$q_3^* > q_3^{\frac{1}{5}}.$$

It follows from (6.17) and (6.19) that

$$|\pi_{q_1q_3^*q_2}(B^{3 \cdot 2880^2 \cdot 2^{\lceil \theta^{-\frac{1}{4}} \rceil}})| > (q_1q_2q_3^*)^{3-300\theta\frac{1}{4}}. \quad (6.20)$$

6.3. The case $q_4'' > q_4^{\frac{1}{2}}, q_5' > (q_4'')^{\frac{1}{2}}$. We begin with a lemma.

Lemma 6.21. *Suppose h is a homomorphism from $\Lambda(p_1^{m_1})/\Lambda(p_1^{n_1})$ to $\Lambda(p_2^{m_2})/\Lambda(p_2^{n_2})$ for some $0 \leq m_1 \leq n_1, 1 \leq m_2 \leq n_2$, and for some $\xi \in \Lambda(p_1^{m_1})/\Lambda(p_1^{n_1})$, $h(\xi) \neq 1$. Then $p_1 = p_2$ and $p^x \parallel \xi - 1$ for some $x \leq m_1 + n_2 - m_2$.*

Proof. We first observe that given $0 \leq m_1 < n_1, 1 \leq m_2 < n_2$ and two primes p_1, p_2 , if there is a nontrivial homomorphism f from $\Lambda(p_1^{m_1})/\Lambda(p_1^{n_1})$ to $\Lambda(p_2^{m_2})/\Lambda(p_2^{n_2})$, this will force $p_1 = p_2$. To see this, if $m_1 \neq 0$, then all elements in $\Lambda(p_1^{m_1})/\Lambda(p_1^{n_1})$ have orders powers of p_1 , and all elements in $\Lambda(p_2^{m_2})/\Lambda(p_2^{n_2})$ have orders powers of p_2 . Since f is nontrivial, we have $p_1 = p_2$.

If $m_1 = 0$, and let us suppose $p_1 \neq p_2$, then f will factor through $\Lambda(p_1)/\Lambda(p_1^{n_1})$ and we obtained a homomorphism $f' : \Lambda_{p_1} \rightarrow \Lambda(p_2^{m_2})/\Lambda(p_2^{n_2})$. Since Λ_{p_1} is almost simple, f' must either be trivial, or injective, or factor thorough the center Z . f' can not be injective because there are elements in Λ_{p_1} of order p_1 , which is coprime to p_2 . Likewise, Z can not be the kernel of f' because one can also find an element $x \in \Lambda_{p_1}/Z$ such that the order of x is coprime to p_2 . Hence, f' as well as f must be trivial and we arrive at a contradiction, so $p_1 = p_2$.

Suppose $h(\xi) = y \not\equiv 1 \pmod{p^{n_2}}$. Since the order of all elements in $\Lambda(p^{m_2})/\Lambda(p^{n_2})$ is bounded by $p^{n_2-m_2}$, it follows that ξ can not be a $p^{n_2-m_2}$ -power in $\Lambda(p^{m_1})/\Lambda(p^{n_1})$, and this will force $x \leq m_1 + n_2 - m_2$. \square

Lemma 6.21 implies that $q_5' \parallel q_2^*$, since $(q_5', q_1^*) = 1$.

Since $\pi_{(q_5')^{\{\theta\frac{1}{4}\}}} \circ \mathbb{P}_1 \circ \tilde{\psi}$ is a homomorphism, and $\pi_{(q_5')^{\{\frac{\theta}{2}\}}} \circ \mathbb{P}_1 \circ \tilde{\psi}$ is nontrivial for each $p^n \parallel q_5'$, we can find an element $g \in G''$ satisfying:

- (1) For each $p^n || q'_5$, write $p^{t_1} || (\mathbb{P}_2 \tilde{\psi}(g) - 1)$ and $p^{t_2} || (\mathbb{P}_1 \tilde{\psi}(g) - 1)$. We have $t_2 = \lceil \frac{2\theta^{\frac{1}{4}}}{3} n \rceil$ and $\lceil \frac{\theta^{\frac{1}{4}}}{6} n \rceil < t_1 < \lceil (\frac{2\theta^{\frac{1}{4}}}{3} + \theta^{1/2}) n \rceil < \lceil (\frac{3\theta^{\frac{1}{4}}}{4}) n \rceil$.
- (2) For each $p^n || q_2^*$ but $p \nmid q'_5$, we have $p^n || \mathbb{P}_2(\tilde{\psi}(g)) - 1$.
- (3) For each $p^n || q_1^*$, we have $p^n || \mathbb{P}_1(\tilde{\psi}(g)) - 1$.

