

HAUSDORFF AND BOX DIMENSION BOUNDS FOR SUBFRACTALS INDUCED BY S -GAP SHIFTS

ELIZABETH SATTLER

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we consider subsets of an attractor of an iterated function system in which each point is associated with an allowable word from an S -gap shift. The main result shows that bounds for the box dimension and Hausdorff dimension of a subfractal induced by an S -gap shift are given by the zeros of the upper and lower topological pressure functions.

1. INTRODUCTION

Symbolic spaces are often used as a tool in fractal geometry. For an iterated function system (IFS) of the form $\{K; f_1, f_2, \dots, f_p\}$, we consider the alphabet $\{1, 2, \dots, p\}$ and the set of all one-sided infinite words from the alphabet. Each point in the attractor of the IFS is associated with an infinite word. In this paper, we will consider subfractals induced by a specific type of subshift; that is, we only consider points in an attractor that are associated with allowable words from a subshifts.

Fractal dimension computations for attractors of IFSs exist for several different types of IFSs: self-similar IFSs [4, 5], non-self-similar attractors of hyperbolic IFSs [2], and recurrent IFSs with hyperbolic maps [7]. In the latter two on this list, the authors consider a subset of the full attractor of the IFS. Expanding on this idea, subfractals induced by subshifts are introduced in [8]. In that article, computations for bounds on the fractal dimensions of a subfractal induced by a subshift are produced by modifying techniques used to compute the entropy of the underlying sofic subshift from [6]. The proofs rely heavily on the existence of an adjacency matrix for the subshift, which is only guaranteed for a sofic subshift. For non-sofic subshifts, there is no unified approach for entropy calculations.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 28A80; Secondary 37B10.

Key words and phrases. Hausdorff dimension, box dimension, subfractal, S -gap shift.

For an IFS $\{K; f_1, \dots, f_p\}$ and a sofic subshift Y , let \mathcal{F}_Y denote the attractor consisting only of points associated with allowable words in Y . Assume for each $1 \leq i \leq p$ there exist constants $0 < c_i \leq \bar{c}_i < 1$ such that f_i satisfies $c_i d(x, y) \leq d(f_i(x), f_i(y)) \leq \bar{c}_i d(x, y)$. In both [7] and [8], a topological pressure function of the form $P(t) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \left(\sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{L}_n} c_\omega^t \right)$ is used, where \mathcal{L}_n denotes the allowable words of length n , and a function $\bar{P}(t)$ is defined similarly using \bar{c}_i . In [8], it is shown that Hausdorff and box dimensions of \mathcal{F}_Y are bounded by the zeros of $P(t)$ and $\bar{P}(t)$.

Using a similar approach, we consider subfractals induced by S -gap shifts in this paper. An S -gap shift is a subshift on the alphabet $\mathcal{A} = \{0, 1\}$ defined by a set $S \subseteq \mathbb{N}_0$ where elements in S describe the allowable number of 0s that can separate two 1s. Although some S -gap shifts are sofic, we cannot guarantee the existence of a finite graph presentation to help us understand the structure of an S -gap shift. Instead, we consider a decomposition of the language to establish bounds on the growth rate of finite words. Techniques for decomposing the language of an S -gap shift and finding growth rate bounds are given in [1].

In the main theorem of this article, we prove that similar bounds for the Hausdorff and box dimension hold for subfractals induced by S -gap shifts:

Theorem. *Let h, H be the unique values such that $P(h) = 0 = \bar{P}(H)$. Then,*

$$h \leq \dim_H(\mathcal{F}_{X(S)}) \leq H, \quad h \leq \underline{\dim}_B(\mathcal{F}_{X(S)}) \leq H, \quad \text{and} \\ h \leq \overline{\dim}_B(\mathcal{F}_{X(S)}) \leq H.$$

Although the assertions are similar, the proofs require a major departure from those in [7, 8]. The novelty in the proof is the introduction of an auxillary function, $Q(t)$, that enables us to incorporate structural properties of S -gap shifts in computations involving the topological pressure function. In section 3, we reveal a clearer connection between the fractal dimension of such an attractor and the entropy of the underlying shift space. In [9], it is shown that the entropy of an S -gap shift is given by $\log(\lambda^{-1})$, where λ satisfies

$$\sum_{s \in S} \lambda^{s+1} = 1.$$

In this paper, we show that the values of h , H for which $P(h) = 0 = \bar{P}(H)$ are the same values for which

$$\sum_{s \in S} c_0^{sh} c_1^h = 1 \text{ and } \sum_{s \in S} \bar{c}_0^{sH} \bar{c}_1^H = 1.$$

Given a set S , this allows us to either compute or estimate h and H , depending on the set S . There is no uniform approach to entropy computations of non-sofic shift spaces; these bounds provide a technique for fractal dimension computations for subfractals induced by non-sofic S -gap shifts, such as the prime gap shift.

