arXiv:2111.14981v1 [math.NT] 29 Nov 2021

Absolute Bounds for Ergodic Deviations of Linear Form Sequences Relative to Intervals in $\mathbb{T}^1$

Hao Wu

Abstract. Given a positive increasing function φ, we show that for a full measure set of vectors $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the maximal ergodic discrepancy of the d-linear form sequence $\left\{\sum_{1\leq i\leq d} k_i\alpha_i \mod 1\right\}_{\substack{1\leq k_i\leq N\\ 1\leq i\leq d}}$ relative to intervals in $[0,1)$ has an absolute upper bound of $C(\boldsymbol{\alpha},\varphi)\cdot(\log N)^d\varphi^{\max\{d,3\}}(\log\log N)$ if $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\varphi(n)}$ converges.

Contents

1 Introduction 3

2 Poisson's summation formula 4

3 Estimating the "tail" of the discrepancy function 8
- 3.1 Estimation for the sum when $|n_1|$ is big. 8
- 3.2 Estimation for the sum when $|n_1\alpha_i|$ is bigger than $\frac{1}{2}$ for one of $1 \leq i \leq d$. 11
- 3.3 Estimation for the sum when $|n_1| \prod_{i=1}^{d} \|n_1\alpha_i|$ is small. 12
- 3.4 Control the sum when n_1 is between $N^2/4$ and $N^2(\log N)^2$. 15

4 Cancellation of the main terms. 17

5 Estimation of small exponentials. 20

References 26

1 Introduction

Given an irrational number $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, the irrational rotation T_α over $\mathbb{T} = (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}) \cong [0,1)$ is defined by $x \mapsto x + \alpha \mod 1$ for $x \in \mathbb{T}$. By Weyl's criterion (see [2], section 1.2.1), the sequence $\{n\alpha \mod 1\}_{1 \le n \le N}$ becomes equidistributed over $\mathbb{T}$ as $N \to \infty$, i.e. for any measurable set $B \subset \mathbb{T}$,

$$\frac{\sum_{n=1}^{N} \chi_B(n\alpha)}{N} \to \mathrm{Vol}(B), \quad N \to \infty.$$

To measure the rate of convergence, we introduce the discrepancy function defined as the difference between the *actual* number of hits in B before time N and the *expected* number of hits $N \cdot \mathrm{Vol}(B)$:

$$D_B(\alpha; N) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \chi_B(n\alpha \mod 1) - N\mathrm{Vol}(B).$$

In 1920s, Khintchine [3] proved that the maximal discrepancy for an irrational rotation T_α relative all possible intervals in $[0,1)$:

$$\Delta(\alpha; N) = \max_{x \in (0,1]} |D_{[0,x)}(\alpha; N)|$$

is exactly between $C(\alpha,\epsilon)(\log N)(\log\log N)$ and $C(\alpha,\epsilon)(\log N)(\log\log N)^{1+\epsilon}$ for any $\epsilon > 0$. His proof used the continued fraction algorithm for irrationals. Due to the absence of the continued fraction algorithm in higher dimensions, the research about the higher-dimensional counterpart of Khintchine's theorem proved to be difficult. Schmidt [4] proved that the maximal discrepancy $\Delta(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; N)$(see the definition below) in dimension k has an upper bound of $C(\boldsymbol{\alpha},\epsilon)(\log N)^{k+1+\epsilon}$ for almost every $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, by using the Erdős–Turán inequality, In 1994, by a suprising method which consists of a combination of Fourier analysis, the "second-moment method" and combinatorics, J. Beck[1] successfully got rid of the extra $\log N$ factor and proved the following multidimensional analogue of Khintchine's theorem:

Theorem 1.1. *Let $k \ge 2$, $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k) \in \mathbb{R}^k$ be the translation vector, and $B(\mathbf{x}) = [0, x_1) \times \cdots \times [0, x_k) \subset [0,1)^k$, define the ergodic discrepancy:*

$$D(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \mathbf{x}; m) = \sum_{1 \le n \le m} \chi_{B(\mathbf{x})}(n\boldsymbol{\alpha}) - m\,Vol(B(\mathbf{x}))$$

and the maximal discrepancy:

$$\Delta(\alpha; N) = \max_{\substack{1 \le m \le N \\ \mathbf{x} \in [0,1]^d}} |D(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \mathbf{x}; m)|.$$

Then for arbitray positive increasing function $\varphi(n)$ of n,

$$\Delta(\alpha; N) \ll (\log N)^k \cdot \varphi(\log\log N) \Longleftrightarrow \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\varphi(n)} < \infty \qquad (1.1)$$

for almost every $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^k$, where $\ll$ denotes the Vinogradov symbol, e.g. $f(N) \ll g(N)$ means that $|f(N)| < c \cdot g(N)$ for all N with a uniform constant c.

In this paper, we consider the sequence of linear forms $\left\{\sum_{1\le i\le d} k_i\alpha_i \mod 1\right\}_{\substack{1\le k_i\le N\\ 1\le i\le d}}$ relative to intervals in $[0,1)$. Define the ergodic discrepancy:

$$D(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, x; N) = \sum_{\substack{1\le k_i\le N\\ 1\le i\le d}} \chi_{[0,x)}\left(\sum_{1\le i\le d} k_i\alpha_i \mod 1\right) - N^d x,$$

and the maximal discrepancy:

$$\Delta(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; N) = \max_{0<x\le 1} |D(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, x; N)|.$$

The term $N^d x$ is the expected value of the number of terms in the sequence $\left\{\sum_{1\le i\le d} k_i\alpha_i\right\}_{\substack{1\le k_i\le N\\ 1\le i\le d}}$ whose fractional parts visit the interval $[0,x)$.

The main result of this paper is the following:

Theorem 1.2. *Let $\varphi(n)$ be an arbitray positive increasing function of n, then for almost every $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have:*

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\varphi(n)} < \infty \;\Rightarrow\; \Delta(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; N) \ll (\log N)^d \cdot \varphi^{\max\{3,d\}}(\log\log N), \qquad (1.2)$$

Remark. *Our result successfully keep the main factor $(\log N)^d$, but due to an absence of a second moment estimation as in Beck[1], we used an L_1 estimation, and the additional factor $\varphi(\log\log N)^{\max\{2,d-1\}}$ is needed in our proof for controlling the small divisor $n\prod_{i=1}\|n\alpha_i\|$.*

This paper is organized as the following: in Section 2, for the convenience of following estimations, we transform the ergodic discrepancy to the Fourier series using Poisson's summation formula. In Section 3 we estimate the contribution of the "tail" of the Fourier series, i.e. the high frequency nodes. Section 4 and 5 deal with the main part of the discrepancy, Section 4 is about the constant part and Section 5 deals with the exponential part, both of which will be properly defined later. Combining the section 3-5, we have an overall estimation of the discrepancy, which gives the desired result above.

2 Poisson's summation formula

In this section, following [1], we use the Poisson formula to transform the ergodic discrepancy into a Fourier series. The main result of this section, Proposition 2.1, gives a better version of the Fourier serires by taking a roof-like average, which has better convergent properties. First we introduces the Fourier series of the ergodic dispcrepancy by the following Lemma.

Lemma 2.1. *By the Poisson formula, the ergodic sum $D(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, x; N)$ becomes:*

$$D(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, x; N) = \mathbf{i}^{d+1} \sum_{\mathbf{n}\in\mathbb{Z}^{n+1}\setminus\{0\}} \frac{1-e^{2\pi\mathbf{i}n_1 x}}{2\pi n_1} \prod_{i=1}^{d} \frac{1-e^{-2\pi\mathbf{i}N(n_1\alpha_i - n_{i+1})}}{2\pi(n_1\alpha_i - n_{i+1})}.$$

Proof. The ergodic sum could be calculated as follows, note that the condition: $0 \leq \{\sum_{1\leq i\leq d} k_i\alpha_i\} < x$ is equivalent to $\exists m \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that:

$$\begin{array}{c} 0 \leq \sum\limits_{1\leq i\leq d} k_i\alpha_i - m < x; \\ 1 \leq k \leq N; \\ 1 \leq l \leq N, \end{array} ,$$

Consider the lattice inside $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$,

$$\left\{ \left(\sum_{1\leq i\leq d} k_i\alpha_i - m, k_1, \ldots, k_d \right) \;\middle|\; (k_1, \ldots, k_d, m) \in \mathbb{Z}^{d+1} \right\},$$

note that the fractional part of $\sum_{1\leq i\leq d} k_i\alpha_i$ lying in $[0, x)$ is equivalent to the lattice point inside box

$$B = [0, x) \times \prod_{\text{d copies}} (0, N].$$

So the sum becomes

$$\sum_{\substack{1\leq k_i\leq N \\ 1\leq i\leq d}} \chi_{[0,x)} \left(\sum_{1\leq i\leq d} k_i\alpha_i \mod 1 \right) = \sum_{(k_1,\ldots,k_d,m)\in\mathbb{Z}^{d+1}} \chi_B \left(\sum_{1\leq i\leq d} k_i\alpha_i - m, k_1, \ldots, k_d \right)$$

