THIN LOEWNER CARPETS AND THEIR QUASISYMMETRIC EMBEDDINGS IN $S^2$
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ABSTRACT. A carpet is a metric space which is homeomorphic to the standard Sierpinski carpet in $\mathbb{R}^2$, or equivalently, in $S^2$. A carpet is called thin if its Hausdorff dimension is $< 2$. A metric space is called $Q$-Loewner if its $Q$-dimensional Hausdorff measure is $Q$-Ahlfors regular and if it satisfies a $(1, Q)$-Poincaré inequality. As we will show, $Q$-Loewner planar metric spaces are always carpets, and admit quasisymmetric embeddings into the plane.

In this paper, for every pair $(Q, Q')$, with $1 < Q < Q' < 2$ we construct infinitely many pairwise quasi-symmetrically distinct $Q$-Loewner carpets $X$ which admit explicit snowflake embeddings, $f : X \to S^2$, for which the image, $f(X)$, admits an explicit description and is $Q'$-Ahlfors regular. In particular, these $f$ are quasisymmetric embeddings. By a result of Tyson, the Hausdorff dimension of a Loewner space cannot be lowered by a quasisymmetric homeomorphism. By definition, this means that the carpets $X$ and $f(X)$ realize their conformal dimension. Each of images $f(X)$ can be further uniformized via post composition with a quasisymmetric homeomorphism of $S^2$, so as to yield a circle carpet and also a square carpet.

Our Loewner carpets $X$ are constructed via what we call an admissible quotiented inverse system. This mechanism extends the inverse limit construction for PI spaces given in [25], which however, does not yield carpets. Loewner spaces are a particular subclass of PI spaces. They have strong rigidity properties which which do not hold for PI spaces in general.

In many cases the construction of the carpets and their snowflake embeddings, $f$, can also be described in terms of replacement rules. The statement above concerning $(Q, Q')$ is already a consequence of these examples. The images of these snowflake embeddings can be de-snowflaked using a deformation by a strong $A_\infty$ weight, which multiplies the metric infinitesimally by a conformal factor of the form $\omega = d(\text{Image}(f), \cdot)^\alpha$. Consequently, our examples also yield new examples of strong $A_\infty$-weights for which the associated metrics admit no bi-Lipschitz embeddings into Banach spaces with the Radon Nikodym Property such as $L_p$, for $1 < p < \infty$ and $\ell_1$.
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1. Introduction

The central objects considered in this paper are quasisymmetric maps, thin carpets and Loewner spaces. The definitions and some background are recalled below. Previously, there were many studies of quasisymmetric homeomorphisms between thin carpets, especially carpets in $S^2$, as well as studies of the relations between quasisymmetric maps and Loewner spaces. These connections are strengthened in Proposition 2.8 and Theorem 2.11 below. By a thin carpet, we mean one with Hausdorff dimension $Q \in (1, 2)$. These are the first results which involve all three concepts simultaneously. Taken together they imply that if a Loewner space with Hausdorff dimension $Q \in (1, 2)$ is planar, i.e. if it embeds topologically in $S^2$, then it is a thin carpet which embeds quasisymmetrically in $S^2$.

Theory notwithstanding, prior to the present paper, there were no explicit examples of thin carpets in $S^2$ which were known to be quasisymmetrically equivalent to Loewner spaces. Here for every $Q, Q'$, with $1 < Q < Q' < 2$, we construct uncountably many explicit examples of Loewner spaces, $X_\alpha$, of Hausdorff dimension $Q$ which admit explicit quasisymmetric embeddings $f: X \to S^2$, such that $f(X)$ has Hausdorff dimension $Q'$; see Theorem 1.17. In fact, these embeddings are $\alpha$-snowflake mappings, i.e. they become bi-Lipschitz if the metric on $X$ is snowflaked with exponent $Q/Q'$. Both the explicit Loewner carpets and their images $f(X)$ can be described in terms of replacement rules. For each $Q, Q'$ as above, we show that an infinite subcollection of our explicit examples are pairwise quasisymmetrically distinct. Conjecturally, this holds for an uncountable subset.

The examples mentioned in the previous paragraph can also be viewed as special cases of a general construction of Loewner carpets $X$ as limits of an admissible quotiented inverse system; see Section 3. For these more general examples, both the fact that the limits are planar and the more precise statement that the planar embedding can be chosen to be quasisymmetric, use a result from [11] which is a sequel to the present paper; see the proof of Theorem 3.28.

The construction of admissible quotiented inverse systems generalizes the admissible inverse system construction of PI spaces given in [25]. That construction does not yield planar Loewner spaces.

The fact that for every fixed $Q, Q'$, infinitely many of our thin carpet examples are pairwise quasisymmetrically distinct, is a consequence of the strong rigidity properties of Loewner spaces. In one sense, the fact that this is not known for the full uncountable set of explicit examples exemplifies the difficulty one often has in deciding whether two explicitly given metric spaces, for example, a pair of carpets in $S^2$, are quasisymmetrically equivalent or distinct. In our case, the carpets in question are given explicitly as $f_1(X_1), f_2(X_2) \subset S^2$ and the issue boils down to being able to decide whether there are tangents of the Loewner spaces $X_1, X_2$ which are bi-Lipschitz equivalent. On the face of it, this looks like it should be easier than deciding whether $X_1, X_2$ themselves are quasisymmetric.

\[^1\]Kleiner (unpublished) by methods different from those of the present paper, constructed examples of thin Loewner carpets for which quasisymmetric embeddings in $S^2$ can be shown to exist, although explicit such embeddings are not known. Also, for interesting explicit examples of 2-dimensional Loewner carpets in $S^2$, see [54], [31], [55] Theorem 1.6.]
In order to provide context and motivation for our main results, in the first part of this introduction, we will review some of what is known about quasisymmetries, carpets, and Loewner spaces. In the second part, which begins with Subsection 1.7, we will state our main results, describe the quotiented inverse system construction which gives rise to our Loewner carpet examples and briefly summarize the remainder of the paper.

1.1. Quasisymmetries. The classical theory of quasiconformal (equivalently, quasisymmetric) mappings between subsets of $S^2$ can be generalized to the context of metric spaces. In particular, it is meaningful for Sierpinski carpets; see for example [16]. In this connection seminal work was done by Heinonen-Koskela, [37]. Let $B(x, r)$ denote the open ball with center $x$ and radius $r$ in a metric space $X$.

**Definition 1.1.** A quasisymmetry between metric spaces, $f : X_1 \to X_2$ is a homeomorphism such that there exists $C > 1$ such that for every ball $B(x, r) \subset X_1$ there exists $R$ and $y \in X_2$ such that $B(y, R/C) \subset f(B(x, r)) \subset B(y, CR)$. A quasisymmetric embedding $f : X \to Y$ is a quasisymmetry onto its image $\text{Image}(f)$.

Note that the collection of quasisymmetric homeomorphisms of a metric space form a group. Also, while bi-Lipschitz maps preserve the Hausdorff dimension of a space, a quasisymmetric map might increase or decrease the Hausdorff dimension. Replacing a given metric with its snowflake provides an example of this for which $f$ is the identity map.

The conformal dimension is a quasisymmetric invariant which was first defined by Pansu [58] and discussed in a different form by Bourdon and Pajot [19].

Let $\mathcal{H}_{dim}(Y)$ denote the Hausdorff dimension of $Y$. The Ahlfors regular conformal dimension of a metric space $X$ is defined as follows.

**Definition 1.2.** The Ahlfors regular conformal dimension of $X$ is:

\[
\text{confdim}(X) := \inf \{ \mathcal{H}_{dim}(Y) \mid Y \text{ is Ahlfors regular and there exists a quasisymmetry } f : X \to Y \}
\]

If there exists some $Y$ as above with $\mathcal{H}_{dim}(Y) = \text{confdim}(X)$, then we say $Y$ realizes the conformal dimension of $X$.

If two metric spaces $X_1, X_2$ can be shown to have different conformal dimensions then one can conclude that they must be quasisymmetrically distinct. However, there is a catch: in practice, the conformal dimension is often difficult to compute.

In general, given $X$, there may be no space $Y$ which realizes the conformal dimension of $X$; see for example [70]. However, if such a $Y$ exists, it will possess additional properties. This was initially observed by Keith and Laakso, who characterized the inability to lower Hausdorff dimension as being equivalent to the condition that some weak tangent possesses a curve family with positive modulus for some positive exponent [45]. (By passing to another weak tangent if necessary, the exponent can always be taken to be 1.) As a simple example, any metric space of the form $X \times I$, with $I$ an interval, realizes its conformal dimension.

Despite the above mentioned characterization, for many spaces of interest, it is difficult to compute the conformal dimension and also to decide whether it is realized. On the other hand, for many such spaces it is known that if the conformal dimension is realized, then it is realized by a
Loewner space; see below for a discussion of Loewner spaces. In light of the known rigidity properties of Loewner spaces, if the conformal dimension is realized, then strong consequences ensue. Specifically, as we will explain, this is related to Cannon’s conjecture and the Kapovich-Kleiner conjecture [36], which pertain to geometric group theory. Both of these conjectures could be solved by proving that the conformal dimension of a planar hyperbolic group boundary is realized. This is explained by the fact that in both cases, it is known that if the conformal dimension is realized, then it must be realized by a Loewner space.

1.2. Carpets. By definition, a carpet is a metric space homeomorphic to the standard Sierpinski carpet $S_2$. Here, we are particularly concerned with thin carpets i.e. those with $1 < \dim_H(X) < 2$. (There do exist fat carpets $X$ in $S^2$, with $\dim_H(X) = 2$ and also, very fat carpets with $\dim_H(X) > 2$.)

A fundamental theorem of Whyburn [71] provides necessary and sufficient intrinsic conditions on a metric space which guarantee that it is a carpet. To state his result we need some definitions.

A topological space is called planar if it is homeomorphic to a subset of the plane. A point $p$ in a metric space $X$ is local cut point if there is a neighborhood $U$ of $p$ such that $U \setminus \{p\}$ is not connected.

**Theorem 1.4** (Whyburn [71]). A compact metric space is a carpet if and only if it is planar, connected, locally connected, has no local cut-points and no open subset is homeomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^2$.

Whyburn gave additional characterizations of carpets in [71]. For example.

**Theorem 1.5** (Whyburn [71]). A compact subset $K \subset S^2$ with empty interior is a carpet if and only if $K = S^2 \setminus \bigcup D_i$, where $D_i$ are countably many Jordan domains with disjoint closures in $S^2$ with $\lim_{n \to \infty} \text{diam}(D_n) = 0$.

Of particular interest are those carpets which arise via removal of sets of a particular form. Namely, a square (respectively circle) carpet is a planar subset $K = \Omega \setminus \bigcup_i D_i$, where $\Omega$ and $D_i$ are each squares (respectively circles). If we assume that “peripheral circles” (see Section 2) are uniformly relatively separated quasicircles and Ahlfors regular with dimension less than 2, carpets can be quasisymmetrically mapped to, i.e. uniformized by, circle carpets, see Theorem 2.11 below and [10], [36, Corollary 3.5]. These assumptions are not very restrictive. So called slit carpets are another interesting class of carpets [55], which, for example, can fail to possess any quasisymmetric embedding to the plane.

Whyburn’s theorems could be viewed a partial explanation for the fact that carpets arise naturally in various contexts including Julia sets of postcritically-finite rational maps and hyperbolic group boundaries. In the case of hyperbolic group boundaries, the carpets which arise come naturally equipped with a quasisymmetry class of metrics, but not with a canonical representative of this class. A special class of circle carpets arise naturally as limit sets of groups acting isometrically, discretely, and co-compactly on a closed convex subset of hyperbolic 3-space with totally geodesic boundary. Circle carpets are quasisymmetrically rigid in the sense that if two of them are quasisymmetric then they are Möbius-equivalent; see [15].

Explicitly describing a circle carpet which is quasisymmetric to a given carpet is typically not easy. Consequently, even though [10] and [36, Corollary 3.5] show that many carpets possess a quasisymmetrically equivalent circle carpet, it is not practical to use this to distinguish carpets up to
quasisymmetries. Further, for group boundaries which are homeomorphic to carpets, the Kapovich-Kleiner conjecture \cite{9} could be resolved by proving that these carpets admit quasisymmetrically equivalent circle carpets.

Remark 1.6. There are numerous studies of analysis/probability on self-similar carpets; see for instance \cite{3}. Also, the physics literature contains various models based on carpets; see e.g. \cite{67}, \cite{60}.

1.3. Loewner spaces. Loewner spaces are a certain subclass of PI spaces with strong rigidity properties that do not hold in general for PI spaces.

Recall that PI spaces are metric measure spaces satisfying a doubling condition,
\begin{equation}
\mu(B(x,2r)) \leq C \mu(B(x,r)),
\end{equation}
and a Poincaré inequality. The latter condition means the following. Set
\begin{align*}
\tau B(x,r) &:= B(x,\tau r) \\
f_B &:= \int_B f \ d\mu := \frac{1}{\mu(B)} \int_B f \ d\mu, \\
\text{Lip} [f](x) &:= \limsup_{y \to x, y \neq x} \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|}{d(x,y)}.
\end{align*}

A metric measure space is said to satisfy a \((1,p)\)-Poincaré inequality, if there are constants \(C_{PI}\) and \(\tau\), such that for every Lipschitz function \(f\) and every ball \(B := B(x,r)\), we have
\begin{equation}
\int_B |f - f_B| \ d\mu \leq C_{PI} r \left( \int_{\tau B} \text{Lip} [f](x)^p \ d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.
\end{equation}

As a consequence of Hölder’s inequality, this inequality becomes stronger with a smaller exponent \(p\). See \cite{37,44} for discussion of alternative (ultimately equivalent) versions of the Poincaré inequality in which the concept of an “upper gradient” for the function \(f\) replaces Lip \(f\).

A PI space carries among other things:
- A unique first order differential structure; \cite{23}.
- A measurable cotangent bundle; \cite{23}.
- A good theory Sobolev spaces \(H^{1,p}\) for \(p > 1\), \cite{23}; see also \cite{65}.
- A theory of \(p\)-harmonic functions and blow-ups of Sobolev functions \cite{23,7,32}.

Remark 1.9. A large class of examples of PI spaces which typically are not Loewner spaces is provided by the admissible inverse limit spaces of \cite{25}. In fact, for a given limiting metric arising from their construction, they construct an uncountable collection of distinct measures which make the limit into a PI space. Schioppa observed that the measures in an uncountable subset of these are in actuality, mutually singular; \cite{62}. For additional examples of PI spaces, see \cite{61,48}.

Remark 1.10. Although in this paper, we are primarily interested in Loewner spaces, to a limited extent, more general PI spaces are also relevant. For one thing, the differentiability theory for \(H^{1,p}\) maps between PI spaces has implications for quasisymmetric maps between Loewner spaces. This plays a role in our proof that for every \(Q, Q'\) as above, there is an infinite collection of carpets which
are pairwise quasisymmetrically distinct. Also, our general quotiented inverse system construction provides new examples of PI spaces which are not carpets. Specifically, these spaces are always doubling and satisfy a $(1,1)$-Poincaré inequality. To obtain carpets, we additionally need to enforce Ahlfors regularity and planarity.

**Definition 1.11.** A $Q$-Loewner space is PI space for which the measure $\mu$ is $Q$-dimensional Hausdorff measure and is Ahlfors regular:

$$c^{-1}r^Q \leq \mu(B(r,x)) \leq cr^Q,$$

and in addition, a $(1, Q)$-Poincaré inequality holds.

In their seminal work [37], Heinonen and Koskela gave a different definition of Loewner spaces which they show to be equivalent to the one given above, when the space is $Q$-Ahlfors regular. To state it, we need some definitions.

A continuum is a compact and connected set. A continuum is nondegenerate if it has more than one point. If $E, F \subset \mathbb{C}$ are two disjoint and compact sets, we define their relative separation $\Delta(E,F)$ as follows:

$$\Delta(E,F) := \frac{d(E,F)}{\min(\text{diam}(E), \text{diam}(F))}.$$

**Definition 1.13** (Definition 3.1 in [37]). A metric measure space, $(X, \mu)$, of Hausdorff dimension $Q$ is a Loewner space (in the sense of Heinonen and Koskela) if there is a function $\phi : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ such that if $E$ and $F$ are nondegenerate continua and

$$t \geq \Delta(E,F),$$

then

$$\text{Mod}_Q(E,F) \geq \phi(t).$$

See below Section 6 for the definition of modulus. Throughout this paper, a $Q$-Loewner space will also be $Q$-Ahlfors regular.

We merely state the above definition to indicate the historical connection.

**Remark 1.14.** The Loewner space concept pertains specifically to metric spaces and Hausdorff measure, while the PI space concept encompasses a more class general metric measure spaces on which one can do first order calculus.

Many examples of Loewner spaces appear in the literature including Euclidean spaces, certain “uniform” subsets of metric spaces [8], Riemannian manifolds with lower Ricci bounds and their Gromov-Hausdorff limit spaces [24], Carnot groups [40], Laakso spaces [51], the Boudon-Pajot Fuchian and hyperbolic buildings [17, 18], certain constructions by Kleiner–Schioppa [48] and the 2-Ahlfors regular “fat carpets” of [54] and [31]. However, none of these are thin Loewner carpets.

1.4. **Rigidity of Loewner spaces under quasisymmetries.** The following properties exemplify the quasisymmetric rigidity of Loewner spaces.

1) A fundamental result from the seminal work of Heinonen-Koskela, [37], states that if a map $f$ between Loewner spaces is quasiconformal, then $f$ is in fact quasisymmetric. Here, quasiconformal is an infinitesimal version of the quasisymmetry condition.
2) According to Semmes, [29, 64] (see also the argument in [12]), if there exists a quasisymmetric homeomorphism between Loewner space $X_1$ and $X_2$, then the metric on $X_2$ is obtained from that on $X_1$ by a process known as deformation by a strong $A_\infty$ weight.

3) By a result of Tyson, [69], a Loewner space realizes its conformal dimension; equivalently it is not quasisymmetrically equivalent to a metric space of strictly smaller Hausdorff dimension.

4) A quasisymmetric homeomorphism between Loewner spaces lies in the Sobolev space $H^{1,Q}$ and in particular, has an almost everywhere defined strong differential which is an almost everywhere defined map of the measurable cotangent bundles; see [23], [38], [47].

Theorem 1.17 below states that for all $Q, Q'$ with $1 < Q < Q' < 2$, there exist infinitely many pairs of Loewner carpets $X_1, X_2$ as above, which are quasisymmetrically distinct. Given the explicit examples, the proof they are quasisymmetrically distinct uses a version of 2) and a refined version of 4), due to Bruce Kleiner (unpublished), which holds in our context; see Theorem 6.2.

We also mention that a different application of our Loewner carpet examples provides new examples of strong $A_\infty$-weights; see Theorem 1.22.

1.5. Cannon’s conjecture and the Kapovich-Kleiner conjecture. As previously mentioned, metric spaces which are boundaries of Gromov hyperbolic spaces, and of Gromov hyperbolic groups have a natural quasisymmetry class of visual metrics, but not a canonical representative of this class; for background on Gromov hyperbolic spaces, see [22]. Bonk and Kleiner have shown that if the conformal dimension of a hyperbolic group boundary is realized, then it must be realized by a Loewner space [14]. Below, we will briefly discuss two important specific instances in which the rigidity of Loewner spaces under quasisymmetries would have significant consequences if one could show that the conformal dimension is realized.

In case the boundary is $S^2$, Cannon’s conjecture asserts that the group (up to finite index) acts isometrically and properly discontinuously on hyperbolic 3-space. In [13], Bonk and Kleiner showed that Cannon’s conjecture is true in those cases in which the conformal dimension of the boundary is realized. They conjecture that this always holds. In this case, the conformal dimension, 2, would be realized, by the Loewner space $S^2$ with its standard metric.

The Kapovich-Kleiner conjecture is the analogous statement for hyperbolic groups whose boundaries are carpets. Namely, that in this case, the group (up to finite index) acts discretely, cocompactly, and isometrically on a convex subset of $\mathbb{H}^3$ with nonempty totally geodesic boundary; see [42]. Haïssinski showed that the Kapovich-Kleiner conjecture follows from the conjecture that if the boundary of a word hyperbolic group is planar then it admits a quasisymmetric embedding in $S^2$; see Conjecture 1.7 of [36]. For boundaries which are carpets of conformal dimension $< 2$, this holds by work of Haïssinski [36], which makes rigorous an idea from Bonk and Kleiner [9], compare also Theorem 2.11 and Proposition 2.8.

The fact that the conformal dimension is $< 2$ would follow, if one could show that these carpets attain their conformal dimension with a Loewner space. While proving that the minimizers for conformal dimension exist may be a harder problem than estimating the conformal dimension, finding such minimizers could also have other consequences for the rigidity of the space [20]. It is then tantalizing to try to understand when and if these carpet boundaries attain their conformal dimension.
As discussed below, there is a general property, the *combinatorial Loewner property*, which guarantees that any minimizer, if it exists, is Loewner [20]. In particular, boundaries of certain Coxeter groups and various other interesting metric spaces have this property [20]. This provides a second proof, different from that of Bonk-Kleiner [14], that, in those cases, a minimizer must be Loewner, provided it exists.

**1.6. The combinatorial Loewner property implies minimizers are Loewner.** For spaces, $X$, which satisfy a combinatorial version of the Loewner condition, it can be shown that if there exists $Y$ which realizes the conformal dimension of $X$ then of necessity, $Y$ is Loewner. Conversely, if there exists a minimizer, $Y$, which is Loewner, then the space $X$ is, of necessity, combinatorially Loewner; see [20], and for further discussion, [47]. So for such spaces, the remaining question is whether the conformal dimension is realized.

The *combinatorial Loewner condition* was introduced in [20]. (See also [28, 35] for a version of the definition with a slight correction.) The first conclusion above follows immediately from the comparability of the discrete and continuous modulus given in [35 Proposition B.2], together with a different definition of the Loewner property above in Definition 1.13, which we take from [37, Definition 3.1].

Spaces satisfying the combinatorial Loewner property arise naturally in contexts with sufficient symmetry. Except for general sufficient conditions from [20] that can be verified in particular instances, the required symmetry has not been fully described in prior literature. For example, any Sierpiński carpet $S_p$, Menger curve and certain boundaries of Coxeter groups satisfy this property.

In all of the above cases, whether the conformal dimension is realized is still a hard open question. In particular, it is not known if a standard carpet $S_p$ carpet attains its conformal dimension. Our constructions of planar Loewner spaces which have some self-similarity and which are quasisymmetric to square carpets, $f(X)$, shows at least that these properties of $S_3$ are not incompatible with the property that the conformal dimension is realized.

