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1 Introduction

This contribution is devoted to the study of positional numeration systems with negative base introduced by Ito and Sadahiro in 2009, called \((−β)\)-expansions. We give an admissibility criterion for more general case of \((−β)\)-expansions and discuss the properties of the set of \((−β)\)-integers, denoted by \(\mathbb{Z}_{−β}\). We give a description of distances within \(\mathbb{Z}_{−β}\) and show that this set can be coded by an infinite word over an infinite alphabet, which is a fixed point of a non-erasing non-trivial morphism.

2 Numeration with negative base

In 1957, Rényi introduced positional numeration system with positive real base \(β > 1\) (see [7]). The \(β\)-expansion of \(x \in [0,1)\) is defined as the digit string \(d_β(x) = 0 \bullet x_1x_2x_3 \cdots\), where

\[
x_i = ⌊β^{T_β^{-1}}(x)⌋,
\]

and \(T_β(x) = βx − \lfloor βx \rfloor\).

It holds that

\[
x = \frac{x_1}{β} + \frac{x_2}{β^2} + \frac{x_3}{β^3} + \cdots.
\]

Note that this definition can be naturally extended so that any real number has a unique \(β\)-expansion, which is usually denoted \(d_β(x) = x_0x_1x_2 \cdots x_{−1}x_{−2} \cdots\), where \(\bullet\), the fractional point, separates negative and non-negative powers of \(β\). In analogy with standard integer base, the set \(\mathbb{Z}_β\) of \(β\)-integers is defined as the set of real numbers having the \(β\)-expansion of the form \(d_β(x) = x_0x_{−1} \cdots x_{−k} \bullet 0_0\).

\((−β)\)-expansions, a numeration system built in analogy with Rényi \(β\)-expansions, was introduced in 2009 by Ito and Sadahiro (see [5]). They gave a lexicographic criterion for deciding whether some digit string is the \((−β)\)-expansion of some \(x\) and also described several properties of \((−β)\)-expansions concerning symbolic dynamics and ergodic theory. Note that dynamical properties of \((−β)\)-expansions were also studied by Frougny and Lai (see [4]). We take the liberty of defining \((−β)\)-expansions in a more general way, while an analogy with positive base numeration can still be easily seen.

**Definition 1.** Let \(−β < −1\) be a base and consider \(x \in [l,l+1)\), where \(l \in \mathbb{R}\) is arbitrary fixed. We define the \((−β)\)-expansion of \(x\) as the digit string \(d(x) = x_1x_2x_3 \cdots\), with digits \(x_i\) given by

\[
x_i = [−βT_β^{-1}(x) − l],
\]

where \(T(x)\) stands for the generalised \((−β)\)-transformation

\[
T : [l,l+1) → [l,l+1), \quad T(x) = −βx − [−βx − l].
\]
It holds that
\[ x = \frac{x_1}{-\beta} + \frac{x_2}{(-\beta)^2} + \frac{x_3}{(-\beta)^3} + \cdots \]
and the fractional point is again used in the notation, \( d(x) = 0 \cdot x_1x_2x_3 \cdots \).

The set of digits used in \((-\beta)\)-expansions of numbers (in the latter referred to as the alphabet of \((-\beta)\)-expansions) depends on the choice of \( l \) and can be calculated directly from (1) as
\[ \mathcal{A}_{-\beta, l} = \{-l(1+\beta) - \beta, \ldots, -l(1+\beta)\} . \]  

We may demand that the numeration system possesses various properties. Let us summarise the most natural ones:

- The most common requirement is that zero is an allowed digit. We see that \( 0 \in \mathcal{A}_{-\beta, l} \) is equivalent to \( 0 \in [l, l+1) \) and consequently \( l \in (-1,0) \). Note that this implies \( d(0) = 0 \cdot 0^{d_0} \).
- We may require that \( \mathcal{A}_{-\beta, l} = \{0,1,\ldots, \lfloor \beta \rfloor \} \). This is equivalent to the choice \( l \in \left(-\frac{|\beta|+1}{\beta} , -\frac{\beta}{\beta+1}) \).
- So far, \((-\beta)\)-expansions were defined only for numbers from \([l, l+1)\). In Rényi numeration, the \( \beta \)-expansion of arbitrary \( x \in \mathbb{R}^+ \) (expansions of negative numbers differ only by "-" sign) is defined as \( d_\beta (x) = x_kx_{k-1}\cdots x_0 \cdot x_{-1}x_{-2} \cdots \), where \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) satisfies \( \frac{k}{\beta^k} \in [l, l+1) \) and \( d_\beta \left( \frac{k}{\beta^k} \right) = 0 \cdot x_kx_{k-1}\cdots \). The same procedure does not work for \((-\beta)\)-expansions in general. A necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of unique \( d(x) \) for all \( x \in \mathbb{R} \) is that \( -\frac{1}{\beta} [l, l+1) \subset [l, l+1) \).
This is equivalent to the choice \( l \in \left(-\frac{\beta}{\beta+1} , -\frac{1}{\beta+1}) \). Note that this choice is disjoint with the previous one, so one cannot have uniqueness of \((-\beta)\)-expansions and non-negative digits bounded by \( \beta \) at the same time.

