

Open intervals in sums and products of Cantor sets.

Aritro Pathak

August 13, 2024

Abstract

We give new arguments for sums and products of sufficient numbers of arbitrary central Cantor sets to produce large open intervals. We further discuss the same question for C^1 images of such central Cantor sets. This gives another perspective on the results obtained by Astels through a different formulation on the thickness of these Cantor sets. There has been recent interest in the question of products and sums of powers of Cantor sets, and these are addressed by our methods.

1 Introduction

Define the central Cantor set $C_\alpha = \bigcap_{l=1}^{\infty} C_l$ in the canonical way as the countable intersection of the sets C_l so that the set C_1 is obtained from the unit interval by removing a middle interval O_0 of length α while keeping the intervals $A_1 = [0, (1-\alpha)/2]$ and $A_2 = [(1+\alpha)/2, 1]$, each of measure $(1-\alpha)/2$. Further, C_2 is obtained from C_1 by deleting a middle interval of proportional length of α , deleting in the process the intervals O_1, O_2 respectively from the segments A_1, A_2 , creating four segments $A_{11}, A_{12}, A_{21}, A_{22}$ in the process. This process would iterate, and at the l 'th step, we have 2^l many segments labelled $A_{i_1 \dots i_l}$ with $i_m \in \{0, 1\} \forall m = 1, 2, \dots, l$, whose union is C_l . In the l 'th step, we have removed from the segments of the $(l-1)$ 'th step the open middle intervals of fractional length α , that are labelled $O_{i_1 \dots i_{l-1}}$ with $i_m \in \{0, 1\} \forall m = 1, \dots, l-1$.

For $\alpha = 1/3$, we get the middle third cantor set.

This paper gives an alternate dynamical method for constructing open intervals in the sums and products of a large set of Cantor sets, a question addressed in a general setting in [Ast00] which also followed a dynamical approximation argument. We extend the methods first presented in [Pat22] for just the middle third Cantor set. For the question of finding open intervals in the products of Cantor sets, that has arisen more recently in certain dynamical problems as in [Tak17], [Ast00] and [Tak17] have dealt with logarithmic Cantor sets and then employed the methods for sums of Cantor sets, whereas our method presents a direct argument following [Pat22] that works for the product question independently of the question of Cantor sum-sets. ⁽¹⁾

For simplicity we speak momentarily of all the Cantor sets being the same but the idea is the same for the case of sums of different Cantor sets. Given a Cantor set $C_\alpha = \bigcap_{l=1}^{\infty} C_l$, [Ast00] works, for each l , with sum-sets of the disjoint segments whose union constitute C_l ,

⁽¹⁾The methods here can also be adopted for the question of other polynomial or rational expressions of Cantor sets, although we have not pursued it here.

and constructs the largest possible open interval so that each point within this open interval lies in the sum-set of these fixed number of copies of C_l and this is done for each l . The underlying idea is essentially the following theorem in elementary analysis which is also the approach of [Ath19];

Theorem 1. *Suppose $\{K_i\} \subset \mathbb{R}$ are nonempty compact sets such that $K_1 \supset K_2 \supset K_3 \supset \dots$, and $K = \bigcap K_i$. If $F : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous, then $F(K^m) = \bigcap F(K_i^m)$.*

Here, K^m denotes the k -fold Cartesian product of K .

Astels defines and considers the thickness of the general class of Cantor sets as defined in [Ast00] in order to construct the open intervals. The case of products of Cantor sets is then dealt with by first considering the logarithmic version of these Cantor sets.

Our dynamical approximation technique is a-priori conceptually different. Again for a sufficient number of copies of the same Cantor set C_α , for a point x in the open interval we start out with the points of C_α whose sum or product approximate x to first order. These points in the first approximation all belong to the set of end points of the segments whose union constitute C_{l_0} for some fixed l_0 . In the next stage of approximation, we carefully choose endpoints of segments that constitute C_{l_1} $l_1 = l_0 + 1$, which give a controlled and better approximation of the point under consideration. We continue this for each value of l so that the sums or products converge to the point x in the limit as $l \rightarrow \infty$, and in the process we have Cauchy sequences of elements of the Cantor set whose limiting points sum or multiply to the point x . This enables us to treat the sum and product questions independent of each other.

The methods presented here are applicable to the case where we are looking for open intervals in the set of sums and products of the type:

$$\sum_i \phi_i(C_i), \prod_i \phi_i(C_i)$$

where each of the functions ϕ_i are continuously differentiable, with upper and lower bounds on this derivative in any closed sub-interval of the support of C_i and the arguments of this paper can be easily adopted for this case. For the case presented in Lemma 2 and Theorem 3, we have the special case of $\phi_i(x) = x^m$ for each i .⁽²⁾

For the approach of Astels, one refers to [Ast00]. For any positive integer m , the case of sums of m 'th powers of Cantor sets has attracted special attention recently, and we state our theorems for the central Cantor sets and m 'th powers. For $m = 1$, the results reduce to sums of Cantor sets.

Finally in the Section 7, we outline the statements of results one would get for sums and products of general C^1 images of Cantor sets.

For more recent and earlier work on these questions, including connections to the Newhouse gap lemma and Palis' conjecture, one can refer to [Ath19, Pat22, Tak17, Ath19, Cab02, Cab97, Yoc01, GuX19, Guo21, Hal91, Maj65, Mar21, New79, Pat18, Ran40, Utz51, Wan21]. One notes in particular the questions raised about products of Cantor sets in the concluding section of [Tak17]. One also notes in particular the paper of [Sol96], which gives us the sums of just two two middle- α Cantor sets typically has positive Lebesgue measure when the sum of the Hausdorff dimensions is greater than 1. The question of the Lebesgue measure of

⁽²⁾In this case one can work, instead of the upper bound of Equation 15, with some different upper bound corresponding to the bounds on the derivatives of the ϕ_i 's.

the sums of Cantor sets which have been addressed with Fourier analytic techniques, is not addressed with our methods.

2 Statement of results

Fix $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. For this fixed α let C_α be the Cantor set as in the introduction. We define the following technical quantities:

$$s_{\alpha,m} = \left\lceil \frac{1}{\left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)^{m-1}} \right\rceil, \quad k_{\alpha,m} = \begin{cases} \left\lceil \frac{\frac{3\alpha-1}{2}}{\left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)^{m-1} \left(\frac{1-\alpha^2}{4}\right)} \right\rceil & \alpha > 1/3 \\ 0 & \alpha \leq 1/3 \end{cases},$$

and let $r_{\alpha,m} = 2s_{\alpha,m} + 2k_{\alpha,m}$. Set

$$\Gamma_{\alpha,m} = \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^{r_{\alpha,m}} c_k^m : c_k \in C_\alpha \right\}.$$

In other words, $\Gamma_{\alpha,m}$ contains $r_{\alpha,m}$ many m 'th powers of elements of C_α . With this, we first prove in Section 2 that,

Lemma 2. *Given the central Cantor set C_α , $s_{\alpha,m}$, $k_{\alpha,m}$, $r_{\alpha,m}$ and $\Gamma_{\alpha,m}$ as above, let*

$$I = \left[\left(\frac{r_{\alpha,m}}{2} - 1 \right) + \left(\frac{r_{\alpha,m}}{2} + 1 \right) \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2} \right)^m, \left(\frac{r_{\alpha,m}}{2} + 1 \right) + \left(\frac{r_{\alpha,m}}{2} - 1 \right) \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2} \right)^m \right]$$

then, $I \subseteq \Gamma_{\alpha,m}$.

We note that for the case of $\alpha < \frac{1}{3}$, for any integer $m \geq 1$, we get with only two summands a set which is a disjoint union of intervals⁽³⁾. In our theorem, for a set with a much larger number of terms, in the next theorem, we can get open intervals whose lengths are exponential in m .

Also consider the expression,

$$2 + \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2} \right)^m - 3 \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2} \right)^m \left(\frac{3-\alpha}{2} \right)^m. \quad (1)$$

When $\alpha = 1$ the above quantity is zero. Further for any fixed positive integer value of m , one can numerically verify the existence of $0 < \alpha(m) < 1$ for which the above expression is 0, and the expression changes sign when passing between the two cases of $\alpha \leq \alpha(m)$ and $\alpha > \alpha(m)$.

With an extension of the argument used to prove Lemma 2, we also show,

Theorem 3. *For $\alpha \geq \alpha(m)$, there is an interval I' of length,*

$$2 + \left(\frac{r_{\alpha,m}}{2} - 3 \right) \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2} \right)^m \left(\frac{3-\alpha}{2} \right)^m - \left(\frac{r_{\alpha,m}}{2} - 1 \right) \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2} \right)^m, \quad (2)$$

⁽³⁾In fact this would be true for any c^2 image of Cantor sets instead of the special case of images under the map $f(x) = x^m$

with $I' \subset \Gamma_{\alpha,m}$.

For $\alpha < \alpha(m)$, we have $I' \subset \Gamma_{\alpha,m}$, a disjoint union of intervals of total length,

$$2r_{\alpha,m} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2} \right)^m \left(\frac{3-\alpha}{2} \right)^m \right). \quad (3)$$

Further for any $0 < \alpha < 1$, we have a single interval $I'' \subset \Gamma_{\alpha,m}$, which is disjoint from I' , such that I'' has length

$$\left(\frac{r_{\alpha,m}}{2} + 1 \right) \left(\frac{3+\alpha^2}{4} \right)^m - 2 \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2} \right)^m + \left(\frac{r_{\alpha,m}}{2} - 1 \right). \quad (4)$$

As pointed out in Section 4 and easily verified, all of these intervals have lengths that are growing exponentially with m .

Further, we also consider in Section 5 sums of Cantor sets of different types. In this case, we construct the following main theorem. The requirement of $\alpha_1 = \beta_1$ is for convenience, and such a requirement is removed later for the analogous question on the products of Cantor sets.

