

# UNIVOQUE BASES OF REAL NUMBERS: LOCAL DIMENSION, DEVIL'S STAIRCASE AND ISOLATED POINTS

DERONG KONG, WENXIA LI, FAN LÜ, ZHIQIANG WANG, AND JIAYI XU

ABSTRACT. Given a positive integer  $M$  and a real number  $x > 0$ , let  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  be the set of all bases  $q \in (1, M + 1]$  for which there exists a unique sequence  $(d_i) = d_1 d_2 \dots$  with each digit  $d_i \in \{0, 1, \dots, M\}$  satisfying

$$x = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{d_i}{q^i}.$$

The sequence  $(d_i)$  is called a  $q$ -*expansion* of  $x$ . In this paper we investigate the local dimension of  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  and prove a ‘variation principle’ for unique non-integer base expansions. We also determine the critical values of  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  that when  $x$  passes the first critical value the set  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  changes from a set with positive Hausdorff dimension to a countable set, and when  $x$  passes the second critical value the set  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  changes from an infinite set to a singleton. Denote by  $\mathbf{U}(x)$  the set of all unique  $q$ -expansions of  $x$  for  $q \in \mathcal{U}(x)$ . We give the Hausdorff dimension of  $\mathbf{U}(x)$  and show that the dimensional function  $x \mapsto \dim_H \mathbf{U}(x)$  is a non-increasing Devil’s staircase. Finally, we investigate the topological structure of  $\mathcal{U}(x)$ . In contrast with  $x = 1$  that  $\mathcal{U}(1)$  has no isolated points, we prove that for typical  $x > 0$  the set  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  contains isolated points.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Given a positive integer  $M$  and a real number  $q \in (1, M + 1]$ , each point  $x \in [0, M/(q - 1)]$  can be written as

$$(1.1) \quad x = \pi_q((d_i)) := \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{d_i}{q^i}, \quad d_i \in \{0, 1, \dots, M\} \quad \forall i \geq 1.$$

The infinite sequence  $(d_i) = d_1 d_2 \dots$  is called a  $q$ -*expansion* of  $x$  with respect to the *alphabet*  $\{0, 1, \dots, M\}$ .

Expansions in non-integer bases were pioneered by Rényi [32] and Parry [31]. Different from the integer base expansions Sidorov [33] (see also [9]) showed that for any  $q \in (1, M + 1)$  Lebesgue almost every  $x \in [0, M/(q - 1)]$  has a continuum of  $q$ -expansions. Furthermore, Erdős et al. [16, 17, 18] showed that for any  $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\aleph_0\}$  there exist  $q \in (1, M + 1)$  and  $x \in [0, M/(q - 1)]$  such that  $x$  has precisely  $k$  different  $q$ -expansions (see also cf. [35]). In particular, there is a great interest in unique  $q$ -expansions due to its close connections with

---

*Date:* November 15, 2019.

*2010 Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 11A63, Secondary: 37B10, 26A30, 28A80, 68R15.

*Key words and phrases.* univoque bases, Hausdorff dimension, Devil’s staircase, critical values, isolated points.

open dynamical systems (cf. [12, 20, 23]). For more information on expansions in non-integer bases we refer to the surveys [22, 34] and the survey chapter [14].

For  $q > 1$  let  $\mathcal{U}_q$  be the *univoque set* of  $x \in I_q := [0, M/(q-1)]$  having a unique  $q$ -expansion, and let  $\mathbf{U}_q := \pi_q^{-1}(\mathcal{U}_q)$  be the set of corresponding  $q$ -expansions. Dual to the univoque set  $\mathcal{U}_q$  we consider in this paper the set of *univoque bases* of real numbers. For  $x \geq 0$  let  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  be the set of bases  $q \in (1, M+1]$  such that  $x$  has a unique  $q$ -expansion, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{U}(x) = \{q \in (1, M+1] : x \in \mathcal{U}_q\}.$$

Clearly, for  $x = 0$  the set  $\mathcal{U}(0) = (1, M+1]$ , because for each  $q \in (1, M+1]$  the point 0 always has a unique  $q$ -expansion  $0^\infty = 00\cdots$ . So, it is interesting to investigate the set  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  for  $x > 0$ .

When  $x = 1$ , the set  $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}(1)$  is well understood. Erdős et al. [16] showed that  $\mathcal{U}$  is a Lebesgue null set of first category but it is uncountable. Later Daróczy and Kátai [11] showed that  $\mathcal{U}$  has full Hausdorff dimension. Clearly, the largest element of  $\mathcal{U}$  is  $M+1$  since 1 has the unique expansion  $M^\infty = MM\cdots$  in base  $M+1$ . Komornik and Loreti [24, 25] found the smallest element  $q_{KL} = q_{KL}(M)$  of  $\mathcal{U}$ , which was called the *Komornik-Loreti constant* by Glendinning and Sidorov [20]. Furthermore, they showed in [26] that its topological closure  $\overline{\mathcal{U}}$  is a *Cantor set*: a non-empty compact set with neither isolated nor interior points. Hence,

$$(1.2) \quad (1, M+1] \setminus \overline{\mathcal{U}} = \bigcup (q_0, q_0^*),$$

where the left endpoints  $q_0$  run through 1 and the set  $\overline{\mathcal{U}} \setminus \mathcal{U}$ , and the right endpoints  $q_0^*$  run through a subset  $\mathcal{U}^*$  of  $\mathcal{U}$  (cf. [12]). In particular, each left endpoint  $q_0$  is algebraic, while each right endpoint  $q_0^*$ , called a *de Vries-Komornik number*, is transcendental (cf. [28]). Recently, Kalle et al. [21] showed that the set  $\mathcal{U}$  has more weight close to  $M+1$ . For the detailed description of the local structure of  $\mathcal{U}$  we refer to the recent paper [2].

However, for a general  $x > 0$  we know very little about  $\mathcal{U}(x)$ . Lü, Tan and Wu [30] showed that for  $M = 1$  and  $x \in (0, 1)$  the set  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  is a Lebesgue null set but have full Hausdorff dimension. Recently, Dajani et al. [10] showed that the algebraic difference  $\mathcal{U}(x) - \mathcal{U}(x)$  contains an interval for any  $x \in (0, 1]$ . The smallest element of  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  was investigated in [27]. In this paper we will investigate the set  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  from the following perspectives. (i) We will determine the local dimension of  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  and establish a so-called ‘variation principle’ in unique non-integer base expansions; (ii) We will determine the Hausdorff dimension of the symbolic set  $\mathbf{U}(x)$  consisting of all expansions of  $x$  in base  $q \in \mathcal{U}(x)$ , and show that the function  $x \mapsto \dim_H \mathbf{U}(x)$  is a non-increasing Devil’s staircase (see Figure 2); (iii) We will determine the critical values of  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  that when  $x$  passes the first critical value the set  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  changes from positive Hausdorff dimension to a countable set, and when  $x$  passes the second critical value the set  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  changes from an infinite set to a singleton; (iv) In contrast with  $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}(1)$  we will show that typically the set  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  contains isolated points.

Our first result focuses on the local dimension of  $\mathcal{U}(x)$ .

**Theorem 1.** For any  $x > 0$  and for any  $q \in (1, q_x] \setminus \overline{\mathcal{W}}$  we have

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \dim_H(\mathcal{W}(x) \cap (q - \delta, q + \delta)) = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \dim_H(\mathcal{U}_q \cap (x - \delta, x + \delta)).$$

Theorem 1 can be viewed as a ‘variation principle’ in unique non-integer base expansions. Recall from [13] the two dimensional univoque set

$$\mathbb{U} = \{(z, p) : z \text{ has a unique } p\text{-expansion}\}.$$

Then the left hand side in Theorem 1 is the local dimension of the vertical slice  $\mathbb{U} \cap \{z = x\} = \mathcal{W}(x)$  at the point  $(x, q)$ , and the right hand side gives the local dimension of the horizontal slice  $\mathbb{U} \cap \{p = q\} = \mathcal{U}_q$  at the same point  $(x, q)$ . So Theorem 1 states that for any  $x > 0$  and any  $q \in (1, q_x] \setminus \overline{\mathcal{W}}$  the local dimension of  $\mathbb{U}$  at the point  $(x, q)$  through the vertical slice is the same as that through the horizontal slice.

Let  $\{0, 1, \dots, M\}^{\mathbb{N}}$  be the set of all sequences  $(d_i) = d_1 d_2 \dots$  over the alphabet  $\{0, 1, \dots, M\}$ . Equipped with the ordering topology on  $\{0, 1, \dots, M\}^{\mathbb{N}}$  induced by the metric

$$(1.3) \quad \rho((c_i), (d_i)) = (M + 1)^{-\inf\{i \geq 1 : c_i \neq d_i\}}$$

we are able to determine the Hausdorff dimension of any subset of  $\{0, 1, \dots, M\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ .

Note that  $\mathbf{U}_q = \pi_q^{-1}(\mathcal{U}_q) \subset \{0, 1, \dots, M\}^{\mathbb{N}}$  is the symbolic horizontal slice of the two dimensional univoque set  $\mathbb{U}$ . The following result for the Hausdorff dimension of  $\mathbf{U}_q$  was established in [23] and [3] (see Figure 1).




FIGURE 1. The figure of  $\psi : q \mapsto \dim_H \mathbf{U}_q$  with  $M = 1$ .  $\psi(q)$  is positive if and only if  $q > q_{KL} \approx 1.78723$ , and  $\psi(q) = 1$  if and only if  $q = 2$ .

**Theorem 1.1** ([23, 3]). *The dimensional function  $\psi : q \mapsto \dim_H \mathbf{U}_q$  is a non-decreasing Devil's staircase on  $(1, M + 1]$ .*

- $\psi$  is non-decreasing and continuous on  $(1, M + 1]$ ;
- $\psi$  is locally constant almost everywhere on  $(1, M + 1]$ ;
- $\psi(q) \in (0, 1]$  if and only if  $q > q_{KL}$ . Furthermore,  $\psi(q) = 1$  only when  $q = M + 1$ .

The detailed study of the plateaus of  $\psi$ , i.e., the largest intervals for which  $\psi$  is constant, can be found in [1]. For the bifurcation set of  $\psi$  which is the set of positions that  $\psi$  has jumps, we refer to [5].

For  $x > 0$  let  $\Phi_x(q) = x_1(q)x_2(q)\dots$  be the quasi-greedy  $q$ -expansion of  $x$  (see Section 2 for its definition). Now we define the symbolic set of univoque bases by

$$\mathbf{U}(x) := \{\Phi_x(q) : q \in \mathcal{U}(x)\}.$$

Observe that for each  $q \in \mathcal{U}(x)$  the sequence  $\Phi_x(q) \in \mathbf{U}(x)$  is the unique  $q$ -expansion of  $x$ . So, the map  $q \mapsto \Phi_x(q)$  is bijective from  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  to  $\mathbf{U}(x)$ . In fact, we will show in Proposition 3.6 that the map  $q \mapsto \Phi_x(q)$  is locally bi-Hölder continuous.

Observe that  $\mathbf{U}(x) = \Phi_x^{-1}(\mathcal{U}(x))$  is the symbolic vertical slice of the two dimensional univoque set  $\mathbb{U}$ . Comparing with Theorem 1.1 our second main result gives the Hausdorff dimension of  $\mathbf{U}(x)$ , and shows that the dimensional function  $x \mapsto \dim_H \mathbf{U}(x)$  is a non-increasing Devil's staircase (see Figure 2).




FIGURE 2. The figure of  $\phi : x \mapsto \dim_H \mathbf{U}(x)$  with  $M = 1$ .  $\phi(x)$  is positive if and only if  $x < x_{KL} \approx 1.27028$ , and  $\phi(x) = 1$  if and only if  $x \leq 1$ .

**Theorem 2.** For any  $x > 0$  the Hausdorff dimension of  $\mathbf{U}(x)$  is given by

$$\dim_H \mathbf{U}(x) = \dim_H \mathbf{U}_{q_x},$$

where

$$(1.4) \quad q_x := \min \left\{ 1 + M, 1 + \frac{M}{x} \right\}.$$

Consequently, the dimensional function  $\phi : x \mapsto \dim_H \mathbf{U}(x)$  is a non-increasing Devil's staircase on  $(0, \infty)$ .

- (i)  $\phi$  is non-increasing and continuous on  $(0, \infty)$ ;
- (ii)  $\phi$  is locally constant almost everywhere;
- (iii)  $\phi(x) \in (0, 1]$  if and only if  $x < \frac{M}{q_{KL}-1}$ . Furthermore,  $\phi(x) = 1$  if and only if  $x \leq 1$ .

We remark that the base  $q_x$  defined in (1.4) is the largest base in  $(1, M + 1]$  such that the given  $x$  has an expansion with respect to the alphabet  $\{0, 1, \dots, M\}$ . Recall from [8] that the *generalized Golden ratio* is defined by

$$(1.5) \quad q_G = q_G(M) := \begin{cases} k + 1 & \text{if } M = 2k; \\ \frac{k+1+\sqrt{k^2+6k+5}}{2} & \text{if } M = 2k + 1. \end{cases}$$

Note that  $q_{KL} = q_{KL}(M)$  is the smallest element of  $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}(1)$  and  $1 < q_G < q_{KL} < M + 1$ . As a compensation of Theorem 1.1 the following result on the critical values of  $\mathcal{U}_q = \pi_q(\mathbf{U}_q)$  was first proven by Glendinning and Sidorov [20] for  $M = 1$  and then proven in [29] for all  $M \geq 2$ . Furthermore, the Hausdorff dimension of  $\mathcal{U}_q$  was given in [23]. For a set  $A$  we denote by  $|A|$  its cardinality.

**Theorem 1.2** ([20, 29]). For any  $q \in (1, M + 1]$  the Hausdorff dimension of  $\mathcal{U}_q$  is given by

$$\dim_H \mathcal{U}_q = \frac{\dim_H \mathbf{U}_q}{\log q}.$$

Furthermore, we have the following properties.

