

ON MICROSETS, ASSOUD DIMENSION AND LOWER DIMENSION OF RANDOM FRACTALS, AND FURSTENBERG'S HOMOGENEITY

YIFTACH DAYAN

ABSTRACT. We study the collection of microsets of randomly constructed fractals, which in this paper, are referred to as Galton-Watson fractals. This is a model that generalizes Mandelbrot percolation, where Galton-Watson trees (whose offspring distribution is not necessarily binomial) are projected to \mathbb{R}^d by a coding map which arises from an iterated function system (IFS) of similarity maps. We show that for such a random fractal E , whenever the underlying IFS satisfies the open set condition, almost surely the Assouad dimension of E is the maximal Hausdorff dimension of a set in $\text{supp}(E)$, the lower dimension is the smallest Hausdorff dimension of a set in $\text{supp}(E)$, and every value in between is the Hausdorff dimension of some microset of E .

In order to obtain the above, we first analyze the relation between the collection of microsets of a (deterministic) set, and certain limits of subtrees of an appropriate coding tree for that set.

The results of this analysis are also applied, with the required adjustments, to gain some insights on Furstenberg's homogeneity property. Corresponding to a discussion in [15], we define a weaker property than homogeneity and show that for self-homothetic sets in \mathbb{R} whose Hausdorff dimension is smaller than 1, it is equivalent to the weak separation condition.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background. The notion of a microset was defined by Furstenberg in his paper [11]. In essence, microsets are limits of repeated local magnifications of a given set. Since the paper [11] was published, several authors used different variations of Furstenberg's definition. In this paper we use the following:

Definition 1.1. Given a compact set $F \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$,

- (1) A non-empty set $A \subset Q$ is called a *miniset* of F if $A = Q \cap \varphi(F)$, for some expanding similarity map $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$.
- (2) A *microset* of F is any limit of a sequence of minisets of F in the Hausdorff metric.

In the definition above and for the rest of the paper $Q = [0, 1]^d$ denotes the closed unit cube in \mathbb{R}^d , and a *similarity map* is a function $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ for which there exists some $r > 0$, which is called the scaling ratio of φ , s.t. for every $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\|\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)\| = r \cdot \|x - y\|$. In case $r < 1$ we call φ a *contracting similarity* and if $r \geq 1$ φ is called an *expanding similarity*. Throughout the paper, $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the euclidean norm in \mathbb{R}^d .

It should be noted that microsets, as defined here, are also called weak tangents by several authors, a notion which has several variations as well.

Recently, there has been an increasing interest in understanding the collection of microsets of certain sets in \mathbb{R}^d , and in particular, their Hausdorff dimensions. It was shown that certain properties of the collection of microsets of a given compact set have interesting implications regarding various properties of the set.

In [11], Furstenberg considered the process of repeated magnification of a set as a dynamical system called a CP-process, and used methods from ergodic theory to get results regarding the Hausdorff dimension of the image of the set under linear transformations, whenever the collection of microsets satisfies certain conditions (see section 5 for more details). As another example, certain properties of the collection of microsets of a given compact set provide interesting information regarding the intersection of the set with winning sets for a variation of Schmidt's game called the hyperplane absolute game ([2], [3]).

It is also known that the Hausdorff dimension of microsets is linked to two different notions of dimension - the *Assouad dimension* and the *lower dimension* (denoted by \dim_A and \dim_L). These provide a coarse and localized information regarding the density of a set in asymptotically small scales. The Assouad dimension describes the densest part of the set while the lower dimension describes the sparsest part of the set. These notions are also gaining popularity recently, and were studied in several recent papers.

Throughout this paper we assume some basic familiarity with Hausdorff dimension (denoted by \dim_H) and its basic properties. For an introduction the reader is referred to [6].

The relation between the Hausdorff dimension of microsets and the Assouad and lower dimensions is given in the theorem below. Since for the lower dimension it is important to only consider microsets which intersect the interior of Q (this has no influence for the Assouad dimension), we denote the collection of those microsets of a given set $F \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ by \mathcal{W}_F .

Theorem 1.2. *Given a non-empty compact set $F \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, the following hold:*

- (1) $\dim_A(F) = \max \{ \dim_H(A) : A \in \mathcal{W}_F \}$
- (2) $\dim_L(F) = \min \{ \dim_H(A) : A \in \mathcal{W}_F \}$

The first point of the above theorem was proved in [14], based on ideas of [1, section 2.4] and [11]. The second point is from [8]. See also [7, section 5].

The Assouad and lower dimensions will be formally defined in subsection 2.4. However, while their formal definition is rather technical, Theorem 1.2 provides a more intuitive equivalent definition for compact sets.

Since addressing every microset of a given set is often impractical, it is common to study the collection of microsets of a given set, and specifically, their Hausdorff dimension, by examining appropriate coding trees for the given set. This is the approach taken in this paper, where we concentrate here in coding trees arising from iterated function systems. This includes coding by digital expansion for example.

The main goal of this paper is to study the collection of microsets and the Assouad and lower dimensions of certain randomly constructed fractals, which we refer to as *Galton-Watson fractals (GWF)* due to their relation to Galton-Watson processes. The analysis presented in this paper joins a few recent papers ([10, 23, 24, 12]) who studied the Assouad dimension of sets generated by some related probabilistic models, as well as certain related notions (quasi-Assouad dimension, and Assouad spectrum). These models include Mandelbrot percolation [10], graphs of (fractional) Brownian motions [12], 1-variable random iterated function systems [10], and the more general random graph directed attractors [23, 24].

In general, for a set E generated by a probabilistic model which assumes some statistical self similarity, it is expected that the Assouad dimension of E will be "as large as possible". In Theorem 1.8 we make this precise for GWF. We show that under certain conditions, for a typical GWF E , the Assouad dimension of E is equal to the maximal Hausdorff dimension of sets in the support of

E . Here, the support of E (which is also denoted by $\text{supp}(E)$) means the support of the probability distribution of E in a suitable space of compact sets in \mathbb{R}^d . Analogously, we show that typically, the lower dimension of E is the minimal Hausdorff dimension of sets in $\text{supp}(E)$. We also show that both quantities, $\dim_{\text{H}}(E)$ and $\dim_{\text{L}}(E)$, may be very easily calculated.

We show the above by analyzing the collection of microsets of a typical realization of E , studying the relation between the collection \mathcal{W}_E and sets in the support of E . As a result we also obtain that for a typical realization of E , every number in the interval $[\dim_{\text{L}}(E), \dim_{\text{A}}(E)]$, is the Hausdorff dimension of some microset in \mathcal{W}_E .

This is a result of a general analysis of deterministic sets, relating certain properties of their coding trees to their microsets. We also apply these results with the required adjustments, to gain some insights on Furstenberg's homogeneity property. This is done in Section 5.

1.2. Some preparations. We now make some necessary preparations for stating the main results of this paper. All notions presented here will be discussed in further detail in Section 2.

1.2.1. Coding trees. Given a finite iterated function system (IFS) $\Phi = \{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ of contracting similarity maps of \mathbb{R}^d , we denote the attractor of Φ by K_Φ or just by K whenever the IFS is clear. Φ defines a continuous and surjective coding map $\gamma_\Phi : \Lambda^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow K$, given by

$$\forall i = (i_1, i_2, \dots) \in \Lambda^{\mathbb{N}}, \quad \gamma_\Phi(i) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_{i_1} \circ \dots \circ \varphi_{i_n}(0).$$

For every compact subset $F \subseteq K$, there is a compact set $P \subseteq \Lambda^{\mathbb{N}}$ which codes F , i.e., such that $\gamma_\Phi(P) = F$.

The statements of the main results below involve the following separation conditions and their respective abbreviations: open set condition (OSC), weak separation condition (WSC), strong separation condition (SSC). These will be defined and discussed in subsection 2.3.

Given a finite set \mathbb{A} , we denote $\mathbb{A}^* = \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{A}^n$ where $\mathbb{A}^0 = \{\emptyset\}$. A *tree* with alphabet \mathbb{A} is a set $T \subseteq \mathbb{A}^*$, such that $\emptyset \in T$ (which is considered as the root of the tree), and for every word $a \in T$, every prefix of a is also a member of T . The *boundary* of T is a compact subset of $\mathbb{A}^{\mathbb{N}}$, defined by $\partial T = \{i_1 i_2 \dots \in \mathbb{A}^{\mathbb{N}} : i_1 \dots i_n \in T, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Given Φ and $F \subseteq K_\Phi$, an infinite tree T with alphabet \mathbb{A} such that $\gamma_\Phi(\partial T) = F$ is called a *coding tree* for F . We further denote $\Gamma_\Phi(T) = \gamma_\Phi(\partial T)$.

We will often be interested in trees that have no leaves, which means that $\forall i_1 \dots i_n \in T$ there is some $j \in \mathbb{A}$ such that $i_1 \dots i_n j \in T$, or in words, this means that every node of the tree has at least one child. For a nonempty finite set \mathbb{A} , the set of trees in the alphabet \mathbb{A} is denoted by $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{A}}$, and its subset of trees with no leaves is denoted by $\mathcal{T}'_{\mathbb{A}}$.

1.2.2. Galton-Watson fractals. Given an IFS $\Phi = \{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ as above, let W be a random variable taking values in the finite set 2^{Λ} . A *Galton-Watson tree (GWT)* is a random tree constructed by iteratively choosing at random the children of each node of the tree as realizations of independent copies of W concatenated to the current node, starting from the root, namely \emptyset . Whenever $\mathbb{P}[W = \emptyset] > 0$, it may happen that in some generation of the tree there will be no surviving elements. In that case, the resulting tree is finite, and we say that the event of *extinction* occurred. It is well known that unless almost surely $|W| = 1$, $\mathbb{E}(|W|) \leq 1 \iff$ extinction occurs a.s. (see [19, Chapter 5]). The case $\mathbb{E}(|W|) > 1$ is called *supercritical* and in this article, we shall always assume this is the case.

Conditioned on the event of non-extinction, the projection of the Galton-Watson tree to \mathbb{R}^d using Γ_Φ yields a random (non-empty) compact subset of the attractor K , which we call a *Galton-Watson fractal (GWF)*. For convenience, in this paper, we take the condition of non-extinction into the definition of a GWF, and so the probability that a GWF is empty is always 0.

An important special case of GWF is a well known model called *fractal percolation* (AKA *Mandelbrot percolation*). Given two parameters: $2 \leq b \in \mathbb{Z}$, and $p \in (0, 1)$, fractal percolation in \mathbb{R}^d may be defined as the GWF corresponding to the IFS $\Phi = \left\{ \varphi_i : x \mapsto \frac{1}{b}x + \frac{i}{b} \right\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ where

$\Lambda = \{0, \dots, b-1\}^d$, and W has a binomial distribution, i.e., every element of Λ is contained in W with probability p , and independently of all other members of Λ . Geometrically, this model may also be described by starting from the unit cube, and successively partitioning the surviving cubes into b^d subcubes of the same dimensions, where each of them either survives with probability p or is discarded with probability $1-p$, independently of the others. Denoting by E_n the union of all surviving cubes in the n^{th} generation (so that $E_0 = Q$), the resulting set is $E = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E_n$, which may

also be empty if at some point of the process no subcube survives (AKA extinction). Hence the corresponding GWF has the distribution of E conditioned on non-extinction.

1.3. Main results.

1.3.1. *Microsets via limits of descendant trees.* Given a tree $T \in \mathcal{T}_\mathbb{A}$, for any $v \in T$, one may consider the tree growing from the node v (thinking of v as the root). We call this tree the descendants tree of v . It is denoted by T^v and formally defined by

$$T^v = \{w \in \mathbb{A}^* : vw \in T\} \in \mathcal{T}_\mathbb{A}.$$

Given an IFS $\Phi = \{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ and $T \in \mathcal{T}'_\Lambda$, we denote $\mathcal{S}_\Phi^T = \{\Gamma_\Phi(T^v) : v \in T\}$, and denote by $\overline{\mathcal{S}_\Phi^T}$ the closure of \mathcal{S}_Φ^T in the Hausdorff metric.

The following two theorems discuss the relation between microsets of a given compact set in \mathbb{R}^d and $\overline{\mathcal{S}_\Phi^T}$ for an appropriate coding tree T .

Theorem 1.3. *Let $F \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a non-empty compact set. Given a similarity IFS $\Phi = \{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ which satisfies WSC and a tree $T \in \mathcal{T}'_\Lambda$ such that $F = \Gamma_\Phi(T)$, there exists some $n \geq 1$ which depends only on Φ , such that for every microset M of F , there are $A_1, \dots, A_n \in \overline{\mathcal{S}_\Phi^T}$ and expanding similarity maps ψ_1, \dots, ψ_n , such that*

$$(1.1) \quad Q^\circ \cap \left(\bigcup_{j=1}^n \psi_j A_j \right) \subseteq M \subseteq Q \cap \left(\bigcup_{j=1}^n \psi_j A_j \right).$$

Moreover, if Φ satisfies the SSC, then $n = 1$.

The theorem above says that except for a possible difference on the boundary of Q , every microset of F may be represented as a finite union of minisets of sets in $\overline{\mathcal{S}_\Phi^T}$, for any coding tree T without leaves, as long as the underlying IFS satisfies the WSC. On the other hand, the following holds:

Theorem 1.4. *Let $F \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a non-empty compact set. Given a similarity IFS $\Phi = \{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ and a tree $T \in \mathcal{T}'_\Lambda$ such that $F = \Gamma_\Phi(T)$, every miniset M of a member of $\overline{\mathcal{S}_\Phi^T}$ is contained in a microset of F .*

Moreover, if M has the form $M = Q \cap \psi(A)$ for some $A \in \overline{\mathcal{S}_\Phi^T}$ and an expanding similarity map ψ , and assuming that Φ satisfies the OSC with an OSC set U such that $\psi^{-1}(Q) \subseteq U$, then M is a microset of F .

The notion of an OSC set is a part of the definition of the OSC, which is given in Definition 2.12.

The difference between the sets in Equation (1.1) is contained in the boundary of Q . Since $\dim_{\mathbb{H}}(\partial Q) = d - 1$, whenever $\dim_{\mathbb{H}}(M) > d - 1$, this difference has no influence on the Hausdorff dimension of the sets. Hence the following is an immediate corollary of Theorem 1.3.

Corollary 1.5. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.3, for every microset M of F with $\dim_{\mathbb{H}}(M) > d - 1$, there is a miniset A of some set in $\overline{\mathcal{S}_\Phi^T}$, with $\dim_{\mathbb{H}}(A) = \dim_{\mathbb{H}}(M)$.*

In particular, in the special case where $d = 1$, the above holds for every $M \in \mathcal{W}_F$ (this includes the case $\dim_{\mathbb{H}}(M) = 0$ since there are minisets whose Hausdorff dimension is 0). Note that $\dim_{\mathbb{H}}(M) > d - 1$ implies that $M \cap Q^\circ \neq \emptyset$ and so $M \in \mathcal{W}_F$, and $A \cap Q^\circ \neq \emptyset$ as well.

Remark 1.6. If one wishes to move from minisets of elements of $\overline{\mathcal{S}_\Phi^T}$ to just elements of $\overline{\mathcal{S}_\Phi^T}$, one needs to take the closure of the set of Hausdorff dimensions, that is

$$\{\dim_{\mathbb{H}}(A) : A \in \mathcal{W}_F\} \cap (d - 1, d] \subseteq \overline{\{\dim_{\mathbb{H}}(S) : S \in \overline{\mathcal{S}_\Phi^T}\}}.$$

For more details see Subsection 3.3, and in particular Proposition 3.10.

If the underlying IFS satisfies the strong separation condition, the converse direction of Corollary 1.5 holds as well. See Corollary 3.13.

1.3.2. Consequences regarding Assouad and lower dimensions. After the relation between \mathcal{W}_F and $\overline{\mathcal{S}_\Phi^T}$ has been established, the following may be deduced regarding the lower and Assouad dimensions.