On the other hand, we see that:

$$\left(\sum_{1\leq i\leq d} k_i\alpha_i \mod 1 \right) = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1 & \alpha_2 & \ldots & \alpha_d & -1 \\ 1 & 0 & \ldots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & \ldots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} k_1 \\ k_2 \\ \vdots \\ k_d \\ m \end{pmatrix} = \mathbf{A}\cdot\mathbf{y}$$

where

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1 & \alpha_2 & \ldots & \alpha_d & -1 \\ 1 & 0 & \ldots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & \ldots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{y} = \begin{pmatrix} k_1 \\ k_2 \\ \vdots \\ k_d \\ m \end{pmatrix}$$

Apply the Poisson formula to the function $f(\mathbf{y}) = \chi_B(\mathbf{A}\cdot\mathbf{y}),\ \mathbf{y} = (k_1,\dots,k_d,m) \in \mathbb{Z}^{d+1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\mathbf{y}\in\mathbb{Z}^{d+1}} \chi_B(\mathbf{A}\cdot\mathbf{y}) &= \sum_{\mathbf{y}\in\mathbb{Z}^{d+1}} f(\mathbf{y}) \\ &= \sum_{\nu\in\mathbb{Z}^{d+1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}} f(\mathbf{y})\cdot e^{-2\pi\mathbf{i}\nu\cdot\mathbf{y}} d\mathbf{y} \\ &= \sum_{\nu\in\mathbb{Z}^{d+1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}} \chi_B(\mathbf{A}\cdot\mathbf{y})\cdot e^{-2\pi\mathbf{i}\nu\cdot\mathbf{y}} d\mathbf{y} \\ &= \frac{1}{\det\mathbf{A}} \sum_{\nu\in\mathbb{Z}^{d+1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}} \chi_B(\mathbf{z}) e^{-2\pi\mathbf{i}\nu\cdot(\mathbf{A}^{-1}\cdot\mathbf{z})} d\mathbf{z}\end{aligned}$$

Integrate with respect to each coordinate of $\mathbf{z}$ and we get

$$\begin{aligned}D(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, x; N) &= \sum_{\mathbf{y}\in\mathbb{Z}^{d+1}} f(\mathbf{y}) - N^d x \\ &= \mathbf{i}^{d+1} \sum_{\mathbf{n}\in\mathbb{Z}^{d+1}\setminus\{0\}} \frac{1-e^{2\pi\mathbf{i}n_1 x}}{2\pi n_1} \prod_{i=1}^{d} \frac{1-e^{-2\pi\mathbf{i}N(n_1\alpha_i - n_{i+1})}}{2\pi(n_1\alpha_i - n_{i+1})}.\end{aligned}$$

□

In order to avoid technical problems with the convergence, we will not study $D(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, x; N)$ directly, instead, we will follow Beck[1] and use a special weighted average of $D(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, x; N)$ over a $\frac{1}{N^2}$ neighborhood. To this end, we oscillate the target interval $[0, x)$ with an amplitude of $\frac{1}{N^2}$, and also the range for summation $\{1,\dots,N\}$ with amplitude of 2, specifically, let $\mathbf{u} = (u_2,\dots,u_{d+1})$, $\mathbf{u}+N = (u_2+N,\dots,u_{d+1}+N)$, and define :

$$D(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; a, b; \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}+N) = \sum_{\substack{u_{i+1}<k_i<N+u_{i+1}\\ 1\le i\le d}} \chi_{[a,b)}\left(\sum_{1\le i\le d} k_i\alpha_i \mod 1\right) - N^d(b-a) \quad (2.1)$$

and define the $\frac{1}{N^2}$ average:

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{D}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, x; N) = \frac{N^2}{2}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^d \int_{-\frac{2}{N^2}}^{\frac{2}{N^2}} \int_{-2}^{2}\cdots\int_{-2}^{2} \left(1-\frac{N^2}{2}|u_1|\right)\prod_{i=1}^{d}\left(1-\frac{|u_{i+1}|}{2}\right) \\ \times D(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; u_1, x+u_1; \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}+N) du_1 du_2 \dots du_{d+1}.\end{aligned}$$

Using the Féjer kernel identity

$$\frac{N^2}{2}\int_{-\frac{2}{N^2}}^{\frac{2}{N^2}} \left(1-\frac{N^2|y|}{2}\right) e^{2\pi\mathbf{i}ky} dy = \left(\frac{\sin(2\pi\frac{k}{N^2})}{2\pi\frac{k}{N^2}}\right)^2,$$

$$\int_{-2}^{2}\left(1-\frac{|y|}{2}\right)e^{2\pi\mathbf{i}ky}dy=\left(\frac{\sin 2\pi k}{2\pi k}\right)^2.$$

We arrive at:

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{D}(\boldsymbol{\alpha},x;N)=\mathbf{i}^{d+1}\sum_{\mathbf{n}\in\mathbb{Z}^{d+1}}&\frac{1-e^{2\pi\mathbf{i}n_1x}}{2\pi n_1}\left(\frac{\sin 2\pi\left(\frac{n_1}{N^2}\right)}{2\pi\left(\frac{n_1}{N^2}\right)}\right)^2\\&\cdot\prod_{i=1}^{d}\left(\frac{1-e^{-2\pi\mathbf{i}N(n_1\alpha_i-n_{i+1})}}{2\pi(n_1\alpha_i-n_{i+1})}\right)\left(\frac{\sin 2\pi(n_1\alpha_i-n_{i+1})}{2\pi(n_1\alpha_i-n_{i+1})}\right)^2.\end{aligned}\tag{2.2}$$

We claim that if $\bar{D}(\boldsymbol{\alpha},x;N)$ is bounded from above by $(\log N)^d\varphi^{d+1}(\log\log N)$, then so is $D(\boldsymbol{\alpha},x;N)$.

Proposition 2.1. *For almost every $\boldsymbol{\alpha}\in[0,1)^d$, we have*

$$|\bar{D}(\boldsymbol{\alpha},x;N)-D(\boldsymbol{\alpha},x;N)|\ll(\log N)^{1+\epsilon},$$

Proof. By a standard application of Borel-Cantelli Lemma, there exists a constant $C(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ for almost every $\boldsymbol{\alpha}\in[0,1)^d$, and every $\mathbf{k}=(k_1,\dots,k_d)\in\mathbb{Z}^d$ such that $|\mathbf{k}|>1$,

$$\|\sum_{1\le i\le d}k_i\alpha_i\|>\frac{C(\boldsymbol{\alpha})}{\left(\sum\limits_{1\le i\le d}k_i^2\right)\left(\log\left(\sum\limits_{1\le i\le d}k_i^2\right)\right)^{1+\epsilon}},$$

therefore $\|\sum_{1\le i\le d}k_i\alpha_i\|\gg\frac{1}{N^d(\log N)^{1+\epsilon}}$ for $k_1,\dots,k_d\le N$. Since the numbers of elements of the sequence $\{\sum_{1\le i\le d}k_i\alpha_i\}$ which lie inside $[0,x)$ and $[-2/N^2,x+2/N^2)$ differ only by the number of elements which lie inside the intervals $[-2/N^2,0)$ and $[x,x+2/N^2)$, by using Dirichlet principle, we have

$$D(\boldsymbol{\alpha},u_1,x+u_1,u_2,N+u_2;u_3;N+u_3)=D(\boldsymbol{\alpha},x;N)+O\left((\log N)^{1+\epsilon}\right),$$

for almost every $\boldsymbol{\alpha}\in[0,1)^d$, and every $u_1\in[-\frac{2}{N^2},\frac{2}{N^2}]$, $u_2,u_3\in[-2,2]$. The constant above only depend on $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ and ϵ, therefore the same bound hold after integration over u_1 and $\mathbf{u}$. □

By Proposition 2.1, we can now shift our attention to the asymptotic behavior of $\bar{D}(\boldsymbol{\alpha},x;N)$, which has better convergence property as shown in Section 3.

3 Estimating the "tail" of the discrepancy function

This section is devoted to estimating the "tail" of $\bar{D}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, x; N)$, note that $\bar{D}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, x; N)$ is a sum of the products (where $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d+1} \backslash \mathbf{0}$)

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mathbf{n}, x, \boldsymbol{\alpha}) =& \mathbf{i}^{d+1} \frac{1 - e^{2\pi \mathbf{i} n_1 x}}{2\pi n_1} \left(\frac{\sin 2\pi \left(\frac{n_1}{N^2} \right)}{2\pi \left(\frac{n_1}{N^2} \right)} \right)^2 \\ & \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{d} \left(\frac{1 - e^{-2\pi \mathbf{i} N (n_1 \alpha_i - n_{i+1})}}{2\pi (n_1 \alpha_i - n_{i+1})} \right) \left(\frac{\sin 2\pi (n_1 \alpha_i - n_{i+1})}{2\pi (n_1 \alpha_i - n_{i+1})} \right)^2 \end{aligned} \tag{3 .1}$$

let:

$$\bar{D}_4(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, x; N) = \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in U_4(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; N)} f(\mathbf{n}, x, \boldsymbol{\alpha}),$$

where

$$U_4(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; N) = \left\{ \mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d+1} \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{l} 1 < |n_1| < N^2/4, \\ |n_1 \alpha_i - n_{i+1}| = \|n_1 \alpha_i\|, \; 1 \le i \le d \\ |n_1| \prod_{i=1}^{d} \|n_1 \alpha_i\| > (\log N)^s \end{array} \right\} \tag{3 .2}$$

$\| \cdot \|$ denotes the distance to the closest integer, and s is a large enough but fixed integer to be determined later(see Lemma 4.1).

