

# METRIC DENSITY RESULTS FOR THE VALUE DISTRIBUTION OF SUDLER PRODUCTS

MANUEL HAUKE

**ABSTRACT.** We study the value distribution of the Sudler product  $P_N(\alpha) := \prod_{n=1}^N |2 \sin(\pi n \alpha)|$  for Lebesgue-almost every irrational  $\alpha$ . We show that for every non-decreasing function  $\psi : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  with  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\psi(k)} = \infty$ , the set  $\{N \in \mathbb{N} : \log P_N(\alpha) \leq -\psi(\log N)\}$  has upper density 1, which answers a question of Bence Borda. On the other hand, we prove that  $\{N \in \mathbb{N} : \log P_N(\alpha) \geq \psi(\log N)\}$  has upper density at least  $\frac{1}{2}$ , with remarkable equality if  $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \psi(k)/(k \log k) \geq C$  for some sufficiently large  $C > 0$ .

## 1. INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF RESULTS

For  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $N$  a natural number, the Sudler product is defined as

$$P_N(\alpha) := \prod_{r=1}^N 2 |\sin(\pi r \alpha)|.$$

This product was first studied by Erdős and Szekeres [12]. Later, Sudler products appeared in many different areas of mathematics that include, among others, Zagier's quantum modular forms and hyperbolic knots in algebraic topology [3, 8, 24], restricted partition functions [23], KAM theory [17] and Padé approximants [18]. Furthermore, they were used in the solution of the Ten Martini Problem [5]. Note that by 1-periodicity of  $P_N(\alpha)$  and the fact that  $P_N(\alpha) = 0$  for rational  $\alpha$  and  $N$  sufficiently large, it suffices to consider irrational numbers  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ .

In [12], it was proven that

$$(1) \quad \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} P_N(\alpha) = 0, \quad \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} P_N(\alpha) = \infty$$

holds for almost every  $\alpha$ , raising the question of whether this holds for all irrationals  $\alpha$ . Lubinsky [19] showed that (1) remains true for all  $\alpha$  that have unbounded partial quotients. On the other hand, Grepstad, Kaltenböck and Neumüller showed in [13] that  $\liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} P_N(\phi) > 0$  for  $\phi$  being the Golden Ratio, answering the question negatively. This counterexample was extended in [4, 15] to certain quadratic irrationals that have only particularly small partial quotients. For more results in this area, we refer the reader to [14] and the references therein.

The asymptotic behaviour of the Sudler product depends delicately on the size of the partial quotients of  $\alpha$ . Since very much is known about the Diophantine properties for almost all irrationals, many results have been obtained in the metrical setting. Note that after taking logarithm, we see that  $\log P_N(\alpha) = \sum_{r=1}^N f(n\alpha)$  is a Birkhoff sum for the irrational rotation with  $f(x) = \log|2 \sin(\pi x)|$ , having a logarithmic singularity. For a general overview of Birkhoff

---

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 11J03; Secondary 11J70, 11K50.

*Key words and phrases.* Diophantine approximation, metric number theory, Sudler product, continued fraction.

sums in similar settings, we refer the reader to the survey [11]. Lubinsky and Saff [20] proved that for almost all  $\alpha$ , we have  $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log P_N(\alpha)}{N} = 0$ . Subsequently, Lubinsky [19] improved this result and obtained a divergence/convergence result as it is typical in metric Diophantine approximation: under a regularity condition (see [19] for the precise requirements), he showed that for a positive, non-decreasing function  $\psi$  with  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\psi(k)} < \infty$ , almost all  $\alpha$  satisfy

$$(2) \quad |\log P_N(\alpha)| \ll \psi(\log N)$$

(where  $\ll$  denotes the usual Vinogradov symbol, see Section 2.1 for a proper definition). On the other hand, if  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\psi(k)} = \infty$ , then both inequalities

$$(3) \quad \log P_N(\alpha) \geq \psi(\log N), \quad \log P_N(\alpha) \leq -\psi(\log N)$$

hold for infinitely many  $N$ . These statements also follow from a more refined result obtained by Aistleitner and Borda [3], who showed that for all  $\alpha$  whose partial quotients fulfill  $(a_1 + \dots + a_K)/K \rightarrow \infty$ , we have

$$(4) \quad \max_{0 \leq N < q_K} \log P_N(\alpha) = (V + o(1))(a_1 + \dots + a_K) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\log \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq K} a_\ell}{a_{K+1}}\right),$$

where  $V = \int_0^{5/6} \log|2 \sin(\pi x)| dx \approx 0.1615$ . In a recent work, Borda [9] proved several results on the value distribution of Sudler products, both for badly approximable irrationals and for almost all  $\alpha$ . In the latter context, he improved (3) in the sense that the inequalities in (3) both hold on a set of positive upper density.