Theorem 1.7. *Let $F \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a non-empty compact set, and let $\Phi = \{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ be a similarity IFS which satisfies the WSC, such that $F = \gamma_\Phi(\partial T)$ for some tree $T \in \mathcal{T}'_\Lambda$.*

- (1) $\dim_{\mathbb{A}}(F) = \max \left\{ \dim_{\mathbb{H}}(S) : S \in \overline{\mathcal{S}_\Phi^T} \right\}$.
- (2) $\dim_{\mathbb{L}}(F) \geq \inf \left\{ \dim_{\mathbb{H}}(S) : S \in \overline{\mathcal{S}_\Phi^T} \right\}$. Moreover, $\exists S \in \overline{\mathcal{S}_\Phi^T}$ with $\dim_{\mathbb{H}}(S) \leq \dim_{\mathbb{L}}(F)$.
- (3) $\dim_{\mathbb{L}}(F) \leq \inf \left\{ \dim_{\mathbb{H}}(\psi(S) \cap Q) : \begin{array}{l} S \in \overline{\mathcal{S}_\Phi^T}, \\ \psi \text{ is a similarity function,} \\ \psi^{-1}(Q) \subseteq U \text{ for an OSC set } U, \\ \text{and } \psi(S) \cap Q^\circ \neq \emptyset \end{array} \right\}$, if Φ satisfies the OSC.
- (4) $\dim_{\mathbb{L}}(F) = \min \left\{ \dim_{\mathbb{H}}(S) : S \in \overline{\mathcal{S}_\Phi^T} \right\}$, if Φ satisfies the SSC.

The reader should note that for the special case where all the contraction ratios of the maps of Φ are equal, (1) was proved in [14], but with a sup instead of a max.¹

¹In fact it was proved for a more general construction called Moran construction, however some restriction on the diameters of the sets in this construction implies that for similarity IFSs the result may only be applied when all the contraction ratios are equal.

1.3.3. *Microsets of Galton-Watson fractals.* Let E be a Galton-Watson fractal w.r.t. a similarity IFS $\Phi = \{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$. Then E may be considered as a random variable which takes values in the space of compact subsets of K_Φ . We denote by $\text{supp}(E)$ the support of the distribution of E , which is a Borel probability measure on the space of compact subsets of K_Φ , w.r.t. the topology induced by the Hausdorff metric. Let T be the corresponding Galton-Watson tree (so that E is defined by $\Gamma_\Phi(T)$ conditioned on non-extinction), and denote by T' the reduced tree without leaves (whenever T is infinite). That is, T' is the set of all nodes of T that have an infinite line of descendants, hence $T' \in \mathcal{T}'_\Lambda$. We show that a.s. conditioned on non-extinction, $\overline{\mathcal{S}_\Phi^{T'}} = \text{supp}(E)$. Thus, applying Theorems 1.3, 1.4, we obtain a strong relation between $\text{supp}(E)$ and \mathcal{W}_E (Theorems 4.17, 4.18). This is done in Subsection 4.5.

As an example, in the simple case where E is a realization of a supercritical Mandelbrot percolation in \mathbb{R}^d , its probability distribution is fully supported on the space of compact subsets of Q . Hence, we obtain that a.s. conditioned on non-extinction, every closed subset of the unit cube is a microset of E . In particular, this implies that $\{\dim_{\text{H}}(F) : F \in \mathcal{W}_E\} = [0, d]$, and therefore $\dim_{\text{L}}(E) = 0$ and $\dim_{\text{A}}(E) = d$ (the latter was already shown in [10]).

In the general case, we obtain the following theorem:

Theorem 1.8. *Let E be a Galton-Watson fractal constructed with respect to a similarity IFS $\Phi = \{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$, which satisfies the OSC, and an offspring distribution W . Denote,*

$$\begin{aligned} m_W &= \min_{A \in \text{supp}(W)} \dim_{\text{H}}(K_A) \\ M_W &= \max_{A \in \text{supp}(W)} \dim_{\text{H}}(K_A) \end{aligned} \quad ,$$

where in case $\emptyset \in \text{supp}(W)$, we set $m_W = 0$.

Then

$$\{\dim_{\text{H}}(F) : F \in \text{supp}(E)\} = [m_W, M_W],$$

and almost surely,

$$\{\dim_{\text{H}}(F) : F \in \mathcal{W}_E\} = [m_W, M_W].$$

In particular, almost surely

$$\dim_{\text{L}}(E) = m_W, \quad \dim_{\text{A}}(E) = M_W.$$

In the statement of the theorem above, $\text{supp}(W)$ denotes the support of the probability distribution of W on the finite set 2^Λ . Hence, m_W and M_W may be very easily calculated whenever the offspring distribution W is given. However, they have another meaning as well, namely, they are the minimal and maximal Hausdorff dimensions of sets in $\text{supp}(E)$.

Remark 1.9. Another notion of dimension which is related to the lower dimension is the *modified lower dimension*. For any $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, the modified lower dimension of A is defined by

$$\dim_{\text{ML}}(A) = \sup \{\dim_{\text{L}}(B) : B \subseteq A\}.$$

For more details the reader is referred to [7]. We remark here that for any GWF $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, which is constructed with respect to a similarity IFS that satisfies the OSC, almost surely,

$$\dim_{\text{ML}}(E) = \dim_{\text{H}}(E).$$

This follows from Theorem 1.8 in [4], which asserts that E a.s. contains Ahlfors-regular subsets whose Hausdorff dimension (which is equal to their lower dimension) is arbitrarily close to $\dim_{\mathbb{H}}(E)$.

1.3.4. *Furstenberg's homogeneity.* So far we have only considered minisets and microsets as defined in Definition 1.1. However, this definition is slightly different than Furstenberg's definition from [11], which allows only homotheties rather than general similarity maps, and is closed under taking compact subsets. This is formally defined in Definition 5.1, using the phrases *F-microsets* and *F-minisets*.

Allowing compact subsets in the definition of F-minisets, makes the relation between the collection of F-microsets of a given compact set and $\overline{\mathcal{S}}_{\Phi}^T$, for an appropriate coding tree T and an IFS of homotheties Φ , nicer than the one established in Theorems 1.3, 1.4. Namely, for a non-empty compact set $F \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, an IFS of homotheties $\Phi = \{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$, and $T \in \mathcal{T}'_{\Lambda}$ a coding tree for F , we obtain that every F-miniset of a member of $\overline{\mathcal{S}}_{\Phi}^T$ is an F-microset of F , and on the other hand, whenever Φ satisfies the WSC, every F-microset of F is a (bounded) finite union of F-minisets of members of $\overline{\mathcal{S}}_{\Phi}^T$. This is the content of Theorems 5.3 and 5.4 in Section 5.

If F is the attractor of Φ , so that we may take $T = \Lambda^*$ and hence $\overline{\mathcal{S}}_{\Phi}^T = \{F\}$, we obtain from the above that if Φ satisfies the WSC, then every F-microset of F is a finite union of F-minisets of F . We view this property as a weaker form of Furstenberg's homogeneity property (where every F-microset is an F-miniset), and show that for self-homothetic sets in \mathbb{R} whose Hausdorff dimension is smaller than 1, this property is equivalent to WSC.

This corresponds to a discussion from [15] where it was shown that for self-homothetic subsets of \mathbb{R} whose Hausdorff dimension is smaller than 1, homogeneity implies WSC, but included a counter example for the converse implication as well, showing that homogeneity is not equivalent to WSC for that class of sets.

1.4. **Structure of the paper.** In Section 2 some relevant preparations are made. First we introduce some basic definitions regarding symbolic spaces and trees. Then we recall some properties of the Hausdorff metric, which will be useful in what follows. Then IFSs and their attractors are discussed, and some technical properties of the coding map are established. Finally the lower and Assouad dimensions are formally defined.

In Section 3 the relation between the collection of microsets and the collection $\overline{\mathcal{S}}_{\Phi}^T$ is discussed. In particular, this section contains the proofs of Theorems 1.3, 1.4, and 1.7, as well as some of their corollaries.

Section 4 deals with Galton-Watson fractals. After providing a formal definition, and discussing some relevant properties regarding the reduced trees of Galton-Watson trees, and the support of Galton-Watson fractals, we apply the results of Section 3 and obtain some results regarding the microsets of GWF. In particular Theorem 1.8 is proved.

In Section 5, we recall Furstenberg's original definition of microsets, and make some adjustments of the results from previous sections to Furstenberg's definition. Furstenberg's homogeneity property is also discussed. In view of a discussion from [15], a weaker property is suggested for consideration, which still implies dimension conservation (as defined in [11]), but is equivalent to the WSC for compact subsets of \mathbb{R} whose Hausdorff dimension is smaller than 1.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Symbols and trees. Given a finite set \mathbb{A} , as mentioned in Section 1, we denote by \mathbb{A}^* the set of all finite words in the alphabet \mathbb{A} , i.e. $\mathbb{A}^* = \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{A}^n$ where $\mathbb{A}^0 = \{\emptyset\}$. Given a word $i \in \mathbb{A}^*$, we use subscript indexing to denote the letters comprising i , so that $i = i_1 \dots i_n$ where $i_k \in \mathbb{A}$ for $k = 1, \dots, n$. \mathbb{A}^* is considered as a semigroup with the concatenation operation $(i_1 \dots i_n) \cdot (j_1 \dots j_m) = (i_1 \dots i_n, j_1 \dots j_m)$ and with \emptyset the identity element. The dot notation will usually be omitted so that the concatenation of two words $i, j \in \mathbb{A}^*$ will be denoted simply by ij . We will also consider the action of \mathbb{A}^* on $\mathbb{A}^{\mathbb{N}}$ by concatenations denoted in the same way.

We put a partial order on $\mathbb{A}^* \cup \mathbb{A}^{\mathbb{N}}$ by defining $\forall i \in \mathbb{A}^*, \forall j \in \mathbb{A}^* \cup \mathbb{A}^{\mathbb{N}}, i \leq j$ iff $\exists k \in \mathbb{A}^* \cup \mathbb{A}^{\mathbb{N}}$ with $ik = j$, that is to say $i \leq j$ iff i is a prefix of j .

Given any $i \in \mathbb{A}^*$ we shall denote the length of i by $|i| = n$, where n is the unique integer with the property $i \in \mathbb{A}^n$. The cylinder set in $\mathbb{A}^{\mathbb{N}}$ corresponding to i is defined by $[i] = \{j \in \mathbb{A}^{\mathbb{N}} : i < j\}$. A finite set $\Pi \subset \mathbb{A}^*$ is called a *section* if $\bigcup_{i \in \Pi} [i] = \mathbb{A}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and the union is a disjoint union.

Definition 2.1. A subset $T \subseteq \mathbb{A}^*$ will be called a *tree* with alphabet \mathbb{A} if $\emptyset \in T$, and for every $a \in T, \forall b \in \mathbb{A}^*, b \leq a \implies b \in T$.

We shall denote $T_n = T \cap \mathbb{A}^n$ for every $n \geq 1$, and $T_0 = \{\emptyset\}$ so that $T = \bigcup_{n \geq 0} T_n$. Moreover, for any section $\Pi \subset \mathbb{A}^*$ we denote $T_{\Pi} = T \cap \Pi$. For every $a \in T$, we denote $W_T(a) = \{i \in \mathbb{A} : ai \in T\}$. The *boundary* of a tree T is denoted by ∂T and is defined by

$$\partial T = \{a \in \mathbb{A}^{\mathbb{N}} : \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, a_1 \dots a_n \in T_n\}.$$

A *subtree* of T is any tree \tilde{T} in the alphabet \mathbb{A} , such that $\tilde{T} \subseteq T$.

The set of all trees with alphabet \mathbb{A} will be denoted by $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{A}} \subset 2^{\mathbb{A}^*}$. We define a metric on $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{A}}$ by

$$d_{\mathbb{A}}(T, S) = 2^{-\min\{n: T_n \neq S_n\}}.$$

Endowed with the metric $d_{\mathbb{A}}$, $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{A}}$ is a compact, separable, metric space.

Given a finite tree $L \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{A}}$, let $[L] \subset \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{A}}$ be defined by

$$[L] = \{S \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{A}} : \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, L_n \neq \emptyset \implies S_n = L_n\}.$$

These sets form a (countable) basis for the topology of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{A}}$ and generate the Borel σ -algebra on $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{A}}$.

We continue with a few more definitions which will come in handy in what follows. Given a tree $T \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{A}}$ and a node $a \in T$, we denote

$$T^a = \{j \in \mathbb{A}^* : aj \in T\} \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{A}},$$

the *descendants tree* of a . The *height* of a tree $T \subseteq \mathbb{A}^*$ is defined by

$$\text{height}(T) = \sup \{n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\} : T_n \neq \emptyset\},$$

and takes values in $\mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$. A basic observation in this context is that $\forall T \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{A}}, \text{height}(T) = \infty \iff \partial T \neq \emptyset$.

In what follows, it will often make sense to restrict the discussion to certain subspaces of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{A}}$, namely, the subspace of all infinite trees in the alphabet \mathbb{A} , which is defined by

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{A}}^{\infty} = \{T \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{A}} : \text{height}(T) = \infty\},$$

and the subspace of all trees in the alphabet \mathbb{A} that have no leaves, which is defined by

$$\mathcal{T}'_{\mathbb{A}} = \{T \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{A}} : \forall v \in T, \exists w \in T, v < w\}.$$

Clearly, $\mathcal{T}'_{\mathbb{A}} \subseteq \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{A}}^{\infty} \subseteq \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{A}}$, where $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{A}}^{\infty}$, $\mathcal{T}'_{\mathbb{A}}$ are both closed subsets of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{A}}$ and hence, equipped with the induced topology, are also compact. There is a natural surjection $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{A}}^{\infty} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}'_{\mathbb{A}}$, which assigns to every infinite tree $T \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{A}}^{\infty}$, the *reduced tree*² with no leaves $T' \in \mathcal{T}'_{\mathbb{A}}$, which is defined by

$$T' = \{v \in T : T^v \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{A}}^{\infty}\}.$$

2.2. Hausdorff metric. For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $r > 0$, we denote by $B_r(x)$ the open ball around x of radius r , that is:

$$B_r(x) = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|x - y\| < r\}.$$

Given any set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, the (closed) ε -neighborhood of A is denoted by

$$A^{(\varepsilon)} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \exists a \in A, \|x - a\| \leq \varepsilon\}.$$

The interior of a set A which is contained in some topological space is denoted by A° .

We now recall the definition of the Hausdorff metric and some of its basic properties.

Definition 2.2. Given two sets $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, we denote by $d_H(A, B)$ the Hausdorff distance between A and B , given by

$$d_H(A, B) = \inf \{\varepsilon : A \subseteq B^{(\varepsilon)} \text{ and } B \subseteq A^{(\varepsilon)}\}.$$

Given any non-empty compact set $F \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, we denote by Ω_F the set of all non-empty compact subsets of F . Restricted to Ω_F , d_H is a metric. Throughout this paper Ω_F is always endowed with the topology induced by the Hausdorff metric, which makes (Ω_F, d_H) a complete, metric, compact space. However, in what follows, the particular space Ω_F will not always be explicitly stated and will only be present in the background, assuming that the set F contains all the relevant sets.

We now state some basic lemmas regarding convergence of sequences in the Hausdorff metric, in an appropriate space. The proofs are standard and are left as exercises for the reader.

Lemma 2.3. *Let A_n, B_n be two sequences of nonempty compact sets in \mathbb{R}^d . Suppose that $A_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} A$, and $B_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} B$ for some compact sets $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. Then every accumulation point of the sequence $A_n \cap B_n$ is a subset of $A \cap B$.*

Remark 2.4. Note that the accumulation points of the sequence $A_n \cap B_n$ could be much smaller than $\left(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_n\right) \cap \left(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} B_n\right)$. For example $A_n = \{\frac{a}{n} : a = 0, 1, \dots, n\}$ and $B_n = (\alpha + A_n \pmod{1}) \cup \{0\}$, for any irrational $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. In this case $A_n \cap B_n = \{0\}$ for every n , but $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} B_n = [0, 1]$.

In the case where instead of the sequence B_n we fix a constant set B , changing the order of the intersection and taking the limit can only cause a difference on the boundary of B .

Lemma 2.5. *Let $A_n \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a sequence of nonempty compact sets. Let $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be nonempty compact sets, and assume that $A_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} A$. Suppose that W is an accumulation point of $A_n \cap B$, then*

$$A \cap B^{\circ} \subseteq W \subseteq A \cap B.$$

²This terminology is taken from [19].

Note that the sequence $A_n \cap B$ need not converge, but the containment of the sequence in a compact space guarantees the existence of accumulation points, whenever $A_n \cap B \neq \emptyset$ for infinitely many values of n .