The main result of this section is the following:

Proposition 3.1. *Let $\varphi(n)$ be a positive increasing function such that $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\varphi(n)} < \infty$, then for almost every $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in [0,1]^d$, we have*

$$|\bar{D}_4(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, x; N) - \bar{D}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, x, N)| \ll (\log N)^d \varphi^{\max\{3,d\}}(\log \log N)$$

To prove Proposition 3.1, we need to control the components of the difference $\bar{D}_4 - \bar{D}$ step by step.

3.1 Estimation for the sum when $|n_1|$ is big.

First we will show that the sum of the terms when $|n_1|$ is big does not contribute much. Define

$$\bar{D}_1(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, x; N) = \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in U_1(N)} f(\mathbf{n}, x, \boldsymbol{\alpha}), \tag{3 .3}$$

where

$$U_1(N) = \{ \mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d+1} \backslash \{\mathbf{0}\} : |n_1| < N^2 (\log N)^2 \}$$

We show the following:

Proposition 3.2. *For almost every $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we have*

$$\left|\bar{D}_1(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, x; N) - \bar{D}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, x; N)\right| = O(1),$$

where $O(1)$ represents an absolute bound which may depend on $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$, but does not depend on x or N.

Proof. First we decompose the sum into three parts:

$$\left|\bar{D}_1(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, x; N) - \bar{D}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, x; N)\right| \ll \bar{D}_{1,0} + \sum_{j=1}^{d} \bar{D}_{1,j} \tag{3 .4}$$

where

$$\bar{D}_{1,0} = \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in U_{1,0}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; N)} \frac{N^4}{|n_1|^{d+1}} \prod_{i=1}^{d} \frac{1}{|n_1\alpha_i - n_{i+1}|}$$

where

$$U_{1,0}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; N) = \left\{ \mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d+1} : |n_1| > N^2(\log N)^2, \quad |n_1\alpha_i - n_{i+1}| < \frac{1}{2}, \quad 1 \le i \le d \right\},$$

and

$$\bar{D}_{1,j} = \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in U_{1,j}(\alpha; N)} \frac{N^4}{|n_1|^{d+1}} \prod_{\substack{1 \le i \le d \\ i \ne j}} \frac{1}{|n_1\alpha_i - n_{i+1}|} \cdot \frac{1}{|n_1\alpha_j - n_{j+1}|^{d+1}},$$

where

$$U_{1,j}(\alpha; N) = \left\{ \mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d+1} : |n_1| > N^2(\log N)^2, \quad |n_1\alpha_i - n_{i+1}| < \frac{1}{2},\ i \ne j, \quad |n_1\alpha_j - n_{j+1}| > \frac{1}{2} \right\}.$$

Define $r_{\alpha_i} = \lceil |n_1\alpha_i - n_{i+1}| \rceil$, $1 \le i \le d$, we have that for $1 \le j \le d$,

$$\bar{D}_{1,j} \ll \sum_{r_{\alpha_j}=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d+1} : \\ |n_1| > N^2(\log N)^2 \\ |n_1\alpha_i - n_{i+1}| < 1/2 \\ i \ne j}} \frac{N^4}{|n_1|^{d+1}} \prod_{\substack{1 \le i \le d \\ i \ne j}} \frac{1}{|n_1\alpha_i - n_{i+1}|} \frac{1}{r_{\alpha_j}^{d+1}} \ll \bar{D}_{1,0},$$

Therefore it suffices to show that $\bar{D}_{1,0} = O(1)$, we will first prove a lemma:

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\varphi(n)$ be a positive increasing function such that $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\varphi(n)} < \infty$, then for almost every $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the sum*

$$\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n\varphi(\log n) \prod_{i=1}^{d} \left(\|n\alpha_i\| \varphi(|\log \|n\alpha_i\||)\right)}$$

converges.

Proof. Note that the integral

$$J(n) = \int_{[0,1]^d} \frac{1}{\prod_{i=1}^d \left(\|n\alpha_i\|\varphi(|\log\|n\alpha_i\|\|)\right)} d\boldsymbol{\alpha}$$

is finite and independent of n, the series $\sum\limits_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n\varphi(\log n)}$ also converges, so the integral

$$\int_{[0,1]^d} \left(\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n\varphi(\log n)\prod_{i=1}^d \left(\|n\alpha_i\|\varphi(|\log\|n\alpha_i\|\|)\right)} \right) d\boldsymbol{\alpha} = \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{J(n)}{n\varphi(\log n)} \tag{3.5}$$

is finite. Therefore we have that the series

$$\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n\varphi(\log n)\prod_{i=1}^d \left(\|n\alpha_i\|\varphi(|\log\|n\alpha_i\|\|)\right)}$$

converges for almost every $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in [0,1]^d$ and ever $\epsilon > 0$, the periodicity of $\|\cdot\|$ gives the result for almost every $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. □

Continuing with the proof for Proposition 3.2, since $\sum\limits_{1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2} = O(1)$, by Borel-Cantelli Lemma, we have for almost every $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\|n\alpha_i\| \geq \frac{1}{n^2}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq d,$$

for all but finitely many $n \in \mathbb{N}$, or equivalently,

$$|\log\|n\alpha_i\|| \leq 2\log n, \quad 1 \leq i \leq d, \tag{3.6}$$

for all but finitely many $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$.

Take $\varphi(n) = n^{1+\epsilon}$ where $\epsilon > 0$ is small, then $\bar{D}_{1,0}$ can be estimated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{D}_{1,0} &= \sum_{n_1 > N^2(\log N)^2} \frac{1}{(\frac{n_1}{N^2})^2} \frac{1}{n_1 \prod_{i=1}^d \|n_1\alpha_i\|} \\
&\ll \sum_{n \geq N^2(\log N)^2} \frac{1}{(\log n)^{3+3\epsilon}} \frac{1}{n\prod_{i=1}^d \|n\alpha_i\|} \\
&\ll \sum_{n \geq N^2(\log N)^2} \frac{1}{|n|\varphi(\log n)\prod_{i=1}^d \left(\|n\alpha_i\|\varphi(|\log\|n\alpha_i\|\|)\right)} \\
&\leq \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{|n|\varphi(\log n)\prod_{i=1}^d \left(\|n\alpha_i\|\varphi(|\log\|n\alpha_i\|\|)\right)} \\
&= O(1),
\end{aligned}$$

finishing the proof. □

3.2 Estimation for the sum when $|n_1\alpha_i|$ is bigger than $\frac{1}{2}$ for one of $1 \le i \le d$.

Let

$$\bar{D}_2(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, x; N) = \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in U_2(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; N)} f(\mathbf{n}, x, \boldsymbol{\alpha})$$

where $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, \dots, n_{d+1})$ satisfies

$$U_2(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; N) = \left\{ \mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d+1} \backslash \{\mathbf{0}\} \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{l} |n_1| < N^2 (\log N)^2, \\ |n_1\alpha_i - n_{i+1}| = \|n_1\alpha_i\|, \; 1 \le i \le d \end{array} \right\} \tag{3.7}$$

We show that $\bar{D}_1$ can be replaced by $\bar{D}_2$:

Proposition 3.3. *Let $\varphi(n)$ be a positive increasing function such that $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\varphi(n)} < \infty$, then for almost every $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in [0,1]^d$, we have*

$$\left| \bar{D}_2(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, x; N) - \bar{D}_1(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, x; N) \right| \ll (\log N)^d \varphi^d(\log\log N)$$

Proof. First we have the following inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \bar{D}_2(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, x; N) - \bar{D}_1(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, x; N) \right| &\ll \sum_{j=1}^{d} \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in U_{2,j}} \frac{1}{|n_1|} \prod_{\substack{1 \le i \le d \\ i \ne j}} \frac{1}{|n_1\alpha_i - n_{i+1}|} \cdot \frac{1}{|n_1\alpha_j - n_{j+1}|^{d+1}} \\ &\ll \sum_{j=1}^{d} \sum_{n=1}^{N^2(\log N)^2} \frac{1}{n \prod_{i \ne j} \|n\alpha_i\|}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

where

$$U_{2,j} = \left\{ |n_1| \le N^2(\log N)^2, \quad |n_1\alpha_i - n_{i+1}| < \frac{1}{2}, \; i \ne j, \quad |n_1\alpha_j - n_{j+1}| \ge \frac{1}{2} \right\}$$

The proposition follows from the following lemma:

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\varphi(n)$ be an arbitrary positive increasing function of n with $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\varphi(n)} < \infty$, then for almost every $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and every $1 \le j \le d$, we have*

$$\sum_{n=1}^{N^2(\log N)^2} \frac{1}{n \prod_{i \ne j} \|n\alpha_i\|} \ll (\log N)^d \varphi^d(\log\log N),$$

Proof. It suffices to prove for every $1 \le j \le d$ the bound above holds, we employ the same technique as in Lemma 3.1. Denote $d\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j = d\alpha_1 \cdots \hat{d\alpha_j} \cdots d\alpha_d$, where $d\alpha_j$ is omitted. Note that the integral

$$J(n) = \int_{[0,1]^{d-1}} \frac{1}{\prod_{i \ne j} (\|n\alpha_i\| |\log \|n\alpha_i\|| \varphi(|\log\log \|n\alpha_i\||)} d\alpha_1 \cdots \hat{d\alpha_j} \cdots d\alpha_d$$

is finite and independent of n, the series $\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n(\log n)\varphi(\log\log n)}$ also converges, so the integral