**Theorem A** (Borda, [9, Theorem 6]). *Let  $\psi$  be a non-decreasing, positive function such that  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\psi(k)} = \infty$ . Then for almost all  $\alpha$ , the sets*

$$(5) \quad \{N \in \mathbb{N} : \log P_N(\alpha) \geq \psi(\log N)\}$$

$$(6) \quad \{N \in \mathbb{N} : \log P_N(\alpha) \leq -\psi(\log N)\}$$

*have upper density at least  $\pi^2/(1440V^2) \approx 0.2627$ , where  $V = \int_0^{5/6} \log|2 \sin(\pi x)| dx$ .*

The proof relies on (4) and the variance estimate

$$\sqrt{\frac{1}{M} \sum_{N=1}^M \log^2 P_N(\alpha)} = \left(\frac{\pi}{\sqrt{720}V} + o(1)\right) \max_{0 \leq N < M} \log P_N(\alpha),$$

which is shown to hold for infinitely many  $M \in \mathbb{N}$ . Additionally, Borda makes use of the “reflection principle” of Sudler products, which will also play a main role in this paper. This principle was observed by [4] and used in the subsequent literature on Sudler products several times. We state it here in the form of [3, Propositions 2 and 3]: for any irrational  $\alpha$  and  $0 \leq N < q_K$  (where  $q_K$  denotes the denominator of the  $K$ -th convergent of  $\alpha$ , see Section 2.2 for a proper definition), we have

$$(7) \quad \log P_N(\alpha) + \log P_{q_K - N - 1}(\alpha) = \log q_K + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1 + \log \max_{\ell \leq K} a_\ell}{a_{K+1}}\right).$$

In particular, (7) implies that for almost all  $\alpha$ , the values  $\log P_N(\alpha)$ ,  $N = 1, \dots, q_K$ , distribute symmetrically around the center  $\log q_K$ , which is however of negligible order for almost all  $\alpha$ . Hence, the numbers  $1 \leq N < q_K$  lie approximately as often in (5) as in (6). Borda remarked in [9] that the estimate on the upper density in Theorem A is probably not optimal, saying that it

might be possible that the union of (5) and (6) has upper density 1. Here we prove something even stronger: we show that already (6) on its own has upper density 1.

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $\psi$  be a non-decreasing, positive function such that  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\psi(k)} = \infty$ . Then for almost every  $\alpha$ , the set*

$$\{N \in \mathbb{N} : \log P_N(\alpha) \leq -\psi(\log N)\}$$

*has upper density 1.*

The symmetry around the negligible center  $\log q_k$  discussed above leads to the belief that (5) has the same upper density than (6). Surprisingly, this turns out to be wrong: we prove that if  $\psi$  is as in Theorem 1 and additionally fulfills a certain regularity condition, (5) has upper density 1/2 for almost every  $\alpha$ .

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $\psi$  be a non-decreasing, positive function such that  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\psi(k)} = \infty$ . Then for almost every  $\alpha$ , the set*

$$\{N \in \mathbb{N} : \log P_N(\alpha) \geq \psi(\log N)\}$$

*has upper density at least 1/2, with equality if  $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\psi(k)}{k \log k} \geq C$  for some absolute constant  $C > 0$ .*

#### Remarks on Theorems 1 and 2 and further research.

- Note that the divergence criterion of  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\psi(k)}$  is invariant under multiplication with constant factors. Therefore, it suffices to show Theorems 1 and the first part of Theorem 2 for the sets (5) and (6) with  $\psi(\log N)$  substituted with  $C_1 \cdot \psi(C_2 \log N)$ , where  $C_1, C_2 > 0$  are arbitrary constants. We will make use of this fact several times in the subsequent proofs without explicitly stating it.
- By (2), we see that the assumption  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\psi(k)} = \infty$  is essential, as otherwise the upper density is trivially zero. Note that also “upper density” cannot be replaced by “lower density”: for  $\psi(k) \geq (12V/\pi^2 + \varepsilon) k \log k$ , where  $V$  is the constant from Theorem A, even the union of (5) and (6) has lower density zero (see [9, Theorem 7]). It is interesting to find the minimal growth rate of  $\psi$  such that the sets (5), (6) or their union have non-zero lower density.
- Note that even in the case when the regularity condition  $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\psi(k)}{k \log k} \geq C$  is not satisfied, Theorem 2 gives an improved lower bound in comparison to Theorem A. Our approach relies on the fact that for almost every irrational, the trimmed sum of its first  $k$  partial quotients is bounded from above by  $k \log k$ , with the largest partial quotient dominating the sum infinitely often. Therefore, we only need to control the Ostrowski coefficient of the largest partial quotient (see Section 3 for an overview). It remains open how far the regularity condition from Theorem 2 can be relaxed such that the upper density of (5) is still 1/2 for almost every  $\alpha$ . Below we show that  $\psi$  has to fulfill  $\psi(k) \geq (1/2 - \varepsilon)k$  infinitely often for arbitrary small  $\varepsilon > 0$ . This can be deduced in the following way from [9, Theorem 9]: the theorem states (among other results) that for any  $t \geq 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \lambda \left( \left\{ \alpha \in [0, 1] : \frac{10\pi}{M \log^2 M} \sum_{N=1}^M \left( \log P_N(\alpha) - \frac{1}{2} \log M \right)^2 \leq t \right\} \right) \\ = \int_0^t \frac{e^{-1/(2x)}}{\sqrt{2\pi} x^{3/2}} dx =: c(t), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\lambda$  denotes the 1-dimensional Lebesgue measure. By Chebyshev's inequality, we obtain that for any  $\varepsilon, y > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{M \rightarrow \infty} \lambda \left( \left\{ \alpha \in [0, 1] : \frac{1}{M} \# \left\{ 1 \leq N \leq M : \left| \log P_N(\alpha) - \frac{1}{2} \log M \right| \geq \varepsilon \log M \right\} \leq y \right\} \right) \\ \geq c(10\pi\varepsilon^2 y). \end{aligned}$$

