

A NON FLC REGULAR PENTAGONAL TILING OF THE PLANE

MARIA RAMIREZ-SOLANO

Abstract

In this paper we describe the pentagonal tiling of the plane defined in the article "A regular pentagonal tiling of the plane" by P. L. Bowers and K. Stephenson as a conformal substitution tiling and summarize many of its properties given in the mentioned article. We show furthermore why such tiling is not FLC with respect to the set of conformal isomorphisms.

Introduction

The conformally regular pentagonal tiling of the plane described in the article [22] is the main character in this work. The goal is to describe this tiling as a conformal substitution tiling, i.e. a tiling generated by a substitution rule with complex scaling factor $\gamma > 1$ and a finite number of prototiles, where each prototile is substituted with "extended-conformal" copies of the prototiles. To this end, we begin by stating some results from the theory of Euclidean tilings of the plane. For more details, see [2], [14], [15], [19], [21]. Then, we introduce the concept of combinatorial tilings. See [10], [8], [11] for more details. Next we give an overview of the construction of the pentagonal tiling including material from [1], [23] for the overview. The main properties of the pentagonal tiling are stated in Proposition 6.1. We should remark that these properties are consequences of the results in [22], and not merely borrowed statements. We end this work with Theorem 6.2 and some remarks on why we have to abandon the notion of FLC with respect to the set of conformal isomorphisms.

1. A little theory on tilings of the plane

A *tile* is a closed subset of the plane homeomorphic to the closed unit disk. A *tiling* T is a cover of the plane by tiles that intersect only on their boundaries. More precisely, T is a collection of tiles, such that their union is \mathbb{R}^2 , and the intersection of any two tiles $t, t' \in T$ is the empty set or a subset of the boundary ∂t of t . There are three ways of constructing interesting tilings and we classify them as (1) substitution tilings, which are described below; (2) cut and project tilings, which invoke a higher dimension and project globally, ie by projection of higher-dimensional structures into spaces with lower dimensionality; (3) local matching rule tilings, which are jigsaw puzzles of the plane. These classes are not disjoint, nor they are equal. For example the Penrose tiling is a substitution tiling and a cut and project tiling. See [19].

Non-periodic tilings give rise to topological dynamical systems, which in turn give rise to C^* -algebras which in turn give rise to K -groups, which are topological invariants. The construction of a topological dynamical system from a tiling is given right after we remind the reader of the definitions of group action and topological dynamical systems.

Supported by the Danish National Research Foundation through the Centre for Symmetry and Deformation (DNRF92), and by the Faculty of Science of the University of Copenhagen.

A *group action* is a triple (X, G, ϕ) composed of a topological space X , an Abelian group G , and an action map $\phi : X \times G \rightarrow X$ defined by $\phi^g : X \rightarrow X$, which is a homeomorphism for every $g \in G$, and $\phi^0 = id$ and $\phi^g \circ \phi^h = \phi^{g+h}$ for every $g, h \in G$.

A *dynamical system* is a group action $((X, d), G, \phi)$, where (X, d) is a compact metric space called the phase space, and the group action ϕ is continuous. For short we write (X, G) instead of $((X, d), G, \phi)$. The study of the topological properties of dynamical systems is called topological dynamics, and the study of the statistical properties of dynamical systems is called ergodic theory. See [18].

The orbit set of a tiling T is defined by

$$\mathcal{O}(T) := \{T + x \mid x \in \mathbb{R}^2\},$$

where $T + x := \{t + x \mid t \in T\}$. The group \mathbb{R}^2 acts on the orbit set $\mathcal{O}(T)$ of a tiling T by translation, for if T' is in the orbit set, then so is $T' + x$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$.

The orbit set $\mathcal{O}(T)$ is equipped with a metric $d : \mathcal{O}(T) \times \mathcal{O}(T) \rightarrow [0, \infty[$ defined by $d(T, T') < \frac{1}{r}$ if there is $x, x' \in B_{1/r}(0)$ such that $(T - x) \cap B_r(0) = (T' - x') \cap B_r(0)$ i.e. if they agree on a ball of radius r centered at the origin up to a small wiggle. See Figure Figure 3.




FIGURE 1. A tiling T (Known as the chair tiling).




FIGURE 2. A translate of T given by $T' := T + (2, 2)$.

The continuous hull Ω_T of a tiling T is defined as the completion of the metric space $(\mathcal{O}(T), d)$, i.e.

$$\Omega_T := \overline{\mathcal{O}(T)}^d.$$

The same definition of d extends to Ω_T , and (Ω_T, d) is a metric space. The group \mathbb{R}^2 acts also on the hull by translation, for if T' is in Ω_T then so is $T' + x$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$. See [15]. A *patch* P is a finite subset of a tiling T . A tiling satisfies the *finite local complexity (FLC)* if for any $r > 0$ there are finitely many patches of diameter less than r up to a group of motion G , usually translation. The finite local complexity (FLC) is also called *finite pattern condition*. By Theorem 2.2 in [15], if a tiling T satisfies the FLC condition then the metric space (Ω_T, d) is compact. Hence, if a tiling T satisfies the FLC condition, then (Ω_T, \mathbb{R}^2) is a topological dynamical system. The action $\phi : \Omega_T \times \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \Omega_T$ given by $\phi^x(T') := T' + x$ is continuous by definition of the metric.




FIGURE 3. The two tilings T , $T' := T + (2, 2)$ shown in Figure 1 and Figure 2 agree on the yellow (large) disk of radius r , so the distance $d(T, T') < 1/r$. If $T'' := T' + x$ and x is in the green (small) disk of radius $1/r$, then $d(T, T'') < 1/r$.

A topological dynamical system (Ω_T, \mathbb{R}^d) is *minimal* if every orbit is dense. By construction, the orbit $\mathcal{O}(T)$ of T is dense in Ω_T . Hence (Ω_T, \mathbb{R}^d) is topologically transitive. A tiling T is said to be *repetitive* if for every patch $P \subset T$ there is an $r > 0$ such that every ball of radius r contains a copy of P . A tiling T is aperiodic if $T + x \neq T$ for all $x \neq 0$.

By Proposition 2.4 in [15], if a tiling is aperiodic and repetitive then its hull contains no periodic tilings.

