

# DIRICHLET SPECTRUM FOR ONE LINEAR FORM

JOHANNES SCHLEISCHITZ

ABSTRACT. For  $n \geq 2$ , we determine the Dirichlet spectrum in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with respect to a linear form and the maximum norm as the entire interval  $[0, 1]$ . This natural result improves on recent work of Beresnevich, Guan, Marnat, Ramírez and Velani, and complements a subsequent paper by the author where the analogous result was proved for simultaneous approximation. Various generalisations that can be obtained by similar methods as in the latter paper are indicated. We believe that our results are an important step towards resolving the very open analogous problem for a general system of linear forms.

*Keywords:* Dirichlet spectrum, linear forms

Math Subject Classification 2020: 11J06, 11J13

## 1. DIRICHLET SPECTRUM FOR LINEAR FORM

For  $\underline{\xi} = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , let the approximation function with respect to one linear form be defined as

$$\psi_{\underline{\xi}}^*(Q) = \min L_{\underline{b}}(\underline{\xi}) = \min |b_0 + b_1\xi_1 + \dots + b_n\xi_n|,$$

where the minimum is taken over all integer vectors  $\underline{b} = (b_0, \dots, b_n) \neq \underline{0}$  with  $\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |b_i| \leq Q$ . Derive the Dirichlet constant of  $\underline{\xi}$  via

$$\Theta^*(\underline{\xi}) = \limsup_{Q \rightarrow \infty} Q^n \psi_{\underline{\xi}}^*(Q).$$

Then  $\Theta^*(\underline{\xi}) \in [0, 1]$  by a well-known variant of Dirichlet's Theorem. Define

$$\mathbb{D}_n^* = \{\Theta^*(\underline{\xi}) : \underline{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^n\} \subseteq [0, 1]$$

the Dirichlet spectrum with respect to approximation of one linear form and the maximum norm. We remark that we use the notation with asterisks above to distinguish our setting from the case of simultaneous approximation from [1, 13]. Our main result is

**Theorem 1.1.** *For any  $n \geq 2$  we have  $\mathbb{D}_n^* = [0, 1]$ . More precisely, for any  $c \in [0, 1]$  there exist uncountably many  $\underline{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  with  $\Theta^*(\underline{\xi}) = c$ . Moreover, we may choose them Liouville vectors, i.e. satisfying  $\liminf_{Q \rightarrow \infty} Q^N \psi_{\underline{\xi}}^*(Q) = 0$  for all  $N$ .*

In fact the  $\underline{\xi}$  constructed in the proof are also Liouville vectors with respect to simultaneous approximation, i.e. with respect to  $\psi_{\underline{\xi}}$  from [13] in place of  $\psi_{\underline{\xi}}^*$ , a stronger property.

---

Middle East Technical University, Northern Cyprus Campus, Kalkanli, Güzelyurt  
johannes@metu.edu.tr ; jschleischitz@outlook.com.

In particular all its coordinates are Liouville numbers. The claims of the theorem fail for  $n = 1$ , for this case we refer to [1] for further references.

