

Besov-Lipschitz norm and p -energy measure on scale-irregular Vicsek sets

Aobo Chen¹, Jin Gao², Zhenyu Yu^{3*}, Junda Zhang⁴

¹Department of Mathematical Sciences, Tsinghua University, Beijing, 100084, China.

²Department of Mathematics, Hangzhou Normal University, Hangzhou, 310036, China.

^{3*}Department of Mathematics, College of Science, National University of Defense Technology, Changsha, 410073, China.

⁴School of Mathematics, South China University of Technology, Guangzhou, 510641, China.

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): yuzy23@nudt.edu.cn;

Contributing authors: cab21@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn; gaojin@hznu.edu.cn;
summerfish@scut.edu.cn;

Abstract

In this paper, we establish the existence of p -energy norms and the corresponding p -energy measures for scale-irregular Vicsek sets, which may lack self-similarity. We also investigate the characterizations of p -energy norms in terms of Besov-Lipschitz norms, with their weak monotonicity and the corresponding Bourgain-Brezis-Mironescu convergence.

Keywords: p -energy, Besov-Lipschitz norm, scale-irregular Vicsek set, critical Besov exponent

Mathematics Subject Classification: 28A80 , 46E30 , 46E35

Contents

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 1 | Introduction | 2 |
| 2 | Geometry and measure of scale-irregular Vicsek set | 4 |
| 2.1 | Preliminaries | 4 |
| 2.2 | Measure on scale-irregular Vicsek set | 8 |
| 3 | p-energy and its associated energy measures | 11 |
| 3.1 | Construction of p -energy norms | 11 |
| 3.2 | Associated p -energy measures | 15 |
| 4 | Besov-Lipschitz norms and their properties | 18 |
| 4.1 | Besov-Lipschitz spaces and discrete p -energies | 18 |
| 4.2 | Norm equivalences and critical Besov exponent | 23 |

1 Introduction

The study of *non-linear potential theory* on metric measure spaces has attracted significant attention in recent decades due to its important role in classic analysis and differential equations. Many previous studies have concentrated on the p -energy within specific classes of fractals. For example, p -energy is constructed on self-similar p.c.f sets by Herman, Peirone and Strichartz [HPS04], Cao, Gu and Qiu [CGQ22], Gao, Yu and Zhang [GYZ23a]; on the standard Sierpiński carpet by Shimizu [Shi24], Murugan and Shimizu [MS23]; and on more general fractal spaces by Kigami [Kig23]. In these previous works, the self-similarity significantly influences the construction of p -energy.

The aim of this work is trying to construct p -energy norm and p -energy measure without using the self-similar structure of underlying fractals. The issue was first highlighted by Murugan and Shimizu in [MS23, Problem 12.5], posing the challenge of defining p -energy measures on the Sierpiński carpet without using the self-similarity, and also establishing their basic properties. However, as far as the authors are concerned, many vital tools such as *Fekete’s lemma* used in [CGQ22, Lemma 4.4], *combinatorial ball Loewner condition* in [MS23, Definition 3.1] and *Knight Move argument* in [Kig23, Shi24] are no longer applicable without self-similarity.

For this reason, we concern here the *scale-irregular Vicsek sets*, which is a class of *Moran sets* [Fal86]. The advantage of Vicsek set lies in their distinctive “gradient structure”, which allows us to construct p -energy norms even in the absence of self-similarity. It is worth mentioning that, when $p = 2$, the 2-energy (or Dirichlet form) may be constructed by a probabilistic approach as Barlow and Hambly [BH97] have done on scale-irregular Sierpiński gaskets.

Our approach is mainly motivated by the works of Baudoin and Chen [BC23, BC24]. We will define the p -energy norm as the limit of p -energy norms on discrete approximating graphs, since the underlying geometry structure ensures the monotonicity of discrete energy norms. To this end, for each scale-irregular Vicsek set K^l determined by contraction ratio sequence l (see Section 2 for details), we always equip K^l with the Euclidean metric d and the canonical Borel probability measure μ (see (2.4)).

Theorem 1.1 (*p -energy on scale-irregular Vicsek sets*). *Let (K^l, d, μ) be a scale-irregular Vicsek set. For each $1 < p < \infty$, there exists a normed vector space $(\mathcal{F}_p, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F}_p})$ and a semi-norm \mathcal{E}_p on \mathcal{F}_p with the following properties.*

- (1) $(\mathcal{F}_p, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F}_p})$ is a uniformly convex separable reflexive Banach space.
- (2) \mathcal{F}_p forms an algebra under point-wise product, that is, $uv \in \mathcal{F}_p$ whenever $u, v \in \mathcal{F}_p$. Moreover,

$$\mathcal{E}_p(uv) \leq 2^{p-1} \left(\|u\|_{C(K^l)}^p \mathcal{E}_p(v) + \|v\|_{C(K^l)}^p \mathcal{E}_p(u) \right) \text{ for all } u, v \in \mathcal{F}_p.$$

- (3) (Regularity) $\mathcal{F}_p \subset C(K^l)$ is a dense subspace of $(C(K^l), \|\cdot\|_\infty)$.
- (4) (Lipschitz contractivity) For every $u \in \mathcal{F}_p$ and 1-Lipschitz function $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we have $\varphi \circ u \in \mathcal{F}_p$ and $\mathcal{E}_p(\varphi \circ u) \leq \mathcal{E}_p(u)$.
- (5) (Spectral gap) For every $u \in \mathcal{F}_p$,

$$\int_{K^l} \left| u(x) - \int_{K^l} u \, d\mu \right|^p \, d\mu(x) \leq \mu(K^l) \text{diam}(K^l)^{p-1} \mathcal{E}_p(u).$$

- (6) (Strong locality) If $u, v \in \mathcal{F}_p$ satisfy $\text{supp}(u) \cap \text{supp}(v - a\mathbb{1}_{K^l}) = \emptyset$ for some $a \in \mathbb{R}$, then

$$\mathcal{E}(u + v) = \mathcal{E}(u) + \mathcal{E}(v).$$

The explicit expressions of \mathcal{E}_p and \mathcal{F}_p are given in Definition 3.1. This helps to understand the dependence of the Sobolev spaces \mathcal{F}_p on the exponent p . As we will see in Remark 3.9 that, for $1 < p \neq q < \infty$, the intersection $\mathcal{F}_p \cap \mathcal{F}_q$ contains non-constant functions.

Our next result shows the existence and some properties of the *p -energy measure* corresponding to the p -energy norm in Theorem 1.1.

Theorem 1.2. Let (K^l, d, μ) be a scale-irregular Vicsek set and $(\mathcal{E}_p, \mathcal{F}_p)$ be the p -energy in Theorem 1.1. Then there exists a family of Borel finite measures $\{\Gamma_p\langle u \rangle\}_{u \in \mathcal{F}_p}$ on K^l satisfying the following:

- (1) Let $u \in \mathcal{F}_p$, then $\Gamma_p\langle u \rangle(K^l) = \mathcal{E}_p(u)$. Moreover, $\Gamma_p\langle u \rangle \equiv 0$ if and only if f is constant.
- (2) For any two $u_1, u_2 \in \mathcal{F}_p$, and any non-negative Borel measurable function g on K^l ,

$$\left(\int_{K^l} g \, d\Gamma_p\langle u_1 + u_2 \rangle \right)^{1/p} \leq \left(\int_{K^l} g \, d\Gamma_p\langle u_1 \rangle \right)^{1/p} + \left(\int_{K^l} g \, d\Gamma_p\langle u_2 \rangle \right)^{1/p}. \quad (1.1)$$

- (3) For any $f \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$ and any $u \in \mathcal{F}_p$,

$$d\Gamma_p\langle f \circ u \rangle(x) = |f'(u(x))|^p \, d\Gamma_p\langle u \rangle(x) \text{ for } \Gamma_p\langle u \rangle\text{-a.e. } x \in K^l. \quad (1.2)$$

- (4) (Energy image density property) For any $u \in \mathcal{F}_p$, $u_*(\Gamma_p\langle u \rangle) \ll \mathcal{L}^1$. Here $u_*(\Gamma_p\langle u \rangle)$ is the push-forward measure defined by $u_*(\Gamma_p\langle u \rangle)(A) := \Gamma_p\langle u \rangle(u^{-1}(A))$ for all Borel subsets $A \subset \mathbb{R}$, and \mathcal{L}^1 is the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R} .

Some previous works have also constructed p -energy measures and discussed their properties by utilizing self-similarity, as Hino [Hin05, Lemma 4.1] have done for $p = 2$, or as Murugan and Shimizu [MS23, Section 9] have done on the standard Sierpiński carpet. Motivated by [BC23], we use the gradient structure as an alternative approach for both construction and direct validation on the properties of the p -energy measure.

Within our framework, the use of word space remains feasible for constructing the p -energy measure, see Proposition 3.13; however, the validation of related properties is impeded by the absence of self-similarity. This gap is bridged in Proposition 3.14 by showing the coincidence of energy measures constructed by these two different approaches, and this suggests a compatibility between the gradient structure and the fractal structure.

Both Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 work for every contraction ratio sequence \mathbf{l} . As Hambly had done in [Ham92, p.5] on homogeneous random fractals, for the critical exponent to be well-defined, \mathbf{l} is required to be *stationary* and *ergodic*, which will be called condition (A) in our paper (see Remark 2.7 for further explanation). In this case, it is possible to generalize Theorem 1.1 further and define more nonlinear norms via discrete approximating p -energy norms, which will be denoted by $\mathcal{E}_{p,\infty}^\beta$ and $\mathcal{E}_{p,p}^\beta$ for $1 < p < \infty$ and $0 < \beta < \infty$ (see Definition 4.1). The p -energy \mathcal{E}_p constructed in Theorem 1.1 is equivalent to $\mathcal{E}_{p,\infty}^{\beta_p^*}$ with β_p^* given in (4.1). Intuitively, when $p = 2$, the norm $\mathcal{E}_p = \mathcal{E}_{p,\infty}^{\beta_p^*}$ gives a strongly local Dirichlet form while $\mathcal{E}_{2,2}^\beta$ gives a non-local Dirichlet form (see (4.6)).

Under this frame, we can describe the above norms in terms of Besov-Lipschitz norms. Let ϕ be the increasing scale function given in (4.2).

Definition 1.3. For every $1 < p < \infty$, $0 \leq \beta < \infty$ and $0 < r < \text{diam}(K^l)$, define

$$\Phi_u^\beta(r) := \int_{K^l} \int_{B(x,r)} \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|^p}{\phi(r)^{\beta/\beta_p^*}} \, d\mu(y) \, d\mu(x), \quad 0 < r \leq \text{diam}(K^l), \quad u \in L^p(K^l, \mu). \quad (1.3)$$

For $1 < q < \infty$, let

$$[u]_{B_{p,q}^\beta} := \left(\int_0^{\text{diam}(K^l)} (\Phi_u^\beta(r))^{q/p} \frac{dr}{r} \right)^{1/p} \quad \text{and} \quad B_{p,q}^\beta := \left\{ u \in L^p(K^l, \mu) : [u]_{B_{p,q}^\beta} < \infty \right\};$$

for $q = \infty$, let

$$[u]_{B_{p,\infty}^\beta} := \sup_{r \in (0, \text{diam}(K^l))} \Phi_u^\beta(r) \quad \text{and} \quad B_{p,\infty}^\beta := \left\{ u \in L^p(K^l, \mu) : [u]_{B_{p,\infty}^\beta} < \infty \right\}.$$

The above Besov-Lipschitz spaces were introduced by Jonsson and Wallin [JW84] for Euclidean spaces, by Korevaar and Schoen [KS93] for Riemann domains and by Jonsson [Jon96] for the Sierpiński gasket. The main difference between Besov-Lipschitz spaces on scale-irregular fractals and those on manifolds or self-similar fractals is that, ϕ is not a power function, which makes the analysis more complicated.

Our last main result is that, for β close enough to β_p^* , the semi-norms \mathcal{E}_p , $\mathcal{E}_{p,\infty}^\beta$ and $\mathcal{E}_{p,p}^\beta$, defined by discrete energies, are comparable with the Besov-Lipschitz norms $[\cdot]_{B_{p,\infty}^\beta}$ and $[\cdot]_{B_{p,p}^\beta}$ respectively. Furthermore, the weak monotonicity and Bourgain-Brezis-Mironescu (BBM) convergence of p -energy semi-norms also hold on scale-irregular Vicsek sets.

Theorem 1.4. *Assume l satisfies condition (A). Then for any $1 < p < \infty$, we have:*

- (1) *there exists a constant $\epsilon_p \in (0, 1)$ such that for every $\beta \in (\epsilon_p \beta_p^*, \infty)$, we have $B_{p,p}^\beta \subset B_{p,\infty}^\beta \subset C(K^l)$, and there exists $C \geq 1$ such that for all $u \in C(K^l)$,*

$$C^{-1}[u]_{B_{p,\infty}^\beta}^p \leq \mathcal{E}_{p,\infty}^\beta(u) \leq C[u]_{B_{p,\infty}^\beta}^p,$$

$$C^{-1}[u]_{B_{p,p}^\beta}^p \leq \mathcal{E}_{p,p}^\beta(u) \leq C[u]_{B_{p,p}^\beta}^p.$$

In particular, when $\beta = \beta_p^$, we have $\mathcal{F}_p = B_{p,\infty}^{\beta_p^*}$, where \mathcal{F}_p is given in Theorem 1.1.*

- (2) *β_p^* is the critical Besov exponent, that is*

$$\beta_p^* = \max \{ \beta \in [0, \infty) : B_{p,\infty}^\beta(K^l) \text{ contains non-constant functions} \}. \quad (1.4)$$

- (3) (Weak-monotonicity property) *for all $u \in \mathcal{F}_p = B_{p,\infty}^{\beta_p^*}$,*

$$\sup_{r \in (0, \text{diam}(K^l))} \Phi_u^{\beta_p^*}(r) \leq C \liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \Phi_u^{\beta_p^*}(r).$$

- (4) (Bourgain-Brezis-Mironescu (BBM) convergence) *there exists $C > 1$ such that for all $u \in \mathcal{F}_p = B_{p,\infty}^{\beta_p^*}$,*

$$C^{-1} \mathcal{E}_p(u) \leq \liminf_{\beta \uparrow \beta_p^*} (\beta_p^* - \beta) \mathcal{E}_{p,p}^\beta(u) \leq \limsup_{\beta \uparrow \beta_p^*} (\beta_p^* - \beta) \mathcal{E}_{p,p}^\beta(u) \leq C \mathcal{E}_p(u), \quad (1.5)$$

and

$$C^{-1}[u]_{B_{p,\infty}^{\beta_p^*}}^p \leq \liminf_{\beta \uparrow \beta_p^*} (\beta_p^* - \beta) [u]_{B_{p,p}^\beta}^p \leq \limsup_{\beta \uparrow \beta_p^*} (\beta_p^* - \beta) [u]_{B_{p,p}^\beta}^p \leq C [u]_{B_{p,\infty}^{\beta_p^*}}^p. \quad (1.6)$$

The structure of the paper is as follows. In Section 2, we introduce scale-irregular Vicsek set and its measure, and discuss their properties including the non-self-similarity. In Section 3, we construct p -energy norm on scale-irregular Vicsek sets and prove Theorems 1.1 and 1.2. In Section 4, we prove Theorem 1.4.

NOTATION. The letters C, C', C_i, C'_i, C''_i and c are universal positive constants which may vary at each occurrence. The sign \asymp means that both \leq and \geq are true with uniform values of C depending only on K^l . $a \wedge b := \min\{a, b\}$, $a \vee b := \max\{a, b\}$. We use $\#A$ and $|A|$ as the cardinality of the set A . For a borel set B , write $\int_B f d\mu := \mu(B)^{-1} \int_B f d\mu$. For any set $A \subset \mathbb{C}$, its diameter $\text{diam}(A) := \sup_{x,y \in A} d(x,y)$ where d is the Euclidean metric.

2 Geometry and measure of scale-irregular Vicsek set

In this section, we review the definition and related notions of scale-irregular Vicsek sets in Section 2.1. The measures on scale-irregular Vicsek sets are analyzed in Section 2.2. In particular, some sufficient conditions for scale-irregular Vicsek sets to be non-self-similar are given in Theorem 2.11.