- If  $q \in (1, q_G]$ , then  $\mathcal{U}_q = \left\{ 0, \frac{M}{q-1} \right\}$ ;
- If  $q \in (q_G, q_{KL})$ , then  $|\mathcal{U}_q| = \aleph_0$ ;
- If  $q = q_{KL}$ , then  $|\mathcal{U}_q| = 2^{\aleph_0}$  and  $\dim_H \mathcal{U}_q = 0$ ;
- If  $q \in (q_{KL}, M + 1]$ , then  $\dim_H \mathcal{U}_q \in (0, 1]$ . Furthermore,  $\dim_H \mathcal{U}_q = 1$  if and only if  $q = M + 1$ .

Here in Theorem 1.2 and throughout the paper we keep using base  $M + 1$  logarithms. By Theorems 2 and 1.2 we are able to determine the critical values of  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  for  $x > 0$  and  $M \geq 1$ . Set

$$x_G := \frac{M}{q_G - 1} \quad \text{and} \quad x_{KL} := \frac{M}{q_{KL} - 1}.$$

Since  $1 < q_G < q_{KL} < M + 1$ , it yields that  $1 < x_{KL} < x_G$ . Furthermore, by (1.4) it follows that  $q_{x_G} = q_G$  and  $q_{x_{KL}} = q_{KL}$ .

**Theorem 3.** *Let  $M \geq 1$ . The set  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  has zero Lebesgue measure for any  $x > 0$ .*

- (i) *If  $x \in (0, 1]$ , then  $\dim_H \mathcal{U}(x) = 1$ ;*
- (ii) *If  $x \in (1, x_{KL})$ , then  $0 < \dim_H \mathcal{U}(x) < 1$ ;*
- (iii) *If  $x \in [x_{KL}, x_G)$ , then  $|\mathcal{U}(x)| = \aleph_0$ ;*
- (iv) *If  $x \geq x_G$ , then  $\mathcal{U}(x) = \{q_x\}$ .*

*Remark 1.3.*

- Theorem 3 (i) was first established in [30] for  $M = 1$ .
- In Lemma 4.5 we present a stronger result of Theorem 3 (ii): for  $x \in (1, x_{KL})$  we have

$$0 < \dim_H \mathcal{U}_{q_x} \leq \dim_H \mathcal{U}(x) \leq \max_{q \in \overline{\mathcal{U}(x)}} \dim_H \mathcal{U}_q < 1.$$

- In contrast with Theorem 1.2 for the univoque set  $\mathcal{U}_q$ , Theorem 3 shows that there is no  $x > 0$  such that the set  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  is uncountable but has zero Hausdorff dimension.

Recall that  $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}(1)$  has no isolated points and its closure  $\overline{\mathcal{U}}$  is a Cantor set. Then it is natural to ask whether this is true for  $\mathcal{U}(x)$ ? Our third main result shows that typically this is not the case. Let

$$X_{iso} := \{x \in (0, \infty) : \mathcal{U}(x) \text{ contains isolated points}\}.$$

We show that for  $M = 1$  the set  $X_{iso}$  is dense in  $(0, \infty)$ .

**Theorem 4.** *Let  $M \geq 1$ . The set  $X_{iso}$  is dense in  $[0, 1]$ . In particular, for  $M = 1$  the set  $X_{iso}$  is dense in  $(0, \infty)$ .*

*Remark 1.4.*

- For  $M \geq 1$  we show in Lemma 5.2 a slightly stronger property: for any  $x \in [0, 1]$  any neighborhood of  $x$  in  $X_{iso}$  contains an interval.
- For  $M = 1$  we show in Proposition 5.3 that  $X_{iso} \supset (1, \infty)$ . This means for any  $x > 1$  the set  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  contains isolated points.

The rest of the paper is arranged in the following way. In the next section we introduce the greedy and quasi-greedy expansions, and present some useful properties needed later in our proofs. In Section 3 we investigate the local dimension of  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  and prove Theorem 1. Based on this we are able to calculate in Section 4 the Hausdorff dimension of the symbolic set  $\mathbf{U}(x)$  and prove the irregularity of the dimensional function  $x \mapsto \dim_H \mathbf{U}(x)$  (see Theorem 2). Furthermore, we determine the critical values of  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  that when  $x$  crosses the first critical value the Hausdorff dimension of  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  vanishes, and when  $x$  crosses the second critical value the set  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  degenerates to a singleton (see Theorem 3). The proof of Theorem 4 for the topological structure of  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  is presented in Section 5. In contrast with that for  $x = 1$  the set  $\mathcal{U}(1)$  has no isolated points, we show that typically  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  contains isolated points. In the final section we pose some remarks and questions on  $\mathcal{U}(x)$ .

## 2. QUASI-GREEDY AND GREEDY EXPANSIONS

Let  $M \geq 1$  and  $x > 0$ . Recall from (1.4) that  $q_x = \min\{1 + M, 1 + M/x\}$ . For  $q \in (1, q_x]$  let

$$\Phi_x(q) = x_1(q)x_2(q)\dots \in \{0, 1, \dots, M\}^{\mathbb{N}}$$

be the *quasi-greedy*  $q$ -expansion of  $x$ , which is the lexicographically largest  $q$ -expansion of  $x$  not ending with  $0^\infty$ . In other words,  $\Phi_x(q) = (x_i(q))$  is the  $q$ -expansion of  $x$  satisfying

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{x_i(q)}{q^i} < x \quad \text{for all } n \geq 1.$$

In particular, for  $x = 1$  and  $q \in (1, q_1] = (1, M + 1]$  we reserve the notation  $\alpha(q) = (\alpha_i(q)) = \Phi_1(q)$  for the quasi-greedy  $q$ -expansion of 1.

For a *word*  $\mathbf{c} = c_1 \dots c_n$  we mean a finite string of digits with each digit  $c_i$  from the alphabet  $\{0, 1, \dots, M\}$ . We denote by  $\mathbf{c}^\infty = \mathbf{c}\mathbf{c}\dots \in \{0, 1, \dots, M\}^{\mathbb{N}}$  the periodic sequence with periodic block  $\mathbf{c}$ . Throughout the paper we will use the lexicographical ordering “ $\prec$ ”, “ $\preceq$ ”, “ $\succ$ ” or “ $\succeq$ ” between sequences and words in the usual way. For example, for two sequences  $(c_i), (d_i) \in \{0, 1, \dots, M\}^{\mathbb{N}}$  we write  $(c_i) \prec (d_i)$  if  $c_1 < d_1$ , or there exists  $n > 1$  such that  $c_1 \dots c_{n-1} = d_1 \dots d_{n-1}$  and  $c_n < d_n$ . Furthermore, for two words  $\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d}$  we say  $\mathbf{c} \prec \mathbf{d}$  if  $\mathbf{c}0^\infty \prec \mathbf{d}0^\infty$ .

Similarly, for  $q \in (1, q_x]$  let  $\Psi_x(q) = \tilde{x}_1(q)\tilde{x}_2(q)\dots \in \{0, 1, \dots, M\}^{\mathbb{N}}$  be the *greedy*  $q$ -expansion of  $x$ , which is the lexicographically largest  $q$ -expansion of  $x$ . Then  $\Psi_x(q) = (\tilde{x}_i(q))$  is the  $q$ -expansion of  $x$  satisfying

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\tilde{x}_i(q)}{q^i} + \frac{1}{q^n} > x \quad \text{whenever } \tilde{x}_n(q) < M.$$

If  $x$  has a unique  $q$ -expansion, i.e.,  $q \in \mathcal{U}(x)$ , then  $\Phi_x(q) = \Psi_x(q)$ .

The following lemma for the quasi-greedy expansions  $\Phi_x(q)$  and greedy expansions  $\Psi_x(q)$  was essentially proven in [13, Lemmas 2.3 and 2.5].

**Lemma 2.1.**

- (i) Let  $x > 0$ . Then the map  $q \mapsto \Phi_x(q)$  is left continuous and strictly increasing in  $(1, q_x]$ . Moreover, the sequence  $\Phi_x(q) = (x_i(q))$  satisfies

$$x_{n+1}(q)x_{n+2}(q)\dots \preceq \alpha(q) \quad \text{whenever } x_n(q) < M.$$

- (ii) For  $x > 0$  the map  $q \mapsto \Psi_x(q)$  is right continuous and strictly increasing in  $(1, q_x]$ . Moreover, the sequence  $\Psi_x(q) = (\tilde{x}_i(q))$  satisfies

$$\tilde{x}_{n+1}(q)\tilde{x}_{n+2}(q)\dots \prec \alpha(q) \quad \text{whenever } \tilde{x}_n(q) < M.$$

*Proof.* The lexicographical characterizations of  $\Phi_x(q)$  and  $\Psi_x(q)$  can be found in [7]. In the following it remains to prove the continuity and monotonicity.

First we prove (i). Take  $x > 0$  and  $q \in (1, q_x]$ . Let  $(x_i(q)) = \Phi_x(q)$  be the quasi-greedy  $q$ -expansion of  $x$ . By the definition of quasi-greedy expansions it follows that for any  $n = 1, 2, \dots$  we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{x_i(q)}{q^i} < x.$$

Then for any large integer  $N$  there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that for any  $p \in (q - \delta, q)$ ,

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{x_i(q)}{p^i} < x \quad \text{for all } n = 1, \dots, N.$$

This implies that the quasi-greedy  $p$ -expansion  $\Phi_x(p) = (x_i(p))$  of  $x$  satisfies

$$(2.1) \quad x_1(p) \dots x_N(p) \succcurlyeq x_1(q) \dots x_N(q).$$

On the other hand, by the definition of quasi-greedy expansions it follows that  $(x_i(p)) \prec (x_i(q))$  for any  $p < q$ . So, by (2.1) we conclude that

$$x_1(p) \dots x_N(p) = x_1(q) \dots x_N(q) \quad \forall p \in (q - \delta, q).$$

This proves the left-continuity of the map  $q \mapsto \Phi_x(q)$ .

To prove the strict monotonicity we take  $p < q$ . Then

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{x_i(q)}{p^i} > \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{x_i(q)}{q^i} = x.$$

So either

$$\frac{x_1(q)}{p} \geq x$$

which implies  $x_1(p) < x_1(q)$ , or there exists a positive integer  $m$  such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{x_i(q)}{p^i} < x \quad \forall n = 1, \dots, m; \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=1}^{m+1} \frac{x_i(q)}{p^i} \geq x.$$

By the definition of quasi-greedy expansions the second case implies

$$x_1(p) \dots x_{m+1}(p) \prec x_1(q) \dots x_{m+1}(q).$$

Therefore,  $\Phi_x(p) \prec \Phi_x(q)$  for any  $p < q$ .

The proof of (ii) is similar to (i). Let  $x > 0$  and  $q \in (1, q_x]$ . Write  $\Psi_x(q) = (\tilde{x}_i(q))$  for the greedy  $q$ -expansion of  $x$ . By the definition of greedy expansions it follows that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\tilde{x}_i(q)}{q^i} + \frac{1}{q^n} > x \quad \text{whenever} \quad \tilde{x}_n(q) < M.$$

Take a large integer  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ . There exists  $\delta > 0$  such that for any  $r \in (q, q + \delta)$  we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\tilde{x}_i(q)}{r^i} + \frac{1}{r^n} > x \quad \text{whenever} \quad n \leq N \text{ and } \tilde{x}_n(q) < M.$$



This implies

$$(2.2) \quad \tilde{x}_1(r) \dots \tilde{x}_N(r) \preccurlyeq \tilde{x}_1(q) \dots \tilde{x}_N(q).$$

Here  $(\tilde{x}_i(r)) = \Psi_x(r)$  is the greedy  $r$ -expansion of  $x$ . On the other hand, by the definition of greedy expansions we have  $(\tilde{x}_i(r)) \succcurlyeq (\tilde{x}_i(q))$  for any  $r > q$ . So by (2.2) it follows that

$$\tilde{x}_1(r) \dots \tilde{x}_N(r) = \tilde{x}_1(q) \dots \tilde{x}_N(q) \quad \text{for any } r \in (q, q + \delta).$$

This proves the right-continuity of the map  $q \mapsto \Psi_x(q)$ .

For the strict monotonicity it can be deduced from the definition of greedy expansions. Let  $r > q$ . Then

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\tilde{x}_i(q)}{r^i} < \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\tilde{x}_i(q)}{q^i} = x.$$

So, either  $\tilde{x}_1(q)/r + 1/r \leq x$  with  $\tilde{x}_1(q) < M$  which implies  $\tilde{x}_1(r) > \tilde{x}_1(q)$ , or there exists a positive integer  $m$  such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\tilde{x}_i(q)}{r^i} + \frac{1}{r^n} > x \quad \text{whenever } n \leq m \text{ and } \tilde{x}_n(q) < M,$$

and

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m+1} \frac{\tilde{x}_i(q)}{r^i} + \frac{1}{r^{m+1}} \leq x \quad \text{with } \tilde{x}_{m+1}(q) < M.$$

By the definition of greedy expansions the second case implies that  $\tilde{x}_1(r) \dots \tilde{x}_{m+1}(r) \succcurlyeq \tilde{x}_1(q) \dots \tilde{x}_{m+1}(q)$ . Hence,  $\Psi_x(r) \succcurlyeq \Psi_x(q)$  for any  $r > q$ .  $\square$

*Remark 2.2.* Taking  $x = 1$  in Lemma 2.1 (i) it follows that the map  $q \mapsto \Phi_1(q) = \alpha(q)$  is left-continuous and strictly increasing in  $(1, M + 1]$ . In particular, the quasi-greedy expansion  $\alpha(q) = (\alpha_i(q))$  satisfies  $\alpha_{n+1}(q)\alpha_{n+2}(q) \dots \preccurlyeq \alpha(q)$  whenever  $\alpha_n(q) < M$ . Indeed, one can verify (see also [15, Proposition 2.3]) that the map  $q \mapsto \alpha(q)$  is bijective from  $(1, M + 1]$  to the set of sequences  $(a_i) \in \{0, 1, \dots, M\}^{\mathbb{N}}$  not ending with  $0^\infty$  and satisfying

$$a_{n+1}a_{n+2} \dots \preccurlyeq a_1a_2 \dots \quad \text{for all } n \geq 0.$$

### 3. LOCAL DIMENSION OF $\mathcal{U}(x)$

In this section we will investigate the local dimension of  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  by showing that the map  $\Phi_x$  is locally bi-Hölder continuous from  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  onto  $\mathbf{U}(x)$ . This provides a good estimation of the local dimension of  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  via its symbolic set  $\mathbf{U}(x)$ . Based on this estimation we are able to prove the ‘variation principle’ as described in Theorem 1.

