

Lemma - 3

Diophantine Conditions: Given  $\gamma > 0, \tau \geq 0, d \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$

$$d \in \text{D.C.}(\gamma, \tau) \stackrel{\text{def}}{\Leftrightarrow} \left| d - \frac{p}{q} \right| \geq \frac{\gamma}{q^{2+\tau}} \quad \forall \frac{p}{q} \in \mathbb{Q}$$

$$\text{D.C.}(\tau) = \bigcup_{\gamma > 0} \text{D.C.}(\gamma, \tau)$$

$$\text{D.C.} = \bigcup_{\tau} \text{D.C.}(\tau). \quad \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q} \setminus \text{D.C.} = \text{Liouville numbers.}$$

Theorem:  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$  and  $P(d) = 0, \deg P = m \geq 2, P \in \mathbb{Z}[x] \Rightarrow d \in \text{L.D.}(m-2)$   
*irreducible*

Proof: ~~sketch to~~

$$\frac{1}{q^m} \leq |P(\frac{p}{q})| = |P(\frac{p}{q}) - P(d)| = |P'(t)| \cdot \left| \frac{p}{q} - d \right| \quad \text{for some } t \in [\alpha, \frac{p}{q}]$$

$$\text{If } \gamma = \inf_{t \in [d, d+1]} |P'(t)|, \text{ we have } \left| \frac{p}{q} - d \right| \geq \frac{\gamma}{q^m} \text{ for large } q. \quad \square$$

Theorem:  $l = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} 10^{-m!}$  is transcendental. Therefore,  $l \in (\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}) \setminus \text{D.C.}$

Proof:  $P_m = \sum_{j=0}^m 10^{(m-j)!} \cdot 5^j, \quad q_m = 10^{(m-1)!}$ . The

$$\left| l - \frac{P_m}{q_m} \right| \leq \frac{2}{10!} = \frac{2}{q_m^m}, \text{ contradiction. } \square$$

Exercise: Prove that almost all  $d \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$  is diophantine.

Hint: Get a bound on  $(0,1) \setminus \text{D.C.}(\gamma, \tau)$ .

$$\text{Proof: } (0,1) \setminus \text{D.C.}(\gamma, \tau) = \bigcup_{\substack{p < q \\ p \neq q}} \left[ \frac{p}{q} - \frac{\gamma}{q^{2+\tau}}, \frac{p}{q} + \frac{\gamma}{q^{2+\tau}} \right] \Rightarrow$$

$$N((0,1) \setminus \text{D.C.}(\gamma, \tau)) \leq \sum_{\substack{q \leq q \\ p \neq q}} \frac{\gamma}{q^{2+\tau}} < \sum_{q=1}^q \frac{\gamma}{q^{2+\tau}} = \gamma \zeta(2+\tau)$$

Now  $N((0,1) \setminus \text{D.C.}(\tau)) \leq \gamma \zeta(2+\tau) \forall \gamma$ . Hence  $\gamma \rightarrow 0, N((0,1) \setminus \text{D.C.}(\tau)) \stackrel{?}{\rightarrow} 0$

$$N((0,1) \setminus \text{D.C.}) = 0.$$



Poincaré: MNMC, tome II: "different notions of convergence".

Koornik: -4

Proof of part:  $RHS = \ln(R_\lambda(z)) = \lambda z + h_2 \lambda^2 z^2 + h_3 \lambda^3 z^3 + \dots$   
 $LHS = f(h(z)) = \lambda z + \lambda h_2 z^2 + \dots + \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} f_j \left( \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} h_i z^i \right)^j$   $h_1 = 1$

$$\Leftrightarrow \underbrace{(\lambda^m - \lambda)}_{\neq 0} h_m = \left[ \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} f_j \left( \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} h_k z^k \right)^j \right]_{z^m}$$

$$= \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} f_j \sum_{k_1 + \dots + k_j = m} h_{k_1} \dots h_{k_j} z^{k_1 + \dots + k_j}$$

$$= \sum_{|I| > 1} f_{|I|} z^{o(I)} \prod_{k \in I} h_{k_i}$$

$$= \sum_{j=2}^m f_j \sum_{\substack{k_1 + \dots + k_j = m \\ k_i \geq 1}} h_{k_1} \dots h_{k_j}$$

