

# TOPOLOGY AUTOMATON AND HÖLDER EQUIVALENCE OF BARAŃSKI CARPETS

YUNJIE ZHU, LIANG-YI HUANG<sup>†</sup>, AND CHUNBO CHENG

**ABSTRACT.** The study of Lipschitz equivalence of fractals is a very active topic in recent years. In 2023, Huang *et al.* (*Topology automaton of self-similar sets and its applications to metrical classifications*, *Nonlinearity* **36** (2023), 2541-2566.) studied the Hölder and Lipschitz equivalence of a class of p.c.f. self-similar sets which are not totally disconnected. The main tool they used is the so called topology automaton. In this paper, we define topology automaton for Barański carpets, and we show that the method used in Huang *et al.* still works for the self-affine and non-p.c.f. settings. As an application, we obtain a very general sufficient condition for Barański carpets to be Hölder (or Lipschitz) equivalent.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

To determine whether two metric spaces are homeomorphic, quasi-symmetric or Lipschitz equivalent is an important and active topic in analysis. In recent years, there are a lot of works devoted to the quasi-symmetric equivalence of fractal sets, see [6–8, 12, 18, 32]. Since 1990, the study of bi-Lipschitz classification of self-similar sets becomes hot and abundant results have been obtained, see [10, 13, 14, 20, 27, 29, 31, 35]. However, most of the studies in literature focus on self-similar sets which are totally disconnected.

Lately, Huang, Wen, Yang and Zhu [16] introduced a notion of topology automaton for posted-critically finite (p.c.f.) fractals. Using this new tool, they give sufficient conditions for Hölder or Lipschitz equivalence of a class of self-similar sets, called fractal gaskets, which are not totally disconnected.

In this paper, we define topology automaton for Barański carpets. Then following the approach of Huang *et al.*, we use topology automaton to study the Hölder and Lipschitz equivalence of Barański carpets.

---

*Date:* January 15, 2025.

This work is supported by NSFC No. 12401110 and No. 62206088.

<sup>†</sup> Corresponding author.

**2020 Mathematics Subject Classification:** 26A16, 28A12, 28A80.

**Key words and phrases:** topology automaton, Barański carpet, Hölder equivalence.

Two metric spaces (or pseudo-metric spaces)  $(X, d_X)$  and  $(Y, d_Y)$  are said to be *Hölder equivalent*, denoted by  $X \stackrel{\text{Hölder}}{\simeq} Y$ , if there is a bijection  $f : X \rightarrow Y$ , and constants  $s, C > 0$  such that

$$(1.1) \quad C^{-1}d_X(x_1, x_2)^{1/s} \leq d_Y(f(x_1), f(x_2)) \leq Cd_X(x_1, x_2)^s, \quad \forall x_1, x_2 \in X.$$

In this case, we say  $f$  is a *bi-Hölder map* with index  $s$ . If  $s = 1$ , we say  $X$  and  $Y$  are *Lipschitz equivalent*, denoted by  $X \simeq Y$ , and call  $f$  a *bi-Lipschitz map*.

First, let us recall the definition of Barański carpet. Let  $n, m \geq 2$  be two integers. Let  $(f_i)_{i=0}^{n-1}$  and  $(g_j)_{j=0}^{m-1}$  be two collections of contracting similarities of  $[0, 1]$  with positive contraction ratios such that

$$[0, 1) = f_0[0, 1) \cup \cdots \cup f_{n-1}[0, 1) \text{ and } [0, 1) = g_0[0, 1) \cup \cdots \cup g_{m-1}[0, 1)$$

be two partitions of  $[0, 1)$  from left to right. We shall call  $(f_i)_{i=0}^{n-1}$  and  $(g_j)_{j=0}^{m-1}$  the *base horizontal IFS* and the *base vertical IFS*, respectively.

Let  $\mathcal{D} = \{\mathbf{d}_1, \dots, \mathbf{d}_N\} \subset \{0, \dots, n-1\} \times \{0, \dots, m-1\}$ . We call  $\mathcal{D}$  a *digit set*. For each  $\mathbf{d}_j = (d_{j,1}, d_{j,2}) \in \mathcal{D}$ , define

$$(1.2) \quad \varphi_j(x, y) = (f_{d_{j,1}}(x), g_{d_{j,2}}(y)).$$

Then  $\varphi = (\varphi_j)_{j=1}^N$  is a self-affine IFS, and we call its attractor  $K = K_\varphi$  a *Barański carpet*, see [4].

For simplicity, we denote by  $\mathcal{B}(n, m, \mathcal{D})$  the collection of Barański carpets with division numbers  $n, m$  and digit set  $\mathcal{D}$ . If all maps in  $(f_i)_{i=0}^{n-1}$  and  $(g_j)_{j=0}^{m-1}$  have contraction ratios  $1/n$  and  $1/m$  respectively, then  $K_\varphi = K(n, m, \mathcal{D})$  is called a *Bedford-McMullen carpet*, see [5, 22]. If in addition  $n = m$ , then  $K_\varphi = K(n, \mathcal{D})$  is called a *fractal square*, see [19, 36].

Let  $K \in \mathcal{B}(n, m, \mathcal{D})$  and denote  $\Sigma = \{1, \dots, N\}$ . For  $1 \leq j \leq N$ , we denote  $K_j = \varphi_j(K)$  and we call it a *first order cylinder*. If  $\mathbf{d}_j = (p, q)$ , then we say  $K_j$  locates in the  $p$ -th row and the  $q$ -th column.

In this paper, we confine ourselves to Barański carpets satisfying the following separation conditions.

We say  $K$  satisfies the *cross intersection condition*, if for any  $i, j \in \Sigma$ ,  $K_i \cap K_j \neq \emptyset$  implies that  $K_i$  and  $K_j$  either locate in a same row, or in a same column. Especially, we say  $K$  satisfies the *vertical separation condition*, if  $K_i \cap K_j \neq \emptyset$  implies that  $K_i$  and  $K_j$  locate in a same row.

We say  $K$  satisfies *top isolated condition*, if the top row of  $\mathcal{D}$  has only one element, say,  $\mathcal{D} \cap \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\} \times \{m-1\} = \{\mathbf{d}_{j^*}\}$ , and  $K_{j^*} \cap K_i = \emptyset$  for all  $i \neq j^*$ . (We shall call  $K_{j^*}$  the *top cylinder* of  $K$ .)

**Remark 1.1.** It is not hard to show that if  $K$  satisfies the top isolated condition or the vertical separation condition, then any non-trivial connected component of  $K$  must be a horizontal line segment.

Next, we define horizontal blocks of Barański carpets.

**Definition 1.1.** Let  $K \in \mathcal{B}(n, m, \mathcal{D})$  be a Barański carpet.

(i) We call  $I \subset \Sigma$  a *horizontal block (H-block)* of  $K$  if all  $K_i$ ,  $i \in I$ , are located in a same row,  $\bigcup_{i \in I} \varphi_i([0, 1]^2)$  is connected, and  $I$  is maximal with this property. We call  $\#I$  the size of  $I$ .

(ii) An H-block of size  $n$  is called a *full H-block*.

(iii) We call  $I$  a *left H-block* (resp. *right H-block*) if it is not a full H-block and  $\bigcup_{i \in I} \varphi_i([0, 1]^2)$  intersects the left side (resp. right side) boundary of  $[0, 1]^2$ .

(iv) Let  $I'$  be a left H-block and  $I''$  be a right H-block. If they locate in the same row, then we call  $(I', I'')$  a *H-block pair*, and call  $(\#I', \#I'')$  the size of the pair.




FIGURE 1. (a)  $E = K(5, \mathcal{D}_E)$  is a fractal square which satisfies the top isolated condition. (b)  $F = K(5, 7, \mathcal{D}_F)$  is a Barański carpet which satisfies the vertical separation condition.

The main result of this paper is the following.

**Theorem 1.1.** Let  $E \in \mathcal{B}(n, m_1, \mathcal{D}_E)$  and  $F \in \mathcal{B}(n, m_2, \mathcal{D}_F)$  be two Barański carpets satisfying the cross intersection condition, and assume that  $E$ , and also  $F$ , satisfies either the top isolated condition or the vertical separation condition. If there is a bijection between the H-blocks of  $E$  and  $F$  preserving their sizes, and there is a bijection between the H-block pairs of  $E$  and  $F$  preserving their sizes, then  $E$  is Hölder equivalent to  $F$ .

If in addition that  $n = m_1 = m_2$ , that is, both  $E$  and  $F$  are fractal squares, then  $E \simeq F$ .

**Example 1.1.** Figure 1 illustrates two Barański carpets  $E$  and  $F$ . It is easy to see that both  $E$  and  $F$  satisfy the cross intersection condition. Moreover,  $E$  satisfies the top isolated condition and  $F$  satisfies the vertical separation condition. Each of them contains one full H-block, one H-block with size 2, two H-blocks with size 1 and one H-block pair with size (1,1). Therefore,  $E$  is Hölder equivalent to  $F$  by Theorem 1.1. Consequently,  $E$  is homeomorphic to  $F$ .

**Example 1.2.** The essence of Theorem 1.1 is, if two cylinders in adjacent rows intersect, we can decouple them.




FIGURE 2.  $K_1 \simeq K_2$  and  $K_3 \simeq K_4$ .

Figure 2 (a) and (b) illustrate two fractal squares, where the small polygons are convex hulls of the first order cylinders. By Theorem 1.1,  $K_1 \simeq K_2$ .

Figure 2 (c) and (d) illustrate two Bedford-McMullen carpets. By Theorem 1.1,  $K_3$  and  $K_4$  are Hölder equivalent. However, according to Rao, Xu and Zhang [28],  $K_3$  and  $K_4$  are not Lipschitz equivalent, since both of them are not totally disconnected, and the fiber sequence of  $K_3$  is not a permutation of that of  $K_4$ . (Let  $s_j$  be the number of cylinders of  $K$  in the  $j$ -th row, then we call  $(s_j)_{j=0}^{m-1}$  the *fiber sequence* of  $K$ .)

**Example 1.3** (Lipschitz classification of fractal squares with expanding factor 3). Luo and Liu [21] raised the question to give a complete Lipschitz classification of fractal squares with expanding factor 3. Let  $E = K(3, \mathcal{D}_E)$  and  $F = K(3, \mathcal{D}_F)$  with  $\#\mathcal{D}_E = \#\mathcal{D}_F = N$ .

The case  $N \leq 4$  was settled by Wen *et al.* [33], the case  $N = 6$  was settled by Rao *et al.* [25], and the cases  $N = 7, 8$  were settled by Ruan and Wang [30]. Luo and Liu [21] dealt with the case  $N = 5$ , but they were not able to determine the Lipschitz equivalence relation about the 6 fractal squares depicted in Figure 3. Later, Zhu and Rao [37] showed that  $F_1 \simeq F_3$ , Zhu and Yang [38] showed that  $F_1 \simeq F_2$ .

We remark that  $F_1 \simeq F_3$  can be obtained by Theorem 1.1. Clearly  $F_1$  satisfies the vertical separation condition, and  $F_3$  satisfies the top isolated condition. Moreover, both of them contain 1 full H-block and two H-blocks of size 1, therefore,  $F_1 \simeq F_3$ .

We conjecture that  $F_1 \simeq F_4$ , but  $F_1, F_5$  and  $F_6$  are not Lipschitz equivalent to each other.