2.1 Preliminaries

Define five points in \mathbb{C} by

$$q_0 := 0, \quad q_j := \exp((2j-1)\pi i/4), \quad 1 \leq j \leq 4.$$

Let K_0 be the closed unit square in \mathbb{C} with vertices $\{q_j\}_{j=1}^4$. Given an odd number $l \geq 3$, define

$$S_l := \left\{ 2nl^{-1}q_j : 0 \leq n \leq \frac{1}{2}(l-1), 1 \leq j \leq 4 \right\}.$$

So that $\#S_l = 2l - 1$. We assign S_l the discrete topology for each l . For convenience of notation, we always let $l_0 := 1$. For any infinite sequence $\mathbf{l} = (l_k)_{k=1}^\infty$, where each $l_k \geq 3$ is an odd integer for $k \geq 1$, define

$$\rho_n := 2 \prod_{k=0}^n l_k^{-1} \text{ for } 0 \leq n < \infty, \quad W_n^{\mathbf{l}} := \prod_{k=1}^n S_{l_k} \text{ for } 1 \leq n \leq \infty \text{ and } W_*^{\mathbf{l}} := \bigcup_{1 \leq n < \infty} W_n^{\mathbf{l}}.$$

We assign $W_n^{\mathbf{l}}$ and $W_*^{\mathbf{l}}$ the product topology. For each $w = w_1 w_2 \cdots \in W_\infty^{\mathbf{l}}$, we define $[w]_n := w_1 w_2 \cdots w_n \in W_n^{\mathbf{l}}$ and $[w]_n$ for $w \in W_k^{\mathbf{l}}$ when $k \geq n \geq 1$ similarly. For $w = w_1 \cdots w_n \in W_*^{\mathbf{l}}$, we write

$$S(w) := \{v \in W_{n+1}^{\mathbf{l}} : [v]_n = w\} = \{w_1 w_2 \cdots w_n w_{n+1} : w_{n+1} \in S_{l_{n+1}}\}.$$

For $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, we define a function δ on $W_\infty^{\mathbf{l}} \times W_\infty^{\mathbf{l}}$ by

$$\delta(w, \tau) := \begin{cases} \alpha^{\min\{n: [w]_n \neq [\tau]_n\} - 1} & \text{if } w \neq \tau, \\ 0 & \text{if } w = \tau. \end{cases}$$

Then δ is a metric on $W_\infty^{\mathbf{l}}$ and generates the same topology on $W_\infty^{\mathbf{l}}$.

For each $w \in S_l$, we define a map

$$F_w^{\mathbf{l}}(z) := w + l^{-1}z, \quad z \in \mathbb{C},$$

and for each $w = w_1 \dots w_n \in W_*^{\mathbf{l}}$, define

$$F_w^{\mathbf{l}} := F_{w_1}^{l_1} \circ \cdots \circ F_{w_n}^{l_n}.$$

Let d be the Euclidean metric on \mathbb{C} . Notice that for each $w = w_1 \dots w_n \in W_*^{\mathbf{l}}$, the set $F_w^{\mathbf{l}}(K_0)$ is an isometric copy of $[0, 2^{1/2} l_1^{-1} l_2^{-1} \cdots l_n^{-1}]^2$, i.e., $F_w^{\mathbf{l}}(K_0)$ is a square with side length $2^{1/2} l_1^{-1} l_2^{-1} \cdots l_n^{-1}$ and

$$\text{diam}(F_w^{\mathbf{l}}(K_0)) = 2 l_1^{-1} l_2^{-1} \cdots l_n^{-1} \leq 2 \cdot 3^{-|w|}.$$

Definition 2.1 (The scale-irregular Vicsek set). *For any infinite sequence $\mathbf{l} = (l_k)_{k=1}^\infty$, where each $l_k \geq 3$ is an odd integer, define $K^{\mathbf{l}}$ to be the non-empty compact subset of K_0 by*

$$K^{\mathbf{l}} := \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{w \in W_n^{\mathbf{l}}} F_w^{\mathbf{l}}(K_0),$$

see Fig. 1. The metric on $K^{\mathbf{l}}$ is given by the restriction of the Euclidean metric d on \mathbb{C} to $K^{\mathbf{l}}$. We call the metric space $K^{\mathbf{l}}$ a scale-irregular Vicsek set.

For $w \in W_*^{\mathbf{l}}$, we write $K_w^{\mathbf{l}} := F_w^{\mathbf{l}}(K_0) \cap K^{\mathbf{l}}$. We call $K_w^{\mathbf{l}}$ a level- n cell if $w \in W_n^{\mathbf{l}}$.

Proposition 2.2. *For $w \in W_*^{\mathbf{l}}$, we have $K_w^{\mathbf{l}} = \bigcup_{v \in S(w)} K_v^{\mathbf{l}}$, namely,*

$$F_w^{\mathbf{l}}(K_0) \cap K^{\mathbf{l}} = \bigcup_{v \in S(w)} F_v^{\mathbf{l}}(K_0) \cap K^{\mathbf{l}}.$$

Proof. Since

$$F_w^{\mathbf{l}}(K_0) \cap \left(\bigcup_{v \in W_{|w|+1}^{\mathbf{l}}} F_v^{\mathbf{l}}(K_0) \right) = \bigcup_{v \in S(w)} F_v^{\mathbf{l}}(K_0) \text{ for any } w \in W_*^{\mathbf{l}},$$

the conclusion follows by taking the intersection with $K^{\mathbf{l}}$ on both sides. \square

Proposition 2.3. *The map $\chi : W_\infty^{\mathbf{l}} \rightarrow K^{\mathbf{l}}$ defined by*

$$\{\chi(w)\} = \bigcap_{n \geq 1} F_{[w]_n}^{\mathbf{l}}(K_0) \text{ for all } w \in W_\infty^{\mathbf{l}}$$




Fig. 1: Two level- l scale-irregular Vicsek sets K^l .

is a continuous surjective map from (W_∞^l, δ) to (K^l, d) . Moreover, $\#\chi^{-1}(x) \leq 2$ for all $x \in K^l$ and $\#\chi^{-1}(x) = 2$ only if $x \in \bigcup_{n=1}^\infty \bigcup_{w \in W_n^l} F_w^l(\{q_j\}_{j=1}^4)$.

We will call χ the *coding map*.

Proof. We first show that $\bigcap_{n \geq 1} F_{[w]_n}^l(K_0)$ is a singleton in K^l so that χ is well-defined. Indeed, since $F_{[w]_n}^l(K_0)$ are compact and decreasing as n increases, we conclude by Cantor's intersection Theorem that $\bigcap_{n \geq 1} F_{[w]_n}^l(K_0)$ is non-empty. Since $\text{diam}(F_{[w]_n}^l(K_0)) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, the set $\bigcap_{n \geq 1} F_{[w]_n}^l(K_0)$ cannot contain more than two points, showing $\#\bigcap_{n \geq 1} F_{[w]_n}^l(K_0) = 1$.

To see that χ is surjective, note that for any $x \in K^l = \bigcap_{n=1}^\infty \bigcup_{w \in W_n^l} F_w^l(K_0)$, there exists $w_1 \in W_1^l$ for each such that $x \in F_{w_1}^l(K_0)$. Whenever we find w_n , we can apply proposition 2.2 and find $w_{n+1} \in S_{l_{n+1}}$ such that $x \in F_{w_1 w_2 \dots w_n w_{n+1}}^l(K_0)$. Let $w = w_1 w_2 \dots$, then $x \in \bigcap_{n \geq 1} F_{[w]_n}^l(K_0) = \{\chi(w)\}$ by definition, showing the desired.

To see that χ is continuous, note that when $\min\{n : [w]_n \neq [\tau]_n\} - 1 = k$, i.e. $\delta(w, \tau) = \alpha^k$, both $\chi(w)$ and $\chi(\tau)$ is in $F_{[w]_k}^l(K_0)$. Thus $d(\chi(w), \chi(\tau)) \leq \text{diam } F_{[w]_k}^l(K_0)$. As $\delta(w, \tau) \rightarrow 0$, we have $k \rightarrow \infty$ and thus $d(\chi(w), \chi(\tau)) \leq \text{diam } F_{[w]_k}^l(K_0) \rightarrow 0$, showing the desired.

To show the final insertion, suppose that $x = \chi(w) = \chi(w')$ for two distinct infinite words $w, w' \in W_\infty^l$. We can write $w = [w]_k \tau, w' = [w]_k \tau'$ where $[w]_k = w_1 w_2 \dots w_k$ denotes the longest common initial word of w, w' with length k (when $k = 0$, $[w]_k$ is the empty word), so that $[\tau]_1 \neq [\tau']_1$. Clearly, we have $x \in F_{[w]_k [\tau]_1}^l(K_0) \cap F_{[w]_k [\tau']_1}^l(K_0)$, which means that there exist two points $z_1, z_2 \in K_0$ such that

$$x = F_{w_1}^{l_1} \circ \dots \circ F_{w_k}^{l_k} \circ F_{[\tau]_1}^{l_{k+1}}(z_1) = F_{w_1}^{l_1} \circ \dots \circ F_{w_k}^{l_k} \circ F_{[\tau']_1}^{l_{k+1}}(z_2). \quad (2.1)$$

Since each $F_{w_j}^{l_j}, 1 \leq j \leq k$ is invertible, we can apply $(F_{w_j}^{l_j})^{-1}$ ($1 \leq j \leq k$) successively on both sides of (2.1) and obtain

$$F_{[\tau]_1}^{l_{k+1}}(z_1) = F_{[\tau']_1}^{l_{k+1}}(z_2). \quad (2.2)$$

Let $[\tau]_1 = 2n l_{k+1}^{-1} q$ and $[\tau']_1 = 2n' l_{k+1}^{-1} q'$ where $0 \leq n \neq n' \leq (l_{k+1} - 1)/2$ and $q, q' \in \{q_j\}_{j=1}^4$. Then (2.2) can be interpreted as

$$2n l_{k+1}^{-1} q + l_{k+1}^{-1} z_1 = 2n' l_{k+1}^{-1} q' + l_{k+1}^{-1} z_2,$$

i.e., $z_1 - z_2 = 2(n' q' - n q)$ and thus $d(z_1, z_2) = 2d(n' q', n q)$.

(1) If $q \neq q'$, then

$$\begin{aligned} 4 &\geq d(z_1, z_2)^2 = 4d(n' q', n q)^2 \\ &= 4 \left(n^2 + n'^2 - 2n' n \text{Re}(q \cdot \bar{q}') \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\geq 4 \left(n^2 + n'^2 \right) \quad (\text{since } \operatorname{Re}(q \cdot \overline{q'}) \in \{0, -1\}) \\ &\geq 4 \quad (\text{since } n \neq n'), \end{aligned}$$

thus $d(z_1, z_2) = 2$.

(2) If $q = q'$, then $2 \geq d(z_1, z_2) = 2|n' - n| \geq 2$, so $d(z_1, z_2) = 2$.

Therefore, z_1 and z_2 must be the endpoints of the diagonal of K_0 , i.e., either $\{z_1, z_2\} = \{q_1, q_3\}$ or $\{z_1, z_2\} = \{q_2, q_4\}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{either } x &= F_{[w]_k[\tau]_1}^l(q_1) \cap F_{[w]_k[\tau']_1}^l(q_3), \\ x &= F_{[w]_k[\tau]_1}^l(q_3) \cap F_{[w]_k[\tau']_1}^l(q_1), \\ x &= F_{[w]_k[\tau]_1}^l(q_2) \cap F_{[w]_k[\tau']_1}^l(q_4), \\ \text{or } x &= F_{[w]_k[\tau]_1}^l(q_4) \cap F_{[w]_k[\tau']_1}^l(q_2). \end{aligned}$$

The proof is complete. \square

We state some terminologies in graph theory for scale-irregular Vicsek sets following [BC23, Mur19, DRY23].

Definition 2.4 (Graph and Cable system). Fix $\mathbf{l} = (l_k)_{k=1}^\infty$.

(1) For each $n \geq 0$, define $V_0 := \{q_j\}_{j=0}^4$ when $n = 0$ and $V_n := \bigcup_{w \in W_n^l} F_w^l(V_0)$ when $n \geq 1$. Define

$$E_n := \{(x, y) \in V_n \times V_n : d(x, y) = l_0^{-1} l_1^{-1} l_2^{-1} \cdots l_n^{-1}\} \text{ for } n \geq 0.$$

So that (V_n, E_n) is a finite connected planer graph. We write $x \sim y$ whenever $(x, y) \in E_n$ and say x and y are adjacent.

- (2) For each $n \geq 0$, by replacing each edge in E_n by an isometric copy of the line segment $[0, l_0^{-1} l_1^{-1} l_2^{-1} \cdots l_n^{-1}]$ and gluing them in an obvious way at the vertices, we obtain a set \overline{V}_n , called the corresponding cable system of (V_n, E_n) . With an abuse of notation, we regard \overline{V}_n as a subset of K^l (see Fig. 2).
- (3) Define the skeleton $\mathcal{S} := \bigcup_{n=0}^\infty \overline{V}_n$. Let ν be the Lebesgue measure on \mathcal{S} , i.e. ν assign $l_0^{-1} l_1^{-1} l_2^{-1} \cdots l_n^{-1}$ for each isometric copy of $[0, l_0^{-1} l_1^{-1} l_2^{-1} \cdots l_n^{-1}]$. We extend ν to K^l by letting $\nu(K^l \setminus \mathcal{S}) = 0$.
- (4) For every $n \geq 0$ and for every adjacent $x, y \in V_n$, write $e(x, y)$ the geodesic in \mathcal{S} connecting x and y , namely, the linear map from $[0, 1]$ to the isometric copy of $[0, l_0^{-1} l_1^{-1} l_2^{-1} \cdots l_n^{-1}]$ connecting u and v such that $e(x, y)(0) = x$ and $e(x, y)(1) = y$. Then $\bigcup_{x \sim y} e(x, y)([0, 1]) = \overline{V}_n$. With an abuse of notation, we sometimes regard $e(x, y)$ as a subset of \mathcal{S} .
- (5) A subset $A \subset K^l$ is said to be convex, if for any two points $x, y \in A \cap \mathcal{S}$, the geodesic path connecting x to y is included in $A \cap \mathcal{S}$.
- (6) For two adjacent x and y in V_n , we say that $x \prec y$ when the geodesic distance from 0 to x in \overline{V}_n is less than the geodesic distance from 0 to y .




Fig. 2: Cable systems \overline{V}_0 , \overline{V}_1 and \overline{V}_2 for K^l with $l = 35 \cdots$.

Remark 2.5. (1) The measure ν is not a Radon measure, since the measure of any ball with positive radius is infinite.

(2) Although the image of $e(x, y)$ and $e(y, x)$ coincide for adjacent vertices x, y , we distinguish them when we take integration along this edge by assigning $e(x, y)$ the positive orientation when $x \prec y$. So for an integrable non-negative function g , we have $0 \leq \int_{e(x, y)} g d\nu = -\int_{e(y, x)} g d\nu$ when $e(x, y)$ is positively oriented.

2.2 Measure on scale-irregular Vicsek set

We first briefly recall some dimension results of self-similar Vicsek set. Give an odd integer $l \geq 3$, let K^l be the self-similar Vicsek set with common contraction ration l^{-1} . Then by solving Moran's equation [Fal97, Theorem 2.7] directly, we see that K^l has Hausdorff dimension

$$\alpha_l := \dim_H(K^l) = \frac{\log(2l - 1)}{\log l}.$$

We need the following condition on the contraction ratio sequence \mathbf{l} for further analysis.

Definition 2.6. We say that condition (A) holds, if \mathbf{l} consists of only two odd numbers $a \neq b \geq 3$, and if we write $[n]_a$ and $[n]_b$ to be the number of a and b in $[\mathbf{l}]_n$ (the first n -digits of \mathbf{l}), the following limit exists¹:

$$\theta := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \theta_n := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{[n]_a}{[n]_b} \in [0, \infty). \quad (\text{A})$$

Remark 2.7. We explain the necessity for introducing condition (A). If we define $\theta_a := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} [n]_a/n$ (the occupation rate of a in \mathbf{l}), and θ_b in the same way, then (A) is equivalent to the existence of θ_a and θ_b , which is the same as the requirement in [Ham92, p.5]. In this case $\theta = \theta_a/\theta_b$. Generalizing condition (A) to the case where \mathbf{l} is composed of a finite set of odd numbers $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^m$ is straightforward by assuming the limits $\theta_i := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} [n]_{a_i}/n$ exist and $\sum_{i=1}^m \theta_i = 1$. Indeed, Theorem 1.4 can be shown to hold for this type of \mathbf{l} . For clarity, we provide a proof in Section 4 for the case where \mathbf{l} contains only two odd numbers. It is possible to generalize the result for \mathbf{l} composed of infinite set of numbers, and we leave this as a future work.

Under condition (A), we can analyse the behaviour of the Hausdorff measure by using [HRWW00, Theorem 3.1], since scale-irregular Vicsek sets are a type of Moran sets (see [HRWW00, Section 1.2] for definitions).

Proposition 2.8. Let $K^{\mathbf{l}}$ be a scale-irregular Vicsek set with \mathbf{l} satisfying condition (A). Define

$$\eta_n := n(\theta_n - \theta), \quad n \geq 1.$$

(1) The Hausdorff dimension of $K^{\mathbf{l}}$, denoted by α , is given by

$$\alpha = \frac{\theta \log(2a - 1) + \log(2b - 1)}{\theta \log a + \log b}. \quad (2.3)$$

(2) When $3 \leq a < b$, we have the following equivalences:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < \mathcal{H}^\alpha(K^{\mathbf{l}}) < \infty & \text{ if and only if } \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \eta_k \in \mathbb{R}, \\ \mathcal{H}^\alpha(K^{\mathbf{l}}) = 0 & \text{ if and only if } \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \eta_k = -\infty, \\ \mathcal{H}^\alpha(K^{\mathbf{l}}) = \infty & \text{ if and only if } \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \eta_k = +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

(3) When $3 \leq b < a$, we have the following equivalences:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < \mathcal{H}^\alpha(K^{\mathbf{l}}) < \infty & \text{ if and only if } \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \eta_k \in \mathbb{R}, \\ \mathcal{H}^\alpha(K^{\mathbf{l}}) = 0 & \text{ if and only if } \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \eta_k = +\infty, \end{aligned}$$

¹We adopt the convention $1/0 = \infty$ and the limit is considered in the extended real line $\overline{\mathbb{R}} = [-\infty, \infty]$.

$$\mathcal{H}^\alpha(K^l) = \infty \text{ if and only if } \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \eta_k = -\infty.$$

Proof. (1) This is a direct application of [HRWW00, Theorem 3.1].

