

Limit behavior of a class of Cantor-integers

Jin CHEN^a, Xin-Yu WANG^a

^aCollege of Science, Huazhong Agricultural University, Wuhan 430070, China.

Abstract

In this paper, we study a class of Cantor-integers $\{C_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ with the base conversion function $f : \{0, \dots, m\} \rightarrow \{0, \dots, p\}$ being strictly increasing and satisfying $f(0) = 0$ and $f(m) = p$. Firstly we provide an algorithm to compute the superior and inferior of the sequence $\{\frac{C_n}{n^\alpha}\}_{n \geq 1}$ where $\alpha = \log_{m+1}^{p+1}$, and obtain the exact values of the superior and inferior when f is a class of quadratic function. Secondly we show that the sequence $\{\frac{C_n}{n^\alpha}\}_{n \geq 1}$ is dense in the close interval with the endpoints being its inferior and superior respectively. As a consequence, (i) we get the upper and lower pointwise density $1/\alpha$ -density of the self-similar measure supported on \mathfrak{C} at 0, where \mathfrak{C} is the Cantor set induced by Cantor-integers. (ii) the sequence $\{\frac{C_n}{n^\alpha}\}_{n \geq 1}$ does not have cumulative distribution function but have logarithmic distribution functions (given by a specific Lebesgue integral). Lastly we obtain the Mellin-Perron formula for the summation function of Cantor-integers. In addition, we investigate some analytic properties of the limit function induced by Cantor-integers.

Keywords: Cantor-integers, Pointwise density, Self-similar measure, Mellin-Perron formula
2010 MSC: 11A63, 28A80, 42A16

1. Introduction

Given two positive integer m and p with $m < p$. For any non negative integer n , the $(m+1)$ -ary expansion of $n = \sum_{j=0}^k \epsilon_j (m+1)^j$ is denoted by $[\epsilon_k \cdots \epsilon_0]_{m+1}$ for some $k \geq 0$, $\epsilon_j \in \{0, 1, \dots, m\}$ and $\epsilon_k > 0$. The integer sequence $\{C_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is called *Cantor-integers* if there exists a non-decreasing function $f : \{0, \dots, m\} \rightarrow \{0, \dots, p\}$ such that the $f(m) \leq p$ and $(p+1)$ -ary expansion of C_n is $[f(\epsilon_k) \cdots f(\epsilon_0)]_{p+1}$ whenever $n = [\epsilon_k \cdots \epsilon_0]_{m+1}$. Here f will be called *base conversion* function and note that f is not unique.

To avoid triviality we always assume $f(x) = x$ and $f(m) = p$ do not hold simultaneously. When $f(x) = 2x$, $m = 1$ and $p = f(m) = 2$, we have that $C_{2n+i} = 3C_n + 2i$ for every $n \geq 0$ and $i \in \{0, 1\}$. Namely, $\{C_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is the only non-negative integers whose ternary expansion contains no 1's (cf. [11, A005823]), which is an analogue of Cantor's triadic set. That's why it is called Cantor-integers. Throughout the paper, set $\alpha := \log_{m+1}^{p+1}$. It is easy to get that the order of growth for C_n is n^α with $\alpha > 1$. Recently, Lü et al. in [9] introduced quasi-linear sequence $g(n)$, in which the order of growth of quasi-linear sequence $\{g(n)\}$ must be strictly larger than $\{g(n) - g(n-1)\}$. They showed that

$$\left\{ \frac{g(n)}{n^\beta} \right\}_{n \geq 1} \text{ is dense in } \left[\inf_{n \geq 1} \frac{g(n)}{n^\beta}, \sup_{n \geq 1} \frac{g(n)}{n^\beta} \right],$$

Email addresses: cj@mail.hzau.edu.cn (Jin CHEN), xinyuwang@webmail.hzau.edu.cn (Xin-Yu WANG)

where β is the order of growth of $g(n)$. It is not hard to check that for every Cantor-integers sequence $\{C_n\}$, the order of growth of $\{C_n - C_{n-1}\}$ is also α . This implies C_n is not quasi-linear. In fact, as an arithmetic function, C_n has been widely investigated:

- When $f(x) = x$, $m = 1$ and $p \geq f(m) + 1 = 2$, $\{C_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is the lexicographically earliest increasing sequence of nonnegative numbers that contains no arithmetic progression of length 3 (cf. [11, A005836]). Flajolet et al. in [7, Section 5] considered the Mellin-Perron formulae of the summation function $S(n) := \sum_{k < n} C_k$.
- When $f(x) = 2x$, $m = 1$ and $p = f(m) + 1 = 3$, then $\alpha = 2$. Gawron and Ulas in [8, Section 3] investigated the density property of $\{C_n/n^2\}_{n \geq 1}$ (here they used the notation $\{b_k/k^2\}_{k \geq 1}$). They obtained that

$$\left\{ \frac{C_n}{n^2} \right\}_{n \geq 1} \text{ is contained and dense in } \left[\frac{2}{3}, 2 \right].$$

- When $f(x) = 2x$ and $p \in \{f(m), f(m) + 1\}$, Cao and Li in [4] generalized Gawron and Ulas's result in [8, Section 3] and reviewed the result about density property in the sense of self-similar measure. In details, they showed that

$$\left\{ \frac{C_n}{n^\alpha} \right\}_{n \geq 1} \text{ is contained and dense in } \left[\frac{f(m)}{p}, f(1) \right],$$

and

$$\left\{ \frac{x}{\mu_{\mathfrak{C}}^\alpha([0, x])} : x \in \mathfrak{C} \cap \left[\frac{2}{p+1}, 1 \right] \right\} = \left[\frac{f(m)}{p}, f(1) \right],$$

where \mathfrak{C} and $\mu_{\mathfrak{C}}$ are defined as in (1.3) and (1.4) respectively.

- When $f(x) = qx + r$ with $q \geq 2$ and $r \geq 0$, and $p + 1 \leq q + f(m)$, Cao and Yu in [5] generalized Cao and Li's results in [4] and they showed that

$$\left\{ \frac{C_n}{n^\alpha} \right\}_{n \geq 1} \text{ is contained and dense in } \left[\frac{f(m)}{p}, f(1) + \frac{f(0)}{p} \right], \quad (1.1)$$

and

$$\left\{ \frac{x}{\mu_{\mathfrak{C}}^\alpha([0, x])} : x \in \mathfrak{C} \cap \left[\frac{f(1)}{p+1}, 1 \right] \right\} = \left[\frac{f(m)}{p}, f(1) + \frac{f(0)}{p} \right]. \quad (1.2)$$

Let the homogeneous Cantor set $\mathfrak{C} := \mathfrak{C}_{f,m,p}$ be the self-similar set generated by the iterated function system (IFS)

$$S_i(x) := \frac{x + f(i)}{1 + p}, i = 0, \dots, m, \quad (1.3)$$

and $\mu_{\mathfrak{C}}$ be the unique self-similar measure supported on \mathfrak{C} satisfying

$$\mu_{\mathfrak{C}} = \sum_{i=0}^m \frac{1}{m+1} \mu_{\mathfrak{C}} \circ S_i^{-1}, \quad (1.4)$$

Much research has focused on the Cantor set satisfying $S_0(0) = 1$ and $S_m(1) = 1$ (or equivalently $f(0) = 0$ and $f(m) = p$) such as [2] and [10]. In this paper, we are concerned with the case that f is strictly increasing and satisfies $f(0) = 0$ and $f(m) = p$. The first term of $\{C_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is always zero and will be omitted. For simplicity, write $\Sigma_m := \{0, 1, \dots, m\}$ and $\Sigma_m^+ := \{1, \dots, m\}$. First we give an algorithm to compute the superior and inferior of $\{\frac{C_n}{n^\alpha}\}_{n \geq 1}$, and obtain the exact values when the base conversion function satisfies (2.6).

Theorem 1. *The superior and inferior of $\{\frac{C_n}{n^\alpha}\}_{n \geq 1}$ are*

$$\max_{\epsilon \in \Sigma_m^+} \frac{C_\epsilon}{\epsilon^\alpha} \text{ and } \min_{1 \leq n < (m+1)^{\ell_0}} \frac{C_n + 1}{(n+1)^\alpha}$$

respectively, where ℓ_0 is the smallest positive integer satisfying

$$\alpha \frac{(f(m) + 1)^{\ell_0}}{(m+1)^{\ell_0+1}} \geq \max_{\epsilon \in \Sigma_m \setminus \{m\}} \frac{f(m) - f(\epsilon)}{m - \epsilon}.$$

In particular, when the base conversion function satisfies (2.6), then we have

$$\inf_{n \geq 1} \frac{C_n}{n^\alpha} = \min_{1 \leq n < (m+1)^2} \frac{C_n + 1}{(n+1)^\alpha} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } a \leq 0, \\ \min \left\{ 1, \min_{\epsilon \in \Sigma_m} \frac{C_{m+\epsilon+1+1}}{(m+\epsilon+2)^\alpha} \right\}, & \text{if } a > 0. \end{cases}$$

Remark 1.1. It should be noticed that ℓ_0 as in Theorem 1 is not optimal. The experiment suggests that $\ell_0 \leq 2$ for every strictly increasing f satisfying $f(0) = 0$ and $f(m) = p$. So far we can not prove this. However, it holds for quadratic f satisfying (2.6). For the exact values of the superior and inferior with respect to this kind of base conversion function, see Proposition 2.5 and Proposition 2.6 respectively.

