The equidistribution of nilsequences

James Leng

October 26, 2023

Types of problems considered

- What can we say about $r_k(N)$, the largest subset of $[N] := \{0, 1, \ldots, N-1\}$ that does not contain a k-term arithmetic progression with nonzero common difference?

Types of problems considered

- What can we say about $r_k(N)$, the largest subset of $[N] := \{0, 1, \ldots, N-1\}$ that does not contain a k-term arithmetic progression with nonzero common difference?
- What about polynomial progressions?

Types of problems considered

- What can we say about $r_k(N)$, the largest subset of $[N] := \{0, 1, \ldots, N-1\}$ that does not contain a k-term arithmetic progression with nonzero common difference?
- What about polynomial progressions?
- How many primes in arithmetic progressions are there in $[N]$?

Types of problems considered

- What can we say about $r_k(N)$, the largest subset of $[N] := \{0, 1, \ldots, N-1\}$ that does not contain a k-term arithmetic progression with nonzero common difference?
- What about polynomial progressions?
- How many primes in arithmetic progressions are there in $[N]$?
- Each of these problems involve the *nilpotent Hardy-Littlewood method*, a generalization of the *Hardy-Littlewood Circle method*.

Heuristic: a high dimensional circle method

- Let $F : \mathbb{R}^d/\mathbb{Z}^d \to \mathbb{C}$ be smooth, and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Heuristic: a high dimensional circle method

- Let $F : \mathbb{R}^d/\mathbb{Z}^d \to \mathbb{C}$ be smooth, and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^d$.
- Consider $F(\alpha n)$. We say that $F(\alpha n)$ is δ-*equidistributed* on scale N if

$$\left|\mathbb{E}_{n\in[N]} := \frac{1}{N}\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} F(n\alpha) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d/\mathbb{Z}^d} F(x)dx\right| < \delta\|F\|_{Lip}.$$

Heuristic: a high dimensional circle method

- Let $F : \mathbb{R}^d/\mathbb{Z}^d \to \mathbb{C}$ be smooth, and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^d$.
- Consider $F(\alpha n)$. We say that $F(\alpha n)$ is δ-*equidistributed* on scale N if

$$\left|\mathbb{E}_{n\in[N]} := \frac{1}{N}\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} F(n\alpha) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d/\mathbb{Z}^d} F(x)dx\right| < \delta\|F\|_{Lip}.$$

- We wish $F(\alpha n)$ to be *equidistributed* since $F(\alpha n)$ equidistributed behaves *randomly*, so is *easy* to study.

Heuristic: a high dimensional circle method

- We wish to "approximate" $F(\alpha n)$ (possibly along progressions) by well-behaved objects.

Heuristic: a high dimensional circle method

- We wish to “approximate” $F(\alpha n)$ (possibly along progressions) by well-behaved objects.
- These well-behaved objects are of the form $\tilde{F}(\alpha' n)$ where α' is “very equidistributed” along a *rational subgroup* $\mathbb{R}^d/\mathbb{Z}^d$.

Heuristic: a high dimensional circle method

- Suppose $\|F\|_{Lip} = 1$.

Heuristic: a high dimensional circle method

- Suppose $\|F\|_{Lip} = 1$.
- If $F(\alpha n)$ is δ-equidistributed, then we are good.

Heuristic: a high dimensional circle method

- Suppose $\|F\|_{Lip} = 1$.
- If $F(\alpha n)$ is δ-equidistributed, then we are good.
- Otherwise, we may Fourier approximate

$$F(\alpha n) = \sum_{\xi \in \mathbb{Z}^d, |\xi| \leq \|F\|_{Lip} \delta^{-1-o(1)}} a_\xi e(\xi \cdot (\alpha n)) + O(\delta^{1+o(1)})$$

with $|a_\xi| \leq 1$.

Heuristic: a high dimensional circle method

- Suppose $\|F\|_{Lip} = 1$.
- If $F(\alpha n)$ is δ-equidistributed, then we are good.
- Otherwise, we may Fourier approximate

$$F(\alpha n) = \sum_{\xi \in \mathbb{Z}^d, |\xi| \leq \|F\|_{Lip} \delta^{-1-o(1)}} a_\xi e(\xi \cdot (\alpha n)) + O(\delta^{1+o(1)})$$

  with $|a_\xi| \leq 1$.
- Thus, there exists some nonzero ξ such that $\mathbb{E}_{n \in [N]} e(\xi \cdot \alpha n) \geq \delta^{O(d)}$. This rearranges to $\|\xi \cdot \alpha\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \leq \frac{\delta^{-O(d)}}{N}$.

Heuristic: a high dimensional circle method

- So we may write $\alpha = \epsilon + \alpha' + \gamma$ where $\|\epsilon\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \ll \frac{\delta^{-O(d)}}{N}$, α' lies on a *subgroup* of $\mathbb{R}^d/\mathbb{Z}^d$ (that is $\delta^{-1-o(1)}$-*rational*), and γ is periodic modulo $\delta^{-1+o(1)}$.

Heuristic: a high dimensional circle method

- So we may write $\alpha = \epsilon + \alpha' + \gamma$ where $\|\epsilon\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \ll \frac{\delta^{-O(d)}}{N}$, α' lies on a *subgroup* of $\mathbb{R}^d/\mathbb{Z}^d$ (that is $\delta^{-1-o(1)}$-*rational*), and γ is periodic modulo $\delta^{-1+o(1)}$.
- Let q be the period of γ.

Heuristic: a high dimensional circle method

- So we may write $\alpha = \epsilon + \alpha' + \gamma$ where $\|\epsilon\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \ll \frac{\delta^{-O(d)}}{N}$, α' lies on a *subgroup* of $\mathbb{R}^d/\mathbb{Z}^d$ (that is $\delta^{-1-o(1)}$-*rational*), and γ is periodic modulo $\delta^{-1+o(1)}$.
- Let q be the period of γ.
- Along arithmetic progressions of common difference q and length $\delta^{O(d)}$, $F(\alpha n)$ can be approximated by $F(\epsilon_0 + \alpha' n)$ for some constant ϵ_0.

Heuristic: a high dimensional circle method

- So we may write $\alpha = \epsilon + \alpha' + \gamma$ where $\|\epsilon\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \ll \frac{\delta^{-O(d)}}{N}$, α' lies on a *subgroup* of $\mathbb{R}^d/\mathbb{Z}^d$ (that is $\delta^{-1-o(1)}$-*rational*), and γ is periodic modulo $\delta^{-1+o(1)}$.
- Let q be the period of γ.
- Along arithmetic progressions of common difference q and length $\delta^{O(d)}$, $F(\alpha n)$ can be approximated by $F(\epsilon_0 + \alpha' n)$ for some constant ϵ_0.
- We can thus restrict this to the subgroup that α' lies in.

Heuristic: a high dimensional circle method

- So we may write $\alpha = \epsilon + \alpha' + \gamma$ where $\|\epsilon\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \ll \frac{\delta^{-O(d)}}{N}$, α' lies on a *subgroup* of $\mathbb{R}^d/\mathbb{Z}^d$ (that is $\delta^{-1-o(1)}$-*rational*), and γ is periodic modulo $\delta^{-1+o(1)}$.
- Let q be the period of γ.
- Along arithmetic progressions of common difference q and length $\delta^{O(d)}$, $F(\alpha n)$ can be approximated by $F(\epsilon_0 + \alpha' n)$ for some constant ϵ_0.
- We can thus restrict this to the subgroup that α' lies in.

