Parametric geometry of numbers and simultaneous approximation to geometric progressions

Damien Roy

Université d'Ottawa

Diophantine Approximation, Fractal Geometry and Related topics

Université Gustave Eiffel

June 3–7, 2024

I. Uniform rational approximation

Let $\mathbf{u}$ be a non-zero point of $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ for some integer $n \geq 1$. We define $\widehat{\lambda}(\mathbf{u})$ to be the supremum of the real numbers $\lambda > 0$ for which the inequalities

$$\|\mathbf{x}\| \leq X \quad \text{and} \quad \|\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{u}\| \leq X^{-\lambda}$$

admit a non-zero solution $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n+1}$ for each sufficiently large X.

- $\widehat{\lambda}(\mathbf{u}) \geq 1/n$ by a theorem of Dirichlet.
- $\widehat{\lambda}(\mathbf{u}A) = \widehat{\lambda}(\mathbf{u})$ for each $A \in \mathrm{GL}_{n+1}(\mathbb{Q})$.

I. Uniform rational approximation

Let $\mathbf{u}$ be a non-zero point of $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ for some integer $n \geq 1$. We define $\widehat{\lambda}(\mathbf{u})$ to be the supremum of the real numbers $\lambda > 0$ for which the inequalities

$$\|\mathbf{x}\| \leq X \quad \text{and} \quad \|\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{u}\| \leq X^{-\lambda}$$

admit a non-zero solution $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n+1}$ for each sufficiently large X.

- $\widehat{\lambda}(\mathbf{u}) \geq 1/n$ by a theorem of Dirichlet.
- $\widehat{\lambda}(\mathbf{u}A) = \widehat{\lambda}(\mathbf{u})$ for each $A \in \mathrm{GL}_{n+1}(\mathbb{Q})$.

For $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$, we set $\widehat{\lambda}_n(\xi) = \widehat{\lambda}(1, \xi, \ldots, \xi^n)$.

- $\widehat{\lambda}_n(\xi) = 1/n$ for almost all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ and each $\xi \in \bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ with $[\mathbb{Q}(\xi) : \mathbb{Q}] > n$.
- $\widehat{\lambda}_n(g.\xi) = \widehat{\lambda}(\xi)$ for each $g \in \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Q})$.

Some estimates

Let $\xi \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \bar{\mathbb{Q}}$. Set $\gamma = (1+\sqrt{5})/2 \cong 1.618$.

1) Davenport & Schmidt (1969): $\widehat{\lambda}_n(\xi) \leq \begin{cases} 1/\gamma \cong 0.618 & \text{if } n = 2, \\ 1/2 & \text{if } n = 3, \\ 1/\lfloor n/2 \rfloor & \text{if } n \geq 4. \end{cases}$

2) Laurent (2003): $\widehat{\lambda}_n(\xi) \leq 1/\lceil n/2 \rceil$ if $n \geq 3$.

3) R. (2003): $\widehat{\lambda}_2(\xi) = 1/\gamma$ for an infinite countable set of ξ.

4) R. (2008): $\widehat{\lambda}_3(\xi) \leq \lambda_3 \cong 0.4245$ the positive root of $T^2 - \gamma^3 T + \gamma$.

Goals of the talk:

- similarities between **3)** and **4)**,
- hints for the proof that λ_3 in **4)** can be improved,
- relevance of parametric geometry of numbers.

II. Two families of convex bodies

Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\mathbb{Q}$-linearly independent coordinates. For each $q \geq 0$, set

$$\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{u}}(q) = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \,;\, \|\mathbf{x}\| \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad |\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{u}| \leq e^{-q}\},$$
$$\mathcal{C}^*_{\mathbf{u}}(q) = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \,;\, \|\mathbf{x}\| \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{u}\| \leq e^{-q}\},$$

and, for each $j = 1, \ldots, n$, define

$$L_{\mathbf{u},j}(q) = \text{smallest } L \geq 0 \text{ such that } e^L \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{u}}(q) \text{ contains at least } j \text{ linearly independent points of } \mathbb{Z}^n,$$
$$L^*_{\mathbf{u},j}(q) = \text{smallest } L \geq 0 \text{ such that } e^L \mathcal{C}^*_{\mathbf{u}}(q) \text{ contains at least } j \text{ linearly independent points of } \mathbb{Z}^n.$$

Finally define $\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{u}} \colon [0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathbf{L}^*_{\mathbf{u}} \colon [0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}^n$ by

$$\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{u}}(q) = (L_{\mathbf{u},1}(q), \ldots, L_{\mathbf{u},n}(q)) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{L}^*_{\mathbf{u}}(q) = (L^*_{\mathbf{u},1}(q), \ldots, L^*_{\mathbf{u},n}(q)).$$

II. Two families of convex bodies

Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\mathbb{Q}$-linearly independent coordinates. For each $q \geq 0$, set

$$\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{u}}(q) = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \,;\, \|\mathbf{x}\| \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad |\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{u}| \leq e^{-q}\},$$
$$\mathcal{C}^*_{\mathbf{u}}(q) = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \,;\, \|\mathbf{x}\| \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{u}\| \leq e^{-q}\},$$

and, for each $j = 1, \ldots, n$, define

$$L_{\mathbf{u},j}(q) = \text{smallest } L \geq 0 \text{ such that } e^L \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{u}}(q) \text{ contains at least } j \text{ linearly independent points of } \mathbb{Z}^n,$$
$$L^*_{\mathbf{u},j}(q) = \text{smallest } L \geq 0 \text{ such that } e^L \mathcal{C}^*_{\mathbf{u}}(q) \text{ contains at least } j \text{ linearly independent points of } \mathbb{Z}^n.$$

Finally define $\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{u}} \colon [0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathbf{L}^*_{\mathbf{u}} \colon [0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}^n$ by

$$\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{u}}(q) = (L_{\mathbf{u},1}(q), \ldots, L_{\mathbf{u},n}(q)) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{L}^*_{\mathbf{u}}(q) = (L^*_{\mathbf{u},1}(q), \ldots, L^*_{\mathbf{u},n}(q)).$$


Mahler's duality : $\boxed{L_{\mathbf{u},j}(q) + L^*_{\mathbf{u},n+1-j}(q) = q + \mathcal{O}(1) \text{ for } j = 1, \ldots, n.}$

The trajectory of a point

The *trajectory* of a non-zero point $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ relative to the family $\mathcal{C}^*_{\mathbf{u}}(q)$ is the map $L^*_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{x}, \cdot)\colon [0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ given by


$$\begin{aligned} L^*_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{x}, q) &= \text{smallest } L \text{ such that } \mathbf{x} \in e^L \mathcal{C}^*_{\mathbf{u}}(q) \\ &= \max\{\log \|\mathbf{x}\|,\ q + \log \|\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{u}\|\}. \end{aligned}$$

It is continuous and piecewise linear with slope 0 then 1.



The first minimum

Finitely many non-zero points $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ have their trajectory cross the domain $0 \leq L \leq L_0$: they all have $\log \|\mathbf{x}\| \leq L_0$.




The first minimum

Finitely many non-zero points $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ have their trajectory cross the domain $0 \le L \le L_0$: they all have $\log \|\mathbf{x}\| \le L_0$. Thus,

$$L^*_{\mathbf{u},1}(q) = \min\{L^*_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{x}, q)\,;\, \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n \setminus \{0\}\}$$

is a continuous piecewise linear function of $q \ge 0$ with slopes 0 and 1, and it is realized by a sequence $(\mathbf{x}_i)_{i\ge 1}$ of integer points called "minimal points".