The difference on the boundary of the set B may be eliminated by approximating B from the outside in the following way:

Lemma 2.6. *Let A_n, B_n be two sequences of nonempty compact sets in \mathbb{R}^d , such that $A_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} A$, and $B_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} B$. Denote $\delta_n = d_H(A_n, A)$, and assume that $B^{(\delta_n)} \subseteq B_n$ for every n . Then*

$$A_n \cap B_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} A \cap B.$$

Lemma 2.7. *Let A_n be a sequence of nonempty compact sets in \mathbb{R}^d , and assume that $A_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$. Let $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a compact neighborhood of A (i.e., C is compact and $A \subseteq C^\circ$). Let $(f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of maps of \mathbb{R}^d , and assume it converges uniformly on C to a continuous function f . Then $f_n(A_n) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} f(A)$.*

2.3. Iterated function systems.

2.3.1. *Basic definitions.* For a great introduction to fractal geometry, which covers iterated function systems and their attractors, the unfamiliar readers are referred to [6].

An iterated function system (IFS) is a finite collection $\Phi = \{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ of contracting Lipschitz maps of \mathbb{R}^d , i.e., for each $\varphi \in \Phi$ there exists some $r \in (0, 1)$ such that for every $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\|\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)\| \leq r \cdot \|x - y\|.$$

A basic result due to Hutchinson [13] states that every IFS $\Phi = \{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$, defines a unique compact set $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, which is called the *attractor* of the IFS, that satisfies

$$K = \bigcup_{i \in \Lambda} \varphi_i(K).$$

Whenever the IFS is consisted of similarity maps, the attractor is called *self-similar* and Φ is referred to as a *similarity IFS*. This means that each $\varphi_i \in \Phi$ has the form $\varphi_i(x) = r_i \cdot O_i x + \alpha_i$ where $r_i \in (0, 1)$ is called the *contraction ratio* of φ_i , O_i is an orthogonal map, and $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$. A special case is when these similarity maps have trivial orthogonal parts. Such maps are called *homotheties*, and an attractor of an IFS which is consisted of homotheties is called *self-homothetic*.

In this paper we only deal with similarity IFSs, and so all IFSs in this paper are assumed to be similarity IFSs, even when not explicitly stated.

An important feature of attractors of IFSs is that their points may be coded in a space of symbols. Suppose that K is the attractor of the IFS $\Phi = \{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$, the map $\gamma_\Phi : \Lambda^\mathbb{N} \rightarrow K$ which is defined by

$$\forall i = (i_1, i_2, \dots) \in \Lambda^\mathbb{N}, \quad \gamma_\Phi(i) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_{i_1} \circ \varphi_{i_2} \circ \dots \circ \varphi_{i_n}(0),$$

is called the *coding map* of Φ . The point 0 was chosen arbitrarily and any other base point chosen instead would yield exactly the same function. The map γ_Φ is surjective (but in general not 1-to-1) and continuous with respect to the product topology on $\Lambda^\mathbb{N}$.

Given a similarity IFS $\Phi = \{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$, for every finite sequence $i = i_1 \dots i_k \in \Lambda^*$, we denote $\varphi_i = \varphi_{i_1} \circ \dots \circ \varphi_{i_k}$. We also denote by r_i, O_i, α_i the scaling ratio, orthogonal part, and translation of the similarity function φ_i so that $\varphi_i(x) = r_i \cdot O_i(x) + \alpha_i$, in particular, $r_i = r_{i_1} \dots r_{i_k}$. Sets of the form $\varphi_i K$ for any $i \in \Lambda^*$ are called cylinder sets. Note that for every $i \in \Lambda^*$, $\varphi_i K = \gamma_\Phi([i])$.

Since the contraction ratios of the functions in the IFS may be different, it will often be useful to consider the sections Π_ρ defined by

$$\Pi_\rho = \left\{ i \in \Lambda^* : r_i \leq \rho < r_{i_1} \dots r_{i_{|i|-1}} \right\},$$

for any $\rho \in (0, r_{\min})$, where $r_{\min} = \min \{r_i : i \in \Lambda\}$. Note that for every $i \in \Pi_\rho$,

$$(2.1) \quad \rho \cdot r_{\min} < r_i \leq \rho.$$

2.3.2. Coding. Given a tree $T \in \mathcal{T}_\Lambda$, one may apply the coding map to the boundary of T resulting in some compact subset of the attractor K . One issue here is that if T is a finite tree it has an empty boundary and so an application of the coding map would yield the empty set which is not a member of Ω_K . Considering only infinite trees, the coding map $\gamma_\Phi : \Lambda^\mathbb{N} \rightarrow K$ induces a function $\Gamma_\Phi : \mathcal{T}_\Lambda^\infty \rightarrow \Omega_K$ given by:

$$\Gamma_\Phi(T) = \gamma_\Phi(\partial T).$$

Note that Γ_Φ is a surjection, mapping the full tree Λ^* to K . However, one should note that for a tree $T \in \mathcal{T}_\Lambda^\infty$, nodes of T that have a finite line of descendants have no influence on the image $\Gamma_\Phi(T)$. Therefore, it sometimes makes sense to consider the restriction of Γ_Φ to the subspace \mathcal{T}'_Λ . The map Γ_Φ restricted to the subspace \mathcal{T}'_Λ has a much nicer behavior, in particular, as shown in the following lemma, it is continuous.

Lemma 2.8. *The function $\Gamma_\Phi \upharpoonright_{\mathcal{T}'_\Lambda} : \mathcal{T}'_\Lambda \rightarrow \Omega_\Phi$ is continuous.*

Proof. Let $(T_{(n)})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a converging sequence of trees in \mathcal{T}'_Λ , and denote $\lim T_{(n)} = T$. We need to show that $\Gamma_\Phi(T_{(n)}) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \Gamma_\Phi(T)$. Fix any $r_\Phi \in (0, 1)$ which satisfies

$$\|\varphi_i(x) - \varphi_i(y)\| < r_\Phi \cdot \|x - y\|,$$

for every $i \in \Lambda$ and $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Given $\varepsilon > 0$, fix some $l_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $(r_\Phi)^{l_\varepsilon} < \varepsilon / \text{diam}(K)$. This implies that for every $i \in \Lambda^{l_\varepsilon}$, the diameter of the cylinder set $\gamma_\Phi[i]$ is smaller than ε .

Since $T_{(n)} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} T$, there is some $N_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{N}$, such that whenever $n > N_\varepsilon$, $(T_{(n)})_t = T_t$ for every $t = 0, 1, \dots, l_\varepsilon$. Assume now that $n > N_\varepsilon$.

For every $x \in \Gamma_\Phi(T)$, there is some $i \in \partial T$, such that $x = \gamma_\Phi(i)$. Since $n > N_\varepsilon$, there is some $j \in \partial T_{(n)}$ such that $j \in [i_1 \dots i_{l_\varepsilon}]$. Denote $y = \gamma_\Phi(j) \in \Gamma_\Phi(T_{(n)})$. Then $x, y \in \gamma_\Phi[i_1 \dots i_{l_\varepsilon}]$, and since $\gamma_\Phi[i_1 \dots i_{l_\varepsilon}]$ has diameter smaller than ε , $\|x - y\| < \varepsilon$.

On the other hand, exactly in the same way as above, for every $y \in \Gamma_\Phi(T_{(n)})$, there is some $j \in \partial T_{(n)}$, such that $y = \gamma_\Phi(j)$. Since $n > N_\varepsilon$, there is some $i \in \partial T$ such that $i \in [j_1 \dots j_{l_\varepsilon}]$, and denoting $x = \gamma_\Phi(i)$, we have found an $x \in \Gamma_\Phi(T)$, such that $\|x - y\| < \varepsilon$. \square

Remark 2.9. Note that $\Gamma_\Phi \upharpoonright_{\mathcal{T}'_\Lambda}$ still need not be 1-to-1, which follows from the fact that γ_Φ is not 1-to-1 in general.

Now, since $\partial T = \partial T'$ for every tree $T \in \mathcal{T}_\Lambda^\infty$, we may decompose $\Gamma_\Phi : \mathcal{T}_\Lambda^\infty \rightarrow \Omega_K$ into $T \mapsto T' \mapsto \Gamma_\Phi(T')$. We have already shown that the second part, $T' \mapsto \Gamma_\Phi(T')$, is continuous. However, the map $T \mapsto T'$ is not continuous. For example, one can pick any infinite sequence $i \in \Lambda^\mathbb{N}$, with the corresponding ray $S = \{\emptyset\} \cup \bigcup_{k=1}^\infty \{i_1 \dots i_k\}$, and consider the sequence of infinite trees $(T_{(n)})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ defined by $T_{(n)} = S \cup \bigcup_{k=0}^n \Lambda^k$. Obviously, $T_{(n)} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \Lambda^*$, while for every n , $(T_{(n)})' = S$.

On the bright side, the map $T \mapsto T'$ is Borel (which is the content of the following proposition), and therefore, so is the map Γ_Φ .

Proposition 2.10. *The map $R : \mathcal{T}_\Lambda^\infty \rightarrow \mathcal{T}'_\Lambda$, defined by $R(T) = T'$ is Borel.*

Proof. A basic open set in \mathcal{T}'_Λ is of the form $[F] \cap \mathcal{T}'_\Lambda$ for a finite tree F . Note that in order for the intersection to not be empty, F must be a prefix of some tree in \mathcal{T}'_Λ , i.e., each vertex $v \in F$ with $|v| < \text{height}(F)$ must have at least one child. It is enough to show that for such a set, $R^{-1}([F])$ is Borel.

This may be proved by induction on the height of F . For $F = \emptyset$, $R^{-1}([F]) = \mathcal{T}_\Lambda^\infty$. For the induction step we need the following claim:

Claim. Given any $v \in \Lambda^*$, the set $\mathcal{V}_v = \{T \in \mathcal{T}_\Lambda : v \in T \text{ and } T^v \in \mathcal{T}_\Lambda^\infty\}$ is Borel, and the same thing holds for the set $\mathcal{W}_v = \{T \in \mathcal{T}_\Lambda : v \in T \text{ and } T^v \notin \mathcal{T}_\Lambda^\infty\}$.

Proof of Claim. Denote

$$\mathcal{S}_v = \{L \in \mathcal{T}_\Lambda \setminus \mathcal{T}_\Lambda^\infty : v \in L, \text{height}(L^v) + |v| < \text{height}(L)\}.$$

This is a countable collection since the set of all finite trees itself is countable. Note that

$$\mathcal{W}_v = \left(\bigcup_{L \in \mathcal{S}_v} [L] \right) \cup \{T \in \mathcal{T}_\Lambda \setminus \mathcal{T}_\Lambda^\infty : v \in T\}.$$

Since $\bigcup_{L \in \mathcal{S}_v} [L]$ is an open set and $\{T \in \mathcal{T}_\Lambda \setminus \mathcal{T}_\Lambda^\infty : v \in T\}$ is countable (and hence Borel), \mathcal{W}_v is indeed a Borel set. Moreover, since the set $\{T \in \mathcal{T}_\Lambda : v \in T\}$ is Borel (in fact, it is open), and

$$\mathcal{V}_v = \{T \in \mathcal{T}_\Lambda : v \in T\} \setminus \mathcal{W}_v,$$

\mathcal{V}_v is also a Borel set. □

Now, for the induction step, we assume that $R^{-1}([F])$ is Borel for every F of height $n-1$. Given a finite tree F of height n , denote $F^- = \bigcup_{k=0}^{n-1} F_k$, then for a tree $T \in \mathcal{T}_\Lambda^\infty$, $T' \in [F]$ iff $T' \in [F^-]$, $F_n \subseteq T$, and for every $v \in T_n$, $T^v \in \mathcal{T}_\Lambda^\infty$ iff $v \in F_n$. To formulate this,

$$\begin{aligned} R^{-1}([F]) &= R^{-1}([F^-]) \cap \\ &\quad \left(\bigcap_{v \in F_n} \{T \in \mathcal{T}_\Lambda : v \in T \text{ and } T^v \in \mathcal{T}_\Lambda^\infty\} \right) \cap \\ &\quad \left(\bigcap_{v \in \Lambda^n \setminus F_n} (\{T \in \mathcal{T}_\Lambda : v \notin T\} \cup \{T \in \mathcal{T}_\Lambda : v \in T \text{ and } T^v \notin \mathcal{T}_\Lambda^\infty\}) \right) \\ &= R^{-1}([F^-]) \cap \left(\bigcap_{v \in F_n} \mathcal{V}_v \right) \cap \left(\bigcap_{v \in \Lambda^n \setminus F_n} (\{T \in \mathcal{T}_\Lambda : v \notin T\} \cup \mathcal{W}_v) \right) \end{aligned}$$

Now, using the assumption that $R^{-1}([F^-])$ is Borel and the claim above, it may be easily seen that $R^{-1}([F])$ is Borel. \square

Proposition 2.11. *The map $\Gamma_\Phi : \mathcal{T}_\Lambda^\infty \rightarrow \Omega_K$ is Borel.*

2.3.3. *Separation conditions.* Recall that given an IFS $\Phi = \{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$, the attractor of the IFS is the unique compact set K which satisfies $K = \bigcup_{i \in \Lambda} \varphi_i K$. Of course, in general, the sets $\varphi_i K$ may intersect each other, and so there are several ‘‘separation properties’’ dealing with the size of these intersections. Here are the two most commonly used separation conditions:

Definition 2.12. Given an IFS $\Phi = \{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ whose attractor is denoted by K , we define the following properties:

- (1) Φ satisfies the *strong separation condition (SSC)* if for every $i \neq j \in \Lambda$, $\varphi_i(K) \cap \varphi_j(K) = \emptyset$.
- (2) Φ satisfies the *open set condition (OSC)* if there exists a non-empty open set $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, such that $\varphi_i U \subseteq U$ for every $i \in \Lambda$, and for every $i \neq j \in \Lambda$, $\varphi_i U \cap \varphi_j U = \emptyset$. In that case we call U an *OSC set*.

Note that whenever U is an OSC set, $K \subseteq \bar{U}$. Roughly speaking, the OSC says that two sets $\varphi_i(K), \varphi_j(K)$ for $i \neq j \in \Lambda$ may only intersect on their boundaries. The SSC is clearly stronger than the OSC. In fact, the following holds:

Lemma 2.13. *A similarity IFS $\Phi = \{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ with an attractor K , satisfies the SSC iff it has an OSC set U such that $K \subseteq U$.*

A stronger condition than the OSC is the so called *strong OSC* which assumes the existence of an OSC set U such that $U \cap K \neq \emptyset$. It was shown by Schief [22] that for similarity³ IFSs the OSC and the strong OSC are equivalent.

One obvious obstruction for the OSC to hold is the existence of overlaps in the IFS, i.e., the existence of $i \neq j \in \Lambda^*$ such that $\varphi_i = \varphi_j$. Aiming to generalize the OSC to allow overlaps, Lau and Ngai defined a weaker condition called the *weak separation condition (WSC)*. The definition given below is in general slightly stronger than the original definition given in [18]. However, it was shown in [25] that when the attractor of the IFS is not contained in an affine hyperplane these two definitions are equivalent.

Definition 2.14. We say that an IFS $\Phi = \{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ satisfies the *weak separation condition (WSC)* if there exists some $c \in \mathbb{N}$, such that for every $\rho > 0$, every ball B of radius ρ intersects at most c different cylinder sets $\varphi_i(K)$ for $i \in \Pi_\rho$, i.e.,

$$|\{\varphi_i(K) : \varphi_i(K) \cap B \neq \emptyset, i \in \Pi_\rho\}| \leq c,$$

where identical cylinder sets $\varphi_i(K) = \varphi_j(K)$ for $i \neq j$ are only counted once.

It is known (see [25]) that similarity IFSs satisfy the OSC if and only if they satisfy the WSC (as defined here) and they have no overlaps.

