EXPLICIT SALEM SETS IN $\mathbb{R}^n$
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Abstract. We construct explicit Salem sets of arbitrary dimension in $\mathbb{R}^n$ by using a construction based on Diophantine approximation in number fields.

1. Introduction

Given a set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, Frostman’s lemma implies that the Hausdorff dimension of the set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is given by the supremum of the values of $s$ such that

$$\int |\hat{\mu}(\xi)|^2 |\xi|^{-s-n} d\xi$$

is convergent for some probability measure $\mu$ supported on $E$. This can be viewed as the statement that, for any $\epsilon > 0$, the Fourier transform $|\hat{\mu}(\xi)|$ of $\mu$ decays like $|\xi|^{-s/2+\epsilon}$ in an $L^2$-average sense.

In contrast, the Fourier dimension of a set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ concerns the fastest pointwise rate of decay of the Fourier transform. The Fourier dimension of a set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is given by the supremum of the values of $s$ such that

$$|\hat{\mu}(\xi)|^2 |\xi|^{-s} \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad |\xi| \to \infty$$

for some probability measure $\mu$ supported on $E$.

It is known that given any $s \leq n$, there exist Salem sets of dimension $s$ contained in $\mathbb{R}^n$. However, most of these Salem set constructions are probabilistic in nature, revolving around random cantor sets [11], Brownian motion [7], [8], or some other random procedure. All known explicit examples of Salem sets of dimension other than $0, n-1$ or $n$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ are based on a construction by Kaufman [9]. Kaufman considers sets of numbers that are well-approximated by real numbers. Given any $\tau$, Kaufman defines the set $E(\tau)$ to be the set

$$\{ x \in [0,1] : |qx - r| \leq |q|^{-\tau} \quad \text{for infinitely many pairs of integers} \ (q, r) \}$$

Jarník [5] and Besicovitch [1] showed that for $\tau > 1$, the set $E(\tau)$ has Hausdorff dimension equal to $\frac{2}{1+\tau}$. This is a key result in metric Diophantine approximation. Kaufman [9] established pointwise Fourier decay bounds for a natural measure supported on the set $E(\tau)$, thereby showing that the Fourier dimension of $E(\tau)$ is also equal to $\frac{2}{1+\tau}$ for $\tau > 1$. This provides Salem sets of arbitrary dimension in $\mathbb{R}$.

The first explicit examples of Salem sets of arbitrary dimension in $\mathbb{R}^2$ are due to the second author [3]. The construction relies on an analogue of the set described above. An analogue of $E(\tau)$ is defined where, instead of considering real numbers $x$ such that $x$ is close to a rational number $\frac{r}{q}$, the set of real vectors $(x_1, x_2)$ such that $x_1 + x_2 i$ is close to a complex number of the form $\frac{r_1 + r_2 i}{q_1 + q_2 i}$, where $r_1, r_2, q_1, q_2$ are integers.
We will use a construction similar to the construction [3] where, instead of considering Gaussian integers, we will consider algebraic integers in general number fields over \( \mathbb{R} \). There are some additional technicalities though: while it makes sense to use the distance function in \( \mathbb{C} \) for the definition of “well-approximable”, we do not have such a tool available for more general number fields because a given real or complex number will in general have many representations as real-linear combinations of elements of an integer basis for a finite extension \( K/\mathbb{Q} \). Furthermore, the ring of integers \( \mathcal{O}(K) \) will not in general be a unique factorization domain, so certain strategies available in the Gaussian integers will not be possible in this setting.

The final complication is that the group of units in \( \mathcal{O}(K) \) has a more complicated structure than the group of units in \( \mathbb{Z} + \mathbb{Z}i \); if \( K \) is not \( \mathbb{Q} \) or an imaginary quadratic field, then in the ring of integers \( \mathcal{O}(K) \), a typical element will have infinitely many divisors because there are infinitely many units.

2. Matrices And Number Fields

We will study a set of matrices related to number fields.

**Definition 2.1.** Let \( K \) be a number field of degree \( n \) generated by some \( \omega \), and let \( B = \{\omega_0, \omega_1, \ldots, \omega_{n-1}\} \) be a vector space basis for \( K \) over \( \mathbb{Q} \). Given an element \( q = q_0\omega_0 + q_1\omega_1 + \cdots + q_{n-1}\omega_{n-1} \in K \), we will define the **matrix associated to \( q \)** with respect to the basis \( B \) to be the matrix corresponding to the linear transformation given by multiplication by \( q \) on \( K \) with respect to the vector space basis \( B \).

Note that this definition depends not just on the field \( K \), but on the specific basis \( B \) chosen. We will present a few simple examples, focusing on the behaviour of the transposes of these matrices.

**Example 2.2.** Let \( B = \{1, i\} \). Then the matrix associated to \( a_0 + a_1i \) is

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
a_0 & -a_1 \\
a_1 & a_0
\end{pmatrix}
\]

Notice that the transpose of this matrix is the matrix associated to \( a_0 - a_1i \). Alternatively, we can view this transpose as being associated to \( a_0 + a_1i \) with respect to the conjugate basis \( \{1, -i\} \).

Let \( \omega = \sqrt{-1} = \frac{\sqrt{2} + \sqrt{2}}{2} \) and let \( B = \{1, \omega, \omega^2, \omega^3\} \). Then the matrix associated to \( a_0 + a_1\omega + a_2\omega^2 + a_3\omega^3 \) is given by

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
a_0 & -a_3 & -a_2 & -a_1 \\
a_1 & a_0 & -a_3 & -a_2 \\
a_2 & a_1 & a_0 & -a_3 \\
a_3 & a_2 & a_1 & a_0
\end{pmatrix}
\]

Once again, the transpose of this matrix is associated to the conjugate element \( a_0 - a_3\omega - a_2\omega^2 - a_1\omega^3 \); alternatively, we can view this as the matrix associated to \( a_0 + a_1\omega + a_2\omega^2 + a_3\omega^3 \) with respect to the conjugate basis \( \{1, -\omega^3, -\omega^2, -\omega\} \).

Let \( B = \{1, \sqrt{2}, \sqrt{4}\} \). Then the matrix associated to \( a_0 + a_1\sqrt{2} + a_2\sqrt{4} \) is given by

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
a_0 & 2a_2 & 2a_1 \\
a_1 & a_0 & 2a_2 \\
a_2 & a_1 & a_0
\end{pmatrix}
\]
The transpose of this matrix is not a matrix associated to any element of \( \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{2}) \) with basis \( \{1, \sqrt{2}, \sqrt{4}\} \). However, it is the matrix associated to the element \( a_0 + 2a_2 \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} + 2a_1 \frac{1}{\sqrt{4}} = a_0 + a_1 \sqrt{2} + a_2 \sqrt{4} \) with respect to the basis \( \{1, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{4}}\} \).