FIGURE 3. Some fractal squares with  $n = 3, \#\mathcal{D} = 5$ .

**Remark 1.2.** The result and proof of this paper is inspired by [16], which dealt with a class of self-similar sets called fractal gaskets. One can easily define topology automaton for Barański carpets (see Section 3), and the topology automaton plays a crucial role in our discussion as it does in [16]. It is still unclear how to define topology automaton for general self-similar sets or self-affine sets.

This article is organized as follows: In Section 2, we introduce the pseudo-metric spaces induced by feasible  $\Sigma$ -automata. We define topology automaton of Barański carpets in Section 3, and introduce the notion of cross automaton in Section 4. In Section 5, we study the one-step simplification of cross automaton. Theorem 1.1 is proved in Section 6. In Section 7, we recall the universal map  $g$  on symbolic space given by [16]. Finally, we prove Theorem 5.1 in Section 8, which is crucial in the proof of Theorem 1.1.

## 2. $\Sigma$ -AUTOMATON AND PSEUDO-METRIC SPACE

In this section, we recall some basic definitions and facts about  $\Sigma$ -automaton and pseudo-metric spaces, which were introduced by Huang *et al.* [16].

## 2.1. Pseudo-metric space.

Let us recall the definition of pseudo-metric space, see for instance, [23].

**Definition 2.1.** A *pseudo-quasi-metric space* is a pair  $(\mathcal{A}, \rho)$  where  $\mathcal{A}$  is a set and  $\rho : \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  satisfying for all  $x, y, z \in \mathcal{A}$ , it holds that  $\rho(x, x) = 0$ ,  $\rho(x, y) = \rho(y, x)$ , and

$$\rho(x, z) \leq C'(\rho(x, y) + \rho(y, z)),$$

where  $C' \geq 1$  is constant independent of  $x, y, z$ .

If in addition  $x \neq y$  implies  $\rho(x, y) > 0$ , then  $(\mathcal{A}, \rho)$  is called a *pseudo-metric space*.

There is a standard way to construct a pseudo-metric space from a pseudo-quasi-metric space  $(\mathcal{A}, \rho)$ : First, define  $x \sim y$  if  $\rho(x, y) = 0$ ; clearly  $\sim$  is an equivalence relation. Denote the equivalent class containing  $x$  by  $[x]$ . Set

$$\tilde{\mathcal{A}} := \mathcal{A} / \sim$$

to be the quotient space. Secondly, for  $[x], [y] \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ , define

$$\tilde{\rho}([x], [y]) = \min\{\rho(a, b); a \in [x], b \in [y]\}.$$

**Theorem 2.1** ([16]). *The quotient space  $(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}, \tilde{\rho})$  is a pseudo-metric space.*

Let  $(\mathcal{A}, \rho)$  be a pseudo-metric space. In the same manner as metric space, we can define convergence of sequence, dense subset and completeness of  $\mathcal{A}$ . (See [23].) Recall that the Hölder and Lipschitz equivalence of pseudo-metric spaces are defined in (1.1). The following theorem is obvious.

**Theorem 2.2** ([16]). *Let  $(\mathcal{A}, \rho)$  and  $(\mathcal{A}', \rho')$  be two complete pseudo-metric spaces. Suppose  $B \subset \mathcal{A}$  is  $\rho$ -dense in  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $B' \subset \mathcal{A}'$  is  $\rho'$ -dense in  $\mathcal{A}'$ . If  $B \simeq B'$ , then  $\mathcal{A} \simeq \mathcal{A}'$ .*

## 2.2. $\Sigma$ -automaton.

Recall that a *finite state automaton (FSA)* is a 5-tuple

$$(Q, \mathcal{A}, \delta, q_0, P),$$

where  $Q$  is a finite set of states,  $\mathcal{A}$  is a finite input alphabet,  $q_0 \in Q$  is the initial state,  $P \subset Q$  is the set of final states, and  $\delta$  is the transition function mapping  $Q \times \mathcal{A}$  to  $Q$ . That is,  $\delta(q, a)$  is a state for each state  $q$  and input symbol  $a$ . (See for instance, [15].)

Let  $\Sigma = \{1, \dots, N\}$  be a finite set which we call an alphabet. For  $a \in \Sigma$ , we shall use  $a^k$  to denote the word consisting of  $k$  numbers of  $a$ . Denote  $\Sigma^\infty$  and  $\Sigma^k$  to be the sets of infinite words and words of length  $k$  over  $\Sigma$ , respectively. Let  $\Sigma^* = \bigcup_{k \geq 0} \Sigma^k$  be the set of all finite words.

**Definition 2.2** ([16]). A finite state automaton  $M$  is called a  $\Sigma$ -automaton if

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

where

- (i) the state set is  $Q = Q_0 \cup \{Id, Exit\}$ , the initial state is  $Id$ , the final state is  $Exit$ ;
- (ii) the input alphabet is  $\Sigma^2$ ;
- (iii) the transition function  $\delta$  satisfies

$$\delta(Id, (i, j)) = Id \Leftrightarrow i = j.$$

### 2.3. Surviving time.

Now inputting symbol string  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in \Sigma^\infty \times \Sigma^\infty$  to  $M$ , we obtain a sequence of states  $(S_i)_{i \geq 0}$  and call it the *itinerary* of  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ . If we arrive at the state  $Exit$ , then we stop there and the itinerary is finite, otherwise, it is infinite. We define the *surviving time* of  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  to be

$$(2.1) \quad T_M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \sup\{k; S_k \neq Exit\}.$$

**Definition 2.3.** We say a  $\Sigma$ -automaton  $M$  is *feasible*, if there exists an integer  $T_0 \geq 0$  such that

$$\min\{T_M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}), T_M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})\} \leq T_M(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) + T_0, \quad \forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z} \in \Sigma^\infty.$$

### 2.4. Pseudo-metric space induced by $\Sigma$ -automaton.

Let  $0 < \xi < 1$ , we define a function  $\rho_{M,\xi}$  on  $\Sigma^\infty \times \Sigma^\infty$  as

$$\rho_{M,\xi}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \xi^{T_M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})}.$$

If a  $\Sigma$ -automaton  $M$  is feasible, then

$$\rho_{M,\xi}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) \leq \xi^{-T_0}(\rho_{M,\xi}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) + \rho_{M,\xi}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})).$$

Hence  $(\Sigma^\infty, \rho_{M,\xi})$  is a pseudo-quasi-metric space. Let

$$(\mathcal{A}_M, \rho_{M,\xi})$$

be the pseudo-metric space obtained from  $(\Sigma^\infty, \rho_{M,\xi})$  by the standard way in Section 2.1, and we call it the *pseudo-metric space induced by  $M$* .

**Lemma 2.1** ([16]). *Let  $M$  be a feasible  $\Sigma$ -automaton and let  $(\mathcal{A}_M, \rho_{M,\xi})$  be the pseudo-metric space induced by  $M$ . Let  $\kappa \in \Sigma$ . Then the set  $\widetilde{\Omega} = \{[\omega\kappa^\infty]; \omega \in \Sigma^*\}$  is  $\rho_{M,\xi}$ -dense in  $\mathcal{A}_M$ .*

## 3. TOPOLOGY AUTOMATON OF BARAŃSKI CARPET

Let  $K \in \mathcal{B}(n, m, \mathcal{D})$  be a Barański carpet generated by  $\{\varphi_j\}_{j=1}^N$ , see (1.2). For  $I = i_1 \cdots i_k \in \Sigma^k$ , denote  $\varphi_I = \varphi_{i_1} \circ \cdots \circ \varphi_{i_k}$  and we call  $K_I = \varphi_I(K)$  a  $k$ -th cylinder. We remark that in this section, we do not assume that  $K$  satisfies the cross intersection condition.

### 3.1. Companion IFS.

Let  $K = K(n, m, \mathcal{D})$  be a Barański carpet, which is the attractor of  $\{\varphi_j\}_{j=1}^N$ . For each  $\mathbf{d}_j = (d_{j,1}, d_{j,2}) \in \mathcal{D}$ , define

$$\tilde{\varphi}_j(x, y) = \left( \frac{x + d_{j,1}}{n}, \frac{y + d_{j,2}}{m} \right).$$

We call  $\{\tilde{\varphi}_j\}_{j=1}^N$  the *companion IFS* of  $\{\varphi_j\}_{j=1}^N$  (or  $K$ ). Clearly the attractor of the companion IFS is either a fractal square, or a Bedford-McMullent carpet.

### 3.2. Topology automaton.

Let  $K \in \mathcal{B}(n, m, \mathcal{D})$  be a Barański carpet generated by the IFS  $\{\varphi_j\}_{j=1}^N$ . Let  $\{\tilde{\varphi}_j\}_{j=1}^N$  be the companion IFS of  $\{\varphi_j\}_{j=1}^N$  and let  $K'$  be the corresponding attractor. For  $I, J \in \Sigma^k$ , if  $\tilde{\varphi}_I([0, 1]^2) \cap \tilde{\varphi}_J([0, 1]^2) \neq \emptyset$ , then there are 8 possible positions between  $\tilde{\varphi}_J([0, 1]^2)$  and  $\tilde{\varphi}_I([0, 1]^2)$ , which we will indicate by elements in

$$Q_0 = \{\pm \mathbf{e}_1, \pm \mathbf{e}_2, \pm(\mathbf{e}_1 + \mathbf{e}_2), \pm(\mathbf{e}_1 - \mathbf{e}_2)\}.$$

**Definition 3.1** (Topology automaton [16]). Let  $\Sigma = \{1, \dots, N\}$ . We define the *topology automaton* of a fractal square or a Bedford-McMullen carpet  $K'$  to be the  $\Sigma$ -automaton

$$M_{K'} = \{Q_0 \cup \{Id, Exit\}, \Sigma^2, \delta, \{Id, Exit\}\}$$

satisfying the following condition: for  $i \neq j$  and  $S \in Q_0 \cup \{id\}$ ,

$$\delta(S, (i, j)) = \begin{cases} \tilde{\varphi}_i^{-1}(\tilde{\varphi}_j(\mathbf{0}) + S), & \text{if } \tilde{\varphi}_i(K) \cap (\tilde{\varphi}_j(K) + \mathbf{s}) \neq \emptyset, \\ Exit, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where we regard  $id$  as  $\mathbf{0}$  in the right hand side of the above formula.

**Definition 3.2.** We define the topology automaton of a Barański carpet  $K$  to be the automaton of  $K'$ , that is,  $M_K := M_{K'}$ .

For  $\mathbf{x} = x_1 x_2 \dots \in \Sigma^\infty$ , denote by  $\mathbf{x}|_k = x_1 \dots x_k$  the prefix of  $\mathbf{x}$  with length  $k$ .

**Theorem 3.1.** *The topology automaton  $M_K$  of a Barański carpet  $K$  is a feasible  $\Sigma$ -automaton. Precisely,*

$$(3.1) \quad \min\{T(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}), T(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})\} \leq T(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) + 1, \quad \forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z} \in \Sigma^\infty.$$

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, we assume that  $K$  is a fractal square or a Bedford-McMullen carpet. Let  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}$  be three different points in  $\Sigma^\infty$ . Denote  $k = T(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})$ . Then  $k$  is the smallest integer such that  $K_{\mathbf{y}|_k} \cap K_{\mathbf{z}|_k} = \emptyset$ .

