

MULTIPLICATIVE ANALOGUE OF MARKOFF-LAGRANGE SPECTRUM AND PISOT NUMBERS

SHIGEKI AKIYAMA AND HAJIME KANEKO

ABSTRACT. Markoff-Lagrange spectrum uncovers exotic topological properties of Diophantine approximation by arithmetic progressions. We observe significantly analogous results on Diophantine approximation by geometric progressions. Letting $\|x\|$ be the distance from x to the nearest integer, we study the set

$$\mathcal{L}(\alpha) = \left\{ \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\xi \alpha^n\| \mid \xi \in \mathbb{R} \right\}$$

when α is an integer with $\alpha \geq 2$, or a quadratic unit with $\alpha \geq 3$.

We show that $\mathcal{L}(\alpha)$ is closed in $[0, 1/2]$, and contains a proper interval when α is quadratic but it does not when α is an integer. We also determine the minimum limit point and all isolated points beneath this point. In the course of the proof, we revisit a property studied by Markoff which characterizes bi-infinite balanced words and sturmian words.

1. INTRODUCTION

For a real number x , we write the distance from x to the nearest integer by $\|x\|$. Denote the integral and fractional parts of x by $[x]$ and $\{x\}$, respectively. Moreover, we write the minimal integer greater than or equal to x by $\lceil x \rceil$. In this paper, \mathbb{N} denotes the set of positive integers. Koksma's theorem [16, Theorem 4.3] implies that for a fixed $\xi \neq 0$ and almost all $\alpha > 1$ (or for a fixed $\alpha > 1$ and almost all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$), the sequence $(\xi \alpha^n)_{n=0,1,\dots}$ is uniformly distributed modulo one.

However for a concrete pair (ξ, α) , it is usually difficult to get a non-trivial result on the distribution of $(\xi \alpha^n)_{n=0,1,\dots}$ modulo one. For example, we consider the limit points of the fractional parts. Pisot [23], Vijayaraghavan [27], and Rédei [26] independently showed for any coprime integers a, b with $a > b \geq 2$ that the sequence $\{(a/b)^n\}$ ($n = 0, 1, \dots$) has infinitely many limit points. However, it is unknown whether $\{(a/b)^n\}$ ($n = 0, 1, \dots$) is dense in $[0, 1]$. In the case where α is a transcendental number, then it is generally difficult to prove that the sequence $\{\alpha^n\}$ ($n = 1, 2, \dots$) has at least two limit points. Note that it is still not proved whether $\{e^n\}$ ($n = 0, 1, \dots$) has a positive limit point, that is, $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \{e^n\} > 0$.

The situation is better when α belongs to a certain class of algebraic integers. A Pisot number is an algebraic integer greater than 1 such that the absolute values of the conjugates (except for itself) are less than 1. Note that every rational integer greater than 1 is a Pisot number. Let α be a Pisot number. Since the trace of the number α^n is a rational integer, we get

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\alpha^n\| = 0.$$

Key words and phrases. Pisot numbers, fractional part, Markoff-Lagrange spectrum, balanced words, sturmian words, symbolic dynamics.

Hardy [12] (c.f. [23]) proved for any algebraic number α greater than 1 and nonzero real number ξ that if

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\xi \alpha^n\| = 0,$$

then α is a Pisot number and $\xi \in \mathbb{Q}(\alpha)$. Dubickas [7] showed that

$$\inf_{\substack{\xi \in \mathbb{R} \\ \xi \notin \mathbb{Q}}} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\xi a^n\| = \frac{1}{a} E\left(\frac{1}{a}\right)$$

for any integer $a \geq 2$, and

$$(1.1) \quad \inf_{\xi \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \xi \left(\frac{a}{b}\right)^n \right\| \geq \frac{1}{a} E\left(\frac{b}{a}\right)$$

for any coprime integers a and b with $a > b \geq 2$, where

$$(1.2) \quad E(X) := \frac{1 - (1 - X) \prod_{n=0}^{\infty} (1 - X^{2^n})}{2X}.$$

In view of [22], the values of $E(X)$ at any algebraic numbers α with $0 < |\alpha| < 1$ are transcendental, which gives nice contrast to our results in §4. The inequality (1.1) was generalized in [14] for expanding algebraic numbers α , i.e., all conjugates have modulus greater than 1.

These developments led us to study the distribution of values $\|\xi \alpha^n\|$ for a fixed Pisot number α and a general $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$. In this paper, we are interested in the set

$$\mathcal{L}(\alpha) = \left\{ \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\xi \alpha^n\| \mid \xi \in \mathbb{R} \right\}.$$

Theorem 2.1 is for a general Pisot number. After that, we specify to the two simplest cases : α is an integer $\alpha = a \geq 2$ or a quadratic unit

$$\alpha = \begin{cases} (b + \sqrt{b^2 - 4})/2 & 3 \leq b \in \mathbb{Z} \\ (b + \sqrt{b^2 + 4})/2 & 1 \leq b \in \mathbb{Z}. \end{cases}$$

We briefly review Markoff-Lagrange spectrum on Diophantine approximation. Hurwitz theorem reads for any irrational x , there exist infinitely many $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with

$$n \|nx\| < \frac{1}{\sqrt{5}},$$

where the right-hand side can not be replaced by a smaller constant if and only if x is the image of Möbius transformation in $GL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ of the golden mean. Putting

$$\mu(x) := \left(\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} n \|nx\| \right)^{-1},$$

we see $\mu((1 + \sqrt{5})/2) = \sqrt{5}$. Extending the observation above, we consider the set

$$\mathbb{L} = \{ \mu(x) \mid x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}, \mu(x) < \infty \},$$

called Lagrange spectrum¹. The set \mathbb{L} attracted a lot of attention through rich connection with many areas of mathematics. Basic results on \mathbb{L} include

- (i) \mathbb{L} is closed in \mathbb{R} (Cusick [5]).
- (ii) $\mathbb{L} \cap [0, 3]$ is discrete and 3 is the accumulation point of \mathbb{L} . Moreover, $\mathbb{L} \cap [0, 3]$ is described in terms of Markoff numbers (Markoff [19]).

¹Markoff spectrum is an intimately related set, but we do not deal with in this article. See [6].

- (iii) Hall [11] showed that $\mathbb{L} \supset [6, \infty)$. Moreover, Freiman [10] determined the minimum c with $\mathbb{L} \supset [c, \infty)$, where

$$c = \frac{2221564096 + 283748\sqrt{462}}{491993569} = 4.527829566 \dots$$

See further developments in [6, 4, 20].

While the set \mathbb{L} concerns the rate of approximation of the point 0 by $(n\alpha)_{n=1,2,\dots}$ up to integer differences, the study of $\mathcal{L}(\alpha)$ is focused on the rate of approximation of 0 by the sequence $(\xi\alpha^n)_{n=1,2,\dots}$. Two settings are not quite identical but of similar flavor, and we observe striking analogy between them when α is an integer or a quadratic unit.

In §2 we prepare our basic setup and show an exact analogy of (i) that $\mathcal{L}(\alpha)$ is closed in Theorem 2.1 for any Pisot number α . Our problems are transferred into the ones in symbolic dynamics. Note that the corresponding dynamics is a one-sided shift when α is an integer, and is a two-sided shift when α is a quadratic unit. The idea of the proof is to select a bi-infinite word whose all central blocks reappear infinitely many times in the limiting process, and glue the blocks together to make another infinite word without changing the limsup value. The method also gives a short alternative proof of the result by Cusick [5] that \mathbb{L} is closed (see Remark 2.1).

The analogy of (ii) forms the main body of the present paper. When α is an integer, Theorem 3.1 gives the discrete part of the spectrum, as a small refinement of Dubickas [7]. When $\alpha > 3$ is a quadratic unit, the discrete part is described by negative continued fraction. The results are summarized as Theorem 4.1 and 4.3. §5 and §6 are devoted to their proofs.

The map intertwining the discrete spectrum of $\mathcal{L}(\alpha)$ and a shift space is quite different from the map used to study the discrete part of \mathbb{L} . To our surprise, however, we deduce that this space \mathcal{X}_F coincides with the one appeared in classical Lagrange spectrum: the set of bi-infinite **balanced words**. In the course of the proof, we rediscover a property of infinite words studied by Markoff [18, pp.397]. This property characterizes balanced words (Theorem 5.8) which is stated without proof in Cusick-Flahive [6]: a written proof is given by Reutenauer [24] using the idea of Sturmian morphism in [17]. Note that Yasutomi [29, Lemma 14] noticed this fact in a little general form. The discrete part of $\mathcal{L}(\alpha)$ corresponds to Christoffel words, the coding of rotation of rational slope, and the proof is finished by using a certain unavoidable symmetry of sturmian words. These phenomena are already observed in the study of Lagrange spectrum, see [4, 25]. In summary, the problem of describing the discrete part of the classical Lagrange spectrum is transferred to an optimization problem of certain values defined on \mathcal{X}_F . In the case of $\mathcal{L}(\alpha)$, it corresponds to a different optimization problem on \mathcal{X}_F of similar flavor.

Finally we show in Theorem 7.3 that $\mathcal{L}(\alpha)$ contains a proper interval for a quadratic unit $\alpha > 3$, which is an analogy of (iii). Our idea in brief: because it is a problem on two sides shift, there is a room to recode symmetric beta expansions in base α to bi-infinite sequences. Note that if α is an integer, then the analogy does not show because $\mathcal{L}(\alpha)$ is of Lebesgue measure zero as in Theorem 2.2. This difference essentially comes from the nature of the corresponding symbolic dynamics whether it is two-sided or one-sided. See the remark before Theorem 2.2 as well.

We introduce notation on words and shift spaces which we use throughout the paper. Let \mathcal{B} be a non empty finite set and \mathcal{B}^* the free monoid generated by \mathcal{B} with the binary operation of concatenation. The empty word λ is the identity and put

$\mathcal{B}^+ = \mathcal{B}^* \setminus \{\lambda\}$. Let $\mathcal{B}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ (resp. $\mathcal{B}^{\mathbb{N}}$) be the set of right infinite (resp. bi-infinite) words equipped with the product topology of discrete topologies on \mathcal{B} . Then $\mathcal{B}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and $\mathcal{B}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ are compact spaces invariant under the shift map $\sigma((s_i)) = (s_{i+1})$. The topological dynamical system $(\mathcal{B}^{\mathbb{N}}, \sigma)$ (resp. $(\mathcal{B}^{\mathbb{Z}}, \sigma)$) is called one-sided (resp. two-sided) full shift.

2. EMBEDDING TO SYMBOLIC DYNAMICS: $\mathcal{L}(\alpha)$ IS CLOSED

For any real number ξ , there exist a unique integer $u(\xi)$ and a real number $\varepsilon(\xi) \in [-1/2, 1/2)$ with

$$\xi = u(\xi) + \varepsilon(\xi).$$

Note that $|\varepsilon(\xi)| = \|\xi\|$.

We introduce the first key of this paper: the formulae in [15] on fractional parts of geometric progressions whose common ratios are Pisot numbers. Let α be a Pisot number whose minimal polynomial is $X^d + a_{d-1}X^{d-1} + \cdots + a_0 \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$. Denote the conjugates of α except itself by $\alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_d$. Let ξ be a real number. For any integer m , set

$$(2.1) \quad s_m = s_m(\alpha; \xi) := u(\xi\alpha^{m+1}) + a_{d-1}u(\xi\alpha^m) + \cdots + a_0u(\xi\alpha^{m+1-d}).$$

Since

$$s_m = -\varepsilon(\xi\alpha^{m+1}) - a_{d-1}\varepsilon(\xi\alpha^m) - \cdots - a_0\varepsilon(\xi\alpha^{m+1-d}),$$

we have $s_m \in \mathcal{B} := [-B, B] \cap \mathbb{Z}$ with $B = (1 + \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} |a_i|)/2$.

First we consider a geometric progression whose common ratio is an integer $\alpha = a \geq 2$. The sequence $(s_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded by $A := (1 + a)/2$ in modulus. We have

$$(2.2) \quad \varepsilon(\xi a^n) = \frac{s_{n+1}}{a} + \frac{s_{n+2}}{a^2} + \frac{s_{n+3}}{a^3} + \cdots =: (s_{n+1}s_{n+2}s_{n+3}\cdots)_a.$$

Conversely, let $(s_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a bounded sequence of integers. It is easily seen for any $n \geq 0$ that

$$(2.3) \quad \varepsilon(\xi a^n) \equiv (s_{n+1}s_{n+2}s_{n+3}\cdots)_a \pmod{\mathbb{Z}},$$

where $\xi = (s_1s_2s_3\cdots)_a$. Problems on $(\varepsilon(\xi a^n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ are viewed as the ones on the one-sided shift $(\mathcal{B}^{\mathbb{N}}, \sigma)$ with $\mathcal{B} = [-A, A] \cap \mathbb{Z}$. In §3 we study sequences $(s_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \mathcal{B}^{\mathbb{N}}$ that $\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} |(\sigma^k((s_n)))_a|$ are small.

Next, we consider the case that α is an irrational Pisot number. Note that

$$(2.4) \quad s_{-m} = s_{-m}(\alpha; \xi) = 0$$

for sufficiently large m . For any $m \geq 0$, let

$$\rho_m(\alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_d) := \sum_{\substack{i_2, \dots, i_d \geq 0 \\ i_2 + \cdots + i_d = m}} \alpha_2^{i_2} \cdots \alpha_d^{i_d} \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Lemma 3.1 in [15] implies that

$$\rho_m(\alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_d) = \sum_{h=2}^d \left(\prod_{\substack{2 \leq k \leq d \\ k \neq h}} \frac{\alpha_h}{\alpha_h - \alpha_k} \right) \alpha_h^m.$$

In the same way as the representation (4.5) in [15]² we get

$$(2.5) \quad \varepsilon(\xi\alpha^n) = \frac{1}{\alpha} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \alpha^{-i} \rho_j(\alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_d) s_{n+i-j} = \sum_{q=-\infty}^{\infty} s_{n+q} \tau_q,$$

where τ_q is a real number defined by

$$\tau_q = \begin{cases} \sum_{h=2}^d \left(\prod_{\substack{2 \leq k \leq d \\ k \neq h}} \frac{\alpha_h}{\alpha_h - \alpha_k} \right) \frac{\alpha_h^{-q}}{\alpha - \alpha_h} & (q \leq 0), \\ \sum_{h=2}^d \left(\prod_{\substack{2 \leq k \leq d \\ k \neq h}} \frac{\alpha_h}{\alpha_h - \alpha_k} \right) \frac{\alpha^{-q}}{\alpha - \alpha_h} & (q > 0). \end{cases}$$

Conversely, let $(s_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ be a bounded sequence of integers such that $s_{-n} = 0$ for sufficiently large integer n . Then Proposition 5.2 in [15] implies that

$$(2.6) \quad \varepsilon(\xi\alpha^n) \equiv \sum_{q=-\infty}^{\infty} s_{n+q} \tau_q \pmod{\mathbb{Z}},$$

where

$$\xi = \xi((s_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}) = \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \alpha^i \rho_j(\alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_d) s_{-i-j-1}.$$

The right-hand side of the equality converges by the assumption on $(s_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$. We write

$$((s_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}})_\alpha := \sum_{q=-\infty}^{\infty} s_{n+q} \tau_q.$$

Note that if $s_n = 0$ for any $n \leq -1$, then

$$\xi((s_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}) = ((s_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}})_\alpha.$$

Since α is a Pisot number, the infinite sequence $((s_n))_\alpha$ converges for any bi-infinite bounded integer sequence $(s_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$. We define a realization map

$$g((s_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}) = ((s_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}})_\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$$

and use this map even when (2.4) does not hold in §4. Because $|\alpha_j| < 1$ for any $2 \leq j$, the value s_h for $h \leq n_0$ has no influence to the limsup value for any fixed n_0 and we embed our problem on $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\xi\alpha^n\|$ to the one on symbolic dynamics $(\mathcal{B}^{\mathbb{Z}}, \sigma)$.