Theorem 4. Consider any two different sets of sequences,

$$\alpha_1 \geq \alpha_2 \geq \dots \geq \alpha_n, \quad \beta_1 \geq \beta_2 \geq \dots \geq \beta_p, \quad \text{with } \alpha_1 = \beta_1, \quad (5)$$

with integers n, p, n_1, n_2, r_1, r_2 , that satisfy $n = n_1 + n_2, p = r_1 + r_2$, and which satisfies the following conditions:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{r_1} \left(\frac{1+\beta_j}{2} \right)^{m-1} \left(\frac{1-\beta_j}{2} \right)^2 > \left(\frac{3\beta_1-1}{1+\beta_1} \right), \quad \sum_{j=r_1+1}^{r_2+r_1} \left(\frac{1+\beta_j}{2} \right)^{m-1} \left(\frac{1-\beta_j}{2} \right) > 1, \quad (6)$$

and,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n_1} \left(\frac{1+\alpha_j}{2} \right)^{m-1} \left(\frac{1-\alpha_j}{2} \right)^2 > \left(\frac{3\alpha_1-1}{1+\alpha_1} \right), \quad \sum_{j=n_1+1}^{n_2+n_1} \left(\frac{1+\alpha_j}{2} \right)^{m-1} \left(\frac{1-\alpha_j}{2} \right) > 1. \quad (7)$$

Then the interval given by:

$$\left[\sum_{i=2}^n \left(\frac{1+\alpha_i}{2} \right)^m + p - 1 + 2 \left(\frac{1+\beta_1}{2} \right)^m, \sum_{i=2}^n \left(\frac{1+\alpha_i}{2} \right)^m + (p+1) \right] \quad (8)$$

is contained in the set,

$$\Gamma = \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^n c_k^m + \sum_{k=1}^p d_k^m : c_i \in C_{\alpha_i}, d_i \in C_{\beta_i} \right\} \quad (9)$$

We do not pursue this problem here, but following the methods of Theorem 3, one can expand the interval obtained in Theorem 4 in the situation of sums of distinct Cantor sets.

We introduce in Section 6, the main definitions and the statement of the Theorem 5, showing the existence of an open interval in the product of sufficient number of Cantor sets of the same type.

3 Sums of Cantor sets.

In this section, we prove Lemma 2. We state this theorem for central Cantor sets, with $m = 1$ being the special case of sums of arbitrary central Cantor sets.

We seek to represent any $x \in I$ as a sum

$$x = \sum_{j=1}^{r_{\alpha,m}} c_k^m.$$

With a bit of thought, one can note that this can be achieved in the following way: we initialize $r_{\alpha,m}$ points on C_α and let S_1 be the sum of their m^{th} powers. These points are initialized so that S_1 serves as an initial approximation of x . In the subsequent steps, we shift these chosen points one at a time in a controlled manner and study the difference $\Delta_k = |x - S_k|$. In particular, we show that at step k , with the right initialization one obtains that $|\Delta_k| \leq m \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{l_k}$ where $\{l_k\}$ is an increasing sequence of positive integers. This tells us that $\Delta_k \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. With this dynamics in mind, it helps to think of each of the initialized points in C_α as the first value in a sequence of points all of which are contained in C_α . Since at every step the points chosen to be a part of this sum belong to C_α , the limit of each of these sequences is also in C_α . The sum of the m^{th} powers of these limiting values is representation of x we seek.

With all this in place, we are ready to prove Lemma 2.

Proof of Lemma 2. We will construct $r_{\alpha,m}$ many sequences, with $a_k^{(j)}$ for all $k \geq 0$ and $j = 1, 2, \dots, r_{\alpha,m}/2$, and with $b_k^{(j)}$ for all $k \geq 0$, and $j = 1, 2, \dots, r_{\alpha,m}/2$.

We initialize these sequences for $k = 1$ as follows: Let $a_1^{(j)} = \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)$, $\forall j = 1, 2, \dots, r_{\alpha,m}/2$ and $b_1^{(j)} = 1$, $\forall j = 1, 2, \dots, r_{\alpha,m}/2$. As the elements $a_k^{(j)}, b_k^{(j)}$ are defined through the algorithm described in this proof, S_k is defined as the sum below:

$$S_k = \sum_{j=1}^{r_{\alpha,m}/2} ((a_k^{(j)})^m + (b_k^{(j)})^m). \quad (10)$$

With our initialization, we have

$$S_1 = \sum_{j=1}^{r_{\alpha,m}/2} ((a_1^{(j)})^m + (b_1^{(j)})^m) = \frac{r_{\alpha,m}}{2} \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)^m + \frac{r_{\alpha,m}}{2}. \quad (11)$$

Note that S_1 is the midpoint of the interval I . Without loss of generality consider any $x \in I$ with $x \leq S_1$. For each k , we define the difference:

$$\Delta_k = x - S_k. \quad (12)$$

Since $x \leq S_1, x \in I$, it is not hard to see that there is a unique real number $x_0 \in \left[\frac{1+\alpha}{2}, 1\right]$ with the property that,

$$x = \sum_{j=1}^{r_{\alpha,m}/2} (a_1^{(j)})^m + x_0^m + \sum_{j=2}^{r_{\alpha,m}/2} (b_1^{(j)})^m \quad (13)$$

If $x_0 \in C_\alpha$, we are done. Otherwise, x_0 falls in the interior of an open interval U cut out when constructing the sets C_l whose countable intersection constitutes the set C_α . In this case, let the length of the specific open interval in which x_0 falls, be $\alpha \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{l_2}$. We start the dynamics by shifting $b_1^{(1)}$ closer to x_0 as follows: set $a_2^{(j)} = \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)$, $\forall j = 1, 2, \dots, r_{\alpha,m}/2$, and $b_2^{(j)} = 1$, $\forall j = 2, \dots, r_{\alpha,m}/2$, while we take $b_2^{(1)}$ to be the left end point of the interval U . It is crucial to note that in this process, for future iterations, one can decrease $b_2^{(1)}$ further by an amount $\left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right) \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^q$ with $q \geq l_2 + 1$, by considering $b_3^{(1)}$ to be the left end point of the open interval of length $\alpha \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^q$ present in the $(q-1)^{th}$ iteration of C_α that is immediately to the left of $b_2^{(1)}$. As will be required later, we note that we can also decrease the values $b_2^{(j)} = 1$ for $j = 2, \dots, n$ by a similar amount.⁽⁴⁾ It is also worth noting that as our dynamics progresses, the sequences are set up so that all the $a^{(j)}$ s can only be increased, and the $b^{(j)}$ s can only be decreased by controlled amounts similar to the ones outlined above; and this in turn controls the way in which $|\Delta_k| \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

From the setup above, and Eq. (13) we get that

$$\Delta_2 = x_0^m - (b_2^{(1)})^m. \quad (14)$$

Here Δ_2 is positive, and is bounded from above by

$$\left(b_2^{(1)} + \alpha \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{l_2}\right)^m - (b_2^{(1)})^m = \alpha \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{l_2} \cdot A_m \leq m\alpha \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{l_2}, \quad (15)$$

where A_m is a sum of m separate terms each of which is bounded from above by 1.⁽⁵⁾

Now to improve the error, we shift one of the $a_2^{(j)}$ s to the right. Note that if we increase exactly one of the $a^{(j)}$ sequences⁽⁶⁾, and take any given $l \geq l_2$, and set $a_3^{(1)} = a_2^{(1)} + \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right) \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^l$, while keeping the rest unchanged, then we have

$$S_3 - S_2 = \left(a_2^{(1)} + \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right) \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^l\right)^m - (a_2^{(1)})^m = \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right) \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^l \cdot B_m$$

where B_m consists of m terms each of which is bounded from above by 1 and bounded from below by $\left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)^{m-1}$, and thus we have

$$m \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)^{m-1} \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right) \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^l \leq S_3 - S_2 \leq m \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right) \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^l \quad (16)$$

At this point we are ready to begin the analysis of how these shifts improve the error. Here, we split into two cases, one for $\alpha \leq 1/3$, and one for $\alpha > 1/3$ corresponding to thinner Cantor sets. We have,

$$\alpha \geq \frac{1-\alpha}{2} \iff \alpha \geq \frac{1}{3}. \quad (17)$$

⁽⁴⁾And in fact for $j = 2, \dots, n$ we have leverage to decrease by bigger amounts $((1-\alpha)/2)^q((1+\alpha)/2)$ with $q \geq 0$, which we won't need.

⁽⁵⁾Here we use the elementary identity $(x^m - y^m) = (x-y)(x^{m-1} + x^{m-2}y + \dots + xy^{m-2} + y^{m-1})$.

⁽⁶⁾The effect is analogous if we exactly decrease one of the $b^{(j)}$ sequences in some other later step

At the k^{th} stage of the iteration, each of the sequences $a^{(j)}$ and $b^{(j)}$ are iterated so that $a_k^{(j)}$ and $b_k^{(j)}$ belong to C_α , which in turn ensures that the sums S_k converge to x . We illustrate below that this convergence is in a way where we are able to assert control over the differences Δ_k so that we have

$$|\Delta_k| = |x - S_k| \leq m \left(\frac{1 - \alpha}{2} \right)^{l_k}, \quad l_k \in \mathbb{N} \forall k, l_k \rightarrow \infty \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty. \quad (18)$$

Since all the elements $a_k^{(j)}, b_k^{(j)}$ for a fixed j will belong to C_α , in the limit as $k \rightarrow \infty$, these Cauchy sequences converge to elements $a_\infty^{(j)}, b_\infty^{(j)}$ also in C_α , and this gives our desired representation of x as

$$x = \sum_{j=1}^{r_{\alpha,m}/2} (a_\infty^{(j)} + b_\infty^{(j)})$$

We outline the argument for going from the $k = 2$ to the $k = 3$ step of the iteration and how in principle the dynamics repeats similarly from there on.