Applying Fatou's Lemma, we get that on a set of measure of at least  $c(10\pi\varepsilon^2 y) > 0$ ,

$$\frac{1}{M} \# \left\{ 1 \leq N \leq M : \left| \log P_N(\alpha) - \frac{1}{2} \log M \right| \geq \varepsilon \log M \right\} \leq y$$

holds for infinitely many  $M$ . This implies that the upper density of

$$\left\{ N \in \mathbb{N} : \log P_N(\alpha) > \left( \frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon \right) \log N \right\}$$

is bounded from below by  $1 - y$ , so choosing  $y < \frac{1}{2}$ , we can deduce that for  $\psi(k) \leq (1/2 - \varepsilon)k$ , the upper density of (5) being  $1/2$  fails to hold on a set of positive measure. However, it remains open whether having  $\psi(k) \geq \frac{k}{2}$  is already sufficient to deduce upper density  $1/2$  for almost all  $\alpha$ .

Similarly, it is interesting if there is some threshold function where the upper density of the set in (5) jumps from  $1/2$  to  $1$  for almost every  $\alpha$  (and if so, how fast does this function grow?), or if the value of the upper density attains a fixed number strictly between  $1/2$  and  $1$  for certain functions  $\psi$  and almost every irrational.

## 2. NOTATION AND PRELIMINARY RESULTS

**2.1. Notation.** Given two functions  $f, g : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we write  $f(x) = \mathcal{O}(g(x))$  or  $f \ll g$ , when  $\limsup_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(x)}{g(x)} < \infty$  and  $f(x) = o(g(x))$ , when  $\limsup_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(x)}{g(x)} = 0$ . If  $f \ll g$  and  $g \ll f$ , we write  $f \asymp g$  and  $f \sim g$  for  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(x)}{g(x)} = 1$ . Given a real number  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , we write  $\|x\| = \min\{|x - k| : k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$  for the distance of  $x$  from its nearest integer.

**2.2. Continued fractions.** In this subsection, we shortly recall all necessary facts about the theory on continued fraction that are used to prove Theorems 1 and 2. For a more detailed introduction, we refer the reader to the classical literature, e.g. [1, 21, 22]. Every irrational  $\alpha$  has a unique infinite continued fraction expansion  $[a_0; a_1, \dots]$  with convergents  $p_k/q_k = [a_0; a_1, \dots, a_k]$  that fulfill the recursions

$$(8) \quad p_{k+1} = p_{k+1}(\alpha) = a_{k+1}(\alpha)p_k + p_{k-1}, \quad q_{k+1} = q_{k+1}(\alpha) = a_{k+1}(\alpha)q_k + q_{k-1}.$$

For shorter notation, we will just write  $p_k, q_k, a_k$ , although these entities depend on  $\alpha$ . We know that  $p_k/q_k$  approximates  $\alpha$  very well, which leads to the following well-known inequalities for  $k \geq 1$ :

$$(9) \quad \frac{1}{q_{k+1} + q_k} \leq \delta_k := \|q_k \alpha\| = |q_k \alpha - p_k| \leq \frac{1}{q_{k+1}},$$

from where we can deduce that

$$(10) \quad \frac{1}{a_{k+1} + 2} \leq q_k \delta_k \leq \frac{q_k}{q_{k+1}} \leq \frac{1}{a_{k+1}}.$$

Using (8), we obtain that

$$(11) \quad a_{k+1} \delta_k = \delta_{k-1} - \delta_{k+1}.$$

Fixing an irrational  $\alpha = [a_0; a_1, \dots]$ , the Ostrowski expansion of a non-negative integer  $N$  is the unique representation

$$N = \sum_{\ell=0}^{K-1} b_\ell q_\ell \quad \text{where} \quad b_K \neq 0, \quad 0 \leq b_\ell \leq a_{\ell+1}, \quad b_0 < a_1,$$

with the additional rule that  $b_{\ell-1} = 0$  whenever  $b_\ell = a_{\ell+1}$ .

**Metrical results.** Much is known about the almost sure behavior of continued fraction coefficients and convergents. Below we state all known properties of almost every  $\alpha$  that are used during the proofs of Theorems 1 and 2.

- (Bernstein [7]): For any monotonically non-decreasing function  $\psi : [1, \infty) \rightarrow [1, \infty)$ , we have

$$(12) \quad \# \{k \in \mathbb{N} : a_k > \psi(k)\} \text{ is } \begin{cases} \text{infinite} & \text{if } \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\psi(k)} = \infty \\ \text{finite} & \text{if } \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\psi(k)} < \infty. \end{cases}$$

- (Diamond and Vaaler [10]):

$$(13) \quad \sum_{\ell \leq K} a_\ell - \max_{\ell \leq K} a_\ell \sim \frac{K \log K}{\log 2}, \quad K \rightarrow \infty.$$

- (Khintchine and Lévy, see e.g. [21, Chapter 5, §9, Theorem 1]):

$$(14) \quad \log q_k \sim \frac{\pi^2}{12 \log 2} k \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

Combining (12) and (13), the following corollary follows immediately.

**Corollary 3.** *Let  $\psi$  be a non-decreasing, positive function such that  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\psi(k)} = \infty$ . Then for almost every  $\alpha$ , there exist infinitely many  $K \in \mathbb{N}$  such that the following hold.*

- $\psi(K) < a_K < K^2$ .
- $\sum_{\ell=1}^{K-1} a_\ell \ll K \log K$  with an absolute implied constant.

