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Abstract. For $q > 1$ we consider expansions in base $q$ with digits set \{0, 1, q\}. Let $U_q$ be the set of points which have a unique $q$-expansion. For $k = 2, 3, \cdots$ let $B_k$ be the set of bases $q > 1$ for which there exists $x$ having precisely $k$ different $q$-expansions, and for $q \in B_k$ let $U_q^{(k)}$ be the set of all such $x$’s which have exactly $k$ different $q$-expansions. In this paper we show that $B_{\aleph_0} = [2, \infty)$ and $B_k = (q_c, \infty)$ for any $k \geq 2$, where $q_c \approx 2.32472$ is the appropriate root of $x^3 - 3x^2 + 2x - 1 = 0$. Moreover, we show that for any integer $k \geq 2$ and any $q \in B_k$ the Hausdorff dimensions of $U_q^{(k)}$ and $U_q$ are the same, i.e.,

$$\dim_H U_q^{(k)} = \dim_H U_q$$

for any $k \geq 2$.

Finally, we conclude that the set of points having a continuum of $q$-expansions has full Hausdorff dimension.

1. Introduction

Expansions in non-integer bases were pioneered by Rényi [18] and Parry [16]. Unlike integer base expansions, for a given $\beta \in (1, 2)$, it is well-known that typically a real number $x \in I_\beta := [0, 1/(\beta - 1)]$ has a continuum of $\beta$-expansions with digits set \{0, 1\} (cf. [2,19]), i.e., for Lebesgue almost every $x \in I_\beta$ there exist a continuum of zero-one sequences $(x_i)$ such that

$$x = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} x_i/\beta^i.$$  

However, there still exist $x \in I_\beta$ having a unique $\beta$-expansion (cf. [5,10,13]). Denote by $U_\beta$ the set of all $x \in I_\beta$ with a unique $\beta$-expansion. De Vries and Komornik [3] investigated the topological properties of $U_\beta$. Komornik et al. [12] considered the Hausdorff dimension of $U_\beta$, and concluded that the dimension function $\beta \mapsto \dim_H U_\beta$ behaves like a Devil’s staircase. Interestingly, for any $k = 2, 3, \cdots$ or $\aleph_0$ Erdös et al. [6,7] showed that there exist $\beta \in (1, 2)$ and $x \in I_\beta$ such that $x$ has precisely $k$ different $\beta$-expansions. For more information on expansions in non-integer bases we refer to [1,21,23], and the surveys [4,11,20].

In this paper we consider expansions with digits set \{0, 1, q\}. Given $q > 1$, the infinite sequence $(d_i)$ is called a $q$-expansion of $x$, if

$$x = ((d_i))_q := \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{d_i}{q^i}, \quad d_i \in \{0, 1, q\} \text{ for all } i \geq 1.$$  

We emphasize that the digits set \{0, 1, q\} also depends on the base $q$.
For \( q > 1 \) let \( E_q \) be the set of points which have a \( q \)-expansion. Then \( E_q \) is the attractor of the iterated function system (IFS)
\[
\phi_d(x) = \frac{x + d}{q}, \quad d \in \{0, 1, q\}.
\]
So, \( E_q \) is the non-empty compact set satisfying \( E_q = \bigcup_{d \in \{0,1,q\}} \phi_d(E_q) \) (cf. [8]). Observe that \( \phi_0(E_q) \cap \phi_1(E_q) \neq \emptyset \) for any \( q > 1 \). Then \( E_q \) is a self-similar set with overlaps. Ngai and Wang [15] gave the Hausdorff dimension of \( E_q \):
\[
(1.1) \quad \dim_H E_q = \frac{\log q^*}{\log q} \quad \text{for any} \quad q > q^*,
\]
where \( q^* = (3 + \sqrt{5})/2 \). Yao and Li [22] considered all possible IFSs generating the set \( E_q \).
Zou et al. [24] considered the set of points in \( E_q \) which have a unique \( q \)-expansion. In this paper, we investigate the set of points in \( E_q \) having multiple \( q \)-expansions.

For \( k = 1, 2, \cdots, \aleph_0 \) or \( 2^{\aleph_0} \), let
\[
B_k := \{ q \in (1, \infty) : \exists x \in E_q \text{ with precisely } k \text{ different } q \text{-expansions} \}.
\]
Accordingly, for \( q \in B_k \) let
\[
U_q^{(k)} := \{ x \in E_q : x \text{ has precisely } k \text{ different } q \text{-expansions} \}.
\]
For simplicity, we write \( U_q := U_q^{(1)} \) for the set of \( x \in E_q \) having a unique \( q \)-expansion, and denote by \( U'_q \) the set of all \( q \)-expansions corresponding to elements of \( U_q \).

In this paper we will describe the sizes of the sets \( B_k \) and \( U_q^{(k)} \). Our first result is on the set \( B_k \) for \( k = 1, 2, \cdots, \aleph_0 \) or \( 2^{\aleph_0} \). Clearly, when \( k = 1 \) we have \( B_1 = (1, \infty) \), since 0 always has a unique \( q \)-expansion for any \( q > 1 \). When \( k = 2, 3, \cdots, \aleph_0 \) or \( 2^{\aleph_0} \) we have the following

**Theorem 1.** Let \( q_c \approx 2.32472 \) be the appropriate root of \( x^3 - 3x^2 + 2x - 1 = 0 \). Then
\[
B_2^{\aleph_0} = (1, \infty), \quad B_{\aleph_0} = [2, \infty), \quad B_k = (q_c, \infty) \quad \text{for any} \quad k \geq 2.
\]

By Theorem 1 it follows that for \( q \in [2, q_c] \), any \( x \in E_q \) can only have a unique \( q \)-expansion, countably infinitely many \( q \)-expansions, or a continuum of \( q \)-expansions.

When \( k = 1 \), the following theorem for the univoque set \( U_q = U_q^{(1)} \) was proven in [24].

**Theorem 1.1.**

(i) If \( q \in (1, q_c) \), then \( U_q = \{0, q/(q - 1)\} \).

(ii) If \( q \in (q_c, q^*) \), then \( U_q \) contains a continuum of points.