Similarly with [4, Theorem 2] and [5, Theorem 1.2], we also have the following density property.

Theorem 2. *The sequence $\{\frac{C_n}{n^\alpha}\}_{n \geq 1}$ is dense in the close interval $[\inf_{n \geq 1} \frac{C_n}{n^\alpha}, \sup_{n \geq 1} \frac{C_n}{n^\alpha}]$.*

Recall that the Hausdorff dimension of \mathfrak{C} is equal to $1/\alpha$, and the density of intervals of the form $[0, x]$ on the interval $(0, 1]$ with respect to $\mu_{\mathfrak{C}}$ is defined by $d(x) := \frac{\mu_{\mathfrak{C}}([0, x])}{x^{1/\alpha}}$. Note that the lower and upper $1/\alpha$ -density of $\mu_{\mathfrak{C}}$ at 0 are defined by

$$\Theta_*^{1/\alpha}(\mu_{\mathfrak{C}}, 0) := \liminf_{x \rightarrow 0^+} d(x) \text{ and } \Theta^{*1/\alpha}(\mu_{\mathfrak{C}}, 0) := \limsup_{x \rightarrow 0^+} d(x)$$

respectively. For more details of pointwise density of self-similar measure, see [6] and [10]. Let

$$\Lambda_0 := \{\ell : \text{there exists a positive and vanishing sequence } \{x_n\}_{n \geq 1} \text{ such that } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(x_n) = \ell\}.$$

Now we have the following corollary about pointwise density of self-similar measure $\mu_{\mathfrak{C}}$ at 0.

Corollary 1.1. *We have that*

$$\Lambda_0 = \left[\inf_{n \geq 1} \frac{n}{C_n^{1/\alpha}}, \sup_{n \geq 1} \frac{n}{C_n^{1/\alpha}} \right].$$

As a consequence,

$$\Theta_*^s(\mu_{\mathfrak{C}}, 0) = \left(\sup_{n \geq 1} \frac{C_n}{n^\alpha} \right)^{-1/\alpha} \text{ and } \Theta^{*s}(\mu_{\mathfrak{C}}, 0) = \left(\inf_{n \geq 1} \frac{C_n}{n^\alpha} \right)^{-1/\alpha}.$$

Remark 1.2. Kong, Li and Yao in [10] considered the homogeneous Cantor set generated by the iterated function system

$$\left\{ S_i(x) = \rho x + \frac{i(1-\rho)}{m} : i = 0, \dots, m \right\},$$

where $m \geq 1$ and $\rho \in (0, 1/(m+1)^2]$. If $\alpha \geq 2$, then we can take $\rho := \frac{1}{f(m)+1}$. This implies that $f(i) = \frac{f(m)}{m}i$, which is the linear case when $m \mid f(m)$.

Arithmetic functions related to number representation systems exhibit various periodicity phenomenon. For example, let $\{r(n)\}_{n \geq 0}$ be the Rudin-Shapiro sequence. Brillhart, Erdős and Morton in [3] considered the properties of the partial sum $s(x) := \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor x \rfloor} r(k)$ and $t(x) := \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor x \rfloor} (-1)^k r(k)$, and introduced the limit functions

$$\tau(x) := \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{s(\lfloor 4^k x \rfloor)}{\sqrt{4^k x}} \text{ and } \mu(x) := \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{t(\lfloor 4^k x \rfloor)}{\sqrt{4^k x}},$$

which are defined for $x > 0$. Note that $\tau(4x) = \tau(x)$ and $\mu(4x) = \mu(x)$. They showed that $\tau(x)$ and $\mu(x)$ are continuous at every $x > 0$, but are non-differentiable almost everywhere, and they also estimated the decay of coefficients of logarithmic Fourier series of $\tau(x)$ and $\mu(x)$. For the Cantor-integers sequence, write $C_x := C_{\lfloor x \rfloor}$ for every $x \in (0, \infty)$. Define a function $\lambda : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ defined by

$$\lambda(x) := \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{C_{(m+1)^k x}}{((m+1)^k x)^\alpha}.$$

It follows from (4.2) that $\lambda(x)$ has a logarithmic Fourier series expansion. For the other analytic properties of $\lambda(x)$, see Proposition 4.1, Proposition 4.2 and Proposition 4.3.

Let the cumulative and logarithmic distribution function of the sequence $\{\frac{C_n}{n^\alpha}\}_{n \geq 1}$ be defined as in Section 7 and Section 8 in [3] respectively. Using Theorem 2 and applying similar arguments of Theorem 1.4 and Theorem 1.5 in [5], we have the following two corollaries.

Corollary 1.2. *The cumulative distribution function of the sequence $\{\frac{C_n}{n^\alpha}\}_{n \geq 1}$ does not exist for any point of $[\inf_{n \geq 1} \frac{C_n}{n^\alpha}, \sup_{n \geq 1} \frac{C_n}{n^\alpha}]$.*

Corollary 1.3. *If $\gamma \in [\inf_{n \geq 1} \frac{C_n}{n^\alpha}, \sup_{n \geq 1} \frac{C_n}{n^\alpha}]$, then the logarithmic distribution function of the sequence $\{\frac{C_n}{n^\alpha}\}_{n \geq 1}$ exists at γ , and has the value*

$$L(\gamma) = \frac{1}{\log(m+1)} \int_{E_\gamma} \frac{1}{x} dx,$$

where $E_\gamma := \{x \in [1, m+1] : \lambda(x) \leq \gamma\}$.

Similarly with [7, Section 5], we have the Mellin-Perron formula for the summation function of Cantor-integers. Let $\zeta(s, a)$ and $\zeta(s)$ be the well-known Hurwitz zeta function and Riemann zeta function respectively. i.e.,

$$\zeta(s, a) := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(n+a)^s} \text{ and } \zeta(s) := \zeta(s, 1).$$

For simplicity, write $\Delta f(r) := f(r) - f(r-1)$ for $r \in \Sigma_m^+$.

Theorem 3. *For the summation function $S(n) := \sum_{1 \leq k < n} C_n$, we have*

$$S(n) = n^{\alpha+1} F(\log_{m+1}^n) - n^2 \frac{f(m)}{f(m)-m} - n \frac{\sum_{r=1}^m f(r)}{f(m)(m+1)} - \frac{f(m)(m+1) - \sum_{r=1}^m f(r)}{f(m)(m+1) + m},$$

where $F(u)$ is the Fourier series

$$F(u) = \frac{1}{(f(m)+1) \log(m+1)} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{\sum_{r=1}^m \Delta f(r) \zeta(\gamma_k, \frac{r}{m+1}) - f(m) \zeta(\gamma_k)}{\gamma_k (\gamma_k + 1)} e^{2\pi i k u},$$

with $\gamma_k := \alpha + \frac{2\pi k i}{\log(m+1)}$.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we prove Theorem 1. In Section 3, we prove Theorem 2 and Corollary 1.1. In Section 4, we prove some analytic properties of the limit function induced by Cantor-integers. In Section 5, we prove Theorem 3.

2. Proof of Theorem 1

With a little abuse of notation, write $m^\ell := \underbrace{m \cdots m}_\ell$ for every $m \geq 1$. Given any finite word u , let $|u|$ denote the length of u . We have the following observation for Cantor-integers. For simplicity, here we assume $n = [\epsilon_\ell \epsilon_{\ell-1} \cdots \epsilon_0]_{m+1}$ with $\epsilon_i \in \Sigma_m$ for some $0 \leq i \leq \ell$. For every integer $n \geq 1$ and $r \in \Sigma_m$, we have

$$C_{[\epsilon_\ell \cdots \epsilon_0 r]_{m+1}} = (f(m) + 1)C_{[\epsilon_\ell \cdots \epsilon_0]_{m+1}} + f(r).$$

In particular, for every integer $k \geq 1$, we have

$$C_{[\epsilon_\ell \cdots \epsilon_0 0^k]_{m+1}} = (f(m) + 1)^k C_{[\epsilon_\ell \cdots \epsilon_0]_{m+1}}. \quad (2.1)$$

First we give some useful propositions about Cantor-integers for general base conversion function.