Lemma 2.15. *Let $\Phi = \{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ be a similarity IFS in \mathbb{R}^d satisfying SSC. Then there is some constant $\tau > 0$ s.t. for every cube C of side-length ρ small enough, C intersects at most one cylinder set $\varphi_i(K)$ such that $i \in \Pi_{\tau\rho}$.*

³The same was shown later for conformal IFSs in [21], and for semi-conformal IFSs in [16]

Proof. Denote $\delta = \min_{i \neq j \in \Lambda} \text{dist}(\varphi_i(K), \varphi_j(K))$, where K is the attractor of Φ . It is not hard to see that the cylinder sets on the section $\Pi_{\frac{\rho \cdot \sqrt{d}}{\delta \cdot r_{\min}}}$ are of distance larger than $\rho \cdot \sqrt{d}$ from each other, and since $\rho \cdot \sqrt{d}$ is exactly the diameter of the cube C , it cannot intersect more than one cylinder set $\varphi_i(K)$ for $i \in \Pi_{\frac{\rho \cdot \sqrt{d}}{\delta \cdot r_{\min}}}$. Hence, the claim is satisfied for $\tau = \frac{\sqrt{d}}{\delta \cdot r_{\min}}$. \square

As mentioned above the SSC is stronger than the OSC (follows e.g. from Lemma 2.13), and it is not hard to show that these two properties are not equivalent. The relations between the separation conditions that were presented in this subsection are summarized in the following lemma:

Lemma 2.16. *For similarity IFSs, the separation conditions discussed above satisfy the following hierarchy:*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & OSC & & \\ & \Leftarrow & \updownarrow & \Leftarrow & \\ SSC & & strong\ OSC & & WSC \\ & \Rightarrow & & \Rightarrow & \end{array}$$

2.4. Assouad and lower dimensions. As the Assouad dimension and the lower dimension are central objects of study in this paper, we now provide their formal definitions. We use the notation $N_r(F)$ to denote the smallest number of (open) balls of radius r needed to cover a set $F \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$.

Definition 2.17. Given a non-empty set $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, the Assouad dimension of S is defined by:

$$\dim_A(S) = \inf \left\{ \alpha \geq 0 : \exists C > 0, \forall 0 < r < R, \forall x \in S, \right. \\ \left. N_r(B_R(x) \cap S) \leq C \cdot \left(\frac{R}{r}\right)^\alpha \right\}$$

The Lower dimension is a dual notion of dimension defined as follows:

Definition 2.18. Given a non-empty set $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\dim_L(S) = \sup \left\{ \alpha \geq 0 : \exists C > 0, \forall 0 < r < R \leq \text{diam}(S), \forall x \in S, \right. \\ \left. N_r(B_R(x) \cap S) \geq C \cdot \left(\frac{R}{r}\right)^\alpha \right\}$$

As mentioned in the introduction, Theorem 1.2 may be considered as an alternative (but equivalent) definition of \dim_L and \dim_A for compact sets. In general, for a compact set $F \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\dim_L(F) \leq \dim_H(F) \leq \dim_A(F).$$

For a thorough exposition to these notions, the reader is referred to [7].

3. MICROSETS VIA CODING

3.1. Limits of descendant trees and their corresponding sets. Given any tree T , we denote the set of all the descendant trees of vertices of T by $\mathcal{D}_T = \{T^v : v \in T\}$. Let $\Phi = \{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ be an IFS whose attractor is denoted by K , and $T \in \mathcal{T}'_\Lambda$. Every descendant tree of T has no leaves and may be mapped using Γ_Φ to Ω_K . We denote $\mathcal{S}_\Phi^T = \Gamma_\Phi(\mathcal{D}_T)$. Note that since $\Gamma_\Phi \upharpoonright_{\mathcal{T}'_\Lambda}$ is continuous (Lemma 2.8) and closed (by compactness),

$$(3.1) \quad \overline{\mathcal{S}_\Phi^T} = \Gamma_\Phi(\overline{\mathcal{D}_T}),$$

where as usual, the topological closure of a set is denoted by an overline, and so $\overline{\mathcal{D}_T}$ is the closure of \mathcal{D}_T in the Hausdorff metric, and $\overline{\mathcal{S}_\Phi^T}$ is the closure of \mathcal{S}_Φ^T in the space of trees with the topology described in subsection 2.1. A simple, but important, observation is that if $T = \Lambda^*$, i.e., T is the full tree which codes the entire self-similar set K , then $\overline{\mathcal{S}_\Phi^T} = \{K\}$.

Lemma 3.1. *Given an alphabet \mathbb{A} and a tree $T \in \mathcal{T}_\mathbb{A}$, for every $S \in \overline{\mathcal{D}_T}$, $\overline{\mathcal{D}_S} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{D}_T}$.*

Proof. First, note that without the closures, the claim is obvious, since for $v \in T$ and $w \in T^v$, $(T^v)^w = T^{vw}$.

Now, for $S \in \overline{\mathcal{D}_T}$, let $S_{(n)} \in \mathcal{D}_T$ be a sequence of trees converging to S , and let $v \in S$ be any node of S . We show that $S^v \in \overline{\mathcal{D}_T}$. Indeed, since $S_{(n)} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} S$, whenever n is large enough $v \in S_{(n)}$, and it is easy to see that $S_{(n)}^v \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} S^v$. Since for every n , $S_{(n)} \in \mathcal{D}_T$, we have $S_{(n)}^v \in \mathcal{D}_T$ as well, and therefore $S^v \in \overline{\mathcal{D}_T}$. \square

The goal in this section of the paper is to investigate the relation between the collection of microsets of a given compact set, and the collection $\overline{\mathcal{S}_\Phi^T}$, for a suitable coding tree T for that set. Of particular interest is the set of Hausdorff dimensions of sets in $\overline{\mathcal{S}_\Phi^T}$ (and their minisets) and its relation with Hausdorff dimensions of microsets.

3.2. Microsets as limits of descendant trees.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Given a microset M of F , there are minisets of F converging to M . That is, there are similarity functions $(f_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$, each of the form $f_i(x) = O_i(\lambda_i \cdot x) + y_i$, where O_i is an orthogonal transformation of \mathbb{R}^d , $\lambda_i \in (1, \infty)$, $y_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$, such that

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} Q \cap f_i(F) = M.$$

First we consider the easy case where the sequence $(\lambda_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded. In that case, after moving to a subsequence, the similarities f_i converge pointwise to some similarity function ψ , where the convergence is uniform on compact subsets of \mathbb{R}^d . Hence, by Lemma 2.7 and Lemma 2.5,

$$Q^\circ \cap \psi(F) \subseteq M \subseteq Q \cap \psi(F).$$

From this point forward we assume the sequence $(\lambda_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is unbounded. Note that

$$Q \cap f_i(F) = f_i(f_i^{-1}(Q) \cap F).$$

$f_i^{-1}(Q)$ is a cube of side-length λ_i^{-1} , hence, it follows from the WSC that there is some $n \geq 1$ such that $f_i^{-1}(Q)$ intersects at most n distinct cylinder sets on the section $\Pi_{\lambda_i^{-1}/r_{\min}}$, i.e., there exist vertices $v_{i,1}, \dots, v_{i,n} \in T \cap \Pi_{\lambda_i^{-1}/r_{\min}}$ (with possible repetitions if there are less than n distinct vertices) such that

$$f_i^{-1}(Q) \cap F = f_i^{-1}(Q) \cap \left(\bigcup_{j=1}^n \varphi_{v_{i,j}} \gamma_\Phi(\partial T^{v_{i,j}}) \right).$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} Q \cap f_i(F) &= \\ f_i(f_i^{-1}(Q) \cap F) &= \\ f_i\left(f_i^{-1}(Q) \cap \left(\bigcup_{j=1}^n \varphi_{v_{i,j}} \gamma_{\Phi}(\partial T^{v_{i,j}})\right)\right) &= \\ Q \cap \left(\bigcup_{j=1}^n f_i \circ \varphi_{v_{i,j}} \gamma_{\Phi}(\partial T^{v_{i,j}})\right) \end{aligned}$$

For convenience we denote $A_{i,j} = \gamma_{\Phi}(\partial T^{v_{i,j}})$ and $\psi_{i,j} = f_i \circ \varphi_{v_{i,j}}$, then

$$Q \cap f_i(F) = Q \cap \left(\bigcup_{j=1}^n \psi_{i,j}(A_{i,j})\right)$$

Since $v_{i,j} \in \Pi_{\lambda_i^{-1}/r_{\min}}$,

$$\lambda_i^{-1} < r_{v_{i,j}} \leq \lambda_i^{-1}/r_{\min}.$$

Therefore, the scaling ratio of $\psi_{i,j}$, which is $r_{v_{i,j}} \cdot \lambda_i$ is in the interval $(1, 1/r_{\min}]$. It is not hard to observe that the translation parts of $\varphi_{v_{i,j}}$ and f_i are also bounded, and hence so is the translation part of $\psi_{i,j}$. This implies that by moving to a subsequence, the similarities $\psi_{i,j}$ converge as $i \rightarrow \infty$ to some similarity function ψ_j , and the convergence is uniform on compact sets.

Note that $A_{i,j} \in \mathcal{S}_{\Phi}^T$. Since $\overline{\mathcal{S}_{\Phi}^T}$ is compact w.r.t. the Hausdorff metric, by passing to a subsequence we may also assume that for every j , $A_{i,j}$ converge to some compact set $A_j \in \overline{\mathcal{S}_{\Phi}^T}$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$. Overall, using Lemma 2.7 the following convergence holds in the Hausdorff metric:

$$\bigcup_{j=1}^n \psi_{i,j}(A_{i,j}) \xrightarrow{i \rightarrow \infty} \bigcup_{j=1}^n \psi_j(A_j)$$

Applying Lemma 2.5, Equation 1.1 now follows.

In case the SSC holds, since we assume the scaling sequence (λ_i) is unbounded, we may use Lemma 2.15, assuming λ_i^{-1} is small enough for all i . Then the proof proceeds exactly as above but with $n = 1$. \square

Remark 3.2. Since the set Λ^* is countable, there is no need to use the axiom of choice during the proof,

Remark 3.3. Note that the expression $Q \cap \left(\bigcup_{j=1}^n \psi_j A_j\right)$ on the right hand side of Equation (1.1), is nothing but a finite union of minisets of the sets $A_1, \dots, A_n \in \overline{\mathcal{S}_{\Phi}^T}$, and the set on the left hand side of Equation (1.1) is the union of those minisets intersected with Q° . Also note that Equation (1.1) implies that

$$Q^\circ \cap \left(\bigcup_{j=1}^n \psi_j A_j\right) = Q^\circ \cap M.$$

In particular, since $M \in \mathcal{W}_F, Q^\circ \cap \left(\bigcup_{j=1}^n \psi_j A_j\right) \neq \emptyset$.

Remark 3.4. One can not expect an equality to hold instead of the inclusion at the RHS of equation (1.1) (the same holds for the LHS inclusion, but that is trivial). Consider for example the middle thirds Cantor set $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{R}$. The set

$$[0, 1] \cap \left(\frac{9}{7} \cdot \left(\mathcal{C} - \frac{1}{9} \right) \right) \setminus \{0, 1\}$$

is a microset of \mathcal{C} but it is not a miniset.

Lemma 3.5. *Let $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a compact set, and let $A \subseteq Q$ be a miniset of S s.t. $A \cap Q^\circ \neq \emptyset$. Then there exists a non-empty set $B \subseteq Q$ with $B \cap Q^\circ \neq \emptyset$, s.t. B is a miniset of S and $\dim_{\text{H}}(B) \leq \dim_{\text{H}}(A \cap Q^\circ)$*

Proof. By assumption, there is some point $x \in A \cap Q^\circ$, and hence there is some smaller closed cube C whose edges are parallel to the axis such that $x \in C \subseteq Q^\circ$. Denote by F_C the unique homothety mapping C to Q , and denote $B = F_C(C \cap A)$. Clearly, B is a miniset of S , and $\dim_{\text{H}}(B) \leq \dim_{\text{H}}(A \cap Q^\circ)$.

Combining Theorem 1.3 and Lemma 3.5, the following corollary is immediate: \square

Corollary 3.6. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.3, for every microset $M \in \mathcal{W}_F$, there is a set $S \in \overline{\mathcal{S}}_\Phi^T$, and two minisets of S , A and B which intersect Q° , such that*

$$\dim_{\text{H}}(A) \leq \dim_{\text{H}}(M) \leq \dim_{\text{H}}(B).$$

3.3. Hausdorff dimensions of sets in $\overline{\mathcal{S}}_\Phi^T$ vs. Hausdorff dimensions of their minisets.

Proposition 3.7. *Let $\Phi = \{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ be a similarity IFS and $T \in \mathcal{T}'_\Lambda$. The following holds:*

$$\overline{\{\dim_{\text{H}}(B \cap Q^\circ) : B \text{ is a miniset of some } S \in \overline{\mathcal{S}}_\Phi^T\}} = \overline{\{\dim_{\text{H}}(S) : S \in \overline{\mathcal{S}}_\Phi^T\}}.$$

Proof. The inclusion \supseteq is trivial even without taking the closure of the sets. For the other inclusion, given $B = Q \cap \psi(S) = \psi(\psi^{-1}Q \cap S)$, let $Y \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}_T$ be a coding tree such that $\Gamma_\Phi(Y) = S$. For every $x \in \psi^{-1}Q^\circ \cap S$ there is some $v \in Y$ such that $x \in \varphi_v(\Gamma_\Phi(Y^v)) \subseteq \psi^{-1}Q^\circ \cap S$. Since as a set Y is countable, there is a sequence $v_n \in Y$ such that $\psi^{-1}Q^\circ \cap S = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \varphi_{v_n}(\Gamma_\Phi(Y^{v_n}))$ and therefore, $\dim_{\text{H}}(B \cap Q^\circ) = \sup \{\dim_{\text{H}}(\Gamma_\Phi(Y^{v_n})) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. By Lemma 3.1, $\Gamma_\Phi(Y^{v_n}) \in \overline{\mathcal{S}}_\Phi^T$ for every n , which implies the inclusion \subseteq . \square

In the statement of the proposition it is necessary to take the intersections with the interior of Q rather than Q itself. Consider the following example in \mathbb{R}^2 :

Example 3.8. Take $F = \left([0, 1]^2 \setminus [0, \frac{1}{2}]^2\right) \cup \left\{\left(\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}\right)\right\}$, and a coding tree T w.r.t. 2-adic coding, i.e., using the IFS $\Phi = \left\{\varphi_i : (x, y) \mapsto \frac{1}{2}(x, y) + \frac{1}{2}i\right\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ where $\Lambda = \{0, 1\}^2$. We define T by $T_0 = \Lambda$, $T^{(0,1)} = T^{(1,0)} = T^{(1,1)} = \Lambda^*$, and $T^{(0,0)} = \{\emptyset\} \cup \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \{i_1 \cdots i_n\}$ where $\gamma_\Phi(i) = \left(\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}\right)$, i.e., $T^{(0,0)}$ is just a ray corresponding to the point $\left(\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}\right)$. Then $\dim_{\text{H}}\left(\varphi_{(0,0)}^{-1}(F) \cap Q\right) = 1$ where $\overline{\{\dim_{\text{H}}(S) : S \in \overline{\mathcal{S}}_\Phi^T\}} = \{2, 0\}$.

Also note that taking the closure of the sets in Proposition 3.7 is necessary as well, and without it the inclusion \subseteq might fail. Indeed, consider the following example:

Example 3.9. For the construction of this example we use the IFS $\Phi = \{\varphi_0 : x \mapsto \frac{1}{2}x, \varphi_1 : x \mapsto \frac{1}{2}x + \frac{1}{2}\}$ which corresponds to base 2 digital expansion in \mathbb{R} . We construct the set F around the point $\frac{1}{3}$ whose base 2 digital expansion sequence is $010101\dots$. Let $V = \{1, 011, 01011, 0101011, \dots\}$, so that V is the set of all $v \in \{0, 1\}^*$ s.t. $\forall x \in \varphi_v([0, 1]), x > \frac{1}{3}$ and $\forall t < v, \frac{1}{3} \in \varphi_t([0, 1])$. We order the set V by the length of its elements, $V = \{v_1, v_2, \dots\}$. We also define $W = \{00, 0100, 010100, 01010100, \dots\}$, i.e. W is the set of all $w \in \{0, 1\}^*$ s.t. $\forall x \in \varphi_w([0, 1]), x < \frac{1}{3}$ and $\forall t < w, \frac{1}{3} \in \varphi_t([0, 1])$. Except for nodes along the ray $01010101\dots$, for every $t \in \{0, 1\}^*$ there exists a unique $y \in W \cup V$ s.t. $t < y$.

Now, we define a tree $T \in \mathcal{T}_{\{0,1\}}$ as follows:

- For every $w \in W$, $T^w = \{0, 1\}^*$
- For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we define T^{v_n} in the following way: for the first n levels of the tree, every node a has only one child $a0$. For the next $n - 1$ levels, every node has both children. Then again for the next n levels of the tree every node a has only one child $a0$ and for the next $n - 1$ levels of the tree we let every node have both children. We repeat this process indefinitely.