**3.1. Hölder continuity of  $\Phi_x$ .** Recall that the symbolic set  $\mathbf{U}(x) = \{\Phi_x(q) : q \in \mathcal{U}(x)\}$  and the metric  $\rho$  is defined in (1.3). First we show that the map  $\Phi_x : \mathcal{U}(x) \mapsto \mathbf{U}(x)$  is locally bi-Hölder continuous.

**Proposition 3.1.** *Let  $x > 0$  and  $q \in (1, M + 1)$ . Then for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that for any  $p_1, p_2 \in \mathcal{U}(x) \cap (q - \delta, q + \delta)$ ,*

$$C_1 |p_1 - p_2|^{\frac{1+\varepsilon}{\log(q+\delta)}} \leq \rho(\Phi_x(p_1), \Phi_x(p_2)) \leq C_2 |p_1 - p_2|^{\frac{1-\varepsilon}{\log q}},$$

where  $C_1, C_2$  are constants independent of  $p_1$  and  $p_2$ .

To prove this proposition we need some property from unique non-integer base expansions. For a word  $\mathbf{c} = c_1 \dots c_n$  we denote its *reflection* by  $\bar{\mathbf{c}} := (M - c_1) \dots (M - c_n)$ , which is also a word. Similarly, for a sequence  $(c_i) \in \{0, 1, \dots, M\}^{\mathbb{N}}$  its *reflection*  $\overline{(c_i)} := (M - c_1)(M - c_2) \dots$  is also a sequence. The following lexicographical characterization of  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  can be found in [7] (see also [12]).

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $x > 0$  and  $q \in (1, q_x]$ . Then  $q \in \mathcal{U}(x)$  if and only if the quasi-greedy expansion  $\Phi_x(q) = (x_i(q))$  satisfies*

$$\begin{cases} x_{n+1}(q)x_{n+2}(q) \dots < \alpha(q) & \text{whenever } x_n(q) < M, \\ \overline{x_{n+1}(q)x_{n+2}(q) \dots} < \alpha(q) & \text{whenever } x_n(q) > 0. \end{cases}$$

Now we start to prove Proposition 3.1.

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $x > 0$  and  $q \in (1, M + 1)$ . Then for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exist  $\delta > 0$  and a constant  $C > 0$  such that*

$$\rho(\Phi_x(p_1), \Phi_x(p_2))^{\log(q+\delta)} \geq C |p_1 - p_2|^{1+\varepsilon}$$

for any  $p_1, p_2 \in \mathcal{U}(x) \cap (q - \delta, q + \delta)$ .

*Proof.* Fix  $\varepsilon > 0$  and let  $q \in (1, M + 1)$ . Then there exists  $0 < \delta < \min\{q - 1, M + 1 - q\}$  satisfying

$$(3.1) \quad \frac{\log(q + \delta)}{\log(q - \delta)} \leq 1 + \varepsilon.$$

Take  $p_1, p_2 \in \mathcal{U}(x) \cap (q - \delta, q + \delta)$  with  $p_1 < p_2$ . By Lemma 2.1 (i) we have  $(x_i(p_1)) = \Phi_x(p_1) < \Phi_x(p_2) = (x_i(p_2))$ . Then by choosing  $\delta > 0$  sufficiently small we can find a large integer  $n \geq 2$  such that

$$(3.2) \quad x_1(p_1) \cdots x_{n-1}(p_1) = x_1(p_2) \cdots x_{n-1}(p_2) \quad \text{and} \quad x_n(p_1) < x_n(p_2).$$

Note that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{x_i(p_1)}{p_1^i} < \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{x_i(p_1)}{p_1^i} = x = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{x_i(p_2)}{p_2^i} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{x_i(p_2)}{p_2^i} + \frac{M}{p_2^{n-1}(p_2 - 1)}.$$

Then by (3.2) we have

$$x(p_2 - p_1) < \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{x_i(p_2)}{p_2^{i-1}} - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{x_i(p_1)}{p_1^{i-1}} + \frac{M}{p_2^{n-2}(p_2 - 1)} \leq \frac{M}{p_2^{n-2}(p_2 - 1)}.$$

So,

$$(3.3) \quad p_2 - p_1 < \frac{M}{p_2^{n-2}(p_2 - 1)x}.$$

Note by (1.3) and (3.2) that

$$\rho(\Phi_x(p_1), \Phi_x(p_2))^{\log(q+\delta)} = (M+1)^{-n \log(q+\delta)} = (q+\delta)^{-n}.$$

Here we emphasize that the logarithm is in base  $M+1$ .

Therefore, by (3.1) and (3.3) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(\Phi_x(p_1), \Phi_x(p_2))^{\log(q+\delta)} &= \left( (q+\delta)^{-\frac{n}{1+\varepsilon}} \right)^{1+\varepsilon} \geq \left( \frac{1}{(q-\delta)^n} \right)^{1+\varepsilon} \geq \left( \frac{1}{p_2^n} \right)^{1+\varepsilon} \\ &> \left( \frac{(p_2-1)x}{Mp_2^2} \right)^{1+\varepsilon} |p_2 - p_1|^{1+\varepsilon} \\ &\geq C|p_2 - p_1|^{1+\varepsilon}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $C := \left( \frac{(q-\delta-1)x}{M(q+\delta)^2} \right)^{1+\varepsilon}$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let  $x > 0$  and  $q \in (1, M+1)$ . Then for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exist  $\delta > 0$  and a constant  $C > 0$  such that*

$$\rho(\Phi_x(p_1), \Phi_x(p_2))^{\log q} \leq C|p_1 - p_2|^{1-\varepsilon}$$

for any  $p_1, p_2 \in \mathcal{U}(x) \cap (q-\delta, q+\delta)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $x > 0$  and  $q \in (1, M+1)$ . Take  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Since  $q \in (1, M+1)$ , there exists  $\delta > 0$  satisfying

$$(3.4) \quad 0 < \delta < \min\{q-1, M+1-q\} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\log(q+\delta)}{\log q} \leq \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}.$$

Take  $p_1, p_2 \in \mathcal{U}(x) \cap (q-\delta, q+\delta)$  with  $p_1 < p_2$ . By Lemma 2.1 (i) we have  $(x_i(p_1)) = \Phi_x(p_1) \prec \Phi_x(p_2) = (x_i(p_2))$ . Then there exists a smallest integer  $n \geq 1$  such that  $x_n(p_1) < x_n(p_2)$ . By (1.3) this implies

$$(3.5) \quad \rho(\Phi_x(p_1), \Phi_x(p_2))^{\log q} = (M+1)^{-n \log q} = q^{-n}.$$

Note by (3.4) that  $q+\delta < M+1$ . By Lemma 2.1 (i) we have  $\alpha(q+\delta) \prec \alpha(M+1) = M^\infty$ . Then there exists  $i_0 \geq 1$  such that

$$(3.6) \quad \alpha_1(q+\delta) \cdots \alpha_{i_0}(q+\delta) \prec \underbrace{M \cdots M}_{i_0}.$$

Observe that  $x_1(p_2) \dots x_{n-1}(p_2) = x_1(p_1) \dots x_{n-1}(p_1)$  and  $x_n(p_2) > x_n(p_1)$ . Since  $p_2 \in \mathcal{U}(x)$ , by Lemma 3.2 and (3.6) it follows that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{x_i(p_2)}{p_1^i} \geq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{x_i(p_1)}{p_1^i} = x = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{x_i(p_2)}{p_2^i} > \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{x_i(p_2)}{p_2^i} + \frac{1}{p_2^{n+i_0}}.$$

This implies

$$(3.7) \quad \frac{1}{p_2^{n+i_0}} < \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \frac{x_i(p_2)}{p_1^i} - \frac{x_i(p_2)}{p_2^i} \right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \left( \frac{M}{p_1^i} - \frac{M}{p_2^i} \right) = \frac{M|p_2 - p_1|}{(p_1 - 1)(p_2 - 1)}.$$

Then by (3.4), (3.5) and (3.7) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(\Phi_x(p_1), \Phi_x(p_2))^{\log q} &= \left( q^{-\frac{n}{1-\varepsilon}} \right)^{1-\varepsilon} \leq \left( \frac{1}{(q+\delta)^n} \right)^{1-\varepsilon} \\ &\leq \left( \frac{1}{p_2^n} \right)^{1-\varepsilon} \\ &< \left( \frac{M(q+\delta)^{i_0}}{(q-\delta-1)^2} \right)^{1-\varepsilon} |p_1 - p_2|^{1-\varepsilon}, \end{aligned}$$

completing the proof.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 3.1.* The proposition follows by Lemmas 3.3 and 3.4.  $\square$

The following lemma for the Hausdorff dimension under Hölder continuous maps is well-known (cf. [19]).

**Lemma 3.5.** *Let  $(X, d_1)$  and  $(Y, d_2)$  be two metric spaces, and let  $f : X \rightarrow Y$ . If there exist positive constants  $\delta, C$  and  $\lambda$  such that*

$$d_2(f(x), f(y)) \leq C d_1(x, y)^\lambda$$

for any  $x, y \in X$  with  $d_1(x, y) \leq \delta$ , then  $\dim_H f(X) \leq \frac{1}{\lambda} \dim_H X$ .

By Proposition 3.1 and Lemma 3.5 we have the following estimations for the local dimension of  $\mathcal{U}(x)$ , which states that the local dimension of  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  at any point  $q \in (1, M+1)$  can be roughly estimated by the local dimension of the symbolic set  $\mathbf{U}(x)$  at  $\Phi_x(q)$ .

**Proposition 3.6.** *Let  $x > 0$  and  $q \in (1, M+1)$ . Then for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that*

$$\frac{1-\varepsilon}{\log q} \dim_H \mathbf{W}_\delta(q) \leq \dim_H (\mathcal{U}(x) \cap (q-\delta, q+\delta)) \leq \frac{1+\varepsilon}{\log(q+\delta)} \dim_H \mathbf{W}_\delta(q),$$

where

$$\mathbf{W}_\delta(q) := \{\Phi_x(p) : p \in \mathcal{U}(x) \cap (q-\delta, q+\delta)\}.$$

*Proof.* Excluding the trivial case we assume that  $\mathcal{U}(x) \cap (q - \delta, q + \delta)$  contains infinitely many elements. Note that the map

$$\Phi_x : \mathcal{U}(x) \cap (q - \delta, q + \delta) \longrightarrow \mathbf{W}_\delta(q); \quad p \mapsto \Phi_x(p)$$

is bijective. Then its inverse map  $\Phi_x^{-1}$  is well-defined. Hence, the proposition follows by Proposition 3.1 and Lemma 3.5.  $\square$

**3.2. Local dimension of  $\mathcal{U}(x)$ .** For  $q \in (1, M + 1]$  we recall the symbolic univoque set

$$\mathbf{U}_q = \left\{ (d_i) \in \{0, 1, \dots, M\}^{\mathbb{N}} : \pi_q((d_i)) \in \mathcal{U}_q \right\},$$

where  $\pi_q$  is the projection map define in (1.1). Then each sequence  $(d_i) \in \mathbf{U}_q$  is the unique  $q$ -expansion of  $\pi_q((d_i))$ . So  $\pi_q$  is the bijective map from  $\mathbf{U}_q$  to  $\mathcal{U}_q$ . The following lexicographical characterization of  $\mathbf{U}_q$  is given by Erdős et al. [16] (see also [12]).

**Lemma 3.7.** *Let  $q \in (1, M + 1]$ . Then  $\mathbf{U}_q$  consists of all sequences  $(d_i) \in \{0, 1, \dots, M\}^{\mathbb{N}}$  satisfying*

$$\begin{cases} d_{n+1}d_{n+2}\dots \prec \alpha(q) & \text{if } d_n < M, \\ \overline{d_{n+1}d_{n+2}\dots} \prec \alpha(q) & \text{if } d_n > 0. \end{cases}$$

So by Lemmas 3.2 and 3.7 it is clear that  $q \in \mathcal{U}(x)$  if and only if  $\Phi_x(q) \in \mathbf{U}_q$ . Recall that  $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}(1)$  is the set of bases for which 1 has a unique expansion. It was shown by Komornik and Loreti [26] that its topological closure  $\overline{\mathcal{U}}$  is a Cantor set as described in (1.2). The following intimate connection between  $\mathbf{U}_q$  and  $\overline{\mathcal{U}}$  was established by de Vries and Komornik [12] (see also [15]).

**Lemma 3.8.** *Let  $M \geq 1$ . The following statements hold true.*

- (i)  $q \in (1, M + 1] \setminus \overline{\mathcal{U}}$  if and only if  $\mathbf{U}_q$  is closed with respect to the metric  $\rho$  defined in (1.3).
- (ii) The set-valued map  $q \mapsto \mathbf{U}_q$  is non-decreasing with respect to the set-inclusion. Furthermore, for any connected component  $(q_0, q_0^*)$  of  $(1, M + 1] \setminus \overline{\mathcal{U}}$  and for any  $p, q \in (q_0, q_0^*)$  the difference between  $\mathbf{U}_p$  and  $\mathbf{U}_q$  is at most countable.

First we prove Theorem 1 for  $q \notin \mathcal{U}(x)$ .