Collecting $\{\tilde{\psi}(g)^m : m \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, we obtain

Lemma 6.22. *There are $Q_1 | \tilde{Q}_1 | q_1^* q'_5$, $Q_2 | \tilde{Q}_2 | q_2$, $\xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2) \in Lie(SL_2)(\mathbb{Z}) \times Lie(SL_2)(\mathbb{Z})$, ξ_1, ξ_2 primitive, such that*

$$\pi_{\tilde{Q}_1, \tilde{Q}_2} [(1, 1) + \mathbb{Z}(Q_1 \xi_1, Q_2 \xi_2)] \subset \pi_{\tilde{Q}_1, \tilde{Q}_2}(B^{2880^2}),$$

The values of $Q_1, Q_2, \tilde{Q}_1, \tilde{Q}_2$ are specified as follows:

For each $p^n || q'_5$, write $p^{t_1} || Q_1$, $p^{t_2} || Q_2$, we have $t_2 = \lceil \frac{2\theta^{\frac{1}{4}}}{3} n \rceil$, $\lceil \frac{\theta^{\frac{1}{4}}}{6} n \rceil < t_1 < \lceil (\frac{3\theta^{\frac{1}{4}}}{4}) n \rceil$, and $p^{2t_1} || \tilde{Q}_1$ and $p^{\lceil \frac{4t_2}{3} \rceil} || \tilde{Q}_2$.

For each $p^n || q_2^*$ but $p \neq q'_5$, we have $p^n || Q_2, \tilde{Q}_2$.

For each $p^n || q_1^*$, we have $p^n || Q_1, \tilde{Q}_1$.

With Lemma 6.22 at hand, which plays the same role as Theorem B to create a one-parameter group, we run the same arguments in Section 5.5 and Section 5.6 and we give a sketch here. The starting step is to apply Proposition 4.2 to find elements from A to conjugate (ξ_1, ξ_2) to other directions. By considering five primitive linear forms, we can produce $g_1, g_2, g_3, g_4, g_5 \in A$ such that the following holds:

There exists $\bar{q}_5 || q_5$ and

$$\bar{q}_5 > (q'_5)^{1-5\theta^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \quad (6.23)$$

such that

$$(\bar{q}_5)^{\{5\theta^{\frac{1}{2}}\}} \pi_{\bar{q}_5}(V \times V) \subset \pi_{\bar{q}_5} \text{Span}_{\mathbb{Z}} \{\xi, g_1 \xi g_1^{-1}, g_2 \xi g_2^{-1}, g_3 \xi g_3^{-1}, g_4 \xi g_4^{-1}, g_5 \xi g_5^{-1}\} \quad (6.24)$$

as long as

$$\delta < \frac{c_2 \epsilon \theta}{2}. \quad (6.25)$$

Let $\bar{Q}_1 = \gcd(Q_1, \bar{q}_5)$, $\bar{Q}_2 = \gcd(Q_2, \bar{q}_5)$. Lemma 6.22 and (6.24) then implies the existence of $F_1 \subset \{B^{2880^2} \cup A\}^{10}$ such that

$$\pi_{\bar{Q}_1 \{ \frac{4}{3} \}, \bar{Q}_2 \{ \frac{4}{3} \}} \left[(1 + \bar{Q}_1 \{ \frac{5}{4} \} V), (1 + \bar{Q}_2 \{ \frac{5}{4} \} V) \right] \subset F_1. \quad (6.26)$$

and

$$\pi_{q_1^*, q_2^*/\bar{q}_5}(F_1) = 1. \quad (6.27)$$

Then taking commutator of the left hand side of (6.26) and taking further commutator iteratively, we obtain a set $F_2 \subset \{B^{2880^2} \cup A\}^{\lceil 199 \cdot 8^{\theta - \frac{1}{4}} \rceil}$ such that

