



HAL
open science

Digital expansions with negative real bases

Wolfgang Steiner

► **To cite this version:**

Wolfgang Steiner. Digital expansions with negative real bases. *Acta Mathematica Hungarica*, 2013, 139 (1-2), pp.106-119. 10.1007/s10474-012-0252-1 . hal-00648536

HAL Id: hal-00648536

<https://hal.science/hal-00648536>

Submitted on 6 Dec 2011

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

DIGITAL EXPANSIONS WITH NEGATIVE REAL BASES

WOLFGANG STEINER

ABSTRACT. Similarly to Parry's characterization of β -expansions of real numbers in real bases $\beta > 1$, Ito and Sadahiro characterized digital expansions in negative bases, by the expansions of the endpoints of the fundamental interval. Parry also described the possible expansions of 1 in base $\beta > 1$. In the same vein, we characterize the sequences that occur as $(-\beta)$ -expansion of $\frac{-\beta}{\beta+1}$ for some $\beta > 1$. These sequences also describe the itineraries of 1 by linear mod one transformations with negative slope.

1. INTRODUCTION

Digital expansions in real bases $\beta > 1$ were introduced by Rényi [Rén57]: The (greedy) β -*expansion* of a real number $x \in [0, 1)$ is

$$x = \frac{\varepsilon_1(x)}{\beta} + \frac{\varepsilon_2(x)}{\beta^2} + \dots \quad \text{with} \quad \varepsilon_n(x) = \lfloor \beta T_\beta^{n-1}(x) \rfloor,$$

where $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ denotes the floor function and T_β is the β -*transformation*

$$T_\beta : [0, 1) \rightarrow [0, 1), \quad x \mapsto \beta x - \lfloor \beta x \rfloor.$$

Rényi suggested representing arbitrary $x \in \mathbb{R}$ by

$$x = \lfloor x \rfloor + \frac{\varepsilon_1(\lfloor x \rfloor)}{\beta} + \frac{\varepsilon_2(\lfloor x \rfloor)}{\beta^2} + \dots,$$

whereas nowadays it is more usual (for $x \geq 0$) to multiply the β -expansion of $x\beta^{-k}$ by β^k , with k an arbitrary integer satisfying $x\beta^{-k} \in [0, 1)$. Anyway, the possible expansions can be described by those of $x \in [0, 1)$. A sequence $b_1 b_2 \dots$ is called β -*admissible* if and only if it is (the digit sequence of) the β -expansion of a number $x \in [0, 1)$, i.e., $b_n = \varepsilon_n(x)$ for all $n \geq 1$. Parry [Par60] showed that an integer sequence $b_1 b_2 \dots$ is β -admissible if and only if

$$00 \dots \leq_{\text{lex}} b_k b_{k+1} \dots <_{\text{lex}} a_1 a_2 \dots \quad \text{for all } k \geq 1,$$

where $<_{\text{lex}}$ denotes the lexicographic order and $a_1 a_2 \dots$ is the (quasi-greedy) β -*expansion of 1*, i.e., $a_n = \lim_{x \rightarrow 1^-} \varepsilon_n(x)$. Moreover, a sequence of integers $a_1 a_2 \dots$ is the (quasi-greedy) β -expansion of 1 for some $\beta > 1$ if and only if

$$00 \dots <_{\text{lex}} a_k a_{k+1} \dots \leq_{\text{lex}} a_1 a_2 \dots \quad \text{for all } k \geq 2.$$

(These results are stated in a slightly different way in [Par60].)

Part of this research was conducted while the author was visiting academic at the Department of Computing of the Macquarie University, Sydney.

Following [Rén57] and [Par60], a lot of papers were dedicated to the study of β -expansions and β -transformations, but surprisingly little attention was given to digital expansions in negative bases. This changed only in recent years, after Ito and Sadahiro [IS09] considered $(-\beta)$ -expansions, $\beta > 1$, defined for $x \in [\frac{-\beta}{\beta+1}, \frac{1}{\beta+1})$ by

$$(1.1) \quad x = \frac{\varepsilon_1(x)}{-\beta} + \frac{\varepsilon_2(x)}{(-\beta)^2} + \cdots \quad \text{with} \quad \varepsilon_n(x) = \lfloor \frac{\beta}{\beta+1} - \beta T_{-\beta}^{n-1}(x) \rfloor,$$

where the $(-\beta)$ -transformation is defined by

$$T_{-\beta} : [\frac{-\beta}{\beta+1}, \frac{1}{\beta+1}) \rightarrow [\frac{-\beta}{\beta+1}, \frac{1}{\beta+1}), \quad x \mapsto -\beta x - \lfloor \frac{\beta}{\beta+1} - \beta x \rfloor.$$

A sequence $b_1 b_2 \cdots$ is $(-\beta)$ -admissible if and only if it is the $(-\beta)$ -expansion of some $x \in [\frac{-\beta}{\beta+1}, \frac{1}{\beta+1})$, i.e., $b_n = \varepsilon_n(x)$ for all $n \geq 1$. Since the map $x \mapsto -\beta x$ is order-reversing, the $(-\beta)$ -admissible sequences are characterized using the alternating lexicographic order. By [IS09], a sequence $b_1 b_2 \cdots$ is $(-\beta)$ -admissible if and only if

$$(1.2) \quad a_1 a_2 \cdots \geq_{\text{alt}} b_k b_{k+1} \cdots >_{\text{alt}} 0 a_1 a_2 \cdots \quad \text{for all } k \geq 1,$$

where $a_1 a_2 \cdots$ is the $(-\beta)$ -expansion of the left endpoint $\frac{-\beta}{\beta+1}$, i.e., $a_n = \varepsilon_n(\frac{-\beta}{\beta+1})$, which is supposed not to be periodic with odd period length. If $a_1 a_2 \cdots = \overline{a_1 a_2 \cdots a_{2\ell+1}}$ for some $\ell \geq 0$, and ℓ is minimal with this property, then the condition (1.2) is replaced by

$$(1.3) \quad a_1 a_2 \cdots \geq_{\text{alt}} b_k b_{k+1} \cdots >_{\text{alt}} \overline{0 a_1 \cdots a_{2\ell} (a_{2\ell+1} - 1)} \quad \text{for all } k \geq 1.$$

Recall that the alternating lexicographic order is defined on sequences $x_1 x_2 \cdots, y_1 y_2 \cdots$ with $x_1 \cdots x_{k-1} = y_1 \cdots y_{k-1}$ and $x_k \neq y_k$ by

$$x_1 x_2 \cdots <_{\text{alt}} y_1 y_2 \cdots \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \begin{cases} x_k < y_k & \text{when } k \text{ is odd,} \\ y_k < x_k & \text{when } k \text{ is even.} \end{cases}$$

