

BASS NOTE SPECTRA OF BINARY FORMS

GIORGOS KOTSOVOLIS

ABSTRACT. We show that the spectrum of every \mathbb{R} -isotropic homogeneous binary form P of degree $n \geq 3$ is an interval of the form $[0, M_P]$, where M_P is some positive constant. This completes the discussion around a conjecture of Mordell from 1940 (disproved by Davenport) regarding the existence of spectral gaps for binary cubic forms and further settles Mahler's program for binary forms of every degree.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. General Theory of Star Bodies	5
3. Preliminaries on Continued Fractions	7
4. The star body problem for binary cubic forms	8
4.1. The case of negative discriminant	10
4.2. The case of positive discriminant	10
5. The sets B_ϵ and E^η	14
6. The structural theorem and density of approximant lattices	20
7. The Measure of $\text{Spec}(P)$	25
8. Fixed point perturbations and intervals in the spectrum	31
Acknowledgements	37
References	37

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $P \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k]$ denote a homogeneous polynomial of degree $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

- For a lattice Λ in \mathbb{R}^k , what is the smallest value that $|P(v)|$ assumes as v ranges over all non-trivial vectors of Λ ?
- What is the distribution of these smallest values as Λ ranges over all k -dimensional unimodular lattices?

By posing these fundamental questions, Mahler ([1],[2]) laid the foundations of a general theory of k -dimensional star bodies and their extremal lattices, which allows for a systematic approach to classical number-theoretical and dynamical

problems (see Sarnak's Chern Lectures [3]). However, although Mahler's program of understanding

$$\text{Spec}(P) := \left\{ \inf_{\underline{x} \in \Lambda \setminus \underline{0}} |P(\underline{x})|, \Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^k \text{ a unimodular lattice} \right\}$$

offers a unified framework for many questions in the Geometry of Numbers, the nature of this spectrum as we vary the form P is diverse enough, so that one can not hope to give an answer in full generality. In this paper we address these questions for the case of real homogeneous binary forms; polynomials of the form

$$P(x, y) = \sum_{i=0}^n c_i x^i y^{n-i},$$

for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $c_i \in \mathbb{R}$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$.

To a binary form P we can associate the differential operator

$$T_P = P \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \right)$$

acting on $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2/\Lambda)$ for every two dimensional unimodular lattice Λ . The smallest in absolute value eigenvalue of T_P is

$$|\lambda_1(\mathbb{R}^2/\Lambda)| = 4\pi^2 \inf_{\underline{x} \in \Lambda \setminus \underline{0}} |P(\underline{x})|,$$

and we see that there is a correspondence between the spectra of binary forms and the λ_1 eigenvalues of the operators T_P , when acting on tori of volume 1. Under this viewpoint, Mahler's questions can be seen as instances of the Bass Note Spectra of differential operators on locally uniform geometries (see [3]).

A binary form P will be called \mathbb{R} -*anisotropic* if the only solution of the equation

$$P(x, y) = 0$$

is $x = y = 0$. If P is not \mathbb{R} -anisotropic, we call it \mathbb{R} -*isotropic*. If the form P is \mathbb{R} -anisotropic, the intermediate value theorem implies that the spectrum is an interval and the question reduces to determining the extremal lattices, as shown by Mahler (see Section 2):

Theorem 1.1 (Mahler). *Let P denote an \mathbb{R} -anisotropic homogeneous binary form of degree $n \geq 2$. Then*

$$\text{Spec}(P) = (0, M_P],$$

for some $M_P > 0$.

However, when the form P is \mathbb{R} -isotropic, the nature of $\text{Spec}(P)$ can be intricate. The spectrum of a binary quadratic form of discriminant 1 is equal to the well studied Markoff spectrum, which we denote by \mathcal{M} .

Theorem 1.2. *For the Markoff spectrum \mathcal{M} we have:*

- (Markoff [4]) *Let m denote an integer solution of the equation*

$$x^2 + y^2 + z^2 = 3xyz.$$

Then $\frac{m}{\sqrt{9m^2-4}} \in \mathcal{M}$. Furthermore, these are all the points of the spectrum larger than $\frac{1}{3}$.

- (Hall [5]) *\mathcal{M} contains an interval of the form $[0, c]$.*
- (Freiman [6]) *The largest value of c is equal to the constant*

$$c_{\max} = \left(\frac{2221564096 + 283748\sqrt{462}}{491993569} \right)^{-1}.$$

For degrees $n \geq 3$ much less is known. The case of binary cubic forms was investigated by Mordell ([7]) who determined the extremal lattices for the star body problem and consequently the maximum point of $\text{Spec}(P)$.

Theorem 1.3 (Mordell). *Let P denote a binary cubic form with discriminant $D_P \neq 0$. Then,*

$$\max \text{Spec}(P) = \begin{cases} \sqrt[4]{\frac{-D_P}{23}}, & \text{if } D_P < 0, \\ \sqrt[4]{\frac{D_P}{49}}, & \text{if } D_P > 0. \end{cases}$$

Observing the existence of a spectral gap already for the case of indefinite quadratic forms, Mordell further suggested that this maximum point is an isolated point of the spectrum, a conjecture disproved by Davenport in [8] by constructing a sequence of infima over unimodular lattices converging to the maximum.

In this work, we give a complete description of $\text{Spec}(P)$ for all binary cubic forms:

Theorem 1.4. *Let P be a binary cubic form with $D_P < 0$. Then,*

$$\text{Spec}(P) = \left[0, \sqrt[4]{\frac{-D_P}{23}} \right].$$

Similarly:

Theorem 1.5. *Let P be a binary cubic form with $D_P > 0$. Then,*

$$\text{Spec}(P) = \left[0, \sqrt[4]{\frac{D_P}{49}} \right].$$

We prove Theorems 1.4 and 1.5 by proving a stronger statement that the values of normalized infima of binary cubic forms fill the whole spectral interval, even when we restrict to lattices in an arbitrarily small neighborhood of the extremal lattice.

For a general higher degree form P , the spectrum is not always an interval. For example, for $P(x, y) = x^2y^2$, we have $\text{Spec}(P) = \{t^2 | t \in \text{Spec}(xy)\}$ which behaves similarly to the Markoff Spectrum. We can exclude simple counterexamples coming from spectra of lower degree forms by assuming $D_P \neq 0$. To the best of our knowledge, there has been no progress in understanding the nature of $\text{Spec}(P)$ for \mathbb{R} -isotropic binary forms of higher degree. In this paper, we resolve this question for all binary forms of degree $n \geq 3$ and $D_P \neq 0$. Our main result is the following:

Theorem 1.6. *Let $P(x, y)$ be an \mathbb{R} -isotropic binary form of degree $n \geq 3$ with non-zero discriminant. Then $\text{Spec}(P) = [0, M_P]$, for some $M_P > 0$.*

It follows that the case of indefinite binary quadratic forms is the only one where the spectrum is not an interval. Interestingly, for a homogeneous binary form P , the body $\{\underline{x} \in \mathbb{R}^2 : |P(\underline{x})| \leq 1\}$ is of finite volume if and only if P is not quadratic indefinite. Although this fact will not be used explicitly in our proof, it seems to be the underlying reason for this phenomenon.

The organization of this paper is as follows:

- In Section 2, we give an overview of Mahler's general theory of star bodies and prove existence theorems for extremal lattices.
- In Section 3, we review some well known facts regarding continued fractions, that we will be using freely throughout the paper.
- In Section 4, we address binary cubic forms. In subsection 4.1 we give a short proof of Theorem 1.4. The proof of Theorem 1.5 is substantially more convoluted. In subsection 4.2 we prove that the spectrum of a binary cubic form of positive discriminant is dense inside the corresponding spectral interval.
- In Section 5, we introduce and discuss the properties of certain Diophantine sets.
- In Section 6, we prove that for any sufficiently thick set $X \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ and any binary form P of degree $n \geq 3$ of signature $(k, n - k)$ and non-vanishing discriminant, we can find a form P' in the same $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ -orbit such that the real roots of $P'(z, 1) = 0$ lie in X and the infima of P, P' on $\mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus \mathcal{O}$ are arbitrarily close. This fact is already enough to deduce that the spectrum of binary forms has no isolated maximum for degrees $n \geq 3$.
- In Section 7, we generate spectra with measure arbitrarily close to maximal using thin neighborhoods of diagonal perturbations and prove that $\text{Spec}(P)$ is an interval of the form $[0, M_P]$ modulo a set of measure zero.
- In Section 8, we show how to pass from full measure to full interval by using fixed point perturbations inside certain curves of $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$, hence concluding the proof of Theorem 1.6.

2. GENERAL THEORY OF STAR BODIES

Suppose F is a non-negative continuous function on \mathbb{R}^k and assume further that F is homogeneous of degree n :

$$F(t\underline{x}) = |t|^n F(\underline{x}).$$

The *star body* associated with F is the set equal to $K = \{\underline{x} \in \mathbb{R}^k : F(\underline{x}) \leq 1\}$ and we call a lattice Λ of \mathbb{R}^k K -admissible if the only $v \in \Lambda \cap K$ is the trivial vector with all coordinates equal to zero. By definition, the determinant of the star body K is equal to:

$$\Delta(K) = \inf \{ \sqrt[k]{|\det(\Lambda)|} : \Lambda \text{ is a } K\text{-admissible lattice} \}$$

or equivalently

$$\Delta^{-1}(K) = \sup_{\Lambda \text{ unimodular}} \inf_{\underline{x} \in \Lambda \setminus \underline{0}} |F(\underline{x})| = \sup(\text{Spec}(F)).$$

For a given F , the existence of K -admissible lattices is not guaranteed and by convention we set $\Delta(K) = \infty$ if no K -admissible lattices exist. From now on, we consider only star bodies of finite type ($\Delta(K) < \infty$). An extremal lattice for the star body K is a K -admissible lattice Λ such that

$$\det(\Lambda) = \Delta^k(K).$$

As a consequence of his celebrated compactness theorem, Mahler proved the existence of extremal lattices for all star bodies of finite type:

Proposition 2.1. *Let $F : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ some non-negative continuous function, homogeneous of degree n . The function*

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{F} : \text{SL}_k(\mathbb{R})/\text{SL}_k(\mathbb{Z}) &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \\ \overline{F}(\Lambda) &= \inf_{\underline{x} \in \Lambda \setminus \underline{0}} |F(\underline{x})| \end{aligned}$$

is upper semi-continuous. As a consequence, extremal lattices exist.

Proof. Let $\Lambda_i \rightarrow \Lambda_0$ denote a converging sequence of $\text{SL}_k(\mathbb{R})/\text{SL}_k(\mathbb{Z})$. We want to show that $\overline{F}(\Lambda_0) \geq \limsup_i (\overline{F}(\Lambda_i))$. By definition of \overline{F} , if Λ_i is a sequence in $\text{SL}_k(\mathbb{R})/\text{SL}_k(\mathbb{Z})$ converging to the cusp, the shortest vector of Λ_i converges to 0 and by continuity of F ,

$$\overline{F}(\Lambda_i) \rightarrow 0.$$

Hence, the function \overline{F} is bounded and we can assume that $\overline{F}(\Lambda_i)$ is convergent. Denote this limit by l and assume that $\overline{F}(\Lambda_0) < l$. Then we can find some vector $u \in \mathbb{Z}^k \setminus \underline{0}$, such that $|F \circ \Lambda_0(u)| < l$. Fix some ϵ smaller than $l - |F \circ \Lambda_0(u)|$. Then, for i large enough we have

$$|F \circ \Lambda_i(u)| < l - \epsilon$$

and hence $\overline{F}(\Lambda_i) < l - \epsilon$, which is a contradiction. We have shown that \overline{F} is bounded and semi-upper continuous and hence assumes its supremum. \square

We thus see that the maximum of the spectrum of some form F can be realized. A K -admissible lattice Λ is called *finitely minimized* if there exists $u \in \Lambda \setminus \mathbf{0}$ such that

$$\overline{F}(\Lambda) = F(u).$$

If the star body K is bounded then every K -admissible lattice is trivially finitely minimized, but we can find unbounded star bodies of finite type without K -admissible extremal lattices. In fact, if the star body K_F associated to the form F is bounded then we can say significantly more:

Proposition 2.2. *Let F denote a non-negative continuous function on \mathbb{R}^k , homogeneous of degree n , such that the star body K_F associated to the form F is bounded. Then the function*

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{F} : SL_k(\mathbb{R})/SL_k(\mathbb{Z}) &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \\ \overline{F}(\Lambda) &= \inf_{\underline{x} \in \Lambda \setminus \mathbf{0}} |F(\underline{x})| \end{aligned}$$

is continuous. Furthermore, if the origin is the only solution of the equation

$$F(\underline{x}) = 0,$$

then \overline{F} is everywhere positive.

Proof. By definition, for any divergent sequence $\underline{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^k$,

$$\lim_i F(\underline{x}_i) \rightarrow \infty.$$

Therefore, there exists some compact ball B in \mathbb{R}^k , that depends only on F , such that for every unimodular lattice Λ ,

$$\lim_{\underline{x} \in \Lambda \setminus \mathbf{0}} F(\underline{x}) = \lim_{\underline{x} \in \Lambda \cap B \setminus \mathbf{0}} F(\underline{x}).$$

Continuity and positivity follow immediately from compactness. \square

As an immediate corollary, we obtain Mahler's Theorem:

Proof of Theorem 1.1: By Lemma 2.1 and Proposition 2.2, $\text{Spec}(P) = (a, M_P]$ for some $a \geq 0$ or $\text{Spec}(P) = [b, M_P]$ for some $b > 0$. It is however clear, that by taking Λ near the cusp of $SL_2(\mathbb{R})/SL_2(\mathbb{Z})$, $\inf_{\underline{x} \in \Lambda \setminus \mathbf{0}} |P(\underline{x})|$ becomes arbitrarily close to 0 and hence:

$$\text{Spec}(P) = (0, M_P].$$

\square

In many rigid examples of star bodies, the function F possesses additional symmetries, such as linear actions. We call some $\gamma \in SL_k(\mathbb{R})$ an automorphism of F if for every lattice $\underline{x} \in \mathbb{R}^k$:

$$F(\underline{x}) = F(\gamma \cdot \underline{x}).$$

A star body is called *automorphic* if it admits a group Γ of automorphisms such that the following holds: There exists a bounded set $\overline{K}_\Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ depending only on K and Γ such that for every $\underline{x} \in K$, there exists $\gamma \in \Gamma$ satisfying

$$\gamma \cdot \underline{x} \in \overline{K}_\Gamma.$$

Every bounded star body is trivially automorphic by taking $\Gamma = \{Id\}$ and $K = \overline{K}_\Gamma$.

