

# TOPOLOGY AUTOMATON AND CONFORMAL DIMENSION OF POST-CRITICALLY FINITE SELF-SIMILAR SETS

HUI RAO, ZHI-YING WEN, QIHAN YUAN\*, AND YUAN ZHANG

**ABSTRACT.** In this paper, we use a class of finite state automata, called topology automaton, to study the metric classification of a special class of post-critically finite self-similar sets. As an application, we prove that the conformal dimension of post-critically finite self-similar dendrites and fractal gasket with connected component is 1.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Quasisymmetric mapping is introduced by Beurling and Ahlfors [4]. Let  $(X, d_X)$  and  $(Y, d_Y)$  be two metric spaces. A homeomorphism  $f : (X, d_X) \rightarrow (Y, d_Y)$  is said to be *quasisymmetric* if there exists an increasing homeomorphism  $\eta$  of  $[0, \infty)$  to itself such that

$$(1.1) \quad d_X(x, y) \leq t d_X(x, z) \quad \Rightarrow \quad d_Y(f(x), f(y)) \leq \eta(t) d_Y(f(x), f(z))$$

for all  $x, y, z \in X$ ; in this case we say that  $(X, d_X)$  and  $(Y, d_Y)$  are *quasisymmetrically equivalent*. The conformal dimension introduced by Pansu [22] is one of the most important quasisymmetry invariants.

**Definition 1.1. conformal dimension:** Let  $(X, d_X)$  be a metric space. The conformal dimension of  $(X, d_X)$ , denoted by  $\dim_C(X, d_X)$ , is the infimum of the Hausdorff dimensions of all metric spaces quasisymmetrically equivalent to  $(X, d_X)$ , i.e.

$$\dim_C(X, d_X) = \inf \{ \dim_H(Y, d_Y); (Y, d_Y) \text{ is quasisymmetrically equivalent to } (X, d_X) \}.$$

Recently, many works have been devoted to the study of the conformal dimension of self-similar sets [5, 9, 11, 19, 20, 26]. J. T. Tyson and J. M. Wu [26] proved that the conformal dimension of the Sierpinski gasket is 1. C. J. Bishop and J. T. Tyson [5] proved that the conformal dimension of the antenna set is 1. J. Kigami [19] showed that the conformal dimension of the Sierpinski carpet is not greater than  $\frac{\log(\frac{9+\sqrt{41}}{2})}{\log 3} \approx 1.858183$ . Y. G. Dang and S. Y. Wen [9] proved that the conformal dimension of a class of planar self-similar dendrites is one. L. V. Kovalev [20] proved that metric spaces of Hausdorff dimension strictly less than one have conformal dimension zero. H. Hakobyan [11] showed that there are sets of zero length and conformal dimension 1. (A self-similar

---

*Date:* March 21, 2023.

\* The correspondence author.

set is said to be an *antenna set*, if it is the attractor of the IFS  $\{f_1(z) = \frac{1}{2}z, f_2(z) = \frac{1}{2}z + \frac{1}{2}, f_3^\alpha(z) = \alpha iz + \frac{1}{2}, f_4^\alpha(z) = -\alpha iz + \frac{1}{2} + \alpha i\}$ , where  $0 < \alpha < \frac{1}{2}$ .)

An *iterated function system (IFS)* is a family of contractions  $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^N$  on a complete metric space  $(X, d)$ , and the *attractor* of it is the unique nonempty compact set  $K$  satisfying  $K = \bigcup_{i=1}^N f_i(K)$ . The attractor  $K$  is called a *self-similar set* if the contractions are all similitudes (see [16]).

We say that  $f : (X, d_X) \rightarrow (Y, d_Y)$  is a bi-Lipschitz map, if there exists constants  $0 < A, B < +\infty$  such that

$$Ad_X(x, y) \leq d_Y(f(x), f(y)) \leq Bd_X(x, y), \quad \text{for all } x, y \in X.$$

For simplicity, we always assume that all mappings in an IFS are bi-Lipschitz in this paper.

Let  $F = \{f_i\}_{i=1}^N$  be an IFS, and let  $K$  be the attractor. Denote  $\Sigma = \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$  and  $\Sigma^* = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \Sigma^k$  the set of all finite words. Refer to J. Kigami [18], the *critical set*  $C_F$  and the *post-critical set*  $P_F$  of  $F$  are defined as

$$C_F = \bigcup_{i \neq j \in \Sigma} f_i(K) \cap f_j(K) \quad \text{and} \quad P_F = \bigcup_{\omega \in \Sigma^*} f_\omega^{-1}(C_F) \cap K,$$

where  $f_{\omega_1 \dots \omega_k} = f_{\omega_1} \circ \dots \circ f_{\omega_k}$ . Let  $\pi_K : \Sigma^\infty \rightarrow K$  be the *coding map* defined by

$$\{\pi_K(i_1 i_2 \dots)\} = \bigcap_{k \geq 1} f_{i_1 \dots i_k}(K).$$

It is following [18] that  $\pi_K$  is continuous. For ease of notation, we use  $C, P$  and  $\pi$  instead of  $C_F, P_F$  and  $\pi_K$  as long as it can not cause any confusion. It is following [18] that  $\pi^{-1}(P) = \bigcup_{n \geq 1} \sigma^n(\pi^{-1}(C))$ , where  $\sigma : \Sigma^\infty \rightarrow \Sigma^\infty$  is defined by  $\sigma(i_1 i_2 \dots) = i_2 i_3 \dots$ . An IFS is said to be a *post-critically finite (p.c.f.)* IFS if  $\pi^{-1}(P)$  is a finite set.

In this paper, we focus on a special class of p.c.f. fractals. An IFS  $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^N$  is said to satisfy the *single intersection condition (SIC)* if for any  $i, j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$  with  $i \neq j$ ,  $\{f_i(K) \cap f_j(K)\}$  contains at most one point. Let  $F = \{f_i\}_{i=1}^N$  be an IFS satisfying the SIC. We say that  $F$  satisfies the *angle separation condition (ASC)*, if there exists constant  $c > 0$ , such that for 1-order cylinders  $f_i(K), f_j(K)$ ,  $i \neq j$  and  $f_i(K) \cap f_j(K) = \{z\}$ , it holds that  $d(x, y) \geq c \max\{d(x, z), d(y, z)\}$  for any  $x \in f_i(K), y \in f_j(K)$ .

**Remark 1.2.** The angle separation condition was first introduced by Zhu and Yang [27] in the Euclidean space.

Rao and Zhu [24] using the neighborhood automaton have proved that two fractal squares which are not totally disconnected are Lipschitz equivalent. Huang, Wen, Yang and Zhu use a class of finite state automata to study the classification of self-similar sets in [15].

In the present paper, we use a class of finite state automata, called *topology automaton*, to determine whether two p.c.f. self-similar sets that satisfy the SIC and ASC are Hölder, Lipschitz or quasisymmetrically equivalent. Topological automaton promote the triangle automaton in Huang

et al. [15], then we can use it to study a larger class of self-similar sets. As an application, we prove that the conformal dimension of p.c.f self-similar dendrites and fractal gasket with connected component is one.

**1.1. Topology automaton.** First, let us recall the finite state automaton.

**Definition 1.3.** (see [14]) A **finite state automaton** is a 5-tuple  $(Q, A, \delta, q_0, Q')$ , where  $Q$  is a finite set of states,  $A$  is a finite input alphabet,  $q_0$  in  $Q$  is the initial state,  $Q' \subset Q$  is the set of final states, and  $\delta$  is the transition function mapping  $Q \times A$  to  $Q$ . That is,  $\delta(q, a)$  is a state for each state  $q$  and input symbol  $a$ .

Huang et al. defined the topology automaton for fractal gasket in [15]. Here we generalize the definition to p.c.f fractals.

**Definition 1.4. Topology automaton :** Let  $F = \{f_i\}_{i=1}^N$  be a p.c.f. IFS satisfying the SIC, and let  $K$  be the attractor. Let  $P$  be the post-critical set of  $F$ . For a pair of points  $u, v \in P$  (here  $u$  can equal to  $v$ ), we associate with it a state and denote it by  $S_{uv}$ . Denote  $N = \{S_{uv}\}_{u,v \in P}$ . We define a finite state automaton  $M_F$  as following:

$$M_F = (Q, \Sigma^2, \delta, Id, Exit),$$

where the state set is  $Q = N \cup \{Id, Exit\}$ , the input alphabet is  $\Sigma^2 = \{1, \dots, N\}^2$ , the initial state is  $Id$ , the final state is  $Exit$ , and the transition function  $\delta$  is given by:

$$(i) \delta(Id, (i, j)) = \begin{cases} Id, & \text{if } i = j; \\ S_{uv}, & \text{if } i \neq j, f_i(K) \cap f_j(K) \neq \emptyset \text{ and } (u, v) \in P^2 \text{ is the unique pair such that} \\ & f_i(v) = f_j(u); \\ Exit, & \text{if } i \neq j \text{ and } f_i(K) \cap f_j(K) = \emptyset. \end{cases}$$

$$(ii) \delta(S_{u_1 v_1}, (i, j)) = \begin{cases} S_{u_2 v_2}, & \text{if } (u_2, v_2) \in P^2 \text{ such that } f_i(v_2) = v_1 \text{ and } f_j(u_2) = u_1 \text{ (where } (u_2, v_2) \\ & \text{is the unique pair by the SIC);} \\ Exit, & \text{otherwise (that is } v_1 \notin f_i(K) \text{ or } u_1 \notin f_j(K)). \end{cases}$$

We call  $M_F$  the **topology automaton** of  $F$ .

**Remark 1.5.** If two IFS satisfying the SIC sharing a same topology automaton, then their attractors are homeomorphic. We can obtain better results under more assumptions.

**Theorem 1.1.** Let  $F = \{f_i\}_{i=1}^N, G = \{g_i\}_{i=1}^N$  be the p.c.f. IFS on the complete metric space  $(X, d_1), (Y, d_2)$  respectively. Let  $K, K'$  be the attractors of  $F, G$  respectively. Suppose

- (i) both  $F$  and  $G$  satisfy the SIC and the ASC;
- (ii)  $F$  and  $G$  have the same topology automaton.

Then  $(K, d_1)$  and  $(K', d_2)$  are Hölder equivalent.

**Remark 1.6.** M. Samuel, A. Tetenov and D. Vaulin [23] introduced a class of IFS, which is called polygonal tree system, and studied when their attractors are Hölder equivalent. Their result is a special case of the Theorem 1.1.

Let  $F = \{f_i\}_{i=1}^N$  be a p.c.f. IFS, and let  $K$  be the attractor. Denote

$$\partial\Sigma_K = \{\mathbf{x}|_1; \mathbf{x} \in \pi_K^{-1}(P_F)\}.$$

**Theorem 1.2.** *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.1, suppose  $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^N$  and  $\{g_i\}_{i=1}^N$  are contractive similitudes. For self-similar IFS  $F$  and  $G$ , we denote  $r_i, r'_i$  as the contraction ratio of  $f_i, g_i$  respectively.*

(i) *If  $r_i = r'_i$  for any  $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ , then  $(K, d_1)$  and  $(K', d_2)$  are Lipschitz equivalent.*

(ii) *If there exist  $s > 0$  such that  $r'_i = (r_i)^s$  for any  $i \in \partial\Sigma_K$ , then  $(K, d_1)$  and  $(K', d_2)$  are quasisymmetrically equivalent.*

**Remark 1.7.** Let  $K, K'$  be fractal triangles (see Definition 1.9). If they have the same topology automaton and are of uniform contraction ratio  $r$ , then  $K$  and  $K'$  are Lipschitz equivalent, which is part of the result of Huang, Wen, Yang and Zhu [15].

**1.2. Conformal dimension of a class of self-similar dendrites.** A *continuum* means a compact connected space. A *dendrite* means a locally connected continuum containing no simple closed curve.

For the theory related to dendrite, one can refer to the paper [6] of J. Charatonik and W. Charatonik. For studies of self-similar dendrites, see [2, 7, 9, 12, 17, 23]. M. Samuel, A. Tetenov and D. Vaulin [23] used the polygonal tree systems to construct self-similar dendrites and discussed their classification. Y. G. Dang and S. Y. Wen [9] proved that the conformal dimension of a class of planar self-similar dendrites is one. Jun Kigami [17] applied the methods of harmonic calculus on fractals to dendrites. D. A. Croydon [7] constructed a collection of random self-similar dendrites and calculated its Hausdorff dimension. We prove the following result.


**Theorem 1.3.** *Let  $F = \{f_i\}_{i=1}^N$  be a self-similar p.c.f. IFS with dendrite attractor  $K$ . If  $F$  satisfies the ASC, then  $\dim_C K = 1$ .*

**Example 1.8.** Y. G. Dang and S. Y. Wen [9] consider the follow IFS. Let  $0 < \alpha < 1/2$  and let

$$f_1^\alpha(z) = \frac{z}{2}, f_2^\alpha(z) = \frac{1}{2} - \alpha iz, f_3^\alpha(z) = \frac{z+1}{2}, f_4^\alpha(z) = \frac{1}{2} + \alpha iz.$$

Let  $K_\alpha$  be the attractor of  $F = \{f_i^\alpha\}_{i=1}^4$  on  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . Clearly,  $K_\alpha$  is a self-similar dendrite and  $F$  satisfies the ASC. Then  $\dim_C K_\alpha = 1$  for any  $0 < \alpha < 1/2$  by Theorem 1.3, which is the result of [9].

**1.3. Conformal dimension of the fractal gasket.** Let  $\Delta \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  be the regular triangle with vertexes  $a_1 = (0, 0), a_2 = (1, 0), a_3 = (1/2, \sqrt{3}/2)$ .


 FIGURE 1. The first iteration of  $K_\alpha$ 

**Definition 1.9.** (see [15]) Let  $\{r_1, \dots, r_N\} \in (0, 1)^N$  and  $\{d_1, \dots, d_N\} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ . Let  $K$  be a self-similar set generated by the IFS  $F = \{f_i\}_{i=1}^N$ , where  $f_i(z) = r_i(z + d_i)$ . We call  $K$  a **fractal gasket** if

- (i)  $\bigcup_{i=1}^N f_i(\Delta) \subset \Delta$ ;
- (ii) for any  $i \neq j$ ,  $f_i(\Delta)$  and  $f_j(\Delta)$  can only intersect at their vertices.

We call the  $F$  a **fractal gasket IFS**.

**Theorem 1.4.** Let  $K$  be a fractal gasket. If  $K$  is totally disconnected, then  $\dim_C K = 0$ . If  $K$  have a connected component, then  $\dim_C K = 1$ .

In fact, we conjecture that the conformal dimension of all p.c.f self-similar sets with connected component satisfying the SIC and ASC is 1, but we have not proved it yet.

**Example 1.10.** Let

$$f_1(z) = \frac{z}{2}, \quad f_2(z) = \frac{z+1}{2}, \quad f_3(z) = \frac{z + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}i}{2}.$$

Let  $K$  be the attractor of  $F = \{f_i\}_{i=1}^3$  on  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . We also say that  $K$  is a *Sierpinski gasket*. J. T. Tyson and J. M. Wu [26] considered the conformal dimension of the Sierpinski gasket as follows.

Fix a positive integer  $m \in \mathbb{N}^*$ . Let  $F_m$  be the  $m$ -level vertex iteration of  $F$  (see section 5 for the definition), i.e.

$$F_m = \{f_i^{(m+1)}; i = 1, 2, 3\} \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^3 \bigcup_{\ell=1}^m \{f_i^\ell \circ f_k; k = 1, 2, 3 \text{ and } k \neq i\}.$$

Clearly, the attractor of the IFS  $F_m$  is still the Sierpinski gasket  $K$ . Figure 2 shows the images of  $\Delta$  under the mappings in  $F_1$  and  $F_2$ . Next, they define a deformation of  $F_m$ , denoted by  $\mathcal{G}_m$ .  $\mathcal{G}_m$  replace the geometrically decreasing sequence of triangles  $f_i^\ell \circ f_k(\Delta)$  with a row of equally sized triangles.  $\mathcal{G}_1$  and  $\mathcal{G}_2$  are shown in Figure 3. Let  $K_m$  be the attractor of  $\mathcal{G}_m$ . Finally they proved  $K_m$  and  $K$  are quasimetrically equivalent, and the Hausdorff dimension of  $K_m$  tends to 1 when  $m$  tends to  $\infty$ .

FIGURE 2. The images of  $\Delta$  under the mappings in  $F_1$  and  $F_2$ FIGURE 3. The images of  $\Delta$  under the mappings in  $\mathcal{G}_1$  and  $\mathcal{G}_2$ 

In this paper, we construct a new metric  $D$  on  $K$  such that  $(K, d)$  and  $(K, D)$  are quasisymmetrically equivalent, where  $d$  is the Euclidean metric on  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . Let  $G_0$  be the complete graph with the vertex set  $\{a_1, a_2, a_3\}$ . Let  $\tau_0 : G_0 \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  be a weight function satisfying the following conditions: if  $e = \overline{a_i a_j}$  with  $i \neq j$ ,  $\tau_0(e) = 1$ ; if  $e = \overline{a_i a_i}$ ,  $\tau_0(e) = 0$ . Then  $(G_0, \tau_0)$  is a weighted graph. We define  $D_0(x, y)$  by the minimum of the weights of all paths joining  $x, y$  in  $G_0$ . Then  $D_0$  is a metric on  $\{a_1, a_2, a_3\}$ .

Fix a positive integer  $m \in \mathbb{N}^*$ . Let  $F_m$  be the  $m$ -level vertex iteration of  $F$ . For  $n \geq 1$ , let  $G_n$  be the union of affine images of  $G_0$  under  $F_m^n$ , that is,

$$G_n = \bigcup_{g \in F_m^n} g(G_0).$$

Let  $R(g) = \frac{1}{(2m+2)^n}$ . Let  $e$  be an edge in  $G_n$ , then  $e$  can be written as  $e = g(h)$ , where  $g \in F_m^n$  and  $h \in G_0$ . We define the weight of the edge  $e$  in  $G_n$ , denoted by  $\tau_n(e)$ , to be  $R(g)\tau_0(h)$ . Then  $(G_n, \tau_n)$  is a weighted graph. We define  $D_n(x, y)$  by the minimum of the weights of all paths joining  $x, y$  in  $G_n$ . Then  $D_n$  is a metric on  $\cup_{g \in F_m^n} g(\{a_1, a_2, a_3\})$  and satisfies compatibility.

For any  $x, y \in K$ . Let  $\{x_n\}_{n \geq 1}, \{y_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  be two sequences of points such that  $x_n \rightarrow x, y_n \rightarrow y$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $x_n, y_n \in \cup_{g \in F_m^n} g(\{a_1, a_2, a_3\})$ . We define

$$D(x, y) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} D_n(x_n, y_n).$$

For any  $g \in F_m$ ,  $g : (K, D) \rightarrow (K, D)$  is a similitude with contraction ratio  $R(g) = \frac{1}{2m+2}$ . Then  $(K, d)$  and  $(K, D)$  are quasisymmetrically equivalent by Theorem 1.2. So the conformal dimension of  $K$

is no more than the similarity dimension of  $F_m$  with respect to the metric  $D$ . Since  $\dim_S(F_m, D) = \frac{\log(6m+3)}{\log(2m+2)} \rightarrow 1$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ . Thus  $\dim_C K = 1$ .

