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Abstract

Shift radix systems provide a unified notation to study several important types of number systems. However, the classification of such systems is already hard in two dimensions. In this paper, we consider a symmetric version of this concept which turns out to be easier: the set of such number systems with finite expansions can be completely classified in dimension two.

1 Introduction

Shift radix systems, defined in [4], provide a unified notation for canonical number systems (for short CNS) as well as \( \beta \)-expansions. Both concepts are generalisations of the well-known \( b \)-ary expansions of integers.

Let \( d \geq 1 \) be an integer and \( r = (r_1, \ldots, r_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d \). With \( r \) we associate a mapping \( \tilde{\tau}_r : \mathbb{Z}^d \to \mathbb{Z}^d \) in the following way: if \( z = (z_1, \ldots, z_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d \) then let

\[
\tilde{\tau}_r(z) = (z_2, \ldots, z_d, -\lfloor rz \rfloor),
\]

where \( rz = r_1z_1 + \cdots + r_dz_d \) is the inner product of the vectors \( r \) and \( z \). Then \( (\mathbb{Z}^d, \tilde{\tau}_r) \) is called a shift radix system (for short SRS) on \( \mathbb{Z}^d \). From (1.1) it follows that \( \tilde{\tau}_r(z) = (z_2, \ldots, z_{d+1}) \) if and only if

\[
0 \leq r_1z_1 + r_2z_2 + \cdots + r_dz_d + z_{d+1} < 1.
\]

It is an important problem for CNS and \( \beta \)-expansions to determine whether or not each number admits a finite expansion. In SRS language, it translates to one question:

*For which \( r \), do all orbits of \( (\mathbb{Z}^d, \tilde{\tau}_r) \) end in \( 0 = (0, \ldots, 0) \)?*
Unfortunately, already for $d = 2$, this seems to be a hard problem, though in [5], a partial answer is given. A main difficulty arises when the polynomial $x^d + r_1 x^{d-1} + \cdots + r_1$ has a root close to the unit circle.

In the present paper, we will study a ‘symmetric’ version of SRS. We consider a mapping

$$\tau_r(z) = (z_2, \ldots, z_d, -\lfloor rz + \frac{1}{2} \rfloor) \quad (1.3)$$

instead of (1.1). Therefore, we obtain a condition

$$-\frac{1}{2} \leq r_1 z_1 + r_2 z_2 + \cdots + r_d z_d + z_{d+1} < \frac{1}{2} \quad (1.4)$$

instead of (1.2). Then $(\mathbb{Z}^d, \tau_r)$ is called a symmetric shift radix system (for short SSRS) on $\mathbb{Z}^d$.

Our aim is to describe as precisely as possible the sets $D_d$ and $D^0_d$. For $d = 1$, we have:

$$D_1 = [-1, 1] \quad \text{and} \quad D^0_1 = \left(-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right). \quad (1.5)$$

Since $\tau_r(x) = -\lfloor rx + \frac{1}{2} \rfloor$, both equalities are almost trivial. In fact, to deduce the second one, we just have to look at orbits $\tau_{\tau_r}(\pm 1)$, $n = 1, 2, \ldots$.

Curiously the minor change from (1.1) to (1.3) affects substantially the behaviour of the system. The above finiteness problem for $d = 2$ is satisfactorily settled in Theorem 5.2 by giving an exact shape (Figure 1) of $D^0_2$, which forms the main result of this paper. The difficulty in $d = 2$ disappears in this case. An essential reason is that the corresponding roots stay far inside the unit circle when we deal with $D^0_2$. Theorems 2.2 and 3.8 illustrate the strength of this result.

On the other hand, the change from (1.1) to (1.3) gives rise to changes of the digit sets of the number systems. They are symmetric canonical number systems and symmetric $\beta$-expansions. By considering a ternary expansion using digits $\{-1, 0, 1\}$ instead of $\{0, 1, 2\}$, we can easily imagine this change in the case of canonical number systems. We shall discuss basic facts on the symbolic system associated with this expansion in §3. See [10, 17, 22, 23] for results on usual $\beta$-expansions.

Note that

$$\tau'_r(z) = (z_2, \ldots, z_d, -\lfloor rz - \frac{1}{2} \rfloor) \quad (1.6)$$

defines a slightly different system. However, it is isomorphic to the one obtained from $\tau_r$ through an involution correspondence $\mathbb{Z}^d \ni z \mapsto -z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. Obviously, the sets $D_d$ and $D^0_d$ are identical for both systems.

\footnote{This can also be seen as a corollary of Theorem 5.2.}
2 SSRS and symmetric CNS

The only difference between symmetric CNS and usual CNS is the set of digits. Let
\[ P(x) = x^d + b_{d-1}x^{d-1} + \cdots + b_0 \in \mathbb{Z}[x] \]
with \( b_0 \neq 0 \) and \( \mathcal{R} = \mathbb{Z}[x]/P(x)\mathbb{Z}[x] \). Define a digit set \( \mathcal{N} = [-\frac{|b_0|}{2}, \frac{|b_0|}{2}] \cap \mathbb{Z} \) which consists of \( |b_0| \) consecutive integers.

We say that an element of \( \mathcal{R} \) has a finite representation, if it admits a representation of the form
\[ \ell_0 + \ell_1 x + \cdots + \ell_h x^h \]
with \( \ell_j \in \mathcal{N} \) for \( 0 \leq j \leq h \). This representation, if it exists, is unique since \( \mathcal{N} \) forms a complete residue system of \( \mathcal{R}/x\mathcal{R} \). Actually the digits are determined from \( \ell_0 \) to \( \ell_h \) by the so called backward division algorithm: letting \( z = z^{(0)} = z_0 + z_1 x + \cdots + z_{d-1} x^{d-1} \in \mathcal{R}, \quad z_j \in \mathbb{Z}, \)
we first get \( \ell_0 \in \mathcal{N} \) by \( z_0 \equiv \ell_0 \pmod{b_0} \). Then \( \ell_0 \) is a unique choice in \( \mathcal{N} \) such that \( z^{(0)} - \ell_0 \equiv 0 \pmod{x} \) and one put \( z^{(1)} := (z^{(0)} - \ell_0)/x \). Iterate this process and define \( z^{(n)} \in \mathcal{R} \) by \( z^{(n)} := (z^{(n-1)} - \ell_{n-1})/x \) with \( z_{n-1} \equiv \ell_{n-1} \pmod{b_0} \). Then we obtain
\[ z^{(0)} = \ell_0 + \ell_1 x + \cdots + \ell_{n-1} x^{n-1} + x^n z^{(n)}. \]
Thus, \( z \) admits a finite representation, if and only if there is an \( n \) with \( z^{(n)} = 0 \).

The numbers \( \ell_j = \ell_j(z), \quad j \geq 0 \), are called the digits of \( z \) with respect to \((P(x), \mathcal{N})\). The pair \((P(x), \mathcal{N})\) is called symmetric canonical number system (for short SCNS) in \( \mathcal{R} \), if each \( z \in \mathcal{R} \) has a finite representation. In other words, a SCNS requires, that for each initial value \( z \in \mathcal{R} \), the backward division algorithm terminates in finitely many steps.

**Theorem 2.1** (cf. [4, Theorem 3.1]) Let \( P(x) := x^d + b_{d-1}x^{d-1} + \cdots + b_0 \in \mathbb{Z}[x] \) and \( \mathcal{N} = [-\frac{|b_0|}{2}, \frac{|b_0|}{2}] \cap \mathbb{Z} \). Then \((P(x), \mathcal{N})\) is a SCNS if and only if
\[ (r_1, \ldots, r_d) := \left( \frac{1}{b_0}, \frac{b_{d-1}}{b_0}, \ldots, \frac{b_1}{b_0} \right) \in \mathcal{D}_d^0. \]
We omit the proof since it is identical to [4, Theorem 3.1]. When \( b_0 \) is negative, the corresponding system comes from (1.6) instead of (1.4).