Theorem 1.1 refines work of [3] and [13, Appendix]. Both papers yield a countable partition of  $[0, 1]$  into intervals each having non-empty intersection with  $\mathbb{D}_n^*$ , and admit the corresponding  $\underline{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  to be Liouville vectors. The main purpose of [3] was to show the existence of  $\underline{\xi}$  satisfying the considerably weaker claims that  $\underline{\xi}$  has Dirichlet constant in  $(0, 1)$ , i.e. is Dirichlet improvable but not singular, and also not badly approximable, i.e.  $\liminf_{Q \rightarrow \infty} Q^n \psi_{\underline{\xi}}^*(Q) = 0$ . It employed Roy's unconstructive existence result on parametric geometry of numbers [11] as the essential tool, which led to aforementioned induced intervals of the form  $[\kappa_n c, c]$  for explicitly computable  $\kappa_n \in (0, 1)$ , which however decays hyperexponentially with  $n$ . In the latter paper [13], the aforementioned partition was a consequence of [13, Theorem 2.1] where it was constructively shown that the dual Dirichlet spectrum  $\mathbb{D}_m$  with respect to simultaneous approximation to  $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_m$  equals the entire interval  $[0, 1]$  for  $m \geq 2$ , as in Theorem 1.1, together with a transference result due to German [4]. See also [1, 2] on the Dirichlet spectrum with respect to simultaneous approximation. In contrast to [3], in the induced intervals in [13], the quotient of interval endpoints depends explicitly on the larger endpoint  $c$ , and this ratio  $\kappa_n(c)$  tends to 0 like  $c^{n^2}$  as  $c \rightarrow 0$ . A comparison between the two results, distinguishing between small and large values of  $c$ , was given in [13, Appendix]. We further want to mention a related paper of Marnat [9], which however does not improve on  $\kappa_n$  from [3]. Theorem 1.1 finally gives the complete, natural answer on the Dirichlet spectrum for one linear form and thereby closes the gap arising in [3, 9, 13]. We note that the problem to determine the Dirichlet spectrum for a general system of  $m$  linear forms in  $n$  variables, both of which  $\mathbb{D}_n^*$  and  $\mathbb{D}_m$  are special cases of, remains open, as does the more moderate problem formulated in [3, Problem 4.1] on the existence of Dirichlet improvable but not badly approximable matrices (even for equal weights). We comment a little more on this topic in § 3.

We can generalize Theorem 1.1 in various directions, with similar methods as in [13]. This includes exact uniform approximation with respect to more general functions  $\Phi^*(Q)$  in place of  $cQ^{-n}$ , metrical results for packing and Hausdorff dimension for  $\underline{\xi}$  (for Hausdorff dimension we omit the property of  $\underline{\xi}$  being Liouville), generalizations to certain Cantor sets, assertions on the spectrum with respect to other norms (applied to  $\underline{b}$ ), and additional refined information on ordinary approximation. We only state one exemplary result.

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let  $n \geq 2$  be an integer. Assume  $\Phi^* : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  satisfies  $\Phi^*(t) < t^{-n}$  for  $t \geq t_0$  and*

$$(1) \quad \liminf_{\alpha \rightarrow 1^+} \liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Phi^*(\alpha t)}{\Phi^*(t)} \geq 1.$$

*Then there exist uncountably many  $\underline{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  satisfying*

$$\limsup_{Q \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\psi_{\underline{\xi}}^*(Q)}{\Phi^*(Q)} = 1.$$

The claim can be interpreted complementary to the special case of one linear form of a result by Jarník [8]. He constructed vectors  $\underline{\xi}$  with the property  $\psi_{\underline{\xi}}^*(Q) < \Phi^*(Q)$  for all

large  $Q$ , for any given  $\Phi^*$  of decay  $\Phi^*(t) < t^{-n}$ , but provides no control for the lower bound of  $\psi_{\underline{\xi}}^*$ . In [8] algebraic independence of the coordinates of  $\underline{\xi}$  was imposed as well, however by some variational argument assuming this does not cause any problem in Theorem 1.2 either. So only the additional condition (1) is a disadvantage of Theorem 1.2, which excludes functions of (local) exponential decay. The “very singular” vectors induced by very fast decreasing  $\Phi^*$  have frequently occurred in the work of Moshchevitin, particularly regarding geometric aspects of their induced best approximating integer linear forms, we only want to quote [10] exemplarily here. See also [12] for inhomogeneous approximation.

## 2. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

**2.1. Outline.** Given  $c \in [0, 1]$ , we construct  $\underline{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  with  $\Theta^*(\underline{\xi}) = c$ . We may assume strict inequalities  $0 < c < 1$  as it is well-known that the set of singular vectors defined via  $\Theta^*(\underline{\xi}) = 0$  is rather large (see [5], [6] for example), and similarly for  $\Theta^*(\underline{\xi}) = 1$  the according set of  $\underline{\xi}$  has full  $n$ -dimensional Lebesgue measure due to work of Davenport and Schmidt [7]. The construction described in § 2.2 is very similar to [13, § 5.1] where simultaneous approximation was studied, with only a small twist. The verification in § 2.3, 2.4 below is based on similar concepts as well, however some new ideas are required, in particular the most challenging Case 3 of § 2.3 employs a fundamentally new technique.