## 2. THE PROOF OF THE THEOREM 1.1 AND THE THEOREM 1.2

For the remainder of this section,  $F = \{f_i\}_{i=1}^N$  will be a p.c.f. IFS that satisfies the SIC and the ASC with attractor  $K$ , and  $M_F$  is the topology automaton of  $F$ .

For  $x \in K$ , we call the *lowest coding* of  $x$  is the smallest member with respect to lexicographical order in  $\pi_K^{-1}(\{x\})$ . We set

$$\Sigma_K = \{ \text{lowest codings of points in } K \},$$

then  $\tilde{\pi}_K := \pi_K|_{\Sigma_K} : \Sigma_K \rightarrow K$  is a bijection.

By inputting symbol string  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in \Sigma^\infty \times \Sigma^\infty$  to  $M_F$ , we obtain a sequence of states starting from  $Id$  and call it the *itinerary* of  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ , i.e.

$$Id \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ y_1 \end{pmatrix}} \text{state 1} \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} x_2 \\ y_2 \end{pmatrix}} \text{state 2} \rightarrow \cdots .$$

If we arrive at the state *Exit*, then we stop there and the itinerary is finite, otherwise, it is infinite. Following [15], for  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \Sigma_K$ , we define  $T_F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ , the *surviving time* of  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ , to be the number of the input pairs when arriving at *Exit*. In particular, if the itinerary is infinite, then we define  $T_F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \infty$ .

For  $\mathbf{I} \in \Sigma^*$ , we denote by  $|\mathbf{I}|$  the length of  $\mathbf{I}$ , and use  $\mathbf{I} \wedge \mathbf{J}$  to denote the maximal common prefix of  $\mathbf{I}$  and  $\mathbf{J}$ .

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $\mathbf{x} = (x_k)_{k=1}^\infty, \mathbf{y} = (y_k)_{k=1}^\infty \in \Sigma_K$  with  $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{y}$ . If  $T_F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = n$ , then  $n$  is the smallest number such that  $f_{x_1 \dots x_n}(K) \cap f_{y_1 \dots y_n}(K) = \emptyset$ .*

*Proof.* Denote  $m = |\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{y}|$ . Clearly  $n > m$ .

If  $n = m + 1$ , then  $f_{x_1 \dots x_n}(K) \cap f_{y_1 \dots y_n}(K) = \emptyset$  by the definition of surviving time. The Lemma holds. Suppose  $m + 1 < n < \infty$ . The itinerary of  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  are

$$(2.1) \quad Id \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ y_1 \end{pmatrix}} Id \rightarrow \cdots \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} x_m \\ y_m \end{pmatrix}} Id \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} x_{m+1} \\ y_{m+1} \end{pmatrix}} S_{u_1 v_1} \rightarrow \cdots \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} x_{n-1} \\ y_{n-1} \end{pmatrix}} S_{u_{n-m-1} v_{n-m-1}} \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} x_n \\ y_n \end{pmatrix}} Exit.$$

First we show that  $f_{x_1 \dots x_{n-1}}(K) \cap f_{y_1 \dots y_{n-1}}(K) \neq \emptyset$  and  $f_{x_1 \dots x_{n-1}}(v_{n-m-1}) = f_{y_1 \dots y_{n-1}}(u_{n-m-1})$  is the intersection point. By (2.1), we have  $(u_1, v_1) \in P^2$  ( $P$  is the post-critical set) and  $f_{x_{m+1}}(v_1) = f_{y_{m+1}}(u_1)$ , both sides of the role of the common prefix mapping, we have  $f_{x_1 \dots x_{m+1}}(v_1) = f_{y_1 \dots y_{m+1}}(u_1)$ . By the SIC,  $f_{x_1 \dots x_{m+1}}(K) \cap f_{y_1 \dots y_{m+1}}(K) \neq \emptyset$  and  $f_{x_1 \dots x_{m+1}}(v_1) = f_{y_1 \dots y_{m+1}}(u_1)$  is the intersection point.

Moreover,  $(\{u_k\}_{k=2}^{n-m-1}, \{v_k\}_{k=2}^{n-m-1}) \subset P^2$  and  $f_{x_{m+k}}(v_k) = v_{k-1}$ ,  $f_{y_{m+k}}(u_k) = u_{k-1}$  for  $2 \leq k \leq n-m-1$ . For each  $k$ , we replace in turn the equation  $f_{x_{m+1}}(v_1) = f_{y_{m+1}}(u_1)$ , and both sides of the role of the common prefix mapping, then we have

$$f_{x_1 \dots x_{n-1}}(v_{n-m-1}) = f_{y_1 \dots y_{n-1}}(u_{n-m-1}).$$

Since  $u_{n-m-1} \notin f_{y_n}(K)$  or  $v_{n-m-1} \notin f_{x_n}(K)$ , we have  $f_{x_1 \dots x_n}(K) \cap f_{y_1 \dots y_n}(K) = \emptyset$ .  $\square$

Let  $X = (X, d)$  be a metric space. For  $A, B \subset X$ , we define the *distance* between  $A$  and  $B$  by

$$\text{dist}(A, B) = \inf\{d(x, y) : x \in A, y \in B\},$$

and define the *diameter* of set  $A$  by  $\text{diam}(A) = \sup\{d(x, y) : x, y \in A\}$ .

Set  $\xi_1$  to be the minimum distance of all 1-order non-intersecting cylinders, i.e.

$$(2.2) \quad \xi_1 = \min\{\text{dist}(f_i(K), f_j(K)) : i, j \in \Sigma \text{ and } f_i(K) \cap f_j(K) = \emptyset\}.$$

Set  $\xi_2$  to be the minimum distance between a 1-order cylinder and a post-critical point that does not intersect with it, i.e.

$$(2.3) \quad \xi_2 = \min\{\text{dist}(f_i(K), a) : i \in \Sigma, a \in P \text{ and } a \notin f_i(K)\}.$$

Clearly  $\xi_1, \xi_2 > 0$ .

For the family of bi-Lipschitz mappings  $F = \{f_i\}_{i=1}^N$ , we denote  $A_i(B_i)$  by the left (right) Lipschitz constant of  $f_i$ , and denote  $A_* = \min_{1 \leq i \leq N} \{A_i\}$ ,  $B^* = \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} \{B_i\}$ .

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let  $\mathbf{x} = (x_k)_{k=1}^\infty, \mathbf{y} = (y_k)_{k=1}^\infty \in \Sigma_K$  with  $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{y}$ . If  $T_F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = n$ , then there exists constants  $c_1, c_2 > 0$  such that*

$$(2.4) \quad c_1(A_*)^n \leq d(\pi(\mathbf{x}), \pi(\mathbf{y})) \leq c_2(B^*)^n.$$

*Proof.* Denote  $m = |\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{y}|$ , and  $\mathbf{I} = \mathbf{x}|_m$ . Denote  $x = \pi(\mathbf{x})$ ,  $y = \pi(\mathbf{y})$ .

On the one hand, since  $T_F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = n$ , we have  $f_{x_1 \dots x_{n-1}}(K) \cap f_{y_1 \dots y_{n-1}}(K) \neq \emptyset$  by Lemma 2.1, then

$$d(x, y) \leq \text{diam}(f_{x_1 \dots x_{n-1}}(K)) + \text{diam}(f_{y_1 \dots y_{n-1}}(K)) \leq \frac{2\text{diam}(K)}{B^*}(B^*)^n.$$

On the other hand, if  $n = m + 1$ , then  $f_{\mathbf{I}x_{m+1}}(K) \cap f_{\mathbf{I}y_{m+1}}(K) = \emptyset$ , thus

$$d(x, y) \geq \text{dist}(f_{\mathbf{I}x_{m+1}}(K), f_{\mathbf{I}y_{m+1}}(K)) \geq \xi_1(A_*)^m > \xi_1(A_*)^n.$$

If  $n > m + 1$ , then  $f_{x_{m+1}}(K) \cap f_{y_{m+1}}(K) \neq \emptyset$ . By the SIC, they intersect a single point, denoted by  $z$ . Denote  $x' = f_{\mathbf{I}}^{-1}(x)$ ,  $y' = f_{\mathbf{I}}^{-1}(y)$  and  $z' = f_{\mathbf{I}}^{-1}(z)$ . Then  $x' \in f_{x_{m+1}}(K)$ ,  $y' \in f_{y_{m+1}}(K)$  and  $f_{x_{m+1}}(K) \cap f_{y_{m+1}}(K) = z'$ . By the ASC, there is a constant  $c > 0$  such that

$$(2.5) \quad d(x', y') \geq c \max\{d(x', z'), d(y', z')\}.$$



By the Lemma 2.1, we have  $f_{x_{m+1} \cdots x_{n-1}}(K) \cap f_{y_{m+1} \cdots y_{n-1}}(K) = z'$  and  $f_{x_{m+1} \cdots x_n}(K) \cap f_{y_{m+1} \cdots y_n}(K) = \emptyset$ , so either  $z' \notin f_{x_{m+1} \cdots x_n}(K)$  or  $z' \notin f_{y_{m+1} \cdots y_n}(K)$ . Without loss of generality, we assume that  $z' \notin f_{x_{m+1} \cdots x_n}(K)$ . Then

$$d(x', z') \geq \xi_2(A_*)^{n-m-1}.$$

By (2.5), we have

$$d(x, y) = d(f_I(x'), f_I(y')) \geq (A_*)^m d(x', y') \geq \frac{c\xi_2}{A_*}(A_*)^n.$$

Set  $c_1 = \min\left\{\xi_1, \frac{c\xi_2}{A_*}\right\}$ ,  $c_2 = \frac{2\text{diam}(K)}{B^*}$ , we obtain the lemma.  $\square$

**The proof of the Theorem 1.1.** We show that  $\widetilde{\pi}_{K'} \circ \widetilde{\pi}_K^{-1}$  is the bi-Hölder map from  $(K, d_1)$  to  $(K', d_2)$ .

Pick  $x, y \in K$  with  $x \neq y$ . Denote  $n = T_G(\widetilde{\pi}_K^{-1}(x), \widetilde{\pi}_K^{-1}(y))$ . Let  $c_1, c_2, A_*$  and  $B^*$  are the constants in the Lemma 2.2 with respect to the IFS  $G$ . By (2.4), we have

$$(2.6) \quad c_1(A_*)^n \leq d_2\left(\widetilde{\pi}_{K'} \circ \widetilde{\pi}_K^{-1}(x), \widetilde{\pi}_{K'} \circ \widetilde{\pi}_K^{-1}(y)\right) \leq c_2(B^*)^n,$$

Since the two topology automaton are the same, we have  $T_F(\widetilde{\pi}_K^{-1}(x), \widetilde{\pi}_K^{-1}(y)) = T_G(\widetilde{\pi}_K^{-1}(x), \widetilde{\pi}_K^{-1}(y)) = n$ . Combining (2.6) and (2.4), we have

$$(2.7) \quad C^{-1}d_1(x, y)^{1/s} \leq d_2\left(\widetilde{\pi}_{K'} \circ \widetilde{\pi}_K^{-1}(x), \widetilde{\pi}_{K'} \circ \widetilde{\pi}_K^{-1}(y)\right) \leq Cd_1(x, y)^s,$$

where  $C, s$  are positive constants.  $\square$

**Definition 2.3.** Let  $\mathbf{x} = (x_i)_{i=1}^\infty, \mathbf{y} = (y_i)_{i=1}^\infty \in \Sigma_K$  with  $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{y}$ . Denote  $k = |\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{y}|$ ,  $\mathbf{I} = \mathbf{x}|_k$ . We define the **separation prefix** of  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ , denoted by  $S_F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ , as follows:

- (i) If  $f_{\mathbf{I}x_{k+1}}(K) \cap f_{\mathbf{I}y_{k+1}}(K) = \emptyset$ , then we set  $S_F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = (\mathbf{x}|_{k+1}, \mathbf{y}|_{k+1})$ .
- (ii) If  $f_{\mathbf{I}x_{k+1}}(K) \cap f_{\mathbf{I}y_{k+1}}(K) = \{a\}$  and  $a \notin \{\pi(\mathbf{x}), \pi(\mathbf{y})\}$ , then we set  $S_F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = (\mathbf{x}|_m, \mathbf{y}|_n)$ , where  $m, n$  are the smallest integers such that  $a \notin f_{x_1 \cdots x_m}(K)$  and  $a \notin f_{y_1 \cdots y_n}(K)$  respectively.
- (iii) If  $f_{\mathbf{I}x_{k+1}}(K) \cap f_{\mathbf{I}y_{k+1}}(K) = \{a\}$  and  $a = \pi(\mathbf{x})$ , then we set  $S_F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}|_n)$ , where  $n$  is the smallest integer such that  $a \notin f_{y_1 \cdots y_n}(K)$ . (If  $f_{\mathbf{I}x_{k+1}}(K) \cap f_{\mathbf{I}y_{k+1}}(K) = \{a\}$  and  $a = \pi(\mathbf{y})$ , then we set  $S_F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = (\mathbf{x}|_m, \mathbf{y})$ , where  $m$  is the smallest integer such that  $a \notin f_{x_1 \cdots x_m}(K)$ .)

Let  $F = \{f_i\}_{i=1}^N$  be a family of contractive similitudes, and let  $r_i$  be the contraction ratios of  $f_i$ . For  $\omega = \omega_1 \cdots \omega_k \in \Sigma^*$ , we define  $r_\omega = \prod_{n=1}^k r_{\omega_n}$ , and for  $\omega = (\omega_k)_{k=1}^\infty \in \Sigma^\infty$ , define  $r_\omega = 0$ . Take  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \Sigma_K$ , we define a metric-like function  $\rho_K$  on  $\Sigma_K \times \Sigma_K$  as

$$\rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \max\{r_\mu, r_\nu\},$$

where  $(\mu, \nu) = S_F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ . In particular, we define  $\rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = 0$  when  $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y}$ .

We denote  $r^* = \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} \{r_i\}$ ,  $r_* = \min_{1 \leq i \leq N} \{r_i\}$ .

**Lemma 2.4.** If all  $f_i$  are contractive similitudes, then there is a constant  $c_3 > 0$  such that

$$(2.8) \quad c_3^{-1} \rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \leq d(\pi(\mathbf{x}), \pi(\mathbf{y})) \leq c_3 \rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}), \quad \text{for any } \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \Sigma_K.$$

*Proof.* Pick  $\mathbf{x} = (x_k)_{k=1}^\infty, \mathbf{y} = (y_k)_{k=1}^\infty \in \Sigma_K$ . Denote  $x = \pi(\mathbf{x}), y = \pi(\mathbf{y}), k = |\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{y}|, \mathbf{I} = \mathbf{x}|_k$ . According to the definition of the separation prefix of  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ , we divide the proof into 3 cases.

Case 1:  $f_{\mathbf{I}x_{k+1}}(K) \cap f_{\mathbf{I}y_{k+1}}(K) = \emptyset$ .

In this case, we have  $S_F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = (\mathbf{x}|_{k+1}, \mathbf{y}|_{k+1})$ , so  $\rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = r_{\mathbf{I}} \max\{r_{x_{k+1}}, r_{y_{k+1}}\}$ .

Since  $x, y \in f_{\mathbf{I}}(K)$ , so we have

$$(2.9) \quad d(x, y) \leq \text{diam}(f_{\mathbf{I}}(K)) \leq \text{diam}(K) r_{\mathbf{I}} \frac{\max\{r_{x_{k+1}}, r_{y_{k+1}}\}}{r_*} = \frac{\text{diam}(K)}{r_*} \rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y});$$

and  $f_{\mathbf{I}x_{k+1}}(K) \cap f_{\mathbf{I}y_{k+1}}(K) = \emptyset$  implies that

$$(2.10) \quad d(x, y) \geq \text{dist}(f_{\mathbf{I}x_{k+1}}(K), f_{\mathbf{I}y_{k+1}}(K)) \geq r_{\mathbf{I}} \xi_1 \geq r_{\mathbf{I}} \xi_1 \max\{r_{x_{k+1}}, r_{y_{k+1}}\} = \xi_1 \rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}),$$

where  $\xi_1$  is defined as (2.2).

Case 2:  $f_{\mathbf{I}x_{k+1}}(K) \cap f_{\mathbf{I}y_{k+1}}(K) = \{a\}$  and  $a \notin \{x, y\}$ .

In this case, we have  $S_F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = (\mathbf{x}|_m, \mathbf{y}|_n)$ , where  $m, n$  are the smallest integer such that  $a \notin f_{x_1 \dots x_m}(K)$  and  $a \notin f_{y_1 \dots y_n}(K)$  respectively. Then  $\rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \max\{r_{x_1 \dots x_m}, r_{y_1 \dots y_n}\}$ .

On one hand, we have  $f_{x_1 \dots x_{m-1}}(K) \cap f_{y_1 \dots y_{n-1}}(K) = \{a\}$  by the SIC, then

$$(2.11) \quad \begin{aligned} d(x, y) &\leq \text{diam}(f_{x_1 \dots x_{m-1}}(K)) + \text{diam}(f_{y_1 \dots y_{n-1}}(K)) \\ &\leq 2 \text{diam}(K) \frac{\max\{r_{x_1 \dots x_m}, r_{y_1 \dots y_n}\}}{r_*} = \frac{2 \text{diam}(K)}{r_*} \rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by the ASC, there is a constant  $c > 0$  such that

$$d(x, y) \geq c \max\{d(x, a), d(y, a)\}.$$

Since  $a \notin f_{x_1 \dots x_m}(K)$  and  $a \notin f_{y_1 \dots y_n}(K)$ , we have  $d(x, a) \geq \xi_2 r_{x_1 \dots x_{m-1}}$  and  $d(y, a) \geq \xi_2 r_{y_1 \dots y_{n-1}}$ . Hence

$$(2.12) \quad d(x, y) \geq c \xi_2 \max\{r_{x_1 \dots x_{m-1}}, r_{y_1 \dots y_{n-1}}\} \geq \frac{c \xi_2}{r_*} \rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}),$$

where  $\xi_2$  is defined as (2.3).

Case 3:  $f_{\mathbf{I}x_{k+1}}(K) \cap f_{\mathbf{I}y_{k+1}}(K) = \{a\}$  and  $a \in \{x, y\}$ .

We only prove the case  $a = x$  (the case of  $a = y$  is similar).

In this case, we have  $S_F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}|_n)$ , where  $n$  is the smallest integer such that  $a \notin f_{y_1 \dots y_n}(K)$ , and  $\rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = r_{y_1 \dots y_n}$ . Since  $x \in f_{y_1 \dots y_{n-1}}(K)$ , so

$$(2.13) \quad d(x, y) \leq \text{diam}(f_{y_1 \dots y_{n-1}}(K)) \leq \frac{\text{diam}(K)}{r_*} \rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}).$$

Since  $a \notin f_{y_1 \dots y_n}(K)$ , we have

$$(2.14) \quad d(x, y) = d(a, y) \geq \xi_2 r_{y_1 \dots y_{n-1}} \geq \frac{\xi_2}{r_*} \rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}),$$

where  $\xi_2$  is defined as (2.3).