$\hookrightarrow k_i + k_j \leq m$   
 $\downarrow$   
 $k_i \leq m-1 \forall i$

$m=2 \rightarrow f_2 h_1^2$

$m=3 \rightarrow f_2 \cdot 2 h_1 h_2 + f_3 h_1^3$

$m=4 \rightarrow f_2 (h_2^2 + 2 h_1 h_3) + f_3 \cdot 3 h_1^2 h_2 + f_4 h_1^4$

We can recursively define

$$h_m = \frac{1}{\lambda^m - \lambda} \sum_{j=2}^m f_j \left( \sum_{\substack{k_1 + \dots + k_j = m \\ k_i \geq 1}} h_{k_1} \dots h_{k_j} \right). \quad \square$$

How can we know whether  $\sum h_n z^n$  converges (locally)?

Theorem (Kolip-Poincaré): If  $|\lambda| \neq 1$ ,  $h \in \mathbb{C}\{z\}$ .

Consider  $|\lambda|=1$ ,  $\lambda = e^{2\pi i \alpha}$  and  $\alpha \in \text{D.C.}(\mathbb{Z})$ ,  $\alpha \geq 0$

Solving recursively,

$$h_2 = \frac{h_2}{\lambda^2 - \lambda}$$

$$h_3 = \frac{1}{\lambda^3 - \lambda} [h_3 + 2(\lambda^2 - \lambda)^{-1} h_2]$$

$$h_4 = \frac{1}{\lambda^4 - \lambda} [h_4 + 3(\lambda^2 - \lambda)^{-1} h_3 h_2 + 2(\lambda^3 - \lambda)^{-1} h_2 h_3 + 4(\lambda^3 - \lambda)^{-1} (\lambda^2 - \lambda)^{-1} h_2^3 + h_2^3 (\lambda^2 - \lambda)^{-2}]$$

We always have the term

$$h_2 = 2^{m-2} \frac{h_2^{m-1}}{(\lambda^m - \lambda) \dots (\lambda^3 - \lambda)(\lambda^2 - \lambda)^{-1}}$$

$$|\lambda^{m+1} - \lambda| = |e^{2\pi i \alpha} - 1| = |e^{\pi i \alpha} - e^{\pi i \alpha}| = 2 |\sin \pi \alpha| \approx \frac{2}{m} \approx 0$$

We approximate

$$h_2 \approx 2^{m-2} \frac{h_2^{m-1}}{(2\lambda)^{-(m-1)}} \cdot [(m-1)!]^{2\pi}$$

$$|\sin \pi \alpha| \approx \frac{2}{m}$$

$$|h_2| = |m\alpha - p| \geq \frac{2}{m^{T+1}}$$

This is not good enough, and that's why  $|\lambda|=1$  has problems.

Proof (Kolip-Poincaré):

We know if  $|\lambda| \neq 1$ ,  $|\lambda^m - \lambda| \geq c > 0$ . Consider  $\{\sigma_j\}$  given by

$$\sigma_1 = 1$$

$$\sigma_m = \sum_{k_1 + \dots + k_j = m} \sigma_{k_1} \dots \sigma_{k_j}$$

Since  $f_j$  make  $\sum f_j x^j$  convergent, we can bound  $f_j$  exponentially and so we only have to check  $\sigma_j$  make

$$\sigma(z) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n z^n \text{ convergent.}$$

But notice that formally  $\sigma(z) = z + \underbrace{\frac{\sigma(z)^2}{1 - \sigma(z)}}_{\sum_2 \sigma(z)^m}$

Solving,  $\sigma(z) = \frac{1 + z - \sqrt{1 - 6z + z^2}}{4}$  (recall  $\sigma(0) = 0$ )

we can get  $\sigma_n \leq C_3 (3 + 2\sqrt{2})^{1-n}$

By induction we can get  $h_n$  bounded by an exponential, and this makes  $h$  convergent.

Theorem (Pomer, ~1920): If  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|h^{(n)} - h\|}{\|h^{(n-1)} - h\|} = +\infty$

$\Rightarrow \exists f(z) = \lambda z + \dots \in \mathbb{C}\langle z \rangle$  not linearizable.

Sketch: Build  $f_n$  s.t.  $f_n$  and  $\sum_{j=0}^n h_{j,k}$  are colinear. Then

$$\|h_n\| \geq \frac{1}{\lambda^n - \lambda} \|f_n\|$$