Link with the exponent $\widehat{\lambda}(\mathbf{u})$

Fix $\lambda > 0$. The following conditions are equivalent:

- There exists a constant $c > 0$ such that the conditions

$$\|\mathbf{x}\| \leq X \quad \text{and} \quad \|\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{u}\| \leq cX^{-\lambda}$$

  admit a non-zero solution $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ for any sufficiently large X.
- We have $\|\mathbf{x}_i \wedge \mathbf{u}\| \ll \|\mathbf{x}_{i+1}\|^{-\lambda}$ for each large enough $i \geq 1$.
- We have $L^*_{\mathbf{u},1}(q) \leq \dfrac{q}{1+\lambda} + \mathcal{O}(1)$ as $q \to \infty$.

Link with the exponent $\widehat{\lambda}(\mathbf{u})$

Fix $\lambda > 0$. The following conditions are equivalent:

- There exists a constant $c > 0$ such that the conditions

$$\|\mathbf{x}\| \leq X \quad \text{and} \quad \|\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{u}\| \leq cX^{-\lambda}$$

  admit a non-zero solution $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ for any sufficiently large X.
- We have $\|\mathbf{x}_i \wedge \mathbf{u}\| \ll \|\mathbf{x}_{i+1}\|^{-\lambda}$ for each large enough $i \geq 1$.
- We have $L^*_{\mathbf{u},1}(q) \leq \dfrac{q}{1+\lambda} + \mathcal{O}(1)$ as $q \to \infty$.

Corollary (Schmidt and Summerer (2013))

For any non-zero $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we have

$$\widehat{\lambda}(\mathbf{u}) = \frac{1}{\bar{\varphi}(\mathbf{u})} - 1 \quad \textit{where} \quad \bar{\varphi}(\mathbf{u}) = \limsup_{q \to \infty} \frac{L^*_{\mathbf{u},1}(q)}{q}.$$

III. The n-systems

Let $q_0 \geq 0$. An n-**system** on $[q_0, \infty)$ is a map $\mathbf{P} = (P_1, \ldots, P_n)$ from $[q_0, \infty)$ to $\mathbb{R}^n$ with the following properties.

(S1) Each P_j is continuous and piecewise linear with slopes 0 and 1.

(S2) We have $0 \leq P_1(q) \leq \cdots \leq P_n(q)$ and $P_1(q) + \cdots + P_n(q) = q$ for each $q \geq q_0$.

(S3) For each $j = 1, \ldots, n-1$ and each $q > q_0$ at which $P_1 + \cdots + P_j$ decreases slope from 1 to 0, we have $P_j(q) = P_{j+1}(q)$.

III. The n-systems

Let $q_0 \geq 0$. An n-**system** on $[q_0, \infty)$ is a map $\mathbf{P} = (P_1, \ldots, P_n)$ from $[q_0, \infty)$ to $\mathbb{R}^n$ with the following properties.

(S1) Each P_j is continuous and piecewise linear with slopes 0 and 1.

(S2) We have $0 \leq P_1(q) \leq \cdots \leq P_n(q)$ and $P_1(q) + \cdots + P_n(q) = q$ for each $q \geq q_0$.

(S3) For each $j = 1, \ldots, n-1$ and each $q > q_0$ at which $P_1 + \cdots + P_j$ decreases slope from 1 to 0, we have $P_j(q) = P_{j+1}(q)$.

The **switch points** of such a map $\mathbf{P}$ are q_0 and all points $q > q_0$ at which at least one of the sums $P_1 + \cdots + P_j$ with $1 \leq j < n$ increases slope from 0 to 1.

III. The n-systems

Let $q_0 \geq 0$. An n-**system** on $[q_0, \infty)$ is a map $\mathbf{P} = (P_1, \ldots, P_n)$ from $[q_0, \infty)$ to $\mathbb{R}^n$ with the following properties.

(S1) Each P_j is continuous and piecewise linear with slopes 0 and 1.

(S2) We have $0 \leq P_1(q) \leq \cdots \leq P_n(q)$ and $P_1(q) + \cdots + P_n(q) = q$ for each $q \geq q_0$.


(S3) For each $j = 1, \ldots, n-1$ and each $q > q_0$ at which $P_1 + \cdots + P_j$ decreases slope from 1 to 0, we have $P_j(q) = P_{j+1}(q)$.

The **switch points** of such a map $\mathbf{P}$ are q_0 and all points $q > q_0$ at which at least one of the sums $P_1 + \cdots + P_j$ with $1 \leq j < n$ increases slope from 0 to 1.

Let $\delta > 0$. We say that $\mathbf{P}$ is **rigid of mesh** $\delta > 0$ if $P_1(q), \ldots, P_n(q)$ are distinct positive multiples of δ for each switch point q of $\mathbf{P}$.


The combined graph of a rigid n-system

The combined graph of an n-system $\mathbf{P} = (P_1, \ldots, P_n)$ over an interval is the union of the graphs of $P_1, \ldots, P_n$ over that interval. If $\mathbf{P}$ is rigid and $r < s$ are consecutive switch points of $\mathbf{P}$, then its combined graph has the following form over a neighborhood of $[r, s]$ (here $n = 6$).




The combined graph of a rigid n-system

The combined graph of an n-system $\mathbf{P} = (P_1, \ldots, P_n)$ over an interval is the union of the graphs of $P_1, \ldots, P_n$ over that interval. If $\mathbf{P}$ is rigid and $r < s$ are consecutive switch points of $\mathbf{P}$, then its combined graph has the following form over a neighborhood of $[r, s]$ (here $n = 6$).




The combined graph of a rigid n-system

The combined graph of an n-system $\mathbf{P} = (P_1, \ldots, P_n)$ over an interval is the union of the graphs of $P_1, \ldots, P_n$ over that interval. If $\mathbf{P}$ is rigid and $r < s$ are consecutive switch points of $\mathbf{P}$, then its combined graph has the following form over a neighborhood of $[r, s]$ (here $n = 6$).




The combined graph of a rigid n-system

The combined graph of an n-system $\mathbf{P} = (P_1, \ldots, P_n)$ over an interval is the union of the graphs of $P_1, \ldots, P_n$ over that interval. If $\mathbf{P}$ is rigid and $r < s$ are consecutive switch points of $\mathbf{P}$, then its combined graph has the following form over a neighborhood of $[r, s]$ (here $n = 6$).




The combined graph of a rigid n-system

The combined graph of an n-system $\mathbf{P} = (P_1, \ldots, P_n)$ over an interval is the union of the graphs of $P_1, \ldots, P_n$ over that interval. If $\mathbf{P}$ is rigid and $r < s$ are consecutive switch points of $\mathbf{P}$, then its combined graph has the following form over a neighborhood of $[r, s]$ (here $n = 6$).




The combined graph of a rigid n-system

The combined graph of an n-system $\mathbf{P} = (P_1, \ldots, P_n)$ over an interval is the union of the graphs of $P_1, \ldots, P_n$ over that interval. If $\mathbf{P}$ is rigid and $r < s$ are consecutive switch points of $\mathbf{P}$, then its combined graph has the following form over a neighborhood of $[r, s]$ (here $n = 6$).



The combined graph of a rigid n-system

The combined graph of an n-system $\mathbf{P} = (P_1, \ldots, P_n)$ over an interval is the union of the graphs of $P_1, \ldots, P_n$ over that interval. If $\mathbf{P}$ is rigid and $r < s$ are consecutive switch points of $\mathbf{P}$, then its combined graph has the following form over a neighborhood of $[r, s]$ (here $n = 6$).