Proposition 2.1. *For every $k \geq 2$ and $\epsilon_k \cdots \epsilon_1 \in \Sigma_m^+ \times \Sigma_m^{k-1}$, we have*

$$\frac{C_{[\epsilon_k \cdots \epsilon_1]_{m+1}}}{[\epsilon_k \cdots \epsilon_1]_{m+1}} \geq \frac{f(m) + m + 1}{2m + 1}. \quad (2.2)$$

Proof. Firstly we claim that for every $k \geq 2$ and $\epsilon_k \cdots \epsilon_1 \in \Sigma_m^+ \times \Sigma_m^{k-1}$, we have

$$\frac{C_{[\epsilon_k \cdots \epsilon_1]_{m+1}}}{[\epsilon_k \cdots \epsilon_1]_{m+1}} \geq \frac{C_{[\epsilon_k \epsilon_{k-1}]_{m+1}}}{[\epsilon_k \epsilon_{k-1}]_{m+1}}.$$

In fact, if $k \geq 3$, we have

$$\frac{C_{[\epsilon_k \cdots \epsilon_1]_{m+1}}}{[\epsilon_k \cdots \epsilon_1]_{m+1}} = \frac{(f(m) + 1)C_{[\epsilon_k \cdots \epsilon_2]_{m+1}} + f(\epsilon_1)}{(m + 1)[\epsilon_k \cdots \epsilon_2]_{m+1} + \epsilon_1} \geq \frac{C_{[\epsilon_k \cdots \epsilon_2]_{m+1}}}{[\epsilon_k \cdots \epsilon_2]_{m+1}}.$$

The last inequality is deduced using the fact that $f(m) > m$. Applying the above inequality $(k - 2)$ times, we have that the claim holds. Meanwhile, note that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{C_{[\epsilon_k \epsilon_{k-1}]_{m+1}}}{[\epsilon_k \epsilon_{k-1}]_{m+1}} &= \frac{(f(m) + 1)f(\epsilon_k) + f(\epsilon_{k-1})}{(m + 1)\epsilon_k + \epsilon_{k-1}} \\ &\geq \frac{(f(m) + 1)\epsilon_k + \epsilon_{k-1}}{(m + 1)\epsilon_k + \epsilon_{k-1}} \\ &= \frac{(f(m) + 1) + \epsilon_{k-1}/\epsilon_k}{(m + 1) + \epsilon_{k-1}/\epsilon_k} \\ &\geq \frac{f(m) + 1 + m}{2m + 1}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. □

Proposition 2.2. *For every $n \geq m + 1$, we have*

$$\frac{C_{(m+1)n+m}}{((m + 1)n + m)^\alpha} \leq \frac{C_n}{n^\alpha}. \quad (2.3)$$

Proof. Note that

$$\frac{C_{(m+1)n+m}}{((m+1)n+m)^\alpha} = \frac{(f(m)+1)C_n + f(m)}{((m+1)n+m)^\alpha} = \frac{C_n + \frac{f(m)}{f(m)+1}}{(n + \frac{m}{m+1})^\alpha}.$$

By Bernoulli inequality, it suffices to show that

$$\frac{\alpha C_n}{n} \geq \frac{f(m)(m+1)}{(f(m)+1)m}.$$

Following from Proposition 2.1, we have

$$\frac{C_n}{n} \geq \frac{f(m)+1+m}{2m+1}.$$

By the fact that $f(m) \geq m+1$, we have

$$\frac{f(m)+1+m}{2m+1} \geq \frac{f(m)(m+1)}{(f(m)+1)m}. \quad (2.4)$$

This completes the proof. \square

Similarly, we have the following results.

Proposition 2.3. *There exists $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $n \geq (m+1)^{k_0}$ and every $\epsilon \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, we have*

$$\frac{C_{(m+1)n+\epsilon}}{((m+1)n+\epsilon)^\alpha} \leq \frac{C_n}{n^\alpha}.$$

Proof. As in the proof of (2.3), it suffices to show that there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $n \geq n_0$ and every $\epsilon \in \{1, \dots, m\}$,

$$\frac{\alpha C_n}{n} \geq \frac{f(\epsilon)(m+1)}{\epsilon(f(m)+1)},$$

which follows from the fact that $\frac{C_n}{n} \rightarrow \infty$ when $n \rightarrow \infty$. \square

Proposition 2.4. *There exists $k_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $n \geq (m+1)^{k_1}$, we have*

$$\frac{C_{(m+1)n}}{((m+1)n)^\alpha} > \frac{C_{(m+1)n+1}}{((m+1)n+1)^\alpha} > \dots > \frac{C_{(m+1)n+m}}{((m+1)n+m)^\alpha}.$$

Proof. Given any $n = [\epsilon_\ell \cdots \epsilon_1]_{m+1}$ for some $\ell \geq 1$, we consider the function $T_\ell : [0, m] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$T_\ell(x) := \frac{C_{[\epsilon_\ell \cdots \epsilon_1 x]_{m+1}}}{([\epsilon_\ell \cdots \epsilon_1 x]_{m+1})^\alpha} = \frac{(f(m)+1)C_{[\epsilon_\ell \cdots \epsilon_1]_{m+1}} + f(x)}{((m+1)[\epsilon_\ell \cdots \epsilon_1]_{m+1} + x)^\alpha}.$$

Note that $\partial T_\ell(x)/\partial x < 0$ if and only if

$$f'(x)((m+1)[\epsilon_\ell \cdots \epsilon_1]_{m+1} + x) - \alpha((f(m)+1)C_{[\epsilon_\ell \cdots \epsilon_1]_{m+1}} + f(x)) < 0.$$

In fact, following from that $C_{[\epsilon_\ell \cdots \epsilon_1]_{m+1}}/[\epsilon_\ell \cdots \epsilon_1]_{m+1} \rightarrow \infty (n \rightarrow \infty)$, if ℓ is sufficiently large, then for every $x \in [0, m]$, $\partial T_\ell(x)/\partial x < 0$. This completes the proof. \square

2.1. The superior of $\{\frac{C_n}{n^\alpha} : n \geq 1\}$

For simplicity, set $M := \max_{\epsilon \in \Sigma_m} \frac{C_\epsilon}{\epsilon^\alpha}$. We only need to show that for every $k \geq 0$,

$$\sup_{(m+1)^k \leq n < (m+1)^{k+1}} \frac{C_n}{n^\alpha} = M.$$

We will prove this by induction. If $k = 0$, it holds trivially. Assume the desired result holds for $k \geq 0$. By (2.1), it suffices to consider $C_{(m+1)n+i}/((m+1)n+i)^\alpha$ for every $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $(m+1)^k \leq n < (m+1)^{k+1}$. In fact, note that

$$\begin{aligned} & C_{(m+1)n+i} - M((m+1)n+i)^\alpha \\ &= (f(m)+1)C_n + f(i) - M((m+1)n+i)^\alpha \\ &\leq (m+1)^\alpha M n^\alpha + M i^\alpha - M((m+1)n+i)^\alpha \\ &= M((m+1)n)^\alpha \left(1 + \left(\frac{i}{(m+1)n} \right)^\alpha - \left(1 + \frac{i}{(m+1)n} \right)^\alpha \right) \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality can be deduced from Bernoulli inequality. This completes the proof of the superior as in Theorem 1.

It should be noticed that when f satisfies (2.6), we have the following result.

Proposition 2.5. Define $T(x) := (2-\alpha)ax - b(\alpha-1)$. Then we have that

$$\max_{\epsilon \in \Sigma_m^+} \frac{C_\epsilon}{\epsilon^\alpha} = \begin{cases} f(1), & \text{if } a \leq 0 \text{ or } a = 1, b = 1, \\ \frac{f(m)}{m^\alpha}, & \text{if } a = 2, b = -1, m = 2 \text{ or } a = 1, b = 0, \\ f(1), & \text{if } a > 0, \alpha \geq 2 \text{ and } b \geq 0, \\ \frac{f(m)}{m^\alpha}, & \text{if } a > 0, \alpha \geq 2, b < 0 \text{ and } T(m) \geq 0, \\ f(1), & \text{if } a > 0, \alpha \geq 2, b < 0 \text{ and } T(1) \leq 0, \\ \max \left\{ \frac{f(\xi_m)}{\xi_m^\alpha}, \frac{f(\xi_{m+1})}{(\xi_{m+1})^\alpha} \right\}, & \text{if } a > 0, \alpha \geq 2, b < 0 \text{ and } T(m) < 0 < T(1). \end{cases}$$

where $\xi_m := \lfloor \frac{-b(\alpha-1)}{a(\alpha-2)} \rfloor$.

