

NUMBER THEORETIC APPLICATIONS OF A CLASS OF CANTOR SERIES FRACTAL FUNCTIONS PART II

BRIAN LI AND BILL MANCE

ABSTRACT. It is well known that all numbers that are normal of order k in base b are also normal of all orders less than k . Another basic fact is that any real number is normal in base b if and only if it is simply normal in base b^k for all k . This may be interpreted to mean that a number is normal in base b if and only if all blocks of digits occur with the desired relative frequency along every arithmetic progression.

We reinterpret these theorems for the Q -Cantor series expansions and show that they are no longer true in a particularly strong way. That is, for any integer $k > 1$, we construct an explicit example of a computable basic sequence Q and a computable real number that is Q -normal of order k , but not Q -normal of orders $1, 2, \dots, k-1$ and fails to be well behaved when blocks of digits are sampled along arithmetic progressions. More of these types of numbers can be constructed. For example, we construct a computable basic sequence Q and a computable real number that is Q -normal of orders 2 and 3, but not Q -normal of order 1. The main theoretical result of this paper will be to reduce the problem of constructing normal numbers with certain pathological properties to the problem of solving a system of Diophantine relations. Both of these examples and others are constructed by using this reduction. This and other results suggest that the theory of normality for the Q -Cantor series expansions is fundamentally different than the theories of normality for any other expansion. Other constructions are given, too.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Motivation. We recall the modern definition of a normal number.

Definition 1.1. A real number x is *normal of order k in base b* if all blocks of digits of length k in base b occur with relative frequency b^{-k} in the b -ary expansion of x . x is *simply normal in base b* if it is normal of order 1 in base b and x is *normal in base b* if it is normal of order k in base b for all natural numbers k .

It is well known that E. Borel [3] was the first mathematician to study normal numbers. In 1909 he gave the following definition.

Definition 1.2. A real number x is *normal in base b* if each of the numbers x, bx, b^2x, \dots is simply normal (in the sense of Definition 1.1), in each of the bases b, b^2, b^3, \dots

E. Borel proved that Lebesgue almost every real number is normal, in the sense of Definition 1.2, in all bases. In 1940, S. S. Pillai [15] simplified Definition 1.2 by proving that

Theorem 1.1. *For $b \geq 2$, a real number x is normal in base b if and only if it is simply normal in each of the bases b, b^2, b^3, \dots .*

Theorem 1.1 was improved in 1951 by I. Niven and H. S. Zuckerman [14] who proved

Theorem 1.2. *Definition 1.1 and Definition 1.2 are equivalent.*

It should be noted that both of these results require some work to establish, but were assumed without proof by several authors. For example, M. W. Sierpinski assumed Theorem 1.1 in [18] without proof. Moreover, D. G. Champernowne [6], A. H. Copeland and P. Erdős [7], and other authors took Definition 1.1 as the definition of a normal number before it was proven that Definition 1.1 and Definition 1.2 are equivalent. More information can be found in Chapter 4 of the book of Y. Bugeaud [4].

The following theorem was proven by H. Furstenberg in his seminal paper “Disjointness in Ergodic Theory, Minimal Sets, and a Problem in Diophantine Approximation” [8] on page 23 as an application of disjointness to stochastic sequences.

Research of the second author is partially supported by the U.S. NSF grant DMS-0943870.

Theorem 1.3. Suppose that $x = d_0.d_1d_2\cdots$ is the b -ary expansion of x . Then x is normal in base b if and only if for all natural numbers m and r the real number $0.d_rd_{m+r}d_{2m+r}d_{3m+r}\cdots$ is normal in base b .

H. Furstenberg mistakenly claimed¹ that this provided an alternate proof of Theorem 1.2, but actually proved that an entirely different definition of normality is equivalent to Definition 1.1. We will say that x is *AP normal of type I in base b* if x satisfies Definition 1.2 and *AP normal of type II in base b* if x satisfies the notion introduced in Theorem 1.3. Thus, for numbers expressed in base b

$$\text{normality} \Leftrightarrow \text{AP normality of type I} \Leftrightarrow \text{AP normality of type II}.$$

Let $\mathbb{N}_k := \mathbb{Z} \cap [k, \infty)$. The Q -Cantor series expansion, first studied by G. Cantor in [5],² is a natural generalization of the b -ary expansion. If $Q \in \mathbb{N}_2^{\mathbb{N}}$, then we say that Q is a *basic sequence*. Given a basic sequence $Q = (q_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$, the Q -Cantor series expansion of a real x in \mathbb{R} is the (unique)³ expansion of the form

$$(1.2) \quad x = E_0 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{E_n}{q_1 q_2 \cdots q_n},$$

where $E_0 = \lfloor x \rfloor$ and E_n is in $\{0, 1, \dots, q_n - 1\}$ for $n \geq 1$ with $E_n \neq q_n - 1$ infinitely often. We abbreviate (1.2) with the notation $x = E_0.E_1E_2E_3\cdots$ w.r.t. Q . Clearly, the b -ary expansion is a special case of (1.2) where $q_n = b$ for all n . If one thinks of a b -ary expansion as representing an outcome of repeatedly rolling a fair b -sided die, then a Q -Cantor series expansion may be thought of as representing an outcome of rolling a fair q_1 sided die, followed by a fair q_2 sided die and so on.

The authors feel that the equivalence of Definition 1.1 and Definition 1.2 and other similar ones is a far more delicate topic than is typically assumed. The core of E. Borel's definition is that a number is normal in base b if blocks of digits occur with the desired relative frequency along all arithmetic progressions. We will extend Definition 1.2 to the Q -Cantor series expansions and call it *AP Q -normality of type I*. P. Laffer has already studied a similar definition in [10], but made no comparison with the definition of Q -normality that naturally arises as an extension of Definition 1.1. We will prove that the analogous extension of Theorem 1.2 to the Q -Cantor series expansions will no longer hold.

We will refer to the natural extension of the concept introduced in Theorem 1.3 to the Q -Cantor series expansions as *AP Q -normality of type II*. We will show that for Q -Cantor series expansions that while Q -normality is implied by AP Q -normality of type I, the bigger picture of the relationship between these notions is far more complex than for the b -ary expansions.⁴

We also note the following trivial theorem about normal numbers in base b .

Theorem 1.4. If x is normal of order k in base b , then x is normal of orders $1, 2, \dots, k - 1$ in base b .

¹ I. Niven and H. S. Zuckerman wrote in [14]:

Let R be a real number with fractional part $.x_1x_2x_3\cdots$ when written to scale r . Let $N(b, n)$ denote the number of occurrences of the digit b in the first n places. The number R is said to be *simply normal* to scale r if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N(b, n)}{n} = \frac{1}{r}$ for each of the r possible values of b ; R is said to be *normal* to scale r if all the numbers R, rR, r^2R, \dots are simply normal to all the scales r, r^2, r^3, \dots . These definitions, for $r = 10$, we introduced by Émile Borel [3], who stated (p. 261) that “la propriété caractéristique” of a normal number is the following: that for any sequence B whatsoever of v specified digits, we have

$$(1.1) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N(B, n)}{n} = \frac{1}{r^v},$$

where $N(B, n)$ stands for the number of occurrences of the sequence B in the first n decimal places. . . If the number R has the property (1.1) then any sequence of digits $B = b_1b_2\cdots b_v$ appears with the appropriate frequency, but will the frequencies all be the same for $i = 1, 2, \dots, v$ if we count only those occurrences of B such that b_1 is an $i, i + v, i + 2v, \dots$ -th digit? It is the purpose of this note to show that this is so, and thus to prove the equivalence of property (1.1) and the definition of normal number.

It is not difficult to see how the equivalent definition of normality introduced in Theorem 1.3 may be confused with the notion discussed in Theorem 1.3.

²G. Cantor's motivation to study the Cantor series expansions was to extend the well known proof of the irrationality of the number $e = \sum 1/n!$ to a larger class of numbers. Results along these lines may be found in the monograph of J. Galambos [9].

³Uniqueness can be proven in the same way as for the b -ary expansions.

⁴Theorem 2.5 in [13] gives that the set of AP Q -normal numbers of type I is contained in the set of Q -normal numbers.

Perhaps much more suprising than the lack of a simple extension of Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3 to the Q -Cantor series expansion is that for all k , we give an example of a computable basic sequence Q and a computable real number x that is Q -normal of order k , but not Q -normal of orders $1, 2, \dots, k-1$. An example is given in Theorem 1.11.

In order to prove these theorems, we must extend the constructions given by the second author in [12] to construct numbers that are AP Q normal of types I and II. A basic sequence $Q = (q_n)$ is *infinite in limit* if $q_n \rightarrow \infty$. Suppose that $M = (m_t)_t$ is an increasing sequence of positive integers. Let $N_{M,n}^Q(B, x)$ be the number of occurrences of the block B at positions m_t for $m_t \leq n$ in the Q -Cantor series expansion of $\{x\}$ and let $N_n(B, x) = N_{(t),n}(B, x)$. If $x = E_0.E_1E_2\cdots$ w.r.t. P , then put

$$\psi_{P,Q}(x) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\min(E_n, q_n - 1)}{q_1 \cdots q_n}.$$

The functions $\psi_{P,Q}$ and their properties ⁵ will be of critical importance to our constructions and were the topic to the predecessor to this paper by the second author [11]. The key property of these functions is the following theorem that was proven in [11].

Theorem 1.5. ⁶ Suppose that $M = (m_t)$ is an increasing sequence of positive integers and $Q_1 = (q_{1,n}), Q_2 = (q_{2,n}), \dots, Q_j = (q_{j,n})$ are basic sequences and infinite in limit. If $x = E_0.E_1E_2\cdots$ w.r.t. Q_1 satisfies $E_n < \min_{2 \leq r \leq j} (q_{r,n} - 1)$ for infinitely many n , then for every block B

$$N_{M,n}^{Q_j}(B, (\psi_{Q_{j-1}, Q_j} \circ \psi_{Q_{j-2}, Q_{j-1}} \circ \cdots \circ \psi_{Q_1, Q_2})(x)) = N_{M,n}^{Q_1}(B, x) + O(1).$$

We should note that not all constructions in the literature of normal numbers are of computable real numbers. For example, the construction by M. W. Sierpinski in [18] is not of a computable real number. V. Becher and S. Figueira modified M. W. Sierpinski's work to give an example of a computable absolutely normal number in [2]. Since not every basic sequence is computable we face an added difficulty. Moreover, many of the numbers constructed in [11] by using Theorem 1.5 are not computable. Thus, we will be careful to indicate which numbers we construct are computable. No deep knowledge of computability theory will be used and any time we make such a claim there will exist a simple algorithm to compute the number under consideration to any degree of precision.

The main theoretical result of this paper will be to reduce the problem of constructing certain types of normal numbers to solving a system of Diophantine relations. This reduction is given in Theorem 1.9 and Theorem 1.10 and relies on Theorem 1.5. Both of these theorems are technical and require several definitions to state so we defer their formulations to Section 1.3. We finish the paper with several conjectures in Section 3.

1.2. Definitions. A *block* is an ordered tuple of non-negative integers, a *block of length k* is an ordered k -tuple of integers, and *block of length k in base b* is an ordered k -tuple of integers in $\{0, 1, \dots, b-1\}$. For a given basic sequence Q , define⁷

$$Q_n^{(k)} := \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{1}{q_j q_{j+1} \cdots q_{j+k-1}}.$$

A. Rényi [16] defined a real number x to be *normal* with respect to Q if for all blocks B of length 1,

$$(1.3) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N_n^Q(B, x)}{Q_n^{(1)}} = 1.$$

If $q_n = b$ for all n and we restrict B to consist of only digits less than b , then (1.3) is equivalent to *simple normality in base b* , but not equivalent to *normality in base b* . A basic sequence Q is *k -divergent* if

⁵See [11] for an overview of properties such as continuity and multifractal analysis of $\psi_{P,Q}$. There are many fractals associated with the functions $\psi_{P,Q}$, but they will not affect the results discussed in this paper.