Suppose on the contrary that (3.1) does not hold. Then  $\varphi_{\mathbf{x}|_{k+2}}([0, 1]^2)$  intersects both  $\varphi_{\mathbf{y}|_{k+2}}([0, 1]^2)$  and  $\varphi_{\mathbf{z}|_{k+2}}([0, 1]^2)$ , which implies that  $\varphi_{\mathbf{y}|_k}([0, 1]^2) \cap \varphi_{\mathbf{z}|_k}([0, 1]^2) \neq \emptyset$ .

*Case 1.*  $\varphi_{\mathbf{y}|_k}(K)$  and  $\varphi_{\mathbf{z}|_k}(K)$  are located in the same row (or column) of order  $k$ .



Since  $\varphi_{x_k}([0, 1]^2)$  intersects both  $\varphi_{y_k}([0, 1]^2)$  and  $\varphi_{z_k}([0, 1]^2)$ , without loss of generality, we may assume that  $\varphi_{x_k}([0, 1]^2)$  locates under  $\varphi_{y_k}([0, 1]^2)$  and  $\varphi_{z_k}([0, 1]^2)$  locates on the right side of  $\varphi_{y_k}([0, 1]^2)$ , see Figure 4. This forces

$$x_{k+1} = (n - 1, m - 1) \in \mathcal{D} \text{ and } z_{k+1} = (0, 0) \in \mathcal{D}.$$

(See the blue rectangle and red rectangle in Figure 4.) We argue that  $y_{k+1} \neq (n - 1, 0)$ , for otherwise,  $\varphi_{z_k}(0) \in \varphi_{y_k}(K) \cap \varphi_{z_k}(K)$ , which contradicts the maximality of  $k$ . (See the yellow rectangle in Figure 4.)




FIGURE 4. Illustration of proof of Theorem 3.1: Case 1.

To guarantee  $\varphi_{x_{k+2}}[0, 1]^2 \cap \varphi_{z_{k+2}}[0, 1]^2 \neq \emptyset$ , we must have  $x_{k+2} = (n - 1, m - 1)$ , but then  $\varphi_{x_{k+2}}([0, 1]^2)$  and  $\varphi_{y_{k+2}}([0, 1]^2)$  are disjoint, which contradicts to our assumption.

*Case 2.*  $\varphi_{y_k}([0, 1]^2) \cap \varphi_{z_k}([0, 1]^2)$  is a single point.

By a similar argument as Case 1, one can show that (3.1) holds in this case.  $\square$

### 3.3. Coding and projection.

Let  $K$  be the attractor of an IFS  $\{\varphi_j\}_{j=1}^N$ . Define  $\pi_K : \Sigma^\infty \rightarrow K$ , which we call a *projection*, by

$$\{\pi_K(\mathbf{x})\} = \bigcap_{k \geq 1} \varphi_{x_1 \dots x_k}(K).$$

If  $\pi_K(\mathbf{x}) = x \in K$ , then we call the sequence  $\mathbf{x} = x_1 x_2 \dots \in \Sigma^\infty$  a *coding* of  $x$ .

Let  $\xi \in (0, 1)$ . Let  $(\mathcal{A}_{M_K}, \rho_{M_K, \xi})$  be the pseudo-metric space induced by  $M_K$ , see Section 2.4. The following lemma is obvious.

**Lemma 3.1.** *That  $\pi_K(\mathbf{x}) = \pi_K(\mathbf{y})$  if and only if  $\rho_{M_K, \xi}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = 0$ .*

We define  $\pi : \mathcal{A}_{M_K} \rightarrow K$  by

$$\pi([\mathbf{x}]) = \pi_K(\mathbf{x}).$$

For  $\varphi_j = (f_{d_{j,1}}, g_{d_{j,2}})$ , we denote  $\varphi'_j = (f'_{d_{j,1}}, g'_{d_{j,2}}) = (a_j, b_j)$ , and denote

$$r^* = \max\{a_j, b_j; 1 \leq j \leq N\}, \quad r_* = \min\{a_j, b_j; 1 \leq j \leq N\}.$$

**Lemma 3.2.** *There is a constant  $C_3 > 0$  such that if  $I, J \in \Sigma^k$  and  $K_I \cap K_J = \emptyset$ , then  $\text{dist}(K_I, K_J) > C_3 r_*^k$ .*

*Proof.* If  $\varphi_I([0, 1]^2) \cap \varphi_J([0, 1]^2) = \emptyset$ , then clearly  $\text{dist}(K_I, K_J) \geq r_*^k$ . So in the following, we assume that  $\varphi_I([0, 1]^2) \cap \varphi_J([0, 1]^2) \neq \emptyset$ . Let

$$\delta_0 = \min(\{\text{dist}(K, K + \mathbf{b}); \mathbf{b} \in \pm\{\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2, \mathbf{e}_1 + \mathbf{e}_2, \mathbf{e}_1 - \mathbf{e}_2\}, K \cap (K + \mathbf{b}) \neq \emptyset\}).$$

We will show that

$$(3.2) \quad \text{dist}(K_I, K_J) \geq \delta_0 r_*^k.$$

Recall that  $\varphi'_I = (a_I, b_I)$ ,  $\varphi'_J = (a_J, b_J)$ .

*Case 1.*  $\varphi_I([0, 1]^2)$  and  $\varphi_J([0, 1]^2)$  locate in the same row or in the same column.

Without loss of generality, let us assume that  $K_I$  and  $K_J$  locate in the same row, then  $b_I = b_J$ . Again, without loss of generality, let us assume  $a_I \leq a_J$ . Notice that  $K_I \cap K_J = \emptyset$  implies that  $K \cap (K + \mathbf{e}_1) = \emptyset$ . Since

$$\varphi_I^{-1} \varphi_J(K) = \mathbf{e}_1 + \text{diag}\left(\frac{a_J}{a_I}, 1\right) \cdot K,$$

we obtain  $\text{dist}(K, \varphi_I^{-1} \varphi_J(K)) \geq \text{dist}(K, K + \mathbf{e}_1) \geq \delta_0$ . Consequently, (3.2) holds.

*Case 2.*  $\varphi_I([0, 1]^2)$  and  $\varphi_J([0, 1]^2)$  meet at a corner.

Without loss of generality, let us assume that the most right-bottom point of  $\varphi_I([0, 1]^2)$  coincides with the most left-top point of  $\varphi_J([0, 1]^2)$ . Denote the intersection point by  $z$ . Let  $f(x) = r_*^{-k}(x - z)$ . Then  $f(K_I)$  and  $f(K_J)$  meet at 0, and

$$f(K_I) = \text{diag}\left(\frac{a_I}{r_*^k}, \frac{b_I}{r_*^k}\right) \cdot (K - \mathbf{e}_1), \quad f(K_J) = \text{diag}\left(\frac{a_J}{r_*^k}, \frac{b_J}{r_*^k}\right) \cdot (K - \mathbf{e}_2),$$

Therefore,  $\text{dist}(f(K_I), f(K_J)) \geq \text{dist}(K, K + (\mathbf{e}_1 - \mathbf{e}_2)) \geq \delta_0$ , and (3.2) follows. The lemma is proved.  $\square$

**Theorem 3.2.** *Let  $K$  be a Barański carpet, Let  $s = \sqrt{\log r^* / \log r_*}$  and  $\xi = (r_*)^s$ . Then  $\pi : (\mathcal{A}_{M_K}, \rho_{M_K, \xi}) \rightarrow K$  is a bi-Hölder map with index  $s$ . In particular, if  $K$  is a fractal square, then  $\pi$  is bi-Lipschitz.*

*Proof.* Take  $x, y \in K$ . Let  $\mathbf{x}$  be a coding of  $x$  and  $\mathbf{y}$  be a coding of  $y$ . Let  $k = T(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  be the surviving time of  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  in the automaton  $M_K$ , see (2.1). Then the  $k$ -th cylinder containing  $x$  and

that containing  $y$ , either coincide or have non-empty intersection. Since every  $k$ -th cylinder has diameter no larger than  $2(r^*)^k$ , it follows that

$$|x - y| \leq 4(r^*)^k.$$

On the other hand, the  $(k + 1)$ -th cylinder containing  $x$  and that containing  $y$  are disjoint, so we have

$$|x - y| \geq C_3(r_*)^{k+1},$$

where  $C_3$  is the constant in Lemma 3.2. Notice that

$$\rho_{M_K, \xi}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \xi^k = (r_*)^{sk} = (r^*)^{k/s}.$$

Set  $C = \max\{4, 1/(C_3 r_*)\}$ , we obtain the theorem.  $\square$

### 3.4. Symmetric $\Sigma$ -automaton.

Let  $M = (\Sigma, Q, \delta, Id, Exit)$  be a  $\Sigma$ -automaton. We say  $M$  is *symmetric*, if

(i)  $Q_0 = Q_1 \cup \overline{Q_1}$  with  $Q_1 \cap \overline{Q_1} = \emptyset$ , and there exist a bijection  $\varrho : Q_1 \rightarrow \overline{Q_1}$ . We call  $\varrho(S)$  the *mirror state* of  $S$ . For simplicity, hereafter we denote  $\varrho(S)$  by  $-S$ .

(ii) By convention, we set  $-Id = Id$  and  $-Exit = Exit$ .

(iii) For any  $\mathbf{s} \in Q$ ,  $i, j \in \Sigma$ , it holds that

$$\delta(\mathbf{s}, (j, i)) = -\delta(-\mathbf{s}, (j, i)).$$

Clearly, the topology automaton of a Barański carpet is symmetric.

## 4. CROSS AUTOMATON

To study Barański carpets satisfying the cross intersection condition, we introduce the cross automaton as following.

**Definition 4.1** (Cross automaton). A symmetric  $\Sigma$ -automaton  $M = \{Q, \Sigma^2, \delta, Id, Exit\}$  is called a *cross automaton* if  $Q_0 = \{\pm \mathbf{e}_1, \pm \mathbf{e}_2\}$  and  $M$  satisfies the following conditions:

(i) (Uniqueness) If  $\delta(S, (i, j_1)) = \delta(S, (i, j_2)) \neq Exit$ , then  $j_1 = j_2$ .

(ii) (Self-looping property) For any  $S \in Q_0$  and  $(i, j) \in \Sigma^2$ ,  $\delta(S, (i, j)) \in \{S, Exit\}$ . (That is, a state  $S$  either transfers to itself or to  $Exit$ .)

(iii) (Triple-coding-free condition) Let  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z} \in \Sigma^\infty$  be distinct, then at most one of  $T_M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ ,  $T_M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$  and  $T_M(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})$  take the value  $+\infty$ .

For  $S, S' \in Q_0 \cup \{Id\}$ , we define

$$\mathcal{P}_{S \rightarrow S'} = \{(i, j) \in \Sigma^2; \delta(S, (i, j)) = S'\}.$$




FIGURE 5. The transition diagram of a cross automaton.

For convenience, we denote

$$\mathcal{P}_H = \mathcal{P}_{Id \rightarrow e_1}, \quad \mathcal{P}_V = \mathcal{P}_{Id \rightarrow e_2}, \quad \mathcal{P}_{e_1} = \mathcal{P}_{e_1 \rightarrow e_1}, \quad \mathcal{P}_{e_2} = \mathcal{P}_{e_2 \rightarrow e_2}.$$

For a set  $\mathcal{P} \subset \Sigma^2$ , we define  $\overline{\mathcal{P}} = \{(j, i); (i, j) \in \mathcal{P}\}$ .