Proof. If $a > 0, \alpha \geq 2$ and $b < 0$, the result follows from the fact that $T(m) \leq T(1)$. The other cases can be verified directly. \square

2.2. The inferior of $\{\frac{C_n}{n^\alpha} : n \geq 1\}$ for general f

It follows from (2.3) that for every finite word $u \in \Sigma_m^{|u|}$ with $|u| \geq 2$ and the first digit being positive, we have

$$\frac{C_{[u]_{m+1}}}{[u]_{m+1}^\alpha} \geq \frac{C_{[um]_{m+1}}}{[um]_{m+1}^\alpha} \geq \frac{C_{[umm]_{m+1}}}{[umm]_{m+1}^\alpha} \geq \dots \geq \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{C_{[um^t]_{m+1}}}{[um^t]_{m+1}^\alpha} = \frac{C_{[u]_{m+1}+1}}{([u]_{m+1}+1)^\alpha}.$$

By Proposition 2.3 and Proposition 2.4, the inferior must be of the form $\frac{C_{[u]_{m+1}+1}}{([u]_{m+1}+1)^\alpha}$ for some u . It suffices to show that if $|u| \geq \ell_0$ with ℓ_0 defined as in Theorem 1, then we have

$$\min_{\epsilon \in \Sigma_m} \frac{C_{[u\epsilon]_{m+1}+1}}{([u\epsilon]_{m+1}+1)^\alpha} = \frac{C_{[um]_{m+1}+1}}{([um]_{m+1}+1)^\alpha} = \frac{C_{[u]_{m+1}+1}}{([u]_{m+1}+1)^\alpha}. \quad (2.5)$$

As in the proof of (2.3), we only need to show that for every finite word u with $|u| \geq \ell_0$ and every $\epsilon \in \Sigma_m \setminus \{m\}$,

$$\frac{\alpha((f(m)+1)C_{[u]_{m+1}} + f(\epsilon) + 1)}{(m+1)[u]_{m+1} + \epsilon + 1} \geq \frac{f(m) - f(\epsilon)}{m - \epsilon}.$$

In fact, if $|u| = k \geq \ell_0$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\alpha((f(m)+1)C_{[u]_{m+1}} + f(\epsilon) + 1)}{(m+1)[u]_{m+1} + \epsilon + 1} &\geq \frac{\alpha(f(m)+1)C_{[u]_{m+1}}}{(m+1)([u]_{m+1} + 1)} \\ &\geq \frac{\alpha(f(m)+1)C_{[10^{k-1}]_{m+1}}}{(m+1)([m^k]_{m+1} + 1)} \\ &= \frac{\alpha(f(m)+1)^k}{(m+1)^{k+1}} \\ &\geq \max_{\epsilon \in \Sigma_m \setminus \{m\}} \frac{f(m) - f(\epsilon)}{m - \epsilon} \geq \frac{f(m) - f(\epsilon)}{m - \epsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the inferior for general f .

2.3. The inferior of $\{\frac{C_n}{n^\alpha} : n \geq 1\}$ for a class of quadratic f

In this subsection, we will investigate the sequence $\{\frac{C_n}{n^\alpha} : n \geq 1\}$ with the corresponding base conversion function f being quadratic with zero constant term. i.e., $f(x) = ax^2 + bx$ with $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ and

$$f'(x) = 2ax + b > 0 \text{ for every } x \in [1, m]. \quad (2.6)$$

If $a = 0$ or $m = 1$, then f can be replaced with a linear function. Following from (1.1) or [5, Theorem 1.1], we have $\inf_{n \geq 1} \frac{C_n}{n^\alpha} = 1$. Without loss of generality we always assume $a \neq 0$ and $m \geq 2$. There are some useful facts for this kind of base conversion function:

- We have that $f(1) = a + b \geq 1$.
- When $1 < \alpha < 2$, we have that $-am + 2 \leq b \leq (1-a)m + 1$ since $m < f(m) < m^2 + 2m$. In details, if $a < 0$, following from (2.6), we have that $a = -1$ and $b \in \{2m, 2m + 1\}$; Similarly, if $a > 0$, we have that either $a = 2, b = -1, m = 2$ or $a = 1, b \in \{0, 1\}$.
- It is not hard to get that $f(m) \geq m^2$ and $\alpha \geq \frac{\log 5}{\log 3}$.

Lemma 2.1. For every $\epsilon_2 \epsilon_1 \in \Sigma_m^+ \times \Sigma_m$, we have

$$\inf_{\ell \geq 0} \left\{ \frac{C_{[\epsilon_2 \epsilon_1 v]_{m+1}}}{[\epsilon_2 \epsilon_1 v]_{m+1}^\alpha} : v \in \Sigma_m^\ell \right\} = \frac{C_{[\epsilon_2 \epsilon_1]_{m+1}} + 1}{([\epsilon_2 \epsilon_1]_{m+1} + 1)^\alpha}.$$

Proof. As in the proof in Section 2.2, we only need to show that for every finite word u with $|u| \geq 2$ and every $\epsilon \in \Sigma_m \setminus \{m\}$,

$$\frac{\alpha((f(m)+1)C_{[u]_{m+1}} + f(\epsilon) + 1)}{(m+1)[u]_{m+1} + \epsilon + 1} \geq \frac{f(m) - f(\epsilon)}{m - \epsilon} = a(m + \epsilon) + b. \quad (2.7)$$

Note that, following from the fact that $[u]_{m+1} \geq m + 1$ and Proposition 2.1, we have

$$\frac{\alpha((f(m)+1)C_{[u]_{m+1}} + f(\epsilon) + 1)}{(m+1)[u]_{m+1} + \epsilon + 1} \geq \frac{\alpha(m+1)(f(m)+1)C_{[u]_{m+1}}}{m+2(m+1)[u]_{m+1}}$$

$$\geq \frac{\alpha(f(m) + 1)(f(m) + m + 1)}{(m + 2)(2m + 1)}.$$

Hence (2.7) can be deduced from

$$\frac{\alpha(f(m) + 1)(f(m) + m + 1)}{(m + 2)(2m + 1)} \geq a(m + \epsilon) + b. \quad (2.8)$$

In fact, (2.7) always holds for $\epsilon = 0$, which follows from (2.4) and that fact that $\frac{\alpha(m+1)}{m+2} \geq 1$. It remains to consider the case $\epsilon \in \Sigma_m \setminus \{0, m\}$. We distinguish two cases according to the sign of a .

Case 1: $a < 0$. Then $a(m + \epsilon) + b \leq a(m + 1) + b \leq \frac{f(m)}{m}$. Therefore by (2.4), the desired inequality (2.8) holds.

Case 2: $a > 0$. Then $a(m + \epsilon) + b \leq a(2m - 1) + b = \frac{2f(m)}{m} - f(1)$.

Subcase 2(1): $\alpha \geq 2$. Then $f(m) \geq m^2 + 2m$. Hence (2.8) follows from

$$\frac{2(f(m) + 1)(f(m) + m + 1)}{(m + 2)(2m + 1)} \geq \frac{2f(m)}{m} - 1 \geq a(m + \epsilon) + b.$$

Subcase 2(2): $\alpha < 2$. First we consider the case $a = 2, b = -1, m = 2$. Then $f(m) = 6$ and $\alpha = \frac{\log 7}{\log 3} > 1.7$. Note that we only need to verify (2.7) for $\epsilon = 1$. In other words,

$$\frac{\alpha(7C_{[u]_3} + 2)}{3[u]_3 + 2} \geq 5.$$

In fact, the above inequality follows from the fact that $C_{[u]_3} \geq \frac{9}{5}[u]_3$ by Proposition 2.1.

Now we investigate the case $a = 1, b = 1$. Then $f(m) = m^2 + m$ and $\alpha = \frac{\log(m^2+m+1)}{\log(m+1)} > 1.7$. Hence that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\alpha(f(m) + 1)(f(m) + m + 1)}{(m + 2)(2m + 1)} &= \frac{\alpha(m^2 + m + 1)(m^2 + 2m + 1)}{(m + 2)(2m + 1)} \\ &\geq \frac{\alpha(m^2 + m + 1)m}{2m + 1} \\ &\geq 2m = \frac{2f(m)}{m} - f(1). \end{aligned}$$

At last, we focus on the case $a = 1, b = 0$. If $m = 2$, then $\alpha = \frac{\log 5}{\log 3}$, and it suffices to check that

$$\frac{\alpha(5C_{[u]_3} + 2)}{3[u]_3 + 2} \geq 3.$$

Following from Proposition 2.1, $C_{[u]_3} \geq \frac{7}{5}[u]_3$. This implies the above inequality holds.

Now we assume $m \geq 3$. Recall that $\frac{2f(m)}{m} - f(1) = 2m - 1$. Then we have

$$\frac{\alpha(f(m) + 1)(f(m) + m + 1)}{(m + 2)(2m + 1)} = \frac{\alpha(m^2 + 1)(m^2 + m + 1)}{(m + 2)(2m + 1)} \geq 2m - 1,$$

where the last inequality follows from the monotonicity of $\frac{\alpha(m^2+1)(m^2+m+1)}{(m+2)(2m+1)} - 2m + 1$ with respect to $m \geq 3$. This completes the proof.

□

Set $\delta_a := 1$ if $a > 0$ otherwise $\delta_a := 0$. We have the following lemma.

