

APPROXIMATION OF IRRATIONAL NUMBERS BY PAIRS OF INTEGERS FROM A LARGE SET

ARTŪRAS DUBICKAS 

(Received 3 January 2024; accepted 2 March 2024)

Abstract

We show that there is a set $S \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ with lower density arbitrarily close to 1 such that, for each sufficiently large real number α , the inequality $|m\alpha - n| \geq 1$ holds for every pair $(m, n) \in S^2$. On the other hand, if $S \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ has density 1, then, for each irrational $\alpha > 0$ and any positive ε , there exist $m, n \in S$ for which $|m\alpha - n| < \varepsilon$.

2020 *Mathematics subject classification*: primary 11J04; secondary 11B05, 11J70, 11K31.

Keywords and phrases: approximation, irrational number, density.

1. Introduction

By Hurwitz's theorem, for each irrational number $\alpha > 0$, there are infinitely many pairs of positive integers (m, n) such that

$$|m\alpha - n| < \frac{1}{\sqrt{5}m} \quad (1.1)$$

(see, for example, [4, page 189] or [16]). In particular, (1.1) implies that if $\alpha > 0$ is irrational, then, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ for which

$$|m\alpha - n| < \varepsilon. \quad (1.2)$$

For some infinite subsets S of \mathbb{N} , the inequality (1.2) also holds for infinitely many pairs (m, n) , where $m \in S$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. In [10], such a set S is called a *Heilbronn set*. For example, by Furstenberg's theorem (see [2, 7]), the inequality (1.2) with any $\varepsilon > 0$ holds for some $m \in S$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, where $S \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ is a multiplicative semigroup with at least two multiplicatively independent integers, for instance, $S = \{p^u q^v \mid u, v \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}\}$, where $p < q$ are two fixed prime numbers. (See [11, 12, 17, 18] for some generalisations of Furstenberg's theorem.) Also, there are some interesting sets S for which the inequality weaker than (1.1) but stronger than (1.2), namely, $|m\alpha - n| < m^{-\tau}$, has been derived for some τ in the range $0 < \tau < 1$. These are, for example, the set of squares

© The Author(s), 2024. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of Australian Mathematical Publishing Association Inc. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

$S = \{n^2 \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ (see [19]) and the set of prime numbers $S = P = \{p_1 < p_2 < p_3 < \dots\}$ (see [1, 8, 14]), so they are Heilbronn sets.

In this paper, we are interested in obtaining inequality (1.2) for each irrational $\alpha > 0$ when not only just m but both m and n belong to a subset S of \mathbb{N} . For an irrational $\alpha > 0$ it is clear that, for each $\varepsilon > 0$, the inequality (1.2) holds with some $m, n \in S$ if and only if $\liminf_{m,n \in S} |m\alpha - n| = 0$.

For a subset E of the set of real numbers \mathbb{R} , we define

$$\Delta(E) := \liminf_{x,y \in E, x \neq y} |x - y|. \tag{1.3}$$

It is clear that $\Delta(S) \geq 1$ for $S \subseteq \mathbb{N}$. With the notation as in (1.3), the problem we are interested in can be rephrased as follows: for a given $S \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, determine whether or not, for each irrational $\alpha > 0$,

$$\Delta(S \cup \alpha S) = 0 \tag{1.4}$$

or, alternatively, whether or not there exists an irrational $\alpha > 0$ for which

$$\Delta(S \cup \alpha S) > 0. \tag{1.5}$$

For the set of squares $S = \{n^2 \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$, we have option (1.5). Indeed, the distance between any two distinct elements of S is at least 3, while the distance between any two distinct elements of αS is at least 3α . Recall that the number $\beta > 0$ is *badly approximable* if there exists a constant $c = c(\beta) > 0$ such that $|m\beta - n| > c/m$ for all $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$. (A number is badly approximable if and only if the partial quotients of its continued fraction are bounded [4, page 190]. For example, all quadratic algebraic numbers β are badly approximable [4, page 194].) For $\alpha = \beta^2$, where $\beta > 0$ is a badly approximable number, the distance between $\alpha m^2 \in \alpha S$ and $n^2 \in S$ is

