

The best Diophantine approximations: the phenomenon of degenerate dimension

Moshchevitin, N.G. *

This brief survey deals with multi-dimensional Diophantine approximations in sense of linear form and with simultaneous Diophantine approximations. We discuss the phenomenon of degenerate dimension of linear subspaces generated by the best Diophantine approximations. Originally most of these results have been established by the author in [14, 15, 16, 17, 18]. Here we collect all of them together and give some new formulations. In contrast to our previous survey [17], this paper contains a wider number of results, especially dealing with the best Diophantine approximations. It also includes proofs or sometimes the sketches of proofs. Some applications of these results and methods to the theory of small denominators can be found in [14, 19] and [13].

§1. The best Diophantine approximations in sense of linear form.

1.1 Notation.

Let $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r$ be real numbers which, together with 1, are linearly independent over rationals. For an integer point

$$m = (m_0, m_1, \dots, m_r) \in \mathbf{Z}^{r+1} \setminus \{(0, \dots, 0)\}$$

we define

$$\zeta(m) = |m_0 + m_1\alpha_1 + \dots + m_r\alpha_r| \quad \text{and} \quad M = \max_{j=0,1,\dots,r} |m_j|.$$

*Research is supported by the grants RFFI (02-01-00192), grant of the President of RF (MD-3321.2004.1) and INTAS (03-51-5070)

A point $m \in \mathbf{Z}^{r+1} \setminus \{0\}$ is defined to be *the best approximation (in sense of linear form)* if

$$\zeta(m) = \min_{n \in \mathbf{Z}^{r+1} \setminus \{0\}: N \leq M} |\zeta(n)|$$

(here $N = \max_j |n_j|$). For the set of all best approximations m the corresponding values of $\zeta(m)$ and M can be ordered in descending (ascending) order:

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_1 &> \zeta_2 > \dots > \zeta_\nu > \zeta_{\nu+1} > \dots, \\ M_1 &< M_2 < \dots < M_\nu < M_{\nu+1} < \dots \end{aligned}$$

(Here $m_\nu = (m_{0,\nu}, \dots, m_{r,\nu})$ is ν -th best approximation and $\zeta_\nu = \zeta(m_\nu)$, $M_\nu = \max_j |m_{j,\nu}|$.) By the Minkowski convex body theorem it follows that $\zeta_\nu M_{\nu+1}^r \leq 1$. Let Δ_ν^r denote the determinant of the $r+1$ consecutive best approximations:

$$\Delta_\nu^r = \begin{vmatrix} m_{0,\nu} & m_{1,\nu} & \dots & m_{r,\nu} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ m_{0,\nu+r} & m_{1,\nu+r} & \dots & m_{r,\nu+r} \end{vmatrix}.$$

1.2. The results on dimension.

Here we observe some properties of the values Δ_ν^r discovered in [16].

The following statement is well known from the continued fractions theory (see [8]).

Theorem 1.1. *Let $r = 1$ and let α_1 be an irrational number. Then for any natural ν the determinant Δ_ν^1 is equal to $(-1)^{\nu-1}$.*

The next result deals with dimension 2. It follows from the Minkowski convex body theorem.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $r = 2$ and let α_1, α_2 be together with 1 linearly independent over rationals. Then there exist infinitely many values of ν for which $\Delta_\nu^2 \neq 0$.*

As was mentioned Theorem 1.2 is a simple corollary of the Minkowski theorem and we shall give a sketch of the proof of Theorem 1.2 in the next section.

Now we formulate our main result in this area which deals with the case $r > 2$.

Theorem 1.3. *Given $r \geq 3$ there exists an uncountable set of r -tuples $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r)$ such that the corresponding sequence of the best approximations m_ν for all large ν lies in a three-dimensional sublattice $\Lambda(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r)$ of the lattice \mathbf{Z}^{r+1} . Moreover, each of these r -tuples consists of linearly independent over rationals together with 1 reals.*

Corollary. For any r -tuple $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r)$ in Theorem 1.3 there exists $\nu_0(\alpha)$ such that for all $\nu > \nu_0(\alpha)$ we have $\Delta_\nu^r = 0$.

We shall give the proof of the Theorem 1.3 in Section 1.5. It is based on the so-called Hinchin's singular r -tuples (see [7],[9] and Cassels' book [1]). Before this proof in Section 1.4 we discuss the properties of Hinchin's singular systems and their generalizations.

To finish this section we would like to emphasize once again that for $r \geq 2$ for any r -tuple $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r)$ of \mathbf{Q} -independent reals all but finite number of the best approximation vectors never lie in a two-dimensional subspace but can lie in a three-dimensional subspace. We also would like to mention that there are many results related to various definitions, algorithmic calculating the best approximations in general and for the algebraic numbers (see for example [3, 4, 10, 11, 12, 24]) .

1.3. Sketch of the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Assume the contrary: suppose that for some α_1, α_2 , which together with 1 are linearly independent over \mathbf{Z} we know that all best approximations m_ν , $\nu \geq \nu_0$ lie in some two-dimensional linear subspace π . Then from the continued fractions theory (compare with Theorem 1.1) we have

$$\zeta_\nu M_{\nu+1} \asymp \zeta_\mu M_{\mu+1}, \quad \forall \nu, \mu > \nu_0. \quad (1)$$

Consider the cube $E_H^3 = \{x = (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in R^3 : |x_j| \leq H\}$ and the domain $L_\sigma^2 = \{x \in R^3; \rho(x; L^2) \leq \sigma\}$. Now the intersection $\Omega(\sigma, H) = E_H^3 \cap L_\sigma^2$ is a convex O -symmetric body in π . As m_ν is a best approximation we conclude that in the set $\Omega(\zeta_\nu, M_{\nu+1})$ there are no integer points. However from (1) it follows that

$$Vol \Omega(\zeta_\nu, M_{\nu+1}) \asymp \zeta_\nu M_{\nu+1}^2 \asymp M_{\nu+1} \rightarrow \infty, \quad \nu \rightarrow \infty,$$

and we have arrived at a contradiction with the Minkowski convex body theorem.

1.4. Hinchin's ψ -singular linear forms.

From the continued fractions theory [8] we know that in the case $r = 1$ we have

$$\zeta_\nu M_{\nu+1} \asymp 1. \quad (2)$$

Next we show that for linear forms in two or more variables the situation may be different: the values of $M_{\nu+1}$, corresponding to the best approximations $m_{\nu+1}$ may not be estimated from below in terms of previous approximation ζ_ν .

Theorem 1.4 . *Let $r \geq 2$ and $\psi(y)$ be a real valued function decreasing to 0 as $y \rightarrow \infty$. Then there exists an uncountable set of vectors $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r)$ (with components $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r, 1$ linearly independent over rationals) such that for all corresponding best approximations we have*

$$\zeta_\nu \leq \psi(M_{\nu+r-1}) \quad \forall \nu. \quad (3)$$

We would like to remind the readers the definition of a ψ -singular linear form (in Hinchin's sense) [9], [7]. Let $\psi(y) = o(y^{-r}), y \rightarrow +\infty$ decreases to zero. An r -tuple $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r$ is ψ -singular (in sense of linear form) if for any $T > 1$ the following Diophantine inequality has a solution in integer r -tuple m :

$$\|m_1\alpha_1 + \dots + m_r\alpha_r\| < \psi(T), \quad 0 < \max_{1 \leq j \leq r} |m_j| \leq T.$$

(Here $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the distance to the nearest integer.)

It is easy to verify that an r -tuple $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r$ is ψ -singular if and only if for all natural ν

$$\zeta_\nu \leq \psi(M_{\nu+1}). \quad (4)$$

From this point of view Theorem 1.4 in the case $s \geq 3$ establishes the existence of r -tuples which are "more singular" than Hinchin's singular linear forms.

Proof of Theorem 1.4.

This proof was sketched in [16]. It is based on the following lemma.

Let

$$\nu_* \equiv \nu \pmod{r}, \quad 1 \leq \nu_* \leq r$$

and σ is a great positive number (σ depends on r , all the constants in symbols $O(\cdot), \ll, \gg$ below may depend on σ). Let

$$\sigma_{j,\nu} = \sigma \nu_*^j, \quad W = \max_{j,\nu} \sigma_{j,\nu}.$$

Lemma 1.1. *There exists an uncountable set of vectors $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r$ such that*

- 1) $1, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r$ are linearly independent over \mathbf{Z} ;
- 2) there exist a sequence of naturals p_ν under the conditions
 - (i) $\sigma_{j,\nu} \psi(p_\nu) \leq \|p_\nu \alpha_j\| = p_\nu \alpha_j - a_{j,\nu} \leq (\sigma_{j,\nu} + 1) \psi(p_\nu)$; $j = 1, \dots, r$,
 - (ii) $p_{\nu+1} \asymp p_\nu (\psi(p_\nu))^{-1}$.

