

A MULTIFRACTAL ANALYSIS FOR STERN-BROCOT INTERVALS, CONTINUED FRACTIONS AND DIOPHANTINE GROWTH RATES

MARC KESSEBÖHMER AND BERND O. STRATMANN

ABSTRACT. In this paper we obtain multifractal generalizations of classical results by Lévy and Khintchin in metrical Diophantine approximations and measure theory of continued fractions. We give a complete multifractal analysis for Stern–Brocot intervals, for continued fractions and for certain Diophantine growth rates. In particular, we give detailed discussions of two multifractal spectra closely related to the Farey map and to the Gauss map.

1. INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENTS OF RESULT

In this paper we give a multifractal analysis for Stern–Brocot intervals, continued fractions and certain Diophantine growth rates. We apply and extend the multifractal formalism for average growth rates of [KS04a] to obtain a complete multifractal description of two dynamical systems originating from the set of real numbers.

Recall that the process of writing an element x of the unit interval in its regular continued fraction expansion

$$x = [a_1(x), a_2(x), a_3(x), \dots] = \frac{1}{a_1(x) + \frac{1}{a_2(x) + \frac{1}{a_3(x) + \dots}}}$$

can be represented either by a uniformly hyperbolic dynamical system which is based on an infinite alphabet and hence has infinite topological entropy, or by a non-uniformly hyperbolic dynamical system based on a finite alphabet and having finite topological entropy. Obviously, for these two systems the standard theory of multifractals (see e.g. [Pes97]) does not apply, and therefore it is an interesting task to give a multifractal analysis for these two number theoretical dynamical systems. There is a well known result which gives some information in the generic situation, that is for a set of full 1-dimensional Lebesgue measure λ . Namely with $p_n(x)/q_n(x) := [a_1(x), a_2(x), \dots, a_n(x)]$ referring to the n -th approximant of x , we have for λ -almost every $x \in [0, 1)$,

$$\ell_1(x) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2 \log q_n(x)}{\sum_{i=1}^n a_i(x)} = 0.$$

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 37A45; Secondary 11J70, 11J83 28A80, 20H10.

Key words and phrases. Diophantine approximations, continued fractions, modular group, multifractals, Stern–Brocot intervals, Gauss map, Farey map.

Note that by employing the analogy between regular continued fraction expansions of real numbers and geodesics on the modular surface, the number $2 \log q_n(x)$ can be interpreted as the 'hyperbolic length' associated with the approximant $p_n(x)/q_n(x)$. Also, the parameter n represents the word length associated with $p_n(x)/q_n(x)$ with respect to the dynamical system on the infinite alphabet, whereas $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i(x)$ can be interpreted as the word length associated with $p_n(x)/q_n(x)$ with respect to the dynamical system on the finite alphabet. There are two classical results by Khintchin and Lévy [Lév29], [Lév36], [Khi35], [Khi36] which allow a closer inspection of the limit ℓ_1 . That is, for λ -almost every $x \in [0, 1)$ we have, with $\chi := \pi^2/(6 \log 2)$,

$$\ell_2(x) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n a_i(x)}{n} = \infty \text{ and } \ell_3(x) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2 \log q_n(x)}{n} = \chi.$$

Clearly, dividing the sequence in ℓ_3 by the sequence in ℓ_2 leads to the sequence in ℓ_1 . Therefore, if we define the level sets

$$\mathcal{L}_i(s) := \{x \in [0, 1) : \ell_i(x) = s\}, \text{ for } s \in \mathbb{R},$$

then these classical results by Lévy and Khintchin imply for the Hausdorff dimensions (\dim_H) of these level sets

$$\dim_H(\mathcal{L}_1(0)) = \dim_H(\mathcal{L}_2(\infty) \cap \mathcal{L}_3(\chi)) = 1.$$

A natural question to ask is what happens to this relation between these Hausdorff dimensions for prescribed non-generic limit behavior. Our first main results in this paper will give an answer to this question. Namely, with $\gamma := (1 + \sqrt{5})/2$ referring to the Golden Mean, we show that for each $\alpha \in [0, 2 \log \gamma]$ there exists a number $\alpha^\# = \alpha^\#(\alpha) \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ such that, with the convention $\alpha^\#(0) := \infty$ and $0 \cdot \alpha^\#(0) := \chi$,

$$\dim_H(\mathcal{L}_1(\alpha)) = \dim_H(\mathcal{L}_2(\alpha^\#) \cap \mathcal{L}_3(\alpha \cdot \alpha^\#)).$$

Furthermore, for the dimension function τ given by

$$\tau(\alpha) := \dim_H(\mathcal{L}_1(\alpha)),$$

we show that τ can be expressed explicitly in terms of the Legendre transform \widehat{P} of a certain pressure function P , referred to as the Stern–Brocot pressure. For the function P we obtain the result that it is real-analytic on the interval $(-\infty, 1)$ and vanishes on the complement of this interval. We then show that the dimension function τ is continuous and strictly decreasing on $[0, 2 \log \gamma]$, that it vanishes outside the interval $[0, 2 \log \gamma)$, and that for $\alpha \in [0, 2 \log \gamma]$ we have

$$\alpha \cdot \tau(\alpha) = -\widehat{P}(-\alpha).$$

Before we state the main theorems, let us recall the following classical construction of Stern–Brocot intervals (cf. [Ste58], [Bro60]). For each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, the elements of the n -th member of the Stern–Brocot sequence

$$\mathfrak{T}_n := \left\{ \frac{s_{n,k}}{t_{n,k}} : k = 1, \dots, 2^n + 1 \right\}$$

are defined recursively as follows.

- $s_{0,1} := 0$ and $s_{0,2} := t_{0,1} := t_{0,2} := 1$;
- $s_{n+1,2k-1} := s_{n,k}$ and $t_{n+1,2k-1} := t_{n,k}$, for $k = 1, \dots, 2^n + 1$;
- $s_{n+1,2k} := s_{n,k} + s_{n,k+1}$ and $t_{n+1,2k} := t_{n,k} + t_{n,k+1}$, for $k = 1, \dots, 2^n$.




FIGURE 1.1. The Stern–Brocot pressure P and the multifractal spectrum τ for ℓ_1 .

neighbouring intervals from \mathcal{T}_{n+1} , a left and a right subinterval. If $T_{n+1}(x)$ is the left of these then we encode this event by the letter A , otherwise we encode it by the letter B . In this way every $x \in [0, 1)$ can be described by a unique sequence of nested Stern–Brocot intervals of any order that contain x , and therefore by a unique infinite word in the alphabet $\{A, B\}$. It is well known that this type of coding is canonically associated with the continued fraction expansion of x (see Section 2 for the details). In particular, this allows to relate the level sets \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_3 to level sets given by means of the Stern–Brocot growth rate ℓ_4 of the nested sequences $(T_n(x))$, and to level sets of certain Diophantine growth rates ℓ_5 and ℓ_6 . These growth rates are given by (assuming that these limits exist)

$$\ell_4(x) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log |T_n(x)|}{-n},$$

$$\ell_5(x) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2 \log \left| x - \frac{p_n(x)}{q_n(x)} \right|}{-\sum_{i=1}^n a_i(x)} \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_6(x) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2 \log \left| x - \frac{p_n(x)}{q_n(x)} \right|}{-n}.$$

Proposition 1.2. *Let $x \in [0, 1)$ be given. If one of the limits in $\{\ell_1(x), \ell_4(x), \ell_5(x)\}$ exists then also the other two do exist, and*

$$\ell_1(x) = \ell_4(x) = \ell_5(x).$$

Furthermore, $\ell_3(x)$ exists if and only if $\ell_6(x)$ exists, and if one of these exists then

$$\ell_3(x) = \ell_6(x).$$

By Theorem 1.1, it therefore follows that for each $\alpha \in [0, 2 \log \gamma]$,

$$\dim_H(\mathcal{L}_4(\alpha)) = \dim_H(\mathcal{L}_5(\alpha)) = \dim_H(\mathcal{L}_2(\alpha^\sharp) \cap \mathcal{L}_6(\alpha^*)) = \tau(\alpha).$$

Note that the level sets $\mathcal{L}_4(\alpha)$ have already been under consideration in [KS04b]. There they were introduced in terms of homological growth rates of hyperbolic geodesics (see Remark 5.1 (2)). Clearly, Theorem 1.1 and Proposition 1.2 consider the dynamical system associated with the finite alphabet, a system which is closely related to the Farey map. Now, our second main result gives a multifractal analysis for the system based on the infinite alphabet, and this system is closely related to




FIGURE 1.2. The Diophantine pressure P_D and the multifractal spectrum τ_D for ℓ_3 .

the Gauss map. In here, the relevant pressure function is the *Diophantine pressure* P_D , which is given by

$$P_D(\theta) := \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{k} \log \sum_{[a_1, \dots, a_k]} q_k ([a_1, \dots, a_k])^{-2\theta}, \text{ for } \theta > \frac{1}{2}.$$

We remark that a very detailed analysis of the function P_D can be found in [May90]. Our second main result is the following.

Theorem 1.3. (see Fig. 1.2) *The function P_D has a singularity at $1/2$, and P_D is decreasing, convex and real-analytic on $(1/2, \infty)$. Furthermore, for $\alpha \in [2 \log \gamma, \infty)$ we have*

$$\dim_H(\mathcal{L}_3(\alpha)) = \dim_H(\mathcal{L}_6(\alpha)) = \frac{\widehat{P}_D(-\alpha)}{-\alpha} =: \tau_D(\alpha).$$

Also, the dimension function τ_D is real-analytic on $(2 \log \gamma, \infty)$, it is increasing on $[2 \log \gamma, \chi]$ and decreasing on $[\chi, \infty)$. In particular, τ_D has a point of inflexion at some point greater than χ and a unique maximum equal to 1 at χ . Additionally, $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \tau_D(\alpha) = 1/2$, $\lim_{\alpha \searrow 2 \log \gamma} \tau_D(\alpha) = 0$ and $\lim_{\alpha \searrow 2 \log \gamma} \tau_D'(\alpha) = \infty$.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we first recall two ways of coding elements of the unit interval. One is based on a finite alphabet and the other on an infinite alphabet, and both are defined in terms of the modular group. These codings are canonically related to regular continued fraction expansions, and we end the section by commenting on a 1-1 correspondence between Stern–Brocot sequences and finite continued fraction expansions. In Section 3 we introduce certain cocycles which are relevant in our multifractal analysis. In particular, we give various estimates relating these cocycles with the geometry of the modular codings and with the sizes of the Stern–Brocot intervals. This will then enable us to prove the first part of Proposition 1.2. Section 4 is devoted to the discussion of several aspects of the Stern–Brocot pressure and its Legendre transform. In Section 5 we give the proof of Theorem 1.1, which we have split into the parts *The lower bound*,

The upper bound, and Discussion of boundary points of the spectrum. Finally, in Section 6 we give the proof of Theorem 1.3 by showing how to adapt the multifractal formalism developed in Section 4 and 5 to the situation here.

Throughout, we shall use the notation $f \ll g$ to denote that for two non-negative functions f and g we have that f/g is uniformly bounded away from infinity. If $f \ll g$ and $g \ll f$, then we write $f \asymp g$.

Remark 1.1. One immediately verifies that the results of Theorem 1.1 and Proposition 1.2 can be expressed in terms of the Farey map \mathfrak{f} acting on $[0, 1]$, and then τ represents the multifractal spectrum of the measure of maximal entropy (see e.g. [Nak00]). Likewise, the results of Theorem 1.3 can be written in terms of the Gauss map \mathfrak{g} , and then in this terminology τ_D describes the Lyapunov spectrum of \mathfrak{g} . For the definitions of \mathfrak{f} and \mathfrak{g} and for a discussion of their relationship we refer to Remark 2.1.