Lemma 2.2. *If $\epsilon_2 \in \{1 + \delta_a, \dots, m\}$, then we have*

$$\min_{\epsilon \in \Sigma_m} \frac{C_{[\epsilon_2 \epsilon]_{m+1}} + 1}{([\epsilon_2 \epsilon]_{m+1} + 1)^\alpha} = \frac{f(\epsilon_2) + 1}{(\epsilon_2 + 1)^\alpha}.$$

Proof. Fixed $\epsilon_2 \in \{1 + \delta_a, \dots, m\}$. Like the proof of Lemma 2.1, it suffices to show that for every $\epsilon \in \Sigma_m \setminus \{m\}$,

$$\frac{\alpha((f(m) + 1)f(\epsilon_2) + f(\epsilon) + 1)}{(m + 1)\epsilon_2 + \epsilon + 1} \geq \frac{f(m) - f(\epsilon)}{m - \epsilon} = a(m + \epsilon) + b. \quad (2.9)$$

Case 1: $a < 0$. Then $a(m + \epsilon) + b \leq am + b = \frac{f(m)}{m}$. Note that $b \geq -2am$ if $a < -1$ otherwise $b \geq 2m$. Hence $f(\epsilon_2)/\epsilon_2 \geq ma + b \geq m$ for every $\epsilon_2 \geq 1$. Hence that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\alpha((f(m) + 1)f(\epsilon_2) + f(\epsilon) + 1)}{(m + 1)\epsilon_2 + \epsilon + 1} &\geq \frac{\alpha((f(m) + 1)m\epsilon_2 + \epsilon + 1)}{(m + 1)\epsilon_2 + \epsilon + 1} \\ &= \frac{\alpha((f(m) + 1)m + (\epsilon + 1)/\epsilon_2)}{m + 1 + (\epsilon + 1)/\epsilon_2} \\ &\geq \frac{\alpha((f(m) + 1)m + m)}{2m + 1} \\ &\geq \frac{f(m)}{m} \geq a(m + \epsilon) + b. \end{aligned}$$

Case 2: $a > 0$. Then $a(m + \epsilon) + b \leq a(2m - 1) + b = \frac{2f(m)}{m} - f(1)$ and $f(\epsilon_2)/\epsilon_2 \geq 2a + b$ for every $\epsilon_2 \geq 2$. To prove (2.9), we only need to show that

$$\frac{\alpha((2a + b)(f(m) + 1) + m/2)}{3m/2 + 1} \geq \frac{2f(m)}{m} - f(1). \quad (2.10)$$

This follows from that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\alpha((f(m) + 1)f(\epsilon_2) + f(\epsilon) + 1)}{(m + 1)\epsilon_2 + \epsilon + 1} &\geq \frac{\alpha((2a + b)(f(m) + 1)\epsilon_2 + \epsilon + 1)}{(m + 1)\epsilon_2 + \epsilon + 1} \\ &= \frac{\alpha((2a + b)(f(m) + 1) + (\epsilon + 1)/\epsilon_2)}{m + 1 + (\epsilon + 1)/\epsilon_2} \\ &\geq \frac{\alpha((2a + b)(f(m) + 1) + m/2)}{3m/2 + 1}. \end{aligned}$$

Subcase 2(1): $\alpha \geq 2$. Then (2.10) follows from the fact that $2a + b \geq 2$.

Subcase 2(2): $\alpha < 2$. First we consider the case $a = 2, b = -1, m = 2$ or $a = 1, b = 1$. Then $2a + b = 3$ and $\alpha \geq \frac{\log 7}{\log 3}$. This implies (2.10) holds. Now for the case $a = 1, b = 0$. Then (2.9) is equivalent to

$$\alpha((m^2 + 1)\epsilon_2^2 + \epsilon^2 + 1) - (m + \epsilon)((m + 1)\epsilon_2 + \epsilon + 1) \geq 0.$$

Note that the left-hand side of the above inequality is decreasing with respect to $\epsilon \in [0, m-1]$, Hence that

$$\begin{aligned} & \alpha((m^2+1)\epsilon_2^2 + \epsilon^2 + 1) - (m+\epsilon)((m+1)\epsilon_2 + \epsilon + 1) \\ \geq & \alpha((m^2+1)\epsilon_2^2 + (m-1)^2 + 1) - (2m-1)((m+1)\epsilon_2 + m) \\ \geq & \alpha(4(m^2+1) + (m-1)^2 + 1) - (2m-1)(2(m+1) + m) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. □

Lemma 2.3. *We have*

$$\min_{x \in \{1, \dots, m\}} \frac{f(x)+1}{(x+1)^\alpha} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } a < 0, \\ \min\left\{1, \frac{a+b+1}{2^\alpha}\right\}, & \text{if } a > 0. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Consider the function $F(x) := \frac{f(x)+1}{(x+1)^\alpha}$ defined on $[1, m]$. It is easy to get that for each $x \in [1, m]$, $F'(x) \leq 0$ if and only if $f'(x)(x+1) - \alpha(f(x)+1) \leq 0$. Set $\tilde{F}(x) := f'(x)(x+1) - \alpha(f(x)+1)$. Note that $\tilde{F}'(x) = 2a(x+1) - (\alpha-1)f'(x)$.

Case 1: $a < 0$. Then $\tilde{F}'(x) \leq 0$ for each $x \in [1, m]$. We will only need to show that $\tilde{F}(1) \leq 0$. Since if this holds, then we have $\tilde{F}(x) \leq 0$ for each $x \in [1, m]$, which implies that

$$\min_{x \in \{1, \dots, m\}} \frac{f(x)+1}{(x+1)^\alpha} = 1.$$

In fact, we have

$$\tilde{F}(1) = 4a + 2b - \alpha(a+b+1) \leq \begin{cases} 2a - 2 \leq 0, & \text{if } \alpha \geq 2, \\ \frac{4m^2}{(m^2+1)\log(m+1)} - 4 \leq 0, & \text{if } a = -1, b = 2m, \\ \frac{m(2m+1)}{(m^2+1)\log(m+1)} - 4 \leq 0, & \text{if } a = -1, b = 2m+1. \end{cases}$$

Case 2: $a > 0$.

Subcase 2(1): $1 < \alpha < 2$. In other words, $a = 2, b = -1, m = 2$ or $a = 1, b \in \{0, 1\}$. We have that $\tilde{F}'(x) \geq 0$ for each $x \in [1, m]$. Note that $\tilde{F}(1) = 4a + 2b - \alpha(a+b+1) \geq 0$. This implies $\tilde{F}(x) \geq 0$ for each $x \in [1, m]$, Hence that

$$\min_{x \in \{1, \dots, m\}} \frac{f(x)+1}{(x+1)^\alpha} = \frac{a+b+1}{2^\alpha}.$$

Subcase 2(2): $\alpha \geq 2$. Note that

$$\tilde{F}(x) = f'(x)(x+1) - \alpha(f(x)+1) = (2-\alpha)ax^2 + (2a+b-\alpha b)x + b - \alpha.$$

Hence if $\tilde{F}(1) \geq 0$, namely $\alpha \leq \frac{4a+2b}{a+b+1}$, then we have

$$\min_{x \in [1, m]} F(x) = \min\{F(1), F(m)\} = \min\left\{1, \frac{a+b+1}{2^\alpha}\right\}.$$

Now it remains to consider the case $\alpha > \frac{4a+2b}{a+b+1}$ (or equivalently $\tilde{F}(1) < 0$). Note that $\tilde{F}'(x) \leq \tilde{F}'(1)$ for each $x \in [1, m]$. We only need to show that $\tilde{F}'(1) \leq 0$. Namely, $\alpha > \frac{6a+b}{2a+b}$. If this inequality holds, then we have $\tilde{F}(x) \leq 0$ for each $x \in [1, m]$. Hence that

$$\min_{x \in \{1, \dots, m\}} \frac{f(x) + 1}{(x+1)^\alpha} = 1.$$

In fact, we have $\frac{4a+2b}{a+b+1} < \frac{6a+b}{2a+b}$ if and only if $2a^2 + ab - 6a - b + b^2 < 0$ if and only if one of the following cases occurs: (i) $a = 1, b \in \{0, 1\}$; (ii) $a = 2, b \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$; (iii) $a = 3, b = -1$. For each case, it is not hard to get that $\alpha < \frac{4a+2b}{a+b+1}$ which contradicts the assumption. It follows that $\alpha > \frac{6a+b}{2a+b}$. This completes the proof. \square

Proof of the inferior in Theorem 1 for f satisfying (2.6). It follows from Lemma 2.1, Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.3 directly. \square

When f satisfies (2.6), it should be noticed that the exact values of the inferior in Theorem 1 depend on the values of a, b and m . In details, we will give the following result.