Proof of Lemma 1.1.

We construct numbers $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r$ with simultaneous approximations of special type.

Let us take a sequence of zeroes and ones $\lambda = \{\lambda_\nu^2, \dots, \lambda_\nu^s\}_{\nu=1}^\infty$; $\lambda_\nu^j \in \{0; 1\}$. Now we define naturals p_ν , $a_{j,\nu}$, $j = 1, \dots, r$, and segments $\Delta_{1,\nu}, \dots, \Delta_{r,\nu}$ with lengths $|\Delta_{j,\nu}| = 2\psi(p_\nu)/p_\nu$ by the following recursive procedure.

Numbers $p_0, a_{1,0}, \dots, a_{r,0}$ may be taken arbitrary. Define

$$\Delta_{j,0} = \left[\frac{a_{j,0}}{p_0} + \sigma_{j,\nu} \frac{\psi(p_0)}{p_0}, \frac{a_{j,0}}{p_0} + (\sigma_{j,\nu} + 1) \frac{\psi(p_0)}{p_0} \right], \quad j = 1, \dots, r.$$

Let p_0, \dots, p_ν ; $a_{j,0}, \dots, a_{j,\nu}$ and $\Delta_{j,0}, \dots, \Delta_{j,\nu}$ are already defined. We are constructing $p_{\nu+1}$, $a_{j,\nu+1}$ and $\Delta_{j,\nu+1}$.

Let

$$p_{\nu+1} = \left[6p_\nu (\psi(p_\nu))^{-1} \right] + 1.$$

Then in any interval of the length $\psi(p_\nu)/(6p_\nu)$ one can find a number $a/p_{\nu+1}$, $a \in \mathbf{Z}$. Let

$$\frac{a_{j,\nu+1}^0}{p_{\nu+1}} \in \left[\frac{a_{j,\nu}}{p_\nu} + \left(\sigma_{j,\nu} + \frac{1}{6}\right) \cdot \frac{\psi(p_\nu)}{p_\nu}, \frac{a_{j,\nu}}{p_\nu} + \left(\sigma_{j,\nu} + \frac{2}{6}\right) \cdot \frac{\psi(p_\nu)}{p_\nu} \right],$$

$$\frac{a_{j,\nu+1}^1}{p_{\nu+1}} \in \left[\frac{a_{j,\nu}}{p_\nu} + \left(\sigma_{j,\nu} + \frac{4}{6}\right) \cdot \frac{\psi(p_\nu)}{p_\nu}, \frac{a_{j,\nu}}{p_\nu} + \left(\sigma_{j,\nu} + \frac{5}{6}\right) \cdot \frac{\psi(p_\nu)}{p_\nu} \right].$$

Now define

$$\Delta_{j,\nu+1}^\tau = \left[\frac{a_{j,\nu+1}^\tau}{p_{\nu+1}} + \sigma_{j,\nu+1} \frac{\psi(p_{\nu+1})}{p_{\nu+1}}, \frac{a_{j,\nu+1}^\tau}{p_{\nu+1}} + (\sigma_{j,\nu+1} + 1) \frac{\psi(p_{\nu+1})}{p_{\nu+1}} \right],$$

$$\tau = 0, 1; j = 2, \dots, r.$$

WE must note that

$$\Delta_{j,\nu+1}^0 \cap \Delta_{2,\nu+1}^1 = \emptyset$$

and

$$\frac{a_{j,\nu}}{p_\nu} \notin \Delta_{j,\nu+1}^\tau, \quad \tau = 0, 1.$$

Moreover $|\Delta_{j,\nu+1}^j| = \psi(p_{\nu+1})/p_{\nu+1}$ and due to

$$(\sigma_{j,\nu+1} + 1)\psi(p_{\nu+1})/p_{\nu+1} \leq \psi(p_\nu)/6p_\nu$$

(here we suppose ψ to decrease fast enough: $W\psi(p_{\nu+1}) < \psi(p_\nu)$), one has $\Delta_{j,\nu+1}^\tau \subset \Delta_{j,\nu}$, $\tau = 0, 1$. Put $a_{j,\nu+1} = a_{j,\nu+1}^{\lambda_\nu^j}$ and $\Delta_{j,\nu+1} = \Delta_{j,\nu+1}^{\lambda_\nu^j}$. An integer number $a_{1,\nu+1}$ we define from the condition

$$\frac{a_{1,\nu+1}}{p_{\nu+1}} \in \left[\frac{a_{j,\nu}}{p_\nu} + \left(\sigma_{j,\nu} + \frac{1}{6}\right) \cdot \frac{\psi(p_\nu)}{p_\nu}, \frac{a_{j,\nu}}{p_\nu} + \left(\sigma_{j,\nu} + \frac{2}{6}\right) \cdot \frac{\psi(p_\nu)}{p_\nu} \right],$$

Now let

$$\Delta_{1,\nu+1} = \left[\frac{a_{1,\nu+1}}{p_{\nu+1}} \sigma_{j,\nu+1} \frac{\psi(p_{\nu+1})}{p_{\nu+1}}, \frac{a_{1,\nu+1}}{p_{\nu+1}} + (\sigma_{j,\nu+1} + 1) \frac{\psi(p_{\nu+1})}{p_{\nu+1}} \right].$$

We have $\Delta_{1,\nu+1} \subset \Delta_{1,\nu}$, $|\Delta_{1,\nu+1}| = \psi(p_{\nu+1})/p_{\nu+1}$ and $\frac{a_{1,\nu}}{p_\nu} \notin \Delta_{1,\nu+1}$.

To summsrize we constructed a sequence of enclosed segments

$$\{\Delta_{1,\nu}\}_{\nu=0}^\infty$$

and for arbitrary 0,1-sequence λ we have a sequence of enclosed segments $\{\Delta_{j,\nu}\}_{\nu=0}^\infty$. Denote

$$\alpha_1 = \bigcap_{\nu} \Delta_{1,\nu}; \quad \alpha_j = \alpha_j(\lambda) = \bigcap_{\nu} \Delta_{j,\nu}.$$

IN the sequences of fractions $a_{1,\nu}/p_\nu$ and $a_{j,\nu}/p_\nu$ all elements are different so $\alpha_1, \alpha_j(\lambda) \notin \mathbf{Q}$. Moreover we can choose λ in such a way that $1, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r$ be linearly independent over rationals. Similar procedure was performed in [20].

So we construct $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r \in \mathbf{R}$ satisfying the conditions

- A.** $1, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r$ are linear independent \mathbf{Z} ;
- B.** for a sequence of naturals p_ν ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|p_\nu \alpha_j\| &= \|p_\nu \alpha_j - a_{j,\nu}\| < \psi(p_\nu), \quad j = 1, \dots, r, \\ 3p_\nu(\psi(p_\nu))^{-1} &\leq p_{\nu+1} \leq 4p_\nu(\psi(p_\nu))^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

One can easily verify that for any decreasing $\psi(y)$ the set

$$M_\psi = \{(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r) \in \mathbf{R}^r : \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r \text{ satisfy } A, B\}$$

is uncountable and dense in \mathbf{R}^r .

We must note for the future that the determinant

$$\begin{vmatrix} \sigma_{1,\nu} & \sigma_{2,\nu} & \dots & \sigma_{r,\nu} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ \sigma_{1,\nu+r-1} & \sigma_{2,\nu+r-1} & \dots & \sigma_{r,\nu+r-1} \end{vmatrix} = \pm \sigma^r \prod_{1 \leq u < v \leq r} (v - u)$$

and for large $\sigma = \sigma(r)$ for any $\eta_{j,\mu} \in [-1, 1]$, $j = 1, \dots, r$; $\mu = \nu, \dots, \nu + r - 1$ one has

$$\begin{aligned} &\begin{vmatrix} \sigma_{1,\nu} + \eta_{1,\nu} & \sigma_{2,\nu} + \eta_{2,\nu} & \dots & \sigma_{r,\nu} + \eta_{r,\nu} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ \sigma_{1,\nu+r-1} + \eta_{1,\nu+r-1} & \sigma_{2,\nu+r-1} + \eta_{2,\nu+r-1} & \dots & \sigma_{r,\nu+r-1} + \eta_{r,\nu+r-1} \end{vmatrix} = \\ &= \pm \sigma^r + o(\sigma^r) \neq 0. \end{aligned}$$

In the sequel this large value of $\sigma = \sigma(r)$ is fixed.