Case $\alpha \leq 1/3$:

In this case, from Eq. (15) and Eq. (17) we get that the upper bound on Δ_2 is given by:

$$\Delta_2 \leq m\alpha \left(\frac{1 - \alpha}{2} \right)^{l_2} \leq m \left(\frac{1 - \alpha}{2} \right)^{l_2+1}. \quad (19)$$

We will see that in this case, it will be enough to consider the $r_{\alpha,m} = 2s_{\alpha,m}$ many sequences. We start by considering the unique positive integer $n_2 \geq (l_2 + 1)$ so that:

$$m \left(\frac{1 - \alpha}{2} \right)^{n_2+1} \leq \Delta_2 < m \left(\frac{1 - \alpha}{2} \right)^{n_2} \quad (20)$$

Given these bounds on Δ_2 , we want to show that increasing $a_2^{(j)}$ to $a_3^{(j)}$ enables $|\Delta_3| \leq m \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2} \right)^{n_2+1}$. Upon showing this, we can find $n_3 > n_2$ so that we have

$$m \left(\frac{1 - \alpha}{2} \right)^{n_3+1} \leq \Delta_3 \leq m \left(\frac{1 - \alpha}{2} \right)^{n_3},$$

from where we proceed inductively. To this end, it is enough to verify the two following cases:

Case $\Delta_2 = m \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{n_2+1}$:

Recall that our shift sets $a_3^{(1)} = a_2^{(1)} + \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{n_2} \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)$, then from Eq. (16) and Eq. (20), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_3 &= \Delta_2 - (S_3 - S_2) \geq m \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{n_2+1} - m \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{n_2} \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right) \\
&= m \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{n_2} \left(\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right) - \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right) \right) \\
&= -m\alpha \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{n_2} \\
&\geq -m \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{n_2+1}
\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

where we obtain the last inequality from Eq. (17). On the other hand $\Delta_3 \leq m \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{n_2+1}$ is clear since $S_3 - S_2 > 0$. Thus in this case, we have

$$|\Delta_3| \leq m \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{n_2+1}$$

as desired.

Case $\Delta_2 = m \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{n_2}$:

Repeating the argument from the previous case, one obtains that $\Delta_3 \geq -m \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{n_2+1}$. We would like to now bound Δ_3 from above by $m \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{n_2+1}$. To achieve this, we note from Eq. (16) that shifting exactly one of the $a_2^{(j)}$ to $a_3^{(j)}$ yields $S_3 - S_2 \geq m \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)^m \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{n_2}$. This however may not be enough to obtain a sufficient reduction in magnitude to Δ_2 , and so we seek to shift multiple $a_j^{(j)}$ s by a similar amount. To this end, we note that upon shifting

$$s_{\alpha,m} = \left\lceil \frac{1}{\left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)^{m-1}} \right\rceil$$

of the $a_2^{(j)}$ to $a_3^{(j)}$ for all $j = 1, \dots, s_{\alpha,m}$ (if necessary) one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_3 &= \Delta_2 - (S_3 - S_2) = m \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{n_2} - s_{\alpha,m} m \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)^m \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{n_2} \\
&\leq m \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{n_2} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)^m\right) \\
&= m \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{n_2+1}
\end{aligned}$$

Which also gives us $|\Delta_3| \leq m \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{n_2+1}$, and the dynamics proceed inductively from here on. Depending on the implied constants and the exact location of the sequences $a_k^{(j)}$ s, we might of course need less than the $s_{\alpha,m}$ many terms as illustrated had above, but even in the worst case, it suffices to have these many terms.

Certainly in case we have $m \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{n_2+1} < \Delta_2 < m \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{n_2}$, which is intermediate between these two extreme cases, it is clear that we can do with increasing anywhere between 1 and $s_{\alpha,m}$ many of the sequences $a^{(j)}$, and achieve a similar type of bound on $|\Delta_3|$. We have thus outlined exactly how the dynamical system runs in the case of going from the $k = 2$ to the $k = 3$, which completes our study of the case $\alpha \leq 1/3$.

Case $\alpha > 1/3$:

(7) In this case, we need one further modification in order to run the above dynamical system: we once again get an upper bound on Δ_2 of the form

$$\Delta_2 \leq m\alpha \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{l_2}, \quad (22)$$

as in Eq. (15). Without loss of generality, consider that,

$$m \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{l_2+1} \leq \Delta_2 \leq m\alpha \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{l_2}, \quad (23)$$

Here we reduce the amount by which we shift our sequences, and consequently increase the number of terms that are being shifted, and $2s_{\alpha,m}$ many terms will no longer give us the desired reduction to the size of $|\Delta_k|$.

In doing this, we include a mix of 'large' and 'small' shifts. We consider the number $k_{\alpha,m}$ which is the least positive integer such that

$$k_{\alpha,m} m \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)^{m-1} \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{l_2+1} \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right) > m\alpha \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{l_2} - m \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{l_2+1} \quad (24)$$

The left hand side of the above inequality uses the lower bound of Eq. (16) to quantify the lower bound on the total change to S_2 upon shifting $k_{\alpha,m}$ many sequences by an amount $\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{l_2+1} \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)$.

Note that the shift is not by the amount $\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{l_2} \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)$ like it was in the case $\alpha \leq 1/3$, but by $\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{l_2+1} \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)$, and thus these $k_{\alpha,m}$ many terms correspond to 'small' shifts.

Also note that,

$$m \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{l_2+1} \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right) < 2m \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{l_2+1} \quad (25)$$

The above inequality ensures that in the extreme case when $\Delta_2 = m \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{l_2+1}$, by increasing exactly one of the $a^{(j)}$'s for some $j \in \{s_{\alpha,m} + 1, \dots, (s_{\alpha,m} + k_{\alpha,m})\}$, by an amount of $\left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right) \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{l_2+1}$, the decrement to Δ_2 is such that Δ_3 is bounded from below by $-m \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{l_2+1}$ ⁽⁸⁾.

⁽⁷⁾For the particular case of $m = 1$, this constitutes the most general interesting case of arbitrary thin central Cantor sets.

⁽⁸⁾Note that above we cannot increase the particular $a^{(j)}$ by an amount of $((1+\alpha)/2)((1-\alpha)/2)^{l_2}$ or some exponent $n \leq l_2$ under the assumption that $\alpha > 1/3$. In the worst case with an increment to $a^{(j)}$ by an amount of $((1+\alpha)/2)((1-\alpha)/2)^{l_2}$, the above inequality Eq. (25) reduces to $\left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right) < 2\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)$, $\Leftrightarrow \alpha < 1/3$.

Here, Eq. (24) ensures that in the other extreme case when $\Delta_2 = m\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{l_2} \alpha$, by considering up-to all of the $k_{\alpha,m}$ many $a^{(j)}$ sequences and increasing them by an amount of $\left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{l_2+1}$, in the worst case Δ_3 is bounded from above by $m\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{l_2+1}$.

Henceforth, it is enough to verify the two following cases for any $l_3 \geq l_2$:

- $\Delta_3 = m\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{l_3+2}$: in this case, if we increase exactly one of the sequences $a^{(j)}$ by an amount $\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{l_3+1}\left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)$, for some fixed $1 \leq j \leq s_{\alpha,m}$, then again we would conclude that

$$\Delta_4 \geq m\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{l_3+2} - m\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{l_3+1}\left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right) = -m\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{l_3+1} \alpha. \quad (26)$$

In this case, $-m\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{l_3+1} \alpha \leq -m\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{l_3+2}$, and now we again employ the argument following Eq. (23). With $k_{\alpha,m}$ many sequences $b^{(j)}$ with $b_1^{(j)} = 1$, and which are decreased in the usual manner, for each $j \in \{s_{\alpha,m} + k_{\alpha,m} + 1, \dots, s_{\alpha,m} + 2k_{\alpha,m}\}$ and this would make $\Delta_4 \geq -m\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{l_3+2}$. Because of the symmetry of the dynamical system, we have the contingency of needing to use, in the next step, the earlier sequences for each $j \in \{s_{\alpha,m} + 1, s_{\alpha,m} + k_{\alpha,m}\}$.

Note that if we increase exactly one of the $a^{(j)}$ sequences by the smaller amount of $\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{l_3+2}\left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)$ then we would not need the next iteration here as stated above with the further $2k_{\alpha,m}$ many terms, but then in the following step the number of terms needed changes to $\tilde{s}_{\alpha,m} = \lceil \frac{1}{((1+\alpha)/2)^{m-1}((1-\alpha)/2)} \rceil$. In this case, it would be enough to need $2\tilde{s}_{\alpha,m}$ many terms. But this is greater than $2s_{\alpha,m} + 2k_{\alpha,m}$ when $\alpha \geq 1/3$ and our number of terms is optimal.

- $\Delta_3 = m\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{l_3+1}$: we increase up to $s_{\alpha,m}$ many of the corresponding $a^{(j)}$ and for each of them we get a decrement to Δ_3 of an amount whose magnitude is lower bounded by the left hand bound of Equation 7, which is $m\left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)^{m-1}\left(\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{l_3+1}\left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)\right)$, for j in the range $\{1, 2, \dots, s_{\alpha,m}\}$, and then we get: $-m\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{l_3+1} \alpha < \Delta_4 \leq m\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{l_3+2}$. Note the lower bound here is the same as in the previous case. Then the dynamical system iterates again with one further use of the argument following Eq. (23) and a set of upto $k_{\alpha,m}$ many further terms.

For the intermediate case when $-m\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{l_3+1} \alpha < \Delta_3 < -m\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{l_3+2}$, it would be enough to decrease at least one and at most $s_{\alpha,m}$ many of the sequences $b^{(j)}$ for $1 \leq j \leq s_{\alpha,m}$, and then this argument would iterate again.

This completes the proof. □

4 Expanding the open interval for sums of Cantor sets.

Here we prove Theorem 3.

Proof. Using essentially the same dynamical argument as in the previous section, one can get an open interval to be contained inside the set $\Gamma_{\alpha,m}$, which is exponentially large in m .

Consider an alteration of the argument of Lemma 2 whereby for each $1 \leq t \leq r_{\alpha,m}/2$, we have a dynamical system where for all $0 < j \leq t$, the $a_1^{(j)}$ values are initialized to $\left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right) + \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right) = \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)\left(\frac{3-\alpha}{2}\right)$ while the remaining $(\frac{r_{\alpha,m}}{2} - t)$ many values of $a_1^{(j)}$ with $t \leq j \leq \frac{r_{\alpha,m}}{2}$ are initialized at $\left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)$.