⁶The conclusions of Theorem 1.5 sometimes do not hold without the requirement that $E_n < \min_{2 \leq r \leq j} (q_{r,n} - 1)$ for infinitely many n . For example, consider $p_n = 3$ and

$$q_n = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } n \equiv 0 \pmod{2} \\ 3 & \text{if } n \equiv 1 \pmod{2} \end{cases}.$$

Let $x = 7/8 = 0.\overline{21}$ w.r.t. P . Then $\psi_{P,Q}(x) = 1.\overline{0}$ w.r.t. Q so $N_n^P((1), x) = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ while $N_n^Q((1), \psi_{P,Q}(x)) = 0$ for all n .

⁷For the remainder of this paper, we will assume the convention that the empty sum is equal to 0 and the empty product is equal to 1.

$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Q_n^{(k)} = \infty$. Q is *fully divergent* if Q is k -divergent for all k and k -convergent if it is not k -divergent. A basic sequence Q is *infinite in limit* if $q_n \rightarrow \infty$.

Definition 1.3. A real number x is Q -normal of order k if for all blocks B of length k ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N_n^Q(B, x)}{Q_n^{(k)}} = 1.$$

We let $\mathcal{N}_k(Q)$ be the set of numbers that are Q -normal of order k . x is Q -normal if $x \in \mathcal{N}(Q) := \bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{N}_k(Q)$.

It is easy to show that for every basic sequence Q , the set of Q -distribution normal numbers has full Lebesgue measure. For Q that are infinite in limit, it has been shown that the set of all x in $[0, 1)$ that are Q -normal of order k has full Lebesgue measure if and only if Q is k -divergent [13]. Early work in this direction has been done by A. Rényi [16], T. Šalát [19], and F. Schweiger [17]. Therefore, if Q is infinite in limit, then the set of all x in $[0, 1)$ that are Q -normal has full Lebesgue measure if and only if Q is fully divergent.

Given a basic sequence M , we define the basic sequence $\Lambda_M(Q) := (q_{m_t})_{t=1}^{\infty}$. If $x = E_0.E_1E_2\cdots$ w.r.t. Q , then let $\Upsilon_{Q,M}(x) := 0.E_{m_1}E_{m_2}E_{m_3}\cdots$ w.r.t. $\Lambda_M(Q)$. Let $\mathcal{MR} := \{(a, b) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} : 0 \leq b \leq a - 1\}$. For any $(m, r) \in \mathcal{MR}$, let $\mathcal{A}_{m,r} := (mt + r)_{t=0}^{\infty}$. Let $N_{n,m,r}^Q(B, x) := N_{\mathcal{A}_{m,r},n}(B, x)$ and $N_{n,m,r}'(B, X) := N_n^{\Lambda_{\mathcal{A}_{m,r}}(Q)}(B, \Upsilon_{Q,\mathcal{A}_{m,r}}(x))$. The following definition is motivated by Definition 1.2 and Theorem 1.3. For $(m, r) \in \mathcal{MR}$, let

$$Q_{n,m,r}^{(k)} := \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor \frac{n-r}{m} \rfloor} \frac{1}{q_{mj+r}q_{mj+r+1}\cdots q_{mj+r+k-1}},$$

Definition 1.4. Let $\mathcal{N}_{k,m,r}^I(Q)$ be the set of real numbers x such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N_{n,m,r}^Q(B, x)}{Q_{n,m,r}^{(k)}} = 1$$

for all blocks B . Additionally, let $\mathcal{N}_{k,m}^I(Q) := \bigcap_{r=0}^{m-1} \mathcal{N}_{k,m,r}^I(Q)$ and $\mathcal{N}_k^I(Q) := \bigcap_{m=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{N}_{k,m}^I(Q)$. A real number x is *AP Q -normal of order k of type I* if $x \in \mathcal{N}_k^I(Q)$ and *AP Q -normal of type I* if $x \in \mathcal{N}^I(Q) := \bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{N}_k^I(Q)$.

Let

$$\mathcal{N}_{k,m,r}^{II}(Q) := \Upsilon_{Q,\mathcal{A}_{m,r}}^{-1}(\mathcal{N}_k(\Lambda_{\mathcal{A}_{m,r}}(Q)))$$

and $\mathcal{N}_{k,m}^{II}(Q) := \bigcap_{r=0}^{m-1} \mathcal{N}_{k,m,r}^{II}(Q)$. A real number x is *AP Q -normal of order k of type II* if $x \in \mathcal{N}_k^{II}(Q) := \bigcap_{r=0}^{m-1} \mathcal{N}_{k,m,r}^{II}(Q)$. Let

$$\mathcal{N}^{II}(Q) := \bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{(m,r) \in \mathcal{MR}} \mathcal{N}_{k,m,r}^{II}(Q)$$

be the set of numbers that are *AP Q -normal of type II*.

The sets $\mathcal{N}^I(Q)$ and $\mathcal{N}^{II}(Q)$ introduced in Definition 1.4 give a natural extension of the notions of AP normality of type I and II given in the intro in Definition 1.2 and Theorem 1.3. These sets along with $\mathcal{N}_k^I(Q)$ and $\mathcal{N}_k^{II}(Q)$ will be the main focus of this paper.

A basic sequence Q is (k, m, r) -divergent of type I (resp. type II.) if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Q_{n,m,r}^{(k)} = \infty$ (resp. $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\Lambda_{\mathcal{A}_{m,r}}(Q))_n^{(k)} = \infty$). Q is *fully divergent of type I* (resp. *type II*) if Q is (k, m, r) -divergent of type I (resp. type II) for all k and $(m, r) \in \mathcal{MR}$. Suppose that Q is infinite in limit. It can be proven using the method in [13] that $\mathcal{N}_{k,k,r}^I(Q)$ (resp. $\mathcal{N}_{k,k,r}^{II}(Q)$) is a set of full Lebesgue measure if and only if Q is (k, m, r) -divergent of type I (resp. type II).

Definition 1.5. ⁸ A real number x is Q -ratio normal of order k (here we write $x \in \mathcal{RN}_k(Q)$) if for all blocks B_1 and B_2 of length k

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N_n^Q(B_1, x)}{N_n^Q(B_2, x)} = 1.$$

⁸It is unknown how the sets $\mathcal{RN}(Q)$, $\mathcal{RN}^I(Q)$, and $\mathcal{RN}^{II}(Q)$ are related except that $\mathcal{RN}^I(Q) \subseteq \mathcal{RN}(Q)$.

Additionally, x is Q -ratio normal if $x \in \mathcal{RN}(Q) := \bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{RN}_k(Q)$. The sets $\mathcal{RN}^I(Q)$ and $\mathcal{RN}^{II}(Q)$ are defined similarly to $\mathcal{N}^I(Q)$ and $\mathcal{N}^{II}(Q)$.

1.3. Results. For the rest of this paper, given sequences of non-negative integers $l = (l_i)$ and $b = (b_i)$ with $b_i \geq 2$ and sequences blocks of digits $X = (X_i)$, we write $L_i := |X_1^{l_1} \dots X_i^{l_i}| = l_1|X_1| + \dots + l_i|X_i|$. Additionally, we let $\Gamma(l, b, X) := (\gamma_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$, where $\gamma_n := b_i$ for $L_{i-1} < n \leq L_i$ and $\eta(l, b, X) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{E_n}{\gamma_1 \dots \gamma_n}$, where $(E_1, E_2, \dots) = X_1^{l_1} X_2^{l_2} X_3^{l_3} \dots$.

For a compact metric space X , let $\mathcal{M}(X)$ be the collection of all Borel probability measures on X . Given $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{N}_0^{\mathbb{N}})$ and $B = (b_1, \dots, b_k) \in \mathbb{N}_0^k$, we write

$$[B] := \{\omega = (\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots) \in \mathbb{N}_0^{\mathbb{N}} : \omega_j = b_j \forall j \in [1, k]\} \text{ and } \mu(B) := \mu([B]).$$

A block of digits Y is (ϵ, k, μ) -normal if for all blocks B of length $m \leq k$, we have

$$(1 - \epsilon)|Y|\mu(B) \leq N(B, Y) \leq (1 + \epsilon)|Y|\mu(B).$$

A measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{N}_0^{\mathbb{N}})$ is (v, b) -uniform if for all k and blocks B of length k in base $v \leq b$, we have $\mu(B) = b^{-k}$. A *block friendly family* (BFF), W , is a sequence of 6-tuples $((l_i, b_i, v_i, \epsilon_i, k_i, \mu_i))_{i=1}^{\infty}$ with non-decreasing sequences of non-negative integers $(l_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$, $(b_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$, $(v_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$, and $(k_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ for which $b_i \geq 2$, $b_i \rightarrow \infty$ and $v_i \rightarrow \infty$, such that $(\mu_i)_{i=1}^{\infty} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{N}_0^{\mathbb{N}})^{\mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of (v_i, b_i) -uniform measures and $(\epsilon_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ strictly decreases to 0. Let $R(W) := [1, \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} k_i] \cap \mathbb{N}$. If $(X_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ is a sequence of blocks such that $|X_i|$ is non-decreasing and X_i is (ϵ_i, k_i, μ_i) -normal, then $(X_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ is W -good if for all k in R ,

$$(1.4) \quad \frac{b_i^k}{\epsilon_{i-1} - \epsilon_i} = o(|X_i|);$$

$$(1.5) \quad \frac{l_{i-1}}{l_i} \cdot \frac{|X_{i-1}|}{|X_i|} = o(i^{-1} b_i^{-k});$$

$$(1.6) \quad \frac{1}{l_i} \cdot \frac{|X_{i+1}|}{|X_i|} = o(b_i^{-k}).$$

We will write $\Gamma(W, X) := \Gamma(l, b, X)$ and $\eta(W, X) := \eta(l, b, X)$. The following is the main theorem in the paper [12] of the second author.⁹

Theorem 1.6. *Let $W = ((l_i, b_i, v_i, \epsilon_i, k_i, \mu_i))_{i=1}^{\infty}$ be a BFF and suppose that $X = (X_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ is W -good. Then¹⁰*

$$\eta(W, X) \in \bigcap_{k \in R(W)} \mathcal{N}_k(\Gamma(W, X)).$$

If W and X are computable, then $\eta(W, X)$ and $\Gamma(W, X)$ are computable.

It is not difficult to see that $\Gamma(W, X)$ must always be fully divergent by using (1.6). We wish to extend Theorem 1.6 to deal with $\mathcal{N}_{k,m,r}^I(Q)$ and $\mathcal{N}_{k,m,r}^{II}(Q)$.