Bounds

- The Lipschitz constant of F increases by $\delta^{-1-o(1)}$,

Bounds

- The Lipschitz constant of F increases by $\delta^{-1-o(1)}$,
- Thus, in order to still keep similar approximation of

$$\left|\mathbb{E}_{n\in[N]}F(\alpha n) - \int F(x)dx\right| \ll \delta$$

we would need to decrease the scale of equidistribution from δ to $\delta^{2+o(1)}$.

Bounds

- The Lipschitz constant of F increases by $\delta^{-1-o(1)}$,
- Thus, in order to still keep similar approximation of

$$\left|\mathbb{E}_{n\in[N]}F(\alpha n) - \int F(x)dx\right| \ll \delta$$

we would need to decrease the scale of equidistribution from δ to $\delta^{2+o(1)}$.

- Under an iteration, this would produce *at best* bounds of the shape δ^{2^d} since $\delta \mapsto \delta^2$ iterates to δ^{2^d}.

Bounds

- The Lipschitz constant of F increases by $\delta^{-1-o(1)}$,
- Thus, in order to still keep similar approximation of

$$\left|\mathbb{E}_{n\in[N]}F(\alpha n) - \int F(x)dx\right| \ll \delta$$

  we would need to decrease the scale of equidistribution from δ to $\delta^{2+o(1)}$.
- Under an iteration, this would produce *at best* bounds of the shape δ^{2^d} since $\delta \mapsto \delta^2$ iterates to δ^{2^d}.
- Can we do better than this? Can we produce bounds *single exponential in dimensions*, i.e. $\delta^{O(d)^{O(1)}}$?

Observation

- Obstacle is "induction on dimensions."

Observation

- Obstacle is "induction on dimensions."
- Something like $\delta \mapsto \delta^2$ is not allowed under iteration, since this iterates to δ^{2^d}.

Observation

- Obstacle is "induction on dimensions."
- Something like $\delta \mapsto \delta^2$ is not allowed under iteration, since this iterates to δ^{2^d}.
- This process produces an equiditribution theory for the sequence (αn) rather than the sequence $F(\alpha n)$.

Observation

- If we define (αn) to be δ-equidistributed if for every Lipschitz function F such that

$$\left|\frac{1}{N}\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} F(n\alpha) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d/\mathbb{Z}^d} F(x)dx\right| < \delta\|F\|_{Lip}$$

a similar process to the work above would produce a factorization $\alpha = \epsilon + \alpha' + \gamma$ where α' is $\delta^{O(d)^{O(d)}}$-equidistrubted on a subgroup for *every* Lipschitz function on the subgroup.

Observation

- If we define (αn) to be δ-equidistributed if for every Lipschitz function F such that

$$\left|\frac{1}{N}\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} F(n\alpha) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d/\mathbb{Z}^d} F(x)dx\right| < \delta \|F\|_{Lip}$$

  a similar process to the work above would produce a factorization $\alpha = \epsilon + \alpha' + \gamma$ where α' is $\delta^{O(d)^{O(d)}}$-equidistrubted on a subgroup for *every* Lipschitz function on the subgroup.
- Such a factorization result is known as a *Ratner-type factorization theorem* in the literature.

Lipschitz function

- As we decrease the dimension, we increase the Lipschitz constant.

Lipschitz function

- As we decrease the dimension, we increase the Lipschitz constant.
- This causes the number of complex exponentials we consider in the Fourier approximation to increase by a lot.

Lipschitz function

- As we decrease the dimension, we increase the Lipschitz constant.
- This causes the number of complex exponentials we consider in the Fourier approximation to increase by a lot.
- However, if we work with a single Lipschitz function, we can forget about the function and just work with the Fourier approximation.

Lipschitz function

- As we decrease the dimension, we increase the Lipschitz constant.
- This causes the number of complex exponentials we consider in the Fourier approximation to increase by a lot.
- However, if we work with a single Lipschitz function, we can forget about the function and just work with the Fourier approximation.
- If we do that, the number of complex exponentials we consider in fact *decreases*.

Lipschitz function

- As we decrease the dimension, we increase the Lipschitz constant.
- This causes the number of complex exponentials we consider in the Fourier approximation to increase by a lot.
- However, if we work with a single Lipschitz function, we can forget about the function and just work with the Fourier approximation.
- If we do that, the number of complex exponentials we consider in fact *decreases*.
- Thus, one can prove an approximation result with bounds single exponential in dimension.

Main question

Question

What is the analogue of this heuristic in other contexts?

For instance, what can we say if instead of $\mathbb{R}^d/\mathbb{Z}^d$, we work with G/Γ where G is a Lie group, Γ a discrete cocompact subgroup (meaning that G/Γ is compact)?

Main theorem (informal version)

Theorem (L. 2023+)

There is such an analogue in the case where G is nilpotent (connected and simply connected), and Γ a discrete cocompact subgroup.

We say G is s-step nilpotent if we take $s+1$ commutators $[G, [G, \cdots, [G, G]]] = id$.

Main theorem (informal version)

Theorem (L. 2023+)

There is such an analogue in the case where G is nilpotent (connected and simply connected), and Γ a discrete cocompact subgroup.

We say G is s-step nilpotent if we take $s+1$ commutators $[G,[G,\cdots,[G,G]]] = id$. We will see applications of this theorem in arithmetic combinatorics later.

Example of nilpotent Lie group: Heisenberg group

Simplest nontrivial example of a nilpotent Lie group is a Heisenberg group:

$$G = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \mathbb{R} & \mathbb{R} \\ 0 & 1 & \mathbb{R} \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\Gamma = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \mathbb{Z} & \mathbb{Z} \\ 0 & 1 & \mathbb{Z} \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

Here, G is two-step nilpotent and admits the *lower central series* $G_0 = G_1 = G, G_i = [G_{i-1}, G]$.

Terminology and example

A Lipschitz function F on G/Γ evaluated at an orbit $g^n\Gamma$ is referred to as a *nilsequence*. If G and Γ are as above, and we let

$$g = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \alpha & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & \beta \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, g^n = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \alpha n & \binom{n}{2}\alpha\beta \\ 0 & 1 & \beta n \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

G/Γ admits a *parametrization* in $(-1/2, 1/2]^3$ as $(\{\alpha n\}, \{\beta n\}, \{\binom{n}{2}\alpha\beta - [\alpha n]\beta n\})$ where $\{x\} = x - [x]$, where $[x]$ is the nearest integer to x with $\{x\} \in (-1/2, 1/2]$.

Terminology and example

Thus, when we Fourier expand $F(g^n\Gamma)$ with respect to that parametrization, we obtain *bracket polynomials* as opposed to characters.

$$e(k[\alpha n]\{\beta n\} + k\binom{n}{2}\alpha\beta + \ell\alpha n + m\beta n).$$

Terminology and example

Thus, when we Fourier expand $F(g^n\Gamma)$ with respect to that parametrization, we obtain *bracket polynomials* as opposed to characters.

$$e(k[\alpha n]\{\beta n\} + k\binom{n}{2}\alpha\beta + \ell\alpha n + m\beta n).$$

These bracket polynomials are *nilcharacters* (to be defined formally later).

