

We have the following

(1)

PROPOSITION let  $K, \delta > 0$  be given and  $D$  sufficiently large. In fact  $K = o(\log D)$  suffices. Given numbers  $\{A(k); 0 \leq k \leq K\}$

satisfying

$$|A(k)| \leq D^{k+1} \quad (0 \leq k \leq K) \quad (i)$$

there exist  $x_d \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$  for  $D < d < D^{1+\delta}$  s.t

$$A(k) = \sum x_d d^k \quad \text{for all } 0 \leq k \leq K \quad (ii)$$

In fact we will only use  $d \sim D^{1+\delta}$ .

Denote for  $\frac{D}{2} < \alpha < D$  a prime by  $\Delta_\alpha = \{ \frac{1}{2} D^{1+\delta} < d < D^{1+\delta}; \alpha | d \}$ .

this gives  $\frac{D}{\log D}$  disjoint sets  $\Delta_\alpha$  of size  $\sim D^\delta$ . In order to prove (ii),

it clearly suffices to show that if  $y = (y_0, \dots, y_K)$  satisfies

$$|y_k| < D^k \log D \quad (0 \leq k \leq K) \quad (3)$$

then, for each  $\alpha$ , there is a representation

$$y_k = \sum_{d \in \Delta_\alpha} x_d d^k \quad (0 \leq k \leq K) \quad (4)$$

with  $x_d \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$ .

Fix  $\alpha$  and set  $\Delta = \Delta_\alpha$

For each  $d \in \Delta$ , denote  $\nu_d$  the probability measure on  $\mathbb{R}^{k+1}$  induced by the map  $[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{k+1} : t \rightarrow t \cdot (1, d, d^2, \dots, d^k)$ . Thus  $\nu_d$  is supported by a line segment in  $\mathbb{R}^{k+1}$ . Set

$$\mu = \ast_{d \in \Delta} (\nu_d \ast \nu_d \ast \nu_d \ast \nu_d) \quad (c)$$

Since  $\hat{\mu}(\xi) = \prod_{d \in \Delta} |\hat{\nu}_d(\xi)|^4$ ,  $\hat{\mu}(\xi) \geq 0$  and  $\|\mu\|_\infty = \mu(0)$

Also  $\text{supp } \mu \subset \mathbb{B}_{\mathbb{D}^{\delta \cdot \mathbb{D}^{k(1+\delta)}}}$  implying

$$\mu(0) \geq \mathbb{D}^{-2k^2} \quad (c)$$

For  $k=0, 1, \dots, k$ , let

$$I_k = [-\mathbb{D}^{-k-\frac{\delta}{4}}, \mathbb{D}^{-k-\frac{\delta}{4}}]$$

and

$$Q = \sum_{k=0}^k I_k e_k = \text{box in } \mathbb{R}^{k+1}$$

By construction

$$\prod_{d \in \Delta} |\hat{\nu}_d(\xi)| = \prod_{d \in \Delta} \left| \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} e(t \cdot (\sum \xi_k d^k)) dt \right|$$

(3)

$$\leq \prod_{d \in \Delta} \min \left( 1, \frac{|\sin \pi (\sum_{k=1}^K d^k)|}{\pi |\sum_{k=1}^K d^k|} \right) \quad (7)$$

Let  $\Delta' = \{d \in \Delta; \frac{1}{\lambda(K+1)} D^{1+\delta} < d < \frac{1}{K+1} D^{1+\delta}\}$ . Hence  $j \Delta' \subset \Delta$  for  $j \leq K+1$

We claim that for each  $d \in \Delta'$

$$\max_{1 \leq j \leq K+1} \left| \sum_{k=0}^K \xi_k (jd)^k \right| > c^K \max_k d^k |\xi_k| \quad (8)$$

To see this, set  $\xi'_k = d^k \xi_k$  and assume

$$\max_{1 \leq j \leq K+1} \left| \sum_{k=0}^K j^k \xi'_k \right| < \theta$$

Using RMT determinants, it follows that

$$\max_k |\xi'_k| < c^K \theta$$

implying (8).

