

HAUSDORFF DIMENSION OF THE EXCEPTIONAL SET OF THE LAW OF LARGE NUMBERS IN PIERCE EXPANSIONS

MIN WOONG AHN

ABSTRACT. The digits of Pierce expansion adhere to the law of large numbers. It is known that the Hausdorff dimension of the set of exceptions to the law of large numbers is 1. We offer an elementary proof of this fact by adapting Jun Wu's method used in the context of Engel expansions.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Preliminaries	3
3. Proof of the result	5
References	14

1. INTRODUCTION

For $x \in [0, 1]$, we denote the *Pierce expansion* or *alternating Engel expansion* of x by $[d_1(x), d_2(x), \dots]_P$, i.e.,

$$x = [d_1(x), d_2(x), \dots]_P := \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \left((-1)^{j+1} \prod_{k=1}^j \frac{1}{d_k(x)} \right),$$

where $(d_k(x))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is either

- (i) a sequence of positive integers satisfying $d_{k+1}(x) > d_k(x)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ or
- (ii) a sequence of strictly increasing initial n positive integer-valued terms followed by ∞ for the rest for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

with the conventions $\infty \cdot \infty = \infty$, $1/\infty = 0$, and $c \cdot \infty = \infty$ for any $c > 0$ (see [1] and [18]). The $d_k(x)$ are called the *digits* of Pierce expansion of x and the digits are

Date: May 6, 2024.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 11K55, Secondary 26A18, 28A80, 37E05.

Key words and phrases. Pierce expansion, Hausdorff dimension, exceptional set, law of large numbers.

obtained dynamically in the following way. Consider two maps $d_1: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ and $T: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ defined by

$$(1.1) \quad d_1(x) := \begin{cases} \lfloor 1/x \rfloor, & \text{if } x \neq 0; \\ \infty, & \text{if } x = 0, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad T(x) := \begin{cases} 1 - d_1(x)x, & \text{if } x \neq 0; \\ 0, & \text{if } x = 0, \end{cases}$$

respectively, where $\lfloor \xi \rfloor$ denotes the largest integer not exceeding $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$. The sequence of digits are then recursively defined by

$$(1.2) \quad d_k(x) := d_1(T^{k-1}(x)) \quad \text{for each } k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

If $n := \inf\{j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\} : T^j(x) = 0\}$ is finite, then $d_1(x) < \dots < d_n(x) < \infty$ and $d_k(x) = \infty$ for all $k \geq n+1$, and if, further, $n \geq 2$, then $d_{n-1}(x) + 1 < d_n(x)$ (see [1, Proposition 2.1] and [18, pp. 23–24]). We refer the reader to [1–3, 5, 7, 13–15, 17–19, 23, 24] or [16, Chapter 2] for more arithmetic and metric properties of Pierce expansion.

In his 1986 paper, Shallit established the *law of large numbers (LLN)* of Pierce expansion digits [18, Theorem 16]: *For Lebesgue-almost every $x \in [0, 1]$, we have*

$$(1.3) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (d_n(x))^{1/n} = e.$$

One natural question arising is to determine the Hausdorff dimension of the exceptional set where (1.3) fails. This is because although the LLN tells us that the exceptional set is of null Lebesgue measure, it might be possible that the exceptional set is fairly large in the Hausdorff dimension sense.

In the context of Engel expansions, a non-alternating version of Pierce expansions, Galambos [9] raised a similar question, which asks one to calculate the Hausdorff dimension of the set on which the LLN in Engel expansions is violated. (See [4] for the LLN in Engel expansions). Wu [25] obtained the answer to the question by an ingenious construction. Precisely, he first fixed a subset $A \subseteq (0, 1]$ of positive Lebesgue measure (hence of full Hausdorff dimension) and then defined a sequence of maps $(g_n: A \rightarrow (0, 1])_{n \geq M}$ for some large enough $M \in \mathbb{N}$. Then he showed that the LLN fails on $g_n(A)$ and that $g_n^{-1}: g_n(A) \rightarrow A$ is $(1/\alpha_n)$ -Hölder continuous for all $n \geq M$, where $\alpha_n \rightarrow 1^+$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, to infer that the Hausdorff dimension of $g_n(A)$ is at least α_n and conclude that the desired exceptional set is of full Hausdorff dimension. (See also [8, 10–12, 20–22, 26] for further results in the Hausdorff dimension of exceptional sets in Engel expansions.)

As for Pierce expansions, in [2], we have recently proved the following results concerning the exceptional set of the LLN (1.3).

Theorem ([2, Corollary 1.3]). *For each $\alpha \in [1, \infty]$, the set*

$$\left\{ x \in [0, 1] : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (d_n(x))^{1/n} = \alpha \right\}$$

is of full Hausdorff dimension.

Main Theorem ([2, Corollary 1.4]). *The subset of $[0, 1]$ on which (1.3) fails is of full Hausdorff dimension.*

Notice that the main theorem of this paper above is an immediate corollary to Theorem.

In fact, in the same paper [2], some more general results were established. The main tools we utilized in the proofs are classical in the field of fractal geometry; for instance, a suitable symbolic space was defined and the so-called ‘mass distribution principle’ (see [6, Example 4.6(a)]) was applied to find a lower bound for the Hausdorff dimension. Occasionally, an upper bound for the Hausdorff dimension was obtained by means of the lower box-counting dimension and the fact that the Hausdorff dimension is at most the lower box-counting dimension (see [6, Propositions 3.4 and 4.1]). See [2] for the details.

In this paper, we re-prove, in a more elementary way, the already-known fact that the Hausdorff dimension of the set where (1.3) fails equals 1 (Main Theorem). We will modify Wu’s [25] method used in the context of Engel expansions.

