

A Weyl Criterion for Finite-State Dimension and Applications

Jack H. Lutz^{*1}, Satyadev Nandakumar², and Subin Pulari²

¹Department of Computer Science, Iowa State University, Ames, IA 50011, USA

¹lutz@cs.iastate.edu

² Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology Kanpur, Kanpur, Uttar Pradesh, India.

²{satyadev,subinp}@cse.iitk.ac.in

May 11, 2023

Abstract

Finite-state dimension, introduced early in this century as a finite-state version of classical Hausdorff dimension, is a quantitative measure of the lower asymptotic *density of information* in an infinite sequence over a finite alphabet, as perceived by finite automata. Finite-state dimension is a robust concept that now has equivalent formulations in terms of finite-state gambling, lossless finite-state data compression, finite-state prediction, entropy rates, and automatic Kolmogorov complexity. The 1972 Schnorr-Stimm dichotomy theorem gave the first automata-theoretic characterization of normal sequences, which had been studied in analytic number theory since Borel defined them in 1909. This theorem implies, in present-day terminology, that a sequence (or a real number having this sequence as its base- b expansion) is normal if and only if it has finite-state dimension 1. One of the most powerful classical tools for investigating normal numbers is the 1916 Weyl's criterion, which characterizes normality in terms of exponential sums. Such sums are well studied objects with many connections to other aspects of analytic number theory, and this has made use of Weyl's criterion especially fruitful. This raises the question whether Weyl's criterion can be generalized from finite-state dimension 1 to arbitrary finite-state dimensions, thereby making it a quantitative tool for studying data compression, prediction, etc. i.e., *Can we characterize all compression ratios using exponential sums?*

This paper does exactly this. We extend Weyl's criterion from a characterization of sequences with finite-state dimension 1 to a criterion that characterizes every finite-state dimension. This turns out *not* to be a routine generalization of the original Weyl criterion. Even though exponential sums may diverge for non-normal numbers, finite-state dimension can be characterized in terms of the *dimensions* of the *subsequence limits* of the exponential sums. In case the exponential sums are convergent, they converge to the Fourier coefficients of a probability measure whose *dimension* is precisely the finite-state dimension of the sequence.

This new and surprising connection helps us bring Fourier analytic techniques to bear in proofs in finite-state dimension, yielding a new perspective. We demonstrate the utility of our criterion by substantially improving known results about preservation of finite-state dimension under arithmetic. We strictly generalize the results by Aistleitner and Doty, Lutz and Nandakumar for finite-state dimensions under arithmetic operations. We use the method of exponential sums and our Weyl criterion to obtain the following new result: *If y is a number having finite-state strong dimension 0, then $\dim_{FS}(x + qy) = \dim_{FS}(x)$ and $\text{Dim}_{FS}(x + qy) = \text{Dim}_{FS}(x)$*

^{*}This author's research was supported in part by National Science Foundation grant 1900716.

for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $q \in \mathbb{Q}$. This generalization uses recent estimates obtained in the work of Hochman [17] regarding the entropy of convolutions of probability measures.

1 Introduction

Finite-state compressibility [34], or equivalently, finite-state dimension [10], [2], [5] is a quantification of the information rate in data as measured by finite-state automata. This formulation, initially motivated by practical constraints, has proved to be rich and mathematically robust, having several equivalent characterizations. In particular, the finite state-dimension of a sequence is equal to the compression ratio of the sequence using information lossless finite-state compressors ([10], [2]). Finite-state dimension has unexpected connections to areas such as number theory, information theory, and convex analysis [20], [12]. Schnorr and Stimm [28] establish a particularly significant connection by showing that a number is Borel normal in base b (see for example, [24]) if and only if its base b expansion has finite-state compressibility equal to 1, *i.e.*, is incompressible (see also: [3], [5]). Equivalently, a number $x \in [0, 1)$ is normal if and only if $\dim_{FS}(x)$, the finite-state dimension of x is equal to 1.

A celebrated characterization of Borel normality in terms of exponential sums, provided by Weyl's criterion [32], has proved to be remarkably effective in the study of normality. Weyl's criterion on uniformly distributed sequences modulo 1 yields a characterization that a real number r is normal to base b if and only if for every integer k ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{2\pi i k (b^j r)} = 0. \quad (1)$$

This tool was used by Wall [31] in his pioneering thesis to show that normality is preserved under certain operations like selection of subsequences along arithmetic progressions, and multiplication with non-zero rationals. Weyl's criterion facilitates the application of tools from Fourier analysis in the study of Borel normality. Weyl's criterion is used in several important constructions of normal numbers including those given by Cassels [7], Erdős and Davenport [11] etc. The criterion was also instrumental in obtaining the construction of absolutely normal numbers given by Schmidt in [27].

The finite-state compression ratio/dimension of an arbitrary sequence is a quantity in $[0, 1]$. The classical Weyl's criterion provides a characterization of numbers having finite-state dimension equal to 1 in terms of exponential sums. This leads us to the natural question - *Can we characterize arbitrary compression ratios using exponential sums?*

This question turns out to be highly non-trivial. It is not easy to generalize Weyl's criterion to study arbitrary finite-state compression ratios/dimension. The major conceptual hurdle arises from the fact that for non-normal numbers, the Weyl sum averages in (1) need not converge. The Weyl averages need not converge even when the finite-state dimension and the strong dimension of a sequence are equal.

We demonstrate this by explicitly constructing such a sequence in Lemma 4.1. Using a new construction method involving the controlled concatenation of two special sequences, we demonstrate the existence of a sequence $x \in \Sigma^\infty$ with non-convergent Weyl averages, while having finite-state dimension and strong dimension both equal to $\frac{1}{2}$. The proof that this constructed sequence satisfies the required properties uses new techniques, which might be of independent interest. Due to the existence of such sequences, it is unclear how to *extract* the finite-state dimension of a sequence from non-convergent Weyl averages. Indeed, it was unclear whether any generalization of the Weyl's criterion to arbitrary finite-state dimensions even exists.

Our paper rescues this approach and gives such a characterization of arbitrary finite-state compressibility/dimension by introducing one important viewpoint, that turns out to be the major

theoretical insight. Even when the exponential sums diverge, the theory of *weak convergence* of probability measures ([4]) enables us to consider the collection of all probability measures having Fourier coefficients equal to the the subsequence limits of the Weyl averages. The *dimensions* of the measures in the set of subsequence weak limit measures gives a generalization of Weyl’s criterion. For any x , let $\dim_{FS}(x)$ and $\text{Dim}_{FS}(x)$ denote the finite-state dimension and finite-state strong dimension [2] of x respectively. We now informally state our Weyl’s criterion for finite-state dimension.

Theorem (Informal statement of Theorem 5.7). *Let $x \in [0, 1)$. If for any subsequence $\langle n_m \rangle_{m=0}^\infty$ of natural numbers, there exist complex numbers c_k such that for every $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n_m} \sum_{j=0}^{n_m-1} e^{2\pi i k (b^j x)} = c_k$, then, there exists a probability measure μ on $[0, 1)$ such that for every k , $c_k = \int e^{2\pi i k y} d\mu$. Let \mathcal{W}_x be the collection of all such probability measures μ on $[0, 1)$ that can be obtained as the subsequence limits of Weyl averages. Then, $\dim_{FS}(x) = \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{W}_x} H^-(\mu)$ and $\text{Dim}_{FS}(x) = \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{W}_x} H^+(\mu)$.*

The *correct* notion of *dimensions* of the subsequence weak limit measures in \mathcal{W}_x which yields the finite-state dimensions of x turns out to be H^- and H^+ , the *lower* and *upper average entropies* of μ as defined in [2]¹. Therefore, this new characterization enables us to *extract* the finite-state compressibility/dimension by studying the behavior of the Weyl sum averages, thereby extending Weyl’s criterion for normality to arbitrary finite-state dimensions.

An interesting special case of our criterion is when the exponential averages of a sequence are convergent. In this case, the averages $\langle c_k \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ are precisely the *Fourier coefficients* of a *unique* limiting measure, whose *dimension* is precisely the finite-state dimension of the sequence. This relates two different notions of dimension to each other. We give the informal statement of our criterion for this special case.

Theorem (Informal statement of Theorem 5.15). *Let $x \in [0, 1)$. If there exist complex numbers c_k for $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{2\pi i k (b^j x)} \rightarrow c_k$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then, there exists a unique measure μ on $[0, 1)$ such that for every k , $c_k = \int e^{2\pi i k y} d\mu$. Furthermore, $\dim_{FS}(x) = \text{Dim}_{FS}(x) = H^-(\mu) = H^+(\mu)$.*

Our results also show that in case there is a unique weak limit measure, the exponential sums (1) converge for every $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. These give the first known relations between Fourier coefficients and finite-state compressibility/dimension.

The proof of Weyl’s criterion for finite-state dimension is not a routine generalization of the available proofs of Weyl’s criterion for normality (see [32], [14], [30]) and requires several facts from the theory of weak convergence of probability measures and new relationships involving the exponential sums, the *dimensions* of weak limit measures and the finite-state dimension of the given sequence. Certain additional technical difficulties we overcome include working with two different topologies - the topology on the torus \mathbb{T} where Fourier coefficients uniquely determine a measure, and another, Cantor space, which is required for studying combinatorial properties of sequences, like normality.

1.1 Applications of our criterion

We illustrate how this framework can be applied in sections 6. These results justify that this framework pioneers a new, powerful, approach to data compression.

It is not very surprising that when the Weyl averages converge, our criterion has applications. Importantly, even in situations where the Weyl averages do not converge, it is possible to derive

¹These are analogues of the well-known *Rényi upper and lower dimensions* of measures as defined in [25]. See the remark following Definition 2.5.

non-trivial consequences. We apply our techniques to substantially improve known results about the preservation of finite-state dimension under arithmetic and combinatorial operations.

Doty, Lutz and Nandakumar [12] show that if x is any real and q is any non-zero rational, then the finite-state dimensions and strong dimensions of x , qx and $x + q$ are equal. When x is normal, a generalization is obtained by Aistleitner [1], which can be described as follows. Let y be any real such that the asymptotic density of zeroes in its expansion is one. Then, for any rational q , we have $x + qy$ is normal. We generalize these results by allowing both the following conditions simultaneously,

1. x is allowed to be any real, obtaining a result for all finite-state dimensions rather than only for normals as in Aistleitner [1] and
2. y is allowed to be any real with finite-state strong dimension 0 which satisfies a natural independence condition. This generalizes both the restrictions in Doty, Lutz and Nandakumar [12] and Aistleitner [1],

and show that for any rational $q \in \mathbb{Q}$, $\dim_{FS}(x + qy) = \dim_{FS}(x)$ and $\text{Dim}_{FS}(x + qy) = \text{Dim}_{FS}(x)$ if x and y are *independent* (see Definition 6.6) and $\text{Dim}_{FS}(y) = 0$.

Using our Weyl criterion along with the results in Hochman [17], we obtain the following inequalities. Let x and y be real numbers in \mathbb{T} such that x and y are independent. Then for any $d, e \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\dim_{FS}(dx + ey) \geq \max\{\dim_{FS}(dx), \dim_{FS}(ey)\}$ and $\dim_{FS}(dx + ey) \leq \dim_{FS}(dx) + \text{Dim}_{FS}(ey)$. Similarly, $\text{Dim}_{FS}(dx + ey) \geq \max\{\text{Dim}_{FS}(dx), \text{Dim}_{FS}(ey)\}$ and $\text{Dim}_{FS}(dx + ey) \leq \text{Dim}_{FS}(dx) + \text{Dim}_{FS}(ey)$. Our main results are consequences of these inequalities.

Further, using our Weyl criterion and techniques from Mance and Madritsch [22] we obtain new methods for the explicit construction of numbers having a specified finite-state dimension. (See Appendix D)

Lossless data compression is practically significant, and theoretically sophisticated. We show how one of the major tools of modern mathematics, Fourier analysis, can be brought to bear to study compressibility of individual data sequences. We hope that our criterion will facilitate the application of more powerful Fourier analytic tools in future works involving finite-state compression/dimension.

1.2 Organization of the article

After the preliminary sections, section 3 gives Weyl's criterion on Cantor space using weak convergence of measures. Next, we show the necessity and the sufficiency of passing to *subsequences* of sequences of measures in order to generalize Weyl's criterion for finite-state dimension. In section 6 we show the applications of our Weyl criterion to yield new, general results regarding the preservation of finite-state dimension under arithmetic and combinatorial operations.

2 Preliminaries

For any natural number $b > 1$, Σ_b denotes the alphabet $\{0, 1, 2, \dots, b - 1\}$. Throughout this paper, we work with base 2, but our results generalize to all bases. We use Σ to denote the binary alphabet Σ_2 . We denote the set of finite binary strings by Σ^* and the set of infinite sequences by Σ^∞ . For any $w \in \Sigma^*$, let C_w be the set of infinite sequences with w as a prefix, called a *cylinder*. For any sequence $x = x_0x_1x_2\dots$ in Σ^∞ , we denote the substring $x_ix_{i+1}\dots x_j$ of x , by x_i^j . The Borel σ -algebra generated by the set of all cylinder sets is denoted by $\mathcal{B}(\Sigma^\infty)$.

Let \mathbb{T} denote the one-dimensional torus or unit circle. i.e, \mathbb{T} is the unit interval $[0, 1)$ with the metric $d(r, s) = \min\{|r - s|, 1 - |r - s|\}$. \mathbb{T} is a compact metric space. The Borel σ -algebra generated by all open sets in \mathbb{T} is denoted by $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{T})$. For any base b , let v_b be the *evaluation map* which maps any $x \in \Sigma^\infty$ to its *value* in \mathbb{T} which is $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{x_i}{b^{i+1}} \bmod 1$. We use the simplified notation v to denote the base 2 evaluation map v_2 . Let T be the left shift transformation $T(x_0x_1x_2\dots) = x_1x_2x_3\dots$ on Σ^∞ . For any base b and $w \in \Sigma_b^*$, let I_w^b denote the interval $[v_b(w0^\infty), v_b(w0^\infty) + b^{-|w|})$ in \mathbb{T} . We use the simplified notation I_w to refer to I_w^2 . Let \mathbb{D} be the set of all dyadic rationals in \mathbb{T} . It is easy to see that $v : \Sigma^\infty \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$ has a well-defined inverse, denoted v^{-1} , over $\mathbb{T} \setminus \mathbb{D}$.

For any measure μ on \mathbb{T} (or Σ^∞), we refer to the collection of complex numbers $\int e^{2\pi iky} d\mu$ where k ranges over \mathbb{Z} as the *Fourier coefficients of measure* μ . For measures over Σ^∞ , the function $e^{2\pi iky}$ inside the integral is replaced with $e^{2\pi ikv(y)}$. For every measure μ on \mathbb{T} , we define the corresponding lifted measure on Σ^∞ as follows.

Definition 2.1 (*Lift $\hat{\mu}$ of a measure μ on \mathbb{T}*). If μ is a measure on \mathbb{T} , then we define the *lift* $\hat{\mu}$ of μ to be the unique measure on Σ^∞ satisfying $\hat{\mu}(C_w) = \mu(I_w)$ for every string $w \in \Sigma^*$.

The uniqueness of $\hat{\mu}$ follows from routine measure theoretic arguments.

Definition 2.2. Let $x \in \Sigma^*$ have length n . We define the *sliding count probability* of $w \in \Sigma^*$ in x denoted $P(x, w)$, and the *disjoint block probability* of w in x , denoted $P^d(x, w)$, as follows.

$$P(x, w) = \frac{|\{i \in [0, n - |w|] : x_i^{i+|w|-1} = w\}|}{n - |w| + 1} \quad \text{and} \quad P^d(x, w) = \frac{|\{i \in [0, \frac{n}{|w|}] : x_{|w|i}^{w|(i+1)-1} = w\}|}{n/|w|}$$

Now, we define normal sequences in Σ^∞ and normal numbers on \mathbb{T} .

Definition 2.3. A sequence $x \in \Sigma^\infty$ is *normal* if for every $w \in \Sigma^*$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(x_0^{n-1}, w) = 2^{-|w|}$. A number $r \in \mathbb{T}$ is *normal* if and only if $r \notin \mathbb{D}$ and $v^{-1}(r)$ is a normal sequence in Σ^∞ .

Equivalently, we can formulate normality using disjoint probabilities [20]. The following is the block entropy characterization of finite-state dimension from [5], which we use instead of the original formulation using s -gales [10], [2].

Definition 2.4 ([10], [5]). For a given block length l , we define the *sliding block entropy* over x_0^{n-1} as $H_l(x_0^{n-1}) = -\frac{1}{l} \sum_{w \in \Sigma^l} P(x_0^{n-1}, w) \log(P(x_0^{n-1}, w))$. The *finite-state dimension* of $x \in \Sigma^\infty$, denoted $\dim_{FS}(x)$, and *finite-state strong dimension* of x , denoted $\text{Dim}_{FS}(x)$, are defined as follows.

$$\dim_{FS}(x) = \inf_l \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} H_l(x_0^{n-1}) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Dim}_{FS}(x) = \inf_l \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} H_l(x_0^{n-1}).$$

Remark: The fact that $\dim_{FS}(x)$ and $\text{Dim}_{FS}(x)$ are equivalent to the lower and upper finite-state compressibilities of x using lossless finite-state compressors, follows immediately from the results in [34] and [10].

Disjoint block entropy H_l^d is defined similarly by replacing P with P^d . Bourke, Hitchcock and Vinodchandran [5], based on the work of Ziv and Lempel [34], demonstrated the entropy characterization of finite-state dimension using H_l^d instead of H_l . Kozachinskiy and Shen ([19]) proved that the finite-state dimension of a sequence can be equivalently defined using sliding block entropies (as in Definition 2.4) instead of disjoint block entropies. It is clear from the definition that, for any $x \in \Sigma^\infty$, $\dim_{FS}(x) \leq \text{Dim}_{FS}(x)$. Any x with $\dim_{FS}(x) = \text{Dim}_{FS}(x)$ is called a *regular sequence*.

Upper and lower average entropies were defined in [2] for measures constructed out of infinite bias sequences. We extend these notions to the set of all measures on Σ^∞ below.

Definition 2.5. For any probability measure μ on Σ^∞ , let $\mathbf{H}_n(\mu) = -\sum_{w \in \Sigma^n} \mu(C_w) \log(\mu(C_w))$. The *upper average entropy* of μ , denoted $H^+(\mu)$, and its *lower average entropy*, denoted $H^-(\mu)$, are defined respectively as the limit superior and the limit inferior as n tends to ∞ of $H_n(\mu)/n$.

Upper and lower average entropies are the Cantor space analogues of *Rényi upper and lower dimensions* of measures on $[0,1]$ which were originally defined for measures on the real line in [25]. For any $x \in \mathbb{T}$ (or $x \in \Sigma^\infty$), let δ_x denote the Dirac measure at x . i.e, $\delta_x(A) = 1$ if $x \in A$ and 0 otherwise for every $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{T})$ (or $A \in \mathcal{B}(\Sigma^\infty)$). Given a sequence $\langle x_n \rangle_{n=0}^\infty$ of numbers in \mathbb{T} (or Σ^∞), we investigate the behavior of exponential averages $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{2\pi i k x_j}$ by studying the weak convergence of sequences of averages of Dirac measures which are defined as follows.

