

ON THE MODULI SPACE OF THE STANDARD CANTOR SET

HIROSHIGE SHIGA

ABSTRACT. We consider a generalized Cantor set $E(\omega)$ for an infinite sequence $\omega = (q_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ of positive numbers with $0 < q_n < 1$, and examine the quasiconformal equivalence to the standard middle one-third Cantor set $E(\omega_0)$. We may give a necessary and sufficient condition for $E(\omega)$ to be quasiconformally equivalent to $E(\omega_0)$ in terms of ω .

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $\omega = (q_n)_{n=1}^\infty = (q_1, q_2, \dots)$ be an infinite sequence of positive numbers with $0 < q_n < 1$ ($n \in \mathbb{N}$). We may create a Cantor set, which is denoted by $E(\omega)$, from the sequence ω . The standard middle one-third Cantor set $E(\omega_0)$ is given by $\omega_0 = (\frac{1}{3})_{n=1}^\infty = (\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}, \dots)$.

The construction of $E(\omega)$ is the same as that of $E(\omega_0)$. Namely, we start with an interval $I := [0, 1]$ and remove an open interval J_1 with the length q_1 so that $I \setminus J_1$ consists of two closed intervals I_1^1 and I_1^2 of the same length. We put $E_1 = \cup_{i=1}^2 I_1^i = I \setminus J_1$. We remove an open interval of length $|I_1^i|q_2$ from each I_1^i so that the remainder E_2 consists of four closed intervals of the same length, where $|J|$ is the length of an interval J . Inductively, we define the set of the $(k+1)$ -th step, E_{k+1} , from $E_k = \cup_{i=1}^{2^k} I_k^i$ by removing an open interval of length $|I_k^i|q_{k+1}$ from each closed interval I_k^i of E_k so that E_{k+1} consists of 2^{k+1} closed intervals of the same length. The generalized Cantor set $E(\omega)$ for ω is defined by

$$E(\omega) = \bigcap_{k=1}^\infty E_k.$$

We say that two generalized Cantor sets $E(\omega_1), E(\omega_2)$ are *quasiconformally equivalent* if there exists a quasiconformal mapping $\varphi : \widehat{\mathbb{C}} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ such that $\varphi(E(\omega_1)) = E(\omega_2)$. For each $\omega = (q_n)_{n=1}^\infty$, we define *the moduli space* $M(\omega)$ of ω as the set of $\omega' = (q'_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ so that $E(\omega')$ is quasiconformally equivalent to $E(\omega)$. In this paper, we completely determine the moduli space $M(\omega_0)$ of ω_0 .

Date: October 26, 2021.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 30C62; Secondary 30F45.

Key words and phrases. Cantor set, Quasiconformal mapping.

The author was partially supported by the Ministry of Education, Science, Sports and Culture, Japan; Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (B), 16H03933, 2016–2020.

In the previous paper [4], we consider conditions for generalized Cantor sets to be quasiconformally equivalent, and we obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 1.1 ([4]). *Let $\omega = (q_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ and $\tilde{\omega} = (\tilde{q}_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ be sequences with δ -lower bound. We put*

$$(1.1) \quad d(\omega, \tilde{\omega}) = \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \max \left\{ \left| \log \frac{1 - \tilde{q}_n}{1 - q_n} \right|, |\tilde{q}_n - q_n| \right\}.$$

- (1) *If $d(\omega, \tilde{\omega}) < \infty$, then there exists an $\exp(C(\delta)d(\omega, \tilde{\omega}))$ -quasiconformal mapping φ on $\widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ such that $\varphi(E(\omega)) = E(\tilde{\omega})$, where $C(\delta) > 0$ is a constant depending only on δ ;*
- (2) *if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \log \frac{1 - \tilde{q}_n}{1 - q_n} = 0$, then $E(\tilde{\omega})$ is asymptotically conformal to $E(\omega)$, that is, there exists a quasiconformal mapping φ on $\widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ with $\varphi(E(\omega)) = E(\tilde{\omega})$ such that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, $\varphi|_{U_\varepsilon}$ is $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -quasiconformal on a neighborhood U_ε of $E(\omega)$.*

Here, we say that a sequence $\omega = (q_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ has δ -lower bound if there exists $\delta \in (0, 1)$ such that $q_n > \delta$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore, it follows from Theorem 1.1 that for $\omega = (q_n)_{n=1}^\infty$, $E(\omega)$ and $E(\omega_0)$ are quasiconformally equivalent if $0 < \inf_n q_n \leq \sup_n q_n < 1$.

On the other hand, we have seen that if $\sup_n q_n = 1$, then $E(\omega)$ and $E(\omega_0)$ are not quasiconformally equivalent ([4]). Thus, it is a problem what happens if $\inf_n q_n = 0$.

