

Distribution of integers with digit restrictions in arithmetic progressions

Vicente Saavedra-Araya

December 12, 2024

Let $g \geq 2$ be an integer, and we consider the base- g expansion of integers.

Let $g \geq 2$ be an integer, and we consider the base- g expansion of integers. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we can write

$$n = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} d_i g^i$$

for some $d_0, \dots, d_{m-1} \in \{0, \dots, g-1\}$.

Let $g \geq 2$ be an integer, and we consider the base- g expansion of integers. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we can write

$$n = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} d_i g^i$$

for some $d_0, \dots, d_{m-1} \in \{0, \dots, g-1\}$. We define the function **sum-of-digits in base g** as follows:

$$S_g(n) := d_0 + \dots + d_{m-1}.$$

Let $g \geq 2$ be an integer, and we consider the base- g expansion of integers. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we can write

$$n = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} d_i g^i$$

for some $d_0, \dots, d_{m-1} \in \{0, \dots, g-1\}$. We define the function **sum-of-digits in base g** as follows:

$$S_g(n) := d_0 + \dots + d_{m-1}.$$

Motivation: Study the relation between n and $S_g(n)$.

Distribution of integers in congruence classes

Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ and $a, a' \in \mathbb{N}$. For $(b, b') \in \mathbb{Z}_a \times \mathbb{Z}_{a'}$, our aim is to understand the behaviour of

$$L(b, b') := \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\{n \in A \cap [0, N) : n \equiv b \pmod{a}, S_g(n) \equiv b' \pmod{a'}\}|}{|A \cap [0, N)|}.$$

Distribution of integers in congruence classes

Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ and $a, a' \in \mathbb{N}$. For $(b, b') \in \mathbb{Z}_a \times \mathbb{Z}_{a'}$, our aim is to understand the behaviour of

$$L(b, b') := \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\{n \in A \cap [0, N) : n \equiv b \pmod{a}, S_g(n) \equiv b' \pmod{a'}\}|}{|A \cap [0, N)|}.$$

Definition

Let $a, a' \in \mathbb{N}$. The set $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ is said to be **uniformly distributed mod (a, a')** if $L(b, b') = 1/aa'$ for all $(b, b') \in \mathbb{Z}_a \times \mathbb{Z}_{a'}$.

If A is uniformly distributed $\bmod (a, a')$, the sequences $n \bmod a$ and $S_g(n) \bmod a'$ are “independent”.

If A is uniformly distributed $\bmod (a, a')$, the sequences $n \bmod a$ and $S_g(n) \bmod a'$ are “independent”.

Theorem (Gelfond, 1968)

Let $a, a' \in \mathbb{N}$. If $\gcd(g-1, a') = 1$, $\mathbb{N}$ is uniformly distributed $\bmod (a, a')$.

If A is uniformly distributed $\bmod (a, a')$, the sequences $n \bmod a$ and $S_g(n) \bmod a'$ are “independent”.

Theorem (Gelfond, 1968)

Let $a, a' \in \mathbb{N}$. If $\gcd(g-1, a') = 1$, $\mathbb{N}$ is uniformly distributed $\bmod (a, a')$.

The hypothesis avoids the obstruction coming from the fact that $S_g(n) \equiv n \bmod g-1$.

Theorem (S. 2024+)

$\mathbb{N}$ is uniformly distributed mod (a, a') if and only if there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $n \equiv 0 \pmod{a}$ and $S_g(n) \equiv 1 \pmod{a'}$.

Theorem (S. 2024+)

$\mathbb{N}$ is uniformly distributed mod (a, a') if and only if there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $n \equiv 0 \pmod{a}$ and $S_g(n) \equiv 1 \pmod{a'}$.

Remark: From Gelfond's theorem, there are infinitely many of those n , but it is possible to provide an elementary construction using $\gcd(g - 1, a') = 1$.

