

EXCEPTIONAL SETS TO SHALLIT'S LAW OF LEAP YEARS IN PIERCE EXPANSIONS

MIN WOONG AHN

ABSTRACT. In his 1994 work, Shallit introduced a rule for determining leap years that generalizes both the historically used Julian calendar and the contemporary Gregorian calendar. This rule depends on a so-called intercalation sequence. According to what we term Shallit's law of leap years, almost every point of the interval $[0, 1]$ with respect to Lebesgue measure has the same limsup and liminf, respectively, of a quotient defined in terms of the number of leap years determined by the rule using the Pierce expansion digit sequence as an intercalation sequence. In this paper, we show that the set of exceptions to this law is dense and has full Hausdorff dimension in $[0, 1]$, and that the exceptional set intersected with any non-empty open subset of $[0, 1]$ has full Hausdorff dimension in $[0, 1]$. As a more general result, we establish that for certain subsets of $[0, 1]$ concerning the limiting behavior of Pierce expansion digits, intersecting with a non-empty open subset of $[0, 1]$ preserves the Hausdorff dimension.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Preliminaries	6
3. Auxiliary results	9
4. Proofs of main results	13
4.1. Proofs of Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 1.3	13
4.2. Proofs of Theorem 1.4 and Corollary 1.5	17
References	19

1. INTRODUCTION

A calendar year consists of either 365 or 366 days, and a year with 366 days is called a *leap year*. In practice, the more common occurrence is a non-leap year, easily observed by an ordinary person without a thorough understanding of calendrical systems. This discrepancy is attributed to the fact that the length of a *tropical year*, one of the various definitions of the Earth's orbital period around the Sun that

Date: April 30, 2024.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 11K55; Secondary 28A80, 85A99.

Key words and phrases. leap year, exceptional set, Pierce expansion, Hausdorff dimension.

calendars aim to match, averages approximately 365.242189 days (see [9, Chapter 14]). It falls between precisely 365 and 366 days but is closer to 365.

The calendar commonly used today is known as the Gregorian calendar. The rule for designating a leap year in the Gregorian calendar is essentially based on the inclusion-exclusion principle in basic set theory. To elaborate, for constructing the set of leap years, we initially include all years that are multiples of 4, then exclude those that are multiples of 100, and finally include those that are multiples of 400. To put it formally, a year N is a leap year in the Gregorian calendar if and only if

$$\sum_{k=1}^3 (-1)^{k+1} \text{mul}(N, \sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_k) = 1,$$

where $(\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3) := (4, 25, 4)$ is a finite sequence comprising 3 terms, and $\text{mul}: \mathbb{N}^2 \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is a function defined as

$$\text{mul}(m, n) := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } m \text{ is an integer multiple of } n; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

for each $(m, n) \in \mathbb{N}^2$. For instance, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^3 (-1)^{k+1} \text{mul}(2028, \sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_k) &= 1 + 0 + 0 = 1, \\ \sum_{k=1}^3 (-1)^{k+1} \text{mul}(2100, \sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_k) &= 1 + (-1) + 0 = 0, \\ \sum_{k=1}^3 (-1)^{k+1} \text{mul}(2400, \sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_k) &= 1 + (-1) + 1 = 1, \end{aligned}$$

and so, if we adhere to the Gregorian calendar, the years 2028 and 2400 will be leap years, while the year 2100 will not be.

A brief mention of the Julian calendar, upon which the reformation to the Gregorian calendar was built, is in order. The Julian calendar designates a year N as a leap year if

$$\sum_{k=1}^1 (-1)^{k+1} \text{mul}(N, \tau_1 \cdots \tau_k) = \text{mul}(N, \tau_1) = 1,$$

where $(\tau_1) := (4)$ is a finite sequence consisting of 1 term. In other words, in the Julian calendar, leap years are exactly the years that are multiples of 4. It should be noted that both the Julian and Gregorian calendars approximate the tropical year, but do not precisely reflect it, as there are $365 + (1/4) = 365.25$ and $365 + (1/4) - (1/100) + (1/400) = 365.2425$ days in a calendar year on average in each calendar, respectively. Consequently, scholars in related fields, such as mathematics and astronomy, have suggested various calendars for better approximations.

For a closer look at mathematical aspects or historical expositions of calendrical systems and their reformation, we recommend the interested reader to refer to the comprehensive book [9] and short articles [4, 5, 10, 13–15].

A generalized rule for determining leap years, which extends both the Julian and Gregorian calendars, was proposed by Shallit [13]. To begin, we fix an *intercalation sequence*, a finite or infinite sequence of positive integers $(\sigma_k)_{k \geq 1}$ satisfying $\sigma_k \geq 2$ for all $k \geq 2$. Then, the year N is declared to be a leap year if

$$\sum_{k \geq 1} (-1)^{k+1} \text{mul}(N, \sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_k) = 1,$$

where the sum is taken over the domain on which the intercalation sequence is defined.

Suppose, for simplicity, that a tropical year has exactly

$$(1.1) \quad 365 + \eta$$

days for some $\eta \in [0, 1]$. (This assumption does not hold in reality because the length of a tropical year is not constant. On average, the value of η is approximately 0.242189, as mentioned in the first paragraph.) For each $N \in \mathbb{N}$, let $L(\sigma, N)$ denote the number of leap years from year 1 through year N determined by the generalized rule that uses $\sigma := (\sigma_k)_{k \geq 1}$ as the intercalation sequence, that is,

$$L(\sigma, N) := \# \left\{ m \in \{1, \dots, N\} : \sum_{k \geq 1} (-1)^{k+1} \text{mul}(m, \sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_k) = 1 \right\},$$

where $\#$ denotes the cardinality of a set. Contrary to the impracticality of the definition, there is a practical formula ([13, Theorem 1])

$$(1.2) \quad L(\sigma, N) = \sum_{k \geq 1} (-1)^{k+1} \left\lfloor \frac{N}{\sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_k} \right\rfloor,$$

which again reminds us of the inclusion-exclusion principle. Note that $N\eta$ is the theoretical number, not necessarily an integer, of leap years required up to the year N to keep the calendar synchronized with the actual date based on the tropical year. Therefore, for the generalized determination rule to be acceptable in the long run, a crucial requirement is that the difference $|N\eta - L(\sigma, N)|$ should remain relatively small as N grows. Moreover, unless we have the precise value of η at hand, another reasonable demand might be that the existence of an intercalation sequence $\sigma = \sigma(x)$ such that the difference $|Nx - L(\sigma, N)|$ is small for most values of $x \in [0, 1]$.

In this paper, we will consider the Pierce expansion digit sequence as a candidate for an intercalation sequence. As is well known, the *Pierce expansion* is the unique

expression of $x \in [0, 1]$ of the form

$$(1.3) \quad \begin{aligned} x &= \langle d_1(x), d_2(x), d_3(x), \dots \rangle_P \\ &:= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{(-1)^{k+1}}{d_1(x) \cdots d_k(x)} = \frac{1}{d_1(x)} - \frac{1}{d_1(x)d_2(x)} + \frac{1}{d_1(x)d_2(x)d_3(x)} - \cdots, \end{aligned}$$

with the conventions $\infty \cdot \infty = \infty$ and $1/\infty = 0$, where the *digit* sequence $(d_k(x))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an $(\mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\})$ -valued sequence defined as follows. Let $d_1: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ and $T: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be mappings given by

$$d_1(x) := \begin{cases} \lfloor 1/x \rfloor, & \text{if } x \neq 0; \\ \infty, & \text{if } x = 0, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad T(x) := \begin{cases} 1 - d_1(x)x, & \text{if } x \neq 0; \\ 0, & \text{if } x = 0, \end{cases}$$

respectively. Now, define $d_k(x) := d_1(T^{k-1}(x))$ for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$. One classical result in Pierce expansions states that the set of all strictly increasing positive integer-valued sequences and the set of irrationals in $[0, 1]$ are in bijective correspondence via the Pierce expansion. In the case where $x \in [0, 1]$ is rational, the digit sequence consists of finitely many, say $n \in \mathbb{N}$, strictly increasing $\mathbb{N}$ -valued terms, followed by ∞ 's, and satisfies $d_{n-1}(x) + 1 < d_n(x)$ whenever $n \geq 2$. We will present some basic facts related to Pierce expansions in detail in Section 2. For further exploration of basic notions and deeper results in Pierce expansions, we refer the reader to [1–3, 7, 8, 11–13].

