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Abstract. Given two primes $p$, $q$, we show how to construct an explicit homeomorphism between the rings of $p$-adic integers $\mathbb{Z}_p$ and $\mathbb{Z}_q$, based on their representation as inverse limit spaces and considering the associated tree graphs.

1. Introduction.

For a fixed prime number $p$, let $v_p(x)$ denote the $p$-adic valuation on the rational numbers $\mathbb{Q}$, namely $v_p(x) = n \in \mathbb{Z}$ when $x \neq 0$ and $x = p^nx^*$ where $x^*$ does not contain $p$ in its factorization, and $v_p(0) = \infty$. The corresponding $p$-adic absolute value $|x|_p = p^{-v_p(x)}$ on $\mathbb{Q}$ is non-archimedean, that is to say, it satisfies not only the triangle inequality but the stronger ultrametric inequality $|x + y|_p \leq \max(|x|_p, |y|_p)$.

Recall that the field of $p$-adic numbers $\mathbb{Q}_p$ may be defined as the completion of the metric space $(\mathbb{Q}, |\cdot|_p)$. The same argument used to construct the real numbers $\mathbb{R}$ as the completion of $\mathbb{Q}$ with respect to the usual (archimedean) absolute value $|\cdot|$ shows that $v_p(x)$ and $|\cdot|_p$ extend uniquely to $\mathbb{Q}_p$, which is indeed a field with $\mathbb{Q}$ isometrically embedded as a dense subfield. In this approach, the ring of $p$-adic integers $\mathbb{Z}_p$ is the closed unit ball $|x|_p \leq 1$ in $\mathbb{Q}_p$. It is also the closure of the ring of ordinary integers $\mathbb{Z}$ in the $p$-adic topology.

One can also define $\mathbb{Z}_p$ as the inverse or projective limit of $\mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z}$ under the reduction maps $\phi_n : \mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}/p^{n-1}\mathbb{Z}$. In other words, an element $x \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ corresponds to a sequence $(\bar{x}_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ with $\bar{x}_n \in \mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z}$ and $\bar{x}_n \equiv \bar{x}_{n-1} \mod p^{n-1}$. We can choose representatives $x_n$ of the residue classes $\bar{x}_n \in \mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z}$ with $0 \leq x_n < p^n$, and using the base $p$ representation of a non-negative integer, write $x_n = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} a_k p^k$ with unique digits $a_k \in \{0, 1, \ldots, p-1\}$. This leads to the representation of $x \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ as an infinite sum $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k p^k$.

Both points of view coincide, with the infinite series $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k p^k$ converging to $x \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ in the metric topology induced by $|\cdot|_p$. For elements of $\mathbb{Q}_p$ it suffices to add a finite number of negative degree terms. Thus we have an analogy between $\mathbb{Q}_p$ and a formal power series ring in one variable.

1.1. The $p$-adic topology. Since $\mathbb{Z}_p$ is a non-archimedean metric space, every ball is a clopen set, i.e. both open and closed, two balls are either
disjoint or one is included in the other, and every point of a ball is its center. $\mathbb{Z}_p$ is thus Hausdorff and totally disconnected. Its representation as the inverse limit of finite rings with the discrete topology implies it is compact. Finally, it is a perfect space, since every ball contains infinitely many points.

Reduction modulo $p^n$ subdivides $\mathbb{Z}_p$ into $p^n$ disjoint clopen copies, consisting of the balls $B(a, p^{-n+1})$ where $a$ ranges over the integers $0 \leq a < p^n$. These are also the $p$-adic completions of the arithmetic progressions $a + p^n\mathbb{Z}$ modulo $p^n$, namely $a + p^n\mathbb{Z}_p$. This process can be structured sequentially, first taking residues modulo $p$, then $p^2$, etc., corresponding to subdividing $\mathbb{Z}_p$ into the $p$ balls $B(a_0, 1) = a_0 + p\mathbb{Z}_p$ for $0 \leq a_0 < p$, then subdividing each of these balls into $p$ others, $B(a_0 + a_1p, p^{-1}) = a_0 + a_1p + p^2\mathbb{Z}_p$, and so on. In this way each $p$-adic integer $x$ is the intersection of a unique sequence of these balls. This provides the visual representation of $\mathbb{Z}_p = \lim\leftarrow \mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z}$ as an infinite complete $p$-ary tree and a point $x$ as a path down through this tree from the top node.

1.2. The Cantor set. Recall that the classical “middle thirds” Cantor set $C$ is constructed by removing from the interval $I = [0, 1] \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ the open middle subinterval $(\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3})$, and proceeding in this manner with the remaining intervals. This leaves a set which is compact, totally disconnected, and perfect. Alternatively, $C$ consists of those real numbers $x \in [0, 1]$ whose ternary expansion is missing the middle digit 1. Here $x = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n2^{-n}$ with $a_0 \in \{0, 2\}$ and convergence is in the usual Euclidean topology defined by the archimedean absolute value $|\cdot|$ on $\mathbb{R}$.

This construction of $C$ represents it as a complete infinite binary tree, so it is reasonable to expect that $C$ is at least homeomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}_2$, even though the respective topologies are quite different. It is a nice exercise to prove this.

It is perhaps a little less obvious that $C$ is homeomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}_p$ for any prime $p$, since a priori it is not clear how infinite subdivision into different parts $p, q$ yield homeomorphic spaces, even if the topologies are both of the same ultrametric type.