Integers with missing digits

For a set of digits $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \{0, \dots, g-1\}$, we define the **missing-digits set**

$$\mathcal{C}_{g,\mathcal{D}} := \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^m d_i g^i : m \in \mathbb{N}, d_i \in \mathcal{D} \right\}.$$

Integers with missing digits

For a set of digits $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \{0, \dots, g-1\}$, we define the **missing-digits set**

$$\mathcal{C}_{g,\mathcal{D}} := \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^m d_i g^i : m \in \mathbb{N}, d_i \in \mathcal{D} \right\}.$$

We say that $\mathcal{C}_{g,\mathcal{D}}$ is **uniformly distributed mod a** if for every $b \in \mathbb{Z}_a$,

$$L(b) := \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\{n \in \mathcal{C}_{g,\mathcal{D}} \cap [0, N) : n \equiv b \pmod{a}\}|}{|\mathcal{C}_{g,\mathcal{D}} \cap [0, N)|} = 1/a.$$

Integers with missing digits

For a set of digits $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \{0, \dots, g-1\}$, we define the **missing-digits set**

$$\mathcal{C}_{g,\mathcal{D}} := \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^m d_i g^i : m \in \mathbb{N}, d_i \in \mathcal{D} \right\}.$$

We say that $\mathcal{C}_{g,\mathcal{D}}$ is **uniformly distributed mod a** if for every $b \in \mathbb{Z}_a$,

$$L(b) := \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\{n \in \mathcal{C}_{g,\mathcal{D}} \cap [0, N) : n \equiv b \pmod{a}\}|}{|\mathcal{C}_{g,\mathcal{D}} \cap [0, N)|} = 1/a.$$

Theorem (Erdős-Mauduit-Sárközy, 1998)

Assume that $0 \in \mathcal{D}$, $\gcd(g(g-1), a) = 1$ and $\gcd\{d \in \mathcal{D}\} = 1$. Then, $\mathcal{C}_{g,\mathcal{D}}$ is uniformly distributed mod a .

Integers with missing digits

For a set of digits $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \{0, \dots, g-1\}$, we define the **missing-digits set**

$$\mathcal{C}_{g,\mathcal{D}} := \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^m d_i g^i : m \in \mathbb{N}, d_i \in \mathcal{D} \right\}.$$

We say that $\mathcal{C}_{g,\mathcal{D}}$ is **uniformly distributed mod a** if for every $b \in \mathbb{Z}_a$,

$$L(b) := \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\{n \in \mathcal{C}_{g,\mathcal{D}} \cap [0, N) : n \equiv b \pmod{a}\}|}{|\mathcal{C}_{g,\mathcal{D}} \cap [0, N)|} = 1/a.$$

Theorem (Erdős-Mauduit-Sárközy, 1998)

Assume that $0 \in \mathcal{D}$, $\gcd(g(g-1), a) = 1$ and $\gcd\{d \in \mathcal{D}\} = 1$. Then, $\mathcal{C}_{g,\mathcal{D}}$ is uniformly distributed mod a .

- ▶ Proof based on the circle method.
- ▶ Further generalisations were provided by Konyagin (2000) and Aloui (2015).

Theorem (S. 2024+)

Let $g \geq 2$ be an integer, and let $\mathcal{D} = \{d_1, \dots, d_t\}$ be a set of digits, where d_1 is the smallest digit. Suppose $\gcd(g, a) = 1$ and denote

$$\delta := \gcd(a, d_2 - d_1, \dots, d_t - d_1).$$

Then,

Equivalent condition to uniform distribution

Theorem (S. 2024+)

Let $g \geq 2$ be an integer, and let $\mathcal{D} = \{d_1, \dots, d_t\}$ be a set of digits, where d_1 is the smallest digit. Suppose $\gcd(g, a) = 1$ and denote

$$\delta := \gcd(a, d_2 - d_1, \dots, d_t - d_1).$$

Then, $\mathcal{C}_{g, \mathcal{D}}$ is uniformly distributed $\bmod a$ if and only if $\delta = 1$.
Moreover,

Equivalent condition to uniform distribution

Theorem (S. 2024+)

Let $g \geq 2$ be an integer, and let $\mathcal{D} = \{d_1, \dots, d_t\}$ be a set of digits, where d_1 is the smallest digit. Suppose $\gcd(g, a) = 1$ and denote

$$\delta := \gcd(a, d_2 - d_1, \dots, d_t - d_1).$$

Then, $\mathcal{C}_{g, \mathcal{D}}$ is uniformly distributed $\bmod a$ if and only if $\delta = 1$.

Moreover,

- If $\delta \neq 1$ and $d_1 \equiv 0 \bmod \delta$, $\mathcal{C}_{g, \mathcal{D}}$ is uniformly distributed in the subgroup $\langle \delta \rangle \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_a$.