Terminology and example

- In the one-step case (i.e. $\mathbb{R}^d/\mathbb{Z}^d$ case), it was an *equidistribution theory* for characters, that is, understanding sums of the form $\mathbb{E}_{n\in[N]}e(\alpha n)$ that led to an *equidistribution theory* for general Lipschitz functions.

Terminology and example

- In the one-step case (i.e. $\mathbb{R}^d/\mathbb{Z}^d$ case), it was an *equidistribution theory* for characters, that is, understanding sums of the form $\mathbb{E}_{n\in[N]}e(\alpha n)$ that led to an *equidistribution theory* for general Lipschitz functions.
- In view of this, we shall aim to develop an equidistribution theory of *nilcharacters.*

More terminology (quantifying nilmanifolds)

We will assume G is s-step nilpotent, Γ discrete cocompact.

More terminology (quantifying nilmanifolds)

We will assume G is s-step nilpotent, Γ discrete cocompact. Consider the *lower central series filtration* $(G_i)_{i=0}^{\infty}$ with $G_0 = G_i = G$, $G_{i+1} = [G_i, G]$.

More terminology (quantifying nilmanifolds)

We will assume G is s-step nilpotent, Γ discrete cocompact. Consider the *lower central series filtration* $(G_i)_{i=0}^{\infty}$ with $G_0 = G_i = G$, $G_{i+1} = [G_i, G]$. It is also equippied with a *Mal'cev basis* $(X_i)_{i=1}^{d}$ *respecting the filtration*, which are elements of the Lie algebra of G satisfying

$$[X_i, X_j] \in \mathrm{Span}_{\mathbb{Q}}(X_{\max(i,j)+1}, \dots, X_d).$$

More terminology (quantifying nilmanifolds)

We will assume G is s-step nilpotent, Γ discrete cocompact. Consider the *lower central series filtration* $(G_i)_{i=0}^{\infty}$ with $G_0 = G_i = G$, $G_{i+1} = [G_i, G]$. It is also equippied with a *Mal'cev basis* $(X_i)_{i=1}^{d}$ *respecting the filtration*, which are elements of the Lie algebra of G satisfying

$$[X_i, X_j] \in \mathrm{Span}_{\mathbb{Q}}(X_{\max(i,j)+1}, \dots, X_d).$$

The *complexity* of the Mal'cev basis, denoted M, is the largest *height* of elements a_{ijk} where

$$[X_i, X_j] = \sum_k a_{ijk} X_k.$$

More terminology (quantifying nilmanifolds)

We will assume G is s-step nilpotent, Γ discrete cocompact. Consider the *lower central series filtration* $(G_i)_{i=0}^{\infty}$ with $G_0 = G_i = G$, $G_{i+1} = [G_i, G]$. It is also equippied with a *Mal'cev basis* $(X_i)_{i=1}^{d}$ *respecting the filtration*, which are elements of the Lie algebra of G satisfying

$$[X_i, X_j] \in \mathrm{Span}_{\mathbb{Q}}(X_{\max(i,j)+1}, \dots, X_d).$$

The *complexity* of the Mal'cev basis, denoted M, is the largest *height* of elements a_{ijk} where

$$[X_i, X_j] = \sum_k a_{ijk} X_k.$$

Furthermore, the elements $\prod_{i=1}^{d} \exp(t_i X_i)$ with $t_i \in \mathbb{R}$ generate G uniquely and when $t_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ generate Γ.

Definition of horizontal character

A horizontal character is a homomorphism $\eta : G/\Gamma \to \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ which annihilates $[G, G]$.

Definition of horizontal character

A horizontal character is a homomorphism $\eta : G/\Gamma \to \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ which annihilates $[G, G]$. By invoking Mal'cev coordinates, we may *represent* η as a vector k in $\mathbb{Z}^d$.

Definition of horizontal character

A horizontal character is a homomorphism $\eta : G/\Gamma \to \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ which annihilates $[G, G]$. By invoking Mal'cev coordinates, we may *represent* η as a vector k in $\mathbb{Z}^d$. The *modulus* is then the largest component of k.

Previous results on quantifying nilsequence equidistribution

Theorem (Green-Tao)

If $F : G/\Gamma$ is Lipschitz, and

$$\left|\mathbb{E}_{n\in[N]}F(g^n\Gamma) - \int_{G/\Gamma} F(x)dx\right| \geq \delta\|F\|_{Lip}$$

then there exists a nonzero horizontal character η of modulus at most $(\delta/M)^{-O(d)^{O(d)^{O(1)}}}$ such that

$$\|\eta(g)\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \ll (\delta/M)^{-O(d)^{O(d)^{O(1)}}}/N.$$

Notes on Green-Tao's theorem

- Theorem works for more general *polynomial sequences* with respect to the filtration.

Notes on Green-Tao's theorem

- Theorem works for more general *polynomial sequences* with respect to the filtration.
- If G is degree two or step one, then bounds are single exponential in dimension.

Nilcharacter

Given a continuous homomorphism $\xi : G_s/\Gamma_s \to \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$, we define a *nilcharacter* of frequency ξ to be a Lipschitz function $F : G/\Gamma \to \mathbb{C}$ satisfying $F(g_s x) = e(\xi(g_s))F(x)$ (think, bracket polynomial with s iterated/nested brackets.)

Iterating Green-Tao's result

- We can again iterate to obtain a similar Ratner-type factorization theorem $g^n = \epsilon(n) g_1(n) \gamma(n)$, but now with bounds double exponential in dimension, even in the one-step case.

Iterating Green-Tao's result

- We can again iterate to obtain a similar Ratner-type factorization theorem $g^n = \epsilon(n)g_1(n)\gamma(n)$, but now with bounds double exponential in dimension, even in the one-step case.
- Since nilcharacters have integral zero, we may iterate this result to obtain a slightly stronger equidistribution theorem in this case.

Iterating Green-Tao's result

- We can again iterate to obtain a similar Ratner-type factorization theorem $g^n = \epsilon(n) g_1(n) \gamma(n)$, but now with bounds double exponential in dimension, even in the one-step case.
- Since nilcharacters have integral zero, we may iterate this result to obtain a slightly stronger equidistribution theorem in this case.
- Unfortunately, inserting this result to the Fourier expanded nilcharacters in the two-step case doesn't do any better; the extra parameter, *complexity*, increases too fast.

Iterating Green-Tao's result

- We can again iterate to obtain a similar Ratner-type factorization theorem $g^n = \epsilon(n)g_1(n)\gamma(n)$, but now with bounds double exponential in dimension, even in the one-step case.
- Since nilcharacters have integral zero, we may iterate this result to obtain a slightly stronger equidistribution theorem in this case.
- Unfortunately, inserting this result to the Fourier expanded nilcharacters in the two-step case doesn't do any better; the extra parameter, *complexity*, increases too fast.
- *induction on dimensions* is a huge issue everywhere.

Bracket polynomials and Bohr sets

- Why should we expect such a theory with bounds single exponential in dimension?

Bracket polynomials and Bohr sets

- Why should we expect such a theory with bounds single exponential in dimension?
- Green and Tao show that degree two bracket polynomials are "morally equivalent" to quadratic functions on large generalized arithmetic progressions.