2. INVERSE LIMIT SPACES AND BROUWER’S THEOREM

It turns out that, up to homeomorphism, the Cantor set $C$ is the only compact, metrizable, totally disconnected perfect topological space. This result is due to Brouwer [1].

**Theorem 2.1** (Brouwer’s Theorem). Every compact, metrizable, totally disconnected, and perfect topological space is homeomorphic to the Cantor set.

In light of the theorem, a Cantor space can be defined as any compact, metrizable, totally disconnected and perfect space or simply as any space homeomorphic to the classical Cantor set $C$. Brouwer’s Theorem is not an obvious result. An interesting consequence of it, for example, is that the continuous images of $C$ comprise every compact metric space.

We will give a brief sketch of the proof following [3], since the method is the basis of our construction of homeomorphisms between spaces of $p$-adic integers.
We will prove that any two compact, metrizable, totally disconnected and perfect spaces are homeomorphic. Since the Cantor set $C$ is all of these things, this will prove Brouwer’s Theorem.

The proof uses the existence of inverse limits in the category of topological spaces, which provides a logical structure in which to frame the results. We only need to deal with sequences. Recall that an inverse limit sequence of topological spaces $X_n$ is a sequence

$$X_0 \xleftarrow{f_1} X_1 \xleftarrow{f_2} X_2 \xleftarrow{f_3} \cdots$$

where each map $f_n : X_n \to X_{n-1}$ is continuous. The inverse limit space is

$$X_\infty = \lim_{\longleftarrow} X_n = \left\{ x = (x_n)_{n=0}^\infty \in \prod_{n=0}^\infty X_n : f_n(x_n) = x_{n-1} \forall n \in \mathbb{N} \right\},$$

with the subspace topology induced by the product topology. $X_\infty$ is a closed subset of the product. Cantor’s Intersection Theorem can be used to show that if each $X_n$ is a nonempty compact Hausdorff space, then so is $X_\infty$.

Maps between inverse limit sequences $(X_n, f_n)$ and $(Y_n, g_n)$ are given by a sequence of maps $\phi_n : X_n \to Y_n$ making the following diagram commutative:

$$\cdots \xleftarrow{f_n} X_{n-1} \xleftarrow{\phi_{n-1} \circ f_n} X_n \xleftarrow{\phi_n} Y_n \xleftarrow{g_n} Y_{n-1} \xleftarrow{\phi_{n-1} \circ g_n} \cdots$$

In other words, $\phi_{n-1} \circ f_n = g_n \circ \phi_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. A map between inverse sequences induces a map $\phi : X_\infty \to Y_\infty$ between the limits by $\phi(x_0, x_1, \ldots) = (\phi_0(x_0), \phi_1(x_1), \ldots)$. If each $\phi_n$ is continuous then so is $\phi$. If each $X_n$ and $Y_n$ is a nonempty compact Hausdorff space and the $\phi_n$ are homeomorphisms, then $\phi$ is a homeomorphism between the inverse limits. In fact, in this context it is enough that the $\phi_n$ be continuous bijections.

The chief ingredients that make the proof work are the subdivision properties of clopen sets in compact totally disconnected spaces. These are given in the following two straightforward lemmas.

**Lemma 2.2.** Let $X$ be a compact totally disconnected metric space. Then for each $\delta > 0$ there is a finite partition of $X$ into clopen sets of diameter less than $\delta$.

Using this lemma we can recursively construct a sequence of finite partitions $\{U_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ of $X$ such that $U_n$ consists of clopen sets of diameter less than $2^{-n}$ and $U_n$ is a refinement of $U_{n-1}$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, which for finite partitions means that each set in $U_{n-1}$ subdivides into a finite number of sets of $U_n$. We will denote the refinement relation by $U_n \preceq U_{n-1}$.

The connection with inverse limits is as follows: consider each $U_n$ as a finite topological space with the discrete topology. Consider the container maps $c_n : U_n \to U_{n-1}$, sending a set $U \in U_n$ to the unique $V \in U_{n-1}$ containing $U$. This is an inverse limit sequence whose limit $U_\infty = \lim U_n$ consists of nested sequences $U_0 \supseteq U_1 \supseteq \cdots$ with $U_n \in U_n$. It is not hard to check that $U_\infty$ is homeomorphic to $X$ via the map which sends a point $x \in X$ to the unique sequence $(U_0, U_1, \ldots) \in U_\infty$ such that $\{x\} = \bigcap_{n=0}^\infty U_n$. 
Thus we have exhibited any compact totally disconnected metric space as an inverse limit of finite discrete spaces.

Note that we did not assume X was perfect. We need this for the next subdivision property, which completes the picture.

Lemma 2.3. Let X be a compact Hausdorff totally disconnected perfect space. Then for any nonempty clopen set $U \subseteq X$ and any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there is a partition of $U$ into $n$ nonempty clopen sets $U_1, \ldots, U_n$.

This is easy to see proceeding by successive partitions into two nonempty clopen sets, and allows us to extend the construction above of $X$ as an inverse limit to two compact, metrizable, totally disconnected and perfect topological spaces $X$, $Y$. We can now recursively construct two sequences $\{U_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$, $\{V_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ of finite partitions of $X$ and $Y$ respectively, such that $U_n$ and $V_n$ consist of clopen sets of diameter less than $2^{-n}$, with $U_n \preceq U_{n-1}$, $V_n \preceq V_{n-1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and, crucially, such that $U_n$ and $V_n$ have the same number $p_n$ of elements for all $n$, with isomorphic inclusion relations, that is to say, we can number

$$U_n = \{U_{n,1}, \ldots, U_{n,p_n}\}, \quad V_n = \{V_{n,1}, \ldots, V_{n,p_n}\},$$

in such a way that $U_{n+1,j} \subseteq U_{n,i}$ if and only if $V_{n+1,j} \subseteq V_{n,i}$.