(iii) If \( q \in [q^*, \infty) \), then \( \dim_H U_q = \log q_c / \log q \).

Our second result complements Theorem 1.1 and shows that there is no difference between the Hausdorff dimensions of \( U_q^{(k)} \) and \( U_q \).

**Theorem 2.**

(i) \( \dim_H U_q > 0 \) if and only if \( q > q_c \).

(ii) For any integer \( k \geq 2 \) and any \( q \in B_k \) we have \( \dim_H U_q^{(k)} = \dim_H U_q \).
As a result of Theorem 2 it follows that \( q_c \) is indeed the critical base, in the sense that \( \mathcal{U}_q^{(k)} \) has positive Hausdorff dimension if \( q > q_c \), while \( \mathcal{U}_q^{(k)} \) has zero Hausdorff dimension if \( q \leq q_c \). In fact, by Theorems 1 and 1.1 (i) it follows that for \( q \leq q_c \) the set \( \mathcal{U}_q = \{0, q/(q - 1)\} \) and \( \mathcal{U}_q^{(k)} = \emptyset \) for any integer \( k \geq 2 \).

Our final result focuses on the sizes of \( \mathcal{U}_q^{(\aleph_0)} \) and \( \mathcal{U}_q^{(2^{\aleph_0})} \).

**Theorem 3.**

(i) Let \( q \in \mathcal{B}_{\aleph_0} \setminus (q_c, q^*) \). Then \( \mathcal{U}_q^{(\aleph_0)} \) is countably infinite.

(ii) For any \( q > 1 \) we have \( \dim_H \mathcal{U}_q^{(2^{\aleph_0})} = \dim_H E_q \).

**Remark 1.2.** In Lemma 5.5 we prove a stronger result of Theorem 3 (ii), and show that the Hausdorff measures of \( \mathcal{U}_q^{(2^{\aleph_0})} \) and \( E_q \) are the same for any \( q > 1 \), i.e.,

\[
\mathcal{H}^s(\mathcal{U}_q^{(2^{\aleph_0})}) = \mathcal{H}^s(E_q) \in (0, \infty),
\]

where \( s = \dim_H E_q \).

The rest of the paper is arranged as follows. In Section 2 we recall some properties of unique \( q \)-expansions. The proof of Theorem 3 for the sets \( \mathcal{B}_k \) will be presented in Section 3 and the proofs of Theorems 2 and 3 for the sets \( \mathcal{U}_q^{(k)} \) will be given in Sections 4 and 5, respectively. Finally, in Section 6 we give some examples and end the paper with some questions.

## 2. Unique Expansions

In this section we recall some properties of the univoque set \( \mathcal{U}_q \) from [24]. Recall that

\[
q_c \approx 2.32472 \quad \text{and} \quad q^* = \frac{3 + \sqrt{5}}{2} \approx 2.61803,
\]

where \( q_c \) is the appropriate root of the equation \( x^3 - 3x^2 + 2x - 1 = 0 \). Note that for \( q \in (1, q^*) \) the attractor \( E_q = [0, q/(q - 1)] \) is an interval. However, for \( q > q^* \) the attractor \( E_q \) is a Cantor set which contains neither interior nor isolated points.

Given \( q > 1 \), let \( \{0, 1, q\}^\mathbb{N} \) be the set of all infinite sequences \( (d_i) \) over the alphabet \( \{0, 1, q\} \). By a word \( c \) we mean a finite string of digits \( c = c_1 \ldots c_n \) with each digit \( c_i \in \{0, 1, q\} \). For two words \( c = c_1 \ldots c_m \) and \( d = d_1 \ldots d_n \), we denote by \( cd = c_1 \ldots c_md_1 \ldots d_n \) their concatenation. For a positive integer \( k \) we write \( c^k = c \cdots c \) for the \( k \)-fold concatenation of \( c \) with itself. Furthermore, we write \( c^\infty = cc \cdots \) the infinite periodic sequence with periodic block \( c \). Throughout the paper we will use lexicographical ordering \( <, \leq, > \) and \( \geq \) between sequences. More precisely, for two sequences \( (c_i), (d_i) \in \{0, 1, q\}^\mathbb{N} \) we say \( (c_i) < (d_i) \) or \( (d_i) > (c_i) \) if there exists an integer \( n \geq 1 \) such that \( c_1 \ldots c_{n-1} = d_1 \ldots d_{n-1} \) and \( c_n < d_n \). Furthermore, we say \( (c_i) \leq (d_i) \) if \( (c_i) < (d_i) \) or \( (c_i) = (d_i) \).

Recall that \( \mathcal{U}_q \) is the set of points in \( E_q \) with a unique \( q \)-expansion, and \( \mathcal{U}_q' \) is the set of corresponding \( q \)-expansions. Then

\[
\mathcal{U}_q' = \left\{(d_i) \in \{0, 1, q\}^\mathbb{N} : ((d_i))_q \in \mathcal{U}_q \right\}.
\]

The following lexicographical characterization of \( \mathcal{U}_q' \) for \( q > q^* \) was established in [24] Lemma 3.1.
Lemma 2.1. Let \( q > q^* \). Then \((d_i) \in \mathcal{U}_q'\) if and only if
\[
\begin{cases}
(d_{n+i}) < q0^\infty & \text{if } d_n = 0, \\
(d_{n+i}) > 1^\infty & \text{if } d_n = 1.
\end{cases}
\]

To describe \( \mathcal{U}_q' \) for \( q \in (1, q^*) \) we need the following notation. Let
\[
\alpha(q) = (\alpha_i(q))
\]
be the quasi-greedy \( q \)-expansion of \( q - 1 \), i.e., the lexicographically largest \( q \)-expansion of \( q - 1 \) with infinitely many non-zero digits. We emphasize that \( \alpha(q) \) is well-defined for \( q \in (1, q^*) \). By (2.2) and a direct calculation one can verify that
\[
(2.2) \quad \alpha(q_c) = q_c1^\infty, \quad \alpha(q^*) = (q^*)^\infty.
\]

Note by Theorem 1.1 that for \( q \in (1, q_c] \) we have \( \mathcal{U}_q = \{0, q/(q - 1)\} \), and then \( \mathcal{U}_q' = \{0^\infty, q^\infty\} \). So, it suffices to consider \( \mathcal{U}_q' \) for \( q \in (q_c, q^*) \). The following lemma was obtained in [24, Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2].

