ON THE EXISTENCE OF CUT POINTS OF CONNECTED GENERALIZED SIERPIŃSKI CARPETS
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Abstract. In a previous work joint with Dai and Luo, we show that a connected generalized Sierpiński carpet (or shortly GSCs) has cut points if and only if the associated level-\(k\) Hata graph has a long tail for all \(k \geq 2\). In this paper, we extend the above result by showing that it suffices to check a finite number of level-\(k\) Hata graphs to reach a conclusion. This criterion provides a truly "algorithmic" solution to the cut point problem of connected GSCs. Some interesting examples such as connected GSCs with exactly \(n \geq 1\) cut points are also included in addition.

1. Introduction

A large amount of common fractal sets are totally disconnected or at least have infinitely many connected components. But there are indeed some of them which are connected (e.g., the standard Sierpiński carpet). For a given pair of these connected fractals, an interesting further question is whether they are mutually homeomorphic. In [6], Whyburn came up with an elegant characterization concerning some special cases: A metrizable topological space is homeomorphic to the standard Sierpiński carpet if and only if it is a planar continuum of topological dimension 1 that is locally connected and has no local cut points.

When the given connected fractal is a planar self-similar set, a well-known result of Hata [2] states that it is also locally connected. However, it appears that developing a universal approach for detecting the existence of local cut points, or even cut points, will be a difficult task.

Together with Dai and Luo, the authors provided a characterization in [1] on the existence of cut points of a special class of self-similar sets called the generalized Sierpiński carpets, which are defined as follows. Let \(N \geq 2\) and let \(\mathcal{D} \subset \{0, 1, \ldots, N-1\}^2\) be a non-empty digit set with \(1 < |\mathcal{D}| < N^2\) (to avoid trivial cases), where \(|\mathcal{D}|\) denotes the number of elements in \(\mathcal{D}\). For each \(i \in \mathcal{D}\), define a similarity map \(\varphi_i\) by

\[
\varphi_i(x) := \frac{1}{N}(x + i), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^2.
\]

We call the self-similar set \(F = F(N, \mathcal{D})\) of the IFS \(\{\varphi_i : i \in \mathcal{D}\}\) a generalized Sierpiński carpet (or shortly a GSC).

For convenience, we regard the digit set \(\mathcal{D}\) as the index set of the IFS \(\{\varphi_i : i \in \mathcal{D}\}\) instead of enumerating it by \(\varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_{|\mathcal{D}|}\). Under this setting, we list the following frequently used notations.
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(1) For \( k \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \), \( D^k = \{i = i_1 \cdots i_k : i_1, \ldots, i_k \in D\} \). Let \( D^0 = \{\emptyset\} \). We call \( \emptyset \) the empty word. For \( k \geq 0 \) and \( i \in D^k \), we call \( i \) a word of length \( |i| := k \).

(2) \( D^* := \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} D^k \) and \( D^\infty := \{i_1i_2 \cdots : i_j \in D \text{ for all } j \in \mathbb{Z}^+\} \);

(3) For \( 1 \leq k \leq n \) and \( i = i_1 \cdots i_n \in D^n \), \( i_k := i_1 \cdots i_k \) stands for its prefix of length \( k \). For \( i \in D^\infty \) and \( k \geq 1 \), \( i_k \) is similarly defined;

(4) For \( i, j \in D^* \), we write \( i < j \) if \( i \) is a prefix of \( j \);

(5) For \( i \in D^* \) and \( k \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \), \( iD^k := \{ij : j \in D^k\} \).

(6) For \( k \geq 1 \) and \( i = i_1 \cdots i_k \in D^k \), \( \varphi_i := \varphi_{i_1} \circ \cdots \circ \varphi_{i_k} \). Define \( \varphi_\emptyset \) to be the identity map. Denote by \( \varphi_j^k \) the \( k \)-fold composition of \( \varphi_j \) for all \( j \in D \).

The method in [1] is based on some examination on the associated Hata graph sequence of \( F \). For \( k \geq 1 \), the \( k \)-th Hata graph \( \Gamma_k = \Gamma_k(N, D) \) of \( F \) is defined by setting the vertex set to be \( D^k \), and demanding that there is an edge joining \( i, j \in D^k \) (\( i \neq j \)) if and only if \( \varphi_i(F) \cap \varphi_j(F) \neq \emptyset \).

**Definition 1.1.** Let \( F = F(N, D) \) be a connected GSC and let \( \Gamma_k = \Gamma_k(N, D) \) be the associated \( k \)-th Hata graph. Suppose \( i \) is a cut point of \( \Gamma_k \) cutting it into \( t \) parts, say \( \Gamma_k - \{i\} = A_{i,1} \cup \cdots \cup A_{i,t} \), where \( A_{i,1}, \ldots, A_{i,t} \) are connected components (i.e., largest connected subgraphs) with \( \#A_{i,1} \geq \#A_{i,2} \geq \cdots \geq \#A_{i,t} \), where \( \#A_{i,j} \) denotes the number of vertices in \( A_{i,j} \). We define

\[
\chi_k(N, D) := \max\{\#A_{i,2} : i \text{ is a cut point of } \Gamma_k\}
\]

if \( \Gamma_k \) has cut points and set \( \chi_k(N, D) = 0 \) otherwise.

For convenience, we say that the \( k \)-th Hata graph \( \Gamma_k \) has a long tail if \( \chi_k(N, D) \geq |D|^{k-1} - 1 \).

**Theorem 1.2 ([1]).** A connected GSC \( F = F(N, D) \) has cut points if and only if \( \chi_k(N, D) \geq |D|^{k-1} - 1 \) for all \( k \geq 2 \).

A connected GSC \( F = F(N, D) \) is called fragile if there is a decomposition of \( D \), say \( D = D_1 \cup D_2 \) with \( D_1 \cap D_2 = \emptyset \), such that the intersection

\[
\left( \bigcup_{i \in D_1} \varphi_i(F) \right) \cap \left( \bigcup_{i \in D_2} \varphi_i(F) \right)
\]

is a singleton. The carpet \( F \) is called non-fragile if it is not fragile. It is easy to see that fragile GSCs always have cut points and we do realize an easily checked criterion for these carpets (please see [1, Theorem 4.5]). However, for non-fragile cases, Theorem 1.2 requires us to check the whole sequence of \( \{\Gamma_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty} \). It is of particular interest to consider whether one can detect the existence of cut points by checking only a small section of that sequence. This is the main topic of the paper, and we will show that it suffices to look at a finite number of level-\( k \) Hata graphs.

For this purpose, we develop a method which reduces the problem to the examination of the existence of “good cut points” defined as follows.
**Definition 1.3.** Let $n \geq 2$ and let $i = i_1 \cdots i_n \in \mathcal{D}^n$ be a cut point of $\Gamma_n$. We call $i$ *good* if there are $i, j \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \{i_1\}$ such that $i\mathcal{D}^{n-1}$ and $j\mathcal{D}^{n-1}$ belong to different connected components of $\Gamma_n - \{i\}$.

The following proposition will be helpful to exclude some special cases.

**Proposition 1.4.** Let $F = F(N, \mathcal{D})$ be a non-fragile connected GSC. If one of $(0, 0)^2, (0, N - 1)^2, (N - 1, 0)^2$ and $(N - 1, N - 1)^2$ is a good cut point of $\Gamma_2$, then $F$ has cut points.

Our main result is:

**Theorem 1.5.** Let $F = F(N, \mathcal{D})$ be a non-fragile connected GSC such that none of $(0, 0)^2, (0, N - 1)^2, (N - 1, 0)^2$ and $(N - 1, N - 1)^2$ is a good cut point of $\Gamma_2$. Then there is some $M \geq 2$ independent of $N$ such that $F$ has cut points if and only if $\Gamma_M$ has good cut points.

So altogether, it suffices to check $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \ldots, \Gamma_M$. It can be seen from later proof that $M \leq 2^{10} + 1$.

We also look into the possible number of cut points of a given connected GSC.

**Theorem 1.6.** For every $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, there is some connected GSC with exactly $k$ cut points.

The organization of this paper is as follows. In Section 2, we collect some preliminary results in [1] which will be used later. In Section 3, we record some basic observations. Sections 4 and 5 are devoted to properties of good cut points of Hata graphs and the proof of Theorem 1.5, respectively. Finally, we construct some interesting examples, which demonstrate Theorem 1.6, in the last section.

## 2. Preliminaries

We invoke here several results in [1] which will be used later.

**Lemma 2.1.** Let $m, k \geq 1$ and let $i, j \in \mathcal{D}^m$ be two distinct words. If there exist exactly one pair of $i', j' \in \mathcal{D}^k$ such that $\varphi_{i'}(F) \cap \varphi_{j'}(F) \neq \emptyset$ then $\varphi_i(F) \cap \varphi_j(F)$ is a singleton.