The construction of these two sequences of partitions of $X$ and $Y$ is clear: at the $n$th step, given any pair of finite partitions $U_n$, $V_n$ into sets of diameter $2^{-n}$, with possibly different numbers of elements, use Lemma 2.3 to further subdivide one or more of the sets in the partition with less elements, until they have the same number. Now number the sets as in (2) and proceed to subdivide each $U_{n,i}$ and the corresponding $V_{n,i}$ into a finite number of clopen subsets with diameter less than $2^{-(n+1)}$, again using Lemma 2.3 to make the subdivisions have the same number of elements. These pieces form the refined partitions $U_{n+1}$ and $V_{n+1}$.

Note that in fact we can make each $U_{n,i}$ and $V_{n,i}$ break into the same number of pieces, independently of $i$, although this is not necessary for the construction.

Finally, it is now clear that the maps $\phi_n : U_n \rightarrow V_n$ sending $U_{n,j}$ to $V_{n,j}$ define a map between the corresponding inverse limit sequences. Since each $\phi_n$ is a bijection, and the $U_n$, $V_n$ are finite discrete spaces, we conclude that the induced map $\phi : U_\infty = \lim U_n \rightarrow V_\infty = \lim V_n$ is a homeomorphism. Since these limits are respectively homeomorphic to $X$ and $Y$, this proves Brouwer’s Theorem, and also provides a method of constructing explicit homeomorphisms.

3. Tilings of the $p$-ary tree

Let us consider the sequence of partitions and clopen covers of $\mathbb{Z}_p$ given by $\{U_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ where $U_0 = \{Z_p\} = \{B(0, p)\}$ and $U_n = \{a + p^n \mathbb{Z}_p\}$ where $a$ runs over any complete set of residues modulo $p^n$, for example $\{0, 1, \ldots, p^n - 1\}$.

Since this does not depend on the choice of such a set, we may write $U_n = \{a + p^n \mathbb{Z}_p : a \in \mathbb{Z}/p^n \mathbb{Z}\} = \{B(a, p^{1-n}) : a \in \mathbb{Z}/p^n \mathbb{Z}\}$.

It is clear that the partitions $U_n$ are of the form discussed in §2, namely they are finite partitions of $\mathbb{Z}_p$ into clopen sets which are successive refinements $U_n \preceq U_{n-1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The corresponding inverse limit may be
represented as the complete $p$-ary tree, which we will denote $T_p$. For example, $Z_2$ is the binary tree shown in Figure 1. Even without the abstract results of the previous section, this representation makes it at least intuitively clear that $Z_2$ is homeomorphic to the Cantor set $C$. The obvious self-replicating property of the $p$-ary tree $T_p$ can be regarded as a symbolic representation of the fractal nature of $Z_p$.

We will construct homeomorphisms between $Z_p$ and $Z_q$ via maps between the corresponding $p$-ary and $q$-ary trees $T_p$ and $T_q$. As in the proof of Brouwer’s Theorem, to define a homeomorphism, it is enough to exhibit two sequences of finite clopen partitions $\{U_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$, $\{V_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ of $Z_p$ and $Z_q$ such that the $n$th partitions in each sequence have the same number of elements and isomorphic inclusion relations and such that the diameter of elements in $U_n$ and $V_n$ is bounded by some sequence in $n$ converging to 0.

We can construct such partitions systematically by replication or tiling of two subtrees $S, S'$ of $T_p$ and $T_q$ respectively, whose sets of leaves (childless nodes) have the same number of elements.

In order to proceed with our construction of explicit homeomorphisms between $Z_p$ and $Z_q$, we need to review some terminology from graph theory and data structures, especially as it pertains to trees. For a graph $G$ we will let $V(G)$ and $E(G)$ denote its vertex and edge sets respectively. We will say that two subgraphs of a graph are almost disjoint if they do not share a common edge. Since we will be concerned with rooted trees, we will also refer to nodes, child and parent nodes, etc. In particular for a subtree $S$ we will denote by $L(S)$ its collection of leaves, that is to say, the childless nodes of $S$, and by $L^*(S)$ the complement $V(S) \setminus L(S)$.

For our purposes it will be convenient to identify the vertex set $V(T_p)$ of the complete $p$-ary tree $T_p$ with the set of $p$-ary words $\Sigma^*_p$, consisting of finite strings over the alphabet $\Sigma_p = \{0, 1, 2, \ldots, p-1\}$, as we did in fig. 1. Thus the set of edges $E(T_p)$ consists of pairs $e = (w, wc)$ where $w \in \Sigma^*_p$ and $c \in \Sigma_p$ is a single character.

As is well-known, $\Sigma^*_p$ is a cancellative monoid with respect to concatenation, denoted by juxtaposition, with the empty word $\epsilon$ as identity element. We will denote the length of a word $w$ by $|w|$, with $|\epsilon| = 0$. The length is a monoid morphism $\Sigma^*_p \to \mathbb{N}_0$, namely $|vw| = |v| + |w|$. 

![Figure 1. First few levels of the binary tree $T_2$ homeomorphic to $Z_2$ and the Cantor set $C$.](image)
Recall that $v$ is a prefix of $w$ if $w = vw'$ for some word $w'$, i.e. if $v$ is a left factor of $w$. The empty word is a prefix of every word. The prefix relation is a partial order on words which we will denote by $\leq$.