For substitution tilings, there is an alternative definition of the hull. See [14]. The construction of a substitution tiling is as follows. Let $P_{prot} := \{p_1, \dots, p_N\}$ be a set of tiles of the plane. These tiles are called prototiles. We define the substitution rule ω with scaling factor $\lambda > 1$ on P_{prot} by the map $\omega : P_{prot} \rightarrow \cup_{i=1}^N \mathcal{O}(p_i)$ defined by

$$p_i \mapsto \omega(p_i) := \{p_j + x_j \mid p_j \in P_{prot}, x_j \in \mathbb{R}^2\}$$

such that $\omega(p_i)$ tiles λp_i , i.e. the tiles in $\omega(p_i)$ overlap only on their boundaries and their union is λp_i . Moreover $\omega(p_i)$ is assumed to be finite. We extend the definition of ω to translates of prototiles: Define $\omega : \cup_{i=1}^N \mathcal{O}(p_i) \rightarrow \cup_{i=1}^N \mathcal{O}(p_i)$ by

$$\omega(p_i + x) := \omega(p_i) + \lambda x.$$

Observe that $\omega(p_i + x)$ tiles $\lambda(p_i + x)$ and not $\lambda p_i + x$, so all the points of the set $p_i + x$ are dilated. Thus, if $(p_i + x) \cap (p_j + y) = e$ then $\lambda(p_i + x) \cap \lambda(p_j + y) = \lambda e$ and so $\omega(p_i + x) \cap \omega(p_j + y)$ tiles λe . A *patch* P is a finite collection of translates of prototiles that overlap only on their boundaries. Let $\mathcal{P}_{patches} \subset \mathcal{P}(\cup_{i=1}^N \mathcal{O}(p_i))$ be the collection of patches derived from the prototiles. We now extend the definition of ω to patches. Let $\omega : \mathcal{P}_{patches} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_{patches}$ be defined by

$$P \mapsto \omega(P) := \bigcup_{t \in P} \omega(t).$$

Observe that $\omega(P)$ tiles the set $\lambda|P|$, where $|P|$ is the union of all the tiles in P . We define the $N \times N$ *substitution matrix* for the substitution map ω with prototiles P_{prot} by $A := (a_{ij})$ where a_{ij} is the number of copies of prototile p_i in $\omega(p_j)$.

It turns out that ω^n is also a substitution map with scaling factor λ^n . Moreover, the substitution matrix of ω^n is A^n . We say that the substitution map ω is primitive if its substitution matrix A is primitive.

If the substitution matrix A is *primitive*, then there is $k > 1$ such that $(A^k)_{ij} > 0$, and hence a copy of each prototile p_i appears inside the patch $\omega^k(p_j)$ for any i, j . If the substitution ω is primitive, we have $p_j + x \in \omega^k(p_j + y)$ for some $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^2$. We can then construct an increasing sequence of supertiles

$$p_j + x_0 \subset \omega^k(p_j + x_1) \subset \omega^{2k}(p_j + x_2) \subset \cdots \omega^{nk}(p_j + x_n) \subset \cdots,$$

for some x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots . Their union might not necessarily cover the entire plane, as $\lambda^{nk}p_j + \lambda^{nk}x_n$ might only cover a section of the plane. The substitution is said to *force its border* if there is a $m \geq 1$ independent of j such that $\omega^m(p_j)$ knows its neighbor tiles. Any substitution can be turned into a substitution that forces its border, simply by introducing collared tiles, which are tiles that remember their neighbors and their location relative to the tile. If the substitution forces its border, then the union of the above increasing sequence will cover the plane, and thus we have created a tiling of the plane. If the substitution does not force its border, then we use collared tiles instead together with the new substitution.

Define Ω to be the set of tilings T whose tiles are translations of the prototiles and each patch P in T is contained in a supertile $\omega^n(p_i + x)$ for some n, i, x . If T is a tiling in Ω then so is

$$\omega(T) := \bigcup_{t \in T} \omega(t).$$

We now extend ω to tilings. Define $\omega : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ by $T \mapsto \omega(T)$.

The space Ω is said to satisfy the *finite local complexity (FLC)* if for each $r > 0$ there are only finitely many patches $P \subset T \in \Omega$ of diameter less than r up to translation. Hence if Ω is FLC then every tiling in it is FLC. Moreover if T is FLC then Ω_T is FLC. If the substitution map ω is primitive and injective, and the space Ω satisfies the FLC condition then: the space Ω is nonempty by Proposition 2.1 in [14]. The map ω is surjective by Proposition 2.2 in [14]. The space Ω contains no periodic tilings by Proposition 2.3 in [14].

The metric d defined before defines a metric on Ω . Under the same conditions that ω is primitive and injective, and Ω satisfies the FLC condition, the group action $((\Omega, d), \mathbb{R}^2)$, where \mathbb{R}^2 acts by translation, is a topological dynamical system, and by Corollary 3.5 in [14] it is minimal. Hence for any $T \in \Omega$ we have

$$\Omega = \overline{\mathcal{O}(T)}^d = \Omega_T.$$

Moreover, by Proposition 3.1 in [14], the substitution map $\omega : (\Omega, d) \rightarrow (\Omega, d)$ is a topologically mixing homeomorphism. In particular ω is continuous. Let T be in Ω . Let Ω' be the set of tilings T' such that T' is a tiling whose tiles are translates of the prototiles P_{prot} and T' is locally isomorphic to T . By Corollary 3.6 in [14] we have $\Omega = \Omega'$.

Also, every primitive substitution tiling is repetitive. By Theorem 1.1 in [21], for a substitution tiling T that satisfies the FLC condition, the substitution map ω is injective if and only if its hull Ω_T contains no periodic tilings.

In conclusion we have,

	T FLC \implies	Ω_T compact.	
	T FLC: ω injective \iff	Ω_T has no periodic tilings.	
T FLC, substitution tiling, ω primitive, \implies	\iff	T repetitive, FLC \iff	(Ω_T, \mathbb{R}^d) minimal.
T substitution tiling, ω primitive, \implies	\iff	T repetitive, aperiodic \implies	Ω_T has no periodic tilings.
Ω FLC, ω primitive, injective \implies	\iff	$\Omega \neq \emptyset$, surjective, has no periodic tilings.	
Ω FLC, ω primitive, injective \implies	\iff	(Ω, \mathbb{R}^2) minimal. Hence $\Omega = \Omega_T$.	

Thus if T is FLC, aperiodic and ω is primitive, then (Ω_T, \mathbb{R}^2) is a minimal topological dynamical system; Ω_T has no periodic tilings, and ω is injective.