Definition 2.6. Given a sequence $\langle x_n \rangle_{n=0}^\infty$ in \mathbb{T} (or elements in Σ^∞), we say that $\langle \nu_n \rangle_{n=1}^\infty$ is the sequence of averages of Dirac measures over \mathbb{T} (or over Σ^∞) constructed out of the sequence $\langle x_n \rangle_{n=0}^\infty$ if, $\nu_n = n^{-1} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \delta_{x_i}$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

3 Weyl's criterion and weak convergence

Schnorr and Stimm [28] (see also [3], [5]) showed a central connection between normal numbers and finite-state compressibility, or equivalently, finite-state dimension: a sequence $x \in \Sigma^\infty$ is normal if and only if its finite-state dimension is 1. Any $x \in \Sigma^\infty$ has finite-state dimension (equivalently, finite-state compressibility) between 0 and 1. In this sense, finite-state dimension is a generalization of the notion of normality. Another celebrated characterization of normality, in terms of exponential sums, was provided by Weyl in 1916. This characterization has resisted attempts at generalization. In the present section, we show that the theory of weak convergence of measures yields a generalization of Weyl's characterization for arbitrary dimensions. We demonstrate the utility of this new characterization to finite-state compressibility/finite-state dimension, in subsequent sections.

Weyl's criterion for normal numbers on \mathbb{T} is the following.

Theorem 3.1 (Weyl's criterion [32]). *A number $r \in \mathbb{T}$ is normal if and only if for every $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{2\pi i k (2^j r)} = 0$.*

The insight in this theorem is the connection between a number x being normal, and the concept of the collection of its shifts being uniformly distributed in the unit interval. It is the latter concept which leads to the cancellation of the exponential sums of all orders. We now prove a formulation of this criterion on Cantor space, which we require in our work.

Theorem 3.2 (Weyl's criterion on Σ^∞). *A sequence $x \in \Sigma^\infty$ is a normal sequence if and only if for every $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{2\pi i k (v(T^j x))} = 0$.*

Proof. Suppose $v(x) \in \mathbb{D}$ for some $x \in \Sigma^\infty$. Then x is not a normal sequence. We also have that $v(T^j x)$ is either 0 or 1 for all sufficiently large j . In either case, for all k , $e^{2\pi i k v(T^j x)} = 1$, for all sufficiently large j . Thus, the following holds.

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{2\pi i k (v(T^j x))} = 1.$$

Hence the theorem holds for dyadic rationals.

If $v(x) \notin \mathbb{D}$, then $x \in \Sigma^\infty$ represents its unique binary expansion. Further, for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $v(T^j x) \notin \mathbb{D}$. Hence, $v(T^j x)$ is equal to $2^j v(x) \bmod 1$. We apply Weyl's theorem on \mathbb{T} to conclude that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{2\pi i k (v(T^j x))} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{2\pi i k (2^j v(x))} = 0 \quad (2)$$

if and only if $v(x)$ is normal. Now, the theorem follows since x represents the unique binary expansion of $v(x)$. \square

The key to generalizing Weyl's criterion to sequences with finite-state dimension less than 1 is to characterize convergence of subsequences of exponential sums using weak convergence of probability measures on Σ^∞ (see Billingsley [4]). Over \mathbb{T} , this equivalent characterization is well-known (see Section 4.4 from [14]). Obtaining the same equivalence over Σ^∞ involves some technical hurdles due to the fact that continuous functions over Σ^∞ need not have a uniform approximation using trigonometric polynomials. In order to overcome these, we need to carefully study the relationship between the convergence of Weyl averages and weak convergence over Σ^∞ . We develop these relationships in the following lemmas. At the end of this section we characterize Theorem 3.2 in terms of weak convergence of a sequence of measures over Σ^∞ .

Definition 3.3. A sequence $\langle \nu_n \rangle_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of probability measures on a metric space (X, d) *converges weakly* to a probability μ on (X, d) , denoted $\nu_n \Rightarrow \mu$, if for every bounded continuous function $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int f d\nu_n = \int f d\mu$.

If a sequence of measures $\langle \nu_n \rangle_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ on a metric space (X, d) has a weak limit measure, then the weak limit must be unique (see Theorem 1.2 from [4]). Since \mathbb{T} and $\Sigma^{\infty 2}$ are compact metric spaces, using Prokhorov's Theorem (see Theorem 5.1 from [4]) we get that any sequence of measures $\langle \nu_n \rangle_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ on \mathbb{T} (or Σ^∞), has a measure μ on \mathbb{T} (or Σ^∞) and a subsequence $\langle \nu_{n_m} \rangle_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\nu_{n_m} \Rightarrow \mu$. We first establish a relationship between weak convergence of measures on \mathbb{T} and the convergence of measures of dyadic intervals in \mathbb{T} . Since the set of all finite unions of dyadic intervals in \mathbb{T} is closed under finite intersections, we obtain the following lemma using Theorem 2.2 from [4].

Lemma 3.4. *If for every dyadic interval I in \mathbb{T} , $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu_n(I) = \mu(I)$, then $\nu_n \Rightarrow \mu$.*

The Portmanteau theorem (Theorem 2.1 from [4]) gives the following partial converse.

Lemma 3.5. *Let $\nu_n \Rightarrow \mu$. Then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu_n(I) = \mu(I)$ for dyadic interval $I = [d_1, d_2)$ if $\mu(\{d_1\}) = \mu(\{d_2\}) = 0$.*

We characterize convergence of exponential sums in terms of weak convergence of probability measures, first on \mathbb{T} and then on the Cantor space Σ^∞ . Unlike Theorem 3.1, the result on Σ^∞ does not follow immediately from that on \mathbb{T} . On \mathbb{T} , the following theorem holds due to Prokhorov theorem, the fact that continuous functions on \mathbb{T} can be approximated uniformly using trigonometric polynomials, and that Fourier coefficients of measures over \mathbb{T} are unique due to Bochner's theorem (see Theorem 4.19 from [16]).

Theorem 3.6. *Let $r \in \mathbb{T}$ and let $\langle \nu_n \rangle_{n=1}^\infty$ be the sequence of averages of Dirac measures constructed out of $\langle 2^n r \bmod 1 \rangle_{n=0}^\infty$. Let $\langle n_m \rangle_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ be any subsequence of natural numbers. Then the following are equivalent.*

1. *For every $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, there is a $c_k \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n_m} \sum_{j=0}^{n_m-1} e^{2\pi i k (2^j r)} = c_k$.*
2. *There is a unique measure μ such that $\nu_{n_m} \Rightarrow \mu$.*

Furthermore, if any of the above conditions are true, then $c_k = \int e^{2\pi i k y} d\mu$ for every $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and μ is the unique measure on \mathbb{T} having Fourier coefficients $\langle c_k \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$.

²The metric on Σ^∞ is $d(x, y) = 2^{-\min\{i | x_i \neq y_i\}}$.

Proof. Suppose condition 1 holds. Let μ be any subsequence weak limit of $\langle \nu_{n_m} \rangle_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ which exists due to Prokhorov's Theorem. Since $e^{2\pi iky}$ is a continuous function on \mathbb{T} , from the definition of weak convergence it follows that $\frac{1}{n_m} \sum_{j=0}^{n_m-1} e^{2\pi ik(2^j r)} = \int e^{2\pi iky} d\nu_{n_m}$ converges along a subsequence to $\int e^{2\pi iky} d\mu$. Since 1 is true we get that $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n_m} \sum_{j=0}^{n_m-1} e^{2\pi ik(2^j r)} = \int e^{2\pi iky} d\mu = c_k$ for every $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Since, every continuous function f on \mathbb{T} can be approximated uniformly using trigonometric polynomials (see Corollary 5.4 from [30]), using routine approximation arguments we get that $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \int f d\nu_{n_m} = \int f d\mu$ for every continuous function f on \mathbb{T} . Hence, $\nu_{n_m} \Rightarrow \mu$. Conditions 1 easily follows from 2 since for every $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $e^{2\pi iky}$ is a continuous function on \mathbb{T} . \square

We require an analogue of this theorem for Cantor space. But the proof above cannot be adapted because on Cantor space, there are continuous functions which cannot be approximated uniformly using trigonometric polynomials. For example, consider χ_{C_0} . Observe that $\chi_{C_0}(0^\infty) = 1 \neq 0 = \chi_{C_0}(1^\infty)$. But since $v(0^\infty) = v(1^\infty)$, every trigonometric polynomial has the same value on 0^∞ and 1^∞ . However, we recover the analogue by handling dyadic rational sequences and other sequences in separate cases. Since the set of all finite unions of cylinder sets in Σ^∞ is closed under finite intersections and since the characteristic functions of cylinder sets are continuous on the Cantor space, we get the following analogue of Lemma 3.4 and 3.5 using Theorem 2.2 from [4].

Lemma 3.7. *For a sequence of measures $\langle \nu_n \rangle_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ on Σ^∞ , $\nu_n \Rightarrow \mu$ if and only if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu_n(C_w) = \mu(C_w)$ for every $w \in \Sigma^*$.*

In the following theorems we relate the convergence of measures of cylinder sets to the convergence of Weyl averages on the Cantor space using Theorem 3.6 and Lemma 3.7. We state these theorems for convergence along any subsequence, since we require these more general results for studying the subsequence limits of Weyl averages.

Theorem 3.8. *Let $x \in \Sigma^\infty$ and $\langle \nu_n \rangle_{n=1}^\infty$ be the sequence of averages of Dirac measures on Σ^∞ constructed out of $\langle T^n x \rangle_{n=0}^\infty$. Let $\langle n_m \rangle_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ be any subsequence of natural numbers. If $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \nu_{n_m}(C_w) = \mu(C_w)$ for every $w \in \Sigma^*$, then for every $k \in \mathbb{Z}$,*

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n_m} \sum_{j=0}^{n_m-1} e^{2\pi ikv(T^j x)} = \int e^{2\pi ikv(y)} d\mu.$$

Observe that $\frac{1}{n_m} \sum_{j=0}^{n_m-1} e^{2\pi ikv(T^j x)} = \int e^{2\pi ikv(y)} d\nu_{n_m}$. Hence, the above claim follows from Lemma 3.7 and the definition of weak convergence since for every $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $e^{2\pi ikv(y)}$ is a continuous function on Σ^∞ ³. While Fourier coefficients uniquely determine measures over \mathbb{T} , Bochner's Theorem does not hold over Σ^∞ . For example let $\mu_1 = \delta_{0^\infty}$ and let $\mu_2 = \delta_{1^\infty}$. Then $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$, but it is easy to verify that for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\int e^{2\pi ikv(y)} d\mu_1 = e^{2\pi ikv(0^\infty)} = 1 = e^{2\pi ikv(1^\infty)} = \int e^{2\pi ikv(y)} d\mu_2$. We need the following lemma to obtain a converse of Theorem 3.8.

Lemma 3.9. *Let $x \in \Sigma^\infty$ such that $v(x) \notin \mathbb{D}$ and let $\langle \nu'_n \rangle_{n=1}^\infty$ be the sequence of averages of Dirac measures on \mathbb{T} constructed out of the sequence $\langle 2^n v(x) \bmod 1 \rangle_{n=0}^\infty$. Let d be any non-zero dyadic rational. If $\nu'_{n_m} \Rightarrow \mu'$ for some subsequence of natural numbers $\langle n_m \rangle_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$, then $\mu'(\{d\}) = 0$.*

Proof. For every k , let U_k be the interval $(d - 1/2^{k+1}, d + 1/2^{k+1})$. Let w_1 be the unique string ending with 0 such that $v(w_1 1^\infty) = d$ and let w_2 be the unique string ending with 1 such that $v(w_2 0^\infty) = d$. Since $v(x) \notin \mathbb{D}$, $v(x)$ has a unique binary expansion which is the sequence x . If $2^n v(x) \bmod 1 \in U_k$, then either $x_n^{n+k-1} = (w_1 1^\infty)_0^{k-1}$ or $x_n^{n+k-1} = (w_2 0^\infty)_0^{k-1}$. Let us consider the

³This follows easily by observing that the valuation map $v : \Sigma^\infty \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$ is a continuous function on Σ^∞ .

case when $x_n^{n+k-1} = (w_1 1^\infty)_0^{k-1}$. Since $d \neq 0$, we have $w_1 \neq 1^{|w_1|}$ and hence $x_{n+i}^{n+i+k-1} \neq (w_1 1^\infty)_0^{k-1}$ and $x_{n+i}^{n+i+k-1} \neq (w_2 0^\infty)_0^{k-1}$ for any i between $\max\{|w_1|, |w_2|\}$ and $k - \max\{|w_1|, |w_2|\}$. Therefore, $2^{n+i}v(x) \bmod 1 \notin U_k$ for any i between $\max\{|w_1|, |w_2|\}$ and $k - \max\{|w_1|, |w_2|\}$. Since this is true for any n , we get that for any $k \geq \max\{|w_1|, |w_2|\}$,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\{2^i v(x) \bmod 1 \in U_k \mid 0 \leq i \leq n-1\}}{n} \leq \frac{2 \max\{|w_1|, |w_2|\}}{k}.$$

We get the same bound in the case when $x_n^{n+k-1} = (w_2 0^\infty)_0^{k-1}$. Hence for any $k \geq \max\{|w_1|, |w_2|\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \int \chi_{U_k} d\nu_{n_m} &= \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\{2^i v(x) \bmod 1 \in U_k \mid 0 \leq i \leq n_m - 1\}}{n_m} \\ &\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\{2^i v(x) \bmod 1 \in U_k \mid 0 \leq i \leq n-1\}}{n} \\ &\leq \frac{C}{k}. \end{aligned}$$

where the constant C only depends on d . Now we define a sequence of functions f_k as follows.

$$f_k(x) = \begin{cases} 1 - 2^{k+1}(x-d) & \text{if } d \leq x \leq d + 1/2^{k+1} \\ 1 + 2^{k+1}(x-d) & \text{if } d - 1/2^{k+1} \leq x \leq d \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Each f_k is a continuous function on \mathbb{T} . Since $\|f_k\|_\infty \leq 1$ for every k , we have $f_k \leq \chi_{U_k}$ and using this inequality we get that,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu'(\{d\}) &= \int \chi_{\{d\}} d\mu' \leq \int f_k d\mu' \\ &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \int f_k d\nu_{n_m} \\ &= \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \int f_k d\nu_{n_m} \\ &\leq \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \int \chi_{U_k} d\nu_{n_m} \\ &\leq \frac{C}{k}. \end{aligned}$$

Since the above bound is true for every for any $k \geq \max\{|w_1|, |w_2|\}$, we get that $\mu'(\{d\}) = 0$. \square

Using Lemma 3.5, Theorem 3.6 and Lemma 3.9 we obtain the following partial converse of Theorem 3.8.

Theorem 3.10. *Let $x \in \Sigma^\infty$ and let $\langle n_m \rangle_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ be any subsequence of natural numbers. Let $\langle c_k \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ be complex numbers such that $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n_m} \sum_{j=0}^{n_m-1} e^{2\pi i k v(T^j x)} = c_k$ for every $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then there exists a unique measure μ on \mathbb{T} having Fourier coefficients $\langle c_k \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ and $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \nu_{n_m}(C_w) = \hat{\mu}(C_w)$ for every $w \in \Sigma^*$ such that $w \neq 1^{|w|}$ and $w \neq 0^{|w|}$.*

Proof. We first consider the case when $v(x)$ is a dyadic rational in \mathbb{T} . In this case, it is easy to verify that for every $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{2\pi i k v(T^j x)} = 1$. The unique measure on \mathbb{T} having all Fourier coefficients equal to 1 is $\mu = \delta_0$ and we have $\mu' = \delta_0$. In this case it is easy to verify that for every w that is not equal to $1^{|w|}$ or $0^{|w|}$, $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \nu_{n_m}(C_w) = 0 = \hat{\mu}(C_w)$. Now, we consider the case when $v(x)$ is not a dyadic rational in \mathbb{T} . In this case we have that $v(T^j x)$ is not a dyadic rational for all $j \geq 0$. In this case, it is easily verified that $v(T^j x) = 2^j v(x) \bmod 1$ for all $j \geq 0$.

This gives us the following equality,

$$\frac{1}{n_m} \sum_{j=0}^{n_m-1} e^{2\pi i k(v(T^j x))} = \frac{1}{n_m} \sum_{j=0}^{n_m-1} e^{2\pi i k(2^j v(x))}. \quad (3)$$

Let $\langle \nu'_n \rangle_{n=1}^\infty$ be the sequence of averages of Dirac measures on \mathbb{T} constructed out of the sequence $\langle 2^n v(x) \bmod 1 \rangle_{n=0}^\infty$. From 3 and Theorem 3.6, we get that $\nu'_n \Rightarrow \mu$ where μ is the unique measure on \mathbb{T} having Fourier coefficients $\langle c_k \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$.

By definition, $\nu_{n_m} = \frac{1}{n_m} \sum_{j=0}^{n_m-1} \delta_{T^j x}$. For any $w \in \Sigma^\infty$, $\delta_{T^j x}(C_w)$ is 1 if and only if $T^j x \in C_w$. Since, $v(T^j x)$ is not a dyadic rational for all $j \geq 0$, we get that $T^j x \in C_w$ if and only if $2^j v(x) \bmod 1 \in I_w$. This is because $v(T^j x) < v(w1^\infty)$ since $v(T^j x)$ is not a dyadic rational and $T^j x \in C_w$. Then, the last observation lets us conclude that,

$$\nu_{n_m}(C_w) = \nu'_{n_m}(I_w) \quad (4)$$

for all $m \geq 1$.

Let w be any string such that $w \neq 1^{|w|}$ and $w \neq 0^{|w|}$. Using Lemma 3.9, we get that $\mu(\{v(w0^\infty)\}) = \mu(\{v(w1^\infty)\}) = 0$. Since $v(w0^\infty)$ and $v(w1^\infty)$ are the end points of I_w , using Lemma 3.5 we get that $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \nu'_{n_m}(I_w) = \mu(I_w)$. Hence, from 4, we get that $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \nu_{n_m}(C_w) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \nu'_{n_m}(I_w) = \mu(I_w) = \hat{\mu}(C_w)$. The proof of the claim is thus complete. \square

For any $x \in \Sigma^\infty$, let $\langle \nu_n \rangle_{n=1}^\infty$ be the sequence of averages of Dirac measures on Σ^∞ constructed out of the sequence $\langle T^n x \rangle_{n=0}^\infty$. Now, for any $A \in \mathcal{B}(\Sigma^\infty)$, $\nu_n(A)$ is the proportion of elements in the finite sequence $x, Tx, T^2x, \dots, T^{n-1}x$ which falls inside the set A . From this remark, and the definitions of ν_n and the sliding count probability P , the following lemma follows easily.