The main result of this paper is a characterization of the sequences $a_1 a_2 \cdots$ that are the $(-\beta)$ -expansion of $\frac{-\beta}{\beta+1}$ for some $\beta > 1$. This turns out to be more complicated than the corresponding problem for β -expansions, and we will see that several proofs cannot be directly carried over from positive to negative bases. From (1.2) and (1.3), one deduces that

$$(1.4) \quad a_k a_{k+1} \cdots \leq_{\text{alt}} a_1 a_2 \cdots \quad \text{for all } k \geq 2.$$

The proof of Proposition 3.5 in [LS] (see also Theorem 3 below) shows that

$$(1.5) \quad a_1 a_2 \cdots >_{\text{alt}} u_1 u_2 \cdots = 100111001001001110011 \cdots,$$

where $u_1 u_2 \cdots$ is the sequence starting with $\varphi^n(1)$ for all $n \geq 0$, with φ being the morphism of words on the alphabet $\{0, 1\}$ defined by $\varphi(1) = 100$, $\varphi(0) = 1$. (See the remarks following Theorem 3 and note that the alphabet is shifted by 1 in [LS].) Our first result states that a sequence satisfying (1.4) and (1.5) is “almost” the $(-\beta)$ -expansion of $\frac{-\beta}{\beta+1}$ for some $\beta > 1$.

Theorem 1. *Let $a_1 a_2 \cdots$ be a sequence of non-negative integers satisfying (1.4) and (1.5). Then there exists a unique $\beta > 1$ such that*

$$(1.6) \quad \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_j}{(-\beta)^j} = \frac{-\beta}{\beta+1} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_{k+j}}{(-\beta)^j} \in \left[\frac{-\beta}{\beta+1}, \frac{1}{\beta+1} \right] \quad \text{for all } k \geq 1.$$

For a $(-\beta)$ -expansion of $\frac{-\beta}{\beta+1}$, we have to exclude the possibility that $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_{k+j}}{(-\beta)^j} = \frac{1}{\beta+1}$ for some $k \geq 1$. If $\overline{a_1 \cdots a_k} \succ_{\text{alt}} u_1 u_2 \cdots$, then out of $\{a_1 \cdots a_k, a_1 \cdots a_{k-1}(a_k-1)0\}^\omega$, which is the set of infinite sequences composed of blocks $a_1 \cdots a_k$ and $a_1 \cdots a_{k-1}(a_k-1)0$, only the periodic sequence $\overline{a_1 \cdots a_k}$ is possibly the $(-\beta)$ -expansion of $\frac{-\beta}{\beta+1}$ for some $\beta > 1$, see Section 4. This implies that

$$(1.7) \quad a_1 a_2 \cdots \notin \{a_1 \cdots a_k, a_1 \cdots a_{k-1}(a_k-1)0\}^\omega \setminus \{\overline{a_1 \cdots a_k}\} \\ \text{for all } k \geq 1 \text{ with } \overline{a_1 \cdots a_k} \succ u_1 u_2 \cdots,$$

$$(1.8) \quad a_1 a_2 \cdots \notin \{a_1 \cdots a_k 0, a_1 \cdots a_{k-1}(a_k+1)\}^\omega \\ \text{for all } k \geq 1 \text{ with } \overline{a_1 \cdots a_{k-1}(a_k+1)} \succ u_1 u_2 \cdots.$$

The main result states that there are no other conditions on $a_1 a_2 \cdots$.

Theorem 2. *A sequence of non-negative integers $a_1 a_2 \cdots$ is the $(-\beta)$ -expansion of $\frac{-\beta}{\beta+1}$ for some (unique) $\beta > 1$ if and only if it satisfies (1.4), (1.5), (1.7), and (1.8).*

It is easy to see that the natural order of bases $\beta > 1$ is reflected by the lexicographical order of the (quasi-greedy) β -expansions of 1 [Par60]. For negative bases, a similar relation with the alternating lexicographic order holds, although it is a bit harder to prove.

Theorem 3. *Let $a_1 a_2 \cdots$ be the $(-\beta)$ -expansion of $\frac{-\beta}{\beta+1}$ and $a'_1 a'_2 \cdots$ be the $(-\beta')$ -expansion of $\frac{-\beta'}{\beta'+1}$, with $\beta, \beta' > 1$. Then $\beta < \beta'$ if and only if $a_1 a_2 \cdots <_{\text{alt}} a'_1 a'_2 \cdots$.*

It is often convenient to study a slightly different $(-\beta)$ -transformation,

$$\tilde{T}_{-\beta} : (0, 1] \rightarrow (0, 1], \quad x \mapsto -\beta x + \lfloor \beta x \rfloor + 1.$$

As already noted in [LS], the transformations $T_{-\beta}$ and $\tilde{T}_{-\beta}$ are conjugate via the involution $\phi(x) = \frac{1}{\beta+1} - x$, i.e.,

$$T_{-\beta} \circ \phi(x) = \phi \circ \tilde{T}_{-\beta}(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in (0, 1].$$

Setting $\tilde{\varepsilon}_n(x) = \lfloor \beta \tilde{T}_{-\beta}^{n-1}(x) \rfloor$ for $x \in (0, 1]$, we have $x = -\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n(x)+1}{(-\beta)^n} = \frac{1}{\beta+1} - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}_n(x)}{(-\beta)^n}$, and $\tilde{\varepsilon}_n(x) = \varepsilon_n(\phi(x))$. Note that $\tilde{T}_{-\beta}(x) = -\beta x - \lfloor -\beta x \rfloor$ except for finitely many points, hence $\tilde{T}_{-\beta}$ is a natural generalization of the beta-transformation. The map $\tilde{T}_{-\beta}$ was studied e.g. by Góra [Gór07], where it corresponds to the case $E = [1, 1, \dots, 1]$, and in [LS]. The following corollary is an immediate consequence of Theorems 1 and 2.

Corollary 1. *Let $a_1 a_2 \cdots$ be a sequence of non-negative integers satisfying (1.4) and (1.5). Then there exists a unique $\beta > 1$ such that*

$$(1.9) \quad - \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_j + 1}{(-\beta)^j} = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad - \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_{k+j} + 1}{(-\beta)^j} \in [0, 1] \quad \text{for all } k \geq 1.$$

Moreover, $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_{k+j} + 1}{(-\beta)^j} \neq 0$ for all $k \geq 1$ if and only if (1.7) and (1.8) hold.