These examples show that the transpose of a matrix associated to an element of \( K \) with one basis \( B \) will not necessarily be a matrix associated to an element of \( K \) with the same basis \( B \). However, the family of transposes of matrices associated to elements of \( K \) will also be isomorphic to the field \( K \).

**Lemma 2.3.** Let \( A \) be the set of matrices associated to elements of a field \( K \) with respect to a basis \( B \). Then \( A \) is isomorphic to \( K \), and \( A^T \), the set of transposes of elements of \( A \), is also isomorphic to \( K \).

**Proof.** To see that \( A \) is isomorphic to \( K \), notice that the map sending elements of \( K \) to their matrix representation with respect to \( B \) is a ring homomorphism from \( K \) to \( M_n \) and is therefore injective because \( K \) is a field. This implies that the image of \( K \) under this map is isomorphic to \( K \). Notice that composing this map with the transpose gives another homomorphism from \( K \) to \( M_n \) so the same argument applies. \( \square \)

We will combine this with a well-known fact about representations of algebraic number fields, see e.g. [2] for a statement of this fact:

**Lemma 2.4.** Let \( \phi : K \to M_n(\mathbb{Q}) \), where \( n \) is the degree of the extension \( K/\mathbb{Q} \), be a nonzero ring homomorphism. Then \( \phi \) sends elements of \( K \) to their associated matrices with respect to some vector space basis \( B \) of the extension \( K/\mathbb{Q} \).

**Proof.** This will immediately follow if we can show that, for any pair of ring homomorphisms \( \phi_1 \) and \( \phi_2 \) from \( K \) into \( M_n(\mathbb{Q}) \), we have that \( \phi_2(x) = A^{-1} \phi_1(x)A \) for some matrix \( A \) with rational entries and for all \( x \in K \). Note that, because \( K \) is a simple extension of \( \mathbb{Q} \) (say \( K = \mathbb{Q}(\theta) \)), the homomorphisms \( \phi_1 \) and \( \phi_2 \) are entirely determined by \( \phi_1(\theta) \) and \( \phi_2(\theta) \), respectively. So it is enough to show that \( \phi_1(\theta) \) and \( \phi_2(\theta) \) are similar.

By the Cayley-Hamilton theorem, \( \phi_1(\theta) \) (resp. \( \phi_2(\theta) \)) satisfies its own characteristic equation. Let \( P_{\phi_1} \) (resp \( P_{\phi_2} \)) be the characteristic polynomial of \( \phi_1(\theta) \) (resp. \( \phi_2(\theta) \)). Then \( 0 = P_{\phi_1}(\phi_1(\theta)) = \phi_1(P_{\phi_1}(\theta)) \), but since \( \phi_1 \) is injective, it follows that \( P_{\phi_1}(\theta) = 0 \). The polynomial \( P_{\phi_1} \) is a monic polynomial of degree \( n \), and \( \theta \) is an element of \( K \) of degree \( n \), so it follows that \( P_{\phi_1} \) is the minimal polynomial of \( \theta \). The same, of course, can be said for \( P_{\phi_2} \), and thus \( P_{\phi_1} = P_{\phi_2} \). Furthermore, any finite extension \( K/\mathbb{Q} \) is separable, so \( P_{\phi_1} \) does not have any multiple roots. This implies \( \phi_1(\theta) \) has \( n \) distinct eigenvalues and is therefore diagonalizable. Thus \( \phi_1(\theta) \) and \( \phi_2(\theta) \) are diagonalizable matrices with the same eigenvalues and are therefore similar. A standard argument involving the rational canonical form shows that the similarity matrix \( A \) can be taken to be rational. \( \square \)

This means that if \( A_q \) is the matrix representing \( q \) with respect to a vector space basis \( B \), then \( A_q^T \) will represent \( q \) with respect to a different vector space basis \( B' \).

**Corollary 2.5.** If the map \( q \mapsto A_q \) gives a matrix representation of the elements of \( K \) with respect to some basis \( B \), then the map \( q \mapsto A_q^T \) will give a matrix representation of \( K \) with respect to a possibly different basis \( B' \).

Before we proceed, we will note the following fact.
Lemma 2.6. Let \( \{\omega_0, \omega_1, \ldots, \omega_{n-1}\} \) be an integer basis for \( K \) and let \( q = q_0\omega_0 + q_1\omega_1 + \cdots + q_{n-1}\omega_{n-1} \) be an element of the ring of integers of \( K \) such that \( \max_j |q_j| \leq H \). Then there exist at most \( H^{(1)} \) divisors \( b \) of \( q \) in \( \mathcal{O}(K) \) of the form \( b_0\omega_0 + b_1\omega_1 + \cdots + b_{n-1}\omega_{n-1} \), where \( b_0, \ldots, b_{n-1} \) are integers such that \( \max_j |b_j| \leq H \).

The proof is described by Elkies \[3\]. The first step is to obtain a bound on the number of ideals dividing the ideal \( \langle q \rangle \). The method of proof here is similar to the Euclidean divisor bound. For any ideal \( i \), let \( \tau(i) \) be the number of ideals dividing the ideal \( i \). We want a bound of the form \( \tau(i) \leq C_{\epsilon} |N(i)|^\epsilon \).

Because \( \mathcal{O}(K) \) is a Dedekind domain, any ideal \( i \) of \( \mathcal{O}(K) \) can be uniquely factored as a product of prime ideals; say \( \langle q \rangle = p_1^{j_1} \cdots p_m^{j_m} \). Furthermore, any ideal dividing \( \langle q \rangle \) is a product of the form \( p_1^{j_1'} \cdots p_m^{j_m'} \) where \( j_1' \leq j_1, \ldots, j_m' \leq j_m \). It follows that the number \( \tau(\langle q \rangle) \) is precisely equal to \((j_1 + 1) \cdots (j_m + 1)\). In particular, \( \tau \) is multiplicative. We now observe for all except finitely many prime ideals \( p \), and for all \( j \) we have \( j + 1 \leq \tau(p^j) \leq |N(p)|^\epsilon \); this holds for all \( j \) whenever \( \max(|N(p)|) \) is sufficiently large (say, larger than \( N_\epsilon \)) depending on \( \epsilon \); because there are only finitely many ideals with any given norm. For the remaining \( p \), we certainly have the weaker bound \( j + 1 \leq C_{\epsilon, p} |N(p)|^\epsilon \). Multiplying these together gives the bound \( \tau(i) \leq \left( \prod_{p \mid N(p) \leq N_\epsilon} C_{\epsilon, p} \right) |N(i)|^\epsilon \) where the product is taken over a finite collection of prime ideals that does not depend on \( i \), so the desired bound holds.