Bracket polynomials and Bohr sets

- Why should we expect such a theory with bounds single exponential in dimension?
- Green and Tao show that degree two bracket polynomials are “morally equivalent” to quadratic functions on large generalized arithmetic progressions.
- In 2010, Gowers and Wolf apply an equidistribution theory for quadratic functions on generalized arithmetic progressions to the *true complexity problem*.

Bracket polynomials and Bohr sets

Let $[\vec{N}] = [N_1] \times [N_2] \times \cdots \times [N_d]$. Let $q(\vec{n}) = \sum_{ij} \alpha_{ij} n_i n_j$. We wish to study exponential sums

$$\mathbb{E}_{\vec{n} \in [\vec{N}]} e(q(\vec{n})).$$

Bracket polynomials and Bohr sets

Let $[\vec{N}] = [N_1] \times [N_2] \times \cdots \times [N_d]$. Let $q(\vec{n}) = \sum_{ij} \alpha_{ij} n_i n_j$. We wish to study exponential sums

$$\mathbb{E}_{\vec{n} \in [\vec{N}]} e(q(\vec{n})).$$

The conclusion is that there exists some integer $q \ll \delta^{-O(d)^{O(1)}}$ such that

$$\|q\alpha_{ij}\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \ll \frac{\delta^{-O(d)^{O(1)}}}{N_i N_j}.$$

Bracket polynomials and Bohr sets

Let $[\vec{N}] = [N_1] \times [N_2] \times \cdots \times [N_d]$. Let $q(\vec{n}) = \sum_{ij} \alpha_{ij} n_i n_j$. We wish to study exponential sums

$$\mathbb{E}_{\vec{n} \in [\vec{N}]} e(q(\vec{n})).$$

The conclusion is that there exists some integer $q \ll \delta^{-O(d)^{O(1)}}$ such that

$$\|q\alpha_{ij}\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \ll \frac{\delta^{-O(d)^{O(1)}}}{N_i N_j}.$$

Bounds are good (single exponential in dimension).

Approaches

- Can we generalize this approach using the Gowers-Wolf equidistribution theory framework (develop a "quadratic geometry of numbers")?

Approaches

- Can we generalize this approach using the Gowers-Wolf equidistribution theory framework (develop a "quadratic geometry of numbers")?
- Can we understand this approach in terms of nilmanifolds?

Statement of Main Theorem

- We will assume G/Γ to be a s-step nilpotent Lie group of degree k, dimension d, and complexity M.

Statement of Main Theorem

- We will assume G/Γ to be a s-step nilpotent Lie group of degree k, dimension d, and complexity M.
- $F : G/\Gamma \to \mathbb{C}$ will be a *nilcharacter* of frequency ξ with $|\xi| \leq (\delta/M)^{-1}$ (with δ some parameter). That is, $F(g_s x) = e(\xi(g_s))F(x)$ for $g_s \in G_{(s)}$.

Statement of Main Theorem

- We will assume G/Γ to be a s-step nilpotent Lie group of degree k, dimension d, and complexity M.
- $F : G/\Gamma \to \mathbb{C}$ will be a *nilcharacter* of frequency ξ with $|\xi| \leq (\delta/M)^{-1}$ (with δ some parameter). That is, $F(g_s x) = e(\xi(g_s))F(x)$ for $g_s \in G_{(s)}$.
- If $\eta : G/\Gamma \to \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ is a horizontal character, we identify it (via Mal'cev coordinates) with a vector $\vec{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, so we may lift it to some $\tilde{\eta} : G \to \mathbb{R}$.

Statement of Main Theorem

- We will assume G/Γ to be a s-step nilpotent Lie group of degree k, dimension d, and complexity M.
- $F : G/\Gamma \to \mathbb{C}$ will be a *nilcharacter* of frequency ξ with $|\xi| \le (\delta/M)^{-1}$ (with δ some parameter). That is, $F(g_s x) = e(\xi(g_s))F(x)$ for $g_s \in G_{(s)}$.
- If $\eta : G/\Gamma \to \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ is a horizontal character, we identify it (via Mal'cev coordinates) with a vector $\vec{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, so we may lift it to some $\tilde{\eta} : G \to \mathbb{R}$.
- We say that $w \in G$ is *orthogonal* to η if $\tilde{\eta}(w) = 0$.

Statement of Main Theorem

- We can define notions of linear independent of horizontal characters by identifying them with vectors in $\mathbb{Z}^d$.
- By identifying $w \in \Gamma$ with a vector $k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, we can also define modulus, and linear independence of w.

Statement of Main Theorem

Theorem

Let $\delta > 0$ and N an integer. Suppose

$$|\mathbb{E}_{n\in[N]} F(g^n\Gamma)| \geq \delta.$$

Then either $N \ll (\delta/M)^{-O_s(d)^{O_s(1)}}$ or there exists linearly independent horizontal characters $\eta_1, \dots, \eta_r$ of modulus at most $(\delta/M)^{-O_s(d)^{O_s(1)}}$ such that

$$\|\eta_j \circ g\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \leq \frac{(\delta/M)^{-O_s(d)^{O_s(1)}}}{N}$$

and if w_i are orthogonal to η_j, $\xi([w_1, \dots, w_s]) = 0$.

Statement of the Main Theorem, s = 2

Theorem

Let $\delta > 0$ and N an integer. Suppose G is two-step and

$$|\mathbb{E}_{n\in[N]}F(g^n\Gamma)| \geq \delta.$$

Then either $N \ll (\delta/M)^{-O(d)^{O(1)}}$ or there exists linearly independent horizontal characters $\eta_1, \dots, \eta_r$ of modulus at most $(\delta/M)^{-O(d)^{O(1)}}$, and $w_1, \dots, w_{d-r} \in \Gamma$ linearly independent and orthogonal to all of the η_i's and modulus at most $(\delta/M)^{-O(d)^{O(1)}}$ such that

$$\|\eta_j \circ g\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}, \|\xi([w_i, g])\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \ll \frac{(\delta/M)^{-O(d)^{O(1)}}}{N}.$$

Remark, s = 2

If we let $\tilde{G} = G/\ker(\xi)$, then

$$H := \{g \in \tilde{G} : \eta_i(g) = 0, \xi([w_i, g]) = 0 \forall i\}$$

is abelian. This is because if $g, h \in H$, then it suffices to check that $[g, h] = 0$. This follows since $\eta_i(g) = 0$ implies that g can be written $\pmod{[G, G]}$ as a combination of w_i's.

Remark, s = 2

If we let $\tilde{G} = G/\ker(\xi)$, then

$$H := \{g \in \tilde{G} : \eta_i(g) = 0, \xi([w_i, g]) = 0 \forall i\}$$

is abelian. This is because if $g, h \in H$, then it suffices to check that $[g, h] = 0$. This follows since $\eta_i(g) = 0$ implies that g can be written $\pmod{[G, G]}$ as a combination of w_i's. In fact, the map $(x, y) \mapsto \xi([x, y])$ is a *symplectic form* (after quotienting by degeneracies) and the theorem states that g morally lies in a Lagrangian (or rather *isotropic*) subspace with respect to the symplectic form.