Figure 5 illustrates the transition diagram of a cross automaton  $M$ . Clearly,  $M$  is completely determined by the sets  $\mathcal{P}_H, \mathcal{P}_V, \mathcal{P}_{e_1}$  and  $\mathcal{P}_{e_2}$ .

If  $(i, j) \in \mathcal{P}_H$ , then we denote  $i \triangleleft_H j$  and say  $i$  is the  $H$ -predecessor of  $j$  and  $j$  is the  $H$ -successor of  $i$ ; similarly, we can define  $i \triangleleft_V j, i \triangleleft_{e_1} j$  and  $i \triangleleft_{e_2} j$ .

The following lemma is obvious.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let  $K$  be a Barański carpet satisfying the cross intersection condition, then the topology automaton  $M_K$  is a cross automaton. Moreover, if  $K$  satisfies the vertical separation condition, then  $\mathcal{P}_V = \emptyset$ .*

*Proof.* We only need to show the theorem holds for a fractal square or a Bedford-McMullen carpet. By the cross intersection condition, the states  $\pm(\mathbf{e}_1 + \mathbf{e}_2)$  and  $\pm(\mathbf{e}_1 - \mathbf{e}_2)$  will not occur in  $M_K$ , so  $Q_0 = \{\pm\mathbf{e}_1, \pm\mathbf{e}_2\}$ .

Now we verify item (i)-(iii) in Definition 4.1. Item (i) holds since for every  $k$ -th cylinder  $K_I$ , there is at most one  $k$ -th cylinder locates on the right (or left, or above, or below) of  $K_I$  and adjacent to  $K_I$ . Item (ii) holds since if two  $k$ -th cylinders  $K_I$  and  $K_J$  locate in the same row (*resp.* column), then  $K_{I_i}$  and  $K_{J_j}$  have no chance to locate in the same column (*resp.* row). Item (iii) holds since by the cross intersection condition, no points of  $K$  has more than two codings.  $\square$

The following example shows that the class of cross automata is much wider than that of topology automata of Barański carpets.

**Example 4.1.** Let  $K$  be the fractal square consisting of 8 cylinders indicated in Figure 6(a). Let  $M_K$  be the topology automaton of  $K$ . Let  $M$  be a  $\Sigma$ -automaton with  $\Sigma = \{1, \dots, 9\}$  such that  $M$  is an extension of  $M_K$ , that is, all edges of  $M_K$  belong to  $M$ . Moreover, we set

$$\delta(Id, (9, 9)) = Id, \quad \delta(Id, (5, 9)) = \mathbf{e}_1, \quad \delta(Id, (9, 5)) = -\mathbf{e}_1,$$

and set  $\delta(S, (i, 9)) = \delta(S, (9, i)) = Exit$  otherwise. Precisely, we have

$$\mathcal{P}_H = \{(1, 2), (2, 3), (3, 4), (4, 5), (5, 9)\},$$

$$\mathcal{P}_V = \{(7, 6), (6, 4)\}, \quad \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{e}_1} = \{(5, 1)\}, \quad \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{e}_2} = \{(8, 7)\}.$$

Then  $M$  is a cross automaton but it is not the topology automaton of any Barański carpet.




FIGURE 6. (a) The cross automaton in Example 4.1. (b) The graph representation of the cross automaton in (a). (We draw the four graphs in one picture, but we use edges of different colors to distinct them.)

#### 4.1. Graph representation of cross automaton.

Firstly, we recall some notions of graph theory, see [1]. Let  $G = (V, \mathcal{E})$  be a directed graph, where  $V$  is the *vertex set* and  $\mathcal{E}$  is the *edge set*. Each edge  $\mathbf{e} \in \mathcal{E}$  is associated to an ordered pair  $(u, v)$  in  $V \times V$ , and we say  $\mathbf{e}$  is *incident out* of  $u$  and *incident into*  $v$ . Denote that  $\mathbf{e} = (u, v)$ . We also call  $u$  and  $v$  the *origin* and *terminus* of  $\mathbf{e}$ , respectively. The number of edges incident out of a vertex  $v$  is the *outdegree* of  $v$  and is denoted by  $\deg^-(v)$ . The number of edges incident into a vertex  $v$  is the *indegree* of  $v$  and is denoted by  $\deg^+(v)$ . If  $\deg^-(v) = 0$ , then we say  $v$  is *maximal*, if  $\deg^+(v) = 0$ , then we say  $v$  is *minimal*. If  $v$  is both minimal and maximal, then we say  $v$  is *isolated*.

A *directed walk* joining vertex  $v_1$  to vertex  $v_k$  in  $G$  is a sequence  $(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k)$  with  $(v_i, v_{i+1}) \in \mathcal{E}$ , in addition, if all  $v_i (1 \leq i \leq k)$  are distinct, then we call it a *path*. If all  $v_i (1 \leq i \leq k-1)$  are distinct and  $v_k = v_1$ , then we call it a *cycle*. Let  $(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k)$  be a path, if  $v_1$  is minimal and  $v_k$  is maximal, then we call it a *chain*.

For a cross automaton  $M$ , we will regard  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{P}_H)$  a graph. Precisely, there is an edge in  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{P}_H)$  from  $i$  to  $j$  if and only if  $(i, j) \in \mathcal{P}_H$ . A symbol  $j \in \Sigma$  is said to be  $H$ -minimal (resp. maximal) if it is minimal (resp. maximal) in  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{P}_H)$ .

Similarly, we define  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{P}_V)$ ,  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{P}_{e_1})$ ,  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{P}_{e_2})$  as well as  $V$ -minimal (maximal),  $e_1$ -minimal (maximal) and  $e_2$ -minimal (maximal). One can refer Figure 6 as an example.

#### 4.2. Feasibility of cross automaton.

We write the initial state by  $id$  instead of  $Id$  for clarity. we will use  $S \xrightarrow{(i,j)} S'$  as an alternative notation for  $\delta(S, (i, j)) = S'$ .

The following theorem says that all cross automata are feasible.

**Theorem 4.2.** *Let  $M$  be a cross automaton. For  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z} \in \Sigma^\infty$ , we have*

$$(4.1) \quad \min\{T_M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}), T_M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})\} \leq T_M(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) + 1.$$

*Proof.* Clearly, (4.1) holds if any two of  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}$  are identical, or  $T_M(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) = \infty$ . Now we assume  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}$  are distinct and  $q = T_M(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) < \infty$ .

Suppose on the contrary that (4.1) is false. Then  $T_M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \geq q + 2$  and  $T_M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) \geq q + 2$ .

Denote the itinerary of  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ ,  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$  and  $(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})$  by  $(S_k)_{k \geq 0}$ ,  $(S'_k)_{k \geq 0}$  and  $(U_k)_{k \geq q+1}$ , respectively. Here we have  $S_0 = S'_0 = U_0 = id$ . Notice that  $U_{q+1} = Exit$ .

*Case 1.*  $S_{q+1} = Id$  or  $S'_{q+1} = Id$ .

Without loss of generality, let us assume that  $S_{q+1} = Id$ . This means that  $\mathbf{x}|_{q+1} = \mathbf{y}|_{q+1}$ . So  $(S'_k)_{k=0}^{q+1} = (U_k)_{k=0}^{q+1}$ . Since  $S'_{q+1} \neq Exit$ , we deduce that  $U_{q+1} \neq Exit$ , which contradicts to  $T_M(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) = q$ .

*Case 2.*  $S_{q+1} \neq Id$  and  $S'_{q+1} \neq Id$ .

Denote  $S_{q+1} = \mathbf{s}$  and  $S'_{q+1} = \mathbf{s}'$ . By the self-looping property, we have  $S_{q+2} = \mathbf{s}$ , so

$$\mathbf{s} \xrightarrow{(x_{q+2}, y_{q+2})} \mathbf{s}.$$

By the same reason, we have  $\mathbf{s}' \xrightarrow{(x_{q+2}, z_{q+2})} \mathbf{s}'$ . Set

$$\mathbf{x}' = (x_1 \dots x_{q+1})(x_{q+2})^\infty, \quad \mathbf{y}' = (y_1 \dots y_{q+1})(y_{q+2})^\infty, \quad \mathbf{z}' = (z_1 \dots z_{q+1})(z_{q+2})^\infty, .$$

Then the itinerary of  $(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y}')$  is  $id \mapsto (S_1 \dots S_q)(\mathbf{s})^\infty$ , and it follows  $T(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y}') = \infty$ . Similarly,  $T(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{z}') = \infty$ . This contradicts to the triple-coding-free condition.

The contradictions in the two cases prove the theorem. □

## 5. SIMPLIFICATION OF CROSS AUTOMATON

In this section, we study the simplification of cross automaton.

### 5.1. Cross automaton of Class 0, Class 1, and Class 2.

We will confine ourselves to three special classes of cross automata.

**Definition 5.1.** Let  $M$  be a cross automaton.

(i) We say  $M$  is of *Class 0* if  $\mathcal{P}_V = \emptyset$ .

(ii) We say  $M$  is of *Class 1* if  $M$  is the topology automaton of a Barański carpet satisfying the cross intersection condition as well as the top isolated condition, but does not satisfy the vertical separation condition.

Let  $K$  be a Barański carpet satisfying the cross intersection condition as well as the top isolated condition, but does not satisfy the vertical separation condition. Let  $\gamma \in \Sigma$  be the letter such that  $\varphi_\gamma(K)$  is the top cylinder of  $K$ . There exists  $\lambda \in \Sigma$  such that  $\varphi_\lambda(K)$  locates in the same column as  $\varphi_\gamma(K)$  and in the bottom of  $[0, 1]^2$ .

**Lemma 5.1.** *Let  $M$  be a cross automaton of Class 1. Then*

(i) *There exists  $\gamma \neq \lambda \in \Sigma$  such that  $\mathcal{P}_{e_2} = \{(\gamma, \lambda)\}$ ; we call  $\gamma$  the top vertex and  $\lambda$  the bottom vertex of  $M$ .*

(ii)  *$\gamma$  is  $H$ -isolated,  $V$ -isolated and  $e_1$ -isolated.*

(iii) *For any  $\theta_1 \neq \lambda$  and  $\theta_2 \in \Sigma$ , the inputs  $(\lambda\lambda, \theta_1\theta_2)$  and  $(\theta_1\theta_2, \lambda\lambda)$  lead id to Exit.*

(iv)  *$\mathcal{P}_V \neq \emptyset$  and the graph  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{P}_V)$  has no cycle.*

*Proof.* (i) and (ii) are obvious. Item (iii) means that  $K_{\lambda\lambda}$  does not intersect other cylinders  $K_\theta$ . If  $K_\lambda$  intersects the right boundary of  $[0, 1]^2$ , then  $K_{\lambda\lambda}$  locates on the most right-bottom corner of  $[0, 1]^2$ , so it does not intersect any other cylinder  $K_\theta$ . If  $K_\lambda$  intersects the left boundary of  $[0, 1]^2$ , the result holds by the same argument. If  $K_\lambda$  does not intersect the right and the left boundaries of  $[0, 1]^2$ , then  $K_{\lambda\lambda}$  does not intersect the right and the left boundaries of  $K_\lambda$ , so the result is also true.