Let us stress that in the following we will need 0 to be a valid digit. Therefore, we shall always assume \( l \in (-1,0) \). Note that we may easily derive that the digits in the alphabet \( \mathcal{A}_{-\beta, l} \) are then bounded by \( |\beta| \) in modulus.

### 3 Admissibility

In Rényi numeration there is a natural correspondence between ordering on real numbers and lexicographic ordering on their \( \beta \)-expansions. In \((-\beta)\)-expansions, standard lexicographic ordering is not suitable anymore, hence a different ordering on digit strings is needed.

The so-called alternate order was used in the admissibility condition by Ito and Sadahiro and it will work also in the general case. Let us recall the definition. For the strings
\[ u, v \in (\mathcal{A}_{-\beta, l})^\mathbb{N}, \quad u = u_1u_2u_3 \cdots \quad \text{and} \quad v = v_1v_2v_3 \cdots \]
we say that \( u \prec_{alt} v \) (\( u \) is less than \( v \) in the alternate order) if \( u_m(1)^m < v_m(-1)^m \), where \( m = \min \{ k \in \mathbb{N} \mid u_k \neq v_k \} \). Note that standard ordering between reals in \([l, l+1)\) corresponds to the alternate order on their respective \((-\beta)\)-expansions.

**Definition 2.** An infinite string \( x_1x_2x_3 \cdots \) of integers is called \((-\beta)\)-admissible (or just admissible), if there exists an \( x \in [l, l+1) \) such that \( x_1x_2x_3 \cdots \) is its \((-\beta)\)-expansion, i.e. \( x_1x_2x_3 \cdots = d(x) \).

We give the criterion for \((-\beta)\)-admissibility (proven in [2]) in a form similar to both Parry lexicographic condition (see [6]) and Ito-Sadahiro admissibility criterion (see [5]).
Theorem 3. (2) An infinite string \(x_1x_2x_3\cdots\) of integers is \((-\beta)\)-admissible, if and only if
\[
l_1l_2l_3\cdots \preceq_{alt} x_{i+1}x_{i+2}\cdots \preceq_{alt} r_1r_2r_3\cdots, \quad \text{for all } i \geq 1,
\]
where \(l_1l_2l_3\cdots = d(l)\) and \(r_1r_2r_3\cdots = d^*(l+1) = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0^+} d(l+1-\epsilon)\).

Remark 4. Ito and Sadahiro have described the admissibility condition for their numeration system considered with \(l = -\frac{\beta}{\beta+1}\). This choice imply for any \(\beta\) the alphabet of the form \(\mathcal{A}_{-\beta, l} = \{0, 1, \ldots, \lfloor \beta \rfloor \}\). They have shown that in this case the reference strings used in the condition in Theorem 3 (i.e. \(d(l) = l_1l_2l_3\cdots\) and \(d^*(l+1) = r_1r_2r_3\cdots\)) are related in the following way:
\[
r_1r_2r_3\cdots = 0l_1l_2l_3\cdots
\]
if \(d(l)\) is not purely periodic with odd period length, and,
\[
r_1r_2r_3\cdots = (0l_1l_2\cdots l_q(l_q-1))^\omega
\]
if \(d(l) = (l_1l_2\cdots l_q)^\omega\), where \(q\) is odd.