At the first glance, the author considered that $E(\omega)$ and $E(\omega_0)$ might not be quasiconformally equivalent if $\inf_n q_n = 0$. However, we find that it is not true. Indeed, we obtain a necessary and sufficient condition for ω so that $E(\omega)$ is quasiconformally equivalent to $E(\omega_0)$. We established the following theorems (see §2 for the terminologies).

Theorem I. *Let $E(\omega)$ be a generalized Cantor set for $\omega = (q_n)_{n=1}^\infty$. Then, $D(\omega) := \widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus E(\omega)$ is a uniform domain if and only if $N(\omega, \delta) < \infty$ for some $\delta \in (0, 1)$.*

The above theorem enables us to determine $M(\omega_0)$.

Theorem II. *An infinite sequence $\omega = (q_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ with $0 < q_n < 1$ ($n = 1, 2, \dots$) belongs to the moduli space $M(\omega_0)$ of $\omega_0 = (\frac{1}{3})_{n=1}^\infty$ if and only if*

- (1) $\sup_n q_n < 1$, and
- (2) $N(\omega, \delta) < \infty$ for some $\delta \in (0, 1)$.

2. PRELIMINARIES

First of all, we define the number $N(\omega, \delta)$ in Theorems I and II.

For $\omega = (q_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$, we define $\omega(\delta; i)$ ($i \in \mathbb{N}$) by

$$\omega(\delta; i) = \inf \{k \in \mathbb{N} \mid q_{i+k} \geq \delta\}$$

and $N(\omega, \delta)$ by

$$N(\omega, \delta) = \sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \omega(\delta; i).$$

For example, $N(\omega_0, \delta) = 1$ for any $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{3}]$. It is easy to see that if $q_n \rightarrow q > 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then $N(\omega, \delta) < \infty$ for any $\delta \in (0, q)$. On the other hand, if $q_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then $N(\omega, \delta) = \infty$ for any $\delta > 0$. Also, for $\omega = (\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{4}, \dots, \frac{1}{3}, (2n)^{-1}, \frac{1}{3}, (2n+2)^{-1}, \dots)$, we have $N(\omega, \delta) = 1$ for any $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{3}]$ but $\inf_n q_n = 0$.

Next, we define uniform domains (cf. [2], [6]).

A domain $D \subset \mathbb{C}$ is *uniform* if there exists a constant $c \geq 1$ such that any $a, b \in D$ can be joined by a curve γ in D so that for each $z \in \gamma$,

$$\text{(U1): } |\gamma| \leq c|a - b|;$$

$$\text{(U2): } \min\{|\gamma_1|, |\gamma_2|\} \leq c \operatorname{dist}(z, \partial D),$$

where γ_1, γ_2 are connected components of $\gamma \setminus \{z\}$, $|\alpha|$ is the length of a curve α , and $\operatorname{dist}(\cdot, \cdot)$ stands for the Euclidian distance.

Typical uniform domains are the upper half plane \mathbb{H} and the unit disk. In fact, for $a, b \in \mathbb{H}$, the hyperbolic geodesic γ connecting a and b satisfies (U1) and (U2) for $c = \frac{\pi}{2}$. Namely, inequalities

$$(2.1) \quad |\gamma| \leq \frac{\pi}{2}|a - b|$$

and

$$(2.2) \quad \min\{|\gamma_1|, |\gamma_2|\} \leq \frac{\pi}{2} \operatorname{dist}(z, \partial \mathbb{H})$$

hold for any $z \in \gamma$.

Finally in this section, we define the uniform perfectness. A closed set in \mathbb{C} is *uniformly perfect* if there exists a constant $c \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$(2.3) \quad E \cap \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid cr < |z - a| < r \neq \emptyset\}$$

for any $a \in E$ and $r \in (0, \operatorname{diam} E)$, where $\operatorname{diam}(A)$ is the Euclidean diameter of a set A in \mathbb{C} .

It is easy to see that the standard Cantor set $E(\omega_0)$ is uniformly perfect. It is also known (cf. [4]) that the limit sets of some Kleinian groups are uniformly perfect.

3. PROOF OF THEOREM I (PART 1)

In this section, we shall prove the sufficiency of the condition. Namely, we show that if $N(\omega, \delta) < \infty$ for some $\delta > 0$, then $D(\omega)$ is a uniform domain.

Suppose that $N_0 := N(\omega, \delta) < \infty$ for some $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Let a, b be an arbitrary pair of points of $D(\omega)$. We find a curve γ connecting a and b which satisfies the conditions (U1) and (U2) of the definition of uniform domains.

Case 1: $a, b \in \mathbb{H}$ (or in the lower half plane \mathbb{L}).