(2) Let $3 \leq a < b$. Define

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_n &:= \sum_{w \in W_n^l} (\text{diam}(K_w^l))^\alpha \\ &= \rho_n^\alpha (\psi(\rho_n))^{-1} = (a^{-[n]_a} b^{-[n]_b})^\alpha (2a-1)^{[n]_a} (2b-1)^{[n]_b}. \end{aligned}$$

By [HRWW00, Theorem 3.1], $\mathcal{H}^\alpha(K^l)$ and $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \xi_k$ are simultaneously zero, finite and positive, or infinite. So by taking logarithm, we only need to show that $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \log \xi_k$ and $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \eta_k$ are simultaneously $-\infty$, finite, or ∞ , respectively. Let

$$f(x) := \frac{x \log(2a-1) + \log(2b-1)}{x \log a + \log b}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}$$

Then for sufficiently large n ,

$$\begin{aligned} \log \xi_n &= -\alpha ([n]_a \log a + [n]_b \log b) + ([n]_a \log(2a-1) + [n]_b \log(2b-1)) \\ &= ([n]_a \log a + [n]_b \log b) \left(\frac{[n]_a \log(2a-1) + [n]_b \log(2b-1)}{[n]_a \log a + [n]_b \log b} - \alpha \right) \\ &\asymp n(f(\theta_n) - f(\theta)) \\ &\asymp f'(\theta) \eta_n, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the conclusion $\alpha = f(\theta)$ of (1) in the third line, and in the fourth line we use $3 \leq a < b$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} f'(x) &= \frac{\log(2a-1) \log b - \log a \log(2b-1)}{(x \log a + \log b)^2} \\ &= \frac{\log a \log b}{(x \log a + \log b)^2} \left(\frac{\log(2a-1)}{\log a} - \frac{\log(2b-1)}{\log b} \right) > 0 \end{aligned}$$

by noting that $\log(2l-1)/\log l$ strictly decreases in l . Therefore $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \log \xi_k$ and $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \eta_k$ are simultaneously $-\infty$, finite, or $+\infty$.

(3) Note that in the case of $3 \leq b < a$, $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \log \xi_n \asymp f'(\theta) \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \eta_n$ as $f'(\theta) < 0$. The rest of the proof is the same as (2). □

We define

$$\psi(r) := \begin{cases} \prod_{k=0}^n (2l_k - 1)^{-1} & \text{for } \rho_{n+1} < r \leq \rho_n \ (n \geq 0), \\ 1 & \text{for } r \geq 2. \end{cases}$$

For each word $w \in W_m^l$, we define

$$\mu(K_w^l) := (\#W_m^l)^{-1} = \psi(\rho_m). \quad (2.4)$$

We extend μ to be a Borel measure on K^l by Kolmogorov's extension theorem.

Proposition 2.9. *Let K^l be a scale-irregular Vicsek set with l satisfying condition (A).*

(1) *There exist constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that for all $0 < r < R \leq 2$,*

$$c_1 \left(\frac{R}{r} \right)^{\alpha_a \wedge \alpha_b} \leq \frac{\psi(R)}{\psi(r)} \leq c_2 \left(\frac{R}{r} \right)^{\alpha_a \vee \alpha_b}. \quad (2.5)$$

(2) There exist constants $c_3, c_4 > 0$ such that for all $x \in K^l$ and $0 < r \leq 2$,

$$c_3\psi(r) \leq \mu(B(x, r)) \leq c_4\psi(r).$$

Proof. The insertion (1) easily follows by a direct calculation. To see (2), we only need to observe that when $r \in (\rho_{m+1}, \rho_m]$ for some m , any metric ball $B(x, r)$ in K^l (where $x \in K^l$) contains a level- $(m+3)$ cell and is contained in a level- $((m-2) \vee 0)$ cell (recall that the level- n cells are those $K_w^l = F_w^l(K_0) \cap K^l$ for $w \in W_n^l$). \square

The measure μ is natural since that, under condition (A), if the Hausdorff measure \mathcal{H}^α of K^l exists, that is, $0 < \mathcal{H}^\alpha(K^l) < \infty$, then \mathcal{H}^α is equivalent to μ . The reason is that $\mathcal{H}^\alpha(K_w^l) = \mathcal{H}^\alpha(K^l)\mu(K_w^l)$ as level- k cells are only translations of each other for all $w \in W_k^l$ ($k \geq 1$), and any measurable set of K^l can be approximated by some unions of cells of level k (as $k \rightarrow \infty$), which means that $\mathcal{H}^\alpha = \mathcal{H}^\alpha(K^l)\mu$.

In our setting μ is not necessarily Ahlfors regular, as we will see in the following statement.

Proposition 2.10. *Let K^l be a scale-irregular Vicsek set with l satisfying condition (A), and α defined by (2.3). The measure μ on K^l is α -Ahlfors regular (under Euclidean metric) if and only if $\{\eta_n\}_n$ is bounded below from 0 and away from ∞ .*

Proof. By Proposition 2.9, μ is α -Ahlfors regular if and only if $\psi(\rho_n) \asymp \rho_n^\alpha$, i.e., the sequence $\{(\psi(\rho_n))^{-1}\rho_n^\alpha\}_n$ is bounded below from 0 and away from ∞ , which, by taking logarithm and using the definition of η_n and θ_n , is equivalent to that the sequence

$$\frac{\eta_n}{1 + \theta_n} \log \left(\frac{2a - 1}{a^\alpha} \right) + \frac{n}{1 + \theta_n} \left(\theta \log \left(\frac{2a - 1}{a^\alpha} \right) + \log \left(\frac{2b - 1}{b^\alpha} \right) \right)$$

is bounded below from 0 and away from ∞ . By (2.3), we have

$$\theta \log \left(\frac{2a - 1}{a^\alpha} \right) + \log \left(\frac{2b - 1}{b^\alpha} \right) = 0$$

and $\log \left(\frac{2a-1}{a^\alpha} \right) \neq 0$ by $\theta \in [0, \infty)$. The conclusion immediately follows by condition (A). \square

Now we can present our sufficient conditions for K^l to be non-self-similar. For such Moran fractals, we can give a short proof that is simpler than [FHZ23] for graph-directed attractors.

Theorem 2.11. *Under condition (A) and let $3 \leq a < b$. If $\{\eta_n\}_n$ satisfies one of the following two conditions:*

- (1) $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \eta_n = \infty$,
- (2) $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \eta_n \in \mathbb{R}$ but $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \eta_n = \infty$,

then K^l is not self-similar, that is, not the attractor of any standard iterated function system.

Proof. (1) By Proposition 2.8, $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \eta_n = \infty$ implies $\mathcal{H}^\alpha(K^l) = \infty$. But it is known that $\mathcal{H}^{\dim_H(K)}(K) < \infty$ for any self-similar set K by [Fal97, Corollary 3.3], thus K^l is not self-similar.

- (2) By Proposition 2.8, $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \eta_n \in \mathbb{R}$ implies $0 < \mathcal{H}^\alpha(K^l) < \infty$. We already show that, in this case, \mathcal{H}^α is equivalent to μ on K^l . By Proposition 2.10, $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \eta_n = \infty$ implies that μ is not Ahlfors regular, so that \mathcal{H}^α is not Ahlfors regular. But [AKT20, Theorem 2.1] states that for any self-similar set K , the Hausdorff measure $\mathcal{H}^{\dim_H(K)}$ is Ahlfors regular, should it exist. This shows that K^l cannot be self-similar. \square

Example 2.12. *We give some examples of scale-irregular Vicsek set with $a = 3$ and $b = 5$ satisfying the conditions in Theorem 2.11. The sequence $l = 335333553333555333335555 \dots$ satisfies Theorem 2.11 (1). That is, “3” appears consecutively $k + 1$ times and then “5” appears consecutively k times ($k \geq 1$), as the following shows.*

$$l = \underbrace{\overbrace{33}^2 \overbrace{5}^1 \overbrace{333}^3 \overbrace{55}^2 \overbrace{3333}^4 \overbrace{555}^3 \dots \overbrace{3 \dots 3}^{k+1} \overbrace{5 \dots 5}^k \overbrace{33 \dots 3}^{k+2} \overbrace{55 \dots 5}^{k+1}}_{\substack{\text{“3” appears } (k^2 + 3k)/2 \text{ times} \\ \text{“5” appears } (k^2 + k)/2 \text{ times}}}} \dots$$

We claim that $\{\theta_n\}_n$ has limit $\theta = 1$ and $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \eta_n = \infty$. Indeed, when $n = (k^2 + 2k) + t$ for some $k \geq 1$ and $1 \leq t \leq k + 2$, “3” occurs $t + (k^2 + 3k)/2$ times and “5” occurs $(k^2 + k)/2$ times in $[l]_n$, thus for $k \geq 1$ and $1 \leq t \leq k + 2$,

$$\theta_{k^2+2k+t} = \frac{k^2 + 3k + 2t}{k^2 + k} \text{ and } \eta_{k^2+2k+t} = \frac{k^2 + 2k + t}{k(k+1)}(2k + 2t).$$

When $n = (k^2 + 3k + 2) + t$ for some $k \geq 1$ and $1 \leq t \leq k + 1$, “3” occurs $(k^2 + 5k + 4)/2$ times and “5” occurs $t + (k^2 + k)/2$ times in $[l]_n$, thus for $k \geq 1$ and $1 \leq t \leq k + 1$,

$$\theta_{k^2+3k+2+t} = \frac{k^2 + 5k + 4}{k^2 + k + 2t} \text{ and } \eta_{k^2+3k+2+t} = \frac{k^2 + 3k + 2 + t}{k^2 + k + 2t}(4k + 4 - 2t).$$

For both cases, the claim follows by noting that

$$\theta_n = 1 + O(n^{-1/2}) \text{ and } \eta_n \geq 2 \cdot 3^{-1} n^{1/2}.$$

In the same way one can verify that the sequence $\mathbf{l} = 35335533355533335555 \dots$ satisfies Theorem 2.11 (2). For both sequences, their corresponding Vicsek sets cannot be self-similar.

3 p -energy and its associated energy measures

In this section, we will construct (discrete) p -energy norms and associated energy measures on scale-irregular Vicsek sets using their gradient structure, to prove Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2. Throughout this section, we fix $\mathbf{l} = (l_k)_{k=1}^{\infty}$ where each $l_k \geq 3$ is an odd integer (*without* assuming condition (A)) and always let $l_0 = 1$ for convenience of notation. We omit the superscript \mathbf{l} and write $K^{\mathbf{l}}$ as K .

3.1 Construction of p -energy norms

We first consider the construction of p -energy norms on scale-irregular Vicsek set, by extending the methods in [BC23].

Definition 3.1. For each convex $A \subset K$, $1 < p < \infty$, $n \geq 0$ and $u \in C(K)$, define

$$\mathcal{E}_{p,n;A}(u) := \frac{1}{2} \left(\prod_{j=0}^n l_j^{p-1} \right) \sum_{\substack{x,y \in A \cap V_n \\ x \sim y}} |u(x) - u(y)|^p$$

and we denote $\mathcal{E}_{p,n;K}$ as $\mathcal{E}_{p,n}$. Define the function space \mathcal{F}_p by

$$\mathcal{F}_p := \left\{ u \in C(K) : \sup_{n \geq 0} \mathcal{E}_{p,n}(u) < \infty \right\}; \quad (3.1)$$

and for each $u \in \mathcal{F}_p$, define

$$\mathcal{E}_{p;A}(u) := \sup_{n \geq 0} \mathcal{E}_{p,n;A}(u), \quad \mathcal{E}_p(u) := \mathcal{E}_{p;K}(u) \text{ and } \|u\|_{\mathcal{F}_p} := \left(\|u\|_{L^p(K,\mu)}^p + \mathcal{E}_p(u) \right)^{1/p}. \quad (3.2)$$

It is then easy to verify that $(\mathcal{F}_p, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F}_p})$ is a normed real vector space. The following proposition shows that these discrete energies $\{\mathcal{E}_{p,n;A}(u)\}$ increase in n .

Proposition 3.2. For each $0 \leq m \leq n$ and each $u \in C(K)$, we have

$$\mathcal{E}_{p,m;A}(u) \leq \mathcal{E}_{p,n;A}(u).$$

In particular,

$$\mathcal{E}_p(u) = \sup_{n \geq 0} \mathcal{E}_{p,n}(u) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_{p,n}(u) \text{ for all } u \in C(K). \quad (3.3)$$

Proof. For two adjacent vertices x and y in V_n , by the tree structure of K , there are unique $(l_{n+1} + 1)$ vertices $\{x_j\}_{j=0}^{l_{n+1}} \subset V_{n+1}$ such that $x_j \sim x_{j+1}$, $1 \leq j \leq l_{n+1}$ and $x_0 = x$, $x_{l_{n+1}} = y$. Thus

$$|u(x_0) - u(x_{l_{n+1}})|^p = \left| \sum_{j=1}^{l_{n+1}} (u(x_{j-1}) - u(x_j)) \right|^p \leq l_{n+1}^{p-1} \sum_{j=1}^{l_{n+1}} |u(x_{j-1}) - u(x_j)|^p.$$

By adding all adjacent vertices in V_n on both sides, we conclude that $\mathcal{E}_{p,n;A}(u) \leq \mathcal{E}_{p,n+1;A}(u)$ for each convex $A \subset K$, which completes the proof. \square

Next, we analyse the ‘‘core’’ functions in the domain \mathcal{F}_p .

Definition 3.3 (Piecewise affine functions). *A continuous function $\Psi : K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called n -piecewise affine, if Ψ is linear between the vertices of \overline{V}_n and constant on any connected component of $\overline{V}_m \setminus \overline{V}_n$ for every $m > n$. A continuous function $\Psi : K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called piecewise affine, if there exists $n \geq 0$ such that Ψ is n -piecewise affine.*

Proposition 3.4. *For each $u \in C(K)$ and $n \geq 0$, define $H_n u$ to be the unique n -piecewise affine function on K that coincides with u on V_n . Then $H_n u \rightarrow u$ uniformly on K as n tends to infinity. Moreover, $H_n u \in \mathcal{F}_p$ for each $u \in C(K)$ and $n \geq 0$.*

Proof. For each word $w \in W_n$, we have

$$\min_{K_w} u \leq H_n u(x) \leq \max_{K_w} u, \quad \forall x \in K_w.$$

It follows that

$$|H_n u(x) - u(x)| \leq \text{Osc}_{K_w} u, \quad \forall x \in K_w,$$

where $\text{Osc}_{K_w} u := \max_{x \in K_w} u(x) - \min_{x \in K_w} u(x)$. It follows that

$$\sup_{x \in K} |H_n u(x) - u(x)| \leq \sup_{w \in W_n} \text{Osc}_{K_w} u \rightarrow 0 \quad (n \rightarrow \infty)$$

as u is uniform continuous. The second assertion is obvious. \square

As in the work of Baudoin and Chen [BC23, Theorem 3.1], a notable characteristic of Vicsek sets lies in their distinctive geometric structure, which permits the existence of gradients. The following proposition says that [BC23, Theorem 3.1] also holds on scale-irregular Vicsek sets.

Proposition 3.5 ([BC23, Theorem 3.1]). *Let $1 < p < \infty$ and $u \in C(K)$. The followings are equivalent:*

- (1) $u \in \mathcal{F}_p$;
- (2) *There exists $g \in L^p(\mathcal{S}, \nu)$ such that, for every $n \geq 0$ and every adjacent $x, y \in V_n$,*

$$u(y) - u(x) = \int_{e(x,y)} g \, d\nu. \quad (3.4)$$

In this case, g is unique in $L^p(\mathcal{S}, \nu)$. Moreover, for every $u \in \mathcal{F}_p$ and every convex $A \subset K$,

$$\mathcal{E}_{p;A}(u) = \int_{A \cap \mathcal{S}} |g|^p \, d\nu. \quad (3.5)$$

We denote g in this proposition by ∂u and refer it as the gradient of u .

