

INTERSECTIONS OF MIDDLE- α CANTOR SETS WITH A FIXED TRANSLATION

YAN HUANG AND DERONG KONG

ABSTRACT. For $\lambda \in (0, 1/3]$ let C_λ be the middle- $(1-2\lambda)$ Cantor set in \mathbb{R} . Given $t \in [-1, 1]$, excluding the trivial case we show that

$$\Lambda(t) := \{\lambda \in (0, 1/3] : C_\lambda \cap (C_\lambda + t) \neq \emptyset\}$$

is a topological Cantor set with zero Lebesgue measure and full Hausdorff dimension. In particular, we calculate the local dimension of $\Lambda(t)$, which reveals a dimensional variation principle. Furthermore, for any $\beta \in [0, 1]$ we show that the level set

$$\Lambda_\beta(t) := \left\{ \lambda \in \Lambda(t) : \dim_H(C_\lambda \cap (C_\lambda + t)) = \dim_P(C_\lambda \cap (C_\lambda + t)) = \beta \frac{\log 2}{-\log \lambda} \right\}$$

has equal Hausdorff and packing dimension $(-\beta \log \beta - (1-\beta) \log \frac{1-\beta}{2}) / \log 3$. We also show that the set of $\lambda \in \Lambda(t)$ for which $\dim_H(C_\lambda \cap (C_\lambda + t)) \neq \dim_P(C_\lambda \cap (C_\lambda + t))$ has full Hausdorff dimension.

1. INTRODUCTION

Intersections of Cantor sets on the real line appear in the setting of homoclinic bifurcations in dynamical systems (cf. [4]). Moreira and Yoccoz [5] studied the stable intersections of regular Cantor sets, and gave an affirmative answer to Palis' conjecture. Intersections of Cantor sets also appear in number theory. Hall [9] proved that any real number can be written as the sum of two numbers whose continued fractional coefficients are at most 4, and from this it follows that the Lagrange spectrum contains a whole half-line. Note that the middle- α Cantor set is an affine Cantor set, which minimizes the Hausdorff dimension with a given thickness (cf. [12, 16]). Motivated by the above works there is a great interest in the study of intersections of middle- α Cantor set with its translations. Kraft [13] gave a complete description when the intersection of middle- α Cantor set with its translation is a single point. Li and Xiao [14] calculated the Hausdorff and packing dimensions of the intersection of middle- α Cantor set with its translation for $\alpha \geq 1/3$. When $\alpha \in (0, 1/3)$, Zou, Lu and Li [19] determined when the intersection of middle- α Cantor set with its translation is a self-similar set under the condition that the translation has a unique coding. Recently, Baker and the second author [2] proved that for $\alpha \in (0, 1/3)$ it is possible that the intersection of middle- α Cantor set with its translation contains only Liouville numbers.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary: 28A78, 37A10; Secondary: 28D10, 28A80, 37B10.

Key words and phrases. Intersection; Cantor set; Hausdorff dimension; Packing dimension; Level set; Digit frequency.

For $\lambda \in (0, 1/2)$ let C_λ be the middle- α Cantor set with $\alpha = 1 - 2\lambda$. Then C_λ is a *self-similar set* generated by the *iterated function system* (IFS): $\{g_i(x) = \lambda x + i(1 - \lambda) : i = 0, 1\}$. In other words, C_λ is the unique nonempty compact set satisfying $C_\lambda = g_0(C_\lambda) \cup g_1(C_\lambda)$. So,

$$(1.1) \quad C_\lambda = \left\{ (1 - \lambda) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} i_n \lambda^{n-1} : i_n \in \{0, 1\} \ \forall n \geq 1 \right\}.$$

Observe that $C_\lambda \cap (C_\lambda + t) \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $t \in C_\lambda - C_\lambda$. By (1.1) it follows that

$$(1.2) \quad E_\lambda := C_\lambda - C_\lambda = \left\{ (1 - \lambda) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} i_n \lambda^{n-1} : i_n \in \{-1, 0, 1\} \ \forall n \geq 1 \right\}.$$

Clearly, if $\lambda \in (0, 1/3)$, then E_λ is a Cantor set having zero Lebesgue measure. And each $t \in E_\lambda$ has a unique *coding* $(i_n) \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ such that $t = (1 - \lambda) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} i_n \lambda^{n-1}$. Li and Xiao [14, Theorem 3.4] gave the Hausdorff and packing dimensions of $C_\lambda \cap (C_\lambda + t)$:

$$(1.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \dim_H(C_\lambda \cap (C_\lambda + t)) &= \frac{\log 2}{-\log \lambda} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\{1 \leq j \leq n : i_j = 0\}}{n}, \\ \dim_P(C_\lambda \cap (C_\lambda + t)) &= \frac{\log 2}{-\log \lambda} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\{1 \leq j \leq n : i_j = 0\}}{n}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\#A$ denotes the cardinality of a set A . If $\lambda = 1/3$, then except for a countable set of points in E_λ having two different codings, all other t s in E_λ have a unique coding; and the dimension formulae (1.3) still hold. If $\lambda \in (1/3, 1/2)$, then $E_\lambda = [-1, 1]$, and it is well known that Lebesgue almost every $t \in [-1, 1]$ has a continuum of codings (cf. [17]). In this case the dimension formulae (1.3) fail for typical $t \in [-1, 1]$, but we still have the dimension formulae (1.3) if t has a unique coding (see [11]).

Let $\tilde{\Gamma} := \{(\lambda, t) \in (0, 1/2) \times [-1, 1] : C_\lambda \cap (C_\lambda + t) \neq \emptyset\}$ be the master set defined by the intersections of Cantor sets. Since for any $\lambda \in (1/3, 1/2)$ and $t \in [-1, 1]$ the intersection $C_\lambda \cap (C_\lambda + t)$ is always non-empty, and $C_\lambda \cap (C_\lambda + t) \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $C_\lambda \cap (C_\lambda - t) \neq \emptyset$, it is then interesting to consider the subset (see Figure 1)

$$\Gamma := \left\{ (\lambda, t) \in (0, \frac{1}{3}] \times [0, 1] : C_\lambda \cap (C_\lambda + t) \neq \emptyset \right\} = \left\{ (\lambda, t) \in (0, \frac{1}{3}] \times [0, 1] : t \in E_\lambda \right\},$$

where the second equality holds because $C_\lambda \cap (C_\lambda + t) \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $t \in C_\lambda - C_\lambda = E_\lambda$. Observe that for $\lambda \in (0, 1/3]$ the vertical fiber $\Gamma(\lambda) = \{t \in [0, 1] : t \in E_\lambda\} = E_\lambda \cap [0, 1]$ is a Cantor set having Hausdorff dimension $-\log 3 / \log \lambda$. Since E_λ is a self-similar set, a lot is known about this vertical fiber $\Gamma(\lambda)$ (cf. [10]). On the other hand, for any $t \in [0, 1]$ let

$$(1.4) \quad \Lambda(t) := \left\{ \lambda \in (0, \frac{1}{3}] : C_\lambda \cap (C_\lambda + t) \neq \emptyset \right\} = \left\{ \lambda \in (0, \frac{1}{3}] : t \in E_\lambda \right\}$$

be a horizontal fiber of Γ . By (1.2) it follows that $\Lambda(0) = \Lambda(1) = (0, 1/3]$, and $\Lambda(1/3) = \{1/3\}$. So it is interesting to study $\Lambda(t)$ for $t \in (0, 1) \setminus \{1/3\}$.

Our first result shows that $\Lambda(t)$ is a *topological Cantor set*, which is a non-empty compact set having neither interior nor isolated points.




FIGURE 1. The fourth level approximation of the master set Γ which consists of all vectors $(\lambda, t) \in (0, 1/3] \times [0, 1]$ such that $C_\lambda \cap (C_\lambda + t) \neq \emptyset$. Each curve corresponds to a unique coding $(i_n) \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ via the equation $t = (1 - \lambda) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} i_n \lambda^{n-1}$. For any $(\lambda, t) \in \Gamma$ the vertical fiber is $E_\lambda \cap [0, 1]$, and the horizontal fiber is $\Lambda(t)$.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $t \in (0, 1) \setminus \{1/3\}$.*

- (i) *The set $\Lambda(t)$ is a topological Cantor set with $\min \Lambda(t) = \min\{t, \frac{1-t}{2}\}$ and $\max \Lambda(t) = 1/3$;*
- (ii) *$\Lambda(t)$ is a Lebesgue null set having full Hausdorff dimension;*
- (iii) *For any $\lambda \in \Lambda(t)$ we have*

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} \dim_H(\Lambda(t) \cap (\lambda - \delta, \lambda + \delta)) = \frac{\log 3}{-\log \lambda}.$$

Remark 1.2. Note that E_λ is a self-similar set having Hausdorff dimension $-\log 3 / \log \lambda$. Then Theorem 1.1 (iii) shows that the local dimension of $\Lambda(t)$ at λ is the same as the local dimension of E_λ at t . In view of Figure 1 it follows that the local dimensions of Γ at any point $(\lambda, t) \in \Gamma$ through the horizontal and the vertical fibers are the same; this can be viewed as a dimensional ‘variation principle’ for the set Γ .

Note by Theorem 1.1 (i) that $\Lambda(t)$ is a topological Cantor set. Then it can be obtained by successively removing a sequence of open intervals from the closed interval $[\min \Lambda(t), 1/3]$. A geometrical construction of $\Lambda(1/2)$ is plotted in Figure 2 (left). By Theorem 1.1 (iii) it follows that

$$\dim_H(\Lambda(t) \cap (0, \lambda]) = \sup_{\gamma \in \Lambda(t) \cap (0, \lambda)} \frac{\log 3}{-\log \gamma} \quad \forall \lambda \in (0, 1/3].$$

Therefore, the dimension function $\psi_t : \lambda \mapsto \dim_H(\Lambda(t) \cap (0, \lambda])$, which describes the distribution of $\Lambda(t)$, is a *Cádlág function* (see Figure 2, right). It is locally constant almost everywhere, left continuous with right-hand limits everywhere, and thus it has countably infinitely many discontinuities; and it has no downward jumps.




FIGURE 2. Left: the geometrical construction of $\Lambda(1/2)$. Right: the graph of $\psi_{1/2} : \lambda \mapsto \dim_H(\Lambda(1/2) \cap (0, \lambda])$ for $\lambda \in (\min \Lambda(1/2), 1/3] = (1/4, 1/3]$.

Observe by (1.3) that the dimension of $C_\lambda \cap (C_\lambda + t)$ is determined by the frequency of digit zero in the coding of t in base λ . Then for $\lambda \in (0, 1/3]$ the vertical fiber $\Gamma(\lambda)$ can be partitioned as

$$\Gamma(\lambda) = \Gamma_{not}(\lambda) \cup \bigcup_{\beta \in [0,1]} \Gamma_\beta(\lambda),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{not}(\lambda) &:= \{t \in [0, 1] : \dim_H(C_\lambda \cap (C_\lambda + t)) \neq \dim_P(C_\lambda \cap (C_\lambda + t))\}, \\ \Gamma_\beta(\lambda) &:= \left\{t \in [0, 1] : \dim_H(C_\lambda \cap (C_\lambda + t)) = \dim_P(C_\lambda \cap (C_\lambda + t)) = \beta \frac{\log 2}{-\log \lambda}\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Li and Xiao [14, Theorem 4.3] showed that

$$\dim_H \Gamma_\beta(\lambda) = \dim_P \Gamma_\beta(\lambda) = \frac{h(\frac{1-\beta}{2}, \beta, \frac{1-\beta}{2})}{-\log \lambda},$$

where for a probability vector (p_1, p_2, p_3)

$$(1.5) \quad h(p_1, p_2, p_3) := -\sum_{i=1}^3 p_i \log p_i.$$

Here we adopt the convention $0 \log 0 = 0$. Furthermore, an application of [3] gives that $\dim_H \Gamma_{not}(\lambda) = -\log 3 / \log \lambda$.

Inspired by the works of [3] and [14] we consider the level sets of the horizontal fiber $\Lambda(t)$. Given $t \in (0, 1) \setminus \{1/3\}$, for $\beta \in [0, 1]$ let

$$\Lambda_\beta(t) := \left\{\lambda \in \Lambda(t) : \dim_H(C_\lambda \cap (C_\lambda + t)) = \dim_P(C_\lambda \cap (C_\lambda + t)) = \beta \frac{\log 2}{-\log \lambda}\right\}.$$

Then the horizontal fiber $\Lambda(t)$ can be partitioned as

$$\Lambda(t) = \Lambda_{not}(t) \cup \bigcup_{\beta \in [0,1]} \Lambda_{\beta}(t),$$

where

$$\Lambda_{not}(t) := \{\lambda \in \Lambda(t) : \dim_H (C_{\lambda} \cap (C_{\lambda} + t)) \neq \dim_P (C_{\lambda} \cap (C_{\lambda} + t))\}.$$

Theorem 1.3. *For any $t \in (0, 1) \setminus \{1/3\}$ and $\beta \in [0, 1]$ the sets $\Lambda_{not}(t)$ and $\Lambda_{\beta}(t)$ are both dense in $\Lambda(t)$. Furthermore,*

$$\dim_H \Lambda_{not}(t) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \dim_H \Lambda_{\beta}(t) = \dim_P \Lambda_{\beta}(t) = \frac{h(\frac{1-\beta}{2}, \beta, \frac{1-\beta}{2})}{\log 3}.$$

Remark 1.4. Our proof of Theorem 1.3 can be adapted to showing that for any $t \in (0, 1) \setminus \{1/3\}$

$$\Lambda_{fin}(t) = \{\lambda \in \Lambda(t) : \#C_{\lambda} \cap (C_{\lambda} + t) < +\infty\}$$

has the same Hausdorff dimension as $\Lambda_0(t)$, that is $\dim_H \Lambda_{fin}(t) = \log 2 / \log 3$.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In the next section we define the coding map Φ_t which maps each $\lambda \in \Lambda(t)$ to its coding of t in base λ , and show that Φ_t is continuous and piecewise monotonic in $\Lambda(t)$. Based on this map Φ_t we show in Section 3 that $\Lambda(t)$ is a topological Cantor set, and it has full Hausdorff dimension. In Section 4 we calculate the local dimension of $\Lambda(t)$, and prove Theorem 1.1. Motivated by the works of non-normal numbers we show in Section 5 that $\Lambda_{not}(t)$ is a dense subset of $\Lambda(t)$ with full Hausdorff dimension. Finally, in Section 6 we calculate the dimension of $\Lambda_{\beta}(t)$ and prove Theorem 1.3.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section we will define a map Φ_t which maps $\Lambda(t)$ to the symbolic space $\{-1, 0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$. First we recall some terminology from symbolic dynamics (cf. [15]). Let $\{-1, 0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ be the set of all infinite sequences over the *alphabet* $\{-1, 0, 1\}$. By a *word* we mean a finite string of digits over $\{-1, 0, 1\}$. Denote by $\{-1, 0, 1\}^*$ the set of all finite words including the empty word ϵ . For two words $\mathbf{c} = c_1 \dots c_m$ and $\mathbf{d} = d_1 \dots d_n$ we write $\mathbf{cd} = c_1 \dots c_m d_1 \dots d_n$ for their concatenation. In particular, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we denote by \mathbf{c}^k the k -fold concatenation of \mathbf{c} with itself, and by \mathbf{c}^{∞} the periodic sequence which is obtained by the infinite concatenation of \mathbf{c} with itself. For a word $\mathbf{c} = c_1 \dots c_m \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^*$ with $m \geq 1$, if $c_m < 1$ we write $\mathbf{c}^+ := c_1 \dots c_{m-1}(c_m + 1)$; and if $c_m > -1$, we write $\mathbf{c}^- := c_1 \dots c_{m-1}(c_m - 1)$. Therefore, \mathbf{c}^+ and \mathbf{c}^- are both words over the alphabet $\{-1, 0, 1\}$. Throughout the paper we will use lexicographical order \prec, \preceq, \succ or \succcurlyeq between sequences in $\{-1, 0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$. For example, we say $(i_n) \succ (j_n)$ if $i_1 > j_1$, or there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $i_1 \dots i_n = j_1 \dots j_n$ and $i_{n+1} > j_{n+1}$. And we write $(i_n) \succcurlyeq (j_n)$ if $(i_n) \succ (j_n)$ or $(i_n) = (j_n)$. Similarly, we say $(i_n) \prec (j_n)$ if $(j_n) \succ (i_n)$,

and say $(i_n) \preccurlyeq (j_n)$ if $(j_n) \succcurlyeq (i_n)$. For two infinite sequences $\mathbf{c} = (c_n), \mathbf{d} = (d_n) \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ with $\mathbf{c} \prec \mathbf{d}$ we write

$$(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d}) := \left\{ (i_n) \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}} : \mathbf{c} \prec (i_n) \prec \mathbf{d} \right\}, \quad [\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d}] := \left\{ (i_n) \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}} : \mathbf{c} \preccurlyeq (i_n) \preccurlyeq \mathbf{d} \right\}.$$

Similarly, we set

$$(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d}] := \left\{ (i_n) \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}} : \mathbf{c} \prec (i_n) \preccurlyeq \mathbf{d} \right\}, \quad [\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d}) := \left\{ (i_n) \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}} : \mathbf{c} \preccurlyeq (i_n) \prec \mathbf{d} \right\}.$$

For $\lambda \in (0, 1/3]$ we note by (1.2) that E_λ is a self-similar set generated by the IFS $\{g_i(x) = \lambda x + i(1 - \lambda) : i = -1, 0, 1\}$. This induces a map π_λ defined by

$$\pi_\lambda : \{-1, 0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow E_\lambda; \quad (i_n) \mapsto (1 - \lambda) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} i_n \lambda^{n-1}.$$

It is clear that the map π_λ is bijective if $\lambda \in (0, 1/3)$; and the map π_λ is bijective up to a countable set if $\lambda = 1/3$. Now, based on π_λ we define the master map Π by

$$(2.1) \quad \Pi : \{-1, 0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \times (0, 1/3] \rightarrow [-1, 1]; \quad ((i_n), \lambda) \mapsto \pi_\lambda((i_n)) = (1 - \lambda) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} i_n \lambda^{n-1}.$$

Note that the symbolic space $\{-1, 0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ becomes a compact metric space under the metric ρ defined by

$$\rho((i_n), (j_n)) = 3^{1 - \inf\{n \geq 1 : i_n \neq j_n\}}.$$

First we show that Π is continuous under the product topology induced by the metric ρ on $\{-1, 0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and the Euclidean metric $|\cdot|$ on \mathbb{R} .