$$\Lambda(\bar{Q}_1^{20} / \Lambda(\bar{q}_5)) \times \Lambda(\bar{Q}_2^{20} / \Lambda(\bar{q}_5)) \subset \pi_{\bar{q}_5}(F_2), \quad (6.28)$$

and

$$\pi_{q_1^*, q_2^*/\bar{q}_5}(F_2) = 1. \quad (6.29)$$

In this case, we let $q_3^* = \bar{q}_5$. From (6.23), we have

$$q_1 q_2 q_3^* > (q_1^* q_2^* q_5')^{1-5\theta^{\frac{1}{2}}} > (q_1 q_2)^{1-6\theta^{\frac{1}{2}}} q_3^{\frac{1}{5}},$$

which implies

$$q_3^* > q_3^{\frac{1}{5}} q^{-12\theta^{\frac{1}{2}}} > q_3^{\frac{1}{10}}. \quad (6.30)$$

And also from (6.3), if $q_1 q_2 / q_3^* > (q_1 q_2)^{\theta^{\frac{1}{2}}}$, then

$$|\pi_{q_1, q_2/q_3^*}(B)| > (q_2/q_3^*)^{3-3\theta^{\frac{1}{2}}}. \quad (6.31)$$

(6.28), (6.29) and (6.31) then imply

$$|\pi_{q_1 q_3^*, q_2}(\{B^{2880^2} \cup A\}^{[200 \cdot 8^{\theta - \frac{1}{4}}]})| > (q_1 q_2 q_3^*)^{3-60\theta^{\frac{1}{4}}}. \quad (6.32)$$

If $q_1 q_2 / q_3^* \leq (q_1 q_2)^{\theta^{\frac{1}{2}}}$, then $q_3^* > q_2^{1-\theta^{\frac{1}{2}}}$ and $q_1 < q_2^{\theta^{\frac{1}{2}}}$. Then (6.28) alone will imply (6.32) as well. Proposition 6.1 is thus proved.

7. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 2.2

Recall $q = q_s q_l$, where $q = \prod_{i \in I} p_i^{n_i}$, $q_s = \prod_{i \in I: n_i \leq L} p_i^{n_i}$, $q_l = \prod_{i \in I: n_i > L} p_i^{n_i}$ for some L to be determined at (7.15). We divide our proof into three cases.

7.1. The case $q_l < q^{\frac{\epsilon}{2}}$. Take

$$\delta < \frac{\log \frac{1}{c_0}}{4} \quad (7.1)$$

for $c_0 = c_0(L)$ the implied constant from Theorem A, so that

$$|\pi_{q_s}^*(\chi_S^{(l)})(x) - \frac{1}{|\Lambda_{q_s}|}| < \frac{1}{2}$$

for any $x \in \Lambda_{q_s}$. Since $\pi_{q_s}^*(\chi_S^{(l)})(A) > q^{-\delta}$, we have $|A| > q^{6-2\delta}$ for q sufficiently large. By taking

$$\delta = \min\left\{\frac{\log \frac{1}{c_0}}{4}, \frac{\epsilon}{3}\right\}, \quad (7.2)$$

we have $|A| > q^{1-\epsilon}$, so the assumption in (2.3) is void and Proposition 2.2 automatically holds.

7.2. **The case** $q^{\frac{\epsilon}{2}} < q_l < q^{1-\frac{\epsilon}{2}}$. We assume the conclusion of Proposition 2.2 fails, i.e.

$$|\pi_q(A \cdot A \cdot A)| \leq |\pi_q(A)|^{1+\delta}. \quad (7.3)$$

and we will arrive at a contradiction if we take δ sufficiently small.

If

$$\delta \leq \frac{\log \frac{1}{c_0}}{4}, \quad (7.4)$$

we have

$$|\pi_{q_s}(A)| > q^{-\delta} q_s^6 > q_s^{6-\frac{\delta}{\epsilon}}, \quad (7.5)$$

Here we can view $\frac{\delta}{\epsilon}$ measures the closeness of $\pi_{q_s}(A)$ to Λ_{q_s} .