**2.2. Construction of  $\underline{\xi}$ .** Define an increasing sequence of positive integers recursively as follows: Define the initial  $n$  terms by  $a_j = 8j!$  for  $1 \leq j \leq n$ . For  $k \geq 1$ , having constructed the first  $nk$  terms  $a_1, \dots, a_{nk}$ , let the next  $n$  terms be given by the recursion

$$(2) \quad a_{nk+1} = a_{nk}^{M_k}$$

and

$$(3) \quad a_{nk+2} = a_{nk+1}^2, \quad a_{nk+3} = a_{nk+1}^3, \quad \dots, \quad a_{nk+n-1} = a_{nk+1}^{n-1},$$

and finally

$$(4) \quad a_{nk+n} = a_{n(k+1)} = \lceil c^{-1} a_{nk+1} \rceil \cdot a_{nk+n-1} \in (a_{nk+1}^n, \infty),$$

with integers  $M_k \rightarrow \infty$  that tend to infinity fast enough.

We observe that

$$(5) \quad a_i | a_{i+1}, \quad i \geq 1.$$

Define the components  $\xi_j$  of  $\underline{\xi}$  via

$$(6) \quad \xi_j = \sum_{h=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{a_{nh+j}}, \quad 1 \leq j \leq n,$$

that is we sum the reciprocals over the indices congruent to  $j$  modulo  $n$ . We show that  $\Theta^*(\underline{\xi}) = c$  for  $\underline{\xi}$  constructed above, and that they are Liouville vectors. Due to the freedom in choice of the  $M_k$  we clearly obtain uncountably many  $\underline{\xi}$ .

For the sequel, for  $1 \leq j \leq n$  and  $k \geq 0$  integers, fix the notation  $\xi_j = S_{j,k} + R_{j,k}$  with

$$S_{j,k} = \sum_{h=0}^k a_{nh+j}^{-1} \in \mathbb{Q}, \quad R_{j,k} = \sum_{h=k+1}^{\infty} a_{nh+j}^{-1}.$$

Let  $S_{0,k} = 1$  and  $R_{0,k} = 0$  for  $k \geq 0$ . Then for any  $\underline{b} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n+1}$  and any  $k \geq 1$  we have

$$(7) \quad L_{\underline{b}}(\underline{\xi}) = \left| \sum_{j=0}^n b_j S_{j,k} + \sum_{j=0}^n b_j R_{j,k} \right|.$$

**2.3. Proof of  $\Theta^*(\underline{\xi}) \leq c$  and Liouville property.** Let  $Q$  be any large parameter. We need to construct  $\underline{b} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n+1} \setminus \{0\}$  with  $\max_{1 \leq j \leq n} |b_j| \leq Q$  and inducing  $L_{\underline{b}}(\underline{\xi}) < c(1+o(1))Q^{-n}$  as  $Q \rightarrow \infty$ . There is a unique large integer  $k$  such that  $a_{nk} \leq Q < a_{(k+1)n}$ . Observing that

$$a_{nk} < \frac{a_{nk+1}a_{n(k-1)}}{a_{nk}} < a_{nk+1} < a_{n(k+1)}$$

we distinguish the three cases for  $Q$  given by

$$Q \in [a_{nk}, a_{nk+1}a_{n(k-1)}/a_{nk}), \quad Q \in [a_{nk+1}a_{n(k-1)}/a_{nk}, a_{nk+1}), \quad Q \in [a_{nk+1}, a_{n(k+1)}), \cdot$$

We start with the easiest case and keep the most challenging middle interval for the end.