Characterization of the minima up to bounded functions

Theorem (R. 2015)

For each nonzero $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ *and each* $\delta > 0$*, there exists a rigid n-system* $\mathbf{P}\colon [q_0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}^n$ *of mesh* δ *such that* $\mathbf{L_u} - \mathbf{P}$ *is bounded on* $[q_0, \infty)$*. Conversely, given any n-system* $\mathbf{P}\colon [q_0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}^n$*, there exists a nonzero* $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ *such that* $\mathbf{L_u} - \mathbf{P}$ *is bounded on* $[q_0, \infty)$*.*

- Schmidt and Summerer prove the first assertion with a larger class of functions $\mathbf{P}$ called (n, γ)-systems, where γ is an auxiliary parameter.

Dual n-systems

Let $q_0 \geq 0$. A **dual n-system** on $[q_0, \infty)$ is a map $\mathbf{P}^* \colon [q_0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}^n$ given by

$$\mathbf{P}^*(q) = (q - P_n(q), \ldots, q - P_1(q)) \quad (q \geq q_0)$$

for some n-system $\mathbf{P} = (P_1, \ldots, P_n) \colon [q_0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}^n$.

Dual n-systems

Let $q_0 \geq 0$. A **dual n-system** on $[q_0, \infty)$ is a map $\mathbf{P}^* \colon [q_0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}^n$ given by

$$\mathbf{P}^*(q) = (q - P_n(q), \ldots, q - P_1(q)) \quad (q \geq q_0)$$

for some n-system $\mathbf{P} = (P_1, \ldots, P_n) \colon [q_0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}^n$.

Equivalently, this is a map $\mathbf{P}^* = (P_1^*, \ldots, P_n^*) \colon [q_0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}^n$ with the following properties.

(S1) Each P_j^* is continuous and piecewise linear with slopes 0 and 1.


(S2) We have $0 \leq P_1^*(q) \leq \cdots \leq P_n^*(q)$ and $P_1^*(q) + \cdots + P_n^*(q) = (n-1)q$ for each $q \geq q_0$.

(S3) For each $j = 1, \ldots, n-1$ and each $q > q_0$ at which $P_1^* + \cdots + P_j^*$ decreases slope from j to $j-1$, we have $P_j^*(q) = P_{j+1}^*(q)$.

Its **switch points** are q_0 and the points $q > q_0$ at which at least one of the sums $P_1^* + \cdots + P_j^*$ with $1 \leq j < n$ increases slopes from $j-1$ to j.


The combined graph of a dual rigid n-system

If $\mathbf{P}^*$ is a rigid dual n-system and $r < s$ are consecutive switch points of $\mathbf{P}^*$, then its combined graph has the following form over a neighborhood of $[r, s]$ (here $n = 6$).




The combined graph of a dual rigid n-system

If $\mathbf{P}^*$ is a rigid dual n-system and $r < s$ are consecutive switch points of $\mathbf{P}^*$, then its combined graph has the following form over a neighborhood of $[r, s]$ (here $n = 6$).




The combined graph of a dual rigid n-system

If $\mathbf{P}^*$ is a rigid dual n-system and $r < s$ are consecutive switch points of $\mathbf{P}^*$, then its combined graph has the following form over a neighborhood of $[r, s]$ (here $n = 6$).




The combined graph of a dual rigid n-system

If $\mathbf{P}^*$ is a rigid dual n-system and $r < s$ are consecutive switch points of $\mathbf{P}^*$, then its combined graph has the following form over a neighborhood of $[r, s]$ (here $n = 6$).




The combined graph of a dual rigid n-system

If $\mathbf{P}^*$ is a rigid dual n-system and $r < s$ are consecutive switch points of $\mathbf{P}^*$, then its combined graph has the following form over a neighborhood of $[r, s]$ (here $n = 6$).




The combined graph of a dual rigid n-system

If $\mathbf{P}^*$ is a rigid dual n-system and $r < s$ are consecutive switch points of $\mathbf{P}^*$, then its combined graph has the following form over a neighborhood of $[r, s]$ (here $n = 6$).



The combined graph of a dual rigid n-system

If $\mathbf{P}^*$ is a rigid dual n-system and $r < s$ are consecutive switch points of $\mathbf{P}^*$, then its combined graph has the following form over a neighborhood of $[r, s]$ (here $n = 6$).




Characterization of the minima up to bounded functions

Corollary


For each nonzero $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ *and each* $\delta > 0$*, there exists a dual rigid n-system* $\mathbf{P}^* : [q_0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}^n$ *of mesh* δ *such that* $\mathbf{L}^*_{\mathbf{u}} - \mathbf{P}^*$ *is bounded on* $[q_0, \infty)$*. Conversely, given any dual n-system* $\mathbf{P}^* : [q_0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}^n$*, there exists a nonzero* $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ *such that* $\mathbf{L}^*_{\mathbf{u}} - \mathbf{P}^*$ *is bounded on* $[q_0, \infty)$*.*

Combined graph of a dual 2-system




Combined graph of a dual 3-system

There is a repetitive pattern :




The generic pattern




The generic pattern

When P_3^* has slope 1, (P_1^*, P_2^*) behaves like a dual 2-system.




The generic pattern

When P_1^* has slope 1, (P_2^*, P_3^*) behaves like a dual 2-system.




The generic pattern

When P_1^* and P_3^* have slope 1, (P_2^*) behaves like a dual 1-system.




Dual 4-systems




Dual 4-systems

When P_4^* has slope 1, (P_1^*, P_2^*, P_3^*) behaves like a dual 3-system.




Dual 4-systems

When P_1^* has slope 1, (P_2^*, P_3^*, P_4^*) behaves like a dual 3-system.




Dual 4-systems


When P_1^* and P_4^* have slope 1, (P_2^*, P_3^*) behaves like a dual 2-system.



No repetitive pattern for dual 4-systems

Transitions when P_1^* and P_4^* have slope 1 may be qualitatively very different






Self-similar dual systems

They are the dual n-systems $\mathbf{P}^*\colon [q_0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}^n$ which, for some $\rho > 1$, satisfy

$$\mathbf{P}^*(\rho q) = \rho \mathbf{P}^*(q) \text{ for each } q \geq q_0$$

Example for $n = 3$:



IV. The trajectory of a subspace

Let $1 \leq k < n$ be integers and let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$. Mahler's k-th compound of

$$\mathcal{C}^*_{\mathbf{u}}(q) = \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \,;\, \log \|\mathbf{x}\| \leq 0 \text{ and } \log \|\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{u}\| \leq -q \right\}$$

is comparable to

$$(\mathcal{C}^*_{\mathbf{u}})^{(k)}(q) = \left\{ X \in \bigwedge^k \mathbb{R}^n \,;\, \log \|X\| \leq -(k-1)q \text{ and } \log \|X \wedge \mathbf{u}\| \leq -kq \right\}.$$

The *trajectory* of a non-zero $X \in \bigwedge^k \mathbb{R}^n$ is

$$L^*_{\mathbf{u}}(X, q) = \max\{\log \|X\| + (k-1)q,\, \log \|X \wedge \mathbf{u}\| + kq\}.$$

The *trajectory* of a k-dimensional subspace V of $\mathbb{R}^n$ **defined over** $\mathbb{Q}$ is

$$L^*_{\mathbf{u}}(V, q) = L(\mathbf{x}_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \mathbf{x}_k, q)$$

where $(\mathbf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_k)$ is any basis of $V \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$.

