

LIPSCHITZ CONTINUITY OF THE HAUSDORFF DIMENSION OF SELF-AFFINE SPONGES AT SIERPINSKI SPONGES

NUNO LUZIA

ABSTRACT. The Hausdorff dimension of general Sierpinski carpets, [4] and [20], and the generalization on Lalley-Gatzouras carpets, [10], are today well known results, the formulas being obtain via the variational principle for the dimension. We call the multidimensional versions of these carpets Sierpinski sponges and self-affine sponges, respectively,. In this paper we show that the Hausdorff dimension of self-affine sponges, defined in \mathbb{R}^3 , is a Lipschitz continuous function at Sierpinski sponges.

1. INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENTS

The dimension theory of $C^{1+\alpha}$ conformal repellers is well understood by means of the thermodynamic formalism introduced by Sinai-Ruelle-Bowen [24], [23], [5] and the famous Bowen's equation [6], [22]. In particular there is a unique ergodic measure of full dimension which is a Gibbs state.

The dimension theory of *non-conformal* repellers is still being developed and no such general formalism exists. The computation of Hausdorff dimension of non-conformal fractals began with the fundamental works by Bedford [4] and McMullen [20] on the *general Sierpinski carpets*, and their generalization [10] on the *Lalley-Gatzouras carpets*, as they are known today. See also [1] for an extension of the Lalley-Gatzouras carpets. These are self-affine fractals in the plane and there is an ergodic measure of full dimension, in fact Bernoulli (such a measure is, in general, not *unique* for Lalley-Gatzouras carpets [2]). There are also some *non-linear* versions of these results, [11], [15], [17] and [19], towards a *Dimension Formalism* for these kind of non-conformal repellers. In particular, in [15] and [19] we compute the Hausdorff dimension of *Non-linear Lalley-Gatzouras carpets* which, as the name suggests, are the $C^{1+\alpha}$ non-linear versions of the Lalley-Gatzouras carpets.

Other approaches try to give a formula for the Hausdorff dimension in a *generic* setting, instead of considering particular families as before. One such example is the famous *Falconer's formula* [8] which gives, under some hypotheses, the Hausdorff dimension of the self-affine fractal for 'almost every' translation vector-parameters, but does not tell for which parameters it holds (exceptions being the self-affine fractals in the plane considered in [12] and its non-linear versions [16]). In fact these two approaches are quite different, for the self-affine fractals for which Falconer's formula holds there is coincidence with Hausdorff and box-counting dimensions, as for the Lalley-Gatzouras carpets these two dimensions do not coincide in general [10]. More recently, Hochmann and Rapaport [13] gave a formula for the Hausdorff dimension of self-affine sets in the plane satisfying an *irreducibility* condition and an *exponential separation* condition.

The computation of the Hausdorff dimension of non-conformal fractals in \mathbb{R}^d , $d > 2$ reveals to be a much more difficult task. There is a natural way of defining the d -dimensional versions of general Sierpinski carpets and Lalley-Gatzouras

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 37D35, Secondary: 37A35.

Key words and phrases. Hausdorff dimension, non-conformal fractals, variational principle.

carpets which we shall call, respectively, *Sierpinski sponges* and *self-affine sponges*. Recently, in a major breakthrough, [7] showed that the *variational principle for the dimension* does not hold, in general, within the class of *Baranski sponges* (even for $d = 3$), i.e. there is not an ergodic measure of full dimension. They showed that the Hausdorff dimension in that class can be calculated via *pseudo-Bernoulli measures*. On the other hand, Kenyon and Peres [14] computed the Hausdorff dimension of Sierpinski sponges by proving the variational principle for the dimension and, moreover, there is a unique ergodic measure of full Hausdorff dimension, in fact Bernoulli (see also [9], and see [3] for a random version). We do not know if the variational principle for the dimension holds for self-affine sponges that are close to Sierpinski sponges but we will show that the Hausdorff dimension of self-affine sponges, $d = 3$, is Lipschitz continuous at Sierpinski sponges. Since the variational principle for the dimension holds for Sierpinski sponges, this implies that the variational principle for the dimension *almost* holds for self-affine sponges close to Sierpinski sponges. We notice that the continuity of the Hausdorff dimension in the class of *Baranski sponges* was proved in [7], but the class of self-affine sponges considered in this paper need not be *Baranski sponges*. Also by restricting to the continuity of Hausdorff dimension at Sierpinski sponges we are able to obtain more explicit and quantitative results.

1.1. Sierpinski sponges. We begin by describing the *Sierpinski sponges* studied in [14] (the multidimensional versions of the general Sierpinski carpets). Let $\mathbb{T}^d = \mathbb{R}^d/\mathbb{Z}^d$ be the d -dimensional torus and $f: \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^d$ be given by

$$f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d) = (l_1 x_1, l_2 x_2, \dots, l_d x_d)$$

where $l_1 \geq l_2 \geq \dots \geq l_d > 1$ are integers. The grids of hyperplanes

$$\begin{aligned} & \{i/l_1\} \times [0, 1]^{d-1}, i = 0, \dots, l_1 - 1 \\ & [0, 1] \times \{i/l_2\} \times [0, 1]^{d-2}, i = 0, \dots, l_2 - 1 \\ & \vdots \\ & [0, 1]^{d-1} \times \{i/l_d\}, i = 0, \dots, l_d - 1 \end{aligned}$$

form a set of boxes each of which is mapped by f onto the entire torus (these boxes are the domains of invertibility of f). Now choose some of these boxes and consider the fractal set Λ consisting of those points that always remain in these chosen boxes when iterating f . Geometrically, Λ is the limit (in the Hausdorff metric), or the intersection, of n -approximations: the 1-approximation consists of the chosen boxes; the 2-approximation consists in replacing each box of the 1-approximation by a rescaled affine copy of the 1-approximation, resulting in more and smaller boxes; the 3-approximation consists in replacing each box of the 2-approximation by a rescaled affine copy of the 1-approximation, and so on. We say that Λ is a *Sierpinski sponge*, and their Hausdorff dimension was computed in [14] (a formula is given in next section).

1.2. Self-affine sponges. Now we describe the *self-affine sponges* (the multidimensional versions of Lalley-Gatzouras carpets), which include as a very particular case the Sierpinski sponges. Let S_1, S_2, \dots, S_r be contractions of \mathbb{R}^d . Then there is a unique nonempty compact set Λ of \mathbb{R}^d such that

$$\Lambda = \bigcup_{i=1}^r S_i(\Lambda).$$

We will refer to Λ as the limit set of the semigroup generated by S_1, S_2, \dots, S_r . We are going to consider sets Λ which are limit sets of the semigroup generated by the

d -dimensional mappings $A_{i^1 i^2 \dots i^d}$ given by

$$A_{i^1 i^2 \dots i^d} = \begin{pmatrix} a_{i^1 i^2 \dots i^d} & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & a_{i^1 i^2 \dots i^{d-1}} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ & \vdots & & & \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & a_{i^1} \end{pmatrix} x + \begin{pmatrix} u_{i^1 i^2 \dots i^d} \\ u_{i^1 i^2 \dots i^{d-1}} \\ \vdots \\ u_{i^1} \end{pmatrix}$$

for $(i^1, i^2, \dots, i^d) \in \mathcal{I}$. Here

$$\mathcal{I} = \{(i^1, i^2, \dots, i^d) : 1 \leq i^1 \leq m, 1 \leq i^2 \leq m_{i^1}, \\ 1 \leq i^3 \leq m_{i^1 i^2}, \dots, 1 \leq i^d \leq m_{i^1 i^2 \dots i^{d-1}}\}$$

is a finite index set, and $0 < a_{i^1 \dots i^k} < 1$, $k = 1, \dots, d$ satisfy

$$a_{i^1 \dots i^k i^{k+1}} \leq a_{i^1 \dots i^k}.$$

Also, for each $(i^1, \dots, i^d) \in \mathcal{I}$ and $k \in \{1, \dots, d\}$,

$$\sum_{i^{k+1}=1}^{m_{i^1 \dots i^k}-1} a_{i^1 \dots i^k i^{k+1}} \leq 1$$

(when $k = 1$ the end of the sum is m) and

$$0 \leq u_{i^1 \dots i^k} < u_{i^1 \dots i^{k+1}} < 1, \quad u_{i^1 \dots i^{k+1}} - u_{i^1 \dots i^k} \geq a_{i^1 \dots i^k},$$

when $k > 1$, $i^k = m_{i^1 \dots i^{k-1}}$ we substitute $u_{i^1 \dots i^{k+1}}$ by 1. These hypotheses guarantee that the boxes

$$R_{i^1 \dots i^d} = A_{i^1 \dots i^d}([0, 1]^d)$$

have interiors that are pairwise disjoint, with edges parallel to the coordinate axes, the box $R_{i^1 \dots i^d}$ having k^{th} -edge with length $a_{i^1 \dots i^k}$. Geometrically, Λ is constructed like the Sierpinski sponges, with the 1-approximation consisting of the boxes $R_{i^1 \dots i^d}$, the 2-approximation consisting in replacing each box of the 1-approximation by a rescaled affine copy of the 1-approximation, and so on. See Figure 1 for an illustration of the case $d = 3$ (where we used c_i , b_{ij} , a_{ijk} instead of a_{i^1} , $a_{i^1 i^2}$, $a_{i^1 i^2 i^3}$, respectively). When $d = 2$ the sets Λ are the Lalley-Gatzouras carpets, and their 1-approximation corresponds to the projection onto the yz -plane of Figure 1. In general we say that Λ is a *self-affine sponge*.

