HAUSDORFF DIMENSION FOR THE WEIGHTED PRODUCTS OF MULTIPLE DIGITS IN d-DECAYING GAUSS LIKE SYSTEMS

AYREENA BAKHTAWAR AND MICHAŁ RAMS

ABSTRACT. We compute the Hausdorff dimension of sets defined by the growth of weighted products of multiple digits at arbitrary positions in d-decaying Gauss-like iterated function systems. We provide the complete Hausdorff dimensional result for product of more than two digits, which was an open problem even for consecutive digits in the classical Gauss map and Lüroth map. In our approach we do not need to assume the Bounded Distortion Property (BDP).

1. Introduction

The study of infinite iterated function systems (iIFS) on the unit interval represents a rich intersection of ergodic theory, number theory, and fractal geometry. A particularly important class are the d-decaying systems, characterized by a polynomial decay rate in the derivatives of the generating maps. The foundational work in this area was established by Mauldin and Urbański [14, 15] on infinite conformal iterated function systems, and later specialized by Jordan and Rams [10] in their study of d-decaying systems.

In this article, we work within the following framework. Denote by $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, \dots, \}$ the set of positive integers. Let d > 1 be a real number. A family $\{T_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ of C^1 expanding maps given by $T_n : [0, 1] \to [0, 1]$ is called d|-decaying Gauss-like iterated function systems if the following properties are satisfied:

- (i) Open set condition: For any $i \neq j \in \mathbb{N}$, $T_i(0,1) \cap T_i(0,1) = \emptyset$;
- (ii) $\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} T_i([0,1]) = [0,1);$
- (iii) if $T_i(x) < T_j(x)$ for all $x \in (0,1)$ then i < j;
- (iv) there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and a real number 0 < h < 1 such that for all $(a_1, \dots, a_m) \in \mathbb{N}^m$ and $x \in [0, 1]$

$$0 < |(T_{a_1} \circ \cdots \circ T_{a_m})'| \le h < 1;$$

(v) for any $\varepsilon > 0$, we have constants $K_1 = K_1(\varepsilon)$, $K_2 = K_2(\varepsilon) > 0$, such that for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists ζ_i, λ_i such that for all $x \in [0, 1]$,

$$\zeta_i \le |T_i'(x)| \le \lambda_i \text{ and } \frac{K_1}{i^{d+\varepsilon}} \le \zeta_i \le \lambda_i \le \frac{K_2}{i^{d-\varepsilon}}.$$

The research of A.B. is partially supported by the research project 'Dynamics and Information Research Institute - Quantum Information, Quantum Technologies' within the agreement between UniCredit Bank and Scuola Normale Superiore (SNS), Pisa. The first author also acknowledges the support of the Centro di Ricerca Matematica Ennio de Giorgi, SNS and the Institute of Mathematics, Polish Academy of Sciences for providing excellent working conditions. The authors thank the ERDÖS Center Budapest for their hospitality during the Workshop on Dimension Theory of Fractals 2024, where some of the discussions were initiated.

This definition, a natural generalization of the Gauss map and its several modifications, follows the framework established by Jordan and Rams [10] and further developed by Liao and Rams [13]. We emphasize that while some systems in this class satisfy the Bounded Distortion Property (BDP), in general it does not hold. However, all d-decaying Gauss-like iterated function systems satisfy certain weaker distortion property, see Proposition 2.1, and it is sufficient for our purposes: we prove first the existence of the geometric pressure and then our dimensional result using only Almost Tempered Distortion.

With the above definition, clearly there is a natural projection $\Pi: \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}} \to [0,1]$ defined by

$$\Pi(\underline{a}) = \lim_{n \to \infty} T_{a_1} \circ \cdots \circ T_{a_n}(1)$$

which gives the symbolic expansion $\underline{a}=(a_1(x),a_2(x),\cdots)$ of any point $x\in[0,1]$. Such a symbolic expansion is uniquely defined except for countably many points. We will denote by $\Lambda=\Pi(N^N)$, the attractor of the IFS. For any $(a_1,a_2,\cdots,a_n)\in\mathbb{N}^n$, the set

$$C_n[a_1, \cdots, a_n] = T_{a_1} \circ \cdots \circ T_{a_n}([0, 1])$$

is called an *n*th level cylinder, it is the set of points in [0,1] whose symbolic expansion begin with a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n . For simplicity denote $C[a_1^n] := C_n[a_1, \dots, a_n]$. Denote by |I| the diameter of the interval I. Let $D[a_1 \dots a_n] = \bigcup_{i > a_n} C[a_1 \dots a_{n-1}i]$.

It can be derived from the conditions (iv) and (v) in the definition of d-decaying Gauss like iterated function systems that

(1.1)
$$K_1^n \prod_{i=1}^n a_i^{-d} \le |C[a_1^n]| \le K_2^n \prod_{i=1}^n a_i^{-d}.$$

Both continued fraction and Lüroth system are special 2-decaying Gauss like iterated function systems.

In the context of infinite iterated function systems, the digits $(a_n(x))_{n\geq 1}$ in the symbolic expansion of a point x can attain arbitrarily large values. This naturally leads to the question of describing the sets of points for which the symbolic expansion grows at prescribed speed, see for example [10, 13], or grows with prescribed speed over certain subsequence, which is the setting investigated in particular by [4, 17, 18].

In the recent years in metric Diophantine approximation, the study of products of digits in the context of continued fraction has become an emerging topic, largely motivated by the work of Kleinbock and Wadleigh [11]. They showed that improvability of Dirichlet's Theorem is linked to the growth of products of consecutive continued fraction digits. This foundational result has since motivated a broad investigation into the metric properties of consecutive digit products in continued fractions and Lüroth expansion with significant contributions in [1, 2, 3, 8, 12, 16]. In particular, the following sets were investigated in [8] and [2], respectively:

$$E_1 = \left\{ x \in [0, 1]; \prod_{m=1}^k a_{n+m}(x) \ge B^n \text{ for infinitely many } n \in \mathbb{N} \right\}$$

and

$$E_2 = \left\{ x \in [0,1]; a_n^{t_0} a_{n+1}^{t_1} \ge B^n \text{ for infinitely many } n \in \mathbb{N} \right\}.$$

We consider, as the natural generalization, the limsup set of weighted products of multiple digits at arbitrary positions. To be more precise: let $B \in (1, \infty)$, let i_1, \ldots, i_k be a finite increasing sequence of

integers, let t_1, \ldots, t_k be positive reals. We denote

$$E = \left\{ x \in [0,1]; \prod_{m=1}^k a_{n+i_m}^{t_m}(x) \ge B^n \text{ for infinitely many } n \in \mathbb{N} \right\}.$$

Moreover, to avoid the necessity of proving the results separately for Gauss map, Lüroth map, and so on, we investigate this set in the general setting of d-decaying Gauss-like iterated function systems. This involves developing the distortion theory of d-decaying Gauss-like systems, which might be of independent interest.

To state the main theorem, we introduce some necessary notations. Let

$$S = \{(b_1, \dots, b_k); b_i \ge 0 \ \forall i, \sum_{i=1}^k b_i t_i = 1\}$$

be a simplex. For $b \in S$ and $1 \le m \le k$ we denote

$$A_m(b,s) = (d-1)sb_m + (ds-1)\sum_{j=1}^{m-1} b_j,$$

and let

(1.2)
$$A(b,s) = \max_{1 \le m \le k} A_m(b,s).$$

The function A(b, s) is positive, continuous with respect to b and continuous and increasing with respect to s. Let

$$A(s) = \min_{b \in S} A(b, s).$$

This function A(s) is also positive, continuous, and increasing.

