

SHRINKING PARALLELEPIPED TARGETS IN BETA-DYNAMICAL SYSTEMS

YUBIN HE

ABSTRACT. For $\beta > 1$ let T_β be the β -transformation on $[0, 1)$. Let $1 < \beta_1 \leq \dots \leq \beta_d$ and let (P_n) be a sequence of parallelepipeds on $[0, 1)^d$. Define

$$W_d(P_n) = \{\mathbf{x} \in [0, 1)^d : (T_{\beta_1} \times \dots \times T_{\beta_d})^n(\mathbf{x}) \in P_n \text{ infinitely often}\}.$$

The ‘rectangle to rectangle’ mass transference principle is usually used to obtain the lower bound of the Hausdorff dimension of $W_d(P_n)$ when each P_n is a hyperrectangle with sides parallel to the axes. However, this principle no longer applies even if P_n is still a hyperrectangle but with rotation. Under some mild conditions on the sidelengths of each P_n , we determine the Hausdorff dimension of $W_d(P_n)$ and prove that $W_d(P_n)$ has large intersection properties. If $d = 2$, then the aforementioned condition can be removed. To further illustrate, we provide several examples that demonstrate how the rotations of rectangles impact the Hausdorff dimension of $W_2(P_n)$.

1. INTRODUCTION

The classical theory of Diophantine approximation is concerned with finding good approximations of irrationals. For any irrational $x \in [0, 1]$, if one can find infinitely many rationals p/q such that $|x - p/q| < q^{-\tau}$ with $\tau > 2$, then x is said to be τ -well approximable. In [8], Hill and Velani introduced a dynamical analogue of the classical theory of τ -well approximable numbers. The study of these sets is known as the so-called *shrinking target problem*. Consider a transformation T on a metric space (X, d) . Let (B_n) be a sequence of balls with radius $r(B_n) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. The shrinking target problem concerns the size, especially the Hausdorff dimension, of the set

$$W(T, B_n) := \{x \in X : T^n x \in B_n \text{ i.o.}\},$$

where ‘i.o.’ stands for infinitely often. Since its initial introduction, $W(T, B_n)$ has been studied intensively in many dynamical systems. See [1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 17, 19] and reference therein.

The set $W(T, B_n)$ can be thought of as trajectories which hit shrinking targets (B_n) infinitely often. Naturally, one would like to consider different targets, such as hyperrectangles, rather than just balls. For this purpose, motivated by the weighted theory of Diophantine approximation, the following set had also been introduced in

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. 28A80.

Key words and phrases. β -expansion, Hausdorff dimension, large intersection property, shrinking target problem.

β -dynamical system. For $d \geq 1$, let $1 < \beta_1 \leq \cdots \leq \beta_d$ and let (P_n) be a sequence of parallelepipeds on $[0, 1]^d$. Define

$$W_d(P_n) = \{\mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]^d : (T_{\beta_1} \times \cdots \times T_{\beta_d})^n(\mathbf{x}) \in P_n \text{ i.o.}\},$$

where $T_{\beta_i}: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is given by

$$T_{\beta_i}x = \beta_i x - [\beta_i x].$$

Here $[\cdot]$ denotes the integer part of a real number. Under the assumption that P_n are hyperrectangles with sides parallel to the axes, the Hausdorff dimension of $W_d(P_n)$, denoted by $\dim_{\text{H}} W_d(P_n)$, was calculated by Li, Liao, Velani and Zorin [12, Theorem 12]. It should be pointed out that their result crucially relies on this assumption. To see this, observe that $W_d(P_n)$ can be written as

$$\bigcap_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n=N}^{\infty} (T_{\beta_1} \times \cdots \times T_{\beta_d})^{-n} P_n.$$

In the presence of such assumption, $(T_{\beta_1} \times \cdots \times T_{\beta_d})^{-n} P_n$ will be the union of hyperrectangles whose sides are also parallel to the axes. Thus, the ‘rectangle to rectangle’ mass transference principle by Wang and Wu [18] can be employed to obtain the desired lower bound of $\dim_{\text{H}} W_d(P_n)$. However, if one removes this restriction on (P_n) , then $(T_{\beta_1} \times \cdots \times T_{\beta_d})^{-n} P_n$ typically turns out to be the union of parallelepipeds, and the mass transference principle is no longer applicable. The main purpose of this paper is to determine $\dim_{\text{H}} W_d(P_n)$ without assuming each P_n is hyperrectangle. We further show that $W_d(P_n)$ has large intersection properties introduced by Falconer [5], which means that the set $W_d(P_n)$ belongs, for some $0 \leq s \leq d$, to the class $\mathcal{G}^s([0, 1]^d)$ of G_δ -sets, with the property that any countable intersection of bi-Lipschitz images of sets in $\mathcal{G}^s([0, 1]^d)$ has Hausdorff dimension at least s . In particular, the Hausdorff dimension of $W_d(P_n)$ is at least s .

Note that up to a translation, each P_n can be uniquely determined by d vectors $(a_{1j}^{(n)}, \dots, a_{dj}^{(n)})$, $1 \leq j \leq d$. Define

$$f_d = \text{diag}(\beta_1^{-1}, \dots, \beta_d^{-1}).$$

Let

$$s_d := \inf \left\{ s \geq 0 : \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \beta_1^n \cdots \beta_d^n \cdot \phi^s(f_d^n P_n) < \infty \right\},$$

where for a set E , $\phi^s(E)$ denotes the singular value function on E defined in (3.1). Our first result is stated below.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $1 < \beta_1 \leq \cdots \leq \beta_d$ and $T_{\beta_1}, \dots, T_{\beta_d}$ be the corresponding β -transformations. Suppose that for any i, j and n , we have $\beta_i^{-n} a_{ij}^{(n)} \leq \beta_d^{-n}$. Then,*

$$\dim_{\text{H}} W_d(P_n) = s_d.$$

Further, we have $W_d(P_n) \in \mathcal{G}^{s_d}([0, 1]^d)$.

The technical condition appearing in Theorem 1.1 says that for each n , the side-lengths of $f_d^n P_n$ are less than β_d^{-n} . This condition yields a satisfactory estimate for the singular value function: $\phi^s(f_d^n P_n) \leq (2\sqrt{d})^s \beta_d^{-ns}$ for any $s \geq 0$, as shown in (3.8). In the special case when $d = 2$, each $f_2^n P_n$ is indeed a parallelogram. The relatively simple geometric properties of parallelograms allow us to estimate $\phi^s(f_2^n P_n)$ without the aforementioned condition. Consequently, we can derive the Hausdorff dimension of $W_2(P_n)$.