**Lemma 2.2.** Let $m \geq 1$ and let $i, j \in \mathcal{D}^m$ be such that there is a unique word $\omega = \omega_1\omega_2 \in \mathcal{D}^2$ such that $\varphi_i(F) \cap \varphi_j(F) \neq \emptyset$. Then $\varphi_i(F) \cap \varphi_j(F)$ is a singleton.

**Proposition 2.3.** Suppose that there is some $m \geq 1$ such that $\mathcal{D}^m$ can be decomposed as $\mathcal{D}^m = I \cup J$ with $I \cap J = \emptyset$ and

$$\left(\bigcup_{i \in I} \varphi_i(F)\right) \cap \left(\bigcup_{i \in J} \varphi_i(F)\right) = \{x\}$$

for some $x \in F$. Then $F$ is fragile.

**Lemma 2.4.** Let $m \geq 2$ and let $B_1, \ldots, B_m$ be connected compact sets in $\mathbb{R}^2$ such that $\bigcup_{i=1}^m B_i$ is also connected. If $A \subset B_1$ satisfies that $B_1 \setminus A$ remains connected and $A \cap B_i = \emptyset$ for all $i \neq 1$, then $X := (B_1 \setminus A) \cup B_2 \cup \cdots \cup B_m$ is also connected.
Lemma 2.5. Let \( k \geq 2 \) and let \( j = j_1 \cdots j_k \in D^k \) be the cut point of \( \Gamma_k \) achieving \( \chi_k(D) \). If \( \chi_k(D) \geq |D|^{k-1} \) then there are \( \omega, \tau \in D \setminus \{j_1\} \) such that \( \omega D^{k-1} \) and \( \tau D^{k-1} \) belong to different connected components of \( \Gamma_{k-\{j\}} \).

Corollary 2.6. Let \( k \geq 1 \) and let \( j \in D^k \) be a cut point of \( \Gamma_k \). Suppose there are \( \omega, \tau \in D \) such that \( \omega D^{k-1} \) and \( \tau D^{k-1} \) belong to different connected components of \( \Gamma_{k-\{j\}} \). Then \( \omega D^{q} \) and \( \tau D^{q} \) belong to different connected components of \( \Gamma_{q+1 - \{j\}} \) for all \( 0 \leq q < k \).

Lemma 2.7. Let \( n \geq 1 \) and let \( j = j_1 \cdots j_n \in D^n \). Let \( \omega, \tau \in D \setminus \{j_1\} \). Then \( \omega D^{n-1} \) and \( \tau D^{n-1} \) belong to different connected components of \( \Gamma_n - \{j\} \) if and only if \( \phi_j(F) \) and \( \phi_{\omega}(F) \) belong to different connected components of \( \bigcup_{\eta \in D^n - \{j\}} \phi_\eta(F) \).

Theorem 2.8. Let \( x \in F, n \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \) and let \( \omega, \tau \) be two words in \( D^n \setminus \Omega_n(x) \) which are well-separated by \( \Omega_n(x) \). Then \( \phi_\omega(F) \) and \( \phi_\tau(F) \) belong to different connected components of \( F \setminus \{x\} \). In particular, \( x \) is a cut point of \( F \).

Theorem 2.9. A non-fragile connected GSC \( F = F(N, D) \) has cut points if and only if \( \chi_k(N, D) \geq |D|^{k-1} \) for all \( k \geq 2 \), where \( |D| \) denotes the number of elements in \( D \).

3. Basic observations

Lemma 3.1. Let \( i \in D^* \). Then
\[
\phi_{ii}(F) \cap \left( \bigcup_{j \in D^{|i|} - \{i\}} \phi_j(F) \right) = \emptyset.
\]
Similarly, for every \( n \geq 2 \),
\[
\phi_{i^n}(F) \cap \left( \bigcup_{j \in D^{(n-1)|i|} - \{i \}^{n-1}} \phi_j(F) \right) = \emptyset.
\]

Proof. For the first statement, it suffices to show that \( \phi_{ii}(F) \cap \phi_j(F) = \emptyset \) for every \( j \in D^{|i|} - \{i\} \). Without loss of generality, Figure 1 illustrates all possibilities of \( i \) due to its location. Then it is easy to see that there is even a positive distance between \( \phi_{ii}(F) \) and \( \phi_j(F) \). The second statement can be verified in the same spirit. \( \square \)
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(A) \( i \) is in the interior
(B) \( i \) is on the boundary
(C) \( i \) is at the corner

Figure 1. An illustration of \( \phi_i([0, 1]^2), \phi_{ii}([0, 1]^2) \) and \( \phi_j([0, 1]^2) \)
Lemma 3.2. Let \( m \geq 1 \) and let \( i, j \in D^m \) be such that there is a unique word \( \omega = \omega_1\omega_2 \in D^2 \) such that \( \varphi_{i\omega}(F) \cap \varphi_j(F) \neq \emptyset \). Then \( \varphi_i(F) \cap \varphi_j(F) \) is a singleton.

Proof. By the assumption, there is only one level-\((m + 2)\) (and hence level-\((m + 1)\)) cell contained in \( \varphi_i(F) \) which intersects with \( \varphi_j(F) \). Let \( I := \{ i \in D : \varphi_{ji}(F) \cap \varphi_{i\omega_1}(F) \neq \emptyset \} \).

1. If \( |I| = 1 \) then there is also exactly one level-\((m + 1)\) cell in \( \varphi_j(F) \) which intersects \( \varphi_i(F) \). Then the desired conclusion follows directly from Lemma 2.1.

2. Assume that \( |I| \geq 2 \). Rotating or reflecting if necessary, Figure 2 depicts all possibilities. Note that in all of these cases, we have \((0, 0), (N - 1, N - 1) \in D\) and hence there are at least two level-\((m + 2)\) cells in \( \varphi_i(F) \) which has a non-empty intersection with \( \varphi_j(F) \). This is a contradiction.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{i} & \text{i} & \text{i} \\
\Downarrow & \Downarrow & \Downarrow \\
\text{j} & \text{j} & \text{j}
\end{array}
\]

Figure 2. Cases when \( |I| = 2 \) in Lemma 3.2

Lemma 3.3. Let \( m \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \), \( i \in D^m \) and let \( \omega \in D \). Denote \( \Lambda := \{ j \in D^m : \varphi_j(F) \cap \varphi_i(F) \neq \emptyset \} \). If for every \( j \in \Lambda \) we have

1. \( \varphi_{i\omega}(F) \) is the only level-\((m + 1)\) cell in \( \varphi_i(F) \) which intersects \( \varphi_j(F) \);
2. there is only one level-\((m + 1)\) cell in \( \varphi_j(F) \) which intersects \( \varphi_i(F) \),

then there is some \( y \in F \) such that \( \varphi_i(F) \cap \varphi_j(F) = \{ y \} \) for all \( j \in \Lambda \). Moreover, if \( i \) is a cut point of \( \Gamma_m \) then \( F \) is fragile.

Proof. Firstly, it follows directly from Lemma 2.1 that \( \varphi_i(F) \cap \varphi_j(F) \) is a singleton for every \( j \in \Lambda \). In particular, if \( |\Lambda| = 1 \) then there is nothing to prove.

If \( |\Lambda| \geq 2 \) then it is easy to see that \( \varphi_{i\omega}[0, 1]^2 \) locates at one of the corners of the square \( \varphi_i([0, 1]^2) \). Then it is not hard to see that \( \varphi_i(F) \cap \varphi_j(F) = \{ y \} \), where \( y \) is just the common vertex of the squares \( \{ \varphi_i([0, 1]^2), \varphi_j([0, 1]^2) : j \in \Lambda \} \).

Select any \( \tau \in \Lambda \). If \( i \) is a cut point of \( \Gamma_m \) then we can denote \( I \) to be the vertex set of the connected component of \( \Gamma_m - \{ i \} \) containing \( \tau \). Since \( y \in \varphi_j(F) \) for every \( j \in \Lambda \), we have \( \Lambda \subset I \). Then

\[
\left( \bigcup_{j \in I} \varphi_j(F) \right) \cap \left( \bigcup_{j \in D^m \setminus I} \varphi_j(F) \right) = \left( \bigcup_{j \in I} \varphi_j(F) \right) \cap \varphi_i(F) = \left( \bigcup_{j \in \Lambda} \varphi_j(F) \right) \cap \varphi_i(F) = \{ y \}.
\]
So we see by Proposition 2.3 that $F$ is fragile. □

4. Good cut points of Hata graphs

Recall Definition 1.3. By Corollary 2.6, if $i \in D^n$ is a good cut point of $\Gamma_n$ then $i|_k$ is a good cut point of $\Gamma_k$ for all $2 \leq k \leq n$. Further, a similar proof shows that $i$ is a cut point of $\Gamma_1$.