**1.7. Planar Loewner spaces are carpets and embed quasisymmetrically in $S^2$.** In addition to our explicit examples of carpets, we will show that if $X$ is a compact planar metric space which is $Q$-Loewner, for some $1 < Q < 2$, then $X$ is a carpet which embeds quasisymmetrically in $S^2$; see Theorem 2.11 and Proposition 2.14. As mentioned, this is the first result in which all three classes of spaces — thin planar Loewner spaces, carpets and spaces with explicit quasisymmetric embeddings in $S^2$ — play a simultaneous role. Thus, it can be viewed as one of our main results. In particular, it provides motivation for our explicit constructions of thin Loewner carpets.

**Remark 1.16.** By a result of [23], no planar Loewner space bi-Lipschitz embeds into the plane. On the other hand, our results give examples of such spaces which admit snowflake embeddings, among them, examples for which snowflaking exponent, $Q/Q'$, can be chosen arbitrarily close to 1.

**1.8. Examples of thin Loewner carpets.** Next we describe our examples of thin Loewner carpets. These provide the first published examples of thin Loewner carpets, and in particular, the first published examples which attain their conformal dimension. These are also the first examples admitting explicit quasi-symmetric embeddings in $S^2$; compare Theorem 2.11 and Proposition 2.14. A figure with an approximation of one such construction is given in Figure 5.1.

---

Theorem 1.17. For every $1 < Q < Q' < 2$, there exist infinitely many quasisymmetrically distinct $Q$-Ahlfors regular carpets, $X$, which satisfy a $(1,1)$-Poincaré inequality. Moreover:

1) The Loewner carpets $X$ can be chosen to be self-similar and to admit explicit quasisymmetric embeddings $f : X \to \mathbb{C}$ such that $f(X)$ has Hausdorff dimension $Q'$.
2) The images $f(X)$ can be constructed by explicit replacement rules.
3) The embeddings $f$ can be chosen to be $(Q/Q')$-snowflake mappings.
4) There exist planar quasiconformal maps $g, h : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}$ so that $g \circ f(X)$ is a circle carpet and $h \circ f(X)$ is a square carpet.

Remark 1.18. Part of the interest in our examples stems from the fact that although they are planar, they do not attain their conformal dimension with a planar quasiconformal map. In general, if $X \subset \mathbb{C}$, one can define also the notion of a conformal dimension with planar quasiconformal maps $f : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}$ replacing the role of general quasisymmetries. In our case, the sets $Y = f(X) \subset \mathbb{C}$, do attain their conformal dimension with an abstract space $X$, but there is no quasiconformal map $g : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}$ so that $g(Y)$ is $Q$-Ahlfors regular.

Remark 1.19. The square and circle carpet images $f(X)$ are obtained via post composition with quasisymmetric maps of $S^2$ as in 4) of Theorem 1.17, using results of [10] or [30]. In principle, the square and circle carpets are explicitly computable, but as a consequence of their complexity carrying out the computations might not provide much insight.

1.9. Admissable inverse and quotiented inverse systems. One might hope, that Loewner carpets could be explicitly constructed by starting with a suitable carpet in $S^2$ and then finding a metric, quasisymmetric to the given one, which is Loewner. This approach, which one might call the “direct method”, seems very difficult to implement. Here we reverse the process by first constructing a Loewner carpet $X$ and then a quasisymmetric embedding $f : X \to S^2$.

Recall that in [25] the first author and Bruce Kleiner introduced a class of admissible inverse limit systems,

$$X_1 \xleftarrow{\pi_1} X_2 \xleftarrow{\pi_1} X_3 \xleftarrow{\pi_1} \ldots$$

whose objects are metric graphs equipped with suitable measures. The spaces, $X_i$, as well as the measures, $\mu_i$ and the maps $\pi_i$, were assumed to satisfy certain so-called admissibility conditions from which it could be deduced that the doubling constants and constants in the $(1,1)$-Poincaré inequality remained uniformly bounded as $i \to \infty$. In some cases these limit spaces are planar while in other cases they are Loewner. However, both conditions are never satisfied simultaneously for these examples.

The sequences of graphs in our construction are part of a more general system which we refer to as an admissible quotiented inverse system. Here, the maps which would be present in an inverse system are alternated with quotient maps, which are subjected to additional assumptions. At the formal level, the quotiented inverse system looks like.

$$X_1 \xleftarrow{\pi_1} X_2 \xleftarrow{\pi_2} X_3 \xleftarrow{\pi_3} \ldots$$

A more elaborate diagram displaying additional structure is given in the Figure [3.5]. By using the admissability conditions, we will show that the graphs in the sequence $X_n$ satisfy uniform $(1,1)$-Poincaré inequalities and are doubling. These graphs converge in the Gromov-Hausdorff sense
(see for example \([21, 33, 44, 27, 24]\)) to limit spaces \(X_n^{dGH} \to X\). The limits \(X\) are more general than carpets, but in special cases, we can ensure that we obtain carpets. We show certain general properties for these limits. For example, they are analytically one dimensional.

The limits of quotiented inverse systems can be made “uniform”, which is a more general variant of Ahlfors regularity. This uniformity plays a role in proving the planarity of the limits and in distinguishing the spaces up to quasisymmetries. See Subsection 3.5 for more details.

**Definition 1.21.** A measure is said to be \(h\)-uniform if \(\mu(B(x, r)) \asymp h(r)\) for some increasing function \(h: [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)\).  

Additionally, to obtain carpets we need to enforce planarity of each graph \(X_n\) in the sequence. It is not difficult to see that, in the planar cases, except for degenerate cases, the Hausdorff dimension satisfies \(1 < \dim_H(X) < 2\). For general admissible quotiented inverse systems, just as for general inverse limits, any Hausdorff dimension can be obtained.

1.10. **Explicit examples via replacement rules.** In certain cases, the sequence \(X_n\) of graphs in our admissable quotiented inverse system can also be described in terms of replacement rules. In fact, we will use these cases in the proof of Theorem 1.17. Roughly speaking, employing a replacement rule means that one passes from \(X_n\) to \(X_{n+1}\), by removing successively disjoint pieces of \(X_n\) of some finite collection of specified types and replacing them successively with pieces of a different specified type chosen from another finite collection. In passing from \(X_n\) to \(X_{n+1}\), edge lengths decrease by a definite factor and the number of edges increases by a definite factor. Essentially by definition, spaces constructed by replacement rules exhibit at least some degree of self-similarity.

The particular examples of Loewner carpets that we construct via replacement rules involve at each stage several distinct choices for the replacement pieces. By suitably varying them, we obtain uncountably many examples, \(X\), for each \(Q, Q'\), as in Theorem 1.17. However, as previously mentioned, for now, we can only show that a countable subclass of the above examples are pairwise quasisymmetrically distinct; see Section 6.

1.11. **Quasisymmetric embeddings.** As mentioned at the beginning of this introduction, Theorem 2.11 states that a thin planar Loewner space is a carpet which embeds quasisymmetrically in \(S^2\). Although our quotiented inverse examples are limits of planar graphs, this in itself does not imply that the limits themselves are planar. **Thus, Theorem 2.11 cannot be used directly to show that our examples have quasisymmetric embeddings.**

The planarity of our general quotiented inverse system examples, together with the more precise fact that the embedding can be chosen to be quasisymmetric, is shown in [11] (in preparation), which is the sequel to the present paper; compare the proof of Theorem 2.11. The explicit examples constructed in Section 3 have a property called \(h\)-uniformity. For certain systems with this property, planarity of the limit is shown in Theorem 3.28.

In fact, if the parameters in the construction are appropriately chosen, then without resorting to general and nonexplicit methods, one can construct explicit uniformly quasisymmetric embeddings.
into the plane in such a way that one can pass to the limit. This can be done for infinitely many quasisymmetrically distinct pairs as above.

The above mentioned embeddings map the $X_n$ to finer and finer grids whose lines are parallel to the coordinate axes. These embeddings become bi-Lipschitz after the original metric on $X$ is snowflaked. The fine grids enable one to make the images wiggle appropriately. An example of such an embedding in which the first few stages are simple enough to actually be drawn is given in Figure 5.1.

For cases in which the construction of explicit embeddings does not apply, we need to use a more general but less explicit embedding result proved in a separate, forthcoming, paper; [11]. The images, $f(X) \subset S^2$, of these embeddings are circle carpets.

1.12. Non-embedding of metrics arising from strong $A_\infty$-weights. Strong $A_\infty$ weights were introduced by David-Semmes [29, 64]. A strong $A_\infty$ weight on a $Q$-Loewner space $(X, D)$ is a nonnegative locally $L_1$ function $\omega$ such that for the measure $\mu$ satisfying $d\mu := \omega \cdot d\mathcal{H}_Q$, the following hold.

1. The measure $\mu$ is doubling with respect to the metric $D$.
2. There exists a metric $D_\omega$ and a constant $C$, such that for all $x, y \in X$:

$$\frac{1}{C} \mu(B(x, D(x, y)))^{\frac{1}{Q}} \leq D_\omega(x, y) \leq C \mu(B(x, D(x, y)))^{\frac{1}{Q}}.$$ 

The metric $D_\omega$ is well defined up to bi-Lipschitz equivalence. A representative of the equivalence class can always be taken to be:

$$d_\omega(x, y) = \inf_{B_0, \ldots, B_m} \sum_{i=0}^m \mu(B_i)^{\frac{1}{Q}}.$$

Here the balls $B_i$ are defined with respect to the metric $D$ and the infimum is taken over chains of balls $B_0, \ldots, B_m$ such that $x \in B_0$, $y \in B_m$ and $B_i \cap B_{i+1} \neq \emptyset$ for $i = 0, \ldots, m - 1$. If $\omega$ is continuous, then the metric has a simpler expression:

$$D_\omega(x, y) = \inf_\gamma \int_\gamma \omega^{\frac{1}{Q}} \, ds,$$

where the infimum is over all rectifiable curves $\gamma$ connecting $x$ to $y$.

Strong $A_\infty$ weights form a strict subset of Muckenhoupt $A_\infty$ weights in the classical sense, see [31]. Equivalently, $\omega$ satisfies a reverse Hölder i.e. there exists $p > 1$ and a constant $C$ such that for every ball $B$,

$$\left( \frac{1}{\mu(B)} \int_B \omega^p \, d\mathcal{H}_Q \right)^{1/p} \leq C \cdot \frac{1}{\mu(B)} \int_B \omega \, d\mathcal{H}_Q.$$ 

If $X$ is $Q$-Loewner and $\omega$ is strong $A_\infty$ weight then $(X, D_\omega)$ is also $Q$-Loewner and the identity map is quasisymmetric from $(X, D)$ to $(X, D_\omega)$. Conversely, if $h : X \to Y$ is a quasisymmetric homeomorphism between $Q$-Loewner spaces, then the push forward, $h_*^{-1}(\mathcal{H}_Q)$ of $\mathcal{H}_Q$, under the map, $h^{-1}$, satisfies:

$$d(h_*^{-1}(\mathcal{H}_Q)) = \omega \cdot d\mathcal{H}_Q,$$
A specific version of the converse question was asked and answered (in the negative) by Semmes. Namely, is every strong $A_\infty$ weight (perhaps even assumed to be continuous) up to a constant multiple of the form $d(h^{-1}(Q)) = \omega dQ$ where the quasisymmetric homeomorphism $h: \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}^N$. Otherwise put, are there examples in which we can be certain that the metric obtained by deformation by a strong $A_\infty$ weight is not just the original metric in some disguised form i.e. disguised by composition with some unknown bi-Lipschitz homeomorphism. Semmes gave two different types of counter examples. The second, which we now describe, is particularly flexible and is the pertinent one for this paper.

Let $(Y,d)$ denote a complete doubling metric space and $f: Y \to \mathbb{R}^N$ be an $\alpha$ snowflake embedding for some $\alpha < 1$. Semmes showed that the following function is a strong $A_\infty$ weight.

$$\omega(x) := (D(x,f(Y)))^{1/\alpha}.$$ Additionally, $f: (Y,d) \to (f(Y),D\omega)$ is bi-Lipschitz. Therefore, if there exists quasisymmetric $h: (\mathbb{R}^N,d) \to (\mathbb{R}^N,d)$ with Jacobian $\omega$, it follows that $h \circ f: Y \to \mathbb{R}^N$ is a bi-Lipschitz embedding. (His other counter example mentioned above worked with $n = 3$.) Subsequently, Laakso, gave a different counter example with target $\mathbb{R}^2$; see [50]. The spaces $(Y,d)$ in these examples in fact were observed not to admit bi-Lipschitz embeddings in any uniformly convex Banach space (let alone $\mathbb{R}^N$).

By Assouad’s theorem, any doubling metric space $Z$ admits a snowflake embedding in some $\mathbb{R}^N$. Thus, as Semmes observed, if $Z$ does not bi-Lipschitz that $\mathbb{R}^N$, his construction of the associated $D\omega$ gives provides an example of a strong $A_\infty$ weight which is not the Jacobian of a quasisymmetric homeomorphism $h: (\mathbb{R}^N,d) \to (\mathbb{R}^N,d)$ as above.

In particular, our examples of thin $Q$ Loewner carpets which admit $Q/Q'$ snowflake embeddings provide such counter examples which do not in fact embed in any Banach space with the Radon Nikodym Property (RNP) of which uniformly convex spaces are a special case); see [cheeger], [cheeger,kleiner], [59] or the references in [26] for additional details. Recall, that a Banach space $B$ is said to satisfy the Radon-Nikodym property if every Lipschitz function $f: [0,1] \to B$ is differentiable almost everywhere. See [59] or the references in [26] for more details. Thus, we have:

**Theorem 1.22.** There exist strong $A_\infty$-weights $\omega$ on $\mathbb{R}^2$, such that $(\mathbb{R}^2,d_\omega)$ does not bi-Lipschitz embed into any Banach space with the Radon-Nikodym property. In particular $\omega$ is not a Jacobian of any quasiconformal map.

These counter examples are particularly strong since the (explicit) snowflake embedding is in the minimal possible dimension, 2 and also because $Q/Q'$ can be taken arbitrarily close to 1.

The examples here are particularly interesting since they lie in the plane $\mathbb{R}^2$. By Assouad, any doubling space admits a snowflake embedding in some Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^N$. Thus, it would give an example in higher dimensions of a weight that wasn’t comparable to a Jacobian. Here, we do this construction in the minimal dimension.

We remark, that the question of giving nontrivial sufficient conditions for a strong $A_\infty$-weight to be comparable to the Jacobian of a quasiconformal mapping is still wide open.

---

4This fact will play a role in Section 6.
1.13. **Overview of the remainder of the paper.** We now briefly summarize the contents of the remaining sections of the paper.

In Section 2 we show that thin planar Loewner spaces are carpets admitting quasisymmetric embeddings in $S^2$.

In Section 3 we define and study admissible quotiented inverse systems.

In Section 4 we give a general scheme involving replacement rules for constructing admissible quotiented inverse systems.

In Section 5 we construct our uncountably many examples of explicit snowflake embeddings.

In Section 6, for each $Q, Q'$, we show that a countable subcollection of our examples are pairwise quasisymmetrically distinct. This uses some new results on the infinitesimal structure of quasisymmetries between analytically 1-dimensional spaces.

1.14. **Notation and conventions.** We list here some conventions which are used in the remainder of the paper.

Throughout we will only be discussing complete, proper metric spaces $(X,d)$ and metric measure spaces $(X,d,\mu)$ equipped with a Radon measure $\mu$.

For two quantities $A, B$, sequences $A = A_n, B = B_n$ or functions $A = A(x_i), B = B(x_i)$, we will say $A \lesssim B$ if $A \leq CB$ for some fixed $C$. Further, denote $A \asymp B$ if $A \lesssim B$ and $B \lesssim A$. If we want to make the constants explicit, we write $A \lesssim C B$ for $A \leq CB$ and $A \asymp C B$ if $A \lesssim C B$ and $B \lesssim C A$. Implicitly this notation means that $C$ does not depend on the parameters $x_i$ or $n$, but may depend on other constants in the statement of the theorem/lemma.

We will need then notions of pointed measured Gromov-Hausdorff convergence, for which we refer to standard references [21, 34, 44, 27, 24]. At a point $p \in X$, the the tangents are limits of $(X, d/r_n, \mu/\mu(B(p, r_n)))$ along some subsequence $r_n \searrow 0$. The collection of them is denoted by $T_{X_p}$, and an individual tangent space is denoted by $T_X$. We also refer to [52] for a discussion of quasisymmetries and their blow-ups. We will briefly discuss Hausdorff convergence in the plane, for which the reader can consult [57, p. 281].

**Acknowledgments:** The first author was partially supported by NSF grant DMS-1406407. The second author was partially supported by NSF grant DMS-1704215.

2. Thin planar Loewner spaces are quasisymmetric to carpets in $S^2$.

In this section which show that thin planar Loewner spaces, are carpets which embed quasisymmetrically in $S^2$; see Theorem 2.11. We will begin by recalling a number relevant definitions. Then we state a basic result of Tukia and Väisälä, Theorem 2.7 which is needed for the proof of our key technical result, Theorem 2.10. Theorem 2.11 is an easy consequence of Theorem 2.10.

2.1. Quasisymmetries and quasicircles.

**Definition 2.1.** A metric space $X$ is $C$-linearly locally connected (LLC) if there is a constant $C$ with the following two properties.

$LC_1$ For all $x, y \in X$ there is a continuum $E$ with $x, y \in E$ and such that $\text{diam}(E) \leq C \cdot d(x, y)$. 
For every $0 < r < \text{diam}(X)/C$ and any ball $B(z, r)$ and any points $x, y \notin B(z, Cr)$, there is a continuum $E$ with $x, y \in E$, and $E \cap B(z, r) \cap \emptyset$.

$X$ is linearly locally connected if $C$ as above exists.

**Definition 2.2.** A metric space $X$ is annularly linearly locally connected (ALLC) if for every $x, y, z \in X$, and any $R > 0$, such that $R < d(x, y) < d(x, z) < 2R$, there is a curve $\gamma$ such that the following hold.

1) $y, z \in \text{Image}(\gamma)$.
2) $\text{diam}(\gamma) \leq C \cdot d(y, z)$.
3) $\gamma \cap B(x, R/C) = \emptyset$.

Usually, the above definition is stated using a continuum instead of a curve. (Recall, that a continuum is a compact connected set.) However, using a curve makes our proofs below easier. Also, for quasiconvex spaces this version is equivalent to the standard one. Quasisymmetries preserve the LLC and ALLC conditions.

**Definition 2.3.** Given a homeomorphism $\eta: [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, we say that a map $f: (X, d_X) \rightarrow (Y, d_Y)$ is $\eta$-quasisymmetric if for all $x, y, z \in X$, with $x \neq z$

\begin{equation}
\frac{d_Y(f(x), f(y))}{d_Y(f(x), f(z))} \leq \eta\left(\frac{d_X(x, y)}{d_X(x, z)}\right).
\end{equation}

**Definition 2.5.** Given a metric space $X$, the image of a quasisymmetric embedding $\phi: S^1 \rightarrow \text{Image}(\gamma) \subset X$ is called a quasicircle. A collection $\Gamma$ of quasicircles is called uniform if for some fixed $\eta$, it consists of images of $\eta$-quasisymmetric maps of $S^1$.

**Definition 2.6.** A curve $\gamma: S^1 \rightarrow X$ has bounded turning, if there is a $C \geq 1$ such that for any distinct $s, t \in S^1$, and arcs $I, J$ of $S^1$ defined by $s, t$,

$$\min(\text{diam}(\gamma(I)), \text{diam}(\gamma(J))) \leq Cd(\gamma(s), \gamma(t)).$$

The following result of Tukia and Väisälä [68] provides a characterization of quasicircles.

**Theorem 2.7 (Tukia–Väisälä, [68]).** If $\gamma: S^1 \rightarrow X$ is an embedded circle, then its image is a quasicircle if and only if $\gamma$ is of bounded turning. The function $\eta$ in Definition 2.3 depends solely on the constant $C$ in the bounded turning condition inequality (2.6).

Next we show that compact thin planar Loewner spaces are carpets.

**Proposition 2.8.** For $1 < Q < 2$, a compact planar $Q$-Loewner space $X$ is a carpet.

**Proof.** Since $X$ is $Q$-Loewner, by [37] Theorem 3.13 it is annularly linearly locally connected. In particular, it is locally connected and connected. We note that, while the definition of Loewner in [37] is stated slightly differently, the authors also establish the equivalence of our definition and theirs.

An annularly linearly locally connected space cannot have local cut points. Also, $X$ cannot have manifold points since if that case, it would then have at least topological dimension $\geq 2$, and hence, Hausdorff dimension $\geq 2$ as well; see [39]. Thus, by Whyburn’s Theorem 1.5, $X$ is a carpet. \qed
We will now show that such planar Loewner spaces $X$, which are also always Loewner carpets, admit a quasisymmetric embedding into the plane.

If $E, F \subset X$ are two disjoint and compact sets of a metric space $X$, which contain more than one point, recall from [1.12] that their relative separation is defined as: $\Delta(E, F) := \frac{d(E, F)}{\min(\text{diam}(E), \text{diam}(F))}$.

**Definition 2.9.** A collection $\mathcal{F}$ of sets is uniformly $\delta$-relatively separated, if $\Delta(E, F) \geq \delta > 0$ for each distinct $E, F \in \mathcal{F}$.

The planarity of a Loewner space $X$ guarantees, that there is a topological embedding $\phi : X \to \mathbb{C}$. Consequently, via stereographic projection, we also have an embedding $\phi : X \to S^2$. As shown above, since $X$ is a carpet so is $\phi(X)$ and by Whyburn’s Theorem [7,5] we can express $\phi(X) = S^2 \setminus \bigcup D_i$, where $D_i$ are countably many Jordan domains with disjoint closures. So, each boundary $\partial D_i$ is a Jordan curve in $X$. We will give each $\partial D_i$ some parametrization by an embedded circle $\gamma_i$, and denote the collection of these circles by $\Gamma$. The curves $\gamma_i$ lie in $\phi(X)$, but we will identify them via the homeomorphism $\phi$ with curves in $X$.

These curves are called peripheral circles. In general, any Jordan curve $\gamma$ in $X$ is a peripheral circle if and only if it doesn’t separate $X$ into two components. This is an easy consequence of the Jordan curve theorem.

In order to prove our main result, Theorem 2.11, we will need the following theorem.