Remark 1.2. Since the theory of multifractals started through essays of Mandelbrot [Man74] [Man88], Frisch and Parisi [FP85], and Halsey et al. [HJK⁺86], there has been a steady increase of the literature on multifractals and calculations of specific multifractal spectra. For a comprehensive account on the mathematical work we refer to [PW96] and [Pes97]. Essays which are closely related to the work on multifractal number theory in this paper are for instance [Byr98], [FO03], [KS04b], [HMU02], [MV04], [Nak00] and [PW99]. We remark that brief sketches of some parts of Theorem 1.3 have already been given in [KS04b]. The results there do for instance not cover the boundary points of the spectra. Furthermore, note that for the ℓ_6 -spectrum partial results have been established in [PW99] (Corollary 2).

2. THE GEOMETRY OF MODULAR CODINGS BY FINITE AND INFINITE ALPHABETS

Let $\Gamma := \mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ refer to the modular group acting on the upper half-plane \mathbb{H} . It is well-known that Γ is generated by the two elements P and Q , given by

$$P : z \mapsto z - 1 \quad \text{and} \quad Q : z \mapsto \frac{-1}{z}.$$

Defining relations for Γ are $Q^2 = (PQ)^3 = \{\mathrm{id.}\}$, and a fundamental domain F for Γ is the hyperbolic quadrilateral with vertices at $i, 1 + i, \{\infty\}$ and $z'_0 := (1 + i\sqrt{3})/2$. For $R := QP$ such that $R : z \mapsto -1/(z - 1)$, one easily verifies that $\Gamma_0 := \Gamma / \langle R \rangle$ is a subgroup of Γ of index 3 and that F_0 is a fundamental domain for Γ_0 , for $F_0 := F \cup R(F) \cup R^2(F)$ the ideal triangle with vertices at $0, 1$ and $\{\infty\}$ (see Fig. 2.1). Consider the two elements $A, B \in \Gamma$ given by

$$A := (Q^{-1}PQ) : z \mapsto \frac{z}{z+1} \quad \text{and} \quad B := (P^{-1}A^{-1}P) : z \mapsto \frac{-1}{z-2},$$

and let G denote the free semi-group generated by A and B . It is easy to see that for $z_0 := A(z'_0) = B(z'_0) = (1 + i/\sqrt{3})/2$ we have that the Cayley graph of G with respect to z_0 coincides with the restriction to

$$\{z \in \mathbb{H} : 0 \leq \Re(z) \leq 1, 0 < \Im(z) \leq 1/2\}$$

of the the Cayley graph of Γ_0 with respect to z_0 (see Fig. 2.2).




FIGURE 2.1. A fundamental domain F for $\mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ and the images under R and R^2 .

2.1. Finite Coding. Let $\Sigma := \{A, B\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ denote the full shift space on the finite alphabet $\{A, B\}$, for $A, B \in \Gamma$ given as above. Also, let Σ be equipped with the usual left-shift $\sigma : \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$. Then Σ is clearly isomorphic to the completion of G , where the completion is taken with respect to a suitable metric on G (see [Flo80]). One immediately verifies that the canonical map

$$\begin{aligned} \pi : \quad \Sigma &\quad \rightarrow \quad [0, 1], \\ (x_1, x_2, \dots) &\mapsto \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_1 \cdots x_n(z_0), \end{aligned}$$

is 1–1 almost everywhere, in the sense that it is 2–1 on the rationals in $[0, 1]$ and 1–1 on \mathbb{I} , for \mathbb{I} referring to the irrational numbers in $[0, 1]$. Note that the Stern–Brocot sequence \mathfrak{T}_{n+1} coincides with the set of vertices at infinity of $\{g(F_0) : g \in G \text{ of word length } n\}$, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

2.2. Infinite Coding. For the infinite alphabet $\{X^n : n \in \mathbb{N}, X \in \{A, B\}\}$ we define the shift space of finite type

$$\Sigma^* := \{(X^{n_1}, Y^{n_2}, X^{n_3}, \dots) : \{X, Y\} = \{A, B\}, n_i \in \mathbb{N} \text{ for all } i \in \mathbb{N}\},$$

which we assume to be equipped with the usual left-shift $\sigma^* : \Sigma^* \rightarrow \Sigma^*$. Then there exists a canonical bijection π^* , given by

$$\begin{aligned} \pi^* : \quad \Sigma^* &\quad \rightarrow \quad \mathbb{I} \\ (y_1, y_2, \dots) &\mapsto \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} y_1 y_2 \cdots y_k(z_0). \end{aligned}$$

This coding is closely related to the continuous fraction expansion. Namely, if $y = (X^{n_1}, Y^{n_2}, X^{n_3}, \dots)$ then

$$\pi^*(y) = \begin{cases} [n_1 + 1, n_2, n_3, \dots] & \text{for } X = A \\ [1, n_1, n_2, \dots] & \text{for } X = B. \end{cases}$$




FIGURE 2.2. Part of the Cayley graph rooted at z_0 , for $\Gamma_0(z_0)$ restricted to $[0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}^+$, and the Stern–Brocot intervals of order 2 and 3.

Also, if $S : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ and $s : \Sigma^* \rightarrow \Sigma^*$ are given by, for $x \in [0, 1]$ and $\{X, Y\} = \{A, B\}$,

$$S(x) := (1 - x) \quad \text{and} \quad s(X^{n_1}, Y^{n_2}, X^{n_3}, \dots) := (Y^{n_1}, X^{n_2}, Y^{n_3}, \dots),$$

then by symmetry we have that $S \circ \pi^* = \pi^* \circ s$.

To overcome the fact that (Σ^*, σ^*) is not topological transitive, we also require the full shift space $(\bar{\Sigma}, \bar{\sigma})$ over \mathbb{N} . In here, $\bar{\Sigma} := \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and $\bar{\sigma}$ refers to the left-shift map on $\bar{\Sigma}$. Clearly, $(\bar{\Sigma}, \bar{\sigma})$ is *finitely primitive* in the sense of [MU03], and we remark that this property is a necessary preliminary for the thermodynamical formalism used throughout this paper.

Note that the two shift spaces (Σ^*, σ^*) and $(\bar{\Sigma}, \bar{\sigma})$ are related by the 2-1 factor map p , which is given by

$$(2.1) \quad p : \Sigma^* \rightarrow \bar{\Sigma}, \quad (X^{n_1}, Y^{n_2}, X^{n_3}, \dots) \mapsto (n_1, n_2, n_3, \dots).$$

Remark 2.1. Note that the finite coding is in 1-1 correspondence to the coding of $[0, 1]$ via the inverse branches f_1 and f_2 of the *Farey map* f . In here, f_1 and f_2 are given by $f_1(x) = x/(x+1)$ and $f_2(x) = 1/(x+1)$, for $x \in [0, 1]$. One easily verifies that $f_1 = A$ and $f_2 \circ S = B$, and hence Σ can be interpreted as arising from a ‘twisted Farey map’. Similarly, one notices that Σ^* is closely related to the

coding of $[0, 1]$ via the infinitely many branches of the Gauss map \mathbf{g} , which is given by $\mathbf{g}(x) := 1/x \bmod 1$ for $x \in [0, 1]$. More precisely, we have that the dynamical system (\mathbb{I}, \mathbf{g}) is a topological 2–1 factor of the dynamical system (Σ^*, σ^*) , where the factor map can be established either on the symbolic level via p or on the geometric level via \mathbf{f} . The situation is summarized in the following commuting diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 \mathbb{I} & \xleftarrow{\pi_{\text{CF}}} & \overline{\Sigma} & \xleftarrow{p} & \Sigma^* & \xrightarrow{\pi^*} & \mathbb{I} & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{f}} & \mathbb{I} \\
 \mathbf{g} \downarrow & & \overline{\sigma} \downarrow & & \sigma^* \downarrow & & \mathbf{g}_s \downarrow & & \mathbf{g} \downarrow \\
 \mathbb{I} & \xleftarrow{\pi_{\text{CF}}} & \overline{\Sigma} & \xleftarrow{p} & \Sigma^* & \xrightarrow{\pi^*} & \mathbb{I} & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{f}} & \mathbb{I}
 \end{array}$$

In here, $\mathbf{g}_s := \pi^* \circ \sigma^* \circ (\pi^*)^{-1}$ denotes the 'twisted Gauss map' and π_{CF} is given by $\pi_{\text{CF}}(n_1, n_2, \dots) := [n_1, n_2, \dots]$ for $(n_1, n_2, \dots) \in \overline{\Sigma}$. Note that both π_{CF} and π^* are bijections and that $\pi_{\text{CF}} \circ p = \mathbf{f} \circ \pi^*$.

2.3. Stern–Brocot sequences versus continued fractions. We end this section by showing that there is a 1–1 correspondence between the elements of the Stern–Brocot sequence and finite continued fraction expansions. This will turn out to be useful in the sequel.

For $n \geq 2$, let A_k^n refer to the set all k -tuples of positive integers which add up to n and whose k -th entry exceeds 1. That is,

$$(2.2) \quad A_k^n := \left\{ (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k) \in \mathbb{N}^k : \sum_{i=1}^k a_i = n, a_k \neq 1 \right\}.$$

Since $a_k \neq 1$, we can identify an element $(a_1, \dots, a_k) \in A_k^n$ in a unique way with the finite continued fraction expansion $[a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k]$. Also, one easily verifies that for $1 \leq k \leq n-1$,

$$(2.3) \quad \text{card}(A_k^n) = \binom{n-2}{k-1}.$$

Lemma 2.1. *For all $n \geq 2$ we have*

$$\bigcup_{k=1}^{n-1} \bigcup_{(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k) \in A_k^n} [a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k] = \mathfrak{T}_{n-1} \setminus \mathfrak{T}_{n-2} = \left\{ \frac{s_{n-1, 2\ell}}{t_{n-1, 2\ell}} : 1 \leq \ell \leq 2^{n-2} \right\}.$$

Furthermore, if $(s_{n,k}/t_{n,k}) = [a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m] \in \mathfrak{T}_n \setminus \mathfrak{T}_{n-1}$ then its two siblings in $\mathfrak{T}_{n+1} \setminus \mathfrak{T}_n$ are, for $\{u, v\} = \{2k, 2k-2\}$,

$$\frac{s_{n+1, u}}{t_{n+1, u}} = [a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{m-1}, a_m + 1] \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{s_{n+1, v}}{t_{n+1, v}} = [a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{m-1}, a_m - 1, 2].$$

Proof. For the first part of the lemma note that the second equality follows by definition of \mathfrak{T}_n . The first equality is obtained by induction as follows. We clearly have $\{[2]\} = \mathfrak{T}_1 \setminus \mathfrak{T}_0$. Then assume that the assertion holds for $n-1$. Since the sets \mathfrak{T}_n are S -invariant it follows for $n \geq 3$,

$$\mathfrak{T}_{n-1} \setminus \mathfrak{T}_{n-2} = \bigcup_{x \in \mathfrak{T}_{n-2} \setminus \mathfrak{T}_{n-3}} A(x) \cup BS(x).$$

For $[a_1, \dots, a_k] \in \mathfrak{T}_{n-2} \setminus \mathfrak{T}_{n-3}$ we have by the inductive assumption that $\sum_{i=1}^k a_i = n-1$, and hence

$$\begin{aligned} A([a_1, \dots, a_k]) &= \frac{1}{1/[a_1, \dots, a_k] + 1} = [a_1 + 1, a_2, \dots, a_k] \in A_k^n, \\ BS([a_1, \dots, a_k]) &= \frac{1}{1 + [a_1, \dots, a_k]} = [1, a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k] \in A_{k+1}^n. \end{aligned}$$

By combining the two latter observation, we obtain

$$\mathfrak{T}_{n-1} \setminus \mathfrak{T}_{n-2} \subset \bigcup_{k=1}^{n-1} \bigcup_{(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k) \in A_k^n} [a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k].$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \text{card}(\mathfrak{T}_{n-1} \setminus \mathfrak{T}_{n-2}) &= \text{card}(\mathfrak{T}_{n-1}) - \text{card}(\mathfrak{T}_{n-2}) = 2^{n-2} \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \binom{n-2}{k-1} = \text{card}\left(\bigcup_{k=1}^{n-1} A_k^n\right), \end{aligned}$$

the first part of the lemma follows.