Example 4.1. Figure 3 presents a connected GSC with the associated 2-nd Hata graph $\Gamma_2$. Here $N = 3$ and $D = \{0, 1, 2\}^2 \setminus \{(1, 1), (1, 2)\}$. It is easy to see that $(1, 0)^2 = (1, 0)(1, 0)$ is a good cut point of $\Gamma_2$.

Figure 3. An example of good cut points

Lemma 4.2. Let $F$ be a non-fragile connected GSC and let $n \geq 2$. Then $\chi_n(D) \geq |D|^{n-1}$ if and only if there is a good cut point of $\Gamma_n$.

Proof. Suppose $\chi_n(D) \geq |D|^{n-1}$ and let $i = i_1 \cdots i_n$ be the vertex achieving $\chi_n(D)$. By Lemma 2.5, there are $i, j \in D \setminus \{i_1\}$ such that $iD^{n-1}$ and $jD^{n-1}$ belong to different connected components of $\Gamma_n - \{i\}$. So $i$ is a good cut point of $\Gamma_n$.

On the other hand, let $j = j_1 \cdots j_n$ be a good cut point of $\Gamma_n$. Then there are two digits $\omega, \tau \in D \setminus \{j_1\}$ such that $\omega D^{n-1}$ and $\tau D^{n-1}$ belong to different connected components of $\Gamma_n - \{j\}$. In particular,

$\chi_n(D) \geq \min \{|\omega D^{n-1}|, |\tau D^{n-1}|\} = |D|^{n-1}$.

□

The following lemma will be used later to remove an annoying exceptional case.

Lemma 4.3. Let $F$ be a non-fragile connected GSC and suppose $i = (0, 0) \in D$. If $i^2$ is a good cut point of $\Gamma_2$ then this statement is true if with 2 replaces by every $n \geq 2$. In particular, the origin is a cut point of $F$.

Proof. Since $i^2$ is a good cut point of $\Gamma_2$, $i = i^2|_1$ is a cut point of $\Gamma_1$. Since $\varphi_i([0, 1]^2)$ locates at the bottom left corner of $[0, 1]^2$, it is not hard to see that $\Gamma_1 - \{i\}$ contains at most two (so the number is two) connected components. It suffices to consider the following two cases.
(1) \((0, 1), (1, 1) \in \mathcal{D}\) and they belong to different connected components of \(\Gamma_1 - \{i\}\) (see Figure 4(A) for an example). Let \(\mathcal{D}_1\) denote vertices which belongs to the same connected component as \((1, 1)\) does and let \(\mathcal{D}_2 := \mathcal{D} \setminus \mathcal{D}_1\). So 
\[
\varphi_j(F) \cap \varphi_{j'}(F) = \emptyset, \quad \forall j \in \mathcal{D}_1, j' \in \mathcal{D}_2 \setminus \{(0, 0)\}.
\]

On the other hand, we claim that \(\varphi_j(F) \cap \varphi_{(0,0)}(F) = \emptyset\) for every \(j \in \mathcal{D}_1 \setminus \{(1, 1)\}\). Otherwise, the digit \(j\) must be \((1, 0)\), i.e., \(\varphi_{(1,0)}(F) \cap \varphi_{(0,0)}(F) \neq \emptyset\). But then it follows from the self-similarity that every pair of left-right adjacent level-1 cells has a non-empty intersection. In particular, \(\varphi_{(0,1)}(F) \cap \varphi_{(1,1)}(F) \neq \emptyset\). So there is an edge in \(\Gamma_1 - \{i\}\) joining \((0, 1)\) and \((1, 1)\). This is a contradiction. Altogether, 
\[
\left(\bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{D}_1} \varphi_j(F)\right) \cap \left(\bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{D}_2} \varphi_j(F)\right) = \varphi_{(1,1)}(F) \cap \varphi_{(0,0)}(F) = \{(1/N, 1/N)\}.
\]

So \(F\) is fragile and this is a contradiction.

(2) \((0, 1), (1, 0) \in \mathcal{D}\) and they belong to different connected components of \(\Gamma_1 - \{i\}\) (see Figure 4(B) for an example). By Lemma 2.7, \(X_1 := \bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \{i\}} \varphi_j(F)\) has two connected components, namely \(A_1\) and \(B_1\). To show that the origin is a cut point of \(F\), we will show that \(A_1\) and \(B_1\) belong to different connected components of \(X_n := \bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \{i^n\}} \varphi_j(F)\) for all \(n \geq 1\). Then it follows from Theorem 2.8 that \((0, 0) = \bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} \varphi_{i^k}(\{0, 1\}^2)\) is a cut point of \(F\).

For every \(n \geq 1\), recursively define \(A_n = \varphi_i(A_{n-1})\) and \(B_n = \varphi_i(B_{n-1})\). Then 
\[
X_n = \left(\bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \{i^n\}, j \not\in i^n-1} \varphi_j(F)\right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \{i^n\}, i^n-1 \prec j} \varphi_j(F)\right)
\]
\[
= \left(\bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \{i^n\}, i^n-1} \varphi_j(F)\right) \cup \varphi_{i^n-1}\left(\bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \{i^n\}} \varphi_j(F)\right)
\]
\[
= X_{n-1} \cup \varphi_{i^n-1}(X_1) = X_{n-1} \cup (A_n \cup B_n).
\]

By an induction argument, it is easy to see that \(X_n = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} A_i \cup B_i\).

Since \(ii\) is a good cut point, \(A_2\) (similarly, \(B_2\)) cannot have a non-empty intersection with both \(A_1\) and \(B_1\). So \(A_1\) and \(B_1\) belong to different connected components of \(X_2\). Denote \(C_n\) and \(C'_n\) to be the connected components of \(X_n\) containing \(A_1\) and \(B_1\), respectively. So \(C_2 \neq C'_2\). Suppose we have already shown that \(C_k \neq C'_k\) for all \(k \leq n-1\). Note that \(C_n = C'_n\), i.e., \(A_1\) and \(B_1\) belong to the same connected component of \(X_n\), only happens when \(A_n\) (or \(B_n\)) intersects both \(C_{n-1}\) and \(C'_{n-1}\). We claim that this cannot happen and hence completes the proof. For simplicity, we only verify this for \(A_n\) (the proof of \(B_n\) is analogous).

Note that \(\varphi_{i^n}(F) \cap \varphi_j(F) = \emptyset\) for every \(j \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \{i^n\}\) (easily seen since \(i = (0, 0)\)). As a result, 
\[
A_n \cap X_{n-2} = A_n \cap \bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \{i^n-2\}} \varphi_j(F) \subset \varphi_{i^n-1}(F) \cap \bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \{i^n-2\}} \varphi_j(F) = \emptyset.
\]
Since $C_{n-1} \subset X_{n-1} = X_{n-2} \cup (A_{n-1} \cup B_{n-1})$, this implies that

$$A_n \cap C_{n-1} \subset A_n \cap (A_{n-1} \cup B_{n-1}).$$

Similarly,

$$A_n \cap C'_{n-1} \subset A_n \cap (A_{n-1} \cup B_{n-1}).$$

We will show that $A_n$ intersects at most one of $A_{n-1}$ and $B_{n-1}$ (which are both connected sets). As a result, $A_n$ intersects at most one of $C_{n-1}$ and $C'_{n-1}$. This is because $A_{n-1}$ (resp. $B_{n-1}$) belongs to at most one of $C_{n-1}$ and $C'_{n-1}$.

But this is easy: note that

$$A_n \cap A_{n-1} = \varphi_{i_{n-2}}(A_2 \cap A_1), \quad A_n \cap B_{n-1} = \varphi_{i_{n-2}}(A_2 \cap B_1).$$

If they are both non-empty then $A_2$ intersects both $A_1$ and $B_1$. We have already seen that this is impossible.

\[\square\]

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 4.** When $(0, 0)$ cuts $\Gamma_1$ into two connected components

The proof of the following proposition is similar to the one in Section 6 but not exactly the same. Since it involves a rather detailed case-by-case discussion, we present the proof in the last section so readers can move on without being overwhelmed by tedious details. Readers can for now take this proposition for granted and come back to the proof of it in the end.

**Proposition 4.4.** Let $F = F(N, D)$ be a non-fragile connected GSC and let $n \geq 4$. Suppose that none of $(0, 0)^2, (0, N - 1)^2, (N - 1, 0)^2$ and $(N - 1, N - 1)^2$ is a good cut point of $\Gamma_2$. If $i = i_1 \cdots i_n \in \mathcal{D}^n$ is a good cut point of $\Gamma_n$ then $i_1 \cdots i_n$ is a good cut point of $\Gamma_{n-1}$.