Lemma 2.1. *The map $\Pi : \{-1, 0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \times (0, 1/3] \rightarrow [-1, 1]$ is continuous and onto.*

Proof. Note that $\Pi(\{-1, 0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \times \{1/3\}) = [-1, 1]$. It suffices to prove the continuity of Π , which follows from the following observation: for any two $((i_n), \lambda_1), ((j_n), \lambda_2) \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \times (0, 1/3]$ with $k = \inf\{n \geq 1 : i_n \neq j_n\}$, by (2.1) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} |\Pi((i_n), \lambda_1) - \Pi((j_n), \lambda_2)| &\leq |\Pi((i_n), \lambda_1) - \Pi((i_n), \lambda_2)| + |\Pi((i_n), \lambda_2) - \Pi((j_n), \lambda_2)| \\ &\leq \sup_{\lambda \in (0, 1/3]} |\Pi_2((i_n), \lambda)| \cdot |\lambda_1 - \lambda_2| + \left| (1 - \lambda_2) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (i_n - j_n) \lambda_2^{n-1} \right| \\ &\leq 2|\lambda_1 - \lambda_2| + \left| (1 - \lambda_2) \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} 2\lambda_2^{n-1} \right| \\ &\leq 2|\lambda_1 - \lambda_2| + 2\rho((i_n), (j_n)), \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows by the mean value theorem that

$$(2.2) \quad \Pi_2((i_n), \lambda) := \frac{\partial \Pi((i_n), \lambda)}{\partial \lambda} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} i_n n \left(\frac{n-1}{n} - \lambda \right) \lambda^{n-2},$$

and the third inequality follows by $|\Pi_2((i_n), \lambda)| \leq 1 + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} n \left(\frac{n-1}{n} - \lambda \right) \lambda^{n-2} = 2$. \square

Next we show that Π is monotonic in its first variable.

Lemma 2.2. *Given $\lambda \in (0, 1/3]$, the function $\Pi(\cdot, \lambda)$ is increasing in $\{-1, 0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ with respect to the lexicographical order. In particular, if $\lambda \in (0, 1/3)$, the function $\Pi(\cdot, \lambda)$ is strictly increasing.*

Proof. Take $(i_n), (j_n) \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ with $(i_n) \prec (j_n)$. Then there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $i_n = j_n$ for all $n < m$, and $i_m < j_m$. By (2.1) this implies

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi((j_n), \lambda) - \Pi((i_n), \lambda) &= (1 - \lambda) \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} (j_n - i_n) \lambda^{n-1} \\ &\geq (1 - \lambda) \lambda^{m-1} - (1 - \lambda) \sum_{n=m+1}^{\infty} 2 \lambda^{n-1} \\ &= (1 - \lambda) \lambda^{m-1} - 2 \lambda^m \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows by $\lambda \in (0, 1/3]$; and this inequality is strict if $\lambda \in (0, 1/3)$. \square




FIGURE 3. Left: the graph of the functions $\Pi((i_n), \cdot)$ for $(i_n) \in (0^\infty, 1^\infty)$.

Right: the piecewise monotonicity of $\Pi((i_n), \cdot)$ for $(i_n) \in (0^\infty, 1^\infty)$, where the number above the sequence (i_n) denotes $t = \Pi((i_n), 1/3)$.

However, Π is not always monotonic with respect to its second variable (see Figure 3, left), which complicates our proofs in many places of the paper. Note that the symbolic space $\{-1, 0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ is symmetric, and $\Pi((i_n), \cdot)$ and $\Pi((-i_n), \cdot)$ have opposite monotonicity. Moreover, $\Pi(0^\infty, \lambda) \equiv 0$ and $\Pi(1^\infty, \lambda) \equiv 1$. So it suffices to consider the piecewise monotonicity of $\Pi((i_n), \cdot)$ for $(i_n) \in (0^\infty, 1^\infty)$, which will be divided into four subintervals (see Figure 3, right):

$$(0^\infty, 001^\infty], \quad (001^\infty, 01(-1)0^\infty), \quad [01(-1)0^\infty, 01^\infty] \quad \text{and} \quad (01^\infty, 1^\infty).$$

Lemma 2.3. *Let $(i_n) \in (0^\infty, 1^\infty)$.*

- (i) If $(i_n) \in (0^\infty, 001^\infty]$, then $\Pi((i_n), \cdot)$ is strictly increasing in $(0, 1/3]$;
- (ii) If $(i_n) \in (001^\infty, 01(-1)0^\infty)$, then $\Pi((i_n), \cdot)$ is strictly concave in $(0, 1/3]$. Furthermore, there exists a unique $\lambda_{(i_n)} \in [1/4, 1/3]$ such that $\Pi((i_n), \cdot)$ is strictly increasing in $(0, \lambda_{(i_n)})$ and strictly decreasing in $[\lambda_{(i_n)}, 1/3]$;
- (iii) If $(i_n) \in [01(-1)0^\infty, 01^\infty]$, then $\Pi((i_n), \cdot)$ is strictly increasing in $(0, 1/3]$;
- (iv) If $(i_n) \in (01^\infty, 1^\infty)$, then $\Pi((i_n), \cdot)$ is strictly decreasing in $(0, 1/3]$.

Proof. For (i) we take $(i_n) \in (0^\infty, 001^\infty]$. Then there exists $k \geq 3$ such that $i_1 \dots i_k = 0^{k-1}1$. By (2.2) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_2((i_n), \lambda) &\geq k \left(\frac{k-1}{k} - \lambda \right) \lambda^{k-2} - \sum_{n=k+1}^{\infty} n \left(\frac{n-1}{n} - \lambda \right) \lambda^{n-2} \\ &= \lambda^{k-2} (k-1-2k\lambda) > 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows by $\lambda \in (0, 1/3)$ and $k \geq 3$. This proves (i).

Next we consider (ii). Take $(i_n) \in (001^\infty, 01(-1)0^\infty)$. Then $01(-1)^\infty \preceq (i_n) \prec 01(-1)0^\infty$, and thus $i_1 i_2 i_3 = 01(-1)$ and $i_4 i_5 \dots \prec 0^\infty$. By (2.2) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_2((i_n), \lambda) &= 2 \left(\frac{1}{2} - \lambda \right) - 3 \left(\frac{2}{3} - \lambda \right) \lambda + \sum_{n=4}^{\infty} i_n n \left(\frac{n-1}{n} - \lambda \right) \lambda^{n-2} \\ (2.3) \quad &= 1 - 4\lambda + 3\lambda^2 + \sum_{n=4}^{\infty} i_n n \left(\frac{n-1}{n} - \lambda \right) \lambda^{n-2}, \end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$(2.4) \quad \frac{\partial \Pi_2((i_n), \lambda)}{\partial \lambda} = 6\lambda - 4 + \sum_{n=4}^{\infty} i_n (n-1) [(n-2) - n\lambda] \lambda^{n-3} < 6\lambda - 4 < 0.$$

So, $\Pi((i_n), \cdot)$ is strictly concave in $(0, 1/3]$. Observe by (2.3) that $\Pi_2((i_n), \lambda) \geq 1 - 4\lambda > 0$ for any $\lambda \in (0, 1/4)$, and $\Pi_2((i_n), 1/3) < 0$ since $i_4 i_5 \dots \prec 0^\infty$. So by (2.4) there exists a unique $\lambda_{(i_n)} \in [1/4, 1/3]$ such that $\Pi((i_n), \cdot)$ is strictly increasing in $(0, \lambda_{(i_n)})$ and strictly decreasing in $[\lambda_{(i_n)}, 1/3]$.

For (iii) we take $(i_n) \in [01(-1)0^\infty, 01^\infty]$. Then $i_1 i_2 = 01$. If $i_3 = -1$, then $i_4 i_5 \dots \succeq 0^\infty$. By (2.2) we obtain that $\Pi_2((i_n), \lambda) \geq 1 - 4\lambda + 3\lambda^2 > 0$ for any $\lambda \in (0, 1/3]$; and thus $\Pi((i_n), \cdot)$ is strictly increasing in $(0, 1/3]$. If $i_3 \in \{0, 1\}$, then by (2.2) it follows that

$$\Pi_2((i_n), \lambda) \geq \Pi(010(-1)^\infty, \lambda) = 2 \left(\frac{1}{2} - \lambda \right) - \sum_{n=4}^{\infty} n \left(\frac{n-1}{n} - \lambda \right) \lambda^{n-2} = 1 - 2\lambda - 3\lambda^2 > 0$$

for all $\lambda \in (0, 1/3)$. This proves (iii).

Finally we consider (iv). Take $(i_n) \in (01^\infty, 1^\infty)$. Then $1(-1)^\infty \preceq (i_n) \prec 1^\infty$, which gives $i_1 = 1$. By (2.2) it follows that

$$\Pi_2((i_n), \lambda) = -1 + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} i_n n \left(\frac{n-1}{n} - \lambda \right) \lambda^{n-2} < -1 + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} n \left(\frac{n-1}{n} - \lambda \right) \lambda^{n-2} = 0,$$

which proves (iv). \square

Remark 2.4. From the proof of Lemma 2.3 (ii) it follows that the critical value $\lambda_{(i_n)}$ is the unique zero in $[1/4, 1/3)$ of (2.3). This implies that the map $(i_n) \mapsto \lambda_{(i_n)}$ is continuous and strictly increasing in $(001^\infty, 01(-1)0^\infty] = [01(-1)^\infty, 01(-1)0^\infty]$ with $\lambda_{01(-1)^\infty} = 1/4$ and $\lambda_{01(-1)0^\infty} = 1/3$.

Given $t \in (0, 1) \setminus \{1/3\}$, by (1.4) it follows that

$$\Lambda(t) = \{\lambda \in (0, 1/3] : \Pi((i_n), \lambda) = t \text{ for some } (i_n) \in (0^\infty, 1^\infty)\}.$$

Note by Lemma 2.2 that each $\lambda \in \Lambda(t) \setminus \{1/3\}$ corresponds to a unique coding (i_n) satisfying $\Pi((i_n), \lambda) = t$, while for $\lambda = 1/3$ there might be two codings (i_n) satisfying $\Pi((i_n), \lambda) = t$, one ends with $(-1)^\infty$ and the other ends with 1^∞ . Now we define the map

$$(2.5) \quad \Phi_t : \Lambda(t) \rightarrow (0^\infty, 1^\infty); \quad \lambda \mapsto (i_n) \quad \text{with} \quad \Pi((i_n), \lambda) = t,$$

where for $\lambda = 1/3$ we set

$$\begin{cases} \Phi_t(1/3) \text{ does not end with } 1^\infty & \text{if } t \in (0, 1/9] \cup [4/27, 1/3), \\ \Phi_t(1/3) \text{ does not end with } (-1)^\infty & \text{if } t \in (1/9, 4/27) \cup (1/3, 1). \end{cases}$$

So, if $t \in (0, 1/9] \cup [4/27, 1/3)$, then $\Phi_t(1/3)$ is the *greedy* triadic coding of t ; and if $t \in (1/9, 4/27) \cup (1/3, 1)$, then $\Phi_t(1/3)$ is the *lazy* triadic coding of t . Note that the definition of $\Phi_t(1/3)$ depends on the monotonicity of $\Pi(\Phi_t(1/3), \cdot)$ (see Figure 3, right).

In the remaining part of this section we will show that Φ_t is continuous and piecewise monotonic, which will be vital in our study of $\Lambda(t)$ and its level sets.

Lemma 2.5. *For any $t \in (0, 1) \setminus \{1/3\}$ the map Φ_t is continuous in $\Lambda(t)$.*

Proof. The proof is similar to that of [18, Lemma 2.2]. For completeness we sketch its main idea. Take $\lambda_* \in \Lambda(t)$. Suppose on the contrary that Φ_t is not continuous at λ_* . Then there exist a large $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and a sequence $(\lambda_k) \subset \Lambda(t)$ such that

$$(2.6) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_k = \lambda_* \quad \text{and} \quad \rho(\Phi_t(\lambda_k), \Phi_t(\lambda_*)) \geq 3^{-N+1} \quad \forall k \geq 1.$$

Write $\Phi_t(\lambda_k) = (i_n^{(k)})$ and $\Phi_t(\lambda_*) = (i_n^*)$. By (2.6) it follows that $i_1^{(k)} \dots i_N^{(k)} \neq i_1^* \dots i_N^*$ for all $k \geq 1$. Since $(\{-1, 0, 1\}^\mathbb{N}, \rho)$ is a compact metric space, there exists a subsequence $(k_j) \subset \mathbb{N}$ such that $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} (i_n^{(k_j)})$ exists, say $(i'_n) \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^\mathbb{N}$. Then

$$(2.7) \quad i'_1 \dots i'_N \neq i_1^* \dots i_N^*.$$

Note that

$$(2.8) \quad \Pi((i_n^{(k_j)}), \lambda_{k_j}) = t = \Pi((i_n^*), \lambda_*) \quad \forall j \geq 1.$$

Letting $j \rightarrow \infty$ in (2.8), by using (2.6) and Lemma 2.1 it follows that

$$(2.9) \quad \Pi((i'_n), \lambda_*) = t = \Pi((i_n^*), \lambda_*).$$

If $\lambda_* \in (0, 1/3)$, then by (2.9) and Lemma 2.2 it follows that $(i'_n) = (i_n^*)$, leading to a contradiction with (2.7). If $\lambda_* = 1/3$, then we consider the following two cases.

Case (I). $t \in (0, 1/9] \cup [4/27, 1/3]$. Then $(i_n^*) = \Phi_t(1/3) \in (0^\infty, 001^\infty] \cup [01(-1)0^\infty, 01^\infty)$. By Lemma 2.3 it follows that $\Pi((i_n^*), \cdot)$ is strictly increasing in $(0, 1/3]$. So by (2.8) and Lemma 2.2 it follows that $(i_n^{(k_j)}) \succ (i_n^*)$ for all $j \geq 1$, and thus $(i'_n) \succ (i_n^*)$. Since $(i_n^*) = \Phi_t(1/3)$ is the greedy triadic coding of t , we must have $(i'_n) = (i_n^*)$, contradicting to (2.7).

