

Multifractal analysis of maximal product of consecutive partial quotients in continued fractions

Kunkun Song^a, Dingding Yu^{b,*}, Yueli Yu^b

^aKey Laboratory of Computing and Stochastic Mathematics (Ministry of Education), School of Mathematics and Statistics, Hunan Normal University, Changsha, 410081, China

^bSchool of Mathematics and Statistics, Wuhan University, Wuhan 430072, China

Abstract

Let $[a_1(x), a_2(x), \dots, a_n(x), \dots]$ be the continued fraction expansion of an irrational number $x \in (0, 1)$. We study the growth rate of the maximal product of consecutive partial quotients among the first n terms, defined by $L_n(x) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{a_i(x)a_{i+1}(x)\}$, from the viewpoint of multifractal analysis. More precisely, we determine the Hausdorff dimension of the level set

$$L(\varphi) := \left\{ x \in (0, 1) : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{L_n(x)}{\varphi(n)} = 1 \right\},$$

where $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is an increasing function such that $\log \varphi$ is a regularly increasing function with index ρ . We show that there exists a jump of the Hausdorff dimension of $L(\varphi)$ when $\rho = 1/2$. We also construct uncountably many discontinuous functions ψ that cause the Hausdorff dimension of $L(\psi)$ to transition continuously from 1 to $1/2$, filling the gap when $\rho = 1/2$.

Keywords: continued fractions, products of consecutive partial quotients, Hausdorff dimension
2010 MSC: 11K50, 28A80

1. Introduction

Each irrational number $x \in (0, 1)$ admits a unique infinite continued fraction expansion given by

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

where $a_1(x), \dots, a_n(x), \dots$ are positive integers, called the partial quotients of x . For any $n \geq 1$, let

$$\frac{p_n(x)}{p_n(x)} := [a_1(x), \dots, a_n(x)] \tag{1.1}$$

*corresponding author

Email addresses: songkunkun@hunnu.edu.cn (Kunkun Song), Yudding_sgr@whu.edu.cn (Dingding Yu), yuyueli@whu.edu.cn (Yueli Yu)

be the n -th convergent of x . For basic properties of continued fractions, we refer to [15, 21] and the references therein.

The theory of continued fractions is closely related to the theory of Diophantine approximation, which studies how well a real number can be approximated by rational numbers. The approximation rate of the sequence of convergents is described by

$$\frac{1}{3a_{n+1}(x)q_n^2(x)} \leq \left| x - \frac{p_n(x)}{q_n(x)} \right| \leq \frac{1}{a_{n+1}(x)q_n^2(x)}.$$

This indicates that the asymptotic Diophantine properties of $x \in (0, 1)$ are reflected in the growth rate of its partial quotients. Regarding the uniform Diophantine properties, the first result is Dirichlet's theorem.

Theorem 1.1. (*Dirichlet, 1842*) *For any $x \in (0, 1)$ and $t > 1$, there exists $(p, q) \in \mathbb{N}^2$ such that*

$$|qx - p| \leq 1/t \text{ and } 1 \leq q < t.$$

It follows that for any $x \in (0, 1)$, there exist infinitely many solutions $(p, q) \in \mathbb{N}^2$ such that $|qx - p| < 1/q$. Continued fractions provide a straightforward method for finding these “good” rational approximations p/q . In other words, we have

$$\min_{p \in \mathbb{N}, 1 \leq q \leq q_n(x)} \left| x - \frac{p}{q} \right| = \left| x - \frac{p_n(x)}{q_n(x)} \right|.$$

Given $t_0 \geq 1$, let $\Psi : [t_0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ be a non-increasing function. Let $\mathcal{D}(\Psi)$ denote the set of Ψ -Dirichlet improvable numbers, that is, the set of all $x \in (0, 1)$ for which there exists $T > t_0$ such that for every $t > T$, the inequalities

$$|qx - p| < \Psi(t) \text{ and } 1 \leq q < t,$$

have non-trivial solutions $(p, q) \in \mathbb{N}^2$. Elements of the complementary set, denoted by $\mathcal{D}^c(\Psi)$, are called Ψ -Dirichlet non-improvable numbers. The study of the metrical properties of $\mathcal{D}(\Psi)$ goes back to the work of Davenport and Schmidt [6, Theorem 1], who proved that, for any $0 < c < 1$, the set $\mathcal{D}(c/t)$ is contained in a union of the set of rational numbers and the set of irrational numbers with uniformly bounded partial quotients. Recently, Kleinbock and Wadleigh [22, Theorem 1.8] established a zero-one law for the Lebesgue measure of $\mathcal{D}^c(\Psi)$. Additionally, assuming $t\Psi(t) < 1$ for all $t \geq t_0$, Kleinbock and Wadleigh [22, Lemma 2.2] provided a useful criterion, using continued fractions, to determine whether a real number belongs to $\mathcal{D}(\Psi)$.

Theorem 1.2. ([22, Lemma 2.2]) *Let $x \in (0, 1) \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ and $\tilde{\Psi}(t) := t\Psi(t)(1 - t\Psi(t))^{-1}$. Then*

- (1) *x is a Ψ -Dirichlet improvable number if $a_n(x)a_{n+1}(x) \leq \frac{\tilde{\Psi}(q_n)}{4}$ for all sufficiently large n .*
- (2) *x is a Ψ -Dirichlet non-improvable number if $a_n(x)a_{n+1}(x) > \tilde{\Psi}(q_n)$ for infinitely many n .*

Subsequently, Hussain, Kleinbock, Wadleigh, and Wang [14] established a zero-infinity law for the set $\mathcal{D}^c(\Psi)$ in the sense of g -dimensional Hausdorff measure, where g is an essentially sub-linear dimension function. Bos, Hussain and Simmons [4] subsequently generalized the Hausdorff measure of $\mathcal{D}^c(\Psi)$ to all dimension functions under natural, non-restrictive conditions. The results of Theorem 1.2 imply that

$$\begin{aligned} \{x \in (0, 1) : a_n(x)a_{n+1}(x) \geq \tilde{\Psi}(q_n(x)) \text{ for infinitely many } n \in \mathbb{N}\} &\subseteq \mathcal{D}^c(\Psi) \\ &\subseteq \{x \in (0, 1) : a_n(x)a_{n+1}(x) \geq 4^{-1}\tilde{\Psi}(q_n(x)) \text{ for infinitely many } n \in \mathbb{N}\}. \end{aligned}$$

This demonstrates that the behavior of the product of consecutive partial quotients is crucial in studying the set of Dirichlet non-improvable numbers. Later on, many interests have been drawn to the growth rate of the product of consecutive partial quotients from various perspectives. See Huang, Wu and Xu [13], Bakhravar and Feng [1], Bakhravar, Hussain, Kleinbock and Wang [2], Fang, Ma, Song and Yang [10] for example.

In another direction, inspired by the works of Khinchin [20] and Diamond and Vaaler [7], Hu, Hussain, and Yu [12] investigated metrical properties related to the sum and the maximum of the product of consecutive partial quotients, defined by

$$S_n(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i(x)a_{i+1}(x) \quad \text{and} \quad L_n(x) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{a_i(x)a_{i+1}(x)\}.$$

In particular, they proved that $S_n(x)/(n \log^2 n)$ converges to $1/(2 \log 2)$ in Lebesgue measure. For the strong law of large numbers, a similar approach to that used by Philipp [28] can show that there is no reasonably regular function such that the ratio of the sum $S_n(x)$ to the function converges to a finite nonzero constant for Lebesgue almost all $x \in (0, 1)$. However, a result of Hu et al. [12] shows that the maximum $L_n(x)$ is responsible for the failure of the strong law of large numbers.

Theorem 1.3. ([12, Theorem 1.5]) *For Lebesgue almost all $x \in (0, 1)$, we have*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{S_n(x) - L_n(x)}{n \log^2 n} = \frac{1}{2 \log 2}.$$

Hu et al. [12] also showed that for Lebesgue almost all $x \in (0, 1)$,

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{L_n(x) \log \log n}{n \log n} = \frac{1}{2 \log 2}.$$

Then, it is natural to study the points for which $L_n(x)$ grows at different rates. More precisely, we are interested in the Hausdorff dimension of the level set

$$L(\varphi) := \left\{ x \in (0, 1) : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{L_n(x)}{\varphi(n)} = 1 \right\},$$

where $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is an increasing function such that $\log \varphi$ is a regularly increasing function with index ρ . Before stating our main results, we shall introduce some classes of functions with different growth rates, representing typical cases of regularly varying functions as described in [3].

Definition 1.1. *Let $c > 0$ be a constant. A function $f \in C^1([c, \infty))$ is said to be a regularly increasing function with index ρ if $f(x) > 0$, $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} f(x) = \infty$, $f'(x) > 0$, and*

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{x f'(x)}{f(x)} = \rho \in [0, \infty]. \quad (1.2)$$

The definition and principal properties of regularly increasing functions are due to Karamata [18] in the case of continuous functions, and to Korevaar, van Aardenne-Ehrenfest and de Bruijn [23] in the case of measurable functions. Regularly increasing functions frequently arise in number theory and probability theory. Jakimczuk [16] employed regularly increasing functions with index 0 to study the asymptotic behavior of Bell numbers. Chang and Chen [5, Theorem 1.2] determined the Hausdorff dimension of level sets associated with the growth rate of the maximum of partial quotients among the first n terms for regularly

increasing functions with index 0. This result was recently extended by Fang and Liu [9] to cover index $\rho \in [0, 1/2) \cup (1/2, \infty]$. Our results reveal that the Hausdorff dimension of $L(\varphi)$ decreases continuously from 1 to 0 in a certain sense, depending on the index ρ of the regularly increasing function $\log \varphi$. In what follows, we use the notation \dim_{H} to denote the Hausdorff dimension.

Now, we are in a position to state the main results.

Theorem 1.4. *Let $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ be an increasing function such that $\log \varphi$ is a regularly increasing function with index ρ . Then we have*

- (1) $\dim_{\text{H}} L(\varphi) = 1$, if $0 \leq \rho < 1/2$,
- (2) $\dim_{\text{H}} L(\varphi) = 1/2$, if $1/2 < \rho \leq 1$,
- (3) $\dim_{\text{H}} L(\varphi) = \frac{1}{1+\beta}$, if $1 < \rho \leq \infty$, where β is given by

$$\beta := \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \varphi(n+1) + \log \varphi(n-1) + \cdots + \log \varphi(n+1-2\lfloor n/2 \rfloor)}{\log \varphi(n) + \log \varphi(n-2) + \cdots + \log \varphi(n-2\lfloor (n-1)/2 \rfloor)}.$$

The illustration of Hausdorff dimension $L(\varphi)$ is given below.




Figure 1: The illustration of Hausdorff dimension $L(\varphi)$

For the critical case $\rho = 1/2$, we construct two regularly increasing functions to show that there exists a jump of the Hausdorff dimension of $L(\varphi)$.

Theorem 1.5. *Let $R : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ be a regularly increasing function with index 0. Then we have*

$$\dim_{\text{H}} L(\varphi) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \log \varphi(n) = \sqrt{n}/R(n); \\ 1/2, & \text{if } \log \varphi(n) = \sqrt{n}R(n), \end{cases}$$

Thus, we are committed to constructing a discontinuous function ψ such that the Hausdorff dimension of $L(\psi)$ decreases continuously from 1 to 1/2. The following result provides an answer. To explain this, we

need to introduce the pressure function $P(\theta)$, defined by

$$P(\theta) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \sum_{a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{N}} q_n^{-2\theta}(a_1, \dots, a_n), \quad \forall \theta > \frac{1}{2}. \quad (1.3)$$

The pressure function $\theta \mapsto P(\theta)$ was shown to be strictly decreasing, convex and real analytical in $(1/2, \infty)$, and admits a singularity in $1/2$ (see [19]). Our conclusion is stated in the following theorem.

Theorem 1.6. *Let $c \in (0, \infty)$ and $\log \psi(n) = c \lfloor \sqrt{n} \rfloor$. Then we have*

$$\dim_{\mathbb{H}} L(\psi) = \theta(c),$$

where $\theta(c)$ is the unique real solution of the equation

$$P(\theta) = c \left(\theta - \frac{1}{2} \right).$$

The function $c \mapsto \theta(c)$ decreases from 1 to $1/2$ as c changes from 0 to ∞ .




Figure 2: The illustration for the solution of the pressure equation in Theorem 1.6

Before proceeding, we give some remarks:

- Using the same method as Fang and Liu [9, Lemma 3.1], we can establish that $L(\varphi)$ is non-empty if and only if φ is equivalent to an increasing function. Thus, we always assume that φ is increasing when analyzing $L(\varphi)$.
- In [16], the function f is referred to as being of slow increase when $\rho = 0$. Functions such as $\log x$, $\log \log x$, $(\log x)^a$ with $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and $e^{(\log x)^b}$ with $0 < b < 1$ regularly increase with the index $\rho = 0$; functions such as e^x , xe^x and e^x/x^2 are regularly increasing with index $\rho = \infty$. Furthermore, if f is regularly increasing with index $\rho = 0$, then $x^{\rho'} f(x)$ and $x^{\rho'}/f(x)$ with $\rho' > 0$ are regularly increasing with index ρ' .
- There exist uncountably many discontinuous functions for which the Hausdorff dimension of $L(\psi)$ continuously decreases from 1 to $1/2$. Examples include $\psi(n) = R(n)e^{c \lfloor \sqrt{n} \rfloor}$ and $\psi(n) = e^{c \lfloor \sqrt{n} \rfloor}/R(n)$, where R is increasing regularly with the index $\rho = 0$.