For the second part note that by the above

$$[a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m + 1], [a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m - 1, 2] \in \mathfrak{T}_{n+1} \setminus \mathfrak{T}_n.$$

Since $[a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m + 1]$, $[a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m]$, and $[a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m - 1, 2]$ are consecutive neighbours in \mathfrak{T}_{n+1} , the lemma follows. \square

Remark 2.2. Note that P can be written alternatively also in terms of denominators of approximants as follows.

$$P(\theta) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{(a_1, \dots, a_k) \in A_k^n} q_k ([a_1, \dots, a_k])^{-2\theta}.$$

In order to see this, note that for $\theta \leq 0$,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{2^n} (t_{n,k} t_{n,k+1})^{-\theta} \leq 2 \sum_{k=1}^{2^{n-1}} (t_{n,2k})^{-2\theta} \leq \sum_{k=1}^{2^{n+1}} (t_{n+1,k} t_{n+1,k+1})^{-\theta}.$$

On the other hand, using the recursive definition of $t_{n,k}$, we have for $\theta > 0$,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{2^{n-1}} (t_{n-1,k} t_{n-1,k+1})^{-\theta} \geq \sum_{k=1}^{2^{n-1}} (t_{n,2k})^{-2\theta} \geq \frac{(n+1)^{-\theta}}{4} \sum_{k=1}^{2^{n+1}} (t_{n+1,k} t_{n+1,k+1})^{-\theta}.$$

Therefore, by taking logarithms, dividing by n and letting n tend to infinity, we obtain

$$P(\theta) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \sum_{k=1}^{2^{n-1}} (t_{n,2k})^{-2\theta}.$$

Hence, using Lemma 2.1, the result follows.

3. DYNAMICAL COCYCLES VERSUS STERN-BROCOT SEQUENCES

In this section we introduce the dynamical cocycles which will be crucial in the multifractal analysis to come. We show that these cocycles are closely related to Stern–Brocot intervals and continued fractions. Finally, we give the proof of the first part of Proposition 1.2. We remark that the results in this section could be obtained alternatively by using elementary estimates for continued fractions only. Instead, we have put some emphasis on obtaining these results by making use of the hyperbolic metric d on \mathbb{H} . The intension here is that this should make it easier to follow the later transfer of the results of [KS04a], which were derived in terms of Kleinian groups, into the language of Stern–Brocot intervals and continued fractions.

Recall that the Poisson kernel \mathfrak{P} for the upper half-plane is given by

$$\mathfrak{P} : (z, \xi) \mapsto \frac{\Im(z)}{(\Re(z) - \xi)^2 + \Im(z)^2}, \text{ for all } z \in \mathbb{H}, \xi \in \mathbb{R}.$$

With z_0 defined as in Section 2, the cocycle $I : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ associated with the finite alphabet is given by

$$I(x) := |\log(\mathfrak{P}(x_1(z_0), \pi(x))) - \log(\mathfrak{P}(z_0, \pi(x)))|, \text{ for } x = (x_1, x_2, \dots) \in \Sigma.$$

We remark that I is continuous with respect to the standard metric. Also, it is well-known that $S_n I(x) := \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} I(\sigma^i(x))$ is equal to the hyperbolic distance of z_0 to the horocycle through $x_1 x_2 \cdots x_n(z_0)$ based at $\pi(x)$. Furthermore, note that in terms of the theory of iterations of maps, I is equal to the logarithm of the modulus of the derivative of the ‘twisted Farey map’, mentioned in Remark 2.1.

Similar, we define the cocycle $I^* : \Sigma^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ associated with the infinite alphabet as follows. For $y = (X^{n_1}, Y^{n_2}, \dots) \in \Sigma^*$ such that $\{X, Y\} = \{A, B\}$, let I^* be given by

$$I^*(y) := |\log(\mathfrak{P}(X^{n_1} Y(z_0), \pi^*(y))) - \log(\mathfrak{P}(z_0, \pi^*(y)))|.$$

One immediately verifies that $S_k I^*(y) := \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} I^*((\sigma^*)^i(y))$ is equal to the hyperbolic distance of z_0 to the horocycle based at $\pi^*(y)$ containing either the point $X^{n_1} Y^{n_2} \cdots X^{n_k} Y(z_0)$ (if k is odd) or $X^{n_1} Y^{n_2} \cdots Y^{n_k} X(z_0)$ (if k is even). Note that in terms of the theory of iterations of maps, the function I^* is clearly an analogue of the logarithm of the modulus of the derivative of the Gauss map. Throughout, we also require the potential function $N : \Sigma^* \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, which is given by

$$N((X^{n_1}, Y^{n_2}, \dots)) := n_1, \text{ for each } (X^{n_1}, Y^{n_2}, \dots) \in \Sigma^*.$$

Note that $S_k N((X^{n_1}, Y^{n_2}, \dots)) = \sum_{i=1}^k n_i$.

Finally, the relevant potentials for the shift space $(\overline{\Sigma}, \overline{\sigma})$ are the functions

$$(3.1) \quad \overline{I} := I^* \circ p_A = I^* \circ p_B \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{N} := N \circ p_A = N \circ p_B.$$

In here, p_X refers to the inverse branch with respect to $X \in \{A, B\}$ of the 2-1 factor map p introduced in Section 2.2. More precisely, we have for $X, Y \in \{A, B\}$ such that $X \neq Y$,

$$p_X((n_1, n_2, n_3, \dots)) := (X^{n_1}, Y^{n_2}, X^{n_3}, \dots).$$

The following lemma relates the Euclidean sizes of the Stern–Brocot intervals to the hyperbolic distances of z_0 to the elements in the orbit $G(z_0)$.

Lemma 3.1. *For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x \in \mathbb{I}$ such that $\pi^{-1}(x) = (x_1, x_2, \dots) \in \Sigma$, we have*

$$|T_n(x)| \asymp m_n(x) e^{-d(z_0, x_1 \dots x_n(z_0))}.$$

In here, $m_n(x)$ is defined by $m_n(x) := \max\{k : x_{n+1-i} = x_n \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, k\}$.

Proof. For $n = 1$ the statement is trivial. For $n \geq 2$, we first consider the case $m_n(x) = 1$. If $g := x_1 \dots x_{n-1} \in G$, then $g^{-1}(T_n(x))$ is equal to either $T_{1,1}$ (for $x_n = A$) or $T_{1,2}$ (for $x_n = B$). Also, note that for the modulus of the conformal derivative we have

$$\left| (g^{-1})'(\xi) \right| \asymp e^{d(z_0, g(z_0))}, \text{ for } \xi \in T_n(x).$$

Combining these two observations, we obtain

$$|T_n(x)| \asymp |g'|_{[0,1]} \asymp \left| (g^{-1})' \Big|_{T_n(x)} \right|^{-1} \asymp e^{-d(z_0, g(z_0))} \asymp e^{-d(z_0, g x_n(z_0))}.$$

This proves the assertion for $m_n(x) = 1$.

For the general situation we only consider the case $x_1 \dots x_n = A^{y_1} B^{y_2} \dots B^{y_k}$. The remaining cases can be dealt with in a similar way. In this case $m_n(x) = y_k$, and the above implies, for $l := \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} y_i$,

$$|T_{l+1}(x)| \asymp e^{-d(z_0, x_1 \dots x_{l+1}(z_0))}.$$

Also, by using the well-known elementary fact that $e^{d(z_0, X^k(z_0))} \asymp \Im(X^k(z_0)) \asymp 1/k^2$ for $X \in \{A, B\}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, one immediately obtains for $1 < m \leq y_k$,

$$e^{d(z_0, x_1 \dots x_{l+m}(z_0))} \asymp e^{d(z_0, x_1 \dots x_l(z_0))} e^{d(x_1 \dots x_l(z_0), x_1 \dots x_{l+m}(z_0))} \asymp m^2 e^{d(z_0, x_1 \dots x_{l+1}(z_0))}.$$

Finally, one also immediately verifies that for $1 \leq m \leq y_k$,

$$(3.2) \quad |T_{l+m}(x)| \asymp \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} k^{-2} |T_{l+1}(x)| \asymp m^{-1} |T_{l+1}(x)|.$$

Combining the three latter observations, the statement of the lemma follows. \square

The previous lemma has the following immediate implication.

Corollary 3.2. *For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x \in \mathbb{I}$ such that $\pi^{-1}(x) \in \Sigma$, we have*

$$|S_n I(\pi^{-1}(x)) + \log |T_n(x)|| \ll \log n.$$

The following lemma relates the cocycle I^* to the sizes of the Stern–Brocot intervals and to the denominators q_k^2 of the approximants.

Lemma 3.3. *For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x \in \mathbb{I}$ we have, with $n_k(x) := S_k N \left((\pi^*)^{-1}(x) \right)$,*

$$|T_{n_k(x)+1}(x)| \asymp \exp \left(-S_k I^* \left((\pi^*)^{-1}(x) \right) \right) \asymp q_k(x)^{-2}.$$

Proof. We only consider the case k even and $X = A$. The remaining cases can be obtained in a similar way. Let $g := A^{y_1} B^{y_2} \dots A^{y_k} \in G$, and note that then

$$q_k(x)^{-2} \asymp e^{-d(z_0, g(z_0))}.$$

Combining this with the fact that for $\xi \in T_{n+1}(x)$ we have

$$\exp(-d(z_0, g(z_0))) \asymp \exp \left(-S_k I^* \left((\pi^*)^{-1}(\xi) \right) \right)$$

(which follows since on $T_{n+1}(x)$ we have that $\exp\left(S_k I^* \circ (\pi^*)^{-1}\right)$ is comparable to $|(g^{-1})'|$), we obtain

$$e^{-S_k I^* ((\pi^*)^{-1}(x))} \asymp q_k(x)^{-2}.$$

Finally, note that by Lemma 3.1 and since $\exp(d(z_0, gB(z_0))) \asymp \exp(d(z_0, g(z_0)))$, we have

$$|T_{n+1}(x)| \asymp e^{-d(z_0, gB(z_0))} \asymp e^{-d(z_0, g(z_0))}.$$

Combining these estimates, the lemma follows. \square

We are now in the position to prove the first part of Proposition 1.2.

Proof of first part of Proposition 1.2. The equalities $\ell_3 = \ell_6$ and $\ell_1 = \ell_5$ are immediate consequences of the following well-known Diophantine inequalities. For all $x \in [0, 1]$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have (see e.g. [Khi35])

$$(3.3) \quad \frac{1}{q_k(x)(q_{k+1}(x) + q_k(x))} < \left| x - \frac{p_k(x)}{q_k(x)} \right| < \frac{1}{q_k(x)q_{k+1}(x)}.$$

In order to show that $\ell_1 = \ell_4$, let $n_k(x) := S_k N\left((\pi^*)^{-1}(x)\right)$, for $x \in \mathbb{I}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Obviously, $(\log q_k(x)/n_k(x))$ is a subsequence of the sequence $(-\log |T_n(x)|/n)$. Therefore, if $\ell_4(x)$ exists then so does $\ell_1(x)$, and both limits must coincide. For the reverse, suppose that $\ell_1(x)$ exists such that $\ell_1(x) = \alpha$. Let $m_n(x)$ be defined as in the statement of Lemma 3.1, and put $k_n(x) := \sup\{k \in \mathbb{N} : n_k(x) \leq n\}$. By combining (3.2) and Lemma 3.3, we then have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{-\log |T_n(x)|}{n} &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2 \log q_{k_n(x)}(x) + 2 \log(m_n(x) + 1)}{n_{k_n(x)}(x) + m_n(x)} \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2 \log q_{k_n(x)}(x)}{n_{k_n(x)}(x)} + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2 \log(m_n(x) + 1)}{n_{k_n(x)}(x) + m_n(x)} = \alpha. \end{aligned}$$

This gives the upper bound, and hence finishes the proof in particular for $\alpha = 0$. For the opposite inequality we can therefore assume without loss of generality that $\alpha > 0$. First, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{-\log |T_n(x)|}{n} &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2 \log q_{k_n(x)}(x) + 2 \log m_n(x)}{n_{k_n(x)}(x) + m_n(x)} \\ &\geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2 \log q_{k_n(x)+1}(x)}{n_{k_n(x)+1}(x)} - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2 \log a_{k_n(x)+1}(x)}{n_{k_n(x)}(x)}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, it is now sufficient to show that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \log a_{k+1}(x)/n_k(x) = 0$, or what is equivalent $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \log a_{k+1}(x)/\log q_k(x) = 0$. For this, observe that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log q_{k+1}(x)}{n_{k+1}(x)} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log q_k(x) + \log a_{k+1}(x)}{n_k(x) + a_{k+1}(x)} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log q_k(x) \left(1 + \frac{\log a_{k+1}(x)}{\log q_k(x)}\right)}{n_k(x) \left(1 + \frac{a_{k+1}(x)}{n_k(x)}\right)}.$$