Generalising a result of Kátai [18] for Gaussian integers, we have
\[ z \mapsto -z. \]
Theorem 2.2

1. \((x + a, N)\) is a SCNS if and only if \(a \geq 2\) or \(a < -2\).

2. \((x^2 + Ax + B, N)\) is a SCNS if and only if one of the following condition holds
   \((a)\) \(|A| < 1 + B/2\) and \(|B| \geq 2\),
  \((b)\) \(A = 1 + B/2\) and \(|B| > 2\).

This is a consequence of Theorems 5.2 and 2.1 for \(d \in \{1, 2\}\). For instance, if \(d = 2\) we have
\[
-\frac{1}{B} - \frac{1}{2} < \frac{A}{B} \leq \frac{1}{B} + \frac{1}{2} \text{ and } \frac{1}{B} \leq \frac{1}{2}.
\]

Example 2.3 \((x^2 + 2x + 2, \{-1, 0\})\) is a SCNS while \((x^2 - 2x + 2, \{-1, 0\})\) is not. These correspond to \((\frac{1}{2}, 1) \in \mathcal{D}_2^0\) and \((\frac{1}{2}, -1) \notin \mathcal{D}_2^0\) in Figure 1. For example, compare
\[
1 - x \equiv -1 - x - x^2 - x^3 - x^4 \pmod{x^2 + 2x + 2}
\]
and
\[
1 - x \equiv -1 - x - \cdots - x^{n-1} + x^n(1 - x) \pmod{x^2 - 2x + 2}.
\]

3 SSRS and symmetric \(\beta\)-expansions

\(\beta\)-expansions of real numbers were introduced by Rényi [23]. Since then, their arithmetic, diophantine and ergodic properties have been extensively studied by several authors (cf. for instance [1, 2, 9, 10, 15, 22, 26]). For a recent survey, we refer to Chapter 7 in Lothaire [21]. In the present paper, we consider a symmetric version of this concept.

Let \(\beta > 1\) be a fixed real number. Define\(^3\)
\[
T_\beta : [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}) \rightarrow [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}) \text{ by } x \mapsto \beta x - \lfloor \beta x + \frac{1}{2} \rfloor.
\]

For every \(x \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})\), \(T_\beta\) generates an expansion
\[
x = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{d_j(x)}{\beta^j},
\]
\(^3\)An isomorphic system using (1.6) is defined by \(x \mapsto \beta x + [-\beta x + \frac{1}{2}]\) which acts on \((-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})\).
where \( d_j = d_j(x) = \lfloor \beta T_j^{-1}(x) + \frac{1}{2} \rfloor \) for every \( j \geq 1 \). We shall consider the digits \( d_j \) as functions of \( x \). When the argument is clear, we shall write \( d_j \) instead of \( d_j(x) \). We will call this expansion a symmetric \( \beta \)-expansion of \( x \) in base \( \beta \). Each \( d_j(x) \) is contained in \( N = (\frac{-\beta+1}{2}, \frac{\beta+1}{2}) \cap \mathbb{Z} \), the digit set.

Define a map

\[
d : [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}) \to N^\mathbb{N} \text{ by } \ x \mapsto d_1(x) d_2(x) \cdots .
\]

By considering formally an orbit starting from \( \frac{1}{2} \), we also define an expansion \( d(\frac{1}{2}) \).

It should be noticed that when \( 1 < \beta < 2 \), the dynamical system \(([-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}), T_\beta]\) does not have an invariant measure which is absolutely continuous to the Lebesgue measure, since each orbit of \( x \neq 0 \) eventually falls into \([-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}) \cup [1-\frac{\beta}{2}, \frac{\beta}{2}] \). Hence no \( x \neq 0 \) has a finite expansion. We do not address to the ergodic study of this system, e.g., the construction of the invariant measure for \( \beta \geq 2 \), in the present paper.

For \( \beta > 1 \) and \( x \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}) \), we will call an infinite series of the form \( x = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} s_j/\beta^j \), \( s_k \in N \) a representation of \( x \) in base \( \beta \). In general, there exist infinitely many representations of \( x \) in base \( \beta \).

Let us treat hereafter \( W = N^\mathbb{N} \) as a shift space, endowed with the lexicographical order \( \preceq_{\text{lex}} \) and the product topology. Let \( \sigma \) be the one sided shift on \( W \), that is, \( \sigma(s_1s_2\cdots) = (s_2s_3\cdots) \). The language \( L(U) \) of a subshift \( U \) is the set of all words which appear as subwords of an element of \( U \).

A sequence \( (s_i)_{i=1}^\infty \in W \) is called admissible, if there exists a number \( x \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}) \) such that \( s_i = d_i(x) \) holds for each \( i \geq 1 \). This means, that \( (s_i)_{i=1}^\infty \) is realized as a symmetric \( \beta \)-expansion \( x = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} s_j/\beta^j \).

Let \( A \) be the set of all admissible sequences. The symmetric \( \beta \)-shift \( S \) is defined to be the closure of \( A \) by the topology of \( W \). Then \( S \) is a subshift of the full shift \( W \).

The mapping \( d : [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}) \to A \) is continuous and fulfils \( d \circ T_\beta = \sigma \circ d \), which shows that the following diagram is commutative:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}) & \xrightarrow{T_\beta} & [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}) \\
\downarrow d & & \downarrow d \\
A & \xrightarrow{\sigma} & A.
\end{array}
\]

An infinite sequence \( s = (s_i)_{i=1}^\infty \in W \) is admissible (i.e., \( s \in A \)) if and only if

\[
-\frac{1}{2^{\beta^{n-1}}} \leq \sum_{i=n}^{\infty} \frac{s_i}{\beta^i} < \frac{1}{2^{\beta^{n-1}}} \quad \text{for every } n \geq 1.
\]
It is easy to see that \( d \) is an order-preserving map:
\[
x < y \iff d(x) <_{\text{lex}} d(y)
\]
for \( x, y \in \left[ -\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} \right) \). For \( s = (s_i)_{i=1}^{\infty} \in \mathcal{W} \), we write \( -s = (-s_i)_{i=1}^{\infty} \).

**Theorem 3.1** An infinite sequence \( s = (s_i)_{i=1}^{\infty} \in \mathcal{W} \) is admissible (i.e., \( s \in A \)) if and only if
\[
d\left( -\frac{1}{2} \right) \leq_{\text{lex}} \sigma^n(s) <_\text{lex} -d\left( -\frac{1}{2} \right)
\]
for all \( n = 0, 1, \ldots \).

