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1. Introduction. Multifractal theory is one of the most important branch in the fractal theory. There are numerous papers on multifractal theory. See, for example, Cawley and Mauldin [2], Edgar and Mauldin [3], Falconer [4], Feder [5] and Mandelbrot [6]. However, there are few works on the classification of the probability measures by their multifractal spectrum $f(\alpha)$. It seems very hard to investigate such problems for general probability measures. In this paper we deal with multinomial measures, which is the most simple one, and clarify the relationship of two multinomial measures with an identical multifractal spectrum $f(\alpha)$. Throughout this paper we use the convention $0 / 0=0$.
2. Preliminaries. We first summarize some fundamental definitions and results in multifractal theory. Our approach essentially follows that of Falconer [4].

Let $I=I_{0,0}=[0,1]$ and $I_{n, j}=\left[\frac{j}{p^{n}}, \frac{j+1}{p^{n}}\right), j=0,1, \ldots, p^{n}-2$,

$$
I_{n, p^{n}-1}=\left[\frac{p^{n}-1}{p^{n}}, 1\right]
$$

for $n=1,2,3, \ldots$.
Definition 2.1. Let $\mu$ be a probability measure on I. For $-\infty<\alpha<\infty$ and $-\infty<q<\infty$, we define

$$
\begin{aligned}
N_{p^{-n}}(\alpha) & =\#\left\{I_{n, j}: \mu\left(I_{n, j}\right) \geq\left(p^{-n}\right)^{\alpha}\right\}, \\
S_{p^{-n}}(q) & =\sum_{\mu\left(I_{n, j}, j\right)>0} \mu\left(I_{n, j}\right)^{q}
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
& f(\alpha)=\lim _{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \left\{N_{p^{-n}}(\alpha+\varepsilon)-N_{p^{-n}}(\alpha-\varepsilon)\right\}}{-\log p^{-n}}, \\
& \tau(q)=\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log S_{p^{-n}}(q)}{-\log p^{-n}} . \\
& \text { Here } \log 0=-\infty \quad \text { We say } f(\alpha) \text { the multifractal }
\end{aligned}
$$ spectrum of $\mu$ and $\tau(q)$ the mass exponent of $\mu$.

Definition 2.2. Let $p \geq 2$ be a positive inte-

[^0]ger and $\boldsymbol{r}=\left(r_{0}, r_{1}, \ldots, r_{p-1}\right)$ be a random vector such that $0<r_{l}<1$ for $l=0,1, \ldots, p-1$. The probability measure $\mu_{p, \boldsymbol{r}}$ on I defined by
(1) $\quad \mu_{p, \boldsymbol{r}}\left(I_{n+1, p j+l}\right)=r_{l} \mu_{p, \boldsymbol{r}}\left(I_{n, j}\right)$
for $n=0,1,2, \ldots, j=0,1, \ldots, p^{n}-1, l=0$, $1, \ldots, p-1$, is said to be a multinomial measure.

The following result is well-known in multifractal theory.

Proposition A. For every multinomial measure $\mu_{p, r}$, the multifractal spectrum $f(\alpha)$ exists and satisfies the equality

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tau(q)=\sup _{0 \leq \alpha<\infty}\{f(\alpha)-q \alpha\} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text { For } \mu_{p, r}, \text { we have } \\
\begin{aligned}
S_{p-n}(q) & =\sum\left(r_{0}^{\alpha_{0}} r_{1}^{\alpha_{1}} \cdots r_{p-1}^{\alpha_{p-1}}\right)^{q} \frac{n!}{\alpha_{0}!\alpha_{1}!\cdots \alpha_{p-1}!} \\
& =\left(r_{0}^{q}+r_{1}^{q}+\cdots+r_{p-1}^{q}\right)^{n},
\end{aligned}
\end{aligned}
$$

and hence
(3) $\tau(q)=\frac{\log S_{p}-n(q)}{-\log p^{-n}}=\frac{\log \left(r_{0}^{q}+r_{1}^{q}+\cdots+r_{p-1}^{q}\right)}{\log p}$.

Further we can calculate the multifractal spectrum $f(\alpha(q))$ by use of the so-called Legendre

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{transform}: \\
& \qquad \begin{array}{l}
\alpha(q)=-r^{\prime}(q)=-\frac{\sum r_{i}^{q} \log r_{i}}{\left(\sum r_{i}^{q}\right) \log p} \\
f(\alpha(q))=\tau(q)+q \alpha(q)=\frac{\log \sum r_{i}^{q}}{\log p}-\frac{q \sum r_{i}^{q} \log r_{i}}{\sum r_{i}^{q} \log p}
\end{array} .
\end{aligned}
$$

3. Result. We now state our result. Let $\mu_{p, r}$ and $\mu_{p^{\prime}, r^{\prime}}$ be two multinomial measures. We denote their multifractal spectrums by $f_{p, r}(\alpha)$ and $f_{p^{\prime}, r^{\prime}}(\alpha)$, respectively and also denote their mass exponents by $\tau_{p, r}(q)$ and $\tau_{p^{\prime}, r^{\prime}}(q)$, respectively.