For $d = 2$, write

$$(1.1) \quad \gamma_n = \max \left(\sqrt{(\beta_1^{-n} a_{11}^{(n)})^2 + (\beta_2^{-n} a_{21}^{(n)})^2}, \sqrt{(\beta_1^{-n} a_{12}^{(n)})^2 + (\beta_2^{-n} a_{22}^{(n)})^2} \right)$$

and

$$(1.2) \quad A_n = a_{11}^{(n)} a_{22}^{(n)} - a_{21}^{(n)} a_{12}^{(n)}.$$

Let \mathcal{U} be the set of accumulation points of the sequence

$$\left\{ \left(-\frac{\log \gamma_n}{n}, -\frac{\log |A_n|}{n} \right) \right\}.$$

Theorem 1.2. *Let $1 < \beta_1 \leq \beta_2$ and T_{β_1}, T_{β_2} be the corresponding β -transformations. Then, the Hausdorff dimension of $W_2(P_n)$, denoted by s^* , is equal to*

$$\max_{(t_1, t_2) \in \mathcal{U}} \min \left(\frac{\log \beta_1 + \log \beta_2}{t_1}, 1 + \frac{\log \beta_1 + \log \beta_2 - t_1}{\log \beta_1 + \log \beta_2 - t_1 + t_2}, \frac{\log \beta_1 + t_1}{t_1} \right).$$

Further, $W_2(P_n) \in \mathcal{G}^{s^*}([0, 1]^2)$.

To gain insight into Theorem 1.2, we present two examples to illustrate how the rotations of rectangles impact the Hausdorff dimension of $W_2(P_n)$.

Example 1. Let $\beta_1 = 2$ and $\beta_2 = 4$. Let (H_n) be a sequence of rectangles with $H_n = [0, 2^{-n}] \times [0, 4^{-n}]$. For a sequence (θ_n) with $\theta_n \in [0, \pi/2]$, let

$$(1.3) \quad P_n = R_{\theta_n} H_n + (1/2, 1/2),$$

where R_θ denotes the counterclockwise rotation by an angle θ . Suppose that $\theta_n \equiv \theta$ for all $n \geq 1$. For any $n \geq 1$ we have

$$\gamma_n = \sqrt{2^{-4n} \cos^2 \theta + 2^{-6n} \sin^2 \theta} \quad \text{and} \quad A_n = 2^{-3n}.$$

Hence,

$$\mathcal{U} = \begin{cases} \{(2 \log 2, 3 \log 2)\} & \text{if } \theta \in [0, \pi/2), \\ \{(3 \log 2, 3 \log 2)\} & \text{if } \theta = \pi/2. \end{cases}$$

By Theorem 1.2, we get

$$\dim_{\text{H}} W_2(P_n) = \begin{cases} 5/4 & \text{if } \theta \in [0, \pi/2), \\ 1 & \text{if } \theta = \pi/2. \end{cases}$$

Example 2. Let P_n be as in (1.3). Suppose that $\theta_n = \arccos 2^{-an}$ for some $a > 0$. Then,

$$\gamma_n = \sqrt{2^{-n(4+2a)} + 2^{-6n}(1 - 2^{-na})^2},$$

and

$$\mathcal{U} = \begin{cases} \{(2+a) \log 2, 3 \log 2\} & \text{if } a \leq 1, \\ \{(3 \log 2, 3 \log 2)\} & \text{if } a > 1. \end{cases}$$

By Theorem 1.2, we get

$$\dim_{\mathbb{H}} W_2(P_n) = \begin{cases} 1 + \frac{1-a}{4-a} & \text{if } a \leq 1, \\ 1 & \text{if } a > 1. \end{cases}$$

The structure of the paper is as follows. In Section 2, we recall several notions and elementary properties of β -transformation. In Section 3, we introduce the definition of singular value function and then estimate the singular value functions on parallelepipeds. In Sections 4 and 5, we prove Theorems 1.1 and 1.2, respectively.

2. β -TRANSFORMATION

We start with a brief discussion that sums up various fundamental properties of β -transformation.

For $\beta > 1$, let T_β be the β -transformation on $[0, 1)$. For any $n \geq 1$ and $x \in [0, 1)$, define $\epsilon_n(x, \beta) = \lfloor \beta T_\beta^{n-1} x \rfloor$. Then we can write

$$x = \frac{\epsilon_1(x, \beta)}{\beta} + \frac{\epsilon_2(x, \beta)}{\beta^2} + \cdots + \frac{\epsilon_n(x, \beta)}{\beta^n} + \cdots,$$

and we call the sequence

$$\epsilon(x, \beta) := (\epsilon_1(x, \beta), \epsilon_2(x, \beta), \dots)$$

the β -expansion of x . From the definition of T_β , it is clear that, for $n \geq 1$, $\epsilon_n(x, \beta)$ belongs to the alphabet $\mathcal{A} = \{0, \dots, \lceil \beta - 1 \rceil\}$, where $\lceil x \rceil$ denotes the smallest integer greater than or equal to x . When β is not an integer, then not all sequences of $\mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{N}}$ are the β -expansion of some $x \in [0, 1)$. This leads to the notion of β -admissible sequence.

Definition 2.1. *A finite or an infinite sequence $(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \dots) \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{N}}$ is said to be β -admissible if there exists an x such that the β -expansion of x begins with $(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \dots)$.*

Denote by Σ_β^n the collection of all admissible sequences of length n . The following result of Rényi [16] implies that the cardinality of Σ_β^n is comparable to β^n .

Lemma 2.1 ([16, formula 4.9]). *Let $\beta > 1$. For any $n \geq 1$,*

$$\beta^n \leq \#\Sigma_\beta^n \leq \frac{\beta^{n+1}}{\beta - 1},$$

where $\#$ denotes the cardinality of a finite set.

Definition 2.2. For any $\epsilon_n := (\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_n) \in \Sigma_\beta^n$, we call

$$I_{n,\beta}(\epsilon_n) := \{x \in [0, 1) : \epsilon_j(x, \beta) = \epsilon_j, 1 \leq j \leq n\}$$

an n th-level cylinder.

From the definition, it follows that $T_\beta^n|_{I_{n,\beta}(\epsilon_n)}$ is linear with slope β^n , and it maps the cylinder $I_{n,\beta}(\epsilon_n)$ into $[0, 1)$. If β is not an integer, then the dynamical system $(T_\beta, [0, 1))$ is not a full shift, which implies that $T_\beta^n|_{I_{n,\beta}(\epsilon_n)}$ is not necessary onto. In other words, the length of $I_{n,\beta}(\epsilon_n)$ may strictly less than β^{-n} , which makes describing the dynamical properties of T_β more challenging. To get around this barrier, we need the following notion.

Definition 2.3. A cylinder $I_{n,\beta}(\epsilon_n)$ or a sequence $\epsilon_n \in \Sigma_\beta^n$ is called β -full if it has maximal length, that is, if

$$|I_{n,\beta}(\epsilon_n)| = \frac{1}{\beta^n},$$

where $|I|$ denotes the diameter of I .

When there is no risk of ambiguity, we will write full instead of β -full. The importance of full sequences is based on the fact that the concatenation of two full sequences is still full.

