

CARTESIAN PRODUCT SETS IN DIOPHANTINE APPROXIMATION WITH LARGE HAUSDORFF DIMENSION

JOHANNES SCHLEISCHITZ

ABSTRACT. We find sets naturally occurring in Diophantine approximation whose Cartesian products exceed the expected Hausdorff dimension, that is the sum of the single dimensions. Examples include n -fold products of the set of Liouville numbers (vectors) as well as of the Diophantine numbers (vectors) with prescribed irrationality exponent, and extend to classical fractals. We also address packing dimensions of Cartesian products. Our method vastly extends ideas of Erdős.

Keywords: Hausdorff dimension, packing dimension, irrationality exponent, continued fractions
 Math Subject Classification 2010: 11J04, 11J82, 11J83

1. HAUSDORFF DIMENSIONS AND CARTESIAN PRODUCTS

Hausdorff measure and Hausdorff dimension are widely used concepts to measure the size of a set. We start by recalling its definition where we restrict ourselves to the Euclidean setting of sets $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$. Let $s > 0$. For given $r > 0$, consider the set of all countable r -covers $(U_i)_{i \geq 1}$ of our set A , that is a countable family of sets $U_i \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ with diameter of each U_i at most r that contain A . For each r -cover we evaluate the (possibly infinite) sum of $\text{diam}(U_i)^s$ over i . Taking the infimum over these numbers we derive at some $H_{r,s} \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$, and taking the (monotonic increasing) limit as $r \rightarrow 0$ over $H_{r,s}$ gives the Hausdorff s -measure of A , write $H_s(A)$. It can be checked that for given A there is a value $s_0 \in [0, n]$ with $H_s(A) = \infty$ for $s < s_0$ and $H_s(A) = 0$ for $s > s_0$. This switch value s_0 is called Hausdorff dimension of A . We will throughout denote by $\dim(A)$ the Hausdorff dimension of the set A . We will sporadically deal with the packing dimension $\dim_P(A)$ of $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ as well, derived similarly from a packing measure. We omit the exact definition and refer to Falconer [20]. The Hausdorff dimension of a set never exceeds its packing dimension.

We investigate Hausdorff dimensions of Cartesian products of certain Euclidean sets. This topic has been addressed for various classes of sets, see for example Besicovitch, Moran [8], Eggleston [18], Marstrand [32], Xiao [48]. A fundamental

Middle East Technical University, Northern Cyprus Campus, Kalkanli, Güzelyurt
 jschleischitz@outlook.com.

property of Hausdorff dimension proved by Marstrand [33] is that for any measurable sets A, B when taking their Cartesian product we have

$$(1) \quad \dim(A \times B) \geq \dim A + \dim B.$$

In general there is no identity, however in many interesting situations identity holds, for example for products of classical fractals like the Cantor middle-third set [20]. Criteria on the sets A, B that imply identity can be found as well in [20]. An upper bound due to Tricot [45] for the left hand side in (1) involving the packing dimension is formulated in Theorem 1.1 below.

Theorem 1.1. *We have $\dim(A \times B) \leq \dim(A) + \dim_P(B)$ for any measurable sets A, B in \mathbb{R}^n . Hence, if A_1, \dots, A_n are subsets of \mathbb{R} , then*

$$\dim(A_1 \times A_2 \times \dots \times A_n) \leq n - 1 + \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} \dim(A_i).$$

See also Bishop, Peres [9] for refinements. The main purpose of this note is to find sets that naturally occur in Diophantine approximation, where the Hausdorff dimension of their Cartesian products exceeds the sum of the single dimensions, i.e. there is no identity in (1). An important tool to achieve this goal is the following rather elementary property of Hausdorff measures and dimensions, when applied in suitable contexts.

Proposition 1.2. *Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ be measurable and $\phi : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be Lipschitz. Then $\dim \phi(A) \leq \dim(A)$. More generally, for any $s \geq 0$ writing H_s for the s -dimensional Hausdorff measure we have $H_s(\phi(A)) \ll_s H_s(A)$.*

See [20, Proposition 2.2, Corollary 2.4] and also [24, Proposition 2.2] for a more general version. In the proposition and the sequel $A \ll B$ denotes $A \leq c(\cdot)B$, that is A does not exceed B by more than some constant that may depend on the subscript variables only, with an absolute constant if no subscript occurs. As customary we shall also use $A \asymp B$ as short notation for $A \ll B \ll A$.

2. PRODUCT SETS OF LIOUVILLE NUMBERS

Even though the deepest results of the paper appear in Section 3, we prefer to start our investigation with Cartesian products of Liouville numbers where the historical context and motivation can be presented more naturally.

2.1. Classes of Liouville numbers with large products. Recall that $\xi \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ is called Liouville number if the inequality

$$\left| \xi - \frac{p}{q} \right| \leq q^{-N}$$

has a solution in rational numbers p/q for arbitrarily large N . Let us denote the set of Liouville numbers by \mathcal{L} . This is an interesting set in many aspects. Its Hausdorff dimension equals 0 but on the other hand, it is co-meager, i.e. its complement $\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathcal{L}$ is of first category. See Chapter 2 of Oxtoby's book [35] for short proofs of both results. For improved measure theoretic results on \mathcal{L} when considering general Hausdorff f -measures, we refer to Olsen and Renfro [34] and Bugeaud, Dodson and Kristensen [12].

A well-known result of Erdős [19] that motivates the investigations in this paper claims that every real number can be written as the sum (he also showed it for the product) of two Liouville numbers. He gives two proofs in his paper. One is based on the mentioned fact that \mathcal{L} is co-meager. Indeed, then the set $\mathcal{L} \cap \mathcal{L}_\xi$ with $\mathcal{L}_\xi = \{\xi - x : x \in \mathcal{L}\}$ is co-meager as well for any $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$, thus non-empty. Now any pair $(y, \xi - y)$ with y in the intersection consists of Liouville numbers that by construction sum up to a given ξ . The argument can be widely extended, see Rieger [39], Schwarz [43], Burger [13], [14] and Senthil Kumar, Thangadurai, Waldschmidt [42]. The second proof effectively constructs Liouville numbers x, y with the property that $x + y = \xi$ for given $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$. We recall this proof as well. Say ξ has decimal expansion $\xi = 0.c_1c_2\dots$. Then he notices that if we define $b_j = j!$ and then let x be the number with the same base 10 digits of ξ for indices from b_{2j} to $b_{2j+1} - 1$, and 0 otherwise, and conversely y having the digits of ξ in the remaining intervals from b_{2j+1} to $b_{2j} - 1$ and 0 otherwise, then $x + y = \xi$ and x, y are both Liouville numbers. Indeed, the rational numbers obtained from cutting off the decimal expansion of x and y after positions of the form $b_{2j+1} - 1$ and $b_{2j} - 1$ respectively, will be very good rational approximations to x and y , respectively. (Unnoticed by Erdős, potentially x or y can be rational, but the method is flexible enough to overcome this problem by a short variation argument.)

Now observe the following consequence of Erdős' result above when combined with Proposition 1.2: Since the map

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} \times \mathcal{L} &\longmapsto \mathbb{R} \\ (x, y) &\longmapsto x + y \end{aligned}$$

is Lipschitz continuous and surjective, the product set $\mathcal{L} \times \mathcal{L}$ has Hausdorff dimension at least 1, even though \mathcal{L} has dimension 0. In fact

$$(2) \quad \dim(\mathcal{L} \times \mathcal{L}) = 1,$$

since the reverse bound follows from Theorem 1.1. An alternative argument is by embedding $\mathcal{L} \times \mathcal{L}$ in the set $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ of all pairs (ξ_1, ξ_2) for which the linear form

$$(3) \quad |a_0 + a_1\xi_1 + a_2\xi_2| \leq (\max |a_j|)^{-N}$$

has a solution in integers a_0, a_1, a_2 for arbitrarily large N , as results on metric Diophantine approximation [7] imply $\dim(\mathcal{K}) = 1$. While (2) is thus an easy implication of Erdős' result, the author has been unable to find this fact explicitly in the literature. In the sequel we write A^n for the n -fold Cartesian product $A \times A \cdots \times A$ of a set A . We use a similar idea to generalize (2) to n -fold products, and also calculate the packing dimensions.

Theorem 2.1. *For any integer $n \geq 1$, the set \mathcal{L}^n has Hausdorff dimension $n - 1$ and packing dimension n .*

The proof of the theorem is not difficult. Similar to Erdős we want to provide two different proofs. While the first shorter one is essentially a special case of [39] or [43], our latter constructive proof is needed for some of the extensions in comments below, and also prepares the reader for the more complicated constructions in the proofs of our results in Section 3.1.

Proof. We only need to show the identity for Hausdorff dimension, the claim on packing dimension then follows from Theorem 1.1 and $\dim(\mathcal{L}) = 0$ via

$$(4) \quad n = \dim(\mathcal{L}^{n+1}) \leq \dim(\mathcal{L}) + \dim_P(\mathcal{L}^n) = \dim_P(\mathcal{L}^n).$$

The reverse bound is trivial. Alternatively the packing dimension formula can be inferred from Theorem 2.6 and (9) below.

The upper bound $n - 1$ for the Hausdorff dimension follows similarly from Theorem 1.1 and $\dim(\mathcal{L}) = 0$. For the lower bound we give two proofs again, each showing in a different way that the Lipschitz map

$$\Psi : \mathcal{L}^n \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$$

$$(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}) \mapsto (x_0 + x_1, x_0 + x_2, \dots, x_0 + x_{n-1}),$$

is surjective. By Proposition 1.2 the claim follows. First again we see that for any real vector $\underline{\xi} = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{n-1})$ the intersection

$$\mathcal{F} := \bigcap_{i=1}^{n-1} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_i} \cap \mathcal{L}, \quad \text{where } \mathcal{L}_{\xi} := \xi - \mathcal{L} = \{\xi - \ell : \ell \in \mathcal{L}\},$$

is co-meager since every single set has this property, in particular \mathcal{F} is non-empty. Now it is again easy to check that any element in \mathcal{F} induces $\underline{\ell} \in \mathcal{L}^n$ with $\Psi(\underline{\ell}) = \underline{t}$. We enclose a second, constructive proof. Let ξ_1, \dots, ξ_{n-1} be arbitrary with decimal

expansions $\xi_i = 0.c_1^{(i)}c_2^{(i)} \dots$. We use a similar argument to Erdős. Let $b_j = j!$ for $j \geq 1$ and partition \mathbb{N} into intervals the form $I_j = \{b_j, b_j + 1, \dots, b_{j+1} - 1\}$. Now we define x_0 as follows. For every $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n - 1\}$, if $j \equiv i \pmod n$ then take the decimal digits in places $u \in I_j$ of x_0 to be those $c_u^{(i)}$ of ξ_i in this interval. For $j \equiv 0 \pmod n$ we define the decimal digits in places $u \in I_j$ as 0. Then x_0 is well-defined and we claim it is a Liouville number, and $x_i := \xi_i - x_0$ are Liouville numbers as well for $1 \leq i \leq n - 1$. Since ξ_1, \dots, ξ_{n-1} were arbitrary, we see that the map is indeed surjective. However, the claim follows easily by considering rational approximations p_j/q_j derived from cutting off the decimal number x_i after a suitable number of digits. For x_i one has to cut off after the last digit in the respective intervals I_{j-1} with $j \equiv i \pmod n$. Since by construction the number $x_i = \xi_i - x_0$ is of the form $p_j/q_j + v$ with v the difference of two numbers whose first non-zero decimal digit is not before first position in I_{j+1} , (mostly x_i will have a zero in its decimal expansion for every index $u \in I_j$ with $j \equiv i \pmod n$ but some carryover from subtraction may occur), one again readily verifies $q_j = 10^{b_j}$ and $|x_i - p_j/q_j| \leq 10^{-(b_{j+1} - b_j) + 1}$. As b_{j+1}/b_j tends to infinity as $j \rightarrow \infty$ thus the rational approximations p_j/q_j are sufficiently good to infer $x_i \in \mathcal{L}$ for $0 \leq i \leq n - 1$ (again, we can easily exclude any $x_i \in \mathbb{Q}$ by a minor variation in our choice of the base and/or the b_j). \square

As noticed above, the main step, the surjectivity of Ψ , can be considered a special case of Rieger [39] or Schwarz [43]. Both show that for any continuous, open maps f_1, \dots, f_r on $(0, 1)$ there is $\xi \in \mathcal{L}$ with all $f_j(\xi)$ again in \mathcal{L} (according to [43] we may even take countably many f_j). Taking $f_j(x) = \xi_j - x$ for $1 \leq j \leq n - 1$ gives the claim. The proof in [43] uses the same method as our first proof anyway. We enclose several observations on Theorem 2.1 and its two proofs.