Further, in this case all the $b_1^{(j)}$ values are exactly 1. In this case, the initial sum is given by

$$S_1^{(t)} = \left(\frac{r_{\alpha,m}}{2} - t\right)\left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)^m + t\left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)^m\left(\frac{3-\alpha}{2}\right)^m + \frac{r_{\alpha,m}}{2}.$$

In this situation, we can make the dynamics of Lemma 2 work for any real number in the interval:

$$I^{(t)} = \left[\left(\frac{r_{\alpha,m}}{2} - t\right)\left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)^m + (t+1)\left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)^m\left(\frac{3-\alpha}{2}\right)^m + \left(\frac{r_{\alpha,m}}{2} - 1\right), \quad (27)\right.$$

$$\left.\left(\frac{r_{\alpha,m}}{2} - t\right)\left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)^m + (t-1)\left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)^m\left(\frac{3-\alpha}{2}\right)^m + \left(\frac{r_{\alpha,m}}{2} + 1\right)\right] \quad (28)$$

To see this, without loss of generality, we only concentrate on one half of the above interval, which is to consider any $x \in I^{(t)}$ with $x \leq S_1^{(t)}$.

In this case, for this fixed t and the initializations above, consider the unique real number $x_0 \in \left[\left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)\left(\frac{3-\alpha}{2}\right), 1\right]$ such that for $x \in I^{(t)}$,

$$x = \sum_{j=1}^{r_{\alpha,m}/2} (a_1^{(j)})^m + x_0^m + \sum_{j=2}^{r_{\alpha,m}/2} (b_1^{(j)})^m \quad (29)$$

After this, for each t the dynamics proceeds similarly as in the proof of Lemma 2; one could as well have initialized all the $a_1^{(j)} = \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)\left(\frac{3-\alpha}{2}\right)$ for each $1 \leq j \leq r_{\alpha,m}/2$ instead of initializing $(r_{\alpha,m}/2 - t)$ many of them to take values of $\left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)$ as done above, in which case the dynamics would have been concentrated in the interval $\left[\left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)\left(\frac{3-\alpha}{2}\right), 1\right]$ entirely.

In this case, the maximum increment permissible for all the $a_1^{(j)}$ terms with $1 \leq j \leq t$ is $\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^3\left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)$, while for $t < j \leq r_{\alpha,m}/2$ the maximum permissible initial increment of the $a_1^{(j)}$ terms in this dynamics is $\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^2\left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)$.

Thus for each $1 \leq t \leq r_{\alpha,m}/2$ we get an open interval $I^{(t)}$ as written above.

Further, for any $1 \leq t \leq r_{\alpha,m}/2$, we can also do the following: for each $1 \leq j \leq r_{\alpha,m}/2$ we initialize $a_1^{(j)} = \frac{1+\alpha}{2}$, while for each $1 \leq j \leq t$ we take $b_1^{(j)} = \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right) + \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right) = \frac{3+\alpha^2}{4}$ and for each $t \leq j \leq r_{\alpha,m}/2$ we take $b_1^{(j)} = 1$.

In this case, the dynamics of Lemma 2 can be made to work as in the above case, and for each $1 \leq t \leq r_{\alpha,m}$, the initial sum $S_{(t),1}$ is given by

$$S_{(t),1} = \frac{r_{\alpha,m}}{2}\left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)^m + t\left(\frac{3+\alpha^2}{4}\right) + \left(\frac{r_{\alpha,m}}{2} - t\right)$$




Figure 1: Typical behavior of the components of inequality 32 for large m

Thus with the identical procedure as earlier, we get the following interval:

$$I_{(t)} = \left[\left(\frac{r_{\alpha,m}}{2} + 1 \right) \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2} \right)^m + (t-1) \left(\frac{3+\alpha^2}{4} \right)^m + \left(\frac{r_{\alpha,m}}{2} - t \right), \right. \quad (30)$$

$$\left. \left(\frac{r_{\alpha,m}}{2} - 1 \right) \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2} \right)^m + (t+1) \left(\frac{3+\alpha^2}{4} \right)^m + \left(\frac{r_{\alpha,m}}{2} - t \right) \right] \quad (31)$$

In this case, for any $x \in I_{(t)}$ with $x \leq S_{(t),1}$, consider the unique $x_0 \in \left[\frac{1+\alpha}{2}, \frac{3+\alpha^2}{4} \right]$ so that Eq. (29) holds, and then the dynamics can be made to run as in the earlier case. In this case, the decrement initially in the $b^{(j)}$ sequence (going from $b_1^{(j)} \rightarrow b_2^{(j)}$) is given by $\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^l \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)$ for some $l \geq 3$, and the maximum decrement permissible for all the $b_1^{(j)}$ terms with $1 \leq j \leq t$ is indeed $\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^3 \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)$ while for $t < j \leq r_{\alpha}/2$ the maximum permissible decrement of the $b^{(j)}$ terms in the dynamics is $\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^2 \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)$.

Following this, depending on the values of α and m we are able to construct a set of measure exponentially larger than the one constructed in Lemma 2.

Note the length of each of the intervals of the form $I^{(t)}$ is $2\left(1 - \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)^m \left(\frac{3-\alpha}{2}\right)^m\right)$, while the length of each interval of the form $I_{(t)}$ is given by $2\left(\left(\frac{3+\alpha^2}{4}\right)^m - \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)^m\right)$.

Consider the sets

$$I' = \bigcup_{i=1}^{r_{\alpha,m}/2} I^{(t)}, I'' = \bigcup_{i=1}^{r_{\alpha,m}/2} I_{(t)};$$

depending on the values of α, m , these could be single intervals or unions of $r_{\alpha,m}/2$ many disjoint intervals.

For I' , we need to check if the left end point of $I^{(t+1)}$ is less than or equal to the right end point of $I^{(t)}$; this is true when

$$2 + \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)^m \geq 3\left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)^m \left(\frac{3-\alpha}{2}\right)^m, \quad (32)$$

in which case I' is a single interval, and if the inequality above is reversed, then I' is the disjoint union of $r_{\alpha,m}/2$ many intervals.

There is at least one case of equality in Eq. (32) for some $\alpha(m) \in (0, 1)$. The typical behavior of the two components of this inequality for large m is illustrated below in figure 3.

For I'' , we need a similar check which reduces to showing:

$$1 + \left(\frac{3 + \alpha^2}{4}\right)^m \geq 2\left(\frac{1 + \alpha}{2}\right)^m, \quad (33)$$

By noting that $(3 + \alpha^2) \geq (1 + \alpha)^2$ whenever $\alpha < 1$, and Cauchy inequality, we see that the above inequality is always true.

As a consequence of this, we have that I'' is always a single interval. For a given positive integer m , call the solution to the corresponding equality in Eq. (32) as $\alpha_1(m)$. In this case, for $\alpha \geq \alpha(m)$, we have that I' is a single interval of length

$$2 + \left(\frac{r_{\alpha,m}}{2} - 3\right)\left(\frac{1 + \alpha}{2}\right)^m \left(\frac{3 - \alpha}{2}\right)^m - \left(\frac{r_{\alpha,m}}{2} - 1\right)\left(\frac{1 + \alpha}{2}\right)^m \quad (34)$$

Recalling the value of $r_{\alpha,m}$ we note that the above expression grows exponentially in m .

On the other hand, when $\alpha < \alpha(m)$, we have a disjoint union of intervals, and the total length of the union of these intervals is:

$$2r_{\alpha,m} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1 + \alpha}{2}\right)^m \left(\frac{3 - \alpha}{2}\right)^m\right), \quad (35)$$

and this is also exponential in m , since $(1 + \alpha)(3 - \alpha)/4 < 1$ and thus the expression within the brackets above is bounded from below by a suitable constant independent of m and $r_{\alpha,m}$ is exponential in m for any $0 < \alpha < 1$.

Further, for any value of α , I'' is always a single interval of length

$$\left(\frac{r_{\alpha,m}}{2} + 1\right)\left(\frac{3 + \alpha^2}{4}\right)^m - 2\left(\frac{1 + \alpha}{2}\right)^m + \left(\frac{r_{\alpha,m}}{2} - 1\right), \quad (36)$$

which is exponential in m . □

5 Sums of different Cantor sets.

Here we prove Theorem 4.

Proof. In this case, we consider two different sets of sequences

$$\alpha_1 \geq \dots \geq \alpha_n, \quad \beta_1 \geq \dots \geq \beta_p \quad (37)$$

for some integers n and p to be determined later, and central Cantor sets with these parameters. With the symmetry in the dynamics, for simplicity we require first that $\alpha_1 = \beta_1$, although this is not necessary.

We consider the sequences $a_k^{(j)}, k \geq 0, \forall j = 1, 2, \dots, n$ with $a_1^{(j)} = (1 + \alpha_j)/2$ for all $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$ and then $b_k^{(j)}, k \geq 0, \forall j = 1, 2, \dots, p$ with $b_1^{(j)} = 1$ for all $j = 1, 2, \dots, p$.

As in Section 2, consider for each $k \geq 1$:

$$S_k = \sum_{j=1}^n (a_k^{(j)})^m + \sum_{j=1}^p (b_k^{(j)})^m \quad (38)$$

Further,

$$S_1 = \sum_{j=1}^n (a_1^{(j)})^m + \sum_{j=1}^p (b_1^{(j)})^m = \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{1+\alpha_i}{2}\right)^m + p. \quad (39)$$

The interval we obtain in this case is given by

$$\left[\sum_{i=2}^n \left(\frac{1+\alpha_i}{2}\right)^m + p - 1 + 2\left(\frac{1+\beta_1}{2}\right)^m, \sum_{i=2}^n \left(\frac{1+\alpha_i}{2}\right)^m + (p+1) \right] \quad (40)$$

Consider first the case where $x \in \tilde{I}$ and $x \leq S_1$. Consider as before the unique $x_0 \in [(1+\beta_1)/2, 1]$ so that

$$x = \sum_{j=1}^n (a_1^{(j)})^m + x_0^m + \sum_{j=2}^p (b_1^{(j)})^m \quad (41)$$

Again, if $x_0 \in C_{\beta_1}$ then we are done. Otherwise as before consider the left end point of the unique open interval in whose interior x_0 lies and take it to be the element $b_2^{(1)}$, while we take $a_2^{(j)} = a_1^{(j)}$ for all $j = 1, \dots, n$ and $b_2^{(j)} = b_1^{(j)}$ for all $j = 2, \dots, p$.

