

AN UNCOUNTABLE SUBRING OF  $\mathbb{R}$  WITH HAUSDORFF DIMENSION ZERO

STEPHAN BAIER AND SHAMEEK PAUL

ABSTRACT. We construct an uncountable subring of  $\mathbb{R}$  with Hausdorff dimension zero (and hence of Lebesgue measure zero).

We denote by  $\mathbb{N}_0$  the set of non-negative integers, by  $\mathbb{N}$  the set of positive integers and by  $\mathbb{Z}$  the set of integers. Let

$$S := \{0\} \cup \{2^n : n \in \mathbb{N}_0\} = \{0, 1, 2, 2^2, 2^3, \dots\}.$$

For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  by  $nS$ , we denote the  $n^{\text{th}}$  sumset of  $S$ , i.e.,

$$nS := \{s_1 + \dots + s_n : s_1, \dots, s_n \in S\}.$$

For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we define

$$A_n := \left\{ \sum_{k \in nS} \frac{x_k}{2^k} : (x_k)_{k \in nS} \text{ is a bounded sequence of integers} \right\}.$$

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . The set  $A_n$  is an uncountable subgroup of  $\mathbb{R}$ .*

*Proof.* We first show that  $A_n$  is a subgroup of  $\mathbb{R}$ . Trivially,  $0 \in A_n$  and  $-x \in A_n$  whenever  $x \in A_n$ . Thus, it suffices to show that  $A_n$  is closed under addition. Let  $x, y \in A_n$ . Therefore,

$$x = \sum_{k \in nS} \frac{x_k}{2^k} \quad \text{and} \quad y = \sum_{k \in nS} \frac{y_k}{2^k}$$

where  $(x_k)_{k \in nS}$  and  $(y_k)_{k \in nS}$  are bounded sequences of integers. It follows that

$$x + y = \sum_{k \in nS} \frac{x_k + y_k}{2^k}$$

is also an element of  $A_n$ .

Clearly, the set  $A_n$  is uncountable, because by the uniqueness of binary expansions which do not end with an infinite string of 1's, the set of real numbers of the form

$$\sum_{k \in nS} \frac{z_k}{2^k} \quad \text{with } z_k \in \{0, 1\}$$

is an uncountable subset of  $A_n$ . □

We now proceed to show that the set  $A_n$  has Hausdorff dimension zero for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  write

$$A_n := \bigcup_{t=1}^{\infty} A_{n,t}$$

where for every  $t \in \mathbb{N}$  we let

$$A_{n,t} := \left\{ \sum_{k \in nS} \frac{x_k}{2^k} \in \mathbb{R} : x_k \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ and } |x_k| \leq t \text{ for all } k \in nS \right\}.$$

We will need the following result to show that the set  $A_{n,t}$  has Hausdorff dimension zero for every  $n, t \in \mathbb{N}$ .

**Lemma 1.** *For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $z \geq 1$ , define*

$$g_n(z) := \#\{k \in nS : k \leq z\}.$$

*Then we have the bound*

$$g_n(z) \leq (2 + \log_2 z)^n.$$

*Proof.* Clearly, for every  $z \geq 1$ , we have

$$g_n(z) \leq g_1(z)^n \text{ and } g_1(z) \leq 2 + \log_2 z.$$

The result follows. □

**Theorem 2.** *The set  $A_{n,t}$  has Hausdorff dimension zero for all  $n, t \in \mathbb{N}$ .*

*Proof.* Write  $nS = \{k_m : m \in \mathbb{N}\}$  where  $(k_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$  is an increasing sequence. Let  $x \in nS$  and write

$$x = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_i}{2^{k_i}}$$

with  $a_i \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $|a_i| \leq t$ . Pick  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  and split  $x$  into

$$x = m_x + e_x,$$

where

$$m_x := \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} \frac{a_i}{2^{k_i}} \quad \text{and} \quad e_x := \sum_{i=j}^{\infty} \frac{a_i}{2^{k_i}}.$$

Then using the triangle inequality, we have the bound

$$|e_x| \leq t \sum_{i=j}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^{k_i}} \leq t \sum_{h=k_j}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^h} = \frac{t}{2^{k_j-1}}.$$

Let  $r_j = t/2^{k_j-1}$ . It follows that

$$A_{n,t} \subseteq \bigcup_{m \in X} I_m,$$

where

$$X := \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} \frac{a_i}{2^{k_i}} : a_i \in \mathbb{Z}, |a_i| \leq t \right\}$$

and

$$I_m := [m - r_j, m + r_j].$$

Then  $\#(X) \leq (2t+1)^{j-1}$  and for every  $m \in X$  we see that  $\mu(I_m) = 2r_j$  where  $\mu(I_m)$  is the length of the interval  $I_m$ .