In the case where $\alpha = a$ is an integer, putting

$$\tau_q := \begin{cases} 0 & (q \leq 0) \\ a^{-q} & (q > 0), \end{cases}$$

we see (2.5) and (2.6) are valid, which gives a unified proof for the following theorem.

Theorem 2.1. *Let α be a Pisot number. Then $\mathcal{L}(\alpha)$ is a closed subset of $[0, 1/2]$.*

²We use $u(x)$ and $\varepsilon(x)$ instead of the usual integral and fractional parts $[x]$ and $\{x\}$, respectively.

Proof. Let η be a limit of the sequence $(\eta_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $\eta_j = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\xi_j \alpha^n\|$. We may assume that $\eta_j \neq \eta$ for all j . For each ξ_j , the sequence $(s[j]_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \mathcal{B}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ is defined by (2.1). For a positive integer K , define

$$W_K = \{\sigma^k((s[j]_n)) \mid k, j \geq K\}$$

and the topological upper limit [13, p.25]:

$$W^+ = \bigcap_{K=1}^{\infty} \overline{W_K},$$

where \overline{V} is the closure of V with respect to the topology of $\mathcal{B}^{\mathbb{Z}}$. We are interested in the set

$$W = \{(s_n) \in \mathcal{B}^{\mathbb{Z}} \mid |(s_n)_\alpha| = \eta, \text{ and } (s_n) \in W^+\}.$$

By definition W is compact. Each element in W is the limit of a sequence of a certain shift of subsequence of $(s[j]_n)$ having its g -value $\pm\eta$.

We claim that W is non empty, and moreover one can select $(s_n) \in W$ so that there exists a sequence $(j_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ of positive integers that every central block $s_{-\ell} \dots s_\ell$ appears infinitely often in $(s[j_p]_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ for $p \geq \ell$. Hereafter a sequence $(s_n) \in W$ having this property is called **limit recurrent**.

We now show the claim above. Put $\varepsilon_j = |2(\eta - \eta_j)|$. By $\eta - \varepsilon_j \leq \eta_j - \varepsilon_j/2$ and $\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} |g(\sigma^k((s[j]_n)))| = \eta_j$, the set

$$A(j) := \{k \in \mathbb{N} \mid |g(\sigma^k((s[j]_n)))| > \eta - \varepsilon_j\}$$

is infinite. Let $m(0, j) = j$ and we shall define $s_{-\ell} \dots s_\ell \in \mathcal{B}^{2\ell+1}$ and a sequence $(m(\ell, j))_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ for $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $(m(\ell+1, j))_j$ is a subsequence of $(m(\ell, j))_j$. Assume that $(m(\ell, j))_j$ is already defined and the set

$$\{n \in A(m(\ell, j)) \mid s[m(\ell, j)]_{n-\ell+1} \dots s[m(\ell, j)]_{n+\ell-1} = s_{-\ell+1} \dots s_{\ell-1}\}$$

is infinite³ for all $m(\ell, j)$. We choose a word $s_{-\ell}^{m(\ell, j)} \dots s_\ell^{m(\ell, j)} \in \mathcal{B}^{2\ell+1}$ satisfying $s_{-\ell+1}^{m(\ell, j)} \dots s_{\ell-1}^{m(\ell, j)} = s_{-\ell+1} \dots s_{\ell-1}$ so that

$$\left\{ n \in A(m(\ell, j)) \mid s[m(\ell, j)]_{n-\ell} \dots s[m(\ell, j)]_{n+\ell} = s_{-\ell}^{m(\ell, j)} \dots s_\ell^{m(\ell, j)} \right\}$$

is infinite. Then we select a subsequence $(m(\ell+1, j))_j$ of $(m(\ell, j))_j$ and $s_{-\ell} \dots s_\ell \in \mathcal{B}^{2\ell+1}$ with the property that for every j the set

$$\{n \in A(m(\ell+1, j)) \mid s[m(\ell+1, j)]_{n-\ell} \dots s[m(\ell+1, j)]_{n+\ell} = s_{-\ell} \dots s_\ell\}$$

is infinite. We continue this selection inductively on ℓ . Then the sequence $(s_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ should satisfy $((s_n)_\alpha) = \eta$ and every central block $s_{-\ell} \dots s_\ell$ appears infinitely often in $(s[m(p, j)]_n)$ for $p > \ell$, which implies the claim.

Let us fix a limit recurrent $(s_n) \in W$. If $\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} |\sigma^k((s_n)_\alpha)| = \eta$, defining

$$s'_n = \begin{cases} s_n & n \geq 0 \\ 0 & n < 0 \end{cases}$$

we obtain $\eta = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\xi \alpha^n\|$ for $\xi = ((s'_n)_\alpha)$. The proof becomes tricky when $\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} |\sigma^k((s_n)_\alpha)| < \eta$. Let $t(\ell) = s_{-\ell} \dots s_\ell$. Since (s_n) is limit recurrent, $t(\ell)$ appears infinitely often in $(s[m(p, j)]_n)$ for $p > \ell$. Thus there exists $a_\ell \in \mathcal{B}^*$ that

³ This condition is trivially valid when $\ell = 0$.

$t(\ell)a_\ell t(\ell)$ is a factor of $(s[m(p, j)]_n)$. We construct a word (x_n) that $x_n = 0$ for $n < 0$ and

$$x_0 x_1 \cdots = t(\ell)s_{\ell+1}a_{\ell+1}t(\ell+1)s_{\ell+2}a_{\ell+2}t(\ell+2)s_{\ell+3}a_{\ell+3} \cdots$$

Since $\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} |(t(\ell))_\alpha| = \eta$, we have $\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} |g(\sigma^k((x_n)))| \geq \eta$. By construction, the subword $x_i \dots x_{i+\ell+k}$ for $i \geq \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} |t(\ell+j)s_{\ell+j+1}a_{\ell+j+1}|$ is a factor of $(s[m(p, j)]_n)$ for $p > \ell+k$. Since we may choose arbitrary large k , this implies that $\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} |g(\sigma^k((x_n)))| \leq \eta$, finishing the proof. \square

Remark 2.1. The method for Theorem 2.1 gives an alternative proof that the classical Lagrange spectrum \mathbb{L} is closed. In fact, set

$$[a_0; a_1, a_2, a_3 \dots] := a_0 + \frac{1}{a_1 + \frac{1}{a_2 + \frac{1}{a_3 + \frac{1}{\ddots}}}}$$

For a bi-infinite sequence $\mathbf{a} = (a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ of positive integers, define

$$\varphi(\mathbf{a}) := \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} ([a_n; a_{n+1}, a_{n+2}, \dots] + [0; a_{n-1}, a_{n-2}, \dots]).$$

It is well known (see [6, 4]) that

$$\mathbb{L} = \bigcup_{A=1}^{\infty} \{\varphi(\mathbf{a}) \mid \mathbf{a} = (a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}, 1 \leq a_n \leq A \text{ for all } n\} =: \bigcup_{A=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{L}_A.$$

In the same way as the proof of Theorem 2.1, we see that \mathbb{L}_A is closed for any $A \geq 1$ and thus \mathbb{L} is closed, because, for any positive integer A , we have $\mathbb{L} \cap [0, A] = \mathbb{L}_A \cap [0, A]$.

We write down a concrete form of $((s_n))_\alpha$ in the case when $\alpha = (b + \sqrt{b^2 \mp 4})/2$ is a quadratic Pisot unit. For each real ξ and integer n , we have

$$(2.7) \quad s_n = u(\xi\alpha^{n+1}) - bu(\xi\alpha^n) \pm u(\xi\alpha^{n-1}) = -\varepsilon(\xi\alpha^{n+1}) + b\varepsilon(\xi\alpha^n) \mp \varepsilon(\xi\alpha^{n-1})$$

and $|s_n| \leq B$, where $B = (2+b)/2$. Then we see that $((s_n))_\alpha$ is represented as

$$(2.8) \quad \frac{1}{\alpha - \alpha_2} \left(\cdots + s_{n-2}\alpha_2^2 + s_{n-1}\alpha_2 + s_n + \frac{s_{n+1}}{\alpha} + \frac{s_{n+2}}{\alpha^2} + \cdots \right).$$

If α is an integer (resp. a quadratic Pisot unit), then (s_n) represents $(s_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \mathcal{B}^{\mathbb{N}}$ (resp. $(s_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \mathcal{B}^{\mathbb{Z}}$). For a given $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$, let $\eta = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\xi\alpha^n\|$ and (s_n) be an infinite sequence corresponding to ξ . Then we find a subsequence $0 \leq n_1 < n_2 < \dots$ that $\eta = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|\xi\alpha^{n_j}\|$. By a similar but simpler discussion as in the above proof, in the sequence $(\sigma^{n_j}((s_n)))_{j=1,2,\dots}$ we can select a converging subsequence and obtain a limit (w_n) by the topology of $\mathcal{B}^{\mathbb{N}}$ or $\mathcal{B}^{\mathbb{Z}}$. By construction, we have

$$(2.9) \quad |(w_n)_\alpha| = \eta, \quad |(\sigma^k((w_n)))_\alpha| \leq \eta \text{ for all } k,$$

where if α is an integer (resp. a quadratic Pisot unit), then k moves through positive integers (resp. integers). We call this word $(w_n) \in \mathcal{B}^{\mathbb{N}} \cup \mathcal{B}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ a **limsup word** for ξ . We give several applications of limsup words in the sequel. Let us denote the

Hausdorff dimension of $Z \subset \mathbb{R}$ by $\dim_H(Z)$. Hereafter we study $\dim_H(\mathcal{L}(a) \cap [0, t])$ when α be an integer $a \geq 2$ or a quadratic Pisot unit $(b + \sqrt{b^2 \mp 4})/2 > 3$.

We give an important remark : the limsup word is two-sided when α is a quadratic unit, and it does not satisfy (2.4). This means we can not apply (2.6). When α is an integer, the limsup word is one-sided and this problem does not happen (see (2.3)). This difference makes Theorem 2.2 sharper than Theorem 2.3. We will see later that the difference is really large in Theorem 7.3: for a quadratic unit $\alpha > 3$, $\mathcal{L}(\alpha)$ contains a proper interval. First we consider the case of $\alpha = a \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Theorem 2.2.

$$\dim_H(\mathcal{L}(a) \cap [0, t]) \leq \log(1/2)/\log(t)$$

for any integer $a \geq 2$. In particular, $\mathcal{L}(a)$ has Lebesgue measure zero.

Proof. Let $t \in [0, 1/2)$ and $\eta \in \mathcal{L}(a) \cap [0, t]$. Choose a limsup word $(w_n) \in \mathcal{B}^{\mathbb{N}}$ for η . Then

$$(w_{n+1}w_{n+2}\dots)_a \in [-t, t],$$

i.e., $\{\eta a^n\} \in [0, t] \cup [1-t, 1]$ holds for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, see the above remark. Using appropriate coverings of $[0, t]$ and $[1-t, 1]$ by cylinder sets of the a -adic expansion map $x \mapsto ax \pmod{1}$ on $[0, 1]$, we see that η belongs to the attractor Z of the iterated function system

$$Z = tZ \cup (tZ + 1 - t),$$

where $\dim_H(Z) = \log(1/2)/\log(t)$. The latter statement follows from

$$\mathcal{L}(a) - \{1/2\} = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\mathcal{L}(a) \cap \left[0, \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{n}\right] \right).$$

□

Next, we consider the case where α is a quadratic Pisot unit $(b + \sqrt{b^2 \mp 4})/2$.

Theorem 2.3. *We have*

$$\dim_H(\mathcal{L}(\alpha) \cap [0, t]) \leq \frac{\log(4m+1)}{\log(\alpha)}$$

for $m = m(t) = \lfloor (2+b)t \rfloor$. In particular, $\mathcal{L}(\alpha) \cap [0, t_0]$ has Lebesgue measure zero, where $t_0 = (\alpha - 1)/(4(b+2)) (< 1/4)$.

Proof. For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $Z_k = \{\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i \alpha^{-i} \mid a_i \in [-k, k] \cap \mathbb{Z}\}$. It is well known that $\dim_H Z_k = \min\{1, \log(2k+1)/\log \alpha\}$, see e.g. [8, Example 4.5]. If $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\xi \alpha^n\| \leq t$, then from (2.7) we have

$$|s_n(\alpha; \xi)| \leq (2+b)t$$

for sufficiently large n . By considering limsup words, this shows that

$$\mathcal{L}(\alpha) \cap [0, t] \subset \bigcup_{a_0=-m}^m (a_0 + \alpha^{-1} Z_{2m}).$$

Since Hausdorff dimension is preserved by finite or countable union, we obtain the former part. For any real number $0 \leq t < t_0$, we get by the irrationality of α that

$$m(t) \leq \left\lfloor \frac{\alpha - 1}{4} \right\rfloor < \frac{\alpha - 1}{4},$$

which implies the latter part. □

Theorem 2.3 suggests that smaller the value t we obtain a more sparse set $\mathcal{L}(\alpha) \cap [0, t]$. We go further to the case when this set becomes discrete. Our goal is to show that the limsup word has a lot of forbidden factors, and such a word does not exist, or exists but in a very special form if t is sufficiently small.