Theorem (S. 2024+)

Let $g \geq 2$ be an integer, and let $\mathcal{D} = \{d_1, \dots, d_t\}$ be a set of digits, where d_1 is the smallest digit. Suppose $\gcd(g, a) = 1$ and denote

$$\delta := \gcd(a, d_2 - d_1, \dots, d_t - d_1).$$

Then, $\mathcal{C}_{g,\mathcal{D}}$ is uniformly distributed $\bmod a$ if and only if $\delta = 1$.

Moreover,

- ▶ If $\delta \neq 1$ and $d_1 \equiv 0 \bmod \delta$, $\mathcal{C}_{g,\mathcal{D}}$ is uniformly distributed in the subgroup $\langle \delta \rangle \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_a$.
- ▶ In any other case, for any $b \in \mathbb{Z}_a$, the limit $L(b)$ is either zero, or does not exist.

Theorem (S. 2024+)

Let $g \geq 2$ be an integer, and let $\mathcal{D} = \{d_1, \dots, d_t\}$ be a set of digits, where d_1 is the smallest digit. Suppose $\gcd(g, a) = 1$ and denote

$$\delta := \gcd(a, d_2 - d_1, \dots, d_t - d_1).$$

Then, $\mathcal{C}_{g,\mathcal{D}}$ is uniformly distributed $\bmod a$ if and only if $\delta = 1$.

Moreover,

- ▶ If $\delta \neq 1$ and $d_1 \equiv 0 \bmod \delta$, $\mathcal{C}_{g,\mathcal{D}}$ is uniformly distributed in the subgroup $\langle \delta \rangle \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_a$.
- ▶ In any other case, for any $b \in \mathbb{Z}_a$, the limit $L(b)$ is either zero, or does not exist.

Observation: A similar version also holds when considering the function sum-of-digits.

Motivation of the proof

For any $w \in \mathcal{D}^m$, let's define

$$(w)_g := w_0 + w_1g + \cdots + w_{m-1}g^{m-1}.$$

Motivation of the proof

For any $w \in \mathcal{D}^m$, let's define

$$(w)_g := w_0 + w_1g + \cdots + w_{m-1}g^{m-1}.$$

Notice that

$$\mathcal{C}_{g,\mathcal{D}} = \left\{ (w)_g : w \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}^{\mathbb{N}_0}) \right\}.$$

Motivation of the proof

For any $w \in \mathcal{D}^m$, let's define

$$(w)_g := w_0 + w_1g + \cdots + w_{m-1}g^{m-1}.$$

Notice that

$$\mathcal{C}_{g,\mathcal{D}} = \left\{ (w)_g : w \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}^{\mathbb{N}_0}) \right\}.$$

Let $p \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $g^p \equiv 1 \pmod{a}$.

Motivation of the proof

For any $w \in \mathcal{D}^m$, let's define

$$(w)_g := w_0 + w_1g + \cdots + w_{m-1}g^{m-1}.$$

Notice that

$$\mathcal{C}_{g,\mathcal{D}} = \left\{ (w)_g : w \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}^{\mathbb{N}_0}) \right\}.$$

Let $p \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $g^p \equiv 1 \pmod{a}$. Let $d \in \mathcal{D}$, $x = x_0 \cdots x_{p-1}$ and $y = y_0 \cdots y_{p-1} \in \mathcal{D}^p$.

Motivation of the proof

For any $w \in \mathcal{D}^m$, let's define

$$(w)_g := w_0 + w_1g + \cdots + w_{m-1}g^{m-1}.$$

Notice that

$$\mathcal{C}_{g,\mathcal{D}} = \left\{ (w)_g : w \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}^{\mathbb{N}_0}) \right\}.$$

Let $p \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $g^p \equiv 1 \pmod{a}$. Let $d \in \mathcal{D}$, $x = x_0 \cdots x_{p-1}$ and $y = y_0 \cdots y_{p-1} \in \mathcal{D}^p$. Note that

$$(dxy)_g = d + g(x_0 + x_1g + \cdots + x_{p-1}g^{p-1}) + g^{p+1}(y_0 + y_1g + \cdots + y_{p-1}g^{p-1}).$$

Motivation of the proof

For any $w \in \mathcal{D}^m$, let's define

$$(w)_g := w_0 + w_1g + \cdots + w_{m-1}g^{m-1}.$$

Notice that

$$\mathcal{C}_{g,\mathcal{D}} = \left\{ (w)_g : w \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}^{\mathbb{N}_0}) \right\}.$$