Case 1: We have  $Q \in [a_{nk+1}, a_{n(k+1)})$ . Then we may simply take

$$b_1 = a_{nk+1}, \quad b_2 = b_3 = \dots = b_n = 0,$$

and  $b_0 = -b_1 S_{1,k} = -\sum_{j \leq k} a_{nk+1}/a_{nj+1}$  the nearest integer to  $-b_1 \xi_1$ , which by (5) is indeed an integer. Clearly  $\max_{1 \leq j \leq n} |b_j| \leq Q$ . From (7), (2) and (4) we get

$$\begin{aligned} L_{\underline{b}}(\underline{\xi}) &= |b_1 S_{1,k} + b_1 R_{1,k} + b_0| = |b_1 R_{1,k}| = a_{nk+1} \sum_{j \geq k+1} a_{nj+1}^{-1} \\ &\leq 2a_{nk+1} a_{n(k+1)+1}^{-1} \leq 2a_{n(k+1)}^{1/n} \cdot (c^{-1} a_{n(k+1)}^{M_{k+1}})^{-1} = 2ca_{n(k+1)}^{1/n - M_{k+1}} < ca_{n(k+1)}^{-n} \leq cQ^{-n} \end{aligned}$$

as soon as we choose  $M_{k+1}$  large enough in the next step of the construction. Thus  $\psi_{\underline{\xi}}^*(Q) \leq cQ^{-n}$  for those  $Q$ . If we let  $M_k \rightarrow \infty$ , by taking  $Q = a_{nk+1}$  and the  $b_j$  as above, it is further easy to see that the induced  $\underline{\xi}$  becomes a Liouville vector.

Case 2: We have  $Q \in [a_{nk}, a_{nk+1}a_{n(k-1)}/a_{nk})$ . Then we choose

$$b_1 = b_2 = \dots = b_{n-1} = 0, \quad b_n = a_{nk}$$

and finally  $b_0 = -b_n S_{n,k} = -\sum_{j \leq k} a_{nk}/a_{nj}$  the nearest integer to  $-b_n \xi_n$ , which again by (5) is indeed an integer. It is again obvious that  $\max_{1 \leq j \leq n} |b_j| \leq Q$ . From (7) we get

$$L_{\underline{b}}(\underline{\xi}) = |b_n S_{n,k} + b_n R_{n,k} + b_0| = |b_n R_{n,k}| = a_{nk} R_{n,k} = \sum_{j \geq k+1} \frac{a_{nk}}{a_{nj}} \leq 2 \frac{a_{nk}}{a_{n(k+1)}}.$$

We want this to be  $< cQ^{-n}$ . By assumption on  $Q$  it suffices to have

$$2 \frac{a_{nk}}{a_{n(k+1)}} < c \left( \frac{a_{nk+1}a_{n(k-1)}}{a_{nk}} \right)^{-n}.$$

Since  $a_{n(k+1)} \geq c^{-1}a_{nk+1}^n$  by (4), a sufficient condition is

$$(8) \quad 2a_{n(k-1)} < a_{nk}^{1-1/n}.$$

Since  $a_{nk} > c^{-1}a_{n(k-1)}^{M_{k-1}n} > a_{n(k-1)}^{M_{k-1}n}$  by (2) and (4), and as  $n \geq 2$ , this can clearly be achieved for all  $k$  by choosing the  $M_j \geq 2$ . Again we infer  $\psi_{\xi}^*(Q) \leq cQ^{-n}$  for these values of  $Q$ .

Case 3: Assume finally  $Q \in [a_{nk+1}a_{n(k-1)}/a_{nk}, a_{nk+1})$ . For  $0 \leq \ell \leq k-1$ , define

$$N_{\ell} = N_{\ell}(k) := a_{nk+1}a_{n\ell} \left( \frac{1}{a_{n(\ell+1)}} + \frac{1}{a_{n(\ell+2)}} + \cdots + \frac{1}{a_{nk}} \right),$$