3. DISCRETE PART OF $\mathcal{L}(\alpha)$: INTEGER CASE

Recall that $E(X)$ is defined by (1.2). For $k \geq 0$, we put

$$E^{(k)}(X) := \frac{1 + X^{2^k} - (1 - X) \prod_{m=0}^{k-1} (1 - X^{2^m})}{2X(1 + X^{2^k})},$$

where $\prod_{m=0}^{k-1} (1 - X^{2^m}) = 1$ if $k = 0$. Note for any integer $a \geq 2$ that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} E^{(k)}\left(\frac{1}{a}\right) = E\left(\frac{1}{a}\right).$$

Put

$$\Xi(a) := \mathcal{L}(a) \cap \left(0, \frac{1}{a} E\left(\frac{1}{a}\right)\right].$$

Theorem 3.1. *For any integer $a \geq 2$, we have*

$$\Xi(a) = \left\{ \frac{1}{a} E^{(k)}\left(\frac{1}{a}\right) \mid k = 0, 1, 2, \dots \right\} \cup \left\{ \frac{1}{a} E\left(\frac{1}{a}\right) \right\}.$$

Proof. Let $\eta \in \Xi(a)$. There exists $\xi = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} s_n a^{-n}$, where $s_n = s_n(a; \xi)$, such that $\eta = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\xi a^n\|$. Let $\mathbf{t} := (t_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be a limsup word of ξ . If necessary, changing ξ and $(t_n)_{n \geq 1}$ by $-\xi$ and $(-t_n)_{n \geq 1}$, we have $\eta = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} t_n a^{-n}$. From the proof of Theorem 4 in Dubickas [7], we see that $\mathbf{t} \in \{\bar{1}, 0, 1\}^{\infty}$ and the following factors (subwords) are forbidden:

$$\begin{cases} 10^k 1, \bar{1}0^k \bar{1} & k \geq 0, \\ 10^m \bar{1}, \bar{1}0^m 1 & m \geq 2, \end{cases}$$

where $\bar{1}$ denotes -1 . Note that each digit from $\{1, -1\}$ appears infinitely often in \mathbf{t} . Therefore $\mathbf{t} = (t_n)_{n \geq 1}$ has the form

$$\mathbf{t} = 10^{v_1-1} \bar{1}0^{v_2-1} 10^{v_3-1} \bar{1} \dots =: \Phi(\mathbf{v}),$$

where $\mathbf{v} = (v_i)_{i \geq 1} \in \{1, 2\}^{\infty}$. Let \mathcal{F} be the set of limsup words \mathbf{t} with initial letter 1 corresponding to a certain $\eta \in \Xi(a)$. For any $\mathbf{y} = (y_i)_{i \geq 1} \in \{1, 2\}^{\infty}$, let

$$f(\mathbf{y}; X) = f(y_1 y_2 \dots; X) := 1 - X^{y_1} + X^{y_1+y_2} - + \dots = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (-1)^i X^{y_1+\dots+y_i}.$$

Set

$$\mathcal{W} := \left\{ \mathbf{y} \in \{1, 2\}^{\infty} \mid \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{1}{a} f\left(\mathbf{y}; \frac{1}{a}\right) \cdot a^n \right| \in \Xi(a) \right\}.$$

Let $\mathbf{y} = y_1 y_2 \dots, \mathbf{y}' = y'_1 y'_2 \dots$ be finite or infinite words on the alphabet $\{1, 2\}$. We denote $\mathbf{y} > \mathbf{y}'$ if there exists $n \geq 1$ satisfying $y_n \neq y'_n$ and

$$y_h > (-1)^{h+1} y'_h,$$

where $h = \min\{n \geq 1 \mid y_n \neq y'_n\}$. We denote by $\mathbf{y} \geq \mathbf{y}'$ if $\mathbf{y} > \mathbf{y}'$ or $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{y}'$. Assume that $\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}' \in \{1, 2\}^\infty$ satisfy $\mathbf{y} \geq \mathbf{y}'$. Then $f(\mathbf{y}; a^{-1}) \geq f(\mathbf{y}'; a^{-1})$, where the equality holds only if $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{y}'$. Hence, we obtain

$$\mathcal{F} = \left\{ \Phi \left(\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sigma^N(\mathbf{y}) \right) \mid \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{W} \right\},$$

where $\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sigma^N(\mathbf{y})$ is determined by the order \geq defined above.

Let τ be the substitution on $\{1, 2\}^*$ defined by $\tau(1) = 2$ and $\tau(2) = 211$. Let A_n ($n = 0, 1, \dots$) be the finite words defined by $A_0 = 1$ and $A_n = \tau(A_{n-1})$ for $n \geq 1$. Then

$$\mathbf{w} = w_1 w_2 \dots := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_n$$

is a fixed point of τ . Recall that

$$\frac{1}{a} E \left(\frac{1}{a} \right) = \frac{1}{a} f \left(\mathbf{w}; \frac{1}{a} \right)$$

(see relation (9) in [7]). Hence, \mathcal{W} is the set of $\mathbf{y} = (y_i)_{i \geq 1} \in \{1, 2\}^\infty$ satisfying the following: For any $u_1 \dots u_l \in \{1, 2\}^+$ with $u_1 \dots u_l > \mathbf{w}$, the word $u_1 \dots u_l$ appears at most finitely many times in \mathbf{y} .

Let us determine all eventually periodic words in \mathcal{F} . Let \mathcal{F}_k ($k = 2, 3, \dots$) be the subsets of \mathcal{F} defined by $\mathcal{F}_2 := \mathcal{F} \setminus \{A_0^\infty, A_1^\infty\}$, and $\mathcal{F}_{k+1} := \mathcal{F}_k \setminus \{A_k^\infty\}$ for $k \geq 2$, where $A_k^\infty = A_k A_k A_k \dots \in \{1, 2\}^\infty$. Let $\mathbf{v} = \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sigma^N(\mathbf{y}) \in \mathcal{F}$ with $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{W}$. Refining the proof of Lemma 4 in [7], we show the following claim by induction: Let $k \geq 2$. Then, if $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{F}_k$, then the word A_k is a prefix of \mathbf{v} , and \mathbf{v} is a concatenation of A_{k-1}, A_k . Moreover, \mathbf{y} can be taken as a word which is a concatenation of A_{k-1}, A_k . In particular, the claim above implies that $\bigcap_{k=2}^\infty \mathcal{F}_k = \{\mathbf{w}\}$, i.e., \mathbf{w} is a unique non-eventually periodic word in \mathcal{F} .

If $y_n = 1$ holds for sufficiently large n , then $\mathbf{v} = 1^\infty = A_0^\infty$. Similarly, if $y_n = 2$ for sufficiently large n , then $\mathbf{v} = 2^\infty = A_0^\infty$. We now prove the claim in the case of $k = 2$. Let $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{F}_2$. Then each digit from $\{1, 2\}$ appears infinitely often in \mathbf{y} . Observe that $212 > \mathbf{w}$ and $2111 > \mathbf{w}$. Thus, we may assume that neither 212 nor 2111 does not appear in \mathbf{y} . Hence, \mathbf{y} is a concatenation of $A_1 = 2$ and $A_2 = 211$. Consequently, \mathbf{v} is also a concatenation of A_1 and A_2 because the initial letter of $\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sigma^N(\mathbf{y})$ is 2. Since $211 > 22$, we see that A_2 is a prefix of \mathbf{v} .

Suppose that the claim is true for $k = \ell \geq 2$. Let $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{F}_{\ell+1}$. By the induction hypothesis, we may assume that \mathbf{y} has the form $\mathbf{y} = \tau^{\ell-1}(z_1 z_2 \dots)$ with $\mathbf{z} = (z_i)_{i \geq 1} \in \{1, 2\}^\infty$. Since $\mathbf{v} \neq A_{\ell-1}^\infty, A_\ell^\infty$, each digit from $\{1, 2\}$ appears infinitely often in \mathbf{z} . Recall that $\tau^{\ell-1}(212) > \mathbf{w}$ and $\tau^{\ell-1}(2111) > \mathbf{w}$. Thus, we may assume that neither 212 nor 2111 does not appear in \mathbf{z} . Hence, \mathbf{z} is a concatenation of $2 = \tau(1)$ and $211 = \tau(2)$. Consequently, \mathbf{y} and \mathbf{v} are concatenations of $\tau^{\ell-1}(2) = \tau^\ell(1) = A_\ell$ and $\tau^{\ell-1}(211) = \tau^\ell(2) = A_{\ell+1}$. Note by $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{F}_{\ell+1} \subset \mathcal{F}_\ell$ that $A_\ell = \tau^\ell(1)$ is a prefix of \mathbf{v} . Observe $\mathbf{v} = \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sigma^N(\tau^\ell(\mathbf{z}'))$ with certain $\mathbf{z}' \in \{1, 2\}^\infty$ and that 2 appears infinitely often in \mathbf{z}' since $\mathbf{v} \neq \tau^\ell(1)^\infty$. We see that either $\tau^\ell(2)$ or $\tau^\ell(11)$ is a prefix of \mathbf{v} . Since $\tau^\ell(2) > \tau^\ell(11)$, we get that $\tau^\ell(2) = A_{\ell+1}$ is a prefix of \mathbf{v} . Therefore, we proved the claim.

Hence, we obtain

$$\mathcal{F} = \{A_k^\infty \mid k = 0, 1, 2, \dots\} \cup \{\mathbf{w}\}$$

and

$$\Xi(a) = \left\{ \frac{1}{a} f \left(A_k^\infty; \frac{1}{a} \right) \mid k = 0, 1, 2, \dots \right\} \cup \left\{ \frac{1}{a} E \left(\frac{1}{a} \right) \right\}.$$

In what follows, we prove for any $k \geq 0$ that

$$(3.1) \quad f \left(A_k^\infty; \frac{1}{a} \right) = E^{(k)} \left(\frac{1}{a} \right),$$

which implies Theorem 3.1. For any $k \geq 0$, let $A_k =: a_1 a_2 \dots a_{\ell(k)}$, where $a_i \in \{1, 2\}$ for any i and $\ell(k)$ is the length of A_k . Set $s_j := \sum_{i=1}^j a_i$ for $1 \leq j \leq \ell(k)$. It is easily seen by induction that $\ell(k)$ is an odd number and $s_{\ell(k)} = 2^k$. Observe that

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{aligned} f(A_k^\infty; X) &= 1 + \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} (-X^{s_{\ell(k)}})^m \cdot (-X^{s_1} + X^{s_2} - X^{s_3} + \dots - X^{s_{\ell(k)}}) \\ &=: \frac{1}{1 + X^{2^k}} \cdot P_k(X), \end{aligned}$$

where $P_k(X) = 1 - X^{s_1} + X^{s_2} - X^{s_3} + \dots - X^{s_{-1+\ell(k)}}$. From $2^{k+1} \geq 1 + 2^k$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} &1 - (1 - X) \prod_{m=0}^{\infty} (1 - X^{2^m}) \\ &= 1 + X^{2^k} - (1 - X) \prod_{m=0}^{k-1} (1 - X^{2^m}) + O(X^{1+2^k}), \end{aligned}$$

where $O(X^n)$ denotes the terms of degree not less than n . Moreover, using

$$P_k(X) = E(X) + O(X^{2^k}),$$

we see

$$\begin{aligned} P_k(X) &= \frac{1 - (1 - X) \prod_{m=0}^{\infty} (1 - X^{2^m})}{2X} + O(X^{2^k}) \\ &= \frac{1 + X^{2^k} - (1 - X) \prod_{m=0}^{k-1} (1 - X^{2^m})}{2X} + O(X^{2^k}). \end{aligned}$$

Since the degree of $P_k(X)$ is less than 2^k , we obtain

$$P_k(X) = \frac{1 + X^{2^k} - (1 - X) \prod_{m=0}^{k-1} (1 - X^{2^m})}{2X}.$$

Substituting the equality above into (3.2), we deduce (3.1). □

4. DISCRETE PART OF $\mathcal{L}(\alpha)$: QUADRATIC UNIT CASE

Let $\alpha > 1$ be a quadratic unit, i.e., a root of $x^2 - bx \pm 1$ with $b \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha_2 = \pm 1/\alpha$ be its conjugate. We have shown that $\mathcal{L}(\alpha)$ is a closed subset of $[0, 1/2]$ in Theorem 2.1 and $\mathcal{L}(\alpha) \cap [0, (\alpha - 1)/(4(b + 2))]$ has Lebesgue measure zero in Theorem 2.3. In this section, we give the minimum limit point and all isolated points beneath this. First, we consider the case $\alpha_2 > 0$.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $\alpha > 3$ be a quadratic unit with $\alpha_2 > 0$. Define sequences of integers (p_n) and (q_n) by*

$$p_0 = 0, \quad p_2 = 1, \quad p_{2n+2} = bp_{2n} - p_{2n-2}, \quad p_{2n-1} = p_{2n-2} + p_{2n}$$

and

$$q_0 = 1, \quad q_2 = 1 + b, \quad q_{2n+2} = bq_{2n} - q_{2n-2}, \quad q_{2n-1} = q_{2n-2} + q_{2n}$$

for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $(p_n/q_n)_{n=0,1,\dots}$ is a strictly increasing sequence converging to $1/(1+\alpha)$ and we have

$$\left\{ \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\xi \alpha^n\| \mid \xi \in \mathbb{R} \right\} \cap \left[0, \frac{1}{1+\alpha} \right] = \left\{ \frac{p_n}{q_n} \mid n = 0, 1, 2, \dots \right\} \cup \left\{ \frac{1}{1+\alpha} \right\}.$$

Moreover, let $X_n = \{\xi \in \mathbb{R} \mid \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\xi \alpha^n\| = p_n/q_n\}$. Then X_n is a subset of $\mathbb{Q}(\alpha)$ explicitly described in terms of Christoffel words and

$$X_\infty = \left\{ \xi \in \mathbb{R} \mid \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\xi \alpha^n\| = \frac{1}{1+\alpha} \right\}$$

is an uncountable set, described by eventually balanced words, a generalization of Sturmian words.

For the definition of Christoffel words and eventually balanced words, see §5. Consider the **negative continued fraction** expansion

$$\frac{1}{1+\alpha} = \frac{1}{1+b - \frac{1}{b - \frac{1}{b - \frac{1}{\ddots}}}} =: [0; 1+b, b, b, b, \dots]_{neg}.$$

Using its n -th convergent $P_n/Q_n = [0, \underbrace{1+b, b, b, \dots, b}_n]_{neg}$, we have

$$\frac{p_{2n}}{q_{2n}} = \frac{P_n}{Q_n} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{p_{2n-1}}{q_{2n-1}} = \frac{P_{n-1} + P_n}{Q_{n-1} + Q_n}.$$

The complete description of X_n will be given in the proof, but we introduce the first two of them:

Corollary 4.2. *We have*

$$X_0 = \frac{1}{\alpha - \alpha_2} \mathbb{Z}[\alpha], \quad X_1 = \pm \frac{\alpha - 1}{b^2 - 4} + X_0.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\xi \alpha^n\| \geq \frac{1}{2+b}$$

for $\xi \in \mathbb{R} \setminus X_0$, and

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\xi \alpha^n\| \geq \frac{1}{1+b}$$

for $\xi \in \mathbb{R} \setminus (X_0 \cup X_1)$.

Next, we consider the case $\alpha_2 < 0$.

Theorem 4.3. *Let $\alpha > 3$ be a quadratic unit with $\alpha_2 < 0$. Define sequences of integers (p_n) and (q_n) by*

$$p_0 = 0, \quad p_2 = b, \quad p_{2n+2} = (b^2 + 2)p_{2n} - p_{2n-2}, \quad p_{2n-1} = p_{2n-2} + p_{2n}$$

and

$$q_0 = 1, \quad q_2 = b^2 + 3, \quad q_{2n+2} = (b^2 + 2)q_{2n} - q_{2n-2}, \quad q_{2n-1} = q_{2n-2} + q_{2n}$$

for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $(p_n/q_n)_{n=0,1,\dots}$ is a strictly increasing sequence converging to $b/(1+\alpha^2)$ and we have

$$\left\{ \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\xi \alpha^n\| \mid \xi \in \mathbb{R} \right\} \cap \left[0, \frac{b}{1+\alpha^2} \right] = \left\{ \frac{p_n}{q_n} \mid n = 0, 1, 2, \dots \right\} \cup \left\{ \frac{b}{1+\alpha^2} \right\}.$$

Moreover, let $X_n = \{\xi \in \mathbb{R} \mid \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\xi \alpha^n\| = p_n/q_n\}$. Then X_n is a subset of $\mathbb{Q}(\alpha)$ explicitly described in terms of Christoffel words and

$$X_\infty = \left\{ \xi \in \mathbb{R} \mid \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\xi \alpha^n\| = \frac{b}{1+\alpha^2} \right\}$$

is an uncountable set, described by eventually balanced words.