In our model of $T_p$, the prefix relation coincides with the ancestor relation, namely $v \leq w$ if and only if $v$ is an ancestor of $w$, or equivalently $w$ is a descendant of $v$. In particular, if $w = a_0a_1 \cdots a_{n-1} \in \Sigma_p^*$, the unique path from $w$ to the root node $\epsilon$ is obtained by removing one character at a time from $w$ proceeding from right to left: $a_0 \cdots a_{n-1} \to a_0 \cdots a_{n-2} \cdots \to a_0 \to \epsilon$ (see fig. 1).

To a word $w = a_0a_1 \cdots a_{n-1} \in \Sigma_p^*$ we associate the natural number $\nu(w) = a_0 + a_1p + \ldots + a_{n-1}p^{n-1}$ in $[0,p^n)$ and the $p$-adic ball $\mathbb{B}_w = B(\nu(w),p^{-n+1})$ in $\mathbb{Z}_p$. The empty word $\epsilon$ is assigned the ball $\mathbb{B}_\epsilon = \mathbb{Z}_p$. Clearly every $p$-adic ball is of the form $\mathbb{B}_w$ for some word $w \in \Sigma_p^*$.

The relevance of word operations to the problem of constructing covers by balls is a consequence of the following simple observation.

**Lemma 3.1.** For two words $v, w \in \Sigma_p^*$, $v \leq w$ if and only if $\mathbb{B}_v \supseteq \mathbb{B}_w$.

**Proof.** Since every point of a $p$-adic ball is its center, $B(\nu(w),p^{-m+1}) \subseteq B(\nu(v),p^{-n+1})$ iff $|\nu(w) - \nu(v)|_p < p^{-n+1}$ and $B(\nu(w),p^{-m+1}) \subseteq B(\nu(w),p^{-n+1})$ iff $n \leq m$ and $\nu(w) \equiv \nu(v)$ mod $p^n$ iff $n \leq m$ and $a_i = b_i$ for $0 \leq i \leq n-1$, i.e. $v \leq w$. □

**Corollary 3.2.** $\mathbb{B}_v \cap \mathbb{B}_w \neq \emptyset$ if and only if either $v \leq w$ or $w \leq v$.

**Proof.** Two $p$-adic balls which are not disjoint satisfy an inclusion relation. □

Note that $\Sigma_p^*$ acts on $T_p$ on the left via prefixing, i.e. left multiplication on itself as vertex set, with the induced action on edges, $w(v,v') = (wv,wv')$. We will refer to this action as left translation or simply translation. Although $V(T_p) = \Sigma_p^*$ as sets, we will use slightly different notation for words when we are concerned with the monoid action.

**Definition.** A tiling of the complete $p$-ary tree $T_p$ consists of:

- A “tile” $S$, which is a nontrivial $(E(S) \neq \emptyset)$ finite subtree of $T_p$.
- A subset $\Omega \subseteq \Sigma_p^*$ such that $T_p$ is the almost disjoint union of the translates $\omega S$. We will denote this by $T_p = \bigcup_{\omega \in \Omega} \omega S$.

Note that this means that both every vertex of $T_p$, i.e. every word $w$, is of the form $w = \omega s$ where $\omega \in \Omega$ and $s \in V(S)$, and also every edge of $T_p$ is of the form $\omega e$ where $\omega \in \Omega$ and $e \in E(S)$.

**Lemma 3.3.** Any tile $S$ is a subtree rooted at $\epsilon$ and is therefore closed under prefixes, namely if $v \in V(S)$ and $w \leq v$ then $w \in V(S)$.

**Proof.** In a tiling, since the empty word $\epsilon$ must also have the form $\omega s$, we must have $\epsilon \in \Omega \cap V(S)$. In particular a tile $S$ is necessarily a subtree rooted at $\epsilon$, and therefore for any $v \in V(S)$, the unique path from $v$ to the root node is contained in $S$. In terms of words, this means $S$ is closed under prefixes. □
Lemma 3.4. For a nontrivial subtree $S$ of $T_p$ which is rooted at $\epsilon$, the following properties are equivalent:

1a) The balls $\{B_\ell : \ell \in L(S)\}$ corresponding to the leaves of $S$ form a partition of $\mathbb{Z}_p$.

1b) For any word $w \in \Sigma_p^*$, there is some $\ell \in L(S)$ such that either $w \leq \ell$ or $\ell \leq w$.

1c) For any word $w \in \Sigma_p^*$, either $w \in L^*(S) = V(S) \setminus L(S)$ or $\ell \leq w$ for some $\ell \in L(S)$.

1d) For any word $w \in \Sigma_p^*$, either $w \in V(S)$ or $\ell \leq w$ for some $\ell \in L(S)$.

Proof.

1a) $\implies$ 1b): Let $w \in \Sigma_p^*$. Since $\mathbb{B}_w \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_p = \bigcup_{\ell \in L(S)} B_\ell$, we must have $\mathbb{B}_w \cap B_\ell \neq \emptyset$ for some $\ell \in L(S)$, hence either $w \leq \ell$ or $\ell \leq w$.

1b) $\implies$ 1a): The union $U = \bigcup_{\ell \in L(S)} B_\ell$ is a clopen subset of $\mathbb{Z}_p$. If $U \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_p$, then $\mathbb{B}_w \cap U = \emptyset$ for some $w \in \Sigma_p^*$. Since $\mathbb{B}_w \cap B_\ell = \emptyset$ for every $\ell \in L(S)$, neither $w \leq \ell$ nor $\ell \leq w$ for every leaf $\ell \in L(S)$.