**Lemma 3.9.** *Let  $x > 0$  and  $q \in (1, M + 1] \setminus \overline{\mathcal{U}}$ . If  $q \notin \mathcal{U}(x)$ , then*

$$(3.8) \quad \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \dim_H (\mathcal{U}(x) \cap (q - \delta, q + \delta)) = 0 = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \dim_H (\mathcal{U}_q \cap (x - \delta, x + \delta)).$$

*Proof.* Since  $q \notin \overline{\mathcal{U}}$ , by Lemma 3.8 (i) the set  $\mathcal{U}_q = \pi_q(\mathbf{U}_q)$  is closed. Note that  $q \notin \mathcal{U}(x)$ , i.e.,  $x \notin \mathcal{U}_q$ . Then  $\mathcal{U}_q \cap (x - \delta, x + \delta) = \emptyset$  for  $\delta > 0$  sufficiently small. This proves the second equality of (3.8).

To prove the first equality we observe that  $q \notin \overline{\mathcal{U}}$ . Then there exists  $\delta_0 > 0$  such that  $(q - \delta_0, q + \delta_0) \cap \overline{\mathcal{U}} = \emptyset$ . Furthermore, by Lemma 3.8 (i) the symbolic set  $\mathbf{U}_q$  is closed under

the topology induced by the metric  $\rho$ . Note that  $q \notin \mathcal{W}(x)$ . Then  $\Phi_x(q) \notin \mathbf{U}_q$ . So by Lemma 2.1 (i) there exists  $\delta_1 \in (0, \delta_0)$  such that

$$(3.9) \quad \Phi_x(p) \notin \mathbf{U}_q \quad \forall p \in (q - \delta_1, q).$$

Note by Lemma 3.8 (ii) that  $\mathbf{U}_p \subseteq \mathbf{U}_q$  for any  $p < q$ . Then (3.9) implies that for any  $p \in (q - \delta_1, q)$  we have  $\Phi_x(p) \notin \mathbf{U}_p$ , which yields  $p \notin \mathcal{W}(x)$ . In other words,

$$(3.10) \quad \mathcal{W}(x) \cap (q - \delta_1, q) = \emptyset.$$

On the other hand, let  $\Psi_x(q)$  be the greedy  $q$ -expansion of  $x$ . Since  $q \notin \mathcal{W}(x)$ , we have  $\Psi_x(q) \notin \mathbf{U}_q$ . By Lemma 2.1 (ii) there exists  $\delta_2 \in (0, \delta_0)$  such that

$$(3.11) \quad \Psi_x(r) \notin \mathbf{U}_q \quad \forall r \in (q, q + \delta_2).$$

Note that  $[q, q + \delta_2] \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}} = \emptyset$ . Then by Lemma 3.8 (ii) for any  $r \in (q, q + \delta_2)$  the difference between  $\mathbf{U}_q$  and  $\mathbf{U}_r$  is at most countable. By (3.11) this implies that  $\Psi_x(r) \in \mathbf{U}_r$  for at most countably many  $r \in (q, q + \delta_2)$ . In other words,  $\mathcal{W}(x) \cap (q, q + \delta_2)$  consists of at most countably many elements. Let  $\delta := \min\{\delta_1, \delta_2\}$ . This, together with (3.10), implies

$$\dim_H(\mathcal{W}(x) \cap (q - \delta, q + \delta)) = 0,$$

proving the first equality. □

Now we prove Theorem 1 for  $q \in \mathcal{W}(x)$  by using Proposition 3.6. We also need the following lemma which can be easily deduced from [4, Lemma 2.2].

**Lemma 3.10.** *Let  $q \in (1, M + 1]$ . Then for any subset  $\mathbf{E} \subseteq \mathbf{U}_q$  we have*

$$\dim_H \pi_q(\mathbf{E}) = \frac{\dim_H \mathbf{E}}{\log q}.$$

**Lemma 3.11.** *Let  $x > 0$  and  $q \in (1, M + 1] \setminus \overline{\mathcal{W}}$ . If  $q \in \mathcal{W}(x)$ , then*

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \dim_H(\mathcal{W}(x) \cap (q - \delta, q + \delta)) = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \dim_H(\mathcal{U}_q \cap (x - \delta, x + \delta)).$$

*Proof.* Let  $q \in \mathcal{W}(x) \setminus \overline{\mathcal{W}}$ . Then  $\Phi_x(q) = (x_i(q)) \in \mathbf{U}_q$ . Note that for any small  $\delta > 0$  there exists a smallest integer  $n_1 = n_1(\delta) \geq 1$  and a largest integer  $n_2 = n_2(\delta) \geq 1$  such that

$$(3.12) \quad \begin{aligned} \pi_q(\{(d_i) \in \mathbf{U}_q : d_1 \dots d_{n_1} = x_1(q) \dots x_{n_1}(q)\}) &\subseteq \mathcal{U}_q \cap (x - \delta, x + \delta), \\ \pi_q(\{(d_i) \in \mathbf{U}_q : d_1 \dots d_{n_2} = x_1(q) \dots x_{n_2}(q)\}) &\supset \mathcal{U}_q \cap (x - \delta, x + \delta). \end{aligned}$$

Observe that  $n_1(\delta), n_2(\delta) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $\delta \rightarrow 0$ . Thus, by (3.12) it follows that

$$(3.13) \quad \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \dim_H(\mathcal{U}_q \cap (x - \delta, x + \delta)) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \dim_H \pi_q(\mathbf{U}_q[x, n]),$$

where

$$\mathbf{U}_q[x, n] := \{(d_i) \in \mathbf{U}_q : d_1 \dots d_n = x_1(q) \dots x_n(q)\}$$

is the cylinder set in  $\mathbf{U}_q$  generated by the word  $x_1(q) \dots x_n(q)$ .

Since  $q \notin \overline{\mathcal{W}}$ , there exists a  $\delta_0 > 0$  such that  $(q - \delta_0, q + \delta_0) \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}} = \emptyset$ . Now take  $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$ . By Lemma 2.1 there exists a largest positive integer  $n = n(\delta)$  such that for any  $p \in \mathcal{U}(x) \cap (q - \delta, q + \delta)$  the  $n$ -prefixes of  $\Phi_x(p) = (x_i(p))$  and  $\Phi_x(q) = (x_i(q))$  coincide, i.e.,

$$(3.14) \quad x_1(p) \dots x_n(p) = x_1(q) \dots x_n(q) \quad \forall p \in \mathcal{U}(x) \cap (q - \delta, q + \delta).$$

Furthermore, note that for any  $p \in \mathcal{U}(x) \cap (q - \delta, q + \delta)$  we have  $\Phi_x(p) \in \mathbf{U}_p \subset \mathbf{U}_{q+\delta}$ . Therefore,

$$(3.15) \quad \mathbf{W}_\delta(q) \subset \{(d_i) \in \mathbf{U}_{q+\delta} : d_1 \dots d_n = x_1(q) \dots x_n(q)\}.$$

So by (3.15) and Proposition 3.6 it follows that for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$  such that

$$(3.16) \quad \begin{aligned} & \dim_H (\mathcal{U}(x) \cap (q - \delta, q + \delta)) \\ & \leq \frac{1 + \varepsilon}{\log(q + \delta)} \dim_H \mathbf{W}_\delta(q) \\ & \leq \frac{1 + \varepsilon}{\log(q + \delta)} \dim_H \{(d_i) \in \mathbf{U}_{q+\delta} : d_1 \dots d_n = x_1(q) \dots x_n(q)\}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $n = n(\delta)$  is defined as in (3.14). Since  $[q - \delta, q + \delta] \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}} = \emptyset$ , by Lemma 3.8 (ii) the difference between  $\mathbf{U}_{q+\delta}$  and  $\mathbf{U}_q$  is at most countable. Thus by (3.16) and Lemma 3.10 it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \dim_H (\mathcal{U}(x) \cap (q - \delta, q + \delta)) & \leq \frac{1 + \varepsilon}{\log(q + \delta)} \dim_H \mathbf{U}_q[x, n] \\ & = \frac{(1 + \varepsilon) \log q}{\log(q + \delta)} \dim_H \pi_q(\mathbf{U}_q[x, n]). \end{aligned}$$

Letting  $\delta \rightarrow 0$ , and then  $n = n(\delta) \rightarrow \infty$ , by (3.13) we conclude that

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \dim_H (\mathcal{U}(x) \cap (q - \delta, q + \delta)) \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \dim_H (\mathcal{U}_q \cap (x - \delta, x + \delta)).$$

Since  $\varepsilon > 0$  was arbitrary, this implies

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \dim_H (\mathcal{U}(x) \cap (q - \delta, q + \delta)) \leq \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \dim_H (\mathcal{U}_q \cap (x - \delta, x + \delta)).$$

To prove the reverse inequality we first claim that for any  $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$  there exists a positive integer  $N = N(\delta)$  such that for any  $n \geq N$  we have

$$\dim_H \mathbf{W}_\delta(q) \geq \dim_H \mathbf{U}_q[x, n].$$

Given  $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$  let  $N = N(\delta) \geq 1$  be the smallest integer satisfying the following condition: for any sequence  $(d_i) \in \mathbf{U}_q$  with  $d_1 \dots d_N = x_1(q) \dots x_N(q)$ , i.e.,  $(d_i) \in \mathbf{U}_q[x, N]$ , the following equation

$$(3.17) \quad x = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{d_i}{p^i}$$

determines a unique  $p \in (q - \delta, q + \delta)$ . Clearly, when  $\delta \rightarrow 0$  we have  $N(\delta) \rightarrow \infty$ . Now let  $n \geq N$ . Note that  $[q - \delta, q + \delta] \cap \overline{\mathcal{W}} = \emptyset$ . Then by Lemma 3.8 (ii) the difference between  $\mathbf{U}_p$  and  $\mathbf{U}_q$  is at most countable for any  $p \in (q - \delta, q + \delta)$ . Then the following set

$$\left\{ (d_i) \in \mathbf{U}_q[x, n] : x = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{d_i}{p^i} \notin \mathcal{U}_p \right\}$$

is at most countable. While for all other  $(d_i) \in \mathbf{U}_q[x, n]$  Equation (3.17) determines a unique  $p \in (q - \delta, q + \delta)$  satisfying  $(d_i) = \Phi_x(p) \in \mathbf{U}_p$ . In other words, for all other sequence  $(d_i) \in \mathbf{U}_q(x, n)$  we have  $(d_i) \in \mathbf{W}_\delta(q)$ . Therefore,

$$\dim_H \mathbf{U}_q[x, n] \leq \dim_H \mathbf{W}_\delta(q),$$

establishing the claim.

By Proposition 3.6, the claim and Lemma 3.10 it follows that for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$  and a positive integer  $N(\delta)$  such that

$$\dim_H (\mathcal{W}(x) \cap (q - \delta, q + \delta)) \geq \frac{1 - \varepsilon}{\log q} \dim_H \mathbf{W}_\delta(q) \geq (1 - \varepsilon) \dim_H \pi_q(\mathbf{U}_q[x, n]),$$

where  $n \geq N(\delta)$ . Letting  $\delta \rightarrow 0$ , and then  $n \geq N(\delta) \rightarrow \infty$ , by (3.13) we conclude that

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \dim_H (\mathcal{W}(x) \cap (q - \delta, q + \delta)) \geq (1 - \varepsilon) \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \dim_H (\mathcal{U}_q \cap (x - \delta, x + \delta)).$$

Since  $\varepsilon > 0$  was arbitrary, this completes the proof.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.* The theorem follows by Lemmas 3.9 and 3.11.  $\square$

#### 4. HAUSDORFF DIMENSION AND CRITICAL VALUES OF $\mathbf{U}(x)$

Given  $x > 0$ , recall that the symbolic set  $\mathbf{U}(x) = \{\Phi_x(q) : q \in \mathcal{W}(x)\}$  consists of all unique expansions of  $x$  with bases in  $\mathcal{W}(x)$ . Clearly,  $\Phi_x$  is a bijective map from  $\mathcal{W}(x)$  to  $\mathbf{U}(x)$ . Instead of looking at the set  $\mathcal{W}(x)$  directly we focus on the symbolic set  $\mathbf{U}(x)$ . In this section we will investigate the Hausdorff dimension of  $\mathbf{U}(x)$  with respect to the metric  $\rho$  defined in (1.3), and prove Theorem 2. Furthermore, by using Theorems 2 and 1.2 we determine the critical values of  $\mathcal{W}(x)$ , and then prove Theorem 3.

**4.1. Hausdorff dimension of  $\mathbf{U}(x)$ .** Our first result states that the set-valued map  $x \mapsto \mathbf{U}(x)$  is non-increasing with respect to the set inclusion.

**Lemma 4.1.** *The set-valued map  $x \mapsto \mathbf{U}(x)$  is non-increasing in  $(0, \infty)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $x, y \in (0, \infty)$  with  $x > y$ . Take  $(d_i) \in \mathbf{U}(x)$ . Then there exists a unique base  $q \in \mathcal{W}(x)$  such that

$$(4.1) \quad (d_i) = \Phi_x(q) \in \mathbf{U}_q.$$



Since  $y < x$ , then the equation

$$(4.2) \quad y = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{d_i}{\beta^i}$$

determines a unique base  $\beta > q$ . Observe by Lemma 3.8 (ii) that the set-valued map  $q \mapsto \mathbf{U}_q$  is non-decreasing. By (4.1) this implies that  $(d_i) \in \mathbf{U}_q \subset \mathbf{U}_\beta$ . In view of (4.2) we obtain that

$$\Phi_y(\beta) = (d_i) \in \mathbf{U}_\beta,$$

which implies  $(d_i) \in \mathbf{U}(y)$ . Hence,  $\mathbf{U}(x) \subseteq \mathbf{U}(y)$ , completing the proof.  $\square$

Now we turn to the Hausdorff dimension of  $\mathbf{U}(x)$ . This is based on the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.2.** *Given  $x \in (0, 1]$  let  $(\varepsilon_i) = \Phi_x(M + 1)$  be the quasi-greedy expansion of  $x$  in base  $M + 1$ . Then there exist a word  $\mathbf{w}$ , a non-negative integer  $N$  and a strictly increasing sequence  $(N_j) \subset \mathbb{N}$  such that*

$$\mathbf{U}_{N_j}(x) \subset \mathbf{U}(x) \quad \text{for all } j \geq 1,$$

where

$$\mathbf{U}_{N_j}(x) := \{\varepsilon_1 \dots \varepsilon_{N+N_j} \mathbf{w} d_1 d_2 \dots : d_{n+1} \dots d_{n+N_j} \notin \{0^{N_j}, M^{N_j}\} \forall n \geq 0\}.$$

*Proof.* The proof of this lemma is similar to [30, Section 4]. Let  $(\varepsilon_i) \in \{0, 1, \dots, M\}$  be the quasi-greedy expansion of  $x$  in base  $M + 1$ . We distinguish the following two cases.