Lemma 2.2. Let \( q \in (q_c, q^*) \). Then
\[
A_q \subseteq \mathcal{U}_q' \subseteq B_q,
\]
where \( A_q \) is the set of sequences \((d_i) \in \{0, 1, q\}^\mathbb{N}\) satisfying
\[
(2.3) \quad \begin{cases}
(d_{n+i}) < 1\alpha(q) & \text{if } d_n = 0, \\
1^\infty < (d_{n+i}) \prec \alpha(q) & \text{if } d_n = 1, \\
(d_{n+i}) > q0^\infty & \text{if } d_n = q,
\end{cases}
\]
and \( B_q \) is the set of sequences \((d_i) \in \{0, 1, q\}^\mathbb{N}\) satisfying the first two inequalities in (2.3).

For \( q > 1 \) let \( \Phi : \{0, 1, q\}^\mathbb{N} \to \{0, 1, 2\}^\mathbb{N} \) be defined by
\[
\Phi((d_i)) = (d_i'),
\]
where \( d_i' = d_i \) if \( d_i \in \{0, 1\} \), and \( d_i' = 2 \) if \( d_i = q \). Clearly, \( \Phi \) is bijective and strictly increasing. The following lemma was given in [24, Lemma 3.2].

Lemma 2.3. The map \( q \to \Phi(\alpha(q)) \) is strictly increasing in \((1, q^*)\).

By (2.2) and Lemma 2.3 it follows that for any \( q \in (q_c, q^*) \) we have \( q1^\infty < \alpha(q) < q^\infty \).

3. Proof of Theorem 1.1

In this section we will investigate the set \( B_k \) of bases \( q > 1 \) in which there exists \( x \in E_q \) having \( k \) different \( q \)-expansions. Excluding the trivial case for \( k = 1 \) that \( B_1 = (1, \infty) \) we consider \( B_k \) for \( k = 2, 3, \ldots, \aleph_0 \) or \( 2^{\aleph_0} \).

The following lemma was established in [24, Theorem 4.1] and [9, Theorem 1.1].

Lemma 3.1. Let \( q \in (1, 2) \).

(i) If \( q \in (1, 2) \), then any \( x \in E_q \) has either a unique \( q \)-expansion, or a continuum of \( q \)-expansions.
(ii) If \( q = 2 \), then any \( x \in E_q \) can only have a unique \( q \)-expansion, countably infinitely many \( q \)-expansions, or a continuum of \( q \)-expansions.
For $q > 1$ we recall that $\phi_d(x) = (x + d)/q$ for $d \in \{0, 1, q\}$. Let
\[(3.1) \quad S_q := (\phi_0(E_q) \cap \phi_1(E_q)) \cup (\phi_1(E_q) \cap \phi_q(E_q)).\]
Then $S_q$ is associated with the switch region, since any $x \in S_q$ has at least two $q$-expansions. More precisely, any $x \in \phi_0(E_q) \cap \phi_1(E_q)$ has at least two $q$-expansions: one begins with the digit 0 and one begins with the digit 1. Accordingly, any $x \in \phi_1(E_q) \cap \phi_q(E_q)$ also has at least two $q$-expansions: one starts with the digit 1 and one starts with the digit $q$. We point out that the union in (3.1) is disjoint if $q > 2$. In particular, for $q > q^*$ the intersection $\phi_1(E_q) \cap \phi_q(E_q) = \emptyset$.

For $x \in E_q$ let $\Sigma(x)$ be the set of all $q$-expansions of $x$, i.e.,
\[\Sigma(x) := \{(d_i) \in \{0, 1, q\}^\mathbb{N} : ((d_i))_q = x\},\]
and denote its cardinality by $|\Sigma(x)|$.

We recall from [1] that a point $x \in S_q$ is called a $q$-null infinite point if $x$ has an expansion $(d_i) \in \{0, 1, q\}^\mathbb{N}$ such that whenever
\[x_n := (d_{n+1}d_{n+2}\cdots)_q \in S_q,\]
on of the following quantities is infinity, and the other two are finite:
\[|\Sigma(\phi_0^{-1}(x_n))|, \quad |\Sigma(\phi_1^{-1}(x_n))| \quad \text{and} \quad |\Sigma(\phi_q^{-1}(x_n))|\].
Then any $q$-null infinite point has countably infinitely many $q$-expansions.

First we consider the set $B_{\aleph_0}$, which is based on the following characterization (cf. [1 2 3]).

**Lemma 3.2.** $q \in B_{\aleph_0}$ if and only if $S_q$ contains a $q$-null infinite point.

**Lemma 3.3.** $B_{\aleph_0} = [2, \infty)$.

**Proof.** By Lemma 3.1 we have $B_{\aleph_0} \subseteq [2, \infty)$ and $2 \in B_{\aleph_0}$. So, it suffices to prove $(2, \infty) \subseteq B_{\aleph_0}$.

