

Appendices

A Basic inequalities

The next two lemmas can be deduced from the Hölder inequality.

Lemma A.1. For $p \in (0, \infty)$,

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \right|^p \leq \max\{1, n^{p-1}\} \sum_{i=1}^n |a_i|^p$$

for any $n \geq 1$ and $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{R}$.

Lemma A.2. Let $p, q \in [1, \infty]$ satisfying $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$. Then for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^n |a_i|^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq \max\{1, n^{\frac{p-2}{p}}\} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |a_i|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

The following fact implies the comparison of two types of Poincaré constants, $\lambda_{p,m}$ and $\tilde{\lambda}_{p,m}$, as in (5.4).

Theorem A.3 ([9, Lemma 4.17]). Let μ be a finite measure on a set X . Then for any $f \in L^p(X, \mu)$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\|f - c\|_{p,\mu} \geq \frac{1}{2} \|f - (f)_\mu\|_{p,\mu},$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{p,\mu}$ is the L^p -norm with respect to μ and $(f)_\mu = \mu(X)^{-1} \int_X f d\mu$.

The following lemma is a discrete version of the above theorem.

Corollary A.4. Let $(\mu_i)_{i=1,\dots,n} \in (0, 1)^n$ with $\sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i = 1$. Then

$$\sum_{i=1}^n |x - a_i|^p \mu_i \geq \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^p \sum_{i=1}^n \left| \sum_{j=1}^n \mu_j a_j - a_i \right|^p \mu_i$$

for any $x, a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{R}$.

B Basic facts on p -energy

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a finite graph. For $A \subseteq V$, set $E_A = \{(x, y) \mid x, y \in A, (w, y) \in E\}$ and $G_A = (A, E_A)$.

Definition B.1. Let $\mu: V \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ and let $A \subseteq V$. Define $\text{supp}(\mu) = \{x \mid x \in V, \mu(x) > 0\}$. Let $p > 0$. For $u \in \ell(V)$, define

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{E}_p^G(u) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{(x,y) \in E} |u(x) - u(y)|^p, \\ \|u\|_{p,\mu} &= \left(\sum_{x \in V} |u(x)|^p \mu(x) \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \\ (u)_\mu &= \frac{1}{\sum_{y \in V} \mu(y)} \sum_{x \in V} \mu(x) u(x)\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\lambda_{p,\mu}^G = \sup_{u \in \ell(V), u \neq 0} \frac{(\min_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \|u - c \chi_V\|_{p,\mu})^p}{\mathfrak{E}_p^G(u)},$$

where $\chi_V \in \ell(V)$ is the characteristic function of the set V .

For $A \subseteq U$, set $\mathfrak{E}_p^A = \mathfrak{E}_p^{G_A}$ and $\lambda_{p,\mu}^A = \lambda_{p,\mu|_A}^{G_A}$.

Lemma B.2. *Define*

$$\tilde{\lambda}_{p,\mu}^G = \sup_{u \in \ell(V), u \neq 0} \frac{(\|u - (u)_\mu \chi_V\|_{p,\mu})^p}{\mathfrak{E}_p^G(u)}.$$

Then

$$\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^p \tilde{\lambda}_{p,\mu}^G \leq \lambda_{p,\mu}^G \leq \tilde{\lambda}_{p,\mu}^G.$$

Proof. By Corollary A.4,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{x \in V} |u(x) - (u)_\mu|^p \mu(x) &\geq \min_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \sum_{x \in V} |u(x) - c|^p \mu(x) \\ &\geq \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^p \sum_{x \in V} |u(x) - (u)_\mu|^p \mu(x). \quad \blacksquare\end{aligned}$$

Lemma B.3 ([36, Proposition 1.5(2)]). *Let $p \in [1, \infty)$ and let $\mu: V \rightarrow (0, \infty)$. Assume that $A \subseteq B \subseteq V$. Then for any $u \in \ell(B)$,*

$$|(u)_A - (u)_B| \leq \frac{1}{\mu(A)^{\frac{1}{p}}} (\tilde{\lambda}_{p,\mu}^B \mathfrak{E}_p^B(u))^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Proof. By the Hölder inequality,

$$|(u)_A - (u)_B| \leq \frac{1}{\mu(A)} \int_B \chi_A |u - (u)_B| d\mu \leq \frac{1}{\mu(A)^{\frac{1}{p}}} \left(\int_B |u - (u)_B|^p d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}. \quad \blacksquare$$

C Useful facts on combinatorial modulus

In this appendix, we have useful facts on combinatorial modulus. In particular, the last lemma, Lemma C.4, is a result on the comparison of moduli in two different graphs. This lemma plays a key role on several occasions in this paper.

Let V be a countable set and let $\mathcal{P}(V)$ be the power set of V . For $\rho: V \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ and $A \subseteq V$, define

$$L_\rho(A) = \sum_{x \in A} \rho(x).$$

For $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(V)$, define

$$\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{U}) = \{\rho \mid \rho: V \rightarrow [0, \infty), L_\rho(A) \geq 1 \text{ for any } A \in \mathcal{U}\}.$$

Moreover, for $\rho: V \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, define

$$M_p(\rho) = \sum_{x \in V} \rho(x)^p \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Mod}_p(\mathcal{U}) = \inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{U})} M_p(\rho).$$

Note that if $\mathcal{U} = \emptyset$, then $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{U}) = [0, \infty)^V$ and $\text{Mod}_p(\mathcal{U}) = 0$.