Now, consider a principal ideal \( \langle q \rangle \). The number of divisors of this ideal has been shown to be bounded above by \( C_{\epsilon} |N(q)|^\epsilon \), and therefore the number of principal ideals dividing \( \langle q \rangle \) is also bounded above by \( C_{\epsilon} |N(q)|^\epsilon \). Note that any divisor of \( q \) generates an ideal that divides \( \langle q \rangle \). So all that remains is to obtain a \( O_{\epsilon}(H^\epsilon) \) bound on the number of elements \( b = b_0\omega_0 + b_1\omega_1 + \cdots + b_{n-1}\omega_{n-1} \) that generate \( \langle a \rangle \) and that satisfy \( \max(|b_0|, |b_1|) \leq H \).

In order to obtain this bound, we will make use of the Dirichlet logarithm map. A good reference for this map is Jarvis \[6\]. Let \( K \subset \mathbb{Q} \) be a finite extension of degree \( n \). Then there are precisely \( n \) embeddings of \( K \) into \( \mathbb{C} \). Suppose that there are \( r_1 \) embeddings and \( r_2 \) conjugate pairs of complex embeddings; then \( n = r_1 + 2r_2 \). We will enumerate the real embeddings \( \rho_1, \ldots, \rho_{r_1} \) and enumerate the complex embeddings \( \sigma_1, \overline{\sigma}_1, \ldots, \sigma_{r_2}, \overline{\sigma}_{r_2} \), where the choice for which embedding is \( \sigma_j \) and which one is \( \overline{\sigma}_j \) is arbitrary. Define the map \( i : K \to \mathbb{R}^{r_1} \times \mathbb{C}^{r_2} \) by
\[
i(x) = (\rho_1(x), \rho_2(x), \ldots, \rho_{r_1}(x), \sigma_1(x), \sigma_2(x), \ldots, \sigma_{r_2}(x)).
\]
Note that \( i \) is a ring homomorphism from \( K \) into \( \mathbb{R}^{r_1} \times \mathbb{C}^{r_2} \). Furthermore, we have the equation \( N(x) = (\prod_{j=1}^{r_1} \rho_j(x))(\prod_{k=1}^{r_2} |\sigma_k(x)|^2) \).

We further define the map \( l : \mathbb{R}^{r_1} \times \mathbb{C}^{r_2} \to \mathbb{R}^{r_1+2r_2} \) by
\[
l((x_1, \ldots, x_{r_1}, z_1, \ldots, z_{r_2})) = (\log |x_1|, \log |x_2|, \ldots, \log |x_{r_1}|, 2 \log |z_1|, 2 \log |z_2|, \ldots, 2 \log |z_{r_2}|).
\]
It is known that \( l \circ i \) is a logarithm from \( K^\times \to \mathbb{R}^{r_1+2r_2} \). We claim that for any generator \( b = b_0\omega_0 + \cdots + b_{n-1}\omega_{n-1} \) of \( \langle a \rangle \) with \( |b_0| \leq H, \ldots, |b_{n-1}| \leq H \), we have that each component of \( l(i(b)) \) has absolute value bounded by \( O(\log H) \).

To see this, notice first that if \( b \) generates \( \langle a \rangle \), then \( N(b) = \pm N(a) \). Next, we notice that \( |\rho_i(b)| = O_K(H) \) for all \( 1 \leq i \leq r_1 \) and \( |\sigma_i(b)| = O(H) \) for all \( 1 \leq i \leq r_2 \). This follows because each of these is certainly bounded above by \( CnH \), where \( C \) is
the maximum of the absolute values of any Galois conjugate of any of \(\omega_0, \ldots, \omega_{n-1}\). Therefore, the components of \(i(b)\) are also bounded from below in absolute value: no such component can be any less than \(\frac{|N(a)|}{(\mathcal{O}_n H)^{n-1}} = \Omega_K(H^{-(n-1)})\). This implies that each component of \(l(i(b))\) is at most \(O_K(\log H)\).

Now, we have stated that \(l \circ i\) is a group homomorphism from \(K^*\) into \(\mathbb{R}^{r_1+r_2}\). In fact, \(l \circ i\) sends the unit group \(\mathcal{O}(K)^*\) to a complete lattice in \(\mathbb{R}^{r_1+r_2}\), see \([6]\). In particular, because every generator of \(\langle a \rangle\) is the product of \(a\) with some unit, it follows that applying \(l \circ i\) to the generators of \(\langle a \rangle\) yields a coset (i.e. a translation) of this lattice in \(\mathbb{R}^{r_1+r_2}\). Because the dimensions of this lattice do not depend on \(\langle a \rangle\), we have that the number of elements of this lattice contained in a box centered at the origin with side length \(O_K(\log H)\) is no more than \(O_K(\log^{r_1+r_2} H)\).

Therefore, the total number of divisors \(b\) of \(q\) with \(|b_j| \leq H\) for all \(j\) is no more than \(O_{e,K}(H^e \log^{r_1+r_2} H) = O_{e,K}(H^e)\), as desired.

3. Exponential sums related to number fields

Fix a number field \(K\) of degree \(n\) and fix an integer basis \(B = \{\omega_0, \omega_1, \ldots, \omega_{n-1}\}\) of \(\mathcal{O}(K)\). If \(q \in K\), then \(q\) is of the form \(q = q_0\omega_0 + q_1\omega_1 + \cdots + q_{n-1}\omega_{n-1}\), where each component is rational. Given such a \(q\), we will write \(q\) for the real \(n\)-vector

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
q_0 \\
q_1 \\
\vdots \\
q_{n-1}
\end{pmatrix}
\]

and we will write \(A_q\) for the matrix associated to \(q\) with respect to the basis \(B\). Conversely, given a vector \(q\), we will use \(q\) to refer to the algebraic number \(q_0\omega_0 + \cdots + q_{n-1}\omega_{n-1}\). Note that \(q\) will be in \(\mathcal{O}(K)\) if and only if every component of \(q\) is an integer.

We will encounter exponential sums of the form

\[
\sum_{r \mod q} e(s \cdot A_q^{-1}r)
\]

where the \(\cdot\) refers to the usual dot product of vectors in \(\mathbb{R}^n\). Notice that this sum is well-defined: if \(r' = r + qy\), then \(A_q^{-1}r' = A_q^{-1}r + y\), and \(y\) is an integer vector that will not affect the exponential. The fundamental claim of this section is the following:

**Lemma 3.1.** For any integer vector \(s\) such that \((A_q^{-1})^Ts\) is not an integer vector, the sum \([1]\) will vanish. For any integer vector \(s\) such that \((A_q^{-1})^Ts\) has integer components, the sum \([1]\) is equal to \(|N(q)|\) where \(N(q)\) is the field norm associated to \(K\).

