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Very well approximable vectors

Definition

A vector \( \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d \) is very well approximable if there exists \( \varepsilon > 0 \) such that for infinitely many \( \frac{p}{q} \in \mathbb{Q}^d \),

\[
\left\| \mathbf{x} - \frac{p}{q} \right\| \leq \frac{1}{q^{1+1/d} + \varepsilon}.
\]

Example

Roth's theorem states that no algebraic irrational number in \( \mathbb{R} \) is very well approximable. Its higher-dimensional generalization (a corollary of Schmidt's subspace theorem) says that an algebraic vector in \( \mathbb{R}^d \) is very well approximable if and only if it is contained in an affine rational subspace of \( \mathbb{R}^d \).
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Dynamical interpretation

Theorem (Kleinbock–Margulis ’99)

Let

\[ g_t = \begin{bmatrix} e^{t/d} l_d & e^{-t} \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad u_x = \begin{bmatrix} l_d & -x \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \]

\( \Lambda_* = \mathbb{Z}^{d+1} \in \Omega_{d+1} = \{ \text{unimodular lattices in } \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \}. \)

Then \( x \) is very well approximable if and only if

\[
\limsup_{t \to \infty} \frac{1}{t} \text{dist}_{\Omega_{d+1}} (\Lambda_*, g_t u_x \Lambda_*) > 0.
\]
Extremal measures

A measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$ is called *extremal* if it gives full measure to the set of not very well approximable vectors.

**Example (Corollary of Borel–Cantelli)**

Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$ is extremal.
A measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$ is called \textit{extremal} if it gives full measure to the set of not very well approximable vectors.

\textbf{Example (Corollary of Borel–Cantelli)}

Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$ is extremal.

\textbf{Conjecture (Mahler ’32, proven by Sprindžuk ’64)}

\textit{Lebesgue measure on} $\{(x, x^2, \ldots, x^d) : x \in \mathbb{R}\}$ \textit{is extremal}.
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A measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$ is called *extremal* if it gives full measure to the set of not very well approximable vectors.

**Example (Corollary of Borel–Cantelli)**

Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$ is extremal.

**Conjecture (Mahler ’32, proven by Sprindžuk ’64)**

*Lebesgue measure on \{$(x, x^2, \ldots, x^d) : x \in \mathbb{R}$\} is extremal.*

**Conjecture (Sprindžuk ’80, proven by Kleinbock–Margulis ’98)**

*Lebesgue measure on any real-analytic manifold not contained in an affine hyperplane is extremal.*
Extremality and dynamically defined measures: First results

Theorem (Klenbock–Lindenstrauss–Weiss ’04)

Let \( \Lambda \) be the limit set of a finite iterated function system generated by similarities and satisfying the open set condition, and let \( \delta = \dim_H(\Lambda) \). Suppose that \( \Lambda \) is not contained in any affine hyperplane. Then \( \mathcal{H}^{\delta} \upharpoonright \Lambda \) is extremal.
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Theorem (Urbański ’05)

Same is true if “similarities” is replaced by “conformal maps”, and if $\mathcal{H}^\delta \upharpoonright \Lambda$ is replaced by “the Gibbs measure of a Hölder continuous potential function”.
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Theorem (Stratmann–Urbański ’06)

Let $G$ be a convex-cocompact Kleinian group whose limit set is not contained in any affine hyperplane. Then the Patterson–Sullivan measure of $G$ is extremal.
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Theorem (Stratmann–Urbański ’06)

Let $G$ be a convex-cocompact Kleinian group whose limit set is not contained in any affine hyperplane. Then the Patterson–Sullivan measure of $G$ is extremal.

Theorem (Urbański ’05 + Markov partition argument)

Let $T : \hat{\mathbb{C}} \to \hat{\mathbb{C}}$ be a hyperbolic (i.e. expansive on its Julia set) rational function, let $\phi : \hat{\mathbb{C}} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a Hölder continuous potential function, and let $\mu_\phi$ be the corresponding Gibbs measure. If $\text{Supp}(\mu_\phi)$ is not contained in an affine hyperplane, then $\mu_\phi$ is extremal.
Friendly and absolutely friendly measures

These theorems in fact all prove a stronger condition than extremality, namely *friendliness*.