A glimpse at Mahler's theory

Suppose that I is a sub-interval of $[0, \infty)$ such that

$$L^*_{\mathbf{u},k}(q) < L^*_{\mathbf{u},k+1}(q) \quad \text{for each } q \in I.$$

Then, the subspace V of $\mathbb{R}^n$ generated by the first k minima of $\mathcal{C}^*_{\mathbf{u}}(q)$ in $\mathbb{Z}^n$ is independent of $q \in I$, and we have

$$L^*_{\mathbf{u}}(V, q) \simeq L^*_{\mathbf{u},1}(q) + \cdots + L^*_{\mathbf{u},k}(q) \quad \text{for each } q \in I.$$

A glimpse at Mahler's theory

Suppose that I is a sub-interval of $[0, \infty)$ such that

$$L^*_{\mathbf{u},k}(q) < L^*_{\mathbf{u},k+1}(q) \quad \text{for each } q \in I.$$

Then, the subspace V of $\mathbb{R}^n$ generated by the first k minima of $\mathcal{C}^*_{\mathbf{u}}(q)$ in $\mathbb{Z}^n$ is independent of $q \in I$, and we have

$$L^*_{\mathbf{u}}(V, q) \simeq L^*_{\mathbf{u},1}(q) + \cdots + L^*_{\mathbf{u},k}(q) \quad \text{for each } q \in I.$$

Consequence. Let $\mathbf{P}^* = (P^*_1, \ldots, P^*_n)$ is a dual n-system on $[q_0, \infty)$ for which $c := \|\mathbf{P}^* - \mathbf{L}^*_{\mathbf{u}}\|_\infty < \infty$. Suppose that I is a subinterval of $[q_0, \infty)$ such that

$$P^*_k(q) < P^*_{k+1}(q) - 2c \quad \text{for each } q \in I.$$

for each $q \geq q_0$. Then, the subspace V of $\mathbb{R}^n$ generated by the points $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ with $L^*_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{x}, q) < P^*_{k+1}(q) - c$ for some $q \in I$ has dimension k and

$$L^*_{\mathbf{u}}(V, q) \simeq P^*_1(q) + \cdots + P^*_k(q) \quad \text{for each } q \in I.$$

Illustration for planes in 3-space




Illustration for planes in 3-space




Illustration for planes in 3-space





Illustration for planes in 3-space



V. Approximation to $(1, \xi, \xi^2)$

Hypothesis

Let $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ with $[\mathbb{Q}(\xi) : \mathbb{Q}] > 2$. Set $\mathbf{u} = (1, \xi, \xi^2)$ and suppose that there exist $\lambda > 1/2$ and $c > 0$ such that the inequalities

$$\|\mathbf{x}\| \leq X \quad \text{and} \quad \|\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{u}\| \leq cX^{-\lambda}$$

admit a non-zero solution $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ for each large enough X.

Fix a dual 3-system $\mathbf{P}^* = (P_1^*, P_2^*, P_3^*)$ such that $\mathbf{L}_\mathbf{u}^* - \mathbf{P}^*$ is bounded. The last hypothesis becomes

$$P_1^*(q) \leq \frac{q}{1+\lambda} + \mathcal{O}(1)$$

as $q \to \infty$.

Exploiting the nature of the point

For each point $\mathbf{x} = (x_0, x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^3$, we define

$$\mathbf{x}^- = (x_0, x_1), \quad \mathbf{x}^+ = (x_1, x_2) \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}^+ - \xi\mathbf{x}^-.$$

Then, $\|\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{u}\| \asymp \|\Delta\mathbf{x}\|$.

Theorem (Davenport and Schmidt, 1969)

For any minimal point $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ with $\|\mathbf{x}\|$ large enough, we have

$$\det(\mathbf{x}) := \det(\mathbf{x}^-, \mathbf{x}^+) \neq 0.$$


Then, $1 \leq |\det(\mathbf{x}^-, \mathbf{x}^+)| = |\det(\mathbf{x}^-, \Delta\mathbf{x})| \ll \|\mathbf{x}\|\|\Delta\mathbf{x}\|$,

and so, $0 \leq \log\|\mathbf{x}\| + \log\|\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{u}\| + \mathcal{O}(1)$.

Consequence on P_1^*

We have $P_1^*(q) \geq q/2 + \mathcal{O}(1)$ as $q \to \infty$.

Proof. We may assume that P_1^* changes slope from 0 to 1 at q.




Consequence on P_1^*

We have $P_1^*(q) \geq q/2 + \mathcal{O}(1)$ as $q \to \infty$.

Proof. We may assume that P_1^* changes slope from 0 to 1 at q. We have

$$P_2^*(q) \geq (P_1^*(q) + P_2^*(q))/2 \geq q/2$$

since $P_1^* + P_2^*$ has slope 1 or 2. So, we may assume that $P_2^*(q) - P_1^*(q)$ is large.



Consequence on P_1^*


We have $P_1^*(q) \geq q/2 + \mathcal{O}(1)$ as $q \to \infty$.

Proof. We may assume that P_1^* changes slope from 0 to 1 at q. We have

$$P_2^*(q) \geq (P_1^*(q) + P_2^*(q))/2 \geq q/2$$

since $P_1^* + P_2^*$ has slope 1 or 2. So, we may assume that $P_2^*(q) - P_1^*(q)$ is large.

Choose a minimal point $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ such that $L_{\mathbf{u},1}^*(q) = L_{\mathbf{u}}^*(\mathbf{x}, q)$.



Consequence on P_1^*


We have $P_1^*(q) \geq q/2 + \mathcal{O}(1)$ as $q \to \infty$.

Proof. We may assume that P_1^* changes slope from 0 to 1 at q. We have

$$P_2^*(q) \geq (P_1^*(q) + P_2^*(q))/2 \geq q/2$$

since $P_1^* + P_2^*$ has slope 1 or 2. So, we may assume that $P_2^*(q) - P_1^*(q)$ is large.

Choose a minimal point $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ such that $L_{\mathbf{u},1}^*(q) = L_{\mathbf{u}}^*(\mathbf{x}, q)$.



Consequence on P_1^*

We have $P_1^*(q) \geq q/2 + \mathcal{O}(1)$ as $q \to \infty$.

Proof. We may assume that P_1^* changes slope from 0 to 1 at q. We have

$$P_2^*(q) \geq (P_1^*(q) + P_2^*(q))/2 \geq q/2$$


since $P_1^* + P_2^*$ has slope 1 or 2. So, we may assume that $P_2^*(q) - P_1^*(q)$ is large.

Choose a minimal point $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ such that $L_{\mathbf{u},1}^*(q) = L_{\mathbf{u}}^*(\mathbf{x}, q)$. Then, we have

$$\log \|\mathbf{x}\| \simeq P_1^*(q), \quad \log \|\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{u}\| \simeq P_1^*(q) - q,$$

Thus, $0 \leq \log \|\mathbf{x}\| + \log \|\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{u}\| + \mathcal{O}(1)$

$$\leq P_1^*(q) + (P_1^*(q) - q) + \mathcal{O}(1).$$



Summary of the constraints

We have

$$[\mathbb{Q}(\xi) : \mathbb{Q}] > 2 \iff \mathbf{u} = (1, \xi, \xi^2) \text{ has } \mathbb{Q}\text{-linearly independent coordinates}$$

$$\iff \boxed{P_3^* \text{ changes slope infinitely often}}$$

Moreover


$$\boxed{\frac{q}{2} + \mathcal{O}(1) \leq P_1^*(q) \leq \frac{q}{1+\lambda} + \mathcal{O}(1)}$$