**Proof.** Since \( d \) is order-preserving, the necessity of this inequality is obvious. Let us prove that \( \sigma^m(s) <_\text{lex} -d\left( -\frac{1}{2} \right) \) for \( m \geq n \geq 1 \) implies
\[
-\frac{1}{2} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\ell_i}{\beta^i} < \frac{1}{2}.
\]
Let \( -d\left( -\frac{1}{2} \right) = \bar{t}_1 \bar{t}_2 \cdots \). Decompose \( \sigma^n(s) \) into admissible blocks in the following manner: \( \sigma^n(s) = s_{n+1}s_{n+2} \cdots = w_1^{(n)}w_2^{(n)} \cdots \) with \( w_i^{(n)} \in \mathcal{N}^* \) such that \( w_i^{(n)} = \bar{t}_1 \cdots \bar{t}_iv \) with \( v \in \mathcal{N} \) and \( v <_{\text{lex}} \bar{t}_{i+1} \). In other words, each word \( w_i^{(n)} \) coincides with the prefix of \( -d\left( -\frac{1}{2} \right) \) apart from the last digit of \( w_i^{(n)} \) and all blocks are chosen to have maximal length with this property. By definition of the symmetric \( \beta \)-expansion, we have
\[
-\frac{1}{2} < \frac{1}{2} - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\ell_i}{\beta^i} < \frac{1}{2}.
\]
This implies that
\[
\sum_{v=1}^{k_i} \frac{c_{i,v}}{\beta^v} < \sum_{v=1}^{k_i} \frac{\ell_i}{\beta^v} - \frac{1}{\beta^{k_i}} < \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{\beta^{k_i}} \right)
\]
for \( w_i^{(n)} = c_{i,1} \cdots c_{i,k_i} \). Therefore
\[
\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{s_{i+n}}{\beta^i} < \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{\beta^{k_1}} \right) + \frac{1}{2\beta^{k_1}} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{\beta^{k_2}} \right) + \frac{1}{2\beta^{k_1+k_2}} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{\beta^{k_3}} \right) + \cdots = \frac{1}{2}.
\]
In a similar manner, we prove that \( d\left( -\frac{1}{2} \right) \leq_{\text{lex}} \sigma^m(s) \) for \( m \geq n \geq 1 \) implies
\[
-\frac{1}{2} < \frac{s_n}{\beta} + \frac{s_{n+1}}{\beta^2} + \cdots.
\]
A word \( w_1 \cdots w_m \in \mathcal{N}^* \) is *admissible* if it is contained in the language \( L(S) \). The next corollary gives a combinatorial criterion for words to be admissible.

**Corollary 3.2** Let \( d(-\frac{1}{2}) = t_1t_2 \cdots \) and \(-d(-\frac{1}{2}) = \bar{t}_1\bar{t}_2 \cdots \). A word \( s_1 \cdots s_m \in \mathcal{N}^* \) is admissible if and only if

\[
t_1 \cdots t_{m-n+1} \leq_{\text{lex}} s_n \cdots s_m \leq_{\text{lex}} \bar{t}_1 \cdots \bar{t}_{m-n+1}
\]

for \( 1 \leq n \leq m \).

**Proof.** If the word \( s_1 \cdots s_m \) is admissible, then by definition, there exists an admissible sequence \( v_1v_2 \cdots \in \mathcal{A} \), such that \( s_1 \cdots s_mv_1v_2 \cdots \) is admissible. Thus the necessity of (3.2) follows from

\[
d(-\frac{1}{2}) \leq_{\text{lex}} \sigma^n(s_1 \cdots s_mv_1v_2 \cdots) <_{\text{lex}} -d(-\frac{1}{2}) \text{ for } n \geq 0.
\]

Now we prove the sufficiency of (3.2). Similarly as in the proof of Theorem 3.1, one can decompose \( s_1 \cdots s_m \) into admissible blocks in two ways

\[
s_1 \cdots s_m = w_1w_2 \cdots w_p = w'_1w'_2 \cdots w'_q
\]

by \( d(-\frac{1}{2}) \) and \(-d(-\frac{1}{2}) \) respectively. In other words, each proper prefix of \( w_i \) (resp. \( w'_i \)) is a prefix of \( t_1t_2 \cdots \) (resp. \( \bar{t}_1\bar{t}_2 \cdots \)) and the \( w_i \) (resp. \( w'_i \)) are chosen to have maximal length with this property. Only the last \( w_p \) and \( w'_q \) can coincide with a prefix of \( t_1t_2 \cdots \) (resp. \( \bar{t}_1\bar{t}_2 \cdots \)). We wish to find an extension \( v_1v_2 \cdots \in \mathcal{A} \) such that \( s_1 \cdots s_mv_1v_2 \cdots \) is admissible.

If \( w_p \) (resp. \( w'_q \)) is not a prefix of \( t_1t_2 \cdots \) (resp. \( \bar{t}_1\bar{t}_2 \cdots \)) simultaneously, then \( t_1 \cdots t_m <_{\text{lex}} s_1 \cdots s_m <_{\text{lex}} \bar{t}_1 \cdots \bar{t}_m \). Thus any \( v_1v_2 \cdots \in \mathcal{A} \) works, since \( \sigma^n(s_1 \cdots s_mv_1v_2 \cdots) <_{\text{lex}} \bar{t}_1\bar{t}_2 \cdots \text{ for any } n \geq 0 \).

Now assume that \( w_p = t_1 \cdots t_k \) and \( w'_q \) is not a prefix of \( t_1t_2 \cdots \). Then \( w'_q = \bar{t}_1 \cdots \bar{t}_{k'} \) \( s_m \) with \( s_m < \bar{t}_{k'} \). Thus \( s_1 \cdots s_mv_1v_2 \cdots <_{\text{lex}} \bar{t}_1\bar{t}_2 \cdots \) for any \( v_1v_2 \cdots \in \mathcal{A} \). In this case we take \( v_1v_2 \cdots = t_{k+1}t_{k+2} \cdots \in \mathcal{A} \). Then \( s_1 \cdots s_mv_1v_2 \cdots \) is admissible. Similarly if \( w'_q = \bar{t}_1 \cdots \bar{t}_k \) and \( w_p \) is not a prefix of \( t_1t_2 \cdots \), we take \( v_1v_2 \cdots = \bar{t}_{k+1}t_{k+2} \cdots \).

Finally if \( w_p = t_1 \cdots t_k \) and \( w'_q = \bar{t}_1 \cdots \bar{t}_{k'} \), then without loss of generality we assume that \( k \geq k' \). Then \( w'_q \) is a suffix of \( w_p \). In this case we take \( v_1v_2 \cdots = t_{k+1}t_{k+2} \cdots \). Then, \( s_1 \cdots s_mv_1v_2 \cdots \) must be admissible since \( t_1t_2 \cdots \) and \( \bar{t}_1 \cdots \bar{t}_{k'}t_{k+1}t_{k+2} \cdots \) are suffixes of \( d(-\frac{1}{2}) \).

The sequence \( d(x) \) associated with \( x \) is said to be *finite* if there exists \( m \geq 0 \), such that \( d_j = 0 \) for \( j \geq m \). It is called *eventually periodic* if there
exist \( m \geq 0 \) and \( p > 0 \), such that \( d_{j+p} = d_j \) for \( j \geq m \). If \( d(x) \) is finite, we can write \( d(x) = d_1 \cdots d_{m-1} \) for simplicity.

An eventually periodic word in \( \mathbb{N}^\mathbb{N} \) is denoted by
\[
b_1 \cdots b_k (b_{k+1} \cdots b_{k+\ell})^\omega
\]
with the period \( b_{k+1}, \ldots, b_{k+\ell} \). Obviously, if \( d(\frac{1}{2}) \) is finite or eventually periodic, then \( \beta \) must be an algebraic integer. Note that \(-T_\beta(x) = T_\beta(-x)\) holds when \( T_\beta(x) \neq -\frac{1}{2} \). Therefore, if \( T_\beta^n(x) \neq -\frac{1}{2} \) for all \( n \geq 0 \), then \( d(x) = -d(-x) \).

An important consequence is that there exists \( m \geq 0 \) such that
\[
d(-\frac{1}{2}) = \pm \sigma^m d(\frac{1}{2}).
\]

Especially, \( d(-\frac{1}{2}) \) is finite if and only if \( d(\frac{1}{2}) \) is finite. The same is valid for eventual periodicity. Furthermore, there is a direct relation between \( d(\frac{1}{2}) \) and \( d(-\frac{1}{2}) \), even when \( T_\beta^m(\frac{1}{2}) = -\frac{1}{2} \) holds for some \( m > 0 \):

**Lemma 3.3** Let \( d(-\frac{1}{2}) = t_1t_2 \cdots \) and \(-d(-\frac{1}{2}) = \bar{t}_1 \bar{t}_2 \cdots \). The following statements are equivalent:

1. There exists an \( m > 0 \) such that \( T_\beta^m(\frac{1}{2}) = -\frac{1}{2} \).
2. \( d(-\frac{1}{2}) \) is purely periodic, i.e., \( d(-\frac{1}{2}) = (t_1 \cdots t_\ell)^\omega \).
3. \( d(\frac{1}{2}) \) has the form \( d(\frac{1}{2}) = \bar{t}_1 \cdots \bar{t}_{\ell-1}(\bar{t}_\ell + 1)(t_1 \cdots t_\ell)^\omega \).