Notice that the formula (1.2) and the series expansion (1.3) are of a similar form, particularly if we take the intercalation sequence as $(d_k(x))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ in (1.2) and multiply (1.3) by N . Regarding the difference between these two particular quantities, what we refer to as *Shallit's law of leap years* ([13, Theorem 3]) states that

$$(1.4) \quad \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{Nx - L((d_k(x))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}, N)}{\sqrt{\log N}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \quad \text{and} \quad \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{Nx - L((d_k(x))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}, N)}{\sqrt{\log N}} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$$

for Lebesgue-almost every $x \in [0, 1]$. Based on this law, he concluded the paper by pointing out that the calendar adopting the generalized rule, with its intercalation sequence given by the Pierce expansion digit sequence, aligns well with the actual dates over the long term. This is because, although $\sqrt{(\log N)/2}$ grows without bound as N tends to infinity, its growth rate is relatively slow.

In this paper, our main focus is on the denseness and Hausdorff dimension of the set of exceptions to Shallit's law of leap years. For our investigation, we shall use the following first main result of this paper, which pertains to a set satisfying a certain property described in terms of Pierce expansions. We say that a subset F of $[0, 1]$ is *finite replacement-invariant* if the implication

$$x \in F \implies \langle \tau_1, \dots, \tau_n, d_{n+1}(x), d_{n+2}(x), \dots \rangle_P \in F$$

holds for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and finite sequence $(\tau_k)_{k=1}^n \in (\mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\})^n$ such that the expression

$$\langle \tau_1, \dots, \tau_n, d_{n+1}(x), d_{n+2}(x), \dots \rangle_P$$

is well-defined, i.e., there exists an $y \in [0, 1]$ such that

$$d_k(y) = \begin{cases} \tau_k, & \text{if } k \in \{1, \dots, n\}; \\ d_k(x), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Theorem 1.1. *Let F be a finite replacement-invariant subset of $[0, 1]$. Then, the following hold:*

- (i) *If F has non-zero Hausdorff dimension, then F is dense in $[0, 1]$.*
- (ii) *For any non-empty open subset U of $[0, 1]$, the intersection of U with F has the same Hausdorff dimension as F .*

Remarks 1.2. (1) Not all dense subsets of $[0, 1]$ are finite replacement-invariant. For instance, the set $F := [0, 1] \setminus \{\langle 2, 3, 4, \dots \rangle_P\}$ is dense in $[0, 1]$ but not finite replacement-invariant, as $\langle 1, 3, 4, \dots \rangle_P \in F$ but $\langle 2, 3, 4, \dots \rangle_P \notin F$.

- (2) In general, the fact that a subset F of $[0, 1]$ has non-zero Hausdorff dimension does not imply that F is dense in $[0, 1]$. For example, the interval $[0, 1/2]$ has Hausdorff dimension 1, but it is not dense in $[0, 1]$.

As an application of Theorem 1.1, we examine the set, the Hausdorff dimension of which was determined in [2], defined as follows. For each $\alpha \in [0, \infty]$, let

$$(1.5) \quad A(\alpha) := \left\{ x \in [0, 1] : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log d_n(x)}{n} = \alpha \right\}.$$

The second part of the following corollary generalizes [2, Corollary 1.3] (see Proposition 2.8 below), and the corollary will play one of the two main roles in proving Theorem 1.4.

Corollary 1.3. *For the sets $A(\alpha)$, the following hold for each $\alpha \in [0, \infty]$:*

- (i) *$A(\alpha)$ is dense in $[0, 1]$.*
- (ii) *For any non-empty open subset U of $[0, 1]$, the set $U \cap A(\alpha)$ has Hausdorff dimension 1.*

Now, we are in a position to state the second main result, which is concerned with certain exceptional sets to Shallit's law of leap years. Specifically, we consider the set

$$(1.6) \quad S(\alpha) := \left\{ x \in [0, 1] : \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{Nx - L((d_k(x))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}, N)}{\sqrt{\log N}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\alpha}} \right. \\ \left. \text{and } \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{Nx - L((d_k(x))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}, N)}{\sqrt{\log N}} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\alpha}} \right\}$$

for each $\alpha \in [0, \infty]$, where we adopt the conventions $1/0 = \infty$ and $1/\infty = 0$.

Theorem 1.4. *For the sets $S(\alpha)$, the following hold for each $\alpha \in [0, \infty]$:*

- (i) $S(\alpha)$ is dense in $[0, 1]$.
- (ii) For any non-empty open subset U of $[0, 1]$, the set $U \cap S(\alpha)$ has Hausdorff dimension 1.

Corollary 1.5. *The set of exceptions to (1.4) is dense in $[0, 1]$ and has Hausdorff dimension 1.*

Our results suggest that, for any given non-empty open subset of $[0, 1]$, while the generalized rule, using the Pierce expansion digit sequence as the intercalation sequence, works well for most points in the Lebesgue measure sense (by the law of leap years), considering the Hausdorff dimension reveals that there are still plenty of points where the difference $|Nx - L((d_k(x))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}, N)|$ grows quite rapidly as N increases. In particular, no matter how short the interval approximating the value of η in (1.1)—such as $(0.2, 0.3)$ or $(0.24, 0.25)$, both containing 0.242189—there are substantial possibilities, in the Hausdorff dimension sense, for the calendar to deviate significantly from the actual date.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we present some facts and results on the Hausdorff dimension and Pierce expansions. Section 3 contains useful lemmas that will be employed in establishing the main results. Finally, we prove the main results in Section 4.

Throughout the paper, the closed unit interval $[0, 1]$ will be endowed with the usual subspace topology inherited from $\mathbb{R}$. For a subset F of $[0, 1]$, we denote by $\dim_{\mathbb{H}} F$ its Hausdorff dimension. The set of positive integers will be denoted by $\mathbb{N}$, the set of extended positive integers by $\mathbb{N}_{\infty} := \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$, and the set of irrational numbers in $[0, 1]$ by $\mathbb{I} := [0, 1] \setminus \mathbb{Q}$. Following the convention, we define $c \cdot \infty := \infty$, $\infty^c := \infty$, and $c/0 := \infty$ for any $c \in (0, \infty)$, and $c/\infty := 0$ and $\infty \pm c := \infty$ for any $c \in \mathbb{R}$.

2. PRELIMINARIES

This section is dedicated to presenting some facts and results on the Hausdorff dimension and Pierce expansions.

We first provide the definition of the Hausdorff dimension.

Definition 2.1 (See [6, Chapter 3]). For a subset F of $[0, 1]$, the *Hausdorff dimension* of F is defined by

$$\dim_{\mathbb{H}} F := \inf\{s \geq 0 : \mathcal{H}^s(F) = 0\} = \sup\{s : \mathcal{H}^s(F) = \infty\},$$

considering the supremum of the empty set to be 0. Here, $\mathcal{H}^s(F)$, for $s \in [0, \infty)$, is the s -dimensional Hausdorff measure given by

$$\mathcal{H}^s(F) := \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \left(\inf \left\{ \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} |U_k|^s : F \subseteq \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} U_k \text{ and } |U_k| \in (0, \delta] \text{ for each } k \in \mathbb{N} \right\} \right),$$

where $|\cdot|$ denotes the diameter of a set.