Throughout this paper, we denote by $\dim_{\mathbb{H}}$ the Hausdorff dimension and λ the Lebesgue measure on $[0, 1]$. We denote the set of positive integers by \mathbb{N} , the set of non-negative integers by \mathbb{N}_0 , the set of extended positive integers by $\mathbb{N}_{\infty} := \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$, and the set of irrational numbers in $[0, 1]$ by \mathbb{I} . Following the convention, we define $\infty \cdot \infty := \infty$, $c \cdot \infty := \infty$ for any $c > 0$, and $1/\infty := 0$. For any map $g: X \rightarrow Y$ and a subset $A \subseteq X$, we write $g|_A$ for the restriction of g to A .

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we introduce some elementary facts on Pierce expansions and the Hausdorff dimension, which will be used in the proof of the Main Theorem.

We first list some well-known properties of Pierce expansions.

Proposition 2.1 ([1, Proposition 2.1]). *Let $x \in [0, 1]$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the following hold:*

- (i) $d_{n+1}(x) \geq d_n(x) + 1$.
- (ii) $d_n(x) \geq n$.

Proof. Both parts follow from the algorithms (1.1) and (1.2). See [1] for the details. \square

We shall introduce a sequence set which is a subset of $\mathbb{N}_{\infty}^{\mathbb{N}}$ closely related to the Pierce expansion digit sequences. This set was discussed in detail in [1]. Let $\Sigma_0 := \{(\infty, \infty, \dots)\}$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, define

$$\Sigma_n := \{(\sigma_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \in \mathbb{N}^{\{1, \dots, n\}} \times \{\infty\}^{\mathbb{N} \setminus \{1, \dots, n\}} : \sigma_1 < \sigma_2 < \dots < \sigma_n\}.$$

Define

$$\Sigma_{\infty} := \{(\sigma_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}} : \sigma_k < \sigma_{k+1} \text{ for all } k \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

Finally, let

$$\Sigma := \Sigma_0 \cup \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \Sigma_n \cup \Sigma_\infty.$$

We say that a sequence $\sigma := (\sigma_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $\mathbb{N}_\infty^{\mathbb{N}}$ is *Pierce realizable* if there exists $x \in [0, 1]$ such that $d_k(x) = \sigma_k$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. We denote by Σ_{re} the collection of all Pierce realizable sequences.

Proposition 2.2 ([1, Proposition 2.4]). *Let $\sigma := (\sigma_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \in \mathbb{N}_\infty^{\mathbb{N}}$. Then $\sigma \in \Sigma_{\text{re}}$ if and only if one of the following hold:*

- (i) $\sigma \in \Sigma_0 \cup \Sigma_1$.
- (ii) $\sigma \in \Sigma_n$ for some $n \geq 2$, with $\sigma_{n-1} + 1 < \sigma_n$.
- (iii) $\sigma \in \Sigma_\infty$.

Define $f: [0, 1] \rightarrow \Sigma$ by

$$f(x) := (d_k(x))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$$

for each $x \in [0, 1]$. Define $\varphi: \Sigma \rightarrow [0, 1]$ by

$$\varphi(\sigma) := \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \left((-1)^{j+1} \prod_{k=1}^j \frac{1}{\sigma_k} \right) = \frac{1}{\sigma_1} - \frac{1}{\sigma_1 \sigma_2} + \cdots + \frac{(-1)^{n+1}}{\sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_n} + \cdots$$

for each $\sigma := (\sigma_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \in \Sigma$.

Proposition 2.3 (See [1, Section 3.2]). *We have $\varphi \circ f = \text{id}_{[0,1]}$ and $f \circ (\varphi|_{\Sigma_{\text{re}}}) = \text{id}_{\Sigma_{\text{re}}}$. In particular, $f|_{\mathbb{I}}: \mathbb{I} \rightarrow \Sigma_\infty$ and $\varphi|_{\Sigma_\infty}: \Sigma_\infty \rightarrow \mathbb{I}$ are inverses to each other.*

Remark 2.4. We remark that, in view of Proposition 2.3, for every rational number $x \in [0, 1]$ there exists $n = n(x) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $d_k(x) = \infty$ for all $k \geq n$. So, we have $(d_k(x))^{1/k} = \infty$ for all $k \geq n$, which is consistent with the convention $\infty^k = \infty$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$. This tells us that the convergence (1.3) is not valid for any rational number.

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\sigma := (\sigma_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \in \Sigma_n$. Define the *fundamental interval* associated with σ by

$$I(\sigma) := \{x \in [0, 1] : d_k(x) = \sigma_k \text{ for all } 1 \leq k \leq n\}.$$

We further define a sequence $\hat{\sigma} := (\hat{\sigma}_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \in \Sigma_n$ by $\hat{\sigma}_n := \sigma_n + 1$ and $\hat{\sigma}_k := \sigma_k$ for $k \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{n\}$, i.e.,

$$\hat{\sigma} = (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{n-1}, \sigma_n + 1, \infty, \infty, \dots).$$

Proposition 2.5 (See [18, Theorem 1] and [1, Proposition 3.5]). *For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\sigma \in \Sigma_n$, we have*

$$I(\sigma) = \begin{cases} (\varphi(\hat{\sigma}), \varphi(\sigma)), & \text{if } n \text{ is odd;} \\ [\varphi(\sigma), \varphi(\hat{\sigma})], & \text{if } n \text{ is even,} \end{cases} \quad \text{or} \quad I(\sigma) = \begin{cases} (\varphi(\hat{\sigma}), \varphi(\sigma)), & \text{if } n \text{ is odd;} \\ (\varphi(\sigma), \varphi(\hat{\sigma})), & \text{if } n \text{ is even,} \end{cases}$$

according as $\sigma \in \Sigma_{\text{re}}$ or $\sigma \notin \Sigma_{\text{re}}$.