Lemma 3.11. *Let w be any finite string in Σ^* and let $l = |w|$. Let x be any element in Σ^∞ . If $\langle \nu_n \rangle_{n=1}^\infty$ is the sequence of averages of Dirac measures over Σ^∞ constructed out of the sequence $\langle T^n x \rangle_{n=0}^\infty$. Then for any n , $\nu_n(C_w) = P(x_0^{n+l-2}, w)$.*

Proof. From the definition, $\nu_n(C_w)$ is the proportion of elements in the finite sequence $\langle T^n x \rangle_{i=0}^{n-1}$ which begins with the string w . This is equal to $P(x_0^{n+l-2}, w)$ by the definition of P . \square

We now give a new characterization of Weyl's criterion on Cantor Space (Theorem 3.2) in terms of weak convergence of measures. In later sections, we generalize this to characterize finite-state dimension in terms of exponential sums.

Theorem 3.12 (Weyl's criterion on Σ^∞ and weak convergence). *Let $x \in \Sigma^\infty$, and $\langle \nu_n \rangle_{n=1}^\infty$ be the sequence of averages of Dirac measures constructed out of $\langle T^n x \rangle_{n=0}^\infty$, and μ be the uniform measure on Σ^∞ . Then the following are equivalent.*

1. x is normal.
2. For every $w \in \Sigma^*$, the sliding block frequency $P(x_0^{n-1}, w) \rightarrow 2^{-|w|}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.
3. For every $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{2\pi i k v(T^j x)} = 0$.
4. $\nu_n \Rightarrow \mu$.

Proof. 1 and 2 are equivalent by definition. The equivalence of 2 and 4 follows from Lemma 3.11 and Lemma 3.7. 2 \implies 3 follows directly from Theorem 3.8 and Lemma 3.11. Now, we prove 3 \implies 2. The uniform distribution μ' on \mathbb{T} is the unique measure having all Fourier coefficients equal to 0. Let $\langle \nu'_n \rangle_{n=1}^\infty$ be the sequence of averages of Dirac measures on \mathbb{T} constructed out of the sequence $\langle 2^n v(x) \bmod 1 \rangle_{n=0}^\infty$. From Theorem 3.6, we get that $\nu'_n \Rightarrow \mu'$. Since $\mu'(\{y\}) = 0$ for any $y \in \mathbb{T}$, using Lemma 3.5 we get that $\nu'_n(I_w) \rightarrow \mu'(I_w)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for every $w \in \Sigma^*$.

If $v(x)$ is a dyadic rational, it is easy to verify that the Weyl averages converges to 1 for every $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Hence, $v(x)$ must not be a dyadic rational. As in the proof of Theorem 3.10, this implies that $\nu_n(C_w) = \nu'_n(I_w)$ for all $m \geq 1$ and every $w \in \Sigma^*$. From the previous observations, we get that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu_n(C_w) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu'_n(I_w) = \mu'(I_w) = 2^{-|w|}$ for every $w \in \Sigma^*$. Finally, we get $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(x_0^{n-1}, w) = 2^{-|w|} = \mu(C_w)$ using Lemma 3.11. \square

4 Divergence of exponential sums for non-normal numbers

Weyl's criterion says that when $\dim_{FS}(x) = \text{Dim}_{FS}(x) = 1$ the averages of the exponential sums for every k converges to 0. However for x with $\dim_{FS}(x) < 1$, the situation is different. It is easy to construct a sequence a with $\dim_{FS}(a) < 1$ and a $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that the sequence of Weyl averages with parameter k do not converge. It is natural to ask if the condition $\dim_{FS}(x) = \text{Dim}_{FS}(x)$ is sufficient to guarantee convergence of the exponential sum averages. But we construct an x with $\dim_{FS}(x) = \text{Dim}_{FS}(x) = \frac{1}{2}$ such that for some k , the sequence $\langle \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{2\pi i k(v(T^j x))} / n \rangle_{n=1}^{\infty}$ diverges.

Entropy rates converging to a limit does not imply that the empirical probability measures converge to a limiting distribution, and it is the latter notion which is necessary for exponential sums to converge.

Lemma 4.1. *There exists $x \in \Sigma^{\infty}$ with $\dim_{FS}(x) = \text{Dim}_{FS}(x) = \frac{1}{2}$ such that for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, the sequence $\langle \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{2\pi i k(v(T^j x))} / n \rangle_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is not convergent.*

The analogue of Lemma 5.2 need not hold in the setting of disjoint block entropies. However, an analogue of 5.3 can be obtained in the disjoint setting, which we require in the proof of Lemma 4.1.

Lemma 4.2. *For any l and k , $H_{kl}^d(x_0^{n-1}) \leq H_l^d(x_0^{n-1}) + o(n)/n$ where the speed of convergence of the error term depends only on k and l .*

Proof. It is enough to show that $(kl)H_{kl}^d(x_0^{n-1}) \leq k(lH_l^d(x_0^{n-1})) + o(n)/n$. The required inequality follows by dividing both sides by kl . If $(kl)H_{kl}^d(x_0^{n-1}) \leq k(lH_l^d(x_0^{n-1}))$ is true for all n such that $kl|n$ then by continuity of entropy we obtain $(kl)H_{kl}^d(x_0^{n-1}) \leq k(lH_l^d(x_0^{n-1})) + o(n)/n$. Due to the uniform continuity of entropy, the speed of convergence of the error term depends only on k and l . Hence, without loss of generality we assume that $kl|n$.

From the definition of disjoint block entropy,

$$(kl)H_{kl}^d(x_0^{n-1}) = - \sum_{w \in \Sigma^{kl}} P^d(x_0^{n-1}, w) \log(P^d(x_0^{n-1}, w)).$$

For $0 \leq j \leq k-1$ and $w \in \Sigma^l$, define $P_j^d(x_0^{n-1}, w)$ to be the fraction of kl -length disjoint blocks in x_0^{n-1} such that within the block, w appears as the $(j+1)$ th disjoint l -length block from the left. Formally,

$$P_j^d(x_0^{n-1}, w) = \frac{|\{0 \leq i < n/kl : x_{kli+jl}^{kli+jl+l-1} = w\}|}{n/kl}.$$

Let us define corresponding entropies,

$$\widehat{H}_j(x_0^{n-1}) = -\frac{1}{l} \sum_{w \in \Sigma^l} P_j^d(x_0^{n-1}, w) \log(P_j^d(x_0^{n-1}, w))$$

for $0 \leq j \leq k-1$.

Using the subadditivity of Shannon entropy, it follows that,

$$(kl)H_{kl}^d(x_0^{n-1}) \leq \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} l\widehat{H}_j(x_0^{n-1}). \quad (5)$$

Since $kl|n$, it can be seen from the definitions that for any $w \in \Sigma^l$,

$$P^d(x_0^{n-1}, w) = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} P_j^d(x_0^{n-1}, w).$$

Using the concavity of the function $x \log(1/x)$, it follows that,

$$l\widehat{H}_l^d(x_0^{n-1}) \geq \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} l\widehat{H}_j^d(x_0^{n-1}). \quad (6)$$

From 5 and 6 it follows that,

$$(kl)H_{kl}^d(x_0^{n-1}) \leq k(lH_l^d(x_0^{n-1})).$$

□

Now we prove Lemma 4.1.

Proof of Lemma 4.1. Let $y \in \Sigma^\infty$ be a fixed normal sequence. Define $a \in \Sigma^\infty$ by $a_{2n} = 0$, $a_{2n+1} = y_n$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Define $b \in \Sigma^\infty$ by $b_{4n} = b_{4n+3} = 0$, and $b_{4n+1} = y_{2n}$, $b_{4n+2} = y_{2n+1}$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Equivalently, a is constructed by repeating the pattern $0 \star 0 \star$ infinitely many times and replacing the \star symbols with successive digits from y . Similarly, b is constructed by repeating the pattern $0 \star \star 0$ infinitely many times and replacing the \star symbols with successive digits of y . The sliding block frequency of 01 in a is easily verified to be equal to $1/4$, whereas it is equal to $3/16$ in b .

For any $l \geq 2$, consider the 2^l length disjoint blocks in the sequence a . It is easily verified that by the construction of a , $2^{2^l/2}$ different strings of length 2^l occurs in a with equal probabilities as the number of blocks goes to infinity. Hence, for every positive ϵ , positive integer l and finite string α with $2^l || \alpha$, there exists an integer $M_l^{\alpha,a}(\epsilon)$ such that for all $n \geq M_l^{\alpha,a}(\epsilon)$,

$$H_{2^l}^d((\alpha a)_0^{n-1}) \geq \frac{1}{2} - \epsilon.$$

Such a number exists for $l = 1$ also, due to Lemma 4.2. Due to similar reasons, analogous quantities exist for the sequence b which we denote using $M_l^{\alpha,b}(\epsilon)$. Since the speed of convergence of the error term in Lemma 4.2 is independent of the string, using the same lemma, for every i , there exists J_i such that for any string z and for all $n \geq J_i$,

$$H_{2^i}^d(z_0^{n-1}) \geq H_{2^{i+1}}^d(z_0^{n-1}) - \frac{1}{2^{i+1}}.$$

For every positive ϵ and a finite string α of even length, there exists an integer $L^{\alpha,a}(\epsilon)$ such that for all $n \geq L^{\alpha,a}(\epsilon)$,

$$P((\alpha a)_0^{n-1}, 01) \geq \frac{1}{4} - \epsilon.$$

Similarly, there exists an integer $L^{\alpha,b}(\epsilon)$ such that for all $n \geq L^{\alpha,b}(\epsilon)$,

$$P((\alpha b)_0^{n-1}, 01) \leq \frac{3}{16} + \epsilon.$$

We construct x by specifying longer and longer prefixes of x in a stage-wise manner. Initially, let the prefix constructed until stage 0 be $\sigma = \lambda$.

In stage i , if i is odd, we do the following. For a fixed i , let K_i be a large enough integer such that for all $n \geq K_i$

$$\frac{\frac{|\sigma|+n}{2^i}}{\frac{|\sigma|+n}{2^i} + M_i^{\lambda,b}(\frac{1}{2^i})} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^{i+1}} \right) \geq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^i}. \quad (7)$$

Let N_i be any integer greater than $\max\{M_i^{\sigma,a}(2^{-(i+1)}) - |\sigma|, J_i, L^{\sigma,a}(2^{-i}), 2^i K_i\}$ such that 2^{i+1} divides $|\sigma| + N_i$. Let σ_i be the N_i length prefix of a . We attach σ_i to the end of the string σ constructed until stage $i-1$. Now, we set σ equal to this longer string $\sigma\sigma_i$. If i is even, we perform

the same steps as above by interchanging the roles of a and b . We set x to be the infinite sequence obtained by concatenating σ_i s, i.e, $x = \sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_3\sigma_4\dots$. Now, we show that x satisfies the required properties.

It can be easily seen that x satisfies conditions 2 and 3 since each $N_i \geq L^{\sigma,a}(2^{-i})$ (or $L^{\sigma,b}(2^{-i})$ if i is even). This forces the slide count probability of 01 in $\sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_3\dots\sigma_i$ to be at least $1/4 - 2^{-i}$ in odd stages and at most $3/16 + 2^{-i}$ in even stages.

Now, we show that $\dim_{FS}(x) = \text{Dim}_{FS}(x) = 1/2$. Towards this end, we first show that for any i ,

$$H_{2^i}^d(x_0^{n-1}) \geq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^i} \quad (8)$$

provided that $n \geq |\sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_3\dots\sigma_i|$. For any $\alpha \in \Sigma^*$ and $\beta \in \Sigma^*$, we write $\alpha \sqsubseteq \beta$ if α is a prefix of β . In order to show 8, it is enough to show that for any i and α such that $\sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_3\dots\sigma_i \sqsubseteq \alpha$ and $\alpha \sqsubseteq \sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_3\dots\sigma_i\sigma_{i+1}$,

$$H_{2^i}^d(\alpha) \geq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^i}. \quad (9)$$

If 9 holds for all i , then 8 holds for all i . This is because if k is the number such that $|\sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_3\dots\sigma_{i+k}| \leq n \leq |\sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_3\dots\sigma_{i+k+1}|$ then,

$$H_{2^{i+k}}^d(x_0^{n-1}) \geq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^{i+k}}$$

due to 9. Now, since $|\sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_3\dots\sigma_{i+k}| \geq |\sigma_{i+k-1}| = N_{i+k-1} \geq J_{i+k-1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} H_{2^{i+k-1}}^d(x_0^{n-1}) &\geq H_{2^{i+k}}^d(x_0^{n-1}) - \frac{1}{2^{i+k}} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^{i+k-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Continuing this process we get,

$$H_{2^i}^d(x_0^{n-1}) \geq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^i}.$$

This proves the claim in 8. Now, we prove the claim in 9. If $\alpha = \sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_3\dots\sigma_i$ then,

$$H_{2^i}^d(\alpha) \geq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^{i+1}}. \quad (10)$$

This is because α is $\sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_3\dots\sigma_{i-1}$ concatenated with the first N_i bits of a if i is odd. And, α is $\sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_3\dots\sigma_{i-1}$ concatenated with the first N_i bits of b if i is even. If i is odd, since

$$N_i \geq M_i^{\sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_3\dots\sigma_{i-1},a} \left(\frac{1}{2^{i+1}} \right) - |\sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_3\dots\sigma_{i-1}|$$

equation 10 follows due to the definition of $M_i^{\sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_3\dots\sigma_{i-1},a}(2^{-(i+1)})$. A similar argument works if i is even with a replaced with b . For $\alpha \neq \sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_3\dots\sigma_i$, there are,

$$\frac{|\sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_3\dots\sigma_i|}{2^i} = \frac{|\sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_3\dots\sigma_{i-1}|}{2^i} + \frac{|\sigma_i|}{2^i}$$

disjoint blocks of length 2^i within the first $|\sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_3\dots\sigma_i|$ bits of α . Let $n_\alpha = |\alpha| - |\sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_3\dots\sigma_i|$ be the number of remaining digits of α . Since 2^{i+1} divides $|\sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_3\dots\sigma_i|$, 2^i also divides $|\sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_3\dots\sigma_i|$. Hence, there are $\lfloor n_\alpha/2^i \rfloor$ disjoint blocks of length 2^i in the n_α length suffix of α which is by construction, a prefix of a or b (depending on whether i is odd or even). Then, due to the concavity of Shannon entropy,

$$H_{2^i}^d(\alpha) \geq \frac{\frac{|\sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_3\dots\sigma_{i-1}|}{2^i} + \frac{|\sigma_i|}{2^i}}{\frac{|\sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_3\dots\sigma_{i-1}|}{2^i} + \frac{|\sigma_i|}{2^i} + \lfloor \frac{n_\alpha}{2^i} \rfloor} H_{2^i}^d(\sigma_1\sigma_2\dots\sigma_i) + \frac{\lfloor \frac{n_\alpha}{2^i} \rfloor}{\frac{|\sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_3\dots\sigma_{i-1}|}{2^i} + \frac{|\sigma_i|}{2^i} + \lfloor \frac{n_\alpha}{2^i} \rfloor} H_{2^i}^d(b_0^{n_\alpha-1}) \quad (11)$$

Above we assumed that i is odd. In the even case, $H_{2^i}^d(b_0^{n_\alpha-1})$ must be replaced by $H_{2^i}^d(a_0^{n_\alpha-1})$.

Now if $n_\alpha \leq M_i^{\lambda,b}(\frac{1}{2^i})$, considering only the first term on the right we have,

$$\begin{aligned} H_{2^i}^d(\alpha) &\geq \frac{\frac{|\sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_3\dots\sigma_{i-1}|}{2^i} + \lfloor \frac{N_i}{2^i} \rfloor}{\frac{|\sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_3\dots\sigma_{i-1}|}{2^i} + \lfloor \frac{N_i}{2^i} \rfloor + M_i^{\lambda,b}(\frac{1}{2^i})} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^{i+1}} \right) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^i}. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows from 7 since $N_i \geq 2^i K_i$. If $n_\alpha > M_i^{\lambda,b}(2^{-i})$ then,

$$H_{2^i}^d(b_0^{n_\alpha-1}) \geq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^i}$$

from the definition of $M_i^{\lambda,b}(2^{-i})$. Now, using the above inequality and the inequality in 10 in 11 we get that 9 is true in the case when $n_\alpha > M_i^{\lambda,b}(2^{-i})$. The proof of the claim in 9 is thus complete which in turn implies that 8 is true. Having established 8, it follows that $\dim_{FS}(x) \geq 1/2$.

Now, we are left to show that $\text{Dim}_{FS}(x) \leq 1/2$. By choosing N_i to be such that 2^{i+1} divides $|\sigma| + N_i$, it is guaranteed that 2^{i+1} divides $|\sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_3\dots\sigma_i|$. Hence, for any fixed i , it follows that 2^i divides $|\sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_3\dots\sigma_k|$ for any $k \geq i-1$. Hence, for large enough n , the length 2^i disjoint blocks encountered in calculating the disjoint count probability $P_{2^i}^d(x_0^{n-1})$ shall be predominantly of the following two types. Either these blocks match the pattern $(0 \star 0 \star)^{2^{i-2}}$ or these blocks match the pattern $(0 \star \star 0)^{2^{i-2}}$. Occurrences of any block that does not match this pattern can only happen in the prefix $\sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_3\dots\sigma_{i-1}$. But these occurrences becomes negligible as n becomes large. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} H_{2^i}^d(x_0^{n-1}) &\leq \frac{\log(2^{2^i/2} + 2^{2^i/2})}{2^i} + \frac{o(n)}{n} \\ &= \frac{2^i/2 + 1}{2^i} + \frac{o(n)}{n}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} H_{2^i}^d(x_0^{n-1}) \leq (2^i/2 + 1)/2^i.$$

Using 35, we get that that $\text{Dim}_{FS}(x) = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} H_{2^i}^d(x_0^{n-1})$. Hence, it follows that,

$$\text{Dim}_{FS}(x) \leq \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2^i/2 + 1}{2^i} = \frac{1}{2}.$$

And hence, x satisfies all the required properties. \square

Generalizing the construction of diluted sequences in [10], we define an x with $v(x) \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \mathbb{D}$ and $\dim_{FS}(x) = \text{Dim}_{FS}(x) = 1/2$, but where for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, the sequences of Weyl sum averages diverge. The idea of dilution is as follows. Let $y \in \Sigma^\infty$ be normal. Define $a \in \Sigma^\infty$ by $a_{2n} = 0$, $a_{2n+1} = y_n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $\dim_{FS}(a) = \text{Dim}_{FS}(a) = 1/2$. Note that $b \in \Sigma^\infty$ defined by $b_{4n} = b_{4n+3} = 0$, and $b_{4n+1} = y_{2n}$, $b_{4n+2} = y_{2n+1}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is also a regular sequence with $\dim_{FS}(b) = \text{Dim}_{FS}(b) = 1/2$. But, the sliding block frequency of 01 in a is $1/4$, whereas it is $3/16$ in b . We leverage the existence of such distinct sequences with equal dimension. The disjoint blocks of x alternate between the above two patterns in a controlled manner to satisfy the following conditions.

1. $\dim_{FS}(x) = \text{Dim}_{FS}(x) = 1/2$
2. There is an increasing sequence of indices $\langle n_i \rangle_{i=1}^\infty$ such that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} P(x_0^{n_i-1}, 01) = 1/4$.
3. There is an increasing sequence of indices $\langle n_j \rangle_{j=1}^\infty$ such that $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} P(x_0^{n_j-1}, 01) = 3/16$.