- The proof shows that \mathcal{L}^n has $(n - 1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure $+\infty$.
- Upon small modifications the argument extends to the cardinality $\kappa_0 = |\mathbb{N}|$ to show the surjectivity of map

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^{\kappa_0} &\longmapsto \mathbb{R}^{\kappa_0} \\ (x_0, x_1, \dots) &\longmapsto (x_0 + x_1, x_0 + x_2, \dots). \end{aligned}$$

- Minor refinements of either proof variant shows that we may restrict to Cartesian products of certain smaller sets. Firstly, altering the constructive proof we can restrict to the subclass of Liouville numbers with well approximating rationals p/q where q is an integral power of 10 (or any other base $b \geq 2$) and still Theorem 2.1 holds. Compare with the sets $\mathcal{V}_{\lambda; \mu, b}$ defined in Section 3.1 below. Moreover, generalizing an observation by Burger [14, Theorem 1], for any increasing unbounded function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, if we consider the set

$\mathcal{L}_f \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ of numbers for which

$$(5) \quad \left| \xi - \frac{p}{q} \right| < q^{-f(q)}$$

has infinitely many solutions rational p/q , then $\dim(\mathcal{L}_f^n) = n - 1$ still remains valid, as can be inferred from both proof variants. Similarly, ultra-Liouville numbers defined by Marques and Moreira [31] where (5) with $f(q)$ replaced by any k -fold composition of the exponential map has infinitely many solutions (simultaneously for all k) satisfy Theorem 2.1. On the other hand, in Section 2.2 below we identify other classes of Liouville numbers that no longer obey Theorem 2.1.

- For any $m \geq 1$, a very similar idea applies to the set \mathcal{L}_m of m -dimensional Liouville vectors defined similarly, see Section 2.2 below for a precise definition. The same digit construction as in the proof of Theorem 2.1 simultaneously applied to all components ξ_1, \dots, ξ_m of $\underline{\xi}$ (i.e. with the same interval choices simultaneously) readily yields that the map

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_m^n &\longmapsto (\mathbb{R}^m)^{n-1} \\ (\underline{x}_0, \underline{x}_1, \dots, \underline{x}_{n-1}) &\longmapsto (\underline{x}_0 + \underline{x}_1, \underline{x}_0 + \underline{x}_2, \dots, \underline{x}_0 + \underline{x}_{n-1}), \end{aligned}$$

is surjective and therefore $\dim(\mathcal{L}_m^n) \geq m(n - 1)$. Again Theorem 1.1 gives the reverse estimate using that $\dim(\mathcal{L}_m) = 0$, a result by Jarník [25].

- Let us restrict to classical missing digit Cantor sets $C_{b,W}$ consisting of all elements that can be expressed as

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i b^{-i}, \quad a_i \in W,$$

where $b \geq 3$ and $W \subseteq \{0, 1, \dots, b - 1\}$. Then for $n = 2$ we still accordingly have

$$(6) \quad \dim((\mathcal{L} \cap C_{b,W}) \times (\mathcal{L} \cap C_{b,W})) = \dim(C_{b,W}) = \frac{\log |W|}{\log b},$$

and $\dim_P((\mathcal{L} \cap C_{b,W}) \times (\mathcal{L} \cap C_{b,W})) = 2 \log |W| / \log b$. First we may assume $0 \in W$. Otherwise we shift by subtracting the rational number $w/(b-1)$ with $w = \min W$ in every component to land in a $C_{b,W}$ with $0 \in W$. This shift preserves Hausdorff dimensions by Proposition 1.2 and the Liouville number property as well. For the lower bound in (6), we notice that when $0 \in W$ the constructive proof argument can still be applied to show that the image of the sum map $\Psi : (x, y) \rightarrow x + y$ restricted to $(C_{b,W} \cap \mathcal{L})^2$ will contain $C_{b,W}$. We conclude by the well-known equality in (1) for products of Cantor sets, and $\dim(C_{b,W}) = \log |W| / \log b$. For the reverse estimate we notice that

$\dim_P(C_{b,W}) = \log |W| / \log b$ as well, this holds for any fractal set arising from an iterated function system, see [20]. See also Jia, Zhou, Zhu, Luo [27] who exactly determined the packing measure of $C_{3,\{0,2\}}$. Hence the claim follows from Theorem 1.1. Unfortunately, the argument seems to fail for more factors to verify the below conjecture.

Conjecture 2.2. For every $n \geq 3$ we have

$$\dim((\mathcal{L} \cap C_{b,W})^n) = (n - 1) \dim(C_{b,W}) = \frac{(n - 1) \log |W|}{\log b}.$$

To close this section, we discuss product dimensions of sets that are closely related to \mathcal{L} from viewpoint of Diophantine approximation. We recall that according to Mahler’s classification of real numbers, we call $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ a U_m -number if

$$0 < |a_0 + a_1\xi + a_2\xi^2 + \cdots + a_m\xi^m| \leq (\max |a_j|)^{-N},$$

has a solution in integers a_i for arbitrarily large N , and m is the smallest index with this property. The careful reader may notice the connection to (3), however here we restrict to vectors on the Veronese curve. By abuse of notation write U_m for the set of U_m -numbers. Liouville numbers are precisely the U_1 -numbers, so Theorem 2.1 claims $\dim(U_1^n) = n - 1$. Improving on a result of Alniaçik [1], Pollington [38] showed that every real number can be written as the sum of two U_m -numbers. Thus from Proposition 1.2 we see $\dim(U_m \times U_m) \geq 1$. Since $\dim(U_m) = 0$ for any $m \geq 1$ by Baker and Schmidt [5] and Bernik [6], from Theorem 1.1 we again infer equality and $\dim_P(U_m \times U_m) = 2$. We ask for a simultaneous generalization of these findings.

Conjecture 2.3. For every pair of integers $m \geq 1$ and $n \geq 1$ we have

$$\dim(U_m^n) = n - 1, \quad \dim_P(U_m^n) = n.$$

The upper bound follows from Theorem 1.1 and $\dim(U_m) = 0$, the lower bound is the open part. Finally we pose the related problem to determine $\dim(T^n), \dim_P(T^n)$ with T the set of T -numbers in Mahler’s classification. We omit their definition and only recall that $\dim(T) = 0$ is again consequence of [5],[6].

2.2. Products of strong and semi-strong Liouville numbers. In this section we show that our results from Section 2.1 fail vastly when we restrict to classes of Liouville numbers whose good rational approximations occur at large rate. In order to define our classes we briefly recall basic notions and properties of continued fractions. Every irrational real number number can be uniquely written as a continued fraction

$$\xi = a_0 + \frac{1}{a_1 + \frac{1}{a_2 + \cdots}}.$$

A short notation is $\xi = [a_0; a_1, a_2, \dots]$, where the a_i can be obtained via an iterative process. The rational number p_k/q_k obtained by terminating the expansion after the finite prefix $[a_0; a_1, \dots, a_k]$, is called convergent. The importance of continued fractions for Diophantine approximation comes from the fact that the convergents essentially induce the good rational approximations to ξ . The next proposition recalls a relation between the growth of the convergent denominators and approximation quality. For convenience of the reader we enclose a proof in Section 6.

Proposition 2.4. *Let ξ be an irrational real number and denote by p_k/q_k the convergents to ξ . Then if we write*

$$\left| \xi - \frac{p_k}{q_k} \right| = q_k^{-\tau_k},$$

then $\tau_k \geq 2$ for any $k \geq 1$ and we have

$$q_{k+1} \asymp q_k^{\tau_k - 1}.$$

In other words

$$q_{k+1} \asymp |q_k \xi - p_k|^{-1}.$$

Strong Liouville numbers were introduced by LeVeque [29]. They can be defined as irrational real numbers with the property that $\log q_{k+1}/\log q_k$ tends to infinity with k . This essentially says that *every* convergent to ξ induces a very good rational approximation to ξ , according to Proposition 2.4. A larger class of semi-strong Liouville (more general U_m) numbers considered by Alniaçik [2] consists of numbers ξ for which one can find a subsequence $(v_i)_{i \geq 0}$ of $\{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ with the properties

$$(7) \quad \left| \xi - \frac{p_{v_i}}{q_{v_i}} \right| = q_{v_i}^{-\omega(v_i)}, \quad \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \omega(v_i) = \infty,$$

$$(8) \quad \limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log q_{v_{i+1}}}{\log q_{v_i}} < \infty.$$

If $v_i = i$ we obtain a strong Liouville number. Essentially, the weakened conditions allow convergents of mediocre approximation quality as long as very good approximations to ξ still occur at high frequency. Denote the sets of strong and semi-strong Liouville numbers by $\mathcal{L}_{(s)}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{(ss)}$, respectively. Petruska [37] showed that arbitrary sums and products of strong Liouville numbers are Liouville numbers or rational. In particular, they no longer form co-meager sets (as otherwise by Erdős' unconstructive argument every real number could be written as sum of two strong Liouville numbers). Hence, the map Ψ from the proof of Theorem 2.1 is no longer surjective when restricted to \mathcal{L}_s^n . This property extends to semi-strong Liouville numbers, as implied by the more general recent results by Chaves, Marques, Trojovský [15]. See also [2] for a related result. We show

Theorem 2.5. *The sets $\mathcal{L}_{(s)}^n$ and $\mathcal{L}_{(ss)}^n$ have Hausdorff dimension 0 for all $n \geq 1$.*

The claim follows directly from the much more general Theorem 3.12 in Section 3.2. Concretely, if we denote by \mathcal{L}_n the similarly defined n -dimensional Liouville vectors (see Definition 3.11 below), the case $C = \infty$ of (27) shows $\mathcal{L}_{(s)}^n \subseteq \mathcal{L}_n$, in fact $\mathcal{L}_{(ss)}^n \subseteq \mathcal{L}_n$ holds by a variant of the argument (see end of Section 6). Together with the obvious fact $\mathcal{L}_n \subseteq \mathcal{L}^n$ (see also (23) below) we obtain the following chain of inclusions.

Theorem 2.6. *Let $n \geq 1$ be an integer. We have $\mathcal{L}_{(s)}^n \subseteq \mathcal{L}_{(ss)}^n \subseteq \mathcal{L}_n \subseteq \mathcal{L}^n$.*

We turn towards packing dimensions. A recent result by Marnat [30, Theorem 1.4] implies

$$(9) \quad \dim_P(\mathcal{L}_n) = n.$$

His proof of the more general claim (25) below is based on the deep variational principle established by Das, Fishman, Simmons, Urbański [16], we discuss a special case of it in Section 5.1. However, (9) and Theorem 2.6 are insufficient to confirm the following conjecture.

Conjecture 2.7. We have $\dim_P(\mathcal{L}_{(s)}^n) = n/2$ and $\dim(\mathcal{L}_{(ss)}^n) = n$.

We establish partial results that illustrate differences between $\mathcal{L}_{(s)}^n$ and $\mathcal{L}_{(ss)}^n$.

Theorem 2.8. *Let $n \geq 1$ be an integer. We have*

$$(10) \quad \dim_P(\mathcal{L}_{(s)}^n) \leq \frac{n}{2}, \quad \dim_P(\mathcal{L}_{(ss)}^n) = 1.$$

Section 5 is reserved for the proof of Theorem 2.8. We combine an analysis of the combined Roy-graph $(L_1(q), L_2(q))$ as in [40] associated to $\xi \in \mathcal{L}_{(s)}$ resp. $\xi \in \mathcal{L}_{(ss)}$ with the variational principle [16] mentioned above. For $n \geq 2$ it seems that the variational principle in its general form can still provide insights, however we do not deepen these thoughts here. Notice that an analogue of (1) for packing dimension that would imply $\dim_P(\mathcal{L}_{(ss)}^n) = n$ by (10) fails in general. In fact

$$(11) \quad \dim_P(A) + \dim_P(B) \geq \dim_P(A \times B) \geq \dim(A) + \dim_P(B)$$

with left inequality due to Howroyd [23], and the right by Tricot [45] is not sufficient for the desired implication. The right estimate may be compared with Theorem 1.1. A strengthened version of it obtained via replacing $\dim(A)$ by the so-called lower packing dimension of A (even a modified dimension variant that is never less) is due to Zindulka [49], thereby extending the special case of compact sets A, B already obtained by Bishop, Peres [9, Proposition 1.2] and independently by Xiao [48]. Hence,

by an inductive argument, for $\dim_P(\mathcal{L}_{(ss)}^n) = n$ it would suffice to show that the lower packing dimension of $\mathcal{L}_{(ss)}$ equals 1, however a stronger claim than in (10). We end this section with a natural generalized problem.

Problem 1. Determine the Hausdorff and packing dimensions of n -fold products of the sets of (semi-)strong U_m -numbers defined by Alniaçik [2], for arbitrary $m \geq 1$.