Case (II). $t \in (1/9, 4/27) \cup (1/3, 1)$. Then $(i_n^*) = \Phi_t(1/3) \in (001^\infty, 01(-1)0^\infty) \cup (01^\infty, 1^\infty)$. Then by Lemma 2.3 there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $\Pi((i_n^*), \cdot)$ is strictly decreasing in $(1/3 - \delta, 1/3]$. So by (2.8) and Lemma 2.2 it follows that $(i_n^{(k_j)}) \preccurlyeq (i_n^*)$ for all $j \geq 1$, and therefore $(i'_n) \preccurlyeq (i_n^*)$. Since (i_n^*) is the lazy triadic coding of t , we must have $(i'_n) = (i_n^*)$, again leading to a contradiction with (2.7).

Hence, Φ_t is continuous at λ_* . Since $\lambda_* \in \Lambda(t)$ was arbitrary, $\Phi(t)$ is continuous in $\Lambda(t)$. \square

We will end this section by showing that Φ_t is piecewise monotonic.

Proposition 2.6 (Key proposition). *Let $t \in (0, 1) \setminus \{1/3\}$.*

- (i) *If $t \in (0, 1/9]$, then Φ_t is strictly decreasing in $\Lambda(t)$;*
- (ii) *If $t \in (1/9, 4/27)$, then there exist a unique $\tau = \tau(t) \in [1/4, 1/3]$ such that Φ_t is strictly decreasing in $(0, \tau) \cap \Lambda(t)$ and strictly increasing in $[\tau, 1/3] \cap \Lambda(t)$;*
- (iii) *If $t \in [4/27, 1/3)$, then Φ_t is strictly decreasing in $\Lambda(t)$;*
- (iv) *If $t \in (1/3, 1)$, then Φ_t is strictly increasing in $\Lambda(t)$.*

The proof of Proposition 2.6 will be split into several lemmas. First we consider (iii) and (iv).

Lemma 2.7. (i) *If $t \in [4/27, 1/3)$, then Φ_t is strictly decreasing in $\Lambda(t)$;*
(ii) *If $t \in (1/3, 1)$, then Φ_t is strictly increasing in $\Lambda(t)$.*

Proof. In view of Lemma 2.3, the proof of (ii) is very similar to (i). Here we only prove (i). Take $t \in [4/27, 1/3)$. Then $\Phi_t(1/3) \in [01(-1)0^\infty, 01^\infty)$. By Lemma 2.3 (iii) it follows that for any $\lambda \in \Lambda(t) \setminus \{1/3\}$

$$\Pi(\Phi_t(\lambda), \lambda) = t = \Pi(\Phi_t(1/3), 1/3) > \Pi(\Phi_t(1/3), \lambda),$$

which, together with Lemma 2.2, implies $\Phi_t(\lambda) \succ \Phi_t(1/3)$. Furthermore, note that $\Phi_t(\lambda) \preccurlyeq 01^\infty$ for any $\lambda \in \Lambda(t) \setminus \{1/3\}$, since otherwise $t = \Pi(\Phi_t(\lambda), \lambda) \geq \Pi(1(-1)^\infty, \lambda) = 1 - 2\lambda > 1/3$, a contradiction. So, $\Phi_t(\lambda) \in [01(-1)0^\infty, 01^\infty]$ for all $\lambda \in \Lambda(t)$. By Lemma 2.3 (iii) it follows that for any $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \Lambda(t)$ with $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$

$$\Pi(\Phi_t(\lambda_1), \lambda_1) = t = \Pi(\Phi_t(\lambda_2), \lambda_2) > \Pi(\Phi_t(\lambda_2), \lambda_1),$$

which implies $\Phi_t(\lambda_1) \succ \Phi_t(\lambda_2)$. This completes the proof. \square

In the following we consider $t \in (0, 4/27)$. Note by Lemma 2.3 (ii) that $\Pi((i_n), \cdot)$ is not globally monotonic in $(0, 1/3]$ for $(i_n) \in [01(-1)^\infty, 01(-1)0^\infty)$, which complicates our proofs of Proposition 2.6 (i) and (ii).

Lemma 2.8. *Let $t \in (0, 4/27)$, and let $\lambda_\diamond = \lambda_\diamond(t)$ be the unique root in $(0, 1/3)$ of the equation $\lambda_\diamond(1 - \lambda_\diamond)^2 = t$. Then Φ_t is strictly decreasing in $(0, \lambda_\diamond] \cap \Lambda(t)$.*

Proof. The proof is similar to Lemma 2.7. Since $t = \lambda_\diamond(1 - \lambda_\diamond)^2 = \Pi(01(-1)0^\infty, \lambda_\diamond)$, by Lemma 2.3 (iii) it follows that for any $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_\diamond] \cap \Lambda(t)$

$$\Pi(\Phi_t(\lambda), \lambda) = t = \Pi(01(-1)0^\infty, \lambda_\diamond) \geq \Pi(01(-1)0^\infty, \lambda),$$

which gives $\Phi_t(\lambda) \succ 01(-1)0^\infty$. Furthermore, $\Phi_t(\lambda) \preccurlyeq 01^\infty$ since $t < 1/3$. Therefore, $\Phi_t(\lambda) \in [01(-1)0^\infty, 01^\infty]$ for any $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_\diamond] \cap \Lambda(t)$. By the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 2.7 (i) one can prove that Φ_t is strictly decreasing in $(0, \lambda_\diamond] \cap \Lambda(t)$. \square

Now we are ready to prove Proposition 2.6 (i). Note by Lemma 2.3 (ii) that for any $(i_n) \in (001^\infty, 01(-1)0^\infty)$ there exists a unique $\lambda_{(i_n)} \in [1/4, 1/3)$ such that $\Pi((i_n), \cdot)$ is strictly increasing in $(0, \lambda_{(i_n)}]$ and strictly decreasing in $[\lambda_{(i_n)}, 1/3]$.

Lemma 2.9. *Let $t \in (0, 1/9]$. Then Φ_t is strictly decreasing in $\Lambda(t)$.*

Proof. First we show that Φ_t is strictly decreasing in $[\sqrt{t}, 1/3] \cap \Lambda(t)$. Observe that $t = (\sqrt{t})^2 = \Pi(001^\infty, \sqrt{t})$. By the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 2.8 we can prove that $\Phi_t(\lambda) \in (0^\infty, 001^\infty]$ for any $\lambda \in [\sqrt{t}, 1/3] \cap \Lambda(t)$, and then by Lemma 2.3 (i) it follows that Φ_t is strictly decreasing in $[\sqrt{t}, 1/3] \cap \Lambda(t)$. Note by Lemma 2.2 that $\Pi(01(-1)0^\infty, \lambda_\diamond) = t = \Pi(001^\infty, \sqrt{t}) < \Pi(01(-1)0^\infty, \sqrt{t})$. Then by Lemma 2.3 (iii) it follows that $\lambda_\diamond < \sqrt{t}$. So, by Lemma 2.8 it suffices to prove that Φ_t is strictly decreasing in $(\lambda_\diamond, \sqrt{t}) \cap \Lambda(t)$. Note that $\Pi(01(-1)0^\infty, \lambda_\diamond) = t = \Pi(001^\infty, \sqrt{t})$. Then by Lemma 2.3 it follows that for any $\lambda \in (\lambda_\diamond, \sqrt{t}) \cap \Lambda(t)$

$$\Pi(001^\infty, \lambda) < \Pi(001^\infty, \sqrt{t}) = t = \Pi(\Phi_t(\lambda), \lambda) = \Pi(01(-1)0^\infty, \lambda_\diamond) < \Pi(01(-1)0^\infty, \lambda),$$

which implies

$$(2.10) \quad \Phi_t(\lambda) \in (001^\infty, 01(-1)0^\infty).$$

Now we claim that $\lambda < \lambda_{\Phi_t(\lambda)}$ for all $\lambda \in (\lambda_\diamond, \sqrt{t}) \cap \Lambda(t)$. Suppose on the contrary that $\lambda \geq \lambda_{\Phi_t(\lambda)}$. Then by the definition of $\lambda_{\Phi_t(\lambda)}$ it follows that for any $\lambda \in (\lambda_\diamond, \sqrt{t}) \cap \Lambda(t)$

$$\Pi(\Phi_t(\lambda), \sqrt{t}) < \Pi(\Phi_t(\lambda), \lambda) = t = \Pi(001^\infty, \sqrt{t}),$$

which yields $\Phi_t(\lambda) \prec 001^\infty$, leading to a contradiction with (2.10). This proves the claim.

Therefore, for any $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in (\lambda_\diamond, \sqrt{t}) \cap \Lambda(t)$ with $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$

$$\Pi(\Phi_t(\lambda_1), \lambda_1) = t = \Pi(\Phi_t(\lambda_2), \lambda_2) > \Pi(\Phi_t(\lambda_2), \lambda_1),$$

where the inequality follows by $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \lambda_{\Phi_t(\lambda_2)}$. This gives $\Phi_t(\lambda_1) \succ \Phi_t(\lambda_2)$, completing the proof. \square

In the following it remains to prove Proposition 2.6 (ii). First we consider $t \in (1/9, 1/8]$.

Lemma 2.10. *Let $t \in (1/9, 1/8]$. Then Φ_t is strictly decreasing in $(0, 1/4] \cap \Lambda(t)$ and strictly increasing in $[1/4, 1/3] \cap \Lambda(t)$.*

Proof. Note that $\Pi(01(-1)0^\infty, \lambda_\diamond) = t \leq 1/8 < 9/64 = \Pi(01(-1)0^\infty, 1/4)$. Then by Lemma 2.3 (iii) it follows that $\lambda_\diamond = \lambda_\diamond(t) < 1/4$ for all $t \in (1/9, 1/8]$. So, by Lemma 2.8 it suffices to prove that Φ_t is strictly decreasing in $(\lambda_\diamond, 1/4] \cap \Lambda(t)$ and strictly increasing in $[1/4, 1/3] \cap \Lambda(t)$. Note that $\Pi(01(-1)0^\infty, \lambda_\diamond) = t > 1/9 = \Pi(001^\infty, 1/3)$. Then by Lemma 2.3 it follows that for any $\lambda \in (\lambda_\diamond, 1/3) \cap \Lambda(t)$

$$\Pi(001^\infty, \lambda) \leq \Pi(001^\infty, 1/3) < \Pi(\Phi_t(\lambda), \lambda) = t = \Pi(01(-1)0^\infty, \lambda_\diamond) < \Pi(01(-1)0^\infty, \lambda).$$

This implies that

$$(2.11) \quad \Phi_t(\lambda) \in (001^\infty, 01(-1)0^\infty) = [01(-1)^\infty, 01(-1)0^\infty).$$

So, by Lemma 2.3 (ii) it follows that for any $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \Lambda(t) \cap (\lambda_\diamond, 1/4]$ with $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$

$$\Pi(\Phi_t(\lambda_1), \lambda_1) = t = \Pi(\Phi_t(\lambda_2), \lambda_2) > \Pi(\Phi_t(\lambda_2), \lambda_1),$$

which gives $\Phi_t(\lambda_1) \succ \Phi_t(\lambda_2)$.

Next we show that Φ_t is strictly increasing in $[1/4, 1/3] \cap \Lambda(t)$. We claim that $\lambda > \lambda_{\Phi_t(\lambda)}$ in this case. Suppose on the contrary that $\lambda \leq \lambda_{\Phi_t(\lambda)}$ for some $\lambda \in (1/4, 1/3) \cap \Lambda(t)$. Then

$$\Pi(\Phi_t(\lambda), 1/4) < \Pi(\Phi_t(\lambda), \lambda) = t \leq 1/8 = \Pi(01(-1)^\infty, 1/4),$$

which implies $\Phi_t(\lambda) \prec 01(-1)^\infty$, leading to a contradiction with (2.11). This proves the claim, and then it follows that for any $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in (1/4, 1/3) \cap \Lambda(t)$ with $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$

$$\Pi(\Phi_t(\lambda_2), \lambda_2) = t = \Pi(\Phi_t(\lambda_1), \lambda_1) > \Pi(\Phi_t(\lambda_1), \lambda_2),$$

where the inequality follows by $\lambda_2 > \lambda_1 > \lambda_{\Phi_t(\lambda_1)}$. This gives $\Phi_t(\lambda_2) \succ \Phi_t(\lambda_1)$. \square

To prove Proposition 2.6 (ii) for $t \in (1/8, 4/27)$ we need two lemmas on the critical value $\lambda_{(i_n)}$.

Lemma 2.11. *The map $\phi : (i_n) \mapsto \Pi((i_n), \lambda_{(i_n)})$ is strictly increasing and continuous in the interval $[01(-1)^\infty, 01(-1)0^\infty)$.*

Proof. Note by Remark 2.4 that $(i_n) \mapsto \lambda_{(i_n)}$ is continuous. Then the continuity of ϕ follows by Lemma 2.1. And the monotonicity of ϕ follows by Lemma 2.2 that for any $(i_n), (j_n) \in [01(-1)^\infty, 01(-1)0^\infty)$ with $(i_n) \prec (j_n)$

$$\Pi((i_n), \lambda_{(i_n)}) < \Pi((j_n), \lambda_{(i_n)}) \leq \Pi((j_n), \lambda_{(j_n)}),$$

where the last inequality follows by Lemma 2.3 (ii) that $\Pi((j_n), \cdot)$ attains its maximum value at $\lambda_{(j_n)} \in [1/4, 1/3)$. \square

Lemma 2.12. *Let $t \in (1/8, 4/27)$. Then there exists a unique $\tau = \tau(t) \in (1/4, 1/3) \cap \Lambda(t)$ such that $\lambda_{\Phi_t(\tau)} = \tau$. Furthermore, the map $t \mapsto \tau(t)$ is strictly increasing.*

Proof. Note by Remark 2.4 that $\lambda_{01(-1)^\infty} = 1/4$ and $\lambda_{01(-1)0^\infty} = 1/3$. Then

$$\phi(01(-1)^\infty) = \Pi\left(01(-1)^\infty, \frac{1}{4}\right) = \frac{1}{8}, \quad \phi(01(-1)0^\infty) = \Pi\left(01(-1)0^\infty, \frac{1}{3}\right) = \frac{4}{27}.$$

So, by Lemma 2.11 it follows that ϕ bijectively maps $(01(-1)^\infty, 01(-1)0^\infty)$ to $(1/8, 4/27)$. Since $t \in (1/8, 4/27)$, by Lemma 2.11 there exists a unique $(j_n) \in (01(-1)^\infty, 01(-1)0^\infty)$ such that

$$(2.12) \quad t = \Pi((j_n), \lambda_{(j_n)}).$$

Observe by Remark 2.4 that the map $(i_n) \mapsto \lambda_{(i_n)}$ is strictly increasing, $\lambda_{01(-1)^\infty} = 1/4$ and $\lambda_{01(-1)0^\infty} = 1/3$. Then by (2.12) it follows that $\tau := \lambda_{(j_n)} \in (1/4, 1/3) \cap \Lambda(t)$ and $(j_n) = \Phi_t(\tau)$. Thus, $\lambda_{\Phi_t(\tau)} = \lambda_{(j_n)} = \tau$.