**Proof.** The expansion \( d(\frac{1}{2}) \) can not be purely periodic. In fact, \( d(\frac{1}{2}) = (a_1 \cdots a_p)^\omega \) implies \( T_\beta^p(\frac{1}{2}) = \frac{1}{2} \) which is impossible. Therefore (2) implies \( d(-\frac{1}{2}) \neq -d(\frac{1}{2}) \) and consequently (1). Assume (1). Take the smallest \( m \), such that \( T_\beta^m(\frac{1}{2}) = -\frac{1}{2} \). This means that \( \beta T_\beta^{m-1}(\frac{1}{2}) \in \frac{1}{2} + \mathbb{Z} \). Then \( T_\beta^n(-\frac{1}{2}) = T_\beta(T_\beta^{m-1}(-\frac{1}{2})) = T_\beta(-T_\beta^{m-1}(\frac{1}{2})) = -\frac{1}{2} \), which shows (2). Suppose (2) is valid. Take the smallest \( m \) such that \( T_\beta^m(-\frac{1}{2}) = -\frac{1}{2} \). Then \( T_\beta^m(\frac{1}{2}) = T_\beta(T_\beta^{m-1}(\frac{1}{2})) = T_\beta(-T_\beta^{m-1}(\frac{1}{2})) = -\frac{1}{2} \) which shows (3) (and also (1)). The expansion of (3) gives \( \beta^m(\frac{1}{2} - \sum_{i=1}^\ell \bar{t}_i \beta^{-i}) = \frac{1}{2} \) which shows (2). \( \square \)

**Remark 3.4** Notice that if \( d(-\frac{1}{2}) \) is purely periodic, then the norm of \( \beta \) is odd. Therefore, if the norm of \( \beta \) is even, then \( -d(\frac{1}{2}) = d(-\frac{1}{2}) \).

Now we discuss basic symbolic dynamical properties of the symmetric \( \beta \)-shift. Recall that a subshift \( \mathcal{U} \) of the full shift \( \mathcal{W} \) is of finite type if it can be described by a finite set of forbidden blocks. A subshift \( \mathcal{U} \) is called sofic if each element is recognised by a finite automaton (cf. [20, 21]).
Theorem 3.5 The symmetric $\beta$-shift $\mathcal{S}$ is sofic if and only if $d(-\frac{1}{2})$ is eventually periodic.

Proof. We follow the classical technique described in [14]. For an introduction to automata theory, we refer to [13, 24]. The proof of Theorem 3.1 also implies that $s \in \mathcal{S}$ if and only if

$$d(-\frac{1}{2}) \leq \sigma^n(s) \leq -d(-\frac{1}{2})$$

(3.3)

holds for all $n \geq 0$.

Assume that $d(-\frac{1}{2}) = t_1 \ldots t_N (t_{N+1} \ldots t_{N+p})^\omega$, such that $t_{k+p} = t_k$ for all $k \geq N + 1$. Construct an automaton $S_1$ as follows: The set of states is given by $\{s_1, \ldots, s_{N+p}\}$ and the labels are taken from $\mathcal{N}$. The initial state is $s_1$. For $j < N + p$, draw an arrow from $s_j$ to $s_{j+1}$ labeled by $t_j$, while arrows with greater labels lead to $s_1$. Draw an arrow from $s_{N+p}$ to $s_{N+1}$ labeled by $t_{N+p}$, while arrows with greater labels lead back to $s_1$. This automaton can check if a given sequence $s \in \mathcal{W}$ fulfills $d(-\frac{1}{2}) \leq \sigma^n(s)$ for all $n \geq 0$. Analogously, we construct an automaton $S_2$ that checks if $\sigma^n(s) \leq -d(-\frac{1}{2})$ holds for all $n \geq 0$. Finally, using $S_1$ and $S_2$, we construct a product automaton $S_1 \times S_2$ that checks if $d(-\frac{1}{2}) \leq \sigma^n(s) \leq -d(-\frac{1}{2})$ holds for all $n \geq 0$. This shows that $\mathcal{S}$ is sofic.

Recall that we denote by $L(\mathcal{S})$ the language of $\mathcal{S}$. Suppose that $d(-\frac{1}{2}) = t_1t_2 \ldots$ is not eventually periodic. Then the sequences $t_kt_{k+1}t_{k+2} \ldots$ are pairwise different for all $k \geq 1$. Therefore, for all pairs $j, \ell \geq 1$, $j \neq \ell$, there exist $p \geq 0$, such that $t_{j+p} \neq t_{\ell+p}$ and $w := t_j \ldots t_{j+p-1} = t_{\ell} \ldots t_{\ell+p-1}$ (with the convention that, if $p = 0$, then $w$ is equal to the empty word). W.l.o.g., we assume that $t_{j+p} > t_{\ell+p}$. Then $t_1 \ldots t_{j-1}w t_{\ell+p} \leq d(-\frac{1}{2})$, and therefore $t_1 \ldots t_{j-1}w t_{\ell+p} \not\in L(\mathcal{S})$ and $t_1 \ldots t_{\ell-1}w t_{j+p} \in L(\mathcal{S})$. Thus, the number of right congruence classes modulo $L(\mathcal{S})$ is infinite. Therefore, $L(\mathcal{S})$ is not recognisable by a finite automaton.

Recall that a subshift $\mathcal{U}$ is $M$-step if it can be described by a collection of forbidden blocks all of which have length $M + 1$. If a subshift $\mathcal{U}$ is of finite type, then there is an $M \geq 0$ such that $\mathcal{U}$ is $M$-step (cf. [20, Proposition 2.1.7]).

Theorem 3.6 The symmetric $\beta$-shift $\mathcal{S}$ is of finite type if and only if $d(-\frac{1}{2})$ is purely periodic.²

²Unlike usual $\beta$-expansion, if $d(-\frac{1}{2})$ is finite, then it is not of finite type. This fact follows from the proof below with $t_{N+1} \ldots t_{N+p} = 0^p$. 

Symmetric shift radix systems
Proof. Suppose that $d(-\frac{1}{2}) = (t_1 \cdots t_m)^\omega$. Then the set 

$$U = \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq m} \{ \pm u \in \mathbb{N}_i : u <_{\text{lex}} t_1 \cdots t_i \}$$

is a finite set of forbidden words. From (3.3), it is easy to show that $s \in W$ is an element of $S$ if no subword of $s$ is contained in $U$.