3. PRODUCTS OF VERY WELL APPROXIMABLE NUMBERS

3.1. Products of numbers with prescribed irrationality exponent. In this section we are concerned with direct products of sets of numbers which are approximable up to a given order by rational numbers. For ξ a real number we consider its irrationality exponent $\mu(\xi)$ defined as the supremum of numbers μ for which the inequality

$$(12) \quad \left| \xi - \frac{p}{q} \right| \leq q^{-\mu}$$

has infinitely many solutions in rational numbers p/q . Then $\mu(\xi) \geq 2$ for all irrational real ξ by continued fractions (or Dirichlet's Theorem) whereas $\mu(\xi) = 1$ for $\xi \in \mathbb{Q}$. Liouville numbers are precisely those ξ with $\mu(\xi) = \infty$. Further define $\theta_b(\xi)$ like $\mu(\xi)$ above but where we restrict the approximating rationals p/q in (12) to $q = b^N$ integral powers of $b \geq 2$ some fixed integer base. This corresponds to $v_b(\xi) + 1$ with exponent v_b as in [3]. Then $\theta_b(\xi) \geq 1$ for any $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ and $b \geq 2$, with equality if $\xi \in \mathbb{Q}$ independent of its form. We define level sets for both exponents.

Definition 3.1. Let

$$\mathcal{W}_{\lambda;\mu} = \{ \xi \in \mathbb{R} : \lambda \leq \mu(\xi) \leq \mu \}, \quad 2 \leq \lambda \leq \mu \leq \infty,$$

and derive the sets

$$\mathcal{W}_\lambda = \mathcal{W}_{\lambda;\lambda} = \{ \xi \in \mathbb{R} : \mu(\xi) = \lambda \}, \quad \lambda \in [2, \infty].$$

Further for $1 \leq \lambda \leq \mu \leq \infty$ define sets $\mathcal{V}_{\lambda;\mu,(b)}$ and $\mathcal{V}_{\lambda,(b)}$ accordingly with respect to the exponent $\theta_b(\xi)$ in place of $\mu(\xi)$.

We observe that any number in a set $\mathcal{V}_{\lambda;\mu,b}$ with $\lambda > 1$ will have infinitely many long consecutive 0 and/or $(b-1)$ digit strings in its base b expansion. Clearly the sets $\mathcal{W}_{\lambda;\mu}$ and $\mathcal{V}_{\lambda;\mu,(b)}$ become larger as λ decreases and as μ increases. Moreover

$$\mathcal{V}_{\lambda;\mu,(b)} \subseteq \mathcal{W}_{\lambda;\infty}, \quad \mu \geq \lambda,$$

however this property fails when the right hand side is replaced by \mathcal{W}_λ . We identify \mathcal{W}_∞ as the set of Liouville numbers treated in Section 2.1. The union of the sets \mathcal{W}_λ over $\lambda > 2$, that is all numbers with $\mu(\xi) > 2$, is commonly referred to as the set of

very-well approximable numbers. While we are mainly concerned with products of the sets $\mathcal{W}_{\lambda;\mu}$, our first result on sets \mathcal{V}_{\cdot} is more complete.

Theorem 3.2. *For any prime number $b \geq 2$ and $\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_{n-1}$ in $[1, \infty]$, we have*

$$(13) \quad n - 1 + \frac{1}{\max_{0 \leq i \leq n-1} \lambda_i} \geq \dim\left(\prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathcal{V}_{\lambda_i, (b)}\right) \geq \max\left\{n - 1, \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \lambda_i^{-1}\right\}.$$

In particular if all λ_i are large enough compared to n we have

$$(14) \quad \dim\left(\prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathcal{V}_{\lambda_i, (b)}\right) > \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \dim(\mathcal{V}_{\lambda_i, (b)}),$$

and for every $n \geq 1$ we have

$$(15) \quad \lim_{\max \lambda_i \rightarrow \infty} \dim\left(\prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathcal{V}_{\lambda_i, (b)}\right) = n - 1, \quad \lim_{\max \lambda_i \rightarrow \infty} \dim_P\left(\prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathcal{V}_{\lambda_i, (b)}\right) = n,$$

where the limit is taken over any point $(\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_{n-1})$ whose maximum tends to infinity.

The restriction to prime bases b is just for ease of the proof, we strongly expect the same result for arbitrary $b \geq 2$. The crucial point is the lower bound $n - 1$ in (13). The Hausdorff dimension formula

$$(16) \quad \dim(\mathcal{V}_{\lambda;\mu, (b)}) = \frac{1}{\lambda}, \quad \mu \geq \lambda \geq 1,$$

by Borosh and Fraenkel [10], see also Amou and Bugeaud [3], when combined with (1) and Theorem 1.1, indeed implies all other claims of (13). From (13), (16) we further derive (14) and (15), where the packing formula also employs Theorem 1.1. We formulate an according conjecture for the sets with unrestricted rationals that will be supported below.

Conjecture 3.3. *For any $\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_{n-1}$ all in $[2, \infty]$, we have*

$$(17) \quad n - 1 + \frac{2}{\max_{0 \leq i \leq n-1} \lambda_i} \geq \dim\left(\prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathcal{W}_{\lambda_i}\right) \geq \max\left\{n - 1, 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^{-1}\right\}.$$

In particular if all λ_i are large enough compared to n we have

$$\dim\left(\prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathcal{W}_{\lambda_i}\right) > \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \dim(\mathcal{W}_{\lambda_i}),$$

and for every $n \geq 1$, with the limit understood as in Theorem 3.2, we have

$$\lim_{\max \lambda_i \rightarrow \infty} \dim \left(\prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathscr{W}_{\lambda_i} \right) = n - 1.$$

Unfortunately, as remarked above there is no inclusion between sets \mathscr{W}_λ and $\mathscr{V}_{\lambda,(b)}$ that would imply the claims via Theorem 3.2. The validity of the lower bound $n - 1$ in (17) is again the key problem. Similar to the remarks below Theorem 3.2, the remaining claims would again follow via the special case $n = 1$ of Jarník's formula [25]

$$(18) \quad \dim(\mathscr{W}_{\lambda;\mu}) = \frac{2}{\lambda}, \quad 2 \leq \lambda \leq \mu \leq \infty.$$

This may be compared with (16). In particular the sets of numbers approximable to order either at least λ or equal to λ both have this dimension $\frac{2}{\lambda}$. Since for $\mu < \infty$ the sets $\mathscr{W}_{\lambda;\mu}$ in question are of first category as they lie in the complement of the Liouville numbers $\mathscr{L} = \mathscr{W}_\infty$, we cannot apply topological arguments similar to the unconstructive proof of $\mathscr{L} + \mathscr{L} = \mathbb{R}$ by Erdős [19] recalled in Section 2.1. Indeed all proofs of partial results below will have constructive character, and rely on similar ideas as Erdős' other digit based proof also explained in Section 2.1.

Our first result supporting Conjecture 3.3 is that similar to Liouville numbers, certain product sets of $\mathscr{W}_{\lambda_i;\mu_i}$ have indeed Hausdorff dimension at least $n - 1$. This is the main substance of Theorem 3.4, where we also add other bounds for completeness.

Theorem 3.4. *Let $\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_{n-1}$ all in $[2, \infty]$ and any μ_0, \dots, μ_{n-1} with*

$$\mu_i > \frac{\Lambda}{\lambda_i - 1} + 1, \quad 0 \leq i \leq n - 1,$$

where $\Lambda = \lambda_0 \lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_{n-1}$. Then we have

$$(19) \quad n - 1 + \frac{2}{\max_{0 \leq i \leq n-1} \lambda_i} \geq \dim \left(\prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathscr{W}_{\lambda_i;\mu_i} \right) \geq \max \left\{ n - 1, 2 \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \lambda_i^{-1} \right\}.$$

We emphasize the substance of the claim is that μ_i can be effectively bounded, if all $\mu_i = \infty$ the claim follows from Theorem 2.1. Theorem 3.4, as well as Theorem 3.7 below, contradicts the conjectured equality in [41, Conjecture 2.5] of the author, therefore the implication in [41, Corollary 2.6] is very open. We point out the conclusion that for products of generic sets $\mathscr{W}_{\lambda;\mu}$ there is no equality in (1), where for simplicity in the next corollary we restrict to all λ_i being equal.

Corollary 3.5. *For $n \geq 2$ an integer and real numbers λ, μ satisfying $\lambda > 2n/(n-1)$ and $\mu > (\lambda^{n-1} + \lambda - 1)/(\lambda - 1)$, we have*

$$\dim(\mathscr{W}_{\lambda;\mu}^n) > n \dim(\mathscr{W}_{\lambda;\mu}).$$

Another corollary to Theorem 3.4 that contains Theorem 2.1 as a special case, with limits understood as in Theorem 3.2 again, reads as follows.

Corollary 3.6. *Let n, λ_i, μ_i be as in Theorem 3.4. Then*

$$\lim_{\max \lambda_i \rightarrow \infty} \dim(\mathscr{W}_{\lambda_i; \mu_i}^n) = n - 1, \quad \lim_{\max \lambda_i \rightarrow \infty} \dim_P(\mathscr{W}_{\lambda_i; \mu_i}^n) = n.$$

The packing dimension formula hereby uses Theorem 1.1 again, similar to (4). In our second result towards Conjecture 3.3 we consider sets of precise order of approximation, for the cost of restricting to $n = 2$.

Theorem 3.7. *Let λ_0, λ_1 be real numbers satisfying*

$$(20) \quad \min\{\lambda_0, \lambda_1\} > \frac{5 + \sqrt{17}}{2}.$$

Then we have

$$1 + \frac{2}{\max\{\lambda_0, \lambda_1\}} \geq \dim(\mathscr{W}_{\lambda_0} \times \mathscr{W}_{\lambda_1}) \geq \max\{1, \frac{2}{\lambda_0} + \frac{2}{\lambda_1}\}.$$

In particular, for every $\lambda \in ((5 + \sqrt{17})/2, \infty]$ we have $\dim(\mathscr{W}_\lambda \times \mathscr{W}_\lambda) \geq 1 > 2 \dim(\mathscr{W}_\lambda)$.

In the proof we will explicitly construct pairs of real numbers of irrationality exponents λ_0, λ_1 respectively that sum up to any given ξ outside a Lebesgue measure 0 set, by manipulating its base b expansion for any prime b . For $n = 2$ and $\lambda_0 = \lambda_1 = \lambda$, the interval for λ where Conjecture 3.3 remains open is $(4, 4.5615 \dots]$. Unfortunately the underlying method fails when $n \geq 3$. We see that for large λ_i , the lower bound 1 in Theorem 3.7 cannot be improved by much.

Corollary 3.8. *With minimum definition analogous to Theorem 3.2, we have*

$$\lim_{\min\{\lambda_0, \lambda_1\} \rightarrow \infty} \dim(\mathscr{W}_{\lambda_0} \times \mathscr{W}_{\lambda_1}) = 1, \quad \lim_{\min\{\lambda_0, \lambda_1\} \rightarrow \infty} \dim_P(\mathscr{W}_{\lambda_0} \times \mathscr{W}_{\lambda_1}) = 2.$$

Similar to the fourth remark to Theorem 2.1, our Theorems 3.2, 3.4, 3.7 can be accordingly extended to product sets of simultaneously very-well approximable vectors in \mathbb{R}^m . In fact we even obtain stronger bounds for the accordingly defined parameters λ_i when $m > 1$, however the natural parameter range $[1 + \frac{1}{m}, \infty]$ is larger as well. We elaborate on it in Remark 3 below. Moreover, Theorem 3.7 extends to classical Cantor sets $C_{b,W}$, analogously to (6). The outline of the proofs is the same as in Section 7 below. The latter result takes into account that almost all numbers in $C_{b,W}$ with respect to its natural Cantor measure (restricted Hausdorff-measure of dimension $\log |W| / \log b$) satisfy $\mu(\xi) = 2$ by Weiss [47] and $\theta_b(\xi) = 1$ by Levesley, Salp, Velani [28, Corollary 1]. Representatively we only highlight one particular claim.

Theorem 3.9. *Let λ_0, λ_1 satisfy (20). Let $K = C_{b,W}$ for $b \geq 3$ prime. Then*

$$\dim((\mathcal{W}_{\lambda_0} \cap K) \times (\mathcal{W}_{\lambda_1} \cap K)) \geq \dim(K) = \frac{\log |W|}{\log b}.$$

3.2. Products of numbers with fast growing partial quotients. We define the following parametrized class of numbers.

Definition 3.10. For $1 < C \leq D \leq \infty$ parameters, let

$$\mathcal{M}_{C,D} := \{\xi \in \mathbb{R} : C \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} q_{k+1}/q_k \leq \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} q_{k+1}/q_k \leq D\},$$

where p_k/q_k denotes the sequence of convergents to ξ . Let $\mathcal{M}_C := \mathcal{M}_{C,\infty}$.