For each prototile p_i choose a point $x_i \in (p_i)^\circ$ in the interior of it. We say that x_i is a puncture of p_i . The puncture of any translate $t = p_i + x$ is defined by $x(t) := x_i + x$. Define the discrete hull

$$\Xi := \{T \in \Omega \mid T \text{ has a puncture at the origin}\}.$$

Since the punctures do not lie on the boundaries, the choice of $p_i - x_i$ is unique. If T is FLC, then Ξ is a Cantor set: compact, totally disconnected, and no isolated points. A basis for Ξ is given by the cylinder sets $U(P, t)$ defined as follows: Let P be a patch of T and t a tile in P . Define $U(P, t) := \{T' \in \Omega_T \mid P - x(t) \subset T'\}$ to be the set of tilings that contain $P - x(t)$. That is, $U(P, t)$ is a subset of Ξ such that the patch $P - x(t)$ is centered at the origin and anything can be outside the patch. Then $U(P, t)$ is clopen in the relative topology of Ξ , and such sets generate the relative topology of Ξ . See [15].

The action of translation induces an equivalence relation R on Ω by declaring two tilings $T, T' \in \Omega$ to be equivalent if they are translates of each other i.e. if $T = T' + x$ for some $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Let R' be the restriction of R to Ξ , which is an equivalence relation on Ξ . The set Ξ is a full transversal of Ω with respect to R because $[T]_R \cap \Xi \neq \emptyset$ is countable for any tiling $T \in \Omega$. Observe that the natural map $\Xi \rightarrow \Omega/R$ given by $T \mapsto [T]_R$ is surjective but not injective.

By [15], we can construct the C^* -algebras $C^*(R')$, $C^*(R)$. These C^* -algebras are strongly Morita equivalent because Ξ is a transversal to Ω relative to R , and R' is the restriction of R to Ξ , and because Ξ satisfies the following three conditions: (1) $T' \in \Omega \implies T' + x \in \Xi$ for some $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$. (2) $T' \in \Xi \implies \{T' + x \mid 0 < |x| < \varepsilon\} = \emptyset$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$. (3) Ξ is closed in Ω .

The pair $((\Omega, d), \omega)$ is also a dynamical system of its own. The group action is \mathbb{Z} , where the homeomorphisms are ω^a , $a \in \mathbb{Z}$. It is a Smale space.

2. Combinatorial Tilings

An n -cell on a topological space X is a subspace homeomorphic to the open n -disk $D^n := \{v \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \|v\| < 1\}$. Hence cells are open in X . A *cell decomposition* of a topological space X is a partition of the space into n -cells.

DEFINITION 2.1 (CW-complex). A pair (X, \mathcal{E}) consisting of a Hausdorff space X and a cell decomposition \mathcal{E} of X is called a *CW-complex* if the following three conditions are satisfied:

- (1) For each n -cell $e \in \mathcal{E}$, there exists a continuous map $\Phi_e : \overline{D}^n \rightarrow X$ from the closed unit n -disk \overline{D}^n to X that takes the boundary S^{n-1} into the $n-1$ skeleton X^{n-1} , and the restriction of this map to the interior D^n is a homeomorphism.
- (2) For any cell $e \in \mathcal{E}$ the closure \bar{e} intersects only a finite number of other cells.
- (3) A subset $A \subset X$ is closed if and only if $A \cap \bar{e}$ is closed in X for each $e \in \mathcal{E}$.

A nice result from CW-complexes which will be used extensively is the following: If (X, \mathcal{E}) is a CW-complex and $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is a map between two topological spaces, then f is continuous if and only if f restricted to each n -cell is continuous if and

only if f restricted to each n -skeleton X^n is continuous. Moreover, X^n is obtained from X^{n-1} by gluing the n -cells in X .

The dimension of a CW-complex is said to be n if all the cells are of degree at most n . A *combinatorial tiling* is a 2-dimensional CW-complex (X, \mathcal{E}) such that X is homeomorphic to the open unit disk $\mathbb{D} := D^2$. The *combinatorial tiles* are the closed 2-cells. We also say that a face is a closed 2-cell, an edge a closed 1-cell, and a vertex a 0-cell.

EXAMPLE 2.2. If T is a tiling of the plane, then T has the structure of a 2-dimensional CW-complex, where the 2-cells are the interior of the tiles, the 1-cells are the interior of the edges of the tiles, and the 0-cells are the vertices of the edges of the tiles. Hence, under this identification, (\mathbb{C}, T) is a combinatorial tiling.

By the cellular approximation theorem, a continuous map between CW-complexes can be taken to be cellular, i.e. that it maps the n -skeleton of the domain to the n -skeleton of the range. However, the maps between CW-complexes that we will consider in this work are stronger than cellular maps, for they map cells to cells. We call such maps *cell-preserving* maps.

We borrow the definition of subdivision of a combinatorial tiling from [3].

DEFINITION 2.3 (subdivision of a combinatorial tiling). Let (X, \mathcal{E}) and (X, \mathcal{E}') be two combinatorial tilings with same topological space X . We say that (X, \mathcal{E}') is a subdivision of (X, \mathcal{E}) if for each cell $e' \in \mathcal{E}'$, there is a cell $e \in \mathcal{E}$ such that $\bar{e}' \subset \bar{e}$.




FIGURE 4. No regular pentagonal tiling on the plane.




FIGURE 5. A pentagonal tiling.

3. Conformal regular pentagonal tiling of the plane T

Figure 4 shows that we cannot tile the plane with regular pentagons. However, we could deform the pentagons and obtain a pentagonal tiling like the one in Figure 5. Although this tiling has many nice properties, we can hope for more. We can construct a tiling with the same combinatorics, but where the tiles are so called conformally regular pentagons, and the tiling looks like the one in Figure 6. The article "A regular pentagonal tiling of the plane" by Philip L. Bowers and Kenneth Stephenson in [22] gives a construction of this tiling using the theory of circle packings on the above combinatorics. They use circle packings to impose a natural geometry on the above combinatorics. This gives the nice feature to the




FIGURE 6. The tiling T , which is a conformal regular pentagonal tiling of the plane.

tiles of being almost round. We give a brief summary of the construction and extract/deduce on our own some of the remarkable combinatorial and geometric properties of the tiling. Before we proceed, we need to introduce some terminology and results from Riemann surfaces.

