

FOURIER DECAY FOR HOMOGENEOUS SELF-AFFINE MEASURES

BORIS SOLOMYAK

ABSTRACT. We show that for Lebesgue almost all d -tuples $(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_d)$, with $|\theta_j| > 1$, any self-affine measure for a homogeneous non-degenerate iterated function system $\{Ax + a_j\}_{j=1}^m$ in \mathbb{R}^d , where A^{-1} is a diagonal matrix with the entries $(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_d)$, has power Fourier decay at infinity.

1. INTRODUCTION

For a finite positive Borel measure μ on \mathbb{R}^d , consider the Fourier transform

$$\hat{\mu}(\xi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-2\pi i \langle \xi, x \rangle} d\mu(x).$$

We are interested in the decay properties of $\hat{\mu}$ at infinity. The measure μ is called *Rajchman* if

$$\lim_{|\xi| \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\mu}(\xi) = 0,$$

where $|\xi|$ is a norm (say, the Euclidean norm) of $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Whereas absolutely continuous measures are Rajchman by the Riemann-Lebesgue Lemma, it is a subtle question to decide which singular measures are such, see, e.g., the survey of Lyons [14]. A much stronger property, useful for many applications is the following.

Definition 1.1. For $\alpha > 0$ let

$$\mathcal{D}_d(\alpha) = \{ \nu \text{ finite positive measure on } \mathbb{R}^d : |\hat{\nu}(t)| = O_\nu(|t|^{-\alpha}), \quad |t| \rightarrow \infty \},$$

and denote $\mathcal{D}_d = \bigcup_{\alpha > 0} \mathcal{D}_d(\alpha)$. A measure ν is said to have *power Fourier decay* if $\nu \in \mathcal{D}_d$.

Many recent papers have been devoted to the question of Fourier decay for classes of “fractal” measures, see e.g., [2, 9, 11, 12, 13, 18, 23, 3, 1, 25, 17]. Here we continue this line of research, focusing on the class of *homogeneous self-affine measures* in \mathbb{R}^d . A measure μ is called self-affine if it is the invariant measure for a self-affine iterated function system (IFS) $\{f_j\}_{j=1}^m$, with $m \geq 2$, where $f_j(x) = A_j x + a_j$, the matrices $A_j : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ are invertible linear contractions (in some norm) and $a_j \in \mathbb{R}^d$ are “digit” vectors. This means that for some probability vector $\mathbf{p} = (p_j)_{j \leq m}$ holds

$$(1.1) \quad \mu = \sum_{j=1}^m p_j (\mu \circ f_j^{-1}).$$

Date: March 4, 2022.

Supported in part by the Israel Science Foundation grant 911/19.

It is well-known that this equation defines a unique probability Borel measure. The self-affine IFS is *homogeneous* if all A_j are equal to each other: $A = A_j$ for $j \leq m$. Denote the digit set by $\mathcal{D} := \{a_1, \dots, a_m\}$ and the corresponding self-affine measure by $\mu(A, \mathcal{D}, \mathbf{p})$. We will write $\mathbf{p} > 0$ if all $p_j > 0$. Following [8], we say that the IFS is *affinely irreducible* if the attractor is not contained in a proper affine subspace of \mathbb{R}^d . It is easy to see that this is a necessary condition for the self-affine measure to be Rajchman, so this will always be our assumption. By a conjugation with a translation, we can always assume that $0 \in \mathcal{D}$. In this case affine irreducibility is equivalent to the digit set \mathcal{D} being a *cyclic family* for A , that is, \mathbb{R}^d being the smallest A -invariant subspace containing \mathcal{D} .

The IFS is *self-similar* if all A_j are contracting similitudes, that is, $A_j = \lambda_j \mathcal{O}_j$ for some $\lambda_j \in (0, 1)$ and orthogonal matrices \mathcal{O}_j . In many aspects, “genuine” (i.e., non-self-similar) self-affine and self-similar IFS are very different; of course, the distinction exists only for $d \geq 2$.

Every homogeneous self-affine measure can be expressed as an infinite convolution product

$$(1.2) \quad \mu(A, \mathcal{D}, \mathbf{p}) = \left(* \prod_{n=0}^{\infty} \right) \sum_{j=1}^m p_j \delta_{A^n a_j},$$

and for every $\mathbf{p} > 0$ it is supported on the attractor (self-affine set)

$$K_{A, \mathcal{D}} := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d : x = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} A^n b_n, b_n \in \mathcal{D} \right\}.$$

By the definition of the self-affine measure,

$$\hat{\mu}(\xi) = \sum_{j=1}^m p_j \int e^{-2\pi i \langle \xi, Ax + a_j \rangle} d\mu = \left(\sum_{j=1}^m p_j e^{-2\pi i \langle \xi, a_j \rangle} \right) \hat{\mu}(A^t \xi),$$

where A^t is the matrix transpose of A . Iterating we obtain

$$(1.3) \quad \hat{\mu}(\xi) = \prod_{n=0}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{j=1}^m p_j e^{-2\pi i \langle (A^t)^n \xi, a_j \rangle} \right) = \prod_{n=0}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{j=1}^m p_j e^{-2\pi i \langle \xi, A^n a_j \rangle} \right),$$

where the infinite product converges, since $\|A^n\| \rightarrow 0$ exponentially fast.