**Proof.** Let \(R\) be a set of representatives of the residue classes modulo \(q\). We rewrite the sum \([1]\) in the form

\[
\sum_{r \in R} e((A_q^{-1})^Ts \cdot r).
\]
We first assume there is some component of \((A_q^{-1})^Ts\) that is not an integer. Say this is the \(j\)th component. Then we have

\[
\sum_{r \in R + \omega_j} e((A_q^{-1})^T s \cdot r) = e((A_q^{-1})^T s_j) \sum_{r \in R} e((A_q^{-1})^T s \cdot r),
\]

but \(R + \omega_j\) is simply a different collection of representatives of the residue classes modulo \(q\). By the discussion preceding the lemma, this is equal to \(\Pi\), and by the choice of \(j\) we have that \(e((A_q^{-1})^T s_j)\) is not equal to 1. It follows that \(\Pi\) is equal to 0.

If, instead, we assume that each component of \((A_q^{-1})^Ts\) is an integer, then each of the \(N(q)\) summands in the sum \(\Pi\) will be equal to 1. \(\square\)

There is no obvious characterization of the pairs \((q, s)\) for which each component of \((A_q^{-1})^Ts\) is an integer. Notice that we can interpret \((A_q^{-1})^Ts\) in the following way. If \(B' = \{\omega'_0, \omega'_1, \ldots, \omega'_{n-1}\}\) is the basis from Corollary 2.5.6.2.2, then we can associate the integer vector \(s\) to the element \(s = s_q \omega'_0 + s_1 \omega'_1 + \cdots + s_{n-1} \omega'_{n-1}\) of \(K\). Note that there is no guarantee that this will be an algebraic integer, even though \(s\) is an integer vector, because there was no guarantee that the elements of the basis \(B'\) were algebraic integers. Nonetheless, the components of \((A_q^{-1})^Ts\) will give the coordinates of \(s/q\) with respect to this basis \(B'\).

Note that even though \(\omega'_0, \ldots, \omega'_{n-1}\) may not be algebraic integers, there is a rational integer \(C_B\) depending only on the field \(K\) and the choice of basis \(B\) such that \(x_0 \omega'_0 + \cdots + x_{n-1} \omega'_{n-1}\) is an algebraic integer if (but not necessarily only if) each \(x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1}\) is divisible by \(C_B\). This means that for any integer vector \(s\), the corresponding \(C_B s\) will be an algebraic integer; furthermore, if each component of \((A_q^{-1})^Ts\) is an integer, then \(C_B s/q\) will also be an algebraic integer. We will record this fact below.

**Lemma 3.2.** There exists a rational integer \(C_B\) with the following property: If \((A_q^{-1})^Ts\) is an integer vector, then \(C_B s/q\) is an algebraic integer, where \(s = s_0 \omega'_0 + \cdots + s_{n-1} \omega'_{n-1}\). In other words, if \(C_B s/q\) is not an algebraic integer, then the sum \(\Pi\) will vanish.

4. Well-Approximable Vectors and Fourier Decay

We will now describe the candidate Salem set. Instead of describing a Salem set in \(\mathbb{R}^n\), we will describe a Salem set in the torus \([0, 1]^n\). This can be converted to a Salem set in \(\mathbb{R}^n\) by a standard argument.

Given a \(q \in \mathcal{O}(K)\), we choose a family of representatives \(R_q\) of residue classes modulo \(q\) in the ring \(\mathcal{O}(K)\). We then define

\[
\mathcal{R}_q := \{r : r \in R_q\};
\]

this is a family of \(|N(q)|\)-many integer vectors, where \(|N(q)|\) is the field norm of \(q\), each of which corresponds to an element \(r \in \mathcal{O}(K)\) in a different residue class.

Let \(K\) be a field with an integer basis \(B\) for \(\mathcal{O}(K)\) given by \(\{\omega_0, \ldots, \omega_{n-1}\}\). We define the set \(E(K, B, \tau)\) in the following way:

\[
E(K, B, \tau) = \{x \in [0, 1]^n : \|y - (A_q^{-1}) r\| \leq |A_q|^{-1 - \tau}
\text{ for infinitely many } q \in \mathcal{O}(K), r \in \mathcal{R}_q, \text{ and some } x'(q, r)
\text{ such that } y \text{ is congruent to } x \text{ modulo } 1.\}\]
Theorem 4.1. The set $E(K, B, \tau)$ is a Salem set of dimension $\frac{2n}{1+\tau}$.

We will use the rest of this section to show the upper bound on the Hausdorff dimension.

Lemma 4.2. The Hausdorff dimension of $E(K, B, \tau)$ is at most $\frac{2n}{1+\tau}$.

Proof. Let $s > \frac{2n}{1+\tau}$. We will show that $\mathcal{H}^s(E(K, B, \tau))$ is finite, where $\mathcal{H}^s$ is the $s$-dimensional Hausdorff measure. We will let $\mathcal{H}_s^s(E(K, B, \tau))$ refer to the quantity

$$\mathcal{H}_s^s(E(K, B, \tau)) = \inf \sum_i r(B_i)^s$$

where $B_i$ are a family of balls covering $E(K, B, \tau)$, $r(B_i)$ is the radius of $B_i$, and the infimum is taken over coverings of $E(K, B, \tau)$ by balls of radius at most $\delta$ [10]. The Hausdorff measure $\mathcal{H}^s(E(K, B, \tau))$ is obtained by taking the limit $\lim_{\delta \to 0} \mathcal{H}_s^s(E(K, B, \tau))$.

In order to show that $\mathcal{H}^s$ is finite, it is enough to show that the $\mathcal{H}_s^s$ are finite for some sequence $\{\delta_j\}$ such that $\delta_j \to 0$ as $j \to \infty$.

For any $M$, define $Q_M$ to be the family of elements $q \in O(K)$ such that $q = q_0\omega_0 + q_1\omega_1 + \cdots + q_{n-1}\omega_{n-1}$ where $M/2 \leq \max(|q_0|, |q_1|, \ldots, |q_{n-1}|) < M$. We then define $B_M$ to be the collection of balls of radius $|A_q|^{-1(1+\tau)}$ centered at points $A_q^{-1}r$ for $q \in Q_M$ and $r \in \mathcal{R}_q$. Then for any $M$, the collection of balls

$$\bigcup_{j=0}^{\infty} B_{2^jM}$$

will provide a cover for $E(K, B, \tau)$. Note that the maximal radius of any ball in $B_{2^jM}$ is $\left(\frac{2^jM}{2}\right)^{-(1+\tau)}$. Furthermore, there are at most $M^n$ choices of $q$ and at most $|N(q)|^n \lesssim n M^n$ choices of $\nabla$ for each $q$, we have that

$$\sum_{B \in B_M} r(B)^s \lesssim \sum_{B \in B_M} (2^jM/2)^{-s(1+\tau)} \lesssim K (2^jM/2)^{-s(1+\tau)+2n}.$$ 