A block of digits X is (ϵ, k, m, μ) -normal of type I (resp. (ϵ, k, m, μ) -normal of type II) if for all blocks B of length $k' \leq k$ and for all $m' \leq m$ and $0 < r \leq m'$, $N_{|X|,m',r}(B, X)$ (resp. $N'_{|X|,m',r}(B, X)$) is in the closed interval

$$\left[\mu(B) \left\lceil \frac{|X| - r}{m'} \right\rceil (1 - \epsilon), \mu(B) \left\lfloor \frac{|X| - r}{m'} \right\rfloor (1 + \epsilon) \right].$$

For a sequence of 7-tuples $D = ((l_i, b_i, v_i, \epsilon_i, k_i, \mu_i, m_i))_{i=1}^{\infty}$, let $\text{BFF}(D) := ((l_i, b_i, v_i, \epsilon_i, k_i, \mu_i))_{i=1}^{\infty}$. An *APBFF* is a sequence of 7-tuples $D = ((l_i, b_i, v_i, \epsilon_i, k_i, \mu_i, m_i))_{i=1}^{\infty}$ where $\text{BFF}(D)$ is a BFF and (m_i) is a sequence of non-decreasing integers. Let D be an APBFF and set $R(D) := R(\text{BFF}(D))$ and $S(D) := [1, \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} m_i] \cap \mathbb{N}$. A sequence $(X_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ of $(\epsilon_i, k_i, m_i, \mu_i)$ -normal of type I (resp. type II) blocks of non-decreasing length is said to be D -good of type I (resp. type II) if for all k and m in R , the conditions (1.4), (1.5), and (1.6) hold. For an APBFF $D = ((l_i, b_i, v_i, \epsilon_i, k_i, \mu_i, m_i))_{i=1}^{\infty}$ and sequence of blocks $X = (X_i)$, we let $\Gamma(D, X) := \Gamma(\text{BFF}(D), X)$ and $\eta(D, X) := \eta(\text{BFF}(D), X)$.

⁹Our statement of Theorem 1.6 and the preceding definitions has been altered to be more concisely stated than they were in [12]. We also removed some unnecessary hypotheses.

¹⁰Clearly, if $k_i \rightarrow \infty$, then $\eta(W, X) \in \mathcal{N}(\Gamma(W, X))$.

Theorem 1.7. ¹¹ Let D be an APBFF and $(X_i)_{i=1}^\infty$ a D -good sequence of type I (resp. type II). Then

$$\eta(D, X) \in \bigcap_{k \in R(D)} \bigcap_{m \in S(D)} \mathcal{N}_{k,m}^I(\Gamma(D, X)) \left(\text{resp. } \bigcap_{k \in R(D)} \bigcap_{m \in S(D)} \mathcal{N}_{k,m}^{II}(\Gamma(D, X)) \right).$$

If $k_i \rightarrow \infty$ and $m_i \rightarrow \infty$, then $\eta(D, X) \in \mathcal{N}^I(\Gamma(D, X))$ (resp. $\mathcal{N}^{II}(\Gamma(D, X))$).

We will prove Theorem 1.7 in Section 2.1. For the rest of this paper, let $C_{b,w}$ be the block formed by concatenating all the blocks of length w in base b in lexicographic order. ¹² Many of our examples of normal numbers will be built up by concatenating blocks of this form. We will study properties of these blocks in Section 2.2.

Theorem 1.8. Let $t \in \mathbb{N}_2$ and put $l_i = 0$ and $X_i = (0)$ for $i < 6$. For $i \geq 6$, let $X_{i,t} = C_{it,i!}$, $b_{i,t} = it$, $l_i = 3^{i!} \cdot (i+1)^{i! \cdot i}$, $\epsilon_i = \frac{1}{i}$, $k_i = i$, $v_{i,t} = it$, $m_i = i$, $\mu_i = \lambda_i$, and $D_t = \{(l_i, b_{i,t}, v_{i,t}, \epsilon_i, k_i, \mu_i, m_i)\}_{i=1}^\infty$. Let $X_t = (X_{i,t})$, $\zeta_t = \eta(D_t, X_t)$, and $R_t = \Gamma(D_t, X_t)$. Then $\zeta_t \in \mathcal{N}^I(R_t) \cap \mathcal{N}^{II}(R_t)$.

Theorem 1.8 is proven in Section 2.2. For $P = (p_n) \in \mathbb{N}_2^\mathbb{N}$, set $\Xi(P, (c_0, \dots, c_{t-1}), d) := (\xi_n)$, where

$$\xi_n := \begin{cases} \max(2, c_0^{-1} p_n) & \text{if } n \equiv 0 \pmod{d} \\ \max(2, c_1^{-1} p_n) & \text{if } n \equiv 1 \pmod{d} \\ \dots & \\ \max(2, c_{t-1}^{-1} p_n) & \text{if } n \equiv t-1 \pmod{d} \\ 2^n p_n & \text{if } n \equiv t, t+1, \dots, d-1 \pmod{d} \end{cases}.$$

We note that Q is a basic sequence if for $j \in [0, t-1]$ we have $c_j = \frac{\alpha_j}{\beta_j}$ in lowest terms for $\alpha_j, \beta_j \in \mathbb{Z}$ where $\alpha_j | p_n$ for all $(j, n) \in [0, t-1] \times \mathbb{N}$. Q is infinite in limit if and only if P is. If P is of the form $P = \Gamma(W, X)$, then Q is fully divergent of types I and II.

Theorem 1.9. Let $W = ((l_i, b_i, v_i, \epsilon_i, k_i, \mu_i))_{i=1}^\infty$ be a BFF. Suppose that (X_i) is W -good and $b_{i+1}/b_i \rightarrow 1$. Let $t \geq 2$ be an integer and suppose that $A \cup B = \{1, \dots, t\}$ and $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} k_i \geq t$. Suppose that there is a solution

$$(c_0, \dots, c_{t-1}, d) = \left(\frac{\alpha_0}{\beta_0}, \dots, \frac{\alpha_{t-1}}{\beta_{t-1}}, d \right) \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}^t \times \mathbb{N}_{t+1},$$

with α_i and β_i relatively prime for all i , of the $t \times (t+1)$ system of Diophantine relations given by

$$(1.7) \quad \sum_{j=0}^{t-k} c_j c_{j+1} \dots c_{j+k-1} = d$$

if $k \in A$ and

$$(1.8) \quad \sum_{j=0}^{t-k} c_j c_{j+1} \dots c_{j+k-1} \neq d$$

if $k \in B$ for all $k \in \{1, \dots, t\}$. Additionally, assume that $\alpha_j | p_n$ for all $j \in [0, t-1]$ and all $(n, j) \in \mathbb{N} \times [0, t-1]$. Put $P = \Gamma(W, X)$ and $Q = \Xi(P, (c_0, \dots, c_{t-1}), d)$. Then Q is fully divergent and

$$(\psi_{P,Q} \circ \eta)(W, X) \in \bigcap_{k \in A} \mathcal{N}_k(Q) \setminus \bigcap_{j \in B} \mathcal{N}_j(Q) \neq \emptyset. ¹³$$

¹¹ We note that Theorem 1.7 constructs numbers that satisfy a condition that might be stronger than being contained in $\mathcal{N}^I(Q)$ if $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \min(k_i, m_i) = \infty$ and (X_i) is D -good of type I. That is,

$$\eta(D, X) \in \bigcap_{k=1}^\infty \bigcap_{m=1}^\infty \mathcal{N}_{k,m}^I(\Gamma(D, X)) \subseteq \mathcal{N}^I(\Gamma(D, X)).$$

It seems likely that there exists a basic sequence Q where $\bigcap_{k=1}^\infty \bigcap_{m=1}^\infty \mathcal{N}_{k,m}^I(Q)$ is strictly contained in $\mathcal{N}^I(Q)$, but the theorems proven in this paper do not seem to be strong enough to establish this. See Conjecture 3.1.

¹²For example, $C_{2,2} = (0, 0)(0, 1)(1, 0)(1, 1) = (0, 0, 0, 1, 1, 0, 1, 1)$.

¹³ For example, if $t = 3$, $A = \{2, 3\}$, and $B = \{1\}$, then we are considering the system

$$\begin{aligned} c_0 + c_1 + c_2 &= d \\ c_0 c_1 + c_1 c_2 &= d \\ c_0 c_1 c_2 &= d, \end{aligned}$$

For simplicity, we stated Theorem 1.9 in such a way that only applies to numbers constructed by using Theorem 1.6. A slightly more general theorem may be stated that applies to P -normal numbers where P is constant for long stretches. However, this greater generality does not seem to allow for any more interesting examples of normal numbers to be constructed. We now state a similar theorem to Theorem 1.9 that may be used to analyze the sets $\mathcal{N}_{k,m,r}^I(Q)$ and $\mathcal{N}_{k,m,r}^{II}(Q)$.

Theorem 1.10. *Let $D = \{(l_i, b_i, v_i, \epsilon_i, k_i, \mu_i, m_i)\}_{i=1}^\infty$ be an APBFF. Suppose that (X_i) is D -good of type I and $b_{i+1}/b_i \rightarrow 1$. Let $t \in [2, \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \min(k_i, m_i)] \cap \mathbb{N}$, $k \in [1, \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} k_i] \cap \mathbb{N}$, $m \in [1, \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} m_i] \cap \mathbb{N}$, and $r \in [0, m-1] \cap \mathbb{N}$. Put $u = \text{lcm}(t, m)$ and suppose that $(c_0, \dots, c_{t-1}, d) = \left(\frac{\alpha_0}{\beta_0}, \dots, \frac{\alpha_{t-1}}{\beta_{t-1}}, d\right) \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}^t \times u\mathbb{N}_2$, with α_i and β_i relatively prime for all i , $\alpha_j | p_n$ for all $(n, j) \in \mathbb{N} \times \{0, \dots, t-1\}$. Put $P = \Gamma(D, X)$ and $Q = \Xi(P, (c_0, \dots, c_{t-1}), d)$. Then Q is fully divergent of types I and II. Additionally,*

$$(1.9) \quad \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor \frac{t-k-r}{m} \rfloor} c_{r+jm} c_{r+jm+1} \cdots c_{r+jm+k-1} = d/m \implies (\psi_{P,Q} \circ \eta)(D, X) \in \mathcal{N}_{k,m,r}^I(Q);$$

$$(1.10) \quad \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor \frac{t-k-r}{m} \rfloor} c_{r+jm} c_{r+jm+1} \cdots c_{r+jm+k-1} \neq d/m \implies (\psi_{P,Q} \circ \eta)(D, X) \notin \mathcal{N}_{k,m,r}^I(Q).$$

Suppose, instead, that (X_i) is D -good of type II. Then

$$(1.11) \quad \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor \frac{t-r-1}{m} \rfloor - k+1} c_{r+jm} c_{r+(j+1)m} \cdots c_{r+(j+k-1)m} = d/m \implies (\psi_{P,Q} \circ \eta)(D, X) \in \mathcal{N}_{k,m,r}^{II}(Q);$$

$$(1.12) \quad \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor \frac{t-r-1}{m} \rfloor - k+1} c_{r+jm} c_{r+(j+1)m} \cdots c_{r+(j+k-1)m} \neq d/m \implies (\psi_{P,Q} \circ \eta)(D, X) \notin \mathcal{N}_{k,m,r}^{II}(Q).$$

Theorem 1.11. *Let $t \in \mathbb{N}_2$ and ζ_t and R_t be defined as in Theorem 1.8. Set $Q = \Xi(R_t, (t!, 1, 1, \dots, 1), t!)$. Then*

$$\psi_{R_t, Q}(\zeta_t) \in \mathcal{N}_t(Q) \setminus \left(\bigcup_{j=1}^{t-1} \mathcal{N}_j(Q) \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^t \mathcal{N}_j^I(Q) \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^t \mathcal{N}_j^{II}(Q) \right) \neq \emptyset$$

and $\psi_{R_t, Q}(\zeta_t)$ is computable.