**Theorem 2.10.** If $X$ is a Loewner carpet, then the collection of peripheral circles $\Gamma = \{\gamma_i\}$ is uniformly relatively separated and consists of uniform quasicircles, that is, there is a function $\eta$ such that $\gamma_i$ are all $\eta$-quasicircles and another $\delta$ so that $\Delta(\gamma_i, \gamma_j) \leq \delta$ for each $\gamma_i, \gamma_j \in \Gamma$ distinct.

**Proof.** In order to simplify notation, and recalling the above discussion, we will identify $X$ with its image $\phi(X) = S^2 \setminus \bigcup D_i$ in the plane. The metric notions of diameter, and distance, will refer to the metric on $X$, which is distinct from the restricted metric in $S^2 \setminus \bigcup D_i$.

By assumption together with [37, Theorem 3.13] and [23] the space $X$ is $R$-ALLC and $R$-quasiconvex for some $R \geq 1$.

**Step 1.** The peripheral circles are uniform quasicircles.

By Theorem 2.7, it suffices to prove that this collection of circles has uniformly bounded turning. We prove this by contradiction. Fix a large $C \geq 1$ (in fact $C = 4R^2$ suffices), and suppose that some $\gamma_i$ is not $C$-bounded turning. Then, there would exist two points $a, b \in \gamma_i$ which separate $\gamma_i$ into Jordan arcs $I, J \subset \gamma_i$ with $\text{diam}(I) \geq \text{diam}(J) \geq Cd(a, b)$. By the R-LLC condition, there exists a curve $\beta \subset X$ such that $\text{diam}(\beta) \leq R \cdot d(a, b)$ connecting $a$ to $b$. By [56, Theorem 1], we can find another curve $\beta_1$ which is a simple curve contained in the image of $\beta$, and which connects the two points $a, b$.

Now, since $D_i$ is a Jordan domain and $\partial D_i = \gamma_i$, by the Jordan curve theorem, we can find a simple curve $\beta_2$ which is contained in the interior of $D_i$, except for its endpoints, which connects $a$ to $b$. Consider the simple Jordan curve $\sigma$ formed by concatenating $\beta_1$ and $\beta_2$. This curve divides $S^2$ into exactly two components.

---

Recall, that a domain $D$ is a Jordan domain if $\partial D_i$ is a Jordan curve. A Jordan curve is any embedded copy of $S^1$ in $S^2$. 
If $C \geq 2R^2$, then we can find two points $s \in I, \ t \in J$, which satisfy
\[ d(s, a) = d(t, a) \geq \frac{1}{2} C \cdot d(a, b). \]

**Claim:** $s, t$ cannot both lie in the same component $U$ of $S^2 \setminus \sigma$.

To prove the claim, suppose that they both lay in the same component $U$ and denote the other component by $V$. Then the Jordan curve theorem implies that $\partial U = \partial V = \sigma$. Since every point in $D_i \setminus \sigma$ can be connected to either $s$ or $t$ by a simple curve contained in the closure and intersecting $D_i$ only at the end-points, we would have that $D_i \setminus \sigma$ would also lie in $U$. However, then each point of $\sigma \cap D_i$ would have a neighborhood $D_i$ which only contains points of $U$, and it would follow that $\sigma \cap D_i \cap \partial V = \emptyset$. This contradicts the equality $\partial V = \sigma$.

Since $X$ is R-ALLC, there exists another curve $\gamma$ connecting $s, t$ within $X$ such that $\gamma \cap B(x, 2Rd(a, b)) = \emptyset$. Then $\beta_1 \cap \gamma = \emptyset$ since $\beta_1 \subset \beta \subset B(x, 2Rd(a, b))$, and $\beta_2 \cap \gamma = \emptyset$ since $\gamma \subset X$. In particular $\gamma \cap \sigma = \emptyset$, which is impossible since $\sigma$ separated the points $s, t$. This completes the proof of Step 1. i.e. peripheral circles are uniform quasicircles.

**Step 2.** The collection $\Gamma$ is uniformly relatively separated.

Again, we argue by contradiction. Assume that for some very small $\delta$ (in fact $\delta = \frac{1}{24R^2}$ suffices), we have, $\Delta(\gamma_i, \gamma_j) \leq \delta$ for some distinct $\gamma_i, \gamma_j \in \Gamma$ i.e.
\[ d(\gamma_i, \gamma_j) \leq \delta \min(\text{diam}(\gamma_i), \text{diam}(\gamma_j)). \]

Let $a \in \gamma_i, b \in \gamma_j$ be such that $d(a, b) = d(\gamma_i, \gamma_j)$. By the $R$-quasiconvexity condition we can connect $a, b$ by a curve $\alpha$ with $\alpha \subset B(a, R \cdot d(a, b))$.

For points $s, t \in \gamma_i$, denote by $A_{st}$ the subarc of $\gamma_i$ containing $s, t$ containing $a$. If $\delta$ is chosen sufficiently small, we can pick $s, t \in \gamma_i$ to be the closest points to $a$, such that $d(s, a) = d(t, a) = 2R^2 \cdot d(a, b)$. By choosing the closest $s, t$, we can ensure that the sub-arc $A_{st}$ containing $a$ satisfies:
\[ A_{st} \subset B(a, 2R^2 \cdot d(a, b)). \]

As above it follows from the ALLC condition that there is a simple curve $\beta_1$ connecting $s, t$ which does not intersect $\alpha$ and satisfies with
\[ \text{diam}(\beta_1) \leq 4R^3 d(a, b) \]
\[ \beta_1 \subset B(a, 8R^3 \cdot d(a, b)). \]

As above, we can connect $s, t$ by a simple curve $\beta_2$ within $D_i$, and form a Jordan curve $\sigma$ by concatenating $\beta_1$ with $\beta_2$. This divides $S^2 \setminus \sigma$ into two components $U, V$.

Without loss of generality, we can assume that $\delta < \frac{1}{2}$ and
\[ d(a, b) = d(\gamma_i, \gamma_j) \leq \delta \min(\text{diam}(\gamma_i), \text{diam}(\gamma_j)). \]

Then we can find $x \in \gamma_i, y \in \gamma_j$ with $d(x, a) \geq \frac{1}{28} d(a, b)$ and $d(y, a) \geq \frac{1}{28} d(a, b)$.

By the same argument as above we see that $x$ and $a$ lie in separate components of $S^2 \setminus \sigma$, say $x \in U$ and $a \in V$. However, $\alpha$ does not intersect $\sigma$, and so $b \in V$ as well. Finally, we can find a simple curve $\beta_3$ contained in $D_j \cup \{b, y\}$ connecting $b$ and $y$. Then since $\sigma \subset D_i \cup X$ and $\beta_3$ does not intersect $\sigma$, it follows that $y \in V$ as well. Consequently $x \in U$ and $y \in V$ lie in separate components.
However, by the R-ALLC condition, we can connect $x$ to $y$ with a curve $\gamma \subset X$ which avoids the ball $B(a, \frac{1}{2\delta R} d(a, b)) \cap X$. By choosing any $\delta < \frac{1}{8R^2}$, we have

$$\sigma \cap X = \beta_1 \subset B(a, 4R^3 \cdot d(a, b)) \subset B(a, \frac{1}{2\delta R} d(a, b)).$$

Therefore, since $\sigma$ separates $x, y$, the curve $\gamma$ must intersect $\sigma$. However, $\gamma \cap \sigma \subset \gamma \cap X \subset \gamma \cap \beta_1$, and so $\gamma$ must also intersect $B(a, \frac{1}{2\delta R} d(a, b))$, which is a contradiction. This completes the proof of Step 2., and hence, the proof of Theorem 2.10 as well. □

Finally, we show that Loewner carpets can be realized as planar subsets via a quasisymmetric embedding.

**Theorem 2.11.** If $X$ is $Q$-Loewner planar space with $Q \in (1, 2)$, then there is a quasisymmetric embedding $f: X \to \mathbb{S}^2$.

**Proof.** By Theorem 2.10 we know that the peripheral circles are uniformly relatively separated uniform quasicircles. Further, by [36, Theorem 3.13] $X$ is ALLC. Now, [36, Corollary 3.5] implies that any space which is ALLC and $Q$-Ahlfors regular with $Q \in (1, 2)$, and whose collections of peripheral circles consists of uniformly separated quasicircles, admits a quasisymmetric embedding \(^6\) to $\mathbb{S}^2$. Since our space satisfies these assumptions, it also admits such an embedding. □

**Remark 2.12.** The proof of [36, Theorem 3.1] involves gluing in quasidisks to the peripheral circles in order to construct a 2-Ahlfors regular and ALLC surface, which then can be quasisymmetrically embedded using [13]. Alternatively, one can produce such a quasisymmetric embedding using the discrete results in [11]. However, this requires first discretizing the space by making appropriate use of [13, Lemma 6.1].

**Remark 2.13.** In the discussion above and following theorem, assuming the Loewner condition is not strictly necessary; ALLC would suffice.

Now, this can be combined with [10] or [30] to give the following.

**Corollary 2.14.** If $Y$ is planar and $Q$-Loewner, then there quasisymmetric embedding $f: Y \to \mathbb{C}$ and a planar quasiconformal map $g: \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}$ so that $g \circ f(Y)$ is a circle carpet. Similarly, the image can be uniformized with a square carpet by another map $h: \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}$ so that $h \circ f(Y)$ is a square carpet.

### 3. Admissible Quotiented Inverse Systems Yielding Planar Loewner Spaces

In this section we define admissible quotiented inverse systems and prove that their measured Gromov-Hausdorff limits are doubling and satisfy Poincaré inequalities. Initially we do not address the issue of quasisymmetric embeddings, and do not assume any uniformity or planarity. The general case does not require these, and leads to other examples, while specializing the construction to enforce these conditions leads to the planar Loewner carpets in Theorem 1.17.

---

\(^6\)A minor technical point in this argument should be noted. There is an additional porosity assumption used in [30], which is only used for a lower bound for Ahlfors regularity, and is not actually needed for the uniformization result. In fact, this lower bound for Ahlfors regularity follows purely from topological considerations. In particular a topological manifold, which is ALLC always satisfies the lower Ahlfors regularity bound, see [40].
We will consider systems of spaces \(X^i_j\), where each \(X^i_j\) is a metric measure graph with each edge isometric to an edge of length \(s_i\). For simplicity, set \(s_0 = 1\) and \(s_i \leq s_{i'}\) for \(i \geq i'\).

**Definition 3.1.** Graphs satisfying the above conditions will be referred to as *monotone*, if there are functions \(h^i_j \colon X^i_j \to \frac{2}{\pi}S^1\), or \(h^i_j \colon X^i_j \to \mathbb{R}\), which are isometries when restricted to edges.

We use \(\frac{2}{\pi}S^1\) to denote the circle rescaled to have length 4. This is convenient for most of our explicit examples, but not actually necessary. The spaces \(\mathbb{R}\) and \(\frac{2}{\pi}S^1\) will be considered as simplicial complexes with edge length 1. They also have a natural structure as directed graphs and so \(X^i_j\) are also directed graphs; the orientation of an edge \(e\) is the one inherited from \(h^i_j(e)\).

Fix a sequence of integers \(\{m_i\}_{i=1}^\infty\) with \(3 \leq m_i \leq M\), and define \(s_k = \prod_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{m_i}\). We assume \(X^i_k\) to have edge lengths given by \(s_i\) with measures \(\mu^i_k\) when \(i,k \in \mathbb{N}_0\) and \(k \leq i\).

**Definition 3.2.** A system as above is called a (monotone) quotiented inverse system if there are mappings

\[
\pi^i_k : X^i_{k+1} \to X^i_k, \quad q^i_k : X^i_{k-1} \to X^i_k, \quad h^i_k : X^i_k \to \mathbb{R} \text{ or } \frac{2}{\pi}S^1
\]

that commute according to diagram in Figure 3.5.

We denote the compositions of these maps by \(q^i_k = q^i_{k-1} \circ \cdots \circ q^i_1 : X^i_1 \to X^i_k\) and \(\pi^i_k = \pi^i_1 \circ \cdots \circ \pi^i_{k-1} : X^i_k \to X^i_1\).

For a graph \(G\), with edge length \(s\), we will denote the graph obtained by subdividing each edge into \(m\) pieces of length \(s/m\) by \(G/m\). If \(v \in G\) is a vertex, we denote by \(\text{Str}_v^G\) the closed star of a vertex in \(G\). By definition, it consists of \(v\) together with the edges adjacent to it. If the graph \(G\) is evident from context we will simply denote \(\text{Str}_v\).

**Definition 3.3.** An quotiented inverse system is called *admissible* if the following properties hold:

1. Simplicial property: The maps \(\pi^i_k\) and \(q^i_k\) are simplicial, where \(\pi^i_k\) is considered as a function onto the subdivided graph \((X^i_k)^{/m_{i+1}}\).
2. Connectivity: The graphs \(X^i_k\) are connected.
3. Bounded geometry: The graphs \(X^i_k\) have \(C\)-bounded degree, and \(\mu^i_k(e) > C \mu^i_k(f)\), when \(e, f \in X^i_k\) are adjacent edges.
4. Compatibility with the measure:
   \[
   (q^i_k)^*(\mu^i_{k-1}) = \mu^i_k, \quad (\pi^i_k)^*(\mu^i_{k+1}) = \mu^i_k.
   \]
5. Compatibility with monotonicity:
   \[
   h^i_k \circ \pi^i_k = h^i_{k+1}, \quad h^i_k \circ q^i_k = h^i_{k-1}.
   \]
6. Diameter bound: \(\text{diam}((\pi^i_k)^{-1}(p)) \leq Cs_i\).
7. Openness: The maps \(\pi^i_k\) are open.
8. Surjectivity: The maps \(\pi^i_k\) and \(q^i_k\) are surjective.
9. Balancing condition: If \(v \in (X^i_k)^{/m_{i+1}}\) and \(v' \in X^{i+1}_k\), then there is a constant \(c_{v,v'}\) such that \((\pi^i_k)^*(\mu^i_{k-1}\mid\text{Str}_{v'}) = c_{v,v'}\mu^i_k\mid\text{Str}_v\). The star at \(v\) is in the subdivided graph \((X^i_k)^{/m_{i+1}}\).
Quotient condition: There are constants $\delta, C > 0$ such that if $l \leq k \leq i$, $x \in X^i_k$ and $r \in (0, \delta s_l)$, then:

$$\text{diam}((q^i_{lk})^{-1}(B(x, r))) \leq C s_l.$$  

![Diagram of quotiented inverse system](image)

**Figure 3.5.** Quotiented inverse system

**Remark 3.6.** The conditions involving $\pi^i$ coincide with the Cheeger-Kleiner axioms for each of the rows being an inverse limit [25] (see Figure 3.5). This guarantees that the rows satisfy certain uniform Poincaré inequalities and doubling properties. The final assumption on $q$ is the crucial assumption that guarantees that the quotient maps preserve the Poincaré inequalities and doubling properties. It is possible to verify the last assumption in many particular instances. For example, it suffices that the quotient maps $q$ only identify vertices close enough to vertices. These will be discussed separately in Subsection 3.4.

### 3.1. Uniform doubling and Poincaré inequality

Throughout this subsection, we will consider an admissible monotone quotiented inverse system $X^i_k$.

**Remark 3.7.** The admissible monotone quotiented inverse systems are constrained only up to unit scale $s_0$. Thus, our analytic properties only hold up to that scale. Consider properties such as in Inequalities (1.7) and (1.8), which depend on a scale $r$ and location $x$. We adopt the convention that such a property is *local* if it holds for all $r < r_0$ for some $r_0$ uniform in $x$ with uniform constants. If we wish to specify the scale, we will say the property holds locally up to scale $r_0$. The constants in the property are assumed here independent of the scale. By analogy with [6], a *semi-local* property...
is one where the property holds for every $r$ but with constants that are bounded only when $r$ lies in some bounded subset of $(0, \infty)$. In [6] the constants are also allowed to depend on the location $x$, but we can avoid this dependence since all of our spaces are quasiconvex and locally doubling.

To give examples: hyperbolic $n$-space $H^n$ is semi-locally doubling, but the space $\mathbb{N}$ equipped with the discrete metric $d(x,y) = 1$ if $x \neq y$ and the counting measure is only locally doubling up to scale $1/2$.

**Lemma 3.8.** Let $L \geq 1$ be arbitrary. The spaces $X^i_k$ are locally measure doubling and satisfy a local $(1,1)$-Poincaré inequality up to scale $Lm^{-k}$.

**Proof.** The space $X^i_k$ satisfies these properties since it has bounded degree and therefore bounded geometry at scales comparable to $s_k$. The rows of a quotiented inverse system satisfy the inverse-limit axioms of [25]. Thus, by [25, Theorem 1.1], the spaces $X^i_k$ satisfy a Poincaré inequality and measure doubling up to a scale comparable to $s_k$. In view of the connectivity and bounded geometry of $X^i_k$, this can be strengthened to hold up to any scale $Ls_k$ by appealing to the results from [6]. The constants will depend on $L$ and the constants defining $X^i_k$. □

The quotient condition leads to doubling bounds.

**Lemma 3.9.** The spaces $X^i_k$ in an admissible monotone quotiented inverse system are doubling up to scale $r_0 = 1$.

**Proof.** Fix $\delta, C$ as in Condition (9) of Definition 3.3 and equation (3.4). Let $x \in X^i_k$, and $r \in (0, \delta/2)$ be fixed. We will show doubling up to scale $\delta/2$, from which we can apply the local-to-semi-local techniques from [6] to obtain a doubling constant at unit scale. By Lemma 3.8 it follows that $X^i_k$ are $D_0$-doubling up to scale $2Cs_k$ for some $D_0$. If $r < Cs_k$, then the doubling bound for $B(x,r)$ follows from this. Thus, assume $r > Cs_k$. Let $l < k$ be such that $\delta s_{l+1} < 2r \leq \delta s_l$ and pick a $z \in (q^i_{lk})^{-1}(x)$. We have from the quotient condition

$$B(z, \delta s_{l+1}) \subset (q^i_{lk})^{-1}(B(x,r)) \subset (q^i_{lk})^{-1}(B(x,2r)) \subset B(z, 2Cs_l).$$

The desired doubling then follows by a direct computation. Note that, since $s_l/s_{l+1} \leq M$, we have $s_l \leq \frac{M}{\delta} r$.

$$\frac{\mu^i_k(B(x,2r))}{\mu^i_k(B(x,r))} = \frac{\mu^i_l((q^i_{lk})^{-1}(B(x,2r)))}{\mu^i_l((q^i_{lk})^{-1}B(x,r))} \leq \frac{\mu^i_l(B(z,2Cs_l))}{\mu^i_l(B(z,\delta s_{l+1}))} \leq D_0 \log_2(CM/\delta)+2.$$ □

Next, using similar estimates we establish the Poincaré inequality.

**Proposition 3.10.** The spaces $X^i_k$ satisfy a local $(1,1)$-Poincaré inequality and doubling at unit scale.
Proof. Let $C, \delta$ be the constants from the quotient condition. The doubling was shown already in Lemma 3.9. It suffices to prove the Poincaré inequality. We show that the Poincaré inequality holds up scale $r < \delta/2$. Fix $x \in X^i_k$, $r \in (0, \delta/2)$ and a Lipschitz function $f : X^i_k \to \mathbb{R}$. By Lemma 3.8 we have a Poincaré inequality on $X^i_j$ up to scale $C s_j$ for all $i \leq j$. Suppose $C_{PI}$ is the constant of this Poincaré inequality. We can thus assume $r > Cs_k$. Then, choose $l < k$ so that $\delta s_l+1 < r \leq \delta s_l$. Also, since $s_l/s_{l+1} \leq M$, we have $s_l \leq \frac{M}{\delta} r$. Denote $\Omega := (q^i_{lk})^{-1}(B(x, r)) \subset X^i_l$ and $z \in (q^i_{lk})^{-1}(x)$. We know that $B(z, \delta s_{l+1}) \subset \Omega \subset B(z, Cs_l)$.

The Poincaré inequality then follows from the following computation.

$$
\int_{B(x, r)} |f - f_{B(x, r)}| \mu^i_k \leq 2 \int_{B(x, r)} |f - (f \circ q^i_{kl})_{B(z, Cs_l)}| \mu^i_k
$$

$$
= 2 \int_{\Omega} |f \circ q^i_{kl} - (f \circ q^i_{kl})_{B(z, Cs_l)}| \mu^i_l
$$

$$
\leq 2D^{\log_2(C M/\delta)+1} \int_{B(z, Cs_l)} |f - (f \circ q^i_{kl})_{B(z, Cs_l)}| \mu^i_l
$$

$$
\leq 2D^{\log_2(C M/\delta)+1} C \frac{M}{\delta} r C_{PI} \int_{B(z, Cs_l)} \text{Lip} \ [f \circ q^i_{lk}] \mu^i_l
$$

$$
\leq 2D^{2 \log_2(C M/\delta)+2} C \frac{M}{\delta} C_{PI} r \int_{B(z, CM/\delta r)} \text{Lip} \ [f] \mu^i_l.
$$

In the above, on the third line we used the Poincaré inequality up to scale $Cs_l$. On the last line we used the almost everywhere equality Lip $[f \circ q^i_{kl}] = \text{Lip} [f] \circ q^i_{lk}$, since $q$ is a local isometry everywhere except on a discrete set of points. We also used the doubling property, a change of variables with $q^i_{lk}$, and $B(x, r) \subset q^i_{lk}(B(x, Cs_l)) \subset B(x, CM/\delta r)$.

Remark 3.11. By [6], it follows from Proposition 3.10 that the Poincaré inequality and doubling property also hold semi-locally.

3.2. Approximation Lemmas. We will need the following lemmas concerning the distance distortion between the spaces $X^i_k$ by the maps $q$ and $\pi$. Throughout, we will assume that $X^i_k$ is an admissible quotiented inverse system where each $X^i_k$ is compact.

We can first define $X^\infty_n$ as the inverse limits of the rows of the diagram. That is, take

$$
X^\infty_n = \{(x^k_n)_{k=n}^\infty \mid x^k_n \in X^k_n, \pi^i_n(x^i_n) = x^i_0\},
$$

and define a distance by

$$
d_{n,\infty}((x^k_n)_{k=n}^\infty, (y^k_n)_{k=n}^\infty) = \lim_{k \to \infty} d(x^k_n, y^k_n).
$$

Since the sequence is increasing and bounded, the limit exists.