Given $\mathbf{p} = (p_{i^1 \dots i^{d-1}})$ a collection of non-negative numbers satisfying

$$p_{i^1 \dots i^k} = \sum_{i^{k+1}} p_{i^1 \dots i^k i^{k+1}}, \quad k = d-2, d-3, \dots, 1 \\ \sum_{i^1} p_{i^1} = 1,$$

we define the numbers $\lambda_k(\mathbf{p})$, $k = 1, \dots, d-1$ by

$$\lambda_k(\mathbf{p}) = \frac{\sum_{i^1 \dots i^k} p_{i^1 \dots i^k} \log p_{i^1 \dots i^k} - \sum_{i^1 \dots i^{k-1}} p_{i^1 \dots i^{k-1}} \log p_{i^1 \dots i^{k-1}}}{\sum_{i^1 \dots i^k} p_{i^1 \dots i^k} \log a_{i^1 \dots i^k}},$$

(by convention: $0 \log 0 = 0$; for $k = 1$ the second sum in the numerator is 0) and the number $t(\mathbf{p})$ as the unique real in $[0, 1]$ satisfying

$$\sum_{i^1 \dots i^{d-1}} p_{i^1 \dots i^{d-1}} \log \left(\sum_{i^d} a_{i^1 \dots i^{d-1} i^d}^{t(\mathbf{p})} \right) = 0.$$




FIGURE 1. Self-affine sponges

The number $\sum_{k=1}^{d-1} \lambda_k(\mathbf{p})$ is the Hausdorff dimension in the hyperplane $x_2 \dots x_d$ of the set of generic points for the distribution \mathbf{p} ; the number $t(\mathbf{p})$ is the Hausdorff dimension of a typical 1-dimensional fibre in the x_1 -direction relative to the distribution \mathbf{p} , and is given by a *random Moran formula*. We will see that the sum of these two numbers is the Hausdorff dimension of a Bernoulli measure supported on Λ , and so we have the following result.

Theorem 1. *Let Λ be a self-affine sponge. Then*

$$\dim_{\text{H}} \Lambda \geq \sup_{\mathbf{p}} \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^{d-1} \lambda_k(\mathbf{p}) + t(\mathbf{p}) \right\}. \quad (1)$$

Here $\dim_{\text{H}} \Lambda$ stands for the Hausdorff dimension of a set Λ .

Problem. *When does equality hold in (1)?*

In other words, when does the *variational principle for the dimension* hold, in the class of self-affine sponges? When $d = 2$ this corresponds to Lalley-Gatzouras carpets and equality in (1) was proved in [10] (see also [15] for an alternative proof and [18] for a random version). For general d but with $a_{i1} \dots a_{ik} = a^{(k)}$, $k = 1, \dots, d$ this corresponds, essentially, to Sierpinski sponges and equality in (1) was, essentially, proved in [14].

As we know now, by [7], equality in (1) might not hold, in general, even when $d = 3$.

For the sake of clarity we will restrict to $d = 3$ (even though the results in this paper might extend to general d). In this case, we use the simpler notation c_i for a_i , $i = 1, \dots, m$ and b_{ij} for a_{ij} , $j = 1, \dots, m_j$, keeping the notation for a_{ijk} , $k = 1, \dots, m_{ij}$ (see Figure 1).

2. $(a, b, c; \varepsilon)$ -SPONGES

In this section $d = 3$.

Definition 1. We say that a self-affine sponge is an $(a, b, c; \varepsilon)$ -sponge, for some numbers $0 < a \leq b \leq c < 1$, $\varepsilon \geq 0$, if

$$e^{-\varepsilon} \leq \frac{a_{ijk}}{a} \leq e^{\varepsilon}, \quad e^{-\varepsilon} \leq \frac{b_{ij}}{b} \leq e^{\varepsilon}, \quad e^{-\varepsilon} \leq \frac{c_i}{c} \leq e^{\varepsilon},$$

for every $(i, j, k) \in \mathcal{I}$.

The case $\varepsilon = 0$ corresponds essentially to what we called Sierpinski sponges (even though the numbers a, b and c need not be integers), and we will still call Sierpinski sponges to this larger class. As said before, their Hausdorff dimension was, essentially, computed in [14] via the variational principle for the dimension. When we are *close* to a Sierpinski sponge, say an $(a, b, c; \varepsilon)$ -sponge with $\varepsilon > 0$ small, we do not know if the variational principle for the dimension holds but we know that the Hausdorff dimension is close to the Hausdorff dimension of the Sierpinski sponge $(a, b, c; 0)$. When we talk about continuity of the Hausdorff dimension of self-affine sponges it is implicit that their alphabet \mathcal{I} is fixed.

Denote by $\Lambda_{a,b,c}$ a Sierpinski sponge $(a, b, c; 0)$, and by $\Lambda_{a,b,c;\varepsilon}$ an $(a, b, c; \varepsilon)$ -sponge.

Let $\mathcal{J} = \{(i, j) : (i, j, k) \in \mathcal{I} \text{ for some } k\}$. Let

$$\underline{t} = \min_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{J}} \frac{\log m_{ij}}{-\log a} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{t} = \max_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{J}} \frac{\log m_{ij}}{-\log a}$$

Theorem 2. *Let $\Lambda_{a,b,c}$ be a Sierpinski sponge such that $\underline{t} < \bar{t}$. There exists a constant C (depending only on a, b, c and \mathcal{I}) such that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small*

$$\dim_{\text{H}} \Lambda_{a,b,c} - C\varepsilon \leq \dim_{\text{H}} \Lambda_{a,b,c;\varepsilon} \leq \dim_{\text{H}} \Lambda_{a,b,c} + C\varepsilon.$$

Remark 1. Going through the proof of Theorem 2 it is possible to give an explicit expression for C , if that is needed for some application, but that is not our purpose in this paper.

The lower estimate in Theorem 2 follows easily from Theorem 1. For the upper estimate in Theorem 2 we will construct a 2-parameter family of Bernoulli measures.

Given Λ a self-affine sponge we write

$$\text{VP}(\Lambda) = \sup_{\mathbf{p}} \{ \lambda_1(\mathbf{p}) + \lambda_2(\mathbf{p}) + t(\mathbf{p}) \}.$$

Even though we do not know if the variational principle for the dimension holds for $(a, b, c; \varepsilon)$ -sponges, $\varepsilon > 0$ small, we have the following result.

Corollary 1. *Let $\Lambda_{a,b,c}$ be a Sierpinski sponge such that $\underline{t} < \bar{t}$. There exists a constant C (depending only on a, b, c and \mathcal{I}) such that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small*

$$\text{VP}(\Lambda_{a,b,c;\varepsilon}) \leq \dim_{\text{H}} \Lambda_{a,b,c;\varepsilon} \leq \text{VP}(\Lambda_{a,b,c;\varepsilon}) + C\varepsilon.$$

The lower estimate in Corollary 1 follows from Theorem 1 and the upper estimate in Corollary 1 follows from the proof of Theorem 2.

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

In this part, d is any integer greater than or equal to 2.

There is a natural symbolic representation associated with our system that we shall describe now. Consider the sequence space $\Omega = \mathcal{I}^{\mathbb{N}}$. Elements of Ω will be represented by $\omega = (\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots)$ where $\omega_n = (i_n^1, \dots, i_n^d) \in \mathcal{I}$. Given $\omega \in \Omega$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\omega(n) = (\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots, \omega_n)$ and define the *cylinder of order n* ,

$$C_{\omega(n)} = \{ \omega' \in \Omega : \omega'_l = \omega_l, l = 1, \dots, n \},$$

and the *basic box of order n* ,

$$R_{\omega(n)} = A_{\omega_1} \circ A_{\omega_2} \circ \dots \circ A_{\omega_n}([0, 1]^d).$$

We have that $(R_{\omega(n)})_n$ is a decreasing sequence of closed boxes having k^{th} -edge with length $\prod_{l=1}^n a_{i_l^1} \dots a_{i_l^k}$. Thus $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} R_{\omega(n)}$ consists of a single point which belongs

to Λ that we denote by $\chi(\omega)$. This defines a continuous and surjective map $\chi: \Omega \rightarrow \Lambda$ which is at most 2^d to 1, and only fails to be a homeomorphism when some of the boxes $R_{i^1 \dots i^d}$ have nonempty intersection.

Let $\lambda(\mathbf{p}) = \sum_{k=1}^{d-1} \lambda_k(\mathbf{p})$. We shall construct probability measures $\mu_{\mathbf{p}}$ supported on Λ with

$$\dim_{\text{H}} \mu_{\mathbf{p}} = \lambda(\mathbf{p}) + t(\mathbf{p}).$$

This gives what we want because $\dim_{\text{H}} \Lambda \geq \dim_{\text{H}} \mu_{\mathbf{p}}$.