Slogan

Theorem (Informal version)

If $F(g(n)\Gamma)$ is a nilcharacter of step s and

$$|\mathbb{E}_n F(g(n)\Gamma) - \int F| \geq \delta$$

then F is "morally" a nilsequence of step $s-1$ (with bounds single exponential in dimension).

Application: Polynomial Szemerédi

In 2022, L. showed:

Theorem

Let $P(x), Q(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ be two linearly independent polynomials with $P(0) = Q(0) = 0$. Suppose $A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_N$ lacks a progression of the form $(x, x + P(y), x + Q(y), x + P(y) + Q(y))$. Then

$$|A| \ll_{P,Q} \frac{N}{\log_{m_{P,Q}}(N)}.$$

Here, $\log_{m_{P,Q}}(N)$ is an iterated logarithm with $m_{P,Q}$ times.

Application: Polynomial Szemerédi

Inserting this equidistribution theorem yields

Theorem (L, 2023+)

Let $P(x), Q(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ be two linearly independent polynomials with $P(0) = Q(0) = 0$. Suppose $A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_N$ lacks a progression of the form $(x, x + P(y), x + Q(y), x + P(y) + Q(y))$. Then

$$|A| \ll_{P,Q} \frac{N}{\exp(\log(N)^{c_{P,Q}})}.$$

Application: Polynomial Szemerédi

In 2023, Peluse, Sah, and Sawhney showed:

Theorem

Suppose a subset $A \subseteq [N]$ lacks a progression of the form $(x, x + y^2 - 1, x + 2(y^2 - 1))$. Then

$$|A| \ll \frac{N}{\log_m(N)}$$

(with $m \approx 200$).

Application: Polynomial Szemerédi

In 2023, Peluse, Sah, and Sawhney showed:

Theorem

Suppose a subset $A \subseteq [N]$ lacks a progression of the form $(x, x + y^2 - 1, x + 2(y^2 - 1))$. Then

$$|A| \ll \frac{N}{\log_m(N)}$$

(with $m \approx 200$).

They remark that a similar application of the equidistribution result would yield

$$|A| \ll_{P,Q} \frac{N}{\exp(\log\log(N)^c)}.$$

Application: Inverse theory of Gowers norm

In 2010, Green-Tao-Ziegler showed:

Theorem

Suppose $\|f\|_{U^{s+1}([N])} \geq \delta$. Then there exists a nilsequence $F(g^n\Gamma)$ of dimension $D(\delta)$ and complexity $M(\delta)$ such that

$$|\langle f, F(g^n\Gamma)\rangle| \geq c(\delta).$$

Application: Inverse theory of Gowers norm

- In 2010, Sanders shows that if $s = 2$, we may take $D(\delta) = \log(1/\delta)^{O(1)}$, $M(\delta) = O(1)$, and $c(\delta) = \exp(-\log(1/\delta)^{O(1)})$.

Application: Inverse theory of Gowers norm

- In 2010, Sanders shows that if $s = 2$, we may take $D(\delta) = \log(1/\delta)^{O(1)}$, $M(\delta) = O(1)$, and $c(\delta) = \exp(-\log(1/\delta)^{O(1)})$.
- In 2018, Manners shows that we may generally take $D(\delta) = \delta^{-O_s(1)}$, $M(\delta) = \exp\exp(\delta^{-O_s(1)})$, and $c(\delta) = \exp(-\exp(\delta^{-O_s(1)}))$.

Application: Inverse theory of Gowers norm

- In 2010, Sanders shows that if $s = 2$, we may take $D(\delta) = \log(1/\delta)^{O(1)}$, $M(\delta) = O(1)$, and $c(\delta) = \exp(-\log(1/\delta)^{O(1)})$.
- In 2018, Manners shows that we may generally take $D(\delta) = \delta^{-O_s(1)}$, $M(\delta) = \exp\exp(\delta^{-O_s(1)})$, and $c(\delta) = \exp(-\exp(\delta^{-O_s(1)}))$.
- In the case of $s = 3$, Manners shows that we may take $M(\delta) = \exp(\delta^{-O(1)})$ and $c(\delta) = \exp(-\delta^{-O(1)})$.

Application: Inverse theory of Gowers norm

We can show:

Theorem (L., 2023+)

In the case of $s = 3$, we can take $M(\delta) = O(1)$, $D(\delta) = \exp(O(\log\log(1/\delta)^2))$, and $c(\delta) = \exp(-\exp(O(\log\log(1/\delta)^2)))$.

Sketch of proof, two-step case

Let $\phi(n) = \alpha n^2 + \sum_i \alpha_i n[\beta_i n]$.

Sketch of proof, two-step case

Let $\phi(n) = \alpha n^2 + \sum_i \alpha_i n[\beta_i n]$. Assume for simplicity that $e(\phi(n+N)) = e(\phi(n))$ with N prime and α_i, β_i have denominator N.

Sketch of proof, two-step case

Let $\phi(n) = \alpha n^2 + \sum_i \alpha_i n[\beta_i n]$. Assume for simplicity that $e(\phi(n+N)) = e(\phi(n))$ with N prime and α_i, β_i have denominator N. We wish to study what happens when

$$|\mathbb{E}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_N} e(\phi(n))| \geq \delta.$$

Sketch of proof, two-step case

Let $\phi(n) = \alpha n^2 + \sum_i \alpha_i n[\beta_i n]$. Assume for simplicity that $e(\phi(n+N)) = e(\phi(n))$ with N prime and α_i, β_i have denominator N. We wish to study what happens when

$$|\mathbb{E}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_N} e(\phi(n))| \geq \delta.$$

Applying van der Corput gives that there exists $\delta^{O(1)} N$ many $h \in \mathbb{Z}_N$ such that

$$|\mathbb{E}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_N} e(\phi(n+h) - \phi(n))| \geq \delta^{O(1)}.$$

Sketch of proof, two-step case

Let $\phi(n) = \alpha n^2 + \sum_i \alpha_i n[\beta_i n]$. Assume for simplicity that $e(\phi(n+N)) = e(\phi(n))$ with N prime and α_i, β_i have denominator N. We wish to study what happens when

$$|\mathbb{E}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_N} e(\phi(n))| \geq \delta.$$

Applying van der Corput gives that there exists $\delta^{O(1)} N$ many $h \in \mathbb{Z}_N$ such that

$$|\mathbb{E}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_N} e(\phi(n+h) - \phi(n))| \geq \delta^{O(1)}.$$

Let us analyze $\phi(n+h)$.

Fourier Complexity and Bracket Polynomials

We can write

$$\alpha(n+h)[\beta(n+h)] = \alpha n[\beta(n+h)] + \alpha h[\beta(n+h)]$$

But how do we deal with $[\beta(n+h)]$?