Lemma C.1. *Assume that \mathcal{U} consists of finite sets. Then there exists $\rho_* \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{U})$ such that*

$$\text{Mod}_p(\mathcal{U}) = M_p(\rho_*).$$

Proof. Choose $\{\rho_i\}_{i \geq 1} \subseteq \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{U})$ such that $M_p(\rho_i) \rightarrow \text{Mod}_p(\mathcal{U})$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$. Since V is countable, there exists a subsequence $\{\rho_{n_j}\}_{j \geq 1}$ such that, for any $v \in V$, $\rho_{n_j}(v)$ is convergent as $j \rightarrow \infty$. Set $\rho_*(v) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{n_j}(v)$. For any $A \in \mathcal{U}$, since A is a finite set, it follows that $L_{\rho_*}(A) \geq 1$. Hence $\rho_* \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{U})$. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a finite set X_ε such that $\sum_{v \in X_\varepsilon} \rho_*(v)^p \geq M_p(\rho_*) - \varepsilon$. As

$$\text{Mod}_p(\mathcal{U}) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} M_p(\rho_{n_j}) \geq \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{v \in X_\varepsilon} \rho_{n_j}(v)^p,$$

we obtain $\text{Mod}_p(\mathcal{U}) \geq M_p(\rho_*) - \varepsilon$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$. Hence $\text{Mod}_p(\mathcal{U}) \geq M_p(\rho_*)$. On the other hand, since $\rho_* \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{U})$, we see $M_p(\rho_*) \geq \text{Mod}_p(\mathcal{U})$. Therefore, $M_p(\rho_*) = \text{Mod}_p(\mathcal{U})$. \blacksquare

Lemma C.2. *Assume that \mathcal{U} consists of finite sets. For $v \in V$, define $\mathcal{U}_v = \{A \mid A \in \mathcal{U}, v \in A\}$. Then*

$$\rho_*(v)^p \leq \text{Mod}_p(\mathcal{U}_v)$$

for any $\rho_ \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{U})$ with $M_p(\rho_*) = \text{Mod}_p(\mathcal{U})$. In particular, if $\mathcal{U}_v = \emptyset$, then*

$$\rho_*(v) = 0.$$

Proof. Suppose that $\rho_* \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{U})$ and $M_p(\rho_*) = \text{Mod}_p(\mathcal{U})$. Assume that $\mathcal{U}_v = \emptyset$ and $\rho_*(v) > 0$. Define ρ'_* by

$$\rho'_*(u) = \begin{cases} \rho_*(u) & \text{if } u \neq v, \\ 0 & \text{if } u = v. \end{cases}$$

Then $\rho'_* \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{U})$ and $M_p(\rho'_*) < M_p(\rho_*)$. This contradicts the fact that $M_p(\rho_*) = \text{Mod}_p(\mathcal{U})$. Thus if $\mathcal{U}_v = \emptyset$, then $\rho_*(v) = 0$. Next assume that $\mathcal{U}_v \neq \emptyset$. Let $\rho_v \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{U}_v)$ with $M_p(\rho_v) = \text{Mod}_p(\mathcal{U}_v)$. Note that such a ρ_v does exist by Lemma C.1. Define

$$\tilde{\rho}(u) = \begin{cases} \max\{\rho_*(u), \rho_v(u)\} & \text{if } u \neq v, \\ \rho_v(v) & \text{if } u = v. \end{cases}$$

Let $A \in \mathcal{U}$. If $v \notin A$, then $\tilde{\rho} \geq \rho_*$ on A , so that $\tilde{\rho} \in \mathcal{A}(A)$. If $v \in A$, then $\tilde{\rho} \geq \rho_v$ on A and hence $\tilde{\rho} \in \mathcal{A}(A)$. Thus we see that $\tilde{\rho} \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{U})$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Mod}_p(\mathcal{U}) &\leq M_p(\tilde{\rho}) \leq \sum_{u \neq v} \rho_*(u)^p + \sum_{u \in V} \rho_v(u)^p \\ &= \text{Mod}_p(\mathcal{U}) - \rho_*(v)^p + \text{Mod}_p(\mathcal{U}_v). \end{aligned} \quad \blacksquare$$

Define $\ell_+(V) = \{f \mid f: V \rightarrow [0, \infty)\}$.

Lemma C.3. *Let V_1 and V_2 be finite sets. Let $\mathcal{U}_i \subseteq \mathcal{P}(V_i)$ for $i = 1, 2$. If there exist maps $\xi: \mathcal{U}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_1$, $F: \ell_+(V_1) \rightarrow \ell_+(V_2)$ and constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that*

$$C_1 L_{F(\rho)}(\gamma) \geq L_\rho(\xi(\gamma)) \quad \text{and} \quad M_p(F(\rho)) \leq C_2 M_p(\rho)$$

for any $\rho \in \ell_+(V_1)$ and $\gamma \in \mathcal{U}_2$, then

$$\text{Mod}_p(\mathcal{U}_2) \leq (C_1)^p C_2 \text{Mod}_p(\mathcal{U}_1)$$

for any $p > 0$.