Proof. We first show that (1) implies (2). If Ψ is a piecewise affine function, it is obvious that there exists a function, denoted by $\partial \Psi$, such that for every adjacent $x, y \in V_n$,

$$\Psi(y) - \Psi(x) = \int_{e(x,y)} \partial \Psi \, d\nu.$$

In fact, for each adjacent $x, y \in V_n$ with $x \prec y$ (so that $e(x, y)$ is positively oriented), we can choose Ψ such that $\partial\Psi$ takes the value $(\Psi(y) - \Psi(x)) \cdot d(x, y)^{-1}$ on $e(x, y)((0, 1))$. Therefore,

$$\int_{A \cap \mathcal{S}} |\partial\Psi|^p d\nu = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{x, y \in A \cap V_n \\ x \sim y}} d(x, y)^{-p+1} |\Psi(x) - \Psi(y)|^p = \frac{1}{2} \left(\prod_{j=0}^n l_j^{p-1} \right) \sum_{\substack{x, y \in A \cap V_n \\ x \sim y}} |\Psi(x) - \Psi(y)|^p.$$

For any $u \in \mathcal{F}_p$ and for each $n \geq 0$, we define $H_n u$ by Lemma 3.4. Then

$$\sup_n \int_{A \cap \mathcal{S}} |\partial(H_n u)|^p d\nu = \sup_n \frac{1}{2} \left(\prod_{j=0}^n l_j^{p-1} \right) \sum_{\substack{x, y \in A \cap V_n \\ x \sim y}} |u(x) - u(y)|^p = \mathcal{E}_{p;A}(u) < \infty.$$

The reflexivity of $L^p(\mathcal{S}, \nu)$ and Mazur's Lemma imply that, there exists a convex combination of a subsequence of $\partial(H_n u)$ that converges in $L^p(\mathcal{S}, \nu)$ to some $g \in L^p(\mathcal{S}, \nu)$. Since $H_n u$ converges uniformly to u by Proposition 3.4, we have then for every adjacent $x, y \in V_n$,

$$u(y) - u(x) = \int_{e(x, y)} g d\nu.$$

This proves (2). Furthermore, since a convex combination of a subsequence of $\partial(H_n u)$ converges in $L^p(\mathcal{S}, \nu)$ to some g , we have

$$\int_{A \cap \mathcal{S}} |g|^p d\nu \leq \sup_n \int_{A \cap \mathcal{S}} |\partial(H_n u)|^p d\nu \leq \mathcal{E}_{p;A}(u).$$

We then show (2) implies (1). It follows from (2) and Hölder's inequality that for $n \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\prod_{j=0}^n l_j^{p-1} \right) \sum_{\substack{x, y \in A \cap V_n \\ x \sim y}} |u(x) - u(y)|^p &\leq \left(\prod_{j=0}^n l_j^{p-1} \right) \sum_{\substack{x, y \in A \cap V_n \\ x \sim y}} \left(\int_{e(x, y)} |g| d\nu \right)^p \\ &\leq \sum_{\substack{x, y \in A \cap V_n \\ x \sim y}} \int_{e(x, y)} |g|^p d\nu \leq 2 \int_{A \cap \mathcal{S}} |g|^p d\nu. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\mathcal{E}_{p;A}(u) = \sup_{n \geq 0} \mathcal{E}_{p,n}(u) \leq \int_{A \cap \mathcal{S}} |g|^p d\nu$$

and we deduce that $u \in \mathcal{F}_p$ with $\|u\|_{\mathcal{F}_p}^p \leq \|u\|_{L^p(K, \mu)}^p + \|g\|_{L^p(\mathcal{S}, \nu)}^p$.

If g_1, g_2 both satisfy (2), then $\int_{e(x, y)} (g_1 - g_2) d\nu = 0$ for all $n \geq 0$ and every adjacent $x, y \in V_n$. Since for each $x, y \in V_n$, $e(x, y)$ is the union of l_{n+1} edges in V_{n+1} , we may apply the Lebesgue differentiation Theorem to $(e(x, y), \nu|_{e(x, y)})$ (note that $\nu|_{e(x, y)}$ is the Lebesgue measure) and conclude that $g_1 - g_2 = 0$ ν -a.e. on $e(x, y)$, thus on all \mathcal{S} . This proves the uniqueness. \square

Remark 3.6. *The uniqueness in Proposition 3.5 tells us more: for any $u \in \mathcal{F}_p$, if a convex combination of a subsequence of $\partial(H_n u)$ converges, then it must converges to ∂u .*

We recall two inequalities that will be used later. These are easy extensions of [BC23, Theorem 3.13 and Corollary 3.14] for the scale-irregular Vicsek sets. Their proof are exactly same as in [BC23].

Lemma 3.7 (Morrey's inequality, [BC23, Theorem 3.13]). *Let $1 < p < \infty$. For every $u \in \mathcal{F}_p$ and $x, y \in A$,*

$$|u(x) - u(y)|^p \leq d(x, y)^{p-1} \mathcal{E}_{p;A}(u).$$

Lemma 3.8 (Poincaré inequality, [BC23, Corollary 3.14]). *Let $A \subset K$ be a closed convex set. Let $1 < p < \infty$. For every $u \in \mathcal{F}_p$, and $x, y \in A$,*

$$\int_A \left| u(x) - \int_A u d\mu \right|^p d\mu(x) \leq \text{diam}(A)^{p-1} \mathcal{E}_{p;A}(u).$$

Combining the above facts, we can now give the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let $(\mathcal{F}_p, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F}_p})$ be defined by (3.1) and (3.2).

- (1) Let $\{u_n\}$ be a Cauchy sequence in $(\mathcal{F}_p, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F}_p})$. Then $\{u_n\}$ is also a Cauchy sequence in $L^p(K, \mu)$. Assume that $u_n \rightarrow u$ in $L^p(K, \mu)$ and a subsequence $u_{n_k} \rightarrow u$ μ -a.e.. Since $\mathcal{E}_p(u_n - u_m) = \|\partial u_n - \partial u_m\|_{L^p(\mathcal{S}, \nu)}$, we know that $\{\partial u_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $L^p(\mathcal{S}, \nu)$. Assume that $\partial u_n \rightarrow g$ in $L^p(\mathcal{S}, \nu)$. Fix a point $x_0 \in K$ and let $g_n = u_n - u_n(x_0)$. By Lemma 3.7, for all $m, n \geq 1$ and all $x \in K$,

$$|g_n(x) - g_m(x)|^p \leq d(x, x_0)^{p-1} \mathcal{E}_p(u_n - u_m) \leq \text{diam}(K)^{p-1} \mathcal{E}_p(u_n - u_m),$$

which implies that $\{g_n\}_n$ is a Cauchy sequence in $C(K)$. Therefore, there exists $g \in C(K)$ such that $g_n \rightarrow g$ in $C(K)$, also in $L^p(K, \mu)$ by Hölder's inequality. It is immediate that $u_n - g_n$ also converges to $u - g$ in $L^p(K, \mu)$. Thus $u_{n_k}(x_0) = u_{n_k} - g_{n_k}$ converges to $u - g$ μ -a.e.. Hence $u - g$ must be a constant, say $u - g \equiv c$, and u admits a continuous μ -version on K , which will also be denoted by u . Note that

$$\|u_{n_k} - u\|_{C(K)} \leq \|g_{n_k} - g\|_{C(K)} + |u_{n_k}(x_0) - c| \rightarrow 0 \quad (k \rightarrow \infty).$$

For every $n \geq 0$ and every adjacent $x, y \in V_n$, we have by Proposition 3.5 that

$$u_{n_k}(y) - u_{n_k}(x) = \int_{e(x,y)} \partial u_{n_k} \, d\nu.$$

Letting $k \rightarrow \infty$, we have $u(y) - u(x) = \int_{e(x,y)} g \, d\nu$. By Proposition 3.5 again, we conclude that $u \in \mathcal{F}_p$ and $\partial u = g$. Thus

$$\mathcal{E}_p(u_n - u) = \|\partial u_n - \partial u\|_{L^p(\mathcal{S}, \nu)} \rightarrow 0$$

and then $u_n \rightarrow u$ in \mathcal{F}_p .

To prove that $(\mathcal{F}_p, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F}_p})$ is uniformly convex, we first define the norm $\|\cdot\|_p$ on the product space $L^p(K, \mu) \times L^p(\mathcal{S}, \nu)$ by $\|(u, v)\|_p := \left(\|u\|_{L^p(K, \mu)}^p + \|v\|_{L^p(\mathcal{S}, \nu)}^p \right)^{1/p}$ for $(u, v) \in L^p(K, \mu) \times L^p(\mathcal{S}, \nu)$, and a map $T : (\mathcal{F}_p, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F}_p}) \rightarrow (L^p(K, \mu) \times L^p(\mathcal{S}, \nu), \|\cdot\|_p)$ by $Tu := (u, \partial u)$ for all $u \in \mathcal{F}_p$. Then by Proposition 3.5 and the previous paragraph, we know that $T(\mathcal{F}_p)$ is isometric to \mathcal{F}_p and is a closed subspace of $(L^p(K, \mu) \times L^p(\mathcal{S}, \nu), \|\cdot\|_p)$. Since L^p spaces are uniformly convex for $1 < p < \infty$, we conclude by [Cla36, Theorem 1] that the product space $(L^p(K, \mu) \times L^p(\mathcal{S}, \nu), \|\cdot\|_p)$ is uniformly convex, and so does its closed subspace $T(\mathcal{F}_p)$. Since \mathcal{F}_p and $T(\mathcal{F}_p)$ are isometric, we conclude that \mathcal{F}_p is uniformly convex. The reflexivity is implied by the uniform convexity and Milman-Pettis theorem (see for example [Bre11, Theorem 3.31]).

The separability is obvious since the space of all piecewise affine functions is dense in \mathcal{F}_p , and clearly there is a countable dense subset of all piecewise affine functions.

- (2) For any $u, v \in \mathcal{F}_p$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{p,n}(uv) &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\prod_{j=0}^n l_j^{p-1} \right) \sum_{\substack{x, y \in V_n \\ x \sim y}} |u(x)v(x) - u(y)v(y)|^p \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\prod_{j=0}^n l_j^{p-1} \right) \sum_{\substack{x, y \in V_n \\ x \sim y}} 2^{p-1} \left(\|u\|_{C(K)}^p |v(x) - v(y)|^p + \|v\|_{C(K)}^p |u(x) - u(y)|^p \right) \\ &\leq 2^{p-1} \left(\|u\|_{C(K)}^p \mathcal{E}_{p,n}(v) + \|v\|_{C(K)}^p \mathcal{E}_{p,n}(u) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Taking the supremum of n on both sides, we have

$$\mathcal{E}_p(uv) \leq 2^{p-1} \left(\|u\|_{C(K)}^p \mathcal{E}_p(v) + \|v\|_{C(K)}^p \mathcal{E}_p(u) \right),$$

which means that the subset $\mathcal{F}_p \subset C(K)$ is an algebra under product operation.

- (3) The regularity follows directly from Proposition 3.4.
(4) This follows by noting that $|\varphi(u(x)) - \varphi(u(y))|^p \leq |u(x) - u(y)|^p$.

(5) This follows from Lemma 3.8 with $A = K$.

(6) We may assume $a = 0$ as $\mathcal{E}(v) = \mathcal{E}(v - a\mathbf{1}_K)$ and $\mathcal{E}(u + v) = \mathcal{E}(u + v - a\mathbf{1}_K)$ by definition. Write $A = \text{supp}(u)$ and $B = \text{supp}(v)$. Then A and B are two disjoint compact subsets of K and thus $d(A, B) > 0$. We can find n_0 sufficiently large so that for all $n \geq n_0$, the closed subsets $A_n := \bigcup_{\substack{w \in W_n \\ K_w \cap A \neq \emptyset}} K_w$ and

$B_n := \bigcup_{\substack{w \in W_n \\ K_w \cap B \neq \emptyset}} K_w$ are also disjoint, and each $x \in A_n \cap V_n$ and $y \in B_n \cap V_n$ are not adjacent. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{p,n}(u + v) &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\prod_{j=0}^n l_j^{p-1} \right) \sum_{\substack{x, y \in V_n \\ x \sim y}} |(u(x) - u(y)) + (v(x) - v(y))|^p \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\prod_{j=0}^n l_j^{p-1} \right) \left(\sum_{\substack{x, y \in A_n \cap V_n \\ x \sim y}} |u(x) - u(y)|^p + \sum_{\substack{x, y \in B_n \cap V_n \\ x \sim y}} |v(x) - v(y)|^p \right) \\ &= \mathcal{E}_{p,n}(u) + \mathcal{E}_{p,n}(v). \end{aligned}$$

Letting $n \rightarrow \infty$, we derive $\mathcal{E}_p(u + v) = \mathcal{E}_p(u) + \mathcal{E}_p(v)$. □

Remark 3.9. As shown in Proposition 3.4 and Theorem 1.1, for two exponents $p, q \in (1, \infty)$ and any non-constant $u \in C(K)$, $H_1 u \in \mathcal{F}_p \cap \mathcal{F}_q$. As we can easily choose u so that $H_1 u$ is non-constant, we see that $\mathcal{F}_p \cap \mathcal{F}_q$ contains non-constant functions.

3.2 Associated p -energy measures

After having a p -energy norm, it is nature to consider constructing the corresponding p -energy measures on scale-irregular Vicsek set. It is shown by Murugan and Shimizu in [MS23, Section 9] that the p -energy measures with good properties on standard Sierpiński carpet can be constructed, which heavily relies on self-similarity. Nevertheless, we can use the special gradient structure of scale-irregular Vicsek set to achieve our aim. Before discussing energy measures, we record some properties of the operator ∂ .

Lemma 3.10. For any $u \in \mathcal{F}_p$ and any adjacent x, y , the function $u_{e(x,y)} : (0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by $u_{e(x,y)}(t) = u(e(x, y)(t))$ belongs to $W^{1,p}((0, 1))$, and its weak derivative $Du_{e(x,y)}$ can be chosen as $t \mapsto \partial u(e(x, y)(t))$.

Proof. Fix $u \in \mathcal{F}_p$. Let $g_{e(x,y)}(t) = \partial u(e(x, y)(t))$, then $g_{e(x,y)} \in L^p((0, 1))$. By the continuity of u and the density of $\bigcup_n V_n$ in K , we can extend (3.4) to

$$u_{e(x,y)}(b) - u_{e(x,y)}(a) = \int_{(a,b)} g_{e(x,y)} d\mathcal{L}^1, \quad 0 \leq a < b \leq 1, \quad (3.6)$$

where \mathcal{L}^1 is the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R}^1 . For any $\phi \in C_c^\infty((0, 1))$, by Fubini's theorem and the fundamental theorem of calculus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^1 u_{e(x,y)}(t) \phi'(t) d\mathcal{L}^1(t) \\ &= \int_0^1 \left(\int_{(0,t)} g_{e(x,y)}(s) d\mathcal{L}^1(s) \right) \phi'(t) d\mathcal{L}^1(t) + u_{e(x,y)}(0) \int_0^1 \phi'(t) d\mathcal{L}^1(t) \text{ (by (3.6))} \\ &= \int_0^1 \left(\int_{(s,1)} \phi'(t) d\mathcal{L}^1(t) \right) g_{e(x,y)}(s) d\mathcal{L}^1(s) \text{ (by Fubini's theorem and } \phi(1) = \phi(0) = 0 \text{)} \\ &= \int_0^1 (\phi(1) - \phi(s)) g_{e(x,y)}(s) d\mathcal{L}^1(s) = - \int_0^1 \phi(s) g_{e(x,y)}(s) d\mathcal{L}^1(s). \end{aligned}$$

Thus $u_{e(x,y)} \in W^{1,p}((0, 1))$ and $Du_{e(x,y)} = g_{e(x,y)}$. □

The following properties on ∂ are generalizations of [BC24, Proposition 2.2].

Proposition 3.11 ([BC24, Proposition 2.2]). *Let $\partial : u \mapsto \partial u$, $\forall u \in \mathcal{F}_p$ be defined as in Proposition 3.5. The following properties hold.*

- (1) (Linearity) *For any two $u_1, u_2 \in \mathcal{F}_p$, $\partial(u_1 + u_2) = \partial u_1 + \partial u_2$.*
- (2) (Leibniz rule) *For any two $u_1, u_2 \in \mathcal{F}_p$, $u_1 u_2 \in \mathcal{F}_p$ and $\partial(u_1 u_2) = u_1 \partial u_2 + u_2 \partial u_1$.*
- (3) (Chain rule) *For any $f \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$ and any $u \in \mathcal{F}_p$, $\partial(f \circ u) = f'(u) \partial u$.*
- (4) (Closeness) *The operator $\partial : \mathcal{F}_p \rightarrow L^p(\mathcal{S}, \nu)$ is closed, if we view ∂ as an unbounded operator on $C(K)$.*

Proof. The insertions (1), (2) and (3) are obtained by Lemma 3.10, the linearity, Leibniz rule, and chain rule of weak derivatives, respectively. The insertion (4) is an immediate consequence of Proposition 3.5. \square

After these preparations, we can prove Theorem 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Define

$$\Gamma_p \langle u \rangle (A) := \int_{A \cap \mathcal{S}} |\partial u|^p d\nu, \text{ i.e. } d\Gamma_p \langle u \rangle := |\partial u|^p d\nu. \quad (3.7)$$

We will prove that $\{\Gamma_p \langle u \rangle\}_{u \in \mathcal{F}_p}$ on K is a family of Borel finite measures having the properties stated in Theorem 1.2.

- (1) That $\Gamma_p \langle u \rangle (K) = \mathcal{E}_p(u)$ follows from Proposition 3.5. The ‘‘if’’ part in the second assertion is trivial by definition. For converse, If $\Gamma_p \langle u \rangle \equiv 0$, then $\mathcal{E}_p(u) = 0$. By Morrey’s inequality in Lemma 3.7, u must be constant.
- (2) Note that for any non-negative Borel measurable function g on K ,

$$\left(\int_K g d\Gamma_p \langle u \rangle \right)^{1/p} = \left(\int_{\mathcal{S}} \left(|g|^{1/p} |\partial u| \right)^p d\nu \right)^{1/p} = \| |g|^{1/p} |\partial u| \|_{L^p(\mathcal{S}, \nu)}.$$

So (1.1) holds by the Minkowski inequality of $L^p(\mathcal{S}, \nu)$.