$$|m^2\beta^2 - n^2| = |(m\beta - n)(m\beta + n)| \geq \frac{c}{m}|m\beta + n| = \frac{c}{m}(m\beta + n) > c\beta = c\sqrt{\alpha}$$

for some $c > 0$. Hence,

$$\Delta(S \cup \alpha S) \geq \min(3, 3\alpha, c\sqrt{\alpha}) > 0$$

for each such α , which proves (1.5). This example appears in Ruzsa’s paper [15] in a slightly different context. (We will also use another idea from the proof of [15, Theorem 1] in the proof of our own Theorem 1.2.)

On the other hand, for the set of primes $S = P$, the problem of determining whether we have option (1.4) or (1.5) seems to be out of reach. Option (1.4) takes place if and only if, for each irrational $\alpha > 0$ and any $\varepsilon > 0$, there are prime numbers p_i, p_j satisfying $|p_i\alpha - p_j| < \varepsilon$. This is true if and only if there is an infinite sequence of primes $q_1 < q_2 < q_3 < \dots$ such that

$$\|q_j\alpha\| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } j \rightarrow \infty \tag{1.6}$$

and the nearest integer to αq_j , namely,

$$\lfloor q_j\alpha + 1/2 \rfloor, \tag{1.7}$$

is a prime number. In particular, condition (1.7) alone, without condition (1.6), is satisfied if and only if there are infinitely many primes p for which $\lfloor p\alpha + 1/2 \rfloor$ is also a prime number. For any $\alpha > 0$, which is not an integer, this problem is completely out of reach (even for rational numbers α). For example, for $\alpha = 1/2$, this problem is equivalent to the following. Are there infinitely many primes p for which $2p - 1$ is also a prime?

As for the problem described in (1.2), in general, it is natural to expect that (1.4) is true when the set S is ‘large’ whereas (1.5) is true when S is ‘small’. However, we show that the answer to the problem does not depend just on the size of S . Recall that the *lower* and the *upper density* of the set $E \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ are defined by

$$\underline{d}(E) = \liminf_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\{E \cap [1, x]\}}{x} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{d}(E) = \limsup_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\{E \cap [1, x]\}}{x},$$

respectively. Clearly, $0 \leq \underline{d}(E) \leq \bar{d}(E) \leq 1$. In the case when $\underline{d}(E) = \bar{d}(E)$, their common value $d(E) = \underline{d}(E) = \bar{d}(E)$ is called the *density* of E .

First, observe that, for any $\delta > 0$, there is a set of positive integers S with density at most δ such that, for each irrational $\alpha > 0$, we have $\Delta(S \cup \alpha S) = 0$. To see this, we can take, for example, an integer $b > 1/\delta$ and $S = \{bk \mid k \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Then the set S has density $d(S) = 1/b < \delta$. Also, by (1.1), for each irrational number $\alpha > 0$ there are infinitely many pairs $(m, n) \in \mathbb{N}^2$ for which

$$|bm\alpha - bn| < \frac{b}{\sqrt{5}m}.$$

For any $\varepsilon > 0$, selecting $m > b/\varepsilon\sqrt{5}$, we see that $0 < |bm\alpha - bn| < \varepsilon$ with $bm, bn \in S$. Hence, $\Delta(S \cup \alpha S) = 0$, as claimed. In this direction, it would be of interest to determine whether or not there is a set $S \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ with density zero such that $\Delta(S \cup \alpha S) = 0$ for each irrational α .

In this paper, we investigate the problem in the opposite direction. First, we show that there is a ‘large’ set S (much greater than the set of squares $\{n^2 \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ with density zero) for which we have option (1.5).

THEOREM 1.1. *For each $\delta > 0$ and each sufficiently large real number α , there is a set of positive integers S with lower density greater than $1 - \delta$ such that*

$$\Delta(S \cup \alpha S) \geq \Delta\left(\bigcup_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha^k S\right) \geq 1. \tag{1.8}$$

Second, we prove that every set $S \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ with density 1 satisfies option (1.4).