1.1. Background. We start with the known results on Fourier decay for classical Bernoulli convolutions ν_λ , namely, self-similar measures on the line, corresponding to the IFS $\{\lambda x, \lambda x + 1\}$, with $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ and probabilities $(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$ (often the digits ± 1 are used instead; it is easy to see that taking any two distinct digits results in the same measure, up to an affine change of variable). Erdős [5] proved that $\hat{\nu}_\lambda(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ when $\theta = 1/\lambda$ is a *Pisot number*. Recall that a Pisot number is an algebraic integer greater than one, whose algebraic (Galois) conjugates are all less than one in modulus. Salem [19] showed that if $1/\lambda$ is not a Pisot number, then $\hat{\nu}_\lambda$ is a Rajchman measure. In the other direction, Erdős [6] proved that for any $[a, b] \subset (0, 1)$ there exists $\alpha > 0$ such that $\nu_\lambda \in \mathcal{D}_1(\alpha)$ for a.e. $\lambda \in [a, b]$. Later, Kahane [10] indicated that Erdős’ argument actually gives

that $\nu_\lambda \in \mathcal{D}_1$ for all $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ outside a set of zero Hausdorff dimension. (We should mention that very few specific λ are known, for which ν_λ has power Fourier decay, see Dai, Feng, and Wang [4].) In the original papers of Erdős and Kahane there were no explicit quantitative bounds; this was done in the survey [15], where the expression “Erdős-Kahane argument” was used first. The general case of a homogeneous self-similar measure on the line is treated analogously to Bernoulli convolutions: the self-similar measure is still an infinite convolution and the Erdős-Kahane argument on power Fourier decay goes through with minor modifications, see [4, 22]. Although one of the main motivations for the study of the Fourier transform has been the question of absolute continuity/singularity of ν_λ , here we do not discuss it but refer the reader to the recent survey [24].

Next we turn to the non-homogeneous case on the line. Li and Sahlsten [12] proved that if μ is a self-similar measure on the line with contraction ratios $\{r_i\}_{i=1}^m$ and there exist $i \neq j$ such that $\log r_i / \log r_j$ is irrational, then μ is Rajchman. Moreover, they showed logarithmic decay of the Fourier transform under a Diophantine condition. A related result for self-conformal measures was recently obtained by Algom, Rodriguez Hertz, and Wang [1]. Brémont [3] obtained an (almost) complete characterization of (non)-Rajchman self-similar measures in the case when $r_j = \lambda^{n_j}$ for $j \leq m$. To be non-Rajchman, it is necessary for $1/\lambda$ to be Pisot. For “generic” choices of the probability vector \mathbf{p} , assuming that $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathbb{Q}(\lambda)$ after an affine conjugation, this is also sufficient, but there are some exceptional cases of positive co-dimension. Varjú and Yu [25] proved logarithmic decay of the Fourier transform in the case when $r_j = \lambda^{n_j}$ for $j \leq m$ and $1/\lambda$ is algebraic, but not a Pisot or Salem number. In [23] we showed that outside a zero Hausdorff dimension exceptional set of parameters, all self-similar measures on \mathbb{R} belong to \mathcal{D}_1 ; however, the exceptional set is not explicit.

Turning to higher dimensions, we mention the recent paper by Rapaport [17], where he gives an algebraic characterization of self-similar IFS for which there exists a probability vector yielding a non-Rajchman self-similar measure. Li and Sahlsten [13] investigated self-affine measures in \mathbb{R}^d and obtained power Fourier decay under some algebraic conditions, which never hold for a homogeneous self-affine IFS. Their main assumptions are total irreducibility of the closed group generated by the contraction linear maps A_j and non-compactness of the projection of this group to $PGL(d, \mathbb{R})$. For $d = 2, 3$ they showed that this is sufficient.

1.2. Statement of results. We assume that A is a matrix diagonalizable over \mathbb{R} . Then we can reduce the IFS, via a linear change of variable, to one where A is a diagonal matrix with real entries. Given $A = \text{Diag}[\theta_1^{-1}, \dots, \theta_d^{-1}]$, with $|\theta_j| > 1$, a set of digits $\mathcal{D} = \{a_1, \dots, a_m\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, and a probability vector \mathbf{p} , we write $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_d)$ and denote by $\mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathcal{D}, \mathbf{p})$ the self-affine measure defined by (1.1). Our main motivation is the class of measures which can be viewed as “self-affine Bernoulli convolutions”, with $A = \text{Diag}[\theta_1^{-1}, \dots, \theta_d^{-1}]$ a diagonal matrix with distinct real entries and $\mathcal{D} = \{0, (1, \dots, 1)\}$. In this special case we denote the self-affine measure by $\mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{p})$.

Theorem 1.2. *There exists an exceptional set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, with $\mathcal{L}^d(E) = 0$, such that for all $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus E$, with $\min_j |\theta_j| > 1$, for all sets of digits \mathcal{D} , such that the IFS is affinely irreducible, and all $\mathbf{p} > 0$, holds $\mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathcal{D}, \mathbf{p}) \in \mathcal{D}_d$.*

The theorem is a consequence of a more quantitative statement.