Theorem. Assume that neither $\mu_{p, r}$ nor $\mu_{p^{\prime}, r^{\prime}}$ is the Lebesgue measure. Then $f_{p, r}(\alpha)=f_{p^{\prime}, r^{\prime}}(\alpha)$ if and only if there exist a unique positive integer $u$ and $a$ unique random vector $\boldsymbol{s}=\left(s_{0}, s_{1}, \ldots, s_{u-1}\right)$ satisfying the following conditions:
( $C-1$ ) $p$ and $p^{\prime}$ are expressed by

$$
p=u^{n}, p^{\prime}=u^{m}
$$

with some mutually prime numbers $n$ and $m$.
(C-2) $r_{i}(i=0,1, \ldots, p-1)$ and $r_{j}^{\prime}(j=0,1$, $\left.\ldots, p^{\prime}-1\right)$ are represented in the form $r_{i}=s_{i_{1}}, s_{i_{2}}, \ldots, s_{i_{n}}, i_{1}, i_{2}, \ldots, i_{n} \in\{0,1, \ldots, u-1\}$,
$r_{j}^{\prime}=s_{j_{1}} s_{j_{2}} \ldots s_{j_{m}}, j_{1}, j_{2}, \ldots, j_{m} \in\{0,1, \ldots, u-1\}$.
The sufficiency immediately follows from the definition of multinomial measures. In the following we prove the necessity. We first notice that the condition $f_{p, \boldsymbol{r}}(\alpha)=f_{p^{\prime}, \boldsymbol{r}^{\prime}}(\alpha)$ implies $\tau_{p, \boldsymbol{r}}=$ $\tau_{p^{\prime}, \boldsymbol{r}^{\prime}}$. Hence, by (3), we have

$$
\sum_{i=0}^{p-1} r_{i}^{t}=\left(\sum_{i=0}^{p^{\prime}-1} r_{i}^{\prime t}\right)^{\frac{\log p}{\log p^{\prime}}}
$$

We now define

$$
g(z)=\sum_{i=0}^{p-1} r_{i}^{z}=\sum_{i=0}^{p-1} e^{z \log r_{i}}, h(z)=\sum_{i=0}^{p^{\prime}-1}{r^{\prime}}_{i}^{z}=\sum_{i=0}^{p^{\prime}-1} e^{z \log r_{i}^{\prime}}
$$

for $z \in \boldsymbol{C}$. Evidently $g$ and $h$ are entire functions with no pole and

$$
g(z)=\{h(z)\}^{\log p / \log p^{\prime}}
$$

We first state several elementary lemmas in function theory.

Lemma 3.1. The functions $g(z)$ and $h(z)$ have (common) zeros and the order of them is equal to 1 .

Proof. We represent the function $g(z)$ in the form $g(z)=\sum_{i} e^{z \log r_{i}}=\sum \frac{\sum\left(\log r_{i}\right)^{n}}{n!} z^{n}=\sum c_{n} z^{n}$, say. Then, denoting the order of $g(z)$ by $\lambda$, we have by Stirling's formula

$$
\begin{aligned}
\lambda & =\limsup _{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n \log n}{\log \left|1 / c_{n}\right|} \\
& =\limsup _{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n \log n}{\log n!-\log \sum\left(\log r_{i}\right)^{n}}=1
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence, if we suppose that $g(z)$ has no zeros, then there exists a polynomial $\alpha_{1}+\alpha_{2} z$ of degree 1 such that

$$
g(z)=e^{\alpha_{1}+\alpha_{2}}=e^{\alpha_{1}} \sum \frac{\alpha_{2}^{n} z^{n}}{n!}
$$

Comparing with (4), we have

$$
e^{\alpha_{1}}=p, \alpha_{2}^{n}=\sum_{i}\left(\log r_{i}\right)^{n}
$$

for every $n$. Hence we obtain $r_{1}=r_{2}=\cdots=$ $r_{p-1}$. This contradicts the assumption.

Lemma 3.2. $\log p / \log p^{\prime}$ is a rational number. Therefore $\{g(z)\}^{m}=\{h(z)\}^{n}$ for some positive integers $m$ and $n$ with $(m, n)=1$.