Let $\langle \nu_n \rangle_{n=1}^\infty$ be the sequence of averages of Dirac measures constructed out of $\langle T^n x \rangle_{n=0}^\infty$, and $\langle \nu'_n \rangle_{n=1}^\infty$, those from $\langle 2^n v(x) \bmod 1 \rangle_{n=0}^\infty$. Assume that $\langle n^{-1} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{2\pi i k(v(T^j x))} \rangle_{n=1}^\infty$ converge for every $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Using the same steps in the proof of Theorem 3.10, we get that $\nu'_n \Rightarrow \mu'$ where μ' is the unique measure on \mathbb{T} having Fourier coefficients equal to the limits of the Weyl averages.

Since $v(x) \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \mathbb{D}$, Theorem 3.10 implies that $\nu(C_{01})$ is convergent. Using Lemma 3.11, we infer that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(x_0^{n-1}, 01)$ exists. But, we know from conditions 2 and 3 that $P(x_0^{n-1}, 01)$ is not convergent. Hence, we arrive at a contradiction. Therefore, for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, the Weyl averages $\langle n^{-1} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{2\pi i k(v(T^j x))} \rangle_{n=1}^{\infty}$ diverge. The above construction is easily adapted to show that for any rational number $p/q \in (0, 1)$, there exists $x \in \Sigma^{\infty}$ with $\dim_{FS}(x) = \text{Dim}_{FS}(x) = p/q$ such that some Weyl average of x diverges.

Theorem 4.3. *For any rational number $p/q \in (0, 1)$, there exists $x \in \Sigma^{\infty}$ with $\dim_{FS}(x) = \text{Dim}_{FS}(x) = p/q$ such that for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, the sequence $\langle \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{2\pi i k(v(T^j x))} / n \rangle_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is not convergent.*

Proof. If $2p < q$ (equivalently $p/q < 1/2$) then the patterns $(0\star)^p 0^{q-2p}$ and $0^{q-p} \star^p$ can be alternated in the construction of x in Theorem 4.1 and the sliding count probability of the string 01 can be made to oscillate between $p/2q$ and $(p+1)/4q$. These probabilities are equal if and only if $p = 1$ which is avoided by assuming that p and q are even (if they are not both even, then we perform the construction with the required dimension being $2p/2q$ and setting $p = 2p$ and $q = 2q$ in the design of the patterns). And if $2p > q$ (equivalently $p/q > 1/2$) then the patterns must be carefully selected. Let us assume without loss of generality that both p and q are even which implies that $(q-p) \geq 2$. Then, the patterns $(0\star)^{q-p} \star^{2p-q}$ and $0^{q-p} \star^p$ can be alternated in the construction of x in Theorem 4.1 and the sliding count probability of the string 01 can be made to oscillate between $1/4$ and $(p+1)/4q$. These probabilities are equal if and only if $q-p = 1$ which is avoided by assuming that p and q are even as indicated above (if they are not both even, then we perform the construction with the required dimension being $2p/2q$ and setting $p = 2p$ and $q = 2q$ in the design of the patterns). \square

5 Weyl's criterion for finite-state dimension

We saw in Lemma 4.1 that Weyl averages may diverge for x having finite-state dimension less than 1, even if x is regular. Hence, it is necessary for us to deal with divergent Weyl averages and obtain their relationship with the finite-state dimension of x . We know from Theorem 3.12 that Weyl's criterion for normality (Theorem 3.2) is equivalently expressed in terms of weak convergence of a sequence of measures over Σ^{∞} . In section 5.1, we generalize the weak convergence formulation to handle arbitrary finite state dimension. Applying this, in section 5.2, we generalize the exponential sum formulation.

5.1 Weak convergence and finite-state dimension

We know from Theorem 3.12 that $x \in \Sigma^{\infty}$ is normal (equivalently, $\dim_{FS}(x) = 1$) if and only if $\nu_n \rightarrow \mu$, where μ is the uniform distribution over Σ^{∞} . In this subsection we give a generalization of this formulation of Weyl's criterion which applies for x having any finite-state dimension. Lemma 4.1 and Theorem 3.8 together imply that ν_n 's need not be weakly convergent even if x is guaranteed to be regular. However, studying the subsequence limits of $\langle \nu_n \rangle_{n=1}^{\infty}$ gives us the following generalization of Weyl's criterion for arbitrary $x \in \Sigma^{\infty}$.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $x \in \Sigma^{\infty}$. Let $\langle \nu_n \rangle_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be the sequence of averages of Dirac measures on Σ^{∞} constructed out of the sequence $\langle T^n x \rangle_{n=0}^{\infty}$. Let \mathcal{W}_x be the collection of all subsequence weak limits of $\langle \nu_n \rangle_{n=1}^{\infty}$. i.e, $\mathcal{W}_x = \{ \mu \mid \exists \langle n_m \rangle_{m=0}^{\infty} \text{ such that } \nu_{n_m} \Rightarrow \mu \}$. Then, $\dim_{FS}(x) = \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{W}_x} H^-(\mu)$ and $\text{Dim}_{FS}(x) = \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{W}_x} H^+(\mu)$.*

We require the following technical lemmas for proving Theorem 5.1.

Lemma 5.2. For any l and m , $(l+m)H_{l+m}(x_0^{n-1}) \leq lH_l(x_0^{n-1}) + mH_m(x_0^{n-1}) + o(n)/n$ where the speed of convergence of the error term only depends on l and m .

The above lemma can be proved by using the techniques in the proof of Lemma 1 from [34].

Proof of Lemma 5.2.

$$\begin{aligned}
(l+m)H_{l+m}(x_0^{n-1}) &= - \sum_{w \in \Sigma^{l+m}} P(x_0^{n-1}, w) \log(P(x_0^{n-1}, w)) \\
&= - \sum_{u \in \Sigma^l} \sum_{v \in \Sigma^m} P(x_0^{n-1}, uv) \left(\log \left(\frac{P(x_0^{n-1}, uv)}{P(x_0^{n-1}, u)} \right) + \log(P(x_0^{n-1}, u)) \right) \\
&= - \sum_{u \in \Sigma^l} P(x_0^{n-m-1}, u) \log(P(x_0^{n-1}, u)) - \sum_{u \in \Sigma^l} \sum_{v \in \Sigma^m} P(x_0^{n-1}, uv) \log \left(\frac{P(x_0^{n-1}, uv)}{P(x_0^{n-1}, u)} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

Let us analyze the first term on the RHS.

$$\begin{aligned}
- \sum_{u \in \Sigma^l} P(x_0^{n-m-1}, u) \log(P(x_0^{n-1}, u)) &= - \sum_{u \in \Sigma^l} P(x_0^{n-m-1}, u) \log(P(x_0^{n-m-1}, u)) \\
&\quad - \sum_{u \in \Sigma^l} P(x_0^{n-m-1}, u) \log \frac{P(x_0^{n-1}, u)}{P(x_0^{n-m-1}, u)} \\
&= lH_l(x_0^{n-m-1}) + o(n)/n
\end{aligned}$$

This is because when $n \rightarrow \infty$, $P(x_0^{n-m-1}, u) \rightarrow P(x_0^{n-1}, u)$, where the speed of convergence depends only on m . Hence, the error term depends only on m and $|\Sigma|^l$. Due to the same reason, using the continuity of entropy we get that,

$$lH_l(x_0^{n-m-1}) = lH_l(x_0^{n-1}) + o(n)/n.$$

Again, the error term in the above equation depends only on m and $|\Sigma|^l$. Now, let us analyze the second term. Using the concavity of the log function,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{u \in \Sigma^l} \sum_{v \in \Sigma^m} P(x_0^{n-1}, uv) \log \frac{P(x_0^{n-1}, uv)}{P(x_0^{n-1}, u)} &= \sum_{v \in \Sigma^m} P(x_0^{n-1}, v) \sum_{u \in \Sigma^l} \frac{P(x_0^{n-1}, uv)}{P(x_0^{n-1}, v)} \log \left(\frac{P(x_0^{n-1}, uv)}{P(x_0^{n-1}, u)} \right) \\
&\leq \sum_{v \in \Sigma^m} P(x_0^{n-1}, v) \log \left(\frac{\sum_{u \in \Sigma^l} \frac{P(x_0^{n-1}, uv)}{P(x_0^{n-1}, v)}}{\sum_{u \in \Sigma^l} \frac{P(x_0^{n-1}, uv)}{P(x_0^{n-1}, v)}} \right) \\
&= \sum_{v \in \Sigma^m} P(x_0^{n-1}, v) \log \left(\frac{1}{P(x_0^{n-1}, v)} \Big/ \frac{P(x_0^{n-1}, v)}{P(x_0^{n-1}, v)} \right) \\
&= \sum_{v \in \Sigma^m} P(x_0^{n-1}, v) \log \frac{1}{P(x_0^{n-1}, v)} + \\
&\quad \sum_{v \in \Sigma^m} P(x_0^{n-1}, v) \log \frac{P(x_0^{n-1}, v)}{P(x_0^{n-1}, v)} \\
&= mH_m(x_0^{n-1}) + o(n)/n
\end{aligned}$$

Where the last equality follows since $P(x_0^{n-1}, v) \rightarrow P(x_0^{n-1}, v)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and the speed of convergence depends only on l . Hence, the error term depends only on l and $|\Sigma|^m$. The required inequality follows from the bounds on both the terms on the RHS. We remark that every $o(n)/n$ term in the above bounds depends only on l and m . \square

The following is an immediate corollary of the above inequality.

Lemma 5.3. For any l and m , $H_{ml}(x_0^{n-1}) \leq H_l(x_0^{n-1}) + o(n)/n$ and $H_l(x_0^{n-1}) \geq H_{ml}(x_0^{n-1}) - o(n)/n$ where the speed of convergence of the error term only depends on l and m .

Now, we prove Theorem 5.1 by proving the equalities in the conclusion separately.

Lemma 5.4. $\dim_{FS}(x) = \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{W}_x} H^-(\mu)$

Proof. We will first show that $\dim_{FS}(x) \leq \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{W}_x} H^-(\mu)$. Let $s = \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{W}_x} H^-(\mu)$. Let $\epsilon > 0$ and μ' be any measure such that $H^-(\mu') < s + \epsilon$. That is,

$$\liminf_{l \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{l} \sum_{w \in \Sigma^l} \mu'(C_w) \log(\mu'(C_w)) < s + \epsilon \quad (12)$$

Let l' be any number such that

$$-\frac{1}{l'} \sum_{w \in \Sigma^{l'}} \mu'(C_w) \log(\mu'(C_w)) < s + \epsilon \quad (13)$$

which exists due to 12 (in fact there exist infinitely many l' satisfying 13). Let $\langle \nu_{n_m} \rangle_{m=0}^\infty$ be any subsequence of $\langle \nu_n \rangle_{n=0}^\infty$ such that $\nu_{n_m} \Rightarrow \mu'$. Hence, for any $w \in \Sigma^{l'}$, $\nu_{n_m}(C_w) \rightarrow \mu'(C_w)$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$. From, Lemma 3.11, we get $P(x_0^{n_m+l'-2}, w) \rightarrow \mu'(C_w)$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, from 13 and continuity of the entropy function we get that, there exist infinitely many n_m such that

$$-\frac{1}{l'} \sum_{w \in \Sigma^{l'}} P(x_0^{n_m+l'-2}, w) \log(P(x_0^{n_m+l'-2}, w)) < s + \epsilon$$

This implies,

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{l'} \sum_{w \in \Sigma^{l'}} P(x_0^{n-1}, w) \log(P(x_0^{n-1}, w)) < s + \epsilon \quad (14)$$

The required inequality directly follows from above. Now we show that conversely, $\inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{W}_x} H^-(\mu) \leq \inf_l \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} H_l(x_0^{n-1})$. Let $s = \inf_l \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} H_l(x_0^{n-1})$. Let $\epsilon > 0$ and l' be any number such that $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} H_{l'}(x_0^{n-1}) < s + \epsilon$. Hence,

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{l'} \sum_{w \in \Sigma^{l'}} P(x_0^{n-1}, w) \log(P(x_0^{n-1}, w)) < s + \epsilon$$

Hence, there are infinitely many $\langle n_m \rangle_{m=0}^\infty$ such that

$$-\frac{1}{l'} \sum_{w \in \Sigma^{l'}} P(x_0^{n_m-1}, w) \log(P(x_0^{n_m-1}, w)) < s + \epsilon \quad (15)$$

For large enough n_m , due to the continuity of the entropy function we have,

$$-\frac{1}{l'} \sum_{w \in \Sigma^{l'}} P(x_0^{n_m+l'-2}, w) \log(P(x_0^{n_m+l'-2}, w)) < s + \epsilon \quad (16)$$

Let $\langle \nu_{n_{m_i}} \rangle_{i=0}^\infty$ be any convergent subsequence of $\langle \nu_{n_m} \rangle_{m=0}^\infty$ such that $\nu_{n_{m_i}} \Rightarrow \mu'$ for some probability measure μ' as $i \rightarrow \infty$, which exists due to Prokhorov's theorem. We have from Lemma 3.11 that for any $w \in \Sigma^{l'}$, $P(x_0^{n_{m_i}+l'-2}, w) = \nu_{n_{m_i}}(C_w)$. Hence we get, $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} P(x_0^{n_{m_i}+l'-2}, w) = \mu'(C_w)$ for any $w \in \Sigma^{l'}$. Using continuity of entropy, 16 implies,

$$-\frac{1}{l'} \sum_{w \in \Sigma^{l'}} \mu'(C_w) \log(\mu'(C_w)) < s + \epsilon \quad (17)$$

Now since 15 is true, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and large enough n_m using Corollary 5.3 we get that,

$$-\frac{1}{kl'} \sum_{w \in \Sigma^{kl'}} P(x_0^{n_m-1}, w) \log(P(x_0^{n_m-1}, w)) < s + \epsilon \quad (18)$$

From 15, we get that the above is true for infinitely many n_m . The steps used in proving 17 can be repeated (by choosing the same μ' as before) for $k'l'$ -length strings to obtain,

$$-\frac{1}{k'l'} \sum_{w \in \Sigma^{k'l'}} \mu'(C_w) \log(\mu'(C_w)) < s + \epsilon \quad (19)$$

Hence, 19 is true for partitions having length in $\{k'l'\}_{k=1}^\infty$. This implies,

$$\liminf_{l \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{l} \sum_{w \in \Sigma^l} \mu'(C_w) \log(\mu'(C_w)) < s + \epsilon$$

It follows that $\inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{W}_x} H^-(\mu) \leq s + \epsilon$. Letting $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, we get the desired inequality. \square

Lemma 5.5. $\text{Dim}_{FS}(x) = \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{W}_x} H^+(\mu)$

Proof. We first show that $\text{Dim}_{FS}(x) \leq \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{W}_x} H^+(\mu)$. It is enough to show that if $\inf_l \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} H_l(x_0^{n-1}) > s$ then $\sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{W}_x} H^+(\mu) \geq s$. If $\inf_l \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} H_l(x_0^{n-1}) > s$ then for any length l ,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{l} \sum_{w \in \Sigma^l} P(x_0^{n-1}, w) \log(P(x_0^{n-1}, w)) > s + \epsilon_1 \quad (20)$$

for some small $\epsilon_1 > 0$. Hence, for any l' there exists infinitely many n such that

$$-\frac{1}{l'} \sum_{w \in \Sigma^{l'}} P(x_0^{n-1}, w) \log(P(x_0^{n-1}, w)) > s + \epsilon_1.$$

Let $\langle n_m^1 \rangle_{m=0}^\infty$ be any increasing sequence such that

$$-\frac{1}{l'} \sum_{w \in \Sigma^{l'}} P(x_1^{n_m^1}, w) \log(P(x_1^{n_m^1}, w)) > s + \epsilon_1$$

for all m . Since, 20 is true for any length, using Corollary 5.3, we can choose a sequence $\langle n_m^2 \rangle_{m=0}^\infty$ such that for each m ,

$$-\frac{1}{2l'} \sum_{w \in \Sigma^{2l'}} P(x_1^{n_m^2}, w) \log(P(x_1^{n_m^2}, w)) > s + \epsilon_2$$

and,

$$-\frac{1}{l'} \sum_{w \in \Sigma^{l'}} P(x_1^{n_m^2}, w) \log(P(x_1^{n_m^2}, w)) > s + \epsilon_2$$

for some $0 < \epsilon_2 < \epsilon_1$. Similarly, for any $k > 0$ we can choose $\langle n_m^k \rangle_{m=0}^\infty$ such that

$$-\frac{1}{2^i l'} \sum_{w \in \Sigma^{2^i l'}} P(x_1^{n_m^k}, w) \log(P(x_1^{n_m^k}, w)) > s + \epsilon_2$$

for any $i \in \{0, 1, 2, 3, \dots, k-1\}$. Let $\langle a_m \rangle_{m=1}^\infty$ be any increasing sequence chosen such that a_k is a member of $\langle n_m^k \rangle_{m=0}^\infty$. Now, consider $\langle \nu_{a_m} \rangle_{m=1}^\infty$ and let μ' be the weak limit point of any subsequence of $\langle \nu_{a_m} \rangle_{m=1}^\infty$, which exists due to Prokhorov's theorem. Now, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $m \geq k+1$,

$$-\frac{1}{2^k l'} \sum_{w \in \Sigma^{2^k l'}} P(x_1^{a_m}, w) \log(P(x_1^{a_m}, w)) > s + \epsilon_2.$$

For any fixed k , using Corollary 5.3 and continuity of the entropy function, for large enough a_m along this sequence we have that,

$$-\frac{1}{2^k l'} \sum_{w \in \Sigma^{2^k l'}} P(x_1^{a_m+2^k l'-2}, w) \log(P(x_1^{a_m+2^k l'-2}, w)) > s + \epsilon_2.$$

From Lemma 3.11 we get that for any $w \in \Sigma^{2^k l'}$, $P(x_0^{a_m+2^k l'-2}, w) = \nu_{a_m}(C_w)$. Since, $\nu_{a_m}(C_w)$

converges along a subsequence to $\mu'(C_w)$, using continuity of the entropy function, we get,

$$-\frac{1}{2^{kl'}} \sum_{w \in \Sigma^{2^{kl'}}} \mu'(C_w) \log(\mu'(C_w)) > s + \epsilon_2.$$

Since the above is true for any k , we get that,

$$\limsup_{l \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{l} \sum_{w \in \Sigma^l} \mu'(C_w) \log(\mu'(C_w)) > s + \epsilon_2.$$

This implies that $\sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{W}_x} H^+(\mu) > s + \epsilon_2$ for $\epsilon_2 > 0$, which in turn implies that $\sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{W}_x} H^+(\mu) \geq s$.