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{[0,1]^{d-1}} \left(\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n(\log n)\varphi(\log\log n) \prod_{i\neq j} (\|n\alpha_i\| |\log \|n\alpha_i\||\varphi(|\log\log \|n\alpha_i\||)} \right) d\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j \\ &= \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{J(n)}{n(\log n)\varphi(\log\log n)}\end{aligned} \tag{3 .9}$$

is finite. Therefore we have that the series

$$\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n(\log n)\varphi(\log\log n) \prod_{i\neq j} (\|n\alpha_i\| |\log \|n\alpha_i\||\varphi(|\log\log \|n\alpha_i\||)}$$

converges for almost every $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in [0,1]^d$ and ever $\epsilon > 0$, the periodicity of $\|\cdot\|$ gives the conevergence for almost every $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Using the inequality (3 .6), we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{n=1}^{N^2(\log N)^2} \frac{1}{n \prod_{i\neq j} \|n\alpha_i\|} \\ &\ll \left(\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{(\log N)^d \varphi(\log\log N)^d}{n(\log n)\varphi(\log\log n) \prod_{i\neq j} (\|n\alpha_i\| |\log \|n\alpha_i\||\varphi(|\log\log \|n\alpha_i\||)} \right) \\ &\ll (\log N)^d \varphi(\log\log N)^d.\end{aligned}$$

□

Since the sum in (3 .8) is a finite sum over $1 \leq j \leq d$, the proof for the proposition is completed. □

3.3 Estimation for the sum when $|n_1| \prod_{i=1}^{d} \|n_1\alpha_i|$ is small.

Define:

$$\bar{D}_3(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, x; N) = \sum_{\mathbf{n}\in U_3(\boldsymbol{\alpha}:N)} f(\mathbf{n}, x, \boldsymbol{\alpha}) \tag{3 .10}$$

where

$$U_3(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; N) = \left\{ \mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d+1}\backslash\{\mathbf{0}\} \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{l} 1 \leq |n_1| \leq N^2(\log N)^2, \\ |n_1| \prod_{i=1}^{d} \|n_1\alpha_i| > (\log N)^s, \\ |n_1\alpha_i - n_{i+1}| = \|n_1\alpha_i\|,\ 1 \leq i \leq d \end{array} \right\}. \tag{3 .11}$$

Note that in (3 .11), $\{n_{i+1}\}_{1\leq i\leq d}$ are respectively the closest integers to $\{n_1\alpha_i\}_{1\leq i\leq d}$, therefore in the sequel we only need to discuss n_1 instead of $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d+1}$. The main result of this step is the following:

Proposition 3.4. *Let $\varphi(n)$ be an arbitrary positive increasing function of n with $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\varphi(n)}<\infty$, then for almost every $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$, we have*

$$\left|\bar{D}_3(\boldsymbol{\alpha},x;N)-\bar{D}_2(\boldsymbol{\alpha},x;N)\right|\ll(\log N)^d\varphi^{d+1}(\log\log N).$$

First we need some preparation lemmas about the lower bound of the small divsors.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\varphi(n)$ be an arbitrary positive increasing function of n with $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\varphi(n)}<\infty$, then for almost every $\boldsymbol{\alpha}\in[0,1]^d$, we have for every $|n|>1$,*

$$|n|\prod_{i=1}^{d}\|n\alpha_i\|\gg\frac{1}{(\log|n|)^d\varphi(\log\log|n|)}$$

and

$$\|n\alpha_i\|\gg\frac{1}{|n|\varphi(\log|n|)},\quad 1\le i\le d,$$

with a constant that depends on $\boldsymbol{\alpha}\in[0,1]^d$.

Proof. For $\epsilon>0$ fixed, define

$$E_n:=\{\boldsymbol{\alpha}\in[0,1]^d:|n|\prod_{i=1}^{d}\|n\alpha_i\|<1/(\log|n|)^d\varphi(\log\log|n|)\},$$

by direct calculation, we have:

$$Leb(E_n)\le\frac{2}{n(\log n)\varphi(\log\log|n|)}$$

therefore $\sum\limits_{n\in\mathbb{Z}\setminus\{0\}}^{\infty}Leb(E_n)<\infty$, by Borel-Cantelli Lemma, we have that for for almost every $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$,

$$|n|\prod_{i=1}^{d}\|n\alpha_i\|\gg 1/(\log|n|)^d\varphi(\log\log|n|)$$

with a constant that depends on $\boldsymbol{\alpha}\in[0,1]^d$. The proof for $|n|\|n\alpha\|$ is similar. □

Proposition 3.4 follows easily from the following lemma:

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\varphi(n)$ be an arbitrary positive increasing function of n with $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\varphi(n)}<\infty$, then for almost every $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$, and $s\in\mathbb{N}$ fixed, we have the following estimation:*

$$\sum_{\substack{1\le n\le N^2(\log N)^2\\ n\prod_{i=1}^{d}\|n\alpha_i\|<(\log N)^s}}\frac{1}{n\prod_{i=1}^{d}\|n\alpha_i\|}\ll(\log N)^d\varphi^{d+1}(\log\log N)\qquad(3.12)$$

where the inequality holds for a constant that depends on s, $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$.

Proof. Divide n in discussion into the following sets:

$$S_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(p,v)=\left\{e^{e^{p-1}}\leq n<e^{e^p}\Big|\quad \frac{2^{v-1}}{(\log n)^d\varphi(\log\log|n|)}\leq n\prod_{i=1}^{d}\|n\alpha_i\|<\frac{2^v}{(\log n)^d\varphi(\log\log|n|)}\right\}$$

Where $0\leq p\leq \log\log N+1$, $v\ll\log\log N$. By Lemma 3.3, there exists a constant $K=K(\boldsymbol{\alpha},\varphi)>0$, such that $v\geq -K$. We prove a sublemma for the upper bound of the number of elements inside each $S_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(p,v)$:

Sublemma 3.4.1. *Let $\varphi(n)$ be an arbitrary positive increasing function of n with $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\varphi(n)}<\infty$, then for almost every $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$, and every $p>1, v\geq -K$,*

$$\#S_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(p,v)\ll 2^v\varphi(v), \tag{3 .13}$$

with a constant that depends only on $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$, φ.

Proof. Define the corresponding set

$$C(n,v)=\left\{\boldsymbol{\alpha}\in[0,1]^d\quad\Big|\quad \frac{2^{v-1}}{(\log n)^d\varphi(\log\log|n|)}\leq n\prod_{i=1}^{d}\|n\alpha_i\|<\frac{2^v}{(\log n)^d\varphi(\log\log|n|)}\right\},$$

we have :

$$Leb(C(n,v))\ll\frac{2^v}{n(\log n)\varphi(\log\log n)},$$

and

Since

$$\#S_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(p,v)=\sum_{e^{e^{p-1}}\leq n<e^{e^p}}\mathbb{1}_{C(n,v)}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$$

We have:

$$\mathbb{E}(\#S_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(p,v))=\sum_{e^{e^{p-1}}\leq n<e^{e^p}}Leb(C(n,v))\ll\frac{2^v}{\varphi(p)}$$

and

$$Leb\{\#S_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(p,v)\geq 2^v\varphi(v)\}\leq\frac{\mathbb{E}(\#S_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(p,v))}{2^v\varphi(v)}\ll\frac{1}{\varphi(p)\varphi(v)}$$

So

$$\sum_{\substack{p>1\\ v\geq -K}}Leb\{\#S_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(p,v)\geq 2^v\varphi(v)\}<\infty.$$

By Borel-Cantelli Lemma, we have that for almost every $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$,

$$\#S_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(p,v)\ll 2^v\varphi(v).$$

□

Continuing with the proof for Lemma 3.4, we have the following estimation:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\substack{1\le n\le N^2(\log N)^2\\ n\prod_{i=1}^d\|n\alpha_i\|<(\log\log N)^s}} \frac{1}{n\prod_{i=1}^d\|n\alpha_i\|}\\
&\ll \sum_{p=1}^{\log\log N+1}\sum_{-K\le v\ll\log\log N}\frac{(e^p)^d\varphi(p)}{2^v}\cdot 2^v\varphi(v) \qquad (3.14)\\
&\ll \sum_{p=1}^{\log\log N+1}(e^p)^d\varphi(p)\sum_{-K\le v\ll\log\log N}\varphi(v)\\
&\ll (\log N)^d\varphi(\log\log N)\cdot(\varphi(\log\log N)\log\log N)\\
&\ll (\log N)^d\varphi^{d+1}(\log\log N).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore Lemma 3.4 is proven. □

Proof for Proposition 3.4:
Note that

$$\left|\bar{D}_3(\boldsymbol{\alpha},x;N)-\bar{D}_2(\boldsymbol{\alpha},x;N)\right|\ll \sum_{\substack{1\le n\le N^2(\log N)^2\\ n\prod_{i=1}^d\|n\alpha_i\|<(\log\log N)^s}}\frac{1}{n\prod_{i=1}^d\|n\alpha_i\|},$$

Proposition 3.4 follows from Lemma 3.4.

