

# CARROT JOHN DOMAINS IN VARIATIONAL PROBLEMS

WEICONG SU, YI RU-YA ZHANG

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we explore carrot John domains within variational problems, dividing our examination into two distinct sections. The initial part is dedicated to establishing the lower semicontinuity of the (optimal) John constant concerning Hausdorff convergence for bounded John domains. This result holds promising implications for both shape optimization problems and Techmüller theory.

In the subsequent section, we demonstrate that an unbounded open set satisfying the carrot John condition with a center at  $\infty$ , appearing in the Mumford-Shah problem, can be covered by a uniformly finite number of unbounded John domains (defined conventionally through cigars). These domains, in particular, support Sobolev-Poincaré inequalities.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In the realm of shape optimization problems, instances frequently arise wherein the objective is to identify the optimal class of sets, denoted as  $U$ , based on the ratio of functionals that incorporate the norm of a specific class of Sobolev functions  $u$ , the norm of its gradient  $Du$ , and the norm of its trace  $u|_{\partial U}$  on  $\partial U$ . A prototypical illustration of such scenarios is the pursuit of the optimal sets  $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  for the first  $p$ -Dirichlet eigenvalue, where for  $1 < p < \infty$  and  $a > 0$ ,

$$\min_{|U|=a} \left\{ \int_U |Du|^p dx : u \in W_0^{1,p}(U), \|u\|_{L^p(U)} = 1 \right\}.$$

According to the Rayleigh-Faber-Krahn inequality, it can be deduced that this quantity is not inferior to the corresponding Dirichlet eigenvalue of a Euclidean ball with a volume of  $a$ . Subsequent research, particularly through transportation techniques as explored in [15, 17], has revealed that *balls have the worst best Sobolev inequalities*. Additional insights and recent advancements in this domain can be found in [18] and its associated references.

Conversely, a distinctive category of domains, termed as *John domains*, which supports Sobolev-Poincaré inequalities. Recall that, a (bounded) domain  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is  $J$ -John for some  $J \geq 1$  if there exists a distinguished point  $x_0 \in \Omega$  so that, for any  $x \in \Omega$ , one can find a curve  $\gamma \subset \Omega$  joining  $x$  to  $x_0$  satisfying

$$\ell(\gamma[x, y]) \leq Jd(y, \partial\Omega) \quad \text{for each } y \in \gamma,$$

---

*Date:* January 17, 2024.

*2000 Mathematics Subject Classification.* 49Q20.

*Key words and phrases.* carrot John domains, lower semicontinuity.

Both of the authors are funded by National Key R&D Program of China (Grant No. 2021YFA1003100), the Chinese Academy of Science and NSFC grant No. 12288201.

where  $\gamma[x, y]$  is any subcurve of  $\gamma$  joining  $x$  and  $y$ . The constant  $J$  is usually called the *John constant*. Heuristically speaking,  $\Omega$  contained a uniformly linearly opened twisted cone at every  $x \in \Omega$ ; see Figure 1. Standard examples of John domains encompass Lipschitz domains in any  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , and quasidisks in the plane, which include von Koch's snowflakes, see e.g. [8, Chapter 6]. Stemming from the definition of a John domain and the Lebesgue differentiation theorem, it can be deduced that the boundary of a John domain possesses a Lebesgue measure of 0.




FIGURE 1. A domain  $\Omega$  is John if, heuristically speaking, it contained a uniformly linearly opened twisted cone at every  $x \in \Omega$ .

For a domain  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  to support Sobolev-Poincaré inequalities, it implies that, for  $1 \leq p < n$  and every  $u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ , one has

$$\inf_c \left( \int_{\Omega} |u - c|^{p^*} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p^*}} \leq C(n, p, J) \left( \int_{\Omega} |Du|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

where  $p^* = \frac{np}{n-p}$  is the critical Sobolev exponent. For comprehensive studies on the Sobolev-Poincaré inequality, we recommend consulting [3] and [9]. Furthermore, for an exploration of this inequality in the context of general metric measure spaces, encompassing Carnot groups, [11] serves as a valuable resource. Moreover, in the specific context of John domains, which inherently support the Poincaré inequality, one can establish trace inequalities for Sobolev functions with additional assumptions on the domain's boundary. For detailed insights and further references on this subject, one may refer to works such as [20], [13], and [19].

In contrast, Buckley and Koskela, as shown in [6], revealed that a domain  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , possessing finite volume and adhering to a ball-separation property, supports Sobolev-Poincaré inequalities. This characteristic is particularly evident in scenarios involving conformal deformations, as discussed in [4, 2], such as bounded and simply connected domains in the plane. The implications of this discovery underscore a deep connection between shape optimization problems involving Sobolev-Poincaré inequalities and the concept of John domains.

This correlation prompts the need for a refined definition of the John constant, one that can be extended to arbitrary Euclidean domains. The ensuing definition is motivated by this imperative, and it is formulated to accommodate general Minkowski norms (defined at the beginning of Section 2) in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  for potential applications in some other forthcoming research endeavors.

**Definition 1.1.** Consider the Euclidean space  $(\mathbb{R}^n, \|\cdot\|)$  endowed with a general Minkowski norm  $\|\cdot\|$ , and  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be a (bounded) domain. Then for any  $x \in \Omega$  and a curve  $\gamma \subset \subset \Omega$  containing  $x$ , we define a function  $j(\cdot; x, \gamma, \Omega) : \gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  as

$$j(y; x, \gamma, \Omega) := \frac{\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma[x, y])}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(y, \partial\Omega)} \quad \text{for any } y \in \gamma,$$

where  $\gamma[x, y] \subset \gamma$  is any subcurve of  $\gamma$  joining  $x$  to  $y$ , and we denote its length with respect to the metric induced via  $\|\cdot\|$  by  $\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma[x, y])$ .

Subsequently, we set

$$J(x, \Omega; x_0) := \inf \left\{ \sup_{y \in \beta} j(y; x, \beta, \Omega) : \beta \subset \Omega \text{ is a curve joining } x \text{ to } x_0 \right\},$$

and

$$J(\Omega; x_0) := \sup_{x \in \Omega} J(x, \Omega; x_0).$$

We assert that  $\Omega$  satisfies the  $J$ -carrot John condition with center  $x_0 \in \Omega$  if

$$J = J(\Omega; x_0) < \infty.$$

Eventually we define  $John(\cdot)$  on the collection of bounded domains of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  as

$$John(\Omega) := \inf_{x_0 \in \Omega} \{J(\Omega; x_0)\},$$

and designate  $John(\Omega)$  as the (optimal) John constant of  $\Omega$ .

By the definition of  $John(\cdot)$  and the definition of John domain, it follows that  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is a John domain with center  $x_0 \in \Omega$  if and only if  $John(\Omega) < +\infty$ .

In the pursuit of broader applications, we extend the definition of the  $J$ -carrot to a pair of suitable points  $x, x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , where  $\mathbb{R}^n$  represents the one-point compactification of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

**Definition 1.2.** Let  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$  be distinct points and  $\gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be a curve joining  $x$  toward  $x_0$ . Assume that  $J \geq 1$ .

When  $x_0 \neq \infty$ , we define

$$car(\gamma, J) := \bigcup \{B_{\|\cdot\|}(y, \ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma[x, y])/J) : y \in \gamma \setminus \{x\}\},$$

where  $\gamma[x, y] \subset \gamma$  is any subcurve of  $\gamma$  joining  $x$  to  $y$ , and we denote its length with respect to the “metric”<sup>1</sup> induced via  $\|\cdot\|$  by  $\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma[x, y])$ .

When  $x_0 = \infty$ , we define

$$car(\gamma, J) := \bigcup \{B_{\|\cdot\|}(y, \ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma[x, y])/J) : y \in \gamma \setminus \{x, \infty\}\}.$$

Then the (open) set  $car(\gamma, J)$  is called the  $J$ -carrot with core  $\gamma$  and vertex  $x$  joining  $x$  to  $x_0$ .

We say an open set  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  satisfies  $J$ -carrot John condition with center  $x_0 \in \Omega \cup \{\infty\}$ , if for each point  $x \in \Omega$ , there exists a curve  $\beta \subset \Omega$  joining  $x$  toward  $x_0$  so that  $car(\beta, J) \subset \Omega$ . Furthermore, if  $\Omega$  also satisfies connectivity, we assert that  $\Omega$  is a  $J$ -carrot John domain.

<sup>1</sup>Given that  $|\cdot|$  represents a generalized norm, the lengths of the curve exhibit variation relative to the parametrized directions.

*Remark 1.3.* It is noteworthy that in the definition of  $car(\gamma, J)$ , one has the flexibility to substitute  $\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma[x, y])$  by either  $\text{diam}_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma[\eta, x])$  or simply  $\|\eta - x\|$ . Importantly, these alternative formulations are equivalent in both bounded and unbounded scenarios, as elucidated in, for instance, [21, Theorem 2.14].

*Remark 1.4.* In the literature, an alternative definition of the John domain is sometimes employed, where the term "J-carrot" is replaced by the so-called "J-cigar". To elucidate, when considering a pair of distinct points  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and a curve  $\beta \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  containing  $x$  and  $y$ , the "J-cigar" is defined as:

$$cig(\beta, J) := \bigcup \{B_{\|\cdot\|}(\eta, \rho(\eta)/J) : \eta \in \beta \setminus \{x, y\}\},$$

where

$$\rho(\eta) = \min\{\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\beta[x, \eta]), \ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\beta[y, \eta])\}.$$

The set  $cig(\beta, J)$  is called the  $J$ -cigar with core  $\beta$  joining  $x$  and  $y$ , and  $\Omega$  is  $J$ -cigar John if each pair of points  $x, y \in \Omega$  implies there exists a curve  $\beta \subset \Omega$  so that  $cig(\beta, J) \subset \Omega$ . Heuristically speaking, in the bounded case, one can interpret a  $J$ -cigar as the union of two  $J$ -carrots. Indeed, it has been rigorously established that when  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is bounded, these two definitions, employing either the  $J$ -carrot or the  $J$ -cigar, are equivalent; refer to, for example, [21, Theorem 2.16], and also Lemma 3.4 in the manuscript.

**1.1. Bounded John domains.** Now we are prepared to articulate our first theorem.

**Theorem 1.5** (lower-semicontinuity of (optimal) John constants). *Let  $J_0 \geq 2$  and assume that  $\{\Omega_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}^+}$  is a sequence of uniformly bounded John domains satisfying*

$$John(\Omega_j) \leq J_0 \quad \text{and} \quad |\Omega_j| \geq c_0 |B_{\|\cdot\|}(0, 1)|,$$

*for some  $c_0 > 0$ . Then up to passing to a subsequence,  $\overline{\Omega}_j$  converges to some compact set  $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  in the Hausdorff distance  $d_H$  so that the interior  $\Omega$  of  $A$  satisfies*

- (i)  $\max_{x \in \Omega} d_{\|\cdot\|}(x, \partial\Omega) \geq c = c(n, C_{\|\cdot\|}, J_0, c_0) > 0$ , where  $C_{\|\cdot\|}$  is defined in (2.1).
- (ii)  $\Omega$  is connected and, particularly, is a John domain with

$$John(\Omega) \leq \liminf_j John(\Omega_j).$$

In Theorem 1.5, one can only anticipate lower semicontinuity, not continuity. To illustrate, consider the sequence of sets

$$\Omega_k := \mathbb{D} \setminus [0, 1] \times [-2^{-k}, 2^{-k}], \quad k \geq 1$$

where  $\mathbb{D}$  denotes the unit disk in the plane. Then  $John(\Omega_k)$  is uniformly bounded below, away from 1, while the limit of  $\overline{\Omega}_k$  is  $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , whose interior has an (optimal) John constant of 1.

**Corollary 1.6.** *For  $R \gg |D|$ ,*

$$\{John(\Omega) : |\Omega| = |D|, \Omega \subset B_{\|\cdot\|, R}\}$$

*has a solution, where  $D$  is the convex body associated with the Minkowski norm  $\|\cdot\|$ . Moreover, the set of minimizers precisely consists of translations of  $D$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\Omega_k$  be a minimizing sequence. As  $\partial\Omega_k$  has Lebesgue measure 0, then

$$|\Omega_k| = |\overline{\Omega}_k|.$$

Then as a direct consequence of Theorem 1.5, up to passing to a subsequence,  $\overline{\Omega}_k \rightarrow \overline{\Omega}$  for some open set  $\Omega \subset B_{\|\cdot\|, R}$ , together with

$$John(\Omega) \leq \liminf_k John(\Omega_k) \leq J$$

for some  $J \geq 1$ . Moreover, by [24, Theorem 2.8]<sup>2</sup>, Lebesgue measure is continuous with respect to the Hausdorff metric for  $J$ -carrot John domains. Thus  $\Omega$  is a desired minimizer.