Let P_n/Q_n be the n -th convergent of the negative continued fraction expansion

$$\frac{1}{1+\alpha^2} = [0; b^2 + 3, b^2 + 2, b^2 + 2, b^2 + 2, \dots]_{neg}.$$

Then we have

$$p_{2n} = bP_n, \quad q_{2n} = Q_n, \quad p_{2n-1} = p_{2n-2} + p_{2n}, \quad \text{and} \quad q_{2n-1} = q_{2n-2} + q_{2n}.$$

Note that p_n and q_n are not always coprime.

Corollary 4.4. *We have*

$$X_0 = \frac{1}{\alpha - \alpha_2} \mathbb{Z}[\alpha], \quad X_1 = \pm \frac{\alpha}{4 + b^2} + X_0.$$

Therefore we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\xi \alpha^n\| \geq \frac{b}{4 + b^2}$$

for $\xi \in \mathbb{R} \setminus X_0$, and

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\xi \alpha^n\| \geq \frac{b}{3 + b^2}$$

for $\xi \in \mathbb{R} \setminus (X_0 \cup X_1)$.

In Theorems 4.1 and 4.3, we have $X_n \subset \mathbb{Q}(\alpha)$ for $n = 0, 1, \dots$ and X_∞ contains a transcendental number. Thus, we get a

Corollary 4.5. *Let $\alpha > 3$ be a quadratic unit. Then*

$$\inf_{\xi \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}(\alpha)} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\xi \alpha^n\| = \begin{cases} 1/(1+\alpha) & \text{for } \alpha_2 > 0 \\ b/(1+\alpha^2) & \text{for } \alpha_2 < 0. \end{cases}$$

5. CHARACTERIZATION OF BALANCED WORDS

We introduce the second key of this paper: a characterization of the set of bi-infinite balanced words. Our proof of Theorem 4.1 and 4.3 will be finished by using an unavoidable symmetry of **balanced words** or **sturmian words** in §6.

Let $\mathcal{A} = \{0, 1\}$ and $v = v_1 v_2 \dots v_n$ be a non empty word on \mathcal{A} . Write the length of v by $|v| = n$. The mirror word of v is denoted by $\tilde{v} = v_n v_{n-1} \dots v_1$ and set $\tilde{\lambda} = \lambda$. Put $v^0 = \lambda$ and $v^k = \underbrace{v v \dots v}_k$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$. We are interested in a subshift of

the full-shift $\mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ (resp $\mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{N}}$). Set $F = \{0v01\tilde{v}1, 1\tilde{v}10v0 \mid v \in \mathcal{A}^*\}$ and we study the subshift \mathcal{X}_F (resp \mathcal{Y}_F) of $\mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ (resp $\mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{N}}$) defined by the set F of forbidden words. In this section, we prove Theorem 5.8, a restatement of Reutenauer [24, Theorem

3.1], which asserts that \mathcal{X}_F is the set of bi-infinite balanced words. The proof is different from [24, 29] and self-contained. This formulation admits a one-sided version (Theorem 5.10) as well.

Clearly \mathcal{X}_F and \mathcal{Y}_F are invariant by the involution $0 \mapsto 1, 1 \mapsto 0$. Moreover, \mathcal{X}_F is invariant by the mirror map $\mathbf{x} \mapsto \tilde{\mathbf{x}}$. We use the standard notation in language theory, e.g., $(1+10)^+$ is the set of non empty finite words generated by 1 and 10. $B^{\mathbb{N}}$ (resp. $B^{\mathbb{Z}}$) is the set of right infinite words (resp. bi-infinite words) generated by $B \subset \mathcal{A}^*$. For $v \in \mathcal{A}^+$, we denote by $v^{\mathbb{N}}$ (resp. $v^{\mathbb{Z}}$) the right infinite (resp. bi-infinite) word concatenating v . For $u, v \in \mathcal{A}^*$ we denote by $u \prec v$ if u is a factor (subword) of v . This notation naturally extends to $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}}$, i.e., $u \prec \mathbf{x}$ if $u \in \mathcal{A}^*$ is a factor of \mathbf{x} . As usual, $u \not\prec v$ means $u \prec v$ does not hold. For $\mathbf{x} = (x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}}$, we write $\mathbf{x}[i, j] = x_i \dots x_j$ for $i \leq j$ and $\mathbf{x}[i, j] = \lambda$ if $i > j$. The relation \prec does not contain information on the position of the factor except when we write $w_1 \mathbf{x}[i, j] w_2 \prec \mathbf{x}$ with $w_1, w_2 \in \mathcal{A}^*$; it means $w_1 = \mathbf{x}[\ell, i-1]$ and $w_2 = \mathbf{x}[j+1, k]$ with some ℓ and k .

Lemma 5.1. *If $10^a 10^b 1$ is a factor of a word \mathbf{x} in \mathcal{X}_F , then $|a-b| \leq 1$.*

Proof. If $b \geq a+2$, then $10^a \mathbf{100}^{a+1} \in F$ is a factor of \mathbf{x} . The case $b \leq a-2$ is similar. \square

Lemma 5.2. *Take $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_F$. Assume that $\mathbf{x}[i, j] = (10^a)^n 10^{a+1} 10^{a1} (0^a 1)^n \prec \mathbf{x}$ or $\mathbf{x}[i, j] = (10^{a+1})^n 10^a 10^{a+1} 1 (0^{a+1} 1)^n \prec \mathbf{x}$ with $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $0^a \mathbf{x}[i, j] 0^a \prec \mathbf{x}$, $0^{a+2} \mathbf{x}[i, j] \not\prec \mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{x}[i, j] 0^{a+2} \not\prec \mathbf{x}$.*

Proof. Let $n = 0$ and $\mathbf{x}[i, j] = 10^{a+1} 10^{a1} \prec \mathbf{x}$. By Lemma 5.1, 0^a must be prepended to $\mathbf{x}[i, j]$. Thus it must be followed by 0^a by considering the forbidden words centered by $\mathbf{01}$ around $0^a 10^a \mathbf{010}^{a1}$, i.e., $0^a \mathbf{x}[i, j] 0^a \prec \mathbf{x}$. By Lemma 5.1, $\mathbf{x}[i, j] 0^{a+2} \not\prec \mathbf{x}$. If $0^{a+2} \mathbf{x}[i, j] \prec \mathbf{x}$ then $\mathbf{x}[i, j]$ must be followed by 0^{a+2} , which is absurd. Now let $\mathbf{x}[i, j] = (10^a)^n 10^{a+1} 10^{a1} (0^a 1)^n \prec \mathbf{x}$ with $n \geq 1$. We have

$$\mathbf{x}[i, j] = (10^a)^n \mathbf{10} (0^a 1)^{n+2} = (10^a)^{n+1} \mathbf{01} (0^a 1)^{n+1}.$$

Considering the forbidden words centered at $\mathbf{10}$, we see $0^a \mathbf{x}[i, j] \prec \mathbf{x}$. Switching focus to the forbidden words centered at $\mathbf{01}$, we see $0^a \mathbf{x}[i, j] 0^a \prec \mathbf{x}$. Clearly $0^{a+2} \mathbf{x}[i, j] \not\prec \mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{x}[i, j] 0^{a+2} \not\prec \mathbf{x}$ by Lemma 5.1.

Let $n = 0$ and $\mathbf{x}[i, j] = 10^a 10^{a+1} 1 \prec \mathbf{x}$. Then $\mathbf{x}[i, j] 0^a \prec \mathbf{x}$ by Lemma 5.1. Considering $10^a \mathbf{100}^{a1}$ centered at $\mathbf{10}$, we have $0^a \mathbf{x}[i, j] 0^a \prec \mathbf{x}$. Since $0^{a+2} \mathbf{x}[i, j] \not\prec \mathbf{x}$, $\mathbf{x}[i, j] 0^{a+2} \prec \mathbf{x}$ leads to $0^{a+2} \mathbf{x}[i, j] 0^{a+2} \prec \mathbf{x}$, a contradiction. Now we assume $\mathbf{x}[i, j] = (10^{a+1})^n 10^a 10^{a+1} 1 (0^{a+1} 1)^n \prec \mathbf{x}$ with $n \geq 1$. By Lemma 5.1, we have $0^a \mathbf{x}[i, j] 0^a \prec \mathbf{x}$. We use two centers of the forbidden words:

$$\mathbf{x}[i, j] = (10^{a+1})^{n-1} 10^a \mathbf{010}^{a1} (0^{a+1} 1)^{n+1} = (10^{a+1})^n 10^a \mathbf{100}^{a1} (0^{a+1} 1)^n.$$

By focusing on $\mathbf{01}$, we see $0^{a+2} \mathbf{x}[i, j] \not\prec \mathbf{x}$. Thus by focusing on $\mathbf{10}$, $\mathbf{x}[i, j] 0^{a+2} \prec \mathbf{x}$ implies $0^{a+2} \mathbf{x}[i, j] 0^{a+2} \prec \mathbf{x}$ which is impossible. \square

Lemma 5.2 shows that the two factors in question must be continued to the right only by $0^a 1$ or $0^{a+1} 1$, and to the left only by 10^a or 10^{a+1} . We have further restrictions.

Lemma 5.3. *Assume that $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_F$. If $\mathbf{x}[i, j] = (10^a)^n 10^{a+1} 10^{a1} (0^a 1)^{n+1} \prec \mathbf{x}$, then we have*

$$10^a \mathbf{x}[i, j] = (10^a)^{n+1} 10^{a+1} 10^{a1} (0^a 1)^{n+1} \prec \mathbf{x}.$$

If $\mathbf{x}[i, j] = (10^{a+1})^n 10^a 10^{a+1} 1 (0^{a+1} 1)^{n+1} \prec \mathbf{x}$, then

$$10^{a+1} \mathbf{x}[i, j] = (10^{a+1})^{n+1} 10^a 10^{a+1} 1 (0^{a+1} 1)^{n+1} \prec \mathbf{x}.$$

Proof. Assume that $\mathbf{x}[i, j] = (10^a)^{n+1} \mathbf{01} (0^a 1)^{n+2} \prec \mathbf{x}$. By Lemma 5.2, $0^a \mathbf{x}[i, j] \prec \mathbf{x}$ and considering the forbidden words centered at $\mathbf{01}$ we see $10^a \mathbf{x}[i, j] \prec \mathbf{x}$. If $\mathbf{x}[i, j] = (10^{a+1})^n 10^a \mathbf{100}^a 1 (0^{a+1} 1)^{n+1}$, then Lemma 5.2 implies $0^a \mathbf{x}[i, j] \prec \mathbf{x}$ and the forbidden words centered at $\mathbf{10}$ shows $10^a \mathbf{x}[i, j] \not\prec \mathbf{x}$. Therefore $10^{a+1} \mathbf{x}[i, j] \prec \mathbf{x}$. \square

Lemma 5.4. *If $10^a 10^{a+1} 1$ or $10^{a+1} 10^a 1$ is a factor of $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_F$, then $\mathbf{x} \in (1(0^a + 0^{a+1}))^{\mathbb{Z}}$.*

Proof. Assume that $10^{a+1} 10^a 1$ is a factor. By Lemmas 5.2 and 5.3, unless the right prolongation is $10^{a+1} 1 (0^a 1)^\infty$, we find a word in $10^{a+1} 1 (0^a 1)^+ 0^{a+1} 1$ whose suffix is $10^a 10^{a+1} 1$ in the right extension. The same goes for $10^a 10^{a+1} 1$ that unless $10^a 1 (0^{a+1} 1)^\infty$ is the right continuation, we find a word in $10^a 1 (0^{a+1} 1)^+ 0^a 1$ having a suffix $10^{a+1} 10^a 1$ in the right. By iterating this discussion, the right extension must be in $(1(0^a + 0^{a+1}))^{\mathbb{N}}$. The left direction is similar. \square

Let K be the set of elements $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ that have at most one occurrence of 0's or 1's, i.e., the set of words of the form $0^{\mathbb{Z}}, 1^{\mathbb{Z}}, \dots 0001000 \dots$ or $\dots 1110111 \dots$. Clearly $K \subset \mathcal{X}_F$. On the other hand, it is easy to see that if $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ has exactly two occurrences of 0's or 1's, then $\mathbf{x} \notin \mathcal{X}_F$. By Lemmas 5.1 and 5.4, any element $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_F \setminus K$ must be in $(1(0^a + 0^{a+1}))^{\mathbb{Z}}$ or $(0(1^a + 1^{a+1}))^{\mathbb{Z}}$ with $a \geq 1$. Therefore for $x \in \mathcal{X}_F \setminus K$, we associate a bi-infinite sequence over two letters a and $a + 1$ by choosing an appropriate index⁴. Replacing a to 0 and $a + 1$ to 1, we define a map ϕ from $\mathcal{X}_F \setminus K$ to $\mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}}$.⁵

Proposition 5.5. *The image of ϕ is contained in \mathcal{X}_F .*

Proof. Assume that a word $0v01\tilde{v}1 \in F$ appeared as a factor of $\phi(\mathbf{x})$ with $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_F \setminus K$. Then there is a factor

$$10^a 10^{a_1} \dots 10^{a_\ell} 10^a \mathbf{100}^a 10^{a_\ell} 1 \dots 0^{a_1} 10^{a+1}$$

of \mathbf{x} with $a_i \in \{a, a + 1\}$. However it is a forbidden word, giving a contradiction. The case of $1\tilde{v}10v0$ is similar. \square

An element $\mathbf{x} = (x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ is positively (resp. negatively) eventually periodic if $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ (resp. $(x_{-i})_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$) is eventually periodic. We say that $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ is eventually periodic if it is positively or negatively eventually periodic. However this distinction does not exist for the elements in \mathcal{X}_F .

Lemma 5.6. *If $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_F$ is positively eventually periodic then it is negatively eventually periodic and vice versa.*

Proof. If $\mathbf{x} = (x_i) \in K$, the statement is trivial. If not, by switching 0 and 1 if necessary, we may assume that $\mathbf{x} \in (1(0^a + 0^{a+1}))^{\mathbb{Z}}$ with $a \geq 1$ and the period in $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is of the form $10^{a_1} 10^{a_2} \dots 10^{a_\ell}$ with $a_i \in \{a, a + 1\}$. Applying ϕ the period length ℓ becomes strictly shorter. Therefore eventually we find $n \in \mathbb{N}$ that

⁴We select the origin of the word $\{a, a + 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ by the position where the origin of \mathbf{x} sits in 10^a or 10^{a+1} , say.