Summing up with (2.9)-(2.14), set  $c_3 = \max \left\{ \frac{2\text{diam}(K)}{r_*}, \frac{1}{\xi_1}, \frac{r^*}{c\xi_2}, \frac{r^*}{\xi_2} \right\}$ , the Lemma holds.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.5.** *Let  $\mathbf{x} = (x_k)_{k=1}^\infty, \mathbf{y} = (y_k)_{k=1}^\infty \in \Sigma_K$  with  $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{y}$ . Denote  $\ell = |\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{y}|$ ,  $\mathbf{I} = \mathbf{x}|_\ell$ . Suppose the separation prefix of  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  is type (ii) in Definition 2.3. Denote  $\{a\} = f_{\mathbf{I}x_{\ell+1}}(K) \cap f_{\mathbf{I}y_{\ell+1}}(K)$  and denote  $m, n$  the smallest integer such that  $a \notin f_{x_1 \dots x_m}(K)$ ,  $a \notin f_{y_1 \dots y_n}(K)$  respectively. Then*

$$\{x_k\}_{k=\ell+2}^{m-1}, \{y_k\}_{k=\ell+2}^{n-1} \subset \partial \Sigma_K.$$

*Proof.* Recall that  $\partial \Sigma_K = \{\mathbf{x}|_1; \mathbf{x} \in \pi_K^{-1}(P_F)\}$ . By the assumption  $f_{\mathbf{I}x_{\ell+1}}(K) \cap f_{\mathbf{I}y_{\ell+1}}(K) = \{a\}$ , we know that  $f_{\mathbf{I}}^{-1}(a)$  is a critical point. Since  $m, n$  are the smallest integers such that  $a \notin f_{x_1 \dots x_m}(K)$ ,  $a \notin f_{y_1 \dots y_n}(K)$  respectively, then words  $x_{\ell+1}x_{\ell+2} \dots x_{m-1}$  and  $y_{\ell+1}y_{\ell+2} \dots y_{n-1}$  are the prefixes of two coding of  $f_{\mathbf{I}}^{-1}(a)$  in  $\pi_K^{-1}$ , respectively. Since  $\pi_K^{-1}(P_F) = \bigcup_{n \geq 1} \sigma^n(\pi_K^{-1}(C_F))$ , then the Lemma holds.  $\square$

**Corollary 2.6.** *Suppose the separation prefix of  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  is type (iii) in Definition 2.3. Denote  $\{a\} = f_{\mathbf{I}x_{\ell+1}}(K) \cap f_{\mathbf{I}y_{\ell+1}}(K)$  and denote  $n$  the smallest integer such that  $a \notin f_{y_1 \dots y_n}(K)$  respectively. Then*

$$\{x_k\}_{k \geq \ell+2}, \{y_k\}_{k=\ell+2}^{n-1} \subset \partial \Sigma_K.$$

We denote  $r'^* = \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} \{r'_i\}$ ,  $r'_* = \min_{1 \leq i \leq N} \{r'_i\}$ .

**The proof of the Theorem 1.2.** First we prove the first assertion. Since  $F$  and  $G$  have the same automaton and the corresponding contraction ratios are the same, so  $\rho_K = \rho_{K'}$ . By the Lemma 2.4, we have  $\tilde{\pi}_{K'} \circ \tilde{\pi}_K^{-1}$  is the bi-Lipschitz map from  $(K, d_1)$  to  $(K', d_2)$ .

Now, we prove the second assertion. We are going to show that  $\tilde{\pi}_{K'} \circ \tilde{\pi}_K^{-1}$  is the quasisymmetric from  $(K, d_1)$  to  $(K', d_2)$ .

Pick  $\mathbf{x} = (x_k)_{k=1}^\infty, \mathbf{y} = (y_k)_{k=1}^\infty, \mathbf{z} = (z_k)_{k=1}^\infty \in \Sigma_K, t \in [0, \infty)$ . We assume that  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}$  are distinct. According to the Lemma 2.4, to prove that  $\tilde{\pi}_{K'} \circ \tilde{\pi}_K^{-1}$  is a quasisymmetric we only need to prove that if  $\rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \leq t\rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$ , then there exists a homeomorphism  $\eta$  of  $[0, \infty)$  to itself such that

$$(2.15) \quad \rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \leq \eta(t)\rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}).$$

Next, we show that

$$\eta(t) = \max \left\{ \frac{t}{r'_* r_*}, \frac{t(r'_*)^{\log t - \log r_*} / \log r^*}{r_*}, \frac{t^s (r'_*)^{\log t - \log r_*} / \log r^*}{(r'_*)^2 (r_*)^s}, \frac{t^s}{(r'_*)^3 (r_*)^{2s}}, \frac{t^s (r'_*)^{\frac{\log t}{\log r^*}}}{(r'_*)^3 (r_*)^{2s}} \right\}$$

is the desired homeomorphism. Each term in the curly brackets of the above equation is of type  $at^b$ , where  $a, b$  are positive constants, so  $\eta(t)$  is a homeomorphism. Denote  $\ell = |\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{y} \wedge \mathbf{z}|$ , and  $\mathbf{I} = \mathbf{x}|_\ell$ .

According to the positions of  $f_{\mathbf{I}x_{\ell+1}}(K)$ ,  $f_{\mathbf{I}y_{\ell+1}}(K)$  and  $f_{\mathbf{I}z_{\ell+1}}(K)$ , up to a permutation of  $\{x, y, z\}$ , we divide the proof into 2 cases, which contains 5 subcases. Notice that the inequality (2.15) contains only  $\rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  and  $\rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$ , so we do not consider the position relationship for  $f_{\mathbf{I}y_{\ell+1}}(K)$  and  $f_{\mathbf{I}z_{\ell+1}}(K)$ .

Case 1:  $f_{\mathbf{I}x_{\ell+1}}(K) \cap f_{\mathbf{I}y_{\ell+1}}(K) = \emptyset$ .

Then  $S_F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = S_G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = (\mathbf{x}|_{\ell+1}, \mathbf{y}|_{\ell+1})$  by the same topology automaton.

Case 1.1:  $f_{\mathbf{I}x_{\ell+1}}(K) \cap f_{\mathbf{I}z_{\ell+1}}(K) = \emptyset$ . See Figure 4.




FIGURE 4. Case 1.1

In this case,  $S_F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = S_G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = (\mathbf{x}|_{\ell+1}, \mathbf{z}|_{\ell+1})$ . According to the definitions of  $\rho_K$  and  $\rho_{K'}$ , we have

$$(2.16) \quad \frac{\rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{\rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})} = \frac{r'_I \max\{r'_{x_{\ell+1}}, r'_{y_{\ell+1}}\}}{r'_I \max\{r'_{x_{\ell+1}}, r'_{z_{\ell+1}}\}} \leq \frac{1}{r'_*},$$

and

$$(2.17) \quad \frac{\rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{\rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})} = \frac{r_I \max\{r_{x_{\ell+1}}, r_{y_{\ell+1}}\}}{r_I \max\{r_{x_{\ell+1}}, r_{z_{\ell+1}}\}} \geq r_*.$$

Since  $\rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \leq t\rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$ , then  $1 \leq \frac{t}{r_*}$  by (2.17). Combining (2.16), we have

$$(2.18) \quad \rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \leq \frac{t}{r'_* r_*} \rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}).$$

Case 1.2:  $f_{\mathbf{I}x_{\ell+1}}(K) \cap f_{\mathbf{I}z_{\ell+1}}(K) = \{a\}$ . See Figure 5.




FIGURE 5. Case 1.2

Suppose the separation prefix of  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$  is of type (ii) in Definition 2.3, i.e.  $a \notin \{\pi_K(\mathbf{x}), \pi_K(\mathbf{z})\}$ . Denote by  $m, n$  the smallest integer such that  $a \notin f_{x_1 \dots x_m}(K)$ ,  $a \notin f_{z_1 \dots z_n}(K)$  respectively, then  $S_F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = S_G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = (\mathbf{x}|_m, \mathbf{z}|_n)$ . Hence

$$(2.19) \quad \frac{\rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{\rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})} = \frac{r'_1 \max\{r'_{x_{\ell+1}}, r'_{y_{\ell+1}}\}}{r'_1 \max\{r'_{x_{\ell+1} \dots x_m}, r'_{z_{\ell+1} \dots z_n}\}} \leq \frac{1}{(r'_*)^2} \cdot \frac{1}{\max\{r'_{x_{\ell+2} \dots x_{m-1}}, r'_{z_{\ell+2} \dots z_{n-1}}\}},$$

and

$$(2.20) \quad \frac{\rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{\rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})} = \frac{r_1 \max\{r_{x_{\ell+1}}, r_{y_{\ell+1}}\}}{r_1 \max\{r_{x_{\ell+1} \dots x_m}, r_{z_{\ell+1} \dots z_n}\}} \geq \frac{r_*}{\max\{r_{x_{\ell+2} \dots x_{m-1}}, r_{z_{\ell+2} \dots z_{n-1}}\}}.$$

By the Lemma 2.5, we have  $\{x_k\}_{k=\ell+2}^{m-1}, \{z_k\}_{k=\ell+2}^{n-1} \subset \partial \Sigma_K$ . Since  $\rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \leq t \rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$  and  $r'_i = (r_i)^s$  when  $i \in \partial \Sigma_K$ , we have

$$(2.21) \quad \frac{1}{\max\{r'_{x_{\ell+2} \dots x_{m-1}}, r'_{z_{\ell+2} \dots z_{n-1}}\}} \leq \left(\frac{t}{r_*}\right)^s.$$

Putting (2.21) into (2.19), we have

$$(2.22) \quad \rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \leq \frac{t^s}{(r'_*)^2 (r_*)^s} \rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}).$$

Suppose the separation prefix of  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$  is of type (iii) in Definition 2.3, i.e.  $a \in \{\pi_K(\mathbf{x}), \pi_K(\mathbf{z})\}$ . Without loss of generality, we assume that  $a = \pi_K(\mathbf{x})$ . Denote by  $n$  the smallest integer such that  $a \notin f_{z_1 \dots z_n}(K)$ , then  $S_F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = S_G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}|_n)$ . Hence  $\rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = r_1 \max\{0, r_{z_{\ell+1} \dots z_n}\}$  and  $\rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = r'_1 \max\{0, r'_{z_{\ell+1} \dots z_n}\}$ . Notice that in the above discussion, if we replace  $r'_{x_{\ell+1} \dots x_m}, r'_{x_{\ell+2} \dots x_{m-1}}$  in (2.19) with 0 and  $r_{x_{\ell+1} \dots x_m}, r_{x_{\ell+2} \dots x_{m-1}}$  in (2.20) with 0, (2.22) still holds according to the Corollary 2.6.

Case 1.3:  $f_{\mathbf{x}_{\ell+1}}(K) = f_{\mathbf{z}_{\ell+1}}(K)$ . See Figure 6.




FIGURE 6. Case 1.3

Denote  $p = |\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{z}|$ . Clearly  $p > \ell$ .

Suppose the separation prefix of  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$  is of type (i) in Definition 2.3, i.e.  $f_{x_1 \dots x_{p+1}}(K) \cap f_{z_1 \dots z_{p+1}}(K) = \emptyset$ . Then we have  $S_F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = S_G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = (\mathbf{x}|_{p+1}, \mathbf{z}|_{p+1})$ , so  $\rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = r_1 r_{x_{\ell+1} \dots x_p} \max\{r_{x_{p+1}}, r_{z_{p+1}}\}$  and

$\rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = r'_1 r'_{x_{\ell+1} \dots x_p} \max\{r'_{x_{p+1}}, r'_{z_{p+1}}\}$ . Hence

$$(2.23) \quad \frac{\rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{\rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})} = \frac{r'_1 \max\{r'_{x_{\ell+1}}, r'_{y_{\ell+1}}\}}{r'_1 r'_{x_{\ell+1} \dots x_p} \max\{r'_{x_{p+1}}, r'_{z_{p+1}}\}} \leq \frac{1}{r'_* r'_{x_{\ell+1} \dots x_p}} \leq \frac{1}{(r'_*)^{p-\ell+1}}.$$

Next, we estimate  $p - \ell + 1 = |\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{z}| - |\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{y}| + 1$ . Since  $\rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \leq t \rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$ , we have

$$(2.24) \quad r_1 \max\{r_{x_{\ell+1}}, r_{y_{\ell+1}}\} \leq t r_1 r_{x_{\ell+1} \dots x_p} \max\{r_{x_{p+1}}, r_{z_{p+1}}\},$$

which implies that  $r_* \leq t(r'_*)^{p-\ell+1}$ , hence

$$(2.25) \quad p - \ell + 1 \leq \frac{\log r_* - \log t}{\log r^*}.$$

Moreover, by (2.24) we have  $t \geq r_*$ . Putting (2.25) into (2.23), we have

$$(2.26) \quad \rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \leq (r'_*)^{(\log t - \log r_*) / \log r^*} \rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) \leq \frac{t(r'_*)^{(\log t - \log r_*) / \log r^*}}{r_*} \rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}).$$

Suppose the separation prefix of  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$  is of type (ii) in Definition 2.3, i.e.  $f_{x_1 \dots x_{p+1}}(K) \cap f_{z_1 \dots z_{p+1}}(K) = \{a\}$  and  $a \notin \{\pi_K(\mathbf{x}), \pi_K(\mathbf{z})\}$ . Denote by  $m, n$  the smallest integer such that  $a \notin f_{x_1 \dots x_m}(K)$ ,  $a \notin f_{z_1 \dots z_n}(K)$  respectively, then  $S_F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = S_G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = (\mathbf{x}|_m, \mathbf{z}|_n)$ . Hence

$$(2.27) \quad \frac{\rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{\rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})} = \frac{r'_1 \max\{r'_{x_{\ell+1}}, r'_{y_{\ell+1}}\}}{r'_1 r'_{x_{\ell+1} \dots x_p} \max\{r'_{x_{p+1} \dots x_m}, r'_{z_{p+1} \dots z_n}\}} \leq \frac{1}{(r'_*)^{p-\ell+2}} \cdot \frac{1}{\max\{r'_{x_{p+2} \dots x_{m-1}}, r'_{z_{p+2} \dots z_{n-1}}\}},$$

and

$$(2.28) \quad \frac{\rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{\rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})} = \frac{r_1 \max\{r_{x_{\ell+1}}, r_{y_{\ell+1}}\}}{r_1 r_{x_{\ell+1} \dots x_p} \max\{r_{x_{p+1} \dots x_m}, r_{z_{p+1} \dots z_n}\}} \geq \frac{r_*}{\max\{r_{x_{p+2} \dots x_{m-1}}, r_{z_{p+2} \dots z_{n-1}}\}}.$$

By the Lemma 2.5, we have  $\{x_k\}_{k=p+2}^{m-1}, \{z_k\}_{k=p+2}^{n-1} \subset \partial \Sigma_K$ . Since  $\rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \leq t \rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$ , we have

$$(2.29) \quad \frac{1}{\max\{r'_{x_{p+2} \dots x_{m-1}}, r'_{z_{p+2} \dots z_{n-1}}\}} \leq \left(\frac{t}{r_*}\right)^s.$$

Next, we estimate  $p - \ell$ . Since  $\rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \leq t \rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$ , we have

$$(2.30) \quad r_1 \max\{r_{x_{\ell+1}}, r_{y_{\ell+1}}\} \leq t r_1 r_{x_{\ell+1} \dots x_p} \max\{r_{x_{p+1} \dots x_m}, r_{z_{p+1} \dots z_n}\},$$

which implies that  $r_* \leq t(r'_*)^{p-\ell}$ , hence

$$(2.31) \quad p - \ell \leq \frac{\log r_* - \log t}{\log r^*}.$$

Putting (2.31) and (2.29) into (2.27), we have

$$(2.32) \quad \rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \leq \frac{t^s (r'_*)^{(\log t - \log r_*) / \log r^*}}{(r'_*)^2 (r'_*)^s} \rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}).$$

Suppose the separation prefix of  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$  is of type (iii) in Definition 2.3, i.e.  $f_{x_1 \dots x_{p+1}}(K) \cap f_{z_1 \dots z_{p+1}}(K) = \{a\}$  and  $a \in \{\pi_K(\mathbf{x}), \pi_K(\mathbf{z})\}$ . Without loss of generality, we assume that  $a = \pi_K(\mathbf{x})$ . Denote by  $n$  the smallest integer such that  $a \notin f_{z_1 \dots z_n}(K)$ , then  $S_F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = S_G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}|_n)$ . Hence  $\rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = r_1 r_{x_{\ell+1} \dots x_p} \max\{0, r_{z_{p+1} \dots z_n}\}$  and  $\rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = r'_1 r'_{x_{\ell+1} \dots x_p} \max\{0, r'_{z_{p+1} \dots z_n}\}$ . Notice that in the

above discussion, if we replace  $r'_{x_{p+1}\dots x_m}, r'_{x_{p+2}\dots x_{m-1}}$  in (2.27) with 0 and  $r_{x_{p+1}\dots x_m}, r_{x_{p+2}\dots x_{m-1}}$  in (2.28), (2.30) with 0, (2.32) still holds according to the Corollary 2.6.

Case 2:  $f_{\mathbf{I}_{x_{\ell+1}}}(K) \cap f_{\mathbf{I}_{y_{\ell+1}}}(K) = \{b\}$ .

Case 2.1:  $f_{\mathbf{I}_{x_{\ell+1}}}(K) \cap f_{\mathbf{I}_{z_{\ell+1}}}(K) = \{a\}$  (here  $a$  can be equal to  $b$ ). See Figure 7.