Moreover it is easy to modify the construction in lemma 1.2 to establish that for any value p_ν there exists the *best* approximation for linear form $\|m_1^* \alpha_1 + \dots + m_r^* \alpha_r$ where vectors (m_1^*, \dots, m_r^*) , $(p_\nu, a_{1,\nu}, 0, \dots, 0)$, \dots , $(p_\nu, 0, \dots, 0, \alpha_{r,\nu})$ are linearly dependent and $M^* \ll p_\nu^2$.

The proof is complete.

Lemma 1.2. *For numbers $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r$, constructed in Lemma 1.1 there exists an infinite sequence of values of the linear form*

$$\zeta(n_\nu) = n_{0,\nu} + n_{1,\nu} \alpha_1 + \dots + n_{r,\nu} \alpha_r = |n_{1,\nu} \alpha_1 + \dots + n_{r,\nu} \alpha_r|$$

such that

$$0 < \zeta(n_{\nu+1}) < \zeta(n_\nu) \ll \psi(\kappa N_{\nu+s-1}),$$

where

$$N_\nu = \max |n_{j,\nu}|$$

and $\kappa > 0$ is a constant.

Proof of Lemma 1.2.

Let

$$\begin{aligned}
\zeta(n_\nu) &= \pm \begin{vmatrix} 1 & \alpha_1 & \cdots & \alpha_r \\ p_\nu & a_{1,\nu} & \cdots & a_{r,\nu} \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ p_{\nu+r-1} & a_{1,\nu+r-1} & \cdots & a_{r,\nu+r-1} \end{vmatrix} = \\
&= \pm \begin{vmatrix} a_{1,\nu} - p_\nu \alpha_1 & \cdots & a_{r,\nu} - p_\nu \alpha_r \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ a_{1,\nu+r-1} - p_{\nu+r-1} \alpha_1 & \cdots & a_{r,\nu+r-1} - p_{\nu+r-1} \alpha_r \end{vmatrix} = \\
&= \psi(p_\nu) \cdots \psi(p_{\nu+r-1}) \times \\
&\times \begin{vmatrix} \sigma_{1,\nu} + \eta_{1,\nu} & \sigma_{2,\nu} + \eta_{2,\nu} & \cdots & \sigma_{r,\nu} + \eta_{r,\nu} \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ \sigma_{1,\nu+r-1} + \eta_{1,\nu+r-1} & \sigma_{2,\nu+r-1} + \eta_{2,\nu+r-1} & \cdots & \sigma_{r,\nu+r-1} + \eta_{r,\nu+r-1} \end{vmatrix} \asymp \\
&\asymp \psi(p_\nu) \cdots \psi(p_{\nu+r-1}).
\end{aligned}$$

(Here $\eta_{j,\mu} = \frac{a_{j,\mu} - p_\mu \alpha_j}{\psi(p_\mu)} + \sigma_{j,\mu} \in [-1, 1]$ and the sign + or - is taken to satisfy $\zeta(n_\nu) > 0$.) Then

$$\zeta(n_\nu) \asymp \prod_{\mu=\nu}^{\nu+s-1} \max_{j=1,r} |a_{j,\mu} - p_\mu \alpha_j| \asymp \prod_{\mu=\nu}^{\nu+r-1} \psi(p_\mu) < \psi(p_{\nu+r-1}). \quad (5)$$

For the coefficients $n_{j,\nu}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
n_{j,\nu} &= \pm \begin{vmatrix} p_\nu & a_{1,\nu} & \cdots & a_{j-1,\nu} & a_{j+1,\nu} & \cdots & a_{r,\nu} \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ p_\nu & a_{1,\nu+r-1} & \cdots & a_{j-1,\nu+r-1} & a_{j+1,\nu+r-1} & \cdots & a_{s,\nu+r-1} \end{vmatrix} = \\
&= \pm \begin{vmatrix} p_\nu & a_{1,\nu} - p_\nu \alpha_1 & \cdots & a_{r,\nu} - p_\nu \alpha_r \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ p_{\nu+r-1} & a_{1,\nu+r-1} - p_{\nu+r-1} \alpha_1 & \cdots & a_{r,\nu+r-1} - p_{\nu+r-1} \alpha_r \end{vmatrix}.
\end{aligned}$$

Using (i) and (ii) we deduce

$$|n_{j,\nu+r-1}| \ll p_{\nu+r-1} \psi(p_{\nu+r-2}) \ll p_\nu \quad \forall j. \quad (6)$$

(We may note that $N_{\nu+r-1} = \max_j |n_{j,\nu+r-1}| \asymp p_\nu$.)

Now from (5), (6) we have

$$0 < \zeta(n_\nu) \ll \psi(\kappa N_{\nu+r-1}).$$

We may suppose $\zeta(n_{\nu+1}) < \zeta(n_\nu)$.

The proof is complete.

Theorem 1.4 follows immediately from Lemmas 1.1 and 1.2 as for the numbers constructed in Lemma 1.1 by Lemma 1.2 we have approximations satisfying (3) and in this case the inequality (3) is also valid for the best approximations.

Theorem 1.4 is proved.

1.5. Proof of Theorem 1.3.

We need the following notation. Let $r \geq 2$, \mathbf{R}^{r+1} be Euclidean space with Cartesian coordinates (x_0, \dots, x_r) , $\mathbf{Z}^{r+1} \subset \mathbf{R}^{r+1}$ be the lattice of integers, L^r be the r -dimensional subspace in \mathbf{R}^{r+1} orthogonal to the vector $(1, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r)$ and the r -tuple $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r$ satisfies (4) with

$$\psi(y) = e^{-\gamma y}, \quad \gamma \in (0; 1). \quad (7)$$

(So for our proof we need only ordinary Hinchin's singular linear forms rather than the generalization from Theorem 1.4.)

Let $\mathbf{R}^{r+2} = \mathbf{R}^{r+1}(x_0, \dots, x_r) \times \mathbf{R}^1(z)$ be the product of \mathbf{R}^{r+1} and \mathbf{R}^1 ,

$$\mathcal{L}^{r+1} = L^r \times \mathbf{R}^1,$$

$$\mathcal{L}_\delta^{r+1} = \{X \in \mathbf{R}^{r+2} : \rho(X, \mathcal{L}^{r+1}) \leq \delta\},$$

$$E_H^{r+2} = \{X = (x_0, \dots, x_r, z) : \max\{|x_0|, \dots, |x_r|, |z|\} \leq H\},$$

$$\Pi(\sigma; H) = E_H^{r+2} \cap \mathcal{L}_\delta^{r+1},$$

$$\mathcal{K} = \bigcup_{t \geq 1} \Pi(2e^{-(\gamma-\varepsilon)t}; t), \quad \varepsilon \in (0, \gamma).$$

The infinite domain \mathcal{K} has finite volume:

$$\text{Vol } \mathcal{K} \ll \int_1^\infty t^{r+1} e^{-(\gamma-\varepsilon)t} dt < +\infty.$$

Moreover from our choice of ψ by (7) we have $m_\nu \in \mathcal{K} \quad \forall \nu \geq \nu_0$.

Let B_ϵ be a $(r+2)$ -dimensional ball with radius $\epsilon < 1/2$ centered at $(0, \dots, 0, 1) \in \mathbf{R}^{r+2}$. For a point $\xi \in B_\epsilon$ we put in correspondence the $(r+1)$ -dimensional lattice $\Lambda_\xi = \mathbf{Z}^{r+1} \oplus \xi \mathbf{Z}$ generated by \mathbf{Z}^{r+1} and the point ξ . Let $T_\xi : \mathbf{R}^{r+2} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{r+2}$ be the linear transformation preserving the lattice \mathbf{Z}^{r+1} and transforming the vector ξ into the unit vector $(0, \dots, 0, 1)$. Consider the

$(r+1)$ -dimensional subspace $T_\xi \mathcal{L}^{r+1}$ and define α_{r+1} in such a way that the vector $(1, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r, \alpha_{r+1})$ is orthogonal to the subspace $T_\xi \mathcal{L}^{r+1}$.

The proof of the following lemma is in general similar to the original proof of the Minkowski-Hlawka theorem (see for example [6]). It is based on well-known metric procedure.