2. BACKGROUND AND DEFINITIONS

Let $\mathcal{A} = \{0, 1\}$ and $X = \{\omega_1\omega_2\omega_3 \dots : \omega_i \in \mathcal{A} \text{ for all } i \geq 1\}$ be the compact metric space of all one-sided infinite words from letters in \mathcal{A} equipped with the metric d_X defined by $d_X(\omega, \tau) = \frac{1}{k}$, where $k = \min\{i : \omega_i \neq \tau_i\}$. We consider the shift space (X, σ) , where the shift map $\sigma : X \rightarrow X$ is defined by $\sigma(\omega_1\omega_2\omega_3 \dots) = \omega_2\omega_3\omega_4 \dots$.

A *subshift* is a subset of X that is both σ -invariant and closed. There are several classes of well-studied subshifts, such as subshifts of finite type (SFTs) and sofic subshifts. In this paper, we will focus on another class of subshifts called S -gap shifts. An S -gap shift is defined using a subset $S \subset \mathbb{N}_0$. S -gap shifts are usually defined as a subset of double-sided infinite words, where consecutive 1s are separated by m 0s, where $m \in S$. For our purpose of defining subfractals we will use one-sided infinite strings, and so an S -gap shift, denoted X_S , will be defined as the closure of the set

$$\{0^n 10^{s_1} 10^{s_2} 1 \dots : s_i \in S \text{ for all } i \geq 1 \text{ and } n \in \mathbb{N}_0\}.$$

Here, we are assuming that S is infinite; if S is finite, we restrict the first block of 0s with $0 \leq n \leq \max\{s : s \in S\}$. Sofic shifts include all SFTs; however, many S -gap shifts are not sofic.

To better understand the structure of a subshift and the construction of a subfractal, we will focus on the allowable finite words in a subshift. Let $\mathcal{L}_n(X)$ denote the collection of all words from \mathcal{A} of length n , and $\mathcal{L}(X) = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_n$. We call $\mathcal{L}(X)$ the *language* of X . Similarly, for a subshift $Y \subset X$, we will use $\mathcal{L}_n(Y)$ to denote the collection of finite words of length n that appear in some infinite string in Y and $\mathcal{L}(Y)$ will denote the language of Y . If the subshift is understood in context, we will just use \mathcal{L}_n and \mathcal{L} .

It will be helpful for us to consider special decompositions of a language. We say a language \mathcal{L} admits a decomposition of the form

$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{C}^p \mathcal{G} \mathcal{C}^s$ if every $\omega \in \mathcal{L}$ can be written as $\omega = \alpha_1 \gamma \alpha_2$ where $\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{C}^p$, $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}$, and $\alpha_2 \in \mathcal{C}^s$. We can think of \mathcal{C}^p and \mathcal{C}^s as prefix and suffix sets respectively, and \mathcal{G} as a core set.

Let $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a compact set and let $\{\mathcal{K}; f_0, f_1\}$ denote an iterated function system (IFS) with $f_i: \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$ for $i = 0, 1$. We will assume that the IFS is *hyperbolic*, meaning that there exist $0 < c_i \leq \bar{c}_i < 1$ such that

$$c_i d(x, y) \leq d(f_i(x), f_i(y)) \leq \bar{c}_i d(x, y)$$

for all $x, y \in \mathcal{K}$ and for $i = 0, 1$. Let \mathcal{F} denote the attractor of this hyperbolic IFS. Given this IFS, we consider the alphabet $\mathcal{A} = \{0, 1\}$, where 0 corresponds to f_0 and 1 to f_1 . For a finite word $\omega \in \mathcal{L}_n$, we adopt the following notations:

$$\begin{aligned} f_\omega &= f_{\omega_n} \circ f_{\omega_{n-1}} \circ \cdots \circ f_{\omega_1} \\ c_\omega &= c_{\omega_1} c_{\omega_2} \cdots c_{\omega_n} \\ \bar{c}_\omega &= \bar{c}_{\omega_1} \bar{c}_{\omega_2} \cdots \bar{c}_{\omega_n} \end{aligned}$$

Define the associated coding map $\pi: X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ by $\pi(\omega) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_{\omega|_n}(\mathcal{K})$, where $\omega|_n = \omega_1 \omega_2 \dots \omega_n$. For any IFS of the form $\{\mathcal{K}; f_1, \dots, f_p\}$ and a subshift $Y \subset X = \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{N}}$, we define a subfractal of \mathcal{F} by only considering points associated with a word from Y . More formally, we define $\mathcal{F}_Y = \{\pi(\omega) : \omega \in Y\}$. We will assume the IFS satisfies the *open set condition (OSC)*, which means that there exists an open set $V \subset \mathcal{K}$ such that $\cup_{i=1}^p f_i(V) \subset V$, where the union is disjoint.