Take $q \in (2, \infty)$. Note that $0 = (0^\infty)_q$ and $q/(q - 1) \in (q^\infty)_q$ belong to $U_q$. We claim that
\[x = (0q^\infty)_q\]
is a $q$-null infinite point. Note that $(10^\infty)_q = (0q0^\infty)_q$. Then by the words substitution $10 \sim 0q$ it follows that all expansions $1^k0q^\infty, k \geq 0$, are $q$-expansions of $x$, i.e.,
\[\bigcup_{k=0}^\infty \{1^k0q^\infty\} \subseteq \Sigma(x).\]
This implies that $|\Sigma(x)| = \infty$. Furthermore, since $q > 2$, the union in (3.1) is disjoint. This implies
\[x = (0q^\infty)_q = (10q^\infty)_q \in \phi_0(E_q) \cap \phi_1(E_q) \setminus \phi_q(E_q).\]
Then $\phi_0^{-1}(x) = (q^\infty)_q \in U_q$, $\phi_1^{-1}(x) = x$ and $\phi_q^{-1}(x) \notin E_q$, i.e.,
\[|\Sigma(\phi_0^{-1}(x))| = 1, \quad |\Sigma(\phi_1^{-1}(x))| = \infty, \quad |\Sigma(\phi_q^{-1}(x))| = 0.\]

By iteration it follows that $x$ is a $q$-null infinite point. Hence, by Lemma 3.2 we have $q \in B_{\aleph_0}$, and therefore $(2, \infty) \subseteq B_{\aleph_0}$. \hfill \Box

Now we turn to describe the set $B_k$. By Lemma 3.1 it follows that $B_k \subseteq (2, \infty)$ for any $k \geq 2$. First we consider $B_2$ and need the following
Lemma 3.4. Let \( q > 2 \). Then \( q \in \mathcal{B}_2 \) if and only if either
\[
(0(a_i))_q = (1(b_i))_q \quad \text{for some} \quad (a_i), (b_i) \in \mathcal{U}'_q,
\]
or
\[
(1(c_i))_q = (q(d_i))_q \quad \text{for some} \quad (c_i), (d_i) \in \mathcal{U}'_q.
\]

Proof. First we prove the necessary condition. Take \( q \in \mathcal{B}_2 \). Suppose \( x \in E_q \) has two different \( q \)-expansions, say
\[
((a_i))_q = x = ((b_i))_q.
\]
Then there exists a least integer \( k \geq 1 \) such that \( a_k \neq b_k \). Then
\[
(a_ka_{k+1} \cdots )_q = (b_kb_{k+1} \cdots )_q \in S_q \quad \text{and} \quad (a_{k+i}), (b_{k+i}) \in \mathcal{U}'_q.
\]
Since \( q > 2 \), it gives that the union in (3.1) is disjoint. Then the necessity follows by (3.2).

To prove the sufficiency, without loss of generality, we assume \((0(a_i))_q = (1(b_i))_q\) with \((a_i), (b_i) \in \mathcal{U}'_q\). Note by \( q > 2 \) that the union in (3.1) is disjoint. Then
\[
(0(a_i))_q = (1(b_i)) \in \phi_0(E_q) \cap \phi_1(E_q) \setminus \phi_q(E_q).
\]
This implies that \( x \) has exactly two different \( q \)-expansions. So, \( q \in \mathcal{B}_2 \). \( \square \)

Recall from (2.2) that \( q_c \approx 2.32472 \) and \( q^* = (3 + \sqrt{5})/2 \) admit the quasi-greedy expansions \( \alpha(q_c) = q_c1^{\infty} \) and \( \alpha(q^*) = (q^*)^{\infty} \). In the following lemma we describe the set \( \mathcal{B}_2 \).

Lemma 3.5. \( \mathcal{B}_2 = (q_c, \infty) \).

Proof. First we show that \( \mathcal{B}_2 \subseteq (q_c, \infty) \). By Lemma 3.1 it suffices to prove that any \( q \in (2, q_c] \) is not contained in \( \mathcal{B}_2 \). Take \( q \in (2, q_c] \). By Theorem 1.1 we have \( \mathcal{U}'_q = \{ (0^{\infty}), (q^{\infty}) \} \). Then by Lemma 3.4 it follows that if \( q \in \mathcal{B}_2 \cap (2, q_c] \) then \( q \) must satisfy one of the following equations
\[
(0q^{\infty})_q = (10^{\infty})_q \quad \text{or} \quad (1q^{\infty})_q = (q0^{\infty})_q.
\]
This is impossible since neither equation has a solution in \( (2, q_c) \). Hence, \( \mathcal{B}_2 \subseteq (q_c, \infty) \).

Now we turn to prove \( (q_c, \infty) \subseteq \mathcal{B}_2 \). By Lemmas 2.1 and 3.4 one can verify that for any \( q > q^* \) the number
\[
x = (0q0^{\infty})_q = (10^{\infty})_q
\]
has precisely two different \( q \)-expansions. This implies that \( (q^*, \infty) \subseteq \mathcal{B}_2 \).

For \( q \in (q_c, q^*] \), one has by (2.2) that \( \alpha(q_c) = q_c1^{\infty} \) and \( \alpha(q^*) = (q^*)^{\infty} \). Then by Lemma 2.3 there exists an integer \( m \geq 0 \) such that
\[
\alpha(q) \succ q1^m q0^{\infty}.
\]
Hence, by Lemmas 2.2 and 3.4 one can verify that
\[
y = (0q(1^{m+1}q)^{\infty})_q = (10(1^{m+1}q)^{\infty})_q
\]
has precisely two different \( q \)-expansions. So, \( (q_c, q^*] \subseteq \mathcal{B}_2 \), and the proof is complete. \( \square \)

Lemma 3.6. \( \mathcal{B}_k = (q_c, \infty) \) for any \( k \geq 3 \).
Proof. First we prove $\mathcal{B}_k \subseteq \mathcal{B}_2$ for any $k \geq 3$. By Lemma 3.1 it follows that $\mathcal{B}_k \subseteq (2, \infty)$. Take $q \in \mathcal{B}_k$ with $k \geq 3$. Suppose $x \in E_q$ has exactly $k$ different $q$-expansions. Since $q > 2$, the union in (3.1) is disjoint. This implies that there exists a word $d_1 \cdots d_n$ such that
\[
\phi_d^{-1} \circ \cdots \circ \phi_{d_n}^{-1}(x)
\]
has exactly two different $q$-expansions. So, $q \in \mathcal{B}_2$. Hence, $\mathcal{B}_k \subseteq \mathcal{B}_2$ for any $k \geq 3$.

Now we prove $\mathcal{B}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{B}_k$ for any $k \geq 3$. Note by Lemma 3.5 that $\mathcal{B}_2 = (q_c, \infty)$. Then it suffices to prove $(q_c, \infty) \subseteq \mathcal{B}_k$. First we prove $(q^*, \infty) \subseteq \mathcal{B}_k$. Take $q \in (q^*, \infty)$. We claim that for any $k \geq 1$,
\[
x_k = (0q^{k-1}(1q)^\infty)_q
\]
has precisely $k$ different $q$-expansions. We will prove this by induction on $k$.