Lemma 1.3. *For almost all points $\xi \in B_\epsilon$ (in sense of Lebesgue measure) we have*

- 1) $\Lambda_\xi \cap \mathcal{L}^{r+1} = \{0\}$,
- 2) *the intersection $\Lambda_\xi \cap \mathcal{K}$ contains the points m_ν and at most finite number of other integer points.*

Corollary. *Almost all but a finite number of the best approximations for the $(r+1)$ -tuple $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r, \alpha_{r+1})$ from the lattice \mathbf{Z}^{r+2} coincide with the best approximations for the r -tuple $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r)$ from the lattice \mathbf{Z}^{r+1} .*

Proof of Lemma 1.3.

Let k be natural, e_j be unit vectors in \mathbf{R}^{r+1} , $\chi(X)$ be the characteristic function of the domain \mathcal{K} . We consider the value

$$S_\xi(T) = \sum_{k=1}^T \sum_m \chi(m_0 e_0 + \dots + m_r e_r + m_{r+1} \xi) \geq 0,$$

where the inner sum is taken over all

$$(m_0, \dots, m_r) \in \mathbf{Z}^{r+1}, \quad m_{r+1} \in \mathbf{Z} \setminus \{0\} : \max\{|m_0|, \dots, |m_{r+1}|\} = k.$$

This sum calculates the number of points of the lattice Λ_ξ with norm not greater than T lying in \mathcal{K} and different from the points of $\mathbf{Z}^{r+1} \subset \mathbf{R}^{r+1}$:

$$S_\xi(T) = \#\{m = m_0 e_0 + \dots + m_r e_r + m_{r+1} \xi, \\ m_{r+1} \neq 0, \quad 0 < \max\{|m_0|, \dots, |m_{r+1}|\} \leq T\}.$$

Observe that

$$\int_{B_\epsilon} S_\xi(T) d\xi = \sum_{k=1}^T \sum_m \text{Vol}(B_\epsilon(m) \cap \mathcal{K}),$$

where

$$B_\epsilon(m) = \{X = m_0 e_0 + \dots + m_r e_r + m_{r+1} \xi : \xi \in B_\epsilon\}$$

It is clear that for $\max |m_j| = k$ we have

$$\text{Vol}(B_\epsilon(m) \cap \mathcal{K}) < \text{Vol}(\mathcal{K} \cap \{z \in \mathbf{R}^{r+2} : \max_j |z_j| \geq k/2\}) \ll e^{-\gamma_1 k},$$

where $0 < \gamma_1 < \gamma$. Hence for any T

$$\int_{B_\epsilon} S_\xi(T) d\xi \ll \sum_{k=1}^T k^{r+2} e^{-\gamma_1 k} \ll 1.$$

Now we use Levi's theorem to establish that for almost all $\xi \in B_\epsilon$ there exists a finite limit $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} S_\xi(T)$. This means that for almost all ξ the intersection $\Lambda_\xi \cap \mathcal{K}$ consist of at most finite number of points different from m_ν .

The proof is complete.

Now Theorem 1.3 can be proved by induction. For $r = 2$ we have Hinchin's singular vector (α_1, α_2) satisfying the singularity condition with $\psi(y) = e^{-y}$. The induction step is performed in Lemma 1.3 and the proof is complete.

§2. The best simultaneous Diophantine approximations.

2.1. Definitions.

For a s -tuple of real numbers $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_s) \in \mathbf{R}^s$ we define *the best simultaneous approximation* (briefly, b.s.a) as an integer point $\zeta = (p, a_1, \dots, a_s) \in \mathbf{Z}^{s+1}$ such that

$$D(\zeta) := \max_{j=1, \dots, s} |p\alpha_j - a_j| < \min^* \max_{j=1, \dots, s} |q\alpha_j - b_j|,$$

where \min^* is taken over all q, b_1, \dots, b_s under conditions

$$1 \leq q \leq p; \quad (b_1, \dots, b_s) \in \mathbf{Z}^s \setminus \{(a_1, \dots, a_s)\}.$$

In the case $\alpha_j \notin \mathbf{Q}$ all b.s.a. to α form infinite sequences

$$\zeta^\nu = (p^\nu, a_1^\nu, \dots, a_s^\nu), \quad \nu = 1, 2, \dots,$$

$$p^1 < \dots < p^\nu < p^{\nu+1} < \dots$$

and

$$D(\zeta^1) > \dots > D(\zeta^\nu) > D(\zeta^{\nu+1}) > \dots$$

Let

$$M_\nu[\alpha] = \begin{pmatrix} p^\nu & a_1^\nu & \dots & a_s^\nu \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ p^{\nu+s} & a_1^{\nu+s} & \dots & a_s^{\nu+s} \end{pmatrix}$$

and $\text{rk } M_\nu[\alpha]$ be the rank of the matrix $M_\nu[\alpha]$. Natural number $R(\alpha)$, $2 \leq R(\alpha) \leq s + 1$ is defined as follows

$$R(\alpha) = \min \{n : \text{there exists a lattice } \Lambda \subseteq \mathbf{Z}^{s+1}, \dim \Lambda = n \\ \text{and } \nu_0 \in \mathbf{N} \text{ such that for all } \nu > \nu_0 \zeta^\nu \in \Lambda \}$$

The value $\dim_{\mathbf{Z}} \alpha$ is defined as the maximum number of reals $\alpha_{i_1}, \dots, \alpha_{i_m}$ chosen from $(\alpha_0 = 1, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_s) \in \mathbf{R}^{s+1}$ to be linearly independent over \mathbf{Z} .

Proposition 1. *For $s = 1$ and any ν we have the equality $\det M_\nu[\alpha] = \pm 1$ (it implies that for any ν we have $\text{rk } M_\nu[\alpha] = 2$).*

Proposition 2. *For any $s \geq 1$ the following equality is valid*

$$R(\alpha) = \dim_{\mathbf{Z}} \alpha.$$

Proposition 3. *Let $s = 2$ and α_1, α_2 together with 1 be linearly independent over \mathbf{Z} . Then there exist infinitely many naturals ν such that $\text{rk } M_\nu[\alpha] = 3 = \dim_{\mathbf{Z}} \alpha$ (hence the inequality $\det M_\nu[\alpha] \neq 0$ holds for infinitely many values of ν).*

Propositions 1- 3 are well-known and can be easily verified (compare [11]).

2.2. Counterexample to Lagarias' conjecture.

We formulate our result from [15] which deals with the degeneracy of the dimension of the spaces generated by successive b.s.a. It gives a counterexample to Lagarias' conjecture [11]. We would like to point out that this result was obtained due to discussion with Nikolai Dolbilin. We shall give a sketched proof in next two sections.

Theorem 2.1 *Let $s \geq 3$. Then there exists an uncountable set of s -tuples α with components $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_s$ linearly independent together with 1 over \mathbf{Z} such that $\text{rk } M_\nu[\alpha] \leq 3 \forall \nu \in \mathbf{N}$. (Hence for all ν the equality $\det M_\nu[\alpha] = 0$ is valid.)*

2.3. Inductive lemma for Theorem 2.1.

We consider Euclidean space \mathbf{R}^{s+1} with Cartesian coordinates (x, y_1, \dots, y_s) . Letter ℓ will denote a ray from the origin of coordinates located in the half-space $\{x > 0\}$. For such ray ℓ and for small enough positive ϵ the opened cone $K_\epsilon(\ell)$ consists of all rays ℓ' such that the angle between ℓ and ℓ' is less than ϵ . For a point ξ from the half-space $\{x > 0\}$ we define $\ell(\xi)$ to be the ray $\{\kappa\xi : \kappa \geq 0\}$. Subspace $\pi \subseteq \mathbf{R}^{s+1}$ is defined to be *absolutely rational* if the lattice $\Lambda = \pi \cap \mathbf{Z}^{s+1}$ has dimension equal to the dimension of the whole π : $\dim \Lambda = \dim \pi$. Let ℓ be a ray parallel to a vector $(1, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_s)$. The best approximation to the ray ℓ is defined as a point $\zeta \in \mathbf{Z}^{s+1}$ which is the b.s.a. to β .