The main result of this paper involves Hausdorff and box dimensions, which we define here. Let $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a compact set, $E \subset \mathcal{K}$, and \mathcal{O} be the collection of all open ε -covers of E . For $s \geq 0$, if $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_\varepsilon^s(E) = \inf_{\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{O}} \sum_{U \in \mathcal{U}} (\text{diam}(U))^s$ then the s -dimensional Hausdorff outer measure is defined by $\mathcal{H}^s(E) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \bar{\mathcal{H}}_\varepsilon^s(E)$. We restrict the outer measure to $\bar{\mathcal{H}}^s$ -measurable sets to define the s -dimensional Hausdorff measure, denoted \mathcal{H}^s . The *Hausdorff dimension* of E , denoted $\dim_H(E)$ is the unique value of s such that

$$\mathcal{H}^r(E) = \begin{cases} 0, & r > s \\ \infty, & r < s \end{cases}$$

Let $N_r(E)$ be the smallest number of sets of diameter r that can cover E . The *lower and upper box dimensions* of E are defined, respectively,

as:

$$\underline{\dim}_B(E) = \liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\log N_r(E)}{-\log r} \text{ and } \overline{\dim}_B(E) = \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\log N_r(E)}{-\log r}$$

The following relationship between these fractal dimensions are well-known [4]:

$$\dim_H(E) \leq \underline{\dim}_B(E) \leq \overline{\dim}_B(E)$$

3. TOPOLOGICAL PRESSURE FUNCTION FOR SUBSHIFTS

Topological pressure functions are sometimes considered to be generalizations of topological entropy. For subshifts, the topological entropy is given by

$$h(Y) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log(\#\mathcal{L}_n(Y)).$$

Computations for the topological entropy of SFTs, sofic subshifts, and S -gap shifts are known [6, 9]. Following [7, 8] we define the following topological pressure function.

Definition 3.1. Let Y be a subshift. The *lower topological pressure function* of \mathcal{F}_Y is given by $P(t) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \left(\sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{L}_n(Y)} c_\omega^t \right)$. Similarly, the *upper topological pressure* is defined by $\bar{P}(t) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \left(\sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{L}_n(Y)} \bar{c}_\omega^t \right)$.

In [8], it is shown that both topological pressure functions are strictly decreasing, convex, and continuous on \mathbb{R} , and there are unique values $h, H \in [0, \infty)$ such that $P(h) = 0 = \bar{P}(H)$ where $h \leq H$. Determining the zeros of a topological pressure function is a difficult process in general; it will be helpful for us to consider other closely related functions that will make it easier for us to find values of h and H .

To define these new functions, we will utilize a suitable decomposition of the language of an S -gap shift, which is used in [1]. We define a core set, prefix set, and suffix set as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G} &= \{0^{s_1} 10^{s_2} 1 \dots 0^{s_k} 1 : s_i \in S \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq k\} \\ \mathcal{C}^p &= \{0^n 1 : n \notin S\} \\ \mathcal{C}^s &= \{0^n : n \in \mathbb{N}_0\} \end{aligned}$$

Given an S -gap shift $X(S)$, notice that every word in $\mathcal{L}(X(S))$ can be written in the form $0^m \omega 0^n$ where $m, n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $\omega \in \mathcal{G}$, and so we can write $\mathcal{L}(X(S)) = \mathcal{C}^p \mathcal{G} \mathcal{C}^s$. Similar to the notation for languages, we will use \mathcal{G}_n , \mathcal{C}_n^p and \mathcal{C}_n^s to denote the subsets consisting of words of length n . Note that we have assumed S is infinite; if S is finite, then we restrict n in both \mathcal{C}^p and \mathcal{C}^s with $n \leq \max(S)$.

Using the core set \mathcal{G} defined above, we define two functions:

$$Q(t) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \left(\sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{G}_n} c_\omega^t \right) \text{ and } \bar{Q}(t) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \left(\sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{G}_n} \bar{c}_\omega^t \right)$$

Our goal is to show that $P(t) = Q(t)$ and $\bar{P}(t) = \bar{Q}(t)$ for t values near the zeros of these functions. We begin by establishing bounds on $\sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{L}_n} c_\omega^t$ and $\sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{G}_n} c_\omega^t$. The techniques are modified from the ideas used to establish bounds on the growth rates of \mathcal{L}_n and \mathcal{G}_n in [1]. All proofs will be presented using $P(t)$ and $Q(t)$ with constants c_i , and proofs for the same results using $\bar{Q}(t)$ and $\bar{P}(t)$ with constants \bar{c}_i are identical.