4. Riemann Surfaces

A *Riemann surface* is a connected Hausdorff topological space S together with an analytic atlas, that is, a Riemann surface is just a one dimensional complex manifold. See pages 33, 39 in [1]. A map $f : S \rightarrow S'$ between two Riemann surfaces is said to be analytic if for every chart $\phi_U : U \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ of S and every chart $\phi_V : V \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ of S' , the map $\phi_V \circ f \circ \phi_U^{-1}$ is analytic. We should note that a chart ϕ_U is a homeomorphism onto its image. Two Riemann surfaces are said to be *conformally equivalent* if there is a bijective analytic map between them (hence an analytic homeomorphism). A connected Hausdorff topological space S with an analytic atlas is always equivalent to the same space S with a different analytic atlas, since the identity map gives a conformally equivalence between them. Hence if we treat conformally equivalent Riemann surfaces as identical, we do not need to worry about which atlas we equip S with. A *topological closed disk* is a topological space homeomorphic to the closed unit disk. In particular it is compact. For example a regular Euclidean pentagon is a topological closed disk. A *conformally regular pentagon* is a Riemann surface P with boundary and five distinguished points on its boundary, which we call corners, such that: (1) it is a topological closed disk, (2) the interior P° is conformally equivalent to the interior of a regular Euclidean pentagon P'° , (3) the bijective analytic map from P° to P'° extends continuously to the boundary, mapping corners to corners. We should emphasize that conformally regular pentagons are analytic on their interior, extend continuously to the boundary and they are not conformal on the boundary, so the angles on the boundaries are not preserved. An example of this is of course a regular Euclidean pentagon. Some more exotic examples of conformally regular pentagons are shown in Figure 7, and




FIGURE 7. The prototiles of T . The interior angles are either $\pi/2$ or $2\pi/3$.

later on we will show why this is the case. From such figure, we notice that the interior angles on the boundary are not necessarily $2\pi/5$ nor equal, as it should be. However, they are all conformally equivalent to the regular Euclidean pentagon.

Thus we could say that conformally regular pentagons are objects constructed from a regular pentagon. Two conformally regular pentagons are conformally equivalent on their interiors and homeomorphic on the whole and this homeomorphism preserves the cyclic ordering of their corners.

We will be working with conformally regular pentagons that are subsets of the complex plane. We call such pentagons *conformally regular pentagons of the plane*. We say that two conformally regular pentagons of the plane are *extended conformally equivalent* if they extend to open sets which are conformally equivalent. Two pentagons from Figure 7 cannot be extended analytically beyond their boundaries since their interior angles do not match. Hence these are not extended conformally equivalent.

5. Conformal substitution

We name T the tiling shown in Figure 6, which is also known as a conformal regular pentagonal tiling of the plane. The reason is that all its tiles are extended conformally equivalent to the pentagons shown in Figure 7, and so the boundary angles are preserved. This tiling is a conformal substitution tiling. That is, there is a substitution map ω with complex dilation $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ that replaces a tile t with a patch $\omega(t)$ satisfying: (1) the tiles in $\omega(t)$ are conformal regular pentagons which are extended conformally equivalent to the prototiles; (2) the union of all the tiles of $\omega(t)$ is λt . The prototiles are the three pentagons shown in Figure 7. The substitution map is shown in Figure 8, where the complex dilation constant is $\lambda = (-324)^{1/5} \approx 3.2e^{i\pi/5}$ - a dilation by 3.2 and a rotation by $\pi/5$ (page 294 in [23]).

The fact that we are filling λt with conformal copies of the prototiles, and not with translations/rotations of the prototiles, is a sign of a generalization of the standard theory for substitution tilings. The construction in [22] of the tiling T is as follows.

6. Construction of the conformal regular pentagonal tiling T .

The story of the construction of T involves five steps. The first one is to construct a combinatorial tiling K , which contains the combinatorics of T . We then equip it with a piecewise affine structure using regular pentagons, and then with a conformal structure to obtain a simply connected non compact Riemann surface. Finally, using a generalization of the Riemann mapping theorem, we map this one dimensional complex manifold onto the plane to obtain our tiling T . However, we need circle packing theory to see a drawing of the tiling T . If no confusion arises we will




FIGURE 8. The substitution map for the tiling T .

use the same symbol K to denote K with any of the structures, but if we want to emphasize which structure we are referring to then we will write K , K_{aff} , K_{conf} to denote that K is equipped with the combinatorial, piecewise-affine, and conformal structure, respectively. Recall that a combinatorial tiling is a CW-complex homeomorphic to the open unit disk, and so it is a pair consisting of a topological space and a partition. Usually, no ambiguity arises by denoting the topological space and the partition with the same symbol, for if we talk about cells, we talk about the partition, and if we talk about points, we talk about the space.

The construction of the combinatorial tiling K is the following. Start with a *combinatorial pentagon* K_0 , which is a closed topological disk with five distinguished points on its boundary. We write *combinatorial* to emphasize that at this stage we only care about combinatorics. That is we can think of it abstractly as one face with five edges and five vertices. Using the combinatorial subdivision rule from Figure 9, we subdivide K_0 into six combinatorial pentagons. The result is a combinatorial flower K_1 , which is shown in Figure 10. We identify K_0 with the central pentagon of K_1 , and we write $K_0 \subset K_1$. Repeat this subdivision for the new six pentagons to obtain the combinatorial superflower K_2 shown in Figure 10. We identify K_1 with the central flower of K_2 and so we have $K_0 \subset K_1 \subset K_2$. Repeating this subdivision n times we obtain an increasing sequence of combinatorial superflowers $K_0 \subset K_1 \subset \dots \subset K_n$. The union of all K_n is a combinatorial tiling whose tiles are combinatorial pentagons, each of them attached as in Figure 6. An alternative construction of K_n from K_{n-1} is using a so called reflection rule, which is shown in Figure 11. This rule consists in (1) reflecting the central pentagon K_0 across each of its five edges; then (2) the two edges coming out from the central pentagon are identified with each other, and so 5 identifications are made, each corresponding to a corner of the central pentagon, as seen in Figure 11. The result is K_1 . Repeat the same reflection procedure of the superpentagon K_1 across each of its five superedges and glue them as before. The result is K_2 , and so on: Reflecting K_{n-1} across each of its superedges and glue them as in Figure 11 we get K_n .