In the case when each β_j is not a half of an integer the sequence of all best approximations

$$\zeta^\nu = (p^\nu, a_1^\nu, \dots, a_s^\nu), \quad p^1 < \dots, p^\nu < p^{\nu+1} < \dots$$

to the ray ℓ is defined correctly. It is finite in the case when there exists an integer point on the ray ℓ different from the origin and is infinite in the opposite case. This sequence of the best approximations we write as

$$\mathcal{B}(\ell) = \{\zeta^1, \zeta^2, \dots, \zeta^\nu, \dots\}.$$

Moreover, we use the following notation:

$$\mathcal{B}_k^t(\ell) = \{\zeta^k, \zeta^{k+1}, \dots, \zeta^t\}.$$

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\Lambda = \mathbf{Z}^{s+1} \cap \pi$ be a lattice located in an absolutely rational subspace π , $\dim \pi \geq 2$. Let a point $\zeta \in \Lambda$ satisfy the condition*

$$\mathcal{B}(\ell(\zeta)) = \{\zeta^1, \zeta^2, \dots, \zeta^\tau, \dots, \zeta^t\}, \quad \zeta^t = \zeta$$

and in addition

$$\mathcal{B}_\tau^t(\ell(\zeta)) = \{\zeta^\tau, \dots, \zeta^t\} \subset \Lambda \subset \pi.$$

Let $D(\zeta^\tau) < D(\xi)$ for any integer point ξ which does not belong to π .

Then for some $\epsilon > 0$ any ray $\ell' \subset K_\epsilon(\ell(\zeta))$ satisfy the following conditions:

- 1) $\mathcal{B}(\ell') \supset \mathcal{B}(\ell(\zeta))$;
- 2) the sequence of the best approximations to the ray ℓ' between the approximations ζ^τ ζ^t lies completely in the subspace π .

We must remember that the all points in

$$\mathcal{B}_\tau^t(\ell(\zeta))$$

obviously belong to the considered sequence of the best approximations to the ray ℓ' between the approximations ζ^τ and ζ^t but it may happen that a number of new points appear.

Lemma 2.1 follows from two easy observations:

1. for a small perturbation ℓ' of the ray ℓ the first best approximations to ℓ remains to be the best approximations to ℓ' ;
2. a small perturbation of ℓ does not enable integer points not belonging to π to become best approximations between the approximations ζ^τ and ζ^t

2.4. Sketch of the proof of Theorem 2.1.

The proof uses two inductive steps.

The first step. Applying Lemma 2.1 many times we construct absolutely rational subspaces

$$\pi_1, \rho_1, \pi_2, \rho_2, \dots, \pi_s, \rho_s$$

with dimensions $\dim \pi_j = 2$, $\dim \rho_j = 3$ and a ray $\ell = \ell(\zeta)$, $\zeta \in \pi_s$ such that

- A) $\pi_j, \pi_{j+1} \subset \rho_j$,
 - B) $\mathcal{B}(\ell) = \{\zeta^1, \dots, \zeta^{\tau_1}, \zeta^{\tau_1+1}, \dots, \zeta^{t_1}, \zeta^{t_1+1}, \dots, \zeta^{\tau_2}, \dots, \zeta^{\tau_s+1}, \dots, \zeta^{t_s}\}$,
- where

$$\zeta^{t_s} = \zeta, \quad t_0 = 1, \quad t_j - \tau_j \geq s + 1, \quad \tau_j - t_{j-1} \geq s + 1 \quad \forall j$$

and

$$\zeta^{\tau_j+1}, \dots, \zeta^{t_j} \in \pi_j \quad \forall j, \quad \zeta^{t_j+1}, \dots, \zeta^{\tau_{j+1}} \in \rho_j \quad \forall j,$$

C) $\mathcal{B}(\ell)$ (as well as the union $\bigcup_{j=1}^s \rho_j$) does not belong to any s -dimensional subspace of \mathbf{R}^{s+1} .

We perform the construction of such a ray $\ell(\zeta)$ for which the best approximations admit A), B), C) by means of Lemma 2.1 by an inductive procedure.

The beginning of the inductive procedure is trivial. Let the subspaces

$$\pi_1, \rho_1, \pi_2, \rho_2, \dots, \pi_k, \rho_k$$

and the ray $\ell(\zeta^{t_k}), \zeta^{t_k} \in \pi_k$ be already constructed. Then by Lemma 2.1 we take $\zeta^{\tau_{k+1}}$ with required properties and choose absolutely rational subspace

π_{k+1} such that the ray $\ell(\zeta^{\tau_{k+1}})$ lie in this subspace and the dimension of the subspace generated by all subspaces $\pi_1, \rho_1, \dots, \pi_{k+1}$ is maximal. Then by Lemma 1.4 in π_{k+1} we find a point $\zeta^{t_{k+1}}$ with the requested properties.

The second step. We must apply the procedure of the first step many times and construct a sequence of rays $\ell^k = \ell(\xi^k)$, $\xi^k \in \mathbf{Z}^{s+1}$, $k = 1, 2, \dots$ in such a way that for any ray ℓ^k the set of the best approximations $\mathcal{B}(\ell^k)$ consists of k successive blocks. Each of these blocks must satisfy the conditions A), B), C) from the first step.

The limit ray for the sequence of rays ℓ^k will correspond to the numbers $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_s$ with the requested in Theorem 2.1 properties: all successive $(s+1)$ b.s.a. for $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_s$ will lie in two- or three-dimensional subspaces and proposition 2 from Section 2.1 and the property C) lead to the independence of the reals $1, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_s$ over rationals.

2.5. Best simultaneous approximations in different norms.

We consider a convex O-symmetric star function $f : \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}_+$ satisfying the conditions

- 1) f is continuous,
- 2) $f(x) \geq 0 \forall x \in \mathbf{R}^n$, $f(x) = 0 \iff x = 0$,
- 3) $f(-x) = f(x) \forall x \in \mathbf{R}^n$,
- 4) $f(tx) = tf(x) \forall x \in \mathbf{R}^n, \forall t \in \mathbf{R}_+$,
- 5) the set $B_f^1 = \{y \in \mathbf{R}^n : f(y) \leq 1\}$ is convex and $0 \in \text{int} B_f^1$.

It is well known (see [2]) that f determines a norm in \mathbf{R}^n . Function (or norm) f is *strictly convex* if the set B_f^1 is strictly convex; that is, the boundary ∂B_f^1 do not have segments of straight lines. We use $B_f^\lambda(a)$ for the set

$$B_f^\lambda(a) = \{y \in \mathbf{R}^n : f(y - a) \leq \lambda\},$$

so $B_f^1 = B_f^1(0)$.

For an n -tuple $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \mathbf{R}^n$ we define f -best simultaneous approximation (f -b.s.a.) as an integer point $\tau = (p, a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbf{Z}^{n+1}$ such that $p \geq 1$ and

$$f(\alpha q - b) > f(\alpha p - a)$$

for all

$$(q, b_1, \dots, b_n) \in \mathbf{Z}^{n+1}, \quad 1 \leq q \leq p - 1$$

and for all

$$(p, b_1, \dots, b_n) \in \mathbf{Z}^{n+1}, \quad b \neq a.$$

In the case when f determines the cube

$$B_f^1 = \{y = (y_1, \dots, y_n) \in \mathbf{R}^n : \max_j |y_j| \leq 1\}$$

our definition leads to the classical definition of the b.s.a. considered in previous sections.

All the f -b.s.a. for α form the sequences

$$\tau_\nu = (p_\nu, a_\nu) \in \mathbf{Z}^{n+1}, \quad p_\nu \in \mathbf{N}, \quad a_\nu = (a_{1,\nu}, \dots, a_{n,\nu}) \in \mathbf{Z}^n,$$

$$p_1 < p_2 < \dots < p_\nu < \dots,$$

$$f(\alpha p_1 - a_1) > f(\alpha p_2 - a_2) > \dots > f(\alpha p_\nu - a_\nu) > \dots,$$

and these sequences are finite in the case $\alpha \in \mathbf{Q}^n$ and are infinite in the opposite situation.

Let $\xi_\nu = (\xi_{1,\nu}, \dots, \xi_{n,\nu})$ denotes the remainder vector $\xi_{j,\nu} = \alpha_j p_\nu - a_{j,\nu}$. Let

$$\Xi_\nu = (\Xi_{1,\nu}, \dots, \Xi_{n,\nu}); \quad \Xi_{j,\nu} = \xi_{j,\nu}/f(\xi_\nu);$$

obviously, $\Xi_\nu \in B_f^1$. For a given vector $\xi \in \mathbf{R}^n$ we also use the notation $\Xi(\xi) = \xi/f(\xi) \in B_f^1$. Moreover, for the integer vector $\zeta = (p, a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ we use the notation $\xi^\alpha(\zeta) = (p\alpha_1 - a_1, \dots, p\alpha_n - a_n) \in \mathbf{R}^n$.