Let  $d > 0$  be a real number, let  $\delta_j := 4r_j$ , and let  $\mathcal{H}_{\delta_j}^d(A_{n,t})$  be defined as in [2]. We see that

$$\mathcal{H}_{\delta_j}^d(A_{n,t}) \leq \sum_{m \in X} \mu(I_m)^d = \#(X)(2r_j)^d \leq \frac{(2t+1)^{j-1} t^d}{2^{(k_j-2)d}}.$$

We claim that

$$(1) \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(2t+1)^{j-1} t^d}{2^{(k_j-2)d}} = 0.$$

Since  $\delta_j \rightarrow 0$  as  $j \rightarrow \infty$ , this implies that  $\mathcal{H}^d(A_{n,t}) = 0$  where  $\mathcal{H}^d(A_{n,t})$  is the  $d$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure of  $A_{n,t}$ . (For the definition of this measure and related terms, see [2].) Since this holds for all  $d > 0$ , we conclude that the Hausdorff dimension of  $A_{n,t}$  is zero.

Equation (1) above is seen as follows. First, it is convenient to note that (1) holds if

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(3t)^j}{2^{k_j d}} = 0.$$

By taking logarithms, we see that (1) holds if

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} (k_j d - j \log_2(3t)) = \infty.$$

As  $d > 0$ , we let  $c$  be the constant  $(1/d) \log_2(3t)$  and we see that (1) holds if

$$(2) \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} (k_j - cj) = \infty.$$

Now using Lemma 1, we have

$$j = g_n(k_j) \leq (2 + \log_2 k_j)^n,$$

which implies

$$k_j \geq 2^{\sqrt[j]{j-2}}.$$

Hence, (2) follows, which justifies our claim.  $\square$

Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . From Theorems 1 and 2 it follows that the set  $A_n$  is an uncountable subgroup of  $\mathbb{R}$  of Hausdorff dimension zero. As  $0 \in S$ , we have  $nS \subseteq (n+1)S$ , and hence  $A_n \subseteq A_{n+1}$ . Let

$$A := \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n.$$

We deduce that the set  $A$  is an uncountable subgroup of  $\mathbb{R}$  of Hausdorff dimension zero. We aim to establish that  $A$  is in fact a subring. To this end, we need the following result.

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and let  $a_n(s)$  be the number of representations of an element  $s \in \mathbb{N}$  as a sum  $s = t_1 + t_2 + \dots + t_n$  of  $n$  elements  $t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n \in S$ . Then there exists  $c_n \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $a_n(s) \leq c_n$  for every  $s \in \mathbb{N}$ .*

*Proof.* Clearly  $a_1(s) \leq 1$  for every  $s \in \mathbb{N}$  and hence, we may take  $c_1 := 1$ . Now assume that  $n \geq 2$  and that there exists  $c_{n-1} \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $a_{n-1}(s) \leq c_{n-1}$  for every  $s \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $s \in \mathbb{N}$  and suppose

$$s = t_1 + \dots + t_n$$

is a representation of  $s$  as a sum of  $n$  elements of  $S$ . Then for at least one  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , we have  $t_i \geq s/n$  and hence  $t_i \neq 0$ . So there exists  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$  such that  $t_i = 2^k$ . As  $s/n \leq t_i \leq s$ , we observe that  $\log_2 s - \log_2 n \leq k \leq \log_2 s$ . So if

$$B_{n,s} := [\log_2 s - \log_2 n, \log_2 s] \cap \mathbb{N}_0,$$

then we see that

$$a_n(s) \leq n \sum_{k \in B_{n,s}} a_{n-1}(s - 2^k) \leq n(1 + \log_2 n)c_{n-1}.$$

So we are done by taking  $c_n := n(1 + \log_2 n)c_{n-1}$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 3.** *The set  $A$  is a subring of  $\mathbb{R}$ .*

*Proof.* It suffices to show that  $1 \in A$  and that  $A$  is closed under multiplication. We see that

$$1 = \frac{1}{2^0} + \sum_{k \in S \setminus \{0\}} \frac{0}{2^k} \in A_1.$$

To establish that  $A$  is closed under multiplication, we proceed as follows. Let  $x, y \in A$ . There exists  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $x \in A_m$  and  $y \in A_n$ . Therefore,

$$x = \sum_{k \in mS} \frac{x_k}{2^k} \quad \text{and} \quad y = \sum_{\ell \in nS} \frac{y_\ell}{2^\ell}$$

where  $(x_k)_{k \in mS}$  and  $(y_\ell)_{\ell \in nS}$  are bounded sequences of integers. Now

$$xy = \left( \sum_{k \in mS} \frac{x_k}{2^k} \right) \left( \sum_{\ell \in nS} \frac{y_\ell}{2^\ell} \right) = \sum_{(k,\ell) \in mS \times nS} \frac{x_k y_\ell}{2^{k+\ell}} = \sum_{r \in (m+n)S} \frac{z_r}{2^r}$$

where

$$z_r := \sum_{\substack{(k,\ell) \in mS \times nS \\ k+\ell=r}} x_k y_\ell.$$

The number of representations of an element  $r \in (m+n)S$  as a sum  $r = k + \ell$  of elements  $k \in mS$  and  $\ell \in nS$  is bounded by the number of representations of  $r$  which are of the form  $r = t_1 + t_2 + \dots + t_{m+n}$  where  $t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{m+n} \in S$ . Hence, we deduce that the sequence  $(z_r)_{r \in (m+n)S}$  is bounded as a consequence of Lemma 2 and the boundedness of the sequences  $(x_k)_{k \in mS}$  and  $(y_\ell)_{\ell \in nS}$ . It follows that  $xy \in A_{m+n}$ . This establishes that  $A$  is closed under multiplication.  $\square$

We now proceed to show that the only rational numbers in  $A$  are the dyadic rationals. In particular, it will follow that the ring  $A$  is not a field.