For $k = 1$ one can easily check by using Lemma 2.1 that $x_1 = (0(1q)^\infty)_q \in \mathcal{U}_q$. Suppose $x_k$ has exactly $k$ different $q$-expansions. Now we consider $x_{k+1}$, which can be written as
\[
x_{k+1} = (0q^k(1q)^\infty)_q = (10q^{k-1}(1q)^\infty)_q.
\]
By Lemma 2.1 we have $q^k(1q)^\infty \in \mathcal{U}^\prime_q$. Moreover, by the induction hypothesis $(0q^{k-1}(1q)^\infty)_q = x_k$ has exactly $k$ different $q$-expansions. Then $x_{k+1}$ has at least $k + 1$ different $q$-expansions. On the other hand, since $q > q^* > 2$, the union in (3.1) is disjoint. Then
\[
x_{k+1} \in \phi_0(E_q) \cap \phi_1(E_q) \setminus \phi_q(E_q).
\]
This implies that $x_{k+1}$ indeed has $k + 1$ different $q$-expansions. By induction this proves the claim, and hence $(q^*, \infty) \subseteq \mathcal{B}_k$ for all $k \geq 3$.

It remains to prove $(q_c, q^*] \subseteq \mathcal{B}_k$. Take $q \in (q_c, q^*]$. By (2.2) and Lemma 2.5 there exists an integer $m \geq 0$ such that
\[
\alpha(q) > q1^mq0^\infty.
\]
We claim that
\[
y_k = (0q^{k-1}(1^{m+1}q)^\infty)_q
\]
has exactly $k$ different $q$-expansions. Again, this will be proven by induction on $k$.

If $k = 1$, then by using (3.3) in Lemma 2.2 it gives that $y_1 = (0(1^{m+1}q)^\infty)_q$ has a unique $q$-expansion. Suppose $y_k$ has exactly $k$ different $q$-expansions. Now we consider
\[
y_{k+1} = (0q^k(1^{m+1}q)^\infty)_q = (10q^{k-1}(1^{m+1}q)^\infty)_q.
\]
By (3.3) and Lemma 2.2 it yields that $q^k(1^{m+1}q)^\infty \in \mathcal{U}^\prime_q$. Furthermore, by the induction hypothesis $(0q^{k-1}(1^{m+1}q)^\infty)_q = y_k$ has exactly $k$ different $q$-expansions. This implies that $y_{k+1}$ has at least $k + 1$ different $q$-expansions. On the other hand, note that $q > q_c > 2$, and therefore the union in (3.1) is disjoint. So, $y_{k+1} \in \phi_0(E_q) \cap \phi_1(E_q) \setminus \phi_q(E_q)$, which implies that $y_{k+1}$ indeed has $k + 1$ different $q$-expansions. By induction this proves the claim, and then $(q_c, q^*] \subseteq \mathcal{B}_k$ for all $k \geq 3$. This completes the proof.

Proof of Theorem 7. By Lemmas 3.3, 3.5 and 3.6 it suffices to prove $\mathcal{B}_{2q^0} = (1, \infty)$. This can be verified by observing that
\[
x = ((100)^\infty)_q \in \mathcal{U}^\prime_q(2q^0)
\]
for any $q > 1$, because by the word substitution $10 \sim 0q$ one can show that $x$ indeed has a continuum of different $q$-expansions. \qed
4. Proof of Theorem 2

For \( q > 1 \) and \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) we recall that \( U_q^{(k)} \) is the set of \( x \in [0, q/(q - 1)] \) having precisely \( k \) different \( q \)-expansions. In this section we are going to investigate the Hausdorff dimension of \( U_q^{(k)} \). First we show that \( q_c \approx 2.32472 \) is the critical base for \( U_q \).

**Lemma 4.1.** Let \( q > 1 \). Then \( \text{dim}_H U_q > 0 \) if and only if \( q > q_c \).

**Proof.** The necessity follows from Theorem 1.1 (i). For the sufficiency we take \( q \in (q_c, \infty) \). If \( q > q^* \), then by Theorem 1.1 (iii) we have

\[
\text{dim}_H U_q = \frac{\log q_c}{\log q} > 0.
\]

So it remains to prove \( \text{dim}_H U_q > 0 \) for any \( q \in (q_c, q^*) \).

Take \( q \in (q_c, q^*) \). Recall from (2.2) that \( \alpha(q_c) = q_c 1^{\infty} \) and \( \alpha(q^*) = (q^*)^{\infty} \). Then by Lemma 2.3 there exists an integer \( m \geq 0 \) such that

\[
\alpha(q) \supseteq q_1^{m+1} 1^{m+2}.
\]

Whence, by Lemma 2.2 one can verify that all sequences in

\[
\Delta'_m := \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} \{ q_1^{m+1}, 1^{m+2} \}
\]

excluding those ending with \( 1^{\infty} \) belong to \( U'_q \). This implies that

\[
\text{dim}_H U_q \geq \text{dim}_H \Delta_m(q) = \frac{\log 2}{(m + 2) \log q} > 0.
\]

□

In the following we will consider the Hausdorff dimension of \( U_q^{(k)} \) for any \( k \geq 2 \), and prove \( \text{dim}_H U_q^{(k)} = \text{dim}_H U_q \). The upper bound of \( \text{dim}_H U_q^{(k)} \) is easy.

**Lemma 4.2.** Let \( q > 1 \). Then \( \text{dim}_H U_q^{(k)} \leq \text{dim}_H U_q \) for any \( k \geq 2 \).

**Proof.** Recall that \( \phi_d(x) = (x + d)/q \) for \( d \in \{0, 1, q\} \). Then the lemma follows by observing that for any \( k \geq 2 \),

\[
U_q^{(k)} \subseteq \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{d_1, \ldots, d_k \in \{0,1,q\}^n} \phi_{d_1} \circ \cdots \circ \phi_{d_k}(U_q),
\]

and the countable stability of Hausdorff dimension.