where we let  $a_0 = 1$ . Note that all  $N_{\ell}$  are integers by (5) and we can assume that  $N_0 > N_1 > N_2 > \cdots > N_{k-1}$  by choosing the  $M_j$  large enough. The assumption of Case 3 translates into  $Q > N_{k-1}$ , hence there exists a minimum integer  $0 \leq e \leq k-1$  such that

$$Q > N_e.$$

Let us define our linear form via

$$b_1 = N_e, \quad b_2 = b_3 = \cdots = b_{n-1} = 0, \quad b_n = -a_{ne}$$

and finally put  $b_0$  the closest integer to  $-(b_1\xi_1 + b_n\xi_n)$ . Clearly  $|b_n| = a_{ne} \leq N_e < Q$  as well, so  $\max_{1 \leq j \leq n} |b_j| \leq Q$ . We may first rewrite  $L_{\underline{b}}(\underline{\xi})$  from (7) with our present  $k$  as

$$(9) \quad \begin{aligned} L_{\underline{b}}(\underline{\xi}) &= \left| \sum_{j=0}^n b_j S_{j,k} + \sum_{j=0}^n b_j R_{j,k} \right| \\ &= |b_0 + b_1 S_{1,k} + b_n S_{n,k} + b_1 R_{1,k} + b_n R_{n,k}| \\ &= |b_0 + b_1 S_{1,k-1} + (b_1(S_{1,k} - S_{1,k-1}) + b_n S_{n,k}) + (b_1 R_{1,k} + b_n R_{n,k})|. \end{aligned}$$

Next we observe that  $b_1 S_{1,k-1} \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Indeed, we may write it as

$$b_1 S_{1,k-1} = U_k a_{ne} \cdot \frac{a_{nk+1}}{a_{n(k-1)+1} a_{nk}}, \quad U_k := \frac{a_{nk}}{a_{n(e+1)}} + \frac{a_{nk}}{a_{n(e+2)}} + \cdots + \frac{a_{nk}}{a_{nk}} \in \mathbb{Z},$$

where  $U_k \in \mathbb{Z}$  by (5). But now  $(a_{n(k-1)+1} a_{nk}) |a_{nk+1}$  again since by (5) we have  $a_{n(k-1)+1} |a_{nk}$  and by (4) we have  $a_{nk}^2 |a_{nk+1}$ , as we may assume  $M_k \geq 2$ . Moreover we easily check via (5) that

$$b_1(S_{1,k} - S_{1,k-1}) + b_n S_{n,k} = N_e/a_{nk+1} - a_{ne} S_{n,k} = -a_{ne}(a_n^{-1} + a_{2n}^{-1} + \cdots + a_{ne}^{-1}) \in \mathbb{Z}$$

as well, where we mean that the sum vanishes if  $e = 0$ . Since the error terms  $b_1 R_{1,k}$  and  $b_n R_{n,k}$  are easily seen to be each smaller than  $1/4$  by absolute value, we get

$$b_0 = -b_1 S_{1,k-1} - (b_1(S_{1,k} - S_{1,k-1}) + b_n S_{n,k}) \in \mathbb{Z}$$

and can simplify (9) to

$$(10) \quad \begin{aligned} L_{\underline{b}}(\underline{\xi}) &= |b_1 R_{1,k} + b_n R_{n,k}| \\ &= |N_e R_{1,k} - a_{ne} R_{n,k}| \\ &= a_{ne} \cdot \left| a_{nk+1} \left( \frac{1}{a_{n(e+1)}} + \frac{1}{a_{n(e+2)}} + \cdots + \frac{1}{a_{nk}} \right) \sum_{j \geq k+1} \frac{1}{a_{nj+1}} - \sum_{j \geq k+1} \frac{1}{a_{nj}} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

We distinguish two cases again.