Theorem 1.3. *Fix $1 < b_1 < b_2 < \infty$ and $c_1, \varepsilon > 0$. Then there exist $\alpha > 0$ and $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, depending on these parameters, such that $\mathcal{L}^d(\mathcal{E}) = 0$ and for all $\boldsymbol{\theta} \notin \mathcal{E}$ satisfying*

$$b_1 \leq \min_j |\theta_j| < \max_j |\theta_j| \leq b_2 \quad \text{and} \quad |\theta_i - \theta_j| \geq c_1, \quad i \neq j,$$

for all digit sets \mathcal{D} such that the IFS is affinely irreducible, and all \mathbf{p} such that $\min_j p_j \geq \varepsilon$, we have $\mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathcal{D}, \mathbf{p}) \in \mathcal{D}_d(\alpha)$.

Reduction of Theorem 1.2 to Theorem 1.3. For $M \in \mathbb{N}$ let $\mathcal{E}^{(M)}$ be the exceptional set obtained from Theorem 1.3 with $b_1 = 1 + M^{-1}$, $b_2 = M$, and $\varepsilon = c_1 = M^{-1}$. Then the set

$$E = \bigcup_{M=2}^{\infty} \mathcal{E}^{(M)} \cup \{\boldsymbol{\theta} : \exists i \neq j, \theta_i = \theta_j\}.$$

has the desired properties. □

The proof of Theorem 1.3 uses a version of the Erdős-Kahane technique. We follow the general scheme of [15, 22], but this is not a trivial extension.

In view of the convolution structure, Theorem 1.3 yields some information on absolute continuity of self-affine measures, by a standard argument.

Corollary 1.4. *Fix $1 < b_1 < b_2 < \infty$ and $c_1, \varepsilon > 0$. Then there exist a sequence $n_k \rightarrow \infty$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, depending on these parameters, such that $\mathcal{L}^d(\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k) = 0$ and for all $\boldsymbol{\theta} \notin \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k$ satisfying*

$$b_1 \leq \min_j |\theta_j^{n_k}| < \max_j |\theta_j^{n_k}| \leq b_2 \quad \text{and} \quad |\theta_i^{n_k} - \theta_j^{n_k}| \geq c_1, \quad i \neq j,$$

for all digit sets \mathcal{D} such that the IFS is affinely irreducible, and all \mathbf{p} such that $\min_j p_j \geq \varepsilon$, the measure $\mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathcal{D}, \mathbf{p})$ is absolutely continuous with respect to \mathcal{L}^d , with a Radon-Nikodym derivative in $C^k(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $k \geq 0$.

Proof (derivation). Let $n \geq 2$. It follows from (1.2) that

$$\mu(A, \mathcal{D}, \mathbf{p}) = \mu(A^n, \mathcal{D}, \mathbf{p}) * \mu(A^n, A\mathcal{D}, \mathbf{p}) \dots * \mu(A^n, A^{n-1}\mathcal{D}, \mathbf{p}).$$

It is easy to see that if the original IFS is affinely irreducible, then so are the IFS associated with $(A^n, A^j\mathcal{D})$, and moreover, these IFS are all affine conjugate to each other. Therefore, if $\mu(A^n, \mathcal{D}, \mathbf{p}) \in \mathcal{D}_d(\alpha)$, then $\mu(A, \mathcal{D}, \mathbf{p}) \in \mathcal{D}_d(n\alpha)$. As is well-known,

$$\mu \in \mathcal{D}_d(\beta), \quad \beta > d + k \implies \frac{d\mu}{d\mathcal{L}^d} \in C^k(\mathbb{R}^d),$$

so we can take n_k such that $n_k\alpha > d + k$, and $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_k = \{\theta : \theta^{n_k} \in \mathcal{E}\}$, where α and \mathcal{E} are from Theorem 1.3. \square

Remark 1.5. (a) In general, the power decay cannot hold for all θ ; for instance, it is easy to see that the measure $\mu(\theta, \mathbf{p})$ is not Rajchman if at least one of θ_k is a Pisot number. Thus in the most basic case with two digits, the exceptional set has Hausdorff dimension at least $d - 1$.

(b) It is natural to ask what happens if A is not diagonalizable over \mathbb{R} . A complex eigenvalue of A corresponds to a 2-dimensional homogeneous self-similar IFS with rotation, or an IFS of the form $\{\lambda z + a_j\}_{j=1}^m$, with $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, $|\lambda| < 1$, and $a_j \in \mathbb{C}$. In [21] it was shown that for all λ outside a set of Hausdorff dimension zero, the corresponding self-similar measure belongs to \mathcal{D}_2 . It may be possible to combine the methods of [21] with those of the current paper to obtain power Fourier decay for a typical A diagonalizable over \mathbb{C} . It would also be interesting to consider the case of non-diagonalizable A , starting with a single Jordan block.

(c) In the special case of $d = 2$ and $m = 2$, our system reduces to a planar self-affine IFS, conjugate to $\{(\lambda x, \gamma y) \pm (-1, 1)\}$ for $0 < \gamma < \lambda < 1$. This system has been studied by many authors, especially the dimension and topological properties of its attractor, see [7] and the references therein. For our work, the most relevant is the paper by Shmerkin [20]. Among other results, he proved absolute continuity with a density in L^2 of the self-affine measure (with some fixed probabilities) almost everywhere in some region, in particular, in some explicit neighborhood of $(1, 1)$. He also showed that if $(\lambda^{-1}, \gamma^{-1})$ for a *Pisot pair*, then the measure is not Rajchman and hence singular.

1.3. Rajchman self-affine measures. The question “when is $\mu(A, \mathcal{D}, \mathbf{p})$ is Rajchman?” is not addressed here. Recently Rapaport [17] obtained an (almost) complete characterization of *self-similar* Rajchman measures in \mathbb{R}^d . Of course, our situation is vastly simplified by the assumption that the IFS is homogeneous, but still it is not completely straightforward. The key notion here is the following.