It follows from (8) that if  $\xi \notin \mathcal{Q}$ , then for each  $d \in \Delta'$

$$\max_{1 \leq j \leq K+1} \left| \sum_{k=0}^K \xi_k (jd)^k \right| > \min_k \left\{ c^{-K} \left( \frac{D^{1+\delta}}{\lambda(K+1)} \right)^k D^{-k-\frac{\delta}{\lambda}} \right\} > D^{-\frac{\delta}{\lambda}} \quad (9)$$

(since  $K = o(\log D)$ )

Therefore

$$(7) < (1 - c D^{-\frac{2s}{3}})^{\Delta^i} < e^{-c D^{-\frac{2s}{3}} \frac{D^s}{2k}} < e^{-D^{s/4}} \quad (16)$$

Define

$$\mu_1(x) = \int_Q \hat{\mu}(\xi) e(x\xi) d\xi$$

Then, by (16) and (5)

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mu - \mu_1\|_\infty &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^{k+1} \setminus Q} |\hat{\mu}(\xi)| \\ &< e^{-D^{s/4}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{k+1}} \prod_{d \in \Delta} |\hat{\nu}_d(\xi)|^2 \\ &= e^{-D^{s/4}} \left\| \prod_{d \in \Delta} \nu_d \right\|_2^2 \quad (\text{Parseval}) \\ &\leq e^{-D^{s/4}} \left\| \prod_{d \in \Delta} \nu_d \right\|_\infty < e^{-D^{s/4}} \quad (17) \end{aligned}$$

Note indeed that if we fix some  $d_i \in \Delta^i$ , then

$$\left\| \prod_{d \in \Delta} \nu_d \right\|_\infty \leq \left\| \nu_{d_1} * \nu_{2d_1} * \dots * \nu_{(k+1)d_1} \right\|_\infty < 1$$

(5)

To prove (i) for  $y$  satisfying (3), it suffices to show that  $\mu(y) \neq 0$  and by (6), (11) this will follow from  $\mu_1(y) \sim \mu_1(\alpha)$ . It follows from definition of  $\mathcal{Q}$  that if  $\xi \in \mathcal{Q}$  and  $y$  as above

$$|\xi \cdot y| \leq \sum D^{-k-\frac{s}{5}} D^k \log D < D^{-\frac{s}{5}}$$

Using 1-point spectral synthesis, with for  $|\psi| < D^{-\frac{s}{5}}$

$$1 - e^{2\pi i \psi} = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \epsilon_n e^{2\pi i n \psi} \quad (12)$$

with

$$\sum |\epsilon_n| \leq D^{-\frac{s}{5}}$$

Applying (12) with  $\psi = \xi \cdot y$  gives

$$\begin{aligned} |\mu_1(\alpha) - \mu_1(y)| &= \left| \int_{\mathcal{Q}} (1 - e(y \cdot \xi)) \hat{\mu}(d\xi) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} |\epsilon_n| \left| \int_{\mathcal{Q}} e(ny \cdot \xi) \hat{\mu}(d\xi) \right| \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} |c_n| \mu_1(ny) \\
&\leq D^{-\frac{\delta}{5}} \| \mu_1 \|_{\infty} \\
&= D^{-\frac{\delta}{5}} \mu_1(0)
\end{aligned}$$

Thus  $\mu_1(y) \sim \mu_1(0)$  as required.

thus proves the Prop

REMARKS

(i) Inspecting the argument, in particular (9), we see that  $\delta, k, D$  should satisfy

$$\delta \log D > ck + c \log y D \quad (13)$$

(ii) Performing an additional randomisation, we see that we may take  $x_d \in \{1, -1\}$ , replacing (2) by

$$(14) \quad |A(n) - \sum x_d d^k| < D^{k + \frac{1}{2} + \delta(k + \frac{1}{2})} \quad (0 \leq k \leq K)$$