FIGURE 7. Case 2.1

Suppose the separation prefixes of both  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$  and  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  are of type (ii) in Definition 2.3, i.e.  $a \notin \{\pi_K(\mathbf{x}), \pi_K(\mathbf{z})\}$  and  $b \notin \{\pi_K(\mathbf{x}), \pi_K(\mathbf{y})\}$ . Denote by  $m, n$  the smallest integer such that  $a \notin f_{x_1\dots x_m}(K)$ ,  $a \notin f_{z_1\dots z_n}(K)$  respectively, and denote by  $m', n'$  the smallest integer such that  $b \notin f_{x_1\dots x_{m'}}(K)$ ,  $b \notin f_{y_1\dots y_{n'}}(K)$  respectively. Then  $S_F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = S_G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = (\mathbf{x}|_m, \mathbf{z}|_n)$  and  $S_F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = S_G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = (\mathbf{x}|_{m'}, \mathbf{y}|_{n'})$ . Hence

$$(2.33) \quad \frac{\rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{\rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})} = \frac{r'_1 \max\{r'_{x_{\ell+1}\dots x_{m'}}, r'_{y_{\ell+1}\dots y_{n'}}\}}{r'_1 \max\{r'_{x_{\ell+1}\dots x_m}, r'_{z_{\ell+1}\dots z_n}\}} \leq \frac{1}{(r'_*)^2} \cdot \frac{\max\{r'_{x_{\ell+2}\dots x_{m'-1}}, r'_{y_{\ell+2}\dots y_{n'-1}}\}}{\max\{r'_{x_{\ell+2}\dots x_{m-1}}, r'_{z_{\ell+2}\dots z_{n-1}}\}},$$

and

$$(2.34) \quad \frac{\rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{\rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})} = \frac{r_1 \max\{r_{x_{\ell+1}\dots x_{m'}}, r_{y_{\ell+1}\dots y_{n'}}\}}{r_1 \max\{r_{x_{\ell+1}\dots x_m}, r_{z_{\ell+1}\dots z_n}\}} \geq (r_*)^2 \frac{\max\{r_{x_{\ell+2}\dots x_{m'-1}}, r_{y_{\ell+2}\dots y_{n'-1}}\}}{\max\{r_{x_{\ell+2}\dots x_{m-1}}, r_{z_{\ell+2}\dots z_{n-1}}\}}.$$

By the Lemma 2.5, we have  $\{x_k\}_{k=\ell+2}^{m-1}, \{z_k\}_{k=\ell+2}^{n-1}, \{x_k\}_{k=\ell+2}^{m'-1}, \{y_k\}_{k=\ell+2}^{n'-1} \subset \partial\Sigma_K$ . Since  $\rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \leq t\rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$ , we have

$$(2.35) \quad \frac{\max\{r'_{x_{\ell+2}\dots x_{m'-1}}, r'_{y_{\ell+2}\dots y_{n'-1}}\}}{\max\{r'_{x_{\ell+2}\dots x_{m-1}}, r'_{z_{\ell+2}\dots z_{n-1}}\}} \leq \left(\frac{t}{(r'_*)^2}\right)^s.$$

Putting (2.35) into (2.33), we have

$$(2.36) \quad \rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \leq \frac{t^s}{(r'_*)^2 (r'_*)^{2s}} \rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}).$$

Suppose that at least one of the separation prefix of  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$  and  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  is of type (iii) in Definition 2.3. Since  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}$  are distinct, without loss of generality, the situations that may occur are (1)  $a = \pi_K(\mathbf{z})$  and  $b \notin \{\pi_K(\mathbf{x}), \pi_K(\mathbf{y})\}$ ; (2)  $b = \pi_K(\mathbf{y})$  and  $a \notin \{\pi_K(\mathbf{x}), \pi_K(\mathbf{z})\}$ ; (3)  $a = \pi_K(\mathbf{z})$  and  $b = \pi_K(\mathbf{y})$ . We show that the situation (3), situations (1) and (2) are similar. Denote by  $m, m'$  the smallest integer such that  $a \notin f_{x_1\dots x_m}(K)$ ,  $b \notin f_{x_1\dots x_{m'}}(K)$  respectively, then  $S_F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = S_G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = (\mathbf{x}|_{m'}, \mathbf{y})$  and

$S_F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = S_G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = (\mathbf{x}|_m, \mathbf{z})$ . Notice that in the above discussion, if we replace  $r'_{y_{\ell+1} \dots y_{n'}}, r'_{y_{\ell+2} \dots y_{n'-1}}, r'_{z_{\ell+1} \dots z_n}, r'_{z_{\ell+2} \dots z_{n-1}}$  in (2.33) with 0 and  $r_{y_{\ell+1} \dots y_{n'}}, r_{y_{\ell+2} \dots y_{n'-1}}, r_{z_{\ell+1} \dots z_n}, r_{z_{\ell+2} \dots z_{n-1}}$  in (2.34) with 0, (2.36) still holds according to the Corollary 2.6.

Case 2.2:  $f_{\mathbf{I}_{x_{\ell+1}}}(K) = f_{\mathbf{I}_{z_{\ell+1}}}(K)$ . See Figure 8.




FIGURE 8. Case 2.2

Denote  $p = |\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{z}|$ . Clearly  $p > \ell$ .

Suppose the separation prefix of  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  is of type (ii) and the separation prefix of  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$  is of type (i) in Definition 2.3, i.e.  $b \notin \{\pi_K(\mathbf{x}), \pi_K(\mathbf{y})\}$  and  $f_{x_1 \dots x_{p+1}}(K) \cap f_{z_1 \dots z_{p+1}}(K) = \emptyset$ . Denote by  $m', n'$  the smallest integer such that  $b \notin f_{x_1 \dots x_{m'}}(K)$ ,  $b \notin f_{y_1 \dots y_{n'}}(K)$  respectively. Then  $S_F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = S_G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = (\mathbf{x}|_{m'}, \mathbf{y}|_{n'})$  and  $S_F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = S_G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = (\mathbf{x}|_{p+1}, \mathbf{z}|_{p+1})$ . Hence

$$(2.37) \quad \frac{\rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{\rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})} = \frac{r'_1 \max\{r'_{x_{\ell+1} \dots x_{m'}}, r'_{y_{\ell+1} \dots y_{n'}}\}}{r'_1 r'_{x_{\ell+1} \dots x_p} \max\{r'_{x_{p+1}}, r'_{z_{p+1}}\}} \leq \frac{1}{(r'_*)^2} \cdot \frac{\max\{r'_{x_{\ell+2} \dots x_{m'-1}}, r'_{y_{\ell+2} \dots y_{n'-1}}\}}{r'_{x_{\ell+2} \dots x_p}},$$

and

$$(2.38) \quad \frac{\rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{\rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})} = \frac{r_1 \max\{r_{x_{\ell+1} \dots x_{m'}}, r_{y_{\ell+1} \dots y_{n'}}\}}{r_1 r_{x_{\ell+1} \dots x_p} \max\{r_{x_{p+1}}, r_{z_{p+1}}\}} \geq (r_*)^2 \frac{\max\{r_{x_{\ell+2} \dots x_{m'-1}}, r_{y_{\ell+2} \dots y_{n'-1}}\}}{r_{x_{\ell+2} \dots x_p}}.$$

By the Lemma 2.5, we have  $\{x_k\}_{k=\ell+2}^{m'-1}, \{y_k\}_{k=\ell+2}^{n'-1} \subset \partial \Sigma_K$ . If  $p < m'$ , then  $\{x_k\}_{k=\ell+2}^p \subset \partial \Sigma_K$ . Since  $\rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \leq t \rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$ , we have

$$(2.39) \quad \frac{\max\{r'_{x_{\ell+2} \dots x_{m'-1}}, r'_{y_{\ell+2} \dots y_{n'-1}}\}}{r'_{x_{\ell+2} \dots x_p}} \leq \left( \frac{t}{(r'_*)^2} \right)^s.$$

Putting (2.39) into (2.37), we have

$$(2.40) \quad \rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \leq \frac{t^s}{(r'_*)^2 (r'_*)^{2s}} \rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}).$$

If  $p \geq m'$ , then

$$(2.41) \quad \frac{\rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{\rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})} \leq \frac{1}{(r'_*)^2} \cdot \frac{1}{(r'_*)^{p-m'+1}} \cdot \frac{\max\{r'_{x_{\ell+2} \dots x_{m'-1}}, r'_{y_{\ell+2} \dots y_{n'-1}}\}}{r'_{x_{\ell+2} \dots x_{m'-1}}},$$



and

$$(2.42) \quad \frac{\max\{r'_{x_{\ell+2}\dots x_{m'-1}}, r'_{y_{\ell+2}\dots y_{n'-1}}\}}{r'_{x_{\ell+2}\dots x_{m'-1}}} \leq \left(\frac{t}{(r_*)^2}\right)^s.$$

Next, we estimate  $p - m' + 1$ . Since  $\rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \leq t\rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$ , we have

$$(2.43) \quad r_1 \max\{r_{x_{\ell+1}\dots x_{m'}}, r_{y_{\ell+1}\dots y_{n'}}\} \leq tr_1 r_{x_{\ell+1}\dots x_p} \max\{r_{x_{p+1}}, r_{z_{p+1}}\},$$

which implies that  $r_{x_{\ell+1}\dots x_{m'}} \leq tr_{x_{\ell+1}\dots x_{m'}}(r^*)^{p-m'+1}$ , hence

$$(2.44) \quad p - m' + 1 \leq \frac{-\log t}{\log r^*}.$$

Putting (2.44) and (2.42) into (2.41), we have

$$(2.45) \quad \rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \leq \frac{t^s (r'_*)^{\frac{\log t}{\log r^*}}}{(r'_*)^2 (r_*)^{2s}} \rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}).$$

Suppose the separation prefixes of both  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$  and  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  are of type (ii) in Definition 2.3, i.e.  $b \notin \{\pi_K(\mathbf{x}), \pi_K(\mathbf{y})\}$  and  $f_{x_1\dots x_{p+1}}(K) \cap f_{z_1\dots z_{p+1}}(K) = \{a\}$ ,  $a \notin \{\pi_K(\mathbf{x}), \pi_K(\mathbf{z})\}$ . Denote by  $m'$ ,  $n'$  the smallest integer such that  $b \notin f_{x_1\dots x_{m'}}(K)$ ,  $b \notin f_{y_1\dots y_{n'}}(K)$  respectively, and denote by  $m$ ,  $n$  the smallest integer such that  $a \notin f_{x_1\dots x_m}(K)$ ,  $a \notin f_{z_1\dots z_n}(K)$  respectively. Then  $S_F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = S_G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = (\mathbf{x}|_{m'}, \mathbf{y}|_{n'})$ , and  $S_F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = S_G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = (\mathbf{x}|_m, \mathbf{z}|_n)$ . Hence

$$(2.46) \quad \frac{\rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{\rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})} = \frac{r'_1 \max\{r'_{x_{\ell+1}\dots x_{m'}}, r'_{y_{\ell+1}\dots y_{n'}}\}}{r'_1 r'_{x_{\ell+1}\dots x_p} \max\{r'_{x_{p+1}\dots x_m}, r'_{z_{p+1}\dots z_n}\}} \leq \frac{1}{(r'_*)^3} \cdot \frac{\max\{r'_{x_{\ell+2}\dots x_{m'-1}}, r'_{y_{\ell+2}\dots y_{n'-1}}\}}{r'_{x_{\ell+2}\dots x_p} \max\{r'_{x_{p+2}\dots x_{m-1}}, r'_{z_{p+2}\dots z_{n-1}}\}},$$

and

$$(2.47) \quad \frac{\rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{\rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})} = \frac{r_1 \max\{r_{x_{\ell+1}\dots x_{m'}}, r_{y_{\ell+1}\dots y_{n'}}\}}{r_1 r_{x_{\ell+1}\dots x_p} \max\{r_{x_{p+1}\dots x_m}, r_{z_{p+1}\dots z_n}\}} \geq (r_*)^2 \frac{\max\{r_{x_{\ell+2}\dots x_{m'-1}}, r_{y_{\ell+2}\dots y_{n'-1}}\}}{r_{x_{\ell+2}\dots x_p} \max\{r_{x_{p+2}\dots x_{m-1}}, r_{z_{p+2}\dots z_{n-1}}\}}.$$

By the Lemma 2.5, we have  $\{x_k\}_{k=\ell+2}^{m-1}, \{z_k\}_{k=\ell+2}^{n-1}, \{x_k\}_{k=\ell+2}^{m'-1}, \{y_k\}_{k=\ell+2}^{n'-1} \subset \partial\Sigma_K$ . If  $p < m'$ , then  $\{x_k\}_{k=\ell+2}^p \subset \partial\Sigma_K$ . Since  $\rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \leq t\rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$ , we have

$$(2.48) \quad \frac{\max\{r'_{x_{\ell+2}\dots x_{m'-1}}, r'_{y_{\ell+2}\dots y_{n'-1}}\}}{r'_{x_{\ell+2}\dots x_p} \max\{r'_{x_{p+2}\dots x_{m-1}}, r'_{z_{p+2}\dots z_{n-1}}\}} \leq \left(\frac{t}{(r_*)^2}\right)^s.$$

Putting (2.48) into (2.46), we have

$$(2.49) \quad \rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \leq \frac{t^s}{(r'_*)^3 (r_*)^{2s}} \rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}).$$

If  $p \geq m'$ , then

$$(2.50) \quad \frac{\rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{\rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})} \leq \frac{1}{(r'_*)^3} \cdot \frac{1}{(r'_*)^{p-m'+1}} \cdot \frac{\max\{r'_{x_{\ell+2}\dots x_{m'-1}}, r'_{y_{\ell+2}\dots y_{n'-1}}\}}{r'_{x_{\ell+2}\dots x_{m'-1}} \max\{r'_{x_{p+2}\dots x_{m-1}}, r'_{z_{p+2}\dots z_{n-1}}\}},$$

and

$$(2.51) \quad \frac{\max\{r'_{x_{\ell+2}\dots x_{m'-1}}, r'_{y_{\ell+2}\dots y_{n'-1}}\}}{r'_{x_{\ell+2}\dots x_{m'-1}} \max\{r'_{x_{p+2}\dots x_{m-1}}, r'_{z_{p+2}\dots z_{n-1}}\}} \leq \left(\frac{t}{(r_*)^2}\right)^s.$$

Next, we estimate  $p - m' + 1$ . Since  $\rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \leq t\rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$ , we have

$$(2.52) \quad r_1 \max\{r_{x_{\ell+1} \dots x_{m'}}, r_{y_{\ell+1} \dots y_{n'}}\} \leq tr_1 r_{x_{\ell+1} \dots x_p} \max\{r_{x_{p+1} \dots x_m}, r_{z_{p+1} \dots z_n}\},$$

which implies that  $r_{x_{\ell+1} \dots x_{m'}} \leq tr_{x_{\ell+1} \dots x_{m'}} (r^*)^{p-m'+1}$ , hence

$$(2.53) \quad p - m' + 1 \leq \frac{-\log t}{\log r^*}.$$

Putting (2.53) and (2.51) into (2.50), we have

$$(2.54) \quad \rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \leq \frac{t^s (r'_*)^{\frac{\log t}{\log r^*}}}{(r'_*)^3 (r_*)^{2s}} \rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}).$$

Suppose the separation prefix of  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  is of type (ii) and the separation prefix of  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$  is of type (iii) in Definition 2.3, i.e.  $b \notin \{\pi_K(\mathbf{x}), \pi_K(\mathbf{y})\}$  and  $f_{x_1 \dots x_{p+1}}(K) \cap f_{z_1 \dots z_{p+1}}(K) = \{a\}$ ,  $a \in \{\pi_K(\mathbf{x}), \pi_K(\mathbf{z})\}$ . Without loss of generality, we assume that  $a = \pi_K(\mathbf{x})$ . Denote by  $m'$ ,  $n'$  the smallest integer such that  $b \notin f_{x_1 \dots x_{m'}}(K)$ ,  $b \notin f_{y_1 \dots y_{n'}}(K)$  respectively, and denote by  $n$  the smallest integer such that  $a \notin f_{z_1 \dots z_n}(K)$  respectively. Hence  $\rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = r_1 r_{x_{\ell+1} \dots x_p} \max\{0, r_{z_{p+1} \dots z_n}\}$  and  $\rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = r'_1 r'_{x_{\ell+1} \dots x_p} \max\{0, r'_{z_{p+1} \dots z_n}\}$ . Notice that in the above discussion, if we replace  $r'_{x_{p+1} \dots x_m}$ ,  $r'_{x_{p+2} \dots x_{m-1}}$  in (2.46) with 0 and  $r_{x_{p+1} \dots x_m}$ ,  $r_{x_{p+2} \dots x_{m-1}}$  in (2.47) with 0, (2.49) and (2.54) still holds according to the Corollary 2.6.

Suppose the separation prefix of  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  is of type (iii) and the separation prefix of  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$  is of type (i) in Definition 2.3, i.e.  $b \in \{\pi_K(\mathbf{x}), \pi_K(\mathbf{y})\}$  and  $f_{x_1 \dots x_{p+1}}(K) \cap f_{z_1 \dots z_{p+1}}(K) = \emptyset$ . Then  $S_F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = S_G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = (\mathbf{x}|_{p+1}, \mathbf{z}|_{p+1})$ .

If  $b = \pi_K(\mathbf{y})$ , denote by  $m'$  the smallest integer such that  $b \notin f_{x_1 \dots x_{m'}}(K)$ . Then  $S_F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = S_G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = (\mathbf{x}|_{m'}, \mathbf{y})$ . Hence  $\rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = r_1 \max\{r_{x_{\ell+1} \dots x_{m'}}, 0\}$  and  $\rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = r'_1 \max\{r'_{x_{\ell+1} \dots x_{m'}}, 0\}$ . If we replace  $r'_{y_{\ell+1} \dots y_{n'}}$ ,  $r'_{y_{p+2} \dots y_{n'-1}}$  in (2.37) with 0 and  $r_{y_{\ell+1} \dots y_{n'}}$ ,  $r_{y_{p+2} \dots y_{n'-1}}$  in (2.38) with 0, (2.40) and (2.45) still holds according to the Corollary 2.6.

If  $b = \pi_K(\mathbf{x})$ , denote by  $n'$  the smallest integer such that  $b \notin f_{y_1 \dots y_{n'}}(K)$ . Then  $S_F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = S_G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}|_{n'})$ . Hence

$$(2.55) \quad \frac{\rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{\rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})} = \frac{r'_1 r'_{y_{\ell+1} \dots y_{n'}}}{r'_1 r'_{x_{\ell+1} \dots x_p} \max\{r'_{x_{p+1}}, r'_{z_{p+1}}\}} \leq \frac{1}{(r'_*)^2} \cdot \frac{r'_{y_{\ell+2} \dots y_{n'-1}}}{r'_{x_{\ell+2} \dots x_p}},$$

and

$$(2.56) \quad \frac{\rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{\rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})} = \frac{r_1 r_{y_{\ell+1} \dots y_{n'}}}{r_1 r_{x_{\ell+1} \dots x_p} \max\{r_{x_{p+1}}, r_{z_{p+1}}\}} \geq (r_*)^2 \frac{r_{y_{\ell+2} \dots y_{n'-1}}}{r_{x_{\ell+2} \dots x_p}}.$$

By the Corollary 2.6, we have  $\{x_k\}_{k \geq \ell+2}, \{y_k\}_{k=\ell+2}^{n'-1} \subset \partial \Sigma_K$ . Since  $\rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \leq t\rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$ , we have

$$(2.57) \quad \frac{r'_{y_{\ell+2} \dots y_{n'-1}}}{r'_{x_{\ell+2} \dots x_p}} \leq \left( \frac{t}{(r'_*)^2} \right)^s.$$

Putting (2.57) into (2.55), we have (2.40) still holds.

Suppose the separation prefix of  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  is of type (iii) and the separation prefix of  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$  is of type (ii) in Definition 2.3, i.e.  $b \in \{\pi_K(\mathbf{x}), \pi_K(\mathbf{y})\}$  and  $f_{x_1 \dots x_{p+1}}(K) \cap f_{z_1 \dots z_{p+1}}(K) = \{a\}$ ,  $a \notin \{\pi_K(\mathbf{x}), \pi_K(\mathbf{z})\}$ . Denote by  $m, n$  the smallest integer such that  $a \notin f_{x_1 \dots x_m}(K)$ ,  $a \notin f_{z_1 \dots z_n}(K)$  respectively. Then  $S_F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = S_G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = (\mathbf{x}|_m, \mathbf{z}|_n)$ .