Let γ be the hyperbolic geodesic γ in \mathbb{H} connecting a and b . From (2.1), we have

$$|\gamma| \leq \frac{\pi}{2}|a - b|.$$

Moreover, since $\text{dist}(z, \partial\mathbb{H}) \leq \text{dist}(z, \partial D(\omega))$ for $z \in \gamma$, we have from (2.2)

$$\min\{\gamma_1, \gamma_2\} \leq \frac{\pi}{2} \text{dist}(z, \partial\mathbb{H}) \leq \frac{\pi}{2} \text{dist}(z, \partial D(\omega)).$$

Hence, (U1) and (U2) are satisfied for $c = \frac{\pi}{2}$.

Case 2: $a \in D(\omega) \setminus \mathbb{R}$ and $b \in D(\omega) \cap \mathbb{R}$ (or $b \in D(\omega) \setminus \mathbb{R}$ and $a \in D(\omega) \cap \mathbb{R}$).

We may assume that $a \in \mathbb{H}$. Let γ be a hyperbolic geodesic in \mathbb{H} whose endpoints are a and $b \in \partial\mathbb{H}$. It is obvious that

$$|\gamma| \leq \frac{\pi}{2}|a - b|.$$

Hence, the condition (U1) holds for $c = \frac{\pi}{2}$.

To consider the condition (U2), we take $z \in \gamma$ and put $\gamma \setminus \{z\} = \gamma_1 \cup \gamma_2$. We label γ_1 as $\gamma_1 \ni a$. For a sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, we take $z_\varepsilon \in \gamma_2$ so that $|\gamma_\varepsilon| = \varepsilon$, where γ_ε is the connected component of $\gamma_2 \setminus \{z_\varepsilon\}$ containing b . We may assume that $z \in \gamma - \gamma_\varepsilon$.

By applying (2.2) to the geodesic $\gamma - \gamma_\varepsilon$, we obtain

$$\min\{|\gamma_1|, |\gamma_2 - \gamma_\varepsilon|\} \leq \frac{\pi}{2} \text{dist}(z, \partial\mathbb{H}) \leq \frac{\pi}{2} \text{dist}(z, \partial D(\omega)).$$

Thus, we have

$$(3.1) \quad \min\{|\gamma_1|, |\gamma_2|\} = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \min\{|\gamma_1|, |\gamma_2 - \gamma_\varepsilon|\} \leq \frac{\pi}{2} \text{dist}(z, \partial D(\omega)).$$

Hence, the condition (U2) still holds for $c = \frac{\pi}{2}$.

Case 3: $a, b \in D(\omega) \cap \mathbb{R}$.

Let γ be the hyperbolic geodesic joining a and b . Then, the same argument as in Case 2 works and we may show that the conditions (U1) and (U2) hold for $c = \frac{\pi}{2}$.

Case 4: $a \in \mathbb{H}$ and $b \in \mathbb{L}$ (or $a \in \mathbb{L}$ and $b \in \mathbb{H}$).

We will show that there exists a constant $c \geq 1$ such that for any $a \in \mathbb{H}$ and $b \in \mathbb{L}$ there exists a curve γ connecting a and b in $D(\omega)$ so that (U1) and (U2) hold for c and γ . We show it by contradiction.

Suppose that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exist $a_n \in \mathbb{H}$, $b_n \in \mathbb{L}$ such that any curve γ connecting a_n and b_n in $D(\omega)$ does not satisfy (U1) or (U2) for $c = n$. Taking subsequences of $\{a_n\}$ and $\{b_n\}$, we may assume that $\{a_n\}$ converges to some a_∞ and $\{b_n\}$ converges to b_∞ .

Case 4-(i). $a_\infty, b_\infty \in D(\omega)$ and $a_\infty \neq b_\infty$.

Take a curve γ connecting a_∞ and b_∞ in $D(\omega)$. Then, the curve γ satisfies (U1) and (U2) for some $c \geq 1$. Since a_n is in a small neighborhood of a_∞ in $D(\omega)$ and so is b_n for a sufficiently large n , it is not hard to see that for a sufficiently large n , we may find a curve γ_n connecting a_n and b_n such that γ_n satisfies (U1) and (U2) for some $c' \geq 1$. Therefore, it is a contradiction.

Case 4-(ii). $a_\infty, b_\infty \in D(\omega)$ and $a_\infty = b_\infty$.

Take a small disk D in $D(\omega)$ centered at a_∞ . Then, for a sufficiently large n , both a_n and b_n are contained in D . We verify that the hyperbolic geodesic γ with respect to the hyperbolic metric of D connecting a_n and

b_n satisfies (U1) and (U2) for some $c \geq 1$. Thus, this case also does not happen.