## 3. HEURISTIC BEHIND THE PROOFS

We start by sketching the heuristic idea behind the proof of Theorems 1 and 2. This can be compared with [2, Section 2.1]. Starting with Theorem 1, note that we can assume without loss of generality that  $\psi(k)/(k \log k) \rightarrow \infty$ , since this implies the statement also for slower-growing  $\psi$ . Let  $\psi$  and  $K$  be as in Corollary 3 and let  $N < q_K$  be arbitrary with Ostrowski expansion  $N = \sum_{\ell=0}^{K-1} b_\ell q_\ell$ . We use the usual decomposition of  $P_N(\alpha)$  into certain shifted Sudler products. This approach was first used in the special case for  $\alpha$  being the Golden Ratio in [13] and made more explicit and general in subsequent works in this area, e.g. [3, 4, 14, 15, 16]. Defining

$$P_N(\alpha, x) := \prod_{n=1}^N |2 \sin(\pi(n\alpha + x))|, \quad \alpha, x \in \mathbb{R},$$

and

$$(15) \quad \varepsilon_\ell(N) := q_\ell \sum_{k=\ell+1}^{K-1} (-1)^{k+\ell} b_k \delta_k,$$

we can deduce (see [3, Lemma 2]) that

$$(16) \quad P_N(\alpha) = \prod_{\ell=0}^{K-1} \prod_{b=0}^{b_\ell-1} P_{q_\ell} \left( \alpha, (-1)^\ell (b q_\ell \delta_\ell + \varepsilon_\ell(N)) / q_\ell \right).$$

Ignoring first the contribution of the numbers  $\varepsilon_\ell(N)$ , and using the approximation  $P_{q_\ell}(\alpha, (-1)^\ell x / q_\ell) \approx |2 \sin(\pi x)|$  elaborated later, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \log P_N(\alpha) &\approx \sum_{b=1}^{b_{K-1}-1} \log |2 \sin(\pi b q_{K-1} \delta_{K-1})| + \sum_{\ell=0}^{K-2} \sum_{b=1}^{b_\ell-1} \log |2 \sin(\pi b q_\ell \delta_\ell)| \\ &\approx a_K \int_0^{b_{K-1}/a_K} \log |2 \sin(\pi x)| \, dx + \sum_{\ell=0}^{K-2} a_{\ell+1} \int_0^{b_\ell/a_{\ell+1}} \log |2 \sin(\pi x)| \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

By the choice of  $K$  as in Corollary 3, the value  $a_K$  dominates the sum  $\sum_{\ell=0}^{K-1} a_\ell$ . So using  $\log |2 \sin(\pi x)| \leq \log(2)$  and assuming that

$$(17) \quad \int_0^{b_{K-1}/a_K} \log |2 \sin(\pi x)| \, dx$$

is bounded away from 0, we have that  $\log P_N(\alpha) \ll -a_K$ , provided that the integral in (17) is negative. It is easy to see that this is the case if and only if  $b_{K-1}/a_K < \frac{1}{2}$ , which leads to

$$(18) \quad \log P_N(\alpha) \ll -\psi(K)$$

for  $b_{K-1}/a_K < 1/2 - \varepsilon$ . As almost all numbers  $N < \lfloor \frac{q_K}{2} \rfloor$  fulfill

$$\log N \asymp \log q_K \underset{(14)}{\asymp} K,$$

(18) is equivalent to  $\log P_N(\alpha) \ll -\psi(\log N)$  for most  $N$ , which implies Theorem 1.

By the same reasoning, we can immediately deduce that at least 50% of all numbers  $N < q_K$  fulfill (18). Using the reflection principle, we see that also

$$\log P_N(\alpha) \gg \psi(K)$$

is fulfilled for about 50% of all numbers  $N < q_K$ , hence the first part of Theorem 2 follows immediately. For the equality in case  $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \psi(k)/(k \log k) \geq C$ , we fix some integer  $q_{K-1} \leq M < q_K$  (this  $K$  does not fulfill in general the properties of Corollary 3), and show that asymptotically, at most 50% of all  $N < M$  can fulfill  $\log P_N(\alpha) \gg \psi(K)$ . Defining  $a_{\ell_0} = \max_{\ell \leq K} a_\ell$ , we can argue similar to before that for  $C$  sufficiently large and  $\log N \gg \log q_K$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \log P_N(\alpha) &\lesssim a_{\ell_0} \int_0^{b_{\ell_0-1}/a_{\ell_0}} \log|2 \sin(\pi x)| \, dx + \mathcal{O} \left( \sum_{k \neq \ell_0}^K a_k \right) \\ &\leq a_{\ell_0} \int_0^{b_{\ell_0-1}/a_{\ell_0}} \log|2 \sin(\pi x)| \, dx + \frac{\psi(\log N)}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

So in order to fulfill  $\log P_N(\alpha) \geq \psi(\log N)$ , we have the necessary condition

$$(19) \quad \int_0^{b_{\ell_0-1}/a_{\ell_0}} \log|2 \sin(\pi x)| \, dx > 0,$$

or equivalently,  $b_{\ell_0-1}(N)/a_{\ell_0} > 1/2$ , which can be seen to be fulfilled by at most 50% of all  $N < M$ . Hence, no matter how we choose  $M \in \mathbb{N}$ , at most half the numbers  $N < M$  fulfill (19), so the upper density of (5) cannot exceed 1/2.