Our main result is:

Theorem 1.1. The Hausdorff dimension of the set E is given by

$$\dim_H E = s_0 \text{ where } s_0 := \inf\{s; P(s) \le A(s) \log B\},\$$

where P denotes the pressure function defined in subsection 2.2.

We note that $1/d \le s_0 < 1$.

Computing the Hausdorff dimension of a set is typically accomplished in two step: obtaining the upper and lower bounds separately. The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we prove some technical results which are the key to the proof of our main theorem, including the distortion properties and the construction of pressure function. Sections 3 and 4 are devoted to the proofs of the upper bound and lower bound, respectively, for $\dim_H E$ in Theorem 1.1.

2. Preliminaries

Throughout this section, we fix the following notation. Let \mathbb{N} be the set of natural numbers and let $\Omega^{\mathbb{N}} = \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ denote the space of all infinite sequences, and $\Omega^n = \mathbb{N}^n$ be the space of finite words of length n.

2.1. **Distortion.** We denote the distortion of a map T_i by

$$Dist(T_i) := \sup_{x,y} \frac{|T_i'(x)|}{|T_i'(y)|}.$$

There are several notions of distortion bounds applicable to iterated function systems:

• Bounded Distortion: there exists K > 1 such that for all n, all $\omega \in \Omega^n$, and $x, y \in C[\omega]$

$$K^{-1} \le \frac{|T'_{\omega}(x)|}{|T'_{\omega}(y)|} \le K,$$

• Tempered Distortion: there exists a function $\rho: \mathbb{N} \to [0, \infty), \frac{1}{n}\rho(n) \to 0$, such that for all n, all $\omega \in \Omega^n$, and $x, y \in C[\omega]$

$$e^{-\rho(n)} \le \frac{|T'_{\omega}(x)|}{|T'_{\omega}(y)|} \le e^{\rho(n)},$$

We will add one more definition to the list: the iterated function system satisfies Almost Tempered Distortion if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a function $\rho^{(\varepsilon)} : \mathbb{N} \to [0, \infty), \frac{1}{n} \rho^{(\varepsilon)}(n) \to 0$, such that for all n, all $\omega \in \Omega^n$, and $x, y \in C[\omega]$

$$e^{-\rho^{(\varepsilon)}(n)}|(T^n)'(x)|^{-\varepsilon} \le \frac{|(T^n)'(x)|}{|(T^n)'(y)|} \le e^{\rho^{(\varepsilon)}(n)}|(T^n)'(x)|^{\varepsilon}.$$

Proposition 2.1. The Gauss-like d-decaying iterated function system satisfies Almost Tempered Distortion. The Gauss-like d-decaying iterated function system restricted to finitely many symbols (that is, with $\omega \in \{1, ..., M\}^n$ for some fixed M) satisfies Tempered Distortion. If in addition we assume T is $C^{1+\operatorname{Holder}}$ then it satisfies Bounded Distortion.

Proof. The third assertion is well known, the second can be checked for example in [9]. We only need to check the first.

Fix ε . Fix some M such that $K(\varepsilon) < M^{\varepsilon}$. We have

$$\log \frac{|(T^n)'(x)|}{|(T^n)'(y)|} = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \log \frac{|T'(T^i x)|}{|T'(T^i y)|}$$

and we will divide the sum into two subsums, over i such that $\omega_i \leq M$ and over i for which $\omega_i > M$. The former subsum is subexponentially bounded for the same reason as in [9]: the distances $|T^{n-i}x-T^{n-i}y|$ decrease to zero uniformly, $\log |T'|$ is a continuous function, and the union of domains of T_i ; $i = 1, \ldots, M$ is compact.

In the latter subsum we have $\omega_i > M$, and hence

$$|\log |T'(T^ix)| - \log |T'(T^iy)|| \le \log (K(\varepsilon)^2 \omega_i^{2\varepsilon}) \le \log |T'(T^ix)|^{4\varepsilon/(d-2\varepsilon)}$$

By choosing ε sufficiently small, so is $4\varepsilon/(d-2\varepsilon)$, and we are done.

2.2. **Pressure.** A central object in the thermodynamic formalism of dynamical systems is the topological pressure. In the context of conformal iterated function systems, it provides a powerful tool for analyzing the fractal geometry of the limit set. For infinite conformal iterated function systems (satisfying the Bounded Distortion Property), the existence and properties of the pressure function are well-established see Hanus- Mauldin-Urbański [7], Mauldin-Urbański [14], or their monograph [15]. These classical results guarantee that the limit defining the pressure exists and yields a convex, analytic function.

However, since our framework encompasses general d-decaying Gauss-like systems where BDP may fail, we cannot directly apply these classical theorems. The existence of the pressure limit is no longer guaranteed a priori. Therefore, we must develop an independent approach to establish the foundational thermodynamics for our setting.

We now construct the pressure function and prove its key properties. For a real parameter s, and a finite word $\omega = (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n) \in \Omega^n$, we define the potential

$$\phi_s(\omega) = s \log |C([\omega])|.$$

The n-th partition function is defined as

$$Z_n(s) = \sum_{|\omega|=n} e^{\phi_s(\omega)} = \sum_{|\omega|=n} |C([\omega])|^s.$$

and let

$$P_n(s) = \frac{1}{n} \log Z_n(s).$$

Observe that $Z_n(s)$, $P_n(s)$ exist and are finite for any n when s > 1/d. The topological pressure is given by the limit as follows:

$$P(s) = \lim_{n \to \infty} P_n(s) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log Z_n(s).$$

Our immediate goal is to prove the existence of this limit. We begin with establishing basic properties of this topological pressure.

Lemma 2.2. The function P_n is a convex, differentiable, and decreasing function of s in the range $s \in (1/d, +\infty)$.

Proof. The function P_n is decreasing in s since $|C[\omega]| < 1$. It therefore suffices to prove convexity and differentiability. For this, we analyze the derivatives of $Z_n(s)$. Let us define the following sums:

$$S_0 = Z_n(s), \quad S_1 = \sum_{|\omega|=n} |C([\omega])|^s \log |C([\omega])|, \quad \text{and} \quad S_2 = \sum_{|\omega|=n} |C([\omega])|^s (\log |C([\omega]))^2.$$

We have

$$\frac{d}{ds}\log S_0 = \frac{dS_0/ds}{S_0} = \frac{S_1}{S_0}$$

and

$$\frac{d^2}{ds^2}\log S_0 = \frac{d}{ds}\frac{S_1}{S_0} = \frac{S_0 dS_1/ds - S_1 dS_0/ds}{S_0^2} = \frac{S_0 S_2 - S_1^2}{S_0^2}.$$

Obviously, $S_0^2 > 0$. As for the numerator,

$$S_0 S_2 - S_1^2 = \sum_{|\omega| = n} \sum_{|\tau| = n} |C([\omega])|^s |C([\tau])|^s ((\log |C([\omega])|)^2 + (\log |C([\tau])|)^2 - 2\log |C([\omega])| \log |C([\tau])|)$$

$$= \sum_{|\omega| = n} \sum_{|\tau| = n} |C([\omega])|^s |C([\tau])|^s (\log |C([\omega])| - \log |C([\tau])|)^2 \ge 0.$$

Thus, $\log Z_n(s)$ is a convex differentiable function of s. Consequently it follows that $P_n(s)$ is also convex differentiable.

We now prove a uniform Lipschitz estimate. This uniformity is essential for the proof of the existence of pressure function.