Case 4-(iii). a_∞ or $b_\infty \in E(\omega)$ and $a_\infty \neq b_\infty$.

We may assume that $b_\infty \in E(\omega)$. From the construction of $E(\omega)$, there exists an infinite sequence of closed intervals $\{I_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ such that

- (1) for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, I_n is a closed interval appearing at the n -th step of the construction of $E(\omega)$;
- (2) $b_\infty \in \cdots \subset I_{n+1} \subset I_n \subset \cdots \subset I_1$;
- (3) $\{b_\infty\} = \bigcap_{n=1}^\infty I_n$.

Take a sufficiently large n so that $\varepsilon_n := |b_n - b_\infty| < 10^{-1}|a_\infty - b_\infty|$ and $|a_n - a_\infty| < 10^{-1}|a_\infty - b_\infty|$.

Here, we exhibit some fundamental estimates for the proof.

From now on, we use $C(N_0)$ as a positive constant depending only on $N_0 = N(\omega, \delta)$ (hence on ω, δ) and C as an absolute positive constant while the both of them may change in each place.

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |a_n - b_n| &\geq |a_\infty - b_\infty| - |a_n - a_\infty| - |b_n - b_\infty| \\ &\geq \frac{4}{5}|a_\infty - b_\infty| \geq 2^3 \varepsilon_n. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain

$$(3.2) \quad 0 < \varepsilon_n \leq C|a_n - b_n|.$$

Let K be the minimal number of $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $|I_k| < \varepsilon_n$. From the definition of $N(\omega, \delta)$, there exists $n_0 \in \{1, 2, \dots, N_0 (= N(\omega, \delta))\}$ such that $q_{K+n_0} \geq \delta$ but $0 < q_{K+i} < \delta$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n_0 - 1$. From the construction of $E(\omega)$,

$$|I_{K+n_0-1}| = \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{n_0-1} \prod_{i=1}^{n_0-1} (1 - q_{K+i}) |I_K|$$

Hence, we have

$$(3.3) \quad \left(\frac{1-\delta}{2}\right)^{N_0-1} \varepsilon_n \leq \left(\frac{1-\delta}{2}\right)^{n_0-1} \varepsilon_n \leq |I_{K+n_0-1}| \leq \varepsilon_n.$$

Let J_n be the removed open interval from I_{n-1} in the construction of $E(\omega)$. Since $q_{K+n_0} \geq \delta$, we see from (3.3)

$$(3.4) \quad |J_{K+n_0}| = q_{K+n_0} |I_{K+n_0-1}| \geq C(N_0) \varepsilon_n.$$

Since $J_{K+n_0} \subset I_{K+n_0-1}$, we also see

$$(3.5) \quad |J_{K+n_0}| \leq \varepsilon_n.$$

Namely, we verify that $|I_{K+n_0-1}|$ and $|J_{K+n_0}|$ are comparable with ε_n .

Now, we proceed to prove the theorem.

Let c_n be the middle point of J_{K+n_0} . We put $b'_n := c_n - |J_{K+n_0}|\sqrt{-1} \in \mathbb{L}$. It follows from (3.3) and (3.5) that

$$\begin{aligned} |\overline{b_n b'_n}| &\leq |b_n - b_\infty| + |b_\infty - c_n| + |c_n - b'_n| \\ &\leq \varepsilon_n + |I_{K+n_0}| + 2|J_{K+n_0}| \leq 4\varepsilon_n, \end{aligned}$$

where \overline{ab} is the line segment between a and b . For the hyperbolic geodesic $\widehat{\gamma}$ in \mathbb{L} connecting b_n and b'_n , we have

$$(3.6) \quad |\widehat{\gamma}| \leq 2\pi\varepsilon_n, \quad |\widehat{\gamma}| \leq C(N_0)|J_{K+n_0}|$$

from (2.1) and (3.4). We also have

$$|\widehat{\gamma}| \leq C|a_n - b_n|$$

from (3.2).

Let $\widetilde{\gamma}$ be the hyperbolic geodesic in \mathbb{H} connecting a_n and $a'_n := c_n + |J_{K+n_0}|\sqrt{-1} \in \mathbb{H}$. Then, $\gamma := \widetilde{\gamma} \cup \overline{a'_n b'_n} \cup \widehat{\gamma}$ is a curve in $D(\omega)$ from a_n to b_n .