**Lemma 3.** *Let  $r, n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Write  $nS = \{k_m : m \in \mathbb{N}\}$  where  $(k_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$  is an increasing sequence. Then there exists  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $k_{m+1} - k_m > r$ .*

*Proof.* For every  $z \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $g_n(z) := \#\{k \in nS : k \leq z\}$ . If the conclusion is false, then  $g_n(z) \geq z/r$  for every  $z \in \mathbb{N}$ . This contradicts Lemma 1.  $\square$

**Proposition 1.** *Let  $x \in A$  and  $l \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then there exists a binary expansion of  $x$  which contains either a string of zeroes or a string of ones having length  $l$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $x \in A_{n,t}$ . Then there exists a sequence of integers  $(x_k)_{k \in nS}$  with  $|x_k| \leq t$  for all  $k \in nS$  such that

$$x = \sum_{k \in nS} \frac{x_k}{2^k} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{x_{k_i}}{2^{k_i}}.$$

Let  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . We observe that

$$2^{k_m} x = q_m + r_m$$

where

$$q_m := \sum_{i=0}^m 2^{k_m - k_i} x_{k_i} \text{ and } r_m := \sum_{i=m+1}^{\infty} \frac{x_{k_i}}{2^{k_i - k_m}}.$$

Then  $q_m \in \mathbb{Z}$  and we have

$$|r_m| \leq t \sum_{j=k_{m+1} - k_m}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^j} = \frac{2t}{2^{k_{m+1} - k_m}}.$$

By Lemma 3, there exists  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $2^{k_{m+1} - k_m} > 2^{l+1}t$  and so  $|r_m| < 1/2^l$ . Hence,

$$\text{frac}(2^{k_m} x) = \begin{cases} r_m, & \text{if } r_m \in [0, \frac{1}{2^l}); \\ 1 + r_m, & \text{if } r_m \in (-\frac{1}{2^l}, 0); \end{cases}$$

and so

$$\text{frac}(2^{k_m} x) \in [0, \frac{1}{2^l}) \cup (1 - \frac{1}{2^l}, 1),$$

where  $\text{frac}(z) := z - [z]$  is the fractional part of  $z \in \mathbb{R}$ . It follows that the digits after the dot in a binary expansion of  $x$  from the  $(k_m + 1)^{\text{th}}$  position to the  $(k_m + l)^{\text{th}}$  position are all equal.  $\square$

**Corollary 1.** *A number  $x \in A$  is rational if and only if there exists  $a \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$  such that  $x = a/2^k$ .*

*Proof.* From Proposition 1, we see that the ring  $A$  only contains those rational numbers which have a finite binary expansion. The result follows.  $\square$

**Remark 1.** The above construction of an uncountable subring of  $\mathbb{R}$  of Hausdorff dimension zero goes through if the initial set  $S = \{0, 1, 2, 2^2, 2^3, \dots\}$  is replaced by a set  $T \cup \{0\}$  where  $T$  is a subset of  $\mathbb{N}$  which has the following property: There exists  $b \in \mathbb{R}$  such that for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , the cardinality of the set  $\{\log t : t \in T\} \cap [n, n+1)$  is less than  $b$ .

**Acknowledgment:** We thank Prof. Shrikrishna G. Dani for sharing with us a preprint of [1] in which we see a different construction of an uncountable subgroup of  $\mathbb{R}$  having Hausdorff dimension zero.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Shrikrishna G. Dani, Measurable subgroups of real numbers, *Math. Stud.* **93** (2024), (to appear).
- [2] Kenneth Falconer, *Fractal geometry, Mathematical foundations and applications (Second Edition)*, John Wiley & Sons Inc., Hoboken, NJ, 2003.

STEPHAN BAIER, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, RAMAKRISHNA MISSION VIVEKANANDA EDUCATIONAL AND RESEARCH INSTITUTE, PO BELUR MATH, HOWRAH, WEST BENGAL 711202, INDIA

*Email address:* `stephanbaier2017@gmail.com`

SHAMEEK PAUL, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, RAMAKRISHNA MISSION VIVEKANANDA EDUCATIONAL AND RESEARCH INSTITUTE, PO BELUR MATH, HOWRAH, WEST BENGAL 711202, INDIA

*Email address:* `shameek.rkmvu@gmail.com`