Monotonicity and *countable stability* are two important properties of the Hausdorff dimension that we will frequently utilize.

Proposition 2.2 (See [6, pp. 48–49]). *For any subsets E and F of $[0, 1]$, the following hold:*

- (i) *If $E \subseteq F$, then $\dim_{\text{H}} E \leq \dim_{\text{H}} F$.*
- (ii) *If $F = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} F_k$, then $\dim_{\text{H}} F = \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \{\dim_{\text{H}} F_k\}$.*

Another useful property of the Hausdorff dimension is its *bi-Lipschitz invariance*.

Proposition 2.3 (See [6, Proposition 3.3]). *Let F be a subset of $[0, 1]$. If $g: F \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a bi-Lipschitz mapping, then $\dim_{\text{H}} F = \dim_{\text{H}} g(F)$.*

Now, we introduce a sequence set consisting of certain sequences in $\mathbb{N}_{\infty}$. This sequence set was discussed in detail in [1], where we studied the error-sum function of Pierce expansions. Let

$$\Sigma_0 := \{(\sigma_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \in \{\infty\}^{\mathbb{N}}\} = \{(\infty, \infty, \dots)\}.$$

For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, define

$$\Sigma_n := \{(\sigma_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \in \mathbb{N}^{\{1, \dots, n\}} \times \{\infty\}^{\mathbb{N} \setminus \{1, \dots, n\}} : \sigma_1 < \dots < \sigma_n\}.$$

For brevity, we write $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n)$ for $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n, \infty, \infty, \dots) \in \Sigma_n$, provided the context is clear. For the set of all strictly increasing infinite sequences in $\mathbb{N}$, put

$$\Sigma_{\infty} := \{(\sigma_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}} : \sigma_k < \sigma_{k+1} \text{ for all } k \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

Finally, let

$$\Sigma := \Sigma_0 \cup \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \Sigma_n \cup \Sigma_{\infty},$$

$$\Sigma' := \Sigma \setminus \{(\sigma_k)_{k=1}^n \in \Sigma : n \geq 2 \text{ and } \sigma_n = \sigma_{n-1} + 1\}.$$

For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\sigma := (\sigma_k)_{k=1}^n \in \Sigma_n$, we define the *cylinder set* associated with σ by

$$\Upsilon_{\sigma} := \{(\tau_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \in \Sigma : \tau_k = \sigma_k \text{ for all } k \in \{1, \dots, n\}\}.$$

Similarly, the *fundamental interval* associated with σ is defined by

$$I_{\sigma} := f^{-1}(\Upsilon_{\sigma}) = \{x \in [0, 1] : d_k(x) = \sigma_k \text{ for all } k \in \{1, \dots, n\}\},$$

i.e., I_{σ} consists of numbers in $[0, 1]$ whose digit sequence begins with $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n$.

For each $x \in [0, 1]$, we denote its Pierce expansion digit sequence $(d_k(x))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ by $f(x)$, that is, $f: [0, 1] \rightarrow \Sigma$ is a map defined by $x \mapsto (d_k(x))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ for each $x \in [0, 1]$. Conversely, define a map $\varphi: \Sigma \rightarrow [0, 1]$ by

$$\varphi(\sigma) := \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{(-1)^{k+1}}{\sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_k}$$

for each $\sigma := (\sigma_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \in \Sigma$. Note that, for any $x \in [0, 1]$, we have

$$(\varphi \circ f)(x) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{(-1)^{k+1}}{d_1(x) \cdots d_k(x)} = \langle d_1(x), d_2(x), \dots \rangle_P = x$$

by definition.

Let $\mathbb{N}_\infty$ denote the one-point compactification of the discrete space $\mathbb{N}$. The product space $\mathbb{N}_\infty^\mathbb{N}$ is compact by Tychonoff's theorem. Equip $\Sigma \subseteq \mathbb{N}_\infty^\mathbb{N}$ with the subspace topology. With the notations introduced so far, a classical result in Pierce expansions mentioned in Section 1—the one-to-one correspondence between $\mathbb{I}$ and Σ_∞ —can be restated and extended as follows.

Proposition 2.4 (See [1, Section 3.2]). *For the mappings $f: [0, 1] \rightarrow \Sigma$ and $\varphi: \Sigma \rightarrow [0, 1]$, the following hold:*

- (i) $f|_{\mathbb{I}}: \mathbb{I} \rightarrow \Sigma_\infty$, the restriction of f to $\mathbb{I}$, is a homeomorphism with the continuous inverse $\varphi|_{\Sigma_\infty}: \Sigma_\infty \rightarrow \mathbb{I}$, the restriction of φ to Σ_∞ .
- (ii) $f: [0, 1] \rightarrow \Sigma'$ is a bijection with the inverse $\varphi|_{\Sigma'}: \Sigma' \rightarrow [0, 1]$, the restriction of φ to Σ' .

The following proposition precisely describes the fundamental intervals.

Proposition 2.5 (See [12, Theorem 1] and [1, Proposition 3.5]). *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\sigma := (\sigma_k)_{k=1}^n \in \Sigma_n$. Define $\sigma' \in \Sigma_n$ by*

$$\sigma' := (\underbrace{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{n-1}}_{n-1 \text{ terms}}, \sigma_n + 1).$$

Then, I_σ is a subinterval of $[0, 1]$ with endpoints $\varphi(\sigma)$ and $\varphi(\sigma')$; more precisely,

$$I_\sigma = \begin{cases} (\varphi(\sigma'), \varphi(\sigma)], & \text{if } n \text{ is odd;} \\ [\varphi(\sigma), \varphi(\sigma')), & \text{if } n \text{ is even,} \end{cases} \quad \text{or} \quad I_\sigma = \begin{cases} (\varphi(\sigma'), \varphi(\sigma)), & \text{if } n \text{ is odd;} \\ (\varphi(\sigma), \varphi(\sigma')), & \text{if } n \text{ is even,} \end{cases}$$

according as $\sigma \in \Sigma'$ or $\sigma \notin \Sigma'$.

Proposition 2.6 (See [2, Lemma 3.4 and Remark 3.5]). *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\sigma := (\sigma_k)_{k=1}^n \in \Sigma_n$. Define a linear map $g_\sigma: [0, 1] \rightarrow g_\sigma([0, 1])$ by*

$$g_\sigma(x) := \varphi(\sigma) + \frac{(-1)^n}{\sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_n} x = \frac{1}{\sigma_1} - \frac{1}{\sigma_1 \sigma_2} + \cdots + \frac{(-1)^{n+1}}{\sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_n} + \frac{(-1)^n}{\sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_n} x$$

for each $x \in [0, 1]$, and denote by g_σ^{-1} its inverse map, which is also linear. Then, the following hold:

- (i) *For each $x \in \mathbb{I}$, if $\sigma_n < d_1(x)$, then*

$$g_\sigma(x) = \langle \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n, d_1(x), d_2(x), \dots \rangle_P \in I_\sigma \cap \mathbb{I}.$$

- (ii) *For each $y \in I_\sigma \cap \mathbb{I}$, we have $y \in g_\sigma([0, 1])$ and*

$$g_\sigma^{-1}(y) = \langle d_{n+1}(y), d_{n+2}(y), \dots \rangle_P \in \mathbb{I}.$$

Recall from (1.5) that the set $A(\alpha)$, defined for each $\alpha \in [0, \infty]$, is concerned with the growth rate of Pierce expansion digits. On this matter, one of the earliest historically significant results is the following, known as the *law of large numbers* in Pierce expansions.

Proposition 2.7 ([12, Theorem 16]). *The set $A(1)$ has full Lebesgue measure on $[0, 1]$, i.e., for Lebesgue-almost every $x \in [0, 1]$, we have*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log d_n(x)}{n} = 1.$$

Regarding some exceptional sets emerging from the law of large numbers in Pierce expansions, we have recently established the following result.