Let $\tilde{\mu}_{\mathbf{p}}$ be the Bernoulli measure on Ω that assigns to each symbol $(i^1, \dots, i^d) \in \mathcal{I}$ the probability

$$p_{i^1 \dots i^{d-1}} = \frac{a_{i^1 \dots i^d}^{t(\mathbf{p})}}{\sum_{j^d} a_{i^1 \dots i^{d-1} j^d}^{t(\mathbf{p})}}.$$

In other words, we have

$$\tilde{\mu}_{\mathbf{p}}(C_{\omega(n)}) = \prod_{l=1}^n p_{i_l^1 \dots i_l^{d-1}} = \frac{a_{i_1^1 \dots i_n^d}^{t(\mathbf{p})}}{\sum_{j^d} a_{i_1^1 \dots i_n^{d-1} j^d}^{t(\mathbf{p})}}.$$

Let $\mu_{\mathbf{p}}$ be the probability measure on Λ which is the pushforward of $\tilde{\mu}_{\mathbf{p}}$ by χ , i.e. $\mu_{\mathbf{p}} = \tilde{\mu}_{\mathbf{p}} \circ \chi^{-1}$.

For calculating the Hausdorff dimension of $\mu_{\mathbf{p}}$, we shall consider some special sets called *approximate cubes*. Given $\omega \in \Omega$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $n \geq (\log \min a_{i^1 \dots i^d}) / (\log \max a_{i^1})$, define $L_n^0(\omega) = n$,

$$\begin{aligned} L_n^1(\omega) &= \max \left\{ k \geq 1 : \prod_{l=1}^n a_{i_l^1} \leq \prod_{l=1}^k a_{i_l^1 i_l^2} \right\} \\ &\vdots \\ L_n^{d-1}(\omega) &= \max \left\{ k \geq 1 : \prod_{l=1}^n a_{i_l^1} \leq \prod_{l=1}^k a_{i_l^1 \dots i_l^d} \right\} \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

and the *approximate cube*

$$B_n(\omega) = \left\{ \bar{\omega} \in \Omega : \begin{array}{l} \bar{i}_l^1 = i_l^1, \quad l = 1, \dots, n \\ \bar{i}_l^2 = i_l^2, \quad l = 1, \dots, L_n^1(\omega) \\ \vdots \\ \bar{i}_l^d = i_l^d, \quad l = 1, \dots, L_n^{d-1}(\omega) \end{array} \right\}.$$

We have that each approximate cube $B_n(\omega)$ is a finite union of cylinder sets, and that approximate cubes are *nested*, i.e., given two, say $B_n(\omega)$ and $B_{n'}(\omega')$, either $B_n(\omega) \cap B_{n'}(\omega') = \emptyset$ or $B_n(\omega) \subset B_{n'}(\omega')$ or $B_{n'}(\omega') \subset B_n(\omega)$. Moreover, $\chi(B_n(\omega)) = \tilde{B}_n(\omega) \cap \Lambda$ where $\tilde{B}_n(\omega)$ is a closed box in \mathbb{R}^d with edges parallel to the coordinate axes, the k^{th} -edge with length $\prod_{l=1}^{L_n^{k-1}(\omega)} a_{i_l^1 \dots i_l^k}$. By (2),

$$1 \leq \frac{\prod_{l=1}^{L_n^{k-1}(\omega)} a_{i_l^1 \dots i_l^k}}{\prod_{l=1}^n a_{i_l^1}} \leq \max a_{i^1 \dots i^d}^{-1}, \tag{3}$$

for $k = 1, \dots, d$, hence the term “approximate cube”. It follows from (3) that

$$\frac{\sum_{l=1}^{L_n^{k-1}(\omega)} \log a_{i_l^1 \dots i_l^k}}{\sum_{l=1}^n \log a_{i_l^1}} = 1 + \frac{1}{n} \frac{\sum_{l=1}^{L_n^{k-1}(\omega)} \log a_{i_l^1 \dots i_l^k} - \sum_{l=1}^n \log a_{i_l^1}}{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n \log a_{i_l^1}} \rightarrow 1. \tag{4}$$

Also observe that $L_n^{k+1}(\omega) \leq L_n^k(\omega)$ and $L_n^k(\omega) \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

First we calculate the dimension of the “vertical” part. Let

$$\mathcal{J} = \{(i^1, \dots, i^{d-1}) : (i^1, \dots, i^{d-1}, i^d) \in \mathcal{I} \text{ for some } i^d\}$$

and $\Gamma = \mathcal{J}^{\mathbb{N}}$. Consider the natural projections $\tilde{\pi}: \Omega \rightarrow \Gamma$ and $\pi: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ given by $\pi(x_1, \dots, x_d) = (x_2, \dots, x_d)$. We consider the measures

$$\tilde{\nu}_{\mathbf{p}} = \tilde{\mu}_{\mathbf{p}} \circ \tilde{\pi}^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \nu_{\mathbf{p}} = \mu_{\mathbf{p}} \circ \pi^{-1}.$$

Lemma 1. *If $d > 2$ then for every $k \in \{1, \dots, d-2\}$,*

$$\frac{L_n^k(\omega)}{L_n^{k-1}(\omega)} \rightarrow \frac{\sum_{i^1 \dots i^k} p_{i^1 \dots i^k} \log a_{i^1 \dots i^k}}{\sum_{i^1 \dots i^{k+1}} p_{i^1 \dots i^{k+1}} \log a_{i^1 \dots i^{k+1}}} \quad \text{for } \tilde{\nu}_{\mathbf{p}}\text{-a.e. } \omega.$$

Proof. It follows from (4) that

$$\frac{\sum_{l=1}^{L_n^k(\omega)} \log a_{i_l^1 \dots i_l^{k+1}}}{\sum_{l=1}^{L_n^{k-1}(\omega)} \log a_{i_l^1 \dots i_l^k}} \rightarrow 1. \quad (5)$$

By Kolmogorov’s Strong Law of Large Numbers (KSLN),

$$\frac{1}{L_n^{k-1}(\omega)} \sum_{l=1}^{L_n^{k-1}(\omega)} \log a_{i_l^1 \dots i_l^k} \rightarrow \sum_{i^1 \dots i^k} p_{i^1 \dots i^k} \log a_{i^1 \dots i^k} \quad \text{for } \tilde{\nu}_{\mathbf{p}}\text{-a.e. } \omega \quad (6)$$

and (redundantly)

$$\frac{1}{L_n^k(\omega)} \sum_{l=1}^{L_n^k(\omega)} \log a_{i_l^1 \dots i_l^{k+1}} \rightarrow \sum_{i^1 \dots i^{k+1}} p_{i^1 \dots i^{k+1}} \log a_{i^1 \dots i^{k+1}} \quad \text{for } \tilde{\nu}_{\mathbf{p}}\text{-a.e. } \omega. \quad (7)$$

The result follows by (5), (6) and (7). \square

The next lemma is a multidimensional version of [10, Proposition 3.3].

Lemma 2. $\dim_{\text{H}} \nu_{\mathbf{p}} = \lambda(\mathbf{p})$.

Proof. To calculate the Hausdorff dimension of $\nu_{\mathbf{p}}$ we are going calculate its point-wise dimension and use [21, Theorem 7.1]. Remember that $\chi(B_n(\omega)) = \tilde{B}_n(\omega) \cap \Lambda$ where, by (3), $\tilde{B}_n(\omega)$ is “approximately” a ball in \mathbb{R}^d with radius $\prod_{l=1}^n a_{i_l^1}$, and that

$$\nu_{\mathbf{p}}(\pi \tilde{B}_n(\omega)) = \tilde{\nu}_{\mathbf{p}}(\tilde{\pi} B_n(\omega)).$$

Also, χ is at most 2^d to 1. Taking this into account, by [21, Theorem 7.1] together with [21, Theorem 15.3], one is left to prove that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \tilde{\nu}_{\mathbf{p}}(\tilde{\pi} B_n(\omega))}{\sum_{l=1}^n \log a_{i_l^1}} = \lambda(\mathbf{p}) \quad \text{for } \tilde{\nu}_{\mathbf{p}}\text{-a.e. } \omega.$$