Obviously \mathcal{M}_∞ equals the set of strong Liouville numbers from Section 2.2. Our goal is to estimate the Hausdorff dimension of Cartesian product sets $\mathcal{M}_{C,D}^n$, with emphasis on \mathcal{M}_C^n . Recent results of Tan and Zhou [44, Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2] imply

$$(21) \quad \dim(\mathcal{M}_{C,D}) = \dim(\mathcal{M}_C) = \frac{1}{C+1}, \quad 1 < C \leq D \leq \infty.$$

For $n > 1$ we obtain information by comparing \mathcal{M}_C^n with classical level sets of Diophantine approximation where we change notation of Definition 3.11 when $n = 1$.

Definition 3.11. For $\underline{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, define an irrationality measure $\mu_n(\underline{\xi})$ as the supremum of real μ for which the estimate

$$(22) \quad \|\underline{\xi} - \underline{p}/q\| \leq q^{-\mu}$$

has infinitely many solutions in rational vectors \underline{p}/q , where $\|\cdot\|$ is any norm on \mathbb{R}^n . Derive the level sets

$$W_n(\mu) = \{\underline{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \mu_n(\underline{\xi}) \geq \mu\}, \quad W_n^*(\mu) = \{\underline{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \mu_n(\underline{\xi}) = \mu\}.$$

Denote by $\mathcal{L}_n = W_n(\infty)$ the set of Liouville vectors in \mathbb{R}^n .

The exponents μ_n extend $\mu = \mu_1$ from Definition 3.1 and the sets $W_1(\mu)$ and $W_1^*(\mu)$ coincide with its $\mathcal{W}_{\mu;\infty}$ and \mathcal{W}_μ , respectively. The sets $W_n(\mu)$ are nested. By Dirichlet's Theorem $W_n(1 + \frac{1}{n}) = \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \mathbb{Q}^n$, whereas $W_n^*(1) = \mathbb{Q}^n$ is easily observed. Obviously

$$(23) \quad W_n(\mu) \subseteq W_1(\mu)^n, \quad \mu \in [1, \infty].$$

Jarník [25] determined the Hausdorff dimensions

$$(24) \quad \dim(W_n(\mu)) = \dim(W_n^*(\mu)) = \frac{n+1}{\mu}, \quad \mu \in [1 + \frac{1}{n}, \infty].$$

In particular $\dim(\mathcal{L}_n) = 0$ for every $n \geq 1$, consistent with $\dim(\mathcal{L}) = 0$ noticed already in Section 2.1. For sake of completeness we complement (24) by

$$(25) \quad \dim_P(W_n(\mu)) = \dim_P(W_n^*(\mu)) = n, \quad \mu \in [1 + \frac{1}{n}, \infty],$$

obtained by Marnat [30]. The main result of this section reads as follows

Theorem 3.12. *Let $1 < C \leq D \leq \infty$. Then we have*

$$(26) \quad \mathcal{M}_{C,D}^n \subseteq W_n(\tau), \quad \frac{n}{C+1} \leq \dim(\mathcal{M}_{C,D}^n) \leq \frac{n+1}{\tau},$$

where $\tau = \frac{\sqrt[n]{C}}{n} + \frac{1}{D}$. In particular

$$(27) \quad \mathcal{M}_C^n \subseteq W_n(\mu), \quad \frac{n}{C+1} \leq \dim(\mathcal{M}_C^n) \leq \frac{n^2+n}{\sqrt[n]{C}}$$

where $\mu = \frac{\sqrt[n]{C}}{n}$. For $n = 1$ we have the stronger results

$$(28) \quad \mathcal{M}_C \subseteq W_1(C+1), \quad \dim(\mathcal{M}_C) = \frac{1}{C+1}.$$

The choice of equal parameters C, D in all factor sets is just for simplicity, similar results can be obtained for products of \mathcal{M}_{C_i, D_i} . Formula (28) is just stated for sake of completeness, the inclusion is a consequence of Proposition 2.4 and the dimension formula just recalls (21). The lower dimension bounds in (26) and (27) come from (21) and (1). The proof of the inclusion in (26) that clearly implies the one in (27) via $D = \infty$ and the upper dimension bounds by (24) is more involved and will be presented in Section 6. The case $C = \infty$ obviously yields the assertion on $\mathcal{L}_{(s)}^n$ in Theorem 2.5 as a corollary, and it can be readily extended to $\mathcal{L}_{(ss)}^n$, we elaborate on it at the end of Section 6. Our (27) shows the stronger property

Corollary 3.13. *Let $n \geq 1$ an integer. For $C \in (1, \infty)$ we have $\dim(\mathcal{M}_C^n) > 0$, but*

$$\lim_{C \rightarrow \infty} \dim(\mathcal{M}_C^n) = 0.$$

4. NOTES ON PRODUCTS OF BADLY APPROXIMABLE NUMBERS

In Sections 2, 3 we treated numbers that are untypically well approximable by rational numbers. On the other end of the spectrum of Diophantine approximation are badly approximable numbers, defined as numbers in the set

$$BAD_1 = \{\xi \in \mathbb{R} : \liminf_{q \rightarrow \infty} q \|q\xi\| > 0\},$$

where $\|x\|$ denotes the distance of a number to the closest integer. If ξ is badly approximable then in particular $\mu(\xi) = 2$. Since the entire set BAD_1 has full Hausdorff dimension 1 by Jarník [26], it is clear from (1) that their n -fold dimension is full as well for every $n \geq 2$. However, one can look closer at level sets of BAD_1 . It is well-known that badly approximable numbers are those for which the partial quotients in the continued fraction expansion are bounded. For $m \geq 2$ an integer, denote by $F(m)$ the set of irrational real numbers with partial quotients $a_i \leq m$, $i \geq 1$, so that BAD_1 is the union over all $F(m)$. We discuss dimensions of product sets of $F(m)$. When we restrict to numbers in $F(4)$ that is numbers with partial quotients among $\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, then according to M. Hall [22] the sumset $F(4) + F(4)$ equals \mathbb{R} . Moreover the difference set $F(3) - F(3)$ equals \mathbb{R} as well according to Astels [4] (which is however false for $F(3) + F(3)$, see Diviš [17]). Thus the Lipschitz map

$$\begin{aligned} F(3)^2 &\longmapsto \mathbb{R} \\ (x, y) &\longmapsto x - y \end{aligned}$$

is surjective and by Proposition 1.2 we infer

$$\dim(F(3)^2) = \dim(F(3) \times F(3)) \geq 1.$$

Clearly the same estimate holds for $F(m)^2$ with any $m \geq 3$. However, the stronger result

$$\dim(F(2)^2) \geq 1.0612$$

can be derived from (1) and Good [21] who showed that the Hausdorff dimension of $F(2)$ is not less than 0.5306 (he also obtained the upper bound 0.5320), thereby reasonably improving on Jarník [26]. See also the more recent paper by Wang, Wu [46] which also provides related problems in a historical context and a wealth of references.

The next logical question to ask is when taking general n -fold products, whether $F(m)$ behave rather like very-well approximable sets or there is equality in (1).

Problem 2. Do we have $\dim(F(2)^3) \geq 2$? Do we generally have $\dim(F(2)^n) \geq n-1$? What about the analogous problem for products of $F(m)$ for larger m ?

The answer is positive if we can construct a surjective Lipschitz map from $F(m)^n$ to a set of full $(n-1)$ -dimensional Lebesgue measure, in particular if

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi : F(m)^n &\longmapsto \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \\ (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}) &\longmapsto (x_0 + x_1, \dots, x_0 + x_{n-1}) \end{aligned}$$

is surjective. For $n = 2$ and $m \in \{2, 3\}$ the latter claim fails, however for $F(3)^2$ the difference map surjects on \mathbb{R} as seen above. For $n \geq 3$ the surjectivity is even unclear if we extend Ψ to the entire domain BAD_1^n .

As in Sections 2, 3.1 we want to discuss the analogous problem of simultaneously badly approximable vectors in higher dimension. Write $B_{m;c}$ for vectors $(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ with $\liminf_{q \rightarrow \infty} \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} q^{1/m} \|q\xi_i\| \geq c$, for given $c > 0$. The union BAD_m of $B_{m;c}$ over $c > 0$ is called badly approximable vectors of \mathbb{R}^m . For large c the set $B_{m;c}$ is empty whereas as $c \rightarrow 0$ the dimension tends to m again. There is no known relation to the continued fraction expansions of ξ_i when $m \geq 2$, in particular $\underline{\xi} \in BAD_m$ does not imply its components lie in BAD_1 , or vice versa.

Problem 3. For which c is the dimensions of product sets $B_{m;c}^n$ at least $n - 1$? For which c is there a surjective Lipschitz map from $B_{m;c}^n$ to \mathbb{R}^{n-1} ?

We do not have any results addressing the problems formulated in this section.

5. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.8

5.1. Parametric geometry of numbers and variational principle. Let ξ be a real number. Following Roy [40], we associate to ξ functions that describe its rational approximation properties. Let $\underline{u} = (u_0, u_1) = (1, \xi)/\sqrt{1 + \xi^2}$ be the unit vector in direction $(1, \xi)$ and consider the parametric family of convex bodies

$$C_\xi(Q) = \{(x_0, x_1) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x_0^2 + x_1^2 \leq 1, |x_0 u_0 + x_1 u_1| \leq Q^{-1}\}.$$

For $i = 1, 2$, let $\lambda_i(C_\xi(Q))$ be the successive minima of $C_\xi(Q)$ with respect to \mathbb{Z}^2 , that is the smallest number λ_i such that $\lambda_i \cdot C_\xi(Q)$ contains i linearly independent integer points. Derive

$$L_\xi(q) = (L_{\xi,1}(q), L_{\xi,2}(q)), \quad L_{\xi,i}(q) = \log \lambda_i(C_\xi(e^q)), \quad i = 1, 2.$$

These functions start at $L_{\xi,1}(0) = L_{\xi,2}(0) = 0$ and are piecewise linear on $[0, \infty)$ with slopes among $\{0, 1\}$. Moreover $L_{\xi,1}(q) \leq L_{\xi,2}(q)$ and $L_{\xi,1}(q) + L_{\xi,2}(q) = q + O(1)$ for all q by Minkowski's Second Convex Body Theorem. Any horizontal component of $L_{\xi,1}(q)$ is induced by a convergent p_k/q_k to ξ , and the better p_k/q_k approximates ξ , the longer are these intervals with locally constant $L_{\xi,1}(q)$.

Next we define P -systems in the template formalism of Marnat [30]. A P -system similarly consists of two piecewise linear functions $P(q) = (P_1(q), P_2(q))$ on $[0, \infty)$. Again $P_i(0) = 0$ and the slopes are among $\{0, 1/2, 1\}$ and at each point of differentiability sum up to 1. Thus, either P_1 rises with slope 1 and P_2 is locally constant, or vice versa, or both increase with slope 1/2. Moreover, we demand that P_2 can only change slope from 0 to another value (1/2 or 1) at points q where $P_1(q) = P_2(q)$.

Hence on intervals where P_1, P_2 both increase with slope $1/2$, they are equal. Geometrically, the image of P -systems consists of rhombuses and lines with slope $1/2$ interconnecting them. The functions $L_{\xi,i}(q)$ differ on $[0, \infty)$ only by $O(1)$ from $P_i(q)$ of some P -system, an easy special case of a deep result of Roy [40]. The parameter range where both P_i have slope $1/2$ relates to intervals of fast change of slope for the $L_{\xi,i}$, which corresponds to a fast succession of convergents p_k/q_k to ξ all of relatively bad approximation quality $|\xi - p_k/q_k| \gg q_k^{-2}$.

The variational principle in [16] in the special case of approximation to a single real number tells us the following. For a P -system, define the average contraction rate up to a parameter Q by

$$\Delta(P, Q) = \frac{1}{Q-1} \int_1^Q \delta(P, q) dq,$$

where δ denotes the local contraction rate defined as

$$\delta(P, q) = 2 - \kappa, \quad \kappa = \min\{k \in \{1, 2\} : P'_k(q) > 0\}.$$

Equivalently, this is the indicator function of the event $\{P'_1(q) > 0\}$. For a family \mathcal{P} of P -systems (closed under finite perturbation), consider all real numbers whose combined graph differs only by $O(1)$ from a P -system in \mathcal{P} , that is

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{P}) = \{\xi \in \mathbb{R} : \exists C \in \mathbb{R}, P \in \mathcal{P} : \|L_\xi - P\|_\infty \leq C\}.$$

Then the variational principle claims

$$(29) \quad \dim_P(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{P})) = \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \limsup_{Q \rightarrow \infty} \Delta(P, Q),$$

where the supremum is taken over all P -systems in the class \mathcal{P} . Taking the limit inferior on the right hand side instead would give the Hausdorff dimension.