**Definition (Kleinbock–Lindenstrauss–Weiss ’04)**

A measure $\mu$ is called *friendly* (resp. *absolutely friendly*) if:

- $\mu$ is doubling and gives zero measure to every hyperplane.
- There exist $C_1, \alpha > 0$ such that for every ball $B = B(x, \rho)$ with $x \in \text{Supp}(\mu)$, for every $0 < \beta \leq 1$, and for every hyperplane $L \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$
\mu\left(\mathcal{N}(L, \beta \text{ess sup}_B d(\cdot, L)) \cap B\right) \leq C_1 \beta^\alpha \mu(B) \text{ (decaying)}
$$

resp.

$$
\mu\left(\mathcal{N}(L, \beta \rho) \cap B\right) \leq C_1 \beta^\alpha \mu(B) \text{ (absolutely decaying)}
$$
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*Every friendly measure is extremal.*
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*Every friendly measure is extremal.*

**Theorem (Kleinbock–Lindenstraus–Weiss ’04)**

*If \( \Phi : \mathbb{R}^k \to \mathbb{R}^d \) is a real-analytic embedding whose image is not contained in any affine hyperplane, then \( \Phi \) sends absolutely friendly measures to friendly measures.*

**Theorem (Folklore)**

*If \( \delta > d - 1 \), then every Ahlfors \( \delta \)-regular measure on \( \mathbb{R}^d \) is absolutely friendly.*

Philosophical meta-theorem: Every Ahlfors regular “nonplanar” measure is absolutely friendly.
Although we have seen several measures from dynamics which are friendly or absolutely friendly, it seems that “most” such measures are not friendly. Intuitively, this is because the friendliness condition compares the measures of sets on similar length scales, while for any given dynamical system, the behavior of a measure at a given length scale may be heavily dependent on location.
Although we have seen several measures from dynamics which are friendly or absolutely friendly, it seems that “most” such measures are not friendly. Intuitively, this is because the friendliness condition compares the measures of sets on similar length scales, while for any given dynamical system, the behavior of a measure at a given length scale may be heavily dependent on location. To solve this problem, it is better to compare the behavior of a measure at significantly different length scales, to allow an “averaging effect” to take place, making the effect of location mostly irrelevant.
Extremal measures which are not necessarily friendly

All subsequent results are from Das–Fishman–S.–Urbański (preprint 2015) unless otherwise noted.

**Theorem**

*If* $\delta > d - 1$, *then every exact dimensional measure on* $\mathbb{R}^d$ *of dimension* $\delta$ *is extremal.*
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**Definition**

A measure $\mu$ is called *exact dimensional of dimension* $\delta$ *if for* $\mu$-a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, 

$$\lim_{\rho \searrow 0} \frac{\log \mu(B(x, \rho))}{\log \rho} = \delta.$$
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**Theorem**

If \( \delta > d - 1 \), then every exact dimensional measure on \( \mathbb{R}^d \) of dimension \( \delta \) is extremal.

**Definition**

A measure \( \mu \) is called *exact dimensional of dimension \( \delta \) if for \( \mu \)-a.e. \( x \in \mathbb{R}^d \),

\[
\lim_{\rho \searrow 0} \frac{\log \mu(B(x, \rho))}{\log \rho} = \delta.
\]

**Example (Barreira–Pesin–Schmeling ’99)**

Any measure ergodic, invariant, and hyperbolic with respect to a diffeomorphism is exact dimensional.
When \( d = 1, \ d - 1 = 0 \), so every exact dimensional measure on \( \mathbb{R} \) of positive dimension is extremal.