Throughout this paper, we use $|\cdot|$ to denote the length of a subinterval of $(0, 1)$, \mathcal{H}^s to denote the s -dimensional Hausdorff measure of a set, $\lfloor x \rfloor$ the largest integer not exceeding x and \sharp the cardinality of a set, respectively. The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we present some elementary properties and dimensional results on continued fractions and regularly increasing functions. Sections 3, 4 and 5 are devoted to the proofs of the main results.

2. Preliminaries

2.1. Elementary properties of continued fractions

For any $n \geq 1$ and $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$, we call

$$I_n(a_1, \dots, a_n) = \{x \in (0, 1) : a_1(x) = a_1, \dots, a_n(x) = a_n\}$$

a basic interval of order n . By (1.1), we know that all the points in $I_n(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ have the same $p_n(x)$ and $q_n(x)$. Thus, we write $p_n(a_1, \dots, a_n) = p_n(x) = p_n$ and $q_n(a_1, \dots, a_n) = q_n(x) = q_n$ for $x \in I_n(a_1, \dots, a_n)$. It is well known (see [21, p. 4]) that p_n and q_n satisfy the following recursive formula:

$$\begin{cases} p_{-1} = 1, & p_0 = 0, & p_n = a_n p_{n-1} + p_{n-2} \quad (n \geq 1); \\ q_{-1} = 0, & q_0 = 1, & q_n = a_n q_{n-1} + q_{n-2} \quad (n \geq 1). \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

As a consequence, we have the following results.

Lemma 2.1. ([15]) *For any $n \geq 1$ and $x \in (0, 1)$, we have*

- (1) $q_n \geq 2^{\frac{n-1}{2}}$;
- (2) $\prod_{i=1}^n a_i \leq q_n \leq \prod_{i=1}^n (a_i + 1)$;
- (3) if $1 \leq i \leq n$, then

$$\frac{a_i + 1}{2} \leq \frac{q_n(a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}, a_i, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_n)}{q_{n-1}(a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_n)} \leq a_i + 1.$$

Lemma 2.2 ([15]). *For any $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$, $I_n(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ is the interval with the endpoints p_n/q_n and $(p_n + p_{n-1})/(q_n + q_{n-1})$. More precisely,*

$$I_n(a_1, \dots, a_n) = \begin{cases} \left[\frac{p_n}{q_n}, \frac{p_n + p_{n-1}}{q_n + q_{n-1}} \right), & \text{if } n \text{ is even,} \\ \left(\frac{p_n + p_{n-1}}{q_n + q_{n-1}}, \frac{p_n}{q_n} \right], & \text{if } n \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

As a result, the length of $I_n(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ equals to

$$|I_n(a_1, \dots, a_n)| = \frac{1}{q_n(q_n + q_{n-1})}.$$

Combining the second of formula (2.1), Lemma 2.1(2) and Lemma 2.2, we deduce that

$$2^{-(2n+1)} \prod_{k=1}^n a_k^{-2} \leq |I_n(a_1, \dots, a_n)| \leq \prod_{k=1}^n a_k^{-2}. \quad (2.2)$$

The following result can be viewed as the bounded distortion property of continued fractions.

Lemma 2.3. ([27, Lemma A.2]) For any $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$ and $(b_1, \dots, b_k) \in \mathbb{N}^k$,

$$\frac{1}{2} \leq \left| \frac{I_{n+k}(a_1, \dots, a_n, b_1, \dots, b_k)}{I_n(a_1, \dots, a_n) \cdot I_k(b_1, \dots, b_k)} \right| \leq 2.$$

As a consequence, for any $(a_1, \dots, a_n, \dots, a_{n+k}) \in \mathbb{N}^{n+k}$,

$$\frac{1}{8} \leq \frac{|I_{n+k}(a_1, \dots, a_n, \dots, a_{n+k})|}{|I_1(a_n)| \cdot |I_{n+k-1}(a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}, a_{n+1}, \dots, a_{n+k})|} \leq 8.$$

2.2. Some useful lemmas for estimating Hausdorff dimension

For any $M \in \mathbb{N}$, let E_M denote the set of points in $(0, 1)$ whose partial quotients in the continued fractions do not exceed M . Specifically,

$$E_M = \{x \in (0, 1) : 1 \leq a_n(x) \leq M, \forall n \geq 1\}. \quad (2.3)$$

Jarník [17] studied the Hausdorff dimension of E_M .

Lemma 2.4 ([17, p. 96]). For any $M \geq 8$, we have

$$1 - \frac{1}{M \log 2} \leq \dim_{\text{H}} E_M \leq 1 - \frac{1}{8M \log M}.$$

The following dimensional result is useful for obtaining the lower bound estimates of the Hausdorff dimension of sets in continued fractions. Let $\{s_n\}$ and $\{t_n\}$ be two sequences of positive real numbers. Assume that $s_n, t_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $s_n > t_n$ and $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{s_n - t_n}{s_n} > 0$. For any $N \geq 1$, let

$$B(\{s_n\}, \{t_n\}, N) := \{x \in (0, 1) : s_n - t_n < a_n(x) \leq s_n + t_n, \forall n \geq N\}. \quad (2.4)$$

Lemma 2.5. ([25, Lemma 2.3]) For any $N \geq 1$, we have

$$\dim_{\text{H}} B(\{s_n\}, \{t_n\}, N) = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{k=1}^n \log t_k}{2 \sum_{k=1}^{n+1} \log s_k - \log t_{n+1}}.$$

It is worth noting that

$$\dim_{\text{H}} B(\{s_n\}, \{t_n\}, N) = \dim_{\text{H}} B(\{s_n\}, \{t_n\}, 1).$$

Indeed, this equality follows from the fact that the dimensional formula in Lemma 2.5 is not affected by a finite number of initial terms in the sequences $\{s_n\}$ and $\{t_n\}$. Moreover, the set $B(\{s_n\}, \{t_n\}, N)$ can be expressed as a countable union of bi-Lipschitz images of $B(\{s_{n+N-1}\}, \{t_{n+N-1}\}, 1)$. Since bi-Lipschitz maps preserve the Hausdorff dimension, the equality holds.

The construction of Cantor-type subsets is another effective method to obtain lower bounds for the Hausdorff dimension of fractal sets. A Cantor-type set is defined as follows. Let $[0, 1] = E_0 \supseteq E_1 \supseteq E_2 \supseteq \dots$ be a decreasing sequence of sets such that each E_n is a union of finite number of disjoint closed intervals, with each interval of E_n containing at least two intervals of E_{n+1} , and the maximum length of intervals in E_n tending to 0 as n tending to infinity. Then the set

$$E := \bigcap_{n \geq 0} E_n \quad (2.5)$$

is a totally disconnected subset of $[0, 1]$. The following lemma provides a lower bound of $\dim_{\text{H}} E$.

Lemma 2.6. ([8, Example 4.6]) Suppose that for any positive integer $n \geq 1$, each interval of E_{n-1} contains at least m_n intervals of E_n which are separated by gaps of at least θ_n in the general construction (2.5). If $m_n \geq 2$ and $0 < \theta_{n+1} < \theta_n$, then we have

$$\dim_{\text{H}} E \geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(m_1 \cdots m_{n-1})}{-\log(m_n \theta_n)}.$$

To end this subsection, we present a method to estimate an upper bound of the Hausdorff dimension.

Lemma 2.7. ([8, Proposition 4.1]) Suppose a set F can be covered by n_k sets of diameter at most $\delta_k \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Then

$$\dim_{\text{H}} F \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log n_k}{-\log \delta_k}.$$

2.3. Regularly increasing functions

In this subsection, we collect some basic properties of regularly increasing functions.

Lemma 2.8 ([26]). Let f be a regularly increasing function with index ρ .

(1) If $\rho = 0$, then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, $x^{-\varepsilon} f(x)$ is ultimately decreasing and $x^\varepsilon f(x)$ is ultimately increasing. Moreover, we have

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} x^{-\varepsilon} f(x) = 0 \text{ and } \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} x^\varepsilon f(x) = \infty.$$

(2) If $\rho \in (0, \infty)$, then for $\alpha > 0$ and $C > 0$, $f(x^\alpha/C)$ is regularly increasing with index $\alpha\rho$.

(3) If $\rho \in [0, \infty)$, then for $C \in \mathbb{R}$, $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} f(x+C)/f(x) = 1$.

(4) If $\rho \in [0, \infty]$, then $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \log f(x)/\log x = \rho$.

Lemma 2.9 ([9]). Let f be a regularly increasing function with index ρ .

(1) If $\rho \in (0, 1)$, then $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} (f(x+1) - f(x)) = 0$.

(2) If $\rho \in (1, \infty]$, then $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} (f(x+1) - f(x)) = \infty$.

(3) If $\rho = 0$, then for any $\alpha > 0$, letting $g(x) = x/f(x^\alpha)$ and $h(x) = xf(x^\alpha)$, we have f and g are ultimately increasing. Moreover,

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} (g(x+1) - g(x)) = 0 \text{ and } \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} (h(x+1) - h(x)) = \infty.$$

3. Proof of Theorem 1.4

This section gives a proof of Theorem 1.4. Our idea is mainly inspired by Hu, Hussain, and Yu [12], Liao and Rams [24]. We divide the proof into three cases. Recall that

$$L(\varphi) = \left\{ x \in (0, 1) : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{L_n(x)}{\varphi(n)} = 1 \right\},$$

where $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is an increasing function such that $\log \varphi$ is a regularly increasing with index ρ .

3.1. *The case* $0 \leq \rho < 1/2$.

Using the properties of the regularly increasing function $\log \varphi$ with index ρ , our strategy is to construct a suitable Cantor-type subset $E_M(\varphi)$ of $L(\varphi)$, and then establish a connection between the sets $E_M(\varphi)$ and $L(\varphi)$ utilizing a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -Hölder function.

Since $\log \varphi$ is regularly increasing with index ρ , satisfying $0 \leq \rho < 1/2$. By Lemma 2.8 (4), we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \log \varphi(n)}{\log n} = \rho. \quad (3.1)$$

For any $0 < \delta < \frac{1}{2} - \rho$, it follows from (3.1) that $\log \varphi(n) \leq n^{\rho+\delta}$ for sufficiently large n . Thus,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \varphi(n)}{\sqrt{n}} = 0. \quad (3.2)$$

For $k \geq 1$, let $m_k = k^2 + 1$. For any $M \geq 8$, define

$$E_M(\varphi) = \{x \in (0, 1) : a_{m_k}(x) = \lfloor \varphi(m_k) \rfloor, a_{m_k-1}(x) = a_{m_k+1}(x) = 1 \text{ for all } k \geq 1, \\ 1 \leq a_i(x) \leq M \text{ for any } i \neq m_k, m_k - 1, m_k + 1\}. \quad (3.3)$$

Proposition 3.1. *Let $E_M(\varphi)$ be defined as in (3.3). Then we have*

$$E_M(\varphi) \subseteq L(\varphi).$$

Proof. Consider the function $\log \varphi(x^2)$. From Lemma 2.8 (2), we deduce that $\log \varphi(x^2)$ is regularly increasing with index $2\rho < 1$. Then, by Lemma 2.9 (1), we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (\log \varphi(m_{k+1}) - \log \varphi(m_k)) = 0 \text{ and } \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\varphi(m_{k+1})}{\varphi(m_k)} = 1.$$

Let $x \in E_M(\varphi)$ be fixed. Note that $\varphi(n)$ tends to infinity as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, there exists a positive integer N_1 such that $\varphi(n) \geq M^2$ for all $n \geq N_1$. Thus, for any sufficiently large n , there exists a positive integer k such that $m_k \geq N_1$ and $m_k \leq n < m_{k+1}$. Since φ is increasing, we have $\varphi(m_k) \leq \varphi(n) < \varphi(m_{k+1})$ and

$$L_n(x) = \max\{a_1(x)a_2(x), \dots, a_n(x)a_{n+1}(x)\} = \lfloor \varphi(m_k) \rfloor.$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$1 = \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\varphi(m_k) - 1}{\varphi(m_{k+1})} \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{L_n(x)}{\varphi(n)} \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{L_n(x)}{\varphi(n)} \leq \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\lfloor \varphi(m_k) \rfloor}{\varphi(m_k)} = 1.$$

□

To estimate the Hausdorff dimension of $E_M(\varphi)$, we need to use some symbolic spaces, as described below. For any $n \geq 1$, let

$$\mathcal{C}_n = \{(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n : \sigma_{m_k}(x) = \lfloor \varphi(m_k) \rfloor, \sigma_{m_k-1}(x) = \sigma_{m_k+1}(x) = 1 \text{ and} \\ 1 \leq \sigma_i(x) \leq M, 1 \leq i \neq m_k, m_k - 1, m_k + 1 \text{ with } m_k + 1 \leq n\}.$$

It follows that

$$E_M(\varphi) = \bigcap_{n \geq 1} \bigcup_{(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n) \in \mathcal{C}_n} I_n(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n).$$

Let $\tau(n) = \#\{k : m_k \leq n\}$. Then we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\tau(n)}{n} = 0. \quad (3.4)$$

For any $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n) \in \mathcal{C}_n$, let $(\overline{\sigma_1}, \dots, \overline{\sigma_n})$ be the block by eliminating the terms

$$\{\sigma_{m_k}(x), \sigma_{m_{k-1}}(x), \sigma_{m_{k+1}}(x) : 1 \leq k \leq \tau(n)\}$$

from $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n)$. For simplicity, we denote

$$\overline{I}_n(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n) = I_{n-3\tau(n)}(\overline{\sigma_1}, \dots, \overline{\sigma_n}). \quad (3.5)$$

