

CONSTRUCTION OF SELF-SIMILAR ENERGY FORMS AND SINGULARITY OF SOBOLEV SPACES ON LAAKSO-TYPE FRACTAL SPACES

RIKU ANTILA, SYLVESTER ERIKSSON-BIQUE, AND RYOSUKE SHIMIZU

ABSTRACT. We construct self-similar p -energy forms as normalized limits of discretized p -energies on a rich class of *Laakso-type fractal spaces*. Collectively, we refer to them as *IGS-fractals*, where IGS stands for (edge-)iterated graph systems. We propose this framework as a rich source of “toy models” that can be consulted for tackling challenging questions that are not well understood on most other fractal spaces. Supporting this, our framework uncovers a novel analytic phenomenon, which we term as *singularity of Sobolev spaces*. This means that the associated Sobolev spaces \mathcal{F}_{p_1} and \mathcal{F}_{p_2} for distinct $p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty)$ intersect only at constant functions. We provide the first example of a self-similar fractal on which this singularity phenomenon occurs for all pairs of distinct exponents. In particular, we show that the Laakso diamond space is one such example.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Overview. The field of analysis on fractals has historically lacked examples where the essential tools of analysis, such as Dirichlet forms, their non-linear counterparts, the associated Sobolev spaces and energy measures, are completely transparent. The primary source of this issue is the geometric complexity of fractals, which makes performing computations difficult and sometimes unfeasible. As a consequence, many proofs of the existence of these analytic objects rely on nonconstructive elements, such as subsequential limits and fixed point theorems. In [18, p. 129] the authors point out “It is a shame to have to resort to a nonconstructive existence proof, but we note that this happens quite often in analysis on fractals”.

The most notable exception is the Vicsek set, which is often overly simple in a more general context due to its tree-structure. For arguably the second simplest class of examples in the literature, the Sierpiński gaskets, let alone for the far more involved Sierpiński carpets, the obscurity of analytic objects has hindered the development of the theory. See [24, Section 7], [31, Section 6.3] and [43, Section 10] for discussions on many relevant open problems.

The intention of this paper is to introduce a unified and self-contained framework of analysis on a recently introduced class of *Laakso-type fractal spaces* [2] (also called *IGS-fractals*). The terminology derives from the framework generalizing two constructions of Laakso [37, 38], and that it arises via edge replacements. This framework is built upon explicit analytic objects, including self-similar p -energy

Date: March 18, 2025.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 28A80, 31E05, 31C45, 46E36.

Key words and phrases. Laakso-type fractals, (edge-)iterated graph systems, energy forms, energy measures, Sobolev spaces, singularity.

forms, Sobolev spaces, p -energy measures and analogue of mollifiers. We propose it as a rich source of “toy models” that can be consulted for various questions in analysis on fractals.

In the following theorem, we present our results regarding one particular example, the *Laakso diamond space*, which was introduced by Laakso [38] more than 20 years ago. Prior to this work, the Laakso diamond has not been studied from the point of view of analysis on fractals, but was well-known in the embeddings and analysis of metric spaces communities [39, 40, 47]. The construction of the space is described in Example 1.3, and the other relevant definitions are discussed in the following subsection.

Theorem 1.1. *Let (X, d, μ) be the Laakso diamond space and \mathcal{F}_p the Sobolev space associated to the self-similar p -energy form $\mathcal{E}_p : L^p(X, \mu) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ for $p \in (1, \infty)$. Then the following hold.*

- (1) *For all $p \in (1, \infty)$ and Sobolev functions $f \in \mathcal{F}_p$ the p -energy measure $\Gamma_p\langle f \rangle$ and the reference measure μ are mutually singular.*
- (2) *Let $p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty)$ be distinct. Then for all pairs of Sobolev functions $f_{p_1} \in \mathcal{F}_{p_1}$ and $f_{p_2} \in \mathcal{F}_{p_2}$ the energy measures $\Gamma_{p_1}\langle f_{p_1} \rangle$ and $\Gamma_{p_2}\langle f_{p_2} \rangle$ are mutually singular.*
- (3) *Let $p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty)$ be distinct. Then it holds that*

$$\mathcal{F}_{p_1} \cap \mathcal{F}_{p_2} = \{f \in L^p(X, \mu) : f \text{ is constant } \mu\text{-almost everywhere}\}.$$

All three statements in Theorem 1.1 are highly non-trivial in broader context of analysis on fractals. Whether these hold for the Sierpiński carpet and some other fractals was posed by Murugan and the third author [43, Problems 10.5-10.7]. Our work provides the first example of a self-similar fractal for which Theorem 1.1-(3) is verified to hold for the Sobolev spaces associated to self-similar p -energy forms. We term this novel phenomenon as *singularity of Sobolev spaces*.




FIGURE 1.2. The Laakso diamond space snowflake-embedded onto a self-similar set of \mathbb{R}^2 . Lang and Plaut showed that Laakso diamond does not admit a biLipschitz embedding into any Euclidean space [39]. See also [14] for a more general result and [38, 40] for further related work.

1.2. General results. The main goal of this work is to construct and investigate self-similar p -energy forms, Sobolev spaces and p -energy measures on a class of metric spaces called *IGS-fractals*. IGS-fractals are self-similar metric spaces that arise from the framework of *(edge)-iterated graph systems (IGS)*, recently introduced by first and second authors [2]. The original purpose of the construction was to extend the class of metric spaces where a deep problem in quasiconformal geometry, the *attainment problem of Ahlfors regular conformal dimension*, can be studied. Through this framework, the authors constructed the first counterexamples to Kleiner’s conjecture [32, Conjecture 7.5], one of which is provided in Figure 3.7. Further details and related topics can be found in [2, Introduction].

A detailed explanation of the construction of IGS-fractals in the full generality is provided in Section 3. At this stage, we suggest the reader to consult a few examples, such as the construction of Laakso diamond in Example 1.3. Other examples are provided in e.g. Subsection 3.3.

Example 1.3 (Laakso diamond). This example regards the construction of the Laakso diamond space [38, 39] as an IGS-fractal. The final product of the construction is a metric measure space (X, d, μ) . We suggest the reader to consult Figure 1.4 while following the construction. See also Figure 1.2 for a self-similar set of \mathbb{R}^2 that is snowflake-equivalent to the Laakso diamond.

The basic idea is to construct an infinite sequence of discrete graphs G_1, G_2, G_3, \dots by an *iterative replacement*, and the Laakso diamond is the limiting objects. The first replacement and the graphs G_1, G_2 are presented in Figure 1.4 and G_3 in Figure 1.5. Let the first graph G_1 be as in Figure 1.4, and assume that $G_n := (V_n, E_n)$




FIGURE 1.4. Figure of the first iteration of the replacement that produces the Laakso diamond space. The blue vertices indicate the gluing rules.

has been constructed. The first step in the construction of G_{n+1} is to replace each edge in G_n by G_1 . Formally, this can be thought as introducing the disconnected graph $G_1 \times E_n := (V_1 \times E_n, E_1 \times E_n)$. The graph $G_{n+1} := (V_{n+1}, E_{n+1})$ is then obtained by taking a quotient $G_{n+1} := G_1 \times E_n / \sim$, where the identifications are given according to predetermined *gluing rules*. Gluing rules refer to a choice of a finite non-empty set I and choices of functions $\phi_{v,e} : I \rightarrow V_1$ for each pair $v \in e \in E_n$. Then, two vertices $(z, e), (z', e') \in V_1 \times E_1$ are identified if and only if e and e' share

a common vertex v and $(z, z') = (\phi_{v,e}(a), \phi_{v,e'}(a))$ for some $a \in I$. In this particular example, the set $I := \{a\}$ contains only one element. The functions $\phi_{v,e}$ are chosen so that for all $e = \{v, w\} \in E_n$ we have $\{\phi_{v,e}(a), \phi_{w,e}(a)\} = \{1, 6\}$. The final product, the Laakso diamond space, is the metric measure space (X, d, μ) that is obtained by taking the Gromov-Hausdorff limit of the metric spaces $(V_n, 4^{-n}d_{G_n})$, where d_{G_n} is the path metric on G_n , and the measure μ is the Q -Hausdorff measure for $Q := \frac{\log(6)}{\log(4)}$. The resulting metric measure space (X, d, μ) is geodesic and Q -Ahlfors regular (Definition 2.1).




FIGURE 1.5. G_3 in the construction of Laakso diamond.

The general construction of an IGS-fractal is given as a simple generalization of the one in Example 1.3. Specifically, the first graph $G_1 = (V_1, E_1)$, which we will refer as the *generator*, can be any finite connected graph, and the set I can be any non-empty finite set. As long as they satisfy the conditions in Definition 3.1 and Assumption 3.3, our framework applies. This idea was strongly influenced by Laakso's work [37, 38] and the distinct inverse limit construction of Cheeger and Kleiner [14]. In the end of Subsection 3.3, we compare the IGS-framework with some other constructions that share similar ideas and goals.

An IGS satisfying the required conditions produces a well-defined *limit space* (X, d, μ) . (We frequently use the term *limit space* as a synonym for IGS-fractal.) As we will see in Proposition 3.42, the limit space (X, d, μ) is compact, path connected and Q -Ahlfors regular for $Q := \frac{\log(|E_1|)}{\log(L_*)}$, where $|E_1|$ is the number of edges in E_1 and $L_* > 1$ is the distance scaling constant.

Furthermore, for each edge $e \in E_1$ there is an injective L_*^{-1} -Lipschitz function $F_e : X \rightarrow X$ so that

$$(1.6) \quad X = \bigcup_{e \in E_1} F_e(X).$$

Thus, according to the self-similarity condition (1.6), IGS-fractals can be regarded as attractors of families of contraction maps (*iterated function systems*). Throughout the discussion in this section, we consider a fixed IGS with generator $G_1 = (V_1, E_1)$, limit space (X, d, μ) and the similarity maps $\{F_e\}_{e \in E_1}$ in (1.6).

The first main result of the work is the construction of *self-similar p -energy forms* $\mathcal{E}_p : L^p(X, \mu) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ for all $p \in (1, \infty)$. Their primary role is to be the counterparts of the Dirichlet p -energy $f \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\nabla f|^p dx$. Unlike the previous

studies [31, 43, 50], our framework has no restriction in the exponent p . See Remark 7.19 for further discussions.

Definition 1.7. We say that $\mathcal{E}_p : L^p(X, \mu) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ is a p -energy form on (X, μ) if the restriction of $\mathcal{E}_p(\cdot)^{\frac{1}{p}}$ to $\{f \in L^p(X, \mu) : \mathcal{E}_p(f) < \infty\}$ defines a semi-norm.

Theorem 1.8 (Theorem 6.3 and Corollary 6.39). *For all $p \in (1, \infty)$ there is a p -energy form $\mathcal{E}_p : L^p(X, \mu) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$, an associated Sobolev space denoted by*

$$\mathcal{F}_p := \{f \in L^p(X, \mu) : \mathcal{E}_p(f) < \infty\}$$

and a Sobolev norm $\|\cdot\|_{L^p} + \mathcal{E}_p(\cdot)^{\frac{1}{p}}$, which satisfy the following conditions.

- (1) The Sobolev space $(\mathcal{F}_p, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F}_p})$ is a reflexive and separable Banach space.
- (2) **(Regularity)** $\mathcal{F}_p \cap C(X)$ is dense in both $(C(X), \|\cdot\|_{L^\infty})$ and $(\mathcal{F}_p, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F}_p})$.
- (3) **(Self-similarity)** There is an energy scaling constant $\mathcal{M}_p > 0$ depending only on the exponent p so that for all $f \in \mathcal{F}_p$ it holds that

$$(1.9) \quad \mathcal{E}_p(f) = \mathcal{M}_p^{-1} \sum_{e \in E_1} \mathcal{E}_p(f \circ F_e).$$

Moreover, it holds that

$$C(X) \cap \mathcal{F}_p = \{f \in C(X) : f \circ F_e \in C(X) \cap \mathcal{F}_p \text{ for all } e \in E_1\}.$$

- (4) **(Lipschitz contractivity)** If $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a 1-Lipschitz function and $f \in \mathcal{F}_p$, then $\varphi \circ f \in \mathcal{F}_p$ and $\mathcal{E}_p(\varphi \circ f) \leq \mathcal{E}_p(f)$.

The other relevant analytic properties of \mathcal{E}_p are collected in Theorem 6.4. For $p = 2$, our construction produces a regular Dirichlet form. See [16] for background.

Corollary 1.10. Define $\mathcal{E}_2 : \mathcal{F}_2 \times \mathcal{F}_2 \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ by

$$\mathcal{E}_2(f, g) := \frac{1}{4}(\mathcal{E}_2(f + g) - \mathcal{E}_2(f - g)).$$

Then $(\mathcal{E}_2, \mathcal{F}_2)$ is a regular symmetric Dirichlet form on $L^2(X, \mu)$.

For our goals, it is extremely important that the p -energy forms \mathcal{E}_p are *exactly self-similar*, which means that (1.9) holds. This is necessary in order to assign a compact and transparent definition for the p -energy measures, which are the natural counterparts of the measures $A \mapsto \int_A |\nabla f|^p dx$.

Remark 1.11. It is quite apparent from the structure of the graphs G_1, G_2, G_3, \dots that each edge in $e \in E_n$ can be naturally identified as a sequence $e_1 e_2 \dots e_n \in (E_1)^n$. This is particularly clear from Figures 1.4 and 1.5. See Remark 3.28 for details. When this identification is made, we shall write

$$(1.12) \quad F_e := F_{e_1} \circ F_{e_2} \circ \dots \circ F_{e_n} \text{ and } X_e := F_e(X).$$

Note that, by iterating (1.6) and (1.9), we have

$$(1.13) \quad X = \bigcup_{e \in E_n} X_e \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{E}_p(f) = \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} \sum_{e \in E_n} \mathcal{E}_p(f \circ F_e).$$

Using (1.13), we assign the following natural and compact definition for energy measures. This approach has been used in e.g. [19, 27, 43, 50]. See [46] for another approach that does not rely on the self-similarity. These two approaches yield the same measures by [27, Corollary 5.13] and [46, Corollary 5.6].

Definition 1.14. Let $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $f \in \mathcal{F}_p$. The p -energy measure of f is the unique Radon measure $\Gamma_p\langle f \rangle$ of X satisfying

$$(1.15) \quad \Gamma_p\langle f \rangle(X_e) = \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} \mathcal{E}_p(f \circ F_e) \text{ for all } e \in E_n \text{ and } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Ensuring that the condition (1.15) determines a well-defined measures requires some work. Specifically, for all $f \in \mathcal{F}_p$, we must show that

$$\Gamma_p\langle f \rangle(X_e \cap X_{e'}) = 0 \text{ for all distinct edges } e, e' \in E_n \text{ and } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

See Proposition 6.50 and Theorem 6.51 for details.

The following theorem states natural Poincaré inequality and upper capacity estimate on the limit space. To formally state them, we need to introduce an important quantity, the p -walk dimension:

$$(1.16) \quad d_{w,p} := \frac{\log(|E_1| \mathcal{M}_p^{-1})}{\log(L_*)}.$$

It always holds that $d_{w,p} \geq p$ but this is often a strict inequality.

Theorem 1.17 (Propositions 7.1 and 7.3). *Let $p \in (1, \infty)$. There are constants $A, C > 1$ so that for all balls $B := B(x, r)$ with $x \in X$ and $r \in (0, \infty)$ the following hold.*

(1) **(Poincaré inequality)** *For every $f \in \mathcal{F}_p$ it holds that*

$$\int_B |f - f_B|^p d\mu \leq Cr^{d_{w,p}} \Gamma_p\langle f \rangle(B(x, Ar)).$$

(2) **(Upper capacity estimate)** *There is $\varphi \in \mathcal{F}_p \cap C(X)$ satisfying*

$$\varphi|_{B(x,r)} \equiv 1, \text{ supp}[\varphi] \subseteq B(x, Ar) \text{ and } \mathcal{E}_p(\varphi) \leq C \frac{\mu(B(x, r))}{r^{d_{w,p}}}.$$

The constructed p -energy form \mathcal{E}_p has the geometric interpretation of being equivalent with the *Korevaar-Schoen* type p -energy [33]. This is a fairly frequent phenomenon on fractals [7, 28].

Theorem 1.18. *Let $p \in (1, \infty)$. There exists a constant $C \geq 1$ such that for any $f \in L^p(X, \mu)$ we have*

$$(1.19) \quad C^{-1} \mathcal{E}_p(f) \leq \liminf_{r \downarrow 0} \int_X \int_{B(x,r)} \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|^p}{r^{d_{w,p}}} \mu(dy) \mu(dx) \\ \leq \sup_{r \in (0, 2 \text{diam}(X))} \int_X \int_{B(x,r)} \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|^p}{r^{d_{w,p}}} \mu(dy) \mu(dx) \leq C \mathcal{E}_p(f).$$

In particular,

$$(1.20) \quad \mathcal{F}_p = \left\{ f \in L^p(X, \mu) : \limsup_{r \downarrow 0} \int_X \int_{B(x,r)} \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|^p}{r^{d_{w,p}}} \mu(dy) \mu(dx) < \infty \right\}.$$

1.3. Singularities of energy measures and Sobolev spaces. Apart from Theorem 1.1, the results we have discussed so far are general – they hold for all examples in our framework. Nevertheless, different IGS-fractals may admit completely different analytic behavior. For instance, the IGS-fractal described in Example 3.4 satisfies none of the three properties in Theorem 1.1 that hold for the Laakso diamond. See Theorem 8.33 for details.

Next, we discuss the primary features of IGS-fractals that are used to investigate their analytic behavior.

The core insight in our framework is that a significant amount of structure of \mathcal{E}_p and the related objects are understood through the generator G_1 . Specifically, we study two discrete optimization problems, p -capacity and p -resistance, which optimize potentials U_p and flows \mathcal{J}_p , respectively.

First, we define the sets I_+ and I_- as the “opposite sides” of the “boundary” of G_1 . In the case of the Laakso diamond, I_+ only consists of the left most vertex and I_- the right most as in Figure 1.23. See Subsection 3.4 for the precise definition. The p -capacity problem is the minimization problem

$$(1.21) \quad \mathcal{M}_p := \text{Cap}_p(I_+, I_-, G_1) := \min_{\substack{U|_{I_+}=1 \\ U|_{I_-}=0}} \sum_{e \in E_1} |\nabla U(e)|^p.$$

Here $|\nabla U| : E_1 \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ denotes the gradient

$$|\nabla U(e)| := |U(v) - U(w)| \text{ for } e = \{v, w\}.$$

The value $\mathcal{M}_p := \text{Cap}_p(I_+, I_-, G_1)$ is the p -capacity constant. The second optimization problem, the p -resistance problem, is given by

$$(1.22) \quad \text{Res}_p(I_+, I_-, G_1) := \min_{\mathcal{J}} \sum_{e \in E_1} |\mathcal{J}(e)|^q,$$

where the minimum is taken over all unit flows from I_+ to I_- and $q := \frac{p}{p-1}$ is the dual exponent of p . Whenever $p \in (1, \infty)$, the respective minimizers U_p and \mathcal{J}_p always exist and are unique. In general, they depend on p .




FIGURE 1.23. Figure of the optimal potentials/flows (U_p/\mathcal{J}_p) on G_1 associated to the Laakso diamond. The values with arrows are the values of the optimal flow $|\mathcal{J}_p(e)|$, and the ones without indicate the values of the optimal potential $U_p(v)$. Notice that the optimal potential depends on p while the optimal flow does not.

In the special case $d_{w,p} = p$, where $d_{w,p}$ is the p -walk dimension given in (1.16), our theory coincides with the more classical theory of analysis on metric spaces. Specifically, \mathcal{F}_p is equivalent with the Newton Sobolev space and the limit space (X, d, μ) admits the p -Poincare inequality. See e.g. [11, 17] for background.

Theorem 1.24. *Let $p \in (1, \infty)$. If $d_{w,p} = p$, then \mathcal{F}_p is equal to the Newton-Sobolev space $N^{1,p}(X, d, \mu)$ with equivalent norms and there are constants $A, C \geq 1$ so that for all Lipschitz function $f \in \text{Lip}(X, d)$ it holds that*

$$(1.25) \quad \int_{B(x,r)} |f - f_{B(x,r)}| d\mu \leq Cr \left(\int_{B(x,Ar)} (\text{Lip } f)^p d\mu \right)^{1/p}.$$

Here $\text{Lip}(f)$ is the pointwise upper Lipschitz-constant function of f ,

$$(1.26) \quad (\text{Lip } f)(x) := \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \sup_{y \in B(x,\varepsilon)} \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|}{\varepsilon}.$$

If $d_{w,p} > p$ and (X, d) is quasiconvex, then there is a Lipschitz function $f \in \text{Lip}(X, d)$ so that $f \notin \mathcal{F}_p$. In particular, $\mathcal{F}_p \neq N^{1,p}(X, d, \mu)$.

Actually, $d_{w,p} = p$ has a simple geometric characterization, which is independent of the exponent p . See Proposition 4.21 for details.

Whether the equality $d_{w,p} = p$ holds or not has significant consequence to the behavior of p -energy measures. When the answer is negative, the p -energy measures admit completely different behavior than in the classical setting.

Theorem 1.27 (Theorem 8.16). *For all $p \in (1, \infty)$ the following hold.*

- (1) *If $d_{w,p} = p$ then for all $f \in \mathcal{F}_p$ it holds that $\Gamma_p \langle f \rangle \ll \mu$.*
- (2) *If $d_{w,p} > p$ then for all $f \in \mathcal{F}_p$ it holds that $\Gamma_p \langle f \rangle \perp \mu$.*

Theorem 1.27 yields the statement in Theorem 1.1-(1). For the particular case $p = 2$, this *dichotomy phenomenon* is understood in a more general setting of Dirichlet forms thanks to the result of Kajino and Murugan [23]. In fact, the statement in Theorem 1.27 is a natural analogue for general $p \in (1, \infty)$, and whether this holds for more general fractals was posed in [43, Problem 10.5]. Nevertheless, the non-linear case appears to be far more complicated even for explicit examples. Our result provides convincing evidence that the dichotomy established in [23] should have a non-linear variant.

A natural follow-up question to Theorem 1.27 is whether similar results hold if we replace the measure μ with some other measures. In the following theorem, we give a complete description of the singularity phenomenon in Theorem 1.1-(2), which regards the particularly curious case of energy measures for distinct exponents.

Theorem 1.28 (Theorem 8.19). *Let $p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty)$ be distinct exponents satisfying*

$$(1.29) \quad |\nabla U_{p_1}(e)| |\mathcal{J}_{p_1}(e)| \neq |\nabla U_{p_2}(e)| |\mathcal{J}_{p_2}(e)| \text{ for some } e \in E_1.$$

Then for all pairs $f_{p_1} \in \mathcal{F}_{p_1}$ and $f_{p_2} \in \mathcal{F}_{p_2}$ it holds that $\Gamma_{p_1} \langle f_{p_1} \rangle \perp \Gamma_{p_2} \langle f_{p_2} \rangle$.

The condition (1.29) may look mysterious at the first glance, but there is a simple computation where it comes from. The self-similar measure given by the weights $|\nabla U_p(e)| |\mathcal{J}_p(e)|$ for $e \in E_1$ is the p -energy measure of the most important Sobolev function in our theory, the (continuous) optimal potential function \mathcal{U}_p . When (1.29) holds, the mutual singularity $\Gamma_{p_1} \langle \mathcal{U}_{p_1} \rangle \perp \Gamma_{p_2} \langle \mathcal{U}_{p_2} \rangle$ follows from a

classical argument using the Strong law of large numbers. With further effort, this extends to the general case of Theorem 1.28.

The analogous singularity result to Theorem 1.28 was proved first by Kajino and the third author [25] for some post-critically finite self-similar fractals. See [26] for a survey focusing on the Sierpiński gasket. The proof in [25] relies on some deep results for the energy scaling constant and for behaviors of p -harmonic functions. There is no such difficulty in the case of IGS-fractals by virtue of the transparent descriptions of $\Gamma_p\langle\mathcal{U}_p\rangle$.

Knowing that the behavior of p -energy measures heavily depend on the initial exponent $p \in (1, \infty)$, we take this opportunity to discuss another singularity phenomenon of similar spirit, *singularity of Sobolev spaces*. We say that the Sobolev spaces \mathcal{F}_{p_1} and \mathcal{F}_{p_2} are *mutually singular* if

$$(1.30) \quad \mathcal{F}_{p_1} \cap \mathcal{F}_{p_2} = \{f \in L^p(X, \mu) : f \text{ is constant } \mu\text{-almost everywhere}\}.$$

This *never* occurs in classical theory due to the presence of test functions, nor in the setting of upper gradients due to Lipschitz function, or in the framework of [10, 36]. It also does not happen on the Vicsek set as the Sobolev spaces for all exponents contain certain Lipschitz functions [8, Lemma 2.8]. Towards understanding this phenomenon in general, we state our result in the following theorem.

Theorem 1.31 (Theorem 8.23). *Assume that the following two conditions hold.*

- (i) *For all $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $e \in E_1$ we have $|\nabla U_p(e)| \neq 0$.*
- (ii) *The optimal flow \mathcal{J}_p is independent of $p \in (1, \infty)$.*

Then, for all pairs of distinct exponents $p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty)$, the following are equivalent.

- (1) *The energy measures $\Gamma_{p_1}\langle\mathcal{U}_{p_1}\rangle$ and $\Gamma_{p_2}\langle\mathcal{U}_{p_2}\rangle$ are mutually singular.*
- (2) *The Sobolev spaces \mathcal{F}_{p_1} and \mathcal{F}_{p_2} are mutually singular.*

The equivalence of the two singularities, as stated in Theorem 1.31, does not hold in general. We provide a detailed explanation and further discussions in Subsection 8.5. Nevertheless, this is sufficient to verify Theorem 1.1-(3) for the Laakso diamond. In Example 8.31 we provide another IGS-fractal with this same property.

1.4. Outline of the construction. Our approach for constructing the p -energy form \mathcal{E}_p is based on a common technique in analysis on fractals, applied in e.g. the works [12, 18, 29, 31, 35, 43, 50]. We consider the discrete p -energies,

$$\mathcal{E}_p(g) := \sum_{\{v,w\} \in E_n} |g(v) - g(w)|^p \quad \text{for all } g : V_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R},$$

where G_1, G_2, G_3, \dots are the graphs produced by the IGS. The rough idea is to introduce a discretization operators $V_n[\cdot]$ that turns functions on the limit space $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ into functions on the graph $V_n[f] : V_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. The p -energy form is then obtained as the *normalized limit*

$$(1.32) \quad \mathcal{E}_p(f) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} \mathcal{E}_p(V_n[f])$$

where \mathcal{M}_p is the p -capacity constant in (1.21).