3.4 Control the sum when n_1 is between $N^2/4$ and $N^2(\log N)^2$.

The goal of this step is to prove the following:

Proposition 3.5. *For almost every $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$, we have*

$$\left|\bar{D}_4(\boldsymbol{\alpha},x;N)-\bar{D}_3(\boldsymbol{\alpha},x;N)\right|\ll(\log N)^2\log\log N.$$

With the proposition above, we could limit the range of $(2\pi n_1/N^2)$ in $f(\mathbf{n},x,\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ to $(-\pi/2,\pi/2)$, which makes f better-behaved for later estimations.

The range for n_1 in the difference $\bar{D}_4-\bar{D}_3$ can be decomposed as follows:

$$T_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\mathbf{l};N)=\left\{n_1\in\mathbb{Z}\;\middle|\;\begin{array}{l}2^{l_1}\le|n_1|<2^{l_1+1},\\ 2^{-l_{i+1}}\le\|n_1\alpha_i\|<2^{-l_{i+1}+1},\ 1\le i\le d-1\\ 2^{\sum_{i=1}^d l_{i+1}-l_1}\le\|n_1\alpha_d\|<2^{\sum_{i=1}^d l_{i+1}-l_1+1}\end{array}\right\},$$

where l_1 defines the range for $|n_1|$, l_{i+1} defines the range for $\|n_1\alpha_i\|$, $1\le i\le d-1$, and l_{d+1} defines the range for $|n_1|\prod_{i=1}^d\|n_1\alpha_i\|$. By Lemma 3.3, the range for $\mathbf{l}=(l_1,\dots,l_{d+1})\in L_1(N)$ is defined by:

$$L_1(N):=\left\{\mathbf{l}\in\mathbb{Z}^{d+1}\;\middle|\;\begin{array}{l}2\log_2 N-2\le l_1\le 2\log_2 N+2\log_2\log N,\\ 2\le l_{i+1}\ll\log N,\ 1\le i\le d-1,\\ \log\log N\ll l_{d+1}\le l_1\ll\log N,\end{array}\right\}. \qquad (3.15)$$

We will first prove a uniform upper bound for $\#T_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\mathbf{l}; N)$:

Lemma 3.5. *If $s > 3$, then for almost every $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and all the $\mathbf{l}$ in $L_1(N)$, we have*

$$\#T_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\mathbf{l}; N) \ll 2^{l_{d+1}}$$

where the constant is uniform for $\mathbf{l}$ in $L_1(N)$.

Proof. The number of elements inside $T_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\mathbf{l}; N)$ corresponds to the number of $n_1 \in [2^{l_1}, 2^{l_1+1})$, such that vector $n_1\boldsymbol{\alpha} \mod 1 = (n_1\alpha_1 \mod 1, \ldots, n_1\alpha_d \mod 1)$ visit one of the 2^d target boxes:

$$\prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \pm[2^{-l_{i+1}}, 2^{-l_{i+1}+1}) \times \pm[2^{\sum_{i=1}^{d} l_{i+1}-l_1}, 2^{\sum_{i=1}^{d} l_{i+1}-l_1+1}),$$

where the negative signs deal with the case when $\frac{1}{2} \leq \{n_1\alpha_i\} < 1$. Therefore the expected value for $\#T_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\mathbf{l}; N)$ is $O(2^{l_{d+1}})$, from Theorem 1 .1 we know that the error term for the cardinality is $O((\log 2^{l_1})^{2+\epsilon})$ for any target box, we have that

$$\#T_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\mathbf{l}; N) = 2^{l_{d+1}} + O(l_1^{2+\epsilon}).$$

Note that $l_1^{2+\epsilon} \ll (\log N)^{2+\epsilon} < (\log N)^s < 2^{l_{d+1}}$, the claim follows. □

Now we can estimate the contribution of the terms for which $N^2/4 \leq n_1 \leq N^2(\log N)^2$.

Proof of Proposition 3.5

Proof. Inside each $T_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\mathbf{l}; N)$, the divisors $n_1 \prod_{i=1}^{d} \|n\alpha_i\|$ is between $2^{l_{d+1}}$ and $2^{l_{d+1}+d+1}$, therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\bar{D}_4 - \bar{D}_3\right| \\
&\leq \sum_{\mathbf{l}\in L_1(N)} \sum_{T_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\mathbf{l};N)} \frac{1}{|n_1| \prod_{i=1}^{d} \|n_1\alpha_i\|} \\
&\leq \sum_{\mathbf{l}\in L_1(N)} \sum_{T_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\mathbf{l};N)} \frac{1}{2^{l_{d+1}}} \\
&\ll \sum_{\mathbf{l}\in L_1(N)} \frac{1}{2^{l_{d+1}}} \#T_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\mathbf{l}; N) \\
&\ll \sum_{\mathbf{l}\in L_1(N)} 1 \\
&\ll (\log N)^d \log\log N.
\end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows from the range of l_i's in $L_1(N)$ (see (3 .15)), which gives the number of possible l_1's is $O(\log\log N)$, and the number of possible l_i's are $O(\log N)$ for $2 \leq i \leq d+1$. □

Proof of Proposition 3.1

Proof. Combining Propositions 3.2-3.5, we have

$$|\bar{D}_4 - \bar{D}| \ll O(1) + (\log N)^d \varphi^d (\log\log N) + (\log N)^d \varphi^{d+1} (\log\log N) + (\log N)^d \log\log N$$
$$\ll (\log N)^d \varphi^{\max\{d,3\}} (\log\log N).$$

□

4 Cancellation of the main terms.

To estimate the contribution of the remaining terms, we first decompose the product $f(\mathbf{n}, x, \boldsymbol{\alpha})$ into 2 distinct parts,

$$\bar{D}_4 = \frac{\mathbf{i}^{d+1}}{(2\pi)^{d+1}} \Bigg(\sum_{\mathbf{n}\in U_4(\boldsymbol{\alpha};N)} \frac{1}{n_1 \prod_{i=1}^d (n_1\alpha_i - n_{i+1})} \cdot g(\boldsymbol{n}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}; N) + \sum_{\mathbf{s}} \pm \sum_{\mathbf{n}\in U_4(\boldsymbol{\alpha};N)} \frac{e^{2\pi \mathbf{i} \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{s}}(\mathbf{n})}}{n_1 \prod_{i=1}^d (n_1\alpha_i - n_{i+1})} \cdot g(\boldsymbol{n}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}; N) \Bigg). \tag{4 .1}$$

Now $g(\mathbf{n}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}; N)$ is the product below (observe that $|g(\mathbf{n}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}; N)| \le 1$):

$$\left(\frac{\sin 2\pi(\frac{n_1}{N^2})}{2\pi(\frac{n_1}{N^2})} \right)^2 \prod_{i=1}^d \left(\frac{\sin 2\pi(n_1\alpha_i - n_{i+1})}{2\pi(n_1\alpha_i - n_{i+1})} \right)^2 \tag{4 .2}$$

and finally, $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{s}} = \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{s},x,N,\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ is one of the $2^{d+1} - 1$ linear forms of $d+1$ variables:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{s}}(\mathbf{n}) = \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{s}}(n_1, \dots, n_{d+1}) = \delta_1 n_1 x - \sum_{i=1}^d \delta_i N(n_1\alpha_i - n_{i+1}) \tag{4 .3}$$

where $\mathbf{s} = (\delta_1, \dots, \delta_{d+1}) \in \{0,1\}^{d+1}$ and $\mathbf{s} \neq \mathbf{0}$.

Note that the sign $\pm$ in the second part of (4 .1) is in fact $\pm = (-1)^{\sum_{i=1}^{d+1} \delta_i}$, and so it is independent of $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d+1}$.

We begin with the first part of $\bar{D}_4$:

Let

$$\bar{D}_5(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, x; N) = \sum_{\mathbf{n}\in U_4(\boldsymbol{\alpha};N)} \frac{g(\boldsymbol{n}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}; N)}{n_1 \prod_{i=1}^d (n_1\alpha_i - n_{i+1})}. \tag{4 .4}$$

The goal of this section is to prove the following:

Proposition 4.1. *For almost every $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in [0,1]^d$, we have*

$$\left|\bar{D}_5(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, x; N)\right| \ll \log N$$

Let $\delta_N = 1/(\log N)^d$, $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} = \{\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_{d+1}\} \in \{\pm 1\}^{d+1}$, and $\mathbf{l} = \{l_1, \dots, l_{d+1}\} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d+1}$, and define the sets:

$$S_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\mathbf{l}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}; N) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d+1} : (1+\delta_N)^{l_1} \le \epsilon_1 n_1 < (1+\delta_N)^{l_1+1}, \\ (1+\delta_N)^{-l_{i+1}} \le \epsilon_{i+1}(n_1\alpha_i - n_{i+1}) < (1+\delta_N)^{-l_{i+1}+1}, \ 1 \le i \le d-1 \\ (1+\delta_N)^{\sum_{i=1}^d l_{i+1} - l_1} \le \epsilon_{d+1}(n_1\alpha_d - n_{d+1}) \le (1+\delta_N)^{\sum_{i=1}^d l_{i+1} - l_1 + 1}, \\ n_{i+1}\text{'s are respectively the closest integer to } n_1\alpha_i, \ 1 \le i \le d \end{cases}, \tag{4.5}$$

where l_i's are positive integers, and the range of $\mathbf{l} = (l_1, \dots, l_{d+1})$ is as the following:

$$L_2(N) = \left\{ \mathbf{l} \in \mathbb{N}^{d+1} \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{l} (\log N)^s \le (1+\delta_N)^{l_{d+1}} \le (1+\delta_N)^{l_1} \le N^2/4, \\ (1+\delta_N)^{l_1 - l_{i+1}} \ge (\log N)^s, \ 1 \le i \le d-1. \end{array} \right\}$$

which gives

$$\log\log N/\delta_N \ll l_{d+1} \le l_1 \ll \log N/\delta_N, \quad l_1 - l_{i+1} \gg \log\log N/\delta_N, \ 1 \le i \le d-1. \tag{4.6}$$