Theorem 2.3 (Mahler). *Every automorphic star body possesses finitely minimized extremal lattices.*

Using the invariance of the form $P(x, y) = xy$ by the diagonal action, we can deduce that the star body associated to the form P is an automorphic star body and hence possesses finitely minimized extremal lattices. Of course, from Markoff's theorem we know much more about the behaviour of this automorphic star body near the top of the spectrum.

3. PRELIMINARIES ON CONTINUED FRACTIONS

We list a number of well known facts regarding continued fractions, that could be found in any relevant textbook (see for example [9],[10],[11]).

For any real number $x \notin \mathbb{Q}$ there exists a unique sequence of numbers

$$[\alpha_0(x), \alpha_1(x), \dots, \alpha_N(x), \dots] \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \times \dots,$$

such that

$$x = \alpha_0(x) + \frac{1}{\alpha_1(x) + \frac{1}{\alpha_2(x) + \frac{1}{\dots}}}.$$

We call this sequence the continued fractions sequence of x . For any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, the real number equal to

$$[\alpha_N(x), \alpha_{N+1}(x), \dots]$$

will be denoted by $a_N(x)$. We call any finite sequence $[\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N] \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \times \dots \times \mathbb{N}$ a starting sequence.

For rational numbers, this procedure terminates and we write $[\alpha_0(x), \alpha_1(x), \dots, \alpha_N(x), \infty]$ for

$$\alpha_0(x) + \frac{1}{\alpha_1(x) + \frac{1}{\dots + \frac{1}{\alpha_N(x)}}}.$$

The continued fractions sequence for rational numbers is unique modulo the identification

$$[\alpha_0(x), \alpha_1(x), \dots, \alpha_N(x), 1, \infty] = [\alpha_0(x), \alpha_1(x), \dots, \alpha_N(x) + 1, \infty].$$

For $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$, the rational number $\frac{P_N(x)}{Q_N(x)}$ equal to $[\alpha_0(x), \alpha_1(x), \dots, \alpha_N(x), \infty]$ is called the N^{th} convergent of x . The following Lemmata are standard:

Lemma 3.1. *Let $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$. The following relation holds between the continued fraction sequence of x and its convergents:*

$$Q_{N+1}(x) = \alpha_{N+1}(x)Q_N(x) + Q_{N-1}(x).$$

Lemma 3.2. *Let $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$. For any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, we have*

$$\left| x - \frac{P_N(x)}{Q_N(x)} \right| = \frac{1}{Q_N(x)(\alpha_{N+1}(x)Q_N(x) + Q_{N-1}(x))}.$$

Hence, convergents provide a very good rational approximation. Conversely, the rational numbers that are good approximations of x have to be convergents:

Lemma 3.3. *Let $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$. If for some rational number $\frac{X}{Y}$ we have*

$$\left| x - \frac{X}{Y} \right| < \frac{1}{2Y^2},$$

then $(X, Y) = (P_N(x), Q_N(x))$ for some $N \in \mathbb{N}$.

Moreover, the convergents provide the best possible rational approximation in the following sense:

Lemma 3.4. *Let $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$. Then for all $Y < Q_N(x)$ and any X we have*

$$\left| x - \frac{X}{Y} \right| > \left| x - \frac{P_N(x)}{Q_N(x)} \right|.$$

Regarding rational approximation of algebraic numbers, we have the following celebrated theorem:

Theorem 3.5 (Thue-Siegel-Roth). *Let α be some algebraric number and $\delta > 0$. There exists $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $X, Y \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $Y \geq N_0$:*

$$\left| \alpha - \frac{X}{Y} \right| > \frac{1}{Y^{2+\delta}}.$$

4. THE STAR BODY PROBLEM FOR BINARY CUBIC FORMS

We consider the action of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ on the space of binary cubic forms given by

$$P \circ \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}^{-1} (x, y) = P(ax + by, cx + dy).$$

We define the action with the inverse so that if the roots of the equation $P(z, 1) = 0$ are denoted by ρ_1, ρ_2, ρ_3 , then the roots of the equation $P \circ T(z, 1) = 0$ are $T(\rho_1), T(\rho_2), T(\rho_3)$. The algebra of invariants for the action of $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ on the space of binary cubic forms is a polynomial algebra in one variable generated by the discriminant polynomial of degree 4 ([12]):

Theorem 4.1. *If P_1, P_2 are two real binary cubic forms with the same discriminant, then there exists a linear transformation $T \in \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ such that*

$$P_1 \circ T(x, y) = P_2(x, y).$$

Since all binary cubic forms of negative (or positive) discriminant are equivalent under linear transformations, we have the following corollaries regarding the spectra of such forms.

Corollary 4.2. *If P_1, P_2 are binary cubic forms of the same discriminant, then*

$$\text{Spec}(P_1) = \text{Spec}(P_2).$$

Since the discriminant of a binary cubic form is a polynomial of degree 4, we have the following:

Corollary 4.3. *The set*

$$\frac{\text{Spec}(P)}{\sqrt[4]{|D_P|}}$$

depends only on the sign of the discriminant of the form P .

Hence we can freely speak of the “Spectrum of binary cubic forms with positive (resp. negative) discriminant”. As a consequence, we have the following “duality” phenomenon:

Corollary 4.4. *If P is some binary cubic form with discriminant D_P ,*

$$\text{Spec}(P) = \left\{ \inf_{\mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus \underline{0}} |G(x, y)|, G \text{ varies over binary cubic forms of discriminant } D_P \right\}.$$

In other words, varying the form with a fixed lattice is the same as varying the lattice with a fixed form. In his original paper, Mordell introduced the form

$$P(x, y) = x^3 - xy^2 - y^3$$

of $D_P = -23$, and showed that for any unimodular lattice Λ , there exists $v \in \Lambda \setminus \underline{0}$, such that

$$|P(v)| \leq 1.$$

Since

$$\inf_{(x,y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus \underline{0}} |P(x, y)| = 1,$$

he proved that \mathbb{Z}^2 is an extremal lattice for P and the maximum point of $\text{Spec}(P)$ is equal to 1. Similarly, for positive discriminant he considered the form

$$P(x, y) = x^3 + xy^2 - 2x^2y - y^3$$

of $D_P = 49$, and showed that for any unimodular lattice Λ , there exists $v \in \Lambda \setminus \underline{0}$, such that

$$|P(v)| \leq 1.$$

Again, since

$$\inf_{(x,y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus \underline{0}} |P(x, y)| = 1,$$

he proved that \mathbb{Z}^2 is an extremal lattice for P and the maximum point of $\text{Spec}(P)$ is equal to 1.

4.1. The case of negative discriminant.

Motivated by Mordell's findings ([7]) and Corollary 4.4, we introduce the following continuous family of forms. For $t \geq 0$ set:

$$P_t(x, y) = (x - \rho y) \left((x + \frac{\rho}{2}y)^2 + (\frac{3}{4}\rho^2 - 1)(1 + t^2)y^2 \right),$$

where ρ denotes the real root of $x^3 - x - 1 = 0$. For example, we have $P_0(x, y) = x^3 - xy^2 - y^3$, the extremal form given by Mordell. The proof of Theorem 1.4 is very simple:

Proof of Theorem 1.4. We start by noticing that $|P_t(x, y)| \geq |P_0(x, y)|$. Hence, we have that

$$\inf_{(x,y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus \underline{0}} |P_t(x, y)| \geq \inf_{(x,y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus \underline{0}} |P_0(x, y)| = 1.$$

On the other hand, $P_t(1, 0) = 1$ and thus

$$\inf_{(x,y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus \underline{0}} |P_t(x, y)| = 1.$$

Since $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} D_{P_t} \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain the Theorem. □

4.2. The case of positive discriminant.

Unlike the case of $D < 0$, for $D > 0$ we cannot take advantage of the positive definite part of the form to trivially construct a one parameter family of unimodular transformations, with infima covering the entire spectral interval. In fact, as we show in Proposition 4.7, it is not possible to find a continuous family of lattices, connecting 0 to the maximum point of the spectrum continuously. Similarly to the definition of finitely minimized lattices, we have:

Definition 1. We call a form P finitely minimized if the value

$$m(P) = \inf_{(x,y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus \underline{0}} |P(x, y)|$$

is a minimum (attained by the function P for some $(x, y) \neq (0, 0)$).

It is obvious that if $P(z, 1) = 0$ has a rational root, then $m(P) = 0$. However, $m(P)$ is almost everywhere positive and, in fact, almost all binary cubic forms P of $D_P > 0$ are finitely minimized:

Proposition 4.5. *For almost all binary cubic forms P of positive discriminant, P is finitely minimized.*

Proof. For any positive number l , define the set

$$S_l = \left\{ \theta \in \mathbb{R}, \text{ such that for all } x \in \mathbb{Z}, y \in \mathbb{N} : \left| \theta - \frac{x}{y} \right| > \frac{1}{ly^{\frac{5}{2}}} \right\}.$$

By Khinchin's Theorem, $\bigcup_{l \in \mathbb{N}} S_l$ has full measure. Pick some $\rho_1, \rho_2, \rho_3 \in S_l$ pairwise distinct and some $c \in \mathbb{R}$ with $c \neq 0$. Consider the form

$$P(x, y) = c(x - \rho_1 y)(x - \rho_2 y)(x - \rho_3 y),$$

and assume that P is not finitely minimized. By definition, there exists a sequence of $(x_i, y_i) \rightarrow \infty$ in \mathbb{Z}^2 and some absolute constant M , not depending on l such that

$$|P(x_i, y_i)| = \left| y_i^3 \left(\frac{x_i}{y_i} - \rho_1 \right) \left(\frac{x_i}{y_i} - \rho_2 \right) \left(\frac{x_i}{y_i} - \rho_3 \right) \right| \leq M.$$

It is not hard to see that $\frac{x_i}{y_i}$ stays in some compact set for all i . By possibly passing to a subsequence, assume that $\frac{x_i}{y_i}$ is convergent. Notice that the limit of this sequence must be one of the ρ_j 's, say ρ_1 without loss of generality. We have:

$$M \geq |P(x_i, y_i)| = \left| (1 + o_i(1))(\rho_1 - \rho_2)(\rho_1 - \rho_3) y_i^3 \left(\frac{x_i}{y_i} - \rho_1 \right) \right| \gg \sqrt{|y_i|} \rightarrow \infty,$$

by definition of S_l , which is a contradiction. \square

By the Thue-Siegel-Roth theorem, we know that every algebraic number is in some S_l , and hence we see that even though binary cubic forms do not admit linear actions in the sense of 2.3, by Mordell's findings, we know that:

Corollary 4.6. *Every extremal lattice associated to the star body of a binary cubic form of non-zero discriminant is finitely minimized.*

Regarding the continuity of the function $\Lambda \rightarrow m(P \circ \Lambda)$ we have:

Proposition 4.7. *Let $P(x, y)$ be a binary form of degree n with non-vanishing discriminant and assume that $P(z, 1) = 0$ has only real roots. Let $u : [0, 1] \rightarrow SL_2(\mathbb{R})/SL_2(\mathbb{Z})$ denote a continuous map on the space of unimodular lattices and let*

$$U : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \quad U(t) = \inf_{(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus \mathbf{0}} |P \circ u(t)(x, y)|.$$

Then,

$$U \text{ is continuous} \iff u \text{ is constant.}$$

Proof. The reverse direction is clear. Assume the function U is continuous and that u is non-constant. Suppose there exists $t_0 \in [0, 1]$ such that $U(t_0) > 0$. Without loss of generality we can assume that u is not constant in any open set containing t_0 . By continuity of u , we can choose continuous functions $u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, so that for every $t \in [0, 1]$, $\{u_1(t), u_2(t), \dots, u_n(t)\}$ is the set of roots of $P \circ u(t)$. Then, there exists some i_0 , such that u_{i_0} is not constant in any open set containing t_0 . Therefore, a sequence $t_i \rightarrow t_0$ exists so that $u_{i_0}(t_i) \in \mathbb{Q}$. It then follows that $U(t_i) = 0$ and thus $U(t_0) = 0$. \square

Therefore, as we will see, the interval nature of the spectral set in question is not a consequence of continuity, but rather an outcome of the chaos in the distribution of continued fractions. The proof of Theorem 1.5 will be concluded in Section 8. For now, we prove a weaker version of this theorem, which we will later, in Theorem 7.3, generalize to forms of degree $n \geq 4$.