Proposition 2.8 ([2, Corollary 1.3]). *For each $\alpha \in [0, \infty]$, the set $A(\alpha)$ has full Hausdorff dimension in $[0, 1]$, i.e.,*

$$\dim_H \left\{ x \in [0, 1] : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log d_n(x)}{n} = \alpha \right\} = 1.$$

In other words, Corollary 1.3(ii) holds when $U = [0, 1]$.

3. AUXILIARY RESULTS

In this section, we present auxiliary results that will be utilized in proving the main results.

We first present crucial properties of the fundamental intervals in the next two lemmas, both of which are consequences of Propositions 2.4 and 2.5.

Lemma 3.1. *We have*

$$(3.1) \quad (0, 1] = \bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} I_{(j)}.$$

Furthermore, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\sigma := (\sigma_k)_{k=1}^n \in \Sigma_n$, we have

$$I_\sigma = \begin{cases} \{\varphi(\sigma)\} \cup \bigcup_{j \geq \sigma_n+1} I_{(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n, j)}, & \text{if } \sigma \in \Sigma'; \\ \bigcup_{j \geq \sigma_n+1} I_{(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n, j)}, & \text{if } \sigma \notin \Sigma', \end{cases}$$

and, consequently,

$$(3.2) \quad I_\sigma \cap \mathbb{I} = \bigcup_{j \geq \sigma_n+1} [I_{(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n, j)} \cap \mathbb{I}].$$

Proof. Since Σ_0 is a singleton containing the unique element $(\infty, \infty, \dots) = f(0) \in f([0, 1])$, Proposition 2.4(ii) tells us that $f^{-1}(\Sigma_0) = \{0\}$. Then, by definitions, we have

$$\bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} I_{(j)} = f^{-1} \left(\bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \Upsilon_{(j)} \right) = f^{-1}(\Sigma \setminus \Sigma_0) = [0, 1] \setminus \{0\} = (0, 1].$$

For the second assertion, fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\sigma := (\sigma_k)_{k=1}^n \in \Sigma_n$. Then, we find, by definitions, that

$$\bigcup_{j \geq \sigma_n + 1} I_{(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n, j)} = f^{-1} \left(\bigcup_{j \geq \sigma_n + 1} \Upsilon_{(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n, j)} \right) = f^{-1}(\Upsilon_\sigma \setminus \{\sigma\}) = I_\sigma \setminus f^{-1}(\{\sigma\}).$$

Assume $\sigma \in \Sigma'$. Then, by Proposition 2.4(ii), we have $\sigma \in f([0, 1])$ and $f^{-1}(\{\sigma\}) = \{\varphi(\sigma)\}$. But $\varphi(\sigma) \in I_\sigma$ by Proposition 2.5, so that $[I_\sigma \setminus f^{-1}(\{\sigma\})] \cup \{\varphi(\sigma)\} = I_\sigma$. On the other hand, if $\sigma \notin \Sigma'$, then, in view of Proposition 2.4(ii), we have $\sigma \notin f([0, 1])$, i.e., $f^{-1}(\{\sigma\}) = \emptyset$. Hence the expression for I_σ as a countable union in the statement of the lemma. Lastly, note that, in any case, $f^{-1}(\{\sigma\}) \subseteq \mathbb{Q}$, and therefore, (3.2) follows. $\square$

Lemma 3.2. *For any non-empty open subset U of $[0, 1]$, there exists a $\sigma \in \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \Sigma_n$ such that $I_\sigma \subseteq U$.*

Proof. Let U be a non-empty open subset of $[0, 1]$. Take a non-degenerate open interval $(a, b) \subseteq [0, 1]$ contained in U . Choose another non-degenerate open interval $J := (a', b')$ contained in (a, b) such that $a < a'$ and $b' < b$. Then, $J \cap \mathbb{I}$ is open in $\mathbb{I}$, and hence, by Proposition 2.4(i), $f(J \cap \mathbb{I})$ is open in Σ_∞ . By the subspace topology on Σ_∞ , we can find a $\sigma \in \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \Sigma_n$ such that $\Upsilon_\sigma \cap \Sigma_\infty \subseteq f(J \cap \mathbb{I})$. Hence,

$$I_\sigma \cap \mathbb{I} = f^{-1}(\Upsilon_\sigma) \cap f^{-1}(\Sigma_\infty) = f^{-1}(\Upsilon_\sigma \cap \Sigma_\infty) \subseteq J \cap \mathbb{I} \subseteq J.$$

Recall from Proposition 2.5 that I_σ is a subinterval of $[0, 1]$. It then follows that

$$I_\sigma \subseteq \text{cl}(I_\sigma) = \text{cl}(I_\sigma \cap \mathbb{I}) \subseteq \text{cl}(J) = [a', b'] \subseteq (a, b) \subseteq U,$$

where $\text{cl}(\cdot)$ denotes the closure in $[0, 1]$. This completes the proof of the lemma. $\square$

The following lemma characterizes a dense subset of $[0, 1]$ in terms of Pierce expansions.

Lemma 3.3. *Let E be a subset of $[0, 1]$. Then, E is dense in $[0, 1]$ if and only if $I_\sigma \cap E \neq \emptyset$ for any $\sigma \in \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \Sigma_n$.*

Proof. Suppose first that E is dense in $[0, 1]$. Let $\sigma \in \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \Sigma_n$ be arbitrary. Since I_σ is a non-degenerate subinterval of $[0, 1]$ by Proposition 2.5, we can find a non-degenerate open interval J contained in I_σ . Clearly, $J = J \cap [0, 1]$ is open in $[0, 1]$. Then, $J \cap E \neq \emptyset$ by the denseness hypothesis, and thus, $I_\sigma \cap E \neq \emptyset$.

Conversely, suppose that $I_\sigma \cap E \neq \emptyset$ for any $\sigma \in \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \Sigma_n$. Let U be a non-empty open subset of $[0, 1]$. By Lemma 3.2, we can find a $\tau \in \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \Sigma_n$ satisfying $I_\tau \subseteq U$. Since $I_\tau \cap E \neq \emptyset$ by the hypothesis, we infer that $U \cap E \neq \emptyset$. This proves that E is dense in $[0, 1]$. $\square$

Lemma 3.4. *Let E be a subset of $[0, 1]$. The following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) $\dim_{\mathbb{H}}(I_\sigma \cap E) = \dim_{\mathbb{H}} E$ for any $\sigma \in \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \Sigma_n$.
- (ii) $\dim_{\mathbb{H}}(U \cap E) = \dim_{\mathbb{H}} E$ for any non-empty open subset U of $[0, 1]$.

Proof. The proof is similar to that of the preceding lemma, so we omit the details. However, it additionally requires the use of the monotonicity property of the Hausdorff dimension (Proposition 2.2(i)). $\square$

Lemma 3.5. *Let $c \in [0, \infty)$. For each $M \in \mathbb{N}$, let*

$$(3.3) \quad Z_c^{(M)} := \{x \in \mathbb{I} : d_n(x) \leq n + c \text{ for all } n \geq M\}.$$

Then, for each $M \in \mathbb{N}$, $Z_c^{(M)}$ is equal to $Z_c^{(1)}$ and has null Hausdorff dimension as a countable set.

Proof. Let $M \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{1\}$. By definition, we clearly have $Z_c^{(M)} \supseteq Z_c^{(1)}$. To prove the reverse inclusion, suppose $x \in Z_c^{(M)}$. Then, $(d_n(x))_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \Sigma_\infty$ by Proposition 2.4(i) so that $d_n(x) < d_{n+1}(x) < \infty$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} d_1(x) &\leq d_2(x) - 1 \leq \cdots \leq d_{M-1}(x) - (M-2) \leq d_M(x) - (M-1) \\ &\leq M + c - (M-1) = 1 + c, \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality in the second line holds true by the hypothesis $x \in Z_c^{(M)}$. From this, we see that $d_n(x) \leq n + c$ for all $n \in \{1, \dots, M-1\}$, and thus for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore, $x \in Z_c^{(1)}$, and this establishes the equality $Z_c^{(M)} = Z_c^{(1)}$.