**Proof.** Please see Section 9.4. \[\square\]

**Corollary 4.5.** Let $F = F(N, D)$ be a non-fragile connected GSC and let $n \geq 4$. Suppose that none of $(0, 0)^2, (0, N - 1)^2, (N - 1, 0)^2$ and $(N - 1, N - 1)^2$ is a good cut point of $\Gamma_2$. If $i = i_1 \cdots i_n \in \mathcal{D}^n$ is a good cut point of $\Gamma_n$ then $i_k \cdots i_n$ is a good cut point of $\Gamma_{n-k+1}$ for all $2 \leq k \leq n - 2$. 
5. Detecting good cut points in finitely many steps

Note that every square to be concerned with is surrounded by at most 8 squares of the same side length, and we label these positions as in Figure 5. The following definition is rather a way of notation.

![Figure 5. The eight surrounding squares and their labels](image)

**Definition 5.1.** For every $i \in D^*$, denote $i(k)$ to be the vertex in $D[i]$, if there is such one, such that $\varphi_{i(k)}([0,1]^2)$ is just the leve-$|i|$ square lying exactly in the position $k$ adjacent to $\varphi_i([0,1]^2)$.

For example, $i(1) = i - (1,0)$ if it is an element in $D$.

**Lemma 5.2.** Let $\omega, \tau \in D^*$ and let $P \subset \{1, \ldots, 8\}$ be such that both of $\omega(k), \tau(k)$ are well-defined for all $k \in P$. That is to say, $\omega(k) \in D[\omega]$ and $\tau(k) \in D[\tau]$. Then for any $E \subset F$, 

$$
\left( \bigcup_{k \in P} \varphi_{\omega(k)}(F) \right) \cap \varphi_{\omega}(E) = \emptyset \iff \left( \bigcup_{k \in P} \varphi_{\tau(k)}(F) \right) \cap \varphi_{\tau}(E) = \emptyset.
$$

**Proof.** By Definition 5.1 and the self-similarity, for each fixed $k \in P$, $\varphi_{\omega(k)}(F) \cap \varphi_{\omega}(F)$ is just a scaled copy of $\varphi_{\tau(k)}(F) \cap \varphi_{\tau}(F)$. So one of them is empty if and only if the other is empty. Then the lemma follows immediately. \qed

Let us begin the proof of Theorem 1.5.

Let $M$ be a large positive integer (to be specified later) and let $i = i_1 \cdots i_M$ be a good cut point of $\Gamma_M$. By definition, there are $i_s, j_s \in D \setminus \{i_1\}$ such that $i_s D^M$ and $j_s D^M$ belong to different connected components of $\Gamma_M - \{i\}$. By Corollary 2.6, the statement remains true with $M$ replaced by every $1 \leq n \leq M$. Equivalently (again by Lemma 2.7), $\varphi_{i_s}(F)$ and $\varphi_{j_s}(F)$ belong to different connected components of $\bigcup_{j \in D^n \setminus \{i_s^n\}} \varphi_j(F) := K_n$. Let $A_n$ denote the connected component of $K_n$ that contains $\varphi_{i_s}(F)$ and $A'_n := K_n \setminus A_n$. Note that both $A_n$ and $A'_n$ consist of finitely many level-$n$ cells and they are disjoint. Furthermore, $\{A_n\}_{n=1}^M$ is an increasing sequence (since $\{K_n\}$ is increasing).

For $1 \leq n \leq M$, Let

$$
P_n := \{1 \leq k \leq 8 : \varphi_{i_n(k)}(F) \subset A_n\}, \quad P'_n := \{1 \leq k \leq 8 : \varphi_{i_n(k)}(F) \subset A'_n\}.
$$

That is to say, $P_n$ (resp. $P'_n$) is the collection of positions of level-$n$ cells adjacent to $\varphi_{i_n}(F)$ which is contained in $A_n$ (resp. $A'_n$). Clearly, $P_n \cap P'_n = \emptyset$. Since $F = A_n \cup A'_n \cup \varphi_{i_n}(F)$
is connected and \( A_n, A'_n \) are disjoint, we see that \( A_n \cap \varphi_{i|n}(F) \neq \emptyset \) and \( A'_n \cap \varphi_{i|n}(F) \neq \emptyset \). Therefore, \( P_n \) and \( P'_n \) are both non-empty.

Taking \( M \) large enough in the beginning, there are \( 1 \leq n_1 < n_2 \leq M \) such that \( n_2 \geq n_1 + 4 \) and

\[
P_{n_1} = P_{n_2}, \quad P'_{n_1} = P'_{n_2}
\]

since there are only \( \leq 1 \) distinct subsets of \( \{1, \ldots, 8\} \) (so \( M \) is independent of \( N \)). Without loss of generality (just ignoring \( i_{n_2+1} \cdots i_M \)), we may assume that \( n_2 = M \), i.e., \( i = i_{n_2} = i_1 \cdots i_{n_2} \). By Corollary 4.5, \( \omega := i_{n_2+1} \cdots i_M \) is a good cut point of \( \Gamma_{M-n_1} \). Let

\[
(5.1) \quad B := \bigcup \{ \varphi_{i|n_1,j}(F) : j \in D^{M-n_1} \setminus \{ \omega \} \} \text{ such that } \varphi_{i|n_1,j}(F) \subset A_M
\]

and

\[
(5.2) \quad B' := \bigcup \{ \varphi_{i|n_1,j}(F) : j \in D^{M-n_1} \setminus \{ \omega \} \} \text{ such that } \varphi_{i|n_1,j}(F) \subset A'_M.
\]

That is to say, \( B \) (resp. \( B' \)) is the union of those level-\( M \) cells in the level-\( n_1 \) cell \( \varphi_{i|n_1}(F) \) which are contained in \( A_M \) (resp. \( A'_M \)). Please see Figure 6 for an illustration. Clearly, \( B \cap B' = \emptyset \). Moreover, \( A_M = A_{n_1} \cup B \) and \( A'_M = A'_{n_1} \cup B' \).

**Lemma 5.3.** Both of \( B \) and \( B' \) are non-empty.

**Proof.** Assume on the contrary that \( B = \emptyset \), i.e., we have \( \varphi_{i|n_1,j}(F) \cap A_M = \emptyset \) for every \( j \in D^{M-n_1} \setminus \{ \omega \} \). So for each level-\( n_1 \) cell \( \varphi_\eta(F) \subset A_M \) such that \( \varphi_\eta(F) \cap \varphi_{i|n_1}(F) \neq \emptyset \), \( \varphi_i(F) \) is the only one level-\( M \) cell in \( \varphi_{i|n_1}(F) \) which has a non-empty intersection with \( \varphi_\eta(F) \). By Lemma 3.2 and recalling that \( M \geq n_1 + 4 \), \( \varphi_\eta(F) \cap \varphi_{i|n_1}(F) \) is a singleton for every \( \eta \). Applying a proof similar to the one of Lemma 3.3, we see that these singletons are the same one, say \( \{ y \} \). Letting \( I = \{ \eta \in D^{n_1} \setminus \{ i_{n_1} \} : \varphi_\eta(F) \subset A_M \} \) and \( J = \{ \eta \in D^{n_1} \setminus \{ i_{n_1} \} : \varphi_\eta(F) \subset A'_M \} \cup \{ i_{n_1} \} \), we see that \( I, J \) form a decomposition of \( D^{n_1} \) such that

\[
\left( \bigcup_{\eta \in I} \varphi_\eta(F) \right) \cap \left( \bigcup_{\eta \in J} \varphi_\eta(F) \right) = \left( \bigcup_{\eta \in I} \varphi_\eta(F) \right) \cap \varphi_{i|n_1}(F) = \{ y \}.
\]

It follows from Proposition 2.3 that \( F \) is fragile. This is a contradiction.

Similarly, we can prove that \( B' \neq \emptyset \). \( \square \)

**Lemma 5.4.** There is at least one level-(\( n_1 + 1 \)) cell contained in \( B \) (resp. \( B' \)).

**Proof.** Assume on the contrary that \( \varphi_{i|n_1}(F) \cap B = \emptyset \) for all \( i \in D \setminus \{ i_{n_1+1} \} \). So there is exactly one level-(\( n_1 + 1 \)) cell (just \( \varphi_{i|n_1+1}(F) \)) contained in \( \varphi_{i|n_1}(F) \) which has a non-empty intersection with \( A_{n_1} \). If for every level-\( n_1 \) cell \( \varphi_\eta(F) \subset A_{n_1} \) with \( \varphi_\eta(F) \cap \varphi_{i|n_1}(F) \neq \emptyset \), there is also only one level-(\( n_1 + 1 \)) cell in \( \varphi_\eta(F) \) intersecting \( \varphi_{i|n_1}(F) \), then we see directly from Lemma 3.3 that \( F \) is fragile and obtain a contradiction.

So we can find some level-\( n_1 \) cell contained in \( A_{n_1} \) such that there are at least two level-(\( n_1 + 1 \)) cells in it which has a non-empty intersection with \( \varphi_{i|n_1}(F) \). Denote this level-\( n_1 \) cell by \( \varphi_\eta(F) \).
Figure 6. An illustration on $A_{n_1}, A'_{n-1}, B, B'$.