Lemma 2.3. For every s > 1/d, there exist z = z(s) such that for every $\delta < (s-1/d)/2$ and for every n, we have

$$|P_n(s-\delta) - P_n(s)| \le z\delta$$

and

$$|P_n(s+\delta) - P_n(s)| \le z\delta.$$

Proof. Fix s > 1/d. Let $s_0 = (s + 1/d)/2$ and $\varepsilon < d - 1/s_0$. We have

$$P_n(s_0) \le \log \sum_i (K_2(\varepsilon)i^{-d+\varepsilon})^{s_0} =: R_1$$

and

$$P_n(s) \ge \log \sum_i (K_1(\varepsilon)i^{-d-\varepsilon})^s =: R_2.$$

for every $t \in [s_0, s]$ we have

$$P_n(t) - P_n(s) \le (s - t) \frac{R_1 - R_2}{s - s_0}$$

and for every t > s we have

$$P_n(s) - P_n(t) \le (s - t) \frac{R_1 - R_2}{s - s_0}.$$

As the function P_n is decreasing, this implies the assertion.

Proposition 2.4. The limit

$$P(s) = \lim_{n \to \infty} P_n(s)$$

exists for every s > 1/d.

Proof. Fix s > 1/d. Fix $\varepsilon < s - 1/d$ and some large n. We have

$$Z_{kn}(s) = \sum_{|\omega^{(1)}|=n} \dots \sum_{|\omega^{(k)}|=n} |C([\omega^{(1)} \dots \omega^{(k)}])|^s.$$

Thus, by the Almost Tempered Distortion property,

$$Z_{kn}(s) \le e^{k\rho^{(\varepsilon)}(n)} \cdot \sum_{\omega^{(1)}} |C([\omega^{(1)}])|^{s(1-\varepsilon)} \cdot \ldots \cdot \sum_{\omega^{(k)}} |C([\omega^{(k)}])|^{s(1-\varepsilon)}$$

and

$$Z_{kn}(s) \ge e^{-k\rho^{(\varepsilon)}(n)} \cdot \sum_{\omega^{(1)}} |C([\omega^{(1)}])|^{s(1+\varepsilon)} \cdot \ldots \cdot \sum_{\omega^{(k)}} |C([\omega^{(k)}])|^{s(1+\varepsilon)}.$$

This implies

$$\limsup_{m \to \infty} \frac{1}{m} Z_m(s) \le \frac{1}{n} \rho^{(\varepsilon)}(n) + P_n(s(1 - \varepsilon))$$

and

$$\liminf_{m \to \infty} \frac{1}{m} Z_m(s) \ge -\frac{1}{n} \rho^{(\varepsilon)}(n) + P_n(s(1+\varepsilon)).$$

Therefore, by Lemma 2.3

$$\limsup_{m \to \infty} \frac{1}{m} Z_m(s) - \liminf_{m \to \infty} \frac{1}{m} Z_m(s) \le \frac{2}{n} \rho^{(\varepsilon)}(n) + P_n(s(1-\varepsilon)) - P_n(s(1+\varepsilon)) \le \frac{2}{n} \rho^{(\varepsilon)}(n) + 2z\varepsilon$$

and the right hand side can be made arbitrarily small by choosing sufficiently small ε and then sufficiently large n.

The pressure function P(s), whose existence is guaranteed by Proposition 2.4, inherits the fundamental properties of the approximants $P_n(s)$ and plays a central role in the dimension theory of the attarctor Λ of the iterated function system.

Proposition 2.5 (Properties of Pressure Function). The pressure function $P:(1/d,\infty)\to\mathbb{R}$ satisfies the following:

- i. P(s) is strictly decreasing and strictly convex.
- ii. P is finite for s > 1/d.
- $iii. \lim_{s\to\infty} P(s) = -\infty.$
- iv. P(1)=0.

We now consider finite subsystems. For $M \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\Omega_M^n = \{1, \dots, M\}^n$. Define the

$$P_M(s) = \lim_{n \to \infty} P_{M,n}(s) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log Z_{M,n}(s), \quad \text{where } Z_{M,n}(s) = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega_M^n} |C[\omega]|^s.$$

Therefore, by Proposition 2.4, the limit in the definition of pressure function P_M is guarantee.

The following proposition states that in d-decaying Gauss-like iterated function systems, the pressure function has a continuity property when the full system is approximated by its finite-alphabet subsystems.

Proposition 2.6. For any s > 1/d, the pressure is continuous with respect to the alphabet, i.e.,

$$P(s) = \lim_{M \to \infty} P_M(s).$$

Proof. By definition of Pressure function $P_{M,n}(s) \leq P_n(s)$. Hence $\lim_{n\to\infty} P_{M,n}(s) \leq \lim_{n\to\infty} P_n(s)$. This implies $\lim_{M\to\infty} P_M(s) \leq P(s)$, for every M. Thus

$$\lim_{M \to \infty} P_M(s) \le P(s).$$

To prove the reverse inequality, fix some n and ε and observe that for every M we have

$$\liminf_{m \to \infty} \frac{1}{m} Z_{M,m}(s) \ge -\frac{1}{n} \rho^{(\varepsilon)}(n) + P_{M,n}(s(1+\varepsilon)).$$

Indeed, we have proven this inequality for Z_m in the course of proving Proposition 2.4, and the same proof works for every $Z_{M,m}$. This implies

$$\lim_{M \to \infty} P_M(s) = \lim_{M \to \infty} \lim_{m \to \infty} \frac{1}{m} Z_{M,m}(s) \ge -\frac{1}{n} \rho^{(\varepsilon)}(n) + \lim_{M \to \infty} P_{M,n}(s(1+\varepsilon)) = -\frac{1}{n} \rho^{(\varepsilon)}(n) + P_n(s(1+\varepsilon)).$$

Keeping ε fixed and passing with n to infinity we get

$$\lim_{M \to \infty} P_M(s) \ge \lim_{n \to \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \rho^{(\varepsilon)}(n) + \lim_{n \to \infty} P_n(s(1+\varepsilon)) = P(s(1+\varepsilon)).$$

Passing now with ε to zero, we get

$$\lim_{M \to \infty} P_M(s) \ge \lim_{\varepsilon \searrow 0} P(s(1+\varepsilon)) = P(s).$$

Combining both inequalities we obtained the required result.

We now connect the pressure to the critical exponent s_0 from our main theorem. Let $M \in \mathbb{N}$. Define

$$s_0 = \inf\{s : P(s) \le A(s) \log B\},\$$

$$s_{0,n} = \inf\{s : P_n(s) \le A(s) \log B\},\$$

$$s_0(M) = \inf\{s : P_M(s) \le A(s) \log B\},\$$

Thus it follows from the definition of the pressure function and by Proposition 2.6 that

Lemma 2.7. For any $M \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} s_{0,n} = s_0, \quad \lim_{M \to \infty} s_0(M) = s_0.$$

Moreover, s_0 is continuous and strictly decreasing as a function of B > 1.

The function $s_0(B)$ is decreasing because P(s) is decreasing in s and $A(s) \log B$ is increasing in B. Continuity follows from the continuity and monotonicity of both P(s) and A(s).

Proposition 2.8. As a function of $B \in (0, \infty)$, s_0 satisfy

$$\lim_{B \to \infty} s_0 = \frac{1}{d} \quad and \quad \lim_{B \to 1} s_0 = 1.$$

Proof. As $B \to \infty$, for any fixed s > 1/d, by Proposition 2.5 (ii) P(s) is finite while $A(s) \log B \to \infty$. Thus, for sufficiently large B, $P(s) \le A(s) \log B$. So $s_0 \le s$ for all s < 1/d, which implies $\lim_{B \to \infty} s_0 = 1/d$.