Theorem 4.8. *Let P denote a binary cubic form of positive discriminant. Then*

$$\overline{\text{Spec}(P)} = \left[0, \sqrt[4]{\frac{D_P}{49}} \right].$$

Proof. Let $\rho > \chi > \psi$ denote the real roots of $x^3 + x^2 - 2x - 1 = 0$ and recall that $P(x, y) = x^3 + x^2y - 2xy^2 - y^3$ is the extremal form for the lattice \mathbb{Z}^2 , as proved by Mordell. Let the continued fraction sequence of ρ be denoted as $[\alpha_0(\rho), \alpha_1(\rho), \alpha_2(\rho), \dots]$ and $\frac{P_N(\rho)}{Q_N(\rho)}$ will be the N^{th} convergent of ρ . Fix some real $c \geq 1$ and for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$ define

$$\rho(c, N) = [\alpha_0(\rho), \alpha_1(\rho), \alpha_2(\rho), \dots, \alpha_N(\rho), \lfloor c(\rho - \chi)(\rho - \psi)Q_N(\rho) \rfloor, 1, 1, 1, \dots].$$

In other, words we construct a real number by defining the first part of the continued fraction sequence to be the same as that of ρ , picking α_{N+1} to be a variable, and then fixing the tail to resemble a badly approximatable number. We now study $m(P_{c,N})$ for

$$P_{c,N}(x, y) = (x - \rho(c, N)y)(x - \psi y)(x - \chi y).$$

Since ρ is an algebraic number, we have by the Thue-Siegel-Roth Theorem, that there exists some integer N_0 , such that for all $i \geq N_0$:

$$\alpha_{i+1}(\rho) \leq \sqrt{Q_i(\rho)}. \quad (1)$$

By Lemma 3.2, we know that

$$\left| \rho - \frac{P_i(\rho)}{Q_i(\rho)} \right| = \frac{1}{Q_i(\rho)(a_{i+1}(\rho)Q_i(\rho) + Q_{i-1}(\rho))}.$$

Therefore, by Eq.1 and Lemma 3.3, there exists some absolute constant M , so that for all $Y > Q_{N_0}$:

$$Y^3 \left| \rho - \frac{X}{Y} \right| \geq M\sqrt{Y}.$$

Now, since $\alpha_i(\rho) = \alpha_i(\rho(c, N))$ for $i \leq N-1$, we have an analogous statement for $\rho(c, N)$ by possibly increasing the value of the constant M . That is, for $N > N_0$ and for all $c \geq 1$:

$$Q_N(\rho(c, N)) > Y > Q_{N_0}(\rho(c, N)) \implies Y^3 \left| \rho(c, N) - \frac{X}{Y} \right| \geq M\sqrt{Y}.$$

Now, since for $j \geq 1$, $\alpha_{N+j+1}(\rho(c, N)) = 1$, we know again from Lemma 3.2 that

$$Y > Q_N(\rho(c, N)) \implies Y^3 \left| \rho(c, N) - \frac{X}{Y} \right| \geq MY.$$

We therefore deduce that by picking N_0 large enough, $P_{c,N}$ is finitely minimized by either $Y \leq Q_{N_0}(\rho(c, N))$ or by $Y = Q_N(\rho(c, N))$. Since Eq. 1, holds for χ and ψ as well we deduce that there exists some compact region $\Omega = [0, T]^2$ (with T an absolute constant), such that

$$m(P(c, N)) = \min \left(\min_{(x,y) \in \Omega \setminus \underline{\Omega}} |P_{c,N}(x, y)|, |P_{c,N}(P_N(\rho(c, N)), Q_N(\rho(c, N)))| \right).$$

However, we have

$$\min_{(x,y) \in \Omega \setminus \underline{\Omega}} |P_{c,N}(x, y)| = (1 + o_N(1)) \min_{(x,y) \in \Omega \setminus \underline{\Omega}} |P(x, y)| = 1 + o_N(1),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} P_{c,N}(P_N(\rho(c, N)), Q_N(\rho(c, N))) &= (1 + o_N(1))(\rho - \chi)(\rho - \psi) \frac{Q_N(\rho(c, N))}{\alpha_{N+1}(\rho(c, N))} = \\ &= (1 + o_N(1))(\rho - \chi)(\rho - \psi) \frac{Q_N(\rho)}{[c(\rho - \chi)(\rho - \psi)Q_N(\rho)]} = \frac{1}{c}(1 + o_N(1)). \end{aligned}$$

Taking everything together, we have that for $c \geq 1$

$$m(P_{c,N}) = \frac{1}{c}(1 + o_N(1)).$$

Since the discriminant of $P_{c,N}$ is equal to $49(1 + o_N(1))$, we derive the Theorem. \square

Remark. Even though we have used the Theorem of Thue-Siegel-Roth to obtain Theorem 1.5, the Theorem of Thue would suffice as for our purposes any saving on the exponent 3 would suffice. In fact, we will see later, that even the use of that can be avoided. In that sense, our proof is completely elementary.

If one is a bit more careful with the crude diophantine cutting of the form “1, 1, 1, ...” that we performed, it is easy to see that we can construct a set of infima that is not simply dense in the spectral set, but also of full measure. We do not pursue this result here, even though it does not require much effort, since we will later give the corresponding “full measure” result for any binary form of degree $n \geq 3$ and non-zero discriminant. Furthermore, note that we have achieved full density of the spectrum in an arbitrary neighborhood of the extremal lattice; that is the lattices that we used to fill the spectral interval where chosen arbitrarily close to the identity.

We also note that the family of binary cubic forms we constructed in the proof of Theorem 1.5, have the property that their largest root lies inside $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{5})$. Of course, we could have chosen any number with Diophantine exponent equal to 2 to perform the “1, 1, 1, ..., 1, ...” cutting for all the roots. We have proved the following:

Theorem 4.9. *For any binary cubic form P and any real quadratic field $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{d})$, define*

$$\text{Spec}(P, d) = \left\{ \inf_{\underline{x} \in \Lambda \setminus \underline{0}} |P(\underline{x})|, \Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \text{ a unimodular lattice such that } P \circ \Lambda \text{ has roots in } \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{d}) \right\}.$$

Then

$$\overline{\text{Spec}(P, d)} = \begin{cases} \left[0, \sqrt[4]{\frac{D_P}{49}}\right] & \text{for } D_P > 0, \\ \left[0, \sqrt[4]{\frac{-D_P}{23}}\right] & \text{for } D_P < 0. \end{cases}$$

We stated the theorem for any binary cubic form, since the proof of Theorem 1.5 could have also been applied for the case of $D < 0$.

5. THE SETS B_ϵ AND E^η

We now turn our focus onto the case of binary forms of higher degree. The situation for forms of degree $n \geq 4$ differs to the cases already discussed, since we have no analogue of Lemma 4.1. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the ring of invariants under the action of SL_2 is a finitely generated graded algebra over the base field of the complex numbers, as proved by Gordan ([12]). However, for $n \geq 4$ this ring is not generated by the discriminant alone and hence there are uncountably many $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ -orbits.

In proving Theorem 1.5, we used our knowledge of the extremal lattice and specifically the fact that the roots of the extremal form are algebraic. Even though we used the theorem of Thue-Siegel-Roth, we are not essentially using the fact that the extremal form is algebraic, but simply that its roots have Diophantine exponent less than 3.

Definition 2. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}$. The Diophantine exponent of x is

$$E(x) = \sup\{r : \exists C > 0 \text{ s.t. } \left|x - \frac{p}{q}\right| \leq \frac{C}{q^r} \text{ for infinitely many } (p, q) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}\}.$$

We will also be denoting E_s the set of real numbers with Diophantine exponent s . Since for $n \geq 4$, almost all $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ -orbits do not contain rational representatives, forms with roots in E_2 will be the analogue of the extremal forms with good Diophantine properties discovered by Mordell.

We can express $E(x)$ as a function of the continued fraction sequence of α :

$$E(x) = 2 + \limsup \frac{\log \alpha_N(x)}{\log Q_N(x)}.$$

We say

- x is sub-critical if $E(x) < n$,

- x is critical if $E(x) = n$,
- x is super-critical if $E(x) > n$.

Of course whether some $x \in \mathbb{R}$ is sub-critical, critical or super-critical depends on the degree n we are discussing. However, this will be clear from the context and hence we omit the dependence. If P is some binary form with a super-critical distinct real root ρ , then

$$\inf_{(x,y) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}} |P(x,y)| \ll \limsup \left| y^n \left(\frac{x}{y} - \rho \right) \right| = 0.$$

If we wanted to summarize in a line, why the spectrum of binary n -forms for $n \geq 3$ is so different from the Markoff Spectrum, it is because for $n = 2$, there are no sub-critical real numbers.

We need some more definitions regarding Diophantine properties of real numbers:

Definition 3. Let $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\eta > 0$. We define $E^\eta(\rho)$ to be the set of points x such that

$$\left| \frac{X}{Y} - x \right| < \frac{1}{Y^{2+\eta}} \implies \left| \frac{X}{Y} - \rho \right| < \frac{2}{Y^{2+\eta}}.$$

The definition of $E^\eta(\rho)$ is a quantitative way to describe the real points with sequence of convergents almost containing the sequence of convergents of ρ .

We make the following conventions for the rest of the paper:

Notational convention: From now on, we assume that all discussed binary forms are homogeneous of degree $n \geq 3$ and have non vanishing discriminant. By “roots of P ” we will be referring to the roots of the equation $P(z, 1) = 0$. These will be denoted by ρ_i , $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, where the first k of them are real and the rest are complex coming in conjugate pairs. Since the case of $k = 0$ has already been discussed, we assume that there exists at least one real root. We denote the largest one by ρ_1 and we can assume that it is positive, since we can always conjugate with some lattice in $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$.

Definition 4. Let P denote some binary form of degree $n \geq 3$ with k distinct real roots ρ_i , $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$ and denote by Λ_0 an extremal lattice. For some $\epsilon > 0$, we call a lattice $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ ϵ -almost extremal if

- $\|\Lambda - \Lambda_0\| < \epsilon$ and

•

$$\inf_{(X,Y) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}} \left| Y^n \left(\frac{X}{Y} - \rho_{\Lambda,i} \right) \right| > \inf_{(X,Y) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}} \left| Y^n \left(\frac{X}{Y} - \rho_i \right) \right| - \epsilon,$$

for $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$, where $\rho_{\Lambda,i}$ are the real roots of $P \circ \Lambda$.

We denote the set of ϵ -almost extremal lattices by $\text{AEL}(\epsilon)$.

Notice that the absence of a spectral gap is equivalent to the statement that for every ϵ , $\text{AEL}(\epsilon)$ contains non-extremal lattices.

Definition 5. Let P denote some binary form of degree $n \geq 3$ with k distinct real roots ρ_i , $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$ and $X \subset \mathbb{R}^k$. For any $\eta, \epsilon > 0$, we define $\text{AEL}(\epsilon, X, \eta)$ the set of those $T \in \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ such that:

- $T \in \text{AEL}(\epsilon)$, where we identify T with its corresponding lattice,
- $(T(\rho_1), T(\rho_2), \dots, T(\rho_k)) \in X$,
- $T(\rho_i) \in E^\eta(\rho_i)$.

The proof of the following theorem will be completed in Section 6.

Theorem 5.1. *Let P denote some binary form of degree $n \geq 3$ with k distinct real roots ρ_i , $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$. Let $X_i \subset \mathbb{R}$ and set*

$$a_i = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\lambda(B(\rho_i, \epsilon) \cap X_i)}{\lambda(B(\rho_i, \epsilon))}.$$

For every $\eta, \epsilon > 0$, we have

$$\overline{\lim}_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu(\text{AEL}(\epsilon, X_1 \times X_2 \times \dots \times X_K, \eta))}{\mu(B(id_2, \epsilon))} \geq 1 - k(1 - \min_i a_i).$$

Here, we denote the Euclidean ball of radius ϵ around ρ by $B(\rho, \epsilon)$ and the Haar measure on $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ by μ .

For our purposes, we will use Theorem 5.1 only for $X_i \subset \mathbb{R}$ conull sets. We see, by Theorem 5.1, that, unlike the case of indefinite quadratic forms, for forms of higher degree, we have a lot of flexibility near our extremal lattices. As an immediate corollary, we obtain:

Corollary 5.2. *For any binary form P of degree $n \geq 3$ and non-zero discriminant, $\text{Spec}(P)$ does not have an isolated maximum.*

We devote the rest of this section to building up machinery for the proof of Theorem 5.1.

Definition 6. For any $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$, we set

$$m(\rho) = \inf_{(X, Y) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}} \left| Y^n \left(\frac{X}{Y} - \rho \right) \right|.$$

We say ρ_1 is ϵ -Diophantine larger than ρ_2 , if

$$m(\rho_1) > (1 - \epsilon)m(\rho_2).$$

Denote by $B_\epsilon(\rho)$ the real numbers ϵ -Diophantine larger than ρ .

The following Lemma is the reason we are interested in the distribution of $B_\epsilon(\rho)$.

Lemma 5.3. *Let P_1, P_2 be binary forms of degree n of the same discriminant with roots denoted by $\rho_{1,i}, \rho_{2,i}$ for $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Fix $\epsilon > 0$. If*

$$\begin{aligned}
(1) \quad & \rho_{1,i} \in B_\epsilon(\rho_{2,i}) \cap B(\rho_{2,i}, \epsilon), \\
& \text{for } i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\} \\
(2) \quad & \rho_{1,i} \in B(\rho_{2,i}, \epsilon), \\
& \text{for } i \in \{k, k+1, \dots, n\},
\end{aligned}$$

then

$$m(P_1) \geq m(P_2) - \epsilon \cdot O_{P_1, P_2}(1),$$

where $O_{P_1, P_2}(1)$ depends only on the size of the coefficients of P_1 and P_2 .