If we would have that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \log a_{k+1}(x)/\log q_k(x) \neq 0$, then there exists a subsequence (k_l) such that $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \log a_{k_l+1}(x)/\log q_{k_l}(x) = c$, for some $c \in (0, \infty]$. It follows that $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} a_{k_l+1} = \infty$, and hence by combining this with the calculation above, we obtain

$$1 = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log a_{k_l+1}(x) \cdot n_{k_l}(x)}{a_{k_l+1}(x) \cdot \log q_{k_l}(x)} = \frac{0}{\alpha} = 0.$$

This shows that $\ell_1(x) = \ell_4(x)$, and hence finishes the proof. \square

4. ANALYTIC PROPERTIES OF P AND \widehat{P}

The main goal in this section is to derive various analytic properties of the Stern–Brocot pressure function P . These properties are derived by considering the pressure functions associated with the systems Σ, Σ^* and $\overline{\Sigma}$. In order to introduce these functions, let $\mathcal{C}_n := \{C_n(x) : x \in \Sigma\}$ refer to the set of all n -cylinders

$$C_n(x) := \{y \in \Sigma : y_i = x_i, \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, n\}.$$

Likewise, let \mathcal{C}_n^* (resp. $\overline{\mathcal{C}}_n$) refer to the set of n -cylinders for the system (Σ^*, σ^*) (resp. $(\overline{\Sigma}, \overline{\sigma})$). The pressure function \mathcal{P} associated with Σ is then given by

$$\mathcal{P}(\theta) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}_n} \exp \left(\sup_{x \in C} S_n(-\theta I)(x) \right), \text{ for } \theta \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Also, for the system Σ^* we define the pressure functions \mathcal{P}^* and P^* , for $\theta < 1, q > 0$ and $f : \Sigma^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ continuous, by

$$\mathcal{P}^*(f) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \sum_{C^* \in \mathcal{C}_n^*} \exp \left(\sup_{y \in C^*} S_n f(y) \right) \text{ and } P^*(\theta, q) := \mathcal{P}^*(-\theta I^* - qN).$$

Finally, the pressure functions $\overline{\mathcal{P}}$ and \overline{P} associated with $(\overline{\Sigma}, \overline{\sigma})$ are given completely analogous, for $\theta < 1, q > 0$ and $g : \overline{\Sigma} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ continuous, by

$$\overline{\mathcal{P}}(g) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \sum_{\overline{C} \in \overline{\mathcal{C}}_n} \exp \left(\sup_{y \in \overline{C}} S_n g(y) \right) \text{ and } \overline{P}(\theta, q) := \overline{\mathcal{P}}(-\theta \overline{I} - q\overline{N}).$$

Clearly, by recalling the definitions of $\overline{I}, \overline{N}$ and I^*, N in Section 3, we immediately have that $\overline{P} = P^*$.

4.1. Analytic Properties of P^* by Hanus, Mauldin and Urbański. In this subsection we employ important results of Hanus, Mauldin and Urbański obtained in [MU01] and [HMU02]. The results here will be crucial cornerstones in our subsequent analysis of the Stern–Brocot pressure.

Studies of analytic properties of pressure functions are usually based on the existence of certain Gibbs measures, here on Σ^* and $\overline{\Sigma}$. The existence of these measures in our situation here is guaranteed by the following proposition, which essentially follows from a result in [MU01].

Proposition 4.1. *For each $\theta < 1, q > 0$, and for $(\theta, q) = (1, 0)$, there exists a unique completely ergodic $\overline{\sigma}$ -invariant Gibbs measure $\overline{\mu}_{\theta, q}$ associated with the potential $-\theta \overline{I} - q\overline{N}$. That is, we have for all $n \in \mathbb{N}, \overline{C} \in \overline{\mathcal{C}}_n$ and $y \in \overline{C}$,*

$$(4.1) \quad \overline{\mu}_{\theta, q}(\overline{C}) \asymp \exp \left(S_n(-\theta \overline{I}(y) - q\overline{N}(y)) - n \overline{\mathcal{P}}(-\theta \overline{I} - q\overline{N}) \right).$$

In particular, the Borel measure $\mu_{\theta, q}^ := 1/2 \cdot (\overline{\mu}_{\theta, q} \circ p_A^{-1} + \overline{\mu}_{\theta, q} \circ p_B^{-1})$ is an ergodic σ^* -invariant Gibbs measure on Σ^* such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}, C^* \in \mathcal{C}_n^*$ and $y \in C^*$,*

$$(4.2) \quad \mu_{\theta, q}^*(C^*) \asymp \exp \left(S_n(-\theta I^*(y) - qN(y)) - n \mathcal{P}^*(-\theta I^* - qN) \right).$$

The measure $\mu_{\theta, q}^$ is unique with respect to this property, and $\overline{\mu}_{\theta, q} = \mu_{\theta, q}^* \circ p^{-1}$.*

Proof. By [KS04a] (Lemma 3.4), the cocycle I^* is Hölder continuous in the sense that there exists $\kappa > 0$ such that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\sup_{C \in \overline{\mathcal{C}}_n} \sup_{x, y \in C} |\overline{I}(x) - \overline{I}(y)| \ll \exp(-\kappa n).$$

Clearly, we also immediately have that \overline{N} is Hölder continuous. Furthermore, the following summability condition holds for $\theta < 1$, $q > 0$, and for $(\theta, q) = (1, 0)$,

$$(4.3) \quad \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \exp(\sup\{-\theta \overline{I}(x) - q \overline{N}(x) : x_1 = i\}) \ll \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} i^{-2\theta} \cdot e^{-qi} < \infty.$$

Hence, all preliminaries of [MU01] (Corollary 2.10) are fulfilled, which then gives the existence of a unique invariant Gibbs measure $\overline{\mu}_{\theta, q}$ with properties as stated in the proposition.

Immediate consequences of the definition of N and the definition $\mu_{\theta, q}^* := 1/2 \cdot (\overline{\mu}_{\theta, q} \circ p_A^{-1} + \overline{\mu}_{\theta, q} \circ p_B^{-1})$ are that $\mu_{\theta, q}^*$ is σ^* -invariant, that $\mu_{\theta, q}^*$ fulfills the Gibbs property (4.2), and that the equality $\overline{\mu}_{\theta, q} = \mu_{\theta, q}^* \circ p^{-1}$ is satisfied. To prove ergodicity of $\mu_{\theta, q}^*$, let $D \subset \Sigma^*$ such that $\sigma^{*-1}(D) = D$. We then have $\overline{\sigma}^{-1} p_X^{-1}(D) = p_Y^{-1}(D)$, for $X, Y \in \{A, B\}$ such that $X \neq Y$. This gives $\overline{\sigma}^{-2}(p_X^{-1}(D)) = p_X^{-1}(D)$. Since $\overline{\mu}_{\theta, q}$ is completely ergodic, which by definition means that $\overline{\mu}_{\theta, q}$ is ergodic with respect to $\overline{\sigma}^n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, it follows $\overline{\mu}_{\theta, q}(p_X^{-1}(D)) \in \{0, 1\}$. The $\overline{\sigma}$ -invariance of $\overline{\mu}_{\theta, q}$ then implies that $\overline{\mu}_{\theta, q}(p_X^{-1}(D)) = \overline{\mu}_{\theta, q}(\overline{\sigma}^{-1}(p_X^{-1}(D))) = \overline{\mu}_{\theta, q}(p_Y^{-1}(D))$. Consequently, it follows that $\mu_{\theta, q}^*(D) \in \{0, 1\}$. \square

The following proposition employs yet another result of Hanus, Mauldin and Urbański, obtained in their spectral analysis of the Perron–Frobenius operator.

Proposition 4.2. *The pressure function P^* is a convex, decreasing and real-analytic function with respect to both coordinates. In the second coordinate P^* is strictly decreasing to $(-\infty)$. In particular, there hence exists a positive real-analytic function β on $(-\infty, 1)$ such that $P^*(\theta, \beta(\theta)) = 0$. Furthermore, for the derivative of β at $\theta < 1$ we have*

$$(4.4) \quad \beta'(\theta) = \frac{-\int I^* d\mu_{\theta}^*}{\int N d\mu_{\theta}^*} = -\int I d\mu_{\theta}.$$

In here, $\mu_{\theta}^* := \mu_{\theta, \beta(\theta)}^*$ refers to the unique σ^* -invariant Gibbs measure associated with the potential $-\theta I^* - \beta(\theta)N$. Also, μ_{θ} refers to the σ -invariant probability measure on Σ absolutely continuous to μ_{θ}^* , whose existence is guaranteed by Kac's formula ([Kac47]; see the proof).

Proof. First, note that it is sufficient to verify the statements in the proposition for $\overline{\Sigma}$ only. Then note that \overline{I} and \overline{N} are Hölder continuous, that the summability condition (4.3) is satisfied for all $(\theta, q) \in (-\infty, 1) \times (0, \infty)$, and that

$$\int (\theta \overline{I} + q \overline{N}) d\overline{\mu}_{\theta, q} \ll \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (2\theta \log n + qn) n^{-2\theta} e^{-qn} < \infty.$$

Hence, we can apply [HMU02] (Proposition 6.5) (see also [MU03] (Proposition 2.6.13)), from which it follows that $\overline{P}(\theta, q)$ is real-analytic on $(-\infty, 1) \times (0, \infty)$. Next, note that for the partial derivatives of \overline{P} we have

$$\frac{\partial \overline{P}(\theta, q)}{\partial \theta} = \int -\overline{I} d\overline{\mu}_{\theta, q} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial \overline{P}(\theta, q)}{\partial q} = \int -\overline{N} d\overline{\mu}_{\theta, q} < 0.$$

This shows that \overline{P} as a function in the second coordinate is strictly decreasing, which then gives the existence of a real-analytic function $\beta : (-\infty, 1) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ for which $\overline{P}(\theta, \beta(\theta)) = 0$, for all $\theta < 1$. Now, the first equality in (4.4) follows from the Implicit Function Theorem. The second equality is a consequence of *Kac's formula* ([Kac47]), which guarantees that there exists a σ -invariant measure $\tilde{\mu}_\theta$ on Σ , given by

$$(4.5) \quad \tilde{\mu}_\theta(M) := \int \sum_{i=0}^{N(y)-1} \mathbb{1}_M \circ \sigma^i(\iota(y)) d\mu_\theta^*(y), \text{ for each Borel set } M \subset \Sigma.$$

In here, $\iota : \Sigma^* \rightarrow \Sigma$ refers to the canonical injection which maps an element of Σ^* to its representation by means of the finite alphabet of Σ . We remark that Kac's formula gives in fact a 1–1 correspondence between σ -invariant measures on Σ and σ^* -invariant measures on Σ^* . Now, one immediately verifies that

$$\tilde{\mu}_\theta(\Sigma) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \ell \mu_\theta^* (\{N = \ell\}) \asymp \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \ell^{-2\theta+1} e^{-\beta(\theta)\ell} < \infty.$$

Hence, this allows to define $\mu_\theta := \tilde{\mu}_\theta / \tilde{\mu}_\theta(\Sigma)$. In particular, we then have that $\int I d\mu_\theta = \mu_\theta^*(N)^{-1} \int I^* d\mu_\theta^*$, from which the second equality follows. Finally, note that since \overline{P} and P^* coincide, in the integrals above we can replace \overline{I} and \overline{N} by I^* and N . This finishes proof of the proposition. \square

Remark 4.1. Note that the measure μ_θ in Proposition 4.2 is in fact a weak Gibbs measure for the potential $-\theta I$. Therefore, the results of [Kes01] are applicable, and hence in this way one could immediately obtain some Large Deviation results for the situation here.