Proof. Note that $C_1 F(\rho) \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{U}_2)$ for any $\rho \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{U}_1)$. Hence if $F'(\rho) = C_1 F(\rho)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Mod}_p(\mathcal{U}_2) &= \min_{\rho \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{U}_2)} M_p(\rho) \leq \min_{\rho \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{U}_1)} M_p(F'(\rho)) \\ &\leq (C_1)^p C_2 \min_{\rho \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{U}_1)} M_p(\rho) (C_1)^p C_2 \text{Mod}_p(\mathcal{U}_1). \end{aligned} \quad \blacksquare$$

Lemma C.4. *Let V_1 and V_2 be countable sets and let $\mathcal{U}_i \subseteq \mathcal{P}(V_i)$ for $i = 1, 2$. Assume that $H_v \subseteq V_1$ and $\#(H_v) < \infty$ for any $v \in V_2$. Furthermore, assume that, for any $B \in \mathcal{U}_2$, there exists $A \in \mathcal{U}_1$ such that $A \subseteq \bigcup_{v \in B} H_v$. Then*

$$\text{Mod}_p(\mathcal{U}_2) \leq \sup_{v \in V_2} \#(H_v)^p \sup_{u \in V_1} \#(\{v \mid v \in V_2, u \in H_v\}) \text{Mod}_p(\mathcal{U}_1)$$

for any $p > 0$.

Proof. For $\rho: V_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, define

$$F(\rho)(v) = \max_{u \in H_v} \rho(u)$$

for any $v \in V_2$. Then $F: \ell_+(V_1) \rightarrow \ell_+(V_2)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} M_p(F(\rho)) &= \sum_{v \in V_2} \max_{u \in H_v} \rho(u)^p \leq \sum_{v \in V_2} \sum_{u \in H_v} \rho(u)^p \\ &\leq \sup_{u \in V_1} \#\{v \mid v \in V_2, u \in H_v\} M_p(\rho). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, for $B \in \mathcal{U}_2$, choose $\xi(B) \in \mathcal{U}_1$ such that $\xi(B) \subseteq \bigcup_{v \in B} H_v$. Then for any $\rho \in \ell_+(V_1)$ and $B \in \mathcal{U}_2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{u \in V_2} \#(H_u) L_{F(\rho)}(B) &\geq \sum_{u \in B} \#(H_u) F(\rho)(u) \geq \sum_{u \in B} \sum_{v \in H_u} \rho(v) \\ &= \sum_{v \in \bigcup_{u \in B} H_u} \#\{u \mid v \in H_u\} \rho(v) \\ &\geq \sum_{v \in \xi(B)} \rho(v) = L_\rho(\xi(B)). \end{aligned}$$

Hence by Lemma C.3, we have the desired conclusion. ■

D An Arzelà–Ascoli theorem for discontinuous functions

The following lemma is a version of Arzelà–Ascoli theorem showing the existence of a uniformly convergent subsequence of a sequence of functions. The difference between the original version and the current one is that it can handle a sequence of discontinuous functions.

Lemma D.1 (Extension of Arzelà–Ascoli). *Let (X, d_X) be a totally bounded metric space and let (Y, d_Y) be a metric space. Let $u_i: X \rightarrow Y$ for any $i \geq 1$. Assume that there exist a monotonically increasing function $\eta: [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ and a sequence $\{\delta_i\}_{i \geq 1} \in [0, \infty)$ such that $\eta(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \downarrow 0$, $\delta_i \rightarrow 0$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$ and*

$$d_Y(u_i(x_1), u_i(x_2)) \leq \eta(d_X(x_1, x_2)) + \delta_i \tag{D.1}$$

for any $i \geq 1$ and $x_1, x_2 \in X$. If $\overline{\bigcup_{i \geq 1} u_i(X)}$ is compact, then there exists a subsequence $\{u_{n_j}\}_{j \geq 1}$ such that $\{u_{n_j}\}_{j \geq 1}$ converges uniformly to a continuous function $u: X \rightarrow Y$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$ satisfying $d_Y(u(x_1), u(x_2)) \leq \eta(d_X(x_1, x_2))$ for any $x_1, x_2 \in X$.

Proof. Since X is totally bounded, there exists a countable subset $A \subseteq X$ which is dense in X and contains a finite τ -net A_τ of X for any $\tau > 0$. Let $K = \overline{\bigcup_{i \geq 1} u_i(X)}$.