This completes the proof of the first part. Conversely, let us show that $s = \inf_l \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} H_l(x_0^{n-1}) \geq \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{W}_x} H^+(\mu)$. For any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an l' such that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{l'} \sum_{w \in \Sigma^{l'}} P(x_0^{n-1}, w) \log(P(x_0^{n-1}, w)) < s + \epsilon$$

Hence, for a small enough $\epsilon' > 0$, there exists $N(\epsilon, l') \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq N(\epsilon, l')$,

$$-\frac{1}{l'} \sum_{w \in \Sigma^{l'}} P(x_0^{n-1}, w) \log(P(x_0^{n-1}, w)) < s + \epsilon - \epsilon'$$

From the above, by using Corollary 5.3, it can be shown that for all $k > 0$, there exists $N(\epsilon, kl') \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq N(\epsilon, kl')$,

$$-\frac{1}{kl'} \sum_{w \in \Sigma^{kl'}} P(x_0^{n-1}, w) \log(P(x_0^{n-1}, w)) < s + \epsilon$$

For $1 < r < l' - 1$, let j be any number such $j = kl' + r$. Now, from Corollary 5.3, we have

$$H_j(x_0^{n-1}) = H_{kl'+r}(x_0^{n-1}) \leq \frac{kl'}{kl'+r} H_{kl'}(x_0^{n-1}) + \frac{r}{kl'+r} H_r(x_0^{n-1}) + o(n)/n$$

Using the fact that H_r is at most 1, for large enough j (equivalently for large enough k) we have,

$$H_j(x_0^{n-1}) = H_{kl'+r}(x_0^{n-1}) \leq H_{kl'}(x_0^{n-1}) + \epsilon + o(n)/n$$

Since this conclusion can be obtained for any r , for large enough j , there exists $N(\epsilon, j)$ such that for all $n \geq N(\epsilon, j)$,

$$-\frac{1}{j} \sum_{w \in \Sigma^j} P(x_0^{n-1}, w) \log(P(x_0^{n-1}, w)) < s + 2\epsilon$$

Using the continuity of entropy, by considering large enough $N(\epsilon, j)$ we can ensure that for all $n \geq N(\epsilon, j)$,

$$-\frac{1}{j} \sum_{w \in \Sigma^j} P(x_0^{n+j-2}, w) \log(P(x_0^{n+j-2}, w)) < s + 2\epsilon \quad (21)$$

Consider any $\mu' \in \mathcal{W}_x$. Let $\langle \nu_{n_m} \rangle_{m=0}^\infty$ be any subsequence of $\langle \nu_n \rangle_{n=0}^\infty$ such that $\nu_{n_m} \Rightarrow \mu'$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$. Now, for any j and $w \in \Sigma^j$, from Lemma 3.11 we have $P(x_0^{n_m+j-2}, w) = \nu_{n_m}(C_w) \rightarrow \mu'(C_w)$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$. From 21 using continuity of entropy, we get that, $-j^{-1} \sum_{w \in \Sigma^j} \mu'(C_w) \log(\mu'(C_w)) < s + 2\epsilon$. Since the above holds for all large enough j , we get

$$\limsup_{l \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{l} \sum_{w \in \Sigma^l} \mu'(C_w) \log(\mu'(C_w)) < s + 2\epsilon.$$

Since the above holds for any $\mu' \in \mathcal{W}_x$ we get that, $\sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{W}_x} H^+(\mu) \leq s + 2\epsilon$. By letting $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ we obtain the desired inequality. \square

Theorem 5.1 now follows from Lemma 5.4 and Lemma 5.5. Now, we prove an equivalent version of Theorem 5.1 which we require in section 5.2. From the definition of lower average entropy, Theorem 5.1 shows that, $\dim_{FS}(x) = \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{W}_x} \liminf_{l \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{H}_l(\mu)/l$. We show that the limit inferior

in this expression can be replaced by an infimum.

Lemma 5.6. $\dim_{FS}(x) = \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{W}_x} \inf_l \mathbf{H}_l(\mu)/l$

Proof. Observe that from Lemma 5.4

$$\inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{W}_x} \inf_l \frac{\mathbf{H}_l(\mu)}{l} \leq \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{W}_x} \liminf_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbf{H}_l(\mu)}{l}$$

we get that $\inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{W}_x} \inf_l \mathbf{H}_l(\mu)/l \leq \dim_{FS}(x)$. Hence, it is enough to show that $\dim_{FS}(x) \leq \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{W}_x} \inf_l \mathbf{H}_l(\mu)/l$. This can be shown using the same steps in the proof of the first part of Lemma 5.4 since the existence of an l' satisfying 13 is true if we assume that $s = \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{W}_x} \inf_l \mathbf{H}_l(\mu)/l$. The rest of the proof follows from 13 using identical steps. \square

5.2 Weyl averages and finite-state dimension

We now obtain the main result of the paper by relating subsequence limits of Weyl averages and finite-state dimension. In case the Weyl averages converge, we show that the sequence is regular. In particular, when the Weyl averages converge to 0, then the regular sequence is normal.

We know from Lemma 4.1 that there exist regular sequences with non-convergent Weyl averages. In the absence of limits, we investigate the subsequence limits of Weyl averages in order to obtain a relationship with the finite-state dimension. If for some $x \in \Sigma^\infty$, there exist a sequence of natural numbers $\langle n_m \rangle_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ and constants $\langle c_k \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ such that $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n_m} \sum_{j=0}^{n_m-1} e^{2\pi i k(v(T^j x))} = c_k$. Then, using Theorem 3.10, we get that there exists a measure μ on \mathbb{T} such that $c_k = \int e^{2\pi i k y} d\mu$ and $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \nu_{n_m}(C_w) = \hat{\mu}(C_w)$ for every $w \neq 0^{|w|}$ and $w \neq 1^{|w|}$. But, $\nu_{n_m}(C_{0^l})$ and $\nu_{n_m}(C_{1^l})$ need not converge. Simple examples of such strings can be obtained by concatenating increasingly large runs of 0's and 1's in an alternating stage wise manner. However, the probabilities of the strings 0^l and 1^l have negligible effect on the finite-state dimension as l gets large. Using Theorem 5.1 we obtain the following.

Theorem 5.7 (Weyl's criterion for finite-state dimension). *Let $x \in \Sigma^\infty$. If for any $\langle n_m \rangle_{m=0}^\infty$ there exist constants c_k for $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n_m} \sum_{j=0}^{n_m-1} e^{2\pi i k(v(T^j x))} = c_k$, for every $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, then there exists a measure μ on \mathbb{T} such that for every k , $c_k = \int e^{2\pi i k y} d\mu$. Let $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}_x$ be the collection of the lifted measures $\hat{\mu}$ on Σ^∞ for all μ on \mathbb{T} that can be obtained as subsequence limits of Weyl averages. Then,*

$$\dim_{FS}(x) = \inf\{H^-(\hat{\mu}) \mid \hat{\mu} \in \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_x\} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Dim}_{FS}(x) = \sup\{H^+(\hat{\mu}) \mid \hat{\mu} \in \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_x\}$$

Hence, the finite-state dimension and finite-state strong dimension are related to the lower and upper average entropies of the subsequence limits of the Weyl averages.

We require the following definitions and technical lemmas for proving Theorem 5.7. We define,

$$\widetilde{H}_l(x_0^{n-1}) = \frac{-1}{l} \sum_{w \in \Sigma^l \setminus \{0^l, 1^l\}} P(x_0^{n-1}, w) \log(P(x_0^{n-1}, w)).$$

Using the above notion of entropy, we define,

$$\widetilde{\dim}_{FS}(x) = \liminf_{l \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \widetilde{H}_l(x_0^{n-1})$$

$$\widetilde{\text{Dim}}_{FS}(x) = \liminf_{l \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \widetilde{H}_l(x_0^{n-1}).$$

The following lemma easily follows from the definitions.

Lemma 5.8. $\widetilde{H}_l(x_0^{n-1}) \leq H_l(x_0^{n-1}) \leq \widetilde{H}_l(x_0^{n-1}) + 2/l$.

We use Lemma 5.8 to prove the following lemma.

Lemma 5.9. *For any $x \in \Sigma^\infty$, $\widetilde{\dim}_{FS}(x) = \dim_{FS}(x)$.*

Proof. From 34, $\dim_{FS}(x) = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} H_l(x_0^{n-1}) = \liminf_{l \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} H_l(x_0^{n-1})$. From Lemma 5.8, we get that $\widetilde{\dim}_{FS}(x) \leq \dim_{FS}(x)$. Conversely using Lemma 5.8 we get,

$$\begin{aligned} \dim_{FS}(x) &= \liminf_{l \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} H_l(x_0^{n-1}) \\ &\leq \liminf_{l \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\widetilde{H}_l(x_0^{n-1}) + 2/l \right) \\ &= \liminf_{l \rightarrow \infty} \left(\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \widetilde{H}_l(x_0^{n-1}) + 2/l \right) \\ &= \liminf_{l \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \widetilde{H}_l(x_0^{n-1}) \\ &= \widetilde{\dim}_{FS}(x). \end{aligned}$$

In the second last equality we used the fact if a_l and b_l are sequences such that $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} b_l = 0$, then $\liminf_{l \rightarrow \infty} (a_l + b_l) = \liminf_{l \rightarrow \infty} a_l$. \square

We prove the analogous lemma for finite-state strong dimension.

Lemma 5.10. *For any $x \in \Sigma^\infty$, $\widetilde{\text{Dim}}_{FS}(x) = \text{Dim}_{FS}(x)$.*

Proof. From 34, $\text{Dim}_{FS}(x) = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} H_l(x_0^{n-1}) = \liminf_{l \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} H_l(x_0^{n-1})$. From Lemma 5.8, we get that $\widetilde{\text{Dim}}_{FS}(x) \leq \text{Dim}_{FS}(x)$. Conversely using Lemma 5.8 we get,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Dim}_{FS}(x) &= \liminf_{l \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} H_l(x_0^{n-1}) \\ &\leq \liminf_{l \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\widetilde{H}_l(x_0^{n-1}) + 2/l \right) \\ &= \liminf_{l \rightarrow \infty} \left(\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \widetilde{H}_l(x_0^{n-1}) + 2/l \right) \\ &= \liminf_{l \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \widetilde{H}_l(x_0^{n-1}) \\ &= \widetilde{\text{Dim}}_{FS}(x). \end{aligned}$$

In the second last equality we used the fact if a_l and b_l are sequences such that $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} b_l = 0$, then $\liminf_{l \rightarrow \infty} (a_l + b_l) = \liminf_{l \rightarrow \infty} a_l$. \square

Now, for any probability measure μ on Σ^∞ , we define

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{H}}_n(\mu) = - \sum_{w \in \Sigma^n \setminus \{0^n, 1^n\}} \mu(C_w) \log(\mu(C_w)).$$

And using the above definition, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{H}^+(\mu) &= \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{H}}_n(\mu)}{n} \\ \widetilde{H}^-(\mu) &= \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{H}}_n(\mu)}{n}. \end{aligned}$$

Analogous to Lemma 5.8, we now have the following lemma which easily follows from the definitions.

Lemma 5.11. $\widetilde{\mathbf{H}}_n(\mu) \leq \mathbf{H}_n(\mu) \leq \widetilde{\mathbf{H}}_n(\mu) + 2$.

Using Lemma 5.11, we prove the following lemmas.

Lemma 5.12. For any μ on Σ^∞ , $\tilde{H}^-(\mu) = H^-(\mu)$.

Proof. From Lemma 5.11, it easily follows that $\tilde{H}^-(\mu) \leq H^-(\mu)$. Conversely, using Lemma 5.11 we get,

$$\begin{aligned} H^-(\mu) &= \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbf{H}_n(\mu)}{n} \\ &\leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_n(\mu)}{n} + \frac{2}{n} \right) \\ &= \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_n(\mu)}{n} \\ &= \tilde{H}^-(\mu). \end{aligned}$$

In the second last equality we used the fact if a_n and b_n are sequences such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_n = 0$, then $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} (a_n + b_n) = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n$. \square

Lemma 5.13. For any μ on Σ^∞ , $\tilde{H}^+(\mu) = H^+(\mu)$.

Proof. From Lemma 5.11, it easily follows that $\tilde{H}^+(\mu) \leq H^+(\mu)$. Conversely, using Lemma 5.11 we get,

$$\begin{aligned} H^+(\mu) &= \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbf{H}_n(\mu)}{n} \\ &\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_n(\mu)}{n} + \frac{2}{n} \right) \\ &= \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_n(\mu)}{n} \\ &= \tilde{H}^+(\mu). \end{aligned}$$

In the second last equality we used the fact if a_n and b_n are sequences such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_n = 0$, then $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (a_n + b_n) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n$. \square

Now, we prove one of the major technical lemmas used in the proof of Theorem 5.7. In the following lemma, for any $x \in \Sigma^\infty$, let $\langle \nu_n \rangle_{n=1}^\infty$ be the sequence of averages of Dirac measures on Σ^∞ constructed out of the sequence $\langle T^n x \rangle_{n=0}^\infty$ and let $\langle \nu'_n \rangle_{n=1}^\infty$ be the sequence of averages of Dirac measures on \mathbb{T} constructed out of the sequence $\langle 2^n v(x) \bmod 1 \rangle_{n=0}^\infty$.

Lemma 5.14. Let $x \in \Sigma^\infty$ be such that $v(x)$ is not a dyadic rational. Let \mathcal{W}_x be the collection of all subsequence weak limits of $\langle \nu_n \rangle_{n=1}^\infty$ and let $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}_x$ be the set constructed in the statement of Theorem 5.7. Then,

$$\inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{W}_x} H^-(\mu) = \inf_{\hat{\mu} \in \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_x} H^-(\hat{\mu}) \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{W}_x} H^+(\mu) = \sup_{\hat{\mu} \in \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_x} H^+(\hat{\mu}).$$

Proof. In order to show these equalities, it is enough to show that $\{H^-(\mu) \mid \mu \in \mathcal{W}_x\} = \{H^-(\hat{\mu}) \mid \hat{\mu} \in \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_x\}$ and $\{H^+(\mu) \mid \mu \in \mathcal{W}_x\} = \{H^+(\hat{\mu}) \mid \hat{\mu} \in \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_x\}$. In order to show these equalities, we show the following:

1. For every $\mu \in \mathcal{W}_x$, there exists a $\hat{\rho} \in \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_x$ such that $\hat{\rho}(C_w) = \mu(C_w)$ for every $w \neq 1^{|w|}$ and $w \neq 0^{|w|}$.
2. For every $\hat{\mu} \in \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_x$, there exists a $\rho \in \mathcal{W}_x$ such that $\hat{\mu}(C_w) = \rho(C_w)$ for every $w \neq 1^{|w|}$ and $w \neq 0^{|w|}$.

If we show the above conditions to be true, then the required conclusion follows from Lemma 5.12 and Lemma 5.13. We first show condition 1.

Let $\mu \in \mathcal{W}_x$ and let $\langle n_m \rangle_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ be such that $\nu_{n_m} \Rightarrow \mu$. Hence, using Lemma 3.7, $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \nu_{n_m}(C_w) = \mu(C_w)$ for every $w \in \Sigma^*$. Since $v(x)$ is not a dyadic rational, we know from the proof of Theorem 3.10 that for every $w \in \Sigma^*$ and $m \geq 1$, $\nu_{n_m}(C_w) = \nu'_{n_m}(I_w)$. Hence, we get $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \nu'_{n_m}(I_w) = \mu(C_w)$ for every $w \in \Sigma^*$. Now, let ρ be a subsequence weak limit of $\langle \nu'_{n_m} \rangle_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ which exists due to Prokhorov's theorem. Consider any w such that $w \neq 1^{|w|}$ and $w \neq 0^{|w|}$. Now, using Lemma 3.9, we get that $\rho(\{v(w0^\infty)\}) = \rho(\{v(w1^\infty)\}) = 0$. Since $v(w0^\infty)$ and $v(w1^\infty)$ are the end points of I_w , using Lemma 3.5 we get that $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \nu'_{n_m}(I_w) = \rho(I_w)$ for every $w \neq 1^{|w|}$ and $w \neq 0^{|w|}$. Since $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \nu'_{n_m}(I_w) = \mu(C_w)$, this implies that $\rho(I_w) = \mu(C_w)$ for every $w \neq 1^{|w|}$ and $w \neq 0^{|w|}$. Since ρ is a subsequence weak limit of $\langle \nu'_{n_m} \rangle_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$, due to Theorem 3.6, we get that $\hat{\rho} \in \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_x$. Now, condition 2 follows since $\hat{\rho}$ is a measure in $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}_x$ with the required property.

Now, we show condition 2. Let $\hat{\mu} \in \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_x$. From the definition of $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}_x$ we can infer that there exists $\langle n_m \rangle_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that for every $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n_m} \sum_{j=0}^{n_m-1} e^{2\pi i k(v(T^j x))} = \int e^{2\pi i k y} d\mu$. From Theorem 3.10, we get that $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \nu_{n_m}(C_w) = \hat{\mu}(C_w)$ for every $w \neq 1^{|w|}$ and $w \neq 0^{|w|}$. Let ρ be any subsequence weak limit of $\langle \nu_{n_m} \rangle_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ which exists due to Prokhorov's Theorem. Then, using Lemma 3.7 we get that $\rho(C_w) = \hat{\mu}(C_w)$ for every $w \neq 1^{|w|}$ and $w \neq 0^{|w|}$. Since $\rho \in \mathcal{W}_x$, condition 2 is true. \square

Now we prove Theorem 5.7

Proof of Theorem 5.7. If $v(x)$ is a dyadic rational in \mathbb{T} , then it can be easily verified that the Weyl averages are convergent to 1. The unique measure having all Fourier coefficients equal to 1 over \mathbb{T} is δ_0 . Since $\hat{\delta}_0 = \delta_{0^\infty}$, it can be easily verified that $\dim_{FS}(x) = H^-(\delta_{0^\infty}) = H^+(\delta_{0^\infty}) = \text{Dim}_{FS}(x) = 0$. Hence, we consider the case when $v(x)$ is not a dyadic rational. We first define analogues of finite-state dimension by avoiding the strings 0^l and 1^l for all l in calculating the sliding entropies. We define $\widetilde{H}_l(x_0^{n-1})$ to be the normalized sliding entropy over x_0^{n-1} as in the definition of $H_l(x_0^{n-1})$, except that the summation is taken over $\Sigma^l \setminus \{0^l, 1^l\}$ instead of Σ^l . Using this notion, we define $\widetilde{\dim}_{FS}(x) = \liminf_{l \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \widetilde{H}_l(x_0^{n-1})$ and $\widetilde{\text{Dim}}_{FS}(x) = \liminf_{l \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \widetilde{H}_l(x_0^{n-1})$. Since, $\widetilde{H}_l(x_0^{n-1}) \leq H_l(x_0^{n-1}) \leq \widetilde{H}_l(x_0^{n-1}) + 2/l$, it can be shown using routine arguments that $\dim_{FS}(x) = \widetilde{\dim}_{FS}(x)$ and $\text{Dim}_{FS}(x) = \widetilde{\text{Dim}}_{FS}(x)$. Similarly we define \widetilde{H}^+ and \widetilde{H}^- by reducing the range of the sum in the definition of H_l to $\Sigma^l \setminus \{0^l, 1^l\}$ instead of Σ^l . Using a similar argument as in the case of sliding entropy, it can be shown that \widetilde{H}^+ and \widetilde{H}^- are the same as H^+ and H^- for any measure on Σ^∞ . Let $\langle \nu_n \rangle_{n=1}^\infty$ be the sequence of averages of Dirac measures on Σ^∞ constructed out of the sequence $\langle T^n x \rangle_{n=0}^\infty$. Let \mathcal{W}_x be the set of all weak limits of ν_n as constructed in Theorem 5.1. Since $v(x)$ is not a dyadic rational, using Prokhorov's theorem for weak convergence of \mathbb{T} and weak convergence over Σ^∞ , it can be shown that, $\inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{W}_x} H^-(\mu) = \inf_{\hat{\mu} \in \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_x} H^-(\hat{\mu})$ and $\sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{W}_x} H^+(\mu) = \sup_{\hat{\mu} \in \widehat{\mathcal{W}}_x} H^+(\hat{\mu})$. The claim now follows from Theorem 5.1. \square

Using Theorem 5.7, we get the following theorem in the case when the Weyl averages are convergent.