Fourier Complexity and Bracket Polynomials

We can write

$$\alpha(n+h)[\beta(n+h)] = \alpha n[\beta(n+h)] + \alpha h[\beta(n+h)]$$

But how do we deal with $[\beta(n+h)]$? We write

$$\alpha n[\beta(n+h)] \equiv \alpha n[\beta n] + \alpha n[\beta h]$$

$$+\{\alpha n\}(\{\beta n\} + \{\beta h\} - \{\beta(n+h)\}).$$

Fourier Complexity and Bracket Polynomials

We can write

$$\alpha(n+h)[\beta(n+h)] = \alpha n[\beta(n+h)] + \alpha h[\beta(n+h)]$$

But how do we deal with $[\beta(n+h)]$? We write

$$\alpha n[\beta(n+h)] \equiv \alpha n[\beta n] + \alpha n[\beta h]$$

$$+\{\alpha n\}(\{\beta n\} + \{\beta h\} - \{\beta(n+h)\}).$$

The function $e(\{\alpha n\}\{\beta n\})$ can be written as $F(\{\alpha n\}, \{\beta n\})$ where $F(x, y) = e(xy)$. F is not defined on $(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^2$, but if we approximate F with a *smoothed out* version of F near the boundary of $(-1/2, 1/2]^2$, it will be!

Fourier Complexity and Bracket Polynomials

We may thus Fourier approximate the smoothed out $\tilde{F}$ to obtain

$$\tilde{F}(x, y) = \sum_{|\eta| \le \delta^{-1}} a_\eta e(\eta \cdot (x, y)) + O_{L^\infty[\mathbb{T}^2]}(\delta)$$

with $|a_\eta| \le 1$ assuming that α, β are denominator N, we have

$$F(\{\alpha n\}, \{\beta n\}) = \sum_{|\eta| \le \delta^{-1}} a_\eta e(\eta \cdot (\alpha n, \beta n)) + O_{L^1[N]}(\delta).$$

Fourier Complexity and Bracket Polynomials

Thus, $e(\{\alpha n\}(\{\beta n\} + \{\beta h\} - \{\beta(n+h)\}))$ is *lower order* and may be Fourier expanded into linear phases. One can show that

$$e(\phi(n+h) - \phi(n)) = e(\sum_{i=1}^{d} \alpha_i n\{\beta_i h\} - \beta_i n\{\alpha_i h\} + \beta nh).$$

Thus, letting $a = (\alpha_i, -\beta_i)$ and $\alpha = (\{\beta_i h\}, \{\alpha_i n\})$, we have

$$|\mathbb{E}_{n\in[N]} e(an \cdot \{\alpha h\} + \beta nh)| \geq \delta^{O(d)^{O(1)}}.$$

This implies that

$$\|\beta h + a \cdot \{\alpha h\}\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \leq \frac{\delta^{-O(d)^{O(1)}}}{N}.$$

Refined Bracket Polynomial Lemma

- (Side note: the manipulations above are morally equivalent to operations in Green and Tao's proof involving the joining $G \times_{G_2} G$).

Refined Bracket Polynomial Lemma

- (Side note: the manipulations above are morally equivalent to operations in Green and Tao's proof involving the joining $G \times_{G_2} G$).
- Green and Tao show that either $|a| \ll \delta^{-O(d)^{O(1)}}/N$, or that there exists some character $\eta \ll \delta^{-O(d)^{O(1)}}$ such that $\|\eta \cdot \alpha\| \ll \frac{\delta^{-O(d)^{O(1)}}}{N}$.

Refined Bracket Polynomial Lemma

- (Side note: the manipulations above are morally equivalent to operations in Green and Tao's proof involving the joining $G \times_{G_2} G$).
- Green and Tao show that either $|a| \ll \delta^{-O(d)^{O(1)}}/N$, or that there exists some character $\eta \ll \delta^{-O(d)^{O(1)}}$ such that $\|\eta \cdot \alpha\| \ll \frac{\delta^{-O(d)^{O(1)}}}{N}$.
- Can we do better?

Refined Bracket Polynomial Lemma

- (Side note: the manipulations above are morally equivalent to operations in Green and Tao's proof involving the joining $G \times_{G_2} G$).
- Green and Tao show that either $|a| \ll \delta^{-O(d)^{O(1)}}/N$, or that there exists some character $\eta \ll \delta^{-O(d)^{O(1)}}$ such that $\|\eta \cdot \alpha\| \ll \frac{\delta^{-O(d)^{O(1)}}}{N}$.
- Can we do better?
- Gowers-Wolf suggests that we may be able to.

Refined Bracket Polynomial Lemma

Lemma

Let $\frac{1}{10} > \delta > 0$ *and* N *be a prime. Suppose* $\alpha, a \in \mathbb{R}^d$ *are of denominator* N, $|a| \leq \delta^{-1}$,

$$\|\beta + a \cdot \{\alpha h\}\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} = 0$$

for δN *many* $h \in [N]$. *The either* $N \ll \delta^{-O(d)^{O(1)}}$ *or else there exists linearly independent* $w_1, \dots, w_r$ *and* $\eta_1, \dots, \eta_{d-r}$ *in* $\mathbb{Z}^d$ *with size at most* $\delta^{-O(d)^{O(1)}}$ *such that* $\langle w_i, \eta_j \rangle = 0$ *and*

$$\|\eta_j \cdot \alpha\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} = 0, \quad |w_i \cdot a| = 0.$$

Description of Proof

- Tao has a simple proof (in the denominator N case) using Minkowski's second theorem. This does not generalize so simply.

Description of Proof

- Tao has a simple proof (in the denominator N case) using Minkowski's second theorem. This does not generalize so simply.
- L.'s proof is quite intricate, at one point involving an iteration

$$(\delta_j, M_j, K_j, N_j, L_j, q_j)$$

$$= (\delta_{j-1}/4, M_{j-1}, (2q_{j-1}K_1/2^d)^{O(jd^2)}, N_{j-1}/(L_{j-1}q_{j-1}), jL_{j-1}(\delta_{j-1}/2^d M)^{-O(d)}, (\delta_{j-1}/2^d M)^{-O(d)} q_{j-1}).$$

Remarks and questions

- One can use similar ideas for the proof with the bracket polynomial $\sum_i \alpha_i n[\beta_i n^2]$, and it would still work.

Remarks and questions

- One can use similar ideas for the proof with the bracket polynomial $\sum_i \alpha_i n[\beta_i n^2]$, and it would still work.
- It is possible (though extremely painful) to rewrite this proof using purely bracket polynomial formalism.

Remarks and questions

- One can use similar ideas for the proof with the bracket polynomial $\sum_i \alpha_i n[\beta_i n^2]$, and it would still work.
- It is possible (though extremely painful) to rewrite this proof using purely bracket polynomial formalism.
- Is it possible to improve the upper bounds for $r_5(N)$, the size of the largest subset of $[N]$ which avoids 5-term arithmetic progressions?

Remarks and questions

- One can use similar ideas for the proof with the bracket polynomial $\sum_i \alpha_i n[\beta_i n^2]$, and it would still work.
- It is possible (though extremely painful) to rewrite this proof using purely bracket polynomial formalism.
- Is it possible to improve the upper bounds for $r_5(N)$, the size of the largest subset of $[N]$ which avoids 5-term arithmetic progressions?
- Is it possible to improve $U^{s+1}(\mathbb{Z}/N\mathbb{Z})$ inverse theorem for all s?

Thank you!

Appendix: sketch of refined bracket polynomial lemma

Begin with the expression:

$$\|a \cdot \{\alpha h\} + \gamma h + \beta\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \approx 0$$

where $|\beta| \approx 0$ for δN_1 many $h \in I$ where I is an interval of size N_1.