2.6. The order of the best approximations.

From the Minkowski convex body theorem applied to the cylinder

$$\Omega_\nu = \{z = (x, y_1, \dots, y_n) \in \mathbf{R}^{n+1} : |x| < p_{\nu+1}, \quad f(\alpha x - y) < f(\xi_\nu)\} \quad (8)$$

(it does not contain nontrivial integer points) it follows that for any ν one has

$$f(\xi_\nu) \leq C_1(f) p_{\nu+1}^{-1/n} \quad (9)$$

with constant $C_1(f) = 2/(\text{Vol} B_f^1)^{1/n}$. On the other hand, we can show that the following result is valid.

Theorem 2.2. *Let $\dim_{\mathbf{Z}}(1, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \geq 3$. Then*

$$f(\xi_\nu) p_{\nu+1} \rightarrow +\infty, \quad \nu \rightarrow +\infty. \quad (10)$$

Proof.

1) Let $\Lambda^2 \in \mathbf{Z}^{s+1}$ be a two-dimensional sublattice and $\det_2 \Lambda^2$ be the area of its fundamental domain. The set of all sublattices

$$\{\Lambda^2 \subset \mathbf{Z}^{s+1} : \det_2 \Lambda^2 \leq \gamma\}$$

is finite for any γ .

2) Consider a two-dimensional lattice $\Lambda_\nu^2 = \langle \tau_\nu, \tau_{\nu+1} \rangle_{\mathbf{Z}}$. From $\text{conv}(0, \tau_\nu, \tau_{\nu+1}) \subset \Omega_\nu$ it follows that

$$\frac{1}{2} \det_2 \Lambda_\nu^2 = \text{vol}_2(\text{conv}(0, \tau_\nu, \tau_{\nu+1})) \ll f(\xi_\nu) p_{\nu+1}.$$

3) From $\dim_{\mathbf{Z}}(1, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_s) \geq 3$ it is easy to deduce (see proposition 2 from Section 2.1) that the sequence of all f -b.s.a. cannot asymptotically lie in a two-dimensional sublattice and hence for a fixed sequence of naturals ν_k the embedding $\cup_{k=1}^{\infty} \tau_{\nu_k} \subset \cup_{n=1}^{\nu_0} \Lambda_\nu^2$ never holds.

Theorem 2.2 immediately follows from 1), 2), 3).

We would like to refer to Hinchin once again as in [7], [9] he actually proved that it is not possible to establish any specific rate of growth of the value $f(\xi_\nu) p_{\nu+1}$ in (10):

Proposition 4. *For any function $\psi(y) \uparrow +\infty$ increasing to infinity (as slow as one wishes) as $y \rightarrow \infty$ there exists an n -tuple*

$$\alpha \in \mathbf{R}^n, \dim_{\mathbf{Z}}(1, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) = n + 1$$

such that

$$f(\xi_\nu) p_{\nu+1} = O(\psi(p_{\nu+1})), \nu \rightarrow +\infty. \quad (11)$$

Formula (11) shows that in the situation $n \geq 2$ there exist vectors α for which the lower estimate from (9,10) is the exact one. Of course, in the case $n = 1$ for any ν we have

$$C_2(f) p_{\nu+1}^{-1} \leq f(\xi_\nu) \leq C_1(f) p_{\nu+1}^{-1}$$

(see [8]).

2.7. The directions of the successive best approximations.

Theorem 2.3. *For any natural ν one has $\Xi_{\nu+1} \notin \text{int} B_f^1(\Xi_\nu)$.*

Theorem 2.3 was actually proved by Rogers in [20] for signatures (see Section 2.11). It follows from the fact that in the cylinder (8) there is no nontrivial integer points and

$$\tau_{\nu+1} - \tau_\nu = (p_{\nu+1} - p_\nu, a_{1,\nu+1} - a_{1,\nu}, \dots, a_{n,\nu+1} - a_{n,\nu})$$

does not belong to the cylinder Ω_ν . Then one must notice that $0 < p_{\nu+1} - p_\nu < p_{\nu+1}$. Hence $\tau_{\nu+1} - \tau_\nu \notin \Omega$ means that

$$\xi_{\nu+1} \notin \text{int} B_f^{f(\xi_\nu)}(\xi_\nu). \quad (12)$$

Now $0 \in \partial S_f^{f(\xi_\nu)}(\xi_\nu)$ and due to convexity we have

$$\xi_{\nu+1} \frac{f(\xi_\nu)}{f(\xi_{\nu+1})} \notin \text{int} B_f^{f(\xi_\nu)}(\xi_\nu)$$

and this is exactly what is stated in the theorem.

We can notice that the statement (12) is a little bit more general than the Theorem 2.3.

2.8. Strictly convex norms.

Theorem 2.4. *Let the norm f be strictly convex. Then there exists $\delta = \delta(f) > 0$ such that for any vector $\alpha \notin \mathbf{Q}^n$ there exist infinitely many values of ν for each of them*

$$\Xi_{\nu+1} \notin B_f^{1+\delta}(\Xi_\nu).$$

We remind the reader that the n -tuple $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ is defined to be *badly approximable* if for some positive $D(\alpha) > 0$ the inequality

$$\max_{1 \leq j \leq n} \min_{a_j \in \mathbf{Z}} |p\alpha_j - a_j| \geq D(\alpha)p^{-1/n}$$

is valid for all $p \in \mathbf{N}$ (Concerning the existence of the badly approximable vectors see [22]). It is easy to see that the vector α is badly approximable if and only if for any norm f there is a constant $D_1(f, \alpha)$ such that for any natural p holds

$$\min_{a \in \mathbf{Z}^n} f(p\alpha - a) \geq D_1(f, \alpha)p^{-1/n}. \quad (13)$$

Theorem 2.5. *Let α be badly approximable and $D = D(\alpha)$ be the corresponding constant. Let the norm f be strictly convex. Then there exist $w = w(D, f) \in \mathbf{N}$ and $\delta = \delta(D, f) > 0$ with the following property:*

for any $\nu \geq 1$ there exists a natural j from the interval $\nu \leq j \leq \nu + w$ such that

$$\Xi_{j+1} \notin B_f^{1+\delta}(\Xi_j). \quad (14)$$

Theorem 2.4 shows that for a strictly convex norm the condition $\theta_{\nu+1} \notin \text{int}B_f^1(\theta)$ for the sequence $\theta_\nu \in B_f^1$ is not sufficient for the existence of α such that $\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} (\theta_\nu - \Xi_\nu) = 0$. Theorem 2.5 shows that for the badly approximable numbers the values of j for which we have (14) appear regularly. Probably, the result of Theorem 2.5 does not depend on the fact that α is badly approximable but we cannot prove it. The proofs of the theorems we give in next two sections. From the results of the Section 2.11 it is clear that Theorem 2.4 *is not valid* for non-strictly convex norms.

2.9. Two lemmas.

Lagarias [10] proved the following statement.

Lemma 2.2. *Define $h = 2^{n+1}$. Then for any norm f and for any natural ν one has $p_{\nu+h} \geq 2p_\nu$.*

Corollary 1. *For any vector $\alpha \notin \mathbf{Q}^n$ and for all $\nu, j > 1$ one has*

$$f(\xi_{\nu+jh}) \leq C_1 p_\nu^{-1/n} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{j/n}.$$

Corollary 2. *Let α be badly approximable. Then there exists $h^* = h^*(f, \alpha) \in \mathbf{N}$ such that*

$$\forall \nu \geq 1 \quad f(\xi_{\nu+h^*}) < \frac{1}{2} f(\xi_\nu) \quad (15)$$

Proof of the Corollary 2.

From (9) and the condition (13) it follows that

$$D_1 p_\nu^{-1/n} \leq f(\xi_\nu) \leq C_1 p_\nu^{-1/n}$$

and by Lemma 2.2 p_ν grows exponentially. Now (15) follows.

Lemma 2.3. *Let f be strictly convex. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for any $\theta \in \partial B_f^1(0)$ and any $\xi \in B_f^1(0) \setminus B_f^1(\theta)$ under condition*

$$\Xi(\xi) \in \partial B_f^1(0) \cap \left(B_f^{1+\delta}(\theta) \setminus B_f^1(\theta) \right)$$

we have $f(\xi) > 1 - \varepsilon$.

Proof.