The maps $q^i_{kl} : X^i_k \to X^i_l$ induce natural maps $q^\infty_{kl} : X^\infty_k \to X^\infty_l$ since they induce maps of the tails of the inverse limit sequences. Then, define $X^\infty_\infty$ as the direct limit of the sequence $X^\infty_n$. 
Lemma 3.15. Recall that spaces $Y_l$ form a directed system of metric spaces if there are maps $q_{kl} : Y_k \to Y_l$ for any $k < l$ which are 1-Lipschitz and surjective, and such that $q_{kl} \circ q_{ln} = q_{kn}$. Then, one can define the direct limit as follows:

$$Y_\infty := \left\{(y_k)_{k=1}^\infty \mid y_k \in Y_k, q_{kl}(y_k) = y_l \right\},$$

$$d_\infty((a_k)_{k=1}^\infty,(b_l)_{l=1}^\infty) = \lim_{n \to \infty} d(a_n, b_n).$$

There are natural maps $q_{kl} : Y_k \to Y_\infty$. The system is called a measured direct limit, if in addition, every space $Y_k$ possesses a measure $\mu_l$ such that $q_{kl}^*(\mu_k) = \mu_l$. The induced map $q_{l\infty} : Y_l \to Y_\infty$ defines a measure on $Y_\infty$ by $q_{l\infty}^*(\mu_l) = \mu_\infty$, which is independent of the choice of $l$. The measure $\mu_\infty$ is called the direct limit measure.

In our cases, the spaces $X^k_l$ form a directed sequence, so they define a direct limit space $X^\infty_l$. The induced quotient maps $q_{l\infty}^k : X^k_l \to X^\infty_l$ may decrease distances, but the quantity can be controlled using the following lemma. We note that it is an easy exercise to verify that the maps $q_{l\infty}^\infty$ satisfy the same quotient condition as in (3.4) with $X^k_l$ replaced by $X^\infty_l$.

Lemma 3.13. Assume that the spaces $X^k_l$ are compact. Assume also that $x, y \in X^\infty_l$ with $d(x, y) = r \leq 1$, and that $l \geq 0$ is such that $\delta s_{l+1} \leq r$. Then for any lifts $a, b \in X^\infty_l$ such that $q_{l\infty}^\infty(a) = x, q_{l\infty}^\infty(b) = y$, we have:

$$d(x, y) \leq d(a, b).$$

Proof. If $d(x, y) \geq \delta$, the assertion is clear since then $l = 0$, and $C \geq \text{diam}(X^\infty_0) \geq d(a, b) \geq r$ for some $C$. Thus we can assume $d(x, y) < \delta$. It then suffices to prove the assertion for the smallest $l$ such that $\delta s_{l+1} \leq r$. In this case, we also have $r < \delta s_l$. By the quotient condition $d(a, b) \leq C s_l \leq C M s_{l+1} \leq \frac{CM}{s} r$, which gives the desired conclusion. \hfill \Box

Recall that by [25] Estimate 2.14 and Section 2.5], if $a, b \in X^\infty_l$, then

(3.14) $$d(a, b) - Ls_l \leq d(\pi^\infty_l(a), \pi^\infty_l(b)) \leq d(a, b).$$

Lemma 3.15. If $x, y \in X^\infty_l$ are two points with $d(x, y) = r \leq 1$. Then if $\max\{\delta s_{l+1}, 2Ls_k\} \leq r$ and $x_k, y_k \in X^k_k$, and $x'_k, y'_k \in X^\infty_k$ are any points such that $q_{k\infty}^\infty(x'_k) = x, q_{k\infty}^\infty(y'_k) = y$, and $\pi_k^\infty(x'_k) = x_k, \pi_k^\infty(y'_k) = y_k$, then

$$r \times d(x_k, y_k) \times d(x'_k, y'_k).$$

Remark 3.16. Such a sequence $\{x_k\}$ is called an approximating sequence for $x$. The points $x_k$ individually are called approximants for $x$.

Proof. Fix an $L$ as in (3.14). Choose any $k \geq 1$ such that $\max\{\delta s_{k+1}, 2Ls_k\} \leq r$. Choose any lifts $x'_k, y'_k \in X^\infty_k$ such that $q_{k\infty}^\infty(x'_k) = x, q_{k\infty}^\infty(y'_k) = y$, and set $\pi_k^\infty(x'_k) = x_k, \pi_k^\infty(y'_k) = y_k$. From Lemma 3.13 we have

$$r \leq d(x'_k, y'_k) \leq r.$$

Also, from (3.14),

$$r/2 \leq d(x'_k, y'_k) - Ls_k \leq d(x_k, y_k) \leq d(x'_k, y'_k) \leq r.$$

This gives the desired estimates. \hfill \Box
3.3. Gromov-Hausdorff convergence of quotiened inverse system. In this section, we prove that the sequence $X_k^i$ converges in the Gromov-Hausdorff sense. See, for example, [21, 34, 43, 27, 24] for terminology. In general, if $Y_k$ is a direct limit system with bounded diameter, one can show that direct systems behave well under Gromov-Hausdorff convergence.

Lemma 3.17. If $Y_1$ is compact, then any direct limit system $Y_i$ as in Remark 3.12 also converges in the Gromov-Hausdorff sense to $Y_\infty$. Further, if the system is measured and $Y_\infty$ is equipped with the direct limit measure, then the sequence converges in the measured Gromov-Hausdorff sense.

Remark 3.18. It is possible to derive better bounds on the distances for quotiened inverse systems. However, this is technical, and we do not need it here.

Proof. Let $A_1 = N_\epsilon$ be an $\epsilon$-net for $Y_1$. Then $A_i = q_i(N_\epsilon)$ define a direct system of finite metric spaces. Clearly, by a diagonal argument, such a net converges to $A_\infty$. The Gromov-Hausdorff distance between $A_1$ and $Y_1$ is of the order $\epsilon$. Consequently, by a diagonal argument sending $\epsilon$ to 0 and $l$ to infinity it follows that $Y_1$ converges to $Y_\infty$.

We claim that if the Gromov-Hausdorff approximation maps (here $q_{\infty}$) are measurable, and the push-forwards of the measures under these approximations coincide with the limit measure, then the sequence converges in the measured Gromov-Hausdorff sense. This can be seen by considering any ball $B(x, r) \subset Y_\infty$, such that $\partial B(x, r)$ has measure 0, and showing that the measures of the balls $B(x_n, r) \subset Y_n$ converge to $\mu_\infty(B(x, r))$ if $q_{\infty}(x_n)$ converge to $x$. Since this holds for almost any $r$, the desired weak convergence follows. □

The above procedure defines the direct limit $X_\infty$ and maps $q_{\infty}^k : X_\infty^k \to X_\infty$ which are 1-Lipschitz. To proceed further, we will need a general lemma concerning Gromov Hausdorff limits.

Lemma 3.19. If $i_n, k_n \to \infty$ are any sequences, then $\lim_{k \to \infty} X_{k_n}^{i_n} = X_\infty^\infty$ in the measured Gromov-Hausdorff sense.

Proof. Relation (3.14) implies that the Gromov-Hausdorff distance can be estimated by

$$d_{GH}(X_{k_n}^{i_n}, X_\infty^\infty) \asymp s_{k_n}.$$ 

Since $X_{k_n}^\infty$ converges in the Gromov-Hausdorff sense to $X_\infty^\infty$, it follows that $X_{k_n}^{i_n}$ also converges to $X_\infty^\infty$. Thus, we have Gromov-Hausdorff approximation maps, which are 1-Lipschitz $\pi_{k_n}^{i_n}$ : $X_{k_n}^\infty \to X_{k_n}^{i_n}$, and $q_{k_n, \infty}^\infty : X_{k_n}^\infty \to X_\infty^\infty$, which preserve the measures. Then, arguing as in Lemma 3.17, using convergence of measures of balls and with an appropriate measurable Gromov-Hausdorff approximation constructed from these maps between $X_{k_n}^{i_n}$ and $X_\infty^\infty$, we see that $X_{k_n}^{i_n}$ also converges in the measured Gromov-Hausdorff sense to $X_\infty^\infty$. □

3.4. Quotient condition. That the quotient condition (3.4) holds can be ensured in various ways. One way is the following.

The star quotient condition. We stipulate that the identifications of $q_k^k$ occur only within half-stars of $X_{k-1}^{k-1}$, i.e for every $x \in X_{k}^{k-1}$, there exists a $v \in X_{k-1}^{k-1}$ such that for $\alpha > 1/2$,

$$(q_k^k)^{-1}(x) \subset (\pi_{k-1}^{k-1})^{-1} B(v, s_{k-1} - \alpha s_{k+1}).$$

(3.20)
In particular, since the maps \( q \) are simplicial, the identifications can only occur at subdivision points, or along an entire edge of a subdivision. Therefore, the maps \( q \) can only identify points \( a, b \) for which \( \pi_{k-1}^k(a), \pi_{k-1}^k(b) \) lie within the star of a vertex \( v \), and within the edges with distance \( \lfloor m_k/2 \rfloor - 1 \) from \( v \).

The star-quotient condition implies that any identifications by \( q \) occur in the vicinity of vertices. This is ensured by preventing identifications by \( q \) for the midpoints of edges if \( m_k \) even, and along the middle edges of subdivisions or its endpoints if \( m_k \) is odd.

**Lemma 3.21.** Let \( A \subset X_k^k \) denote a connected set. Then \( \pi_{k-1}^k((q_k^k)^{-1}(A)) \subset \overline{A} \subset X_k^{k-1} \), where \( \overline{A} \) is a connected set and \( \text{diam}(h_{k-1}^k(A)) \leq \text{diam}(h_k^k(A)) + s_{k-1} - 2\alpha s_k \).

**Proof.** Let \( A' = \pi_{k-1}^k(q_k^{-1}(A)) \). We will construct \( \overline{A} \) from \( A' \) in such a way as to ensure that it is connected.

For each \( x \in A \), let \( P_x = \pi_k^k((q_k^k)^{-1}(x)) \). This set may not be connected. However, by assumption there exists a vertex \( v \) such that \( P_x \subset B(v, \frac{s_{k-1}}{2} - \alpha s_k) \). We can define \( S_x = P_x \) if \( P_x \) is a singleton.

If \( P_x \) is not a singleton, then either the shorter arc between \( h_k^k(x) \) and \( h_{k-1}^k(v) \) is directed away from \( h_{k-1}^k(v) \), or the opposite holds.

In the first case let \( S_x \) the edges of the subdivision of \( X_{k-1}^k \) strictly contained in \( B(v, \frac{s_{k-1}}{2} - \alpha s_k) \) which are directed out of \( v \). In the second case, let all of the edges be directed towards \( v \). Then, \( P_x \subset S_x \) and \( S_x \) is connected. Define \( \overline{A} := \bigcup_{x \in A} S_x \). Since \( S_x \) intersects \( A' \) we obtain \( h_{k-1}^k(S_x) \cap h_k^k(A) \neq \emptyset \). This, combined with \( \text{diam}(h_{k-1}^k(S_x)) \leq \frac{s_{k-1}}{2} - \alpha s_k \), gives

\[
\text{diam}(h_{k-1}^k(\overline{A})) \leq \text{diam}(h_k^k(A)) + s_{k-1} - 2\alpha s_k.
\]

Now, we show that \( \overline{A} \) is connected. Note that by construction, each set \( S_x \) is connected since it is a union of edges on one side of a star or a singleton. For each \( a, b \in \overline{A} \) there are corresponding points \( x, y \in A \) such that \( a \in S_x, b \in S_y \). Moreover, there is a chain of edges (or parts of edges) \( e_0, \ldots, e_n \) connecting \( a \) to \( b \) in \( A \) by connectivity. Since the maps in question are simplicial, for each edge \( e_i \) the set \( \pi_{k-1}^k(q_k^{-1}(e_i)) \) is either a single edge, or finitely many edges.

Pick \( f_i \) in each of these collections. For consecutive edges \( e_i, e_{i+1} \), let \( p_i \) be their shared endpoint. By construction \( f_i \cup S_{p_i} \cup f_{i+1} \) is connected. Thus, \( \bigcup f_i \cup \bigcup S_{p_i} \cup S_a \cup S_b \) is a connected finite union of edges within \( \overline{A} \).

The following Lemma is a direct corollary of the estimate in (3.14).

**Lemma 3.22.** There is a \( C \geq 1 \) so that the following holds. If \( A \subset X_k^i \), and \( j \geq i \), then

\[
\text{diam}((\pi_k^i)^{-1}(A)) \leq \text{diam}(A) + C s_j.
\]

**Lemma 3.23.** Assume \( \delta < 2\alpha - 1 \), that \( A \subset X_k^k \) is a connected subset with \( \text{diam}(A) < \delta s_{l+1} \), and that \( l \leq k \). Then for some \( x \in X_l^k \) and universal \( C \geq l \),

\[
(q_k^k)^{-1}(A) \subset B(x, C s_l).
\]
Proof. Let $A \subset X^k_i$ denote a connected subset and $l \leq k$ with $\text{diam}(A) < \delta s_{l+1}$. We construct sets $A_l \subset X^{k-l}_{k-i}$ by setting $A_0 = A$ and then recursively applying Lemma 3.21 to get connected sets $A_i \subset X^{k-i}_{k-i}$ with the property that $\pi^{k-i}_i((q_i^{k-i})^{-1}(A_i)) \subset A_{i+1}$, and

$$\text{diam}(h^{k-i-1}_i(A_{i+1})) \leq \text{diam}(h^{k-i}_i(A_i)) + s_{k-i} - 2\alpha s_k.$$ 

This is possible as long as $i < k$.

Now, by inductively applying the previous estimate we get

$$\text{diam}(h_l(A_{k-l})) \leq \text{diam}(A_0) + s_l - (2\alpha - 1)s_{l+1} < s_l - (2\alpha - 1 - \delta)s_{l+1} = s_l.$$

In particular, since $A_{k-l} \subset X^l_i$ is connected and $h_l$ is an isometry on edges, it must be entirely contained in one vertex star. Thus $\text{diam}(A_{l-k}) \leq 2s_l$.

Finally,

$$(q_{l-k})^{-1}(A) \subset (\pi^{k-l}_l)^{-1}(A_{l-k}).$$

Therefore, by Lemma 3.22 $\text{diam}((q_{l-k})^{-1}(A)) \leq 2s_l + C s_l$.

Lemma 3.24. Assume that an quotiented inverse system satisfies conditions (1)–(9) the definition of an admissible quotiented inverse system, Definition 3.3. If in addition, the star-quotient condition holds, then the system satisfies the quotient condition, (10), in Definition 3.3 as well. Equivalently, the quotiented inverse system is admissible.

Proof. Let $r \in (0, \frac{1}{2}s_l)$. If we apply Lemma 3.23 to the set $A = B(x, r)$, since $\text{diam}(A) < \frac{1}{2}s_l \leq \delta s_{l+1}$, our assertion follows.

3.5. Uniformity. We give here a simple condition to ensure that the measure on the limit space is uniform i.e. $h$-uniform for some $h$; see Definition 1.21. Assume $h: [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$ is an increasing function (not necessarily continuous) such that $\lim_{t \to 0} h(t) = 0$ and doubling in the sense that $h(2t) \asymp h(t)$.

Definition 3.25. 1) An admissible quotiented inverse system is $h$-uniform if for each edge $e$ in $X^k_i$ we have $\mu^k(e) \asymp h(s_k)$.

2) A metric measure space $(X, d, \mu)$ is called $h$-uniform if $\mu(B(x, r)) \asymp C_{\mu} h(r)$ for all $0 < r \leq 1$.

The implicit constant $C_{\mu}$ in this comparison is called the uniformity constant.

Lemma 3.26. Assume that each graph $X^l_i$ has bounded diameter. Let $X^\infty_i$ denote an admissible quotiented inverse system which is $h$-uniform. Then the limit space $X^\infty_i$ is $h$-uniform as well. The uniformity constant of $X^\infty_i$ depends quantitatively on the parameters and the uniformity constant of the system.

Proof. By the doubling condition, it suffices to prove the statement for small enough $r$. Thus, assume $r < \delta$. Then we can choose a scale $k \geq 1$ such that $\delta s_{k+1} \leq r < \delta s_k$. By the quotient condition, for any $y \in X^\infty_i$ such that $q_{l-k}^\infty(y) = x$, we have $B(y, \delta s_{k+1}) \subset (q_{l-k}^\infty)^{-1}(B(x, r)) \subset B(y, C_{\mu})$. Also, $B(z, C_{\mu}) = \pi^\infty_k(B(y, C_{\mu}))$ and $B(z, \delta s_{k+1}) = \pi^\infty_k(B(y, \delta s_{k+1}))$ for $z = \pi^\infty_k(y)$ (see [25] Equation 2.12).

However, $X^k_i$ has finite degree and edge length is $s_k$. Moreover, it is doubling and each edge has measure comparable to $h(s_k)$, then

$$\mu^k(B(z, s_k)) \asymp \mu^k(B(z, C_{\mu})) \asymp h(s_k).$$
This gives
\[ \mu_\infty \left( (\eta_\infty^{-1}(B(x,r))) \right) \asymp h(r), \]
from which it follows that
\[ \mu_\infty(B(x,r)) \asymp h(r). \]

Remark 3.27. The special case, \( h(r) = r^Q \) of Lemma 3.26 is particularly important for the proof of Theorem 1.17 and from the perspective of Loewner spaces as well. In this case, the uniformity of the limit coincides with the limit space being \( Q \)-Ahlfors regular.

3.6. Planarity. For the purposes of the following proof we will call a planar graph 1-vertex connected, if it is connected and the removal of no vertex would disconnect it. It is called non-degenerate if it contains more than three vertices. Let \( X \) be a metric measure graph with unit edge lengths and \( \mu \) giving each edge unit measure. In our setting such is obtained by renormalizing the measure and length.

We also say that such a graph \( X \) is discretely annularly linearly locally connected (ALLC) if there is a constant \( C \) so that for every \( x, y, z \in X \), and any \( R \geq C \) with \( R < d(x,y) < d(x,z) < 2R \), there is a curve \( \gamma \) with \( y, z \in \text{Image}(\gamma) \), \( \text{diam}(\gamma) \leq C \cdot d(y,z) \) and \( \gamma \cap B(x,R/C) = \emptyset \). That is, the estimate holds for points farther away than a constant scale. Further, we call \( X \) discretely Ahlfors regular, if \( \mu(B(x,R)) \asymp R^Q \) for some \( Q \) and all \( R \in [1, \text{diam}(X)] \).

Theorem 3.28. Let \( Q \in (1,2) \). If \( X^n_1 \) is a compact admissible quotiented inverse system with \( X^n_1 \) a topological circle, which is \( h \)-uniform with \( h(s) \asymp s^Q \), and if each \( X^n \) is a planar graph, then the limit space \( X_\infty \) is also planar. Moreover, each \( X^n \) and \( X_\infty \) admits a quasisymmetric embedding into the plane.

Proof. We will apply the results from [11] (in preparation), which is a sequel to the present paper. There, it is shown that any 1-vertex connected non-degenerate planar graph with unit edge lengths, which is discretely Ahlfors regular and discretely Annularly linearly connected admits a uniformly quasisymmetric embedding to the plane. The 1-connectivity follows since \( X^n_1 \) is assumed to be a circle. Next, we verify the other properties in our case.

Consider now the spaces \( (X^n_1, d/s_n) \) with edge lengths unity. They are discretely Ahlfors regular at scales above 1 if we rescale the measure by \( s_n^Q \), that is \( \mu_n(B(x,r)) \asymp r^Q/s_n^Q \) for each \( r \geq s_n \). This follows from Lemma 3.26. Next, the ALLC condition follows by the same argument as in [37, Theorem 3.13]. The only proviso is that we need to take care to avoid scales where \( R \) is small, since at such scales, we do not have the needed Ahlfors regularity bound. \( \square \)

3.7. Analytic dimension, differentiability spaces and chart functions. In this section we show that our admissible quotiented inverse systems have analytic dimension one; see Proposition 3.32. This holds for all limits of systems; i.e. our discussion of planarity and uniformity plays no role here. It will be used in Section 6. We begin by recalling some relevant background.

A metric measure space \( X \) is called a differentiability space, if there exist countably many measurable subsets \( U_i \) and Lipschitz functions \( \phi_i : U_i \to \mathbb{R}^{n_i} \) such that \( \mu(X \setminus \bigcup U_i) = 0 \) and if
for any Lipschitz function \( f : X \to \mathbb{R}^m \) and any \( i \), and almost every \( x \in U_i \), there exists a unique \( df_i : \mathbb{R}^{n_i} \to \mathbb{R}^m \) such that
\[
(3.29) \quad f(y) = f(x) + df_i(x)(\phi_i(y) - \phi_i(x)) + o(d(x,y)).
\]
In general, for any continuous function \( f : X \to \mathbb{R}^m \), then we say that it is Cheeger differentiable if for almost every \( x \in U_i \) and any \( i \) there exists \( df_i \) as before. Such a \( df_i \) is called the Cheeger differential. Naturally, many functions may fail to differentiate in such a way. However, as seen in [2] continuous Sobolev functions with appropriately chosen exponents (large enough so that there is Sobolev embedding theorem to Hölder spaces), are Cheeger differentiable almost everywhere.

If \( M = \max_i n_i \), then \( M \) is referred to as the analytic dimension of \( X \). For the following proofs it will be easier to consider our monotone maps \( h_k \) with target in \( \mathbb{R} \). However, the proofs would be analogous for \( \mathbb{S}^1 \), and can be obtained by collapsing the circle to \( \mathbb{R} \). If we can take \( U_i = X \) for some \( i \), then the corresponding function \( \phi_i \) is called a global chart function.

The charts \( U_i \) define trivializations of the measurable co-tangent bundle \( T^*X \). In particular, we set \( T^*X | U_i = \mathbb{R}^{n_i} \). If \( U_i \) and \( U_j \) intersect, then by the uniqueness of derivatives \( \phi_i \) is differentiable with respect to \( \phi_j \) almost everywhere, and this induces a map \( \rho_{ij}(x) : \mathbb{R}^{n_i} \to \mathbb{R}^{n_j} \), which is defined for almost every \( x \in U_j \cap U_i \), and which is invertible. Therefore, if charts intersect in positive measure subsets, then \( n_i = n_j \). A section of the measurable cotangent bundle is an almost everywhere defined section \( d\sigma \) of \( \mathbb{R} \) on the measurable co-tangent bundle at that point, and so that it commutes (almost everywhere) via the change-of-chart functions \( \rho_{ij} \). Each Lipschitz function \( f \) has an almost everywhere defined section \( df \), its derivative in the charts, of the measurable co-tangent bundle. The measurable tangent bundle is defined as the dual bundle \( TX \). It corresponds to tangent vectors of curves, as shown in [27]. See [27] for a detailed discussion on measurable vector bundles and natural norms defined on them.