Denote $F = \Gamma_\Phi(T)$. By the way T is constructed, for every $w \in W$, $\Gamma_\Phi(T^w) = [0, 1]$, and on the other hand, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\Gamma_\Phi(T^{v_n})$ is a self-similar set with Hausdorff dimension $\frac{n-1}{2n-1}$. By the way T is constructed, for every limit $S = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} T^{t_k}$ such that t_k is not eventually constant, $\dim_H(\Gamma_\Phi(S)) \in \{0, 1\}$, and so $\frac{1}{2} \notin \left\{ \dim_H(S) : S \in \overline{\mathcal{S}_\Phi^T} \right\}$. However, $\dim_H\left(\left[\frac{1}{3}, 1\right] \cap F\right) = \frac{1}{2}$.

Since the boundary of the unit cube Q in \mathbb{R}^d has Hausdorff dimension $d - 1$, minisets with Hausdorff dimension larger than $d - 1$ have to intersect the interior of Q and their dimension stays the same after removing the boundary of Q . Hence the following holds.

Proposition 3.10. *Let $\Phi = \{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ be a similarity IFS and $T \in \mathcal{T}'_\Lambda$. Then*

$$\overline{\left\{ \dim_H(B) : B \text{ is a miniset of some } S \in \overline{\mathcal{S}_\Phi^T} \right\}} \cap (d-1, d] = \overline{\left\{ \dim_H(S) : S \in \overline{\mathcal{S}_\Phi^T} \right\}} \cap (d-1, d].$$

3.4. Limits of descendant trees as microsets.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. The miniset M has the form $M = Q \cap \psi(A)$, for some $A \in \overline{\mathcal{S}_\Phi^T}$, and some similarity function $\psi(x) = O(\lambda \cdot x) + r$. Since $A \in \overline{\mathcal{S}_\Phi^T}$, there is some sequence of compact sets $A_i = \gamma_\Phi(\partial T^{v_i}) \in \mathcal{S}_\Phi^T$ where $v_i \in T$, s.t. $A_i \rightarrow A$ in the Hausdorff metric. This implies that $\psi(A_i) \rightarrow \psi(A)$ as well. As in Lemma 2.6, denote $\delta_n = d_H(\psi(A_i), \psi(A))$, and notice that $Q^{(\delta_n)} \subset \psi_n(Q)$, where $\psi_n : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is the homothety given by

$$\psi_n(x) = (1 + 2\delta_n) \cdot x - \delta_n \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

This is the homothety that maps Q to the smallest cube that contains $Q^{(\delta_n)}$ (which is not a cube).

By Lemma 2.6,

$$\psi_n(Q) \cap \psi(A_i) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} Q \cap \psi(A),$$

and since $\psi_n^{-1} \rightarrow Id$, using Lemma 2.7, one obtains

$$(3.2) \quad Q \cap \psi_n^{-1} \circ \psi(A_i) = \psi_n^{-1}(\psi_n(Q) \cap \psi(A_i)) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} Q \cap \psi(A).$$

Note that $A_i \subseteq \varphi_{v_i}^{-1}(F)$ for every i , and therefore,

$$Q \cap \psi_n^{-1} \circ \psi(A_i) \subseteq Q \cap \psi_n^{-1} \circ \psi \circ \varphi_{v_i}^{-1}(F).$$

Hence, any limit of the sequence $Q \cap \psi_n^{-1} \circ \psi \circ \varphi_{v_i}^{-1}(F)$ contains $Q \cap \psi(A)$. By compactness such a limit exists and by definition it is a microset of F , which concludes the proof of the first part of the theorem.

Moreover, if $\psi^{-1}(Q) \subseteq U$ for an OSC set U , since $\psi_n^{-1} \rightarrow Id$, $\psi_n \circ \psi^{-1}(Q) \subseteq U$ whenever n is large enough, and by moving to a subsequence we may assume this is the case for all n . Since U is an OSC set,

$$Q \cap \psi_n^{-1} \circ \psi \circ \varphi_{v_i}^{-1}(F) = Q \cap \psi_n^{-1} \circ \psi(A_i),$$

and hence, by Equation (3.2), M is in fact a microset of F . \square

Proposition 3.11. *Let $F \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a non-empty compact set, and let $\Phi = \{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ be a similarity IFS which satisfies the OSC, such that $F = \gamma_\Phi(\partial T)$ for some tree $T \in \mathcal{T}'_\Lambda$. Then for every $S \in \overline{\mathcal{S}}_\Phi^T$ such that $S \subseteq U$ for an OSC set U , there are finitely many microsets $A_1, \dots, A_k \in \mathcal{W}_F$, and similarity maps η_1, \dots, η_k , such that*

$$(3.3) \quad S = \bigcup_{j=1}^k \eta_j(A_j).$$

Proof. By compactness, S may be covered by finitely many closed cubes C_1, \dots, C_k which are contained in U and centered at points of S . This implies that

$$S = \bigcup_{j=1}^k C_j \cap S.$$

For every $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, denote by η_j a similarity function such that $\eta_j(Q) = C_j$, and denote $A_j = Q \cap \eta_j^{-1}(S)$. We may assume that each of the cubes C_1, \dots, C_k has side-length smaller than 1, and so the similarities η_j^{-1} are expanding and the sets A_j are minisets of S . Since $C_j \subseteq U$ for every j , by Theorem 1.4, A_j is a microset of F , and since each C_j is centered at a point of S , $A_j \in \mathcal{W}_F$. \square

A version of Proposition 3.11 also holds for minisets of $S \in \overline{\mathcal{S}}_\Phi^T$.

Proposition 3.12. *Let F, Φ, T be as in Proposition 3.11, and assume that for $S \in \overline{\mathcal{S}}_\Phi^T$ and a similarity function ψ , $\psi^{-1}(Q) \cap S \subseteq U$ for an OSC set U . Then the following holds*

$$Q \cap \psi(S) = \bigcup_{j=1}^k \chi_j(A_j),$$

for microsets A_1, \dots, A_k of F , and similarity maps χ_1, \dots, χ_k .

Proof. The proof of this assertion is similar to the proof of Proposition 3.11, but C_1, \dots, C_k need to be chosen differently, so that they are all contained in $\psi^{-1}(Q)$ (and not necessarily centered at points of S). For example, by partitioning the cube $\psi^{-1}(Q)$ to subcubes of diameter smaller than $\text{dist}(\psi^{-1}(Q) \cap S, U^c)$, and then taking C_1, \dots, C_k to be those subcubes that intersect S (and therefore contained in U). Hence,

$$\psi^{-1}(Q) \cap S = \bigcup_{j=1}^k C_j \cap S.$$

As in the proof of Proposition 3.11, for every $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, denote by η_j a similarity function such that $\eta_j(Q) = C_j$, and $A_j = Q \cap \eta_j^{-1}(S)$. Applying Theorem 1.4, each A_j is a microset of F , and denoting $\chi_j = \psi \circ \eta_j$ for every j ,

$$Q \cap \psi(S) = \psi \left(\bigcup_{j=1}^k \eta_j(A_j) \right) = \bigcup_{j=1}^k \chi_j(A_j).$$

□

Note that unlike Proposition 3.11, in Proposition 3.12 there is no guarantee that the microsets A_1, \dots, A_k intersect the interior of Q .

Whenever the IFS Φ satisfies the SSC, by Lemma 2.13 there is an OSC set U which contains the attractor of Φ , and therefore it also contains every $S \in \overline{\mathcal{S}}_\Phi^T$. Hence, we obtain the following corollary:

Corollary 3.13. *Let $F \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a non-empty compact set, and let $\Phi = \{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ be a similarity IFS which satisfies the SSC, such that $F = \Gamma_\Phi(T)$ for some tree $T \in \mathcal{T}'_\Lambda$, then*

- (1) $\{\dim_{\text{H}}(A) : A \in \mathcal{W}_F\} \supseteq \{\dim_{\text{H}}(S) : S \in \overline{\mathcal{S}}_\Phi^T\}$
- (2) $\{\dim_{\text{H}}(A) : A \in \mathcal{W}_F\} \cap (d-1, d] = \{\dim_{\text{H}}(B) : B \text{ is a miniset of some } S \in \overline{\mathcal{S}}_\Phi^T\} \cap (d-1, d]$

Proof. (1) follows immediately from Proposition 3.11. To prove (2), note that every miniset B of some $S \in \overline{\mathcal{S}}_\Phi^T$ is equal to a finite union of minisets of S that are contained in U , and at least one of these minisets has the same Hausdorff dimension as B . The rest is an immediate consequence of Proposition 3.12 combined with Corollary 1.5 and with the observation that if a microset has Hausdorff dimension larger than $d-1$, then it has a non-empty intersection with Q° . □

Note that Corollary 3.13 above could be especially useful when $d = 1$.

3.5. Consequences regarding Assouad and lower dimensions.

Lemma 3.14. *Let $\Phi = \{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ be a similarity IFS, and $S \in \mathcal{T}'_\Lambda$ some infinite tree. Then for every miniset $M \subseteq Q$ of $\Gamma_\Phi(S)$ s.t. $M \cap Q^\circ \neq \emptyset$, there is a non-empty set $F \in \mathcal{S}_\Phi^S$ such that $\psi(F) \subseteq M \cap Q^\circ$ for some similarity function ψ . In particular $\dim_{\text{H}}(F) \leq \dim_{\text{H}}(M)$.*

Proof. Pick any $x \in M \cap Q^\circ$, and assume $\gamma_\Phi(i) = x$ for $i = i_1 i_2 \dots \in \Lambda^{\mathbb{N}}$. For a large enough $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\Gamma_\Phi([i_1 \dots i_k] \cap S) \subseteq M \cap Q^\circ.$$

Denote $F = \Gamma_\Phi(S^{i_1 \dots i_k})$, then $\varphi_{i_1 \dots i_k}(F) = \Gamma_\Phi([i_1 \dots i_k] \cap S) \subseteq M \cap Q^\circ$. □

As a consequence, the following Lemma follows at once:

Lemma 3.15. *Let $\Phi = \{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ be a similarity IFS, and $T \in \mathcal{T}'_\Lambda$ some infinite tree. Then*

$$\inf \left\{ \dim_{\text{H}}(S) : S \in \overline{\mathcal{S}_\Phi^T} \right\} = \inf \left\{ \dim_{\text{H}}(M) : M \text{ is a miniset of some } S \in \overline{\mathcal{S}_\Phi^T}, \text{ and } M \cap Q^\circ \neq \emptyset \right\},$$

and if one of the sets has a minimum, so does the other.

Proof of Theorem 1.7. (1): By Theorem 1.2,

$$\dim_{\text{A}}(F) = \max \{ \dim_{\text{H}}(A) : A \in \mathcal{W}_F \}.$$

Now, let $A \in \mathcal{W}_F$ be such a microset of maximal dimension. By Theorem 1.3, A is contained in a union of minisets of elements of $\overline{\mathcal{S}_\Phi^T}$, hence, there is some $S \in \overline{\mathcal{S}_\Phi^T}$ with $\dim_{\text{H}}(A) \leq \dim_{\text{H}}(S)$. On the other hand, given any $S \in \overline{\mathcal{S}_\Phi^T}$, for some similarity function ψ with a scaling ratio > 1 , $\dim_{\text{H}}(Q \cap \psi(S)) = \dim_{\text{H}}(S)$. We may assume that $Q^\circ \cap \psi(S) \neq \emptyset$, otherwise we may take ψ with a slightly smaller scaling ratio. By Theorem 1.4, there is some microset in \mathcal{W}_F which contains $Q \cap \psi(S)$ and therefore has a Hausdorff dimension $\geq \dim_{\text{H}}(S)$.

(2): Again, by Theorem 1.2,

$$\dim_{\text{L}}(F) = \min \{ \dim_{\text{H}}(A) : A \in \mathcal{W}_F \}.$$

Given a microset $A \in \mathcal{W}_F$, by Theorem 1.3, $Q^\circ \cap \psi(F) \subseteq A$ for some $F \in \overline{\mathcal{S}_\Phi^T}$ and an expanding similarity ψ , such that $Q^\circ \cap \psi(F) \neq \emptyset$. Given a tree $Y \in \overline{\mathcal{D}_T}$ such that $F = \Gamma_\Phi(Y)$, by Lemma 3.14 there is a set $S \in \mathcal{S}_\Phi^Y$ s.t. $\dim(S) \leq \dim(Q^\circ \cap \psi(F)) \leq \dim(A)$, and by Lemma 3.1, $S \in \overline{\mathcal{S}_\Phi^T}$.

(3): On the other hand, by Theorem 1.4, a miniset $\psi(S) \cap Q$ of some $S \in \overline{\mathcal{S}_\Phi^T}$, where $\psi^{-1}(Q) \subseteq U$ for an OSC set U , and $\psi(S) \cap Q^\circ \neq \emptyset$, is a microset of F , and therefore, the inequality follows from Theorem 1.2.

(4): Follows at once by combining (2) and Corollary 3.13. \square

Remark 3.16. Equality in (2) of Theorem 1.7 need not hold. Consider for example the set $[\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ coded by binary expansion, i.e. by the IFS $\Phi = \{f_0 : x \mapsto \frac{1}{2}x, f_1 : x \mapsto \frac{1}{2}x + \frac{1}{2}\}$. One possible coding tree is given by T where $T_0 = \{0, 1\}$, $T^1 = \{0, 1\}^*$ and $T^0 = \{\emptyset\} \cup \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \{a_1 \dots a_n\}$, where $a_1 a_2 \dots = 11111 \dots$. Then w.r.t. the tree T , the singleton $\{1\} \in \overline{\mathcal{S}_\Phi^T}$, although $\dim_{\text{L}}[\frac{1}{2}, 1] = 1$. The problem here is the intersection of the cylinder sets. In case the IFS satisfies the SSC, this problem goes away (as can be seen in (4) of Theorem 1.7).

Moreover, equality in (3) also need not hold. In fact, In some cases, $S \cap U = \emptyset$ for every $S \in \overline{\mathcal{S}_\Phi^T}$. For example, take $F = [0, 1]^2 \setminus (0, 1)^2$ coded using the IFS $\left\{ \varphi_i : (x, y) \mapsto \frac{1}{2}(x, y) + \frac{1}{2}i \right\}_{i \in \{0,1\}^2}$. Every OSC set U for this IFS has to be contained in $(0, 1)^2$, and for any coding tree T with respect to this IFS, for every $S \in \overline{\mathcal{S}_\Phi^T}$, $S \cap U = \emptyset$.

4. GALTON-WATSON FRACTALS

4.1. Basic definitions and results. Although defined slightly differently, the name ‘‘Galton-Watson fractal’’ as well as some of the formalism and notations regarding trees are taken from the book [19], which is a great reference for an introduction to Galton-Watson processes.

In order to define Galton-Watson fractals, we first need to define Galton-Watson trees.

Given a finite alphabet \mathbb{A} , and some random variable W with values in $2^{\mathbb{A}}$, we assign for each word $a \in \mathbb{A}^*$ an independent copy of W denoted by W_a . Then we define the (random) Galton-Watson tree $T \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{A}}$ by the following process: we set $T_0 = \{\emptyset\}$, and for every integer $n \geq 1$, $T_n = \bigcup_{a \in T_{n-1}} \{aj : j \in W_a\}$. Finally $T = \bigcup_{n \geq 0} T_n$ is the resulting Galton-Watson tree.

It may be easily seen that T is indeed a tree in the alphabet \mathbb{A} . In the case where T is finite we say that the tree is *extinct* or that the event of *extinction* occurred. Most of the events considered in this paper are conditioned on non-extinction, i.e. on the event that T is infinite. It is well known that whenever $\mathbb{E}[|W|] > 1$, the probability of non-extinction is positive (see [19] for more information). The case $\mathbb{E}[|W|] > 1$ is called *supercritical* and throughout the paper we only consider this case.

By Kolomogorov's extension theorem, the process described above yields a unique Borel measure on the space $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{A}}$, which is the law of T , denoted here by \mathcal{G} . Since we only deal with supercritical processes, the measure \mathcal{G} may be conditioned on the event of non-extinction. We denote this conditional measure by \mathcal{G}^∞ , which may be considered as a measure on $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{A}}^\infty$. The notations \mathcal{G} , \mathcal{G}' will be used throughout this subsection.