⁵ $(01)^\infty$ is the unique word in $\mathcal{X}_F \setminus K$ that is in $(1(0^1 + 0^2))^{\mathbb{Z}}$ and $(0(1^1 + 1^2))^{\mathbb{Z}}$. We put $\phi((01)^\infty) := 0^\infty$.

$\phi^n(\mathbf{x})$ has a period of length one in positive direction. In view of Lemma 5.3, we see $\phi^n(\mathbf{x}) \in K$ which is negatively eventually periodic. Considering the inverse image $\phi^{-n}(\mathbf{y})$ for $\mathbf{y} \in K$, we obtain the result. The converse direction is shown in a similar manner. \square

Later we will see that Lemma 5.6 corresponds to Lemma 6.2.2 in [9]. The same proof shows that for every eventually periodic element $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_F$, there is $n \in \mathbb{N}$ that $\phi^n(\mathbf{x}) \in K$.

A word $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{A}^* \cup \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{N}} \cup \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ is **balanced** if $||u|_1 - |v|_1| \leq 1$ holds for all $u, v \prec \mathbf{x}$ with $|u| = |v|$, where $|u|_1$ denotes the number of occurrences of 1 in u . An infinite word $\mathbf{y} := (y_m) \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{N}}$ is **eventually balanced**, if there exist $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and a function $h : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ with $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} h(m) = \infty$ so that

$$\mathbf{y}[\max\{1, m - h(m)\}, m + h(m)]$$

is balanced for all $m \geq m_0$.

Lemma 5.7. *If a word $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{A}^* \cup \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{N}} \cup \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ is not balanced then there exist a palindrome $w \in \mathcal{A}^*$ such that $0w0$ and $1w1$ are the factors of \mathbf{x} .*

Proof. Take $u, v \prec \mathbf{x}$ with $|u| = |v|$, $|v|_1 - |u|_1 \geq 2$ and $|u|$ being minimum. Then u, v must have the desired form (see [17, Proposition 2.1.3]). \square

Theorem 5.8. *\mathcal{X}_F is the set of balanced words in $\mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}}$.*

Proof. Since every element of F is not balanced, all balanced words are in \mathcal{X}_F . Clearly the element in K is balanced. Let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_F \setminus K$ and assume that there is a palindrome w that $0w0$ and $1w1$ are the factors of \mathbf{x} . If $|w| = 0$, then 00 and 11 are the factors of \mathbf{x} , which already contradicts Lemma 5.4, i.e., \mathbf{x} can not be in $(1(0^a + 0^{a+1}))^{\mathbb{Z}}$ or $(0(1^a + 1^{a+1}))^{\mathbb{Z}}$. If $w \in 0^+$ or $w \in 1^+$, then we get the same contradiction. Since w is a palindrome, $|w| \leq 2$ is impossible. Assume that $|w| \geq 3$ and $w \notin 0^+$ and $w \notin 1^+$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that w is of the shape $0^a 1 \dots 10^a$. Thus, since $10^a 1 \dots 10^a 1$ and $0^{a+1} 1 \dots 10^{a+1}$ are factors of \mathbf{x} , there is a palindrome w' such that $0w'0$ and $1w'1$ are factors of $\phi(\mathbf{x})$ and $|w'| < |w|$. Iterating this we reach a contradiction in finite steps. \square

For \mathcal{Y}_F , the story goes in a similar but a little more intricate way. By abuse of notation, let K be the set of elements $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{N}}$ that have at most one occurrence of 0's or 1's, i.e., the set of words of the form $0^{\mathbb{N}}$, $1^{\mathbb{N}}$, $0^*10^{\mathbb{N}}$ or $1^*01^{\mathbb{N}}$. Clearly $K \subset \mathcal{Y}_F$. Suppose $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{N}}$ has a suffix $0^{\mathbb{N}}$. If \mathbf{y} has more than one occurrences of 1, then \mathbf{y} has a forbidden factor $10^n 10^{n+2}$ and it is not in \mathcal{Y}_F . Thus if $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}_F$ has a suffix $0^{\mathbb{N}}$ or $1^{\mathbb{N}}$, then it must be in K . For a $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}_F \setminus K$, considering the involution $0 \mapsto 1, 1 \mapsto 0$, we may assume that $\mathbf{y} = 0^\ell 10^{a_1} 10^{a_2} \dots$ and $a_i \geq 1, a_{i+1} \geq 1$ for infinitely many i 's. Assume that there are infinitely many indices i that $a_i \neq a_{i+1}$. As in the proof of Lemma 5.4, $w_i \in 0^*(1(0^{b_i} + 0^{b_i+1}))^+$ with $b_i = \min\{a_i, a_{i+1}\}$ is the prefix of \mathbf{y} where $|w_i|$ is the index of the last 0 of 0^{a_i+1} . Clearly b_i does not depend on the index i and $\mathbf{y} \in 0^*(1(0^a + 0^{a+1}))^{\mathbb{N}}$. Observing the exponents of 0 in \mathbf{y} , we obtain a sequence over a and $a + 1$. Substituting a by 0, $a + 1$ by 1, we see the map $\phi : \mathcal{Y}_F \setminus K \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{N}}$ is defined in a similar manner. Consider the case that there is $m \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying $a_i = a_{i+1}$ for $i \geq m$. If there exists an index $i < m$ that $a_i \neq a_{i+1}$, then take the largest $i = i_0$ with this property. Let $a = \min\{a_{i_0}, a_{i_0+1}\}$. By Lemmas 5.2 and 5.3, we have $\mathbf{y} \in 0^*(10^a)^+ 10^{a+1} (10^a)^{\mathbb{N}}$ or

$\mathbf{y} \in 0^*(10^{a+1})+10^a(10^{a+1})^{\mathbb{N}}$. Thus in all cases, $\mathbf{y} \in 0^*(1(0^a + 0^{a+1}))^{\mathbb{N}}$ and we can define $\phi(\mathbf{y})$. After all we obtain in the same way:

Proposition 5.9. *ϕ is a map from $\mathcal{Y}_F \setminus K$ to \mathcal{Y}_F .*

And once this map is defined, we obtain

Theorem 5.10. *\mathcal{Y}_F is the set of balanced words in $\mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{N}}$*

by the same proof.

Corollary 5.11. *If $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}} \cup \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{N}}$ is not balanced, then there is a word $v \in \mathcal{A}^*$ that $0v01\tilde{v}1$ or $1v10\tilde{v}0$ is a factor of \mathbf{y} .*

Note that the same statement no longer holds for finite words. Indeed $w = 1010010001$ is not balanced but there is no factor of w in F . This is a characteristic difference from Lemma 5.7.

Let $p(\mathbf{x}, n)$ be the number of distinct factors of $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{N}} \cup \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ of length n . The word $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{N}}$ is **sturmian** if $p(\mathbf{x}, n) = n + 1$ for all $n = 1, 2, \dots$. Theorem of Morse-Hedlund asserts that $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{N}}$ is sturmian if and only if \mathbf{x} is not eventually periodic and balanced (See [17, Theorem 2.1.5] and [9, Theorem 6.1.8]). For $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}}$, there is an eventually period word $\mathbf{y} = \dots 000111 \dots$ which satisfies $p(\mathbf{y}, n) = n + 1$ but not balanced. For a bi-infinite word $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}}$, we define \mathbf{x} is **sturmian** if it is not eventually periodic and $p(\mathbf{x}, n) = n + 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Under this definition, a sturmian word is a non eventually periodic balanced word and vice versa (see [9, Proposition 6.2.5]).

If $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_F \cup \mathcal{Y}_F$ is not eventually periodic, then $\phi(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{X}_F \cup \mathcal{Y}_F$ is so. One can iterate ϕ infinitely many times to \mathbf{x} . On the other hand, if \mathbf{x} is eventually periodic, then there is $n \in \mathbb{N}$ that $\phi^n(\mathbf{x}) \in K$, because the period length decreases by ϕ .

For $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$, a lower mechanical word in $\mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{N}} \cup \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ is

$$(\lfloor \alpha(n+1) + \beta \rfloor - \lfloor \alpha n + \beta \rfloor)$$

with $n \in \mathbb{N}$ or $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Its slope is α and intercept β . Upper mechanical word is defined by replacing $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ by $\lceil \cdot \rceil$. A mechanical word is either a lower or an upper mechanical word. A sturmian word $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{N}} \cup \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ is characterized as a mechanical word with an irrational slope α (see [17, Theorem 2.1.13] and [9, Chapter 6]). Its slope α is computed as a frequency of 1, i.e.,

$$\alpha = \alpha(\mathbf{x}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\mathbf{x}[0, n-1]_1|}{n}.$$

For a sturmian word \mathbf{x} , we may assume that the frequency of 0 is larger than that of 1. Our map ϕ is conjugate to a continued fraction algorithm acting on slopes, that is,

$$\alpha(\phi(\mathbf{x})) = \frac{1}{\alpha(\mathbf{x})} - \left\lfloor \frac{1}{\alpha(\mathbf{x})} \right\rfloor.$$

Let $\alpha(\mathbf{x}) = [0; a_1, a_2, a_3, \dots]$ be the continued fraction expansion of α . Then the sturmian sequence $\phi^{n-1}(\mathbf{x})$ lies in $0^*(1(0^{a_n} + 0^{a_{n+1}}))^{\mathbb{N}}$. In other words, the map ϕ is the shift acting on the first coordinate of the multiplicative coding of sturmian words (see [9, Chapter 6]).

Let $\iota(\mathbf{x}) = \sup\{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid |v| = n, v01\tilde{v} \prec \mathbf{x} \text{ or } v10\tilde{v} \prec \mathbf{x}\}$. Every mechanical word $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{N}}$ is equivalent to a cutting sequence of integer coordinate grids in \mathbb{R}^2 by a line (see [17, Remark 2.1.12]). As the line must pass an arbitrary small neighborhood of

some lattice point, we immediately see arbitrary large symmetric coding centered at 01 or 10 around the lattice point, i.e., $\iota(\mathbf{x}) = \infty$. Therefore every non eventually periodic sturmian word $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_F$, we have $\iota(\mathbf{x}) = \infty$ as well. Here we give a little more general statement with a simple proof.

Proposition 5.12. *For every $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_F \cup \mathcal{Y}_F$, we have $\iota(\mathbf{x}) < \infty$ if and only if \mathbf{x} is a purely periodic balanced word.*

In other words, $\iota(\mathbf{x}) = \infty$ if and only if \mathbf{x} is a sturmian word or a balanced periodic word which is not purely periodic.

Proof. For a non eventually periodic \mathbf{x} , we can apply ϕ infinitely many times. If $\iota(\mathbf{x}) \leq 1$, then $10^a 10^{a+1} 1$ or $10^{a+1} 10^a 1$ with $a \geq 1$ can not be a factor of \mathbf{x} . The same is true for $01^a 01^{a+1} 0$ or $01^{a+1} 01^a 0$ with $a \geq 1$ and \mathbf{x} must be eventually periodic. Assume that $2 \leq \iota(\mathbf{y}) < \infty$. We easily see $\iota(\phi(\mathbf{y})) < \iota(\mathbf{y})$. For example, if the central part of

$$10^a 10^{a_1} 10^{a_2} 1 \dots 10^{a_\ell} 10^a \mathbf{0} 10^a 10^{a_\ell} 1 \dots 10^{a_2} 10^{a_1} 10^{a+1}$$

attains $\iota(\mathbf{y})$ with $a_i \geq 1, a \geq 1$, then

$$\phi(\mathbf{y}) = \tau(a_1 \dots a_\ell (a+1) a a_\ell \dots a_1)$$

where $\tau : \{a, a+1\}^* \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^*$ is the morphism defined by $\tau(a) = 0, \tau(a+1) = 1$. Thus $\iota(\mathbf{y}) = 2a+1 + \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} (a_i+1) > \iota(\phi(\mathbf{y})) = \ell$. Iterating ϕ we get a contradiction.

If \mathbf{x} is eventually periodic, then there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ that $\phi^n(\mathbf{x}) \in K$. We claim that $\iota(\mathbf{x}) < \infty$ if \mathbf{x} is purely periodic. In fact, assume that $\iota(\mathbf{x}) = \infty$ and let p be the period of \mathbf{x} . Take v with $|v| > p$ that $v01\bar{v}$ (or $v10\bar{v}$) is a factor of \mathbf{x} then we find that $v = w01u$ with $w, u \in \mathcal{A}^*$ that u is a palindrome and we have $\mathbf{x} = ((01)u)^{\mathbb{Z}}$. However we have $\iota(\mathbf{x}) = |u| < \infty$, a contradiction. This shows the claim. In the case that $\mathbf{x} \in \phi^{-n}(\mathbf{y})$ with $\mathbf{y} \in \{0^{\mathbb{Z}}, 1^{\mathbb{Z}}\}$, \mathbf{x} is purely periodic and $\iota(\mathbf{x}) < \infty$. Otherwise $\mathbf{y} \in \{0^\infty 10^\infty, 1^\infty 01^\infty\}$ and we see $\iota(\mathbf{x}) = \infty$, since $\iota(\phi(\mathbf{x})) < \iota(\mathbf{x})$ and $\iota(\mathbf{y}) = \infty$. \square

Example 5.13. *Let $\mathbf{x} = 0110100110010110 \dots \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{N}}$ be the fixed point of the Thue-Morse substitution $0 \rightarrow 01, 1 \rightarrow 10$. Since $0011 \prec \mathbf{x}$, it is not balanced. We can confirm that $\iota(\mathbf{x}) = 6$ and $F \ni 0100110010110011, 0011001011001101 \prec \mathbf{x}$.*

A **Christoffel word** $w \in \mathcal{A}^*$ is the period of a mechanical word of rational slope and intercept 0. For coprime integers p, q with $0 \leq p \leq q$, we define the lower Christoffel word of slope p/q by

$$\left(\left[\frac{p(i+1)}{q} \right] - \left[\frac{pi}{q} \right] \right)_{i=0,1,\dots,q-1} \in \mathcal{A}^q$$

and replace $[\cdot]$ by $\lceil \cdot \rceil$ to get the upper Christoffel word. A purely periodic balanced word is written as $w^{\mathbb{Z}}$ with a Christoffel word w (see [3, Theorem 2.1,3.2,4.1]). A comprehensive survey on Christoffel words is found in [2]. Standard words can be defined by a slight modification of Christoffel words, switching indices from $i = 0, \dots, q-1$ to $i = 1, \dots, q$. An equivalent definition of standard words by a generating binary tree is found in [17], which is related to trees emerged in the study of the classical Markoff-Lagrange spectrum. We shall use two basic properties of Christoffel words:

Lemma 5.14. *A Christoffel word of length greater than 1 is of the form $0v1$ or $1v0$ with a palindrome v .*

Proof. This directly follows from the definition. See [17, Formula (2.1.14)] and [2, Proposition 4.2]. \square

The palindrome v appeared in the Christoffel word w is called a **central word**, which plays an important role (see [17]).