□

For the lower bound of \( \text{dim}_H U_q^{(k)} \) we need more. By Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2 it follows that

\[
\text{dim}_H U_q^{(k)} = 0 = \text{dim}_H U_q \quad \text{for any } q \leq q_c.
\]

So, it suffices to consider \( q > q_c \). Let

\[
F'_q(1) := \{(d_i) \in U'_q: d_1 = 1\}
\]
be the follower set in $U'_q$ generated by the word 1, and let $F_q(1)$ be the set of $x \in E_q$ which have a $q$-expansion in $F_q(1)$, i.e., $F_q(1) = \{((d_i)) : (d_i) \in E'_q(1)\}$.

**Lemma 4.3.** Let $q > q_c$. Then $\dim_H U_q^{(k)} \geq \dim_H F_q(1)$ for any $k \geq 1$.

**Proof.** For $k \geq 1$ and $q > q_c$ let

$$\Lambda_q^k := \{((d_i)) : d_1 \cdots d_k = 0q^{k-1}, (d_{k+i}) \in E'_q(1)\}.$$ 

Then $\Lambda_q^k = \phi_0 \circ \phi_q^{k-1}(F_q(1))$, and therefore $\dim_H \Lambda_q^k = \dim_H F_q(1)$. So it suffices to prove $\Lambda_q^k \subseteq U_q^{(k)}$. Arbitrarily take

$$x_k = (0q^{k-1}(c_i))q \in \Lambda_q^k \quad \text{with} \quad (c_i) \in E'_q(1).$$

We will prove by induction on $k$ that $x_k$ has exactly $k$ different $q$-expansions.

For $k = 1$, by Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2 it follows that $x_1 = (0(c_i))q \in U_q$. Suppose $x_k = (0q^{k-1}(c_i))q$ has precisely $k$ different $q$-expansions. Now we consider $x_{k+1}$, which can be expanded as

$$x_{k+1} = (0q^k(c_i))q = (0q^{k-1}(c_i))q.$$ 

By Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2 we have $q^k(c_i) \in U'_q$, and by the induction hypothesis it yields that $(0q^{k-1}(c_i))q = x_k$ has $k$ different $q$-expansions. This implies that $x_{k+1}$ has at least $k + 1$ different $q$-expansions. On the other hand, since $q > q_c > 2$, it gives that the union in (3.1) is disjoint. So, $x_{k+1} \in \phi_0(E_q) \cap \phi_1(E_q) \setminus \phi_q(E_q)$, which implies that $x_{k+1}$ indeed has $k + 1$ different $q$-expansions.

By induction this proves $x_k \in U_q^{(k)}$ for all $k \geq 1$. Since $x_k$ was taken arbitrarily from $\Lambda_q^k$, we conclude that $\Lambda_q^k \subseteq U_q^{(k)}$ for any $k \geq 1$. The proof is complete. $\square$

**Lemma 4.4.** Let $q > q_c$. Then $\dim_H F_q(1) \geq \dim_H U_q$.

**Proof.** First we consider $q > q^*$. By Lemma 2.1 one can show that $U'_q$ is contained in an irreducible sub-shift of finite type $X_A'$ over the states $\{0, 1, q\}$ with adjacency matrix

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. $$

Moreover, the complement set $X_A' \setminus U'_q$ contains all sequences ending with $1^\infty$. This implies that

$$\dim_H U_q = \dim_H X_A(q),$$

where $X_A(q) := \{((d_i)) : (d_i) \in X_A'\}$. Note that $X_A(q)$ is a graph-directed set satisfying the open set condition (cf. [24] Theorem 3.4]), and the sub-shift of finite type $X_A'$ is irreducible. Then by (4.3) it follows that

$$\dim_H U_q = \dim_H X_A(q) = \dim_H F_q(1).$$

Now we consider $q \in (q_c, q^*)$. By Lemma 2.2 it follows that

$$U_q' \subseteq \{q^\infty\} \cup \bigcup_{k=0}^\infty \{q^{k0^\infty}\} \cup \bigcup_{k=0}^\infty \bigcup_{m=0}^\infty \{q^{k0^m}F'_q(1)\},$$
where
\[ q^k 0^m F_q'(1) := \{(d_i) : d_1 \cdots d_{k+m} = q^k 0^m, (d_{k+m+i}) \in F_q'(1) \}. \]
This implies that \( \dim_H U_q \leq \dim_H F_q(1) \).

**Proof of Theorem 2.** The theorem follows directly by Lemmas 4.1–4.4. \( \square \)

5. **Proof of Theorem 3**

In this section we will consider the set \( U_q^{(\aleph_0)} \) which consists of all \( x \in E_q \) having countably infinitely many \( q \)-expansions.

**Lemma 5.1.** For any \( q \in B_{\aleph_0} \), the set \( U_q^{(\aleph_0)} \) contains infinitely many points.

**Proof.** Let \( q \in B_{\aleph_0} \). By Theorem 1, we have \( q \in [2, \infty) \). Then it suffices to show that for any \( k \geq 1 \),
\[ z_k := (0^k q^\infty)_q \]
is a \( q \)-null infinite points, and thus \( z_k \in U_q^{(\aleph_0)} \).

If \( q > 2 \), then by the proof of Lemma 3.3, it yields that \( z_1 = (0q^\infty)_q \) is a \( q \)-null infinite point. Moreover, note that \( z_k = \phi_{q0}^{k-1}(z_1) \notin S_q \) for any \( k \geq 2 \). This implies that all of these points \( z_k, k \geq 1 \), are \( q \)-null infinite points. So, \( \{z_k : k \geq 1\} \subseteq U_q^{(\aleph_0)} \).

If \( q = 2 \), then by using the substitutions
\[ 0q \sim 10, \quad 0q^\infty = 1^\infty = q0^\infty, \]
one can also show that \( z_k \) is a \( q \)-null infinite point. In fact, all of the \( q \)-expansions of \( z_k = (0^k q^\infty)_q \) are of the form
\[ 0^k q^\infty, \quad 0^{k-1}q^\infty, \quad 0^{k-1}1^m 0q^\infty \quad \text{and} \quad 0^{k-1}1^{m-1}q0^\infty, \]
where \( m \geq 1 \). Therefore, \( z_k \in U_q^{(\aleph_0)} \) for any \( k \geq 1 \).