Since K is compact and $\{u_i(x)\}_{i \geq 1} \subseteq K$ is bounded for any $x \in A$, there exists a subsequence $\{u_{m_k}(x)\}_{k \geq 1}$ converging as $k \rightarrow \infty$. By the standard diagonal argument, we may find a subsequence $\{u_{n_j}(x)\}_{j \geq 1}$ such that $\{u_{n_j}(x)\}_{j \geq 1}$ converges as $j \rightarrow \infty$ for any $x \in A$. Set $v_j = u_{n_j}$ and $\alpha_j = \delta_{n_j}$. Define $v(x) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} v(x)$ for any $x \in A$. By (D.1),

$$d_Y(v_j(x_1), v_j(x_2)) \leq \eta(d_X(x_1, x_2)) + \alpha_j$$

for any $x_1, x_2 \in A$. Letting $j \rightarrow \infty$, we see that

$$d_Y(v(x_1), v(x_2)) \leq \eta(d_X(x_1, x_2)) \quad (\text{D.2})$$

for any $x_1, x_2 \in A$. Since A is dense in X , v is extended to a continuous function on X satisfying (D.2) for any $x_1, x_2 \in X$. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Choose $\tau > 0$ such that $\eta(\tau) < \frac{\varepsilon}{3}$. Since the τ -net A_τ is a finite set, there exists k_0 such that if $k \geq k_0$, then $\alpha_k < \frac{\varepsilon}{3}$ and $d_Y(v(z), v_k(z)) < \varepsilon$ for any $z \in A_\tau$. Let $x \in X$ and choose $z \in A_\tau$ such that $d_X(x, z) < \tau$. If $k \geq k_0$, then

$$\begin{aligned} d_Y(v_k(x), v(x)) &\leq d_Y(v_k(x), v_k(z)) + d_Y(v_k(z), v(z)) + d_Y(v(z), v(x)) \\ &\leq 2\eta(d_X(x, z)) + \alpha_k + d_Y(v_k(z), v(z)) < 2\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\{v_j\}_{j \geq 1}$ converges uniformly to v as $j \rightarrow \infty$. ■

E Geometric properties of strongly symmetric self-similar sets

In this appendix, we will give proofs of claims on topological and geometric properties of self-similar sets treated in Section 4.6. Namely, we will give proofs of Propositions 4.40 and 4.42. First, we recall the setting of Section 4.6. Let S be a finite subset of \mathbb{R}^L and let $\rho \in (0, 1)$. Let $U_q \in O(L)$ for any $q \in S$. Define $f_q: \mathbb{R}^L \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^L$ by

$$f_q(x) = \rho U_q(x - q) + q$$

for $x \in \mathbb{R}^L$. Let K be the self-similar set with respect to $\{f_q\}_{q \in S}$, i.e., K is the unique non-empty compact set K satisfying

$$K = \bigcup_{q \in S} f_q(K).$$

The triple $(K, S, \{f_q\}_{q \in S})$ is known to be a self-similar structure defined in Definition 4.1 and the map $\chi: S^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow K$ is given by

$$\{\chi(q_1 q_2 \dots)\} = \bigcap_{m \geq 0} f_{q_1 \dots q_m}(K)$$

as we have seen in Section 4.1.

Definition E.1. (1) Define $\tilde{\sigma}: S^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow S^{\mathbb{N}}$ by

$$\tilde{\sigma}(q_1 q_2 \dots) = q_2 q_3 \dots \quad \text{for } q_1 q_2 \dots \in S^{\mathbb{N}}.$$

(2) Define

$$C_K = \bigcup_{i \neq j \in S} K_i \cap K_j, \quad \mathcal{C} = \chi^{-1}(C_K), \quad \mathcal{P} = \bigcup_{k \geq 1} \tilde{\sigma}^k(\mathcal{C}),$$

and $V_0 = \chi(\mathcal{P})$. The sets \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{P} are called the critical set and the post critical set of $(K, S, \{f_q\}_{q \in S})$, respectively. A self-similar structure $(K, S, \{f_q\}_{q \in S})$ is said to be post critically finite (p.c.f. for short) if \mathcal{P} is a finite set.

By [29, Theorem 1.2.3], we have the following proposition.

Proposition E.2. *The map χ is continuous and surjective. Moreover,*

$$\chi(q_1 q_2 \dots) = f_{q_1}(\chi(\tilde{\sigma}(q_1 q_2 \dots))) \quad (\text{E.1})$$

for any $q_1 q_2 \dots \in S^{\mathbb{N}}$.

In this appendix, we suppose that Assumption 4.39 holds.

The next lemma gives a proof of Proposition 4.40.

Lemma E.3. *Under Assumption 4.39, we have*

- (1) For any $q \in S$, $\chi^{-1}(q) = \bar{q}$, where $\bar{q} = q q q \dots \in S^{\mathbb{N}}$.
- (2) $\mathcal{P} = \{\bar{q} \mid q \in U\}$, where U is the set appearing in Assumption 4.39. In particular, the self-similar structure $(K, S, \{f_q\}_{q \in S})$ is post critically finite and $V_0 = U$.

Proof. (1) Suppose $\chi(\tau_1 \tau_2 \dots) = q$. Then by (E.1),

$$q = \chi(\tau_1 \tau_2 \dots) = f_{\tau_1}(\chi(\tau_2 \tau_3 \dots)) \in K_{\tau_1}.$$

By Assumption 4.39 (1), it follows that $\tau_1 = q$. Since f_q is invertible, we see that $\chi(\tau_2 \tau_3 \dots) = q$. Using the same argument as above, we see that $\tau_2 = q$ as well. Thus we deduce that $\tau_k = q$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ inductively.