Lemma 5.15. *Let w be a Christoffel word and put $\mathbf{x} = w^{\mathbb{Z}}$. Then $\iota(\mathbf{x}) = |w| - 2$.*

Proof. Lemma 5.14 shows $\iota(\mathbf{x}) \geq |w| - 2$. Let $\mathbf{y} = \sigma^n(\mathbf{x})$ and $\mathbf{y}[0, 1] = ab$ with $\{a, b\} = \{0, 1\}$. From periodicity, we see $\mathbf{y}[1 - |w|, 1 - |w|] = b$ and $\mathbf{y}[|w|, |w|] = a$. This implies $\iota(\mathbf{x}) \leq |w| - 2$. \square

Remark 5.1. *In Lemma 5.15, $\iota(\mathbf{x})$ is the maximum length of a factor v that $\tilde{v}abv \prec \mathbf{x}$ with $\{a, b\} = \{0, 1\}$. The equality $|v| = \iota(\mathbf{x}) (= |w| - 2)$ is attained at exactly two indices n modulo $|w|$. They correspond to the upper and lower Christoffel words (see Appendix).*

6. PROOF OF THEOREMS 4.1 AND 4.3

6.1. Preparation. If $\alpha_2 = \alpha^{-1}$, then

$$(6.1) \quad \frac{1}{\alpha + 1} = (\dots 001.\bar{1}00\dots)_\alpha = (0^\infty 1.\bar{1}0^\infty)_\alpha,$$

where b^∞ denotes the infinite sequence of b . For simplicity, we write

$$(0^\infty y_n y_{n-1} \dots y_0 . y_{-1} y_{-2} \dots y_{-m} 0^\infty)_\alpha =: (y_n y_{n-1} \dots y_0 . y_{-1} y_{-2} \dots y_{-m})_\alpha.$$

In particular, (6.1) implies that

$$\frac{1}{\alpha + 1} = (01.\bar{1})_\alpha = (\bar{1}1.0)_\alpha.$$

Moreover, if $\alpha_2 < 0$, then

$$(6.2) \quad \frac{b}{\alpha^2 + 1} = (1.0\bar{1})_\alpha = (\bar{1}01.0)_\alpha.$$

Let $\mathbf{y} = (y_n)_{n=-\infty}^\infty$ and $\mathbf{y}' = (y'_n)_{n=-\infty}^\infty$ be sequences of integers such that $|y_n|, |y'_n| \leq 1$ for each n . Now we define the sequence $\underline{\psi}(\mathbf{y}) = (\psi_n(\mathbf{y}))_{n=0}^\infty$ as follows: If $\alpha_2 = \alpha^{-1}$, then we put

$$\psi_0(\mathbf{y}) := y_0, \psi_n(\mathbf{y}) := y_n + y_{-n} \text{ for } n = 1, 2, \dots$$

If $\alpha_2 = -\alpha^{-1}$, then let

$$\psi_0(\mathbf{y}) := y_0, \psi_n(\mathbf{y}) := (-1)^n y_n + y_{-n} \text{ for } n = 1, 2, \dots$$

We denote $\mathbf{y} \gg \mathbf{y}'$ if there is a nonnegative integer l such that, for $h = 0, 1, \dots, l-1$, $\psi_h(\mathbf{y}) = \psi_h(\mathbf{y}')$ and that $\psi_l(\mathbf{y}) > \psi_l(\mathbf{y}')$ and $|\psi_n(\mathbf{y}) - \psi_n(\mathbf{y}')| \leq 2$ for $n \geq l$.

Lemma 6.1. *If $\mathbf{y} \gg \mathbf{y}'$, then $(\mathbf{y})_\alpha > (\mathbf{y}')_\alpha$.*

Proof. Suppose that $\mathbf{y} \gg \mathbf{y}'$. Let $l = \min\{h \geq 0 \mid y_h \neq y'_h\}$. Then, since $\alpha > 3$ and $|\psi_n(\mathbf{y}) - \psi_n(\mathbf{y}')| \leq 2$ for each n , we get

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{y})_\alpha - (\mathbf{y}')_\alpha &\geq \frac{1}{\alpha - \alpha_2} \left(\alpha^{-l} - \sum_{h \geq l+1} \alpha^{-h} \cdot 2 \right) \\ &\geq \frac{\alpha^{-l}}{\alpha - \alpha_2} \left(1 - 2 \sum_{h \geq 1} \alpha^{-h} \right) > 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

6.2. Proof of Theorem 4.1. Assume that $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfies

$$(6.3) \quad \eta = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\xi \alpha^n\| \leq \frac{1}{\alpha + 1}$$

and take a limsup word $(w_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ for ξ . First we show that $|w_n| \leq 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. In fact, suppose that $|w_n(\alpha; \xi)| \geq 2$ for some n . Then, by (2.7),

$$|\varepsilon(\xi \alpha^{n+1}) + b\varepsilon(\xi \alpha^n) + \varepsilon(\xi \alpha^{n-1})| \geq 2.$$

Hence, we get

$$\max_{i \in \{n+1, n, n-1\}} \|\xi \alpha^i\| \geq \frac{2}{2+b} = \frac{2}{2+\alpha+\alpha^{-1}} > \frac{1}{\alpha+1},$$

which contradicts (2.9). In the sequel, we list forbidden subwords of the limsup word (w_n) . Since

$$0^\infty 1 \bar{1} 0^\infty \ll \dots s_{n-2} 0 1 \cdot 0 s_{n+2} \dots$$

and

$$0^\infty 1 \bar{1} 0^\infty \ll \dots s_{n-2} 1 1 \cdot s_{n+1} \dots,$$

for any $s_n \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$, we see that the words 010 and 11 are forbidden. From $g((-s_n)) = -g((s_n))$, if a subword $s_1 s_2 \dots s_\ell$ is forbidden then $(-s_1) \dots (-s_\ell)$ does not show in (w_n) . Therefore $0\bar{1}0, \bar{1}\bar{1}$ are forbidden as well. Hereafter we skip this symmetric discussion within the proof of Theorem 4.1.

Lemma 6.2. $10^k 1$ and $\bar{1}0^k \bar{1}$ are forbidden for $k \geq 0$.

Proof. This is valid for $k = 0$. Assume that they are forbidden for $k \leq t-1$. If $10^t 1$ appeared in (w_n) , then since

$$\dots 10^t 1 \bar{1} s_{n-2} \dots \gg 0^\infty 1 \bar{1} 0^\infty$$

is not possible by Lemma 6.1, from the induction assumption we see $s_{n-k} = 0$ for $k = 2, \dots, t+1$, arriving at a contradiction. Therefore the words are forbidden for $k = t$ as well. □

Lemma 6.3. $0(\bar{1}\bar{1})^k 10$ and $0(\bar{1}\bar{1})^k \bar{1}0$ are forbidden for $k \geq 0$.

Proof. We already know the case $k = 0$. Assume that these words are forbidden for $k \leq t-1$ and $0(\bar{1}\bar{1})^t 10$ appeared in the limsup word (w_n) , Then since

$$\dots 0(\bar{1}\bar{1})^t 1 \cdot 0 s_{n-2} \dots \gg 0^\infty 1 \bar{1} 0^\infty$$

is not allowed, we obtain $s_{n-2} = \bar{1}$. Since $0\bar{1}0, \bar{1}\bar{1}$ are forbidden, this implies $s_{n-3} = 1$. Continuing in this manner, we must have $s_{n-2} \dots s_{n-2t-1} = (\bar{1}\bar{1})^t$, arriving at a contradiction. □

Having these forbidden words, we see either $(w_n) \in (0^* + (1\bar{1})^*)^{\mathbb{Z}}$ or $(w_n) \in (0^* + (\bar{1}1)^*)^{\mathbb{Z}}$ holds. If $(w_n) \in (0^* + (1\bar{1})^*)^{\mathbb{Z}}$, then by using the monoid morphism $\gamma : \mathcal{A}^* \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^*$ defined by

$$\gamma(1) = 1\bar{1}, \gamma(0) = 0,$$

we obtain $(w_n) = \gamma((x_n))$ with some $(x_n) \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}}$. When $(w_n) \in (0^* + (\bar{1}1)^*)^{\mathbb{Z}}$, we use

$$\tilde{\gamma}(1) = \bar{1}1, \tilde{\gamma}(0) = 0,$$

to get $(w_n) = \tilde{\gamma}((x_n))$ with some $(x_n) \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}}$. Now we study forbidden words of (x_n) .

Lemma 6.4. $F = \{0v01\tilde{v}1, 1\tilde{v}10v0 \mid v \in \mathcal{A}^*\}$ is a set of forbidden words of $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$.

Proof. From $g((s_n)) = g((s_{-n}))$, it is enough to show that $0v01\tilde{v}1$ is forbidden. Assume that $0\tilde{v}01v1$ is a subword of the limsup word (x_n) . Then the word

$$0\gamma(\tilde{v})01\bar{1}\gamma(v)1\bar{1}$$

appears in (w_n) . Then

$$|(0\gamma(\tilde{v})01\bar{1}\gamma(v)1)_{\alpha}| = (00^{\rho-1}1\bar{1}0^{\rho-2}1)_{\alpha},$$

where $\rho = |\gamma(\tilde{v})|$. Hence,

$$(\bar{1}^{\infty}0^{\rho+1}01\bar{1}0^{\rho}1\bar{1}^{\infty})_{\alpha} > (01\bar{1})_{\alpha} = \frac{1}{\alpha + 1},$$

a contradiction. □

In summary, if $\eta = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\xi \alpha^n\| \leq 1/(1 + \alpha)$, then the limsup word $(w_n) \in \mathcal{B}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ corresponding to ξ must have a preimage $\mathbf{x} = (x_n) \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ by γ or $\tilde{\gamma}$. By Theorem 5.8, (x_n) is balanced. We say that a balanced word (x_n) is **symmetric**, if it is a mechanical word of intercept 0, i.e., $x_0x_1 \in \{01, 10\}$ and $x_n = x_{-n+1}$ for $n \geq 2$. Then we have a

Lemma 6.5. *If (x_n) is balanced, then $|g(\gamma((x_n)))| \leq 1/(1 + \alpha)$ and $|g(\tilde{\gamma}((x_n)))| \leq 1/(1 + \alpha)$ holds. The equality holds if and only if (x_n) is symmetric.*

Proof. We only show the case of γ . Since $(w_n) = \gamma((x_n)) \in (0^* + (1\bar{1})^*)^{\mathbb{Z}}$, unless $w_{-1}w_0w_1 = 01\bar{1}$, we have $g((w_n)) < \frac{1}{1+\alpha}$. If $w_{-n} + w_n = 0$ for all $n > 1$, then $g((w_n)) = 1/(1 + \alpha)$. Otherwise, there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ that $w_{-n} + w_n \neq 0$. Then we can find $v \in \mathcal{A}^*$ that $\gamma(v01\tilde{v}) = w_{-m} \dots w_{-2}01\bar{1}w_2 \dots w_m$ with $w_n + w_{-n} = 0$ for $n \leq m$ but $w_{m+1} + w_{-m-1} \neq 0$. Since $(x_n) \in \mathcal{X}_F$, $\gamma(0v01\tilde{v}1)$ does not show, it must be the image of $\gamma(1v01\tilde{v}0)$. Therefore $w_{-m-2} = -1$ and $w_{m+2} = 0$ gives $g((w_n)) < \frac{1}{1+\alpha}$. □

The proof above also shows that if $\iota(\mathbf{x}) < \infty$, then

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} |g(\sigma^n(w_n))| < \frac{1}{1 + \alpha}.$$

We claim that $\eta < 1/(1 + \alpha)$ implies $\iota(\mathbf{x}) < \infty$. In fact, if $\eta < 1/(1 + \alpha)$ and $\iota(\mathbf{x}) = \infty$, then we may assume that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there is a word $v \in \mathcal{A}^+$ with $|v| = n$ that $\tilde{v}01v$ is a factor of \mathbf{x} (the proof is similar for $\tilde{v}10v$). This would imply

$\gamma(\tilde{v})01\bar{1}\gamma(v)$ (or $\tilde{\gamma}(\tilde{v})0\bar{1}1\tilde{\gamma}(v)$) is a factor of the limsup word (w_n) . If $\gamma(\tilde{v})01\bar{1}\gamma(v)$ is a factor, then

$$(6.4) \quad \left| (\dots \gamma(\tilde{v})01\bar{1}\gamma(v) \dots)_\alpha - \frac{1}{1+\alpha} \right| \leq \frac{2\alpha^{-n-2}}{1-\alpha},$$

which yields a contradiction if n is sufficiently large. The case $\tilde{\gamma}(\tilde{v})0\bar{1}1\tilde{\gamma}(v)$ is similar. Thus, we proved the claim. By Proposition 5.12 we see $\eta < 1/(1+\alpha)$ implies (x_n) is purely periodic. Therefore there exists a Christoffel word $w \in \mathcal{A}^*$ that $(x_n) \simeq w^{\mathbb{Z}}$. Here $\mathbf{x} \simeq \mathbf{y}$ means there exists $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ that $\mathbf{x} = \sigma^n(\mathbf{y})$. By Lemma 5.15, we evaluate the value $g((x_n))$ for $(x_n) \simeq \gamma(w^{\mathbb{Z}})$ that the letter at index 0 of $\mathbf{x} = w^{\mathbb{Z}}$ is the last letter of the Christoffel word w , and $x_{-1}x_0x_1 = 01\bar{1}$ (or $1\bar{1}0$) for $|w| \geq 2$, which is enough to obtain $\limsup_n |g(\sigma^n((w_n)))|$. In fact, the computation below shows that the limit superior depends only on $\iota(\mathbf{x})$. If $|w| = 1$, then

$$|(0^{\mathbb{Z}})_\alpha| = 0$$

and

$$|((1\bar{1})^{\mathbb{Z}})_\alpha| = \frac{1}{\alpha - \alpha_2} \left(1 + \frac{-2\alpha^{-1} + 2\alpha^{-2}}{1 - \alpha^{-2}} \right) = \frac{1}{b+2}.$$

By recalling $s_{-n}(\alpha; \xi) = 0$ for sufficiently large n , the tail $0^{\mathbb{N}}$ occurs if and only if (s_n) ends up 0^∞ in both directions, i.e.,

$$\xi \in X_0 := \frac{1}{\alpha - \alpha_2} \mathbb{Z}[\alpha]$$

and tails $(1\bar{1})^{\mathbb{N}}$ or $(\bar{1}1)^{\mathbb{N}}$ occur if and only if

$$\xi \in X_1 := \pm \frac{1}{\alpha - \alpha_2} \left(\frac{1 - \alpha^{-1}}{1 - \alpha^{-2}} + \mathbb{Z}[\alpha] \right).$$