Now we show that a minimizer  $\Omega$  must be a translation of  $D$ . Indeed, since  $John(\Omega) \geq 1$  and  $John(D) = 1$ , then it follows that  $John(\Omega) = 1$ . Now by the definition of  $John(\Omega)$  and Lemma 2.5, saying that the infimum of  $x_0$  is taken away from the boundary, we conclude that for any  $y \in \Omega$

$$\|y - x_0\| \leq \ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma_{y, x_0}) \leq d_{\|\cdot\|}(x_0, \partial\Omega),$$

where  $\gamma_{y, x_0}$  is a John curve joining  $y$  to  $x_0$  given by Lemma 2.2. Thus  $\Omega$  is a translation of  $D$ .  $\square$

We expect that this outcome is intricately connected to the observation that "balls have the worst best Sobolev inequalities."

In contrast, it was proven that a Jordan domain  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  quantifies as a quasidisk if and only if both  $\Omega$  and its complementary domain are John domains, as documented in [21] and [8, Theorem 6.12]. Consequently, considering the role of normalized quasidisks in modeling the universal Teichmüller space [14, Section III.1.5], Theorem 1.5 not only enables the exploration of extremal maps in quasiconformal mappings but also offers insights into the properties of quasidisks.

Furthermore, it is noteworthy to recall that for a bounded  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , Heinonen [12] established that if  $f: B \rightarrow \Omega$  is a quasiconformal mapping, then it is quasisymmetric with respect to the intrinsic metric if and only if  $\Omega$  is quantitatively John. Consequently, Theorem 1.5 carries potential significance for Teichmüller theory in higher dimensions as well.

**1.2. Unbounded open sets satisfying carrot John condition with center  $\infty$ .** Advancing in our exploration, we turn our attention to the  $J$ -carrot condition for unbounded domains  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  with unbounded  $\partial\Omega$ , i.e. for any  $x \in \Omega$  domains, there exists a curve  $\gamma \subset \Omega$  from  $x$  toward  $\infty$  in such a way that the infinite  $J$ -carrot

$$car(\gamma, J) \subset \Omega.$$

---

<sup>2</sup>Even though in [24, Theorem 2.8] it is only prove that for a  $J$ -carrot John domain  $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  with  $diam(U) \leq 1$ ,

$$|\{x \in U : d(x, \partial U) < t\}| \leq \mu(t, J, n) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow 0.$$

However, it follows from a similar argument that for a bounded  $J$ -carrot John domain  $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  with  $|U| \leq M$ , where  $M$  is a positive constant,

$$|\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : d(x, \partial U) < t\}| \leq \mu(t, J, n, M) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow 0.$$

This, coupled with the fact that  $\overline{\Omega}_k$  forms a Cauchy sequence in terms of the Hausdorff distance, leads us to the desired conclusion.

Such domains find relevance in the exploration of the Mumford-Shah problem, as expounded in, for instance, [5, Section 19] and [7, Section 56, Proposition 7].

**Theorem 1.7.** *Suppose that  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is a closed set,  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus K$  is an unbounded open set satisfying  $J$ -carrot John condition with center  $\infty$  and  $0 \in K$ . Then for any  $R \geq 0$ , there exists at most  $N$ -many  $J'$ -carrot John subdomains (where some of them could be empty)  $\{W_{j,R}\}_{j \in \{1, \dots, N\}}$  of  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus K$  of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with  $J' = J'(n, J)$  and  $N = N(n, J)$ , such that*

(i) *We have*

$$B_R \setminus K \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^N \overline{W}_{j,R},$$

together with  $W_{j,R} \subset B_{C'R}$  with  $C' = C'(n, J)$  and (if it is non-empty)

$$C(n, J)^{-1}R^n \leq |W_{j,R}| \leq C(n, J)R^n. \quad (1.1)$$

In addition, for each  $1 \leq k \leq N$  and  $R > 0$ , there exists a sequence  $\{k_l\}_{l=0}^{+\infty}$  and  $k_0 = k$  so that

$$C(n, J)^{-1}|W_{k_l, 2^l R}| \leq |W_{k_l, 2^l R} \cap W_{k_{l+1}, 2^{l+1} R}|, \quad l \geq 0. \quad (1.2)$$

(ii) *For  $1 \leq j \leq N$  and some  $x_j \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , the set*

$$W_{j,\infty} := \bigcup_{R > |x_j|} W_{j,R} \subset \mathbb{R}^n \setminus K$$

is also a  $J'$ -carrot John subdomain centered at  $\infty$ , for which

$$\mathbb{R}^n \setminus K \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^N \overline{W}_{j,\infty}. \quad (1.3)$$

Moreover, for any  $z, w \in W_{j,\infty}$ , there exists a ball  $B_{z,w} \subset W_{j,\infty}$  whose radius is  $r_{z,w}$  so that there are two rectifiable curve  $\gamma_z, \gamma_w$  respectively joining  $z, w$  to the center  $a_{z,w}$  of  $B_{z,w}$  satisfying

$$B_{z,w} \subset \text{car}(\gamma_z, J') \subset W_{j,\infty} \quad \text{and} \quad B_{z,w} \subset \text{car}(\gamma_w, J') \subset W_{j,\infty}, \quad (1.4)$$

where the radius  $r_{z,w}$  satisfy

$$\frac{\ell(\gamma_z[z, a_{z,w}])}{J'} = r_{z,w} = \frac{\ell(\gamma_w[w, a_{z,w}])}{J'}. \quad (1.5)$$

(iii) *In particular, as a consequence of [3], [9] (for bounded domains) together with [10] (for unbounded domains), we have*

$$\inf_c \left( \int_{W_{j,R}} |u - c|^{p^*} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p^*}} \leq C(n, p, J) \left( \int_{W_{j,R}} |Du|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \quad \text{for any } u \in W^{1,p}(W_{j,R}),$$

and

$$\inf_c \left( \int_{W_{j,\infty}} |u - c|^{p^*} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p^*}} \leq C(n, p, J) \left( \int_{W_{j,\infty}} |Du|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \quad \text{for any } u \in W^{1,p}(W_{j,\infty}).$$

*Remark 1.8.* As noted in Remark 1.4, according to [21, Theorem 2.16], the  $J$ -carrot John condition and the  $J$ -cigar John condition are equivalent for any bounded domain, up to positive constants.

However, this equivalence does not necessarily hold for unbounded domains, and the Sobolev-Poincaré inequality in [10] is proven for unbounded cigar John domains. An example for the failure of the equivalence is given by the following: Consider the unbounded domain

$$U = \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus ((-\infty, -1] \times \{0\} \cup [1, +\infty) \times \{0\})$$

which satisfies the 1-carrot John condition with center  $\infty$ . However, it does not satisfy any cigar John condition. Nevertheless, observe that,  $U$  can be covered as the union of two sets  $\mathbb{H}^+ \cup B(0, 1)$  and  $\mathbb{H}^-$ , where  $\mathbb{H}^\pm$  denote the upper/lower (open) half plane, and each of them individually satisfies the 2-cigar condition.

In a similar vein, Theorem 1.7 establishes that any unbounded  $J$ -carrot John domain can be covered by a uniformly finite number of  $J'$ -cigar John domains, where the number of domains is uniformly bounded depending only on  $J$  and  $n$ . We remark that (1.4) is indeed equivalent to stating that every two distinct points  $z, w$  can be connected by a  $J'$ -cigar inside  $W_{j, \infty}$ . However, to streamline terminology, the theorem is presented in the context of carrots.

The manuscript is structured as follows: In Section 2, we provide the proof of Theorem 1.5, devoting careful attention to the continuity of functions as defined in Definition 1.1. A pivotal lemma, namely Lemma 2.1, examines the behavior of carrots under Hausdorff convergence. Another crucial aspect involves preventing the John centers of converging John domains from reaching the boundary, a concern addressed in Proposition 2.5.

The proof of Theorem 1.7 is detailed in Section 3, with an introductory overview of the proof presented at the outset of the section.

## 2. LOWER-SEMICONTINUITY OF JOHN CONSTANT

In our manuscript, we employ the notation as follows: A general norm in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is denoted by  $\|\cdot\|$ . Recall that a function

$$\|\cdot\|: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

is a general norm if it satisfies

$$\|x + y\| \leq \|x\| + \|y\|, \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

$$\|\lambda x\| = \lambda \|x\|, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \lambda > 0,$$

and

$$\|x\| = 0 \text{ if and only if } x = 0.$$

See e.g. [1, Section 2.1]. We set

$$C_{\|\cdot\|} := \max_{\|x\|=1} \|\cdot - x\|. \tag{2.1}$$

Specifically, the standard Euclidean norm is denoted by  $|\cdot|$ . For any set  $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , the closure of  $E$  with respect to the Euclidean topology is denoted as  $\overline{E}$  or  $Cl(E)$ , and its complement is denoted by  $E^c$ . Given that the Euclidean space is of finite dimension, the topology induced by the norms remains the same.

For a non-empty open set  $\Omega \subsetneq \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $x \in \Omega$ , we write

$$d_{\|\cdot\|}(x, \partial\Omega) := \inf_{y \in \partial\Omega} \|x - y\|,$$

and when the norm is the stand Euclidean one, we simply write

$$d(x, \partial\Omega) := \inf_{y \in \partial\Omega} |x - y|.$$

For  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $r > 0$ , we use the notation

$$B_{\|\cdot\|}(x, r) := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|x - y\| < r\}$$

and by  $\overline{B}_{\|\cdot\|}(x, r)$  its closure. We drop the subindices and write  $B(x, r)$  when the norm is the standard Euclidean norm. Especially, we denote the standard Euclidean ball  $B(0, r)$  centered at 0 by  $B_r$  for brevity.

The space consisting of all nonempty compact sets in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  equipped with the Hausdorff metric  $d_H$  is denoted as  $(\mathcal{C}^n, d_H)$ . The topology of  $(\mathcal{C}^n, d_H)$  induced by all norms in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  are equivalent. For simplicity, one can think of  $d_H$  as the metric induced by the standard Euclidean norm in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

The Lebesgue measure of the set  $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is denoted by  $|E|$  and the  $s$ -dimension Hausdorff measure of  $E$  is denoted by  $\mathcal{H}^s(E)$ . A general constant is denoted by  $C$ , which may vary across different estimates, and we include all the constants it depends on within the parentheses, denoted as  $C(\cdot)$ .

Suppose that  $(X, \|\cdot\|)$  is a general Minkowski space and  $\gamma \subset X$  is a rectifiable curve. Using reparametrization,  $\gamma$  can be seen as a homeomorphism

$$\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow X, \quad t \mapsto \gamma(t).$$

For every two distinct points  $a_1, a_2 \in \gamma$ , there exists  $t_1, t_2 \in [0, 1]$ , such that  $a_i = \gamma(t_i)$  for  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ . We may assume  $t_1 < t_2$ . Then we denote the subcurve  $\gamma([t_1, t_2])$  joining  $a_1$  to  $a_2$  by  $\gamma[a_1, a_2]$ . Under the assumption above, the length of the rectifiable curve  $\gamma \subset X$  is written as

$$\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma) = \sup \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \|\gamma(t_{i+1}) - \gamma(t_i)\| : 0 = a_0 < a_1 < a_2 < \cdots < a_N = 1, \quad N \in \mathbb{N}^+ \right\}.$$

If  $\gamma$  is the union of curves, then  $\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma)$  denotes the sum of the length of these curves under the same parametrization.

We next prove a key lemma which later helps us to deduce the lower-semicontinuity of certain function characterizing the John domain.

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $\{x_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $\{y_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  be two sequences of points with  $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $y_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$  for  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ . Assume that  $\{\gamma_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a sequence of locally rectifiable curves in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  joining pairs of distinct points  $x_i, y_i$ , respectively, with  $x_i \neq \infty$ .*

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} x_i =: x \neq \infty \quad \text{and} \quad y := \lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} y_i$$

*exist in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and that either*

$$\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma_i) \text{ is uniformly bounded,}$$



or

$$y = \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma_i \cap B_R), \quad R \geq 1 \quad \text{uniformly bounded independent of } i \quad (2.2)$$

holds.

Moreover, let  $\{J_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  be an uniformly bounded sequence with  $J \geq 1$  and  $\text{car}(\gamma_i, J_i)$  is the corresponding  $J_i$ -carrot joining  $x_i$  toward  $y_i$ , respectively. Then up to relabeling the sequence (and taking subcurves if necessary),

(i) In  $(\mathbb{R}^n, \|\cdot\|)$

$$\gamma_i \rightarrow \gamma \quad \text{locally uniformly,} \quad (2.3)$$

and

$$\text{car}(\gamma, J) \subset \bigcap_{m=1}^{+\infty} \bigcup_{i=m}^{+\infty} \text{car}(\gamma_i, J_i), \quad (2.4)$$

where  $J := \liminf_{i \rightarrow +\infty} J_i$ .