By the definition of m_k and $\tau(n)$, we deduce from (3.2) that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{\tau(n)} \log \varphi(m_i) \\ &= \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} (\log \varphi(m_1) + \log \varphi(m_2) + \dots + \log \varphi(m_{\tau(n)})) \\ &\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{(\tau(n) + 1)^2} (\log \varphi(1^2 + 1) + \log \varphi(2^2 + 2) + \dots + \log \varphi(\tau(n)^2 + 1)) \\ &\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{(n + 1)^2} (\log \varphi(1^2 + 1) + \log \varphi(2^2 + 1) + \dots + \log \varphi(n^2 + 1)) \\ &\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \varphi(n^2 + 1)}{n} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{\tau(n)} \log \varphi(m_i) = 0. \quad (3.6)$$

Proposition 3.2. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists N_2 such that for any $n \geq N_2$ and $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n) \in \mathcal{C}_n$, we have

$$|I_n(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n)| \geq |\overline{I}_n(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n)|^{1+\varepsilon}.$$

Proof. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, it follows from (3.4), (3.6) and Lemma 2.1 (1) that, there exists N_2 such that for any $n \geq N_2$ and $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n) \in \mathcal{C}_n$,

$$q_{n-3\tau(n)}^{2\varepsilon} \geq 2^{(n-3\tau(n)-1)\varepsilon} \geq 2^{4\tau(n)} \prod_{i=1}^{\tau(n)} (\lfloor \varphi(m_i) \rfloor + 1)^2. \quad (3.7)$$

Together with (3.5), (3.7), Lemma 2.1 (3) and Lemma 2.2, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |I_n(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n)| &\geq \frac{1}{2q_n^2(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n)} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2q_{n-3\tau(n)}^2(\overline{\sigma_1}, \dots, \overline{\sigma_n}) \left(\prod_{i=1}^{\tau(n)} (\lfloor \varphi(m_i) \rfloor + 1) \cdot 2^{2\tau(n)} \right)^2} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{\left(q_{n-3\tau(n)}^2(\overline{\sigma_1}, \dots, \overline{\sigma_n}) \right)^{1+\varepsilon}} \\ &\geq |\overline{I}_n(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n)|^{1+\varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

□

The following provides an estimate for the distance between any two distinct points $x, y \in E_M(\varphi)$. Let $x = [\eta_1, \eta_2, \dots] \in E_M(\varphi)$, $y = [\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots] \in E_M(\varphi)$. Then there exists a greatest integer n such that x and y lie within the same basic interval $I_n(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n)$. That is, there exist two distinct positive integers ℓ_{n+1}, r_{n+1} such that $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n, \ell_{n+1}) \in \mathcal{C}_{n+1}$, $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n, r_{n+1}) \in \mathcal{C}_{n+1}$ and

$$x \in I_{n+1}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n, \ell_{n+1}), \quad y \in I_{n+1}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n, r_{n+1}). \quad (3.8)$$

By the construction of the set $E_M(\varphi)$ and the definition of the greatest for n , we have

$$n+1 \notin \bigcup_{k \geq 1} \{m_k - 1, m_k, m_k + 1\}. \quad (3.9)$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that $\ell_{n+1} < r_{n+1}$. Then by (3.9), we have $1 \leq \ell_{n+1} < r_{n+1} \leq M$. Consequently, the interval $I_{n+2}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n, \ell_{n+1}, M+1)$ or $I_{n+2}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n, r_{n+1}, M+1)$ lies in the gap between x and y .

Proposition 3.3. *For any two distinct points $x, y \in E_M(\varphi)$ defined as in (3.8), we have*

$$|x - y| \geq \frac{1}{9(M+1)^4} I_n(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n).$$

Proof. From Lemma 2.2 and the second formula of (2.1), we deduce that

$$\frac{|I_{n+1}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{n+1})|}{|I_n(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n)|} = \frac{q_n(q_n + q_{n-1})}{q_{n+1}(q_{n+1} + q_n)} = \frac{1}{\sigma_{n+1}^2} \cdot \frac{1 + \frac{q_{n-1}}{q_n}}{\left(1 + \frac{q_{n-1}}{\sigma_{n+1}q_n}\right) \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sigma_{n+1}} + \frac{q_{n-1}}{\sigma_{n+1}q_n}\right)} \geq \frac{1}{3\sigma_{n+1}^2}.$$

This shows that

$$\begin{aligned} |x - y| &\geq |I_{n+2}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n, \ell_{n+1}, M+1)| \geq \frac{1}{9\ell_{n+1}^2(M+1)^2} |I_n(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n)| \\ &\geq \frac{1}{9(M+1)^4} |I_n(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n)|. \end{aligned}$$

A similar calculation yields the same inequality for the estimate of $|I_{n+2}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n, r_{n+1}, M+1)|$. \square

Now, we are in a position to present the estimate of $\dim_{\text{H}} L(\varphi)$. Let $f : E_M(\varphi) \rightarrow E_M$ be defined as follows. For any $x = [\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n]$, set

$$f(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} [\overline{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n}].$$

For any $\varepsilon > 0$, If $x, y \in E_M(\varphi)$ and

$$|x - y| < \frac{1}{9(M+1)^4} \min_{(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{N_2}) \in \mathcal{C}_{N_2}} \{|I_{N_2}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{N_2})|\},$$

where N_2 is as in Proposition 3.2. Then by Propositions 3.2 and 3.3, we have

$$|f(x) - f(y)| \leq |\overline{I_n}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n)| \leq |I_n(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n)|^{\frac{1}{1+\varepsilon}} \leq (9(M+1)^4)^{\frac{1}{1+\varepsilon}} |x - y|^{\frac{1}{1+\varepsilon}}.$$

Combining this with Proposition 3.1 and [8, Proposition 3.3], we obtain that

$$\dim_{\text{H}} L(\varphi) \geq \dim_{\text{H}} E_M(\varphi) \geq \frac{1}{1+\varepsilon} \dim_{\text{H}} E_M.$$

Letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ and $M \rightarrow \infty$, from (2.3) and Lemma 2.4, we deduce that

$$\dim_{\text{H}} L(\varphi) = 1.$$

3.2. The case $1/2 < \rho \leq 1$.

In this subsection, we divide the proof into three parts: the lower bounds for the case $1/2 < \rho < 1$ and $\rho = 1$, the upper bound for the case $1/2 < \rho \leq 1$.

3.2.1. Lower bound for the case $1/2 < \rho < 1$.

To establish a lower bound for $\dim_{\text{H}} L(\varphi)$ in the case $1/2 < \rho < 1$, we construct a Cantor-type subset of $L(\varphi)$ using Lemma 2.5.

Proposition 3.4. *For any $n \geq 1$, let $s_n = \sqrt{\varphi(n)}$ and $t_n = \sqrt{\varphi(n)/n}$. Then, we have*

$$B(\{s_n\}, \{t_n\}, 1) \subseteq L(\varphi),$$

where $B(\{s_n\}, \{t_n\}, 1)$ is defined as in (2.4).

Proof. First, we show that $\varphi(n)/n$ tends to infinity as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Consider the function $f(x) = \varphi(x)/x$. Since $\log \varphi$ is regularly increasing with index $1/2 < \rho < 1$, then by (1.2), we have

$$f'(x) = \frac{x\varphi'(x) - \varphi(x)}{x^2} > \frac{\varphi(x) \left(\frac{\log \varphi(x)}{2} - 1 \right)}{x^2} > 0,$$

for sufficiently large x . Hence, there exists a positive integer $N_1 \geq 2$ such that $n \mapsto \varphi(n)/n$, where $n \geq N_1$, is increasing and tends to infinity as $n \rightarrow \infty$. For any $x \in B(\{s_n\}, \{t_n\}, 1)$, by the definition of $L_n(x)$, we have

$$\begin{cases} L_n(x) \geq a_n(x)a_{n+1}(x) \geq (1 - 1/\sqrt{n})^2 \varphi(n), \\ L_n(x) \leq \max_{1 \leq k \leq n} \{(s_k + t_k)(s_{k+1} + t_{k+1})\} \leq 4\varphi(N-1) + (1 + 1/\sqrt{n+1})^2 \varphi(n+1). \end{cases} \quad (3.10)$$

By Lemma 2.9 (1), we obtain that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\varphi(n+1)}{\varphi(n)} = 1. \quad (3.11)$$

It follows from (3.10) and (3.11) that

$$1 \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{L_n(x)}{\varphi(n)} \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{L_n(x)}{\varphi(n)} \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\varphi(n+1)}{\varphi(n)} = 1,$$

which implies that $x \in L(\varphi)$. Thus, $B(\{s_n\}, \{t_n\}, 1) \subseteq L(\varphi)$. \square

Notice that $\log \varphi$ is regularly increasing with index $\rho > 1/2$. By Lemma 2.8 (3) and (4), we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \varphi(n+1)}{\log \varphi(n)} = 1 \text{ and } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \varphi(n)}{\log n} = \infty. \quad (3.12)$$

Together with Lemma 2.5 and (3.12), we obtain

$$\dim_{\text{H}} L(\varphi) \geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\frac{1}{2} (\sum_{k=1}^n \log \varphi(k) - \sum_{k=1}^n \log k)}{\sum_{k=1}^n \log \varphi(k) + \frac{1}{2} \log \varphi(n+1) + \frac{1}{2} \log(n+1)} = \frac{1}{2}.$$

3.2.2. Lower bound for the case $\rho = 1$.

If $\rho = 1$, the equality (3.11) cannot hold, so we need to provide a new method to obtain the lower bound. To establish a lower bound for $\dim_{\mathbb{H}} L(\varphi)$ in the case $\rho = 1$, we construct a Cantor-type subset of $L(\varphi)$ by using the definition of the regularly increasing function.

Since $\log \varphi$ is a regularly increasing function with index 1. By (1.2), we have $\varphi(n) = e^{\alpha n + o(n)}$, where $0 < \alpha < \infty$ is a constant. For convenience, we set $\varphi(n) = e^{\alpha n}$, which does not affect the conclusion.

Step 1: Construct a subset $\Upsilon(\alpha, N)$ of $L(\varphi)$. Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$, define

$$\Upsilon(\alpha, N) = \left\{ x \in (0, 1) : e^{-\frac{\alpha}{4}} < \frac{a_n(x)}{e^{\frac{\alpha}{2}n}} < e^{-\frac{\alpha}{4}} + \frac{1}{n}, \forall n \geq N \right\}. \quad (3.13)$$

Let N_2 denote the smallest integer n such that $e^{\frac{\alpha}{2}n}/n \geq 2$. When $N \geq N_2$, the set $\Upsilon(\alpha, N)$ is non-empty. For any $x \in \Upsilon(\alpha, N)$. Let $n \geq N$ be sufficiently large, we have $a_{n-1}(x) < a_n(x)$ and

$$e^{\alpha n} < a_n(x)a_{n+1}(x) < e^{\alpha n} + e^{\alpha n + \alpha/4} \left(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{n+1} \right) + \frac{e^{\alpha n + \alpha/2}}{n(n+1)}.$$

Thus, for sufficiently large $n \geq N$, we have

$$L_n(x) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{a_i(x)a_{i+1}(x)\} = a_n(x)a_{n+1}(x).$$

It follows that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{L_n(x)}{\varphi(n)} = 1.$$

Hence,

$$\Upsilon(\alpha, N) \subseteq L(\varphi).$$

Step 2: Construct a measure μ supported on $\Upsilon(\alpha, N)$. Without loss of generality, we assume $N_2 = 1$ and set $N = 1$. Then, the number of basic intervals $I_n(a_1, \dots, a_n)$, which have nonempty intersection with $\Upsilon(\alpha, 1)$, is approximately

$$\prod_{j=1}^n \left(\frac{1}{j} e^{\frac{\alpha}{2}j} \right) = \frac{1}{n!} e^{\frac{\alpha}{2} \sum_{j=1}^n j}. \quad (3.14)$$

By (2.2), the length of such interval is

$$2^{-(2n+1)} \prod_{j=1}^n \left(e^{-\frac{\alpha}{4}} + \frac{1}{j} \right)^{-2} e^{-\alpha \sum_{j=1}^n j} \leq |I_n(a_1, \dots, a_n)| \leq e^{\frac{n\alpha}{2} - \alpha \sum_{j=1}^n j}. \quad (3.15)$$

Now, we construct a probability measure μ uniformly distributed on $\Upsilon(\alpha, 1)$. If a_1, \dots, a_{n-1} are given, then the probability of a_n taking any integer value between $e^{\frac{\alpha}{2}n - \frac{\alpha}{4}}$ and $(e^{-\alpha/4} + \frac{1}{n})e^{\frac{\alpha}{2}n}$ is same. Let ε be sufficiently small, up to a factor $e^{\varepsilon \sum_{j=1}^n j}$, by (3.14) and (3.15), we have the following relations:

(1) For the basic intervals $I_n(a_1, \dots, a_n)$, the length and the measure are given by

$$|I_n(a_1, \dots, a_n)| \approx e^{-\alpha \sum_{j=1}^n j} \quad \text{and} \quad \mu(I_n(a_1, \dots, a_n)) \approx e^{-\frac{\alpha}{2} \sum_{j=1}^n j}.$$

(2) All $I_n(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ contained within a single $I_n(a_1, \dots, a_{n-1})$ form an interval of length

$$e^{\frac{\alpha}{2}n - \alpha \sum_{j=1}^n j}.$$

Step 3: Estimate the lower bound of $L(\varphi)$. For any $x \in \Upsilon(\alpha, 1)$ and $r \in (e^{-\alpha \sum_{j=1}^n j}, e^{-\alpha \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} j})$, the measure of the ball $B(x, r)$ is

$$\mu(B(x, r)) \approx \begin{cases} r \cdot e^{-\frac{\alpha}{2} \sum_{j=1}^n j}, & \text{if } r < e^{\frac{\alpha}{2} n - \alpha \sum_{j=1}^n j}, \\ e^{-\frac{\alpha}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} j}, & \text{if } r \geq e^{\frac{\alpha}{2} n - \alpha \sum_{j=1}^n j}. \end{cases}$$

Then, we obtain

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\log \mu(B(x, r))}{\log r} \geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{-\frac{\alpha}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} j}{\frac{\alpha}{2} n - \alpha \sum_{j=1}^n j} = \frac{1}{2}.$$

Hence, the lower local dimension of μ equals $1/2$ at each point of $\Upsilon(\alpha, 1)$, which implies that

$$\dim_{\text{H}} \Upsilon(\alpha, 1) \geq \frac{1}{2}.$$

By the Frostman Lemma ([8, Principle 4.2]), we have

$$\dim_{\text{H}} L(\varphi) \geq \dim_{\text{H}} \Upsilon(\alpha, 1) = \frac{1}{2}.$$

3.2.3. Upper Bound for the case $1/2 < \rho \leq 1$.

To obtain the upper bound of $\dim_{\text{H}} L(\varphi)$, we employ a method of selecting an appropriate positive real number s such that $\mathcal{H}^s(L(\varphi)) < \infty$. Before proceeding with the proof, we present several key lemmas by choosing this positive real number s . Let

$$\Lambda(m, n) := \{(i_1, \dots, i_n) \in \{1, \dots, m\}^n : i_1 + \dots + i_n = m\},$$

and $\xi(\cdot)$ be the Riemann zeta function.