**Definition 3.30.** We call a 1-Lipschitz map \( q : (X, \mu) \to (Y, \nu) \) \( C \)-strongly measure preserving if \( q^*(\mu) = \nu \) and \( \mu(B(x,r)) \leq C(\nu(B(x,r)) \leq C \mu(B(x,r)) \).

The quotient maps in an quotiented inverse system satisfy this condition.

**Proposition 3.31.** Let \( Y_1 \to Y_2 \to Y_3 \cdots Y_\infty \) be a directed system of metric measure spaces which are uniformly doubling and satisfy uniform Poincaré inequalities and so that all \( q_{ij} = q_i \circ q_{i-1} \circ \cdots \circ q_{i+1} \) are \( C \)-strongly measure preserving, and so that the metric on \( Y_\infty \) is the direct limit metric. If \( \phi_i : Y_i \to \mathbb{R}^n \) are \( L \)-Lipschitz global chart functions so that \( \phi_i \circ q_i = \phi_{i-1} \), then the direct limit function \( \phi_\infty : Y_\infty \to \mathbb{R}^n \) is also \( L \)-Lipschitz and a global chart function. That is, \( Y_\infty \) has the same analytic dimension as \( Y_i \).

**Proof.** The existence of the direct limit function \( \phi_\infty \) follows from universality and that it is \( L \)-Lipschitz is easy to verify. Let \( f_\infty : Y_\infty \to \mathbb{R} \) be a Lipschitz function, then it induces Lipschitz functions \( f_i : Y_i \to \mathbb{R} \), and each one is differentiable outside a null set \( N_i \) with derivative \( df_i : Y_i \to \mathbb{R}^n \). Further, by enlarging the sets to another null set, we can assume that \( \text{Lip}(\langle a, \phi_i \rangle)(X) \neq 0 \) for all \( x \notin N_i \) and all non-zero \( a \in \mathbb{R}^n \), and any fixed inner product on \( \mathbb{R}^n \). This follows from the uniqueness of \( df_i \), as discussed in [3].

The spaces \( Y_i \) are complete, and so by Borel-regularity each \( N_i \) can be assumed Borel. Let \( N_\infty \subset Y_\infty \) be the union of the images of all the sets \( N_i \). This is a Suslin set as the image of
Borel sets, and so measurable \[43\]. It is a null set, since the quotient maps preserve measure. Next, outside the pre-images of \(N_\infty\) in \(Y_i\), which are null, the differential \(df_i\) is defined, and must commute with \(q_i\), since \(\text{Lip} (\langle a, \phi_i \rangle) \neq 0\). Indeed, \(q_i \circ df_i\) would be a derivative for \(f_{i-1}\), and the assumption \(\text{Lip} (\langle a, \phi_i \rangle) \neq 0\) ensures almost everywhere uniqueness.

Since \(df_i\) commute with \(q_i\) outside the pre-images of the measurable null-set \(N_\infty\), then we can canonically define the measurable “differential” \(df_\infty : Y_\infty \to \mathbb{R}^n\). We will now show that if \(x \notin N_\infty\) is a Lebesgue point of \(df_\infty\), then Equation (3.29) is satisfied at \(x\). Fix the vector \(v = df_\infty(x)\). Let \(B_\epsilon = \{y \in Y_\infty \mid ||df_\infty(y) - v|| \geq \epsilon, \text{ or } y \in N_\infty\}\). It is inconsequential which norm is used on \(\mathbb{R}^n\) here. Next, for any \(\epsilon > 0\) and any \(\delta > 0\) there is some \(r_\epsilon > 0\) so that for all \(r \in (0, r_{\epsilon, \delta})\) we have

\[
\frac{\mu(B_\epsilon \cap B(x, r))}{\mu(B(x, r))} < \delta.
\]

Fix such an \(r\). We can define \(x_i\) converging to \(x\) in \(Y_i\), and similarly define \(B_i^\epsilon = \{y \in Y_i \mid ||df_i(y) - v|| \geq \epsilon, \text{ or } y \in N_i\}\). It is clear then that

\[
\frac{\mu_i(B_i^\epsilon \cap B(x_i, r))}{\mu_i(B(x_i, r))} < C\delta
\]

for large \(i\) and for all fixed \(r \in (0, r_{\epsilon, \delta})\).

Fix a large constant \(L\) depending on the Poincaré inequality constants. If now \(y \in B(x, r/L)\), then for \(i\) large enough also its pre-images satisfy \(y_i \in B(x_i, r/L)\). Since the spaces satisfy uniform Poincaré inequalities, then there exists a curve \(\gamma_{xy}\) connecting \(x_i\) to \(y_i\) with length at most \(Ld(x_i, y_i)\) and so that

\[
\int_{\gamma_{xy}} 1_{B_i^\epsilon \cup N_i} \, ds \leq f(\delta),
\]

with \(\lim_{\delta \to 0} f(\delta) = 0\). See for example \[33\], or alternatively consider the modulus bounds in Keith \[44\]. A similar argument is also employed below in Lemma 6.10. However, then, since \(\phi_i\) is differentiable almost everywhere along \(\gamma_{xy}\), by chain rule \((f \circ \gamma)' = df_i \circ \gamma \cdot (\phi_i \circ \gamma)'\), and since \(df_i \approx v\) on most of \(\gamma_{xy}\), we would get

\[
f_i(y_i) - f_i(x_i) = df_i(x)(\phi_i(y_i) - \phi_i(x)) + g(\epsilon, \delta)r,
\]

where \(\lim_{\delta, \epsilon \to 0} g(\epsilon, \delta) = 0\) independent of \(i\). Thus, letting \(i \to \infty\), and \(\delta, \epsilon \to 0\), as \(r \to 0\) gives the desired equation. \(\square\)

**Proposition 3.32.** Let \(X_\infty\) be the Gromov-Hausdorff limit of an admissible inverse-quotient system. Then \(X_\infty\) is a differentiability space with analytic dimension 1 and a chart given by \(h_\infty : X_\infty \to \mathbb{R}\).

**Proof.** By \[25\] each \(X^i\) is analytically one dimensional and a differentiability space with the given chart. Further, since \(X^\infty\) satisfy uniform Poincaré inequalities by Lemma 3.8 and since the quotient maps of admissible quotient systems are strongly measure preserving, we get from Proposition 3.31 that \(X_\infty\) is a differentiability space with the given chart. \(\square\)
4. Admissable quotiented inverse systems constructed via replacement rules

In this section, we will construct special quotiented inverse systems whose limits have explicit quasisymmetric embeddings in $\mathbb{R}^2$. They are constructed by iteratively taking copies of the space and identifying these copies with “two sets of identifications”: identifications satisfying inverse limit axioms and additional identifications within vertex stars. These latter identifications are used to ensure and maintain planarity. These methods do not exhaust all quotiented inverse systems which lead to planar PI-spaces as discussed in Section 3. However, they do suffice to construct for each $Q, Q'$, the infinitely many Loewner carpets as in Theorem 1.17.

Let $G_1$ be any bounded degree graph with edge length $s_1 = 1$. Let $h_1: G_1 \to \frac{4}{\pi}S^1$ be a monotone function. Define $\mu_1$ to be Lebesgue measure on each edge with unit mass.

Let $1 \leq K_i \leq M, 4 \leq N_i \leq M$ be sequences of integers. Inductively, define spaces $\overline{G}_k, G_k$ equipped with measures $\overline{\mu}_k, \mu_k$ and maps $\overline{h}_k: \overline{G}_{k+1} \to \frac{4}{\pi}S^1, h_k: G_{k+1} \to \frac{4}{\pi}S^1$ and scales $s_k$ as follows.

Recursively define $s_{k+1} = \frac{s_k}{N_k}$. Let $Y_{k+1} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{N_k} G_k^i$ be the disjoint union of spaces, where $G_k^i$ are identical disjoint copies of $G_k$. To each copy assign the measure which $1/K_k$ times the measure of $G_k$. Let $\overline{\pi}_k: Y_{k+1} \to G_k$ denote the map which the identifies the copies with the original $G_k$.

Next, let $\sim_{k+1}$ be any equivalence relation on $Y_k$ that only identifies pairs of points $x, y \in Y_{k+1}$ if the following hold.

1) $x \in G_k^i, y \in G_k^j$ for some $i \neq j$.
2) $\overline{\pi}_k(x) = \overline{\pi}_k(y)$.
3) $\overline{\pi}_k(x)$ is a subdivision point in the graph $G_k^{i/N_k}$, which is not an original vertex of $G_k^i$.

Remark 4.1. Usually only a subset of the subdivision points get identified by $\overline{\pi}_k$.

Denote the quotient space $\overline{G}_{k+1} = Y_{k+1} / \sim_{k+1}$ and assign to it the push-forward measure $\overline{\mu}_{k+1}$. The map $h_k$ induces trivially a map on $Y_{k+1}$ and therefore also a map $\overline{h}_{k+1}$ on $\overline{G}_{k+1}$, since the identifications correspond to matching points in $G_k$. For a point $x \in G_k$ denote by $(x, i)$ its copy in $G_k^i$. We also use $(x, i)$ to denote a point in $\overline{G}_{k+1}$ although the same point can have different representations in this way. For a point $(x, i)$ in either $\overline{G}_{k+1}$ or $Y_{k+1}$, we will call $i$ its label. The metric on $\overline{G}_{k+1}$ is the quotient metric.

In order to satisfy Condition (6) in Definition 3.3 it is necessary that the inverse limit identifications are sufficiently dense so as to ensure that $d_{\overline{G}_{k+1}}((q, i), (q, j)) \leq C s_k$ for some $C$ independent of $q, i, j$. This will hold under the following condition. (The terminology is adapted from Laakso [51].)

Definition 4.2. The pair of identified points $(x, i) \sim_{k+1} (x, j)$ in $Y_{k+1}$ as well as the resulting point in $\overline{G}_{k+1}$ are called wormholes. For each edge $e$ in $G_k$, we associate a wormhole graph $G_{k,e} = (V_k, E_{k,e})$. The vertex set is given by the set of labels $V_k = \{1, \ldots, K_k\}$ and edge set $E_{k,e}$ by all pairs $(i, j) \in E$ if there is an $x \in e$ such that $(x, i) \sim_{k+1} (x, j)$.

Otherwise put, the graph $G_{k,e}$ encodes when one can change labels $i$ to $j$ while remaining within copies of a single edge in $G_k$. The connectivity means that one can go back and forth along copies of
an edge $e$ in $G_k$ within $\overline{G_{k+1}}$ to change the labels. In particular, $d((q,i),(q,j)) \leq (L+2)s_k \leq Cs_k$, where $L$ is the length of the longest path in the wormhole graph $G_{k,e}$ for the edge $e$ containing $q$.

The identifications $\sim_{k+1}^k$ are restricted to identify points with $\overline{\pi_k}(x) = \overline{\pi_k}(y)$. Next, we allow additional identifications. These identifications are denoted by $\sim_{k+1}^Q$, for which the following conditions must hold.

1. The condition $(x,i) \sim_{k+1}^Q (y,j)$ implies that $h_k(x) = h_k(y)$. That is, $x,y$ might correspond to different points in $G_k$, but must have the same value for the monotone function.
2. The condition $(x,i) \sim_{k+1}^Q (y,j)$ implies that there is a vertex $v$ in $G_k$ such that $x, y \in \text{Str}_v^{G_k}$ and $|h_k(x) - h_k(v)| \leq \frac{1}{2} - s_{k+1}$.
3. The condition $(x,i) \sim_{k+1}^Q (y,j)$ implies that $x,y$ are vertices in the subdivision $G_{k/N_k}$ and not original vertices of $G_k$. This prevents too many identifications and ensures separation between identification points.
4. Each equivalence class of $\sim_{k+1}^Q$ has size at most some universal $\Delta$ for some $\Delta$, and the equivalence classes of $\sim_{k+1}^Q$ are disjoint from the ones for $\sim_{k+1}^I$.

Assuming that (1)–(4) above hold, we define the graph $G_{k+1} := \overline{G_{k+1}}/\sim_{k+1}^Q$ which we equip with the path metric and the push-forward measure $\mu_{k+1}$.

Denote the quotient maps by $q^k_k : \overline{G_{k+1}} \to G_{k+1}$, and the natural map by $\pi^k_k : \overline{G_{k+1}} \to G_k$.

**Remark 4.3.** Note: To be clear, we allow that $\sim_{k+1}^Q$ does not make any identifications at all.

In order to define a quotiented inverse system, we begin by defining $X^k_1 = G_k, X_{k+1}^k = \overline{G_{k+1}}$. Next, we will recursively define $X^l_1$ for $l \geq k$ and define maps $\pi^l_{k+1}$ and $q^l_{k+1}$, column by column. Since the cases $k = k, k+1$ are already defined, we will only need to consider $1 \leq k+1 < l$. The details are given below, where we assume that $X^n_1$ has been defined for all $n \leq l$ and we proceed to define $X_{n+1}^l$.

![Figure 4.4](image)

**Figure 4.4.** The graphs $G_k$ are converted into a quotiented inverse system by “lifting identifications”.

### 4.1. Additional details.

Define $X_{n+1}^l$ as follows. Take $M_l$ copies of $X^l_1$. Denote the copies by $X^l_{n,i}$. Denote the points in different copies by $(x,i)$, with $i = 1, \ldots, M_l$. Again the index $i$ is referred to as the label of the point $(x,i)$. Then define an identification $\sim_{l+1,n}^l$ by

$$(x,i) \sim_{l+1,n}^l (x,j) \text{ if } (q^l_{n,l}(x), i) \sim_{l+1}^l (q^l_{n,l}(x), j).$$
Since, \( \sim_{l+1}^I \) only identifies subdivision vertices, we must have that \( x \in X^I_k \) is a vertex in the subdivided graph \( (X^I_n)'/N_i \). Finally, define \( X^{l+1}_n = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^{M_l} X^{I,i}_n / \sim_{l+1,n}^I \) and equip it with the quotient metric. As above, we continue to denote points of \( X^{l+1}_n \) by \( (x,i) \), despite the ambiguity in the label \( i \). The measures on \( X^{l+1}_n \) are defined by averaging the measures on each copy of \( X^I_k \).

Since \( \sim_{l+1,n}^I \) defines a valid inverse limit step, we have a natural map \( \pi_n^I : X^{l+1}_n \to X^I_n \) (which sends \( (x,i) \) to \( x \) and is well defined). Also, the map \( q^l_n : X^l_{n-1} \to X^I_n \) lifts to a map \( q^{l+1}_n : X^{l-1}_{n-1} \to X^I_n \) for \( n \geq 2 \), by defining as follows:

\[
q^{l+1}_n(x,i) := (q^l_n(x), i).
\]

**Remark 4.5.** It is easy to verify that the above is well-defined, since it respects the quotient relations \( \sim^Q \) and \( \sim^I \).

**Theorem 4.6.** If the wormhole graphs are connected, then any construction as above provides an admissible inverse quotient system with spaces \( X^I_k \).

**Proof.** The numbers below refer to the conditions in Definition 3.3. Conditions (1), (5) and (8) are automatic from the fact that the spaces arise via taking copies and identifying them along points where the monotone function agrees. The conditions (4) and (9) follow since we distribute mass equally among copies. Condition (3) follows since we only identify copies along subdivision points, and each equivalence class has size at most \( \max(\Delta, M) \). Thus, each vertex has degree at most \( 2 \max(\Delta, M) \).

The openness in condition (7) follows since \( X^{l+1}_k \) consists of copies of \( X^I_k \) identified along points \( (x,i) \sim (x,j) \) for some \( x \in X^I_k \). That is, copies are identified along matching points.

The condition (2) follows from (6) and the fact that the relevant maps are simplicial. Condition (6) follows for \( \pi^{k+1}_k \) from the connectivity of the wormhole graphs. Indeed, given \( x \in G_k = X^I_k \) on an edge \( e \) of \( G_k = X^I_k \), the points \( (x,i), (x,j) \in (\pi^{k+1}_k)^{-1}(x) \subset X^{k+1}_k \) can be connected by changing an arbitrary label \( i \) to another \( j \) within the wormhole graph \( G_{k,e} \). This path then corresponds to a path of moving back and forth within copies of the edge \( e \) in \( (\pi^{k+1}_k)^{-1}(e) \) and passing through wormholes of length at most \( C_{Sk} \).

Next, we need to verify conditions (6) for \( \pi^l_k \) for \( l > k \). Take \( x \in X^I_k \) and \( (x,i), (x,j) \in (\pi^l_k)^{-1}(x) \). Given the previous paragraph, we can connect \( (q^l_k(x),i) \) to \( (q^l_k(x),i) \) with length bounded by \( C_{Sl} \) only using wormholes given by \( \sim_{l+1}^I \). Each of these wormholes is also a wormhole in \( X^{l+1}_k \) by the definition of \( \sim_{l+1,n}^I \). Thus, the path lifts to a path in \( X^{l+1}_k \) with the same diameter bound.

Finally, the quotient condition (10) follows by verifying the star-quotient condition of Subsection 3.4. Namely, the sets \( (q^l_k)^{-1}(x) \) for different \( x \in X^I_k \) consist of equivalence classes of \( \sim^Q_k \), which are contained within vertex stars and which are within distance \( \frac{\delta}{2} - s_{k+1} \) from the center. This is exactly the star-quotient condition. \( \square \)

**4.2 Replacement rules.** Since the quotient maps \( q_k \) are only allowed to identify points within vertex stars, we can obtain \( G_{k+1} \) from \( G_k \) by using various replacement rules, in which vertex stars with the same “type” are iteratively replaced by new graphs containing multiple copies of the initial vertex star. These replacement rules consist of rules for subdivided vertex stars \( \text{Str}_v^{g/2} \) in the subdivided graph \( G^{g/2} \) for \( v \) a vertex in \( G_k \).
Remark 4.7. Note that these vertex stars may have different types, depending on the degree, how $h_k$ is defined (specifying in and out edges), and on additional data that may be specified (for example, the way the previous stage $G_k$ is embedded in the plane). The collection of all this data defines the “type” of a vertex.

At stage $k$ we will give a rule which specifies how each star of a given type is replaced by $K_k$ copies of its self with two sets of identifications, which are subject to the same requirements as above, and to the following additional requirements as well:

1. The wormhole graphs defined above are required to be connected.
2. The previous identifications must lead to new vertices which fall into the same collection of predefined types.\(^7\)

Remark 4.8. Suppose $G_{k+1}$ is constructed from $G_k$ by taking $K_k$ copies and subdividing by a factor $N_k$, and assigning equal measure to each edge. If $e$ is an edge of $G_{k+1}$, it follows by induction that

$$
\mu_{k+1}(e) = \prod_{i=1}^{k} \frac{1}{K_i} \prod_{i=1}^{k} \frac{1}{N_i}.
$$

Define $h(r) = 1$ for $r \geq 1$, and

$$
h(r) = \prod_{i=1}^{k} \frac{1}{K_i} \prod_{i=1}^{k} \frac{1}{N_i} \quad \text{for } s_{k+1} \leq r < s_k.
$$

Then we get an increasing function such that, by Lemma 3.26, the limit space $X_{\infty}$ of $G_k$ will be a $h$-uniform space with constant $C_h$ depending only on $N, M, \Delta$. In particular, if we are using a finite set of replacement rules, then independent of the ordering of such replacement rules we get a uniform $C_h$.

5. Replacement rules and snowflake embeddings

In this section we use replacement rules to construct the Loewner carpets of Theorem 1.17 as limits of certain explicit admissible quotiented inverse systems and give their snowflake embeddings. These will be constructed using the framework of replacement rules as a special case of the construction in Section 4. In particular, some of the previous examples may fail to be planar. Additionally, we will impose many additional simplifying conditions that allow us to present the examples explicitly.

We will first do this by describing the general setting and the proof of the snow-flake embedding in Subsections 5.1, 5.2 and then giving a simple example in Subsection 5.3 and then the more complicated examples in Subsection 5.4. It is these latter constructions that resolve Theorem 1.17, while the simpler ones allow to give an explicit drawing in Figure 5.1.

\(^7\)For example, degrees of vertices shouldn’t increase beyond a certain limit. And, if additional data such as a planar embedding is preserved, then this data must be translated to the new graph.
5.1. Framework. In what follows, the notation from Section 4 will still be in force. The graphs \( G_k \) will each be subgraphs of finer and finer integer lattices, and will possess two metrics: one as a subset of the plane and another given by the path-metric with rescaled edge lengths. The embedding will be the limit of the identity map between these different metrics.

Start with \( G_0 \) which is the unit square with vertices at \((0, 0), (1, 0), (1, 1)\) and \((0, 1)\). Each graph \( G_k \) will then be a subgraph of a finer integer lattice \( l_k \mathbb{Z}^2 \), where the lattice has edge length \( l_k \). Set \( l_0 = 1 \). Throughout, we will assume that \( l_{k+1} \leq (16)^{-1} l_k \), in order to obtain a summability condition below in Equation (5.5). The path metric on \( G_k \) will be with respect to edge lengths \( s_k \).

Further, we will maintain maps \( h_k : G_k \rightarrow \frac{2}{\pi} S^1 \), which are isometries when restricted to edges. First, define the isometry (with respect to the path metric) \( h_0 : G_0 \rightarrow \frac{2}{\pi} S^1 \). Since \( \frac{2}{\pi} S^1 \) has a natural clockwise orientation, this induces for each edge an orientation. Therefore, \( G_0 \) becomes an directed graph, where each edge is directed clockwise. In \( G_k \) each edge is directed so that \( h_k \) is clockwise when restricted to the edge. For each of the vertices, the edges adjacent to it are divided into in-edges and out-edges, depending on the direction of the edges.

The graph \( G_{k+1} \) is obtained by replacement rules from \( G_k \). For each vertex \( v \in G_k \) consider the \( 2^{-1}s_k \)-neighborhood in the graph \( G_k \), \( B(v, s_k/2) = B_v \), which is a \( 2^{-1}l_k \)-neighborhood in the
lattice. In our replacement rules we will maintain the condition that these vertex stars have one of four types; which are determined by the identification of $G_k$ with a subgraph of $l_k\mathbb{Z}^2$.