As before, we get for some integer l_2 , that,

$$\Delta_2 = x - S_2 \leq m \left(\frac{1-\beta_1}{2}\right)^{l_2} \beta_1 \quad (42)$$

We note with some basic calculus that the expression $\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^l \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)$ is decreasing in α whenever $l \geq 1$. Given the chain of inequalities in Eq. (82), we thus have:

$$\left(\frac{1-\alpha_1}{2}\right)^l \left(\frac{1+\alpha_1}{2}\right) \leq \dots \leq \left(\frac{1-\alpha_n}{2}\right)^l \left(\frac{1+\alpha_n}{2}\right), \quad \left(\frac{1-\beta_1}{2}\right)^l \left(\frac{1+\beta_1}{2}\right) \leq \dots \leq \left(\frac{1-\beta_p}{2}\right)^l \left(\frac{1+\beta_p}{2}\right). \quad (43)$$

In this case, consider that $\alpha_1 = \beta_1 \geq 1/3$.

For each positive integer l , each α_j for $j \geq 2$ and each β_j for $j \geq 2$, we choose the minimum integers $n_{\alpha_j, l}, n_{\beta_j, l}$ such that

$$\left(\frac{1-\alpha_j}{2}\right)^{n_{\alpha_j, l}} \left(\frac{1+\alpha_j}{2}\right) \leq \left(\frac{1-\alpha_1}{2}\right)^l \left(\frac{1+\alpha_1}{2}\right), \quad \left(\frac{1-\beta_j}{2}\right)^{n_{\beta_j, l}} \left(\frac{1+\beta_j}{2}\right) \leq \left(\frac{1-\beta_1}{2}\right)^l \left(\frac{1+\beta_1}{2}\right) \quad (44)$$

And thus, we get

$$\begin{aligned} n_{\alpha_j, l} &= \left\lceil \frac{1}{\log\left(\frac{1-\alpha_j}{2}\right)} \left(l \cdot \log\left(\frac{1-\alpha_1}{2}\right) + \log\left(\frac{1+\alpha_1}{1+\alpha_j}\right) \right) \right\rceil \\ n_{\beta_j, l} &= \left\lceil \frac{1}{\log\left(\frac{1-\beta_j}{2}\right)} \left(l \cdot \log\left(\frac{1-\beta_1}{2}\right) + \log\left(\frac{1+\beta_1}{1+\beta_j}\right) \right) \right\rceil \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

Note that the coefficient of l on the right above is strictly greater than 1 and as a result the sequence $n_{\alpha_j, l}$ is strictly increasing in l . We also note that $n_{\alpha_1, l} = l$ for all positive integer l , and that for $j \geq 2$, we have $n_{\alpha_j, l}$ is at least 2.

Now we apply the techniques of Section 3 to this problem.

We need the analogs of Eqs. (24) and (25) in the case. Here, Eq. (25) works just with α_1 . Further, for the analog of Eq. (24), we need to ensure for the sequence of α_j 's, for every positive integer l , that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n_1} m \left(\frac{1 + \alpha_j}{2} \right)^{m-1} \left(\frac{1 - \alpha_j}{2} \right)^2 \left(\frac{1 - \alpha_j}{2} \right)^{n_{\alpha_j, l-1}} \left(\frac{1 + \alpha_j}{2} \right) > m \left(\frac{1 - \alpha_1}{2} \right)^l \left(\frac{3\alpha_1 - 1}{2} \right)$$

For this, because of how $n_{\alpha_j, l}$ is defined, it is enough to require that,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n_1} \left(\frac{1 + \alpha_j}{2} \right)^{m-1} \left(\frac{1 - \alpha_j}{2} \right)^2 \left(\frac{1 - \alpha_1}{2} \right)^l \left(\frac{1 + \alpha_1}{2} \right) > \left(\frac{1 - \alpha_1}{2} \right)^l \left(\frac{3\alpha_1 - 1}{2} \right),$$

which is equivalent to,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n_1} \left(\frac{1 + \alpha_j}{2} \right)^{m-1} \left(\frac{1 - \alpha_j}{2} \right)^2 > \left(\frac{3\alpha_1 - 1}{1 + \alpha_1} \right) \quad (46)$$

Further, for the smallest integer n_1 for which we have the above inequality, it is automatically ensured that we don't exceed: $m \left(\frac{1 - \alpha}{2} \right)^l \alpha - \left(-m \left(\frac{1 - \alpha_1}{2} \right)^{l+1} \right) = m \left(\frac{1 - \alpha_1}{2} \right)^l \left(\frac{1 + \alpha_1}{2} \right)$, because of Eq. (90), Eq. (25) for α_1 , and because $\left(\frac{1 + \alpha_j}{2} \right)^{m-1} < 1$.

Lastly, we also need the inequality corresponding to ?? in this case. Thus we need, for every positive integer l , that

$$\sum_{j=n_1+1}^{n_1+n_2} m \left(\frac{1 + \alpha_j}{2} \right)^{m-1} \left(\frac{1 - \alpha_j}{2} \right) \left(\frac{1 - \alpha_j}{2} \right)^{n_{\alpha_j, l-1}} \left(\frac{1 + \alpha_j}{2} \right) > m \left(\frac{1 - \alpha_1}{2} \right)^l \left(\frac{1 + \alpha_1}{2} \right) \quad (47)$$

Similar to the previous case, it is enough to require that

$$\sum_{j=n_1+1}^{n_2+n_1} \left(\frac{1 + \alpha_j}{2} \right)^{m-1} \left(\frac{1 - \alpha_j}{2} \right) > 1. \quad (48)$$

Further, we have $n_1 + n_2 = n$ and also a similar set of constraints works for the β parameters, with two parameters r_1, r_2 with $r_1 + r_2 = p$, and

$$\sum_{j=1}^{r_1} \left(\frac{1 + \beta_j}{2} \right)^{m-1} \left(\frac{1 - \beta_j}{2} \right)^2 > \left(\frac{3\beta_1 - 1}{1 + \beta_1} \right), \quad \sum_{j=r_1+1}^{r_2+r_1} \left(\frac{1 + \beta_j}{2} \right)^{m-1} \left(\frac{1 - \beta_j}{2} \right) > 1. \quad (49)$$

□

We note that by switching the roles of the α_i and β_i terms, and employing the same arguments and noting that $\alpha_1 = \beta_1$, one can get the following interval as well:

$$\left[\sum_{i=2}^n \left(\frac{1 + \beta_i}{2} \right)^m + p - 1 + 2 \left(\frac{1 + \alpha_1}{2} \right)^m, \sum_{i=2}^n \left(\frac{1 + \beta_i}{2} \right)^m + (p + 1) \right] \quad (50)$$

6 Products of same Cantor set.

Now consider the case of products of Cantor sets of the same type C_α , in order to get an open interval, with this method. First consider the case where $\alpha \leq 1/3$.

Consider the k_α 'th stage of the construction of the Cantor set C_α , in which case we have a closed interval I_{k_α} of length $(\frac{1-\alpha}{2})^{k_\alpha} \in C_{k_\alpha}$ whose right end point is 1. We consider the $2t_\alpha$ many sequences $a^{(j)}, b^{(j)}$, with $j = 1, \dots, t_\alpha$, which are initialized such that $a_1^{(j)} = (1 - (\frac{1-\alpha}{2})^{k_\alpha})$ are all at the left end point of I_{k_α} , and $b_1^{(j)} = 1$ for each $j = 1, \dots, t_\alpha$. In this case, consider the set

$$\Gamma_\alpha = \left\{ \prod_{k=1}^{2t_\alpha} c_k : c_k \in C_\alpha, k = \overline{1, 2t_\alpha} \right\},$$

where we take, the value of t_α to be determined later, such that,

$$\begin{cases} t_\alpha = s_\alpha & \alpha \leq \frac{1}{3} \\ t_\alpha = s_\alpha + p_\alpha & \alpha > \frac{1}{3}. \end{cases}$$

Here, s_α and p_α are determined in the equations Eq. (74) and Eq. (78) below, which we state here.

$$s_\alpha = \left\lceil \frac{1}{\left(1 - \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{k_\alpha}\right)^{2t_\alpha-1}} \right\rceil, \quad p_\alpha = \begin{cases} \left\lceil \frac{\left(\frac{3\alpha-1}{2}\right)^{k_\alpha}}{\left(1 - \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{k_\alpha}\right)^{2t_\alpha-1} \left(\frac{1-\alpha^2}{4}\right)} \right\rceil & \alpha > \frac{1}{3} \\ 0 & \alpha \leq \frac{1}{3} \end{cases} \quad (51)$$

First for the case of $\alpha \leq \frac{1}{3}$, we have

$$\frac{1}{\left(1 - \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{k_\alpha}\right)^{2t_\alpha-1}} \leq t_\alpha < 1 + \frac{1}{\left(1 - \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{k_\alpha}\right)^{2t_\alpha-1}} \quad (52)$$

In this case, we consider the number $a_0 > 1$ such that the graph of the function $f(t) = a_0^{2t-1} - (t-1)$ is tangent to the t axis, or in other words, the graph of the equation $y = a_0^{2t-1}$ is tangent to the graph of the straight line $y = t - 1$. In this case, the graph of $y = a_0^{2t-1}$ would also cross the straight line $y = t$ and further for any function $a^{2t-1} - (t-1)$ with $a \leq a_0$ the graph of the function a^{2t-1} would cross the graph of the straight line $y = t - 1$. If we choose the minimum integer k_α such that:

$$\frac{1}{1 - \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{k_\alpha}} \leq a_0 \Leftrightarrow k_\alpha \geq \frac{\log\left(1 - \frac{1}{a_0}\right)}{\log\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)}, \quad (53)$$

which means taking,

$$k_\alpha = \left\lceil \frac{\log\left(1 - \frac{1}{a_0}\right)}{\log\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)} \right\rceil, \quad (54)$$

we can find a positive integer solution to Eq. (52) in t_α as well. Henceforth we consider this minimum possible solution in Eq. (54).