In summary, the combinatorial tiling K is a CW-complex whose cells are shown in Figure 6 and whose topological space is (homeomorphic to) \mathbb{C} . It has a central pentagon K_0 , and its group of combinatorial automorphisms (i.e. cell-preserving homeomorphisms) $\text{Aut}(K)$ is the dihedral group D_5 , which is composed of five




FIGURE 9. Subdivision map.



FIGURE 10. The central pentagon K_0 , combinatorial flower K_1 , and superflower K_2 .

FIGURE 11. Reflection rule.

rotations with respect to K_0 , and five reflections with respect to K_0 and a vertex of K_0 . Another important property of the combinatorial tiling K is that its vertices have either degree 3 or 4; that is, each vertex of K is a vertex of either 3 faces or 4 faces.

We now equip K with a piecewise affine structure: Equip the one skeleton K^1 with the unit edge metric, making each edge isometric to the unit interval. Then extend this metric to faces so that each face is isometric to a regular pentagon of side-length 1. The distance between two points is defined to be the length of the shortest path between them. This amounts to replacing each pentagon of K with Euclidean regular pentagons of side-length 1, all glued along their edges according to the combinatorics of K . Observe that on each pentagon we use the Euclidean metric and that the resulting metric ensures compatibility with the combinatorial structure of K ; for example, the isometric cell-preserving automorphisms of K are still the five rotations and reflections of the dihedral group D_5 .

As a side note, we wondered how the piecewise affine space K_{aff} looked like. The pentagonal flower K_1 is simply a half-dodecahedron. The superflower K_2 should look like Figure 12, but unfortunately, Mathematica shows otherwise. The three degree vertices and flatness of the pentagons, force us to glue a face of 5 dodecahedrons around 5 faces of a dodecahedron, which is not possible - there are

gaps in between. The dihedral angle of a dodecahedron is $\arccos \frac{1}{\sqrt{5}}$, while the angle to be filled is of $\pi - \arccos \frac{3}{5}$, which leaves a gap of about 10 degrees.



FIGURE 12. K_2 as a gluing of six half dodecahedrons.




FIGURE 13. K_2 is not the gluing of six half dodecahedrons.

We now equip K_{aff} with a conformal structure: The piecewise affine space K_{aff} is a nonflat surface. The corners and edges will be smoothed by charting them into the plane. For each edge and each vertex we define a chart: Suppose that e is an oriented edge of K_{aff} with pentagon $P_1 \in K_{\text{aff}}$ on its left and pentagon $P_2 \in K_{\text{aff}}$ on its right. See Figure 14. Define the open set $U_e := (P_1 \cup P_2)^\circ$ as the interior of the union of the pentagons. We now introduce a coordinate system on U_e by identifying e with the interval $] -1/2, 1/2[$ and P_1 and P_2 with the two regular pentagons Q_1, Q_2 that have in common this interval with Q_1 being above the x -axis and Q_2 below. We define $V := (Q_1 \cup Q_2)^\circ \subset \mathbb{C}$ as the interior of the union of these two pentagons; see Figure 14. The identification map $\phi_e : U_e \rightarrow V$ is given by $\phi_e(z) := z$. The map ϕ_e is the chart containing edge e , it is indexed by it, and it is an isometry. The intersection of two domains $U_e, U_{e'}$ is (1) itself if e and e' are the same as nonoriented edges; (2) is a pentagon P if e and e' are two edges of P ; (3) is the empty set otherwise. For the first case, the transition map is $\phi_e \circ \phi_{e'}^{-1}(z) = -z$ if e and e' have opposite orientation, else $\phi_e \circ \phi_{e'}^{-1}(z) = z$. For the second case, the transition map is $\phi_e \circ \phi_{e'}^{-1}(z) = (z - z_0)e^{m2\pi i/5} + z_0$, where $z_0 = \pm \frac{1}{4}i(1 + \sqrt{5})$ is the baricenter of the pentagon, $m = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4$ is the number of times we have to rotate (around the baricenter z_0 of the pentagon) the edge e' to match edge e , but this is assuming that both edges have same orientation; if they have opposite orientations then $\phi_e \circ \phi_{e'}^{-1} = \phi_e \circ \phi_{-e'}^{-1}(-z)$, where $-e'$ is the edge in the opposite direction of e' . See Figure 15. Hence, the transition maps for charts on edges are all analytic.

If v is a d -degree vertex of K_{aff} and U_v is the open metric ball of radius $1/3$ centered at v , and $V' \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is the open ball of the plane of radius $1/3$ centered at the origin, then the chart $\phi_v : U_v \rightarrow V'$ is defined by $\phi_v(z) = z^{10/(3d)}$, where $z := re^{i\theta}$, and $0 \leq \theta \leq \frac{3\pi}{5}d$ and $0 \leq r < \frac{1}{3}$ and the degree of the vertex is $d = 3, 4$. See Figure 16 and Figure 17. Observe that $\phi_v(re^{d\frac{3\pi}{5}i}) = r^{10/(3d)}e^{d\frac{3\pi}{5}i\frac{10}{3d}} = r^{10/(3d)}e^{2\pi i} = r^{10/(3d)} = \phi_v(r)$, as expected. Notice that we could as well have used open balls of radius $1/2$ instead of open balls of radius $1/3$ around the vertices.




FIGURE 14. The chart $\phi_e : U_e \rightarrow V$, where $U_e = (P_1 \cup P_2)^\circ$.




FIGURE 15. The transition map $\phi_e \phi_{e'}^{-1}(z) = (z - z_0)e^{2\pi i 4/5} + z_0$, where $z_0 = i(1 + \sqrt{5})/4$.

Observe that the radius of the ball V' is $(1/3)^{10/(3d)}$ which takes the values 0.295 and 0.40.




FIGURE 16. The chart $\phi_v : U_v \rightarrow V'$.




FIGURE 17. The flattened version of the chart $\phi_v : U_v \rightarrow V'$ when $d = 3$.