If  $b = \pi_K(\mathbf{y})$ , denote by  $m'$  the smallest integer such that  $b \notin f_{x_1 \dots x_{m'}}(K)$ . Then  $S_F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = S_G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = (\mathbf{x}|_{m'}, \mathbf{y})$ . Hence  $\rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = r_1 \max\{r_{x_{\ell+1} \dots x_{m'}}, 0\}$  and  $\rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = r'_1 \max\{r'_{x_{\ell+1} \dots x_{m'}}, 0\}$ . If we replace  $r'_{y_{\ell+1} \dots y_{n'}}$ ,  $r'_{y_{\ell+2} \dots y_{n'-1}}$  in (2.46) with 0 and  $r_{y_{\ell+1} \dots y_{n'}}$ ,  $r_{y_{\ell+2} \dots y_{n'-1}}$  in (2.47) with 0, (2.49) and (2.54) still holds according to the Corollary 2.6.

If  $b = \pi_K(\mathbf{x})$ , denote by  $n'$  the smallest integer such that  $b \notin f_{y_1 \dots y_{n'}}(K)$ . Then  $S_F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = S_G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}|_{n'})$ . Hence

$$(2.58) \quad \frac{\rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{\rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})} = \frac{r'_1 r'_{y_{\ell+1} \dots y_{n'}}}{r'_1 r'_{x_{\ell+1} \dots x_p} \max\{r'_{x_{p+1} \dots x_m}, r'_{z_{p+1} \dots z_n}\}} \leq \frac{1}{(r'_*)^3} \cdot \frac{r'_{y_{\ell+2} \dots y_{n'-1}}}{r'_{x_{\ell+2} \dots x_p} \max\{r'_{x_{p+2} \dots x_{m-1}}, r'_{z_{p+2} \dots z_{n-1}}\}},$$

and

$$(2.59) \quad \frac{\rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}{\rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})} = \frac{r_1 r_{y_{\ell+1} \dots y_{n'}}}{r_1 r_{x_{\ell+1} \dots x_p} \max\{r'_{x_{p+1} \dots x_m}, r'_{z_{p+1} \dots z_n}\}} \geq (r_*)^2 \frac{r_{y_{\ell+2} \dots y_{n'-1}}}{r_{x_{\ell+2} \dots x_p} \max\{r_{x_{p+2} \dots x_{m-1}}, r_{z_{p+2} \dots z_{n-1}}\}}.$$

By the Corollary 2.6, we have  $\{x_k\}_{k \geq \ell+2}$ ,  $\{y_k\}_{k=\ell+2}^{n'-1} \subset \partial \Sigma_K$ . By the Lemma 2.5, we have  $\{z_k\}_{k=p+2}^{n-1}$ . Since  $\rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \leq t \rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$ , we have

$$(2.60) \quad \frac{r'_{y_{\ell+2} \dots y_{n'-1}}}{r'_{x_{\ell+2} \dots x_p} \max\{r'_{x_{p+2} \dots x_{m-1}}, r'_{z_{p+2} \dots z_{n-1}}\}} \leq \left( \frac{t}{(r'_*)^2} \right)^s.$$

Putting (2.60) into (2.58), we have (2.49) still holds.

Suppose the separation prefixes of both  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$  and  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  are of type (iii) in Definition 2.3, i.e.  $b \in \{\pi_K(\mathbf{x}), \pi_K(\mathbf{y})\}$  and  $f_{x_1 \dots x_{p+1}}(K) \cap f_{z_1 \dots z_{p+1}}(K) = \{a\}$ ,  $a \in \{\pi_K(\mathbf{x}), \pi_K(\mathbf{z})\}$ . Since  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}$  are distinct, the situations that may occur are (1)  $b = \pi_K(\mathbf{y})$  and  $a = \pi_K(\mathbf{x})$  or  $a = \pi_K(\mathbf{z})$ ; (2)  $b = \pi_K(\mathbf{x})$  and  $a = \pi_K(\mathbf{z})$ .

In situation (1), without loss of generality, we assume that  $a = \pi_K(\mathbf{x})$ . Denote by  $m'$  the smallest integer such that  $b \notin f_{x_1 \dots x_{m'}}(K)$ , and denote by  $n$  the smallest integer such that  $a \notin f_{z_1 \dots z_n}(K)$ . Then  $S_F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = S_G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = (\mathbf{x}|_{m'}, \mathbf{y})$  and  $S_F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = S_G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}|_n)$ . Hence  $\rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = r_1 \max\{r_{x_{\ell+1} \dots x_{m'}}, 0\}$ ,  $\rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = r'_1 \max\{r'_{x_{\ell+1} \dots x_{m'}}, 0\}$  and  $\rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = r_1 r_{x_{\ell+1} \dots x_p} \max\{0, r_{z_{p+1} \dots z_n}\}$ ,  $\rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = r'_1 r'_{x_{\ell+1} \dots x_p} \max\{0, r'_{z_{p+1} \dots z_n}\}$ . If we replace  $r'_{y_{\ell+1} \dots y_{n'}}$ ,  $r'_{y_{\ell+2} \dots y_{n'-1}}$ ,  $r'_{x_{p+1} \dots x_m}$ ,  $r'_{x_{p+2} \dots x_{m-1}}$  in (2.46) with 0 and  $r_{y_{\ell+1} \dots y_{n'}}$ ,  $r_{y_{\ell+2} \dots y_{n'-1}}$ ,  $r_{x_{p+1} \dots x_m}$ ,  $r_{x_{p+2} \dots x_{m-1}}$  in (2.47) with 0, (2.49) and (2.54) still holds according to the Corollary 2.6.

We show that the situation (2). Denote by  $n'$  the smallest integer such that  $b \notin f_{y_1 \dots y_{n'}}(K)$ , and denote by  $m$  the smallest integer such that  $a \notin f_{x_1 \dots x_m}(K)$ . Then  $S_F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = S_G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = (\mathbf{x}|_m, \mathbf{z})$ . Hence  $\rho_K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = r_1 r_{x_{\ell+1} \dots x_p} \max\{r_{x_{p+1} \dots x_m}, 0\}$  and  $\rho_{K'}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = r'_1 r'_{x_{\ell+1} \dots x_p} \max\{r'_{x_{p+1} \dots x_m}, 0\}$ . If we replace  $r'_{z_{p+1} \dots z_n}$ ,  $r'_{z_{p+2} \dots z_{n-1}}$  in (2.58) with 0 and  $r_{z_{p+1} \dots z_n}$ ,  $r_{z_{p+2} \dots z_{n-1}}$  in (2.59) with 0, then (2.49) still holds according to the Corollary 2.6.  $\square$

### 3. THE PROOF OF THE THEOREM 1.3

Firstly, we define the primary arcs of a self-similar dendrite.

**Proposition 3.1.** (see [6]) *Every dendrite is uniquely arcwise connected, and every subcontinuum of a dendrite is a dendrite.*

Let  $F = \{f_i\}_{i=1}^N$  be a self-similar p.c.f. IFS with dendrite attractor  $K$ . For any  $u, v \in P$  with  $u \neq v$ , we denote by  $\gamma_{uv}$  the arc in  $K$  connecting  $u$  and  $v$ , and we call these arcs the *main arcs* of  $K$ . The union of all main arcs

$$\Gamma_0 = \bigcup_{u,v \in P, u \neq v} \gamma_{uv}$$

is called the *main tree* of  $K$ . Clearly,  $\Gamma_0$  is a subcontinuum of  $K$ . C. Bandt [2] proved in a more general situation than p.c.f. fractals that the main arcs are the attractors of a graph-directed system of similarities.

Let  $X$  be a dendrite and let  $a$  be a point in  $X$ . The *order* of  $a$  (with respect to  $X$ ) is defined to be the number of the connected components of the set  $X \setminus \{a\}$ , see [23]. Recall that any point with at least order 3 is called a *ramification point* of  $X$ , and the set of all ramification points of  $X$  will be denoted by  $RP(X)$ .

For the self-similar dendrite  $K$ , we call all connected components of the set  $\Gamma_0 \setminus RP(\Gamma_0)$  the *primary arcs* of  $K$ .

Secondly, we prove the primary arcs of  $K$  are the components of the attractor of a graph-directed system of similarities.

Let us recall the definition of graph-directed sets. Let  $(V, \Gamma)$  be a directed graph with vertex set  $V = \{1, 2, \dots, q\}$  and directed-edge set  $\Gamma$ . A pair of vertices may be joined by several edges and we also allow edges starting and ending at the same vertex. The set of edges from vertex  $i$  to  $j$  is denoted by  $\Gamma_{i,j}$ . For each edge  $e \in \Gamma$ , let  $F_e : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  be a contracting similarity of ratio  $r_e$  with  $0 < r_e < 1$ . Then, there is a unique family of non-empty compact sets  $E_1, \dots, E_q$  such that

$$(3.1) \quad E_i = \bigcup_{j=1}^q \bigcup_{e \in \Gamma_{i,j}} F_e(E_j), \quad 1 \leq i \leq q.$$

The sets  $E_1, \dots, E_q$  are called the graph-directed sets.

**Definition 3.2.** Let  $\gamma$  be an arc in  $K$ . We call  $\gamma_1 + \dots + \gamma_k$  the **canonical decomposition** of  $\gamma$  if each  $\gamma_j$  ( $1 \leq j \leq k$ ) belong to a single cylinder, and it is the maximal subarc enjoying this property.

Clearly the head (also the tail) of each  $\gamma_j$  has at least two codings if it is neither the head nor the tail of  $\gamma$ .

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^N$  be a self-similar p.c.f. IFS with dendrite attractor  $K$ , and let  $V$  be the set of primary arcs of  $K$ . For any  $v \in V$ , we have*

$$(3.2) \quad v = \sum_{j=1}^{T_v} \phi_{v,j}(u_{v,j}),$$

where  $\phi_{v,j}$  are taking from  $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^N$  and  $u_{v,j} \in V$ .

*Proof.* Pick  $v \in V$ . Denote the head and terminus of  $v$  by  $a$  and  $b$ . Let

$$v = \theta_1 + \cdots + \theta_h$$

be the canonical decomposition of  $v$ . Assume that  $\theta_j \subset K_{n_j}$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq h$ . Denote  $a' = f_{n_1}^{-1}(a)$  and  $b' = f_{n_h}^{-1}(b)$ . Denote  $P^* = P \cup RP(\Gamma_0)$ .

First, we show that  $a' \in P^*$ . Notice that if  $a$  has at least two codings or  $a \in P$ , then  $a' \in P$ ; so in the following we assume  $a$  has only one coding and  $a \notin P$ . Since  $a \notin P$ , we deduce that  $a$  is a ramification point in the main tree. Let  $\gamma_{ap_1}$ ,  $\gamma_{ap_2}$  and  $\gamma_{ap_3}$  be three arcs in the main tree such that any two of them only intersect at  $a$  and  $p_1, p_2, p_3 \in P$ .

Let  $\gamma_{aq_1}$  be the first arc of the canonical partition of  $\gamma_{ap_1}$ . Then  $\gamma_{aq_1} \in K_{n_1}$  since  $a$  is an inner point of  $K_{n_1}$ . Moreover, either  $q_1 = p_1$ , or  $q_1$  has at least two codings. In both cases, we have  $f_{n_1}^{-1}(q_1) \in P$ . The same holds for  $f_{n_1}^{-1}(\gamma_{aq_2})$  and  $f_{n_1}^{-1}(\gamma_{aq_3})$ . It follows that  $f_{n_1}^{-1}(\gamma_{aq_1}) \cup f_{n_1}^{-1}(\gamma_{aq_2})$  is an arc joining  $f_{n_1}^{-1}(q_1)$  and  $f_{n_1}^{-1}(q_2)$ , two points on the main tree. It follows that  $a'$  is ramification point of the main tree, so  $a' \in P^*$ .

By the same argument we have  $b' \in P^*$ .

Next, we prove that for all  $1 \leq j \leq h$ ,  $f_{n_j}^{-1}(\theta_j)$  is a joining of primary arcs. Denote the head and terminus of  $\theta_j$  by  $a_j$  and  $b_j$ . Note that  $a_1 = a$  and  $b_h = b$ . Notice that  $a_j \neq a$  (similarly  $b_j \neq b$ ), then  $a_j$  (similarly  $b_j$ ) has two codings, so

$$a'_j = f_{n_j}^{-1}(a_j), \quad b'_j = f_{n_j}^{-1}(b_j) \in P^*.$$

Consequently, there is an arc in the main tree connecting  $a'_j$  and  $b'_j$ , and this arc must be a joining of primary arcs, say, it is  $\tau_1 + \cdots + \tau_m$ . Then

$$(3.3) \quad \theta_j = f_{n_j}(\tau_1) + \cdots + f_{n_j}(\tau_m).$$

This proves that the primary arcs form a graph-directed system, where the vertex set is  $V$ , and all the maps in the system are taking from  $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^N$ .  $\square$

Thirdly, we define a new metric on  $K$ .

Denote  $\Sigma = \{1, \dots, N\}$ . Let  $R(f_i) = R(i)$  be a function from  $\Sigma$  to  $(0, 1)$ . We define a function  $L : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  by

$$(3.4) \quad L(v) = \sum_{j=1}^{T_v} R(\phi_{v,j}).$$

Let  $X_0 = P \cup RP(\Gamma_0)$ . We define a metric-like function  $D_0$  on  $X_0$  as follows: For  $x, y \in X_0$ , we set  $D_0(x, y) = h$  where  $h$  is the number of primary arcs containing in the arc joining  $x$  and  $y$ . Especially,  $D_0(x, y) = 1$  if  $\gamma_{xy} \in V$ .

For  $n \geq 1$ , set

$$X_n = X_0 \cup \bigcup_{I \in \Sigma^n} f_I(X_0) \text{ and } \Gamma_n = \Gamma_0 \cup \bigcup_{I \in \Sigma^n} f_I(\Gamma_0).$$

Clearly  $\Gamma_n$  is a connected subset of  $K$ , hence it is a dendrite. Now, we define a metric-like function  $D_n$  on  $X_n$ . By abusing of notations, for an arc  $\tau$  with end points  $a$  and  $b$ , we will denote  $D_n(\tau) := D_n(a, b)$ . Pick  $x, y \in X_n$ . Let  $\tau$  be the arc joining  $x$  and  $y$  in  $\Gamma_n$ , and let

$$\tau = \theta_1 + \dots + \theta_k$$

be the canonical decomposition of  $\tau$  in  $K$ . Assume that  $\theta_j \subset K_{n_j}$ . We define

$$(3.5) \quad D_n(x, y) = D_n(\tau) =: \sum_{j=1}^k R(f_{n_j}) D_{n-1}(f_{n_j}^{-1}(\theta_j)).$$

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^N$  be a self-similar p.c.f. IFS with dendrite attractor  $K$ . If for each primary arc  $v$  we have  $L(v) = 1$ , then*

(i)  $D_n$  is a metric on  $X_n$ ,  $n \geq 1$ ;

(ii)  $D_n$  coincides with  $D_{n-1}$  on  $X_{n-1}$ .

Hence,  $D$  also induces a metric on  $K$ , where  $D$  is the completion metric of  $D_n$ .

*Proof.* We proof the theorem by induction on  $n$ .

First we prove the first assertion. Clearly  $(X_0, D_0)$  is a metric space. Suppose that  $D_{n-1}$  is a metric on  $X_{n-1}$ , we are going to show that  $(X_n, D_n)$  is a metric space.

Pick three distinct points  $x, y, z \in X_n$ . We only need to verify the triangle inequality

$$(3.6) \quad D_n(x, y) + D_n(y, z) \geq D_n(x, z).$$

Case 1.  $x, y, z$  are located in a same arc in  $\Gamma_n$ .

Case 1.1. Suppose  $y$  is between  $x$  and  $z$ .

Let

$$\gamma_{xz} = \theta_1 + \dots + \theta_k$$

be the canonical decomposition of  $\gamma_{xz}$ . Assume that  $y \in \theta_j$ . If  $y$  is an end point of  $\theta_j$ , then clearly by definition

$$(3.7) \quad D_n(x, y) + D_n(y, z) = D_n(x, z).$$

If  $y$  is not an end point of  $\theta_j$ , then  $y$  divides  $\theta_j$  into two subarcs:  $\theta_j = \theta'_j + \theta''_j$ . To show (3.7) holds, after cancelation, we only need to show that

$$R(f)D_{n-1}(f^{-1}(\theta_j)) = R(f)D_{n-1}(f^{-1}(\theta'_j)) + R(f)D_{n-1}(f^{-1}(\theta''_j)).$$

By induction hypothesis (I),  $D_{n-1}(f^{-1}(\theta_j)) = D_{n-1}(f^{-1}(\theta'_j)) + D_{n-1}(f^{-1}(\theta''_j))$ .

Case 1.2. Suppose  $z$  is between  $x$  and  $y$ .

Let

$$\gamma_{xy} = \theta_1 + \cdots + \theta_k$$

be the canonical decomposition of  $\gamma_{xy}$ . Assume that  $z \in \theta_j$ . If  $z$  is an end point of  $\theta_j$ , then clearly by definition

$$(3.8) \quad D_n(x, z) < D_n(x, y).$$

If  $z$  is not an end point of  $\theta_j$ , then  $z$  divides  $\theta_j$  into two subarcs:  $\theta_j = \theta'_j + \theta''_j$ . Thus  $\theta_1 + \cdots + \theta_{j-1} + \theta'_j$  is the canonical decomposition of  $\gamma_{xz}$ . To show (3.8) holds, after cancelation, we only need to show that

$$R(f)D_{n-1}(f^{-1}(\theta'_j)) < R(f)D_{n-1}(f^{-1}(\theta_j)).$$

By induction hypothesis (I),  $D_{n-1}(f^{-1}(\theta'_j)) < D_{n-1}(f^{-1}(\theta_j))$ .

Case 2. Exists  $a \in X_n$  such that  $\gamma_{xa}, \gamma_{ya}, \gamma_{za}$  are arcs in  $\Gamma_n$  joining at  $a$ .

By (3.7) in case 1.1, we have

$$D_n(x, a) + D_n(a, y) = D_n(x, y), D_n(y, a) + D_n(a, z) = D_n(y, z) \text{ and } D_n(x, a) + D_n(a, z) = D_n(x, z),$$

thus (3.6) holds.

Now we prove the second assertion of the theorem.

First we prove that  $D_1$  coincides with  $D_0$  on  $X_0$ . Pick  $x, y \in X_0$ . Let  $\rho$  be the arc joining  $x$  and  $y$  in  $\Gamma$  and let

$$\rho = \theta_1 + \cdots + \theta_k$$

be the canonical decomposition of  $\rho$  in  $K$ . Assume that  $\theta_j \subset K_{n_j}$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq k$ .

If  $\rho \in V$ , by the proof in Lemma 3.3,  $f_{n_j}^{-1}(\theta_j)$  is a joining of primary arcs for all  $1 \leq j \leq k$ , say, it is  $\tau_1^{(j)} + \cdots + \tau_{m_j}^{(j)}$ . Thus

$$(3.9) \quad \rho = \sum_{j=1}^k f_{n_j}(\tau_1^{(j)}) + \cdots + f_{n_j}(\tau_{m_j}^{(j)}),$$

so

$$D_1(x, y) = \sum_{j=1}^k R(f_{n_j}) D_0(f_{n_j}^{-1}(\theta_j)) = \sum_{j=1}^k m_j R(f_{n_j}) = L(\rho) = 1 = D_0(x, y).$$

Now assume that  $\rho$  is a joining of primary arcs, say,  $\rho = \tau_1 + \cdots + \tau_h$ . By (3.7), we have  $D_0(\rho) = \sum_{j=1}^h D_0(\tau_j)$  and  $D_1(\rho) = \sum_{j=1}^h D_1(\tau_j)$ . By the above discussion, we have  $D_0(\tau_j) = D_1(\tau_j)$ , so  $D_0(\rho) = D_1(\rho)$ . This proves that  $D_1$  coincides with  $D_0$  on  $X_0$ .