With the notation of [Gór07], this means, for $E = [1, 1, \dots, 1]$, that $a_1 a_2 \cdots$ is the itinerary $\text{It}_{\beta}(1)$ for some $\beta > 1$ if and only if (1.4), (1.5), (1.7), and (1.8) hold. Note that Góra [Gór07, Theorems 25 and 28] claims that already (1.4) is sufficient when $a_1 \geq 2$, and he has a less explicit statement for $a_1 = 1$. However, his proof deals only with the first part of the theorem, i.e., that there exists a unique $\beta > 1$ satisfying (1.9). To see that this is not sufficient, consider the sequences $a_1 a_2 \cdots \in \{2, 10\}^{\omega}$. They all satisfy (1.9) with $\beta = 2$, and there are uncountably many of them satisfying (1.4) and $a_1 = 2$. All these uncountably many sequences would have to be equal to $\text{It}_2(1)$ by [Gór07, Theorem 25], which is of course not true. (See also [DMP11].) Moreover, Góra's proof of the existence of a unique $\beta > 1$ satisfying (1.9) is incorrect when β is small, see Remark 1.

2. PROOF OF THEOREM 3

Let $\beta > 1$. For a sequence of digits $b_1 \cdots b_n$, set

$$I_{b_1 \cdots b_n} = \left\{ x \in \left[\frac{-\beta}{\beta+1}, \frac{1}{\beta+1} \right) : \varepsilon_1(x) \cdots \varepsilon_n(x) = b_1 \cdots b_n \right\},$$

with $\varepsilon_j(x)$ as in (1.1). Let $L_{\beta,n}$ be the number of different sequences $b_1 \cdots b_n$ such that $I_{b_1 \cdots b_n} \neq \emptyset$, and let $L'_{\beta,n}$ be the number of different sequences $b_1 \cdots b_n$ such that $I_{b_1 \cdots b_n}$ is an interval of positive length. (The latter is called the lap number of $T_{-\beta}^n$.)

Lemma 1. *For any $\beta > 1$, we have that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log L_{\beta,n} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log L'_{\beta,n} = \log \beta$.*

Proof. It is well known that the entropy of $T_{-\beta}$, which is a piecewise linear map of constant slope $-\beta$, is $\log \beta$. The lemma can be derived from this fact, see [FL11], but we prefer giving a short elementary proof, following Faller [Fal08, Proposition 3.6]. As $\left| \frac{d}{dx} T_{-\beta}^n(x) \right| = \beta^n$ at all points of continuity of $T_{-\beta}^n$, the length of any interval $I_{b_1 \cdots b_n}$ is at most β^{-n} . Since the intervals $I_{b_1 \cdots b_n}$ form a partition of an interval of length 1, we obtain that $L_{\beta,n} \geq L'_{\beta,n} \geq \beta^n$.

To get an upper bound for $L'_{\beta,n}$, let m be the smallest positive integer such that $\beta^m > 2$, and let δ be the minimal positive length of an interval $I_{b_1 \cdots b_m}$. Consider an interval $I_{b_1 \cdots b_n}$, $n > m$, such that $b_1 \cdots b_n$ is neither the minimal nor the maximal sequence (with respect to the alternating lexicographic order) starting with $b_1 \cdots b_{n-m}$ and satisfying $I_{b_1 \cdots b_n} \neq \emptyset$. Then each prolongation $b_1 b_2 \cdots$ satisfies the inequalities in (1.2) and (1.3), respectively, for $1 \leq k \leq n - m$. Therefore, $b_1 b_2 \cdots$ is $(-\beta)$ -admissible if and only if $b_{n-m+1} b_{n-m+2} \cdots$ is $(-\beta)$ -admissible. This implies that $T_{-\beta}^{n-m}(I_{b_1 \cdots b_n}) = I_{b_{n-m+1} \cdots b_n}$, and the length of $I_{b_1 \cdots b_n}$ is β^{m-n} times the length of $I_{b_{n-m+1} \cdots b_n}$, thus at least $\beta^{m-n} \delta$ when the length is positive. There are at least $L'_{\beta,n} - 2L'_{\beta,n-m}$ sequences $b_1 \cdots b_n$ such that $I_{b_1 \cdots b_n}$ has positive length

and $b_1 \cdots b_n$ is neither the minimal nor the maximal sequence starting with $b_1 \cdots b_{n-m}$ and satisfying $I_{b_1 \cdots b_n} \neq \emptyset$. This yields that $(L'_{\beta,n} - 2L'_{\beta,n-m})\beta^{m-n}\delta \leq 1$ for all $n > m$, thus

$$\begin{aligned} L'_{\beta,n} &\leq \frac{\beta^{n-m}}{\delta} + 2L'_{\beta,n-m} \leq \frac{\beta^{n-m}}{\delta} + \frac{2\beta^{n-2m}}{\delta} + 4L'_{\beta,n-2m} \leq \cdots \\ &\leq \frac{\beta^{n-m}}{\delta} \sum_{j=0}^{\lceil n/m \rceil - 2} \left(\frac{2}{\beta^m} \right)^j + 2^{\lceil n/m \rceil - 1} L'_{\beta,n - \lceil n/m \rceil m + m} < \frac{\beta^n}{\delta} \frac{1}{\beta^m - 2} + \beta^n L'_{\beta,m} \leq \frac{\beta^n}{\delta} \frac{\beta^m - 1}{\beta^m - 2}. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log L'_{\beta,n} = \beta$.

An interval $I_{b_1 \cdots b_n}$ consists only of one point if and only if $I_{b_1 \cdots b_k} = \left\{ \frac{-\beta}{\beta+1} \right\}$ and $b_{k+1} \cdots b_n = a_1 \cdots a_{n-k}$ for some $k \leq n$. (This can happen only in case that $a_1 a_2 \cdots$ is periodic with odd period length.) Therefore, we can estimate $L_{\beta,n} - L'_{\beta,n} \leq L'_{\beta,0} + L'_{\beta,1} + \cdots + L'_{\beta,n} \leq C\beta^n$ for some constant $C > 0$, thus $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log L_{\beta,n} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log L'_{\beta,n}$. \square

For the proof of Theorem 3, let $a_1 a_2 \cdots$ be the $(-\beta)$ -expansion of $\frac{-\beta}{\beta+1}$ and $a'_1 a'_2 \cdots$ be the $(-\beta')$ -expansion of $\frac{-\beta'}{\beta'+1}$, $\beta, \beta' > 1$. If $\beta = \beta'$, then we clearly have that $a_1 a_2 \cdots = a'_1 a'_2 \cdots$. If $a_1 a_2 \cdots = a'_1 a'_2 \cdots$, then the $(-\beta)$ -admissible sequences are equal to the $(-\beta')$ -admissible sequences, thus $L_{\beta,n} = L_{\beta',n}$ for all $n \geq 1$, and $\beta = \beta'$ by Lemma 1. Therefore, the equations $\beta = \beta'$ and $a_1 a_2 \cdots = a'_1 a'_2 \cdots$ are equivalent. Hence, it suffices to show that $a_1 a_2 \cdots <_{\text{alt}} a'_1 a'_2 \cdots$ implies that $\beta < \beta'$, as the other direction follows by contraposition.