Proof. Notice that for a form P of non-zero discriminant, we have similarly to the proof of Theorem 1.5, that

$$m(P) = \min \left(\inf_{(X,Y) \in [-T,T] \times \mathbb{Q}} |P(X,Y)|, \min_i (m(\rho_i) \prod_{j \neq i} |\rho_i - \rho_j|) \right) + o_P\left(\frac{1}{T}\right),$$

as $T \rightarrow \infty$. The Lemma easily follows from this observation. \square

Corollary 5.4. *Let P be binary forms of degree n with roots denoted by ρ_i , $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and let Λ_0 denote an extremal lattice. For every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that if for some unimodular lattice $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, the roots $\rho_{\Lambda, i}$, $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ of $P \circ \Lambda$ satisfy*

$$\begin{aligned}
(1) \quad & \rho_{\Lambda, i} \in B_\delta(\rho_i) \cap B(\rho_i, \delta), \\
& \text{for } i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\} \\
(2) \quad & \rho_{\Lambda, i} \in B(\rho_i, \delta), \\
& \text{for } i \in \{k, k+1, \dots, n\},
\end{aligned}$$

then

$$\Lambda \in AEL(\epsilon).$$

For the proof of Theorem 5.1, we will need to show that the set

$$B_\epsilon(\rho) \cap E^\eta(\rho) \cap B(\rho, \epsilon)$$

has many points. Before we demonstrate how to obtain such a result, we need two lemmata regarding the distribution of continued fractions.

Lemma 5.5. *Let $[\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N]$ denote some starting sequence. Then there exists positive absolute constants A, B such that for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\frac{A}{k^2 Q_N^2} < \lambda(x \in \mathbb{R} : \alpha_i(x) = \alpha_i \text{ for all } i \leq N \text{ and } \alpha_{N+1}(x) = k) < \frac{B}{k^2 Q_N^2},$$

where Q_N is the denominator of the rational number with continued fraction $[\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N]$ in simple form.

Proof. Define the two rational numbers

$$\begin{aligned} z_1 &= [\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N, k+1, \infty] \\ z_2 &= [\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N, k, \infty], \end{aligned}$$

and notice that

$$\lambda(x \in \mathbb{R} : \alpha_i(x) = \alpha_i(r) \text{ for all } i \leq N \text{ and } \alpha_{N+1}(x) = k) = |z_1 - z_2|.$$

By Lemma 3.2, we know that $|z_1 - z_2| = \frac{1}{(kQ_N + Q_{N-1})((k+1)Q_N + Q_{N-1})}$, from which the result follows. \square

Hence by observing that for some fixed number ρ and some large natural number $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $\alpha_N(\rho)$ needs to be of size $\sim Q_{N-1}^{n-2}$ to “affect” $m(\rho)$, we see that for most numbers, $m(\rho)$ is determined by the smaller integer pairs (X, Y) rather than the larger ones. We quantify this by showing:

Lemma 5.6. *Let $[\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N]$ denote some starting sequence and let $\eta > 0$. Then there exists some absolute constant $C > 0$, such that*

$$\frac{\lambda\left(\left\{x \in \mathbb{R} : \alpha_i(x) = \alpha_i \text{ for all } i \leq N \text{ and } \alpha_{N+i+1}(x) < Q_{N+i}^\eta(x) \text{ for all } i \geq 0\right\}\right)}{\lambda\left(\left\{x \in \mathbb{R} : \alpha_i(x) = \alpha_i \text{ for all } i \leq N\right\}\right)} > 1 - C\phi^{-\eta N},$$

where ϕ denotes the golden ratio.

Proof. By Lemma 5.5, we know that

$$\lambda\left(\left\{x \in \mathbb{R} : \alpha_i(x) = \alpha_i \text{ for all } i \leq N\right\}\right) \sim \frac{1}{Q_N^2}.$$

If for some x with starting sequence that of the statement of the Lemma, there exists $i \geq 0$ such that $\alpha_{N+i+1}(x) \geq Q_{N+i}^\eta(x)$, then by Lemma 3.2 we can find a rational number $\frac{X}{Y}$ so that $Y > Q_N$ and

$$\left|x - \frac{X}{Y}\right| < \frac{1}{Y^{2+\eta}}.$$

Furthermore, since x has $\frac{P_N}{Q_N}$ as a convergent, we can assume $C_1 Y < X < C_2 Y$, where $C_2 - C_1 = O(\frac{1}{Q_N^2})$. We obtain the bound

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\lambda\left(\left\{x \in \mathbb{R} : \alpha_i(x) = \alpha_i \text{ for all } i \leq N \text{ and } \alpha_{N+i+1}(x) < Q_{N+i}^\eta(x) \text{ for all } i \geq 0\right\}\right)}{\lambda\left(\left\{x \in \mathbb{R} : \alpha_i(x) = \alpha_i \text{ for all } i \leq N\right\}\right)} \geq \\ & 1 - O\left(Q_N^2 \sum_{\substack{C_1 Y < X < C_2 Y, \\ Y > Q_N}} \frac{1}{Y^{2+\eta}}\right) \geq 1 - O\left(Q_N^2 \sum_{Y > Q_N} \frac{Y}{Q_N^2} \frac{1}{Y^{2+\eta}}\right) \geq \\ & 1 - O\left(\sum_{Y > Q_N} \frac{1}{Y^{1+\eta}}\right) \geq 1 - O(\phi^{-\eta N}). \end{aligned}$$

Here we used the fact that $Q_N \geq F_N$, where F_N stands for the N^{th} Fibonacci number. \square

The following technical lemma is the key to constructing points inside

$$B_\epsilon(\rho) \cap E^\eta(\rho).$$

Lemma 5.7. *Let $n \geq 3$ a natural number, $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$, $\epsilon > 0$ and $\eta \in (0, n - 2)$. For any $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and any positive integer $h \leq \alpha_N(\rho)$ define $S_{\rho, \epsilon, N, h, \eta}$ to be the set of real numbers x with*

$$\alpha_i(x) \begin{cases} = \alpha_i(\rho) & \text{for } i < N, \\ \in [h, \min((1 - \epsilon)^{-1} (Q_{N-1}^{n-2}(\rho)m^{-1}(\rho) + 1) - 1, (1 + \epsilon)a_N(\rho))] & i = N, \\ < Q_{i-1}^\eta(x) & \text{for all } i > N. \end{cases}$$

Then for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists N_0 such that for every $N \geq N_0$, every $h \leq a_N(\rho)$ and every $\eta > 0$:

$$S_{\rho, \epsilon, N, h, \eta} \subset B_\epsilon(\rho) \cap E^\eta(\rho).$$

Proof. If $m(\rho) = 0$ then $B_\epsilon(\rho) = \mathbb{R}$. We assume thus that $m(\rho) > 0$. The fact that $S_{\rho, \epsilon, N, h, \eta} \subset E^\eta(\rho)$ follows immediately from the definition of the set $S_{\rho, \epsilon, N, h, \eta}$. As for $B_\epsilon(\rho)$, let $x \in S_{\rho, \epsilon, N, h, \eta}$. Notice that for $Y > Q_{N-1}(x)$, we know by Lemmata 3.2 and 3.3 and the fact that $a_i(x) < Q_{i-1}^\eta(x)$ for $i > N$, that there exists some absolute constant $C > 0$, such that

$$|Y^n x - XY^{n-1}| \geq CY^{n-2-\eta}.$$

Hence, there exists N_0 such that for $N \geq N_0$:

$$m(x) = \min_{0 < Y < Q_N(x), |X| < P_N(x)} |Y^n x - XY^{n-1}|.$$

By Lemma 3.3, we know that there exists some constant T that depends only on ρ such that

$$m(x) = \min \left(\min_{Y < T, |X| < T} |Y^n x - XY^{n-1}|, \min_{i \leq N-1} |Q_i^n(x)x - P_i(x)Q_i^{n-1}(x)| \right).$$

Now since the constant T is fixed and $\cap_N S_{\rho, \epsilon, N, h, \eta} = \{\rho\}$, we have that by picking N_0 large enough:

$$\min_{0 < Y < T, |X| < T} |Y^n x - XY^{n-1}| \geq m(\rho)(1 - \epsilon).$$

Hence, we are done in the case of

$$\min_{0 < Y < T, |X| < T} |Y^n x - XY^{n-1}| \leq \min_{i \leq N-1} |Q_i^n(x)x - P_i(x)Q_i^{n-1}(x)|.$$

Assume now that

$$\min_{i \leq N-1} |Q_i^n(x)x - P_i(x)Q_i^{n-1}(x)| < \min_{0 < Y < T, |X| < T} |Y^n x - XY^{n-1}|.$$

For $i = N - 1$ we have by Lemma 3.2, that if N is sufficiently large:

$$\left| Q_{N-1}^n(x)x - P_{N-1}(x)Q_{N-1}^{n-1}(x) \right| \geq \frac{Q_{N-1}^{n-2}(x)}{\alpha_N(x) + 1} \geq \frac{Q_{N-1}^{n-2}(x)}{(1-\epsilon)^{-1}Q_{N-1}^{n-2}(x)m^{-1}(\rho)} = (1-\epsilon)m(\rho),$$

where here we used that $\alpha_N(x) + 1 \leq (1-\epsilon)^{-1}Q_{N-1}^{n-2}(x)m^{-1}(\rho)$. We are left with showing

$$\min_{i \leq N-2} \left| Q_i^n(x)x - P_i(x)Q_i^{n-1}(x) \right| > (1-\epsilon)m(\rho).$$

Assume

$$\min_{i \leq N-1} \left| Q_i^n(x)x - P_i(x)Q_i^{n-1}(x) \right| = \left| Q_k^n(x)x - P_k(x)Q_k^{n-1}(x) \right|,$$

for some $T < Q_k \leq Q_{N-1}$. Then we can deduce that for some absolute constant C that depends only on ρ ,

$$\alpha_{k+1}(x) > CQ_k^{n-2}(x),$$

and hence by the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| Q_k^n(x)x - P_k(x)Q_k^{n-1}(x) \right| &\geq \left| Q_k^n(\rho)\rho - P_k(\rho)Q_k^{n-1}(\rho) \right| \\ &\quad - \frac{Q_k^{n-1}(\rho) |a_{k+1}(\rho) - a_{k+1}(x)|}{(Q_k(\rho)a_{k+1}(\rho) + Q_{k-1}(\rho))(Q_k(\rho)a_{k+1}(\rho) + Q_{k-1}(\rho))}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\alpha_{k+1}(\rho) = \alpha_{k+1}(x)$, we have $|a_{k+1}(\rho) - a_{k+1}(x)| < 1$. We deduce that

$$\frac{Q_k^{n-1}(\rho) |a_{k+1}(\rho) - a_{k+1}(x)|}{(Q_k(\rho)a_{k+1}(\rho) + Q_{k-1}(\rho))(Q_k(\rho)a_{k+1}(\rho) + Q_{k-1}(\rho))} < \frac{1}{C^2Q_k^{n-1}} < \frac{1}{C^2T^{n-1}}.$$

By possibly increasing the value of T (only in terms of the fixed ϵ), we hence get

$$\left| Q_k^n(x)x - P_k(x)Q_k^{n-1}(x) \right| \geq \left| Q_k^n(\rho)\rho - P_k(\rho)Q_k^{n-1}(\rho) \right| - \epsilon m(\rho) \geq (1-\epsilon)m(\rho).$$

□

6. THE STRUCTURAL THEOREM AND DENSITY OF APPROXIMANT LATTICES

By Lemmata 5.6 and 5.7, we have a way of constructing points in $B_\epsilon(\rho) \cap E^\eta(\rho)$ close to ρ . For the proof of Theorem 5.1, we would like to show that $B_\epsilon(\rho) \cap E^\eta(\rho)$ has density arbitrarily close to 1 as we restrict to smaller and smaller open sets around ρ , in order to capture points in X . This is however not true and we will see that

$$\lim_{\lambda(I) \rightarrow 0} \frac{\lambda(\{x : m(x) > m(\rho) - \delta\} \cap I)}{\lambda(I)} = 0.$$

In order to overcome this obstacle we prove the following Proposition, which constitutes the main ingredient of Theorem 5.1. In a very informal way we show that if we pick some interval I around ρ , then either 99% of the points in I are in $B_\epsilon(\rho) \cap E^\eta(\rho)$ or there exists some subinterval $I' \subset I$ containing ρ , which

has at least $\frac{\epsilon}{100}\%$ the size of I , such that 99,99% of the points in I' are inside $B_\epsilon(\rho) \cap E^\eta(\rho)$.

Theorem 6.1 (Structural Theorem). *Let $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$ with $E(\rho) < \infty$ and $\epsilon > 0$. There exists some constant $C > 0$ such that for every pair of positive parameters (τ_1, τ_2) , there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for every interval I of diameter less than δ and containing ρ , we have that one of the following two holds:*

- (1) (Many $B_\epsilon(\rho) \cap E^\eta(\rho)$ -points)

Either

$$\lambda(I \cap B_\epsilon(\rho) \cap E^\eta(\rho)) \geq (1 - \tau_1)\lambda(I).$$

- (2) (Subinterval with higher concentration of $B_\epsilon(\rho) \cap E^\eta(\rho)$ -points)

Or there exists some subinterval $I' \subset I$ containing ρ such that

$$\lambda(I') \geq C\tau_1\epsilon\lambda(I)$$

and

$$\lambda(I' \cap B_\epsilon(\rho) \cap E^\eta(\rho)) > \lambda(I')(1 - \tau_2).$$

For our applications, the reader is encouraged to consider $0 < \tau_2 \ll \tau_1 \ll 1$.