Remark 5. Besides Ito-Sadahiro case and the general one, we may consider another interesting example, the choice \(l = -\frac{1}{2}\), \(\beta \notin 2\mathbb{Z} + 1\). This leads to a numeration defined on “almost symmetric” interval \([-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})\) with symmetric alphabet
\[
\mathcal{A}_{-\beta, -\frac{1}{2}} = \left\{ \left\lfloor \frac{\beta+1}{2} \right\rfloor, \ldots, 1, 0, 1, \ldots, \left\lfloor \frac{\beta+1}{2} \right\rfloor \right\}
\]
Note that we use the notation \((-a) = \overline{a}\) for shorter writing of negative digits. If we denote the reference strings as usual, i.e. \(d\left(-\frac{1}{2}\right) = l_1l_2l_3\cdots\) and \(d^*(\frac{1}{2}) = r_1r_2r_3\cdots\), the following relation can be shown:
\[
r_1r_2r_3\cdots = l_1l_2l_3\cdots
\]
if \(d(l)\) is not purely periodic with odd period length, and,
\[
r_1r_2r_3\cdots = (l_1l_2\cdots l_q(l_q-1)l_1l_2\cdots l_{q-1}(l_{q-1}-1))^\omega
\]
if \(d(l) = (l_1l_2\cdots l_q)^\omega\), where \(q\) is odd.

4 \((-\beta)\)-integers

We have already discussed basic properties of \((-\beta)\)-expansions and the question of admissibility of digit strings. In the following, \((-\beta)\)-admissibility will be used to define the set of \((-\beta)\)-integers.

Let us define a “value function” \(\gamma\). Consider a finite digit string \(x_{k-1} \cdots x_1x_0\), then \(\gamma(x_{k-1}, \cdots x_1x_0) = \Sigma_{i=0}^{k-1} x_i(-\beta)^i\).

Definition 6. We call \(x \in \mathbb{R}\) a \((-\beta)\)-integer, if there exists a \((-\beta)\)-admissible digit string \(x_kx_{k-1}\cdots x_00^\omega\) such that \(d(x) = x_kx_{k-1}\cdots x_1x_0\cdot 0^\omega\). The set of \((-\beta)\)-integers is then defined as
\[
\mathbb{Z}_{-\beta} = \{ x \in \mathbb{R} \mid x = \gamma(a_{k-1}a_{k-2}\cdots a_1a_0), \ a_{k-1}a_{k-2}\cdots a_1a_00^\omega \text{ is } (-\beta)\text{-admissible}, \}
\]
or equivalently
\[
\mathbb{Z}_{-\beta} = \bigcup_{i \geq 0} (-\beta)^i T^{-i}(0).
\]
Note that \((-\beta)\)-expansions of real numbers are not necessarily unique. As was said before, uniqueness holds if and only if \(l \in \left( -\frac{\beta}{\beta+1}, -\frac{1}{\beta+1} \right) \). Let us demonstrate this ambiguity on the following example.

**Example 7.** Let \(\beta\) be the greater root of the polynomial \(x^2 - 2x - 1\), i.e. \(\beta = 1 + \sqrt{2}\), and let \([l, l+1) = \left(-\frac{\beta}{\beta+1}, \frac{1}{\beta+1}\right)\). Note that \([l, l+1)\) is not invariant under division by \((-\beta)\).

If we want to find the \((-\beta)\)-expansion of number \(x \not\in [l, l+1)\), we have to find such \(k \in \mathbb{N}\) that \(\frac{x}{(-\beta)^k} \in [l, l+1)\), compute \(d\left(\frac{x}{(-\beta)^k}\right)\) by definition and then shift the fractional point by \(k\) positions to the right. The problem is that, in general, different choices of the exponent \(k\) may give different \((-\beta)\)-admissible digit strings which all represent the same number \(x\).

Let us find possible \((-\beta)\)-expansions of 1. It can be shown that \(\frac{1}{(-\beta)^k} \in [l, l+1)\) if and only if \(k \in \mathbb{N}\setminus\{0, 2, 4, 6, 8\}\) and there are 5 \((-\beta)\)-admissible digit strings representing 1, computed from \((-\beta)\)-expansions of \(\frac{1}{(-\beta)^k}\) for \(k = 1, 3, 5, 7, 9\) respectively:

\[
1 \cdot 0^\omega = 120 \cdot 0^\omega = 13210 \cdot 0^\omega = 132210 \cdot 0^\omega = 13222210 \cdot 0^\omega.
\]

Let us mention some straightforward observations on the properties of \(\mathbb{Z}_{-\beta}\):