The intersection of the domains $U_v, U_{v'}$ for the charts $\phi_v, \phi_{v'}$ for distinct vertices is always empty. However, the intersection of the domains U_e, U_v is nonempty whenever v is a vertex of the edge e . For such case, the transition maps $\phi_e \circ \phi_v^{-1} : \phi_v(U_e \cap U_v) \rightarrow \phi_e(U_e \cap U_v)$, $\phi_v \circ \phi_e^{-1} : \phi_e(U_e \cap U_v) \rightarrow \phi_v(U_e \cap U_v)$ are also analytic. For example, if the "x-axis" on the ball U_v matches the edge e then $\phi_v \circ \phi_e^{-1}(z) = (z - z_e)^{(10/3d)}$ and $\phi_e \circ \phi_v^{-1} = (\phi_v \circ \phi_e^{-1})^{-1}$, where $z_e := \phi_e \circ \phi_v^{-1}(0)$. See Figure 18. Since the transition maps are analytic maps, we have constructed an atlas - our conformal structure, and thus we have turned K_{aff} into a simply connected noncompact Riemann surface K_{conf} . This structure also preserves the combinatorial structure. For instance, the analytic cell-preserving homeomorphisms on K_{conf} are still the five rotations and five reflections of the dihedral group D_5 .

The creation of our tiling is obtained as follows. A generalized version of the Riemann mapping theorem (called the uniformization theorem) tells us that there




FIGURE 18. A transition map $\phi_v \circ \phi_e^{-1}(z) = (z - z_e)^{10/(3d)}$ with $d = 3$.

is an essentially unique analytic map Φ that sends our Riemann surface bijectively onto either the Euclidean plane or hyperbolic disk. We define our conformally regular pentagonal tiling of the plane $T := \{\Phi(f) \mid f \in K\}$, and so (\mathbb{C}, T) or (\mathbb{D}, T) is a CW-complex, and Φ becomes a cell-preserving map. By Schwarz reflection principle, the subdivision map (or more precisely the reflection map) $\omega : K \rightarrow K$ induces an analytic cell-preserving homeomorphism $\omega : K_{\text{conf}} \rightarrow K_{\text{conf}}$, and thus $\alpha := \Phi \circ \omega \circ \Phi^{-1}$ is a cell-preserving analytic homeomorphism. The fact that $\omega(K) = K$ (i.e. the self similarity of K) implies that α increases area. Since none of the automorphisms on the hyperbolic disk increase area, α must be an automorphism of \mathbb{C} . Hence the image of Φ is the Euclidean plane \mathbb{C} .

The map $\Phi : K_{\text{conf}} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ tells us how to flatten our Riemann surface K_{conf} onto the Euclidean plane. Unfortunately, the Riemann mapping theorem (and its generalized version) is an existence theorem. It does not tell us how to draw it. We use the theory of circle packings to do this, which is explained in full detail in [23]. First we triangulate our space K_{aff} by triangulating each pentagon as follows: Put a vertex on the center of the pentagon and join this vertex with every corner of the pentagon. The resulting triangulation of K_{aff} is denoted by K' . The analytic atlas of K_{conf} is also an analytic atlas of K' and so K' is a Riemann surface which is conformally equivalent to K_{conf} . Circle packing theory gives us an essentially unique collection of Euclidean circles $P_{K'}$ whose centers in \mathbb{C} are indexed by the vertices of this triangulation. These circles will not overlap, and will follow the combinatorics of K' in the sense that every vertex corresponds to a circle, every edge corresponds to two mutually tangent circles, and every face (i.e. triangle) corresponds to three mutually tangent circles, all respecting the orientation. The carrier $\text{Carr}(P_{K'}) \subset \mathbb{C}$ is defined as the CW-complex whose 2-cells are the Euclidean triangles in \mathbb{C} induced by the faces of K' . The carrier is a piecewise affine space. Since it has the same combinatorics of K' , we can define a piecewise affine cell-preserving map $\Phi_1 : K' \rightarrow \text{Carr}(P_{K'})$. The uniform lower bounds on the triangles in $\text{Carr}(P_{K'})$ and K' implies that Φ_1 is a k -quasi conformal map for some $k > 1$. Recall that k -quasiconformal (or k -qc) maps are generalizations of analytic maps. A 1-qc map is actually an analytic map, and

composition of a k' -qc map and a k'' -qc map is a $k'k''$ -qc map, for $k', k'' \geq 1$. Hence, $\Phi_1 \circ \Phi^{-1} : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \text{Carr}(P_{K'})$ is a k -qc map. By Liouville's theorem, there is no quasiconformal mapping of \mathbb{C} onto a proper subset of \mathbb{C} , and so $\text{Carr}(P_{K'}) = \mathbb{C}$. We now refine the affine space K' into the triangulation K'' by introducing a vertex at the midpoint of each edge of K' and then joining these vertices together with new edges. We say that K'' is a hexagonal refinement of K' . By the same procedure we obtain a bijective k_2 -qc map $\Phi_2 : K'' \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, and by induction we obtain a sequence of bijective k_n -qc maps $\Phi_n : K^{(n)} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. The maps $\Phi_n \circ \Phi^{-1}$ are also known as discrete conformal mappings. Since we are doing hexagonal refinement, all k_n are the same as k , and therefore $\Phi_n \circ \Phi^{-1}$ converges to some k -qc map Ψ , (after some normalization). By the Rodin-Sullivan Theorem (Theorem 19.1 in [23], also known as Thurston's conjecture) Ψ restricted to any triangle of K' is analytic and thus, Ψ is analytic everywhere except on a set of measure zero, which implies that Ψ is analytic everywhere.

Define $T_n := \{\Phi_n(K_{\text{aff}}) \mid f \in K_{\text{aff}}\}$. We say that T_n is an approximation of T . The construction of the first approximation T_1 of T (i.e. $n = 1$) is shown in Figure 19 and is done as follows: each $\text{Carr}(P_{K'_i})$ is normalized so that their central pentagons agree, where K'_i is the triangulation of $K_i \subset K$; their union converge to the space $\text{Carr}(P_{K'})$.




FIGURE 19. The approximation T_1 of T .





FIGURE 20. The tilings T (the blue one) and λT (the red one) where $\lambda = |\lambda|e^{(\pi/5)i}$, $|\lambda| = 18^{2/5}$.

The properties of our tiling T are listed in the following Proposition. Recall that the automorphisms of \mathbb{C} are the complex linear maps. Two subsets of the plane are said to be *euclideanly similar* if there is a conformal automorphism of \mathbb{C} that maps one subset to the other. Thus, euclidean similarity filters out location, scale and rotational effects from the subsets when comparing them.

PROPOSITION 6.1. *Our conformal regular pentagonal tiling T has the following properties.*

- (1) *Each tile of T is extended conformally equivalent to one of the three pentagons shown in Figure 7. We call these three pentagons, the prototiles of T .*
- (2) *With a single tile $\tau \in T$, we can reconstruct the entire tiling T .*

FIGURE 21. Prototiles of K .