One can show that these conditions imply


Theorem (Davenport and Schmidt, 1969)

$$\lambda \leq 1/\gamma \cong 0.618$$

Application to a generic pattern



Application to a generic pattern




$$P_1^*(t) \lesssim t/(1+\lambda)$$

$$P_1^*(t') \lesssim t'/(1+\lambda)$$

$$P_1^*(q) \gtrsim q/2$$

Application to a generic pattern




$$P_1^*(t) \lesssim t/(1+\lambda)$$

$$P_1^*(t') \lesssim t'/(1+\lambda)$$

$$P_1^*(q) \gtrsim q/2$$

$$P_1^*(q) \geq P_1^*(t)$$

Application to a generic pattern



$$P_1^*(t) \lesssim t/(1+\lambda)$$


$$P_1^*(t') \lesssim t'/(1+\lambda)$$

$$P_1^*(q) \gtrsim q/2$$

$$P_1^*(q) \geq P_1^*(t)$$

$$P_3^*(q) \leq P_1^*(t')$$

Application to a generic pattern



$$P_1^*(t) \lesssim t/(1+\lambda)$$

$$P_1^*(t') \lesssim t'/(1+\lambda)$$


$$P_1^*(q) \gtrsim q/2$$

$$P_1^*(q) \geq P_1^*(t)$$

$$P_3^*(q) \leq P_1^*(t')$$

$$t' - P_1^*(t') = q - P_1^*(q)$$

Application to a generic pattern



$$P_1^*(t) \lesssim t/(1+\lambda)$$

$$P_1^*(t') \lesssim t'/(1+\lambda)$$

$$P_1^*(q) \gtrsim q/2$$


$$P_1^*(q) \geq P_1^*(t)$$

$$P_3^*(q) \leq P_1^*(t')$$

$$t' - P_1^*(t') = q - P_1^*(q)$$

$$2P_1^*(t) - t = P_1^*(q) + P_2^*(q) - q$$

Application to a generic pattern



$$P_1^*(t) \lesssim t/(1+\lambda)$$

$$P_1^*(t') \lesssim t'/(1+\lambda)$$

$$P_1^*(q) \gtrsim q/2$$

$$P_1^*(q) \geq P_1^*(t)$$


$$P_3^*(q) \leq P_1^*(t')$$

$$t' - P_1^*(t') = q - P_1^*(q)$$

$$2P_1^*(t) - t$$
$$= P_1^*(q) + P_2^*(q) - q$$

$$2q = \sum_{i=1}^{3} P_i^*(q)$$

Application to a generic pattern



$$P_1^*(t) \lesssim t/(1+\lambda)$$

$$P_1^*(t') \lesssim t'/(1+\lambda)$$

$$P_1^*(q) \gtrsim q/2$$

$$P_1^*(q) \geq P_1^*(t)$$

$$P_3^*(q) \leq P_1^*(t')$$


$$t' - P_1^*(t') = q - P_1^*(q)$$

$$2P_1^*(t) - t$$
$$= P_1^*(q) + P_2^*(q) - q$$

$$2q = \sum_{i=1}^{3} P_i^*(q)$$

Limit case

- Solving the above inequalities yields $\lambda \leq 1/\gamma$.
- If $\lambda = 1/\gamma$, all inequalities are equalities up to a bounded difference:




A particular minimal point

As $P_2^*(q) - P_1^*(q) \to \infty$, there is a unique primitive pair $\pm\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ with

$$\log \|\mathbf{y}\| \simeq q/2 \quad \text{and} \quad \log \|\mathbf{y} \wedge \mathbf{u}\| \simeq -q/2$$

and thus $|\det(\mathbf{y})| \asymp 1$.




A particular minimal point

As $P_2^*(q) - P_1^*(q) \to \infty$, there is a unique primitive pair $\pm\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ with

$$\log \|\mathbf{y}\| \simeq q/2 \quad \text{and} \quad \log \|\mathbf{y} \wedge \mathbf{u}\| \simeq -q/2$$

and thus $|\det(\mathbf{y})| \asymp 1$.




The sequence of these points

We get real numbers $q_i > 0$ in $\mathbb{R}$ and primitive points $\mathbf{y}_i \in \mathbb{Z}^4$ with

$$q_{i+1} \simeq \gamma q_i, \quad \log \|\mathbf{y}_i\| \simeq q_i/2, \quad \log \|\mathbf{y}_i \wedge \mathbf{u}\| \simeq -q_i/2.$$

We may choose $\mathbf{P}^*$ self similar with ratio γ,
so that $q_{i+1} = \gamma q_i$ for each $i \geq 1$.




The sequence of these points

We get real numbers $q_i > 0$ in $\mathbb{R}$ and primitive points $\mathbf{y}_i \in \mathbb{Z}^4$ with

$$q_{i+1} \simeq \gamma q_i, \quad \log \|\mathbf{y}_i\| \simeq q_i/2, \quad \log \|\mathbf{y}_i \wedge \mathbf{u}\| \simeq -q_i/2.$$

We may choose $\mathbf{P}^*$ self similar with ratio γ,
so that $q_{i+1} = \gamma q_i$ for each $i \geq 1$.




The sequence of these points

We get real numbers $q_i > 0$ in $\mathbb{R}$ and primitive points $\mathbf{y}_i \in \mathbb{Z}^4$ with

$$q_{i+1} \simeq \gamma q_i, \quad \log \|\mathbf{y}_i\| \simeq q_i/2, \quad \log \|\mathbf{y}_i \wedge \mathbf{u}\| \simeq -q_i/2.$$

We may choose $\mathbf{P}^*$ self similar with ratio γ,
so that $q_{i+1} = \gamma q_i$ for each $i \geq 1$.




The sequence of these points

We get real numbers $q_i > 0$ in $\mathbb{R}$ and primitive points $\mathbf{y}_i \in \mathbb{Z}^4$ with

$$q_{i+1} \simeq \gamma q_i, \quad \log \|\mathbf{y}_i\| \simeq q_i/2, \quad \log \|\mathbf{y}_i \wedge \mathbf{u}\| \simeq -q_i/2.$$

We may choose $\mathbf{P}^*$ self similar with ratio γ,
so that $q_{i+1} = \gamma q_i$ for each $i \geq 1$.




The sequence of these points

We get real numbers $q_i > 0$ in $\mathbb{R}$ and primitive points $\mathbf{y}_i \in \mathbb{Z}^4$ with

$$q_{i+1} \simeq \gamma q_i, \quad \log \|\mathbf{y}_i\| \simeq q_i/2, \quad \log \|\mathbf{y}_i \wedge \mathbf{u}\| \simeq -q_i/2.$$

We may choose $\mathbf{P}^*$ self similar with ratio γ,
so that $q_{i+1} = \gamma q_i$ for each $i \geq 1$.



Linear independence of three consecutive points

Claim. The points $\mathbf{y}_{i-1}, \mathbf{y}_i, \mathbf{y}_{i+1}$ are linearly independent if $i \gg 1$.

Step 1. The trajectory of a non-zero $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ changes slope at


$$q(\mathbf{x}) = \log \frac{\|\mathbf{x}\|}{\|\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{u}\|}.$$

Thus, if $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ are linearly independent, then $q(\mathbf{x}) = q(\mathbf{y})$.

Since $L^*_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{y}_i, q)$ changes slope around q_i and $q_{i+1} - q_i \to \infty$, the points $\mathbf{y}_i$ and $\mathbf{y}_{i+1}$ are linearly independent if $i \gg 1$.

Step 2


The trajectory of $\langle \mathbf{y}_{i-1}, \mathbf{y}_i \rangle_{\mathbb{R}}$ changes slope around q_i.