(ii) If  $\ell(\gamma_i)$  is uniformly bounded, then

$$\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma) \leq \liminf_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma_i). \quad (2.5)$$

*Proof. Case 1:  $\ell(\gamma_i)$  is uniformly bounded.* Then our assumption implies that, for some  $L > 0$ ,

$$l_i := \ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma_i) \leq L.$$

As  $\{J_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a uniformly bounded sequence, we may assume

$$l_\infty := \lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} l_i, \quad J := \lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} J_i \quad (2.6)$$

with  $l_\infty \leq L$ .

By parameterizing  $\gamma_i$  via arc length on  $[0, L]$ , up to extending as a constant curve if necessary on the interval  $[\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma_i), L]$ , we obtain that  $\{\gamma_i(\cdot)\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  is equicontinuous and uniformly bounded as  $x_i \rightarrow x \neq \infty$ . Thus, up to passing to a subsequence, it follows from Arzelá-Ascoli theorem that, up to extracting a subsequence,

$$\gamma_i \rightarrow \gamma \in C([0, L]; \mathbb{R}^n) \quad \text{uniformly.} \quad (2.7)$$

As  $\gamma_i$  is 1-Lipschitz,  $\gamma$  is also 1-Lipschitz, and thus

$$\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma) \leq \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma_i) \quad (2.8)$$

as desired.

In addition, for any point  $\zeta \in \text{car}(\gamma, J)$ , there exists  $t_z \in (0, L]$  with  $z = \gamma(t_z) \in \gamma$  so that

$$\zeta \in B_{\|\cdot\|}(z, \ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma[x, z])/J), \quad (2.9)$$

which yields a positive constant  $\delta := \ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma[x, z])/J - \|z - \zeta\| > 0$ .

Note that (2.7) yields the existence of a sequence  $\{z_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  for which  $z_i = \gamma_i(t_z) \in \gamma_i$  and  $z_i \rightarrow z$  as  $i \rightarrow \infty$ . Therefore, by (2.8), for any positive  $\epsilon < \delta/2$ , when  $i \geq i_0$  for some big integer  $i_0$ , we have  $\|z_i - z\| < \epsilon$  and

$$\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma[x, z]) \leq \ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma_i[x_i, z_i]) + \epsilon$$

As a result, combining (2.9) and triangle inequality, the estimate above gives

$$\begin{aligned} \|z_i - \zeta\| &\leq \|z - \zeta\| + \|z_i - z\| < \|z - \zeta\| + \epsilon \\ &\leq (\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma[x, z])/J - \delta) + \epsilon \leq \ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma_i[x_i, z_i])/J + 2\epsilon - \delta \\ &< \ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma_i[x_i, z_i])/J, \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\zeta \in \bigcup_{i=m}^{+\infty} B_{\|\cdot\|} \left( z_i, \ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma_i[x_i, z_i])/J_i \right) \subset \bigcup_{i=m}^{+\infty} \text{car}(\gamma_i, J_i).$$

Consequently,  $\zeta \in \bigcap_{m=1}^{+\infty} \left( \bigcup_{i=m}^{+\infty} \text{car}(\gamma_i, J_i) \right)$  implies the right hand side of (2.4), whose left hand side can be proved by similar argument. In conclusion, when  $y \neq \infty$ , Lemma 2.1 holds.

**Case 2:**  $y = \infty$  and  $\ell(\gamma_i) \rightarrow \infty$ : In this case, as  $\gamma_i$  is locally rectifiable and satisfies (2.2), then via suitable truncation, by Step 1 and applying a diagonal argument, we have  $\gamma_i$  converges locally uniformly to a curve  $\gamma$  parametrized by arc length on  $[0, \infty)$ . Similarly, by taking the union of carrots along  $\gamma_i$ , (2.4) is obtained also from Step 1.  $\square$

For a bounded domain  $\Omega$  and any rectifiable curve  $\gamma \subset \subset \Omega$  joining  $x$  to  $x_0$  with  $x, x_0 \in \Omega$ , recall the definition of  $j(y; x, \gamma, \Omega)$  in Definition 1.1. Then  $j(y; x, \gamma, \Omega)$  is continuous with respect to  $y \in \gamma$ , and then the compactness of  $\gamma$  tells that there exists a point  $z \in \gamma$  such that

$$\frac{\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma[x, z])}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(z, \partial\Omega)} = \sup_{y \in E} j(y; x, E, \Omega) < +\infty.$$

Thus,

$$J(x, \Omega; x_0) := \inf \left\{ \sup_{y \in \beta} j(y; x, \beta, \Omega) : \beta \subset \Omega \text{ is a curve joining } x \text{ to } x_0 \right\}$$

is finite. We next show that Lemma 2.1 ensures the existence of the rectifiable curve who make this infimum be reached.

**Lemma 2.2.** *Assume  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is a bounded domain. Let  $x, x_0 \in \Omega$  be two distinct points with  $J(x, \Omega; x_0) < +\infty$ . Then there exists a rectifiable curve  $\gamma \subset \Omega$  joining  $x$  to  $x_0$  such that*

$$\sup_{y \in \gamma} j(y; x, \gamma, \Omega) = J(x, \Omega; x_0).$$

*Proof.* Choose a minimizing sequence  $\{\gamma_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}^+}$ ,  $\gamma_i \subset \Omega$  of rectifiable curves joining  $x$  to  $x_0$  so that

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} J_i := \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{y \in \gamma_i} j(y; x, \gamma_i, \Omega) = J(x, \Omega; x_0) =: J.$$

Then by the Definition 1.1, the uniform boundness of  $J_i$  implies that  $\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma_i)$  is bounded uniformly. Thus by letting  $\text{car}(\gamma_i, J_i)$  be the  $J_i$ -carrot joining  $x$  to  $x_0$  for  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ , Lemma 2.1 tells that there exists a rectifiable curve  $\gamma$  of a  $J$ -carrot joining  $x$  to  $x_0$ , such that

$$\text{car}(\gamma, J) \subset \Omega,$$

which implies that  $J \geq \sup_{y \in \gamma} j(y; x, \gamma, \Omega)$ . On the other hand, the convergence of  $J_i$  to  $J$  together with Definition 1.1, gives

$$J \leq \sup_{y \in \gamma} j(y; x, \gamma, \Omega).$$

The proof is completed. □

**Lemma 2.3.** *Let  $x_0 \in \Omega$  and  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be a bounded  $J$ -carrot John domain with  $J := J(\Omega; x_0)$ . Then for any  $z \in \Omega$ ,  $J(\Omega; z)$  is finite. Moreover, for any  $y \in \Omega$  satisfying*

$$d_{\|\cdot\|}(y, \partial\Omega) = \max_{x \in \Omega} d_{\|\cdot\|}(x, \partial\Omega),$$

we get  $J(\Omega; y) \leq C(n, C_{\|\cdot\|}, J)$ .

This lemma directly follows from Theorem 3.6 in [23]. Despite their findings being initially formulated for the standard Euclidean norm, one can establish them for a general norm in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  by employing identical arguments, necessitating only notational adjustments, with additional dependency on  $C_{\|\cdot\|}$ .

**Lemma 2.4.** *Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be a bounded John domain. Then*

$$J(\cdot, \Omega; \cdot) : \Omega \times \Omega \rightarrow [1, +\infty), \quad (x, y) \mapsto J(x, \Omega; y)$$

is locally Lipschitz continuous.

*Proof.* Given  $(x, y) \in \Omega \times \Omega$  and  $(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) \in \Omega \times \Omega$  close to  $(x, y)$ , We first estimate

$$J(\hat{x}, \Omega; \hat{y}) - J(x, \Omega; y)$$

from above and below, respectively.

**Step 1: Estimate  $J(\hat{x}, \Omega; \hat{y}) - J(x, \Omega; y)$  from above.** Let

$$J := J(x, \Omega; y).$$

Then Lemma 2.2 yields a rectifiable curve  $\gamma \subset \Omega$  joining  $x$  to  $y$  together with the corresponding  $J$ -carrot  $car(\gamma, J)$ , such that

$$\sup_{a \in \gamma} j(a; x, \gamma, \Omega) = J(x, \Omega; y) = J \quad \text{and} \quad car(\gamma, J) \subset \Omega. \quad (2.10)$$

As a consequence of the compactness of  $\gamma$ , the definition of  $j(a; x, \gamma, \Omega)$  gives us a point  $\zeta \in \gamma$ , such that

$$\frac{\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma[x, \zeta])}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(\zeta, \partial\Omega)} = J = \sup_{a \in \gamma} j(a; x, \gamma, \Omega). \quad (2.11)$$

We claim that

$$d_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma, \partial\Omega) \geq \frac{d_{\|\cdot\|}(x, \partial\Omega)}{2C_{\|\cdot\|}J}. \quad (2.12)$$

Indeed, for any  $z \in \gamma \cap B_{\|\cdot\|}(x, \frac{1}{2}d_{\|\cdot\|}(x, \partial\Omega))$ , then triangle inequality gives

$$d_{\|\cdot\|}(z, \partial\Omega) \geq \frac{1}{2}d_{\|\cdot\|}(x, \partial\Omega);$$

while  $z \in \gamma \setminus B_{\|\cdot\|} \left( x, \frac{1}{2}d_{\|\cdot\|}(x, \partial\Omega) \right)$ , it follows from (2.10) and the definition of  $\text{car}(\gamma, J)$  that

$$d_{\|\cdot\|}(z, \partial\Omega) \geq \frac{\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma[x, z])}{J} \geq \frac{\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma[z, x])}{C_{\|\cdot\|}J} \geq \frac{d_{\|\cdot\|}(x, \partial\Omega)}{2C_{\|\cdot\|}J}.$$

As  $J \geq 1$ , our claim (2.12) follows.

Let  $(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) \in \Omega \times \Omega$  close to  $(x, y)$  with

$$\hat{x} \in B_{\|\cdot\|} \left( x, \frac{d_{\|\cdot\|}(x, \partial\Omega)}{2} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{y} \in B_{\|\cdot\|} \left( y, \frac{d_{\|\cdot\|}(y, \partial\Omega)}{2} \right).$$

Set

$$\hat{\gamma} := L_{\hat{x}, x} \cup \gamma \cup L_{y, \hat{y}}, \quad (2.13)$$

where  $L_{\hat{x}, x}$  is the line segment joining  $\hat{x}$  to  $x$  and  $L_{y, \hat{y}}$  is the one joining  $y$  to  $\hat{y}$ . As  $y \in \gamma$ , we conclude from (2.11) that

$$\frac{\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma[x, y])}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(y, \partial\Omega)} \leq \frac{\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma[x, \zeta])}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(\zeta, \partial\Omega)},$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma[x, y])}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(y, \partial\Omega) - \|y - \hat{y}\|} - \frac{\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma[x, \zeta])}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(\zeta, \partial\Omega)} \\ & \leq \left( \frac{\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma[x, y])}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(y, \partial\Omega) - \|y - \hat{y}\|} - \frac{\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma[x, y])}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(y, \partial\Omega)} \right) + \left( \frac{\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma[x, y])}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(y, \partial\Omega)} - \frac{\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma[x, \zeta])}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(\zeta, \partial\Omega)} \right) \\ & \leq \frac{\|y - \hat{y}\|}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(y, \partial\Omega)(d_{\|\cdot\|}(y, \partial\Omega) - \|y - \hat{y}\|)} \ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma[x, y]). \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

For each  $z \in \hat{\gamma}$ , we now estimate

$$\frac{\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\hat{\gamma}[\hat{x}, z])}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(z, \partial\Omega)} - \frac{\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma[x, \zeta])}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(\zeta, \partial\Omega)}$$

in three cases.