5.2. The graphs. In view of the sublinearity (11) of packing dimension under Cartesian products, for the left estimate in (10) it suffices to show the case $n = 1$, i.e.

$$(30) \quad \dim_P(\mathcal{L}_{(s)}) \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

It can be checked that any strong Liouville number ξ induces a combined Roy graph $L_\xi = (L_{\xi,1}(q), L_{\xi,2}(q))$ that is $O(1)$ from a P -system of the following shape




Figure 1: Visualization of P -systems associated to strong Liouville numbers

Hereby we wrote $q = d_i$ for the switch points where the slopes of P_i interchange, to avoid notational confusion with the convergents p_k/q_k . The main features are

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d_{2k+1}}{d_{2k}} = \infty, \quad d_{2k+2} - d_{2k+1} = d_{2k+1} - d_{2k},$$

and there are no intervals where the P_i have slope $1/2$. We remark that the converse is not true, $\|L_\xi - P\| \ll 1$ for P with these properties does not guarantee that ξ is a strong Liouville number, as there may be some convergents of rather bad approximation quality very close to good approximating convergents p_k/q_k . The local contraction rate $\delta(P, q)$ in intervals $q \in [d_{2k}, d_{2k+1}]$ equals 0, in $[d_{2k-1}, d_{2k}]$ it is 1. Since the intervals $[d_{2k}, d_{2k+1}]$ and $[d_{2k+1}, d_{2k+2}]$ have the same length and $d_{2k} = o(d_{2k+1} - d_{2k})$, the average contraction rate $\Delta(P, Q)$ is maximal at positions $Q = d_{2k+1}$ and a very short calculation verifies $\Delta(P, d_{2k+1}) = \frac{1}{2} + o(1)$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Thus from (29) we derive (30) and hence the left estimate in (10) as observed above.

For semi-strong Liouville numbers, we consider the following type of P -systems




Figure 2: Visualization of P -systems for certain semi-strong Liouville numbers

The slopes of $P_i(q)$ change at sequences $(d_i)_{i \geq 1}, (e_i)_{i \geq 1}, (f_i)_{i \geq 1}$ with

$$0 = d_1 < e_1 < f_1 < d_2 < e_2 < \dots,$$

where in $[d_i, e_i]$ the function P_1 has slope 0 and P_2 slope 1, vice versa in $[e_i, f_i]$, and in $[f_i, d_{i+1}]$ both rise with slope $1/2$. In order to obtain only semi-strong Liouville numbers ξ whose L_ξ is in $O(1)$ distance from a system P as in Figure 2, it suffices to demand

$$(31) \quad \frac{d_{i+1}}{f_i} = c, \quad \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{e_i}{d_i} = \infty,$$

with some $c = c(P) > 1$ independent from i . We omit the elementary verification. Now we see the local contraction rate $\delta(P, q)$ equals 1 in intervals $[e_i, d_{i+1}]$ and 0 in the remaining intervals $[d_i, e_i]$. Together with (31), we check that the inferred average contraction rate $\Delta(P, Q)$ at $Q = d_i$ will be $(c + 1/2)/(c + 1) + o(1)$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$, again a very simple calculation. As we may consider P -systems with arbitrarily large c (associated to ξ with arbitrarily large, finite value in (8)), identity (29) yields the packing dimension of semi-strong Liouville numbers must equal 1.

6. PROOF OF THEOREM 3.12

The proof of the crucial claim (26) uses the following simple combinatorial lemma.

Lemma 6.1. *Let $C > 1$ be an real number and $(z_{1,k})_{k \geq 1}, \dots, (z_{n,k})_{k \geq 1}$ be n increasing sequences of positive real numbers satisfying*

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{z_{i,k+1}}{z_{i,k}} \geq C, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

If $(c_k)_{k \geq 1}$ is the mixed increasing sequence obtained from ordering the union of the n sequences by size, then

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{c_{k+1}}{c_k} \geq \sqrt[n]{C}.$$

Proof. By assumption we can choose $Y = Y(C)$ such that $z_{i,k+1}/z_{i,k} > C$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $z_{i,k} \geq Y$. Take any $z_{1,k} \geq Y$. We elaborate why, upon relabelling, we may assume that between $z_{1,k}$ and $z_{1,k+1}$ there is no index i so that there occur two successive elements $z_{i,u}, z_{i,u+1}$ with $z_{i,k} < z_{1,u} < z_{1,u+1} < z_{i,k+1}$. Let $I_0 := (a_{1,k}, a_{1,k+1})$. Otherwise we take another index $i \neq 1$ for which the opposite property holds that there are two elements $z_{i,u}, z_{i,u+1}$ in the interval I_0 , and consider the new interval $I_1 := (z_{i,u}, z_{i,u+1})$ with $I_1 \subseteq I_0$. Observe that by construction still $z_{i,u+1}/z_{i,u} > C$ and there is no element of $(z_{1,k})_{k \geq 1}$ in I_1 . If the claim holds for the new values $z_{i,u}, z_{i,u+1}$, i.e. no sequence has two or more values in I_1 , we are done. Otherwise we can repeat the argument with another index j that disobeys this fact and an interval $I_2 := (z_{j,v}, z_{j,v+1})$ for some $j \notin \{1, i\}$. Then in $I_2 \subseteq I_1$ there lies at most one element of each sequences $(z_{1,k})_{k \geq 1}$ and $(z_{i,k})_{k \geq 1}$, and $z_{j,v+1}/z_{j,v} > C$. Iterating this process, by finiteness of indices we ultimately must derive at an some index for which the property is satisfied.

Now since there is only at most one element of any sequence between $z_{1,k}$ and $z_{1,k+1}$, the increasing mixed sequence must have a multiplicative gap at least $c_{j+1}/c_j \geq \sqrt[n]{z_{1,k+1}/z_{1,k}} \geq \sqrt[n]{C}$ with c_j and c_{j+1} in the interval $[z_{1,k}, z_{1,k+1}]$. \square

We will apply Lemma 6.1 to logarithms of convergent denominators of the ξ_j . We further require Proposition 2.4 which we shall prove now.

Proof of Proposition 2.4. See Perron [36] for all facts used in the proof below. The estimate $\tau_k \geq 2$ is a standard result on continued fractions, using that the best approximations $|q\xi - p|$ in Dirichlet's Theorem in dimension 1 are induced by convergents, i.e. $(p, q) = (p_k, q_k)$. It is further well-known that

$$\frac{p_{k+1}}{q_{k+1}} - \frac{p_k}{q_k} = \pm \frac{1}{q_k q_{k+1}}.$$

Moreover since the distances of the convergents to ξ are strictly decreasing

$$\left| \frac{p_{k+1}}{q_{k+1}} - \frac{p_k}{q_k} \right| \leq \left| \frac{p_{k+1}}{q_{k+1}} - \xi \right| + \left| \frac{p_k}{q_k} - \xi \right| < 2 \left| \frac{p_k}{q_k} - \xi \right| = 2q_k^{-\tau_k}.$$

Combination shows $q_{k+1} > q_k^{\tau_k - 1}/2$. On the other hand two successive convergents lie on opposite sides of ξ and therefore

$$q_k^{-\tau_k} = \left| \frac{p_k}{q_k} - \xi \right| < \left| \frac{p_{k+1}}{q_{k+1}} - \frac{p_k}{q_k} \right|,$$

and similarly we derive $q_{k+1} < q_k^{\tau_k - 1}$. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.12. By the comments below the formulation of the theorem, only the inclusion in (26) remains to be shown. Let ξ_1, \dots, ξ_n each belong to $\mathcal{M}_{C,D}$. Let $p_{i,k}/q_{i,k}$ denote the k -th convergent of ξ_i , for $1 \leq i \leq n$. Then by definition $z_{i,k} := \log q_{i,k}$ satisfy the hypothesis of Lemma 6.1 for our parameter C . Hence we conclude that for any $\omega < \sqrt[n]{C}$ in the mixed increasing sequence $(c_k)_{k \geq 1}$ there are arbitrarily large indices ℓ with $c_{\ell+1}/c_\ell > \omega$. Fix $\omega < \sqrt[n]{C}$ very close to $\sqrt[n]{C}$ for now and an associated ℓ . For every $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ let d_i be the largest element of the sequence $(z_{i,k})_{k \geq 1}$ not exceeding c_ℓ . Every d_i gives rise to a convergent $p_{i,t}/q_{i,t}$ with $t = t(i)$ to ξ_i , via $q_{i,t} = e^{d_i}$. Then for some i we have $e^{d_i} = c_\ell$, without loss of generality assume $i = 1$. Then $e^{d_1} = c_\ell$ and clearly $q_{i,t} \leq c_\ell$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. Since no ξ_i has a convergent denominator between $C_\ell := e^{c_\ell}$ and $C_\ell^\omega = e^{\omega c_\ell}$, the elementary estimates in Proposition 2.4 yield

$$|q_{i,t}\xi_i - p_{i,t}| \ll c_\ell^{-\omega}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

For every i , multiplying the according relation by the integer $Q/q_{i,t}$ where $Q = Q_\ell = q_{1,t}q_{2,t} \cdots q_{n,t}$, gives

$$(32) \quad |Q\xi_i - p_{i,t}Q/q_{i,t}| \ll c_\ell^{-\omega}Q/q_{i,t}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

Now on the one hand $Q \leq c_\ell^n$, on the other hand the limsup condition for any $\delta < D$ yields $q_{i,t}^\delta \geq q_{i,t+1} \geq Q$ and thus may estimate $q_{i,t} \geq Q^{1/\delta}$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$, if ℓ was chosen large enough. Inserting these relations in (32), we conclude

$$|Q\xi_i - p_{i,t}Q/q_{i,t}| \ll c_\ell^{-\omega+n+\frac{n}{\delta}} \ll Q^{-(\omega-n+1/\delta)/n} = Q^{1-(\omega+1/\delta)/n}.$$

Since all $p_{i,t}Q/q_{i,t}$ are integers, dividing by Q gives a simultaneous rational approximations to ξ_1, \dots, ξ_n of order at least $(\omega + 1/\delta)/n$, and since ω, δ can be taken arbitrarily close to $\sqrt[n]{C}, D$ respectively, we infer $\underline{\xi} = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) \in W_n(\tau)$ for any $\tau \leq \sqrt[n]{C}/n + 1/D$. But $\xi_i \in \mathcal{M}_{C,D}$ were arbitrary, so we derive the desired inclusion. \square

As pointed out in Section 2.1, the case $C = \infty$ implies Theorem 2.5 for $\mathcal{L}_{(s)}^n$. To extend the claim to semi-strong Liouville numbers ξ_i , we observe that assumption (8) guarantees that in the mixed ordered sequence considered in the proof, there are still multiplicative gaps of size essentially $\sqrt[n]{C}$ divided by the maximum value in (8) over the ξ_i . As $C = \infty$, this is infinite as well and we conclude $\underline{\xi} = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) \in W_n(\infty) = \mathcal{L}_n$ as above.

7. PROOFS FROM SECTION 3.1

The principal idea of the proofs is similar to Theorem 2.1. Again we define very elementary Lipschitz maps from the respective product sets into an Euclidean space with codimension 1, with large image. For technical reasons, this will be easier than to show surjectivity to \mathbb{R}^{n-1} (which in some cases may even be wrong). The next lemma guarantees that these images still have full Lebesgue measure relative to the according dimension. The sets $\mathcal{V}_{\lambda,(b)}$ from Definition 3.1 occur in it.

Lemma 7.1. *Let $b \geq 2$ an integer. The set of real vectors ξ_1, \dots, ξ_{n-1} for which ξ_1 and ξ_{n-1} as well as $\xi_i - \xi_j$ for every index pair $1 \leq i < j \leq n - 1$ all lie in $\mathcal{V}_{1,(b)}$ has full $(n - 1)$ -dimensional Lebesgue measure.*

Remark 1. In fact the complement set is of Hausdorff dimension $n - 2$.

The proof is not deep at all and only uses standard measure theoretic arguments.

Proof. It follows from (16) and a standard measure theoretic argument that the complement of $\mathcal{V}_{1,(b)}$ in \mathbb{R} has Lebesgue measure 0 (is a nullset in \mathbb{R}). We can write the set in the theorem as the intersection of $U = \mathcal{V}_{1,(b)} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-3} \times \mathcal{V}_{1,(b)}$ with the sets

$$U_{i,j} := \{(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} : \xi_i - \xi_j \in \mathcal{V}_{1,(b)}, \quad 1 \leq i < j \leq n - 1\}.$$

Every such set $U_{i,j}$ has full measure because it can be identified with $\mathbb{R}^{n-3} \times V$ where $V \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ is given by $(\mathcal{V}_{1,(b)} + \mathbb{R}) \times \mathbb{R} = \{(x + y, y) : x \in \mathcal{V}_{1,(b)}, y \in \mathbb{R}\}$. The set V thus is the image of $\mathcal{V}_{1,(b)} \times \mathbb{R}$ under the Lipschitz map $(x, y) \rightarrow (x + y, y)$ and since $\mathcal{V}_{1,(b)} \times \mathbb{R} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ has full 2-dimensional Lebesgue measure by a standard fact on product Lebesgue measures, thus the same applies to V by Proposition 1.2. By (1) we conclude that any set $U_{i,j}$ has full $(n - 1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure. Hence the intersection of the finitely many $U_{i,j}$ has full measure as well, and intersecting it with the full measure set U (by the same argument) again preserves the property. \square

We further need the following observation of an equally easy nature.