If $S$ is of finite type, then it is sofic. Thus by Theorem 3.5, $d(-\frac{1}{2})$ must be eventually periodic. Set $\bar{t}_i = -t_i$ and assume that there exists $N \geq 1$ that

$$-d(-\frac{1}{2}) = \bar{t}_1 \cdots \bar{t}_N (\bar{t}_{N+1} \cdots \bar{t}_{N+p})^\omega$$

where $\bar{t}_{k+p} = \bar{t}_k$ for all $k \geq N + 1$ and $\bar{t}_N \neq \bar{t}_{N+p}$. Since $d(-\frac{1}{2})$ is not purely periodic, we have $-T^k_d(-\frac{1}{2}) < \frac{1}{2}$ and $\sigma^k(-d(-\frac{1}{2})) <_{\text{lex}} -d(-\frac{1}{2})$ for $k \geq 1$. By the admissible block decomposition as in the proof of Theorem 3.1, for each positive integer $s$, there exists a $k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, p\}$ such that

$$\sigma^n((\bar{t}_{N+1} \cdots \bar{t}_{N+p})^s \bar{t}_{N+1} \cdots \bar{t}_{N+k-1}(\bar{t}_{N+k} + 1)) <_{\text{lex}} \bar{t}_1 \cdots \bar{t}_{sp+N+k-n}$$

for each $n \leq sp + N + k - 1$. Here we used an abusive terminology of $\sigma$ acting on finite words by $\sigma(w_1 \cdots w_m) = w_2 \cdots w_m$. By Corollary 3.2, we have

$$(\bar{t}_{N+1} \cdots \bar{t}_{N+p})^s \bar{t}_{N+1} \cdots \bar{t}_{N+k-1}(\bar{t}_{N+k} + 1) \in L(S).$$

Since $S$ is of finite type, it must be $M$-step with some $M \geq 0$. Take a positive integer $s$ such that $sp \geq \max(N + p, M)$. Then the two words $\bar{t}_1 \cdots \bar{t}_{N}(\bar{t}_{N+1} \cdots \bar{t}_{N+p})^s$ and $(\bar{t}_{N+1} \cdots \bar{t}_{N+p})^s \bar{t}_{N+1} \cdots \bar{t}_{N+k-1}(\bar{t}_{N+k} + 1)$ are both in $L(S)$. However

$$\bar{t}_1 \cdots \bar{t}_{N}(\bar{t}_{N+1} \cdots \bar{t}_{N+p})^p \bar{t}_{N+1} \cdots \bar{t}_{N+k-1}(\bar{t}_{N+k} + 1) \notin L(S).$$

This is a contradiction. 

For a real number $x$, there exists $m \geq 0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ that $\beta^{-m}x \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$ with $d(\beta^{-m}x) = x_1x_2 \cdots$. Following the usual convention to express real numbers, we write:

$$x = x_1 \cdots x_m.x_{m+1}x_{m+2} \cdots$$

using the ‘decimal’ point. For the integer part $x_1 \cdots x_m$, the leading zeros may be omitted.

The sequence (3.4) is called a symmetric $\beta$-expansion of $x$. In the sequel, we will use the following notations:

$$\text{Per}(\beta) = \{ x \in \mathbb{R} : x \text{ has eventually periodic symmetric } \beta\text{-expansion} \},$$

$$\text{Fin}(\beta) = \{ x \in \mathbb{R} : x \text{ has finite symmetric } \beta\text{-expansion} \}.$$
Recall that a *Pisot number* is an algebraic integer $\beta > 1$ for which all algebraic conjugates $\gamma$ with $\gamma \neq \beta$ satisfy $|\gamma| < 1$. If $\beta$ is a Pisot number, then $\text{Per}(\beta) = \mathbb{Q}(\beta)$ which follows by a similar proof as in [9, 26]. Especially $\mathcal{S}$ is sofic when $\beta$ is a Pisot number.

Following [15], we say that $\beta$ has the *symmetric finiteness property* if

$$\text{Fin}(\beta) = \mathbb{Z}[\beta^{-1}].$$

(SF)

A similar proof as in [15] allows us to show, that if $\beta$ has the property (SF), then $\beta$ is a Pisot number. Moreover the weaker condition $\mathbb{Z} \cap [0, \infty) \subset \text{Fin}(\beta)$ implies the same fact (cf. [3]). For symmetric SRS, we can show:

**Theorem 3.7** Let $\beta$ be a Pisot number with the minimal polynomial $X^d - a_1X^{d-1} - \cdots - a_d$. Set

$$r_{d-j+1} = \frac{a_j}{\beta} + \frac{a_{j+1}}{\beta^2} + \cdots + \frac{a_d}{\beta^{d-j+1}} \quad \text{for } 2 \leq j \leq d.$$

Then $\beta$ has the property (SF) if and only if $\mathbf{r} = (r_1, \ldots, r_{d-1}) \in \mathcal{D}_{d-1}^0$.

This is merely a reformulation of [4, Theorem 2.1] originally due to Hollander [16]. Using (1.5) and Theorems 5.2 and 3.7, we can show:

**Theorem 3.8**

1. The quadratic Pisot number $\beta$ with the minimal polynomial $X^2 - aX - b$ has the property (SF), if and only if

$$-\frac{1}{2} < \frac{b}{\beta} \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

2. The cubic Pisot number $\beta$ with the minimal polynomial $X^3 - AX^2 - BX - C$ has the property (SF), if and only if

$$-\frac{C}{\beta} - \frac{1}{2} < \frac{B}{\beta} \leq \frac{C}{\beta} + \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{C}{\beta} < \frac{1}{2}.$$

The first statement is an application of (1.5) and Theorem 3.7 with $d = 2$, $r_1 = b/\beta$. The second statement follows from Theorems 5.2 and 3.7 with $d = 3$, $r_1 = C/\beta$ and $r_2 = B/\beta + C/\beta^2$. Note that $C/\beta \neq \frac{1}{2}$ since $C$ is an integer.

In both quadratic and cubic cases of Theorem 3.8, each right inequality can not be an equality, taking the degree of $\beta$ into consideration.

**Example 3.9** $(x^3 - 3x^2 - 2x - 1, \{-2, -1, 0, 1, 2\})$ has the property (SF) since $(0.276, 0.627) \in \mathcal{D}_2^0$ in Figure 1. We have $\mathbf{d}(-1/2) = ((-2)1(-1)(-1)111)^d$ and for example

$$\mathbf{d}(\beta^2 - 4\beta + 1) = (-1)(-1).$$
On the other hand, \((x^3 - 3x^2 - 3x - 1, \{-2, -1, 0, 1, 2\})\) does not have the property (SF), since \((0.260, 0.847) \not\in D_2^d\). We have \(d(-1/2) = ((-2)011)^\omega\) and \(d(\beta^2 - 4\beta + 1) = (2(-2))^\omega\). Both of them are of finite type by Theorem 3.6.

Theorem 3.8 is substantially stronger than the one in [3] where the cubic Pisot units with (F) are classified. The characterisation problem of cubic Pisot numbers with (F) is still open for the usual \(\beta\)-expansion. Some partial answers for this problem are given in [5].

4 Basic properties of symmetric SRS

Let us first study \(D_d\). For \(r = (r_1, \ldots, r_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d\), let

\[
R(r) = \begin{pmatrix}
0 & 1 & 0 & \ldots & 0 \\
\vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\
\vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\
0 & \ldots & \ldots & 0 & 1 \\
-r_1 & -r_2 & \ldots & -r_{d-1} & -r_d
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

For \(M \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}\), denote by \(\varrho(M)\) the spectral radius of \(M\), i.e., the maximum absolute value of all eigenvalues of \(M\). For any \(\delta > \varrho(M)\), we can fix a vector norm \(\| \cdot \|_{M,\delta}\) with \(\|Mv\|_{M,\delta} \leq \delta\|v\|_{M,\delta}\). For instance, if \(\| \cdot \|\) denotes the euclidean norm, then

\[
\|x\|_{M,\delta} := \max_{k=0}^\infty \left\{ \frac{1}{\delta^k} \|M^kx\| \right\}
\]

has the desired property. This maximum exists since \(\lim_{k \to \infty} \|M^kx\|/\delta^k = 0\).

For a similar definition, see the formula (3.2) of [19]. Note that \(\| \cdot \|_{M,\delta}\) depends on \(M\) and \(\delta\). For simplicity, we write

\[
\varrho(r) := \varrho(R(r)) \quad \text{and} \quad \|x\|_{r,\delta} := \|x\|_{R(r),\delta}.
\]

Let \(E_d = \{ r \in \mathbb{R}^d : \varrho(r) < 1 \}\). It is known that the closure \(\overline{E}_d\) is a regular set, i.e., the set coincides with the closure of its interior (cf. [4, Lemma 4.3]). Furthermore, \(\overline{E}_d\) coincides with \(\{ r \in \mathbb{R}^d : \varrho(r) \leq 1 \}\). Thus

\(E_d \subset D_d \subset \overline{E}_d\).
It seems to be a hard problem to characterise the set $\mathcal{D}_d \cap \partial \mathcal{E}_d$ (cf. [5]). In the non symmetric case (1.1), some partial results have been proved by Akiyama et al. [6].