First of all, when  $z \in \gamma$ , as

$$\frac{\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma[x, z])}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(z, \partial\Omega)} \leq \sup_{a \in \gamma} j(a; x, \gamma, \Omega) = \frac{\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma[x, \zeta])}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(\zeta, \partial\Omega)}$$

by (2.11) and  $d_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma, \partial\Omega) = \inf_{a \in \gamma} d_{\|\cdot\|}(a, \partial\Omega)$ , then we have

$$\frac{\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\hat{\gamma}[\hat{x}, z])}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(z, \partial\Omega)} - \frac{\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma[x, \zeta])}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(\zeta, \partial\Omega)} \leq \frac{\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma[x, z]) + \|x - \hat{x}\|}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(z, \partial\Omega)} - \frac{\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma[x, \zeta])}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(\zeta, \partial\Omega)} \leq \frac{\|x - \hat{x}\|}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma, \partial\Omega)}. \quad (2.15)$$

Secondly, suppose that  $z \in L_{y, \hat{y}}$ . Then as (2.13) yields

$$\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma[\hat{x}, z]) \leq \|z - y\| + \ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma[x, y]) + \|x - \hat{x}\| \leq \|\hat{y} - y\| + \ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma[x, y]) + \|x - \hat{x}\|,$$

and triangle inequality yields

$$d_{\|\cdot\|}(z, \partial\Omega) \geq d_{\|\cdot\|}(y, \partial\Omega) - \|y - z\| \geq d_{\|\cdot\|}(y, \partial\Omega) - \|y - \hat{y}\|,$$

it then follows from (2.14) that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\hat{\gamma}[\hat{x}, z])}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(z, \partial\Omega)} - \frac{\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma[x, \zeta])}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(\zeta, \partial\Omega)} \\
 & \leq \frac{\|x - \hat{x}\| + \|\hat{y} - y\|}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(y, \partial\Omega) - \|y - \hat{y}\|} + \frac{\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma[x, y])}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(y, \partial\Omega) - \|y - \hat{y}\|} - \frac{\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma[x, \zeta])}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(\zeta, \partial\Omega)} \\
 & \leq \frac{\|x - \hat{x}\| + C_{\|\cdot\|}\|y - \hat{y}\|}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(y, \partial\Omega) - \|y - \hat{y}\|} + \frac{\|y - \hat{y}\|}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(y, \partial\Omega)(d_{\|\cdot\|}(y, \partial\Omega) - \|\hat{y} - y\|)} \ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma[x, y]) \\
 & \leq \frac{\|x - \hat{x}\|d_{\|\cdot\|}(y, \partial\Omega) + C_{\|\cdot\|}\|y - \hat{y}\|d_{\|\cdot\|}(y, \partial\Omega) + \|y - \hat{y}\|\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma[x, y])}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(y, \partial\Omega)(d_{\|\cdot\|}(y, \partial\Omega) - \|y - \hat{y}\|)} \\
 & \leq \frac{2C_{\|\cdot\|}(d_{\|\cdot\|}(y, \partial\Omega) + \ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma[x, y]))}{(d_{\|\cdot\|}(y, \partial\Omega))^2} (\|x - \hat{x}\| + \|y - \hat{y}\|) \leq \frac{C(n, C_{\|\cdot\|}, J)}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(y, \partial\Omega)} (\|x - \hat{x}\| + \|y - \hat{y}\|).
 \end{aligned} \tag{2.16}$$

The last case is when  $z \in L_{\hat{x}, x}$ , which implies  $\|x - z\| \leq \|x - \hat{x}\|$  and then

$$d_{\|\cdot\|}(z, \partial\Omega) \geq d_{\|\cdot\|}(x, \partial\Omega) - \|x - z\| \geq d_{\|\cdot\|}(x, \partial\Omega) - \|x - \hat{x}\|.$$

Thus we obtain that

$$\frac{\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\hat{\gamma}[\hat{x}, z])}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(z, \partial\Omega)} - \frac{\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma[x, \zeta])}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(\zeta, \partial\Omega)} \leq \frac{\|x - \hat{x}\|}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(x, \partial\Omega) - \|x - \hat{x}\|} - \frac{\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma[x, \zeta])}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(\zeta, \partial\Omega)} \leq \frac{2\|x - \hat{x}\|}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(x, \partial\Omega)}. \tag{2.17}$$

All in all, we conclude from (2.15), (2.16) and (2.17) that, for any  $z \in \hat{\gamma}$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\hat{\gamma}[\hat{x}, z])}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(z, \partial\Omega)} - \frac{\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma[x, \zeta])}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(\zeta, \partial\Omega)} \\
 & \leq \max \left\{ \frac{\|x - \hat{x}\|}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma, \partial\Omega)}, \frac{C(n, C_{\|\cdot\|}, J)}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(y, \partial\Omega)} (\|x - \hat{x}\| + \|y - \hat{y}\|), \frac{2\|x - \hat{x}\|}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(x, \partial\Omega)} \right\}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{2.18}$$

As a result, we conclude from (2.12) that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & J(\hat{x}, \Omega; \hat{y}) - J(x, \Omega; y) \\
 & \leq \sup_{z \in \hat{E}} \frac{\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\hat{\gamma}[\hat{x}, z])}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(z, \partial\Omega)} - \frac{\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma[x, \zeta])}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(\zeta, \partial\Omega)} \\
 & \leq \max \left\{ \frac{\|x - \hat{x}\|}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma, \partial\Omega)}, \frac{C(n, C_{\|\cdot\|}, J)}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(y, \partial\Omega)} (\|x - \hat{x}\| + \|y - \hat{y}\|), \frac{2\|x - \hat{x}\|}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(x, \partial\Omega)} \right\} \\
 & \leq \frac{C(n, C_{\|\cdot\|}, J)}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma, \partial\Omega)} (\|x - \hat{x}\| + \|y - \hat{y}\|) \leq \frac{C(n, C_{\|\cdot\|}, J)}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(x, \partial\Omega)} (\|x - \hat{x}\| + \|y - \hat{y}\|).
 \end{aligned} \tag{2.19}$$

**Step 2: Estimate  $J(x, \Omega; y) - J(\hat{x}, \Omega; \hat{y})$  from above.** Similarly, we repeat the argument and gain the following estimate:

$$J(x, \Omega; y) - J(\hat{x}, \Omega; \hat{y}) \leq \frac{C(n, C_{\|\cdot\|}, J)}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(x, \partial\Omega)} (\|x - \hat{x}\| + \|y - \hat{y}\|), \tag{2.20}$$

when  $\|x - \hat{x}\| + \|y - \hat{y}\| < \delta$  for a constant  $\delta = \delta(x, y, C_{\|\cdot\|})$  satisfying

$$0 < \delta \leq \frac{1}{2} \min\{d_{\|\cdot\|}(x, \partial\Omega), d_{\|\cdot\|}(y, \partial\Omega)\}.$$

Detailed proof of (2.20) is included in the Appendix A.

**Step 3: Conclusion** Combining (2.19) and (2.20) we get that  $J(\cdot, \Omega, \cdot)$  is continuous and

$$|J(x, \Omega; y) - J(\hat{x}, \Omega; \hat{y})| \leq \frac{C(n, C_{\|\cdot\|}, J)}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(x, \partial\Omega)} (\|x - \hat{x}\| + \|y - \hat{y}\|), \quad (2.21)$$

when  $\|x - \hat{x}\| + \|y - \hat{y}\| < \delta$ . Thus for any  $(x, y) \in \Omega \times \Omega$ , by letting

$$U_{x,y} := \left\{ (a, b) \in \Omega \times \Omega : \|a - x\| + \|b - y\| < \frac{1}{16C_{\|\cdot\|}} \delta \right\},$$

the estimate (2.21) yields that whenever  $(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2) \in U_{x,y}$ ,

$$|J(x_1, \Omega; y_1) - J(x_2, \Omega; y_2)| \leq \frac{C_{x,y}}{d_{x,y}} (\|x_1 - x_2\| + \|y_1 - y_2\|), \quad (2.22)$$

where

$$C_{x,y} = \max_{(a,b) \in \bar{U}_{x,y}} C(n, C_{\|\cdot\|}, J(a, \Omega; b)) < \infty$$

by the John assumption on  $\Omega$ , and

$$d_{x,y} = \min_{(a,b) \in \bar{U}_{x,y}} d_{\|\cdot\|}(a, \partial\Omega).$$

From (2.22) we finally conclude that  $J(\cdot, \Omega; \cdot)$  is locally Lipschitz continuous.  $\square$

Recall that

$$J(\Omega; x_0) := \sup_{x \in \Omega} J(x, \Omega; x_0).$$

**Lemma 2.5.** *Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be a bounded John domain. Then  $J(\Omega; \cdot) : \Omega \rightarrow [1, +\infty)$  is a lower-semicontinuous function, such that*

(i) *For  $y \in \Omega$ ,  $r_\Omega := \max_{z \in \Omega} \{d_{\|\cdot\|}(z, \partial\Omega)\}$ , we have*

$$J(\Omega; y) \geq \frac{r_\Omega - d_{\|\cdot\|}(y, \partial\Omega)}{C_{\|\cdot\|} d_{\|\cdot\|}(y, \partial\Omega)};$$

(ii) *Let  $x_\Omega \in \Omega$  be a point with  $d_{\|\cdot\|}(x_\Omega, \partial\Omega) = r_\Omega$ . Then  $J(\Omega; \cdot)$  attains the infimum in*

$$\{x \in \Omega : d_{\|\cdot\|}(x, \partial\Omega) \geq r_0\},$$

*where  $r_0 := \frac{r_\Omega}{1+2C_{\|\cdot\|} J(\Omega; x_\Omega)} > 0$ .*

*Proof.* Observe that for any  $x \in \Omega$ ,  $J(x, \Omega; \cdot)$  is a continuous function in  $\Omega$  by Lemma 2.4. Then we find that  $J(\Omega; \cdot)$  is a lower-semicontinuous function in  $\Omega$  since

$$J(\Omega; \cdot) = \sup_{x \in \Omega} J(x, \Omega; \cdot).$$

Now we prove (i). Let  $x_\Omega \in \Omega$  be a point satisfying

$$d_{\|\cdot\|}(x_\Omega, \partial\Omega) = \max_{y \in \Omega} \{d_{\|\cdot\|}(y, \partial\Omega)\} =: r_\Omega.$$

For any  $y \in \Omega$ , combining the definition of  $J(x_\Omega, \Omega; y)$ , Lemma 2.2 and the triangle inequality, there exists a rectifiable curve  $\gamma \subset \Omega$  joining  $x_\Omega$  to  $y$ , such that

$$J(x_\Omega, \Omega; y) = \sup_{a \in \gamma} \frac{\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma[x_\Omega, a])}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(a, \partial\Omega)} \geq \frac{\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma[x_\Omega, y])}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(y, \partial\Omega)} \geq \frac{\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma[y, x_\Omega])}{C_{\|\cdot\|} d_{\|\cdot\|}(y, \partial\Omega)} \geq \frac{r_\Omega - d_{\|\cdot\|}(y, \partial\Omega)}{C_{\|\cdot\|} d_{\|\cdot\|}(y, \partial\Omega)},$$

then we have

$$J(\Omega; y) \geq J(x_\Omega, \Omega; y) \geq \frac{r_\Omega - d_{\|\cdot\|}(y, \partial\Omega)}{C_{\|\cdot\|} d_{\|\cdot\|}(y, \partial\Omega)}. \quad (2.23)$$

Now we proceed to (ii). Recall that  $J(\Omega; x_\Omega) < +\infty$  by Lemma 2.3. We define

$$r_0 := \frac{r_\Omega}{1 + 2C_{\|\cdot\|} J(\Omega; x_\Omega)} \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega_{r_0} := \{x \in \Omega : d_{\|\cdot\|}(x, \partial\Omega) > r_0\}$$

so that for any  $0 < r \leq r_0$

$$\frac{r_\Omega - r}{C_{\|\cdot\|} r} \geq \frac{r_\Omega - r_0}{C_{\|\cdot\|} r_0} = 2J(\Omega; x_\Omega).$$

Then since  $x_\Omega \in \Omega_{r_0}$ , for any  $z \in \Omega \setminus \Omega_{r_0}$ , we conclude from (2.23) that

$$J(\Omega; z) \geq 2J(\Omega; x_\Omega) > J(\Omega; x_\Omega) \geq \inf_{x \in \overline{\Omega}_{r_0}} J(\Omega; x).$$

Then the above estimate yields that  $\inf_{x \in \Omega} J(\Omega; x) = \inf_{x \in \overline{\Omega}_{r_0}} J(\Omega; x)$ .

Notice that  $\overline{\Omega}_{r_0}$  is a compact set and  $J(\Omega; \cdot)$  is a lower-semicontinuous function in  $\Omega$ . As a consequence, there exist a point  $b \in \overline{\Omega}_{r_0}$  such that

$$J(\Omega; b) = \inf_{x \in \overline{\Omega}_{r_0}} J(\Omega; x) = \inf_{x \in \Omega} J(\Omega; x).$$

□

We further need an auxiliary lemma regarding the Hausdorff convergence.

**Lemma 2.6.** *Suppose that  $\{K_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a sequence of compact sets converging to a compact set  $K$  in Hausdorff metric and the interior of  $K$  is denoted as  $\Omega$ . Assume further that*

$$\inf_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \max_{x \in K_j} d_{\|\cdot\|}(x, \partial K_j) \geq r_0.$$

*Then for any  $r \in (0, r_0]$  and any converging sequence  $\{x_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  satisfying  $x_j \in K_j$  and*

$$d_{\|\cdot\|}(x_j, \partial K_j) \geq r,$$

*the limit  $x := \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} x_j$  satisfies*

$$x \in \Omega \quad \text{and} \quad d_{\|\cdot\|}(x, \partial\Omega) \geq r. \quad (2.24)$$

*Proof.* As  $K_j$  converge to  $K$  in Hausdorff metric by our assumption, we claim that  $K$  can be explicitly represented as

$$K = \bigcap_{m=1}^{+\infty} Cl\left(\bigcup_{j=m}^{+\infty} K_j\right). \quad (2.25)$$

This conclusion can be found in [16, Exercise 7.3.4].