Step 2

The trajectory of $\langle \mathbf{y}_{i-1}, \mathbf{y}_i \rangle_{\mathbb{R}}$ changes slope around q_i.

$\Longrightarrow$ That of $\langle \mathbf{y}_i, \mathbf{y}_{i+1} \rangle_{\mathbb{R}}$ changes slope around q_{i+1}.




Step 2

The trajectory of $\langle \mathbf{y}_{i-1}, \mathbf{y}_i \rangle_{\mathbb{R}}$ changes slope around q_i.

$\Longrightarrow$ That of $\langle \mathbf{y}_i, \mathbf{y}_{i+1} \rangle_{\mathbb{R}}$ changes slope around q_{i+1}.

$\Longrightarrow$ $\langle \mathbf{y}_{i-1}, \mathbf{y}_i \rangle_{\mathbb{R}} \neq \langle \mathbf{y}_i, \mathbf{y}_{i+1} \rangle_{\mathbb{R}}$ if $i \gg 1$.



Summary

Set $\mathbf{u} = (1, \xi, \xi^2)$ for some $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ with $[\mathbb{Q}(\xi) : \mathbb{Q}] > 2$. Suppose that, for some $c > 0$,

$$\|\mathbf{x}\| \leq X \quad \text{and} \quad \|\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{u}\| \leq cX^{-1/\gamma}$$

admits a non-zero solution $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ for each large enough X.

Then, there exist an unbounded sequence $(\mathbf{y}_i)_{i \geq 1}$ of primitive points of $\mathbb{Z}^3$ such that, for each large enough i,

- $\|\mathbf{y}_{i+1}\| \asymp \|\mathbf{y}_i\|^{\gamma}$ and $\|\Delta \mathbf{y}_i\| \asymp \|\mathbf{y}_i \wedge \mathbf{u}\| \asymp \|\mathbf{y}_i\|^{-1}$,
- $|\det(\mathbf{y}_i)| \asymp 1$,
- $\mathbf{y}_{i-1}, \mathbf{y}_i, \mathbf{y}_{i+1}$ are linearly independent.

The polynomial map Ξ

We define a polynomial map $\Xi : \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathbb{R}^3$ by

$$\Xi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = (\det(\mathbf{x}^-, \mathbf{y}^+) - \det(\mathbf{x}^+, \mathbf{y}^-))\mathbf{x} - \det(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{y}.$$

where $\det(\mathbf{x}) := \det(\mathbf{x}^-, \mathbf{x}^+) = \begin{vmatrix} x_0 & x_1 \\ x_1 & x_2 \end{vmatrix}$.

Algebraic properties

(i) $\det(\Xi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})) = \det(\mathbf{x})^2 \det(\mathbf{y})$,
(ii) $\Xi(\mathbf{x}, \Xi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})) = \det(\mathbf{x})^2 \mathbf{y}$.

Analytic properties

(i) $\|\Xi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})\| \ll \|\mathbf{x}\|^2 \|\Delta\mathbf{y}\| + \|\mathbf{y}\| \|\Delta\mathbf{y}\|^2$,
(ii) $\|\Delta\Xi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}))\| \ll \big(\|\mathbf{x}\| \|\Delta\mathbf{y}\| + \|\mathbf{y}\| \|\Delta\mathbf{x}\|\big) \|\Delta\mathbf{x}\|$.

Application

We find

- $\|\Xi(\mathbf{y}_i, \mathbf{y}_{i+1})\| \ll \|\mathbf{y}_{i-2}\|$ and $\|\Delta\Xi(\mathbf{y}_i, \mathbf{y}_{i+1})\| \ll \|\mathbf{y}_{i-2}\|^{-1}$,

and then

- $|\det(\mathbf{y}_{i-2}, \mathbf{y}_{i-1}, \Xi(\mathbf{y}_i, \mathbf{y}_{i+1}))| \ll \|\mathbf{y}_{i-4}\|^{-1} \to 0$,
- $|\det(\mathbf{y}_{i-3}, \mathbf{y}_{i-2}, \Xi(\mathbf{y}_i, \mathbf{y}_{i+1}))| \ll \|\mathbf{y}_{i-3}\|^{-1} \to 0$.

Thus, for each large enough i,

$$\det(\mathbf{y}_{i-2}, \mathbf{y}_{i-1}, \Xi(\mathbf{y}_i, \mathbf{y}_{i+1})) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \det(\mathbf{y}_{i-3}, \mathbf{y}_{i-2}, \Xi(\mathbf{y}_i, \mathbf{y}_{i+1})) = 0,$$

and so $\Xi(\mathbf{y}_i, \mathbf{y}_{i+1}) \propto \mathbf{y}_{i-2}$. As $\Xi(\mathbf{y}_i, \mathbf{y}_{i+1}) \neq 0$, we find

$$\boxed{\Xi(\mathbf{y}_i, \mathbf{y}_{i-2}) \propto \Xi(\mathbf{y}_i, \Xi(\mathbf{y}_i, \mathbf{y}_{i+1})) \propto \mathbf{y}_{i+1},}$$

which determines the primitive point $\mathbf{y}_{i+1}$ as a function of $\mathbf{y}_{i-2}$ and $\mathbf{y}_i$ up to multiplication by ± 1.

Solution to the inverse problem

Choose linearly independent $\mathbf{y}_1, \mathbf{y}_2, \mathbf{y}_3 \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ with $\det(\mathbf{y}_j) = 1$ for $j = 1, 2, 3$. Then the sequence $(\mathbf{y}_i)_{i \geq 1}$ given recursively by

$$\mathbf{y}_{i+1} = \Xi(\mathbf{y}_i, \mathbf{y}_{i-2}) \text{ for each } i \geq 3$$

belongs to $\mathbb{Z}^3$. For each $i \geq 1$, it has $\det(\mathbf{y}_i) = 1$ and $(\mathbf{y}_i, \mathbf{y}_{i+1}, \mathbf{y}_{i+2})$ is a linearly independent triple.

For an appropriate choice of $\mathbf{y}_1, \mathbf{y}_2, \mathbf{y}_3$, the image of $\mathbf{y}_i$ in $\mathbb{P}^2(\mathbb{R})$ converges to the class of $(1, \xi, \xi^2)$ for some $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ with $[\mathbb{Q}(\xi) : \mathbb{Q}] > 2$ and $\widehat{\lambda}_2(\xi) = 1/\gamma$.

VI. Approximation to $(1, \xi, \xi^2, \xi^3)$

Let $\lambda = \lambda_3 = 0.4245\ldots$ = the positive root of $T^2 - \gamma^3 T + \gamma$.

Hypothesis

Let $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ with $[\mathbb{Q}(\xi) : \mathbb{Q}] > 3$. Set $\mathbf{u} = (1, \xi, \xi^2, \xi^3)$ and suppose that there exists $c > 0$ such that the inequalities

$$\|\mathbf{x}\| \leq X \quad \text{and} \quad \|\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{u}\| \leq cX^{-\lambda}$$

admit a non-zero solution $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ for each large enough X.

We want to show that this leads to a contradiction. The proof can be adapted to shows that $\widehat{\lambda}_3(\xi) \leq \lambda_3 - \epsilon$ for some small explicit ϵ (not computed).

First main tool : the map C

For each point $\mathbf{x} = (x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{R}^4$, we define

$$\mathbf{x}^- = (x_0, x_1, x_2), \quad \mathbf{x}^+ = (x_1, x_2, x_3) \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}^+ - \xi\mathbf{x}^-.$$

Then, $\|\Delta\mathbf{x}\| \asymp \|\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{u}\|$.