**Theorem (Hofbauer ’95)**

Let \( T : [0, 1] \to [0, 1] \) be a piecewise monotonic transformation whose derivative has bounded \( p \)-variation for some \( p > 0 \). Let \( \mu \) be a measure on \( [0, 1] \) which is ergodic and invariant with respect to \( T \). Let \( h(\mu) \) and \( \chi(\mu) \) denote the entropy and Lyapunov exponent of \( \mu \), respectively. If \( \chi(\mu) > 0 \), then \( \mu \) is exact dimensional of dimension

\[
\delta(\mu) = \frac{h(\mu)}{\chi(\mu)}.
\]

So if \( h(\mu) > 0 \), then \( \mu \) is extremal.
The positive entropy assumption is necessary, as shown by the following example:

**Theorem**

Let $T : X \to X$ be a hyperbolic toral endomorphism, where $X = \mathbb{R}^d/\mathbb{Z}^d$ (e.g. $Tx = nx \pmod{1}$ for some $n \geq 2$). Let $\mathbb{M}_T(X)$ be the space of $T$-invariant probability measures on $X$. Then the set of non-extremal measures is comeager in $\mathbb{M}_T(X)$. 
Gibbs states of CIFSes

**Theorem**

Fix $d \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $(u_a)_{a \in A}$ be an irreducible CIFS on $\mathbb{R}^d$. Let $\phi : A^\mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a summable locally Hölder continuous potential function, let $\mu_\phi$ be a Gibbs measure of $\phi$, and let $\pi : A^\mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}^d$ be the coding map. Suppose that the Lyapunov exponent

$$\chi_{\mu_\phi} := \int \log(1/|u'_{\omega_1}(\pi \circ \sigma(\omega))|) \, d\mu_\phi(\omega)$$

is finite. Then $\pi_*[\mu_\phi]$ is quasi-decaying.
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The improvements on Urbański ’05 are twofold:

- The CIFS can be infinite, as long as the Lyapunov exponent is finite.
- The open set condition is no longer needed.
Finite Lyapunov exponent assumption

The necessity of the finite Lyapunov exponent assumption is demonstrated by the following example:

**Theorem (Fishman–S.–Urbański ’14)**

There exists a set $I \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ such that if $\mu$ is the conformal measure of the CIFS $(u_n(x) = \frac{1}{n+x})_{n \in I}$, then $\mu$ is not extremal.
The necessity of the finite Lyapunov exponent assumption is demonstrated by the following example:

**Theorem (Fishman–S.–Urbański ’14)**

There exists a set \( I \subseteq \mathbb{N} \) such that if \( \mu \) is the conformal measure of the CIFS \( (u_n(x) = \frac{1}{n+x})_{n \in I} \), then \( \mu \) is not extremal.

Another connection between the finite Lyapunov exponent condition and extremality appears in the following theorem:

**Theorem (Fishman–S.–Urbański ’14)**

If \( \mu \) is a probability measure on \([0, 1] \setminus \mathbb{Q}\) invariant with finite Lyapunov exponent under the Gauss map, then \( \mu \) is extremal.
Patterson–Sullivan measures

**Theorem**

Let $G$ be a geometrically finite group of Möbius transformations of $\mathbb{R}^d$ which does not preserve any affine hyperplane. Then the Patterson–Sullivan measure of $G$ is extremal. If $G$ also does not preserve any sphere, then the Patterson–Sullivan measure is friendly, and is absolutely friendly if and only if all cusps have maximal rank.

**Remark**

The first part of this theorem (extremality) is easier to prove than the second part (friendliness).
Gibbs states of rational functions via inducing

Definition (Inoquio-Renteria + Rivera-Letelier, ’12)

If \( T : X \to X \) is a dynamical system, then a potential function \( \phi : X \to \mathbb{R} \) is called hyperbolic if there exists \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) such that \( \sup(S_n\phi) < P(T^n, S_n\phi) \), where \( P(T, \phi) \) is the pressure of \( \phi \) with respect to \( T \).

Theorem

Let \( T : \hat{\mathbb{C}} \to \hat{\mathbb{C}} \) be a rational function, let \( \phi : \hat{\mathbb{C}} \to \mathbb{R} \) be a Hölder continuous hyperbolic potential function, and let \( \mu_\phi \) be the Gibbs measure of \((T, \phi)\). If the Julia set of \( T \) is not contained in an affine hyperplane, then \( \mu_\phi \) is extremal.
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Definition (Inoquio-Renteria + Rivera-Letelier, ’12)

If $T : X \to X$ is a dynamical system, then a potential function $\phi : X \to \mathbb{R}$ is called hyperbolic if there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\sup(S_n \phi) < P(T^n, S_n \phi)$, where $P(T, \phi)$ is the pressure of $\phi$ with respect to $T$.