One verifies with elementary calculus that the number a_0 above satisfies:

$$a_0^{2+\frac{1}{\log a_0}} = \frac{1}{2 \log a_0} \Leftrightarrow a_0^2 \log a_0 = \frac{1}{2e}. \quad (55)$$

Next, for the case of $\alpha > \frac{1}{3}$, with a little arithmetic combining the two parts from Eq. (101), it follows that:

$$\left(\frac{6\alpha - 1 - \alpha^2}{1 - \alpha^2}\right) \frac{1}{\left(1 - \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{k_\alpha}\right)^{2t_\alpha-1}} \leq t_\alpha < 2 + \left(\frac{6\alpha - 1 - \alpha^2}{1 - \alpha^2}\right) \frac{1}{\left(1 - \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{k_\alpha}\right)^{2t_\alpha-1}} \quad (56)$$

We call:

$$\beta_\alpha = \frac{1 - \alpha^2}{6\alpha - 1 - \alpha^2} \quad (57)$$

In this case, the above reduces to:

$$\beta_\alpha(t_\alpha - 2) < \frac{1}{\left(1 - \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{k_\alpha}\right)^{2t_\alpha-1}} \leq \beta_\alpha t_\alpha. \quad (58)$$

Here again, consider the number a_1 such that the graph of the function $g_\alpha(t) = a_1^{2t-1} - \beta_\alpha(t-2)$ is tangent to the t axis, or that the graph of the equation $y = a_1^{2t-1}$ is tangent to the graph of the straight line $y = \beta_\alpha(t-3)$. By similar arguments as before, we are guaranteed to have positive integer solution in t_α when k_α is chosen to be the smallest integer such that

$$\frac{1}{1 - \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{k_\alpha}} \leq a_1 \Leftrightarrow k_\alpha \geq \frac{\log(1 - \frac{1}{a_1})}{\log(\frac{1-\alpha}{2})}, \quad (59)$$

and thus choosing

$$k_\alpha = \left\lceil \frac{\log(1 - \frac{1}{a_1})}{\log(\frac{1-\alpha}{2})} \right\rceil, \quad (60)$$

we can get at least one positive integer solution t_α to Eq. (56) as well. Henceforth we choose the minimum possible solution.

Again with elementary calculus one verifies that the number a_1 satisfies:

$$a_1^{5+\frac{1}{\log a_1}} = \frac{\beta_\alpha}{2 \log a_1} \Leftrightarrow a_1^5 \log a_1 = \frac{\beta_\alpha}{2e} \quad (61)$$

Once we get a positive integer solution t_α to Eq. (56), we can also find integers s_α, p_α that satisfy Eq. (101) with the condition that $t_\alpha = s_\alpha + p_\alpha$. From the geometry of the line

$y = \beta_\alpha t$ and the graph of $y = a_1^{2t-1}$ one sees that the solution t_α is at least $1/\beta_\alpha$ which is the point where the line $y = \beta_\alpha t$ intersects the line $y = 1$.

Also consider the interval,

$$I_\alpha = \left[\left(1 - \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2} \right)^{k_\alpha} \right)^{t_\alpha+1}, \left(1 - \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2} \right)^{k_\alpha} \right)^{t_\alpha-1} \right] \quad (62)$$

Theorem 5. *Given the central Cantor set C_α and $t_\alpha, k_\alpha, I_\alpha, \Gamma_\alpha$ as above, we have:*

$$I_\alpha \subset \Gamma_\alpha.$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, we only show that any $x \in \left[\left(1 - \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2} \right)^{k_\alpha} \right)^{t_\alpha+1}, \left(1 - \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2} \right)^{k_\alpha} \right)^{t_\alpha} \right]$ belongs to Γ_α .

Consider for each $j \geq 1$, the expression,

$$P_j = \prod_{k=1}^{t_\alpha} a_j^{(k)} b_j^{(k)}. \quad (63)$$

Also, define for each j ,

$$\Delta_j = x - P_j. \quad (64)$$

In this case, consider the unique real number x_0 such that $x = a_1^{(1)} \dots a_1^{(t_\alpha)} x_0 b_1^{(2)} \dots b_1^{(t_\alpha)}$. If $x_0 \in C_\alpha$ we are done, otherwise, we consider the unique open interval in the further construction of C_α restricted to I_{k_α} , in which x_0 lies, and take $b_2^{(1)}$ to be the left end point of this interval, and keep $a_2^{(j)} = a_1^{(j)} \forall j = 1, \dots, t_\alpha$, and $b_2^{(j)} = b_1^{(j)} \forall j = 2, \dots, t_\alpha$. Let this open interval have a length $\alpha \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2} \right)^{k_1}$, with clearly $k_1 \geq k_\alpha$.

In this case, we have

$$\Delta_2 = x - P_2 = (x_0 - b_2^{(1)}) \prod_{k=1}^{t_\alpha} a_2^{(k)} \prod_{k=2}^{t_\alpha} b_2^{(k)} < \alpha \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2} \right)^{k_1} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2} \right)^{k_\alpha} \right)^{t_\alpha} \cdot 1 \quad (65)$$

$$< \alpha \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2} \right)^{k_1} \quad (66)$$

$$< \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2} \right)^{k_1+1}, \quad (67)$$

in this case, since $\alpha \leq 1/3$, we have the last inequality.

Further consider the unique $k_2 \geq k_1 + 1$ such that

$$\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2} \right)^{k_2+1} \leq \Delta_2 < \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2} \right)^{k_2} \quad (68)$$

In this case, we would like to increase one or more of the $a^{(j)}$ sequences so that Δ_2 decreases to a value of Δ_3 , with $|\Delta_3| \leq \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{k_3}$ with $k_3 > k_2$.

If we increase just $a_2^{(1)}$ to

$$a_3^{(1)} = a_2^{(1)} + \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{k_2},$$

and keep $a_3^{(j)} = a_2^{(j)}$ for all $j = 2, \dots, m$, and $b_3^{(j)} = a_2^{(j)}$ for all $j = 1, \dots, m$, we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{k_\alpha}\right)^{2t_\alpha-1} \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{k_2} < P_3 - P_2 = (a_3^{(1)} - a_2^{(1)}) \prod_{k=2}^{t_\alpha} a_2^{(k)} \prod_{k=1}^{t_\alpha} b_2^{(k)} \\ < \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{k_2} \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

We call,

$$\theta_\alpha = \left(1 - \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{k_\alpha}\right). \quad (70)$$

As in the case of Lemma 2, it is now enough to consider the following two cases:

- $\Delta_2 = \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{k_2+1}$. In this case, we have

$$\Delta_3 = \Delta_2 - (P_3 - P_2) > \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{k_2+1} - \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{k_2} \quad (71)$$

$$> -\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{k_2} \alpha \quad (72)$$

$$> -\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{k_2+1} \quad (73)$$

- $\Delta_2 = \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{k_2}$. In this case, in the worst case, by considering $t_\alpha = \lceil \frac{1}{\theta_\alpha^{2t_\alpha-1}} \rceil$ many sequences $a^{(j)}$ which we increase each by an amount $\left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{k_2}$, we get, in a case analogous to Lemma 2 by considering the lower bound on $P_3 - P_2$, that $\Delta_3 < \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{k_2+1}$.

Thus we have the condition for $\alpha \leq 1/3$:

$$t_\alpha = s_\alpha = \left\lceil \frac{1}{\theta_\alpha} \right\rceil = \left\lceil \frac{1}{\left(1 - \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{k_\alpha}\right)^{2t_\alpha-1}} \right\rceil \quad (74)$$

Further on, the dynamics works in the same way so that we get $|\Delta_k| = |x - P_k| \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

Next, the case when $\alpha > 1/3$ is again very similar to the corresponding case of Lemma 2: the analogue of Eq. (25) is given explicitly as:

$$\left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{k_2+1} < 2\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{k_2+1} \quad (75)$$

Also, the case corresponding to Eq. (24) is given by considering the least positive integer p_α so that:

$$p_\alpha \theta_\alpha^{2t_\alpha-1} \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right) \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{k_2+1} > \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{k_2} \left(\frac{3\alpha-1}{2}\right) \quad (76)$$

$$= \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{k_2} \alpha - \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{k_2+1} \quad (77)$$

This gives us,

$$p_\alpha = \left\lceil \frac{\left(\frac{3\alpha-1}{2}\right)}{\left(1 - \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{k_\alpha}\right)^{2t_\alpha-1} \left(\frac{1-\alpha^2}{4}\right)} \right\rceil, \quad (78)$$

while we also have

$$s_\alpha = \left\lceil \frac{1}{\left(1 - \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{k_\alpha}\right)^{2t_\alpha-1}} \right\rceil, \quad (79)$$

and we recall that $t_\alpha = s_\alpha + p_\alpha$.

Thus we have that:

$$t_\alpha = \left\lceil \frac{1}{\left(1 - \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{k_\alpha}\right)^{2t_\alpha-1}} \right\rceil + \left\lceil \frac{\left(\frac{3\alpha-1}{2}\right)}{\left(1 - \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{k_\alpha}\right)^{2t_\alpha-1} \left(\frac{1-\alpha^2}{4}\right)} \right\rceil. \quad (80)$$

The condition in Eq. (75) above ensures that in the case when $\Delta_2 = \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{k_2+1}$, by increasing exactly one of the $a^{(j)}$'s, for some $j \in \{1 + t_\alpha, \dots, (p_\alpha + t_\alpha)\}$, by an amount of $\left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{k_2+1}$, that in the worst case, the decrement to Δ_2 is such that Δ_3 is bounded from below by $-\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{k_2+1}$.

The second case above ensures that in the other extreme case when $\Delta_2 = \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{k_2} \alpha$, by considering up-to all of the p_α many $a^{(j)}$ sequences and increasing them by an amount of $((1+\alpha)/2)\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{k_2+1}$, that in the worst case, we have that Δ_3 is bounded from above by $\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{k_2+1}$.

This process iterates at every step, with the argument repeating for each of the stages with the exponents $k_q \rightarrow \infty$ as $q \rightarrow \infty$.

Further on, the dynamics iterates exactly as in the case of $\alpha > 1/3$ for Lemma 2; we would need a further $2p_\alpha$ many sequences.