- (3) The identity (1.2) holds by the definition of $\Gamma_p \langle u \rangle$ and the Leibniz rule in Proposition 3.11.
- (4) The proof is essentially the same as in [CF12, Theorem 4.3.8] and [Shi24, Proposition 7.6]. Since all compact subset generates the Borel σ -algebra of \mathbb{R} , we only need to prove that $u_* (\Gamma_p \langle u \rangle) (F) = 0$, whenever $u \in \mathcal{F}_p$ and F is a compact subset of \mathbb{R} with $\mathcal{L}^1(F) = 0$. We can choose a sequence $\{\phi_n\}_{n \geq 1} \subset C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ such that $|\phi_n| \leq 1$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \phi_n(x) = \mathbf{1}_F(x)$ for each $x \in \mathbb{R}$, and

$$\int_0^\infty \phi_n(t) dt = \int_{-\infty}^0 \phi_n(t) dt = 0$$

for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\Phi_n(x) := \int_0^x \phi_n(t) dt$ for each $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then we see that $\Phi_n \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$ with compact support, $\Phi_n(0) = 0$, and $|\Phi_n'| \leq 1$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By the dominated convergence theorem, we know that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_n(x) = 0$ for each $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\Phi_n \circ u$ converges to 0 in $L^p(K, \mu)$. Since $\mathcal{E}_p(\Phi_n \circ u) \leq \mathcal{E}_p(u)$ by the Lipschitz contractivity of \mathcal{E}_p in Theorem 1.1, we know that $\{\Phi_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ is bounded in \mathcal{F}_p . By the uniform convexity of \mathcal{F}_p and [Kak39], there exists a subsequence $\{N_j\}_{j \geq 1}$ of \mathbb{N} such that the arithmetic mean $\Psi_j \circ u := \frac{1}{N_j} \sum_{k=1}^{N_j} \Phi_{n_k} \circ u \rightarrow 0$ in \mathcal{F}_p as $j \rightarrow \infty$. For each $x \in \mathbb{R}$, since

$$\left| \mathbf{1}_F(x) - \frac{1}{N_j} \sum_{k=1}^{N_j} \phi_{n_k}(x) \right| = \left| \frac{1}{N_j} \sum_{k=1}^{N_j} (\mathbf{1}_F(x) - \phi_{n_k}(x)) \right| \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } j \rightarrow \infty,$$

we conclude by Fatou’s lemma that

$$\begin{aligned} (u_* \Gamma_p \langle u \rangle) (F) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{1}{N_j} \sum_{k=1}^{N_j} \Phi_{n_k}'(t) \right|^p d(u_* \Gamma_p \langle u \rangle) (t) \\ &\leq \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_K |\Psi_j'(u(x))|^p d\Gamma_p \langle u \rangle (x) \\ &= \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \Gamma_p \langle \Psi_j \circ u \rangle (K) = \liminf_{l \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_p(\Psi_j \circ u) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

- Remark 3.12.** (1) *Theorem 1.2 shows that it is possible to define energy measure on some fractals that lack self-similarity. However, it is still an open problem to give a general procedure to define p -energy and associated energy measure on general Moran fractals, such as scale-irregular Sierpiński gaskets.*
- (2) *By definition, $\Gamma_p\langle u \rangle \ll \nu$ for all $u \in \mathcal{F}_p$. So ν is a minimal energy-dominant measure in the sense of [Hin10]. Since ν is independent of p , this gives an example of p -energy on fractals whose the minimal energy-dominant measure for different exponents can be absolutely continuous (with or without self-similarity).*

The approach in [MS23, Section 9], using word space of a fractal, provides another way to construct energy measures, which also works in the scale-irregular Vicsek fractal setting with minor modification. Proposition 3.14 shows that the construction using fractal structure agree with the construction using gradient structure in Theorem 1.2.

Proposition 3.13. *For any $u \in \mathcal{F}_p$ and $n \geq 1$, the measure defined by*

$$m_p^{(n)}\langle u \rangle : E \mapsto \sum_{w \in E} \mathcal{E}_{p;K_w}(u) =: m_p^{(n)}\langle u \rangle(E), \quad \forall E \subset W_n$$

satisfies

$$\sum_{v \in S(w)} m_p^{(n+1)}\langle u \rangle(\{v\}) = m_p^{(n)}\langle u \rangle(\{w\}). \quad (3.8)$$

Proof. By (3.5),

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{v \in S(w)} \mathcal{E}_{p;K_v}(u) &= \sum_{v \in S(w)} \int_{S \cap K_v} |\partial u|^p d\nu \\ &= \int_{S \cap K_w} |\partial u|^p d\nu - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{v, v' \in S(w)} \int_{S \cap K_v \cap K_{v'}} |\partial u|^p d\nu \\ &= \int_{S \cap K_w} |\partial u|^p d\nu = \mathcal{E}_{p;K_w}(u) \end{aligned}$$

since $\bigcup_{v \in S(w)} K_v = K_w$ and ν has no atom, thus showing (3.8). □

By the Kolmogorov's extension theorem and Proposition 3.13, we obtain a finite Borel measure $m_p\langle u \rangle$ on W_∞ such that

$$m_p\langle u \rangle(\{\tau \in W_\infty : [\tau]_n = w\}) = \mathcal{E}_{p;K_w}(u), \quad \forall n \geq 1, w \in W_n.$$

Clearly, $m_p\langle u \rangle(W_\infty) = \mathcal{E}_p(u)$. Also $m_p\langle u \rangle$ is non-atomic, since $m_p\langle u \rangle(w) \leq \mathcal{E}_{p;K_{[w]_n}}(u) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for any $w \in W_\infty$. Now we show that, these two different ways give the same p -energy measure.

Recall that χ is the coding map in Proposition 2.3.

Proposition 3.14. *For any $u \in \mathcal{F}_p$, the push-forward of $m_p\langle u \rangle$ under χ coincides with $\Gamma_p\langle u \rangle$, namely, $\Gamma_p\langle u \rangle = \chi_* m_p\langle u \rangle$, where $\chi_* m_p\langle u \rangle(\cdot) := m_p\langle u \rangle(\chi^{-1}(\cdot))$.*

Proof. We first prove that for any $w \in W_*$, $\Gamma_p\langle u \rangle(K_w) = \chi_* m_p\langle u \rangle(K_w)$, namely,

$$m_p\langle u \rangle(\chi^{-1}(K_w)) = \mathcal{E}_{p;K_w}(u).$$

Assume that $w \in W_n$. Since $\{\tau \in W_\infty : [\tau]_n = w\} \subset \chi^{-1}(K_w)$, we first have

$$m_p\langle u \rangle(\chi^{-1}(K_w)) \geq \mathcal{E}_{p;K_w}(u).$$

If $\tau \in \chi^{-1}(K_w)$ but $[\tau]_n \neq w$, then by the last insertion in Proposition 2.3, $\chi(\tau)$ must belong to $K_w \cap V_n$. So the set $\chi^{-1}(K_w) \setminus \{\tau \in W_\infty : [\tau]_n = w\}$ has countably many elements. Since $m_p\langle u \rangle$ is non-atomic, we must have $m_p\langle u \rangle(\chi^{-1}(K_w)) = \mathcal{E}_{p;K_w}(u)$. If we write \mathcal{P} to be the collection of all $K_w (w \in W_*)$ and all singleton-sets in K , and write \mathcal{L} as the collection of all Borel subsets B of K such that $\Gamma_p\langle u \rangle(B) = \chi_* m_p\langle u \rangle(B)$. It is easy to verify that \mathcal{P} forms a π -system and \mathcal{L} forms a λ -system. A standard application of $\pi - \lambda$ theorem shows

that \mathcal{L} contains $\sigma(\mathcal{P})$, the σ -algebra generated by \mathcal{P} . It suffices to show that $\sigma(\mathcal{P})$ is the Borel σ -algebra of K . To show this, we only need to show that every closed subset F of K is in $\sigma(\mathcal{P})$. Let $F_m = \bigcup_{\substack{w \in W_m \\ K_w \cap F \neq \emptyset}} K_w$ so that $F_m \in \sigma(\mathcal{P})$. Since $\max_{w \in W_m} \text{diam}(K_w) \rightarrow 0$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$, we have $\bigcap_{m \geq 1} F_m = F$. Therefore $F \in \sigma(\mathcal{P})$ and we complete the proof. \square

We conclude this section by comparing the energy measure constructed here with that in [Kuw24]. In the case $p = 2$, Theorem 1.1 gives a regular Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E}_2, \mathcal{F}_2)$ on a Vicsek set in the definition of [FOT11, Chapter 1], and Theorem 1.2 gives the energy measure with respect to $(\mathcal{E}_2, \mathcal{F}_2)$ in the definition of [FOT11, Chapter 3]. As we said in Remark 3.12, ν is a minimal energy-dominant measure for the Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E}_2, \mathcal{F}_2)$. For every $u \in \mathcal{F}_2$, we see from (3.7) that the Radon-Nikodym derivative is

$$\frac{d\Gamma_2\langle u \rangle}{d\nu} = |\partial u|^2$$

and therefore, at least formally,

$$\mathcal{E}_p(u) = \int_K \left| \frac{d\Gamma_2\langle u \rangle}{d\nu} \right|^{p/2} d\nu \quad \text{and} \quad d\Gamma_p\langle u \rangle = \left| \frac{d\Gamma_2\langle u \rangle}{d\nu} \right|^{p/2} d\nu.$$

It turns out the p -energy norm and p -energy measure we constructed here are also equivalent to those in [Kuw24].

4 Besov-Lipschitz norms and their properties

Throughout this section, we fix a contraction ratio sequence \mathbf{l} satisfying condition (A). As we said in Remark 2.7, our method also works for \mathbf{l} that consists of a finite set of odd numbers $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^m$ with the limit $\theta_i := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} [n]_{a_i}/n$ exists and $\sum_{i=1}^m \theta_i = 1$. The inclusion of a finite set of odd numbers in \mathbf{l} only makes the notation complicated without adding any essential mathematical difficulty in the proofs. Therefore, we focus our proof on the scenario where \mathbf{l} consists of only two odd numbers $a \neq b \geq 3$. We write $K^{\mathbf{l}} = K$, $K_w^{\mathbf{l}} = K_w$ and omit the index p when no confusion is caused. Under condition (A), we first investigate some basic properties of Besov-Lipschitz spaces in Section 4.1. The norm equivalences in Theorem 1.4 will be proved in Section 4.2. Weak monotonicity property and Bourgain-Brezis-Mironescu convergence are shown in Section 4.3.

4.1 Besov-Lipschitz spaces and discrete p -energies

We first define

$$\beta_p^* := \frac{\theta \log(a^{p-1}(2a-1)) + \log(b^{p-1}(2b-1))}{\theta \log a + \log b}. \quad (4.1)$$

Clearly

$$\beta_p^* = \left(\frac{\theta \log a}{\theta \log a + \log b} \right) \beta_a^{(p)} + \left(\frac{\log b}{\theta \log a + \log b} \right) \beta_b^{(p)},$$

where

$$\beta_l^{(p)} := p - 1 + \alpha_l = \frac{\log(l^{p-1}(2l-1))}{\log l} \quad \text{for } l \in \{a, b\},$$

is the *critical Besov exponent* of p -energy on the self-similar Vicsek set $K^{\mathbf{l}}$ with common contraction ration l^{-1} , having the property that

$$\beta_l^{(p)} := \sup \{ \beta \geq 0 : B_{p, \infty}^\beta(K^{\mathbf{l}}) \text{ contains non-constant functions} \}.$$

See [Bau23, Theorem 6.1] for a proof². In particular, when \mathbf{l} consists of $l = b$ only, we have $\theta = 0$ and $\beta_p^* = \beta_b^{(p)}$.

²Due to slightly different notation of Besov space in [Bau23], the critical Besov exponent in our context corresponds to p times that in their setting. To be precise, the $B_{p, \infty}^\beta$ here is equivalent to $\mathcal{B}^{\beta/p, p}$ in [Bau23].

Recall that we define the diagonal length of each level- n square by

$$\rho_n := 2a^{-[n]_a} b^{-[n]_b}.$$

Define a function

$$\phi(r) = \begin{cases} \rho_n^{p-1} \psi(\rho_n) & \text{for } \rho_{n+1} < r \leq \rho_n \ (n \geq 0), \\ 2^{p-1} & \text{for } r \geq 2. \end{cases} \quad (4.2)$$

And we define the Besov semi-norms $[\cdot]_{B_{p,q}^\beta}$ and Besov spaces $B_{p,q}^\beta$ as in Definition 1.3 with ϕ given in (4.2). Using (2.5) and the definition of ρ_n , there exists a $C > 0$ such that, for all $n \geq 0$, $\rho_{n+1} < r \leq \rho_n$ and all $u \in L^p(K, \mu)$,

$$C^{-1} \Phi_u^\beta(\rho_{n+1}) \leq \Phi_u^\beta(r) \leq C \Phi_u^\beta(\rho_n). \quad (4.3)$$

Using these notions, we generalize the p -energy given in Definition 3.1.

Definition 4.1. For every $1 < p < \infty$, $0 \leq \beta \leq \beta_p^*$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and every $u \in C(K)$, define

$$\mathcal{E}_n^\beta(u) := \frac{1}{2} \phi(\rho_n)^{-\frac{\beta}{\beta_p^*}} \psi(\rho_n) \sum_{\substack{x,y \in V_n \\ x \sim y}} |u(x) - u(y)|^p, \quad (4.4)$$

and

$$\mathcal{E}_{p,\infty}^\beta(u) := \sup_{n \geq 0} \mathcal{E}_n^\beta(u), \quad \mathcal{E}_{p,p}^\beta(u) := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{E}_n^\beta(u).$$

Remark 4.2. (1) In view of (3.2) and (3.3), we have for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $u \in C(K)$ that $\mathcal{E}_{p,n;K}(u) = \mathcal{E}_n^{\beta_p^*}(u)$. Therefore,

$$\mathcal{E}_p(u) = \mathcal{E}_{p,\infty}^{\beta_p^*}(u) = \sup_{n \geq 0} \mathcal{E}_n^{\beta_p^*}(u) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_n^{\beta_p^*}(u). \quad (4.5)$$

(2) We may write $\mathcal{E}_{p,p}^\beta(u)$ in a “non-local p -energy” manner:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{p,p}^\beta(u) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \phi(\rho_n)^{-\frac{\beta}{\beta_p^*}} \psi(\rho_n) \sum_{\substack{x,y \in V_n \\ x \sim y}} |u(x) - u(y)|^p \\ &= \iint_{(K \times K) \setminus \text{diag}} |u(x) - u(y)|^p dJ_\beta(x, y), \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

with the symmetric positive measure

$$dJ_\beta(x, y) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{a,b \in V_n \\ a \sim b}} \phi(\rho_n)^{-\frac{\beta}{\beta_p^*}} \psi(\rho_n) d\delta_a(x) d\delta_b(y)$$

defined in $(K \times K) \setminus \text{diag}$, where $\text{diag} := \{(x, x) : x \in K\}$ and δ_a is the Dirac measure at point a .

For any $1 < p < \infty$, we define a real number ϵ_p by

$$\epsilon_p := \left(1 + \frac{p-1}{\alpha_a \vee \alpha_b} \right)^{-1}. \quad (4.7)$$

It is easy to see that

$$\frac{\alpha}{\beta_p^*} < \epsilon_p < 1.$$

The number ϵ_p is used in the following estimates for continuous embedding.

Proposition 4.3. For any $1 < p < \infty$, we have let ϵ_p be in (4.7).

(1) For any $\beta \in (\epsilon_p \beta_p^*, \infty)$, we have $\left(\frac{\beta}{\beta_p^*} \beta_a^{(p)} - \alpha_a \right) \wedge \left(\frac{\beta}{\beta_p^*} \beta_b^{(p)} - \alpha_b \right) > 0$. For every δ satisfying

$$0 \leq \delta < \left(\frac{\beta}{\beta_p^*} \beta_a^{(p)} - \alpha_a \right) \wedge \left(\frac{\beta}{\beta_p^*} \beta_b^{(p)} - \alpha_b \right), \quad (4.8)$$

there exists $C = C(\beta, \delta)$ such that for any integer $n \geq 0$,

$$\sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \phi(\rho_k)^{\frac{\beta}{\beta^*}} \psi(\rho_k)^{-1} \rho_k^{-\delta} \leq C \phi(\rho_n)^{\frac{\beta}{\beta^*}} \psi(\rho_n)^{-1} \rho_n^{-\delta}, \quad (4.9)$$

$$\sum_{k=0}^n \phi(\rho_k)^{-\frac{\beta}{\beta^*}} \psi(\rho_k) \rho_k^\delta \leq C \phi(\rho_n)^{-\frac{\beta}{\beta^*}} \psi(\rho_n) \rho_n^\delta. \quad (4.10)$$

Moreover, the sequence

$$\left\{ \phi(\rho_k)^{\frac{\beta}{\beta^*}} \psi(\rho_k)^{-1} \rho_k^{-\delta} \right\}_{k \geq 0} \text{ is decreasing and tends to } 0 \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty. \quad (4.11)$$

(2) For any integer $n \geq 0$ and any $\delta > 0$, we have

$$\sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \phi(\rho_k)^\delta \in \left[\frac{\phi(\rho_n)^\delta}{1 - (t_a \vee t_b)^{-\delta}}, \frac{\phi(\rho_n)^\delta}{1 - (t_a \wedge t_b)^{-\delta}} \right], \quad (4.12)$$

where $t_l = (2l - 1)l^{p-1}$ for $l = a, b$.