(1) There are exactly two level-$(n_1+1)$ cells in $\varphi_\eta(F)$ which has a non-empty intersection with $\varphi_{i_1 n_1}(F)$. Rotating or reflecting if necessary, Figure 7 depicts all possibilities. Note that in both cases, we have $(N - 1, 0), (0, N - 1) \in \mathcal{D}$. For convenience, write $i_{n_1+1} = (a, N - 1)$. Since $\varphi_{i_1 n_1+1}(F)$ is the only one level-$(n_1+1)$ cell in $\varphi_{i_1 n_1}(F)$ which has a non-empty intersection with $\varphi_\eta(F)$, we see that $(a - 1, N - 1), (a + 1, N - 1) \notin \mathcal{D}$. Recall that $\omega = i_1 n_1 + 1 \cdots i_M$ is a good cut point so $i_{n_1+1}$ is a cut point of $\Gamma_1$.

If every pair of left-right adjacent cells of the same level does not intersect with each other then Figure 8 illustrates all possibilities on how $i_{n_1+1}$ cuts $\Gamma_1$. If it is as in the left two cases of Figure 8 then $(0, 0), (N - 1, N - 1) \in \mathcal{D}$. Now we have that

\[
\{(0, 0), (N - 1, N - 1), (N - 1, 0), (0, N - 1)\} \subset \mathcal{D}.
\]

As a result, there are at least two level-$(n_1 + 1)$ cells in $\varphi_{i_1 n_1}(F)$ which intersects $\varphi_\eta(F)$ (i.e., $\varphi_{i_1 n_1} \circ \varphi_{(0,N-1)}(F)$ and $\varphi_{i_1 n_1} \circ \varphi_{(N-1,N-1)}(F)$). This is a contradiction. If it is as in the rightmost case of Figure 8 then note that if we denote the vertex set of the connected component of $\Gamma_1 - \{i_{n_1+1}\}$ containing $(a + 1, N - 2)$ by $V$, then

\[
\left( \bigcup_{i \in V} \varphi_i(F) \right) \cap \left( \bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{D} \setminus V} \varphi_i(F) \right) = \varphi_{(a+1,N-2)}([0,1]^2) \cap \varphi_{i_{n_1+1}}([0,1]^2),
\]

which is a singleton. This implies that $F$ is fragile and leads to a contradiction.

If every pair of left-right adjacent cells of the same level has a non-empty intersection then the first figure in Figure 8 illustrates the only possibility on how $i_{n_1+1}$ cuts $\Gamma_1$. We have already seen that this implies that $F$ is fragile and leads to a contradiction.

(2) There are three level-$(n_1 + 1)$ cells in $\varphi_\eta(F)$ which has a non-empty intersection with $\varphi_{i_1 n_1}(F)$. Since we have drawn analogous figures many times, we just omit the figure here. It is not hard to see that

\[
\{(0, 0), (N - 1, N - 1), (N - 1, 0), (0, N - 1)\} \subset \mathcal{D}
\]
and we shall obtain a contradiction as in (1).

\[ \square \]

\textbf{Figure 7.} An illustration of case (1)

\textbf{Figure 8.} The cutting effect of \( i_{n+1} \)

Recall that \( \omega := i_{n+1} \cdots i_M \). Denote

\[ Q := \{ 1 \leq k \leq 8 : \varphi_{i|n_1}(F) \subset B \} \quad \text{and} \quad Q' := \{ 1 \leq k \leq 8 : \varphi_{i|n_1}(F) \subset B' \}, \]

i.e., \( Q \) (resp. \( Q' \)) is the collection of positions of level-\( |\omega| \) cells adjacent to \( \varphi_\omega(F) \) which is contained in \( B \) (resp. \( B' \)).

\textbf{Lemma 5.5.} \( Q \subset P_M = P_{n_1}, \quad Q' \subset P'_M = P'_{n_1} \).

\textbf{Proof.} Since \( A_M = A_{n_1} \cup B \), for every \( k \in Q \), we see that \( \varphi_{i|n_1}(F) \subset B \subset A_M \). Recalling that \( \omega \) is the notation of \( i_{n+1} \cdots i_M \), we have \( i|n_1 \omega(k) = (i|n_1 \omega)(k) = i(k) \). So \( \varphi_{i(k)}(F) \subset A_M \), which implies that \( k \in P_M = P_{n_1} \) (recall that the last equality follows from our choice of \( n_1 \)). Similarly, \( Q' \subset P'_M = P'_{n_1} \). \( \square \)

\textbf{Lemma 5.6.} \( \omega \omega \) is a good cut point of \( \Gamma_{2|\omega|} \).

\textbf{Proof.} By definition, we have to show that there are \( i, j \in D \) such that \( iD^{2|\omega|-1} \) and \( jD^{2|\omega|-1} \) belong to different connected components of \( \Gamma_{2|\omega|} \). Equivalently, \( \varphi_i(F) \) and \( \varphi_j(F) \) belong to different connected components of \( \bigcup_{j \in D|\omega| \setminus \{ \omega \}} \varphi_j(F) \).

Note that

\begin{align*}
(5.3) \quad \bigcup_{j \in D^{2|\omega| \setminus \{ \omega \}}} \varphi_j(F) = \left( \bigcup_{j \in D^{2|\omega| \setminus \{ \omega \}}} \varphi_j(F) \right) \cup \varphi_\omega \left( \bigcup_{j \in D^{2|\omega| \setminus \{ \omega \}}} \varphi_j(F) \right).
\end{align*}
Recalling the definitions of $B$ and $B'$ ((5.1) and (5.2)), we see that
\begin{equation}
\bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{D}^{n} \setminus \{\omega\}} \varphi_j(F) = \varphi_{\psi_{n_1}}^{-1}(B) \cup \varphi_{\psi_{n_1}}^{-1}(B') := U \cup U'.
\end{equation}

Therefore,
\begin{equation}
\bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{D}^{n} \setminus \{\omega\}} \varphi_j(F) = (U \cup U') \cup \varphi_{\omega}(U \cup U')
= (U \cup \varphi_{\omega}(U)) \cup (U' \cup \varphi_{\omega}(U')).
\end{equation}

Since $B \cap B' = \emptyset$, we have $U \cap U' = \emptyset$ and $\varphi_{\omega}(U) \cap \varphi_{\omega}(U') = \emptyset$. So to our end, it suffices to verify the following two facts:

(1) there are $i, j \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $\varphi_i(F) \subset U$ and $\varphi_j(F) \subset U'$;
(2) $U \cap \varphi_{\omega}(U') = \emptyset$ and $U' \cap \varphi_{\omega}(U) = \emptyset$ (so $(U \cup \varphi_{\omega}(U)) \cap (U' \cup \varphi_{\omega}(U')) = \emptyset$).

By Lemma 5.4, there are $i, j \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $\varphi_{i_{n_1}i}(F) \subset B$ and $\varphi_{i_{n_1}j}(F) \subset B'$. Thus $\varphi_i(F) \subset \varphi_{\psi_{n_1}}^{-1}(B) = U$ and $\varphi_j(F) \subset \varphi_{\psi_{n_1}}^{-1}(B') = U'$. This establishes (1).

For (2), note that by the definition of $U$, Definition 5.1, the definition of $Q$ and Lemma 5.5,
\begin{equation}
U \cap \varphi_{\omega}(U') = \varphi_{\psi}^{-1}(B) \cap \varphi_{\omega}(U')
= \left( \bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{D}^{M-n_1} \setminus \{\omega\}} \varphi_{j}(F) \cap \varphi_{\omega}(U') \right) \cap \varphi_{\omega}(U')
\end{equation}

Recalling that $A_{n_1} \cap B' = \emptyset$, we have
\begin{equation}
\emptyset = A_{n_1} \cap B' = \left( \bigcup_{k \in P_{n_1}} \varphi_{i_{n_1}k}(F) \right) \cap \varphi_{i_{n_1}}(U').
\end{equation}

Combining the above two relationships with Lemma 5.2, we see that $U \cap \varphi_{\omega}(U') = \emptyset$. Similarly, $U' \cap \varphi_{\omega}(U) = \emptyset$.\hfill\Box

To complete the proof of Theorem 1.5, we shall show that $\omega^n$ is a good cut point for all $n \geq 2$. Note that for every $n \geq 2$,\begin{equation}
\bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{D}^{n} \setminus \{\omega^n\}} \varphi_j(F) = \left( \bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{D}^{n-1} \setminus \{\omega^{n-1}\}} \varphi_j(F) \right) \cup \varphi_{\omega^{n-1}} \left( \bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{D}^{n} \setminus \{\omega\}} \varphi_j(F) \right),
\end{equation}

Denoting $U_n := \varphi_{\omega^n}(U)$, $U'_n := \varphi_{\omega^n}(U')$ (for $n \geq 1$), $U_0 := U$ and $U'_0 := U'$ (the latter two are for notational convenience), we can obtain by (5.3), (5.4), (5.5) and an induction argument that
\begin{equation}
\bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{D}^{n} \setminus \{\omega^n\}} \varphi_j(F) = \bigcup_{t=0}^{n-1} (U_t \cup U'_t) = \bigcup_{t=0}^{n-1} U_t \cup \bigcup_{t=0}^{n-1} U'_t := X_{n-1} \cup Y_{n-1}.
\end{equation}
We remark here that both of $X_{n-1}$ and $y_{n-1}$ are finite unions of level-$n[\omega]$ cells and hence compact. To show that $\omega^n$ is a good cut point, it suffices to show that $X_{n-1} \cap Y_{n-1} = \emptyset$ since this implies that $U_0 = U$ and $U'_0 = U'$ belong to different connected components of $X_{n-1} \cup Y_{n-1}$.