Lemma 7.2. *If A_1, \dots, A_k are subsets of \mathbb{R}^n , then $\dim(\prod(A_i \cup \mathbb{Q})) = \dim(\prod A_i)$.*

Proof. We only show the claim for two factors, i.e. $\dim((A \cup \mathbb{Q}) \times (B \cup \mathbb{Q})) = \dim(A \times B)$. The general case works very similarly. Clearly $\dim((A \cup \mathbb{Q}) \times (B \cup \mathbb{Q})) \geq \dim(A \times B)$ by monotonicity of measures. For the reverse estimate, the difference set $((A \cup \mathbb{Q}) \times (B \cup \mathbb{Q})) \setminus (A \times B)$ is contained in $(A \times \mathbb{Q}) \cup (\mathbb{Q} \times B) \cup \mathbb{Q}^2$. Clearly $\dim(\mathbb{Q}^2) = 0$ and $A \times \mathbb{Q}$ and $B \times \mathbb{Q}$ are countable unions of translates of A, B respectively, thus bounded by $\dim(A)$ and $\dim(B)$, respectively. Hence by (1) their union has dimension $\max\{\dim(A), \dim(B)\} \leq \dim(A) + \dim(B) \leq \dim(A \times B)$, thus adding it to $A \times B$ does not increase the Hausdorff dimension. \square

We also use continued fractions in the proofs. Complementary to Proposition 2.4, we require Legendre's Theorem on continued fractions that tells us that every good approximating rational is a convergent, see Perron [36].

Theorem 7.3 (Legendre). *If $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ and p/q is rational and satisfies $|p/q - \xi| < q^{-2}/2$, then p/q is a convergent to ξ .*

We will first prove the most technical Theorem 3.4.

Proof of Theorem 3.4. Let $\lambda_i \geq 2$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$ be fixed throughout. As mentioned above, by Jarník's result (18) and (1) we have

$$\dim\left(\prod_{i=0}^{n-1} (\mathcal{W}_{\lambda_i; \mu_i})\right) \geq \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \dim(\mathcal{W}_{\lambda_i; \mu_i}) = 2 \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \lambda_i^{-1}.$$

The upper bound in (19) follows from (18) and Theorem 1.1. To derive the bound $n-1$, we follow a similar idea as in the proof of Theorem 2.1 above. Write $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ for the set in Lemma 7.1 when choosing the base $b = 5$ for $\mathcal{V}_{1,(b)}$. We show that for every λ_i, μ_i as in the theorem, the image of the Lipschitz map

$$(33) \quad \begin{aligned} \Psi_1 : \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} (\mathcal{W}_{\lambda_i; \mu_i} \cup \mathbb{Q}) &\longmapsto \mathbb{R}^{n-1}, \\ (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}) &\longmapsto (x_0 + x_1, x_0 + x_2, \dots, x_0 + x_{n-1}), \end{aligned}$$

contains $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. Since by Lemma 7.1 the set \mathcal{T} has full $(n-1)$ -dimensional Lebesgue measure, the from Proposition 1.2 we see that the domain set has Hausdorff dimension at least $n-1$. Finally by Lemma 7.2 the same applies when we remove \mathbb{Q} from each factor.

Construction of the preimage: Let $(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{n-1})$ be arbitrary in \mathcal{T} . We construct a preimage under Ψ_1 in our product set for given λ_i, μ_i as in the theorem. Partition

the positive integers in interval sets $(I_j)_{j \geq 1}$ according to the following recursion. Let $I_0 = \{1, 2\}$ and write $g_0 = 1$ and $h_0 = 2$ for the interval ends. We then define

$$I_j = \{g_j, g_j + 1, \dots, h_j\}$$

for $j \geq 1$ where g_j, h_j are recursively given by

$$(34) \quad g_j = h_{j-1} + 1, \quad h_j = \lceil \lambda_i h_{j-1} \rceil,$$

where we take i the residue class of $j-1$ modulo n in the usual representation system $\{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$. Thereby we obtain

$$\frac{h_j}{g_j} = \lambda_i + o(1), \quad \frac{g_{j+1}}{g_j} = \lambda_i + o(1),$$

as $j \rightarrow \infty$, with $i = i(j)$ as above, that is two consecutive right (and left) interval endpoints roughly differ by a multiplicative factor among our numbers $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$ depending on the index. For $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, let x_0 have the digits of ξ_i in base 5 expansion for any digit in those intervals I_j with $j \equiv i \pmod{n}$, and put the base 5 digit zero for digits in I_j with $j \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$. Then x_0 is well-defined. We need to show that x_0 and $x_i := \xi_i - x_0$ for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ all lie in the prescribed $\mathscr{W}_{\lambda_i; \mu_i} \cup \mathbb{Q}$.

Proof of the claim. Let $0 \leq i \leq n-1$ be fixed. We check that $\mu(x_i) \geq \lambda_i$ by essentially chopping off the digits after the last base 5 digit in I_{j-1} for every $j \equiv i \pmod{n}$. More precisely, for any such j consider p_j/q_j obtained from the difference of the rational numbers obtained from cutting the base 5 expansion of x_i after the last base 5 digit of I_{j-1} , that is up to place h_{j-1} . Then by construction this rational number equals p_j/q_j with $p_j = \lfloor 5^{h_{j-1}} x_i \rfloor$ and $q_j = 5^{h_{j-1}}$, possibly not in lowest terms. On the other hand, since ξ_i and x_0 have the same base 5 digits in I_j so that x_i has zeros accordingly, the difference $x_i - p_j/q_j$ has its first non-zero base 5 digit not before the first element of I_{j+1} , that is $g_{j+1} = h_j + 1 = \lambda_i g_j + O(1)$. Hence indeed $|x_i - p_j/q_j| \ll 5^{-\lambda_i g_j} \ll q_j^{-\lambda_i}$. This means $\mu(x_i) \geq \lambda_i$ unless the approximations are ultimately constant and equal to x_i , thus $x_i \in \mathbb{Q}$. We need to show the inequality $\mu(x_i) \leq \Lambda/(\lambda_i - 1) + 1$ for $0 \leq i \leq n-1$. Write $\nu_i = \Lambda/(\lambda_i - 1) + 1$ for simplicity.

Assume the contrary that $\mu(x_i) > \nu_i$ for some i . Then for some $\mu > \nu_i$ the estimate

$$(35) \quad \left| x_i - \frac{p}{q} \right| < q^{-\mu}$$

has infinitely many rational solutions p/q . Upon minor modifications we may without loss of generality assume (35) holds for x_1 , we explain below how to alter the argument for a different index. We distinguish two cases: p/q can be among the p_j/q_j defined in the proof of the lower bound, or distinct from them.

Case 1: the rational in (35) satisfies $p/q = p_j/q_j$ for some j . Here we will make use of the assumption $\underline{\xi} \in \mathscr{T}$. Let $u \equiv 1 \pmod{n}$ and p_u/q_u be the rational number

obtained after cutting off the digits in x_1 in base 5 expansion after the last position in I_{u-1} , as in the proof of the lower bound. Then, as noticed above, before potential reduction to lowest terms, we have

$$(36) \quad q_u = 5^{h_{u-1}}, \quad p_u = \lfloor 5^{h_{u-1}} x_1 \rfloor$$

and p_u/q_u is a very good (of order at least λ_1) rational approximation to x_1 . Now we claim the reverse estimate, that is for given $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and u large enough we have

$$(37) \quad \left| x_1 - \frac{p_u}{q_u} \right| \gg 5^{-g_{u+1}(1+\varepsilon)}.$$

Assume the converse holds, that is

$$(38) \quad \left| x_1 - \frac{p_u}{q_u} \right| = |\xi_1 - x_0 - p_u/q_u| \ll 5^{-g_{u+1}(1+\varepsilon)}.$$

Now on the other hand

$$(39) \quad |\xi_2 - x_0 - \tilde{p}_{u+1}/q_{u+1}| \ll 5^{-g_{u+2}}$$

with some positive integer \tilde{p}_{u+1} . Indeed, since ξ_2 and x_0 have the same digits in I_{u+1} and thus defining \tilde{p}_{u+1} via cutting off the base 5 expansion of $\xi_2 - x_0$ after last position h_u in I_u , the remaining number is the difference of two real numbers with first non-zero base 5 digit not before the first digit g_{u+2} of I_{u+2} . Combining (38) and (39) in view of $x_1 = \xi_1 - x_0$ and $g_{u+1} = \lambda_1 g_u + O(1) \geq 2g_u + O(1) > (1 + \varepsilon)g_u$ gives

$$\left| \xi_1 - \xi_2 - \frac{p_u}{q_u} + \frac{\tilde{p}_{u+1}}{q_{u+1}} \right| \ll 5^{-g_{u+1}(1+\varepsilon)} + 5^{-g_{u+2}} \ll 5^{-g_{u+1}(1+\varepsilon)}.$$

Now since $q_u = 5^{g_u-1}$ divides $q_{u+1} = 5^{g_{u+1}-1}$ we may write $p_u/q_u - \tilde{p}_{u+1}/q_{u+1} = m_{u+1}/q_{u+1}$ for some integer m_{u+1} and thus we obtain

$$\left| \xi_1 - \xi_2 - \frac{m_{u+1}}{q_{u+1}} \right| \ll 5^{-g_{u+1}(1+\varepsilon)} \ll q_{u+1}^{-(1+\varepsilon)}.$$

Since q_{u+1} is a power of 5, if this happens infinitely often we get a contradiction to our assumption $\xi_1 - \xi_2 \in \mathcal{V}_{1,(5)}$. Thus the claim (37) is proved in this case. If we would have started to assume (35) with any other $i \in \{2, 3, \dots, n-2\}$ instead of $i = 1$, the procedure is analogous, leading to a contradiction of $\xi_i - \xi_{i+1}$ being in $\mathcal{V}_{1,(5)}$. In case of $i = 0$, we would similarly contradict $\xi_1 \in \mathcal{V}_{1,(5)}$, in case $i = n-1$ we would finally contradict $\xi_{n-1} \in \mathcal{V}_{1,(5)}$.

We return to considering x_1 now. Write $\lambda = \lambda_1$ for simplicity. Next we observe that the fraction p_u/q_u is "almost" reduced. Indeed we claim that if we write r_u/s_u for the reduced fraction, then for $\varepsilon > 0$ and $u \geq u_0(\varepsilon)$ large

$$(40) \quad s_u \geq 5^{(1-\varepsilon)g_u} \asymp q_u^{1-\varepsilon}.$$

Our proof is similar to (37). Assume the converse

$$(41) \quad s_u < 5^{(1-\varepsilon)g_u} \asymp q_u^{1-\varepsilon}$$

holds. We next claim that there is an integer \tilde{r}_u such that

$$(42) \quad \left| x_1 - \xi_1 - \frac{\tilde{r}_u}{s_u} \right| \ll 5^{-g_u} \ll q_u^{-1} \ll s_u^{-1/(1-\varepsilon)}.$$

Indeed since ξ_1 and x_1 have the same base 5 digits at any position in the interval $[\log_5 s_u, g_u - 1] \subseteq I_{u-1}$, if we take the rational numbers v_1 and v_2 obtained from cutting off the base 5 expansion of ξ_1 and x_1 after position $\log_5 s_u$ respectively, the difference $x_1 - \xi_1$ equals $v_1 - v_2 + \delta$ for δ the difference of two numbers whose base 5 expansion has zeros up to the last number h_{u-1} in I_{u-1} . Hence it is smaller than $2 \cdot 5^{h_{u-1}} \ll 5^{-g_u}$. So we may take $\tilde{r}_u/s_u = v_1 - v_2$, as clearly by construction the denominator of $v_1 - v_2$ equals s_u (possibly not in lowest terms), so (42) is shown.

On the other hand the lower bound we proved above and (41) imply

$$\left| x_1 - \frac{r_u}{s_u} \right| = \left| x_1 - \frac{p_u}{q_u} \right| \ll q_u^{-\lambda} \ll s_u^{-\lambda/(1-\varepsilon)}.$$

Combining with (42) yields

$$\left| \xi_1 + \frac{\tilde{r}_u}{s_u} - \frac{r_u}{s_u} \right| \ll s_u^{-1/(1-\varepsilon)} + s_u^{-\lambda/(1-\varepsilon)} \ll s_u^{-1/(1-\varepsilon)}.$$

Now we can write the difference $r_u/s_u - \tilde{r}_u/s_u$ as \tilde{d}_u/s_u with an integer $\tilde{d}_u = r_u - \tilde{r}_u$ and see that ξ_1 has base 5 irrationality exponent at least $1/(1-\varepsilon) > 1$, a contradiction to $\xi_1 \in \mathcal{V}_{1,(b)}$. Again we similarly get contradictions when starting with x_i for other indices i . Thus (40) is shown. When combined with (37) and $g_{u+1}/g_u = \lambda + o(1)$ we infer

$$\left| x_1 - \frac{r_u}{s_u} \right| \geq cs_u^{-\lambda-\varepsilon}, \quad u \geq 1,$$

for some $c > 0$ and ε some minor modification of ε above. Taking $\varepsilon < (\mu_1 - \lambda)/2$ we see that these are not the good approximations in (35). This case is thus finished.