For any $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^4$,

- $C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := \big(\det(\mathbf{x}^-, \mathbf{x}^+, \mathbf{y}^-), \det(\mathbf{x}^-, \mathbf{x}^+, \mathbf{y}^+)\big) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ satisfies

$$\|C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})\| \ll \|\mathbf{x}\|\|\Delta\mathbf{x}\|\|\Delta\mathbf{y}\| + \|\mathbf{y}\|\|\Delta\mathbf{x}\|^2$$
$$\|\Delta C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})\| \ll \|\mathbf{x}\|\|\Delta\mathbf{x}\|\|\Delta\mathbf{y}\|.$$

- $\mathbf{w} := C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})^-\mathbf{z}^+ - C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})^+\mathbf{z}^- \in \mathbb{R}^3$ satisfies

$$\|\mathbf{w}\| \ll \|C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})\|\|\Delta\mathbf{z}\| + \|\mathbf{z}\|\|\Delta C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})\|$$
$$\|\Delta\mathbf{w}\| \ll \|C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})\|\|\Delta\mathbf{z}\|.$$

Non-vanishing results

Let $(\mathbf{x}_i)_{i\geq 1}$ denote a sequence of minimal points for ξ in $\mathbb{Z}^4$.

For each sufficiently large i,

- **Davenport and Schmidt 1969 :** $V_i := \langle \mathbf{x}_i^-, \mathbf{x}_i^+ \rangle_{\mathbb{R}} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3$ has dimension 2 (uses $\lambda > 1/3$),
- **R. 2008 :** $V_i \neq V_{i+1}$ (uses $\lambda > \sqrt{2} - 1 \cong 0.4142$),

thus

$$C(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_{i+1}) \neq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad C(\mathbf{x}_{i+1}, \mathbf{x}_i) \neq 0.$$

Non-vanishing results

Let $(\mathbf{x}_i)_{i\geq 1}$ denote a sequence of minimal points for ξ in $\mathbb{Z}^4$.

For each sufficiently large i,

- **Davenport and Schmidt 1969 :** $V_i := \langle \mathbf{x}_i^-, \mathbf{x}_i^+ \rangle_{\mathbb{R}} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3$ has dimension 2 (uses $\lambda > 1/3$),
- **R. 2008 :** $V_i \neq V_{i+1}$ (uses $\lambda > \sqrt{2} - 1 \cong 0.4142$),

thus

$$\boxed{C(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_{i+1}) \neq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad C(\mathbf{x}_{i+1}, \mathbf{x}_i) \neq 0.}$$

In particular, this gives $1 \leq \|C(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_{i-1})\|$ which yields

$$\|\mathbf{x}_{i+1}\| \ll \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^{\theta} \quad \text{where} \quad \theta = \frac{1-\lambda}{\lambda}.$$

In terms of a dual 4-system $\mathbf{P}^*$ that approximates $\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{u}}^*$, we find

$$\boxed{2P_1^*(q) + P_2^*(q) \geq 2q + \mathcal{O}(1).}$$

First reduction

Using the above, we can argue in two ways


- we can work with minimal points only using Schmidt's height inequalities for subspaces spanned by consecutive minimal points
- or we can use a dual 4-system $\mathbf{P}^*$ with $\|\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{u}}^* - \mathbf{P}^*\| < \infty$.

Then, there exist an unbounded sequence $(\mathbf{y}_i)_{i\geq 1}$ of primitive points of $\mathbb{Z}^4$ such that, for each large enough i,

- $|\det(\mathbf{y}_{2i-2}, \mathbf{y}_{2i-1}, \mathbf{y}_{2i}, \mathbf{y}_{2i+1})| \asymp 1$ and $\det(\mathbf{y}_{2i-3}, \mathbf{y}_{2i-2}, \mathbf{y}_{2i-1}, \mathbf{y}_{2i}) = 0$,
- $\|C(\mathbf{y}_{2i}, \mathbf{y}_{2i-1})\| \asymp 1$,
- $\|\mathbf{y}_{2i}\| \asymp \|\mathbf{y}_{2i-1}\|^{\gamma/\theta}$ and $\|\mathbf{y}_{2i+1}\| \asymp \|\mathbf{y}_{2i}\|^{\theta}$,
- $\|\Delta\mathbf{y}_{2i-1}\| \asymp \|\mathbf{y}_{2i}\|^{-\lambda}$ and $\|\Delta\mathbf{y}_{2i}\| \asymp \|\mathbf{y}_{2i+1}\|^{-\lambda}$.


Consequence on $\mathbf{L}^*$

There is a self-similar dual 4-system $\mathbf{P}^*$ with ratio γ such that $\mathbf{L}^* - \mathbf{P}^*$ is bounded. Its combined graph is the following.




Consequence on $\mathbf{L}^*$

There is a self-similar dual 4-system $\mathbf{P}^*$ with ratio γ such that $\mathbf{L}^* - \mathbf{P}^*$ is bounded. Its combined graph is the following.




Consequence on $\mathbf{L}^*$

There is a self-similar dual 4-system $\mathbf{P}^*$ with ratio γ such that $\mathbf{L}^* - \mathbf{P}^*$ is bounded. Its combined graph is the following.




Consequence on $\mathbf{L}^*$

There is a self-similar dual 4-system $\mathbf{P}^*$ with ratio γ such that $\mathbf{L}^* - \mathbf{P}^*$ is bounded. Its combined graph is the following.



Consequence on $\mathbf{L}^*$

There is a self-similar dual 4-system $\mathbf{P}^*$ with ratio γ such that $\mathbf{L}^* - \mathbf{P}^*$ is bounded. Its combined graph is the following.



Second main tool : the maps $\Psi_\pm$

For each sign ϵ among $\{-,+\}$, we define $\Psi_\epsilon\colon (\mathbb{R}^4)^3 \to \mathbb{R}^4$ by

$$\Psi_\epsilon(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y},\mathbf{z}) = C(\mathbf{y},\mathbf{z})^\epsilon \mathbf{x} + E(\mathbf{y},\mathbf{z},\mathbf{x})^\epsilon \mathbf{y} - C(\mathbf{y},\mathbf{x})^\epsilon \mathbf{z}$$

where $E(\mathbf{y},\mathbf{z},\mathbf{x})$ is the unique 3-linear map, symmetric in its first two arguments, such that $E(\mathbf{y},\mathbf{y},\mathbf{x}) = 2C(\mathbf{y},\mathbf{x})$.

General estimates imply that the integer

$$\det(\mathbf{y}_{2i-2}, \mathbf{y}_{2i-1}, \mathbf{y}_{2i}, \Psi_\epsilon(\mathbf{y}_{2i}, \mathbf{y}_{2i+1}, \mathbf{y}_{2i+2}))$$

vanishes for any sign ϵ if i is large enough. Then algebraic considerations show the existence of non-zero rational numbers c_i and t_i with bounded numerator and denominator such that

1) $C(\mathbf{y}_{2i+1}, \mathbf{y}_{2i+2}) = t_i C(\mathbf{y}_{2i}, \mathbf{y}_{2i+1})$,
2) $C(\mathbf{y}_{2i+2}, \mathbf{y}_{2i+1}) = c_i t_i C(\mathbf{y}_{2i}, \mathbf{y}_{2i-1})$,
3) $\det(C(\mathbf{y}_{2i+2}, \mathbf{y}_{2i}), C(\mathbf{y}_{2i}, \mathbf{y}_{2i-1}) = c_i^2 \det(C(\mathbf{y}_{2i-1}, \mathbf{y}_{2i}),\ C(\mathbf{y}_{2i}, \mathbf{y}_{2i-1}))$.