- \(\mathbb{Z}_{-\beta}\) is nonempty if and only if \(0 \in \mathcal{A}_{-\beta,l}\), i.e. if and only if \(l \in (-1, 0]\).
- The definition implies \(-\beta \mathbb{Z}_{-\beta} \subset \mathbb{Z}_{-\beta}\).
- A phenomenon unseen in Rényi numeration arises, there are cases when the set of \((-\beta)\)-integers is trivial, i.e. when \(\mathbb{Z}_{-\beta} = \{0\}\). This happens if and only if both numbers \(\frac{1}{\beta}\) and \(-\frac{1}{\beta}\) are outside of the interval \([l, l+1)\). This can be reformulated as

\[
\mathbb{Z}_{-\beta} = \{0\} \iff \beta < -\frac{1}{l} \text{ and } \beta \leq \frac{1}{l+1},
\]

and it can be seen that the strictest limitation for \(\beta\) arises when \(l = -\frac{1}{2}\). This implies for any choice of \(l \in \mathbb{R}\):

\[
\mathbb{Z}_{-\beta} \neq \emptyset \text{ and } \beta \geq 2 \Rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{-\beta} \supseteq \{0\}.
\]

- It holds that \(\mathbb{Z}_{-\beta} = \mathbb{Z}\) if and only if \(\beta \in \mathbb{N}\).

**Remark 8.** As was shown in Example 7 in a completely general case of \((-\beta)\)-expansions, there is a problem with ambiguity. Because of this, in the following we shall limit ourselves to the choice \(l \in \left[ -\frac{\beta}{\beta+1}, -\frac{1}{\beta+1} \right)\). Note that we allow Ito-Sadahiro case \(l = -\frac{\beta}{\beta+1}\), which also contains ambiguities, but only in countably many cases, which can be avoided by introducing a notion of strong \((-\beta)\)-admissibility.

**Definition 9.** Let \(x_1x_2x_3\cdots \in \mathcal{A}_{-\beta,l}\). We say that

\[
x_1x_2x_3\cdots \text{ is strongly } (-\beta)\text{-admissible} \quad \text{if} \quad 0x_1x_2x_3\cdots \text{ is } (-\beta)\text{-admissible}.
\]

**Remark 10.** Note that if \(l \in \left( -\frac{\beta}{\beta+1}, -\frac{1}{\beta+1} \right)\), the notions of strong admissibility and admissibility coincide. In the case \(l = -\frac{\beta}{\beta+1}\), the only numbers with non-unique expansions are those of the form \((-\beta)^k l\), which have exactly two possible expansions using digit strings \(l_1l_2l_3\cdots\) and \(1l_1l_2l_3\cdots\). While both are \((-\beta)\)-admissible, only the latter is also strongly \((-\beta)\)-admissible.
In order to describe distances between adjacent \((-\beta)\)-integers, we will study ordering of finite digit strings in the alternate order. Denote by \(\mathcal{S}(k)\) the set of infinite \((-\beta)\)-admissible digit strings such that erasing a prefix of length \(k\) yields \(0^{\infty}\), i.e. for \(k \geq 0\), we have

\[
\mathcal{S}(k) = \{a_{k-1}a_{k-2}\cdots a_00^{\infty} \mid a_{k-1}a_{k-2}\cdots a_00^{\infty} \text{ is } (-\beta)\text{-admissible}\},
\]

in particular \(\mathcal{S}(0) = \{0^{\infty}\}\). For a fixed \(k\), the set \(\mathcal{S}(k)\) is finite. Denote by \(\text{Max}(k)\) the string \(a_{k-1}a_{k-2}\cdots a_00^{\infty}\) which is maximal in \(\mathcal{S}(k)\) with respect to the alternate order and by \(\text{max}(k)\) its prefix of length \(k\), i.e. \(\text{Max}(k) = \text{max}(k)0^{\infty}\). Similarly, we define \(\text{Min}(k)\) and \(\text{min}(k)\). Thus,

\[
\text{Min}(k) \preceq_{alt} r \preceq_{alt} \text{Max}(k), \quad \text{for all digit strings } r \in \mathcal{S}(k).
\]

With this notation we can give a theorem describing distances in \(\mathbb{Z}_{-\beta}\) valid for cases \(l \in \left[ -\frac{\beta}{\beta+1}, -\frac{1}{\beta+1} \right] \).

Note that for case \(l = -\frac{\beta}{\beta+1}\) it was proven in \([1]\).