Proposition 2.2 ([6, Lemma 3.2]). An n th-level cylinder $I_{n,\beta}(\epsilon_n)$ is full if and only if, for any β -admissible sequence $\epsilon'_m \in \Sigma_\beta^m$ with $m \geq 1$, the concatenation $\epsilon_n \epsilon'_m$ is still β -admissible. Moreover,

$$|I_{n+m,\beta}(\epsilon_n \epsilon'_m)| = |I_{n,\beta}(\epsilon_n)| \cdot |I_{m,\beta}(\epsilon'_m)|.$$

So, for any two full cylinders $I_{n,\beta}(\epsilon_n), I_{m,\beta}(\epsilon'_m)$, the cylinder $I_{n+m,\beta}(\epsilon_n \epsilon'_m)$ is also full.

For an interval $I \subset [0, 1)$, let $\Lambda_\beta^n(I)$ denote the set of full sequences ϵ_n of length n with $I_{n,\beta}(\epsilon_n) \subset I$. In particular, if $I = [0, 1)$, then we simply write Λ_β^n instead of $\Lambda_\beta^n([0, 1))$. Applying [3, Proposition 4.2] and [14, Lemma 1.1.46], we can estimate the cardinality of $\Lambda_\beta^n(I)$.

Lemma 2.3. Let $\delta > 0$. Let $n_0 \geq 3$ be an integer such that $(\beta n_0)^{1+\delta} < \beta^{n_0 \delta}$. Then for any interval I with $|I| < n_0 \beta^{-n_0}$, there exists a constant c_β such that for any $n \geq -(1 + \delta) \log_\beta |I|$,

$$\#\Lambda_\beta^n(I) \geq c_\beta |I|^{1+\delta} \beta^n.$$

Proof. Since $|I| < n_0 \beta^{-n_0}$, by [3, Proposition 4.2] we can find a full cylinder $I_{m,\beta}(\epsilon_m)$ satisfying

$$I_{m,\beta}(\epsilon_m) \subset I \quad \text{and} \quad |I|^{1+\delta} \leq |I_{m,\beta}(\epsilon_m)| < |I|.$$

Then, for any $n \geq -(1 + \delta) \log_\beta |I|$, we have $n \geq m$. By Proposition 2.2, the concatenation of two full sequences $\epsilon_{n-m} \in \Lambda_\beta^{n-m}$ and ϵ_m is still full. Thus,

$$\#\Lambda_\beta^n(I) \geq \#\Lambda_\beta^{n-m} \geq c_\beta \beta^{n-m} \geq c_\beta |I|^{1+\delta} \beta^n,$$

where we have used [14, Lemma 1.1.46] in the second inequality. \square

3. SINGULAR VALUE FUNCTIONS ON PARALLELEPIPEDS

3.1. Singular value function. In order to establish Theorems 1.1 and 1.2, we need to study the most effective coverings of parallelepipeds. The singular value function introduced by Falconer [4] is a proper tool to serve this purpose.

For a rectangle $R \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ with sidelengths a and b , define the singular value function ϕ^s on R by

$$\phi^s(R) = \begin{cases} \max(a^s, b^s) & \text{if } s \leq 1, \\ \max(a, b) \cdot \min(a^{s-1}, b^{s-1}) & \text{if } s > 1. \end{cases}$$

Since the singular value function does not depend on the location of R , we will use $\phi^s(a, b)$ instead of $\phi^s(R)$. In [10, Equation (2.1)], Koivusalo and Rams generalized the singular value function as follows: For a Borel set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, define

$$(3.1) \quad \phi^s(E) = \sup_{\mu} \inf_{x \in E} \inf_{r > 0} \frac{r^s}{\mu(B(x, r))},$$

where the supremum is taken over all Borel probability measures supported on E . They further proved that up to a multiplicative constant, the singular value function agrees with the better-known quantity of Hausdorff content

$$\mathcal{H}_{\infty}^s(E) = \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |A_n i|^s : E \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} A_n i \right\},$$

where the sets $A_n i$ are closed cubes.

Proposition 3.1 ([10, Proposition 2.1]). *Let E be a bounded Borel set. Then,*

$$\phi^s(E) \leq \mathcal{H}_{\infty}^s(E) \leq 6^s \phi^s(E).$$

By the above proposition, s_d is equivalent to

$$\inf \left\{ s \geq 0 : \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \beta_1^n \cdots \beta_d^n \cdot \mathcal{H}_{\infty}^s(f_d^n P_n) < \infty \right\}.$$

3.2. Singular value functions on parallelepipeds. In this subsection, we estimate the singular value functions on parallelepipeds. We begin with the case $d = 2$.

For a parallelogram P , up to a translation, it can be identified by two vectors (a_1, a_2) and (b_1, b_2) . Moreover, its area is given by:

$$|a_1 b_2 - a_2 b_1|.$$

Write

$$\gamma = \max \left(\sqrt{a_1^2 + a_2^2}, \sqrt{b_1^2 + b_2^2} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad A := a_1 b_2 - a_2 b_1.$$

Lemma 3.2. *Let P be as above. Then, we have*

$$(3.2) \quad 4^{-1} \phi^s(\gamma, |A|/\gamma) \leq \phi^s(P) \leq 4^s \phi^s(\gamma, |A|/\gamma).$$

In particular, let P_n be as in Theorem 1.2, we have

$$(3.3) \quad 4^{-1} \phi^s(\gamma_n, \beta_1^{-n} \beta_2^{-n} |A_n|/\gamma_n) \leq \phi^s(f_2^n P_n) \leq 4^s \phi^s(\gamma_n, \beta_1^{-n} \beta_2^{-n} |A_n|/\gamma_n).$$

Proof. Suppose that γ is attained at $\sqrt{a_1^2 + a_2^2}$. Otherwise we can interchange the roles a_1, a_2 and b_1, b_2 , and the following discussion is invariant. Let

$$(3.4) \quad x_1 = \frac{-a_2(a_1b_2 - a_2b_1)}{a_1^2 + a_2^2} = b_1 - a_1 \cdot \frac{a_1b_1 + a_2b_2}{a_1^2 + a_2^2}$$

and

$$(3.5) \quad x_2 = \frac{a_1(a_1b_2 - a_2b_1)}{a_1^2 + a_2^2} = b_2 - a_2 \cdot \frac{a_1b_1 + a_2b_2}{a_1^2 + a_2^2}.$$

By the first equalities of (3.4) and (3.5), it is easily verified that x_1 and x_2 satisfy the following equations:

$$\begin{cases} a_1x_1 + a_2x_2 = 0 \\ -a_2x_1 + a_1x_2 = a_1b_2 - a_2b_1. \end{cases}$$

These equations imply that (x_1, x_2) is orthogonal to (a_1, a_2) and the rectangle determined by the vectors (x_1, x_2) , (a_1, a_2) has area $|A|$ the same as P . Since $\sqrt{a_1^2 + a_2^2} = \gamma \geq \sqrt{b_1^2 + b_2^2}$, using the inequality $|ab| \leq (a^2 + b^2)/2$ we have

$$\left| \frac{a_1b_1 + a_2b_2}{a_1^2 + a_2^2} \right| \leq 1.$$

From the second equalities of (3.4) and (3.5) it follows that P is contained in the rectangle

$$R = \{t_1(a_1, a_2) + t_2(x_1, x_2) : -2 \leq t_1 \leq 2, 0 \leq t_2 \leq 1\}.$$

Moreover, such rectangle R has sidelengths $\sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2}$ and $4\sqrt{a_1^2 + a_2^2}$ satisfying

$$(3.6) \quad \sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2} = \frac{|A|}{\gamma} = \frac{|a_1b_2 - a_2b_1|}{\sqrt{a_1^2 + a_2^2}} < 4\sqrt{a_1^2 + a_2^2}.$$

This gives the second inequality of (3.2).