Now, by the preceding paragraph, to finish the proof of the lemma, we only need to show that $Z_c^{(1)}$ is countable. It will then imply that $\dim_{\text{H}} Z_c^{(1)} = 0$, since any countable set has Hausdorff dimension 0 (see [6, p. 49]). By Proposition 2.4(i), it is then sufficient to show that the set

$$f(Z_c^{(1)}) = \{(\sigma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \Sigma_\infty : \sigma_n \leq n + c \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}\}$$

is countable. If $c \in [0, 1)$, then $f(Z_c^{(1)})$ is a singleton, since any $(\sigma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in f(Z_c^{(1)})$ satisfies $n \leq \sigma_n \leq n + c < n + 1$, so that $\sigma_n = n$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Assume $c \in [1, \infty)$. Put $\theta(\sigma, n) := \sigma_n - n$ for each $\sigma := (\sigma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in f(Z_c^{(1)})$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that for fixed $\sigma \in f(Z_c^{(1)})$, the map $\theta(\sigma, n)$ is non-decreasing in n . Indeed, given $\sigma := (\sigma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in f(Z_c^{(1)})$, we have

$$\theta(\sigma, n+1) - \theta(\sigma, n) = \sigma_{n+1} - \sigma_n - 1 \geq 1 - 1 = 0$$

for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence, for each $\sigma := (\sigma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in f(Z_c^{(1)})$, we can find an ordered $\lfloor c \rfloor$ -tuple

$$(n_1, n_2, \dots, n_{\lfloor c \rfloor}) \in \{(n_k)_{k=1}^{\lfloor c \rfloor} \in \mathbb{N}^{\lfloor c \rfloor} : n_1 \leq n_2 \leq \cdots \leq n_{\lfloor c \rfloor}\}$$

such that

$$\theta(\sigma, n) = \sigma_n - n = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } n_0 := 1 \leq n < n_1; \\ 1, & \text{if } n_1 \leq n < n_2; \\ \vdots & \\ \lfloor c \rfloor - 1, & \text{if } n_{\lfloor c \rfloor - 1} \leq n < n_{\lfloor c \rfloor}; \\ \lfloor c \rfloor, & \text{if } n_{\lfloor c \rfloor} \leq n. \end{cases}$$

Observe that the choice of $(n_1, n_2, \dots, n_{\lfloor c \rfloor})$ is unique. To see this, suppose that we have two distinct choices $(n_1, n_2, \dots, n_{\lfloor c \rfloor})$ and $(n'_1, n'_2, \dots, n'_{\lfloor c \rfloor})$ for some $\sigma \in f(Z_c^{(1)})$. Put $k := \min\{1 \leq j \leq \lfloor c \rfloor : n_j \neq n'_j\}$. Without loss of generality, we may assume $n_k < n'_k$. Then, $n'_{k-1} = n_{k-1} \leq n_k \leq n'_k - 1 < n'_k$. Since $\theta(\sigma, n)$ is non-decreasing in n for fixed σ , we deduce that

$$k \leq \theta(\sigma, n_k) \leq \theta(\sigma, n'_k - 1) = k - 1,$$

a contradiction. Hence, the mapping $\sigma \mapsto (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_{\lfloor c \rfloor})$ is well-defined on $f(Z_c^{(1)})$. Furthermore, it is immediate from the definition that this mapping is an injection from $f(Z_c^{(1)})$ into $\mathbb{N}^{\lfloor c \rfloor}$. But $\mathbb{N}^{\lfloor c \rfloor}$ is countable, and thus, we conclude that $f(Z_c^{(1)})$ is countable. Hence the lemma. $\square$

Recall the definition of the set $A(\alpha)$, $\alpha \in [0, \infty]$, described in (1.5). The following lemma generalizes [13, Lemma 4], where the case for $\alpha = 1$ was established.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $x \in [0, 1]$. If $x \in A(\alpha)$ for some $\alpha \in [0, \infty]$, then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(d_1(x) \cdots d_n(x))}{n^2/2} = \alpha.$$

Proof. Suppose first that $x \in A(\alpha)$ for some $\alpha \in [0, \infty)$. Let $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$ be arbitrary. Since $(\log d_n(x))/n \rightarrow \alpha$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ by assumption, there exists a $K \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(\alpha - \varepsilon)n < \log d_n(x) < (\alpha + \varepsilon)n$ for all $n > K$. Then, for any $n > K$, we have

$$(\alpha - \varepsilon) \frac{(n - K)(n + K + 1)}{2} < \log(d_{K+1}(x) \cdots d_n(x)) < (\alpha + \varepsilon) \frac{(n - K)(n + K + 1)}{2}.$$

It follows that

$$\alpha - \varepsilon \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(d_1(x) \cdots d_n(x))}{n^2/2} \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(d_1(x) \cdots d_n(x))}{n^2/2} \leq \alpha + \varepsilon.$$

On letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$, the desired limit follows.

The proof for the case where $x \in A(\infty)$ is similar; hence, we omit the details. $\square$

It is known that the series $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (1/d_n(x))$ converges Lebesgue-almost everywhere on $[0, 1]$ (see [12, Theorem 12] and [3, Corollary 1.17]). This is an immediate consequence of the law of large numbers (Proposition 2.7). That is to say, if x is an element of a full-Lebesgue measure set $A(1)$, then $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (1/d_n(x))$ is convergent. We shall need the following generalization of this fact.

Lemma 3.7. *Let $x \in [0, 1]$. If $x \in A(\alpha)$ for some $\alpha \in (0, \infty]$, then the series $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (1/d_n(x))$ is convergent.*

Proof. Suppose that $x \in A(\alpha)$ for some $\alpha \in (0, \infty]$. Since $(\log d_n(x))/n \rightarrow \alpha$, or, equivalently, $(d_n(x))^{1/n} \rightarrow e^\alpha \in (1, \infty]$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we see that $(1/d_n(x))^{1/n} \rightarrow 1/e^\alpha \in [0, 1]$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, the root test tells us that the series $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (1/d_n(x))$ converges. $\square$

4. PROOFS OF MAIN RESULTS

In this section, we prove the two main theorems and their corresponding corollaries mentioned in Section 1.

4.1. Proofs of Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 1.3.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Put $E := F \cap \mathbb{I}$, which is clearly finite replacement-invariant. For part (i), if we show that E is dense in $[0, 1]$, then it will imply that F is also dense in $[0, 1]$. For part (ii), we note that $\dim_{\mathbb{H}}(X \cap E) = \dim_{\mathbb{H}}(X \cap F)$ for any subset $X \subseteq [0, 1]$ (see [6, p. 49]), and therefore, for a non-empty open subset U of $[0, 1]$, if the equality $\dim_{\mathbb{H}}(U \cap E) = \dim_{\mathbb{H}} E$ holds true, then we may conclude that $\dim_{\mathbb{H}}(U \cap F) = \dim_{\mathbb{H}} F$.