**Theorem 11.** Let \(x < y\) be two consecutive \((-\beta)\)-integers. Then there exist a finite string \(w\) over the alphabet \(\mathcal{A}_{-\beta,1}\), a non-negative integer \(k \in \{0,1,2,\ldots\}\) and a positive digit \(d \in \mathcal{A}_{-\beta,1}\setminus\{0\}\) such that \(w(d-1)\text{Max}(k)\) and \(wd\text{Min}(k)\) are strongly \((-\beta)\)-admissible strings and

\[
x = \gamma(w(d-1)\text{max}(k)) < y = \gamma(wd\text{min}(k)) \quad \text{for } k \text{ even},
\]

\[
x = \gamma(wd\text{min}(k)) < y = \gamma(w(d-1)\text{max}(k)) \quad \text{for } k \text{ odd}.
\]

In particular, the distance \(y - x\) between these \((-\beta)\)-integers depends only on \(k\) and equals to

\[
\Delta_k := \left| (-\beta)^k + \gamma(\text{min}(k)) - \gamma(\text{max}(k)) \right|.
\]

(5)

5 **Coding \(\mathbb{Z}_{-\beta}\) by an infinite word**

Note that in order to get an explicit formula for distances from Theorem\([3]\) knowledge of reference strings \(\text{min}(k)\) and \(\text{max}(k)\) is necessary. These depend on both reference strings \(d(l)\) and \(d^*(l+1)\). Concerning the form of \(\text{min}(k)\) and \(\text{max}(k)\) we provide the following proposition.

**Proposition 12.** Let \(\beta > 1\). Denote \(d(l) = l_1l_2l_3\cdots, d^*(l+1) = r_1r_2r_3\cdots\).

- \(\text{min}(0) = \text{max}(0) = \varepsilon\).
- for \(k \geq 1\) either \(\text{min}(k) = l_1l_2\cdots l_k\) or there exists \(m(k) \in \{0,\ldots,k-1\}\) such that

\[
\text{min}(k) = \begin{cases} 
  l_1l_2\cdots(l_{k-m(k)}+1)\text{min}(m(k)) & \text{if } k-m(k) \text{ even} \\
  l_1l_2\cdots(l_{k-m(k)}-1)\text{max}(m(k)) & \text{if } k-m(k) \text{ odd}
\end{cases}
\]

- for \(k \geq 1\) either \(\text{max}(k) = r_1r_2\cdots r_k\) or there exists \(m'(k) \in \{0,\ldots,k-1\}\) such that

\[
\text{max}(k) = \begin{cases} 
  r_1r_2\cdots(r_{k-m'(k)}-1)\text{max}(m'(k)) & \text{if } k-m'(k) \text{ even} \\
  r_1r_2\cdots(r_{k-m'(k)}+1)\text{min}(m'(k)) & \text{if } k-m'(k) \text{ odd}
\end{cases}
\]
Computing min\((k)\) and max\((k)\) for a general choice of \(l\) may lead to difficult discussion, however, in special cases an important relation between \(d(l)\) and \(d^*(l + 1)\) arises and eases the computation. Examples were given in Remarks 4 and 5.

Let us now describe how we can code the set of \((-\beta)\)-integers by an infinite word over the infinite alphabet \(\mathbb{N}\).

Let \((z_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}\) be a strictly increasing sequence satisfying

\[
z_0 = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad Z_{-\beta} = \{z_n \mid n \in \mathbb{Z}\}.
\]

We define a bidirectional infinite word over an infinite alphabet \(v_{-\beta} \in \mathbb{N}^\mathbb{Z}\), which codes the set of \((-\beta)\)-integers. According to Theorem 11, for any \(n \in \mathbb{Z}\) there exist a unique \(k \in \mathbb{N}\), a word \(w\) with prefix 0 and a letter \(d\) such that

\[
z_{n+1} - z_n = |\gamma(w(d-1)\max(k)) - \gamma(wd\min(k))|.
\]

We define the word \(v_{-\beta} = (v_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}\) by \(v_n = k\).

**Theorem 13.** Let \(v_{-\beta}\) be the word associated with \((-\beta)\)-integers. There exists an antimorphism \(\Phi : \mathbb{N}^* \to \mathbb{N}^*\) such that \(\Psi = \Phi^2\) is a non-erasing non-identical morphism and \(\Psi(v_{-\beta}) = v_{-\beta}\). \(\Phi\) is always of the form

\[
\Phi(2l) = S_{2l}(2l + 1)R_{2l} \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi(2l + 1) = R_{2l+1}(2l + 2)\widetilde{S}_{2l+1},
\]

where \(\widetilde{u}\) denotes the reversal of the word \(u\) and words \(R_j, S_j\) depend only on \(j\) and on \(\min(k), \max(k)\) with \(k \in \{j, j + 1\}\).