For the first inequality of (3.2), let ν be the normalized Lebesgue measure on P . We only prove the case $s \leq 1$, as the remaining case $s > 1$ follows in a similar way. By (3.6), write $\tau = \sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2} = |A|/\gamma$. For any $\mathbf{x} \in P$, we consider three cases.

(1) If $0 < r \leq \tau$, then $\nu(B(\mathbf{x}, r)) \leq 4r^2/|A| = 4r^2/(\tau\gamma)$ and

$$(3.7) \quad \frac{r^s}{\nu(B(\mathbf{x}, r))} \geq \frac{\tau\gamma r^s}{4r^2} = \frac{\gamma^s \gamma^{1-s} \tau r^s}{4r^2} \geq \gamma^s/4 = \phi^s(\gamma, \tau)/4.$$

(2) If $\tau < r \leq \gamma$, then $\nu(B(\mathbf{x}, r)) \leq 2r\tau/|A| = 2r/\gamma$ and

$$\frac{r^s}{\nu(B(\mathbf{x}, r))} \geq \frac{\gamma r^s}{2r} = \frac{\gamma^s \gamma^{1-s} r^s}{2r} \geq \gamma^s/2 = \phi^s(\gamma, \tau)/2.$$

(3) If $\gamma < r$, then $\nu(B(\mathbf{x}, r)) \leq 1$ and

$$\frac{r^s}{\nu(B(\mathbf{x}, r))} \geq r^s \geq \gamma^s = \phi^s(\gamma, \tau).$$

Then, by (3.1), we obtain the first inequality of (3.2).

To conclude (3.3), it suffices to notice that up to a translation, $f_2^n P_n$ is determined by two vectors $(\beta_1^{-n} a_{11}^{(n)}, \beta_2^{-n} a_{21}^{(n)})$ and $(\beta_1^{-n} a_{12}^{(n)}, \beta_2^{-n} a_{22}^{(n)})$. \square

The technique used in Lemma 3.2 can not be directly employed to estimate the singular value functions on parallelepipeds, given the greater intricacy of their geometry compared to that of parallelograms. However, with additional assumption on the sidelengths of parallelepipeds, it is possible to obtain satisfactory estimations.

Lemma 3.3. *Let P_n be as in Theorem 1.1. Suppose that for any i and j , we have $\beta_i^{-n} a_{ij}^{(n)} \leq \beta_d^{-n}$. Then, for $s \geq i$,*

$$\beta_1^n \cdots \beta_{d-i}^n \cdots \beta_d^n \cdot \phi^s(f_d^n P_n) \leq \beta_1^n \cdots \beta_{d-i}^n \cdot (2\sqrt{d})^s \beta_{d-i+1}^{-n(s-i)}.$$

Proof. By assumption, the sidelengths of $f_d^n P_n$ are less than $\sqrt{d}\beta_d^{-n}$. Hence, $f_d^n P_n$ is contained in a cube D with sidelength $2\sqrt{d}\beta_d^{-n}$. Therefore, by Proposition 3.1,

$$(3.8) \quad \phi^s(f_d^n P_n) \leq \mathcal{H}_\infty^s(f_d^n P_n) \leq \mathcal{H}_\infty^s(D) \leq (2\sqrt{d})^s \beta_d^{-ns}.$$

Finally, since $1 < \beta_1 \leq \cdots \leq \beta_d$, for $s \geq i$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_1^n \cdots \beta_{d-i}^n \cdots \beta_d^n \cdot \phi^s(f_d^n P_n) &\leq \beta_1^n \cdots \beta_{d-i}^n \cdots \beta_d^n \cdot (2\sqrt{d})^s \beta_d^{-ns} \\ &\leq \beta_1^n \cdots \beta_{d-i}^n \cdot (2\sqrt{d})^s \beta_{d-i+1}^{-n(s-i)}, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. \square

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

4.1. Upper bound of $\dim_{\mathbb{H}} W_d(P_n)$. Obtaining upper estimates for the Hausdorff dimension of a lim sup set is typically straightforward, as it involves a natural covering argument.

For $1 \leq i \leq d$, and any $\epsilon_n^i = (\epsilon_1^i, \dots, \epsilon_n^i) \in \Sigma_{\beta_i}^n$, we always take

$$(4.1) \quad x_i^* = \frac{\epsilon_1^i}{\beta_i} + \frac{\epsilon_2^i}{\beta_i^2} + \cdots + \frac{\epsilon_n^i}{\beta_i^n}$$

to be the left endpoint of $I_{n, \beta_i}(\epsilon_n^i)$. Write $\mathbf{x}^* = (x_1^*, \dots, x_d^*)$. Then $W_d(P_n)$ is contained in the following set

$$(4.2) \quad \bigcap_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n=N}^{\infty} \bigcup_{\epsilon_n^1 \in \Sigma_{\beta_1}^n} \cdots \bigcup_{\epsilon_n^d \in \Sigma_{\beta_d}^n} (f_d^n P_n + \mathbf{x}^*).$$

Since the singular value function does not depend on the location of parallelepiped, for any $s \geq 0$, by Proposition 3.1 we have

$$(4.3) \quad \mathcal{H}_\infty^s(f_d^n P_n + \mathbf{x}^*) \leq \phi_\infty^s(f_d^n P_n + \mathbf{x}^*) = \phi^s(f_d^n P_n).$$

Let $s > s_d$. Then we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \beta_1^n \cdots \beta_d^n \cdot \phi^s(f_d^n P_n) < \infty.$$

Hence, for any $s > s_d$ by Lemma 2.1 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}^s(W_d(P_n)) &\leq \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n=N}^{\infty} \sum_{\epsilon_n^1 \in \Sigma_{\beta_1}^n} \cdots \sum_{\epsilon_n^d \in \Sigma_{\beta_d}^n} \mathcal{H}_{\infty}^s(f_d^n P_n + \mathbf{x}^*) \\ &\leq \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n=N}^{\infty} \frac{6^s \beta_1^{n+1} \cdots \beta_d^{n+1} \phi^s(f_d^n P_n)}{(\beta_1 - 1) \cdots (\beta_d - 1)} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

By the arbitrariness of s , this means that

$$\dim_{\text{H}} W_d(P_n) \leq s_d.$$

4.2. Large intersection properties of $W_d(P_n)$. The proof of Theorem 1.2 crucially relies on the following improvement to the result of Persson and Reeve [15, Lemma 2.1]. See [7, Lemma 5.4] for the detailed proof.