Assume that $a_1 a_2 \cdots <_{\text{alt}} a'_1 a'_2 \cdots$, and let $b_1 b_2 \cdots$ be a $(-\beta)$ -admissible sequence. By (1.2) and (1.3) respectively, we have that

$$(2.1) \quad b_k b_{k+1} \cdots \leq_{\text{alt}} a_1 a_2 \cdots <_{\text{alt}} a'_1 a'_2 \cdots.$$

Furthermore, as $\overline{0a_1 \cdots a_{2\ell}(a_{2\ell+1}-1)} >_{\text{alt}} 0a_1 a_2 \cdots$ for all $\ell \geq 0$, we obtain that

$$(2.2) \quad b_k b_{k+1} \cdots >_{\text{alt}} 0a_1 a_2 \cdots >_{\text{alt}} 0a'_1 a'_2 \cdots.$$

If $a'_1 a'_2 \cdots$ is not periodic with odd period length, then (2.1) and (2.2) show that $b_1 b_2 \cdots$ is $(-\beta')$ -admissible, thus $L_{\beta,n} \leq L_{\beta',n}$ for all $n \geq 1$, and $\beta \leq \beta'$ by Lemma 1. Since $a_1 a_2 \cdots \neq a'_1 a'_2 \cdots$, this yields that $\beta < \beta'$. In case $a'_1 a'_2 \cdots = \overline{a'_1 \cdots a'_{2\ell'+1}}$, we show that

$$(2.3) \quad a_1 a_2 \cdots \leq_{\text{alt}} \overline{a'_1 \cdots a'_{2\ell'}(a'_{2\ell'+1}-1)}0.$$

This is clearly true when $a_1 \cdots a_{2\ell'+1} <_{\text{alt}} a'_1 \cdots a'_{2\ell'}(a'_{2\ell'+1}-1)$. If $a_1 \cdots a_{2\ell'+1} = a'_1 \cdots a'_{2\ell'+1}$, then $a_{2\ell'+2} a_{2\ell'+3} \cdots >_{\text{alt}} a'_{2\ell'+2} a'_{2\ell'+3} \cdots = a'_1 a'_2 \cdots >_{\text{alt}} a_1 a_2 \cdots$, contradicting (1.4). It remains to consider the case that $a_1 \cdots a_{2\ell'+1} = a'_1 \cdots a'_{2\ell'}(a'_{2\ell'+1}-1)$. If $a_{2\ell'+1} > 0$, then (2.3) holds, otherwise $a_1 \cdots a_{2\ell'+2} = a'_1 \cdots a'_{2\ell'}(a'_{2\ell'+1}-1)0$. In the latter case, (1.4) implies that $a_{2\ell'+3} \cdots a_{4\ell'+4} \leq_{\text{alt}} a_1 \cdots a_{2\ell'+2} = a'_1 \cdots a'_{2\ell'}(a'_{2\ell'+1}-1)0$, and we obtain inductively that (2.3) holds. Now, (2.1), (2.2), and (2.3) show that $b_1 b_2 \cdots$ is $(-\beta')$ -admissible, which yields as above that $\beta < \beta'$.

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Let $a_1 a_2 \cdots$ be a sequence of non-negative integers satisfying (1.4) and (1.5). We show that there exists a unique $\beta > 1$ satisfying (1.9), which is equivalent to (1.6). For $n \geq 1$, set

$$P_n(x) = (-x)^n + \sum_{j=1}^n (a_j + 1) (-x)^{n-j},$$

$$J_n = \{x > 1 \mid P_j(x) \in [0, 1] \text{ for all } 1 \leq j \leq n\}.$$

Then $J_1 \supseteq J_2 \supseteq J_3 \supseteq \cdots$, and J_n is compact if and only if $\inf J_n \neq 1$.

First note that, for $\beta > 1$, (1.9) is equivalent to $\beta \in \bigcap_{n \geq 1} J_n$. Indeed, if (1.9) holds, then $P_n(\beta) = -\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_{n+j}+1}{(-\beta)^j} \in [0, 1]$ for all $n \geq 1$. On the other hand, if $P_n(\beta) \in [0, 1]$ for all $n \geq 1$, then $|1 + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_j+1}{(-\beta)^j}| = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{P_n(\beta)}{(-\beta)^n} = 0$, thus (1.9) holds.

Inductively for $n \geq 1$, we show the following statements, where we use the abbreviations $v_{[j,k]}$ for $v_j v_{j+1} \cdots v_k$ and $v_{[j,k]}$ for $v_j v_{j+1} \cdots v_{k-1}$:

- (1) J_n is a non-empty interval, with $\inf J_n = 1$ if and only if $a_{[1,n]} = u_{[1,n]}$.
If $P_n(\beta) = P_n(\beta') \in \{0, 1\}$ with $\beta, \beta' \in J_n$, then $\beta = \beta'$.
- (2) If n is even, $a_{[1,n-2m+1]} = u_{[1,n-2m+1]}$ or $a_{[n-2m+2,n]} \neq a_{[1,2m]}$ for all $1 \leq m \leq n/2$, and $a_{[1,n]} \neq u_{[1,n]}$, then $P_n(\min J_n) = 0$.
If n is odd and $a_{[n-2m+2,n]} \neq a_{[1,2m]}$ for all $1 \leq m \leq n/2$, then $P_n(\max J_n) = 0$.
- (3) If n is even, $a_{[1,n-2m+1]} \neq u_{[1,n-2m+1]}$ and $a_{[n-2m+2,n]} = a_{[1,2m]}$ for some $1 \leq m \leq n/2$, and m is maximal with this property, then $P_n(\min J_n) = P_{2m-1}(\min J_n)$.
If n is odd, $a_{[n-2m+2,n]} = a_{[1,2m]}$ for some $1 \leq m \leq n/2$, and m is maximal with this property, then $P_n(\max J_n) = P_{2m-1}(\max J_n)$.
- (4) If n is even and $a_{[n-2m+1,n]} \neq a_{[1,2m]}$ for all $1 \leq m < n/2$, then $P_n(\max J_n) = 1$.
If n is odd, $a_{[1,n-2m]} = u_{[1,n-2m]}$ or $a_{[n-2m+1,n]} \neq a_{[1,2m]}$ for all $1 \leq m < n/2$, and $a_{[1,n]} \neq u_{[1,n]}$, then $P_n(\min J_n) = 1$.
- (5) If n is even, $a_{[n-2m+1,n]} = a_{[1,2m]}$ for some $1 \leq m < n/2$, and m is maximal with this property, then $P_n(\max J_n) = P_{2m}(\max J_n)$.
If n is odd, $a_{[1,n-2m]} \neq u_{[1,n-2m]}$ and $a_{[n-2m+1,n]} = a_{[1,2m]}$ for some $1 \leq m < n/2$, and m is maximal with this property, then $P_n(\min J_n) = P_{2m}(\min J_n)$.