Given a similarity IFS $\Phi = \{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ with an attractor $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, one may construct a GWT $T \in \mathcal{T}_{\Lambda}$. Assuming the process is supercritical, there is a positive probability that $T \in \mathcal{T}_{\Lambda}^\infty$, and in this case it may be projected to \mathbb{R}^d using Γ_Φ . $E = \Gamma_\Phi(T)$ is then called a *Galton-Watson fractal (GWF)*. Since the map $\Gamma_\Phi : \mathcal{T}_{\Lambda}^\infty \rightarrow \Omega_K$ is Borel (Proposition 2.11), the probability distribution of E is a Borel measure on Ω_K , which is obtained as the pushforward measure $\Gamma_{\Phi*}(\mathcal{G}^\infty)$.

As already mentioned, we only deal with similarity IFSs (although it would be interesting to consider general affine IFSs). Whenever the underlying similarity IFS satisfies the OSC, the Hausdorff dimension of a Galton-Watson fractal is a.s. a fixed deterministic value which may be easily calculated as stated in the following Theorem due to Falconer [5] and Mauldin and Williams [20]. One may also refer to [19, Theorem 15.10] for another elegant proof.

Theorem 4.1. *Let E be a Galton-Watson fractal w.r.t. a similarity IFS $\Phi = \{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ satisfying the OSC, with contraction ratios $\{r_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ and offspring distribution W . Then almost surely $\dim_{\text{H}} E = \delta$ where δ is the unique number satisfying*

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i \in W} r_i^\delta \right) = 1.$$

The following theorem is a basic result in the theory of Galton-Watson processes ([17], see also [19]) which states that in supercritical Galton-Watson processes, the size of the generations grows at an exponential rate.

Theorem 4.2 (Kesten-Stigum). *Let T be a supercritical GWT, then $\frac{|T_k|}{\mathbb{E}[|W|]^k}$ converges a.s. (as $k \rightarrow \infty$) to a random variable L , where $\mathbb{E}[L] = 1$, and $L > 0$ a.s. conditioned on non-extinction.*

Another property which we shall use is stated in the following proposition, which is a result of the inherent independence in the construction of Galton-Watson trees (for a proof see [4, Proposition 2.6])

Proposition 4.3. *Let T be a supercritical Galton-Watson tree with alphabet \mathbb{A} and let $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{A}}$ be a measurable subset. Suppose that $\mathbb{P}(T \in \mathcal{S}) > 0$, then a.s. conditioned on non-extinction, there exist infinitely many $v \in T$ s.t. $T^v \in \mathcal{S}$.*

4.2. Galton-Watson trees without leaves. Recall that for a tree $S \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{A}}^{\infty}$, S' denotes the reduced tree in $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathbb{A}}$.

Remark 4.4. Note that for every nonempty $A \subseteq \mathbb{A}^n$ there is a unique tree F of height n s.t. $F_n = A$ and $[F] \cap \mathcal{T}'_{\mathbb{A}} \neq \emptyset$. Hence, given a finite tree $F \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{A}}$ of height n s.t. $[F] \cap \mathcal{T}'_{\mathbb{A}} \neq \emptyset$, for every $S \in \mathcal{T}'_{\mathbb{A}}$, $S \in [F]$ iff $S_n = F_n$.

Theorem 4.5. *Let T be a supercritical GWT on an alphabet \mathbb{A} with offspring distribution W s.t. $\mathbb{P}[W = \emptyset] > 0$. Then conditioned on non-extinction, T' has the law of a GWT with the offspring distribution W' defined as follows: $\mathbb{P}[W' = \emptyset] = 0$, and for every $A \in 2^{\mathbb{A}} \setminus \{\emptyset\}$,*

$$\mathbb{P}[W' = A] = \frac{1}{p} \sum_{A \subseteq B \subseteq \mathbb{A}} \mathbb{P}[W = B] \cdot p^{|A|} \cdot (1-p)^{|B \setminus A|}$$

where $p = \mathbb{P}[\text{non-extinction}]$.

In a slightly different setting, relating only to the size of the generations of T' , it is shown in [19, Theorem 5.28] that T' is a Galton-Watson tree, which is described by means of a probability generating function.

Obviously, in the case $\mathbb{P}[W = \emptyset] = 0$, T already has no leaves and so T and T' coincide.

Note that indeed the normalization factor p is correct. The expression

$$(4.1) \quad \sum_{A \subseteq 2^{\mathbb{A}} \setminus \{\emptyset\}} \sum_{A \subseteq B \subseteq \mathbb{A}} \mathbb{P}[W = B] \cdot p^{|A|} \cdot p^{|B \setminus A|}$$

may be interpreted as the probability that there exists some $A \subseteq 2^{\mathbb{A}} \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ s.t. $A \subseteq T_1$ and for every $v \in A$, T^v is infinite, and for every $w \in T_1 \setminus A$, T^w is finite. This is exactly the probability that T is infinite, i.e. the expression in (4.1) is equal to p .

The following lemma will be used in order to prove Theorem 4.5.

Lemma 4.6. *Let \tilde{T} be the GWT generated with the offspring distribution W' , then for every $A \subseteq \mathbb{A}^n \setminus \{\emptyset\}$,*

$$\mathbb{P}[\tilde{T}_n = A] = \frac{1}{p} \sum_{A \subseteq B \subseteq \mathbb{A}^n} \mathbb{P}[T_n = B] \cdot p^{|A|} \cdot (1-p)^{|B \setminus A|}$$

Proof. The lemma is proved by induction on n . For $n = 1$ the claim is trivial.

Assume this holds for $n-1$ and let $A \subseteq \mathbb{A}^n$. Denote by F the unique tree of height n s.t. $F_n = A$ and $[F] \cap \mathcal{T}'_{\mathbb{A}} \neq \emptyset$. Note that $\tilde{T}_n = A$ iff $\tilde{T}_{n-1} = F_{n-1}$ and for every $v \in F_{n-1}$, $W_{\tilde{T}}(v) = W_F(v)$.

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbb{P} \left[\tilde{T}_n = A \right] = \\
 & \mathbb{P} \left[\tilde{T}_{n-1} = F_{n-1} \right] \cdot \prod_{v \in F_{n-1}} \mathbb{P} [W' = W_F(v)] = \\
 & \left(\frac{1}{p} \sum_{F_{n-1} \subseteq B} \mathbb{P} [T_n = B] \cdot p^{|F_{n-1}|} \cdot (1-p)^{|B \setminus F_{n-1}|} \right) \cdot \\
 & \left(\prod_{v \in F_{n-1}} \frac{1}{p} \sum_{W_F(v) \subseteq B} \mathbb{P} [W = B] \cdot p^{|W_F(v)|} \cdot (1-p)^{|B \setminus W_F(v)|} \right) = \\
 & \frac{1}{p} \cdot \underbrace{\left(\sum_{F_{n-1} \subseteq B} \mathbb{P} [T_n = B] \cdot (1-p)^{|B \setminus F_{n-1}|} \right)}_{\Xi} \cdot \underbrace{\left(\prod_{v \in F_{n-1}} \sum_{W_F(v) \subseteq B} \mathbb{P} [W = B] \cdot p^{|W_F(v)|} \cdot (1-p)^{|B \setminus W_F(v)|} \right)}_{\Upsilon}
 \end{aligned}$$

Now, let us interpret the expressions Ξ , Υ . Ξ may be interpreted as the probability of the following event:

$$F_{n-1} \subseteq T_{n-1} \text{ and } \forall v \in T_{n-1} \setminus F_{n-1}, T^v \notin \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{A}}^{\infty},$$

and Υ may be interpreted as the probability of the event:

$$\forall v \in F_{n-1}, (W_F(v) \subseteq W_v) \text{ and } (\forall w \in W_F(v), T^w \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{A}}^{\infty}) \text{ and } (\forall w \in W_v \setminus W_F(v), T^w \notin \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{A}}^{\infty}).$$

These events are independent and so the product of their probabilities is the probability of their intersection. Their intersection is equivalent to the following event:

$$F_n \subseteq T_n \text{ and } (\forall w \in F_n, T^w \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{A}}^{\infty}) \text{ and } (\forall w \in T_n \setminus F_n, T^w \notin \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{A}}^{\infty}),$$

whose probability is exactly

$$\frac{1}{p} \sum_{A \subseteq B} \mathbb{P} [T_n = B] \cdot p^{|A|} \cdot (1-p)^{|B \setminus A|}.$$

□

proof of Theorem 4.5. Let \tilde{T} be a GWT generated according to the offspring distribution W' . We need to show that \tilde{T} has the same law as T' (conditioned on non-extinction). To do that, it is enough to show that for every finite tree F s.t. $[F] \cap \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{A}}'$,

$$\mathbb{P} [T' \in [F] \mid T \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{A}}^{\infty}] = \mathbb{P} [\tilde{T} \in [F]].$$

As mentioned above, $T' \in [F] \iff T'_n = F_n$ where n is the height of F , and since \tilde{T} has no leaves, the same holds for \tilde{T} , i.e. $\tilde{T} \in [F] \iff \tilde{T}_n = F_n$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbb{P} [T' \in [F] \mid T \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{A}}^{\infty}] = \\
 & \mathbb{P} [T'_n = F_n \mid T \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{A}}^{\infty}] = \\
 & \mathbb{P} [T_n \supseteq F_n \text{ and } (\forall v \in F_n, T^v \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{A}}^{\infty}) \text{ and } (\forall v \in T_n \setminus F_n, T^v \notin \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{A}}^{\infty}) \mid T \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{A}}^{\infty}] = \\
 & \frac{1}{p} \cdot \mathbb{P} [T_n \supseteq F_n \text{ and } (\forall v \in F_n, T^v \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{A}}^{\infty}) \text{ and } (\forall v \in T_n \setminus F_n, T^v \notin \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{A}}^{\infty})] = \\
 & \frac{1}{p} \sum_{F_n \subseteq B \subseteq \mathbb{A}} \mathbb{P} [T_n = B] \cdot p^{|F_n|} \cdot (1-p)^{|B \setminus F_n|} = \\
 & \mathbb{P} [\tilde{T}_n = F_n] = \mathbb{P} [\tilde{T} \in [F]]
 \end{aligned}$$

□

Given a GWT T , as mentioned in the beginning of the section, its probability distribution is denoted here by \mathcal{G} and conditioned on non-extinction by \mathcal{G}^{∞} . From this point forward, we also denote the probability distribution of T' (conditioned on non-extinction) by \mathcal{G}' .

4.3. The supports of the measures. Given any random variable X , we denote by $\text{supp}(X)$ the support of its distribution. In what follows we often (but not always) use this notation instead of addressing explicitly to the probability distribution of the random variable.

Let T be a GWT on the alphabet \mathbb{A} with an offspring distribution W . Keeping the notations introduced in the beginning of the section, the probability distribution of T is denoted by \mathcal{G} . It may be easily seen that

$$(4.2) \quad \text{supp}(\mathcal{G}) = \{S \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{A}} : \forall v \in S, W_S(v) \in \text{supp}(W)\},$$

and

$$(4.3) \quad \text{supp}(\mathcal{G}^{\infty}) = \text{supp}(\mathcal{G}) \cap \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{A}}^{\infty}.$$

Assuming that $\mathbb{P}[W = \emptyset] > 0$, since according to Theorem 4.5 T' is itself a GWT with an offspring distribution W' , such that

$$\text{supp}(W') = \{B \in 2^{\mathbb{A}} \setminus \{\emptyset\} : \exists A \in \text{supp}(W), B \subseteq A\},$$

the support of T' is given by

$$(4.4) \quad \text{supp}(\mathcal{G}') = \{S \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{A}}' : \forall v \in S, \exists A \in \text{supp}(W), \emptyset \neq W_S(v) \subseteq A\}.$$

Proposition 4.7. *Let T be a GWT on the alphabet \mathbb{A} and with an offspring distribution W . Then*

$$\{S' : S \in \text{supp}(\mathcal{G}^{\infty})\} = \text{supp}(\mathcal{G}').$$

Proof. In view of the Equations (4.2), (4.3), (4.4), the inclusion \subseteq is trivial.

For the other inclusion, assume $S \in \text{supp}(T')$. By Equation (4.4), for every $v \in S$, $W_S(v) \subseteq B$ for some B in $\text{supp}(W)$. Choose for every $v \in S$ such a set B_v , and construct a new tree $P \supseteq S$ by setting for every $v \in S$, $W_P(v) = B_v$ and for every $w \in W_P(v) \setminus W_S(v)$, set $W_P(w) = \emptyset$. Then clearly $P \in \text{supp}(T)$ and $P' = S$.

□

Recall that according to Lemma 2.8, the map $\Gamma_{\Phi} \upharpoonright_{\mathcal{T}'_{\mathbb{A}}} : \mathcal{T}'_{\mathbb{A}} \rightarrow \Omega_{\Phi}$ is continuous, and therefore

$$\Gamma_{\Phi}(\text{supp}(\mathcal{G}')) = \text{supp}(E).$$

Combining this with the above Proposition, one obtains

Lemma 4.8. *Let E be a GWF as above, then*

$$\text{supp}(E) = \Gamma_{\Phi}(\text{supp}(\mathcal{G}^{\infty}))$$

Recall the notation $\mathcal{D}_T = \{T^v : v \in T\}$ for a tree T . A direct consequence of Proposition 4.3 is the following.

Proposition 4.9. *Let T be a supercritical GWT on the alphabet \mathbb{A} , and let \mathcal{G} be the corresponding measure on $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{A}}$. Then a.s. conditioned on non-extinction,*

$$\overline{\mathcal{D}_T} = \text{supp}(\mathcal{G}).$$

Since T' is also a GWT, Proposition 4.9 may be applied to \mathcal{G}' , and so we obtain that a.s. conditioned on non-extinction,

$$\overline{\mathcal{D}_{T'}} = \text{supp}(\mathcal{G}'),$$

Now, given a similarity IFS $\Phi = \{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ and a tree $T \in \mathcal{T}'_{\Lambda}$, recall the notation $\mathcal{S}_{\Phi}^T = \Gamma_{\Phi}(\mathcal{D}_T)$, and the fact that $\overline{\mathcal{S}_{\Phi}^T} = \overline{\Gamma_{\Phi}(\mathcal{D}_T)} = \Gamma_{\Phi}(\overline{\mathcal{D}_T})$ (Equation (3.1)). Summarizing the above, the following holds:

Theorem 4.10. *Let T be a supercritical Galton-Watson tree w.r.t. a similarity IFS Φ , and with E , the corresponding Galton-Watson fractal. Then*

$$\text{supp}(E) = \Gamma_{\Phi}(\text{supp}(\mathcal{G}')) = \Gamma_{\Phi}(\text{supp}(\mathcal{G}^{\infty})),$$

and a.s. conditioned on non-extinction,

$$\text{supp}(E) = \overline{\mathcal{S}_{\Phi}^{T'}}.$$

Recall that $\text{supp}(\mathcal{G}')$ was formulated explicitly in (4.4).

Now that we have analyzed the set $\overline{\mathcal{S}_{\Phi}^{T'}}$, we shall apply the results of Section 3.

4.4. Trees with a prescribed set of allowed configurations. Given a finite alphabet \mathbb{A} , and a collection $\mathcal{A} \subseteq 2^{\mathbb{A}}$, a tree $T \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{A}}$ is called an \mathcal{A} -tree if for every $v \in T$, $W_T(v) \in \mathcal{A}$.

For an IFS $\Phi = \{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$, and every non-empty set $A \subseteq \Lambda$, we denote the attractor of the IFS $\{\varphi_i\}_{i \in A}$ by K_A . Obviously, $K_A \subseteq K$ where $K = K_{\Lambda}$ is the attractor of Φ .