Lemma 4.1. *Let (G_n) be a sequence of open sets and $G = \limsup G_n$. Let $s > 0$. If for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and $t < s$ with $t + \varepsilon < s$, there exists a constant $c_{t,\varepsilon}$ such that*

$$(4.4) \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{H}_{\infty}^t(G_n \cap D) \geq c_{t,\varepsilon} |D|^{t+\varepsilon}$$

holds for all dyadic cubes $D \subset [0, 1]^d$, then G is in the class $\mathcal{G}^s([0, 1]^d)$.

Define

$$E_n = \bigcup_{\epsilon_n^1 \in \Sigma_{\beta_1}^n} \cdots \bigcup_{\epsilon_n^d \in \Sigma_{\beta_d}^n} (I_{n,\beta_1}(\epsilon_n^1) \times \cdots \times I_{n,\beta_d}(\epsilon_n^d)) \cap (f_d^n P_n + \mathbf{x}^*),$$

where $\mathbf{x}^* = (x_1^*, \dots, x_d^*)$ is defined as in (4.1). We will use Lemma 4.1 to prove that $\limsup E_n$ belongs to $\mathcal{G}^{s_d}([0, 1]^d)$ by showing that (4.4) holds with G_n replaced by E_n .

Lemma 4.2. *For any $\varepsilon > 0$ and $t < s_d$ with $t + \varepsilon < s_d$, and for all dyadic cubes $D \subset [0, 1]^d$, we have*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{H}_{\infty}^t(E_n \cap D) \geq \frac{c_{\beta_1} \cdots c_{\beta_d} |D|^{t+\varepsilon}}{(2\sqrt{d})^s \cdot 2^{2d+1}},$$

where $c_{\beta_1}, \dots, c_{\beta_d}$ are constants given in Lemma 2.3.

Proof. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and $t < s_d$ with $t + \varepsilon < s_d$. By definition,

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \beta_1^n \cdots \beta_d^n \phi^{t+\varepsilon}(f_d^n P_n) = \infty.$$

Since $t + \varepsilon < s_d$ and $\phi^{t+\varepsilon}(f_d^n P_n)$ decays exponentially as $n \rightarrow \infty$ (see (3.8)), by the definition of s_d we deduce that there exists a sequence (n_k) such that

$$(4.5) \quad \beta_1^{n_k} \cdots \beta_d^{n_k} \phi^{t+\varepsilon}(f_d^{n_k} P_{n_k}) \geq 1.$$

Let t_k be such that the left hand side of (4.5) with $t + \varepsilon$ replaced by t_k equals to 1. Obviously, we have

$$(4.6) \quad t + \varepsilon \leq t_k.$$

In view of Lemma 2.3, let $D \subset [0, 1]^d$ be a dyadic cube with $|D| \leq n_0 \beta_d^{-n_0}$, where n_0 is an integer such that $(\beta_1 n_0)^{1+\varepsilon/d} < \beta_1^{n_0 \varepsilon/d}$. Let k_0 be an integer such that for all $k \geq k_0$,

$$(4.7) \quad n_k \geq -(1 + \varepsilon/d) \log_{\beta_1} |D| \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_1^{-n_k}/2 \leq |D|^{d+\varepsilon}.$$

The first inequality in (4.7) ensures that Lemma 2.3 is applicable to $\Lambda_{\beta_i}^{n_k}(I_i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq d$.

By (3.1), for the parallelepiped $f_d^{n_k} P_{n_k}$, there exists a probability measure ν supported on it such that for any $\mathbf{x} \in f_d^{n_k} P_{n_k}$ and any $r > 0$,

$$(4.8) \quad \nu(B(\mathbf{x}, r)) \leq \frac{2r^{t_k}}{\phi^{t_k}(f_d^{n_k} P_{n_k})}.$$

Write $D = I_1 \times \cdots \times I_d$ with $|I_1| = \cdots = |I_d|$ and recall the definition of $\Lambda_{\beta}^n(I)$ from Section 2. For any $k \geq k_0$, define the probability measure μ supported on E_{n_k} by

$$(4.9) \quad \mu = \sum_{\epsilon_{n_k}^1 \in \Lambda_{\beta_1}^{n_k}(I_1)} \cdots \sum_{\epsilon_{n_k}^d \in \Lambda_{\beta_d}^{n_k}(I_d)} \frac{\nu_{\mathbf{x}^*}}{\#\Lambda_{\beta_1}^{n_k}(I_1) \cdots \#\Lambda_{\beta_d}^{n_k}(I_d)},$$

where $\nu_{\mathbf{x}^*}$ is defined by $\nu_{\mathbf{x}^*}(A) := \nu(A - \mathbf{x}^*)$ for any Borel measurable set A . Clearly, $\nu_{\mathbf{x}^*}$ is supported on $f_d^{n_k} P_{n_k} + \mathbf{x}^*$. Moreover, (4.8) holds with ν and $\mathbf{x} \in f_d^{n_k} P_{n_k}$ replaced by $\nu_{\mathbf{x}^*}$ and $\mathbf{x} \in f_d^{n_k} P_{n_k} + \mathbf{x}^*$, respectively.

Let $\mathbf{x} \in f_d^{n_k} P_{n_k} + \mathbf{x}^*$ and $r > 0$. Next, we estimate $\mu(B(\mathbf{x}, r))$, and the proof is divided into four distinct cases.

Case 1: $r \leq \beta_d^{-n_k}/2$. As all the cylinders we deal with are full with respect to some β_i , we see that the ball $B(\mathbf{x}, r)$ intersects at most 2^d parallelepipeds of the form $f_d^{n_k} P_{n_k} + \mathbf{x}^*$. For any such parallelepiped, we have $B(\mathbf{x}, r) \cap (f_d^{n_k} P_{n_k} + \mathbf{x}^*) \subset B(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}, 2r)$ for some $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} \in f_d^{n_k} P_{n_k} + \mathbf{x}^*$. Then, for each \mathbf{x}^* , by (4.8) and Lemma 2.3 we have

$$(4.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{\nu_{\mathbf{x}^*}(B(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}, 2r))}{\#\Lambda_{\beta_1}^{n_k}(I_1) \cdots \#\Lambda_{\beta_d}^{n_k}(I_d)} &\leq \frac{1}{c_{\beta_1} \beta_1^{n_k} \cdots c_{\beta_d} \beta_d^{n_k} |D|^{d+\varepsilon}} \cdot \frac{2^{d+1} r^{t_k}}{\phi^{t_k}(f_d^{n_k} P_{n_k})} \\ &= \frac{2^{d+1} r^{t_k}}{c_{\beta_1} \cdots c_{\beta_d} |D|^{d+\varepsilon}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from the definition of t_k . By (4.6) and the second inequality in (4.7),

$$(4.11) \quad r^{t_k} \leq r^t r^\varepsilon \leq r^t \cdot \beta_d^{-n_k \varepsilon} < r^t |D|^{d+\varepsilon}.$$