If $|w| > 1$, then by Lemma 5.14, there exists a palindrome $v \in \mathcal{A}^*$ that $w = 0v1$ or $1v0$. Consider the case $w = 1v0$. Since $\gamma((1v0)^{\mathbb{Z}}) = (1\bar{1}\gamma(v)0)^{\mathbb{Z}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & ((01\bar{1}\gamma(v))^\infty 01\bar{1}(\gamma(v)01\bar{1})^\infty)_\alpha \\ &= \frac{1}{\alpha - \alpha_2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\alpha} + \frac{-\alpha^{-n} + 2\alpha^{-n-1} - \alpha^{-n-2}}{1 - \alpha^{-n-1}} \right) =: x_n < (0^\infty 1\bar{1}0^\infty)_\alpha \end{aligned}$$

for $|\gamma(v)| + 2 = n$. By Lemma 5.15, we see $\iota((1v0)^{\mathbb{Z}}) = |v|$ and $\limsup_m \|\xi \alpha^m\|$ attains the value $x_n < 1/(1+\alpha)$. Since

$$\frac{1}{x_n} - 1 = \frac{\alpha^{n+2} - 1}{\alpha(\alpha^n - 1)}$$

is invariant under the Galois conjugation $\alpha \mapsto \alpha_2$, we see $x_n \in \mathbb{Q}$. Moreover, using

$$(6.5) \quad b - \frac{\alpha^{n+2} - 1}{\alpha(\alpha^n - 1)} = \frac{\alpha(\alpha^{n-2} - 1)}{\alpha^n - 1},$$

we get that

$$\frac{1}{x_{2n}} - 1 = \frac{\alpha^{2n+2} - 1}{\alpha(\alpha^{2n} - 1)} = b - \frac{1}{b - \frac{1}{b - \frac{1}{\ddots}}}} = b - [0; \underbrace{b, b, \dots, b}_{n-1}]_{neg},$$

which proves $x_{2n} = p_{2n}/q_{2n}$ by the statement after Theorem 4.1. Since (6.5) holds for odd n as well, the proof for x_{2n-1} is similar. Switching to the case $w = 0v1$ or the case using the map $\tilde{\gamma}$, we obtain the same values of $\limsup_m \|\xi\alpha^m\|$ because the absolute value of g does not change. By this proof, we see for $n \geq 2$ that

$$X_n = \left\{ \xi \in \mathbb{R} \mid \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \|\xi\alpha^m\| = x_n \right\}$$

corresponds to purely periodic balanced words generated by Christoffel words w whose central word v satisfies $|\gamma(v)| + 2 = n$. This formula is consistent with $n = 0, 1$ as well. More explicitly we have

$$(6.6) \quad X_n = \left\{ \pm g(\sigma^k(\mathbf{x})) + \frac{1}{\alpha - \alpha_2} \mathbb{Z}[\alpha] \mid \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{x} = 0^\infty 1 \bar{1}(\gamma(v)01\bar{1})^\infty, 0 \leq k \leq n \\ |\gamma(v)| + 2 = n, v : \text{central} \end{array} \right\}$$

for $n \geq 2$. By Lemma 6.5, X_∞ contains

$$\mathcal{Q} := \left\{ \pm g(0^\infty .s_k s_{k+1} \dots) + \frac{1}{\alpha - \alpha_2} \mathbb{Z}[\alpha] \mid \begin{array}{l} (s_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} = \gamma(\mathbf{y}), k = 1, 2 \\ \mathbf{y} : \text{sturmian} \end{array} \right\}.$$

For a given element of \mathcal{Q} , the slope of its corresponding sturmian word is uniquely retrieved, we see X_∞ is uncountable. We claim that X_∞ corresponds to the set of all eventually balanced aperiodic words, i.e.,

$$X_\infty = \left\{ \pm g(0^\infty .s_k s_{k+1} \dots) + \frac{1}{\alpha - \alpha_2} \mathbb{Z}[\alpha] \mid \begin{array}{l} (s_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} = \gamma(\mathbf{y}), k = 1, 2 \\ \mathbf{y} : \text{not eventually periodic} \\ \text{and eventually balanced} \end{array} \right\}.$$

In fact, if $\xi \in X_\infty$, then its corresponding limsup word is balanced but (x_i) may not be balanced. However for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists m_0 that if $m \geq m_0$ then $\|\xi\alpha^m\| < 1/(1+\alpha) + \varepsilon$. By refining the proof of this section, the length of forbidden words in F we may observe in (x_i) for $i \geq n$ diverges as $n \rightarrow \infty$. By quantifying Theorem 5.8, the minimum length of a word containing an unbalanced pair $0w0$ and $1w1$ in Lemma 5.7 must be large if the minimum length of forbidden words in F is large. Thus the claim follows from (6.4).

Since being eventually balanced is a tail event, i.e., invariant by changing a finite number of terms, there are many eventually balanced words which is not balanced. We now give two further examples.

Example 6.6. Let $(n_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be an integer sequence with $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} n_i = \infty$. A one-sided infinite word

$$0^{n_1} 1 0^{n_2} 1 0^{n_3} 1 \dots$$

is eventually balanced but not balanced.

Example 6.7. Let τ be the substitution defined by: $\tau(0) = 01, \tau(1) = 0$. Then the unique fixed point $\tau(w) = w \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ is the Fibonacci word, the most famous sturmian word. We consider the one-sided infinite word

$$x = \tau(0)\tau(0)\tau^2(0)\tau^2(0)\tau^3(0)\tau^3(0)\dots$$

Then for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $\sigma^m(x)$ is eventually balanced but not balanced. In fact, $\tau^n(0)\tau^n(0) = \tau^n(00)$, $\tau^n(0)\tau^{n+1}(0) = \tau^n(001)$ is a factor of w and therefore balanced, which implies that x is eventually balanced. On the other hand, by considering the frequency of letters, x can not be periodic. If $\sigma^m(x)$ were balanced, then $\sigma^m(x)$ is a sturmian word. However, since τ is a sturmian morphism (see

[17]), $\tau^n(0)\tau^n(0)\tau^{n+1}(0)\tau^{n+1}(0)\dots$ is sturmian implies $00x$ is balanced but has a forbidden prefix $000101 \in F$.

Therefore \mathcal{Q} is a proper subset of X_∞ and the difference $X_\infty \setminus \mathcal{Q}$ is uncountable. Moreover there are eventually balanced words whose frequency of 1 does not converge, see [29, Proposition 2].

6.3. Proof of Theorem 4.3. We prove Theorem 4.3 in a similar way as in the proof of Theorem 4.1. Our idea is to reduce the problem on $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\xi\alpha^n\|$ to the one on $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\xi\alpha^{2n}\|$ and obtain the conclusion because $0 < \alpha_2^2 < 1$. Assume that there exists $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\xi\alpha^n\| < \frac{b}{\alpha^2 + 1} = (1.0\bar{1})_\alpha,$$

and select a limsup word (w_n) for ξ . In what follows, we find forbidden subwords of the limsup word (w_n) . We easily see that the words in

$$\mathcal{S}_1 = \{\bar{1}11, 011, \bar{1}10, 1\bar{1}\bar{1}, 0\bar{1}\bar{1}, 1\bar{1}0\}.$$

are forbidden. For instance, we see $\dots s_{n-2}\bar{1}1.0s_{n+1}\dots \gg 0^\infty 1.0\bar{1}0^\infty$ for any $s_n \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$, which shows $\bar{1}10$ does not appear in (w_n) . For brevity, we write this reasoning as

$$\bar{1}1.0 \gg 0^\infty 1.0\bar{1}0^\infty.$$

Next, we verify that the words in

$$\mathcal{S}_2 = \{11, 1\bar{1}, \bar{1}1, \bar{1}\bar{1}\}$$

are forbidden. In fact, the letter prepends to 11 must be 1 because any word in \mathcal{S}_1 is forbidden. Thus, 11 is forbidden by $111.11 \gg 0^\infty 001.0\bar{1}0^\infty$. Similarly $1\bar{1}$ must be followed by 1, and $\bar{1}1$ must be followed by $\bar{1}$. Thus, each of $1\bar{1}$ and $\bar{1}1$ is forbidden by $1\bar{1}1.\bar{1}1 \gg 0^\infty 001.0\bar{1}0^\infty$. Thirdly we show that

$$\mathcal{S}_3 := \{101, \bar{1}0\bar{1}, 00100, 00\bar{1}00\}$$

is a set of forbidden words because we have $01.01 \gg 0^\infty 001.0\bar{1}0^\infty$ and $00100 \gg 0^\infty 001.0\bar{1}0^\infty$.

Fourthly, we see

$$\mathcal{S}_4 := \{1001, 100\bar{1}, \bar{1}001, \bar{1}00\bar{1}\}$$

is a set of forbidden words, which follows from $0\bar{1}01.001 \gg 0^\infty 0\bar{1}01.0000^\infty$ and $\bar{1}001.0\bar{1}0 \gg 0^\infty 0001.0\bar{1}00^\infty$.

Lemma 6.8. *For any $k \geq 0$, the words $0(010\bar{1})^k 0100$ and $0(0\bar{1}01)^k 0\bar{1}00$ are forbidden.*

Proof. The case $k = 0$ is in \mathcal{S}_3 . Assume that the statement is valid for $k \leq n$ and $w = 0(010\bar{1})^{n+1}0100$ is a factor of the limsup word. Since

$$\dots 001.0\bar{1}(010\bar{1})^n 0100 \dots \gg 0^\infty 1.0\bar{1}0^\infty$$

is not allowed, we see that w must be inductively prepended by $s0\bar{1}(010\bar{1})^n$ with $s = 0$ or 1. Using the induction assumption, we get $s = 1$. Thus, we obtain

$$10\bar{1}(010\bar{1})^n 001.0\bar{1}(010\bar{1})^n 0100 \gg 0^\infty 1.0\bar{1}0^\infty,$$

a contradiction. □

Let S_5 be the set consisted of words of the form

$$\begin{cases} 10^k 1, & \bar{1}0^k \bar{1} \quad (k \geq 0), \\ \bar{1}0^{2l} 1, & 10^{2l} \bar{1} \quad (l \geq 0). \end{cases}$$

Lemma 6.9. *S_5 is a set of forbidden words.*

Proof. The statement is already shown for $k = 0, 1, 2$ and $l = 0, 1$. Assume that it is proved for $k, 2l \leq n$. When $k = n + 1$ is odd, since

$$(6.7) \quad 10^k 1.0\bar{1} \dots \gg 0^\infty 0^{k+1} 1.0\bar{1}0^\infty$$

is not possible, $10^k 1.0\bar{1}$ must be followed by $0^{k-2}\bar{1}$. Then we reach a forbidden word $\bar{1}0^{k-2}\bar{1}$ by induction assumption. If $k = n + 1$ is even, then the proof is simpler. $10^k 1.0\bar{1}$ must be followed by $0^{k-2}s$ with $s \in \mathcal{A}$ but (6.7) holds regardless of the choice of s . The same simpler reasoning applies to $\bar{1}0^{2l+2}1$ with $2l+2 > n \geq 2l$. \square

Considering all these forbidden words, we see that the limsup word (w_n) belongs to $((00)^* + (010\bar{1})^*)^{\mathbb{Z}}$ or $((00)^* + (0\bar{1}01)^*)^{\mathbb{Z}}$. Thus we have $w_{2n-1} = 0$ for $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ (or $w_{2n} = 0$ for $n \in \mathbb{Z}$) and the problem is reduced to $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\xi \alpha^{2n}\|$. The remaining proof is similar to Theorem 4.1, by substituting α by α^2 .

7. $\mathcal{L}(\alpha)$ CONTAINS AN INTERVAL: QUADRATIC UNIT CASE

Define the map T from $[-1/2, 1/2)$ to itself by

$$T : x \mapsto \alpha x - \lfloor \alpha x + 1/2 \rfloor.$$

Set $\mathcal{D} = (-(\alpha + 1)/2, (\alpha + 1)/2) \cap \mathbb{Z}$. We define the coding map d from $[-1/2, 1/2)$ to $\mathcal{D}^{\mathbb{N}}$ by $d(x) = d_1 d_2 \dots \in \mathcal{D}^{\mathbb{N}}$, where $d_i = \lfloor \alpha T^{i-1}(x) + 1/2 \rfloor$. Note that

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

This expression is called **symmetric beta expansion** and studied in [1]. An infinite sequence $(d_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \in \mathcal{D}^{\mathbb{N}}$ is realized as a symmetric beta expansion if and only if

$$d \left(-\frac{1}{2} \right) \leq_{\text{lex}} \sigma^k((d_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}) <_{\text{lex}} d \left(\frac{1}{2} \right)$$

for all $k \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}$ where \leq_{lex} and $<_{\text{lex}}$ are the natural lexicographical orders. Put $c = \lfloor (\alpha + 1)/2 \rfloor$. It is useful to extend the domain of T to $[-(c + 1/2)/\alpha, (c + 1/2)/\alpha)$. We obtain an expansion in the same digits \mathcal{D} . If $x \in [1/2, (c + 1/2)/\alpha)$, then the first digit is c and $T(x) = \alpha x - c \in [-1/2, 1/2)$ and if $x \in [-(c + 1/2)/\alpha, -1/2]$, then the first digit is \bar{c} and $T(x) = \alpha x + c \in [-1/2, 1/2)$. Therefore its orbit falls into the original domain $[-1/2, 1/2)$ after a single application of T . The domain of the coding map d is naturally extended to $[-(c + 1/2)/\alpha, (c + 1/2)/\alpha)$.

From now on, we restrict ourselves to the case when α is a quadratic unit, i.e., $\alpha = (b + \sqrt{b^2 \mp 4})/2$. Direct computation gives

Lemma 7.1. *For $3 \leq b \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\alpha = (b + \sqrt{b^2 - 4})/2$, we have*

$$d \left(\frac{1}{2} \right) = c 0(\bar{c}1)^\infty, \quad d \left(-\frac{1}{2} \right) = (\bar{c}1)^\infty$$

when b is even and

$$d\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) = c c 0 (\bar{c} \bar{c} 1)^\infty, \quad d\left(-\frac{1}{2}\right) = (\bar{c} \bar{c} 1)^\infty$$

when b is odd.

Lemma 7.2. For $1 \leq b \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\alpha = (b + \sqrt{b^2 + 4})/2$, we have

$$d\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) = c 1 (\bar{c} 0)^\infty, \quad d\left(-\frac{1}{2}\right) = (\bar{c} 0)^\infty$$

when b is even and

$$d\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) = c \overline{(c-1)} 0 (\bar{c}(c-1) 1)^\infty, \quad d\left(-\frac{1}{2}\right) = (\bar{c}(c-1) 1)^\infty$$

when b is odd.

Using these facts, we obtain

Theorem 7.3. If $\alpha \geq 3$ then there exists $\kappa < 1/2$ that $[\kappa, 1/2] \subset \mathcal{L}(\alpha)$. In particular, $\mathcal{L}(\alpha)$ has a positive Lebesgue measure.