By integration over $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in [0,1)$, the expected value for $\#S_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\mathbf{l}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}; N)$ is:

$$E(\mathbf{l}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}; N) = \int_{\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in [0,1]^d} \#S_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\mathbf{l}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}; N) \, d\boldsymbol{\alpha} = \delta_N^{d+1}(1+\delta_N)^{l_{d+1}}.$$

A more precise description for the number of elements in $\#S_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\mathbf{l}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}; N)$ is the following:

Lemma 4.1. *If $s > (d+2)d + 3$, then for almost every $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and every $\mathbf{l} \in L_2(N)$, we have*

$$|\#S_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\mathbf{l}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}; N) - E(\mathbf{l}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}; N)| \ll \delta_N E(\mathbf{l}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}; N)$$

where the constant is uniform for $\mathbf{l} \in L_2(N)$ and N.

Proof. With the same reasoning as in Lemma 3.5, the number of elements inside $S_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\mathbf{l}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}; N)$ corresponds to the number of

$$n_1 \in [(1+\delta_N)^{l_1}, (1+\delta_N)^{l_1+1}),$$

such that vector $n_1\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ lies inside the target box

$$\prod_{i=1}^{d-1} [(1+\delta_N)^{-l_{i+1}}, (1+\delta_N)^{-l_{i+1}+1}) \times [(1+\delta_N)^{\sum_{i=1}^d l_{i+1} - l_1}, (1+\delta_N)^{\sum_{i=1}^d l_{i+1} - l_1 + 1}),$$

therefore the expected value for $\#S_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\mathbf{l}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}; N)$ is $\delta_N^{d+1}(1+\delta_N)^{l_{d+1}}$, from Theorem 1.1 we know that the error term is $O((\log(1+\delta_N)^{l_1})^{2+\epsilon})$ for any box, i.e.

$$\#S_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\mathbf{l}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}; N) = \delta_N^{d+1}(1+\delta_N)^{l_{d+1}} + O((\log(1+\delta_N)^{l_1})^{2+\epsilon}).$$

Note that $(\log(1+\delta_N)^{l_1})^{2+\epsilon} \ll (\log N)^{2+\epsilon} < \delta_N^{d+2}(\log N)^s \le \delta_N^{d+2}(1+\delta_N)^{l_{d+1}} = \delta_N E(\mathbf{l}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}; N)$, the claim follows. ∎

For the sake of simplicity, we abbreviate $S_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\mathbf{l},\boldsymbol{\epsilon};N)$ and note it by $S(\mathbf{l},\boldsymbol{\epsilon};N)$ in later discussions. Using the Lemma above, we can estimate the sum $\bar{D}_5$ by cancelling out the main terms.

Proof of Proposition 4.1

Proof. Let $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^+$ and $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^-$ be two vectors in $\{-1,+1\}^{d+1}$ such that one and only one coordinate is different, and the sign of the divisor is $+$ for $S(\mathbf{l},\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^+;N)$, and $-$ for $S(\mathbf{l},\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^-;N)$.

$$\bar{D}_5=\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{l}\in L_2(N),\\ \text{pairs of }\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\pm}}}\left(\sum_{\mathbf{n}\in S(\mathbf{l},\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^+;N)}\frac{g(\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{\alpha};N)}{n_1\prod_{i=1}^{d}(n_1\alpha_i-n_{i+1})}+\sum_{\mathbf{n}\in S(\mathbf{l},\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^-;N)}\frac{g(\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{\alpha};N)}{n_1\prod_{i=1}^{d}(n_1\alpha_i-n_{i+1})}\right).$$

Inside each $S(\mathbf{l},\boldsymbol{\epsilon};N)$, denote by $g(\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{\alpha};N)_{max/min}$ the maximal/minimal value of $g(\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{\alpha};N)$ for $\mathbf{n}\in S(\mathbf{l},\boldsymbol{\epsilon};N)$, we have:

$$|g(\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{\alpha};N)_{max}-g(\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{\alpha};N)_{min}|\ll\delta_N g(\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{\alpha};N)_{min}$$

and

$$0<g(\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{\alpha};N)_{max}\leq 1.$$

For each pair, the sum would cancel out as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\mathbf{n}\in S(\mathbf{l},\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^+;N)}\frac{g(\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{\alpha};N)}{n_1\prod_{i=1}^{d}(n_1\alpha_i-n_{i+1})}+\sum_{\mathbf{n}\in S(\mathbf{l},\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^-;N)}\frac{g(\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{\alpha};N)}{n_1\prod_{i=1}^{d}(n_1\alpha_i-n_{i+1})}\\
&\leq\frac{g(\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{\alpha};N)_{max}}{(1+\delta_N)^{l_{d+1}}}(1+\delta_N)E(\mathbf{l},\boldsymbol{\epsilon};N)-\frac{g(\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{\alpha};N)_{min}}{(1+\delta_N)^{l_{d+1}+d+1}}(1-\delta_N)E(\mathbf{l},\boldsymbol{\epsilon};N)\\
&\ll\frac{\big(g(\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{\alpha};N)_{max}(1+\delta_N)^{d+1}-g(\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{\alpha};N)_{min}\big)}{(1+\delta_N)^{l_{d+1}+d+1}}E(\mathbf{l},\boldsymbol{\epsilon};N)+\frac{g(\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{\alpha};N)_{max}}{(1+\delta_N)^{l_{d+1}}}\delta_N E(\mathbf{l},\boldsymbol{\epsilon};N)\\
&\ll\delta_N\frac{E(\mathbf{l},\boldsymbol{\epsilon};N)}{(1+\delta_N)^{l_{d+1}}}\\
&\ll\delta_N^{d+2}
\end{aligned}$$

The other direction is the same:

$$\sum_{\mathbf{n}\in S(\mathbf{l},\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^+;N)}\frac{g(\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{\alpha};N)}{n_1\prod_{i=1}^{d}(n_1\alpha_i-n_{i+1})}+\sum_{\mathbf{n}\in S(\mathbf{l},\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^-;N)}\frac{g(\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{\alpha};N)}{n_1\prod_{i=1}^{d}(n_1\alpha_i-n_{i+1})}\gg-\delta_N^{d+2}.$$

Summing over all the possible pairs of $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\pm}$ and $l_1,\ \ldots,\ l_{d+1}$, note that from (4 .6), $0\leq l_{i+1}\leq l_1,\ 1\leq i\leq d$, we have:

$$\big|\bar{D}_5\big|\ll\sum_{\mathbf{l}\in L_2(N)}\delta_N^{d+2}\ll\sum_{\frac{\log\log N}{\delta_N}\leq l_1\leq\frac{\log N}{\delta_N}}\delta_N^{d+2}l_1^d\ll\delta_N^{d+2}\cdot\frac{(\log N)^{d+1}}{\delta_N^{d+1}}=\log N.$$

□

5 Estimation of small exponentials.

Finally we study the contribution of the linear forms $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{s}}$ in (4 .1).

Let

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{D}_6 = \bar{D}_6^{(\mathbf{s})} &= \sum_{\mathbf{n}\in U_4(\boldsymbol{\alpha};N)} \frac{e^{2\pi \mathbf{i}\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{s}}(\mathbf{n})}}{n_1\prod_{i=1}^{d}(n_1\alpha_i - n_{i+1})}\cdot g(\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{\alpha};N)\\ &= \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{l}\in L_2(N),\\ \text{pairs of } \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\pm}}} \left(\sum_{\mathbf{n}\in S(\mathbf{l},\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{+};N)} \bar{f}(\mathbf{n},x,\boldsymbol{\alpha}) + \sum_{\mathbf{n}\in S(\mathbf{l},\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{-};N)} \bar{f}(\mathbf{n},x,\boldsymbol{\alpha}), \right)\end{aligned} \tag{5 .1}$$

where

$$\bar{f}(\mathbf{n},x,\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \frac{e^{2\pi \mathbf{i}\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{s}}(\mathbf{n})}}{n_1\prod_{i=1}^{d}(n_1\alpha_i - n_{i+1})}\cdot g(\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{\alpha};N) \tag{5 .2}$$

and $\mathcal{L}$ is one of the $2^{d+1}-1$ linear forms $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{s},x,N,\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ defined in (4 .3). Following the same line of reasoning as in J. Beck[1], we prove a version of Key Lemma as in [1] that can be adopted in our case. We shall emphasize the key ingredient in the proof is that arithmetic progressions will contribute like a single term inside the progression. Using Lemma 5.1, we can estimate the number of $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$-big vectors defined as follows, which can be used to cancel the extra $\log N$ in the crude estimation by bounding every numerator by 1.

