

ON A PROBLEM OF DANZER

R. P. BAMBAH AND A. C. WOODS

By a Danzer set S we shall mean a subset of the n -dimensional Euclidean space R_n which has the property that every closed convex body of volume one in R_n contains a point of S . L. Danzer has asked if for $n \geq 2$ there exist such sets S with a finite density. The answer to this question is still unknown. In this note our object is to prove two theorems about Danzer sets.

If A is a n -dimensional lattice, any translate $\Gamma = A + p$ of A will be called a grid Γ ; A will be called the lattice of Γ and the determinant $d(A)$ of A will be called the determinant of Γ and will be denoted by $d(\Gamma)$. In § 2 we prove

THEOREM 1. For $n \geq 2$, a Danzer set cannot be the union of a finite number of grids.

Let S be a Danzer set and $X > 0$ a positive real number. Let $N(S, X)$ be the number of points of S in the box $\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |x_i| \leq X$. Let $D(S, X) = N(S, X)/(2X)^n$. In § 3 we prove

THEOREM 2. There exist Danzer sets S with $D(S, X) = O((\log X)^{n-1})$ as $X \rightarrow \infty$.

The case $n = 2$ of the theorem is known, although no proof seems to have been published. The referee has pointed out that a lower bound of 2 can easily be established for the density of a Danzer set in $n = 2$, but the authors are unaware of any further results in this direction.

2. Proof of Theorem 1. We shall assume throughout that $n \geq 2$. It is obvious that if S is a Danzer set and T is a volume preserving affine transformation of R_n onto itself, then $T(S)$ is also a Danzer set.

Let S_1, S_2, \dots be a sequence of sets in R_n . Let S be the set of points X such that there exists a subsequence S_{i_1}, S_{i_2}, \dots of $\{S_r\}$ and points $X_{i_r} \in S_{i_r}$, such that $X_{i_r} \rightarrow X$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$. We write

$$S = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} S_r = \lim S_r .$$

LEMMA 1. Let $\{S_r\}$ be a sequence of Danzer sets in R_n . Then $S = \lim S_r$ is also a Danzer set.

Proof. Let K be a closed convex body of Volume 1. Then for

each r , $K \cap S_r \neq \phi$, so that for each r , there exists $X_r \in K \cap S_r$. Since K is compact, $\{X_r\}$ has a convergent subsequence $\{X_{i_r}\}$ converging to a point X in $K \cap S$.

LEMMA 2. *Let $S^{(j)} = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} S_r^{(j)}$, $j = 1, \dots, k$. Then*

$$\bigcup_{j=1}^k S^{(j)} = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \left(\bigcup_{j=1}^k S_r^{(j)} \right).$$

Proof. $X \in \bigcup S^{(j)} \Rightarrow X \in S^{(j)}$ for some j , say $j = j_0 \Rightarrow$ there exist a subsequence $\{S_{i_r}^{(j_0)}\}$ of $\{S_r^{(j_0)}\}$ and points $X_{i_r} \in S_{i_r}^{(j_0)}$ such that $X_{i_r} \rightarrow X \Rightarrow X_{i_r} \in \bigcup S_{i_r}$ and $X_{i_r} \rightarrow X \Rightarrow X \in \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} (\bigcup_{j=1}^k S_r^{(j)})$. Thus $\bigcup S^{(j)} \subset \lim (\bigcup_{j=1}^k S_r^{(j)})$. Let $X \in \lim (\bigcup_{j=1}^k S_r^{(j)})$. Then there exists a sequence $\{i_r\}$ of natural numbers and $X_{i_r} \in \bigcup_{j=1}^k S_{i_r}^{(j)}$ such that $X_{i_r} \rightarrow X$. Since k is finite, there exists a $j = j_0$ say, and an infinite subsequence k_r of i_r such that $X_{k_r} \in S_{k_r}^{(j_0)}$. Then $X_{k_r} \rightarrow X$ and $X \in S^{(j_0)}$, so that $X \in \bigcup S^{(j)}$ and $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} (\bigcup_{j=1}^k S_r^{(j)}) \subset \bigcup S^{(j)}$.

This completes the proof of the lemma.