It follows from (2.1) that

$$|\widetilde{\gamma}| \leq \frac{\pi}{2}|a_n - a'_n|.$$

As we have seen that $|\overline{b_n b'_n}| \leq 4\varepsilon_n$, we have

$$|a_n - a'_n| \leq |a_n - b_n| + |\overline{b_n b'_n}| + |\overline{a'_n b'_n}| \leq |a_n - b_n| + C\varepsilon_n.$$

From (3.2)

$$|a_n - a'_n| \leq C|a_n - b_n|$$

and we get

$$|\widetilde{\gamma}| \leq C|a_n - b_n|.$$

Combining those inequalities, we obtain

$$|\gamma| = |\widetilde{\gamma}| + |\overline{a'_n b'_n}| + |\widehat{\gamma}| \leq C|a_n - b_n|,$$

Namely, γ satisfies (U1) for some C .

Next, we consider the condition (U2) for γ .

Let z be an arbitrary point of γ and $\gamma \setminus \{z\} = \gamma_1 \cup \gamma_2$. We label γ_1 as $\gamma_1 \ni a_n$.

Suppose that $z \in \widetilde{\gamma}$. Then, $\gamma_1 \subset \widetilde{\gamma}$, $\gamma_2 = \gamma'_2 \cup \overline{a'_n b'_n} \cup \widehat{\gamma}$, where $\gamma'_2 := \gamma' \setminus \gamma_1$ is the hyperbolic geodesic in \mathbb{H} connecting z and a'_n .

If $|\gamma_1| \leq |\gamma'_2|$, then $|\gamma_1| \leq |\gamma_2|$ and it follows from (2.2) that

$$\min\{|\gamma_1|, |\gamma_2|\} = |\gamma_1| \leq \frac{\pi}{2} \text{dist}(z, \partial\mathbb{H}) \leq \frac{\pi}{2} \text{dist}(z, \partial D(\omega)).$$

In this case, the condition (U2) holds for $c = \frac{\pi}{2}$.

If $|\gamma_1| \geq |\gamma'_2|$, then we also have from (2.2)

$$|\gamma'_2| \leq \frac{\pi}{2} \text{dist}(z, \partial\mathbb{H}) \leq \frac{\pi}{2} \text{dist}(z, \partial D(\omega)).$$

Moreover, if $|\gamma'_2| \geq \frac{1}{2}|\overline{a'_n c_n}|$, then we see that

$$|\gamma_2| = |\gamma'_2| + |\overline{a'_n c_n}| + |\widehat{\gamma}| \leq 3|\gamma'_2| + |\widehat{\gamma}|.$$

We also see $|\widehat{\gamma}| \leq C(N_0)|J_{K+n_0}| = C(N_0)\overline{|a'_n c_n|}$ from (3.6). Therefore, we verify that

$$\min\{|\gamma_1|, |\gamma_2|\} \leq |\gamma_2| \leq C(N_0)|\gamma'_2| \leq C(N_0)\frac{\pi}{2}\text{dist}(z, \partial D(\omega))$$

and (U2) also holds.

If $|\gamma'_2| < \frac{1}{2}\overline{|a'_n c_n|}$ ($= \frac{1}{2}|J_{K+n_0}|$), then z is in the disk centered at a'_n with radius $\frac{1}{2}|J_{K+n_0}|$. Hence,

$$\text{dist}(z, \partial D(\omega)) \geq \text{Im } z \geq \frac{1}{2}|J_{K+n_0}|.$$

We obtain

$$|\gamma_2| = |\gamma'_2| + \overline{|a'_n b'_n|} + |\widehat{\gamma}| \leq \frac{3}{2}|J_{K+n_0}| + |\widehat{\gamma}| \leq C(N_0)|J_{K+n_0}|$$

from (3.6), and

$$|\gamma_2| \leq C(N_0)\text{dist}(z, \partial D(\omega)).$$

The condition (U2) also holds.

Next, we suppose that $z \in \overline{a'_n b'_n}$. Then, it is easily seen that

$$\text{dist}(z, \partial D(\omega)) \geq \frac{1}{2}|J_{K+n_0}|,$$

since c_n is the middle point of J_{K+n_0} . As we have seen,

$$\overline{|a'_n b'_n|} + |\widehat{\gamma}| \leq C(N_0)|J_{K+n_0}|.$$

Since $\gamma_2 \subset \overline{a'_n b'_n} \cup \widehat{\gamma}$, we obtain

$$|\gamma_2| \leq C(N_0)\text{dist}(z, \partial D(\omega)),$$

as desired.

Finally, we suppose that $z \in \widehat{\gamma}$ and we may put $\widehat{\gamma} \setminus \{z\} = \widehat{\gamma}_1 \cup \gamma_2$.

If $|\gamma_2| \leq |\widehat{\gamma}_1|$, then we have

$$|\gamma_2| \leq \frac{\pi}{2}\text{dist}(z, \partial \mathbb{H}) \leq \frac{\pi}{2}\text{dist}(z, \partial D(\omega))$$

from (2.2).