For some $k_3 \geq k_2$, it is enough to consider the following two cases:

- $\Delta_3 = \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{k_3+2}$; in this case, if we increase exactly one of the sequences $a^{(j)}$ for some fixed $1 \leq j \leq s_\alpha$, then again we would conclude that

$$\Delta_4 \geq -\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{k_3+1} \alpha. \quad (81)$$

In this case, $\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{k_3+1} \alpha \geq \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{k_3+2}$, and we would have to recursively employ the argument following Eq. (78) above, with p_α many sequences $b^{(j)}$ with $b^{(j)}$ being

initialized to 1, and which are decreased in the manner identical to the one above, and this would make $\Delta_4 \geq -\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{k_3+2}$. Because of the symmetry of the dynamical system, we have the requirement of the other set of p_α sequences in the later step.

- $\Delta_3 = \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{k_3+1}$; here we have to increase up to s_α many of the corresponding $a^{(j)}$ and for each of them we get a decrement to Δ_3 of the amount whose magnitude is lower bounded by $\left(1 - \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{k_\alpha}\right)^{2t_\alpha-1} \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right) \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{k_2}$, for j in the range $\{1, 2, \dots, s_\alpha\}$, and then again we get:

$$-\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{k_3+1} \alpha < \Delta_4 \leq \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{k_3+2},$$

and the dynamical system iterates again with the use possibly of $2p_\alpha$ many sequences as in the previous case. □

Given any fixed $0 < \alpha < 1$, we have taken the smallest permissible positive integer t_α and k_α , in order to get the fewest number of terms needed to get the biggest possible open interval.

7 Products of different Cantor sets.

In this case, as in Section 5, we consider two different sets of sequences;

$$\alpha_1 \geq \dots \geq \alpha_n, \quad \beta_1 \geq \dots \geq \beta_p, \quad (82)$$

for some integers n, p to be determined later, and central Cantor sets with these parameters. We also require for simplicity that $\alpha_1 = \beta_1$, although this is not strictly necessary.

As in Section 5, we consider the sequences $a_k^{(j)}, k \geq 0, \forall j = 1, 2, \dots, n$ with $a_1^{(j)} = (1 + \alpha_j)/2$ for all $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$ and then $b_k^{(j)}, k \geq 0, \forall j = 1, 2, \dots, p$ with $b_1^{(j)} = 1$ for all $j = 1, 2, \dots, p$. Consider similar to Section 5, for each $k \geq 1$, the expression

$$P_k = \prod_{j=1}^n a_k^{(j)} \prod_{j=1}^p b_k^{(j)}. \quad (83)$$

Recall, we defined in Section 6,

$$\theta_\alpha = \left(1 - \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2}\right)^{k_\alpha}\right).$$

and here we define a parameter,

$$\chi := \left(\prod_{i=1}^n \theta_{\alpha_i} \prod_{i=1}^p \theta_{\beta_i}\right) \quad (84)$$

We note that in this case we are making the lower bound corresponding to Eq. (69) weaker by putting in an additional θ_{α_1} factor on the left. Thus the contribution to the total number of terms, as in Eq. (74) increases in this case.

We state the main theorem:

Theorem 6. Consider the sequences $\alpha_1 \geq \alpha_2 \geq \dots \geq \alpha_n$ and $\beta_1 \geq \beta_2 \geq \dots \geq \beta_p$ as defined earlier, with $\alpha_1 = \beta_1$, with the constraints that,

$$\chi \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \left(\frac{1 - \alpha_i}{2} \right)^2 > \left(\frac{3\alpha_1 - 1}{1 + \alpha_1} \right), \quad \chi \sum_{i=1+n_1}^{n_1+n_2} \left(\frac{1 - \alpha_i}{2} \right) > 1. \quad (85)$$

Here, χ is defined above, and we have $n_1 + n_2 = n$. Further, we require, with $r_1 + r_2 = p$, that,

$$\chi \sum_{i=1}^{r_1} \left(\frac{1 - \beta_i}{2} \right)^2 > \left(\frac{3\beta_1 - 1}{1 + \beta_1} \right), \quad \chi \sum_{i=1+r_1}^{r_1+r_2} \left(\frac{1 - \beta_i}{2} \right) > 1. \quad (86)$$

Then the following intervals,

$$\left[\left(\prod_{i=1}^p \left(1 - \left(\frac{1 - \beta_i}{2} \right)^{k_{\beta_i}} \right) \right) \left(1 - \left(\frac{1 - \alpha_1}{2} \right)^{k_{\alpha_1}} \right), \left(\prod_{i=2}^p \left(1 - \left(\frac{1 - \beta_i}{2} \right)^{k_{\beta_i}} \right) \right) \right], \quad (87)$$

$$\left[\left(\prod_{i=1}^n \left(1 - \left(\frac{1 - \alpha_i}{2} \right)^{k_{\alpha_i}} \right) \right) \left(1 - \left(\frac{1 - \beta_1}{2} \right)^{k_{\beta_1}} \right), \left(\prod_{i=2}^n \left(1 - \left(\frac{1 - \alpha_i}{2} \right)^{k_{\alpha_i}} \right) \right) \right], \quad (88)$$

are contained in the set,

$$\Gamma = \left\{ \prod_{k=1}^n c_k \prod_{l=1}^p d_l : c_k \in C_{\alpha_k}, d_l \in C_{\beta_l} \right\} \quad (89)$$

In this case, for each $l \geq 1$, we again have the chain of inequalities from Eq. (43), and we further define for each positive integer l , for each $\alpha_j \geq 2$ and for each $\beta_j \geq 2$, we find the minimum integers $n_{\alpha_j, l}$ and $n_{\beta_j, l}$ so that,

$$\left(\frac{1 - \alpha_j}{2} \right)^{n_{\alpha_j, l}} \left(\frac{1 + \alpha_j}{2} \right) \leq \left(\frac{1 - \alpha_1}{2} \right)^l \left(\frac{1 + \alpha_1}{2} \right), \quad \left(\frac{1 - \beta_j}{2} \right)^{n_{\beta_j, l}} \left(\frac{1 + \beta_j}{2} \right) \leq \left(\frac{1 - \beta_1}{2} \right)^l \left(\frac{1 + \beta_1}{2} \right). \quad (90)$$

This gives us the expressions for $n_{\alpha_j, l}, n_{\beta_j, l}$ as in Eq. (45). Now we use the techniques of Section 5 in this problem. Without loss of generality, we work with the case where $\alpha_1 = \beta_1 \geq 1/3$. We work with the analog of Eq. (76) with α_1 , and require:

$$\chi \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \left(\frac{1 - \alpha_i}{2} \right)^2 \left(\frac{1 - \alpha_i}{2} \right)^{n_{\alpha_i, l-1}} \left(\frac{1 + \alpha_i}{2} \right) > \left(\frac{1 - \alpha_1}{2} \right)^l \left(\frac{3\alpha_1 - 1}{2} \right).$$

Because of how the $n_{\alpha_i, l}$ are defined, it is enough to require that,

$$\chi \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \left(\frac{1 - \alpha_i}{2} \right)^2 \left(\frac{1 - \alpha_1}{2} \right)^l \left(\frac{1 + \alpha_1}{2} \right) > \left(\frac{1 - \alpha_1}{2} \right)^l \left(\frac{3\alpha_1 - 1}{2} \right).$$

This gives us the requirement,

$$\chi \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \left(\frac{1 - \alpha_i}{2} \right)^2 > \left(\frac{3\alpha_1 - 1}{1 + \alpha_1} \right). \quad (91)$$

We further require an analog of Eq. (74):

$$\chi \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \left(\frac{1-\alpha_i}{2} \right) \left(\frac{1+\alpha_i}{2} \right) \left(\frac{1-\alpha_i}{2} \right)^{n_{\alpha_i, l}-1} > \left(\frac{1-\alpha_1}{2} \right)^l \left(\frac{1+\alpha_1}{2} \right).$$

Further, because of the definition of $n_{\alpha_i, l}$, it is enough to require that:

$$\chi \sum_{i=1+n_1}^{n_1+n_2} \left(\frac{1-\alpha_i}{2} \right) > 1. \quad (92)$$

and finally we have $n_1 + n_2 = n$. An analogous set of constraints is needed for the β_i parameters. Given Eq. (84), the Eqs. (91) and (92) are coupled inequalities in the parameters n_1 and n_2 . This would have a set of solutions in the parameters α_i and then the n_1, n_2 . A similar statement holds for β_i parameters.

We end with a discussion for the arbitrary sequence $\gamma_n \leq \gamma_{n-1} \leq \dots \leq \gamma_1$. We can split it up into two disjoint subsequences $\alpha_k \leq \alpha_{k-1} \leq \alpha_{k-2} \leq \alpha_1$ and $\beta_j \leq \beta_{j-1} \leq \dots \leq \beta_1$ and consider the sets $A = \{\alpha_t : \alpha_t \leq \beta_1\}$ and $B = \{\beta_t : \beta_t \leq \alpha_1\}$. In this case, one can verify that it would be enough to require analogs of Eqs. (91) and (92) which are the following:

$$\chi_1 \sum_{i \in A_1} \left(\frac{1-\alpha_i}{2} \right)^2 > \left(\frac{3\beta_1-1}{1+\beta_1} \right), \quad \chi_1 \sum_{i \in A_2} \left(\frac{1-\alpha_i}{2} \right) > 1. \quad (93)$$

Further we also require:

$$\chi_1 \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \left(\frac{1-\beta_i}{2} \right)^2 > \left(\frac{3\beta_1-1}{1+\beta_1} \right), \quad \chi_1 \sum_{i=(n_1+1)}^{n_1+n_2} \left(\frac{1-\beta_i}{2} \right) > 1. \quad (94)$$

Here we have the disjoint union $A = A_1 \sqcup A_2$ and also $n_1 + n_2 = j$.