The punchline why the upper densities of (5) and (6) differ is the following: on the full period  $1 \leq N \leq q_K$ , there are about as many elements in (5) as in (6), and for  $a_K$  being large, almost all elements are in one of those sets. The criterion whether  $N$  is in (5) or in (6) is (almost) equivalent  $b_{K-1}(N) > a_K/2$  or not. As  $b_{K-1}$  is the most significant coefficient for the size of  $N$  (since  $b_{K-1}(M) < b_{K-1}(N)$  implies  $M < N$ ), we see that all elements in (6) appear before the elements in (5), causing the asymmetric result.

**Remark.** Note that all estimates in this paper only consider upper bounds. This makes the analysis much easier since we can ignore the singularities of the function  $\log|2 \sin(\pi x)|$  at  $x = 0$  or  $x = 1$ , as we trivially bound  $\log|2 \sin(\pi x)| \leq \log(2)$  from above. The reflection principle provides the tool to use the upper bounds also to achieve Theorem 2, without having to consider that singularities.

#### 4. PROOF OF THE THEOREMS

**4.1. Preparatory results for the approximation errors.** In this section, we discuss the actual errors that are made by comparing  $\log P_N(\alpha)$  with  $a_K \int_0^{b_{K-1}/a_K} \log|2 \sin(\pi x)| \, dx$  (see Lemma 7). The first step in this direction is done by [2, Proposition 12]. For the convenience of the reader, we state it below as Proposition 4.

**Proposition 4.** Let  $N = \sum_{\ell=0}^{K-1} b_\ell q_\ell$  be the Ostrowski expansion of a non-negative integer and  $\varepsilon_\ell(N)$  as in (15). There exists a universal constant  $C > 0$  such that for any  $\ell \geq 1$  with  $b_\ell \geq 1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{b=0}^{b_\ell-1} \log P_{q_\ell}(\alpha, (-1)^\ell (bq_\ell \delta_\ell + \varepsilon_\ell(N))/q_\ell) &\leq \sum_{b=1}^{b_\ell-1} \log |2 \sin(\pi(bq_\ell \delta_\ell + \varepsilon_\ell(N)))| \\
&+ \sum_{b=0}^{b_\ell-1} V_\ell(bq_\ell \delta_\ell + \varepsilon_\ell(N)) \\
&+ \log(2\pi(b_\ell q_\ell \delta_\ell + \varepsilon_\ell(N))) + \frac{C}{a_{\ell+1} q_\ell},
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$(20) \quad V_\ell(x) := \sum_{n=1}^{q_\ell-1} \sin(\pi n \delta_\ell / q_\ell) \cot \left( \pi \frac{n(-1)^\ell p_\ell + x}{q_\ell} \right)$$

denotes a modified cotangent sum.

We see that we need to find upper bounds on the modified cotangent sums  $V_\ell$ . This is done by the following variant of [2, Lemma 8].

**Lemma 5.** *Let  $1 \leq k \leq K-1$ ,  $a_{\ell_0} = \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq K} a_\ell$ ,  $x \in (-1, 1)$  and  $V_k$  as in (20). Then the following statements hold.*

(i)

$$V'_k(x) < 0, \quad |V_k(0)| \ll \frac{1 + \log a_{\ell_0}}{a_{k+1}}.$$

(ii)

$$|V_k(x)| \ll \log a_{\ell_0} + \frac{1}{1 - |x|},$$

with the implied constants independent of  $x$  and  $k$ .

*Proof.* The statements in (i) are proven in [2, Lemma 8]. For (ii), we use the estimate  $|V'_k(x)| \ll \frac{1}{(1-|x|)^2}$ , which is also shown in [2]. The result now follows immediately after integration.  $\square$

Next, we turn our attention to controlling the size of the perturbations  $\varepsilon_\ell(N)$ . It is easy to see that  $-1 < \varepsilon_\ell(N) < 1$  for any  $1 \leq \ell \leq K-1$ . By Lemma 5, we see that the error made by  $V_\ell(bq_\ell \delta_\ell + \varepsilon_\ell(N))$  is particularly large when its argument is close to its singularities at  $-1$  and  $1$ . The following proposition aims to bound the arguments away from those singularities and to show that the perturbation  $\varepsilon_\ell(N)$  is small if  $a_{\ell+1}$  is large, which will be the case in the main term (see Section 3).

**Proposition 6.** *Let  $\varepsilon_\ell(N)$  be defined as in (15) and  $b_\ell \geq 1$ . Then we have the following inequalities:*

(i)

$$(21) \quad -\frac{1}{a_{\ell+1}} \leq -q_\ell \delta_\ell \leq \varepsilon_\ell(N) \leq \frac{1}{a_{\ell+1}}.$$

(ii)

$$(22) \quad 1 - |\varepsilon_\ell(N)| \gg \frac{1}{a_{\ell+2}}.$$



If  $b_{\ell+1} \leq \frac{a_{\ell+2}}{2}$ , then

$$(23) \quad 1 - |\varepsilon_\ell(N)| \gg 1,$$

with the implied constants being absolute.