A. If $v$ has degree two, then $B_v$ consists of an in-edge and an out-edge which form a right angle turning left.

B. As in A, but the turn is to the right.

C. The vertex $v$ has degree two and $B_v$ consists of two parallel edges adjacent to $v$.

D. The degree at $v$ is four with two in-edges and two out edges. The in edges are always adjacent to each other.

For the constructions in Subsection 5.3, we will additionally assign to each vertex a color, red or blue. This color is chosen so that neighboring vertices do not have matching color. For example, since each $v = (ml_k, nl_k) \in l_k\mathbb{Z}^2$, then we can color a vertex red if $m + n$ is even, and blue if $m + n$ is odd. The replacement rules will also depend on the orientation of the edges in the lattice which is determined by specifying a suitably rotated version of one of the above types.

In the replacement steps, each neighborhood of a vertex $v \in G_k$ is replaced, abstractly, by $K_{k+1}$ copies of the neighborhood with two sets of identifications. These copies are then identified with isomorphic subgraphs of finer subgrids, and so that $v$, as a grid point, also is one of the grid points in the refined graph. These isomorphic copies are drawn in such a way that neighboring pieces only intersect at their boundaries. This drawing specifies for each new vertex its assigned type. The union of all the resulting copies is $G_{k+1}$ equipped with a rescaled metric with edge length $s_{k+1}$. Since this was constructed from copies of $G_k$ identified at points where $h_k$ agrees, then it gives an induced map $h_{k+1}: G_{k+1} \to 2\pi S^1$.

5.2. Snow-flake embeddings. The graphs $G_k$ arise as planar subsets via replacing the vertices in the grid (depending on their degree, and type) by the replacement rules shown below. Since the graphs are subgraphs of the grids, this gives natural drawings $f_k: G_k \to l_k\mathbb{Z}^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ which are homeomorphisms. We will identify $G_k$ with its image in the plane, but keep track of the fact that there are two metrics: one on the image, and one given by the path metric on $G_k$ with edge length $s_k$. Further, to ensure convergence in the plane, we assume that the vertices of $G_k$ are always a subset of vertices of $G_{k+1}$ (as a subset of the plane).

We will assume that

there is an $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ so that $l_k \asymp s_k^\alpha$.

This $\alpha$ will be the snowflake exponent. Without this assumption, we would obtain other moduli of continuity, and would still be able to prove quasisymmetric embeddings. This restriction, however, suffices for our examples.

The embeddings $f_k$, and the corresponding replacement rules, will be chosen so that each copy of a point $x$ on an edge $e \in G_k$ in $G_{k+1}$ will be within a $5l_k$-neighborhood of the previous edge $f_k(e)$. Note, if $A \subset X$ is a subset of a metric space $X$, then denote its $\delta$-neighborhood by

$$N_\delta(A) := \bigcup_{a \in A} B(a, \delta).$$

That is, these embeddings satisfy the following property:
If \( e_0 \) is an edge of \( G_k = X_k^k \), and if \( e_1 = q_{k+1}^{k+1}(\pi_k^{-1}(e_0)) \), then \( e_1 \) is a union of edges in \( G_{k+1} = X_k^{k+1} \) such that

\[
(5.2) \quad f_{k+1}(e_1) \subset N_{5l_{k+1}}(f_k(e_0)).
\]

Next, we inductively define

\[
(5.3) \quad e_l = q_{k+l}^{k+l}((\pi_{k+l}^{-1}(e_{l-1})) = q_{k,k+l}^{k,k+l}((\pi_{k}^{k+l,k}^{-1}(e_0)).
\]

Then, since \( e_l \) is a union of edges in \( X_k^{k+l} \), we can repeat edgewise the first part of the construction to obtain

\[
(5.4) \quad f_{k+l+1}(e_{l+1}) \subset N_{5l_{k+l+1}}(f_{k+l}(e_l)).
\]

Iterating (5.4) and using the geometric decay \( l_{k+1} \leq (16)^{-1}l_k \) we get:

\[
(5.5) \quad f_{k+l}(e_l) \subset N_{5l_{k}}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{16^k}(f_k(e_k)) \subset N_{l_k/3}(f_k(e_k)).
\]

Now, let \( x \in X_n^{\infty} \), and let \( x_n \in X_n^{n} \) such that \( x \in q_{k,n}^{\infty}(\pi^n_k(x_n)) \). Recall from Subsection 3.2 that such sequences are called approximating sequences. We can choose edges \( e_n \) containing \( x_n \), such that \( e_{k+l} \subset q_{k,k+l}^{k,k+l}((\pi_{k}^{k+l,k}^{-1}(e_k)). \) By the same argument leading to estimate (5.5) we obtain

\[
\text{In particular, the sequence } f_k(e_k) \text{ is a Cauchy sequence, and thus we can define } f_{\infty}(x) \text{ as its limit with}
\]

\[
(5.6) \quad f_{\infty}(x) \in N_{l_k/3}(f_k(e_k)).
\]

Moreover, we get the estimate

\[
(5.7) \quad |f_{\infty}(x) - f_n(x_n)| \leq 2l_n.
\]

Also, if \( x, y \in X_{\infty}^{\infty} \) are such that \( x_k, y_k \) belong to non-adjacent edges \( e_k^x, e_k^y \), then from Equation (5.6) and since the distance of non-adjacent edges in the lattice \( l_k \mathbb{Z}^2 \) is \( l_k \), we get:

\[
(5.8) \quad |f_{\infty}(x) - f_{\infty}(y)| \geq d(N_{l_k/3}(f_k(e_k^x)), N_{l_k/3}(f_k(e_k^y))) \geq l_k/3.
\]

At this juncture, what is left to prove is that the limit spaces \( X_{\infty}^{\infty} \) within the above framework are PI-spaces admitting quasisymmetric embeddings. In the next sections, we will additionally specify the replacement rules and \( s_k \) so that \( X_{\infty}^{\infty} \) is Ahlfors regular and thus Loewner with the desired exponents.

**Lemma 5.9.** Suppose \( X_{\infty}^{\infty}, \alpha \) and \( f_{\infty} \) are as above. The space \( X_{\infty}^{\infty} \) is a planar PI-space and \( f_{\infty} \) is an \( \alpha \)-snowflake embedding.
Proof. Since the graphs \( G_k \) were constructed as in Theorem 4.6, the limit space \( X^\infty \) exists and is a PI-space.

Next, we show that the mapping \( f_\infty \) is uniformly \( \alpha \)-holder. For each \( x, y \in X_\infty \), choose \( s_l \) so that \( s_l \asymp d(x, y) \) so that Lemma 3.15 holds and \( s_l \leq d(x, y)/8 \). Choose an approximating sequence \( x_n, y_n \in X^n = G_n \). By Lemma 3.15, \( d(x_n, y_n) \asymp d(x, y) \asymp s_l \) for \( n \geq l \).

The points \( x_l, y_l \) lie in distinct edges which are not adjacent since \( d(x_l, y_l) \geq d(x, y)/2 \geq 4s_l \). Then, by the estimate in (5.8) we have

\[
|f_\infty(x) - f_\infty(y)| \lesssim l_l \lesssim |f_\infty(x) - f_\infty(y)|.
\]

Since \( d(x_l, y_l) \asymp s_l \) there is a bounded length edge path in \( G_l \) connecting \( x_l \) to \( y_l \), and thus also of \( f_\infty(x_l) \), \( f_\infty(y_l) \) in the lattice. Since the distance of \( f_\infty(x_l) \) to \( f_\infty(x) \) is controlled by \( l_l \), and similarly for \( y_l \) and \( y \), we obtain

\[
|f_\infty(x_l) - f_\infty(x)| \lesssim l_l.
\]

Since \( l_l \asymp s_l^\alpha \), we have

\[
|f_\infty(x) - f_\infty(y)| \asymp d(x, y)^\alpha,
\]

proving that \( f_\infty \) is an \( \alpha \)-snowflake embedding.

Since the vertex sets of \( G_k \) are contained in the vertex set of \( G_{k+1} \), using similar techniques, one can show that \( f_\infty(X_\infty) \) is equal to the Hausdorff limit of the subsets \( G_k \) of the plane. (For the notion of Hausdorff convergence of subsets see [57, p. 281].) In particular \( f_\infty(X_\infty) \) is the set arising from the infinite sequence of replacement rules. \( \square \)

5.3. **A basic example.** We will begin with a relatively simple example, in which the replacement rules and embeddings can be made explicit, as shown in Figure 5.1.

Here, at each stage we subdivide the lattice in the plane by \( 1/16 \), giving \( l_k = 16^{-k} \). The edge lengths in \( G_k \) are rescaled by 32 giving \( s_k = 32^{-k} \).

Each vertex has additional to the type \( A, B, C, D \) also a color, either red or blue as given above. We will now describe the replacement rules giving the identifications and the explicit isomorphic copies in the plane by figures. Let \( v \in G_k \) be any vertex, and let \( B \{ v, s_k/2 \} = B \) be its neighborhood.

The neighborhoods of \( G_k \) are replaced by taking two copies of the sub-graph and identifying them by two sets of identifications \( \sim_k^{1} \) and \( \sim_k^{2} \). The first is easy to describe: \( \sim_k^{1} \) simply identifies the boundaries of each copies, which coincide with mid-points of edges in \( G_k \).

**Remark 5.10.** These identifications satisfy conditions for \( \sim_k^{1} \) imposed in Section 4. These correspond to the inverse limit axioms in [25] and Definition 3.3.

In the case of degree two vertices, that is of type \( A, B \) or \( C \), these are all the identifications we will make. The isomorphic copies are rotated versions of the ones in Figure 5.11, and depend on the color; the black part is always included but only one, either the blue or red, copy is added. In doing this, the vertices and midpoints of the previous level remain fixed.

For vertices of type \( D \), drawing in the plane introduces additional identifications \( \sim_k^{2} \), as two copies of a degree four vertex star must intersect. These identifications will depend on the orientation of the vertex, on their existing drawing in the plane, and on the function \( h_k \), as follows.
Figure 5.11. The replacement rules for the different types of degree two vertex neighborhoods. Whether the red or blue edges are added depends on the color of the vertex. The arrows indicate the orientation of the edges.

Figure 5.12. The replacement rule for the degree four vertex, for either the red or blue cases. The black copy corresponds to $i = 1$ below.

Let $v$ be a degree four vertex, and let $i_s, i_w$ be the two in-edges (with respect to the natural orientation of edges induced by $h_k$), and so that $i_w$ is adjacent and immediately clockwise from $i_s$ in the planar drawing of $G_k$. Going in the clockwise direction, the remaining edges are the two out
edges $o_n, o_e$. We will need to specify explicit identification points along the edges adjacent to $v$ by their values of $h_k$. To describe the identifications we will use the following convention:

If $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, then $t + \theta$ signifies the point on $\frac{2}{\pi} S^1$ obtained by traveling clockwise, if $\theta$ is negative, or counterclockwise, if $\theta$ is positive, along the circle by the distance $\theta$.

We continue following the notation of Section 4. The graph $G_{k+1}$ is obtained from two copies of $G_k$, whose points are denoted by $(x, i)$ for $x \in G_k$, $i = 1, 2$, by the following identifications:

(1) If $v \in G_k$ is a vertex of degree four which is blue, and $x \in i_e$ and $y \in i_s$, then we identify $(x, 2) \sim_{Q_{k+1}} (y, 1)$, if $h_k(x) = h_k(y) = h_k(v) - 4s_{k+1}$.

(2) If $v \in G_k$ is a vertex of degree four which is red, and $x \in i_e$ and $y \in i_s$, then we identify $(x, 1) \sim_{Q_{k+1}} (y, 2)$, if $h_k(x) = h_k(y) = h_k(v) - 4s_{k+1}$.

(3) If $v \in G_k$ is a vertex of degree four which is blue, and $x \in o_n$ and $y \in o_w$, then we identify $(x, 2) \sim_{Q_{k+1}} (y, 1)$, if $h_k(x) = h_k(y) = h_k(v) + 4s_{k+1}$.

(4) If $v \in G_k$ is a vertex of degree four which is red, and $x \in o_n$ and $y \in o_w$, then we identify $(x, 1) \sim_{Q_{k+1}} (y, 2)$, if $h_k(x) = h_k(y) = h_k(v) + 4s_{k+1}$.

Finally, the embedding of $G_{k+1}$ is obtained by first drawing the copies for each vertex neighborhood and then allowing them to intersect at midpoints and at the points specified by $\sim_{Q}$. The interaction of multiple different rules on the graph in Figures 5.13 is depicted in Figure 5.14.

![Figure 5.13](image-url)

**Figure 5.13.** Before the replacement rule is applied. There are two red and two blue vertices.

These replacement rules give the following example.

**Theorem 5.15.** The space $X^\infty$ is $\frac{6}{5}$-Ahlfors regular, and satisfies a $(1, 1)$-Poincaré inequality. It is quasisymmetric to the planar subset $\tilde{X}$, which is $\frac{3}{2}$-Ahlfors regular, and the natural mapping $f_\infty : X^\infty \to \tilde{X}$ is $\frac{4}{5}$-snowflake.
Figure 5.14. The result of the replacement rules applied to several neighborhoods simultaneously.

Proof of Theorem 5.15. By Theorem 4.6 equipping $G_k$ with the metric where each edge has length $s_k$, we get the diagonal sequence $X^k$ of a quotiented inverse system, which converges to $X^\infty$ in the measures Gromov-Hausdorff sense. Since $K_k = 2, N_k = 32$, it follows from Lemma 3.26 and Remark 4.8 that $X^\infty$ is $h$-uniform, where $h(r) = r^{6^2}$, and thus $6/5$-Ahlfors regular. Now $l_k = (16)^{-k} s_k^{2^5}$. Thus Lemma 5.9 with $\alpha = \frac{4}{5}$ shows that, the image of that $f^\infty$ is $\alpha$-snowflake. The fact that $f^\infty(\X^\infty)$ is $3^2$-Ahlfors regular is then immediate. \hfill \Box

5.4. General examples. To obtain other dimensions, we need to introduce more complicated replacement rules, and alternate different ones at different levels.

We now describe three different replacement schemes $S_N, C_N$ and $WS_N$. These describe how $G_{k+1}$ is obtained from $G_k$. The copies of a point $x \in G_k$ are denoted by $(x, i)$. We also describe the intermediate graphs $\G_{k+1}$ from Section 4 and the identifications $\simI, \simQ$. These replacement rules have a free parameter $N \in \N$.

$S_N$: The graph $G_{k+1} = \G_{k+1} = G_k/N$, that is the graph is subdivided by $N$, and the grid is equally subdivided by $N$. Then $s_{k+1} = s_k/N$, and $l_{k+1} = l_k/N$. There are no identifications. The map $h_{k+1}$ is equal to $h_k$.

$WS_N$: We subdivide by a large factor $G_{k+1} = \G_{k+1} = G_k/(8(N+2N^2))$ as before, but the drawing in the plane is wiggled to fit in a larger grid subdivided only by $8N$. The graph is drawn by appropriately wiggling the edges. This replacement rule is more naturally represented for each edge.

$C_N$: The graph $\G_{k+1}$ is obtained by taking $2N+1$ copies of $G_k$ labeled $i = 1, \ldots, 2N+1$ and quotiented by the identifications $\simI_{k+1}$, which we now describe. Each graph is subdivided by $96N + 26$ and the grids are subdivided by a factor $64N$. That is, $s_{k+1} = s_k/(96N + 26)$ and $l_{k+1} = l_k/(64N)$. These are identified and embedded as shown in Figure 5.17.

The identifications can be expressed explicitly as follows. Each vertex star in $v$ has one of four types, A,B,C,D. The first three are subgraphs of type $D$, or rotations of one, and thus it suffices to describe in detail the identifications for the case $D$. Let $v$ be a vertex
with two in edges $i_s, i_w$ (one from the south, and the second from the west), and two out edges $o_n, o_e$ (towards north and east). Every degree four vertex star can be rotated to this case.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{fig5.17}
\caption{\textbf{C}_N-\textbf{Replacement rule}: Here the neighborhood is replaced by $2N + 1$ copies, $N$ above and $N$ below. Each copy has a label $i = 1, \ldots, 2N + 1$ indexed linearly from the top to bottom. These are obtained by a translation in a diagonal direction of the original vertex, and then evening it out with a transitional red region shown in Figure 5.18 so that neighboring pieces match together. The identifications in the red zone are given by $\sim^I$, and in the blue by $\sim^Q$.

1. $(x, 1) \sim^I_{k+1} (x, j)$ if $x \in i_w$ and $h_k(x) = h_k(v) - 4(2N + j - 1)s_{k+1}$, or $h_k(x) = h_k(v) - 4(8N + 2 + (2N + 1 - j))s_{k+1}$.

\end{figure}
Additionally, to obtain $G_{k+1}$, we make identifications using $\sim_{Q}$ as follows.

(1) $(x,i) \sim_{Q_{k+1}} (y,j)$ if $i > j$ and $x \in i_e$, $y \in i_s$ and $h_k(x) = h_k(y) = h_k(v) - 4(i - j) s_{k+1}$.

(2) $(x,i) \sim_{Q_{k+1}} (y,j)$ if $i > j$ and $x \in o_n$, $y \in o_w$ and $h_k(x) = h_k(y) = h_k(v) + 4(i - j) s_{k+1}$.

This chosen subdivision factors are so that the copies fit isomorphically in the refined grids.

These replacement rules lead to the Loewner carpets of Theorem 1.17. First, we prove existence and embeddability. Later, in Section 6 we prove the assertion that for each $Q, Q'$, infinitely many of the constructed examples are quasisymmetrically distinct.

Proof of existence and embeddability in Theorem 1.17: Fix $N_0, N_1, N_3$ to be determined later, and let $S_{N_0}, C_{N_1}, W S_{N_3}$ be the replacement rules described above. Let $\alpha_i$ for $i = 0, 1, 2$ be such that $\alpha_0 + \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = 1$. Construct an infinite sequence $a = \{a_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$, with each $a_i = 0, 1, 2$, with the property that

$$\limsup_{N \to \infty} \left| \left\{ a_i = j \mid i = 1, \ldots, N \right\} \right| - \alpha_j N < \infty.$$ 

Here, if $S \subset \mathbb{N}$, then $|S|$ is the number of its elements.

Remark 5.19. Note that there exist uncountably many sequences as above. However, as mentioned in the introduction, at present we can only prove that for each $Q,Q'$, countably many of our examples are quasisymmetrically distinct; see Section 6.
Next we construct a quotiented inverse system, by applying at the \( i \)’th stage the replacement rule 
\[ S_{N_0} \quad \text{if} \quad a_i = 0, \quad C_{N_1} \quad \text{if} \quad a_i = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad WS_{N_3} \quad \text{if} \quad a_i = 2. \]

The replacement rules are applied to edges for \( S_{N_0}, WS_{N_3} \), and to vertex stars in the second case.

For such a sequence the edges have length
\[ s_k \asymp \left( \frac{1}{N_0^{a_0}} \left( \frac{1}{(N_1 + 26)^{a_1}} \right) \left( \frac{1}{(N_2 + 2N^2)^{a_2}} \right) \right)^k. \]

Define
\[ h(s_k) = \left( \frac{1}{N_0^{a_0}} \left( \frac{1}{(2N_1 + 1)(N_1 + 26)^{a_1}} \right) \left( \frac{1}{(8N_2 + 2N^2)^{a_2}} \right) \right)^k \]
and
\[ Q = \frac{\alpha_0 \log(N_0) + \alpha_1 \log((96N_1 + 26)(2N_1 + 1)) + \alpha_2 \log(8(N_2 + 2N^2))}{\alpha_0 \log(N_0) + \alpha_1 \log(96N_1 + 26) + \alpha_2 \log(8(N_2 + 2N^2))}. \]

Then, since \( Q = \lim_{k \to \infty} \log(h(s_k))/\log(s_k) \), it is easy to see by Lemmas 3.26 and 4.8 that \( X_\infty \) is \( Q \)-Ahlfors regular, and thus has Hausdorff dimension \( Q \). Also, by Theorem 4.6 it follows that \( X_\infty \) is \( Q \)-Loewner, since it satisfies a \((1, 1)\)-Poincaré inequality and is \( Q \)-Ahlfors regular.

Each graph \( G_k \) is a subgraph of the grid \( l_k \mathbb{Z}^2 \), where each edge in the grid has length
\[ l_k \asymp \left( \frac{1}{N_0^{a_0}} \left( \frac{1}{(64N_1)^{a_1}} \right) \left( \frac{1}{(8N_2)^{a_2}} \right) \right)^k. \]

Set
\[ \alpha = \frac{\alpha_0 \log(N_0) + \alpha_1 \log(64N_1) + \alpha_2 \log(8N_2)}{\alpha_0 \log(N_0) + \alpha_1 \log(96N_1 + 26) + \alpha_2 \log(8(N_2 + 2N^2))}. \]

We then have, \( \alpha = \lim_{k \to \infty} \frac{\log(l_k)}{\log(s_k)} \). By Lemma 5.9, the maps \( f_k \) are uniformly \( \alpha \)-snowflake. Further, these converge to \( f_\infty \), which is a \( \alpha \)-snowflake embedding for \( X_\infty \). Thus, the image \( f_\infty(X_\infty) \) is \( Q' \)-Ahlfors regular with \( Q' = Q/\alpha \).

We wish to now find the values of \( \alpha_i \) and \( N_i \) which will enable to obtain the desired Hausdorff dimensions \( Q, Q' \). That is, we want to find solutions to the three equations
\[ \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = 1, \]
\[ Q = \frac{\alpha_0 \log(N_0) + \alpha_1 \log((96N_1 + 26)(2N_1 + 1)) + \alpha_2 \log(8(N_2 + 2N^2))}{\alpha_0 \log(N_0) + \alpha_1 \log(96N_1 + 26) + \alpha_2 \log(8(N_2 + 2N^2))}, \]
and
\[ Q' = \frac{\alpha_0 \log(N_0) + \alpha_1 \log((96N_1 + 26)(2N_1 + 1)) + \alpha_2 \log(8(N_2 + 2N^2))}{\alpha_0 \log(N_0) + \alpha_1 \log((64N_1) + \alpha_2 \log(8N_2))}. \]
Define the following constants:
\[
A_Q := (1 - Q) \log(N_0) \\
B_Q := \log([96N_1 + 26](2N_1 + 1)] - Q \log(96N_1 + 26) \\
C_Q := (1 - Q) \log(8(N_2 + 2N_2^2)) \\
A_{Q'} := (1 - Q') \log(N_0) \\
B_{Q'} := \log([96N_1 + 26](2N_1 + 1)] - Q' \log(64N_1) \\
C_{Q'} := \log(8(N_2 + 2N_2^2)) - Q' \log(8N_2).
\]

By multiplying with the denominators and simplifying, we get three linear equations
\[
\begin{align*}
\alpha_0 + \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 &= 1 \\
\alpha_0A_Q + \alpha_1B_Q + \alpha_2C_Q &= 0 \\
\alpha_0A_{Q'} + \alpha_1B_{Q'} + \alpha_2C_{Q'} &= 0
\end{align*}
\]

Additionally, we have the constraint \(\alpha_i \geq 0\).