Now we turn to the study of $\mathcal{D}_0^d$. Similarly as in [4], we can deduce a bound for the periodic orbits. Let $r \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\rho(r) < \delta < 1$. If $a$ is periodic for $\tau_r$, then

$$\|a\|_{r,\delta} \leq \frac{1}{2(1-\delta)} =: K.$$  

Simply by testing all $a \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ with $\|a\|_{r,\delta} \leq K$, this estimate provides an algorithm to determine whether $r \in \mathcal{E}$ is contained in $\mathcal{D}_0^d$ or not.

However, we do not use this method in the present paper because we develop an efficient alternative way. Let $e_i = (0, \ldots, 0, 1, 0, \ldots, 0)$ be the $i$-th unit vector. For a given $r = (r_1, \ldots, r_d)$, we say that a finite set $V(r) \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ is a set of witnesses for $r$, if $\{e_i, -e_i\} \subset V(r)$ for $1 \leq i \leq d$, and for each $(z_1, \ldots, z_d) \subset V(r)$, the element $(z_2, \ldots, z_{d+1})$ belongs to $V(r)$ provided that

$$-1 < r_1z_1 + \cdots + r_dz_d + z_{d+1} < 1. \quad (4.3)$$

If $\rho(r) < 1$, then $V(r)$ can be constructed by successive addition of new elements $(z_2, \ldots, z_{d+1})$. For simplicity, we write $V = V(r)$ when $r$ is fixed. Let $G(V)$ be a directed graph with vertices $V$ and edges defined by $(z_1, \ldots, z_d) \rightarrow (z_2, \ldots, z_{d+1})$ if and only if

$$-\frac{1}{2} \leq r_1z_1 + \cdots + r_dz_d + z_{d+1} < \frac{1}{2}. \quad (4.4)$$

Note that the set of vertices $V$ is exactly the same as in [4, Theorem 5.1]. However, the edges are defined in a different manner. By definition, for each vertex there exists exactly one outgoing edge.

**Theorem 4.1** Let $r \in \mathbb{R}^d$. If every walk in the graph $G(V(r))$ falls into the trivial cycle $0 \rightarrow 0$, then $r$ belongs to $\mathcal{D}_0^d$.

**Proof.** The proof is a generalisation of ideas from [4, 7, 8, 11, 12]. Let $r = (r_1, \ldots, r_d)$. We say that $a \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ is SSRS-finite, if there is a $k \geq 0$ such that $\tau^k_r(a) = 0$.

Suppose that $a$ is SSRS-finite and $b \in V$. We will prove that $a + b$ is SSRS-finite. Denote by $\tau_r(a) = (a_2, \ldots, a_{d+1})$ and $\tau_r(b) = (b_2, \ldots, b_{d+1})$. Since $a_{d+1} = -[ra + \frac{1}{2}], b_{d+1} = -[rb + \frac{1}{2}]$, we obtain

$$-\frac{1}{2} \leq r_1a_1 + \cdots + r_d a_d + a_{d+1} < \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad (4.5)$$
$$-\frac{1}{2} \leq r_1b_1 + \cdots + r_d b_d + b_{d+1} < \frac{1}{2}. \quad (4.6)$$
Thus
\[-1 \leq r_1(a_1 + b_1) + \cdots + r_d(a_d + b_d) + a_{d+1} + b_{d+1} < 1.\]

We distinguish between three cases.

(i) If $\frac{1}{2} \leq \xi$, then $0 < r_1 b_1 + \cdots + r_d b_d + b_{d+1}$ implies
\[-1 < r_1 b_1 + \cdots + r_d b_d + b_{d+1} - 1 < 1\]
and
\[-\frac{1}{2} \leq r_1(a_1 + b_1) + \cdots + r_d(a_d + b_d) + a_{d+1} + b_{d+1} - 1 < \frac{1}{2}.\]

Thus take $\eta = (b_2, \ldots, b_d, b_{d+1} - 1) \in \mathcal{V}$.

(ii) If $\xi < -\frac{1}{2}$, then $r_1 b_1 + \cdots + r_d b_d + b_{d+1} < 0$ implies
\[-1 < r_1 b_1 + \cdots + r_d b_d + b_{d+1} + 1 < 1\]
and
\[-\frac{1}{2} \leq r_1(a_1 + b_1) + \cdots + r_d(a_d + b_d) + a_{d+1} + b_{d+1} + 1 < \frac{1}{2}.\]

In this case, we take $\eta = (b_2, \ldots, b_d, b_{d+1} + 1) \in \mathcal{V}$.

(iii) If $-\frac{1}{2} \leq \xi < \frac{1}{2}$, then take $\eta = (b_2, \ldots, b_d, b_{d+1}) \in \mathcal{V}$.

Therefore, in any case, there exists $\eta \in \mathcal{V}$ such that $\tau_r(a + b) = \tau_r(a) + \eta$ with $\eta =: \eta^{(1)} \in \mathcal{V}$. Repeating this argument, we find that
\[\tau_r^k(a + b) = \tau_r^k(a) + \eta^{(k)}\]
with $\eta^{(k)} \in \mathcal{V}$. Since $a$ is SSRS-finite, there is a $k$ such that $\tau_r^k(a) = \mathbf{0}$. By the assumption of the Theorem, we conclude that $a + b$ is SSRS-finite. Since $\mathcal{V}$ contains the $i$-th unit vectors, the proof is finished. \qed

The set $\mathcal{D}^0_d$ can be constructed from $\mathcal{D}_d$ by cutting out countable many families of convex polyhedra. The following technique was developed in [4, 16, 25]. Consider a finite sequence $a_1, \ldots, a_L$ of integers. Define $a_j$ ($j \in \mathbb{Z}$) by periodicity $a_j = a_{j+L}$. This gives a periodic bi-infinite word designated by $\pi = [a_1, \ldots, a_L]^\infty \in \mathbb{Z}^\mathbb{Z}$ which is called a cycle of length $L$. We define the set:

\[P(\pi) = \{ \mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{R}^d : -\frac{1}{2} \leq r_1 a_{1+j} + \cdots + r_d a_{d+j} + a_{d+j+1} < \frac{1}{2} \text{ for } j \in \mathbb{Z} \}. \]
Since each of these inequalities gives an upper (resp. lower) halfspace in \( \mathbb{R}^d \), the system (4.7) defines a (possibly degenerated) convex polyhedron. A cycle \( \pi = [a_1, \ldots, a_d]^\infty \) of period \( L \) is called primitive, \(^5\) if the vectors \((a_{1+j}, \ldots, a_{d+j})\) are pairwise different for \( j = 0, \ldots, L-1 \). Using this terminology, we trivially have

\[
D^0_d = D_d \setminus \bigcup_{\pi} P(\pi),
\]

where \( \pi \) runs through all non zero primitive cycles \( \pi = [a_1, \ldots, a_L]^\infty \) of arbitrary length. Unfortunately since the set of periods is infinite, this expression is far from being practical.

As an analogy of Theorem 5.2 in [4], the next theorem gives an efficient algorithm for a closed set \( H \subset E_d \) to construct \( H \cap D^0_d \). The basic idea is to collect and merge all possible graphs \( G(V(r)) \) which correspond to points \( r \in H \). This allows us to apply Theorem 4.1 not only for a single point \( r \) but also for the set \( H \). The proof given below is rewritten from the one in [4] in order to make clearer the convergence of the algorithm.