As $B \to 1$, we have $A(s) \log B \to 0$. The condition in the infimum becomes $P(s) \le 0$. By Proposition 2.5, (i) and (iv), P(1) = 0 and P(s) is strictly decreasing, so the unique solution of P(s) = 0 is s = 1. Hence $s_0 \to 1$ as $B \to 1$

2.3. s-measures. In the main body of the paper we will need the following construction. Fix some large $M \in \mathbb{N}$ and consider the restriction of the system to the maps T_1, \ldots, T_M . For any $s \in \mathbb{R}$ we will distribute a measure on the limit set in such a way that for every n and every $\omega \in \Omega_M^n$ the measure $\mu(C[\omega])$ is roughly proportional to $|C[\omega]|^s$.

We will use the *conformal measures*, which in our case means probabilistic measures on the symbolic space $\Omega_M^{\mathbb{N}} = \{1, \dots, M\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ such that for certain continuous potential ϕ we have

$$\mu(TA) = \int_{A} e^{\phi(\omega)} \mu(d\omega)$$

for every measurable set A such that TA is also measurable and $T|_A$ is invertible. In other words, the conformal measure is a measure with prescribed Jacobian. By [5, Theorem 3.12], for any M and any continuous function φ on $\Omega_M^{\mathbb{N}}$, there exists a $(P_M(\varphi) - \varphi)$ -conformal measure on $\Omega_M^{\mathbb{N}}$.

We are going to apply this to the geometric potentials $\varphi_s(\omega) = -s \log |T'(\pi(\omega))|$ for $s \in [0, \infty)$. By the choice of φ_s , we have thus a probabilistic measure on $\Pi(\Omega_M^{\mathbb{N}})$ such that for any n and for any word $\omega \in \Omega_M^n$ we have

$$e^{-nP_M(\varphi_s)} \cdot \min_{x \in C[\omega]} |(T^n)'(x)|^{-s} \le \mu(C[\omega]) \le e^{-nP_M(\varphi_s)} \cdot \max_{x \in C[\omega]} |(T^n)'(x)|^{-s}$$

We now remind that by Proposition 2.1 we have Tempered Distortion. Thus,

$$\frac{\max_{x \in C[\omega]} |(T^n)'(x)|^{-s}}{\min_{x \in C[\omega]} |(T^n)'(x)|^{-s}} < e^{\rho(n)}$$

for certain sublinear function ρ . Thus,

$$\max_{x \in C[\omega]} |(T^n)'(x)|^{-s} \le e^{\rho(n)} \cdot |C[\omega]|^s$$

and

$$\min_{x \in C[\omega]} |(T^n)'(x)|^{-s} \ge e^{-\rho(n)} \cdot |C[\omega]|^s$$

We obtained, for any $s \in [0, \infty)$ and M, a probabilistic measure μ_s satisfying

(2.1)
$$e^{-\rho(n)} \le \frac{\mu_s(C[\omega])}{|C[\omega]|^s \cdot e^{-nP_M(s)}} \le e^{\rho(n)}$$

for certain sublinear function ρ , for all n and all words $\omega \in \{1, \ldots, M\}^n$. We will call it s-measure.

3. Proof of the Upper bound for $\dim_H E$

This section is devoted to establishing the upper bound for $\dim_H E \leq s_0$.

Fix $s \in (s_0, 1)$ and choose small parameters $\delta, \varepsilon > 0$. For large n > 0, we define the set

$$E_n = \left\{ x \in [0, 1]; \prod_{m=1}^k a_{n+i_m}^{t_m}(x) \ge B^n \right\}.$$

Since $E = \limsup_{n \to \infty} E_n$, it suffices to construct for each large n a cover of E_n and use those covers to estimate from above the s-dimensional Hausdorff measure of E. That is, if $E_n \subset \bigcup D_i$ and $\sum |D_i|^s < c \cdot \gamma^n$ for some $\gamma < 1$, then this will prove $\dim_H E \leq s$.

Our cover will be actually a union of k covers:

$${D_i} = \bigcup_{t=1}^k {D_i^{(t)}},$$

where each cover $\{D_i^{(t)}\}$ consisting of certain intervals $D[a_1, \ldots, a_{n+i_t}] := D[a_1^{n+i_t}]$, chosen according to restrictions on specific digits.

- 3.1. Construction of covers $\{D_i^{(t)}\}$. For a fixed $t \in \{1, ..., k\}$, the cover $\{D_i^{(t)}\}$ is defined by imposing restrictions on the "special" digits $a_{n+i_1}, ..., a_{n+i_t}$ as follows:
 - (i) First, for all the positions $i \neq n + i_m$, (where $m = 1, \ldots, t$) all the digits are allowed.
 - (ii) Second, at the positions $n + i_1, \ldots, n + i_t$ we put some digits such that

$$\prod_{m=1}^{t} a_{n+i_m}^{t_m} \le B^n,$$

with some restrictions we will describe later. For now, let us just denote by F_t the set of possible $(a_{n+i_1}, \ldots, a_{n+i_t})$ that are allowed for a given t.

The specific choice of F_t is crucial. For now, assume it is chosen so that for every $x \in E_n$, the sequence $(a_{n+i_1}(x), \ldots, a_{n+i_k}(x))$ is contained in F_t for some $t \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$. This ensures $\bigcup_{t=1}^k D_i^{(t)}$ is indeed a cover of E_n .

3.2. Estimating the Size of a Covering Element.

The size of each element in the cover $\{D_i^t\}$ is bounded by the following expression:

$$|D_i^{(t)}| \le e^{\rho^{(\varepsilon)}(n+i_t)} \cdot \left(|C[a_1^{n+i_1-1}]| \cdot |C[a_{n+i_1+1}^{n+i_2-1}]| \cdot \dots \cdot |C[a_{n+i_{t-1}+1}^{n+i_t-1}]| \cdot \prod_{m=1}^{t-1} a_{n+i_m}^{-d} \cdot a_{n+i_t}^{1-d} \right)^{1-\varepsilon}.$$

To estimate $\sum |D_i^{(t)}|^s$, we analyze the structure of the cylinders. The sum is taken over all cylinders in the family $\{D_i^t\}$, which corresponds to the sequences where the special digits lie in F_t :

$$\sum_{\substack{a_1, \dots, a_{n+i_t} \\ (a_{n+i_1}, \dots, a_{n+i_t}) \in F_t}} |D[a_1^{n+i_t}]|^s.$$

We decompose this sum according to the positions of the special digits. First, observe that

$$\sum_{a_1, \dots, a_{n+i_1-1}} |C[a_1^{n+i_1-1}]|^{s(1-\varepsilon)} = Z_{n+i_1-1}(s(1-\varepsilon))$$

which is, up to a multiplicative constant, equal to $Z_n(s(1-\varepsilon))$. Moreover, for the intermediate blocks between special digits, for any fixed prefix a_1, \dots, a_{n+i_m} , the sums

$$\sum_{a_{n+i_m+1},\cdots,a_{n+i_{m+1}-1}} |C[a_{n+i_m+1}^{n+i_{m+1}-1}]|^{s(1-\varepsilon)}$$

are all bounded by a constant independent of n. Therefore for distortion property, we can write

$$\sum |D_i^{(t)}|^s \approx e^{\rho^{(\varepsilon)}(n)} \cdot Z_n(s(1_{\varepsilon})) \cdot \sum_{(a_{n+i_1}, \dots, a_{n+i_t}) \in F_t} \prod_{m=1}^{t-1} a_{n+i_m}^{-sd(1-\varepsilon)} \cdot a_{n+i_t}^{s(1-d)(1-\varepsilon)}.$$

Next, we estimate the sum over the F_t . For this, we will divide the possible values of a_{n+i_m} into blocks

$$(B^{n(\ell_m-1)\delta}, B^{n\ell_m\delta}]$$
 where $\ell_m \in \mathbb{N}$.