Let $\sigma := (\sigma_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \in \Sigma$. Define $\sigma^{(0)} := (\infty, \infty, \dots)$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we define $\sigma^{(n)} := (\tau_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \in \Sigma$ by $\tau_k := \sigma_k$ for $1 \leq k \leq n$ and $\tau_k := \infty$ for $k \geq n + 1$, i.e.,

$$\sigma^{(n)} = (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n, \infty, \infty, \dots).$$

Proposition 2.6 ([1, Lemma 3.29]). *Let $\sigma := (\sigma_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \in \Sigma$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have*

$$|\varphi(\sigma) - \varphi(\sigma^{(n)})| \leq \prod_{k=1}^{n+1} \frac{1}{\sigma_k}.$$

The following proposition will play a key role in establishing a lower bound of the Hausdorff dimension.

Proposition 2.7 ([6, Proposition 3.3(a)]). *Let $F \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and suppose that $g: F \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is α -Hölder continuous, i.e., there exist constants $\alpha > 0$ and $c > 0$ such that*

$$|g(x) - g(y)| \leq c|x - y|^\alpha$$

for all $x, y \in F$. Then, $\dim_{\text{H}} g(F) \leq (1/\alpha) \dim_{\text{H}} F$.

3. PROOF OF THE RESULT

It is worth reiterating that our proof idea is inspired by [25], in which the exceptional set of the LLN in Engel expansions is discussed.

Proof of Main Theorem. Put

$$E := \{x \in [0, 1] : (d_n(x))^{1/n} \not\rightarrow e \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty\} = \{x \in [0, 1] : (1.3) \text{ fails}\}.$$

The inequality $\dim_{\text{H}} E \leq 1$ is obvious, so it suffices to prove the reverse inequality. Our aim is to find a sequence of subsets of E such that the Hausdorff dimensions of the subsets can be made arbitrarily close to 1.

Recall that the LLN (1.3) holds λ -almost everywhere in $[0, 1]$. By Egorov's theorem, there exists a Lebesgue measurable subset $A \subseteq [0, 1]$ with $\lambda(A) > 0$ such that $(d_n(x))^{1/n} \rightarrow e$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ uniformly on A . As mentioned in Remark 2.4, we have $A \subseteq \mathbb{I}$, so that $f(A) \subseteq f(\mathbb{I}) = \Sigma_\infty$, where the equality follows from Proposition 2.3. Since $2 < e < 4$, by the uniform convergence, we can find an $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$(3.1) \quad 2^n < d_n(x) < 4^n \quad \text{for all } n \geq N \text{ and for all } x \in A.$$

Claim 1. *We have $\dim_{\text{H}} A = 1$.*

Proof of Claim 1. The claim is clear since any subset of positive Lebesgue measure in $[0, 1]$ is of full Hausdorff dimension (see [6, p. 45]). ■

Let $M \in \mathbb{N}$ be arbitrary such that $M > N$ (so that, in particular, $M \geq 2$). For each $\sigma := (\sigma_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \in \Sigma_\infty$, define $\bar{\sigma} := (\bar{\sigma}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ by $\bar{\sigma}_{j(M+1)+l} := \sigma_{jM+l} + j$ for each $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $l \in \{0, 1, \dots, M\}$ but $(j, l) = (0, 0)$. By the Euclidean algorithm, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we may write $n = j(M+1) + l$ for some $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $l \in \{0, 1, \dots, M\}$

in a unique way, and thus, the sequence $(\bar{\sigma}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is well-defined. We denote the map $\sigma \mapsto \bar{\sigma}$ on Σ_∞ by Ψ .

Claim 2. *We have $\Psi(\Sigma_\infty) \subseteq \Sigma_\infty$.*

Proof of Claim 2. Let $\sigma := (\sigma_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \in \Sigma_\infty$. Put $\bar{\sigma} := \Psi(\sigma)$ and write $\bar{\sigma} = (\bar{\sigma}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. We need to show that $\bar{\sigma}_n < \bar{\sigma}_{n+1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, it is clear that $p(M+1) \leq n \leq (p+1)(M+1) - 1 = p(M+1) + M$ for some $p \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Assume first that $p(M+1) \leq n < p(M+1) + M$ for some $p \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Then, $n = p(M+1) + l$ for some $l \in \{0, 1, \dots, M-1\}$, and $n+1 = p(M+1) + (l+1)$ with $l+1 \in \{1, 2, \dots, M\}$. It follows that

$$\bar{\sigma}_n = \sigma_{pM+l} + p < \sigma_{pM+(l+1)} + p = \bar{\sigma}_{n+1}.$$

Now, assume $n = p(M+1) + M = (p+1)M + p$ for some $p \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Then, $n+1 = (p+1)(M+1) + 0$, and we have

$$\bar{\sigma}_n = \sigma_{(p+1)M} + p < \sigma_{(p+1)M} + (p+1) = \bar{\sigma}_{n+1}.$$

Thus, $\Psi(\sigma) = \bar{\sigma}$ is indeed in Σ_∞ , and this completes the proof of the claim. \blacksquare

Since $\Psi(f(\mathbb{I})) \subseteq f(\mathbb{I})$ by Proposition 2.3 and Claim 2, for any $x \in \mathbb{I}$, we infer that $(\Psi \circ f)(x) = f(\bar{x})$ for some $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{I}$, in which case the Pierce expansion of \bar{x} equals $(\Psi \circ f)(x)$. Note that $\bar{x} = (\varphi \circ f)(\bar{x}) = (\varphi \circ \Psi \circ f)(x)$ due to Proposition 2.3 and that the Pierce expansion of \bar{x} is given by

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{array}{l} \bar{x} = \\ \left[\begin{array}{cccccc} d_1, & \dots, & d_{M-1}, & d_M, & d_{M+1}, & \\ d_{M+1} + 1, & \dots, & d_{2M-1} + 1, & d_{2M} + 1, & d_{2M} + 2, & \\ d_{2M+1} + 2, & \dots, & d_{3M-1} + 2, & d_{3M} + 2, & d_{3M} + 3, & \\ & \dots, & & & & \\ d_{jM+1} + j, & \dots, & d_{(j+1)M-1} + j, & d_{(j+1)M} + j, & d_{(j+1)M} + j + 1, & \\ & \dots, & & & & \end{array} \right]_P, \end{array}$$

where $d_k := d_k(x)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Define $g: A \rightarrow \mathbb{I}$ by $g(x) := (\varphi \circ \Psi \circ f)(x)$ for each $x \in A$. One can easily see that g is well-defined and injective.