Proposition 2.6. *Given any $a > 0$ and define*

$$T(x) := (2ax + b)(x + m + 2) - \alpha((f(m) + 1)f(1) + f(x) + 1).$$

Then we have that

$$\min_{\epsilon \in \Sigma_m} \frac{C_{m+\epsilon+1} + 1}{(m + \epsilon + 2)^\alpha} = \begin{cases} \frac{a+b+1}{2^\alpha}, & \text{if } T(m) \leq 0, \\ \min \left\{ \frac{C_{m+\xi_m+1} + 1}{(m+\xi_m+2)^\alpha}, \frac{C_{m+\xi_m+2} + 1}{(m+\xi_m+3)^\alpha} \right\}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

where $\xi_m := \min\{x \in \Sigma_m : T(x) \leq 0 \text{ but } T(x+1) > 0\}$.

Proof. Consider the function $S(x) := \frac{C_{m+x+1} + 1}{(m+x+2)^\alpha}$. Then we can get that $S'(x) \leq 0$ if and only if $T(x) \leq 0$. Rewriting the function T by

$$T(x) := (2 - \alpha)ax^2 + (2a(m+2) - b(\alpha - 1))x + b(m+2) - \alpha((f(m) + 1)f(1) + 1).$$

Clearly $T(0) \leq 0$. It suffices to investigate the case that $T(m) \leq 0$ and $\alpha > 2$. Since if $T(m) > 0$ or $\alpha \leq 2$, then this proposition holds directly. Note that

$$T'(x) := 2ax(2 - \alpha) + 2a(m+2) - b(\alpha - 1).$$

Without loss of generality we can assume that $T'(0) \geq 0$ and $T'(m) \leq 0$ (otherwise this proposition holds directly). This implies that $\alpha \geq 3$ if $b < 0$. Now we claim that $T(x) \leq 0$ for every $x \in \mathbb{R}$. We only need to show that the discriminant Δ of T is non-positive. In fact,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\Delta}{2a(\alpha - 2)} \\ := & (2a(m+2) - b(\alpha - 1))^2 / (2a(\alpha - 2)) - 2\alpha((f(m) + 1)f(1) + 1) + 2b(m+2) \\ \leq & m(2am + 4a - b\alpha + b) - 2\alpha(f(m) + 2) + 2b(m+2) \quad (\text{By } T'(0) \geq 0 \text{ and } T'(m) \leq 0) \\ \leq & \begin{cases} m(2am + 4a - b) - 4(am^2 + bm + 2) + 2b(m+2) \leq 0, & \text{if } b \geq 0, \\ 2a(3 - \alpha) + 10(1 - \alpha) \leq 0, & \text{if } b < 0. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

The last inequalities for the case $b < 0$ can be deduced from the fact that $\alpha \geq 3$ and the monotonicity of $m(2am + 4a - b\alpha + b) - 2\alpha(f(m) + 2) + 2b(m+2)$ with respect to $b(\geq 1 - a)$ and $m(\geq 2)$. This completes the proof. \square

3. Proof of Theorem 2 and Corollary 1.1

Proof of Theorem 2. For simplicity, set $\tilde{C}_n := \frac{C_n}{n^\alpha}$ for every $n \geq 1$. By (2.1) and the superior of $\{\tilde{C}_n\}_{n \geq 1}$, we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{C}_n = \sup_{n \geq 1} \tilde{C}_n.$$

Following from (2.3), we have that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{C}_n = \inf_{n \geq 1} \tilde{C}_n$$

and the limit $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{C}_{[um^k]_{m+1}}$ exists for each $u \in \cup_{\ell \geq 0} \Sigma_m^\ell$.

Set $E := \{\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{C}_{[um^k]_{m+1}} : u \in \cup_{\ell \geq 0} \Sigma_m^\ell\}$. Fixed any $\gamma \in (\inf_{n \geq 1} \tilde{C}_n, \sup_{n \geq 1} \tilde{C}_n) \setminus E$, we will construct a subsequence $\{\tilde{C}_{n_k}\}_{k \geq 1}$ of $\{\tilde{C}_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ converging to γ . Let k_0 and k_1 be defined as Proposition 2.3 and Proposition 2.4 respectively. Set $k_2 := \max\{k_0, k_1\}$ and $L(\gamma) := \{\tilde{C}_\xi : \xi \in \{1, \dots, m\}, \tilde{C}_\xi \geq \gamma\}$. Now we take

$$n_1 := \min \left\{ \epsilon \in \{1, \dots, m\} : \tilde{C}_\epsilon = \min L(\gamma) \right\},$$

and $n_k = (m+1)^{k-1} n_1$ for $2 \leq k \leq k_2$. Assume that $n_k (k \geq k_2)$ has been chosen. We will choose n_{k+1} recursively as follows:

$$n_{k+1} = (m+1)n_k + \max \left\{ \epsilon \in \{0, 1, \dots, m\} : \tilde{C}_{(m+1)n_k + \epsilon} \geq \gamma \right\}.$$

Then we have that for every $k \geq 1$,

$$\tilde{C}_{n_{k+1}} \leq \tilde{C}_{n_k}.$$

This implies that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{C}_{n_k}$ exists and is larger than γ . Now it suffices to show that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{C}_{n_k} \leq \gamma.$$

Define the set

$$\mathcal{S} := \{k \in \mathbb{N} : n_k \not\equiv m \pmod{m+1}\}.$$

Note that \mathcal{S} is non-empty. We claim that \mathcal{S} is infinite. Otherwise if it is finite, then there exists k^* such that for every $k \geq k^*$, $n_{k+1} = (m+1)n_k + m$. This contradicts with the value of γ . By Proposition 2.4, we have that for every $k \geq k_2$,

$$\tilde{C}_{(m+1)n_k} > \tilde{C}_{(m+1)n_{k+1}} > \dots > \tilde{C}_{(m+1)n_{k+m}}.$$

Hence that there exist infinite $k \geq k_2$ such that $\tilde{C}_{(m+1)n_k + m} < \gamma$. i.e.,

$$\frac{(f(m)+1)C_{n_k} + f(m)}{((m+1)n_k + m)^\alpha} < \gamma.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{C}_{n_k} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{C_{n_k}}{n_k^\alpha} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(f(m)+1)C_{n_k} + f(m)}{((m+1)n_k + m)^\alpha} \leq \gamma.$$

This completes the proof. \square

Now we can prove Corollary 1.1.

Proof of Corollary 1.1. Recall that $d(x) := \frac{\mu_{\mathfrak{C}}([0, x])}{x^{1/\alpha}}$. Note that $S_0(0) = 0$ and $S_m(1) = 1$. By blow-up principle in [2, Lemma 2.1], we have

$$\{d(x) : x \in (0, 1]\} = \left\{ d(x) : x \in \left[\frac{1}{f(m)+1}, 1 \right] \right\}.$$

Since $d(x)$ is continuous, the minimum and maximum of $d(x)$ on the interval $[\frac{1}{f(m)+1}, 1]$ are attained, denoted by $d(x_m)$ and $d(x_M)$ respectively. Then we have that x_m and x_M are both contained in the set $\mathfrak{C} \cap [\frac{1}{f(m)+1}, 1]$. On the other hand, using the same argument of (1.2) or [5, Corollary 1.3], we have that

$$\left\{ \frac{x}{\mu_{\mathfrak{C}}^\alpha([0, x])} : x \in \mathfrak{C} \cap \left[\frac{f(1)}{f(m)+1}, 1 \right] \right\} = \left[\inf_{n \geq 1} \frac{C_n}{n^\alpha}, \sup_{n \geq 1} \frac{C_n}{n^\alpha} \right].$$

In other words, we have

$$\left\{ d(x) : x \in \left[\frac{1}{f(m)+1}, 1 \right] \cap \mathfrak{C} \right\} = \left[\inf_{n \geq 1} \frac{n}{C_n^{1/\alpha}}, \sup_{n \geq 1} \frac{n}{C_n^{1/\alpha}} \right].$$

This implies that

$$\{d(x) : x \in (0, 1]\} = \left\{ d(x) : x \in \left[\frac{1}{f(m)+1}, 1 \right] \cap \mathfrak{C} \right\}.$$

Hence that

$$\left[\liminf_{x \rightarrow 0^+} d(x), \limsup_{x \rightarrow 0^+} d(x) \right] \subset \{d(x) : x \in (0, 1]\}.$$

Following from the fact that $d\left(\frac{x}{(f(m)+1)^k}\right) = d(x)$ for any $k \geq 1$ and $x \in (0, 1]$, we have

$$\{d(x) : x \in (0, 1]\} \subset \left[\liminf_{x \rightarrow 0^+} d(x), \limsup_{x \rightarrow 0^+} d(x) \right].$$

This completes the proof. \square

4. The limit function induced by Cantor-integers

First we prove the existence of $\lambda(x) := \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{C_{(m+1)^k x}}{((m+1)^k x)^\alpha}$ for every $x > 0$. In fact, we claim that

$$\lambda(x) = \frac{C_x}{x^\alpha} + \frac{\sum_{r=1}^{\infty} f(\epsilon_r)(f(m)+1)^{-r}}{x^\alpha}, \quad (4.1)$$

where $x = [\epsilon_{-\ell} \cdots \epsilon_0. \epsilon_1 \epsilon_2 \cdots]_{m+1} := \sum_{r=-\ell}^{\infty} \epsilon_r (m+1)^{-r}$ with $\epsilon_r \in \Sigma_m$ for each $r \geq -\ell$. In fact, $[(m+1)^k x] = [\epsilon_{-\ell} \cdots \epsilon_0 \epsilon_1 \cdots \epsilon_k]_{m+1}$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{C_{(m+1)^k x}}{((m+1)^k x)^\alpha} &= \frac{(f(m)+1)^k C_{[\epsilon_{-\ell} \cdots \epsilon_0]_{m+1}} + \sum_{r=1}^k f(\epsilon_r)(f(m)+1)^{k-r}}{(f(m)+1)^k x^\alpha} \\ &= \frac{C_x + \sum_{r=1}^k f(\epsilon_r)(f(m)+1)^{-r}}{x^\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies (4.1) holds. There are some observations for $\lambda(x)$.