By Lemma 5.1, it follows that \( U_q^{(\aleph_0)} \) is at least countably infinite for any \( q \in B_{\aleph_0} = [2, \infty) \).

In the following lemma we show that \( U_q^{(\aleph_0)} \) is indeed countably infinite if \( q \geq q^* \).

**Lemma 5.2.** Let \( q \geq q^* \). Then \( U_q^{(\aleph_0)} \) is at most countable.

**Proof.** Let \( x \in U_q^{(\aleph_0)} \). Then \( x \) has a \( q \)-expansion \( (d_i) \) such that
\[ |\Sigma(x_n)| = \infty \quad \text{for infinitely many} \ n \in \mathbb{N}, \]
where \( x_n := ((d_{n+i}))_q \). This implies that \( (d_i) \) cannot end in \( U_q' \).

Note by the proof of Lemma 4.4 that \( U_q' \subseteq X_A' \), where \( X_A' \) is a sub-shift of finite type over the state \( \{0, 1, q\} \) with adjacency matrix \( A \) defined in 4.2. Moreover, \( X_A' \setminus U_q' \) is at most countable (cf. 24 Theorem 3.4). Note that the expansion \( (d_i) \) of \( x \in U_q^{(\aleph_0)} \) does not end in \( U_q' \). Then it suffices to prove that the sequence \( (d_i) \) must end in \( X_A' \).

Suppose on the contrary that \( (d_i) \) does not end in \( X_A' \). Then by 4.2, the word \( 0q \) or 10 occurs infinitely many times in \( (d_i) \). Using the word substitution \( 0q \sim 10 \) this implies that \( x = ((d_i))_q \) has a continuum of \( q \)-expansions, leading to a contradiction with \( x \in U_q^{(\aleph_0)} \). \( \square \)
Furthermore, we can prove that $\mathcal{U}_q^{(\aleph_0)}$ is also countably infinite for $q \in [2, q_c]$. 

**Lemma 5.3.** Let $q \in [2, q_c]$. Then $\mathcal{U}_q^{(\aleph_0)}$ is at most countable.

**Proof.** Take $q \in [2, q_c]$. By Theorems 1 and 1.1 it follows that any $x \in E_q$ with $|\Sigma(x)| < \infty$ must belong to $\mathcal{U}_q = \{0, q/(q - 1)\}$. Suppose $x \in \mathcal{U}_q^{(\aleph_0)}$. Then there exists a word $d_1 \cdots d_n$ such that

$$\phi_1^{-1} \circ \cdots \circ \phi_n^{-1}(x) \in \mathcal{U}_q.$$ 

This implies that the set $\mathcal{U}_q^{(\aleph_0)}$ is at most countable, since

$$\mathcal{U}_q^{(\aleph_0)} \subseteq \bigcup_{n=1}^\infty \bigcup_{d_1, \ldots, d_n \in \{0, 1, q\}^n} \phi_{d_1} \circ \cdots \circ \phi_{d_n}(\mathcal{U}_q).$$

When $q \in (q_c, q^*)$, one might expect that $\mathcal{U}_q^{(\aleph_0)}$ is also countably infinite. Unfortunately, we are not able to prove this. Instead, we show that the Hausdorff dimension of $\mathcal{U}_q^{(\aleph_0)}$ is strictly smaller than $\dim_H E_q = 1$.

**Lemma 5.4.** For $q \in (q_c, q^*)$ we have $\dim_H \mathcal{U}_q^{(\aleph_0)} \leq \dim_H E_q < 1$.

**Proof.** Take $q \in (q_c, q^*)$. Note that

$$\mathcal{U}_q^{(\aleph_0)} \subseteq \bigcup_{n=1}^\infty \bigcup_{d_1, \ldots, d_n \in \{0, 1, q\}^n} \phi_{d_1} \circ \cdots \circ \phi_{d_n}(\mathcal{U}_q).$$

By using the countable stability of Hausdorff dimension this implies that $\dim_H \mathcal{U}_q^{(\aleph_0)} \leq \dim_H E_q$. In the following it suffices to prove $\dim_H E_q < 1$.

Note that $\mathcal{U}_q \subseteq X_A(q)$, where $X_A(q)$ is the sub-shift of finite type over the state $\{0, 1, q\}$ with adjacency matrix $A$ defined in (1). Then

$$\mathcal{U}_q \subseteq X_A(q) = \{(d_i)_q : (d_i) \in X_A\}.$$ 

Note that $X_A(q)$ is a graph-directed set (cf. [14]). This implies that

$$\dim_H \mathcal{U}_q \leq \dim_H X_A(q) \leq \frac{\log q_c}{\log q} < 1.$$ 

At the end of this section we investigate the set $\mathcal{U}_q^{(2^{\aleph_0})}$ which consists of all points having a continuum of $q$-expansions, and show that $\mathcal{U}_q^{(2^{\aleph_0})}$ has full Hausdorff measure.

**Lemma 5.5.** For any $q > 1$ we have

$$\mathcal{H}^{\dim_H E_q}(\mathcal{U}_q^{(2^{\aleph_0})}) = \mathcal{H}^{\dim_H E_q}(E_q) \in (0, \infty).$$

**Proof.** Clearly, for $q \in (1, q^*)$ we have $E_q = [0, q/(q - 1)]$, and then $\mathcal{H}^{\dim_H E_q}(E_q) \in (0, \infty)$. Moreover, for $q > q^*$ we have by (1) that $\dim_H E_q = \log q^*/\log q$, and the set $E_q$ has positive and finite Hausdorff measure (cf. [15]). Therefore,

$$0 < \mathcal{H}^{\dim_H E_q}(E_q) < \infty \text{ for any } q > 1.$$
First we prove the lemma for $q \leq q^*$. By Theorems 1 and 1.1 it follows that for any $q \in (1, q^*)$,

$$\dim_H U_q^{(k)} = \dim_H U_q < 1 = \dim_H E_q \quad \text{for any} \quad k \geq 2.$$  

Moreover, by Lemmas 5.2–5.4 we have $\dim_H U_q^{(\aleph_0)} < 1$. Observe that

$$E_q = U_q^{(2^{\aleph_0})} \cup U_q^{(\aleph_0)} \cup \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} U_q^{(k)} \quad \text{for any} \quad q > 1.$$  

Therefore, by (5.1) and (5.2) we have $\dim_H E_q (U_{2^{\aleph_0}}) = \dim_H E_q (U_{\aleph_0}) \in (0, \infty)$. 