Theorem 1.11 shows that a number that is Q -normal of order k need not be Q -normal of any of the orders $1, 2, \dots, k-1$. At the same time, it also shows that members of $\mathcal{N}_k(Q)$ need not be in $\mathcal{N}_j^I(Q)$ or $\mathcal{N}_j^{II}(Q)$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$. In contrast to AP normality of type I, there exists a basic sequence Q where $\mathcal{N}_k^{II}(Q) \setminus \mathcal{N}_k(Q) \neq \emptyset$. Theorem 1.12 gives an example of such a Q and a member of this set.

Theorem 1.12. *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}_2$ and put $t = 2k^2$. Let ζ_t and R_t be defined as in Theorem 1.8. Set $c_0 = c_1 = \dots = c_{k-1} = 2k$ and $c_{k^2} = c_{k^2+1} = \dots = c_{k^2+(k-1)} = 2k$. For all other n , we set $c_n = 1$. If $Q = \Xi(R_t, (c_0, c_1, \dots, c_{t-1}), 2k^2(k+1))$, then*

$$\psi_{R_t, Q}(\zeta_t) \in \mathcal{N}_k^{II}(Q) \setminus \mathcal{N}_k(Q) \neq \emptyset$$

and $\psi_{R_t, Q}(\zeta_t)$ is computable.

Theorem 1.11 and Theorem 1.12 follow from Theorem 1.9 and Theorem 1.10. We give a proof of Theorem 1.12 in Section 2.4. Theorem 1.11 is proven similarly. Theorem 2.5 in [13], Theorem 1.11, and Theorem 1.12 immediately imply the following main result.

Theorem 1.13. *When $k \geq 2$, Figure 1 describes the complete containment relation between the sets $\mathcal{N}_k(Q)$, $\mathcal{N}_k^I(Q)$, and $\mathcal{N}_k^{II}(Q)$ for Q that are infinite in limit and fully divergent of types I and II.*

It should be noted that I. Niven and H. S. Zuckerman proved, but did not state, in [14] that for b -ary expansions, every number that is normal of order k must also be AP normal of order k of type I. Thus, Figure 1 shows a difference between Q -Cantor series expansions and b -ary expansions. Further possible differences are discussed in Conjecture 3.1.

which has a solution $(c_0, c_1, c_2, d) = (2, 1, 2, 4)$. Thus, $\psi_{P, Q}(\eta(W, X)) \in \mathcal{N}_2(Q) \cap \mathcal{N}_3(Q) \setminus \mathcal{N}_1(Q)$ when W is a BFF and X is a W -good sequence. However, not all such systems have solutions.




FIGURE 1.

Theorem 1.5 has the following immediate corollary that we will use in the proofs of Theorem 1.10 and Theorem 1.15.

Corollary 1.14. *Suppose that $M = (m_t)$ is an increasing sequence of positive integers, $Q_1 = (q_{1,n}), Q_2 = (q_{2,n}), \dots, Q_j = (q_{j,n})$ are basic sequences and infinite in limit. If $x = E_0.E_1E_2\cdots$ w.r.t Q_1 satisfies $E_{m_t} < \min_{1 \leq r \leq j} (q_{r,m_t} - 1)$ for infinitely many t , then for every block B*

$$N_n^{\Lambda_M(Q_j)}(B, (\psi_{\Lambda_M(Q_{j-1}), \Lambda_M(Q_j)} \circ \cdots \circ \psi_{\Lambda_M(Q_1), \Lambda_M(Q_2)})(\Upsilon_{Q_1, M}(x))) = N_n^{\Lambda_M(Q_1)}(B, (\Upsilon_{Q_1, M}(x))) + O(1).$$

Theorem 1.15. *Let $Q \in \mathbb{N}_2^\mathbb{N}$ be infinite in limit. Let ζ_1 and R_1 be as in Theorem 1.8. Then*

$$\psi_{R_1, Q}(\zeta_1) \in \mathcal{RN}^I(Q) \cap \mathcal{RN}^{II}(Q) \subseteq \mathcal{RN}(Q).$$

If Q is a computable sequence, then $\psi_{R_1, Q}(\zeta_1)$ is a computable real number.

Theorem 1.15 follows directly from Theorem 1.5, Theorem 1.8, and Corollary 1.14.

2. PROOFS OF THEOREMS

2.1. Proof of Theorem 1.7. We prove the first part of Theorem 1.7 that gives conditions for constructing members of $\mathcal{N}_{k, m}^I(Q)$. The second half is proven similarly with nearly identical lemmas. In this subsection, we fix an APBFF $D = ((l_i, b_i, v_i, \epsilon_i, k_i, \mu_i, m_i))_{i=1}^\infty$ and a sequence of blocks $X = (X_i)$ that is D -good of type I. Put $Q = (q_n) = \Gamma(D, X)$, $x = \eta(D, X)$, and let $m \in S(D)$. We list some of the lemmas in this section without proof due to their similarity to lemmas leading towards the proof of the main theorem in [12]. However, we leave a few of the proofs to demonstrate some of the difference between the two.

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be given and let $i = i(n)$ be the integer that satisfies $L_i < n \leq L_{i+1}$. Let u, α , and β be integers such that $(\alpha, \beta) \in [0, l_{i+1}] \times [0, |X_{i+1}|]$, and $u = n - L_i = \alpha|X_i| + \beta$.

Lemma 2.1. *If X_i is $(\epsilon_i, k_i, m_i, \mu_i)$ -normal of type I, $k \leq k_i$, and B is a block of length k in base v_i , then*

$$(2.1) \quad (1 - \epsilon_i)b_i^{-k} \left\lceil \frac{|X_i| - r}{m} \right\rceil \leq N_{m, r}(B, X_i) \leq (1 + \epsilon_i)b_i^{-k} \left\lceil \frac{|X_i| - r}{m} \right\rceil;$$

$$(2.2) \quad (1 - \epsilon_{i+1})b_{i+1}^{-k} \alpha \left\lceil \frac{|X_{i+1}| - r}{m} \right\rceil \leq N_{u, m, r}(B, l_{i+1}X_{i+1}) \leq (1 + \epsilon_{i+1})b_{i+1}^{-k} \alpha \left\lceil \frac{|X_{i+1}| - r}{m} \right\rceil + \left\lceil \frac{k\alpha}{m} \right\rceil + \left\lceil \frac{\beta}{m} \right\rceil.$$

The next lemma follows by an application of Lemma 2.1

Lemma 2.2. *If $k \leq k_i$ and B is a block of length k in base v_i ,*

$$(2.3) \quad (1 - \epsilon_i)b_i^{-k}l_i \left\lceil \frac{|X_i| - r}{m} \right\rceil + (1 - \epsilon_{i+1})b_{i+1}^{-k} \alpha \left\lceil \frac{|X_{i+1}| - r}{m} \right\rceil \leq N_{n, m, r}^Q(B, X) \leq \left\lceil \frac{L_{i+1} - r}{m} \right\rceil + (1 + \epsilon_i)b_i^{-k}l_i \left\lceil \frac{|X_i| - r}{m} \right\rceil + (1 + \epsilon_{i+1})b_{i+1}^{-k} \alpha \left\lceil \frac{|X_{i+1}| - r}{m} \right\rceil + \left\lceil \frac{\beta}{m} \right\rceil + \left\lceil \frac{k\alpha}{m} \right\rceil + \left\lceil \frac{k}{m} \right\rceil (l_i + 1).$$

We introduce a quantity $S_{n, m, r}^{(k)}$ to estimate $Q_{n, m, r}^{(k)}$.

$$S_{n, m, r}^{(k)} = \sum_{j=1}^i b_j^{-k} \left\lceil \frac{l_j|X_j| - r}{m} \right\rceil + b_{i+1}^{-k} \left\lceil \frac{|u| - r}{m} \right\rceil$$

Lemma 2.3. $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{Q_{n,m,r}^{(k)}}{S_{n,m,r}^{(k)}} = 1.$

Proof. We will need to show that $\frac{S_{n,m,r}^{(k)} - Q_{n,m,r}^{(k)}}{S_{n,m,r}^{(k)}} \rightarrow 0$. Let $s = \min \left\{ t : k < \left\lceil \frac{|X_t| - r}{m} \right\rceil \right\}$. For $j \geq s$, set

$$\bar{Q}_j^{(k)} = \left(\left(\frac{1}{b_j^k} + \dots + \frac{1}{b_j^k} \right) + \left(\frac{1}{b_j^{k-1}b_{j+1}} + \dots + \frac{1}{b_j b_{j+1}^{k+1}} \right) \right) = \frac{l_j |X_j| - (k-1)}{b_j^k} + \sum_{t=1}^{k-1} \frac{1}{b_j^{k-1-t} b_{j+1}^t}$$

and $\bar{S}_j^{(k)} = \frac{l_j |X_j|}{b_j^k}$. We note that for n large enough that $i(n) > s$

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{n,m,r}^{(k)} &= Q_{L_{s-1},m,r}^{(k)} + \sum_{\substack{j=s \\ j \equiv r \pmod m}}^i \bar{Q}_j^{(k)} + \sum_{\substack{t=L_i+1 \\ t \equiv r \pmod m}}^n \frac{1}{qtq_{t+1} \dots q_{t+k+1}}; \\ S_{n,m,r}^{(k)} &= S_{L_{s-1},m,r}^{(k)} + \sum_{\substack{j=s \\ j \equiv r \pmod m}}^i \bar{S}_j^{(k)} + \sum_{\substack{t=L_i+1 \\ t \equiv r \pmod m}}^n \frac{1}{qtq_{t+1} \dots q_{t+k+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

We can observe that $S_{n,m,r}^{(k)} \geq Q_{n,m,r}^{(k)}$ since all the terms after $L_i + 1$ are the same, but the terms up to L_i satisfy $\bar{S}_j^{(k)} \geq \bar{Q}_j^{(k)}$. Thus, $S_{n,m,r}^{(k)} - Q_{n,m,r}^{(k)} \geq 0$ when $i(n) > s$ and is an increasing function of $i = i(n)$, so

$$S_{n,m,r}^{(k)} - Q_{n,m,r}^{(k)} \leq S_{L_{i+1},m,r}^{(k)} - Q_{L_{i+1},m,r}^{(k)} = \left(S_{L_{s-1},m,r}^{(k)} - Q_{L_{s-1},m,r}^{(k)} \right) + \sum_{\substack{j=s \\ j \equiv r \pmod m}}^{i+1} \left(\bar{S}_j^{(k)} - \bar{Q}_j^{(k)} \right).$$

We now wish to estimate

$$\sum_{\substack{j=s \\ j \equiv r \pmod m}}^{i+1} \left(\bar{S}_j^{(k)} - \bar{Q}_j^{(k)} \right).$$

In the proof of Lemma 2.3 in [12], it is shown that $\bar{S}_j^{(k)} - \bar{Q}_j^{(k)} < k$, so

$$\sum_{\substack{j=s \\ j \equiv r \pmod m}}^{i+1} \left(\bar{S}_j^{(k)} - \bar{Q}_j^{(k)} \right) < \left\lceil \frac{i+2-s}{m} \right\rceil k.$$

Put $v = S_{L_{s-1},m,r}^{(k)} - Q_{L_{s-1},m,r}^{(k)}$. Then $S_{n,m,r}^{(k)} - Q_{n,m,r}^{(k)} \leq v + \left\lceil \frac{i+2-s}{m} \right\rceil k$ and

$$\frac{S_{n,m,r}^{(k)} - Q_{n,m,r}^{(k)}}{S_{n,m,r}^{(k)}} < \frac{(v + k + \frac{2k}{m} - \frac{2s}{m}) + \frac{ki}{m}}{\frac{l_i |X_i|}{m}} = \frac{(mv + mk + 2k - 2s) + ki}{l_i |X_i|}.$$