Proof. (1) That $\left(\frac{\beta}{\beta^*} \beta_a^{(p)} - \alpha_a \right) \wedge \left(\frac{\beta}{\beta^*} \beta_b^{(p)} - \alpha_b \right) > 0$ follows by simple calculation. To show the rest, let $a_k := \phi(\rho_k)^{\frac{\beta}{\beta^*}} \psi(\rho_k)^{-1} \rho_k^{-\delta} = \rho_k^{(p-1)\frac{\beta}{\beta^*} - \delta} \psi(\rho_k)^{\frac{\beta}{\beta^*} - 1}$, we have for each $j \geq n$,

$$\frac{a_{j+1}}{a_j} \leq \max_{l \in \{a, b\}} \left(l^{\delta - (p-1)\frac{\beta}{\beta^*}} (2l - 1)^{1 - \frac{\beta}{\beta^*}} \right) := c_0 < 1. \quad (4.13)$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \phi(\rho_k)^{\frac{\beta}{\beta^*}} \psi(\rho_k)^{-1} \rho_k^{-\delta} &= a_n + \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} a_n \prod_{j=n}^{k-1} \frac{a_{j+1}}{a_j} \leq a_n \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} c_0^{k-n} \\ &\leq C a_n = C \phi(\rho_n)^{\frac{\beta}{\beta^*}} \psi(\rho_n)^{-1} \rho_n^{-\delta}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

which implies (4.9). For $0 \leq k \leq n$, let $b_k := a_{n-k}^{-1} = \phi(\rho_{n-k})^{-\frac{\beta}{\beta^*}} \psi(\rho_{n-k}) \rho_{n-k}^\delta$. Then

$$\frac{b_{n-i}}{b_{n-i-1}} = \frac{a_{i+1}}{a_i} \leq c_0.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^n \phi(\rho_k)^{-\frac{\beta}{\beta^*}} \psi(\rho_k) \rho_k^\delta &= \sum_{k=0}^n b_{n-k} = b_0 + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} b_0 \prod_{j=0}^{n-k-1} \frac{b_{n-k-j}}{b_{n-k-j-1}} \\ &\leq b_0 \sum_{k=0}^n c_0^{n-k} \leq C b_0 = C \phi(\rho_n)^{-\frac{\beta}{\beta^*}} \psi(\rho_n) \rho_n^\delta, \end{aligned}$$

which implies (4.10).

Let $n = 0$, by (4.13) and the convergence of the series in (4.14), we see that the sequence $\left\{ \phi(\rho_k)^{\frac{\beta}{\beta^*}} \psi(\rho_k)^{-1} \rho_k^{-\delta} \right\}_{k \geq 1}$ is decreasing and tends to 0 as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

(2) Since $\phi(\rho_{k+1})^\delta \phi(\rho_k)^{-\delta} \in \{t_a^{-\delta}, t_b^{-\delta}\}$ for all $k \geq 0$, the proof is the same as in (1). \square

In Lemma 3.7, we study the Morrey-Sobolev's inequality for the space \mathcal{F}_p . Such inequality still holds for the Besov spaces $B_{p,\infty}^\beta$ and $B_{p,p}^\beta$ when $\beta \in (\epsilon_p \beta_p^*, \infty)$. The proof does not use the gradient structure as in Lemma 3.7.

Lemma 4.4 (Morrey-Sobolev's inequality). *For any $\beta \in (\epsilon_p \beta_p^*, \infty)$ and any $u \in B_{p,\infty}^\beta$, there exists a continuous version $\tilde{u} \in C(K)$ satisfying $\tilde{u} = u$ μ -almost everywhere on K and*

$$|\tilde{u}(x) - \tilde{u}(y)|^p \leq C \phi(d(x,y))^{\frac{\beta}{\beta_p^*}} \psi(d(x,y))^{-1} [u]_{B_{p,\infty}^\beta}^p, \quad (4.15)$$

for all $x, y \in K$, where C is a positive constant.

Proof. The proof is adapted from [GHL03, Theorem 4.11(iii)] with $p = 2$, we present it here for completeness. For any $x \in K$ and $0 < r \leq 2/3$, define

$$u_r(x) := \frac{1}{\mu(B(x,r))} \int_{B(x,r)} u(\xi) \, d\mu(\xi).$$

We claim that for any $u \in B_{p,\infty}^\beta$, and all $x, y \in K$ with $r = d(x,y) < 2/3$, the following inequality holds:

$$|u_r(x) - u_r(y)| \leq C \psi(r)^{-1/p} \phi(r)^{\frac{\beta}{p\beta_p^*}} \sup_{r \in (0, 3d(x,y)]} (\Phi_u^\beta(r))^{1/p}. \quad (4.16)$$

Indeed, letting $B_1 = B(x, r)$, $B_2 = B(y, r)$, we have

$$u_r(x) = \frac{1}{\mu(B_1)} \int_{B_1} u(\xi) \, d\mu(\xi) = \frac{1}{\mu(B_1)\mu(B_2)} \int_{B_1} \int_{B_2} u(\xi) \, d\mu(\eta) \, d\mu(\xi),$$

and

$$u_r(y) = \frac{1}{\mu(B_1)\mu(B_2)} \int_{B_1} \int_{B_2} u(\eta) \, d\mu(\eta) \, d\mu(\xi).$$

Assume that $\rho_{k+1} \leq 3r < \rho_k$, by the Hölder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} |u_r(x) - u_r(y)|^p &= \left(\frac{1}{\mu(B_1)\mu(B_2)} \int_{B_1} \int_{B_2} (u(\xi) - u(\eta)) \, d\mu(\eta) \, d\mu(\xi) \right)^p \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\mu(B_1)\mu(B_2)} \int_{B_1} \int_{B_2} |u(\xi) - u(\eta)|^p \, d\mu(\eta) \, d\mu(\xi) \\ &\leq C_1 \psi(r)^{-2} \int_K \left[\int_{B(\xi, 3r)} |u(\xi) - u(\eta)|^p \, d\mu(\eta) \right] \, d\mu(\xi) \\ &\leq C_2 \psi(r)^{-1} \phi(r)^{\frac{\beta}{\beta_p^*}} \sup_{r \in (0, 3d(x,y)]} \Phi_u^\beta(r), \end{aligned}$$

thus showing (4.16).

Next, let L be the set of μ -Lebesgue points of u , and fix $x \in L$. Define $r_0 = r$, $r_k = a^{-[k]_a} b^{-[k]_b} r$, we have $r_k + r_{k+1} \leq r_k + (a \wedge b)^{-1} r_k < 2r_k$ for $k \geq 0$. By (4.16), we can similarly show that, for any $u \in B_{p,\infty}^\beta$,

$$|u_{r_k}(x) - u_{r_{k+1}}(x)|^p \leq C_3 \psi(r_k)^{-1} \phi(r_k)^{\frac{\beta}{\beta_p^*}} \sup_{r \in (0, 3d(x,y)]} \Phi_u^\beta(r).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} |u(x) - u_r(x)| &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} |u_{r_k}(x) - u_{r_{k+1}}(x)| \\ &\leq C_3 \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \phi(r_k)^{\frac{\beta}{p\beta_p^*}} \psi(r_k)^{-1/p} \sup_{r \in (0, 3d(x,y)]} (\Phi_u^\beta(r))^{1/p} \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq C_4 \phi(r)^{\frac{\beta}{p\beta^*}} \psi(r)^{-1/p} \sup_{r \in (0, 3d(x,y)]} (\Phi_u^\beta(r))^{1/p} \quad (\text{similar to (4.9)}). \quad (4.17)$$

Similar inequality holds for $|u(y) - u_r(y)|$. Combining (4.16) and (4.17), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |u(x) - u(y)| &\leq |u(x) - u_r(x)| + |u_r(x) - u_r(y)| + |u_r(y) - u(y)| \\ &\leq C_5 \phi(r)^{\frac{\beta}{p\beta^*}} \psi(r)^{-1/p} \sup_{r \in (0, 3d(x,y)]} (\Phi_u^\beta(r))^{1/p} \\ &\leq C_5 \phi(r)^{\frac{\beta}{p\beta^*}} \psi(r)^{-1/p} [u]_{B_{p,\infty}^\beta} \end{aligned}$$

for all $x, y \in L$.

Finally, as $\phi(r)^{\frac{\beta}{p\beta^*}} \psi(r)^{-1} \rightarrow 0$ as $r \rightarrow 0$ by (4.11) with $\delta = 0$, we can use the standard procedure as in [GYZ23a, Lemma 2.1] to obtain a continuous version $\tilde{u} \in C(K)$ for any $u \in B_{p,\infty}^\beta$ and the desired inequality (4.15). \square

Proposition 4.5. *There exist $C > 1$ such that for any $\beta \in [0, \infty)$ and any $u \in L^p(K, \mu)$,*

$$C^{-1} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \Phi_u^\beta(\rho_n) \leq [u]_{B_{p,p}^\beta}^p \leq C \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \Phi_u^\beta(\rho_n). \quad (4.18)$$

In particular, $B_{p,p}^\beta$ is continuously embedded into $B_{p,\infty}^\beta$, namely, there exists $C > 0$ such that $[u]_{B_{p,\infty}^\beta}^p \leq C [u]_{B_{p,p}^\beta}^p$ for all $u \in L^p(K, \mu)$.

Proof. Splitting the integral domain $(0, 2]$ into $(\rho_{n+1}, \rho_n]$ ($n \geq 0$), we have by (4.3) that

$$\begin{aligned} [u]_{B_{p,p}^\beta}^p &= \int_0^2 \Phi_u^\beta(r) \frac{dr}{r} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \int_{\rho_{n+1}}^{\rho_n} \Phi_u^\beta(r) \frac{dr}{r} \\ &\leq C \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \int_{\rho_{n+1}}^{\rho_n} \Phi_u^\beta(\rho_n) \frac{dr}{r} \leq C \log(a \vee b) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \Phi_u^\beta(\rho_n) \end{aligned} \quad (4.19)$$

and

$$[u]_{B_{p,p}^\beta}^p = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \int_{\rho_{n+1}}^{\rho_n} \Phi_u^\beta(r) \frac{dr}{r} \geq C^{-1} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \Phi_u^\beta(\rho_{n+1}) \geq C^{-1} \log(a \wedge b) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \Phi_u^\beta(\rho_n). \quad (4.20)$$

Note that K satisfies the chain condition (see [GHL03, Definition 3.4]). Using a similar argument in [Yan18, Corollary 2.2], we can conclude that for all $n \geq 1$, there exists some constant $C(n) > 0$ such that

$$\Phi_u^\beta(\rho_n) \geq C(n)^{-1} \int_K \int_K |u(x) - u(y)|^p d\mu(y) d\mu(x) = C(n)^{-1} \Phi_u^\beta(\rho_0).$$

It follows by (4.20) that

$$[u]_{B_{p,p}^\beta}^p \geq c \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \Phi_u^\beta(\rho_n), \quad (4.21)$$

for some constant $c > 0$, thus showing (4.18) by (4.19) and (4.21). By (4.18) and (4.3), we see that exists $C > 0$ such that $[u]_{B_{p,\infty}^\beta}^p \leq C [u]_{B_{p,p}^\beta}^p$ and consequently $B_{p,p}^\beta \hookrightarrow B_{p,\infty}^\beta$. \square

Combining Lemma 4.4 and the above continuous embedding $B_{p,p}^\beta \hookrightarrow B_{p,\infty}^\beta$, we immediately derive the following Morrey-Sobolev's inequality for $B_{p,p}^\beta$.

Corollary 4.6. For $\beta \in (\epsilon_p \beta_p^*, \infty)$ and $u \in B_{p,p}^\beta$, there exists a continuous version $\tilde{u} \in C(K)$ such that

$$|\tilde{u}(x) - \tilde{u}(y)|^p \leq C \phi(d(x, y))^{\frac{\beta}{\beta_p^*}} \psi(d(x, y))^{-1} [u]_{B_{p,p}^\beta}^p$$

for all $x, y \in K$, where C is a positive constant.

Remark 4.7. In view of Lemma 4.4 and Corollary 4.6, we always regard $B_{p,\infty}^\beta$ and $B_{p,p}^\beta$ as subsets of $C(K)$ whenever $\beta \in (\epsilon_p \beta_p^*, \infty)$. That is, we represent every function u in $B_{p,\infty}^\beta, B_{p,p}^\beta$ by its continuous version. In particular, for such u , the energies in Definitions 3.1 and 4.1 are well-defined.

4.2 Norm equivalences and critical Besov exponent

In this subsection, we prove (1) and (2) of Theorem 1.4. The proofs are mainly adapted from [GYZ23b, Section 4] where the measure there is Ahlfors regular and the fractal there is self-similar. For any positive integer m , let μ_m be the Borel measure on V_m given by

$$\mu_m := \frac{1}{|V_m|} \sum_{a \in V_m} \delta_a.$$

Technically, we will use the discrete measures μ_m to approximate μ and convert the estimates of the integrations in (1.3) to the estimates of discrete sums. To be precise, denote the ball-energy

$$I_{m,n}(u) := \int_K \int_{B(x, \rho_n)} |u(x) - u(y)|^p d\mu_m(y) d\mu_m(x).$$

As μ_m weak $*$ -converges to μ , we have the weak $*$ -convergence of $\mu_m \times \mu_m$ to $\mu \times \mu$. For any $u \in C(K)$, the set of discontinuity points of $(x, y) \mapsto \mathbb{1}_{B(x, \rho_n)} |u(x) - u(y)|^p$ is $\mu \times \mu$ -null. By an argument similar to [GL20, Remark 1], we have that for any $\beta \in (\epsilon_p \beta_p^*, \infty)$ and any $u \in C(K)$, the following limit exists

$$I_{\infty,n}(u) := \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} I_{m,n}(u) = \int_K \int_{B(x, \rho_n)} |u(x) - u(y)|^p d\mu(y) d\mu(x).$$

Under this notion, we can see that

$$\Phi_u^\beta(r) \asymp \phi(\rho_n)^{-\frac{\beta}{\beta_p^*}} \psi(\rho_n)^{-1} I_{\infty,n}(u) \quad \text{for } \rho_{n+1} < r \leq \rho_n. \quad (4.22)$$

The following two lemmas compares the energies in Definitions 1.3 and 4.1.

Lemma 4.8. For any $\beta \in (\epsilon_p \beta_p^*, \infty)$, there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$I_{\infty,n}(u) \leq C \phi(\rho_n)^{\frac{\beta}{\beta_p^*}} \psi(\rho_n) \sup_{k \geq n} \mathcal{E}_k^\beta(u) \quad \text{for all } u \in C(K). \quad (4.23)$$

In other words,

$$\Phi_u^\beta(\rho_n) \leq C \sup_{k \geq n} \mathcal{E}_k^\beta(u) \quad \text{for all } u \in C(K). \quad (4.24)$$

Proof. We first estimate $I_{m,n}(u)$ for all integers $m > n \geq 0$. For any $x, y \in K$ with $d(x, y) \leq \rho_n$ and $x \in K_w$ for some $w \in W_n$, due to the geometry of K , there exist a word $\tilde{w} \in W_n$ (not necessarily distinct from w) such that $y \in K_{\tilde{w}}$ and $K_{\tilde{w}} \cap K_w \neq \emptyset$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} I_{m,n}(u) &\leq \sum_{\substack{w, \tilde{w} \in W_n \\ K_{\tilde{w}} \cap K_w \neq \emptyset}} \int_{K_w} \int_{K_{\tilde{w}}} |u(x) - u(y)|^p d\mu_m(y) d\mu_m(x) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{w, \tilde{w} \in W_n \\ K_{\tilde{w}} \cap K_w \neq \emptyset}} \sum_{x \in K_w \cap V_m} \sum_{y \in K_{\tilde{w}} \cap V_m} \frac{1}{|V_m|^2} |u(x) - u(y)|^p. \end{aligned}$$

For every pair $(w, \tilde{w}) \in W_n \times W_n$ with $K_{\tilde{w}} \cap K_w \neq \emptyset$, as in the proof of Proposition 2.3, there exists a common vertex $z \in K_w \cap K_{\tilde{w}} \cap V_n$. Moreover, since $|u(x) - u(y)|^p \leq 2^{p-1} (|u(x) - u(z)|^p + |u(z) - u(y)|^p)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_{m,n}(u) &\leq 2^{p-1} \sum_{w, \tilde{w} \in W_n} \sum_{x \in K_w \cap V_m} \sum_{y \in K_{\tilde{w}} \cap V_m} \frac{1}{|V_m|^2} (|u(x) - u(z)|^p + |u(z) - u(y)|^p) \\ &\leq C_1 \sum_{w \in W_n} \sum_{x \in K_w \cap V_m} \sum_{z \in K_w \cap V_n} \frac{|K_{\tilde{w}} \cap V_m|}{|V_m|^2} |u(x) - u(z)|^p \\ &\leq C_1 \psi(\rho_n) \psi(\rho_m) \sum_{w \in W_n} \sum_{x \in K_w \cap V_m} \sum_{z \in K_w \cap V_n} |u(x) - u(z)|^p, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used $|V_m| \asymp \psi(\rho_m)^{-1}$ and $|K_{\tilde{w}} \cap V_m| \asymp \psi(\rho_m)^{-1} \psi(\rho_n)$ in the third line.