For the Laakso diamond the discretizations $V_n[\cdot]$ are easy to define. By comparing Figures 1.4 and 1.5 to Figure 1.2, one can observe that the vertex sets V_n have natural embeddings into the limit fractal. From this identification, we define the discretization by simply the restriction $V_n[f] := f|_{V_n}$. We remark that $V_n[f]$ is not

well-defined for general L^p -function since points are μ -null. For now, we ignore this for the sake of convenience.

The same choice of $V_n[\cdot]$ applies whenever $|I| = 1$ where I is the gluing set. If $|I| > 1$ then there are no natural embeddings of G_n into the limit space X . Instead, every vertex $v \in V_n$ is naturally associated by an infinite cantor set which we denote by $\text{Fib}(v) \subseteq X$. This set is called the *fiber* of v . The discretization of f is then given by averaging over the fibers,

$$(1.33) \quad V_n[f](v) := \int_{\text{Fib}(v)} f d\nu_v,$$

where ν_v is an appropriately chosen probability measure supported on $\text{Fib}(v)$. This method is strongly inspired by a similar averaging procedure introduced by Cheeger and Kleiner [14]. For the Laakso diamond, $\text{Fib}(v)$ consists of only one points and ν_v is the Dirac delta measure of $\text{Fib}(v)$. In the general case, ν_v is determined by the optimal unit flow \mathcal{J}_p , which is the unique solution to the p -resistance problem (1.22). Specifically, ν_v is the self-similar probability measure determined by the divergences of the optimal flow $\text{div}(\mathcal{J}_{p,+})(\cdot)$ on I_+ . In particular, the measures ν_v and the operators V_n may depend on the exponent p . See Section 5 for details.

Theorem 1.34 (Theorem 6.10). *Let $p \in (1, \infty)$. For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there is a discretization operator $V_n[\cdot] : C(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{V_n}$ so that the sequence of normalized discrete p -energies,*

$$\mathcal{M}_p^{-n} \mathcal{E}_p(V_n[f]) = \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} \sum_{\{v,w\} \in E_n} |V_n[f](v) - V_n[f](w)|^p$$

in non-decreasing in $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, the discretization $V_n[f]$ is given without referencing the background measure μ , and in general, it may depend on the initial exponent $p \in (1, \infty)$.

The primary reason why $V_n[\cdot]$ is only defined on continuous functions is that the fibers are μ -null, so the averaging procedure is not well-defined for general L^p -functions. Although, $V_n[\cdot]$ has a natural extension to the Sobolev space \mathcal{F}_p . See Subsection 6.4 for details.

Towards the construction of the p -energy form $\mathcal{E}_p : L^p(X, \mu) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$, our first step is to consider the *pre-energy form* $\mathbf{E}_p : C(X) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$,

$$\mathbf{E}_p(f) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} \mathcal{E}_p(V_n[f]),$$

and the set functions called a *core*, $\mathcal{C}_p := \{f \in C(X) : \mathbf{E}_p(f) < \infty\}$. According to Theorem 1.34, $\mathbf{E}_p(f)$ is well-defined. The p -energy form \mathcal{E}_p is then obtained as a natural extension of \mathbf{E}_p to the L^p -space. To this end, we need to establish the *closability* of \mathbf{E}_p on $L^p(X, \mu)$.

Theorem 1.35 (Theorem 6.19). *The pre-energy form $\mathbf{E}_p : \mathcal{C}_p \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is closable in the following sense. For any sequence $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \subseteq \mathcal{C}_p$ of continuous functions satisfying $f_i \rightarrow 0$ in $L^p(X, \mu)$ and the \mathbf{E}_p -Cauchy condition*

$$(1.36) \quad \lim_{i,j \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}_p(f_i - f_j) = 0,$$

we always have $\mathbf{E}_p(f_i) \rightarrow 0$.

For $f \in L^p(X, \mu)$, we now define $\mathcal{E}_p(f)$ as the limit of $E_p(f_i)$ where $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \subseteq \mathcal{C}_p$ is any sequence satisfying $f_i \rightarrow f$ in $L^p(X, \mu)$ and the condition (1.36). When such sequence does not exist, we set $\mathcal{E}_p(f) = \infty$. The closability of E_p ensures that \mathcal{E}_p is well-defined. By taking $f_i := f \in \mathcal{C}_p$ to be a constant sequence, we see that $\mathcal{E}_p|_{\mathcal{C}_p} = E_p|_{\mathcal{C}_p}$. This equality actually extends to all continuous functions (see Corollary 6.39). Consequently, \mathcal{E}_p indeed is a well-defined extension of E_p .

1.5. Organization of the paper. We present some general terminology and recall a few classical results in Section 2. In Section 3, we introduce iterated graph systems and the construction of IGS-fractals. Then in Section 4, we study discrete potential theory of IGSs. We establish two key ingredients of our framework, the strong monotonicity principle and Poincaré inequality.

The main goals of the paper, the construction of the p -energy forms, p -energy measures and other analytic tools, as well as the investigation of their general properties, are covered in Sections 5 and 6. In Section 7 we compare our framework to some other frequently considered analogous constructions, such as Korevaar-Schoen and Newton-Sobolev. We finish the paper in Section 8, where we study the singularities of energy measures and Sobolev spaces.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The first author is supported by the Finnish Ministry of Education and Culture's Pilot for Doctoral Programmes (Pilot project Mathematics of Sensing, Imaging and Modelling). Part of the research work was conducted during his participation in the Trimster program *Metric Analysis*, organized by Hausdorff Research Institute of Mathematics (HIM) in Bonn, and was financially supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) under Germany's Excellence Strategy - EXC-2047/1 - 390685813. He thanks the institute and local organizers for their hospitality and other participants for the stimulating atmosphere. The second author is supported by the Research Council of Finland via the project *GeoQuantAM: Geometric and Quantitative Analysis on Metric spaces*, grant no. 354241. The third author (JSPS Research Fellow PD) is supported in part by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP23KJ2011. The work was started during the visit of the third author to University of Jyväskylä. The authors thank Mathav Murugan for many inspiring discussions.

2. PRELIMINARY

We begin by recalling some classical terminology and results from metric geometry and graph theory.

2.1. Metric spaces and measures. In this paper, we only consider metric measure spaces (X, d, μ) where (X, d) is a compact metric space and μ is a finite measure defined on the Borel σ -algebra. In particular, every measure is a Radon measure.

Let (X, d, μ) be a metric measure space. We denote the *open balls*

$$B(x, r) := \{y \in X : d(x, y) < r\} \text{ for } x \in X \text{ and } r \in (0, \infty).$$

The *diameter* of a non-empty subset $A \subseteq X$ is $\text{diam}(A, d) := \sup_{x, y \in A} d(x, y)$. If $B \subseteq X$ is another non-empty subset, then the *distance* between A and B is $\text{dist}(A, B, d) := \inf_{x \in A, y \in B} d(x, y)$. Whenever the metric d is clear from the context, we omit it from the notation. If $A \subseteq X$ is any Borel set with $\mu(A) > 0$ and

$f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is any Borel measurable function that is integrable on A , we denote the *integral average* of f over A by

$$f_A := \int_A f d\mu := \frac{1}{\mu(A)} \int_A f d\mu.$$

When $K \subseteq X$ is a compact subset, we denote $\mu \upharpoonright_K$ to be the Radon measure on $(K, d|_{K \times K})$ obtained by restricting μ to the Borel subsets of K .

Definition 2.1. A Radon measure μ on a metric space (X, d) is *doubling* if there is a constant $D > 0$ so that for all $x \in X$ and $r > 0$ we have

$$\mu(B(x, 2r)) \leq D \cdot \mu(B(x, r)).$$

For $Q \in (0, \infty)$, we say that (X, d, μ) is *Q -Ahlfors regular* if there is $C \geq 1$ so that for all $x \in X$ and $r \in (0, \text{diam}(X))$ we have

$$C^{-1} \cdot r^Q \leq \mu(B(x, r)) \leq C \cdot r^Q.$$

Definition 2.2. A metric space (X, d) is *quasiconvex* if there is a constant $C \geq 1$ so that for every pair $x, y \in X$ there is a continuous curve $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$ with $\gamma(0) = x, \gamma(1) = y$ and $\text{len}(\gamma) \leq C \cdot d(x, y)$. Here the *length* of γ is given by

$$\text{len}(\gamma) := \sup \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} d(\gamma(x_i), \gamma(x_{i+1})) : 0 = x_1 < x_2 < \dots < x_N = 1 \right\}.$$

2.2. Terminologies of graphs. A (*finite*) *graph* is a pair $G := (V, E)$ where V is a non-empty finite set of *vertices* and E is a finite multiset of *edges* consisting of unordered pairs $\{v, w\}$ for distinct vertices $v, w \in V$. We do not allow loops (edges of the form $\{v, v\}$) in our graphs. The *degree* of a vertex $v \in V$ is the number of edges in E containing v ,

$$\text{deg}(v) := |\{e \in E : v \in e\}|$$

Note that the multiplicities are counted, i.e., if there are distinct edges with same endpoints, then these are counted separately.

In this paper, graphs are always assumed to be finite, meaning that $|V|, |E| < \infty$.

Definition 2.3. Let $G := (V, E)$ be a graph. A sequence of vertices $\theta := [v_1, \dots, v_k]$, which is allowed to contain only one vertex, is a *path* in G if $\{v_i, v_{i+1}\} \in E$ for all $1 \leq i < k$. The length of a θ is $\text{len}(\theta) := k - 1$. We say that G is *connected* if for every pair of vertices $v, w \in V$ there is a path $[v = v_1, \dots, v_k = w]$ in G . For a connected graph we define the (*shortest*) *path metric* $d_G(v, w) := \min_{\theta} \text{len}(\theta)$, where the minimum is taken over all paths connecting v and w .

Note that if G is a connected graph then (V, d_G) is a metric space.

Definition 2.4. Let $G := (V, E)$ be a graph and $A \subseteq V$ be any subset. We say that A is *connected* if every pair of points in A can be connected by path entirely contained in A . We also say that A is *independent* if for every pair of vertices in $v, w \in A$ we have $\{v, w\} \notin E$.

Definition 2.5. Let $G := (V, E)$ be a graph and $A \subseteq V$ be any subset. The *boundary* of A is the subset $\partial A := \{v \in V \setminus A : \{v, w\} \in E \text{ for some } w \in A\}$. The *closure* of A is $\bar{A} := A \cup \partial A$.

2.3. Discrete potential theory. Next, we recall some relevant definitions and classical results in discrete potential theory. See e.g. [22] for further background. Let $G := (V, E)$ be a graph and $p \in (1, \infty)$. For any $g : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we define its *gradient* as the function $\nabla g : V \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by $\nabla g(v, w) := g(w) - g(v)$. If $e = \{v, w\} \in E$ we denote $|\nabla g(e)| := |\nabla g(v, w)|$. The *graph p -energy form* $\mathcal{E}_p : \mathbb{R}^V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ of G is given by

$$\mathcal{E}_p(g) := \sum_{e \in E} |\nabla g(e)|^p.$$

If $A, B \subseteq V$ are non-empty disjoint subsets of V , we define the *p -capacity* between A and B as

$$\text{Cap}_p(A, B, G) := \inf \{ \mathcal{E}_p(U) : U|_A \equiv 1 \text{ and } U|_B \equiv 0 \}.$$

Functions satisfying $U|_A \equiv 1$ and $U|_B \equiv 0$ are sometimes referred as *potential functions* for the p -capacity problem $\text{Cap}_p(A, B, G)$. Potential functions with minimal energy are referred as *optimal potential functions*. If $A \subseteq V$, we say that $U : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is *p -harmonic* in A if

$$\sum_{\{v, w\} \in E} \text{sgn}(\nabla U(v, w)) |\nabla U(v, w)|^{p-1} = 0 \text{ for all } v \in A.$$

Lemma 2.6. *Let G be a connected graph, $A, B \subseteq V$ be non-empty disjoint subsets and $p \in (1, \infty)$. There is a unique function $U : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ so that $U|_A \equiv 1, U|_B \equiv 0$ and $\mathcal{E}_p(U) = \text{Cap}_p(A, B, G) > 0$. Moreover, this function is p -harmonic in $V \setminus (A \cup B)$. The converse is also true. If U is p -harmonic in $V \setminus (A \cup B)$ satisfying $U|_A \equiv 1, U|_B \equiv 0$ then $\mathcal{E}_p(U) = \text{Cap}_p(A, B, G)$.*

Lemma 2.7 (Strong maximum principle). *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph and $A \subsetneq V$ be a non-empty connected subset. If $U : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is p -harmonic in A then*

$$\max_{x \in \bar{A}} U(x) = \max_{x \in \partial A} U(x) \text{ and } \min_{x \in \bar{A}} U(x) = \min_{x \in \partial A} U(x).$$

Moreover, if $U(y) = \max_{x \in \bar{A}} U(x)$ for some $y \in A$ then U is constant in \bar{A} .

We say that a function $\mathcal{J} : V \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is *anti-symmetric* on G if $\mathcal{J}(v, w) = -\mathcal{J}(w, v)$ for all $v, w \in V$, and $\mathcal{J}(v, w) = 0$ unless $\{v, w\} \in E$. For simplicity, if $e = \{v, w\} \in E$, we denote $|\mathcal{J}(e)| := |\mathcal{J}(v, w)|$. Further, given non-empty disjoint subsets $A, B \subseteq V$ we say that an anti-symmetric function \mathcal{J} is a *flow* from A to B if its *divergence* at a vertex $v \in V$

$$\text{div}(\mathcal{J})(v) := \sum_{\{v, w\} \in E} \mathcal{J}(v, w)$$

is equal to 0 for all $v \in V \setminus (A \cup B)$. The flow \mathcal{J} from A to B is a *unit flow* if

$$\sum_{v \in A} \text{div}(\mathcal{J})(v) = 1.$$

The *p -energy* of a unit flow \mathcal{J} is defined as

$$\mathcal{E}_q(\mathcal{J}) := \sum_{e \in E} |\mathcal{J}(e)|^q,$$

where $q := \frac{p}{p-1} \in (1, \infty)$ is the *dual exponent* of p . Given non-empty disjoint subsets $A, B \subseteq V$, we define the *p -resistance* between A and B as

$$\text{Res}_p(A, B, G) := \inf \{ \mathcal{E}_q(\mathcal{J}) : \mathcal{J} \text{ is a unit flow from } A \text{ to } B \}.$$

A unit flow from A to B with minimal p -energy is referred as *optimal unit flow*.

Throughout the paper, $q \in (1, \infty)$ always denotes the dual exponent of $p \in (1, \infty)$, whenever the exponent p is clear from the context.

Lemma 2.8 (Divergence theorem). *Let $U : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be any function and $\mathcal{J} : V \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be any antisymmetric function on a graph $G = (V, E)$. Then*

$$(2.9) \quad \sum_{v \in V} \operatorname{div}(\mathcal{J})(v) \cdot U(v) = - \sum_{\{v, w\} \in E} \mathcal{J}(v, w) \cdot \nabla U(v, w).$$

Next we recall the duality of potentials and flows. See e.g. [44, Theorem 5.1].

Lemma 2.10 (Duality). *Let G be a connected graph, $A, B \subseteq V$ be non-empty disjoint subsets and $p \in (1, \infty)$. Then there is a unique unit flow \mathcal{J} from A to B satisfying $\mathcal{E}_q(\mathcal{J}) = \operatorname{Res}_p(A, B, G)$. Moreover, if U is the unique solution to the p -capacity problem $\operatorname{Cap}_p(A, B, G)$ as in Lemma 2.6, then*

$$(2.11) \quad |\mathcal{J}(e)| = \mathcal{E}_p(U)^{-1} \cdot |\nabla U(e)|^{p-1}.$$

Moreover, we have

$$(2.12) \quad \mathcal{E}_p(U)^{\frac{1}{p}} \cdot \mathcal{E}_q(\mathcal{J})^{\frac{1}{q}} = 1.$$

3. CONSTRUCTION OF IGS-FRACTALS

This section covers the geometric framework of iterated graph systems and IGS-fractals. The term “iterated graph system” is inspired by the work of Neroli Z. [45], where the author studied a similar construction with the primary focus on graph theory.

3.1. Iterated graph systems.

Definition 3.1. An *iterated graph system (IGS)* consists of the data (V_1, E_1, I) and of the collection of functions $\phi_{v,e} : I \rightarrow V_1$ for all pairs $e \in E_1$ and $v \in V_1$ so that $v \in e$. We assume that they satisfy the following properties.

- (1) $G_1 := (V_1, E_1)$ is a connected finite graph and I is a non-empty finite set called the *gluing set*.
- (2) For each $e \in E_1$ and its endpoint point $v \in e$ the function $\phi_{v,e} : I \rightarrow V_1$ is an injection whose image $I_{v,e} := \phi_{v,e}(I)$ is an independent set of V_1 (recall Definition 2.4).
- (3) For each $e = \{v, w\} \in E_1$ it holds that $I_{v,e} \cap I_{w,e} = \emptyset$.

The graph G_1 will be referred as the *generator* of the IGS, and the set I together with the maps $\phi_{v,e}$ will be referred as the *gluing rules*. The use of the term “generator” was inspired by [52].

Remark 3.2. A variant of IGS-framework, the vertex-iterated graph systems, was introduced by the first and second author in [1]. Current work does not regard vertex-IGSs, and the term “IGS-fractals” exclusively refer to the spaces studied herein.

In later sections, the notations $V_1, E_1, G_1, I, \phi_{v,e}$ always refer to the data associated to the IGS whenever the IGS is clear from the context. For the most part, we will not explicitly restate the association of the data.

Before proceeding to the construction, we record the necessary assumptions for our approach to work and a few relevant constants. We explain each condition later in detail when they become relevant. The reader may skip Assumption 3.3 for now and come back later when we explicitly state that these conditions hold, which is in Section 4.

Assumption 3.3. *The IGS consisting of the data $V_1, E_1, I, \{\phi_{v,e}\}_{v \in e \in E_1}$ and the associated generator G_1 satisfy the following conditions.*

- (1) **(Simplicity)** *There are functions $\phi_+, \phi_- : I \rightarrow V_1$ so that for all edges $e = \{v, w\} \in E_1$ it holds that*

$$\{\phi_{v,e}, \phi_{w,e}\} = \{\phi_+, \phi_-\}.$$

We also denote $I_+ := \phi_+(I)$ and $I_- := \phi_-(I)$.

- (2) **(Non-degeneracy)** *There is no edge between the sets I_+ and I_- .*
- (3) **(Doubling)** *For all $v \in I_+ \cup I_-$ it holds that $\deg(v) = 1$. The unique neighbor of such v is denoted $\mathbf{n}(v)$.*
- (4) **(Conductively uniform)** *For all $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $a \in I$ it holds that*

$$\mathcal{J}_{p,+}(\phi_+(a), \mathbf{n}(\phi_+(a))) = -\mathcal{J}_{p,+}(\phi_-(a), \mathbf{n}(\phi_-(a))).$$

Here, $\mathcal{J}_{p,+}$ is the p -energy minimizing unit flow from I_+ to I_- in G_1 .

We also fix the following constants that depend on at most the initial data associated to the IGS and the exponent $p \in (1, \infty)$.

- (i) **(Geometric constants)**

$$C_{\text{diam}} := \text{diam}(V_1, d_{G_1}), \quad C_{\text{deg}} := \max_{v \in V_1} \deg(v), \quad L_* := \text{dist}(I_+, I_-, d_{G_1}).$$

- (ii) **(Hausdorff dimension)**

$$Q := \frac{\log(|E_1|)}{\log(L_*)}.$$

- (iii) **(p -capacity constant)**

$$\mathcal{M}_p := \text{Cap}_p(I_+, I_-, G_1).$$

- (iv) **(p -walk dimension)**

$$d_{w,p} := \frac{\log(|E_1| \mathcal{M}_p^{-1})}{\log(L_*)}.$$

3.2. Replacement rule. We discuss an iterative procedure associated to a given IGS consisting of the data $V_1, E_1, I, \{\phi_{v,e}\}_{v \in e \in E_1}$ and $G_1 := (V_1, E_1)$ that produces an infinite sequence of graphs $(G_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$.

In general, a graph $G = (V, E)$ is said to be *labeled* by G_1 if for every $v \in e \in E$ there is an associated injective mapping $\phi_{v,e} : I \rightarrow V_1$, whose image is an independent set. Given a labeled graph G , we can form a new graph $\widehat{G} = (\widehat{V}, \widehat{E})$, whose vertices are $\widehat{V} = V_1 \times E / \sim$, where we identify

$$(\phi_{v,e}(a), e) \sim (\phi_{v,f}(a), f)$$

for every $e, f \in E$ which share an end point $v \in V$ and $a \in I$. Further, we define the set of edges

$$\widehat{E} = \{[(v, e)], [(w, e)] : \{v, w\} \in E_1 \text{ and } e \in E\}.$$

This amounts to replacing each edge in G by a copy of G_1 , which are glued along the images of the mappings $\phi_{v,e}$. We can also define a labeling for \widehat{G} by

$$\phi_{[(v,e)],\{[(v,e)],[(w,e)]\}} = \phi_{v,\{v,w\}}$$

so that \widehat{G} is labeled by G_1 . This procedure is called a *replacement rule*.

By applying the replacement rule recursively to the generator G_1 , we can construct an infinite sequence of graphs: Set $G_{n+1} := \widehat{G}_n$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The edges and vertices of $G_{n+1} = (V_{n+1}, E_{n+1})$ can be described as follows.

- (1) Let $V_{n+1} = V_1 \times E_n / \sim$, where we identify vertices with the relationships $(\phi_{v,e}(a), e) \sim (\phi_{v,f}(a), f)$ for every $e, f \in E_n$ which share an end point v and $a \in I$.
- (2) $\{[v, e], [w, e]\} \in E_{n+1}$ if $\{v, w\} \in E_1$.
- (3) $\phi_{[v,e],\{[v,e],[w,e]\}} = \phi_{v,\{v,w\}}$.

Notice that in the notation of equivalence classes $[(v, e)]$, we drop the parenthesis and write $[v, e]$. We call the graphs G_n *replacement graphs*.

The replacement graphs have a natural *projective structure*. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we define $\pi_{n+1} : V_{n+1} \cup E_{n+1} \rightarrow V_n \cup E_n$ as follows. For each vertex $[v, e] \in V_{n+1}$ define $\pi_{n+1}([v, e]) = e$ if $v \notin I_{w,e}$ for any $w \in e$, and otherwise set $\pi_{n+1}([v, e]) = w$ if $v \in I_{w,e}$. For an edge $\{[v, e], [w, e]\} \in E_{n+1}$ we define $\pi_{n+1}(\{[v, e], [w, e]\}) = e$. For $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $n > m$, we define $\pi_{n,m} := \pi_{m+1} \circ \cdots \circ \pi_{n-1} \circ \pi_n$. We also define $\pi_{n,n} := \text{id}_{V_n \cup E_n}$. If $n > m$, $w \in V_n$ and $\pi_{n,m}(w) = v \in V_m$, then we call w an *ancestor* of v .

3.3. First examples. The general results of the paper, e.g. the constructions of the p -energy forms and p -energy measures, cover all examples of IGSs that satisfy Assumption 3.3. Among the four conditions therein, the only one that requires careful consideration is the *conductive uniform property*. In Theorem 4.9, we collected three easily verifiable sufficient conditions for this property. The examples discussed in this subsection all satisfy the symmetry condition (CUP-2). See Figure 4.23 for a construction of a non-symmetric example.

Before proceeding to the examples, it may be helpful for the reader to revisit the construction of the Laakso diamond in Example 1.3.

Example 3.4 (Laakso space). Laakso introduced a construction of metric spaces [37] (today known as *Laakso spaces*) that satisfy arguably one the strongest pair of analytic conditions in modern analysis on metric spaces – Ahlfors regularity and 1-Poincaré inequality. In this example, we consider a construction of an IGS-fractal, that can be regarded as a variant of a Laakso space. A generalization of this concept is discussed in Proposition 4.21 See also Figure 4.23.

The generator $G_1 = (V_1, E_1)$ is given in Figure 3.5, and the gluing rules are defined as follows. The gluing rules are given by $I := \{a, b\}$

$$(\phi_+(a), \phi_+(b)) := (1, 2) \text{ and } (\phi_-(a), \phi_-(b)) := (7, 8).$$

For $\{v, w\} \in E_1$, we define $\phi_{v,\{v,w\}} = \phi_+$ if and only if $v < w$. When $v > w$, we define $\phi_{v,\{v,w\}} = \phi_-$.




FIGURE 3.5. Figure of the first replacement that produces the variant of a Laakso space discussed in Example 3.4. The colors of vertices indicate the gluing rules: Blue vertex is connected to the other blue vertex and orange to the other orange.

Example 3.6. A major motivation for the IGS-framework is that it can produce self-similar fractals that does not satisfy as strong analytic properties as e.g. the Laakso space in Example 3.4. In this example, we discuss the construction of the main counterexample to Kleiner’s conjecture in [2]. Let $G_1 := (V_1, E_1)$ and the gluing rules be as in Example 3.4. Consider the IGS whose generator $\tilde{G}_1 := (V_1, E_1 \cup \{4, 5\})$ is the graph in the left of Figure 3.7. The additional gluing rule is given by $(\phi_{4,\{4,5\}}, \phi_{5,\{4,5\}}) = (\phi_+, \phi_-)$.




FIGURE 3.7. A figure of the IGS in Example 3.6.

Example 3.8 (Vicsek set). We discuss an IGS that produces a variant of the Vicsek set. Let G_1 be the graph in the right of Figure 3.9. The gluing rules are defined as follows. First, we set $I := \{a\}, (\phi_-, (a), \phi_+(a)) := (5, 1)$. For a given edge $\{v, w\} \in E_1$, we define $\phi_{v,\{v,w\}} = \phi_+$ if and only if $v < w$. Notice that the regular Vicsek set has 5 similarity maps and our version has 4.

Example 3.10. In Figure 3.11 we provide an example of an IGS whose generator is a multigraph.

Remark 3.12. The current framework exclusively produces self-similar metric spaces. By modifying the replacement rule to allow replacements with multiple different generators, we could easily construct metric spaces without exact self-similarity. Nevertheless, the treatment of the analogous notion of conductive uniform property would become much more delicate.




FIGURE 3.9. A figure of the IGS discussed in Example 3.8.




FIGURE 3.11. Figure of an IGS whose generator is a multigraph.

We end this subsection by discussing the connections and differences to some similar frameworks where the goals intersect with ours in some way. First, we are inspired by two spaces constructed by Laakso in [37,38], and both of these examples are contained within our framework. Our description of these spaces is different, but is heavily suggested by the constructions of sequences of graphs in [39], [15, Example 2.9], [13, Example 1.4]. The terminology “Laakso-type spaces” derives from this connection.

The examples of Laakso were later generalized in two different directions. Barlow and Evans [6] studied diffusions on so called “vermiculated spaces” that extended the construction of Laakso by replacing intervals with more general metric spaces, such as trees. The terminology refers to the “wormholes” in [37]. These spaces were further studied [42,51]. A similar construction was used in [5,48] to construct infinite graphs. The framework of Barlow-Evans, and the techniques used in their study, appears quite different from ours. Nevertheless, the resulting spaces have many similarities. A further study of their connections is warranted.