Claim 3. *We have $g(A) \subseteq E$.*

Proof of Claim 3. Let $x \in A$, and put $\bar{x} := g(x)$. By the Euclidean algorithm, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we may write $n = j(M+1) + l$ for some $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $l \in \{0, 1, \dots, M\}$ in a unique way, so that $d_n(\bar{x}) = d_{jM+l}(x) + j$ by (3.2). Note that $j \leq jM + l \leq d_{jM+l}(x)$ by Proposition 2.1(ii). Then, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$d_{jM+l}(x) \leq d_n(\bar{x}) = d_{jM+l}(x) + j \leq 2d_{jM+l}(x).$$

By definition of A , we know that the sequence $((d_{jM+l}(x))^{1/(jM+l)})_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to e as $j \rightarrow \infty$ for any $l \in \{0, 1, \dots, M\}$, as a subsequence of $((d_n(x))^{1/n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. Hence,

for any $l \in \{0, 1, \dots, M\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} (d_n(\bar{x}))^{\frac{1}{n}} &\leq \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} (d_{jM+l}(x) + j)^{\frac{1}{j(M+1)+l}} \\ &\leq \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \left[(2d_{jM+l}(x))^{\frac{1}{jM+l}} \right]^{\frac{jM+l}{j(M+1)+l}} = e^{\frac{M}{M+1}} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (d_n(\bar{x}))^{\frac{1}{n}} &\geq \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} (d_{jM+l}(x) + j)^{\frac{1}{j(M+1)+l}} \\ &\geq \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \left[(d_{jM+l}(x))^{\frac{1}{jM+l}} \right]^{\frac{jM+l}{j(M+1)+l}} = e^{\frac{M}{M+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $(d_n(\bar{x}))^{1/n} \rightarrow e^{M/(M+1)} \neq e$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and this proves the claim. \blacksquare

For any $x, y \in \mathbb{I}$, define

$$\rho(x, y) := \inf\{k \in \mathbb{N} : (f(x))^{(k)} \neq (f(y))^{(k)}\} = \inf\{k \in \mathbb{N} : d_k(x) \neq d_k(y)\},$$

with the convention $\inf \emptyset := \infty$. Put $\sigma = (\sigma_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}} := f(x)$ and $\tau = (\tau_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}} := f(y)$. If $x \neq y$, then $\sigma \neq \tau$ since f is injective by Proposition 2.3, so that there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\sigma^{(k-1)} = \tau^{(k-1)}$ and $\sigma_k \neq \tau_k$. In such a case, as a non-empty subset of positive integers, the set for which the infimum is taken has a smallest element. Hence, ρ is well-defined.

We will derive lower and upper bounds for the distance between two distinct irrational numbers x and y in terms of their Pierce expansion digits.

Claim 4. *Let $x, y \in \mathbb{I}$ with $x \neq y$, and put $n := \rho(x, y)$, which is finite. If $d_n(x) < d_n(y)$, then*

$$(3.3) \quad \left(\prod_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{d_k} \right) \frac{1}{d_n(y)(d_{n+1}(y) + 1)} \leq |x - y| \leq \prod_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{d_k},$$

where $d_k := d_k(x) = d_k(y)$ for each $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$, with the convention that the product over the empty set equals one.

Proof of Claim 4. By definition of n , we have $d_k(x) = d_k(y)$ for each $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$, so that we may write the common value as d_k .

Put $\sigma := f(x)$ and $\tau := f(y)$. Then, both σ and τ are elements of Σ_∞ by Proposition 2.3. Also observe that $\tau^{(n)} \in \Sigma_n$ and $\tau^{(n+1)} \in \Sigma_{n+1}$. By the definition of $I(\sigma)$, we have that $y \in I(\tau^{(n+1)}) \subseteq I(\tau^{(n)})$ but $x \notin I(\tau^{(n)})$. Consider all the endpoints of $I(\tau^{(n)})$ and $I(\tau^{(n+1)})$. Then, exactly two of them, $\varphi(\tau^{(n)})$ and $\varphi(\widehat{\tau^{(n+1)}})$, lie between x and y , while the other two, $\varphi(\widehat{\tau^{(n)}})$ and $\varphi(\tau^{(n+1)})$, do not. Indeed,

Proposition 2.5 and the assumption $d_n(x) < d_n(y)$ tell us that

$$\begin{cases} \varphi(\widehat{\tau^{(n)}}) < \varphi(\tau^{(n+1)}) < y < \varphi(\widehat{\tau^{(n+1)}}) < \varphi(\tau^{(n)}) \leq \varphi(\widehat{\sigma^{(n)}}) < x, & \text{if } n \text{ is odd;} \\ \varphi(\widehat{\tau^{(n)}}) > \varphi(\tau^{(n+1)}) > y > \varphi(\widehat{\tau^{(n+1)}}) > \varphi(\tau^{(n)}) \geq \varphi(\widehat{\sigma^{(n)}}) > x, & \text{if } n \text{ is even.} \end{cases}$$

By noting that $\tau^{(n)}$ and $\widehat{\tau^{(n+1)}}$ share the initial n terms, $(d_k(y))_{k=1}^n$, we obtain, by the definition of φ , that

$$|x - y| \geq |\varphi(\tau^{(n)}) - \varphi(\widehat{\tau^{(n+1)}})| = \left(\prod_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{d_k} \right) \frac{1}{d_n(y)(d_{n+1}(y) + 1)}$$