If $s > \frac{2n}{1+\tau}$, then the power on $2^j$ is negative. So summing $r(B)^s$ over all $B$’s given in the cover [2] will give a finite number that decreases to 0 as $M$ increases. This provides a cover of $E(K, B, \tau)$ by balls of radius at most $(M/2)^{-1(1+\tau)}$ such that the sum of the $s$th powers of the radii remains bounded (in fact approaches zero) as $M \to \infty$. This shows that $\mathcal{H}^s(E(K, B, \tau))$ is finite (in fact 0), showing that the Hausdorff dimension of $E(K, B, \tau)$ is at most $s$. Since $s$ is an arbitrary number greater than $\frac{2n}{1+\tau}$, we get the desired upper bound on the Hausdorff dimension. $\square$

5. Fourier bounds at a single scale

Fix $K$ and $B$ as in the theorem statement. Given an element $q = q_0\omega_0 + q_1\omega_1 + \cdots + q_{n-1}\omega_{n-1}$, where $q_0, \ldots, q_{n-1}$ are integers, we will use $A_q$ to refer to the matrix associated to $q$ with respect to $\omega$, and we will use $q$ to refer to the integer column vector

$$q = \begin{pmatrix} q_0 \\ q_1 \\ \vdots \\ q_{n-1} \end{pmatrix}$$
We will let $Q_M$ denote the family of elements $q \in O(K)$ such that $q = q_0\omega_0 + q_1\omega_1 + q_{n-1}\omega_{n-1}$ where each $q_j$ is an integer satisfying $M/2 \leq q_j \leq M$ for all $j$. We will remove a certain set of numbers from $Q_M$. Specifically, consider the family of $q$ such that $q$ divides some element $a = C_Ba_0 + C_Ba_1\omega' + \cdots + C_Ba_{n-1}\omega_{n-1}$ with $|a_j| \leq M^{1/(2n)}$ for all $j$, where the rational integer $C_B$ is the one from Lemma 3.2. Note that such an element will always be an algebraic integer by choice of $C_B$. By Lemma 2.6 and the fact from linear algebra that each such element $a$ can be written in the form $b_0\omega_0 + \cdots + b_{n-1}\omega_{n-1}$ for some integers $b_j$ with $|b_j| = O(M^{1/(2n)})$, we have that each such element $a$ has at most $M^{\alpha(1)}$ divisors $q$ with $q \in Q_M$; and there are at most $M^{1/2+o(1)} \ll M$ such values of $q$ that divide such an element $a$. Therefore, if we define $Q'_M$ to be the family of elements in $q \in Q_M$ such that $q$ does not divide any such element $a$, then $Q'_M$ contains at least a constant times $M^n/100^n$ elements provided that $M$ is sufficiently large.

We will further restrict the set of $q$ under consideration. The pigeonhole principle implies that there exists an $N \leq M^n$ such that there are at least $C\log M$ values of $q$ in $Q'_M$ such that $N/2 \leq |N(q)| < N$. Pick such an $N$ and let $Q''_M$ be the set of elements of $Q'_M$ such that $N/2 \leq |N(q)| < N$.

We define the sets $E_M(K, B, \tau)$ by

$$E_M(K, B, \tau) = \{ x \in [0,1]^n : |y - (A_q)^{-1}r| \leq |A_q^T|^{-1}r \}
$$

for some $q \in Q''_M$, some $y \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ and some $r \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Notice that, for any sequence $\{M_j\} \nearrow \infty$, the intersection $\bigcap_j E_{M_j}(K, B, \tau)$ is contained in the set $E(K, B, \tau)$ (since $M_j^{-1}x \leq |A|^{-1}x$ for $q \in Q''_M$). This means that any measure supported in the intersection of these $E_{M_j}(K, B, \tau)$ will necessarily be supported on $E(K, B, \tau)$.

We now choose an appropriate measure on $E_M(K, B, \tau)$. Let $\phi$ be a nonnegative, nonzero Schwartz function supported on the unit ball with integral 1, and let $\phi_M$ be the $L^\infty$-normalized dilation $\phi(M^{1+\tau}x)$, a function supported in the ball of radius $M^{-(1+\tau)}$ centered at the origin. We define the function $\phi_M(x - (A_q)^{-1}r)$ to be the 1-periodization of the Schwartz function $\phi_M(x - (A_q)^{-1}r)$ supported in the ball of radius $M^{-(1+\tau)}$ centered at $A^{-1}r$. This function is 1-periodic. We define a 1-periodic function $G_M$ by

$$G_M = \sum_{q \in Q''_M} \sum_{r \in \mathbb{R}^n} \phi_{q, r, \tau}$$

and define $F_M$ to be the $L^1$-normalized function given by $G_M/\hat{G}_M(0)$.

This function is a 1-periodic function and will hereafter be viewed as a function on the $n$-torus. A standard argument shows that it is sufficient to show that this function has Fourier coefficients with the appropriate decay. We will use $\hat{F}_M(s)$ to denote the Fourier coefficients of this function on the torus. We now compute $\hat{F}_M$.

**Proposition 5.1.** If $M$ is sufficiently large, then $\hat{F}_M(s)$ satisfies the following bounds:

$$\hat{F}_M(s) \begin{cases} 
= 1 & \text{if } s = 0 \\
= 0 & \text{if } 0 < |s| \leq M^{1/(2n)} \\
\ll M^{-n+o(1)} & \text{if } M^{1/(2n)} < |s| < CM^{1+\tau} \\
\ll |s|^{-100n} & \text{in absolute value if } |s| \geq CM^{1+\tau}
\end{cases}$$

Here, the implicit constants do not depend on $s$ or on $M$. 

Before we begin the proof of this proposition, we point out that the lower bound $M^{1/(2n)}$ on $s$ in the third case of the proposition is artificial, but the upper bound of $CM^{1+\tau}$ is important and provides the main reason that we get the desired Fourier decay for our limiting measure.

**Proof.** We have selected the normalization $\hat{F}_M(0) = 1$. We will prove the lemma for nonzero $s$.

$$
\hat{F}_M(s) = \frac{1}{G_M(0)} \sum_{q \in \mathbb{Q}'_M} \sum_{r \in \mathbb{R}_q} \int_{|x - (A_q)^{-r}\cdot q| \leq M^{-(1+\tau)}} \phi_{q,r,r}(x)e(s \cdot x) \, dx,
$$

Where we are using the notation $|x - (A_q)^{-r}\cdot q| \leq M^{-(1+\tau)} (\mod 1)$ to mean that there exists a $y$ congruent to $x$ mod 1 such that $|x - (A_q)^{-r}\cdot q| \leq M^{-(1+\tau)}$.