Next we prove that the map $t \mapsto \tau(t)$ is strictly increasing. Take $t_1, t_2 \in (1/8, 4/27)$ with $t_1 < t_2$. Write $\tau_i = \tau(t_i)$ for $i = 1, 2$. Since $\Pi(\Phi_{t_1}(\tau_1), \tau_1) = t_1 < t_2 = \Pi(\Phi_{t_2}(\tau_2), \tau_2)$, by Lemma 2.11 we have $\Phi_{t_1}(\tau_1) \prec \Phi_{t_2}(\tau_2)$. Hence, by Remark 2.4 it follows that

$$\tau_1 = \lambda_{\Phi_{t_1}(\tau_1)} < \lambda_{\Phi_{t_2}(\tau_2)} = \tau_2$$

as desired. \square

Lemma 2.13. *Let $t \in (1/8, 4/27)$. Then Φ_t is strictly decreasing in $(0, \tau] \cap \Lambda(t)$ and strictly increasing in $[\tau, 1/3] \cap \Lambda(t)$, where $\tau = \tau(t)$ is defined as in Lemma 2.12.*

Proof. Note by the proof of Lemma 2.12 that $\Phi_t(\tau) \in (01(-1)^\infty, 01(-1)0^\infty)$ for any $t \in (1/8, 4/27)$. Then by Lemma 2.2 it follows that $\Pi(01(-1)0^\infty, \lambda_\diamond) = t = \Pi(\Phi_t(\tau), \tau) < \Pi(01(-1)0^\infty, \tau)$, which implies $\lambda_\diamond < \tau$ by Lemma 2.3 (iii). So, by Lemma 2.8 it suffices to prove that Φ_t is strictly decreasing in $(\lambda_\diamond, \tau) \cap \Lambda(t)$ and strictly increasing in $[\tau, 1/3] \cap \Lambda(t)$. First we claim that $\lambda \leq \lambda_{\Phi_t(\lambda)}$ for all $\lambda \in (\lambda_\diamond, \tau] \cap \Lambda(t)$. Note that for $\lambda \in (\lambda_\diamond, \tau] \cap \Lambda(t)$

$$\Pi(\Phi_t(\lambda), \lambda) = t = \Pi(\Phi_t(\tau), \tau) \geq \Pi(\Phi_t(\tau), \lambda),$$

which gives $\Phi_t(\lambda) \succ \Phi_t(\tau)$. Since the map $(i_n) \mapsto \lambda_{(i_n)}$ is strictly increasing, by Lemma 2.12 we conclude that $\lambda_{\Phi_t(\lambda)} \geq \lambda_{\Phi_t(\tau)} = \tau \geq \lambda$, proving the claim. Therefore, for any $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in (\lambda_\diamond, \tau] \cap \Lambda(t)$ with $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$

$$\Pi(\Phi_t(\lambda_1), \lambda_1) = t = \Pi(\Phi_t(\lambda_2), \lambda_2) > \Pi(\Phi_t(\lambda_2), \lambda_1),$$

which yields $\Phi_t(\lambda_1) \succ \Phi_t(\lambda_2)$.

Next we prove that Φ_t is strictly increasing in $[\tau, 1/3] \cap \Lambda(t)$. We claim that $\lambda \geq \lambda_{\Phi_t(\lambda)}$ in this case. Suppose on the contrary that $\lambda < \lambda_{\Phi_t(\lambda)}$ for some $\lambda \in [\tau, 1/3] \cap \Lambda(t)$. Then

$$\Pi(\Phi_t(\tau), \tau) = t = \Pi(\Phi_t(\lambda), \lambda) \geq \Pi(\Phi_t(\lambda), \tau),$$

which implies that $\Phi_t(\tau) \succ \Phi_t(\lambda)$. Since the map $(i_n) \mapsto \lambda_{(i_n)}$ is strictly increasing, by Lemma 2.12 it follows that $\lambda_{\Phi_t(\lambda)} \leq \lambda_{\Phi_t(\tau)} = \tau \leq \lambda$, leading to a contradiction. This proves the claim, and then it follows that for any $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in [\tau, 1/3] \cap \Lambda(t)$ with $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$

$$\Pi(\Phi_t(\lambda_2), \lambda_2) = t = \Pi(\Phi_t(\lambda_1), \lambda_1) > \Pi(\Phi_t(\lambda_1), \lambda_2),$$

which gives $\Phi_t(\lambda_2) \succ \Phi_t(\lambda_1)$. This completes the proof. \square

Proof of Proposition 2.6. The proposition follows by Lemmas 2.7, 2.9, 2.10 and 2.13. \square

By the proof of Proposition 2.6 (i) and (ii) it follows that

$$(2.13) \quad t < \lambda_\diamond(t) < \sqrt{t} \leq \frac{1}{3} \quad \text{if } 0 < t \leq \frac{1}{9}, \quad t < \lambda_\diamond(t) < \tau(t) < \frac{1}{3} \quad \text{if } \frac{1}{9} < t < \frac{4}{27}.$$

Here $\tau(t) = 1/4$ for any $t \in (1/9, 1/8]$, and $\tau(t)$ is defined as in Lemma 2.12 for $t \in (1/8, 4/27)$.

3. TOPOLOGY AND HAUSDORFF DIMENSION OF $\Lambda(t)$

In this section we will show that $\Lambda(t)$ is a topological Cantor set (Proposition 3.1) and it has full Hausdorff dimension (Corollary 3.7).

3.1. Topology of $\Lambda(t)$. Recall that a topological Cantor set in \mathbb{R} is a non-empty perfect set with no interior points.

Proposition 3.1. *For any $t \in (0, 1) \setminus \{1/3\}$ the set $\Lambda(t)$ is a topological Cantor set with*

$$\min \Lambda(t) = \min \left\{ t, \frac{1-t}{2} \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad \max \Lambda(t) = \frac{1}{3}.$$

First we determine the extreme points of $\Lambda(t)$.

Lemma 3.2. *For any $t \in (0, 1) \setminus \{1/3\}$ we have $\min \Lambda(t) = \min\{t, \frac{1-t}{2}\}$ and $\max(\Lambda(t)) = 1/3$.*

Proof. Note that $E_\lambda = [-1, 1]$ for $\lambda = 1/3$. This implies that $\max \Lambda(t) = 1/3$ for any $t \in [-1, 1]$. For the minimum value of $\Lambda(t)$ we consider two cases: (I) $t \in (0, 1/3)$; (II) $t \in (1/3, 1)$.

(I) $t \in (0, 1/3)$. Then $\Phi_t(\lambda) \in (0^\infty, 01^\infty]$ for any $\lambda \in (0, 1/3] \cap \Lambda(t)$. By Lemmas 2.7 (i) and 2.8 it follows that the minimum value $\lambda_* = \min \Lambda(t)$ satisfies $\Pi(01^\infty, \lambda_*) = t$. So, $\min \Lambda(t) = \lambda_* = t$.

(II) $t \in (1/3, 1)$. Then $\Phi_t(\lambda) \in [1(-1)^\infty, 1^\infty]$ for any $\lambda \in \Lambda(t)$. Then by Lemma 2.7 (ii) it follows that $\lambda_* = \min \Lambda(t)$ satisfies $\Pi(1(-1)^\infty, \lambda_*) = t$, which implies that $t = 1 - 2\lambda_*$. Hence, $\min \Lambda(t) = \lambda_* = \frac{1-t}{2}$. \square

Next we show that $\Lambda(t)$ is a topological Cantor set.

Lemma 3.3. *For any $t \in (0, 1) \setminus \{1/3\}$, $\Lambda(t)$ is a non-empty perfect set.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.2 it suffices to prove that $\Lambda(t)$ is closed and has no isolated points. First we prove the closeness of $\Lambda(t)$. Let $(\lambda_j) \subset \Lambda(t)$ with $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_j = \lambda_0$. Suppose on the contrary that $\lambda_0 \notin \Lambda(t)$, i.e., $t \notin E_{\lambda_0}$. Since E_{λ_0} is compact, we have $\text{dist}(t, E_{\lambda_0}) := \inf \{|x - t| : x \in E_{\lambda_0}\} > 0$. Note that $E_{\lambda_0} = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} E_{\lambda_0}(n)$, where for $\lambda \in (0, 1/3]$

$$(3.1) \quad E_{\lambda}(n) := \bigcup_{i_1 \dots i_n \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^n} g_{i_1} \circ \dots \circ g_{i_n}([-1, 1])$$

with $g_i(x) = \lambda x + i(1 - \lambda)$ for $i = -1, 0, 1$. Since $E_{\lambda_0}(n) \supset E_{\lambda_0}(n+1)$ for all $n \geq 1$, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$(3.2) \quad d_0 := \text{dist}(t, E_{\lambda_0}(N)) > 0.$$

Note that $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_j = \lambda_0$, and by (3.1) each $E_{\lambda_j}(N)$ is the union of 3^N pairwise disjoint intervals of equal length $2\lambda_j^N$. Then $E_{\lambda_j}(N)$ converges to $E_{\lambda_0}(N)$ under the Hausdorff metric d_H as $j \rightarrow \infty$. So there exists a large $j \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\text{dist}(t, E_{\lambda_0}(N)) \leq d_H(E_{\lambda_j}(N), E_{\lambda_0}(N)) \leq \frac{d_0}{2},$$

where the first inequality follows by $t \in E_{\lambda_j} \subset E_{\lambda_j}(N)$. This leads to a contradiction with (3.2). So, $\lambda_0 \in \Lambda(t)$, and thus $\Lambda(t)$ is closed.

Next we prove that $\Lambda(t)$ has no isolated points. Take $\lambda \in \Lambda(t)$ and let $(i_n) = \Phi_t(\lambda)$. Then there exists a subsequence $(n_j) \subset \mathbb{N}$ such that $i_{n_j} \in \{-1, 0\}$ for all $j \geq 1$, or $i_{n_j} \in \{0, 1\}$ for all $j \geq 1$. Without loss of generality we assume that n_1 is sufficiently large, and $i_{n_j} \in \{-1, 0\}$ for all $j \geq 1$. For any $j \geq 1$ we define $\lambda_j \in (0, 1/3] \cap (\lambda - \delta, \lambda + \delta)$ for some small $\delta > 0$, such that $\Phi_t(\lambda_j) = i_1 \dots i_{n_j-1} (i_{n_j} + 1) 0^\infty$. Then it is clear that $(\lambda_j) \subset \Lambda(t)$ and $\lambda_j \rightarrow \lambda$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, λ is not isolated in $\Lambda(t)$. \square

Proof of Proposition 3.1. By Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3 it suffices to prove that $\Lambda(t)$ has no interior points. Take $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \Lambda(t)$ with $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$. It suffices to prove $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \setminus \Lambda(t) \neq \emptyset$. By Proposition 2.6 there exists $\hat{\lambda} \in (\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ such that Φ_t is strictly monotonic in $(\hat{\lambda}, \lambda_2)$. Without loss of generality we may assume that Φ_t is strictly increasing in $(\hat{\lambda}, \lambda_2)$. Write $(i_n) = \Phi_t(\hat{\lambda})$ and $(j_n) = \Phi_t(\lambda_2)$. Then $(i_n) \prec (j_n)$. So there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $i_1 \dots i_{N-1} = j_1 \dots j_{N-1}$ and $i_N < j_N$. Suppose $j_N - i_N = 1$, since otherwise we can choose a larger $\hat{\lambda}$. Let

$$\mathbf{c} = i_1 \dots i_N 1^\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{d} = j_1 \dots j_N (-1)^\infty.$$

Then by Lemma 2.2 it follows that

$$(3.3) \quad \Pi(\mathbf{c}, \lambda_2) < \Pi(\mathbf{d}, \lambda_2) \leq \Pi((j_n), \lambda_2) = t = \Pi((i_n), \hat{\lambda}) \leq \Pi(\mathbf{c}, \hat{\lambda}) < \Pi(\mathbf{d}, \hat{\lambda}).$$

Denote the open interval by $I_{\lambda} := (\Pi(\mathbf{c}, \lambda), \Pi(\mathbf{d}, \lambda))$. Observe that the map $\lambda \mapsto cl(I_{\lambda})$ is continuous with respect to the Hausdorff metric d_H . Then (3.3) implies that $t \in I_{\lambda}$ for some $\lambda \in (\hat{\lambda}, \lambda_2) \subset (\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$. Since $I_{\lambda} \cap E_{\lambda} = \emptyset$, we have $t \notin E_{\lambda}$, i.e., $\lambda \notin \Lambda(t)$. So, $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \setminus \Lambda(t) \neq \emptyset$, completing the proof. \square

3.2. Hausdorff dimension of $\Lambda(t)$. Now we turn to prove that $\Lambda(t)$ has full Hausdorff dimension, which can be deduced from the following result.

Proposition 3.4. *For any $t \in (0, 1) \setminus \{1/3\}$ we have*

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} \dim_H (\Lambda(t) \cap (1/3 - \delta, 1/3 + \delta)) = 1.$$

Our strategy to prove Proposition 3.4 is to construct a sequence of subsets of $\Lambda(t) \cap (1/3 - \delta, 1/3 + \delta)$ whose Hausdorff dimension can be arbitrarily close to one. In view of $\Phi_t(1/3)$ defined in (2.5), we consider two cases: $t \in (0, 1/9] \cup [4/27, 1/3)$ and $t \in (1/9, 4/27) \cup (1/3, 1)$.

First we consider $t \in (0, 1/9] \cup [4/27, 1/3)$. Then $\Phi_t(1/3) \in (0^\infty, 001^\infty] \cup [01(-1)0^\infty, 01^\infty)$, and $\Phi_t(1/3)$ does not end with 1^∞ . So there exists a subsequence $\{n_j\} \subset \mathbb{N}_{\geq 4}$ such that $x_{n_j} < 1$ for all $j \geq 1$. Note by Proposition 2.6 (i) and (iii) that Φ_t is strictly decreasing in $\Lambda(t)$. Then for each $j \geq 1$ there exists a unique $\eta_j \in (0, 1/3)$ such that

$$t = \Pi(x_1 \dots x_{n_j}^+ 1^\infty, \eta_j).$$

Accordingly, for $k \geq 1$ we let

$$\Delta_{k,j}^+(t) := \{\lambda \in \Lambda(t) : \Phi_t(\lambda) = x_1 \dots x_{n_j}^+ d_1 d_2 \dots \text{ with } d_{ik} \neq -1 \forall i \geq 1\}.$$

Then by Proposition 2.6 (i) and (iii) it follows that

$$(3.4) \quad \Delta_{k,j}^+(t) \subset \Lambda(t) \cap (\eta_j, 1/3) \quad \forall k \geq 1; \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_j \nearrow 1/3 \text{ as } j \rightarrow \infty.$$

Lemma 3.5. *Let $t \in (0, 1/9] \cup [4/27, 1/3)$. Then for any $k, j \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$|\pi_{\eta_j}(\Phi_t(\lambda_1)) - \pi_{\eta_j}(\Phi_t(\lambda_2))| \leq C|\lambda_1 - \lambda_2|$$

for any $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \Delta_{k,j}^+(t)$.