Lemma 3.1. ([24, Lemma 2.1]) For any $s \in (1/2, 1)$ and $m \geq n \geq 1$, we have

$$\sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_n) \in \Lambda(m, n)} \prod_{k=1}^n i_k^{-2s} \leq \left(\frac{9}{2} (2 + \xi(2s)) \right)^n m^{-2s}.$$

Lemma 3.2. ([12, Lemma 5.4]) For any $\varepsilon > 0$ and $n \geq 2$, let

$$\pi(n) = \#\{(a, b) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} : ab = n\}.$$

Then, there exists a constant c_ε depending on ε such that $\pi(n) \leq c_\varepsilon n^\varepsilon$.

Let $0 < \delta < \rho - 1/2$ be fixed. For any $k \geq 1$, define

$$\gamma := \rho - \delta \quad \text{and} \quad n_k := \lfloor k^{1/\gamma} \rfloor. \tag{3.16}$$

Proposition 3.5. Let n_k be defined as in (3.16). We have

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\varphi(n_k)}{\varphi(n_{k-1})} > 1.$$

Proof. Since φ is a differentiable function, we have

$$\frac{\varphi(n_k)}{\varphi(n_{k-1})} = \frac{\varphi(n_{k-1}) + \int_{n_{k-1}}^{n_k} \varphi'(t) dt}{\varphi(n_{k-1})}.$$

Therefore, it suffices to prove

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\int_{n_{k-1}}^{n_k} \varphi'(t) dt}{\varphi(n_{k-1})} > 0.$$

Note that $\log \varphi$ is an increasing function with index ρ , satisfying $1/2 < \rho \leq 1$. Let $0 < \varepsilon < \delta$. By (1.2) and Lemma 2.8 (4), we have

$$\frac{\varphi'(x)}{\varphi(x)} \geq (\rho - \varepsilon) \frac{\log \varphi(x)}{x} \quad \text{and} \quad \log \varphi(x) \geq x^{\rho - \varepsilon},$$

for sufficiently large x . Then, for sufficiently large k , it follows that

$$\frac{\int_{n_{k-1}}^{n_k} \varphi'(t) dt}{\varphi(n_{k-1})} \geq \int_{n_{k-1}}^{n_k} \frac{\varphi'(t)}{\varphi(t)} dt \geq (\rho - \varepsilon) \int_{n_{k-1}}^{n_k} \frac{\log \varphi(t)}{t} dt \geq (\rho - \varepsilon) \int_{n_{k-1}}^{n_k} \frac{t^{\rho - \varepsilon}}{t} dt = (n_k^{\rho - \varepsilon} - n_{k-1}^{\rho - \varepsilon}),$$

which, together with $\rho - \varepsilon > \rho - \delta = \gamma$, implies that

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\int_{n_{k-1}}^{n_k} \varphi'(t) dt}{\varphi(n_{k-1})} > 0.$$

The proof is complete. □

The next proposition shows the position of the maximal product of consecutive partial quotients among the first n_k terms in the continued fraction expansion of x .

Proposition 3.6. *Let $x \in L(\varphi)$ be fixed. Then, for sufficiently large $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $j_k \geq 1$ such that $n_{k-1} < j_k \leq n_k$ and $L_{n_k}(x) = a_{j_k}(x)a_{j_k+1}(x)$.*

Proof. Let $x \in L(\varphi)$ be fixed. Suppose that there exist infinitely many integers k_i and j_{k_i} with $k_i > k_{i-1}$ such that $j_{k_i} < n_{k_i-1}$ and $L_{n_{k_i}}(x) = a_{j_{k_i}}(x)a_{j_{k_i}+1}(x)$. Then

$$L_{n_{k_i-1}}(x) = L_{n_{k_i}}(x) = a_{j_{k_i}}(x)a_{j_{k_i}+1}(x).$$

Since $L_n(x)/\varphi(n) \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we deduce from Proposition 3.5 that

$$1 = \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{L_{n_{k_i-1}}(x)}{\varphi(n_{k_i-1})} = \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{L_{n_{k_i}}(x)}{\varphi(n_{k_i})} \cdot \frac{\varphi(n_{k_i})}{\varphi(n_{k_i-1})} = \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\varphi(n_{k_i})}{\varphi(n_{k_i-1})} > 1,$$

which is a contradiction. Thus, the proof is complete. □

In the following, we construct a cover of the set $L(\varphi)$. Let $s \in (1/2, 1)$ be arbitrary. Then for any $x \in L(\varphi)$ and $0 < \varepsilon < 2s - 1$, we have

$$(1 - \varepsilon)\varphi(n) \leq L_n(x) \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\varphi(n),$$

for sufficiently large n . Recall that $S_n(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i(x)a_{i+1}(x)$. By Proposition 3.6, we obtain that

$$(1 - \varepsilon)\varphi(n_k) \leq L_{n_k}(x) \leq S_{n_k}(x) - S_{n_{k-1}}(x) \leq S_{n_k}(x) \leq n_k L_{n_k}(x) \leq (1 + \varepsilon)n_k\varphi(n_k), \quad (3.17)$$

for sufficiently large k . From Lemma 2.8 (4), We deduce that for sufficiently large k ,

$$\log \varphi(n_k) = \log \varphi(\lfloor k^{1/\gamma} \rfloor) \geq \log \varphi(k^{1/\gamma} - 1) \geq \log \varphi(k^{1/\gamma}/2) > 2k, \quad (3.18)$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that the function $x \mapsto \log \varphi(x^{1/\gamma}/2)$ is regularly increasing with index $\rho/\gamma > 1$. For sufficiently large k , we also have

$$n_k - n_{k-1} = \lfloor k^{1/\gamma} \rfloor - \lfloor (k-1)^{1/\gamma} \rfloor \leq k^{1/\gamma} - (k-1)^{1/\gamma} + 1 \leq \gamma^{-1} \cdot k^{1/\gamma-1} + 1 \leq \frac{2}{\gamma} k^{1/\gamma-1}. \quad (3.19)$$

By the choice of δ , we have $1/\gamma - 1 < 1$. Let $K \geq 1$ be an integer such that (3.17), (3.18) and (3.19) hold for all $k \geq K$.

For any $k \geq K$, set

$$M_k = \{i \in \mathbb{N} : (1 - \varepsilon)\varphi(n_k) \leq i \leq (1 + \varepsilon)n_k\varphi(n_k)\}.$$

For any $K_1 \geq K$ and $k \geq K_1$, define

$$J(\varphi, k, K_1) = \left\{ I_{n_k+1}(a_1, \dots, a_{n_k+1}) : \sum_{j=n_{\ell-1}+1}^{n_\ell} a_j a_{j+1} = m_\ell \text{ with } m_\ell \in M_\ell, K_1 \leq \ell \leq k \right\},$$

and

$$J(\varphi, K_1) = \bigcap_{k=K_1}^{\infty} J(\varphi, k, K_1). \quad (3.20)$$

It follows that

$$L(\varphi) \subseteq \bigcup_{K_1=K}^{\infty} J(\varphi, K_1).$$

Now, we estimate the upper bound for the Hausdorff dimension of $J(\varphi, K)$. For any other $K_1 > K$, we apply the same method to obtain the upper bound for $J(\varphi, K_1)$. For $k \geq K$, the cylinders from $J(\varphi, k, K)$ forms a cover of $J(\varphi, K)$. For any $\ell \geq K$, denote

$$A_\ell = \left\{ (a_{n_{\ell-1}+1}, \dots, a_{n_\ell+1}) \in \mathbb{N}^{n_\ell - n_{\ell-1} + 1} : \sum_{j=n_{\ell-1}+1}^{n_\ell} a_j a_{j+1} = m_\ell \text{ with } m_\ell \in M_\ell \right\}.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{I_{n_k+1} \subseteq J(\varphi, k, K)} |I_{n_k+1}|^s &\leq \sum_{I_{n_k+1} \subseteq J(\varphi, k, K)} \prod_{\ell=K}^k (a_{n_{\ell-1}+1} a_{n_{\ell-1}+2} \dots a_{n_\ell} a_{n_\ell+1})^{-2s} \\ &\leq \prod_{\ell=K}^k \sum_{(a_{n_{\ell-1}+1}, \dots, a_{n_\ell+1}) \in A_\ell} (a_{n_{\ell-1}+1} a_{n_{\ell-1}+2} \dots a_{n_\ell} a_{n_\ell+1})^{-2s} \\ &:= \prod_{\ell=K}^k \Gamma_\ell(s). \end{aligned} \quad (3.21)$$

Next, we estimate the upper bound of $\Gamma_\ell(s)$. We divide the integers $n_{\ell-1} + 1, \dots, n_\ell$ into two parts:

$$\Delta_{\ell,0} := \left\{ n_{\ell-1} + 2k : k \in \mathbb{Z}, 1 \leq k \leq \frac{n_\ell - n_{\ell-1}}{2} \right\},$$

and

$$\Delta_{\ell,1} := \left\{ n_{\ell-1} + 2k + 1 : k \in \mathbb{Z}, 0 \leq k \leq \frac{n_\ell - n_{\ell-1} - 1}{2} \right\}.$$

If $(a_{n_{\ell-1}+1}, \dots, a_{n_\ell+1}) \in A_\ell$, then either

$$\frac{1-\varepsilon}{2}\varphi(n_\ell) \leq \sum_{j \in \Delta_{\ell,0}} a_j a_{j+1} \leq (1+\varepsilon)n_\ell \varphi(n_\ell),$$

or

$$\frac{1-\varepsilon}{2}\varphi(n_\ell) \leq \sum_{j \in \Delta_{\ell,1}} a_j a_{j+1} \leq (1+\varepsilon)n_\ell \varphi(n_\ell). \quad (3.22)$$

Consider the case where $n_{\ell-1}$ and n_ℓ are even and $j \in \Delta_{\ell,1}$. The proof of other cases is similar. In this case, we have

$$\#\Delta_{\ell,1} = \frac{n_\ell - n_{\ell-1}}{2}. \quad (3.23)$$

Let $b_j = a_j a_{j+1}$. We have

$$\prod_{j \in \Delta_{\ell,1}} b_j = a_{n_{\ell-1}+1} a_{n_{\ell-1}+2} \cdots a_{n_\ell}. \quad (3.24)$$

From (3.22), we deduce that

$$\frac{1-\varepsilon}{2}\varphi(n_\ell) \leq \sum_{j \in \Delta_{\ell,1}} b_j \leq (1+\varepsilon)n_\ell \varphi(n_\ell). \quad (3.25)$$

Set $\pi(b_j) = \#\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : xy = b_j\}$. By Lemma 3.2,

$$\pi(b_j) \leq c_\varepsilon b_j^\varepsilon. \quad (3.26)$$

Define

$$D_\ell = \left\{ i \in \mathbb{N} : \frac{1-\varepsilon}{2}\varphi(n_k) \leq i \leq (1+\varepsilon)n_k \varphi(n_k) \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad \Xi(\ell, m_\ell) = \left\{ (b_j)_{j \in \Delta_{\ell,1}} : \sum_{j \in \Delta_{\ell,1}} b_j = m_\ell \right\}.$$

Then by (3.23)-(3.26), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_\ell(s) &= \sum_{(a_{n_{\ell-1}+1}, \dots, a_{n_\ell+1}) \in A_\ell} (a_{n_{\ell-1}+1} a_{n_{\ell-1}+2} \cdots a_{n_\ell})^{-2s} \\ &\leq \sum_{m_\ell \in D_\ell} \sum_{(b_j) \in \Xi(\ell, m_\ell)} \prod_{j \in \Delta_{\ell,1}} \pi(b_j) b_j^{-2s} \\ &\leq c_\varepsilon^{\frac{n_\ell - n_{\ell-1}}{2}} \sum_{m_\ell \in D_\ell} \sum_{(b_j) \in \Xi(\ell, m_\ell)} \prod_{j \in \Delta_{\ell,1}} b_j^{-2s+\varepsilon}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.27)$$