THEOREM 1.2. *If S is a set of positive integers with density 1, then, for each irrational number $\alpha > 0$, we have $\Delta(S \cup \alpha S) = 0$.*

One can also consider approximation weaker than that in (1.2), namely, for a given $S \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, investigate whether or not, for each $\alpha > 0$ and any $\varepsilon > 0$, there are $m, n \in S$ for which

$$\left| \alpha - \frac{n}{m} \right| < \varepsilon. \tag{1.9}$$

For example, for the set of primes $S = P$, this problem has been considered in [9]. It was shown there that the quotients of primes are everywhere dense in $[0, \infty)$, so each $\alpha > 0$ can be approximated as in (1.9) by a quotient of two primes n/m . The density of the sequence of rational numbers of the form b^m/m modulo one, where $b \geq 2$ is a fixed integer and m runs through the set \mathbb{N} , and similar sequences, have been considered in [3, 5, 6, 13].

The proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 will be given in Sections 2 and 3, respectively. In fact, the irrationality of α is not relevant in Theorem 1.2. We show that if $S \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ is a set with density 1, then, for each rational $\alpha > 0$,

$$m\alpha - n = 0 \tag{1.10}$$

for infinitely many pairs $(m, n) \in S^2$ (see the end of Section 3).

2. Proof of Theorem 1.1

By the definition of Δ in (1.3), it is clear that $\Delta(E) \geq \Delta(F)$ whenever $E \subseteq F$. Since $S \cup \alpha S$ is a subset of $\bigcup_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha^k S$, this immediately implies the first inequality in (1.8).

In order to prove the second inequality in (1.8), we fix δ in the interval $(0, 1)$ and a real number α satisfying

$$\alpha > \frac{3}{\delta} + 1. \tag{2.1}$$

We begin the construction of an infinite set $S = \{s_1 < s_2 < s_3 < \dots\}$ depending on α by selecting $s_1 = 1$. Assume that, for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we have already chosen the first m elements $s_1 < s_2 < \dots < s_m$ of S . The next element s_{m+1} is always taken as the least positive integer that is greater than s_m and is not equal to any of the numbers

$$\lfloor \alpha^k s_j \rfloor, \quad \lceil \alpha^k s_j \rceil, \quad \text{where } k \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } j = 1, \dots, m. \tag{2.2}$$

To see that the integers in (2.2) do not occupy all integers greater than s_m and that such an $s_{m+1} > s_m$ always exists, we choose $t = t(m) \in \mathbb{N}$ so large that $\alpha^t > s_m + 2tm + 1$. (This is possible because $\alpha > 1$.) Then, for $k \geq t$, the numbers in (2.2) are all greater than or equal to

$$\lfloor \alpha^k \rfloor > \alpha^k - 1 \geq \alpha^t - 1 > s_m + 2tm,$$

while for k in the range $1 \leq k \leq t - 1$, there are at most $2m(t - 1) < 2mt$ integers of the form (2.2). So, for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$, it is always possible to choose the required integer s_{m+1} in the interval $[s_m + 1, s_m + 2tm]$; therefore, the set S is infinite.

We claim that, for this set S , the distance between any two distinct elements of the set

$$S_\alpha := \bigcup_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha^k S$$

is at least 1. Indeed, take $x = \alpha^u s_i \in S_\alpha$ and $y = \alpha^v s_j \in S_\alpha$, where $u, v \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$. Assume that $x \neq y$. Then $|x - y| \geq 1$ in the case when $u = v$, since $i \neq j$ and $|x - y| = \alpha^u |s_i - s_j|$. Assume that $u \neq v$. Without restriction of generality, we may assume that $u < v$. Setting $w := v - u \in \mathbb{N}$, we find that

$$|x - y| = |\alpha^u s_i - \alpha^v s_j| = \alpha^u |s_i - \alpha^w s_j| \geq |\alpha^w s_j - s_i|.$$

Now, in the case when $i \leq j$, using (2.1) and $s_j \geq s_i$, we deduce that

$$|\alpha^w s_j - s_i| = \alpha^w s_j - s_i \geq \alpha^w s_j - s_j \geq \alpha^w - 1 \geq \alpha - 1 > \frac{3}{\delta} > 3,$$

so $|x - y| > 3$. In the case when $i > j$, by (2.2), s_i is neither $\lfloor \alpha^w s_j \rfloor$ nor $\lceil \alpha^w s_j \rceil$. Thus, the distance between $\alpha^w s_j$ and $s_i \in \mathbb{N}$ is greater than or equal to 1, that is, $|\alpha^w s_j - s_i| \geq 1$. This yields $|x - y| \geq 1$ and implies that $\Delta(S_\alpha) \geq 1$, which is the second inequality in (1.8).