Proof. Let $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \Delta_{k,j}^+(t)$ with $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$. Write $(a_n) = \Phi_t(\lambda_1)$ and $(b_n) = \Phi_t(\lambda_2)$. Since Φ_t is strictly decreasing in $[\eta_j, 1/3] \cap \Lambda(t)$, we have $(a_n) \succ (b_n)$; and then there exists a $N > n_j$ such that $a_1 \dots a_{N-1} = b_1 \dots b_{N-1}$ and $a_N > b_N$. So,

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{aligned} |\pi_{\eta_j}(\Phi_t(\lambda_1)) - \pi_{\eta_j}(\Phi_t(\lambda_2))| &= \left| (1 - \eta_j) \left(\sum_{n=N}^{\infty} a_n \eta_j^{n-1} - \sum_{n=N}^{\infty} b_n \eta_j^{n-1} \right) \right| \\ &\leq (1 - \eta_j) \sum_{n=N}^{\infty} 2\eta_j^{n-1} = 2\eta_j^{N-1}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 2.2 it follows that

$$(1 - \lambda_1) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n \lambda_1^{n-1} = t = (1 - \lambda_2) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_n \lambda_2^{n-1} \leq (1 - \lambda_2) \left(\sum_{n=1}^N a_n \lambda_2^{n-1} - \sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} \lambda_2^{n-1} \right),$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned}
(1 - \lambda_1) \sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} (a_n + 1) \lambda_1^{n-1} &\leq (1 - \lambda_2) \left(\sum_{n=1}^N a_n \lambda_2^{n-1} - \sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} \lambda_2^{n-1} \right) \\
&\quad - (1 - \lambda_1) \left(\sum_{n=1}^N a_n \lambda_1^{n-1} - \sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} \lambda_1^{n-1} \right) \\
(3.6) \quad &= \Pi(a_1 \dots a_N (-1)^\infty, \lambda_2) - \Pi(a_1 \dots a_N (-1)^\infty, \lambda_1) \\
&\leq 2(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows by (2.2) that $|\Pi_2((i_n), \lambda)| \leq 2$ for any $(i_n) \in (0^\infty, 1^\infty)$ and $\lambda \in (0, 1/3]$. Note by the definition of $\Delta_{k,j}^+(t)$ that $a_{N+1}a_{N+2} \dots \succ ((-1)^{k-1}0)^\infty$. Then $(a_{N+1} + 1)(a_{N+2} + 1) \dots \succ (0^{k-1}1)^\infty$. So, by (3.6) and using $\lambda_1 \in (\eta_j, 1/3)$ it follows that

$$2(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1) > (1 - \lambda_1) \lambda_1^{N+k-1} > \frac{2}{3} \eta_j^{N+k-1}.$$

This, together with (3.5), implies that

$$|\pi_{\eta_j}(\Phi_t(\lambda_1)) - \pi_{\eta_j}(\Phi_t(\lambda_2))| \leq \frac{6}{\eta_j^k} |\lambda_1 - \lambda_2|$$

as required. \square

Next we consider $t \in (1/9, 4/27) \cup (1/3, 1)$. Then $\Phi_t(1/3) \in (001^\infty, 01(-1)0^\infty) \cup (01^\infty, 1^\infty)$, and it does not end with $(-1)^\infty$. So there exists a subsequence $\{n_j\} \subset \mathbb{N}$ such that $x_{n_j} > -1$ for any $j \geq 1$. By Proposition 2.6 (ii) and (iv) there exists $\delta > 0$ such that Φ_t is strictly increasing in $\Lambda(t) \cap (1/3 - \delta, 1/3]$. So, without loss of generality, by deleting the first finitely many terms of $\{n_j\}$, we can assume that for any $j \geq 1$ the equation

$$t = \Pi(x_1 \dots x_{n_j}^- (-1)^\infty, \gamma_j)$$

determines a unique $\gamma_j \in (1/3 - \delta, 1/3)$. Note by Lemma 2.3 (ii) that if $x_1 \dots x_{n_j}^- (-1)^\infty \in (001^\infty, 01(-1)0^\infty)$, the above equation may determine two different γ_j s in $(0, 1/3)$, but only one is in $(1/3 - \delta, 1/3)$. Accordingly, for $k \geq 1$ we set

$$\Delta_{k,j}^-(t) := \{\lambda \in \Lambda(t) \cap (1/3 - \delta, 1/3) : \Phi_t(\lambda) = x_1 \dots x_{n_j}^- d_1 d_2 \dots \text{ with } d_{ik} \neq -1 \forall i \geq 1\}.$$

Then by Proposition 2.6 (ii) and (iv) it follows that

$$(3.7) \quad \Delta_{k,j}^-(t) \subset \Lambda(t) \cap (\gamma_j, 1/3) \quad \forall k \geq 1; \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_j \nearrow 1/3 \text{ as } j \rightarrow \infty.$$

Lemma 3.6. *Let $t \in (1/9, 4/27) \cup (1/3, 1)$. Then for any $k, j \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$|\pi_{\gamma_j}(\Phi_t(\lambda_1)) - \pi_{\gamma_j}(\Phi_t(\lambda_2))| \leq C |\lambda_1 - \lambda_2|$$

for any $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \Delta_{k,j}^-(t)$.

Proof. Note that Φ_t is strictly increasing in $[\gamma_j, 1/3] \cap \Lambda(t)$. Then by a similar argument as in the proof of Lemma 3.5 one can verify that $|\pi_{\gamma_j}(\Phi_t(\lambda_1)) - \pi_{\gamma_j}(\Phi_t(\lambda_2))| \leq \frac{6}{\gamma_j^k} |\lambda_1 - \lambda_2|$ for any $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \Delta_{k,j}^-(t)$. \square

Proof of Proposition 3.4. Take $t \in (0, 1) \setminus \{1/3\}$. Since the proof for $t \in (1/9, 4/27) \cup (1/3, 1)$ is similar, we only consider $t \in (0, 1/9] \cup [4/27, 1/3)$. By (3.4) and Lemma 3.5 it follows that

$$(3.8) \quad \dim_H(\Lambda(t) \cap (\eta_j, 1/3)) \geq \dim_H \Delta_{k,j}^+(t) \geq \dim_H \pi_{\eta_j}(\Phi_t(\Delta_{k,j}^+(t)))$$

for all $k, j \in \mathbb{N}$. Note by the definition of $\Delta_{k,j}^+(t)$ that $\Phi_t(\Delta_{k,j}^+(t))$ consists of all sequences $(i_n) \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ with a prefix $i_1 \dots i_{n_j} = x_1 \dots x_{n_j}^+$ and $i_{n_j+m} \neq -1$ for all $m \geq 1$. So, by using $\eta_j \in (0, 1/3)$ and (3.8) we obtain that

$$(3.9) \quad \dim_H(\Lambda(t) \cap (\eta_j, 1/3)) \geq \frac{(k-1)\log 3 + \log 2}{-k \log \eta_j} \rightarrow \frac{\log 3}{-\log \eta_j} \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

Hence, by (3.4) and (3.9) it follows that

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} \dim_H(\Lambda(t) \cap (1/3 - \delta, 1/3 + \delta)) \geq \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \dim_H(\Lambda(t) \cap (\eta_j, 1/3)) \geq \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log 3}{-\log \eta_j} = 1.$$

The reverse inequality is obvious, since $\dim_H(\Lambda(t) \cap (1/3 - \delta, 1/3 + \delta)) \leq 1$ for any $\delta > 0$. \square

The following corollary follows directly from Proposition 3.4.

Corollary 3.7. *For any $t \in (0, 1) \setminus \{1/3\}$ we have $\dim_H \Lambda(t) = 1$.*

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

In this section we will determine the local dimension of $\Lambda(t)$, and prove Theorem 1.1.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $t \in (0, 1) \setminus \{1/3\}$. Then for any $\lambda \in \Lambda(t)$*

$$(4.1) \quad \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} \dim_H(\Lambda(t) \cap (\lambda - \delta, \lambda + \delta)) = \frac{\log 3}{-\log \lambda}.$$

Note by Proposition 3.4 that (4.1) holds for $\lambda = 1/3$. So, in the following we only need to prove (4.1) for $\lambda \in \Lambda(t) \setminus \{1/3\}$, which will be split into two subsections.

4.1. A lower bound on the local dimension of $\Lambda(t)$. Take $\lambda_* \in \Lambda(t) \setminus \{1/3\}$ and let $(x_i) = \Phi_t(\lambda_*)$ be the unique coding of t defined as in (2.5), i.e., $t = \Pi((x_i), \lambda_*)$. We will prove in this subsection that

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} \dim_H(\Lambda(t) \cap (\lambda_* - \delta, \lambda_* + \delta)) \geq \frac{\log 3}{-\log \lambda_*}.$$

For this we consider two cases: (I) (x_i) does not end with 1^∞ ; (II) (x_i) ends with 1^∞ .

Case (I). $(x_i) = \Phi_t(\lambda_*)$ does not end with 1^∞ . Then there exists a subsequence $(n_j) \subset \mathbb{N}$ such that $x_{n_j} < 1$ for all $j \geq 1$. By Proposition 2.6 there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that $(\lambda_* - \delta, \lambda_* + \delta) \subset (0, 1/3)$, and Φ_t is monotonic in $(\lambda_* - \delta, \lambda_*) \cap \Lambda(t)$ and $(\lambda_*, \lambda_* + \delta) \cap \Lambda(t)$, respectively. Furthermore, if Φ_t is strictly decreasing in $(\lambda_*, \lambda_* + \delta) \cap \Lambda(t)$, then so is Φ_t in

$(\lambda_* - \delta, \lambda_* + \delta) \cap \Lambda(t)$. By deleting the first finitely many terms from (n_j) we can assume that for any $j \geq 1$ the equation

$$(4.2) \quad t = \Pi(x_1 \dots x_{n_j}^+ 1^\infty, \eta_j)$$

determines a unique root $\eta_j \in (\lambda_* - \delta, \lambda_*)$. Accordingly, for $k \geq 1$ we set

$$\Delta_{k,j}^+(\lambda_*, t) := \left\{ \lambda \in \Lambda(t) \cap (\lambda_* - \delta, \lambda_*) : \Phi_t(\lambda) = x_1 \dots x_{n_j}^+ d_1 d_2 \dots \text{ with } d_{ik} \neq -1 \ \forall i \geq 1 \right\}.$$

Then by Proposition 2.6 it follows that

$$(4.3) \quad \Delta_{k,j}^+(\lambda_*, t) \subset (\eta_j, \lambda_*) \cap \Lambda(t) \ \forall k \geq 1; \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_j \nearrow \lambda_* \text{ as } j \rightarrow \infty.$$

If Φ_t is strictly increasing in $(\lambda_*, \lambda_* + \delta) \cap \Lambda(t)$, then we can assume that for any $j \geq 1$ (4.2) determines a unique $\tilde{\eta}_j \in (\lambda_*, \lambda_* + \delta)$. Accordingly, for $k \geq 1$ we let

$$\tilde{\Delta}_{k,j}^+(\lambda_*, t) := \left\{ \lambda \in \Lambda(t) \cap (\lambda_*, \lambda_* + \delta) : \Phi_t(\lambda) = x_1 \dots x_{n_j}^+ d_1 d_2 \dots \text{ with } d_{ik} \neq -1 \ \forall i \geq 1 \right\}.$$

Therefore,

$$(4.4) \quad \tilde{\Delta}_{k,j}^+(\lambda_*, t) \subset (\lambda_*, \tilde{\eta}_j) \cap \Lambda(t) \ \forall k \geq 1; \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\eta}_j \searrow \lambda_* \text{ as } j \rightarrow \infty.$$

Lemma 4.2. *Let $t \in (0, 1) \setminus \{1/3\}$ and $\lambda_* \in \Lambda(t) \setminus \{1/3\}$. Suppose $\Phi_t(\lambda_*)$ does not end with 1^∞ .*

- (i) *If Φ_t is strictly decreasing in $(\lambda_*, \lambda_* + \delta) \cap \Lambda(t)$, then for any $k, j \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $C_1 > 0$ such that*

$$|\pi_{\eta_j}(\Phi_t(\lambda_1)) - \pi_{\eta_j}(\Phi_t(\lambda_2))| \leq C_1 |\lambda_1 - \lambda_2|$$

for any $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \Delta_{k,j}^+(\lambda_, t)$.*

- (ii) *If Φ_t is strictly increasing in $(\lambda_*, \lambda_* + \delta) \cap \Lambda(t)$, then for any $k, j \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $C_2 > 0$ such that*

$$|\pi_{\lambda_*}(\Phi_t(\lambda_1)) - \pi_{\lambda_*}(\Phi_t(\lambda_2))| \leq C_2 |\lambda_1 - \lambda_2|$$

for any $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \tilde{\Delta}_{k,j}^+(\lambda_, t)$.*

Proof. Since the proofs of (i) and (ii) are similar, we only prove (i). Suppose Φ_t is strictly decreasing in $(\lambda_*, \lambda_* + \delta) \cap \Lambda(t)$. Then so is Φ_t in $[\eta_j, \lambda_*] \cap \Lambda(t)$ for any $j \geq 1$. By a similar argument as in the proof of Lemma 3.5 one can verify that for any $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \Delta_{k,j}^+(\lambda_*, t)$

$$|\pi_{\eta_j}(\Phi_t(\lambda_1)) - \pi_{\eta_j}(\Phi_t(\lambda_2))| \leq \frac{6}{\eta_j^k} |\lambda_1 - \lambda_2|,$$

proving (i). □

Case (II). $(x_i) = \Phi_t(\lambda_*)$ ends with 1^∞ . Then there exists a subsequence $(n_j) \subset \mathbb{N}$ such that $x_{n_j} > -1$ for all $j \geq 1$. The proof is similar to Case (I). By Proposition 2.6 there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that $(\lambda_* - \delta, \lambda_* + \delta) \subset (0, 1/3)$, and Φ_t is monotonic in $(\lambda_* - \delta, \lambda_*) \cap \Lambda(t)$ and $(\lambda_*, \lambda_* + \delta) \cap \Lambda(t)$, respectively. Furthermore, if Φ_t is strictly decreasing in $(\lambda_*, \lambda_* + \delta) \cap \Lambda(t)$,

then Φ_t is also strictly decreasing in $(\lambda_* - \delta, \lambda_* + \delta) \cap \Lambda(t)$. So, by deleting the first finitely many terms from (n_j) we can assume that for any $j \geq 1$ the equation

$$(4.5) \quad t = \Pi(x_1 \dots x_{n_j}^- (-1)^\infty, \gamma_j)$$

determines a unique root $\gamma_j \in (\lambda_*, \lambda_* + \delta)$. Accordingly, for $k \geq 1$ let

$$\Delta_{k,j}^-(\lambda_*, t) := \left\{ \lambda \in \Lambda(t) \cap (\lambda_*, \lambda_* + \delta) : \Phi_t(\lambda) = x_1 \dots x_{n_j}^- d_1 d_2 \dots \text{ with } d_{ik} \neq -1 \ \forall i \geq 1 \right\}.$$

Then by Proposition 2.6 it follows that

$$(4.6) \quad \Delta_{k,j}^-(\lambda_*, t) \subset (\lambda_*, \gamma_j) \cap \Lambda(t) \ \forall k \geq 1; \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_j \searrow \lambda_* \text{ as } j \rightarrow \infty.$$

If Φ_t is strictly increasing in $(\lambda_*, \lambda_* + \delta) \cap \Lambda(t)$, then we can assume that for any $j \geq 1$ (4.5) determines a unique $\tilde{\gamma}_j \in (\lambda_* - \delta, \lambda_*)$. Accordingly, for $k \geq 1$ we set

$$\tilde{\Delta}_{k,j}^-(\lambda_*, t) := \left\{ \lambda \in \Lambda(t) \cap (\lambda_* - \delta, \lambda_*) : \Phi_t(\lambda) = x_1 \dots x_{n_j}^- d_1 d_2 \dots \text{ with } d_{ik} \neq -1 \ \forall i \geq 1 \right\}.$$

Therefore,

$$(4.7) \quad \tilde{\Delta}_{k,j}^-(\lambda_*, t) \subset (\tilde{\gamma}_j, \lambda_*) \cap \Lambda(t) \ \forall k \geq 1; \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\gamma}_j \nearrow \lambda_* \text{ as } j \rightarrow \infty.$$

By a similar argument as in the proof of Lemma 3.5 we have the following Lipschitz property.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $t \in (0, 1) \setminus \{1/3\}$ and $\lambda_* \in \Lambda(t) \setminus \{1/3\}$. Suppose $\Phi_t(\lambda_*)$ ends with 1^∞ .*

- (i) *If Φ_t is strictly decreasing in $(\lambda_*, \lambda_* + \delta) \cap \Lambda(t)$, then for any $k, j \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $C_1 > 0$ such that*

$$|\pi_{\lambda_*}(\Phi_t(\lambda_1)) - \pi_{\lambda_*}(\Phi_t(\lambda_2))| \leq C_1 |\lambda_1 - \lambda_2|$$

for any $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \Delta_{k,j}^-(\lambda_, t)$.*

- (ii) *If Φ_t is strictly increasing in $(\lambda_*, \lambda_* + \delta) \cap \Lambda(t)$, then for any $k, j \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $C_2 > 0$ such that*

$$|\pi_{\tilde{\gamma}_j}(\Phi_t(\lambda_1)) - \pi_{\tilde{\gamma}_j}(\Phi_t(\lambda_2))| \leq C_2 |\lambda_1 - \lambda_2|$$

for any $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \tilde{\Delta}_{k,j}^-(\lambda_, t)$.*

Proof of Proposition 4.1 (a lower bound). Let $t \in (0, 1) \setminus \{1/3\}$ and $\lambda_* \in \Lambda(t) \setminus \{1/3\}$. If $\Phi_t(\lambda_*)$ does not end with 1^∞ and Φ_t is strictly decreasing in $(\lambda_*, \lambda_* + \delta) \cap \Lambda(t)$ for some $\delta > 0$, then by (4.3) and Lemma 4.2 (i) it follows that for any $j \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \dim_H(\Lambda(t) \cap (\lambda_* - \delta, \lambda_* + \delta)) &\geq \dim_H \pi_{\eta_j}(\Phi_t(\Delta_{k,j}^+(\lambda_*, t))) \\ &\geq \frac{(k-1) \log 3 + \log 2}{-k \log \eta_j} \rightarrow \frac{\log 3}{-\log \eta_j} \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\eta_j \nearrow \lambda_*$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$ by (4.3), we conclude that

$$(4.8) \quad \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} \dim_H(\Lambda(t) \cap (\lambda_* - \delta, \lambda_* + \delta)) \geq \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log 3}{-\log \eta_j} = \frac{\log 3}{-\log \lambda_*}.$$

Similarly, if $\Phi_t(\lambda_*)$ does not end with 1^∞ and Φ_t is strictly increasing in $(\lambda_*, \lambda_* + \delta) \cap \Lambda(t)$, then by (4.4), Lemma 4.2 (ii) and the same argument as above we can prove (4.8). Moreover,

if $\Phi_t(\lambda_*)$ ends with 1^∞ , then (4.8) can be proved by a similar argument as above together with (4.6), (4.7) and Lemma 4.3. \square

4.2. An upper bound on the local dimension of $\Lambda(t)$. Now we turn to prove that

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} \dim_H(\Lambda(t) \cap (\lambda_* - \delta, \lambda_* + \delta)) \leq \frac{\log 3}{-\log \lambda_*} \quad \forall \lambda_* \in \Lambda(t) \setminus \{1/3\}.$$

In view of our proof of Proposition 2.6 we consider $t \in (0, 1/9]$, $t \in (1/9, 4/27)$ and $t \in [4/27, 1/3) \cup (1/3, 1)$, separately.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $t \in [4/27, 1/3) \cup (1/3, 1)$. Then for any $\theta \in (\min \Lambda(t), 1/3)$ there exists $C > 0$ such that*

$$|\pi_\theta(\Phi_t(\lambda_1)) - \pi_\theta(\Phi_t(\lambda_2))| \geq C|\lambda_2 - \lambda_1|$$

for any $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \Lambda(t) \cap (0, \theta]$.