On the other hand, since $\varphi(\sigma) = (\varphi \circ f)(x) = x$ and $\varphi(\tau) = (\varphi \circ f)(y) = y$ by Proposition 2.3 and since $\sigma^{(n-1)} = \tau^{(n-1)}$ by the definition of n , we have

$$\begin{aligned} |x - y| &= |[\varphi(\sigma) - \varphi(\sigma^{(n-1)})] - [\varphi(\tau) - \varphi(\tau^{(n-1)})]| \\ &\leq |\varphi(\sigma) - \varphi(\sigma^{(n-1)})| + |\varphi(\tau) - \varphi(\tau^{(n-1)})| \\ &\leq \left(\prod_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{d_k} \right) \left(\frac{1}{d_n(x)} + \frac{1}{d_n(y)} \right) < \prod_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{d_k}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used Proposition 2.6 for the second inequality. ■

Recall that $M > N$ and, in particular, $M \geq 2$. Let

$$\varepsilon := \frac{12}{M} \quad \text{and} \quad c := 4^{6M(M+1)}.$$

For later use, we note that

$$(3.4) \quad \varepsilon > \frac{1}{M \log M - 1} \quad \text{and} \quad c > 2e \cdot 4^{M(M+1)}.$$

Indeed, one can check by direct calculation that the former inequality holds when $M = 2$. For $M \geq 3$, we have $M \log M > 2$ and $\log M > 1$ so that $(M \log M - 1)^{-1} < 6(M \log M - 1)^{-1} < 12(M \log M)^{-1} < 12M^{-1} = \varepsilon$. For the latter, it is enough to notice that $4^{5M(M+1)} > 4^{2 \cdot 3} > 2e$.

Claim 5. *For any $x, y \in A$, we have*

$$|g(x) - g(y)| \geq c^{-1} |x - y|^{1+3\varepsilon}.$$

Proof of Claim 5. If $x = y$, the inequality holds trivially. Suppose $x \neq y$, and let $n := \rho(x, y) < \infty$. Then, $d_k(x) = d_k(y)$ for each $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$, and we denote the common value by d_k . Without loss of generality, we may assume $d_n(x) < d_n(y)$. Put $\bar{x} := g(x)$ and $\bar{y} := g(y)$. By injectivity of g , it follows that $\bar{x} \neq \bar{y}$. Put $r := \rho(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) < \infty$. Then $d_k(\bar{x}) = d_k(\bar{y})$ for each $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, r-1\}$, and it is clear that $d_r(\bar{x}) < d_r(\bar{y})$. We break down the proof into two cases depending on the size of n .

CASE I. Assume $n \leq 2M$. Then, $r \leq 2M + 1$ by (3.2), and this implies that $d_{r+1}(\bar{y}) \leq d_{2M+2}(\bar{y})$ by Proposition 2.1(i). Using the lower bound in (3.3), together with (3.2), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\bar{x} - \bar{y}| &\geq \left(\prod_{k=1}^r \frac{1}{d_k(\bar{y})} \right) \frac{1}{d_{r+1}(\bar{y}) + 1} \geq \left(\prod_{k=1}^{2M+1} \frac{1}{d_k(\bar{y})} \right) \frac{1}{d_{2M+2}(\bar{y}) + 1} \\ &= \left(\prod_{k=1}^M \frac{1}{d_k(y)} \right) \frac{1}{d_M(y) + 1} \left(\prod_{k=M+1}^{2M} \frac{1}{d_k(y) + 1} \right) \frac{1}{d_{2M}(y) + 3}. \end{aligned}$$

But, since $y \in A$ and $M > N$, Proposition 2.1(i) and (3.1) tell us that $d_1(y) < d_2(y) < \dots < d_M(y) < 4^M$ and $d_k(y) < 4^k$ for each $k \in \{M + 1, M + 2, \dots, 2M\}$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} |\bar{x} - \bar{y}| &\geq \left(\prod_{k=1}^M \frac{1}{4^M} \right) \frac{1}{4^M + 1} \left(\prod_{k=M+1}^{2M} \frac{1}{4^k + 1} \right) \frac{1}{4^{2M} + 3} \\ &> \left(\frac{1}{4^{2M} + 3} \right)^{2M+2} > \left(\frac{1}{4^{3M}} \right)^{2M+2} = \frac{1}{4^{6M(M+1)}} = c^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, since $|x - y| \leq 1$ and $1 + 3\varepsilon > 1$, it follows that $|\bar{x} - \bar{y}| \geq c^{-1}|x - y|^{1+3\varepsilon}$.

CASE II. Assume $pM < n \leq (p + 1)M$ for some positive integer $p \geq 2$. Then, $p(M + 1) + 1 \leq r \leq p(M + 1) + M$ by (3.2). To obtain a lower bound for $|\bar{x} - \bar{y}|$ by using (3.3), we first find that $d_{r+1}(\bar{y}) \leq d_{n+1}(y) + p$ by considering two cases:

- If $pM < n < (p + 1)M$, then

$$d_r(\bar{y}) = d_n(y) + p \quad \text{and} \quad d_{r+1}(\bar{y}) = d_{n+1}(y) + p.$$

- If $n = (p + 1)M$, then, since $d_n(y) + 1 \leq d_{n+1}(y)$ by Proposition 2.1(i), we have

$$d_r(\bar{y}) = d_n(y) + p \quad \text{and} \quad d_{r+1}(\bar{y}) = d_n(y) + (p + 1) \leq d_{n+1}(y) + p.$$

(See the two rightmost columns in (3.2).)