Substituting this upper bound into (4.10), we get

$$\mu(B(\mathbf{x}, r)) \leq \frac{2^{2d+1} r^t}{c_{\beta_1} \cdots c_{\beta_d}}.$$

Case 2: $\beta_{i+1}^{-n_k}/2 < r \leq \beta_i^{-n_k}/2$ for $1 \leq i \leq d-1$. For $j \geq i+1$, an interval with length $2r$ can intersect at most $2r\beta_j^{n_k}$ full cylinders with respect to β_j . Meanwhile, for $j \leq i$, given that $r < \beta_i^{-n_k}/2$, an interval with length $2r$ can intersect at most 2 full cylinders with respect to β_j . It therefore follows that

$$(4.12) \quad \mu(B(\mathbf{x}, r)) \leq \frac{2^d r^{d-i} \beta_{i+1}^{n_k} \cdots \beta_d^{n_k}}{\#\Lambda_{\beta_1}^{n_k}(I_1) \cdots \#\Lambda_{\beta_d}^{n_k}(I_d)} \leq \frac{2^d r^{d-i}}{c_{\beta_1} \cdots c_{\beta_d} |D|^{d+\varepsilon} \beta_1^{n_k} \cdots \beta_i^{n_k}}.$$

If $t \leq d-i$, then it trivially holds that

$$\mu(B(\mathbf{x}, r)) \leq \frac{2^d r^{d-i}}{c_{\beta_1} \cdots c_{\beta_d} |D|^{d+\varepsilon} \beta_1^{n_k} \cdots \beta_i^{n_k}} \leq \frac{2^d r^t}{c_{\beta_1} \cdots c_{\beta_i}}.$$

If $t > d-i$, then by Lemma 3.3,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(B(\mathbf{x}, r)) &\leq \frac{2^d r^{d-i}}{c_{\beta_1} \cdots c_{\beta_d} |D|^{d+\varepsilon} \beta_1^{n_k} \cdots \beta_i^{n_k}} \\ &= \frac{2^d r^{d-i}}{c_{\beta_1} \cdots c_{\beta_d} |D|^{d+\varepsilon} \beta_1^{n_k} \cdots \beta_i^{n_k}} \cdot \frac{\beta_{i+1}^{-n_k(t_k-d+i)}}{\beta_{i+1}^{-n_k(t_k-d+i)}} \\ &\leq \frac{2^d r^{d-i} \cdot (2\sqrt{d})^s (2r)^{t_k-d+i}}{c_{\beta_1} \cdots c_{\beta_d} |D|^{d+\varepsilon} \beta_1^{n_k} \cdots \beta_d^{n_k} \phi^{t_k}(f_d^{n_k} P_{n_k})} = \frac{(2\sqrt{d})^s \cdot 2^{2d} r^{t_k}}{c_{\beta_1} \cdots c_{\beta_d} |D|^{d+\varepsilon}} \\ &\leq \frac{(2\sqrt{d})^s \cdot 2^{2d} r^t}{c_{\beta_1} \cdots c_{\beta_d}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows in a way similar to (4.11).

Case 3: $\beta_1^{-n_k}/2 \leq r < |D|$. By the same reason as (4.12), we have

$$(4.13) \quad \mu(B(\mathbf{x}, r)) \leq \frac{2^d r^d}{c_{\beta_1} \cdots c_{\beta_d} |D|^{d+\varepsilon}} \leq \frac{2^d r^t}{c_{\beta_1} \cdots c_{\beta_d} |D|^{t+\varepsilon}}.$$

Here we use $r/|D| < 1$ and $t < d$ in the last inequality.

Case 4: $r \geq |D|$. We have

$$(4.14) \quad \mu(B(\mathbf{x}, r)) = 1 \leq \frac{r^t}{|D|^t}.$$

Summarizing the estimates of the μ -measures of balls presented in Cases 1–4, we get

$$\mu(B(\mathbf{x}, r)) \leq \frac{(2\sqrt{d})^s \cdot 2^{2d+1} r^t}{c_{\beta_1} \cdots c_{\beta_d} |D|^{t+\varepsilon}} \quad \text{for all } r > 0.$$

Finally, it follows from (3.1) and Proposition 3.1 that

$$\mathcal{H}_\infty^t(E_{n_k} \cap D) \geq \phi^t(E_{n_k} \cap D) \geq \frac{c_{\beta_1} \cdots c_{\beta_d} |D|^{t+\varepsilon}}{(2\sqrt{d})^s \cdot 2^{2d+1}},$$

which completes the proof. \square

5. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

In this section, we will restrict our attention on $d = 2$.

5.1. Upper bound of $\dim_{\mathbb{H}} W_2(P_n)$. Let $\mathbf{x}^* \in I_{n,\beta_1}(\epsilon_n^1) \times I_{n,\beta_2}(\epsilon_n^2)$ with $\epsilon_n^i \in \Sigma_{\beta_i}^n$ be defined analogously to (4.1). Similarly, $W_2(P_n)$ is contained in the following set

$$(5.1) \quad \bigcap_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n=N}^{\infty} \bigcup_{\epsilon_n^1 \in \Sigma_{\beta_1}^n} \bigcup_{\epsilon_n^2 \in \Sigma_{\beta_2}^n} (f_2^n P_n + \mathbf{x}^*).$$

As we refrain from making any assumptions on P_n , it is possible that the sidelengths of $f_2^n P_n$ could exceed β_2^{-n} substantially. If this happens, then the covering strategy outlined in Section 4.1 may not be the optimal one. Therefore, we will use two different methods to cover the set in (5.1) and obtain the upper estimates for its Hausdorff measure accordingly.

(1) The first method closely resembles the one introduced in Section 4.1. However, for our specific needs, we will present it with a slight variation. For any $s \geq 0$, by Proposition 3.1 and Lemma 3.2 we have

$$(5.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_{\epsilon_n^1 \in \Sigma_{\beta_1}^n} \sum_{\epsilon_n^2 \in \Sigma_{\beta_2}^n} \mathcal{H}_{\infty}^s(f_2^n P_n + \mathbf{x}^*) &\leq \frac{6^s \beta_1^{n+1} \beta_2^{n+1} \phi^s(f_2^n P_n)}{(\beta_1 - 1)(\beta_2 - 1)} \\ &\leq \frac{24^s \beta_1^{n+1} \beta_2^{n+1} \phi^s(\gamma_n, \beta_1^{-n} \beta_2^{-n} |A_n| / \gamma_n)}{(\beta_1 - 1)(\beta_2 - 1)}. \end{aligned}$$

(2) If $\gamma_n \geq \beta_2^{-n}$, then a square with sidelength γ_n can cover multiple parallelograms along the vertical direction. Hence, for any given ϵ_n^1 , the innermost union in (5.1) can be covered by γ_n^{-1} squares, each with sidelength γ_n . Therefore, for any $s \geq 0$

$$(5.3) \quad \sum_{\epsilon_n^1 \in \Sigma_{\beta_1}^n} \mathcal{H}_{\infty}^s \left(\bigcup_{\epsilon_n^2 \in \Sigma_{\beta_2}^n} (f_2^n P_n + \mathbf{x}^*) \right) \leq \frac{\beta_1^{n+1} \gamma_n^{-1}}{\beta_1 - 1} \cdot \gamma_n^s.$$