We know m , k , and s do not depend on i , and since v depends only on m , k , and s , it also does not vary in terms of i . Thus, we know $l_i |X_i| \frac{i}{l_i |X_i|} \rightarrow 0$ by (1.5), so

$$\frac{S_{n,m,r}^{(k)} - Q_{n,m,r}^{(k)}}{S_{n,m,r}^{(k)}} < \frac{(mv + mk + 2k - 2s) + ki}{l_i |X_i|} \rightarrow 0 \Rightarrow \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{Q_{n,m,r}^{(k)}}{S_{n,m,r}^{(k)}} = 1.$$

□

We will define two rational functions to estimate $\left| \frac{N_{n,m,r}^Q(B,X)}{Q_{n,m,r}^{(k)}} - 1 \right|$. Let

$$f_i(w, z) = \frac{\left(S_{L_{i-1},m,r} + \epsilon_i b_i^{-k} l_i \left\lceil \frac{|X_i| - r}{m} \right\rceil \right) + w \left(\epsilon_{i+1} b_{i+1}^{-k} \left\lceil \frac{|X_{i+1}| - r}{m} \right\rceil \right) + z \left(\frac{b_{i+1}^{-k}}{m} \right)}{S_{L_i,m,r}^{(k)} + w \left(b_{i+1}^{-k} \left\lceil \frac{|X_{i+1}| - r}{m} \right\rceil \right) + z \left(\frac{b_{i+1}^{-k}}{m} \right)};$$

$$g_i(w, z) = \frac{1}{S_{L_i,m,r}^{(k)} + w \left(b_{i+1}^{-k} \left\lceil \frac{|X_{i+1}| - r}{m} \right\rceil \right) + z \left(\frac{b_{i+1}^{-k}}{m} \right)} \left(\left(\frac{L_{i-1} - r}{m} + 3 + b_i^{-k} l_i + \epsilon_i b_i^{-k} l_i \left\lceil \frac{|X_i| - r}{m} \right\rceil \right) \right.$$

$$\left. + \left\lceil \frac{k}{m} \right\rceil (l_i + 1) + b_{i+1}^{-k} \frac{r}{m} \right) + w \left(\frac{k}{m} + \epsilon_{i+1} b_{i+1}^{-k} \left\lceil \frac{|X_{i+1}| - r}{m} \right\rceil + b_{i+1}^{-k} \right) + \frac{z}{m}.$$

Lemma 2.4. *Let B be a block of length k in base v_i . If $k \leq k_i$, then*

$$\left| \frac{N_{n,m,r}^Q(B,X)}{Q_{n,m,r}^{(k)}} - 1 \right| < 2g_i(w, z) + \frac{S_{n,m,r}^{(k)} - Q_{n,m,r}^{(k)}}{Q_{n,m,r}^{(k)}}.$$

Proof. Using the lower bound from (2.1) and (2.2) of $N_{n,m,r}^Q(B,X)$, we get,

$$\left| \frac{N_{n,m,r}^Q(B,X)}{Q_{n,m,r}^{(k)}} - 1 \right| < 1 - \frac{(1 - \epsilon_i) b_i^{-k} l_i \left\lceil \frac{|X_i| - r}{m} \right\rceil + (1 - \epsilon_{i+1}) b_{i+1}^{-k} \alpha \left\lceil \frac{|X_{i+1}| - r}{m} \right\rceil}{Q_{n,m,r}^{(j)}}$$

$$< \frac{S_{n,m,r}^{(k)} - \left((1 - \epsilon_i) b_i^{-k} l_i \left\lceil \frac{|X_i| - r}{m} \right\rceil + (1 - \epsilon_{i+1}) b_{i+1}^{-k} \alpha \left\lceil \frac{|X_{i+1}| - r}{m} \right\rceil \right)}{Q_{n,m,r}^{(k)}} \frac{Q_{n,m,r}^{(k)}}{S_{n,m,r}^{(k)}} \left(\frac{S_{n,m,r}^{(k)}}{Q_{n,m,r}^{(k)}} \right)$$

$$< \frac{S_{n,m,r}^{(k)} - \left((1 - \epsilon_i) b_i^{-k} l_i \left\lceil \frac{|X_i| - r}{m} \right\rceil + (1 - \epsilon_{i+1}) b_{i+1}^{-k} \alpha \left\lceil \frac{|X_{i+1}| - r}{m} \right\rceil \right)}{S_{n,m,r}^{(k)}} \cdot 2 = 2f_i(\alpha, \beta).$$

Let

$$\kappa = \left\lceil \frac{L_{i-1} - r}{m} \right\rceil + (1 + \epsilon_i) b_i^{-k} l_i \left\lceil \frac{|X_i| - r}{m} \right\rceil + (1 + \epsilon_{i+1}) b_{i+1}^{-k} \alpha \left\lceil \frac{|X_{i+1}| - r}{m} \right\rceil + \left\lceil \frac{\beta}{m} \right\rceil + \left\lceil \frac{k\alpha}{m} \right\rceil + \left\lceil \frac{k}{m} \right\rceil (l_i + 1).$$

Using the upper bound from (2.3) of $N_{n,m,r}^Q(B,X)$,

$$\left| \frac{N_{n,m,r}^Q(B,X)}{Q_{n,m,r}^{(k)}} - 1 \right| \leq \frac{\kappa}{Q_{n,m,r}^{(k)}} - 1 = \frac{(\kappa - S_{n,m,r}^{(k)}) + (S_{n,m,r}^{(k)} - Q_{n,m,r}^{(k)})}{Q_{n,m,r}^{(k)}}$$

$$< \frac{\kappa - S_{n,m,r}^{(k)}}{Q_{n,m,r}^{(k)}} \frac{Q_{n,m,r}^{(k)}}{S_{n,m,r}^{(k)}} \left(\frac{S_{n,m,r}^{(k)}}{Q_{n,m,r}^{(k)}} \right) + \frac{S_{n,m,r}^{(k)} - Q_{n,m,r}^{(k)}}{Q_{n,m,r}^{(k)}} < 2 \frac{\kappa - S_{n,m,r}^{(k)}}{S_{n,m,r}^{(k)}} + \frac{S_{n,m,r}^{(k)} - Q_{n,m,r}^{(k)}}{Q_{n,m,r}^{(k)}}.$$

Next, $\kappa - S_{n,m,r}^{(k)}$ is equal to

$$\left\lceil \frac{L_{i-1} - r}{m} \right\rceil + (1 + \epsilon_i) b_i^{-k} l_i \left\lceil \frac{|X_i| - r}{m} \right\rceil + (1 + \epsilon_{i+1}) b_{i+1}^{-k} \alpha \left\lceil \frac{|X_{i+1}| - r}{m} \right\rceil + \left\lceil \frac{\beta}{m} \right\rceil$$

$$+ \left\lceil \frac{k\alpha}{m} \right\rceil + \left\lceil \frac{k}{m} \right\rceil (l_i + 1) - \left(\sum_{j=1}^i b_j^{-k} \left\lceil \frac{l_j |X_j| - r}{m} \right\rceil + b_{i+1}^{-k} \left\lceil \frac{|u| - r}{m} \right\rceil \right)$$

$$= \left(\left\lceil \frac{L_{i-1} - r}{m} \right\rceil - \sum_{j=1}^i b_j^{-k} \left\lceil \frac{l_j |X_j| - r}{m} \right\rceil \right) + (1 + \epsilon_i) b_i^{-k} l_i \left\lceil \frac{|X_i| - r}{m} \right\rceil + \left\lceil \frac{k\alpha}{m} \right\rceil + \left\lceil \frac{k}{m} \right\rceil (l_i + 1)$$

$$+ (1 + \epsilon_{i+1}) b_{i+1}^{-k} \alpha \left\lceil \frac{|X_{i+1}| - r}{m} \right\rceil + \left\lceil \frac{\beta}{m} \right\rceil - b_{i+1}^{-k} \left\lceil \frac{|u| - r}{m} \right\rceil$$

$$< \left(\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \frac{l_j |X_j| - r}{m} - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} b_j^{-k} \frac{l_j |X_j| - r}{m} + 1 \right) + \left(b_i^{-k} l_i \left\lceil \frac{|X_i| - r}{m} \right\rceil - b_i^{-k} \left\lceil \frac{l_i |X_i| - r}{m} \right\rceil \right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \epsilon_i b_i^{-k} l_i \left\lceil \frac{|X_i| - r}{m} \right\rceil + \left\lceil \frac{k\alpha}{m} \right\rceil + \left\lceil \frac{k}{m} \right\rceil (l_i + 1) + \epsilon_{i+1} b_{i+1}^{-k} \alpha \left\lceil \frac{|X_{i+1}| - r}{m} \right\rceil \\
& + \left(b_{i+1}^{-k} \alpha \frac{|X_{i+1}| - r}{m} + b_{i+1}^{-k} \alpha + \frac{\beta}{m} + 1 - b_{i+1}^{-k} \frac{\alpha |X_{i+1}| + \beta - r}{m} \right) \\
& < \frac{L_{i-1} - r}{m} + 1 + \left(b_i^{-k} \frac{l_i |X_i| - l_i r}{m} - b_i^{-k} \frac{l_j |X_j| - r}{m} + b_i^{-k} l_i \right) + \epsilon_i b_i^{-k} l_i \left\lceil \frac{|X_i| - r}{m} \right\rceil + \left\lceil \frac{k\alpha}{m} \right\rceil \\
& + \left\lceil \frac{k}{m} \right\rceil (l_i + 1) + \epsilon_{i+1} b_{i+1}^{-k} \alpha \left\lceil \frac{|X_{i+1}| - r}{m} \right\rceil + \left(\frac{\beta}{m} + 1 + b_{i+1}^{-k} \left(\frac{r}{m} + \alpha \right) \right) \\
& < \frac{L_{i-1} - r}{m} + 1 + b_i^{-k} l_i + \epsilon_i b_i^{-k} l_i \left\lceil \frac{|X_i| - r}{m} \right\rceil + \frac{k\alpha}{m} + 1 + \left\lceil \frac{k}{m} \right\rceil (l_i + 1) + \epsilon_{i+1} b_{i+1}^{-k} \alpha \left\lceil \frac{|X_{i+1}| - r}{m} \right\rceil + \frac{\beta}{m} + 1 + b_{i+1}^{-k} \alpha + b_{i+1}^{-k} \frac{r}{m} \\
& = \left(\frac{L_{i-1} - r}{m} + 3 + b_i^{-k} l_i + \epsilon_i b_i^{-k} l_i \left\lceil \frac{|X_i| - r}{m} \right\rceil + \left\lceil \frac{k}{m} \right\rceil (l_i + 1) + b_{i+1}^{-k} \frac{r}{m} \right) + \alpha \left(\frac{k}{m} + \epsilon_{i+1} b_{i+1}^{-k} \left\lceil \frac{|X_{i+1}| - r}{m} \right\rceil + b_{i+1}^{-k} \right) + \frac{\beta}{m} \\
& = g_i(\alpha, \beta) S_{n,m,r}^{(k)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $g_i(w, z) > f_i(w, z)$ since $\frac{L_{i-1}-r}{m} > S_{n,m,r}^{(k)}$ and the coefficients of α and β in the numerator of $g_i(w, z)$ are greater than those in the numerator of $f_i(w, z)$. Thus,

$$\left| \frac{N_{n,m,r}^Q(B, X)}{Q_{n,m,r}^{(k)}} - 1 \right| < 2g_i(w, z) + \frac{S_{n,m,r}^{(k)} - Q_{n,m,r}^{(k)}}{Q_{n,m,r}^{(k)}}.$$

□

Lemma 2.5. If $|X_{i+1}| > \frac{k+2m}{1-\epsilon_{i+1}b_{i+1}^{-k}}$, $|X_i| > \frac{9m+2k}{1-\frac{\epsilon_i b_i^{-k}}{m}}$, $|X_{i+1}| > \frac{kb_{i+1}^k+3m}{1-\epsilon_{i+1}}$, and $|X_{i+1}| > \frac{(k+2m)b_{i+1}^k}{\epsilon_i - \epsilon_{i+1}} + r$, then $g_i(w, z) < g_i(0, |X_{i+1}|)$.