It follows from the definition of $\tilde{\nu}_{\mathbf{p}}$ that, for $\tilde{\nu}_{\mathbf{p}}$ -a.e. ω , $p_{i_l^1 \dots i_l^d} > 0$ for every l , so we may restrict our attention to these ω . If $d = 2$ then $\tilde{\nu}_{\mathbf{p}}(\tilde{\pi} B_n(\omega)) = \prod_{l=1}^n p_{i_l^1}$ and the result follows by a direct application of KSLN. Otherwise we have that

$$\tilde{\nu}_{\mathbf{p}}(\tilde{\pi} B_n(\omega)) = \prod_{l=1}^{L_n^{d-2}(\omega)} p_{i_l^1 \dots i_l^{d-1}} \prod_{k=1}^{d-2} \prod_{l=L_n^k(\omega)+1}^{L_n^{k-1}(\omega)} p_{i_l^1 \dots i_l^k}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\log \tilde{\nu}_{\mathbf{p}}(\tilde{\pi} B_n(\omega))}{\sum_{l=1}^n \log a_{i_l^1}} &= \frac{\sum_{l=1}^{L_n^{d-2}(\omega)} \log p_{i_l^1 \dots i_l^{d-1}}}{\sum_{l=1}^n \log a_{i_l^1}} \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=1}^{d-2} \frac{\sum_{l=1}^{L_n^{k-1}(\omega)} \log a_{i_l^1 \dots i_l^k}}{\sum_{l=1}^n \log a_{i_l^1}} \frac{\sum_{l=L_n^k(\omega)+1}^{L_n^{k-1}(\omega)} \log p_{i_l^1 \dots i_l^k}}{\sum_{l=1}^{L_n^{k-1}(\omega)} \log a_{i_l^1 \dots i_l^k}} \\ &= \gamma_n + \sum_{k=1}^{d-2} \alpha_n^k \beta_n^k. \end{aligned}$$

By successive application of Lemma 1 one gets that

$$\frac{L_n^{d-2}(\omega)}{n} \rightarrow \frac{\sum_{i^1} p_{i^1} \log a_{i^1}}{\sum_{i^1 \dots i^{d-1}} p_{i^1 \dots i^{d-1}} \log a_{i^1 \dots i^{d-1}}} \text{ for } \tilde{\nu}_{\mathbf{p}}\text{-a.e. } \omega,$$

and so, by KSLLN,

$$\gamma_n = \frac{\frac{L_n^{d-2}(\omega)}{n} \frac{1}{L_n^{d-2}(\omega)} \sum_{l=1}^{L_n^{d-2}(\omega)} \log p_{i_l^1 \dots i_l^{d-1}}}{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n \log a_{i_l^1}} \rightarrow \frac{\sum_{i^1 \dots i^{d-1}} p_{i^1 \dots i^{d-1}} \log p_{i^1 \dots i^{d-1}}}{\sum_{i^1 \dots i^{d-1}} p_{i^1 \dots i^{d-1}} \log a_{i^1 \dots i^{d-1}}}$$

for $\tilde{\nu}_{\mathbf{p}}$ -a.e. ω . By (4), $\alpha_n^k \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 1$ for every k . We write

$$\beta_n^k = \frac{\frac{1}{L_n^{k-1}(\omega)} \sum_{l=1}^{L_n^{k-1}(\omega)} \log p_{i_l^1 \dots i_l^k} - \frac{L_n^k(\omega)}{L_n^{k-1}(\omega)} \frac{1}{L_n^k(\omega)} \sum_{l=1}^{L_n^k(\omega)} \log p_{i_l^1 \dots i_l^k}}{\frac{1}{L_n^{k-1}(\omega)} \sum_{l=1}^{L_n^{k-1}(\omega)} \log a_{i_l^1 \dots i_l^k}}.$$

Using KSLLN and Lemma 1 one gets that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \beta_n^k = \frac{\sum_{i^1 \dots i^k} p_{i^1 \dots i^k} \log p_{i^1 \dots i^k}}{\sum_{i^1 \dots i^k} p_{i^1 \dots i^k} \log a_{i^1 \dots i^k}} - \frac{\sum_{i^1 \dots i^k} p_{i^1 \dots i^k} \log p_{i^1 \dots i^k}}{\sum_{i^1 \dots i^{k+1}} p_{i^1 \dots i^{k+1}} \log a_{i^1 \dots i^{k+1}}} \text{ for } \tilde{\nu}_{\mathbf{p}}\text{-a.e. } \omega,$$

and this gives what we want after a simple rearrangement. \square

Lemma 3. $\dim_{\mathbf{H}} \mu_{\mathbf{p}} = \lambda(\mathbf{p}) + t(\mathbf{p})$.

Proof. As before, one is left to prove that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \tilde{\mu}_{\mathbf{p}}(B_n(\omega))}{\sum_{l=1}^n \log a_{i_l^1}} = \lambda(\mathbf{p}) + t(\mathbf{p}) \text{ for } \tilde{\mu}_{\mathbf{p}}\text{-a.e. } \omega.$$

We have that

$$\tilde{\mu}_{\mathbf{p}}(B_n(\omega)) = \tilde{\nu}_{\mathbf{p}}(\tilde{\pi} B_n(\omega)) \underbrace{\prod_{l=1}^{L_n^{d-1}(\omega)} \frac{a_{i_l^1 \dots i_l^d}^{t(\mathbf{p})}}{\sum_{i^d} a_{i_l^1 \dots i_l^{d-1} i^d}^{t(\mathbf{p})}}}_{\alpha_n},$$

By Lemma 2, we only have to prove that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \alpha_n}{\sum_{l=1}^n \log a_{i_l^1}} = t(\mathbf{p}) \text{ for } \tilde{\mu}_{\mathbf{p}}\text{-a.e. } \omega.$$

But

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\log \alpha_n}{\sum_{l=1}^n \log a_{i_l^1}} &= t(\mathbf{p}) \frac{\sum_{l=1}^{L_n^{d-1}(\omega)} \log a_{i_l^1 \dots i_l^d}}{\sum_{l=1}^n \log a_{i_l^1}} - \frac{\frac{1}{L_n^{d-1}(\omega)} \sum_{l=1}^{L_n^{d-1}(\omega)} \log \left(\sum_{i^d} a_{i_l^1 \dots i_l^{d-1} i^d}^{t(\mathbf{p})} \right)}{\frac{n}{L_n^{d-1}(\omega)} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n \log a_{i_l^1}} \\ &= t(\mathbf{p}) \beta_n - \frac{\gamma_n}{\delta_n}. \end{aligned}$$

That $\beta_n \rightarrow 1$ follows from (4). Now we can write

$$\gamma_n = \sum_{i^1 \dots i^{d-1}} \frac{P(\omega, L_n^{d-1}(\omega), i^1 \dots i^{d-1})}{L_n^{d-1}(\omega)} \log \left(\sum_{i^d} a_{i^1 \dots i^{d-1} i^d}^{t(\mathbf{p})} \right),$$

where

$$P(\omega, n, i^1 \dots i^{d-1}) = \# \{1 \leq l \leq n : (i_l^1 \dots i_l^{d-1}) = (i^1 \dots i^{d-1})\}$$

for $(i^1, \dots, i^{d-1}) \in \mathcal{J}$. By KSLN,

$$\frac{P(\omega, n, i^1 \dots i^{d-1})}{n} \rightarrow p_{i^1 \dots i^{d-1}} \text{ for } \tilde{\mu}_{\mathbf{p}}\text{-a.e. } \omega,$$

so, by the definition of $t(\mathbf{p})$,

$$\gamma_n \rightarrow 0 \text{ for } \tilde{\mu}_{\mathbf{p}}\text{-a.e. } \omega.$$

Since $n/L_n^{d-1}(\omega) \geq 1$, we have that $|\delta| \geq \log(\min a_{i^1}^{-1}) > 0$, so we also have that

$$\frac{\gamma_n}{\delta_n} \rightarrow 0 \text{ for } \tilde{\mu}_{\mathbf{p}}\text{-a.e. } \omega,$$

thus completing the proof. \square

As noticed in the beginning of this section, these lemmas imply

$$\dim_{\text{H}} \Lambda \geq \sup_{\mathbf{p}} \{\lambda(\mathbf{p}) + t(\mathbf{p})\}.$$

Remark 2. Theorem 1 can be extended to *non-linear self-affine sponges* by using the bounded distortion techniques employed in [15] (see also [19]).

4. A 2-PARAMETER FAMILY OF BERNOULLI MEASURES

In this section $d = 3$ and Λ is a self-affine sponge.

We start by generalizing the definitions of \underline{t} and \bar{t} for any self-affine sponge. Let $\underline{t} = \min_{\mathbf{p}} t(\mathbf{p})$ and $\bar{t} = \max_{\mathbf{p}} t(\mathbf{p})$. For $(i, j) \in \mathcal{J}$, define t_{ij} to be the unique real in $[0, 1]$ satisfying

$$\sum_{k=1}^{m_{ij}} a_{ijk}^{t_{ij}} = 1. \quad (8)$$

It is easy to see that

$$\underline{t} = \min_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{J}} t_{ij} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{t} = \max_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{J}} t_{ij}$$

We observe that the condition $\underline{t} < \bar{t}$ is *open* in the numbers a_{ijk} , so if it is satisfied for an $(a, b, c; 0)$ -sponge then it is also satisfied for an $(a, b, c; \varepsilon)$ -sponge, for some $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(a, \mathcal{I}) > 0$.