- (3) Each tile $\tau \in T$ is euclideanly similar to at most ten tiles in T .
- (4) The tiling T is aperiodic.
- (5) The support of the 1-skeleton $(\lambda T)^1$ is a subset of the support of the one-skeleton T^1 , where $\lambda = (-324)^{1/5} = 18^{2/5}e^{i\pi/5} \approx 3.17e^{i\pi/5}$. See Figure 20.
- (6) From the circle packing approximation T_1 of T we can obtain good approximations of the tiles of T .
- (7) There are infinitely many tiles of diameter less than n for some $n > 1$.
- (8) The set of diameters of the tiles of T is an unbounded set.

PROOF. (1). There are three prototiles of K_{conf} , namely those shown in Figure 21. Since $\Phi : (K, \text{atlas}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a conformal map, their images are the prototiles of T . What remains to be shown are the interior angles of such prototiles. If the degree of a vertex $v \in K$ is d , then we have d pentagons glued at v . The interior angles of these pentagons at v are $3\pi/5$. Recall that the angle between two smooth curves γ_1, γ_2 which cross at v on a Riemann surface is defined as the angle between the charted curves $\phi_v \circ \gamma_1, \phi_v \circ \gamma_2$ at $\phi_v(v) = 0$. Thus, the interior angles of these pentagons at v charted by ϕ_v are $(3\pi/5)(10/(3d)) = (2\pi/d)$. Since $d = 3, 4$, the interior angles of these charted pentagons is either $2\pi/3$ or $2\pi/4 = \pi/2$. Since $\Phi : (K, \text{atlas}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a conformal map, the interior angles of the pentagons are preserved.

(2). This is shown on page 9 of the article [22]. The idea is that each edge e of the tile τ is an analytic arc, and we can use the corresponding local (anticonformal) reflection to map τ to the neighboring tile across e . By repeated reflections in edges, we reconstruct $T = T(\tau)$.

(3). Since the automorphisms of the combinatorial tiling K is the dihedral group D_5 , the automorphisms of the tiling T are the Φ -conjugations, that is, if $\alpha \in \text{Aut}(K)$ then $\Phi \circ \alpha \circ \Phi^{-1} : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a (conformal) automorphism of T ; in particular, it is a conformal automorphism of \mathbb{C} and hence a Möbius transformation. Thus, T has ten automorphisms. Since Möbius transformations of \mathbb{C} are exactly combinations of rotations dilations and translations, τ and $\Phi \circ \alpha \circ \Phi^{-1}(\tau)$ are similar. If two tiles $\tau_1 := \Phi(f_1), \tau_2 := \Phi(f_2)$ are similar in \mathbb{C} , then by (2), the tiling $T(\tau_1)$ is similar to the tiling $T(\tau_2)$, hence combinatorially equivalent. Thus, there exists a combinatorial automorphism of K mapping f_1 to f_2 . By page 9 in the article [22], the converse is also true if we use their normalization, which places the center of the tile corresponding to K_0 at the origin. In summary, two tiles are similar if and only if there is an automorphism of T that maps one tile to the other. Thus, there are at most 10 similar tiles to τ (five reflections and five rotations with respect to the central pentagon).

(4) If T was periodic, then there would be an $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ such that T and $T + x$ are translates, i.e $T = T + x$. Hence $T = T + x = (T + x) + x = T + 2x = \dots = T + nx$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since the automorphisms of T are in total ten, a finite number, and a translation is an automorphism, T cannot be periodic.

(5),(6). In [22], it is shown that the central tile of T can be subdivided with the subdivision rule in a conformal way, and using Schwarz reflection principle, we can divide the whole T . The result is a tiling T' whose combinatorics are $\omega(K)$, and an analytic bijective map $\alpha : T \rightarrow T'$ mapping each tile to its subdivision. Hence $\omega = \Phi^{-1} \circ \alpha \circ \Phi$, and thus ω is analytic. In page 9 of the same article, it is shown that the map $\alpha : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is given by $\alpha(z) := \lambda z$, $\lambda = (-324)^{1/5}$ (under some normalization settings). Hence (5). We show (6) only when the tile is the central pentagon, since we have notation for this, and the same argument applies for any other tile of T . Let $\tau_n := \Phi(K_n)$. Since K_n is the subdivision of K_{n-1} , $\tau_n = \alpha(\tau_{n-1}) = \lambda\tau_{n-1} = \dots = \lambda^n\tau_0$. Hence τ_n and τ_0 are euclideanly similar. Recall that $T_1 := \Phi_1(K)$ is the first approximation of T . Let $t_n := \Phi_1(K_n)$ be the first approximation of the supertile τ_n . Since the interior angles of the boundary of t_n are closer to $2\pi/3$ the bigger n gets, t_n gives a better approximation of τ_0 than t_0 . See Figure 22.

(7) In the proof of Proposition 5.1 of the article, it is shown that for each tile τ there is a sequence $(\tau_j^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of tiles that converge in Hausdorff metric to $b\bar{\tau}$, where $b \approx 1.3$. See Figure 23 and Figure 24. Recall that the Hausdorff metric is defined on compact sets A, B by $d(A, B) = \max(\max_{x \in A} d'(x, B), \max_{y \in B} d'(A, y))$, where $d'(x, B)$ is the smallest distance between x and B . See Figure 25.




FIGURE 22. The approximations t_i , $i = 0, 1, 2, 3$ of the central tile τ_0 .




FIGURE 23. The colored pentagons, once normalized as in Figure 24, converge in Hausdorff measure to $b\bar{\tau}_0$, where τ_0 is the central pentagon.

(8) Let $\tau_0 \in T$ be a tile. By the proof of (7), there is a tile τ_1 satisfying $b'diam(\tau_0) < diam(\tau_1)$, where $b' < b \approx 1.3$, say $b' := 1.1$. Repeating the same argument for τ_1 , we find a tile τ_2 satisfying $b'^2diam(\tau_0) < b'diam(\tau_1) < diam(\tau_2)$. Repeating the same argument n times we obtain a tile $\tau_n \in T$ satisfying $b'^ndiam(\tau_0) < diam(\tau_n)$ of any size.