(i) Suppose that $\dim_{\mathbb{H}} F > 0$. Then, $\dim_{\mathbb{H}} E > 0$, and, in particular, $E \neq \emptyset$. We show that $I_\sigma \cap E \neq \emptyset$ for any $\sigma \in \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \Sigma_n$. Suppose otherwise. Then, there exist $M \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\tau := (\tau_n)_{n=1}^M \in \Sigma_M$ such that $I_\tau \cap E = \emptyset$. Observe that $I_{(1, \dots, M)} \cap E \neq \emptyset$. This is because, if $x \in E$, then, since $M \leq d_M(x) < d_{M+1}(x)$ by Proposition 2.4(i), we have

$$\langle 1, \dots, M, d_{M+1}(x), d_{M+2}(x), \dots \rangle_P \in I_{(1, \dots, M)} \cap E$$

by finite replacement-invariance of E . This tells us that $\tau_M \neq M$. Hence, $\tau_M \geq M+1$ so that $\tau_M - M - 1 \in [0, \infty)$. Write

$$E = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0} Y_k \cup Z,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} Y_k &:= \{x \in [0, 1] : d_{M+k}(x) \geq \tau_M + k\} \cap E, \quad \text{for } k \in \mathbb{N}_0, \\ Z &:= Z_{\tau_M - M - 1}^{(M)} \cap E. \end{aligned}$$

Here, the set $Z_{\tau_M - M - 1}^{(M)}$ is defined as in (3.3), i.e.,

$$Z_{\tau_M - M - 1}^{(M)} := \{x \in \mathbb{I} : d_n(x) \leq n + (\tau_M - M - 1) \text{ for all } n \geq M\}.$$

In fact, on one hand, it is clear from definitions that $Y_k \subseteq E$ for each $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and that $Z \subseteq E$; on the other hand, if $x \in E \setminus \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0} Y_k$, then $d_{M+k}(x) \leq \tau_M + k - 1$ for

each $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ so that $x \in Z_{\tau_M - M - 1}^{(M)}$. Notice that each Y_k , $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, is empty. Indeed, if $y \in Y_k$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, then, since $\tau_M + k \leq d_{M+k}(y) < d_{M+k+1}(y)$, we have

$$\langle \tau_1, \dots, \tau_M, \underbrace{\tau_M + 1, \dots, \tau_M + k}_{k \text{ terms}}, d_{M+k+1}(y), d_{M+k+2}(y), \dots \rangle_P \in I_\tau \cap E,$$

where the containment in E is due to finite replacement-invariance of E . This contradicts the hypothesis $I_\tau \cap E = \emptyset$. Thus, $E = Z$, i.e., $E \subseteq Z_{\tau_M - M - 1}^{(M)}$. But then, since $\dim_{\mathbb{H}} Z_{\tau_M - M - 1}^{(M)} = 0$ by Lemma 3.5, it follows by monotonicity (Proposition 2.2(i)) that $\dim_{\mathbb{H}} E = 0$, a contradiction. Therefore, $I_\sigma \cap E \neq \emptyset$ for any $\sigma \in \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \Sigma_n$, and thus, Lemma 3.3 tells us that E is dense in $[0, 1]$.

(ii) By Lemma 3.4, it suffices to show that $\dim_{\mathbb{H}}(I_\sigma \cap E) = \dim_{\mathbb{H}} E$ for any $\sigma \in \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \Sigma_n$. Let $\sigma := (\sigma_k)_{k=1}^n \in \Sigma_n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. If $\dim_{\mathbb{H}} E = 0$, then $\dim_{\mathbb{H}}(I_\sigma \cap E) = 0$ by monotonicity (Proposition 2.2(i)), and hence, the equality $\dim_{\mathbb{H}} E = \dim_{\mathbb{H}}(I_\sigma \cap E)$ holds true.

Assume that $\dim_{\mathbb{H}} E > 0$. Put $\sigma_0 := 0$. For each $m \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, define $\sigma^{(m)}(j) \in \Sigma_m$ by

$$\sigma^{(m)}(j) := (\underbrace{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{m-1}}_{m-1 \text{ terms}}, j)$$

for each integer $j \geq \sigma_{m-1} + 1$.

Claim. For each $m \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, we have

$$\dim_{\mathbb{H}}(I_{\sigma^{(m)}(j)} \cap E) = \dim_{\mathbb{H}}(I_{\sigma^{(m)}(j+1)} \cap E)$$

for any integer $j \geq \sigma_{m-1} + 1$.

Proof of Claim. Let $\tau \in \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \Sigma_n$ be arbitrary. Consider the map $g_\tau: [0, 1] \rightarrow g_\tau([0, 1])$, defined as in Proposition 2.6, and its inverse g_τ^{-1} . By Proposition 2.6(ii), we have $I_\tau \cap E \subseteq I_\tau \cap \mathbb{I} \subseteq g_\tau([0, 1])$, with $I_\tau \cap E$ being non-empty by part (i) of this theorem and Lemma 3.3. So, we may consider the restriction of the map g_τ^{-1} to the set $I_\tau \cap E$. Throughout the proof of this claim, for each $\tau \in \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \Sigma_n$, we define a map

$$(4.1) \quad \tilde{g}_\tau: I_\tau \cap E \rightarrow g_\tau^{-1}(I_\tau \cap E) \quad \text{by} \quad \tilde{g}_\tau := g_\tau^{-1} \quad \text{on} \quad I_\tau \cap E.$$

Note that, by definition, $\tilde{g}_\tau$ is bi-Lipschitz and bijective.

Let $m \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, and let $j \in \mathbb{N}$ be arbitrary such that $j \geq \sigma_{m-1} + 1$. We first show that

$$\dim_{\mathbb{H}}(I_{\sigma^{(m)}(j)} \cap E) \geq \dim_{\mathbb{H}}(I_{\sigma^{(m)}(j+1)} \cap E).$$

Define the map $\tilde{g}_{\sigma^{(m)}(j+1)}$ as in (4.1), which is bi-Lipschitz and bijective. Then, the composition

$$g := g_{\sigma^{(m)}(j)} \circ \tilde{g}_{\sigma^{(m)}(j+1)}: I_{\sigma^{(m)}(j+1)} \cap E \rightarrow g(I_{\sigma^{(m)}(j+1)} \cap E)$$

is well-defined, and is bi-Lipschitz and bijective. Observe that

$$(4.2) \quad g(I_{\sigma^{(m)}(j+1)} \cap E) \subseteq I_{\sigma^{(m)}(j)} \cap E.$$

To see this, let $x \in I_{\sigma^{(m)}(j+1)} \cap E$, and write

$$(4.3) \quad x = \langle \underbrace{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{m-1}}_{m-1 \text{ terms}}, j+1, d_{m+1}(x), d_{m+2}(x), \dots \rangle_P.$$

By Proposition 2.6(ii), it follows that

$$\tilde{g}_{\sigma^{(m)}(j+1)}(x) = \langle d_{m+1}(x), d_{m+2}(x), \dots \rangle_P \in \mathbb{I}.$$

Since $j < j+1 < d_{m+1}(x)$, we find, in view of Proposition 2.6(i), that

$$g(x) = \langle \underbrace{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{m-1}}_{m-1 \text{ terms}}, j, d_{m+1}(x), d_{m+2}(x), \dots \rangle_P.$$

Hence, $g(x) \in I_{\sigma^{(m)}(j)} \cap E$, where the containment in E follows from (4.3) and finite replacement-invariance of E . Hence the inclusion (4.2). Thus, by using bi-Lipschitz invariance (Proposition 2.3), (4.2), and monotonicity (Proposition 2.2(i)), we conclude that

$$\dim_{\mathbb{H}}(I_{\sigma^{(m)}(j+1)} \cap E) = \dim_{\mathbb{H}} g(I_{\sigma^{(m)}(j+1)} \cap E) \leq \dim_{\mathbb{H}}(I_{\sigma^{(m)}(j)} \cap E),$$

as desired.