1b) $\iff$ 1c): If $\ell \leq w$ for some $\ell \in L(S)$, there is nothing to show; otherwise, observe that by Lemma 3.3, if $w < \ell$ for some $\ell \in L(S)$, then $w \in V(S) \setminus L(S)$ and conversely, if $w \in V(S) \setminus L(S)$ then, since $S$ is a finite subtree, any path in $S$ starting at $w$ and formed by successive descendants eventually ends in a leaf $\ell$, in which case $w < \ell$.

1c) $\iff$ 1d): The second follows trivially from the . Conversely if 1d) holds and $w \in \Sigma_p^*$ then if $\ell \leq w$ doesn't hold for any leaf, in particular $w \notin L(S)$, and by 1d) we must have $w \in V(S) \setminus L(S)$.

Proposition 3.5. For a nontrivial subtree $S$ of $T_p$ which is rooted at $\epsilon$, the following properties are equivalent:

1) The balls $\{B_\ell : \ell \in L(S)\}$ form a partition of $\mathbb{Z}_p$.

2) Each non-leaf node of $S$ has $p$ child nodes in $S$, i.e. $s\Sigma_p \subseteq V(S)$ if $s \in V(S) \setminus L(S)$. We will say that each such node splits completely in $S$.

Proof. Recall that such an $S$ is closed under prefixes.

1) $\implies$ 2): Suppose $s \in V(S) \setminus L(S)$ and let $c \in \Sigma_p$. By 1) there is some $\ell \in L(S)$ such that $\ell \leq sc$ or $sc \leq \ell$. In the latter case $sc \in V(S)$ and we are done. If $\ell \leq sc$ then we are also done if equality holds. Otherwise, since $|c| = 1$, then $\ell \leq s$, but since $\ell$ is a leaf, this implies $s = \ell \in L(S)$, contradicting the initial assumption.

2) $\implies$ 1): If $\{B_\ell : \ell \in L(S)\}$ does not cover $\mathbb{Z}_p$, then by Lemma 3.4, there is some $w \in \Sigma_p^*$ such that neither $w \leq \ell$ nor $\ell \leq w$ for all $\ell \in L(S)$. Clearly $w \notin V(S)$ since otherwise some leaf $\ell$ is a descendant of $w$, i.e. $w \leq \ell$. Let $s \in V(S)$ be the first node of $S$ encountered along the path from $w$ to the root node $\epsilon$. The previous node on this path is of the form $sc$ with $c \in \Sigma_p$ and $sc \notin V(S)$. Since $s \leq w$ but no leaf prefixes $w$, we must have $s \in V(S) \setminus L(S)$ yet $sc \notin V(S)$.

Theorem 3.6. For a nontrivial subtree $S$ of $T_p$ which is rooted at $\epsilon$, the following properties are equivalent:

1) $S$ is a tile in some tiling $T_p = \bigsqcup_{\omega \in \Omega} \omega S$.

2) The balls $\{B_\ell : \ell \in L(S)\}$ form a partition of $\mathbb{Z}_p$. 
(3) All $p$ child nodes of any non-leaf node of $S$ belong to $S$.
In addition, if these properties hold, then $\Omega$ may be chosen to be the submonoid of $\Sigma^*_p$ generated by the leaves of $S$.

Proof. The equivalence of (2) and (3) has already been established in Proposition 3.5.

• (1) $\implies$ (3): Suppose that $S$ is a tile but that (3) doesn’t hold. This means there is a word $s \in V(S) \setminus L(S)$ which does not split completely in $S$, i.e. such that $sc \notin V(S)$ for some character $c \in \Sigma_p$. Choose such an $s$ having minimal length. Thus, if $\sigma \in V(S) \setminus L(S)$ with $|\sigma| < |s|$ then $\sigma$ must split completely in $S$.

Consider the edge $(s, sc) \in E(T_p)$. Since $S$ is a tile, there is some $\omega \in \Omega$ and an edge $(\sigma, \sigma c') \in E(S)$ such that $(s, sc) = \omega(\sigma, \sigma c')$. Then $c = c'$ and $s = \omega \sigma$ with $(\sigma, \sigma c) \in E(S)$. Since $sc \notin V(S)$, we have $(s, sc) \notin E(S)$ and in particular $\omega \neq \epsilon$. Hence $|\sigma| < |s|$. In addition since $sc \in V(S)$, $\sigma$ is not a leaf, so $\sigma \in V(S) \setminus L(S)$. Thus $\sigma \Sigma_p \subseteq V(S)$. On the other hand, since also $s \in V(S) \setminus L(S)$, $s$ has some child, i.e. $sb \in V(S)$ for some $b \in \Sigma_p$, so $(s, sb) \in E(S)$. But then $(s, sb) = \omega(\sigma, \sigma b) \in E(S) \cap \omega E(S)$. However, since $\omega \neq \epsilon$ the subtrees $S$ and $\omega S$ are almost disjoint. Thus we arrive at a contradiction which implies that (3) holds.