Proof. Let $\delta > 0$ to be chosen later and let I be some interval of size δ containing ρ . Let $\pi_N(x)$ denote the function

$$x \rightarrow \alpha_N(x), x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}.$$

Even though we define this function on the irrational numbers, this is not a problem as our arguments are measure theoretic. Define N_0 to be the smallest integer such that the set $\pi_{N_0}(I)$ is not a singleton. Note that as a function of δ , N_0 tends to infinity. We now take cases:

Case I $\#\pi_{N_0}(I) \geq 3$:

Suppose $\pi_{N_0}(I)$ consists of the integers in $[h, M]$, with $M - h \geq 2$. Since $\rho \in I$, we have $h \leq \alpha_{N_0}(\rho)$. Let

$$I' = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R} : \alpha_{N_0} \in \left[h, \min \left((1 - \epsilon)^{-1} \left(Q_{N-1}^{n-2}(\rho)m^{-1}(\rho) + 1 \right) - 1, (1 + \epsilon)a_N(\rho) \right) \right] \right\} \cap I.$$

Clearly we have that $I' \subset I$ and $\rho \in I'$, since by definition of $m(\rho)$ we know that

$$\alpha_{N_0}(\rho) < Q_{N_0-1}^{n-2}m(\rho)^{-1} + 1.$$

Remember that $S_{\rho, \epsilon, N, h, \eta}$ is the set of real numbers x such that

$$\alpha_i(x) \begin{cases} = \alpha_i(\rho) & \text{for } i < N, \\ \in \left[h, \min \left((1 - \epsilon)^{-1} \left(Q_{N-1}^{n-2}(\rho)m^{-1}(\rho) + 1 \right) - 1, (1 + \epsilon)a_N(\rho) \right) \right] & i = N, \\ < Q_{i-1}^\eta(x) & \text{for all } i > N. \end{cases}$$

By Lemma 5.7, we have that

$$S_{\rho, \epsilon, N_0, h, \eta} \subset B_\epsilon(\rho) \cap E^\eta(\rho),$$

by taking δ small enough. By Lemma 5.6 we further have that

$$\lambda(S_{\rho,\epsilon,N_0,h,\eta} \cap I') = \lambda(I')(1 + o_\delta(1)),$$

and therefore we can clearly choose δ so that $\lambda(S_{\rho,\epsilon,N_0,h,\eta} \cap I') \geq \lambda(I')(1 - \tau_2)$.

We now show that

$$\frac{\lambda(I')}{\lambda(I)} > C\epsilon,$$

for some absolute constant C . Since $\pi_{N_0}(I)$ consists of the integers in $[h, M]$, it is clear that if we define

$$I'' = \left\{ x \in I : \alpha_{N_0} \in \left[h + 1, \min \left((1 - \epsilon)^{-1} \left(Q_{N_0-1}^{n-2}(\rho) m^{-1}(\rho) + 1 \right) - 1, (1 + \epsilon) a_N(\rho), M - 1 \right) \right] \right\},$$

then $I'' \subset I'$ and by Lemma 5.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\lambda(I'')}{\lambda(I)} &\geq \frac{A}{B} \left(\frac{\frac{1}{h} - \frac{1}{\min \left((1 - \epsilon)^{-1} \left(Q_{N_0-1}^{n-2}(\rho) m^{-1}(\rho) + 1 \right) - 1, (1 + \epsilon) a_N(\rho), M - 1 \right)}}}{\frac{1}{h} - \frac{1}{M}} \right) \gg \\ &\left(1 - \frac{h}{(1 - \epsilon)^{-1} (Q_{N_0-1}^{n-2}(\rho) m^{-1}(\rho) + 1) - 1} \right) \gg \left(1 - \frac{\alpha_{N_0}(\rho)}{(1 - \epsilon)^{-1} (Q_{N_0-1}^{n-2}(\rho) m^{-1}(\rho) + 1) - 1} \right) \geq \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, I' satisfies the second possible conclusion.

Case II $\#\pi_{N_0}(I) = 2$

Assume $\pi_{N_0}(I) = \{k, k + 1\}$ and set $S_i = I \cap \pi_{N_0}^{-1}(i)$. Without loss of generality we can assume that ρ is one of the endpoints of the interval I . We further assume that $\rho \in S_{k+1}$. The case $\rho \in S_k$ can be treated similarly. For simplicity we write $\pi_{N_0+1}(\rho) = \alpha_{N_0+1}(\rho) = s$. If $S_{k+1,s}$ is the interval with endpoints ρ and the rational number

$$[\alpha_0(\rho), \alpha_1(\rho), \dots, \alpha_{N_0}(\rho), \infty]$$

then

$$S_{k+1,s} \subset I, \lambda(S_{k+1,s}) \sim \frac{1}{sQ_{N_0}^2}$$

By applying Case I of our proof for the point ρ and the interval $S_{k+1,s}$ we see that we can find $S'_{k+1,s} \subset S_{k+1,s}$ containing ρ , with

$$\frac{\lambda(S'_{k+1,s})}{\lambda(S_{k+1,s})} > C\epsilon$$

and

$$\frac{\lambda(S'_{k+1,s} \cap B_\epsilon(\rho))}{\lambda(S'_{k+1,s})} > (1 - \tau_2).$$

We now consider S_k . Define u the smallest possible natural number such that, if we define $S_{k,1,u}$ the set of real numbers with

$$\alpha_i(x) = \begin{cases} \alpha_i(\rho) & \text{for } < N_0, \\ k & i = N_0, \\ 1 & i = N_0 + 1, \\ \geq u & i = N_0 + 2, \end{cases},$$

we then have $S_{k,1,u} \subset I$. By Lemma 5.5:

$$\lambda(S_{k,1,u}) \sim \frac{1}{uQ_{N_0}^2} \text{ and by minimality of } u: \lambda(S_k) \sim \lambda(S_{k,1,u}).$$

If $s \leq u$ we are done, since then $\lambda(S_{k+1,s}) \sim \lambda(I)$ and thus $\lambda(S'_{k+1,s}) > C'\epsilon\lambda(I)$ for some absolute constant C' . Assume, thus, that $u < s$. By similar considerations as previously we have that:

$$\frac{\lambda(S_{k,1,u} \cap B_\epsilon(\rho) \cap E^\eta(\rho))}{\lambda(S_{k,1,u})} = (1 + o_\delta) \frac{\frac{1}{u} - \frac{1}{s}}{\frac{1}{u}} = (1 - \frac{u}{s})(1 + o_\delta).$$

Taking everything together, we have that

$$\frac{\lambda(I \cap B_\epsilon(\rho) \cap E^\eta(\rho))}{\lambda(I)} \gg \frac{\lambda(S_{k,1,u} \cap B_\epsilon(\rho) \cap E^\eta(\rho))}{\lambda(S_{k,1,u}) + \lambda(S_{k+1,s})} = (1 + o_\delta) \frac{\frac{1}{u} - \frac{1}{s}}{\frac{1}{u} + \frac{1}{s}} = 1 - (1 + o_\delta) \frac{2}{1 + \frac{s}{u}}.$$

Therefore, if $\frac{s}{u} + 1 \geq 2\tau_1^{-1}$ we are in the case of “Many $B_\epsilon(\rho) \cap E^\eta(\rho)$ –points”.

If $\frac{s}{u} + 1 < 2\tau_1^{-1}$, then

$$\frac{\lambda(S'_{k+1,s})}{\lambda(I)} = \frac{\lambda(S'_{k+1,s})}{\lambda(S_{k+1,s})} \frac{\lambda(S_{k+1,s})}{\lambda(I)} \geq C\epsilon \frac{\frac{1}{s}}{\frac{1}{s} + \frac{1}{u}} = C\epsilon \frac{1}{1 + \frac{s}{u}} > \frac{1}{2}C\tau_1\epsilon,$$

and we are in the case of a “Subinterval with higher concentration of $B_\epsilon(\rho) \cap E^\eta(\rho)$ –points” inside the subinterval $S'_{k+1,s}$. \square

For any real number z , define

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_z : \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{R}) &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \\ \Pi_z(T) &= T(z). \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 5.1 is an immediate corollary of the following:

Proposition 6.2. *Let ρ_i , $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ be k distinct points in \mathbb{R} . Then for any $\eta \in (0, 1)$ we have*

$$\overline{\lim}_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu(\bigcap_{i=1}^k \Pi_{\rho_i}^{-1}(B(\rho_i, \epsilon) \cap B_\epsilon(\rho_i) \cap E^\eta(\rho_i)))}{\mu(\bigcap_{i=1}^k \Pi_{\rho_i}^{-1}(B(\rho_i, \epsilon)))} = 1.$$

Proof. Let $\epsilon > 0$ and τ_1, τ_2 to be chosen later: Pick some δ that satisfies the assumptions of Proposition 6.1 for all the ρ'_i s. For any interval I and $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$, we define

$$\Pi_{i,j}(I) = \Pi_{\rho_i}(\Pi_{\rho_j}^{-1}(I) \cap C(\delta)),$$

where $C(\delta)$ denotes some cube of diameter δ around the identity matrix of $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$, when identifying this space locally with \mathbb{R}^3 . We now construct an algorithm that will give us our transformations $T \in \bigcap_{i=1}^k \Pi_{\rho_i}^{-1}(B(\rho_i, \epsilon) \cap B_\epsilon(\rho_i) \cap E^\eta(\rho_i))$. Let I_0 any interval containing ρ_1 with diameter less than δ . Therefore, $\Pi_{\rho_1}^{-1}(I_0) \cap C(\delta)$ is an open neighborhood of the identity matrix in $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$, and $\Pi_{2,1}(I_0) = \Pi_{\rho_2}(\Pi_{\rho_1}^{-1}(I_0) \cap C(\delta))$ is an interval containing ρ_2 . We say this interval is of Type I if it satisfies the first conclusion of Proposition 6.1 and Type II if it satisfies the second. If it satisfies both, we call it Type I.

- Set $L_0 = \emptyset$. If $\Pi_{1,1}(I_0)$ is of Type I, then consider $\Pi_{2,1}(I_0)$. If $\Pi_{2,1}(I_0)$ is of Type I, then consider $\Pi_{3,1}(I_0)$. If all of them up to $\Pi_{k,1}(I_0)$ are Type I, terminate the procedure.
- Suppose i_0 is the smallest natural with $\Pi_{i_0,1}(I_0)$ of Type II. Then, we can find by Proposition 6.1, some subinterval $I'_1 \subset \Pi_{i_0,1}(I_0)$, such that

$$\lambda(I'_1) \geq C\tau_1\epsilon\lambda(\Pi_{i_0,1}(I_0)) \text{ and } \lambda(I'_1 \cap B_\epsilon(\rho_{i_0}) \cap E^\eta(\rho_{i_0})) \geq (1 - \tau_2)\lambda(I'_1).$$

Define $I_1 = \Pi_{1,i_0}(I'_1) \cap I_0$ and $L_1 = L_0 \cup \{i_0\}$.

- We repeat the first step with I_1 instead of I_0 and skipping the numbers in L_1 :

Let $i_1 \notin L_1$ the smallest number such that $\Pi_{i_1,1}(I_1)$ is Type II. If there is none, terminate the procedure. If there is, then by Proposition 6.1, we can find some subinterval $I'_2 \subset \Pi_{i_1,1}(I_1)$, such that

$$\lambda(I'_2) \geq C\tau_1\epsilon\lambda(\Pi_{i_1,1}(I_1)) \text{ and } \lambda(I'_2 \cap B_\epsilon(\rho_{i_1}) \cap E^\eta(\rho_{i_1})) \geq (1 - \tau_2)\lambda(I'_2).$$

Define $I_2 = \Pi_{1,i_1}(I'_2) \cap I_1$ and $L_2 = L_1 \cup \{i_1\}$.

- Terminate the algorithm at \mathbb{T} -th step if $L_{\mathbb{T}} = \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$.

Notice that after at most k steps we obtain an interval I_f around ρ_1 and some subset L of $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ such that

- (1) For all $i \in L$:

$$\lambda(\Pi_{i,1}(I_f) \cap B_\epsilon(\rho_i) \cap E^\eta(\rho_i)) \geq (1 - (C\tau_1\epsilon)^{-k}\tau_2)\lambda(\Pi_{i,1}(I_f)),$$

by possibly increasing the value of the constant C . Here we have used that $\lambda(\Pi_{i,1}(I)) \sim \lambda(I)$ for some small interval I around ρ_1 .

- (2) For all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\} \setminus L$:

$$\lambda(\Pi_{i,1}(I_f) \cap B_\epsilon(\rho_i) \cap E^\eta(\rho_i)) \geq (1 - \tau_1)\lambda(\Pi_{i,1}(I_f)).$$

By identifying small enough neighborhoods of $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ around the identity with the space \mathbb{R}^3 , it is not hard to see that for every $z \in \mathbb{R}$, there exist positive

constants m, M such that for δ small enough and for every measurable set $B \subset (z - \delta, z + \delta)$, we have that

$$m\mu\left(\Pi_z^{-1}(B) \cap C(\delta)\right) < \lambda(B) < M\mu\left(\Pi_z^{-1}(B) \cap C(\delta)\right). \quad (2)$$

Therefore, we have

$$\frac{\mu(\Pi_1^{-1}(I_f) \cap C(\delta) \cap \Pi_i^{-1}(B_\epsilon(\rho_i) \cap E^n(\rho_i)))}{\mu(\Pi_1^{-1}(I_f) \cap C(\delta))} > \begin{cases} 1 - M(C\tau_1\epsilon)^{-k}\tau_2 & i \in L \\ 1 - M\tau_1 & i \notin L. \end{cases}$$

Pick $\tau_1 < \frac{\epsilon}{M}$ and $\tau_2 < \frac{(C\tau_1\epsilon)^k\epsilon}{M}$. We deduce that

$$\frac{\mu(\Pi_1^{-1}(I_f) \cap C(\delta) \cap \Pi_i^{-1}(B_\epsilon(\rho_i) \cap E^n(\rho_i)))}{\mu(\Pi_1^{-1}(I_f) \cap C(\delta))} > 1 - \epsilon.$$

□

We have established the existence of ϵ -almost extremal lattices for every $\epsilon > 0$ and therefore proved the absence of a spectral gap for the spectrum of all binary forms of degree $n \geq 3$. The lattices we constructed have the additional property that all of the roots of $P \circ \Lambda$ lie in E_2 and hence

Corollary 6.3. *Let P denote a homogeneous binary form of degree $n \geq 3$ and non-zero discriminant. Then, for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a finitely minimized ϵ -almost extremal lattice.*

Given our result, the following question regarding the existence of finitely minimized extremal lattices is natural.