Proof. First we consider the case $\alpha = (b + \sqrt{b^2 - 4})/2$ and $\alpha_2 = 1/\alpha$. Then $\alpha \geq 3$ if and only if $b \geq 4$. We will show that $\kappa = c/(\alpha + 1)$ suffices for $b \geq 8$. Since α is irrational, we have $\kappa < 1/2$. Take $\eta \in [\kappa, 1/2]$ and set

$$d\left(\frac{\eta(\alpha - \alpha_2)}{\alpha}\right) = y_0 y_1 y_2 \dots$$

Define $(s_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ by $s_0 = y_0$, $s_n = \lceil y_n/2 \rceil$ and $s_{-n} = \lfloor y_n/2 \rfloor$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $\lceil y/2 \rceil + \lfloor y/2 \rfloor = y$ for any $y \in \mathbb{Z}$, we see $((s_n))_\alpha = \eta$ from the definition. We claim that $|g(\sigma^k((s_n)))| \leq \eta$ for $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. In fact, since $s_n \leq \lceil c/2 \rceil$ holds except $n = 0$, it suffices to show an inequality

$$(7.1) \quad \left\lceil \frac{c}{2} \right\rceil \left(1 + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{2}{\alpha^i} + \frac{1}{\alpha} \right) = \left\lceil \frac{c}{2} \right\rceil \left(1 + \frac{2}{\alpha - 1} + \frac{1}{\alpha} \right) \leq c - \frac{c}{\alpha}.$$

Note that the term $1/\alpha$ in the left side of (7.1) gives the maximum possible contribution from the exceptional digit c after shifting the sequence (s_n) . Thus, (7.1) holds for $b \geq 8$, which shows the claim. We expect (s_n) to play a role of the limsup word. Take the central block $t(n) = s_{-n} \dots s_n$ and a sufficiently large integer ℓ and construct a word $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ by $x_n = 0$ for $n \leq 0$ and

$$x_1 x_2 \dots = t(\ell) t(\ell + 1) \dots$$

Then by (7.1), the conjunction part of $t(k)$ and $t(k + 1)$ does no harm and we have

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} |g(\sigma^k((x_n)))| = \eta.$$

This finishes the case $\alpha = (b + \sqrt{b^2 - 4})/2$ with $b \geq 8$. For $b = 5$ and $b = 7$, we can confirm

$$(7.2) \quad \left\lceil \frac{c}{2} \right\rceil \left(1 + \frac{2}{\alpha - 1} + \frac{1}{\alpha} \right) \leq c$$

and the statement is valid for

$$\kappa = \frac{c}{\alpha - \alpha_2} < \frac{1}{2}.$$

For $b = 6$, since $c = 3$ is odd, $x_i = \pm \lceil c/2 \rceil$ occurs only when $y_i = \pm c$. In addition, we use the fact that if c (resp. \bar{c}) appears as a digit y_i , then it must be followed by a non-positive (resp. non-negative) digit in the symmetric beta expansion by Lemma 7.1. Thus we may substitute (7.1) by

$$(7.3) \quad \left\lceil \frac{c}{2} \right\rceil \left(1 + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{2}{\alpha^{2i}} + \frac{2}{\alpha} \right) = \left\lceil \frac{c}{2} \right\rceil \left(1 + \frac{2}{\alpha^2 - 1} + \frac{2}{\alpha} \right) \leq c - \frac{10}{9\alpha},$$

which holds for $b = 4, 6$. Therefore the statement for $b = 6$ holds with

$$\kappa = \frac{c - 10/(9\alpha)}{\alpha - \alpha_2} < \frac{1}{2}.$$

Finally we consider the case $b = 4$. This implies $c = 2$ and the same logic for $b = 6$ does not work. We make a minor change of definition of (s_n) : $s_0 = y_0$, $s_n = \lceil y_n/2 \rceil$ and $s_{-n} = \lfloor y_n/2 \rfloor$ for odd $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $s_n = \lfloor y_n/2 \rfloor$ and $s_{-n} = \lceil y_n/2 \rceil$ for even $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then we can confirm that $s_n \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$ and $s_n s_{n+1} \neq 11, \bar{1}\bar{1}$ if $n \geq 1$ or $n \leq -2$. Therefore we can apply (7.3) and the same κ for $b = 4$ as well.

The proof goes in a similar manner for $\alpha = (b + \sqrt{b^2 + 4})/2$ and $\alpha_2 = -1/\alpha$. In this case $\alpha \geq 3$ is equivalent to $b \geq 3$. There is a small difference that if we take $\eta \in [\kappa, 1/2)$, the value $(\alpha - \alpha_2)\eta/\alpha$ may not be in $[-1/2, 1/2)$ but in $[-(c + 1/2)/\alpha, (c + 1/2)/\alpha)$, which follows from a subtle⁶ inequality

$$\frac{\alpha - \alpha_2}{2} \leq \left\lfloor \frac{\alpha + 1}{2} \right\rfloor + \frac{1}{2}$$

for $\alpha = (b + \sqrt{b^2 + 4})/2$ with $b \in \mathbb{N}$. As described above, we obtain $d((\alpha - \alpha_2)\eta/\alpha) \in \mathcal{D}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and it does not affect the course of the proof. For $b \geq 7$, we see (7.1) holds and we can take

$$\kappa = \frac{1}{\alpha - \alpha_2} \left(c - \frac{c}{\alpha} \right) = \frac{c(\alpha - 1)}{\alpha^2 + 1} < \frac{1}{2}.$$

For $b = 6, 4$,

$$(7.4) \quad \left\lceil \frac{c}{2} \right\rceil \left(1 + \frac{2}{\alpha - 1} + \frac{1}{\alpha} \right) \leq c + \frac{2}{3\alpha},$$

which gives the choice $\kappa = (c + 2/(3\alpha))/(\alpha - \alpha_2) < 1/2$. For $b = 5$, since $c = 3$ is odd, by using the same discussion as above,

$$(7.5) \quad \left\lceil \frac{c}{2} \right\rceil \left(1 + \frac{2}{\alpha^2 - 1} + \frac{2}{\alpha} \right) \leq c - \frac{c - 1}{\alpha},$$

which gives the choice

$$\kappa = \frac{1}{\alpha - \alpha_2} \left(c - \frac{c - 1}{\alpha} \right) < \frac{1}{2}.$$

Indeed, if $b = 5$ then the digits c (resp. \bar{c}) must be followed by a non-positive (resp. non-negative) digit except for the first digit. Finally $b = 3$ implies $c = 2$ and we can use the same trick to change the definition of (s_n) and the estimate (7.5). \square

⁶This is shown by classifying b by its parity.

8. OPEN PROBLEMS

We list several open problems of interest.

- (1) It is of interest whether Theorems 4.1, 4.3 and 7.3 can be extended to three remaining cases $\alpha \in \{(3 + \sqrt{5})/2, (1 + \sqrt{5})/2, 1 + \sqrt{2}\}$ where $\alpha \leq 3$.
- (2) What can be said about $\mathcal{L}(\alpha)$ in the case where α is a Pisot unit of degree greater than 2? For example, describe the minimal $t > 0$ such that $L(\alpha) \cap (0, t] \neq \emptyset$. Moreover, determine the minimal limit point $t_0(\alpha)$ of $\mathcal{L}(\alpha)$. In particular, is $t_0(\alpha)$ transcendental?
- (3) Let $\alpha > 1$ be a fixed quadratic unit. Is $\dim_H(\mathcal{L}(\alpha) \cap [0, t])$ continuous in t ?
- (4) Let $\alpha > 3$ be a Pisot unit and $t_0(\alpha)$ be the minimal limit point of $\mathcal{L}(\alpha)$. Can we find an interval in $[t_0(\alpha), 1/2] \setminus \mathcal{L}(\alpha)$?
- (5) Let α be a Salem number. It is well known that 0 is a limit point of $\mathcal{L}(\alpha)$. Is $\mathcal{L}(\alpha)$ a closed set?
- (6) For a real number $c \in [0, 1/2]$, put

$$\mathcal{G}(c) := \{\xi \in [0, 1] \mid \|\xi\alpha^n\| \geq c \text{ for any } n \geq 0\}.$$

What can be said on $\dim_H \mathcal{G}(c)$? When α is an integer, Nilsson [21] showed that $\dim_H \mathcal{G}(c)$ is continuous and its derivative is zero for almost every c .

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors are deeply indebted to Teturo Kamae and Shin-ichi Yasutomi for helpful and insightful discussions. We also would like to thank Yann Bugeaud and Dong Han Kim for informing us relevant references. This research was partially supported by JSPS grants (17K05159, 17H02849, BBD30028, 15K17505, 19K03439).

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Akiyama and K. Scheicher, *Symmetric shift radix systems and finite expansions*, Math. Pannon. **18** (2007), no. 1, 101–124.
- [2] J. Berstel, A. Lauve, C. Reutenauer, and F.V. Saliola, *Combinatorics on words*, CRM Monograph Series, vol. 27, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2009, Christoffel words and repetitions in words.
- [3] J. Berstel and A. de Luca, *Sturmian words, Lyndon words and trees*, Theoret. Comput. Sci. **178** (1997), no. 1-2, 171–203.
- [4] E. Bombieri, Continued fractions and the Markoff tree. Expo. Math. **25** (2007), 187–213.
- [5] T. W. Cusick, The connection between the Lagrange and Markoff spectra. Duke Math. J. **42** (1975), no. 3, 507–517.
- [6] T. W. Cusick, M.E. Flahive, The Markoff and Lagrange spectra. Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, 30. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1989. x+97 pp. ISBN: 0-8218-1531-8
- [7] A. Dubickas, On the distance from a rational power to the nearest integer, J. Number Theory. **117** (2006), 222–239.
- [8] K. J. Falconer, *Fractal Geometry*, John Wiley and Sons, 1990, Chichester.
- [9] N. Pytheas Fogg, *Substitutions in dynamics, arithmetics and combinatorics*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1794, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2002.
- [10] G. A. Freiman, Diophantine approximations and the geometry of numbers (Markov's problem), Kalinin. Gosudarstv. Univ., Kalinin., 1975. 144 pp., (Russian)
- [11] M. Hall Jr., On the sum and product of continued fractions, Ann. of Math. **48** (1947), 966–993.
- [12] G. H. Hardy, A problem of Diophantine approximation, J. Indian Math. Soc. **11** (1919), 162–166.
- [13] A. S. Kechris, *Classical descriptive set theory*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, **156**, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995, xviii+402

- [14] H. Kaneko, Distribution of geometric sequences modulo 1, *Result. Math.* **52** (2008), 91–109.
- [15] H. Kaneko, Limit points of fractional parts of geometric sequences, *Unif. Distrib. Theory* **4** (2009), 1–37.
- [16] L. Kuipers and H. Niederreiter, *Uniform Distribution of Sequences*, J. Wiley and Sons, 1974, New York.
- [17] M. Lothaire, *Algebraic combinatorics on words*, *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*, vol. 90, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002.
- [18] A. Markoff, Sur les formes quadratiques binaires indéfinies, *Math. Ann.* **15** (1879), 381–496.
- [19] A. Markoff, Sur les formes quadratiques binaires indéfinies, *Math. Ann.* **17** (1880), 379–399.
- [20] C. Matheus, The Lagrange and Markov spectra from the dynamical point of view, *Ergodic theory and dynamical systems in their interactions with arithmetics and combinatorics*, *Lecture Notes in Math.*, vol. 2213, Springer, Cham, 2018, pp. 259–291.
- [21] J. Nilsson, On numbers badly approximable by q -adic rationals. PhD thesis, Lund University and Université du Sud Toulon-Var, 2007.
- [22] K. Nishioka, Mahler Functions and Transcendence, in: *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, Vol. 1631, Springer, Berlin, 1996.
- [23] Ch. Pisot, La répartition modulo 1 et les nombres algébriques, *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci.* **7** (1938), 205–248.
- [24] C. Reutenauer, On Markoff’s property and Sturmian words. *Math. Ann.* **336** (2006), no. 1, 1–12.
- [25] C. Reutenauer, Christoffel words and Markoff triples. *Integers* **9** (2009), A26, 327–332.
- [26] L. Rédei, Zu einem Approximationssatz von Koksma, *Math. Z.* **48** (1942), 500–502.
- [27] T. Vijayaraghavan, On the fractional parts of the powers of a number, *J. London. Math. Soc.* **15** (1940), 159–160.
- [28] H. Weyl, Über die Gleichverteilung von Zahlen mod Eins, *Math. Ann.* **77** (1916), 313–352.
- [29] S. Yasutomi, The continued fraction expansion of α with $\mu(\alpha) = 3$. *Acta Arith.* **84** (1998), no. 4, 337–374.

Appendix (Proof of Remark 5.1)

Lemma 8.1. *Let w be a lower Christoffel word with $|w| \geq 2$ and $\mathbf{x} := w^{\mathbb{Z}}$. Assume that $\mathbf{y}(n) := \sigma^n(\mathbf{x}) = AvbvB$ satisfies $ab = \mathbf{y}(n)[0, 1] \in \{01, 10\}$, where v is palindrome, and A, B are left infinite and right infinite, respectively. Then $|v| = |w| - 2$ if and only if $\mathbf{y}(n)[1, |w|]$ is equal to the lower or upper Christoffel word.*

Proof. We may assume $q := |w| \geq 3$. For $p < q$ with $(p, q) = 1$, consider a bi-infinite integer sequence $(n_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ with $n_i \in [0, q - 1]$ and $n_i \equiv ip \pmod{q}$. Define

$$a_i = \begin{cases} 0 & n_{i-1} < n_i \\ 1 & n_{i-1} > n_i \end{cases}.$$

Then $a_1 \dots a_q$ is nothing but the lower Christoffel word of slope p/q . Since switching the slope p/q to $(q - p)/q$ corresponds to the involution $0 \rightarrow 1, 1 \rightarrow 0$, we may additionally assume that $2p < q$. Then we have $a_i = 1, a_{i+1} = 0$ if and only if $n_i \in [0, p - 1]$ and $a_i = 0, a_{i+1} = 1$ if and only if $n_i \in [q - p, q - 1]$. For the index k with $n_k = 0$, we see that $a_{k-1} = 1, a_k = 0$ and $a_{k-1-\ell} = a_{k+\ell}$ holds for $\ell \leq |w| - 2$. This case corresponds to the lower Christoffel word of slope p/q . When $n_k = q - 1$, we have $a_{k-1} = 0, a_k = 1$ and $a_{k-1-\ell} = a_{k+\ell}$ holds for $\ell \leq |w| - 2$, corresponding to the upper Christoffel word. Our goal is to show that for an index k that $n_k \not\equiv 0, q - 1 \pmod{q}$ with $a_{k-1} \neq a_k$, there exists $\ell < |w| - 2$ that $a_{k-1-\ell} \neq a_{k+\ell}$. We may assume that $2kp \not\equiv -1 \pmod{q}$. Indeed, $2kp \equiv -1 \pmod{q}$ implies q is odd and $kp = (q - 1)/2$, but $p \leq (q - 1)/2 < q - p$ implies $a_{k-1} = a_k$. Then we see that $n_{k+\ell} \in [0, p - 1]$ is not equivalent to $n_{k-\ell} \in [q - p, q - 1]$. If they are equivalent, then there must exist ℓ that $n_{k+\ell} = 0$ and $n_{k-\ell} = q - 1$, which contradicts $2kp \not\equiv -1$

(mod q). Similarly $n_{k+\ell} \in [q-p, q-1]$ is not equivalent to $n_{k-\ell} \in [0, p-1]$. Therefore there are $\ell_1, \ell_2 \in [1, q-1] \cap \mathbb{Z}$ that $n_{k+\ell_1} \in [0, p-1]$, $n_{k-\ell_1} \notin [p-q, p-1]$, $n_{k+\ell_2} \in [q-p, q-1]$ and $n_{k-\ell_2} \notin [0, p-1]$. Since one of ℓ_i is less than $q-1$, we obtain the result. \square