• (2) $\iff$ (3) $\implies$ (1): We will show that given (2) or the equivalent property (3), $S$ is a tile with $\Omega$ the submonoid of $\Sigma^*_p$ generated by $L(S)$. We will show first that any $w \in \Sigma^*_p$ is of the form $w = \omega s$ for some $\omega \in \Omega$ and $s \in V(S)$. This is trivial if $w \in V(S)$, thus assume $w \notin V(S)$. Then by (2) and Lemma 3.4, there is some leaf $\ell_1 \in L(S)$ such that $\ell_1 \leq w$. Thus $w = \ell_1 w_1$ for some word $w_1$. If $w_1 \in V(S)$ we are done, otherwise there is some $\ell_2 \in L(S)$ such that $\ell_2 \leq w_1$ and then $w = \ell_1 \ell_2 w_2$ for some $w_2$. Proceeding in this manner we arrive at a factorization $w = \ell_1 \cdots \ell_n s$ with $\ell_j \in L(S)$ and $s \in V(S)$, thus $w \in \omega V(S)$ for $w = \ell_1 \cdots \ell_n \in \Omega$. We may assume that $s \in V(S) \setminus L(S)$ since otherwise we can incorporate $s$ into the product of leaves and replace it with the empty word $\epsilon$ which is indeed in $V(S) \setminus L(S)$ since $S$ is nontrivial.

Now consider any edge $(w, wc) \in E(T_p)$, with $w \in \Sigma^*_p$ and $c \in \Sigma_p$. Write $w = \omega s$ with $\omega \in \Omega$ and $s \in V(S) \setminus L(S)$. By (3) $sc \in V(S)$, hence $(w, wc) = \omega(s, sc) \in \omega E(S)$.

Finally, let us see that the translates $\omega S$ are almost disjoint. Let $\alpha, \beta \in \Omega$. We need to show that if $\alpha E(S) \cap \beta E(S) \neq \emptyset$ then $\alpha = \beta$. If the intersection is nonempty, there are edges $(s_j, s_j c_j) \in E(S)$ for $j = 1, 2$ such that $\alpha(s_1, s_1 c_1) = \beta(s_2, s_2 c_2)$, i.e. $\alpha s_1 = \beta s_2$ and $\alpha s_1 c_1 = \beta s_2 c_2$. This implies $c_1 = c_2$. Denote the common value by $c$. Note that $s_j \in V(S) \setminus L(S)$. Since $\Omega$ is the submonoid generated by $L(S)$, we may write $\alpha = \ell_1 \cdots \ell_n$ and $\beta = \ell'_1 \cdots \ell'_m$ with $\ell_i, \ell'_j \in L(S)$ for all $i, j$. We thus have two factorizations

$$\ell_1 \cdots \ell_n s_1 = \ell'_1 \cdots \ell'_m s_2$$

where $s_j \in V(S) \setminus L(S)$. We will show such a factorization is unique, imitating the proof of unique factorization of integers into primes. Without loss of generality assume $|\ell_1| \leq |\ell'_1|$. Then in fact $\ell_1 \leq \ell'_1$ and, since both are leaves of $S$, $\ell_1 = \ell'_1$. Cancelling these terms leaves a shorter relation.
We must have $n = m$, otherwise eventually we would arrive at a relation of the form $s_1 = \ell_1' \cdots \ell_k' s_2$ or $s_2 = \ell_1'' \cdots \ell_k'' s_1$ with $\ell_j'' \in L(S)$. In the first case $\ell_1' \leq s_1$, which since $\ell_1' \in L(S)$ and $s_1 \in V(S)$, can only hold if $\ell_1' = s_1$, contradicting $s_1 \notin L(S)$, and similarly in the second case. Since $n = m$, successive cancellations show that $\ell_j = \ell_j'$ for all $j$ and $s_1 = s_2$. In particular $\alpha = \beta$.

\textbf{Remark 3.7.} It may be shown that given a tile $S$, the only possible choice for the subset $\omega$ such that $T_\omega$ is the disjoint union of the translates $\{\omega S : \omega \in \Omega\}$, is in fact the submonoid generated by the leaves of $S$, which we will denote by $\Omega = \langle L(S) \rangle$.

4. $p$-ADIC HOMEOMORPHISMS VIA TILING

Theorem 3.6 shows that we may construct many tilings of $T_p$ via the process of completely splitting nodes into all their possible $p$ children. If $S$ is such a tile, then translation by its leaves covers all of $T_p$ in almost disjoint fashion, i.e. $S$ “tiles” $T_p$. We construct $\Omega = \langle L(S) \rangle$ successively as $\Omega = \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} L_n(S)$ where

$$L_0(S) = \{\epsilon\}, \quad L_n(S) = \{\ell_1 \cdots \ell_n : \ell_1, \ldots, \ell_n \in L(S)\} \quad (n \geq 1).$$

We can replicate $S$ by defining

$$S_0 = S, \quad S_n = \bigsqcup_{k=0}^{n} L_k(S)S$$

where $L_k(S)S = \bigsqcup_{k} \ell_1 \cdots \ell_k S$ with each $\ell_j$ ranging over $L(S)$. For example, $S_1 = S \sqcup L_1(S)S = S \sqcup \bigsqcup_{\ell \in L(S)} \ell S$. It is easy to check that $L(S_n) = L_{n+1}(S)$ for all $n \geq 0$. Note that $S_{n+1}$ is obtained by adding to $S_n$ the translates of $S$ at each element of $L(S_n)$.