For each $n \geq 1$, let v_n and w_n be the least numbers such that

$$\beta_1^n \beta_2^n \phi^{v_n}(\gamma_n, \beta_1^{-n} \beta_2^{-n} |A_n| / \gamma_n) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_1^n \gamma_n^{w_n - 1} = 1.$$

Let

$$u_n = \min(v_n, w_n) \quad \text{and} \quad s^* := \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} u_n.$$

By a direct computation, we have

$$v_n = \min \left(\frac{\log \beta_1 + \log \beta_2}{-\frac{1}{n} \log \gamma_n}, 1 + \frac{\log \beta_1 + \log \beta_2 + \frac{1}{n} \log \gamma_n}{\log \beta_1 + \log \beta_2 + \frac{1}{n} \log \gamma_n - \frac{1}{n} \log |A_n|} \right)$$

and

$$w_n = \frac{\log \beta_1 - \frac{1}{n} \log \gamma_n}{-\frac{1}{n} \log \gamma_n}.$$

From these equalities, it is not difficult to verify that

$$s^* = \max_{(t_1, t_2) \in \mathcal{U}} \min \left(\frac{\log \beta_1 + \log \beta_2}{t_1}, 1 + \frac{\log \beta_1 + \log \beta_2 - t_1}{\log \beta_1 + \log \beta_2 - t_1 + t_2}, \frac{\log \beta_1 + t_1}{t_1} \right),$$

which is exactly the formula given in Theorem 1.2.

For any $s > s^*$, we have for large n

$$u_n < s + \varepsilon \quad \text{for some } \varepsilon > 0,$$

and so either

$$\beta_1^n \beta_2^n \phi^s(\gamma_n, \beta_1^{-n} \beta_2^{-n} |A_n| / \gamma_n) = \phi^{s-v_n}(\gamma_n, \beta_1^{-n} \beta_2^{-n} |A_n| / \gamma_n) \leq \beta_1^{-n\varepsilon}$$

or

$$\beta_1^n \gamma_n^{s-1} = \gamma_n^{s-w_n} \leq \beta_1^{-n\varepsilon}.$$

In each case, by (5.2) and (5.3), we have

$$\mathcal{H}^s(W_2(P_n)) \leq \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n=N}^{\infty} \frac{4 \cdot 6^s \beta_1 \beta_2 \cdot \beta_1^{-n\varepsilon}}{(\beta_1 - 1)(\beta_2 - 1)} = 0.$$

By the arbitrariness of s , we have

$$\dim_{\mathbb{H}} W_2(P_n) \leq s^*.$$

5.2. Large intersection properties of $W_2(P_n)$. Define

$$F_n = \bigcup_{\epsilon_n^1 \in \Sigma_{\beta_1}^n} \bigcup_{\epsilon_n^2 \in \Sigma_{\beta_2}^n} (I_{n,\beta_1}(\epsilon_n^1) \times I_{n,\beta_2}(\epsilon_n^2)) \cap (f_2^n P_n + \mathbf{x}^*),$$

where \mathbf{x}^* is the bottom left vertex of $I_{n,\beta_1}(\epsilon_n^1) \times I_{n,\beta_2}(\epsilon_n^2)$. The remainder of this subsection is dedicated to proving the following result, which implies the conclusion of Theorem 1.2. The proof follows an argument similar to that of Lemma 4.2, with the distinction that more cases will be considered, as the sidelengths of $f_2^n P_n$ may exceed β_2^{-n} .

Lemma 5.1. *For any $\varepsilon > 0$ and $t < s^*$ with $t + \varepsilon < s^*$, for all dyadic cubes $D \subset [0, 1]^2$, we have*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{H}_{\infty}^t(F_n \cap D) \geq \frac{c_{\beta_1} c_{\beta_2} |D|^{t+\varepsilon}}{16},$$

where c_{β_1} and c_{β_2} are constants given in Lemma 2.3.

Proof. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and $t < s^*$ with $t + \varepsilon < s^*$. By definition, there exists a sequence (n_k) so that

$$u_{n_k} \geq t + \varepsilon \quad \text{for any } k \geq 1.$$

Besides, by the definition of u_{n_k} , we have

$$(5.4) \quad \beta_1^{n_k} \beta_2^{n_k} \phi^t(\gamma_{n_k}, \beta_1^{-n_k} \beta_2^{-n_k} |A_{n_k}| / \gamma_{n_k}) \geq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_1^{n_k} \gamma_{n_k}^{t-1} \geq 1.$$

In view of Lemma 2.3, let D be a dyadic cube with $|D| \leq n_0 \beta_2^{-n_0}$, where n_0 is an integer such that $(\beta_1 n_0)^{1+\varepsilon/2} < \beta_1^{n_0 \varepsilon/2}$. Let k_0 be an integer such that for all $k \geq k_0$,

$$(5.5) \quad n_k \geq -(1 + \varepsilon/2) \log_{\beta_1} |I_1| \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_1^{-n_k} / 2 \leq |D|^{2+\varepsilon}.$$

Write $D = I_1 \times I_2$. For any $k \geq k_0$, define the probability measure $\tilde{\mu}$ supported on E_{n_k} by

$$(5.6) \quad \tilde{\mu} = \sum_{\epsilon_{n_k}^1 \in \Lambda_{\beta_1}^{n_k}(I_1)} \sum_{\epsilon_{n_k}^2 \in \Lambda_{\beta_2}^{n_k}(I_2)} \frac{\mathcal{L}_{f_2^{n_k} P_{n_k} + \mathbf{x}^*}}{\#\Lambda_{\beta_1}^{n_k}(I_1) \cdot \#\Lambda_{\beta_2}^{n_k}(I_2)},$$

where $\mathcal{L}_{f_2^{n_k} P_{n_k} + \mathbf{x}^*}$ is the normalized Lebesgue measure on $f_2^{n_k} P_{n_k} + \mathbf{x}^*$.

Let $\mathbf{x} \in f_2^{n_k} P_{n_k} + \mathbf{x}^*$ and $r > 0$. The task now is to compare the quantity $\tilde{\mu}(B(\mathbf{x}, r))$ with r^t to yield a suitable lower bound for $\mathcal{H}_{\infty}^t(E_{n_k} \cap D)$. We consider four cases.