**(I).**  $(\varepsilon_i)$  **ends with**  $M^\infty$ . Then we can write

$$(\varepsilon_i) = \varepsilon_1 \dots \varepsilon_m M^\infty \quad \text{for some } m \geq 0 \text{ with } \varepsilon_m \neq M.$$

Let  $\mathbf{w} = \epsilon$  be the empty word,  $N = m$  and  $N_j = m + j$  for  $j \geq 1$ . Take a sequence  $(y_i) \in \mathbf{U}_{N_j}(x)$ . Then it can be written as

$$(y_i) = \varepsilon_1 \dots \varepsilon_{N+N_j} d_1 d_2 \dots = \varepsilon_1 \dots \varepsilon_m M^{N_j} d_1 d_2 \dots,$$

where  $(d_i) \in \{0, 1, \dots, M\}^\mathbb{N}$  contains neither  $N_j$  consecutive 0's nor  $N_j$  consecutive  $M$ 's. Let  $q_j$  be the unique root in  $(1, M + 1)$  of the equation

$$x = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{y_i}{q_j^i}.$$

Here we emphasize that  $q_j < M + 1$  because  $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} y_i / (M + 1)^i < x$ . We claim that  $(y_i)$  is the unique  $q_j$ -expansion of  $x$ .

Observe that the tail sequence

$$y_{m+1} y_{m+2} \dots = M^{N_j} d_1 d_2 \dots =: (\delta_i)$$

satisfies  $\sigma^n((\delta_i)) \preccurlyeq (\delta_i)$  for all  $n \geq 0$ . Then by Remark 2.2 it follows that  $(\delta_i)$  is the quasi-greedy expansion of 1 for some base  $q \in (1, M + 1]$ , i.e.,  $\alpha(q) = (\delta_i)$ . In view of the definition

of  $(y_i)$  and by Lemma 3.2 it suffices to prove that  $\alpha(q_j) \succ \alpha(q) = (\delta_i)$ . In other words, it suffices to prove

$$(4.3) \quad \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\delta_i}{q_j^i} < 1.$$

This follows from the following calculation: By the definition of  $(\varepsilon_i)$  and  $(y_i)$  we obtain

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\varepsilon_i}{(M+1)^i} + \frac{1}{(M+1)^m} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\varepsilon_i}{(M+1)^i} = x = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{y_i}{q_j^i} = \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\varepsilon_i}{q_j^i} + \frac{1}{q_j^m} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\delta_i}{q_j^i},$$

which gives

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\delta_i}{q_j^i} = q_j^m \left( \frac{1}{(M+1)^m} + \sum_{i=1}^m \left( \frac{\varepsilon_i}{(M+1)^i} - \frac{\varepsilon_i}{q_j^i} \right) \right) \leq \frac{q_j^m}{(M+1)^m} < 1,$$

where the inequalities follow by  $q_j < M+1$ . This proves (4.3).

Therefore, by Lemma 3.2 it follows that  $(y_i)$  is the unique  $q_j$ -expansion of  $x$ , i.e.,  $(y_i) \in \mathbf{U}(x)$ . Hence,  $\mathbf{U}_{N_j}(x) \subset \mathbf{U}(x)$ .

**(II).**  $(\varepsilon_i)$  **does not end with**  $M^\infty$ . Then we can write

$$(\varepsilon_i) = \mathbf{a}_0 M^{r_1} \mathbf{a}_1 M^{r_2} \mathbf{a}_2 \cdots M^{r_k} \mathbf{a}_k \cdots,$$

where  $\mathbf{a}_0 \in \{0, 1, \dots, M-1\}^*$ ,  $r_k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\mathbf{a}_k \in \{0, 1, \dots, M-1\}^* \setminus \{\epsilon\}$  for all  $k \geq 1$ . Here  $\{0, 1, \dots, M-1\}^*$  is the set of all finite words with alphabet  $\{0, 1, \dots, M-1\}$  including the empty word  $\epsilon$ . For  $k \geq 0$  let  $s_k := |\mathbf{a}_k|$  be the length of  $\mathbf{a}_k$ . Set

$$\mathbf{w} = 0M, \quad N = s_0 + 3 \quad \text{and} \quad N_j = (r_1 + s_1) + (r_2 + s_2) + \cdots + (r_{N+j+2} + s_{N+j+2}) - 3.$$

Then  $N_j \geq N + j + 2$ . Fix  $j \geq 1$  and take a sequence  $(y_i) \in \mathbf{U}_{N_j}(x)$ . Then

$$(y_i) = \varepsilon_1 \dots \varepsilon_{N+N_j} 0M d_1 d_2 \dots = \mathbf{a}_0 M^{r_1} \mathbf{a}_1 \cdots M^{r_{N+j+2}} \mathbf{a}_{N+j+2} 0M d_1 d_2 \dots,$$

where the tail sequence  $(d_i)$  contains neither  $N_j$  consecutive 0's nor  $N_j$  consecutive  $M$ 's. Observe that the equation

$$x = \pi_{q_j}((y_i)) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{y_i}{q_j^i}$$

determines a unique  $q \in (1, M+1)$ . Here we emphasize that  $q_j < M+1$  since  $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} y_i / (M+1)^i < x$ . Then by Lemma 3.2, to prove that  $(y_i)$  is the unique  $q_j$ -expansion of  $x$  it suffices to show that  $\alpha(q_j) \succ M^{N_j+1} 0^\infty$ , or equivalently, to prove

$$(4.4) \quad \sum_{i=1}^{N_j+1} \frac{M}{q_j^i} < 1.$$

Observe that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N+N_j} \frac{\varepsilon_i}{q_j^i} < \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{y_i}{q_j^i} = x = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\varepsilon_i}{(M+1)^i} < \sum_{i=1}^{N+N_j} \frac{\varepsilon_i}{(M+1)^i} + \frac{1}{(M+1)^{N+N_j}}.$$

This, combined with  $\varepsilon_{N-2} = \varepsilon_{s_0+1} = M$  and  $q_j < M + 1$ , implies that

$$\frac{M+1-q_j}{q_j(M+1)^{N-2}} \leq \frac{1}{q_j^{N-2}} - \frac{1}{(M+1)^{N-2}} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{N+N_j} \left( \frac{\varepsilon_i}{q_j^i} - \frac{\varepsilon_i}{(M+1)^i} \right) < \frac{1}{(M+1)^{N+N_j}}.$$

Rearranging the above inequality yields

$$M+1-q_j < \frac{q_j}{(M+1)^{N_j+2}} < \frac{M}{q_j^{N_j+1}},$$

which gives  $M(1-q_j^{-N_j-1}) < q_j - 1$ . Thus,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N_j+1} \frac{M}{q_j^i} = \frac{M(1-q_j^{-N_j-1})}{q_j-1} < 1,$$

proving (4.4).

Therefore,  $(y_i)$  is the unique  $q_j$ -expansion of  $x$ , i.e.,  $(y_i) \in \mathbf{U}(x)$ . Hence,  $\mathbf{U}_{N_j}(x) \subset \mathbf{U}(x)$  for all  $j \geq 1$ , completing the proof.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 2.* Note by Theorem 1.1 that the function  $q \mapsto \dim_H \mathbf{U}_q$  is a non-decreasing Devil's staircase on  $(1, M+1]$ . Then by the definition of  $q_x$  it suffices to prove

$$(4.5) \quad \dim_H \mathbf{U}(x) = \dim_H \mathbf{U}_{q_x} \quad \text{for all } x > 0.$$

First we consider  $x \in (0, 1]$ . Let  $(\varepsilon_i) = \Phi_x(M+1)$  be the quasi-greedy expansion of  $x$  in base  $M+1$ . Then by Lemma 4.2 there exist a word  $\mathbf{w}$ , a large integer  $N$  and a strictly increasing sequence  $(N_j) \subset \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$(4.6) \quad \mathbf{U}_{N_j}(x) = \{\varepsilon_1 \dots \varepsilon_{N+N_j} \mathbf{w} d_1 d_2 \dots : (d_i) \in \Lambda_j\} \subset \mathbf{U}(x) \quad \text{for all } j \geq 1,$$

where

$$\Lambda_j := \left\{ (d_i) \in \{0, 1, \dots, M\}^{\mathbb{N}} : d_{n+1} \dots d_{n+N_j} \notin \{0^{N_j}, M^{N_j}\} \quad \forall n \geq 0 \right\}.$$

By (4.6) it follows that for any  $j \geq 1$ ,

$$(4.7) \quad \dim_H \mathbf{U}(x) \geq \dim_H \mathbf{U}_{N_j}(x) = \dim_H \Lambda_j = \dim_H \mathbf{U}_{p_j}$$

where  $p_j \in (1, M+1]$  satisfies

$$1 = \sum_{i=1}^{N_j} \frac{M}{p_j^i}.$$

Note by Theorem 1.1 that the function  $q \mapsto \dim_H \mathbf{U}_q$  is continuous. Letting  $j \rightarrow \infty$  in (4.7), and then  $p_j \rightarrow M+1$ , by Theorem 1.1 this gives

$$\dim_H \mathbf{U}(x) \geq \dim_H \mathbf{U}_{M+1} = 1.$$

Note that  $q_x = M+1$  for all  $x \in (0, 1]$ . Hence,  $\dim_H \mathbf{U}(x) = 1 = \dim_H \mathbf{U}_{q_x}$  for all  $x \in (0, 1]$ . This proves (4.5) for  $x \in (0, 1]$ .

Now we prove (4.5) for  $x > 1$ . Let  $x \in (1, \infty)$ . Then  $q_x = 1 + M/x$ , and the quasi-greedy  $q_x$ -expansion of  $x$  is  $M^\infty$ . We claim that for any  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  there exists a large integer  $J = J(N)$  such that

$$(4.8) \quad \Gamma_{N,J} := \{M^J d_1 d_2 \dots : (d_i) \in \mathbf{U}_{q_x, N}\} \subset \mathbf{U}(x),$$

where  $\mathbf{U}_{q_x, N}$  consists of all sequences  $(d_i) \in \{0, 1, \dots, M\}^{\mathbb{N}}$  satisfying

$$\overline{\alpha_1(q_x) \dots \alpha_N(q_x)} \prec d_{n+1} \dots d_{n+N} \prec \alpha_1(q_x) \dots \alpha_N(q_x) \quad \forall n \geq 0.$$

This can be verified by the following observation. Take  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ . Since  $\Phi_x(q_x) = M^\infty$ , by the definition of  $\Gamma_{N,J}$  it follows that each sequence  $(y_i) \in \Gamma_{N,J}$  determines a unique base  $q_{N,J} \in (1, q_x)$  via the equation

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{y_i}{q^i} = x.$$

Here we emphasize that  $q_{N,J} < q_x$  since  $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} y_i/q_x^i < x$ . Since  $q_{N,J} \rightarrow q_x$  as  $J \rightarrow \infty$ , by Lemma 2.1 we can choose  $J$  sufficiently large such that

$$\alpha(q_{N,J}) \succ \alpha_1(q_x) \dots \alpha_N(q_x) M^\infty.$$

Then by Lemma 3.2 it follows that each  $(y_i) \in \Gamma_{N,J}$  is the unique expansion of  $x$ . In other words,  $\Gamma_{N,J} \subset \mathbf{U}(x)$ , proving (4.8).

By (4.8) it follows that

$$\dim_H \mathbf{U}(x) \geq \dim_H \Gamma_{N,J} = \dim_H \mathbf{U}_{q_x, N}.$$

Letting  $N \rightarrow \infty$  in the above equation we conclude by Theorem 1.1 (see also [3, Theorem 3.1]) that

$$\dim_H \mathbf{U}(x) \geq \dim_H \mathbf{U}_{q_x}.$$

The reverse inequality is obvious since  $\mathbf{U}(x) \subset \mathbf{U}_{q_x}$  by Lemma 3.8 (ii). This proves (4.5) for  $x > 1$ .  $\square$

**4.2. Critical values of  $\mathcal{U}(x)$ .** Observe by Proposition 3.6 that the map  $\Phi_x : \mathcal{U}(x) \rightarrow \mathbf{U}(x)$  is bijective and locally bi-Hölder continuous. So, to determine the critical values of  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  is equivalent to determine the critical values of  $\mathbf{U}(x)$ . We do this by using Theorems 2 and 1.2.

Recall from (1.5) that  $q_G = q_G(M) \in (1, M+1)$  is the generalized Golden ratio. Then  $x_G = M/(q_G - 1) > 1$ . First we show that  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  is a singleton for  $x \geq x_G$ .