4.2. Analytic properties of P and \widehat{P} . In this subsection we employ the results of the previous subsection, in order to derive analytic properties of the Stern–Brocot pressure P and its Legendre transform \widehat{P} .

A key preliminary observation is stated in the following proposition, which shows that the Stern–Brocot pressure P coincides with the function β obtained in Proposition 4.2.

Proposition 4.3. *For $\theta < 1$, we have*

$$P(\theta) = \beta(\theta).$$

Proof. Let μ_θ^* be the measure obtained in Proposition 4.2, for $\theta < 1$ fixed. First, recall from the proof of Proposition 4.2 that the measure class of μ_θ^* contains a σ -invariant probability measure μ_θ on Σ for which $\int I d\mu_\theta = \mu_\theta^*(N)^{-1} \int I^* d\mu_\theta^*$. Secondly, note that for the measure $\overline{\mu}_\theta := \mu_\theta^* \circ p^{-1}$ we have by *Abramov's formula* ([Abr59], [Nev69]) that the measure theoretical entropies h_{μ_θ} and $h_{\overline{\mu}_\theta}$ are related by $h_{\mu_\theta} = h_{\overline{\mu}_\theta} / \mu_\theta^*(N)$. Thirdly, by applying *Pinsker's result on relative entropies* ([Roh67]) to our situation here, we obtain that the relative entropy $h_{\mu_\theta^*}(\sigma^* | \overline{\sigma})$ of μ_θ^* vanishes. This gives $h_{\mu_\theta^*} - h_{\overline{\mu}_\theta} = h_{\mu_\theta^*}(\sigma^* | \overline{\sigma}) = 0$. Combining these observations with the usual variational principle ([DGS76]), it now follows

$$\begin{aligned} P(\theta) &\geq h_{\mu_\theta} - \int \theta I d\mu_\theta = (\mu_\theta^*(N))^{-1} \left(h_{\mu_\theta^*} - \int \theta I^* d\mu_\theta^* \right) \\ &= (\overline{\mu}_\theta(\overline{N}))^{-1} \left(h_{\overline{\mu}_\theta} - \int \theta \overline{I} d\overline{\mu}_\theta \right) = \beta(\theta). \end{aligned}$$

In here, the latter equality is obtained as follows. Note that $\bar{\mu}_\theta$ is an equilibrium measure on $(\bar{\Sigma}, \bar{\sigma})$ for the potential $-\theta\bar{I} - \beta(\theta)\bar{N}$. Also, $\bar{\mu}_\theta$ fulfills the Gibbs property 4.1, and $\bar{\mu}_\theta(\theta\bar{I} + \beta(\theta)\bar{N}) < \infty$. Next, recall *Sarig's variational principle* ([Sar99]) which states that for $g : \bar{\Sigma} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ Hölder continuous,

$$(4.6) \quad \bar{P}(g) = \sup \left\{ h_{\bar{\mu}} + \int g d\bar{\mu} : \bar{\mu} \in \mathcal{M}(\bar{\Sigma}, \bar{\sigma}) \text{ such that } - \int g d\bar{\mu} < \infty \right\}.$$

In here, $\mathcal{M}(\bar{\Sigma}, \bar{\sigma})$ refers to the set of $\bar{\sigma}$ -invariant Borel probability measures on $\bar{\Sigma}$. Applying this to the situation here, we obtain

$$h_{\bar{\mu}_\theta} - \int (\theta\bar{I} + \beta(\theta)\bar{N}) d\bar{\mu}_\theta = \bar{P}(-\theta\bar{I} - \beta(\theta)\bar{N}) = \bar{P}(\theta, \beta(\theta)) = 0.$$

An elementary rearrangement then gives the result.

For the reverse inequality, first note that we can induce (Σ, σ) on the set $\mathcal{H} := \{(x_1, x_2, \dots) \in \Sigma : x_1 \neq x_2\}$. For the resulting induced system the return time to \mathcal{H} of a point $y = \iota(X, Y^{n_1}, X^{n_2}, \dots) \in \mathcal{H}$ is given by $n_1 = N(\sigma^*(X, Y^{n_1}, X^{n_2}, \dots))$. Define $\mathcal{G} := \iota(\Sigma^*) \cap \mathcal{H}$, and let $m_\theta \in \mathcal{M}(\Sigma, \sigma)$ be an ergodic equilibrium measure for the potential $-\theta I$, that is $P(\theta) = h_{m_\theta} - \theta \int I dm_\theta$. In this situation we necessarily have that $m_\theta(\mathcal{G}) > 0$, and this can be seen as follows. First, we show that $m_\theta(\mathcal{G}) = 0$ implies that m_θ is equal to either $\delta_{\bar{A}}$ or $\delta_{\bar{B}}$, where $\delta_{\bar{A}}$ (resp. $\delta_{\bar{B}}$) refers to the Dirac measure at the periodic point $\bar{A} = \pi^{-1}(0)$ (resp. $\bar{B} = \pi^{-1}(1)$). Namely, if $m_\theta(\mathcal{H}) = 0$ then we immediately have $m_\theta \in \{\delta_{\bar{A}}, \delta_{\bar{B}}\}$. On the other hand, if $m_\theta(\mathcal{H}) > 0$ then ergodicity of m_θ gives $m_\theta(\Sigma \setminus \iota(\Sigma^*)) = 1$. Now, since $I(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in \Sigma$, where $I(x) = 0$ if and only if $x \in \{\bar{A}, \bar{B}\}$, we have $\lim n^{-1} S_n I(x) = 0 = \int I dm_\theta$ for m_θ -almost every x , and this again implies that $m_\theta \in \{\delta_{\bar{A}}, \delta_{\bar{B}}\}$. Thus, if $m_\theta(\mathcal{G}) = 0$ then $m_\theta \in \{\delta_{\bar{A}}, \delta_{\bar{B}}\}$. This shows that $h_{m_\theta} = m_\theta(-\theta I) = 0$, giving $P(\theta) = 0$, and hence contradicting the fact $P(\theta) \geq \beta(\theta) > 0$. Therefore, we can assume without loss of generality that $m_\theta(\mathcal{G}) > 0$. We can now use Kac's formula once more, which guarantees that there exists a σ^* -invariant probability measure m_θ^* in the measure class of m_θ , such that $m_\theta^* := \frac{1}{m_\theta(\mathcal{G})} m_\theta|_{\mathcal{G}} \circ \sigma^{-1} \circ \iota$ and

$$- \int (-\theta I^* - \beta(\theta)N) dm_\theta^* = (m_\theta(\mathcal{G}))^{-1} \left(\int \theta I dm_\theta + \beta(\theta) \right) < \infty.$$

For $\bar{m}_\theta := m_\theta^* \circ p^{-1}$, we argue similar as above and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq h_{\bar{m}_\theta} - \int (\theta\bar{I} + \beta(\theta)\bar{N}) d\bar{m}_\theta && \text{(Sarig's variational principle)} \\ &= h_{m_\theta^*} - \int (\theta I^* + \beta(\theta)N) dm_\theta^* && \text{(Pinsker's result on relative entropies)} \\ &= m_\theta^*(N) \left(h_{m_\theta} - \int \theta I dm_\theta - \beta(\theta) \right) && \text{(Abramov's formula)} \\ &= m_\theta^*(N) (P(\theta) - \beta(\theta)) && \text{(since } m_\theta \text{ is an equilibrium state).} \end{aligned}$$

□

The following proposition collects the properties of P and \hat{P} which will be crucial in the analysis to come.

Proposition 4.4.

- (1) *The Stern–Brocot pressure function P coincides with the pressure function \mathcal{P} associated with Σ .*
- (2) *P is convex and non-increasing on \mathbb{R} and real-analytic on $(-\infty, 1)$.*
- (3) *$P(\theta) = 0$, for all $\theta \geq 1$.*
- (4) *P is differentiable throughout \mathbb{R} .*
- (5) *The domain of \widehat{P} is equal to $[-\alpha_+, 0]$, where*

$$-\alpha_+ := \lim_{\theta \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{P(\theta)}{\theta} = -2 \log \gamma.$$

- (6) *We have $\lim_{\alpha \searrow 0} \widehat{P}(-\alpha)/(-\alpha) = 1$.*
- (7) *We have $\lim_{\alpha \nearrow 2 \log \gamma} (-\widehat{P}(-\alpha)) = 0$.*
- (8) *We have $\lim_{\theta \rightarrow -\infty} (P(\theta) + 2\theta \log \gamma) = 0$.*

For the proofs of (7) and (8) the following lemma will turn out to be useful.

Lemma 4.5. *For each $x := [a_1, a_2, a_3, \dots] \in (0, 1)$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ we have, with $\tau_0 := 0$, $\tau_k := \sum_{i=1}^k a_i$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\rho := 1 - \gamma^{-6}$,*

$$q_k(x) \leq \gamma^{\tau_k} \rho^{\tau_k - k - 1}.$$

Proof. We give a proof by complete induction of the slightly stronger inequality

$$(4.7) \quad q_k(x) \leq \gamma^{\tau_k} \rho^{\tau_k - k} \rho^{\delta_{1, a_k} - 1},$$

in which δ denotes the Kronecker symbol.

First note that $q_0 \equiv 1$, $q_1([1, \dots]) = 1 \leq \gamma^1 \rho^{1-1}$, and if $a_1 \geq 2$ then one immediately verifies that $q_1[a_1, \dots] = a_1 \leq \gamma^{a_1} \rho^{a_1-1} \rho^{-1}$. Also, for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$(4.8) \quad q_k(\gamma - 1) = q_k([1, 1, 1, \dots]) = f_k \leq \gamma^k = \gamma^{\tau_k} \rho^{\tau_k - k},$$

where f_k refers to the $(k+1)$ -th member of the Fibonacci sequence $(f_0, f_1, f_2, \dots) := (0, 1, 1, 2, \dots)$, given by $f_{k+1} := f_{k-1} + f_k$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Recall that $f_k = (\gamma^k - (-\gamma)^{-k})/\sqrt{5}$. Now suppose that (4.7) holds for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and for all $0 \leq m \leq k$. It is then sufficient to consider the following two cases.

- (1) If $a_{k+1} = 1$ such that $a_n \geq 2$ and $a_{n+i} = 1$, for all $i = 1, \dots, l$ and some $n \leq k$ and $l \geq k - n + 1$, then $q_{n-1}(x) \leq \gamma^{\tau_{n-1}} \rho^{\tau_{n-1} - n + 1} \rho^{-1}$ and $q_n(x) \leq \gamma^{\tau_n} \rho^{\tau_n - n} \rho^{-1}$. Hence, an elementary calculation gives

$$\begin{aligned} q_{n+l}(x) &= f_{l+1} q_n(x) + f_l q_{n-1}(x) \\ &\leq f_{l+1} \gamma^{\tau_n} \rho^{\tau_n - n} \rho^{-1} + f_l \gamma^{\tau_{n-1}} \rho^{\tau_{n-1} - n + 1} \rho^{-1} \\ &\leq \gamma^{\tau_{n+l}} \rho^{\tau_{n+l} - n - l} \left(\rho^{-1} \left(\frac{f_{l+1}}{\gamma^l} + \frac{f_l}{\gamma^{a_n+l} \rho^{a_n-1}} \right) \right) \\ &\leq \underbrace{\gamma^{\tau_{n+l}} \rho^{\tau_{n+l} - n - l} \left(\rho^{-1} \left(\frac{f_{l+1}}{\gamma^l} + \frac{f_l}{\gamma^l (\gamma \rho)^2} \right) \right)}_{\leq 1}. \end{aligned}$$

- (2) If $a_{k+1} = 2$, then either $a_i = 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$, or there exists $n \leq k$ such that $a_n \geq 2$ and $a_i = 1$ for all i with $n < i \leq k$. In the first case we use

(4.8), whereas in the second case we employ (1), and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} q_{k+1}([a_1, \dots, a_k, 2]) &= q_{k+2}([a_1, \dots, a_k, 1, 1]) \\ &\leq \gamma^{\tau_{k+1}} \rho^{\tau_{k+1}-k-1} \rho^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

For $a_{k+1} > 2$, the inequality follows by induction over a_{k+1} , using (1) and the fact that $q_{k+1}([a_1, \dots, a_k, a_{k+1}]) = q_{k+2}([a_1, \dots, a_{k+1} - 1, 1])$. \square

Before giving the proof of Proposition 4.4, we remark that the statements (7) and (8) in Proposition 4.4 are in fact equivalent. Nevertheless, we shall prove these two statements separately, where the proof of (7) primarily uses ergodic theory, whereas the proof of (8) is of elementary number theoretical nature.