Let $\epsilon'_i = g(0, |X_{i+1}|)$. Then

$$\left| \frac{N_{n,m,r}^Q(B, X)}{Q_{n,m,r}^{(k)}} - 1 \right| < 2\epsilon'_i + \frac{S_{n,m,r}^{(k)} - Q_{n,m,r}^{(k)}}{Q_{n,m,r}^{(k)}}.$$

Since we have shown $\frac{S_{n,m,r}^{(k)} - Q_{n,m,r}^{(k)}}{Q_{n,m,r}^{(k)}} \rightarrow 0$, we now need to show that $\epsilon'_i \rightarrow 0$.

Lemma 2.6. $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \epsilon'_i = 0$.

Proof. This can be shown by applying all of our estimates as well as (1.5) and (1.6) to

$$\epsilon'_i = \frac{\frac{L_{i-2}-r}{m} + \frac{l_{i-1}|X_{i-1}|}{m} + 3 + b_i^{-k} l_i + \epsilon_i b_i^{-k} l_i \left\lceil \frac{|X_i| - r}{m} \right\rceil + \left\lceil \frac{k}{m} \right\rceil (l_i + 1) + b_{i+1}^{-k} \frac{r}{m} + \frac{|X_{i+1}|}{m}}{S_{L_{i-1},m,r}^{(k)} + \frac{b_i^{-k} l_i |X_i|}{m} + |X_{i+1}| \left(\frac{b_{i+1}^{-k}}{m} \right)}.$$

□

Proof of Theorem 1.7. For an arbitrary block B in base b , we can estimate the bounds of $N_{n,m,r}^Q(B, X)$ by using Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 2.2. The hypotheses of Lemma 2.5 are satisfied as we can pick a large enough n s.t. b_i and ϵ_i are small and by (1.4), the last condition is satisfied. We also assume that n is large such that $k \leq k_i$, $m \leq m_i$, $b \leq v_i$, and $S_{n,m,r}^{(k)}/Q_{n,m,r}^{(k)} < 2$ for all $(m, r) \in \mathcal{MR}$. Using Lemma 2.4 and Lemma 2.5,

$$\left| \frac{N_{n,m,r}^Q(B, X)}{Q_{n,m,r}^{(k)}} - 1 \right| < 2\epsilon'_i + \frac{S_{n,m,r}^{(k)} - Q_{n,m,r}^{(k)}}{Q_{n,m,r}^{(k)}}.$$

By Lemma 2.3 and Lemma 2.6, $\epsilon'_i \rightarrow 0$ and $\frac{S_{n,m,r}^{(k)} - Q_{n,m,r}^{(k)}}{Q_{n,m,r}^{(k)}} \rightarrow 0$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$. We also know that $i \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, so

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{N_{n,m,r}^Q(B, X)}{Q_{n,m,r}^{(k)}} - 1 \right| = 0.$$

Therefore,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{N_{n,m,r}^Q(B, X)}{Q_{n,m,r}^{(k)}} \right| = 1.$$

□

2.2. Analysis of $C_{b,w}$. In this section, we perform a careful analysis of the blocks $C_{b,w}$ that will allow us to prove Theorem 1.8. We recall that $C_{b,w}$ is the concatenation of all blocks in base b of length w in lexicographic order, so $|C_{b,w}| = wb^w$.

Lemma 2.7. *Let $b \geq 2$, $w \geq 1$. Suppose that M is an integer, $M!|w$, $(m, r) \in \mathcal{MR}$, $m \leq M$, and $n = |C_{b,w}|$. If B is a block of length k , then*

$$(2.4) \quad \left\lfloor \frac{w-k+1}{m} \right\rfloor b^{w-k} \leq N_{n,m,r}(B, C_{b,w}) < \left(\frac{w}{m} + 2 \right) b^{w-k};$$

$$(2.5) \quad \max \left(\left(\left\lfloor \frac{w-r}{m} \right\rfloor - k + 1 \right) b^{w-k}, 0 \right) \leq N'_{n,m,r}(B, C_{b,w}) < \left\lfloor \frac{w-r}{m} \right\rfloor b^{w-k}.$$

Proof. We first prove that (2.4) holds. To calculate the lower bound, the occurrences of B that only occur on the inside on the blocks of $C_{b,w}$ will be counted. For convenience, denote $C_{b,w}$ as the concatenation of $C_1 C_2 \dots C_{b^w}$ where each C_i is the i th block concatenated in $C_{b,w}$.

To arrive at the lower bound of (2.4), we count the possible number occurrences of B in C_1, \dots, C_{b^w} . First, assume that B occurs in some C_i . In this C_i , there are $w-k+1$ positions B could possibly start at in such a way that B remains inside C_i . For example, if B starts at the $(w-k+2)$ th position of C_i , then the last number of B will be in C_{i+1} . Let j be the position that B begins on in C_i , thus $1 \leq j \leq w-k+1$.

Next for this block B in C_i that begins at position j , there are b^{w-k} other blocks of $C_{b,w}$ such that B begins on position j because there are $w-k$ positions of C_i that could contain any value less than b yet still contain B at starting position j . Thus there are a total of $(w-k+1)b^{w-k}$ positions any block B could begin.

We must count occurrences of B at positions that are $r \pmod{m}$, so we would expect that approximately $\frac{1}{m}$ of these blocks will be counted. Each position that is counted in the previous C_i is also counted in C_{i+1} because $M!|w \implies m|w$ implies that for every m , each position that is counted in some C_i will be counted in C_{i+1} as well. To arrive at a lower bound, this number must be rounded down because some of these positions may straddle the boundary between C_i and C_{i+1} . Thus,

$$\left\lfloor \frac{w-k+1}{m} \right\rfloor b^{w-k} \leq \left\lfloor \frac{w-k+1}{m} b^{w-k} \right\rfloor \leq N_{n,m,r}(B, X).$$

For the upper bound, we take the same value for the lower bound, but instead round this up for those special cases where there is an additional block B found on positions $r \pmod{m}$. We then must add on the number of times B will occur on the boundaries of these blocks.

To count occurrences of B on these boundaries, we must look at an occurrence of B between C_i and C_{i+1} . Let B occur on the position j of C_i , and if $j+k > w$, then the block B will occur on the boundary between C_i and C_{i+1} . There will be $k-1$ values that B could begin on in such a C_i . There are also b^{w-k} other blocks in $C_{b,w}$ such that B begins on the position j , because there are $w-k$ positions of C_i that could hold any value less than b .

Since $C_{b,w} = C_1 C_2 \dots C_{b^w}$ is written in lexicographic order, there is a direct relationship between the value of each position in C_i and the value of each position in C_{i+1} . Given B , we can determine the beginning $k-(w-j+1)$ positions of C_i since there are at the beginning of C_{i+1} , and the ending $w-j+1$ positions of C_{i+1} since they are at the end of C_i . Thus, out of the w positions, we have $w-(w-j+1)-(k-(w-j+1)) = w-k$ that are truly undetermined. Thus, there are a total of $(k-1)b^{w-k}$ positions that B could begin at on the boundary.

Only approximately $\frac{1}{m}$ of these will be counted though as $N_{n,m,r}(B, C_{b,w})$ only checks blocks that begin on positions $r \pmod{m}$. This value is then rounded up to obtain an upper bound for all cases. Thus,

$$N_{n,m,r}(B, X) \leq \left\lfloor \frac{w-k+1}{m} \right\rfloor b^{w-k} + \left\lceil \frac{k-1}{m} b^{w-k} \right\rceil < \left(\frac{w}{m} + 2 \right) b^{w-k}.$$

We now prove (2.5). To calculate the lower bound, we will count the number of occurrences of B only inside blocks of $C_{b,w}$. Let C_i be some block B that occurs on positions given by an arithmetic progression.

For example, the first value of B occurs on some position j and the second value of B occurs on the position $j + m$, and so on. Then let the block D_i be constructed from the values inside of C_i on positions congruent to $r \pmod{m}$.

The block D_i will have length greater than or equal to $\lfloor \frac{w-r}{m} \rfloor$. So there are $\lfloor \frac{w-r}{m} \rfloor - k + 1$ possible positions the block B could begin at in copies of D_i . If $\lfloor \frac{w-r}{m} \rfloor - k + 1 < 0$, we take 0 as our lower bound for $N'_{n,m,r}(B, C_{b,w})$. Otherwise, similarly to our proof of (2.4), there will be b^{w-k} other blocks of $C_{b,w}$ such that B begins on position j in C_i and occurs in D_i . This is because there could be $w - k$ positions that could hold any value no larger than b in such a block C_i .

Additionally since $M!|w \implies m|w$, it is ensured that for every m , every position in C_i that will be counted will also be counted in C_{i+1} . This ensures that no position that is counted in the previous block will be skipped, as this will lead to $\frac{1}{m}$ of the counted occurrences of B . Thus we form the lower bound of

$$\max\left(\left(\left\lfloor \frac{w-r}{m} \right\rfloor - k + 1\right)b^{w-k}, 0\right) \leq N'_{n,m,r}(B, X).$$

The upper bound is found similarly to the other methods of counting blocks on boundaries like in Lemma 2.7. We assume on every boundary of D_i that B occurs. Thus there will be a maximum of $\lceil \frac{k-1}{m} \rceil$ positions on D_i where B could begin on such that B will occur on the boundary of D_i and D_{i+1} . There will also be b^{w-k} other blocks of $C_{b,w}$ such that B begins on the position j in C_i and occurs between D_i and D_{i+1} . Thus in total, there will be $\lceil \frac{k-1}{m} \rceil b^{w-k}$ occurrences of B on the boundaries. When this is added to the lower bound,

$$N'_{n,m,r}(B, X) \leq \max\left(\left(\left\lfloor \frac{w-r}{m} \right\rfloor - k + 1\right)b^{w-k}, 0\right) + \left\lceil \frac{k-1}{m} \right\rceil b^{w-k} \leq \left\lfloor \frac{w-r}{m} \right\rfloor b^{w-k}.$$

□

Lemma 2.8. *If $K < w$, $\epsilon \geq \frac{m+\max(k,m)}{w}$, and $M!|w$, then $C_{b,w}$ is $(\epsilon, K, M, \lambda_b)$ -normal of type I.*

Proof. Let $n = |C_{b,w}|$. Then for $k \leq K$, $m \leq M$, and every block B of length k in base b

$$\left\lfloor \frac{w-k+1}{m} \right\rfloor b^{w-k} > b^{-k} n \left(\frac{\frac{w-k+1}{m} - 1}{w} \right) = \lambda_b(B) \frac{n}{m} \left(1 - \left(\frac{k}{w} - \frac{1}{w} + \frac{m}{w} \right) \right) > \lambda_b(B) \frac{n}{m} \left(1 - \left(\frac{k+m}{w} \right) \right).$$