Suppose that  $D_{n-1}$  coincides with  $D_{n-2}$  on  $X_{n-2}$ . This together with (3.5) imply that  $D_n(x, y) = D_{n-1}(x, y)$  for  $x, y \in X_{n-1}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let  $F = \{f_i\}_{i=1}^N$  be a self-similar p.c.f. IFS with dendrite attractor  $K$ . If for each primary arc  $v$  we have  $L(v) = 1$ , then  $f_i : (K, D) \rightarrow (K, D)$  is a similitude with contraction ratio  $R(f_i)$  for any  $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ . Moreover,  $F$  satisfies the angle separation condition with respect to the metric  $D$ .*

*Proof.* First we prove the first assertion. Pick  $x, y \in K$ . Let  $\tau$  be the arc joining  $x$  and  $y$  in  $K$ , then  $f_i(\tau)$  is the arc joining  $f_i(x)$  and  $f_i(y)$  in  $K_i$ . Since  $f_i(\tau)$  is the canonical decomposition of  $f_i(\tau)$  in  $K$ , we have

$$D(f_i(x), f_i(y)) = D(f_i(\tau)) = R(f_i) D(f_i^{-1} \circ f_i(\tau)) = R(f_i) D(\tau) = R(f_i) D(x, y).$$

Now we prove the second assertion. Let  $i, j \in \Sigma$  such that  $f_i(K) \cap f_j(K) = \{z\}$ , pick  $x \in f_i(K)$  and  $y \in f_j(K)$ . Let  $\gamma_{xz}$  be the arc joining  $x$  and  $z$  in  $K_i$  and let  $\gamma_{zy}$  be the arc joining  $z$  and  $y$  in  $K_j$ . Then  $\gamma_{xz} + \gamma_{zy}$  is the canonical decomposition of  $\gamma_{xy}$  in  $K$ , by (3.7) we have

$$D(x, y) = D(x, z) + D(z, y) \geq \max\{D(x, z), D(y, z)\}.$$

$\square$

We view the  $K$  as the invariant set for the IFS  $F^m = \{f_I\}_{I \in \Sigma^m}$ , where  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ .

**Lemma 3.5.** (Kigami, [18]) *Let  $F = \{f_i\}_{i=1}^N$  be an IFS. Then  $P_F = P_{F^m}$ .*

**The proof of the Theorem 1.3.** By Lemma 3.5,  $F$  and  $F^m$  have the same main arcs and primary arcs. First, we define a valuation function  $R$  for  $F^m = \{f_I\}_{I \in \Sigma^m}$ .

Let  $v$  be a primary arc. Pick a cylinder  $f_I(K)$ , where  $I \in \Sigma^m \setminus \partial \Sigma_K^m$  and  $\partial \Sigma_K^m = \{\mathbf{x}|_m; \mathbf{x} \in \pi_K^{-1}(P_F)\}$ . If only  $v$  intersects the cylinder  $f_I(K)$  more than one point in all primary arcs, then we call  $f_I(K)$  a *private cylinder* subordinated to  $v$ . If  $f_I(K)$  is not a private cylinder, then we call it a *non-private cylinder*. By Lemma 3.3, we have  $v = \sum_{j=1}^{T_v} \phi_{v,j}(u_{v,j})$ , where  $\phi_{v,j}$  are taking from  $F^m$  and  $u_{v,j} \in V$ . We denote by  $n'_{v,m}, n''_{v,m}$  the number of the private and non-private cylinders in  $\{\phi_{v,j}(K)\}_{j=1}^{T_v}$ , respectively. And denote by  $A_{v,m}$  the family of functions in  $\{\phi_{v,j}\}_{j=1}^{T_v}$  belonging to  $\{f_I; I \in \partial \Sigma_K^m\}$ .



Pick  $0 < \delta < 1, c > 0$ . Take  $f_I \in F^m$ , if  $I \in \partial \Sigma_K^m$ , then we set  $R(f_I) = (f'_I)^c$ , where  $f'_I$  denotes the derivative of  $f_I$ ; if  $f_I(K)$  is a non-private cylinder, then we set  $R(f_I) = \delta$ ; if  $f_I(K)$  is a private cylinder subordinated to  $v$ , then we set

$$R(f_I) = \left( 1 - \sum_{f_I \in A_{v,m}} (f'_I)^c - n''_{v,m} \delta \right) / n'_{v,m},$$

here we choose sufficiently small  $\delta$  such that  $0 < R(f_I) < 1$ . Then  $L(v) = 1$ .

Next, we estimate the dimension of  $(K, D)$ . Let

$$v = \theta_1 + \cdots + \theta_k$$

be the canonical decomposition of  $v$  in  $F^m$ . Assume that  $\theta_j \in K_{n_j}$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq k$ . Denote by  $a_{v,m}$  the number of private cylinders in  $\{K_{n_j}\}_{j=1}^k$  and denote  $b = \#\{\partial \Sigma_K^m\}$ .

Denote  $s_m = \dim_S(F^m, D)$ . We have

$$(3.10) \quad \sum_{I \in \partial \Sigma_K^m} (f'_I)^{c s_m} + \left( N^m - b - \sum_{v \in V} a_{v,m} \right) \delta^{s_m} + \sum_{v \in V} a_{v,m} \left( 1 - \sum_{f_I \in A_{v,m}} (f'_I)^c - n''_{v,m} \delta \right)^{s_m} / n'_{v,m} = 1.$$

One can show that  $s_m \rightarrow 1$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\delta \rightarrow 0$ . Suppose on the contrary that  $s_m \not\rightarrow 1$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\delta \rightarrow 0$ , i.e. there exists  $\epsilon > 0$  such that for any  $N_1, N_2 > 0$ , we have  $s_m \geq 1 + \epsilon$  whenever  $m > N_1$  and  $\delta < N_2$ . Denote  $R_{\max} = \max_{f_I \in F^m} \{R(f_I)\}$ . Pick  $m_1, \delta_1, c_1 > 0$  such that  $R_{\max} < 1/\#\{V\}$ . And pick  $\delta_2 > 0$  such that  $N^{m_1} \delta_2^{1+\epsilon} < 1 - R_{\max}^\epsilon \#\{V\}$ . Let  $N_1 = m_1$  and let  $N_2 = \min\{\delta_1, \delta_2\}$ , then we have

$$(3.11) \quad N^m \delta^{1+\epsilon} + R_{\max}^\epsilon \#\{V\} < 1,$$

whenever  $m > N_1$  and  $\delta < N_2$ . Denote by  $\varphi(s_m)$  the left-hand side of equation (3.10). Since  $s_m \geq 1 + \epsilon$  whenever  $m > N_1$  and  $\delta < N_2$ , then

$$1 = \varphi(s_m) \leq \varphi(1 + \epsilon) < N^m \delta^{1+\epsilon} + R_{\max}^\epsilon \#\{V\}.$$

And it contradicts (3.11), so  $s_m \rightarrow 1$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\delta \rightarrow 0$ .

Finally, since  $(F^m, K, d)$  and  $(F^m, K, D)$  have the same topology automaton, thus  $(F^m, K, d)$  and  $(F^m, K, D)$  are quasisymmetrically equivalent for any  $m$  by Theorem 1.2. So  $\dim_C K \leq \dim_H(K, D) \leq s_m \rightarrow 1$ , and  $\dim_C K \geq 1$  by  $K$  is a connected set, then  $\dim_C K = 1$ .  $\square$

#### 4.

Let  $G$  be a weighted graph. Let  $W$  be a path in  $G$  (a path means that it is a walk whose vertices are distinct). We define the weight of  $W$  to be the sum of the weights of the edges in  $W$ . Let  $x$  and  $y$  be two vertices of  $G$ . If  $x$  and  $y$  are in the same component of  $G$ , then we define  $D(x, y)$  by the minimum of the weights of all paths joining  $x, y$  in  $G$ ; otherwise, we define  $D(x, y)$  to be  $\infty$ . If  $G$  is a connected graph, then  $D$  is a metric. We call the path with weight  $D(x, y)$  as the *geodesic* joining  $x$  and  $y$  in  $G$ .

For the remainder of this section,  $F = \{f_i\}_{i=1}^N$  will be a self-similar p.c.f. IFS that satisfies the SIC with connected attractor  $K$ .

Denote  $P = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m\}$ . Let  $G_0 = \{\overline{a_i a_j}; 1 \leq i, j \leq m\}$  be the complete graph with vertex set  $P$  (here  $i$  may be equal to  $j$ ). Let  $\tau_0 : G_0 \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  be a weight function satisfying the following conditions: if  $e = \overline{a_i a_j}$  with  $i \neq j$ ,  $\tau_0(e) \in (0, \infty)$ ; if  $e = \overline{a_i a_i}$  for any  $1 \leq i \leq m$ ,  $\tau_0(e) = 0$ . Then  $(G_0, \tau_0)$  is a connected weighted graph, and we denote by  $D_0$  the metric on  $P$ .

Let  $G = (\mathcal{A}, \Gamma)$  be a graph and let  $f$  be an affine mapping. Recall that the affine copy of a graph,  $f(G) = (f(\mathcal{A}), f(\Gamma))$ , is defined as follows: there is an edge in  $f(\Gamma)$  between  $f(x)$  and  $f(y)$  if and only if there is an edge  $e \in \Gamma$  between vertex  $x$  and  $y$  (see [8]).

Denote  $\Sigma = \{1, \dots, N\}$ . Following [8], for  $n \geq 1$ , let  $G_n$  be the union of affine images of  $G_0$  under  $\{f_I\}_{I \in \Sigma^n}$ , that is,

$$G_n = \bigcup_{I \in \Sigma^n} f_I(G_0),$$

and we call it the  $n$ -refined graph induced by  $G_0$ . Let  $R(f_i) = R(i)$  be a function from  $\Sigma$  to  $(0, 1)$ . For  $I = i_1 \dots i_n \in \Sigma^n$ , we define  $R(I) = \prod_{j=1}^n R(i_j)$ . Let  $e$  be an edge in  $G_n$ , then  $e$  can be written as  $e = f_I(h)$ , where  $I \in \Sigma^n$  and  $h \in G_0$ . We define the weight of the edge  $e$  in  $G_n$ , denoted by  $\tau_n(e)$ , to be

$$(4.1) \quad \tau_n(e) =: R(I)\tau_0(h).$$

Then  $(G_n, \tau_n)$  is a connected weighted graph, and we denote by  $D_n$  the metric on  $\cup_{I \in \Sigma^n} f_I(P)$ . By abusing of notations, for a path  $W$  in  $(G_n, \tau_n)$ , we will denote  $\tau_n(W)$  by the weight of the path.

**Definition 4.1.** Let  $W$  be a geodesic in  $(G_n, \tau_n)$ . We call  $W_1 + \dots + W_k$  the  $m$ -level decomposition of  $W$  if each  $W_j$  ( $1 \leq j \leq k$ ) belong to one  $f_I(G_m)$  where  $I \in \Sigma^{n-m}$ , and  $W_j, W_{j+1}$  belong to different  $f_I(G_m)$ .

**Lemma 4.2.** If  $D_1$  coincides with  $D_0$  on  $P$ , then  $D_n$  coincides with  $D_{n-1}$  on  $\cup_{I \in \Sigma^{n-1}} f_I(P)$ ,  $n > 1$ . Hence,  $D$  induces a metric on  $K$ , where  $D$  is the completion metric of  $D_n$ .

Moreover,  $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^N$  satisfies the ASC with respect to the metric  $D$ .

*Proof.* First we prove the first assertion. Pick  $x, y \in \cup_{I \in \Sigma^{n-1}} f_I(P)$ .

On the one hand, let  $W$  be a geodesic joining  $x, y$  in  $G_n$ , and let

$$W = W_1 + \dots + W_k$$

be the 1-level decomposition of  $W$ . Assume that  $W_j \subset f_{I_j}(G_1)$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq k$ , where  $I_j \in \Sigma^{n-1}$ . Denote by  $a_j, b_j$  the endpoints of  $W_j$ , clearly  $a_j, b_j \in \cup_{I \in \Sigma^{n-1}} f_I(P)$ .

Let  $A_j$  be a geodesic joining  $f_{I_j}^{-1}(a_j), f_{I_j}^{-1}(b_j)$  in  $G_0$ . Since  $f_{I_j}^{-1}(W_j)$  is a geodesic joining  $f_{I_j}^{-1}(a_j), f_{I_j}^{-1}(b_j)$  in  $G_1$  and  $D_1$  coincides with  $D_0$ , so  $\tau_0(A_j) = \tau_1(f_{I_j}^{-1}(W_j))$ , thus

$$\tau_{n-1}(f_{I_j}(A_j)) = R(I_j)\tau_0(A_j) = R(I_j)\tau_1(f_{I_j}^{-1}(W_j)) = \tau_n(W_j).$$

Since  $f_{I_1}(A_1) + \cdots + f_{I_k}(A_k)$  is a path joining  $x, y$  in  $G_{n-1}$ , so

$$D_n(x, y) = \tau_n(W_1) + \cdots + \tau_n(W_k) = \tau_{n-1}(f_{I_1}(A_1) + \cdots + f_{I_k}(A_k)) \geq D_{n-1}(x, y).$$

On the other hand, let  $W'$  be a geodesic joining  $x, y$  in  $G_{n-1}$ , and let

$$W' = W'_1 + \cdots + W'_\ell$$

be the 0-level decomposition of  $W'$ . Assume that  $W'_j \subset f_{I_j}(G_0)$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq \ell$ , where  $I_j \in \Sigma^{n-1}$ . Denote by  $a'_j, b'_j$  the endpoints of  $W'_j$ , clearly  $a'_j, b'_j \in \cup_{I \in \Sigma^{n-1}} f_I(P)$ .

Let  $B_j$  be a geodesic joining  $f_{I_j}^{-1}(a'_j), f_{I_j}^{-1}(b'_j)$  in  $G_1$ . Since  $f_{I_j}^{-1}(W'_j)$  is a geodesic joining  $f_{I_j}^{-1}(a'_j), f_{I_j}^{-1}(b'_j)$  in  $G_0$  and  $D_1$  coincides with  $D_0$ , so  $\tau_1(B_j) = \tau_0(f_{I_j}^{-1}(W'_j))$ , thus

$$\tau_n(f_{I_j}(B_j)) = R(I_j)\tau_1(B_j) = R(I_j)\tau_0(f_{I_j}^{-1}(W'_j)) = \tau_{n-1}(W'_j).$$

Since  $f_{I_1}(B_1) + \cdots + f_{I_k}(B_k)$  is a path joining  $x, y$  in  $G_n$ , so

$$D_{n-1}(x, y) = \tau_{n-1}(W'_1) + \cdots + \tau_{n-1}(W'_k) = \tau_n(f_{I_1}(B_1) + \cdots + f_{I_k}(B_k)) \geq D_n(x, y).$$

Next we prove the second assertion. Let  $i, j \in \Sigma$  such that  $f_i(K) \cap f_j(K) = \{z\}$ , pick  $x \in f_i(K)$  and  $y \in f_j(K)$ . Let  $W$  be a geodesic between  $x, y$  in  $(K, D)$ .

If  $W$  passes through the point  $z$ , then

$$D(x, y) = D(x, z) + D(z, y) \geq \max\{D(x, z), D(y, z)\}.$$

Otherwise, then  $W$  passes through at least two different points in the critical set  $C$  by the SIC, so

$$D(x, y) \geq \min_{a, b \in C, a \neq b} D(a, b) \geq \frac{\min_{a, b \in C, a \neq b} D(a, b)}{\max_{i \in \Sigma} \text{diam}_D(f_i(K))} \max\{D(x, z), D(y, z)\}.$$

□

Notice that  $f_i$  may not be a self-similar mapping under the new metric  $D$ . To avoid this, we need to define the ‘good assignment’. We say that  $(\tau_0 : G_0 \rightarrow [0, \infty), R : \Sigma \rightarrow (0, 1))$  are *good assignment*, if they satisfy the following two conditions:

- (i)  $D_1$  coincides with  $D_0$  on  $P$ ;
- (ii)  $e$  is a geodesic in  $(G_1, \tau_1)$  for any  $e \in G_1$ .

**Lemma 4.3.** *Let  $a, b \in f_j(P)$ ,  $f_j \in F$ . If  $(\tau_0, R)$  are good assignment, then there exists a geodesic  $W$  joining  $a, b$  in  $G_{n+1}$  such that every edge in  $W$  belongs to  $f_j(G_n)$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .*

*Proof.* We proof the lemma by induction on  $n$ .

In case  $n = 0$ , since any edge in  $G_1$  is a geodesic, we can take  $W = \overline{ab}$ .

Suppose that there exists a geodesic  $V$  joining  $a, b$  in  $f_j(G_{n-1})$ , we are going to show that there exists a geodesic  $W$  joining  $a, b$  in  $f_j(G_n)$ . Clearly,

$$D_n(a, b) = \tau_n(V) = R(j)\tau_{n-1}(f_j^{-1}(V)).$$

Let  $V'$  be a geodesic joining  $f_j^{-1}(a), f_j^{-1}(b)$  in  $G_n$ . Since  $D_{n-1}$  coincides with  $D_n$  by Lemma 4.2, so  $\tau_n(V') = \tau_{n-1}(f_j^{-1}(V))$ , thus

$$D_n(a, b) = R(j)\tau_n(V') = \tau_{n+1}(f_j(V')).$$

By the compatibility of  $D_n$ , we have  $D_{n+1}(a, b) = D_n(a, b) = \tau_{n+1}(f_j(V'))$ , then  $f_j(V')$  is a geodesic joining  $a, b$  in  $f_j(G_n)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 4.4.** *If  $(\tau_0, R)$  are good assignment, then  $f_j : (K, D) \rightarrow (K, D)$  is a similitude with contraction ratio  $R(f_j)$  for any  $f_j \in F$ .*

*Proof.* Pick  $x, y \in K$ . Let  $\{x_n\}_{n \geq 1}, \{y_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  be two sequences of points such that  $x_n \rightarrow x, y_n \rightarrow y$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $x_n, y_n \in \cup_{I \in \Sigma^n} f_I(P)$ .

Fix  $n$ , let  $W_n$  be a geodesic joining  $x_n, y_n$  in  $G_n$ . Pick  $f_j \in F$ . Now, we prove that  $f_j(W_n)$  is a geodesic joining  $f_j(x_n), f_j(y_n)$  in  $G_{n+1}$ . Suppose on the contrary that there exist a geodesic  $W'$  joining  $f_j(x_n), f_j(y_n)$  in  $G_{n+1}$  such that  $\tau_{n+1}(W') < \tau_{n+1}(f_j(W_n))$ . Without loss of generality, we assume that not all the edges in  $W'$  belong to  $f_j(G_n)$ .