*Proof.* We argue similarly to [3, Lemma 3]. By definition of  $\varepsilon_\ell(N)$  and (11), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_\ell(N) &= q_\ell \sum_{k=\ell+1}^{K-1} (-1)^{k+\ell} b_k \delta_k \leq q_\ell (a_{\ell+3} \delta_{\ell+2} + a_{\ell+5} \delta_{\ell+4} + \dots) \\ &= q_\ell ((\delta_{\ell+1} - \delta_{\ell+3}) + (\delta_{\ell+3} - \delta_{\ell+5}) + \dots) \\ &= q_\ell \delta_{\ell+1} \leq \frac{q_\ell}{q_{\ell+2}} \leq \frac{1}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used (9) in the last line. Similarly, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_\ell(N) &\geq -q_\ell (b_{\ell+1} \delta_{\ell+1} + a_{\ell+4} \delta_{\ell+3} + \dots) \\ &= -q_\ell ((b_{\ell+1} - a_{\ell+2}) \delta_{\ell+1} + (\delta_\ell - \delta_{\ell+2}) + (\delta_{\ell+2} - \delta_{\ell+4}) + \dots) \\ &= -q_\ell (\delta_\ell - (b_{\ell+1} - a_{\ell+2}) \delta_{\ell+1}). \end{aligned}$$

As  $b_\ell \geq 1$  implies  $b_{\ell+1} \leq a_{\ell+2} - 1$ , combining these bounds leads to

$$(24) \quad -1 < -q_\ell \delta_\ell + q_\ell \delta_{\ell+1} \leq -q_\ell \delta_\ell + q_\ell (a_{\ell+2} - b_{\ell+1}) \delta_{\ell+1} \leq \varepsilon_\ell(N) \leq q_\ell \delta_{\ell+1} \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

(i): As  $\delta_{\ell+1} \leq \delta_\ell$ , (21) follows immediately from (10) and (24).

(ii): By (24), we have  $\varepsilon_\ell(N) < \frac{1}{2}$ , so it suffices to find lower bounds for  $\varepsilon_\ell(N)$ . Using (9) and  $q_{\ell+1} \leq 2a_{\ell+1}q_\ell$ , we get

$$q_\ell \delta_{\ell+1} \geq \frac{q_\ell}{q_{\ell+2} + q_{\ell+1}} \geq \frac{q_\ell}{3a_{\ell+2}q_{\ell+1}} \geq \frac{1}{6a_{\ell+2}a_{\ell+1}}.$$

Applying (10), we get

$$-q_\ell \delta_\ell + (a_{\ell+2} - b_{\ell+1})q_\ell \delta_{\ell+1} \geq \frac{1}{a_{\ell+1}} \left( -1 + \frac{a_{\ell+2} - b_{\ell+1}}{6a_{\ell+2}} \right),$$

which in view of (24) finishes the proof. □

The following lemma combines the preparatory results from above. It contains the main ingredients to the proof of both Theorems 1 and 2.

**Lemma 7.** *Let  $N < q_K$  with Ostrowski expansion  $\sum_{\ell=0}^{K-1} b_\ell q_\ell$  and let  $1 \leq \ell_0 \leq K$  be such that  $a_{\ell_0} = \max_{\ell \leq K} a_\ell \geq 2$ . Assume that  $b_{\ell_0-1} \leq \frac{a_{\ell_0}}{2} \leq \frac{K^2}{2}$  and*

$$(25) \quad \sum_{\substack{k=1, \\ k \neq \ell_0}}^K a_k \ll K \log K.$$

Then we have

$$\log P_N(\alpha) \leq \sum_{b=1}^{b_{\ell_0-1}-1} \log \left| 2 \sin \left( \pi b q_{\ell_0-1} \delta_{\ell_0-1} + \varepsilon_{\ell_0-1}(N) \right) \right| + \mathcal{O}(K \log K).$$

*Proof of Lemma 7.* Using the decomposition into shifted Sudler products from (16), we have

$$\log P_N(\alpha) = \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \sum_{b=0}^{b_k-1} \log P_{q_k} \left( \alpha, (-1)^k (b q_k \delta_k + \varepsilon_k(N)) / q_k \right).$$

Next, we apply Proposition 4 for every  $1 \leq k \leq K-1$  with  $b_k \neq 0$  and obtain for some  $C > 0$  that

$$\begin{aligned} \log P_N(\alpha) \leq & \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \left( \sum_{b=1}^{b_k-1} \log \left| 2 \sin(\pi(b q_k \delta_k + \varepsilon_k(N))) \right| \right. \\ & + \sum_{b=0}^{b_k-1} V_k(b q_k \delta_k + \varepsilon_k(N)) \\ & \left. + \log(2\pi(b q_k \delta_k + \varepsilon_k(N))) + \frac{C}{a_{k+1} q_k} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Applying rough bounds on the arguments of the logarithms and using (25) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \log P_N(\alpha) \leq & \sum_{b=1}^{b_{\ell_0-1}-1} \log \left| 2 \sin \left( \pi b q_{\ell_0-1} \delta_{\ell_0-1} + \varepsilon_{\ell_0-1}(N) \right) \right| \\ & + \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \sum_{b=0}^{b_k-1} V_k(b q_k \delta_k + \varepsilon_k(N)) + \mathcal{O}(K \log K). \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 6 (i), we see that  $b \geq 1$  implies that  $b q_k \delta_k + \varepsilon_k(N) \geq 0$ . So Lemma 5 (i) and  $a_{\ell_0} \leq K^2$  lead to

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \sum_{b=1}^{b_k-1} V_k(b q_k \delta_k + \varepsilon_k(N)) \ll \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \frac{b_k}{a_{k+1}} \log a_{\ell_0} \ll K \log K.$$