Then we estimate $|u(x) - u(z)|^p$. For every $w \in W_n$, $x \in K_w \cap V_m$ and $z \in K_w \cap V_n$, we pick (and fix) a decreasing sequence of cells $\{K_{w_k}\}_{k=n}^m$ such that $w_k \in W_k$ with $z \in K_{w_n} \cap V_n$, $x \in K_{w_m} \cap V_m$. Then we obtain a sequence of vertices $\{z = x_n, x_{n+1}, \dots, x_m = x\}$ such that

$$x_k \in K_{w_k} \cap V_k \text{ for } k = n, \dots, m. \quad (4.25)$$

By Hölder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} |u(z) - u(x)|^p &\leq \left(\sum_{k=n}^{m-1} (\psi(\rho_n)^{-1} \psi(\rho_k))^{q/p} \right)^{p/q} \left(\sum_{k=n}^{m-1} \psi(\rho_n) \psi(\rho_k)^{-1} |u(x_k) - u(x_{k+1})|^p \right) \\ &\leq C_2 \sum_{k=n}^{m-1} \psi(\rho_n) \psi(\rho_k)^{-1} |u(x_k) - u(x_{k+1})|^p. \end{aligned}$$

Noting that the cardinality of $(x, z) \in (K_w \cap V_m) \times (K_w \cap V_n)$ with $(s, t) = (x_k, x_{k+1})$ is no greater than $C' \psi(\rho_k) \psi(\rho_m)^{-1}$ for some $C' > 0$, since cardinality of $K_w \cap V_n$ is uniformly bounded and cardinality of $K_w \cap V_m$ is equivalent to the total number of level- m cells located in the level- k cells containing x_k . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} I_{m,n}(u) &\leq C_3 \psi(\rho_n) \psi(\rho_m) \sum_{w \in W_n} \sum_{\substack{x \in K_w \cap V_m \\ z \in K_w \cap V_n}} \sum_{k=n}^{m-1} \psi(\rho_n) \psi(\rho_k)^{-1} |u(x_k) - u(x_{k+1})|^p \\ &\leq C_3 \psi(\rho_n) \psi(\rho_m) \sum_{w \in W_n} \sum_{k=n}^{m-1} \sum_{\substack{w' \in W_k \\ K_{w'} \subset K_w}} \sum_{\substack{(x,z) \in (K_w \cap V_m) \times (K_w \cap V_n) \\ (s,t) \in (K_{w'} \cap V_k) \times (K_{w'} \cap V_{k+1})}} \psi(\rho_n) \psi(\rho_k)^{-1} |u(s) - u(t)|^p \\ &\leq C_4 \psi(\rho_n) \psi(\rho_m) \sum_{w \in W_n} \sum_{k=n}^{m-1} \sum_{\substack{w' \in W_k \\ K_{w'} \subset K_w}} \sum_{s,t \in K_{w'} \cap V_{k+1}} \psi(\rho_m)^{-1} \psi(\rho_n) |u(s) - u(t)|^p \\ &= C_4 \psi(\rho_n)^2 \sum_{k=n}^{m-1} \sum_{w \in W_n} \sum_{\substack{w' \in W_k \\ K_{w'} \subset K_w}} \sum_{s,t \in K_{w'} \cap V_{k+1}} |u(s) - u(t)|^p \\ &\leq C_5 \psi(\rho_n)^2 \sum_{k=n}^{m-1} \sum_{\substack{s,t \in V_{k+1} \\ s \sim t}} |u(s) - u(t)|^p \\ &\leq 2C_5 \psi(\rho_n)^2 \sum_{k=n}^m \phi(\rho_k)^{\frac{\beta}{\beta-p}} \psi(\rho_k)^{-1} \sup_{k \geq n} \mathcal{E}_k^\beta(u) \quad (\text{by (4.4)}), \end{aligned} \quad (4.26)$$

where in the second inequality we have used the fact that $(s, t) = (x_k, x_{k+1}) \in (K_{w'} \cap V_k) \times (K_{w'} \cap V_{k+1})$ with $w' = w_k$ by (4.25), and in the third inequality we use $(K_{w'} \cap V_k) \subset (K_{w'} \cap V_{k+1})$. Therefore, we obtain

by (4.26) and (4.9) with $\delta = 0$ that

$$I_{m,n}(u) \leq C_6 \psi(\rho_n)^2 \phi(\rho_n)^{\frac{\beta}{\beta_p}} \psi^{-1}(\rho_n) \sup_{k \geq n} \mathcal{E}_k^\beta(u) = C_6 \phi(\rho_n)^{\frac{\beta}{\beta_p}} \psi(\rho_n) \sup_{k \geq n} \mathcal{E}_k^\beta(u).$$

Let $m \rightarrow \infty$ and we complete the proof. \square

Denote the *ring-energy* by

$$I_n(u) := \int_K \int_{\{\rho_{n+1} \leq d(x,y) < \rho_n\}} |u(x) - u(y)|^p d\mu(y) d\mu(x).$$

Lemma 4.9. For $\beta \in (\epsilon_p \beta_p^*, \infty)$ and $u \in C(K)$, we have

$$\mathcal{E}_n^\beta(u) \leq C \sup_{k \geq n} \Phi_u^\beta(\rho_k). \quad (4.27)$$

Proof. For $s, t \in V_n$ with $s \sim t$, there exists some $w \in W_n$ such that $s, t \in K_w \cap V_n$. Note that for any $x \in K_w$,

$$|u(s) - u(t)|^p \leq 2^{p-1} (|u(s) - u(x)|^p + |u(x) - u(t)|^p).$$

Integrating with respect to x and dividing by $\mu(K_w)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{s,t \in V_n \\ s \sim t}} |u(s) - u(t)|^p &= \sum_{w \in W_n} \sum_{s,t \in K_w \cap V_n} |u(s) - u(t)|^p \\ &\leq 2^{p-1} \sum_{w \in W_n} \sum_{s,t \in K_w \cap V_n} \int_{K_w} |u(s) - u(x)|^p + |u(x) - u(t)|^p d\mu(x) \\ &\leq C_1 \sum_{w \in W_n} \sum_{s \in K_w \cap V_n} \int_{K_w} |u(s) - u(x)|^p d\mu(x). \end{aligned} \quad (4.28)$$

For every $m \geq n+1$ and $s \in K_w \cap V_n$ with $w \in W_n$, we can find (and fix) a decreasing sequence of cells $\{K_{w_k}\}_{k=n}^m$ such that $s \in \cap_{k=n}^m K_{w_k}$ with $w_n = w$, $w_k \in W_k$. Let

$$\delta \in \left(0, \left(\frac{\beta}{\beta_p^*} \beta_a^{(p)} - \alpha_a\right) \wedge \left(\frac{\beta}{\beta_p^*} \beta_b^{(p)} - \alpha_b\right)\right). \quad (4.29)$$

By the Hölder's inequality, we have all $x_k \in K_{w_k}$ that

$$\begin{aligned} &|u(s) - u(x_n)|^p \\ &\leq 2^{p-1} |u(s) - u(x_m)|^p + 2^{p-1} \left(\sum_{k=n}^{m-1} (\rho_n^{-\delta} \rho_k^\delta)^{q/p}\right)^{p/q} \left(\sum_{k=n}^{m-1} \rho_n^\delta \rho_k^{-\delta} |u(x_k) - u(x_{k+1})|^p\right) \\ &\leq 2^{p-1} |u(s) - u(x_m)|^p + C_2 \left(\sum_{k=n}^{m-1} \rho_n^\delta \rho_k^{-\delta} |u(x_k) - u(x_{k+1})|^p\right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.30)$$

Integrating (4.30) with respect to $x_k \in K_{w_k}$ and dividing by $\mu(K_{w_k})$ for all $n \leq k \leq m$ successively, then combining with (4.28), we have for any $m \geq n+1$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{s,t \in V_n \\ s \sim t}} |u(s) - u(t)|^p &\leq C_3 \left(\sum_{w \in W_n} \sum_{s \in K_w \cap V_n} \int_{K_{w_m}} |u(s) - u(x_m)|^p d\mu(x_m) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{w \in W_n} \sum_{s \in K_w \cap V_n} \sum_{k=n}^{m-1} \rho_n^\delta \rho_k^{-\delta} \int_{K_{w_k}} \int_{K_{w_{k+1}}} |u(x_k) - u(x_{k+1})|^p d\mu(x_{k+1}) d\mu(x_k) \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$:= C_3 (J_1(n, m) + J_2(n, m)) \quad (4.31)$$

For $s, x_m \in K_{w_m}$,

$$|u(s) - u(x_m)| \leq \underset{K_{w_m}}{\text{Osc}} u,$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} J_1(n, m) &= \sum_{w \in W_n} \sum_{s \in K_w \cap V_n} \frac{1}{\mu(K_{w_m})} \int_{K_{w_m}} |u(s) - u(x_m)|^p d\mu(x_m) \\ &\leq |V_n| \left(\underset{K_{w_m}}{\text{Osc}} u \right)^p \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } m \rightarrow \infty, \end{aligned} \quad (4.32)$$

since u is uniformly continuous on the compact set K .

On the other hand, for all $x_k \in K_{w_k}, x_{k+1} \in K_{w_{k+1}}$, we have $|x_k - x_{k+1}| \leq \rho_k$, thus

$$\begin{aligned} J_2(n, m) &= \sum_{w \in W_n} \sum_{s \in K_w \cap V_n} \sum_{k=n}^{m-1} \frac{\rho_n^\delta \rho_k^{-\delta}}{\mu(K_{w_k}) \mu(K_{w_{k+1}})} \int_{K_{w_k}} \int_{K_{w_{k+1}}} |u(x_k) - u(x_{k+1})|^p d\mu(x_{k+1}) d\mu(x_k) \\ &\leq C_4 \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \rho_n^\delta \rho_k^{-\delta} \psi(\rho_k)^{-2} \int_K \int_{B(x, \rho_k)} |u(x) - u(y)|^p d\mu(y) d\mu(x) \end{aligned} \quad (4.33)$$

$$\leq C_4 \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \rho_n^\delta \rho_{n+k}^{-\delta} \psi(\rho_{n+k})^{-2} \cdot \sum_{l=k}^{\infty} I_{n+l}(u) = C_4 \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{k=0}^l \rho_n^\delta \rho_{n+k}^{-\delta} \psi(\rho_{n+k})^{-2} \right) I_{n+l}(u)$$

$$\leq C_5 \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \rho_n^\delta \rho_{n+k}^{-\delta} \psi(\rho_{n+k})^{-2} I_{n+k}(u), \quad (4.34)$$

where in the last inequality we have used the fact that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^l \frac{\rho_{n+k}^{-\delta} \psi(\rho_{n+k})^{-2}}{\rho_{n+l}^{-\delta} \psi(\rho_{n+l})^{-2}} &= \sum_{k=0}^l \left(\frac{\rho_{n+l}}{\rho_{n+k}} \right)^\delta \left(\frac{\psi(\rho_{n+l})}{\psi(\rho_{n+k})} \right)^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{k=0}^l (a \wedge b)^{-\delta(l-k)} (2a \wedge b - 1)^{-2(l-k)} < \left(1 - (a \wedge b)^{-(\delta+2)} \right)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

By definition of $\mathcal{E}_n^\beta(u)$ and (4.31), we have for any $m \geq n+1$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_n^\beta(u) &= \frac{1}{2} \phi(\rho_n)^{-\frac{\beta}{\beta^*}} \psi(\rho_n) \sum_{x, y \in V_n, x \sim y} |u(x) - u(y)|^p \\ &\leq C_3 \phi(\rho_n)^{-\frac{\beta}{\beta^*}} \psi(\rho_n) (J_1(n, m) + J_2(n, m)). \end{aligned}$$

Letting $m \rightarrow \infty$, we see by (4.32) that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_n^\beta(u) &\leq C_3 \phi(\rho_n)^{-\frac{\beta}{\beta^*}} \psi(\rho_n) \sup_{m \geq n+1} J_2(n, m) \\ &\leq C_6 \phi(\rho_n)^{-\frac{\beta}{\beta^*}} \psi(\rho_n) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \rho_n^\delta \rho_{n+k}^{-\delta} \psi(\rho_{n+k})^{-2} I_{n+k}(u) \text{ (by (4.34))} \\ &\leq C_7 \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\phi(\rho_n)}{\phi(\rho_{n+k})} \right)^{-\frac{\beta}{\beta^*}} \left(\frac{\psi(\rho_n)}{\psi(\rho_{n+k})} \right) \left(\frac{\rho_n}{\rho_{n+k}} \right)^\delta \sup_{k \geq n} \Phi_u^\beta(\rho_k) \end{aligned} \quad (4.35)$$

$$\leq C_8 \sup_{k \geq n} \Phi_u^\beta(\rho_k) \quad (\text{by (4.9)}),$$

where the third inequality used the fact that $I_{k+n}(u) \leq I_{\infty, k+n}(u)$ and (4.22). The proof is complete. \square

The following lemma shows the equivalence between $[\cdot]_{B_{p,p}^\beta}^p$ and $\mathcal{E}_{p,p}^\beta$.

Lemma 4.10. *If $\beta \in (\epsilon_p \beta_p^*, \infty)$, then there exists $C > 0$ such that for all $u \in C(K)$,*

$$C^{-1}[u]_{B_{p,p}^\beta}^p \leq \mathcal{E}_{p,p}^\beta(u) \leq C[u]_{B_{p,p}^\beta}^p. \quad (4.36)$$

Proof. Using the same argument as in (4.26), for $l \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \phi(\rho_n)^{-\frac{\beta}{\beta_p^*}} \psi(\rho_n)^{-1} I_{n+l,n}(u) \\ & \leq C_1 \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \phi(\rho_n)^{-\frac{\beta}{\beta_p^*}} \psi(\rho_n) \sum_{k=n}^{n+l} \sum_{\substack{x,y \in V_k \\ x \sim y}} |u(x) - u(y)|^p \\ & = C_1 \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{n=0}^k \phi(\rho_n)^{-\frac{\beta}{\beta_p^*}} \psi(\rho_n) \sum_{\substack{x,y \in V_k \\ x \sim y}} |u(x) - u(y)|^p \\ & \leq C_2 \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \phi(\rho_k)^{-\frac{\beta}{\beta_p^*}} \psi(\rho_k) \sum_{\substack{x,y \in V_k \\ x \sim y}} |u(x) - u(y)|^p \quad (\text{by (4.10) with } \delta = 0) \\ & = 2C_2 \mathcal{E}_{p,p}^\beta(u). \end{aligned} \quad (4.37)$$

Letting $l \rightarrow \infty$ and applying Fatou's lemma in (4.37), the left-hand inequality of (4.36) follows by (4.21).

On the other hand, fix δ as required in (4.29), then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{p,p}^\beta(u) &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{E}_n^\beta(u) \leq C_3 \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \phi(\rho_n)^{-\frac{\beta}{\beta_p^*}} \psi(\rho_n) \sup_{m \geq n+1} J_2(n, m) \quad (\text{by (4.35)}) \\ &\leq C_3 \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \phi(\rho_n)^{-\frac{\beta}{\beta_p^*}} \psi(\rho_n) \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \rho_n^\delta \rho_k^{-\delta} \psi(\rho_k)^{-2} \int_K \int_{B(x, \rho_k)} |u(x) - u(y)|^p d\mu(y) d\mu(x) \quad (\text{by (4.33)}) \\ &\leq C_4 \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{n=0}^k \frac{\phi(\rho_n)^{-\beta/\beta_p^*} \psi(\rho_n) \rho_n^\delta}{\phi(\rho_k)^{-\beta/\beta_p^*} \psi(\rho_k) \rho_k^\delta} \right) \Phi_u^\beta(\rho_k) \quad (\text{by (4.22)}) \\ &\leq C_5 \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \Phi_u^\beta(\rho_k) \leq C_5 [u]_{B_{p,p}^\beta}^p \quad (\text{by (4.10) and (4.19)}), \end{aligned}$$

showing the right-hand inequality of (4.36). \square

Proof of Theorem 1.4 (1) and (2).

(1) Taking limsup and sup (of n) on both sides of (4.24) and (4.27) respectively, we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_n^\beta(u) \asymp \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_u^\beta(\rho_n) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{E}_{p,\infty}^\beta(u) \asymp [u]_{B_{p,\infty}^\beta}^p. \quad (4.38)$$

Combining Lemma 4.10, we complete the proof.

(2) Given any $\beta > \beta_p^*$ and any $u \in B_{p,\infty}^\beta$, we first have

$$\sup_{r \in (0,2]} \Phi_u^{\beta_p^*}(r) = \sup_{r \in (0,2]} \phi(r)^{\frac{\beta}{\beta_p^*} - 1} \Phi_u^\beta(r) \leq C \sup_{r \in (0,2]} \Phi_u^\beta(r) = C [u]_{B_{p,\infty}^\beta}^p,$$

which implies $u \in B_{p,\infty}^{\beta_p^*}$. Since $\beta_p^* \in (\epsilon_p \beta_p^*, \infty)$, it follows from (4.5), (4.38) and (4.3) that

$$\sup_{r \in (0,2]} \Phi_{u^p}^{\beta_p^*}(r) \asymp \sup_{n \geq 0} \Phi_{u^p}^{\beta_p^*}(\rho_n) \leq C \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_{u^p}^{\beta_p^*}(\rho_n) \asymp C \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \Phi_{u^p}^{\beta_p^*}(r).$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{r \in (0,2]} \Phi_{u^p}^{\beta_p^*}(r) &\leq C \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \Phi_{u^p}^{\beta_p^*}(r) = C \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \phi(r)^{\frac{\beta_p^*}{\beta_p^*} - 1} \Phi_u^\beta(r) \\ &\leq C \sup_{r \in (0,2]} \Phi_u^\beta(r) \cdot \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \phi(r)^{\frac{\beta_p^*}{\beta_p^*} - 1} \\ &= C [u]_{B_{p,\infty}^\beta}^p \cdot \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \phi(r)^{\frac{\beta_p^*}{\beta_p^*} - 1} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\Phi_{u^p}^{\beta_p^*}(r) \equiv 0$ for all $r > 0$ which implies that u is constant by its continuity. On the other hand, Lemma 3.4 shows that $\mathcal{F}_p = B_{p,\infty}^{\beta_p^*}$ contains all piecewise affine functions, which can be chosen to be non-constant, proving (1.4). \square

4.3 Weak monotonicity property and BBM convergence

We now modify the proofs in [GYZ23b, Lemma 4.12] to show the weak monotonicity property in Theorem 1.4 (3). The crucial element is the following lemma that gives the upper bound of semi-norms by the lower limit of $\Phi_{u^p}^{\beta_p^*}(r)$.