So, by the lower bound in (3.3), (3.2), and the bound for $d_{r+1}(\bar{y}) + 1$ obtained above, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\bar{x} - \bar{y}| &\geq \left(\prod_{k=1}^r \frac{1}{d_k(\bar{y})} \right) \frac{1}{d_{r+1}(\bar{y}) + 1} \\ &= \left(\prod_{k=1}^{p(M+1)} \frac{1}{d_k(\bar{y})} \right) \left(\prod_{k=p(M+1)+1}^r \frac{1}{d_k(\bar{y})} \right) \frac{1}{d_{r+1}(\bar{y}) + 1} \\ &\geq \left[\left(\prod_{k=1}^M \frac{1}{d_k(y)} \right) \frac{1}{d_M(y) + 1} \right] \left[\left(\prod_{k=M+1}^{2M} \frac{1}{d_k(y) + 1} \right) \frac{1}{d_{2M}(y) + 2} \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \times \cdots \times \left[\left(\prod_{k=(p-1)M+1}^{pM} \frac{1}{d_k(y) + (p-1)} \right) \frac{1}{d_{pM}(y) + p} \right] \\ & \times \left(\prod_{k=pM+1}^n \frac{1}{d_k(y) + p} \right) \frac{1}{d_{n+1}(y) + (p+1)}, \end{aligned}$$

or, equivalently,

$$\begin{aligned} (3.5) \quad |\bar{x} - \bar{y}| & \geq \prod_{j=0}^{p-1} \left[\left(\prod_{l=1}^M \frac{1}{d_{jM+l} + j} \right) \frac{1}{d_{(j+1)M} + (j+1)} \right] \\ & \times \left(\prod_{k=pM+1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{d_k + p} \right) \frac{1}{(d_n(y) + p)(d_{n+1}(y) + p + 1)}. \end{aligned}$$

We first investigate the term in the square brackets in (3.5) by considering two cases depending on the value of j . For $j = 0$, we have $d_1(y) < d_2(y) < \cdots < d_M(y) < 4^M$ by Proposition 2.1(i) and (3.1), so that

$$\begin{aligned} (3.6) \quad \left(\prod_{l=1}^M \frac{1}{d_l(y)} \right) \frac{1}{d_M(y) + 1} & > \left(\prod_{l=1}^M \frac{1}{4^M} \right) \frac{1}{4^M + 1} \\ & > \frac{1}{4^{M \cdot M}} \cdot \frac{1}{4^M + 4^M} = \frac{1}{2 \cdot 4^{M(M+1)}}. \end{aligned}$$

Fix $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, p-1\}$. Since $y \in A$ and $(j+1)M > M$, we have, by (3.1), that

$$\begin{aligned} (3.7) \quad d_{(j+1)M}(y) + (j+1) & < 4^{(j+1)M} + (j+1) \\ & < 4^{(j+1)M} + 4^{(j+1)M} = 2^{2jM+(2M+1)} \\ & < 2^{2jM+4jM} = 4^{3jM}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, note that

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon = \frac{12}{M} & > \frac{12}{2M + \frac{M+1}{j}} = \frac{6jM}{jM^2 + \frac{M(M+1)}{2}} = \frac{3jM}{\sum_{l=1}^M (jM+l)} \cdot \frac{\log 4}{\log 2} \\ & = \frac{3jM \log 4}{\sum_{l=1}^M \log(2^{jM+l})} > \frac{3jM \log 4}{\sum_{l=1}^M \log(2^{jM+l} + j)} = \frac{3jM \log 4}{\log \left(\prod_{l=1}^M (2^{jM+l} + j) \right)}, \end{aligned}$$

and so,

$$3jM \log 4 < \varepsilon \log \left(\prod_{l=1}^M (2^{jM+l} + j) \right),$$

or, equivalently,

$$(3.8) \quad 4^{3jM} < \left(\prod_{l=1}^M (2^{jM+l} + j) \right)^\varepsilon.$$

Hence, (3.7) and (3.8), in conjunction with (3.1), lead us to

$$d_{(j+1)M}(y) + (j+1) < \left(\prod_{l=1}^M (2^{jM+l} + j) \right)^\varepsilon < \left(\prod_{l=1}^M (d_{jM+l}(y) + j) \right)^\varepsilon,$$

and thus, we obtain a lower bound for the square-bracketed term in (3.5) for each $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, p-1\}$:

$$(3.9) \quad \left(\prod_{l=1}^M \frac{1}{d_{jM+l} + j} \right) \frac{1}{d_{(j+1)M} + (j+1)} > \left(\prod_{l=1}^M \frac{1}{d_{jM+l} + j} \right)^{1+\varepsilon}.$$

Next, we find a lower bound for the rightmost term $[(d_n(y) + p)(d_{n+1}(y) + p + 1)]^{-1}$ in (3.5). By (3.1), we first have that

$$(d_n(y) + p)(d_{n+1}(y) + p + 1) < (4^n + p)(4^{n+1} + p + 1).$$

Since $pM < n$, it is clear that $p < n$, and so, $p < 4^n$ and $p + 1 < 4^{n+1}$. Then,

$$(3.10) \quad (d_n(y) + p)(d_{n+1}(y) + p + 1) < (2 \cdot 4^n)(2 \cdot 4^{n+1}) = 4^{2n+2} \leq 4^{3n}.$$

Now, note that since $p \geq 2$ and $pM + 1 \leq n \leq (p+1)M$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon = \frac{12}{M} &> \frac{12}{(p-1)M+1} = \frac{6(M+pM)}{\frac{M+pM}{2} \cdot (pM - (M-1))} = \frac{3(p+1)M}{\sum_{k=M}^{pM} k} \cdot \frac{\log 4}{\log 2} \\ &\geq \frac{3n}{\sum_{k=M}^{n-1} k} \cdot \frac{\log 4}{\log 2} = \frac{3n \log 4}{\log \left(\prod_{k=M}^{n-1} 2^k \right)}, \end{aligned}$$

and so,

$$(3.11) \quad 3n \log 4 \leq \varepsilon \log \left(\prod_{k=M}^{n-1} 2^k \right), \quad \text{or, equivalently,} \quad 4^{3n} \leq \left(\prod_{k=M}^{n-1} 2^k \right)^\varepsilon.$$

Hence, (3.10) and (3.11), together with (3.1), yield

$$(d_n(y) + p)(d_{n+1}(y) + p + 1) \leq \left(\prod_{k=M}^{n-1} 2^k \right)^\varepsilon \leq \left(\prod_{k=M}^{n-1} d_k(y) \right)^\varepsilon,$$

and therefore,

$$(3.12) \quad \frac{1}{(d_n(y) + p)(d_{n+1}(y) + p + 1)} \geq \left(\prod_{k=M}^{n-1} \frac{1}{d_k} \right)^\varepsilon \geq \left(\prod_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{d_k} \right)^\varepsilon.$$