**Theorem 4.2** Let \( r_1, \ldots, r_k \in D_d \) and let \( H \) be the convex hull of \( r_1, \ldots, r_k \). Assume that \( H \) is contained in the interior of \( D_d \) and sufficiently small in diameter. Then there exists an algorithm to construct a finite directed graph \( G = (V, E) \) with vertices \( V \subset \mathbb{Z}^d \) and edges \( E \subset V \times V \) which satisfy

(i) \( \pm e_i \in V \) for all \( i = 1, \ldots, d \),

(ii) \( G(V(s)) \) is a subgraph of \( G \) for all \( s \in H \),

(iii) \( H \cap D^0_d = H \setminus \bigcup_{\pi} P(\pi) \), where \( \pi \) are taken over all nonzero primitive cycles of \( G \).

**Proof.** For \( z \in \mathbb{Z}^d \), let

\[
m(z) = \min_{1 \leq i \leq k} \{-[r_i, z]\}, \quad M(z) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq k} \{-[r_i, z]\},
\]

\[
\xi_1(z) = \min\{m(z), -M(-z)\}, \quad \xi_2(z) = \max\{-m(-z), M(z)\}.
\]

Set \( V_1 = \{\pm e_i : i = 1, \ldots, n\} \) and define inductively \(^6\)

\[
V_{i+1} = V_i \cup \{(z_2, \ldots, z_d, j) : z = (z_1, \ldots, z_d) \in V_i \text{ and } j \in [\xi_1(z), \xi_2(z)] \cap \mathbb{Z}\}.
\]

\(^5\)Remark that this definition depends on the dimension \( d \).

\(^6\)In fact, \( \xi_1(z) = -M(-z) \) and \( \xi_2(z) = M(z) \) always hold. See [4].
Assume for the moment that there exists a finite limit set \( V = \bigcup_i V_i \), i.e., there exists \( i \) with \( V_{i+1} = V_i : = V \). Draw edges
\[
z = (z_1, \ldots, z_d) \to (z_2, \ldots, z_d, j)
\]
according to the SSRS algorithm, i.e.,
\[
\min_{1 \leq i \leq k} \{-\lfloor r_i z + \frac{1}{2} \rfloor\} \leq j \leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq k} \{-\lfloor r_i z + \frac{1}{2} \rfloor\}.
\]
We claim that this finite graph \( G := (V, E) \) has the desired properties.

In fact, the condition (i) is trivial. For \( s \in H \), the graph \( G(V(s)) \) was given by the algorithm:
\[
\begin{align*}
V_1(s) &= \{e_i, -e_i : i = 1, \ldots, n\} \\
V_{i+1}(s) &= V_i(s) \cup \{(z_2, \ldots, z_d, j) : z = (z_1, \ldots, z_d) \in V_i(s) \text{ and } -1 < sz + j < 1\}
\end{align*}
\]
together with the corresponding edges. The inequality \(-1 < sz + j < 1\) only gives
\[
j \in [\xi_1(z), \xi_2(z)] \cap \mathbb{Z}
\]
since \( s \) is a convex linear combination of \( r_i \)'s. Hence we see that \( G(V(s)) \) is a subgraph of \( G \) which shows the property (ii). Now let us prove (iii).

Obviously
\[
H \setminus \bigcup_{\pi} P(\pi) \supset H \cap D_d^0.
\]
Take \( r \in H \setminus D_d^0 \). In view of Theorem 4.1 since \( H \subset D_d \), there exists a non zero primitive cycle \( \pi \) in \( G(V(r)) \) and \( r \in P(\pi) \). By using (ii), \( \pi \) is a non zero primitive cycle of \( (V, E) \) as well. This shows that
\[
r \notin H \setminus \bigcup_{\pi} P(\pi)
\]
which proves the claim.

Finally it remains to show the existence of \( i \) with \( V_{i+1} = V_i \), i.e., the convergence of our procedure, provided the diameter of \( H \) is sufficiently small.

According to (4.1), we start with an arbitrary point \( r \in E_d \) with \( \rho(r) < \delta < 1 \) and choose a norm \( \| \cdot \|_r, \delta \), such that \( R(r) \) is contractive. For a matrix \( M \), the same symbol \( \| M \|_r, \delta \) stands for the operator norm, that is,
\[
\| M \|_r, \delta = \sup_{v \neq 0} \frac{\| Mv \|_r, \delta}{\| v \|_r, \delta}.
\]
Take \( H \) small enough such that \( r \in H \) and for any \( s \in H \), we have
\[
\| R(s) - R(r) \|_r, \delta < \delta_1 < 1 - \delta.
\]
This is possible since \( \| \cdot \|_{r, \delta} \) is continuous. Put \( \delta_2 = \delta_1 + \delta < 1 \). Then, by induction, for any \( s, v \in \mathbb{R}^d \), we have
\[
\| R(s_k) \cdots R(s_2)R(s_1)v \|_{r, \delta} < \delta_2^k \| v \|_{r, \delta}.
\] (4.8)

Since \( j \in [\xi_1(z), \xi_2(z)] \cap \mathbb{Z} \), the mapping \( (z_1, \ldots, z_d) \rightarrow (z_2, \ldots, z_d, j) \) is given by
\[
(z_2, \ldots, z_d, j)^t = R(s)(z_1, \ldots, z_d)^t + u
\]
with \( \| u \| \leq \frac{1}{2} \) and \( s \in H \). Successive applications of this mapping yield elements of the form
\[
R(s_k) \cdots R(s_1)(z_1, \ldots, z_d)^t + R(s_k) \cdots R(s_2)u_1 + R(s_k) \cdots R(s_d)u_2 + \ldots + u_k
\]
with bounded \( u_i \)'s. By using the estimate (4.8), the set \( V_i \) \((i = 1, 2, \ldots)\) must be uniformly bounded. Thus there exists \( i \) such that \( V_i = V_{i+1} \).

This algorithm is quite sensitive to the choice of the initial convex hull \( H \). Let us denote by \( G(H) \) the corresponding graph by this algorithm. (It might be an infinite graph.) If the convex hull \( H \) is subdivided into several convex hulls \( \bigcup H_i \), then \( G(H) \supset \bigcup_i G(H_i) \) but it is usually not equal. For example, let \( d = 2 \) and \( H_i \) \((i = 1, 2)\) be segments from \((\frac{1}{2}, 0)\) to \((\frac{1}{2}, 1)\) and from \((\frac{1}{2}, 0)\) to \((\frac{1}{2}, -1)\). Then \( G(H_1 \cup H_2) \) is infinite\(^7\) since one can easily show that \((n-1, n) \in V_{n+1} \) for \( n \geq 2 \), but both \( G(H_i) \) are finite graphs with 19 vertices. Especially \( G(H) \) is usually larger than \( \bigcup_{r \in H} G(V(r)) \). Therefore subdivision of the initial convex hull \( H \) is meaningful not only by the requirement of Theorem 4.2 but also from the computational point of view. Even if we get a finite graph \( G(H) \) given by the algorithm, further subdivision of \( H \) may drastically help us to create smaller graphs. This is practically important since it is hard to list up all the primitive cycles out of a large graph.

Since for each compact set \( A \subset E_d \) we can find a finite covering of \( A \) by sufficiently small convex hulls containing open balls, Theorem 4.2 theoretically gives an algorithm to construct \( A \cap D^d_0 \). The clue of convergence is the smallness of \( H \) with respect to the norm \( \| \cdot \|_{r, \delta} \). This criterion is not easily checked. However from the proof, \( H \) must be smaller if it is located closer to the boundary \( \partial E_d \) since \( \delta \) becomes larger. When implementing Theorem 4.2 in a computer language equipped with interruption, there is no need to care on the smallness of \( H \). Perform ‘trial and error’. If we get a finite graph \( G(H) \), then we are ready. If the graph grows too large, then interrupt and restart with a smaller \( H \).