Each such block has approximately $B^{n\ell_m\delta}$ integer elements, and the value of a_{n+i_m} inside each block can vary at most by a factor of $B^{n\delta}$. Observe that there are at most c/δ blocks for every m (that is, a number not depending on n). Let us denote by G_t the set of possible (ℓ_1, \ldots, ℓ_t) such that the corresponding product of blocks has nonempty intersection with F_t .

We now estimate

$$\sum_{(a_{n+i_1}, \cdots, a_{n+i_t}) \in F_t} \prod_{m=1}^{t-1} a_{n+i_m}^{-sd(1-\varepsilon)} \cdot a_{n+i_t}^{s(1-d)(1-\varepsilon)}$$

Step 1: For a fixed $(\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_t) \in G_t$.

For each $m \le t-1$, the number of integers in block ℓ_m is $\le B^{n\ell_m\delta}$. For each such integer a_{n+i_m} in block ℓ_m :

block
$$\ell_m$$
:

If $m \leq t - 1$: $a_{n+i_m}^{-sd(1-\varepsilon)} \leq \left(B^{n(\ell_m-1)\delta}\right)^{-sd(1-\varepsilon)} = B^{-n(\ell_m-1)\delta \cdot sd(1-\varepsilon)}$.

If $m = t$: $a_{n+i_t}^{s(1-d)(1-\varepsilon)} \leq \left(B^{n(\ell_t-1)\delta}\right)^{s(1-d)(1-\varepsilon)} = B^{n(\ell_t-1)\delta \cdot s(1-d)(1-\varepsilon)}$.

Therefore, for fixed $(\ell_t - \ell_t)$, the contribution is:

Therefore, for fixed (ℓ_1, \ldots, ℓ_t) , the contribution is:

$$\leq \prod_{m=1}^{t-1} \left(B^{n\ell_m \delta} \right) \cdot \prod_{m=1}^{t-1} B^{-n(\ell_m - 1)\delta \cdot sd(1-\varepsilon)} \cdot B^{n(\ell_t - 1)\delta \cdot s(1-d)(1-\varepsilon)}.$$

Step 2: Now sum over G_t

$$\sum_{(a_{n+i_1}, \cdots, a_{n+i_t}) \in F_t} \prod_{m=1}^{t-1} a_{n+i_m}^{-sd(1-\varepsilon)} \cdot a_{n+i_t}^{s(1-d)(1-\varepsilon)} \leq \sum_{(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_t) \in G_t} \left[\prod_{m=1}^{t-1} B^{n\ell_m \delta} \cdot \prod_{m=1}^{t-1} B^{-n(\ell_m-1)\delta \cdot sd(1-\varepsilon)} \cdot B^{n(\ell_t-1)\delta \cdot s(1-d)(1-\varepsilon)} \right]$$

$$\leq \sum_{(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_t) \in G_t} \left[B^{-n\delta[\sum_{m=1}^{t-1} (\ell_m(sd-1)) + s\ell_t(d-1)]} \cdot B^{n\delta[\sum_{m=1}^{t-1} \varepsilon \ell_m sd + \varepsilon \ell_t s(d-1) + \sum_{m=1}^{t-1} sd(1-\varepsilon) + s(d-1) - s(d-1)\varepsilon]} \right].$$

Note that since ε is arbitrary small, the ε and constant dependent part of the exponent in

$$B^{n\delta[\sum_{m=1}^{t-1}\varepsilon\ell_m sd+\varepsilon\ell_t s(d-1)+\sum_{m=1}^{t-1}sd(1-\varepsilon)+s(d-1)-s(d-1)\varepsilon]}$$

is small compared to the main term and is bounded by $B^{n(c_1\delta+c_2\epsilon)}$ for some constants $c_1,c_2>0$.

Thus we can write up to factor $k(\delta, \varepsilon) \cdot B^{n(c_1\delta+c_2\varepsilon)}$,

$$\sum_{(a_{n+i_1}, \cdots, a_{n+i_t}) \in F_t} \prod_{m=1}^{t-1} a_{n+i_m}^{-sd(1-\varepsilon)} \cdot a_{n+i_t}^{s(1-d)(1-\varepsilon)} \leq \sum_{(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_t) \in G_t} c(\delta, \varepsilon) \cdot B^{n(c_1\delta + c_2\varepsilon)} \left[B^{-n\delta[\sum_{m=1}^{t-1} (\ell_m(sd-1)) + s\ell_t(d-1)]} \right]^{-sd(1-\varepsilon)} ds = \sum_{(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_t) \in G_t} c(\delta, \varepsilon) \cdot B^{n(c_1\delta + c_2\varepsilon)} \left[B^{-n\delta[\sum_{m=1}^{t-1} (\ell_m(sd-1)) + s\ell_t(d-1)]} \right]^{-sd(1-\varepsilon)} ds = \sum_{(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_t) \in G_t} c(\delta, \varepsilon) \cdot B^{n(c_1\delta + c_2\varepsilon)} \left[B^{-n\delta[\sum_{m=1}^{t-1} (\ell_m(sd-1)) + s\ell_t(d-1)]} \right]^{-sd(1-\varepsilon)} ds = \sum_{(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_t) \in G_t} c(\delta, \varepsilon) \cdot B^{n(c_1\delta + c_2\varepsilon)} \left[B^{-n\delta[\sum_{m=1}^{t-1} (\ell_m(sd-1)) + s\ell_t(d-1)]} \right]^{-sd(1-\varepsilon)} ds = \sum_{(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_t) \in G_t} c(\delta, \varepsilon) \cdot B^{n(c_1\delta + c_2\varepsilon)} \left[B^{-n\delta[\sum_{m=1}^{t-1} (\ell_m(sd-1)) + s\ell_t(d-1)]} \right]^{-sd(1-\varepsilon)} ds = \sum_{(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_t) \in G_t} c(\delta, \varepsilon) \cdot B^{n(c_1\delta + c_2\varepsilon)} \left[B^{-n\delta[\sum_{m=1}^{t-1} (\ell_m(sd-1)) + s\ell_t(d-1)]} \right]^{-sd(1-\varepsilon)} ds = \sum_{(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_t) \in G_t} c(\delta, \varepsilon) \cdot B^{n(c_1\delta + c_2\varepsilon)} \left[B^{-n\delta[\sum_{m=1}^{t-1} (\ell_m(sd-1)) + s\ell_t(d-1)]} \right]^{-sd(1-\varepsilon)} ds = \sum_{(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_t) \in G_t} c(\delta, \varepsilon) \cdot B^{n(c_1\delta + c_2\varepsilon)} \left[B^{-n\delta[\sum_{m=1}^{t-1} (\ell_m(sd-1)) + s\ell_t(d-1)]} \right]^{-sd(1-\varepsilon)} ds = \sum_{(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_t) \in G_t} c(\delta, \varepsilon) \cdot B^{n(c_1\delta + c_2\varepsilon)} \left[B^{-n\delta[\sum_{m=1}^{t-1} (\ell_m(sd-1)) + s\ell_t(d-1)]} \right]^{-sd(1-\varepsilon)} ds = \sum_{(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_t) \in G_t} c(\delta, \varepsilon) \cdot B^{n(c_1\delta + c_2\varepsilon)} \left[B^{-n\delta[\sum_{m=1}^{t-1} (\ell_m(sd-1)) + s\ell_t(d-1)]} \right]^{-sd(1-\varepsilon)} ds = \sum_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_t} c(\delta, \varepsilon) \cdot B^{n(c_1\delta + c_2\varepsilon)} ds = \sum_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_t} c(\delta, \varepsilon) \cdot B^{n(c_1\delta + c_2\varepsilon)} ds = \sum_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_t} c(\delta, \varepsilon) \cdot B^{n(c_1\delta + c_2\varepsilon)} ds = \sum_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_t} c(\delta, \varepsilon) \cdot B^{n(c_1\delta + c_2\varepsilon)} ds = \sum_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_t} c(\delta, \varepsilon) \cdot B^{n(c_1\delta + c_2\varepsilon)} ds = \sum_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_t} c(\delta, \varepsilon) \cdot B^{n(c_1\delta + c_2\varepsilon)} ds = \sum_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_t} c(\delta, \varepsilon) \cdot B^{n(c_1\delta + c_2\varepsilon)} ds = \sum_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_t} c(\delta, \varepsilon) \cdot B^{n(c_1\delta + c_2\varepsilon)} ds = \sum_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_t} c(\delta, \varepsilon) \cdot B^{n(c_1\delta + c_2\varepsilon)} ds = \sum_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_t} c(\delta, \varepsilon) \cdot B^{n(c_1\delta + c_2\varepsilon)} ds = \sum_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_t} c(\delta, \varepsilon) \cdot B^{n(c_1\delta + c_2\varepsilon)} ds = \sum_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_t} c(\delta, \varepsilon) \cdot B^{n(c_1\delta + c_2\varepsilon)} ds = \sum_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_t} c(\delta, \varepsilon) \cdot B^{n(c_1\delta + c_2\varepsilon)} ds = \sum_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_t} c(\delta, \varepsilon) \cdot B^{n(c_1\delta + c_2\varepsilon)} ds = \sum_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_t} c(\delta, \varepsilon) \cdot$$