Definition 1.6. A collection of numbers $(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_m)$ (real or complex) is called a *Pisot family* or a *P.V. m -tuple* if

- (i) $|\theta_j| > 1$ for all $j \leq m$ and
- (ii) there is a monic integer polynomial $P(t)$, such that $P(\theta_j) = 0$ for all $j \leq m$, whereas every other root θ' of $P(t)$ satisfies $|\theta'| < 1$.

It is not difficult to show, using the classical techniques of Pisot [16] and Salem [19], as well as some ideas from [17, Section 5] that

- If $\mu(A, \mathcal{D}, \mathbf{p})$ is not a Rajchman measure and the IFS is affinely irreducible, then the spectrum $\text{Spec}(A^{-1})$ contains a Pisot family;
- if $\text{Spec}(A^{-1})$ contains a Pisot family, then for a “generic” choice of \mathcal{D} , with $m \geq 3$, the measure $\mu(A, \mathcal{D}, \mathbf{p})$ is Rajchman; however,

- if $\text{Spec}(A^{-1})$ contains a Pisot family, then under appropriate conditions the measure $\mu(A, \mathcal{D}, \mathbf{p})$ is not Rajchman. For instance, this holds if there is at least one conjugate of the elements of the Pisot family less than 1 in absolute value, $m = 2$, and A is diagonalizable over \mathbb{R} .

We omit the details.

2. PROOFS

The following is an elementary inequality.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, \dots, p_m) > 0$ be a probability vector and $\alpha_1 = 0$, $\alpha_j \in \mathbb{R}$, $j = 2, \dots, m$. Denote $\varepsilon = \min_j p_j$ and write $\|x\| = \text{dist}(x, \mathbb{Z})$. Then for any $k \leq m$,*

$$(2.1) \quad \left| \sum_{j=1}^m p_j e^{-2\pi i \alpha_j} \right| \leq 1 - 2\pi \varepsilon \|\alpha_k\|^2.$$

Proof. Fix $k \in \{2, \dots, m\}$. We can estimate

$$\left| \sum_{j=1}^m p_j e^{-2\pi i \alpha_j} \right| = \left| p_1 + \sum_{j=2}^m p_j e^{-2\pi i \alpha_j} \right| \leq |p_1 + p_k e^{-2\pi i \alpha_k}| + (1 - p_1 - p_k).$$

Assume that $p_1 \geq p_k$, otherwise, write $|p_1 + p_k e^{-2\pi i \alpha_k}| = |p_1 e^{2\pi i \alpha_k} + p_k|$ and repeat the argument. Then observe that $|p_1 + p_k e^{-2\pi i \alpha_k}| \leq (p_1 - p_k) + p_k |1 + e^{-2\pi i \alpha_k}|$ and $|1 + e^{-2\pi i \alpha_k}| = 2|\cos(\pi \alpha_k)| \leq 2(1 - \pi \|\alpha_k\|^2)$. This implies the desired inequality. \square

Recall (1.3):

$$\hat{\mu}(\xi) = \prod_{n=0}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{j=1}^m p_j e^{-2\pi i \langle \xi, A^n a_j \rangle} \right).$$

For $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$, with $\|\xi\|_{\infty} \geq 1$, let $\eta(\xi) = (A^t)^{N(\xi)} \xi$, where $N(\xi) \geq 0$ is maximal, such that $\|\eta(\xi)\|_{\infty} \geq 1$. Then $\|\eta(\xi)\|_{\infty} \in [1, \|A^t\|_{\infty}]$ and (1.3) implies

$$(2.2) \quad \hat{\mu}(\xi) = \hat{\mu}(\eta(\xi)) \cdot \prod_{n=1}^{N(\xi)} \left(\sum_{j=1}^m p_j e^{-2\pi i \langle \eta(\xi), A^{-n} a_j \rangle} \right).$$

2.1. Proof of Theorem 1.3. First we show that the case of a general digit set may be reduced to $\mathcal{D} = \{0, (1, \dots, 1)\}$. We start with the formula (2.2), which under the current assumptions becomes

$$\hat{\mu}(\xi) = \hat{\mu}(\eta(\xi)) \cdot \prod_{n=1}^{N(\xi)} \left(\sum_{j=1}^m p_j \exp \left[-2\pi i \sum_{k=1}^d \eta_k a_j^{(k)} \theta_k^n \right] \right),$$

where $a_j = (a_j^{(k)})_{k=1}^d$ and $\eta(\xi) = (\eta_k)_{k=1}^d$. Note that $\|\eta(\xi)\|_\infty \in [1, \max_j |\theta_j|]$. Assume without loss of generality that $a_1 = 0$, then we have by (2.1), for any fixed $j \in \{2, \dots, m\}$:

$$|\hat{\mu}(\xi)| \leq \prod_{n=1}^{N(\xi)} \left(1 - 2\pi\varepsilon \left\| \sum_{k=1}^d \eta_k a_j^{(k)} \theta_k^n \right\|^2 \right),$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the distance to the nearest integer. Further, we can assume that all the coordinates of a_j are non-zero; otherwise, we can work in the subspace

$$\mathcal{H} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : x_k = 0 \iff a_j^{(k)} = 0\}$$

and with the corresponding variables θ_k , and then get the exceptional set of zero \mathcal{L}^d measure as a product of a set of zero measure in \mathcal{H} and the entire \mathcal{H}^\perp . Finally, apply a linear change of variables, so that $a_j^{(k)} = 1$ for all k , to obtain:

$$(2.3) \quad |\hat{\mu}(\xi)| \leq \prod_{n=1}^{N(\xi)} \left(1 - 2\pi\varepsilon \left\| \sum_{k=1}^d \eta_k \theta_k^n \right\|^2 \right).$$

This is exactly the situation corresponding to the measure $\mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{p})$, and we will be showing (typical) power decay for the right-hand side of (2.3). This completes the reduction.