Putting (3.5), (3.6), (3.9), and (3.12) altogether, we now have

$$|\bar{x} - \bar{y}| \geq \frac{1}{2 \cdot 4^{M(M+1)}} \left[\prod_{j=1}^{p-1} \left(\prod_{l=1}^M \frac{1}{d_{jM+l} + j} \right)^{1+\varepsilon} \right] \left(\prod_{k=pM+1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{d_k + p} \right) \left(\prod_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{d_k} \right)^\varepsilon.$$

But, by Proposition 2.1(ii), for all $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, p-1\}$ and $l \in \{1, 2, \dots, M\}$, we have $jM < jM + l \leq d_{jM+l}$, which implies

$$d_{jM+l} + j < d_{jM+l} + \frac{1}{M}d_{jM+l} = \left(1 + \frac{1}{M}\right) d_{jM+l}.$$

Similarly, for all $k \in \{pM+1, pM+2, \dots, n-1\}$, we have $pM < k \leq d_k$, and this implies $d_k + p < (1 + M^{-1})d_k$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} |\bar{x} - \bar{y}| &\geq \frac{1}{2 \cdot 4^{M(M+1)}} \left[\prod_{j=1}^{p-1} \left(\prod_{l=1}^M \frac{1}{(1 + M^{-1})d_{jM+l}} \right)^{1+\varepsilon} \right] \\ &\quad \times \left(\prod_{k=pM+1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{(1 + M^{-1})d_k} \right) \left(\prod_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{d_k} \right)^\varepsilon \\ &= \frac{1}{2 \cdot 4^{M(M+1)}} \left[\prod_{j=1}^{p-1} \left(\frac{1}{(1 + M^{-1})^M} \prod_{k=jM+1}^{(j+1)M} \frac{1}{d_k} \right)^{1+\varepsilon} \right] \frac{1}{(1 + M^{-1})^{n-1-pM}} \\ &\quad \times \left(\prod_{k=pM+1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{d_k} \right) \left[\left(\prod_{k=1}^M \frac{1}{d_k} \right)^\varepsilon \left(\prod_{k=M+1}^{pM} \frac{1}{d_k} \right)^\varepsilon \left(\prod_{k=pM+1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{d_k} \right)^\varepsilon \right] \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2 \cdot 4^{M(M+1)}} \frac{1}{(1 + M^{-1})^M} \left(\prod_{k=1}^M \frac{1}{d_k} \right)^\varepsilon \\ (3.13) \quad &\quad \times \left[\prod_{j=1}^{p-1} \left(\frac{1}{(1 + M^{-1})^{M(1+\varepsilon)}} \left(\prod_{k=jM+1}^{(j+1)M} \frac{1}{d_k} \right)^{1+2\varepsilon} \right) \right] \left(\prod_{k=pM+1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{d_k} \right)^{1+\varepsilon}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds true since $n-1 < (p+1)M$ by the assumption for CASE II.

We estimate each term of the product in the square-bracketed part in (3.13). Fix $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, p-1\}$. Recall from (3.4) that $\varepsilon > (M \log M - 1)^{-1}$. Since $k \leq d_k$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ by Proposition 2.1(ii), we have

$$\varepsilon > \frac{1}{M \log M - 1} = \frac{1}{\sum_{l=1}^M \log M - 1} > \frac{1}{\sum_{l=1}^M \log(jM + l) - 1}$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{\sum_{l=1}^M \log d_{jM+l} - 1} = \frac{1}{\sum_{k=jM+1}^{(j+1)M} \log d_k - 1} = \frac{1}{\log \left(\prod_{k=jM+1}^{(j+1)M} d_k \right) - 1},$$

and so

$$1 + \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon \log \left(\prod_{k=jM+1}^{(j+1)M} d_k \right), \quad \text{or, equivalently,} \quad e^{1+\varepsilon} \leq \left(\prod_{k=jM+1}^{(j+1)M} d_k \right)^\varepsilon.$$

By making use of the well-known fact that

$$(3.14) \quad \left(1 + \frac{1}{n} \right)^n \leq e \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N},$$

it follows that

$$\left(1 + \frac{1}{M} \right)^{M(1+\varepsilon)} \leq \left(\prod_{k=jM+1}^{(j+1)M} d_k \right)^\varepsilon.$$

Hence, for any $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, p-1\}$, we have

$$(3.15) \quad \frac{1}{(1 + M^{-1})^{M(1+\varepsilon)}} \left(\prod_{k=jM+1}^{(j+1)M} \frac{1}{d_k} \right)^{1+2\varepsilon} \geq \left(\prod_{k=jM+1}^{(j+1)M} \frac{1}{d_k} \right)^{1+3\varepsilon}.$$

Therefore, on combining (3.13) and (3.15), we finally obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & |\bar{x} - \bar{y}| \\ & \geq \frac{1}{2 \cdot 4^{M(M+1)}} \frac{1}{(1 + M^{-1})^M} \left(\prod_{k=1}^M \frac{1}{d_k} \right)^\varepsilon \left(\prod_{k=M+1}^{pM} \frac{1}{d_k} \right)^{1+3\varepsilon} \left(\prod_{k=pM+1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{d_k} \right)^{1+\varepsilon} \\ & \geq \frac{1}{2e \cdot 4^{M(M+1)}} \left(\prod_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{d_k(y)} \right)^{1+3\varepsilon} \geq c^{-1} |x - y|^{1+3\varepsilon}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from (3.14) and the last from (3.4) and the upper bound in (3.3). \blacksquare