Now we consider $q > q^*$. By Theorems 1.1 (iii), 2 and (1.1) it follows that

$$\dim_H U_q^{(k)} = \log q_c / \log q < \log q^* / \log q = \dim_H E_q$$  

for any $k \geq 1$. Moreover, by Lemma 5.2 we have $\dim_H U_q^{(\aleph_0)} = 0$. Again, by (5.1) and (5.2) it follows that $\dim_H E_q (U_{2^{\aleph_0}}) = \dim_H E_q (E_q) \in (0, \infty)$. This completes the proof. □

Proof of Theorem 3. The theorem follows by Lemmas 5.1–5.3 and 5.5 □

6. Examples and final remarks

In this section we consider some examples. The first example is an application of Theorems 1 and 3 to expansions with deleted digits set.

**Example 6.1.** Let $q = 3$. We consider $q$-expansions with digits set $\{0, 1, 3\}$. This is a special case of expansions with deleted digits (cf. [17]). Then

$$E_3 = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{d_i}{3^i} : d_i \in \{0, 1, 3\} \right\}.$$  

By Theorems 1.1 and 2 we have

$$\dim_H U_3^{(k)} = \dim_H U_3 = \log q_c / \log 3 \approx 0.767877$$  

for any $k \geq 2$. This means that the set $U_3^{(k)}$ consisting of all points in $E_3$ with precisely $k$ different triadic expansions has the same Hausdorff dimension $\log q_c / \log 3$ for any integer $k \geq 1$. Moreover, by Theorem 3 it follows that $U_3^{(\aleph_0)}$ is countably infinite, and

$$\dim_H U_3^{(2^{\aleph_0})} = \dim_H E_3 = \log q^* / \log 3 \approx 0.876036.$$  

Theorem 1.1 gives a uniform formula for the Hausdorff dimension of $U_q$ for $q \in [q^*, \infty)$. Excluding the trivial case for $q \in (1, q_c]$ that $U_q = \{0, q/(q-1)\}$, it would be interesting to ask whether the Hausdorff dimension of $U_q$ can be determined for $q \in (q_c, q^*)$. In the following we give an example for which the Hausdorff dimension of $U_q$ can be explicitly calculated.

**Example 6.2.** Let $q = 1 + \sqrt{2} \in (q_c, q^*)$. Then

$$(q0^{\infty})_q = (1qq0^{\infty})_q \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha(q) = (q1)^{\infty}.$$
Moreover, the quasi-greedy \( q \)-expansion of \( q-1 \) with alphabet \( \{0,q-1,q\} \) is \( q(q-1)\infty \). Therefore, by Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2 of [24] it follows that \( \mathcal{U}_q^\prime \) is the set of sequences \((d_i) \in \{0,1,q\}^\infty \) satisfying

\[
\begin{cases}
d_{n+1}d_{n+2}\cdots \prec (1q)^\infty & \text{if } d_n = 0, \\
1^\infty < d_{n+1}d_{n+2}\cdots \prec (q1)^\infty & \text{if } d_n = 1, \\
d_{n+1}d_{n+2}\cdots > 01^\infty & \text{if } d_n = q.
\end{cases}
\]

Let \( X'_A \) be the sub-shift of finite type over the states

\( \{00,01,11,1q,q0,q1,qq\} \)

with adjacency matrix

\[
A = \begin{pmatrix}
1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

Then one can verify that \( \mathcal{U}_q^\prime \subseteq X'_A \), and \( X'_A \setminus \mathcal{U}_q^\prime \) contains all sequences ending with \( 1^\infty \) or \( (1q)^\infty \). This implies that

\[
\dim_H \mathcal{U}_q = \dim_H X_A(q),
\]

where \( X_A(q) = \{((d_i))_q : (d_i) \in X'_A\} \). Note that \( X_A(q) \) is a graph-directed set satisfying the open set condition (cf. [14]). Then by Theorem 2 we have

\[
\dim_H \mathcal{U}^{(k)}_q = \dim_H \U_q = \frac{h(X'_A)}{\log q} \approx 0.691404.
\]

Furthermore, by the word substitution \( q00 \sim 1qq \) and in a similar way as in the proof of Lemma 5.2 one can show that \( \mathcal{U}_q^{(\omega_0)} \) is countably infinite. Finally, by Theorem 3 we have \( \dim_H \mathcal{U}_q^{(\omega_0)} = \dim_H E_q = 1 \).

**Question 1.** Can we give a uniform formula for the Hausdorff dimension of \( \mathcal{U}_q \) for \( q \in (q_c, q^*) \)?

In beta expansions we know that the dimension function of the univoque set has a Devil’s staircase behavior (cf. [12]).

**Question 2.** Does the dimension function \( D(q) = \dim_H \mathcal{U}_q \) have a Devil’s staircase behavior in the interval \( (q_c, q^*) \)?

By Theorem 3 one has that \( \mathcal{U}_q^{(\omega_0)} \) is countable for any \( q \in B_2 \setminus (q_c, q^*) \). Moreover, in Lemma 5.2 we show that \( \dim_H \mathcal{U}_q^{(\omega_0)} \leq \dim_H \U_q < 1 \) for any \( q \in (q_c, q^*) \). In view of Example 5.2 we ask the following

**Question 3.** Does there exist a \( q \in (q_c, q^*) \) such that \( \mathcal{U}_q^{(\omega_0)} \) has positive Hausdorff dimension?
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