\(^7\)This also shows the necessity of subdivision in the proof of Theorem 5.2.
5 Two dimensional symmetric SRS

In this section, we give a complete description of $\mathcal{D}_2^0$. We already know that

$$D_2 \subset \Delta := (E_2)^\omega = \{ (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x \leq 1, |y| \leq x + 1 \}.$$ 

First we show

**Proposition 5.1** $D_2^0 \subset \Delta_2 := \{ (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x \leq \frac{1}{2}, |y| \leq x + \frac{1}{2} \}$.

**Proof.** We give cycle $\pi$’s so that $F = \Delta \setminus \Delta_2$ is completely covered by the cutout $P(\pi)$’s. The purpose is almost fulfilled by the following five cycles.

- $\pi_1 = [-1]^{\infty}$ gives $P(\pi_1) = \{ (x, y) : -\frac{3}{2} < y + x \leq -\frac{1}{2} \}$.
- $\pi_2 = [1, -1]^{\infty}$ gives $P(\pi_2) = \{ (x, y) : \frac{1}{2} < y - x < \frac{3}{2} \}$.
- $\pi_3 = [-1, 0, 1]^{\infty}$ gives $P(\pi_3) = \{ (x, y) : \frac{1}{2} < x \leq \frac{3}{2}, \frac{1}{2} \leq y < \frac{3}{2}, -\frac{1}{2} < y - x \leq \frac{1}{2} \}$.
- $\pi_4 = [0, -1, 0, 1]^{\infty}$ gives $P(\pi_4) = \{ (x, y) : \frac{1}{2} < x < \frac{3}{2}, -\frac{1}{2} < y < \frac{1}{2} \}$.
- $\pi_5 = [1, 1, 0, -1, -1, 0]^{\infty}$ gives $P(\pi_5) = \{ (x, y) : \frac{1}{2} < x < \frac{3}{2}, -\frac{1}{2} < y < -\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2} < y + x < \frac{1}{2} \}$.

Then

$$F \setminus \left( \bigcup_{i=1}^{5} P(\pi_i) \right) = \{ (1, \frac{1}{2}), (1, \frac{3}{2}) \} \cup \{ (x, y) : \frac{1}{2} < x \leq 1, y = -\frac{1}{2} \} := M.$$ 

It is easily proved that

$$\begin{align*}
(1, \frac{1}{2}) &= P([0, 1, -1, -1, 1, 0, -1]^{\infty}), \\
(1, \frac{3}{2}) &= P([0, 1, -2, -1, -1, 2, -2, 1, 0, -1, 1, -1]^{\infty}), \\
M &= P([0, 1, 0, -1, -1]^{\infty}).
\end{align*}$$

□

**Theorem 5.2** Define two segments by $L_1 = \{ (x, y) : |x| \leq \frac{1}{2}, y = -x - \frac{1}{2} \}$ and $L_2 = \{ (\frac{1}{2}, y) : \frac{1}{2} < y < 1 \}$. Then $\mathcal{D}_2^0 = \frac{A}{2} \setminus (L_1 \cup L_2)$. 
Proof. In light of Proposition 5.1, we subdivide the triangle $\Delta_3$ into small ones and apply Theorem 4.2. Let $T(a, b, c)$ be the triangle of vertices $a, b$ and $c$. Applying Theorem 4.2 for $\Delta_3 = T((-\frac{1}{2}, 0), (0, -\frac{1}{2}), (0, \frac{1}{2}))$, the associated graph $(V_1, E_1)$ is given by

$$V_1 = \{(0, 1), (1, 0), (0, -1), (-1, 0), (-1, -1), (1, -1), (0, 0), (-1, 1), (1, 1)\}$$

and

$$E_1 = \{(-1, -1) \rightarrow (-1, -1), (-1, -1) \rightarrow (-1, 0), (0, -1) \rightarrow (-1, -1), (0, 1) \rightarrow (1, 1), (0, 0) \rightarrow (0, 0), (1, 0) \rightarrow (0, 0), (1, -1) \rightarrow (1, 1), (-1, -1) \rightarrow (-1, 0), (1, 1) \rightarrow (1, -1), (0, 1) \rightarrow (0, -1)\}.$$ 

This graph has exactly one non-trivial strongly connected component (cf. Figure 2):

$$(-1, -1) \leftrightarrow (-1, -1) \leftrightarrow (-1, 0) \leftrightarrow (0, -1) \rightarrow (0, 1) \rightarrow (1, 1).$$

This yields three primitive cycles: $\pi_1 = [-1]^\infty$, $\theta_1 = [0, -1]^\infty$ and $\theta_2 = [-1, -1, 0]^\infty$. Since

$$\begin{align*}
P(\pi_1) &= \{(x, y) : -\frac{3}{2} < x + y \leq -\frac{1}{2}\}, \\
P(\theta_1) &= \{(x, y) : -\frac{1}{2} < y \leq \frac{1}{2}, -\frac{3}{2} < x \leq -\frac{1}{2}\} \quad \text{and} \\
P(\theta_2) &= \emptyset,
\end{align*}$$

we have shown that $\Delta_1 \cap D_2^0 = \Delta_1 \setminus L_1$.

We proceed in a similar manner with

$$\begin{align*}
\Delta_2 &= T((\frac{1}{2}, 0), (0, -\frac{1}{2}), (0, \frac{1}{2})) \\
\Delta_3 &= T((\frac{1}{2}, 0), (0, \frac{1}{2}), (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})) \\
\Delta_4 &= T((\frac{1}{2}, 1), (0, \frac{1}{2}), (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})) \\
\Delta_5 &= T((\frac{1}{2}, 0), (0, -\frac{1}{2}), (\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2})) \\
\Delta_6 &= T((\frac{1}{2}, -1), (0, -\frac{1}{2}), (\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2})).
\end{align*}$$

The corresponding graphs $(V_i, E_i)$ ($i = 2, \ldots, 6$) are depicted in Figures 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7.

The triangle $\Delta_2$ only gives $\pi_1$ which shows $\Delta_2 \cap D_2^0 = \Delta_2 \setminus L_1$. The triangle $\Delta_3$ gives rise to the primitive cycle $[-1, -1, 1]^\infty$. Since $P([-1, -1, 1]^\infty) = \emptyset$,

\footnote{The 0-cycle always forms a single component.}
we have $\Delta_3 \subset D_2^0$. The triangle $\Delta_4$ only gives $\theta_3 = [0, -1, 1]_\infty$ and $P(\theta_3) = \{(x, y) : \frac{1}{2} \leq x < \frac{3}{2}, \frac{1}{2} < y \leq \frac{3}{2}, -\frac{1}{2} \leq y - x < \frac{1}{2}\}$. Thus we have $\Delta_4 \cap D_2^0 = \Delta_4 \setminus L_2$. Both $\Delta_5$ and $\Delta_6$ only give $\pi_1$. Thus $(\Delta_5 \cup \Delta_6) \setminus L_1 \subset D_2^0$.

Summing up, we have shown the result. □

**Remark 5.3** The referee pointed out that in the last proof, several regions could be merged like $\Delta_3 \cup \Delta_4$ and $\Delta_1 \cup \Delta_2 \cup \Delta_5 \cup \Delta_6$ to obtain the same result. This comment is correct and we will have two larger graphs with 19 vertices. As we discussed the end of §4, this algorithm is rather sensitive to the choice of subdivisions and under this choice we have to study all primitive cycles in these new graphs. This may be finished automatically by computer. However by our choice, the graphs are smaller and all computation can be confirmed possibly by hand. The reader may easily list up all primitive cycles by observing the graphs listed below. In this sense, we believe that our choice is more handy than the suggestion by the referee.
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Figure 2: The graph \((V_1, E_1)\).

Figure 3: The graph \((V_2, E_2)\).
Figure 4: The graph \((V_3, E_3)\).

Figure 5: The graph \((V_4, E_4)\).

Figure 6: The graph \((V_5, E_5)\).
Figure 7: The graph $(V_6, E_6)$.
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