We make a simple change of variables in order to re-center the integral at zero, using the fact that replacing $x$ by $y$ where $x$ and $y$ are congruent modulo 1 will not affect the exponential because $s$ is an integer vector, and will not affect the value of $\phi_{q,r,r}$ since this function was taken to be 1-periodic.

$$
\hat{F}_M(s) = \frac{1}{G_M(0)} \sum_{q \in \mathbb{Q}'_M} \sum_{r \in \mathbb{R}_q} \int_{|x| \leq M^{-(1+\tau)}} \phi_M(x)e(s \cdot (x + (A_q)^{-r}\cdot q))
$$

We pull $e(s \cdot (A_q)^{-r}r)$ out of the integral as it does not depend on $r$; then the integral of $\phi_M(x)e(s \cdot x)$ does not depend on $r$ or on $A$ and can be pulled out of the sum.

$$
\hat{F}_M(s) = \frac{1}{G_M(0)} \left( \int_{|x| \leq M^{-(1+\tau)}} \phi_M(x)e(s \cdot x) \, dx \right) \sum_{q \in \mathbb{Q}'_M} \sum_{r \in \mathbb{R}_q} e(s \cdot (A_q)^{-1}r).
$$

We now take the transpose in order to move the $(A_q)^{-1}$ away from $r$.

$$
\hat{F}_M(s) = \frac{1}{G_M(0)} \left( \int_{|x| \leq M^{-(1+\tau)}} \phi_M(x)e(s \cdot x) \, dx \right) \sum_{q \in \mathbb{Q}'_M} \sum_{r \in \mathbb{R}_q} e((A_q^{-1})^T s \cdot r).
$$

The inner sum is of exactly the same form as in Lemma 3.1 and will therefore vanish unless $C_Bs/q$ is an algebraic integer, where $C_B$ and $s$ are as in Corollary 3.2 in which case the sum in $r$ will either vanish or be equal to $|N(q)| \leq N$.

It is at this point that we take advantage of the choice of $\mathbb{Q}_M'$. First of all, every element of $\mathbb{Q}_M$ is an algebraic integer, so the divisor bound guarantees that, for a given $s$, there will be no more than $\max(|s|, M)^{(1)}$ matrices $q \in \mathbb{Q}_M$ for which the sum in $r$ does not vanish (this follows by rewriting the algebraic integer $C_Bs$ in the basis $B$; this leads to only a multiplicative constant loss in each coefficient). Moreover, if $|s| \leq M^{1/(2n)}$, then the definition of $\mathbb{Q}_M'$ specifically excludes the case in which $qC_Bs$ as elements of $O(K)$, so we get that $\hat{F}_M(s) = 0$ whenever $0 < |s| \leq M^{1/(2n)}$.

For $|s| > M^{1/(2n)}$, there are $\max(|s|, M)^{(1)} = |s|^{(1)}$ choices for $q$ for which all of the components of $(A_q^{-1})^T s$ are integers. For each such choice, Lemma 3.1 shows that

$$
\sum_{r \in \mathbb{R}_q} e((A_q^{-1})^T s \cdot r) \leq N.
$$
Therefore, we have the bound
\[ \sum_{\eta \in Q_M} \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_\eta} e\left( (A_q^{-1}) s \cdot r \right) \lesssim_K \varepsilon^0 N. \]
The integral
\[ \left( \int_{|s| \leq M^{-(1+\tau)}} \phi_M(x)e(s \cdot x) \, dx \right) \]
is taken over the support of \( \phi_M \), and is therefore exactly equal to \( \hat{\phi}_M(s) \), which is equal to \( M^{-n(1+\tau)} \hat{\phi}(M^{-1-\tau})s \). Now, because \( \phi \) is a Schwartz function, there exists some value \( s_0 \) such that for \( |s| \geq s_0 \), we have that \( |\hat{\phi}(s)| \leq |s|^{-200n} \) for all \( |s| \geq s_0 \).

Therefore, for all \( s \) satisfying \( |s| \geq s_0 M^{1+\tau} \), we have that \( M^{-n(1+\tau)} \hat{\phi}(M^{-1-\tau})s \leq M^{-n(1+\tau)}|s|^{-200n} \). Note further that for all \( s \) such that \( s < s_0 M^{-n(1+\tau)} \) we have that \( M^{-n(1+\tau)} \hat{\phi}(M^{-1-\tau})s \leq M^{-n(1+\tau)} \) trivially.

Finally, we need to estimate \( G_M(0) \), the integral of the function \( G_M \). Recall that \( G_M \) is defined by
\[ G_M = \sum_{\eta \in Q_M} \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_\eta} \phi_{\eta, r, \tau} \]
and each \( \phi_{\eta, r, \tau} \) has integral \( M^{-n(1+\tau)} \) over the torus. The number of \( r \in \mathcal{R}_\eta \) for a given \( \eta \) is \( |N(\eta)| \gtrsim N \), and the number of \( \eta \) under consideration is at least \( M^{n-o(1)} \). Thus the number of summands is at least \( M^n N \). We therefore get that \( G_M(0) \) is on the order of \( M^{-n\tau-o(1)} \).

Putting all of this together, we get, for \( s \) satisfying \( M^{1/(2n)} \leq |s| \leq M^{1+\tau} \), an estimate of \( (|s|^{o(1)} N)(M^{o(1)+n\tau N^{-1}}(M^{-n(1+\tau)}) \lesssim M^{-n+o(1)} \). If instead we have \( |s| \geq s_0 M^{1+\tau} \), we instead get an estimate of
\[ (|s|^{o(1)} N)(|s|^{-200n} N^{+n\tau+o(1)} N^{-1}) \]
\[ = |s|^{-200n+n\tau+o(1)} \]
\[ \lesssim |s|^{-100n} \]
provided that \( M \) is sufficiently large.

\[ \square \]

6. Constructing the Salem Measure

We will use Proposition \[ \Box \] in order to construct the desired Salem measure. In order to do this, we will use the following lemma:

**Lemma 6.1.** Let \( m \ll M \), let \( \varepsilon, \delta \ll \frac{n}{1+\tau} \) and suppose \( |f| \leq 1 \) and \( |g| < 3/2 \) are functions on \( \mathbb{Z}^n \) satisfying
\[ f(0) = 1 \]
\[ |f(s)| \leq \begin{cases} 
0 & \text{if } 0 < |s| \leq M^{1/(2n)} \\
C_\delta M^{-n+\delta} & \text{if } M^{1/(2n)} < |s| < CM^{1+\tau} \\
|s|^{-100n} & \text{if } |s| \geq CM^{1+\tau}
\end{cases} \]
and
\[ |g(s)| \leq |s|^{-100n+\varepsilon} \text{ if } |s| \geq m. \]
Let $\eta$ be a positive number such that $\eta < 3/2 - \max|g|$. Then if $M$ is sufficiently large with respect to $\eta, m, \delta$, and $\epsilon$, we have that $f * g$ satisfies the estimates

$$|f * g(s) - g(s)| \leq \eta \quad \text{if} \quad |s| \leq \frac{M^{1/(2n)}}{100}$$  

$$|f * g(s)| \leq |s|^{-\frac{1}{2n^2} + 2\delta + \epsilon} \quad \text{if} \quad \frac{M^{1/(2n)}}{100} \leq |s| \leq \exp(M)$$  