The proof is based on the self-similarity of \(Z_{-\beta}\), i.e. \(-\beta Z_{-\beta} \subset Z_{-\beta}\), and on the following idea. Let \(x = \gamma(w(d-1)\max(k)) < y = \gamma(wd\min(k))\) be two neighbours in \(Z_{-\beta}\) with gap \(\Delta_k\) and suppose only \(k\) even. If we multiply both \(x\) and \(y\) by \((-\beta)\), we get a longer gap with possibly more \((-\beta)\)-integers in between. It can be shown that between \(-\beta y\) and \(-\beta x\) there is always a gap \(\Delta_{k+1}\). Hence the description is of the form \(\Phi(k) = S_k(k+1)\widetilde{R}_k\), where the word \(S_k\) codes the distances between \((-\beta)\)-integers in \([\gamma(wd\min(k)0), \gamma(wd\min(k+1))])\) and, similarly, \(R_k\) encodes distances within the interval \([\gamma(w(d-1)\max(k)0), \gamma(w(d-1)\max(k+1))])\).

As it turns out, in some cases (mostly when reference strings \(l_1l_2l_3\cdots\) and \(r_1r_2r_3\cdots\) are eventually periodic of a particular form) we can find a letter-to-letter projection to a finite alphabet \(\Pi : \mathbb{N} \to \mathcal{B}\) with \(\mathcal{B} \subset \mathbb{N}\), such that \(u_{-\beta} = \Pi v_{-\beta}\) also encodes \(Z_{-\beta}\) and it is a fixed point of an antimorphism \(\varphi = \Pi \circ \Phi\) over the finite alphabet \(\mathcal{B}\). Clearly, the square of \(\varphi\) is then a non-erasing morphism over \(\mathcal{B}\) which fixes \(u_{-\beta}\).

Let us mention that \((-\beta)\)-integers in the Ito-Sadahiro case \(l = -\frac{\beta}{l+1}\) are also subject of 8. For \(\beta\) with eventually periodic \(d(l)\), Steiner finds a coding of \(Z_{-\beta}\) by a finite alphabet and shows, using only the properties of the \((-\beta)\)-transformation, that the word is a fixed point of a non-trivial morphism. Our approach is of a combinatorial nature, follows a similar idea as in 11 and shows existence of an antimorphism for any base \(\beta\).

To illustrate the results, let us conclude this contribution by an example.

**Example 14.** Let \(\beta\) be the real root of \(x^3 - 3x^2 - 4x - 2\) (\(\beta\) Pisot, \(\approx 4.3\)) and \(l = -\frac{1}{2}\). The admissibility condition gives us for any admissible digit string\((x_i)_{i \geq 0}\):

\[
201^\omega \preceq_{alt} x_i x_{i+1} x_{i+2} \cdots \preceq_{alt} 201^\infty \quad \text{for all } x \geq 0.
\]

We obtain

\[
\min(0) = \varepsilon, \quad \min(1) = 2, \quad \min(2) = 20
\]

**Substitutions over infinite alphabet generating \((-\beta)\)-integers**
and
\[ \min(2k+1) = 20(11)^{k-1}0, \quad \min(2k+2) = 20(11)^k \quad \text{for } k \geq 1. \]

Clearly it holds that \( \max(i) = \min(i) \) for all \( i \in \mathbb{N} \).

Theorem 27 gives us the following distances within \( \mathbb{Z}_\beta \):
\[
\Delta_0 = 1, \quad \Delta_1 = -1 + \frac{4}{\beta} + \frac{2}{\beta^2}, \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta_{2k} = 1 - \frac{2}{\beta} - \frac{2}{\beta^2}, \quad \Delta_{2k+1} = 1 + \frac{2}{\beta} + \frac{2}{\beta^2} \quad \text{for } k \geq 1.
\]

Finally, the antimorphism \( \Phi : \mathbb{N}^* \to \mathbb{N}^* \) is given by
\[
0 \to 0^210^2, \\
1 \to 2, \\
2 \to 3,
\]

and for \( k \geq 1 \)
\[
2k+1 \to 0^210^2(2k+2)010^2, \\
2k+2 \to 2k+3.
\]

It can be easily seen that a projection from \( \mathbb{N} \) to a finite alphabet exists and a final antimorphism \( \varphi : \{0,1,2,3\}^* \to \{0,1,2,3\}^* \) is of the form
\[
0 \to 0^210^2, \\
1 \to 2, \\
2 \to 3, \\
3 \to 0^2102010^2.
\]
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