The second extension of Laakso’s work was general inverse limits by Cheeger and Kleiner [13,14]. Here, a set of axioms were developed for an inverse limit of graphs to support a metric and a measure with a Poincaré inequality. Also, embeddability to L^1 was studied. Many of our techniques were inspired by the methods to study these spaces, such as the averaging technique on fibers. However, there are many subtle differences. First, our graphs do not always define a projective sequence satisfying the axioms of [14]. Second, even when they do, the measure we construct is different from theirs. Consequently Sobolev spaces, Poincaré inequalities and analysis on these spaces take an entirely different form. A good example of this second case is the Laakso diamond, where the Sobolev spaces that we construct are distinct from the ones studied in [14] – this follows quite easily from Theorem 1.24. Another way to see this is that there is no singularity of Sobolev spaces in [14], since Lipschitz functions always lie in the Sobolev spaces considered in [14].

3.4. Geometric conditions. In this subsection, we discuss the first three conditions in Assumption 3.3 that serve the purpose of ensuring controlled and non-trivial

geometry for the IGS-fractals. Discussions on the last condition (conductively uniform property) is postponed to Section 4.

Definition 3.13. An IGS is *simple* if there are two functions $\phi_+, \phi_- : I \rightarrow V_1$ so that for all $\{v, w\} \in E_1$ we have

$$\{\phi_{v, \{v, w\}}, \phi_{w, \{v, w\}}\} = \{\phi_+, \phi_-\}.$$

When the IGS is simple, the gluing sets are denoted as

$$I_+ := \phi_+(I) \text{ and } I_- := \phi_-(I).$$

For all edges $e \in E_\#$ we shall denote the vertices $e^+, e^- \in e$ so that

$$(\phi_{e^+, e}, \phi_{e^-, e}) = (\phi_+, \phi_-).$$

For simple IGSs it is convenient to introduce the level-0 graph $G_0 := (V_0, E_0)$. We define

$$V_0 := \{v_+, v_-\} \text{ and } E_0 := \{e_0\} := \{\{v_+, v_-\}\}.$$

Moreover, we give G_0 the gluing rules

$$\phi_{v_+, e_0} := \phi_+ \text{ and } \phi_{v_-, e_0} := \phi_-.$$

Notice that the replacement rule on G_0 gives G_1 . We then define the projection $\pi_1 : V_1 \cup E_1 \rightarrow V_0 \cup E_0$ so that

$$\pi_1(e) := e_0 \text{ for all } e \in E_1 \text{ and } \pi_1(v) := \begin{cases} v_+ & \text{if } v \in I_+ \\ v_- & \text{if } v \in I_- \\ e_0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In particular, it holds that

$$\pi_1^{-1}(v_+) = I_+ \text{ and } \pi_1^{-1}(v_-) = I_-.$$

We also denote $\pi_{n,0} := \pi_1 \circ \pi_{n,1}$. The set of all edges/vertices in all replacement graphs are denoted

$$E_\# := \bigsqcup_{n=0}^{\infty} E_n \text{ and } V_\# := \bigsqcup_{n=0}^{\infty} V_n.$$

Lastly, we define the higher-order gluing sets by

$$I_+^{(n)} := \pi_{n,0}^{-1}(v_+) \text{ and } I_-^{(n)} := \pi_{n,0}^{-1}(v_-).$$

For $v \in e \in E_\#$ we define

$$I_{v,e}^{(n)} := \begin{cases} I_+^{(n)} & \text{if } v = e^+ \\ I_-^{(n)} & \text{if } v = e^-. \end{cases}$$

Definition 3.14. A simple IGS is said to be *doubling* if for every $v \in I_+ \cup I_-$ we have $\deg(v) = 1$. For such $v \in I_+ \cup I_-$ we denote the unique neighbor of v by $\mathfrak{n}(v)$, and the corresponding edge by $\mathfrak{e}(v)$, i.e., $\mathfrak{e}(v) = \{v, \mathfrak{n}(v)\}$.

The doubling property ensures that the geometry of the replacement graphs do not grow uncontrollably. The following lemma is proven in [2, Lemma 3.21].

Lemma 3.15. *If the simple IGS is doubling then*

$$\sup_{v \in V_\#} \deg(v) = \max_{v \in V_1} \deg(v).$$

Definition 3.16. A simple IGS is *non-degenerate* if $\text{dist}(I_+, I_-, d_{G_1}) \geq 2$. Equivalently, there is no edge between the sets I_+ and I_- .

Non-degeneracy removes uninteresting examples such as the case where G_1 contains only one edge. It also ensures that the discrete distances grow exponentially with respect to the level of the graph. This is seen in the following lemma, which was essentially proven in [2, Lemma 3.18] using the path decomposition in [2, Proposition 3.16]. The proof is identical so we omit the details.

Lemma 3.17. *Let $L_* := \text{dist}(I_+, I_-, d_{G_1})$. If $n, m \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and $v, w \in V_m$ are distinct vertices, then*

$$\text{dist}(\pi_{n+m,m}^{-1}(v), \pi_{n+m,m}^{-1}(w), d_{G_{n+m}}) \geq L_*^n.$$

Lemma 3.18. *If the IGS is simple and doubling then $\deg(v) = 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $v \in I_+^{(n)} \cup I_-^{(n)}$. Let $\mathbf{n}(v)$ denote the unique neighbor of such v . If the IGS is also non-degenerate, then*

$$\mathbf{n}(v) \in V_n \setminus \left(I_+^{(n)} \cup I_-^{(n)} \right).$$

Proof. The existence and the uniqueness of $\mathbf{n}(v)$ is a direct inductive argument on $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The base case follows from the doubling property, and the rest from the gluing rules.

Next, we argue the latter part, and assume $v \in I_-^{(n)}$ for simplicity. First, $\mathbf{n}(v) \notin I_-^{(n)}$ follows from the fact that the gluing sets are independent sets (Definition 3.1-(2)). According to Lemma 3.17, $\mathbf{n}(v) \in I_+^{(n)}$ would violate the fact that the IGS is non-degenerate. \square

3.5. Symbolic dynamics. The purpose of this subsection is to simplify the symbolic language of IGSs into a more geometric and intuitive form.

The following proposition gives a precise meaning to the self-similarity of our construction, and was essentially proven in [2, Proposition 3.11]. There is a slight difference in (SM2), since in this paper we allow multigraphs. The proof would be identical so we omit the details.

Proposition 3.19. *For every $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $e \in E_n$ there is a mapping $\sigma_{e,m} : V_m \rightarrow V_{n+m}$, the image of $\sigma_{e,m}$ denoted as $e \cdot G_m$ and the edges contained in this image as $e \cdot E_m$, with the following properties.*

(SM1) *For every $e \in E_n$ the mapping $\sigma_{e,m}$ is injective and the collection of subsets $\{e \cdot G_m\}_{e \in E_n}$ is a covering of V_{n+m} . For $v, w \in V_m$, $\{v, w\} \in E_m$ if and only if $\{\sigma_{e,m}(v), \sigma_{e,m}(w)\} \in E_{n+m}$. Furthermore,*

$$(3.20) \quad \phi_{v, \{v, w\}} = \phi_{\sigma_{e,m}(v), \{\sigma_{e,m}(v), \sigma_{e,m}(w)\}}.$$

(SM2) *For distinct edges $e, f \in E_n$ the subsets $e \cdot G_m$ and $f \cdot G_m$ intersect if and only if e, f have a common vertex v . Moreover, their intersection is*

$$\bigcup_{v \in e \cap f} \sigma_{e,m} \left(I_{v,e}^{(m)} \right) = \pi_{n+m,n}^{-1}(e \cap f) = \bigcup_{v \in e \cap f} \sigma_{f,m} \left(I_{v,f}^{(m)} \right)$$

(SM3) *For every $e \in E_n$ we have $e \cdot E_m = \pi_{n+m,n}^{-1}(e)$. In particular, $\{e \cdot E_m\}_{e \in E_n}$ is a partition of E_{n+m} .*

Remark 3.21. The mappings $\sigma_{e,m} : V_m \rightarrow V_{n+m}$ are given inductively by the following conditions.

- (1) $\sigma_{e,0} : V_0 \rightarrow V_n$ is defined so that $\sigma_{e,0}(v_{\pm}) := e^{\pm}$.
- (2) $\sigma_{e,m+1} : V_{m+1} \rightarrow V_{n+m+1}$, $[z, \{v, w\}] \mapsto [z, \{\sigma_{e,m}(v), \sigma_{e,m}(w)\}]$.

Corollary 3.22. *Suppose that the IGS is simple and doubling, and let $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $v \in e \in E_n$. Then every ancestor $w \in \pi_{n+m,n}^{-1}(v)$ of v has a unique neighbor in $e \cdot G_m$. Let $\mathbf{n}(w, e)$ denote the unique neighbor of such w in $e \cdot G_m$. If the IGS is also non-degenerate then*

$$(3.23) \quad \mathbf{n}(w, e) \in e \cdot G_m \setminus (\pi_{n+m,n}^{-1}(e^+) \cup \pi_{n+m,n}^{-1}(e^-))$$

Proof. The claim follows from (SM1) and Lemma 3.18. Indeed, if $w = \sigma_{e,m}(z)$, then $\mathbf{n}(w, e) = \sigma_{e,m}(\mathbf{n}(z))$. \square

When the IGS is simple and doubling, $v \in e \in E_n$ and $w \in \pi_{n+m,n}^{-1}(v)$, we define $\mathfrak{e}(w, e) := \{w, \mathbf{n}(w, e)\}$.

Definition 3.24. For any $v \in V_n$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we define the *higher order gluing map* $\Phi_{v,m} : I^m \rightarrow \pi_{n+m,n}^{-1}(v)$ recursively as follows.

- (1) $\Phi_{v,1}(a) := [\phi_{v,e}(a), e]$ for all $a \in I$.
- (2) If $w := \Phi_{v,m}(a_1 \dots a_m) \in \pi_{n+m,n}^{-1}(v)$ is given for all $a_1 \dots a_m \in I^m$, we define

$$\Phi_{v,m+1}(a_1 \dots a_m a_{m+1}) := [\phi_{w,\mathfrak{e}(w,e)}(a_{m+1}), \mathfrak{e}(w, e)].$$

If $v = v_{\pm}$ we denote $\phi_{\pm,m} := \Phi_{v_{\pm},m}$.

Note that the mappings $\Phi_{v,\bullet}$ do not depend on the choice of the edge e containing v due to the identifications at the end of a replacement.

Lemma 3.25. *For all $v \in V_n$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ the higher order gluing map $\Phi_{v,m} : I^m \rightarrow \pi_{n+m,n}^{-1}(v)$ is bijective.*

Proof. This follows from the injectivity of the first order gluing maps $\phi_{v,e}$ (Definition 3.1-(2)). \square

Definition 3.26. We define the following symbolic operations.

- (1) If $e \in E_{\#}$ and $v \in V_n$ we define $e \cdot v := \sigma_{e,n}(v)$.
- (2) If $e \in E_{\#}$ and $f \in E_{\#}$ we define $e \cdot f := \{e \cdot f^-, e \cdot f^+\}$.
- (3) If $v \in V_{\#}$ and $a \in I^m$ we define $v \cdot a := \Phi_{v,m}(a)$.
- (4) If $a = a_1 \dots a_n \in I^n$ and $b_1 \dots b_m \in I^m$ we define

$$a \cdot b := a_1 \dots a_n b_1 \dots b_m \in I^{n+m}.$$

Lemma 3.27. *Suppose that the IGS is simple and doubling. Let $e, f, g \in E_{\#}$, $v \in V_{\#}$ and $a \in I^n, b \in I^m$. Then the following associativity properties hold.*

- (1) $(e \cdot f) \cdot v = e \cdot (f \cdot v)$
- (2) $(e \cdot f) \cdot g = e \cdot (f \cdot g)$
- (3) $(e \cdot v) \cdot a = e \cdot (v \cdot a)$
- (4) $(v \cdot a) \cdot b = v \cdot (a \cdot b)$

Proof. (1)-(2): Follows from the explicit form of the mappings $\sigma_{\bullet,\bullet}$ in Remark 3.21.

(3): Choose any edge $v \in e_v$, and first assume that $a \in I$. It follows from (3.20) and the explicit form of the mappings $\sigma_{\bullet, \bullet}$ that

$$(e \cdot v) \cdot a = \Phi_{e \cdot v}(a) = [\phi_{e \cdot v, e \cdot e_v}(a), e \cdot e_v] = e \cdot [\phi_{v, e_v}(a), e_v] = e \cdot (v \cdot a).$$

This proves the case $n = 1$, and the general case $a \in I^n$ for $n \geq 1$ follows from a similar computation and induction.

(4): Suppose e_v is again an edge containing v , and first assume $b \in I$. Then

$$(v \cdot a) \cdot b = \Phi_{v \cdot a, 1}(b) = [\phi_{v \cdot a, \mathfrak{c}(v \cdot a, e_v)}(b), \mathfrak{c}(v \cdot a, e_v)] = v \cdot (a \cdot b)$$

and this proves the case $m = 1$. The general case would again follow from a direct inductive computation. \square

Remark 3.28. It is easy to see from (SM3) that the set of edges E_n can be identified as the set of sequences of length n ,

$$E_1^n := \{e_1 e_2 \dots e_n : e_i \in E_1 \text{ for all } i = 1, 2, \dots, n\}.$$

Using the product operation defined in Definition 3.26 and the associativity property proven in Lemma 3.27-(2), this identification can be naturally given by

$$e_1 e_2 \dots e_n \mapsto e_1 \cdot e_2 \cdot \dots \cdot e_n \in E_n.$$

Motivated by this, we sometimes denote $e_1 e_2 \dots e_n := e_1 \cdot e_2 \cdot \dots \cdot e_n \in E_n$. This notation particularly useful for defining measures. However, in order to avoid confusion, we always explicitly mention when this notation is used.

3.6. Limit space. The finish line in the geometric framework of IGSs is the construction of the limit space. For this subsection, we fix a simple and non-degenerate IGS satisfying the doubling property.

We define the *symbol space* as the family of projective sequences

$$\Sigma := \{(e_i)_{i=0}^\infty : e_i \in E_i \text{ and } \pi_{i+1}(e_{i+1}) = e_i \text{ for all } i \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}\}.$$

For $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and $e \in E_n$ we define the subsets $\Sigma_e \subseteq \Sigma$ by

$$\Sigma_e := \{(e_i)_{i=0}^\infty \in \Sigma : e_n = e\},$$

which are also obtained as the images of the mappings

$$\sigma_e : \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma, (e_i)_{i=0}^\infty \mapsto (f_i)_{i=0}^\infty,$$

where $f_{n+i} := e \cdot e_i$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and $f_{n-i} := \pi_{n, n-i}(e)$ for all $0 \leq i \leq n$. Note that $\sigma_{e_0} = \text{id}_\Sigma$. We equip Σ with the natural *word metric*

$$\delta_\Sigma((e_i)_{i=0}^\infty, (f_i)_{i=0}^\infty) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } e_i = f_i \text{ for all } i \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\} \\ 2^{-\min\{k : (e_i)_{i=0}^k \neq (f_i)_{i=0}^k\}} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Remark 3.29. The symbol space alternatively can be defined as the space of sequences

$$E_1^\mathbb{N} := \{(e_i)_{i=1}^\infty : e_i \in E_1 \text{ for all } i \in \mathbb{N}\}$$

through the identification $T : E_1^\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \Sigma$,

$$(e_i)_{i=1}^\infty \mapsto (e_1 e_2 \dots e_i)_{i=0}^\infty \in \Sigma.$$

Here, $e_1 e_2 \dots e_0$ is understood as e_0 . It follows from the discussion in Remark 3.28 that T is a well-defined bijection.

Definition 3.30. Let $\alpha : E_{\#} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be any function satisfying

$$(3.31) \quad \alpha(e) = \sum_{f \in E_1} \alpha(e \cdot f) \quad \text{for all } e \in E_{\#}.$$

Then we define \mathbf{m}_{α} to be the Radon measure on Σ satisfying

$$(3.32) \quad \mathbf{m}_{\alpha}(\Sigma_e) = \alpha(e) \text{ for all } e \in E_{\#}.$$

To see that \mathbf{m}_{α} exists, we can construct it by first defining it on the alternative symbol space $E_1^{\mathbb{N}}$. Kolmogorov's extension theorem and the conditions (3.31) ensure that there is a unique Radon measure $\widehat{\mathbf{m}}_{\alpha}$ on $E_1^{\mathbb{N}}$ satisfying

$$\widehat{\mathbf{m}}_{\alpha}(\{(e_i)_{i=1}^{\infty} \in E_1^{\mathbb{N}} : e_1 e_2 \dots e_n = e\}) = \alpha(e) \text{ for all } e \in E_n.$$

By using the identification $T : E_1^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \Sigma$ discussed in Remark 3.29, the push-forward measure $\mathbf{m}_{\alpha} := T_*(\widehat{\mathbf{m}}_{\alpha})$ satisfies (3.32). If it holds that $\alpha(e_0) = 1$ and $\alpha(e_1 e_2 \dots e_n) = \alpha(e_1)\alpha(e_2)\dots\alpha(e_n)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $e_1, \dots, e_n \in E_1$, we say that the measure \mathbf{m}_{α} is a *Bernoulli measure* of Σ . Since $\mathbf{m}_{\alpha}(\Sigma) = \alpha(e_0) = 1$, \mathbf{m}_{α} is a probability measure. The values $\{\alpha(e)\}_{e \in E_1}$ are called the *weights* of \mathbf{m}_{α} . Observe that if we identify Σ with $E_1^{\mathbb{N}}$, then \mathbf{m}_{α} would be a Bernoulli measure in the usual sense. Lastly, we define the *uniform Bernoulli measure* to be the Bernoulli measure \mathbf{m}_{unif} with weights $\alpha(e) = |E_1|^{-1}$ for all $e \in E_1$.

We are now prepared to introduce the precise definition of the limit space. Certain aspects, in particular the definition of the metric, are quite technical. Therefore in the later sections, we will reference the geometric properties of the limit space through Propositions 3.39 and 3.42.

Definition 3.33. The *limit space* of an IGS consists of the metric measure space (X, d, μ) and mappings $\chi : \Sigma \rightarrow X$ and $F_e : X \rightarrow X$ for all $e \in E_{\#}$, which are constructed as follows. The underlying set X is obtained as the quotient set

$$(3.34) \quad X := \Sigma / \sim, \text{ where } (e_i)_{i=0}^{\infty} \sim (f_i)_{i=0}^{\infty} \iff e_i \cap f_i \neq \emptyset \text{ for all } i \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}.$$

The *coding map* is the canonical projection $\chi : \Sigma \rightarrow X$, and we define the measure μ on X as the push-forward of the uniform Bernoulli measure $\mu := \chi_*(\mathbf{m}_{\text{unif}})$. We define the *similarity maps* $F_e : X \rightarrow X$ for all $e \in E_{\#}$ as the unique mappings satisfying

$$(3.35) \quad F_e \circ \chi = \chi \circ \sigma_e.$$

The image of F_e is denoted $X_e := F_e(X)$. For $v \in V_{\#}$, we denote the associated *closed star* by

$$X_v := \bigcup_{\substack{e \in E_{\#} \\ v \in e}} X_e.$$

The metric d on X is chosen to be so that it satisfies the *visual metric property*. This means that there exists a constant $A \geq 1$ and $L_* > 1$ so that for all distinct sequences $(e_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}, (f_i)_{i=1}^{\infty} \in \Sigma$, if $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ is the largest non-negative integer so that $e_n \cap f_n \neq \emptyset$, it holds that

$$(3.36) \quad A^{-1}L_*^{-n} \leq d(\chi((e_i)_{i=0}^{\infty}), \chi((f_i)_{i=0}^{\infty})) \leq AL_*^{-n}.$$

We give it the following explicit description. Fix $L_* := \text{dist}(I_+, I_-, d_{G_1})$, which is at least 2 since the IGS is assumed to be non-degenerate. For $e \in E_{\#}$ denote

$|e| := n$ to be the integer so that $e \in E_n$. We define a metric d_n on V_n by

$$d_n(v, w) := \inf_{\Omega} \sum_{e \in \Omega} L_*^{-|e|}$$

where the infimum is taken over all sets $\Omega \subseteq \bigcup_{j=0}^n E_j$, so that

$$(3.37) \quad \bigcup_{e \in \Omega} e \cdot G_{n-|e|} \subseteq V_n \text{ is connected in } G_n \text{ and } v, w \in \bigcup_{e \in \Omega} e \cdot G_{n-|e|}.$$

The set $e \cdot G_m$ is as in Proposition 3.19. We now define

$$(3.38) \quad d(\chi((e_i)_{i=0}^\infty), \chi((f_i)_{i=0}^\infty)) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d_n(e_n, f_n).$$

Here, $d_n(e_n, f_n)$ is understood as

$$d_n(e_n, f_n) := \min_{\substack{v \in e_n \\ w \in f_n}} d_n(v, w).$$

The definition of the metric is slightly modified from the one in [2]. This is because in the current work we do not assume the L_* -uniform scaling property (see [2, Definition 3.17]), and therefore the metric has to be adjusted.

Proposition 3.39. *Let (X, d, μ) be the limit space of a simple and non-degenerate IGS satisfying the doubling property, and denote its generator $G_1 := (V_1, E_1)$ and $L_* := \text{dist}(I_+, I_-, d_{G_1})$.*

- (1) *The metric d on X given in (3.38) is well-defined and satisfies the visual metric property (3.36). Moreover, $\chi : \Sigma \rightarrow X$ is a continuous surjection.*
- (2) *For all $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and $e \in E_n$ the condition (3.35) uniquely determines a well-defined mapping $F_e : X \rightarrow X$. Furthermore, these mappings are injective, L_*^{-n} -Lipschitz and their images $F_e(X) = X_e$ satisfy*

$$(3.40) \quad X = \bigcup_{e \in E_n} X_e.$$

Proof. (1): The arguments in this proof are modified versions of the ones in [2, Subsection 3.6]. We first show that (3.38) produces a well-defined metric. First notice that $d_n \leq 1$ for all n by choosing $\Omega := \{e_0\}$. Now, our first objective is obtain the inequalities

$$(3.41) \quad d_n(e_n, f_n) \leq d_{n+m}(e_{n+m}, f_{n+m}) \leq 2L_*^{-n} + d_n(e_n, f_n)$$

for all pairs of projective sequences $(e_n)_{n=0}^\infty, (f_n)_{n=0}^\infty \in \Sigma$. These are analogical estimates to [2, (DL4) and (DL5) in Corollary 3.19].

We begin with the first one. If $e_n \cap f_n \neq \emptyset$ we clearly have $d_n(e_n, f_n) = 0 \leq d_{n+1}(e_{n+1}, f_{n+1})$. Assume $e_n \cap f_n = \emptyset$ and let Ω satisfy (3.37) so that it minimizes the distance $d_{n+1}(e_{n+1}, f_{n+1})$. By (SM1)-(SM2), Ω also connects a pair of ancestors $v_{n+1}, w_{n+1} \in V_{n+1}$ of $v_n \in e_n, w_n \in f_n$ respectively. This shows $d_{n+1}(v_{n+1}, w_{n+1}) \leq d_{n+1}(e_{n+1}, f_{n+1})$. By using Lemma 3.17 we see that $d_n(v_n, w_n) = d_{n+1}(v_{n+1}, w_{n+1})$. We thus have

$$d_n(e_n, f_n) \leq d_n(v_n, w_n) = d_{n+1}(v_{n+1}, w_{n+1}) \leq d_{n+1}(e_n, f_n).$$

The latter inequality in (3.41) is obtained by setting $\widehat{\Omega} := \Omega \cup \{e_n, f_n\}$ where Ω is a set satisfying (3.37) that minimizes the distance of $d_n(e_n, f_n)$. To see that the triangle inequality holds, suppose $e_n, f_n, g_n \in E_n$ and let Ω_1, Ω_2 satisfy (3.37)

and minimize the distances $d_n(e_n, f_n), d_n(f_n, g_n)$ respectively. By setting $\Omega := \Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2 \cup \{f_n\}$, we get

$$d_n(e_n, g_n) \leq d_n(e_n, f_n) + d_n(f_n, g_n) + L_*^{-n}.$$

The triangle inequality now follows by letting $n \rightarrow \infty$. We now conclude that d is a well-defined metric on X .

We move on to verifying the visual metric property (3.36). Fix an arbitrary pair $(e_n)_{n=0}^\infty, (f_n)_{n=0}^\infty$ of projective sequences and let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be the largest $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ so that $e_n \cap f_n \neq \emptyset$. Then $d_{n+m}(e_{n+m}, f_{n+m}) \leq 2L_*^{-n}$ (choose $\Omega := \{e_n, f_n\}$). On the other hand, since $e_{n+1} \cap f_{n+1} = \emptyset$, it follows from Lemma 3.17 that $d_{n+1}(e_{n+1}, f_{n+1}) \geq L_*^{-(n+1)}$. The visual metric property now follows from (3.41). Consequently, the continuity of $\chi : \Sigma \rightarrow X$, where Σ is given the word metric, is clear from the visual metric property and $L_* > 1$.

(2): Fix $e \in E_n$ for $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. The uniqueness of the mapping F_e satisfying (3.35) follows from the fact that χ is a surjection. To see that F_e is well-defined, this follows from the definition of the identifications in (3.34) and (SM1). The condition (3.40) is then clear from $X_e = \chi(\Sigma_e)$. Lastly, to conclude that F_e is L_*^{-n} -Lipschitz, this follows from the definition of the metric and (SM1). \square

Proposition 3.42. *Let (X, d, μ) be the limit space of a simple and non-degenerate IGS satisfying the doubling property, and denote its generator $G_1 := (V_1, E_1)$ and $L_* := \text{dist}(I_+, I_-, d_{G_1})$. Then the following hold.*

(1) *For every $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, $e \in E_n$ and $v \in V_n$ we have*

$$\text{diam}(X_e) = L_*^{-n} \text{ and } \mu(X_e) = |E_1|^{-n},$$

and

$$\text{diam}(X_v) \leq 2L_*^{-n} \text{ and } \mu(X_v) = \deg(v)|E_1|^{-n}.$$

Moreover, it holds that

$$(3.43) \quad \mu(X_e \cap X_f) = 0 \text{ for all distinct edges } e, f \in E_n \text{ and } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

(2) *Let $x \in X$ and $r \in (0, \infty)$ so that $\frac{1}{4}L_*^{-n-1} \leq r < \frac{1}{4}L_*^{-n}$ holds for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then there is a vertex $v \in V_n$ so that the closed star X_v satisfies*

$$B(x, r) \subseteq X_v \subseteq B(x, 8L_*r).$$

(3) *(X, d, μ) is compact, path connected and Q -Ahlfors regular for*

$$Q_* := \frac{\log(|E_1|)}{\log(L_*)}.$$

The proof of Proposition 3.42 is postponed to the end of the next subsection.