Lemma 3.2. *For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{G}_n} c_\omega^t \leq e^{nP(t)}.$$

Proof. First, we notice that $(\mathcal{G}_n)^k \subset \mathcal{L}_{nk}$. Using this and some algebra, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{nk} \log \left(\sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{G}_n} c_\omega^t \right)^k \leq \frac{1}{nk} \log \left(\sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{L}_{nk}} c_\omega^t \right). \text{ This implies that}$$

$$\frac{1}{n} \log \left(\sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{G}_n} c_\omega^t \right) \leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{nk} \log \left(\sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{L}_{nk}} c_\omega^t \right) = P(t),$$

and so $\sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{G}_n} c_\omega^t \leq e^{nP(t)}$. □

Lemma 3.3. *For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and t in a neighborhood of h ,*

$$e^{nP(t)} \leq \sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{L}_n} c_\omega^t \leq K_1 e^{nP(t)},$$

where K_1 is a constant.

Proof. First, using the fact that $\mathcal{L}_{nk} \subset (\mathcal{L}_n)^k$, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{nk} \log \left(\sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{L}_{nk}} c_\omega^t \right) \leq \frac{1}{nk} \log \left(\sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{L}_n} c_\omega^t \right)^k = \frac{1}{n} \log \left(\sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{L}_n} c_\omega^t \right).$$

Letting $k \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain $P(t) \leq \frac{1}{n} \log \left(\sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{L}_n} c_\omega^t \right)$, and so $e^{nP(t)} \leq \sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{L}_n} c_\omega^t$.

To find an upper bound, we will work with the language decomposition of \mathcal{L} . Recall that $\mathcal{C}_n^p = \{0^{n-1}1\}$ or \emptyset and $\mathcal{C}_n^s = \{0^n\}$. Therefore,

$$\sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{C}_n^p} c_\omega^t = c_0^{(n-1)t} c_1^t \text{ when } n-1 \notin S \text{ and } \sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{C}_n^s} c_\omega^t = c_0^{nt}.$$

Next, recall that $P(t)$ is a continuous function and $P(h) = 0$, so there exists a neighborhood $N_\alpha(h)$ such that $\log(c_0^t) < P(t)$ and $\log(c_1^t) < P(t)$ for $t \in N_\alpha(h)$. Therefore, we can find $\varepsilon > 0$ such that both $\log(c_0^t) \leq P(t) - \varepsilon$ and $\log(c_1^t) \leq P(t) - \varepsilon$. This implies that $c_0^{tn} \leq e^{n(P(t)-\varepsilon)}$ and $c_1^t \leq e^{P(t)-\varepsilon}$.

Now, we use this fact with Lemma 3.2 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{L}_n} c_\omega^t &\leq \sum_{i+j+k=n} \left(\sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{C}_i^p} c_\omega^t \right) \left(\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{G}_j} c_\tau^t \right) \left(\sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{C}_k^s} c_\gamma^t \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{i+j+k=n} c_0^{(i+k-1)t} c_1^t e^{jP(t)} \\ &\leq \sum_{i+j+k=n} e^{(i+k)(P(t)-\varepsilon)} e^{jP(t)} \\ &= e^{nP(t)} \sum_{i+j+k=n} e^{-\varepsilon(i+k)} \\ &= e^{nP(t)} \sum_{m=0}^n \sum_{i=0}^m e^{-m\varepsilon} \\ &\leq e^{nP(t)} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} (m+1) e^{-m\varepsilon} \end{aligned}$$

Since $\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} (m+1) e^{-m\varepsilon}$ converges, we can find K_1 such that $\sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{L}_n} c_\omega^t \leq K_1 e^{nP(t)}$. \square

Corollary 3.4. *Let h be the unique value such that $P(h) = 0$. Then, there exists constant K_2 such that*

$$1 \leq \sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{L}_n} c_\omega^h \leq K_2.$$

Corollary 3.5. *Let H be the unique value such that $\bar{P}(H) = 0$. Then, there exists constant L_2 such that*

$$1 \leq \sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{L}_n} \bar{c}_\omega^H \leq L_2.$$

Lemma 3.6. *There exist constants $K_3 > 0$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists l satisfying $n - N \leq l \leq n$ such that*

$$K_3 e^{lP(t)} \leq \sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{G}_l} c_\omega^t$$

for t in a neighborhood of h .