(2) Suppose that $\chi(\tau_1 \tau_2 \dots) \in f_{\tau_1}(K) \cap f_q(K)$ for some $q \neq \tau_1$. By (E.1), it follows that $\chi(\tau_1 \tau_2 \dots) = f_{\tau_1}(\chi(\tau_2 \tau_3 \dots))$. Hence by Assumption 4.39 (2),

$$\chi(\tau_2 \tau_3 \dots) \in (f_{\tau_1})^{-1}(f_{\tau_1}(K) \cap f_q(K)) \subseteq U.$$

Thus $\tau_2 \tau_3 \dots = \bar{q}'$ for some $q' \in U$. Therefore, $\mathcal{P} \subseteq U$.

Conversely, again by Assumption 4.39 (2), for any $q \in U$, there exist $p_1, p_2 \in S$ with $p_1 \neq p_2$ such that $\chi(p_1 \bar{q}) \in f_{p_1}(K) \cap f_{p_2}(K)$. This shows that $p_1 \bar{q} \in \mathcal{C}$ and hence $\bar{q} \in \mathcal{P}$. ■

In the next two lemmas, we are going to show a sufficient condition for Assumption 4.41.

Lemma E.4. *Suppose that Assumption 4.39 holds and that U_q is the identity map for any $q \in V_0$. Let $q = f_{p_1}(q_1) = f_{p_2}(q_2)$ for some $p_1, p_2 \in S$ with $p_1 \neq p_2$ and $q_1, q_2 \in V_0$. Then there exists $\gamma = \gamma(p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2) > 0$ such that*

$$d(\overline{K_{p_1} \setminus K_{p_1(q_1)^{m-1}}}, K_{p_2}) \geq \gamma \rho^m$$

for any $m \geq 1$, where $d(A, B) = \inf_{x \in A, y \in B} |x - y|$ and $(q)^k = \underbrace{q \dots q}_{k\text{-times}} \in T_k$.

In the following proof, we assume that

$$\#(f_{p_1}(K) \cap f_{p_2}(K)) \leq 1$$

to avoid a non-essential complication of arguments. Without this assumption, the lemma is still true with a technical modification of the proof.

Proof. Set $c_m = \inf\{d(K_w, K_v) \mid w, v \in T_m, K_w \cap K_v = \emptyset\}$. Define

$$X_m = \overline{K_{p_1} \setminus K_{p_1(q_1)^{m-1}}} \quad \text{and} \quad Y_m = \overline{K_{p_1 q_1} \setminus K_{p_1(q_1)^{m-1}}}$$

for $m \geq 1$. Then $X_m = Y_m \cup (\bigcup_{q \neq q_1} K_{p_1 q})$ and $K_{p_2} = K_{p_2 q_2} \cup (\bigcup_{q \neq q_2} K_{p_2 q})$. This implies that

$$d(X_m, K_{p_2}) \geq \min\{d(Y_m, K_{p_2 q_2}), c_2\}.$$

On the other hand, letting $f(x) = \rho(x - q) + q$, we see that

$$Y_m \cup K_{p_2 q_2} = f(X_{m-1} \cup K_{p_2}).$$

This yields $d(Y_m, K_{p_2 q_2}) = \rho d(X_{m-1}, K_{p_2})$. Consequently, we have

$$d(X_m, K_{p_2}) \geq \min\{\rho d(X_{m-1}, K_{p_2}), c_2\}.$$

Now inductive argument suffices. ■

Lemma E.5. *Suppose that Assumption 4.39 holds and that U_q is the identity map for any $q \in V_0$. Then Assumption 4.41 holds.*

Remark. According to the notation in the proof of Lemma E.4, this lemma claims $c_m \geq c \rho^m$ for any $m \geq 1$.

Proof. Suppose that $w, v \in T_m$ and $K_w \cap K_v = \emptyset$. Let $w = w_1 \dots w_m$ and let $v = v_1 \dots v_m$. In the case $w_1 = w_2$,

$$d(K_w, K_v) = \rho d(K_{w_2 \dots w_m}, K_{v_2 \dots v_m}) \geq c_{m-1} \rho.$$

Otherwise, assume that $w_1 \neq v_1$. If $K_{w_1} \cap K_{v_1} = \emptyset$, then $d(K_w, K_v) \geq c_1$. So, the remaining possibility is that $w_1 \neq v_1$ and $K_{w_1} \cap K_{v_1} \neq \emptyset$. In this case, let $q = K_{w_1} \cap K_{v_1}$. Then $q = f_{w_1}(p_{j_1}) = f_{w_2}(p_{j_2})$ for some $j_1, j_2 \in \{1, \dots, L\}$. By Lemma E.4, it follows that $d(K_w, K_v) \geq \bar{\gamma}\rho^m$, where $\bar{\gamma} = \min\{\gamma(p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2) \mid p_1, p_2 \in S, q_1, q_2 \in V_0, f_{p_2}(q_1) = f_{p_1}(q_2)\}$. Combining all the cases and using induction on m , we see that $c_m \geq \min\{c_1, \bar{\gamma}\}\rho^m$ for any $m \geq 1$. ■

Now we start showing Proposition 4.42, that is, Assumption 2.15 holds under Assumptions 4.39 and 4.41.