Since each $S_n$ is easily verified to be a tile, the balls corresponding to its leaves $L(S_n) = L_{n+1}(S)$ form a nested sequence of partitions of $\mathbb{Z}_p$ which as we saw in §2, defines a homeomorphism of the inverse limit space with $\mathbb{Z}_p$. Note that by the unique factorization result in the proof of Theorem 3.6, the number of elements in the $n$th partition is $\# L_{n+1}(S) = \# L(S)^{n+1}$ for all $n \geq 0$. Also note that the number of descendants of an element of $L(S_n)$ that belong to $L(S_{n+1})$ is exactly $\# L(S)$. This means that in such a nested sequence of partitions every clopen ball is subdivided in to $\# L(S)$ clopen balls in the next partition.

As explained at the beginning of §3, to define a homeomorphism between $\mathbb{Z}_p$ and $\mathbb{Z}_q$ it suffices to construct tiles $S$ of $T_p$ and $S'$ of $T_q$ having the same number of leaves and assign to them the partitions $\{U_n = L(S_n)\}$ and $\{V_n = L(S'_n)\}$ described above. If we construct $S$ in $n$ steps by successively completely splitting certain nodes starting with the root node, then the number of leaves of $S$ is easily verified to be $1 + (p - 1)(s_0 + s_1 + \cdots + s_k)$ where $s_j$ is the number of nodes completely split at the $j$th step. In other words, $N = \# L(S) = 1 + (p - 1)s$ where $s$ is the total number of splittings, and similarly $N' = \# L(S') = 1 + (q - 1)s'$. Hence we wish to find positive integer values of $s, s'$ such that

$$1 + (p - 1)s = 1 + (q - 1)s'.$$
The general solution of this Diophantine equation is \( s = (q - 1)m/d \) and \( s' = (p - 1)m/d \) where \( d = \gcd(p - 1, q - 1) \) is the greatest common factor of \( p - 1 \) and \( q - 1 \) and \( m \in \mathbb{N} \).

Let us study the process in more detail. We aim to assign to any solution \((x, y) = (s, s')\) of the Diophantine equation \((p - 1)x = (q - 1)y\) a homeomorphism between \(\mathbb{Z}_p\) and \(\mathbb{Z}_q\). For this, we shall first build from such a solution tiles for \(T_p\) and \(T_q\). This provides a homeomorphism as already explained, and we shall describe it more explicitly using blocks of digits.

Fix a number \( s \geq 1 \) and a prime \( p \). Our goal is to find a tile \( S \) of \( T_p \) with \( \#L(S) = 1 + (p - 1)s \). In order to do so, we fix a partition \( s - 1 = s_1 + \ldots + s_n \) where, \( s_k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \) and \( 0 \leq s_k \leq 1 + (p - 1)(1 + \ldots + s_{k-1}) \). Then the tile \( S \) is constructed as follows:

1. Define \( S^0 = \{\epsilon\} \).
2. Let \( S^1 = S^0 \sqcup \Sigma_p \).
3. For \( k \geq 1 \), choose \( w_1, \ldots, w_{s_k} \in L(S^k) \) and let
   \[
   S^{k+1} = S^k \sqcup \left( \bigcup_{i=1}^{s_k} w_i \Sigma_p \right).
   \]

Then \( \#L(S^{k+1}) = 1 + (p - 1)(1 + s_1 + \ldots + s_k) \) for all \( 2 \leq k \leq n \), in particular \( S = S^{n+1} \) satisfies \( \#L(S) = 1 + (p - 1)s \). As mentioned above, each \( s_k \) indicates the number of leaves we have to split in \( S^k \) to obtain \( S^{k+1} \), which makes sense since \( s_k \leq \#L(S^k) \) by the bounds above. In particular we always take \( s_0 = 1 \) so that our tree is not trivial. Note that any tile \( S \) with \( \#L(S) = 1 + (p - 1)s \) can be recovered for a suitable choice of leaves.

Before describing the associated homeomorphism, we show there is a more systematic way of constructing \( S \). We consider a total order \( \leq' \) in \( \Sigma_p \), which we will always take as the usual order in \( \Sigma_p = \{0, \ldots, p-1\} \). This induces a total order \( \leq' \) in \( \Sigma_k \) as follows: let \( w_1, \ldots, w_r, w'_1, \ldots, w'_s \in \Sigma_p \), then \( w = w_1 \cdots w_r \leq' w' = w'_1 \cdots w'_s \) if and only if \( w = w' \), or \( r < s \), or \( r = s \) and there exists \( 1 \leq i \leq r \) such that \( w_1 = w'_1, \ldots, w_{i-1} = w'_{i-1}, w_i <' w'_i \). This is a natural choice in terms of the tree \( T_p \) since we are ordering the nodes first by length as words (which corresponds to depth inside the tree), and nodes of the same depth are ordered left-to-right according to the convention of fig. 1. However the chosen order could be replaced by a total order with the property \( w < w' \) whenever \( |w| < |w'| \) for most of what follows, except for the final explicit expression of homeomorphisms in digits, which is nicer when using this particular order.

We will say that a tile \( S \) is explicit if it satisfies that leaves are chosen according to the order \( \leq' \). We present some examples of explicit and not explicit tiles in \( \mathbb{Z}_3 \) in figs. 2 and 3, where the tiles are represented by black dots.