Subcase 3i: Assume  $e \geq 1$ . Choosing  $M_{k+1} \geq 2$ , from (2) we easily see that  $a_{nk+1}/a_{n(k+1)+1} = o(a_{n(k+1)}^{-1})$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  and consequently  $a_{ne}/a_{n(k+1)}$  is the dominating term in (10). It suffices to estimate (10) by

$$L_{\underline{b}}(\underline{\xi}) \leq 2 \frac{a_{ne}}{a_{n(k+1)}}.$$

Again we want this to be  $< cQ^{-n}$ . This is equivalent to

$$Q < \left( \frac{ca_{n(k+1)}}{2a_{ne}} \right)^{1/n}.$$

By assumption  $e \geq 1$  and minimality of  $e$ , we have

$$Q \leq N_{e-1} < 2 \frac{a_{n(e-1)}}{a_{ne}} a_{nk+1}.$$

Hence, it suffices to confirm

$$2 \frac{a_{n(e-1)}}{a_{ne}} a_{nk+1} \leq \left( \frac{ca_{n(k+1)}}{2a_{ne}} \right)^{1/n}.$$

But using  $a_{n(k+1)} \geq c^{-1} a_{nk+1}^n$  from (4) and  $n \geq 2$ , a sufficient condition for the latter is

$$(11) \quad a_{n(e-1)} \leq \frac{1}{4} \cdot a_{ne}^{1/2} \leq \frac{1}{4} \cdot a_{ne}^{1-1/n}.$$

Now we conclude similar as for (8): For  $e = 1$  we may assume this since  $a_0 = 1$  and  $a_n = 8n! \geq 16$ , and for  $e > 1$  by (3) and (2) we have

$$a_{ne} > c^{-1} a_{n(e-1)}^{M_{e-1}n} > a_{n(e-1)}^{M_{e-1}n} \geq a_{n(e-1)}^{2M_{e-1}}.$$

If we let  $M_j \geq 2$  for all  $j \geq 1$  and choose larger initial terms  $M_j$  if necessary, the quotient  $a_{n(e-1)}/a_{ne}^{1/2}$  from (11) can be made arbitrarily small, uniformly in  $c \in [0, 1]$  and  $e \geq 1$ . Thus again  $\psi_{\underline{\xi}}^*(Q) \leq cQ^{-n}$  for  $Q$  as above in any case.

Subcase 3ii: Finally assume  $e = 0$ , i.e.  $Q > a_{nk+1}(a_n^{-1} + a_{2n}^{-1} + \dots + a_{kn}^{-1})$ . Again  $a_0/a_{n(k+1)} = a_{n(k+1)}^{-1}$  is the dominating term in (10), for large  $k$ . Thus, from (4) as  $Q \rightarrow \infty$  (or equivalently  $k \rightarrow \infty$ ) we get

$$L_{\underline{b}}(\underline{\xi}) \leq a_{n(k+1)}^{-1}(1 + o(1)) = ca_{nk+1}^{-n}(1 + o(1)) \leq cQ^{-n}(1 + o(1)).$$

This yields  $\psi_{\underline{\xi}}^*(Q) \leq c(1 + o(1))Q^{-n}$  as  $Q \rightarrow \infty$  for values  $Q$  in question. Since we exhausted all cases, we infer  $\Theta^*(\underline{\xi}) \leq c$ .

**2.4. Proof of  $\Theta^*(\underline{\xi}) \geq c$ .** Take  $Q = a_{nk+1} - 1$  for large  $k$ . Consider any non-trivial linear form  $L_{\underline{b}}$  of height at most  $Q$ . Let  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  be the largest index with  $b_i \neq 0$ . By (5), the denominator of any  $S_{j,k} \in \mathbb{Q}$  written in lowest terms divides  $a_{nk+j}$ . Assume for the moment that for  $j = i$ , the denominator of  $S_{i,k}$  equals  $a_{nk+i}$  when reduced. If  $i = 1$ , then  $b_1 S_{1,k} \notin \mathbb{Z}$  by  $|b_1| \leq Q < a_{nk+1}$ , thus also  $b_0 + b_1 S_{1,k} \notin \mathbb{Z}$ . If  $i > 1$ , then since  $|b_i| \leq Q < a_{nk+1} \leq a_{nk+i}/a_{nk+i-1}$  by (3), (4) (with equality in the last inequality if  $i < n$ ), we have that  $b_i S_{i,k}$  in reduced form still has denominator strictly larger than  $a_{nk+i-1} = (i-1)a_{nk+1}$ . On the other hand, by (5) all other  $b_j S_{j,k}$  for  $0 \leq j < i$  have