For  $1 \leq k \neq \ell_0 - 2 \leq K-2$ , we use (22) to obtain

$$(26) \quad \frac{1}{1 - |\varepsilon_k(N)|} \ll a_{k+2}.$$

For  $k = \ell_0 - 2$ , we observe that  $b_{\ell_0-1} \leq \frac{a_{\ell_0}}{2}$ , hence we have by (23) that

$$(27) \quad \frac{1}{1 - |\varepsilon_{\ell_0-2}(N)|} \ll 1.$$

For  $k = \ell_0 - 1$ , we apply Proposition 6 (i) to obtain  $|\varepsilon_{\ell_0-1}(N)| \leq \frac{1}{2}$ , and from the definition of  $\varepsilon_\ell(N)$ , we can follow that  $\varepsilon_{K-1}(N) = 0$ . Combining these observations with (26) and (27) yields

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K-1} V_k(\varepsilon_k(N)) \ll K \log K,$$

where we used (25) once more. This finishes the proof.  $\square$

**4.2. Proof of Theorem 1.** We can assume without loss of generality that  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \psi(k)/(k \log k) = \infty$ , as showing this will imply the statement of Theorem 1 also for slower growing  $\psi$ . Applying Corollary 3, we know that there exist infinitely many  $K$  such that

$$(28) \quad \psi(K) < a_K < K^2, \quad \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} a_k \ll K \log K.$$

Fixing an arbitrary small  $\delta > 0$ , we define for every  $K \geq 1$  that fulfills (28), the set

$$M_K = M_K(\delta) := \left\{ 1 \leq N \leq \left\lfloor \frac{q_K}{2} \right\rfloor : \delta a_K \leq b_{K-1}(N) \leq \left( \frac{1}{2} - \delta \right) a_K \right\}.$$

Choosing  $K$  sufficiently large, we have by (14) that for all  $N \in M_K$ ,

$$\psi(\log N) \asymp \psi(\log M_K) \asymp \psi(K).$$

As  $\#M_K(\delta)/\left\lfloor \frac{q_K}{2} \right\rfloor \xrightarrow{\delta \rightarrow 0} 1$ , it suffices to show that for each  $N \in M_K$ , we have

$$\log P_N(\alpha) \ll -\psi(K).$$

We apply Lemma 7 with  $\ell_0 = K$  and obtain

$$\log P_N(\alpha) \leq \sum_{b=1}^{b_{K-1}-1} \log \left| 2 \sin \left( \pi b q_{K-1} \delta_{K-1} + \varepsilon_{K-1}(N) \right) \right| + \mathcal{O}(K \log K).$$

Note that we have  $\varepsilon_{K-1}(N) = 0$  and  $b_{K-1}(N) \leq \left( \frac{1}{2} - \delta \right) a_K$ , so since  $\log |2 \sin(\pi x)|$  is monotonically increasing on  $[0, 1/2]$ , we have for some  $c = c(\delta) > 0$  that

$$\sum_{b=0}^{b_{K-1}-1} \log \left| 2 \sin \left( \pi b q_{K-1} \delta_{K-1} + \varepsilon_{K-1}(N) \right) \right| \leq a_K \int_1^{b_{K-1}/a_K} \log |2 \sin(\pi x)| dx \leq -c \cdot a_K \ll -\psi(K),$$

which completes the proof.

**4.3. Proof of Theorem 2.** By the proof of Theorem 1, we can deduce that

$$(29) \quad \limsup_{K \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\{0 \leq N \leq q_K : \log P_N(\alpha) \leq -2\psi(K)\}}{q_K} \geq \frac{1}{2}.$$

By the reflection principle (7), we see that at most one of the inequalities

$$\log P_N(\alpha) \leq -2\psi(K), \quad \log P_{q_K-N-1}(\alpha) \leq -2\psi(K)$$

can be fulfilled, hence there is equality in (29). Applying the reflection principle a second time implies

$$\limsup_{K \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\{0 \leq N \leq q_K : \log P_N(\alpha) \geq \psi(K)\}}{q_K} \geq \frac{1}{2},$$

which finishes the proof of the first part of Theorem 2.

To show equality in the case where  $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \psi(k)/(k \log k) \geq C$ , let  $q_{K-1} \leq M < q_K$  be an arbitrary integer and let  $a_{\ell_0} = \max_{\ell \leq K} a_\ell$ . We define the sets

$$M^+ := \left\{ N \leq M : b_{\ell_0-1}(N) \geq \frac{a_{\ell_0}}{2} \right\}, \quad M^- := \left\{ N \leq M : b_{\ell_0-1}(N) \leq \frac{a_{\ell_0}}{2} \right\}$$

and the function

$$f : M^+ \rightarrow M^-$$

$$N = \sum_{\ell=0}^{K-1} b_\ell q_\ell \mapsto \sum_{\ell=0}^{K-1} \tilde{b}_\ell q_\ell$$

with  $\sum_{\ell=0}^{K-1} b_\ell q_\ell$  being the Ostrowski expansion of  $N$  and

$$\tilde{b}_\ell := \begin{cases} a_{\ell_0} - b_{\ell_0-1} & \text{if } \ell = \ell_0, \\ b_k & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It is straightforward to check that  $f$  is well-defined and injective, hence  $|M^-| \geq \frac{M}{2}$ . For arbitrary  $N \in M^-$ , we apply Lemma 7 to obtain

$$(30) \quad \log P_N(\alpha) \leq \sum_{b=1}^{b_{\ell_0-1}-1} \log \left| 2 \sin \left( \pi b q_{\ell_0-1} \delta_{\ell_0-1} + \varepsilon_{\ell_0-1}(N) \right) \right| + \mathcal{O}(K \log K).$$