Appendix: sketch of refined bracket polynomial lemma

Begin with the expression:

$$\|a \cdot \{\alpha h\} + \gamma h + \beta\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \approx 0$$

where $|\beta| \approx 0$ for δN_1 many $h \in I$ where I is an interval of size N_1.

- If $|a| \approx 0$, we're done.

Appendix: sketch of refined bracket polynomial lemma

Begin with the expression:

$$\|a \cdot \{\alpha h\} + \gamma h + \beta\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \approx 0$$

where $|\beta| \approx 0$ for δN_1 many $h \in I$ where I is an interval of size N_1.

- If $|a| \approx 0$, we're done.
- since β is small, we can pigeonhole in h, showing that there exists some θ such that for $\delta/2N_2$ many $h \in J$ (where $N_2 \sim N_1(\delta/2^{d+1}dM)^{O(d)}/L$) ($|J| = N_2$):

$$\|a \cdot \{\alpha h\} + \theta\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \approx 0.$$

Refined proof

By pigeonholing in sign pattern of $\{\alpha h\}$, there exists $\delta/2^{d+1}dMN_2$ many $h \in J$ such that

$$a \cdot \{\alpha h\} \approx j$$

for some $j \in [2dM]$.

Refined proof

By pigeonholing in sign pattern of $\{\alpha h\}$, there exists $\delta/2^{d+1}dMN_2$ many $h \in J$ such that

$$a \cdot \{\alpha h\} \approx j$$

for some $j \in [2dM]$. Subtract two such values to get for δN_2 many $h \in [-N_2, N_2]$,

$$|a \cdot \{\alpha h\}| \approx 0.$$

Refined proof

By pigeonholing in sign pattern of $\{\alpha h\}$, there exists $\delta/2^{d+1}dMN_2$ many $h \in J$ such that

$$a \cdot \{\alpha h\} \approx j$$

for some $j \in [2dM]$. Subtract two such values to get for δN_2 many $h \in [-N_2, N_2]$,

$$|a \cdot \{\alpha h\}| \approx 0.$$

Consider the tube in the direction of a and width $(\delta/2^{d+1}dM)^2$ and length $(\delta/2^{d+1}dM)^{-4d}$.

Refined proof

By pigeonholing in sign pattern of $\{\alpha h\}$, there exists $\delta/2^{d+1}dMN_2$ many $h \in J$ such that

$$a \cdot \{\alpha h\} \approx j$$

for some $j \in [2dM]$. Subtract two such values to get for δN_2 many $h \in [-N_2, N_2]$,

$$|a \cdot \{\alpha h\}| \approx 0.$$

Consider the tube in the direction of a and width $(\delta/2^{d+1}dM)^2$ and length $(\delta/2^{d+1}dM)^{-4d}$. (By Minkowski), this has a lattice point η.

Refined proof

By pigeonholing in sign pattern of $\{\alpha h\}$, there exists $\delta/2^{d+1}dMN_2$ many $h \in J$ such that

$$a \cdot \{\alpha h\} \approx j$$

for some $j \in [2dM]$. Subtract two such values to get for δN_2 many $h \in [-N_2, N_2]$,

$$|a \cdot \{\alpha h\}| \approx 0.$$

Consider the tube in the direction of a and width $(\delta/2^{d+1}dM)^2$ and length $(\delta/2^{d+1}dM)^{-4d}$. (By Minkowski), this has a lattice point η. One can show after scaling a up and Vinogradov's that there exists some $q \leq (\delta/2^{d+1}dM)$ such that

$$\|q\eta \cdot \alpha\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \approx 0.$$

Refined proof

Lemma

Suppose there are at least δN_1 many $h \in J$ where J is an interval of size N_1 such that

$$\|\beta + \gamma h + a \cdot \{\alpha h\}\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \leq \frac{K}{N}$$

with $|\gamma| \leq L/N_1$. Then either
$N \ll L^{O(1)}(K\delta/2^d Md)^{-O(d)^{O(1)}}$ or
$N_1 \ll L^{O(1)}(K\delta/2^d Md)^{-O(d)^{O(1)}}$ or
$(\delta/2^d Md)^{4d}\|a\|_\infty \leq K/N$ or there exists an integer vector v of size at most $(\delta/2^d Md)^{-O(d)}$ in a $(\delta/2^d Md)$-tube in the direction of a such that $\|v \cdot \alpha\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \leq L(\delta/2^d Md)^{-O(d)}/N_1$.

Refined proof

Cleaned up version:

Lemma

Suppose $|a| \leq M$, for $\gg_\delta N_1$ many h that

$$\|\beta + \gamma h + a \cdot \{\alpha h\}\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \approx 0.$$

Then provided parameters aren't too small, either $|a| \approx 0$ or there exists some v with $|v| \ll_{\delta, M} 1$ in a small tube in the direction of a such that $\|v \cdot \alpha\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \approx 0$.

Refined proof

Now we begin the iteration.

Refined proof

Now we begin the iteration. Suppose

$$\|\beta + \gamma h + a \cdot \{\alpha h\}\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \approx 0.$$

Refined proof

Now we begin the iteration. Suppose

$$\|\beta + \gamma h + a \cdot \{\alpha h\}\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \approx 0.$$

Then either $|a| \approx 0$ or there exists some η such that $\eta \cdot \alpha \approx 0 \pmod 1$.

Refined proof

Now we begin the iteration. Suppose

$$\|\beta + \gamma h + a \cdot \{\alpha h\}\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \approx 0.$$

Then either $|a| \approx 0$ or there exists some η such that $\eta \cdot \alpha \approx 0 \pmod 1$. Suppose (for simplicity) $\eta_1 = 1$.

Refined proof

Now we begin the iteration. Suppose

$$\|\beta + \gamma h + a \cdot \{\alpha h\}\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \approx 0.$$

Then either $|a| \approx 0$ or there exists some η such that $\eta \cdot \alpha \approx 0 \pmod 1$. Suppose (for simplicity) $\eta_1 = 1$. So

$$\|\tilde{a} \cdot \{\alpha h\} + \gamma h + \beta + a_1 P(h)\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \approx 0$$

where $\tilde{a} = (0, a_2\eta_1 - a_1\eta_2, a_3\eta_1 - a_1\eta_3, \ldots, a_d\eta_1 - a_1\eta_d)$ and

$$P(h) = \{\alpha_1 h\} + \eta_2\{\alpha_2 h\} + \cdots + \eta_d\{\alpha_d h\}.$$

Refined proof

Now we begin the iteration. Suppose

$$\|\beta + \gamma h + a \cdot \{\alpha h\}\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \approx 0.$$

Then either $|a| \approx 0$ or there exists some η such that $\eta \cdot \alpha \approx 0 \pmod 1$. Suppose (for simplicity) $\eta_1 = 1$. So

$$\|\tilde{a} \cdot \{\alpha h\} + \gamma h + \beta + a_1 P(h)\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \approx 0$$

where $\tilde{a} = (0, a_2\eta_1 - a_1\eta_2, a_3\eta_1 - a_1\eta_3, \dots, a_d\eta_1 - a_1\eta_d)$ and

$$P(h) = \{\alpha_1 h\} + \eta_2\{\alpha_2 h\} + \dots + \eta_d\{\alpha_d h\}.$$

By pigeonholing h in one of the values P takes, we can iterate.