LEMMA 3. *Let $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \dots$ be a sequence of grids in R_n with equal determinants $d(\Gamma_r) = \Delta$. Then $\{\Gamma_r\}$ has a subsequence $\{\Gamma_{i_r}\}$, such that $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \Gamma_{i_r}$ is either a grid or is contained in a hyperplane.*

Proof. If $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \Gamma_r = \phi$, there is nothing to prove. Assume, therefore, that $\Gamma = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \Gamma_r \neq \phi$. Let $X \in \Gamma$. Then there exists a subsequence $\{i_r\}$ of natural numbers and points $X_{i_r} \in \Gamma_{i_r}$, such that $X_{i_r} \rightarrow X$. Then $A_{i_r} = \Gamma_{i_r} - X_{i_r}$ is a sequence of homogeneous lattices and $\lim \Gamma_{i_r} = X + \lim A_{i_r}$. Therefore, it is enough to prove the theorem for lattices.

Let $\{A_r\}$ be a sequence of lattices with determinants $d(A_r) = \Delta$, independent of r . Let $\mu_1(A_r), \dots, \mu_n(A_r)$ be the successive minima of the Euclidean distance with respect to A_r , i.e., $\mu_i(A_r) = \inf \mu$: such that $|X| < \mu$ has i linearly independent points of A_r .

Suppose, first, that there exists $\delta > 0$, such that $\mu_1(A_r) \geq \delta$ for infinitely many r . Then a subsequence satisfies the conditions of Mahler's compactness theorem and has a subsequence convergent in the sense of Mahler (see, e.g., Cassels [2]). The last subsequence converges to the limiting lattice in our sense also.

We may, therefore, assume $\mu_1(A_r) \rightarrow 0$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$. Since

$$\mu_1(A_r) \cdots \mu_n(A_r) \geq \frac{2^n}{n!} \cdot \frac{1}{J_n},$$

where J_n is the volume of the sphere $|X| < 1$, (see, e.g., Cassels [2]),

and since $n \geq 2$, it follows that $\mu_n(A_r) \rightarrow \infty$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$. For each r , let P_{r_1}, \dots, P_{r_n} be points such that $|P_{r_i}| = \mu_i(A_r)$. Let π_r be the plane through $0, p_{r_1}, \dots, p_{r_{n-1}}$. It is easily seen that there exists a subsequence $\{A_{i_r}\}$ of $\{A_r\}$ such that the sequence $\{\pi_{i_r}\}$ converges to a plane π . We assert that $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \{A_{i_r}\} \subset \pi$. For, let $X \in \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} A_{i_r}$. Then $X = \lim X_{k_r}$, where k_r is a subsequence of i_r and $X_{k_r} \in A_{k_r}$. There exists M independent of k_r , such that $|X_{k_r}| \leq M$ for all k_r . Also

$$X_{k_r} = g_{r,1}P_{k_r,1} + \dots + g_{r,n}P_{k_r,n}, g_{r,i} \text{ real,}$$

and if $g_{r,n} \neq 0$ then $|X_{k_r}| \geq \mu_n(A_{k_r})$. Since $\mu_n(A_{k_r}) \rightarrow \infty$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$, $g_{r,n} = 0$ for all large r and $X \in \pi$. This proves the lemma

LEMMA 4. *Let $\{\pi_i\}$ be a sequence of hyperplanes. Then $\{\pi_i\}$ has a subsequence $\{\pi_{i_\mu}\}$ whose limit lies in a hyperplane.*

Proof. If $\pi = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \pi_i = \phi$ then there is nothing to prove. Assume, therefore, $X \in \pi$. Then there is a subsequence $\{k_r\}$ of natural numbers and points $X_{k_r} \in \pi_{k_r}$ such that $X_{k_r} \rightarrow X$. The planes $\hat{\pi}_{k_r} = \pi_{k_r} - X_{k_r}$ pass through 0 and have a subsequence $\hat{\pi}_{i_r}$ which converges to a plane $\hat{\pi}$ say. Then $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \pi_{i_r} = \hat{\pi} + X$. This proves the lemma.

Proof of Theorem 1. We shall prove more, namely, a Danzer set cannot be the union of a finite number of hyperplanes and a finite number of grids.