Let

$$\mathcal{P} = \left\{ \mathbf{p} = (p_{ij})_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{J}} : p_{ij} > 0 \text{ for all } (i, j) \in \mathcal{J} \text{ and } \sum_{i,j} p_{ij} = 1 \right\}.$$

We will need the following *generic* hypothesis on the numbers a_{ijk} . For each $t \in (\underline{t}, \bar{t})$, there exist $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $1 \leq j < j' \leq m_i$ such that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{m_{ij}} a_{ijk}^t \neq \sum_{k=1}^{m_{ij'}} a_{ij'k}^t. \quad (9)$$

In the next lemma there will be no restrictions on the numbers a_{ijk} (beside hypothesis (9)). In this way, we say that a self-affine sponge is an $(c, b; \varepsilon)$ -sponge, for some numbers $0 < b \leq c < 1$, $\varepsilon \geq 0$, if

$$e^{-\varepsilon} \leq \frac{b_{ij}}{b} \leq e^{\varepsilon}, \quad e^{-\varepsilon} \leq \frac{c_i}{c} \leq e^{\varepsilon},$$

for every $(i, j) \in \mathcal{J}$.

Lemma 4. *Let $0 < b \leq c \leq 1$, $0 < a_{ij} \leq 1$, $(i, j) \in \mathcal{J}$ and $\delta > 0$. There exists $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(c, b, a_{ij}, \mathcal{I}, \delta)$ such that if Λ is an $(b, c; \varepsilon)$ -sponge satisfying (9) and $\underline{t} < \bar{t}$ then: given $t \in [\underline{t} + \delta, \bar{t} - \delta]$ and $\rho \in [\delta, 1]$, there exists a probability vector $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{p}(t, \rho)$ such that $t(\mathbf{p}) = t$ and*

$$p_{ij} = c_i^{\lambda_1(\mathbf{p})} b_{ij}^{\lambda_2(\mathbf{p})} \left(\sum_k a_{ijk}^t \right)^\alpha \left(\sum_j b_{ij}^{\lambda_2(\mathbf{p})} \left(\sum_k a_{ijk}^t \right)^\alpha \right)^{\rho-1}, \quad (i, j) \in \mathcal{J},$$

where $\alpha = \alpha(t, \rho) \in \mathbb{R}$ is a C^1 function defined in $[\underline{t} + \delta, \bar{t} - \delta] \times [\delta, 1]$. Moreover, for each $\rho \in (0, 1]$, $\alpha(\underline{t} + \delta, \rho) \rightarrow -\infty$ and $\alpha(\bar{t} - \delta, \rho) \rightarrow \infty$ when $\delta \rightarrow 0$.

Proof. Given $\alpha, \lambda_1 \in \mathbb{R}$, $t \in (\underline{t}, \bar{t})$, $\rho \in (0, 1]$ and $\lambda_2 \in [0, 1]$, we define a probability vector $\mathbf{p}(\alpha, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, t, \rho)$ by

$$p_{ij}(\alpha, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, t, \rho) = C(\alpha, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, t, \rho) c_i^{\lambda_1} b_{ij}^{\lambda_2} \left(\sum_k a_{ijk}^t \right)^\alpha \gamma_i(\alpha, \lambda_2, t)^{\rho-1}$$

where

$$\gamma_i(\alpha, \lambda_2, t) = \sum_j b_{ij}^{\lambda_2} \left(\sum_k a_{ijk}^t \right)^\alpha$$

and

$$C(\alpha, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, t, \rho) = \left(\sum_i c_i^{\lambda_1} \gamma_i(\alpha, \lambda_2, t)^\rho \right)^{-1},$$

for each $(i, j) \in \mathcal{J}$.

Let F be the continuous function defined by

$$F(\alpha, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, t, \rho) = \sum_{i,j} p_{ij}(\alpha, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, t, \rho) \log \left(\sum_k a_{ijk}^t \right).$$

We are going to prove there exists a unique $\alpha = \alpha(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, t, \rho)$, continuously varying, such that $F(\alpha, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, t, \rho) = 0$, i.e. $t(\mathbf{p}(\alpha, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, t, \rho)) = t$.

Unicity. We have that, for each $(i, j) \in \mathcal{J}$,

$$\frac{\partial p_{ij}}{\partial \alpha} = \frac{1}{C} \frac{\partial C}{\partial \alpha} p_{ij} + \log \left(\sum_k a_{ijk}^t \right) p_{ij} + (\rho - 1) \frac{1}{\gamma_i} \frac{\partial \gamma_i}{\partial \alpha} p_{ij}.$$

Also,

$$\frac{1}{C} \frac{\partial C}{\partial \alpha} = -\rho \sum_i p_i \frac{1}{\gamma_i} \frac{\partial \gamma_i}{\partial \alpha} \quad (10)$$

and

$$\frac{1}{\gamma_i} \frac{\partial \gamma_i}{\partial \alpha} = \sum_j \frac{p_{ij}}{p_i} \log \left(\sum_k a_{ijk}^t \right) \quad (11)$$

where

$$p_i = \sum_j p_{ij} = C c_i^{\lambda_1} \gamma_i^\rho. \quad (12)$$

So, by simple rearrangement we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial F}{\partial \alpha} &= \sum_{i,j} \frac{\partial p_{ij}}{\partial \alpha} \log \left(\sum_k a_{ijk}^t \right) \\ &= \rho \left\{ \sum_i p_i \left(\sum_j \frac{p_{ij}}{p_i} \log \left(\sum_k a_{ijk}^t \right) \right)^2 - \left(\sum_{i,j} p_{ij} \log \left(\sum_k a_{ijk}^t \right) \right)^2 \right\} \\ &\quad + \sum_i p_i \left\{ \sum_j \frac{p_{ij}}{p_i} \left(\log \left(\sum_k a_{ijk}^t \right) \right)^2 - \left(\sum_j \frac{p_{ij}}{p_i} \log \left(\sum_k a_{ijk}^t \right) \right)^2 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we have that the expressions between curly brackets are non-negative and the second one is positive if there exists $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ such that the function

$$j \mapsto \sum_k a_{ijk}^t$$

is non-constant (note that $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{P}$). This is guaranteed by hypothesis (9). Thus $\partial F / \partial \alpha > 0$.

Existence. For fixed $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, t, \rho)$, we will look at the limit distributions of $\mathbf{p}(\alpha) = \mathbf{p}(\alpha, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, t, \rho)$ as α goes to $+\infty$ and $-\infty$. Let

$$A_t = \max_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{J}} \sum_k a_{ijk}^t.$$

For $(i, j) \in \mathcal{J}$ such that $t < t_{ij}$ (remember the definition (8)) we have that

$$\sum_k a_{ijk}^t > \sum_k a_{ijk}^{t_{ij}} = 1,$$

so $A_t > 1$. Consider $(\bar{i}, \bar{j}), (i, j) \in \mathcal{J}$ such that

$$\sum_k a_{ijk}^t < \sum_k a_{i\bar{j}k}^t = A_t.$$

We have

$$\frac{p_{ij}(\alpha)}{p_{i\bar{j}}(\alpha)} \leq D \left(\frac{\sum_k a_{ijk}^t}{\sum_k a_{i\bar{j}k}^t} \right)^\alpha \left(\frac{\gamma_{\bar{i}}(\alpha)}{\gamma_i(\alpha)} \right)^{1-\rho},$$

for some constant D not depending on α . Now, for $\alpha > 0$,

$$\frac{\gamma_{\bar{i}}(\alpha)}{\gamma_i(\alpha)} \leq \tilde{D} \left(\frac{\sum_k a_{ijk}^t}{\sum_k a_{i\bar{j}k}^t} \right)^\alpha,$$

for some constant \tilde{D} not depending on α . So,

$$\frac{p_{ij}(\alpha)}{p_{i\bar{j}}(\alpha)} \leq D \tilde{D} \left(\frac{\sum_k a_{ijk}^t}{\sum_k a_{i\bar{j}k}^t} \right)^{\alpha \rho},$$

which converges to 0 as $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$. This implies that

$$\sum_{i,j} p_{ij}(\alpha) \log \left(\sum_k a_{ijk}^t \right) \xrightarrow{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \log A_t > 0. \quad (13)$$

In the same way, defining

$$B_t = \min_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{J}} \sum_k a_{ijk}^t < 1,$$

and taking $(\underline{i}, \underline{j}), (i, j) \in \mathcal{J}$ such that

$$B_t = \sum_k a_{\underline{i}\underline{j}k}^t < \sum_k a_{ijk}^t,$$

we get, for $\alpha < 0$,

$$\frac{p_{ij}(\alpha)}{p_{ij}(\alpha)} \leq D\tilde{D} \left(\frac{\sum_k a_{ijk}^t}{\sum_k a_{ijk}^t} \right)^{\alpha\rho},$$

which converges to 0 as $\alpha \rightarrow -\infty$. This implies that

$$\sum_{i,j} p_{ij}(\alpha) \log \left(\sum_k a_{ijk}^t \right) \xrightarrow{\alpha \rightarrow -\infty} \log B_t < 0. \quad (14)$$