Definition 5.1. *We say* $\mathbf{l} = (l_1,\dots,l_{d+1})$ *is "*$\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$*-big" vector if*

$$\frac{|S(\mathbf{l},\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{+};N)| + |S(\mathbf{l},\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{-};N)|}{\log N} \le \left| \sum_{\mathbf{n}\in S(\mathbf{l},\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{+};N)} e^{2\pi \mathbf{i}\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{n})} - \sum_{\mathbf{n}\in S(\mathbf{l},\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{-};N)} e^{2\pi \mathbf{i}\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{n})} \right|, \tag{5 .3}$$

where $|S| = \#S$ *dentoes the number of elements inside the set* S*, and as in the proof of Proposition 4.1,* $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{+}$ *and* $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{-}$ *are a pair of vectors in* $\{-1,+1\}^{d+1}$ *such that one and only one coordinate is different, and the sign of the divisor is* $+$ *for* $S(\mathbf{l},\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{+};N)$*, and* $-$ *for* $S(N,\mathbf{l},\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{-})$*.*

For convenience denote

$$S(\mathbf{l},\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\pm};N) = S(\mathbf{l},\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{+};N)\cup S(\mathbf{l},\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{-};N).$$

Definition 5.2. *Two integral vectors* $\mathbf{l} = (l_1,\dots,l_{d+1})$ *and* $\mathbf{h} = (h_1,\dots,h_{d+1})$ *satisfying* (4 .6) *are called "**neighbors**" if*

$$(1+\delta_N)^{h_1-l_1} = (\log N)^9, \tag{5 .4}$$

$$(1+\delta_N)^{h_{i+1}-l_{i+1}} = (\log N)^{-9},\ 1\le i\le d-1, \tag{5 .5}$$

$$(1+\delta_N)^{h_{d+1}-l_{d+1}} = (\log N)^{9(d+1)}. \tag{5 .6}$$

The notation $\mathbf{l}\to\mathbf{h}$ means that the ordered pair $\langle \mathbf{l}, \mathbf{h}\rangle$ of vectors satisfies (5 .4) and (5 .6).

Note that by slightly modifying the value of $\delta_N \approx (\log N)^{-d}$, we can make sure that the above definitions are met for integer vectors $\mathbf{l}$ and $\mathbf{h}$.

Definition 5.3. *A sequence $H = \langle \mathbf{h}^{(1)}, \mathbf{h}^{(2)}, \mathbf{h}^{(3)}, \ldots\rangle$ of vectors satisfying (4 .6) is called a "special line" if $\mathbf{h}^{(1)}\to\mathbf{h}^{(2)}\to\mathbf{h}^{(3)}\to\ldots$, that is, any two consecutive vectors in H are neighbors.*

Lemma 5.1. *For almost every $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ every special line contains at most one $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$-big vector.*

Proof. Let $H = \langle \mathbf{h}^{(1)}, \mathbf{h}^{(2)}, \mathbf{h}^{(3)}, \ldots\rangle$ be a special line with two $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$-big vectors $\mathbf{h}^{(p)}$ and $\mathbf{h}^{(q)}$, $1 \le p < q$. If

$$\|\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{n})\| \le (\log N)^{-2} \text{ for every } \mathbf{n} \in S(\mathbf{h}^{(p)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\pm}; N), \tag{5 .7}$$

then

$$|1 - e^{2\pi \mathbf{i}\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{n})}| \ll (\log N)^{-2} \text{ for every } \mathbf{n} \in S(\mathbf{h}^{(p)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\pm}; N). \tag{5 .8}$$

By repeating the argument of the cancellation of the main term with the above equation, we obtain (Err means error for the number of elements in the set S)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \sum_{\mathbf{n}\in S(\mathbf{h}^{(p)},\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{+};N)} e^{2\pi\mathbf{i}\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{n})} - \sum_{\mathbf{n}\in S(\mathbf{h}^{(p)},\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{-};N)} e^{2\pi\mathbf{i}\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{n})} \right| \\
&\ll (1+(\log N)^{-2})(E(\mathbf{h}^{(p)},\epsilon;N)) + |\mathrm{Err}|) - (1-(\log N)^{-2})(E(\mathbf{h}^{(p)},\epsilon;N)) - |\mathrm{Err}|) \\
&\ll |\mathrm{Err}| + (\log N)^{-2} E(\mathbf{h}^{(p)},\epsilon;N)) \\
&\ll \delta_N (E(\mathbf{h}^{(p)},\epsilon;N)) \\
&\ll \frac{|S(\mathbf{h}^{(p)},\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\pm};N)|}{(\log N)^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

But this contradicts the assumption that $\mathbf{h}^{(p)}$ is $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$-big, see (5 .3). So there is an $\mathbf{n}^* \in S(\mathbf{h}^{(p)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\pm}; N)$ such that

$$\|\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{n})\| > (\log N)^{-2}. \tag{5 .9}$$

For every $\mathbf{m} \in S(\mathbf{h}^{(q)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\pm}; N)$ (another $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$-big vector), consider the "arithmetic progression" with difference $\mathbf{n}^*$:

$$\mathbf{m} + r\cdot\mathbf{n}^* = (m_1 + r\cdot {\mathbf{n}^*}_1, \ldots, m_{d+1} + r\cdot {\mathbf{n}^*}_{d+1}), \quad r = 0, \pm1, \pm2, \ldots$$

We will estimate how many consecutive members $\mathbf{m}+r\cdot\mathbf{n}^*$ are contained in $S(N, \mathbf{h}^q, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\pm})$. Since $n^* \in S(\mathbf{h}^p, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\pm}; N)$, the definition for $S(\mathbf{h}^q, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\pm}; N)$ (see (4 .5)) gives the following:

$$(1+\delta_N)^{h_1^{(p)}} \le \epsilon_1 n_1^* < (1+\delta_N)^{h_1^{(p)}+1}, \tag{5 .10}$$

$$(1+\delta_N)^{-h_{i+1}^{(p)}} \le \epsilon_{i+1}(n_1^*\alpha_i - n_{i+1}^*) < (1+\delta_N)^{-h_{i+1}^{(p)}+1}, \tag{5 .11}$$

$$(1+\delta_N)^{\sum_{i=1}^d h_{i+1}^{(p)} - h_1^{(p)}} \le \epsilon_{d+1}(n_1^*\alpha_d - n_{d+1}^*) < (1+\delta_N)^{\sum_{i=1}^d h_{i+1}^{(p)} - h_1^{(p)}+1}. \tag{5 .12}$$

Definition 5.4. *An* $\mathbf{m} \in S(\mathbf{h}^q, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\pm}; N)$ *is called an inner point if*

$$(1+\delta_N)^{h_1^{(q)}}(1+\frac{\delta_N}{(\log N)^2}) \le \epsilon_1 m_1 < (1-\frac{\delta_N}{(\log N)^2})(1+\delta_N)^{h_1^{(q)}+1}, \tag{5 .13}$$

$$(1+\delta_N)^{-h_{i+1}^{(q)}}(1+\frac{\delta_N}{(\log N)^2}) \le \epsilon_{i+1}(m_1\alpha_i - m_{i+1}) < (1-\frac{\delta_N}{(\log N)^2})(1+\delta_N)^{-h_{i+1}^{(q)}+1}, \tag{5 .14}$$

$$(1+\delta_N)^{\sum_{i=1}^d h_{i+1}^{(p)} - h_1^{(q)}}(1+\frac{\delta_N}{(\log N)^2}) \le \epsilon_{d+1}(m_1\alpha_{d+1} - m_{d+1}) < (1-\frac{\delta_N}{(\log N)^2})(1+\delta_N)^{\sum_{i=1}^d h_{i+1}^{(p)} - h_1^{(q)}+1}. \tag{5 .15}$$

The rest of the points in $S(\mathbf{h}^q, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\pm}; N)$ *are called border points.*

For every inner point $\mathbf{m} \in S(\mathbf{h}^q, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\pm}; N)$, and for every $|r| \le (\log N)^4$, it follows from (5 .4), (5 .10) and (5 .13) that,

$$\begin{aligned}
&(1+\delta_N)^{h_1^{(q)}} < (1+\delta_N)^{h_1^{(q)}}(1+\frac{\delta_N}{(\log N)^2}) - (\log N)^4(1+\delta_N)^{h_1^{(p)}+1} \\
&\le \epsilon_1(m_1 + r\cdot n_1^*) \\
&< (1-\frac{\delta_N}{(\log N)^2})(1+\delta_N)^{h_1^{(q)}+1} + (\log N)^4(1+\delta_N)^{h_1^{(p)}+1} < (1+\delta_N)^{h_1^{(q)}+1}
\end{aligned} \tag{5 .16}$$

Similarly, from (5 .5), (5 .11) and (5 .14), and from (5 .6), (5 .12) and (5 .15) we obtain the following, for $1 \le i \le d-1$,

$$(1+\delta_N)^{-h_{i+1}^{(q)}} < \epsilon_{i+1}\left((m_1 + rn_1^*)\alpha_{i+1} - (m_{i+1} + r\cdot n_{i+1}^*)\right) < (1+\delta_N)^{-h_{i+1}^{(q)}+1}, \tag{5 .17}$$

and

$$(1+\delta_N)^{\sum_{i=1}^d h_{i+1}^{(q)} - h_1^{(q)}} < \epsilon_{d+1}\left((m_1 + rn_1^*)\alpha_{d+1} - (m_{d+1} + r\cdot n_{d+1}^*)\right) < (1+\delta_N)^{\sum_{i=1}^d h_{i+1}^{(q)} - h_1^{(q)}+1} \tag{5 .18}$$