Proof of Proposition 4.4.

ad (1). The assertion is an immediate consequence of (3.2) and Corollary 3.2.

ad (2). The assertion follows immediately by combining Proposition 4.2 and Proposition 4.3. Alternatively, the statement can also be derived from Proposition 2.1 in [KS04a].

ad (3). By definition of P we have $P(1) = 0$. Also, by (2) we know that P is non-increasing. Therefore, it is sufficient to show that P is non-negative, and indeed this follows since

$$P(\theta) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} |T_{n,k}|^\theta \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |T_{n,1}|^\theta = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{-\theta}{n} \log(n+1) = 0.$$

ad (4). In order to determine the left derivative $P^-(1)$ of P at 1, recall from Proposition 4.2 that μ_θ^* refers to the unique Gibbs measure on Σ^* such that $\mu_\theta^*(C_n^*(y)) \asymp \exp(-\theta S_n I^*(y) - \beta(\theta) S_n N^*(y))$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}, y \in \Sigma^*$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let us fix an element $y_X^{(n)} \in \Sigma^*$ such that $y_X^{(n)} = (X^n, \dots)$, for $X \in \{A, B\}$. We then have by Lemma 3.3,

$$\begin{aligned} \int N d\mu_\theta^* &= \sum_{X \in \{A, B\}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n \cdot \mu_\theta^*(C_1^*(y_X^{(n)})) \\ &\asymp \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n \cdot \exp(-\theta I^*(y_A^{(n)}) - \beta(\theta) N^*(y_A^{(n)})) \\ &\gg \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} n \cdot n^{-2\theta} e^{-\beta(\theta)n} \rightarrow \infty, \quad \text{for } \theta \nearrow 1. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have for all $\theta \in (1/2, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int I^* d\mu_\theta^* &\asymp \sum_{X \in \{A, B\}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \log n \mu_\theta^*(C_1^*(y_X^{(n)})) \\ &\asymp \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \log n \exp(-\theta I^*(y_A^{(n)}) - \beta(\theta) N^*(y_A^{(n)})) \\ &\ll \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{-2\theta} \log n < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that $P^-(1) = 0$, and hence P is differentiable everywhere.

ad (5). Since $\lim_{\theta \rightarrow \infty} P(\theta)/\theta = 0$, the upper bound of the domain of \widehat{P} is equal to 0. For the lower bound $-\alpha_+$ of the domain we have by [KS04a] (Proposition 2.3),

$$(4.9) \quad -\alpha_+ = \lim_{\theta \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{P(\theta)}{\theta} = - \sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\Sigma, \sigma)} \int I d\nu.$$

We are left with to determine the actual value of α_+ . For this, first note that for the linear combination $m := 1/2(\delta_{\overline{AB}} + \delta_{\overline{BA}}) \in \mathcal{M}(\Sigma, \sigma)$ of the Dirac measures $\delta_{\overline{AB}}$ and $\delta_{\overline{BA}}$ at the periodic points $\overline{AB} := \pi^{-1}(2 - \gamma)$ and $\overline{BA} := \pi^{-1}(\gamma - 1)$, an elementary calculation shows that $\int I dm = 2 \log \gamma$. This implies that $\sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\Sigma, \sigma)} \int I d\nu \geq 2 \log \gamma$. For the reverse inequality note that $\int I d\nu \leq \sup_{x \in \Sigma} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (S_n I(x))/n$, for all $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\Sigma, \sigma)$, where $\mathcal{M}(\Sigma, \sigma)$ refers to the set of σ -invariant Borel probability measures on Σ . In order to calculate the right hand side of the latter inequality, recall that the smallest interval in \mathcal{T}_n has the length $(f_{n+1}f_{n+2})^{-1}$. Using this observation and Corollary 3.2, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{y \in \Sigma} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{S_n I(y)}{n} &= \sup_{x \in [0,1)} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{-\log |T_n(x)|}{n} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(f_{n+1}f_{n+2})}{n} \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(\gamma^{n+1} - (-\gamma)^{-(n+1)}) + \log(\gamma^{n+2} - (-\gamma)^{-(n+2)})}{n} \\ &= 2 \log \gamma. \end{aligned}$$

Note that in here the supremum is achieved at for instance any noble number in $(0, 1)$, that is at numbers whose continued fraction expansion eventually consists of 1's only.

ad (6). The result in (3) implies that

$$\lim_{\alpha \searrow 0} -\widehat{P}(-\alpha)/\alpha = \inf \{t \in \mathbb{R} : P(t) = 0\}.$$

Therefore, it is sufficient to show that 1 is the least zero of P . For this assume by way of contradiction that $P(s) = 0$, for some $s < 1$. Since P is non-increasing, it follows that P vanishes on the interval $(s, 1)$. But this contradicts the fact that P is real-analytic on $(-\infty, 1)$ and positive at for instance 0.

ad (7). For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\theta \leq 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{\gamma^{n+1} - (-\gamma)^{-(n+1)}}{\sqrt{5}} \right)^{-2\theta} &\leq (f_{n+1}f_{n+2})^{-\theta} \leq \sum_{k=1}^{2^n} |T_{n,k}|^\theta \\ &\leq 2^n (f_{n+1}f_{n+2})^{-\theta} \leq 2^n \gamma^{-2\theta(n+2)}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$-2\theta \log \gamma \leq P(\theta) \leq \log 2 - 2\theta \log \gamma \text{ for all } \theta \leq 0,$$

which implies that $\widehat{P}(-\alpha) \leq 0$, for all $\alpha \in [0, 2 \log \gamma]$. Hence, in order to verify that $\lim_{\alpha \nearrow 2 \log \gamma} \widehat{P}(-\alpha) = 0$ it is sufficient to show that this limit is non-negative. For this, let $t(\alpha) := (P')^{-1}(-\alpha)$ and recall that by the variational principle (cf. [DGS76]) we have for each $\alpha \in [0, 2 \log \gamma]$ that there exists $m_{t(\alpha)} \in \mathcal{M}(\Sigma, \sigma)$ such that

$$P(t(\alpha)) = h_{m_{t(\alpha)}} - t(\alpha) \int I dm_{t(\alpha)}.$$

Furthermore, by [KS04a] (Proposition 2.3) we have $\int I d\mu_{t(\alpha)} = \alpha$. Therefore, if $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\Sigma, \sigma)$ denotes a weak limit of some sequence $(\mu_{t(\alpha)})$ for α tending to $2 \log \gamma$ from below, then the lower semi-continuity of the entropy (cf. [DGS76]) gives

$$h_\nu \geq \limsup_{\alpha \nearrow 2 \log \gamma} h_{\mu_{t(\alpha)}} = \limsup_{\alpha \nearrow 2 \log \gamma} (P(t(\alpha)) + \alpha \cdot t(\alpha)) = \limsup_{\alpha \nearrow 2 \log \gamma} (-\widehat{P}(-\alpha)).$$

Note that we clearly have $\int I d\nu = 2 \log \gamma$. Now, the final step is to show that for the discrete measure m considered in the proof of (5) we have

$$\left\{ \nu \in \mathcal{M}(\Sigma, \sigma) : \int I d\nu = 2 \log \gamma \right\} = \{m\}.$$

This will be sufficient, since $h_m = 0$. Therefore, suppose by way of contradiction that there exists $\mu \neq m$ such that

$$\mu \in \left\{ \nu \in \mathcal{M}(\Sigma, \sigma) : \int I d\nu = 2 \log \gamma \right\}.$$

Let us first show that $\eta := \mu(\{x \in \Sigma : x_1 = x_2 = X\}) > 0$, for some $X \in \{A, B\}$. If this would not be the case, then the σ -invariance of μ would imply

$$\mu(\{x \in \Sigma : x_1 = A, x_2 = B\}) = \mu(\{x \in \Sigma : x_1 = B, x_2 = A\}) = \frac{1}{2},$$

and hence we obtain by induction that $\mu = m$. This contradicts our assumption $\mu \neq m$, showing that $\eta > 0$. We can now continue the above argument as follows. Since $\{\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\Sigma, \sigma) : \int I d\nu = 2 \log \gamma\}$ is convex, we can assume without loss of generality that μ is ergodic. This then immediately implies that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (S_n I(y))/n = \int I d\mu$ for μ -almost every $y \in \Sigma$, and furthermore that for some $X \in \{A, B\}$ and n sufficiently large,

$$(4.10) \quad S_n \mathbb{1}_{\{x \in \Sigma : x_1 = x_2 = X\}}(y) > \frac{n\eta}{2}.$$

Let us fix $x \in \Sigma$ with this property, and define $\tau_k := \sum_{i=1}^k a_i(x)$ as in Lemma 4.5. Combining Lemma 2.1 and inequality (4.10), it follows $(\tau_k - k - 1) \geq \tau_k \eta / 2$. Hence, using Corollary 3.2, Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 4.5,

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \log \gamma &= \int I d\mu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{S_n I(x)}{n} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{-\log |T_n(x)|}{n} \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{-\log |T_{\tau_k+1}(x)|}{\tau_k} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2 \log(q_k(x))}{\tau_k} \\ &\leq \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2 \log(\gamma^{\tau_k} \rho^{(\tau_k - k - 1)})}{\tau_k} \leq \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2 \log(\gamma^{\tau_k} \rho^{\tau_k \eta / 2})}{\tau_k} \\ &= 2 \log \gamma + \eta \cdot \log \rho < 2 \log \gamma. \end{aligned}$$

ad (8). First note that $t_{n,2\ell} > t_{n,2\ell \pm 1}$, for each $n \geq 2$ and $\ell = 1, \dots, 2^{n-1}$. This implies that $|T_{n,2\ell}|^{-1} = t_{n,2\ell} \cdot t_{n,2\ell+1}$ and $|T_{n,2\ell-1}|^{-1} = t_{n,2\ell-1} \cdot t_{n,2\ell}$ are both less than $(t_{n,2\ell})^2$. Hence, using Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 4.5, it follows for $n > 2$ and

$\theta < 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=1}^{2^n} |T_{n,k}|^\theta &\leq 2 \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{A_k^{n+1}} q_k ([a_1, \dots, a_k])^{-2\theta} \\
&\leq 2 \sum_{k=1}^n \binom{n-1}{k-1} (\gamma^{n+1} \rho^{n+1-k-1})^{-2\theta} \\
&= 2\gamma^{-2\theta(n+1)} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \binom{n-1}{k} (\rho^{n-1-k})^{-2\theta} \\
&= 2\gamma^{-2\theta(n+1)} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \binom{n-1}{k} (\rho^{-2\theta})^{n-1-k} \\
&\leq 2\gamma^{-2\theta(n+1)} (1 + \rho^{-2\theta})^{n-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Recalling the definition of P , we then obtain

$$P(\theta) \leq -2\theta \log \gamma + \log(1 + \rho^{-2\theta}).$$

For the lower bound, note that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{2^n} |T_{n,k}|^\theta \geq (f_{n+1} f_{n+2})^{-\theta}.$$

Since $f_n = (\gamma^n - (-\gamma)^{-n})/\sqrt{5}$, it therefore follows

$$P(\theta) \geq -2\theta \log \gamma.$$

By combining these two bounds for $P(\theta)$ and then letting θ tend to $(-\infty)$, the proposition follows. \square

5. MULTIFRACTAL FORMALISM FOR CONTINUED FRACTIONS

In this section we give the proof of Theorem 1.1, which we have split up into the three separate parts *The lower bound*, *The upper bound* and *Discussion of boundary points of the spectrum*. We begin with the following important preliminary remarks.

Remark 5.1.