Case 2: Now assume infinitely many p/q with property (35) are distinct from all p_u/q_u . Again we can restrict ourselves to $i = 1$ and use the notation above, in particular $\lambda = \lambda_1$ and $\mu > \nu_1$. First we settle that for any $\varepsilon_1 > 0$, any such p/q must satisfy

$$(43) \quad q_u^{\lambda-1-\varepsilon_1} \ll q \ll q_{u+n}^{1/(\mu-1)+\varepsilon_1},$$

for some u . For p/q satisfying (35), let u now be the unique integer defined by $q_u < q \leq q_{u+1}$. In the proof of the lower bound above we have noticed that $|x_1 - \frac{p_u}{q_u}| \ll q_u^{-\lambda}$, thus also

$$\left| x_1 - \frac{r_u}{s_u} \right| \ll s_u^{-\lambda}.$$

Since $\lambda > 2$ clearly $p_u/q_u = r_u/s_u$ is a convergent in the continued fraction expansion of x_1 by Legendre Theorem. Then Proposition 2.4 gives that the next convergent denominator is $\gg s_u^{\lambda-1}$ and since p/q is clearly also a convergent to x_1 by Legendre Theorem and $q > q_u$, we infer $q \gg s_u^{\lambda-1}$. By (40) the left estimate in (43) follows with ϵ_1 some modification of ϵ . The right is induced very similarly using the assumption that p/q satisfies $|x_1 - p/q| < q^{-\mu}$. Then by Proposition 2.4 the subsequent convergent has denominator $\gg q^{\mu-1}$. Since $r_{n+u}/s_{n+u} = p_{u+n}/q_{u+n}$ is another convergent to x_1 , the same lower bound applies to s_{u+n} and finally by (40) (applied for index $u+n$) up to some small $\epsilon_2 > 0$ for q_{u+n} , i.e. $q_{u+n} \gg q^{\mu-1-\epsilon_2}$, equivalent to the right bound in (43). Now from (43) we see that

$$q_{u+n} \gg q_u^{(\lambda-1)(\mu-1)-\epsilon_3},$$

where again ϵ_3 is a minor modification of ϵ_1 . On the other hand (36) and (34) imply $q_{u+n} \asymp q_u^\Lambda$. Hence $\Lambda \geq (\lambda-1)(\mu-1) - \epsilon_3$, which by choice of $\mu > \nu_1$ is however false for ϵ_3 small enough. Thus we have derived the desired contradiction in both cases and conclude the dimension of our product set is at least $n-1$. \square

If all $\lambda_i = \infty$, we proved the claim already within the proof of Theorem 2.1. The proof leaves the following problem open.

Conjecture 7.4. For $n \geq 2$ and λ_i, μ_i as in Theorem 3.4, the map Ψ_1 in (33) is surjective (possibly even without unions of \mathbb{Q} factors in the domain).

The proof of Theorem 3.2 is easy given the information of the proof above. Not surprisingly, Case 2 is easier to handle here, that is to rule out the existence of putative good approximations of the form p/b^N different from the p_u/q_u of the proof.

Proof of Theorem 3.2. Let b be any prime. The main claim is the lower bound $n-1$ in (13). We proceed as in the proof of Theorem 3.4, where for obvious reasons we work in base b instead of 5. We show that for any choices of $\lambda_i \geq 1$, the image of the map

$$(44) \quad \Psi_2 : \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} (\mathcal{V}_{\lambda_i, (b)} \cup \mathbb{Q}) \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{n-1},$$

$$(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}) \mapsto (x_0 + x_1, x_0 + x_2, \dots, x_0 + x_{n-1}),$$

contains \mathcal{T} from Lemma 7.1 again. Then again we can conclude with Proposition 1.2 and Lemma 7.2. We start with arbitrary $\underline{x} \in \mathcal{T}$ again and derive the preimage components x_i by the same construction as in the proof of Theorem 3.4. Then we see $\theta_b(x_i) \geq \lambda_i$ since in Theorem 3.4 rational approximations p_j/q_j to x_i of order λ_i and of the desired form p/q^N were constructed, unless $x_i \in \mathbb{Q}$. The proof of Case

1 of confirming the reverse bound $\theta_b(x_i) \leq \lambda_i$ is done precisely as in Theorem 3.4. For Case 2, we can now restrict to p/q in (35) with q an integer power of b . But it follows from our setup and $\xi \in \mathcal{T}$ that there is no other rational apart from the p_u/q_u with these properties, a very similar argument was used to prove (37) in the proof of Case 1. This shows the lower bound $n - 1$ for the Hausdorff dimension. The remaining claims follow easily taking (1) and (16) into account, as explained below the formulation of Theorem 3.2. \square

An analogous problem to Conjecture 7.4 is open. We remark that for $n = 2$ and $\lambda_0 \neq \lambda_1$, the map Ψ_2 when restricted to $\prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathcal{V}_{\lambda_i, (b)}$ does not surject on \mathbb{R}^{n-1} . Indeed, any rational of the form p/b^N cannot be in the image of Ψ_2 because $\theta_b(\xi) = \theta_b(p/b^N - \xi)$ is easily verified, but it lies in $\mathcal{V}_{1, (b)}$. On the other hand, potentially the image of Ψ_2 could contain $\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \setminus \mathbb{Q}^{n-1}$.

The proof of Theorem 3.7 again uses similar ideas as Theorem 3.4. Here we restrict the one-dimensional image of our sum map further to numbers in $\mathcal{V}_{1, (5)}$ that additionally are not very well-approximable. The first condition again guarantees that the obvious good rational approximations to ξ of order λ are not actually of better order, as in the proof of Theorem 3.4. The latter condition will guarantee with some trick (that only works for $n = 2$) that there is no other good rational approximation to ξ . Finally we infer that the sum map $(x, y) \rightarrow x + y$ is surjective from $\mathcal{W}_{\lambda_0} \times \mathcal{W}_{\lambda_1}$ to the image set.

Proof of Theorem 3.7. We only need to show the lower bound 1 upon our assumption (20) on the λ_i , everything else follows easily from (18) and Theorem 1.1 again. We can assume both $\lambda_i < \infty$, otherwise the claim follows from the upper bound being 1 anyway. Let $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{V}_{1, (5)} \cap \mathcal{W}_2$ be the set of not very-well approximable numbers with not too long consecutive 0 or 4 digit strings in base 5. We show that the image of the Lipschitz map

$$(45) \quad \begin{aligned} \Psi_3 : (\mathcal{W}_{\lambda_0} \cup \mathbb{Q}) \times (\mathcal{W}_{\lambda_1} \cup \mathbb{Q}) &\longmapsto \mathbb{R}, \\ (x_0, x_1) &\longmapsto x_0 + x_1, \end{aligned}$$

contains \mathcal{U} . Provided this is true, as clearly \mathcal{U} still has full 1-dimensional Lebesgue measure since this is true for both $\mathcal{V}_{1, (5)}$ and \mathcal{W}_2 , the claim follows from Proposition 1.2 and Lemma 7.2. Start with arbitrary $\xi \in \mathcal{U}$. Similar to the proof of Theorem 3.4, partition \mathbb{N} into intervals $I_j = \{g_j, g_j + 1 \dots, h_j\}$ with $g_{j+1} = h_j + 1$ and $h_j/g_j = \lambda_1 + o(1)$ for even j and $h_j/g_j = \lambda_0 + o(1)$ for odd j . Let the number x_0 have the base 5 digits of ξ in intervals I_j for even j and 0 in intervals I_j for odd j , and vice versa for x_1 . Then clearly $x_0 + x_1 = \xi$. A very similar argument further shows that the rationals p_j/q_j obtained by cutting off the base 5 expansions after intervals

I_j approximate x_0 or x_1 respectively of order λ_i , hence $\mu(x_i) \geq \lambda_i$, for $i = 0, 1$, unless $x_i \in \mathbb{Q}$. Again the main difficulty is to show the converse $\mu(x_i) \leq \lambda_i$, $i = 0, 1$. By symmetry it suffices to show the claim for $i = 1$.

Assume conversely for some $\mu > \lambda_1$ we have infinitely many p/q with

$$(46) \quad \left| x_1 - \frac{p}{q} \right| \leq q^{-\mu}.$$

Again we split into two cases according to the cases of rational approximations p/q being among p_j/q_j above or not. In the first case the same argument as in Theorem 3.4 applies and shows that the approximations are not better than of order $\lambda + o(1) = \lambda_1 + o(1)$. In the latter case that p/q is not among p_j/q_j above, we will show that (46) implies $\mu(\xi) > 2$, contradicting our hypothesis $\xi \in \mathcal{W}_2$. Observe that for p_j, q_j defined above again (36) holds. For given p/q let again u be the largest even index with $q_u < q$. For the same reason as in Theorem 3.4, with the upper bound μ_0 identified with λ , again we get

$$q_u^{\lambda_1 - 1 - \epsilon_1} \ll q \ll q_{u+2}^{1/(\lambda_0 - 1) + \epsilon_1}.$$

Now since $q_{u+2} \asymp q_u^\Lambda$ with $\Lambda = \lambda_0 \lambda_1$ and by (36) we derive

$$(47) \quad 5^{g_u(\lambda_1 - 1 - \epsilon_1)} \ll q \ll 5^{\Lambda g_u(1/(\lambda_0 - 1) + \epsilon_1)}.$$

Now consider the rational number r/s defined by

$$\frac{r}{s} = y_2 + y_4 + y_6 + \cdots + y_u, \quad y_k = \sum_{j \in I_k} c_j 5^{-j},$$

where c_j is the j -th base 5 digit of ξ (or equivalently x_0). In other words r/s is obtained by cutting off the base 5 expansion of x_0 after the last digit of I_u . Then $s = 5^{h_u} \asymp 5^{g_{u+1}}$ and $r = \lfloor s x_0 \rfloor$. Observe that by construction $r/s + x_1$ has the same base 5 digits as ξ up to the last position in I_{u+1} (since x_1 and ξ have the same base 5 digits in I_j for all odd j , including I_{u+1}), that is at $h_{u+1} \asymp \Lambda g_u$. Thus

$$\left| \xi - x_1 - \frac{r}{s} \right| \ll 5^{-\Lambda g_u}.$$

Combining with (46) and $\mu > \lambda_1$ yields

$$\left| \xi - \left(\frac{p}{q} + \frac{r}{s} \right) \right| \leq \left| \xi - x_1 - \frac{r}{s} \right| + \left| x_1 - \frac{p}{q} \right| \ll \max\{q^{-\mu}, 5^{-\Lambda g_u}\} \ll \max\{q^{-\lambda_1}, 5^{-\Lambda g_u}\}.$$

We distinguish two cases. Firstly assume the right expression in the bound is the larger one, equivalent to $q > 5^{\lambda_0 g_u}$. Then the rational number $M/N := p/q + r/s = (ps + qr)/(qs)$ satisfies

$$\left| \xi - \frac{M}{N} \right| \leq 5^{-\Lambda g_u}.$$

On the other hand, in lowest terms it has denominator at most $N \leq qs \ll 5^{h_u} q \ll 5^{\lambda_1 g_u} q$. Thus we have

$$-\frac{\log |\xi - \frac{M}{N}|}{\log N} \geq \frac{\log 5 \cdot \Lambda g_u}{\log q + \log 5 \cdot \lambda_1 g_u}.$$

The right hand side is obviously decreasing in q and thus in view of the upper bound in (47) after some calculation we derive

$$(48) \quad -\frac{\log |\xi - \frac{M}{N}|}{\log N} \geq \frac{\Lambda}{\frac{\Lambda}{\lambda_0 - 1} + \lambda_1} - \epsilon_2 = \frac{\lambda_0^2 - \lambda_0}{2\lambda_0 - 1} - \epsilon_2,$$

with ϵ_2 a small variation of ϵ_1 . Now in case of $\lambda_0 > (5 + \sqrt{17})/2$ this yields $\mu(\xi) > 2$ upon choosing ϵ_2 small enough, contradicting $\xi \in \mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{W}_2$. (We notice that if only finitely many M/N would occur, then $M/N = \xi$ is ultimately constant thus $\xi \in \mathbb{Q}$, again contradicting our hypothesis $\xi \in \mathcal{W}_2$.) Finally assume the left expression in the bound is larger, thus $q \leq 5^{\lambda_1 g_u}$. Then we infer

$$-\frac{\log |\xi - \frac{M}{N}|}{\log N} \geq \frac{\lambda_1 \log q}{\log q + \log 5 \cdot \lambda_1 g_u}.$$

Since the right hand side expression increases in q , by (47) we conclude

$$(49) \quad -\frac{\log |\xi - \frac{M}{N}|}{\log N} \geq \frac{\lambda_1 \cdot (\lambda_1 - 1)}{(\lambda_1 - 1) + \lambda_1} - \epsilon_3 = \frac{\lambda_1^2 - \lambda_1}{2\lambda_1 - 1} - \epsilon_3$$

hence again $\mu(\xi) > 2$ as soon as $\lambda_1 > (5 + \sqrt{17})/2$ and ϵ_3 is sufficiently small, again contradicting $\xi \in \mathcal{W}_2$. Thus condition (20) guarantees the implication in any case. \square

Remark 2. The proof in fact shows that $\dim((\mathcal{W}_{\lambda_0} \cap \mathcal{V}_{\lambda_0, (b)}) \times (\mathcal{W}_{\lambda_1} \cap \mathcal{V}_{\lambda_1, (b)})) \geq 1$ upon assumption (20), with a semi-effective construction of elements in the intersections. The fact that $\mathcal{W}_{\lambda} \cap \mathcal{V}_{\lambda, (b)} \neq \emptyset$ for any $\lambda > 2$ was already proved with a different construction by Amou and Bugeaud [3, Theorem 5].