3.7. Fiber sets. According to (SM2), the self-similar pieces of the replacement graphs intersect exactly at the set of ancestors. The analogous concept for the limit space are the fiber sets. The precise definition of the fiber set is somewhat technical, and the main purpose of this subsection is to simplify the language involving it.

Recall from Lemma 3.25 that the mapping $\Phi_{v,m}(a) = v \cdot a$ determines a bijection from I^m onto $\pi_{n+m,n}^{-1}(v)$. We shall denote the space of sequences

$$I^\mathbb{N} := \{(a_i)_{i=1}^\infty : a_i \in I \text{ for all } i \in \mathbb{N}\},$$

and equip it with the natural word metric.

For $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and any $v \in e \in E_n$, we define the subset $\Sigma_{v,e} \subseteq \Sigma_e$ to be the set obtained as the image of the mapping $T_{v,e} : I^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \Sigma, (a_i)_{i=1}^{\infty} \mapsto (e_i)_{i=0}^{\infty}$, where

$$(3.44) \quad e_i = \begin{cases} \mathbf{e}(v \cdot (a_1 \dots a_{i-n}), e) & \text{for all } i > n \\ \pi_{n,i}(e) & \text{if } i \leq n. \end{cases}$$

Note that by the uniqueness part of Corollary 3.22, we have

$$\mathbf{e}(v \cdot a_1 \dots a_m a_{m+1}, e) = \mathbf{e}(v \cdot a_1 \dots a_m a_{m+1}, \mathbf{e}(v \cdot a_1 \dots a_m, e)).$$

Combining this with Lemma 3.27-(4) and the bijectiveness of the mappings $\Phi_{v,\bullet}$, it follows that $T_{v,e} : I^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \Sigma$ is a homeomorphism onto $\Sigma_{v,e}$. Then we define the *fiber set* of $v \in V_n$ as the subset $\text{Fib}(v) := \chi(\Sigma_{v,e}) \subseteq X$. We also denote

$$\text{Fib}(X) := \bigcup_{v \in V_{\#}} \text{Fib}(v).$$

Proposition 3.45. *For all $v \in V_{\#}$ the fiber set $\text{Fib}(v)$ does not depend on the choice of the edge $e \in E_{\#}$ containing v . Furthermore, $\chi|_{\Sigma_{v,e}}$ is a homeomorphism onto $\text{Fib}(v)$.*

Proof. Let $e, f \in E_{\#}$ be two edges containing v . By the definition of the projections, we have $\pi_{n,i}(e) \cap \pi_{n,i}(f) \neq \emptyset$ for all $0 \leq i \leq n$. For $(a_i)_{i=1}^{\infty} \in I^{\mathbb{N}}$, let $v_{n+i} = v \cdot (a_1 \dots a_i)$ for $i > 0$. Then

$$v_{n+i} \in \mathbf{e}(v \cdot a_1 \dots a_m, e) \cap \mathbf{e}(v \cdot a_1 \dots a_m, f).$$

Thus, by the identifications in (3.34), we have $\chi(\Sigma_{v,e}) = \chi(\Sigma_{v,f})$, and we conclude that $\text{Fib}(v)$ does not depend on the choice of the edge containing v .

We next move on to proving that $\chi|_{\Sigma_{v,e}}$ is a homeomorphism onto $\text{Fib}(v)$. Since $\Sigma_{v,e}$ can be regarded as a continuous image of the compact metric space $I^{\mathbb{N}}$ with the word metric, it is clear that $\Sigma_{v,e} \subseteq \Sigma$ is a compact subset. Thus, it is sufficient to verify that $\chi|_{\Sigma_{v,e}}$ is injective. Suppose $(a_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}, (b_i)_{i=1}^{\infty} \in I^{\mathbb{N}}$ are distinct, and let $j \geq 1$ be the smallest integer for which $a_j \neq b_j$. Since the mapping $I^n \ni a \mapsto v \cdot a = \Phi_{v,m}(a) \in \pi_{n+m,n}^{-1}(v)$ is bijective, we have that $v \cdot (a_1 \dots a_j) \neq v \cdot (b_1 \dots b_j)$. It now follows from Lemma 3.17 that

$$d_{G_{n+j+2}}(v \cdot (a_1 \dots a_{j+2}), v \cdot (b_1 \dots b_{j+2})) \geq L_*^2 \geq 4.$$

In particular, the edges $\mathbf{e}(v \cdot (a_1 \dots a_{j+2}), e)$ and $\mathbf{e}(v \cdot (b_1 \dots b_{j+2}), e)$ do not share a vertex. \square

Lemma 3.46. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $e, f \in E_n$ be distinct edges. Then the sets X_e and X_f intersect if and only if e and f have a common vertex. Moreover, their intersection is*

$$(3.47) \quad X_e \cap X_f = \bigcup_{v \in e \cap f} \text{Fib}(v).$$

Proof. The first part of the claim, regarding when the sets X_e and X_f intersect, follows directly from the definition of the identification (3.34).

We will now prove (3.47). Since $\Sigma_{v,e} \subseteq \Sigma_e$, we obviously have $\text{Fib}(v) \subseteq X_e$ for all $v \in e \in E_{\#}$. Then assume that $x \in X_e \cap X_f$ for distinct edges $e, f \in E_n$, and write $x = \chi((e_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}) = \chi((f_i)_{i=1}^{\infty})$ for $e_n = e$ and $f_n = f$. Note that $e_i \cap f_i$ contains

exactly one vertex for all $i > n$. To see this, suppose $v_i \in e_i \cap f_i$. By (SM2), v_i is an ancestor of $v \in e \cap f$. Then we necessarily have

$$e_i = \mathbf{e}(v_i, e) = \{v_i, \mathbf{n}(v_i, e)\} \text{ and } f_i = \mathbf{e}(v_i, f) = \{v_i, \mathbf{n}(v_i, f)\}.$$

By the last part of Corollary 3.22 the vertices $\mathbf{n}(v_i, e)$ and $\mathbf{n}(v_i, f)$ are not ancestors of any vertices in V_n . Since e and f are distinct vertices, it now follows from (SM2) that $\mathbf{n}(v_i, e) \neq \mathbf{n}(v_i, f)$.

Thus, we know that there are vertices $v_i \in V_i$ for all $i \geq n$ so that each v_i is an ancestor of a vertex $v \in e \cap f$. By using the uniqueness part in Corollary 3.22, we have that each v_j is an ancestor of v_i for all $j \geq i$, and thus, we can construct a sequence $(a_i)_{i=1}^\infty$ inductively so that each e_i can be expressed as in (3.44). \square

An immediate corollary of the previous lemma is that $\text{Fib}(X) \subseteq X$ is dense.

Corollary 3.48. *$\text{Fib}(X) \subseteq X$ is a dense subset.*

Proof. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $x = \chi((e_i)_{i=1}^\infty)$. Choose $n \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough so that $L_*^{-n} < \varepsilon$, and an edge $f_n \in E_n$ so that $v_n \in e_n \cap f_n$. Then $X_{e_n} \subseteq B(x, \varepsilon)$ by Proposition 3.42-(1), so it follows from Lemma 3.46 that $\text{Fib}(v_n) \cap B(x, \varepsilon) \neq \emptyset$. \square

The following lemma will be useful for introducing measures on the fiber sets.

Lemma 3.49. *The fiber sets satisfy the following properties.*

(1) *For all $v \in V_\#$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have*

$$\text{Fib}(v) = \bigsqcup_{a \in I^n} \text{Fib}(v \cdot a).$$

(2) *For all $e \in E_\#$ we have $F_e(\text{Fib}(v)) = \text{Fib}(e \cdot v)$.*

(3) *If $w \in V_\#$ is another vertex so that neither v nor w is an ancestor of the other, then*

$$\text{Fib}(v) \cap \text{Fib}(w) = \emptyset.$$

Proof. (1): Let $f \in E_\#$ be an edge containing v . The coding map χ restricted to $\Sigma_{v,f}$ is injective by Proposition 3.45. Thus, the claim follows by noting that

$$\Sigma_{v,f} = \bigsqcup_{a \in I^n} \Sigma_{v \cdot a, \mathbf{e}(v \cdot a, f)}.$$

(2): If $f \in E_\#$ is any edge containing v , we compute

$$\text{Fib}(e \cdot v) = \chi(\Sigma_{e \cdot v, e \cdot f}) = \chi(\sigma_e(\Sigma_{v,f})) = F_e(\chi(\Sigma_{v,f})) = F_e(\text{Fib}(v)).$$

(3): According to (1) of the current lemma, it is sufficient to prove the case where $v, w \in V_{n+2}$ and $\pi_{n+2,n}(v), \pi_{n+2,n}(w) \in V_n$ are distinct vertices for some $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. If $e, f \in E_n$ are edges containing $\pi_{n+2,n}(v)$ and $\pi_{n+2,n}(w)$ respectively, then it follows from the non-degeneracy of the IGS and Lemma 3.17 that $d_{G_{n+2}}(v, w) \geq 4$. In particular, the edges $\mathbf{e}(v, e)$ and $\mathbf{e}(w, f)$ do not share a vertex, and it now follows from Lemma 3.46 that

$$\text{Fib}(v) \cap \text{Fib}(w) \subseteq X_{\mathbf{e}(v,e)} \cap X_{\mathbf{e}(w,f)} = \emptyset.$$

\square

Definition 3.50. Let ν be a probability density on the gluing set I . For any vertex $v \in V_{\#}$ the *fiber measure* ν_v on $\text{Fib}(v)$ is defined as the Radon probability measure satisfying

$$(3.51) \quad \nu_v(\text{Fib}(v \cdot a)) = \prod_{i=1}^n \nu(a_i) \text{ for all } a = a_1 \dots a_n \in I^n \text{ and } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

To see that such fiber measure exist for any given ν , fix $e \in E_{\#}$ with $v \in e$ and recall that $\text{Fib}(v)$ is obtained as a homeomorphic image of $\chi \circ T_{v,e} : I^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \text{Fib}(v)$. Now, if ν_{∞} is the Bernoulli measure on $I^{\mathbb{N}}$ given by,

$$\nu_{\infty}(\{(b_i)_{i=1}^{\infty} : a_i = b_i \text{ for all } i = 1, \dots, n\}) := \prod_{i=1}^n \nu(a_i) \text{ for any } n \in \mathbb{N}, (a_i)_{i=1}^n \in I^n,$$

then the push-forward measure $\nu_v := (\chi \circ T_{v,e})_*(\nu_{\infty})$ is a Radon probability measure on $\text{Fib}(v)$ satisfying (3.51). It is furthermore clear that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a \in I^n$ it holds that

$$(3.52) \quad \nu_v \upharpoonright_{\text{Fib}(a \cdot v)} = \left(\prod_{i=1}^n \nu(a_i) \right) \nu_{a \cdot v}.$$

Let us conclude this subsection by proving Proposition 3.42.

Proof of Proposition 3.42. (1): Let $e \in E_n$. It is clear from the definition of the metric that by choosing $\Omega := \{e\}$, we have $\text{diam}(X_e) \leq L_*^{-n}$. The reverse inequality follows by noting that $\text{dist}(\text{Fib}(e^+), \text{Fib}(e^-), d) = L_*^{-n}$, which follows from Lemma 3.17. Observe that $\text{diam}(X_v) \leq 2L_*^{-n}$ is now immediate.

Next, we compute the values of the measure μ . Notice that we only need to verify (3.43). Indeed, we would then have $\mu(X_e) = \mathbf{m}_{\text{unif}}(\Sigma_e) = |E_1|^{-n}$. According to Lemma 3.46 we only need to show that $\mu(\text{Fib}(v)) = 0$ for all $v \in V_n$. The same lemma also implies that

$$\chi^{-1}(\text{Fib}(v)) \subseteq \bigcup_{\substack{e \in E_n \\ v \in e}} \Sigma_e,$$

so we have $\mu(\text{Fib}(v)) \leq \text{deg}(v)|E_1|^{-n}$. Using Lemma 3.49-(1) and the fact that the degrees are uniformly bounded (Lemma 3.15) by some number C_{deg} , we get

$$\mu(\text{Fib}(v)) = \sum_{a \in I^k} \mu(\text{Fib}(v \cdot a)) \leq C_{\text{deg}} |I|^k |E_1|^{-k} |E_1|^{-n}.$$

Since the IGS is doubling and non-degenerate it holds that $|I| < |E_1|$. Therefore $\mu(\text{Fib}(v)) = 0$ follows by letting $k \rightarrow \infty$.

(2): Fix any $e \in E_n$ so that $x \in X_e$. In the proof of (1) of the current proposition, we noted that $\text{dist}(\text{Fib}(e^-), \text{Fib}(e^+)) = L_*^{-n}$. Thus, we must have $\text{dist}(x, \text{Fib}(w)) \geq L_*^{-n}/2$ for some $w \in e$. If $v \in e$ is the other vertex, then it follows from the definition of the metric d that

$$\text{dist}(x, X \setminus X_v) \geq \text{dist}(x, \text{Fib}(w)) \geq L_*^{-n}/2.$$

Therefore $B(x, r) \subseteq B(x, 3/4 \cdot L_*^{-n}) \subseteq X_v$. The latter inclusion $X_v \subseteq B(x, 8L_* r)$ is a direct corollary of $\text{diam}(X_v) \leq 2L_*^{-n}$.

(3): X is a continuous image of χ and Σ is compact. Thus, X is compact as well. Path connectedness follows from the Arzela-Ascoli theorem using the visual metric property and fact that the graphs G_n are connected. The Q -Ahlfors regularity

of (X, d, μ) follows from an identical argument as in [2, Lemma 3.31] using the previous results of the current proposition. The basic idea is to approximate a ball $B(x, r)$ with appropriately chosen set X_v using (2) and estimate the measure by using (1). \square

3.8. Self-similar structure. For future reference, we have included a discussion on the self-similarity of our construction. Specifically, we clarify that IGS-fractals admit a natural self-similar structure in the sense of [29]. Another motivation for this discussion is that many works with similar goals use this notion, making it potentially helpful for some readers.

Let K be any compact metrizable topological space, S be any non-empty finite set and $\{F_i : X \rightarrow X\}_{i \in S}$ be a collection of injective continuous maps. Denote

$$S^{\mathbb{N}} := \{\omega_1 \omega_2 \omega_3 \dots : \omega_i \in S \text{ for all } i \in \mathbb{N}\}$$

and equip with the natural word metric. The triplet $(K, S, \{F_i\}_{i \in S})$ is a *self-similar structure* if there is a surjective continuous map $\xi : S^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow K$ so that

$$\xi(\omega_1 \omega_2 \omega_3 \dots) = F_{\omega_1}(\xi(\omega_2 \omega_3 \dots)) \text{ for all } \omega_1 \omega_2 \omega_3 \dots \in S^{\mathbb{N}}.$$

Proposition 3.53. *Let (X, d) be a limit space of a simple and non-degenerate IGS satisfying the doubling property, $G_1 := (V_1, E_1)$ be the associated generator and $\{F_e\}_{e \in E_1}$ be the similarity maps. Then $(X, E_1, \{F_e\}_{e \in E_1})$ is a self-similar structure.*

Proof. Recall from the discussion in Definition 3.30 that we have a natural identification $T : E_1^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \Sigma$. By setting $\xi := \chi \circ T : E_1^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow X$ where $\chi : \Sigma \rightarrow X$ is the coding map in Definition 3.33, it follows from Proposition 3.39-(2) and (3.35) that $(X, E_1, \{F_e\}_{e \in E_1})$ is a self-similar structure. \square

We also clarify the two properties of the self-similar structure of IGS-fractals. These easily follow from the definitions (see e.g. [29, Proposition 1.3.5 and Definition 1.3.13]), so we omit the details.

Corollary 3.54. *Let $(X, d), G_1, \{F_e\}_{e \in E_1}$ be as in Proposition 3.53. The boundary $V_0(\mathcal{L})$ (see [29, Definition 1.3.4]) of the self-similar structure $\mathcal{L} := (X, E_1, \{F_e\}_{e \in E_1})$ is $\text{Fib}(v_+) \sqcup \text{Fib}(v_-)$.*

Corollary 3.55. *Let $(X, d), G_1, \{F_e\}_{e \in E_1}$ be as in Proposition 3.53. The self-similar structure $(X, E_1, \{F_e\}_{e \in E_1})$ is post-critically finite (see [29, Definition 1.3.13]) if and only if $|I| = 1$.*

4. DISCRETE POTENTIAL THEORY

Our approach for constructing the p -energy forms involves taking an appropriate limit of discrete graph energies on the replacement graphs. This section is devoted to developing tools of discrete potential theory of IGSs. The reader may recall the terminology and basic results of discrete potential theory from Subsection 2.3.

During the computations, we will frequently use the notation $A \lesssim B$ to indicate the existence of a constant $C \geq 1$ so that $A \leq C \cdot B$, where C depends on some inessential parameters. For the most part, these parameters are the constants mentioned in Assumption 3.3 and the exponent p .

4.1. Conductive uniform property. We begin by introducing the final general assumption of our framework, the *conductively uniform property*. This was a key ingredient for establishing the combinatorial Loewner property in [2].

We first introduce some notation. Suppose we are given a simple IGS and let $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and $p \in (1, \infty)$. We denote $U_{p,+n}$ as the solution to the p -capacity problem

$$(4.1) \quad \text{Cap}_p \left(I_+^{(n)}, I_-^{(n)}, G_n \right).$$

The p -capacity constant \mathcal{M}_p is the value of the p -capacity problem (4.1) for $n = 1$, i.e., $\mathcal{M}_p := \mathcal{E}_p(U_{p,+1})$. Recall from Lemma 2.6 that $U_{p,+n}$ exists and is unique. The solution to the p -capacity problem (4.1) where roles of the signs $+$ and $-$ are interchanged is denoted $U_{p,-n}$. These functions are collectively referred as the *optimal potential functions*.

We denote $\mathcal{J}_{p,+n}$ the solution to the p -resistance problem

$$(4.2) \quad \text{Res}_p \left(I_+^{(n)}, I_-^{(n)}, G_n \right).$$

Similarly, we denote $\mathcal{J}_{p,-n}$ the solution to (4.2) where the signs are interchanged. According to Lemma 2.10, the flow $\mathcal{J}_{p,\pm n}$ exists and is unique.

By the uniqueness of the optimal potential function, we have $U_{p,\pm n} = 1 - U_{p,\mp n}$. In particular, the gradient $|\nabla U_{p,\pm n}|$ does not depend on the choice of the sign. We thus denote $|\nabla U_{p,n}| := |\nabla U_{p,\pm n}|$ and $|\nabla U_p| := |\nabla U_{p,1}|$. Similarly, the energies of the optimal potentials are denoted as $\mathcal{E}_p(U_{p,n})$ and $\mathcal{E}_p(U_p)$. In the case of the flows, since $\mathcal{J}_{p,\pm n} = -\mathcal{J}_{p,\mp n}$, we slightly abuse the notation by writing $\mathcal{J}_{p,n} := \mathcal{J}_{p,\pm n}$ and $\mathcal{J}_p := \mathcal{J}_{p,\pm} := \mathcal{J}_{p,\pm 1}$ whenever the sign has no role during the computations or is understood from the context.

Example 4.3. Consider the IGSs in Examples 3.4 and 3.6, and let $U : V_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the function in Figure 4.4 (note that the function is the same in both graphs). To see that U is the energy minimizer to the p -capacity problem $\text{Cap}_p(I_+, I_-, G_1)$ for both IGSs, it is direct to verify that U is p -harmonic in $V_1 \setminus (I_+ \cup I_-)$ for all $p \in (1, \infty)$. According to Lemma 2.6, U is the p -energy minimizer. The optimal flow is then easily computed through the duality (2.11). For computations of optimal potentials and flows on some other IGSs, see e.g. Figures 1.23 and 8.35.




FIGURE 4.4. Figure of the optimal potentials/flows on G_1 associated to IGSs in Examples 3.4 and 3.6. The values next to vertices indicate the value of the optimal potential $U_{p,+}$, and the values next to the edges indicate the values of the optimal flow $\mathcal{J}_{p,+}$.

Definition 4.5. We say that a simple and non-degenerate IGS satisfying the doubling property is *conductively uniform* if for all $a \in I$ and $p \in (1, \infty)$

$$(4.6) \quad \mathcal{J}_{p,+}(\phi_+(a), \mathbf{n}(\phi_+(a))) = -\mathcal{J}_{p,+}(\phi_-(a), \mathbf{n}(\phi_-(a))).$$

Here $\mathbf{n}(z)$ denotes the unique neighbor of $z \in I_+ \cup I_-$ as defined in Definition 3.14. Whenever this condition is satisfied, the value in (4.6) is denoted as $\mathcal{J}_p(a)$.

Remark 4.7. $\mathcal{J}_p(\cdot)$ is a probability density on I . Indeed, by the doubling property, every vertex in I_+ has degree 1, so we have

$$1 = \sum_{a \in I} \operatorname{div}(\mathcal{J}_{p,+})(\phi_+(a)) = \sum_{a \in I} \mathcal{J}_{p,+}(\phi_+(a), \mathbf{n}(\phi_+(a))) = \sum_{a \in I} \mathcal{J}_p(a).$$

The strong maximum principle of p -harmonic functions (Lemma 2.7) and the duality (2.11) (note that here we need the version that does not involve absolute values) implies that $\mathcal{J}_p(a) > 0$. Consequently, $\mathcal{J}_p(\cdot)$ produces a probability density on I^n , denoted as $\mathcal{J}_{p,n}(\cdot)$, which is given by

$$(4.8) \quad \mathcal{J}_{p,n}(a_1 \dots a_n) := \prod_{i=1}^n \mathcal{J}_p(a_i).$$

For $n = 0$, we interpret I^0 to consist of a single (empty) element, and simply set $\mathcal{J}_{p,0}(\cdot) := 1$.

If we view the p -capacity problem (4.1) as a discrete optimization problem, the number of variables grow exponentially with respect to n . The main motivation of conductively uniform property is to reduce this problem to the case $n = 1$. This is stated formally in Theorem 4.13. Nevertheless, this condition is by far the most restrictive one in our framework. In the following theorem, we review a few sufficient conditions for the conductive uniform property.

Theorem 4.9. *Suppose that the IGS is simple, non-degenerate and satisfies the doubling property. Then any one of the following conditions are sufficient for the IGS to satisfy the conductive uniform property.*

(CUP-1) *The gluing set I only contains one element.*

(CUP-2) *There is a graph isomorphism $\eta : V_1 \rightarrow V_1$ of G_1 satisfying*

$$\eta(\phi_{\pm}(a)) = \phi_{\mp}(a) \text{ for all } a \in I.$$

(CUP-3) *There exists a family of paths Θ in G_1 so that each $\theta \in \Theta$ connects I_+ to I_- and is of length $L_* = \operatorname{dist}(I_+, I_-, d_{G_1})$, and each edge in $e \in E_1$ is contained in exactly one of the paths $\theta \in \Theta$.*

Proof. Suppose first that (CUP-1) holds and $I = \{a\}$. Since $\mathcal{J}_{p,+}$ is a unit flow from $I_+ = \{\phi_+(a)\}$ to $I_- = \{\phi_-(a)\}$, we have

$$\mathcal{J}_{p,+}(\phi_+(a), \mathbf{n}(\phi_+(a))) = 1 = \mathcal{J}_{p,+}(\phi_-(a), \mathbf{n}(\phi_-(a))).$$

Next assume (CUP-2), and let η be a graph isomorphism as in the claim. Since η satisfies $\eta(I_{\pm}) = I_{\mp}$, it holds that

$$\eta(\mathcal{J}_{p,+})(v, w) := \mathcal{J}_{p,+}(\eta(v), \eta(w))$$

is a unit flow from I_- to I_+ satisfying $\mathcal{E}_q(\eta(\mathcal{J}_{p,\pm})) = \mathcal{E}_q(\mathcal{J}_{p,\mp})$. It follows from the uniqueness of the energy minimizing flow that $\eta(\mathcal{J}_{p,+}) = \mathcal{J}_{p,-}$. By the doubling property, we necessarily have $\eta(\mathbf{n}(\phi_-(a))) = \mathbf{n}(\phi_+(a))$. Thus, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_{p,+}(\phi_-(a), \mathbf{n}(\phi_-(a))) &= \eta(\mathcal{J}_{p,+})(\phi_+(a), \mathbf{n}(\phi_+(a))) \\ &= \mathcal{J}_{p,-}(\phi_+(a), \mathbf{n}(\phi_+(a))) \\ &= -\mathcal{J}_{p,+}(\phi_+(a), \mathbf{n}(\phi_+(a))). \end{aligned}$$

Lastly, we assume (CUP-3), and let Θ be a family of paths satisfying the therein conditions. For $a \in I$ let $\theta_a \in \Theta$ be the path containing the edge $\epsilon(\phi_+(a))$. Note that $a \mapsto \theta_a, I \rightarrow \Theta$ is a bijection by the properties of Θ . Thus, it holds that

$$(4.10) \quad |E_1| = |I| \cdot L_*.$$

Now, for every $a \in I$, consider the unit flow \mathcal{J}_a from I_+ to I_- along the path θ_a . Then we define the unit flow from I_+ to I_- ,

$$\mathcal{J} := |I|^{-1} \sum_{a \in I} \mathcal{J}_a.$$

Using the fact that the paths in Θ are edge-wise disjoint, we get

$$\mathcal{J}(\phi_+(a), \mathbf{n}(\phi_+(a))) = |I|^{-1} = \mathcal{J}(\mathbf{n}(\phi_-(a)), \phi_-(a)).$$

Therefore, the conductively uniform property follows after we show that \mathcal{J} is the p -energy minimizing unit flow. To see this, it follows from the properties of Θ that $|\mathcal{J}| \equiv |I|^{-1}$. By the duality (2.11) and (4.10), it follows that

$$\mathcal{M}_p \geq \mathcal{E}_q(\mathcal{J})^{\frac{-p}{q}} = (|E_1||I|^{-q})^{\frac{-p}{q}} = \frac{|E_1|}{L_*^p}.$$

In Lemma 4.12-(3) below we show that the reverse inequality $\mathcal{M}_p \leq |E_1|/L_*^p$ always holds (even without the conductively uniform property). Hence, by using the duality one more time, we see that \mathcal{J} is the p -energy minimizing unit flow. \square

Remark 4.11. At this stage, we have introduced all the assumptions of our framework. Hereafter, throughout the paper, the IGSs are always assumed to satisfy the conditions in Assumption 3.3.

For the rest of this subsection, we review important consequences of the conductively uniform property.