Let $\eta \in \partial B_f^1(\theta) \cap \partial B_f^1(0)$. As f is strictly convex we have $(0; \eta) \subset \text{int} B_f^1(\theta)$. Now if $\Xi \in \partial B_f^1(0) \setminus B_f^1(\theta)$ belongs to a small δ -neighborhood of the point η then the segment $[0; \Xi]$ must intersect with $\partial B_f^1(\theta)$ in some point $\zeta(\Xi) = [0; \Xi] \cap (\partial B_f^1(\theta) \setminus 0)$ and $\zeta(\Xi) \rightarrow \eta$ when $\Xi \rightarrow \eta$. If $\xi \in B_f^1(0) \setminus B_f^1(\theta)$ then ξ is between $\Xi(\xi)$ and $\zeta(\Xi(\xi))$.

Lemma is proved.

2.10. The proofs of Theorems 2.4, 2.5.

We prove Theorem 2.4.

Suppose that Theorem 2.4 is not valid. Then for any $\delta > 0$ we have

$$\Xi_{\nu+1} \in B_f^{1+\delta}(\Xi_\nu)$$

for $\nu \geq \nu_0(\delta)$. Now from Theorem 2.3 and Lemma 2.3 we deduce that for any $\varepsilon > 0$

$$f(\xi_{\nu+1}) \geq (1 - \varepsilon)f(\xi_\nu)$$

when $\nu \geq \nu_0(\varepsilon)$. It means that

$$f(\xi_{\nu_0+j}) \geq (1 - \varepsilon)^j f(\xi_{\nu_0}). \quad (16)$$

But from Corollary 1 to Lemma 2.2 we see that

$$f(\xi_{\nu_0+j}) \leq C_1 p_{\nu_0}^{-1/n} (1/2)^{j/n}. \quad (17)$$

For small values of ε the inequalities (16) and (17) lead to contradiction when $j \rightarrow \infty$.

Theorem 2.4 is proved.

Now we prove Theorem 2.5.

Suppose that Theorem 2.5 is not valid. In this situation for arbitrary large $w \in \mathbf{N}$ and for arbitrary small $\delta > 0$ there exists ν satisfying the condition

$$\Xi_{j+1} \in B_f^{1+\delta}(\Xi_j), \quad j = \nu, \nu + 1, \dots, \nu + w.$$

Applying Lemma 2.3 we see that

$$f(\xi_{\nu+w}) \geq (1 - \varepsilon)^w f(\xi_\nu), \quad (18)$$

and $\varepsilon > 0$ may be taken arbitrary small. But at the same time from Corollary 2 to Lemma 2.2 we deduce that

$$f(\xi_{\nu+w}) \leq \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{\lfloor w/h^* \rfloor} f(\xi_\nu). \quad (19)$$

Again we take ε small enough and the inequalities (18) and (19) lead to contradiction when $w \rightarrow \infty$.

The proofs are complete.

2.11. Result on signatures and illuminated points.

For vector $\eta = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n)$ its signature is defined as

$$\text{sign } \eta = (\text{sign } \eta_1, \dots, \text{sign } \eta_n).$$

Rogers [20] showed that for ordinary b.s.a. (in the case $B_f^1 = \{y : \max_j |y_j| \leq 1\}$) the successive best approximations satisfy the condition

$$\forall \nu \quad \text{sign } \xi_\nu \neq \text{sign } \xi_{\nu+1}.$$

(This simple result was generalized in Theorem 2.3.) On the other hand, Sos and Szekeres [23] proved that for any sequence of signatures $\{\sigma_\nu\}$ with $\sigma_\nu \neq \sigma_{\nu+1}$ there exists a vector $\alpha \in \mathbf{R}^n$ with components $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ linearly independent together with 1 over \mathbf{Z} such that $\text{sign } \xi_\nu = \sigma_\nu$. We give a generalization of this result.

Let $M \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ be a convex closed domain, $b \in \partial M$ and $a \notin M$. The point b (as a point of the boundary ∂M) is *illuminated* from the point a if there exists a positive λ such that $b + \lambda(b - a) \in \text{int}M$.

Theorem 2.6. *Let the sequence of points $\{\theta_\nu\}_{\nu=1}^\infty \subset B_f^1$ satisfy the following condition: for each ν the point 0 as the point of the boundary*

$\partial B_f^1(\theta_\nu)$ is illuminated from the point $\theta_{\nu+1}$. Then there exists a vector $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ with linearly independent components such that

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow +\infty} |\Xi_\nu - \theta_\nu| = 0. \quad (20)$$

Remark 1. *The result by Sos and Szekeres on signatures immediately follows from our Theorem 2.6.*

Remark 2. *In (20) we can provide any rate of convergence to zero.*

We would like to say that the formulation of the conditions of Theorem 2.6 in terms of illuminated points is due to O. German [5]. Moreover O. German [5] proved some interesting and new results on distribution of directions for the best approximations in sense of linear forms and on the rate of convergence to the asymptotic directions. In the next section we shall give a sketch of the proof of this theorem and here we consider one example.

In the case $s = 2$ we consider the norm $f^*(x_1, x_2)$ with unit ball B_f^1 defined by the inequalities

$$|x_1 + x_2| \leq 4, \quad |x_1 - x_2| \leq 1.$$

Applying Theorem 2.6 and observing the geometry of mutual configuration of the balls $B_f^1(0)$ and $B_f^1(\theta)$ we obtain the following statement.

Theorem 2.7. *For the norm $f^*(x)$ the set of all f -b.s.a. may have the constant sequence of signatures: $\sigma_\nu = (+, +)$, $\forall \nu$.*

Theorem 2.7 shows that the conclusion of Rogers' theorem from [20] is not true for the norm $f^*(x)$. One can easily construct the corresponding multi-dimensional example and an example with strictly convex norm.

We would like to point out that we cannot construct an example of a norm f for which the sequence of all f -b.s.a. can have any given sequence of signatures. We may conjecture that the Euclidean norm $f(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \sqrt{x_1^2 + \dots + x_n^2}$ has this property.

2.12. Sketch of the proof of Theorem 2.6.

The proof is performed in the same manner as the proof of Theorem 2.1. By means of some inductive procedure we construct a sequence of integer points

$$\tau_\nu = (p_\nu, a_{1,\nu}, \dots, a_{n,\nu})$$

which must form the sequence of all f -b.s.a. for the limit point

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow +\infty} (a_{1,\nu}/p_\nu, \dots, a_{n,\nu}/p_\nu).$$

The base of induction is trivial.

We sketch the induction step.

Let the points

$$\tau_1, \dots, \tau_\nu \in \mathbf{Z}^{n+1}, \quad \tau_j = (p_j; a_j) = (p_j, a_{1,j}, \dots, a_{n,j}), \quad 1 \leq p_1 < p_2 < \dots < p_\nu$$

be constructed satisfying the following conditions:

- 1) τ_1, \dots, τ_ν is the set of *all* f -b.s.a. to rational vector

$$\beta^\nu = (a_{1,\nu}/p_\nu, \dots, a_{n,\nu}/p_\nu),$$

- 2) $\Xi(\xi^{\beta^\nu}(\tau_j)) - \theta_j$ is small for all

$$j = 1, \dots, \nu - 1,$$

- 3) θ_j illuminates the point 0 of the boundary of $\partial B_f^1(\Xi(\xi^{\beta^\nu}(\tau_{j-1})))$ for all $j = 1, \dots, \nu$,

- 4) there is no integer points on the boundary of the cylinder

$$\{(x, y_1, \dots, y_n) \in \mathbf{R}^{n+1} : |x| < p_\nu, f(\alpha x - y) \leq f(\xi_{\nu-1})\}$$

but the best approximations.

We must show how one can determine an integer point

$$\tau_{\nu+1} = (p_{\nu+1}; a_{\nu+1}) = (p_{\nu+1}, a_{1,\nu+1}, \dots, a_{n,\nu+1}), \quad p_\nu < p_{\nu+1}$$

such that

- 1*) $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{\nu+1}$ are *all* f -b.s.a. to rational vector

$$\beta^{\nu+1} = (a_{1,\nu+1}/p_{\nu+1}, \dots, a_{n,\nu+1}/p_{\nu+1}),$$

- 2*) $\Xi(\xi^{\beta^{\nu+1}}(\tau_j)) - \theta_j$ is small for all $j = 1, \dots, \nu$,

- 3*) θ_j illuminates the point 0 of the boundary $B_f^1(\Xi(\xi^{\beta^{\nu+1}}(\tau_{j-1})))$ for all $j = 1, \dots, \nu + 1$,

- 4*) there is no integer points on the boundary of the cylinder

$$\{(x, y_1, \dots, y_n) \in \mathbf{R}^{n+1} : |x| < p_{\nu+1}, f(\alpha x - y) \leq f(\xi_\nu + 1)\}$$

but the best approximations.