Let $S = \bigcup_{i=1}^r \pi_i \bigcup_{j=1}^t \Gamma_j$ be a Danzer set, such that π_i are hyperplanes and Γ_j are grids. Let $t \geq 1$. Let $X \neq Y, X, Y \in \Gamma_1$. For each positive integer k , let T_k be a volume preserving affine transformation such that $T_k(X) = X$ and $|T_k(Y) - X| = k^{-1}|Y - X|$. Since $n \geq 2$, such transformations exist. For each $k, T_k(S)$ is a Danzer set, and by Lemma 1, so is the limit of every subsequence of $\{T_k(S)\}$. By Lemmas 3 and 4 we can choose a subsequence $\{T_{k_r}\}$ of $\{T_k\}$ such that each $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} T_{k_r}(\pi_i)$ lies in a hyperplane, while each $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} T_{k_r}(\Gamma_j)$ is either a grid or lies in a hyperplane. Since

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} T_{k_r}(S) = \bigcup_{i=1}^t \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} T_{k_r}(\pi_i) \bigcup_{j=1}^t \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} T_{k_r}(\Gamma_j)$$

and $\lim T_{k_r}(\Gamma_1)$ is in a hyperplane, the Danzer set $\lim T_{k_r}(S)$ lies in the union of a finite number of hyperplanes and $t_1 < t$ grids, so that we have (by increasing $T_{k_r}(S)$ if necessary) a Danzer set consisting of a finite number of hyperplanes and $t_1 < t$ grids. Repeating this process a number of times we obtain a Danzer set that is the union of a finite number of hyperplanes. This can easily be seen to lead to a contradiction which proves the theorem.

3. Proof of Theorem 2. Let K be a closed convex body in R_n . The set $S \subset R_n$ is said to be a covering set for K if $R_n \subset \bigcup_{A \in S} (K + A)$. The set S contains a point of each translate of K if and only if S is a covering set for $-K$. Clearly a set S is a Danzer set if and only if it is a covering set for each closed convex body of volume one. Therefore, in order to prove a given set S is a Danzer set, it is enough to prove that for every closed convex body K of volume one, S contains a covering set for K .

If Γ is a grid with lattice Λ , then it is easy to see that Γ is a covering set for K if and only if Λ is.

Let π be a parallelepiped. Let A_0 be one of its vertices and A_1, \dots, A_n be the n vertices joined to A_0 by edges of π . Let Λ be the lattice generated by $A_1 - A_0, \dots, A_n - A_0$. By the grid generated by π we shall mean the grid $\Lambda + A_0$. It is easily seen that if a closed convex body K contains a parallelepiped which generates a grid Γ , then Γ is a covering set for K .

A lattice Λ will be called rectangular if it consists of points $(\alpha_1 u_1, \dots, \alpha_n u_n)$, where α_i are fixed positive real numbers and u_i take integral values. A grid Γ will be called rectangular if its lattice is rectangular.

Let $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ be positive real numbers. Let Γ_α be the grid generated by the parallelepiped $|x_i| \leq \alpha_i$. Let B be a box $|x_i| \leq \beta_i$, where $\beta_i \geq \alpha_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Then Γ_α is clearly a covering set for B .

Let K be a closed convex body of volume one. Let K_1 be the steiner symmetrical of K with respect to the plane $x_1 = 0$. Let K_2 be the steiner symmetrical of K_1 with respect to $x_2 = 0$ and so on. Then K_n is symmetrical about all the coordinate planes and has volume one. We next have

LEMMA 5. *If a rectangular lattice Λ is a covering set for K_n , then it is a covering set for K also.*

(The lemma and its proof are easy adaptations of Lemma 2 of Sawyer (3). For completeness, we give the proof below).

Proof. Let Λ be the rectangular lattice consisting of points $(\alpha_1 u_1, \dots, \alpha_n u_n)$, $\alpha_i > 0$ fixed real numbers and u_i running over the set of integers. It is enough to prove that if Λ is a covering set for K_1 , then it is a covering set for K also.