(1) Note that by Corollary 3.2 and Lemma 3.3, we have for $x \in \Sigma$ and $y \in \Sigma^*$ (assuming in each case that the limit exists),

$$\begin{aligned}
\ell_1(\pi^*(y)) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{S_n I^*(y)}{S_n N(y)}, & \ell_2(\pi^*(y)) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{S_n N(y)}{n}, \\
\ell_3(\pi^*(y)) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{S_n I^*(y)}{n}, & \ell_4(\pi(x)) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{S_n I(x)}{n}.
\end{aligned}$$

(2) Recall that in [KS04a] and [KS04b] we in particular considered oriented geodesics $\ell \subset \mathbb{H}^2$ from $\{\infty\}$ to $[0, 1)$, and coded these by means of their intersections with the tessellation given by the G -orbit of the fundamental domain F . More precisely, if ℓ ends at $\xi \in [0, 1) \cap \mathbb{I}$ such that ℓ intersects $g_{\xi,1}(F), g_{\xi,2}(F), g_{\xi,3}(F), \dots$ in succession, with $g_{\xi,n} \in G$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then ξ is coded by the infinite word $(g_{\xi,1}, g_{\xi,2}, g_{\xi,3}, \dots)$. Clearly, this type of coding is analogous to the finite coding

represented by Σ . Hence, the results of [KS04a] and [KS04b] for the Hausdorff dimensions of the level sets

$$\mathcal{F}(\alpha) := \left\{ \xi \in [0, 1) : \frac{d(z_0, g_{\xi, n}(z_0))}{n} = \alpha \right\}$$

can immediately be transferred to the situation in this paper, and in this way we obtain that for each $\alpha \in (0, 2 \log \gamma)$,

$$(5.1) \quad \dim_H(\mathcal{L}_4(\alpha)) = \dim_H(\mathcal{F}(\alpha)) = \frac{\widehat{P}(-\alpha)}{-\alpha}.$$

Therefore, the following proof of Theorem 1.1 will in particular also give an alternative proof of the identity in (5.1). Let us also emphasize that a straight forward inspection of the arguments in the general multifractal analysis of [KS04a] shows that there we did not make full use of the group structure of the Kleinian group. In fact, the arguments there exclusively consider certain rooted sub-trees of the Cayley graph of the Kleinian group, and therefore they continue to hold if the underlying algebraic structure is only a semi-group acting on hyperbolic space, rather than a group. Therefore, the main results of this general multifractal analysis for growth rates can be applied immediately to the setting in this paper. In this way one also immediately obtains that P is differentiable everywhere, real-analytic on $(-\infty, 1)$ and equal to 0 otherwise.

5.1. The lower bound.

Lemma 5.1. *For each $\alpha \in (0, 2 \log \gamma)$ there exists a unique Gibbs measure $\mu_{t(\alpha)}^*$ on Σ^* such that for*

$$(5.2) \quad \alpha^* := \int I^* d\mu_{t(\alpha)}^* \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha^\sharp := \int N d\mu_{t(\alpha)}^*,$$

we have

$$(5.3) \quad \mathcal{L}_2(\alpha^\sharp) \cap \mathcal{L}_3(\alpha^*) \subset \mathcal{L}_1(\alpha).$$

In here, the function t is given by $t(\alpha) := (P')^{-1}(-\alpha)$.

Proof. The existence of the unique ergodic Gibbs measure $\mu_{t(\alpha)}^*$ has already been obtained in Proposition 4.1. As shown in Proposition 4.2, the significance of $\mu_{t(\alpha)}^*$ is that it allows to represent the Lyapunov exponent α in terms of I^* and N as follows.

$$(5.4) \quad \alpha = -P'(t(\alpha)) = \frac{\int I^* d\mu_{t(\alpha)}^*}{\int N d\mu_{t(\alpha)}^*} = \frac{\alpha^*}{\alpha^\sharp}.$$

Using Remark 5.1 (1), it follows that $\mathcal{L}_2(\alpha^\sharp) \cap \mathcal{L}_3(\alpha^*) \subset \mathcal{L}_1(\alpha)$. □

For the following lemma recall that the Hausdorff dimension $\dim_H(\mu)$ of a probability measure μ on some metric space is given by

$$\dim_H(\mu) := \inf \{ \dim_H(K) : \mu(K) = 1 \}.$$

Lemma 5.2. *For each $\alpha \in (0, 2 \log \gamma)$ we have, with $\tilde{\mu}_{t(\alpha)} := \mu_{t(\alpha)}^* \circ (\pi^*)^{-1}$,*

$$\dim_H(\tilde{\mu}_{t(\alpha)}) \leq \dim_H(\mathcal{L}_2(\alpha^\sharp) \cap \mathcal{L}_3(\alpha^*)) \leq \dim_H(\mathcal{L}_1(\alpha)).$$

Proof. The first inequality follows, since by ergodicity of $\mu_{t(\alpha)}^*$ we have

$$\tilde{\mu}_{t(\alpha)}(\mathcal{L}_2(\alpha^\sharp) \cap \mathcal{L}_3(\alpha^*)) = 1.$$

The second inequality is an immediate consequence of Lemma 5.1. \square

Lemma 5.3. *For each $\alpha \in (0, 2 \log \gamma)$ we have*

$$\dim_H(\tilde{\mu}_{t(\alpha)}) = \frac{\widehat{P}(-\alpha)}{-\alpha}.$$

Proof. The aim is to show that the local dimension of $\tilde{\mu}_\alpha$ exists and is equal to $\widehat{P}(-\alpha)/(-\alpha)$, for each $\alpha \in (0, 2 \log \gamma)$. For this, let $B(x, r) := [x - r, x + r] \cap \mathbb{I}$ for $0 < r \leq 1$ and $x \in \mathbb{I}$, and define

$$\begin{aligned} m_r(x) &:= \max \left\{ n \in \mathbb{N} : \pi^* C_n^* \left((\pi^*)^{-1} x \right) \supset B(x, r) \right\}, \\ n_r(x) &:= \min \left\{ n \in \mathbb{N} : \pi^* C_n^* \left((\pi^*)^{-1} x \right) \subset B(x, r) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

We obviously have that $|m_r(x) - n_r(x)|$ is uniformly bounded from above, and hence $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} m_r(x)/n_r(x) = 1$. Combining the Gibbs property of $\mu_{t(\alpha)}^*$, Lemma 3.3, (5.2) and (5.4), it follows for $\tilde{\mu}_{t(\alpha)}$ -almost every x ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\log \tilde{\mu}_{t(\alpha)}(B(x, r))}{\log r} \\ & \leq \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{-t(\alpha) \left(S_{n_r(x)} I^* \left((\pi^*)^{-1} x \right) \right) - P(t(\alpha)) S_{n_r(x)} N \left((\pi^*)^{-1} x \right)}{- \left(S_{m_r(x)} I^*(x) \right)} \\ & = \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{-t(\alpha) \frac{S_{n_r(x)} I^* \left((\pi^*)^{-1} x \right)}{S_{n_r(x)} N \left((\pi^*)^{-1} x \right)} - P(t(\alpha))}{-\frac{S_{n_r(x)} I^* \left((\pi^*)^{-1} x \right)}{S_{n_r(x)} N \left((\pi^*)^{-1} x \right)} \cdot \frac{S_{m_r(x)} I^* \left((\pi^*)^{-1} x \right)}{m_r(x)} \cdot \frac{n_r(x)}{S_{n_r(x)} N \left((\pi^*)^{-1} x \right)} \cdot \frac{m_r(x)}{n_r(x)}} \\ & = \frac{t(\alpha)\alpha + P(t(\alpha))}{\alpha} = \frac{\widehat{P}(-\alpha)}{-\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

The reverse inequality for the ‘lim inf’ is obtained by similar means, and we omit its proof. \square

5.2. The upper bound.

Lemma 5.4. *For each $\alpha \in (0, 2 \log \gamma)$ we have*

$$\dim_H \left(\pi^* \left\{ x \in \Sigma^* : \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{S_n I^*(x)}{S_n N(x)} \geq \alpha \right\} \right) \leq \frac{\widehat{P}(-\alpha)}{-\alpha}.$$

Proof. Note that $\max \{t(\alpha) + P(t(\alpha))/s : s \in [\alpha, 2 \log \gamma]\} = t(\alpha) + P(t(\alpha))/\alpha$, for each $\alpha \in (0, 2 \log \gamma)$. By combining this with the Gibbs property of $\mu_{t(\alpha)}^*$, it follows that for each $\varepsilon > 0$ and $x \in \Sigma^*$ such that $\pi^*(x) \in \mathcal{L}_4(\alpha)$, we have for n sufficiently

large,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu_{t(\alpha)}^*(C_n^*(x)) &\gg \exp(-t(\alpha) S_n I^*(x) - P(t(\alpha)) S_n N(x)) \\
&= \exp\left(-S_n I^*(x) \left(t(\alpha) + P(t(\alpha)) \frac{S_n N(x)}{S_n I^*(x)}\right)\right) \\
&\gg (\exp(-S_n I^*(x)))^{\frac{\hat{P}(-\alpha)}{-\alpha} + \varepsilon} \\
&\gg |\pi^*(C_n^*(x))|^{\frac{\hat{P}(-\alpha)}{-\alpha} + \varepsilon}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for the sequence of balls $(B(\pi(x), r_n))$ with radii $r_n := |\pi^*(C_n^*(x))|$ and centre $\pi(x)$, which tends to $\{\pi(x)\}$ for n tending to infinity, we have

$$\tilde{\mu}_{t(\alpha)}(B(\pi(x), r_n)) \gg \mu_{t(\alpha)}^*(C_n^*(x)) \gg (r_n)^{\frac{\hat{P}(-\alpha)}{-\alpha} + \varepsilon}.$$

Applying the mass distribution principle, the proposition follows. \square

Corollary 5.5. *For each $\alpha \in (0, 2 \log \gamma)$ we have*

$$\max\{\dim_H(\mathcal{L}_2(\alpha^\#) \cap \mathcal{L}_3(\alpha^*)), \dim_H(\mathcal{L}_1(\alpha))\} \leq \frac{\hat{P}(-\alpha)}{-\alpha}.$$

Proof. The assertion is an immediate consequence of combining Lemma 5.4 and the fact

$$\mathcal{L}_2(\alpha^\#) \cap \mathcal{L}_3(\alpha^*) \subset \mathcal{L}_1(\alpha) \subset \left\{x \in \Sigma^* : \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{S_n I^*(x)}{S_n N(x)} \geq \alpha\right\}.$$

\square

5.3. Discussion of boundary points of the spectrum.

The case $\alpha = 0$: Recall the two classical results of Lévy and Khintchin mentioned in the introduction. >From these we immediately deduce that $\tau(0) = 1$. Also, recall that by Proposition 4.4 (6) we have that $\lim_{\alpha \searrow 0} \hat{P}(-\alpha)/(-\alpha) = 1$. This shows that $\tau(0) = \lim_{\alpha \searrow 0} \hat{P}(-\alpha)/(-\alpha) = 1$, and hence gives that the dimension function τ is continuous from the right at 0.

In order to show that $\alpha^*(0) = \chi$, we argue as follows. For $\alpha = 0$, we already know that $0 = \int I^* d\mu_1^* / \int N d\mu_1^* = \alpha^*(0) / \infty$ and that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (2 \log q_k(x)) / k = \alpha^*(0)$, for $\mu_1^* \circ (\pi^*)^{-1}$ -almost every $x \in (0, 1)$. Hence, Lévy's result gives that, if $\mu_1^* \circ (\pi^*)^{-1}$ is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure λ on $(0, 1)$ then $\alpha^*(0) = \chi$. Hence, it remains to show that $\mu_1^* \circ (\pi^*)^{-1}$ has this property. For this, consider some $T \in \mathcal{T}_n$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and fix $y \in \Sigma^*$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\pi^*(C_k^*(y)) = T \cap \mathbb{I}$. Using the Gibbs property of μ_1^* and Lemma 3.3, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu_1^* \circ (\pi^*)^{-1}(T) &\asymp \mu_1^*(C_k^*(y)) \asymp \exp(-S_k(I^*(y))) \\
&\asymp |\pi^*(C_k^*(y))| \asymp \lambda(T).
\end{aligned}$$

The case $\alpha = 2 \log \gamma$: In order to show that the dimension function τ is continuous from the left at $2 \log \gamma$, we proceed as follows. Proposition 4.4 (7) implies that $\lim_{\alpha \nearrow 2 \log \gamma} \hat{P}(-\alpha)/(-\alpha) = 0$. Using monotonicity of the Hausdorff dimension together with Lemma 5.4, it then follows

$$0 \leq \tau(2 \log \gamma) \leq \lim_{\alpha \nearrow 2 \log \gamma} \tau(\alpha) = 0.$$

Hence, we have $\tau(2 \log \gamma) = 0$, which gives that τ is continuous from the left at $2 \log \gamma$.