It remains to prove the reverse inequality

$$(4.4) \quad \dim_{\mathbb{H}}(I_{\sigma^{(m)}(j)} \cap E) \leq \dim_{\mathbb{H}}(I_{\sigma^{(m)}(j+1)} \cap E).$$

For each $k \geq 2$ and $(l, \tau_{m+1}, \dots, \tau_{m+k-1}) \in \Sigma_k$, where $l \in \{j, j+1\}$, define

$$\sigma^{(m)}(l, \tau_{m+1}, \dots, \tau_{m+k-1}) := \langle \underbrace{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{m-1}}_{m-1 \text{ terms}}, l, \tau_{m+1}, \dots, \tau_{m+k-1} \rangle,$$

which clearly satisfies $\sigma^{(m)}(l, \tau_{m+1}, \dots, \tau_{m+k-1}) \in \Sigma_{m+k-1}$ since $\sigma_{m-1} < j \leq l$. Write

$$(4.5) \quad I_{\sigma^{(m)}(j)} \cap E = \bigcup_{k \geq 2} Y_k \cup Z,$$

where

$$Y_k := \bigcup_{\substack{\sigma^{(m)}(j, \tau_{m+1}, \dots, \tau_{m+k-1}) \in \Sigma_{m+k-1} \\ \tau_{m+k-1} \geq j+k}} [I_{\sigma^{(m)}(j, \tau_{m+1}, \dots, \tau_{m+k-1})} \cap E], \quad \text{for } k \geq 2,$$

$$Z := I_{\sigma^{(m)}(j)} \cap Z_{j-m}^{(m+1)} \cap E.$$

Here, the set $Z_{j-m}^{(m+1)}$ is defined as in (3.3), i.e.,

$$Z_{j-m}^{(m+1)} := \{x \in \mathbb{I} : d_k(x) \leq k + (j - m) \text{ for all } k \geq m+1\}.$$

To see that (4.5) holds true, note first that the set on the right-hand side is evidently contained in the set on the left-hand side by the definition of the fundamental

intervals. For the reverse inclusion, let $x \in I_{\sigma^{(m)}(j)} \cap E$, and suppose that $x \notin \bigcup_{k \geq 2} Y_k$. Then, for each $k \geq 2$, since $x \notin Y_k$, it must be that $d_{m+k-1}(x) \leq j+k-1$. Hence, $x \in Z_{j-m}^{(m+1)}$ so that $x \in Z$, and this verifies (4.5).

Now, since $Z \subseteq Z_{j-m}^{(m+1)}$ by definition and since $\dim_{\mathbb{H}} Z_{j-m}^{(m+1)} = 0$ by Lemma 3.5, monotonicity (Proposition 2.2(i)) implies that $\dim_{\mathbb{H}} Z = 0$. Then, by (4.5) and countable stability (Proposition 2.2(ii)), we deduce that

$$\dim_{\mathbb{H}}(I_{\sigma^{(m)}(j)} \cap E) = \sup_{k \geq 2} \{\dim_{\mathbb{H}} Y_k, \dim_{\mathbb{H}} Z\} = \sup_{k \geq 2} \{\dim_{\mathbb{H}} Y_k\}.$$

Thus, to establish (4.4), it is enough to show that the inequality (4.6) below holds for each integer $k \geq 2$:

$$\begin{aligned} \dim_{\mathbb{H}} Y_k &= \sup_{\substack{\sigma^{(m)}(j, \tau_{m+1}, \dots, \tau_{m+k-1}) \in \Sigma_{m+k-1} \\ \tau_{m+k-1} \geq j+k}} \{\dim_{\mathbb{H}}(I_{\sigma^{(m)}(j, \tau_{m+1}, \dots, \tau_{m+k-1})} \cap E)\} \\ (4.6) \quad &\leq \dim_{\mathbb{H}}(I_{\sigma^{(m)}(j+1)} \cap E), \end{aligned}$$

where the equality holds by the definition of Y_k and countable stability (Proposition 2.2(ii)). To achieve this, fix $k \geq 2$, and fix a sequence $\sigma^{(m)}(j, \tau_{m+1}, \dots, \tau_{m+k-1}) \in \Sigma_{m+k-1}$ satisfying $\tau_{m+k-1} \geq j+k$. Define the map $\tilde{g}_{\sigma^{(m)}(j, \tau_{m+1}, \dots, \tau_{m+k-1})}$ as in (4.1), which is bi-Lipschitz and bijective. Then, the composition

$$h := g_{\sigma^{(m)}(j+1, \dots, j+k)} \circ \tilde{g}_{\sigma^{(m)}(j, \tau_{m+1}, \dots, \tau_{m+k-1})} : I_{\sigma^{(m)}(j, \tau_{m+1}, \dots, \tau_{m+k-1})} \cap E \rightarrow h(I_{\sigma^{(m)}(j, \tau_{m+1}, \dots, \tau_{m+k-1})} \cap E)$$

is well-defined, and is bi-Lipschitz and bijective. Notice that

$$(4.7) \quad h(I_{\sigma^{(m)}(j, \tau_{m+1}, \dots, \tau_{m+k-1})} \cap E) \subseteq I_{\sigma^{(m)}(j+1)} \cap E.$$

To see this, let $x \in I_{\sigma^{(m)}(j, \tau_{m+1}, \dots, \tau_{m+k-1})} \cap E$, and write

$$(4.8) \quad x = \langle \underbrace{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{m-1}}_{m-1 \text{ terms}}, j, \tau_{m+1}, \dots, \tau_{m+k-1}, d_{m+k}(x), d_{m+k+1}(x), \dots \rangle_P.$$

By Proposition 2.6(ii), we have

$$\tilde{g}_{\sigma^{(m)}(j, \tau_{m+1}, \dots, \tau_{m+k-1})}(x) = \langle d_{m+k}(x), d_{m+k+1}(x), \dots \rangle_P \in \mathbb{I}.$$

Since $\sigma_{m-1} < j < j+1$ and $j+k \leq \tau_{m+k-1} < d_{m+k}(x)$, we infer, in light of Proposition 2.6(i), that

$$h(x) = \langle \underbrace{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{m-1}}_{m-1 \text{ terms}}, j+1, \dots, j+k, d_{m+k}(x), d_{m+k+1}(x), \dots \rangle_P.$$

Then, $h(x) \in I_{\sigma^{(m)}(j+1)} \cap E$, where the containment in E follows from (4.8) and finite replacement-invariance of E . Hence the inclusion (4.7). Thus, by using bi-Lipschitz

invariance (Proposition 2.3), (4.7), and monotonicity (Proposition 2.2(i)), we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \dim_{\mathbb{H}}(I_{\sigma^{(m)}(j, \tau_{m+1}, \dots, \tau_{m+k-1})} \cap E) &= \dim_{\mathbb{H}} h(I_{\sigma^{(m)}(j, \tau_{m+1}, \dots, \tau_{m+k-1})} \cap E) \\ &\leq \dim_{\mathbb{H}}(I_{\sigma^{(m)}(j+1)} \cap E). \end{aligned}$$

This proves that (4.6) holds for each integer $k \geq 2$. Hence (4.4). This completes the proof of the claim. $\blacksquare$

We are now ready to finish the proof of the lemma by using Claim. By (3.1) and countable stability (Proposition 2.2(ii)), we have

$$\dim_{\mathbb{H}} E = \dim_{\mathbb{H}} \bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} [I_{(j)} \cap E] = \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \{\dim_{\mathbb{H}}(I_{(j)} \cap E)\} = \dim_{\mathbb{H}}(I_{(\sigma_1)} \cap E),$$

where we used Claim for the last equality. Recall that $E \subseteq \mathbb{I}$. Then, similarly, by using (3.2), countable stability (Proposition 2.2(ii)), and Claim, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \dim_{\mathbb{H}}(I_{(\sigma_1)} \cap E) &= \dim_{\mathbb{H}} \bigcup_{j \geq \sigma_1+1} [I_{(\sigma_1, j)} \cap E] \\ &= \sup_{j \geq \sigma_1+1} \{\dim_{\mathbb{H}}(I_{(\sigma_1, j)} \cap E)\} = \dim_{\mathbb{H}}(I_{(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)} \cap E). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, using a similar argument, it can be concluded that

$$\dim_{\mathbb{H}} E = \dim_{\mathbb{H}}(I_{(\sigma_1)} \cap E) = \dim_{\mathbb{H}}(I_{(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)} \cap E) = \dots = \dim_{\mathbb{H}}(I_{(\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_n)} \cap E),$$

as was to be shown. $\square$

Proof of Corollary 1.3. Let $\alpha \in [0, \infty]$. It is immediate from the definition (1.5) that $A(\alpha)$ is finite replacement-invariant. Recall from Proposition 2.8 that $\dim_{\mathbb{H}} A(\alpha) = 1 > 0$. We infer, in view of Theorem 1.1(i), that $A(\alpha)$ is dense in $[0, 1]$. Hence part (i). Moreover, Theorem 1.1(ii) tells us that $\dim_{\mathbb{H}}(U \cap A(\alpha)) = \dim_{\mathbb{H}} A(\alpha)$ for any non-empty open subset U of $[0, 1]$. Hence part (ii). $\square$

4.2. Proofs of Theorem 1.4 and Corollary 1.5. Recall from (1.6) the definition of the set $S(\alpha)$, $\alpha \in [0, \infty]$. The following lemma extends [13, Theorem 3], which presented the case for $\alpha = 1$.