Proof. First we consider $t \in [4/27, 1/3)$. Take $\theta \in (\min \Lambda(t), 1/3)$. By the proof of Lemma 2.7 it follows that $\Phi_t(\lambda) \in [01(-1)0^\infty, 01^\infty]$ for any $\lambda \in \Lambda(t) \cap (0, \theta]$. Furthermore, by the proof of Lemma 2.3 (iii) we obtain that

$$(4.9) \quad \Pi_2((i_n), \lambda) \geq \min \{1 - 4\lambda + 3\lambda^2, 1 - 2\lambda - 3\lambda^2\} \geq 1 - 4\theta + 3\theta^2 =: C_1 > 0$$

for any $(i_n) \in [01(-1)0^\infty, 01^\infty]$ and $\lambda \in \Lambda(t) \cap (0, \theta]$.

Now take $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \Lambda(t) \cap (0, \theta]$ with $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$. Then $(i_n) := \Phi_t(\lambda_1) \succ \Phi_t(\lambda_2) =: (j_n)$ by Lemma 2.7. So there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 3}$ such that $i_1 \dots i_{N-1} = j_1 \dots j_{N-1}$ and $i_N > j_N$. Thus,

$$(4.10) \quad \begin{aligned} |\pi_\theta(\Phi_t(\lambda_1)) - \pi_\theta(\Phi_t(\lambda_2))| &= (1 - \theta) \sum_{n=N}^{\infty} (i_n - j_n) \theta^{n-1} \\ &\geq (1 - \theta) \theta^{N-1} - (1 - \theta) \sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} 2\theta^{n-1} = (1 - 3\theta) \theta^{N-1}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, note that $(1 - \lambda_1) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} i_n \lambda_1^{n-1} = t = (1 - \lambda_2) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} j_n \lambda_2^{n-1}$. Then by (4.9) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & (1 - \lambda_1) \sum_{n=N}^{\infty} (i_n - 1) \lambda_1^{n-1} - (1 - \lambda_2) \sum_{n=N}^{\infty} (j_n - 1) \lambda_2^{n-1} \\ &= \left((1 - \lambda_2) \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} j_n \lambda_2^{n-1} + (1 - \lambda_2) \sum_{n=N}^{\infty} \lambda_2^{n-1} \right) \\ & \quad - \left((1 - \lambda_1) \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} j_n \lambda_1^{n-1} + (1 - \lambda_1) \sum_{n=N}^{\infty} \lambda_1^{n-1} \right) \\ &= \Pi(j_1 \dots j_{N-1} 1^\infty, \lambda_2) - \Pi(j_1 \dots j_{N-1} 1^\infty, \lambda_1) \\ &= \Pi_2(j_1 \dots j_{N-1} 1^\infty, \lambda_*)(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1) \geq C_1(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1) \end{aligned}$$

for some $\lambda_* \in [\lambda_1, \lambda_2]$, where the third equality follows by the mean value theorem. So,

$$(4.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \lambda_2 - \lambda_1 &\leq \frac{1}{C_1} \left[(1 - \lambda_1) \sum_{n=N}^{\infty} 2\lambda_1^{n-1} + (1 - \lambda_2) \sum_{n=N}^{\infty} 2\lambda_2^{n-1} \right] \\ &\leq \frac{2}{C_1} (\lambda_1^{N-1} + \lambda_2^{N-1}) \leq \frac{4}{C_1} \theta^{N-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by (4.10) and (4.11) we conclude that

$$|\pi_{\theta}(\Phi_t(\lambda_1)) - \pi_{\theta}(\Phi_t(\lambda_2))| \geq \frac{C_1(1-3\theta)}{4} |\lambda_1 - \lambda_2|$$

as required.

Next we consider $t \in (1/3, 1)$. Then by the proof of Lemma 2.7 there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\Phi_t(\lambda) \in [1(-1)^{\infty}, 1^k(-1)^{\infty}]$ for any $\lambda \in \Lambda(t) \cap (0, \theta]$. Since $\min \Lambda(t) = (1-t)/2$, by (2.2) it follows that

$$|\Pi_2((i_n), \lambda)| \geq |\Pi_2(1^k(-1)^{\infty}, \lambda)| = 2k\lambda^{k-1} \geq 2k \left(\frac{1-t}{2} \right)^{k-1} =: C_2 > 0.$$

By a similar argument as above one can prove that for any $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \Lambda(t) \cap (0, \theta]$

$$|\pi_{\theta}(\Phi_t(\lambda_1)) - \pi_{\theta}(\Phi_t(\lambda_2))| \geq \frac{C_2(1-3\theta)}{4} |\lambda_1 - \lambda_2|,$$

completing the proof. \square

Recall from Lemma 2.8 that $\lambda_{\diamond} = \lambda_{\diamond}(t) \in (0, 1/3)$ satisfies $\lambda_{\diamond}(1 - \lambda_{\diamond})^2 = t$. Furthermore, by (2.13) we have $t < \lambda_{\diamond}(t) < \sqrt{t} \leq 1/3$ for all $t \in (0, 1/9]$.

Lemma 4.5. *Let $t \in (0, 1/9]$.*

(i) *For any $\theta \in [t, \lambda_{\diamond}]$ there exists $C > 0$ such that for any $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \Lambda(t) \cap (0, \lambda_{\diamond}]$*

$$|\pi_{\theta}(\Phi_t(\lambda_1)) - \pi_{\theta}(\Phi_t(\lambda_2))| \geq C |\lambda_2 - \lambda_1|;$$

(ii) *For any $\theta \in (\lambda_{\diamond}, \sqrt{t})$ there exists $C' > 0$ such that for any $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \Lambda(t) \cap (\lambda_{\diamond}, \sqrt{t})$*

$$|\pi_{\theta}(\Phi_t(\lambda_1)) - \pi_{\theta}(\Phi_t(\lambda_2))| \geq C' |\lambda_1 - \lambda_2|;$$

(iii) *For any $\theta \in [\sqrt{t}, 1/3]$ there exists $C'' > 0$ such that for any $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \Lambda(t) \cap [\sqrt{t}, \theta]$*

$$|\pi_{\theta}(\Phi_t(\lambda_1)) - \pi_{\theta}(\Phi_t(\lambda_2))| \geq C'' |\lambda_2 - \lambda_1|.$$

Proof. For (i), note by the proof of Lemma 2.8 that $\Phi_t(\lambda) \in [01(-1)0^{\infty}, 01^{\infty}]$ for any $\lambda \in \Lambda(t) \cap (0, \lambda_{\diamond}]$. Then by (4.9) it follows that $\Pi_2((i_n), \lambda) \geq 1 - 4\lambda_{\diamond} + 3\lambda_{\diamond}^2 > 0$ for all $(i_n) \in [01(-1)0^{\infty}, 01^{\infty}]$ and $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_{\diamond}]$. So, (i) follows by the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 4.4.

For (ii), note by (2.10) that for any $\lambda \in \Lambda(t) \cap (\lambda_{\diamond}, \sqrt{t})$ we have $\Phi_t(\lambda) \in (001^{\infty}, 01(-1)0^{\infty})$, and the proof of Lemma 2.9 yields that $\lambda < \lambda_{\Phi_t(\lambda)}$. Then $\Pi_2(\Phi_t(\lambda), \lambda) > 0$ for all $\lambda \in \Lambda(t) \cap (\lambda_{\diamond}, \sqrt{t})$. Furthermore, observe by Lemma 2.3 that $\Pi_2(\Phi_t(\lambda_{\diamond}), \lambda_{\diamond}) = \Pi_2(01(-1)0^{\infty}, \lambda_{\diamond}) > 0$

and $\Pi_2(\Phi_t(\sqrt{t}), \sqrt{t}) = \Pi_2(001^\infty, \sqrt{t}) > 0$. Since the map $t \mapsto \Pi_2(\Phi_t(\lambda), \lambda)$ is continuous by Lemma 2.5 and $\Lambda(t)$ is compact by Proposition 3.1, it follows that

$$C_1 := \inf_{\lambda \in [\lambda_\diamond, \sqrt{t}] \cap \Lambda(t)} \Pi_2(\Phi_t(\lambda), \lambda) = \min_{\lambda \in [\lambda_\diamond, \sqrt{t}] \cap \Lambda(t)} \Pi_2(\Phi_t(\lambda), \lambda) > 0.$$

Now take $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \Lambda(t) \cap (\lambda_\diamond, \sqrt{t})$ with $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$. Then by Lemma 2.9 we have $(i_n) := \Phi_t(\lambda_1) \succ \Phi_t(\lambda_2) = (j_n)$. So, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 4}$ such that $i_1 \dots i_{N-1} = j_1 \dots j_{N-1}$ and $i_N > j_N$. By the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 4.4 one can show that

$$|\pi_\theta(\Phi_t(\lambda_1)) - \pi_\theta(\Phi_t(\lambda_2))| \geq (1 - 3\theta)\theta^{N-1},$$

and there exists $\lambda_* \in [\lambda_1, \lambda_2]$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & (1 - \lambda_1) \sum_{n=N}^{\infty} (i_n - 1)\lambda_1^{n-1} - (1 - \lambda_2) \sum_{n=N}^{\infty} (j_n - 1)\lambda_2^{n-1} \\ &= \Pi(j_1 \dots j_{N-1} 1^\infty, \lambda_2) - \Pi(j_1 \dots j_{N-1} 1^\infty, \lambda_1) \\ &= \Pi_2(j_1 \dots j_{N-1} 1^\infty, \lambda_*)(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1) \\ &\geq \Pi_2(j_1 \dots j_{N-1} 1^\infty, \lambda_2)(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1) \\ &\geq \Pi_2(\Phi_t(\lambda_2), \lambda_2)(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1) \geq C_1(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1), \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows by the concavity of $\Pi(j_1 \dots j_{N-1} 1^\infty, \cdot)$ and the second inequality follows by Lemma 2.2. Therefore, one can deduce from this that

$$|\pi_\theta(\Phi_t(\lambda_1)) - \pi_\theta(\Phi_t(\lambda_2))| \geq \frac{C_1(1 - 3\theta)}{4} |\lambda_1 - \lambda_2|,$$

establishing (ii).

For (iii), by the proof of Lemma 2.9 it follows that $\Phi_t(\lambda) \in [\Phi_t(1/3), \Phi_t(\sqrt{t})] \subset (0^\infty, 001^\infty)$ for all $\lambda \in \Lambda(t) \cap [\sqrt{t}, 1/3]$. So, by the proof of Lemma 2.3 (i) there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 3}$ such that

$$\Pi_2((i_n), \lambda) \geq \Pi_2(\Phi_t(1/3), \lambda) \geq \lambda^{k-2}(k - 1 - 2k\lambda) \geq \min_{\lambda \in [\sqrt{t}, \theta]} \lambda^{k-1}(k - 1 - 2k\lambda) =: C_2 > 0.$$

for all $(i_n) \in [\Phi_t(1/3), \Phi_t(\sqrt{t})]$ and $\lambda \in [\sqrt{t}, \theta]$. Thus (iii) follows by the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 4.4. \square

Note by the proof of Proposition 2.6 (ii) that $\tau = \tau(t) \in [1/4, 1/3]$ for $t \in (1/9, 4/27)$. Furthermore, by (2.13) we have $t < \lambda_\diamond(t) < \tau(t) < 1/3$ for all $t \in (1/9, 4/27)$.

Lemma 4.6. *Let $t \in (1/9, 4/27)$.*

(i) *For any $\theta \in [t, \lambda_\diamond]$ there exists $C > 0$ such that for any $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \Lambda(t) \cap (0, \lambda_\diamond]$*

$$|\pi_\theta(\Phi_t(\lambda_1)) - \pi_\theta(\Phi_t(\lambda_2))| \geq C|\lambda_2 - \lambda_1|;$$

(ii) *For any $\theta \in (\lambda_\diamond, \tau)$ there exists $C' > 0$ such that for any $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \Lambda(t) \cap [\lambda_\diamond, \theta]$*

$$|\pi_\theta(\Phi_t(\lambda_1)) - \pi_\theta(\Phi_t(\lambda_2))| \geq C'|\lambda_2 - \lambda_1|;$$

(iii) For any $\theta \in (\tau, 1/3)$ there exists $C'' > 0$ such that for any $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \Lambda(t) \cap [\theta, 1/3]$

$$|\pi_\theta(\Phi_t(\lambda_1)) - \pi_\theta(\Phi_t(\lambda_2))| \geq C''|\lambda_2 - \lambda_1|.$$

Proof. The proof is similar to that for Lemma 4.5. More precisely, (i) follows by the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 4.5 (i). In view of the proofs of Lemmas 2.10 and 2.13, (ii) and (iii) follow by a similar argument as in the proof of Lemma 4.5 (ii). \square

Proof of Proposition 4.1 (an upper bound). Let $\lambda_* \in \Lambda(t) \setminus \{1/3\}$. We consider the following two cases.

Case I. $t \in [4/27, 1/3) \cup (1/3, 1)$. Then by Lemma 4.4 it follows that for any $\delta \in (0, 1/3 - \lambda_*)$,

$$\dim_H(\Lambda(t) \cap (\lambda_* - \delta, \lambda_* + \delta)) \leq \dim_H \pi_{\lambda_* + \delta}(\Phi_t(\Lambda(t) \cap (\lambda_* - \delta, \lambda_* + \delta))) \leq \frac{\log 3}{-\log(\lambda_* + \delta)},$$

which implies

$$(4.12) \quad \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} \dim_H(\Lambda(t) \cap (\lambda_* - \delta, \lambda_* + \delta)) \leq \frac{\log 3}{-\log \lambda_*}$$

as desired.