If $|\gamma_2| \geq |\widehat{\gamma}_1|$, then we see that $|\text{Im } z| \geq \frac{1}{2}|\text{Im } b'_n| = \frac{1}{2}|J_{K+n_0}|$ because $\widehat{\gamma}$ is under the line segment $\overline{b_n b'_n}$ in \mathbb{L} . Since

$$\text{dist}(z, \partial D(\omega)) \geq |\text{Im } z|$$

and

$$|\gamma_2| \leq |\widehat{\gamma}| \leq C(N_0)|J_{K+n_0}|,$$

we obtain the condition (U2):

$$\min\{|\gamma_1|, |\gamma_2|\} \leq |\gamma_2| \leq C(N_0)\text{dist}(z, \partial D(\omega)).$$

Case 4-(iv): $a_\infty = b_\infty \in E(\omega)$.

We may assume that $\varepsilon_n := |a_n - b_n|$ is sufficiently small, and put $\{x_0\} := \overline{a_n b_n} \cap \mathbb{R}$.

If $x_0 \in E(\omega)$, then there exists an infinite sequence $\{I_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ of closed intervals such that

- (1) for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, I_n is a closed interval appearing at the n -th step of the construction of $E(\omega)$;
- (2) $x_0 \in \cdots \subset I_{n+1} \subset I_n \subset \cdots \subset I_1$;
- (3) $\{x_0\} = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} I_n$.

Let K be the minimal number of k with $|I_k| \leq \varepsilon_n$. From the definition of $N(\omega, \delta)$, there exists $n_0 \in \{1, 2, \dots, N(\omega, \delta)\}$ such that $q_{K+n_0} \geq \delta$ but $0 < q_{K+i} < \delta$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n_0 - 1$.

Let J_n be the removed open interval from I_{n-1} in the construction of $E(\omega)$.

We define $a'_n := x_n + |J_{K+n_0}| \sqrt{-1}$ and $b'_n = x_n - |J_{K+n_0}| \sqrt{-1}$, where x_n is the middle point of J_{K+n_0} . Then, we put $\gamma = \tilde{\gamma} \cup \overline{a'_n b'_n} \cup \hat{\gamma}$, where $\tilde{\gamma}$ is the hyperbolic geodesic in \mathbb{H} connecting a_n and a'_n , and $\hat{\gamma}$ is the hyperbolic geodesic in \mathbb{L} connecting b_n and b'_n . By using the same estimates as (3.3)–(3.5), we see that

$$|a_n - a'_n| \leq |a_n - x_0| + |x_0 - x_n| + |x_n - a'_n| \leq C\varepsilon_n.$$

Similarly, we have

$$|b_n - b'_n| \leq C\varepsilon_n.$$

It follows from (2.1) that

$$|\tilde{\gamma}| \leq C\varepsilon_n, \quad |\hat{\gamma}| \leq C\varepsilon_n.$$

Thus, we have

$$|\gamma| = |\tilde{\gamma}| + |\overline{a'_n b'_n}| + |\hat{\gamma}| \leq C|a_n - b_n|,$$

that is, the condition (U1) holds.

As for (U2), repeating the same argument as in Case 4-(iii), we can prove that the condition (U2) hold for some $c \geq 1$.

Next, we suppose that $x_0 \in D(\omega)$.

If $\text{dist}(x_0, \partial D(\omega)) \geq 2\varepsilon_n$, then it is easy to see that $\gamma := \overline{a_n b_n}$ satisfies the conditions (U1) and (U2) for $c = 1$.

If $\text{dist}(x_0, \partial D(\omega)) < 2\varepsilon_n$, we take $x_1 \in E(\omega)$ so that

$$|x_0 - x_1| = \text{dist}(x_0, \partial D(\omega)) < 2\varepsilon_n.$$

Since $x_1 \in E(\omega)$, we may take an infinite sequence $\{I_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ for x_1 as before. Repeating the same argument as above for $\{I_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ to get $K, n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ for ε_n , we obtain an open interval J_{K+n_0} and x_n , the middle point of J_{K+n_0} . We put $a'_n := x_n + |J_{K+n_0}| \sqrt{-1}$ and $b'_n := x_n - |J_{K+n_0}| \sqrt{-1}$. Applying the same argument as above, we verify that $\gamma := \tilde{\gamma} \cup \overline{a'_n b'_n} \cup \hat{\gamma}$ satisfies the conditions (U1) and (U2) for some $c = C(N_0)$, where $\tilde{\gamma}$ is the hyperbolic geodesic in \mathbb{H} connecting a_n and a'_n , and $\hat{\gamma}$ is the hyperbolic geodesic in \mathbb{L} connecting b_n and b'_n .