Since $M!|w \implies m|w$ and $n = wb^w$, we know that for an integer $c = \frac{n}{m}$ and $0 \leq r < m$, then for some integer d , where $0 \leq d < m$, $\lceil \frac{n-r}{m} \rceil = \lceil c + \frac{d}{m} \rceil = c = \frac{n}{m}$, or $\lceil \frac{n-r}{m} \rceil = \frac{n}{m}$. Thus,

$$\lambda_b(B) \left\lceil \frac{n-r}{m} \right\rceil \left(1 - \frac{k+m}{w} \right) \geq \lambda_b(B) \left\lceil \frac{n-r}{m} \right\rceil (1 - \epsilon).$$

For the upper bound,

$$\left(\frac{w}{m} + 2 \right) b^{w-k} = b^{-k} n \left(\frac{\frac{w}{m} + 2}{w} \right) = \lambda_b(B) \frac{n}{m} \left(1 + \frac{2m}{w} \right).$$

So,

$$\lambda_b(B) \frac{n}{m} \left(1 + \frac{2m}{w} \right) = \lambda_b(B) \left\lceil \frac{n-r}{m} \right\rceil \left(1 + \frac{2m}{w} \right) \leq \lambda_b(B) \left\lceil \frac{n-r}{m} \right\rceil (1 + \epsilon)$$

and we have proved that $C_{b,w}$ is (ϵ, K, M, μ) -normal of type I. □

Lemma 2.9. *If $K < w$, $b^w > \frac{r}{m} + \frac{3r}{w}$, $\epsilon \geq \frac{(k+1)m}{w}$, and $M!|w$, then $C_{b,w}$ is $(\epsilon, K, M, \lambda_b(B))$ -normal of type II.*

Proof. Let $n = |C_{b,w}|$. For $k \leq K$, $m \leq M$, and blocks B of length k in base b

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\left\lfloor \frac{w-r}{m} \right\rfloor - k + 1 \right) b^{w-k} &> b^{-k} n \left(\frac{\left\lfloor \frac{w-r}{m} \right\rfloor - k + 1}{w} \right) > \lambda_b(B) n \left(\frac{\frac{w-r}{m} - k}{w} \right) \\ &> \lambda_b(B) \frac{n}{m} \left(\frac{w-r-km}{w} \right) = \lambda_b(B) \frac{n}{m} \left(1 - \frac{r}{w} - \frac{km}{w} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $M!|w \implies m|w$ and $n = wb^w$, we know that for an integer $c = \frac{n}{m}$ and $0 \leq r < m$, then for some integer d , where $0 \leq d < m$, $\lceil \frac{n-r}{m} \rceil = \lceil c + \frac{d}{m} \rceil = c = \frac{n}{m}$, or $\lceil \frac{n-r}{m} \rceil = \frac{n}{m}$. Thus,

$$\lambda_b(B) \frac{n}{m} \left(1 - \frac{r}{w} - \frac{km}{w} \right) = \lambda_b(B) \left\lceil \frac{n-r}{m} \right\rceil \left(1 - \left(\frac{r+km}{w} \right) \right) \geq \lambda_b(B) \left\lceil \frac{n-r}{m} \right\rceil (1 - \epsilon).$$

For the upper bound,

$$\left\lceil \frac{w-r}{m} \right\rceil b^{w-k} \leq b^{-k} n \left(\frac{w-r+m}{mw} \right) = \lambda_b(B) \frac{n}{m} \left(1 + \frac{m}{w} \right).$$

Therefore,

$$\lambda_b(B) \frac{n}{m} \left(1 + \frac{m}{w} \right) = \lambda_b(B) \left\lceil \frac{n-r}{m} \right\rceil \left(1 + \frac{m}{w} \right) \leq \lambda_b(B) \left\lceil \frac{n-r}{m} \right\rceil (1 + \epsilon)$$

and we have proved that $C_{b,w}$ is (ϵ, K, M, μ) -normal of type II. \square

We may now prove Theorem 1.8.

Proof of Theorem 1.8. Since $X_i = C_{i,i!}$, X_i is $(\epsilon_i, k_i, m_i, \mu_i)$ -normal of types I and II by Lemma 2.8 and Lemma 2.9. It is easy to show that (1.4), (1.5), and (1.6) are satisfied noting that $|X_i| = i! \cdot i^{i!}$. The conclusion follows from Theorem 1.7. \square

2.3. Proof of Theorem 1.9 and Theorem 1.10. We will first need the following two elementary lemmas.

Lemma 2.10. *Let L be a real number and $(a_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ and $(b_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ be two sequences of positive real numbers such that*

$$\sum_{n=1}^\infty b_n = \infty \text{ and } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{a_n}{b_n} = L.$$

Then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_n}{b_1 + b_2 + \dots + b_n} = L.$$

Lemma 2.11. *Let L be a real number and $(a_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ and $(b_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ be two sequences of positive integers. Let $(c_t)_{t=1}^\infty$ be an increasing sequence of positive integers. Set $A_t = \sum_{n=c_t}^{c_{t+1}-1} a_n$ and $B_t = \sum_{n=c_t}^{c_{t+1}-1} b_n$. If $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{A_1 + A_2 + \dots + A_t}{B_1 + B_2 + \dots + B_t} = L$, $\sum_{t=1}^\infty A_t = \sum_{t=1}^\infty B_t = \infty$, and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{A_{t+1}}{A_1 + A_2 + \dots + A_t} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{B_{t+1}}{B_1 + B_2 + \dots + B_t} = 0$, then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_n}{b_1 + b_2 + \dots + b_n} = L.$$

We may now proceed with the proof of Theorem 1.9.

Proof of Theorem 1.9. Since $\alpha_j | b_i$, Q is a basic sequence. Let L_i be defined as in Theorem 1.6 and let $i = i(n)$ be the integer that satisfies $L_{i-1} < n \leq L_i$. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and set

$$P_{j,k} = \sum_{v=0}^{d-1} \frac{1}{p_{jd+v+1} p_{jd+v+2} \dots p_{jd+v+k}} \text{ and } Q_{j,k} = \sum_{v=0}^{d-1} \frac{1}{q_{jd+v+1} q_{jd+v+2} \dots q_{jd+v+k}}.$$

Note that for large enough j , we have $p_n \in \{b_{i(jd+1)}, b_{i(jd+1)+1}\}$ for $jd+1 \leq n \leq (j+1)d+k-1$. Thus, since b_i is non-decreasing $\frac{d}{b_{i+1}^k} \leq P_{j,k} \leq \frac{d}{b_i^k}$. Similarly,

$$\frac{\sum_{j=0}^{t-k} c_j c_{j+1} \dots c_{j+k-1}}{b_i^k} < Q_{j,k} < \frac{\sum_{j=0}^{t-k} c_j c_{j+1} \dots c_{j+k-1}}{b_i^k} + \frac{d - (t - k + 1)}{2^{jd+1} b_i^{k-1}} \cdot \max_{0 \leq r \leq t-1} c_r^{k-1},$$

so

$$(2.6) \quad \frac{Q_{j,k}}{P_{j,k}} < \frac{\frac{\sum_{j=0}^{t-k} c_j c_{j+1} \dots c_{j+k-1}}{b_i^k} + \frac{d - (t - k + 1)}{2^{jd+1} b_i^{k-1}} \cdot \max_{0 \leq r \leq t-1} c_r^{k-1}}{\frac{d}{b_{i+1}^k}}$$

$$(2.7) \quad = \left(\frac{b_{i+1}}{b_i} \right)^k \cdot \frac{\sum_{j=0}^{t-k} c_j c_{j+1} \dots c_{j+k-1}}{d} + \frac{d - (t - k + 1)}{d} \cdot \left(\frac{b_{i+1}}{b_i} \right)^{k-1} \cdot \frac{b_{i+1}}{2^{jd+1}} \cdot \max_{0 \leq r \leq t-1} c_r^{k-1}$$

and

$$(2.8) \quad \frac{Q_{j,k}}{P_{j,k}} > \frac{\frac{\sum_{j=0}^{t-k} c_j c_{j+1} \dots c_{j+k-1}}{b_i^k}}{\frac{d}{b_i^k}} = \frac{\sum_{j=0}^{t-k} c_j c_{j+1} \dots c_{j+k-1}}{d}.$$

However, $\frac{b_{i+1}}{b_i} \rightarrow 1$ and (1.4) holds, so $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{b_{i(jd+1)+1}}{2^{jd+1}} \rightarrow 0$. Therefore,

$$(2.9) \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{Q_{j,k}}{P_{j,k}} = \frac{\sum_{j=0}^{t-k} c_j c_{j+1} \cdots c_{j+k-1}}{d},$$

by (2.6) and (2.8). Using Lemma 2.10, Lemma 2.11, (2.9), the fact that $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{Q_{j,k}}{P_{j,k}}$ exists, and that P and Q are k -divergent, we have that

$$(2.10) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{Q_n^{(k)}}{P_n^{(k)}} = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{Q_{j,k}}{P_{j,k}} = \frac{\sum_{j=0}^{t-k} c_j c_{j+1} \cdots c_{j+k-1}}{d}.$$

Let $k \in \{1, \dots, t\}$ and let B be any block of length k . By Theorem 1.5

$$(2.11) \quad N_n^Q(B, (\psi_{P,Q} \circ \eta)(W, X)) = N_n^P(B, \eta(W, X)) + O(1).$$

Since $\eta(W, X) \in \mathcal{N}_k(Q)$ by Theorem 1.6, we know that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N_n^P(B, \eta(W, X))}{P_n^{(k)}} = 1$. Thus, by (2.10) and (2.11)

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N_n^Q(B, (\psi_{P,Q} \circ \eta)(W, X))}{Q_n^{(k)}} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N_n^P(B, \eta(W, X)) + O(1)}{P_n^{(k)}} \cdot \frac{P_n^{(k)}}{Q_n^{(k)}} = \frac{d}{\sum_{j=0}^{t-k} c_j c_{j+1} \cdots c_{j+k-1}},$$

which is equal to 1 if $k \in A$ and not equal to 1 if $k \in B$. Thus, $(\psi_{P,Q} \circ \eta)(W, X) \in \mathcal{N}_k(Q)$ if and only if $k \in A$. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.10. The proof follows along similar, but slightly more complex lines than the proof of Theorem 1.9, so we omit the details. It should be noted that Theorem 1.5 is used to prove (1.9) and (1.10) and Corollary 1.14 is used to prove (1.11) and (1.12). \square

2.4. Proof of Theorem 1.12. We note that with $m = k, t = 2k^2, d = 2k^2(k+1), c_0 = c_1 = \cdots = c_{k-1} = c_{k^2} = c_{k^2+1} = \cdots = c_{k^2+k-1} = 2k$, and $c_n = 1$ for all other n , we have $c_{r+jm} c_{r+(j+1)m} \cdots c_{r+(j+k-1)m} = 2k$ for all j, m , and r . Also,

$$\left\lfloor \frac{t-r-1}{m} \right\rfloor = \left\lfloor \frac{2k^2-r-1}{k} \right\rfloor = \left\lfloor \frac{2k^2-(k-1)-1}{k} \right\rfloor = 2k-1 \text{ for all } r \in [0, k-1].$$

Thus, there are $\left(\left\lfloor \frac{t-r-1}{m} \right\rfloor - k + 1\right) - 0 + 1 = 2k-1-k+1+1 = k+1$ terms in the sum in (1.11), each of which is equal to $2k$. Therefore,

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\left\lfloor \frac{t-r-1}{m} \right\rfloor - k + 1} c_{r+jm} c_{r+(j+1)m} \cdots c_{r+(j+k-1)m} = (k+1) \cdot 2k = \frac{2k^2(k+1)}{k} = d/m,$$

so (1.11) holds for all $r \in [0, k-1]$ and $\psi_{R_t,Q}(\zeta_t) \in \bigcap_{r=0}^{k-1} \mathcal{N}_{k,k,r}^{II}(Q) = \mathcal{N}_k^{II}(Q)$.