Question: *Does the star body of every homogeneous binary form of non-zero discriminant possess a finitely minimized extremal lattice?*

7. THE MEASURE OF $\text{Spec}(P)$

The results of the previous sections imply that we can find almost extremal lattices that have good diophantine properties with respect to our form P . In this section, and specifically in Theorem 7.3, we show how we can generate a spectrum of full measure using diagonal perturbations of such lattices. This is, of course, a weaker measure theoretic version of Theorem 1.6. We begin with the following proposition regarding diagonal perturbations.

Proposition 7.1. *Let $P(x, y) = \prod_{i=1}^k (x - y\rho_i) D(x, y)$ a binary form of degree $n \geq 3$ of non-zero discriminant, with k real roots ρ_i , where $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ and positive definite part denoted by D . Denote by $\frac{P_N}{Q_N}$ the convergents of ρ_1 and define θ_N to be the first point on the left of $\frac{P_N}{Q_N}$ such that*

$$|P \circ \Delta_{\theta_N}(P_N, Q_N)| = \inf_{(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus \mathbf{0}} |P(x, y)|,$$

where

$$\Delta_\theta = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\theta} & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{\frac{1}{\theta}} \end{pmatrix}, \theta \in \mathbb{R}_+.$$

There exists some $M > 0$, that depends continuously on the coefficients of P , such that for every $\theta \in [\theta_N, \frac{P_N}{\rho_1 Q_N}]$ one of the following holds:

- (1) $P \circ \Delta_\theta$ is finitely minimized by (P_N, Q_N) .
- (2) There exists $(x_c, y_c) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}$ with $y_c > \frac{1}{M} Q_N^{\frac{5}{4}}$ and

$$\left| \frac{x_c}{y_c} - \theta \rho_i \right| < \frac{M}{y_c^n},$$

for some $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$.

- (3) $P \circ \Delta_\theta$ is finitely minimized by some $(x_c, y_c) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}$ with $y_c < M Q_N^{\frac{5}{7}}$ and

$$\left| \frac{x_c}{y_c} - \rho_i \right| < \frac{M}{y_c^{2+\frac{4}{5}}},$$

for some $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$.

- (4) There exists $(x_c, y_c) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}$ with $y_c < M Q_N^{\frac{5}{4}}$ and

$$\left| \frac{x_c}{y_c} - \frac{\rho_i P_N}{\rho_1 Q_N} \right| < \frac{M}{(y_c Q_N)^{\frac{5}{4}}},$$

for some $i \in \{2, \dots, k\}$.

Proof. Assume N is odd for convenience, so that $\frac{P_N}{Q_N} > \rho_1$. We have the formula

$$P \circ \Delta_\theta(x, y) = \theta^{-\frac{n}{2}} \prod_i (x - \theta \rho_i y).$$

It is clear that

$$P \circ \Delta_{\frac{P_N}{\rho_1 Q_N}}(P_N, Q_N) = 0.$$

Since

$$\left. \frac{\partial P \circ \Delta_\theta(P_N, Q_N)}{\partial \theta} \right|_{\frac{P_N}{\rho_1 Q_N}} = C(1 + o_N(1)) Q_N^n,$$

for some explicit non-zero constant C , we have $\theta_N = \frac{P_N}{\rho_1 Q_N} + O(\frac{1}{Q_N^n})$. Consider the interval

$$I_N = [\theta_N, \frac{P_N}{\rho_1 Q_N}].$$

By an analogue of Lemma 4.5, we know that for almost all θ , $P \circ \Delta_\theta$ is finitely minimized. If for some $\theta \in I_N$, $P \circ \Delta_\theta$ is not finitely minimized, or minimized by some (x_c, y_c) with $y_c \geq Q_N^{\frac{5}{4}}$, then we are clearly in the second possible case.

Assume hence that $P \circ \Delta_\theta$ is minimized by some $y_c \neq Q_N$ with $y_c < Q_N^{\frac{5}{4}}$. By the intermediate value theorem there should be an intersection of the curves:

$$\theta \rightarrow P \circ \Delta_\theta(P_N, Q_N)$$

and

$$\theta \rightarrow P \circ \Delta_\theta(x_c, y_c),$$

at some $\theta_c \in I_N$. Therefore, we have:

$$Q_N^n \prod_{i=1}^k \left(\frac{P_N}{Q_N} - \theta_c \rho_i \right) D \circ \Delta_{\theta_c} \left(\frac{P_N}{Q_N}, 1 \right) = y_c^n \prod_{i=1}^k \left(\frac{x_c}{y_c} - \theta_c \rho_i \right) D \circ \Delta_{\theta_c} \left(\frac{x_c}{y_c}, 1 \right).$$

Since $\theta_c = \frac{1}{\rho_1} \frac{P_N}{Q_N} + O(\frac{1}{Q_N^n})$, we have

$$y_c^n \prod_{i=1}^k \left(\frac{x_c}{y_c} - \frac{\rho_i}{\rho_1} \frac{P_N}{Q_N} \right) + O\left(\frac{y_c^n}{Q_N^n}\right) = O(1),$$

and thus

$$\prod_{i=1}^k \left(\frac{x_c}{y_c} - \frac{\rho_i}{\rho_1} \frac{P_N}{Q_N} \right) = O\left(\frac{1}{Q_N^n}\right) + O\left(\frac{1}{y_c^n}\right). \quad (3)$$

If there exists some rational number $\frac{x}{y}$ with $y \ll Q_N^{\frac{5}{4}}$ and

$$\left| \frac{x}{y} - \frac{\rho_i}{\rho_1} \frac{P_N}{Q_N} \right| \ll \frac{1}{(yQ_N)^{\frac{5}{4}}},$$

for some $i \in \{2, 3, \dots, k\}$, then we are in the fourth possible case and hence assume that for $y \ll Q_N^{\frac{5}{4}}$, we have

$$\left| \frac{x_c}{y_c} - \frac{\rho_i}{\rho_1} \frac{P_N}{Q_N} \right| \gg \frac{1}{(yQ_N)^{\frac{5}{4}}}. \quad (4)$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{1}{(y_c Q_N)^{\frac{5}{4}}} = O\left(\frac{1}{Q_N^n}\right) + O\left(\frac{1}{y_c^n}\right),$$

which gives

$$\min(y_c, Q_N)^{n-\frac{5}{4}} \ll \max(y_c, Q_N)^{\frac{5}{4}},$$

or equivalently

$$\min(y_c, Q_N)^{\frac{4n}{5}-1} \ll \max(y_c, Q_N). \quad (5)$$

We now consider individually each possibility for the $\min(y_c, Q_N)$:

- If $\min(y_c, Q_N) = y_c$, then by Eq. 5, $y_c \ll Q_N^{\frac{5}{4n-5}} \ll Q_N^{\frac{5}{7}}$. Hence, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{y_c^n} \gg \left| \frac{x_c}{y_c} - \frac{\rho_i}{\rho_1} \frac{P_N}{Q_N} \right| \geq \left| \frac{x_c}{y_c} - \rho_i \right| - \left| \frac{\rho_i}{\rho_1} \left(\frac{P_N}{Q_N} - \rho_1 \right) \right| \gg \left| \frac{x_c}{y_c} - \rho_i \right| - \frac{1}{Q_N^2},$$

and thus

$$\left| \frac{x_c}{y_c} - \rho_i \right| \ll \frac{1}{y_c^{\frac{2+\frac{4}{5}}{2+\frac{4}{5}}}}.$$

- If $\min(y_c, Q_N) = Q_N$, we have $Q_N \ll y_c^{\frac{5}{4n-5}}$ and $y_c \gg Q_N^{\frac{7}{5}} \gg Q_N^{\frac{5}{4}}$, since $n \geq 3$.

□

As we will see, the usefulness of Proposition 7.1 lies in the fact that if ρ_i have “good diophantine properties”, then the possible conclusions (2), (3), (4) of the proposition, occupy only a $o_N(1)\%$ proportion of I_N , providing a way to construct curves of almost full spectral measure near an extremal lattice. We begin with conclusion (4):

Lemma 7.2. *Let $\rho_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\frac{P_N}{Q_N}$ its convergents. Let D_{ρ_1} denote the set of all $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$, such that for some $M > 0$, there exist infinitely many $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and integers x_c, y_c satisfying*

- $y_c < MQ_N^{\frac{5}{4}}$,
-

$$\left| \frac{x_c}{y_c} - \frac{\rho}{\rho_1} \frac{P_N}{Q_N} \right| < \frac{M}{(y_c Q_N)^{\frac{5}{4}}}.$$

Then

$$\lambda(D_{\rho_1}) = 0.$$

Proof. We have

$$D_{\rho_1} = \bigcup_{M \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcap_{N_0 \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcup_{N > N_0} \bigcup_{\substack{(X,Y) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}, \\ Y < MQ_N^{\frac{5}{4}}}} I(N, X, Y),$$

where

$$I(N, X, Y) = \left(\rho_1 \frac{Q_N}{P_N} \frac{X}{Y} - \rho_1 \frac{Q_N}{P_N} \frac{M}{(YQ_N)^{\frac{5}{4}}}, \rho_1 \frac{Q_N}{P_N} \frac{X}{Y} + \rho_1 \frac{Q_N}{P_N} \frac{M}{(YQ_N)^{\frac{5}{4}}} \right).$$

We therefore have that for any interval $[a, b]$, there exist some constants A, B , such that

$$D_{\rho_1} \cap [a, b] = \bigcup_{M \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcap_{N_0 \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcup_{N > N_0} \bigcup_{\substack{AY < X, \\ X < BY}} \bigcup_{Y < MQ_N^{\frac{5}{4}}} I(N, X, Y).$$

To show that this set is of measure zero it suffices by classical measure theory to show that for any $M > 0$,

$$\sum_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda \left(\bigcup_{\substack{AY < X, \\ X < BY}} \bigcup_{\substack{Y \in \mathbb{N}, \\ Y < MQ_N^{\frac{5}{4}}}} I(N, X, Y) \right) < \infty.$$

By the trivial bounds, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda \left(\bigcup_{\substack{AY < X, \\ X < BY}} \bigcup_{\substack{Y \in \mathbb{N}, \\ Y < MQ_N^{\frac{5}{4}}}} I(N, X, Y) \right) &\ll \sum_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{Y < MQ_N^{\frac{5}{4}}} \frac{1}{Y^{\frac{1}{4}} Q_N(\rho)^{\frac{5}{4}}} \ll \\ &\sum_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{Q_N^{\frac{3}{4} \frac{5}{4}}}{Q_N^{\frac{5}{4}}} \ll \sum_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \phi^{-\frac{5}{16}N}, \end{aligned}$$

The result follows. \square

Theorem 7.3. *Let P a binary form of degree $n \geq 3$ of non-zero discriminant. Then, $\text{Spec}(P)$ is a set of full measure inside $[0, M_P]$.*

Proof. If \mathbb{Z}^2 is not an extremal lattice for P , we can simply conjugate by some $T \in \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ and arrange that. Hence, assume that $m(P) = M_P$. Let $\epsilon > 0$. By Theorem 5.1, Lemma 7.2 and the fact that E_2 has full measure, we can find $T_\epsilon \in \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$, such that

- $\|T_\epsilon - id_2\| < \epsilon$,
- $m(P \circ T_\epsilon) > m(P) - \epsilon$,
- $\rho_i \notin D_{T_\epsilon(\rho_1)}$, for $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$,
- The roots of $P \circ T_\epsilon$ lie in E_2 .

Denote by $I_{N,\epsilon}$ the interval defined in Proposition 7.1, corresponding to the form $P \circ T_\epsilon$ and the root $T(\rho_1)$. It follows that there exists some $M_\epsilon > 0$, such that for N large enough and $\theta \in I_{N,\epsilon}$, one of the following holds:

- (1) $P \circ T_\epsilon \circ \Delta_\theta$ is minimized by $(P_N(T_\epsilon(\rho_1)), Q_N(T_\epsilon(\rho_1)))$,
- (2) $P \circ T_\epsilon \circ \Delta_\theta$ is minimized by (x_c, y_c) , for some $(x_c, y_c) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}$ with $y_c < M_\epsilon$,
- (3) there exist $(x_c, y_c) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}$ with $y_c > \frac{1}{M_\epsilon} Q_N(T_\epsilon(\rho_1))^{\frac{5}{4}}$ and

$$\left| \frac{x_c}{y_c} - \theta \rho_i \right| < \frac{M_\epsilon}{y_c^n},$$

for some $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$.