On the other hand, Proposition 5.6 provides some $q' || q_l, q' > q_l^{\frac{c_1 c_3}{1024 C_1}}$, such that

$$|\pi_{q'} \circ \mathbb{P}_1(A^{C'})| > (q')^{3-\theta}$$

where both C' and θ are functions of δ given by

$$C' = C'(\delta) = C_3 2^{C_2+1} 8^{\lceil \frac{c_1^5 C_3^3}{c_{11} c_2 c_3^5} \frac{\epsilon}{\delta} \rceil}, \quad (7.6)$$

$$\theta = \theta(\delta) = \frac{3 \times 10^{18} C_1^4 C_3^2 \delta}{c_1^9 c_2 c_3^5 \epsilon}. \quad (7.7)$$

We clearly have $\theta(\delta) \rightarrow 0$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$.

Now we apply Proposition 7.6 with $B = A^{C'}$, $q_1 = q_2 = q_s$, $q_3 = q'$ and θ given in (7.7), with the requirement that

$$\delta < \frac{c_1^9 c_2 c_3^5}{3 \times 10^{30} C_1^4 C_3^2} \epsilon, \quad (7.8)$$

so that the assumption (6.2) in Proposition 7.6 is satisfied. We then obtain $q'' | q', q'' > q'^{\frac{1}{4} 10^{-4}}$, and

$$|\pi_{q_s q'', q_s}(A^{C' C''})| > (q_s^2 q'')^{3-300\theta^{\frac{1}{4}}}, \quad (7.9)$$

where

$$C'' = \lceil 200 \cdot 8^{\theta^{-\frac{1}{2}}} \rceil. \quad (7.10)$$

By (7.10), we have increased the modulus of the first component from q_s to $q_s q''$, at the cost of a density loss from $3 - \theta$ to $3 - 300\theta^{\frac{1}{4}}$.

If $q_s q'' < q^{1-\frac{\epsilon}{2}}$, we apply Proposition 5.6 with modulus q_l replaced by $\frac{q}{q_s q''}$, then we apply Proposition 7.6 to increase the modulus to a larger one. We apply Proposition 5.6 and Proposition 7.6 iteratively until we reach a modulus $q_1^* || q, q_1^* > q^{1-\frac{\epsilon}{2}}$. Next, we go through

the same procedure to increase the modulus of the second component to $q_2^* || q, q_2^* > q^{1-\frac{\epsilon}{2}}$. In total it takes at most $\lceil \frac{10^8 C_1}{c_1 c_3 \epsilon} \rceil$ steps. In the end, we obtain

$$\left| \pi_{q_1^*, q_2^*} \left(A^{C'(C'')^{\lceil \frac{10^8 C_1}{c_1 c_3 \epsilon} \rceil}} \right) \right| > (q_1^* q_2^*)^{3-(300\theta^{\frac{1}{4}})^{\lceil \frac{10^8 C_1}{c_1 c_3 \epsilon} \rceil}} > q^{6-3\epsilon-2(300\theta^{\frac{1}{4}})^{\lceil \frac{10^8 C_1}{c_1 c_3 \epsilon} \rceil}}. \quad (7.11)$$

Recall also $\pi_q(A) < q^{6-6\epsilon}$, so

$$\left| \pi_q \left(A^{C'(C'')^{\lceil \frac{10^8 C_1}{c_1 c_3 \epsilon} \rceil}} \right) \right| > |A|^{1+\frac{\epsilon}{3}} \quad (7.12)$$

if

$$2(300\theta^{\frac{1}{4}})^{\lceil \frac{10^8 C_1}{c_1 c_3 \epsilon} \rceil} < \epsilon. \quad (7.13)$$

Then (7.13) and (5.2) imply

$$|\pi_q(A \cdot A \cdot A)| > |A|^{1+\frac{\epsilon}{3C'}(C'')^{-\lceil \frac{10^8 C_1}{c_1 c_3 \epsilon} \rceil}}. \quad (7.14)$$

We take δ_0 sufficiently small so that $\theta = \theta(\delta_0)$ satisfies (7.13). Then we take

$$L = \left\lceil \frac{14}{\delta_0} \right\rceil \quad (7.15)$$

in view of the condition (5.5). Then take $C' = C'(\delta_0)$ given at (7.6) and $C'' = C''(\theta(\delta_0))$ given at (7.10). Finally, we set

$$\delta = \min\left\{ \delta_0, \frac{\log \frac{1}{c_0}}{4}, \frac{\epsilon}{3C'}(C'')^{-\lceil \frac{10^8 C_1}{c_1 c_3 \epsilon} \rceil} \right\}.$$

Then (7.14) contradicts (7.3). Proposition 2.2 is proved in this case as well.