Proof. By Lemma 3.3, there exists a constant K_1 with $\sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{L}_n} c_\omega^t \leq K_1 e^{nP(t)}$. For $j \in \mathbb{N}$, let $a_j = e^{-jP(t)} \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{G}_j} c_\tau^t$. Choose $\varepsilon > 0$ as in the proof of Lemma 3.3 and following a similar approach, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} e^{nP(t)} &\leq \sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{L}_n} c_\omega^t \leq \sum_{i+j+k=n} \left(\sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{C}_i^p} c_\omega^t \right) \left(\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{G}_j} c_\tau^t \right) \left(\sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{C}_k^s} c_\gamma^t \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{i+j+k=n} e^{(i+k)(P(t)-\varepsilon)} \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{G}_j} c_\tau^t \end{aligned}$$

By dividing both sides by $e^{nP(t)}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &\leq \sum_{i+j+k=n} e^{-jP(t)} e^{(i+k)(-\varepsilon)} \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{G}_j} c_\tau^t \\ &= \sum_{i+j+k=n} e^{(i+k)(-\varepsilon)} a_j \\ &\leq \sum_{m=0}^n (m+1) e^{-m\varepsilon} a_{n-m} \end{aligned}$$

Choose N large enough such that $1 - \sum_{m=N}^{\infty} (m+1) e^{-m\varepsilon} > 0$, and let $M = \max\{(m+1) e^{-m\varepsilon} : m \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Using the inequalities above and Lemma 3.2, we get

$$1 \leq \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} M a_{n-m} + \sum_{m=N}^{\infty} (m+1) e^{-m\varepsilon}.$$

By rearranging, we obtain:

$$M \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} a_{n-m} \geq 1 - \sum_{m=N}^{\infty} (m+1) e^{-m\varepsilon} > 0.$$

This implies that there exists an l with $n - N \leq l \leq n$ satisfying $N M a_l \geq 1 - \sum_{m=M}^{\infty} (m+1) e^{-m\varepsilon}$, and so

$$\sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{G}_l} c_\omega^t \geq \frac{1 - \sum_{m=N}^{\infty} e^{-m\varepsilon}}{MN} e^{lP(t)}.$$

□

Proposition 3.7. For t in a neighborhood of h , $Q(t) = P(t)$.

Proof. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathcal{G}_n \subset \mathcal{L}_n$, and so $\sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{G}_n} c_\omega^t \leq \sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{L}_n} c_\omega^t$. It follows that $Q(t) \leq P(t)$.

Next, using Lemma 3.6 we find constants K_3 and N to construct a sequence (l_n) for which $n - N \leq l_n \leq n$ and $K_3 e^{l_n P(t)} \leq \sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{G}_{l_n}} c_\omega^t$. Using this with Lemma 3.3, we obtain the inequality

$$\frac{K_3}{K_1 e^{NP(t)}} \sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{L}_n} c_\omega^t \leq K_3 e^{(n-N)P(t)} \leq K_3 e^{l_n P(t)} \leq \sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{G}_{l_n}} c_\omega^t.$$

Building off of this inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} P(t) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \left(\frac{K_3}{K_1 e^{NP(t)}} \sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{L}_n} c_\omega^t \right) \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \left(\sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{G}_{l_n}} c_\omega^t \right) \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{l_n} \log \left(\sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{G}_{l_n}} c_\omega^t \right) \\ &\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \left(\sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{G}_n} c_\omega^t \right) = Q(t). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $Q(t) = P(t)$. □

An analogous argument proves the following.

Proposition 3.8. *For t in a neighborhood of h , $\bar{Q}(t) = \bar{P}(t)$.*

In the next section, we will show that the values h and H for which $P(h) = 0$ and $\bar{P}(H) = 0$ give bounds for the box and Hausdorff dimension of the attractor, and so we are interested in $Q(h) = 0$ and $\bar{Q}(H) = 0$. This leads us to our next proposition that will provide a better computational tool for finding these special values for h and H .

Proposition 3.9. *For real number $h > 0$, $Q(h) = 0$ if and only if $\sum_{s \in S} c_0^{sh} c_1^h = 1$.*

Proof. First, we let $Q(h) = 0$ and consider the series $\sum_{n \geq 1} \sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{G}_n} c_\omega^t$. If $t < h$, then $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{G}_n} c_\omega^t)^{1/n} = e^{Q(t)} > 1$, so by the root test, $\sum_{n \geq 1} \sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{G}_n} c_\omega^t$ diverges. Similarly, if $t > h$, then $\sum_{n \geq 1} \sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{G}_n} c_\omega^t$ converges. Next, notice that

$$(1) \quad \sum_{n \geq 1} \sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{G}_n} c_\omega^t = \sum_{k \geq 1} \left(\sum_{s \in S} c_0^{st} c_1^t \right)^k,$$

and $\sum_{k \geq 1} (\sum_{s \in S} c_0^{st} c_1^t)^k$ converges when $\sum_{s \in S} c_0^{st} c_1^t < 1$ and diverges when $\sum_{s \in S} c_0^{st} c_1^t > 1$. Therefore, $\sum_{s \in S} c_0^{sh} c_1^h = 1$ where h satisfies $Q(h) = 0$.