Let $p \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $g^p \equiv 1 \pmod{a}$. Let $d \in \mathcal{D}$, $x = x_0 \cdots x_{p-1}$ and $y = y_0 \cdots y_{p-1} \in \mathcal{D}^p$. Note that

$$(dxy)_g = d + g(x_0 + x_1g + \cdots + x_{p-1}g^{p-1}) + g^{p+1}(y_0 + y_1g + \cdots + y_{p-1}g^{p-1}).$$

Therefore,

$$(dxy)_g \equiv d + g(x)_g + g(y)_g \pmod{a}$$

Motivation of the proof

For any $w \in \mathcal{D}^m$, let's define

$$(w)_g := w_0 + w_1g + \cdots + w_{m-1}g^{m-1}.$$

Notice that

$$\mathcal{C}_{g,\mathcal{D}} = \left\{ (w)_g : w \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}^{\mathbb{N}_0}) \right\}.$$

Let $p \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $g^p \equiv 1 \pmod{a}$. Let $d \in \mathcal{D}$, $x = x_0 \cdots x_{p-1}$ and $y = y_0 \cdots y_{p-1} \in \mathcal{D}^p$. Note that

$$(dxy)_g = d + g(x_0 + x_1g + \cdots + x_{p-1}g^{p-1}) + g^{p+1}(y_0 + y_1g + \cdots + y_{p-1}g^{p-1}).$$

Therefore,

$$(dxy)_g \equiv d + g(x)_g + g(y)_g \pmod{a} \text{ (Stationarity)}$$

Motivation of the proof

For any $w \in \mathcal{D}^m$, let's define

$$(w)_g := w_0 + w_1g + \cdots + w_{m-1}g^{m-1}.$$

Notice that

$$\mathcal{C}_{g,\mathcal{D}} = \left\{ (w)_g : w \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}^{\mathbb{N}_0}) \right\}.$$

Let $p \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $g^p \equiv 1 \pmod{a}$. Let $d \in \mathcal{D}$, $x = x_0 \cdots x_{p-1}$ and $y = y_0 \cdots y_{p-1} \in \mathcal{D}^p$. Note that

$$(dxy)_g = d + g(x_0 + x_1g + \cdots + x_{p-1}g^{p-1}) + g^{p+1}(y_0 + y_1g + \cdots + y_{p-1}g^{p-1}).$$

Therefore,

$$(dxy)_g \equiv d + g(x)_g + g(y)_g \pmod{a} \text{ (Stationarity)}$$

$$(dxy)_g \equiv (dx)_g + g(y)_g \pmod{a}$$

Motivation of the proof

For any $w \in \mathcal{D}^m$, let's define

$$(w)_g := w_0 + w_1g + \cdots + w_{m-1}g^{m-1}.$$

Notice that

$$\mathcal{C}_{g,\mathcal{D}} = \left\{ (w)_g : w \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}^{\mathbb{N}_0}) \right\}.$$

Let $p \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $g^p \equiv 1 \pmod{a}$. Let $d \in \mathcal{D}$, $x = x_0 \cdots x_{p-1}$ and $y = y_0 \cdots y_{p-1} \in \mathcal{D}^p$. Note that

$$(dxy)_g = d + g(x_0 + x_1g + \cdots + x_{p-1}g^{p-1}) + g^{p+1}(y_0 + y_1g + \cdots + y_{p-1}g^{p-1}).$$

Therefore,

$$(dxy)_g \equiv d + g(x)_g + g(y)_g \pmod{a} \text{ (Stationarity)}$$

$$(dxy)_g \equiv (dx)_g + g(y)_g \pmod{a} \text{ (Loss of memory)}$$

Outline of the proof

Let $\gcd(g, a) = 1$.

Outline of the proof

Let $\gcd(g, a) = 1$.

- 1 Fix $p := \phi(a(g-1))$ (in particular, $g^p \equiv 1 \pmod{a}$).

Outline of the proof

Let $\gcd(g, a) = 1$.

- 1 Fix $p := \phi(a(g-1))$ (in particular, $g^p \equiv 1 \pmod{a}$).
- 2 For each $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, we can construct Markov chains $X^i = (X_n^i)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ with state space $\mathbb{Z}_a$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(X_n^i = b) = \frac{|\{w \in \mathcal{D}^{i+np} : (w)_g \equiv b \pmod{a}\}|}{|\mathcal{D}^{i+np}|}.$$

Outline of the proof

Let $\gcd(g, a) = 1$.