Theorem 5.15 (Weyl's criterion for convergent Weyl averages). *Let $x \in \Sigma^\infty$. If there exist $c_k \in \mathbb{C}$ for $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{2\pi i k(v(T^j x))} \rightarrow c_k$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then, there exists a unique measure μ on \mathbb{T} such that for every k , $c_k = \int e^{2\pi i k y} d\mu$. Furthermore, $\dim_{FS}(x) = \text{Dim}_{FS}(x) = H^-(\hat{\mu}) = H^+(\hat{\mu})$.*

Proof. Since the Weyl averages are convergent, any subsequence shall also converge to the same limit. This implies that $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}_x$ is a singleton set and hence from Theorem 5.7 it follows that $\dim_{FS}(x) =$

$H^-(\hat{\mu})$ and $\text{Dim}_{FS}(x) = H^+(\hat{\mu})$. Let $\tilde{H}_l(x_0^{n-1})$ be defined as in the proof of Theorem 5.7. From the remarks at the start of this section and Lemma 3.11, we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu_n(C_w) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(x_0^{n-1}, w) = \hat{\mu}(C_w)$ for every $w \neq 0^{|w|}$ and $w \neq 1^{|w|}$. Hence, $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{H}_l(x_0^{n-1}) = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{H}_l(x_0^{n-1})$. Therefore, $\widetilde{\text{dim}}_{FS}(x) = \widetilde{\text{Dim}}_{FS}(x)$. Now, $\text{dim}_{FS}(x) = \text{Dim}_{FS}(x)$ follows because $\text{dim}_{FS}(x) = \widetilde{\text{dim}}_{FS}(x)$ and $\text{Dim}_{FS}(x) = \widetilde{\text{Dim}}_{FS}(x)$ as given in the proof of Theorem 5.7. \square

As a special case, we derive Weyl's criterion for normality, i.e, for sequences x such that $\text{dim}_{FS}(x) = \text{Dim}_{FS}(x) = 1$ as a special case of Theorem 5.1 and Theorem 5.15.

Theorem 5.16. *Let $x \in \Sigma^\infty$. Then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{2\pi i k(v(T^j x))} = 0$ for every $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ if and only if $\text{dim}_{FS}(x) = \text{Dim}_{FS}(x) = 1$.*

Proof. The forward direction follows from Theorem 5.15 since the uniform distribution is the unique measure on \mathbb{T} having all Fourier coefficients equal to 0. Conversely, assume that $\text{dim}_{FS}(x) = \text{Dim}_{FS}(x) = 1$. From Lemma 5.6, for any $\nu \in \mathcal{W}_x$, we have $\inf_l \mathbf{H}_l(\nu)/l = 1$. Since $\mathbf{H}_l(\nu) \leq l$, this implies that for every l , $\mathbf{H}_l(\nu) = \sum_{w \in \Sigma^l} \nu(C_w) \log(\nu(C_w)) = l$. From this we can infer that ν is the uniform distribution on Σ^∞ . Hence, the uniform distribution is the unique weak limit in the set \mathcal{W}_x defined in the statement of Theorem 5.1. The claim now follows from the definition of weak convergence since $e^{2\pi i k v(y)}$ is a continuous function over Σ^∞ . \square

The conclusion of Theorem 5.15 says that $\text{dim}_{FS}(x) = \text{Dim}_{FS}(x)$. i.e, x is a regular sequence. Hence, Theorem 4.3 and Theorem 5.15 together yield the following.

Corollary 5.17. *If for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{2\pi i k(v(T^j x))} = c_k$ for a sequence of complex numbers $\langle c_k \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$. Then, x is a regular sequence. But there exist regular sequences having non-convergent Weyl averages.*

6 Preservation of finite-state dimension under real arithmetic

In this section, we demonstrate the utility of our framework by proving the most general results yet regarding the preservation of finite-state dimension under arithmetic operations like addition with reals satisfying a natural independence condition, and multiplication with non-zero rationals. These results strictly generalize all known results regarding the preservation of finite-state dimension including those of Doty, Lutz and Nandakumar [12] and Aistleitner [1]. Our Weyl criterion plays a pivotal role in these extensions. We combine our Weyl criterion along with recent estimates by Hochman [17] for the entropy of convolution of probability measures.

It is easier to analyze addition and multiplication as operations over \mathbb{T} . Hence we first obtain an equivalent Weyl's criterion for finite-state dimension in terms of measures over \mathbb{T} . We now define the analogues of upper and lower average entropies for measures over \mathbb{T} . This turns out to be the notion of Rényi dimension as defined by Alfréd Rényi in [25]. Recall that for any m and $w \in \Sigma_m^n$, I_w^m denotes the interval $[v_m(w0^\infty), v_m(w0^\infty) + m^{-|w|})$ in \mathbb{T} .

Definition 6.1 (Rényi Dimension). For any probability measure μ on \mathbb{T} and *partition factor* m , let $\mathbf{H}_n^m(\mu) = -\sum_{w \in \Sigma_m^n} \mu(I_w^m) \log(\mu(I_w^m))$. The *Rényi upper and lower dimensions* (see [25] and [33]) are defined as follows,

$$\overline{\text{dim}}_R^m(\mu) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbf{H}_n^m(\mu)}{n \log m} \quad \text{and} \quad \underline{\text{dim}}_R^m(\mu) = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbf{H}_n^m(\mu)}{n \log m}$$

If $\overline{\text{dim}}_R^m(\mu) = \underline{\text{dim}}_R^m(\mu)$ then the *Rényi dimension* of μ is $\text{dim}_R^m(\mu) = \overline{\text{dim}}_R^m(\mu) = \underline{\text{dim}}_R^m(\mu)$.

From the above definition, it seems as if the notion of Rényi dimension is dependent on the choice of the partition factor m . However, Rényi upper and lower dimensions are quantities that are independent of the partition factor. This important fact regarding Rényi dimension seems to be a folklore result. However, for completeness we give a full proof of this fact in the appendix.

Lemma 6.2. *Let μ be any measure on \mathbb{T} . For any two partition factors m_1 and m_2 , $\overline{\dim}_R^{m_1}(\mu) = \overline{\dim}_R^{m_2}(\mu)$ and $\underline{\dim}_R^{m_1}(\mu) = \underline{\dim}_R^{m_2}(\mu)$.*

In the light of Lemma 6.2, we suppress the partition factor m in the notations $\overline{\dim}_R^m(\mu)$, $\underline{\dim}_R^m(\mu)$ and $\dim_R^m(\mu)$ and use $\overline{\dim}_R(\mu)$, $\underline{\dim}_R(\mu)$ and $\dim_R(\mu)$ to refer to the corresponding quantities for a measure μ on \mathbb{T} . Now, we state an equivalent Weyl's criterion for finite-state dimension for $r \in \mathbb{T}$ in terms of weak limit measures over \mathbb{T} and Rényi dimension of measures over \mathbb{T} .

Theorem 6.3 (Restatement of Weyl's criterion for finite-state dimension (Theorem 5.7)). *Let $r \in \mathbb{T}$. If for any $\langle n_m \rangle_{m=0}^\infty$ there exist constants c_k for $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that ⁴*

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n_m} \sum_{j=0}^{n_m-1} e^{2\pi i k 2^j r} = c_k \quad (22)$$

for every $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, then there exists a measure μ on \mathbb{T} such that for every k , $c_k = \int e^{2\pi i k y} d\mu$. Let \mathcal{W}_r be the collection of all μ on \mathbb{T} that can be obtained as subsequence limits of Weyl averages. Then, $\dim_{FS}(r) = \inf\{\underline{\dim}_R(\mu) \mid \mu \in \mathcal{W}_r\}$ and $\text{Dim}_{FS}(r) = \sup\{\overline{\dim}_R(\mu) \mid \mu \in \mathcal{W}_r\}$.

Proof. If r is a dyadic rational in \mathbb{T} , the conclusion is trivial since it is easily verified that \mathcal{W}_r consists only of the measure δ_0 . Now, the statement follows since $\dim_R(\delta_0) = 0$. For $r \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \mathcal{D}$, there exists a unique $x \in \Sigma^\infty$ such that $v(x) = r$. And we also have $v(T^j x) = 2^j v(x) = 2^j r$ for every $j \geq 0$. If we fix the partition factor m to be equal to $|\Sigma|$, then the quantities $\underline{\dim}_R(\mu)$ and $\overline{\dim}_R(\mu)$ for any measure μ on \mathbb{T} coincide with the quantities $H^-(\hat{\mu})$ and $H^+(\hat{\mu})$ of the lifted measure $\hat{\mu}$. The equivalence of the above theorem with Theorem 5.7 follows from these observations. \square

D. D. Wall in his thesis [31] proved that *if $r \in [0, 1]$ and q is any non-zero rational number, then r is a normal number if and only if qr and $q+r$ are normal numbers*. Doty, Lutz and Nandakumar [12] generalized this result to arbitrary finite-state dimensions and proved that the finite-state dimension and finite-state strong dimension of any number are preserved under multiplication and addition with rational numbers.

Theorem 6.4 ([12]). *Let $r \in \mathbb{T}$ and q be any non-zero rational number. Then for any base b , $\dim_{FS}^b(r) = \dim_{FS}^b(q+r) = \dim_{FS}^b(qr)$ and $\text{Dim}_{FS}^b(r) = \text{Dim}_{FS}^b(q+r) = \text{Dim}_{FS}^b(qr)$.*

In the above \dim^b and Dim^b denotes the finite-state dimension and finite-state strong dimension of the number r calculated by considering the sequence representing the base- b expansion of r . For r having multiple base b expansions, this does not cause any ambiguity since in this case the finite-state dimensions of r are 0 with respect to any of the two possible expansions.

In the specific case of normal sequences, Wall's result has been generalized by Aistleitner in the following form. Let \mathcal{C} be the set of reals $y = 0.y_0y_1\dots$ such that the ratio $P(y_0^{n-1}, 0)$ goes to 1 as n tends to ∞ . Then we have the following.

Theorem 6.5. *If y is any real number in \mathcal{C} , then for any normal $r \in \mathbb{T}$ and $q \in \mathbb{Q}$, the number $r + qy$ is normal.*

⁴The 2^j term in (22) must be replaced with b^j while investigating the above criterion in any arbitrary base b

We strictly generalize all these above results by formulating a natural independence notion between two reals. We describe the framework below. Given strings x and y in Σ^∞ and strings $u, w \in \Sigma^\ell$ for some $\ell \geq 1$, we define the *joint occurrence count* of u and w in x and y up to n as,

$$N_{u,w}(x_0^{n-1}, y_0^{n-1}) = |\{i \in [0, n - \ell] : x_i^{i+\ell-1} = u \text{ and } y_i^{i+\ell-1} = w\}|$$

And, the *joint occurrence probability* of u and w in x and y up to n is defined as $P_{u,w}(x_0^{n-1}, y_0^{n-1}) = \frac{N_{u,w}(x_0^{n-1}, y_0^{n-1})}{n-\ell+1}$.

Informally, we define two infinite strings x and y to be independent if for infinitely many lengths l , the occurrence probability distributions of l -length strings within x and y are *independent* in the limit. The straightforward formulation of independence between x and y is

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{u,w}(x_0^{n-1}, y_0^{n-1}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(x_0^{n-1}, u)P(y_0^{n-1}, w).$$

But these limits need not exist for general x and y . Hence, the more admissible and useful definition is the following.

Definition 6.6. Any two strings x and y in Σ^∞ are said to be *independent* if for infinitely many $\ell \geq 1$ and for every $u, w \in \Sigma^\ell$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |P_{u,w}(x_0^{n-1}, y_0^{n-1}) - P(x_0^{n-1}, u)P(y_0^{n-1}, w)| = 0. \quad (23)$$

Note. A basic intuition for our approach can be viewed as follows. A standard result in probability theory (see for example, Shiryaev [29], 2nd. edition, Section II.8) is that, if X and Y are two independent random variables, then the distribution of $X + Y$ is the convolution of the distributions of X and Y . Moreover, the Fourier coefficients of the convolution is the product of the Fourier coefficients of the individual distributions. Our result may be viewed as an analogous result using sequences.

The following theorem gives an important connection between the exponential averages of the sum of independent reals and the exponential averages of the individual reals.

Theorem 6.7. *If x and y are real numbers in \mathbb{T} such that x and y are independent in the sense of condition 6.6, then for any integers d, e and $q \in \mathbb{Q}$,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{2\pi i k 2^j (dx+ey)} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{2\pi i k 2^j dx} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{2\pi i k 2^j ey} \right| = 0. \quad (24)$$

Proof. Observe that for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{2\pi i k 2^j (dx+ey)} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{2\pi i k 2^j dx} e^{2\pi i k 2^j ey}$$

With a slight abuse of notation we let $0.x_1x_2x_3\dots$ and $0.y_1y_2y_3\dots$ denote the base-2 expansions of r and y respectively. Then,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{2\pi i k 2^j (dx+ey)} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{2\pi i dk(0.x_jx_{j+1}x_{j+2}\dots)} e^{2\pi i ek(0.y_jy_{j+1}y_{j+2}\dots)}.$$

Fix an arbitrary $\ell \geq 1$ such that the independence condition is satisfied. Using the inequality $|e^{i\theta} - 1| \leq |\theta|$, we get that

$$\left| e^{2\pi i dk(0.x_jx_{j+1}x_{j+2}\dots)} - e^{2\pi i dk(0.x_j\dots x_{j+\ell-1})} \right| \leq \frac{2\pi|dk|}{2^{\ell-1}}.$$

Similarly,

$$\left| e^{2\pi i ek(0.y_jy_{j+1}y_{j+2}\dots)} - e^{2\pi i ek(0.y_j\dots y_{j+\ell-1})} \right| \leq \frac{2\pi|ek|}{2^{\ell-1}}.$$

Using the above two inequalities we obtain that

$$\left| e^{2\pi idk(0.x_j x_{j+1} x_{j+2} \dots)} e^{2\pi iek(0.y_j y_{j+1} y_{j+2} \dots)} - e^{2\pi idk(0.x_j \dots x_{j+\ell-1})} e^{2\pi iek(0.y_j \dots y_{j+\ell-1})} \right| \leq \frac{2\pi(|d| + |e|)|k|}{2^{\ell-1}}.$$

Therefore, from the above observations we get

$$\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{2\pi ik 2^j(dx+ey)} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{2\pi idk(0.x_j \dots x_{j+\ell-1})} e^{2\pi iek(0.y_j \dots y_{j+\ell-1})} \right| \leq \frac{2\pi(|d| + |e|)|k|}{2^{\ell-1}}. \quad (25)$$

Observe that,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{2\pi idk(0.x_j \dots x_{j+\ell-1})} e^{2\pi iek(0.y_j \dots y_{j+\ell-1})} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{u,w \in \Sigma^\ell} N_{u,w}(x_0^{n+\ell-2}, y_0^{n+\ell-2}) e^{2\pi idk(0.u)} e^{2\pi iek(0.w)} \\ &= \sum_{u,w \in \Sigma^\ell} P_{u,w}(x_0^{n+\ell-2}, y_0^{n+\ell-2}) e^{2\pi idk(0.u)} e^{2\pi iek(0.w)} \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \sum_{u,w \in \Sigma^\ell} P_{u,w}(x_0^{n+\ell-2}, y_0^{n+\ell-2}) e^{2\pi idk(0.u)} e^{2\pi iek(0.w)} - \sum_{u,w \in \Sigma^\ell} P(x_0^{n+\ell-2}, u) e^{2\pi idk(0.u)} P(y_0^{n+\ell-2}, w) e^{2\pi iek(0.w)} \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{u,w \in \Sigma^\ell} \left| P_{u,w}(x_0^{n+\ell-2}, y_0^{n+\ell-2}) - P(x_0^{n+\ell-2}, u) P(y_0^{n+\ell-2}, w) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Since the independence condition is satisfied, we get that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \sum_{u,w \in \Sigma^\ell} \left(P_{u,w}(x_0^{n+\ell-2}, y_0^{n+\ell-2}) - P(x_0^{n+\ell-2}, u) P(y_0^{n+\ell-2}, w) \right) e^{2\pi idk(0.u)} e^{2\pi iek(0.w)} \right| = 0 \quad (27)$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{u,w \in \Sigma^\ell} P(x_0^{n+\ell-2}, u) e^{2\pi idk(0.u)} P(y_0^{n+\ell-2}, w) e^{2\pi iek(0.w)} \\ &= \sum_{u \in \Sigma^\ell} P(x_0^{n+\ell-2}, u) e^{2\pi idk(0.u)} \sum_{w \in \Sigma^\ell} P(y_0^{n+\ell-2}, w) e^{2\pi iek(0.w)} \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{u \in \Sigma^\ell} N(x_0^{n+\ell-2}, u) e^{2\pi idk(0.u)} \times \frac{1}{n} \sum_{w \in \Sigma^\ell} N(y_0^{n+\ell-2}, w) e^{2\pi iek(0.w)} \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{2\pi idk(0.x_j \dots x_{j+\ell-1})} \times \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{2\pi iek(0.y_j \dots y_{j+\ell-1})} \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Therefore, using (26), (27) and (28) we get that for any ℓ satisfying the independence condition,

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{2\pi idk(0.x_j \dots x_{j+\ell-1})} e^{2\pi iek(0.y_j \dots y_{j+\ell-1})} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{2\pi idk(0.x_j \dots x_{j+\ell-1})} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{2\pi iek(0.y_j \dots y_{j+\ell-1})} \right| \\ &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Observe that,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{2\pi i dk(0.x_j x_{j+1} x_{j+2} \dots)} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{2\pi i dk(0.x_j \dots x_{j+\ell-1})} \right| \\
& \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \left| e^{2\pi i dk(0.x_j x_{j+1} x_{j+2} \dots)} - e^{2\pi i dk(0.x_j \dots x_{j+\ell-1})} \right| \\
& \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \frac{2\pi |dk|}{2^{\ell-1}} \\
& = \frac{2\pi |dk|}{2^{\ell-1}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

Similarly,

$$\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{2\pi i dk(0.y_j y_{j+1} y_{j+2} \dots)} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{2\pi i dk(0.y_j \dots y_{j+\ell-1})} \right| \leq \frac{2\pi |ek|}{2^{\ell-1}}. \tag{31}$$

Finally using (25), (29), (30) and (31) we obtain that,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{2\pi i k 2^j (dx+ey)} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{2\pi i k 2^j dx} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{2\pi i k 2^j ey} \right| \leq \frac{4\pi(|d| + |e|)|k|}{2^{\ell-1}}.$$

Since the independence condition holds for infinitely many ℓ , we get

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{2\pi i k 2^j (dx+ey)} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{2\pi i k 2^j dx} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{2\pi i k 2^j ey} \right| = 0.$$

□

For any measures μ_1 and μ_2 on \mathbb{T} , let $\mu_1 * \mu_2$ denote the convolution of these two measures (see [26] or [16]).