(iv) That  $(a, b) \in \mathcal{P}_V$  implies that  $\phi_b([0, 1]^2)$  is adjacent and above  $\phi_a([0, 1]^2)$ , so there is no cycle.  $\square$

**Definition 5.2.** Let  $M$  be a cross automaton and let  $\{\gamma, \lambda\} \in \Sigma$ . If all the items (i)-(iv) in Lemma 5.1 hold for  $M$ , then we call  $M$  a cross automaton of *Class 2*.

Clearly, Class 1 is a sub-family of Class 2, and the later one is much wider.

### 5.2. Simplification of cross automaton.

Let  $M$  be a cross automaton of Class 2. Since  $\mathcal{P}_V \neq \emptyset$  and the graph  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{P}_V)$  has no cycle, we can pick  $(\tau, \kappa) \in \mathcal{P}_V$  such that  $\kappa$  is  $V$ -maximal.

Let

$$(5.1) \quad \mathcal{P}'_V = \mathcal{P}_V \setminus \{(\tau, \kappa)\}, \mathcal{P}'_H = \mathcal{P}_H, \mathcal{P}'_{e_1} = \mathcal{P}_{e_1} \text{ and } \mathcal{P}'_{e_2} = \mathcal{P}_{e_2}.$$


Let  $M'$  be the cross automaton determined by  $\mathcal{P}'_H, \mathcal{P}'_V, \mathcal{P}'_{e_1}$  and  $\mathcal{P}'_{e_2}$ , and we call it the *one-step simplification* of  $M$  by deleting  $(\tau, \kappa)$ .

**Lemma 5.2.** *Let  $M$  be a cross automaton of Class 2. If  $M'$  is a one-step simplification of  $M$  by deleting  $(\tau, \kappa)$  in the graph  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{P}_V)$ . Then we have*


- (i)  $M'$  is a cross automaton of Class 0 if  $\mathcal{P}'_V = \emptyset$ , and is of Class 2 otherwise;
- (ii)  $\tau$  is  $V$ -maximal and  $\kappa$  is  $V$ -isolated in  $M'$ .

*Proof.* (i) Notice that  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{P}'_H) = (\Sigma, \mathcal{P}_H)$ ,  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{P}'_{e_i}) = (\Sigma, \mathcal{P}_{e_i}) (i = 1, 2)$ , and  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{P}'_V)$  is a subgraph of  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{P}_V)$ , we infer that  $M'$  satisfies uniqueness property, the self-looping property and triple-coding-free condition in the definition of cross automaton. By the same reason,  $M'$  satisfies item (i)-(iv) in Lemma 5.1.

(ii) That  $\kappa$  is  $V$ -maximal in  $M$  means  $\kappa$  is maximal in  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{P}_V)$  and thus also is maximal in  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{P}'_V)$ , so  $\kappa$  is  $V$ -maximal in  $M'$ . The process of one-step simplification breaks one edge of  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{P}_V)$  from  $\tau$  to  $\kappa$ , therefore, by uniqueness property,  $\tau$  is  $V$ -maximal in  $M'$  and  $\kappa$  is  $V$ -isolated in  $M'$ .  $\square$



(a)  $K_1$ : before simplification. (b)  $K_2$ : after simplification.



(c)  $K_2$ : before simplification. (d)  $K_3$ : after simplification.

FIGURE 7.  $M_{K_2}$  is a one step simplification of  $M_{K_1}$ , and  $M_{K_3}$  is a one step simplification of  $M_{K_2}$ .

**Theorem 5.1.** *Let  $M$  be a cross automaton of Class 2, and let  $M'$  be a one-step simplification of  $M$ . Then for any  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \Omega = \{\omega\kappa^\infty; \omega \in \Sigma^*\}$  there exists a bijection  $g : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  such that*

$$(5.2) \quad |T_M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - T_{M'}(g(\mathbf{x}), g(\mathbf{y}))| \leq 4.$$



Theorem 5.1 is the most important theorem in this paper, and the proof is rather technical. We will prove it in Section 8. As a corollary of Theorem 5.1, we have

**Theorem 5.2.** *Let  $M$  be a cross automaton of Class 2 and let  $M'$  be a one-step simplification of  $M$ . Then  $(\mathcal{A}_M, \rho_{M, \xi}) \simeq (\mathcal{A}_{M'}, \rho_{M', \xi})$  for any  $\xi \in (0, 1)$ .*

*Proof.* Recall that  $\Omega = \{\omega\kappa^\infty; \omega \in \Sigma^*\}$ . Let  $\widetilde{\Omega} = \{[\omega\kappa^\infty]; \omega \in \Sigma^*\}$ . Let  $g : \Omega \rightarrow \widetilde{\Omega}$  be the bijection map given in Theorem 5.1. Since for any  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \Omega$ ,

$$|T_M([\mathbf{x}], [\mathbf{y}]) - T_{M'}([g(\mathbf{x})], [g(\mathbf{y})])| \leq 2 + 2 + 4 = 8.$$

which implies that  $\xi^8 \rho_M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \leq \rho_{M'}(g(\mathbf{x}), g(\mathbf{y})) \leq \xi^{-8} \rho_M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ . Hence  $g : \widetilde{\Omega} \rightarrow \widetilde{\Omega}$  is a bi-Lipschitz map.

By Lemma 2.1,  $\widetilde{\Omega}$  is dense in  $\mathcal{A}_M$ , so  $\mathcal{A}_M \simeq \mathcal{A}_{M'}$  by Lemma 2.2. □

## 6. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

Recall that a cross automaton  $M$  of Class 2 admits a one-step simplification, so there exists a sequence

$$M = M_0, M_1, \dots, M_q = M^*$$

such that  $M_j$ ,  $0 \leq j < q$  are of Class 2,  $M_{j+1}$  is a one-step simplification of  $M_j$  and  $M_q$  is of Class 0. We call  $M^*$  the *final-simplification* of  $M$ .

By using Theorem 5.2 repeatedly, we obtain

**Corollary 6.1.** *Let  $M$  be a cross automaton of Class 2 and let  $M^*$  be the final-simplification of  $M$ . Then  $(\mathcal{A}_M, \rho_M) \simeq (\mathcal{A}_{M^*}, \rho_{M^*})$ .*

Let  $K$  be a Barański carpet satisfying the cross intersection condition. If  $K$  satisfies the top-isolated condition but not satisfies the vertical separation condition, we set  $M_K^*$  be the final-simplification of  $M_K$ ; if  $K$  satisfies the vertical separation condition, we set  $M_K^* = M_K$ .

**Lemma 6.2.** *Let  $E$  and  $F$  be two Barański carpets satisfying the assumptions in Theorem 1.1. Then there exists a map  $f : (\mathcal{A}_{M_E^*, \xi}, \rho_{M_E^*, \xi}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{A}_{M_F^*, \xi}, \rho_{M_F^*, \xi})$  which is an isometry.*

*Proof.* Let  $I = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k\} \subset \Sigma$  be a H-block of  $E$ . By our assumption in Theorem 1.1, there is a size-preserving bijection from the collection of H-blocks of  $E$  to that of  $F$ , which we denote by  $\widehat{h}$ . That is, for any H-block  $I = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k\}$  of  $E$ ,

$$\widehat{h}(I) = \{b_1, b_2, \dots, b_k\}$$

is an H-block of  $F$ , and if  $(I_1, I_2)$  is an H-block pair of  $E$ , then  $(\widehat{h}(I_1), \widehat{h}(I_2))$  is an H-block pair of  $F$ .

Define  $h : \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$  by  $h(a_j) = b_j$ , that is, if  $a_j$  is the  $j$ -th element of an H-block  $I$  of  $E$ , then define  $h(a_j)$  be the  $j$ -th element of  $\widehat{h}(I)$ . Clearly, for any  $r, s \in \Sigma$ ,

$$(6.1) \quad r \triangleleft_H s \Leftrightarrow h(r) \triangleleft_H h(s) \quad \text{and} \quad r \triangleleft_{e_1} s \Leftrightarrow h(r) \triangleleft_{e_1} h(s).$$

Now we define  $f : \Sigma^\infty \rightarrow \Sigma^\infty$  by  $f((x_i)_{i \geq 1}) = (h(x_i))_{i \geq 1}$ . Clearly,  $f$  is a bijection. Moreover, by (6.1), for any  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \Sigma^\infty$  we have

$$T_{M_E^*}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = T_{M_F^*}(f(\mathbf{x}), f(\mathbf{y})).$$

It follows that  $[\mathbf{x}] \mapsto [f(\mathbf{x})]$  is an isometry from  $\mathcal{A}_{M_E^*}$  to  $\mathcal{A}_{M_F^*}$ .  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 1.1.** By Theorem 3.2 and Corollary 6.1, we have

$$(E, |\cdot|) \stackrel{\text{H\"older}}{\simeq} (\mathcal{A}_{M_E, \xi}, \rho_{M_E, \xi}) \simeq (\mathcal{A}_{M_E^*, \xi}, \rho_{M_E^*, \xi})$$

and

$$(F, |\cdot|) \stackrel{\text{H\"older}}{\simeq} (\mathcal{A}_{M_F, \xi}, \rho_{M_F, \xi}) \simeq (\mathcal{A}_{M_F^*, \xi}, \rho_{M_F^*, \xi}),$$

Therefore, by Lemma 6.2, we have  $E \stackrel{\text{H\"older}}{\simeq} F$ .

If both  $E$  and  $F$  are fractal squares, by setting  $\xi = 1/n$ , we obtain that  $E \simeq F$ .  $\square$

## 7. A UNIVERSAL MAP

Let  $N \geq 3$  be an integer. Let  $\Sigma = \{1, \dots, N\}$  and let  $\gamma, \lambda, \kappa \in \Sigma$  be three distinct letters. Let  $\tau \in \Sigma \setminus \{\gamma, \kappa\}$ , that is, it can happen that  $\tau = \lambda$ .

Set

$$\Omega = \{\omega \kappa^\infty, \omega \in \Sigma^*\}$$

as in Section 5. In this section, we recall a bijection map  $g : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  introduced by Huang *et al.* [16]. We emphasize that the discussion of this section is purely symbolic, and is irrelevant to metric or automaton.

### 7.1. Segment decomposition.

The article [16] introduced two decompositions of sequences in  $\Sigma$ . Set

$$(7.1) \quad C_M := \{\tau \gamma^k; k \geq 2\} \cup \{\kappa \lambda^k \kappa \gamma; k \geq 0\}.$$

**Definition 7.1** (*M*-initial decomposition). Let  $\mathbf{x} = (x_i)_{i=1}^\infty \in \Omega$ . The longest prefix  $X_1$  of  $\mathbf{x}$  satisfying  $X_1 \in C_M \cup \Sigma$  is called the *M*-initial segment of  $\mathbf{x}$ .

Inductively, each  $\mathbf{x} = (x_i)_{i=1}^\infty \in \Omega$  can be uniquely written as  $\mathbf{x} = \prod_{j=1}^\infty X_j := X_1 X_2 \cdots X_k \cdots$ , where  $X_k$  is the *M*-initial segment of  $\prod_{j \geq k} X_j$ . We call  $(X_j)_{j \geq 1}$  the *M*-decomposition of  $\mathbf{x}$ .