Lemma E.6. *Under Assumptions 4.39 and 4.41, Assumption 2.15 (2) holds with $r = \rho$, $M_* = 1$, and $d = d_*$, where d_* is the restriction of the Euclidean metric.*

Proof. (2A) is obvious. Set

$$\Gamma_{1,n}(x) = \bigcup_{\substack{w \in T_n \\ x \in K_w}} \Gamma_1(w)$$

for $x \in K$ and $n \geq 1$. Then for any $v \in T_n \setminus \Gamma_{1,n}(x)$, there exists $w \in T_n$ such that $x \in K_w$ and $K_w \cap K_v = \emptyset$. By Lemma E.5, we see that $d(K_w, x) \geq c\rho^n$ and hence $B_{d_*}(x, c\rho^n) \cap K_v = \emptyset$. Thus we have

$$B_{d_*}(x, c\rho^n) \subseteq U_1(x : n). \tag{E.2}$$

On the other hand, by (2A), there exists $c' > 0$ such that $\text{diam}(K_w, d_*) \leq c'\rho^{|w|}$ for any $w \in T$. This implies

$$U_1(x : n) \subseteq B_{d_*}(x, 3c'\rho^n). \tag{E.3}$$

So we have (2B). Choose $x_0 \in K \setminus V_0$ and choose $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $2\rho^{m_0} < d(x_0, V_0)$. Let $w \in T_n$ and let $u \in \Gamma_{1,m_0+n}(f_w(x_0))$. Suppose that $u \in T(v)$ for some $v \in T_n$ with $v \neq w$. Since $u \in \Gamma_{1,m_0+n}(f_w(x_0))$, there exists $u_0 \in T_{n+m_0}$ such that $f_w(x_0) \in K_{u_0}$ and $K_{u_0} \cap K_u \neq \emptyset$. Let $y \in K_u$. Since K is connected (and hence arcwise connected by [29, Theorem 1.6.2]), there exists a continuous curve $\zeta: [0, 1] \rightarrow K_{u_0} \cup K_u$ such that $\zeta(0) = f_w(x_0)$ and $\zeta(1) = y$. Note that $f_w(x_0) \in K_w$ and $y \in K_v$. By (4.24), the curve ζ intersects with $f_w(V_0)$. Therefore, $(K_u \cup K_{u_0}) \cap f_w(V_0) \neq \emptyset$. However, since $\text{diam}(K_u, d_*) = \text{diam}(K_{u_0}, d_*) = \rho^{m_0+n}$, it follows

$$d(f_w(x_0), K_u \cup K_{u_0}) \leq 2\rho^{m_0+n} < d(f_w(x_0), f_w(V_0)),$$

so that $(K_{u_0} \cup K_u) \cap f_w(V_0) = \emptyset$. This contradiction shows that $u \in T(w)$ and hence $U_1(f_w(x_0) : m_0 + n) \subseteq K_w$. By (E.2), we see that

$$B_{d_*}(f_w(x_0), c\rho^{m_0+n}) \subseteq U_1(f_w(x_0) : m_0 + n) \subseteq K_w.$$

This shows (2C). ■

Next set $\alpha_H = -\frac{\log \#(S)}{\log \rho}$. Note that $\rho^{\alpha_H} = \#(S)^{-1}$. Let μ be the self-similar measure on K with weight $(\rho^{\alpha_H}, \dots, \rho^{\alpha_H})$. By [31, Theorem 1.2.7], we see that $\mu(K_w) = \rho^{|w|}$ for any $w \in T$ and consequently $\mu(\{x\}) = 0$ for any $x \in K_w$. These facts show that μ satisfies Assumption 2.12. Moreover, we have the following proposition.

Proposition E.7. *Under Assumptions 4.39 and 4.41, there exist $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that*

$$c_1 s^{\alpha_H} \leq \mu(B_{d_*}(x, s)) \leq c_1 s^{\alpha_H} \quad (\text{E.4})$$

for any $s \in [0, 1]$. In particular, μ is α_H -Ahlfors regular with respect to d_* and the Hausdorff dimension of (K, d_*) equals α_H .