Let A_1 = subset of Λ in the plane $x_1 = 0$. The sets $K_1 + A$ cover R_n . We assert each line $x_2 = a_2, \dots, x_n = a_n$ meets $K_1 + P$ is a segment of length at least α_1 for some $P \in A_1$. Such a line meets only a finite number of translates $K_1 + P_s, P_s \in A_1$, each of them in a seg-

ment $|x_i| \leq b_s$ and hence meets $K_1 + A_1$ in the segment $|x_1| \leq b = \max b_s$. If $b < \frac{1}{2}\alpha_1$, then $K_1 + A$ meets the line in segments $|x_1 - m\alpha_1| \leq b < \frac{1}{2}\alpha_1$, where m takes integral values. This leaves part of the line uncovered by sets $K_1 + A$, contrary to the fact that A is a covering set for K_1 . Thus $b \geq \frac{1}{2}\alpha_1$, i.e., $b_s \geq \frac{1}{2}\alpha_1$ for some s . Therefore, the line meets $K_1 + P_s$ and hence $K + P_s$ in a segment of length at least α_1 , and is therefore, covered by the sets $K + A$. Since this is true for all such lines, A is a covering set for K .

COROLLARY. *A rectangular grid Γ which is a covering set for K_n is also a covering set for K .*

Because of the corollary, in order to prove that a given set S is a Danzer set, it is enough to prove that for every given closed convex body K of volume one, which is symmetrical about all the coordinate planes, S contains a rectangular grid Γ which is a covering set for K .

Let K be a closed convex body of volume one, which is symmetrical about the coordinate planes. Then K contains a point (a_1, \dots, a_n) , $a_i > 0$, such that $2^n a_1 \dots a_n \geq n!/n^n$. (See, e.g., Sawyer [3]). Then K contains a box $B_\beta: |x_i| \leq \beta_i, \beta_i \leq a_i$ with volume $2^n \beta_1 \dots \beta_n = n!/n^n$. A covering rectangular grid of B_β is automatically a covering set for K . Therefore, S is a Danzer set if for all closed boxes B_β of volume $n!/n^n$, S contains a rectangular grid Γ_α generated by $|x_i| \leq \alpha_i$ with $\alpha_i \leq \beta_i$.

We now construct a set A of points $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n), \alpha_i > 0$, such that for each set $(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n), \beta_i > 0, \beta_1 \dots \beta_n = n!/(2n)^n = k$, say, there exists an $\alpha \in A$, such that $\alpha_i \leq \beta_i$. Then the grid Γ_α will provide a covering by B_β and the set $S = \bigcup_{\alpha \in A} \Gamma_\alpha$ will be a Danzer set.

Let H be the set of point x such that $x_1 \dots x_n = k, x_i > 0$. Divide the part $x_1 > 0, \dots, x_{n-1} > 0$ of the plane $x_n = 0$ into $n - 1$ dimensional parallelepipeds $\pi_{k_1, \dots, k_{n-1}}$ defined by

$$e^{k_i} \leq x_i \leq e^{k_i+1}, i = 1, \dots, n - 1, (k_1, \dots, k_{n-1}) \in Z^{n-1},$$

when Z is the set of rational integers. Let $H_{k_1, \dots, k_{n-1}} = \{x: x \in H \text{ and } (x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}) \in \pi_{k_1, \dots, k_{n-1}}\}$. Then $H = \bigcup_{(k_1, \dots, k_{n-1}) \in S^{n-1}} H_{k_1, \dots, k_{n-1}}$. If $X \in H_{k_1, \dots, k_{n-1}}$, then $x_i \geq e^{k_i}, i = 1, \dots, n - 1$ and

$$x_n = \frac{k}{x_1 \dots x_{n-1}} \geq \frac{k}{e^{k_1 + \dots + k_{n-1} + n - 1}}.$$

Let

$$\alpha = \alpha_{k_1, \dots, k_{n-1}} = \left(e^{k_1}, \dots, e^{k_{n-1}}, \frac{k}{e^{k_1 + \dots + k_{n-1} + n - 1}} \right)$$

Then Γ_α is a grid of determinant $2^n k/e^{n-1}$. Let

$$A = \{ \alpha_{k_1, \dots, k_{n-1}} : (k_1, \dots, k_{n-1}) \in Z^{n-1} \} .$$

For each $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n) \in H_{k_1, \dots, k_{n-1}}$, $\alpha_{k_1, \dots, k_{n-1}} \in A$ has the property that Γ_α is a covering set for B_β . Therefore $S = \bigcup_{\alpha \in A} \Gamma_\alpha$ is a Danzer set. To prove Theorem 2, it will be enough to prove $D(S, X) = O((\log X)^{n-1})$, as $X \rightarrow \infty$.