We have that $P_1(x) = a_1 + 1 - x$, and $a_1 \geq 1$ by (1.5). If $a_1 \geq 2$, then $J_1 = [a_1, a_1 + 1]$, $P_1(a_1) = 1$ and $P_1(a_1 + 1) = 0$; if $a_1 = 1$, then $J_1 = (1, 2]$ and $P_1(2) = 0$. Therefore, the statements hold for $n = 1$. Assume that they hold for $n - 1$, and set

$$B = \{b \in \{0, 1, \dots, a_1\} : b + 1 - x P_{n-1}(x) \in [0, 1] \text{ for some } x \in J_{n-1}\},$$

i.e., $J_n \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $a_n \in B$.

Assume first that $a_{[1,n]} \neq u_{[1,n]}$, i.e., $\inf J_{n-1} = \min J_{n-1} > 1$, and that n is even.

- (i) If $a_{[n-2m+1,n]} \neq a_{[1,2m]}$ for all $1 \leq m < n/2$, then $P_{n-1}(\max J_{n-1}) = 0$, thus

$$1 - (\max J_{n-1}) P_{n-1}(\max J_{n-1}) = 1.$$

This implies that $0 \in B$, and $P_n(\max J_n) = P_n(\max J_{n-1}) = 1$ if $a_n = 0$. Since the map $x \mapsto x P_{n-1}(x)$ is continuous and J_{n-1} is an interval, we get that $P_n(\max J_n) = 1$

for $a_n > 0$ as well, when $J_n \neq \emptyset$. Moreover, we clearly have that $a_{[n-2m+1,n]} \neq a_{[1,2m]}$ for all $1 \leq m < n/2$, thus (4) holds when $a_n \in B$.

- (ii) If $a_{[n-2m+1,n]} = a_{[1,2m]}$ for some $1 \leq m < n/2$, and m is maximal with this property, then $P_{n-1}(\max J_{n-1}) = P_{2m-1}(\max J_{n-1})$, thus

$$a_{2m} + 1 - (\max J_{n-1}) P_{n-1}(\max J_{n-1}) = P_{2m}(\max J_{n-1}) \in [0, 1],$$

where we have used that $J_{n-1} \subseteq J_{2m}$ and $P_{2m}(J_{2m}) \subseteq [0, 1]$. This gives $a_{2m} \in B$.

If $a_n = a_{2m}$, then $\max J_n = \max J_{n-1}$ and $P_n(\max J_{n-1}) = P_{2m}(\max J_{n-1})$, thus $P_n(\max J_n) = P_{2m}(\max J_n)$ and $a_{[n-2m+1,n]} = a_{[1,2m]}$. By the maximality of m , we have that $a_{[n-2\ell+1,n]} \neq a_{[1,2\ell]}$ for all $m < \ell < n/2$, thus (5) holds.

If $a_n \neq a_{2m}$, then the equation $a_{[n-2m+1,n]} = a_{[1,2m]}$ and (1.4) yield that $a_n > a_{2m}$, thus $P_n(\max J_n) = 1$ when $J_n \neq \emptyset$, similarly to (i). If $a_{[1,2\ell]} = a_{[n-2\ell+1,n]}$, $1 \leq \ell < m$, then we also have that $a_{[1,2\ell]} = a_{[2m-2\ell+1,2m]}$, thus $a_{2\ell} \leq a_{2m} < a_n$. This implies that $a_{[n-2\ell+1,n]} \neq a_{[1,2\ell]}$ for all $1 \leq \ell < n/2$, thus (4) holds when $a_n \in B$.

- (iii) If $a_{[1,n-2m]} = u_{[1,n-2m]}$ or $a_{[n-2m,n]} \neq a_{[1,2m]}$ for all $1 \leq m \leq n/2 - 1$, then we have that $P_{n-1}(\min J_{n-1}) = 1$, thus

$$a_1 + 1 - (\min J_{n-1}) P_{n-1}(\min J_{n-1}) = P_1(\min J_{n-1}) \in [0, 1],$$

and $a_1 \in B$. If $a_n = a_1$, then $\min J_n = \min J_{n-1}$ and $P_n(\min J_{n-1}) = P_1(\min J_{n-1})$, thus $P_n(\min J_n) = P_1(\min J_n)$, and $a_{[1,n-2m+1]} = u_{[1,n-2m+1]}$ or $a_{[n-2m+2,n]} \neq a_{[1,2m]}$ for all $2 \leq m \leq n/2$. Therefore, (3) holds. If $a_n < a_1$, then $P_n(\min J_n) = 0$ when $J_n \neq \emptyset$, $a_{[1,n-2m+1]} = u_{[1,n-2m+1]}$ or $a_{[n-2m+2,n]} \neq a_{[1,2m]}$ for all $1 \leq m \leq n/2$, thus (2) holds when $a_n \in B$.

- (iv) If $a_{[1,n-2m]} \neq u_{[1,n-2m]}$ and $a_{[n-2m,n]} = a_{[1,2m]}$ for some $1 \leq m \leq n/2 - 1$, and m is maximal with this property, then $P_{n-1}(\min J_{n-1}) = P_{2m}(\min J_{n-1})$, thus

$$a_{2m+1} + 1 - (\min J_{n-1}) P_{n-1}(\min J_{n-1}) = P_{2m+1}(\min J_{n-1}) \in [0, 1],$$

hence $a_{2m+1} \in B$. If $a_n = a_{2m+1}$, then $\min J_n = \min J_{n-1}$ and $P_n(\min J_{n-1}) = P_{2m+1}(\min J_{n-1})$, thus $P_n(\min J_n) = P_{2m+1}(\min J_n)$, and $a_{[n-2m,n]} = a_{[1,2m+1]}$. The maximality of m yields that $a_{[1,n-2\ell+1]} = u_{[1,n-2\ell+1]}$ or $a_{[n-2\ell+2,n]} \neq a_{[1,2\ell]}$ for all $m+1 < \ell \leq n/2$, thus (3) holds. If $a_n \neq a_{2m+1}$, then $a_n < a_{2m+1}$ by (1.4). If moreover $a_{[1,2\ell-2]} = a_{[n-2\ell+2,n]}$, $1 \leq \ell \leq m$, then we have that $a_{[1,2\ell-2]} = a_{[2m-2\ell+3,2m]}$, thus $a_{2\ell-1} \geq a_{2m+1} > a_n$. Then we get that $P_n(\min J_n) = 0$ when $J_n \neq \emptyset$, $a_{[1,n-2\ell+1]} = u_{[1,n-2\ell+1]}$ and $a_{[n-2\ell+2,n]} \neq a_{[1,2\ell]}$ for all $1 \leq \ell \leq n/2$, thus (2) holds when $a_n \in B$.