By applying Lemma 3.1 to (3.27), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma_\ell(s) &\leq c_\varepsilon \frac{n_\ell - n_{\ell-1}}{2} \sum_{m_\ell \in D_\ell} \left(\frac{9}{2} (2 + \xi(2s - \varepsilon)) \right)^{\frac{n_\ell - n_{\ell-1}}{2}} m_\ell^{-2s+\varepsilon} \\
&\leq c_\varepsilon \frac{n_\ell - n_{\ell-1}}{2} \left(\frac{9}{2} (2 + \xi(2s - \varepsilon)) \right)^{\frac{n_\ell - n_{\ell-1}}{2}} \left(\frac{1 - \varepsilon}{2} \varphi(n_\ell) \right)^{-2s+\varepsilon} (1 + \varepsilon) n_\ell \varphi(n_\ell) \\
&= C e^{(1+\varepsilon-2s) \log \varphi(n_\ell) + \log n_\ell + \frac{n_\ell - n_{\ell-1}}{2} c(s)},
\end{aligned} \tag{3.28}$$

where

$$C = \left(\frac{1 - \varepsilon}{2} \right)^{-2s+\varepsilon} (1 + \varepsilon) \text{ and } c(s) = \log \left(\frac{9}{2} (2 + \xi(2s - \varepsilon)) c_\varepsilon \right)$$

are independent of ℓ . By (3.18) and (3.19), there exists $\ell_0(s)$ such that, when $\ell > \ell_0(s)$, we have

$$(1 + \varepsilon - 2s) \log \varphi(n_\ell) + \log n_\ell + \frac{n_\ell - n_{\ell-1}}{2} c(s) < (1 + \varepsilon - 2s)\ell.$$

Hence,

$$C e^{(1+\varepsilon-2s) \log \varphi(n_\ell) + \log n_\ell + \frac{n_\ell - n_{\ell-1}}{2} c(s)} < C e^{(1+\varepsilon-2s)\ell}. \tag{3.29}$$

Thus, we deduce from (3.20), (3.21), (3.28) and (3.29) that

$$\mathcal{H}^s(J(\varphi, K)) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{I_{n_{k+1}} \subseteq J(\varphi, k, K)} |I_{n_{k+1}}|^s \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \prod_{\ell=K}^k \Gamma_\ell(s) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \prod_{\ell=K}^k C e^{(1+\varepsilon-2s)\ell} = 0,$$

which implies that $\dim_{\text{H}} J(\varphi, K) \leq 1/2$. Since $s \in (1/2, 1)$ is arbitrary, we have

$$\dim_{\text{H}} L(\varphi) \leq 1/2.$$

3.3. The case $1 < \rho \leq \infty$.

In this section, we take $\phi(n) := \log \varphi(n)$. From Lemma 2.9 (2), we deduce that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\phi(n+1) - \phi(n)) = \infty \text{ and } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\varphi(n+1)}{\varphi(n)} = \infty. \tag{3.30}$$

3.3.1. Lower bound

To estimate the lower bound for the Hausdorff dimension of $L(\varphi)$, we will construct a Cantor-type subset $E = \bigcap_{n \geq 0} E_n$ contained in $L(\varphi)$. The Hausdorff dimension of E will be computed in four steps by using the Lemma 2.6.

Step 1: Construct a Cantor-type subset of $L(\varphi)$. Let $\{d_n\}$ be a sequence of positive real numbers, defined by

$$d_1 = 1, d_2 = \varphi(1) \text{ and } d_n d_{n+1} = \varphi(n) - \varphi(n-1), \forall n \geq 2. \tag{3.31}$$

By (3.30), there exists an even number N_1 such that for $n \geq N_1$, we have $d_n \geq 2, \frac{d_n}{\phi(n-1)} \geq 3$, and

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d_{n+1}}{d_{n-1}} &= \frac{d_n d_{n+1}}{d_{n-1} d_n} = \frac{e^{\phi(n)} - e^{\phi(n-1)}}{e^{\phi(n-1)} - e^{\phi(n-2)}} \\
&= \frac{e^{\phi(n)} (1 - e^{\phi(n-1) - \phi(n)})}{e^{\phi(n-1)} (1 - e^{\phi(n-2) - \phi(n-1)})} = e^{\phi(n) - \phi(n-1) + o(1)},
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$d_n d_{n+1} \geq \left(1 + \frac{1}{\phi(n-2)}\right) \left(1 + \frac{1}{\phi(n-1)}\right) d_{n-1} d_n. \quad (3.32)$$

In the following, we claim that for any $n \geq N_1$,

$$d_n d_{n+1} = e^{\phi(n)+o(n)}. \quad (3.33)$$

Indeed, if $n \geq N_1$ is even, then

$$d_n = \frac{d_n}{d_{n-2}} \cdot \frac{d_{n-2}}{d_{n-4}} \cdots \frac{d_{N_1+4}}{d_{N_1+2}} \cdot \frac{d_{N_1+2}}{d_{N_1}} = e^{\phi(n-1)-\phi(n-2)+\cdots+\phi(N_1+3)-\phi(N_1+2)+\phi(N_1+1)-\phi(N_1)+o(n)}.$$

If $n \geq N_1$ is odd, then

$$d_n = \frac{d_n}{d_{n-2}} \cdot \frac{d_{n-2}}{d_{n-4}} \cdots \frac{d_{N_1+5}}{d_{N_1+3}} \cdot \frac{d_{N_1+3}}{d_{N_1+1}} = e^{\phi(n-1)-\phi(n-2)+\phi(n-3)-\phi(n-4)+\cdots+\phi(N_1+2)-\phi(N_1+1)+o(n)}.$$

Now, we use the sequence $\{d_n\}$ and the even number N_1 to construct a Cantor-type subset of $L(\varphi)$. Let

$$E = \left\{x \in (0, 1) : a_n(x) = 1 \text{ for } 1 \leq n \leq N_1, d_n \leq a_n(x) \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{\phi(n-1)}\right) d_n \text{ for } n > N_1\right\}.$$

By (3.33) and the definition of $L_n(x)$, we conclude that

$$E \subseteq L(\varphi).$$

Step 2: Represent the subset E . For any $n \geq N_1$ and any positive integers a_1, \dots, a_n , we define

$$J_n(a_1, \dots, a_n) := \bigcup_{a_{n+1}} \text{cl} I_{n+1}(a_1, \dots, a_n, a_{n+1}),$$

where “cl” denotes the closure of a set and the union is taken over all integers a_{n+1} satisfying

$$d_{n+1} \leq a_{n+1}(x) \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{\phi(n)}\right) d_{n+1}.$$

Let $a_i = 1$ for all $i = 1, \dots, N_1$. For any $n \geq 1$, define $E_0 = [0, 1]$ and

$$E_n = \bigcup_{a_{N_1+1}, \dots, a_{N_1+n}} J_{N_1+n}(a_1, \dots, a_{N_1+n}),$$

where the union is taken over all integers $a_{N_1+1}, \dots, a_{N_1+n}$ such that

$$d_{N_1+i} \leq a_{N_1+i}(x) \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{\phi(N_1+i-1)}\right) d_{N_1+i},$$

for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. Thus, we obtain

$$E = \bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} E_n.$$

Step 3: Estimate the gap between E_n and the number of E_n contained in E_{n-1} . For any $n \geq 1$, based on the structure of the set E_n , it is known that each $J_{N_1+n-1}(a_1, \dots, a_{N_1+n-1})$ in E_{n-1} contains at least m_n intervals $J_{N_1+n}(a_1, \dots, a_{N_1+n})$ of E_n . The number m_n can be estimated as follows:

$$m_n = \left\lfloor \left(1 + \frac{1}{\phi(N_1+n-1)}\right) d_{N_1+n} \right\rfloor - \lfloor d_{N_1+n} \rfloor \geq \frac{d_{N_1+n}}{\phi(N_1+n-1)} - 1. \quad (3.34)$$

Let $J_{N_1+n}(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{N_1+n})$ and $J_{N_1+n}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{N_1+n})$ be two distinct intervals in E_n . These intervals are separated by the basic interval of order N_1+n+1 , namely, $I_{N_1+n+1}(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{N_1+n}, 1)$ or $I_{N_1+n+1}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{N_1+n}, 1)$, depending on the relative position between $J_{N_1+n}(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{N_1+n})$ and $J_{N_1+n}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{N_1+n})$. Then, using (2.2), the gap between $J_{N_1+n}(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{N_1+n})$ and $J_{N_1+n}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{N_1+n})$ is at least

$$\begin{aligned} |I_{N_1+n+1}(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{N_1+n}, 1)| &\geq 2^{-2(N_1+n+2)} (\tau_{N_1+1} \cdots \tau_{N_1+n})^{-2} \\ &\geq 2^{-2(N_1+n+2)} \prod_{i=1}^n \left(\left(1 + \frac{1}{\phi(N_1+i-1)}\right) d_{N_1+i} \right)^{-2} := \theta_n. \end{aligned} \quad (3.35)$$

Note that $0 < \theta_{n+1} < \theta_n$ for any $n \geq 1$. A similar calculation yields the same inequality for the estimate of $|I_{N_1+n+1}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{N_1+n}, 1)|$.

Step 4: Estimate the Hausdorff dimension of E . We distinguish the following two cases: $n = 2k - 1$ and $n = 2k$ for any $k \geq 1$.

Case 1: If $n = 2k - 1$ for any $k \geq 1$. Then, by (3.33) and (3.34), we have

$$\begin{aligned} m_1 \cdots m_{n-1} &= m_1 \cdots m_{2k-2} \\ &\geq \prod_{i=1}^{2k-2} \left(\frac{d_{N_1+i}}{\phi(N_1+i-1)} - 1 \right) \geq \prod_{i=1}^{2k-2} \frac{d_{N_1+i}}{2\phi(N_1+i-1)} \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^{2k-2} \frac{1}{2\phi(N_1+i-1)} (d_{N_1+1} d_{N_1+2}) (d_{N_1+3} d_{N_1+4}) \cdots (d_{N_1+2k-3} d_{N_1+2k-2}) \\ &= e^{\phi(N_1+1) + \phi(N_1+3) + \cdots + \phi(N_1+2k-3)(1+o(1))}. \end{aligned}$$

At the same time, we deduce from (3.33), (3.34) and (3.35) that

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_n m_n &= \theta_{2k-1} m_{2k-1} \\ &\geq 2^{-2(N_1+2k-1+2)} \frac{d_{N_1+2k-1}}{2\phi(N_1+2k-2)} \prod_{i=1}^{2k-1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\phi(N_1+i-1)}\right)^{-2} \prod_{i=1}^{2k-1} d_{N_1+i}^{-2} \\ &= e^{\phi(N_1+1) + \phi(N_1+2) + \cdots + \phi(N_1+2k-2)(1+o(1))}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by Lemma 2.6, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\dim_{\mathbb{H}} E &\geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(m_1 \cdots m_{n-1})}{-\log(\theta_n m_n)} = \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(m_1 \cdots m_{2k-2})}{-\log(\theta_{2k-1} m_{2k-1})} \\
&\geq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \phi(N_1 + 2i - 1)}{\sum_{i=1}^{2k-2} \phi(N_1 + i)} \geq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^k \phi(2i - 1)}{\sum_{i=1}^{2k} \phi(i)} \\
&= \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^k \log \varphi(2i - 1)}{\sum_{i=1}^k \log \varphi(2i - 1) + \sum_{i=1}^k \log \varphi(2i)} \\
&= \frac{1}{1 + \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^k \log \varphi(2i)}{\sum_{i=1}^k \log \varphi(2i-1)}}. \tag{3.36}
\end{aligned}$$

Case 2: If $n = 2k$ for any $k \geq 1$. Then, by using the same methods in **Case 1**, we obtain that

$$m_1 \cdots m_{n-1} = m_1 \cdots m_{2k-1} \geq e^{(\phi(N_1+2)+\phi(N_1+4)+\dots+\phi(N_1+2k-2))(1+o(1))},$$

and

$$\theta_n m_n = \theta_{2k} m_{2k} \geq e^{(\phi(N_1+1)+\phi(N_1+2)+\dots+\phi(N_1+2k-1))(1+o(1))}.$$

Thus, by Lemma 2.6, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\dim_{\mathbb{H}} E &\geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(m_1 \cdots m_{n-1})}{-\log(\theta_n m_n)} = \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(m_1 \cdots m_{2k-1})}{-\log(\theta_{2k} m_{2k})} \\
&\geq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \phi(N_1 + 2i)}{\sum_{i=1}^{2k-1} \phi(N_1 + i)} \geq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^k \phi(2i)}{\sum_{i=1}^{2k+1} \phi(i)} \\
&= \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^k \log \varphi(2i)}{\sum_{i=1}^{k+1} \log \varphi(2i - 1) + \sum_{i=1}^k \log \varphi(2i)} \\
&= \frac{1}{1 + \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k+1} \log \varphi(2i-1)}{\sum_{i=1}^k \log \varphi(2i)}}. \tag{3.37}
\end{aligned}$$

We deduce from (3.36) and (3.37) that

$$\dim_{\mathbb{H}} L(\varphi) \geq \dim_{\mathbb{H}} E \geq \frac{1}{1 + \beta},$$

$$\text{where } \beta = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \varphi(n+1) + \log \varphi(n-1) + \dots + \log \varphi(n+1-2\lfloor n/2 \rfloor)}{\log \varphi(n) + \log \varphi(n-2) + \dots + \log \varphi(n-2\lfloor (n-1)/2 \rfloor)}.$$