**Lemma 4.3.** *If  $x \geq x_G$ , then  $\mathcal{U}(x) = \{q_x\}$ .*

*Proof.* Note by Theorem 1.2 (i) that for  $q \leq q_G$  the symbolic univoque set  $\mathbf{U}_q = \{0^\infty, M^\infty\}$ . For  $x \geq x_G$  we have  $q_x \leq q_G$  by (1.4). Then

$$\mathbf{U}(x) \subseteq \{0^\infty, M^\infty\} \quad \forall x \geq x_G.$$

If  $0^\infty \in \mathbf{U}(x)$ , then  $x = (0^\infty)_q = 0$ , leading to a contradiction with our assumption that  $x \geq x_G > 0$ . So  $\mathbf{U}(x) = \{M^\infty\}$ , which implies  $\mathcal{U}(x) = \{q_x\}$  for all  $x \geq x_G$ .  $\square$

In the following lemma we show that  $x_G$  is indeed a critical value for  $\mathcal{U}(x)$ . Recall that  $q_{KL} \in (q_G, M+1)$  is the Komornik-Loreti constant. Then  $x_{KL} = M/(q_{KL}-1) \in (1, x_G)$ .

**Lemma 4.4.** *For any  $x < x_G$  the set  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  contains infinitely many elements. Furthermore, for  $x \in [x_{KL}, x_G)$  we have  $|\mathcal{U}(x)| = \aleph_0$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $x < x_G$ . Then  $q_x > q_G$ . Note by Lemma 4.1 that the set-valued map  $x \mapsto \mathbf{U}(x)$  is non-increasing. It suffices to prove that  $\mathbf{U}(x)$  contains infinitely many elements for  $x \in (1, x_G)$ . Take  $x \in (1, x_G)$ . Then by (1.4) it follows that  $q_x \in (q_G, M+1)$  and the quasi-greedy expansion  $\Phi_x(q_x) = M^\infty$ . By Lemma 2.1 (i) and Lemma 3.2 there exists a large integer  $N = N(x)$  such that

$$M^k \alpha(q_G) \in \mathbf{U}(x) \quad \forall k \geq N.$$

This implies that  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  is an infinite set for any  $x < x_G$ .

Observe by Lemma 3.8 (ii) that  $\mathbf{U}(x) \subseteq \mathbf{U}_{q_x}$  for any  $x > 0$ . Furthermore,  $q_x \in (q_G, q_{KL})$  if and only if  $x \in (x_{KL}, x_G)$ . By using Theorem 1.2 (ii) it follows that  $\mathbf{U}(x)$  is at most countable for any  $x \in (x_{KL}, x_G)$ . If  $x = x_{KL}$ , then  $q_x = q_{KL}$  and  $\Phi_x(q_x) = M^\infty$ . Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{U}(x) &= \{M^\infty\} \cup \{\Phi_x(p) : p \in \mathcal{U}(x) \cap (1, q_{KL})\} \\ &= \{M^\infty\} \cup \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \left\{ \Phi_x(p) : p \in \mathcal{U}(x) \cap \left(1, q_{KL} - \frac{1}{2^n}\right) \right\} \\ &\subseteq \{M^\infty\} \cup \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{U}_{q_{KL} - \frac{1}{2^n}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then by Theorem 1.2 (ii) we can deduce from the above equation that  $\mathbf{U}(x)$  is also a countable for  $x = x_{KL}$ . Therefore,  $|\mathcal{U}(x)| = \aleph_0$  for any  $x \in [x_{KL}, x_G)$ .  $\square$

In the next lemma we demonstrate that  $x_{KL}$  is also a critical value of  $\mathcal{U}(x)$ .

**Lemma 4.5.**

- (i) *If  $x \in (0, 1]$ , then  $\dim_H \mathcal{U}(x) = 1$ ;*
- (ii) *If  $x \in (1, x_{KL})$ , then*

$$0 < \dim_H \mathcal{U}_{q_x} \leq \dim_H \mathcal{U}(x) \leq \max_{q \in \mathcal{U}(x)} \dim_H \mathcal{U}_q < 1.$$

*Proof.* (i) was first proven by Lü, Tan and Wu [30] for  $M = 1$ . For  $M > 1$  the proof was given by Xu [36] in his thesis. For completeness we prove this by using Lemma 4.2 and an adaption of Lemma 3.4. Let  $x \in (0, 1]$  and let  $(\varepsilon_i) = \Phi_x(M+1)$  be the quasi-greedy  $(M+1)$ -expansion of  $x$ . Then by Lemma 4.2 there exists a sequence of subsets  $\{\mathbf{U}_{N_j}(x)\}_{j \geq 1}$  of  $\mathbf{U}(x)$  such that  $N_j \rightarrow \infty$  as  $j \rightarrow \infty$ , and each subset  $\mathbf{U}_{N_j}(x)$  consists of all sequences of the form

$$(4.9) \quad \varepsilon_1 \dots \varepsilon_{N+N_j} \mathbf{w} d_1 d_2 \dots \quad \text{with} \quad d_{n+1} \dots d_{n+N_j} \notin \{0^{N_j}, M^{N_j}\} \quad \forall n \geq 0.$$

Here the positive integer  $N$  and the word  $\mathbf{w}$  depend only on  $x$ . Then

$$(4.10) \quad \mathcal{U}_{N_j}(x) := \Phi_x^{-1}(\mathbf{U}_{N_j}(x)) \subset \mathcal{U}(x) \quad \forall j \geq 1.$$

By (4.9) and a similar argument as in the proof of Lemma 3.4 it follows that for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists a large integer  $j \geq 1$  such that

$$(4.11) \quad \dim_H \mathcal{U}_{N_j}(x) \geq (1 - \varepsilon) \dim_H \mathbf{U}_{N_j}(x) = (1 - \varepsilon) \dim_H \mathbf{U}_{p_j},$$

where  $p_j \in (1, M+1]$  satisfies  $1 = \sum_{i=1}^{N_j} M/p_j^i$ . Letting  $j \rightarrow \infty$  in (4.11), and then  $p_j \rightarrow M+1$ , by (4.10) and Theorem 1.1 it follows that

$$\dim_H \mathcal{U}(x) \geq \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \dim_H \mathcal{U}_{N_j}(x) \geq (1 - \varepsilon) \dim_H \mathbf{U}_{M+1} = 1 - \varepsilon.$$

Since  $\varepsilon > 0$  was given arbitrarily, we conclude that  $\dim_H \mathcal{U}(x) = 1$  for all  $x \in (0, 1]$ .

Now we prove (ii). Let  $x \in (1, x_{KL})$ . Then  $q_x \in (q_{KL}, M+1)$ . By the proof of Theorem 2 it follows that

$$(4.12) \quad \dim_H \{\Phi_x(p) : p \in (q_x - \delta, q_x]\} = \dim_H \mathbf{U}(x) = \dim_H \mathbf{U}_{q_x} > 0$$

for any  $\delta > 0$ , where the last inequality follows by Theorem 1.2. Using Proposition 3.6 and (4.12) it follows that for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \dim_H \mathcal{U}(x) &\geq \dim_H(\mathcal{U}(x) \cap (q_x - \delta, q_x]) \\ &\geq \frac{1 - \varepsilon}{\log q_x} \dim_H \{\Phi_x(p) : p \in (q_x - \delta, q_x]\} \\ &= \frac{1 - \varepsilon}{\log q_x} \dim_H \mathbf{U}_{q_x} = (1 - \varepsilon) \dim_H \mathcal{U}_{q_x}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows by  $\mathcal{U}_{q_x} = \pi_{q_x}(\mathbf{U}_{q_x})$  and Lemma 3.10. Since  $\varepsilon > 0$  was arbitrary, this together with (4.12) establishes the first two inequalities of (ii).

On the other hand, set

$$\xi := \max_{q \in \mathcal{U}(x)} \dim_H \mathcal{U}_q.$$

Since  $\overline{\mathcal{U}(x)} \subset (1, q_x]$  and  $q_x \in \mathcal{U}(x) \cap (q_{KL}, M+1)$ , by Theorem 1.1 it follows that  $0 < \xi < 1$ . Let  $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{1}{2}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\xi}} - 1)$ . Then by Proposition 3.6, Lemma 3.10 and Theorem 1.1 it follows that for each  $q \in \mathcal{U}(x)$  there exists  $\delta > 0$ ,

$$(4.13) \quad \begin{aligned} \dim_H(\mathcal{U}(x) \cap (q - \delta, q + \delta)) &\leq \frac{1 + \varepsilon}{\log(q + \delta)} \dim_H \mathbf{U}_{q+\delta} \\ &= (1 + \varepsilon) \dim_H \mathcal{U}_{q+\delta} \\ &\leq (1 + \varepsilon)^2 \dim_H \mathcal{U}_q \\ &\leq (1 + \varepsilon)^2 \xi < \frac{(1 + \varepsilon)^2}{(1 + 2\varepsilon)^2} < 1. \end{aligned}$$

For each  $q \in \overline{\mathcal{W}(x)}$  we choose a  $\delta_q \in (0, M + 1 - q_x)$  satisfying (4.13). Then the collection  $\{(q - \delta_q, q + \delta_q) : q \in \overline{\mathcal{W}(x)}\}$  forms an open cover of  $\overline{\mathcal{W}(x)}$ . Since  $\overline{\mathcal{W}(x)}$  is compact, there exists a finite cover  $\{(q_i - \delta_i, q_i + \delta_i)\}_{i=1}^N$  of  $\overline{\mathcal{W}(x)}$ , where  $\delta_i := \delta_{q_i}$ . By (4.13) this implies

$$\begin{aligned} \dim \mathcal{W}(x) &= \dim_H \left( \mathcal{W}(x) \cap \bigcup_{i=1}^N (q_i - \delta_i, q_i + \delta_i) \right) \\ &= \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} \dim_H(\mathcal{W}(x) \cap (q_i - \delta_i, q_i + \delta_i)) \\ &\leq (1 + \varepsilon)^2 \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} \dim_H \mathcal{U}_{q_i} \leq (1 + \varepsilon)^2 \xi < 1. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\varepsilon > 0$  was arbitrary, this completes the proof.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 3.* By Lemmas 4.3–4.5 it suffices to prove that  $\mathcal{W}(x)$  has zero Lebesgue measure. This result was first proven in [30] for  $M = 1$  by using the Lebesgue density theorem. Here we present an alternate proof by using Proposition 3.6. By the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 4.5 (ii) one can easily verify that for  $x > 0$ ,

$$\dim_H \left( \mathcal{W}(x) \cap \left(1, M + 1 - \frac{1}{2^n}\right) \right) < 1 \quad \text{for any } n \geq 1.$$

This implies that  $\mathcal{W}(x) \cap \left(1, M + 1 - \frac{1}{2^n}\right)$  has zero Lebesgue measure for all  $n \geq 1$ . Then we conclude that  $\mathcal{W}(x)$  is a Lebesgue null set by observing

$$\mathcal{W}(x) \subseteq \{M + 1\} \cup \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \left( \mathcal{W}(x) \cap \left(1, M + 1 - \frac{1}{2^n}\right) \right).$$

$\square$

## 5. ISOLATED POINTS OF $\mathcal{W}(x)$

In this section we will consider the topological structure of  $\mathcal{W}(x)$  when  $x$  varies in  $(0, \infty)$ . In particular, we will investigate the isolated points of  $\mathcal{W}(x)$ , and prove Theorem 4. Recall from (1.2) that  $(1, M + 1] \setminus \overline{\mathcal{W}} = \bigcup (q_0, q_0^*)$ . Motivated by the work of de Vries and Komornik [12] we introduce the bifurcation set  $\mathcal{V}$  of the set-valued map  $q \mapsto \mathbf{U}_q$  defined by

$$\mathcal{V} := \{q \in (1, M + 1] : \mathbf{U}_r \neq \mathbf{U}_q \ \forall r > q\}.$$

They showed in [12] that  $\overline{\mathcal{W}} \subset \mathcal{V}$ , and  $\mathcal{V} \setminus \overline{\mathcal{W}}$  is countably infinite. Moreover, for each connected component  $(q_0, q_0^*)$  we can write the elements in  $\mathcal{V} \cap (q_0, q_0^*) = \{q_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  in an increasing order as

$$q_0 < q_1 < q_2 < \cdots < q_n < q_{n+1} < \cdots, \quad \text{and } q_n \nearrow q_0^* \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Then by the definition of  $\mathcal{V}$  it follows that  $\mathbf{U}_p = \mathbf{U}_{q_{n+1}}$  for any  $p \in (q_n, q_{n+1}]$ . For  $n \geq 1$  set

$$\mathbf{U}_{q_{n+1}}^* := \mathbf{U}_{q_{n+1}} \setminus \mathbf{U}_{q_n} = \left\{ (d_i) \in \mathbf{U}_{q_{n+1}} : (d_i) \text{ ends with } \alpha(q_n) \text{ or } \overline{\alpha(q_n)} \right\}.$$

It was shown in [12] that  $\mathbf{U}_{q_{n+1}}^*$  is dense in  $\mathbf{U}_{q_{n+1}}$  for any  $n \geq 1$ .

First we give a sufficient condition for the set  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  including isolated points.

**Proposition 5.1.** *Let  $(q_0, q_0^*)$  be a connected component of  $(1, M+1] \setminus \overline{\mathcal{U}}$ , and let  $\{q_n\} = \mathcal{V} \cap (q_0, q_0^*)$ . Then for any*

$$x \in \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{p \in (q_n, q_{n+1})} \pi_p(\mathbf{U}_{q_{n+1}}^*)$$

the set  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  contains isolated points.