This is verified by induction. First note that $X_0 \cap Y_0 = U \cap U' = \emptyset$. Suppose we have $X_{t-1} \cap Y_{t-1} = \emptyset$ for all $1 \leq t \leq n - 1$. Since

$$X_n \cap Y_n = (X_{n-1} \cup U_n) \cap (Y_{n-1} \cup U'_n),$$

it suffices to show that $U_n \cap U'_n = \emptyset$, $X_{n-1} \cap U'_n = \emptyset$ and $Y_{n-1} \cap U_n = \emptyset$.

The first one is easy: $U_n \cap U'_n = \varphi_\omega(U \cap U') = \emptyset$. For the second one, note that

$$X_{n-1} \cap U'_n = (X_{n-2} \cup U_{n-1}) \cap U'_n = (X_{n-2} \cap U'_n) \cup (U_{n-1} \cap U'_n).$$

Recall from the proof of the above lemma that $U \cap \varphi_\omega(U') = \emptyset$. As a result,

$$U_{n-1} \cap U'_n = \varphi_{\omega-1}(U \cap \varphi_\omega(U')) = \emptyset.$$

Moreover, we can deduce from the definition of $U$ and $B$ that

$$U \subset \bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{D}^{\omega \setminus \{\omega\}}} \varphi_j(F).$$

Thus for every $1 \leq t \leq n - 1$,

$$U_t = \varphi_\omega(U) \subset \varphi_\omega\left( \bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{D}^{\omega \setminus \{\omega\}}} \varphi_j(F) \right) \subset \bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{D}^{(t+1)\omega \setminus \{\omega^{t+1}\}}} \varphi_j(F) \subset \bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{D}^{(n-1)\omega \setminus \{\omega^{n-1}\}}} \varphi_j(F).$$

It then follows that

$$X_{n-2} \cap U'_n = \left( \bigcup_{t=0}^{n-2} U_t \right) \cap U'_n \subset \left( \bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{D}^{(n-1)\omega \setminus \{\omega^{n-1}\}}} \varphi_j(F) \right) \cap \varphi_\omega(F),$$

and the last set is empty by Lemma 3.1. This completes the induction proof and hence the proof of Theorem 1.5.

Remark 5.7. In conclusion, to determine whether a non-fragile connected GSC $F$ has cut points, we first check that whether any of $(0,0)^2,(0, N-1)^2, (N-1,0)^2$ and $(N-1, N-1)^2$ is a good cut point of $\Gamma_2$. If it were the case then we can find a cut point of the carpet $F$ (Lemma 4.3). If not, then we check whether $\Gamma_1, \ldots, \Gamma_M$ have good cut points. If they all have then $F$ has cut points (Theorem 1.5 and Theorem 2.9). If there is one of them which has no good cut points then $F$ has no cut points (Lemma 4.2 and Theorem 2.9).

6. Proof of Proposition 4.4

Assume on the contrary that $i_2 \cdots i_n$ is not a good cut point of $\Gamma_{n-1}$. This means that $i_2 \cdots i_n$ is either not a cut point (so $\Gamma_{n-1} - \{i_2 \cdots i_n\}$ is connected) or a “bad” cut point of $\Gamma_{n-1}$. Both of them imply that \{iD^{n-2} : i \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \{i_2\}\} lies in one connected component.
of $\Gamma_{n-1} - \{i_2 \cdots i_n\}$. Equivalently (by Lemma 2.7), $\bigcup_{i \in D \setminus \{i_2\}} \varphi_i(F)$ is a subset of some connected component of $\bigcup_{j \in D^{n-1} \setminus \{i_2 \cdots i_n\}} \varphi_j(F)$. Denoting

$$A := \varphi_{i_1} \left( \bigcup_{i \in D \setminus \{i_2\}} \varphi_i(F) \right),$$

we see that $A$ is contained in exactly one connected component $C$ of

$$\varphi_{i_1} \left( \bigcup_{j \in D^{n-1} \setminus \{i_2 \cdots i_n\}} \varphi_j(F) \right) = \bigcup_{j \in D^{n} \setminus \{i_1, i_1 \prec j\}} \varphi_j(F).$$

**Lemma 6.1.** There is some $i_* \in D \setminus \{i_1\}$ such that $\varphi_{i_*}(F) \cap \varphi_{i_1 i_2}(F) \neq \emptyset$ and $\varphi_{i_*}(F) \cap C = \emptyset$.

**Proof.** Firstly, assume that $\varphi_j(F) \cap \varphi_{i_1 i_2}(F) = \emptyset$ for all $j \in D \setminus \{i_1\}$. So

$$\varphi_j(F) \cap (\varphi_{i_1}(F) \setminus C) \subset \varphi_j(F) \cap \varphi_{i_1 i_2}(F) = \emptyset, \quad \forall j \in D \setminus \{i_1\}.$$

Note that $\{\varphi_j(F) : j \in D\}$ is a sequence of connected compact sets such that their union (i.e., $F$) is connected. Applying Lemma 2.4, we see that $C \cup \bigcup_{j \in D \setminus \{i_1\}} \varphi_j(F)$ is connected. This contradicts the goodness of $i_1 i_2 = i_2$. So the set $J := \{j \in D \setminus \{i_1\} : \varphi_j(F) \cap \varphi_{i_1 i_2}(F) \neq \emptyset\}$ is non-empty.

Moreover, assume that $\varphi_j(F) \cap C \neq \emptyset$ for all $j \in J$. Then $B := C \cup \bigcup_{j \in J} \varphi_j(F)$ is connected. Note that for every $i \in D \setminus J$ with $i \neq i_1$,

$$\varphi_i(F) \cap (\left( \bigcup_{j \in J \setminus \{i_1\}} \varphi_j(F) \right) \setminus B) \subset \varphi_i(F) \cap (\varphi_{i_1}(F) \setminus C) \subset \varphi_i(F) \cap \varphi_{i_1 i_2}(F) = \emptyset.$$

By another application of Lemma 2.4 (similarly as above), we see that

$$B \cup \bigcup_{i \in D \setminus J, i \neq i_1} \varphi_i(F) \supset \bigcup_{i \in D \setminus \{i_1\}} \varphi_i(F)$$

is connected, which again contradicts the goodness of $i_1 i_2$. \hfill $\Box$

Fix such a digit $i_*$ as in the above lemma and consider

$$I := \{j = j_1 j_2 \in D^2 \setminus \{i_1 i_2\} : i_* \prec j \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi_j(F) \cap \varphi_{i_1 i_2}(F) \neq \emptyset\}.$$

In other words, for each $j \in I$, $\varphi_j(F)$ is a level-2 cell contained in $\varphi_{i_*}(F)$ which has a non-empty intersection with the level-2 cell $\varphi_{i_1 i_2}(F)$. In particular, $\varphi_{i_1}([0,1]^2)$ and $\varphi_{i_*}([0,1]^2)$ are two adjacent squares.

**Lemma 6.2.** Let $i \in D \setminus \{i_1, i_*\}$ be such that $\varphi_i(F) \cap \varphi_{i_*}(F) \neq \emptyset$. Then $\varphi_i(F) \cap \varphi_{i_*}(F) \neq \emptyset$ and $\varphi_i(F) \cap C = \emptyset$.