- ① Fix $p := \phi(a(g-1))$ (in particular, $g^p \equiv 1 \pmod{a}$).
- ② For each $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, we can construct Markov chains $X^i = (X_n^i)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ with state space $\mathbb{Z}_a$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(X_n^i = b) = \frac{|\{w \in \mathcal{D}^{i+np} : (w)_g \equiv b \pmod{a}\}|}{|\mathcal{D}^{i+np}|}.$$

- ③ If $\gcd(a, d_2 - d_1, \dots, d_t - d_1) = 1$, each Markov chain is aperiodic and irreducible. Then, every X^i converges to its invariant distribution, and we can show that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\{n \in \mathcal{C}_{g, \mathcal{D}} \cap [0, g^N) : n \equiv b \pmod{a}\}|}{|\mathcal{C}_{g, \mathcal{D}} \cap [0, g^N)|} = \frac{1}{a}$$

Outline of the proof

Let $\gcd(g, a) = 1$.

- ① Fix $p := \phi(a(g-1))$ (in particular, $g^p \equiv 1 \pmod{a}$).
- ② For each $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, we can construct Markov chains $X^i = (X_n^i)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ with state space $\mathbb{Z}_a$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(X_n^i = b) = \frac{|\{w \in \mathcal{D}^{i+np} : (w)_g \equiv b \pmod{a}\}|}{|\mathcal{D}^{i+np}|}.$$

- ③ If $\gcd(a, d_2 - d_1, \dots, d_t - d_1) = 1$, each Markov chain is aperiodic and irreducible. Then, every X^i converges to its invariant distribution, and we can show that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\{n \in \mathcal{C}_{g, \mathcal{D}} \cap [0, g^N) : n \equiv b \pmod{a}\}|}{|\mathcal{C}_{g, \mathcal{D}} \cap [0, g^N)|} = \frac{1}{a}$$

- ④ Exploiting the “nice” structure of these sets, we can obtain uniform distribution.

If $\gcd(a, d_2 - d_1, \dots, d_t - d_1) \neq 1$, we can find $b \in \mathbb{Z}_a$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(X_n^j = b) = 0$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

If $\gcd(a, d_2 - d_1, \dots, d_t - d_1) \neq 1$, we can find $b \in \mathbb{Z}_a$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(X_n^j = b) = 0$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. In particular, the limit $L(b)$ is either zero, or does not exist.

More general digit restrictions

Let $g = 10$, and consider the set of integers

$$A := \left\{ \sum_{j=0}^m w_j 10^j : w_j \in \{0, \dots, 9\}, w_{j+1} \in \{w_j - 1, w_j, w_j + 1\} \bmod 10 \right\}.$$

More general digit restrictions

Let $g = 10$, and consider the set of integers

$$A := \left\{ \sum_{j=0}^m w_j 10^j : w_j \in \{0, \dots, 9\}, w_{j+1} \in \{w_j - 1, w_j, w_j + 1\} \bmod 10 \right\}.$$

For example, $121099 \in A$, but $1235 \notin A$.

More general digit restrictions

Let $g = 10$, and consider the set of integers

$$A := \left\{ \sum_{j=0}^m w_j 10^j : w_j \in \{0, \dots, 9\}, w_{j+1} \in \{w_j - 1, w_j, w_j + 1\} \bmod 10 \right\}.$$

For example, $121099 \in A$, but $1235 \notin A$.

Let $a, a' \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\gcd(10, a) = \gcd(a, a') = 1$. Therefore,

More general digit restrictions

Let $g = 10$, and consider the set of integers

$$A := \left\{ \sum_{j=0}^m w_j 10^j : w_j \in \{0, \dots, 9\}, w_{j+1} \in \{w_j - 1, w_j, w_j + 1\} \bmod 10 \right\}.$$

For example, $121099 \in A$, but $1235 \notin A$.

Let $a, a' \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\gcd(10, a) = \gcd(a, a') = 1$. Therefore,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\{n \in A \cap [0, N) : n \equiv b \bmod a, S_{10}(n) \equiv b' \bmod a'\}|}{|A \cap [0, N)|} = \frac{1}{aa'}$$

for every $(b, b') \in \mathbb{Z}_a \times \mathbb{Z}_{a'}$.

When there are much more general restrictions,
is it possible to say anything?

When there are much more general restrictions,
is it possible to say anything?

Yes, by understanding these sets as fractals in the integers!