Now by (2.25) and the convergence of  $x_j$ , we have

$$\{x\} = \bigcap_{m=1}^{+\infty} Cl\left(\bigcup_{j=m}^{+\infty} \{x_j\}\right) \subset \bigcap_{m=1}^{+\infty} Cl\left(\bigcup_{j=m}^{+\infty} K_j\right) = K. \quad (2.26)$$

Choosing  $\epsilon > 0$  sufficiently small and for any  $r \in (0, r_0]$ , there is  $j_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ , such that

$$\|x_j - x\| < \epsilon$$

for any  $j \geq j_0$ . Thus, we get

$$d_{\|\cdot\|}(x, K_j^c) \geq d_{\|\cdot\|}(x_j, K_j^c) - \|x_j - x\| \geq r - \epsilon \quad \forall j \geq j_0.$$

The estimate above yields that

$$d_{\|\cdot\|}\left(x, \left(Cl\left(\bigcup_{j=m}^{+\infty} K_j\right)\right)^c\right) \geq d_{\|\cdot\|}\left(x, \left(\bigcup_{j=m}^{+\infty} K_j\right)^c\right) \geq r - \epsilon \quad \forall m \geq j_0.$$

Let  $m \rightarrow +\infty$ , then we have

$$d_{\|\cdot\|}(x, K^c) \geq r - \epsilon.$$

Further let  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ , from the above estimate and (2.26) we get (2.24).  $\square$

Now we are ready to show Theorem 1.5.

*Proof of Theorem 1.5.* Assume that

$$J := \liminf_{j \rightarrow +\infty} John(\Omega_j) \leq J_0 < \infty.$$

Let

$$\Omega_{j,r} := \{x \in \Omega_j : d_{\|\cdot\|}(x, \partial\Omega_j) \geq r\} \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega_r := \{x \in \Omega : d_{\|\cdot\|}(x, \partial\Omega) \geq r\}$$

for some  $r > 0$  to be determined. Further let  $\{\Omega_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}^+}$  be a minimizing sequence and  $x_{\Omega_j} \in \Omega_j$  be a point satisfying

$$d_{\|\cdot\|}(x_{\Omega_j}, \partial\Omega_j) = \max_{x \in \Omega_j} d_{\|\cdot\|}(x, \partial\Omega_j) =: r_{\Omega_j}.$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 2.5, for each  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  there exist a (center) point  $x_j \in \Omega_{j,r}$ , such that

$$J(\Omega_j; x_j) = John(\Omega_j).$$

We remark that  $x_j$  might not be  $x_{\Omega_j}$ . Nevertheless, by Lemma 2.3 we have

$$J(\Omega_j; x_{\Omega_j}) \leq C(n, C_{\|\cdot\|}, J_0). \quad (2.27)$$



In addition, since  $(\mathcal{C}^n, d_H)$  is complete and its bounded subset is precompact, up to passing to a subsequence,  $\{\bar{\Omega}_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges in Hausdorff metric to a compact set  $A$ . We set the interior of  $A$  as  $\Omega$ .

**Step 1:  $r_{\Omega_j}$  is uniformly bounded away from 0.** To this end, for each  $j \in \mathbb{N}^+$ , the definition of  $J(\Omega_j; x_{\Omega_j})$  and Lemma 2.2 tells that, for any  $x \in \Omega_j \setminus \{x_{\Omega_j}\}$ , there exists a rectifiable curve  $\beta_j$  joining  $x$  to  $x_{\Omega_j}$ , such that

$$\sup_{a \in \beta_j} \frac{\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\beta_j[x, a])}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(a, \partial\Omega_j)} = J(x, \Omega_j; x_{\Omega_j}) \leq J(\Omega_j; x_{\Omega_j})$$

and thus by (2.27)

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\beta_j[x, x_{\Omega_j}]) &\leq \sup_{a \in \beta_j} \frac{\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\beta_j[x, a])}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(a, \partial\Omega_j)} d_{\|\cdot\|}(x_{\Omega_j}, \partial\Omega_j) \\ &\leq J(\Omega_j; x_{\Omega_j}) d_{\|\cdot\|}(x_{\Omega_j}, \partial\Omega_j) \leq C(n, C_{\|\cdot\|}, J_0) r_{\Omega_j}. \end{aligned}$$

This yields that  $\Omega_j \subset B_{\|\cdot\|}(x_{\Omega_j}, C(n, C_{\|\cdot\|}, J_0) r_{\Omega_j})$ , from which we conclude

$$c_0 |B_{\|\cdot\|}(0, 1)| \leq |\Omega_j| \leq |B_{\|\cdot\|}(0, 1)| (C(n, C_{\|\cdot\|}, J_0) r_{\Omega_j})^n.$$

As a result, we conclude that

$$r_{\Omega_j} \geq c. \tag{2.28}$$

for some  $c = c(n, C_{\|\cdot\|}, J_0, c_0) > 0$ .

**Step 2:  $x_j$  is uniformly away from the boundary.** Up to further extracting a subsequence, we may assume

$$x_{\Omega} := \lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} x_{\Omega_j} \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Recalling Lemma 2.6 and (2.28), it follows that

$$\max_{x \in \Omega} d_{\|\cdot\|}(x, \partial\Omega) \geq d_{\|\cdot\|}(x_{\Omega}, \partial\Omega) \geq c > 0.$$

In addition, we can choose  $r > 0$  so that

$$r \leq \inf_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{r_{\Omega_j}}{1 + 2C_{\|\cdot\|} J(\Omega; x_{\Omega_j})},$$

where its existence is ensured by (2.28), (2.27) and Lemma 2.5.

Recall that  $x_j \in \Omega_{j,r}$ . Then up to further passing to a subsequence, we may assume that the limit  $x$  of  $\{x_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  exists, and Lemma 2.6 implies that  $x \in \Omega_r$ .

**Step 3: Lower semicontinuity of  $John(\Omega_j)$ .** Let  $J_i := John(\Omega_j)$ . Note that for any  $y \in \Omega$ , the Hausdorff convergence yields the existence of a sequence  $y_j \in \bar{\Omega}_j$  such that  $\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} y_j = y$ . Combining the definition of  $John(\Omega_j)$ , Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.5, for each  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  we obtain a rectifiable curve  $\gamma_j \subset \Omega_j$  joining  $y_j$  to  $x_j$  such that the corresponding  $J_i$ -carrot  $car(\gamma_j, J_j)$  satisfies

$$car(\gamma_j, J_j) \subset \Omega_j,$$

which, due to the fact that  $\Omega_j$  are uniformly bounded and  $J_j \leq J_0$  for each  $j \in \mathbb{N}^+$ , yields that  $\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\gamma_j[y_j, x_j]) \leq J_0 \max_{j \in \mathbb{N}^+} r_{\Omega_j}$ . Then by Lemma 2.1, there exists a rectifiable curve  $\gamma \subset \Omega$  joining  $y$  to  $x$  so that the  $J$ -carrot  $\text{car}(\gamma, J)$  (as a Euclidean open set) satisfies

$$\text{car}(\gamma, J) \subset \bigcap_{m=1}^{+\infty} \left( \bigcup_{j=m}^{+\infty} \text{car}(\gamma_j, J_j) \right) \subset \bigcap_{m=1}^{+\infty} \text{Cl} \left( \bigcup_{j=m}^{+\infty} \bar{\Omega}_j \right) = A. \quad (2.29)$$

As  $\Omega$  is the interior of  $A$ , then from (2.29) we have  $\text{car}(\gamma, J) \subset \Omega$ , which implies that

$$J(y, \Omega; x) \leq J. \quad (2.30)$$

To conclude, each  $y \in \Omega$  can be joint from  $x$  by a rectifiable curve inside  $\Omega$ , which implies that  $\Omega$  is connected. Furthermore, the arbitrariness of  $y$  in (2.30) yields

$$\text{John}(\Omega) \leq J(\Omega; x) \leq J = \liminf_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \text{John}(\Omega_j).$$

We complete the second part of the proof.  $\square$

### 3. JOHN COMPONENT OF UNBOUNDED CARROT JOHN DOMAIN

In this section, we consider the John domain defined via the standard Euclidean norm  $|\cdot|$ .

The proof of Theorem 1.7 is rather technical since most of the sets defined in question are open. To obtain the sets  $W_{j,\infty}$  as mentioned in Theorem 1.7, we initially decompose  $B_R \setminus K$  into at most  $C(n, J)$ -many sets  $\{V_{j,R}\}$ . Subsequently, for each  $y \in V_{j,R}$ , we create a bounded  $J'$ -carrot John domain  $\Omega_{j,R,y}$  (refer to Proposition 3.2). In the proof of Theorem 1.7, we choose sequences of points  $x_{j,r} \in V_{j,R}$  along with the corresponding John curves  $\gamma_{x_{j,r}}$  extending from  $x_{j,r}$  towards  $\infty$ , where  $r$  is a positive number with  $r \leq R$ . This selection ensures that we can obtain sets

$$W_{j,R} = \Omega_{j,R,x_{j,r}} \subset B_{C'R}, \quad C' = C'(n, J).$$

In particular, by eventually choosing  $x_j \in \mathbb{R}^n$  suitably,

$$W_{j,\infty} := \bigcup_{R > |x_j|} W_{j,R} \subset \mathbb{R}^n \setminus K$$

fulfills the condition that for every pair of distinct points  $z, w \in W_{j,\infty}$ , there exists a point  $a \in \gamma_{x_j}$  to which both  $z$  and  $w$  can be connected by  $\hat{\gamma}_z$  and  $\hat{\gamma}_w$ , respectively. Moreover, these connecting curves satisfy the properties (1.4) and (1.5).

Prior to identifying the desired bounded John domain  $\Omega_{j,R,y}$ , we rely on the following proposition. While this technique has been commonly employed in previous manuscripts, such as [21], it has not been explicitly formulated, to the best of our knowledge, in the context of our present work.

**Proposition 3.1.** *Let  $J \geq 1$ . Assume that  $\gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is a locally rectifiable curve joining  $x$  to  $y$ , where  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $y \in \bar{\mathbb{R}}^n$  ( $y$  may be  $\infty$ ). Then  $\text{car}(\gamma, J)$  is a  $J$ -carrot John domain.*

*To be more specific, for any  $z \in \text{car}(\gamma, J)$ , we can find a rectifiable curve  $\gamma_z$  joining  $z$  to  $y$ , such that for some  $\eta \in \gamma$ , we have*

$$\gamma[\eta, y] = \gamma_z[\eta, y]$$

and for each  $a \in \gamma[\eta, y] \setminus \{\infty\}$ ,

$$\ell(\gamma_z[z, a]) \leq \ell(\gamma[x, a]), \quad \text{car}(\gamma_z, J) \subset \text{car}(\gamma, J). \quad (3.1)$$

*Proof.* For any  $z \in \text{car}(\gamma, J)$ , the definition of  $\text{car}(\gamma, J)$  yields a ball

$$B(\eta, \ell(\gamma[x, \eta])/J) \subset \text{car}(\gamma, J)$$

for some points  $\eta \in \gamma \setminus \{x\}$  so that  $z \in B(\eta, \ell(\gamma[x, \eta])/J)$ .

Let  $L_{z, \eta}$  be the line segment joining  $z$  to  $\eta$  and then  $\gamma_z := L_{z, \eta} \cup \gamma[\eta, y]$  is locally rectifiable curve joining  $z$  to  $y$ . When  $a \in L_{z, \eta}$ ,

$$\ell(\gamma_z[z, a]) \leq d(a, \partial B(\eta, \ell(\gamma[x, \eta])/J)) \leq \ell(\gamma[x, \eta])/J. \quad (3.2)$$

When  $a \in \gamma[\eta, y]$ , by applying (3.2) with  $a = \eta$  there, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(\gamma_z[z, a]) &\leq \ell(\gamma_z[z, \eta]) + \ell(\gamma_z[\eta, a]) \leq \frac{\ell(\gamma[x, \eta])}{J} + \ell(\gamma[\eta, a]) \\ &\leq \ell(\gamma[x, \eta]) + \ell(\gamma[\eta, a]) = \ell(\gamma[x, a]). \end{aligned}$$

To conclude, we obtain that

$$\ell(\gamma_z[z, a]) \leq \ell(\gamma[x, a]),$$

which is the first formula of (3.1). The second one follows directly from our construction of  $\text{car}(\gamma_z, J)$  and  $\text{car}(\gamma, J)$ , we conclude the lemma.  $\square$

**3.1. A decomposition  $V_{j, R}$  of  $B_R \setminus K$ .** Now for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus K$ , we choose a John curve  $\gamma_x \subset \mathbb{R}^n \setminus K$  joining  $x$  towards  $\infty$  with  $\text{car}(\gamma, J) \subset \mathbb{R}^n \setminus K$ . Although there could be many choices of curves for  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus K$ , we just choose one of them. Let  $\Gamma = \{\gamma_x\}_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus K}$  be the collection of these chosen curves. In what follows, for any points  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus K$ ,  $\gamma_x$  always refers to this particular choice of John curve.