3.3.2. Upper bound

We will present a cover of the set $L(\varphi)$. By Lemma 2.9 (2) and the definition of $L(\varphi)$, for any $0 < \varepsilon < 1/3$ and sufficiently large n , we have

$$\frac{\varphi(n+1)}{\varphi(n)} > \frac{1+\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon} \quad \text{and} \quad 1-\varepsilon < \frac{L_n(x)}{\varphi(n)} < 1+\varepsilon. \tag{3.38}$$

Combining (3.38) with the definition of $L_n(x)$, we obtain

$$a_n(x) a_{n+1}(x) \leq L_n(x) < (1+\varepsilon)\varphi(n) \quad \text{for sufficiently large } n.$$

We claim that

$$a_n(x)a_{n+1}(x) > (1 - \varepsilon)\varphi(n) \text{ for sufficiently large } n.$$

Indeed, we deduce from (3.38) that

$$L_{n-1}(x) \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\varphi(n-1) < (1 - \varepsilon)\varphi(n) < L_n(x) = \max\{L_{n-1}(x), a_n(x)a_{n+1}(x)\},$$

which implies $a_n(x)a_{n+1}(x) = L_n(x) > (1 - \varepsilon)\varphi(n)$ for sufficiently large n . Clearly, we have

$$L(\varphi) \subseteq \bigcup_{N=1}^{\infty} E(\varphi, N),$$

where $E(\varphi, N)$ is defined as

$$E(\varphi, N) := \{x \in (0, 1) : (1 - \varepsilon)\varphi(n) < a_n(x)a_{n+1}(x) < (1 + \varepsilon)\varphi(n), \forall n \geq N\}.$$

It suffices to estimate the upper bound for the Hausdorff dimension of $E(\varphi, N)$ for all $N \geq 1$. We only consider the case $N = 1$, the same method can be used in other cases. For any $n \geq 1$, set

$$D_{n+1}(\varphi) := \{(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{n+1}) \in \mathbb{N}^{n+1} : (1 - \varepsilon)\varphi(k) < \sigma_k \sigma_{k+1} < (1 + \varepsilon)\varphi(k), \forall 1 \leq k \leq n\}.$$

For any $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{n+1}) \in D_{n+1}(\varphi)$, let

$$J_{n+1}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{n+1}) := \bigcup_{\sigma_{n+2}: (1-\varepsilon)\varphi(n+1) < \sigma_{n+1}\sigma_{n+2} < (1+\varepsilon)\varphi(n+1)} I_{n+2}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{n+1}, \sigma_{n+2}). \quad (3.39)$$

Then, we have

$$E(\varphi, 1) = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{n+1}) \in D_{n+1}(\varphi)} J_{n+1}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{n+1}). \quad (3.40)$$

For any $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{n+1}) \in D_{n+1}(\varphi)$, we shall estimate the length of $J_{n+1}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{n+1})$ and the cardinality of the set $D_{n+1}(\varphi)$. It follows from (2.2) and (3.39) that

$$\begin{aligned} |J_{n+1}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{n+1})| &\leq \sum_{\sigma_{n+1}\sigma_{n+2} > (1-\varepsilon)\varphi(n+1)} |I_{n+2}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{n+1}, \sigma_{n+2})| \\ &\leq \sum_{\sigma_{n+1}\sigma_{n+2} > (1-\varepsilon)\varphi(n+1)} \left(\frac{1}{\sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_{n+1}\sigma_{n+2}} \right)^{-2} \\ &= \sum_{\sigma_{n+1}\sigma_{n+2} > (1-\varepsilon)\varphi(n+1)} \frac{1}{\sigma_1} \cdot \frac{1}{\sigma_1\sigma_2} \cdot \frac{1}{\sigma_2\sigma_3} \cdots \frac{1}{\sigma_n\sigma_{n+1}} \cdot \frac{1}{\sigma_{n+1}} \cdot \frac{1}{\sigma_{n+2}^2} \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} \right)^n \frac{1}{\varphi(1)\varphi(2) \cdots \varphi(n)} \frac{1}{\sigma_{n+1}} \sum_{\sigma_{n+1}\sigma_{n+2} > (1-\varepsilon)\varphi(n+1)} \frac{1}{\sigma_{n+2}^2} \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} \right)^{n+1} \frac{2}{\varphi(1)\varphi(2) \cdots \varphi(n)\varphi(n+1)} := \delta_{n+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.41)$$

For the cardinality of the set $D_{n+1}(\varphi)$, we have

$$\#D_{n+1}(\varphi) \leq \sum_{\sigma_1=1}^{(1+\varepsilon)\varphi(1)} \sum_{\sigma_2=\frac{(1-\varepsilon)\varphi(1)}{\sigma_1}}^{\frac{(1+\varepsilon)\varphi(1)}{\sigma_1}} \sum_{\sigma_3=\frac{(1-\varepsilon)\varphi(2)}{\sigma_2}}^{\frac{(1+\varepsilon)\varphi(2)}{\sigma_2}} \cdots \sum_{\sigma_{n+1}=\frac{(1-\varepsilon)\varphi(n)}{\sigma_n}}^{\frac{(1+\varepsilon)\varphi(n)}{\sigma_n}} 1. \quad (3.42)$$

Notice that for any $k \geq 1$,

$$\frac{\sum_{\sigma_{k+1}=\frac{(1+\varepsilon)\varphi(k)}{\sigma_k}}^{(1+\varepsilon)\varphi(k)}}{\sum_{\sigma_{k+2}=\frac{(1-\varepsilon)\varphi(k+1)}{\sigma_{k+1}}}^{(1+\varepsilon)\varphi(k+1)}} = \frac{\sum_{\sigma_{k+1}=\frac{(1+\varepsilon)\varphi(k)}{\sigma_k}}^{(1+\varepsilon)\varphi(k)}}{\sum_{\sigma_{k+1}=\frac{(1-\varepsilon)\varphi(k)}{\sigma_k}}^{(1+\varepsilon)\varphi(k)}} \frac{2\varepsilon\varphi(k+1)}{\sigma_{k+1}} \leq (2\varepsilon)^2(1-\varepsilon)^{-1}\varphi(k+1). \quad (3.43)$$

To continue the proof, we distinguish the two cases.

Case 1: If $n = 2k - 1$ for any $k \geq 1$. Then by (3.42) and (3.43), we have

$$\#D_{n+1}(\varphi) = \#D_{2k}(\varphi) \leq (2\varepsilon)^{2k-1}(1-\varepsilon)^{-k}\varphi^2(1)\varphi(3)\cdots\varphi(2k-1).$$

We deduce from (3.40), (3.41) and Lemma 2.7 that

$$\begin{aligned} \dim_{\mathbb{H}} E(\varphi, 1) &\leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(\#D_{n+1}(\varphi))}{-\log \delta_{n+1}} \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(\#D_{2k}(\varphi))}{-\log \delta_{2k}} \\ &= \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^k \log \varphi(2i-1)}{\sum_{i=1}^{2k} \log \varphi(i)} = \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^k \log \varphi(2i-1)}{\sum_{i=1}^k \log \varphi(2i-1) + \sum_{i=1}^k \log \varphi(2i)} \\ &= \frac{1}{1 + \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^k \log \varphi(2i)}{\sum_{i=1}^k \log \varphi(2i-1)}}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.44)$$

Case 2: If $n = 2k$ for any $k \geq 1$. Then by the same method used in **Case 1**, we obtain

$$\#D_{n+1}(\varphi) = \#D_{2k+1}(\varphi) \leq (2\varepsilon)^{2k}(1-\varepsilon)^{-k}(1+\varepsilon)\varphi(1)\varphi(2)\varphi(4)\cdots\varphi(2k).$$

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \dim_{\mathbb{H}} E(\varphi, 1) &\leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(\#D_{n+1}(\varphi))}{-\log \delta_{n+1}} \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(\#D_{2k+1}(\varphi))}{-\log \delta_{2k+1}} \\ &= \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^k \log \varphi(2i)}{\sum_{i=1}^{2k+1} \log \varphi(i)} = \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^k \log \varphi(2i)}{\sum_{i=1}^{k+1} \log \varphi(2i-1) + \sum_{i=1}^k \log \varphi(2i)} \\ &= \frac{1}{1 + \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k+1} \log \varphi(2i-1)}{\sum_{i=1}^k \log \varphi(2i)}}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.45)$$

Thus, by (3.44) and (3.45), we conclude that

$$\dim_{\mathbb{H}} L(\varphi) \leq \sup_{N \geq 1} \{\dim_{\mathbb{H}} E(\varphi, N)\} \leq \frac{1}{1 + \beta},$$

where $\beta = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \varphi(n+1) + \log \varphi(n-1) + \cdots + \log \varphi(n+1-2\lfloor n/2 \rfloor)}{\log \varphi(n) + \log \varphi(n-2) + \cdots + \log \varphi(n-2\lfloor (n-1)/2 \rfloor)}$.

4. Proof of Theorem 1.5

4.1. *The case $\log \varphi(n) = \sqrt{n}/R(n)$.*

In this case, we will prove $\dim_{\mathbb{H}} L(\varphi) = 1$. For any $k \geq 1$, let $m_k = k^2 + 1$. For any $M \in \mathbb{N}$, define $E_M(\varphi)$ as in (3.3). Let $x \in E_M(\varphi)$. For sufficiently large $n \geq 1$, there exists $k \geq 1$ such that

$m_k \leq n < m_{k+1}$. From Lemma 2.9 (3), we deduce that the function $x \mapsto e^{\frac{x}{R(x^2)}}$ is ultimately increasing. Therefore, we have $\varphi(m_k) \leq \varphi(n) < \varphi(m_{k+1})$, and thus $L_n(x) = \lfloor \varphi(m_k) \rfloor$. By Lemma 2.9 (3), we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\log \varphi(m_{k+1}) - \log \varphi(m_k)) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\varphi(m_{k+1})}{\varphi(m_k)} = 1.$$

Hence, we obtain

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{L_n(x)}{\varphi(n)} = 1,$$

which implies that $E_M(\varphi)$ is a subset of $E(\varphi)$. Using the same method as in Theorem 1.4 for the case $0 \leq \rho < 1/2$, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, we obtain

$$\dim_{\text{H}} L(\varphi) \geq \dim_{\text{H}} E_M(\varphi) \geq \frac{1}{1 + \varepsilon} \dim_{\text{H}} E_M.$$

Letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ and $M \rightarrow \infty$, we get the desired result.

4.2. The case $\log \varphi(n) = \sqrt{n}R(n)$.

For the lower bound of $\dim_{\text{H}} L(\varphi)$, we can apply the same method as in Theorem 1.4 for the case $1/2 < \rho < 1$. Since this follows as a corollary of Lemma 2.5, the proof is omitted.

For the upper bound, we follow the proof of Theorem 1.4 for the case $1/2 < \rho \leq 1$. For any $k \geq 1$, define $n_k = k^2$. From Lemma 2.9 (3), we deduce that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\varphi(n_{k+1})}{\varphi(n_k)} = \infty.$$

Let $x \in L(\varphi)$ be fixed. By applying the same arguments as in Proposition 3.6, we obtain that for sufficiently large $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $j_k \geq 1$ such that $n_{k-1} < j_k \leq n_k$ and $L_{n_k}(x) = a_{j_k}(x)a_{j_k+1}(x)$. Consequently, for any $s \in (1/2, 1)$ and $0 < \varepsilon < 2s - 1$, there exists $K \geq 1$ such that for all $k \geq K$,

$$(1 - \varepsilon)\varphi(n_k) \leq L_{n_k}(x) \leq S_{n_k}(x) - S_{n_{k-1}}(x) < S_{n_k}(x) \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\varphi(n_k). \quad (4.1)$$

For any $k \geq K$, set

$$\widetilde{M}_k = \{i \in \mathbb{N} : (1 - \varepsilon)\varphi(n_k) \leq i \leq (1 + \varepsilon)n_k\varphi(n_k)\}.$$

For any $K_1 \geq K$, define

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{J}}(\varphi, k, K_1) = \left\{ I_{n_{k+1}}(a_1, \dots, a_{n_{k+1}}) : \sum_{j=n_{\ell-1}+1}^{n_{\ell}} a_j a_{j+1} = m_{\ell} \text{ with } m_{\ell} \in M_{\ell}, K_1 \leq \ell \leq k \right\}.$$

It follows that

$$L(\varphi) \subseteq \bigcup_{K_1=K}^{\infty} \bigcap_{k=K_1}^{\infty} \widetilde{\mathcal{J}}(\varphi, k, K_1).$$

As in the proof of the case $1/2 < \rho \leq 1$ in Theorem 1.4, we estimate the sum

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{I_{n_{k+1}} \subseteq \widetilde{\mathcal{J}}(\varphi, k, K)} |I_{n_{k+1}}|^s &\leq \prod_{\ell=K}^k \left\{ C n_{\ell} e^{(1+\varepsilon-2s)\log \varphi(n_{\ell})} \left(\frac{9}{2} (2 + \xi(2s - \varepsilon)) \right)^{\frac{n_{\ell} - n_{\ell-1}}{2}} \right\} \\ &= \prod_{\ell=K}^k \left\{ C \ell^2 e^{(1+\varepsilon-2s)\ell R(\ell^2)} \left(\frac{9}{2} (2 + \xi(2s - \varepsilon)) \right)^{\frac{2\ell-1}{2}} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where C is a constant independent of ℓ . Since $R(x)$ is a regularly increasing function with index 0, by using the same method as in (3.29), we can conclude that

$$\ell^2 e^{(1+\varepsilon-2s)\ell R(\ell^2)} \left(\frac{9}{2}(2 + \xi(2s - \varepsilon)) \right)^{\frac{2\ell-1}{2}} < e^{(1+\varepsilon-2s)\ell},$$

for sufficiently large ℓ . This implies

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{I_{n_k+1} \subseteq \tilde{J}(\varphi, k, K)} |I_{n_k+1}|^s = 0.$$

Hence, we conclude that

$$\dim_{\text{H}} L(\varphi) \leq 1/2.$$

5. Proof of Theorem 1.6

Our method is mainly inspired by Fang, Moreira and Zhang [11].