*Proof.* Let  $x \in \pi_p(\mathbf{U}_{q_{n+1}}^*)$  for some  $p \in (q_n, q_{n+1})$  and  $n \geq 1$ . In the following we will show that  $p$  is an isolated point of  $\mathcal{U}(x)$ . Note by the definition of  $\mathcal{V}$  that  $\Phi_x(p) \in \mathbf{U}_{q_{n+1}}^* \subset \mathbf{U}_{q_{n+1}} = \mathbf{U}_p$ . Then  $\Phi_x(p) = (x_i(p)) \in \mathbf{U}_p$ . Furthermore, by the definition of  $\mathbf{U}_{q_{n+1}}^*$  it follows that  $\Phi_x(p)$  ends with  $\alpha(q_n) = (a_1 \dots a_m \overline{a_1 \dots a_m})^\infty$  for some  $m \geq 1$ . So there exists  $N_1 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$\Phi_x(p) = x_1(p) \dots x_{N_1}(p) (a_1 \dots a_m \overline{a_1 \dots a_m})^\infty.$$

Now suppose  $p \in (q_n, q_{n+1})$  is not an isolated point of  $\mathcal{U}(x)$ . Then by Lemma 2.1 (i) there exists a  $p' \in \mathcal{U}(x) \cap (q_n, q_{n+1})$  such that  $p' \neq p$  and  $\Phi_x(p') = (x_i(p'))$  coincides with  $\Phi_x(p)$  for the first  $N_1 + 2m$  digits, i.e.,

$$(5.1) \quad x_1(p') \dots x_{N_1+2m}(p') = x_1(p) \dots x_{N_1}(p) a_1 \dots a_m \overline{a_1 \dots a_m}.$$

Observe that  $\Phi_x(p') \in \mathbf{U}_{p'} = \mathbf{U}_{q_{n+1}}$  and

$$\alpha(q_{n+1}) = (a_1 \dots a_m \overline{a_1 \dots a_m}^+ \overline{a_1 \dots a_m}^- a_1 \dots a_m^-)^\infty,$$

where for a word  $\mathbf{c} = c_1 \dots c_n$  we write  $\mathbf{c}^- := c_1 \dots c_{n-1}(c_n - 1)$  if  $c_n > 0$ , and write  $\mathbf{c}^+ := c_1 \dots c_{n-1}(c_n + 1)$  if  $c_n < M$ . Then by (5.1) and Lemma 3.2 it follows that

$$\Phi_x(p') = x_1(p) \dots x_{N_1}(p) (a_1 \dots a_m \overline{a_1 \dots a_m})^\infty = \Phi_x(p).$$

By Lemma 2.1 (i) this implies  $p' = p$ , leading to a contradiction with our hypothesis. So,  $p$  is an isolated point of  $\mathcal{U}(x)$ .  $\square$

Recall from Section 1 that  $X_{iso} = \{x > 0 : \mathcal{U}(x) \text{ contains isolated points}\}$ . By Lemma 4.3 we see that  $\mathcal{U}(x) = \{q_x\}$  is a singleton for any  $x \geq x_G = M/(q_G - 1)$ . This implies that  $[x_G, \infty) \subset X_{iso}$ . In the following result we show that the set  $X_{iso}$  is dense in  $[0, 1]$ .

**Lemma 5.2.** *For any  $x \in [0, 1]$  and any  $\delta > 0$  the intersection  $X_{iso} \cap (x - \delta, x + \delta)$  contains an interval.*

*Proof.* Take  $x \in [0, 1]$  and  $\delta > 0$ . Then there exist  $y \in (x - \frac{\delta}{3}, x + \frac{\delta}{3})$  and a large integer  $N_1 = N_1(x, \delta)$  such that the quasi-greedy expansion  $\Phi_y(M+1) = y_1 y_2 \dots$  contains neither  $N_1$  consecutive 0's nor  $N_1$  consecutive  $M$ 's. By Lemmas 3.7 and 3.8 (ii) this implies

$$(5.2) \quad (y_i) \in \mathbf{U}_q \quad \forall q > p_{N_1},$$



where  $p_n$  is the root of  $\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{M}{p_i^n} = 1$  in  $(1, M+1)$ . Clearly,  $p_n \nearrow M+1$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Note that the map

$$g : [p_{N_1}, M+1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}; \quad q \mapsto \pi_q((y_i))$$

is continuous, and  $g(M+1) = y$ . So there exists an integer  $N_2 > N_1$  such that

$$(5.3) \quad g(q) \in \left( y - \frac{\delta}{3}, y + \frac{\delta}{3} \right) \subseteq \left( x - \frac{2\delta}{3}, x + \frac{2\delta}{3} \right) \quad \forall q \in [p_{N_2}, M+1].$$

Let  $(q_0, q_0^*) \subset [p_{N_2}, M+1]$  be a connected component of  $(1, M+1) \setminus \overline{\mathcal{W}}$ , and write  $(q_0, q_0^*) \setminus \mathcal{V} = \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} (q_n, q_{n+1})$ . Take  $n \geq 1$ . Recall from [12, Theorem 1.4] that the set  $\mathbf{U}_{q_{n+1}}^*$  is dense in  $\mathbf{U}_{q_{n+1}}$  with respect to the metric  $\rho$  defined in (1.3). Note by (5.2) that  $(y_i) \in \mathbf{U}_{q_{n+1}}$ . Then there exists a sequence  $(z_i) \in \mathbf{U}_{q_{n+1}}^*$  such that

$$(5.4) \quad |\pi_q((z_i)) - g(q)| = |\pi_q((z_i)) - \pi_q((y_i))| < \frac{\delta}{3} \quad \forall q \in (q_n, q_{n+1}).$$

Since  $(q_n, q_{n+1}) \subset [p_{N_2}, M+1]$ , by (5.3) and (5.4) it follows that

$$z^q := \pi_q((z_i)) \in (x - \delta, x + \delta) \quad \forall q \in (q_n, q_{n+1}).$$

Furthermore, by using Proposition 5.1 we obtain that  $\mathcal{U}(z^q)$  contains isolated points for any  $q \in (q_n, q_{n+1})$ . In other words,  $X_{iso} \cap (x - \delta, x + \delta)$  contains the sub-interval  $(z^{q_{n+1}}, z^{q_n})$ .  $\square$

In the following we consider isolated points of  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  for  $x > 1$ . When  $M = 1$  we show that  $X_{iso} \supset (1, \infty)$ .

**Proposition 5.3.** *Let  $M = 1$ . Then for any  $x > 1$  the set  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  contains isolated points.*

Note by Lemma 4.3 that  $X_{iso} \supset [x_G, \infty)$ . Then it suffices to prove that  $X_{iso}$  covers  $(1, x_G)$ . We will prove this in several steps. Let  $(q_0, q_0^*) = (1, q_{KL})$  be the first connected component of  $(1, 2] \setminus \overline{\mathcal{W}}$ . Then  $\mathcal{V} \cap (q_0, q_0^*) = \{q_1, q_2, q_3, \dots\}$  satisfying

$$1 = q_0 < q_1 < q_2 < q_3 < \dots < q_0^* = q_{KL}, \quad \text{and} \quad q_n \nearrow q_{KL} \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Furthermore, for each  $n \geq 1$  the base  $q_n \in (1, q_{KL})$  admits the quasi-greedy expansion

$$(5.5) \quad \alpha(q_n) = (\tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^n}^-)^\infty,$$

where  $(\tau_i)_{i=0}^\infty = 01101001\dots$  is the classical Thue-Morse sequence (cf. [6]).

The following property for the sequence  $(\tau_i)$  is well-known [25].

**Lemma 5.4.** *For any integer  $n \geq 0$  we have*

- (i).  $\tau_{2^{n+1}} \dots \tau_{2^{n+1}} = \overline{\tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^n}^+}$ .
- (ii).  $\overline{\tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^n-i}} \prec \tau_{i+1} \dots \tau_{2^n} \preceq \tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^n-i} \quad \forall 0 \leq i < 2^n$ .

Now we construct sequences in  $\mathbf{U}_{q_{n+1}}^*$ .

**Lemma 5.5.** *For  $n \geq 1$  and  $k \geq 1$  let*

$$\mathbf{c}_{n,k} := \tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^{n-1}} (\overline{\tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^{n-1}}})^k (\overline{\tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^n}})^\infty.$$

Then  $\mathbf{c}_{n,k} \in \mathbf{U}_{q_{n+1}}^*$  for all  $k \geq 1$ .

*Proof.* Note by (5.5) that  $\mathbf{c}_{n,k}$  ends with  $(\overline{\tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^n}})^\infty = \overline{\alpha(q_n)}$ . Then by Lemma 3.7 it suffices to prove

$$(5.6) \quad \overline{\alpha(q_{n+1})} \prec \sigma^j(\mathbf{c}_{n,k}) \prec \alpha(q_{n+1}) \quad \forall j \geq 1,$$

where  $\sigma$  is the left-shift map. Since  $\alpha(q_{n+1})$  begins with  $\tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^n}$ , we prove (5.6) by considering the following three cases.

(I).  $1 \leq j < 2^{n-1}$ . Then (5.6) follows by Lemma 5.4 (ii) that

$$\overline{\tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^{n-1-j}}} \prec \tau_{j+1} \dots \tau_{2^{n-1}} \preceq \tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^{n-1-j}} \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{\tau_1 \dots \tau_j} \prec \tau_{2^{n-1-j+1}} \dots \tau_{2^{n-1}}.$$

(II).  $2^{n-1} \leq j < (k+1)2^{n-1}$ . Note that  $\sigma^{2^{n-1}}(\mathbf{c}_{n,k}) = (\overline{\tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^{n-1}}})^k (\overline{\tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^n}})^\infty$ . Then (5.6) again follows by Lemma 5.4 (ii) that

$$\overline{\tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^{n-1-i}}} \prec \overline{\tau_{i+1} \dots \tau_{2^{n-1}}} \preceq \tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^{n-1-i}} \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{\tau_1 \dots \tau_i} \prec \tau_{2^{n-1-i+1}} \dots \tau_{2^{n-1}}$$

for any  $0 \leq i < 2^{n-1}$ .

(III).  $j \geq (k+1)2^{n-1}$ . Then the proof of (5.6) is similar to Case (II).  $\square$

By the definition of  $\mathbf{c}_{n,k}$  it is easy to see that

$$\mathbf{c}_{n,k} \nearrow \mathbf{c}_{n,\infty} := \tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^{n-1}} (\overline{\tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^{n-1}}})^\infty \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

In the following lemma we construct sequences in  $\mathbf{U}_{q_{n+1}}^*$  decrease to  $\mathbf{c}_{n,\infty}$ .

**Lemma 5.6.** *For  $n \geq 2$  and  $k \geq 1$  let*

$$\mathbf{d}_{n,k} := \tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^{n-1}} (\overline{\tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^{n-1}}})^k \overline{\tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^{n-2}}} (\overline{\tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^n}})^\infty.$$

Then  $\mathbf{d}_{n,k} \in \mathbf{U}_{q_{n+1}}^*$  for all  $k \geq 1$ .

*Proof.* It is clear that  $\mathbf{d}_{n,k}$  ends with  $\overline{\alpha(q_n)}$ . Then by Lemma 3.7 it suffices to prove

$$(5.7) \quad \overline{\alpha(q_{n+1})} \prec \sigma^j(\mathbf{d}_{n,k}) \prec \alpha(q_{n+1}) \quad \forall j \geq 1.$$

Since  $\alpha(q_{n+1})$  begins with  $\tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^n}$ , by the proof of Lemma 5.5 we only need to verify (5.7) for  $k2^{n-1} + 2^{n-2} \leq j < (k+1)2^{n-1} + 2^{n-2}$ . Observe by Lemma 5.4 (i) that

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^{k2^{n-1} + 2^{n-2}}(\mathbf{d}_{n,k}) &= \tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^{n-2}} \overline{\tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^{n-2}}} (\overline{\tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^{n-1}}} \tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^{n-1}})^\infty \\ &= (\tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^{n-1}} \overline{\tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^{n-1}}})^\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Then by using Lemma 5.4 (ii) and the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 5.5 one can verify (5.7) for all  $j \geq k2^{n-1} + 2^{n-2}$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

Clearly, the sequence

$$\mathbf{d}_{n,k} \searrow \mathbf{d}_{n,\infty} := \tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^{n-1}} (\overline{\tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^{n-1}}})^\infty = \mathbf{c}_{n,\infty} \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

Now we are ready to prove Proposition 5.3.

*Proof of Proposition 5.3.* Let  $M = 1$ . Note that  $[x_G, \infty) \subset X_{iso}$ . We only need to prove that  $X_{iso}$  covers  $(1, x_G)$ . Note by Lemma 5.5 that the sequences  $\mathbf{c}_{n,k}$  belong to  $\mathbf{U}_{q_{n+1}}$  for all  $n \geq 1$  and  $k \geq 1$ . Then by Proposition 5.1 it follows that

$$(5.8) \quad X_{iso} \supset \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{p \in (q_n, q_{n+1})} \pi_p(\mathbf{c}_{n,k}) = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} (\pi_{q_{n+1}}(\mathbf{c}_{n,k}), \pi_{q_n}(\mathbf{c}_{n,k})),$$

where the bases  $q_n \in \mathcal{V}$  are defined as in (5.5). Similarly, by Lemma 5.6 and Proposition 5.1 it follows that

$$(5.9) \quad X_{iso} \supset \bigcup_{n=2}^{\infty} \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{p \in (q_n, q_{n+1})} \pi_p(\mathbf{d}_{n,k}) = \bigcup_{n=2}^{\infty} \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} (\pi_{q_{n+1}}(\mathbf{d}_{n,k}), \pi_{q_n}(\mathbf{d}_{n,k})).$$

In the following we will show that the unions in (5.8) and (5.9) are sufficient to cover  $(1, x_G)$ .