Finally, for the left derivative of τ at $2 \log \gamma$, note that a straight forward computation of the derivative of τ on the interval $(0, 2 \log \gamma)$ shows that $\tau'(\alpha) = -P(t(\alpha))/\alpha^2$. Since $t(\alpha)$ tends to $(-\infty)$ as α approaches $2 \log \gamma$, it follows

$$\lim_{\alpha \nearrow 2 \log \gamma} \tau'(\alpha) = -\infty.$$

6. MULTIFRACTAL FORMALISM FOR APPROXIMANTS

In this section we outline the necessary changes which have to be implemented in the proof of Theorem 1.1 in order to derive Theorem 1.3.

The analytic properties of P_D as stated in Theorem 1.3 can be obtained as follows. In Section 4 replace the function $N : \bar{\Sigma} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ (resp. $N : \Sigma^* \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$) by the function $\bar{\mathbf{1}} : \bar{\Sigma} \rightarrow \{1\}$ (resp. $\mathbf{1}^* : \Sigma^* \rightarrow \{1\}$) constant equal to 1. In this way we obtain for the pressure function $\bar{\mathcal{P}}$ associated with $\bar{\Sigma}$,

$$\bar{\mathcal{P}}(-\theta \bar{\mathbf{1}} - \bar{\mathcal{P}}(-\theta \bar{\mathbf{1}}) \bar{\mathbf{1}}) = 0.$$

Also, note that by Lemma 3.3 we have

$$P_D(\theta) = \bar{\mathcal{P}}(-\theta \bar{\mathbf{1}}).$$

(Below, we shall specify the domain of P_D). Hence, combining these observations with Proposition 4.2 adapted to the situation here, the alleged analytic properties of P_D follow. Also, using the same strategy in Section 5.1 and 5.2, that is replacing in there the function N by the function $\mathbf{1}^*$, one immediately obtains

$$\tau_D(\alpha) = \frac{\hat{P}_D(-\alpha)}{-\alpha}.$$

(Below, we shall specify the domain of τ_D).

For clarifying the range of P_D and of τ_D , and for the discussion of the boundary points of τ_D , we first remark that P_D has a singularity at $1/2$. This follows, since for every approximant $[a_1, \dots, a_k]$ we have (see e.g. [Khi36])

$$\prod_{i=1}^k a_i \leq q_k([a_1, \dots, a_k]) \leq 2^k \prod_{i=1}^k a_i,$$

which immediately gives

$$0 \leq \log \zeta(\theta) - P_D(\theta) \leq 2\theta \log 2, \text{ for } \theta > 1/2.$$

Here, ζ refers to the Riemann zeta-function $\zeta(\theta) := \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} n^{-\theta}$. This shows that $P_D(\theta)$ and $P'_D(\theta)$ both tend to infinity for θ tending to $1/2$ from above. From this we deduce that $\hat{P}_D(-\alpha)$ is well defined for arbitrary large values of α , and also that

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \hat{P}_D(-\alpha)/(-\alpha) = 1/2.$$

In order to see that the domain of \hat{P}_D is the interval $[2 \log \gamma, \infty)$ and that $\lim_{\alpha \searrow 2 \log \gamma} \hat{P}_D(-\alpha)/(-\alpha) = 0$, it is now sufficient to show that

$$(6.1) \quad \lim_{\theta \rightarrow \infty} |P_D(\theta) + 2\theta \log \gamma| = 0.$$

Indeed, on the one hand we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{k} \log \sum_{[a_1, \dots, a_k]} q_k([a_1, \dots, a_k])^{-2\theta} \leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{k} 2\theta \log q_k(\gamma) = -2\theta \log \gamma.$$

On the other hand, using Lemma 4.5 and 2.1, we observe for $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\theta > (1 + \log N)/(2 \log \gamma)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{k} \log \sum_{[a_1, \dots, a_k]} q_k ([a_1, \dots, a_k])^{-2\theta} \\
& \leq \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{k} \log \sum_{n=k+1}^{\infty} \binom{n}{k} \gamma^{-2\theta n} \\
& = -2\theta \log \gamma + \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{k} \log \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \binom{n+k}{k} \gamma^{-2\theta n} \\
& \leq -2\theta \log \gamma + \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{k} \log \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(n+k)^{(n+k)}}{k^k n^n} \gamma^{-2\theta n} \\
& \leq -2\theta \log \gamma + \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{k} \log \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(1 + \frac{k}{Nn}\right)^n N^n \left(1 + \frac{n}{k}\right)^k \gamma^{-2\theta n} \\
& \leq -2\theta \log \gamma + \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{k} \log \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{k/N} e^{n(1+\log N - 2\theta \log \gamma)} \\
& \leq -2\theta \log \gamma + 1/N.
\end{aligned}$$

A combination of these two observations gives the statement in (6.1).

In order to prove continuity of τ_D at $2 \log \gamma$, note that by arguing similar as in the proof of Lemma 5.4, we obtain for $\alpha < \chi$,

$$\dim_H \left(\pi_{\text{CF}} \left\{ x \in \bar{\Sigma} : \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{S_n \bar{I}(x)}{n} \leq \alpha \right\} \right) \leq \frac{\widehat{P}_D(-\alpha)}{-\alpha}.$$

Combining this with the monotonicity of Hausdorff dimension, it follows

$$\dim_H (\mathcal{L}_3(2 \log \gamma)) \leq \lim_{\alpha \searrow 2 \log \gamma} \widehat{P}_D(-\alpha)/(-\alpha) = 0.$$

Finally, the same argument as used in Section 5.3 for determining the limit behaviour of τ' , gives that for the left derivative of τ_D at $2 \log \gamma$ we have

$$\lim_{\alpha \searrow 2 \log \gamma} \tau'_D(\alpha) = \infty.$$

This finishes the proof of Theorem 1.3.

REFERENCES

- [Abr59] L. M. Abramov. The entropy of a derived automorphism. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 128:647–650, 1959.
- [Bro60] A. Brocot. Calcul des rouages par approximation, nouvelle méthode. *Revue Chronométrique*, 6:186–194, 1860.
- [Byr98] J. W. Byrne. *Multifractal Analysis of Parabolic Rational Maps*. PhD thesis, University of North Texas, 1998.
- [DGS76] M. Denker, C. Grillenberger, and K. Sigmund. *Ergodic Theory on Compact Spaces*, volume 527. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, LNM edition, 1976.
- [Flo80] W. J. Floyd. Group completions and limit sets of Kleinian groups. *Invent. Math.*, 57:205–218, 1980.
- [FO03] D.-J. Feng and E. Olivier. Multifractal analysis of weak Gibbs measures and phase transition—application to some Bernoulli convolutions. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 23(6):1751–1784, 2003.

- [FP85] U. Frisch and G. Parisi. On the singularity structure of fully developed turbulence. In *Turbulence and predictability in geophysical fluid dynamics and climate dynamics*, pages 84–88, North Holland Amsterdam, 1985.
- [HJK⁺86] T. C. Halsey, M. H. Jensen, L. P. Kadanoff, I. Procaccia, and B. J. Shraiman. Fractal measures and their singularities: The characterization of strange sets. *Phys. Rev. A*, 85(33):1141–1151, 1986.
- [HMU02] P. Hanus, R. D. Mauldin, and M. Urbański. Thermodynamic formalism and multifractal analysis of conformal infinite iterated function systems. *Acta Math. Hungar.*, 96(1-2):27–98, 2002.
- [Kac47] M. Kac. On the notion of recurrence in discrete stochastic processes. *Bull. Am. Math. Soc.*, 53:1002–1010, 1947.
- [Kes01] M. Kesseböhmer. Large deviation for weak Gibbs measures and multifractal spectra. *Nonlinearity*, 14(2):395–409, March 2001.
- [Khi35] A. Khinchin. Metrische Kettenbruchprobleme. *Compositio math.*, 1:361–382, 1935.
- [Khi36] A. Khinchin. Zur metrischen Kettenbruchtheorie. *Compositio math.*, 3:276–285, 1936.
- [KS04a] M. Kesseböhmer and B. O. Stratmann. A multifractal formalism for growth rates and applications to geometrically finite Kleinian groups. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 24(1):141–170, 2004.
- [KS04b] M. Kesseböhmer and B. O. Stratmann. Stern-Brocot pressure and multifractal spectra in ergodic theory of numbers. *Stoch. Dyn.*, 4(1):77–84, 2004.
- [Lév29] P. Lévy. Sur les lois de probabilité dont dépendent les quotients complets et incomplets d’une fraction continue. *Bull. Soc. Math.*, 57:178–194, 1929.
- [Lév36] P. Lévy. Sur le développement en fraction continue d’un nombre choisi au hasard. *Compositio math.*, 3:286–303, 1936.
- [Man74] B. B. Mandelbrot. Intermittent turbulence in self-similar cascades: Divergence of high moments and dimension of the carrier. *J. Fluid Mech.*, 62:331–358, 1974.
- [Man88] B. B. Mandelbrot. An introduction to multifractal distribution functions. In *Fluctuation and Pattern Formation*. K. Academic, 1988.
- [May90] Dieter H. Mayer. On the thermodynamic formalism for the Gauss map. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 130(2):311–333, 1990.
- [MU01] R. D. Mauldin and M. Urbański. Gibbs states on the symbolic space over an infinite alphabet. *Israel J. Math.*, 125:93–130, 2001.
- [MU03] R. D. Mauldin and M. Urbański. *Graph directed Markov systems*, volume 148 of *Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003. Geometry and dynamics of limit sets.
- [MV04] A. M. Mesón and F. Vericat. Dimension theory and Fuchsian groups. *Acta Appl. Math.*, 80(1):95–121, 2004.
- [Nak00] K. Nakaishi. Multifractal formalism for some parabolic maps. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 20(3):843–857, 2000.
- [Nev69] J. Neveu. Une démonstration simplifiée et une extension de la formule d’Abramov sur l’entropie des transformations induites. *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verw. Gebiete*, 13:135–140, 1969.
- [Pes97] Ya. Pesin. *Dimension Theory in Dynamical Systems: Contemporary Views and Applications*. Chicago lectures in mathematics. The University of Chicago Press, 1997.
- [PW96] Ya. Pesin and H. Weiss. The multifractal analysis of Gibbs measures: motivation, mathematical foundation, and examples. *Chaos*, October 1996.
- [PW99] M. Pollicott and H. Weiss. Multifractal analysis of Lyapunov exponent for continued fraction and Manneville-Pomeau transformations and applications to Diophantine approximation. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 207(1):145–171, 1999.
- [Roh67] V. A. Rohlin. Lectures on the entropy theory of transformations with invariant measure. *Uspehi Mat. Nauk*, 22(5 (137)):3–56, 1967.
- [Sar99] O. M. Sarig. Thermodynamic formalism for countable Markov shifts. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 19(6):1565–1593, 1999.
- [Ste58] M. A. Stern. Über eine zahlentheoretische Funktion. *J. reine angew. Math.*, 55:193–220, 1858.

FACHBEREICH 3 – MATHEMATIK UND INFORMATIK, UNIVERSITÄT BREMEN, BIBLIOTHEKSTR.
1, D-28359 BREMEN, GERMANY
E-mail address: `mhk@math.uni-bremen.de`

MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE, UNIVERSITY OF ST. ANDREWS, NORTH HAUGH, ST. ANDREWS
KY16 9SS, SCOTLAND
E-mail address: `bos@maths.st-and.ac.uk`