Remark 3. We sketch how to extend the result to simultaneous approximation. When starting with a vector $\underline{x} \in \mathbb{R}^m$, we may apply the proof construction coordinatewise and show that the corresponding vector sum map $\tilde{\Psi}_3$ has large image of dimension m again. The lower bounds $\mu_m(\underline{x}_i) \geq \lambda_i$ follow analogously as for $m = 1$, for arbitrary $\lambda_i \geq 1$. For the reverse estimates, since almost all $\underline{x} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ are only simultaneously approximable of order $\mu_m(\underline{x}) = 1 + \frac{1}{m}$ (see Definition 3.11), according to (48), (49) we eventually end up at the conditions $(\lambda_i^2 - \lambda_i)/(2\lambda_i - 1) > 1 + \frac{1}{m}$, $i = 0, 1$. Thus the lower bound for $\min \lambda_i$ decreases to $\frac{3+\sqrt{5}}{2} = 2.6180\dots$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$.

For similar reasons as in the remark below the proof of Theorem 3.2, the image of Ψ_3 in (45) when restricted to domain $\mathcal{W}_{\lambda_0} \times \mathcal{W}_{\lambda_1}$ does not contain any rational number if $\lambda_0 \neq \lambda_1$, but potentially contains any irrational number. This demonstrates that we had to be very careful with our digit argument.

We close with comments on the proofs of this section. The problem we experience in the proof of Theorem 3.7 when we want to extend the claim to $n \geq 3$ is that, even if $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda$, the polynomial inequality arising from the accordingly modified version of (48) will not imply $\mu(\xi) > 2$ for any $\lambda \geq 2$. On the other hand, the proof extends to smaller sets defined via more stringent rational approximation assumptions. For instance, define $\mathcal{G}_\lambda \subseteq \mathcal{W}_\lambda$ the set of numbers ξ for which

$$(50) \quad \left| \xi - \frac{p}{q} \right| \leq q^{-\lambda} \log q$$

has infinitely many rational solutions p/q but

$$\left| \xi - \frac{p}{q} \right| \geq cq^{-\lambda}$$

for some $c > 0$ and all rationals p/q . Then a refinement of the argument shows that actually the product $\mathcal{G}_\lambda \times \mathcal{G}_\lambda$ satisfies all claims of Theorem 3.7 again (for $\lambda > (5 + \sqrt{17})/2$). Essentially we just need to redefine the intervals I_j slightly and shrink the image set (sharpen the property $\xi \in \mathcal{V}_{1,(b)}$) insignificantly enough to preserve full 1-dimensional Lebesgue measure. Similar extensions apply to other results of Section 3.1. We remark that even if we drop the $\log q$ factor in (50), the Hausdorff dimension of the arising subset of \mathbb{R} will still be $2/\lambda$ as for $\mathcal{W}_{\lambda,\infty}$. The identity even holds for the smaller sets *Exact*(Φ) of numbers of "exact approximation of order Φ " associated to any suitable decaying function $\Phi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$, see Bugeaud [11]. The same dimension invariance holds for the according sets where we restrict q to integer powers of b , related to $\mathcal{V}_{\lambda,(b)}$, $\mathcal{V}_{\lambda,\infty,(b)}$, see Borosh and Fraenkel [10]. We conclude with the suggestive open problem generalizing Conjecture 3.3.

Problem 4. For any $\Phi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ of decay $\Phi(q) = o(q^{-2})$ as $q \rightarrow \infty$, for *Exact*(Φ) defined in [11], do we have $\dim(\text{Exact}(\Phi)^n) \geq n - 1$, with equality as soon as Φ decays sufficiently fast (e.g. faster than every power function)?

REFERENCES

- [1] K. Aliaçık. Representation of real numbers as sums of U_2 -numbers. *Acta Arith.* 55 (1990), no. 4, 301–310.
- [2] K. Aliaçık. On Mahler's U -numbers. *Amer. J. Math.* 105 (1983), no. 6, 1347–1356.
- [3] M. Amou, Y. Bugeaud. Exponents of Diophantine approximation and expansions in integer bases. *J. Lond. Math. Soc.* (2) 81 (2010), no. 2, 297–316.

- [4] S. Astels. Sums of numbers with small partial quotients. II. *J. Number Theory* 91 (2001), no. 2, 187–205.
- [5] A. Baker, W.M. Schmidt. Diophantine approximation and Hausdorff dimension. *Proc. London Math. Soc.* (3) 21 (1970), 1–11.
- [6] V.I. Bernik. Application of the Hausdorff dimension in the theory of Diophantine approximations. (Russian) *Acta Arith.* 42 (1983), no. 3, 219–253.
- [7] A.S. Besicovitch. Sets of fractional dimensions (IV): On rational approximation to real numbers, *J. London Math. Soc.* 9 (1934), no. 2, 126–131.
- [8] A.S. Besicovitch, P.A.P. Moran. The measure of product and cylinder sets. *J. London Math. Soc.* 20 (1945), 110–120.
- [9] C.J. Bishop, Y. Peres. Packing dimension and Cartesian products. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 348 (1996), no. 11, 4433–4445.
- [10] I. Borosh, I. A.S. Fraenkel. A generalization of Jarník’s theorem on Diophantine approximations. *Nederl. Akad. Wetensch. Proc. Ser. A 75=Indag. Math.* 34 (1972), 193–201.
- [11] Y. Bugeaud. Sets of exact approximation order by rational numbers. *Math. Ann.* 327 (2003), no. 1, 171–190.
- [12] Y. Bugeaud, M.M. Dodson, S. Kristensen. Zero-infinity laws in Diophantine approximation. *Q. J. Math.* 56 (2005), no. 3, 311–320.
- [13] E.B. Burger. On Liouville decompositions in local fields. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 124 (1996), no. 11, 3305–3310.
- [14] E.B. Burger. Diophantine inequalities and irrationality measures for certain transcendental numbers. *Indian J. Pure Appl. Math.* 32 (2001), no. 10, 1591–1599.
- [15] A.P. Chaves, D. Marques, P. Trojovský. On the arithmetic behavior of Liouville numbers under rational maps. *arXiv:1910.14190*.
- [16] T. Das, L. Fishman, D. Simmons, M. Urbański. A variational principle in the parametric geometry of numbers. *arXiv:1901.06602*
- [17] B. Diviš. On the sums of continued fractions. *Acta Arith.* 22 (1973), 157–173.
- [18] H. G. Eggleston. A correction to a paper on the dimension of cartesian product sets. *Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* 49 (1953), 437–440.
- [19] P. Erdős. Representations of real numbers as sums and products of Liouville numbers. *Michigan Math. J.* 9 (1962), 59–60.
- [20] K. Falconer. Fractal geometry. Mathematical foundations and applications. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Chichester, 1990. xxii+288 pp.
- [21] I.J. Good. The fractional dimensional theory of continued fractions. *Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* 37 (1941), 199–228.
- [22] M. Hall, Jr. On the sum and product of continued fractions. *Ann. of Math.* (2) 48 (1947), 966–993.
- [23] J. D. Howroyd. On Hausdorff and packing dimension of product spaces, *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* 119 (4) (1996), 715–727.
- [24] M. Hussain, J. Schleisnitz, D. Simmons. The generalised Baker–Schmidt problem on hypersurfaces. *to appear in Int. Math. Res. Not., arXiv:1803.02314*.
- [25] V. Jarník, Über die simultanen diophantischen Approximationen, *Math. Z.* 33 (1931), 505–543.
- [26] V. Jarník. Zur metrischen Theorie der diophantischen Approximationen. *Prace Matematyczno-Fizyczne* 36 (1928-1929), no. 1, 91–106.
- [27] B. Jia, Z. Zhou, Z. Zhu, J. Luo. The packing measure of the Cartesian product of the middle third Cantor set with itself. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 288 (2003), no. 2, 424–441.

- [28] J. Levesley, C. Salp, S.L. Velani. On a problem of K. Mahler: Diophantine approximation and Cantor sets. *Math. Ann.* 338 (2007), no. 1, 97–118.
- [29] W.J. LeVeque. On Mahler’s U-numbers. *J. London Math. Soc.* 28 (1953), 220–229.
- [30] A. Marnat. Hausdorff and packing dimension of Diophantine sets. *arXiv:1904.08416*.
- [31] D. Marques, C. G. Moreira. On a variant of a question posed by K. Mahler concerning Liouville numbers. *Bull. Math. Aust. Soc.* 91, no. 1 (2015), 29–33.
- [32] J.M. Marstrand. The dimension of Cartesian product sets. *Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* 50 (1954), 198–202.
- [33] J.M. Marstrand. Some fundamental geometrical properties of plane sets of fractional dimensions. *Proc. London Math. Soc.* (3) 4, (1954), 257–302.
- [34] L. Olsen, D.L. Renfro. On the exact Hausdorff dimension of the set of Liouville numbers. II. *Manuscripta Math.* 119 (2006), no. 2, 217–224.
- [35] J. Oxtoby. Measure and Category. A survey of the analogies between topological and measure spaces. Second edition. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 2. Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1980. x+106 pp.
- [36] O. Perron. Die Lehre von den Kettenbrüchen. B.G. Teubner, 1913.
- [37] G. Petruska. On strong Liouville numbers. *Indag. Math. (N. S.)* 3 (1992), 211–218.
- [38] A. Pollington. Sum sets and U-numbers. Number theory with an emphasis on the Markoff spectrum. (Provo, UT, 1991), 207–214, Lecture Notes in Pure and Appl. Math., 147, Dekker, New York, 1993.
- [39] G.J. Rieger. Über die Lösbarkeit von Gleichungssystemen durch Liouville-Zahlen. (German) *Arch. Math. (Basel)* 26 (1975), 40–43.
- [40] D. Roy. On Schmidt and Summerer parametric geometry of numbers. *Ann. of Math.* (2) 182 (2015), no. 2, 739–786.
- [41] J. Schleischitz. Rational approximation to surfaces defined by polynomials in one variable. *Acta Math. Hungar.* 155 (2018), no. 2, 362–375.
- [42] K. Senthil Kumar, R. Thangadurai, M. Waldschmidt. Liouville numbers and Schanuel’s Conjecture. *Arch. Math. (Basel)* 102 (2014), no. 1, 59–70.
- [43] W. Schwarz. Liouville-Zahlen und der Satz von Baire. (German) *Math.-Phys. Semesterber.* 24 (1977), no. 1, 84–87.
- [44] B. Tan, Q. Zhou. The relative growth rate for partial quotients in continued fractions. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 478 (2019), no. 1, 229–235.
- [45] C. Tricot Jr. Two definitions of fractional dimension. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* 91 (1982), no. 1, 57–74.
- [46] B.-W. Wang, J. Wu. Hausdorff dimension of certain sets arising in continued fraction expansions. *Adv. Math.* 218 (2008), no. 5, 1319–1339.
- [47] B. Weiss. Almost no points on a Cantor set are very well approximable. *R. Soc. Lond. Proc. Ser. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci.* 457 (2001), no. 2008, 949–952.
- [48] Y. Xiao. Packing dimension, Hausdorff dimension and Cartesian product sets. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* 120 (1996), no. 3, 535–546.
- [49] O. Zindulka. Packing measures and dimensions on Cartesian products. *Publ. Mat.* 57 (2013), no. 2, 393–420.