Next we define *M'*-initial segment and *M'*-decomposition. Set

$$(7.2) \quad C_{M'} = \{\kappa \lambda^k \kappa \gamma; k \geq 0\} \cup \{\kappa \lambda^k \kappa \gamma \gamma; k \geq 0\} \cup \{\tau \gamma \gamma\},$$

**Definition 7.2** ( $M'$ -initial decomposition). Let  $\mathbf{u} = (u_i)_{i=1}^\infty \in \Omega$ . A word  $U_1$  is called the  $M'$ -initial segment of  $\mathbf{u}$ , if it is the longest prefix of  $\mathbf{u}$  such that  $U_1 \in C_{M'} \cup \Sigma$ . Similar as above, we define the  $M'$ -decomposition of  $\mathbf{u}$ .

Two words are said to be *comparable*, if one word is a prefix of another one.

**Remark 7.1.** Here are two useful observations.

(i) If two elements in  $C_M$  are comparable, then both of them are of the form  $\tau\gamma^k$ . If two elements in  $C_{M'}$  are comparable, then one of them is  $\kappa\lambda^k\kappa\gamma$  and another one is  $\kappa\lambda^k\kappa\gamma\gamma$ .

(ii) Let  $W \in C_M \cup C_{M'}$ . Then  $W$  is initialled by a word in  $\{\kappa\lambda, \kappa\kappa, \tau\gamma\}$ . Moreover, these words cannot appear in  $W$  except as a prefix.

## 7.2. Construction of $g$ .

First we define  $g_0 : C_M \cup \Sigma \rightarrow C_{M'} \cup \Sigma$  by

$$(7.3) \quad g_0 : \begin{cases} \tau\gamma^k & \mapsto \kappa\lambda^{k-2}\kappa\gamma, \quad k \geq 2; \\ \kappa\lambda^k\kappa\gamma & \mapsto \kappa\lambda^{k-1}\kappa\gamma\gamma, \quad k \geq 1; \\ \kappa\kappa\gamma & \mapsto \tau\gamma\gamma; \\ i & \mapsto i, \quad \forall i \in \Sigma. \end{cases}$$

It is easy to see that  $g_0 : C_M \cup \Sigma \rightarrow C_{M'} \cup \Sigma$  is a bijection. Now we define  $g : \Omega \rightarrow \Sigma^\infty$  by

$$(7.4) \quad g(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} g_0(X_j),$$

where  $(X_j)_{j=1}^\infty$  is the  $M$ -decomposition of  $\mathbf{x}$ .

Any  $\omega \in C_M$  is not ended with  $\kappa$ , so the  $M$ -decomposition of  $\mathbf{x} = x_1 \dots x_k \kappa^\infty \in \Omega$  is  $(X_j)_{j=1}^\ell (\kappa)^\infty$  for some  $\ell$ . Consequently,  $g(\mathbf{x}) = (\prod_{j=1}^\ell g_0(X_j))(\kappa)^\infty \in \Omega$ . Thus  $g(\Omega) \subset \Omega$ .

**Proposition 7.2** ([16]). Let  $\mathbf{x} = x_1 x_2 \dots$ ,  $\mathbf{u} = u_1 u_2 \dots = g(\mathbf{x})$ .

- (i) If  $(X_j)_{j=1}^\infty$  is the  $M$ -decomposition of  $\mathbf{x}$ , then the  $M'$ -decomposition of  $g(\mathbf{x})$  is  $\prod_{j=1}^\infty g_0(X_j)$ .
- (ii) Similarly, if  $(U_j)_{j=1}^\infty$  is the  $M'$ -decomposition of  $\mathbf{u}$ , then the  $M$ -decomposition of  $h(\mathbf{u})$  is  $(g_0^{-1}(U_j))_{j \geq 1}$ , where  $h(\mathbf{u}) = \prod_{j=1}^\infty g_0^{-1}(U_j)$ .
- (iii) The map  $g : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  is a bijection.

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

**Lemma 7.3** ([16]). Let  $\mathbf{x} = (x_k)_{k \geq 1}$ ,  $\mathbf{y} = (y_k)_{k \geq 1} \in \Omega$ . Then

$$|g(\mathbf{x}) \wedge g(\mathbf{y})| \geq |\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{y}| - 2.$$

In other words,  $u_1 \dots u_k$  is determined by  $x_1 \dots x_{k+2}$ , where  $k \geq 1$ .

The following lemma is our new observation.

**Lemma 7.4.** *Let  $\mathbf{a} = (a_i)_{i \geq 1} \in \Omega$ . If  $k \geq 3$  and  $\gamma$  does not occur in  $a_1 \dots a_k$ , then  $g(\mathbf{a})|_{k-2} = \mathbf{a}|_{k-2}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $(A_i)_{i \geq 1}$  be the  $M$ -decomposition of  $\mathbf{a}$ . Let  $p$  be the largest integer such that  $|A_i| = 1$  for all  $i \leq p$ . (Here  $p$  may equal 0.) If  $p \geq k - 2$ , then the lemma holds.

Now we assume that  $p \leq k - 3$ . Since  $A_{p+1} \in C_M$ , it does not end at or before  $a_k$  by the assumption, we have  $A_{p+1} \notin \{\tau\gamma^\ell; \ell \geq 2\} \cup \{\kappa\kappa\gamma\}$ . So the only choice is  $A_{p+1} = \kappa\lambda^\ell\kappa\gamma$ , and we further have  $\ell \geq k - p - 2$ . Therefore,

$$g(\mathbf{a}) = (a_1 \dots a_p)g(A_{p+1}) \cdots = (a_1 \dots a_p)\kappa\lambda^{\ell-1}\kappa\gamma\gamma \dots,$$

it follows that  $|g(\mathbf{a}) \wedge \mathbf{a}| \geq p + 1 + \ell - 1 \geq k - 2$ . The lemma is proved.  $\square$

## 8. PROOF OF THEOREM 5.1

Let  $M$  be a cross automaton of *Class 2* with top and bottom vertices  $\gamma$  and  $\lambda$  respectively, let  $M'$  be a one-step simplification of  $M$  by deleting  $(\tau, \kappa)$ , see (5.1).

For  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \Omega = \{\omega\kappa^\infty; \omega \in \Sigma^*\}$ , denote  $\mathbf{u} = g(\mathbf{x})$  and  $\mathbf{v} = g(\mathbf{y})$ . Let  $(X_j)_{j=1}^\infty, (Y_j)_{j=1}^\infty$  be the  $M$ -decompositions of  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}$  respectively, and  $(U_j)_{j=1}^\infty, (V_j)_{j=1}^\infty$  be the  $M'$ -decompositions of  $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}$  respectively.

In  $M$  (or  $M'$ ), for  $S, S' \in Q$  and  $(i, j) \in \Sigma^2$ , we will use  $S \xrightarrow{(i,j)} S'$  as an alternative notation for  $\delta(S, (i, j)) = S'$ . One should keep in mind that, in both  $M$  and  $M'$ ,

$$(8.1) \quad \mathbf{e}_2 \xrightarrow{(i,j)} \mathbf{e}_2 \text{ if and only if } (i, j) = (\gamma, \lambda),$$

and except that  $\mathbf{e}_2 \xrightarrow{(\gamma,\lambda)} \mathbf{e}_2$ ,  $-\mathbf{e}_2 \xrightarrow{(\lambda,\gamma)} -\mathbf{e}_2$  and  $Id \xrightarrow{(\gamma,\gamma)} Id$ , we have

$$(8.2) \quad S \xrightarrow{(\gamma,\theta)} Exit, \quad S \xrightarrow{(\theta,\gamma)} Exit, \quad \forall \theta \in \Sigma.$$

(See Lemma 5.1).

**Lemma 8.1.** *Let  $\mathbf{a} = (a_i)_{i=1}^\infty, \mathbf{b} = (b_i)_{i=1}^\infty \in \Omega$  with  $a_1 \neq b_1$ . If  $\mathbf{a} = \lambda^k\kappa\gamma \cdots$  ( $k \geq 0$ ), then*

$$T_M(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}), T_{M'}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \in \{0, 1, 2\}.$$

*Proof.* Since  $M'$  is a simplification of  $M$ , we have  $T_{M'}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \leq T_M(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ . So we only need to prove  $T_M(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \leq 2$ . Suppose  $T_M(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) > 0$ , then  $S_1 = \delta(id, (a_1, b_1)) \in \{\pm\mathbf{e}_1, \pm\mathbf{e}_2\}$  since  $a_1 \neq b_1$ .

① If  $k = 0$ , then  $a_1 = \kappa$  and  $a_2 = \gamma$ . Since  $\kappa$  is  $V$ -maximal in  $M$ , we have  $S_1 \neq \mathbf{e}_2$ , which forces  $S_1 = \pm\mathbf{e}_1$ . So  $(a_2, b_2)$  leads the state  $S_1$  to  $Exit$  in  $M$  by (8.2), hence  $T_M(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \leq 1$ .

② If  $k = 1$ , then  $a_1 = \lambda, a_2 = \kappa$  and  $a_3 = \gamma$ . Suppose  $S = \mathbf{e}_2$ , then  $(a_2, b_2) = (\gamma, \lambda)$ , which contradicts to  $a_2 = \kappa$ . So  $S_1 = \pm\mathbf{e}_1$ , and the next state is also  $\pm\mathbf{e}_1$  by the self-looping property. Thus  $\pm\mathbf{e}_1 \xrightarrow{(a_3, b_3)} Exit$  since  $a_3 = \gamma$ , so  $T_M(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \leq 2$ .

③ If  $k \geq 2$ , then  $a_1 = a_2 = \lambda$ . By item (iii) of Lemma 5.1, we have  $id \xrightarrow{(\lambda\lambda, b_1 b_2)} Exit$ , so  $T_M(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \leq 1$ . The lemma is proved.  $\square$

Recall that  $C_M = \{\tau\gamma^k; k \geq 2\} \cup \{\kappa\lambda^k\kappa\gamma; k \geq 0\}$ , see (7.1).

**Lemma 8.2.** (i) Let  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \Omega$ . If  $x_1 = y_1$  and  $X_1 \neq Y_1$ , then

$$(8.3) \quad T_M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \leq |\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{y}| + 2.$$

(ii) Let  $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \Omega$ . If  $u_1 = v_1$  and  $U_1 \neq V_1$ , then

$$(8.4) \quad T_{M'}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \leq |\mathbf{u} \wedge \mathbf{v}| + 2.$$

*Proof.* (i) Let  $k = |\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{y}|$ , then  $k \geq 1$  and

$$T_M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = k + T_M(x_{k+1}x_{k+2}\dots, y_{k+1}y_{k+2}\dots).$$

Note that  $X_1 \neq Y_1$ , at least one of  $X_1$  and  $Y_1$  is in  $C_M$ , say  $X_1 \in C_M$ .

*Case 1.*  $X_1 = \tau\gamma^\ell (\ell \geq 2)$ .

In this case,  $k \leq \ell + 1$ , for otherwise  $X_1 = Y_1$ , a contradiction. If  $k \leq \ell$ , then  $(x_{k+1}, y_{k+1}) = (\gamma, \theta)$ , where  $\theta \neq \gamma$ ; if  $k = \ell + 1$ , then  $Y_1 = \tau\gamma^s$  with  $s \geq \ell + 1$  and we have  $(x_{k+1}, y_{k+1}) = (\theta, \gamma)$  with  $\theta \neq \gamma$ . So by (8.2),  $T_M(x_{k+1}\dots, y_{k+1}\dots) = 0$  and  $T_M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = k$ .