- For every positive integer n , we have $\lambda(n) = \frac{C_n}{n^\alpha}$.
- For every real number $x > 0$, we have

$$\lambda((m+1)x) = \lambda(x). \quad (4.2)$$

We know that the $(m+1)$ -expansion is unique by excluding the expansions with a tail of (m) s. Recall that a real number x is called $(m+1)$ -rational if its $(m+1)$ -expansion is finite, otherwise x is called $(m+1)$ -irrational. By (4.2), without loss of generality we can always assume that $x \in [1, m+1)$. For simplicity, define a function

$$D(x) := \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} f(\epsilon_r)(f(m)+1)^{-r} \text{ for } x = \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \epsilon_r(m+1)^{-r} \text{ with } \epsilon_r \in \Sigma_m. \quad (4.3)$$

Let $\mathfrak{C} := \mathfrak{C}_{m,f}$ and $\mu_{\mathfrak{C}}$ be defined as in (1.3) and (1.4) respectively, define a function $g_{\mathfrak{C}} : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ by

$$g_{\mathfrak{C}}(t) := \mu_{\mathfrak{C}}([0, t]),$$

which is a generalization of the Cantor function since $g_{\mathfrak{C}}(t)$ is the Cantor function if \mathfrak{C} is the middle-thirds Cantor set. Equivalently,

$$g_{\mathfrak{C}}(t) = \begin{cases} \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \epsilon_r(m+1)^{-r}, & t = \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} f(\epsilon_r)(f(m)+1)^{-r} \in \mathfrak{C} \text{ for } \epsilon_r \in \Sigma_m, \\ \sup_{y \leq t, y \in \mathfrak{C}} g_{\mathfrak{C}}(y), & t \in [0, 1] \setminus \mathfrak{C}. \end{cases}$$

It is not hard to check that $D(x) = \sup\{t \in [0, 1] : g_{\mathfrak{C}}(t) \leq x\}$. Hence the function $D(x)$ is an inversion of the generalized Cantor function in some sense. Since $D(x)$ is strictly increasing, it is differentiable almost everywhere by the Lebesgue theorem about monotone function. This implies $\lambda(x)$ is also differentiable almost everywhere. Moreover, for the continuity of $\lambda(x)$, we have the following explicit result by [5, Remark 2].

Proposition 4.1. (i) *The function $\lambda(x)$ is continuous at every positive $(m+1)$ -irrational number.*

(ii) *The function $\lambda(x)$ is right continuous at every $(m+1)$ -rational number, and $\lambda(x)$ is left continuous at $x_0 = [\epsilon_0.\epsilon_1\epsilon_2\cdots\epsilon_n]_{m+1}$ if and only if $\epsilon_n \in \{r \in \Sigma_m^+ : \Delta f(r) = 1\}$.*

At the same time, $\lambda(x)$ satisfies $(\alpha - \delta)$ -Hölder condition almost everywhere for every sufficiently small $\delta > 0$. To prove this, first we give the definition of normality.

Definition 4.1. *Let $\ell \geq 1$, and let B_{ℓ} be a block of ℓ digits to the base $(m+1)$ (recall that $m \geq 1$). Also let $x_0 = [x_0] + \sum_{r \geq 1} \epsilon_r(m+1)^{-r}$, and denote by $N(k, B_{\ell})$ the number of occurrences of the block B_{ℓ} in the initial block $\epsilon_1\epsilon_2\cdots\epsilon_k$ of $x_0 - [x_0]$. Then x_0 is normal if and only if*

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N(k, B_{\ell})}{k} = \frac{1}{(m+1)^{\ell}},$$

for all $\ell \geq 1$ and all blocks B_{ℓ} of length ℓ .

It is well-known that almost all positive real numbers are normal. Now we have the following result.

Proposition 4.2. *If x_0 is normal to the base $(m+1)$, then we have that for every sufficiently small $\delta > 0$,*

$$|\lambda(x_0 + h) - \lambda(x_0)| = \mathcal{O}(|h|^{\alpha-\delta}), \text{ as } h \rightarrow 0,$$

where the implied constant depends only on x_0 .

Proof. It suffices to show that $|D(x_0 + h) - D(x_0)| = \mathcal{O}(|h|^{\alpha-\delta})$ as $h \rightarrow 0$. Let $x_0 = [x_0] + \sum_{r \geq 1} \epsilon_r (m+1)^{-r}$, and assume $(m+1)^{-(n+1)} \leq h < (m+1)^{-n}$ for some $n \geq 1$. Then

$$h = \sum_{r \geq n+1} h_r (m+1)^{-r}, 0 \leq h_r \leq m, h_{n+1} \neq 0.$$

Then

$$x_0 + h = [x_0] + \sum_{r=1}^n \epsilon_r (m+1)^{-r} + \sum_{r \geq n+1} (\epsilon_r + h_r) (m+1)^{-r}.$$

There may be a carry into the n -th place in the right of the above equation. We need to estimate how long the carrying continues. Fixed any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, we may choose n_0 and $B_\ell := m^\ell$ (i.e., the ℓ consecutive block of m 's) such that $\frac{2}{(m+1)^\ell} + \frac{\ell}{n_0} < \frac{\delta}{\alpha}$ and

$$N(k, B_\ell) < \frac{2}{(m+1)^\ell} k, \text{ for } k \geq n_0.$$

Hence if $n \geq n_0$, then there exists $t \in (1 - \delta/\alpha, 1)$ such that the number of occurrences of the block B_ℓ for ϵ_r between tn and n is at most

$$\frac{2}{(m+1)^\ell} n < (1-t)n - \ell.$$

Hence there is $r_0 > tn$ for which $\epsilon_{r_0} \neq m$, and this implies that

$$x_0 + h = [x_0] + \sum_{r=1}^{r_0-1} \epsilon_r (m+1)^{-r} + \sum_{r \geq r_0} \epsilon_r^* (m+1)^{-r}$$

where $\epsilon_r^* \in \Sigma_m$ are digits. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} |D(x_0 + h) - D(x_0)| &= \left| \sum_{r \geq r_0} (f(\epsilon_r) - f(\epsilon_r^*)) (f(m) + 1)^{-r} \right| \\ &\leq (f(m) + 1)^{-tn} = (m+1)^{-tan} \leq (1 + f(m)) h^{t\alpha} \leq (1 + f(m)) h^{\alpha-\delta}, \end{aligned}$$

for $n \geq n_0$. Thus

$$|D(x_0 + h) - D(x_0)| = \mathcal{O}(h^{\alpha-\delta}), \text{ as } h \rightarrow 0^+.$$

A similar discussion shows that for every $h > 0$,

$$|D(x_0 - h) - D(x_0)| = \mathcal{O}(h^{\alpha-\delta}), \text{ as } h \rightarrow 0^+.$$

This completes the proof. \square

Proposition 4.3. *The function $\lambda(x)$ has the logarithmic Fourier series expansion*

$$\lambda(x) \sim \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} c_n e^{2\pi i \log x / \log(m+1)} \quad (4.4)$$

where

$$c_n = \frac{1}{\log(m+1)} \int_1^{m+1} \frac{\lambda(x)}{x^{1-\alpha+\gamma_n}} dx \text{ with } \gamma_n := \alpha + \frac{2\pi ni}{\log(m+1)}, \quad (4.5)$$

and where the infinite series converges to $\lambda(x)$ in the sense of Cesàro sum at each continuity point as in Proposition 4.1. Moreover, $c_n = \mathcal{O}(1/|n|)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ or $n \rightarrow -\infty$.