Next we use a variant of the Erdős-Kahane argument, see e.g. [15, 22] for other versions of it. Intuitively, we will get power decay if $\|\sum_{k=1}^d \eta_k \theta_k^n\|$ is uniformly bounded away from zero for a set of n 's of positive lower density, uniformly in η .

Fix $c_1 > 0$ and $1 < b_1 < b_2 < \infty$, and consider the compact set

$$H = \{\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_d) \in ([-b_2, -b_1] \cup [b_1, b_2])^d : |\theta_i - \theta_j| \geq c_1, i \neq j\}.$$

We will use the notation $[N] = \{1, \dots, N\}$, $[n, N] = \{n, \dots, N\}$. For $\rho, \delta > 0$ we define the “bad set” at scale N :

$$(2.4) \quad E_{H,N}(\delta, \rho) = \left\{ \boldsymbol{\theta} \in H : \max_{\eta: 1 \leq \|\eta\|_\infty \leq b_2} \frac{1}{N} \left| \left\{ n \in [N] : \left\| \sum_{k=1}^d \eta_k \theta_k^n \right\| < \rho \right\} \right| > 1 - \delta \right\}.$$

Now we can define the exceptional set:

$$\mathcal{E}_H(\delta, \rho) := \bigcap_{N_0=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{N=N_0}^{\infty} E_{H,N}(\delta, \rho).$$

Theorem 1.3 will immediately follow from the next two propositions.

Proposition 2.2. *For any positive ρ and δ , we have $\mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{p}) \in \mathcal{D}_d(\alpha)$ whenever $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in H \setminus \mathcal{E}_H(\delta, \rho)$, where α depends only on δ, ρ, H , and $\varepsilon = \min\{p, 1 - p\}$.*

Proposition 2.3. *There exist $\rho = \rho_H > 0$ and $\delta = \delta_H > 0$ such that $\mathcal{L}^d(\mathcal{E}_H(\delta, \rho)) = 0$.*

Proof of Proposition 2.2. Suppose that $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in H \setminus \mathcal{E}_H(\delta, \rho)$. This implies that there is $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\boldsymbol{\theta} \notin E_{H,N}(\delta, \rho)$ for all $N \geq N_0$. Let $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be such that $\|\xi\|_\infty > b_2^{N_0}$. Then $N = N(\xi) \geq N_0$, where $\eta = \eta(\xi) = A^{N(\xi)}\xi$ and $N(\xi)$ is maximal with $\|\eta\|_\infty \geq 1$. From the fact that $\boldsymbol{\theta} \notin E_{H,N}(\delta, \rho)$ it follows that

$$\frac{1}{N} \left| \left\{ n \in [N] : \left\| \sum_{k=1}^d \eta_k \theta_k^n \right\| < \rho \right\} \right| \leq 1 - \delta.$$

Then by (2.3),

$$|\hat{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{p})(\xi)| \leq (1 - 2\pi\varepsilon\rho^2)^{\lfloor \delta N \rfloor}.$$

By the definition of $N = N(\xi)$ we have

$$\|\xi\|_\infty \leq b_2^{N+1}.$$

It follows that

$$|\hat{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{p})(\xi)| = O_{H,\varepsilon}(1) \cdot \|\xi\|_\infty^{-\alpha},$$

for $\alpha = -\delta \log(1 - 2\pi\varepsilon\rho^2) / \log b_2$, and the proof is complete. \square

Proof of Proposition 2.3. It is convenient to express the exceptional set as a union, according to a dominant coordinate of η (which may be non-unique, of course): $E_{H,N}(\delta, \rho) = \bigcup_{j=1}^d E_{H,N,j}(\delta, \rho)$, where

$$(2.5) \quad E_{H,N,j}(\delta, \rho) := \left\{ \boldsymbol{\theta} \in H : \exists \eta, 1 \leq |\eta_j| = \|\eta\|_\infty \leq b_2, \frac{1}{N} \left| \left\{ n \in [N] : \left\| \sum_{k=1}^d \eta_k \theta_k^n \right\| < \rho \right\} \right| > 1 - \delta \right\}.$$

It is easy to see that $E_{H,N,j}(\delta, \rho)$ is measurable. Observe that

$$\mathcal{E}_H(\delta, \rho) := \bigcup_{j=1}^d \mathcal{E}_{H,j}(\delta, \rho), \quad \text{where} \quad \mathcal{E}_{H,j}(\delta, \rho) := \bigcap_{N_0=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{N=N_0}^{\infty} E_{H,N,j}(\delta, \rho).$$