Here, we used that $\rho_i \in E_2$ along with the fact that the constant M behaves continuously on the roots ρ_i . Denote S_i the set of those $\theta \in I_{N,\epsilon}$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$ in

each of the above cases respectively. We now prove that

$$\lambda(S_1) = (1 + o_N(1))\lambda(I_{N,\epsilon}).$$

It clearly suffices to show that

$$\lambda(S_2) = o_N(1)Q_N^{-n}(T_\epsilon(\rho_1)) \text{ and } \lambda(S_3) = o_N(1)Q_N^{-n}(T_\epsilon(\rho_1)).$$

Notice that for some fixed $(x_0, y_0) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}$, the set

$$\{\theta \in I_{N,\epsilon} : P \circ T_\epsilon \circ \Delta_\theta \text{ is minimized by } (x_0, y_0)\}$$

has measure $o_N(1)\frac{1}{Q_N^n(T_\epsilon(\rho_1))}$ and therefore, $\lambda(S_2) = o_N(1)\frac{1}{Q_N^n(T_\epsilon(\rho_1))}$. As for S_3 , fix some $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ and let $S_{3,i} \subset I_{N,\epsilon}$ denote the set of those θ , such that there exist $(x_c, y_c) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}$ with $y_c > \frac{1}{M_\epsilon}Q_N(T_\epsilon(\rho_1))^{\frac{5}{4}}$ and

$$\left| \frac{x_c}{y_c} - \theta \rho_i \right| < \frac{M_\epsilon}{y_c^n}.$$

We have

$$\lambda(S_{3,i}) \leq \sum_{\substack{\frac{X}{Y} \in \mathbb{Q} \cap I_{N,\epsilon}, \\ Y > \frac{1}{M_\epsilon}Q_N(T_\epsilon(\rho_1))^{\frac{5}{4}}}} \frac{1}{Y^n}.$$

For some $Y \in \mathbb{N}$, denote by $N(Y)$ the cardinality of the set

$$\left\{ X \in \mathbb{Z} : \frac{X}{Y} \in I_{N,\epsilon} \right\}.$$

For $N(Y)$, we have the trivial bound $N(Y) \ll \frac{Y}{Q_N^n(T_\epsilon(\rho_1))}$. We thus get the bound

$$\lambda(S_{3,i}) \ll \sum_{Y > \frac{1}{M_\epsilon}Q_N(T_\epsilon(\rho_1))^{\frac{5}{4}}} \frac{N(Y)}{Y^n} \ll \frac{1}{Q_N(T_\epsilon(\rho_1))^n} \sum_{Y > \frac{1}{M_\epsilon}Q_N(T_\epsilon(\rho_1))^{\frac{5}{4}}} \frac{1}{Y^{n-1}} \ll \frac{1}{Q_N(T_\epsilon(\rho_1))^{n+\frac{5(n-2)}{4}}}.$$

However, for $\theta \in S_1$,

$$|P \circ T_\epsilon \circ \Delta_\theta(P_N, Q_N)| \in \text{Spec}(P),$$

and hence

$$\lambda(\text{Spec}(P)) \geq m(P \circ T_\epsilon) - o_N(1).$$

By taking $N \rightarrow \infty$, we have proved that

$$\lambda(\text{Spec}(P)) \geq m(P \circ T_\epsilon) \geq m(P) - \epsilon.$$

The theorem follows by taking $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. □

8. FIXED POINT PERTURBATIONS AND INTERVALS IN THE SPECTRUM

The machinery we have built so far, coupled with a generalization of the classical Steinhaus theorem ([13],[14]), is already enough to prove Theorem 1.5.

Lemma 8.1 (General Steinhaus Theorem). *Fix $\epsilon, m, M > 0$. There exists some δ , such that for every $a_2 > a_1 > 0, b_2 > b_1 > 0, c_2 > c_1 > 0$, every C^∞ function $f : [a_1, a_2] \times [b_1, b_2] \times [c_1, c_2] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying*

$$m < \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial a}(a_0, b_0, c_0) \right|, \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial b}(a_0, b_0, c_0) \right|, \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial c}(a_0, b_0, c_0) \right| < M,$$

for all $(a_0, b_0, c_0) \in [a_1, a_2] \times [b_1, b_2] \times [c_1, c_2]$, has the following property: For any $X_1 \times X_2 \times X_3 \subset [a_1, a_2] \times [b_1, b_2] \times [c_1, c_2]$ measurable set with

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(X_1) &\geq (1 - \delta)\lambda([a_1, a_2]), \\ \lambda(X_2) &\geq (1 - \delta)\lambda([b_1, b_2]), \\ \lambda(X_3) &\geq (1 - \delta)\lambda([c_1, c_2]), \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$f([a_1(1 + \epsilon), a_2(1 - \epsilon)] \times [b_1(1 + \epsilon), b_2(1 - \epsilon)] \times [c_1(1 + \epsilon), c_2(1 - \epsilon)]) \subset f(X_1 \times X_2 \times X_3).$$

Proof. Fix some $h \in f([a_1, a_2] \times [b_1, b_2] \times [c_1, c_2])$, and assume that for some $a, b, c \in [a_1, a_2] \times [b_1, b_2] \times [c_1, c_2]$, we have $h = f(a, b, c)$. Then by the implicit function theorem, we can find some C^∞ function

$$g_h : I_h \rightarrow [b_1, b_2] \times [c_1, c_2],$$

where

$$I_h = [a_1, a_2] \cap B(a, \min(\frac{m}{M} \min(b - b_1, b_2 - b), \frac{m}{M} \min(c - c_1, c_2 - c))),$$

such that $f(a, g_h(a)) = h$. Write \mathbf{b} for $b_2 - b_1$ and \mathbf{c} for $c_2 - c_1$. We have,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_2(g_h(X_1 \cap I_h) \cap X_2 \times X_3) &= \lambda_2(g_h(X_1 \cap I_h)) + \lambda_2(X_2 \times X_3) - \lambda_2(g_h(X_1 \cap I_h) \cup X_2 \times X_3) \geq \\ &\lambda_2(g_h(X_1 \cap I_h)) + (1 - \delta)^2(\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{c}) - (\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{c}) = \lambda_2(g_h(I_h)) - \lambda_2(g_h(X_1^c \cap I_h)) - \delta(2 - \delta)(\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{c}) \geq \\ &\lambda_2(g_h(I_h)) - M\lambda(X_1^c \cap I_h) - \delta(2 - \delta)(\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{c}) \geq \lambda_2(g_h(I_h)) - M\delta - \delta(2 - \delta)(\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{c}). \end{aligned}$$

We have shown that

$$\lambda_2(g_h(I_h)) \geq M\delta + \delta(2 - \delta)(\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{c}) \implies g_h(X_1) \cap (X_2 \times X_3) \neq \emptyset,$$

which concludes our proof. \square

We are now in position to prove Theorem 1.5.

Proof of Theorem 1.5. Let $\rho > \chi > \psi$ denote the real roots of $x^3 + x^2 - 2x - 1 = 0$, with $P(x, y) = x^3 + x^2y - 2xy^2 - y^3$ being the extremal form for the lattice \mathbb{Z}^2 , as proved by Mordell. Consider the following family of binary cubic forms

$$P_{\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3}(x, y) = c_{\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3}(x - \theta_1\rho y)(x - \theta_2\chi y)(x - \theta_3\psi y),$$

where $c_{\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3}$ is such that the discriminant of the form is 1. Denote by $\frac{P_N(\rho)}{Q_N(\rho)}$ the convergents of ρ and define $\theta_N(\rho)$ to be the first point on the left of $\frac{P_N(\rho)}{\rho Q_N(\rho)}$ such that

$$\left| P_{\theta_N(\rho), 1, 1}(P_N(\rho), Q_N(\rho)) \right| = \sqrt[4]{\frac{1}{49}}.$$

We define $I_N^\rho = [\theta_N(\rho), \frac{P_N(\rho)}{\rho Q_N(\rho)}]$ and analogously we can define the sets I_N^χ, I_N^ψ . Similarly to the proof of Theorem 7.3, we can find subsets $\overline{I}_N^\rho, \overline{I}_N^\chi, \overline{I}_N^\psi$ of proportion $100 - o_N(1)\%$ such that for all $(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) \in \overline{I}_N^\rho \times \overline{I}_N^\chi \times \overline{I}_N^\psi$, we have that $m(P_{\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3})$ is minimized by

- $(P_N(\rho), Q_N(\rho))$ or
- $(P_N(\chi), Q_N(\chi))$ or
- $(P_N(\psi), Q_N(\psi))$.

Hence, by Lemma 8.1, we get by taking $N \rightarrow \infty$, that $\text{Spec}(P)$ contains the set

$$\left\{ \min_{(P_N(\rho), Q_N(\rho)), (P_N(\chi), Q_N(\chi)), (P_N(\psi), Q_N(\psi))} |P_{\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3}(x, y)| : (\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) \in I_N^\rho \times I_N^\chi \times I_N^\psi \right\}^\circ,$$

which implies that

$$\left(0, \sqrt[4]{\frac{1}{49}} \right) \in \text{Spec}(P).$$

Since we have already shown that 0 and $\sqrt[4]{\frac{1}{49}}$ are in the spectrum, we have concluded the proof of the theorem. \square

The use of the generalization of Steinhaus' theorem relies on the product structure of the family we constructed. This construction is not possible for $n \geq 4$ as we have discussed.

Definition 7. Let P denote some binary form of degree $n \geq 3$. As usual, we denote its roots by $\rho_i, i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, with ρ_i being real for $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$. For $N \in \mathbb{N}$ let I_N as in Proposition 7.1. For $\theta \in I_N$, we define the curve

$$\Sigma_{N, \theta, u} = \left\{ T \in \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{R}) : T(\rho_1) = \rho_1, \|T - id_2\| < 1, \prod_{i \geq 2} \left(\frac{P_N}{Q_N} - \theta T(\rho_i) \right) = u \right\}.$$

Since $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ is 3 dimensional, any $T \in \Sigma_{N, \theta, u}$ is completely determined by the value of $T(\rho_2)$. Fix some $i \in \{3, \dots, n\}$. By solving the equation

$$\prod_{i \geq 2} \left(\frac{P_N}{Q_N} - \theta T(\rho_i) \right) = u$$

in the two variables $T(\rho_2), T(\rho_i)$, we obtain a non trivial polynomial equation

$$F_{N, \theta, u, i}(T(\rho_2), T(\rho_i)) = 0$$

unique up to a constant. Taking $N \rightarrow \infty$ and $u \rightarrow \prod_{i \geq 2} (\rho_1 - \rho_i)$, $F_{N,\theta,u,i}$ converges to some polynomial F_i in the two variables $T(\rho_2)$ and $T(\rho_i)$, unique up to rescaling, which trivially does not reduce to a one variable polynomial. The non-vanishing of the derivative of F_i with respect to the variable $T(\rho_i)$ implies by the implicit function theorem, that $T(\rho_i)$ is a C^∞ function of $T(\rho_2)$ on the curve $\Sigma_{N,\theta,u}$. We show that can find many matrices $T \in \Sigma_{N,\theta,u}$, such that the roots of $P \circ T$ have our desired Diophantine properties:

Proposition 8.2. *Let P some binary form with real roots denoted by ρ_i , $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ and let $\eta > 0$. Assume that*

$$\frac{\partial F_i}{\partial \rho_2'}|_{(\rho_2, \rho_i)} \neq 0$$

for $i \in \{3, \dots, k\}$. For every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists some $\delta > 0$, such that for every N large enough, $\theta \in I_N$ and u satisfying

$$|v - \prod_{i \geq 2} (\rho_i - \rho_1)| < \delta,$$

there exists some non-trivial open subset $U \subset \Sigma_{N,\theta,v}$ such that

$$\mu \left(U \cap \bigcap_{i \geq 2} \Pi_i^{-1}(E^\eta(\rho_i) \cap B_\epsilon(\rho_i) \cap B(\epsilon, \rho_i)) \right) \geq (1 - \epsilon)\mu(U),$$

where here

$$\mu(U) = \lambda(\{T(\rho_2), T \in U\}).$$

Proof. Fix some $\epsilon > 0$. By the non-vanishing of the partial derivatives and the implicit function theorem, we can find for ϵ, δ small enough, C^∞ functions $f_{i,N,\theta,u}$, defined locally as:

$$T(\rho_2) = \rho_2', T \in \Sigma_{N,\theta,v} \iff T(\rho_i) = f_{i,N,\theta,u}(\rho_2').$$

Note that this implies that the measure μ is well defined. For example,

$$f_{1,N,\theta,u} \equiv \rho_1 \text{ and } f_{2,N,\theta,u} \equiv id.$$

Let τ, τ_1, τ_2 some parameters to be chosen later as functions of ϵ . The reader is encouraged to consider $1 \gg \tau_1 \gg \tau_2 \gg \tau$. By Theorem 6.1, we can find some interval I_0 centered at ρ_2 such that

$$\lambda(I_0 \cap B_\epsilon(\rho_2) \cap E^\eta(\rho_2)) \geq (1 - \tau)\lambda(I_0).$$

Now, $f_{i,N,\theta,u}(I_0)$ is an interval that might not contain ρ_i . To remedy this problem and keep applying Theorem 6.1 we define $e_{i,N,\theta,u}(I_0)$ to be the smallest interval containing $f_{i,N,\theta,u}(I_0)$ and ρ_i . For u sufficiently small in terms of ϵ and τ , we can achieve

$$(1 + \tau)\lambda(f_{i,N,\theta,u}(I_0)) \geq \lambda(e_{i,N,\theta,u}(I_0)).$$

We now construct an algorithm, that could be thought of us a “shifted version” of that constructed in Theorem 6.2. We will call an interval $e_{i,N,\theta,u}(I)$ containing ρ_i

of Type I or Type II according to whether it satisfies the first or second conclusion of Theorem 6.1 respectively, with respect to ϵ and the parameters τ_1, τ_2 .