**Proof.** Under this assumption, there are at least two level-1 cells which has a non-empty intersection with the level-$n$ ($\geq 4$) cell $\varphi_i(F)$. So $\varphi_i([0,1]^2)$ must locate at one of the corners of the square $\varphi_{i_1}([0,1]^2)$. So there is one digit

$$\alpha \in \{(0,0), (0, N-1), (N-1, 0), (N-1, N-1)\}$$

such that $i_2 = \cdots = i_n = \alpha$. Without loss of generality, assume that $i_2 = \cdots = i_n = (0,0)$. 
We may also assume that $i, i_*$ are as in Figure 9 (other cases can be analogously discussed). If they are as in Figure 9(A) then

$$\varphi_i(F) \cap \varphi_1(F) \neq \emptyset \implies (0, N - 1) \in \mathcal{D}, \varphi_i(F) \cap \varphi_1(F) \neq \emptyset \implies (N - 1, N - 1) \in \mathcal{D}.$$ 

This implies that $\varphi_i((0,1)) = \varphi_i((1,1))$ and hence $\varphi_{i_*}(F) \cap \varphi_i(F) \neq \emptyset$. If they are as in Figure 9(B) then

$$\varphi_i(F) \cap \varphi_1(F) \neq \emptyset \implies (N - 1, 0) \in \mathcal{D}, \varphi_i(F) \cap \varphi_1(F) \neq \emptyset \implies (0, N - 1) \in \mathcal{D}.$$ 

This implies that $\varphi_i((1,0)) = \varphi_i((0,1))$ and hence $\varphi_{i_*}(F) \cap \varphi_i(F) \neq \emptyset$.

![Figure 9. Possible locations of $i, i_*$](image)

To show that $\varphi_i(F) \cap C = \emptyset$, we first claim that there is no digit $\eta$ in $\mathcal{D}$ other than $i, i_*$ such that $\varphi_{\eta}(F) \cap \varphi_{i_1}(F) \neq \emptyset$. Otherwise, $\eta$ should be as in Figure 10 and we immediately see that

$$\{(0,0), (0,N-1), (N-1,0), (N-1,N-1)\} \subset \mathcal{D}.$$ 

If $\eta$ is as in Figure 10(A) then

$$C \cap \varphi_{i_*}(F) \supset \left(\varphi_{i_1} \circ \varphi_{(N-1,0)}(F)\right) \cap \left(\varphi_{i_*} \circ \varphi_{(N-1,N-1)}(F)\right) \neq \emptyset.$$ 

If $\eta$ is as in Figure 10(B) then

$$C \cap \varphi_{i_*}(F) \supset \left(\varphi_{i_1} \circ \varphi_{(0,N-1)}(F)\right) \cap \left(\varphi_{i_*} \circ \varphi_{(N-1,N-1)}(F)\right) \neq \emptyset.$$ 

So both would lead to a contradiction.

![Figure 10. Possible locations of $\eta$](image)
Assume that $\varphi_i(F) \cap C \neq \emptyset$. Then $B := \varphi_i(F) \cup \varphi_{i_1}(F) \cup C$ is connected. Letting $J := D \setminus \{i, i_*, i_1\}$, we have already seen in the above paragraph that

$$\varphi_j(F) \cap \varphi_{i_1}(F) = \emptyset, \quad \forall j \in J.$$ 

This implies that

$$\varphi_j(F) \cap \bigg( \bigg( \bigcup_{\eta \in D \setminus J} \varphi_\eta(F) \bigg) \setminus B \bigg) \subset \varphi_j(F) \cap \varphi_{i_1}(F) = \emptyset, \quad \forall j \in J.$$ 

Again, it follows from Lemma 2.4 that $B \cup \bigcup_{j \in J} \varphi_j(F)$ is connected, which contradicts the goodness of $i_1i_2$. □

**Lemma 6.3.** Suppose $(0, 0) \in D$ but $(0, 0)^2$ is not a good cut point of $\Gamma_2$. Denote $E := \bigcup_{j \in D \setminus \{(0, 0)\}} \varphi_j(F)$. Then $E \cap \varphi_{(0, 0)}(E) \neq \emptyset$.

**Proof.** Since $(0, 0)^2$ is not a good cut point of $\Gamma_2$, $E$ lies in one connected component of $\bigcup_{j \in D \setminus \{(0, 0)^2\}} \varphi_j(F)$ (again by Lemma 2.7). So $\varphi_{(0, 0)}(E)$ lies in one connected component of $\varphi_{(0, 0)}\big( \bigcup_{j \in D \setminus \{(0, 0)^2\}} \varphi_j(F) \big)$. Since $F = E \cup \varphi_{(0, 0)}(F)$ is connected, $E \cap \varphi_{(0, 0)}(F) \neq \emptyset$. It is easy to see that

$$\varphi_{(0, 0)^2}(F) \cap \varphi_j(F) = \emptyset, \quad \forall j \in D \setminus \{(0, 0)\}.$$ 

So $\varphi_{(0, 0)^2}(F) \cap E = \emptyset$ and hence

$$\emptyset \neq E \cap \varphi_{(0, 0)}(F) = E \cap \varphi_{(0, 0)}\big( E \cup \varphi_{(0, 0)}(F) \big) = E \cap \varphi_{(0, 0)}(E).$$ 

□

We start the case-by-case discussion to prove Proposition 4.4.

**Case 1.** $|I| = 1$. Rotating and reflecting if necessary, Figure 11 depicts all possibilities.

![Figure 11. Cases when $|I| = 1$](image)
and $D_2 := D \setminus D_1$. Clearly, $i_1 \in D_1$ and $i_1 \in D_2$ so they are non-empty. By Lemma 6.2, if $i \in D \setminus \{i_1\}$ is such that $\varphi_i(F) \cap \varphi_i(F) \neq \emptyset$ then $i \in D_1$. We will show that $\varphi_i(F) \cap \varphi_{i_1}(F) = \{x_\ast\}$ for every such $i$. Also it is clearly that

$$\varphi_i(F) \cap \varphi_j(F) = \emptyset, \quad \forall i \in D_1, j \in D_2 \setminus \{i_1\}.$$ 

As a result, (since the deletion of $i$ breaks the connectedness of $\Gamma_n$)

$$\left( \bigcup_{i \in D_1} \varphi_i(F) \right) \cap \left( \bigcup_{j \in D_2} \varphi_j(F) \right) \subset \left( \bigcup_{i \in D_1} \varphi_i(F) \right) \cap \varphi_i(F) = \{x_\ast\}.$$ 

So $F$ is fragile and we arrive at a contradiction.

Now let us show that $\varphi_i(F) \cap \varphi_{i_1}(F) = \{x_\ast\}$ for every $i \in D \setminus \{i_1\}$ such that $\varphi_i(F) \cap \varphi_i(F) \neq \emptyset$. If $i = i_\ast$ then there is nothing to prove. If $i \neq i_\ast$ then Figure 9 illustrates all possible locations of $i$.

**Subcase 1.1.** $i$ is as in Figure 9(A). Clearly, $\varphi_i([0,1]^2) \cap \varphi_{i_1}([0,1]^2)$ is a singleton and hence so is $\varphi_i(F) \cap \varphi_{i_1}(F)$. It is also easy to see that this point is just $x_\ast$.

**Subcase 1.2.** $i$ is as in Figure 9(B). In this case, $i_2 = \cdots = i_n = (0,0)$ and $(0,N - 1), (N - 1,0) \in D$ (since Lemma 6.2 tells us $\varphi_i(F) \cap \varphi_i(F) \neq \emptyset$). Recall that $n \geq 4$. We claim that there is only one level-$n$ cell in $\varphi_i(F)$ which intersects $\varphi_i(F)$. Then it follows from Lemma 2.1 that $\varphi_i(F) \cap \varphi_{i_1}(F)$ is a singleton and again, this point is just $x_\ast$.

If there is a level-$n$ cell in $\varphi_i(F)$ other than $\varphi_i \circ \varphi(a_n \cdot 0)^n \cdot 1(F)$ which intersects $\varphi_i(F) = \varphi_{i_1} \circ \varphi(0,0) \cdot 1(F)$, this cell must be $\varphi_i \circ \varphi(a_n \cdot 0)^n \cdot 2 \circ \varphi(a_n \cdot 1)(F)$. In particular, $(N - 1,1) \in D_1$.

But this implies that

$$\varphi_i \circ \varphi(a_n \cdot 1) \circ \varphi(a_n \cdot 0)(F) \cap \varphi_{i_1} \circ \varphi(0,0) \circ \varphi(0,N - 1)(F) \neq \emptyset.$$ 

Since the former set is contained in $\varphi_i(F)$ and the latter is contained in $\varphi_{i_1} \circ \varphi(0,0)(F)$, we see that $\varphi_i(F) \cap \varphi_{i_1} \circ \varphi(0,0)(F) \neq \emptyset$. By Lemma 6.3, $\varphi_{i_1}(E) \cap \varphi_{i_1} \circ \varphi(0,0)(F) \neq \emptyset$. So $\varphi_i(F)$ and $\varphi_{i_1}(E) = A$ (recall the notation $A$ from (6.1)) belong to the same connected component of $\bigcup_{j \in D \setminus \{i\}} \varphi_j(F)$, i.e., $\varphi_i(F) \subset C$. This contradicts Lemma 6.2.