Denote the inverse map of $g: A \rightarrow \mathbb{I}$ on $g(A)$ by $g^{-1}: g(A) \rightarrow A$. Then, $1 = \dim_{\mathbb{H}} A = \dim_{\mathbb{H}} g^{-1}(g(A))$ by Claim 1. Note that, by Claim 5, we have

$$|g^{-1}(\bar{x}) - g^{-1}(\bar{y})| \leq c^{1/(1+3\varepsilon)} |\bar{x} - \bar{y}|^{1/(1+3\varepsilon)},$$

for all $\bar{x}, \bar{y} \in g(A)$, which shows that g^{-1} is $[1/(1+3\varepsilon)]$ -Hölder continuous. Hence, Proposition 2.7 tells us that $\dim_{\mathbb{H}} g^{-1}(g(A)) \leq (1+3\varepsilon) \dim_{\mathbb{H}} g(A)$, and so, $\dim_{\mathbb{H}}$

$g(A) \geq 1/(1 + 3\varepsilon)$. Since $E \supseteq g(A)$ due to Claim 3, by the monotonicity property of the Hausdorff dimension (see [6, p. 48]), it follows that

$$\dim_{\text{H}} E \geq \dim_{\text{H}} g(A) \geq \frac{1}{1 + 3\varepsilon} = \frac{1}{1 + (36/M)}.$$

Since $M (> N)$ can be chosen arbitrarily large, it follows that $\dim_{\text{H}} E \geq 1$, as was to be shown. \square

Remark 3.1. Our definition of \bar{x} in (3.2) is different from that in Wu's [25] original work for the LLN in Engel expansions. This was inevitable because the constructed expansion in [25] satisfies only the non-decreasing condition but not the strict increasing condition for digits, and hence, it is not Pierce realizable in light of Proposition 2.2. That is to say, the expression considered in [25] cannot be a Pierce expansion of any number. However, a slight modification allowed us to follow a similar argument. We further note that Proposition 2.1(ii), which does not hold for Engel expansions, played a crucial role in our proof.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. W. Ahn, *On the error-sum function of Pierce expansions*, J. Fractal Geom. **10** (2023), 389–421.
- [2] M. W. Ahn, *Hausdorff dimensions in Pierce expansions*, to appear in Acta Arith., arXiv:2304.14162v1 (2023).
- [3] E. de Amo, M. Díaz Carillo, & J. Fernández-Sánchez, *A study of topological conjugacies between alternate representation systems*, Rev. R. Acad. Cienc. Exactas Fís. Nat. Ser. A Mat. RACSAM **116** (2022), Paper No. 136, 26 pp.
- [4] P. Erdős, A. Rényi, & P. Szüsz, *On Engel's and Sylvester's series*, Ann. Univ. Sci. Budapest. Eötvös Sect. Math. **1** (1958), 7–32.
- [5] P. Erdős & J. O. Shallit, *New bounds on the length of finite Pierce and Engel series*, Sémin. Théor. Nombres Bordeaux **3** (1991), 43–53.
- [6] K. Falconer, *Fractal Geometry: Mathematical Foundations and Applications*, 3rd ed., John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Chichester, 2014.
- [7] L. Fang, *Large and moderate deviation principles for alternating Engel expansions*, J. Number Theory **156** (2015), 263–276.
- [8] L. Fang & M. Wu, *Hausdorff dimension of certain sets arising in Engel expansions*, Nonlinearity **31** (2018), 2105–2125.
- [9] J. Galambos, *Representations of Real Numbers by Infinite Series*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 502, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1976.
- [10] Y.-Y. Liu & J. Wu, *Hausdorff dimensions in Engel expansions*, Acta Arith. **99** (2001), 79–83.
- [11] Y.-Y. Liu & J. Wu, *Some exceptional sets in Engel expansions*, Nonlinearity **16** (2003), 559–566.

- [12] M. Lü & J. Liu, *Hausdorff dimensions of some exceptional sets in Engel expansions*, J. Number Theory **185** (2018), 490–498.
- [13] J. Paradís, P. Viader, & L. Bibiloni, *Approximation of quadratic irrationals and their Pierce expansions*, Fibonacci Quart. **36** (1998), 146–153.
- [14] T. A. Pierce, *On an algorithm and its use in approximating roots of an algebraic equation*, Amer. Math. Monthly **36** (1929), 523–525.
- [15] E. Ya. Remez, *On series with alternating sign which may be connected with two algorithms of M. V. Ostrogradskiĭ for the approximation of irrational numbers*, (Russian), Uspehi Matem. Nauk (N.S.) **6** (1951), 33–42.
- [16] F. Schweiger, *Ergodic Theory of Fibred Systems and Metric Number Theory*, Oxford Sci. Publ., The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1995.
- [17] J. O. Shallit, *Some predictable Pierce expansions*, Fibonacci Quart. **22** (1984), 332–335.
- [18] J. O. Shallit, *Metric theory of Pierce expansions*, Fibonacci Quart. **24** (1986), 22–40.
- [19] J. O. Shallit, *Pierce expansions and rules for the determination of leap years*, Fibonacci Quart. **32** (1994), 416–423.
- [20] L. Shang & M. Wu, *Slow growth rate of the digits in Engel expansions*, Fractals **28** (2020), 2050047.
- [21] L. Shang & M. Wu, *On the growth speed of digits in Engel expansions*, J. Number Theory **219** (2021), 368–385.
- [22] L.-M. Shen, *A further discussion of the Hausdorff dimension in Engel expansions*, Acta Arith. **143** (2010), 271–276.
- [23] J. L. Varona, *The continued fraction expansion of certain Pierce series*, J. Number Theory **180** (2017), 573–578.
- [24] P. Viader, L. Bibiloni, & J. Paradís, *On a problem of Alfréd Rényi*, Acta Arith. **91** (1999), 107–115.
- [25] J. Wu, *A problem of Galambos on Engel expansions*, Acta Arith. **92** (2000), 383–386.
- [26] J. Wu, *How many points have the same Engel and Sylvester expansions?*, J. Number Theory **103** (2003), 16–26.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SUNY AT BUFFALO, BUFFALO, NY 14260-2900, USA
Email address: minwoong@buffalo.edu