Overall, we get a contradiction in any case in the arguments of Case 4. Therefore, we conclude that $D(\omega)$ is a uniform domain.

4. PROOF OF THEOREM I (PART 2)

In this section, we show that if $N(\omega, \delta) = \infty$ for any $\delta > 0$, then $D(\omega)$ is not a uniform domain.

Suppose that there exists $c \geq 1$ such that (U1) and (U2) are satisfied for any $a, b \in D(\omega)$ and for some γ .

Take $N \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $c < N$. Since

$$\frac{x-1}{|\log(1-N^{-x})|} - \frac{x-1}{\log 2} \rightarrow \infty \quad (x \rightarrow \infty),$$

there exist $L > 0$ and $K \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$(4.1) \quad \frac{L-1}{\log 2} \log N - 3 < K < \frac{L-1}{|\log(1-N^{-L})|} \log N - 1.$$

For those K, L , we take $M \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $q_{M+i} < N^{-L}$ for $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, K$. The condition $N(\omega, N^{-L}) = \infty$ guarantees the existence of M . We may assume that K, L, M, N are sufficiently large, more than 10, for example.

Now, we consider a closed interval I_{M-1} in the $(M-1)$ -th step of the construction on $E(\omega)$. We remove an closed interval J_M with length $q_M |I_{M-1}|$ from I_{M-1} and we have two closed intervals I_M^i ($i = 1, 2$) with the same length. Hence,

$$(4.2) \quad |I_M^1| = |I_M^2| = \frac{1}{2}(1 - q_M)|I_{M-1}| \geq \frac{1}{2}(1 - N^{-L})|I_{M-1}|.$$

and

$$(4.3) \quad |J_M| = q_M |I_{M-1}| < N^{-L} |I_{M-1}|.$$

Let $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ be the middle point of J_M . We define $a \in \mathbb{H}$ and $b \in \mathbb{L}$ by

$$a = x_0 + N^{-L+2} |I_{M-1}| \sqrt{-1}, \quad b = x_0 - N^{-L+2} |I_{M-1}| \sqrt{-1}.$$

From our assumption, there exists a curve γ in $D(\omega)$ connecting a and b such that it satisfies (U1) and (U2) for c ($< N$). We look for $z \in \gamma \cap \mathbb{R}$ and consider $\gamma \setminus \{z\} = \gamma_1 \cup \gamma_2$ with $\gamma_1 \ni a$.

First of all, if $z \notin I_{M-1}$, then

$$|\gamma| > |I_{M-1}| \geq N(2N^{-L+2})|I_{M-1}| > c|a - b|.$$

The condition (U1) does not hold for c . Hence, z must be in $I_{M-1} = I_M^1 \cup J_M \cup I_M^2$.

If $z \in J_M$, then

$$c \operatorname{dist}(z, \partial D(\omega)) \leq \frac{N}{2} |J_M| \leq \frac{1}{2} N^{-L+1} |I_{M-1}|.$$

On the other hand, since $|\gamma_1|, |\gamma_2| \geq |a - x_0| = N^{-L+2} |I_{M-1}|$,

$$\min(|\gamma_1|, |\gamma_2|) > c \operatorname{dist}(z, \partial D(\omega)).$$

The condition (U2) does not hold. Hence, $z \notin J_M$ and $z \in I_M^1 \cup I_M^2$.

We may assume that $z \in I_M^1$. Since $z \in D(\omega)$, z is contained in some $J_{M+m} \subset I_M^1$ ($m \geq 1$), where $J_n \subset I$ is a closed interval obtained in the n -th step of the construction of $E(\omega)$.

We have

$$(4.4) \quad |I_{M+i}^k| = \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{i+1} \prod_{j=0}^i (1 - q_{M+j}) |I_{M-1}| \quad (k = 1, 2),$$

where I_{M+i}^k ($k = 1, 2$) are closed intervals adjoining J_{M+i} . and

$$(4.5) \quad |J_{M+i}| = q_{M+i} |I_{M+i-1}^k|.$$

If $m \leq K$, then $q_{M+i} < N^{-L}$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, m$. From (4.4) and (4.5), we have

$$\left(\frac{1 - N^{-L}}{2}\right)^{m+1} |I_{M-1}| \leq |I_{M+m}^k| \leq \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{m+1} |I_{M-1}|$$

and

$$|J_{M+m}| \leq q_{M+m} |I_{M+m-1}| \leq N^{-L} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{m+1} |I_{M-1}|.$$

Since $z \in J_{M+m}$, $|\gamma_1| \geq |a - z|$, $|\gamma_2| \geq |b - z|$. Hence, we have

$$(4.6) \quad |\gamma_1|, |\gamma_2| \geq |I_{M+m}^k| \geq \left(\frac{1 - N^{-L}}{2}\right)^{m+1} |I_{M-1}|.$$