Step 3: Apply the maximum bound Since $\#G_t \leq c\delta^{-t}$, we have:

$$\sum_{(a_{n+i_1},\cdots,a_{n+i_t})\in F_t} \prod_{m=1}^{t-1} a_{n+i_m}^{-sd(1-\varepsilon)} \cdot a_{n+i_t}^{s(1-d)(1-\varepsilon)} \leq c\delta^{-t} \cdot k(\delta,\varepsilon) \cdot B^{n(c_1\delta+c_2\varepsilon)} \cdot \max_{G_t} \sum_{(\ell_1,\dots,\ell_t)\in G_t} \left[B^{-n\delta A_t(\ell_1,\cdots,\ell_t,0,\cdots,0)} \right]^{-sd(1-\varepsilon)} \cdot a_{n+i_t}^{s(1-d)(1-\varepsilon)} \leq c\delta^{-t} \cdot k(\delta,\varepsilon) \cdot B^{n(c_1\delta+c_2\varepsilon)} \cdot \max_{G_t} \sum_{(\ell_1,\dots,\ell_t)\in G_t} \left[B^{-n\delta A_t(\ell_1,\cdots,\ell_t,0,\cdots,0)} \right]^{-sd(1-\varepsilon)}$$

Therefore,

$$\sum_{F_{\star}} \prod_{m=1}^{t-1} a_{n+i_m}^{-sd(1-\varepsilon)} \cdot a_{n+i_t}^{s(1-d)(1-\varepsilon)} \approx k(\delta, \varepsilon) \cdot B^{n(c_1\delta+c_2\varepsilon)} B^{-n \min_{G_t} A_t(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_t, 0, \dots, 0)}.$$

Now is the time to choose G_t . For any $b \in S$, there exists t such that $A_t(b) \geq A$. Denoting by $\ell_m(b)$; $m = 1, \ldots, t$ the closest integer approximations of b_m/δ , we define G_t as the set of $(\ell_1(b), \ldots, \ell_t(b))$ for all $b \in S$ such that $A_t(b) \geq A$. We then define F_t as the set of all $(a_{n+i_1}, \ldots, a_{n+i_t})$ that belong to the blocks from G_t .

The penultimate thing to check is that we have indeed obtained a cover for E_n . Consider any sequence $(a_1(x),\ldots,a_{n+i_k}(x))$ for $x\in E_n$. We do not need to pay attention to $a_i;i\neq n+i_m$, but we need to check that the sequence $a_{n+i_1},\ldots,a_{n+i_k}$ is covered by $\bigcup_t F_t$. Let r be the smallest such that $\prod_{m=1}^r a_{n+i_m}^{t_m} \geq B^n$, we check that the sequence $a_{n+i_1},\cdots,a_{n+i_r}$ is covered by F_t . Denote by ℓ_1,\ldots,ℓ_{r-1} the boxes corresponding to $a_{n+i_1},\ldots,a_{n+i_{r-1}}$. To complete the cover, we add the box

$$\ell_r = (1 - \sum_{m=1}^{r-1} \ell_m t_m) / t_r$$

and set $\ell_{r+1} = \ldots = \ell_k = 0$. The choice ensures that the resulting point b constructed by the sequence $\ell_1 = \ldots = \ell_k$ belongs to S.

Now, we verify the time t at which $A_t(b) \geq A$.

The smallest such time t at which $A_t(b) \ge A$ is at most equal to r (because $A_{r+1}(b), \ldots, A_k(b)$ are all not larger than $A_r(b)$). Thus we have $A_t(b) \le A_r(b)$ for t > r, confirming that the smallest index t for which $A_t(b) \ge A$ is bounded by r.

Thus, by construction of the sets F_t , we conclude that F_t contains the sequence

$$a_1(x),\ldots,a'_{n+i_t}(x),$$

with

$$\begin{cases} a'_{n+i_t}(x) = a_{n+i_t}(x) \text{ if } t < r \\ a'_{n+i_t}(x) \le a_{n+i_t}(x) \text{ if } t = r \end{cases}$$

In both cases we have

$$D[a_1(x) \dots a'_{n+i_t}(x)] \supset C[a_1(x) \dots a_{n+i_t}(x)]$$

and thus our cover contains x.

Finally, we estimate the upper bound for the s-dimensional Hausdorff measure of E. By above, we have

$$\sum |D_i^{(t)}|^s \le B^{n(c_1\delta + c_2\varepsilon)} \cdot Z_{n+i_1-1}(s(1-\varepsilon)) \cdot B^{-nA}.$$

Taking logarithms and dividing by n:

$$\frac{1}{n}\log\sum|D_i^{(t)}|^s \le P(s(1-\varepsilon)) - (A + c_1\delta + c_2\varepsilon)\log B$$

Thus, if

$$(3.1) P(s(1-\varepsilon)) < (A+c_1\delta+c_2\varepsilon)\log B.$$

then $\sum |D_i^{(t)}|^s$ is exponentially small for large n. As we can choose δ and ε arbitrarily small, and $s > s_0$, we can satisfy (3.1), and the proof is complete.

4. Proof of the Lower bound for $\dim_H E$

To obtain the lower bound, we will construct an appropriate Cantor subset of set E and the apply the following mass distribution principle [6].

Proposition 4.1 (Mass Distribution Principle). Let μ be a probability measure supported on a measurable set F. Suppose there are positive constants c and r_0 such that

$$\mu(B(x,r)) \le cr^s$$

for any ball B(x,r) with radius $r \leq r_0$ and center $x \in F$. Then $\dim_H F \geq s$.