THEOREM 6.2. *The tiling T does not satisfy the finite local complexity with respect to the group of isometries.*

PROOF. Let G be the group of isometries. Suppose that T has FLC with respect to G . Let τ_0 be the central tile of T . By part (7) of the previous Proposition 6.1,



FIGURE 24. The colored pentagons (rotated and centered) from Figure 23 converge in Hausdorff measure to $b\overline{\tau_0}$.




FIGURE 25. Define $a := \max_{x \in A} d'(x, B)$, $b := \max_{y \in B} d'(A, y)$. The Hausdorff distance between A and B is $\max(a, b) = a$.

there is a sequence of tiles of diameter less than $b \cdot \text{diam}(\tau_0)$, $b \approx 1.3$. Since T has FLC with respect to G , there is a finite number of patterns; that is, each of these tiles are euclideanly similar to a finite number of them. This is a contradiction, because by part (3) of the previous Proposition 6.1 each tile is euclideanly similar to at most 10 other tiles.

Informally, FLC says that if we consider all regions of a fixed size, up to some notion of equivalence, there are only finitely many. We don't need a group; we need notion of equivalence. In the classical theory, everything is sitting in the plane and it is natural to use translations or isometries. If the notion of equivalence we are using does not preserve the notion of size, it is useless, for what is the point of taking two regions of size r and asking if there is an isomorphism between them that doubles the size? This isn't the end of the problems because we will lose compactness and so on as well. But it is enough to give up on the idea. Take for example the sequence of tiles of diameter less than $b \cdot \text{diam}(\tau_0)$, $b \approx 1.3$ from the proof of Theorem 6.2 with the additional property that they shrink by the factor 1.3, but the patches around them are converging combinatorially to K . What does this sequence converge to? We don't know.

Thus we have to abandon the notion of FLC with respect to the set of conformal isomorphisms that are defined between open subsets of the plane. However, we will show in another article that the combinatorial tiling K has FLC with respect to the set of isomorphisms that are defined between subcomplexes of K .

Acknowledgments

The results of this paper were obtained during my Ph.D. studies at University of Copenhagen. I would like to express deep gratitude to my supervisor Erik Christensen and to Ian F. Putnam, Kenneth Stephenson, Philip L. Bowers, Bill Floyd, whose guidance and support were crucial for the successful completion of this work.

REFERENCES

1. A. F. Beardon, *A Primer on Riemann Surfaces*. Cambridge University Press, 1984.
2. Jean Bellissard, Riccardo Benedetti, and Jean-Marc Gambaudo, *Spaces of Tilings, Finite Telescopic Approximations and Gap-Labeling*. Commun. Math. Phys. 261, (2006) 1-41.
3. J. W. Cannon, W. J. Floyd, and W. R. Parry, *Finite subdivision rules*. <http://www.math.vt.edu/people/floyd/research/papers/fsr.pdf>, (2001).
4. J. W. Cannon, W. J. Floyd, R. Kenyon and W. R. Parry, *Constructing rational maps from subdivision rules*. <http://www.math.brown.edu/~rkenyon/papers/ratsub.pdf>, (2003).
5. A. Connes, *Non-commutative Geometry*. Academic Press, San Diego (1994).
6. J. W. Cannon, W. J. Floyd, and W. R. Parry, *Expansion complexes for finite subdivision rules I*. Conformal Geomtry and Dynamics, An Electronic Journal of the American Mathematical Society. (2006) 6399.
7. J. W. Cannon, W. J. Floyd, and W. R. Parry, *Expansion complexes for finite subdivision rules I*. Conformal Geomtry and Dynamics, An Electronic Journal of the American Mathematical Society. (2006) 326354.
8. Allen Hatcher, *Algebraic Topology*. Cambridge University Press, 2002.
9. Arnaud Hilion, Nicolas Bedaride, *Geometric realizations of 2-dimensional substitutive tilings*. arXiv:1101.3905 [math.GT], (2011).
10. K. Jänich, S. Levy, *Topology*. Springer-Verlag New York Inc., (1984).
11. J. P. May, *A concise course in Algebraic Topology*. The Univeristy of Chicago Press. Chicago and London, 1999.
12. Shahar Mozes, *Tilings, substitution systems and dynamical systems generated by them*. Journal D'analyse Mathematique, (1989).
13. Ian F. Putnam, *The ordered K-theory of C*-algebras associated with substitution tilings*. Commun. Math. Phys. 214, (2000) 593-605.
14. Ian F. Putnam, Jared E. Anderson . *Topological Invariants for Substitution Tilings and their Associated C*-algebras*. Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Victoria, Victoria B.C. Canada. (1995) 1-45.
15. Johannes Kellendonk and Ian F. Putnam, *Tilings, C*-algebras and K-theory*. Directions in mathematical quasicrystals, CRM Monogr. Ser., 13, Amer. Math. Soc., Provicence, RI (2000) 177-206.
16. Ian F. Putnam, Jason Peebles, Ian Zwierns, *Minimal Dynamical Systems on the Cantor Set*. Lecture notes, (2011).
17. Leonard F. Richardson, *Measure and Integration*. Wiley, (2009).
18. E. Arthur Robinson, Jr., *Symbolic Dynamics and Tilings of \mathbb{R}^d* . George Washington University. Washington DC. 1991.
19. Lorenzo Sadun, *Topology of Tiling Spaces*. University Lecture Series Vol. 46, Providence, Rhode Island, 2008.
20. Lorenzo Sadun, R. F. Williams, *Tiling Spaces Are Cantor Set Fiber Bundles*. <http://arxiv.org/pdf/math/0105125.pdf> 2001.
21. B. Solomyak, *Nonperidicity implies unique composition of self-similar translationally-finite tilings*. Disc. Comp. Geom. 1998.
22. Kenneth Stephenson, Philip L. Bowers, *A "regular" pentagonal tiling of the plane*. Conformal geometry and dynamics. An electronic journal of the American Mathematical Society, (1997) 58-86.
23. K. Stephenson, *Introduction to Circle Packing*. Cambridge University Press, 2005.
24. Kenneth stephenson, Philip L. Bowers, *Uniformizing dessins and Belyi maps via circle packing*. Memoirs of the American Mathematica Society, (2004).
25. Klaus Thomsen, *KMS states and conformal measures*. arXiv:1109.2336 [math.OA], 2012.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF COPENHAGEN, UNIVERSITETSPARKEN 5, 2100 KØBENHAVN Ø, DENMARK.
E-mail: mrs@math.ku.dk