Theorem

Let $T : \hat{\mathbb{C}} \to \hat{\mathbb{C}}$ be a rational function, let $\phi : \hat{\mathbb{C}} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a Hölder continuous hyperbolic potential function, and let $\mu_\phi$ be the Gibbs measure of $(T, \phi)$. If the Julia set of $T$ is not contained in an affine hyperplane, then $\mu_\phi$ is extremal.

Proof uses the “fine inducing” technique of Szostakiewicz–Urbański–Zdunik (preprint 2011).
As before, all our theorems prove more than extremality:

**Definition**

A finite measure $\mu$ is called *weakly quasi-decaying* (resp. *quasi-decaying*) if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\mu(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus E) \leq \varepsilon$ such that for all $x \in E$ and $\gamma > 0$, there exist $C_1, \alpha > 0$ such that for all $0 < \rho \leq 1$, $0 < \beta \leq \rho^{\gamma}$, and affine hyperplane $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, if $B = B(x, \rho)$ then

$$\mu \left( \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{L}, \beta \text{ ess sup}_B d(\cdot, \mathcal{L})) \cap B \cap E \right) \leq C_1 \beta^{\alpha} \mu(B) \quad \text{(weak QD)}$$

resp.

$$\mu \left( \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{L}, \beta \rho) \cap B \cap E \right) \leq C_1 \beta^{\alpha} \mu(B) \quad \text{(QD)}$$
Differences between (weak) quasi-decay and (absolute) friendliness

The main difference between our conditions and those of Kleinbock–Lindenstrauss–Weiss is the restriction $\beta \leq \rho^\gamma$, which makes our condition cover a larger class of measures. It makes precise the earlier intuitive notion that any criterion on a measure should consider “significantly different length scales”.
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Differences between (weak) quasi-decay and (absolute) friendliness

The following implications hold:

Absolutely friendly  ⇒  Friendly
            ↓               ↓
Quasi-decaying    ⇒  Weakly quasi-decaying
            ↓               ↓
              Extremal

Also, the image of an absolutely friendly (resp. quasi-decaying) measure under a nondegenerate embedding is friendly (resp. weakly quasi-decaying).
### Examples of measures in various categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Absolutely friendly</th>
<th>Friendly but not absolutely friendly</th>
<th>Not friendly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QD</td>
<td>• Patterson–Sullivan measures of convex-cocompact groups</td>
<td>• Patterson–Sullivan measures of geometrically finite groups which satisfy $k_{\text{min}} &lt; d - 1$</td>
<td>• Gibbs measures of nonplanar infinite IFSes and rational functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQD\QD</td>
<td>Impossible</td>
<td>• Lebesgue measures of nondegenerate manifolds</td>
<td>• Conformal measures of infinite IFSes which have invariant spheres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extr\WQD</td>
<td>Impossible</td>
<td>Impossible</td>
<td>• Measures with finite Lyapunov exponent and zero entropy under the Gauss map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Extr</td>
<td>Impossible</td>
<td>Impossible</td>
<td>• Generic invariant measures of hyperbolic toral endomorphisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Certain measures with infinite Lyapunov exponent under the Gauss map</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sketch of a proof

**Theorem**

Let $T : X \to X$ be a hyperbolic toral endomorphism, where $X = \mathbb{R}^d / \mathbb{Z}^d$ (e.g. $Tx = nx \pmod{1}$ for some $n \geq 2$). Let $\mathbb{M}_T(X)$ be the space of $T$-invariant probability measures on $X$. Then the set of non-extremal measures is comeager in $\mathbb{M}_T(X)$.

**Proof.** For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$U_n = \bigcup_{\frac{p}{q} \in \mathbb{Q} \atop q \geq n} B\left(\frac{p}{q}, \frac{1}{q^n}\right),$$

where

$$B\left(\frac{p}{q}, \frac{1}{q^n}\right)$$

is a ball centered at $\left(\frac{p}{q}, \frac{1}{q^n}\right)$ with radius $\frac{1}{q^n}$.
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and let $\mathcal{U}_n$ be the set of all measures $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_T(X)$ such that $\mu(U_n) > 1 - 2^{-n}$. 
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