4.1. Construction of a subset $F \subset E$. Let $n_j \to \infty$ be a sparse sequence of integers. Let s be such that $P(s) = A(s) \cdot \log B$. Fix $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_k) \in S$ such that $A(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{s}) = A(s)$. Fix small ε and δ . Fix a large M and let ν_s be the corresponding s-measure.

We begin with a construction of a certain subset of Σ (and the corresponding subset of [0,1)). Let $F \subset [0,1)$ be the set of points which symbolic expansions $a_i(x)$ satisfy, for every $x \in F$, the following conditions:

- $a_i \in \{1, ..., M\}$ for $i \le n_1 + i_1 1$ and for $n_j + i_k + 1 \le i \le n_{j+1} + i_1 1$,
- $a_i = 1$ for $n_j + i_m + 1 \le i \le n_j + i_{m+1} 1$, $B^{n_j b_m} + 1 \le a_i \le 2B^{n_j b_m}$ for $i = n_j + i_m$.

Clearly, $F \subset E$.

- 4.2. Construction of a measure μ supported on F. To estimate from below $\dim_H E$ it is enough to estimate $\dim_H F$, and we will do that using the Mass Distribution Principle. To apply it we will introduce the following notation: given a (finite or infinite) sequence ω , we denote $\omega_\ell^m := \omega_\ell, \omega_{\ell+1}, \ldots, \omega_m$. In this notation, let μ be as follows:
 - for $n \leq n_1 + i_1 1$ we have

$$\mu(C[\omega_1^n]) = \nu_s(C[\omega_1^n]),$$

• for $n \in [n_j + i_k + 1, n_{j+1} + i_1 - 1]$ we have

$$\mu(C[\omega_1^n]) = \mu(C[\omega_1^{n_j+i_k}]) \cdot \nu_s(C[\omega_{n_j+i_k+1}^n]),$$

• for $n = n_j + i_k \ \mu(C[\omega_1^n])$ is nonzero only if $\omega_{n_j + i_1}^{n_j + i_k} = \ell_1 1^{i_2 - i_1 - 1} \ell_2 1^{i_3 - i_2 - 1} \dots 1^{i_k - i_{k-1} - 1} \ell_k$, with $B^{n_j b_m} + 1 \le \ell_m \le 2B^{n_j b_m}$, and then it is equal to

$$\mu(C[\omega_1^n]) = \mu(C[\omega_1^{n_j+i_1-1}]) \cdot \prod_{m=1}^k B^{-n_j b_m}.$$

That is, for symbols in the range $n_j + i_1, \ldots, n_j + i_k$ we uniformly distribute the measure according to the choice of the set F, while for symbols between positions $n_j + i_k + 1$ and $n_{j+1} + i_1 - 1$, including the initial segment from 1 to $n_1 + i_1 - 1$, we use the s-measure ν_s . Clearly, μ is a probabilistic measure supported on F.

4.3. Calculating the lower local dimension of μ . The last step in the proof is to calculate the lower local dimension of measure μ at any point in F. Fix $x \in F$ and let ω be its symbolic expansion. We need to estimate from below

(4.1)
$$\underline{d}\mu(x) := \liminf_{r \to 0} \frac{\log \mu(B_r(x))}{\log r}$$

and to prove it has a lower bound, which can be made arbitrarily close to s by taking larger M and sparser $(n_j)_{j\geq 1}$.

To simplify the notation let $r_n = |C[(\omega_1^n)]|$ and note that we only need to check the right hand side of (4.1) for a subsequence of r's with bounded multiplicative gaps. We will do the calculation by considering several cases, and note that the order of estimation is: Case 1, Case 2 for j = 1, Case 3 for j = 1, Case 3 for j = 2, and so on.

Case 1:
$$r = r_n, n \le n_1 + i_1 - 1$$
.

In this case we have

$$\mu(B_{r_n}(x)) \approx \mu(C[\omega_1^n]) \le r_n^s \cdot e^{-nP_M(s)} \cdot e^{\rho(n)},$$

and by Proposition 2.6 we have $P_M(s) \ge P(s) - \epsilon > 0$ for M large enough and $\rho(n)/n \to 0$ (and hence can be made arbitrarily small around n_1 if n_1 is large), we have

$$\mu(B_r(x)) \leq Kr^s$$

for some uniform constant K.

Case 2:
$$r_{n_i+i_k} \le r \le r_{n_i+i_1-1}$$
.

From Case 1 (and maybe Case 3) we know that $\mu(C[\omega_1^{n_j+i_1-1}])$ is approximately equal to $r_{n_j+i_1-1}^s e^{-(n_j+i_1-1)P(s)}$ modulo error terms $e^{\rho(n_j+i_1-1)}$ and $e^{(n_j+i_1-1)(P(s)-P_M(s))}$, which are small for large M and large n_j . We can thus write

$$\mu(C[\omega_1^{n_j+i_1-1}]) \le r_{n_j+i_1-1}^{s(1-\varepsilon)} e^{-(n_j+i_1-1)P(s)}.$$

Moreover, the distortion

$$\operatorname{Dist}(T_{\omega_{n_i+i_1-1}} \circ \ldots \circ T_{\omega_1}) \le r_{n_i+i_1-1}^{-\varepsilon} \cdot e^{\rho^{(\varepsilon)}(n_i+i_1-1)}$$

and for large n_j the right hand side can be estimated by $r_{n_j+i_1-1}^{-2\varepsilon}$.

Observe that the maps $T_{\omega_{n_j+i_m-1}} \circ \ldots \circ T_{\omega_{n_j+i_{m-1}+1}} = T_1^{i_m-i_{m-1}-1}$ are iterations of uniformly bounded number of copies of the same map T_1 , hence they have uniformly bounded derivative and uniformly bounded distortion. We are thus going to ignore those ranges of r and concentrate on the meaningful areas, with r related to $r_{n_j+i_m}$. Let us start with m=1. In this area the measure m is distributed the following way: we have $B^{n_jb_1}$ cylinders, each of roughly the same size, and positioned next to each other. Thus, to get the minimal right hand side of (4.1), we need to look at

$$r = \left| \bigcup_{w = B^{n_j b_1}}^{2B^{n_j b_1}} C[\omega_1^{n_j + i_1 - 1} w] \right|$$

and we have

$$\mu(B_r(x)) = \mu(C[\omega_1^{n_j+i_1-1}]).$$

Estimating

$$r \ge r_{n_j+i_1-1} \cdot B^{n_jb_1} \cdot K^{-1}(\delta)B^{-(d+\delta)n_jb_1} \cdot r_{n_j+i_1-1}^{2\varepsilon}$$

we can write

$$\frac{\log \mu(B_r(x))}{\log r} \ge \frac{s(1-\varepsilon)\log r_{n_j+i_1-1} - (n_j+i_1-1)P(s)}{(1+2\varepsilon)\log r_{n_j+i_1-1} - (d-1+\delta)n_jb_1\log B}$$