It is, of course, sufficient to show that $\mathcal{L}^d(\mathcal{E}_{H,j}(\delta, \rho)) = 0$ for every $j \in [d]$, for some $\delta, \rho > 0$. Without loss of generality, assume that $j = d$. Since $\mathcal{E}_{H,d}(\delta, \rho)$ is measurable, the desired claim will follow if we prove that every slice of $\mathcal{E}_{H,d}(\delta, \rho)$ in the direction of the x_d -axis has zero \mathcal{L}^1 measure. Namely, for fixed $\boldsymbol{\theta}' = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{d-1})$ let

$$\mathcal{E}_{H,d}(\delta, \rho, \boldsymbol{\theta}') := \{\theta_d : (\boldsymbol{\theta}', \theta_d) \in \mathcal{E}_{H,d}(\delta, \rho)\}.$$

We want to show that $\mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{E}_{H,d}(\delta, \rho, \boldsymbol{\theta}')) = 0$ for all $\boldsymbol{\theta}'$. Clearly,

$$\mathcal{E}_{H,d}(\delta, \rho, \boldsymbol{\theta}') := \bigcap_{N_0=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{N=N_0}^{\infty} E_{H,N,d}(\delta, \rho, \boldsymbol{\theta}'),$$

where

(2.6)

$$E_{H,N,d}(\delta, \rho, \boldsymbol{\theta}') = \left\{ \theta_d : (\boldsymbol{\theta}', \theta_d) \in H : \max_{\substack{\eta: 1 \leq |\eta_d| \leq b_2 \\ \|\eta\|_\infty = |\eta_d|}} \frac{1}{N} \left| \left\{ n \in [N] : \left\| \sum_{k=1}^d \eta_k \theta_k^n \right\| < \rho \right\} \right| > 1 - \delta \right\}$$

Lemma 2.4. *There exists a constant $\rho > 0$ such that, for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, the set $E_{H,N,d}(\delta, \rho, \boldsymbol{\theta}')$ can be covered by $\exp(O_H(\delta \log(1/\delta)N))$ intervals of length b_1^{-N} .*

We first complete the proof of the proposition, assuming the lemma. By Lemma 2.4,

$$\mathcal{L}^1 \left(\bigcup_{N=N_0}^{\infty} E_{H,N,d}(\delta, \rho, \boldsymbol{\theta}') \right) \leq \sum_{N=N_0}^{\infty} \exp(O_H(\delta \log(1/\delta)N)) \cdot b_1^{-N} \rightarrow 0, \quad N_0 \rightarrow \infty,$$

provided $\delta > 0$ is so small that $\log b_1 > O_H(\delta \log(1/\delta))$. Thus $\mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{E}_{H,d}(\delta, \rho, \boldsymbol{\theta}')) = 0$. \square

Proof of Lemma 2.4. Fix $\boldsymbol{\theta}'$ in the projection of H to the first $(d-1)$ coordinates and $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^d$, with $1 \leq |\eta_d| = \|\eta\|_\infty \leq b_2$. Below all the constants implicit in the $O(\cdot)$ notation are allowed to depend on H and d . Let θ_d be such that $(\boldsymbol{\theta}', \theta_d) \in H$ and write

$$\sum_{k=1}^d \eta_k \theta_k^n = K_n + \varepsilon_n, \quad n \geq 0,$$

where $K_n \in \mathbb{Z}$ is the nearest integer to the expression in the left-hand side, so that $|\varepsilon_n| \leq \frac{1}{2}$. We emphasize that K_n depends on η and on θ_d . Define $A_n^{(0)} = K_n$, $\tilde{A}_n^{(0)} = K_n + \varepsilon_n$, and then for all n inductively:

$$(2.7) \quad A_n^{(j)} = A_{n+1}^{(j-1)} - \theta_j A_n^{(j-1)}; \quad \tilde{A}_n^{(j)} = \tilde{A}_{n+1}^{(j-1)} - \theta_j \tilde{A}_n^{(j-1)}, \quad j = 1, \dots, d-1.$$

It is easy to check by induction that

$$\tilde{A}_n^{(j)} = \sum_{i=j+1}^d \eta_i \prod_{k=1}^j (\theta_i - \theta_k) \theta_i^n, \quad j = 1, \dots, d-1,$$

hence

$$(2.8) \quad \tilde{A}_n^{(d-1)} = \eta_d \prod_{k=1}^{d-1} (\theta_d - \theta_k) \theta_d^n; \quad \theta_d = \frac{\tilde{A}_{n+1}^{(d-1)}}{\tilde{A}_n^{(d-1)}}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

We have $\|\eta\|_\infty \leq b_2$ and $|\tilde{A}_n^{(0)} - A_n^{(0)}| \leq |\varepsilon_n|$, and then by induction, by (2.7),

$$(2.9) \quad |\tilde{A}_n^{(j)} - A_n^{(j)}| \leq (1 + b_2)^j \max\{|\varepsilon_n|, \dots, |\varepsilon_{n+j}|\}, \quad j = 1, \dots, d-1.$$

Another easy calculation gives

$$\begin{aligned}
 K_{n+d+1} &= \theta_1 K_{n+d} + A_{n+d}^{(1)} = \dots \\
 (2.10) \quad &= [\theta_1 K_{n+d} + \theta_2 A_{n+d-1}^{(1)} + \dots + \theta_{d-1} A_{n+2}^{(d-2)}] + A_{n+2}^{(d-1)}
 \end{aligned}$$