By (21), it follows that

$$0 \leq b q_{\ell_0-1} \delta_{\ell_0-1} + \varepsilon_{\ell_0-1}(N) \leq \frac{1}{2}, \quad b = 1, \dots, b_{\ell_0-1} - 1,$$

so each summand on the right-hand side of (30) is negative. Thus, for  $N \geq \sqrt{M}$ , we have for almost every  $\alpha$  that

$$\log P_N(\alpha) \ll K \log K \ll \log N \log \log N.$$

Choosing  $C$  sufficiently large, this shows  $\log P_N(\alpha) \leq \psi(\log N)$  for  $N \in M^- \cap \{\lceil \sqrt{M} \rceil, \dots, M\}$ , and as

$$\limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|M^- \cap \{1, \dots, \lfloor \sqrt{M} \rfloor\}|}{M} = 0,$$

the result follows.

**Acknowledgements.** The author is grateful to Bence Borda for various comments on an earlier version of this paper.

## REFERENCES

- [1] J. Allouche, J. Shallit, *Automatic Sequences: Theory, Applications, Generalizations*. Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- [2] C. Aistleitner, B. Borda, *Maximizing Sudler products via Ostrowski expansions and cotangent sums*, arXiv:2104.01379.
- [3] C. Aistleitner, B. Borda, *Quantum invariants of hyperbolic knots and extreme values of trigonometric products*, arXiv:2006.08578.

- [4] C. Aistleitner, N. Technau and A. Zafeiropoulos *On the order of magnitude of Sudler products*, Amer. J. Math., to appear. arXiv:2002.06602.
- [5] A. Avila, S. Jitomirskaya, *The Ten Martini Problem*. Ann. of Math. (2) 170 (2009), no. 1, 303–342.
- [6] A. Avila, S. Jitomirskaya, C.A. Marx, *Spectral theory of extended Harper’s model and a question by Erdős and Szekeres*. Invent. Math. 210 (2017), no. 1, 283–339.
- [7] F. Bernstein, *Über eine Anwendung der Mengenlehre auf ein aus der Theorie der säkularen Störungen herrührendes Problem*, Math. Ann. 71 (1912), p. 417–439.
- [8] S. Bettin, S. Drappeau, *Modularity and value distribution of quantum invariants of hyperbolic knots*. Math. Ann., to appear. arXiv:1905.02045
- [9] B. Borda, *On the distribution of Sudler products and Birkhoff sums for the irrational rotation*, arXiv:2104.06716.
- [10] H. Diamond, J. Vaaler, *Estimates for partial sums of continued fraction partial quotients*, Pacific J. Math. 122 (1986), 73–82.
- [11] D. Dolgopyat, B. Fayad, *Limit theorems for toral translations*. Hyperbolic Dynamics, Fluctuations and Large Deviations 227–277. Proc. Sympos. Pure Math. 89. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2015.
- [12] P. Erdős, G. Szekeres, *On the product  $\prod_{k=1}^n (1 - z^{\alpha_k})$* . Acad. Serbe Sci. Publ. Inst. Math. 12 (1958), 29–34.
- [13] S. Grepstad, L. Kaltenböck, M. Neumüller, *A positive lower bound for  $\liminf N \rightarrow \infty \prod_{r=1}^N 2|\sin \pi r\psi|$* . Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 147 (2019), 4863–4876.
- [14] S. Grepstad, M. Neumüller, *On the asymptotic behaviour of the sine product  $\prod_{r=1}^n |2\sin(\pi r\alpha)|$* . arXiv:1909.00980.
- [15] S. Grepstad, M. Neumüller, A. Zafeiropoulos, *On the order of magnitude of Sudler products II*, arXiv:2109.04342.
- [16] M. Hauke, *On extreme values for the Sudler product of quadratic irrationals*, Acta Arith., to appear. arXiv:2111.12974.
- [17] O. Knill, F. Tangerman *Self-similarity and growth in Birkhoff sums for the golden rotation*. Nonlinearity 24 (2011), 3115–3127.
- [18] D. Lubinsky, *Rogers–Ramanujan and the Baker–Gammel–Wills (Padé) conjecture*. Ann. of Math. 157 (2003), 847–889.
- [19] D. Lubinsky, *The Size of  $(q; q)_n$  for  $q$  on the Unit Circle*, Journal of Number Theory vol.76 (1999), 217–247.
- [20] D. Lubinsky, E. B. Saff, *Convergence of Padé Approximants of Partial Theta Functions and the Rogers–Szegő Polynomials*. Constr. Approx. 3 (1987), no. 4, 331–361.
- [21] A. M. Rockett, P. Szűsz *Continued fractions*. World Scientific Publishing, River Edge, NJ, 1992.
- [22] W. M. Schmidt *Diophantine approximation*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 785. Springer, Berlin, 1980.
- [23] C. Sudler Jr. *An estimate for a restricted partition function*. Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser. 15 (1964), 1–10.
- [24] D. Zagier, *Quantum modular forms*, Quanta of maths, 659–675, Clay Math. Proc., 11, Amer. Math.Soc., Providence, RI, 2010.

GRAZ UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, INSTITUTE OF ANALYSIS AND NUMBER THEORY, STEYRERGASSE 30/II, 8010 GRAZ, AUSTRIA

Email address: hauke@math.tugraz.at