First we prove that the unions in (5.8) covers  $(1, x_G)$  up to a countable set. Recall that

$$\mathbf{c}_{n,k} = \tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^{n-1}} (\overline{\tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^{n-1}}})^k (\overline{\tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^n}})^\infty.$$

Then by (5.5) and Lemma 5.4 (i) it follows that

$$(5.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \pi_{q_{n+1}}(\mathbf{c}_{n,k+1}) &= \pi_{q_{n+1}}(\tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^{n-1}} (\overline{\tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^{n-1}}})^{k+1} \overline{\tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^{n-1}}} (\tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^{n-1}} \overline{\tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^{n-1}}})^\infty) \\ &< \pi_{q_{n+1}}(\tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^{n-1}} (\overline{\tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^{n-1}}})^{k+2} 0^\infty) \\ &= \pi_{q_{n+1}}(\tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^n} 0^{2^{n-1}k} \overline{\tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^{n-1}}})^\infty + \pi_{q_{n+1}}(0^{2^n} (\overline{\tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^{n-1}}})^k 0^\infty). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by (5.5) we obtain

$$(5.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \pi_{q_n}(\mathbf{c}_{n,k}) &= \pi_{q_n}(\tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^{n-1}} \overline{\tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^{n-1}}})^\infty + \pi_{q_n}(0^{2^n} (\overline{\tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^{n-1}}})^k 0^\infty) \\ &= 1 + \pi_{q_n}(0^{2^n} (\overline{\tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^{n-1}}})^k 0^\infty). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\pi_{q_{n+1}}(\tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^n} 0^{2^{n-1}k} \overline{\tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^{n-1}}})^\infty < 1$  for any  $n \geq 1, k \geq 1$ , by (5.10) and (5.11) it follows that  $\pi_{q_{n+1}}(\mathbf{c}_{n,k+1}) < \pi_{q_n}(\mathbf{c}_{n,k})$ . Therefore, the intervals  $J_k := (\pi_{q_{n+1}}(\mathbf{c}_{n,k}), \pi_{q_n}(\mathbf{c}_{n,k}))$  are pairwise overlapped. So,

$$(5.12) \quad \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} (\pi_{q_{n+1}}(\mathbf{c}_{n,k}), \pi_{q_n}(\mathbf{c}_{n,k})) = (\pi_{q_{n+1}}(\mathbf{c}_{n,1}), \pi_{q_n}(\mathbf{c}_{n,\infty})),$$

where  $\mathbf{c}_{n,\infty} = \tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^{n-1}} (\overline{\tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^{n-1}}})^\infty$ . Note by Lemma 5.4 (i) that

$$\mathbf{c}_{n,1} = \tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^{n-1}} \overline{\tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^{n-1}}} (\overline{\tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^n}})^\infty = \tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^n} (\overline{\tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^n}})^\infty = \mathbf{c}_{n+1,\infty}.$$

Write  $z_n := \pi_{q_n}(\mathbf{c}_{n,\infty})$ . Then by (5.8) and (5.12) it follows that

$$X_{iso} \supset \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} (z_{n+1}, z_n).$$

Observe that  $z_1 = \pi_{q_1}(\mathbf{c}_{1,\infty}) = \pi_{q_1}(1^\infty) = x_G$ . Furthermore, since  $q_n \nearrow q_{KL}$  and  $\mathbf{c}_{n,\infty} \searrow \tau_1 \tau_2 \dots$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we have

$$z_n = \pi_{q_n}(\mathbf{c}_{n,\infty}) \searrow \pi_{q_{KL}}(\tau_1 \tau_2 \dots) = 1 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Therefore,

$$X_{iso} \supset (1, x_G) \setminus \{z_n : n \geq 2\}.$$

To complete the proof it remains to prove  $z_n \in X_{iso}$  for all  $n \geq 2$ . We will show that all of these points  $z_n$  belong to the unions in (5.9). Observe that for  $n \geq 2$  the sequence  $\mathbf{d}_{n,k}$  decreases to  $\mathbf{d}_{n,\infty} = \mathbf{c}_{n,\infty}$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Since  $\mathbf{d}_{n,k}$  and  $\mathbf{c}_{n,\infty}$  are both quasi-greedy  $q_n$ -expansions, by Lemma 2.1 it follows that

$$(5.13) \quad \pi_{q_n}(\mathbf{d}_{n,k}) > \pi_{q_n}(\mathbf{c}_{n,\infty}) = z_n \quad \forall k \geq 1.$$

On the other hand, since

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \pi_{q_{n+1}}(\mathbf{d}_{n,k}) = \pi_{q_{n+1}}(\mathbf{c}_{n,\infty}) < \pi_{q_n}(\mathbf{c}_{n,\infty}) = z_n,$$

by (5.13) there exists  $K \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for all  $k \geq K$  we have

$$z_n \in (\pi_{q_{n+1}}(\mathbf{d}_{n,k}), \pi_{q_n}(\mathbf{d}_{n,k})) \subset X_{iso} \quad \forall n \geq 2.$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

*Remark 5.7.* By Proposition 5.1 and the proof of Proposition 5.3 it follows that for each

$$z_n = \pi_{q_n}(\mathbf{c}_{n,\infty}) = \pi_{q_n}(\tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^{n-1}}(\overline{\tau_1 \dots \tau_{2^{n-1}}})^\infty) \quad \text{with } n \geq 2,$$

the set  $\mathcal{U}(z_n)$  contains infinitely many isolated points.

*Proof of Theorem 4.* The theorem follows by Lemma 5.2 and Proposition 5.3.  $\square$

## 6. FINAL REMARKS AND QUESTIONS

At the end of this paper we pose some questions based on Theorems 1–4. In view of Theorem 1 it is natural to ask the following question.

**Question 1:** Does Theorem 1 hold for  $x > 0$  and  $q \in \overline{\mathcal{U}}$ ?

By Theorem 2 and Theorem 1.1 it follows that the bifurcation set of  $\phi : x \mapsto \dim_H \mathbf{U}(x)$  can be easily obtained by the bifurcation set of  $\psi : q \mapsto \dim_H \mathbf{U}_q$ . More precisely,  $x$  is a bifurcation point of  $\phi$  if and only if  $q_x$  is a bifurcation point of  $\psi$ . The same correspondence holds for the plateaus of  $\phi$  and  $\psi$ . Motivated by Lemma 4.1 and the works studied in [12, 5] we ask the following question.

**Question 2:** Can we describe the bifurcation sets of the set-valued map  $x \mapsto \mathbf{U}(x)$ ? In other words, can we describe the following sets

$$E_1 = \{x : \mathbf{U}(y) \neq \mathbf{U}(x) \forall y > x\} \quad \text{and} \quad E_2 = \{x : \dim_H(\mathbf{U}(x) \setminus \mathbf{U}(y)) > 0 \forall y > x\}?$$

Although we can calculate the Hausdorff dimension of  $\mathbf{U}(x)$  as in Theorem 3, we are not able to give the Hausdorff dimension of  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  for  $x \in (1, x_{KL})$ .

**Question 3:** What is the Hausdorff dimension of  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  for  $x \in (1, x_{KL})$ ?

Finally, for the isolated points of  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  we have shown in Theorem 4 that  $X_{iso}$  is dense in  $(0, \infty)$  for  $M = 1$ . Our proof does not work for  $M \geq 2$  in the interval  $(1, x_G)$ .

**Question 4:** Is it true that  $X_{iso}$  is dense in  $(0, \infty)$  for any  $M \geq 2$ ? We conjecture that

$$\mathcal{U}(x) \text{ contains isolated points} \iff x \in (0, 1) \cup (1, \infty).$$

Up to now we know very little about the topological structure of  $\mathcal{U}(x)$ .

**Question 5:** When is  $\mathcal{U}(x)$  a closed set? Clearly, for  $x \geq x_G$  the set  $\mathcal{U}(x) = \{q_x\}$  is a singleton which is closed.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

D. Kong thanks Pieter Allaart for providing the Maple codes of Figure 1. He was supported by NSFC No. 11971079 and the Fundamental and Frontier Research Project of Chongqing No. cstc2019jcyj-msxmX0338. W. Li was supported by NSFC No. 11671147, 11571144 and Science and Technology Commission of Shanghai Municipality (STCSM) No. 13dz2260400. F. Lü was supported by NSFC No. 11601358.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] R. Alcaraz Barrera, S. Baker, and D. Kong. Entropy, topological transitivity, and dimensional properties of unique  $q$ -expansions. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 371(5):3209–3258, 2019.
- [2] P. Allaart and D. Kong. Relative bifurcation sets and the local dimension of univoque bases. *arXiv:1809.00323*. To appear in *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 2018.
- [3] P. Allaart and D. Kong. On the continuity of the Hausdorff dimension of the univoque set. *Adv. Math.*, 354:106729, 24, 2019.
- [4] P. C. Allaart. On univoque and strongly univoque sets. *Adv. Math.*, 308:575–598, 2017.
- [5] P. C. Allaart, S. Baker, and D. Kong. Bifurcation sets arising from non-integer base expansions. *arXiv:1706.05190*. To appear in *J. Fractal Geometry*, 2017.
- [6] J.-P. Allouche and J. Shallit. The ubiquitous Prouhet-Thue-Morse sequence. In *Sequences and their applications (Singapore, 1998)*, Springer Ser. Discrete Math. Theor. Comput. Sci., pages 1–16. Springer, London, 1999.
- [7] C. Baiocchi and V. Komornik. Greedy and quasi-greedy expansions in non-integer bases. *arXiv:0710.3001v1*, 2007.
- [8] S. Baker. Generalized golden ratios over integer alphabets. *Integers*, 14:Paper No. A15, 28, 2014.
- [9] K. Dajani and M. de Vries. Invariant densities for random  $\beta$ -expansions. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 9(1):157–176, 2007.

- [10] K. Dajani, V. Komornik, D. Kong, and W. Li. Algebraic sums and products of univoque bases. *Indag. Math. (N.S.)*, 29(4):1087–1104, 2018.
- [11] Z. Daróczy and I. Kátai. On the structure of univoque numbers. *Publ. Math. Debrecen*, 46(3-4):385–408, 1995.
- [12] M. de Vries and V. Komornik. Unique expansions of real numbers. *Adv. Math.*, 221(2):390–427, 2009.
- [13] M. de Vries and V. Komornik. A two-dimensional univoque set. *Fund. Math.*, 212(2):175–189, 2011.
- [14] M. de Vries and V. Komornik. Expansions in non-integer bases. In *Combinatorics, words and symbolic dynamics*, volume 159 of *Encyclopedia Math. Appl.*, pages 18–58. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2016.
- [15] M. de Vries, V. Komornik, and P. Loreti. Topology of the set of univoque bases. *Topology Appl.*, 205:117–137, 2016.
- [16] P. Erdős, I. Joó, and V. Komornik. Characterization of the unique expansions  $1 = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} q^{-n_i}$  and related problems. *Bull. Soc. Math. France*, 118:377–390, 1990.
- [17] P. Erdős, M. Horváth, and I. Joó. On the uniqueness of the expansions  $1 = \sum q^{-n_i}$ . *Acta Math. Hungar.*, 58(3-4):333–342, 1991.
- [18] P. Erdős and I. Joó. On the number of expansions  $1 = \sum q^{-n_i}$ . *Ann. Univ. Sci. Budapest. Eötvös Sect. Math.*, 35:129–132, 1992.
- [19] K. Falconer. *Fractal geometry*. John Wiley & Sons Ltd., Chichester, 1990. Mathematical foundations and applications.
- [20] P. Glendinning and N. Sidorov. Unique representations of real numbers in non-integer bases. *Math. Res. Lett.*, 8:535–543, 2001.
- [21] C. Kalle, D. Kong, W. Li, and F. Lü. On the bifurcation set of unique expansions. *Acta Arith.*, 188(4):367–399, 2019.
- [22] V. Komornik. Expansions in noninteger bases. *Integers*, 11B:Paper No. A9, 30, 2011.
- [23] V. Komornik, D. Kong, and W. Li. Hausdorff dimension of univoque sets and devil’s staircase. *Adv. Math.*, 305:165–196, 2017.
- [24] V. Komornik and P. Loreti. Unique developments in non-integer bases. *Amer. Math. Monthly*, 105(7):636–639, 1998.
- [25] V. Komornik and P. Loreti. Subexpansions, superexpansions and uniqueness properties in non-integer bases. *Period. Math. Hungar.*, 44(2):197–218, 2002.
- [26] V. Komornik and P. Loreti. On the topological structure of univoque sets. *J. Number Theory*, 122(1):157–183, 2007.
- [27] D. Kong. On small univoque bases of real numbers. *Acta Math. Hungar*, pages 1–15, 2016.
- [28] D. Kong and W. Li. Hausdorff dimension of unique beta expansions. *Nonlinearity*, 28(1):187–209, 2015.
- [29] D. Kong, W. Li, and F. M. Dekking. Intersections of homogeneous Cantor sets and beta-expansions. *Nonlinearity*, 23(11):2815–2834, 2010.
- [30] F. Lü, B. Tan, and J. Wu. Univoque sets for real numbers. *Fund. Math.*, 227(1):69–83, 2014.
- [31] W. Parry. On the  $\beta$ -expansions of real numbers. *Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar.*, 11:401–416, 1960.
- [32] A. Rényi. Representations for real numbers and their ergodic properties. *Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar.*, 8:477–493, 1957.
- [33] N. Sidorov. Almost every number has a continuum of  $\beta$ -expansions. *Amer. Math. Monthly*, 110(9):838–842, 2003.
- [34] N. Sidorov. Arithmetic dynamics. In *Topics in dynamics and ergodic theory*, volume 310 of *London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser.*, pages 145–189. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2003.
- [35] N. Sidorov. Expansions in non-integer bases: lower, middle and top orders. *J. Number Theory*, 129(4):741–754, 2009.

- [36] J. Xu. *Lebesgue measure and Hausdorff dimension of univoque sets for  $\beta > 1$* . 2019. Thesis (M.Sc.)—East China Normal University (Shanghai).

(D. Kong) COLLEGE OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, CHONGQING UNIVERSITY, CHONGQING 401331, PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

*E-mail address:* derongkong@126.com

(W. Li) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SHANGHAI KEY LABORATORY OF PMMP, EAST CHINA NORMAL UNIVERSITY, SHANGHAI 200062, PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

*E-mail address:* wxli@math.ecnu.edu.cn

(F. Lü) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SICHUAN NORMAL UNIVERSITY, CHENGDU 610068, PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

*E-mail address:* lvfan1123@163.com

(Z. Wang) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SHANGHAI KEY LABORATORY OF PMMP, EAST CHINA NORMAL UNIVERSITY, SHANGHAI 200062, PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

*E-mail address:* zhiqiangwzy@163.com

(J. Xu) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SHANGHAI KEY LABORATORY OF PMMP, EAST CHINA NORMAL UNIVERSITY, SHANGHAI 200062, PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

*E-mail address:* dkxujy@163.com