denominator dividing  $(i-1)a_{nk+1}$ , after reduction. Hence this also applies to their sum. In both cases  $i = 1$  or  $i > 1$ , we infer that the entire sum

$$\sum_{j=0}^n b_j S_{j,k} = \sum_{j=0}^i b_j S_{j,k} = b_i S_{i,k} + \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} b_j S_{j,k}$$

cannot vanish. But again by (5) it can be written as a rational with denominator dividing  $a_{nk+i}$  when reduced. Therefore its modulus is bounded from below by

$$\left| \sum_{j=0}^n b_j S_{j,k} \right| \geq a_{nk+i}^{-1} \geq a_{n(k+1)}^{-1} > c(1-o(1))a_{nk+1}^{-n} > c(1-o(1))Q^{-n},$$

as  $Q \rightarrow \infty$  (or equivalently  $k \rightarrow \infty$ ), where we used (4) and that  $Q$  is very close to  $a_{nk+1}$ . The sum of remainder terms can be estimated via

$$\left| \sum_{j=0}^n b_j R_{j,k} \right| \leq nQ \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} |R_{j,k}| \ll_n a_{nk+1} a_{n(k+1)+1}^{-1} = o(a_{nk+1}^{-n}) = o(Q^{-n}),$$

as  $Q \rightarrow \infty$  as soon as we let all  $M_j \geq 2$  by (2). By triangle inequality and (7) we get

$$\begin{aligned} L_{\underline{b}}(\underline{\xi}) &= \left| \sum_{j=0}^n b_j S_{j,k} + \sum_{j=0}^n b_j R_{j,k} \right| \\ &\geq \left| \sum_{j=0}^n b_j S_{j,k} \right| - \left| \sum_{j=0}^n b_j R_{j,k} \right| \geq c(1-o(1))Q^{-n}, \quad Q \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, if we let  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , we get  $\Theta^*(\underline{\xi}) \geq c$  as desired.

It remains to be shown that  $S_{i,k}$  is already reduced with denominator  $a_{nk+i}$ , for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . We use induction on  $k$ . It is clear that  $S_{i,0} = 1/a_i$  is reduced. Now assume  $S_{i,k-1} = u/v$  is in lowest terms with denominator  $v = a_{n(k-1)+i}$ . If  $i < n$  by (2), (3) and (4) we have that

$$S_{i,k} = \frac{u}{v} + \frac{1}{a_{nk+i}} = \frac{u}{v} + \frac{1}{(vG_{i,k})^{iM_k}} = \frac{v^{iM_k-1}G_{i,k}^{iM_k}u + 1}{v^{iM_k}G_{i,k}^{iM_k}} = \frac{v^{iM_k-1}G_{i,k}^{iM_k}u + 1}{a_{nk+i}}$$

for some integer  $G_{i,k} = a_{n(k-1)+1}^{n-1-i} \lceil c^{-1}a_{n(k-1)+1} \rceil$ . This is clearly again reduced with denominator  $a_{nk+i}$  since upon  $M_k \geq 2$  the numerator is congruent to 1 modulo any prime divisor of  $vG_{i,k}$ , the latter being an integer multiple of the radical of the denominator. Finally in case of  $i = n$ , we have

$$S_{n,k} = \frac{u}{v} + \frac{1}{a_{nk+n}} = \frac{u}{v} + \frac{1}{H_{n,k}v^{M_k(n-1)}} = \frac{v^{M_k(n-1)-1}H_{n,k}u + 1}{v^{M_k(n-1)}H_{n,k}} = \frac{v^{M_k(n-1)-1}H_{n,k}u + 1}{a_{nk+n}}$$

where  $H_{n,k} = \lceil c^{-1}a_{nk+1} \rceil = \lceil c^{-1}v^{M_k} \rceil$ , and a similar argument applies.

## 3. SKETCH OF THE PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2 AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

To prove Theorem 1.2, we replace (4) by

$$a_{nk+n} = a_{nk+n-1} \cdot L_k^*, \quad k \geq 1,$$

with

$$L_k^* = \min\{z \in \mathbb{N} : (za_{nk+n-1})^{-1} < \Phi^*(a_{nk+1})\}.$$

The adaptations in the proof above can be readily made, very similarly as in [13, § 5.2]. We omit the details.

The proof of  $\Theta^*(\underline{\xi}) \leq c$  above shows that independent of  $n$  and  $Q$ , we only require at most 3 non-vanishing coefficients  $b_j$  in the integer vector  $\underline{b}$  to guarantee the estimate  $\psi_{\underline{\xi}}^*(Q) < (c + o(1))Q^{-n}$ , as  $Q \rightarrow \infty$ . However, it is probably not true that these sparse linear forms are minimal points to  $\underline{\xi}$  in general (i.e. realize the minimum  $\psi_{\underline{\xi}}^*(Q)$  over all  $\underline{b}$  in the according intervals). The proof shows that upon taking larger initial terms  $a_1, \dots, a_n$  if necessary, actually taking integers  $M_k \geq 2$  in each step in (2) should be sufficient. Then our vector  $\underline{\xi}$  does not consist of Liouville number entries, in fact it is no Liouville vector in the sense of Theorem 1.1. It would be highly desirable to combine ideas from [13] and the present note to generalize the construction to a system of  $m$  linear forms in  $n$  variables. However, particularly the modification of our integer vectors in Case 3 to the case  $m > 1$  causes technical problems that we have not yet been able to overcome.

## REFERENCES

- [1] R. K. Akhunzhanov, N. G. Moshchevitin. A note on Dirichlet spectrum. *arXiv: 2111.12259*.
- [2] R. K. Akhunzhanov, D. O. Shatskov. On Dirichlet spectrum for two-dimensional simultaneous Diophantine approximation. *Mosc. J. Comb. Number Theory* 3 (2013), no. 3–4, 5–23.
- [3] V. Beresnevich, L. Guan, A. Marnat, F. Ramírez, S. Velani. Dirichlet is not just Bad and Singular. *Adv. Math.* 401 (2022), Paper No. 108316.
- [4] O. German. On Diophantine exponents and Khintchine’s transference principle. *Mosc. J. Comb. Number Theory* 2 (2012), no. 2, 22–51.
- [5] T. Das, L. Fishman, D. Simmons, M. Urbański. A variational principle in the parametric geometry of numbers, with applications to metric Diophantine approximation. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris* 355 (2017), no. 8, 835–846.
- [6] T. Das, L. Fishman, D. Simmons, M. Urbański. A variational principle in the parametric geometry of numbers. *arXiv:1901.06602*.
- [7] H. Davenport, H. W. M. Schmidt. Dirichlet’s theorem on diophantine approximation. II. *Acta Arith.* 16 (1969/70), 413–424.
- [8] V. Jarník. Eine Bemerkung über diophantische Approximationen. *Math. Z.* 72 (1959), 187–191.
- [9] A. Marnat. Diophantine sets and Dirichlet improvability. *arXiv: 2201.11093*.
- [10] N.G. Moshchevitin. Singular Diophantine systems of A. Ya. Khinchin and their application. (Russian) *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk* 65 (2010), no. 3(393), 43–126; translation in *Russian Math. Surveys* 65 (2010), no. 3, 433–511.
- [11] D. Roy. On Schmidt and Summerer parametric geometry of numbers. *Ann. of Math.* (2) 182 (2015), no. 2, 739–786.
- [12] J. Schleischitz. Metric results on inhomogeneously singular vectors. *arXiv: 2201.01527*.
- [13] J. Schleischitz. Exact uniform approximation and Dirichlet spectrum in dimension at least two. *arXiv: 2202.04951*.