*Case 2.*  $X_1 = \kappa\lambda^\ell\kappa\gamma (\ell \geq 0)$ .

In this case, we have  $k \leq \ell + 2$ , for otherwise  $X_1 = Y_1$ . If  $k \leq \ell + 1$ , then  $x_{k+1}x_{k+2}\dots = \lambda^p\kappa\gamma\dots (p \geq 0)$ , by Lemma 8.1 we have

$$T_M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = k + T_M(x_{k+1}x_{k+2}\dots, y_{k+1}y_{k+2}\dots) \in \{k, k + 1, k + 2\}.$$

If  $k = \ell + 2$ , then  $x_{k+1} = \gamma$  and  $(x_{k+1}, y_{k+1}) = (\gamma, \theta)$  with  $\theta \neq \gamma$ , so by (8.2) we have  $T_M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = k$ . Consequently, (8.3) always holds.

(ii) Using item (i) we have

$$T_{M'}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \leq T_M(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \leq |\mathbf{u} \wedge \mathbf{v}| + 2,$$

where the first inequality holds since  $M'$  is a simplification of  $M$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 8.3.** Let  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \Omega$ . If  $X_1 \neq Y_1$ , then

$$(8.5) \quad T_M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - T_{M'}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \leq 4.$$

*Proof.* Let  $k = T_M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ . Obviously, the lemma holds when  $k \leq 4$ , so in the following we assume that  $k \geq 5$ . Let  $S_{M,1} = \delta_M(id, (x_1, y_1))$  be the first state of the itinerary of  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  in  $M$ . In the following we prove (8.5) by 3 cases.

Case 1.  $S_{M,1} = Id$ .

In this case we have  $x_1 = y_1$ , so  $T_M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \leq |\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{y}| + 2$  by Lemma 8.2 (i). Besides,  $|\mathbf{u} \wedge \mathbf{v}| \geq |\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{y}| - 2$  by Lemma 7.3. So

$$T_M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - T_{M'}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \leq (|\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{y}| + 2) - |\mathbf{u} \wedge \mathbf{v}| \leq 4.$$

Case 2.  $S_{M,1} = \mathbf{e}_1$  or  $-\mathbf{e}_1$ .

By symmetry, we assume that  $S_{M,1} = \mathbf{e}_1$ . The itinerary of  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  in  $M$  is  $id \rightarrow (\mathbf{e}_1)^k \rightarrow Exit$ , so by (8.2),  $\gamma$  neither occurs in  $x_1 \dots x_k$  nor in  $y_1 \dots y_k$ . Then by lemma 7.4, we have  $u_1 \dots u_{k-2} = x_1 \dots x_{k-2}$  and  $v_1 \dots v_{k-2} = y_1 \dots y_{k-2}$ . So  $T_{M'}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \geq k - 2$  since  $\mathcal{P}'_H = \mathcal{P}_H$  and  $\mathcal{P}'_{\mathbf{e}_1} = \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{e}_1}$ , and (8.5) follows.

Case 3.  $S_{M,1} = \mathbf{e}_2$  or  $-\mathbf{e}_2$ .

By symmetry, we assume that  $S_{M,1} = \mathbf{e}_2$ . The itinerary of  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  in  $M$  must be  $id \rightarrow (\mathbf{e}_2)^k \rightarrow Exit$ . Recall that  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{e}_2} = \{(\gamma, \lambda)\}$ , so  $(x_1, y_1) \in \mathcal{P}_V$  and

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \gamma^{k-1} x_{k+1} \dots \\ y_1 \lambda^{k-1} y_{k+1} \dots \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } \begin{pmatrix} x_{k+1} \\ y_{k+1} \end{pmatrix} \neq \begin{pmatrix} \gamma \\ \lambda \end{pmatrix}.$$

① If  $x_1 \neq \tau$ , then  $y_1 \neq \kappa$  by the uniqueness property of the cross automaton. So  $|X_i| = |Y_i| = 1$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq k$ , which implies that

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{u} \\ \mathbf{v} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \gamma^{k-1} \dots \\ y_1 \lambda^{k-1} \dots \end{pmatrix}.$$

The itinerary of  $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$  in  $M'$  must be  $id \rightarrow (\mathbf{e}_2)^k \rightarrow \dots$  since  $(u_1, v_1) = (x_1, y_1) \in \mathcal{P}'_V$ . Thus  $T_{M'}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \geq k$  and (8.5) follows.

② If  $x_1 = \tau$ , then  $y_1 = \kappa$ . In this case, by the definition of  $g$  (see (7.4)) we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{u} \\ \mathbf{v} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \kappa \lambda^{k-3} \dots \\ \kappa \lambda^{k-2} \dots \end{pmatrix}.$$

The itinerary of  $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$  in  $M'$  is  $id \rightarrow (Id)^{k-2} \rightarrow \dots$ , so  $T_{M'}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \geq k - 2$  and (8.5) holds.  $\square$

Let  $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \Omega$ . We shall show that if  $U_1 \neq V_1$ , then

$$(8.6) \quad T_{M'}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) - T_M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \leq 4.$$

Let  $S_{M',1} = \delta_{M'}(id, (u_1, v_1))$  be the first state of the itinerary of  $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$  in  $M'$ . If  $S_{M',1} = Exit$ , it is obvious that (8.6) holds. We will prove (8.6) for other cases in the following three lemmas.

Recall that  $C_{M'} = \{\kappa \lambda^k \kappa \gamma; k \geq 0\} \cup \{\kappa \lambda^k \kappa \gamma \gamma; k \geq 0\} \cup \{\tau \gamma \gamma\}$ , see (7.2).

**Lemma 8.4.** Equation (8.6) holds if  $U_1 \neq V_1$  and  $S_{M',1} = Id$ .

*Proof.* That  $S_{M',1} = Id$  implies that  $u_1 = v_1$ , so at least one of  $U_1$  and  $V_1$  is in  $C_{M'}$ , say  $U_1 \in C_{M'}$ .

*Case 1.*  $U_1 = \tau\gamma\gamma$ .

In this case we have  $|\mathbf{u} \wedge \mathbf{v}| \leq 2$  and  $T_{M'}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \leq 4$  by Lemma 8.2 (ii). So (8.6) holds.

*Case 2.*  $U_1 = \kappa\lambda^k\kappa\gamma$  or  $\kappa\lambda^k\kappa\gamma\gamma$  ( $k \geq 0$ ).

① If  $V_1 = \kappa\lambda^\ell\kappa\gamma$  or  $\kappa\lambda^\ell\kappa\gamma\gamma$  ( $\ell \geq 0$ ), it is clear that  $\ell \neq k$  when  $U_1$  and  $V_1$  are of the same type. We see that  $|\mathbf{u} \wedge \mathbf{v}| \leq \max\{|U_1|, |V_1|\} \leq 4 + \min\{k, \ell\}$ . Applying  $g_0^{-1}$  (see (7.3)) to  $U_1$  and  $V_1$ , we have

$$X_1 \in \{\tau\gamma^{k+2}, \kappa\lambda^{k+1}\kappa\gamma\}, \quad Y_1 \in \{\tau\gamma^{\ell+2}, \kappa\lambda^{\ell+1}\kappa\gamma\}.$$

Then  $T_M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \geq 1 + \min\{k+1, \ell+1\}$  holds for all possible combinations of  $X_1$  and  $Y_1$ . Hence

$$T_{M'}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) - T_M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \leq |\mathbf{u} \wedge \mathbf{v}| + 2 - T_M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \leq 4.$$

②  $V_1 = \kappa$ , write  $\mathbf{v}$  as  $\kappa\lambda^{\ell}\bar{\lambda}\dots$ , where  $\bar{\lambda} \neq \lambda$ . Then  $|\mathbf{u} \wedge \mathbf{v}| \leq 2 + \min\{k, \ell\}$ , and  $|V_i| = 1$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq \ell$  since  $V_1 = \kappa$ , and  $\lambda\lambda$  is not a prefix of any words in  $C_{M'}$  (even if  $\lambda = \tau$ ). By the definition of  $g$ , see (7.4), we have

$$X_1 \in \{\tau\gamma^{k+2}, \kappa\lambda^{k+1}\kappa\gamma\}, \quad \mathbf{y} = \kappa\lambda^{\ell-1}\dots.$$

Then  $T_M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \geq 1 + \min\{k+1, \ell-1\}$  holds for all possible combinations of  $X_1$  and  $\mathbf{y}$ . Thus

$$T_{M'}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) - T_M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \leq |\mathbf{u} \wedge \mathbf{v}| + 2 - T_M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \leq 4.$$

□

**Lemma 8.5.** *Equation (8.6) holds if  $S_{M',1} = \mathbf{e}_1$  or  $-\mathbf{e}_1$ .*

*Proof.* By symmetry, we assume that  $S_{M',1} = \mathbf{e}_1$ . Let  $k = T_{M'}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \geq 5$ , then the itinerary of  $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$  in  $M'$  is  $id \rightarrow (\mathbf{e}_1)^k \rightarrow Exit$ . By (8.2),  $\gamma$  neither occurs in  $u_1 \dots u_k$  nor in  $v_1 \dots v_k$ .

*Case 1.*  $\lambda$  is  $\mathbf{e}_1$ -isolated.

In this case,  $u_i, v_i \notin \{\lambda, \gamma\}$  ( $2 \leq i \leq k$ ), then  $|U_i| = |V_i| = 1$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq k-2$ , hence

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} u_1 \cdots u_{k-2} x_{k-1} \cdots \\ v_1 \cdots v_{k-2} y_{k-1} \cdots \end{pmatrix}.$$

The itinerary of  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  in  $M$  is  $id \rightarrow (\mathbf{e}_1)^{k-2} \rightarrow \dots$ . So  $T_M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \geq k-2$  and (8.6) holds.

*Case 2.*  $\lambda$  is not  $\mathbf{e}_1$ -isolated.

In this case, there exists a letter  $\theta \in \Sigma \setminus \{\gamma\}$  such that  $(\lambda, \theta) \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{e}_1} \cup \overline{\mathcal{P}}_{\mathbf{e}_1}$ .

We claim that  $\kappa$  is  $H$ -isolated. Suppose on the contrary that  $(\kappa, \eta) \in \mathcal{P}_H$ . Set

$$\mathbf{x}' = \kappa\lambda^\infty, \mathbf{y}' = \eta\theta^\infty, \mathbf{z}' = \tau\gamma^\infty.$$

Then the itineraries of  $(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y}')$  and  $(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{z}')$  in  $M$  are  $id \rightarrow (\mathbf{e}_1)^\infty$  and  $id \rightarrow (-\mathbf{e}_2)^\infty$ , respectively. So  $T_M(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y}') = T_M(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{z}') = +\infty$ , which contradicts to triple-coding-free condition. Our claim is proved.

If  $|U_1| > 1$ , then  $U_1 \in \{\kappa\lambda^\ell\kappa\gamma; \ell \geq 2\} \cup \{\kappa\lambda^\ell\kappa\gamma\gamma; \ell \geq 2\}$  since  $u_i \neq \gamma$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq 5$ , so  $(\kappa, v_1) = (u_1, v_1) \in \mathcal{P}_H$ , which contradicts that  $\kappa$  is  $H$ -isolated. So  $|U_1| = 1$ . By symmetry, we have  $|V_1| = 1$ .