By (13), (14) and continuity, there exists $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $F(\alpha, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, t, \rho) = 0$. The continuity of $\alpha(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, t, \rho)$ follows from the uniqueness part and the implicit function theorem. Actually, since $F(\alpha, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, t, \rho)$ is continuously differentiable, we also get that $\alpha(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, t, \rho)$ is continuously differentiable. Observe that $t(\mathbf{p}) = \bar{t} \Rightarrow \mathbf{p} \in \partial\mathcal{P}$ (in this lemma we are assuming $\underline{t} < \bar{t}$), so since

$$t(\mathbf{p}(\alpha(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, t, \rho))) \rightarrow \bar{t} \quad \text{when} \quad t \rightarrow \bar{t}$$

then

$$\mathbf{p}(\alpha(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, t, \rho)) \rightarrow \partial\mathcal{P} \quad \text{when} \quad t \rightarrow \bar{t},$$

which implies

$$\alpha(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, t, \rho) \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{when} \quad t \rightarrow \bar{t}$$

(this convergence is uniform in $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in [0, 1]$, and ρ in a compact set of $(0, 1]$). In the same way we see that

$$\alpha(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, t, \rho) \rightarrow -\infty \quad \text{when} \quad t \rightarrow \underline{t}.$$

Moreover,

$$\frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial \lambda_1} = - \left(\frac{\partial F}{\partial \alpha} \right)^{-1} \frac{\partial F}{\partial \lambda_1}, \quad (15)$$

where

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial \lambda_1} = \sum_{i,j} \frac{\partial p_{ij}}{\partial \lambda_1} \log \left(\sum_k a_{ijk}^t \right) = \sum_{i,j} p_{ij} \log c_i \log \left(\sum_k a_{ijk}^t \right), \quad (16)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial \lambda_2} = - \left(\frac{\partial F}{\partial \alpha} \right)^{-1} \frac{\partial F}{\partial \lambda_2}, \quad (17)$$

where

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial \lambda_2} = \sum_{i,j} \frac{\partial p_{ij}}{\partial \lambda_2} \log \left(\sum_k a_{ijk}^t \right) = \sum_{i,j} p_{ij} \left(\log b_{ij} + (\rho - 1) \frac{1}{\gamma_i} \frac{\partial \gamma_i}{\partial \lambda_2} \right) \log \left(\sum_k a_{ijk}^t \right), \quad (18)$$

and

$$\frac{1}{\gamma_i} \frac{\partial \gamma_i}{\partial \lambda_2} = \sum_j \frac{p_{ij}}{p_i} \log b_{ij}. \quad (19)$$

Now we want to find $\lambda_1 = \lambda_1(\lambda_2, t, \rho)$ continuously differentiable such that

$$C(\alpha(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, t, \rho), \lambda_1, \lambda_2, t, \rho) = 1. \quad (20)$$

We have

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda_1} C(\alpha(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, t, \rho), \lambda_1, \lambda_2, t, \rho) = \frac{\partial C}{\partial \alpha} \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial \lambda_1} + \frac{\partial C}{\partial \lambda_1}$$

Observe that, by (10) and (11),

$$\frac{\partial C}{\partial \alpha} = 0$$

(at points $(\alpha(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, t, \rho), \lambda_1, \lambda_2, t, \rho)$), and

$$\frac{\partial \log C}{\partial \lambda_1} = \frac{1}{C} \frac{\partial C}{\partial \lambda_1} = - \sum_i p_i \log c_i \geq \min_i \log c_i^{-1} > 0. \quad (21)$$

So, $C(\alpha(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, t, \rho), \lambda_1, \lambda_2, t, \rho)$ is a continuously differentiable function, for each (λ_2, t, ρ) , is strictly increasing in λ_1 and, by (21), has limit ∞ as $\lambda_1 \rightarrow \infty$ and limit 0 as $\lambda_1 \rightarrow -\infty$. By the implicit function theorem, there is a unique $\lambda_1 = \lambda_1(\lambda_2, t, \rho)$, which is continuously differentiable, satisfying (20). Moreover,

$$\frac{\partial \lambda_1}{\partial \lambda_2} = - \left(\frac{\partial C}{\partial \lambda_1} \right)^{-1} \frac{\partial C}{\partial \lambda_2} \quad (22)$$

and

$$\frac{1}{C} \frac{\partial C}{\partial \lambda_2} = -\rho \sum_i p_i \frac{1}{\gamma_i} \frac{\partial \gamma_i}{\partial \lambda_2}. \quad (23)$$

So, by (21)-(23) and (19), we get

$$\frac{\partial \lambda_1}{\partial \lambda_2} = -\rho \frac{\sum_{i,j} p_{ij} \log b_{ij}}{\sum_i p_i \log c_i} \quad (24)$$

We see that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1(\mathbf{p}) &= \lambda_1 + \rho \frac{\sum_i p_i \log \gamma_i}{\sum_i p_i \log c_i}, \\ \lambda_2(\mathbf{p}) &= \lambda_2 - \frac{\sum_i p_i \log \gamma_i}{\sum_{i,j} p_{ij} \log b_{ij}}. \end{aligned}$$

We use the following notation

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Theta}(\lambda_2, t, \rho) &= (\alpha(\lambda_1(\lambda_2, t, \rho), \lambda_2, t, \rho), \lambda_1(\lambda_2, t, \rho), \lambda_2, t, \rho), \\ \Theta(\lambda_2, t, \rho) &= (\alpha(\lambda_1(\lambda_2, t, \rho), \lambda_2, t, \rho), \lambda_2, t, \rho). \end{aligned}$$

We want to prove there exists a unique $\lambda_2 = \lambda_2(t, \rho)$, continuously differentiable, such that

$$H(\lambda_2, t, \rho) := \sum_i p_i(\tilde{\Theta}) \log \gamma_i(\Theta) = 0.$$

By (12) and (20),

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda_2} \sum_i p_i(\tilde{\Theta}) \log \gamma_i(\Theta) &= \frac{\partial \lambda_1}{\partial \lambda_2} \sum_i p_i(\tilde{\Theta}) \log c_i \log \gamma_i(\Theta) \\ &+ \rho \sum_i p_i(\tilde{\Theta}) \frac{1}{\gamma_i(\Theta)} \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda_2} \gamma_i(\Theta) \log \gamma_i(\Theta) + \sum_i p_i(\tilde{\Theta}) \frac{1}{\gamma_i(\Theta)} \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda_2} \gamma_i(\Theta) \end{aligned}$$

We have that

$$\frac{1}{\gamma_i(\Theta)} \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda_2} \gamma_i(\Theta) = \frac{1}{\gamma_i(\Theta)} \frac{\partial \gamma_i}{\partial \alpha}(\Theta) \left(\frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial \lambda_1} \frac{\partial \lambda_1}{\partial \lambda_2} + \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial \lambda_2} \right) + \frac{1}{\gamma_i(\Theta)} \frac{\partial \gamma_i}{\partial \lambda_2}(\Theta).$$

Then, using (24) and (19), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda_2} \sum_i p_i(\tilde{\Theta}) \log \gamma_i(\Theta) &= \sum_{i,j} p_{ij}(\tilde{\Theta}) \log b_{ij} \\ &+ \rho \sum_i p_i(\tilde{\Theta}) \left\{ \sum_j \frac{p_{ij}(\tilde{\Theta})}{p_i(\tilde{\Theta})} \log b_{ij} - \log c_i \frac{\sum_{i,j} p_{ij}(\tilde{\Theta}) \log b_{ij}}{\sum_i p_i(\tilde{\Theta}) \log c_i} \right\} \log \gamma_i(\Theta) \quad (25) \end{aligned}$$

$$+ \rho \left(\frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial \lambda_1} \frac{\partial \lambda_1}{\partial \lambda_2} + \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial \lambda_2} \right) \sum_i p_i(\tilde{\Theta}) \frac{1}{\gamma_i(\Theta)} \frac{\partial \gamma_i}{\partial \alpha}(\Theta) \log \gamma_i(\Theta). \quad (26)$$

The term (25) can be made arbitrarily small if c_i and b_{ij} are sufficiently close to c and b , respectively. Note that $\log \gamma_i(\Theta)$ is uniformly bounded for $t \in [\underline{t} + \delta, \bar{t} - \delta]$ and $\rho \in [\delta, 1]$. The term (26) can also be made arbitrarily small if c_i and b_{ij} are

sufficiently close to c and b , respectively, because, by (15)-(19), $\frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial \lambda_1}$ and $\frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial \lambda_2}$ satisfy this property (and the other quantities are uniformly bounded for $t \in [\underline{t} + \delta, \bar{t} - \delta]$ and $\rho \in [\delta, 1]$, see (11)). Then

$$\frac{\partial H}{\partial \lambda_2} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda_2} \sum_i p_i(\tilde{\Theta}) \log \gamma_i(\Theta) < 0$$

if Λ is a $(c, b; \varepsilon)$ -sponge, for some $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(c, b, a_{ij}, \mathcal{I}, \delta) > 0$. Then the existence of $\lambda_2(t, \rho)$ as claimed follows from the implicit function theorem. \square

5. PROOF OF THEOREM 2 AND COROLLARY 1

It follows from definitions (2) that, for $(a, b, c; \varepsilon)$ -sponges,

$$-\frac{1}{n} + \frac{L_n^1 \varepsilon}{n \log b} + \frac{\varepsilon}{\log b} + \frac{\log c}{\log b} \leq \frac{L_n^1}{n} \leq \frac{\log c}{\log b} - \frac{\varepsilon}{\log b} - \frac{L_n^1 \varepsilon}{n \log b},$$

and similarly,

$$-\frac{1}{n} + \frac{L_n^2 \varepsilon}{n \log a} + \frac{\varepsilon}{\log a} + \frac{\log c}{\log a} \leq \frac{L_n^2}{n} \leq \frac{\log c}{\log a} - \frac{\varepsilon}{\log a} - \frac{L_n^2 \varepsilon}{n \log a}.$$

And so,

$$-\frac{1}{n} - A\varepsilon + \frac{\log c}{\log b} \leq \frac{L_n^1}{n} \leq \frac{\log c}{\log b} + A\varepsilon, \quad (27)$$

and

$$-\frac{1}{n} - A\varepsilon + \frac{\log c}{\log a} \leq \frac{L_n^2}{n} \leq \frac{\log c}{\log a} + A\varepsilon, \quad (28)$$

where A is a positive constant (depending only on a, b, c) and for every $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small.