Since $\frac{A_{n+2}^{(d-1)}}{A_{n+1}^{(d-1)}} \approx \frac{\tilde{A}_{n+1}^{(d-1)}}{\tilde{A}_n^{(d-1)}} = \theta_d$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 (2.11) \quad K_{n+d+1} &\approx [\theta_1 K_{n+d} + \theta_2 A_{n+d-1}^{(1)} + \dots + \theta_{d-1} A_{n+2}^{(d-2)}] + \frac{(A_{n+1}^{(d-1)})^2}{A_n^{(d-1)}} \\
 &=: R_{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{d-1}}(K_n, \dots, K_{n+d}),
 \end{aligned}$$

where $R_{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{d-1}}(K_n, \dots, K_{n+d})$ is a rational function, depending on the (fixed) parameters $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{d-1}$. To make the approximate equality precise, note that by (2.8) and our assumptions,

$$|\tilde{A}_n^{(d-1)}| \geq c_1^{d-1} b_1^n,$$

where $b_1 > 1$, and $|\tilde{A}_n^{(d-1)} - A_n^{(d-1)}| \leq (1 + b_2)^{d-1}/2$ by (2.9). Hence

$$(2.12) \quad |A_n^{(d-1)}| \geq c_1^{d-1} b_1^n / 2 \quad \text{for } n \geq n_0 = n_0(H),$$

and so

$$|A_{n+1}^{(d-1)} / A_n^{(d-1)}| \leq O(1), \quad n \geq n_0.$$

In the next estimates we assume that $n \geq n_0(H)$. In view of the above, especially (2.9) for $j = d - 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \left| \frac{A_{n+1}^{(d-1)}}{A_n^{(d-1)}} - \theta_d \right| &= \left| \frac{A_{n+1}^{(d-1)}}{A_n^{(d-1)}} - \frac{\tilde{A}_{n+1}^{(d-1)}}{\tilde{A}_n^{(d-1)}} \right| \\
 &\leq \left| \frac{A_{n+1}^{(d-1)} - \tilde{A}_{n+1}^{(d-1)}}{A_n^{(d-1)}} \right| + \left| \tilde{A}_{n+1}^{(d-1)} \right| \cdot \left| \frac{1}{A_n^{(d-1)}} - \frac{1}{\tilde{A}_n^{(d-1)}} \right| \\
 &\leq O(1) \cdot \max\{|\varepsilon_n|, \dots, |\varepsilon_{n+d}|\} \cdot |A_n^{(d-1)}|^{-1}.
 \end{aligned}$$

It follows that, on the one hand,

$$(2.13) \quad \left| \frac{A_{n+1}^{(d-1)}}{A_n^{(d-1)}} - \theta_d \right| \leq O(1) \cdot b_1^{-n};$$

and on the other hand,

$$(2.14) \quad \left| \frac{(A_{n+1}^{(d-1)})^2}{A_n^{(d-1)}} - A_{n+2}^{(d-1)} \right| \leq O(1) \cdot \max\{|\varepsilon_n|, \dots, |\varepsilon_{n+d+1}|\}.$$

Note that $A_n^{(j)}$, for $j \in [d-1]$, is a linear combination of $K_n, K_{n+1}, \dots, K_{n+j}$ with coefficients that are polynomials in the (fixed) parameters $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{d-1}$, hence the inequality (2.13) shows that

$$(2.15) \quad \boxed{\text{given } K_n, \dots, K_{n+d}, \text{ we have an } O(1) \cdot b_1^{-n}\text{-approximation of } \theta_d.}$$

The inequality (2.14) yields, using (2.11) and (2.10), that, for $n \geq n_0$,

$$|K_{n+d+1} - R_{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{d-1}}(K_n, \dots, K_{n+d})| \leq O(1) \cdot \max\{|\varepsilon_n|, \dots, |\varepsilon_{n+d+1}|\}.$$

Thus we have:

- (i) Given K_n, \dots, K_{n+d} , there are at most $O(1)$ possible values for K_{n+d+1} , uniformly in η and $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{d-1}$. There are also $O(1)$ possible values for K_1, \dots, K_{n_0} since $\|\eta\|_\infty$ and $\|\theta\|$ are bounded above by b_2 .
- (ii) There is a constant $\rho = \rho(H) > 0$ such that if $\max\{|\varepsilon_n|, \dots, |\varepsilon_{n+d+1}|\} < \rho$, then K_n, \dots, K_{n+d} uniquely determine K_{n+d+1} , as the nearest integer to $R_{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{d-1}}(K_n, \dots, K_{n+d})$, again independently of η and $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{d-1}$.

Fix an N sufficiently large. We claim that for each fixed set $J \subset [N]$ with $|J| \geq (1-\delta)N$, the set

$$\left\{ (K_n)_{n \in [N]} : \varepsilon_n = \left\| \sum_{k=1}^d \eta_k \theta_k^n \right\| < \rho \text{ for some } \theta_d, \eta \text{ and all } n \in J \right\}$$

has cardinality $\exp(O(\delta N))$. Indeed, fix such a J and let

$$\tilde{J} = \{i \in [n_0 + (d+1), N] : i, i-1, \dots, i-(d+1) \in J\}.$$

We have $|\tilde{J}| \geq (1 - (d+2)\delta)N - n_0 - (d+1)$. If we set

$$\Lambda_j = (K_i)_{i \in [j]},$$

then (i), (ii) above show that $|\Lambda_{j+1}| = |\Lambda_j|$ if $j \in \tilde{J}$ and $|\Lambda_{j+1}| = O(|\Lambda_j|)$ otherwise. Thus $|\Lambda_N| \leq O(1)^{(d+2)\delta N}$, as claimed.