First, choose \(N_1\) and \(N_2\) so big that \(C_{Q'}, B_{Q'}, B_Q > 0\). Also, choose \(N_1\) so big that \(Q \log(96N_1 + 26) < Q' \log(64N_1)\). We have \(0 > A_Q > A_{Q'}\) and \(B_Q > B_{Q'}\) by these assumptions.

Now, solving the third and the first equations (5.20), (5.22) with \(\alpha_1 = 0\), we obtain the equation
\[
0 = \alpha_0A_{Q'} + (1 - \alpha_0)C_{Q'},
\]
and \(\alpha_0 = \frac{-C_{Q'}}{A_{Q'} - C_{Q'}} \in (0, 1)\). This gives a partial solution \((\frac{-C_{Q'}}{A_{Q'} - C_{Q'}}, 0, \frac{A_{Q'}}{A_{Q'} - C_{Q'}}) = (\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \alpha_2) = A_\pm\).

Similarly, setting \(\alpha_2 = 0\), we obtain the partial solution \((\frac{-B_{Q'}}{A_{Q'} - B_{Q'}}, \frac{A_{Q'}}{A_{Q'} - B_{Q'}}, 0) = (\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \alpha_2) = A\_\).

Let \(f(\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \alpha_2)\) be the left hand side of the second equation (5.21). Plugging in \(A\_\), and using \(Q' > Q\) we get \(f(A\_) < 0\), since \(Q > 1\). Then, plugging in \(A\_\) we get \(f(A\_+) > 0\) since \(A_Q > A_{Q'}\) and \(B_Q > B_{Q'}\). Now, by continuity there must exist a \(t \in (0, 1)\), such that for \(A_t = tA\_ + (1 - t)A\_)\) we have \(f(A_t) = 0\). Since this solution is a convex combination of the solutions to the first and third equations, and we have \(\alpha_i \geq 0\), it follows that \(A_t\) is the solution we are looking for.

Finally, since \(f\infty: X_\infty \to \mathbb{C}\) is a quasisymmetric embedding and \(X_\infty\) is ALLC, then its image is also an ALLC subset of the plane. Consequently, by Corollary 2.14 it follows that \(f\infty(X_\infty)\) can be uniformized by a circle, or square carpet by a planar quasiconformal map \(g: \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}\).

6. Quasisymmetrically distinguishing thin carpets using Loewner rigidity

The main result of this section is Theorem 6.2. In particular, it will enable us to show that for fixed \(Q, Q'\), the infinitely many examples of Loewner carpets constructed Section 5 are pairwise quasisymmetrically distinct.

After some preliminary work, the rigidity Theorem 6.2 is proved in Subsection 6.5. First we discuss properties of quasiconformal maps giving them a metric differential \(\text{Lip}[f](x)\) and absolute continuity properties in Subsection 6.2. A differential with respect to Cheeger charts is constructed in Subsection 6.3. The two notions of a metric derivative and Cheeger differentials are connected using 27 in Subsection 6.4. This control at certain regular points leads to the proof of the main theorem. In the end, we make a few remarks on related and useful results for quasiconformal maps in Subsection 6.6.
The application to prove the quasisymmetrically distinctness is done in the final Subsection 6.7.

6.1. **Statement of Rigidity theorem.** Recall, that if $\Gamma$ is any family of rectifiable curves, a non-negative Borel function $\rho$ is called admissible, if $\int_{\gamma} \rho \, ds \geq 1$ for every $\gamma \in \Gamma$. The modulus of $\Gamma$ is defined as

$$\text{Mod}_p(\Gamma) := \inf \int \rho^p \, d\mu,$$

where the infimum is over all admissible functions. See [37] for references and further discussion.

We will need the following definition.

**Definition 6.1.** Let

$$\Gamma^C_{\epsilon}(x,y) := \{ \gamma | \gamma \text{ connects } B(x,\epsilon r) \text{ to } B(y,\epsilon r) \text{ and } \text{length}(\gamma) \leq C(1 + \epsilon) \text{d}(x,y) \}.$$

A metric on $X$ is called $C$-monotone if for all $x_1, x_2 \in X$, if there exists a positive function $\Phi : (0, \frac{1}{2}] \to (0, \infty)$ such that for all $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ and any $x, y \in X$ with $r := d(x,y) > 0$,

$$\text{Mod}_Q(\Gamma^C_{\epsilon}(x,y)) \geq \Phi(\epsilon).$$

For PI spaces, and in particular, for Loewner spaces, one easily gets such a modulus bound by the capacity bounds in [49, Proposition 2.2 and Lemma 3.2]; compare also to [23, Section 15]. The function $\Phi$ and the constant $C$ depend only on the constants in the Poincaré inequality and the doubling constant. In some cases, such as for inverse limits and for some cases of quotiented inverse systems, one can choose $C = 1$, but this is not necessary for our proofs. The case of $C = 1$ corresponds to the condition of thickness studied in [23, Section 15]. Consequently, in such special instances, these can even be chosen independent of the Poincaré and doubling constants. The terminology of tangents is given at the end of the introduction and the notion of a blow-up map is made rigorous in Subsection 6.5.

Recall, that a map $f : (X,d_X) \to (Y,d_Y)$ is $(C-,C)$-bi-Lipschitz if for all $x, y \in X$,

$$d_Y(f(x),f(y)) \asymp_C d_X(x,y).$$

Our main rigidity theorem is the following.

**Theorem 6.2** (Kleiner, unpublished). Let $X, Y$ be analytically one dimensional $Q$-Loewner spaces and assume that $X$ and $Y$ have $C$-monotone metrics. If $f : X \to Y$ is a quasisymmetric homeomorphism, then for almost every $x \in X$, and for any tangents $T_X$ of $X$ at $x$ there exists a tangent $T_Y$ of $Y$ at $f(x)$ such that for any blow-up map $T_f : T_X \to T_Y$ is $C^2$-bi-Lipschitz.

**Remark 6.3.** Although we will not need this here, it follows that under the assumptions of Theorem 6.2, any quasisymmetric self map $f : X \to X$ is $K$-quasiconformal with a uniform $K$; see Corollary 6.27. Moreover, if the metrics on $X$ and $Y$ are $1$-monotone, then the tangent map can be chosen to be an isometry and the map $f$ is a conformal map.

**Remark 6.4.** The conclusion that the blow-up maps are bi-Lipschitz follows from the absolute continuity of $f$, the $L^Q$ integrability of its upper gradient $\text{Lip}[f]$ and the Poincaré inequality, see [38, Proof of Theorem 10.8], together with the theory of $H^{1,p}$ Sobolev spaces from [23, 65]. However, in full generality, there is no control on the bi-Lipschitz constant of the blow-ups.
6.2. Results on Quasisymmetries. We will need some background and auxiliary results related to quasiconformal maps, modulus and differentiation. Below we will consider quasisymmetries \( f: X \to Y \), where \( X, Y \) are assumed \( Q \)-Loewner. We will denote the \( Q \)-Ahlfors regular measures of \( X, Y \) by \( \mu, \nu \) respectively. Where needed for explicit bounds, we denote by \( C_{AR} \) the Ahlfors regularity constant. In other words, \( \mu(B(x, r)) \geq C_{AR} r^Q \) and \( \nu(B(x, r)) \geq C_{AR} r^Q \).

Positive modulus families also behave well under quasisymmetric maps. This was shown by Tyson.

Lemma 6.5 (Tyson, \[69\]). If \( X, Y \) are \( Q \)-Loewner metric measure spaces and \( f: X \to Y \) is a quasisymmetry and \( \Gamma \) is a family of curves in \( X \), then there is a constant \( K \) such that

\[
\frac{1}{K} \text{Mod}_Q(\Gamma) \leq \text{Mod}_Q(f(\Gamma)) \leq K \text{Mod}_Q(\Gamma).
\]

This is connected to the following fact which pertains to the issue of controlling the behavior of the restriction of \( f \) to curves. First, a map \( \gamma: [a, b] \to X \) is called absolutely continuous, if the push-forwards measure \( \gamma^*(\lambda) \) is absolutely continuous with respect to the Hausdorff measure \( H^1|_{\gamma} \). In this case, by [1], the curve is controlled by its metric derivative which is almost everywhere defined by:

\[
d_{\gamma}(t) = \lim_{h \to 0} \frac{d(\gamma(t), \gamma(t+h))}{h}.
\]

Indeed, the length of the curve can be given by

\[
\text{length}(\gamma(t)) = \int_a^b d_{\gamma}(t) \, dt.
\]

Now, if \( \gamma: [a, b] \to X \) is absolutely continuous, then \( f \) is said to be absolutely continuous along \( \gamma \) if \( f \circ \gamma \) is an absolutely continuous curve and \( f^*(H^1|_{\gamma}) \) is absolutely continuous with respect to \( H^1|_{f \circ \gamma} \). In this case, the metric derivative \( d_{f \circ \gamma} \) satisfies

\[
\text{length}(f \circ \gamma) \leq \int_a^b d_{f \circ \gamma}(t) \, dt.
\]

Further, by using

\[
\text{Lip } [f](x) := \limsup_{y \to x, y \neq x} \frac{d(f(x), f(y))}{d(x, y)}
\]

we obtain \( d_{f \circ \gamma} \leq \text{Lip } [f] \cdot d_{\gamma}(t) \) almost everywhere. (Note that both sides are defined almost everywhere.) Hence, we obtain

\[
\text{length}(f \circ \gamma) \leq \int_a^b \text{Lip } [f](\gamma(t))d_{\gamma}(t) \, dt.
\]

The following lemma, which is adapted from [37, Theorem 8.1], provides an abundance of curves \( \gamma \) along which \( f \circ \gamma \) can be controlled.

Lemma 6.8. If \( \Gamma \) is a family of curves and \( f: X \to Y \) is a quasisymmetry between two \( Q \)-Loewner spaces, then

\[
\Gamma = \{ \gamma \in \Gamma \mid f \text{ is absolutely continuous on } \gamma \}
\]

satisfies \( \text{Mod}_Q(\Gamma) = \text{Mod}_Q(\Gamma) \) and \( \text{Mod}_Q(\Gamma \setminus \Gamma) = 0 \).
The lemma can be paraphrased as follows: $f$ is absolutely continuous on almost every curve $\gamma$.

We will need a Muckenhoupt-property, or more precisely, a reverse Hölder property, for $\text{Lip}[f]$ established in [37, Theorem 7.11]. This property is equivalent to various different versions of the Muckenhoupt condition. See [66] for more background and discussion of various equivalent definitions. We will not need most properties of these weights here.

**Proposition 6.9.** Let $X$ and $Y$ be $Q$-Loewner spaces and let $f: X \to Y$ denote a quasisymmetry. Then, there is a $Q' > Q$ and constant $C$ such that for any ball $B = B(x,r)$

$$\left( \int_{B(x,r)} \text{Lip}[f]^Q \, d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{Q'}} \leq C \left( \int_{CB(x,r)} \text{Lip}[f]^Q \, d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{Q}}.$$  

In particular, the function $\text{Lip} f$ is a Muckenhoupt $A_{\infty}$-weight as defined in [66].

As a consequence of the reverse Hölder property, we get the following result which states that if the set $E$ is small in measure, then not only is the integral of $1_E$ along some curve $\gamma$ small, but the integral of $\text{Lip}[f]^Q 1_E$ as well.

**Lemma 6.10.** Let $f: X \to Y$ be as in the previous lemma. Assume $\text{Mod}_Q(\Gamma) > c$, and that $\gamma \subset B(x,R)$, for every $\gamma \in \Gamma$. Then, there exists $C_{\text{con}}$ and $\alpha$ such that the following holds. For every Borel set $E$ with $\frac{\mu(E \cap B(x,R))}{\mu(B(x,R))} \leq \epsilon$, there exists $\gamma \in \Gamma$ such that:

$$\int_{\gamma} \text{Lip} f 1_E \, ds \leq C_{\text{con}} \frac{\epsilon^\alpha}{c^{\frac{\alpha}{Q}}} \left( \int_{B(x,CR)} \text{Lip}[f]^Q \, d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{Q}}.$$  

**Proof.** Let $C$ and $Q' > Q$ be the constants from Proposition 6.9. Let $C_{AR}$ be the Ahlfors regularity constant of $X$ and $A = \left( \int_{B(x,R)} \text{Lip}[f]^Q \, d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{Q}}$. Set $\alpha = \frac{Q'-Q}{Q'}$ and $g = \frac{c^{\frac{1}{Q'}}}{2C(C_{AR}A)^{\frac{1}{Q'}}} \text{Lip}[f] 1_{E \cap B(x,R)}$. Then, by Hölder’s inequality and Proposition 6.9

$$\int g^Q \, d\mu \leq \frac{c}{2QACQ} \int_{B(x,R)} \text{Lip}[f]^Q 1_E \, d\mu \leq \frac{c}{2QACQ} \left( \int_{B(x,R)} \text{Lip}[f]^Q \, d\mu \right)^{\frac{Q}{Q'}} \epsilon^{\frac{Q'-Q}{Q'}} < c.$$  

The function $g$ is then not admissible, and so, there is a curve $\gamma$ with

$$\int_{\gamma} g \, ds < 1.$$  

Setting $C_{\text{con}} = 2C(C_{AR}A)^{\frac{1}{Q'}}$ we get then the desired integral bound.  

□
We will also need the following quantitative version of absolute continuity, which is related to the Muckenhoupt condition. It follows from the arguments in [37, Section 7.8], the Muckenhoupt condition and the equivalent characterizations of Muckenhoupt weights in [66, Chapter V]. (Recall, that the push-forward measure is defined as \( f^*(\mu)(E) = \mu(f^{-1}(E)) \).)

Proposition 6.11. Let \( f : X \to Y \) be a quasisymmetry, then there is a constant \( L \geq 1 \) so that
\[
f^{-1*}(\nu) \leq LLip[f]Q\mu,\]
and
\[
f^*(\mu) \leq LLip[f^{-1}]Q\nu.\]
Moreover, there exists an \( \alpha \) so that
\[
\frac{f^{-1*}(\nu)(B \cap E)}{f^{-1*}(\nu)(B)} \leq L \left( \frac{\mu(E \cap LB)}{\mu(LB)} \right)^\alpha,
\]
and
\[
\frac{f^*(\mu)(B \cap E)}{f^*(\mu)(B)} \leq L \left( \frac{\nu(E \cap LB)}{\nu(LB)} \right)^\alpha,
\]
holds for all balls \( B \) and Borel sets \( E \) in \( X \) and \( Y \) respectively. The constants depend only on the constants in the quasisymmetry and Loewner conditions.

6.3. Existence of a differential and Sobolev spaces. In this section, using Cheeger derivatives we will define a linear differential \( df \) for the function \( f \). Later, we will show that the dilation \( Lip[f] \) of \( f \) is controlled by \( df \).

For the following proposition, we define \( H^{1,p}_{loc}(X) \) as the space of \( f : X \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, \infty\} \) which possess weak upper gradients \( g \) so that \( f \) and \( g \) are in \( L^p_{loc} \). Here, \( p \in (1, \infty) \). A function \( g \) is an upper gradient for \( f \), if for every rectifiable curve \( \gamma : [a,b] \to X \) we have
\[
|f(x) - f(y)| \leq \int_\gamma g \, ds,
\]
if \( f(x), f(y) < \infty \), and if one of them is infinity, then the right hand side is infinity. Upper gradients were initially defined in [37]. The function \( g \) is called a weak upper gradient if the previous holds for every curve \( \gamma \) except for a family of exceptional curves with vanishing modulus, as defined in [65].

The above definition of a Sobolev space \( H^{1,p}_{loc} \) is the one best suited for our purposes. Another, earlier definition appeared in [23] involving a minimal generalized upper gradient defined using relaxation. By results in [23] we could derive the same estimates for this gradient using the upper gradients that we use below, but the approach we use is slightly more direct. As shown in [65], these definitions are equivalent. For a discussion using the definition using upper gradients see [7].

The following proposition is related to [38, Theorem 10.8]. Our proof is somewhat different though. The derivative we construct can naturally be interpreted as the adjoint of the natural map defined on the measurable cotangent bundles \( (df)_*: T^*Y \to T^*X \).

Proposition 6.12. Let \( X \) and \( Y \) be Q-Loewner, \( f : X \to Y \) be a quasisymmetry, and \( U \subset X, V \subset Y \) be measurable sets. Suppose \( \phi : U \to \mathbb{R}^n \) is a chart of \( X \), and \( f(U) \subset V \) for some chart \( \psi : V \to \mathbb{R}^m \). Then, for almost every \( x \in U \) the function \( \psi \circ f \) is Cheeger differentiable with respect
to $\phi$ at $x$ with derivative $d(\psi \circ f) : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^m$. Moreover, $m = n$ and $d(\psi \circ f)$ is invertible almost everywhere with inverse $d(\phi \circ f^{-1})(f(x))$.

**Proof of Proposition 6.12.** Fix a chart $\phi : U \to \mathbb{R}^n$ in $X$ which is a $L$-Lipschitz and $f(U) \subset V$, where $\psi : V \to \mathbb{R}^m$ is a $L$-Lipschitz chart in $Y$. By Heinonen-Koskela [37 Theorem 7.11], it follows that the function

$$\text{Lip } [f](x) := \limsup_{y \to x, y \neq x} \frac{d(f(x), f(y))}{d(x, y)}$$

satisfies $\text{Lip } [f] \in L^{Q'}$, that is, it is locally in $L^{Q'}$, for some $Q' > Q$. Now, extend $\psi$ to all of $Y$ by a Lipschitz extension. Then, for each component $\psi_i$ of $\psi$, $\text{Lip } [\psi_i \circ f](x) \leq L \text{Lip } [f](x)$. The function $\text{Lip } [\psi_i \circ f]$ is a (weak)-upper gradient for $\psi_i \circ f$; see [38 Theorem 10.8]. From this it follows that $\psi_i \circ f \in H^{1, Q'}$. Also note that $\psi_i \circ f$ is continuous since both functions, $\psi_i$ and $f$, are continuous.

By [2] the function $\psi_i \circ f$ is Cheeger differentiable almost everywhere in $U$ with derivative $d(\psi_i \circ f)$ defined for almost every $x \in U$. Combining the components, we obtain the derivative $d(\psi \circ f)$.

The argument can be repeated for $f^{-1}$ on the measurable set $f(U)$ (which is a Suslin set, since $f$ is continuous [33]). If now $x$ is a point of differentiability for $\psi \circ f$, and $f(x)$ is a point of differentiability of $\phi \circ f^{-1}$, then the definition of Cheeger-differentiability ensures the following

$$\phi(y) - \phi(x) = d(\phi \circ f^{-1})(f(x))(\psi(f(y)) - \psi(f(x))) + o(d(f(x), f(y)))$$

$$= d(\phi \circ f^{-1})(f(x))d(\psi \circ f)(x)(\phi(y) - \phi(x)) + o(d(x, y)) + o(d(f(x), f(y))).$$

Now, at generic points, as $\delta \to 0$, the vectors $\phi(y) - \phi(x)$, for $y \in B_\delta(x)$ span the space $\mathbb{R}^n$ (see e.g. [5]). Further, by combining the quasisymmetry property with a density argument from the proof of [38 Theorem 10.8], we get also that the error $o(d(f(x), f(y)))$ can be controlled by an error of the form $o(d(x, y))$. These two facts then force the linear map $d(\phi \circ f^{-1})(f(x))d(\psi \circ f)(x)$ to be identity. Here, we are implicitly using the fact that $f$ and $f^{-1}$ are absolutely continuous, see Proposition 6.11.

6.4. **Controlling metric differential using Cheeger differential.** From now on, without essential loss of generality, we assume that $X$, $Y$ are analytically one dimensional equipped with global charts $\phi_X : X \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\phi_Y : Y \to \mathbb{R}$. This will simplify arguments below, while the general case could be obtained by restrictions to appropriate subsets. Also, in the application to rigidity in Theorem 1.17, we do in fact have global chart functions.

From now on we assume $X$, $Y$ are analytically one dimensional equipped with global charts $\phi_X : X \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\phi_Y : Y \to \mathbb{R}$.

**Remark 6.13.** By restricting to a subset $U_i$ so that $f(U_i) \subset V_i$, and $U_i$ and $V_i$ are charts of $X$ and $Y$ respectively, the notions here could be defined without assuming the existence of a global chart.

Let now $D_X$ denote a fixed dense set of points in $X$. Let $F_X = \{d(x, \cdot) \mid x \in D\}$ denote a collection of functions. Set $V_X = \{x \in X \mid dg(x) \text{ exists at } x, \forall g \in F\}$. By the statement that “$dg(x)$ exists”, we mean that $g$ is differentiable with unique derivative $dg(x)$ with respect to the fixed global chart.

The following is the specialization of a definition from [27] to our setting in which we consider curves rather than more general curve fragments.
Definition 6.14. A pair $(\gamma,t)$ is generic, if $\gamma: I \to X$ is a rectifiable curve and $t \in I$ is such that the following properties hold.

1. For each $g \in \mathcal{F}_X$, $(g \circ \gamma)'(t)$ exists at $t$ and is approximately continuous at $t$.
2. The point $t$ is in the interior of $I$ and an approximate continuity point of $\sup_{g \in \mathcal{F}_X} |(g \circ \gamma)'(t)|$.
3. The derivative $(\phi_X \circ \gamma)'(t)$ exists and is approximately continuous at $t$.

Recall, that a function $g: U \to \mathbb{R}$ for an subset $U \subset \mathbb{R}$ is said to be approximately continuous at an interior point $t \in U$ if for every $\epsilon > 0$ we have

$$\lim_{s \to 0^+} \frac{|\{t - s, t + s] \cap \{|g - g(t)| > \epsilon\}|}{2s} = 0.$$ 

The first two conditions in Definition 6.14 are from [1, Thm. 4.1.6] . They guarantee existence of the metric derivative $d_\gamma(t)$ and the equality

$$d_\gamma(t) = \sup_{g \in \mathcal{F}_X} |(g \circ \gamma)'(t)|.$$ 

The last condition in Definition 6.14 allows us to define an element $\gamma'(t)$ of $TX_{\gamma(t)} = \mathbb{R}$, by $(\phi_X \circ \gamma)'(t) \in \mathbb{R}$.