Next, assume that $\sum_{s \in S} c_0^{sh} c_1^h = 1$. Notice that $\sum_{s \in S} c_0^{st} c_1^t$ is decreasing with respect to t and so $\sum_{k \geq 1} (\sum_{s \in S} c_0^{st} c_1^t)^k$ converges for $t > h$ and diverges for $t < h$. Therefore, $\sum_{n \geq 1} \sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{G}_n} c_\omega^t$ converges for $t > h$ and diverges for $t < h$. Because $e^{Q(t)} = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{G}_n} c_\omega^t)^{1/n}$ is strictly decreasing, we can consider all possible outcomes for the root test applied to $\sum_{n \geq 1} \sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{G}_n} c_\omega^t$ and find that it must be the case the $e^{Q(h)} = 1$ and so $Q(h) = 0$. \square

Again, an analogous argument proves the following.

Proposition 3.10. *For real number $H > 0$, $\bar{Q}(H) = 0$ if and only if $\sum_{s \in S} \bar{c}_0^{sH} \bar{c}_1^H = 1$.*

4. MAIN THEOREM

To establish the lower bound for the Hausdorff dimension of a subfractal induced by an S -gap shift, we must find a suitable Borel probability measure that is supported on the subfractal that will satisfy the Mass Distribution Principle [3]. For that purpose, we define a measure on the symbolic space. For $\omega \in \mathcal{L}(X)$, let $[\omega] = \{\tau \in X : \tau_i = \omega_i \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq \ell(\omega)\}$ denote the cylinder set of ω . We fix h to be the unique value such that $P(h) = 0$, let $\omega \in \mathcal{L}(X(S))$ and define

$$\nu_n([\omega]) = \frac{\sum_{\omega\tau \in \mathcal{L}_{n+\ell(\omega)}} c_{\omega\tau}^h}{\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{L}_{n+\ell(\omega)}} c_\tau^h}.$$

Next, notice that for $n \geq 1$ and any $\omega \in \mathcal{L}$, by Corollary 3.4 we have

$$0 \leq \frac{\sum_{\omega\tau \in \mathcal{L}_{n+\ell(\omega)}} c_{\omega\tau}^h}{K_2} \leq \nu_n([\omega]) \leq \frac{c_\omega^h \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{L}_n} c_\tau^h}{\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{L}_{n+\ell(\omega)}} c_\tau^h} \leq K_2 c_\omega^h < \infty.$$

Therefore, we can use the Banach limit to define $\nu([\omega]) = \text{Lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu_n([\omega])$. Next, notice that :

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^p \nu([\omega i]) &= \text{Lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^p \frac{\sum_{\omega i \tau \in \mathcal{L}_{n+\ell(\omega i)}} c_{\omega i \tau}^h}{\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{L}_{n+\ell(\omega i)}} c_\tau^h} \\ &= \text{Lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{\omega\tau \in \mathcal{L}_{n+1+\ell(\omega)}} c_{\omega\tau}^h}{\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{L}_{n+1+\ell(\omega)}} c_\tau^h} = \nu([\omega]) \end{aligned}$$

By the Kolmogorov Extension Theorem, we can extend ν to a unique Borel probability measure ξ on all of $X(S)$. We can use this measure to define a measure $\mu_h = \xi \circ \pi^{-1}$, where π is the coding map $\pi : X(S) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$. The measure μ_h is supported on $\mathcal{F}_{X(S)}$.

For the proof of our main theorem, we will use a special cover of the subfractal $\mathcal{F}_{X(S)}$. For $0 < r < 1$, we define the cover $\mathcal{U}_r = \{f_\omega(\mathcal{K}) : |f_\omega(\mathcal{K})| < r \leq |f_{\omega^-}(\mathcal{K})|\}$, where $\omega^- = \omega_1\omega_2 \dots \omega_{n-1}$ if $\omega \in \mathcal{L}_n$. From [8], we know that for $x \in \mathcal{F}_{X(S)}$, the open ball $B(x, r)$ intersects at most M elements of \mathcal{U}_r , where M is independent of r . This gives us the last tool we need to complete the proof of the main theorem.