Lemma 4.1. *For each $\alpha \in [0, \infty]$, we have $A(\alpha) \subseteq S(\alpha)$.*

Proof. The inclusion $A(1) \subseteq S(1)$ was established by Shallit in [13, Theorem 3]. For each $\alpha \in (0, \infty]$, by following a similar line to the proof of [13, Theorem 3] and by adjusting a parameter, and employing Lemmas 3.6 and 3.7, it is not hard to derive the desired inclusion. Hence, we omit the details.

Now, suppose that $x \in A(0)$. We show that $x \in S(0)$, i.e.,

$$\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{Nx - L(f(x), N)}{\sqrt{\log N}} = \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{Nx - L(f(x), N)}{\sqrt{\log N}} = -\infty.$$

Let $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$ be arbitrary. Since $(\log d_n(x))/n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ by the hypothesis, we can find a $K \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\log d_n(x) < n\varepsilon$ for all $n > K$. For each $j \in \mathbb{N}$, put

$$N_j := -1 + d_1(x) - d_1(x)d_2(x) + \cdots + (-1)^{j+1}d_1(x)d_2(x) \cdots d_j(x).$$

Notice that

$$(4.9) \quad 1 < N_3 < N_5 < \cdots \quad \text{and} \quad N_j < d_1(x) \cdots d_j(x) \text{ for all } j \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Then, for any positive integer $r \geq K/2$, we have

$$0 < \log N_3 \leq \log N_{2r+1} < \sum_{j=1}^{2r+1} \log d_j(x) < \sum_{j=1}^K \log d_j(x) + \varepsilon \sum_{j=K+1}^{2r+1} j.$$

By using [13, Theorem 2], which states that

$$N_{2r+1}x - L(f(x), N_{2r+1}) \geq \frac{r}{4} > 0 \quad \text{for any } r \in \mathbb{N},$$

we find that

$$\frac{N_{2r+1}x - L(f(x), N_{2r+1})}{\sqrt{\log N_{2r+1}}} > \frac{r/4}{\sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^K \log d_j(x) + \varepsilon(2r - K + 1)(2r + K + 2)/2}}$$

for any positive integer $r \geq K/2$. Since $(N_{2r+1})_{r \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a strictly increasing sequence of positive integers by (4.9), it follows that

$$\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{Nx - L(f(x), N)}{\sqrt{\log N}} \geq \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N_{2r+1}x - L(f(x), N_{2r+1})}{\sqrt{\log N_{2r+1}}} \geq \frac{1}{4\sqrt{2\varepsilon}}.$$

By letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$, we obtain the desired limsup. One can prove the liminf part in a similar way by using the sequence $(M_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ defined by $M_j := -N_j$ for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$. We have left the detailed calculations as an exercise for the readers. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.4. Let $\alpha \in [0, \infty]$. We have $A(\alpha) \subseteq S(\alpha)$ by Lemma 4.1. Since $A(\alpha)$ is dense in $[0, 1]$ by Corollary 1.3(i), we conclude that $S(\alpha)$ is dense in $[0, 1]$. This proves part (i). Now, let U be a non-empty open subset of $[0, 1]$. Then, by Lemma 4.1, we have $U \cap A(\alpha) \subseteq U \cap S(\alpha)$. Here, $\dim_{\text{H}}(U \cap A(\alpha)) = 1$ by Corollary 1.3(ii), and thus, $\dim_{\text{H}}(U \cap S(\alpha)) = 1$ by monotonicity (Proposition 2.2(i)). This establishes part (ii). $\square$

Remark 4.2. We have not determined whether $S(\alpha)$, $\alpha \in [0, \infty]$, is finite replacement-invariant. Since we already know that $S(\alpha)$ contains some dense subset of $[0, 1]$ with full Hausdorff dimension, such a determination was not necessary. Moreover, if $S(\alpha)$ turns out to be finite replacement-invariant, one must ascertain first that $\dim_{\text{H}} S(\alpha) \neq 0$ before applying Theorem 1.1 directly to $S(\alpha)$ in proving Theorem 1.4(i). For Theorem 1.4(ii), even more critically, one must ascertain the precise value of $\dim_{\text{H}} S(\alpha)$.

Proof of Corollary 1.5. Put $F := [0, 1] \setminus S(1)$, i.e., F is the set of exceptions to (1.4). Let $\alpha \in [0, \infty] \setminus \{1\}$. By definition, it is clear that $S(\alpha) \subseteq F$. But, due to Theorem 1.4, $S(\alpha)$ is dense in $[0, 1]$ and $\dim_{\text{H}} S(\alpha) = 1$. Therefore, F is dense in $[0, 1]$, and, by monotonicity (Proposition 2.2(i)), $\dim_{\text{H}} F = 1$. $\square$

REFERENCES

- [1] M. W. Ahn, *On the error-sum function of Pierce expansions*, J. Fractal Geom. **10** (2023), 389–421.
- [2] M. W. Ahn, *Hausdorff dimensions in Pierce expansions*, to appear in Acta Arith., arXiv:2304.14162v1 (2023).
- [3] M. W. Ahn, *Convergence exponent of Pierce expansion digit sequences*, arXiv:2309.01722v2 (2023).
- [4] J. Dutka, *On the Gregorian revision of the Julian calendar*, Math. Intelligencer **10** (1988), 56–64.
- [5] F. Eisenbrand, *Pope Gregory, the calendar, and continued fractions*, Doc. Math. **Extra vol.** (2012), 87–93.
- [6] K. Falconer, *Fractal Geometry: Mathematical Foundations and Applications*, 3rd ed., John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Chichester, 2014.
- [7] L. Fang, *Large and moderate deviation principles for alternating Engel expansions*, J. Number Theory **156** (2015), 263–276.
- [8] T. A. Pierce, *On an algorithm and its use in approximating roots of an algebraic equation*, Amer. Math. Monthly **36** (1929), 523–525.
- [9] E. M. Reingold & N. Dershowitz, *Calendrical Calculations*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2018.
- [10] V. F. Rickey, *Mathematics of the Gregorian calendar*, Math. Intelligencer **7** (1985), 53–56.
- [11] F. Schweiger, *Ergodic Theory of Fibred Systems and Metric Number Theory*, Oxford Sci. Publ., The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1995.
- [12] J. O. Shallit, *Metric theory of Pierce expansions*, Fibonacci Quart. **24** (1986), 22–40.
- [13] J. O. Shallit, *Pierce expansions and rules for the determination of leap years*, Fibonacci Quart. **32** (1994), 416–423.
- [14] N. M. Swerdlow, *The origin of the Gregorian civil calendar*, J. Hist. Astronomy **5** (1974), 48–49.
- [15] N. M. Swerdlow, *The length of the year in the original proposal for the Gregorian calendar*, J. Hist. Astronomy **17** (1986), 109–118.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SUNY AT BUFFALO, BUFFALO, NY 14260-2900, USA
 Email address: minwoong@buffalo.edu