Final contradiction

- The condition 2), namely

$$C(\mathbf{y}_{2i+2}, \mathbf{y}_{2i+1}) = c_i t_i C(\mathbf{y}_{2i}, \mathbf{y}_{2i-1}),$$

implies that each $C(\mathbf{y}_{2i}, \mathbf{y}_{2i-1})$ with i large enough is a bounded integer multiple of some fixed primitive integer point of $\mathbb{Z}^2$.

Final contradiction

- The condition 2), namely

$$C(\mathbf{y}_{2i+2}, \mathbf{y}_{2i+1}) = c_i t_i C(\mathbf{y}_{2i}, \mathbf{y}_{2i-1}),$$

implies that each $C(\mathbf{y}_{2i}, \mathbf{y}_{2i-1})$ with i large enough is a bounded integer multiple of some fixed primitive integer point of $\mathbb{Z}^2$.

- The condition 3), namely

$$\det(C(\mathbf{y}_{2i+2}, \mathbf{y}_{2i}), C(\mathbf{y}_{2i}, \mathbf{y}_{2i-1}) = c_i^2 \det(C(\mathbf{y}_{2i-1}, \mathbf{y}_{2i}),\ C(\mathbf{y}_{2i}, \mathbf{y}_{2i-1})),$$

implies that

$$\|C(\mathbf{y}_{2i-1}, \mathbf{y}_{2i})\| \ll \|C(\mathbf{y}_{2i+2}, \mathbf{y}_{2i})\| \ll \|\mathbf{y}_{2i}\|^{\gamma(1-\lambda\theta\gamma)=0.1113\ldots}$$

which is much better than the standard estimate

$$\|C(\mathbf{y}_{2i-1}, \mathbf{y}_{2i})\| \ll \|\mathbf{y}_{2i}\|^{1-2\lambda=0.1509\ldots}.$$

With some additional work, this leads to a contradiction.

Similarities with the case $n = 2$

Although the upper bound $\widehat{\lambda}_3(\xi) \leq \lambda_3 = 0.424506\ldots$ can be improved, the analysis of the two cases have similarities.

- Both yield that $\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{u}}^*$ is approximated by a self-similar dual n-system $\mathbf{P}^*$ with ratio γ, the golden ratio.
- In both cases, we have a subsequence $(\mathbf{y}_i)_{i\geq 1}$ of the sequence of minimal points which realizes the successive minima of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{u}}^*(q)$.
- There are bounded quantities namely $\det(\mathbf{y}_i)$ for $n = 2$, and $C(\mathbf{y}_{2i}, \mathbf{y}_{2-1})$ for $n = 3$.
- There is also a polynomial map $\Xi\colon (\mathbb{R}^4)^3 \to \mathbb{R}^4$ with similar properties, given by

$$\begin{aligned}\Xi(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y},\mathbf{z}) &= C(\mathbf{z},\mathbf{x})^{-}\Psi_{+}(\mathbf{y},\mathbf{x},\mathbf{z}) - C(\mathbf{z},\mathbf{x})^{+}\Psi_{-}(\mathbf{y},\mathbf{x},\mathbf{z})\\ &= -\det(E(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{z},\mathbf{y}), C(\mathbf{z},\mathbf{x}))\mathbf{x} - \det(C(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{z}), C(\mathbf{z},\mathbf{x}))\mathbf{y}\\ &\qquad + \det(C(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}), C(\mathbf{z},\mathbf{x}))\mathbf{z}.\end{aligned}$$

Properties of Ξ

We can recover $\mathbf{z}$ from $\Xi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})$ via the formula

$$\Xi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, \Xi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})) = \det(C(\Xi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}), \mathbf{x}), C(\mathbf{x}, \Xi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})))\,\mathbf{z}.$$

We also have a factorization for the determinant on the right.

- $C(\Xi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}), \mathbf{x}) = \det(C(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{x}), C(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y}))\det(C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}), C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}))C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$,
- $C(\mathbf{x}, \Xi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})) = \det(C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}), C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}))C(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{x})$,

So, $\det(C(\Xi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}), \mathbf{x}), C(\mathbf{x}, \Xi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})))$
$= \det(C(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{x}), C(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y}))\det(C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}), C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}))^2\det(C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}), C(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{x}))$

Properties of Ξ

We can recover $\mathbf{z}$ from $\Xi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})$ via the formula

$$\Xi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, \Xi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})) = \det(C(\Xi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}), \mathbf{x}), C(\mathbf{x}, \Xi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})))\, \mathbf{z}.$$

We also have a factorization for the determinant on the right.

- $C(\Xi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}), \mathbf{x}) = \det(C(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{x}), C(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y}))\det(C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}), C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}))C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$,
- $C(\mathbf{x}, \Xi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})) = \det(C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}), C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}))C(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{x})$,

So, $\det(C(\Xi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}), \mathbf{x}), C(\mathbf{x}, \Xi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})))$
$= \det(C(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{x}), C(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y}))\det(C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}), C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}))^2 \det(C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}), C(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{x}))$

Assuming that $\lambda \cong 0.4245$, general estimates imply that

$$\det(\mathbf{y}_{2i-6}, \mathbf{y}_{2i-5}, \mathbf{y}_{2i-4}, \Xi(\mathbf{y}_{2i}, \mathbf{y}_{2i+1}, \mathbf{y}_{2i+2})) = 0$$

for each large enough i, a polynomial relation of degree 10 in 24 variables.

VII. Relevant dual 4-systems

Suppose that

$$\widehat{\lambda}_3(\xi) > \sqrt{2} - 1 \cong 0.4142$$

for some $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ with $[\mathbb{Q}(\xi) : \mathbb{Q}] > 3$. We set

$$\mathbf{u} = (1, \xi, \xi^2, \xi^3)$$

and choose a dual 4-system $\mathbf{P}^*$ for which $\mathbf{L}^*_{\mathbf{u}} - \mathbf{P}^*$ is bounded. Then,

$$\lim_{q\to\infty} P^*_3(q) - P^*_1(q) = \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{q\to\infty} P^*_4(q) - P^*_2(q) = \infty.$$

VII. Relevant dual 4-systems

Suppose that

$$\widehat{\lambda}_3(\xi) > \sqrt{2} - 1 \cong 0.4142$$

for some $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ with $[\mathbb{Q}(\xi) : \mathbb{Q}] > 3$. We set

$$\mathbf{u} = (1, \xi, \xi^2, \xi^3)$$


and choose a dual 4-system $\mathbf{P}^*$ for which $\mathbf{L}^*_{\mathbf{u}} - \mathbf{P}^*$ is bounded. Then,


$$\lim_{q\to\infty} P^*_3(q) - P^*_1(q) = \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{q\to\infty} P^*_4(q) - P^*_2(q) = \infty.$$

Moreover, if $P^*_2(r) = P^*_3(r)$ and $P^*_3(s) = P^*_4(s)$ for some $r < s$, then we have $P^*_1(t) = P^*_2(t)$ for some t with $r < t < s$.

Consequence of the last assertion

Suppose that $t_0 < t_1$ are consecutive points at which P_1^* and P_2^* coincide. Suppose also that there is a point r between t_0 and t_1 where P_3^* and P_4^* coincide. Then the combined graph of $\mathbf{P}^*$ over $[t_0, t_1]$ takes the form





https://tex.stackexchange.com/questions/337529/how-to-randomly-fill-an-area-with-daisies-in-tikz