In view of (5 .16)-(5 .18), for any inner point $\mathbf{m} \in S(\mathbf{h}^q, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\pm}; N)$, at least $(\log N)^4$ consecutive members in the progression $\mathbf{m} + r\cdot\mathbf{n}^*$ are contained in $S(\mathbf{h}^q, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\pm}; N)$. Therefore, we can decommpose $S(\mathbf{h}^q, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\pm}; N)$ into three parts:

$$S(\mathbf{h}^q, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\pm}; N) = AP^+ \cup AP^- \cup BP \tag{5 .19}$$

where $AP^{\pm}$ denotes the family of arithmetic progreesions $\{\mathbf{m} + r\cdot\mathbf{n}^* : 0 \le r \le l-1\}$ in $S(\mathbf{h}^q, \epsilon^+; N)$ and $S(\mathbf{h}^q, \epsilon^-; N)$ respectively, where $l = l(\mathbf{m})$ is the length of the progression starting from $\mathbf{m}$, and $l \ge (\log N)^4$. BP denotes a set of border points of $S(\mathbf{h}^q, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\pm}; N)$ that are not included in any arithmetic progressions. Using $\|\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{n})\| >$

$(\log N)^{-2}$ (see (5 .9)), the linearity of $\mathcal{L}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
|\sum_{\mathbf{AP}^+} e^{2\pi \mathbf{i}\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{n})}| &\leq \sum_{\text{arithmetic progressions}} |\sum_{r=0}^{l-1} e^{2\pi \mathbf{i}\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{m}+r\mathbf{n}^*)}| \\
&= \sum_{\text{arithmetic progressions}} |\sum_{r=0}^{l-1} e^{2\pi \mathbf{i}\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{m})+r\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{n}^*)}| \\
&\ll \sum_{\text{arithmetic progressions}} \frac{1}{\|\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{n})\|} < \sum_{\text{arithmetic progressions}} (\log N)^2 \\
&\leq \sum_{\text{arithmetic progressions}} \frac{\text{length}}{(\log N)^2} \leq \frac{|S(\mathbf{h}^q, \epsilon^+; N)|}{(\log N)^2}
\end{aligned} \tag{5 .20}$$

since each length $\geq (\log N)^4$. Similarly,

$$|\sum_{\mathbf{AP}^-} e^{2\pi \mathbf{i}\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{n})}| \ll \frac{|S(\mathbf{h}^q, \epsilon^-; N)|}{(\log N)^2} \tag{5 .21}$$

Finally, for border points, at least one of the inequalities in definition 5.4 is violated, thus the range for at least one components is shrinked with ratio $\frac{\delta_N}{(\log N)^2}$. Using the same reasoning as in Lemma 3.5 and 4.1, and the cardinality of the set BP can be controlled by the total number of border points of $S(\mathbf{h}^q, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\pm}; N)$, we have for almost every $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$,

$$|BP| \ll \frac{|S(\mathbf{h}^q, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\pm}; N)|}{(\log N)^2} \tag{5 .22}$$

Combining (5 .19)-(5 .22), for almost every $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$, we obtain

$$\left| \sum_{\mathbf{n}\in S(\mathbf{h}^{(p)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^+; N)} e^{2\pi \mathbf{i}\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{n})} - \sum_{\mathbf{n}\in S(\mathbf{h}^{(p)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^-; N)} e^{2\pi \mathbf{i}\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{n})} \right| \ll \frac{|S(\mathbf{h}^{(p)}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\pm}; N)|}{(\log N)^2}$$

which contradicts the assumption that $h^{(q)}$ is $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$-big (see (5 .3)), therefore for almost very $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$, every special line contains at most one $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$-big vector, which proves the lemma. □

Corollary 5.1.1. *The number of $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$-big vectors is $\ll (\log\log N)(\log N)^d \delta_N^{-(d+1)}$.*

Proof. First we estimate the number of maximal special lines. Let $H = \langle \mathbf{h}^{(1)}, \mathbf{h}^{(2)}, \mathbf{h}^{(3)}, \ldots \rangle$ be a "special line", here $\mathbf{h}^{(1)}$ is the first element of H, that is, if $\mathbf{h}^{(0)} \to \mathbf{h}^{(1)}$ holds for some $\mathbf{h}^{(0)}$, then at least one of the following inequalities is violated:

$$(1+\delta_N)^{h_1^{(0)}} \geq (\log N)^s,$$

$$(1+\delta_N)^{h_1^{(0)} - h_{i+1}^{(0)}} \geq (\log N)^s, 1 \leq i \leq d-1,$$

$$(1+\delta_N)^{h_{d+1}^{(0)}} \geq (\log N)^s.$$

Thus, by (5 .4) and (5 .6), one of the inequalities below holds:

$$(\log N)^s \leq (1+\delta_N)^{h_1^{(1)}} \leq (\log N)^{s+9},$$

$$(\log N)^s \leq (1+\delta_N)^{h_1^{(1)}-h_{i+1}^{(1)}} \leq (\log N)^{s+18},\ 1 \leq i \leq d-1,$$

$$(\log N)^s \leq (1+\delta_N)^{h_{d+1}^{(1)}} \leq (\log N)^{s+9(d+1)},$$

So at least one coordinate of $h_1^{(1)}$, $h_{d+1}^{(1)}$, or $h_1^{(1)} - h_{i+1}^{(1)}$ of the first element $\mathbf{h}^{(1)}$ of H is restricted to a short interval of length const$\cdot \log\log N \cdot \delta_N^{-1}$, the rest, by the condition (4 .6), are restricted to an interval of length const$\cdot \log N \cdot \delta_N^{-1}$. Since the starting vector determines the whole special line, the number of special line is

$$\ll (\log\log N) \cdot (\log N)^d \cdot \delta_N^{-(d+1)}.$$

By Lemma 5.1, the total number of $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$-big vectors is also

$$\ll (\log\log N) \cdot (\log N)^d \cdot \delta_N^{-(d+1)}.$$

□

With the help of the Lemma 5.1, we can estimate the contribution of the exponential terms, we have the following claim:

Proposition 5.1. *For almost every α, β we have*

$$\left|\bar{D}_6\right| \ll (\log N)^2 (\log\log N)$$

Proof.

$$\bar{D}_6 = \sum_{\text{small}} + \sum_{\text{big}}$$

where

$$\sum_{\text{small}} = \sum_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \sum_{\mathbf{l} \text{ not } \boldsymbol{\epsilon}\text{-big}} \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in S(N,\mathbf{l},\boldsymbol{\epsilon})} \bar{f}(\mathbf{n}, x, \boldsymbol{\alpha}) \tag{5 .23}$$

$$\sum_{\text{big}} = \sum_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \sum_{\mathbf{l} \text{ is } \boldsymbol{\epsilon}\text{-big}} \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in S(N,\mathbf{l},\boldsymbol{\epsilon})} \bar{f}(\mathbf{n}, x, \boldsymbol{\alpha}) \tag{5 .24}$$

By Lemma 4.1, range for $\mathbf{l}$:(4 .6), and (5 .3),

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|\sum_{\text{small}}\right| &\ll \sum_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \sum_{\mathbf{l} \text{ is not } \boldsymbol{\epsilon}\text{-big}} (1+\delta_N)^{-l_{d+1}} \cdot \frac{E(\mathbf{l}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}; N)}{\log N} \\
&\ll \sum_{\mathbf{l} \in L_2(N)} \frac{\delta_N^{d+1}}{\log N} \\
&\ll \frac{\delta_N^{d+1}}{\log N} \cdot \frac{(\log N)^{d+1}}{\delta_N^{d+1}} \\
&\ll (\log N)^d
\end{aligned}$$

By Corollary 5.1.1,

$$\begin{aligned}|\sum_{\text{big}}| &\ll \sum_{\mathbf{l} \text{ is } \boldsymbol{\epsilon}\text{-big}} (1+\delta_N)^{-l_{d+1}} \cdot E(\mathbf{l}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}; N) \\ &\ll [(\log\log N)(\log N)^d \delta_N^{-(d+1)}] \cdot [(1+\delta_N)^{-l_{d+1}} \cdot (1+\delta_N)^{l_{d+1}} \delta_N^{d+1}] \\ &\ll (\log N)^d \log\log N\end{aligned}$$

□

Combining Proposition 2.1, 3.1, 4.1, 5.1, we finally proved Theorem 1.2.

References

[1] József Beck. Probabilistic diophantine approximation, i. kronecker sequences. *Annals of Mathematics*, pages 449–502, 1994.

[2] Michael Drmota and Robert F Tichy. *Sequences, discrepancies and applications*. Springer, 2006.

[3] A Khintchine. Ein satz über kettenbrüche, mit arithmetischen anwendungen. *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 18(1):289–306, 1923.

[4] Wolfgang M Schmidt. Metrical theorems on fractional parts of sequences. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 110(3):493–518, 1964.