Proof. Since $g(z)$ and $h(z)$ are entire functions with zeros but with no pole, we have

$$
\frac{1}{2 \pi i} \int_{r} \frac{g^{\prime}(z)}{g(z)} d z=n^{\prime}, \quad \frac{1}{2 \pi i} \int_{r} \frac{h^{\prime}(z)}{h(z)} d z=\mathrm{m}^{\prime}
$$

for some positive integers $m^{\prime}$ and $n^{\prime}$, where $\gamma$ is a closed contour not containing zeros on it. Put $\alpha=\log p / \log p^{\prime}$. Since $g(z)=(h(z))^{\alpha}$, we have

$$
g^{\prime}(z)=\alpha h^{\prime}(z)(h(z))^{\alpha-1}
$$

and

$$
\int_{\gamma} \frac{g^{\prime}(z)}{g(z)} d z=\int_{\gamma} \frac{\alpha h^{\prime}(z)(h(z))^{\alpha-1}}{(h(z))^{\alpha}} d z=\alpha \int_{\gamma} \frac{h^{\prime}(z)}{h(z)} d z
$$

Hence we obtain $\alpha=m^{\prime} / n^{\prime}$. Obviously we can choose positive integers $m$ and $n$ with ( $m, n$ ) $=1$ so that $m / n=m^{\prime} / n^{\prime}$.
$\underset{(x+i y) \log r_{1}}{\text { Lemma }} \quad$ 3.3. Let $g(z)=g(x+i y)=$ $\sum e^{(x+i y) \log r_{i}}$. Then there exist $M>0$ and $c_{1}, c_{2}>$ 0 such that

$$
0<c_{1}<|g(x+i y)|<c_{2}<\infty
$$

for $M<x<M+1$.
Proof. Let $r_{\max }=\max _{0 \leqslant k \leqslant p-1} r_{k} \quad$ and $\quad \tilde{r}=$ $\max _{r_{k} \neq r_{\max }} \boldsymbol{r}_{k}$. Since

$$
g(x+i y)=e^{x \log r_{\max }} \sum_{i} e^{x\left(\log r_{i}-\log r_{\max }\right)} e^{i y \log r_{i}}
$$

taking $M$ large enough so that $1>2 p e^{M\left(\log \tilde{r}-\log r_{\max }\right)}$, there exists $c_{1}>0$ such that $|g(x+i y)|>c_{1}>$ 0 for $x>M$. Evidently $|g(x+i y)|$ is bounded from above for $M<x<M+1$.

Lemma 3.4. Let $\Omega_{1}=\{(x, y) \in \boldsymbol{C}: M<x$ $<M+1\}$. Then $\log g(z)$ is almost periodic in $\Omega_{1}$.

Proof. By the definition of $g(z)$, it is clear that $g(z)$ is almost periodic in $\Omega_{1}$. Since

$$
\begin{aligned}
\log g(z+i \tau) & -\log g(z) \\
& =(\log |g(z+i \tau)|-\log |g(z)|) \\
& +i(\arg g(z+i \tau)-\arg g(z))
\end{aligned}
$$

by Lemma 3.3 , there exists $c_{0}>0$ such that

$$
|\log g(z+\tau i)-\log g(z)|<\varepsilon
$$

for $z$ satisfying $|g(z)|>c_{0}$. Hence $\log g(z)$ is almost periodic.

Lemma 3.5. If $a(z)$ is an almost periodic function on $\Omega_{1}$ satisfying $|a(z)|<C<\infty$ for $z \in$ $\Omega_{1}$, then $e^{a(z)}$ is also almost periodic on $\Omega_{1}$.

Proof. Since
$e^{a(z+i \tau)}-e^{a(z)}=e^{\Re a(z+i \tau)+i \Im a(z+i \tau)}-e^{\Re a(z)+i \Im a(z)}$ $=\left(e^{\Re a(z+i \tau)}-e^{\Re a(z)}\right) e^{i \Im a(z+i \tau)}$ $+e^{\mathfrak{F} a(z)}\left(e^{i \mathfrak{Y} a(z+i \tau)}-e^{i \mathfrak{Y} a(z)}\right)$,
we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|e^{a(z+i \tau)}-e^{a(z)}\right| & \leq\left|e^{\Re a(z+i \tau)}-e^{\Re a(z)}\right| \\
& +e^{\Re a(z)}\left|e^{i(\mathfrak{F} a(z+i \tau)-\Im a(z))}-1\right| \\
& \leq e^{C} \varepsilon+2 e^{c} \sin \varepsilon
\end{aligned}
$$