Consider a small neighborhood of $B_f^\lambda(a_\nu)$. Let λ be small enough. Then for any $\beta \in B_f^\lambda(a_\nu)$ integer points $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{\nu-1}$ form *all* the first successive $\nu - 1$ f -b.s.a to β . The main difficulty is that for any λ there are some $\beta \in B_f^\lambda(a_\nu)$ for which between $\tau_{\nu-1}$ and τ_ν must arrive one new f -b.s.a. and it must be controlled.

We consider the ball B_f^1 and the point $\Xi(\xi^{\beta^\nu}(\tau_{\nu-1})) \in \partial B_f^1$. Let $B^* = B_f^1(\Xi(\xi^{\beta^\nu}(\tau_{\nu-1})))$. From the induction hypotheses 3) we know that θ_ν illuminates $0 \in B^*$.

Then near the point $\theta_\nu \cdot t$ for some positive t in the set $B_f^1 \cap \text{int} B^*$ there exists a point Ξ^* such that the two-dimensional subspace π^* generated by the points $\tau_\nu, \zeta^* = (p_\nu, \Xi^*)$ is absolutely rational. The point Ξ^* must be very close to $\theta_\nu \cdot t$. So due to continuity we can obtain $\theta_{\nu+1} \cdot t' \in \text{int} B_f^1(\Xi^*)$ for some positive t' .

In the absolutely rational subspace π^* a point $\tau_{\nu+1} = (p_{\nu+1}; a_{\nu+1})$ must be taken in such a way that $\tau_{\nu+1}$ and ζ^* be by the same side of the line $0\tau_\nu$ (here we use the fact that π^* has dimension 2). As $\Xi^* \in \text{int} B^*$ we deduce from convexity that the whole segment $(0; \Xi^*)$ is in $\text{int} B^*$. Now we can choose $\tau_{\nu+1}$ very close to the line $0\tau_\nu$ and hence the sequence $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{\nu+1}$ really be the set of *all* f -b.s.a. to the rational vector $\beta^{\nu+1} = (a_{1,\nu+1}/p_{\nu+1}, \dots, a_{n,\nu+1}/p_{\nu+1})$.

The inductive step is sketched.

The sequence of vectors β^ν converges due to the smallness of the difference $|\beta^{\nu+1} - \beta^\nu|$.

Linear independence over \mathbf{Z} of the limit numbers $1, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ may be obtained by the application of the Proposition 2 of Section 2.1.

2.13. Asymptotic directions.

In this section we formulate without proofs some simple corollaries from our previous results in terms of the asymptotic directions for the best approximations.

The asymptotic direction for the f -b.s.a. sequence for a vector α is defined as a point $\theta \in \partial B_f^1(0)$ such that there exists a subsequence ν_j with the property $\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \Xi_{\nu_j} = \theta$. The set of all asymptotic directions for α we denote by $\Gamma_f(\alpha)$. Obviously $\Gamma_f(\alpha) \subseteq B_f^1(0)$ is closed.

It seems to the author that C. Rogers was the first who gave the definition of the asymptotic direction for the Diophantine approximations [21] but our definition differs from the Rogers' definition.

A set $\mathcal{A} \subseteq B_f^1(0)$ is defined to be *f-asymptotically admissible* if there is

an infinite sequence

$$\theta_0, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_k, \dots, \text{ with } \theta_j \in \mathcal{A}$$

such that

- 1) θ_j illuminates the point $0 \in \partial B_f^1(\theta_{j-1})$,
- 2) the set of all limiting points of the sequence $\{\theta_k\}$ is just \mathcal{A} .

Theorem 2.8.

Let $\mathcal{A} \subseteq B_f^1(0)$ be f -asymptotically admissible. Then there exists a vector $\alpha \in \mathbf{R}^n$ with linearly independent over rationals components such that $\mathcal{A} = \Gamma_f(\alpha)$.

Corollary. *If \mathcal{A} is closed and there is $x \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $-x \in \mathcal{A}$ then there exists $\alpha \in \mathbf{R}^n$ with independent components such that $\mathcal{A} = \Gamma_f(\alpha)$.*

This result may be compared to Rogers observation [21] that the set of all asymptotic directions is not necessary 0-symmetric but there is some kind of symmetry.

The next theorem follows from Theorem 2.4.

Theorem 2.9. *Let norm f be strictly convex. Then there exists a positive δ_1 depending on f such that in the case*

$$\mathcal{A} \subset \text{int}B_f^{1+\delta_1}(\theta) \quad \forall \theta \in \mathcal{A}$$

\mathcal{A} cannot be the set of the form $\Gamma_f(\alpha)$.

References

- [1] *Cassels J.W.S.* An introduction to Diophantine approximations., Cambridge Univ. Press., 1957
- [2] *Cassels J.W.S.* An introduction to the geometry of numbers. Springer-Verlag., 1959.
- [3] *Cusick T.W.* Best diophantine approximations for ternary linear forms. // J. Reine Angew. Math., V 315 , 1980, p. 40 - 52.
- [4] *Cusick T.W.* Diophantine approximations of linear forms over an algebraic number field. // Mathematika V.20, 1973, p. 16 - 23.
- [5] *German, O.N.* Asymptotic directions for the best approximation to linear form in n -variables. // Matematicheskie zametki, V. 71, No 1, 2004, 55 – 70. (in Russian)
- [6] *Gruber P.M., Lekkerkerker C.G.* Geometry of Numbers., 2-nd edition, Amsterdam, 1987.
- [7] *Hinchin A.Ya.* Regular systems of linear equations and general Tchebyshev's problem. // Izvestiya AN SSSR (Ser. Matematicheskaya), 12, 1950, 249 – 258.(in Russian)
- [8] *Hinchin A. Ya.* Continued Fractions., Scripta technica, 1964.
- [9] *Khinchin A.Ya.* Uber eine klasse linear Diophantine Approximationen. // Rendiconti Circ. Math. Palermo, 1926, 50, p.170 - 195.
- [10] *Lagarias J.S.* Best simultaneous Diophantine approximation I. // Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. , 1982, V. 272, No 2, p. 545 - 554.
- [11] *Lagarias J.S.* Best simultaneous Diophantine approximation II. // Pac. J. Math., 1982, V. 102, No 1, p. 61 -88.
- [12] *Lagarias J.S.* Best Diophantine approximations to a set of linear forms. // J. Austral. Math. Soc. (A) , 1983, V. 34, p. 114 - 122.
- [13] *Lochak P.* Canonical perturbation theory via simultaneous approximations. // Russian Mathematical Surveys., 1992, V. 47, No. 6, p. 57 – 133.

- [14] *Moshchevitin N.G.* Multidimensional Diophantine approximations and dynamical systems. // Regular and Chaotic dynamics, 1997, V.2, No. 1, P. 81 - 95.
- [15] *Moshchevitin N.G.* On best simultaneous approximations. // Russian Mathematical Surveys, 1996, V. 51, No.6, P. 213 - 214.
- [16] *Moshchevitin N.G.* Geometry of the best approximations. // Doklady Mathematics, 1998, V 57, No. 2 , p. 261 - 263.
- [17] *Moshchevitin N.G.* Continued fractions, multidimensional Diophantine approximations and applications.// J. de Theorie de Nombres Bordeaux, 1999, V. 11, p. 425 – 438.
- [18] *Moshchevitin N.G.* Best simultaneous Diophantine approximations: norms, signatures, and asymptotic directions. // Mathematical Notes.,2000 , V. 67, No. 5, P. 618 - 624.
- [19] *Moshchevitin N.G.* Distribution of Kronecker sequence.// Algebraic Number Theory and Diophantine analysis. Proc. Int. Conf. Graz, Austria., 2000, p. 311 – 329.
- [20] *Rogers C. A.* The signatures of the errors of simultaneous Diophantine Approximations. // Proc. London Math. Soc., Ser. 2, 1951, 52, p. 186 – 190.
- [21] *Rogers C. A.* The asymptotic directions of n linear forms in $n + 1$ integrall variables. // Proc. London Math. Soc., Ser. 2, 1951, 52, p. 161 – 185.
- [22] *Schmidt W.M.* Diophantine approximations., Lecture Notes in Mathematics., 785 , Springer-Verlag., 1980.
- [23] *Sos V.T., Szekeres G.* Rational approximation vectors. // Acta Arithm. 1988, V. 49, N^o 3, P. 255 – 261.
- [24] *Voronoi G.F.* On one generalization of continued fractions algorithm./ in book *Voronoi G.F.* Selected wotks V.1, AN USSR, Kiev., 1952. (in Russian)