Furstenberg's conjecture (1967): Let $A \subset [0, 1]$ be closed and invariant under $\times 2 \bmod 1$, and let $B \subset [0, 1]$ be closed and invariant under $\times 3 \bmod 1$. Then, the fractal sets A and B are *transverse* (they have a “lack of common structure”).

Furstenberg's conjecture (1967): Let $A \subset [0, 1]$ be closed and invariant under $\times 2 \bmod 1$, and let $B \subset [0, 1]$ be closed and invariant under $\times 3 \bmod 1$. Then, the fractal sets A and B are *transverse* (they have a “lack of common structure”).

This conjecture was solved independently by Shmerkin and Wu.

Furstenberg's conjecture (1967): Let $A \subset [0, 1]$ be closed and invariant under $\times 2 \bmod 1$, and let $B \subset [0, 1]$ be closed and invariant under $\times 3 \bmod 1$. Then, the fractal sets A and B are *transverse* (they have a “lack of common structure”).

This conjecture was solved independently by Shmerkin and Wu. Motivated by an integer version of this conjecture, Glasscock, Moreira and Richter introduced the notion of **multiplicatively invariant sets of integers**.

Definition

Let $g \geq 2$ and let $\Sigma \subseteq \{0, \dots, g-1\}^{\mathbb{N}_0}$ be a subshift. We define the set generated by Σ as

$$A_\Sigma := \left\{ (w)_g : w \in \mathcal{L}(\Sigma) \right\}.$$

Definition

Let $g \geq 2$ and let $\Sigma \subseteq \{0, \dots, g-1\}^{\mathbb{N}_0}$ be a subshift. We define the set generated by Σ as

$$A_\Sigma := \left\{ (w)_g : w \in \mathcal{L}(\Sigma) \right\}.$$

Definition

Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}_0$ be non-empty. We define the *lower mass dimension* and the *upper mass dimension* of A as:

$$\underline{\dim}_M(A) := \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log |A \cap [0, N)|}{\log N}, \quad \overline{\dim}_M(A) := \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log |A \cap [0, N)|}{\log N}.$$

If $\underline{\dim}_M(A) = \overline{\dim}_M(A)$, we denote this value by $\dim_M(A)$ and say that the *mass dimension* of A exists.

Let A_Σ be a multiplicatively invariant set and P be any arithmetic progression. Is it true that $\dim_{\mathbb{M}}(A_\Sigma \cap P)$ is either zero or $\dim_{\mathbb{M}}(A_\Sigma)$?

Theorem (S. 2024+)

Let $g \geq 2$ and let $\Sigma \subset \{0, \dots, g-1\}^{\mathbb{N}_0}$ be a sofic and transitive subshift. Then, for any arithmetic progression, $\dim_M(A_\Sigma \cap P)$ is either zero or $\dim_M(A_\Sigma)$. This dichotomy is not always true if Σ is only sofic, or only transitive.

Theorem (S. 2024+)

Let $g \geq 2$ and let $\Sigma \subset \{0, \dots, g-1\}^{\mathbb{N}_0}$ be a sofic and transitive subshift. Then, for any arithmetic progression, $\dim_M(A_\Sigma \cap P)$ is either zero or $\dim_M(A_\Sigma)$. This dichotomy is not always true if Σ is only sofic, or only transitive.

A subshift Σ is said to be *entropy minimal* if for any other subshift $\Sigma' \subsetneq \Sigma$, $h_{\text{top}}(\Sigma) > h_{\text{top}}(\Sigma')$.

Conjecture

Σ is entropy minimal if and only if for every arithmetic progression P , $\dim_M(A_\Sigma \cap P)$ is either zero or $\dim_M(A_\Sigma)$.

Thanks for your attention!

References

-  P. Erdos, C. Mauduit, and A. Sárközy.
On arithmetic properties of integers with missing digits. I. Distribution in residue classes.
J. Number Theory, 70(2):99–120, 1998.
-  A. O. Gelfond.
Sur les nombres qui ont des propriétés additives et multiplicatives données.
Acta Arith., 13:259–265, 1967/68.
-  D. Glasscock, J. Moreira, and F. K. Richter.
Additive and geometric transversality of fractal sets in the integers.
J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2), 109(5):Paper No. e12902, 55, 2024.
-  V. Saavedra-Araya.
Distribution of integers with digit restrictions via markov chains.
arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.07418, 2024.