On the other hand,

$$(4.7) \quad \text{dist}(z, \partial D(\omega)) \leq |J_{M+m}| \leq \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{m+1} N^{-L} |I_{M-1}|.$$

However, from (4.1), we have

$$m \leq K \leq \frac{L-1}{|\log(1 - N^{-L})|} \log N - 1.$$

This implies

$$(4.8) \quad N^{-L+1} \leq (1 - N^{-L})^{K+1} \leq (1 - N^{-L})^{m+1}.$$

From (4.6)–(4.8), we have

$$c \text{ dist}(z, \partial D(\omega)) < N \text{ dist}(z, \partial D(\omega)) \leq |\gamma_1|, |\gamma_2|.$$

Therefore, γ does not satisfy the condition (U2) if $\gamma \cap J_{M+m} \neq \emptyset$ for $m \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$.

Finally, we suppose that $z \in J_{M+m}$ for some $m > K$. Since $J_{M+m} \subset I_{M+K}^k$ ($k = 1$ or 2), we have

$$|J_{M+m}| \leq \frac{1}{2} |I_{M+K}| \leq \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{K+1} |I_{M-1}|.$$

Hence,

$$(4.9) \quad \text{dist}(z, \partial D(\omega)) \leq \frac{1}{2} |J_{M+m}| \leq \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{K+2} |I_{M-1}|.$$

On the other hand,

$$(4.10) \quad |\gamma_1|, |\gamma_2| \geq |a - b| = 2N^{-L+2} |I_{M-1}|.$$

However, from (4.1), we have

$$\frac{L-1}{\log 2} \log N - 3 < K.$$

This implies

$$(4.11) \quad N \left(\frac{1}{2} \right)^{K+2} < 2N^{-L+2}.$$

From (4.9)–(4.11), we have

$$c \operatorname{dist}(z, \partial D(\omega)) < N \operatorname{dist}(z, \partial D(\omega)) \leq |\gamma_1|, |\gamma_2|.$$

Hence, we verify that if $\gamma \cap J_{M+m} \neq \emptyset$ for $m > K$, then γ does not satisfy the condition (U2) for $c < N$.

Thus, there is no curve γ in $D(\omega)$ for a, b satisfying the conditions (U1) and (U2), and we conclude that $D(\omega)$ is not a uniform domain.

5. PROOF OF THEOREM II

Theorem II is an immediate consequence of the following proposition (cf. [1] Corollary 2.1, [3] Theorem D).

Proposition 5.1. *Let D be a domain in \mathbb{C} whose complement is a Cantor set. The domain D is quasiconformally equivalent to $D(\omega_0)$ if and only if $\mathbb{C} \setminus D$ is uniformly perfect and D is a uniform domain.*

It is easy to see that $E(\omega)$ is uniformly perfect if $\sup_n q_n < 1$. It follows from Theorem I that $D(\omega)$ is uniform if $N(\omega, \delta) < \infty$ for some $\delta > 0$. Therefore, from Proposition 5.1, we conclude that $D(\omega)$ is quasiconformally equivalent to $D(\omega_0)$.

Conversely, if $\sup_n q_n = 1$, then it is already shown that $D(\omega)$ is not quasiconformally equivalent to $D(\omega_0)$. From Theorem I, $D(\omega)$ is not uniform if $N(\omega, \delta) = \infty$ for any $\delta > 0$. Hence, $D(\omega)$ is not quasiconformally equivalent to $D(\omega_0)$ from Proposition 5.1.

Thus, we complete the proof of the theorem.

REFERENCES

- [1] P. Bonfert-Taylor and E. C. Taylor, Quasiconformally homogeneous planar domains, *Conf. Geom. & Dyn.* 12 (2008), 188–198.
- [2] F. W. Gehring and K. Hag, *The Ubiquitous Quasidisk*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs 184, Amer. Math. Soc., 2012.
- [3] P. MacManus, R. Näkki and B. Palka, Quasiconformally bi-homogeneous compacta in the complex plane, *Proc. London Math. Soc.* (3) 78 (1999), 215–240.
- [4] H. Shiga, On the quasiconformal equivalence of Dynamical Cantor sets, to appear in *J. d'Analyse Math.*
- [5] T. Sugawa, Uniform perfectness of the limit sets of Kleinian groups, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 353 (2001), 3603–3615.
- [6] J. Väisälä, Uniforma domains, *Tôhoku Math.* 40 (1988), 101–118.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, KYOTO SANGYO UNIVERSITY, MOTOYAMA, KAMIG-
AMO, KITA-KU KYOTO, JAPAN

Email address: `shiga@cc.kyoto-su.ac.jp`