Refined proof

James Leng

Problems:

- $|\tilde{a}|$ might be too large. This causes the M parameter to increase.

Refined proof

Problems:

- $|\tilde{a}|$ might be too large. This causes the M parameter to increase.
- pigeonholing in h causes the density to decrease like $\delta \mapsto \Omega_M(\delta^{O(d)})$, which is worse than $\delta \mapsto \delta^2$ which isn't allowed.

Refined proof

To overcome first problem, observe (from Minkowski) that η must lie in a tube in the direction of a. Thus, $|\tilde{a}|$ is actually *smaller* than $|a|$.

Refined proof

To overcome first problem, observe (from Minkowski) that η must lie in a tube in the direction of a. Thus, $|\tilde{a}|$ is actually *smaller* than $|a|$. This is because if η lies in a tube of width ϵ in the direction of a, we write

$$\eta = ta + O_{\leq 1}(\epsilon)$$

(where $O_{\leq 1}$ denotes that the implicit constant is ≤ 1) then

$$\eta_i = ta_i + O_{\leq 1}(\epsilon).$$

Then

$$\eta_1 a_i - a_1 \eta_i = O_{\leq 2}(|a|\epsilon).$$

Side note

Green and Tao use a Fourier proof in their proof of "bracket polynomial lemma." One can get that η lies in a tube around a via the uncertainty principle.

Side note

Green and Tao use a Fourier proof in their proof of "bracket polynomial lemma." One can get that η lies in a tube around a via the uncertainty principle. This doesn't give as good bounds though, and still would result in an increase in $|\tilde{a}|$ over $|a|$, but increase is not *fatal* to the argument. This would still work for the iteration.

Refined proof

To overcome the second issue, we observe the following:

- $S = \{h : P(h) = j\}$ has "bounded Fourier complexity," i.e., 1_S can be described by a "bounded number of Fourier coefficients." (more on this later)

Refined proof

To overcome the second issue, we observe the following:

- $S = \{h : P(h) = j\}$ has "bounded Fourier complexity," i.e., 1_S can be described by a "bounded number of Fourier coefficients." (more on this later)
- By pigeonholing in h, you lose this information.

Refined proof

To overcome the second issue, we observe the following:

- $S = \{h : P(h) = j\}$ has "bounded Fourier complexity," i.e., 1_S can be described by a "bounded number of Fourier coefficients." (more on this later)
- By pigeonholing in h, you lose this information.
- Idea: convert the problem to:

$$|\mathbb{E}_{n\in[N]} e(an \cdot \{\alpha h\} + \gamma nh + \beta n)| \geq K^{-1}.$$

Refined proof

Making similar substitutions gives:

$$|\mathbb{E}_{n\in[N]} e(\tilde{a}n \cdot \{\alpha h\} + \gamma nh + \beta n + \{a_1 n\}P(h))| \geq K^{-1}.$$

Refined proof

Making similar substitutions gives:

$$|\mathbb{E}_{n\in[N]} e(\tilde{a}n \cdot \{\alpha h\} + \gamma nh + \beta n + \{a_1 n\}P(h))| \geq K^{-1}.$$

We have

$$e(\{a_1 n\}P(h)) = e(\{a_1 n\}(\{\alpha_1 h\}+\eta_2\{\alpha_2 h\}+\cdots+\eta_d\{\alpha_d h\}))$$

Refined proof

Making similar substitutions gives:

$$|\mathbb{E}_{n\in[N]} e(\tilde{a}n \cdot \{\alpha h\} + \gamma nh + \beta n + \{a_1 n\}P(h))| \geq K^{-1}.$$

We have

$$e(\{a_1 n\}P(h)) = e(\{a_1 n\}(\{\alpha_1 h\} + \eta_2\{\alpha_2 h\} + \cdots + \eta_d\{\alpha_d h\}))$$

We can use the previous Fourier expansion trick!

Fourier complexity lemma

We define the $L^p[N]$ δ-*Fourier complexity* (likewise $L^p([N] \times [H])$ δ-Fourier complexity) of a function $f : [N] \to \mathbb{C}$ to be the infimum of all L such that

$$f(n) = \sum_i a_i e(\xi_i n) + g$$

where $\|g\|_{L^p[N]} \leq \delta$ and $\sum_i |a_i| = L$.

Fourier complexity lemma

Lemma (Bilinear Fourier Complexity Lemma I)

Let

$$\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_d, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_d, \gamma_1', \dots, \gamma_d' \in \mathbb{R}$$

and let $\delta > 0$ *a real number and* $N, H > 0$ *integers. Then either* $N \ll (\delta/2^d k)^{-O(d)^2}$*, or* $H \ll (\delta/2^d k)^{-O(d)^2}$ *or else*

$$e(k_1\{\alpha_1 h + \gamma_1\}\{\beta_1 n + \gamma_1'\}$$

$$+k_2\{\alpha_2 h + \gamma_2\}\{\beta_2 n + \gamma_2'\} + \cdots k_d\{\alpha_d h + \gamma_d\}\{\beta_d h + \gamma_d'\})$$

has $L^1([N] \times [H])$*-*δ*-Fourier complexity at most* $(\delta/2^d k)^{-O(d^2)}$ *for* $|k_i| \leq k$ *integers.*

Idea of proof

- Let $F(\vec{x}, \vec{y}) = e(\sum_i k_i x_i y_i)$. Then we have $F(\{\alpha h + \gamma\}, \{\beta n + \gamma'\})$ is the expression we want to study.

Idea of proof

- Let $F(\vec{x}, \vec{y}) = e(\sum_i k_i x_i y_i)$. Then we have $F(\{\alpha h + \gamma\}, \{\beta n + \gamma'\})$ is the expression we want to study.
- Approximate F with Lipschitz function $\tilde{F}$ and Fourier expand.

Idea of proof

- Let $F(\vec{x}, \vec{y}) = e(\sum_i k_i x_i y_i)$. Then we have $F(\{\alpha h + \gamma\}, \{\beta n + \gamma'\})$ is the expression we want to study.
- Approximate F with Lipschitz function $\tilde{F}$ and Fourier expand.
- Doesn't always work, since $\{h : \|\alpha_i h + \gamma_i - 1/2\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \approx 0\}$ might have a lot of elements.

Idea of proof

- Let $F(\vec{x}, \vec{y}) = e(\sum_i k_i x_i y_i)$. Then we have $F(\{\alpha h + \gamma\}, \{\beta n + \gamma'\})$ is the expression we want to study.
- Approximate F with Lipschitz function $\tilde{F}$ and Fourier expand.
- Doesn't always work, since $\{h : \|\alpha_i h + \gamma_i - 1/2\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \approx 0\}$ might have a lot of elements.
- To remedy this, just approximate along subprogressions.

End of the proof

Iteration now works and gives

$$(\delta_j, M_j, K_j, N_j, L_j, q_j)$$

$$= (\delta_{j-1}/4, M_{j-1}, (2q_{j-1}K_1/2^d)^{O(jd^2)}, N_{j-1}/(L_{j-1}q_{j-1}),$$
$$jL_{j-1}(\delta_{j-1}/2^d M)^{-O(d)}, (\delta_{j-1}/2^d M)^{-O(d)} q_{j-1}).$$