Since $x \mapsto xP_{n-1}(x)$ is continuous and J_{n-1} is an interval, the set B is an interval of integers. The paragraphs (i) and (ii) show that a_n is not smaller than the smallest element of B , (iii) and (iv) show that a_n is not larger than the largest element of B , thus $a_n \in B$. We have therefore proved that $J_n \neq \emptyset$ and (2)–(5) hold, when $a_{[1,n]} \neq u_{[1,n]}$ and n is even. For odd n , the proof runs along the same lines and is left to the reader.

If $a_{[1,n]} = u_{[1,n]}$, then $\inf J_{n-1} = 1$. From [LS, Proposition 3.5], we know that $u_n \in B$, that $\inf J_n = 1$ when $a_n = u_n$, and that $\min J_n > 1$ when $u_n \neq a_n \in B$. Let first n be even, thus $a_n \leq u_n$ by (1.5). If $a_{[n-2m+1,n]} \neq a_{[1,2m]}$ for all $1 \leq m < n/2$, then we obtain as in (i) that $0 \in B$, thus $a_n \in B$, and (4) holds. If $a_{[n-2m+1,n]} = a_{[1,2m]}$ for some $1 \leq m < n/2$, and

m is maximal with this property, then (ii) yields that $a_{2m} \in B$ and $a_{2m} \leq a_n$, thus $a_n \in B$. If $a_n = a_{2m}$, then (5) holds; if $a_n > a_{2m}$, then (4) holds. Moreover, if $a_n < u_n$, then we get that $P_n(\min J_n) = 0$, thus (2) holds. Again, if n is odd, then similar arguments apply. Hence, we have proved that $J_n \neq \emptyset$ and (2)–(5) hold for the case that $a_{[1,n]} = u_{[1,n]}$ too.

If J_n is not an interval, then the continuity of $x \mapsto xP_{n-1}(x)$ on the interval J_{n-1} implies that P_n meets the lower bound 0 or the upper bound 1 at least twice within J_n . Therefore, suppose that $P_n(\beta) = P_n(\beta') \in \{0, 1\}$ for $\beta, \beta' \in J_n$. If $P_j(\beta) \in (0, 1]$ and $P_j(\beta') \in (0, 1]$ for all $1 \leq j < n$, then the $(-\beta)$ -expansion of $\frac{-\beta}{\beta+1}$ and the $(-\beta')$ -expansion of $\frac{-\beta'}{\beta'+1}$ are both $\overline{a_{[1,n]}}$ (if $P_n(\beta) = 1$) or $\overline{a_{[1,n]}(a_n+1)}$ (if $P_n(\beta) = 0$), thus $\beta = \beta'$ by Theorem 3.

Suppose in the following that $P_j(\beta') = 0$ for some $1 \leq j < n$, and let $\ell \geq 1$ be minimal such that $P_\ell(\beta') \in \{0, 1\}$. If $P_\ell(\beta') = 0$, then $a_{\ell+1} = 0$ and $P_{\ell+1}(\beta') = 1$, hence $a_{[1,n]}$ is a concatenation of blocks $a_{[1,\ell]}0$ and $a_{[1,\ell]}(a_\ell+1)$, except possibly for the last block, which is $a_{[1,\ell]}$ when $P_n(\beta') = 0$. If $P_\ell(\beta') = 1$, then $a_{[1,n]}$ is a concatenation of blocks $a_{[1,\ell]}$ and $a_{[1,\ell]}(a_\ell-1)0$, ending with $a_{[1,\ell]}(a_\ell-1)$ when $P_n(\beta') = 0$. We obtain that

$$P_n(x) = P_n(\beta') + (P_\ell(x) - P_\ell(\beta')) Q(x)$$

for some polynomial $Q(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{n-\ell} q_j (-x)^j$ with coefficients $q_j \in \{0, 1\}$, and $q_{j-1} = q_{j-2} = \dots = q_{j-\ell+1} = 0$ whenever $q_j = 1$. If $P_\ell(\beta) = P_\ell(\beta')$, then the induction hypotheses yield that $\beta = \beta'$. If $P_\ell(\beta) \neq P_\ell(\beta')$, then $Q(\beta) = 0$, which implies that $1 < \frac{1}{\beta^{\ell+1}} + \frac{1}{\beta^{2\ell+1}} + \dots = \frac{1}{\beta^{\ell+1}-\beta}$ when ℓ is even, $1 < \frac{1}{\beta^\ell} + \frac{1}{\beta^{2\ell+1}} + \dots = \frac{\beta}{\beta^{\ell+1}-1}$ when ℓ is odd, i.e., $\beta^{\ell+1} < \beta + 1$.