It is easy to check that explicitness implies that there is some \( m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \) such that for every \( l \in L(S) \), \( |l| \in \{m, m + 1\} \). Also, up to changing \( n \) in the partition of \( s - 1 \), we can assume the integers \( s_k \) are of the form \( s_k = p^k \) for all \( 1 \leq k \leq n - 1 \) and \( s_n > 0 \). In that case, the tile \( S \) is constructed by successively splitting all nodes of \( T_p \) of length \( < n \) together with the first \( s_n \) nodes of length \( n \) (according to \( \leq' \)), \( m \) above is equal to \( n \) and at least one leave of \( S \) has length equal to \( n + 1 \). For such \( n \), we denote \( L = n + 1 \geq 1 \),
We now present an example for Example 1.

\[
\phi \text{ of which satisfies that all leaves of } S \text{ by } s \text{ is at least one leaf in } L.
\]

It is also possible to compute the numbers of leaves \( n_{L-1}, n_L \) of lengths \( L - 1 \) and \( L \) respectively in terms of \( s \). Indeed, by the previous discussion \( s_n = s_{L-1} = s-(1+\ldots+p^{L-2}) \) is the number of words of length \( L-1 \) not in \( L(S) \) (since they are splitted), thus one easily sees that \( n_{L-1} = p^{L-1}-s_{L-1} = (1+\ldots+p^{L-1})-s \) and \( n_L = p \cdot s_{L-1} \). Moreover, if we let \( A = L(S) \cap \Sigma_p^{L-1} \) and let \( B = \Sigma_p^{L-1} \setminus A \), then \( L(S) = A \cup (B \Sigma_p) \), unless \( A = \emptyset \), in which case \( L(S) = B \Sigma_p = \Sigma_p^L \) (we are using here our particular choice of order \( \leq' \)).

Finally, we introduce the blocks of digits. Given \((s, s') \in \mathbb{N}^2\) such that \((p-1)s = (q-1)s'\), we can apply the previous discussion to get explicit tiles \( S \) of \( T_p \) and \( S' \) of \( T_q \) such that \#\( L(S) = \#L(S') = (p-1)s + 1 \). If we choose a bijection \( \tau : L(S) \rightarrow L(S') \), then we can define a homeomorphism \( \varphi : \mathbb{Z}_p \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_q \) where the image of \( a = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k p^k \in \mathbb{Z}_p \) is determined as follows: regarding \( a \) as the infinite word \( a_0 \cdot a_1 \cdots a_n \cdots \in \sum_{p \geq 0} \), we can uniquely factorize \( a = l_1 \cdot l_2 \cdots l_n \cdots \) with \( l_n \in L(S) \) for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), and let \( \varphi(a) = \tau(l_1) \cdot \tau(l_2) \cdots \tau(l_n) \cdots \).

4.1. Examples.

Example 1. We now present and example for \( p = 3, q = 5 \). The associated Diophantine equation is \( 2x = 4y \), whose minimal positive solution is \((s, s') = (2, 1)\). First of all, we construct the explicit tile \( S \) of \( T_3 \) represented in fig. 4, whose parameters are \( L = 2, n_1 = 2, n_2 = 3, \#L(S) = 5 \) and \( A = \{(1), (2)\}, B = \{(0, 0), (0, 1), (0, 2)\} \). Next, we construct the explicit tile \( S' \) of \( T_5 \), see fig. 5, with parameters \( L' = 1, n'_0 = 0, n'_1 = 5, \#L(S') = 5 \) and \( A' = \emptyset, B' = \{(0), (1), (2), (3), (4)\} \).
Consider the bijection \( \tau: L(S) \to L(S') \) with \( \tau(0, 0) = (0), \tau(1) = (1), \tau(2) = (2), \tau(0, 1) = (3), \tau(0, 2) = (4) \). Then from \( S \) and \( S' \) we can construct the sequence of partitions \( U_n = L_n(S) \) and \( V_n = L_n(S') \) for \( n \geq 1 \) as in §4. Note that for \( v \in L_n(S), w \in L_{n+1}(S) \), we have \( w \) is contained in \( v \) as balls if and only if \( v \) is a prefix of \( w \) by theorem 3.1. Then the bijection \( \tau \) trivially extends to a bijection \( \tau: \{U_n\} \to \{V_n\} \) by letting \( \tau(l_1 \cdots l_n) = \tau(l_1) \cdots \tau(l_n) \), which respects prefix relation, thus inclusion of balls. In other words, \( \tau \) gives isomorphic inclusion relations for \( \{U_n\} \) and \( \{V_n\} \).

Then to compute the image of \( a = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k p^k \in \mathbb{Z}_3 \), we have to factorize \( a \) using the elements of \( L(S) \) and apply \( \tau \) to this factorization. For example, the image of \( a = (2, 1, 0, 1, 0, 2, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0, \ldots) = (2) \cdot (0,1) \cdot (0,2) \cdot (0,0) \cdot (0,1) \cdot (0,0) \cdot (0,0) \cdot (0,\ldots) \) is \( \varphi(a) = (2, 1, 3, 4, 0, 0, 3, 0, \ldots) \).

We can also represent the bijection \( \tau \) using colours as follows:

Two nodes are of the same colour if \( \tau \) maps one to the other. Then \( \varphi \) can be represented by the following colourings.
These colourings show the fractal flavour of this construction. Note we are only colouring the nodes corresponding elements of \( L_n(S) \) or \( L_n(S') \), so not all nodes in \( T_3 \) (i.e. not all balls in \( \mathbb{Z}_3 \)) are coloured. In terms of digits, the fact that the node corresponding to 0 in \( T_3 \) is not coloured corresponds to the fact that only knowing the first digit of \( a \) is 0 is not enough to determine the first digit of its image, we need to know the second digit too. This is allowed since an element of \( \mathbb{Z}_3 \) corresponds to an infinite sequence of digits. This behaviour explains why we talk about blocks of digits, because the image of an element is determined using its factorization by elements of \( L(S) \).
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