Proof. By (E.3), for any $x \in K$ and $n \geq 1$, if $w \in \Gamma_{1,n}(x)$, then

$$(\rho^n)^{\alpha_H} = \mu(K_w) \leq \mu(B_{d_*}(x, 3c'\rho^n)). \quad (\text{E.5})$$

On the other hand, by [31, Proposition 1.6.11], there exists $J_* \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\#(\Gamma_{1,n}(x)) \leq J_* \quad (\text{E.6})$$

for any $x \in T$ and $n \geq 0$. (Note that $\Lambda_{\rho^n, x}^1$ defined in [31, Definition 1.3.3] equals $\Gamma_{1,n}(x)$.) Therefore by (E.2),

$$\mu(B_{d_*}(x, c\rho^n)) \leq \sum_{v \in \Gamma_{1,n}(x)} \mu(K_v) \leq J_*(\rho^n)^{\alpha_H}. \quad (\text{E.7})$$

Combining (E.5) and (E.7), we obtain (E.4). ■

The following proposition is immediately deduced from the previous propositions and lemmas. Note that $\Gamma_1(w) \subseteq \Gamma_{1,n}(x)$ for any $w \in T$ and $x \in K_w$. Hence by (E.6), we see that the partition $\{K_w\}_{w \in T}$ is uniformly finite.

Proposition E.8 (Proposition 4.42). *Under Assumptions 4.39 and 4.41, Assumption 2.15 holds with $r = \rho$, $d = d_*$ and $M_* = M_0 = 1$.*

The fact that $M_0 = 1$ is due to the second remark after Assumption 2.6.

F List of definitions and notations

Definitions

adjacency matrix, Definition 2.1
 Ahlfors regular, (2.9)
 Ahlfors regular conformal dimension, (1.1)
 Arzelà–Ascoli, Appendix 6.3
 child, Definition 2.2 (1)
 chipped Sierpiński carpet, Example 4.25
 conductance constant, Definition 2.17
 conductively homogeneous (conductive homogeneity), Definition 3.4
 covering, Definition 2.26
 covering numbers, Definition 2.26
 covering system, Definition 2.29
 critical set, Definition E.1
 exponential, Lemma 2.13
 folding map, Definition 4.11 (2)
 geodesic, Definition 2.1 (3)
 graph, Definition 2.1
 graph distance, Definition 2.21
 hyperoctahedral group, Definition 4.9
 locally finite, Definition 2.1 (1)
 locally symmetric, Definition 4.11 (4)
 Markov property, Theorem 3.21 (c)
 minimal, Definition 2.5 (1)
 modulus, Definition 2.21 (3)
 Moulin, Example 4.27
 m -walk, Definition 4.44
 neighbor disparity constant, Definition 2.26
 nested fractal, Definition 4.47
 non-degenerate, Definition 4.11 (1)
 partition, Definition 2.3
 path, Definition 2.1 (2)
 p -energy, Theorem 3.21
 pentakun, Example 4.47
 pinwheel, Example 4.27
 Poincaré constant, Definition 5.4
 post critical set, Definition E.1
 post critically finite, Definition E.1
 p.c.f., Definition E.1
 quasisymmetry, Definition 1.1
 rationally related contraction ratios, right after Assumption 4.4
 ray, Definition 2.2

reference point, Definition 2.2
 root, Definition 2.2
 self-similar set, (4.1)
 self-similar structure, Definition 4.1
 Sierpiński cross, Section 4.5
 simple, Definition 2.1 (2)
 snowflake, Example 4.48
 strict 0-walk, Definition 4.44
 strongly connected, Definition 4.11 (3)
 strongly symmetric, Definition 4.44
 sub-multiplicative inequality (conductance), Corollary 2.24
 sub-multiplicative inequality (modulus), Theorem 2.23
 sub-multiplicative inequality (neighbor disparity), Lemma 2.34
 subsystem of cubic tiling, Definition 4.11
 super-exponential, Assumption 2.12
 symmetry, Definition 4.7
 tree, Definition 2.1 (3)
 uniformly finite, Definition 2.5 (3)

Notations

$\mathcal{A}_m^{(M)}(A_1, A_2, A)$, Definition 2.21 (2)
 $\mathcal{A}_{N,m}^{(M)}(w)$, Definition 2.21 (3)
 A_s , Definition 4.11
 $B_d(x, r)$, Assumption 2.15
 $B_{j,i}$, Definition 4.9
 \mathbb{B}_L , Definition 4.9
 $B_{M,k}(w)$, Definition 2.11
 B_w , Definition 2.5
 $c_s^{L,N}$, Definition 4.9
 $\underline{c}_{\mathcal{E}}(L, N, p)$, $\overline{c}_{\mathcal{E}}(L, N, p)$, Definition 6.4
 $\underline{c}_{\lambda}(p, L, N)$, $\overline{c}_{\lambda}(p, L, N)$, Definition 6.8
 $\underline{c}_{\sigma}(L, N_1, N_2, \kappa)$, $\overline{c}_{\sigma}(L, N_1, N_2, \kappa)$, Definition 6.11
 C_*^L , Definition 4.9
 $C_*^{L,N}$, Definition 4.9
 $\mathcal{C}_m^{(M)}(A_1, A_2, A)$, Definition 2.21 (2)
 $\mathcal{C}_{N,m}^{(M)}(w)$, Definition 2.21 (3)
 $\text{diam}(K, d)$, Assumption 2.15
 $\dim_{AR}(K, d)$, (1.1)
 \overline{D}_{κ} , Lemma 5.10