Note that for any  $R > 0$ , we have  $B_R \cap K \neq \emptyset$  as  $0 \in K$ . Our first step is to decompose  $B_R \setminus K$  into finitely many subsets  $V_{j, R}$  so that, there exists a collection  $\mathcal{B}_{j, R}$  of at most  $C(n, J)$ -many balls, whose center is on  $\partial B_{3R}$  and whose radius at least  $J^{-1}R$ , satisfying that, for any  $x \in V_{j, R}$ , we can find a ball  $B \in \mathcal{B}_{j, R}$  with

$$\gamma_x \cap B \neq \emptyset.$$

To this end, observe that for each  $x \in B_R \setminus K$  and  $\gamma_x \in \Gamma$ , there exists a point

$$x_R \in \gamma_x \cap \partial B_{3R} \quad (3.3)$$

so that

$$2R \leq \ell(\gamma[x, x_R]) \leq Jd(x_R, K). \quad (3.4)$$

Consider the collection of closed balls

$$\{\overline{B}_x\}_{x \in B_R \setminus K} := \left\{ \overline{B} \left( x_R, \frac{d(x_R, K)}{2} \right) \right\}_{x \in B_R \setminus K}. \quad (3.5)$$

Then thanks to (3.4) and  $0 \in K$ , we obtain that

$$\frac{R}{J} \leq r_x = \frac{d(x_R, K)}{2} \leq 2R, \quad (3.6)$$

and hence  $B_x \cap B_R = \emptyset$ .

We next let

$$A_R := \bigcup_{x \in B_R \setminus K} \{x_R\}$$

be the collection of the centers of  $B_x$ 's. By Besicovitch's covering theorem, there exists a subcollection  $\{\overline{B}_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  of  $\{\overline{B}_x\}_{x \in B_R \setminus K}$  consisting of at most countably many balls, such that

$$\chi_{A_R}(z) \leq \sum_{B_i} \chi_{\overline{B}_i}(z) \leq C(n) \quad \forall z \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus K;$$

see Figure 2.




FIGURE 2. The set  $K$  is the union of black lines. We apply Besicovitch's covering theorem to cover the set  $A_R$  with balls centered at  $\partial B_{3R}$ .

Recall that by (3.6)

$$B_i \subset B_{5R} \setminus \overline{B}_R$$

and  $|B_i| \geq c(n, J)R^n$ . Thus we have at most  $C(n, J)$ -many elements in  $\{\overline{B}_i\}$ . As a result, the union of balls

$$\bigcup_i \overline{B}_i$$

has at most  $\hat{N} = \hat{N}(n, J)$  components  $U_{j,R}$  for  $j \in \{1, \dots, N_R\}$  and

$$N_R \leq \hat{N} = \hat{N}(n, J);$$

By defining  $U_{j,R}$  to be empty for  $j > N_R$ , we may assume that there exists exactly  $\hat{N}$  components  $U_{j,R}$ . We write  $\mathcal{B}_{j,R}$  as the collection of balls in each component  $U_{j,R}$ .

Now it follows from our construction, for any  $x \in B_R \setminus K$ , there exists some  $\mathcal{B}_{j,R}$  so that,  $x_R \in \gamma_x$  is covered by a ball in  $\mathcal{B}_{j,R}$ . Thus, by defining

$$V_{j,R} := \{x \in B_R \setminus K : x_R \in D \text{ for some } D \in \mathcal{B}_{j,R}\}, \quad (3.7)$$

we obtain the desired decomposition of  $B_R \setminus K$ . The set  $V_{j,R}$  is defined to be empty if  $U_{j,R}$  is empty.

**3.2. Construction of  $\Omega_{j,R,y}$ .** Given  $R > 0$  and  $j \in \{1, \dots, N_R\}$ , recall the construction of  $\mathcal{B}_{j,R}$  and  $V_{j,R}$ . Then for each point  $y \in V_{j,R}$  we set up a bounded  $J'$ -carrot John domain  $\Omega_{j,R,y}$  with John center  $y_R$ , where  $J' = J'(n, J)$ , so that

$$V_{j,R} \subset \overline{\Omega}_{j,R,y} \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega_{j,R,y} \subset (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus K) \cap B_{C'R}$$

where  $C' = C'(n, J)$ ; see Figure 3. We formulate it as the following proposition.




FIGURE 3. The set  $V_{j,R}$  may not necessarily be connected. We connect each point in  $V_{j,R}$  to the curve  $\gamma_y[y, y_R]$  using appropriate curves. Subsequently, we take the union of the carrots surrounding these curves to form  $\Omega_{j,R,y}$ .

**Proposition 3.2.** *For fixed  $y \in V_{j,R}$  and  $1 \leq j \leq \hat{N}$  with  $\hat{N} = \hat{N}(n, J)$  defined above, the set  $\Omega_{j,R,y}$  is either empty (if  $V_{j,R}$  is empty), or*

$$\Omega_{j,R,y} := \text{car}(\gamma_y[y, y_R], J) \cup \bigcup_{z \in V_{j,R}} \text{car}(\beta_z, J'). \quad (3.8)$$

*is a  $J'$ -carrot John domain with John center  $y_R$ , where  $J' = J'(n, J)$  and  $\beta_z$  is a rectifiable curve joining  $z$  to  $y_R$  with  $\gamma_z[z, z_R] \subset \beta_z$ . Moreover, there exists  $C_1 = C_1(n, J) \geq 1$  so that, each point  $z \in \Omega_{j,R,y}$  can be joined to  $y_R$  by a rectifiable curve  $\beta_z$  as the core of a  $J'$ -carrot satisfying*

$$\ell(\beta_z) \leq C_1 R$$

and

$$V_{j,R} \subset \overline{\Omega}_{j,R,y}, \quad \text{car}(\beta_z, J') \subset \Omega_{j,R,y} \subset (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus K) \cap B_{2C_1 R}. \quad (3.9)$$

*Proof.* Suppose that  $V_{j,R}$  is non-empty, and fix  $y \in V_{j,R}$ . Then the corresponding point  $y_R \in \gamma_y \cap \partial B_{3R}$  is covered by some ball  $D_1 \in \mathcal{B}_{j,R}$ , and we join the center  $\hat{x}_1$  of  $D_1$  to  $y_R$  by a line segment  $L_{\hat{x}_1, y_R} \subset D_1$ .

Now for any  $z \in V_{j,R}$ , we claim that there exists a rectifiable curve  $\beta_z \subset \mathbb{R}^n \setminus K$  as the core of a  $J'$ -carrot joining  $z$  to  $y_R$ , such that  $\gamma_z[z, z_R] \subset \beta_z$  and

$$\text{car}(\beta_z, J') \subset \mathbb{R}^n \setminus K. \quad (3.10)$$

Indeed, the point  $z_R \in A_R \cap D_2$  is also covered by another ball  $D_2 \in \mathcal{B}_{j,R}$  as  $z \in V_{j,R}$ . Likewise, we join  $z_R$  to the center  $\hat{x}_2$  of  $D_2$  by the line segment  $L_{z_R, \hat{x}_2} \subset D_2$ .

Recall that  $U_{j,R}$  is connected and consists of at most  $\hat{N}$ -many balls from  $\mathcal{B}_{j,R}$ , where  $\hat{N} = \hat{N}(n, J)$ . This implies that  $\hat{x}_1$  and  $\hat{x}_2$  can be joined by a broken line consisting of at most  $\hat{N}(n, J)$ -many line segments with endpoints being the centers of balls in  $\mathcal{B}_{j,R}$ . Therefore, we can join  $z_R$  to  $y_R$  by a broken line  $\gamma_{z_R, y_R}$ .

We show that

$$\beta_z := \gamma_z[z, z_R] \cup \gamma_{z_R, y_R}$$

is the desired curve. To this end, we estimate the length of  $\beta_z$  and the distance  $d(\eta, K)$  for any  $\eta \in \beta_z$ . To start with, thanks to (3.6), for any pair of intersecting balls  $D, D' \in \mathcal{B}_{j,R}$ , the line segments  $L$  joining the center of  $D$  with radius  $r$  to the center of  $D'$  with radius  $r'$  satisfies

$$L \subset D \cup D' \quad \text{and} \quad \ell(L) \leq r + r' \leq 4R. \quad (3.11)$$

In particular, (3.6) together with the facts that  $L_{z_R, \hat{x}_2} \subset D_2$  and that  $L_{y_R, \hat{x}_1} \subset D_1$  also yields  $\ell(L_{z_R, \hat{x}_2}) \leq 2R$ ,  $\ell(L_{y_R, \hat{x}_1}) \leq 2R$ . Therefore employing (3.11) and (3.4), the construction of  $\beta_z$  tells

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(\beta_z) &\leq \ell(\gamma_z[z, z_R]) + \ell(\gamma_{z_R, y_R}) \\ &\leq Jd(z_R, K) + \ell(L_{z_R, \hat{x}_2}) + \ell(L_{y_R, \hat{x}_1}) + 4\hat{N}(n, J)R \\ &\leq C(n, J)R =: C_1R; \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

we may assume that  $C_1 \geq 4$ . This gives the first part of the proposition.

Towards (3.9), we first note that, every point  $\eta \in \gamma_{z_R, y_R}$  is contained in some  $D_\eta \in \mathcal{B}_{j,R}$ . So combining (3.4), (3.5) and (3.6), we get

$$d(\eta, K) \geq d(D_\eta, K) \geq \frac{R}{J}. \quad (3.13)$$

Let

$$J' := C_1J. \quad (3.14)$$

Then combining (3.4), (3.12) and (3.13), we conclude

$$\ell(\beta_z[z, \eta]) \leq \ell(\beta_z) \leq C_1R \leq J'd(\eta, K) \quad \text{when } \eta \in \gamma_{z_R, y_R},$$

and since  $\beta_z[z, \eta] = \gamma_z[z, \eta]$  is a John curve,

$$\ell(\beta_z[z, \eta]) \leq Jd(\eta, K) \leq J'd(\eta, K) \quad \text{when } \eta \in \gamma_z[z, z_R].$$

This implies (3.10). Moreover by Proposition 3.1, every point  $w \in \text{car}(\beta_z, J')$  also can be joined to  $y_R$  by a rectifiable curve  $\hat{\gamma}_w$  satisfying

$$\ell(\hat{\gamma}_w) \leq \ell(\beta_z) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{car}(\hat{\gamma}_w, J') \subset \text{car}(\beta_z, J').$$

Hence, by employing (3.10), the arbitrariness of  $z$  gives the right handside of (3.9). The left hand side of (3.9) holds due to  $z \in Cl(\text{car}(\beta_z, J'))$  for any  $z \in V_{j,R}$ .  $\square$

We need two more technical lemmas. The first one states how to choose a smaller carrot in the union two carrots.




FIGURE 4. The two curves  $\gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$  are presented, respectively, with their end points and the intersection point  $y_2$ .