Theorem 4.1. *Let h and H be the unique values such that $P(h) = 0 = \bar{P}(H)$. Then, $h \leq \dim_H(\mathcal{F}_{X(S)}) \leq H$, $h \leq \underline{\dim}_B(\mathcal{F}_{X(S)}) \leq H$, and $h \leq \overline{\dim}_B(\mathcal{F}_{X(S)}) \leq H$.*

Proof. We will utilize the following well-known relationships between Hausdorff and box dimension [4]:

$$\dim_H(\mathcal{F}_{X(S)}) \leq \underline{\dim}_B(\mathcal{F}_{X(S)}) \leq \overline{\dim}_B(\mathcal{F}_{X(S)}).$$

We start by proving h is a lower bound for the Hausdorff dimension. Next, let $x \in \mathcal{F}_{X(S)}$ and consider the open ball $B(x, r)$ for some $0 < r < 1$ and the cover $\mathcal{U}_r = \{f_\omega(\mathcal{K}) : |f_\omega(\mathcal{K})| < r \leq |f_{\omega^-}(\mathcal{K})|\}$. We know at most M elements of \mathcal{U}_r intersect $B(x, r)$, so let $\mathcal{U}_M = \{f_\omega(\mathcal{K}) \in \mathcal{U}_r : f_\omega(\mathcal{K}) \cap B(x, r) \neq \emptyset\}$ and let $\mathcal{L}_M = \{\omega : f_\omega(\mathcal{K}) \in \mathcal{U}_M\}$. Notice that for any $f_\omega(\mathcal{K}) \in \mathcal{U}_M \subseteq \mathcal{U}_r$ and corresponding $\omega \in \mathcal{L}_M$,

(2)

$$c_\omega |\mathcal{K}| \leq |f_\omega(\mathcal{K})| < r \text{ and}$$

(3)

$$\nu([\omega]) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{\omega\tau \in \mathcal{L}_{n+\ell(\omega)}} c_{\omega\tau}^h}{\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{L}_{n+\ell(\omega)}} c_\tau^h} \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{c_\omega^h \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{L}_n} c_\tau^h}{\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{L}_{n+\ell(\omega)}} c_\tau^h} \leq K_2 c_\omega^h.$$

Using (2) and (3), we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mu_h(B(x, r))}{r^h} &\leq \frac{\sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{L}_M} \mu_h(f_\omega(\mathcal{K}))}{r^h} = \frac{\sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{L}_M} \nu([\omega])}{r^h} \\ &\leq \frac{\sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{L}_M} K_2 c_\omega^h}{r^h} \leq \frac{MK_2 r^h}{r^h |\mathcal{K}^h|} \\ &= \frac{MK_2}{|\mathcal{K}|^h} \end{aligned}$$

This inequality holds for all $0 < r < 1$, and so $\limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu_h(B(x,r))}{r^h} \leq \frac{MK_2}{|\mathcal{K}|^h}$. By the Mass Distribution Principle, it follows that $\mathcal{H}^h(\mathcal{F}_{X(S)}) \geq \frac{\mu_h(\mathcal{F}_{X(S)})|\mathcal{K}|^h}{MK_2} > 0$. Hence, $h \leq \dim_H(\mathcal{F}_{X(S)})$ and so h is also a lower bound for the box dimensions of $\mathcal{F}_{X(S)}$.

It remains to show that $\overline{\dim}_B(\mathcal{F}_{X(S)}) \leq H$. To construct covers with minimal overlap, we start with an open set V as in the definition of the OSC and consider its closure $\text{cl}(V)$. Let $0 < \delta < 1$ and consider the cover $\mathcal{U}_\delta = \{f_\omega(\text{cl}(V)) : |f_\omega(\text{cl}(V))| < \delta \leq |f_{\omega^-}(\text{cl}(V))|\}$ and the collection of associated finite words $\mathcal{L}_\delta = \{\omega : f_\omega(\text{cl}(V)) \in \mathcal{U}_\delta\}$. For $k = \min\{\ell(\omega) : \omega \in \mathcal{L}_\delta\}$, we define another cover $\mathcal{U}_k = \{f_\omega(\text{cl}(V)) : \omega \in \mathcal{L}_k\}$. Notice that $\cup_{U \in \mathcal{U}_\delta} U \subseteq \cup_{U \in \mathcal{U}_k} U$. Using this fact with Corollary 3.5, it follows that

$$(4) \quad \sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{L}_\delta} |f_\omega(\text{cl}(V))|^H \leq \sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{L}_k} |f_\omega(\text{cl}(V))|^H \leq \sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{L}_k} \bar{c}_\omega^H |\text{cl}(V)|^H \leq L_2 |\text{cl}(V)|^H$$

The cover \mathcal{U}_δ contains finitely many elements, so there must exist some $\tau \in \mathcal{L}_\delta$ associated with the element of smallest diameter. Specifically, let τ be the word such that $|f_\tau(\text{cl}(V))| \leq |f_\omega(\text{cl}(V))|$ for all $\omega \in \mathcal{L}_\delta$. For this τ and using the definition of \mathcal{U}_δ , we obtain

$$(5) \quad \sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{L}_\delta} |f_\omega(\text{cl}(V))|^H \geq |f_\tau(\text{cl}(V))|^H |\mathcal{L}_\delta| \geq |f_{\tau^-}(\text{cl}(V))|^H c_{\min}^H |\mathcal{L}_\delta| \geq \delta^H c_{\min}^H |\mathcal{L}_\delta|.$$