7.3. The case $q_l > q^{1-\frac{\epsilon}{2}}$. In this case the modulus q_s can be ignored. We use Proposition 5.6 to create a product set B of A such that $\pi_{q_1} \mathbb{P}_1(B)$ and $\pi_{q_2} \mathbb{P}_1(B)$ are large, where $q_1, q_2 || q, \gcd(q_1, q_2) = 1$. Then we start our iterative process from B . The analysis is virtually identical to the previous case.

Proposition 2.2 is thus fully proved.

REFERENCES

- [AM85] Noga Alon and Vitali D Milman. λ_1 , isoperimetric inequalities for graphs, and superconcentrators. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 38(1):73–88, 1985. 4
- [BFLM11] Jean Bourgain, Alex Furman, Elon Lindenstrauss, and Shahar Mozes. Stationary measures and equidistribution for orbits of nonabelian semigroups on the torus. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 24(1):231–280, 2011. 2
- [BG08a] Jean Bourgain and Alex Gamburd. Expansion and random walks in $SL_d(\mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z})$: I. *Journal of the European Mathematical Society*, 10(4):987–1011, 2008. 1, 4
- [BG08b] Jean Bourgain and Alex Gamburd. Uniform expansion bounds for Cayley graphs of $SL_2(\mathbb{F}_p)$. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 167(2):625–642, 2008. 1
- [BG09] Jean Bourgain and Alex Gamburd. Expansion and random walks in $SL_d(\mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z})$, II. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 11(5):1057–1103, 2009. 1, 4, 12
- [BGS10] Jean Bourgain, Alex Gamburd, and Peter Sarnak. Affine linear sieve, expanders, and sum-product. *Invent. Math.*, 179(3):559–644, 2010. 1
- [Bou08] Jean Bourgain. The sum-product theorem in $\mathbb{Z}/q\mathbb{Z}$ with q arbitrary. *Journal d’Analyse Mathématique*, 106(1):1, 2008. 5, 6
- [BV12] Jean Bourgain and Péter P. Varjú. Expansion in $SL_d(\mathbb{Z}/q\mathbb{Z})$, q arbitrary. *Invent. Math.*, 188(1):151–173, 2012. 1, 2, 3, 4
- [BY91] Carlos A Berenstein and Alain Yger. Effective Bézout identities in $Q[z_1, \dots, z_n]$. *Acta Math.*, 166(3):69–120, 1991. 12
- [Gol19] Alireza Salehi Golsefidy. Super-approximation, II: the p -adic case and the case of bounded powers of square-free integers. *Journal of the European Mathematical Society*, 21(7):2163–2232, 2019. 1, 2
- [Gol20] Alireza Salehi Golsefidy. Sum-product phenomena: p -adic case. *Journal d’Analyse Mathématique*, 142(2):349–419, 2020. 2
- [Gow08] William T Gowers. Quasirandom groups. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, 17(3):363–387, 2008. 8
- [GV12] A. Salehi Golsefidy and Péter P. Varjú. Expansion in perfect groups. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 22(6):1832–1891, 2012. 1, 2
- [HdS19] Weikun He and Nicolas de Saxcé. Linear random walks on the torus. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.13421*, 2019. 2
- [HdS21] Weikun He and Nicolas de Saxcé. Trou spectral dans les groupes simples. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.06679*, 2021. 2, 3
- [Hel08] H. A. Helfgott. Growth and generation in $SL_2(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})$. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 167(2):601–623, 2008. 1, 8, 14
- [Mar73] Grigorii Aleksandrovich Margulis. Explicit constructions of concentrators. *Problemy Peredachi Informatsii*, 9(4):71–80, 1973. 1
- [TZ23] Jincheng Tang and Xin Zhang. Sum-product phenomenon in quotients of rings of algebraic integer. 2023. 2
- [Var12] Péter P Varjú. Expansion in $SL_d(O_K/I)$, I square-free. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 14(1):273–305, 2012. 1

Email address: `tangent@connect.hku.hk`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, THE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG

Email address: `xz27@hku.hk`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, THE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG