

# THE DUFFIN–SCHAEFFER CONJECTURE FOR SYSTEMS OF LINEAR FORMS

FELIPE A. RAMÍREZ

**ABSTRACT.** We extend the Duffin–Schaeffer conjecture to the setting of systems of  $m$  linear forms in  $n$  variables. That is, we establish a criterion to determine whether, for a given rate of approximation, almost all or almost no  $n$ -by- $m$  systems of linear forms are approximable at that rate using integer vectors satisfying a natural coprimality condition. When  $m = n = 1$ , this is the classical 1941 Duffin–Schaeffer conjecture, which was proved in 2020 by Koukoulopoulos and Maynard. Pollington and Vaughan proved the higher-dimensional version, where  $m > 1$  and  $n = 1$ , in 1990. The general statement we prove here was conjectured in 2009 by Beresnevich, Bernik, Dodson, and Velani. For approximations with no coprimality requirement, they also conjectured a generalized version of Catlin’s conjecture, and in 2010 Beresnevich and Velani proved the  $m > 1$  cases of that. Catlin’s classical conjecture, where  $m = n = 1$ , follows from the classical Duffin–Schaeffer conjecture. The remaining cases of the generalized version, where  $m = 1$  and  $n > 1$ , follow from our main result. Finally, through the Mass Transference Principle, our main results imply their Hausdorff measure analogues, which were also conjectured by Beresnevich *et al* (2009).

## 1. INTRODUCTION

**1.1. Results.** We establish the following result, which was conjectured by Beresnevich, Bernik, Dodson, and Velani in [4, 2009]. It is the generalization of the Duffin–Schaeffer conjecture to the setting of systems of linear forms.

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $m$  and  $n$  be positive integers. If  $\psi : \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  is a function such that*

$$(1) \quad \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}^n \setminus \{0\}} \left( \frac{\varphi(\gcd(\mathbf{q}))\psi(\mathbf{q})}{\gcd(\mathbf{q})} \right)^m = \infty,$$

*then for Lebesgue-almost every  $\mathbf{x} \in \text{Mat}_{n \times m}(\mathbb{R})$  there are infinitely many  $(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) \in \mathbb{Z}^m \times \mathbb{Z}^n$  such that*

$$(2) \quad |\mathbf{q}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{p}| < \psi(\mathbf{q})$$

*and*

$$(3) \quad \gcd(p_i, \mathbf{q}) = 1 \quad \text{for every } i = 1, \dots, m,$$

*both hold. Conversely, if the sum converges, then there are almost no such  $\mathbf{x}$ .*

*Remark.* Throughout this paper,  $|\cdot|$  denotes sup-norm,  $\varphi$  is Euler’s totient function, and  $\gcd(\mathbf{q})$  is the greatest common divisor of the components of  $\mathbf{q}$ , which we implicitly regard as a row vector.

---

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 11J83, 11J13, 11K60.

*Key words and phrases.* Metric number theory, Diophantine approximation, Duffin–Schaeffer conjecture, linear forms.

When  $m = n = 1$ , Theorem 1 is the classical Duffin–Schaeffer conjecture [11, 1941], which was proved by Koukoulopoulos and Maynard [20, 2020]. When  $n = 1$  and  $m > 1$ , Theorem 1 gives the higher-dimensional “simultaneous” version of the Duffin–Schaeffer conjecture, which was proved by Pollington and Vaughan [22, 1990]. The cases of Theorem 1 where  $nm > 1$  comprise the version for “approximation of systems of linear forms.” The subcases where  $m = 1$  and  $n > 1$  are often called the “dual” Duffin–Schaeffer conjecture.

For solutions to (2) without the coprimality requirement (3), we complete the following result—also conjectured by Beresnevich, Bernik, Dodson, and Velani in [4]—by proving its  $m = 1, n > 1$  cases. It is the generalization of Catlin’s conjecture to the setting of systems of linear forms.

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $m$  and  $n$  be positive integers. For  $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ , let*

$$\Phi_m(\mathbf{q}) = \#\{\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{Z}^m : |\mathbf{p}| \leq |\mathbf{q}|, \gcd(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) = 1\}.$$

*If  $\psi : \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  is a function such that*

$$(4) \quad \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}^n \setminus \{0\}} \Phi_m(\mathbf{q}) \sup_{t \geq 1} \left( \frac{\psi(t\mathbf{q})}{t|\mathbf{q}|} \right)^m = \infty,$$

*then for almost every  $\mathbf{x} \in \text{Mat}_{n \times m}(\mathbb{R})$  there are infinitely many  $(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) \in \mathbb{Z}^m \times \mathbb{Z}^n$  such that (2) holds. Conversely, if the series converges, then there are almost no such  $\mathbf{x}$ .*

When  $m = n = 1$ , this is Catlin’s conjecture [9, 1976], which follows from Koukoulopoulos and Maynard’s proof of the Duffin–Schaeffer conjecture. The cases of Theorem 2 where  $m > 1$  were proved by Beresnevich and Velani [8]. Interestingly, they do not follow from the  $m > 1$  cases of Theorem 1. We prove the remaining “dual” cases, where  $m = 1$  and  $n > 1$ . In these cases, we show that Theorem 2 is actually equivalent to a version of Theorem 1 where the condition (3) has been removed.

**1.2. Context.** These results belong to the field of metric Diophantine approximation. The most basic questions in this area have to do with approximating real numbers  $x$  with rational numbers  $p/q$ . One endeavors to understand how small the quantity  $|qx - p|$  can be, while controlling the size of the denominator  $q$ . The seminal theorem is Dirichlet’s approximation theorem. It implies that for every real  $x$  there are infinitely many  $(p, q)$  for which  $|qx - p| < 1/q$ .

In higher dimensions, one may want to approximate a vector  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^m$  with rational vectors  $\mathbf{p}/q$ , where  $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{Z}^m$  and  $q \in \mathbb{N}$ . This is referred to as “simultaneous approximation” because the components of  $\mathbf{x}$  are real numbers which are being approximated simultaneously by the components of  $\mathbf{p}/q$ , all having the same denominator. The corresponding higher-dimensional Dirichlet theorem says that for every  $\mathbf{x}$  there are infinitely many  $(\mathbf{p}, q)$  such that  $|q\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{p}| < q^{-1/m}$ .

If we try to replace  $q^{-1/m}$  by some other function  $\psi(q)$ , we quickly find that in general only metric statements are possible. This is the start of metric Diophantine approximation. The foundational result here is due to Khintchine [18, 19].

**Theorem** (Khintchine’s theorem, 1926). *If  $\psi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  is a non-increasing function such that*

$$(5) \quad \sum_{q=1}^{\infty} \psi(q)^m = \infty,$$

then for Lebesgue-almost every  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^m$  there are infinitely many  $(\mathbf{p}, q) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$(6) \quad |q\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{p}| < \psi(q).$$

Conversely, if the above series converges, then there are almost no  $\mathbf{x}$  for which this holds.

The “convergence” part of this theorem is a straightforward consequence of the Borel–Cantelli lemma (indeed, all of the “convergence” parts in this paper are), and it would hold even without the monotonicity assumption on  $\psi$ . This led to the question of whether the monotonicity assumption was necessary for the “divergence” part. As it turns out, one can remove the assumption when  $m > 1$  (Gallagher [13]), but not when  $m = 1$ . Duffin and Schaeffer showed this by constructing a counterexample function  $\psi$  which was supported on blocks of integers with high multiplicative interdependence. In the same paper, they posed their eponymous conjecture, where a coprimality assumption is imposed on the approximating rationals and the divergence condition is suitably modified [11]. This avoids the issue of multiplicative interdependence that arises in their counterexample.

It is worth explaining the previous paragraph in a bit more detail here. The set of points  $\mathbf{x}$  which is sought in all of the above theorems is naturally seen as the “limsup” set for a sequence of sets. For Khintchine’s theorem, that sequence of sets is, for each  $q \in \mathbb{N}$ , the set of points  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^m$  which satisfy  $|q\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{p}| < \psi(q)$  with some  $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{Z}^m$ . Since these sets are periodic, it is enough to consider their intersections with  $[0, 1]^m$ , intersections which we denote  $A(q)$  for the moment. The important point here is that  $\text{Leb}(A(q)) \leq 2^m \psi(q)^m$ , with equality if  $\psi(q) \leq 1/2$ . That is, the sum in (5) should be viewed as a measure sum of the sets  $A(q)$ . This is why the convergence part of Khintchine’s theorem follows easily from the Borel–Cantelli lemma. The reason the divergence part is more difficult is that the sets  $A(q)$  lack the probabilistic independence needed to apply the second Borel–Cantelli lemma. The Duffin–Schaeffer counterexample mentioned above exploits this issue in dimension  $m = 1$ , and the Duffin–Schaeffer conjecture avoids the issue by requiring  $\gcd(p, q) = 1$ . But with the coprimality requirement, the limsup set in question corresponds to a sequence of smaller sets, denoted  $A'(q)$ , whose measures are comparable to  $\frac{\varphi(q)\psi(q)}{q}$  in dimension one, and  $\left(\frac{\varphi(q)\psi(q)}{q}\right)^m$  in general. This is where the divergence condition in the Duffin–Schaeffer conjecture comes from, and by extension it is where (1) comes from.

The Duffin–Schaeffer conjecture animated a great deal of research in Diophantine approximation until it was finally proved in a breakthrough of Koukoulopoulos and Maynard in 2020 [20]. In the meantime, many results were proved that brought us nearer to the full conjecture:

- In [14], Gallagher established a zero-one law which showed that in order to prove the Duffin–Schaeffer conjecture, it sufficed to prove that its conclusion held for a positive measure set of real numbers  $x$ .
- In [12], Erdős proved the Duffin–Schaeffer conjecture for functions taking only the values 0 and  $c/n$ , for some fixed  $c > 0$ .
- In [26], Vaaler proved the Duffin–Schaeffer conjecture under the additional assumption that  $\psi(q) = O(1/q)$ .
- In [22, 21], Pollington and Vaughan proved the  $m$ -dimensional Duffin–Schaeffer conjecture,  $m > 1$ .

- In [17, 5, 1, 2], Haynes–Pollington–Velani, Beresnevich–Harman–Haynes–Velani, Aistleitner, and Aistleitner–Lachmann–Munsch–Technau–Zafeiropoulos proved versions of the Duffin–Schaeffer conjecture where  $\psi$  enjoys various forms of “extra divergence.”

These hold an important place in metric Diophantine approximation. Gallagher’s zero-one law (and a higher-dimensional version due to Vilchinski [27]) was used in all of the above cited results that followed it, including, of course, in the eventual proof by Koukoulopoulos and Maynard. The overlap estimates appearing in Erdős’s, Vaaler’s, and Pollington & Vaughan’s work (seen here as Proposition 1) contain in them the obstacle that had to be overcome in order to prove the Duffin–Schaeffer conjecture, hence the focus of most of the work that followed. Naturally, these themes will appear in the present paper as well.

**1.3. Approximation of systems of linear forms.** During all of this, there has been the parallel development of the theory of approximation of systems of linear forms. Here, one takes a real  $n \times m$  matrix  $\mathbf{x}$  and examines the quantity  $|\mathbf{q}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{p}|$ , with  $(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) \in \mathbb{Z}^m \times \mathbb{Z}^n$ . Groshev proved an analogue of Khintchine’s theorem for this kind of approximation [15].

**Theorem** (Khintchine–Groshev theorem, 1931). *If  $\psi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  is a non-increasing function such that*

$$(7) \quad \sum_{q=1}^{\infty} q^{n-1} \psi(q)^m = \infty,$$

*then for Lebesgue-almost every  $\mathbf{x} \in \text{Mat}_{n \times m}(\mathbb{R})$  there are infinitely many  $(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) \in \mathbb{Z}^m \times \mathbb{Z}^n$  such that*

$$(8) \quad |\mathbf{q}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{p}| < \psi(|\mathbf{q}|).$$

*Conversely, if the above series converges, then there are almost no  $\mathbf{x}$  for which this holds.*

As before, (7) should be viewed as a measure sum. Here, we can take the sets  $A(q)$  to be all  $\mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]^{nm}$  satisfying (8) with some  $\mathbf{q}$  whose norm is  $|\mathbf{q}| = q$ . The measure of  $A(q)$  is comparable to  $q^{n-1} \psi(q)^m$  once  $\psi(q)$  is small enough. Hence, the Borel–Cantelli lemma takes care of the convergence part of the theorem, and one must work harder for the divergence part.

Again, the question of whether monotonicity can be removed arises. Sprindzuk showed in [24, Theorem 12] that it can be removed if  $n > 2$ , leaving open the cases where  $n = 2$ . (Recall that the cases where  $n = 1$  and  $m > 1$  were handled by Gallagher [14] and that Duffin–Schaeffer showed that monotonicity is required in the case  $m = n = 1$ .) The question was answered in full by Beresnevich and Velani [8, Theorem 1]. They showed that one can remove the monotonicity assumption from the Khintchine–Groshev theorem whenever  $nm > 1$ .

**1.4. Multivariate theory.** Now that  $\mathbf{q}$  ranges through  $\mathbb{Z}^n$ , there is a more general setup that one can consider. Namely, one should allow for  $\psi$  to be multivariate, meaning it depends on  $\mathbf{q}$  rather than just  $|\mathbf{q}|$ . In this setting, there is the following theorem of Beresnevich and Velani [8, Theorem 5], which we view as a multivariate analogue of Gallagher’s version of Khintchine’s theorem without monotonicity [14].

**Theorem** (Beresnevich–Velani, 2010). *Let  $m > 1$ . If  $\psi : \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  is a function such that*

$$(9) \quad \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}^n} \psi(\mathbf{q})^m = \infty,$$

then for Lebesgue-almost every  $\mathbf{x} \in \text{Mat}_{n \times m}(\mathbb{R})$  there are infinitely many  $(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) \in \mathbb{Z}^m \times \mathbb{Z}^n$  such that (2) holds.

*Remark.* This improved on another result of Sprindzuk [24, Theorem 14], where the same was proved for functions  $\psi$  supported on the primitive vectors of  $\mathbb{Z}^n$ .

As with the other theorems, (9) should be viewed as a measure sum. Here, the relevant sets  $A(\mathbf{q})$  consist of  $\mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]^{nm}$  satisfying (2).

The above theorem is equivalent to the  $m > 1$  cases of Theorem 2 (see [4]). Indeed, when  $m > 1$  we have that  $\Phi_m(\mathbf{q})$  is comparable to  $|\mathbf{q}|^m$ . Armed with this fact, one can quickly show that Beresnevich and Velani’s theorem implies the  $m > 1$  cases of Theorem 2. (Similarly, Gallagher’s non-monotonic Khintchine theorem implies a higher-dimensional “simultaneous” Catlin conjecture.) However, an example like the one constructed by Duffin and Schaeffer shows that Beresnevich and Velani’s theorem cannot possibly hold for  $m = 1$ , and so the dual Catlin conjecture cannot be handled in the same way. We prove it here as a corollary to the dual Duffin–Schaeffer conjecture (Theorem 1 with  $m = 1$ ), whose coprimality requirement (3) avoids the issue caused by the (dual) Duffin–Schaeffer counterexample.

Regarding the Duffin–Schaeffer conjecture for systems of linear forms (the full Theorem 1), the result is new in all cases where  $n > 1$ . Its relationship to the  $n > 1$  cases of the Khintchine–Groshev theorem, the generalized version of Catlin’s conjecture (Theorem 2), and Beresnevich & Velani’s theorem is the same as the relationship between the  $n = 1$  cases of Theorem 1 (the classical Duffin–Schaeffer conjecture and its  $m$ -dimensional analogue) and the  $n = 1$  versions of the aforementioned theorems (specifically, Khintchine’s theorem, Catlin’s conjecture and its “simultaneous” analogues, and Gallagher’s non-monotonic Khintchine theorem), in terms of the implications and non-implications between them.

**1.5. Idea of the proof.** The general goal of the proof of Theorem 1 is one that pervades this field. In order to show that a limsup set is large, one must show that the corresponding sequence of sets does not overlap itself too much. That is, we must ensure that the measure sum (1) is not overly redundant. In this work, we will find that the geometric properties of our approximation sets allow us to control many of these overlaps, and for the ones that cause difficulties, we reframe the problem in a way that allows us to apply overlap estimates that were achieved in the work of Koukoulopoulos & Maynard [20] and Pollington & Vaughan [22, 21].

To say a bit more, recall that the second Borel–Cantelli lemma offers us one way to turn control of overlaps into a full-measure statement: For a sequence of pairwise independent sets having diverging measure sum, the limsup set has full measure. As it turns out, this is not directly helpful for proving the kinds of theorems we are after, because the sets involved are not pairwise independent. For example, the sets  $A(q)$  appearing above in our short discussion of Khintchine’s theorem are not pairwise independent. But in the case of Khintchine’s theorem, the fact that  $\psi$  is monotonic allows one to show that they do enjoy a type of “average” independence, where instead of  $\text{Leb}(A(q) \cap A(r))$  being bounded by (a constant times)  $\text{Leb}(A(q))\text{Leb}(A(r))$ , one has the bound on average over large sets of pairs  $(q, r)$ . This turns out to be enough to prove Khintchine’s theorem, after application of a zero-one law.

For the sets  $A'_{1,m}(q)$  appearing in the  $m$ -dimensional Duffin–Schaeffer conjecture, the situation is harder, in part because  $\psi$  is arbitrary. Nevertheless, Pollington and Vaughan



achieved an averaged pairwise independence in the  $m > 1$  cases and, in a momentous breakthrough, Koukoulopoulos and Maynard managed it in the  $m = 1$  setting. In the end, our proof depends crucially on those accomplishments. The specific parts of them that we avail ourselves of are encapsulated in Section 3, Proposition 2.

In the setting of systems of linear forms, we denote the relevant sets by  $A'_{n,m}(\mathbf{q})$  (to be formally introduced in Section 2). We pursue the same goal of showing that they enjoy this kind of averaged independence. The sets  $A'_{n,m}(\mathbf{q})$  are different in shape from the sets  $A'_{1,m}(q)$ . The latter are unions of metric balls, whereas if  $n > 1$  then  $A'_{n,m}(\mathbf{q})$  is a union of “stripes” through  $[0, 1]^{nm}$ . One effect of this is that when  $\mathbf{q}$  and  $\mathbf{r}$  are linearly independent, the sets  $A'_{n,m}(\mathbf{q})$  and  $A'_{n,m}(\mathbf{r})$  are independent (Section 4, Lemma 2). This means that when computing the average measures of intersections, the contributions from linearly independent pairs  $(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{r})$  are manageable, and we only have to control the contributions from dependent pairs. The idea for dependent pairs is to show that for  $1 \leq k < \ell$ , the pairwise intersections between sets from the collection  $\{A'_{n,m}(k\mathbf{q})\}_{\gcd(\mathbf{q})=1}$  and sets from the collection  $\{A'_{n,m}(\ell\mathbf{q})\}_{\gcd(\mathbf{q})=1}$  have a cumulative contribution to the average which is comparable to the contribution of  $A'_{1,m}(k) \cap A'_{1,m}(\ell)$  in the  $(1, m)$  setting, with an approximating function  $\Psi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  defined by  $\Psi(d) = \left(\sum_{\gcd(\mathbf{q})=1} \psi(d\mathbf{q}^m)\right)^{1/m}$  (Section 5, Proof of Theorem 1). At this point we are able to apply Proposition 2, the aforementioned results of Koukoulopoulos & Maynard and Pollington & Vaughan. Once all contributions are collected, we find the averaged pairwise independence that is needed to guarantee that the limsup set has positive measure. The theorem follows after applying an analogue of Gallagher’s zero-one law due to Beresnevich and Velani (Section 3, Theorem 5).

**1.6. Hausdorff measure analogues.** In [6] Beresnevich and Velani proved the Mass Transference Principle, a result that allows us to deduce Hausdorff measure statements about limsup sets for sequences of metric balls from Lebesgue measure statements for the same. Through it, they showed that the Duffin–Schaeffer conjecture implies its own Hausdorff measure analogues. The Mass Transference Principle has wide application. Using it in combination with Dirichlet’s theorem, one can prove the Jarník–Besicovitch theorem, and, in combination with Khitchine’ theorem, one obtains Jarník’s theorem.

In [3] Allen and Beresnevich modified the Mass Transference Principle in a way that allows it to be applied to limsup sets of sequences of thickened affine subspaces, confirming [4, Conjecture E]. Using that in combination with the Khintchine–Groshev theorem, they proved a Hausdorff measure analogue of Khintchine–Groshev [3, Theorem 2], partial versions of which had previously been obtained through other methods [4, 10]. In [4], the authors point out that their Conjecture E together with the Duffin–Schaeffer conjecture for systems of linear forms would yield Hausdorff measure analogues, and similarly for Catlin’s conjecture for systems of linear forms. Specifically, Theorems 1 and 2 in this paper, together with the Mass Transference Principle as extended in [3], give the following.

**Theorem 3** (General Duffin–Schaeffer, [4, Conjecture F]). *Let  $f$  and  $g : r \mapsto g(r) := r^{-m(n-1)}f(r)$  be dimension functions such that  $r^{-mn}f(r)$  is monotonic. Let  $\psi : \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  be a function. Then*

$$\mathcal{H}^f(W'(\psi)) = \mathcal{H}^f([0, 1]^{nm}) \quad \text{if} \quad \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}^n \setminus \{0\}} \left( \frac{\varphi(\gcd(\mathbf{q}))}{\gcd(\mathbf{q})} |\mathbf{q}| \right)^m \cdot g \left( \frac{\psi(\mathbf{q})}{|\mathbf{q}|} \right) = \infty.$$

**Theorem 4** (General Catlin, [4, Conjecture G]). *Let  $f$  and  $g : r \mapsto g(r) := r^{-m(n-1)}f(r)$  be dimension functions such that  $r^{-mn}f(r)$  is monotonic. Let  $\psi : \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  be a function. Then*

$$\mathcal{H}^f(W(\psi)) = \mathcal{H}^f([0, 1]^{nm}) \quad \text{if} \quad \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}^n \setminus \{0\}} \Phi_m(\mathbf{q}) \cdot \sup_{t \in \mathbb{N}} g\left(\frac{\psi(t\mathbf{q})}{t|\mathbf{q}|}\right) = \infty,$$

with  $\Phi_m$  defined as in Theorem 2.

We refer the reader to [6, 3, 4] for full discussions of the Mass Transference Principle and its applications in Diophantine approximation.

**1.7. Contents of the paper.** In Section 2 we collect notation, conventions, and initial reductions. Section 3 contains results of other authors that are crucial in this and other works on the topic. In order to streamline the presentation of the proof of Theorem 1, we collect several useful lemmas in Section 4. Section 5 is the proof of Theorem 1. In Section 6 we show how the  $m = 1$  cases of Theorem 2 follow from Theorem 1.

**Acknowledgments.** I thank Victor Beresnevich and Dimitris Koukoulopoulos for helpful conversations and advice.

## 2. NOTATION, CONVENTIONS, AND INITIAL REDUCTIONS

Notice that if the divergence condition in Theorem 1 is met, then there is some orthant in  $\mathbb{Z}^n$  where it is met, and it suffices to prove the theorem for a version of  $\psi$  which is supported in that orthant. Moreover, by applying reflections over coordinate hyperplanes, we may assume without loss of generality that it is the positive orthant, so that it suffices to prove Theorem 1 for functions of the form  $\psi : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ .

Since the set of  $\mathbf{x} \in \text{Mat}_{n \times m}(\mathbb{R})$  for which there are infinitely many solutions to (2) is periodic, it is customary to restrict attention to those  $\mathbf{x}$  lying in  $[0, 1]^{nm}$ . The set of such  $\mathbf{x}$  is denoted  $W(\psi)$ . We are further interested in a subset of  $W(\psi)$ , namely those  $\mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]^{nm}$  for which (2) has infinitely many solutions which additionally satisfy the coprimality condition (3). That subset is denoted  $W'(\psi)$ , and the conclusion of Theorem 1 is equivalent to

$$(10) \quad \text{Leb}(W'(\psi)) = 1.$$

This is what we will show.

It is useful to identify  $[0, 1]^{nm}$  with the  $nm$ -dimensional torus  $\mathbb{T}^{nm} = \mathbb{R}^{nm}/\mathbb{Z}^{nm}$ . We view its elements as  $n \times m$  matrices. For  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ , let

$$A'_{n,m}(\mathbf{q}, \varepsilon) = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{T}^{nm} : \exists \mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{Z}^m, \gcd(p_i, \mathbf{q}) = 1 (i = 1, \dots, m), |\mathbf{q}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{p}| < \varepsilon\}.$$

Notice that

$$\text{Leb}(A'_{n,m}(\mathbf{q}, \varepsilon)) \leq \left( \frac{2\varphi(\gcd(\mathbf{q}))\varepsilon}{\gcd(\mathbf{q})} \right)^m.$$

For a function  $\psi : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ , denote

$$A'_{n,m}(\mathbf{q}) := A'_{n,m}(\mathbf{q}, \psi(\mathbf{q})) = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{T}^{nm} : \exists \mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{Z}^m \text{ such that (2) and (3) hold}\}.$$

This way,

$$W'(\psi) = \limsup_{q \rightarrow \infty} \bigcup_{|\mathbf{q}|=q} A'_{n,m}(\mathbf{q})$$

is the set of points lying in infinitely many of the sets  $A'_{n,m}(\mathbf{q})$ , and the sum appearing in Theorem 1 bounds (half) the sum of their measures.

Let  $\mathbb{P}^n$  denote the (nonzero) primitive vectors in  $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ . Then the divergence condition in Theorem 1 can be rephrased as

$$(11) \quad \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{P}^n} \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \left( \frac{\varphi(d)}{d} \psi(d\mathbf{q}) \right)^m = \infty.$$

With this, Theorem 1 can be stated as

$$(11) \quad \implies \quad (10).$$

For  $d \geq 1$ , let

$$\Psi(d) = \left( \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{P}^n} \psi(d\mathbf{q})^m \right)^{1/m}.$$

Eventually, we will see that no generality is lost in assuming that  $\Psi(d)$  is always finite.

Finally, we use the Vinogradov asymptotic notation throughout. For two functions  $f(t), g(t)$ , the notations  $f(t) \ll g(t)$  and  $g(t) \gg f(t)$  are used to mean that there is some constant  $c > 0$  such that  $f(t) \leq cg(t)$  for all relevant values of  $t$ . The notation  $f(t) \asymp g(t)$  is used to mean that  $f(t) \ll g(t)$  and  $f(t) \gg g(t)$  both hold. The implicit constants  $c > 0$  appearing here depend only on the parameter  $m$ .

### 3. ESSENTIAL INGREDIENTS

The challenging parts of all of the theorems mentioned in Section 1 are the divergence parts. As we have mentioned, this is because the sets we work with are not pairwise independent, such as one would need in order to apply the second Borel–Cantelli lemma to achieve full measure of the limsup set. The following overlap estimates have appeared in [25, 12, 26, 22, 21, 2, 1, 5, 17, 20]. In a sense, they represent the best one can do when it comes to pairwise independence.

**Proposition 1** (Overlap estimates). *Let  $\psi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  be such that  $\Psi(d) \leq d/(2\varphi(d))$  for every  $d \geq 1$ . If  $k \neq \ell$ , then*

$$\text{Leb}\left(A'_{1,1}(k, \Psi(k)) \cap A'_{1,1}(\ell, \Psi(\ell))\right) \ll \mathbf{1}_{M(k,\ell) \geq \gcd(k,\ell)} \frac{\varphi(k)\Psi(k)}{k} \frac{\varphi(\ell)\Psi(\ell)}{\ell} \prod_{\substack{p|k\ell/\gcd(k,\ell)^2 \\ p > M(k,\ell)/\gcd(k,\ell)}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{p}\right),$$

where  $M(k, \ell) = \max\{\ell\Psi(k), k\Psi(\ell)\}$ . The implicit constant is absolute.

*Proof.* This is found in [22, Pages 195–196] as well as [16, Lemma 2.8].  $\square$

Much of the effort in the above cited papers goes into controlling the effect that the factor

$$\prod_{\substack{p|k\ell/\gcd(k,\ell)^2 \\ p > M(k,\ell)/\gcd(k,\ell)}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{p}\right)$$

can have on the overlaps. In [22, 21, 20], Pollington & Vaughan and Koukoulopoulos & Maynard manage to control this effect on average. The following proposition summarizes the control they achieve.

**Proposition 2** (Koukoulopoulos–Maynard, Pollington–Vaughan). *Let  $\Psi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow [0, 1/2]$  be a function. Then for all large  $X \geq 1$  and  $Y > X$  such that*

$$\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{m-1} < \sum_{X \leq d \leq Y} \left(\frac{\varphi(d)\Psi(d)}{d}\right)^m < \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{m-2},$$



one has

$$\sum_{X \leq k < \ell \leq Y} \text{Leb}\left(A'_{1,m}(k, \Psi(k)) \cap A'_{1,m}(\ell, \Psi(\ell))\right) \ll 1.$$

The implicit constant depends only on  $m$ .

*Proof.* In the case  $m = 1$ , this is contained in [20, Proof of Theorem 1 assuming Proposition 5.4].

In the cases where  $m > 1$ , it is contained in [22, Pages 197–199, Cases (i)–(iii)], and in [21, Cases (a),(b),(d)], but the notation is slightly different, so some translation is in order. Pollington and Vaughan let  $\eta \in (0, 1)$  be any fixed parameter, and  $Z \subset \mathbb{N}$  a finite set (with large minimum) such that

$$\frac{1}{2}\eta < \sum_{d \in Z} \text{Leb}(A_{1,m}(d, \Psi(d))) < \eta.$$

They show

$$\sum_{\substack{k, \ell \in Z \\ k < \ell}} \text{Leb}\left(A'_{1,m}(k, \Psi(k)) \cap A'_{1,m}(\ell, \Psi(\ell))\right) \ll \sum_{d \in Z} \text{Leb}\left(A'_{1,m}(d, \Psi(d))\right),$$

with an implicit constant depending at most on  $m$ . In our proposition's statement, we have taken  $\eta = 2^{2-m}$  and the range  $Z = [X, Y] \cap \mathbb{Z}$ .  $\square$

With this on-average bound of overlaps, Pollington & Vaughan and Koukoulopoulos & Maynard are able to show, through an application of the Chung–Erdős lemma (a version of which is listed below as Proposition 3), that the associated limsup sets have positive measure. At this point, Gallagher's zero-one law [14] and Vilchinski's higher-dimensional version [27] lead to the proof of the Duffin–Schaeffer conjecture in dimensions  $m \geq 1$ .

Here is the version of the Chung–Erdős lemma that we will use. Usually, it is stated for sums of finitely many measurable sets, but it is not hard to show that it also holds for infinitely many sets having a finite measure sum.

**Proposition 3** (Chung–Erdős Lemma). *If  $(X, \mu)$  is a probability space and  $(A_q)_{q \in \mathbb{N}} \subset X$  is a sequence of measurable subsets such that  $0 < \sum_q \mu(A_q) < \infty$ , then*

$$\mu\left(\bigcup_{q=1}^{\infty} A_q\right) \geq \frac{\left(\sum_{q=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_q)\right)^2}{\sum_{q,r=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_q \cap A_r)}.$$

*Proof.* For any  $Q > 1$ , let

$$C_Q = \bigcup_{q=1}^Q A_q.$$

Applying the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \int_X \sum_{q=1}^Q \mathbf{1}_{A_q} d\mu \right)^2 &= \left( \int_X \mathbf{1}_{C_Q} \sum_{q=1}^Q \mathbf{1}_{A_q} d\mu \right)^2 \\ &\leq \mu(C_Q) \int_X \left( \sum_{q=1}^Q \mathbf{1}_{A_q} \right)^2 d\mu \\ &= \mu(C_Q) \sum_{q,r=1}^Q \mu(A_q \cap A_r). \end{aligned}$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned} \mu \left( \bigcup_{q=1}^{\infty} A_q \right) &= \lim_{Q \rightarrow \infty} \mu(C_Q) \\ &\geq \limsup_{Q \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\left( \sum_{q=1}^Q \mu(A_q) \right)^2}{\sum_{q,r=1}^Q \mu(A_q \cap A_r)}. \end{aligned}$$

For any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we have

$$\left( \sum_{q=1}^Q \mu(A_q) \right)^2 \geq (1 - \varepsilon) \left( \sum_{q=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_q) \right)^2$$

for all sufficiently large  $Q$ . Therefore,

$$\limsup_{Q \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\left( \sum_{q=1}^Q \mu(A_q) \right)^2}{\sum_{q,r=1}^Q \mu(A_q \cap A_r)} \geq (1 - \varepsilon) \frac{\left( \sum_{q=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_q) \right)^2}{\sum_{q,r=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_q \cap A_r)},$$

and the result follows since  $\varepsilon > 0$  was arbitrary.  $\square$

Finally, we will need a zero-one law that holds in the setting of approximation of systems of linear forms. This is provided by Beresnevich and Velani [7, Theorem 1].

**Theorem 5** (Beresnevich–Velani). *For any  $n, m$ , and  $\psi$  we have  $\text{Leb}(W'(\psi)) \in \{0, 1\}$ .*

#### 4. LEMMAS

This section is a collection of the lemmas we will need for the proof of Theorem 1.

**Lemma 1.** *For  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ , and  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , let*

$$E(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{v}, \varepsilon) = \pi(\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{x}| < \varepsilon\} + \mathbf{v}),$$

where  $\pi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^n$  is the natural quotient map. If  $\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^n$  are linearly independent, then

$$\text{Leb}(E(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{v}_1, \varepsilon_1) \cap E(\mathbf{q}_2, \mathbf{v}_2, \varepsilon_2)) = \text{Leb}(E(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{v}_1, \varepsilon_1)) \text{Leb}(E(\mathbf{q}_2, \mathbf{v}_2, \varepsilon_2)),$$

for all  $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 > 0$  and  $\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ .

*Proof.* First, note that if  $\varepsilon_1 \geq 1/2$  or  $\varepsilon_2 \geq 1/2$ , then at least one of  $E(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{v}_1, \varepsilon_1)$  and  $E(\mathbf{q}_2, \mathbf{v}_2, \varepsilon_2)$  is all of  $\mathbb{T}^n$  and the lemma will clearly hold. So we will assume that  $0 < \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 < 1/2$ .

Next, note that the vectors  $\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2$  do not increase the generality, because the set

$$E(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{v}_1, \varepsilon_1) \cap E(\mathbf{q}_2, \mathbf{v}_2, \varepsilon_2)$$

is a translate of

$$E(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{0}, \varepsilon_1) \cap E(\mathbf{q}_2, \mathbf{0}, \varepsilon_2)$$

by a solution  $\mathbf{x}_0$  to  $\mathbf{q}_1 \cdot (\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{v}_1) = \mathbf{q}_2 \cdot (\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{v}_2)$ . Such a solution  $\mathbf{x}_0$  is guaranteed to exist because  $\mathbf{q}_1$  and  $\mathbf{q}_2$  are linearly independent. So it is enough to treat the case where  $\mathbf{v}_1 = \mathbf{v}_2 = \mathbf{0}$ .

Let  $\mathbf{1}_i$  denote the indicator function of the interval  $(-\varepsilon_i, \varepsilon_i)$ . Then

$$\text{Leb}(E_1 \cap E_2) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^n} \mathbf{1}_1(\mathbf{q}_1 \cdot \mathbf{x}) \mathbf{1}_2(\mathbf{q}_2 \cdot \mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}.$$

Expanding  $\mathbf{1}_i$  into a Fourier series

$$\mathbf{1}_i(x) \sim \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} a_i(n) e(nx),$$

where  $e(r) := \exp(2\pi i r)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Leb}(E_1 \cap E_2) &= \int_{\mathbb{T}^n} \left( \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} a_1(n) e(n\mathbf{q}_1 \cdot \mathbf{x}) \right) \left( \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} a_2(n) e(n\mathbf{q}_2 \cdot \mathbf{x}) \right) d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \sum_{n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{Z}} a_1(n_1) a_2(n_2) \underbrace{\int_{\mathbb{T}^n} e((n_1\mathbf{q}_1 + n_2\mathbf{q}_2) \cdot \mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}}_{=0 \text{ if } n_1\mathbf{q}_1 + n_2\mathbf{q}_2 \neq \mathbf{0}} \\ &= a_1(0) a_2(0) \\ &= \text{Leb}(E_1) \text{Leb}(E_2). \end{aligned}$$

This is what we had to show. □

**Lemma 2.** *If  $\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^n$  are linearly independent, then*

$$\text{Leb}(A'_{n,m}(\mathbf{q}_1) \cap A'_{n,m}(\mathbf{q}_2)) = \text{Leb}(A'_{n,m}(\mathbf{q}_1)) \text{Leb}(A'_{n,m}(\mathbf{q}_2)),$$

*that is, the sets  $A'_{n,m}(\mathbf{q}_1)$  and  $A'_{n,m}(\mathbf{q}_2)$  are independent.*

*Proof.* The lemma clearly holds if either of the sets  $A'_{n,m}(\mathbf{q}_i)$  has measure 0. Let us assume that they both have positive measure. The set  $A'_{n,m}(\mathbf{q}_i)$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ) has the form

$$A'_{n,m}(\mathbf{q}_i) = \prod_{j=1}^m A'_{n,1}(\mathbf{q}_i)$$

where the  $j$ th factor corresponds to the  $j$ th column in  $\mathbb{T}^{nm}$  viewed as  $n \times m$  matrices. Therefore,

$$(12) \quad \text{Leb}(A'_{n,m}(\mathbf{q}_i)) = \text{Leb}(A'_{n,1}(\mathbf{q}_i))^m$$

and

$$(13) \quad \text{Leb}(A'_{n,m}(\mathbf{q}_1) \cap A'_{n,m}(\mathbf{q}_2)) = \text{Leb}(A'_{n,1}(\mathbf{q}_1) \cap A'_{n,1}(\mathbf{q}_2))^m$$

where  $\text{Leb}$  is to be understood as Lebesgue measure in the appropriate dimension.

We claim that each  $A'_{n,1}$  is a disjoint union of finitely many sets of the form  $E(\mathbf{q}_i, \mathbf{v}, \varepsilon)$ . To see it, note that we have

$$A'_{n,1}(\mathbf{q}) = \bigcup_{|p| \leq |\mathbf{q}|} E(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{v}_{p,\mathbf{q}}, \psi(\mathbf{q})),$$

where  $\mathbf{v}_{p,\mathbf{q}}$  is any solution to  $\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{v} = p$ . The sets  $E(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{v}_{p,\mathbf{q}}, \psi(\mathbf{q}))$  may not be disjoint, but any two that intersect have a union that is of the form  $E(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{v}, \varepsilon)$  for some other  $\mathbf{v}$  and  $\varepsilon$ . The claim follows upon recombining.

Therefore, by Lemma 1 we have

$$\text{Leb}\left(A'_{n,1}(\mathbf{q}_1) \cap A'_{n,1}(\mathbf{q}_2)\right) = \text{Leb}\left(A'_{n,1}(\mathbf{q}_1)\right) \text{Leb}\left(A'_{n,1}(\mathbf{q}_2)\right).$$

The lemma is proved by combining this last expression with (12) and (13).  $\square$

**Lemma 3.** For  $d, k, \ell \geq 1$  and  $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{P}^n$ , we have

$$\text{Leb}\left(A'_{n,m}(d\mathbf{q})\right) = \text{Leb}\left(A'_{1,m}(d, \psi(d\mathbf{q}))\right)$$

and

$$\text{Leb}\left(A'_{n,m}(k\mathbf{q}) \cap A'_{n,m}(\ell\mathbf{q})\right) = \text{Leb}\left(A'_{1,m}(k, \psi(k\mathbf{q})) \cap A'_{1,m}(\ell, \psi(\ell\mathbf{q}))\right).$$

*Proof.* Because of (12) and (13), it is sufficient to prove the lemma in the case  $(n, m) = (n, 1)$ . We have

$$A'_{n,1}(d\mathbf{q}) = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{T}^n : \exists p \in \mathbb{Z}, |d\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{x} - p| < \psi(d\mathbf{q}), \gcd(p, d) = 1\}.$$

Let  $T_{\mathbf{q}}: \mathbb{T}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^1$  be the transformation  $\mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{x} \pmod{1}$ , and notice that

$$A'_{n,1}(d\mathbf{q}) = T_{\mathbf{q}}^{-1}\left(A'_{1,1}(d, \psi(d\mathbf{q}))\right).$$

Since  $T_{\mathbf{q}}$  preserves Lebesgue measure, the lemma follows.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.** Suppose  $I_1, I_2, \dots, I_r \subset \mathbb{T}^m$  are disjoint balls and  $J_1, J_2, \dots, J_r \subset \mathbb{T}^m$  are disjoint balls. Then for any  $0 < \Sigma \leq 1$ ,

$$\text{Leb}\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^r \Sigma \cdot I_i \cap \bigcup_{j=1}^s \Sigma \cdot J_j\right) \leq \Sigma^m \text{Leb}\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^r I_i \cap \bigcup_{j=1}^s J_j\right),$$

where  $\Sigma \cdot I_i$  denotes the concentric scaling of the ball  $I_i$  by  $\Sigma$ , and similar for  $\Sigma \cdot J_j$ .

*Proof.* By the disjointness assumption, we have

$$(14) \quad \text{Leb}\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^r I_i \cap \bigcup_{j=1}^s J_j\right) = \sum_{i,j} \text{Leb}(I_i \cap J_j)$$

and

$$(15) \quad \text{Leb}\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^r \Sigma \cdot I_i \cap \bigcup_{j=1}^s \Sigma \cdot J_j\right) = \sum_{i,j} \text{Leb}(\Sigma \cdot I_i \cap \Sigma \cdot J_j)$$

Clearly,

$$(16) \quad \text{Leb}(\Sigma I_i \cap \Sigma J_j) = \Sigma^m \text{Leb}(I_i \cap J_j),$$

where  $\Sigma I_i$  and  $\Sigma J_j$  denote the images of  $I_i$  and  $J_j$  under the contraction of  $[0, 1]^m \subset \mathbb{R}^m$  by  $\Sigma$ . Since

$$\text{Leb}(\Sigma I_i) = \text{Leb}(\Sigma \cdot I_i) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Leb}(\Sigma J_j) = \text{Leb}(\Sigma \cdot J_j),$$

and the centers of  $\Sigma \cdot I_i$  and  $\Sigma \cdot J_j$  are farther apart than the centers of  $\Sigma I_i$  and  $\Sigma J_j$ , we have

$$(17) \quad \text{Leb}(\Sigma \cdot I_i \cap \Sigma \cdot J_j) \leq \text{Leb}(\Sigma I_i \cap \Sigma J_j).$$

The lemma follows on combining (14), (15), (16), and (17).  $\square$

**Lemma 5.** *Let  $d \geq 1, \mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{P}^n$ . If  $\psi(d\mathbf{q}) \leq d/(2\varphi(d))$ , then*

$$\text{Leb}(A'_{n,m}(d\mathbf{q})) \geq \left( \frac{\varphi(d)}{d} \psi(d\mathbf{q}) \right)^m.$$

*In fact, for every  $d$ , there is a subset*

$$P_d \subset \{ \mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{Z}^m : |\mathbf{p}| \leq d, \gcd(p_i, d) = 1, (i = 1 \dots, m) \}$$

*such that  $\#P_d \geq 3^{-m} \varphi(d)^m$  and such that*

$$(18) \quad \left| \frac{\mathbf{p}_1}{d} - \frac{\mathbf{p}_2}{d} \right| \geq \frac{d}{\varphi(d)}$$

*for any two distinct  $\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2 \in P_d$ .*

*Proof.* The first part is [22, Page 192, Equation (3)] applied to  $A'_{1,1}(d, \psi(d\mathbf{q}))$ , which has the same measure as  $A'_{n,1}(d\mathbf{q})$ , by Lemma 3. We then apply (12).

The second part can be deduced from the first part in the following way. We have

$$\text{Leb} \left( A'_{1,m} \left( d, \frac{d}{2\varphi(d)} \right) \right) \geq \frac{1}{2^m}.$$

By Vitali's covering lemma, there is a disjoint subcollection

$$A'' \subset A'_{1,m} \left( d, \frac{d}{2\varphi(d)} \right)$$

of balls such that the union of their 3-fold dilates covers  $A'_{1,m} \left( d, \frac{d}{2\varphi(d)} \right)$ . Denote by  $P_d$  the set of numerator vectors of the centers of the balls making up  $A''$ . Then

$$\text{Leb} \left( A'_{1,m} \left( d, \frac{d}{2\varphi(d)} \right) \right) \leq \#P_d \cdot \left( \frac{3}{2\varphi(d)} \right)^m.$$

Combining, we have  $\#P_d \geq 3^{-m} \varphi(d)^m$ . And since the disjoint balls comprising  $A''$  have radius  $d/(2\varphi(d))$ , we have (18).  $\square$

**Lemma 6.** *Suppose that for every  $d \geq 1$  and  $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{P}^n$ , we have  $\psi(d\mathbf{q}) = 0$  or  $\psi(d\mathbf{q}) > d/(2\varphi(d))$  and that the latter occurs for infinitely many  $(d, \mathbf{q}) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{P}^n$ . Then  $\text{Leb}(W'(\psi)) = 1$ .*

*Proof.* If  $\psi(d\mathbf{q}) > d/(2\varphi(d))$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Leb}(A'(d\mathbf{q}, \psi(d\mathbf{q}))) &\geq \text{Leb}(A'(d\mathbf{q}, d/(2\varphi(d)))) \\ &\geq 2^{-m}, \end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 5. This implies that  $W'(\psi)$  has measure at least  $2^{-m}$ , and so by Theorem 5 it must have measure 1.  $\square$

**Lemma 7.** *Suppose  $\psi : \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  and for each  $d \geq 1$  and  $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{P}^n$  we have  $\psi(d\mathbf{q}) \leq d/(2\varphi(d))$ . If there is some  $c > 0$  such that  $\frac{\varphi(d)\Psi(d)}{d} \geq c$  for infinitely many  $d \geq 1$ , then  $\text{Leb}(W'(\psi)) = 1$ .*

*Proof.* If for some  $d \geq 1$  we have  $\Psi(d) = \infty$ , then the sets  $\{A'_{n,m}(d\mathbf{q}, \psi(d\mathbf{q}))\}_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{P}^n}$  have a diverging measure sum, and by Lemma 2, they are pairwise independent. The result follows from the second Borel–Cantelli lemma. So let us assume that  $\Psi(d)$  is always finite.

Define for each  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ , the set

$$C(d) = \bigcup_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{P}^n} A'_{n,m}(d\mathbf{q}).$$



By Proposition 3,

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Leb}(C(d)) &\geq \frac{(\sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{P}^n} \text{Leb}(A'_{n,m}(d\mathbf{q})))^2}{\sum_{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{P}^n} \text{Leb}(A'_{n,m}(d\mathbf{q}) \cap A'_{n,m}(d\mathbf{r}))} \\
&\stackrel{\text{Lem. 2}}{\geq} \frac{(\sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{P}^n} \text{Leb}(A'_{n,m}(d\mathbf{q})))^2}{\sum_{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{P}^n} \text{Leb}(A'_{n,m}(d\mathbf{q})) \text{Leb}(A'_{n,m}(d\mathbf{r}))} \\
&= \frac{(\sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{P}^n} \text{Leb}(A'_{n,m}(d\mathbf{q})))^2}{(\sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{P}^n} \text{Leb}(A'_{n,m}(d\mathbf{q})))^2 + \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{P}^n} \text{Leb}(A'_{n,m}(d\mathbf{q}))} \\
&\stackrel{\text{Lem. 5}}{\geq} \frac{\sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{P}^n} \left(\frac{\varphi(d)\Psi(d\mathbf{q})}{d}\right)^m}{\sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{P}^n} \left(\frac{2\varphi(d)\Psi(d\mathbf{q})}{d}\right)^m + 1}
\end{aligned}$$

If  $\frac{\varphi(d)\Psi(d)}{d} \geq c$ , then this implies

$$\text{Leb}(C(d)) \geq \frac{c^m}{2^m c^m + 1} > 0.$$

Since this happens for infinitely many  $d$ , it immediately implies  $\limsup C(d)$  has positive measure, hence  $W'(\psi)$  has positive measure. The lemma follows by applying Theorem 5.  $\square$

## 5. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

We can dispatch the convergence part quickly. The sets  $A'_{n,m}(\mathbf{q}, \psi(\mathbf{q}))$  ( $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ ) have measures bounded above by  $\left(\frac{2\varphi(\gcd(\mathbf{q}))\psi(\mathbf{q})}{\gcd(\mathbf{q})}\right)^m$ . If the series in (1) converges, then the Borel–Cantelli lemma implies  $W'(\psi)$  has measure zero.

For the divergence part, we are given a function  $\psi : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  satisfying the divergence condition (11) and we must show (10). For  $d \geq 1$ ,  $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{P}^n$ , let

$$\psi_1(d\mathbf{q}) = \begin{cases} \psi(d\mathbf{q}) & \text{if } \psi(d\mathbf{q}) \leq \frac{d}{2\varphi(d)} \\ 0 & \text{if } \psi(d\mathbf{q}) > \frac{d}{2\varphi(d)} \end{cases}$$

and  $\psi_2 = \psi - \psi_1$ . If  $\psi_2$  satisfies (11), then  $\text{Leb}(W'(\psi_2)) = 1$ , by Lemma 6, and we are done because  $W'(\psi_2) \subset W'(\psi)$ . Therefore, it suffices to prove the theorem for  $\psi_1$ , that is, we may assume that  $\psi_2 \equiv 0$  and  $\psi = \psi_1$ . Having made that assumption, Lemma 7 lets us further assume that

$$(19) \quad \frac{\varphi(d)\Psi(d)}{d} < 1/4$$

for every  $d \geq 1$ . Among other things, this implies that for every  $X \geq 1$  there exists some  $Y > X$  such that

$$\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{m-1} < \sum_{X \leq d \leq Y} \left(\frac{\varphi(d)\Psi(d)}{d}\right)^m < \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{m-2}.$$

Let  $X$  be one such large parameter.

Rather than work directly with the sets  $A'_{n,m}(d\mathbf{q}, \psi(d\mathbf{q}))$ , it will be convenient to define the subsets

$$A''_{n,m}(d\mathbf{q}, \psi(d\mathbf{q})) = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{T}^{nm} : \exists \mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{Z}^m, \mathbf{p} \pmod{1} \in P_d, |(d\mathbf{q})\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{p}| < \psi(d\mathbf{q})\},$$

where  $P_d$  is as in Lemma 5. It will suffice to show that the limsup set associated to the sets  $A''_{n,m}(d\mathbf{q}, \psi(d\mathbf{q}))$  has full measure. Notice that since

$$(20) \quad A''_{n,m}(d\mathbf{q}, \psi(d\mathbf{q})) \gg A'_{n,m}(d\mathbf{q}, \psi(d\mathbf{q})),$$

the new sets also have a diverging measure sum.

Our goal is to show that for  $X$  sufficiently large,

$$(21) \quad \text{Leb} \left( \bigcup_{X \leq d \leq Y} \bigcup_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{P}^n} A''_{n,m}(d\mathbf{q}, \psi(d\mathbf{q})) \right) \gg 1$$

with an implicit constant that depends only on  $m$ . To that end, observe that by Proposition 3,

$$(22) \quad \text{Leb} \left( \bigcup_{X \leq d \leq Y} \bigcup_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{P}^n} A''_{n,m}(d\mathbf{q}, \psi(d\mathbf{q})) \right) \geq \frac{(\sum_{X \leq d \leq Y} \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{P}^n} \text{Leb}(A''_{n,m}(d\mathbf{q}, \psi(d\mathbf{q})))^2}{\sum_{X \leq k, \ell \leq Y} \sum_{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{P}^n} \text{Leb}(A''_{n,m}(k\mathbf{q}, \psi(k\mathbf{q})) \cap A''_{n,m}(\ell\mathbf{r}, \psi(\ell\mathbf{r})))}.$$

By Lemma 5 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \sum_{X \leq d \leq Y} \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{P}^n} \text{Leb}(A''_{n,m}(d\mathbf{q}, \psi(d\mathbf{q}))) \right)^2 &\gg \left( \sum_{X \leq d \leq Y} \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{P}^n} \left( \frac{\varphi(d)\psi(d\mathbf{q})}{d} \right)^m \right)^2 \\ &= \left( \sum_{X \leq d \leq Y} \left( \frac{\varphi(d)\Psi(d)}{d} \right)^m \right)^2 \\ &\geq \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)^{2(m-1)} \gg 1. \end{aligned}$$

For the denominator expression in (22) we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{X \leq k, \ell \leq Y} \sum_{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{P}^n} \text{Leb}(A''_{n,m}(k\mathbf{q}, \psi(k\mathbf{q})) \cap A''_{n,m}(\ell\mathbf{r}, \psi(\ell\mathbf{r}))) \\ &= \sum_{X \leq d \leq Y} \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{P}^n} \text{Leb}(A''_{n,m}(d\mathbf{q}, \psi(d\mathbf{q}))) \\ &\quad + \sum_{X \leq k, \ell \leq Y} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{P}^n \\ k\mathbf{q} \neq \ell\mathbf{r}}} \text{Leb}(A''_{n,m}(k\mathbf{q}, \psi(k\mathbf{q})) \cap A''_{n,m}(\ell\mathbf{r}, \psi(\ell\mathbf{r}))) \\ &\ll \sum_{X \leq d \leq Y} \left( \frac{\varphi(d)\Psi(d)}{d} \right)^m + \sum_{X \leq k, \ell \leq Y} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{P}^n \\ k\mathbf{q} \neq \ell\mathbf{r}}} \text{Leb}(A''_{n,m}(k\mathbf{q}, \psi(k\mathbf{q})) \cap A''_{n,m}(\ell\mathbf{r}, \psi(\ell\mathbf{r}))) \\ &\leq \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)^{m-2} + \sum_{X \leq k, \ell \leq Y} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{P}^n \\ k\mathbf{q} \neq \ell\mathbf{r}}} \text{Leb}(A''_{n,m}(k\mathbf{q}, \psi(k\mathbf{q})) \cap A''_{n,m}(\ell\mathbf{r}, \psi(\ell\mathbf{r}))). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, showing (21) reduces to showing

$$(23) \quad \sum_{X \leq k, \ell \leq Y} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{P}^n \\ k\mathbf{q} \neq \ell\mathbf{r}}} \text{Leb}(A''_{n,m}(k\mathbf{q}, \psi(k\mathbf{q})) \cap A''_{n,m}(\ell\mathbf{r}, \psi(\ell\mathbf{r}))) \ll 1.$$

We rewrite

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{X \leq k, \ell \leq Y} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{P}^n \\ k\mathbf{q} \neq \ell\mathbf{r}}} \text{Leb}(A''_{n,m}(k\mathbf{q}, \psi(k\mathbf{q})) \cap A''_{n,m}(\ell\mathbf{r}, \psi(\ell\mathbf{r}))) \\ &= \sum_{X \leq k, \ell \leq Y} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{P}^n \\ \mathbf{q} \neq \mathbf{r}}} \text{Leb}(A''_{n,m}(k\mathbf{q}, \psi(k\mathbf{q})) \cap A''_{n,m}(\ell\mathbf{r}, \psi(\ell\mathbf{r}))) \\ & \quad + 2 \sum_{X \leq k < \ell \leq Y} \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{P}^n} \text{Leb}(A''_{n,m}(k\mathbf{q}, \psi(k\mathbf{q})) \cap A''_{n,m}(\ell\mathbf{q}, \psi(\ell\mathbf{q}))). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2, the first term is bounded above by

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{X \leq k, \ell \leq Y} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{P}^n \\ \mathbf{q} \neq \mathbf{r}}} \text{Leb}(A'_{n,m}(k\mathbf{q}, \psi(k\mathbf{q})) \cap A'_{n,m}(\ell\mathbf{r}, \psi(\ell\mathbf{r}))) \\ & \leq \sum_{X \leq k, \ell \leq Y} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{P}^n \\ \mathbf{q} \neq \mathbf{r}}} \text{Leb}(A'_{n,m}(k\mathbf{q}, \psi(k\mathbf{q}))) \text{Leb}(A'_{n,m}(\ell\mathbf{r}, \psi(\ell\mathbf{r}))) \\ & \ll \left( \sum_{X \leq d \leq Y} \left( \frac{\varphi(d)\Psi(d)}{d} \right)^m \right)^2 \leq \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)^{2(m-2)} \ll 1. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the task of establishing (23) has reduced to showing

$$(24) \quad \sum_{X \leq k < \ell \leq Y} \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{P}^n} \text{Leb}(A''_{n,m}(k\mathbf{q}, \psi(k\mathbf{q})) \cap A''_{n,m}(\ell\mathbf{q}, \psi(\ell\mathbf{q}))) \ll 1$$

with implicit constant depending at most on  $m$ .

A simple modification of Lemma 3 shows that

$$\text{Leb}(A''_{n,m}(k\mathbf{q}, \psi(k\mathbf{q})) \cap A''_{n,m}(\ell\mathbf{q}, \psi(\ell\mathbf{q}))) = \text{Leb}(A''_{1,m}(k, \psi(k\mathbf{q})) \cap A''_{1,m}(\ell, \psi(\ell\mathbf{q}))).$$

Notice that, because of (19), the set  $A''_{1,m}(d, \Psi(d))$  is a union of disjoint balls for every  $d \geq 1$ . Therefore, by Lemma 4,

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Leb}(A''_{1,m}(k, \psi(k\mathbf{q})) \cap A''_{1,m}(\ell, \psi(\ell\mathbf{q}))) \\ & \leq \max \left\{ \left( \frac{\psi(k\mathbf{q})}{\Psi(k)} \right)^m, \left( \frac{\psi(\ell\mathbf{q})}{\Psi(\ell)} \right)^m \right\} \text{Leb}(A''_{1,m}(k, \Psi(k)) \cap A''_{1,m}(\ell, \Psi(\ell))). \end{aligned}$$

(In fact, this is the sole reason we work with  $A''$  instead of  $A'$ .) Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} (25) \quad & \sum_{X \leq k < \ell \leq Y} \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{P}^n} \text{Leb}(A''_{n,m}(k\mathbf{q}, \psi(k\mathbf{q})) \cap A''_{n,m}(\ell\mathbf{q}, \psi(\ell\mathbf{q}))) \\ & \leq \sum_{X \leq k < \ell \leq Y} \text{Leb}(A''_{1,m}(k, \Psi(k)) \cap A''_{1,m}(\ell, \Psi(\ell))) \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{P}^n} \left( \frac{\psi(k\mathbf{q})}{\Psi(k)} + \frac{\psi(\ell\mathbf{q})}{\Psi(\ell)} \right) \\ & \leq 2 \sum_{X \leq k < \ell \leq Y} \text{Leb}(A''_{1,m}(k, \Psi(k)) \cap A''_{1,m}(\ell, \Psi(\ell))). \end{aligned}$$

Let  $I$  be the set of  $d \geq 1$  for which  $\Psi(d) > 1/2$ . If  $k, \ell \in I$ , then

$$\max\{2k\Psi(\ell), 2\ell\Psi(k)\} \geq \max\{k, \ell\} \geq \sqrt{k\ell}.$$

By (19), we also have  $2\Psi(d) \leq d/(2\varphi(d))$ , so Proposition 1 applies. Combining it with (12) and (13), it tells us that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Leb}\left(A'_{1,m}(k, 2\Psi(k)) \cap A'_{1,m}(\ell, 2\Psi(\ell))\right) &\ll 4^m \left(\frac{\varphi(k)\Psi(k)}{k}\right)^m \left(\frac{\varphi(\ell)\Psi(\ell)}{\ell}\right)^m \\ &\ll \text{Leb}\left(A'_{1,m}(k, \Psi(k))\right) \text{Leb}\left(A'_{1,m}(\ell, \Psi(\ell))\right), \end{aligned}$$

where again we have used (19) in this last comparison. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Leb}\left(A''_{1,m}(k, \Psi(k)) \cap A''_{1,m}(\ell, \Psi(\ell))\right) &\leq \text{Leb}\left(A'_{1,m}(k, 2\Psi(k)) \cap A'_{1,m}(\ell, 2\Psi(\ell))\right) \\ &\ll \text{Leb}\left(A'_{1,m}(k, \Psi(k))\right) \text{Leb}\left(A'_{1,m}(\ell, \Psi(\ell))\right) \\ &\ll \text{Leb}\left(A''_{1,m}(k, \Psi(k))\right) \text{Leb}\left(A''_{1,m}(\ell, \Psi(\ell))\right), \end{aligned}$$

by (20). If in addition we had

$$\sum_{d \in \mathbb{I}} \left(\frac{\varphi(d)\Psi(d)}{d}\right)^m = \infty,$$

then we could have restricted  $\psi(d\mathbf{q})$  to  $(d, \mathbf{q}) \in \mathbb{I} \times \mathbb{P}^n$  at the outset. With (25), we would have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{X \leq k < \ell \leq Y} \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{P}^n} \text{Leb}\left(A''_{n,m}(k\mathbf{q}, \psi(k\mathbf{q})) \cap A''_{n,m}(\ell\mathbf{q}, \psi(\ell\mathbf{q}))\right) \\ \leq 2 \sum_{X \leq k < \ell \leq Y} \text{Leb}\left(A''_{1,m}(k, \Psi(k))\right) \text{Leb}\left(A''_{1,m}(\ell, \Psi(\ell))\right) \\ \ll \left(\sum_{X \leq d \leq Y} \left(\frac{\varphi(d)\Psi(d)}{d}\right)^m\right)^2 \leq \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{2(m-2)} \ll 1, \end{aligned}$$

establishing (24), (23), and (21), which is our goal.

We may therefore assume that  $\Psi(d) \leq 1/2$  for all  $d \geq 1$ . In this case, we apply Proposition 2 to get

$$\sum_{X \leq k \leq \ell \leq Y} \text{Leb}\left(A''_{1,m}(k, \Psi(k)) \cap A''_{1,m}(\ell, \Psi(\ell))\right) \ll 1.$$

With (25), this implies (24), which implies (23) and in turn (21). As a consequence, we find that  $W'(\psi)$  has measure bounded below by the implicit constant in (21). In particular, it has positive measure, so it must have full measure, by Theorem 5. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.  $\square$

## 6. PROOF OF THEOREM 2

The cases of Theorem 2 where  $m > 1$  were proved by Beresnevich and Velani in [8] and the case  $m = n = 1$  follows from Koukoulopoulos–Maynard, so it is only left to establish the cases where  $m = 1$  and  $n > 1$ .

In this case, notice that we have

$$(26) \quad \Phi_1(\mathbf{q}) \asymp \frac{\varphi(\gcd(\mathbf{q}))}{\gcd(\mathbf{q})} |\mathbf{q}|.$$

Let  $\bar{\psi}(\mathbf{q}) = \sup_{t \geq 1} \frac{\psi(t\mathbf{q})}{t}$ . We can assume without loss of generality that

$$(27) \quad \psi(\mathbf{q})/|\mathbf{q}| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as} \quad |\mathbf{q}| \rightarrow \infty.$$

Otherwise, one can easily show that  $W(\psi) = W(\bar{\psi}) = [0, 1]^n$ .

We first consider the convergence part of Theorem 2. Suppose

$$(28) \quad |\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{x} - p| < \psi(\mathbf{q})$$

and let  $t = \gcd(p, \mathbf{q})$ . Then

$$|\mathbf{q}' \cdot \mathbf{x} - p'| < \frac{\psi(t\mathbf{q}')}{t},$$

where  $\mathbf{q}' := \mathbf{q}/t$  and  $p' := p/t$ , and therefore we have

$$|\mathbf{q}' \cdot \mathbf{x} - p'| < \bar{\psi}(\mathbf{q}')$$

where  $\gcd(p', \mathbf{q}') = 1$ . This, together with the assumption (27), implies that  $W(\psi) \subset W'(\bar{\psi})$ . Note that the convergence of the series in (4) is equivalent to the convergence of the series in (1) applied to  $\bar{\psi}$ . Therefore, by Theorem 1,  $\text{Leb}(W'(\bar{\psi})) = 0$  and so  $\text{Leb}(W(\psi)) = 0$ .

Now we will show that the divergence part of the  $m = 1$  cases of Theorem 2 are equivalent to the  $m = 1$  cases of a version of Theorem 1 where the requirement (3) is removed. We follow the argument in [23, Appendix] where the equivalence is shown in the case  $(m, n) = (1, 1)$ .

We claim that

$$(29) \quad W(\psi) = W(\bar{\psi}).$$

Since  $\psi \leq \bar{\psi}$ , we automatically have  $W(\psi) \subset W(\bar{\psi})$ . Now suppose  $\mathbf{x} \in W(\bar{\psi})$ . Then there are infinitely many  $(p, \mathbf{q})$  for which

$$(30) \quad |\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{x} - p| < \bar{\psi}(\mathbf{q})$$

holds. For a given  $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}^n \setminus 0$ , let  $t_{\mathbf{q}}$  be an integer for which  $\bar{\psi}(\mathbf{q}) = \frac{\psi(t_{\mathbf{q}}\mathbf{q})}{t_{\mathbf{q}}}$ . (Such an integer is guaranteed to exist because we have assumed that  $\psi(\mathbf{q})/|\mathbf{q}|$  approaches 0.) Note that if  $(p, \mathbf{q})$  solves (30), then

$$|t_{\mathbf{q}}\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{x} - t_{\mathbf{q}}p| < \psi(t_{\mathbf{q}}\mathbf{q}).$$

In this way, infinitely many solutions to (30) give rise to infinitely many solutions to (28). This establishes  $W(\bar{\psi}) \subset W(\psi)$ , which proves (29).

Now, assume the weak form of Theorem 1 where the coprimality condition (3) is removed. Suppose  $\psi : \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  satisfies the divergence condition (4). Then, recalling (26), we have that  $\bar{\psi}$  satisfies the divergence condition (1). Therefore, by our assumption, we have  $\text{Leb}(W(\bar{\psi})) = 1$ , hence by (29),  $\text{Leb}(W(\psi)) = 1$ , and the divergence part of Theorem 2 holds.

Conversely, suppose Theorem 2 holds, and suppose  $\psi$  satisfies the divergence condition (1). Since  $\psi \leq \bar{\psi}$ , we must also have that  $\bar{\psi}$  satisfies (1), that is,  $\psi$  satisfies (4). Therefore,  $\text{Leb}(W(\psi)) = 1$ , by Theorem 2. This proves the weak form of Theorem 1 in the cases where  $m = 1$ .  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] Christoph Aistleitner. A note on the Duffin–Schaeffer conjecture with slow divergence. *Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society*, 46(1):164–168, 2014. 4, 8
- [2] Christoph Aistleitner, Thomas Lachmann, Marc Munsch, Niclas Technau, and Agamemnon Zafeiropoulos. The Duffin-Schaeffer conjecture with extra divergence. *Adv. Math.*, 356:106808, 11, 2019. 4, 8
- [3] Demi Allen and Victor Beresnevich. A mass transference principle for systems of linear forms and its applications. *Compos. Math.*, 154(5):1014–1047, 2018. 6, 7
- [4] Victor Beresnevich, Vasily Bernik, Maurice Dodson, and Sanju Velani. Classical metric Diophantine approximation revisited. In *Analytic number theory*, pages 38–61. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2009. 1, 2, 5, 6, 7



- [5] Victor Beresnevich, Glyn Harman, Alan Haynes, and Sanju Velani. The Duffin-Schaeffer conjecture with extra divergence II. *Math. Z.*, 275(1-2):127–133, 2013. [4](#), [8](#)
- [6] Victor Beresnevich and Sanju Velani. A mass transference principle and the Duffin-Schaeffer conjecture for Hausdorff measures. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 164(3):971–992, 2006. [6](#), [7](#)
- [7] Victor Beresnevich and Sanju Velani. A note on zero-one laws in metrical Diophantine approximation. *Acta Arith.*, 133(4):363–374, 2008. [10](#)
- [8] Victor Beresnevich and Sanju Velani. Classical metric Diophantine approximation revisited: the Khintchine-Groshev theorem. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (1):69–86, 2010. [2](#), [4](#), [17](#)
- [9] Paul A. Catlin. Two problems in metric Diophantine approximation. I. *J. Number Theory*, 8(3):282–288, 1976. [2](#)
- [10] Detta Dickinson and Sanju L. Velani. Hausdorff measure and linear forms. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 490:1–36, 1997. [6](#)
- [11] R. J. Duffin and A. C. Schaeffer. Khintchine’s problem in metric Diophantine approximation. *Duke Math. J.*, 8:243–255, 1941. [2](#), [3](#)
- [12] P. Erdős. On the distribution of the convergents of almost all real numbers. *J. Number Theory*, 2:425–441, 1970. [3](#), [8](#)
- [13] P. X. Gallagher. Metric simultaneous diophantine approximation. II. *Mathematika*, 12:123–127, 1965. [3](#)
- [14] Patrick Gallagher. Approximation by reduced fractions. *J. Math. Soc. Japan*, 13:342–345, 1961. [3](#), [4](#), [9](#)
- [15] A. Groshev. A theorem on a system of linear forms. *Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR*, 19:151–152, 1938. [4](#)
- [16] Glyn Harman. *Metric number theory*, volume 18 of *London Mathematical Society Monographs. New Series*. The Clarendon Press Oxford University Press, New York, 1998. [8](#)
- [17] Alan K. Haynes, Andrew D. Pollington, and Sanju L. Velani. The Duffin-Schaeffer conjecture with extra divergence. *Math. Ann.*, 353(2):259–273, 2012. [4](#), [8](#)
- [18] A. Khintchine. Einige Sätze über Kettenbrüche, mit Anwendungen auf die Theorie der Diophantischen Approximationen. *Math. Ann.*, 92(1-2):115–125, 1924. [2](#)
- [19] A. Khintchine. Zur metrischen Theorie der diophantischen Approximationen. *Math. Z.*, 24(1):706–714, 1926. [2](#)
- [20] Dimitris Koukoulopoulos and James Maynard. On the Duffin-Schaeffer conjecture. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 192(1):251–307, 2020. [2](#), [3](#), [5](#), [8](#), [9](#)
- [21] A. D. Pollington and R. C. Vaughan. The  $k$ -dimensional Duffin and Schaefer conjecture. *Sém. Théor. Nombres Bordeaux (2)*, 1(1):81–88, 1989. [3](#), [5](#), [8](#), [9](#)
- [22] A. D. Pollington and R. C. Vaughan. The  $k$ -dimensional Duffin and Schaeffer conjecture. *Mathematika*, 37(2):190–200, 1990. [2](#), [3](#), [5](#), [8](#), [9](#), [13](#)
- [23] Felipe A. Ramírez. Khintchine’s theorem with random fractions. *Mathematika*, 66(1):178–199, 2020. [18](#)
- [24] Vladimir G. Sprindžuk. *Metric theory of Diophantine approximations*. Scripta Series in Mathematics. V. H. Winston & Sons, Washington, D.C.; John Wiley & Sons, New York-Toronto, Ont.-London, 1979. Translated from the Russian and edited by Richard A. Silverman, With a foreword by Donald J. Newman. [4](#), [5](#)
- [25] Oto Strauch. Some new criteria for sequences which satisfy Duffin-Schaeffer conjecture. I. *Acta Math. Univ. Comenian.*, 42/43:87–95 (1984), 1983. [8](#)
- [26] Jeffrey D. Vaaler. On the metric theory of Diophantine approximation. *Pacific J. Math.*, 76(2):527–539, 1978. [3](#), [8](#)
- [27] V. T. Vil’činskii. On simultaneous approximations by irreducible fractions. *Vesti Akad. Nauk BSSR Ser. Fiz.-Mat. Nauk*, (2):41–47, 140, 1981. [4](#), [9](#)

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY, MIDDLETOWN, CT, USA

Email address: framirez@wesleyan.edu