Lemma 4.12. *Let $p \in (1, \infty)$. Then the following hold.*

(1) *For all $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ we have*

$$\text{Cap}_p \left(I_+^{(n)}, I_-^{(n)}, G_n \right) = \mathcal{M}_p^n.$$

(2) *For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a \in I^n$ we have*

$$\text{div}(\mathcal{J}_{p,\pm,n})(\phi_{\pm,n}(a)) = \mathcal{J}_{p,n}(a) = -\text{div}(\mathcal{J}_{p,\pm,n})(\phi_{\mp,n}(a)).$$

Here $\phi_{\pm,n}$ are the higher order gluing maps in Definition 3.24 and $\mathcal{J}_{p,n}(\cdot)$ is the probability density given in Remark 4.7.

(3) *The p -capacity constant has the upper bound $\mathcal{M}_p \leq |E_1|/L_*^p$, or equivalently, $d_{w,p} \geq p$. These inequalities are equalities if and only if $|\nabla U_p| \equiv L_*^{-1}$. Here, $d_{w,p}$ is the p -walk dimension in Assumption 3.3.*

(4) The optimal potential functions $U_{p,\pm,n}$ satisfy the following strong maximum principle: If $z \in V_n \setminus (I_+^{(n)} \cup I_-^{(n)})$ then $0 < U_{p,\pm,n}(z) < 1$.

Proof. (1): This was proven in [2, Corollary 4.32] for discrete (edge) p -modulus, which is always equal to discrete p -capacity (see e.g. [2, Lemma 4.13]).

(2): This was essentially verified in the proof of [2, Proposition 4.30].

(3): A variant of this claim was proven in [2, Proposition 6.11]. Nevertheless, we present the details. Consider the potential function $U : V_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$U(v) := \frac{\text{dist}(v, I_-, d_{G_1})}{L_*} \wedge 1.$$

Since $L_* = \text{dist}(I_+, I_-, d_{G_1})$, we clearly have $U|_{I_+} \equiv 1$ and $U|_{I_-} \equiv 0$. Moreover, for any edge $\{v, w\} \in E_1$ we have

$$|U(v) - U(w)| \leq \frac{1}{L_*} |\text{dist}(v, I_-) - \text{dist}(w, I_-)| \leq \frac{1}{L_*}.$$

Thus, we obtain the inequality

$$\mathcal{M}_p \leq \mathcal{E}_p(U) \leq \frac{|E_1|}{L_*^p}.$$

The latter part of the claim now follows from the uniqueness of the optimal potential function.

(4): Since the replacement graphs are connected and the IGS is doubling, it follows from Lemma 3.15 that $V_n \setminus (I_+^{(n)} \cup I_-^{(n)})$ is a connected subset. Thus, the claim follows from the strong maximum principle of p -harmonic functions (Lemma 2.7). \square

Theorem 4.13. For all $n, m \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ the optimal potential function $U_{p,\pm,n+m}$ can be expressed as

$$(4.14) \quad U_{p,\pm,n+m}(e \cdot v) = U_{p,\pm,n}(e^-) + (U_{p,\pm,n}(e^+) - U_{p,\pm,n}(e^-)) \cdot U_{p,\pm,m}(v)$$

for all $e \in E_n$ and $v \in V_m$. In particular, for all $v \in V_n$ it holds that

$$(4.15) \quad U_{p,\pm,n+m}(w) = U_{p,\pm,n}(v) \text{ for all } w \in \pi_{n+m,n}^{-1}(v).$$

Proof. Let $\widehat{U}_{p,\pm,n+m}$ be the function given by the right-hand side of (4.14). First, we verify that it is well-defined. Assume that $e \cdot v = e' \cdot v'$ for $e, e' \in E_n$ and $v, v' \in V_m$. By (SM2) the edges e, e' have a common vertex $w \in e \cap e'$ so that $v \in I_{w,e}^{(n)}$ and $v' \in I_{w,e'}^{(n)}$. It then follows by the definition of $\widehat{U}_{p,\pm,n+m}$

$$(4.16) \quad \widehat{U}_{p,\pm,n+m}(e \cdot v) = U_{p,\pm,n}(w) = \widehat{U}_{p,\pm,n+m}(e' \cdot v'),$$

and $\widehat{U}_{p,\pm,n+m}$ is thus well-defined. It is also clear from (4.16) that $\widehat{U}_{p,\pm,n+m}$ is potential function to the p -capacity problem. To conclude that $\widehat{U}_{p,\pm,n+m} = U_{p,\pm,n+m}$, we thus only need to show that $\mathcal{E}_p(\widehat{U}_{p,\pm,n+m}) = \mathcal{E}_p(U_{p,\pm,n+m})$. The desired equality then follows from the uniqueness of the optimal potential function (Lemma 2.6). Consequently, (4.15) would follow from (4.16).

Using (SM3) (or Lemma 4.28) and Lemma 4.12-(1), we compute

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}_p(\widehat{U}_{p,\pm,n+m}) &= \sum_{e_n \in E_n} \sum_{e_m \in E_m} |\nabla \widehat{U}_{p,\pm,n+m}(e_n \cdot e_m)|^p \\
&= \sum_{e_n \in E_n} |\nabla U_{p,n}(e_n)|^p \sum_{e_m \in E_m} |\nabla U_{p,m}(e_m)|^p \\
&= \mathcal{M}_p^{n+m} \\
&= \mathcal{E}_p(U_{p,n+m}).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 4.17. *Let $e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n \in E_1$ and $e := e_1 e_2 \dots e_n \in E_n$. Then*

$$(4.18) \quad |\nabla U_{p,n}(e)| = \prod_{i=1}^n |\nabla U_p(e_i)| \quad \text{and} \quad |\mathcal{J}_{p,n}(e)| = \prod_{i=1}^n |\mathcal{J}_p(e_i)|.$$

Here the sequence $e_1 e_2 \dots e_n$ is understood as in Remark 3.28.

Proof. The first equality in (4.18) follows from a direct iteration of (4.14), and the second now follows from the duality (2.11) and Lemma 4.12-(1). □

Corollary 4.19. *Let $p \in (1, \infty)$ and set*

$$c_p := \max_{e \in E_1} |\nabla U_p(e)|.$$

For all $n, m \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ we have

$$(4.20) \quad |U_{p,\pm,n+m}(e \cdot v_1) - U_{p,\pm,n+m}(e \cdot v_2)| \leq c_p^n$$

for all $e \in E_n$ and $v_1, v_2 \in V_m$.

Proof. It follows from Corollary 4.17 that

$$|\nabla U_{p,n}(e)| \leq c_p^n \quad \text{for all } e \in E_n.$$

By using the strong maximum principle (Lemma 4.12-(4)), we see that

$$|U_{p,\pm,m}(v_1) - U_{p,\pm,m}(v_2)| \leq 1 \quad \text{for all } v_1, v_2 \in V_m.$$

By combining the previous estimates and using (4.14), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&|U_{p,\pm,n+m}(e \cdot v_1) - U_{p,\pm,n+m}(e \cdot v_2)| \\
&= |\nabla U_{p,n}(e)| \cdot |U_{p,\pm,m}(v_1) - U_{p,\pm,m}(v_2)| \\
&\leq |\nabla U_{p,n}(e)| \leq c_p^n.
\end{aligned}$$

□

We finish the subsection by discussing the equality $d_{w,p} = p$ from Lemma 4.12-(3). Specifically, we show that it has a geometric characterization that is *independent* of the exponent $p \in (1, \infty)$.

Proposition 4.21. *The equality $d_{w,p} = p$ is equivalent to the existence of a family of paths Θ as in (CUP-3). In particular, whether $d_{w,p} = p$ holds is independent of the exponent p .*

Proof. In the proof of Theorem 4.9 we showed that (CUP-3) implies $\mathcal{M}_p = |E_1|/L_*^p$. Thus, $d_{w,p} = p$.

Next assume that $d_{w,p} = p$ holds. For any vertex $v \in V_1$ we divide the edges containing v by

$$E_+(v) := \{\{v, w\} \in E_1 : U_{p,+}(v) > U_{p,+}(w)\},$$

and the others are denoted $E_-(v)$. Since $|\nabla U_p| \equiv L_*^{-1}$ holds by Lemma 4.12-(3), it follows from the p -harmonicity of $U_{p,+}$ that

$$(4.22) \quad |E_+(v)| = |E_-(v)| \text{ for any } v \in V_1 \setminus (I_+ \cup I_-)$$

We now have enough ingredient to describe an algorithm that constructs the family of paths $\Theta := \{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{|I|}\}$. First, fix $v_0 \in I_+$ and choose any path $\theta_1 = [v_0, v_1 \dots, v_k]$ so that $U_{p,+}(v_i)$ is strictly increasing in i and $v_k \in I_-$. Such choice is possible due to the strong maximum principle (Lemma 4.12-(4)) and p -harmonicity of $U_{p,+}$. Further, since $|\nabla U_p| \equiv L_*^{-1}$, we have $k = L_*$.

Second, to construct θ_2 , we choose any vertex $v'_0 \in I_+ \setminus \{v_0\}$ and a path $\theta_2 = [v'_0, v'_1 \dots, v'_k]$ satisfying the same conditions as θ_1 . Additionally, we require that θ_1 and θ_2 are edge-wise disjoint. Such choice is possible thanks to (4.22). By repeating, we obtain the paths $\Theta := \{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{|I|}\}$. It follows from (4.22) and the doubling property that the paths in Θ contain all edges. \square




FIGURE 4.23. Suppose that there is a family of paths Θ satisfying the conditions in Theorem (CUP-3). As we showed in Proposition 4.21, this is equivalent to $d_{w,p} = p$ for all p . The generator of such IGS can be constructed by taking k disjoint discrete intervals, where $k = |I|$, of length L_* , and by applying some “vertical identification” as in the figure. This procedure closely resembles Laakso’s construction in [37]. These vertical identifications correspond to the “wormholes” in Laakso’s work.

4.2. Strong monotonicity. For our goals, it is crucial to understand the interrelation between the discrete energies at different levels. In other words, we need a convenient way to translate functions between replacement graphs of different levels, and effectively compare their energies. To this end, we introduce the *averaging operators* $V_{p,n,m}[\cdot] : \mathbb{R}^{V_n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{V_m}$ for $n \geq m$ defined as

$$(4.24) \quad V_{p,n,m}[f](v) := \sum_{a \in I^{n-m}} \mathcal{J}_{p,n-m}(a) \cdot f(v \cdot a),$$

where $\mathcal{J}_{p,k}(\cdot)$ is the probability density on I^k defined in Remark 4.7. Note that these operators in general depend on p . However, we omit the exponent from the notation for the most part, and instead write $V_{n,m}[\cdot]$.

While the expression (4.24) is clearly valid for any probability density on the gluing set I , our specific choice is one of the most fundamental pieces of our framework. We will prove in Theorem 4.30 that these operators satisfy a highly useful analytic condition we call *strong monotonicity*. First, we review a few lemmas.

Lemma 4.25. *Let $n, m, l \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ so that $m \leq l \leq n$. Then $V_{n,m}[\cdot] = V_{l,m}[\cdot] \circ V_{n,l}[\cdot]$.*

Proof. This is immediate from (4.8). Indeed, for any $f \in \mathbb{R}^{V_n}$ and $v \in V_n$, by using the associativity property, Lemma 3.27-(4),

$$\begin{aligned} V_{n,m}[f](v) &= \sum_{a \in I^{n-l}} \sum_{b \in I^{l-m}} \mathcal{J}_{p,n-l}(a) \mathcal{J}_{p,l-m}(b) f(v \cdot (a \cdot b)) \\ &= \sum_{a \in I^{n-l}} \sum_{b \in I^{l-m}} \mathcal{J}_{p,n-l}(a) \mathcal{J}_{p,l-m}(b) f((v \cdot a) \cdot b) \\ &= \sum_{a \in I^{n-l}} \mathcal{J}_{p,n-l}(a) V_{n,l}[f](v \cdot a) = V_{l,m}[V_{n,l}[f]](v), \end{aligned}$$

proving $V_{n,m} = V_{l,m} \circ V_{n,l}$. \square

Lemma 4.26. *Let $n, m, k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ so that $n \geq m$. Then for all $f : V_{n+k} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $e \in E_k$ we have*

$$(4.27) \quad V_{n,m}[f \circ \sigma_{e,n}] = V_{n+k,m+k}[f] \circ \sigma_{e,m}$$

Proof. By Lemma 3.27-(3) we have $\sigma_{e,n}(v \cdot a) = \sigma_{e,m}(v) \cdot a$ for all $v \in V_m$ and $a \in I^{n-m}$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} V_{n,m}[f \circ \sigma_{e,n}](v) &= \sum_{a \in I^{n-m}} \mathcal{J}_{p,n-m}(a) f(\sigma_{e,n}(v \cdot a)) \\ &= \sum_{a \in I^{n-m}} \mathcal{J}_{p,n-m}(a) f(\sigma_{e,m}(v) \cdot a) \\ &= (V_{n+k,m+k}[f] \circ \sigma_{e,m})(v). \end{aligned}$$

\square

Lemma 4.28. *Let $n, m \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ so that $n \geq m$. Then for all $f : V_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$*

$$(4.29) \quad \mathcal{E}_p(f) = \sum_{e \in E_m} \mathcal{E}_p(f \circ \sigma_{e,n-m}).$$

Proof. Directly follows from (SM3). \square

Theorem 4.30 (Strong monotonicity). *Let $n, m \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ so that $n \geq m$ and $f : V_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Then*

$$(4.31) \quad \mathcal{E}_p(V_{n,m}[f]) \leq \mathcal{M}_p^{-(n-m)} \mathcal{E}_p(f),$$

where \mathcal{M}_p is the p -capacity constant in Assumption 3.3.

Proof. There is nothing to prove if $n = m$, so we assume $n > m$. First, choose any edge $e \in E_m$. Using Lemma 4.12-(2) and the fact that $\mathcal{J}_{p,n-m} := \mathcal{J}_{p,+,n-m}$ is a unit flow from $I_+^{(n-m)}$ to $I_-^{(n-m)}$, we have for all $v \in V_{n-m}$ that

$$(4.32) \quad \operatorname{div}(\mathcal{J}_{p,n-m})(v) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{J}_{p,n-m}(a) & \text{if } v = \phi_{+,n-m}(a) \text{ for } a \in I^{n-m} \\ -\mathcal{J}_{p,n-m}(a) & \text{if } v = \phi_{-,n-m}(a) \text{ for } a \in I^{n-m} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

By applying this, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& |V_{n,m}[f](e^+) - V_{n,m}[f](e^-)| \\
= & \left| \sum_{a \in I^{n-m}} \mathcal{J}_{p,n-m}(a) f(e^+ \cdot a) - \sum_{a \in I^{n-m}} \mathcal{J}_{p,n-m}(a) f(e^- \cdot a) \right| \\
= & \left| \sum_{v \in V_{n-m}} \operatorname{div}(\mathcal{J}_{p,n-m})(v) (f \circ \sigma_{e,n-m})(v) \right| && \text{(Equation (4.32))} \\
= & \left| \sum_{\{v,w\} \in E_{n-m}} \mathcal{J}_{p,n-m}(v,w) \nabla(f \circ \sigma_{e,n-m})(v,w) \right| && \text{(Divergence theorem (2.9))} \\
\leq & \mathcal{E}_q(\mathcal{J}_{p,n-m})^{\frac{1}{q}} \mathcal{E}_p(f \circ \sigma_{e,n-m})^{\frac{1}{p}} && \text{(Hölder's IE)} \\
= & (\mathcal{M}_p)^{-\frac{(n-m)}{p}} \mathcal{E}_p(f \circ \sigma_{e,n-m})^{\frac{1}{p}}. && \text{(Lemma 4.12-(1) and (2.12))}
\end{aligned}$$

By summing over all edges in E_n and using Lemma 4.28, we obtain the desired estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}_p(V_{n,m}[f]) &= \sum_{e \in E_m} |V_{n,m}[f](e^-) - V_{n,m}[f](e^+)|^p \\
&\leq \mathcal{M}_p^{-(n-m)} \sum_{e \in E_m} \mathcal{E}_p(f \circ \sigma_{e,n-m}) \\
&= \mathcal{M}_p^{-(n-m)} \mathcal{E}_p(f).
\end{aligned}$$

□

4.3. Poincaré inequality. The final addition to our toolbox is the following (p, p) -Poincaré-type inequality. The proof is strongly inspired by [14, Section 5].

Theorem 4.33 (Poincaré inequality). *There is a constant $C > 0$ so that for all $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and $f : V_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we have*

$$(4.34) \quad \frac{1}{|E_n|} \sum_{v \in V_n} |f(v) - V_{n,0}[f](v_{\pm})|^p \leq C \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} \mathcal{E}_p(f).$$

Here, v_{\pm} means that the statement is true for both v_+ and v_- . We first prove the following lemma.

Lemma 4.35. *There is a constant $C > 0$ so that the following holds. For every $n, i \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ with $n > i$, and any $v_i \in e_i \in E_i$ and $v_{i+1} \in e_i \cdot G_1$, we have*

$$(4.36) \quad |V_{n,i+1}[f](v_{i+1}) - V_{n,i}[f](v_i)|^p \leq C \mathcal{M}_p^{-(n-i)} \mathcal{E}_p(f \circ \sigma_{e_i,n-i}).$$

Proof. Note that for any $a \in I$ we have $v_i \cdot a \in e_i \cdot G_1$. By the self-similarity of the graphs (see (SM1)) there is a path $[w_1, \dots, w_k]$ from v_{i+1} to $v_i \cdot a$ contained in $e_i \cdot G_1$ and of length at most $\operatorname{diam}(V_1, d_{G_1})$. Then we estimate using Hölder's inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
|V_{n,i+1}[f](v_{i+1}) - V_{n,i+1}[f](v_i \cdot a)|^p &\lesssim \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} |V_{n,i+1}[f](w_{l+1}) - V_{n,i+1}[f](w_l)|^p \\
&\leq \mathcal{E}_p(V_{n,i+1}[f] \circ \sigma_{e_i,1}).
\end{aligned}$$

We finish the proof by estimating

$$\begin{aligned}
& |V_{n,i+1}[f](v_{i+1}) - V_{n,i}[f](v_i)|^p \\
= & \left| \sum_{a \in I} \mathcal{J}_p(a) (V_{n,i+1}[f](v_{i+1}) - V_{n,i+1}[f](v_i \cdot a)) \right|^p && \text{(Lemma 4.25)} \\
\leq & \sum_{a \in I} \mathcal{J}_p(a) |V_{n,i+1}[f](v_{i+1}) - V_{n,i+1}[f](v_i \cdot a)|^p && \text{(Jensen's IE)} \\
\lesssim & \sum_{a \in I} \mathcal{J}_p(a) \mathcal{E}_p(V_{n,i+1}[f] \circ \sigma_{e_i,1}) \\
= & \mathcal{E}_p(V_{n,i+1}[f] \circ \sigma_{e_i,1}) \\
= & \mathcal{E}_p(V_{n-i,1}[f \circ \sigma_{e_i,n-i}]) && \text{(Lemma 4.26)} \\
\lesssim & \mathcal{M}_p^{-(n-i)} \mathcal{E}_p(f \circ \sigma_{e_i,n-i}) && \text{(Theorem 4.30)}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Theorem 4.33. Since the IGS is non-degenerate, it follows from Lemma 4.12-(3) that there is $\alpha > 1$ satisfying $\alpha \cdot \mathcal{M}_p < |E_1|$.

First fix some $v := v_n \in V_n$. For each $i = 0, \dots, n-1$ we choose the vertices v_0, \dots, v_{n-1} and edges e_0, \dots, e_{n-1} so that $v_i \in e_{i-1} \cdot G_1$ and $v_i \in e_i \in E_i$. Then we estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
|f(v) - V_{n,0}[f](v_\pm)|^p & \leq \left(\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} |V_{n,i+1}[f](v_{i+1}) - V_{n,i}[f](v_i)| \alpha^{\frac{i}{p}} \alpha^{-\frac{i}{p}} \right)^p \\
& \leq \left(\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \left(\alpha^{\frac{q}{p}} \right)^{-i} \right)^{\frac{p}{q}} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} |V_{n,i+1}[f](v_{i+1}) - V_{n,i}[f](v_i)|^p \alpha^i \right) \\
& \leq \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \left(\alpha^{\frac{q}{p}} \right)^{-i} \right)^{\frac{p}{q}} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} |V_{n,i+1}[f](v_{i+1}) - V_{n,i}[f](v_i)|^p \alpha^i \\
& \lesssim \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathcal{M}_p^{-(n-i)} \mathcal{E}_p(f \circ \sigma_{e_i,n-i}) \alpha^i.
\end{aligned}$$

We used triangle inequality in the first row, Hölder's inequality in the second and the last row follows from Lemma 4.35 and the fact that $\alpha > 1$.

Next we do the previous choices of vertices and edges for all $v \in V_n$, which we denote $v_i(v) \in e_i(v) \in E_i$. Notice that $v \in e_i(v) \cdot G_{n-i}$. Since $|V_{n-i}| \leq |E_1|^{n-i}$, we conclude the following:

(★) Each edge in E_i is chosen at most $|E_1|^{n-i}$ many times.

We finish the proof by estimating

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{v \in V_n} |f(v) - V_{n,0}[f](v_-)|^p &\lesssim \sum_{v \in V_n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathcal{M}_p^{-(n-i)} \mathcal{E}_p(f \circ \sigma_{e_i(v), n-i}) \alpha^i \\
&\stackrel{(*)}{\leq} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \left(\mathcal{M}_p^{-(n-i)} \alpha^i \cdot |E_1|^{n-i} \sum_{e \in E_i} \mathcal{E}_p(f \circ \sigma_{e, n-i}) \right) \\
&= \mathcal{E}_p(f) \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathcal{M}_p^{-(n-i)} \alpha^i \cdot |E_1|^{n-i} \\
&= |E_1|^n \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} \mathcal{E}_p(f) \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \left(\alpha \frac{\mathcal{M}_p}{|E_1|} \right)^i \\
&\leq |E_1|^n \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} \mathcal{E}_p(f) \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \left(\alpha \frac{\mathcal{M}_p}{|E_1|} \right)^i \\
&\lesssim |E_1|^n \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} \mathcal{E}_p(f).
\end{aligned}$$

The equality in the third line follows from Lemma 4.28, and the geometric series in the second last line converges due to the choice of the constant α . \square

5. DISCRETIZATIONS AND MOLLIFIERS

In this section, we take the first step towards analysis. Using the tools of discrete potential theory developed in Section 4, we introduce analytic objects that will support the construction and investigation of the p -energy forms, p -energy measures and Sobolev spaces in later sections. Throughout the section, we consider a fixed exponent $p \in (1, \infty)$ and an IGS satisfying Assumption 3.3. For the associated limit space (X, d, μ) , we use the same notation as in Definition 3.33.

5.1. Discretization operators. The preliminary step in our framework is discretization. We introduce linear operators $V_n[\cdot] : C(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{V_n}$, which computes the integral averages over the fibers,

$$V_n[f](v) := \int_{\text{Fib}(v)} f d\nu_v \text{ for all } v \in V_n.$$

Now the key problem is to find suitable measures for ν_v . It turns out that the fiber measures given by the divergence of optimal unit flow $\text{div}(\mathcal{J}_p)$ are the correct ones. The reader may recall the definition of the fiber measures in Definition 3.50, and the probability density $\mathcal{J}_p(\cdot)$ on I from Remark 4.7.

Hereafter, we denote $\mathcal{J}_{p,v}$ as the Fiber measure on $\text{Fib}(v)$ corresponding to the measure \mathcal{J}_p on I .

Definition 5.1. Let $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and $p \in (1, \infty)$. We define the V_n -discretization operator $V_{p,n}[\cdot] : C(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{V_n}$ to be the linear operator which maps any continuous function $f \in C(X)$ to the function $V_{p,n}[f] : V_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$V_{p,n}[f](v) := \int_{\text{Fib}(v)} f d\mathcal{J}_{p,v}.$$

Notice that $\mathcal{J}_{p,v}$ is a probability Radon measure on $\text{Fib}(v)$. The V_n -discrete p -energy of $f \in C(X)$ is the normalized discrete p -energy

$$\mathcal{E}_p^{(n)}(f) := \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} \mathcal{E}_p(V_{p,n}[f]).$$

Since the underlying fiber measure depends on p , so do the V_n -discretization operators. For simplicity we omit the exponent from the notation and write $V_n[\cdot]$ instead of $V_{p,n}[\cdot]$.

The operators $V_n[\cdot]$ satisfy the following *tower rule*, which is essentially thanks to the self-similarity of the fiber measures.

Lemma 5.2 (Tower rule). *Let $n, m \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ so that $n \geq m$. For all $f \in C(X)$ we have*

$$(5.3) \quad V_{n,m}[[V_n[f]]] = V_m[f].$$

Here $V_{n,m}[\cdot]$ is the averaging operator in (4.24).

Proof. Let $v \in V_m$. Using (3.52) and Lemma 3.49-(1), we compute

$$\begin{aligned} V_{n,m}[V_n[f]](v) &= \sum_{a \in I^{n-m}} \mathcal{J}_{p,n-m}(a) V_n[f](v \cdot a) \\ &= \sum_{a \in I^{n-m}} \mathcal{J}_{p,n-m}(a) \int_{\text{Fib}(v \cdot a)} f d\mathcal{J}_{p,v \cdot a} \\ &= \sum_{a \in I^{n-m}} \int_{\text{Fib}(v \cdot a)} f d\mathcal{J}_{p,v} \\ &= \int_{\text{Fib}(v)} f d\mathcal{J}_{p,v} \\ &= V_m[f](v). \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 5.4. *Let $f \in C(X)$ and $n, k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. Then for all edges $e \in E_k$ it holds that*

$$(5.5) \quad V_n[f \circ F_e] = V_{n+k}[f] \circ \sigma_{e,n}.$$

Proof. By the definition of fiber measures (3.51) and Lemmas 3.27-(3) and 3.49-(2), the fiber measure $\mathcal{J}_{p,e \cdot v}$ is equal to the push-forward measure $\mathcal{J}_{p,e \cdot v} = (F_e)_*(\mathcal{J}_{p,v})$. Given this, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} V_n[f \circ F_e](v) &= \int_{\text{Fib}(v)} f \circ F_e d\mathcal{J}_{p,v} = \int_{\text{Fib}(e \cdot v)} f d(F_e)_*(\mathcal{J}_{p,v}) \\ &= \int_{\text{Fib}(e \cdot v)} f d\mathcal{J}_{p,e \cdot v} = V_{n+k}[f](\sigma_{e,n}(v)). \end{aligned}$$

□

5.2. Optimal potential functions. Next, we discuss the most important family of functions in our analysis. For $p \in (1, \infty)$ we denote $\mathcal{U}_{p,+} : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as the unique continuous function satisfying

$$(5.6) \quad \mathcal{U}_{p,+}|_{\text{Fib}(v)} \equiv U_{p,+,n}(v) \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\} \text{ and } v \in V_n.$$

Similarly, we define $\mathcal{U}_{p,-}$ by replacing the sign $+$ by $-$ in (5.6). Frequently, when the computation at the moment works for both signs, we write $\mathcal{U}_{p,\pm}$. These functions are collectively referred as the (*continuous*) *optimal potential functions*.