Denote the head of  $W'$  by  $a$  and denote the terminus of  $W'$  by  $d$ . Starting from the head  $a$ , we denote the point at which  $W'$  first leaves  $f_j(G_n)$  as  $b$  and the point at which it last enters  $f_j(G_n)$  as  $c$ . Obviously,  $a$  may be equal to  $b$  and  $c$  may be equal to  $d$ . Then

$$\tau_{n+1}(W') = \tau_{n+1}(W'(a, b)) + D_{n+1}(b, c) + \tau_{n+1}(W'(c, d)),$$

where  $W'(a, b)$  is the sub-path in  $W'$  with  $a, b$  as endpoints and  $W'(c, d)$  is the sub-path in  $W'$  with  $c, d$  as endpoints.

Since  $b, c \in f_j(P)$  and  $(\tau_0, R)$  are good assignment, we have there exists a geodesic  $A$  joining  $b, c$  in  $f_j(G_n)$  by the Lemma 4.3, so

$$\tau_{n+1}(W'(a, b) + A + W'(c, d)) = \tau_{n+1}(W') < \tau_{n+1}(f_j(W_n)),$$

this contradicts the definition of geodesic since all edges in  $W'(a, b) + A + W'(c, d)$  belong to  $f_j(G_n)$ . So  $f_j(W_n)$  is a geodesic joining  $f_j(x_n), f_j(y_n)$  in  $G_{n+1}$ .

Then

$$\begin{aligned} D(f_j(x), f_j(y)) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} D_{n+1}(f_j(x_n), f_j(y_n)) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tau_{n+1}(f_j(W_n)) = R(f_j) \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tau_n(W_n) \\ &= R(f_j) \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} D_n(x_n, y_n) = R(f_j)D(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

Let  $F$  be an IFS in a complete metric space  $(X, d)$ . We use the notation  $\dim_S(F, d)$  to denote the similarity dimension of  $F$  with respect to the metric  $d$ .

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let  $F = \{f_i\}_{i=1}^N$  be a self-similar p.c.f. IFS with connected attractor  $K$ , and it satisfies the SIC and the ASC. If there exist  $(\tau_0 : G_0 \rightarrow [0, \infty), R : \Sigma \rightarrow (0, 1))$  such that the following two conditions hold,*

(i)  $(\tau_0, R)$  are good assignment;

(ii) let  $r_i$  be the contraction ratio of  $f_i$ , there exist  $s > 0$  such that  $R(i) = (r_i)^s$  for any  $i \in \partial\Sigma_K$ ,

then  $\dim_C K \leq \dim_S(F, D)$ .

It is a direct consequence of Lemma 4.2, Lemma 4.4 and Theorem 1.2.

## 5. THE PROOF OF THE THEOREM 1.4

Let  $\Delta \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  be the regular triangle with vertexes  $a_1 = (0, 0), a_2 = (1, 0), a_3 = (1/2, \sqrt{3}/2)$ . We use  $\overline{[a, b]}$  to denote the line segment in  $\partial\Delta$  with  $a, b$  as endpoints.

Let  $F = \{f_i\}_{i=1}^N$  be a fractal gasket IFS defined in Definition 1.9. For  $f_i \in F$ , we call  $f_i(\Delta)$  a *basic triangle*, and write  $F(\Delta) = \{f_i(\Delta); f_i \in F\}$  for the family of basic rectangles with respect to  $F$ . If  $f_i(\Delta) \cap \partial\Delta$  is contained in an edge  $e$  of the  $\Delta$ , then we call  $f_i(\Delta)$  a *private triangle* subordinated to  $e$  in  $F(\Delta)$ . If  $f_i(\Delta) \cap \partial\Delta = \emptyset$ , then we call  $f_i(\Delta)$  an *inner triangle* in  $F(\Delta)$ , and denote the family of all inner triangles in  $F(\Delta)$  by  $F_I(\Delta)$ . We set

$$I_F = \{\text{the vertices of the private triangles in } F(\Delta)\} \cap \Delta^\circ.$$

Let  $F = \{f_i\}_{i=1}^N$  be an IFS and let  $K$  be the attractor. The *Hata graph* of  $F$ , denote  $H(K)$ , is defined as follows: the vertex set is  $\{f_1, f_2, \dots, f_N\}$ , and there is an edge between two vertices  $f_i$  and  $f_j$  if and only if  $f_i(K) \cap f_j(K) \neq \emptyset$  (see [12]). Hata [12] proved that a self-similar set  $K$  is connected if and only if the graph  $H(K)$  is connected.

**Lemma 5.1.** *Let  $F$  be a fractal gasket IFS. There exist a fractal gasket IFS  $F'$  such that  $F \subset F'$  and  $F'$  satisfies the following conditions:*

(i) let  $K'$  be the attractor of  $F'$ ,  $K'$  is connected and  $\partial\Delta \subset K'$ ;

(ii) the private triangles subordinate to different edges do not intersect;

(iii) each edge of  $\Delta$  have the same number  $N_0$  of the private triangles in  $F'(\Delta)$ ;

(iv) denote  $d_0 = \min_{x, y \in I_F, x \neq y} d(x, y)$ , the diameter of the triangle in  $F'_I(\Delta)$  is strictly less than  $d_0/N_0$ .

*Proof.* To get (i), we only need to construct an IFS  $F_1$  such that  $F \cup F_1$  is a fractal gasket IFS and  $\bigcup_{f \in F \cup F_1} f(\Delta)$  is a connected set containing  $\partial\Delta$ . See Appendix A for the details of constructing the IFS  $F_1$ .

Take  $F' = F \cup F_1$ . Clearly, we have  $f_i(\Delta) \cap f_j(\Delta) \neq \emptyset$  implies  $f_i(K') \cap f_j(K') \neq \emptyset$  for any  $f_i, f_j \in F'$ . So  $H(K')$  is connected by  $\bigcup_{f \in F'} f(\Delta)$  is connected, then  $K'$  is connected by [12].

We assume that (i) already hold for  $F'$ . Denote  $F' = \{f_i\}_{i=1}^N$  and  $\Sigma = \{1, \dots, N\}$ . Suppose that  $a_i \in f_i(\Delta)$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ . Next, we view  $K'$  as an attractor of a new fractal gasket IFS, and this IFS satisfies (ii), (iii), (iv). The construction of the new IFS is as follows:

Step 1: Denote  $r^* = \max_{f_i \in F'} f'_i$  and  $r' = \min_{i \in \{1, 2, 3\}} f'_i$ , where  $f'_i$  denotes the derivative of  $f_i$ . Let  $k = \lfloor \log \frac{r'}{2} / \log r^* \rfloor$ . For any  $f_i$  with  $f_i(\Delta)$  is a private triangle in  $F'(\Delta)$ , we replace  $f_i$  with  $\bigcup_{I \in \Sigma^k} f_i \circ f_I$ . This means that we have iterated over all the private triangles for  $k$  times. Then the edge length of the private triangles in the new IFS is strictly less than  $r'/2$ . By abusing of notations, we denote the new IFS as  $F'$ , then (ii) holds.

Step 2: At this time  $F'$  satisfies (i) and (ii). We denote the number of the private triangles in  $F'(\Delta)$  subordinate to the three sides  $\overline{[a_1, a_2]}$ ,  $\overline{[a_1, a_3]}$ , and  $\overline{[a_2, a_3]}$  of the triangle  $\Delta$  as  $p_1$ ,  $p_2$ , and  $p_3$ , respectively. Without loss of generality, we assume that  $p_1, p_2, p_3$  are not less than 1 (otherwise, we will consider  $F'^2$ ).

Pick  $f_{i_1}$  with  $f_{i_1}(\Delta)$  is a private triangle subordinated to  $\overline{[a_1, a_2]}$  in  $F'(\Delta)$ , we replace  $f_{i_1}$  with  $\bigcup_{i \in \Sigma} f_{i_1} \circ f_i$ . Next, we replace  $f_{i_1}^2$  with  $\bigcup_{i \in \Sigma} f_{i_1}^2 \circ f_i$ , and repeat this process  $(p_2 + 1)(p_3 + 1) - 1$  times until we replace  $f_{i_1}^{(p_2 + 1)(p_3 + 1) - 1}$  with  $\bigcup_{i \in \Sigma} f_{i_1}^{(p_2 + 1)(p_3 + 1) - 1} \circ f_i$ . Then the edge  $\overline{[a_1, a_2]}$  have  $(p_1 + 1)(p_2 + 1)(p_3 + 1) - 1$  private triangles with respect to the new IFS.

Similar treatment for edges  $\overline{[a_1, a_3]}$  and  $\overline{[a_2, a_3]}$ . That means we pick  $f_{j_1}$  with  $f_{j_1}(\Delta)$  is a private triangle subordinated to  $\overline{[a_1, a_3]}$  in  $F'(\Delta)$ , replace  $f_{j_1}$  with  $\bigcup_{i \in \Sigma} f_{j_1} \circ f_i$  and repeat this process  $(p_1 + 1)(p_3 + 1) - 1$  times. Pick  $f_{k_1}$  with  $f_{k_1}(\Delta)$  is a private triangle subordinated to  $\overline{[a_2, a_3]}$  in  $F'(\Delta)$ , replace  $f_{k_1}$  with  $\bigcup_{i \in \Sigma} f_{k_1} \circ f_i$  and repeat this process  $(p_1 + 1)(p_2 + 1) - 1$  times. Then the edges  $\overline{[a_1, a_3]}$ ,  $\overline{[a_2, a_3]}$  also have  $(p_1 + 1)(p_2 + 1)(p_3 + 1) - 1$  private triangles with respect to the new IFS.

Take  $N_0 = (p_1 + 1)(p_2 + 1)(p_3 + 1) - 1$ . By abusing of notations, we denote the new IFS as  $F'$ , then (iii) holds.

Step 3: At this time  $F'$  satisfies (i), (ii) and (iii). Let  $k_0 = \lfloor \log \frac{d_0}{N_0} / \log r^* \rfloor$ . For any  $f_i$  with  $f_i(\Delta)$  is a triangle in  $F'_1(\Delta)$ , we replace  $f_i$  with  $\bigcup_{I \in \Sigma^{k_0}} f_i \circ f_I$ . This means that we have iterated over all the triangles in  $F'_1(\Delta)$  for  $k_0$  times. Then the edge length (also the diameter) of the inner triangle in the new IFS is strictly less than  $d_0/N_0$ . By abusing of notations, we denote the new IFS as  $F'$ , then (iv) holds.  $\square$

For the remainder of this section, the fractal gasket IFS  $F = \{f_i\}_{i=1}^N$  will satisfies the (i), (ii), (iii), (iv) in Lemma 5.1 and  $a_i \in f_i(\Delta)$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ . For an illustration, see Figure 11 (a). Next, we define the vertex iteration of  $F$ . Fix a positive integer  $m \in \mathbb{N}^*$ . Denote  $\Sigma = \{1, \dots, N\}$ . We replace  $f_1$  with  $\bigcup_{i \in \Sigma} f_1 \circ f_i$ . Next, we replace  $f_1^2$  with  $\bigcup_{i \in \Sigma} f_1^2 \circ f_i$ , and repeat this process  $m$  times until we replace  $f_1^m$  with  $\bigcup_{i \in \Sigma} f_1^m \circ f_i$ . Similar treatment for  $f_2$  and  $f_3$ . Then we get a new IFS with attractor




FIGURE 9. (a)




FIGURE 10. (b)

 FIGURE 11. An example of the  $F(\Delta)$  and  $F_1(\Delta)$ 

$K$ , i.e.

$$F_m = \{f_i; i \neq 1, 2, 3\} \cup \{f_i^{(m+1)}; i = 1, 2, 3\} \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^3 \bigcup_{\ell=1}^m \{f_i^\ell \circ f_k; k = 1, \dots, N \text{ and } k \neq i\}.$$

We call  $F_m$  the  $m$ -level vertex iteration of  $F$ . For  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ , we call the sub-IFS

$$V_i = f_i^{(m+1)} \cup \bigcup_{\ell=1}^m \{f_i^\ell \circ f_k; k = 1, \dots, N \text{ and } k \neq i\}$$

the iteration component of  $f_i$ .

Let  $F_m$  be the  $m$ -level vertex iteration of  $F$ , and let  $V_1, V_2, V_3$  be the iteration component of  $f_1, f_2, f_3$  respectively, Figure 11 (b) shows the images of  $\Delta$  under the mappings in  $F_1$ . Let  $G_0 = \{\overline{a_i a_j}; 1 \leq i, j \leq 3\}$  be the complete graph with vertex set  $\{a_1, a_2, a_3\}$ . We set

$$(5.1) \quad \tau_0(\overline{a_1 a_2}) = \tau_0(\overline{a_1 a_3}) = \tau_0(\overline{a_2 a_3}) = 1.$$

Since each edge of  $\Delta$  has  $N_0$  private triangles in  $F(\Delta)$ , there are  $C_m = (2N_0 + 2)m + N_0 + 2$  basic triangles in  $F_m(\Delta)$  intersected by each edge of  $\Delta$ . Let  $T_1, T_2, T_3$  be the basic triangles in  $\{g(\Delta)\}_{g \in F_m \setminus (V_1 \cup V_2 \cup V_3)}$  containing points  $f_3(a_2), f_3(a_1), f_1(a_2)$  respectively, see Figure 11 (b). Pick  $s > \frac{\log C_m}{(-m-1) \log r_0}$ , where  $r_0 = \max_{i \in \{1, 2, 3\}} r_i$ . Take  $g \in F_m$ , we set

$$(5.2) \quad R(g) = \begin{cases} r_i^{(m+1)s}, & \text{if } g = f_i^{(m+1)}, i \in \{1, 2, 3\}; \\ r_j^{(m+1)s}, & \text{if } g(\Delta) = T_j, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}; \\ \frac{1 - r_1^{(m+1)s} - r_2^{(m+1)s} - r_3^{(m+1)s}}{C_m - 3}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For convenience, we will denote  $W_{m,s} = \frac{1 - r_1^{(m+1)s} - r_2^{(m+1)s} - r_3^{(m+1)s}}{C_m - 3}$ . Clearly, we have  $W_{m,s} > r_i^{(m+1)s}$  for any  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$  by  $s > \frac{\log C_m}{(-m-1) \log r_0}$ .

**Lemma 5.2.** *Let  $\Gamma$  be a connected graph. Let  $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2$  be two connected subgraphs of  $\Gamma$  such that  $\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2 = \Gamma$  and  $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2$  have only two common vertices, denote by  $\{a, b\}$ . If  $P$  is a path in  $\Gamma$  and the origin (terminus) of  $P$  is the vertex in  $\Gamma_1$  ( $\Gamma_2$ ) that is different from  $\{a, b\}$ , then the subgraphs decompose the path into 2 sub-paths, i.e.*

$$P = P_1 + P_2,$$

where  $P_1 \subset \Gamma_1$ ,  $P_2 \subset \Gamma_2$ , the terminus of  $P_1$  and the origin of  $P_2$  belongs to  $\{a, b\}$ .

Let  $F^*$  be a sub-IFS of  $F_m$  and let  $G_{F^*} = \bigcup_{g \in F^*} g(G_0)$  be a sub-graph of  $G_n$ . we denote by  $D_{F^*}$  the metric on  $\bigcup_{g \in F^*} g(P)$ . We call that a path  $P$  passes through a triangle if one side of the triangle belongs to  $P$ .

**Lemma 5.3.** *Let  $F^* = F_m \setminus (V_1 \cup V_2 \cup V_3)$  be the sub-IFS of  $F_m$  and let  $G_{F^*} = \bigcup_{g \in F^*} g(G_0)$  be a sub-graph of  $G_n$ . If  $(\tau_0, R)$  are defined in (5.1) and (5.2), then*

$$(5.3) \quad D_{F^*}(a, b) \geq (N_0 - 1) \times W_{m,s} + r_2^{(m+1)s},$$

where  $a \in \{f_1(a_2), f_1(a_3)\}$  and  $b \in \{f_3(a_1), f_3(a_2)\}$ . In particular,

$$D_{F^*}(f_1(a_3), f_3(a_1)) = (N_0 - 1) \times W_{m,s} + r_2^{(m+1)s}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $a \in \{f_1(a_2), f_1(a_3)\}$  and  $b \in \{f_3(a_1), f_3(a_2)\}$ . Pick a path  $P$  joining  $a, b$  in  $G_{1,F^*}$ .

If none of edges of  $P$  belong to the triangles in  $F_I(\Delta)$ , then  $P$  can only be a path joining  $f_1(a_3)$  and  $f_3(a_1)$ . Since  $\overline{[f_1(a_3), f_3(a_1)]}$  has  $N_0$  private triangles and one of them is  $T_2$ , so the weight of  $P$  is not less than  $(N_0 - 1) \times W_{m,s} + r_2^{(m+1)s}$  by (5.1) and (5.2).

Otherwise, there exists a sub-path of  $P$  joining two different points in  $I_F$ , and each edge belongs to a triangle in  $F_I(\Delta)$ . Since the distance between two different points in  $I_F$  is not less than  $d_0$ , and the diameter of the triangle in  $F_I(\Delta)$  is strictly less than  $d_0/N_0$  by the Lemma 5.1 (iv), then the sub-path passes through at least  $N_0$  basic triangles. By (5.1) and (5.2), the edges in the sub-path have the same weight  $W_{m,s}$ . So, we have the weight of  $P$  is bigger than  $N_0 \times W_{m,s}$ . Since  $s > \frac{\log C_m}{(-m-1) \log r_0}$ , we have  $N_0 \times W_{m,s} > (N_0 - 1) \times W_{m,s} + r_2^{(m+1)s}$ , thus (5.3) holds.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.4.** *Let  $V_3$  be the iteration component of  $f_3$  and let  $G_{V_3} = \bigcup_{g \in V_3} g(G_0)$  be a sub-graph of  $G_n$ . If  $(\tau_0, R)$  are defined in (5.1) and (5.2), then*

$$(1) D_{V_3}(a_3, f_3(a_1)) = D_{V_3}(a_3, f_3(a_2)) = r_3^{(m+1)s} + (N_0 m + m) \times W_{m,s},$$

$$(2) D_{V_3}(f_3(a_1), f_3(a_2)) = (N_0 + 2) \times W_{m,s}.$$

*Proof.* First we prove the first assertion.

Pick a path  $P$  joining vertex  $a_3$  and  $f_3(a_1)$  (or  $f_3(a_2)$ ) in  $G_{V_3}$ . By Lemma 5.2, we have the subgraphs  $\Gamma_1 = \bigcup_{k \in \Sigma \setminus \{3\}} f_3 \circ f_k(G_0)$ ,  $\Gamma_2 = \bigcup_{k \in \Sigma \setminus \{3\}} f_3^2 \circ f_k(G_0)$ , ...,  $\Gamma_m = \bigcup_{k \in \Sigma \setminus \{3\}} f_3^m \circ f_k(G_0)$ ,



$\Gamma_{m+1} = f_3^{m+1}(G_0)$  decompose the path  $P$  into  $m + 1$  sub-paths, denote by

$$P = P_1 + P_2 + \cdots + P_m + P_{m+1},$$

where  $P_\ell \subset \Gamma_\ell$ , and the origin of  $P_\ell$  belongs to  $\{f_3^\ell(a_1), f_3^\ell(a_2)\}$ , the terminus of  $P_\ell$  belongs to  $\{f_3^{\ell+1}(a_1), f_3^{\ell+1}(a_2)\}$ ,  $1 \leq \ell \leq m$ .