It remains to show that the lower density of S is greater than $1 - \delta$. Let $x \geq \alpha$ be a real number. Choose the unique $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ for which $\alpha^\ell \leq x + 1 < \alpha^{\ell+1}$. We derive a lower bound for the number of elements of S in the interval $(x/\alpha, x]$. By (2.2), an integer in this interval belongs to S if and only if it is not of the form $\lfloor \alpha^k s_j \rfloor$ or $\lceil \alpha^k s_j \rceil$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and some $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that it is sufficient to consider k in the range $1 \leq k \leq \ell$, since, otherwise, when $k > \ell$,

$$\lceil \alpha^k s_j \rceil \geq \lfloor \alpha^k s_j \rfloor \geq \lfloor \alpha^k \rfloor \geq \lfloor \alpha^{\ell+1} \rfloor > \alpha^{\ell+1} - 1 > x.$$

Fix $k \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$. For this k , at least one of the numbers $\lfloor \alpha^k s_j \rfloor, \lceil \alpha^k s_j \rceil$ belongs to the interval $(x/\alpha, x]$ only if j is such that $x/\alpha < \lceil \alpha^k s_j \rceil$ or j is such that $\lfloor \alpha^k s_j \rfloor \leq x$. The first inequality does not hold if

$$x \geq \alpha \lceil \alpha^k s_j \rceil \geq \alpha^{k+1} s_j,$$

while the second inequality does not hold if

$$x < \lfloor \alpha^k s_j \rfloor \leq \alpha^k s_j.$$

Consequently, at least one of the inequalities $x/\alpha < \lceil \alpha^k s_j \rceil$ or $\lfloor \alpha^k s_j \rfloor \leq x$ holds only if j is such that

$$\frac{x}{\alpha^{k+1}} < s_j \leq \frac{x}{\alpha^k}. \tag{2.3}$$

Fix a pair of positive integers (k, j) for which (2.3) is true. Recall that $1 \leq k \leq \ell$. The pair (k, j) prevents at most two integers $\lfloor \alpha^k s_j \rfloor, \lceil \alpha^k s_j \rceil$ in the interval $(x/\alpha, x]$ from belonging to the set S . Evidently, for each $k \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$, there are at most x/α^k indices

j satisfying (2.3). So, the collection of all relevant pairs (k, j) , where $k = 1, \dots, \ell$ and j satisfies (2.3), prevents at most

$$2 \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} \frac{x}{\alpha^k} < 2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{x}{\alpha^k} = \frac{2x}{\alpha - 1}$$

integers of the interval $(x/\alpha, x]$ from being in S . It follows that the intersection $S \cap (x/\alpha, x]$ contains at least

$$\lfloor x \rfloor - \lfloor x/\alpha \rfloor - 1 - \frac{2x}{\alpha - 1} > x - 2 - \frac{x}{\alpha} - \frac{2x}{\alpha - 1} = x \left(1 - \frac{1}{\alpha} - \frac{2}{\alpha - 1} \right) - 2$$

elements. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{d}(S) &= \liminf_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\{S \cap [1, x]\}}{x} \geq \liminf_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\{S \cap (x/\alpha, x]\}}{x} \\ &\geq 1 - \frac{1}{\alpha} - \frac{2}{\alpha - 1} > 1 - \frac{3}{\alpha - 1}, \end{aligned}$$

which is greater than $1 - \delta$ in view of (2.1).