5.1. Lower bound

Let $\{n_k\}$ be a strictly increasing sequence of positive integers, and $\{s_k\}$ and $\{t_k\}$ be two sequences of positive numbers with $s_k, t_k \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. For any $M \in \mathbb{N}$, define

$$E(\{n_k\}, \{s_k\}, \{t_k\}) := \left\{ x \in (0, 1) : s_k < a_{n_k} \leq s_k + t_k \text{ for all large } k \in \mathbb{N}, \right. \\ \left. 1 \leq a_j(x) \leq M \text{ for all } j \neq n_k \right\}.$$

For the sequences $\{n_k\}$, $\{s_k\}$ and $\{t_k\}$, we make the following assumptions:

(H1) $\{n_k\}$ satisfies that $n_k/k \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$;

(H2) $\{s_k\}$ and $\{t_k\}$ are logarithmically equivalent in the sense that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log s_k}{\log t_k} = 1;$$

(H3) there exist two real numbers α_1, α_2 such that

$$\alpha_1 := \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{j=1}^k \log s_j \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_2 := \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n_k} \log s_k.$$

Lemma 5.1. ([11, Theorem A]) *Under hypotheses (H1), (H2) and (H3). If $\alpha_1 \in (0, \infty)$, then*

$$\dim_{\text{H}} E(\{n_k\}, \{s_k\}, \{t_k\}) = \theta_1(\alpha_1, \alpha_2),$$

where $\theta_1(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$ is the unique real solution of the pressure equation

$$P(\theta) = (2\alpha_1 - \alpha_2)\theta - (\alpha_1 - \alpha_2).$$

Now, we use Lemma 5.1 to construct the Cantor-type subset of $L(\psi)$. For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$n_k = k^2, \quad s_k = e^{ck} \quad \text{and} \quad t_k = \frac{s_k}{k}. \quad (5.1)$$

Then, for any $n \geq 1$, there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $n_k \leq n < n_{k+1}$. Thus, $\psi(n) = e^{c\lfloor\sqrt{n}\rfloor} = e^{ck}$.

Proposition 5.1. *For the above sequences $\{n_k\}$, $\{s_k\}$ and $\{t_k\}$, we have*

$$E(\{n_k\}, \{s_k\}, \{t_k\}) \subseteq L(\psi).$$

Proof. Let $a_j(x) = 1$ for any $j \neq n_k$ with $k \geq 1$. Then, for any $x \in E(\{n_k\}, \{s_k\}, \{t_k\})$, we have

$$e^{ck} = s_k \leq a_{n_k}(x) \leq s_k + t_k = \left(1 + \frac{1}{k}\right) e^{ck}.$$

For sufficiently large n , there exists k such that $n_k \leq n < n_{k+1}$, which implies that

$$e^{ck} \leq a_{n_k}(x) a_{n_{k+1}}(x) = L_n(x) \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{k}\right) e^{ck}.$$

Therefore,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{L_n(x)}{\psi(n)} = 1.$$

□

By (5.1) and (H3), it can be checked that $\alpha_1 = \frac{c}{2}$ and $\alpha_2 = 0$. Then by Lemma 5.1, we have

$$\dim_{\text{H}} L(\psi) \geq \dim_{\text{H}} E(\{n_k\}, \{s_k\}, \{t_k\}) = \theta_1(c/2, 0) = \theta(c).$$

5.2. Upper bound

By classifying the value of the product of consecutive partial quotients, we shall construct a big Cantor-type set containing $L(\psi)$. For any $c > 0$ and integer $m \geq 0$, let

$$\Pi_n^{(m)}(x) := \prod_{\substack{a_i(x)a_{i+1}(x) > e^{cm} \\ 1 \leq i \leq n}} a_i(x) a_{i+1}(x) \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma_{m,n}(c) = \left\{x \in (0, 1) : \Pi_n^{(m)}(x) > e^{\frac{cn}{2}}\right\}.$$

Then, denote by

$$\Gamma(c) := \bigcap_{m=0}^{\infty} \Gamma_m(c). \quad (5.2)$$

Here, the set $\Gamma_m(c)$ is given by

$$\Gamma_m(c) := \bigcap_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n=N}^{\infty} \Gamma_{m,n}(c). \quad (5.3)$$

Proposition 5.2. *For any $\delta > 0$, we have $L(\psi) \subseteq \Gamma(c - \delta)$.*

Proof. Let $x \in L(\psi)$. For any $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{e-1}{e}$ and $m \geq 0$, there exists $K_0(\varepsilon, m)$ such that for any $k \geq K_0$,

$$L_{k^2}(x) \geq (1 - \varepsilon)e^{ck} \geq e^m. \quad (5.4)$$

Using the same method as in Proposition 3.6, we can verify that

$$L_{k^2}(x) = a_{j_k}(x)a_{j_k+1}(x),$$

where $(k-1)^2 < j_k \leq k^2$. From (5.4), we deduce that

$$\Pi_{k^2}^{(m)}(x) \geq \prod_{i=K_0}^k L_{i^2}(x) \geq (1 - \varepsilon)^{k-K_0+1} e^{\frac{c}{2}(k^2-K_0^2)} \geq e^{\frac{c}{2}(k^2-K_0^2)-k} \geq e^{\frac{(c-\delta)}{2}k^2},$$

where δ depends on K_0 and the penultimate inequality holds for $(1 - \varepsilon)^k \geq e^{-k}$. This implies that

$$x \in \Gamma(c - \delta).$$

□

In the following, we shall estimate the upper bound of $\dim_{\text{H}} \Gamma(c)$.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $c > 0$. Then*

$$\dim_{\text{H}} \Gamma(c) \leq \theta(c),$$

where $\theta(c)$ is the unique real solution of the equation $P(\theta) = c \left(\theta - \frac{1}{2}\right)$.

Proof. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, choose positive integer $m_* > \max \left\{ \frac{c}{2}, e^8 \right\}$ large enough such that

$$\max \left\{ (em_*)^{1/m_*}, (2em_*/c)^{1/m_*} \right\} \leq e^\varepsilon. \quad (5.5)$$

Then by (5.2), we have

$$\Gamma(c) \subseteq \Gamma_{m_*}(c). \quad (5.6)$$

It is sufficient to estimate the upper bound of the Hausdorff dimension of $\Gamma_{m_*}(c)$. By (5.3), we first focus on the set $\Gamma_{m_*,n}(c)$. Since $c > 0$, there exists $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $e^{\frac{cn}{2}} > e^{m_*}$ for all $n \geq N_0$. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n > N_0$ be fixed. For any $x \in \Gamma_{m_*,n}(c)$, there exists $1 \leq \ell \leq \lfloor (n+1)/2 \rfloor$ with $1 \leq j_\ell \leq n$ and $j_k + 1 < j_{k+1}$ such that for all $1 \leq k \leq \ell$,

$$a_{j_k}(x)a_{j_k+1}(x) > e^{m_*} \quad \text{and} \quad \prod_{k=1}^{\ell} a_{j_k}(x)a_{j_k+1}(x) > e^{\frac{cn}{2}}. \quad (5.7)$$

Meanwhile, for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ with $i \neq j_1, \dots, j_\ell$, we have

$$1 \leq a_i(x)a_{i+1}(x) \leq e^{m_*}. \quad (5.8)$$

For any $1 \leq k \leq \ell$, let $\lambda_k(x) := \lfloor \log a_{j_k}(x)a_{j_k+1}(x) \rfloor + 1$. Then by (5.7) and (5.8), we have

$$\lambda_1(x) + \dots + \lambda_\ell(x) > \max \left\{ \frac{cn}{2}, m_* \ell \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad e^{\lambda_k(x)-1} < a_{j_k}(x)a_{j_k+1}(x) \leq e^{\lambda_k(x)}.$$

We take some notations. For any $n, \ell, \lambda \in \mathbb{N}$ with $1 \leq \ell \leq \lfloor (n+1)/2 \rfloor$ and $\lambda > \max\{cn/2, m_*\ell\}$, let

$$\mathcal{A}_{n,\ell} := \left\{ (j_1, \dots, j_\ell) \in \mathbb{N}^\ell : j_k + 1 < j_{k+1} \text{ for all } 1 \leq k \leq \ell \text{ and } 1 \leq \ell \leq \lfloor (n+1)/2 \rfloor \right\},$$

and

$$\mathcal{B}_{\ell,\lambda} := \left\{ (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_\ell) \in \mathbb{N}^\ell : \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_\ell > m_*, \lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_\ell = \lambda \right\}.$$

Let $\mathbf{j}_\ell := (j_1, \dots, j_\ell) \in \mathcal{A}_{n,\ell}$ and $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_\ell := (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_\ell) \in \mathcal{B}_{\ell,\lambda}$. It follows that

$$\Gamma_{m_*,n}(c) \subseteq \bigcup_{\ell=1}^{\lfloor (n+1)/2 \rfloor} \bigcup_{\lambda > \max\{cn/2, m_*\ell\}} \bigcup_{\mathbf{j}_\ell \in \mathcal{A}_{n,\ell}} \bigcup_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_\ell \in \mathcal{B}_{\ell,\lambda}} \Gamma_{\mathbf{j}_\ell}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_\ell}(c),$$

where

$$\Gamma_{\mathbf{j}_\ell}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_\ell}(c) := \left\{ x \in (0, 1) : 1 \leq a_i(x)a_{i+1}(x) \leq e^{m_*} \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq n \text{ with } i \neq j_1, \dots, j_\ell; \right. \\ \left. e^{\lambda_k(x)-1} < a_{j_k}(x)a_{j_k+1}(x) \leq e^{\lambda_k(x)} \text{ for all } 1 \leq k \leq \ell \right\}.$$

Now, we provide a symbolic description of the structure of $\Gamma_{m_*,n}(c)$. For any $n \geq 1$, let

$$\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{j}_\ell}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_\ell}(n+1) := \left\{ (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{n+1}) \in \mathbb{N}^{n+1} : 1 \leq \sigma_i \sigma_{i+1} \leq e^{m_*} \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq n \text{ with } i \neq j_1, \dots, j_\ell; \right. \\ \left. e^{\lambda_k(x)-1} < \sigma_{j_k} \sigma_{j_k+1} \leq e^{\lambda_k(x)} \text{ for all } 1 \leq k \leq \ell \right\}. \quad (5.9)$$

Therefore,

$$\Gamma_{m_*,n}(c) \subseteq \bigcup_{\ell=1}^{\lfloor (n+1)/2 \rfloor} \bigcup_{\lambda > \max\{cn/2, m_*\ell\}} \bigcup_{\mathbf{j}_\ell \in \mathcal{A}_{n,\ell}} \bigcup_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_\ell \in \mathcal{B}_{\ell,\lambda}} \bigcup_{(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{n+1}) \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{j}_\ell}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_\ell}(n+1)} I_{n+1}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{n+1}). \quad (5.10)$$

The following is to estimate the cardinalities of $\mathcal{A}_{n,\ell}$ and $\mathcal{B}_{\ell,\lambda}$, as well as the diameter of $I_{n+1}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{n+1})$ with $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{n+1}) \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{j}_\ell}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_\ell}(n+1)$. Before proceeding, we state a version of the Stirling formula (see [29]) that will be used in the sequel:

$$\sqrt{2\pi} n^{n+\frac{1}{2}} e^{-n} \leq n! \leq e n^{n+\frac{1}{2}} e^{-n}, \quad \forall n \geq 1. \quad (5.11)$$