We begin by proving the lower estimate in Theorem 2. We leave to the reader to prove that, for $(a, b, c; \varepsilon)$ -sponges,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m p_i \log p_i}{\sum_{i=1}^m p_i \log c_i} + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} p_{ij} \log p_{ij} - \sum_{i=1}^m p_i \log p_i}{\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} p_{ij} \log b_{ij}} \\ & \geq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m p_i \log p_i}{\log c} + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} p_{ij} \log p_{ij} - \sum_{i=1}^m p_i \log p_i}{\log b} - B\varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where B is a positive constant (depending only on a, b, c and \mathcal{I}) and for every $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small. Let t_0 be such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} p_{ij} \log \left(\sum_{k=1}^{m_{ij}} a_{ijk}^{t_0} \right) = 0.$$

We want to see that $t(\mathbf{p}) \geq t_0 - D\varepsilon$ for some positive constant D (depending only on a, b, c and \mathcal{I}) and for every $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small. This is true if

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} p_{ij} \log \left(\sum_{k=1}^{m_{ij}} a_{ijk}^{t_0 - D\varepsilon} \right) \geq 0.$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} p_{ij} \log \left(\sum_{k=1}^{m_{ij}} a_{ijk}^{t_0 - D\varepsilon} \right) \geq \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} p_{ij} \log \left(\sum_{k=1}^{m_{ij}} (ae^{-\varepsilon})^{t_0 - D\varepsilon} \right) \\ & \geq D\varepsilon \log a^{-1} - \varepsilon(t_0 - D\varepsilon) \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

for some appropriate D as before and for every $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small. Then we have that $\text{VP}(\Lambda_{a,b,c;\varepsilon}) \geq \text{VP}(\Lambda_{a,b,c}) - C\varepsilon$, for some positive constant C (depending

only on a, b, c and \mathcal{I}) and for every $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small. Using Theorem 1 and that $\dim_{\text{H}} \Lambda_{a,b,c} = \text{VP}(\Lambda_{a,b,c})$ we get $\dim_{\text{H}} \Lambda_{a,b,c;\varepsilon} \geq \dim_{\text{H}} \Lambda_{a,b,c} - C\varepsilon$, as we wish.

Remark 3. The fact that $\dim_{\text{H}} \Lambda_{a,b,c} = \text{VP}(\Lambda_{a,b,c})$ was *essentially* proved in [11]. Although in [11] the numbers a^{-1}, b^{-1}, c^{-1} are assumed to be integers, the proofs work the same when these numbers are not integers. Alternatively, this paper (see the next two lemmas) with $\varepsilon = 0$ also gives this result.

Now we prove the upper estimate in Theorem 2.

Lemma 5. *Let $0 < a \leq b \leq c \leq 1$ and assume $\underline{t} < \bar{t}$. There exists a positive constant \tilde{C} (depending only on a, b, c and \mathcal{I}) such that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small we have the following: if Λ is a $(a, b, c; \varepsilon)$ -sponge and $\omega \in \Omega$ there exists $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{P}$ such that*

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \tilde{\mu}_{\mathbf{p}}(B_n(\omega))}{\sum_{l=1}^n \log c_{i_l}} \leq \text{VP}(\Lambda) + \tilde{C}\varepsilon.$$

Proof. First assume that Λ satisfy hypothesis (9) (at the end of the proof we say how to deal with the general case). Fix $\omega \in \Omega$. We use the notation

$$d_{\mathbf{p},n}(\omega) = \frac{\log \tilde{\mu}_{\mathbf{p}}(B_n(\omega))}{\sum_{l=1}^n \log c_{i_l}}.$$

Then it follows from the proofs of Lemma 2 and Lemma 3 that, if $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{P}$,

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathbf{p},n}(\omega) &= \frac{\sum_{l=1}^n \log p_{i_l}}{\sum_{l=1}^n \log c_{i_l}} + \beta_n(\omega) \frac{\sum_{l=1}^{L_n^1(\omega)} \log p_{i_l j_l} - \sum_{l=1}^{L_n^1(\omega)} \log p_{i_l}}{\sum_{l=1}^{L_n^1(\omega)} \log b_{i_l j_l}} \\ &\quad + \eta_n(\omega) t(\mathbf{p}) - \frac{\sum_{l=1}^{L_n^2(\omega)} \log \left(\sum_k a_{i_l j_l k}^{t(\mathbf{p})} \right)}{\sum_{l=1}^n \log c_{i_l}} \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

where, by (4),

$$\beta_n(\omega) = \frac{\sum_{l=1}^{L_n^1(\omega)} \log b_{i_l j_l}}{\sum_{l=1}^n \log c_{i_l}} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 1$$

and

$$\eta_n(\omega) = \frac{\sum_{l=1}^{L_n^2(\omega)} \log a_{i_l j_l k_l}}{\sum_{l=1}^n \log c_{i_l}} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 1.$$

Given $t \in (\underline{t}, \bar{t})$ and $\rho \in (0, 1]$, consider the probability vector $\mathbf{p}(t, \rho)$, such that $t(\mathbf{p}(t, \rho)) = t$, given by Lemma 4. Applying (29) to $\mathbf{p}(t, \rho)$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathbf{p}(t,\rho),n}(\omega) &= \lambda_1(\mathbf{p}(t, \rho)) + \beta_n(\omega) \lambda_2(\mathbf{p}(t, \rho)) + \eta_n(\omega) t \\ &\quad + \frac{\rho \sum_{l=1}^n \log \gamma_{i_l}(t, \rho) - \sum_{l=1}^{L_n^1(\omega)} \log \gamma_{i_l}(t, \rho)}{\sum_{l=1}^n \log c_{i_l}} \\ &\quad + \frac{\alpha(t, \rho) \sum_{l=1}^{L_n^1(\omega)} \log \left(\sum_k a_{i_l j_l k}^t \right) - \sum_{l=1}^{L_n^2(\omega)} \log \left(\sum_k a_{i_l j_l k}^t \right)}{\sum_{l=1}^n \log c_{i_l}}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\gamma_i(t, \rho) = \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} b_{ij}^{\lambda_2(\mathbf{p}(t,\rho))} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{m_{ij}} a_{ijk}^t \right)^{\alpha(t,\rho)}.$$

We choose $\rho = \frac{\log c}{\log b}$ and t such that $\alpha(t, \rho) = \frac{\log b}{\log a}$. Using estimates (27), (28) and the fact that we are considering an $(a, b, c; \varepsilon)$ -sponge, we get

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathbf{p}(t, \rho), n}(\omega) &\leq \lambda_1(\mathbf{p}(t, \rho)) + \beta_n(\omega) \lambda_2(\mathbf{p}(t, \rho)) + \eta_n(\omega) t \\ &+ \frac{\frac{\log c}{\log b} \sum_{l=1}^n \log \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m_{i_l}} m_{i_l j}^{\frac{\log b}{\log a}} \right) - \sum_{l=1}^{\lfloor n \frac{\log c}{\log b} \rfloor} \log \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m_{i_l}} m_{i_l j}^{\frac{\log b}{\log a}} \right)}{\sum_{l=1}^n \log c_{i_l}} \\ &+ \frac{\frac{\log b}{\log a} \sum_{l=1}^{\lfloor n \frac{\log c}{\log b} \rfloor} \log m_{i_l j_l} - \sum_{l=1}^{\lfloor n \frac{\log c}{\log a} \rfloor} \log m_{i_l j_l}}{\sum_{l=1}^n \log c_{i_l}} + \tilde{C}\varepsilon + \frac{D}{n}, \end{aligned}$$

for some constants \tilde{C} and D (depending only on a, b, c and \mathcal{I}) and for every $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small. By [11, Lemma 4.1] we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \left\{ \frac{\log c}{\log b} \sum_{l=1}^n \log \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m_{i_l}} m_{i_l j}^{\frac{\log b}{\log a}} \right) - \sum_{l=1}^{\lfloor n \frac{\log c}{\log b} \rfloor} \log \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m_{i_l}} m_{i_l j}^{\frac{\log b}{\log a}} \right) \right. \\ \left. + \frac{\log b}{\log a} \sum_{l=1}^{\lfloor n \frac{\log c}{\log b} \rfloor} \log m_{i_l j_l} - \sum_{l=1}^{\lfloor n \frac{\log c}{\log a} \rfloor} \log m_{i_l j_l} \right\} \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

so

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} d_{\mathbf{p}(t, \rho), n}(\omega) \leq \lambda_1(\mathbf{p}(t, \rho)) + \lambda_2(\mathbf{p}(t, \rho)) + t + \tilde{C}\varepsilon \leq \text{VP}(\Lambda) + \tilde{C}\varepsilon.$$