$$|f * g(s)| \leq |s|^{-100n + 2\delta + \epsilon} \quad \text{if} \quad |s| \geq \exp(M)$$

where $\Delta = \frac{1}{2n^2} + \delta$. Then, provided that $2 \sum_{j=1}^{j} \delta_j < \delta^*$, we choose a decreasing sequence of positive numbers $\delta_j \to 0$ such that $2 \sum_{j=1}^{j} \delta_j < \delta^*$. Select a large positive integer $M_1$, and define the function $\mu_1(x) = F_{M_1}(x)$, where $F_{M_1}(x)$ is as described in the previous section; more specifically, we can guarantee that $F_{M_1}(s)$ satisfies the bounds $F_{M_1}(s) \leq |s|^{-n/(1+\tau) + \delta}$ for $M_1 < |s| \leq CM_1^{1+\tau}$. Then $\hat{\mu}_1$ satisfies the bounds described in Proposition 5.1, in particular $\hat{\mu}_1$ satisfies the conditions

$$|\hat{\mu}_1(s)| \leq (3/2 - 2^{-1})|s|^{-n/(1+\tau) + \delta_j} \quad \text{for} \quad |s| < CM_1^{1+\tau}$$

$$|\hat{\mu}_1(s)| \leq |s|^{-100n} \quad \text{for} \quad |s| \geq CM_1^{1+\tau}$$

We will now describe a recursive construction of a sequence of absolutely continuous measures $\mu_j$. Given a $\mu_j$, we will obtain the function $\mu_{j+1}(x) = F_{M_{j+1}}(x)\mu_j(x)$ for an appropriately chosen $M_{j+1}$. The following lemma describes this inductive procedure in more detail.

**Lemma 6.2.** Suppose that $\mu_j$ satisfies the bounds

$$|\mu_j(s)| \leq (3/2 - 2^{-j})|s|^{-n/(1+\tau) + \Delta_j} \quad \text{for} \quad |s| < m_j$$

$$|\hat{\mu}_j(s)| \leq |s|^{-100n + \Delta_j} \quad \text{for} \quad |s| \geq m_j$$

where $\Delta_j = 2 \sum_{i=1}^{j} \delta_i$. Then, provided that $M_{j+1}$ is chosen sufficiently large, and we take $m_{j+1} = \exp(M_{j+1})$, we have the bounds

$$|\hat{\mu}_{j+1}(s)| \leq (3/2 - 2^{-j+1})|s|^{-n/(1+\tau) + \Delta_{j+1}} \quad \text{for} \quad |s| < m_{j+1}$$

$$|\hat{\mu}_{j+1}(s)| \leq |s|^{-100n + \Delta_{j+1}} \quad \text{for} \quad |s| \geq m_{j+1}$$

Furthermore, for $|s| \leq M_{j+1}^{1/(2n)}$, we have that

$$|\hat{\mu}_{j+1}(s) - \hat{\mu}_j(s)| \leq 2^{-(j+1)}|s|^{-n/(1+\tau)}.$$

**Proof.** Suppose that $\mu_j$ satisfies the conditions of Lemma 6.2. Then, by the condition on $s$ such that $|s| \geq m_j$, we have that $\mu_j$ satisfies the conditions placed on $g$ in Lemma 6.1. Let $\eta_{j+1} = 2^{-j+1}m_j^{-n/(1+\tau)}$. Then $\eta_{j+1} \leq 2^{-1}M_1^{-n/(1+\tau)}$ for $|s| < m_j$. We observe that for $M_{j+1}$ sufficiently large, Proposition 5.1 implies that $F_{M_{j+1}}$ will satisfy the bounds

$$F_{M_{j+1}}(s) \begin{cases} 
= 1 & \text{if } s = 0 \\
= 0 & \text{if } 0 < |s| \leq M_{j+1}^{1/(2n)} \\
\leq C_{\delta_{j+1}}M_{j+1}^{-n+\delta_{j+1}} & \text{in absolute value if } M_{1/(2n)} < |s| < CM_1^{1+\tau} \\
\leq |s|^{-100n} & \text{in absolute value if } |s| \geq CM_1^{1+\tau}
\end{cases}$$
and is uniformly bounded above by 1 in absolute value; hence $\hat{F}_{M_{j+1}}$ can serve as the function $f$, and $\hat{\mu}_j$ can serve as the function $g$ in Lemma 6.1 with parameters $m = m_j$, $\delta = \delta_{j+1}$, $\epsilon = \Delta_j$, and $\eta = \eta_{j+1}$. This gives that the $\hat{\mu}_{j+1}$, obtained as the convolution of $\hat{\mu}_j$ and $\hat{F}_{M_{j+1}}$, is bounded above in absolute value by $\eta_{j+1} + |\hat{\mu}_j(s)|$ for any $s$ such that $|s| \leq M_{j+1}/(2^n)$. In particular, this implies that for $|s| \leq m_j$, we have the desired bound. For $M_{j+1}^{1/(2^n)} \leq |s| \leq m_{j+1}$, Lemma 6.1 implies that $|\hat{\mu}_{j+1}(s)| \leq |s|^{-\frac{1}{1+\Delta_j} + \frac{2\eta_{j+1}}{1+\Delta_j}} = |s|^{-\frac{1}{1+\Delta_j} + \frac{\Delta_j}{1+\Delta_j}}$. This proves 6.2 for all $s < m_{j+1}$.

The only thing that remains is to verify that 6.2 holds for $s \geq m_{j+1}$; this follows directly from the estimate (3). \hfill \square

Now, the $\mu_j$ are finite positive measures, each of which has total variation norm at most 3/2. Thus, a subsequence of the $\mu_j$ (call this subsequence $\nu_j$) have a weak limit by the Banach-Alaoglu theorem. Because the $\nu_j$ converge weakly to $\mu$, it follows by testing against the Fourier characters that $\hat{\nu}_j(s) \to \hat{\mu}(s)$ for all $s$. Therefore we have that $|\hat{\mu}(s)| \leq \lim_{j \to \infty} |\hat{\nu}_j(s)| \leq \lim_{j \to \infty} \frac{3}{2} |s|^{-(1+\tau) + \delta^*}$. Furthermore, $\mu$ is supported on $E(K, B, \tau)$: this is clear because $\mu_j$ is supported on the compact set $\bigcap_{j=1}^{j_0} E_{M_j}(K, B, \tau)$ for all $j \geq j_0$; the complement of this set is a union of open intervals and thus the integral of any continuous function over this set with respect to the measure $\mu_j$ for any $j > j_0$ is zero. Because $E(K, B, \tau)$ contains the intersection of $E_{M_j}(K, B, \tau)$, it follows that $\mu$ is supported on $E(K, B, \tau)$.

7. Appendix: A proof of Lemma 6.1

We will present the proof of Lemma 6.1 in this section.