Lemma 6.8. *Let x and y be real numbers in \mathbb{T} such that x and y are independent in the sense of condition 6.6 and let $d, e \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then, for any $\mu \in \mathcal{W}_{dx+ey}$ there exist $\mu_1 \in \mathcal{W}_{dx}$ and $\mu_2 \in \mathcal{W}_{ey}$ such that $\mu = \mu_1 * \mu_2$.*

Proof. Consider any $\mu \in \mathcal{W}_{dx+ey}$. Let $\langle n_m \rangle_{m=0}^{\infty}$ be a subsequence such that

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n_m} \sum_{j=0}^{n_m-1} e^{2\pi i k 2^j (dx+ey)} = c_k$$

where $\langle c_k \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ are the Fourier coefficients of μ . Using Prokhorov's Theorem, we assume without loss of generality that $\langle n_m \rangle_{m=0}^{\infty}$ is such that,

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n_m} \sum_{j=0}^{n_m-1} e^{2\pi i k 2^j dx} = c_k^1$$

and,

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n_m} \sum_{j=0}^{n_m-1} e^{2\pi i k 2^j ey} = c_k^2$$

where $\langle c_k^1 \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ and $\langle c_k^2 \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ are the Fourier coefficients of measures $\mu_1 \in \mathcal{W}_{dx}$ and $\mu_2 \in \mathcal{W}_{ey}$ respectively. Using (24) we obtain that $c_k = c_k^1 c_k^2$ for every $k \in \mathbb{Z}$.

If $\langle c_k^* \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ denotes the Fourier coefficients of $\mu_1 * \mu_2$, then it follows that $c_k^* = c_k^1 c_k^2 = c_k$ for every $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ (see Theorem 1.3.3 from [26]). Hence, using the Bochner's Theorem we obtain that $\mu = \mu_1 * \mu_2$. \square

Lemma 6.9. *If x and y are real numbers in \mathbb{T} such that x and y are independent in the sense of condition 6.6. Let $d, e \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $q \in \mathbb{Q}$. Then, for any $\mu_1 \in \mathcal{W}_{dx}$ there exist $\mu \in \mathcal{W}_{dx+ey}$ and $\mu_2 \in \mathcal{W}_{ey}$ such that $\mu = \mu_1 * \mu_2$.*

Proof. Let $\langle n_m \rangle_{m=0}^\infty$ be a subsequence such that

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n_m} \sum_{j=0}^{n_m-1} e^{2\pi i k 2^j dx} = c_k^1$$

where $\langle c_k^1 \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ are the Fourier coefficients of μ_1 . Using the Prokhorov's Theorem, we assume without loss of generality that $\langle n_m \rangle_{m=0}^\infty$ is such that,

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n_m} \sum_{j=0}^{n_m-1} e^{2\pi i k 2^j (dx+ey)} = c_k$$

and,

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n_m} \sum_{j=0}^{n_m-1} e^{2\pi i k 2^j ey} = c_k^2$$

where $\langle c_k \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ and $\langle c_k^2 \rangle_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ are the Fourier coefficients of measures $\mu \in \mathcal{W}_{dx+ey}$ and $\mu_2 \in \mathcal{W}_{ey}$ respectively. Using (24) we obtain that $c_k = c_k^1 c_k^2$ for every $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Now the lemma follows using the same argument in the proof of Lemma 6.8. \square

The proofs of the following bounds on Rényi dimension of convolutions crucially employ inequalities from Hochman [17].

Lemma 6.10. *For any measures μ_1 and μ_2 on \mathbb{T} , $\underline{\dim}_R(\mu_1 * \mu_2) \geq \max\{\underline{\dim}_R(\mu_1), \underline{\dim}_R(\mu_2)\}$*

Proof. Using Corollary 4.10 from [17] and the fact that $\mu_1 * \mu_2 = \mu_2 * \mu_1$ (see [26] or [16]) we obtain that,

$$\frac{\mathbf{H}_n^2(\mu_1 * \mu_2)}{n} \geq \frac{\mathbf{H}_n^2(\mu_1)}{n} - O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right).$$

By applying \liminf on both sides, we obtain that $\underline{\dim}_R(\mu_1 * \mu_2) \geq \underline{\dim}_R(\mu_1)$. Using Corollary 4.10 from [17] and the fact that $\mu_1 * \mu_2 = \mu_2 * \mu_1$ it follows that $\underline{\dim}_R(\mu_1 * \mu_2) \geq \underline{\dim}_R(\mu_2)$. This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

The upper bound for the Rényi dimension of the convolution is as follows.

Lemma 6.11. *Let μ_1 and μ_2 be measures on \mathbb{T} . Then, $\underline{\dim}_R(\mu_1 * \mu_2) \leq \underline{\dim}_R(\mu_1) + \overline{\dim}_R(\mu_2)$*

Proof. As in [17] for any measure μ on \mathbb{T} , let $\sigma_m \mu$ denote the m -discretization of μ defined as $\sigma_m \mu = \sum_{w \in \Sigma^m} \mu(I_w) \delta_{v(w0^\infty)}$. Let X denote the discrete random variables which takes the value $v(w0^\infty)$ with probability $\mu_1(I_w)$ for every $w \in \Sigma^m$. Let Y be the analogous random variable defined using μ_2 such that X and Y are independent. Using routine information theoretic arguments involving the data processing inequality (see [9]), it follows that $H(X+Y) \leq H(X) + H(Y)$. Since X and Y are independent, $\sigma_m \mu_1 * \sigma_m \mu_2$ denotes the distribution of the random variable $X + Y$. Therefore,

$$\frac{\mathbf{H}_m^2(\sigma_m \mu_1 * \sigma_m \mu_2)}{m} \leq \frac{\mathbf{H}_m^2(\sigma_m \mu_1) + \mathbf{H}_m^2(\sigma_m \mu_2)}{m} = \frac{\mathbf{H}_m^2(\mu_1) + \frac{1}{m} \mathbf{H}_m^2(\mu_2)}{m}. \quad (32)$$

Using Lemma 4.8 from [17], we have,

$$\left| \frac{1}{m} \mathbf{H}_m^2(\sigma_m \mu_1 * \sigma_m \mu_2) - \frac{1}{m} \mathbf{H}_m^2(\mu_1 * \mu_2) \right| \leq O\left(\frac{1}{m}\right). \quad (33)$$

From (32) and (33), we get

$$\frac{\mathbf{H}_m^2(\mu_1 * \mu_2)}{m} \leq \frac{\mathbf{H}_m^2(\mu_1) + \mathbf{H}_m^2(\mu_2)}{m} + O\left(\frac{1}{m}\right) \leq \frac{\mathbf{H}_m^2(\mu_1)}{m} + \sup_{n \geq m} \frac{\mathbf{H}_n^2(\mu_2)}{n} + O\left(\frac{1}{m}\right).$$

Taking lim inf on both sides we get that, and noting that the second and third terms above have limits, we get the required result. \square

By applying lim sup instead of lim inf in the proofs of the bounds above we get the following inequalities for Rényi upper dimension of $\mu_1 * \mu_2$.

Lemma 6.12. *For any measures μ_1 and μ_2 on \mathbb{T} , $\overline{\dim}_R(\mu_1 * \mu_2) \geq \max\{\overline{\dim}_R(\mu_1), \overline{\dim}_R(\mu_2)\}$ and $\overline{\dim}_R(\mu_1 * \mu_2) \leq \overline{\dim}_R(\mu_1) + \overline{\dim}_R(\mu_2)$*

The following is our main result.

Theorem 6.13. *Let x and y be real numbers in \mathbb{T} such that x and y are independent in the sense of condition 6.6. Then for any $d, e \in \mathbb{Z}$,*

1. $\dim_{FS}(dx+ey) \geq \max\{\dim_{FS}(dx), \dim_{FS}(ey)\}$ and $\dim_{FS}(dx+ey) \leq \dim_{FS}(dx) + \dim_{FS}(ey)$
2. $\text{Dim}_{FS}(dx + ey) \geq \max\{\text{Dim}_{FS}(dx), \text{Dim}_{FS}(ey)\}$ and $\text{Dim}_{FS}(dx + ey) \leq \text{Dim}_{FS}(dx) + \text{Dim}_{FS}(ey)$

Proof. We prove the bounds in 1. in Consider any $\mu \in \mathcal{W}_{dx+ey}$. Using Lemma 6.8 we get that there exists $\mu_1 \in \mathcal{W}_{dx}$ and $\mu_2 \in \mathcal{W}_{ey}$ such that $\mu = \mu_1 * \mu_2$. Now, it follows from Lemma 6.10 that $\underline{\dim}_R(\mu) = \underline{\dim}_R(\mu_1 * \mu_2) \geq \underline{\dim}_R(\mu_1)$. On applying Theorem 6.3 for $dx \in \mathbb{T}$, we get $\underline{\dim}_R(\mu) \geq \dim_{FS}(dx)$. Since μ was arbitrary, applying Theorem 6.3 for $dx + ey \in \mathbb{T}$, we obtain $\dim_{FS}(dx+ey) \geq \dim_{FS}(dx)$. The proof of $\dim_{FS}(dx+ey) \geq \dim_{FS}(ey)$ is similar. This completes the proof of the first inequality.

In order to show the second inequality, consider any $\mu_1 \in \mathcal{W}_{dx}$. Using Lemma 6.9, there exist $\mu \in \mathcal{W}_{dx+ey}$ and $\mu_2 \in \mathcal{W}_{ey}$ such that $\mu = \mu_1 * \mu_2$. Now using Lemma 6.11, it follows that $\underline{\dim}_R(\mu) = \underline{\dim}_R(\mu_1 * \mu_2) \leq \underline{\dim}_R(\mu_1) + \overline{\dim}_R(\mu_2)$. On applying Theorem 6.3 for the points $dx + ey \in \mathbb{T}$ and $ey \in \mathbb{T}$, we get $\dim_{FS}(dx + ey) \leq \underline{\dim}_R(\mu_1) + \text{Dim}_{FS}(ey)$. Since μ_1 was arbitrary, applying Theorem 6.3 for $dx \in \mathbb{T}$, we obtain $\dim_{FS}(dx + ey) \leq \dim_{FS}(dx) + \text{Dim}_{FS}(ey)$. The inequalities for finite-state strong dimension in 2 follows using similar arguments by using Lemma 6.12 instead of Lemmas 6.10 and 6.11. \square

The following is an immediate corollary of the above theorem.

Corollary 6.14. *If x and y are real numbers in \mathbb{T} such that x and y are independent in the sense of condition 6.6, then for any $q \in \mathbb{Q}$,*

1. $\dim_{FS}(x + qy) \geq \max\{\dim_{FS}(x), \dim_{FS}(y)\}$ and $\dim_{FS}(x + qy) \leq \dim_{FS}(x) + \text{Dim}_{FS}(y)$
2. $\text{Dim}_{FS}(x + qy) \geq \max\{\text{Dim}_{FS}(x), \text{Dim}_{FS}(y)\}$ and $\text{Dim}_{FS}(x + qy) \leq \text{Dim}_{FS}(x) + \text{Dim}_{FS}(y)$

Proof. Let e, d be integers such that $q = e/d$ in the reduced form. Since $\dim_{FS}(r + e/d \times y) = \dim_{FS}(dr + ey)$ and $\text{Dim}_{FS}(r + e/d \times y) = \text{Dim}_{FS}(dr + ey)$ due to Theorem 6.4, the required conclusion follows immediately from Theorem 6.13. \square

On considering the case when $\text{Dim}_{FS}(y) = 0$, we obtain the following corollaries, generalizing earlier results by Doty, Lutz, Nandakumar [12] and Aistleitner [1], regarding the preservation of finite-state dimension under addition with an independent sequence having zero finite-state strong dimension.

Corollary 6.15. *If x and y are real numbers in \mathbb{T} such that x and y are independent in the sense of condition 6.6 with $\text{Dim}_{FS}(x) = 0$, then for any $q \in \mathbb{Q}$, $\dim_{FS}(x + qy) = \dim_{FS}(x)$ and $\text{Dim}_{FS}(x + qy) = \text{Dim}_{FS}(x)$.*

It is easy to verify that any string in \mathcal{C} is independent of any other string $x \in \Sigma^\infty$. Thus we obtain the following generalization of Aistleitner's result to every dimension [1].

Corollary 6.16. *If y is any real number in \mathcal{C} , then for any $x \in \mathbb{T}$ and $q \in \mathbb{Q}$, $\dim_{FS}(x + qy) = \dim_{FS}(x)$ and $\text{Dim}_{FS}(x + qy) = \text{Dim}_{FS}(x)$.*

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Michael Hochman for technical clarifications regarding his paper [17].

References

- [1] Christoph Aistleitner. On modifying normal numbers. *Unif. Distrib. Theory*, 6(2):49–58, 2011.
- [2] Krishna B Athreya, John M Hitchcock, Jack H Lutz, and Elvira Mayordomo. Effective strong dimension in algorithmic information and computational complexity. *SIAM journal on computing*, 37(3):671–705, 2007.
- [3] Verónica Becher and Pablo Ariel Heiber. Normal numbers and finite automata. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 477:109–116, 2013.
- [4] Patrick Billingsley. *Convergence of probability measures*. John Wiley & Sons, 2013.
- [5] Chris Bourke, John M Hitchcock, and NV Vinodchandran. Entropy rates and finite-state dimension. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 349(3):392–406, 2005.
- [6] Y. Bugeaud. *Distribution Modulo 1 and Diophantine Approximation*. Pure and Applied Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- [7] J. W. S. Cassels. On a problem of Steinhaus about normal numbers. *Colloq. Math.*, 7:95–101, 1959. doi:10.4064/cm-7-1-95-101.
- [8] D. G. Champernowne. Construction of decimals normal in the scale of ten. *J. London Math. Soc.*, 2(8):254–260, 1933.
- [9] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas. *Elements of Information Theory*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, N.Y., 1991.
- [10] Jack J Dai, James I Lathrop, Jack H Lutz, and Elvira Mayordomo. Finite-state dimension. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 310(1-3):1–33, 2004.

- [11] H. Davenport and P. Erdős. Note on normal decimals. *Canad. J. Math.*, 4:58–63, 1952. [doi:10.4153/cjm-1952-005-3](https://doi.org/10.4153/cjm-1952-005-3).
- [12] D. Doty, J. H. Lutz, and S. Nandakumar. Finite state dimension and real arithmetic. In *Proceedings of the 33rd International Colloquium on Automata, Logic and Programming*, 2006.
- [13] Rodney G. Downey and Denis R. Hirschfeldt. *Algorithmic randomness and complexity. Theory and Applications of Computability*. Springer, New York, 2010. [doi:10.1007/978-0-387-68441-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-68441-3).
- [14] Manfred Einsiedler and Thomas Ward. *Ergodic theory with a view towards number theory*, volume 259 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag London, Ltd., London, 2011. [doi:10.1007/978-0-85729-021-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-85729-021-2).
- [15] Meir Feder. Gambling using a finite state machine. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 37(5):1459–1465, 1991. [doi:10.1109/18.133269](https://doi.org/10.1109/18.133269).
- [16] Gerald B Folland. *A course in abstract harmonic analysis*, volume 29. CRC press, 2016.
- [17] Michael Hochman. On self-similar sets with overlaps and inverse theorems for entropy. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 180(2):773–822, 2014. [doi:10.4007/annals.2014.180.2.7](https://doi.org/10.4007/annals.2014.180.2.7).
- [18] A. I. Khinchin. *Mathematical foundations of information theory*. Dover Publications, Inc., New York, N. Y., 1957. Translated by R. A. Silverman and M. D. Friedman.
- [19] Alexander Kozachinskiy and Alexander Shen. Two characterizations of finite-state dimension. In *International Symposium on Fundamentals of Computation Theory*, pages 80–94. Springer, 2019.
- [20] L. Kuipers and H. Niederreiter. *Uniform distribution of sequences*. Pure and Applied Mathematics. Wiley-Interscience [John Wiley & Sons], New York-London-Sydney, 1974.
- [21] Jack H. Lutz. Dimension in complexity classes. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 32(5):1236–1259, 2003. [doi:10.1137/S0097539701417723](https://doi.org/10.1137/S0097539701417723).
- [22] Manfred G Madritsch and Bill Mance. Construction of μ -normal sequences. *Monatshefte für Mathematik*, 179(2):259–280, 2016.
- [23] Joseph S. Miller. Extracting information is hard: a Turing degree of non-integral effective Hausdorff dimension. *Adv. Math.*, 226(1):373–384, 2011. [doi:10.1016/j.aim.2010.06.024](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aim.2010.06.024).
- [24] I. Niven. *Irrational Numbers*. Carus Mathematical Monographs, 1956.
- [25] A. Rényi. On the dimension and entropy of probability distributions. *Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar.*, 10:193–215 (unbound insert), 1959. [doi:10.1007/BF02063299](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02063299).
- [26] Walter Rudin. *Fourier analysis on groups*. Interscience Tracts in Pure and Applied Mathematics, No. 12. Interscience Publishers (a division of John Wiley & Sons, Inc.), New York-London, 1962.
- [27] Wolfgang M. Schmidt. Über die Normalität von Zahlen zu verschiedenen Basen. *Acta Arith.*, 7:299–309, 1961/62. [doi:10.4064/aa-7-3-299-309](https://doi.org/10.4064/aa-7-3-299-309).

- [28] C. P. Schnorr and H. Stimm. Endliche Automaten und Zufallsfolgen. *Acta Informatica*, 1:345–359, 1972.
- [29] A. N. Shiryaev. *Probability*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics v.95. Springer, 2 edition, 1995.
- [30] Elias M. Stein and Rami Shakarchi. *Fourier analysis*, volume 1 of *Princeton Lectures in Analysis*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2003. An introduction.
- [31] D. D. Wall. *Normal Sequences*. PhD thesis, University of California, Berkeley, 1949.
- [32] Hermann Weyl. Über die Gleichverteilung von Zahlen mod. Eins. *Math. Ann.*, 77(3):313–352, 1916. [doi:10.1007/BF01475864](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01475864).
- [33] Lai-Sang Young. Dimension, entropy and Lyapunov exponents. *Ergodic theory and dynamical systems*, 2(1):109–124, 1982.
- [34] J. Ziv and A. Lempel. Compression of individual sequences via variable rate coding. *IEEE Transaction on Information Theory*, 24:530–536, 1978.

Appendix

In section A, we give a brief account of some important equivalent characterizations of finite-state dimension.