Next, we prove that the number of edges of  $P_\ell$  is not less than  $N_0 + 1$  for any  $1 \leq \ell \leq m$ . If none of edges of  $P_\ell$  belong to the triangles in  $f_3^\ell(F_I(\Delta))$ , then  $P_\ell$  passes through at least  $N_0 + 1$  basic triangles. Otherwise, there exists a sub-path of  $P_\ell$  joining two different points in  $f_3^\ell(I_F)$ , and each edge belongs to a triangle in  $f_3^\ell(F_I(\Delta))$ . Notice that the distance between two different points in  $f_3^\ell(I_F)$  is not less than  $d_0 r_3^\ell$ , and the diameter of the triangle in  $f_3^\ell(F_I(\Delta))$  is strictly less than  $d_0 r_3^\ell / N_0$  by the Lemma 5.1 (iv), then the sub-path of  $P_\ell$  passes through at least  $N_0$  basic triangles. Thus the number of edges of  $P_\ell$  is not less than  $N_0 + 1$ .

By (5.1) and (5.2), the edges in  $P_\ell$ ,  $1 \leq \ell \leq m$ , have the same weight  $W_{m,s}$ . Since the weight of  $P_{m+1}$  is not less than  $r_3^{(m+1)s}$ , so

$$D_{V_3}(a_3, f_3(a_1)) = D_{V_3}(a_3, f_3(a_2)) = r_3^{(m+1)s} + (N_0 m + m) \times W_{m,s}.$$

Next we prove the second assertion of the lemma.

Pick a path  $P'$  joining vertex  $f_3(a_1)$  and  $f_3(a_2)$  in  $G_{V_3}$ .

If one edge of  $P'$  belongs to the subgraph  $\bigcup_{\ell=2}^{m+1} \Gamma_\ell$ , then  $P'$  passes through the vertexes  $f_3^2(a_1)$  and  $f_3^2(a_2)$ . By the proof of the first assertion, we have that  $P'$  has two sub-paths with edge number at least  $N_0 + 1$  and that the weights of these edges are both  $W_{m,s}$ . Then the weight of  $P'$  is bigger than  $(2N_0 + 2) \times W_{m,s}$ .

Assume that  $P'$  is contained in the subgraph  $\Gamma_1$ . If none of edges of  $P'$  belong to the triangles in  $f_3(F_I(\Delta))$ , then  $P'$  has at least  $N_0 + 2$  edges. Otherwise, there exists a sub-path of  $P'$  joining two different points in  $f_3(I_F)$ , and each edge belongs to a triangle in  $f_3(F_I(\Delta))$ . By the proof of the first assertion, we have the sub-path passes through at least  $N_0$  basic triangles. Thus  $P'$  also has at least  $N_0 + 2$  edges. Since the weight of the edge in  $\Gamma_1$  is  $W_{m,s}$ , we have the weight of  $P'$  is not less than  $(N_0 + 2) \times W_{m,s}$ , thus the second assertion holds.  $\square$

**Corollary 5.5.** *If  $F^* = F_m \setminus (V_1 \cup V_2 \cup V_3)$  is replaced by  $F^* = F_m \setminus (V_1 \cup V_3)$  in Lemma 5.3, then the conclusion also holds.*

**Proof of Theorem 1.4.** We prove the second assertion below. By Lemma 5.1, we can find a fractal gasket IFS  $F' = \{f_i\}_{i=1}^N$  with attractor  $K'$  satisfying (i), (ii), (iii), (iv). Suppose that  $a_i \in f_i(\Delta)$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ .

Fix a positive integer  $m \in \mathbb{N}^*$ . Let  $F'_m$  be the  $m$ -level vertex iteration of  $F'$ , and let  $V_1, V_2, V_3$  be the iteration component of  $f_1, f_2, f_3$  respectively. Let  $G_0 = \{\overline{a_i a_j}; 1 \leq i, j \leq 3\}$  be the complete

graph with vertex set  $\{a_1, a_2, a_3\}$ . Let  $G_1 = \bigcup_{g \in F'_m} g(G_0)$  and let  $(\tau_0, R)$  are defined in (5.1) and (5.2).

Next, we prove that  $(\tau_0, R)$  are good assignment. Let's prove the compatibility first.

Notice that  $\overline{[a_1, a_3]}$  is decomposed by  $C_m$  cylinders in  $F'_m$ . We ordered these cylinders in order from bottom to top, denote by  $g_k(K'), k = 1, \dots, C_m$ . Then

$$P_0 = g_1(\overline{a_1 a_3}) + g_2(\overline{a_1 a_3}) + \dots + g_{C_m}(\overline{a_1 a_3})$$

is a path joining  $a_1, a_3$  in  $G_1$ . And we have

$$\tau_1(P_0) = r_1^{(m+1)s} + r_2^{(m+1)s} + r_3^{(m+1)s} + (C_m - 3) \times \frac{1 - r_1^{(m+1)s} - r_2^{(m+1)s} - r_3^{(m+1)s}}{C_m - 3} = 1.$$

To prove that  $P_0$  is a geodesic in  $G_1$ , we need to prove that the weight of any path joining  $a_1, a_3$  in  $G_1$  is not less than 1.

Pick a path  $P$  join  $a_1, a_3$  in  $G_1$ . By Lemma 5.2, we have the subgraphs  $G_{V_1} = \bigcup_{g \in V_1} g(G_0)$ ,  $G_{V_3} = \bigcup_{g \in V_3} g(G_0)$ ,  $G_{F_m \setminus (V_1 \cup V_3)} = \bigcup_{g \in F_m \setminus (V_1 \cup V_3)} g(G_0)$  decompose the path  $P$  into 3 sub-paths, denote by

$$P = P_1 + P_2 + P_3.$$

By Lemma 5.4 and Corollary 5.5, we have  $\tau_1(P_1) \geq r_1^{(m+1)s} + (N_0 m + m) \times W_{m,s}$ ,  $\tau_1(P_2) \geq (N_0 - 1) \times W_{m,s} + r_2^{(m+1)s}$ ,  $\tau_1(P_3) \geq r_3^{(m+1)s} + (N_0 m + m) \times W_{m,s}$ , so  $\tau_1(P) \geq 1$ . Then,  $P_0$  is a geodesic in  $G_1$ . Thus

$$D_1(a_1, a_3) = \tau_1(P_0) = 1 = D_0(a_1, a_3).$$

By the same argument we have  $D_1(a_1, a_2) = D_0(a_1, a_2)$  and  $D_1(a_2, a_3) = D_0(a_2, a_3)$ . Then  $D_1$  coincides with  $D_0$  on  $\{a_1, a_2, a_3\}$ . The compatibility holds.

Next, we prove that  $e$  is a geodesic in  $(G_1, \tau_1)$  for any  $e \in G_1$ .

Pick an edge  $e$  in  $G_1$ . Suppose that  $e \in g_{i_0}(G_0)$ , and denote by  $a, b$  the endpoints of  $e$ . Pick a path  $P'$  joining vertex  $a$  and  $b$  in  $G_1$ . To prove that  $e$  is a geodesic in  $G_1$ , we only need to prove that

$$(5.4) \quad \tau_1(P') \geq \tau_1(e).$$

If there is an edge in  $P'$  belongs to  $g_{i_0}(G_0)$ , then (5.4) obviously holds by (5.1). So we assume that all edges in  $P'$  do not belong to  $g_{i_0}(G_0)$ . Since  $(\tau_0, R)$  are defined in (5.1) and (5.2), we deduce that  $P'$  has an edge with weight  $W_{m,s}$ . Since  $s > \frac{\log C_m}{(-m-1) \log r_0}$ , we have  $\tau_1(e) \leq W_{m,s}$  for any  $e$ , then (5.4) holds.

So  $e$  is a geodesic in  $(G_1, \tau_1)$  for any  $e \in G_1$ . Thus  $(\tau_0, R)$  are good assignment. By Theorem 4.1, we have  $1 \leq \dim_C K' \leq \dim_S(F'_m, D)$ . Clearly,  $\dim_S(F'_m, D) \rightarrow 1$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ . Thus  $\dim_C K \leq \dim_C K' = 1$ . Since  $K$  have a connected component,  $\dim_C K = 1$ .  $\square$

# REFERENCES

- [1] C. Bandt and H. Rao, *Topology and separation of self-similar fractals in the plane*, Nonlinearity, **20** (2007), 1463-1474.
- [2] C. Bandt and J. Stahnke, *Self-similar sets 6. Interior distance on deterministic fractals*, preprint, Greifswald (1990).
- [3] T. Q. Bao, S. Cobza and A. Soubeyran, *Variational principles, completeness and the existence of traps in behavioral sciences*, Annals of Operations Research, **269** (2018), 57-39.
- [4] A. Beurling and L. Ahlfors, *The boundary correspondence under quasiconformal mappings*, Acta Math., **96** (1956), 125-142.
- [5] C. J. Bishop and J. T. Tyson, *Conformal dimension of the antenna set*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **129** (2001), 3631-3636.
- [6] J. J. Charatonik, W. J. Charatonik, *Dendrites*, Aportaciones Mat. Comun., **22** (1998), 227-253.
- [7] D. A. Croydon, *The Hausdorff dimension of a class of random self-similar fractal trees*, Adv. Appl. Prob., **39** (2007), 708-730.
- [8] X. R. Dai, H. Rao and S. Q. Zhang, *Space-filling curves of self-similar sets: edge-to-trail substitution rule*, Nonlinearity, **32** (2009), 1772-1809.
- [9] Y. G. Dang and S. Y. Wen, *Conformal dimension of a class of planar self-similar sets*, Sci. Sin. Math., **51** (2021), 581-590.
- [10] P. Hajłasz and P. Koskela, *Sobolev met Poincaré*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc., **145** (2000), x+101.
- [11] H. Hakobyan, *Conformal dimension: Cantor sets and Fuglede modulus*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN, (2010), 87-111.
- [12] M. Hata, *On the structure of self-similar sets*, Japan. J. Appl. Math., **2** (1985), 381-414.
- [13] J. Heinonen, *Lectures on analysis on metric spaces*, Universitext. Springer-Verlag, New York, (2001).
- [14] J. E. Hopcroft, R. Motwani, Rotwani and J. D. Ullman, *Introduction to Automata Theory, Language, and Computation*, Addison-Wesley, Massachusetts., (1979).
- [15] L. Y. Huang, Z. Y. Wen, Y. M. Yang and Y. J. Zhu, *Topology automaton of self-similar sets and its applications to metrical classifications*, Nonlinearity, **0** (2023), 1-26.
- [16] J. E. Hutchinson, *Fractals and self-similarity*, Indiana Univ. Math. J., **30** (1981), 713-747.
- [17] J. Kigami, *Harmonic calculus on limits of networks and its application to dendrites*, J. Funct. Anal., (1995), 48-86.
- [18] J. Kigami, *Analysis on fractals*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics **143** (2001).
- [19] J. Kigami, *Quasisymmetric modification of metrics on self-similar sets*, Springer Proc. Math. Stat., **88** (2014), 253-282.
- [20] L. V. Kovalev, *Conformal dimension does not assume values between zero and one*, Duke Math. J., **134** (2006), 1-13.
- [21] D. Mauldin and S. Williams, *Hausdorff dimension in graph directed constructions*, Trans. Am. Math. Soc., **309** (1988), 811-829.
- [22] P. Pansu, *Dimension conforme et sphère à l'infini des variétés à courbure négative*, Ann Acad Sci Fenn Ser A I Math **14** (1989), 177-212.
- [23] M. Samuel, A. Tetenov and D. Vaulin, *Self-similar dendrites generated by polygonal systems in the plane*, Sib. Èlektron. Mat. Izv. **14** (2017), 737-751.
- [24] H. Rao and Y. J. Zhu, *Lipschitz equivalence of fractal squares and finite state automation*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.04271 (2016).

- [25] E. M. Stein, *Harmonic analysis: real-variable methods, orthogonality, and oscillatory integrals*, Princeton Mathematical Series, **43** (Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1993).
- [26] J. T. Tyson, J. M. Wu, *Quasiconformal dimensions of self-similar fractals*, Rev. Mat. Iberoam., **22** (2006), 205-258.
- [27] Y. J. Zhu and Y. M. Yang, *Lipschitz equivalence of self-similar sets with two-state neighbor automaton*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., **458** (2018), 379-392.

#### APPENDIX A. THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE IFS $F_1$ IN LEMMA 5.1 (I)

*Proof.* Firstly, we construct an IFS  $F'_1$  such that  $F \cup F'_1$  is a fractal gasket IFS and  $\partial\Delta \subset \bigcup_{f \in F \cup F'_1} f(\Delta)$ . The construction of the IFS  $F'_1$  is as follows:

Pick  $e \in \{\overline{[a_1, a_2]}, \overline{[a_2, a_3]}, \overline{[a_1, a_3]}\}$ . If  $e \not\subset \bigcup_{f \in F} f(\Delta)$ , then  $e \setminus \bigcup_{f \in F} f(\Delta)$  is a union of line segments. Let  $\overline{[u, v]}$  be a line segment in  $e \setminus \bigcup_{f \in F} f(\Delta)$ , clearly we can add a family of small regular triangles  $\{g_k(\Delta)\}_{k=1}^q$  such that  $F \cup \{g_k\}_{k=1}^q$  is a fractal gasket IFS and  $\bigcup_{k=1}^q g_k(e) = \overline{[u, v]}$ . Repeat this process for each line segment in  $e \setminus \bigcup_{f \in F} f(\Delta)$  (see Figure 12). Take  $F'_1$  for all the added mappings  $\{g_k\}$ .




FIGURE 12. The construction of the  $F'_1$


Secondly, we construct an IFS  $F''_1$  such that  $F \cup F'_1 \cup F''_1$  is a fractal gasket IFS and  $\bigcup_{f \in F \cup F'_1 \cup F''_1} f(\Delta)$  is connected.

Pick two connected components  $A, B$  of  $\bigcup_{f \in F \cup F'_1} f(\Delta)$ . Let  $a, b$  be the vertices of  $A, B$  respectively, and these two vertices belong to a single basic triangle in  $(F \cup F'_1)(\Delta)$ . Denote the triangles in which  $a, b$  is located by  $f_i(\Delta), f_j(\Delta)$  respectively.

We construct a broken line  $L$  connecting  $a, b$  such that it satisfies: (1)  $L$  consists of segments parallel to  $\overline{[a_1, a_2]}, \overline{[a_1, a_3]}$ ; (2) The broken line  $L$  do not intersect with the triangles in  $((F \cup F'_1) \setminus \{f_i, f_j\})(\Delta)$ . The construction of the broken line  $L$  see Figure 13.

Step 1: We find a curve  $\gamma$  in  $\Delta$  connecting  $a, b$  and  $\gamma$  do not intersect the triangles in  $((F \cup F'_1) \setminus \{f_i, f_j\})(\Delta)$ . Denote

$$d_0 = \inf \left\{ d(x, y); x \in \gamma, y \in \bigcup_{f \in (F \cup F'_1) \setminus \{f_i, f_j\}} f(\Delta) \right\}.$$


 FIGURE 13. The construction of the broken line  $L$ 

Let  $\gamma_{d_0-\epsilon} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2; \text{dist}(x, \gamma) \leq d_0 - \epsilon\}$  be the  $(d_0 - \epsilon)$ -neighborhood of  $\gamma$ . Then the set  $\gamma_{d_0-\epsilon}$  also do not intersect the triangles in  $((F \cup F'_1) \setminus \{f_i, f_j\})(\Delta)$ .

Step 2: Let  $P_1, P_2$  be the two families of parallel lines parallel to  $\overline{[a_1, a_2]}, \overline{[a_1, a_3]}$  respectively, where  $P_1, P_2$  both contain parallel lines passing through  $a, b$  and the distance between any two parallel lines is less than  $(d_0 - \epsilon)/100$ . We call the part enclosed by  $P_1, P_2$  a *parallelogram net*.

Suppose that the number of parallel lines in  $P_1, P_2$  are sufficiently large. The parallelogram net  $C$  can cover the set  $\gamma_{d_0-\epsilon}$ . Since the parallelogram in  $C$  has small side lengths and  $a, b$  are the lattice points of  $C$ , we can choose a joining of parallelograms in  $\gamma_{d_0-\epsilon}$  connecting  $a, b$ , and the joining do not intersect the  $\partial\gamma_{d_0-\epsilon}$ .

Step 3: The broken line  $L$  can be taken from the boundary of this parallelogram joining (see Figure 13).

Denote  $d_1 = \inf\{d(x, y); x \in L, y \in \partial\gamma_{d_0-\epsilon}\}$ . Pick a line segment  $L_1$  in  $L$ . Suppose  $L_1$  is parallel to  $e, e \in \{\overline{[a_1, a_2]}, \overline{[a_1, a_3]}\}$ , we can add a family of regular triangles  $\{h_k(\Delta)\}_{k=1}^\ell$  with side lengths strictly smaller than  $d_1$  such that  $F \cup F'_1 \cup \{h_k\}_{k=1}^\ell$  is a fractal gasket IFS and  $\bigcup_{k=1}^\ell h_k(e) = L_1$ . Take  $F''_1$  for all the added mappings  $\{h_k\}$ .

Finally, take  $F_1 = F'_1 \cup F''_1$ . □

## APPENDIX B. PROOF OF LEMMA 5.2

*Proof.* Let  $P$  be a path in  $\Gamma$  and the origin (terminus) of  $P$  is the vertex in  $\Gamma_1$  ( $\Gamma_2$ ) that is different from  $\{a, b\}$ . Denote by  $P(o)$  the sub-path of  $P$  from the origin of  $P$  to the first pass through the set  $\{a, b\}$ . Clearly  $P(o) \subset \Gamma_1$ . Denote by  $P(t)$  the sub-path of  $P$  from the last pass through the set  $\{a, b\}$  to the terminus of  $P$ . Clearly  $P(t) \subset \Gamma_2$ .

Suppose on the contrary that  $P \setminus (P(o) \cup P(t)) \neq \emptyset$ . We denote the sub-path  $P \setminus (P(o) \cup P(t))$  by  $P(m)$ . Clearly the two endpoints of  $P(m)$  are taken from  $\{a, b\}$ . Since  $P(m)$  is a path, so the two endpoints are different. If  $P(m) \subset \Gamma_1$  or  $P(m) \subset \Gamma_2$ , then the lemma holds. Otherwise,  $P(m)$  will pass through the set  $\{a, b\}$ . This means that there are two identical vertices in  $P(m)$ , which contradicts the definition of path.  $\square$

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, CENTRAL CHINA NORMAL UNIVERSITY, WUHAN, 430079, CHINA

*Email address:* `h rao@mail.ccnu.edu.cn`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, TSINGHUA UNIVERSITY, BEIJING, 100084, CHINA

*Email address:* `wenzy@tsinghua.edu.cn`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, CENTRAL CHINA NORMAL UNIVERSITY, WUHAN, 430079, CHINA

*Email address:* `yuanqihan@mails.ccnu.edu.cn`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, CENTRAL CHINA NORMAL UNIVERSITY, WUHAN, 430079, CHINA

*Email address:* `yzhang@mail.ccnu.edu.cn`