Case 1: $r \leq \beta_2^{-n_k}/2$. Following the same step as in the proof of Case 1 in Lemma 4.2 and using (3.7) and (5.4) instead of (4.8) and (4.5), we deduce that

$$\tilde{\mu}(B(\mathbf{x}, r)) \leq \frac{16r^t}{c_{\beta_1} c_{\beta_2}}.$$

Case 2: $\beta_2^{-n_k}/2 < r \leq \max(\beta_2^{-n_k}/2, \gamma_{n_k})$. We may suppose that $\gamma_{n_k} \geq \beta_2^{-n_k}/2$, otherwise there is nothing to be proved. In this situation, $B(\mathbf{x}, r)$ can intersect, respectively, at most 2 and $2r\beta_2^{n_k}$ parallelograms along the horizontal and vertical directions. Moreover, the normalized Lebesgue measure of the intersection with each parallelogram does not exceed $2r/\gamma_{n_k}$. It follows from the second inequality in (5.4) that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mu}(B(\mathbf{x}, r)) &\leq \frac{2 \cdot 2r\beta_2^{n_k}}{\#\Lambda_{\beta_1}^{n_k}(I_1) \cdot \#\Lambda_{\beta_2}^{n_k}(I_2)} \cdot \frac{2r}{\gamma_{n_k}} \leq \frac{8r^2}{c_{\beta_1} c_{\beta_2} \beta_1^{n_k} \gamma_{n_k} |D|^{2+\varepsilon}} \\ &= \frac{8r^2 \gamma_{n_k}^{u_{n_k}-2}}{c_{\beta_1} c_{\beta_2} \beta_1^{n_k} \gamma_{n_k}^{u_{n_k}-1} |D|^{2+\varepsilon}} \leq \frac{8r^{u_{n_k}}}{c_{\beta_1} c_{\beta_2} |D|^{2+\varepsilon}} \leq \frac{8r^t}{c_{\beta_1} c_{\beta_2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows in a way similar to (4.11).

Case 3: $\max(\beta_2^{-n_k}/2, \gamma_{n_k}) \leq r < \beta_1^{-n_k}/2$. Similar to Case 2, $B(\mathbf{x}, r)$ intersects at most $4r\beta_2^{-n_k}$ parallelograms. It follows that

$$(5.7) \quad \tilde{\mu}(B(\mathbf{x}, r)) \leq \frac{2r\beta_2^{n_k}}{\#\Lambda_{\beta_1}^{n_k}(I_1) \cdot \#\Lambda_{\beta_2}^{n_k}(I_2)} \leq \frac{2r}{c_{\beta_1} c_{\beta_2} \beta_1^{n_k} |D|^{2+\varepsilon}}.$$

If $t \leq 1$, then it trivially holds that

$$\tilde{\mu}(B(\mathbf{x}, r)) \leq \frac{2r}{c_{\beta_1} c_{\beta_2} \beta_1^{n_k} |D|^{2+\varepsilon}} \leq \frac{2r^t}{c_{\beta_1} c_{\beta_2}}.$$

If $t \geq 1$, then by the second inequality in (5.4)

$$\tilde{\mu}(B(\mathbf{x}, r)) \leq \frac{2r}{c_{\beta_1} c_{\beta_2} \beta_1^{n_k} |D|^{2+\varepsilon}} = \frac{2r \gamma_{n_k}^{u_{n_k}-1}}{c_{\beta_1} c_{\beta_2} \beta_1^{n_k} \gamma_{n_k}^{u_{n_k}-1} |D|^{2+\varepsilon}} \leq \frac{2r^{u_{n_k}}}{c_{\beta_1} c_{\beta_2} |D|^{2+\varepsilon}} \leq \frac{2r^t}{c_{\beta_1} c_{\beta_2}}.$$

Case 4: $\beta_1^{-n_k}/2 \leq r$. The proof is exactly the same as (4.13) and (4.14). Therefore, we have

$$\tilde{\mu}(B(\mathbf{x}, r)) \leq \frac{4r^t}{c_{\beta_1} c_{\beta_2} |D|^{t+\varepsilon}}.$$

Finally, using (3.1) and Proposition 3.1, we conclude that

$$\mathcal{H}_\infty^t(E_{n_k} \cap D) \geq \phi^t(E_{n_k} \cap D) \geq \frac{c_{\beta_1} c_{\beta_2} |D|^{t+\varepsilon}}{4}. \quad \square$$

Acknowledgements. The author would like to thank Lingmin Liao for bringing this problem to his attention.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Allen and B. Bárány. On the Hausdorff measure of shrinking target sets on self-conformal sets. *Mathematika* 67 (2021), 807–839.
- [2] B. Bárány and M. Rams. Shrinking targets on Bedford-McMullen carpets. *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3)* 117 (2018), 951–995.
- [3] Y. Bugeaud and B. Wang. Distribution of full cylinders and the Diophantine properties of the orbits in β -expansions. *J. Fractal Geom.* 1(2) (2014), 221–241.
- [4] K. Falconer. The Hausdorff dimension of self-affine fractals. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* 103(2) (1988), 339–350.
- [5] K. Falconer. Sets with large intersection properties. *J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2)* 49(2) (1994), 267–280.
- [6] A. Fan and B. Wang. On the lengths of basic intervals in beta expansions. *Nonlinearity* 25(5) (2012), 1329–1343.
- [7] Y. He. Path-dependent shrinking target problems in beta-dynamical systems. *to appear in Nonlinearity*, 2023.
- [8] R. Hill and S. Velani. Metric Diophantine approximation in Julia sets of expanding rational maps. *Inst. Hautes Etudes Sci. Publ. Math.* 85 (1997), 193–216.
- [9] M. Hussain and W. Wang. Higher-dimensional shrinking target problem for beta dynamical systems. *J. Aust. Math. Soc.* 114(3) (2023), 289–311.
- [10] H. Koivusalo and M. Rams. Mass transference principle: from balls to arbitrary shapes. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN* 2021, no. 8, 6315–6330.
- [11] H. Koivusalo, L. Liao and M. Rams. Path-dependent shrinking targets in generic affine iterated function systems. arXiv:2210.05362 (2022).
- [12] B. Li, L. Liao, S. Velani and E. Zorin. The shrinking target problem for matrix transformations of tori: revisiting the standard problem. *Adv. Math.* 421 (2023), Paper No. 108994, 74.
- [13] B. Li, B. Wang, J. Wu and J. Xu. The shrinking target problem in the dynamical system of continued fractions. *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3)* 108(1) (2014), 159–186.
- [14] Y. Li. *Some results on beta-expansions and generalized Thue–Morse sequences*. PhD thesis, Sorbonne Université; South China University of Technology, 2021.
- [15] T. Persson and H. Reeve. A Frostman type lemma for sets with large intersections, and an application to Diophantine approximation. *Proc. Edinburgh Math. Soc.* 58(2) (2015), 521–542.
- [16] A. Rényi. Representations for real numbers and their ergodic properties. *Acta Math. Hungar.* 8 (1957), 477–493.
- [17] L. Shen and B. Wang. Shrinking target problems for beta-dynamical system. *Sci. China Math.* 56 (2013), 91–104.
- [18] B. Wang and J. Wu. Mass transference principle from rectangles to rectangles in Diophantine approximation. *Math. Ann.* 381 (2021), 243–317.
- [19] B. Wang and G. Zhang. A dynamical dimension transference principle for dynamical Diophantine approximation. *Math. Z.* 298 (2021), 161–191.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SHANTOU UNIVERSITY, SHANTOU, GUANGDONG, 515063,
CHINA

Email address: `ybhe@stu.edu.cn`