Let $n, \ell, \lambda \in \mathbb{N}$ be fixed such that $1 \leq \ell \leq \lfloor (n+1)/2 \rfloor$ and $\lambda > \max\{cn/2, m_*\ell\}$. Then by (5.5) and (5.11), we have

$$\#\mathcal{A}_{n,\ell} \leq \binom{\lfloor (n+1)/2 \rfloor - \ell}{\ell} < \binom{n}{\ell} < \frac{n^\ell}{\ell!} < \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\ell}} \left(\frac{en}{\ell}\right)^\ell < \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\ell}} \left(\frac{2e\lambda}{c\ell}\right)^\ell \\ < \left(\frac{2e\lambda}{c\ell}\right)^\ell < \left(\frac{2}{c}em_*\right)^{\frac{\lambda}{m_*}} \leq e^{\varepsilon\lambda}, \quad (5.12)$$

where the fifth inequality holds for $\lambda > \frac{cn}{2}$, the penultimate inequality comes from the fact that $m_* > c/2$ and the function $\ell \mapsto \left(\frac{2e\lambda}{c\ell}\right)^\ell$ is increasing on $(0, 2\lambda/c)$. For the cardinality of $\mathcal{B}_{\ell,\lambda}$, by using (5.5) and (5.11) again, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \#\mathcal{B}_{\ell,\lambda} &= \binom{\lambda - m_*\ell - 1}{\ell - 1} < \binom{\lambda - 1}{\ell - 1} < \frac{\lambda^\ell}{\ell!} < \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\ell}} \left(\frac{e\lambda}{\ell}\right)^\ell \\ &< \left(\frac{e\lambda}{\ell}\right)^\ell < (em_*)^{\lambda/m_*} \leq e^{\varepsilon\lambda}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.13)$$

where the penultimate inequality holds for $\ell < \lambda/m_*$ and the function $\ell \mapsto \left(\frac{e\lambda}{\ell}\right)^\ell$ is increasing on $(0, \lambda)$. Now, we turn to estimate the diameter of $I_{n+1}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{n+1})$. For any $j_\ell \in \mathcal{A}_{n,\ell}$, $\lambda_\ell \in \mathcal{B}_{\ell,\lambda}$ and $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{n+1}) \in \mathcal{C}_{j_\ell}^{\lambda_\ell}(n+1)$, By Lemma 2.3, (2.2) and (5.9), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |I_{n+1}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{n+1})| &\leq 2^\ell 8^{2\ell} \left(\prod_{k=1}^{\ell} |I_2(\sigma_{j_k}, \sigma_{j_k+1})| \right) |I_{n+1-2\ell}(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{n+1-2\ell})| \\ &\leq 2^{7\ell} \left(\prod_{k=1}^{\ell} (\sigma_{j_k} \sigma_{j_k+1})^{-2} \right) \frac{1}{q_{n+1-2\ell}^2(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{n+1-2\ell})} \\ &\leq 2^{7\ell} \left(\prod_{k=1}^{\ell} (e^{-2(\lambda_k(x)-1)}) \right) \frac{1}{q_{n+1-2\ell}^2(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{n+1-2\ell})} \\ &= (2^7 e^2)^\ell e^{-2\lambda} \frac{1}{q_{n+1-2\ell}^2(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{n+1-2\ell})}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.14)$$

where $(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{n+1-2\ell})$ denotes the sequence obtained by eliminating the terms $\{\sigma_{j_k}, \sigma_{j_k+1} : 1 \leq k \leq \ell\}$ from $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{n+1})$. That is, for all $1 \leq i \leq n - 2\ell$, we have $1 \leq \tau_i(x)\tau_{i+1}(x) \leq e^{m_*}$.

In the following, we shall choose a suitable positive real number s such that $\mathcal{H}^s(\Gamma_{m_*}(c)) \leq 0$. It is worth pointing out that $\theta(c)$ is the unique real solution of $P(\theta) = c(\theta - \frac{1}{2})$, then $\theta(c) \in (1/2, 1)$. For any $s > \theta(c)$, we deduce that $P(s) < c(s - \frac{1}{2})$. Let ε be small enough such that (5.5) and

$$0 < \varepsilon < \min \left\{ \frac{2s-1}{s+2}, \frac{c(s-1/2) - P(s)}{(1+s/2)c+1} \right\} \quad (5.15)$$

hold. Denote by

$$\Sigma_s := \sum_{(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{n+1}) \in \mathcal{C}_{j_\ell}^{\lambda_\ell}(n+1)} |I_{n+1}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{n+1})|^s. \quad (5.16)$$

Then by (5.14), we have

$$\Sigma_s \leq \sum_{(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{n+1}) \in \mathcal{C}_{j_\ell}^{\lambda_\ell}(n+1)} (2^7 e^2)^{\ell s} e^{-2\lambda s} \frac{1}{q_{n+1-2\ell}^{2s}(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{n+1-2\ell})}.$$

Notice that

$$\begin{cases} 1 \leq \sigma_i(x)\sigma_{i+1}(x) \leq e^{m_*} \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq n \text{ with } i \neq j_1, \dots, j_\ell, \\ e^{\lambda_k(x)-1} < \sigma_{j_k}(x)\sigma_{j_k+1}(x) \leq e^{\lambda_k(x)} \text{ for all } 1 \leq k \leq \ell. \end{cases}$$

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma_s &\leq (2^7 e^2)^{\ell s} \prod_{k=1}^{\ell} \left(\sum_{e^{\lambda k-1} < \sigma_{j_k} \sigma_{j_{k+1}} \leq e^{\lambda k}} e^{-2\lambda s} \right) \sum_{1 \leq \tau_i \tau_{i+1} \leq e^{m_*}} \frac{1}{q_{n+1-2\ell}^{2s}(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{n+1-2\ell})} \\ &\leq (2^7 e^2)^{\ell s} e^{(1-2s)\lambda} \sum_{\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{n+1-2\ell} \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{q_{n+1-2\ell}^{2s}(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{n+1-2\ell})}.\end{aligned}\quad (5.17)$$

Since $\lambda > m_* \ell$ and $m_* > e^8$, we deduce from (5.5) that

$$(2^7 e^2)^\ell < (em_*)^{\lambda/m_*} \leq e^{\varepsilon \lambda}.\quad (5.18)$$

Notice that $s > 1/2$, then by (1.3), there exists $K_\varepsilon > 0$ such that for all $n \geq 1$,

$$\sum_{a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{N}} q_n^{-2s}(a_1, \dots, a_n) \leq K_\varepsilon e^{n(P(s)+\varepsilon)}.\quad (5.19)$$

Substituting (5.18) and (5.19) into (5.17), we obtain

$$\Sigma_s \leq e^{\varepsilon \lambda s} e^{(1-2s)\lambda} K_\varepsilon e^{(n+1-2\ell)(P(s)+\varepsilon)} \leq K_\varepsilon e^{\lambda(1-2s+\varepsilon s)} e^{n(P(s)+\varepsilon)}.$$

This, in combination with (5.12) and (5.13), implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\lambda > \max\{cn/2, m_* \ell\}} \sum_{j_\ell \in \mathcal{A}_{n,\ell}} \sum_{\lambda_\ell \in \mathcal{B}_{\ell,\lambda}} \Sigma_s &\leq K_\varepsilon e^{n(P(s)+\varepsilon)} \sum_{\lambda > \max\{cn/2, m_* \ell\}} e^{(1-2s+\varepsilon(s+2))\lambda} \\ &\leq K_\varepsilon e^{n(P(s)+\varepsilon)} \sum_{\lambda > cn/2} e^{(1-2s+\varepsilon(s+2))\lambda} \\ &\leq K_\varepsilon^* e^{n(P(s)+\varepsilon)+(1-2s+\varepsilon(s+2))cn/2},\end{aligned}\quad (5.20)$$

where K_ε^* is a constant only depending on s, ε and c . Now we are ready to estimate the upper bound of the Hausdorff dimension of $\Gamma_{m_*}(c)$. It follows from (5.3), (5.10), (5.15), (5.16) and (5.20) that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}^s(\Gamma_{m_*}(c)) &\leq \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n=N}^{\infty} \sum_{\ell=1}^{\lfloor (n+1)/2 \rfloor} \sum_{\lambda > \max\{bn, m_* \ell\}} \sum_{j_\ell \in \mathcal{A}_{n,\ell}} \sum_{\lambda_\ell \in \mathcal{B}_{\ell,\lambda}} \sum_{(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{n+1}) \in \mathcal{C}_{j_\ell}^{\lambda_\ell}(n+1)} |I_{n+1}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{n+1})|^s \\ &\leq \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n=N}^{\infty} \sum_{\ell=1}^{\lfloor (n+1)/2 \rfloor} \sum_{\lambda > \max\{bn, m_* \ell\}} \sum_{j_\ell \in \mathcal{A}_{n,\ell}} \sum_{\lambda_\ell \in \mathcal{B}_{\ell,\lambda}} \Sigma_s \\ &\leq \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n=N}^{\infty} \sum_{\ell=1}^{\lfloor (n+1)/2 \rfloor} K_\varepsilon^* e^{n(P(s)+\varepsilon)+(1-2s+\varepsilon(s+2))cn/2} \\ &\leq K_\varepsilon^* \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n=N}^{\infty} n e^{n(P(s)+\varepsilon)+(1-2s+\varepsilon(s+2))cn/2} = 0.\end{aligned}$$

This shows that

$$\dim_{\mathbb{H}} \Gamma_{m_*}(c) \leq s.$$

Consequently, it follows from (5.6) that $\dim_{\mathbb{H}} \Gamma(c) \leq s$. Since $s > \theta(c)$ is arbitrary, we conclude that

$$\dim_{\mathbb{H}} \Gamma(c) \leq \theta(c).$$

□

From Theorem 5.1 and Proposition 5.2, we deduce that, for any $\delta > 0$,

$$\dim_{\mathbb{H}} L(\psi) \leq \dim_{\mathbb{H}} \Gamma(c - \delta) \leq \theta(c - \delta).$$

Letting $\delta \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$\dim_{\mathbb{H}} L(\psi) \leq \theta(c).$$

Acknowledgement: The authors would like to thank Professor Lingmin Liao for his invaluable comments. The research is partially supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Nos. 12201207, 12371072).

References

- [1] A. Bakhtawar and J. Feng. Increasing rate of weighted product of partial quotients in continued fractions. *Chaos Solitons Fractals* 172(2023), 113591, 7pp.
- [2] A. Bakhtawar, M. Hussain, D. Kleinbock and B.W. Wang. Metrical properties for the weighted products of multiple partial quotients in continued fractions. *Houston J. Math.* 49(2023), no. 1, 159-194.
- [3] N. Bingham, C. Goldie and J. Teugels. *Regular variation*. Cambridge university press, 1989.
- [4] P. Bos, M. Hussain and D. Simmons. The generalised Hausdorff measure of sets of Dirichlet non-improvable numbers. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 151(2023), no. 5, 1823-1838.
- [5] J.H. Chang and H.B. Chen. Slow increasing functions and the largest partial quotients in continued fraction expansions. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* 164(2018), no. 1, 1-14.
- [6] H. Davenport and W. Schmidt. Dirichlet's theorem on diophantine approximation. *Symposia Mathematica*, (INDAM, Rome, 1968/69)(London:Academic Press), Vol. IV: 113-132, 1970.
- [7] H. Diamond and J. Vaaler. Estimates for partial sums of continued fraction partial quotients. *Pacific J. Math.* 122(1986), no. 1, 73-82.
- [8] K. Falconer. *Fractal geometry: Mathematical Foundations and Applications*. John Wiley & Sons, 2004.
- [9] L.L. Fang and J. Liu. On the largest partial quotients in continued fraction expansions. *Fractals*. 26(2021), no. 4, 2150099.
- [10] L.L. Fang, J.H. Ma, K.K. Song and X. Yang. Multifractal analysis of the convergence exponents for products of consecutive partial quotients in continued fractions. *Acta Math. Sci. Ser. B (Engl. Ed.)* 44(2024), no. 4, 1594-1608.
- [11] L.L. Fang, C.G. Moreira and Y.W. Zhang. Fractal geometry of continued fractions with large coefficients and dimension drop problems. *arXiv:2409.00521*, 2024.
- [12] H. Hu, M. Hussain and Y.L. Yu. Limit theorems for sums of products of consecutive partial quotients of continued fractions. *Nonlinearity* 34(2021), no. 12, 8143-8173.
- [13] L.L. Huang, J. Wu and J. Xu. Metric properties of the product of consecutive partial quotients in continued fractions. *Israel J. Math.* 238(2020), no. 2, 901-943.
- [14] M. Hussain, D. Kleinbock, N. Wadleigh and B.W. Wang. Hausdorff measure of sets of Dirichlet non-improvable numbers. *Mathematika* 64(2018), no. 2, 502-518.
- [15] M. Iosifescu, and C. Kraaikamp. *Metrical theory of continued fractions*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 2002.
- [16] R. Jakimczuk. Integer sequences, functions of slow increase, and the Bell numbers. *J.Integer Seq.* 14 (2011), no. 5, Article 11.5.8, 11 pp.
- [17] V. Jarník. Zur metrischen Theorie der diophantischen Approximationen. *Prace. Mat. Fiz.* 36(1928), no. 1, 91-106.
- [18] J. Karamata. Sur un mode de croissance régulière des fonctions. *Mathematica (Cluj)* IV, 38-53.
- [19] M. Kesseböhmer and B. Stratmann. A multifractal analysis for Stern-Brocot intervals, continued fractions and Diophantine growth rates. *J. Reine Angew. Math.* 605(2007), 133-163.
- [20] A.Ya. Khinchin. *Metrische Kettenbruchprobleme*. *Compos. Math.* no. 1, 361-382, 1935.
- [21] A.Ya. Khinchin. *Continued Fractions*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1964.
- [22] D. Kleinbock and N. Wadleigh. A zero-one law for improvements to Dirichlet's Theorem. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 146(2018), no. 5, 1833-1844.

- [23] J. Korevaar, T. van Aardenne-Ehrenfest and N.G. De Bruijn. A note on slowly oscillating functions. *Nieuw Arch. Wiskunde*(2), 23(1949), 77-86.
- [24] L.M. Liao and M. Rams. Subexponentially increasing sums of partial quotients in continued fraction expansions. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* 160(3): 401-412, 2016.
- [25] L.M. Liao and M. Rams. Big Birkhoff sums in d -decaying Gauss like iterated function systems. *Studia. Math* 264(2022), no. 1, 1-25.
- [26] V. Marić. *Regular Variation and Differential Equations*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2000.
- [27] C.G. Moreira. Geometric properties of the Markov and Lagrange spectra. *Ann. of Math. (2)* 188(2018), no. 1, 145-170.
- [28] W. Philipp. Limit theorems for sums of partial quotients of continued fractions. *Monatsh. Math.* 105(1988), no. 3, 195-206.
- [29] H. Robbins. A remark on stirling's formula. *Amer. Math. Monthly* 62 (1955), 26–29.