A Equivalent characterizations of finite-state dimension

Finite-state dimension was originally defined using finite-state s -gales by Dai, Lathrop, Lutz and Mayordomo [10]. We employed the equivalent characterization of finite-state dimension in terms of block entropy rates given by Bourke, Hitchcock and Vinodchandran [5] in Definition 2.4. In this section, we give a brief account of the original definition of finite-state dimension in terms of finite-state s -gales and an equivalent characterization in terms of finite-state compression ratios given in [10] and [2]. We give these formulations for the binary alphabet $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}$ for the sake of simplicity. It is routine to extend these characterizations to arbitrary alphabets.

A.1 Finite-state dimension using finite-state s -gales ([10], [2])

We first define an s -gale

Definition A.1 (s -gale [10],[21]). Let $s \in [0, \infty)$. A function $d : \Sigma^* \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is an s -gale if it satisfies, $d(\lambda) < \infty$ and

$$d(w) = \frac{1}{2^s} (d(w0) + d(w1))$$

for every $w \in \Sigma^*$.

Now, we define the success criteria for s -gales and the corresponding winning sets,

Definition A.2 (Success criteria for s -gales [10], [2]). Let $s \in [0, \infty)$ and let d be an s -gale.

1. We say that d succeeds on the sequence $x \in \Sigma^\infty$ if,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(x_0^{n-1}) = \infty.$$

And, the success set of d is defined as $S^\infty[d] = \{x \in \Sigma^\infty \mid d \text{ succeeds on } x\}$.

2. We say that d succeeds strongly on the sequence $x \in \Sigma^\infty$ if,

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(x_0^{n-1}) = \infty.$$

And, the *strong success set* of d is defined as $S_{str}^\infty[d] = \{x \in \Sigma^\infty \mid d \text{ succeeds strongly on } x\}$.

Now, we define finite-state gamblers.

Definition A.3 (Finite-state gamblers [10], [28], [15]). A *finite-state gambler* is a 5-tuple, $G = (Q, \delta, \beta, q_0, c_0)$ where,

- Q is a non-empty set of *states*.
- $\delta : Q \times \Sigma \rightarrow Q$ is the *transition function*.
- $\beta : Q \rightarrow \mathbb{Q} \cap [0, 1]$ is the *betting function*.
- $q_0 \in Q$ is the *initial state*.
- $c_0 \geq 0$ is the *initial capital* of the gambler.

Let $\delta^* : Q \times \Sigma^* \rightarrow Q$ denote the natural *extension* of δ to finite strings in Σ^* defined recursively as,

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(q, \lambda) &= q \\ \delta(q, wb) &= \delta(\delta^*(q, w), b). \end{aligned}$$

Finite-state dimension was defined in [10] in terms of finite-state s -gales. We define finite-state s -gales corresponding to finite-state gamblers.

Definition A.4 (Finite-state s -gales [10]). An s -gale of a finite-state gambler $G = (Q, \delta, \beta, q_0, c_0)$ is the function $d_G^{(s)} : \Sigma^* \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ defined recursively as,

$$\begin{aligned} d_G^{(s)}(\lambda) &= c_0 \\ d_G^{(s)}(wb) &= 2^s d_G^{(s)}(w) ((1-b)(1-\beta(\delta^*(w))) + b\beta(\delta^*(w))) \end{aligned}$$

for every $w \in \Sigma^*$ and $b \in \Sigma$. A *finite-state s -gale* is an s -gale d for which there exists a finite-state gambler G such that $d = d_G^{(s)}$.

The following is the original definition of finite-state dimension in terms finite-state s -gales, given in [10].

Definition A.5 (Finite-state dimension [10]). Let $x \in \Sigma^\infty$. The *finite-state dimension* of $x \in \Sigma^\infty$ is defined as,

$$\dim_{FS}(x) = \inf\{s \in [0, \infty) \mid \exists \text{ a finite-state } s\text{-gale } d \text{ such that } x \in S^\infty[d]\}.$$

Similarly, the finite-state strong dimension was defined in [2] by replacing $S^\infty[d]$ with $S_{str}^\infty[d]$.

Definition A.6 (Finite-state strong dimension [2]). Let $x \in \Sigma^\infty$. The *finite-state strong dimension* of $x \in \Sigma^\infty$ is defined as,

$$\text{Dim}_{FS}(x) = \inf\{s \in [0, \infty) \mid \exists \text{ a finite-state } s\text{-gale } d \text{ such that } x \in S_{str}^\infty[d]\}.$$

We remark that finite-state dimension and finite-state strong dimension were defined in [10] and [2] more generally for subsets of Σ^∞ . But, we only require the concept of finite-state dimensions of individual sequences in Σ^∞ for developing our results.

A.2 Finite-state compression and finite-state dimension ([10], [2])

Finite-state dimension is also characterized in terms of compression ratios using information lossless finite-state compressors ([10],[2],[5]). Let \mathcal{C} be the collection of all information lossless finite-state compressors. Let \mathcal{C}_k be the collection of all k -state information lossless finite-state compressors. The following compressibility characterization of finite-state dimension and finite-state strong dimension were given in [10] and [2] respectively.

Theorem A.7 ([10],[2],[5]). *For any $x \in \Sigma^\infty$,*

$$\dim_{FS}(x) = \inf_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|C(x_0^{n-1})|}{n}$$

and,

$$\text{Dim}_{FS}(x) = \inf_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \min_{C \in \mathcal{C}_k} \frac{|C(x_0^{n-1})|}{n}.$$

B Preliminaries

For a given block length l , we define the *disjoint block entropy* over x_0^{n-1} as follows.

$$H_l^d(x_0^{n-1}) = -\frac{1}{l} \sum_{w \in \Sigma^l} P^d(x_0^{n-1}, w) \log(P^d(x_0^{n-1}, w)).$$

Kozachinskiy and Shen ([19]) also demonstrated that⁵,

$$\dim_{FS}(x) = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} H_l^d(x_0^{n-1}) = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} H_l(x_0^{n-1}) \quad (34)$$

$$\text{Dim}_{FS}(x) = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} H_l^d(x_0^{n-1}) = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} H_l(x_0^{n-1}) \quad (35)$$

These equalities are used in the proofs of certain results in the paper.

C Preservation of finite-state dimension under arithmetic and combinatorial operations

We require the following lemma for proving Lemma 6.2.

Lemma C.1. *Let m_1, m_2 be any two partition factors. For any $l > 0$, let n be such that $m_1^n \leq m_2^l < m_1^{n+1}$. Then,*

$$\left| \frac{\mathbf{H}_{m_2}^l(\mu')}{l \log m_2} - \frac{\mathbf{H}_{m_1}^n(\mu')}{n \log m_1} \right| \leq \frac{2}{n}.$$

⁵Though Shen and Kozachinskiy proved the equivalence between disjoint block entropies and sliding block entropies for finite-state dimension, the same techniques in [19] proves the equivalences for finite-state strong dimension by replacing \liminf 's with \limsup 's.

Proof. The left hand side is equal to,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \frac{n \log m_1 \mathbf{H}_{m_2}^l(\mu') - \log(m_1^n + m_2^l - m_1^n) \mathbf{H}_{m_1}^n(\mu')}{l \log m_2 \cdot n \log m_1} \right| \\
&= \left| \frac{n \log m_1 \mathbf{H}_{m_2}^l(\mu') - \left(n \log m_1 + \log \left(1 + \frac{m_2^l - m_1^n}{m_1^n} \right) \right) \mathbf{H}_{m_1}^n(\mu')}{l \log m_2 \cdot n \log m_1} \right| \\
&= \left| \frac{n \log m_1 (\mathbf{H}_{m_2}^l(\mu') - \mathbf{H}_{m_1}^n(\mu')) - \log \left(1 + \frac{m_2^l - m_1^n}{m_1^n} \right) \mathbf{H}_{m_1}^n(\mu')}{l \log m_2 \cdot n \log m_1} \right|.
\end{aligned}$$

Using the triangle inequality and the fact that $m_2^l \geq m_1^n$, we can upper bound the right hand side above by,

$$\frac{|\mathbf{H}_{m_2}^l(\mu') - \mathbf{H}_{m_1}^n(\mu')|}{|l \log m_2|} + \frac{\log \left(1 + \frac{m_2^l - m_1^n}{m_1^n} \right) \mathbf{H}_{m_1}^n(\mu')}{|n \log m_1|^2}.$$

Since, $\mathbf{H}_{m_1}^n(\mu') \leq \log(m_1^n) = n \log m_1$ and $m_2^l - m_1^n \leq m_1^n(m_1 - 1)$, the second term is at most $1/n$. Since $m_2^l \geq m_1^n$, the first term above can be upper bounded by,

$$\frac{|\mathbf{H}_{m_2}^l(\mu') - \mathbf{H}_{m_1}^n(\mu')|}{n \log m_1}. \tag{36}$$

Now, we make the following two observations. First, $\mathbf{H}_{m_2}^l(\mu')$ is the Shannon entropy corresponding to the probability distribution μ' over the finite set $\{I_w^{m_2} : w \in \Sigma_{m_2}^l\}$. Similarly, $\mathbf{H}_{m_1}^n(\mu')$ is the Shannon entropy corresponding to the probability distribution μ' over the finite set $\{I_w^{m_1} : w \in \Sigma_{m_1}^n\}$. Secondly, any interval in $\{I_w^{m_1} : w \in \Sigma_{m_1}^n\}$ intersects with at most m_1 other intervals in $\{I_w^{m_2} : w \in \Sigma_{m_2}^l\}$ since $m_1^n \leq m_2^l < m_1^{n+1}$. Hence, it follows that $|\mathbf{H}_{m_2}^l(\mu') - \mathbf{H}_{m_1}^n(\mu')| \leq \log m_1$ since conditioned on any interval in $\{I_w^{m_1} : w \in \Sigma_{m_1}^n\}$, there are at most m_1 possibilities among the intervals in $\{I_w^{m_2} : w \in \Sigma_{m_2}^l\}$. So, we obtain that [36](#) is at most $1/n$. The two bounds that we obtained above completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Now, we prove [Lemma 6.2](#).

Proof of Lemma 6.2. We show that,

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbf{H}_{m_1}^n(\mu')}{n \log m_1} = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbf{H}_{m_2}^n(\mu')}{n \log m_2}.$$

We show that the left hand side is less than or equal to the right hand side. The opposite inequality can be shown in a similar way by interchanging the roles of m_1 and m_2 . The required inequality follows if for every positive ϵ , there exists infinitely many N such that,

$$\frac{\mathbf{H}_{m_1}^N(\mu')}{N \log m_1} \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbf{H}_{m_2}^n(\mu')}{n \log m_2} + \epsilon.$$

In order to show this, we consider any L such that,

$$\frac{\mathbf{H}_{m_2}^L(\mu')}{L \log m_2} \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbf{H}_{m_2}^n(\mu')}{n \log m_2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2}. \tag{37}$$

The existence of infinitely many such L is guaranteed by the definition of limit infimum. Now, if N is such that $m_1^N \leq m_2^L < m_1^{N+1}$, using [Lemma C.1](#) we have,

$$\frac{\mathbf{H}_{m_1}^N(\mu')}{N \log m_1} \leq \frac{\mathbf{H}_{m_2}^L(\mu')}{L \log m_2} + \frac{1}{N} \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbf{H}_{m_2}^n(\mu')}{n \log m_2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{1}{N}.$$

For large enough L , N also gets large enough so that $1/N$ is at most $\epsilon/2$. For such an N we have,

$$\frac{\mathbf{H}_{m_1}^N(\mu')}{N \log m_1} \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbf{H}_{m_2}^n(\mu')}{n \log m_2} + \epsilon.$$

Since there are infinitely many L satisfying 37, there exists infinitely many N satisfying the last inequality. The proof of the part corresponding to lower Rényi dimension is complete. The other part can be proved in a similar way. \square

D μ -normality and finite-state dimension

There are several known techniques for explicit constructions of normal numbers (see, for example, the monographs by Kuipers and Niederreiter [20], or Bugeaud [6]), but constructions of those with finite-state dimension $s \in [0, 1)$ follow two techniques: first, to start with a normal sequence, and to “dilute” it with an appropriate fraction of simple patterns, as we did in Section 4, and second, to start with a coin with bias p such that $-p \log_2 p - (1-p) \log_2(1-p) = s$, and consider any typical sequence drawn from this distribution (see also [23]). The second technique does not directly yield a computable normal. As an application of Theorem 5.15, we show that a construction due to Mance and Madritsch [22] explicitly yields such sequences, which are computable if the given measure is computable. This technique involves the notion of μ -normality used to generalize the Champernowne sequence [8].

Definition D.1 (Mance, Madritsch [22]). Let μ be a measure on Σ^∞ . We say that $x \in \Sigma^\infty$ is μ -normal if, for every $w \in \Sigma^*$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(x_0^{n-1}, w) = \mu(C_w)$.

Let T be the left shift transformation $T(x_0 x_1 x_2 \dots) = x_1 x_2 x_3 \dots$ on Σ^∞ . We say that a measure μ on Σ^∞ is *invariant* with respect to T if for every $A \in \mathcal{B}(\Sigma^\infty)$, $\mu(T^{-1}(A)) = \mu(A)$. If x is μ -normal, as a consequence of Lemma 3.11 and Lemma 3.7, we get that $\nu_n \Rightarrow \mu$ where $\langle \nu_n \rangle_{n=1}^\infty$ is the sequence of averages of Dirac measures constructed out of $\langle T^n x \rangle_{n=0}^\infty$. Therefore, we get the following lemma as a consequence of Theorem 5.1 and the fact that stationary processes have a well defined entropy rate (see Section 3 from [18]).

Lemma D.2. *Let μ be a measure on Σ^∞ and $x \in \Sigma^\infty$ be a μ -normal sequence. Then, μ is invariant with respect to T and $\dim_{FS}(x) = \text{Dim}_{FS}(x) = H^+(\mu) = H^-(\mu)$.*

Proof of Lemma D.2. It is enough to show that $\mu(T^{-1}(C_w)) = \mu(C_w)$ for every string $w \in \Sigma^*$. Since w is arbitrary, routine approximation arguments can be used to prove that μ is thus invariant measure with respect to the left shift transformation.

In order to show that $\mu(T^{-1}(C_w)) = \mu(C_w)$, let us first observe that, $T^{-1}(C_w) = C_{0w} \cup C_{1w}$. It can be easily verified that,

$$P(x_0^{n+l-2}, w) = P(x_0^{n+l-2}, 0w) + P(x_0^{n+l-2}, 1w) + O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) \quad (38)$$

since the slide counts for $0w$ and $1w$ together misses out at most constantly many counts of w at the start and end of x_0^{n+l-2} . Now, since $\nu_n \Rightarrow \mu$, using Lemma 3.11 we have,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu_n(C_{0w}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(x_1^{n+l-2}, 0w) = \mu(C_{0w})$$

and,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu_n(C_{1w}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(x_1^{n+l-2}, 1w) = \mu(C_{1w}).$$

We also have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu_n(C_w) = \mu(C_w)$. Hence from 38 we get, $\mu(C_w) = \mu(C_{0w}) + \mu(C_{1w})$ which implies that $\mu(C_w) = \mu(T^{-1}(C_w))$.

It is well-known that stationary processes have a well defined entropy rate (see Section 3 from [18]). The same techniques used in proving this claim can be used to show that $H^+(\mu) = H^-(\mu)$ for any invariant measure μ which along with Theorem 5.1 completes a proof of the lemma. \square

We remark that for any $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ there exists an invariant measure μ on $[0, 1]$ such that $H^+(\mu) = H^-(\mu) = \alpha$. We can further assume that μ is a Bernoulli measure. For any invariant measure μ on Σ^∞ , in Section 3 of [22], Mance and Madritsch construct μ -normal numbers by generalizing the construction of the Champernowne sequence. We summarize the construction of μ -normal sequences given in [22] below.

Construction. (Mance, Madritsch [22]) Let $\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2, \dots, \mathbf{p}_{2^l}$ be any ordering of the set of l -length strings Σ^l . Let $m_l = \min\{\mu(C_w) \mid w \in \Sigma^l \wedge \mu(C_w) > 0\}$. Let M be any constant such that $M \geq m_l^{-1}$. Then, we define $\mathbf{p}_{l,M} = \mathbf{p}_1^{\lceil M\mu(\mathbf{p}_1) \rceil} \mathbf{p}_2^{\lceil M\mu(\mathbf{p}_2) \rceil} \mathbf{p}_3^{\lceil M\mu(\mathbf{p}_3) \rceil} \dots \mathbf{p}_{2^l}^{\lceil M\mu(\mathbf{p}_{2^l}) \rceil}$.

Now given μ , an invariant measure on Σ^∞ , we construct a μ -normal number as follows. Let $M_i = \lceil \max\{i^{2^i} \log i, (\inf\{\mu(C_w) \mid w \in \Sigma^i \wedge \mu(C_w) > 0\})^{-1}\} \rceil$. Now, let $\ell_1 = 1$ and for $i \geq 2$ define,

$$\ell_i = \left\lceil \log i \cdot \max \left\{ \frac{M_{i+1} + (i+1)^{i+1}}{M_i}, \frac{M_{i-1} + (i-1)^{i-1}}{M_i} \cdot i\ell_{i-1} \right\} \right\rceil.$$

Finally, we define the *Champernowne sequence* for μ as $x_\mu = \mathbf{p}_{1,M_1}^{\ell_1} \mathbf{p}_{2,M_2}^{\ell_2} \mathbf{p}_{3,M_3}^{\ell_3} \mathbf{p}_{4,M_4}^{\ell_4} \dots$. In Section 5.2, Mance and Madritsch show [22] that x_μ is a μ -normal number. So, for any invariant measure μ (not necessarily Bernoulli), this construction yields a μ -normal number. Hence, the above construction along with Lemma D.2 and Theorem 3.8 gives us the following.

Theorem D.3. *For any $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ and any invariant measure μ on Σ^∞ such that $H^+(\mu) = H^-(\mu) = \alpha$, the sequence x_μ constructed above is such that $\dim_{FS}(x_\mu) = \text{Dim}_{FS}(x_\mu) = \alpha$ and, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{2\pi i k(v(T^j x_\mu))} = \int e^{2\pi i k v(y)} d\mu$.*

Given any computable α , due to the computability of the Shannon entropy, it is straightforward to compute a p such that $-p \log_2 p - (1-p) \log_2 (1-p) = \alpha$. Then the Bernoulli measure with bias p is computable (see [13]). If μ is a Bernoulli measure with bias p , Mance and Madritsch [22] show that by choosing $M_i = \min\{p, 1-p\}^{-2^i}$ and $\ell_i = i^{2^i}$, the resulting x_μ is a μ -normal number. Since in this case μ is computable, it follows that x_μ is a computable sequence. Therefore, we obtain the following theorem.

Theorem D.4. *For any computable $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ and the Bernoulli measure μ defined above, the sequence x_μ is a computable sequence such that $\dim_{FS}(x_\mu) = \text{Dim}_{FS}(x_\mu) = \alpha$ and,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{2\pi i k(v(T^j x_\mu))} = \int e^{2\pi i k v(y)} d\mu.$$