Let  $p$  be the largest integer such that  $|U_i| = 1$  for all  $i \leq p$ . We claim that  $p \geq k - 2$ . Suppose on the contrary  $p \leq k - 3$ . Then  $U_{p+1} \in \{\kappa\lambda^\ell\kappa\gamma; \ell \geq 1\} \cup \{\kappa\lambda^\ell\kappa\gamma\gamma; \ell \geq 1\}$  since  $u_i \neq \gamma$  for all  $p+1 \leq i \leq k$ . We set

$$\mathbf{x}'' = u_1 \dots u_p \kappa \lambda^\infty, \mathbf{y}'' = v_1 \dots v_p v_{p+1} \theta^\infty \text{ and } \mathbf{z}'' = u_1 \dots u_p \tau \gamma^\infty.$$

Obviously,  $\mathbf{x}'', \mathbf{y}''$  and  $\mathbf{z}''$  are distinct since  $u_1 \neq v_1$  and  $\theta \neq \gamma$ . Moreover, the itineraries of  $(\mathbf{x}'', \mathbf{y}'')$  and  $(\mathbf{x}'', \mathbf{z}'')$  in  $M$  are  $id \rightarrow (\mathbf{e}_1)^\infty$  and  $id \rightarrow (Id)^p \rightarrow (-\mathbf{e}_2)^\infty$  respectively. It also contradicts to triple-coding-free condition.

Therefore,  $x_1 \dots x_{k-2} = u_1 \dots u_{k-2}$ . By symmetry, we have  $y_1 \dots y_{k-2} = v_1 \dots v_{k-2}$ . By  $\mathcal{P}'_H = \mathcal{P}_H$  and  $\mathcal{P}'_{\mathbf{e}_1} = \mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{e}_1}$ , we obtain  $T_M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \geq k - 2$ , so (8.6) holds.  $\square$

**Lemma 8.6.** Equation (8.6) holds if  $S_{M',1} = \mathbf{e}_2$  or  $-\mathbf{e}_2$ .

*Proof.* By symmetry, we may assume that  $S_{M',1} = \mathbf{e}_2$ . Let  $k = T_{M'}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \geq 5$ . The itinerary of  $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$  in  $M'$  must be  $id \rightarrow (\mathbf{e}_2)^k \rightarrow Exit$ . So  $(u_1, v_1) \in \mathcal{P}'_V$  and by (8.1) we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{u} \\ \mathbf{v} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} u_1 \gamma^{k-1} u_{k+1} \dots \\ v_1 \lambda^{k-1} v_{k+1} \dots \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } \begin{pmatrix} u_{k+1} \\ v_{k+1} \end{pmatrix} \neq \begin{pmatrix} \gamma \\ \lambda \end{pmatrix}.$$

By Lemma 5.2,  $\kappa$  is  $V$ -isolated and  $\tau$  is  $V$ -maximal in  $M'$ , so  $u_1 \notin \{\tau, \kappa\}$  and  $v_1 \neq \kappa$ . It follows that  $|U_i| = |V_i| = 1$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq k - 1$ . Then

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} u_1 \gamma^{k-1} \dots \\ v_1 \lambda^{k-2} \dots \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since  $(u_1, v_1)$  also belongs to  $\mathcal{P}_V$ , we conclude that  $T_M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \geq k - 1$ , and (8.6) follows.  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 5.1:** Let  $\sigma$  be the shift operation defined by  $\sigma((x_k)_{k \geq 1}) = (x_k)_{k \geq 2}$ . For any  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \Omega$ , if  $X_1 \dots X_k = Y_1 \dots Y_k$  and  $X_{k+1} \neq Y_{k+1}$ , then  $U_1 \dots U_k = V_1 \dots V_k$  and  $U_{k+1} \neq V_{k+1}$ . Let  $\ell = |X_1 \dots X_k|$ , we have

$$T_M(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - T_{M'}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = T_M(\sigma^\ell(\mathbf{x}), \sigma^\ell(\mathbf{y})) - T_{M'}(\sigma^\ell(\mathbf{u}), \sigma^\ell(\mathbf{v})).$$

Since (8.5) and (8.6) hold for  $\sigma^\ell(\mathbf{x}), \sigma^\ell(\mathbf{y}), \sigma^\ell(\mathbf{u})$  and  $\sigma^\ell(\mathbf{v})$ , we obtain (5.2) and we are done.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] R. Balakrishnan and K. Ranganathan, *A textbook of graph theory*, Springer, (2012).
- [2] C. Bandt and M. Mesing, *Self-affine fractals of finite type*, Banach Center Publ., **84** (2009), 131-148.



- [3] T.Q. Bao, S. Cobzaş and A. Soubeyran, *Variational principles, completeness and the existence of traps in behavioral sciences*, Ann. Oper. Res., **269** (2018), 53-79.
- [4] K. Barański, *Hausdorff dimension of the limit sets of some planar geometric constructions*, Adv. Math. **210** (2007), 215-245.
- [5] T. Bedford, *Crinkly curves, Markov partitions and dimensions*, PhD Thesis, University of Warwick, 1984.
- [6] C.J. Bishop and J.T. Tyson, *Conformal dimension of the antenna set*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **129** (2001), 3631-3636.
- [7] M. Bonk and S. Merenkov, *Quasisymmetric rigidity of square Sierpiński carpets*, Anal. of Math., **177** (2013), 591-643.
- [8] Y.G. Dang and S.Y. Wen, *Conformal dimension of a class of planar self-similar sets*, Sci. Sin. Math., **51** (2021), 581-590.
- [9] T. Das and D. Simmons, *The Hausdorff and dynamical dimensions of self-affine sponges: a dimension gap result*. Invent. Math., **210** (2017), 85-134.
- [10] G. David and S. Semmes, *Fractured fractals and broken dreams: self-similar geometry through metric and measure*, Oxford Univ Press, (1997).
- [11] J. Deng, Z.Y. Wen, Y. Xiong and L.F. Xi, *Bilipschitz embedding of self-similar sets*, J. Anal. Math., **114** (2011), 63-97.
- [12] K.I. Eroğlu, S. Rohde and B. Solomyak, *Quasisymmetric conjugacy between quadratic dynamics and iterated function systems*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems, **30** (2010), 1665-1684.
- [13] K.J. Falconer and D.T. Marsh, *On the Lipschitz equivalence of Cantor sets*, Mathematika, **39** (1992), 223-233.
- [14] A.H. Fan, H. Rao and Y. Zhang, *Higher dimensional Frobenius problem: maximal saturated cone, growth function and rigidity*, J. Math. Pures Appl., **104** (2015), 533-560.
- [15] J.E. Hopcroft, R. Motwani and J.D. Ullman, *Introduction to automata theory, language, and computation, 2nd edition*, Addison-Wesley, (2001).
- [16] L.Y. Huang, Z.Y. Wen, Y.M. Yang, Y.J. Zhu, *Topology automaton of self-similar sets and its applications to metrical classifications*, Nonlinearity **36** (2023), 2541-2566.
- [17] J.E. Hutchinson, *Fractals and self-similarity*, Indiana Univ. Math. J., **30** (1981), 713-747.
- [18] J. Kigami, *Quasisymmetric modification of metrics on self-similar sets*, Springer Proc. Math. Stat., Springer, Heidelberg, **88** (2014), 253-282.
- [19] K.S. Lau, J.J. Luo and H. Rao, *Topological structure of fractal squares*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc., **155** (2013), 73-86.
- [20] J.J. Luo and K.S. Lau, *Lipschitz equivalence of self-similar sets and hyperbolic boundaries*, Adv. Math., **235** (2013), 555-579.
- [21] J.J. Luo and J.C. Liu, *On the classification of fractal squares*, Fractals, **24** (2016), 11 pp.
- [22] C. McMullen, *The Hausdorff dimension of Sierpiński carpets*, Nagoya Math. J., **966** (1984), 1-9.
- [23] B. Pepo, *Fixed points for contractive mappings of third order in pseudo-quasimetric spaces*, Indag. Math. (N.S.), **1** (1990), 473-481.
- [24] F. Rao, X.H. Wang and S.Y. Wen, *On the topological classification of fractal squares*, Fractals, **25** (2017), 12 pp.
- [25] F. Rao, X.H. Wang, Y.J. Zhu, *Lipschitz equivalence of a pair of fractal squares (in Chinese)*, Sci. Sin. Math., **48** (2018), 363-372.
- [26] H. Rao, H.J. Ruan and Y. Wang, *Lipschitz equivalence of Cantor sets and algebraic properties of contraction ratios*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc, **364** (2012), 1109-1126.
- [27] H. Rao, H.J. Ruan and L.F. Xi, *Lipschitz equivalence of self-similar sets*, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris, **342** (2006), 191-196.

- [28] H. Rao, Y.L. Xu, and Y. Zhang, *Point-wise doubling indices of measures and its application to bi-Lipschitz classification of Bedford-McMullen carpets*, Preprint (2025), (arXiv:2501.02426 [math.DS]).
- [29] H. Rao and Y. Zhang, *Higher dimensional Frobenius problem and Lipschitz equivalence of Cantor sets*, J. Math. Pures Appl., **104** (2015), 868-881.
- [30] H.J. Ruan and Y. Wang, *Topological invariants and Lipschitz equivalence of fractal squares*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., **451** (2017), 327-344.
- [31] H.J. Ruan, Y. Wang and L.F. Xi, *Lipschitz equivalence of self-similar sets with touching structures*, Nonlinearity, **27** (2014), 1299-1321.
- [32] J.T. Tyson and J.M. Wu, *Quasiconformal dimensions of self-similar fractals*, Rev. Mat. Iberoam, **22** (2006), 205-258.
- [33] Z.X. Wen, Z.Y. Zhu and G.T. Deng, *Lipschitz equivalence of a class of general Sierpiński carpets*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., **385** (2012), 16-23.
- [34] L.F. Xi and H.J. Ruan, *Lipschitz equivalence of self-similar sets satisfying strong separation condition*, Acta Math. Sinica (Chinese Ser.), **51** (2008), 493-500.
- [35] L.F. Xi and Y. Xiong, *Algebraic criteria for Lipschitz equivalence of dust-like self-similar sets*, J. Lond. Math. Soc., **103** (2021), 760-780.
- [36] L.F. Xi and Y. Xiong, *Self-similar sets with initial cubic patterns*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser.I, **348** (2010), 15-20.
- [37] Y.J. Zhu and H. Rao, *Lipschitz equivalence of self-similar sets and finite-state automaton*, Fractals, **29** (2021), 2150271.
- [38] Y.J. Zhu and Y.M. Yang, *Lipschitz equivalence of self-similar sets with two-state neighbor automaton*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., **458** (2018), 379-392.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND PHYSICS, HUBEI POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY, HUANGSHI, 435000, CHINA.

*Email address:* yjzhu\_ccnu@sina.com

COLLEGE OF SCIENCE, WUHAN UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, WUHAN, 430070, CHINA

*Email address:* liangyihuang@wust.edu.cn

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND PHYSICS, HUBEI POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY, HUANGSHI, 435000, CHINA.

*Email address:* bccheng@hbpu.edu.cn