**Case 2.** $|I| = 2$. Rotating and reflecting if necessary, Figure 12(A)(B) depict all possibilities.

**Subcase 2.1.** Consider the case as in Figure 12(A). For convenience, write $i_2 = (a,0)$. Then $(a - 1, N - 1), (a, N - 1) \in D$ and $(0,0), (N - 1, N - 1) \in D$. Since $A \cap \varphi_{i_1}(F) = \emptyset$, we see that $(a - 1,0), (a + 1,0) \notin D$ and

$$\varphi_{i_1}(F) \cap \varphi_{i_1}(F) \subset \varphi_{i_1 i_2}(F) \cap \varphi_{i_1}(F).$$

Since $F = A \cup \varphi_{i_1 i_2}(F)$ is connected, $A \cap \varphi_{i_1 i_2}(F) \neq \emptyset$.

By (6.2) and the self-similarity, for every pair of words $j, j' \in D^*$ (of the same length) such that $\varphi_j([0,1]^2)$ and $\varphi_{j'}([0,1]^2)$ are up-down adjacent (assuming that the former square is upon the latter one)

$$\varphi_j(F) \cap \varphi_{j'}(F) \subset (\varphi_j \circ \varphi_{a,0}(F)) \cap \varphi_{j'}(F).$$

Therefore, there is only one level-3 cell (i.e., $\varphi_{i_1} \circ \varphi_{a,0}^2(F)$) in $\varphi_{i_1 i_2}(F)$ which intersects $\varphi_{i_1} \circ \varphi_{a,N - 1}(F)$. Clearly, there is only one level-3 cell (i.e., $\varphi_{i_1} \circ \varphi_{a,0}(0,0)(F)$) in $\varphi_{i_1 i_2}(F)$.
which intersects \( \varphi_i \circ \varphi(a_{-i,N-1})(F) \). Since \( \varphi_i(F) \cap \varphi_i(F) \neq \emptyset \) and \( |i| = n \geq 4 \), \( \varphi_i(F) \) must be contained in those two level-3 cells. This means that \( i_3 \) is either \((a,0)\) or \((0,0)\).

If \( i_3 = i_2 = (a,0) \) then we see by the position of \( \varphi_{i_1 i_2 i_3}(F) \) that \( A \cap \varphi_{i_1 i_2 i_3}(F) = \emptyset \). Thus
\[
\emptyset \neq A \cap \varphi_{i_1 i_2}(F) = A \cap (\varphi_i(A) \cup \varphi_{i_1 i_2 i_3}(F)) = A \cap \varphi_i(A).
\]
So \( \varphi_i(A) \subset C \) (recall the notation \( C \) in the paragraph below Proposition 4.4). But we also have
\[
\varphi_i(A) \cap \varphi_i(F) \supset (\varphi_{i_1 i_2} \circ \varphi((0,0))(F)) \cap (\varphi_i \circ \varphi(a_{-i,N-1})(a_{-i,N-1})(F)) \neq \emptyset,
\]
so \( \varphi_i(F) \cap C \neq \emptyset \). This contradicts Lemma 6.1.

If \( i_3 = (0,0) \) then \( i_4 = \cdots = i_n = (0,0) \). We claim that \( i_3 \cdots i_n = (0,0)^{n-2} \) must be a good cut point. Otherwise, \( \{jD^{n-3} : j \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \{(0,0)\}\} \) lies in one common connected component of \( \Gamma_{n-2} - \{(0,0)^{n-2}\} \). Equivalently (again by Lemma 2.7), \( \bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \{(0,0)\}} \varphi_j(F) \) lies in exactly one connected component of \( \bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \{(0,0)^{n-2}\}} \varphi_j(F) \). Recall that \( A \cap \varphi_{i_1 i_3}(F) \neq \emptyset \) (right after (6.2)). By their location, we see (similarly as in the proof of Lemma 6.3) that
\[
\varphi_{i_1 i_2 i_3}(F) \cap A = \varphi_i \circ \varphi((0,0)^2)(F) \cap \varphi_i \left( \bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \{(0,0)\}} \varphi_j(F) \right) = \emptyset.
\]
Altogether,
\[
\emptyset \neq A \cap \varphi_{i_1 i_2}(F) = A \cap \varphi_{i_1 i_2} \left( \varphi((0,0)) \cup \bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \{(0,0)\}} \varphi_j(F) \right) = A \cap \varphi_{i_1 i_2} \left( \bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \{(0,0)\}} \varphi_j(F) \right).
\]
Thus \( \varphi_{i_1 i_2} \left( \bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \{(0,0)\}} \varphi_j(F) \right) \subset C \). On the other hand,
\[
\varphi_{i_1 i_2} \left( \bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \{(0,0)\}} \varphi_j(F) \right) \cap \varphi_i(F) \supset (\varphi_{i_1 i_2} \circ \varphi_{(0,0)}(F)) \cap (\varphi_i \circ \varphi(a_{-i,N-1})(a_{-i,N-1})(F)) \neq \emptyset
\]
since the last two cells are up-down adjacent. This implies that \( \varphi_i(F) \cap C \neq \emptyset \) which contradicts Lemma 6.1.

Since \( i_3 \cdots i_n = (0,0)^{n-2} \) is a good cut point and \( n \geq 4 \), we see that \( (0,0)^2 \) is a good cut point of \( \Gamma_2 \). This is also a contradiction and the proof of Proposition 4.4 is completed.

**Subcase 2.2.** Consider the case as in Figure 12(B). Then it is easy to see that
\[
\{(0,0), (0,N-1), (N-1,0), (N-1,N-1)\} \subset \mathcal{D}.
\]
Note that at least one of \( (0,0) \) and \( (N-1,0) \) is not \( i_2 \), say \( (0,0) \). Then
\[
A \cap \varphi_{i_1}(F) \supset \varphi_i(\varphi((0,0))(F)) \cap \varphi_i \circ \varphi(0,N-1)(F) \neq \emptyset
\]
(since the last two cells are up-down adjacent). This is a contradiction.

**Case 3.** \( |I| = 3 \). See Figure 12(C). In this case, we again have
\[
\{(0,0), (0,N-1), (N-1,0), (N-1,N-1)\} \subset \mathcal{D}.
\]
and obtain a contradiction as above.
7. Possible numbers of cut points

Given a connected GSC $F$, its topology falls into one of the following possibilities.

1. $F$ has no cut point (e.g., the standard Sierpiński carpet).
2. $F$ has exactly one cut point. For example, take $N = 3$ and

   $$\mathcal{D} = \{(0, 0), (0, 1), (0, 2), (1, 0), (2, 0), (2, 1), (2, 2)\}.$$

   Please see Figure 13(A). In this case, $(1/2, 0)$ is the only cut point of $F$. Please see Lemma 4.1 in [5] for a detailed proof.

3. $F$ has more than one but finitely many cut points. For example, take $N = 5$ and

   $$\mathcal{D} = \{(0, j), (4, j) : 0 \leq j \leq 4\} \cup \{(1, j), (3, j) : 0 \leq j \leq 2\} \cup \{(2, 3), (2, 4)\}.$$

   Please see Figure 13(B). In this case, $F$ contains exactly two cut points $(2/5, 3/5)$ and $(3/5, 3/5)$.

4. $F$ has countably many cut points. For example, take $N = 3$ and

   $$\mathcal{D} = \{(0, 1), (1, 0), (1, 1), (1, 2), (2, 0), (2, 1), (2, 2)\}.$$

   Please see Figure 13(C). In this case, the collection of cut points of $F$ is a subset of

   $$\{(1/2, 1/3)\} \cup \{\varphi_d((1/2, 1/3)) : d \in \mathcal{D}^*\},$$

   and it is easy to see that $\{\varphi^n_{(1,0)}((1/2, 1/3)) : n \geq 1\}$ are cut points of $F$.

5. $F$ has uncountably many cut points. This happens trivially when the GSC is a line segment. For example, take $N = 3$ and $\mathcal{D} = \{(0, 0), (1, 0), (2, 0)\}$ (so $F = F(N, \mathcal{D})$ is just the unit interval $[0, 1] \times \{0\}$).

The following example establishes Theorem 1.6.
Example 7.1. Given any positive integer \( n \geq 2 \), there is a connected GSC with exactly \( n \) cut points. For example, take \( N = n + 3 \) and

\[
\mathcal{D} = \{(0, j), (N-1, j) : 0 \leq j \leq N - 1\} \\
\cup \{(i, j) : 0 < i < N - 1 \text{ odd}, 0 \leq j \leq n - 1\} \\
\cup \{(i, j) : 0 < i < N - 1 \text{ even}, n \leq j \leq N - 1\}.
\]

It is not hard to see that the corresponding GSC \( F = F(N, \mathcal{D}) \) has exactly \( n \) cut points

\[
\left(\frac{k}{N}, 1 - \frac{3}{N}\right), \quad 2 \leq k \leq N - 2.
\]

Figure 14 depicts cases when \( n = 3 \) and \( n = 4 \).
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