Lemma 4.11. *There exists $C > 0$ such that for all $u \in \mathcal{F}_p = B_{p,\infty}^{\beta_p^*}$,*

$$\mathcal{E}_p(u) = \mathcal{E}_{p,\infty}^{\beta_p^*}(u) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_n^{\beta_p^*}(u) \leq C \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_{u^p}^{\beta_p^*}(\rho_n). \quad (4.39)$$

Proof. The proof is based on the monotonicity of discrete p -energy norms. We first have

$$\begin{aligned} I_n(u) &\leq I_{\infty,n}(u) \\ &\leq C_1 \phi(\rho_n) \psi(\rho_n) \sup_{k \geq n} \mathcal{E}_k^{\beta_p^*}(u) \quad (\text{by (4.23)}) \\ &= C_1 \phi(\rho_n) \psi(\rho_n) \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_n^{\beta_p^*}(u) \quad (\text{by (3.3)}). \end{aligned} \quad (4.40)$$

Since $\beta_p^* \in (\epsilon_p \beta_p^*, \infty)$ and $\beta_l^{(p)} - \alpha_l = p - 1$ for $l \in \{a, b\}$, we fix a $\delta \in (0, p - 1)$ as in (4.8) with $\beta = \beta_p^*$. Using the fact that $\phi(\rho_n) \psi(\rho_n)^{-1} = \rho_n^{p-1}$ and (4.40), we see that for any $L \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=L+1}^{\infty} \psi(\rho_{n+k})^{-2} \rho_{n+k}^{-\delta} I_{n+k}(u) &\leq C_1 \sum_{k=L+1}^{\infty} \phi(\rho_{n+k}) \psi(\rho_{n+k})^{-1} \rho_{n+k}^{-\delta} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_n^{\beta_p^*}(u) \\ &= C_1 \sum_{k=L+1}^{\infty} \rho_{n+k}^{p-1-\delta} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_n^{\beta_p^*}(u) \leq C_2 \rho_{n+L+1}^{p-1-\delta} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_n^{\beta_p^*}(u), \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we have used (4.9) with $\beta = \beta_p^*$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_n^{1-p+\delta} \sum_{k=L+1}^{\infty} \psi(\rho_{n+k})^{-2} \rho_{n+k}^{-\delta} I_{n+k}(u) &\leq C_2 \left(\frac{\rho_{n+L+1}}{\rho_n} \right)^{p-1-\delta} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_n^{\beta_p^*}(u) \\ &\leq C_2 (a \wedge b)^{(-p+1+\delta)(L+1)} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_n^{\beta_p^*}(u). \end{aligned} \quad (4.41)$$

We know by (4.35) that,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}_n^{\beta_p^*}(u) &\leq C_3 \phi(\rho_n)^{-1} \psi(\rho_n) \rho_n^\delta \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \psi(\rho_{n+k})^{-2} \rho_{n+k}^{-\delta} I_{k+n}(u) \\
&= C_3 \rho_n^{1-p+\delta} \left(\sum_{k=0}^L + \sum_{k=L+1}^{\infty} \right) \psi(\rho_{n+k})^{-2} \rho_{n+k}^{-\delta} I_{k+n}(u) \\
&\leq C_3 \rho_n^{1-p+\delta} \sum_{k=0}^L \psi(\rho_{n+k})^{-2} \rho_{n+k}^{-\delta} I_{n+k}(u) + C_3 C_2 (a \wedge b)^{-(p+1+\delta)(L+1)} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_n^{\beta_p^*}(u),
\end{aligned}$$

where (4.41) is used in the last inequality. Taking $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty}$ on the right-hand side above, we have

$$C_4 \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_n^{\beta_p^*}(u) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_n^{1-p+\delta} \sum_{k=0}^L \psi(\rho_{n+k})^{-2} \rho_{n+k}^{-\delta} I_{n+k}(u),$$

where

$$C_4 = \frac{1}{C_3} - C_2 (a \wedge b)^{-(p-1-\delta)(L+1)}.$$

Fix L large enough such that $C_4 > 0$, then for every $0 \leq k \leq L$,

$$\left(\frac{\psi(\rho_n)}{\psi(\rho_{n+k})} \right)^2 \left(\frac{\rho_n}{\rho_{n+k}} \right)^\delta \leq \left(\frac{\psi(\rho_n)}{\psi(\rho_{n+L})} \right)^2 \left(\frac{\rho_n}{\rho_{n+L}} \right)^\delta \leq 4^L (a \vee b)^{(2+\delta)L}$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
C_4 \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_n^{\beta_p^*}(u) &\leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{\rho_n^{1-p}}{\psi(\rho_n)^2} \sum_{k=0}^L \left(\frac{\psi(\rho_n)}{\psi(\rho_{n+k})} \right)^2 \left(\frac{\rho_n}{\rho_{n+k}} \right)^\delta I_{n+k}(u) \right) \\
&\leq C_5 \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \phi(\rho_n)^{-1} \psi(\rho_n)^{-1} \sum_{k=0}^L I_{n+k}(u) \\
&\leq C_5 \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \phi(\rho_n)^{-1} \psi(\rho_n)^{-1} I_{\infty,n}(u) \\
&\leq C_6 \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_u^{\beta_p^*}(\rho_n) \quad (\text{by (4.22)}).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus (4.39) holds with $C = C_6/C_4$. □

We are ready to prove the weak monotonicity property and BBM convergence.

Proof of Theorem 1.4 (3) and (4).

(3) For any $u \in B_{p,\infty}^{\beta_p^*} = \mathcal{F}_p$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{r \in (0,2]} \Phi_u^{\beta_p^*}(r) &\leq C_1 \sup_{n \geq 0} \mathcal{E}_n^{\beta_p^*}(u) \quad (\text{by (4.38)}) \\
&= C_1 \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_n^{\beta_p^*}(u) \quad (\text{by (3.3)}) \\
&\leq C_2 \liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \Phi_u^{\beta_p^*}(r) \quad (\text{by (4.39)}).
\end{aligned}$$

(4) We first show (1.5). Fix a function $u \in B_{p,\infty}^{\beta_p^*} = \mathcal{F}_p$. By (4.12), for any $\beta < \beta_p^*$,

$$(\beta_p^* - \beta) \mathcal{E}_{p,p}^\beta(u) = (\beta_p^* - \beta) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \phi(\rho_n)^{1-\frac{\beta}{\beta_p^*}} \mathcal{E}_n^{\beta_p^*}(u)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq (\beta_p^* - \beta) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \phi(\rho_n)^{1 - \frac{\beta}{\beta_p^*}} \mathcal{E}_{p,\infty}^{\beta_p^*}(u) \\
&\leq \beta_p^* \left(1 - \frac{\beta}{\beta_p^*}\right) \left(1 - (t_a \wedge t_b)^{-1 + \frac{\beta}{\beta_p^*}}\right)^{-1} \mathcal{E}_{p,\infty}^{\beta_p^*}(u),
\end{aligned}$$

where $t_a = a^{p-1}(2a-1)$, $t_b = b^{p-1}(2b-1)$. Therefore,

$$\limsup_{\beta \uparrow \beta_p^*} (\beta_p^* - \beta) \mathcal{E}_{p,p}^\beta(u) \leq \frac{\beta_p^*}{\log(t_a \wedge t_b)} \mathcal{E}_{p,\infty}^{\beta_p^*}(u). \quad (4.42)$$

On the other hand, for any $A < \mathcal{E}_{p,\infty}^{\beta_p^*}(u)$, there exists $N \geq 1$ such that $\mathcal{E}_n^{\beta_p^*}(u) > A$ for all $n > N$. Similarly, by (4.12) again,

$$\begin{aligned}
(\beta_p^* - \beta) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \phi(\rho_n)^{1 - \frac{\beta}{\beta_p^*}} \mathcal{E}_n^{\beta_p^*}(u) &> (\beta_p^* - \beta) \sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} \phi(\rho_n)^{1 - \frac{\beta}{\beta_p^*}} A \\
&\geq (\beta_p^* - \beta) \left(1 - (t_a \vee t_b)^{\frac{\beta}{\beta_p^*} - 1}\right)^{-1} \phi(\rho_{N+1})^{1 - \frac{\beta}{\beta_p^*}} A \\
&\geq \beta_p^* \left(1 - \frac{\beta}{\beta_p^*}\right) \frac{(t_a \vee t_b)^{(N+1)\left(\frac{\beta}{\beta_p^*} - 1\right)}}{1 - (t_a \vee t_b)^{\frac{\beta}{\beta_p^*} - 1}} A.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\liminf_{\beta \uparrow \beta_p^*} (\beta_p^* - \beta) \mathcal{E}_{p,p}^\beta(u) \geq \frac{\beta_p^*}{\log(t_a \vee t_b)} A,$$

for any $A < \mathcal{E}_{p,\infty}^{\beta_p^*}(u)$. Letting $A \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_{p,\infty}^{\beta_p^*}(u)$, we obtain

$$\liminf_{\beta \uparrow \beta_p^*} (\beta_p^* - \beta) \mathcal{E}_{p,p}^\beta(u) \geq \frac{\beta_p^*}{\log(t_a \vee t_b)} \mathcal{E}_{p,\infty}^{\beta_p^*}(u). \quad (4.43)$$

Then (1.5) follows by combining (4.43) with (4.42). The convergence in (1.6) is a consequence of (1.5) and Theorem 1.4 (1). □

Remark 4.12. If we define Korevaar-Schoen norms by

$$\|u\|_{\text{KS}_{p,\infty}^\beta} := \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \Phi_u^\beta(r),$$

then its corresponding BBM convergence, that is, (1.6) with $\|\cdot\|_{\text{KS}_{p,\infty}^{\beta_p^*}}$ in-place of $\|\cdot\|_{B_{p,\infty}^{\beta_p^*}}$, also holds by (4.38) and (4.5).

Declarations

- **Funding:** The authors were supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (12271282). The first author was also supported by China Scholarship Council (202306210073).
- **Conflict of interest:** The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.
- **Data availability:** Data sharing not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated or analysed during the current study. Our manuscript has no associated data.

References

- [AKT20] Jasmina Angelevska, Antti Käenmäki, and Sascha Troscheit. Self-conformal sets with positive Hausdorff measure. *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.*, 52(1):200–223, 2020. doi:10.1112/blms.12320.

- [Bau23] Fabrice Baudoin. Korevaar-schoen-sobolev spaces and critical exponents in metric measure spaces, 2023. [arXiv:2207.12191](#).
- [BC23] Fabrice Baudoin and Li Chen. Sobolev spaces and Poincaré inequalities on the Vicsek fractal. *Ann. Fenn. Math.*, 48(1):3–26, 2023. [doi:10.54330/afm.122168](#).
- [BC24] Fabrice Baudoin and Li Chen. Heat kernel gradient estimates for the vicsek set, 2024. [arXiv:2311.03499](#).
- [BH97] M. T. Barlow and B. M. Hambly. Transition density estimates for Brownian motion on scale irregular Sierpinski gaskets. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.*, 33(5):531–557, 1997. [doi:10.1016/S0246-0203\(97\)80104-5](#).
- [Bre11] Haim Brezis. *Functional analysis, Sobolev spaces and partial differential equations*. Universitext. Springer, New York, 2011.
- [CF12] Zhen-Qing Chen and Masatoshi Fukushima. *Symmetric Markov processes, time change, and boundary theory*, volume 35 of *London Mathematical Society Monographs Series*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2012.
- [CGQ22] Shiping Cao, Qingsong Gu, and Hua Qiu. p -energies on p.c.f. self-similar sets. *Adv. Math.*, 405:Paper No. 108517, 58, 2022. [doi:10.1016/j.aim.2022.108517](#).
- [Cla36] James A. Clarkson. Uniformly convex spaces. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 40(3):396–414, 1936. [doi:10.2307/1989630](#).
- [DRY23] Baptiste Devyver, Emmanuel Russ, and Meng Yang. Gradient estimate for the heat kernel on some fractal-like cable systems and quasi-Riesz transforms. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (18):15537–15583, 2023. [doi:10.1093/imrn/rnac287](#).
- [Fal86] Kenneth J. Falconer. *The geometry of fractal sets*, volume 85 of *Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1986.
- [Fal97] Kenneth J. Falconer. *Techniques in fractal geometry*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Chichester, 1997.
- [FHZ23] Kenneth J. Falconer, Jiaxin Hu, and Junda Zhang. A dichotomy on the self-similarity of graph-directed attractors. *J. Fractal Geom.*, 11(1):161–204, 2024. [doi:10.4171/JFG/140](#).
- [FOT11] Masatoshi Fukushima, Yoichi Oshima, and Masayoshi Takeda. *Dirichlet forms and symmetric Markov processes*, volume 19 of *De Gruyter Studies in Mathematics*. Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, extended edition, 2011.
- [GHL03] Alexander Grigor’yan, Jiaxin Hu, and Ka-Sing Lau. Heat kernels on metric measure spaces and an application to semilinear elliptic equations. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 355(5):2065–2095, 2003. [doi:10.1090/S0002-9947-03-03211-2](#).
- [GL20] Qingsong Gu and Ka-Sing Lau. Dirichlet forms and convergence of Besov norms on self-similar sets. *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math.*, 45(2):625–646, 2020. [doi:10.5186/aasfm.2020.4536](#).
- [GYZ23a] Jin Gao, Zhenyu Yu, and Junda Zhang. Convergence of p -energy forms on homogeneous p.c.f. self-similar sets. *Potential Anal.*, 59(4):1851–1874, 2023. [doi:10.1007/s11118-022-10031-y](#).
- [GYZ23b] Jin Gao, Zhenyu Yu, and Junda Zhang. Heat kernel-based p -energy norms on metric measure spaces, 2023. [arXiv:2303.10414](#).
- [Ham92] B. M. Hambly. Brownian motion on a homogeneous random fractal. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 94(1):1–38, 1992. [doi:10.1007/BF01222507](#).

- [Hin05] Masanori Hino. On singularity of energy measures on self-similar sets. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 132(2):265–290, 2005. doi:10.1007/s00440-004-0396-1.
- [Hin10] Masanori Hino. Energy measures and indices of Dirichlet forms, with applications to derivatives on some fractals. *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3)*, 100(1):269–302, 2010. doi:10.1112/plms/pdp032.
- [HPS04] P. Edward Herman, Roberto Peirone, and Robert S. Strichartz. p -energy and p -harmonic functions on Sierpinski gasket type fractals. *Potential Anal.*, 20(2):125–148, 2004. doi:10.1023/A:1026377524793.
- [HRWW00] Su Hua, Hui Rao, Zhiying Wen, and Jun Wu. On the structures and dimensions of Moran sets. *Sci. China Ser. A*, 43(8):836–852, 2000. doi:10.1007/BF02884183.
- [Jon96] Alf Jonsson. Brownian motion on fractals and function spaces. *Math. Z.*, 222(3):495–504, 1996. doi:10.1007/PL00004543.
- [JW84] Alf Jonsson and Hans Wallin. Function spaces on subsets of \mathbf{R}^n . *Math. Rep.*, 2(1):xiv+221, 1984.
- [Kak39] Shizuo Kakutani. Weak convergence in uniformly convex spaces. *Tohoku Mathematical Journal, First Series*, 45:188–193, 1939.
- [Kig23] Jun Kigami. *Conductive homogeneity of compact metric spaces and construction of p -energy*, volume 5 of *Memoirs of the European Mathematical Society*. European Mathematical Society (EMS), Berlin, [2023] ©2023. doi:10.4171/mems/5.
- [KS93] Nicholas J. Korevaar and Richard M. Schoen. Sobolev spaces and harmonic maps for metric space targets. *Comm. Anal. Geom.*, 1(3-4):561–659, 1993. doi:10.4310/CAG.1993.v1.n4.a4.
- [Kuw24] Kazuhiro Kuwae. $(1,p)$ -sobolev spaces based on strongly local dirichlet forms, 2024. arXiv:2310.11652.
- [MS23] Mathav Murugan and Ryosuke Shimizu. First-order sobolev spaces, self-similar energies and energy measures on the sierpiński carpet, 2023. arXiv:2308.06232.
- [Mur19] Mathav Murugan. Quasisymmetric uniformization and heat kernel estimates. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 372(6):4177–4209, 2019. doi:10.1090/tran/7713.
- [Shi24] Ryosuke Shimizu. Construction of p -energy and associated energy measures on Sierpiński carpets. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 377(2):951–1032, 2024. doi:10.1090/tran/9036.
- [Yan18] Meng Yang. Equivalent semi-norms of non-local Dirichlet forms on the Sierpiński gasket and applications. *Potential Anal.*, 49(2):287–308, 2018. doi:10.1007/s11118-017-9657-3.