3. Proof of Theorem 1.2

Let S be a set of positive integers with density 1 and let $\alpha > 0$ be an irrational number. It is sufficient to prove that

$$\liminf_{m, n \in S} |m\alpha - n| = 0 \tag{3.1}$$

for each irrational α in the range $0 < \alpha < 1$. Indeed, for irrational $\alpha > 1$, applying (3.1) to the number $\alpha^{-1} \in (0, 1)$, by $|m\alpha^{-1} - n| = \alpha^{-1}|m - n\alpha|$, we deduce that

$$\liminf_{m, n \in S} |m - n\alpha| = 0,$$

and hence $\Delta(S \cup \alpha S) = 0$.

So, from now on, we assume that $0 < \alpha < 1$. Let ε be in the range

$$0 < \varepsilon < \frac{1}{9}.$$

Throughout, we consider positive integers n satisfying

$$n > \frac{3}{\varepsilon} \quad \text{and} \quad n > \frac{1}{1 - \alpha}. \tag{3.2}$$

Assume that the n th and the $(n + 1)$ st convergents of the continued fraction of α are h_n/k_n and h_{n+1}/k_{n+1} (here $h_n, k_n, h_{n+1}, k_{n+1} \in \mathbb{N}$), which means that

$$\left| \alpha - \frac{h_n}{k_n} \right| < \frac{1}{k_n k_{n+1}} \quad \text{and} \quad \left| \alpha - \frac{h_{n+1}}{k_{n+1}} \right| < \frac{1}{k_{n+1} k_{n+2}} \tag{3.3}$$

(see [4, page 181]). Let u, v be positive integers satisfying

$$u \leq \varepsilon k_{n+1} \quad \text{and} \quad v \leq \varepsilon k_n. \tag{3.4}$$

(Such integers exist, because $\varepsilon k_{n+1} \geq \varepsilon(k_n + k_{n-1}) > \varepsilon k_n \geq \varepsilon n > 3$ by the first inequality in (3.2).) Consider the rational number

$$\mu := \frac{uh_n + vh_{n+1}}{uk_n + vk_{n+1}}.$$

It is well known that $h_n/k_n < \alpha < h_{n+1}/k_{n+1}$ for even n and $h_{n+1}/k_{n+1} < \alpha < h_n/k_n$ for odd n (see [4, page 181]). In both cases, the numbers α and μ are between the fractions h_n/k_n and h_{n+1}/k_{n+1} . Therefore, by the identity

$$h_{n+1}k_n - h_nk_{n+1} = (-1)^n \tag{3.5}$$

(see [4, page 180]), we derive

$$\left| \alpha - \frac{uh_n + vh_{n+1}}{uk_n + vk_{n+1}} \right| = |\alpha - \mu| < \left| \frac{h_n}{k_n} - \frac{h_{n+1}}{k_{n+1}} \right| = \frac{1}{k_nk_{n+1}}.$$

This, combined with (3.4), implies that, for

$$s(u, v, n) := uk_n + vk_{n+1} \in \mathbb{N} \quad \text{and} \quad t(u, v, n) := uh_n + vh_{n+1} \in \mathbb{N}, \tag{3.6}$$

we have

$$|s(u, v, n)\alpha - t(u, v, n)| < \frac{uk_n + vk_{n+1}}{k_nk_{n+1}} = \frac{u}{k_{n+1}} + \frac{v}{k_n} \leq 2\varepsilon. \tag{3.7}$$

Now, to complete the proof of the theorem it suffices to show that there are $u, v, n \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying (3.2) and (3.4) such that the integers $s(u, v, n), t(u, v, n)$ as defined in (3.6) both belong to the set S .

Put

$$L_n := \lfloor 2\varepsilon k_n k_{n+1} \rfloor. \tag{3.8}$$

We first show that, for infinitely many $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\#\{j \notin S, 1 \leq j \leq L_n\} \leq \varepsilon^2 L_n. \tag{3.9}$$

Indeed, if the inequality opposite to (3.9) holds for all sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then

$$\frac{\#\{j \in S, 1 \leq j \leq L_n\}}{L_n} < \frac{L_n - \varepsilon^2 L_n}{L_n} = 1 - \varepsilon^2,$$

and hence

$$\underline{d}(S) = \liminf_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\{S \cap [1, x]\}}{x} \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\{j \in S, 1 \leq j \leq L_n\}}{L_n} \leq 1 - \varepsilon^2,$$

which is contrary to $d(S) = \underline{d}(S) = 1$.