Symmetrically, we can also have the following:

$$\chi_2 \sum_{i \in B_1} \left(\frac{1-\beta_i}{2} \right)^2 > \left(\frac{3\alpha_1-1}{1+\alpha_1} \right), \quad \chi_2 \sum_{i \in B_2} \left(\frac{1-\beta_i}{2} \right) > 1, \quad (95)$$

as well as,

$$\chi_2 \sum_{i=1}^{m_1} \left(\frac{1-\alpha_i}{2} \right)^2 > \left(\frac{3\alpha_1-1}{1+\alpha_1} \right), \quad \chi_2 \sum_{i=(m_1+1)}^{m_1+m_2} \left(\frac{1-\alpha_i}{2} \right) > 1, \quad (96)$$

where $B = B_1 \sqcup B_2$ and also $m_1 + m_2 = k$.

Here, $\chi_1 := \prod_{i \in A} \theta_{\alpha_i} \prod_{t=1}^j \theta_{\beta_t}$, $\chi_2 := \prod_{i \in B} \theta_{\beta_i} \prod_{t=1}^k \theta_{\alpha_t}$.

Associated to each $\gamma_i, i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ is also the k_{γ_i} factor that appears in θ_{γ_i} which are optimized, and which would give us, subject to satisfying Eqs. (93) and (94), the open intervals

$$I_1 = \left[\left(\prod_{i \in A} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1-\alpha_i}{2} \right)^{k_{\alpha_i}} \right) \right) \left(1 - \left(\frac{1-\beta_1}{2} \right)^{k_{\beta_1}} \right), \left(\prod_{i \in A} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1-\alpha_i}{2} \right)^{k_{\alpha_i}} \right) \right) \right], \quad (97)$$

$$I_2 = \left[\left(\prod_{i=1}^j \left(1 - \left(\frac{1-\beta_i}{2} \right)^{k_{\beta_i}} \right) \right), \left(\prod_{i=2}^j \left(1 - \left(\frac{1-\beta_i}{2} \right)^{k_{\beta_i}} \right) \right) \right] \quad (98)$$

Further, subject to satisfying the constraints of Eqs. (95) and (96), we get the following two intervals:

$$I_3 = \left[\left(\prod_{i \in B} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1-\beta_i}{2} \right)^{k_{\beta_i}} \right) \right) \left(1 - \left(\frac{1-\alpha_1}{2} \right)^{k_{\alpha_1}} \right), \left(\prod_{i \in B} \left(1 - \left(\frac{1-\beta_i}{2} \right)^{k_{\beta_i}} \right) \right) \right], \quad (99)$$

$$I_4 = \left[\left(\prod_{i=1}^k \left(1 - \left(\frac{1-\alpha_i}{2} \right)^{k_{\alpha_i}} \right) \right), \left(\prod_{i=2}^k \left(1 - \left(\frac{1-\alpha_i}{2} \right)^{k_{\alpha_i}} \right) \right) \right] \quad (100)$$

Finally, we note that the intervals obtained here will change if some of the Cantor sets have support in a unit interval other than $[0, 1]$. Further, one can employ the methods of Section 4 to expand the open intervals obtained in the case of products of Cantor sets, which we have not pursued here.

8 Sums and products under images of C^1 maps.

We conclude with an outline of the results one would get for one function $\phi(x)$ that is C^1 and supported in $[0, 1]$.⁽⁹⁾

For the problem of the sumsets, suppose that the first derivative being continuous and thus bounded on $[\frac{1+\alpha}{2}, 1]$, is such that $0 \leq g_2 \leq \phi'(x) \leq g_1$ and ϕ is monotonic on $[\frac{1+\alpha}{2}, 1]$. In this case, one can use the mean value theorem and these bounds to alter the upper bound on Eq. (15) and the upper and lower bounds on Eq. (16), so that we would get the following.

Fix $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. For this fixed α let C_α be the Cantor set as in the introduction. Also, let

$$s_{\alpha, \phi} = \left\lfloor \frac{g_1}{g_2} \right\rfloor, \quad k_{\alpha, \phi} = \begin{cases} \left\lfloor \frac{\frac{3\alpha-1}{2}}{\left(\frac{g_2}{g_1}\right)\left(\frac{1-\alpha^2}{4}\right)} \right\rfloor & \\ 0 & \alpha \leq 1/3 \end{cases},$$

and let $r_{\alpha, \phi} = 2s_{\alpha, \phi} + 2k_{\alpha, \phi}$. Set

$$\Gamma_{\alpha, \phi} = \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^{r_{\alpha, \phi}} \phi(c_k) : c_k \in C_\alpha \right\}$$

Then one has the interval I similar to the one defined in Theorem 2;

$$I = \left[\left(\frac{r_{\alpha, m}}{2} - 1 \right) \phi(1) + \left(\frac{r_{\alpha, m}}{2} + 1 \right) \phi\left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right), \left(\frac{r_{\alpha, m}}{2} + 1 \right) \phi(1) + \left(\frac{r_{\alpha, m}}{2} - 1 \right) \phi\left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right) \right]$$

⁽⁹⁾One can in principle extend these to multiple functions with different Cantor sets, which we don't do here.

and that we have $I \subset \Gamma_{\alpha, \phi} := \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^{r_{\alpha, \phi}} \phi(c_k) : c_k \in C_{\alpha} \right\}$.

Consider the case of products, and the quantities,

$$s_{\alpha} = \left[\frac{\frac{g_3}{g_4}}{\left(\phi \left(1 - \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2} \right)^{k_{\alpha}} \right) \right)^{2t_{\alpha}-1}} \right], \quad p_{\alpha} = \begin{cases} \left[\frac{\frac{g_3 \left(\frac{3\alpha-1}{2} \right)}{g_4}}{\left(\phi \left(1 - \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2} \right)^{k_{\alpha}} \right) \right)^{2t_{\alpha}-1} \left(\frac{1-\alpha^2}{4} \right)} \right] & \alpha > \frac{1}{3} \\ 0 & \alpha \leq \frac{1}{3} \end{cases}, \quad (101)$$

where we have the bounds $0 \leq g_4 \leq \phi'(x) \leq g_3$ and ϕ is monotonic on the range $\left[\left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2} \right)^{k_{\alpha}}, 1 \right]$.

Then we contain the interval

$$I_{\alpha} = \left[\left(\phi \left(1 - \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2} \right)^{k_{\alpha}} \right) \right)^{t_{\alpha}+1}, \left(\phi \left(1 - \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2} \right)^{k_{\alpha}} \right) \right)^{t_{\alpha}-1} \right] \subset \Gamma_{\alpha, \phi} := \left\{ \prod_{k=1}^{2t_{\alpha}} \phi(c_k) : c_k \in C_{\alpha} \right\}. \quad (102)$$

Here, as in Section 6, we again have

$$\begin{cases} t_{\alpha} = s_{\alpha} & \alpha \leq \frac{1}{3} \\ t_{\alpha} = s_{\alpha} + p_{\alpha} & \alpha > \frac{1}{3}. \end{cases}$$

Note that if the function ϕ is positive within $[0, 1]$ one can alter the argument to run the dynamics within the entire interval $[0, 1]$ as opposed to the restricted interval $\left[\frac{1+\alpha}{2}, 1 \right]$.

9 Acknowledgements

The author is grateful to Arun Suresh for many discussions, and to Pablo Shmerkin, Anton Gorodetski and Petros Valettas for feedback on these questions.

References

- [Ast00] Astels, S., Cantor Sets and Numbers with Restricted Partial Quotients, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society Vol. 352, No. 1 (Jan., 2000), pp. 133-170.
- [Ath19] Athreya, J.S., Reznick, B., Tyson, J.T. (2019), Cantor Set Arithmetic, *Amer. Math. Monthly*, 126(1): 4-17.
- [Ast00] Astels, S., Cantor Sets and Numbers with Restricted Partial Quotients, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society Vol. 352, No. 1 (Jan., 2000), pp. 133-170.
- [Ath19] Athreya, J.S., Reznick, B., Tyson, J.T. (2019), Cantor Set Arithmetic, *Amer. Math. Monthly*, 126(1): 4-17.
- [Cab02] Cabrelli, C. A., Hare, K., and Molter, U., Sums of Cantor sets yielding an interval. Journal of the Australian Mathematical Society 73, no. 3 (2002): 405-418.

- [Cab97] Cabrelli, C. A., Hare, K., and Molter, U., Sums of Cantor sets. *Ergodic theory and dynamical systems* 17, no. 6 (1997): 1299-1313.
- [Yoc01] Carlos Gustavo, T. de A., and Jean-Christophe Yoccoz. Stable intersections of regular Cantor sets with large Hausdorff dimensions. *Annals of Mathematics* (2001): 45-96
- [GuX19] Gu, J., Xi, Z., (2019), Multiplication on uniform λ -Cantor sets. arXiv:1910.08303.
- [Guo21] Guo, Y., Waring-Hilbert problem on Cantor sets. *Expositiones Mathematicae* (2021).
- [Hal91] Halmos, P.,(1991) *Problems for Mathematicians, Young and Old*, The Mathematical Association of America, pp-105, 141.
- [Maj65] Majumdar, N. C. B.,(1965), On the Distance Set of the Cantor Middle Third Set, III, *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 72 725.
- [Mar21] Marchese, L., (2021). On the measure of products from the middle-third Cantor set. arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.09939.
- [New79] Newhouse, S. E. The abundance of wild hyperbolic sets and non-smooth stable sets for diffeomorphisms. *Publications Mathématiques de l’IHÉS* 50 (1979): 101-151.
- [Pat18] Pathak, A. (2018), Reals in the unit interval as average of two reals in the Cantor’s middle third set, *The Mathematics Student*, Vol 87 Nos 3-4: 131-133.
- [Pat22] Pathak, A. “On sums, products and slices of some Cantor sets”, Submitted.
- [Ran40] Randolph, J.F, Distances Between Points of the Cantor Set, *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 47 (1940) 549
- [Sol96] Solomyak, B. (1997). On the measure of arithmetic sums of Cantor sets. *Indagationes Mathematicae*, 8(1), 133-141.
- [Tak17] Takahashi, Y. (2017). Products of two Cantor sets. *Nonlinearity*, 30(5), 2114.
- [Utz51] Utz, W.R, The distance set for the Cantor discontinuum, *The American Mathematical Monthly* , 58 (1951) 407.
- [Wan21] Wang, Z., Jiang, K., Li, W., Zhao, B., On the sum of squares of the middle-third Cantor set. *Journal of Number Theory*, 218, 209-222 (2021).