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $1 \leq J_1 \leq J_2$ . Assume that  $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $y_1 \in \dot{\mathbb{R}}^n$ . Let  $\gamma_1$  be a rectifiable curve joining  $z_1$  to  $y_1$ . If there exists a curve  $\gamma_2$  joining  $z_2$  to some point  $y_2 \in \gamma_1$ , so that*

$$\frac{\ell(\gamma_2[z_2, y_2])}{J_2} \leq \frac{\ell(\gamma_1[z_1, y_2])}{J_1}, \quad (3.15)$$

*then for any point  $w \in \gamma_1[y_2, y_1]$ , the curve  $\hat{\gamma} := \gamma_2 \cup \gamma_1[y_2, w]$  joining  $z_2$  to  $w$  satisfies*

$$\text{car}(\hat{\gamma}, J_2) \subset \text{car}(\gamma_2, J_2) \cup \text{car}(\gamma_1, J_1) \quad (3.16)$$

*See Figure 4 for a illustration.*

*Proof.* We first note that

$$\text{car}(\hat{\gamma}[z_2, y_2], J_2) \subset \text{car}(\gamma_2, J_2).$$

In addition, the assumption  $J_1 \leq J_2$  together with (3.15) yields for any  $a \in \gamma_1[y_2, w]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\ell(\hat{\gamma}[z_2, a])}{J_2} &= \frac{\ell(\gamma_2[z_2, y_2])}{J_2} + \frac{\ell(\gamma_1[y_2, a])}{J_2} \\ &\leq \frac{\ell(\gamma_1[z_1, y_2])}{J_1} + \frac{\ell(\gamma_1[y_2, a])}{J_1} \leq \frac{\ell(\gamma_1[z_1, a])}{J_1}. \end{aligned}$$

As a result, by the definition of  $\text{car}(\hat{\gamma}, J_1)$  and  $\text{car}(\gamma_2, J_2)$ , we finally get (3.16).  $\square$

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let  $x, y, z \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $J \geq 1$ . Assume that there exists two curves  $\gamma_{x,z}, \gamma_{y,z}$  respectively joining  $x, y$  to  $z$ . We denote the parametrization of*

$$\gamma := \gamma_{x,z} \cup \gamma_{y,z}$$

*starting from  $x$  and ending at  $y$  by  $\gamma_1$ , and the one in the reversed direction, starting from  $y$  and ending at  $x$ , as  $\gamma_2$ . Then there exists a ball  $B$  centered at  $a \in \gamma$  such that*

$$\text{car}(\gamma_1[x, a], J) \cup \text{car}(\gamma_2[y, a], J) \subset \text{car}(\gamma_{x,z}, J) \cup \text{car}(\gamma_{y,z}, J)$$

and the radius  $r$  of  $B$  satisfies

$$r = \frac{\ell(\gamma_1[x, a])}{J} = \frac{\ell(\gamma_2[y, a])}{J}.$$

*Remark 3.5.* Proposition 3.4 is a corollary following from [23, Theorem 3.6] and [23, Lemma 4.3]. Since [23, Lemma 4.3] has used the concept of cigar in the statement, for the sake of completeness, we provide a proof avoiding the concept of "cigar" in the Appendix B.

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 1.7.

*Proof of Theorem 1.7.* We construct a sequence  $\{W_{j,\infty}\}_{j \in \{1, \dots, N\}}$  inductively.

**Step 1: Construct  $W_{1,\infty}$ .** We start from a point  $x_1 \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus K$  close to the origin. Then for any  $R \geq 1$ , the corresponding point  $(x_1)_R \in \gamma_x \cap \partial B_{3R}$  is covered by some ball, say  $D_R \in \mathcal{B}_{1,R}$ . Thus, by (3.7), we know that

$$x_1 \in V_{1,R}. \quad (3.17)$$

Recall the definition (3.8). Let

$$W_{1,R} := \Omega_{1,R,x_1}, \quad \text{and} \quad W_{1,\infty} := \bigcup_{R \geq 1} W_{1,R}.$$

Then from (3.17) and (3.8) it follows that

$$\text{car}(\gamma_{x_1}[x_1, (x_1)_R], J) \subset W_{1,R}, \quad \text{and} \quad \text{car}(\gamma_{x_1}, J) \subset W_{1,\infty},$$

and from Proposition 3.2 that  $W_{1,R}$  is  $J'$ -carrot John domain with  $W_{1,R} \subset B_{2C_1 R}$ .

**Step 2: Proceeding inductively to construct  $\{W_{j,\infty}\}$ .** We run the induction based on the two subindices  $j$  and  $r$  for  $W_{j,r}$ .

For any  $r > 0$ , define  $x_{1,r} := x_1$ . Suppose that for some  $m \geq 1$ , via the induction process, we have obtained points  $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^m$  and the corresponding sets  $\{W_{j,R}\}_{j=1}^m$  so that for any  $1 \leq j \leq m$ ,  $R > |x_j|$  and some  $r = r(R, j) > 0$ ,

$$W_{j,R} := \Omega_{j,R,x_{j,r}}, \quad \text{and} \quad W_{j,\infty} := \bigcup_{R > |x_j|} W_{j,R} \quad \text{for some } r < R.$$

Suppose that, for some  $s > 0$

$$B_s \setminus \left( K \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^m \overline{W}_{j,s} \right) \neq \emptyset. \quad (3.18)$$

This yields the existence of another point in  $B_s \setminus \left( K \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^m \overline{W}_{j,s} \right)$ . Take  $r > 0$  to be (almost) the smallest  $s > 0$  for which (3.18) holds. Next, we consider two cases.

Case 1: Suppose that

$$B_r \setminus K \subset \bigcup_{R \geq r} \bigcup_{j=1}^m V_{j,R}. \quad (3.19)$$






FIGURE 5. The set  $W_{3,R}$  is contained in  $W_{2,R'}$ , and  $W_{2,R'}$  is contained in  $W_{1,R''}$ , where  $R \leq R' \leq R''$ . Eventually they are all contained in  $W_{1,\infty}$ . However, we note that  $W_{3,R}$  and  $W_{3,R''}$  could have no intersection.

Since  $V_{j,r}$  is a decomposition of  $B_r \setminus K$  for any  $r > 0$ , (3.18) and (3.9) imply that there exists some point  $x_{m+1,r} \in V_{m+1,r}$ , and

$$\text{car}(\gamma_{x_{m+1,r}}[x_{m+1,r}, (x_{m+1,r})_r], J) \subset \Omega_{m+1,r,x_{m+1,r}} \quad (3.20)$$

according to Proposition 3.2. Now from (3.19) it follows that for some  $R > r$ , we have

$$x_{m+1,r} \in V_{k,R} \neq \emptyset, \quad \text{for some } 1 \leq k \leq m. \quad (3.21)$$

Let  $R'$  be the infimum among all positive number for which (3.21) happens. Then if  $R' > r$ , we define

$$W_{m+1,s} := \Omega_{m+1,s,x_{m+1,r}}.$$

for  $r \leq s < R'$ . If  $R' = r$ , then we only define  $W_{m+1,s} := \Omega_{m+1,s,x_{m+1,r}}$  for  $s = r$ .

In addition, it follows from (3.20) that

$$\text{car}(\gamma_{x_{m+1,r}}[x_{m+1,r}, (x_{m+1,r})_s], J) \subset W_{m+1,s}$$

and from Proposition 3.2 that  $W_{m+1,s}$  is  $J'$ -carrot John domain with  $W_{m+1,s} \subset B_{2C_1s}$ .

Next we check if

$$B_r \setminus \left( K \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^{m+1} \overline{W}_{j,r} \right) \neq \emptyset. \quad (3.22)$$

If it is non-empty, we continue to define  $W_{m+2,r}$  and iterate our process. Otherwise, we define  $W_{j,r} := \emptyset$  for  $j \in \{m+1, \dots, \hat{N}\}$ . Then increase  $r$  until (3.22) holds for some  $r' \geq r$ , and consider the set  $W_{m+1,r'}$ .

Case 2:

If (3.19) fails, then there exists point  $x_{m+1,r} \notin V_{j,R}$  for any  $k \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  and  $R \geq r$ , which, together with the decomposition of  $B_R \setminus K$ , implies that  $x_{m+1,r} \in V_{m+1,R}$  for each

$R \geq r$ . To distinguish from the first case, we rewrite  $x_{m+1,r}$  as  $x_{m+1}$ . Then define

$$W_{m+1,s} := \Omega_{m+1,s,x_{m+1}} \quad \text{for all } s > |x_{m+1}|,$$

and let

$$W_{m+1,\infty} := \bigcup_{R > |x_{m+1}|} W_{m+1,R}. \quad (3.23)$$

Likewise, (3.9) gives

$$\text{car}(\gamma_{x_{m+1}}[x_{m+1}, (x_{m+1})_R], J) \subset W_{m+1,R} \quad \forall R > |x_{m+1}| \quad \text{and} \quad \text{car}(\gamma_{x_{m+1}}, J) \subset W_{m+1,\infty},$$

and from Proposition 3.2 that  $W_{m+1,R}$  is  $J'$ -carrot John domain with  $W_{m+1,R} \subset B_{2C_1R}$ .

**Step 3: Uniformly finitely many  $W_{j,\infty}$ .**

Our process is stopped when, for any  $R > 0$ ,

$$B_R \setminus \left( K \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^{\hat{N}} \overline{W}_{j,R} \right) = \emptyset.$$

and in particular, all  $W_{j,\infty}$  have been founded so that

$$\mathbb{R}^n = \left( K \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^N \overline{W}_{j,\infty} \right) \quad (3.24)$$

for some  $N \leq \hat{N}$ . Suppose that (3.24) is not true. Then there exists a point

$$z \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \left( K \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^N \overline{W}_{j,\infty} \right).$$

Further observe that (3.23) and (3.9) give  $V_{j,R} \subset \overline{W}_{j,\infty}$ . Then our induction process tells that we can obtain a new set  $W_{N+1,\infty}$  according to  $z \notin V_{j,R}$  for any  $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$  and those sufficiently large  $R$ , which is impossible.

Moreover, for any  $1 \leq j \leq \hat{N}$ ,  $W_{j,R}$  is a  $J'$ -carrot John domain with  $W_{j,R} \subset B_{2C_1R}$ , and for each  $R \geq 1$ , there exists  $0 < r \leq R$  so that

$$\text{car}(\gamma_{x_j,r}[x_{j,r}, (x_{j,r})_R], J) \subset W_{j,R} \quad (3.25)$$

and

$$\text{car}(\gamma_{x_j}, J) \subset W_{j,\infty} \quad \text{for any } 1 \leq j \leq N. \quad (3.26)$$

**Step 4:  $W_{j,\infty}$  is  $J'$ -carrot John with John center  $\infty$ .** Fix  $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ . For every  $z \in W_{j,\infty}$ , it follows that  $z \in W_{j,R}$  for some  $R > |x_j|$ . Hence, thanks to Proposition 3.2,  $z$  can be joined to  $(x_j)_R$  by a rectifiable curve  $\beta_z$  as the core of a  $J'$ -carrot satisfying

$$\ell(\beta_z) \leq C_1 R \quad \text{and} \quad \text{car}(\beta_z, J') \subset W_{j,\infty}, \quad (3.27)$$

In addition, Proposition 3.2, the definition of  $J'$  (3.14) and (3.4) also give

$$\frac{\ell(\beta_z)}{J'} \leq \frac{R}{J} \leq \frac{\ell(\gamma_{x_j}[x_j, (x_j)_R])}{J}. \quad (3.28)$$

Further note that  $(x_j)_R \in \gamma_{x_j}$ . Then by employing (3.28), Lemma 3.3 tells that the curve  $\zeta_z := \beta_z \cup \gamma_{x_j}[(x_j)_R, \infty)$  joining  $z$  toward  $\infty$  satisfies

$$\text{car}(\zeta_z, J') \subset \text{car}(\beta_z, J') \cup \text{car}(\gamma_{x_j}, J).$$

Moreover, (3.26) and (3.27) yield

$$\text{car}(\beta_z, J') \cup \text{car}(\gamma_{x_j}, J) \subset W_{j,\infty}.$$

Thus the arbitrariness of  $z$  implies that  $W_{j,\infty}$  is  $J'$ -carrot John with John center  $\infty$ .

**Step 5: Proof of (1.4) and (1.5).** In addition, for each pair of points  $z, w \in W_{j,\infty}$ , we can find  $R_z, R_w > |x_j|$ , such that  $z \in W_{j,R_z}$  and  $w \in W_{j,R_w}$ . We may assume  $R_z \leq R_w$ , then Step 4 gives us two curves  $\beta_z, \beta_w$  joining  $z, w$  to  $(x_j)_{R_z}, (x_j)_{R_w}$ , respectively, such that

$$\text{car}(\beta_w, J') \subset W_{j,\infty}, \quad \text{car}(\beta_z, J') \subset W_{j,\infty} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\ell(\beta_z)}{J'} \leq \frac{\ell(\gamma_{x_j}[x_j, (x_j)_{R_z}])}{J};$$

see (3.27) and (3.28). Therefore, applying (3.26) and Lemma 3.3 with  $\gamma_1 = \gamma_{x_j}[x_j, (x_j)_{R_w}]$ ,  $\gamma_2 = \beta_z$ , and

$$J = J_1 \leq J_2 = J',$$

there is a curve  $\hat{\gamma} := \beta_z \cup \gamma_{x_j}[(x_j)_{R_z}, (x_j)_{R_w}]$  joining  $z$  to  $(x_j)_{R_w}$ , such that

$$\text{car}(\hat{\gamma}, J') \subset \text{car}(\beta_z, J') \cup \text{car}(\gamma_{x_j}, J) \subset W_{j,\infty}.$$

Then, by Lemma 3.4, we finally arrive at (1.4) and (1.5).