To show that $\psi_{R_t,Q}(\zeta_t) \notin \mathcal{N}_k(Q)$, we first consider the case where $k = 2$. Here,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^{t-k} c_j c_{j+1} \cdots c_{j+k-1} &= \sum_{j=0}^6 c_j c_{j+1} = c_0 c_1 + c_1 c_2 + c_2 c_3 + c_3 c_4 + c_4 c_5 + c_5 c_6 + c_6 c_7 \\ &= 16 + 4 + 1 + 4 + 16 + 4 + 1 = 46 \neq 24 = 2 \cdot 2^2(2+1) = d. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to show that $(2k)^k > 2k^2(k+1)$ for all $k \geq 3$. Hence, if $k \geq 3$, then

$$\sum_{j=0}^{t-k} c_j c_{j+1} \cdots c_{j+k-1} > c_0 c_1 \cdots c_{k-1} = (2k)^k > 2k^2(k+1) = d.$$

In either case, (1.8) holds, so $\psi_{R_t,Q}(\zeta_t) \notin \mathcal{N}_k(Q)$.




FIGURE 2.

3. FURTHER QUESTIONS

Several conjectures are presented in this section. We will intentionally omit many details in this section as the computations supporting the likelihood of some of these assertions would make this section disproportionately long.

It is likely that there exist much stranger examples of numbers than those that can be constructed with Theorem 1.9 and Theorem 1.10.

Conjecture 3.1. There exists a basic sequence Q that is infinite in limit and fully divergent of type I and a real number x is that Q -normal but “AP Q -abnormal”. That is,

$$x \in \mathcal{N}(Q) \setminus \bigcup_{k=2}^{\infty} \bigcup_{r=0}^{k-1} \mathcal{N}_{k,k,r}^I(Q).$$

We may think of this number described in Conjecture 3.1 as being a normal number whose digits along *every* arithmetic progression do not behave in a way that one would expect from a normal number. We will outline the evidence for Conjecture 3.1 and provide an even stronger conjecture.

Definition 3.1. ¹⁴ Let $Q \in \mathbb{N}_2^{\mathbb{N}}$ and put $T_{Q,n}(x) = (\prod_{j=1}^n q_j) x \pmod{1}$. A real number x is Q -distribution normal if the sequence $(T_{Q,n}(x))_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is uniformly distributed mod 1. Let $\mathcal{DN}(Q)$ be the set of Q -distribution normal numbers.

We refer to the directed graph in Figure 2 for the complete containment relationships between these notions when Q is infinite in limit and fully divergent. The vertices are labeled with all possible intersections of one, two, or three choices of the sets $\mathcal{N}(Q)$, $\mathcal{RN}(Q)$, and $\mathcal{DN}(Q)$. The set labeled on vertex A is a subset of the set labeled on vertex B if and only if there is a directed path from vertex A to vertex B .¹⁵ For example, $\mathcal{N}(Q) \cap \mathcal{DN}(Q) \subset \mathcal{RN}(Q)$, so all numbers that are Q -normal and Q -distribution normal are also Q -ratio normal. The relations described in Figure 2 are best derived through use of Theorem 1.5. More information can be found in [11].

Let $\dim_{\mathbb{H}}(S)$ be the Hausdorff dimension of a set $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. The following is a special case of a much more general theorem proven in [1].

¹⁴ Note that in base b , where $q_n = b$ for all n , the corresponding notions of Q -normality, Q -ratio normality, and Q -distribution normality are equivalent.

¹⁵ The underlying undirected graph in Figure 2 has an isomorphic copy of complete bipartite graph $K_{3,3}$ as a subgraph. Thus, it is not planar and the directed graph that connects two vertices if and only if there is a containment relation between the two labels is more difficult to read.

Theorem 3.2. Suppose that Q is infinite in limit and put

$$A = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : (T_{Q, mn+r}(x))_{n=1}^{\infty} \text{ is not uniformly distributed mod } 1 \forall m \in \mathbb{N}_2, r \in [0, m-1]\}.$$

Then $\dim_H(\mathcal{DN}(Q) \cap A) = 1$.

Thus, the following stronger version of Conjecture 3.1 seems likely to be true.

Conjecture 3.3. If Q is infinite in limit and fully divergent of type I, then

$$\dim_H \left(\mathcal{N}(Q) \setminus \bigcup_{k=2}^{\infty} \bigcup_{r=0}^{k-1} \mathcal{N}_{k,k,r}^I(Q) \right) = 1.$$

While there is a substantial amount of machinery that may be used to prove statements like Theorem 3.2, neither of the authors is aware of anything that could be used to establish Conjecture 3.3. However, Conjecture 3.1 may lend itself to more immediate analysis.

Conjecture 3.4. ¹⁶ Let $t \in \mathbb{N}_3$ and let $\vec{\epsilon} = (\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_t) \in \mathbb{R}^t$. Then the nonlinear system of equations

$$\begin{aligned} c_0 + c_1 + c_2 + c_3 + \dots + c_{t-1} &= 2t + \epsilon_1 \\ c_0 c_1 + c_1 c_2 + c_2 c_3 + c_3 c_4 + \dots + c_{t-2} c_{t-1} &= 2t + \epsilon_2 \\ c_0 c_1 c_2 + c_1 c_2 c_3 + c_2 c_3 c_4 + c_3 c_4 c_5 + \dots + c_{t-3} c_{t-2} c_{t-1} &= 2t + \epsilon_3 \\ &\dots \\ c_0 c_1 \dots c_{t-1} &= 2t + \epsilon_t \end{aligned}$$

has a solution $(c_0, c_1, \dots, c_{t-1}) \in [t, t+1] \times \left[1 + \frac{1}{2t}, 1 + \frac{1}{t-1}\right]^{t-1}$ whenever $\|\vec{\epsilon}\|$ is sufficiently small.

If Conjecture 3.4 is true, then we can prove Conjecture 3.1 by means of a more sophisticated version of Theorem 1.9 and Theorem 1.10 that allows for members of $\mathcal{N}(Q)$ to be constructed. Furthermore, a proof of Conjecture 3.4 would prove the following conjecture.

Conjecture 3.5. Let $t \geq 2$ be an integer and suppose that $\{1, \dots, t\} = A \cup B$. There there exists a real number x and basic sequence Q that is t -divergent where

$$x \in \bigcap_{k \in A} \mathcal{N}_k(Q) \setminus \bigcap_{j \in B} \mathcal{N}_j(Q).$$

It is possible that careful analysis of the solutions of the system described in Conjecture 3.4 could settle the following much more surprising conjecture.

Conjecture 3.6. Suppose that $\mathbb{N} = A \cup B$ is a partition of the set of natural numbers. Then there exists a real number x and basic sequence Q that is fully divergent where

$$x \in \bigcap_{k \in A} \mathcal{N}_k(Q) \setminus \bigcap_{j \in B} \mathcal{N}_j(Q).$$

The authors feel that Conjecture 3.1 and Conjecture 3.5 are almost surely true, but hesitate to suggest that Conjecture 3.6 is true. We also wish to state the following extension of Conjecture 3.5 and Conjecture 3.6.

Conjecture 3.7. If Q is infinite in limit and t divergent and $\{1, \dots, t\} = A \cup B$, then

$$\dim_H \left(\bigcap_{k \in A} \mathcal{N}_k(Q) \setminus \bigcap_{j \in B} \mathcal{N}_j(Q) \right).$$

If Q is infinite in limit and fully divergent and $\mathbb{N} = C \cup D$, then

$$\dim_H \left(\bigcap_{k \in C} \mathcal{N}_k(Q) \setminus \bigcap_{j \in D} \mathcal{N}_j(Q) \right).$$

However, neither of the authors anticipate an approach that could be used to settle Conjecture 3.7.

¹⁶ Ryan Greene has verified Conjecture 3.4 by computer up to $t = 100$ when $\vec{\epsilon} = (0, 0, \dots, 0)$. It is plausible that small perturbations of the right hand side of this system will still allow for solutions in this critical region.

REFERENCES

- [1] D.. Airey and B. Mance. Unexpected distribution phenomenon resulting from cantor series expansions. In preparation.
- [2] V. Becher and S. Figueira. An example of a computable absolutely normal number. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, 270(1–2):947–958, 2002.
- [3] E. Borel. Les probabilités dénombrables et leurs applications arithmétiques. *Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo*, 27:247–271, 1909.
- [4] Y. Bugeaud. *Distribution modulo one and diophantine approximation*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012.
- [5] G. Cantor. Über die einfachen zahlensysteme. *Zeitschrift für Math. und Physik*, 14:121–128, 1869.
- [6] D. G. Champernowne. The construction of decimals normal in the scale of ten. *Journal of the London Mathematical Society*, 8:254–260, 1933.
- [7] A. H. Copeland and P. Erdős. Note on normal numbers. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 52:857–860, 1946.
- [8] H. Furstenberg. Disjointness in ergodic theory, minimal sets, and a problem in diophantine approximation. *Math. Systems Theory*, 1:1–49, 1967.
- [9] J. Galambos. *Representations of real numbers by infinite series*, volume 502 of *Lecture Notes in Math*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Hiedelberg, New York, 1976.
- [10] P. Laffer. *Normal numbers with respect to Cantor series representation*. PhD thesis, Washington State University, Pullman, Washington, 1974.
- [11] B. Mance. Number theoretic applications of a class of cantor series fractal functions part i. In preparation.
- [12] B. Mance. Construction of normal numbers with respect to the q -cantor series expansion for certain q . *Acta Arith.*, 148:135–152, 2011.
- [13] B. Mance. Typicality of normal numbers with respect to the cantor series expansion. *New York J. Math.*, 17:601–617, 2011.
- [14] I. Niven and H. S. Zuckerman. On the definition of normal numbers. *Pacific J. Math.*, 1:103–109, 1951.
- [15] S. S. Pillai. On normal numbers. *Proc. Indian Acad. Sci.*, 12:179–184, 1940.
- [16] A. Rényi. On the distribution of the digits in cantor’s series. *Mat. Lapok*, 7:77–100, 1956.
- [17] F. Schweiger. Über den satz von borel-rényi in der theorie der cantorschen reihen. *Monatsh. Math.*, 74:150–153, 1969.
- [18] M. W. Sierpiński. Démonstration élémentaire du théorème de m. borel sur les nombres absolument normaux et détermination effective d’un tel nombre. *Bull. Soc. Math. France*, 45:125–153, 1917.
- [19] T. Šalát. Über die cantorsche reihen. *Czech. Math. J.*, 18 (93):25–56, 1968.

(B. Li) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS
 THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
 231 WEST 18TH AVENUE
 COLUMBUS, OH 43210-1174, USA
 FAX: +1-614-292-1479
E-mail address: `brianua13@yahoo.com`

(B. Mance) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS
 UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS
 GENERAL ACADEMICS BUILDING 435
 1155 UNION CIRCLE #311430
 DENTON, TX 76203-5017, USA
 TEL.: +1-940-369-7374
 FAX: +1-940-565-4805
E-mail address: `mance@unt.edu`