Proposition 5.7. *The condition (5.6) uniquely determine a continuous function $\mathcal{U}_{p,\pm} : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and it satisfies the following properties.*

(1) *For all $v \in e \in E_{\#}$ the function $\mathcal{U}_{p,\pm}$ is δ_p -Hölder continuous for*

$$\delta_p := -\frac{\log(c_p)}{\log(L_*)},$$

where c_p is as in Corollary 4.19.

(2) *It holds that*

$$\mathcal{U}_{p,\pm}|_{\text{Fib}(v_{\pm})} = 1 \text{ and } \mathcal{U}_{p,\pm}|_{\text{Fib}(v_{\mp})} = 0.$$

(3) *It holds that*

$$0 \leq \mathcal{U}_{p,\pm} \leq 1 \text{ and } \mathcal{U}_{p,+} = 1 - \mathcal{U}_{p,-}.$$

(4) *For all $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ it holds that $\mathcal{E}_p^{(n)}(\mathcal{U}_{p,\pm}) = 1$.*

Proof. It follows from Lemma 3.49-(3) and (4.15) that the condition (5.6) determines a well-defined function on the fiber set $\mathcal{U}_{p,\pm} : \text{Fib}(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Since $\text{Fib}(X) \subseteq X$ is a dense subset according to Corollary 3.48, the existence and uniqueness of the continuous extension of $\mathcal{U}_{p,\pm}$ to X , and consequently (1) of the current lemma, follow once we prove that $\mathcal{U}_{p,\pm}$ is δ_p -Hölder continuous in $\text{Fib}(X)$.

(1): Let $x, y \in \text{Fib}(X)$ be arbitrary distinct points. By Lemma 3.49-(1) there is $m \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and vertices $v, w \in V_m$ so that $x \in \text{Fib}(v)$ and $y \in \text{Fib}(w)$. Then we choose any edges $v \in e_v$ and $w \in e_w$. By the definition of the fiber sets, we can express $x = \chi((e_i)_{i=1}^{\infty})$ and $y = \chi((e'_i)_{i=1}^{\infty})$ where $e_m = e_v$ and $e'_m = e_w$. Lastly, we fix $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ to be the largest non-negative integer for which $e_n \cap e'_n \neq \emptyset$. By the visual metric property (Proposition 3.39-(1)) we have

$$(5.8) \quad d(x, y) \gtrsim L_*^{-n}.$$

Also, thanks to Lemma 3.49-(1), we may assume that $m \geq n$.

Since $v \in e_v = e_m$ and $\pi_{m,n}(e_v) = e_n$, it follows from (SM3) that $v \in e_n \cdot G_{m-n}$. Similarly, $w \in e'_n \cdot G_{m-n}$. Using (SM2) we can choose a vertex $v_m \in e_n \cdot G_{m-n} \cap e'_n \cdot G_{m-n}$. We now use Corollary 4.19 and (5.8) to estimate

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{U}_{p,\pm}(x) - \mathcal{U}_{p,\pm}(y)| &= |U_{p,\pm,m}(v) - U_{p,\pm,m}(w)| \\ &\leq |U_{p,\pm,m}(v) - U_{p,\pm,m}(v_m)| + |U_{p,\pm,m}(v_m) - U_{p,\pm,m}(w)| \\ &\leq 2c_p^n = 2(L_*^{-n})^{\delta_p} \lesssim d(x, y)^{\delta_p}. \end{aligned}$$

(2): By using the definition (5.6), we have

$$\mathcal{U}_{p,\pm}|_{\text{Fib}(v_{\pm})} = U_{p,0}(v_{\pm}) = 1 \text{ and } \mathcal{U}_{p,\pm}|_{\text{Fib}(v_{\mp})} = U_{p,0}(v_{\mp}) = 0.$$

(3): Note that, by Lemma 4.12-(4), we have $0 \leq U_{p,\pm,m} \leq 1$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. Also $U_{p,+m} = 1 - U_{p,-m}$ follows from the uniqueness of the optimal potential. By the density $\text{Fib}(X) \subseteq X$, these properties directly translate to the analogous properties of $\mathcal{U}_{p,\pm}$.

(4): Since, by the definition (5.6), $\mathcal{U}_{p,\pm}$ is constant on all fibers. Thus, we have $V_n[\mathcal{U}_{p,\pm}] = U_{p,\pm,n}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. By using Lemma 4.12-(1), we have

$$\mathcal{E}_p^{(n)}(\mathcal{U}_{p,\pm}) = \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} \mathcal{E}_p(U_{p,\pm,n}) = 1.$$

□

5.3. Mollifiers. Next, we introduce the mollifier operators. As the name suggests, their main purpose is to produce approximations of functions with higher “regularity”. In this subsection, we define the mollification of continuous functions, and later in Subsection 6.4, we extend the mollifier for general Sobolev functions. We prove in Theorem 6.35 that mollified functions converge to the original function in the Sobolev norm.

Definition 5.9. For $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ we define the V_n -interpolation operator as the linear operator $\mathcal{U}_{p,n}[\cdot] : \mathbb{R}^{V_n} \rightarrow C(X)$ so that for any given function $g : V_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $\mathcal{U}_{p,n}[g] : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the continuous function satisfying

$$(5.10) \quad (\mathcal{U}_{p,n}[g] \circ F_e)(x) := g(e^-) + (g(e^+) - g(e^-))\mathcal{U}_{p,+}(x)$$

for all $e \in E_n$ and $x \in X$. The V_n -mollifier is then defined as the composition $\Psi_{p,n}[\cdot] := \mathcal{U}_{p,n}[\cdot] \circ V_n[\cdot] : C(X) \rightarrow C(X)$.

Lemma 5.11. For all $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and $g : V_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the condition (5.10) determines a well-defined δ_p -Hölder continuous function $\mathcal{U}_{p,n}[g] \in C(X)$, where δ_p is as in Proposition 5.7, satisfying the following conditions.

$$(1) \quad \mathcal{E}_p^{(m)}(\mathcal{U}_{p,n}[g]) = \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} \mathcal{E}_p(g) \text{ for all } m \geq n.$$

$$(2) \quad \text{For all } n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\} \text{ and } e \in E_n \text{ it holds that}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{x,y \in X_e} |\mathcal{U}_{p,n}[g](x) - \mathcal{U}_{p,n}[g](y)| &= |\nabla g(e)|, \\ \sup_{x \in X_e} |\mathcal{U}_{p,n}[g](x)| &= \max\{|g(e^-)|, |g(e^+)|\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. First, we verify that $\mathcal{U}_{p,n}[g]$ is well-defined. Since $e \cdot v_{\pm} = e^{\pm}$ it follows from Lemma 3.49-(2), Proposition (5.7)-(2) and the definition of the interpolation (5.10) that

$$\mathcal{U}_{p,n}[g]|_{\text{Fib}(e^{\pm})} = g(e^{\pm}) \text{ for all } e \in E_n.$$

Hence, $\mathcal{U}_{p,n}[g]$ is well-defined by Lemma 3.46. Furthermore, it is δ_p -Hölder continuous by Proposition 5.7-(1).

(1): Let $n, m \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ so that $m \geq n$. We compute

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{E}_p^{(m)}(\mathcal{U}_{p,n}[g]) \\ &= \mathcal{M}_p^{-m} \mathcal{E}_p(V_m[\mathcal{U}_{p,n}[g]]) \\ &= \mathcal{M}_p^{-m} \sum_{e \in E_n} \mathcal{E}_p(V_m[\mathcal{U}_{p,n}[g]] \circ \sigma_{e,m-n}) && \text{(Lemma 4.28)} \\ &= \mathcal{M}_p^{-m} \sum_{e \in E_n} \mathcal{E}_p(V_{m-n}[\mathcal{U}_{p,n}[g] \circ F_e]) && \text{(Lemma 5.4)} \\ &= \mathcal{M}_p^{-m} \sum_{e \in E_n} |\nabla g(e)|^p \mathcal{E}_p(V_{m-n}[\mathcal{U}_{p,-}]) && \text{(Definition 5.9)} \\ &= \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} \mathcal{E}_p(g) && \text{(Proposition 5.7)-(4)}. \end{aligned}$$

(2): Let $e \in E_n$ and $y \in X_e$. By (2) and (3) of Lemma 5.7, $\mathcal{U}_{p,n}[g](y)$ is a convex combination of $g(e^+)$ and $g(e^-)$, and $\mathcal{U}_{p,n}[g](y) \in \{g(e^-), g(e^+)\}$ if $y \in \text{Fib}(e^\pm)$. Thus we have $\sup_{x \in X_e} |\mathcal{U}_{p,n}[g](x)| = \max\{|g(e^-)|, |g(e^+)|\}$,

$$|\mathcal{U}_{p,n}[g](x) - \mathcal{U}_{p,n}[g](y)| \leq |\nabla g(e)| \text{ for all } x, y \in X_e,$$

and this inequality is equality for $x \in \text{Fib}(e^-)$ and $y \in \text{Fib}(e^+)$. \square

Proposition 5.12. *Let $f \in C(X)$ and $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. Then the following holds.*

(1) $\mathcal{E}_p^{(m)}(\Psi_{p,n}[f]) = \mathcal{E}_p^{(n)}(f)$ for all $m \geq n$.

(2) For all $m \geq n$ and $v \in V_m$ the function $\Psi_{p,n}[f]$ is constant on $\text{Fib}(v)$.

(3) For all $e \in E_n$ we have

$$\sup_{x, y \in X_e} |\Psi_{p,n}[f](x) - \Psi_{p,n}[f](y)| = |\nabla V_n[f](e)|$$

and

$$\sup_{x \in X_e} |\Psi_{p,n}[f](x)| = \max\{|V_n[f](e^-)|, |V_n[f](e^+)|\}.$$

(4) $\Psi_{p,n}[f] \rightarrow f$ in $L^\infty(X)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. (1): Directly follows from Lemma 5.11-(1).

(2): Let $m \geq n$ and $v \in V_m$. Choose an edge $e \in E_n$ and $v' \in V_{m-n}$ so that $v = e \cdot v'$. Then we have

$$\Psi_{p,n}[f]|_{\text{Fib}(v)} = V_n[f](e^-) + (V_n[f](e^+) - V_n[f](e^-))\mathcal{U}_{p,+}|_{\text{Fib}(v')}.$$

It is clear from (5.6) that $\mathcal{U}_{p,+}$ is constant on $\text{Fib}(v')$, so we are done.

(3): Directly follows from Lemma 5.11-(2).

(4): If $v \in e \in E_n$, it follows from Proposition 3.42-(1) that

$$\text{diam}(\text{Fib}(v)) \leq \text{diam}(X_e) = L_*^{-n}.$$

It is now routine to verify that $\Psi_{p,n}[f] \rightarrow f$ in $L^\infty(X)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ using the uniform continuity of f and (3) of the current proposition. \square

6. CONSTRUCTION OF THE ENERGY FORMS

In this section, we construct self-similar p -energy forms, p -energy measures and few other analytic tools for all IGS-fractals in our framework and all $p \in (1, \infty)$. We state the general results regarding the p -energy forms in Subsection 6.1, and prove them in Subsections 6.2 and 6.3. In Subsection 6.4, we extend the discretizations and mollifiers introduced in Section 5 to general Sobolev functions. Subsection 6.5 is devoted to studying energy measures.

6.1. Main theorems. Throughout the section, we consider fixed exponent $p \in (1, \infty)$ and the limit space of an IGS satisfying Assumption 3.3. Regarding the limit space (X, d, μ) , we use the same notation as in Definition 3.33.

As the first step, we introduce the *pre-energy form* $\mathbb{E}_p : C(X) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$,

$$(6.1) \quad \mathbb{E}_p(f) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} \mathcal{E}_p(V_n[f]) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_p^{(n)}(V_n[f]),$$

where \mathcal{M}_p is the p -capacity constant in Assumption 3.3 and $V_n[\cdot]$ are the discretization operators in Definition 5.1. We show in Theorem 6.10 that $\mathbf{E}_p(f)$ always exists in $[0, \infty]$. We also introduce a *core*, which is the family of functions

$$(6.2) \quad \mathcal{C}_p := \{f \in C(X) : \mathbf{E}_p(f) < \infty\}.$$

We state the main results of the section in the following two theorems. The proofs will be given in Subsections 6.2 and 6.3. The reader may recall the Definition of p -energy form from Definition 1.7.

Theorem 6.3. *For all $p \in (1, \infty)$ there is a p -energy form $\mathcal{E}_p : L^p(X, \mu) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ of $L^p(X, \mu)$ that, together with the associated Sobolev space $(\mathcal{F}_p, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F}_p})$ as given in Definition 6.9, satisfies the following properties.*

- (1) $\mathcal{E}_p(f) = \mathbf{E}_p(f)$ for all $f \in \mathcal{C}_p$.
- (2) The Sobolev space $(\mathcal{F}_p, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F}_p})$ is a reflexive and separable Banach space.
- (3) **(Regularity)** \mathcal{C}_p is dense in both $(C(X), \|\cdot\|_{L^\infty})$ and $(\mathcal{F}_p, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F}_p})$.
- (4) **(Self-similarity)** For all $f \in \mathcal{F}_p$ it holds that

$$\mathcal{E}_p(f) = \mathcal{M}_p^{-1} \sum_{e \in E_1} \mathcal{E}_p(f \circ F_e).$$

- (5) **(Lipschitz contractivity)** For every 1-Lipschitz function $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $f \in \mathcal{F}_p$ we have $\mathcal{E}_p(\varphi \circ f) \leq \mathcal{E}_p(f)$.

The equality in Theorem 6.3-(1) is extended to $C(X)$ in Corollary 6.39.

Theorem 6.4. *For all $p \in (1, \infty)$ the p -energy form $\mathcal{E}_p : L^p(X, \mu) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ satisfies the following conditions.*

- (1) **(Poincaré inequality)** There is a constant $C > 0$ so that for all $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and $f \in \mathcal{F}_p$ we have the (p, p) -Poincaré-type inequalities

$$(6.5) \quad \int_{X_e} |f - f_{X_e}|^p d\mu \leq C \mathcal{E}_p(f \circ F_e),$$

$$(6.6) \quad \int_{X_v} |f - f_{X_v}|^p d\mu \leq C \sum_{\substack{e \in E_n \\ v \in e}} \mathcal{E}_p(f \circ F_e).$$

In particular, $\{f \in L^p(X, \mu) : \mathcal{E}_p(f) = 0\} = \{\text{constant functions}\}$.

- (2) **(p -Clarkson's inequality)** For all $f, g \in \mathcal{F}_p$ it holds that

$$(6.7) \quad \begin{cases} \mathcal{E}_p(f+g) + \mathcal{E}_p(f-g) \geq 2(\mathcal{E}_p(f)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} + \mathcal{E}_p(g)^{\frac{1}{p-1}})^{p-1} & \text{if } p \in (1, 2], \\ \mathcal{E}_p(f+g) + \mathcal{E}_p(f-g) \leq 2(\mathcal{E}_p(f)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} + \mathcal{E}_p(g)^{\frac{1}{p-1}})^{p-1} & \text{if } p \in [2, \infty). \end{cases}$$

- (3) **(Strong locality)** If $f, g \in \mathcal{F}_p$ so that $\text{supp}_\mu(f - a) \cap \text{supp}_\mu(g - b) = \emptyset$ for some $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, then for all $h \in \mathcal{F}_p$ we have

$$\mathcal{E}_p(f + g + h) + \mathcal{E}_p(h) = \mathcal{E}_p(f + h) + \mathcal{E}_p(g + h).$$

6.2. Closability. The key step in the construction of the p -energy form \mathcal{E}_p is to establish the *closability* of the pre-energy \mathbf{E}_p . This means that for any sequence $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \subseteq \mathcal{C}_p$ satisfying $f_i \rightarrow 0$ in $L^p(X, \mu)$ and the \mathbf{E}_p -Cauchy condition

$$(6.8) \quad \lim_{i,j \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}_p(f_i - f_j) = 0,$$

we always have $\mathbf{E}_p(f_i) \rightarrow 0$. A sequence satisfying (6.8) is called an \mathbf{E}_p -Cauchy sequence. Having closability, the p -energy form \mathcal{E}_p can be defined as follows.

Definition 6.9. For arbitrary $f \in L^p(X, \mu)$ we define

$$\mathcal{E}_p(f) := \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}_p(f_i)$$

where $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \subseteq \mathcal{C}_p$ is any \mathbf{E}_p -Cauchy sequence so that $f_i \rightarrow f$ in $L^p(X, \mu)$. Note that $\mathcal{E}_p(f)$ does not depend on the choice of the \mathbf{E}_p -Cauchy sequence, as soon as we have verified closability. If such sequence does not exist, we define $\mathcal{E}_p(f) := \infty$. The associated *Sobolev space* is

$$\mathcal{F}_p := \{f \in L^p(X, \mu) : \mathcal{E}_p(f) < \infty\}$$

and is equipped with the *Sobolev norm* $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F}_p} := \|\cdot\|_{L^p} + \mathcal{E}_p(\cdot)^{\frac{1}{p}}$.

Thus, our initial target is the closability of \mathbf{E}_p . First, we verify that $\mathbf{E}_p(f)$ is well-defined for all continuous functions.

Theorem 6.10. For all $f \in C(X)$ the sequence of p -energies $\mathcal{E}_p^{(n)}(f)$ as defined in Definition 5.1 is non-decreasing with respect to $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. In particular, $\mathbf{E}_p(f) \in [0, \infty]$ is well-defined.

Proof. Let $n, m \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ so that $m \geq n$. Monotonicity follows from the computation

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_p^{(n)}(f) &= \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} \cdot \mathcal{E}_p(V_n[f]) \\ &= \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} \cdot \mathcal{E}_p(V_{m,n}[V_m[f]]) && \text{(Tower rule)} \\ &\leq \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} \cdot \mathcal{M}_p^{-(m-n)} \mathcal{E}_p(V_m[f]) && \text{(Strong monotonicity)} \\ &= \mathcal{M}_p^{-m} \cdot \mathcal{E}_p(V_m[f]) \\ &= \mathcal{E}_p^{(m)}(f). \end{aligned}$$

□

The main ingredients of the proof of closability are the following two lemmas. The first regards the self-similarity of \mathbf{E}_p .

Lemma 6.11. For all $f \in C(X)$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$

$$(6.12) \quad \mathbf{E}_p(f) = \mathcal{M}_p^{-m} \sum_{e \in E_m} \mathbf{E}_p(f \circ F_e).$$

Proof. By applying Lemmas 4.28 and 5.4 we simply compute

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E}_p(f) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{M}_p^{-(n+m)} \mathcal{E}_p(V_{n+m}[f]) \\
&= \mathcal{M}_p^{-m} \sum_{e \in E_m} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} \mathcal{E}_p(V_{n+m}[f] \circ \sigma_{e,n}) \\
&= \mathcal{M}_p^{-m} \sum_{e \in E_m} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} \mathcal{E}_p(V_n[f \circ F_e]) \\
&= \mathcal{M}_p^{-m} \sum_{e \in E_m} \mathbf{E}_p(f \circ F_e).
\end{aligned}$$

□

The second ingredient is the (p, p) -Poincaré-type inequality.

Lemma 6.13. *There is a constant $C > 0$ so that for all continuous functions $f \in C(X)$, $m \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and $e \in E_m$, it holds that*

$$(6.14) \quad \int_{X_e} |f - V_m[f](e^\pm)|^p d\mu \leq C \mathbf{E}_p(f \circ F_e).$$

Proof. We will only prove the case $m = 0$ and $v = v_\pm$. To justify this, it follows from the self-similarity properties (Proposition 3.42-(1) and Lemma 5.4) that

$$\int_{X_e} |f - V_m[f](e^\pm)|^p d\mu = \int_X |f \circ F_e - V_0[f \circ F_e](v_\pm)|^p d\mu.$$

Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. By Proposition 5.12-(4) we can choose a large enough $n \in \mathbb{N}$ so that

$$\int_X |f|^p d\mu - \varepsilon \leq \int_X |\Psi_{p,n}[f]|^p d\mu.$$

Using this and Proposition 5.12-(3), we estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_X |f|^p d\mu - \varepsilon &\leq \int_X |\Psi_{p,n}[f]|^p d\mu \\
&= \sum_{e \in E_n} \int_{X_e} |\Psi_{p,n}[f]|^p d\mu \\
&\leq \sum_{e \in E_n} \int_{X_e} |V_n[f](e^-)|^p + |V_n[f](e^+)|^p d\mu \\
&= \sum_{v \in V_n} \sum_{v \in e \in E_n} \mu(X_e) |V_n[f](v)|^p \\
&\leq \frac{C_{\text{deg}}}{|E_1|^n} \sum_{v \in V_n} |V_n[f](v)|^p.
\end{aligned}$$

In the last line we used $\mu(X_e) = |E_1|^{-n}$, which is proven in Proposition 3.42-(1). Next, we replace f with $f - V_0[f](v_\pm)$ in the previous computation. Since

$$V_n[f - V_0[f](v_\pm)] = V_n[f] - V_0[f](v_\pm)$$

we obtain the estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_X |f - V_0[f](v_\pm)|^p d\mu - \varepsilon \\
& \lesssim \frac{1}{|E_1|^n} \sum_{v \in V_n} |V_n[f](v) - V_0[f](v_\pm)|^p \\
& = \frac{1}{|E_1|^n} \sum_{v \in V_n} |V_n[f](v) - V_{n,0}[V_n[f]](v_\pm)|^p \quad (\text{Tower rule}) \\
& \lesssim \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} \mathcal{E}_p(V_n[f]) \quad (\text{Poincaré IE (4.34)}) \\
& \leq \mathbf{E}_p(f). \quad (\text{Theorem 4.30})
\end{aligned}$$

The result now follows by letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. \square

The mapping $V_n : C(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{V_n}$ given by $f \rightarrow V_n[f]$ is bounded in the following sense.

Proposition 6.15. *There is a constant $C_0 > 0$ so that for all $f \in C(X)$, $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $v \in V_n$ we have*

$$(6.16) \quad |V_n[f](v)|^p \leq C_0 \left(\frac{\mathcal{M}_p^n}{2^{m(p-1)}} \mathbf{E}_p(f) + \frac{|I|^m |E_1|^{n+m}}{\mathcal{M}_p^m 2^{m(p-1)}} \|f\|_{L^p}^p \right).$$

Proof. Fix $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and $w \in e \in E_k$. We first derive a preliminary inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.17) \quad & |V_k[f](w)|^p \lesssim (|V_k[f](w) - f_{X_e}|^p + |f_{X_e}|^p) \\
& \leq \int_{X_e} |f - V_k[f](w)|^p d\mu + \int_{X_e} |f|^p d\mu \quad (\text{Jensen's IE}) \\
& \lesssim \mathbf{E}_p(f \circ F_e) + \frac{1}{\mu(X_e)} \int_{X_e} |f|^p d\mu \quad (\text{Poincaré IE (6.14)}) \\
& \leq \mathbf{E}_p(f \circ F_e) + |E_1|^k \|f\|_{L^p}^p. \quad (\text{Proposition (3.42)-(1)})
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that (6.17) is almost the goal estimate (6.16). The difference is that the coefficients do not match. To fix this, we show that the inequality (6.17) has a *self-improving property*, which means that we can alter the coefficients of the two terms to more suitable ones.

Since the gluing sets are independent, the edges $\mathbf{e}(v_\pm \cdot a), \mathbf{e}(v_\pm \cdot b) \in E_1$ are distinct whenever $a, b \in I$ are distinct. Also the edges $\mathbf{e}(v_+ \cdot a), \mathbf{e}(v_- \cdot b) \in E_1$ are distinct for all $a, b \in I$ due to the non-degenerateness. Thus, using the duality relation (2.12) and the conductive uniform property, we estimate

$$(\mathcal{M}_p^{-1})^{\frac{q}{p}} = \sum_{e \in E_1} |\mathcal{J}_p(e)|^q \geq \sum_{a \in I} (|\mathcal{J}_p(\mathbf{e}(v_- \cdot a))|^q + |\mathcal{J}_p(\mathbf{e}(v_+ \cdot a))|^q) = 2 \cdot \sum_{a \in I} \mathcal{J}_p(a)^q.$$

Using Lemma 4.12-(2) we obtain

$$(6.18) \quad \sum_{a \in I^m} \mathcal{J}_{p,m}(a)^q = \left(\sum_{a \in I} \mathcal{J}_p(a)^q \right)^m \leq \frac{(\mathcal{M}_p^{-m})^{\frac{q}{p}}}{2^m}.$$

Now fix any edge $e \in E_n$ containing v . By combining the inequalities (6.17) and (6.18) we obtain the estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
|V_n[f](v)|^p &= |V_{n+m,n}[V_{n+m}[f]](v)|^p && \text{(Tower rule)} \\
&= \left| \sum_{a \in I^m} \mathcal{J}_{p,m}(a) V_{n+m}[f](v \cdot a) \right|^p \\
&\leq \left(\sum_{a \in I^m} \mathcal{J}_{p,m}(a)^q \right)^{\frac{p}{q}} \left(\sum_{a \in I^m} |V_{n+m}[f](v \cdot a)|^p \right) && \text{(Hölder's IE)} \\
&\lesssim \frac{\mathcal{M}_p^{-m}}{2^{m(p-1)}} \sum_{a \in I^m} (\mathbb{E}_p(f \circ F_{\mathfrak{e}(v \cdot a, e)}) + |E_1|^{n+m} \|f\|_{L^p}^p) && \text{(6.17)-(6.18)} \\
&\leq \frac{\mathcal{M}_p^n}{2^{m(p-1)}} \mathbb{E}_p(f) + \frac{|I|^m |E_1|^{n+m}}{\mathcal{M}_p^m 2^{m(p-1)}} \|f\|_{L^p}^p. && \text{(Lemma 6.11)}
\end{aligned}$$

In the last line, we used the fact that the mapping $a \mapsto \mathfrak{e}(v \cdot a, e)$, where $\mathfrak{e}(v \cdot a, e)$ is the unique edge in $e \cdot G_m$ containing $v \cdot a$, is injective. This follows from Corollary 3.22. \square

We are now ready to prove the closability.