Proof. Let $g(x) := \lambda((m+1)^{x/(2\pi)})$. Then $g(x)$ has the period 2π and thus g has a Fourier series

$$g(x) \sim \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} c_n e^{in\theta}, \text{ with } c_n = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} g(\theta) e^{-in\theta} d\theta,$$

Then by [12, Theorem 5.2 in p. 53], we have that the infinite series converges to $g(x)$ in the sense of Cesàro sum at each point x_0 which makes $(m+1)^{x_0/(2\pi)}$ be a continuity point as in Proposition 4.1. Using $\lambda(x) = g(2\pi \log x / \log(m+1))$, this easily yields the desired result. Recall that $D(x)$ is monotone, it follows from [13] that $c_n = \mathcal{O}(1/|n|)$. \square

5. Proof of Theorem 3

Following from [7, Theorem 2.1] with the case $m = 1$, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $c_j \neq 0$ lie in the half-plane of absolute convergence of $\sum_k v_k k^{-s}$. Then we have*

$$\sum_{1 \leq k < n} v_k \left(1 - \frac{k}{n}\right) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{c-i\infty}^{c+i\infty} \left(\sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{v_k}{k^s} \right) n^s \frac{ds}{s(s+1)}$$

Consequently, we have the following identity (cf. [7, Equation (2.6)]).

$$\int_{-1/4-i\infty}^{-1/4+i\infty} \zeta(s) n^s \frac{ds}{s(s+1)} = 0. \quad (5.1)$$

Proof of Theorem 3. Recall that $\Delta C_n := C_n - C_{n-1}$ with $n \geq 1$. It is not hard to get that for every $n \geq 1$,

$$\Delta C_{(m+1)n} = (f(m) + 1)\Delta C_n - f(m),$$

and for every $n \geq 0$ and every $r \in \{1, \dots, m\}$,

$$\Delta C_{(m+1)n+r} = \Delta f(r).$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\Delta C_n}{n^s} &= \sum_{r=1}^m \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\Delta f(r)}{((m+1)n+r)^s} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(f(m)+1)\Delta C_n - f(m)}{((m+1)n)^s} \\ &= \sum_{r=1}^m \frac{\Delta f(r)}{(m+1)^s} \zeta\left(s, \frac{r}{m+1}\right) + \frac{f(m)+1}{(m+1)^s} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\Delta C_n}{n^s} - \frac{f(m)}{(m+1)^s} \zeta(s). \end{aligned}$$

Hence that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\Delta C_n}{n^s} = \frac{\sum_{r=1}^m \Delta f(r) \zeta\left(s, \frac{r}{m+1}\right) - f(m) \zeta(s)}{(f(m)+1)((m+1)^{s-\alpha} - 1)}.$$

By Lemma 5.1, with $v_k = \Delta C_k$, for any $c > \alpha + 1$, we have

$$\frac{S(n)}{n} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{c-i\infty}^{c+i\infty} \frac{\sum_{r=1}^m \Delta f(r) \zeta\left(s, \frac{r}{m+1}\right) - f(m) \zeta(s)}{(f(m)+1)((m+1)^{s-\alpha} - 1)} n^s \frac{ds}{s(s+1)} \quad (5.2)$$

The integrand in (5.2) has simple poles at $s = 0$, $s = 1$ and $s = \gamma_k$ for every $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Shifting the line of integration to $\operatorname{Re} s = -\frac{1}{4}$ and taking residue into account, we get

$$\frac{S(n)}{n} = \frac{\sum_{r=1}^m f(r)}{(m+1)f(m)} - 2 + F(\log_{m+1}^n) + R(n), \quad (5.3)$$

where the Fourier series of $F(u)$ is

$$\frac{n^\alpha}{(f(m)+1) \log(m+1)} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{\sum_{r=1}^m \Delta f(r) \zeta\left(\gamma_k, \frac{r}{m+1}\right) - f(m) \zeta(\gamma_k)}{\gamma_k(\gamma_k+1)} e^{2\pi i k u},$$

which is the sum of residues of the integrand at the poles $s = \gamma_k$. We still have to analyse the remainder term

$$R(n) := \frac{1}{2\pi i (f(m)+1)} \int_{-1/4-i\infty}^{-1/4+i\infty} \frac{\sum_{r=1}^m \Delta f(r) \zeta\left(s, \frac{r}{m+1}\right) - f(m) \zeta(s)}{(m+1)^{s-\alpha} - 1} n^s \frac{ds}{s(s+1)}.$$

The integral converges since $|\zeta(-\frac{1}{4} + it, a) - a^{\frac{1}{4}-it}| \ll |t|^{3/4}$ where the constant does not depend on a and t (cf. [1, Theorem 12.23]). Using the expansion

$$\frac{1}{(m+1)^{s-\alpha} - 1} = -1 - (m+1)^{s-\alpha} - (m+1)^{2s-2\alpha} - (m+1)^{3s-3\alpha} - \dots,$$

in the integrand of $R(n)$, which is legitimate since $\operatorname{Re}(s - \alpha) < 0$. By (5.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} R(n) &= \frac{1}{2\pi i (f(m)+1)} \int_{-1/4-i\infty}^{-1/4+i\infty} \frac{\sum_{r=1}^m \Delta f(r) \zeta\left(s, \frac{r}{m+1}\right)}{(m+1)^{s-\alpha} - 1} n^s \frac{ds}{s(s+1)} \\ &= - \sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{\sum_{r=1}^m \Delta f(r) R'((m+1)^k n, r)}{(f(m)+1)^{k+1}}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$R'(n, r) := \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{-1/4-i\infty}^{-1/4+i\infty} \zeta\left(s, \frac{r}{m+1}\right) n^s \frac{ds}{s(s+1)}$$

Applying [7, Equation (2.3)] by setting $\lambda_k \equiv 1$, $\mu_k \equiv k + \frac{r}{m+1}$, $x \equiv n^{-1}$ and $f(x) \equiv (1-x)H_0(x)$, we have

$$\sum_{1 \leq k < n} \left(1 - \frac{k + \frac{r}{m+1}}{n}\right) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{3/2-i\infty}^{3/2+i\infty} \zeta\left(s, \frac{r}{m+1}\right) n^s \frac{ds}{s(s+1)}.$$

Shifting the the contour of $R'(n, r)$ back to $\text{Re } s = \frac{3}{2}$, by taking into account the residue at $s = 0$ and $s = 1$,

$$R'(n, r) = \frac{n+1}{2} - \frac{r}{m+1} + \sum_{1 \leq k < n} \left(1 - \frac{k + \frac{r}{m+1}}{n}\right) = n - \left(2 - \frac{1}{n}\right) \frac{r}{m+1}.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} R(n) &= - \sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{\sum_{r=1}^m \Delta f(r) \left((m+1)^k n - \left(2 - \frac{1}{(m+1)^k n}\right) \frac{r}{m+1} \right)}{(f(m)+1)^{k+1}} \\ &= -n \frac{f(m)}{f(m)-m} + 2 - \frac{2 \sum_{r=1}^m f(r)}{f(m)(m+1)} - \frac{1}{n} \frac{f(m)(m+1) - \sum_{r=1}^m f(r)}{f(m)(m+1) + m} \end{aligned}$$

Substituting $R(n)$ into (5.3), the proof is complete. \square

Acknowledgments. The first author thanks C.-Y. Cao for her valuable discussion. The work is supported by NSFC (Grant No. 11701202).

References

- [1] Tom M. Apostol, Introduction to analytic number theory, Springer New York, 1976.
- [2] E. Ayer and R. Strichartz, Exact Hausdorff measure and intervals of maximum density for Cantor sets, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 351(9):3725-3741, 1999.
- [3] J. Brillhart, P. Erdős and P. Morton, On sums of Rudin-Shapiro coefficients II, Pacific J. Math. 107(1):39-69, 1983.
- [4] C.-Y. Cao and H.-H. Li, Asymptotic behaviour of a class of Cantor-integers, Mathematica Applicata [In Press].
- [5] C.-Y. Cao and J. Yu, On the distribution of the linear Cantor-integers, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2209.05119>.
- [6] D.-J. Feng, S. Hua and Z.-Y. Wen. The pointwise densities of the Cantor measure, J. Math. Anal. Appl., 250(2):692-705, 2000.
- [7] Ph. Flajolet, P. Grabner, P. Kirschenhofer, H. Prodinger and R. F. Tichy, Mellin transforms and asymptotics: digital sums, Theoret. Comput. Sci. 123:291-314, 1994.
- [8] M. Gawron and M. Ulas, On the formal inverse of the Prouhet-Thue-Morse sequence, Discrete Math. 339:1459-1470, 2016.
- [9] X.-T. Lü, J. Chen, Z.-X. Wen and W. Wu, Limit behavior of the quasi-linear discrete functions, Fractals, 28(3):2050041, 2020.
- [10] D.-R. Kong, W.-X. Li and Y.-Y. Yao, Pointwise densities of homogeneous Cantor measure and critical values, Nonlinearity, 34(4):2350-2380, 2021.
- [11] N. J. A. Sloane, On-Line Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences, <https://oeis.org>.
- [12] E. M. Stein and R. Shakarchi, Fourier analysis: an introduction. Princeton University Press, New Jersey, 2003.
- [13] M. Taibleson, Fourier coefficients of functions of bounded variation, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 18:766, 1967.