- Set $L_0 = \emptyset$. If $e_{3,N,\theta,u}(I_0)$ is of Type I, then consider $e_{4,N,\theta,u}(I_0)$. If $e_{4,N,\theta,u}(I_0)$ is of Type I, then consider $e_{5,N,\theta,u}(I_0)$. If all of them up to $e_{k,N,\theta,u}(I_0)$ are Type I, terminate the procedure.
- Suppose i_0 is the smallest number in $\{3, \dots, k\}$ with $e_{i_0,N,\theta,u}(I_0)$ of Type II. We can then find, by Proposition 6.1, some subinterval $I'_1 \subset e_{i_0,N,\theta,u}(I_0)$, such that

$$\lambda(I'_1) \geq C\tau_1\epsilon\lambda(e_{i_0,N,\theta,u}(I'_1)) \text{ and } \lambda(I'_1 \cap B_\epsilon(\rho_{i_0}) \cap E^\eta(\rho_{i_0})) \geq (1 - \tau_2)\lambda(I'_1),$$

where C is some absolute constant. Define $I''_1 = I'_1 \cap f_{i_0,N,\theta,u}(I_0)$. We have

$$\lambda(I''_1) \geq (C\tau_1\epsilon - \tau)\lambda(f_{i_0,N,\theta,u}(I_0)) \text{ and } \lambda(I''_1 \cap B_\epsilon(\rho_{i_0}) \cap E^\eta(\rho_{i_0})) \geq (1 - \tau_2 - \frac{\tau}{C\tau_1\epsilon - \tau})\lambda(I''_1).$$

For $I_1 = f_{i_0,N,\theta,u}^{-1}(I''_1)$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(I_1 \cap B_\epsilon(\rho_2) \cap E^\eta(\rho_2)) &\geq \lambda(I_1) - \lambda(I_0 \cap (B_\epsilon(\rho_2) \cap E^\eta(\rho_2))^c) \geq \\ &\geq \lambda(I_1) - \tau\lambda(I_0) \geq (1 - C'\frac{\tau}{C\tau_1\epsilon - \tau})\lambda(I_1), \end{aligned}$$

where C' is again some absolute constant depending only on the size of the derivatives of $f_{i_0,N,\theta,u}$. Define $L_1 = L_0 \cup \{i_0\}$.

- We repeat the first step with I_1 instead of I_0 , skipping the numbers in L_1 and so on.
- Terminate the algorithm at \mathbb{T} -th step if $L_{\mathbb{T}} = \{2, \dots, k\}$.

Notice that after at most k steps we obtain an interval $I_f \subset I_0$, some subset $L \subset \{3, \dots, k\}$ and an absolute constant, which we denote again by C such that:

(1) For all $i \in L$:

$$\lambda(f_{i,N,\theta,u}(I_f) \cap B_\epsilon(\rho_i) \cap E^\eta(\rho_i)) \geq (1 - (C\tau_1\epsilon - \tau)^{-k}(\tau_2 + \frac{\tau}{C\tau_1\epsilon - \tau}))\lambda(f_{i,N,\theta,u}(I_f)).$$

(2) For all $i \in \{3, \dots, k\} \setminus L$:

$$\lambda(f_{i,N,\theta,u}(I_f) \cap B_\epsilon(\rho_i) \cap E^\eta(\rho_i)) \geq (1 - \tau_1 - \tau)\lambda(f_{i,N,\theta,u}(I_f)).$$

Choosing τ, τ_1, τ_2 rapidly decaying functions of ϵ accordingly and defining

$$U = \{T \in \Sigma_{N,\theta,v} : T(\rho_2) \in I_f\},$$

concludes the proof. □

In Theorem 7.3 we used diagonal perturbations of ϵ -almost extremal lattices to generate spectrum of full measure. We now show how to further perturb by lattices on the curve $\Sigma_{N,\theta,v}$ to show that the values

$$m(P \circ T_\epsilon \circ T_u \circ \Delta_\theta),$$

where $T_\epsilon \in \text{AEL}(\epsilon)$, $T_u \in \Sigma_{N,\theta,v}$, $\theta \in I_N$ cover the entire spectral interval.

Proof of Theorem 1.6: Fix $\epsilon > 0$. We can assume that P is extremal with respect to \mathbb{Z}^2 , since we can always achieve that by conjugating with some lattice. By Theorem 5.1, we can find some $T_\epsilon \in \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$, such that:

- $m(P \circ T_\epsilon) > m(P) - \epsilon$,
- $\|T_\epsilon - id_2\| < \epsilon$.
- $T_\epsilon(\rho_i) \in E_2$ for $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$.

We will abuse notation and denote the roots of $P \circ T_\epsilon$ by ρ_i . This will hopefully not cause any confusion, since throughout this proof we will be considering the roots $P \circ T_\epsilon$ and not those of P . We can further assume that

$$\frac{\partial F_i}{\partial \rho_2'}|_{(\rho_2, \rho_i)} \neq 0$$

for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ since $\frac{\partial F_i}{\partial \rho_2'}$ is not indentially 0. Let M as in the statement of Proposition 7.1 corresponding to the form $P \circ T_\epsilon$. Applying Theorem 8.2 for some $\eta < \frac{4}{5}$, we can find some $\delta > 0$, such that for N large enough, $\theta \in I_N$ and u satisfying

$$|v - \prod_{i \geq 2} (\rho_i - \rho_1)| < \delta,$$

there exists some open subset $U \subset \Sigma_{N, \theta, v}$ such that

$$\mu \left(U \cap \bigcap_{i \geq 2} \Pi_i^{-1}(E^\eta(\rho_i) \cap B_\epsilon(\rho_i)) \right) \geq (1 - \epsilon) \mu(U).$$

Now, the set of $\rho \in B(\rho_i, \epsilon)$, for which we can find $(x_c, y_c) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}$ satisfying $y_c < 2MQ_N^{\frac{5}{4}}$ and

$$\left| \frac{x_c}{y_c} - \frac{\rho}{\rho_1} \frac{P_N}{Q_N} \right| < \frac{2M}{(y_c Q_N)^{\frac{5}{4}}},$$

has measure bounded above by

$$\sum_{\substack{\frac{X}{Y} \in \mathbb{Q} \cap B(\rho_i, 2\epsilon), \\ Y < 2MQ_N^{\frac{5}{4}}}} \frac{4M}{(YQ_N)^{\frac{5}{4}}} \ll \epsilon \sum_{Y < 2MQ_N^{\frac{5}{4}}} \frac{1}{Y^{\frac{1}{4}} Q_N^{\frac{5}{4}}} \ll \epsilon \phi^{-N \frac{5}{16}} = o_N(1) \epsilon.$$

Similarly, the set of $\rho \in B(\rho_i, \epsilon)$ for which we can find $(x_c, y_c) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}$ satisfying $y_c > \frac{1}{2M} Q_N^{\frac{5}{4}}$ and

$$\left| \frac{x_c}{y_c} - \theta \rho \right| < \frac{2M}{y_c^n},$$

is bounded above by $o_N(1) \epsilon$.

Hence, putting everything together, for every $u \in (\prod_{i \geq 2} (\rho_i - \rho_1) - \delta, \prod_{i \geq 2} (\rho_i - \rho_1) + \delta)$, N large, and $\theta \in I_N$, we can find some $T_u \in \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ such that

$$(1) \ T_u(\rho_1) = \rho_1$$

$$(2) \quad \prod_{i \geq 2} \left(\frac{P_N}{Q_N} - \theta T_u(\rho_i) \right) = v$$

(3)

$$\left| \frac{x_c}{y_c} - \frac{T_u(\rho_i)}{\rho_1} \frac{P_N}{Q_N} \right| > \frac{2M}{(y_c Q_N)^{\frac{5}{4}}},$$

for all $y_c < 2M Q_N^{\frac{5}{4}}$ and $i \in \{2, \dots, k\}$.

$$(4) \quad m(P \circ T_\epsilon \circ T_u) \geq m(P \circ T_\epsilon) - \epsilon \geq m(P) - 2\epsilon.$$

$$(5) \quad T_u(\rho_i) \in E^\eta(\rho_i).$$

(6)

$$\left| \frac{x_c}{y_c} - \theta T_u(\rho_i) \right| > \frac{2M}{y_c^n},$$

for $y_c > \frac{1}{2M} Q_N^{\frac{5}{4}}$ and $i \in \{2, 3, \dots, k\}$.

This T_u of course depends on N and θ as well. This is however understood, and we omit the extra notation. Assume now θ is such that

$$\left| \frac{x_c}{y_c} - \theta \rho_1 \right| > \frac{2M}{y_c^n}, \quad (6)$$

for $y_c > \frac{1}{2M} Q_N^{\frac{5}{4}}$. By Theorem 7.1, the only possibility for $m(P \circ T_\epsilon \circ T_u \circ \Delta_\theta)$ is that $P \circ T_\epsilon \circ T_u \circ \Delta_\theta$ is minimized by (P_N, Q_N) or some (X, Y) such that

$$\left| \frac{X}{Y} - T_u(\rho_i) \right| < \frac{2M}{Y^{2+\frac{4}{5}}},$$

for some $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$. Here, we have used again that M varies continuously as a function of (ρ_1, \dots, ρ_k) . However, since $T_u(\rho_i) \in E^\eta(\rho_i)$ and $\rho_i \in E_2$, X, Y should be bounded above by an absolute constant uniform over all u and θ . We have shown that for N large enough and $\theta \in I_N$ satisfying (6), we have

$$m(P \circ T_\epsilon \circ T_u \circ \Delta_\theta) = P \circ T_\epsilon \circ T_u \circ \Delta_\theta(P_N, Q_N) = \theta^{-\frac{n}{2}} \left(\frac{P_N}{Q_N} - \theta \rho_1 \right) u.$$

or

$$m(P \circ T_\epsilon \circ T_u \circ \Delta_\theta) = P \circ T_\epsilon \circ T_u \circ \Delta_\theta(X, Y),$$

where X, Y are bounded by some absolute constant. For $N \rightarrow \infty$, and $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ we know that

$$P \circ T_\epsilon \circ T_u \circ \Delta_\theta(X, Y) \rightarrow P(X, Y) \geq m(P),$$

and therefore for any $t_0 > 0$, if we choose θ to satisfy $\frac{\theta - \theta_N}{\frac{P_N}{\rho_1 Q_N} - \theta_N} \geq t_0$, we have that for N large enough and ϵ small enough,

$$m(P \circ T_\epsilon \circ T_u \circ \Delta_\theta) = \theta^{-\frac{n}{2}} \left(\frac{P_N}{Q_N} - \theta \rho_1 \right) u.$$

To sum up, we have constructed an interval in the spectrum of the form

$$\left\{ \theta^{-\frac{n}{2}} \left| \left(\frac{P_N}{Q_N} - \theta \rho_1 \right) u \right|, u \in \left(\prod_{i \geq 2} (\rho_i - \rho_1) - \delta, \prod_{i \geq 2} (\rho_i - \rho_1) + \delta \right) \right\}.$$

in $\text{Spec}(P)$. It is easy now to see that, since condition (6) is satisfied for all but $o_N(1)$ proportion of I_N , these intervals cover all of $(0, M_P)$ by taking $N \rightarrow \infty$, $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. By Lemma 2.1, we have $M_P \in \text{Spec}(P)$. As for 0, we can find some lattice Λ , such that $P \circ \Lambda$ has a rational root and hence 0 is also in $\text{Spec}(P)$. This concludes the proof of Theorem 1.6. \square

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am greatly indebted to my advisor Peter Sarnak for many enlightening discussions and his constant encouragement throughout the execution of this project. I also want to express my gratitude towards Alex Gamburd, Elon Lindenstrauss, Nikolai Moshchevitin, Uri Shapira, Barak Weiss and Nina Zubrilina for interesting conversations in connection to this problem as well as comments and suggestions on earlier drafts of this paper.

REFERENCES

- [1] Kurt Mahler. On lattice points in n-dimensional star bodies I. existence theorems. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A. Mathematical and Physical Sciences*, 187(1009):151–187, 1946.
- [2] Kurt Mahler. Lattice points in n-dimensional star bodies. II. In *Proc. Acad. Amsterdam*, volume 49, pages 624–532, 1946.
- [3] Peter Sarnak. Chern Lectures Berkeley - “Prescribing the Spectra of Locally Uniform Geometries”. 2022-2023. URL <https://publications.ias.edu/sarnak/paper/2728>.
- [4] Andrey Markoff. Sur les formes quadratiques binaires indéfinies. *Mathematische Annalen*, 15(3-4):381–406, 1879.
- [5] Marshall Hall. On the sum and product of continued fractions. *Annals of Mathematics*, pages 966–993, 1947.
- [6] GA Freiman. Diofantovy priblizheniya i geometriya chisel (zadacha markova). *Diophantine approximations and the geometry of numbers (Markov’s problem)] Kalinin. Gosudarstv. Univ., Kalinin*, 1975.
- [7] L. J. Mordell. On Numbers Represented by Binary Cubic Forms. *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, s2-48(1):198–228, 01 1945. ISSN 0024-6115. doi: 10.1112/plms/s2-48.1.198.
- [8] H Davenport. On a conjecture of Mordell concerning binary cubic forms. In *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, volume 37, pages 325–330. Cambridge University Press, 1941.

- [9] J. W. S. Cassels. *An introduction to the geometry of numbers*. Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1997. ISBN 3-540-61788-4. Corrected reprint of the 1971 edition.
- [10] Thomas W. Cusick and Mary E. Flahive. *The Markoff and Lagrange spectra*, volume 30 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1989. ISBN 0-8218-1531-8. doi: 10.1090/surv/030.
- [11] A. Ya. Khinchin. *Continued fractions*. Dover Publications, Inc., Mineola, NY, russian edition, 1997. ISBN 0-486-69630-8. With a preface by B. V. Gnedenko, Reprint of the 1964 translation.
- [12] T. A. Springer. *Invariant theory*, volume Vol. 585 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1977.
- [13] Robert Rałowski, Przemysław Szczepaniak, and Szymon Żeberski. A generalization of steinhaus' theorem and some nonmeasurable sets. 2009.
- [14] Paul Erdos and John C Oxtoby. Partitions of the plane into sets having positive measure in every non-null measurable product set. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 79(1):91–102, 1955.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY, PRINCETON, NJ 08540
Email address: gk13@princeton.edu