Case II. $t \in (0, 4/27)$. Then by Lemmas 4.5 and 4.6 it follows that for any $\delta \in (0, 1/3 - \lambda_*)$

$$\dim_H(\Lambda(t) \cap (\lambda_* - \delta, \lambda_*)) \leq \frac{\log 3}{-\log \lambda_*} \quad \text{and} \quad \dim_H(\Lambda(t) \cap (\lambda_*, \lambda_* + \delta)) \leq \frac{\log 3}{-\log(\lambda_* + \delta)}.$$

Letting $\delta \rightarrow 0^+$ we also obtain (4.12). \square

Proof of Theorem 1.1. By Proposition 3.1, Corollary 3.7 and Proposition 4.1 it suffices to prove that $\Lambda(t)$ has zero Lebesgue measure for all $t \in (0, 1) \setminus \{1/3\}$. Note by Proposition 4.1 that for each $\lambda \in \Lambda(t) \setminus \{1/3\}$ there exists $\delta_\lambda > 0$ such that $\dim_H(\Lambda(t) \cap (\lambda - \delta_\lambda, \lambda + \delta_\lambda)) < 1$, and thus $\Lambda(t) \cap (\lambda - \delta_\lambda, \lambda + \delta_\lambda)$ has zero Lebesgue measure. Since by Proposition 3.1 that $\Lambda(t)$ is compact, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 4}$ the segment $\Lambda(t) \cap (0, 1/3 - 1/n]$ can be covered by finitely many open intervals, say $\{(\lambda_i - \delta_{\lambda_i}, \lambda_i + \delta_{\lambda_i}) : i = 1, \dots, N\}$. This implies that $\Lambda(t) \cap (0, 1/3 - 1/n]$ has zero Lebesgue measure for all $n \geq 4$. Therefore, $\Lambda(t) = \{1/3\} \cup \bigcup_{n=4}^{\infty} (\Lambda(t) \cap (0, 1/3 - 1/n])$ is a Lebesgue null set. \square

5. INTERSECTIONS WITH DIFFERENT HAUSDORFF AND PACKING DIMENSIONS

In this section we consider the set

$$\Lambda_{not}(t) := \{\lambda \in \Lambda(t) : \dim_H(C_\lambda \cap (C_\lambda + t)) \neq \dim_P(C_\lambda \cap (C_\lambda + t))\},$$

and show that it has full Hausdorff dimension. Our proof is motivated by the work of [1] to construct subsets of $\Lambda_{not}(t)$ with Hausdorff dimension arbitrarily close to 1. Recall by (1.3) that

$$\dim_H(C_\lambda \cap (C_\lambda + t)) = \frac{\log 2}{-\log \lambda} \overline{\text{freq}}_0(\Phi_t(\lambda)), \quad \dim_P(C_\lambda \cap (C_\lambda + t)) = \frac{\log 2}{-\log \lambda} \overline{\text{freq}}_0(\Phi_t(\lambda)),$$

where for $(i_n) \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ we denote

$$\underline{freq}_0((i_n)) := \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\{1 \leq k \leq n : i_k = 0\}}{n}, \quad \overline{freq}_0((i_n)) := \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\{1 \leq k \leq n : i_k = 0\}}{n}.$$

Then $\Lambda_{not}(t)$ can be rewritten as

$$(5.1) \quad \Lambda_{not}(t) = \left\{ \lambda \in \Lambda(t) : \underline{freq}_0(\Phi_t(\lambda)) \neq \overline{freq}_0(\Phi_t(\lambda)) \right\}.$$

Proposition 5.1. *For any $t \in (0, 1) \setminus \{1/3\}$ we have $\dim_H \Lambda_{not}(t) = 1$.*

Similar to the proof of Proposition 3.4, we consider two cases: $t \in (0, 1/9] \cup [4/27, 1/3)$ and $t \in (1/9, 4/27) \cup (1/3, 1)$. Note by Proposition 2.6 that the map Φ_t is strictly monotonic for $t \in (0, 1/9] \cup [4/27, 1/3)$ but piecewise monotonic for $t \in (1/9, 4/27) \cup (1/3, 1)$. Since the proofs of the two cases are similar, in the following we only consider $t \in (1/9, 4/27) \cup (1/3, 1)$. By Proposition 2.6 it follows that there exists a small $\delta > 0$ such that Φ_t is strictly increasing in $\Lambda(t) \cap [1/3 - \delta, 1/3]$. Let $(x_i) = \Phi_t(1/3)$. Then (x_i) does not end with $(-1)^\infty$. So there exists a subsequence $\{n_j\} \subset \mathbb{N}$ such that $x_{n_j} > -1$ for all $j \geq 1$. By deleting the first finitely many terms from (n_j) we may assume that for each $j \geq 1$ the equation

$$t = \Pi(x_1 \dots x_{n_j}^- (-1)^\infty, \gamma_j)$$

determines a unique $\gamma_j \in (1/3 - \delta, 1/3)$. Clearly, $\gamma_j \nearrow 1/3$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$.

Now, for $q \in \mathbb{N}$ let $\Sigma_{q,j}(t)$ consists of all $\lambda \in \Lambda(t) \cap (1/3 - \delta, 1/3)$ such that

$$(5.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \Phi_t(\lambda) &= x_1 \dots x_{n_j}^- d_1 d_2 \dots \\ &= x_1 \dots x_{n_j}^- \\ &\quad d_{r_0+1} d_{r_0+2} \dots d_{r_0+3q} 110 \\ &\quad d_{r_1+1} d_{r_1+2} \dots d_{r_1+2+3q} 111100 \\ &\quad \dots \\ &\quad d_{r_{m-1}+1} d_{r_{m-1}+2} \dots d_{r_{m-1}+2^{m-1}+3q} 1^{2^m} 0^{2^{m-1}} \\ &\quad d_{r_m+1} d_{r_m+2} \dots d_{r_m+2^m+3q} 1^{2^{m+1}} 0^{2^m} \\ &\quad \dots, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$r_m := 3(q+1)(1+2+\dots+2^{m-1}) = 3(q+1)(2^m - 1) \quad \text{and} \quad d_{r_m+kq} \neq -1$$

for all $k \in \{1, \dots, 2^m \cdot 3\}$ and $m \geq 0$. Here we point out that $r_0 = 0$. Then by Proposition 2.6 it follows that $\Sigma_{q,j}(t) \subset \Lambda(t) \cap (\gamma_j, 1/3)$ for all $q \geq 1$. In the following we show that $\Sigma_{q,j}(t)$ is a subset of $\Lambda_{not}(t)$.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $t \in (1/9, 4/27) \cup (1/3, 1)$. Then*

$$\Sigma_{q,j}(t) \subset \Lambda_{not}(t) \cap (\gamma_j, 1/3) \quad \forall q, j \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Proof. Take $\lambda \in \Sigma_{q,j}(t)$. Then $\Phi_t(\lambda) = x_1 \dots x_{n_j}^- d_1 d_2 \dots$ is defined as in (5.2). By (5.1) it suffices to prove that the frequency of digit zero in the sequence (d_i) does not exist. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let $N_0((d_i), n)$ be the number of zeros in the word $d_1 \dots d_n$. Then

$$N_0((d_i), r_m) = \xi_m((d_i)) + (1 + 2 + \dots + 2^{m-1}) = \xi_m((d_i)) + 2^m - 1,$$

where $\xi_m((d_i))$ denotes the number of zeros in the word

$$d_{r_0+1} d_{r_0+2} \dots d_{r_0+3q} d_{r_1+1} d_{r_1+2} \dots d_{r_1+2 \cdot 3q} \dots d_{r_{m-1}+1} d_{r_{m-1}+2} \dots d_{r_{m-1}+2^{m-1} \cdot 3q}.$$

This implies that

$$(5.3) \quad \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N_0((d_i), r_m)}{r_m} = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\xi_m((d_i)) + 2^m - 1}{3(q+1)(2^m - 1)} = \frac{1}{3(q+1)} \left(1 + \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\xi_m((d_i))}{2^m} \right).$$

Similarly, for $\ell_m := r_m - 2^{m-1}$ we have

$$N_0((d_i), \ell_m) = \xi_m((d_i)) + (1 + 2 + \dots + 2^{m-2}) = \xi_m((d_i)) + 2^{m-1} - 1,$$

and thus

$$(5.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N_0((d_i), \ell_m)}{\ell_m} &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\xi_m((d_i)) + 2^{m-1} - 1}{3(q+1)(2^m - 1) - 2^{m-1}} \\ &= \frac{1}{6q+5} \left(1 + 2 \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\xi_m((d_i))}{2^m} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Combining (5.3) with (5.4), if the limit $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\xi_m((d_i))}{2^m}$ does not exist, then both limits $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N_0((d_i), r_m)}{r_m}$ and $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N_0((d_i), \ell_m)}{\ell_m}$ do not exist, and thus the frequency of digit zero in (d_i) does not exist. If the limit $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\xi_m((d_i))}{2^m}$ exists, call this limit ζ , then since $\xi_m((d_i)) \leq 3q(1 + 2 + \dots + 2^{m-1}) = 3q(2^m - 1)$, we have $\zeta \leq 3q$. Therefore, by (5.3) and (5.4) it follows that

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N_0((d_i), r_m)}{r_m} = \frac{\zeta + 1}{3(q+1)} > \frac{2\zeta + 1}{6q+5} = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N_0((d_i), \ell_m)}{\ell_m},$$

which again implies that the frequency of digit zero in (d_i) does not exist. So, $\lambda \in \Lambda_{not}(t)$, completing the proof. \square

Next we give a lower bound for the Hausdorff dimension of $\Sigma_{q,j}(t)$.

Lemma 5.3. *Let $t \in (1/9, 4/27) \cup (1/3, 1)$. Then for any $q, j \in \mathbb{N}$ we have*

$$\dim_H \Sigma_{q,j}(t) \geq \frac{(q-1) \log 3 + \log 2}{-(q+1) \log \gamma_j}.$$

Proof. Note by Lemma 5.2 that $\Sigma_{q,j}(t) \subset \Lambda_{not}(t) \cap (\gamma_j, 1/3)$. Then for any $\lambda \in \Sigma_{q,j}(t)$ the sequence $\Phi_t(\lambda)$ begins with $x_1 \dots x_{n_j}^-$ and the tail sequence does not contain q consecutive (-1) s. Then by the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 3.6 there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$|\pi_{\gamma_j}(\Phi_t(\lambda_1)) - \pi_{\gamma_j}(\Phi_t(\lambda_2))| \leq C|\lambda_1 - \lambda_2|$$

for any $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \Sigma_{q,j}(t)$. This implies that $\dim_H \Sigma_{q,j}(t) \geq \dim_H \pi_{\gamma_j}(\Phi_t(\Sigma_{q,j}(t)))$. So it suffices to prove

$$(5.5) \quad \dim_H \pi_{\gamma_j}(\Phi_t(\Sigma_{q,j}(t))) \geq \frac{(q-1)\log 3 + \log 2}{-(q+1)\log \gamma_j}.$$

Observe by (5.2) that

$$(5.6) \quad \dim_H \pi_{\gamma_j}(\Phi_t(\Sigma_{q,j}(t))) = \dim_H \pi_{\gamma_j} \left(\prod_{m=0}^{\infty} E_m(q) \right),$$

where

$$E_m(q) := \left(\{-1, 0, 1\}^{q-1} \times \{0, 1\} \right)^{3 \cdot 2^m} \times \left\{ 1^{2^{m+1}} 0^{2^m} \right\}.$$

Note that each word in $E_m(q)$ has length $3(q+1)2^m$, and $\#E_m(q) = (3^{q-1} \cdot 2)^{3 \cdot 2^m}$. Furthermore, $\prod_{m=0}^{\infty} E_m(q)$ is the set of infinite sequences by concatenating words from each $E_m(q)$. So $\pi_{\gamma_j}(\prod_{m=0}^{\infty} E_m(q))$ is a homogeneous Moran set satisfying the strong separation condition. Hence, by [8, Theorem 2.1] it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \dim_H \pi_{\gamma_j} \left(\prod_{m=0}^{\infty} E_m(q) \right) &\geq \liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \prod_{\ell=0}^{m-1} (3^{q-1} \cdot 2)^{3 \cdot 2^\ell}}{-\sum_{l=0}^{m-1} 3(q+1)2^l \log \gamma_j} \\ &= \liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{\ell=0}^{m-1} 3 \cdot 2^\ell \log(3^{q-1} \cdot 2)}{-3(q+1)(2^m - 1) \log \gamma_j} \\ &= \liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{3(2^m - 1) \log(3^{q-1} \cdot 2)}{-3(q+1)(2^m - 1) \log \gamma_j} = \frac{(q-1)\log 3 + \log 2}{-(q+1)\log \gamma_j}. \end{aligned}$$

This, together with (5.6), proves (5.5). \square

Proof of Proposition 5.1. Take $t \in (0, 1) \setminus \{1/3\}$. Since the proof for $t \in (0, 1/9] \cup [4/27, 1/3)$ is analogous, we only consider for $t \in (1/9, 4/27) \cup (1/3, 1)$. By Lemmas 5.2 and 5.3 it follows that for any $q \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\dim_H \Lambda_{not}(t) \geq \dim_H \Sigma_{q,j}(t) \geq \frac{(q-1)\log 3 + \log 2}{-(q+1)\log \gamma_j} \rightarrow \frac{(q-1)\log 3 + \log 2}{(q+1)\log 3} \quad \text{as } j \rightarrow \infty.$$

Letting $q \rightarrow \infty$ we obtain $\dim_H \Lambda_{not}(t) \geq 1$. Since the reverse inequality is obvious, this proves $\dim_H \Lambda_{not}(t) = 1$. \square

6. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.3

In this section we consider the level set

$$\Lambda_\beta(t) := \left\{ \lambda \in \Lambda(t) : \dim_H (C_\lambda \cap (C_\lambda + t)) = \dim_P (C_\lambda \cap (C_\lambda + t)) = \beta \frac{\log 2}{-\log \lambda} \right\}$$

for $\beta \in [0, 1]$, and prove Theorem 1.3. Recall from (1.5) the entropy function $h(p_1, p_2, p_3) = -\sum_{i=1}^3 p_i \log p_i$ for a probability vector (p_1, p_2, p_3) .

Proposition 6.1. *Let $t \in (0, 1) \setminus \{1/3\}$. Then for any $\beta \in [0, 1]$*

$$\dim_H \Lambda_\beta(t) = \dim_P \Lambda_\beta(t) = \frac{h(\frac{1-\beta}{2}, \beta, \frac{1-\beta}{2})}{\log 3}.$$

It is worth mentioning that the dimension of $\Lambda_\beta(t)$ is independent of t . Since the proof for $t \in (0, 1/9] \cup (4/27, 1/3)$ is similar, we only consider $t \in (1/9, 4/27) \cup (1/3, 1)$. Then $(x_i) = \Phi_t(1/3)$ does not end with $(-1)^\infty$. So there exists a subsequence $(n_j) \subset \mathbb{N}$ such that $x_{n_j} > -1$ for all $j \geq 1$. By Proposition 2.6 there exists $\delta > 0$ such that Φ_t is strictly increasing in $\Lambda(t) \cap (1/3 - \delta, 1/3)$. By deleting the first finitely many terms from (n_j) we may assume that for each $j \geq 1$ the equation

$$t = \pi_{\gamma_j}(x_1 \dots x_{n_j}^- (-1)^\infty)$$

determines a unique $\gamma_j \in (1/3 - \delta, 1/3)$. Then by Lemma 2.5 it follows that $\gamma_j \nearrow 1/3$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$.

Given $\beta \in [0, 1]$, we first prove the lower bound

$$\dim_H \Lambda_\beta(t) \geq \frac{h(\frac{1-\beta}{2}, \beta, \frac{1-\beta}{2})}{\log 3}.$$

For $k, j \in \mathbb{N}$ let $\mathcal{F}_{k,j}^-(t, \beta)$ consist of all $\lambda \in \Lambda(t) \cap (1/3 - \delta, 1/3)$ such that

$$\Phi_t(\lambda) = x_1 \dots x_{n_j}^- d_1 d_2 \dots$$

satisfying

$$(6.1) \quad d_{nk+1} \dots d_{nk+k} \neq (-1)^k \quad \forall n \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{freq}_0((d_i)) := \underline{\text{freq}}_0((d_i)) = \overline{\text{freq}}_0((d_i)) = \beta.$$

Then by Proposition 2.6 it follows that for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$(6.2) \quad \mathcal{F}_{k,j}^-(t, \beta) \subset \Lambda_\beta(t) \cap (\gamma_j, 1/3) \quad \forall k \geq 1.$$

Note that for any sequence $(c_i) \in \Phi_t(\mathcal{F}_{k,j}^-(t, \beta))$ the tail sequence $c_{n_j+1} c_{n_j+2} \dots$ does not contain $2k - 1$ consecutive (-1) s. Then by the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 3.5 it follows that

$$(6.3) \quad \dim_H \mathcal{F}_{k,j}^-(t, \beta) \geq \dim_H \pi_{\gamma_j}(\Phi_t(\mathcal{F}_{k,j}^-(t, \beta))).$$

So it is necessary to consider a lower bound of $\dim_H \pi_{\gamma_j}(\Phi_t(\mathcal{F}_{k,j}^-(t, \beta)))$.