Indeed, as $\log r_{n_i+i_1-1} < 0$, we have

$$\frac{\log \mu(B_r(x))}{\log r} \geq \frac{s(1-\varepsilon)|\log r_{n_j+i_1-1}| + (n_j+i_1-1)P(s)}{(1+2\varepsilon)|\log_{r_{n_i}+i_1-1}| + (d-1+\delta)n_jb_1\log B} = \frac{J_1+J_2}{J_3+J_4},$$

with $J_1, J_2, J_3, J_4 > 0$. We will apply the obvious inequality

$$\frac{J_1 + J_2}{J_3 + J_4} \ge \min\left(\frac{J_1}{J_3}, \frac{J_2}{J_4}\right).$$

and so, as

$$\frac{s(1-\varepsilon)|\log r_{n_j+i_1-1}|}{(1+2\varepsilon)|\log_{r_{n_j}+i_1-1}|} = s \cdot \frac{(1-\varepsilon)}{1+2\varepsilon} = s \cdot (1+O(\varepsilon))$$

and as $P(s) = A(s) \log B \ge A_1(\mathbf{b}, s) \log B$ so J_2/J_4 becomes,

$$\frac{(n_j + i_1 - 1)P(s)}{(d - 1 + \delta)n_j b_1 \log B} \ge \frac{(n_j + i_1 - 1)(d - 1)sb_1 \log B}{(d - 1 + \delta)n_j b_1 \log B} = s \cdot \frac{n_j + i_1 - 1}{n_j} \cdot \frac{d - 1}{d - 1 + \delta} = s \cdot (1 + O(\delta) + O(1/n_j)),$$

we get

$$\frac{\log \mu(B_r(x))}{\log r} \ge s \cdot (1 + O(\varepsilon) + O(\delta) + O(1/n_j)).$$

Therefore, the right hand side is at least $s + O(\varepsilon, \delta, n_i^{-1})$.

The case for larger m is similar. We have approximately $B^{n_jb_m}$ cylinders next to each other, each of size approximately $r_{n_j+i_1-1} \cdot B^{-dn_j(b_1+\ldots+b_m)}$ (up to distortion) and of measure $B^{-n_j(b_1+\ldots+b_m)} \cdot \mu(C[\omega_1^{n_j+i_1-1}])$, covering them all with one ball we get

$$\frac{\log \mu(B_r(x))}{\log r} \ge s \log r_{n_j + i_1 - 1} - n_j P(s) + O(n_j \varepsilon + 1) \log r_{n_j + i_1 - 1} - n_j s^{-1} A_m(\mathbf{b}, s) \log B + O(n_j \varepsilon + n_j \delta + 1)$$

and as $A_m(\mathbf{b}, s) \log B \leq P(s)$, the right hand side is again at least $s + O(\varepsilon, \delta, n_i^{-1})$.

Case 3:
$$r_{n_{j+1}+i_1-1} \le r \le r_{n_j+i_k+1}$$
.

This case is similar to case 1. We have the initial cylinder $C[\omega_1^{n_j+i_k}]$) of measure $\nu_s(C[\omega_1^{n_1+i_1-1}]) \cdot \dots \cdot \nu_s(C[\omega_{n_{j-1}+i_k+1}^{n_j+i_1-1}]) \cdot B^{-(n_1+\ldots+n_j)(b_1+\ldots+b_k)}$, and we subdivide the measure inside it according to measure ν_s . We remind from case 1 that

$$\nu_s(B_r(y)) \le Kr^s$$

for any r and any y (provided M is large enough), and hence as the distortion of $T^{n_j+i_k}|_{C[\omega_1^{n_j+i_k}]}$ is bounded from above by $r_{n_j+i_k}^{-2\varepsilon}$, we have

$$\mu(B_r(x)) \le \mu(B_{r_{n_j+i_k}}(x))^{1-2\varepsilon} \cdot \left(\frac{r}{r_{n_j+i_k}}\right)^s \cdot K.$$

Thus,

$$\frac{\log \mu(B_r(x))}{\log r} \ge \min((1-2\varepsilon)\frac{\log \mu(B_{r_{n_j+i_k}}(x))}{\log r_{n_i+i_k}}, s) - O(n_j^{-1}).$$

Observe that, as **b** is fixed and known beforehand, we can choose n_{j+1} sufficiently large that for the interval $C[\omega_1^{n_{j+1}+i_1-1}]$ the measure $\mu(C[\omega_1^{n_{j+1}+i_1-1}])$ is approximately equal to $r_{n_{j+1}+i_1-1}^s e^{-(n_{j+1}+i_1-1)P(s)}$ modulo error terms of order at most $r_{n_{j+1}+i_1-1}^{-2\varepsilon}$, which allows us to proceed to the Case 2 for j+1. This ends the proof.

References

- [1] A. Bakhtawar and J. Feng. Increasing rate of weighted product of partial quotients in continued fractions. *Chaos Solitons Fractals*, 172:Paper No. 113591, 7, 2023.
- [2] A. Bakhtawar, M. Hussain, D. Kleinbock, and B.-W. Wang. Metrical properties for the weighted products of multiple partial quotients in continued fractions. Houston J. Math., 49(1):159-194, 2023.
- [3] A. Brown-Sarre, G. González Robert, and M. Hussain. Metrical properties of weighted products of consecutive Lüroth digits. *Houston J. Math.*, 49(4):861–897, 2023.
- [4] C.-Y. Cao, B.-W. Wang, and J. Wu. The growth speed of digits in infinite iterated function systems. Studia Math., 217(2):139-158, 2013.
- [5] M. Denker and M. Urbański. On the existence of conformal measures. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 328(2):563-587, 1991.
- [6] K. Falconer. FRACTAL GEOMETRY. Mathematical foundations and applications. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Chichester, third edition, 2014.
- [7] P. Hanus, R. D. Mauldin, and M. Urbański. Thermodynamic formalism and multifractal analysis of conformal infinite iterated function systems.
- [8] L. Huang, J. Wu, and J. Xu. Metric properties of the product of consecutive partial quotients in continued fractions. Israel J. Math., 238(2):901–943, 2020.
- [9] T. Jordan and M. Rams. Multifractal analysis of weak Gibbs measures for non-uniformly expanding C¹ maps. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 31(1):143–164, 2011.
- [10] T. Jordan and M. Rams. Increasing digit subsystems of infinite iterated function systems. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 140(4):1267–1279, 2012.
- [11] D. Kleinbock and N. Wadleigh. A zero-one law for improvements to Dirichlet's Theorem. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 146(5):1833–1844, 2018.
- [12] D. Kleinbock and Y. Zhang. Metrical properties of functions of consecutive digits in Lüroth series. Integers, 24:Paper No. A67, 9, 2024.
- [13] L. Liao and M. Rams. Big Birkhoff sums in d-decaying Gauss like iterated function systems. Studia Math., 264(1):1–25, 2022.
- [14] R. D. Mauldin and M. Urbański. Dimensions and measures in infinite iterated function systems. Proc. London Math. Soc. (3), 73(1):105–154, 1996.

- [15] R. D. Mauldin and M. Urbański. Graph directed Markov systems, volume 148 of Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003. Geometry and dynamics of limit sets.
- [16] B. Tan and Q.-L. Zhou. Metrical properties of the large products of partial quotients in continued fractions. Non-linearity, 37(2):Paper No. 025008, 28, 2024.
- [17] M. Zhang. Geometric average of the digits with fast growth rates in d-decaying Gauss like iterated function system. J. Math. Anal. Appl., 544(2):Paper No. 129103, 18, 2025.
- [18] M. Zhang. Growth behaviour of weighted products of digits in d-decaying Gauss like systems. Bull. Malays. Math. Sci. Soc., 48(5):Paper No. 141, 13, 2025.

Centro di Ricerca Matematica Ennio De Giorgi, Scuola Normale Superiore, Piazza dei Cavalieri 3,56126 Pisa, Italy

Institute of Mathematics, Polish Academy of Sciences, ul. Śniadeckich 8, 00-656 Warszawa, Poland

Email address: ayreena.bakhtawar@sns.it, abakhtawar@impan.pl

Institute of Mathematics, Polish Academy of Sciences, ul. Śniadeckich 8, 00-656 Warszawa, Poland Email address: rams@impan.pl