For a fixed $x \in V_X$, there are two norms on $TX_x = \mathbb{R}$, one is the dual norm that Lip induces on the cotangent bundle:

$$||t||_{\text{Lip},x} := \frac{|t|}{\text{Lip } |\phi_X|(x)}.$$ 

The other is defined by the differentials of functions in $\mathcal{F}_X$:

$$||t||_{\mathcal{D},x} = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_X} |df(t)|.$$ 

Both norms are defined on the full measure subset $x \in V_X$. Further, by [27, Theorem 6.1] for almost every $x \in V_X$, the above two norms coincide.

Let $V_X$ denote the set of $x$ such that there exists a curve $\gamma$ s.t. $\gamma(t) = x$, $\phi_X \circ \gamma'(t) \neq 0$, and $(\gamma, t)$ is generic. By a slight modification of [27] involving filling in the curve fragments to give true curves, this set has full measure and for each $x \in V_X$ the above two norms are equal. By combining [1, Thm. 4.1.6] with the above, if $(\gamma, t)$ is regular and $\gamma(t) \in V_X$ we have

$$d_\gamma(t) = ||\gamma'||_{\mathcal{D},x} = ||\gamma'||_{\text{Lip},x}.$$ 

In particular, the metric derivative $d_\gamma$ can be expressed using the differential structure.

The global charts give a global trivialization $TX_x = \mathbb{R}$ and the norms are given by $||v||_x = \tau_X(x)||v||$ for some measurable $\tau: \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$. In fact, by the previous paragraph, we can set $\tau_X(x) = \frac{1}{\text{Lip } |\phi_X|(x)}$, which is almost everywhere defined. Further, in the context of Proposition 6.12 and on analytically one dimensional spaces, the function $d(\phi_Y \circ f)$ will simply be a scalar quantity.

The maps $f: X \to Y$ will be controlled at certain generic regular points defined as follows.

Definition 6.17. The point $x \in X$ regular for a quasi-symmetric map $f: X \to Y$ if the following conditions hold.
(1) \( x \in \overline{V}_X, f(x) = \overline{V}_Y \).

(2) \( x \) is an approximate continuity point of \( \tau_X \) and \( \tau_X(x) > 0 \), and \( y = f(x) \) is an approximate continuity point of \( \tau_Y(y) > 0 \).

(3) \( x \) is an approximate continuity point of \( d(\phi_Y \circ f) \) and \( \phi_Y \circ f \) is Cheeger differentiable at \( x \) with respect to \( \phi_X \) with \( d(\phi_Y \circ f) \neq 0 \).

(4) \( f(x) \) is an approximate continuity point of \( d(\phi_X \circ f^{-1}) \) with \( d(\phi_X \circ f^{-1}) \neq 0 \) and \( \phi_X \circ f^{-1} \) is Cheeger differentiable at \( f(x) \) with respect to \( \phi_Y \) with derivative \( d(\phi_X \circ f^{-1}) \).

(5) \( x \) is a Lebesgue point of \( \text{Lip} [\phi_X] \) with \( \text{Lip} [\phi_X](x) \neq 0 \).

(6) \( f(x) \) is a Lebesgue point of \( \text{Lip} [\phi_Y] \) with \( \text{Lip} [\phi_Y](f(x)) \neq 0 \).

(7) \( d(\phi_Y \circ f)(x)^{-1} = d(\phi_X \circ f^{-1})(f(x)) \)

Note that If \( x \) is regular for \( f \), then \( f(x) \) is regular for \( f^{-1} \). Also, it follows from Proposition \ref{prop:6.12} and Proposition \ref{prop:6.11} that almost every point \( x \) is a regular point.

6.5. **Blow-up maps and proof of Theorem \ref{thm:6.2}** Next, we will blow up \( f \) at a regular point \( x \). Let \( r_n \to 0 \) be some sequence. Choose another sequence \( s_n = \text{diam}(f(B(x,r_n))) \). If \( f : X \to Y \) is a quasisymmetry, then also \( \lim_{n \to \infty} s_n = 0 \). Next, choose a sub-sequence so that

\[
(X, d_n/r_n, \mu_X/\mu_X(B(x,r_n)))
\]

converges in the measured Gromov-Hausdorff sense to some tangent space \( T_X \) and

\[
(Y, d_n/s_n, \mu_Y/\mu_Y(B(f(x),s_n)))
\]

converges in the measured Gromov-Hausdorff sense to some tangent space \( T_Y \). Since our spaces are doubling, such subsequences exist.

Since \( X, Y \) are quasiconvex, it follows that \( X \) and \( Y \) are uniformly perfect. This guarantees that \( s_n \neq 0 \) and that the division above is well defined. The technical details of the proofs of the various unproved statements below are are classical; for these details, see the proof of \cite{cheeger} Theorem 1.1. Directly applying Definition \ref{def:3.3} shows that the maps \( f_n = f : (X, d_n/r_n, \mu_X/\mu_X(B(x,r_n))) \to (Y, d_n/s_n, \mu_Y/\mu_Y(B(f(x),s_n))) \) are equicontinuous. Therefore, using a variant of Arzelà-Ascoli, we obtain a map \( T_f : T_X \to T_Y \). Indeed, there exist Gromov-Hausdorff approximations \( \phi_{n,X} : T_X \to (X, d_n/r_n, \mu_X/\mu_X(B(x,r_n))) \) and inverse approximations \( \psi_{n,Y} : (Y, d_n/s_n, \mu_Y/\mu_Y(B(f(x),s_n))) \to T_Y \). Then, we can define \( T_f(z) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \phi_{n,Y} \circ f_n \circ \phi_{n,X}(z) \). Here the limit can be shown to exist along a subsequence, initially on a dense subset and then everywhere. One can also show that \( T_f \) is a quasisymmetry. This construction is possible for any sequence of \( r_n \), and so for any tangent space \( T_X \) of \( X \) there is an associated \( T_Y \) which is quasisymmetric to \( T_X \).

The crucial fact concerning regular points is that, asymptotically, the change \( d(f(x), f(y)) \) can be estimated from above by a constant times \( \frac{\tau_Y(f(y))}{\tau_X(f(x))} |d(\phi_Y \circ f)| \). This quantity is essentially the metric derivative \( \text{Lip}[f](x) \) of \( f \). As usual, denote by \( o(d(y,x)) \) some function such that \( \lim_{y \to x} \frac{o(d(y,x))}{d(y,x)} = 0 \).
Lemma 6.18. Assume that $X$ and $Y$ admit $C$-monotone metrics and let $\Delta > 0$. If $x$ is a regular point, and $z, y$ satisfy $d(z, y) \geq \Delta d(x, y)$ and $d(z, x) \leq \frac{1}{\Delta} d(x, y)$, then

$$d(f(z), f(y)) \leq C \cdot \frac{\tau_Y(f(x))}{\tau_X(x)} \cdot |d(\phi_Y \circ f)| \cdot d(z, w) + o(d(y, x)).$$

Proof. It suffices to show

$$\limsup_{z \to x} \frac{d(f(z), f(y))}{d(z, y)} \leq C \frac{\tau_Y(f(x))}{\tau_X(x)} |d(\phi_Y \circ f)|,$$

where the limit is along pairs $(y, z)$ such that $d(z, y) \geq \Delta d(x, y)$ and $d(z, x) \leq \frac{1}{\Delta} d(x, y)$. Below, all the limit superiors are taking along sequences satisfying this assumption.

Let $\eta, \epsilon > 0$ be very small constants to be determined. Given a measurable function $g$ on $X$ and $q$ with $g(q) > 0$, we define

$$A_{\eta, q, g} := \left\{ w \in X \mid |g(w) - g(q)| > \eta |g(q)|, \left| \frac{1}{g(w)} - \frac{1}{g(q)} \right| > \frac{\eta}{g(q)} \right\}.$$

Define the “bad set” by

$$\mathcal{B} := A_{\eta, \tau X} \cup A_{\eta, \tau Y \circ f} \cup A_{\eta, \mu(d(\phi_Y \circ f))} \cup (X \setminus (\nabla X \cup f^{-1}(\nabla Y))).$$

From the assumed regularity of $x$ and Proposition 6.11 it follows that

$$\lim_{r \to 0} \frac{\mu(\mathcal{B} \cap B(x, 6Cr))}{\mu(B(x, 6Cr))} = 0.$$

In particular, there is an $r_\eta > 0$ such that

$$\frac{\mu(\mathcal{B} \cap B(x, 6Cr))}{\mu(B(x, 6Cr))} < \eta,$$

for all $r < r_\eta$.

Consider the family $\Gamma_\epsilon^C(z, y)$ and the collection $\Gamma_\epsilon^C(z, y)$ with the same modulus, where $f$ is absolutely continuous on each curve. Then, by assumption and Lemma 6.8 we have

$$\text{Mod}_Q(\Gamma_\epsilon^C(z, y)) > \Phi(\epsilon).$$

By Lemma 6.10 and the doubling property, there is a constant $C_D$ (depending on doubling and $\Delta$) with the following property. There is a curve $\gamma : [a, b] \to X$ in $\Gamma_\epsilon^C(z, y)$ connecting $B(z, \epsilon d(z, y))$ to $B(y, \epsilon d(z, y))$ with

$$\int_{\gamma} \text{Lip}[f](\gamma(t)) ds \leq C_D \frac{[\text{Lip}[f](x) + \eta]}{\Phi(\epsilon)^\frac{1}{q}} d(x, y),$$

for all $y, z$ with $d(y, x) \leq r_\eta$ and $d(z, x) \leq r_\eta$.

Here, we used that $d(y, z) \geq \Delta d(x, y)$, since this allows on to translate estimates for $\mathcal{B}$ in (6.20) in $B(x, 6Cd(x, y))$ to density estimates for the ball $B(z, C\delta(y, z))$.

Now, $\gamma(a) \in B(z, \epsilon d(z, y))$ and $\gamma(b) \in B(y, \epsilon d(z, y))$. Also, if $\gamma(t) \not\in \mathcal{B}$ then $\phi_Y \circ f \circ \gamma$ and $\phi_X \circ \gamma$ are differentiable, and by the chain rule, we get:
By the quasisymmetry Definition 2.3, there exists a function 
\[ \psi \]
\[ (6.24) \]
\[ \text{satisfies} \quad \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \psi(\epsilon) = 0. \]

Next, from inequalities and equations (6.23), (6.21), (6.16), (6.7) and (6.6) we get
\[ d(f(\gamma(t)), y) \leq \psi(\epsilon) d(f(z), f(y)). \]
\[ (6.25) \]

By Definition 2.3 the function \( \psi \) satisfies \( \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \psi(\epsilon) = 0 \).

So, by reorganizing, we get
\[ d(f(z), f(y)) \leq \frac{1}{1 - 2\psi(\epsilon)} (1 + \eta)^3 \rho C d(z, y) + \frac{1}{1 - 2\psi(\epsilon)} C_D (\text{Lip}[f(x) + \eta \eta^\alpha]) d(z, y). \]
Finally, if we fix $\epsilon > 0$ then $y, z \to x$ we can send $\eta \to 0$ in Equation 6.20 and $r_\eta \to 0$, giving:

$$
\limsup_{y,z \to x} \frac{d(f(y), f(z))}{d(z, y)} \leq \frac{1}{1 - 2\psi(\epsilon)} C \rho(x).
$$

Then, since $\epsilon > 0$ was arbitrary, we get the desired result:

$$
\limsup_{y,z \to x} \frac{d(f(y), f(z))}{d(z, y)} \leq C \rho(x).
$$

□

An application of the previous theorem gives the proof of our rigidity result.

**Proof of Theorem 6.2.** Let $\rho$ be as in (6.24).

Note that by Lemma 6.12, we have $d(\phi_Y \circ f)(x) = d(\phi_X \circ f^{-1})(f(x))$. Also, by Lemma 6.18 applied to $f$ and $f^{-1}$, if for fixed $\Delta$, we have $d(y, z) \geq \Delta d(x, y)$ and $d(z, x) \leq \frac{1}{2} d(x, y)$, then we have:

$$
\frac{1}{C} \rho(x) \leq \liminf_{y,z \to x} \frac{d(f(z), f(y))}{d(z, y)} \leq \sup_{y,z \to x} \frac{d(f(z), f(y))}{d(x, y)} \leq C \rho(x).
$$

If $r_n \searrow 0$ is any sequence and $\epsilon > 0$, then for $n$ large enough we get:

$$
s_n = \text{diam}(f(B(x, r_n))) \leq 2(1 + \epsilon)C \rho(x)r_n
$$

However, we also have:

$$
\frac{2pr_n}{C(1 + \epsilon)} \leq s_n,
$$

This can be obtained by choosing a generic $(\gamma, t)$ with $\gamma(t) = x$, and considering the sequence $\alpha_n^\pm \searrow 0$, with $d(\gamma(t \pm \alpha_n^\pm), x) = r_n$.

Therefore,

$$
\frac{1}{2C} \leq \liminf_{n \to \infty} \frac{r_n}{s_n} \leq \sup_{n \to \infty} \frac{r_n}{s_n} \leq \frac{C}{2}.
$$

Then, by Lemma 6.18 again, fixing $R$ large, for any sequence $y_n, z_n \in B(x, Rr_n)$ with $d(y_n, z_n) \geq \Delta r_n$, we get:

$$
\frac{1}{2C^2} \leq \liminf_{n \to \infty} \frac{d(f(y_n), f(z_n)r_n)}{s_n d(z_n, y_n)} \leq \sup_{n \to \infty} \frac{d(f(y_n), f(z_n)r_n)}{s_n d(z_n, y_n)} \leq \frac{C^2}{2}.
$$

Thus, with respect to the rescaled metrics $d_X/r_n$ and $2d_Y/(s_n)$, the maps $f|_{B(x,Rr_n)}$ converge to $C^2$-Bi-Lipschitz maps on any $\Delta r_n$-separated nets. By sending $\Delta \searrow 0, R \nearrow \infty$ we get the desired result for the tangent maps $T_f : T_X \to T_X$, which is a limit of the previous maps. If $C = 1$, then we get an isometry. □
6.6. **Further remarks on Quasiconformality:** Consider a homeomorphism \( f : X \to Y \). Put 
\[ L_f(x, t) := \sup_{y \in B(x, t)} d(f(x), f(y)), \]
and 
\[ l_f(x, t) := \inf_{y \notin B(x, t)} d(f(x), f(y)). \]
We define 
\[ H_f(x, t) := L_f(x, t)^{-1} l_f(x, t)^{1}. \]
\[ H_f(x) := \limsup_{t \to 0} H_f(x, t). \]

**Definition 6.26.**

1) The map \( f \) is quasiconformal if there exists \( M \) such that for all \( x \), we have \( H_f(x) < M \).

2) The map \( K \)-quasiconformal if \( H_f \) is bounded, and \( H_f(x) \leq K \) almost everywhere; equivalently \( \|H_f(x)\|_{\infty} \leq K \).

By [37], any quasiconformal map between Loewner spaces is quasisymmetric. That is, the infinitesimal boundedness of \( H_f(x) \) implies the boundedness of \( H_f(x, t) < M \) at all scales.

Next, we show a striking conclusion which is due to Kleiner. Namely, the quasiconformality constant can be uniformly controlled if the domain and target are analytically one dimensional.

**Proposition 6.27** (Kleiner, unpublished). Let \( X, Y \) be \( Q \)-Loewner and analytically 1-dimensional. Assume in addition that metrics on \( X, Y \) are \( C \)-monotone. Any quasiconformal map \( f : X \to Y \) is \( C^4 \)-quasiconformal.

**Proof.** First, note that if \( g : X \to Y \) is a \( L \)-bi-Lipschitz map, and \( X, Y \) are connected, then it is not hard to show that \( H_g(x) \leq L^2 \). Similarly, it is not hard to show that \( H_f(x) = H_{T_f}(p) \), where \( T_f \) is obtained by taking a tangent map along some sequence \( r_n \searrow 0 \) where \( H_f(x) \) obtains its limit superior. Here \( p \) is the base point of the tangent. By Theorem 6.2 the map \( T_f \) is \( C^2 \)-bi-Lipschitz and so it is \( C^4 \)-quasiconformal and \( H_{T_f}(p) \leq C^4 \). Consequently, \( H_f(x) \leq C^4 \). \( \square \)

In particular, if \( C = 1 \), then any quasiconformal map is conformal.

6.7. **For all \( Q, Q' \), infinitely many quasisymmetrically distinct examples.** In this subsection we prove the remaining part of Theorem 1.17. Namely, for all \( Q, Q' \), infinitely many of our examples are pairwise quasisymmetrically distinct.

For the following statement, if \( h : (0, \infty) \to (0, \infty) \) is a function, we define 
\[ \overline{h}_{\text{inf}}(t) := \liminf_{r \to 0} \frac{h(tr)}{h(r)}. \]

**Proposition 6.28.** Suppose \( X, Y \) have measures \( \mu, \nu \) which are \( Q \)-Ahlfors regular. Suppose, moreover, that these measures are \( h_X, h_Y \)-uniform with comparability constants \( C_X, C_Y \). Suppose also that \( h_X, h_Y \) are uniformly doubling with constant \( D \), and that the spaces admit \( (1, Q) \)-Poincaré inequalities with constants \( C_{PI} \). Then, if there is a quasiconformal map \( f : X \to Y \), then for every \( t \in (0, 1] \) we have 
\[ \overline{h}_{\text{inf}, X}(t) \asymp \overline{h}_{\text{inf}, Y}(t). \]
Here the comparability constant depends only on \( C_X, C_Y, D, C_{PI} \).

**Remark 6.29.** In particular, the comparability does not depend on the constants in the Ahlfors regularity condition.
Proof. Fix $t > 0$. Without loss of generality assume $t < \frac{1}{2}$, since otherwise the claim follows from the uniform doubling of $h_X, h_Y$.

Let $x$ be a regular point for $f$. By Theorem 6.2 it follows that at $x$, the map $f$ induces a $L$-bi-Lipschitz map $T_X \to T_Y$ between any tangent cone $T_X$ at $X$, and some tangent cone $T_Y$ at $f(x)$ obtained along a compatible sequence in $Y$. The constant $L$ depends only on the doubling constant and the constant in the Poincaré inequality.

We can choose to define $T_X$ along a sequence $r_n \searrow 0$ so that we have

$$\bar{h}_{\inf,X}(t) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{h(tr_n)}{h(r_n)}.$$ 

Let $p_X$ be the base-point of $T_X$ and $\mu_X$ its limit measure, and $p_Y, \nu_Y$ the analogous quantities for $T_Y$. There is an $t$-net $N_X$ in $B(p_X, 1) \subset T_X$ of size at least $D\bar{h}_{\inf,X}(t)^{-1}$. The set $f(N_X)$ will be a $\frac{1}{L}$-$t$-net within $B(p_Y, L) \subset T_Y$. Therefore, its size is bounded by

$$\inf_{q \in T_Y} \nu_Y(B(q, \frac{1}{L}t)) \lesssim \frac{1}{\bar{h}_{\inf,Y}(t)}.$$ 

By combining these with the doubling property, we get $\bar{h}_{\inf,Y}(t) \lesssim \bar{h}_{\inf,X}(t)$. The other direction follows by switching the roles of $X$ and $Y$. 

Theorem 1.17 (Completion of the proof.) In Subsection 5.4 we showed that there exist positive integers $N_1, N_2, N_3$, and $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3$, so that the following holds. Consider three replacement rules $S_{N_1}, C_{N_2}$ and $WS_{N_3}$ and index them by 1, 2 and 3 respectively. Take any sequence $a = (a_j) \in \{1, 2, 3\}^\mathbb{N}$, with

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} ||\{j \mid a_j = k\}|| - \alpha_k N < \infty.$$ 

Then, the sequence of spaces resulting from performing the replacement rule $a_i$ at the $i$’th step will have a limit space $X_a$ which is $Q$-Loewner and whose snow-flake image in the plane is $Q'$-Ahlfors regular. By choosing $N_i$ sufficiently large we can ensure that $a$ is not constant.

Fix such a sequence, and define $a^N$ by repeating every value of $a$ $N$-times. That is, for example, $a^2 = (a_1, a_1, a_2, a_2, a_3, a_3, \ldots)$. Each of these sequences gives rise to a space $X_N = X_a^N$, which is uniformly doubling and satisfies a uniform Poincaré inequality. These spaces are $h_N$-uniform with functions $h_N(t)$ and with comparability constant $C_1$ independent of $N$. In fact, we can set $h_N(s_k^N)$ to be the measure of an edge at the $k$’th level of the construction, where $s_k^N$ are the edge lengths in that construction. Let now $C_3$ be the constant from Proposition 6.2 corresponding to the uniform comparability constants $C_X = C_Y = C_1$, and the uniform constants in doubling and the Poincaré inequalities of $X_N$.

We have for every $t \in (0, 1]$

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \bar{h}_{\inf,X_N}(t) \leq C_2 t^P$$

for some $P > Q$. This is because rescaling along a long sequences of repeated replacement rules of the form $C_{N_2}$ gives scales where the space resembles a space slightly higher dimensional than $Q$.
Fix $n_1 = 1$ and $t_1 = 1$, and proceed inductively as follows to define an increasing sequence of $n_i$ and a decreasing sequence $t_i \in (0, 1]$. First, we have a constant $L_N$ for each $N$ so that
\[
\overline{h}_{\inf, X_N}(t) \geq L_N t^Q.
\]

Now, choose $t_2 \leq t_1$ so that $L_n t_2^Q \geq 4C_3 C_2 t_1^P$, and then choose an $n_2$ using Equation (6.30) so large that $\overline{h}_{\inf, X_{n_2}}(t_2) \leq 2C_2 t_2^P$.

Next, if $t_n, N_n$ have been defined, then define $t_{n+1} \leq t_n$ so that
\[
\min\{L_{N_1}, \ldots, L_{N_n}\} t_{n+1}^Q \geq 4C_3 C_2 t_{n+1}^P,
\]
and choose $N_{n+1}$ using Equation (6.30) so large that
\[
\overline{h}_{\inf, X_{N_{n+1}}}(t_{n+1}) \leq 2C_2 t_{n+1}^P.
\]

We observe that the sequence of spaces $X_{N_i}$ so constructed are quasisymmetrically distinct. Namely, if $X_{N_i}$ were quasisymmetric to $X_{N_j}$ for some $j > i$, then by Proposition 6.28 we would have $\overline{h}_{\inf, X_N}(t) \asymp C_3 h_{\inf, X_{N_j}}(t)$. However, the choice of $t = t_j$ would contradict the choices made in (6.31) and (6.32), as this would give $4C_2 t_{n+1}^P \leq 2C_2 t_{n+1}^P$, which is an impossibility. □
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