**Step 6: Proof of (1.1) and (1.2).** The remaining task is to prove (1.1) and (1.2). As  $W_{j,R}$  is a  $J'$ -carrot John domain with center  $(x_j)_R$  with some  $r < R$ . Then it follows the definition of John domain that

$$B\left(x_{j,r}, \frac{\ell(\gamma_{x_{j,r}}[x_{j,r}, (x_{j,r})_R])}{J}\right) \subset \text{car}(\gamma_{x_{j,r}}[x_{j,r}, (x_{j,r})_R], J) \subset W_{j,R} \subset B((x_{j,r})_R, J'd((x_{j,r})_R, K)).$$

As a result, by (3.4) and (3.6), the above estimate yields that

$$C(n, J)^{-1}R^n \leq |W_{j,R}| \leq C(n, J)R^n.$$

and then the inequality (1.1) follows.

Furthermore, given  $k \in \{1, \dots, \hat{N}\}$ , we consider the set  $W_{k,R}$  which contains the carrot

$$\text{car}(\gamma_{x_{k,r}}[x_{k,r}, (x_{k,r})_R], J)$$

by (3.25). Then we choose  $1 \leq k_l \leq \hat{N}$  so that  $x_{k,r} \in V_{k_l, 2^l R}$ ; such a  $k_l$  exists since  $\{V_{j, 2^l R}\}_j$  covers  $B_{2^l R} \setminus K$ .

Toward the inequality (1.2), recall that  $W_{k_l, 2^l R}$  is constructed via Proposition 3.2, which, in particular by the definition of  $\beta_{x_{k,r}}$ , contains the carrot

$$\text{car}(\gamma_{x_{k,r}}[x_{k,r}, (x_{k,r})_{2^l R}], J');$$

recall that

$$\gamma_{x_{k,r}}[x_{k,r}, (x_{k,r})_{2^l R}] \subset \beta_{x_{k,r}}.$$

Especially,

$$\text{car}(\gamma_{x_{k,r}}[x_{k,r}, (x_{k,r})_{2^l R}], J') \subset W_{k_l, 2^l R} \cap W_{k_{l+1}, 2^{l+1} R},$$

and (1.2) follows from (1.1) as

$$\left| \text{car}(\gamma_{x_k, r}[x_k, r, (x_k, r)_{2^l R}], J') \right| \geq C(n, J)(2^l R)^n.$$

□

#### APPENDIX A. PROOF OF THE ESTIMATE (2.20)

*Proof.* Let

$$\hat{J} := J(\hat{x}, \Omega; \hat{y}).$$

Then using Proposition 2.2, there exists a rectifiable curve  $\beta \subset \Omega$  joining  $\hat{x}$  to  $\hat{y}$  together with the corresponding  $\hat{J}$ -carrot  $\text{car}(\beta, \hat{J})$ , such that

$$\sup_{a \in \beta} j(a; \hat{x}, \beta, \Omega) = J(\hat{x}, \Omega; \hat{y}) = \hat{J} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{car}(\beta, \hat{J}) \subset \Omega. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Analogously, thanks to the compactness of  $\beta$ , the definition of  $j(a; \hat{x}, \beta, \Omega)$  tells that we can find a point  $\eta \in \beta$ , such that

$$\frac{\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\beta[\hat{x}, \eta])}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(\eta, \partial\Omega)} = \hat{J} = \sup_{a \in \beta} j(a; \hat{x}, \beta, \Omega).$$

We repeat the argument by replacing  $\gamma, x$  and  $J$  respectively by  $\beta, \hat{x}$  and  $\hat{J}$  in the proof of (2.12), then we have

$$d_{\|\cdot\|}(\beta, \partial\Omega) \geq \frac{d_{\|\cdot\|}(\hat{x}, \partial\Omega)}{2C_{\|\cdot\|} \hat{J}}. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Further assume that  $L_{x, \hat{x}} \subset \Omega$  is the line segment joining  $x$  to  $\hat{x}$  and  $L_{\hat{y}, y} \subset \Omega$  is the one joining  $\hat{y}$  to  $y$ . Then

$$\hat{\beta} := L_{x, \hat{x}} \cup \beta \cup L_{\hat{y}, y}$$

is a rectifiable curve within  $\Omega$  joining  $x$  to  $y$ . Now we also repeat the argument by replacing  $\zeta, J, \gamma$  and  $\hat{\gamma}$  respectively by  $\eta, \hat{J}, \beta$  and  $\hat{\beta}$  and swapping  $x, y$  respectively with  $\hat{x}, \hat{y}$ , so that by letting  $(\hat{x}, \hat{y})$  close enough to  $(x, y)$ , (2.18) changes into

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\hat{\beta}[x, z])}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(z, \partial\Omega)} - \frac{\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\beta[\hat{x}, \eta])}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(\eta, \partial\Omega)} \\ & \leq \max \left\{ \frac{\|\hat{x} - x\|}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(\beta, \partial\Omega)}, \frac{C(n, C_{\|\cdot\|}, \hat{J})}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(\hat{y}, \partial\Omega)} (\|\hat{x} - x\| + \|\hat{y} - y\|), \frac{2\|\hat{x} - x\|}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(\hat{x}, \partial\Omega)} \right\}. \quad (\text{A.3}) \end{aligned}$$

for any  $z \in \hat{\beta}$ . Further notice that when  $\|x - \hat{x}\| + \|y - \hat{y}\| < \delta$  for a sufficiently small and positive constant  $\delta = \delta(x, y, C_{\|\cdot\|})$  satisfying  $\delta \leq \frac{1}{2} \min\{d_{\|\cdot\|}(x, \partial\Omega), d_{\|\cdot\|}(y, \partial\Omega)\}$  at least, by (2.10) and (A.1), the estimate (2.19) gives

$$\hat{J} \leq C(n, C_{\|\cdot\|}, J). \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Consequently, combining the construction of  $\hat{\beta}$ , (A.3), (A.2) and (A.4) it follows that when  $\|x - \hat{x}\| + \|y - \hat{y}\| < \delta$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & J(x, \Omega; y) - J(\hat{x}, \Omega; \hat{y}) \\
 & \leq \sup_{z \in \hat{\beta}} \frac{\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\hat{\beta}[x, z])}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(z, \partial\Omega)} - \frac{\ell_{\|\cdot\|}(\beta[\hat{x}, \eta])}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(\eta, \partial\Omega)} \\
 & \leq \max \left\{ \frac{\|\hat{x} - x\|}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(\beta, \partial\Omega)}, \frac{C(n, C_{\|\cdot\|}, \hat{J})}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(\hat{y}, \partial\Omega)} (\|\hat{x} - x\| + \|\hat{y} - y\|), \frac{2\|\hat{x} - x\|}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(\hat{x}, \partial\Omega)} \right\} \\
 & \leq \frac{C(n, C_{\|\cdot\|}, \hat{J})}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(\beta, \partial\Omega)} (\|\hat{x} - x\| + \|\hat{y} - y\|) \leq \frac{C(n, C_{\|\cdot\|}, \hat{J})}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(\hat{x}, \partial\Omega)} (\|\hat{x} - x\| + \|\hat{y} - y\|) \\
 & \leq \frac{C(n, C_{\|\cdot\|}, \hat{J})}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(x, \partial\Omega)} (\|\hat{x} - x\| + \|\hat{y} - y\|) \leq \frac{C(n, C_{\|\cdot\|}, J)}{d_{\|\cdot\|}(x, \partial\Omega)} (\|x - \hat{x}\| + \|y - \hat{y}\|), \tag{A.5}
 \end{aligned}$$

which yields (2.20). □

#### APPENDIX B. PROOF OF LEMMA 3.4

*Proof.* We may assume that  $\ell(\gamma_{x,z}) \geq \ell(\gamma_{y,z})$ . Then there exists a point  $a \in \gamma_{x,z}$ , such that

$$\ell(\gamma_{x,z}[x, a]) = \ell(\gamma_{y,z}) + \ell(\gamma_{x,z}[z, a]).$$

Now recall that  $\gamma_1[x, a] = \gamma_{x,z}[x, a]$  and  $\gamma_2[y, a] = \gamma_{y,z} \cup \gamma_1[z, a]$ . Then we have

$$\text{car}(\gamma_1[x, a], J) \subset \text{car}(\gamma_{x,z}, J), \quad \text{car}(\gamma_{y,z}, J) = \text{car}(\gamma_2[y, z], J). \tag{B.1}$$

and

$$\ell(\gamma_1[x, a]) = \ell(\gamma_2[y, a]).$$

Therefore, for each  $\eta \in \gamma_2[z, a] = \gamma_{x,z}[z, a]$ ,

$$\ell(\gamma_2[y, \eta]) \leq \ell(\gamma_2[y, a]) = \ell(\gamma_1[x, a]) \leq \ell(\gamma_1[x, \eta]),$$

which, together with the definition of  $\text{car}(\gamma_{y,z}, J)$  and (B.1), implies that

$$\text{car}(\gamma_1[x, a], J) \cup \text{car}(\gamma_2[y, a], J) \subset \text{car}(\gamma_{x,z}, J) \cup \text{car}(\gamma_{y,z}, J).$$

As a result, the desired ball is

$$B = B \left( a, \frac{\ell(\gamma_1[x, a])}{J} \right).$$

The proof is completed. □

## REFERENCES

- [1] L. Ambrosio, M. Novaga, E. Paolini, *Some regularity results for minimal crystals*. A tribute to J. L. Lions. ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var. **8** (2002), 69–103.
- [2] Z. Balogh, S. Buckley, *Geometric characterizations of Gromov hyperbolicity*. Invent. Math. 153 (2003), no. 2, 261–301.
- [3] B. Bojarski, *Remarks on Sobolev imbedding inequalities*. Complex analysis, Joensuu 1987, 52–68, Lecture Notes in Math., 1351, Springer, Berlin, 1988.
- [4] M. Bonk, J. Heinonen, P. Koskela, *Uniformizing Gromov hyperbolic spaces*. Astérisque No. 270 (2001), viii+99 pp.
- [5] A. Bonnet and G. David. *Cracktip is a global Mumford-Shah minimizer*. Astérisque, 274:vi+259, 2001.
- [6] S. Buckley, P. Koskela, *Sobolev-Poincaré implies John*. Math. Res. Lett. 2 (1995), no. 5, 577–593.
- [7] G. David *Singular sets of minimizers for the Mumford-Shah functional*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.
- [8] F. W. Gehring, K. Hag, *The ubiquitous quasidisk*. Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, 184. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2012.
- [9] V. M. Goldshtein, Yu. G. Reshetnyak, *Introduction to the theory of functions with generalized derivatives, and quasiconformal mappings* "Nauka", Moscow, 1983. 285 pp.
- [10] R. Hurri-Syrjänen, *Unbounded Poincaré domains*. Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Ser. A I Math. 17 (1992), no. 2, 409–423.
- [11] P. Hajlasz and P. Koskela. *Sobolev met Poincaré*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. 145, (2000).
- [12] J. Heinonen, *Quasiconformal mappings onto John domains*. Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana 5 (1989), no. 3-4, 97–123.
- [13] P. Lahti, N. Shanmugalingam, *Trace theorems for functions of bounded variation in metric spaces*. J. Funct. Anal. 274 (2018), no. 10, 2754–2791.
- [14] O. Lehto, *Univalent functions and Teichmüller spaces*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 109. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1987.
- [15] F. Maggi, C. Villani, *Balls have the worst best Sobolev inequalities*. J. Geom. Anal. 15 (2005), no. 1, 83–121.
- [16] D. Burago, Y. Burago, S. Ivanov, *A course in metric geometry*[M]. American Mathematical Society, 2022.
- [17] F. Maggi, C. Villani, *Balls have the worst best Sobolev inequalities. II*. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations 31 (2008), no. 1, 47–74.
- [18] F. Maggi, R. Neumayer, I. Tomasetti, *Rigidity theorems for best Sobolev inequalities*. Adv. Math. 434 (2023), Paper No. 109330, 43 pp.
- [19] L. Malý, N. Shanmugalingam, M. Snipes, *Trace and extension theorems for functions of bounded variation*. Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5) 18 (2018), no. 1, 313–341.
- [20] L. Malý, *Trace and extension theorems for Sobolev-type functions in metric spaces*, arXiv:1704.06344.
- [21] R. Näkki, J. Väisälä, *John disks*. Exposition. Math. 9 (1991), no. 1, 3–43.
- [22] J. Väisälä, *Uniform domains*, Tohoku Math. J. (2) 40 (1988), no. 1, 101–118.
- [23] J. Väisälä, *Exhaustions of John domains*. Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Ser. A I Math. 19 (1994), no. 1, 47–57.
- [24] J. Väisälä, *Unions of John domains*. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 128 (2000), no. 4, 1135–1140.

ACADEMY OF MATHEMATICS AND SYSTEMS SCIENCE, THE CHINESE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, BEIJING 100190, P. R. CHINA

*Email address:* suweicong@amss.ac.cn

*Email address:* yzhang@amss.ac.cn