This completes the proof.
We now state a key lemma.
Lemma 3.6. The functions $g(z)$ and $h(z)$ are represented in the form
where $\lambda_{1}<\lambda_{2}<\cdots<\lambda_{N}$.
Proof. By Lemmas 3.1, 3.2 and Hadamard's theorem, $g$ and $h$ are represented in the form

$$
\begin{aligned}
& g(z)=e^{\alpha_{1}^{\prime}+\alpha_{2}^{\prime} z} \Pi\left(1-\frac{z}{\beta_{i}}\right)^{k_{i}^{\prime}} e^{\frac{k_{i}^{\prime}}{\beta_{i}} z} \\
& h(z)=e^{\alpha_{1}^{\prime}+\alpha_{2}^{\prime} z} \Pi\left(1-\frac{z}{\beta_{i}}\right)^{k_{i}^{\prime}} e^{\frac{k_{i}^{\prime}}{\beta_{i}} z} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Furthermore, since zeros of $g$ coincide with those of $h$, we have

$$
\alpha_{1}^{\prime} m=\alpha_{1}^{\prime \prime} n, \quad \alpha_{2}^{\prime} m=\alpha_{2}^{\prime \prime} n, \quad k_{i}^{\prime} m=k_{i}^{\prime \prime} n .
$$

Hence

$$
\begin{equation*}
g(z)=(I(z))^{n}, \quad h(z)=(I(z))^{m} \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
I(z)=e^{\alpha_{1}+\alpha_{2} z} \Pi\left(1-\frac{z}{\beta_{i}}\right)^{k} e^{i^{\frac{k_{1}}{\beta_{i}}}}
$$

for some $\alpha_{1}, \alpha_{2}$, and $k_{i}, i=1,2, \ldots$ By Lemma $3.4, \log I(z)$ is almost periodic on $\Omega_{1}$. Hence, by Lemma $3.5, I(z)$ is also almost periodic on $\Omega_{1}$. Then it is well-known that there exists a Dirichlet series corresponding to $I(z)$ :

$$
I(z) \sim \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_{j} e^{-\lambda_{j} z}, a_{j}=\lim _{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\tau} \int_{a}^{a+\tau} I(x+i y) e^{i \lambda_{f} y} d y
$$

By (7) and the fact that $(m, n)=1$, we have $I(z)=g^{\alpha}(z) h^{\beta}(z)$ for some integers $\alpha, \beta$. We also have

$$
\lim _{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\tau} \int_{a}^{a+\tau} g^{\alpha}(z) h^{\beta}(z) e^{\lambda z} d z=0
$$

except for a finite set of $\lambda$ by a theorem of Riemann-Lebesgue's type for almost periodic functions (see [1, p. 22, Lemma]). Therefore we obtain $I(z)=\sum_{j=1}^{N} a_{j} e^{-\lambda_{j} z}$ for some positive integer $N$.

Proof of the necessity. It suffices to show that there exists a unique random vector $\boldsymbol{s}=\left(s_{0}\right.$, $s_{1}, \ldots, s_{u-1}$ ) such that

$$
g(t)=\left(\sum_{j=0}^{u-1} s_{j}^{t}\right)^{n}, h(t)=\left(\sum_{j=0}^{u-1} s_{j}^{t}\right)^{m}
$$

for all $t$. We have only to prove in the case

$$
0>\log r_{0} \geq \log r_{1} \geq \cdots \geq \log r_{p-1}
$$

Multiplying $e^{\lambda_{i} n t}$ to both sides of (5), we get

$$
\sum_{j=1}^{p-1} e^{t\left(n \lambda_{i}+\log r_{j}\right)}=\left(\sum_{j=1}^{N} a_{j} e^{\left(\lambda_{i}-\lambda_{j}\right) t}\right)^{n}
$$

Therefore,

$$
a_{i}^{n}=\#\left\{j: n \lambda_{i}+\log r_{j}=0\right\}
$$

In the same manner we have by (6)

$$
a_{i}^{m}=\#\left\{j: m \lambda_{i}+\log r_{j}^{\prime}=0\right\}
$$

Consequently, noticing that $n$ and $m$ are relatively prime, we know that $a_{i}$ is a positive integer. Putting $z=0$ in (5) and (6), we have $p=\left(\sum a_{j}\right)^{n}$ and $p^{\prime}=\left(\sum a_{j}\right)^{m}$, respectively. Let $u=\sum a_{i}$. Evidently $p=u^{n}, p^{\prime}=u^{m}$ and

$$
I(t)=\sum_{j=1}^{N} a_{j} e^{-\lambda_{j} t}=\sum_{i=0}^{u-1} e^{-\lambda_{i} t}
$$

where $\lambda_{i}^{\prime}=\lambda_{j}$ for some $j$. Let $-\lambda_{j}^{\prime}=\log s_{j}$, then we know that $0<s_{j}<1, \sum_{j=0}^{u-1} s_{j}=1$ and

$$
\begin{aligned}
& g(t)=\left(\sum_{j=0}^{u-1} e^{t \log s_{j}}\right)^{n}=\left(\sum s_{j}^{t}\right)^{n} \\
& h(t)=\left(\sum_{j=0}^{u-1} e^{t \log s_{j}}\right)^{m}=\left(\sum s_{j}^{t}\right)^{m}
\end{aligned}
$$

from which, the necessity follows.
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