To exclude the latter case, suppose that $P_n(\beta) = P_n(\beta') \in \{0, 1\}$ for $\beta, \beta' \in J_n$, $\beta \neq \beta'$, and that $\beta^{\ell+1} < \beta + 1$ for the minimal $\ell \geq 1$ such that $P_\ell(\beta') \in \{0, 1\}$. Set $g_k = \lfloor 2^{k+1}/3 \rfloor$, and let, for $k \geq 1$, γ_k and η_k be the real numbers greater than 1 satisfying $\gamma_k^{g_k+1} = \gamma_k + 1$, $\eta_k^{g_k+1} = \eta_k^{g_k-1+1} + 1$ when k is even, $\eta_k^{g_k} = \eta_k^{g_k-1} + 1$ when k is odd, as in [LS]. For the positive integer m satisfying $g_m \leq \ell < g_{m+1}$, we have that $\beta < \gamma_m < \eta_m$. By Proposition 3.5 in [LS] and its proof, $\beta < \eta_m$ implies that the $(-\beta)$ -expansion of $\frac{-\beta}{\beta+1}$ starts with $\varphi^m(1)$ and that $\tilde{T}_{-\beta}^j(1) \notin \{0, 1\}$ for all $1 \leq j \leq |\varphi^m(1)| = g_{m+1} + \frac{1-(-1)^m}{2}$, where $|w|$ denotes the length of the word w . Since $\beta \in J_n$ and $P_n(\beta) \in \{0, 1\}$, we obtain that $a_1 a_2 \dots$ starts with $\varphi^m(1)$ and that $n > |\varphi^m(1)|$. By equation (3.2) in [LS], we have that $P_{2^m}(x) > 1$ for all $x > \eta_m$ (note that $2^m = |\varphi^{m-1}(10)| < |\varphi^m(1)|$), thus $J_{2^m} = (1, \eta_m]$, and $\ell < g_{m+1}$ yields that $\beta' = \eta_m$, $\ell = 2^m$. As β and β' are in the interval J_{n-1} , we also have that $\gamma_m \in J_{n-1}$. The $(-\gamma_m)$ -expansion of $\frac{-\gamma_m}{\gamma_m+1}$ is $\varphi^{m-1}(1) \overline{\varphi^{m-1}(0)}$ by [LS, Theorem 2.5]. Since $n \geq 2\ell$ by the above block decomposition of $a_{[1,n]}$, we obtain that $a_1 a_2 \dots$ starts with $\varphi^{m-1}(1000)$ if $m \geq 2$, and with 100 if $m = 1$. In case $m = 1$, we get that $P_3(2) \notin J_3$, contradicting that $2 = \eta_1 = \beta' \in J_n$. For $m \geq 2$, we have that $P_{|\varphi^{m-1}(1000)|}(\eta_m) > P_{|\varphi^{m-1}(10)|}(\eta_m) = 1$ because $P_{|\varphi^{m-1}(1000)|}(\eta_m) = P_{|\varphi^m(1)|}(\eta_m) < P_{|\varphi^{m-1}(1)|}(\eta_m)$ by equation (3.4) in [LS] and, using the notation of [LS], the function $f_{\gamma_m, \varphi^{m-1}(0)}$ is order-reversing. Again, this contradicts that $\eta_m = \beta' \in J_n$. Therefore, we have shown that $\beta = \beta'$ whenever $P_n(\beta) = P_n(\beta') \in \{0, 1\}$, $\beta, \beta' \in J_n$. Hence, J_n is an interval, and (1)–(5) hold for all $n \geq 1$.

As the J_n form a sequence of nested non-empty intervals that are compact for sufficiently large n , we have that $\bigcap_{n \geq 1} J_n \neq \emptyset$, thus there exists some $\beta > 1$ satisfying (1.9), which is

equivalent to (1.6). To show that β is unique, suppose that $\bigcap_{n \geq 1} J_n$ is not a single point. Then $\bigcap_{n \geq 1} J_n$ is an interval of positive length, thus there exist $\beta, \beta' \in \bigcap_{n \geq 1} J_n$, $\beta \neq \beta'$, such that $P_n(\beta) \in (0, 1]$ and $P_n(\beta') \in (0, 1]$ for all $n \geq 1$. This means that $a_1 a_2 \cdots$ is both the $(-\beta)$ -expansion of $\frac{-\beta}{\beta+1}$ and the $(-\beta')$ -expansion of $\frac{-\beta'}{\beta'+1}$, which contradicts that $\beta \neq \beta'$ by Theorem 3. This concludes the proof of Theorem 1.

Remark 1. Some parts of the proofs of Theorems 1 and 3 can be simplified when one is only interested in $\beta > 1$ not too close to 1. Since $P_n(x) = a_n + 1 - xP_{n-1}(x)$ for $n \geq 2$, and $P'_1(x) = -1$, the derivative of $P_n(x)$ is

$$P'_n(x) = (-1) (P_{n-1}(x) + xP'_{n-1}(x)) = \cdots = (-1)^n x^{n-1} \left(1 + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \frac{P_j(x)}{(-x)^j} \right).$$

If $x \in J_{n-1}$, then $1 + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \frac{P_j(x)}{(-x)^j} > 1 - \frac{1}{x} - \frac{1}{x^3} - \cdots = \frac{x^2 - x - 1}{x^2 - 1}$. If moreover $x \geq (1 + \sqrt{5})/2$, then we get that $(-1)^n P'_n(x) > 0$, hence P_n is a strictly increasing (decreasing) function on $J_{n-1} \cap [(1 + \sqrt{5})/2, \infty)$ when n is even (odd). Moreover, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |P'_n(x)| = \infty$ if $x \geq (1 + \sqrt{5})/2$ and $x \in J_n$ for all $n \geq 1$.

However, it is not true that P_n is always increasing (decreasing) on J_{n-1} when n is even (odd). For instance, if $a_1 a_2 \cdots$ starts with 1001, then $P_4(x) = x^4 - 2x^3 + x^2 - x + 2$ and $J_3 = (1, \beta]$ with $\beta^3 = 2\beta^2 - \beta + 1$ ($\beta \approx 1.755$). The function P_4 decreases on $(1, \beta']$, with $\beta' \approx 1.261$, and increases on $[\beta', \infty)$. Note that this is a major flaw in the proof of Theorem 28 of [Gór07] (besides the fact that the statement is incorrect, as explained in the Introduction). This lack of monotonicity is what makes Theorems 1 and 3 more difficult to prove than the corresponding statements for β -expansions.

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 2

Let $a_1 a_2 \cdots$ be a sequence of non-negative integers satisfying (1.4) and (1.5). We have already seen in the Introduction that these conditions are necessary to be the $(-\beta)$ -expansion of $\frac{-\beta}{\beta+1}$ for some $\beta > 1$. Moreover, β can only be the number given by Theorem 1. Then $a_1 a_2 \cdots$ is the $(-\beta)$ -expansion of $\frac{-\beta}{\beta+1}$ if and only if $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_{k+j}}{(-\beta)^j} \neq \frac{1}{\beta+1}$ for all $k \geq 1$.