Theorem 6.19. *The pre-energy form $\mathbb{E}_p : \mathcal{C}_p \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is closable, i.e., for every \mathbb{E}_p -Cauchy sequence $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \subseteq \mathcal{C}_p$ so that $f_i \rightarrow 0$ in $L^p(X, \mu)$ we have $\mathbb{E}_p(f_i) \rightarrow 0$. In particular, the p -energy $\mathcal{E}_p(f)$ of an arbitrary $f \in L^p(X, \mu)$, as described in Definition 6.9, is well-defined.*

Proof. Let $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \subseteq \mathcal{C}_p$ to be \mathbb{E}_p -Cauchy satisfying $f_i \rightarrow 0$ in $L^p(X, \mu)$. First, we show for any fixed $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and $v \in V_n$ that we have

$$(6.20) \quad V_n[f_i](v) \xrightarrow{i \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Since $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \subseteq \mathcal{C}_p$ is \mathbb{E}_p -Cauchy, there is a uniform upper bound for the energies

$$\mathbb{E}_p(f_i) \leq M < \infty.$$

Next, let $C_0 > 0$ be as in Proposition 6.15, and choose $m \in \mathbb{N}$ so large that

$$\frac{M \mathcal{M}_p^n}{2^{m(p-1)}} < \frac{\varepsilon}{2C_0}.$$

Since $f_i \rightarrow 0$ in $L^p(X, \mu)$, there is $k \in \mathbb{N}$ so that for any $i \geq k$ we have

$$\frac{|I|^m |E_1|^{n+m}}{\mathcal{M}_p^m 2^{m(p-1)}} \|f_i\|_{L^p}^p < \frac{\varepsilon}{2C_0}.$$

For any such $i \in \mathbb{N}$, by Proposition 6.15, we have

$$|V_n[f_i](v)|^p < \varepsilon.$$

This proves (6.20), and consequently, we have

$$\mathcal{E}_p^{(n)}(f_i) = \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} \mathcal{E}_p(V_n[f_i]) \xrightarrow{i \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

Next, we show that $\mathbb{E}_p(f_i) \rightarrow 0$. Fix $N(\varepsilon) \in \mathbb{N}$ so that

$$\sup_{i, j \geq N(\varepsilon)} \mathbb{E}_p(f_i - f_j)^{\frac{1}{p}} < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

By Theorem 6.10, it is sufficient to prove that $\mathcal{E}_p^{(n)}(f_i) < \varepsilon$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $i \geq N(\varepsilon)$. We achieve this by choosing $j \geq N(\varepsilon)$ so that $\mathcal{E}_p^{(n)}(f_j)^{\frac{1}{p}} < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$, and using Minkowski's inequality and Theorem 6.10 to estimate

$$\mathcal{E}_p^{(n)}(f_i)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq \mathcal{E}_p^{(n)}(f_i - f_j)^{\frac{1}{p}} + \mathcal{E}_p^{(n)}(f_j)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq \mathbf{E}_p(f_i - f_j)^{\frac{1}{p}} + \mathcal{E}_p^{(n)}(f_j)^{\frac{1}{p}} < \varepsilon.$$

□

Remark 6.21. Hereafter, up to the end of the paper, $\mathcal{E}_p : L^p(X, \mu) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ denotes the p -energy form and \mathcal{F}_p the associated Sobolev space, as given in Definition 6.9.

We now move on to establishing the main theorems of the section, Theorems 6.3 and 6.4. Proving Theorem 6.3-(5) regarding the Lipschitz contractivity requires a more delicate arguments. Therefore, we postpone it to the next subsection.

Proof of Theorem 6.3: (1)-(4). (1): If $f \in \mathcal{C}_p$, then $\mathcal{E}_p(f) \leq \mathbf{E}_p(f)$ follows by taking the constant sequence $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$, $f_i = f$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. The opposite inequality follows from Theorem 6.19 and by sending $n \rightarrow \infty$ in the estimate $\mathcal{E}_p^{(n)}(f)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq \mathcal{E}_p^{(n)}(f - f_i)^{\frac{1}{p}} + \mathcal{E}_p^{(n)}(f_i)^{\frac{1}{p}}$, which follows from Minkowski's inequality.

(2): The Sobolev space \mathcal{F}_p can be regarded as the completion of \mathcal{C}_p with respect to the Sobolev norm. Thus, it is a Banach space. Reflexivity and separability of \mathcal{F}_p follow once we have established the p -Clarkson's inequality (6.7) (see [27, Proposition 3.13 and Corollary 3.16] for details), which is covered in Theorem 6.4. Separability can also be directly seen from Theorem 6.35 below.

(3): The density of $\mathcal{C}_p \subseteq \mathcal{F}_p$ is clear from the construction. The density $\mathcal{C}_p \subseteq C(X)$ in the uniform norm $\|\cdot\|_{L^\infty}$ follows from (1) and (4) of Proposition 5.12.

(4): It is sufficient to show that whenever $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \subseteq \mathcal{C}_p$ is an \mathbf{E}_p -Cauchy sequence then so is $\{f_i \circ F_e\}_{i=1}^\infty$ for all $e \in E_n$. The self-similarity of \mathcal{E}_p is then be inherited from the self-similarity of the pre-energy form \mathbf{E}_p established in Lemma 6.11.

Let $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \subseteq \mathcal{C}_p$ be \mathbf{E}_p -Cauchy and $e \in E_n$. By Theorem (1) of the current theorem and Lemma 6.11 we get

$$\mathcal{E}_p((f_i - f_j) \circ F_e) = \mathbf{E}_p((f_i - f_j) \circ F_e) \leq \mathcal{M}_p^n \mathbf{E}_p(f_i - f_j) \xrightarrow{i, j \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

□

Proof of Theorem 6.4. (1): Since $\mathcal{C}_p \subseteq \mathcal{F}_p$ is dense, it is sufficient to prove the inequalities (6.5) and (6.6) only for the functions $f \in \mathcal{C}_p$. We also make one more simplification, which is to replace the constants f_{X_v} and f_{X_e} in the right-hand side of the inequalities with more suitable ones. This is justified by

$$(6.22) \quad \left(\int_A |f - f_A|^p d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq 2 \left(\inf_{c \in \mathbb{R}} \int_A |f - c|^p d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

where $A \subseteq X$ is any Borel set of positive and finite measure. This inequality follows trivially from Minkowski's inequality as long as $f \in L^p(A)$, see e.g. [11, Lemma 4.17].

The first inequality (6.5) now directly follows from Lemma 6.13 and (6.22). To prove the second one (6.6), we apply (6.14) and Proposition (3.42)-(1) to estimate

$$\int_{X_v} |f - V_n[f](v)|^p d\mu = \sum_{\substack{e \in E_n \\ v \in e}} \frac{\mu(X_e)}{\mu(X_v)} \int_{X_e} |f - V_n[f](v)|^p d\mu \lesssim \sum_{\substack{e \in E_n \\ v \in e}} \mathcal{E}_p(f \circ F_e).$$

(2): Since the operators $V_n[\cdot]$ are linear, for any $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and $f, g \in \mathcal{C}_p$ we have (6.7) with $\mathcal{E}_p^{(n)}$ in place of \mathcal{E}_p by p -Clarkson's inequality on $\ell^p(V_n)$. We obtain (6.7) in the case $f, g \in \mathcal{C}_p$ by letting $n \rightarrow \infty$. For general $f \in \mathcal{F}_p$, the claim follows by taking approximating sequences of continuous functions.

(3): Since the closed sets $\text{supp}_\mu(f - a)$ and $\text{supp}_\mu(g - b)$ are disjoint, it follows from Proposition 3.42-(1) that we can choose a large $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and a subset of edges $H_n \subseteq E_n$ so that

$$\text{supp}_\mu(f - a) \subseteq \bigcup_{e \in H_n} X_e \text{ and } \text{supp}_\mu(g - b) \subseteq \bigcup_{e \in E_n \setminus H_n} X_e.$$

It is clear from the construction of \mathcal{E}_p that $\mathcal{E}_p(f + c1_X) = \mathcal{E}_p(f)$ for all $c \in \mathbb{R}$. This fact combined with Theorem 6.3-(4) yield

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{E}_p(f + g + h) \\ = & \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} \sum_{e \in H_n} \mathcal{E}_p((f + g + h) \circ F_e) + \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} \sum_{e \in E_n \setminus H_n} \mathcal{E}_p((f + g + h) \circ F_e) \\ = & \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} \sum_{e \in H_n} \mathcal{E}_p((f + h) \circ F_e) + \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} \sum_{e \in E_n \setminus H_n} \mathcal{E}_p((g + h) \circ F_e). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_p(h) &= \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} \sum_{e \in H_n} \mathcal{E}_p(h \circ F_e) + \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} \sum_{e \in E_n \setminus H_n} \mathcal{E}_p(h \circ F_e) \\ &= \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} \sum_{e \in H_n} \mathcal{E}_p((g + h) \circ F_e) + \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} \sum_{e \in E_n \setminus H_n} \mathcal{E}_p((f + h) \circ F_e). \end{aligned}$$

The desired claim now follows by combining the previous two equalities using Theorem 6.3-(4) one last time. \square

6.3. Contraction properties. In this subsection, we finish the proof of Theorem 6.3 by establishing the Lipschitz contraction property. We also record the proof of the *generalized p -contraction property* introduced in [27] for future references.

The proof for the contraction property turned out to be quite delicate, unlike e.g. the proof of the p -Clarkson's inequality which was easy to prove for the functions in \mathcal{C}_p and the general case immediately followed from the density $\mathcal{C}_p \subseteq \mathcal{F}_p$. The main difficulty in the proof of the contraction property comes with the fact that the averaging operators $V_n[\cdot]$ and the contraction mapping $f \mapsto \varphi \circ f$ do not commute in general, i.e., the equality of functions

$$(6.23) \quad \varphi \circ V_n[f] = V_n[\varphi \circ f]$$

does not need to hold for an arbitrary continuous function $f \in \mathcal{C}_p$. The key observation for our argument is that (6.23) still holds for a large family of continuous functions, which we will prove in the following lemma.

Lemma 6.24. *Let $m \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, and $f := \mathcal{U}_{p,m}[g]$ for any $g : V_m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Then (6.23) holds for all $n \geq m$ and 1-Lipschitz functions $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and we also have $\mathcal{E}_p(\varphi \circ f) \leq \mathcal{E}_p(f)$.*

Proof. It follows from Proposition 5.12-(2) that f is constant on each fiber $\text{Fib}(v)$ for $v \in V_n$ and $n \geq m$. Thus, if $x \in \text{Fib}(v)$ is any point, we have

$$V_n[\varphi \circ f](v) = \varphi(f(x)) = \varphi(V_n[f](v)).$$

Since discrete graph energies satisfy the Lipschitz contraction property, i.e., for every $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and $h : V_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we have $\mathcal{E}_p(\varphi \circ h) \leq \mathcal{E}_p(h)$, we finish the proof by computing

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_p(\varphi \circ f) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} \mathcal{E}_p(V_n[\varphi \circ f]) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} \mathcal{E}_p(\varphi \circ V_n[f]) \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} \mathcal{E}_p(V_n[f]) = \mathcal{E}_p(f). \end{aligned}$$

□

The next step is the lower-semicontinuity of \mathcal{E}_p , which is a direct corollary of the p -Clarkson's inequality (6.7) and [27, Proposition 3.18-(a)]. We omit the proof here.

Lemma 6.25. *Let $f \in L^p(X, \mu)$ and $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of $L^p(X, \mu)$ -functions so that $f_i \rightarrow f$ in $L^p(X, \mu)$. Then*

$$\mathcal{E}_p(f) \leq \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_p(f_i).$$

In particular, if $\sup_{i \geq 1} \mathcal{E}_p(f_i) < \infty$, then $f \in \mathcal{F}_p$. If additionally $f_i \in \mathcal{F}_p$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_p(f_i) = \mathcal{E}_p(f),$$

then $f_i \rightarrow f$ in \mathcal{F}_p .

We are now ready to finish the proof of Theorem 6.4.

Proof of Theorem 6.3-(5). We first assume that $f \in \mathcal{C}_p$, and consider the approximating functions $\varphi \circ \Psi_{p,n}[f]$ for $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. It follows from Proposition 5.12-(4) that $\varphi \circ \Psi_{p,n}[f] \rightarrow \varphi \circ f$ in $L^p(X, \mu)$. Hence, we obtain the desired contraction property by computing

$$\begin{aligned} (6.26) \quad \mathcal{E}_p(\varphi \circ f) &\leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_p(\varphi \circ \Psi_{p,n}[f]) && \text{(Lemma 6.25)} \\ &\leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_p(\Psi_{p,n}[f]) && \text{(Lemma 6.24)} \\ &= \mathcal{E}_p(f). && \text{(Proposition 5.12-(1))} \end{aligned}$$

For a general $f \in \mathcal{F}_p$, we argue by taking an approximating sequence of continuous functions $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ in \mathcal{F}_p . Since $\varphi \circ f_n \rightarrow \varphi \circ f$ in $L^p(X, \mu)$ and $\varphi \circ f_n \in \mathcal{F}_p$ are continuous, it follows from Lemma 6.25 and the fact that we have verified the contraction property for continuous Sobolev functions that

$$(6.27) \quad \mathcal{E}_p(\varphi \circ f) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_p(\varphi \circ f_n) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_p(f_n) = \mathcal{E}_p(f).$$

□

Herein, we have gathered enough ingredients to conclude that, for $p = 2$, our construction produces a regular Dirichlet form on $L^2(X, \mu)$. For definitions of concepts only mentioned here, see [16].

Proof of Corollary 1.10. Let $\mathcal{E}_2(f, g)$ denote the two variable functional given in the statement of Corollary 1.10. By Theorems 6.3 and 6.4, the two variable functional \mathcal{E}_2 is Markovian and closed. Thus, we only need to show that it is bilinear. It is a direct computation using Theorem 6.3-(1) that the bilinearity holds when we

restrict the domain to \mathcal{C}_p . The general case then follows by taking approximating sequences of continuous functions. \square

For the rest of the subsection, we discuss a more general version of the contractivity introduced by Kajino and the third author, which is arguably the strongest form of contraction for p -energy forms. See [27] for further motivation of this notion.

We say that the p -energy form \mathcal{E}_p satisfies the *generalized p -contraction property* if the following implication always holds. Suppose $k, l \in \mathbb{N}$ and $q \in (0, p]$, $r \in [p, \infty]$, and let $T := (T_1, \dots, T_l) : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^l$ be a function satisfying

$$(6.28) \quad \|T(x) - T(y)\|_{\ell^r} \leq \|x - y\|_{\ell^q} \quad \text{for any } x, y \in \mathbb{R}^k.$$

Then we have

$$(6.29) \quad \left\| \left(\mathcal{E}_p(T_j(f_1, \dots, f_k))^{\frac{1}{p}} \right)_{j=1}^l \right\|_{\ell^r} \leq \left\| \left(\mathcal{E}_p(f_i)^{\frac{1}{p}} \right)_{i=1}^k \right\|_{\ell^q}.$$

We remark that the original definition in [27, Definition 2.2] includes the condition $T_j(0, \dots, 0) = 0$ for all $j = 1, \dots, l$. This is required to ensure that $T_j(f_1, \dots, f_k) \in L^p(X, \mu)$ whenever $f_1, \dots, f_k \in L^p(X, \mu)$. When the measure is finite and $\mathcal{E}_p(f) = \mathcal{E}_p(f + c1_X)$ for all constants $c \in \mathbb{R}$, in particular for the setting of this paper, this condition can be removed. This is because we can replace T_j by $T_j - T_j(0, \dots, 0)$. In particular, if \mathcal{E}_p satisfies the generalized p -contraction property, then $T_j(f_1, \dots, f_k) \in \mathcal{F}_p$ for all $f_1, \dots, f_k \in \mathcal{F}_p$. Moreover, the Lipschitz contraction property would follow by taking $k = l = 1$, $q = r = p$ and $T := \varphi$.

Theorem 6.30. *\mathcal{E}_p satisfies the generalized p -contraction property.*

Proof. We use the proof of the Lipschitz contractivity (Theorem 6.3-(5)) as the general guideline. It may be helpful for the reader to recall it first.

We begin by remarking that the generalized p -contraction property is satisfied by the discrete graph energy \mathcal{E}_p , i.e., for any $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, $T := (T_1, \dots, T_l) : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^l$ satisfying (6.28) and $g_1, \dots, g_k : V_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\left\| \left(\mathcal{E}_p(T_j(g_1, \dots, g_k))^{\frac{1}{p}} \right)_{j=1}^l \right\|_{\ell^r} \leq \left\| \left(\mathcal{E}_p(g_i)^{\frac{1}{p}} \right)_{i=1}^k \right\|_{\ell^q}.$$

See [27, Example 6.3-(3)]. We use this fact to prove the generalized p -contraction property, first for the case where each $f_1, \dots, f_k \in \mathcal{F}_p$ is continuous, and extend it to the general case by taking approximating sequences of continuous functions.

Let $f_1, \dots, f_k \in \mathcal{F}_p$ be continuous and consider the approximating sequences of continuous functions $\Psi_{p,n}[f_i]$. It follows from the estimate [27, (2.20)] that

$$T_j(\Psi_{p,n}[f_1], \dots, \Psi_{p,n}[f_k]) \rightarrow T_j(f_1, \dots, f_k) \text{ in } L^p(X, \mu).$$

By using a similar argument as in the proof of Lemma 6.24, whenever $m \geq n$ and $j = 1, \dots, l$, we have the equality of functions on V_m , which reads

$$V_m[T_j(\Psi_{p,n}[f_1], \dots, \Psi_{p,n}[f_k])] = T_j(V_m[\Psi_{p,n}[f_1]], \dots, V_m[\Psi_{p,n}[f_k]]).$$

(In fact, it is direct to show that this convergence is uniform, cf. Proposition 5.12.) Now, by following the steps in (6.26), we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \left(\mathcal{E}_p(T_j(f_1, \dots, f_k))^{\frac{1}{p}} \right)_{j=1}^l \right\|_{\ell^r} \\
& \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \left(\mathcal{E}_p(T_j(\Psi_{p,n}[f_1], \dots, \Psi_{p,n}[f_k]))^{\frac{1}{p}} \right)_{j=1}^l \right\|_{\ell^r} \\
& = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \left((\mathcal{M}_p^{-m} \mathcal{E}_p(V_m[T_j(\Psi_{p,n}[f_1], \dots, \Psi_{p,n}[f_k]))])^{\frac{1}{p}} \right)_{j=1}^l \right\|_{\ell^r} \\
& = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \left((\mathcal{M}_p^{-m} \mathcal{E}_p(T_j(V_m[\Psi_{p,n}[f_1]], \dots, V_m[\Psi_{p,n}[f_k]])))^{\frac{1}{p}} \right)_{j=1}^l \right\|_{\ell^r} \\
& \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \left((\mathcal{M}_p^{-m} \mathcal{E}_p(V_m[\Psi_{p,n}[f_i]]))^{\frac{1}{p}} \right)_{i=1}^k \right\|_{\ell^q} \\
& = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \left(\mathcal{E}_p(\Psi_{p,n}[f_i])^{\frac{1}{p}} \right)_{i=1}^k \right\|_{\ell^q} \\
& = \left\| \left(\mathcal{E}_p(f_i)^{\frac{1}{p}} \right)_{i=1}^k \right\|_{\ell^q}.
\end{aligned}$$

The case for general Sobolev functions $f_1, \dots, f_k \in \mathcal{F}_p$ is derived by following the computation in (6.27). \square

6.4. Extending operators. Here, we discuss the extension of the discretization operators $V_n[\cdot]$ and the mollifiers $\Psi_{p,n}[\cdot]$ to general Sobolev functions.

For all $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, we equip the space \mathbb{R}^{V_n} with the complete norm

$$\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{E}_p} := |E_1|^{-\frac{n}{p}} \|\cdot\|_{\ell^p} + (\mathcal{M}_p)^{-\frac{n}{p}} \mathcal{E}_p(\cdot)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

We prove that operators $V_n[\cdot]$ and $\mathcal{U}_{p,n}[\cdot]$ are uniformly bounded with respect to $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{E}_p}$ and the Sobolev norm.

Lemma 6.31. *There is a constant $C \geq 1$ so that for all $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, $f \in \mathcal{C}_p$ and $g \in \mathbb{R}^{V_n}$ we have*

$$(6.32) \quad \|V_n[f]\|_{\mathcal{E}_p} \leq C \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}_p} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\mathcal{U}_{p,n}[g]\|_{\mathcal{F}_p} \leq C \|g\|_{\mathcal{E}_p}.$$

In particular, the linear operator $\Psi_{p,n}[\cdot]|_{\mathcal{C}_p} = (\mathcal{U}_{p,n}[\cdot] \circ V_n[\cdot])|_{\mathcal{C}_p} : \mathcal{C}_p \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_p$ satisfies

$$(6.33) \quad \|\Psi_{p,n}[f]\|_{\mathcal{F}_p} \leq C^2 \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}_p}.$$

Proof. First, we derive the estimate for $\|V_n[f]\|_{\ell^p}$. It follows from Theorem 6.10 that $\mathcal{M}_p^{-n} \mathcal{E}_p(V_n[f]) \leq \mathcal{E}_p(f)$. The ℓ^p -norm of $V_n[f]$ can be estimated by using the Poincaré inequality (6.14) and Proposition 3.42-(1),

$$\begin{aligned}
\|V_n[f]\|_{\ell^p} &= \left(\sum_{v \in V_n} |V_n[f](v)|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq \left(\sum_{v \in V_n} |V_n[f](v) - f_{X_v}|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} + \left(\sum_{v \in V_n} |f_{X_v}|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\
&\lesssim (\mathcal{M}_p)^{\frac{n}{p}} \mathcal{E}_p(f)^{\frac{1}{p}} + |E_1|^{\frac{n}{p}} \|f\|_{L^p}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathcal{M}_p < |E_1|$ by Lemma 4.12-(3), we have

$$\|V_n[f]\|_{\mathcal{E}_p} \lesssim \left(\frac{\mathcal{M}_p^n}{|E_1|^n} \mathcal{E}_p(f) \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} + \mathcal{E}_p(f)^{\frac{1}{p}} + \|f\|_{L^p} \lesssim \|f\|_{\mathcal{F}_p}.$$

We move on to estimating $\|\mathcal{U}_{p,n}[g]\|_{\mathcal{F}_p}$. It follows from Lemma 5.11-(1) that $\mathcal{E}_p(\mathcal{U}_{p,n}[g]) = \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} \mathcal{E}_p(g)$. Using Lemma 5.11-(2) we estimate

$$\left(\int_X |\mathcal{U}_{p,n}[g]|^p d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq \sum_{e \in E_n} \left(\int_{X_e} |g(e^+)|^p + |g(e^-)|^p d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \lesssim |E_1|^{-\frac{n}{p}} \|g\|_{\mathcal{E}_p}.$$

□

Remark 6.34. According to Lemma 6.31, the linear operators $V_n[\cdot]|_{\mathcal{C}_p}$ and $\Psi_{p,n}[\cdot]|_{\mathcal{C}_p}$ are bounded. Since the Sobolev space \mathcal{F}_p is a Banach space and $\mathcal{C}_p \subseteq \mathcal{F}_p$ is dense, these operators have unique extensions to bounded linear operators that act on the Sobolev space \mathcal{F}_p . Furthermore, these operators are *uniformly bounded*, i.e., their operator norms are bounded by a constant independent of $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Hereafter, we denote the extensions simply by $V_n[\cdot]$ and $\Psi_{p,n}[\cdot]$.

Theorem 6.35. *Let $V_n[\cdot]$ and $\Psi_{p,n}[\cdot]$ be the extended linear operators as discussed in Remark 6.34. For all $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ it holds that $\Psi_{p,n}[\cdot] = \mathcal{U}_{p,n}[\cdot] \circ V_n[\cdot]$. Moreover, for all $f \in \mathcal{F}_p$ we have*

$$(6.36) \quad \Psi_{p,n}[f] \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} f \text{ in } \mathcal{F}_p.$$

Proof. Since $\Psi_{p,n}[f] = \mathcal{U}_{p,n}[f] \circ V_n[f]$ holds for all functions in the core $f \in \mathcal{C}_p$, this equality extends to arbitrary Sobolev function $f \in \mathcal{F}_p$ by the density of $\mathcal{C}_p \subseteq \mathcal{F}_p$ and Lemma 6.31.

We first derive (6.36) for the functions in the core $f \in \mathcal{C}_p$. By (1) and (4) of Proposition 5.12 we have

$$\mathcal{E}_p(\Psi_{p,n}[f]) = \mathcal{E}_p^{(n)}(f) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_p(f) \quad \text{and} \quad \Psi_{p,n}[f] \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} f \text{ in } L^p(X, \mu).$$

It now follows from Lemma 6.25 that (6.36) holds for all functions in the core $f \in \mathcal{C}_p$. The general case follows from the density $\mathcal{C}_p \subseteq \mathcal{F}_p$, and the fact that the operators $\Psi_{p,n}[\cdot]$ for $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ are bounded by a constant independent of n . □

According to Theorem 6.35, mollifiers provide a systematic approach for studying Sobolev functions through more tractable approximations. This technique is one of the key ingredients in the study of energy measures in Subsection 6.5 and later in Section 8.

Nevertheless, mollifiers have one major disadvantage; they provide hardly any information about general continuous functions, let alone general L^p -functions. This is the primary source for the ambiguity that we address here. In Section 5, the operators $V_n[\cdot], \Psi_{p,n}[\cdot]$ were initially defined to act on the continuous functions. On the other hand, in this subsection, we defined the corresponding operators by extending them from \mathcal{C}_p to \mathcal{F}_p . Therefore, at this point, it is not clear whether these two definitions agree on the intersection $C(X) \cap \mathcal{F}_p$.

Fortunately, the answer is positive. The objective of the rest of the subsection is to clarify that $C(X) \cap \mathcal{F}_p = \mathcal{C}_p$. Our approach for proving it involves the following variant of mollifiers that works for general $L^p(X, \mu)$ functions.

Definition 6.37. For $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, let $M_n[\cdot] : L^p(X, \mu) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{V_n}$ be the linear operator

$$M_n[f](v) := \int_{X_v} f d\mu \text{ for all } v \in V_n.$$

Additionally, we define the linear operator $\Xi_{p,n}[\cdot] : L^p(X, \mu) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_p$ given by the composition $\mathcal{U}_{p,n}[\cdot] \circ M_n[\cdot]$.

Lemma 6.38. *The following conditions hold for the operators $M_n[\cdot]$ and $\Xi_{p,n}[\cdot]$.*

- (1) *The restrictions of $M_n[\cdot]$ and $\Xi_{p,n}[\cdot]$ for $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ to the Sobolev space \mathcal{F}_p are uniformly bounded with respect to the norms $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{E}_p}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{F}_p}$.*
- (2) *For all $f \in L^p(X, \mu)$ it holds that $\Xi_{p,n}[f] \rightarrow f$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in $L^p(X, \mu)$. If additionally $f \in C(X)$, then $\Xi_{p,n}[f] \rightarrow f$ uniformly.*

Proof. (1): This follows from an identical argument as in Lemma 6.31 or the proof of Theorem 7.16.