In the rest of this subsection we are about to prove the following Theorem:

Theorem 4.11. *Given a similarity IFS $\Phi = \{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ which satisfies the OSC, and a non-empty collection $\mathcal{A} \subseteq 2^{\Lambda}$, denote*

$$m_{\mathcal{A}} = \min_{A \in \mathcal{A}} (\dim_{\text{H}}(K_A)) \quad \text{and} \quad M_{\mathcal{A}} = \max_{A \in \mathcal{A}} (\dim_{\text{H}}(K_A)),$$

where in case $\emptyset \in \mathcal{A}$, we set $\dim_{\text{H}}(K_{\emptyset}) = 0$ (and so $m_{\mathcal{A}} = 0$). Then the following equality holds:

$$\{\dim_{\text{H}}(\Gamma_{\Phi}(T)) : T \text{ is an infinite } \mathcal{A}\text{-tree}\} = [m_{\mathcal{A}}, M_{\mathcal{A}}].$$

Note that it is enough to prove the Theorem for the case $\emptyset \notin \mathcal{A}$. Indeed, assume that $\emptyset \in \mathcal{A}$. Denote $\underline{\mathcal{A}} = \{A \in 2^{\Lambda} \setminus \{\emptyset\} : \exists B \in \mathcal{A}, A \subseteq B\}$. Then

$$\{T' : T \in \mathcal{T}_{\Lambda}^{\infty} \text{ is an } \mathcal{A}\text{-tree}\} = \{T \in \mathcal{T}_{\Lambda}^{\infty} : T \text{ is an } \underline{\mathcal{A}}\text{-tree}\}.$$

This implies that

$$\{\dim_{\text{H}}(\Gamma_{\Phi}(T)) : T \text{ is an infinite } \mathcal{A}\text{-tree}\} = \{\dim_{\text{H}}(\Gamma_{\Phi}(T)) : T \text{ is an infinite } \underline{\mathcal{A}}\text{-tree}\}.$$

Now, $\emptyset \notin \underline{\mathcal{A}}$, however, unless $\mathcal{A} = \{\emptyset\}$ (which we assume is not the case), $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$ contains singletons, which implies that $m_{\underline{\mathcal{A}}} = m_{\mathcal{A}} = 0$. Of course, $M_{\underline{\mathcal{A}}} = M_{\mathcal{A}}$ as well, and so assuming the claim holds for $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$ implies that it holds for \mathcal{A} as well. Therefore, in view of the above, we assume for the rest of this subsection that $\emptyset \notin \mathcal{A}$.

In order to prove the theorem we first need to establish several lemmas.

Lemma 4.12. *For every \mathcal{A} -tree T , and every section $\Pi \subset \Lambda^*$,*

$$m_{\mathcal{A}} \leq \dim_{\mathbb{H}}(K_{T \cap \Pi}) \leq M_{\mathcal{A}}$$

Proof. Given a section Π , we denote $h(\Pi) = \max_{i \in \Pi} |i|$. The claim is proved by induction on $h(\Pi)$.

When $h(\Pi) = 1$, the claim follows immediately from the definition of $m_{\mathcal{A}}, M_{\mathcal{A}}$ as $T \cap \Pi \in \mathcal{A}$.

Assume the claim holds for sections Π' with $h(\Pi') = n - 1$, and that $h(\Pi) = n$. Let Π^- be the section defined as follows:

$$\Pi^- = (\Pi \setminus \Lambda^n) \cup \{w \in \Lambda^{n-1} : \exists v \in \Pi, w < v\}$$

It may be easily seen that Π^- is a section with $h(\Pi^-) = n - 1$. Recall that $\dim_{\mathbb{H}}(K_{T \cap \Pi^-}) = \alpha$ where α is the unique number satisfying

$$\sum_{i \in T \cap \Pi^-} r_i^\alpha = 1.$$

By the induction hypothesis, $\sum_{i \in T \cap \Pi^-} r_i^{m_{\mathcal{A}}} \geq 1$ and $\sum_{i \in T \cap \Pi^-} r_i^{M_{\mathcal{A}}} \leq 1$.

For every α ,

$$(4.5) \quad \sum_{i \in T \cap \Pi} r_i^\alpha = \sum_{i \in T \cap \Pi^- \cap \Pi} r_i^\alpha + \sum_{w \in T \cap \Pi^- \setminus \Pi} r_w^\alpha \cdot \sum_{v \in W_T(w)} r_v^\alpha.$$

For every $w \in T$, $W_T(w) \in \mathcal{A}$, and therefore, $\sum_{v \in W_T(w)} r_v^{m_{\mathcal{A}}} \geq 1$ and $\sum_{v \in W_T(w)} r_v^{M_{\mathcal{A}}} \leq 1$. Hence, replacing α by $m_{\mathcal{A}}$ in Equation (4.5), using the induction hypothesis we obtain $\sum_{i \in T \cap \Pi} r_i^{m_{\mathcal{A}}} \geq 1$ and replacing α by $M_{\mathcal{A}}$ we obtain $\sum_{i \in T \cap \Pi} r_i^{M_{\mathcal{A}}} \leq 1$ which concludes the proof. \square

Lemma 4.13. *For any $\rho \in (0, r_{\min})$, the following holds for every \mathcal{A} -tree T :*

$$\rho^{-m_{\mathcal{A}}} \leq |T_{\Pi_\rho}| \leq \rho^{-M_{\mathcal{A}}} \cdot r_{\min}^{-M_{\mathcal{A}}}.$$

Proof. Denote $\alpha = \dim_{\mathbb{H}}(K_{T \cap \Pi_\rho})$, which means that $\sum_{i \in T \cap \Pi_\rho} r_i^\alpha = 1$. Hence, it follows from Equation (2.1) that

$$|T_{\Pi_\rho}| \cdot \rho^\alpha r_{\min}^\alpha < 1 \leq |T_{\Pi_\rho}| \cdot \rho^\alpha,$$

or put differently, that

$$\rho^{-\alpha} \leq |T_{\Pi_\rho}| < \rho^{-\alpha} r_{\min}^{-\alpha}.$$

By Lemma 4.12, $m_{\mathcal{A}} \leq \alpha \leq M_{\mathcal{A}}$, which implies the required inequalities. \square

The following lemma is taken from [4, Proposition 4.1].

Lemma 4.14. *Given any $\rho \in (0, r_{\min})$, and any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, for every $i \in \Pi_{\rho^n}$ we denote $a(i) = \frac{r_i}{\rho^n}$. Then for every $j \in \Lambda^*$,*

$$ij \in \Pi_{\rho^{n+1}} \iff j \in \Pi_{\frac{\rho}{a(i)}}.$$

Lemma 4.15. *As before, let T be an \mathcal{A} -tree. Given any $\varepsilon > 0$, whenever $\rho \in (0, r_{\min})$ is small enough, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and for every $i \in T \cap \Pi_{\rho^n}$,*

$$\rho^{-(m_{\mathcal{A}} - \varepsilon)} \leq |\{w \in T \cap \Pi_{\rho^{n+1}} : i < w\}|.$$

Proof. By Lemma 4.14, for any $\rho \in (0, r_{\min})$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $i \in T \cap \Pi_{\rho^n}$,

$$\{w \in T \cap \Pi_{\rho^{n+1}} : i < w\} = \left\{ ij : j \in T^i \cap \Pi_{\frac{\rho}{a(i)}} \right\}.$$

Since T^i is also an \mathcal{A} -tree, by Lemma 4.13,

$$\rho^{-m_{\mathcal{A}}} \cdot a(i)^{m_{\mathcal{A}}} \leq \left| T^i \cap \Pi_{\frac{\rho}{a(i)}} \right|.$$

Note that $r_{\min} < a(i) \leq 1$, hence, taking ρ small enough so that $\rho^\varepsilon \leq r_{\min}^{m_{\mathcal{A}}}$, we obtain

$$\rho^{-m_{\mathcal{A}} + \varepsilon} \leq \left| T^i \cap \Pi_{\frac{\rho}{a(i)}} \right|$$

for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $i \in T \cap \Pi_{\rho^n}$, as claimed. \square

We are now ready to prove Theorem 4.11.

Proof of Theorem 4.11. (The inclusion \subseteq): For any $\varepsilon \in (0, m_{\mathcal{A}})$, choose some $\rho \in (0, r_{\min})$ small enough for Lemma 4.14 to hold for the given ε , and such that $\rho^{-m_{\mathcal{A}} + \varepsilon}$ is an integer. Conceptually, we think of the set $\{\emptyset\} \cup \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} T \cap \Pi_{\rho^n}$ as a tree whose n^{th} level is $T \cap \Pi_{\rho^n}$, and for every $i \in T \cap \Pi_{\rho^n}$, we think of the set $\{v \in T \cap \Pi_{\rho^{n+1}} : i < v\}$ as the set of children of i . According to Lemma 4.15, every such $i \in T \cap \Pi_{\rho^n}$ has at least $\rho^{-m_{\mathcal{A}} + \varepsilon}$ descendants in the section $T \cap \Pi_{\rho^{n+1}}$. By choosing for each $i \in T \cap \Pi_{\rho^n}$ a set of exactly $\rho^{-m_{\mathcal{A}} + \varepsilon}$ descendants, we obtain a $\rho^{-m_{\mathcal{A}} + \varepsilon}$ -ary subtree, which projects using Γ_{Φ} to an Ahlfors-regular subset of $\Gamma_{\Phi}(T)$ of Hausdorff dimension $m_{\mathcal{A}} - \varepsilon$ (see [4, Lemma 4.21]). This implies, in particular, that $\dim_{\text{H}}(\Gamma_{\Phi}(T)) \geq m_{\mathcal{A}} - \varepsilon$. Since ε is arbitrary, we obtain the required lower bound.

On the other hand, By Lemma 4.13, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\left| T_{\Pi_{\rho^n}} \right| \leq (\rho^n)^{-M_{\mathcal{A}}} \cdot r_{\min}^{-M_{\mathcal{A}}},$$

which is enough in order to determine that $\dim_{\text{H}}(\Gamma_{\Phi}(T)) \leq M_{\mathcal{A}}$.

(The inclusion \supseteq): We prove this part using a probabilistic argument. Recall that according to Theorem 4.1, for a Galton-Watson fractal with an offspring distribution \tilde{W} , the Hausdorff dimension is a.s. (conditioned on non-extinction) the unique $s \geq 0$ s.t. the following equality holds

$$(4.6) \quad \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i \in \tilde{W}} r_i^s \right) = 1.$$

Denote by $A_{\min}, A_{\max} \in \mathcal{A}$ any two sets that satisfy

$$\dim_{\text{H}}(K_{A_{\min}}) = m_{\mathcal{A}} \text{ and } \dim_{\text{H}}(K_{A_{\max}}) = M_{\mathcal{A}}.$$

Given any $t \in [0, 1]$, consider a GWF which is constructed using the offspring distribution $W_t = t\delta_{A_{\min}} + (1-t)\delta_{A_{\max}}$ and denote its a.s. Hausdorff dimension by s_t , i.e., s_t is the solution of equation (4.6) with W_t instead of \tilde{W} . Note that $\text{supp}(W_t) \subseteq \text{supp}(W)$. Now, given any $a \in [m_{\mathcal{A}}, M_{\mathcal{A}}]$, since the mapping $t \mapsto s_t$ is continuous, there is some (unique) t_a s.t. $s_{t_a} = a$. This means that a GWF constructed with the offspring distribution W_{t_a} , almost surely has its Hausdorff dimension equal to a , in particular there exists an \mathcal{A} -tree $T \in \mathcal{T}_{\Lambda}$, such that $\Gamma_{\Phi}(T) = a$. \square

Remark 4.16. The OSC was used quite extensively in the proof of Theorem 4.11. However it might not be necessary for the conclusion of the Theorem to hold and it would be interesting to try proving the theorem without it.

4.5. Microsets and dimensions of Galton-Watson fractals. We now apply Theorem 1.3 to Galton-Watson fractals. Using Theorem 4.10 we obtain:

Theorem 4.17. *Let E be a Galton-Watson fractal w.r.t. a similarity IFS Φ which satisfies the WSC. Then there exists some $n \geq 1$, which depends only on Φ , s.t. almost surely for every microset M of E , there are $A_1, \dots, A_n \in \text{supp}(E)$, and expanding similarity maps ψ_1, \dots, ψ_n , such that*

$$Q^\circ \cap \left(\bigcup_{j=1}^n \psi_j A_j \right) \subseteq M \subseteq Q \cap \left(\bigcup_{j=1}^n \psi_j A_j \right).$$

Moreover, if Φ satisfies the SSC, then $n = 1$.

On the other hand, we apply Theorem 1.4 and obtain the following:

Theorem 4.18. *Let E be a Galton-Watson fractal w.r.t. a similarity IFS Φ . Then almost surely, every miniset M of a member of $\text{supp}(E)$ is contained in a microset of E .*

Moreover, if M has the form $M = Q \cap \psi(A)$ for some $A \in \text{supp}(E)$ and an expanding similarity map ψ , and assuming that Φ satisfies the OSC with an OSC set U such that $\psi^{-1}(Q) \subseteq U$, then M is a microset of E .

In fact, when the underlying IFS satisfies the OSC, we can say more. Here, we make use of the fact that the strong OSC is equivalent to the OSC for similarity IFSs (Lemma 2.16).

Theorem 4.19. *Let E be a Galton-Watson fractal w.r.t. a similarity IFS $\Phi = \{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ which satisfies the OSC, and with offspring distribution W . Then a.s. every miniset M of a member of $\text{supp}(E)$, is contained in some microset L of E , such that $\dim_{\text{H}}(M) = \dim_{\text{H}}(L)$.*

Moreover, in the case where $\mathbb{P}[W = \emptyset] > 0$, a.s. every miniset of a member of $\text{supp}(E)$ is a microset of E .

Proof. Let T be the corresponding GWT. Suppose we are given an $M = Q \cap \psi(S)$ for some $S \in \text{supp}(E)$ and an expanding similarity map ψ . Recall that by Theorem 4.10, $\text{supp}(E) = \Gamma_{\Phi}(\text{supp}(T'))$. Let $Y \in \text{supp}(T')$ satisfy $\Gamma_{\Phi}(Y) = S$. By the strong OSC there exists some $x \in K \cap U$, where U is an OSC set. Assume that $x = \gamma_{\Phi}(i)$ for $i = i_1 i_2 \dots \in \Lambda^{\mathbb{N}}$. For k large enough, $\varphi_{i_1 \dots i_k}(\psi^{-1}(Q)) \subseteq U$. Since we assume that $\forall a \in \Lambda, \mathbb{P}[a \in W] > 0$, there is some finite tree F of height k , s.t. $j := i_1 \dots i_k \in F$, and $\mathbb{P}[T' \in [F]] > 0$. Consider the tree $\tilde{Y} \in \mathcal{T}'_{\Lambda}$ constructed as follows:

- $\tilde{Y} \in [F]$,
- $\tilde{Y}^j = Y$,

- For every $v \in F_k \setminus \{j\}$, $\tilde{Y}^v = X$ where $X \in \text{supp}(T')$ and $\dim_{\text{H}}(\Gamma_{\Phi}(X)) \leq \dim_{\text{H}}(M)$. The existence of such X is guaranteed by Lemma 3.15 combined with Theorem 4.10.

It may be easily verified that $\tilde{Y} \in \text{supp}(T')$ and therefore $\tilde{S} = \Gamma_{\Phi}(\tilde{Y}) \in \text{supp}(E)$.

Denote $L := Q \cap \psi \circ \varphi_j^{-1}(\tilde{S})$. Since $\varphi_j \circ \psi^{-1}(Q) \subseteq U$, by Theorem 4.18, L is a microset of E .

Note that $\tilde{S} = \bigcup_{v \in F_n} \varphi_v \circ \Gamma_{\Phi}(\tilde{Y}^v)$, and therefore

$$L = \bigcup_{v \in F_n} Q \cap \psi \circ \varphi_j^{-1} \circ \varphi_v \circ \Gamma_{\Phi}(\tilde{Y}^v).$$

In particular, since $j \in F_n$, $M \subseteq L$. Together with the fact that $\dim(\Gamma_{\Phi}(\tilde{Y}^v)) \leq \dim_{\text{H}}(M)$ for every $v \in F_n \setminus \{j\}$, this implies that $\dim_{\text{H}}(M) = \dim_{\text{H}}(L)$.

For the “moreover” part, in case $\mathbb{P}[W = \emptyset] > 0$, we could define \tilde{Y} just by

$$\tilde{Y} = \{\emptyset\} \cup \bigcup_{n=1}^k \{i_1 \cdots i_n\} \cup jY$$

and proceed in the same way. Thus we obtain that $L = M$ is a microset. \square

The following lemma may be proved using the same argument used in the proof of Theorem 4.19. To avoid redundancy, the proof of the lemma is omitted, and the required adjustments are left to the reader.