Suppose first that $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_{k+j}}{(-\beta)^j} = \frac{1}{\beta+1}$ for some $k \geq 1$, and let $\ell \geq 1$ be minimal such that $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_{\ell+j}}{(-\beta)^j} \in \left\{ \frac{-\beta}{\beta+1}, \frac{1}{\beta+1} \right\}$. If $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_{\ell+j}}{(-\beta)^j} = \frac{-\beta}{\beta+1}$, then the $(-\beta)$ -expansion of $\frac{-\beta}{\beta+1}$ is $\overline{a_{[1, \ell]}}$. Then $a_1 a_2 \cdots$ is composed of blocks $a_{[1, \ell]}$ and $a_{[1, \ell]}(a_\ell - 1)0$. Since $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_{k+j}}{(-\beta)^j} = \frac{1}{\beta+1}$ for some $k \geq 1$, we have at least one block $a_{[1, \ell]}(a_\ell - 1)0$, i.e., $a_1 a_2 \cdots \in \{a_{[1, \ell]}, a_{[1, \ell]}(a_\ell - 1)0\}^\omega \setminus \{\overline{a_{[1, \ell]}}\}$. As $\overline{a_{[1, \ell]}}$ is the $(-\beta)$ -expansion of $\frac{-\beta}{\beta+1}$, we have that $\overline{a_{[1, \ell]}} >_{\text{alt}} u_1 u_2 \cdots$, thus (1.7) does not hold. If $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_{\ell+j}}{(-\beta)^j} = \frac{1}{\beta+1}$, then the $(-\beta)$ -expansion of $\frac{-\beta}{\beta+1}$ is $\overline{a_{[1, \ell]}(a_\ell + 1)}$, $a_1 a_2 \cdots$ is composed of blocks $a_{[1, \ell]}0$ and $a_{[1, \ell]}(a_\ell + 1)$, and we have that $\overline{a_{[1, \ell]}(a_\ell + 1)} >_{\text{alt}} u_1 u_2 \cdots$, thus (1.8) does not hold. Therefore, (1.4), (1.5), (1.7), and (1.8) imply that $a_1 a_2 \cdots$ is the $(-\beta)$ -expansion of $\frac{-\beta}{\beta+1}$ for some (unique) $\beta > 1$.

Suppose now that (1.7) does not hold, i.e., $a_1 a_2 \cdots \in \{a_{[1, k]}, a_{[1, k]}(a_k - 1)0\}^\omega \setminus \{\overline{a_{[1, k]}}\}$ for some $k \geq 1$ with $\overline{a_{[1, k]}} >_{\text{alt}} u_1 u_2 \cdots$. We show that the sequence $\overline{a_{[1, k]}}$ satisfies (1.4).

Suppose on the contrary that $a_{[j,k]} \overline{a_{[1,k]}} >_{\text{alt}} \overline{a_{[1,k]}}$ for some $2 \leq j \leq k$. This implies that $a_{[j,k]} a_{[1,j]} >_{\text{alt}} a_{[1,k]}$. Since $a_{[k+1,2k]} = a_{[1,k]}$, we obtain that $a_{[j,j+k]} = a_{[j,k]} a_{[1,j]} >_{\text{alt}} a_{[1,k]}$, thus $a_j a_{j+1} \cdots >_{\text{alt}} a_1 a_2 \cdots$, contradicting that $a_1 a_2 \cdots$ satisfies (1.4). Therefore, $\overline{a_{[1,k]}}$ satisfies (1.4) and (1.5), and we can apply Theorem 1 for this sequence. Let $\beta' > 1$ be the number satisfying (1.6) for the sequence $\overline{a_{[1,k]}}$. Then β' also satisfies (1.6) for the original sequence $a_1 a_2 \cdots$, thus $\beta' = \beta$. Therefore, $a_1 a_2 \cdots$ is not the $(-\beta)$ -expansion of $\frac{-\beta}{\beta+1}$.

Suppose finally that (1.8) does not hold, i.e., $a_1 a_2 \cdots \in \{a_{[1,k]}0, a_{[1,k]}(a_k+1)\}^\omega$ for some $k \geq 1$ with $\overline{a_{[1,k]}(a_k+1)} >_{\text{alt}} u_1 u_2 \cdots$. If $a_1 a_2 \cdots = \overline{a_{[1,k]}0}$, then $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_{k+j}}{(-\beta)^j} = \frac{1}{\beta+1}$, thus $a_1 a_2 \cdots$ is not the $(-\beta)$ -expansion of $\frac{-\beta}{\beta+1}$. If $a_1 a_2 \cdots \neq \overline{a_{[1,k]}0}$, then we show that the sequence $\overline{a_{[1,k]}(a_k+1)}$ satisfies (1.4). Suppose that $a_{[j,k]}(a_k+1) \overline{a_{[1,k]}(a_k+1)} >_{\text{alt}} \overline{a_{[1,k]}(a_k+1)}$ for some $2 \leq j \leq k$. This implies that $a_{[j,k]}(a_k+1) a_{[1,j]} >_{\text{alt}} a_{[1,k]}$. Since $a_{[j,k]}(a_k+1) a_{[1,j]} = a_{[\ell, \ell+k]}$ for some $\ell \geq 2$, we have that $a_\ell a_{\ell+1} \cdots >_{\text{alt}} a_1 a_2 \cdots$, contradicting that $a_1 a_2 \cdots$ satisfies (1.4). As in the preceding paragraph, the number given by Theorem 1 for the sequence $\overline{a_{[1,k]}(a_k+1)}$ is β , thus $a_1 a_2 \cdots$ is not the $(-\beta)$ -expansion of $\frac{-\beta}{\beta+1}$. Therefore, (1.7) and (1.8) are necessary for $a_1 a_2 \cdots$ to be the $(-\beta)$ -expansion of $\frac{-\beta}{\beta+1}$ for some $\beta > 1$.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to thank Edita Pelantová for many fruitful discussions.

REFERENCES

- [DMP11] D. Dombek, Z. Masáková, and E. Pelantová, *Number representation using generalized $(-\beta)$ -transformation*, Theoret. Comput. Sci. **412** (2011), no. 48, 6653–6665.
- [Fal08] B. Faller, *Contribution to the ergodic theory of piecewise monotone continuous maps*, Ph.D. thesis, École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne, 2008.
- [FL11] C. Frougny and A. C. Lai, *Negative bases and automata*, Discrete Math. Theor. Comput. Sci. **13** (2011), no. 1, 75–94.
- [Gór07] P. Góra, *Invariant densities for generalized β -maps*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **27** (2007), no. 5, 1583–1598.
- [IS09] S. Ito and T. Sadahiro, *Beta-expansions with negative bases*, Integers **9** (2009), A22, 239–259.
- [LS] L. Liao and W. Steiner, *Dynamical properties of the negative beta-transformation*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems, to appear.
- [Par60] W. Parry, *On the β -expansions of real numbers*, Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar. **11** (1960), 401–416.
- [Rén57] A. Rényi, *Representations for real numbers and their ergodic properties*, Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar. **8** (1957), 477–493.

LIAFA, CNRS UMR 7089, UNIVERSITÉ PARIS DIDEROT – PARIS 7, CASE 7014, 75205 PARIS CEDEX 13, FRANCE

E-mail address: steiner@liafa.jussieu.fr