The number of subsets A of $[N]$ of size $\geq (1-\delta)N$ is bounded by $\exp(O(\delta \log(1/\delta)N))$ (using e.g. Stirling's formula), so we conclude that there are

$$\exp(O(\delta \log(1/\delta)N)) \cdot \exp(O(\delta N)) = \exp(O(\delta \log(1/\delta)N))$$

sequences K_1, \dots, K_N such that $|\varepsilon_n| < \rho$ for at least $(1-\delta)N$ values of $n \in [N]$. Hence by (2.15) the set (2.6) can be covered by $\exp(O_H(\delta \log(1/\delta)N))$ intervals of radius b_1^{-N} , as desired. \square

The proof of Theorem 1.3 is now complete.

Acknowledgement. Thanks to Ariel Rapaport for corrections and helpful comments on a preliminary version.

REFERENCES

- [1] Amir Algom, Federico Rodriguez Hertz, and Zhiren Wang. Pointwise normality and Fourier decay for self-conformal measures. *arXiv e-prints*, December 2020. arXiv:2012.06529.
- [2] Jean Bourgain and Semyon Dyatlov. Fourier dimension and spectral gaps for hyperbolic surfaces. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 27(4):744–771, 2017.
- [3] Julien Brémont. Self-similar measures and the Rajchman property. *arXiv e-prints*, October 2019. arXiv:1910.03463.
- [4] Xin-Rong Dai, De-Jun Feng, and Yang Wang. Refinable functions with non-integer dilations. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 250(1):1–20, 2007.
- [5] Paul Erdős. On a family of symmetric Bernoulli convolutions. *Amer. J. Math.*, 61:974–976, 1939.
- [6] Paul Erdős. On the smoothness properties of a family of Bernoulli convolutions. *Amer. J. Math.*, 62:180–186, 1940.
- [7] Kevin G. Hare and Nikita Sidorov. On a family of self-affine sets: topology, uniqueness, simultaneous expansions. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 37(1):193–227, 2017.
- [8] Michael Hochman. On self-similar sets with overlaps and inverse theorems for entropy in \mathbb{R}^d . *arXiv e-prints, Memoirs of the AMS, to appear*, page arXiv:1503.09043, March 2015.
- [9] Thomas Jordan and Tuomas Sahlsten. Fourier transforms of Gibbs measures for the Gauss map. *Math. Ann.*, 364(3-4):983–1023, 2016.
- [10] J.-P. Kahane. Sur la distribution de certaines séries aléatoires. *Bull. Soc. Math. France, Mém. No. 25, Soc. Math. France Paris*, pages 119–122, 1971.
- [11] Jialun Li. Decrease of Fourier coefficients of stationary measures. *Math. Ann.*, 372(3-4):1189–1238, 2018.
- [12] Jialun Li and Tuomas Sahlsten. Trigonometric series and self-similar sets. *arXiv e-prints*, Feb 2019. arXiv:1902.00426.
- [13] Jialun Li and Tuomas Sahlsten. Fourier transform of self-affine measures. *Adv. Math.*, 374:107349, 2020.
- [14] Russell Lyons. Seventy years of Rajchman measures. *J. Fourier Anal. Appl.*, pages 363–377, 1995.
- [15] Yuval Peres, Wilhelm Schlag, and Boris Solomyak. Sixty years of Bernoulli convolutions. In *Fractal geometry and stochastics, II (Greifswald/Koserow, 1998)*, volume 46 of *Progr. Probab.*, pages 39–65. Birkhäuser, Basel, 2000.
- [16] Charles Pisot. La répartition modulo 1 et les nombres algébriques. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (2)*, 7(3-4):205–248, 1938.
- [17] Ariel Rapaport. On the Rajchman property for self-similar measures on \mathbb{R}^d . *arXiv e-prints*, April 2021. arXiv:2104.03955.
- [18] Tuomas Sahlsten and Connor Stevens. Fourier decay in nonlinear dynamics. *arXiv e-prints*, Oct 2018. arXiv:1810.01378.
- [19] Raphael Salem. Sets of uniqueness and sets of multiplicity. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 54:218–228, 1943.
- [20] Pablo Shmerkin. Overlapping self-affine sets. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 55(4):1291–1331, 2006.
- [21] Pablo Shmerkin and Boris Solomyak. Absolute continuity of complex Bernoulli convolutions. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 161(3):435–453, 2016.
- [22] Pablo Shmerkin and Boris Solomyak. Absolute continuity of self-similar measures, their projections and convolutions. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 368(7):5125–5151, 2016.
- [23] Boris Solomyak. Fourier decay for self-similar measures. *arXiv e-prints, Proc. of the AMS, to appear*, June 2019. arXiv:1906.12164.

- [24] Péter P. Varjú. Recent progress on Bernoulli convolutions. In *European Congress of Mathematics*, pages 847–867. Eur. Math. Soc., Zürich, 2018.
- [25] Péter P. Varjú and Han Yu. Fourier decay of self-similar measures and self-similar sets of uniqueness. *arXiv e-prints*, April 2020. arXiv:2004.09358.

BORIS SOLOMYAK, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BAR-ILAN UNIVERSITY, RAMAT GAN, 5290002 ISRAEL
Email address: bsolom3@gmail.com