Lemma 4.20. *Let E be a Galton-Watson fractal w.r.t. a similarity IFS $\Phi = \{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$, which satisfies the OSC. Then for every $A \in \text{supp}(E)$, there exists some $\tilde{A} \in \text{supp}(E)$ and an expanding similarity ψ , such that the following hold:*

- (1) $\psi^{-1}(Q) \subseteq U$ for an OSC set U ;
- (2) $\dim_{\text{H}}(A) = \dim_{\text{H}}(\psi(\tilde{A}) \cap Q)$;
- (3) $\psi(\tilde{A}) \cap Q^\circ \neq \emptyset$.

Note that by Theorem 4.18, a.s. $\psi(\tilde{A}) \cap Q \in \mathcal{W}_E$.

Proof of Theorem 1.8. Let T be the corresponding GWT. As mentioned in Equation (4.2), the support of T is just the set of all $\text{supp}(W)$ -trees. By Theorem 4.11, we have

$$\{\dim_{\text{H}}(\Gamma_{\Phi}(S)) : S \in \text{supp}(\mathcal{G}^\infty)\} = [m_W, M_W].$$

Hence, by Theorem 4.10 we obtain

$$\{\dim_{\text{H}}(F) : F \in \text{supp}(E)\} = [m_W, M_W].$$

Combining Lemma 4.20 and Theorem 4.18 yields that a.s. for every $A \in \text{supp}(E)$ there is some $F \in \mathcal{W}_E$, such that $\dim_{\text{H}}(A) = \dim_{\text{H}}(F)$. This shows that $\{\dim_{\text{H}}(F) : F \in \mathcal{W}_E\} \supseteq [m_W, M_W]$.

Recalling that a.s. conditioned on non-extinction, $\overline{\mathcal{S}}_{\Phi}^{T'} = \text{supp}(E)$ (Theorem 4.10), the opposite inclusion follows from Corollary 1.7 combined with Theorem 1.2. \square

5. SOME REMARKS ON FURSTENBERG'S DEFINITION OF MICROSETS AND HOMOGENEITY.

We now recall Furstenberg's original definition of a microset. To distinguish this definition from Definition 1.1, we use the terminology *F-microset* and *F-miniset*.

Definition 5.1. Given a compact set $F \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, we define the following:

- (1) A non-empty subset of a miniset of F , whose defining similarity map is a homothety is called an F-miniset of F .
- (2) An F-microset of F is any limit of F-minisets of F in the Hausdorff metric.

We denote by \mathcal{F}_F the set of all F-microsets of F .

The following Lemma establishes the relation between microsets as defined in Definition 1.1 and F-microsets as defined above.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $F \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ and $M \subseteq Q$ be non-empty compact sets. Then M is an F-microset of $F \iff M$ is a subset of a microset of F which is obtained using only homotheties.*

Proof. (\implies): Assume M is an F-microset of F , then it is a limit of a sequence M_i of F-minisets of F . Each M_i is contained in a miniset L_i of F , which is obtained using a homothety. By moving to a subsequence, L_i converges in the Hausdorff metric to some compact set L which is by definition a microset of F . Since $M_i \subseteq L_i$ for every i , $M \subseteq L$.

(\impliedby): Assume $M \subseteq L$ where $L = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} Q \cap \psi_i(F)$, and all the ψ_i are homotheties. By Lemma 2.6, there is a sequence M_i of thickenings of M such that

$$Q \cap \psi_i(F) \cap M_i \xrightarrow{i \rightarrow \infty} L \cap M = M.$$

Since each $Q \cap \psi_i(F) \cap M_i$ is an F-miniset of F , M is indeed an F-microset of F . \square

Using the same arguments as in the proof of Theorem 1.3, we may obtain the following:

Theorem 5.3. *Let $F \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a non-empty compact set. Given an IFS $\Phi = \{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ of homotheties which satisfies WSC and a tree $T \in \mathcal{T}'_\Lambda$ such that $F = \Gamma_\Phi(T)$, there exists some $n \geq 1$ which depends only on Φ , such that every $M \in \mathcal{F}_F$ satisfies $M = \bigcup_{j=1}^n S_j$, where S_1, \dots, S_n are F-minisets of some $A_1, \dots, A_n \in \overline{\mathcal{S}}_\Phi^T$. Moreover, if Φ satisfies the SSC, then $n = 1$.*

On the other hand, the following theorem is an immediate consequence of Theorem 1.4 together with Lemma 5.2.

Theorem 5.4. *Let $F \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a non-empty compact set. Given an IFS $\Phi = \{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ of homotheties and a tree $T \in \mathcal{T}'_\Lambda$ such that $F = \Gamma_\Phi(T)$, every F-miniset of a member of $\overline{\mathcal{S}}_\Phi^T$ is an F-microset of F .*

Theorems 5.3 and 5.4 are suitable versions of Theorems 1.3 and 1.4 for F-microsets. Since the definition of F-microsets allows taking subsets, Theorems 5.3 and 5.4 take nicer forms than their parallels. In case the SSC holds, the following corollary is immediate:

Corollary 5.5. *Given an IFS $\Phi = \{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ of homotheties, and a tree $T \in \mathcal{T}'_\Lambda$, denote $F = \gamma_\Phi(\partial T)$. Assume that Φ satisfies the SSC, then*

$$\mathcal{F}_F = \left\{ M : M \text{ is an F-miniset of } S, S \in \overline{\mathcal{S}}_\Phi^T \right\}.$$

The following definition is from [11].

Definition 5.6. A set F is called *homogeneous* if every F-microset of F is an F-miniset of F .

In [11], Furstenberg showed that every linear map restricted to a homogeneous set has a property called dimension conservation, whose definition will now be recalled.

Definition 5.7. A linear map $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^l$ is *dimension conserving* on a compact set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ if there exists some $\delta \geq 0$, such that

$$\delta + \dim_{\text{H}} \{y \in \mathbb{R}^l : \dim_{\text{H}} (f^{-1}(y) \cap A) \geq \delta\} \geq \dim_{\text{H}} (A),$$

with the convention that $\dim_{\text{H}} (\emptyset) = -\infty$.

Roughly speaking, $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^l$ is dimension conserving on A if any decrease of the Hausdorff dimension between A and $f(A)$ is compensated by the Hausdorff dimension of the fibers $f^{-1}(y)$. This may be seen as a generalization of the property described by the rank-nullity theorem for linear maps between two vector spaces.

Now, assume that F is the attractor of an IFS $\Phi = \{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \Lambda}$ of homotheties, so that $T = \Lambda^*$ is a coding tree for F , and $\overline{\mathcal{S}}_{\Phi}^T = \{F\}$. If Φ satisfies the SSC, then by Corollary 5.5, F is homogeneous. This is already well known. In [15] it was shown using a result from [9] that for self-homothetic sets in \mathbb{R} with Hausdorff dimension < 1 , homogeneity implies the WSC. However, it was shown that the WSC does not characterize homogeneity, even for this class of sets, and there exist such sets which satisfy the OSC, but are not homogeneous. In that paper it is mentioned that a characterization for homogeneity is not yet known.

However, assuming that Φ satisfies the WSC, Theorem 5.3 implies that every F-microset of F is a union of some (bounded) finite number of F-minisets of F . One may consider this property as a weaker form of homogeneity.

Definition 5.8. A set F is called *weakly homogeneous* if every F-microset of F is a union of finitely many F-minisets of F .

An immediate consequence of Theorem 5.3 is the following:

Proposition 5.9. *Let $F \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be the attractor of an IFS of homotheties which satisfies the WSC. Then F is weakly homogeneous.*

Now, using the same arguments as in [15] as well as Proposition 5.9, we obtain the following equivalence:

Theorem 5.10. *Let $F \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ be the attractor of Φ - an IFS of homotheties. Assume that $\dim_{\text{H}}(F) < 1$ and that F is not a singleton. Then F is weakly homogeneous $\iff \Phi$ satisfies WSC.*

Proof. The direction (\Leftarrow) follows from Proposition 5.9. For the direction (\Rightarrow), assume that F is weakly homogeneous. By [14, Propositions 5.7, 5.8], there is an F-microset M of F s.t. $\dim_{\text{H}}(M) = \dim_{\text{A}}(F)$. By weak homogeneity $\dim_{\text{H}}(M) \leq \dim_{\text{H}}(F)$ which implies that $\dim_{\text{A}}(F) < 1$. By [9, Theorem 3.1], this implies that Φ satisfies WSC. \square

Remark 5.11. Some remarks on the Theorem:

- (1) For a self-similar set $F \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ which is not a singleton and with $\dim_{\text{H}}(F) < 1$, the WSC of its defining IFS is a property of the set F itself. That is, if F is the attractor of some similarity IFS which satisfies the WSC, then every similarity IFS whose attractor is F satisfies the WSC as well. This follows from [9, Theorem 1.3].

- (2) Using the example constructed in [15] of a self-homothetic set which is the attractor of an IFS that satisfies the open set condition, but fails to be homogeneous, it follows that weak homogeneity does not imply homogeneity, and so these two properties are not equivalent, and homogeneity is indeed a stronger property.

The weak homogeneity property also makes sense in the context of Furstenberg's work since as we now show, weak homogeneity implies the same conclusion regarding dimension conservation as homogeneity.

Theorem 5.12. *If a compact set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is weakly homogeneous, then every linear map $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^l$ is dimension conserving on A .*

Proof. By [11, Theorem 6.1] A has an F-microset M such that $\dim_{\text{H}}(M) \geq \dim_{\text{H}}(A)$, and f is dimension conserving on M . Assuming that A is weakly homogeneous, $M = \bigcup_{i=1}^k M_i$, where each M_i is an F-miniset of A .

f being dimension conserving on M , means that for some $\delta \geq 0$,

$$\delta + \dim_{\text{H}} \{y : \dim_{\text{H}}(f^{-1}(y) \cap M) \geq \delta\} \geq \dim_{\text{H}}(M) \geq \dim_{\text{H}}(A).$$

Denote $L = \{y : \dim_{\text{H}}(f^{-1}(y) \cap M) \geq \delta\}$, and for every i , denote $L_i = \{y : \dim_{\text{H}}(f^{-1}(y) \cap M_i) \geq \delta\}$.

Note that $L = \bigcup_{i=1}^k L_i$, and therefore there exists some $i_0 \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ such that $\dim_{\text{H}}(L_{i_0}) = \dim_{\text{H}}(L)$. Hence, we obtain

$$\delta + \dim_{\text{H}} \{y : \dim_{\text{H}}(f^{-1}(y) \cap M_{i_0}) \geq \delta\} \geq \dim_{\text{H}}(A).$$

Now, M_{i_0} is a miniset of A , so $M_{i_0} \subseteq \psi(A)$ for some homothety $\psi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$. Therefore, we also have

$$\delta + \dim_{\text{H}} \{y : \dim_{\text{H}}(f^{-1}(y) \cap \psi(A)) \geq \delta\} \geq \dim_{\text{H}}(\psi(A)).$$

In words, this means that f is dimension conserving on $\psi(A)$, which is equivalent to f being dimension conserving on A . \square

Corollary 5.13. *Let $F \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be the attractor of an IFS of homotheties which satisfies the WSC, then every linear map $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^l$ is dimension conserving on F .*

Remark 5.14. The weak homogeneity property could be given two alternative definitions. One is weaker than Definition 5.8, requiring that every F-microset is the union of at most countably many F-minisets. The other is stronger than Definition 5.8, requiring that there exists some $c \in \mathbb{N}$ s.t. every F-microset is the union of at most c F-minisets.

In both cases, Theorem 5.12, Proposition 5.9 and Theorem 5.10 would still hold. Also, note that the latter implies that for self-homothetic subsets of \mathbb{R} with Hausdorff dimension < 1 , all these alternative definitions are in fact equivalent.

Finally, we consider the application of Theorem 5.3 to Galton-Watson fractals. This yields the following probabilistic version of the implication (\Leftarrow) in Theorem 5.10.

Theorem 5.15. *Let E be a GWF, constructed with respect to an IFS Φ of homotheties which satisfies the WSC, then a.s. there exists some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ which depends only on Φ , such that every*

$M \in \mathcal{F}_E$ satisfies $M = \bigcup_{j=1}^n S_j$, where S_1, \dots, S_n are F -minisets of some $A_1, \dots, A_n \in \text{supp}(E)$. Moreover, if Φ satisfies the SSC, then $n = 1$.

The property that every F -microset of E is a finite union of F -minisets of elements of $\text{supp}(E)$, may be seen as a generalization of the weak homogeneity property to random fractals. Also note that when Φ satisfies the SSC, we obtain the assertion that every F -microset of E is an F -miniset of some set in $\text{supp}(E)$ which, again, may be considered as a generalization of the homogeneity property to random fractals.

Acknowledgments

The author wishes to thank Jonathan Fraser for some helpful tips, and especially for the reference to his great book [7]. The author is also thankful to Barak Weiss for some helpful comments on the paper.

REFERENCES

- [1] C. J. Bishop and Y. Peres. *Fractals in Probability and Analysis*, volume 162. Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- [2] R. Broderick, L. Fishman, D. Kleinbock, A. Reich, and B. Weiss. The set of badly approximable vectors is strongly C^1 incompressible. *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, 153(2):319–339, 2012.
- [3] T. Das, L. Fishman, D. Simmons, and M. Urbański. Badly approximable points on self-affine sponges and the lower Assouad dimension. *ArXiv e-prints*, Aug. 2016.
- [4] Y. Dayan. Random fractals and their intersection with winning sets. *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, pages 1–30, 2021.
- [5] K. J. Falconer. Random fractals. *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, 100(3):559–582, November 1986.
- [6] K. J. Falconer. *Fractal Geometry: Mathematical Foundations and Applications*. Wiley, 2013.
- [7] J. Fraser. *Assouad Dimension and Fractal Geometry*. Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- [8] J. Fraser, D. Howroyd, A. Käenmäki, and H. Yu. On the Hausdorff dimension of microsets. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 147(11):4921–4936, 2019.
- [9] J. M. Fraser, A. M. Henderson, E. J. Olson, and J. C. Robinson. On the Assouad dimension of self-similar sets with overlaps. *Advances in Mathematics*, 273:188–214, 2015.
- [10] J. M. Fraser, J. J. Miao, and S. Troscheit. The Assouad dimension of randomly generated fractals. *Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems*, 38(3):982–1011, 2018.
- [11] H. Furstenberg. Ergodic fractal measures and dimension conservation. *Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems*, 28(2):405–422, 2008.
- [12] D. C. Howroyd and H. Yu. Assouad dimension of random processes. *Proceedings of the Edinburgh Mathematical Society*, 62(1):281–290, 2019.
- [13] J. E. Hutchinson. Fractals and self similarity. *Indiana University Mathematics Journal*, 30(5):713–747, 1981.
- [14] A. Käenmäki, T. Ojala, and E. Rossi. Rigidity of quasisymmetric mappings on self-affine carpets. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, 2018(12):3769–3799, 2018.
- [15] A. Käenmäki and E. Rossi. Weak separation condition, Assouad dimension, and Furstenberg homogeneity. *Annales Academiæ scientiarum Fennicæ. Mathematica*, 41(1):465–490, 2016.
- [16] A. Käenmäki and M. Vilppolainen. Separation conditions on controlled moran constructions. *Fundamenta Mathematicæ*, 200:69–100, 2008.
- [17] H. Kesten and B. P. Stigum. A limit theorem for multidimensional galton-watson processes. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 37(5):1211–1223, 1966.

- [18] K.-S. Lau and S.-M. Ngai. Multifractal measures and a weak separation condition. *Advances in mathematics*, 141(1):45–96, 1999.
- [19] R. Lyons and Y. Peres. *Probability on Trees and Networks*. Cambridge University Press, New York, 2016.
- [20] R. D. Mauldin and S. C. Williams. Random recursive constructions: Asymptotic geometric and topological properties. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 295(1):325–346, May 1986.
- [21] Y. Peres, M. Rams, K. Simon, and B. Solomyak. Equivalence of positive hausdorff measure and the open set condition for self-conformal sets. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 129(9):2689–2699, 2001.
- [22] A. Schief. Separation properties for self-similar sets. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 122(1):111–115, 1994.
- [23] S. Troscheit. On the dimensions of attractors of random self-similar graph directed iterated function systems. *Journal of Fractal Geometry*, 4(3):257–303, 2017.
- [24] S. Troscheit. The quasi-Assouad dimension of stochastically self-similar sets. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh Section A: Mathematics*, 150(1):261–275, 2020.
- [25] M. Zerner. Weak separation properties for self-similar sets. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 124(11):3529–3539, 1996.