Let $B(X)$ be the box $|x_i| \leq X$. Since $N(S, X), N(\Gamma_\alpha, X)$ denote the number of points of S and Γ_α , respectively, in $B(X)$, it follows that

$$(*) \quad N(S, X) \leq \sum_{\alpha \in A} N(\Gamma_\alpha, X) .$$

If $\alpha = \alpha_{k_1, \dots, k_{n-1}} \in A$, then the points of Γ_α have coordinates

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(e^{k_1} u_1, e^{k_2} u_2, \dots, e^{k_{n-1}} u_{n-1}, \frac{k}{e^{k_1 + \dots + k_{n-1} + n-1}} u_n \right) \\ & = (e^{k_1} u_1, e^{k_2} u_2, \dots, e^{k_{n-1}} u_{n-1}, k e^l u_n) , \end{aligned}$$

say, where u_i are odd integers. If $\Gamma_\alpha \cap B(X) \neq \phi$, then

$$e^{k_1} \leq X, \dots, e^{k_{n-1}} \leq X, k e^l \leq X ,$$

so that for

$$\begin{aligned} i = 1, 2, \dots, n - 1, e^{k_i} & \geq \frac{k}{e^{n-1}} \cdot \frac{e^{k_i}}{e^{k_1 + \dots + k_{n-1}}} \cdot \frac{1}{X} \\ & \geq \frac{k}{e^{n-1}} \cdot \frac{1}{X^{n-1}} . \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_\alpha \cap B(X) \neq \phi & \Rightarrow \frac{k}{(eX)^{n-1}} \leq e^{k_i} \leq X, \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, n - 1 \\ & \Rightarrow \log k - (n - 1)(1 + \log X) \leq k_i \leq \log X \\ & \qquad \qquad \qquad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n - 1 . \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the number $\nu(X)$ of α for which $\Gamma_\alpha \cap B(X) \neq \phi$, satisfies

$$(**) \quad \begin{aligned} \nu(X) & \leq (n(1 + \log X) - \log k)^{n-1} \\ & = O(\log X)^{n-1} . \end{aligned}$$

If $\Gamma_\alpha \cap B(X) \neq \phi$, then the number $N(\Gamma_\alpha, X)$ of points of Γ_α in $B(X)$ is the number of points $(u_1, \dots, u_n) \in Z^n, u_i$ odd, with

$$-X \leq u_i e^{k_i} \leq X, i = 1, \dots, n - 1$$

and

$$-X \leq u_n \frac{k}{e^{k_1 + \dots + k_{n-1} + n-1}} \leq X .$$

Writing $[\xi]$ for the largest integer $\leq \xi$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 N(\Gamma_\alpha, X) &= \left(\prod_{i=1}^{n-1} 2 \left[\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{X}{e^{k_i}} + 1 \right) \right] \right) 2 \left[\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{X e^{k_1 + \dots + k_{n-1} + n-1}}{k} + 1 \right) \right] \\
 (***) \quad &\leq 2^n \left(\prod_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{X}{e^{k_i}} \right) \frac{X e^{k_1 + \dots + k_{n-1} + n-1}}{k} \\
 &= (2X)^n e^{n-1} / k.
 \end{aligned}$$

Combining (*), (**) and (***), we get

$$D(S, X) = N(S, X) / (2X)^n = O((\log X)^{n-1}).$$

Thus S is a Danzer set which provides an example for Theorem 2.

REFERENCES

1. L. Danzer, *Convexity*, Proc. Coll., Copenhagen, (1965), 310.
2. J. W. S. Cassels, *Introduction to the Geometry of Numbers*, Springer-Verlag, 1959.
3. D. B. Sawyer, J. London Math. Soc., **41** (1966), 466-468.

Received July 29, 1970. Research partially supported by NSF Grant GP-9588.

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

AND

PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGRAH, INDIA