Now we deal with hypothesis (9). Given $\eta > 0$, since the quantities in this lemma depend continuously on the numbers a_{ijk} , we can substitute a_{ijk} by arbitrarily close numbers \tilde{a}_{ijk} that satisfy hypothesis (9) and so that at the end we obtain $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} d_{\mathbf{p}(t, \rho), n}(\omega) \leq \text{VP}(\Lambda) + \tilde{C}\varepsilon + \eta$. Since η can be made arbitrarily close to zero by making \tilde{a}_{ijk} sufficiently close to a_{ijk} , we get the desired result. \square

Lemma 6. *Let $0 < a \leq b \leq c \leq 1$ and assume $\underline{t} < \bar{t}$. There exists a positive constant \tilde{C} (depending only on a, b, c and \mathcal{I}) such that, for every $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, if Λ is an $(a, b, c; \varepsilon)$ -sponge then*

$$\dim_{\text{H}} \Lambda \leq \text{VP}(\Lambda) + \tilde{C}\varepsilon.$$

Proof. Let $\xi > 0$. Consider the approximate cubes of order n given by $B_n(z) = \chi(B_n(\omega))$ where $\omega \in \chi^{-1}(z)$, $z \in \Lambda$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then it follows from Lemma 5 that

$$\forall z \in \Lambda \quad \forall N \in \mathbb{N} \quad \exists n > N \quad \exists \mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{P} : \frac{\log \mu_{\mathbf{p}}(B_n(z))}{\log |B_n(z)|} \leq \text{VP}(\Lambda) + \tilde{C}\varepsilon + \xi. \quad (30)$$

Given $\delta, \eta > 0$, we shall build a cover $\mathcal{U}_{\delta, \eta}$ of Λ by sets with diameter $< \eta$ such that

$$\sum_{U \in \mathcal{U}_{\delta, \eta}} |U|^{\text{VP}(\Lambda) + \tilde{C}\varepsilon + \xi + 2\delta} \leq \sqrt{3} (\max a_{ijk}^{-1}) M_{\delta}$$

where M_{δ} is an integer depending on δ but not on η . This implies that $\dim_{\text{H}} \Lambda \leq \text{VP}(\Lambda) + \tilde{C}\varepsilon + \xi + 2\delta$ which gives what we want because ξ and δ can be taken arbitrarily small. Let $c = \max c_i < 1$. It is clear that there exists a finite number of Bernoulli measures $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_{M_{\delta}}$ such that

$$\forall \mathbf{p} \quad \exists k \in \{1, \dots, M_{\delta}\} : \frac{\mu_{\mathbf{p}}(B_n)}{\mu_k(B_n)} \leq c^{-\delta n}$$

for all approximate cubes of order n , B_n . By (30), we can build a cover of Λ by approximate cubes $B_{n(z^i)}$, $i = 1, 2, \dots$ that are disjoint and have diameters $< \eta$, such that

$$\mu_{\mathbf{p}^i}(B_{n(z^i)}) \geq |B_{n(z^i)}|^{\text{VP}(\Lambda) + \tilde{C}\varepsilon + \xi + \delta}$$

for some probability vectors \mathbf{p}^i . It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_i |B_{n(z^i)}|^{\text{VP}(\Lambda) + \tilde{C}\varepsilon + \xi + 2\delta} &\leq \sum_i \mu_{\mathbf{p}^i}(B_{n(z^i)}) |B_{n(z^i)}|^\delta \\ &\leq \sum_i \mu_{k_i}(B_{n(z^i)}) c^{-\delta n(z^i)} \sqrt{3} (\max a_{ijk}^{-1}) c^{\delta n(z^i)} \\ &\leq \sqrt{3} (\max a_{ijk}^{-1}) \sum_{k=1}^{M_\delta} \sum_i \mu_k(B_{n(z^i)}) \leq \sqrt{3} (\max a_{ijk}^{-1}) M_\delta \end{aligned}$$

as we wish. \square

The upper estimate of Corollary 1 follows from Lemma 6. As in the beginning of this section, we have that $\text{VP}(\Lambda_{a,b,c;\varepsilon}) \leq \text{VP}(\Lambda_{a,b,c}) + D\varepsilon$ for some positive constant D (depending only on a, b, c and \mathcal{I}) and for every $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small. This together with Lemma 6 gives the upper estimate in Theorem 2.

REFERENCES

- [1] K. Baranski, Hausdorff dimension of the limit sets of some planar geometric constructions, *Adv. Math.* **210** (2007), 215-245.
- [2] J. Barral, D.-J. Feng, Non-uniqueness of ergodic measures with full Hausdorff dimension on Gatzouras-Lalley carpet, *Nonlinearity* **24** (2011), 2563-2567.
- [3] J. Barral, D.-J. Feng, Dimensions of random statistically self-affine Sierpinski sponges in \mathbb{R}^k , *J. Math. Pures Appl.* **149** (2021), 254-303.
- [4] T. Bedford, Crinkly curves, Markov partitions and box dimension of self similar sets, *PhD Thesis*, University of Warwick, 1984.
- [5] R. Bowen, *Equilibrium states and the ergodic theory of Anosov diffeomorphisms (Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 470)*. Springer, 1975.
- [6] R. Bowen, Hausdorff dimension of quasi-circles, *Publ. Math. I.H.E.S.* **50** (1979), 11-26.
- [7] T. Das and D. Simmons, The Hausdorff and dynamical dimensions of self-affine sponges: a dimension gap result, *Invent. Math.* (2017), 1-50.
- [8] K. Falconer, *Fractal geometry, Mathematical foundations and applications*, Wiley, 1990.
- [9] D.-J. Feng, Equilibrium states for factor maps between subshifts, *Adv. Math.* **226** (2011), 2470-2502.
- [10] D. Gatzouras and P. Lalley, Hausdorff and box dimensions of certain self-affine fractals, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **41** (1992), 533-568.
- [11] D. Gatzouras and Y. Peres. Invariant measures of full dimension for some expanding maps, *Ergod. Th. & Dynam. Sys.* **17** (1997), 147-167.
- [12] I. Heuter and S. Lalley. Falconer's formula for the Hausdorff dimension of a self-affine set in \mathbb{R}^2 , *Ergod. Th. & Dynam. Sys.* **15** (1997), 77-97.
- [13] M. Hochman, A. Rapaport, Hausdorff dimension of planar self-affine sets and measures with overlaps, *J. Eur. Math. Soc.* (2021), published online first.
- [14] R. Kenyon and Y. Peres, Measures of full dimension on affine-invariant sets, *Ergod. Th. and Dynam. Sys.* **16** (1996), 307-323.
- [15] N. Luzia, A variational principle for the dimension for a class of non-conformal repellers, *Ergod. Th. & Dynam. Sys.* **26** (2006), 821-845.
- [16] N. Luzia. Hausdorff dimension for an open class of repellers in \mathbb{R}^2 . *Nonlinearity* **19** (2006), 2895-2908.
- [17] N. Luzia, Measure of full dimension for a class of nonconformal repellers, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.* **26** (2010), 291-302.
- [18] N. Luzia, Hausdorff dimension of certain random self-affine fractals, *Stoch. Dyn.* **11** (2011), 627-642.
- [19] N. Luzia, On the uniqueness of an ergodic measure of full dimension for non-conformal repellers, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.* **37** (2017), 5763-5780.
- [20] C. McMullen, The Hausdorff dimension of general Sierpiński carpets, *Nagoya Math. J.* **96** (1984), 1-9.
- [21] Ya. Pesin, *Dimension Theory in Dynamical Systems: Contemporary Views and Applications*, Chicago University Press, 1997.
- [22] D. Ruelle, Repellers for real analytic maps, *Ergod. Th. and Dynam. Sys.* **2** (1982), 99-107.
- [23] D. Ruelle, *Thermodynamic Formalism*, Second Edition, Cambridge University Press, 2004.

- [24] Ya. Sinai, Gibbs measures in ergodic theory, *Uspehi Mat. Nauk* **27** (1972), 21-64. English translation: *Russian Math. Surveys* **27** (1972), 21-69.

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DO RIO DE JANEIRO, INSTITUTO DE MATEMÁTICA, RIO DE JANEIRO
21941-909, BRAZIL
Email address: `nuno@im.ufrj.br`