We want to show that there are n satisfying (3.2) and $u, v \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying (3.4) such that $s(u, v, n)$ and $t(u, v, n)$ both belong to S . Take any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ for which the inequalities (3.2) and (3.9) hold. Note that, by (3.4), (3.6) and (3.8), it follows that $s(u, v, n) \leq L_n$. We claim that

$$t(u, v, n) < s(u, v, n) \leq L_n. \tag{3.10}$$

Indeed, by the first inequality in (3.3), we find that $|k_n\alpha - h_n| < 1/k_{n+1}$. Hence, $h_n < k_n\alpha + 1/k_{n+1}$. By the second inequality in (3.2), we obtain

$$1 < (1 - \alpha)n \leq (1 - \alpha)k_n \leq (1 - \alpha)k_n^2.$$

It follows that $k_n\alpha + 1/k_{n+1} < 1/k_n + k_n\alpha < k_n$, and hence $h_n < k_n$. By the same argument, from the second inequality in (3.3), we get $h_{n+1} < k_{n+1}$. Thus,

$$t(u, v, n) = uh_n + vh_{n+1} < uk_n + vk_{n+1} = s(u, v, n),$$

which completes the proof of (3.10) because $s(u, v, n) \leq L_n$.

By (3.10), the integers $s(u, v, n)$ and $t(u, v, n)$ are distinct. Assume that, for some two pairs of positive integers $(u, v) \neq (u', v')$ satisfying (3.4), we have $s(u, v, n) = s(u', v', n)$. This implies that $uk_n + vk_{n+1} = u'k_n + v'k_{n+1}$ by (3.6). Hence, $(u - u')k_n = (v' - v)k_{n+1}$. By (3.5), the numbers k_n and k_{n+1} are coprime, which implies that $k_n \mid (v' - v)$. However, by (3.4), $1 \leq v, v' \leq \varepsilon k_n < k_n$, so this is only possible if $v = v'$. This forces $u = u'$, which is a contradiction. Therefore, $s(u, v, n) \neq s(u', v', n)$. By the same argument, we conclude that $t(u, v, n) \neq t(u', v', n)$.

We call a positive integer *bad* if it does not belong to the set S . Similarly, we call a pair of distinct integers $(s(u, v, n), t(u, v, n))$ *bad* if at least one of those integers is bad. Let us consider all bad integers not exceeding L_n . Because of (3.9), there are at most $\varepsilon^2 L_n$ of them. By what we have just shown above, each of them occurs in at most two pairs $(s(u, v, n), t(u, v, n))$. (It may happen that $s(u, v, n)$ is equal to $t(u', v', n)$ for $(u, v) \neq (u', v')$.) So, by (3.8), at most

$$2\varepsilon^2 L_n \leq 4\varepsilon^3 k_n k_{n+1}$$

among the pairs under consideration are bad. Note that, by (3.4), there are exactly $\lfloor \varepsilon k_{n+1} \rfloor \lfloor \varepsilon k_n \rfloor$ pairs $(s(u, v, n), t(u, v, n))$ with u, v satisfying (3.4). Using $\varepsilon k_{n+1} > \varepsilon k_n > 3$ and $0 < \varepsilon < 1/9$, we deduce that

$$\lfloor \varepsilon k_{n+1} \rfloor \lfloor \varepsilon k_n \rfloor > (\varepsilon k_{n+1} - 1)(\varepsilon k_n - 1) > \frac{2\varepsilon k_{n+1}}{3} \cdot \frac{2\varepsilon k_n}{3} > 4\varepsilon^3 k_n k_{n+1}.$$