Proof. We will start with the case where $0 \leq |s| \leq M_{j+1}^{1/(2^n)}$. We write out the convolution

$$f \ast g(s) = \sum_{s' \in \mathbb{Z}^n} f(s')g(s-s')$$

When $s' = 0$, we have that $f(0)g(s) = g(s)$, so the estimate (3) is equivalent to showing

$$\left| \sum_{s' \neq 0} f(s')g(s-s') \right| \leq \eta$$

We will use the triangle inequality to pull the absolute value into the sum. Now we know that $f(s')$ is equal to zero whenever $0 < |s'| \leq M_{j+1}^{1/(2^n)}$, so if we assume that $M_{j+1}^{1/(2^n)} > 100m$, then we have

$$\sum_{|s'-s| > M_{j+1}^{1/(2^n)}} f(s')|s-s'|^{-100n+\epsilon}$$

Now $f(s')$ is bounded above by 1 everywhere; and when $|s| \leq M_{j+1}^{1/(2^n)}$ and $|s-s'| \geq M_{j+1}^{1/(2^n)}$, we must also have $s' \geq M_{j+1}^{1/(2^n)}/2$ this sum is bounded above by

$$\sum_{|s'| > M_{j+1}^{1/(2^n)}/2} |s'|^{-100n+\epsilon}$$

This is a convergent series because $100n+\epsilon > n$, and thus will be bounded above by $\eta$ provided that the parameter $M$ is chosen to be sufficiently large. This completes the proof of the estimate (3).
Next, we will prove the estimate \( \text{(3)} \). This is the most involved part of the proof. We will start specifically with those \( s \) satisfying \( \frac{M^{1/(2n)}}{100} < |s| \leq 2CM^{1+\tau} \). We once again write out the convolution as a sum

\[
f * g(s) = \sum_{s' \in \mathbb{Z}^n} f(s')g(s-s')
\]

The \( s' = 0 \) again yields \( g(s) \), which is bounded above by \( |s|^{-100n+\epsilon} \).

The main contribution is going to come from those terms for which \( M^{1/(2n)} \leq |s'| \leq CM^{1+\tau} \). For such \( s' \), we have that \( |f(s')| \) is bounded above by \( M^{-n} \). We must also consider the values of \( g(s-s') \) for these \( s \). Of course, the bound available for such \( s \) is \( 3/2 \) when \(|s-s'| < m\), and \(|s-s'|^{-100n+\epsilon} \) otherwise. There are at most \((2m)^n\) terms for which \(|s-s'| < m\), and the total contribution from such terms is at most

\[
\sum_{|s-s'|<m} \frac{3}{2} M^{-n} \leq 3C\delta 2^{n-1}m^n M^{-n+\delta} \leq \frac{1}{4} M^{-n+2\delta}
\]

provided that \( M \) is sufficiently large with respect to \( m \). When \( s' \) is such that \(|s-s'| > m\), but \(|s'| < CM^{1+\tau} \), we have a bound of \(|s-s'|^{-100n+\epsilon} \), so the contribution from such terms is

\[
\sum_{|s-s'|>m \atop |s'|<CM^{1+\tau}} |s-s'|^{-100n+\epsilon} \cdot C\delta M^{-n+\delta} \\
\leq C^2 M^{-n+\delta} m^{-100n+\epsilon+n} \\
\leq \frac{1}{4} M^{-n+2\delta}
\]

provided \( M \) is sufficiently large with respect to \( C\delta \).

Finally, we must control the contribution of those \( s' \) for which \( s' > CM^{1+\tau} \). Here, we use the bound of \( 3/2 \) on \(|g(s-s')|\); we do not need the better bound available for large \( g \).

\[
\sum_{|s'|>CM^{1+\tau}} \frac{3}{2} |s'|^{-100n} \\
\leq \frac{3}{2} (CM(1+\tau))^{-99n} \\
\leq \frac{3}{2} |s/2|^{-99n} \\
\leq \frac{1}{4} |s|^{-\frac{99n+\epsilon}{1+\tau}}+2\delta+\epsilon
\]

provided that \( M \) is sufficiently large. This establishes the estimate \( \text{(3)} \) for \(|s| < 2CM^{1+\tau} \).

Next, we will prove the estimate \( \text{(4)} \) for \(|s| > 2CM^{1+\tau} \). The important feature this time is that whenever \(|s-s'| < m\), we have that \(|s'| > CM^{1+\tau} \), and that \(|s| \geq |s'| \) so in this region we can always use the estimate of \( f(s') \leq |s'|^{-100n} \) whenever \(|s-s'| < m\). Summing over such choices gives an estimate of \( |s/2|^{-100n} (2m)^n \), which is certainly smaller than \( \frac{1}{3} |s|^{-99n+\epsilon+\delta} \) provided that \( M \) is large enough with respect to \( m \).
Similarly, if \(|s'| < M^{1+\tau}\), then we certainly have \(|s - s'| > M^{1+\tau}\) and \(|s| > |s-s'|\).

So we this time get an estimate of \(2^n M^{n(1+\tau)}|s/2|^{-100n+\epsilon}\), which is bounded above by \(\frac{1}{3}|s|^{-99n+\epsilon+\delta}\) provided that \(M\) is large enough.

If \(|s'| > M^{1+\tau}\) and \(|s - s'| > m\) then we have a good estimate on both terms: we have that \(|f(s')| \leq |s'|^{-100n}\) and that \(|g(s - s')| \leq |s - s'|^{-100n+\epsilon}\). Note that at least one of \(|s'|\) and \(|s - s'|\) will be at least \(|s/2|\), and therefore we have

\[
\sum_{s' > M^{1+\tau}} |s'|^{-100n} |s - s'|^{-100n+\epsilon} \\
\leq \sum_{s' \neq 0} |s'|^{-100n} |s/2|^{-100n+\tau} + \sum_{s' \neq s} |s/2|^{-100n} |s - s'|^{-100n+\epsilon} \\
\leq C_1 |s|^{-100n} + C_2 |s|^{-100n+\epsilon} \\
\leq \frac{1}{3} |s|^{-99n+\epsilon+\delta},
\]

So we in fact get an estimate of \(|s|^{-99n+\epsilon+\delta}\) for \(s > 2M^{1+\tau}\) in (1), which is superior to the claimed bound. However, the bound stated in (1) is good enough for our purposes, so there is no real reason to record the superior bound for such \(s\).

Finally, we will establish the bound (5). This argument proceeds exactly as in the case of the proof of (4) for \(|s| \geq 2CM^{1+\tau}\), but this time, we have that \(M^{n(1+\tau)}\) is negligible compared to \(|s|\), so we will lose only a factor of \(|s|^n\) in the part of the estimate coming from the places where \(|s'| < M^{1+\tau}\), as opposed to the \(|s|^n\) that was lost in the previous estimate. We will omit this proof, as the argument is exactly the same as the previous one except for this detail.

\[\square\]
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