- E_n^* , Proposition 2.8
 $E_n^*(A)$, (2.15)
 $E_{M,n}^*$, Definition 2.21
 E_n^ℓ , Definition 4.11 (3)
 $\mathcal{E}_{p,A}^n(\cdot)$, $\mathcal{E}_p^n(\cdot)$, Definition 2.17 (1)
 $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_p^m(\cdot)$, (3.6), (4.5)
 $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_p(\cdot)$, Theorem 3.21
 $\mathcal{E}_{p,m}(A_1, A_2, A)$, Definition 2.17
 $\mathcal{E}_{M,p,m,n}$, Definition 3.1
 $\mathcal{E}_{M,p,m}(w, A)$, Definition 2.17
 \tilde{f} , Definition 3.20
 $g(w)$, (4.2)
 $\mathcal{G}(L, N)$, Definition 6.5
 $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{E}}(L, N)$, Definition 6.2
 $\mathcal{G}_\sigma(L, N_1, N_2)$, Definition 6.9
 $\mathcal{G}(K, T)$, Definition 4.7
 $h_{M,w,m}^*$, Definition 2.20
 $h_{M^*,w}^*$, Lemma 3.18
 \mathcal{H}_{j_1,j_2}^i , Definition 4.10
 $I_{A,k,m}$, Lemma 5.3
 $\hat{I}_{A,m}$, Lemma 5.1
 $\tilde{I}_{A,k}$, Lemma 5.2
 $\mathcal{IT}(K, T)$, Definition 4.7
 \mathcal{J}_* , Example 2.30
 \mathcal{J}_ℓ , Example 2.32, (4.15)
 $j(w)$, (4.2)
 J_n , (3.5)
 $K(\cdot)$, (4.9)
 K_T, K_B, K_R, K_L , (4.20)
 $\ell(\cdot)$, (2.10)
 $\ell_{w,v}$, (4.14)
 $\ell_T, \ell_B, \ell_R, \ell_L$, Definition 4.32
 L_* , (2.3)
 M_0 , Assumption 2.6 (3),
 Assumption 2.15 (4)
 M_* , Assumption 2.6 (2),
 Assumption 2.15 (2)
 $\mathcal{M}_{p,m}^{(M)}(A_1, A_2, A)$, Definition 2.21 (2)
 $\mathcal{M}_{N,p,m}^{(M)}(w)$, Definition 2.21 (3)
 $n_L(\cdot, \cdot)$, Definition 3.7
 $\mathcal{N}_p(\cdot)$, Lemma 3.13
 N_E, N_T , Definition 2.26
 N_* , (2.7)
 O_w , Definition 2.5
 P_n , Definition 3.11
 $P_{n,m}$, Definition 2.26
 $\mathcal{P}(V, E)$, Definition 6.5
 $\mathcal{P}(G, \kappa)$, Definition 6.9
 Q_n , (3.14)
 R_j, R_{j_1,j_2}^i , Definition 4.10
 $R_{i,jk}, R_{i,jk}^*$, Definition 4.35
 $S(w), S^m(w)$, Definition 2.2 (1)
 T_m , Definition 2.2 (2)
 T_n^n, T_n^{n+1} , Lemma 4.36
 $T(w)$, Definition 2.2 (3)
 $U_M(w)$, Lemma 3.18
 $U_M(x : n)$, Assumption 2.15
 $|w|$, Definition 2.2 (2)
 $\bar{w}\bar{v}$, Definition 2.1 (3)
 \mathcal{W}^p , Lemma 3.13
 $X(e)$ – Definition 4.7
 β_* , Theorem 3.35
 γ , Assumption 2.12
 $\Gamma_M^A(w), \Gamma_M(w)$, Definition 2.5
 $\delta_L(\cdot, \cdot)$, Definition 3.7
 $\partial S^m(w)$, Definition 2.9
 κ , Assumption 2.12
 $\lambda_{p,m}(A), \tilde{\lambda}_{p,m}(A)$, Definition 5.4
 $\bar{\lambda}_{p,m}$, Definition 5.8
 $\Lambda_{r^n}^g$, (4.3)
 $\theta_m(\cdot, \cdot)$, Definition 2.21
 $\Theta_{\frac{\pi}{2}}$, Theorem 4.14
 ξ_n , Lemma 5.9
 $\xi_n(w)$, Definition 5.6
 π , Definition 2.2
 σ , Theorem 3.30
 $\sigma_{p,m}(A)$, Definition 2.26
 $\sigma_{p,m,n}^{\mathcal{F}}, \sigma_{p,m}^{\mathcal{F}}$, Definition 2.29
 $\sigma_{p,\mu}(G)$, Definition 6.9
 τ , Lemma 3.10
 τ_p , Lemma 3.34
 τ_* , Theorem 3.35
 Φ_S , Definition 4.11
 φ_e , Definition 4.7
 $\varphi_{M,w,m}^*$, Definition 2.20
 $\varphi_{M^*,w}^*$, Lemma 3.18
 ψ_n , Definition 4.7
 $\psi_{n,m}^*$, Definition 4.37 (1)
 Σ , Definition 2.2 (4)
 $\#(\cdot)$, Definition 2.5
 $\|\cdot\|_{p,\mu}$, Lemma 3.13, Definition 5.4