Consequently, there is a pair $(s(u, v, n), t(u, v, n))$, where u, v satisfy (3.4), which is not bad. This means that these two positive integers $s(u, v, n), t(u, v, n)$ for which (3.7) is true are both in S , which is the desired conclusion. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Finally, to prove (1.10), we write $\alpha = u/v$, where $u, v \in \mathbb{N}$ are coprime. The result is trivial for $u = v = 1$, so assume that $u \neq v$. Take $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and consider the N pairs $(m, n) = (kv, ku)$ with $k = 1, \dots, N$. As above, a positive integer is called bad if it does not belong to the set S . Since the density of S is 1, for infinitely many $N \in \mathbb{N}$, the set $\{1, 2, \dots, N \max(u, v)\}$ contains at most $N/4$ bad integers. Each of those bad integers can appear in at most two pairs (kv, ku) for $k = 1, 2, \dots, N$. So, for at least $N - 2N/4 = N/2$ indices k in the range $1 \leq k \leq N$, we must have $m = kv \in S$ and $n = ku \in S$. For each of those k and $(m, n) = (kv, ku) \in S^2$, we get $m\alpha - n = kv(u/v) - ku = 0$, as claimed in (1.10).

References

- [1] A. Balog, ‘A remark on the distribution of ap modulo one’, in: *Analytic and Elementary Number Theory (Marseille, 1983)* (eds. H. Daboussi, P. Liardet and G. Rauzy), Publications Mathématiques d’Orsay, 86-1 (Univ. Paris XI, Orsay, 1986), 6–24.
- [2] M. D. Boshernitzan, ‘Elementary proof of Furstenberg’s diophantine result’, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **122** (1994), 67–70.
- [3] J. Cilleruelo, A. Kumchev, F. Luca, J. Rué and I. E. Shparlinski, ‘On the fractional parts of a^n/n^n ’, *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.* **45** (2013), 249–256.
- [4] W. A. Coppel, *Number Theory: An Introduction to Mathematics*, 2nd edn, Universitext (Springer, New York, 2009).
- [5] A. Dubickas, ‘Density of some sequences modulo 1’, *Colloq. Math.* **128** (2012), 237–244.
- [6] A. Dubickas, ‘Density of some special sequences modulo 1’, *Mathematics* **11** (2023), Article no. 1727, 10 pages.
- [7] H. Furstenberg, ‘Disjointness in ergodic theory, minimal sets, and a problem in diophantine approximation’, *Math. Systems Theory* **1** (1967), 1–49.
- [8] D. R. Heath-Brown and C. Jia, ‘The distribution of ap modulo one’, *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3)* **84** (2002), 79–104.
- [9] D. Hobby and D. M. Silberger, ‘Quotients of primes’, *Amer. Math. Monthly* **100** (1993), 50–52.
- [10] S. Iyer, ‘Rational approximation with digit-restricted denominators’, Preprint, 2023, [arXiv:2312.01076](https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.01076).
- [11] A. Katz, ‘Generalizations of Furstenberg’s Diophantine result’, *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems* **38** (2018), 1012–1024.
- [12] B. Kra, ‘A generalization of Furstenberg’s Diophantine theorem’, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **127** (1999), 1951–1956.
- [13] M. Lind, ‘Some remarks related to the density of $\{(b^n \pmod n) / n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ ’, Preprint, 2023, [arXiv:2308.14354](https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.14354).
- [14] K. Matomäki, ‘The distribution of ap modulo one’, *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* **147** (2009), 267–283.
- [15] I. Ruzsa, ‘Beurling integers with lacunarity’, *Math. Pannon. (N.S.)*, to appear.
- [16] W. M. Schmidt, *Diophantine Approximation*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 785 (Springer, Berlin, 1980).
- [17] R. Urban, ‘On density modulo 1 of some expressions containing algebraic integers’, *Acta Arith.* **127** (2007), 217–229.
- [18] R. Urban, ‘Algebraic numbers and density modulo 1’, *J. Number Theory* **128** (2008), 645–661.
- [19] A. Zaharescu, ‘Small values of $n^2\alpha \pmod 1$ ’, *Invent. Math.* **121** (1995), 379–388.

ARTŪRAS DUBICKAS, Institute of Mathematics,
 Faculty of Mathematics and Informatics,
 Vilnius University, Naugarduko 24, LT-03225 Vilnius, Lithuania
 e-mail: arturas.dubickas@mif.vu.lt