Let $N_\delta(\mathcal{F}_{X(S)})$ denote the smallest number of sets of diameter at most δ that cover $\mathcal{F}_{X(S)}$. Using (4) and (5), we obtain

$$L_2 |\text{cl}(V)|^H \geq \delta^H c_{\min}^H |\mathcal{L}_\delta| \geq \delta^H c_{\min}^H N_\delta(\mathcal{F}_{X(S)}).$$

Therefore, $N_\delta(\mathcal{F}_{X(S)}) \leq \frac{L_2 |\text{cl}(V)|^H}{\delta^H c_{\min}^H}$. Using this we find that

$$\frac{\log(N_\delta(\mathcal{F}_{X(S)}))}{-\log \delta} \leq \frac{\log(L_2 |\text{cl}(V)|^H) - \log(c_{\min}^H) - H \log \delta}{-\log \delta}$$

Therefore, by letting $\delta \rightarrow 0$, we find that

$$\overline{\dim}_B(\mathcal{F}_{X(S)}) = \limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\log(N_\delta(\mathcal{F}_{X(S)}))}{-\log \delta} \leq H.$$

It follows that H is also an upper bound for the Hausdorff dimension and lower box dimension. \square

Example 4.2. Let X_F denote the Golden Mean shift, a subshift of finite type on $\mathcal{A} = \{0, 1\}$ with forbidden word list $F = \{11\}$. We can also view X_F as an S -gap shift with set $S = \mathbb{N}$. Let \mathcal{F}_{X_F} denote the subfractal induced by X_F , where \mathcal{F} is an attractor of an IFS with maps f_0, f_1 and these maps have lower and upper contractive bounds of $c_0, \bar{c}_0, c_1, \bar{c}_1$, respectively. Using the results above, we see that both the Hausdorff and box dimension of \mathcal{F}_{X_F} is bounded by h and H , where $P(h) = \bar{P}(H) = 0$. Using Proposition 3.9, we find that

$$1 = \sum_{s \in S} c_0^{sh} c_1^h = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} c_0^{nh} c_1^h = \frac{c_1^h c_0^h}{1 - c_0^h},$$

and a similar result involving H . Therefore, we are interested in the values of h and H for which $c_0^h + c_0^h c_1^h = 1$ and $\bar{c}_0^H + \bar{c}_0^H \bar{c}_1^H = 1$.

We can also compute these bounds using techniques from [8] by viewing X_F as an SFT. In this approach, we must compute the maximal eigenvalue of $\begin{bmatrix} c_0^t & c_1^t \\ c_0^t & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ which is $\rho(t) = \frac{1}{2}(c_0^t + \sqrt{c_0^{2t} + 4c_0^t c_1^t})$. We are interested in the value h for which $\rho(h) = 1$, and with some algebra we find that $c_0^h + c_0^h c_1^h = 1$. Through a similar process, we also find H by $\bar{c}_0^H + \bar{c}_0^H \bar{c}_1^H = 1$.

5. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author thanks Doğan Çömez and Scott Corry for their helpful feedback and suggestions on this work.

REFERENCES

- [1] Vaughn Climenhaga and Daniel Thompson. Intrinsic ergodicity beyond specification: β -shifts, s -gap shifts, and their factors. *Israel J. Math.*, 192(2):785–817, 2012.
- [2] David B. Ellis and Michael G. Branton. Non-self-similar attractors of hyperbolic iterated function systems. In *Dynamical systems (College Park, MD, 1986–87)*, volume 1342 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 158–171. Springer, Berlin, 1988.
- [3] Kenneth Falconer. *Techniques in fractal geometry*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Chichester, 1997.
- [4] Kenneth Falconer. *Fractal geometry*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Chichester, third edition, 2014. Mathematical foundations and applications.
- [5] John E. Hutchinson. Fractals and self-similarity. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 30(5):713–747, 1981.
- [6] Douglas Lind and Brian Marcus. *An introduction to symbolic dynamics and coding*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.
- [7] Mrinal Kanti Roychowdhury. Hausdorff and upper box dimension estimate of hyperbolic recurrent sets. *Israel J. Math.*, 201(2):507–523, 2014.

- [8] Elizabeth Sattler. Fractal dimensions of subfractals induced by sofic subshifts. *Monatsh. Math.*, 183(3):539–557, 2017.
- [9] Christoph Spandl. Computing the topological entropy of shifts. *MLQ Math. Log. Q.*, 53(4-5):493–510, 2007.

LAWRENCE UNIVERSITY, 711 E JOHN ST, APPLETON, WI 54911
Email address: `sattlere@lawrence.edu`