To do this, for each $k, j \in \mathbb{N}$ we construct a measure $\hat{\mu}_{k,j}$ on the tree

$$\mathbf{T}_{k,j}(t) := \left\{ x_1 \dots x_{n_j}^- d_1 d_2 \dots : d_{nk+1} \dots d_{nk+k} \neq (-1)^k \quad \forall n \geq 0 \right\}.$$

Let $(p_{-1}, p_0, p_1) = (\theta_k, 1 - 2\theta_k, \theta_k)$ be a probability vector with $\theta_k \in [0, 1/2]$ satisfying

$$(6.4) \quad \frac{1 - 2\theta_k}{1 - (\theta_k)^k} = \beta.$$

Then $\theta_k \rightarrow (1-\beta)/2$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. For each cylinder set of the tree $\mathbf{T}_{k,j}(t)$ we set $\hat{\mu}_0([x_1 \dots x_{n_j}^-]) = 1$, and for $n \geq 1$, we let

$$\hat{\mu}_n([x_1 \dots x_{n_j}^- d_1 \dots d_{nk}]) = \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \frac{p_{d_{ik+1}} p_{d_{ik+2}} \dots p_{d_{ik+k}}}{1 - p_{-1}^k}.$$

By Kolmogorov's extension theorem (cf. [6]) there exists a unique probability measure $\hat{\mu} = \hat{\mu}_{k,j}$ on the tree $\mathbf{T}_{k,j}(t)$ satisfying $\hat{\mu}([x_1 \dots x_{n_j}^- d_1 \dots d_{nk}]) = \hat{\mu}_n([x_1 \dots x_{n_j}^- d_1 \dots d_{nk}])$ for any $n \geq 0$.

Lemma 6.2. $\hat{\mu}(\Phi_t(\mathcal{F}_{k,j}^-(t, \beta))) = 1$.

Proof. Note that $\Phi_t(\mathcal{F}_{k,j}^-(t, \beta)) \subset \mathbf{T}_{k,j}(t)$. By (6.1) it suffices to prove that for $\hat{\mu}$ -a.e. $(c_i) \in \mathbf{T}_{k,j}(t)$ we have $\text{freq}_0((c_i)) = \beta$. Note that $c_1 \dots c_{n_j} = x_1 \dots x_{n_j}^-$ is fixed, and the choice of each block $c_{n_j+nk+1} \dots c_{n_j+nk+k}$ is independent and identical distributed for all $n \geq 0$ according to our definition of $\hat{\mu}$. So, by the law of large numbers it follows that for $\hat{\mu}$ -a.e. $(c_i) \in \mathbf{T}_{k,j}(t)$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{freq}_0((c_i)) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\{i \in [1, n] : c_i = 0\}}{n} \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\{i \in [n_j + 1, n_j + nk] : c_i = 0\}}{nk} \\ &= \sum_{d_1 \dots d_k \neq (-1)^k} \frac{\#\{i \in [1, k] : d_i = 0\}}{k} \hat{\mu}([x_1 \dots x_{n_j}^- d_1 \dots d_k]) \\ &= \sum_{\ell=1}^k \frac{\ell}{k} \binom{k}{\ell} 2^{k-\ell} \frac{(\theta_k)^{k-\ell} (1 - 2\theta_k)^\ell}{1 - (\theta_k)^k}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows since the number of blocks $d_1 \dots d_k \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^k \setminus \{(-1)^k\}$ with precisely $\ell (\geq 1)$ zeros is $\binom{k}{\ell} 2^{k-\ell}$. Rearranging the above summation and by (6.4) we conclude that

$$\text{freq}_0((c_i)) = \frac{1}{1 - (\theta_k)^k} \sum_{\ell=1}^k \frac{(k-1)!}{(\ell-1)!(k-\ell)!} (2\theta_k)^{k-\ell} (1 - 2\theta_k)^\ell = \frac{1 - 2\theta_k}{1 - (\theta_k)^k} = \beta,$$

completing the proof. \square

By the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 6.2 one can verify that for $\hat{\mu}$ -a.e. $(c_i) \in \mathbf{T}_{k,j}(t)$ the frequencies of digits 1 and -1 in (c_i) are given respectively by

$$(6.5) \quad \text{freq}_1((c_i)) = \frac{\theta_k}{1 - (\theta_k)^k} \rightarrow \frac{1 - \beta}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{freq}_{-1}((c_i)) = \frac{\theta_k - (\theta_k)^k}{1 - (\theta_k)^k} \rightarrow \frac{1 - \beta}{2}$$

as $k \rightarrow \infty$, where the limits follow by $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \theta_k = (1 - \beta)/2$.

Proof of Proposition 6.1 (a lower bound). Note by Lemma 6.2 the set $\pi_{\gamma_j}(\Phi_t(\mathcal{F}_{k,j}^-(t, \beta)))$ has full $\mu := \hat{\mu} \circ \pi_{\gamma_j}^{-1}$ measure. Then for μ -a.e. $y = \pi_{\gamma_j}(x_1 \dots x_{n_j}^- d_1 d_2 \dots) \in \pi_{\gamma_j}(\Phi_t(\mathcal{F}_{k,j}^-(t, \beta)))$

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\log \mu(B(y, r))}{\log r} &= \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \hat{\mu}([x_1 \dots x_{n_j}^- d_1 \dots d_{nk}])}{\log \gamma_j^{n_j + nk}} \\ &= \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \prod_{i=1}^{nk} p_{d_i} - \log(1 - p_{-1}^k)^n}{(n_j + nk) \log \gamma_j} \\ &= \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{s=-1,0,1} N_s(nk) \log p_s - n \log(1 - p_{-1}^k)}{nk \log \gamma_j}, \end{aligned}$$

where $N_s(nk)$ denotes the number of digit s in the block $d_1 \dots d_{nk}$. Therefore, by Lemma 6.2 and (6.5) it follows that for μ -a.e. $y \in \pi_{\gamma_j}(\Phi_t(\mathcal{F}_{k,j}^-(t, \beta)))$

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\log \mu(B(y, r))}{\log r} &= \frac{\frac{\theta_k - (\theta_k)^k}{1 - (\theta_k)^k} \log \theta_k + \beta \log(1 - 2\theta_k) + \frac{\theta_k}{1 - (\theta_k)^k} \log \theta_k}{\log \gamma_j} - \frac{\log(1 - (\theta_k)^k)}{k \log \gamma_j} \\ &\rightarrow \frac{\frac{1-\beta}{2} \log \frac{1-\beta}{2} + \beta \log \beta + \frac{1-\beta}{2} \log \frac{1-\beta}{2}}{\log \gamma_j} = \frac{h(\frac{1-\beta}{2}, \beta, \frac{1-\beta}{2})}{-\log \gamma_j} \end{aligned}$$

as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Then by Billingsley's Lemma (cf. [7]) it follows that

$$\dim_H \pi_{\gamma_j}(\Phi_t(\mathcal{F}_{k,j}^-(t, \beta))) \geq \frac{h(\frac{1-\beta}{2}, \beta, \frac{1-\beta}{2})}{-\log \gamma_j} \quad \forall j \geq 1.$$

This, together with (6.2) and (6.3), implies

$$\dim_H(\Lambda_\beta(t) \cap (\gamma_j, 1/3)) \geq \frac{h(\frac{1-\beta}{2}, \beta, \frac{1-\beta}{2})}{-\log \gamma_j} \quad \forall j \geq 1.$$

Since $\gamma_j \nearrow 1/3$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$, we conclude that $\dim_H \Lambda_\beta(t) \geq h(\frac{1-\beta}{2}, \beta, \frac{1-\beta}{2})/\log 3$. \square

Next we consider the upper bound.

Lemma 6.3. *Let $t \in [4/27, 1/3) \cup (1/3, 1)$ and $\beta \in [0, 1]$. Then*

$$\dim_P \Lambda_\beta(t) \leq \frac{h(\frac{1-\beta}{2}, \beta, \frac{1-\beta}{2})}{\log 3}.$$

Proof. By the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 4.4 it follows that for any $\theta \in (t, 1/3)$ there exists $C > 0$, such that $|\pi_\theta(\Phi_t(\lambda_1)) - \pi_\theta(\Phi_t(\lambda_2))| \geq C|\lambda_1 - \lambda_2|$ for any $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \Lambda_\beta(t) \cap (0, \theta]$. This implies that

$$\dim_P(\Lambda_\beta(t) \cap (0, \theta]) \leq \dim_P \pi_\theta(\Phi_t(\Lambda_\beta(t))) \leq \dim_P \pi_{1/3}(\Phi_t(\Lambda_\beta(t))).$$

By the countable stability of packing dimension we obtain

$$(6.6) \quad \dim_P \Lambda_\beta(t) \leq \dim_P \pi_{1/3}(\Phi_t(\Lambda_\beta(t))).$$

Define a Bernoulli measure $\hat{\nu}$ on the symbolic space $\{-1, 0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ such that

$$\hat{\nu}([d_1 \dots d_n]) = \prod_{i=1}^n p_{d_i} \quad \forall n \geq 0,$$

where $p_{-1} = p_1 = (1 - \beta)/2$ and $p_0 = \beta$. Let $\nu = \hat{\nu} \circ \pi_{1/3}^{-1}$. Note that for each $(d_i) \in \Phi_t(\Lambda_\beta(t))$ we have $\text{freq}_0((d_i)) = \beta$. Then for any $y \in \pi_{1/3}(\Phi_t(\Lambda_\beta(t)))$ with $(c_i) = \Phi_t(1/3)$

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\log \nu(B(y, r))}{\log r} &= \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \prod_{i=1}^n p_{c_i}}{-\log 3^{N+n}} = \frac{1}{-\log 3} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \log p_{c_i}}{n} \\ &= \frac{1}{-\log 3} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \left(N_0(n) \log \beta + (n - N_0(n)) \log \frac{1 - \beta}{2} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{-\log 3} \left(\beta \log \beta + (1 - \beta) \log \frac{1 - \beta}{2} \right) = \frac{h(\frac{1-\beta}{2}, \beta, \frac{1-\beta}{2})}{\log 3}, \end{aligned}$$

where $N_0(n)$ denotes the number of digit zero in the block $c_1 \dots c_n$. So, by [7, Proposition 2.3] and (6.6) it follows that

$$\dim_P \Lambda_\beta(t) \leq \dim_P \pi_{1/3}(\Phi_t(\Lambda_\beta(t))) \leq \frac{h(\frac{1-\beta}{2}, \beta, \frac{1-\beta}{2})}{\log 3},$$

completing the proof. \square

Proof of Proposition 6.1 (an upper bound). By Lemma 6.3 it suffices to consider $t \in (0, 4/27)$. If $t \in (0, 1/9]$, then by Lemma 4.5 and the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 6.3 it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \dim_P(\Lambda_\beta(t) \cap (0, \lambda_\diamond]) &\leq \frac{h(\frac{1-\beta}{2}, \beta, \frac{1-\beta}{2})}{-\log \lambda_\diamond} \leq \frac{h(\frac{1-\beta}{2}, \beta, \frac{1-\beta}{2})}{\log 3}, \\ \dim_P(\Lambda_\beta(t) \cap (\lambda_\diamond, \sqrt{t})) &\leq \frac{h(\frac{1-\beta}{2}, \beta, \frac{1-\beta}{2})}{-\log \sqrt{t}} \leq \frac{h(\frac{1-\beta}{2}, \beta, \frac{1-\beta}{2})}{\log 3} \\ \dim_P(\Lambda_\beta(t) \cap [\sqrt{t}, 1/3]) &\leq \frac{h(\frac{1-\beta}{2}, \beta, \frac{1-\beta}{2})}{\log 3}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies $\dim_P \Lambda_\beta(t) \leq h(\frac{1-\beta}{2}, \beta, \frac{1-\beta}{2})/\log 3$ as desired.

Similarly, if $t \in (1/9, 4/27)$, then by Lemma 4.6 and the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 6.3 we can also prove $\dim_P \Lambda_\beta(t) \leq h(\frac{1-\beta}{2}, \beta, \frac{1-\beta}{2})/\log 3$. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.3. By Propositions 5.1 and 6.1 it suffices to prove that for any $\beta \in [0, 1]$ both $\Lambda_{\text{not}}(t)$ and $\Lambda_\beta(t)$ are dense in $\Lambda(t)$. Since the proofs are similar, we only prove it for $\Lambda_\beta(t)$. Take $\lambda_* \in \Lambda(t)$ and $\delta > 0$. Then we can always find $\lambda \in \Lambda(t)$ such that $\Phi_t(\lambda)$ has a long common prefix with $\Phi_t(\lambda_*)$, and the tail sequence of $\Phi_t(\lambda)$ has digit zero frequency equaling β . In other words, $\lambda \in \Lambda_\beta(t) \cap (\lambda_* - \delta, \lambda_* + \delta)$. So, $\Lambda_\beta(t)$ is dense in $\Lambda(t)$. \square

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The second author was supported by NSFC No. 11971079.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Alberverio, M. Pratsiovytyi, and G. Torbin. Topological and fractal properties of real numbers which are not normal. *Bull. Sci. Math.*, 129(8):615–630, 2005.
- [2] S. Baker and D. Kong. Unique expansions and intersections of Cantor sets. *Nonlinearity*, 30(4):1497–1512, 2017.
- [3] L. Barreira and J. Schmeling. Sets of “non-typical” points have full topological entropy and full Hausdorff dimension. *Israel J. Math.*, 116:29–70, 2000.
- [4] C. G. T. de A. Moreira. Stable intersections of Cantor sets and homoclinic bifurcations. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 13(6):741–781, 1996.
- [5] C. G. T. de A. Moreira and J.-C. Yoccoz. Stable intersections of regular Cantor sets with large Hausdorff dimensions. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 154(1):45–96, 2001.
- [6] R. Durrett. *Probability: theory and examples*. Duxbury Press, Belmont, CA, second edition, 1996.
- [7] K. Falconer. *Techniques in fractal geometry*. John Wiley & Sons Ltd., Chichester, 1997.
- [8] D. Feng, Z. Wen, and J. Wu. Some dimensional results for homogeneous Moran sets. *Sci. China Ser. A*, 40(5):475–482, 1997.
- [9] M. Hall, Jr. On the sum and product of continued fractions. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 48:966–993, 1947.
- [10] J. E. Hutchinson. Fractals and self-similarity. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 30(5):713–747, 1981.
- [11] D. Kong, W. Li, and F. M. Dekking. Intersections of homogeneous Cantor sets and beta-expansions. *Nonlinearity*, 23(11):2815–2834, 2010.
- [12] R. Kraft. Intersections of thick Cantor sets. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 97(468):vi+119, 1992.
- [13] R. L. Kraft. One point intersections of middle- α Cantor sets. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 14(3):537–549, 1994.
- [14] W. Li and D. Xiao. On the intersection of translation of middle- α Cantor sets. In *Fractals and beyond (Valletta, 1998)*, pages 137–148. World Sci. Publ., River Edge, NJ, 1998.
- [15] D. Lind and B. Marcus. *An introduction to symbolic dynamics and coding*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.
- [16] J. Palis and F. Takens. *Hyperbolicity and sensitive chaotic dynamics at homoclinic bifurcations*, volume 35 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993. Fractal dimensions and infinitely many attractors.
- [17] N. Sidorov. Almost every number has a continuum of β -expansions. *Amer. Math. Monthly*, 110(9):838–842, 2003.
- [18] Z. Wang, K. Jiang, D. Kong, and W. Li. On a class of self-similar sets which contain finitely many common points. *arXiv:2109.10014*, 2021.
- [19] Y. Zou, J. Lu, and W. Li. Self-similar structure on the intersection of middle- $(1 - 2\beta)$ Cantor sets with $\beta \in (1/3, 1/2)$. *Nonlinearity*, 21(12):2899–2910, 2008.

(Y. Huang) COLLEGE OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, CHONGQING UNIVERSITY, 401331, CHONGQING, P.R.CHINA

Email address: yanhuangyh@126.com

(D. Kong) COLLEGE OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, CHONGQING UNIVERSITY, 401331, CHONGQING, P.R.CHINA

Email address: derongkong@126.com