(2): Recall from Proposition 3.42-(1) that $\text{diam}(X_v) \leq 2L_*^{-n}$. It is now routine to check that for all continuous functions $f \in C(X)$ we have $\Xi_{p,n}[f] \rightarrow f$ uniformly using Lemma 5.11-(2) and the uniform continuity of f . Then assume $f \in L^p(X, \mu)$. By noting that the linear operators $\Xi_{p,n}[\cdot] : L^p(X, \mu) \rightarrow L^p(X, \mu)$ are uniformly bounded, the desired convergence $\Xi_{p,n}[f] \rightarrow f$ follows by taking approximating sequences of continuous functions. \square

Corollary 6.39. *It holds that $\mathcal{C}_p = C(X) \cap \mathcal{F}_p$. In particular, the equality $\mathcal{E}_p(f) = \mathcal{E}_p(f)$ holds for all continuous functions $f \in C(X)$. Furthermore, we have*

$$(6.40) \quad C(X) \cap \mathcal{F}_p = \{f \in C(X) : f \circ F_e \in \mathcal{F}_p \text{ for all } e \in E_1\}.$$

Proof. It is clear from the construction that $\mathcal{C}_p \subseteq C(X) \cap \mathcal{F}_p$. Fix an arbitrary continuous Sobolev function $f \in C(X) \cap \mathcal{F}_p$, and consider the two types of discretization operators, the extended discretization operators from Theorem 6.35 and the averaging operators given in Definition 5.1. For clearness, the former is denoted $\tilde{V}_n[\cdot] : \mathcal{F}_p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{V_n}$ and the latter $V_n[\cdot] : C(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{V_n}$.

We will show that $V_n[f] = \tilde{V}_n[f]$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. It would then follow from (6.36) and Lemma 5.11-(1) that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_p(f) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} \mathcal{E}_p(V_n[f]) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} \mathcal{E}_p(\tilde{V}_n[f]) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_p(\Psi_{p,n}[f]) = \mathcal{E}_p(f) < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

By the definition of \mathcal{C}_p given in (6.2), we would have $f \in \mathcal{C}_p$.

In order to verify the desired equality $V_n[f] = \tilde{V}_n[f]$, we consider the mollifiers $\Xi_{p,n}[\cdot]$ given in Definition 6.37. Since $\Xi_{p,n}[f] \rightarrow f$ uniformly by Lemma 6.38-(2), it follows directly from the definition of $V_n[\cdot]$ that $V_n[\Xi_{p,m}[f]] \rightarrow V_n[f]$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$. Using the fact that $\Xi_{p,m}[f] \in \mathcal{C}_p$, we get

$$(6.41) \quad \tilde{V}_n[\Xi_{p,m}[f]] = V_n[\Xi_{p,m}[f]].$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 6.38-(1), the sequence $\{\Xi_{p,m}[f]\}_{m=0}^\infty$ is bounded in \mathcal{F}_p . Since \mathcal{F}_p is reflexive by Theorem 6.3-(2), it follows from Mazur's lemma (see [17, Page 19 and Theorem 2.41]) that there is a convergent sequence of convex combinations,

$$\sum_{j=m}^{N_m} \lambda_{j,m} \Xi_{p,m}[f] \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} f \text{ in } \mathcal{F}_p.$$

By using (6.41), the linearity and continuity of $\tilde{V}_n[\cdot]$, and the fact that $V_n[\Xi_{p,m}[f]] \rightarrow V_n[f]$, we get

$$\tilde{V}_n[f] = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=m}^{N_m} \lambda_{j,n} V_n[\Xi_{p,m}[f]] = V_n[f].$$

Thus, we conclude that $f \in \mathcal{C}_p$.

It is now clear from Theorem 6.3-(1) that the equality $\mathcal{E}_p(f) = \mathbf{E}_p(f)$ holds for all $f \in C(X)$. Indeed, for $f \in C(X) \setminus \mathcal{C}_p$, both values read ∞ . Thus, (6.40) now follows from Lemma 6.11. \square

6.5. Construction of energy measures. In this subsection, we construct natural p -energy measures associated to the p -energy form \mathcal{E}_p , whose role is to be the counterparts of the measures $A \mapsto \int_A |\nabla f|^p dx$.

For any Sobolev function $f \in \mathcal{F}_p$ we define its *pre-energy measure* as the Radon measure $\mathbf{m}_p\langle f \rangle$ on the symbol space Σ given by the conditions

$$\mathbf{m}_p\langle f \rangle(\Sigma_e) := \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} \mathcal{E}_p(f \circ F_e) \text{ for all } e \in E_n.$$

As it was discussed in Definition 3.30, these conditions uniquely determine a Radon measure on Σ by Theorem 6.3-(4) and Kolmogorov's extension theorem. The *p -energy measure of f* is then defined as the push-forward measure $\Gamma_p\langle f \rangle := \chi_*(\mathbf{m}_p\langle f \rangle)$.

In the following two lemmas, we collect fundamental properties of the p -energy measures. See [27, Subsections 5.2 and 5.3] for further details on these measures.

Lemma 6.42. *The p -energy measures satisfy the following properties.*

(1) *For every $f \in \mathcal{F}_p$ we have $\Gamma_p\langle f \rangle(X) = \mathcal{E}_p(f)$.*

(2) *For any Borel set $A \subseteq X$ and $f, g \in \mathcal{F}_p$ we have*

$$\Gamma_p\langle f + g \rangle(A)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq \Gamma_p\langle f \rangle(A)^{\frac{1}{p}} + \Gamma_p\langle g \rangle(A)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

(3) *Let $A \subseteq X$ be a Borel set and $f, g \in \mathcal{F}_p \cap C(X)$. If $(f - g)|_A$ is a constant function on A , then $\Gamma_p\langle f \rangle(A) = \Gamma_p\langle g \rangle(A)$.*

Proof. (1): This follows from $\Gamma_p\langle f \rangle(X) = \mathbf{m}_p\langle f \rangle(\Sigma) = \mathcal{E}_p(f)$.

(2): The triangle inequality follows from [27, Propositions 4.11 and 5.10-(a)]. We also sketch a quick argument here. It is immediate from the fact that $\mathcal{E}_p(\cdot)^{\frac{1}{p}}$ is a norm, that we have

$$(6.43) \quad \mathbf{m}_p\langle f + g \rangle(\Sigma_e)^{1/p} \leq \mathbf{m}_p\langle f \rangle(\Sigma_e)^{1/p} + \mathbf{m}_p\langle g \rangle(\Sigma_e)^{1/p} \text{ for all } e \in E_{\#}.$$

Since the sets Σ_e generate the topology of Σ , we have (6.43) for all Borel sets $B \subset \Sigma$. Applying this to the Borel set $B = \chi^{-1}(A)$ yields the claim.

(3): This property, which is sometimes called strong locality of self-similar energy measures, follows from [27, Corollary 5.15-(b)], Theorems 6.3-(2) and 6.4. For the convenience of the reader, we also sketch a short argument.

By (2) of the current lemma, it suffices to consider the case $g = 0$. If A is open, then for all $e \in E_{\#}$ satisfying $X_e \subseteq A$ we have $f \circ F_e = 0$. Thus, we have $\mathbf{m}_p\langle f \rangle(\Sigma_e) = 0$. Therefore, for the open set $\Omega = \chi^{-1}(A)$ we get:

$$\Gamma_p\langle f \rangle(A) = \mathbf{m}_p\langle f \rangle(\Omega) \leq \sum_{e \in E_{\#}, \Sigma_e \subset \Omega} \mathbf{m}_p\langle f \rangle(\Sigma_e) = 0.$$

Now, if A is Borel, then $f = 0$ on \bar{A} . Consider the approximations

$$f_n := \max(f, n^{-1}) + \min(f, -n^{-1}).$$

Clearly $f_n \rightarrow f$ in $L^p(X, \mu)$. Since the map $t \mapsto \max\{t, c\} + \min\{t, -c\}$ is a contraction for all $c \in \mathbb{R}$, it follows from the Lipschitz contraction property of \mathcal{E}_p (Theorem 6.3-(5)) that $\mathcal{E}_p(f_n) \leq \mathcal{E}_p(f)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. These together with Clarkson's inequality and Lemma 6.25 implies that $f_n \rightarrow f$ in \mathcal{F}_p . Thus, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Gamma_p \langle f_n \rangle (A) = \Gamma_p \langle f \rangle (A)$ by (2) of the current lemma (see also Lemma 6.44 below). But $\Gamma_p \langle f_n \rangle (A) = 0$, since $f_n = 0$ in a neighborhood of A . \square

Lemma 6.44. *Let $f \in \mathcal{F}_p$ and $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ be any sequence of Sobolev functions so that $f_i \rightarrow f$ in \mathcal{F}_p . Then*

$$\Gamma_p \langle f_i \rangle (A) \xrightarrow{i \rightarrow \infty} \Gamma_p \langle f \rangle (A) \text{ for all Borel sets } A \subseteq X.$$

In particular, if ν is a Borel measure of X so that $\Gamma_p \langle f_i \rangle \ll \nu$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $\Gamma_p \langle f \rangle \ll \nu$.

Proof. Let $A \subseteq X$ be a Borel set. Then it follows from (1)-(2) of Lemma 6.42 that

$$\left| \Gamma_p \langle f \rangle (A)^{\frac{1}{p}} - \Gamma_p \langle f_n \rangle (A)^{\frac{1}{p}} \right| \leq \Gamma_p \langle f - f_n \rangle (A)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq \mathcal{E}_p(f - f_n)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Since $\mathcal{E}_p(f - f_n) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we are done. \square

Since $\mathcal{U}_{p,-} = 1 - \mathcal{U}_{p,+}$, it holds that the measures $\mathfrak{m}_p \langle \mathcal{U}_{p,\pm} \rangle$ and $\Gamma_p \langle \mathcal{U}_{p,\pm} \rangle$ do not depend on the choice of the sign. Thus, for simplicity, we simplify the notation by writing $\mathfrak{m}_p \langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle := \mathfrak{m}_p \langle \mathcal{U}_{p,\pm} \rangle$ and $\Gamma_p \langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle := \Gamma_p \langle \mathcal{U}_{p,\pm} \rangle$. We also write $\mathcal{U}_p := \mathcal{U}_{p,\pm}$ if the sign has no role in the computation.

The next goal is to give a transparent description of energy measures. We first verify the following self-similarity property of the optimal potentials.

Lemma 6.45. *For all $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and $e \in E_n$*

$$(6.46) \quad \mathcal{U}_{p,\pm} \circ F_e = U_{p,\pm,n}(e^-) + (U_{p,\pm,n}(e^+) - U_{p,\pm,n}(e^-))\mathcal{U}_{p,+}.$$

Proof. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $v \in V_m$ be any vertex and $x \in \text{Fib}(v)$. It follows from the definition of $\mathcal{U}_{p,\pm}$, (5.6), and Theorem 4.13 that

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{U}_{p,\pm} \circ F_e)|_{\text{Fib}(v)} &= \mathcal{U}_{p,\pm}|_{\text{Fib}(e \cdot v)} = U_{p,\pm,n+m}(e \cdot v) \\ &= U_{p,\pm,n}(e^-) + (U_{p,\pm,n}(e^+) - U_{p,\pm,n}(e^-))U_{p,+}(v) \\ &= U_{p,\pm,n}(e^-) + (U_{p,\pm,n}(e^+) - U_{p,\pm,n}(e^-))\mathcal{U}_{p,+}|_{\text{Fib}(v)}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the equality of functions (6.46) holds on the dense subset $\text{Fib}(X)$. The equality on the whole space follows from the continuity of optimal potential functions. \square

Recall the definition of Bernoulli measures from Definition 3.30.

Proposition 6.47. *The measure $\mathfrak{m}_p \langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle$ is a Bernoulli measure given by the weights*

$$(6.48) \quad \mathfrak{m}_p \langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle (\Sigma_e) = |\nabla U_p(e)| |\mathcal{J}_p(e)| = \mathcal{M}_p^{-1} |\nabla U_p(e)|^p \text{ for all } e \in E_1.$$

Furthermore, if $f := \mathcal{U}_{p,n}[g]$ for $g : V_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, then the pre-energy measure $\mathfrak{m}_p \langle f \rangle$ satisfies

$$(6.49) \quad \mathfrak{m}_p \langle f \rangle \upharpoonright_{\Sigma_e} = \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} |\nabla g(e)|^p \cdot (\sigma_e)_* (\mathfrak{m}_p \langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle) \text{ for all } e \in E_n.$$

Proof. It follows from Proposition 5.7-(4) and Lemma 6.42-(1) that $\mathbf{m}_p\langle\mathcal{U}_p\rangle$ is a probability measure. For $e \in E_n$ we compute using Lemma 6.45 that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{m}_p\langle\mathcal{U}_p\rangle(\Sigma_e) &= \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} \mathcal{E}_p(\mathcal{U}_p \circ F_e) = \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} |\nabla U_{p,n}(e)|^p \mathcal{E}_p(\mathcal{U}_p) \\ &= \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} |\nabla U_{p,n}(e)|^p = |\nabla U_{p,n}(e)| |\mathcal{J}_{p,n}(e)|.\end{aligned}$$

The last equality follows from the duality relation (2.11). Thus, it follows from Corollary 4.17 that $\mathbf{m}_p\langle\mathcal{U}_p\rangle$ is the Bernoulli measure with weights (6.48).

We move on to (6.49). Let $e \in E_n$ and $e' \in E_m$. From (5.10) we see that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{m}_p\langle f\rangle(\Sigma_{e,e'}) &= \mathcal{M}_p^{-(n+m)} \mathcal{E}_p(f \circ F_{e,e'}) \\ &= \mathcal{M}_p^{-(n+m)} \mathcal{E}_p(f \circ F_e \circ F_{e'}) \\ &= \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} |\nabla g(e)|^p \mathcal{M}_p^{-m} \mathcal{E}_p(\mathcal{U}_p \circ F_{e'}) \\ &= \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} |\nabla g(e)|^p (\sigma_e)_* (\mathbf{m}_p\langle\mathcal{U}_p\rangle)(\Sigma_{e,e'})\end{aligned}$$

Since the sets $\Sigma_{e,e'}$ generate the topology of Σ_e , the equality of measures (6.49) follows. \square

Measures on self-similar sets that are obtained as push-forwards of Bernoulli measures are typically called *self-similar measures*. According to Proposition 6.47, the p -energy measure of the optimal potential function $\Gamma_p\langle\mathcal{U}_p\rangle = \chi_*(\mathbf{m}_p\langle\mathcal{U}_p\rangle)$ is, by definition, a self-similar measure. Such behavior of energy measures does not hold in broader context of self-similar fractals. See Remark 8.18 for further discussions.

We would like to replace the pre-energy measures with the energy measures in Proposition 6.47. To do this, we need to verify that the intersection of distinct self-similar pieces are null-sets with respect to all energy measures.

Proposition 6.50. *For all $f \in \mathcal{F}_p$ and $v \in V_\#$ we have $\Gamma_p\langle f\rangle(\text{Fib}(v)) = 0$. In particular, it holds that*

$$\Gamma_p\langle f\rangle(X_e \cap X_{e'}) = 0 \text{ for all distinct edges } e, e' \in E_n \text{ and } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Proof. By Lemma 6.44 it is sufficient to verify $\Gamma_p\langle f\rangle(\text{Fib}(v)) = 0$ for a dense subset of Sobolev functions. Indeed if $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ is a sequence of Sobolev functions in \mathcal{F}_p so that $f_n \rightarrow f$ in \mathcal{F}_p , then we can take

$$\nu := \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i \Gamma_p\langle f_i\rangle,$$

where $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ is any sequence of positive numbers so that $\nu(X) < \infty$. Thus, by Theorem 6.35, it is sufficient to verify the case $f = \mathcal{U}_{p,n}[g]$ for any $g : V_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. Moreover, it is sufficient to verify the case $f = \mathcal{U}_p$ and $v = v_\pm$ due to Lemma 6.45 and (6.49). For simplicity we assume $v = v_+$.

Following these reductions, note that

$$\chi^{-1}(\text{Fib}(v_+)) \subseteq \bigcup_{a \in I^k} \Sigma_{\epsilon(v_+ \cdot a)} \text{ for all } k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

For any $a \in I^k$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{m}_p\langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle(\Sigma_{\mathfrak{e}(v_+ \cdot a)}) &= \mathfrak{m}_p\langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle(\Sigma_{\mathfrak{e}(v_+ \cdot a)}) \sum_{e \in E_1} \mathfrak{m}_p\langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle(\Sigma_e) \\
&\geq \mathfrak{m}_p\langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle(\Sigma_{\mathfrak{e}(v_+ \cdot a)}) \sum_{b \in I} (\mathfrak{m}_p\langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle(\Sigma_{\mathfrak{e}(\phi_+(b))}) + \mathfrak{m}_p\langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle(\Sigma_{\mathfrak{e}(\phi_-(b))})) \\
&= 2\mathfrak{m}_p\langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle(\Sigma_{\mathfrak{e}(v_+ \cdot a)}) \sum_{b \in I} \mathfrak{m}_p\langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle(\Sigma_{\mathfrak{e}(\phi_+(b))}) \\
&= 2 \sum_{b \in I} \mathfrak{m}_p\langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle(\Sigma_{\mathfrak{e}(v_+ \cdot (a \cdot b))}).
\end{aligned}$$

The third row follows from the conductive uniform property and the last row from the fact that $\mathfrak{m}_p\langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle$ is a Bernoulli measure. By iterating the previous estimate, we have

$$\Gamma_p\langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle(\text{Fib}(v_+)) \leq \sum_{a \in I^k} \mathfrak{m}_p\langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle(\Sigma_{\mathfrak{e}(v_+ \cdot a)}) \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{a \in I^{k-1}} \mathfrak{m}_p\langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle(\Sigma_{\mathfrak{e}(v_- \cdot a)}) \leq \cdots \leq \frac{1}{2^k}.$$

Thus, $\Gamma_p\langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle(\text{Fib}(v_+)) = 0$ follows by letting $k \rightarrow \infty$. \square

Theorem 6.51. *For all $f \in \mathcal{F}_p$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have*

$$\Gamma_p\langle f \rangle(X_e) = \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} \mathcal{E}_p(f \circ F_e) \text{ for all } e \in E_n.$$

In particular, the energy measure of the optimal potential function satisfy

$$(6.52) \quad \Gamma_p\langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle(X_e) = |\nabla U_{p,n}(e)| |\mathcal{J}_{p,n}(e)| = \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} |\nabla U_{p,n}(e)|^p \text{ for all } e \in E_n.$$

The energy measure of the Sobolev function $f := \mathcal{U}_{p,n}[g]$ where $g : V_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfies

$$(6.53) \quad \Gamma_p\langle f \rangle \lfloor_{X_e} = \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} |\nabla g(e)|^p \cdot (F_e)_*(\Gamma_p\langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle) \text{ for all } e \in E_n.$$

Proof. This directly follows from Propositions 6.47 and 6.50. \square

7. COMPARISONS OF OTHER CONSTRUCTIONS OF p -ENERGIES WITH \mathcal{E}_p

In this section, we compare the p -energy form \mathcal{E}_p constructed in Section 6 to a few other frequently considered p -energies. Throughout the section, (X, d, μ) is the limit space of an IGS satisfying Assumption 3.3.

7.1. Equivalence with Korevaar-Schoen. We first verify that \mathcal{E}_p is always equivalent to the *Korevaar-Schoen* p -energy, where the L^p Besov critical exponent (See [7, Definition 4.1]) is equal to $\alpha_p := d_{w,p}/p$. The precise statement is given in Theorem 1.18. We start with the general Poincaré inequality with respect to the energy measures and the capacity upper bound estimate over annuli.

Proposition 7.1. *There exist constants $A, C \geq 1$ so that for every Sobolev function $f \in \mathcal{F}_p$ and any ball $B := B(x, r) \subseteq X$ with radius $r \in (0, \infty)$ we have*

$$(7.2) \quad \int_B |f - f_B|^p d\mu \leq Cr^{d_{w,p}} \Gamma_p\langle f \rangle(B(x, Ar)).$$

Proof. We assume that $r < \frac{1}{4}L_*^{-1}$. Otherwise, the claim easily follows from Theorem 6.4(1) by making the constant A so large that $B(x, Ar) = X$.

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be so that $\frac{1}{4}L_*^{-(n+1)} \leq r < \frac{1}{4}L_*^{-n}$. By choosing $A := 8L_*$, by Proposition 3.42-(2), we can choose a vertex $v \in V_n$ satisfying $B \subseteq X_v \subseteq B(x, Ar)$. We can now estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_B |f - f_B|^p d\mu &\lesssim \int_B |f - f_{X_v}|^p d\mu && \text{(Equation (6.22))} \\
&\lesssim \int_{X_v} |f - f_{X_v}|^p d\mu && \text{(Ahlfors regularity of } \mu) \\
&\lesssim \mathcal{M}_p^n \sum_{\substack{e \in E_n \\ v \in e}} \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} \mathcal{E}_p(f \circ F_e) && \text{(Poincaré IE (6.6))} \\
&= (L_*^{-n})^{d_{w,p}-Q} \Gamma_p \langle f \rangle (X_v) && \text{(Proposition 6.50)} \\
&\lesssim r^{d_{w,p}-Q} \Gamma_p \langle f \rangle (B(x, Ar)).
\end{aligned}$$

The desired inequality (7.2) follows by using the Ahlfors regularity of μ ,

$$\int_B |f - f_B|^p d\mu \lesssim r^Q \int_B |f - f_B|^p d\mu \lesssim r^{d_{w,p}} \Gamma_p \langle f \rangle (B(x, Ar)).$$

□

Proposition 7.3. *There exist constants $A, C > 1$ so that for every ball $B(x, r) \subseteq X$ with $r \in (0, \infty)$ there is a continuous Sobolev function $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_p$ satisfying*

$$(7.4) \quad \varphi|_{B(x,r)} \equiv 1, \text{ supp}[\varphi] \subseteq B(x, Ar) \text{ and } \mathcal{E}_p(\varphi) \leq C \frac{\mu(B(x, r))}{r^{d_{w,p}}}.$$

Proof. We may assume that $r < \frac{1}{4}L_*^{-1}$. Otherwise, we could choose the constant A so that $B(x, Ar) = X$ and $\varphi \equiv 1$.

Thus, let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be so that $\frac{1}{4}L_*^{-(n+1)} \leq r < \frac{1}{4}L_*^{-n}$. Now it follows from Proposition 3.42-(2) that there is a vertex $v \in V_n$ so that $B \subseteq X_v$. We will prove that the Sobolev function $\varphi := \mathcal{U}_{p,n}[1_N] \in \mathcal{C}_p$, where $1_N : V_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the characteristic function of the set

$$N := \{w \in V_n : d_{G_n}(v, w) \leq 1\},$$

satisfies (7.4).

It is clear that $\varphi|_{X_v} \equiv 1$. According to Proposition 3.42-(1), we have

$$\text{supp}[\varphi] \subseteq \bigcup_{w \in N} X_w \subseteq B(x, 4L_*^{-n}) \subseteq B(x, 16L_*r).$$

Thus, we may choose $A := 16L_*$, and what is left is to verify the energy estimate. Consider the cut-set of edges $C_N := \{\{w, w'\} : w \in N \text{ and } w' \notin N\}$, which clearly satisfies $|C_N| \leq C_{\text{deg}}^2$. It follows from (5.10) that φ is constant on each set X_e for $e \in E_n \setminus C_N$. Thus, we compute

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}_p(\varphi) &= \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} \sum_{e \in E_n} \mathcal{E}_p(\varphi \circ F_e) = \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} \sum_{e \in C_N} \mathcal{E}_p(\varphi \circ F_e) \\
&= \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} \sum_{e \in C_N} \mathcal{E}_p(\mathcal{U}_p) = |C_N| \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} \\
&\lesssim r^{Q-d_{w,p}} \lesssim \frac{\mu(B(x, r))}{r^{d_{w,p}}}.
\end{aligned}$$

In the last row we used Q -Ahlfors regularity of μ (Proposition 3.42-(3)).

□

Proof of Theorem 1.18. The theorem is implied by [49, Corollaries 1.14 and 1.15] since therein assumptions follow from Propositions 3.42, 7.1, 7.3, Theorems 6.3 and 6.4 and Lemma 6.42. For the convenience of the reader, we also sketch a short argument. For any $x \in X$, $r \in (0, \infty)$ and $f \in L^p(X, \mu)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B(x,r)} \int_{B(y,r)} \frac{|f(y) - f(z)|^p}{r^{d_{w,p}}} \mu(dz) \mu(dy) \\ \lesssim & \int_{B(x,2r)} \int_{B(x,2r)} \frac{|f(y) - f(z)|^p}{r^{d_{w,p}}} \mu(dz) \mu(dy) \quad (\text{Ahlfors regularity of } \mu) \\ \lesssim & \int_{B(x,2r)} \frac{|f(y) - f_{B(x,2r)}|^p}{r^{d_{w,p}}} \mu(dy) \\ \lesssim & \Gamma_p \langle f \rangle (B(x, 2Ar)) \quad (\text{Proposition 7.1}). \end{aligned}$$

(Here we put $\Gamma_p \langle f \rangle (B(x, 2Ar)) = \infty$ if $f \notin \mathcal{F}_p$.) Taking the summation over a suitable family of points x , we get the upper estimate in (1.19). To show the lower estimate in (1.19), for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $e \in E_n$, we estimate

$$|M_n[f](e^+) - M_n[f](e^-)|^p \lesssim |E_1|^n \int_{X_{e^+}} \int_{B(x, 4L_*^{-n})} |f(x) - f(y)|^p \mu(dy) \mu(dx).$$

Using this and (6.53), we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_p \langle \Xi_{p,n}[f] \rangle (X_e) & \leq \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} |M_n[f](e^+) - M_n[f](e^-)|^p \\ & \lesssim \int_{X_{e^+}} \int_{B(x, 4L_*^{-n})} \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|^p}{L_*^{-nd_{w,p}}} \mu(dy) \mu(dx). \end{aligned}$$

Taking the summation over $e \in E_n$, we have

$$(7.5) \quad \mathcal{E}_p(\Xi_{p,n}[f]) \lesssim \int_X \int_{B(x, 4L_*^{-n})} \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|^p}{L_*^{-nd_{w,p}}} \mu(dy) \mu(dx).$$

Now the desired lower estimate in (1.19) follows from an argument using (7.5), Lemma 6.38 and Lemma 6.25. \square

We also have the following version of the (p, p) -Poincaré inequality described in terms of Korevaar–Schoen p -energy forms.

Proposition 7.6. *There exist constants $A, C \geq 1$ so that for every Sobolev function $f \in \mathcal{F}_p$ and any ball $B := B(x, r) \subseteq X$ with radius $r \in (0, \infty)$ we have*

$$(7.7) \quad \int_B |f - f_B|^p d\mu \leq Cr^{d_{w,p}} \liminf_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \int_{B(x, Ar)} \int_{B(y, \varepsilon)} \frac{|f(y) - f(z)|^p}{\varepsilon^{d_{w,p}}} \mu(dz) \mu(dy).$$

Proof. This follows from Proposition 7.1 and [49, Theorem 3.12]. \square

7.2. Newton-Sobolev spaces. The next objective is to prove Theorem 1.24, which characterizes when the Sobolev space \mathcal{F}_p can be identified as the Newton-Sobolev space $N^{1,p}(X, d, \mu)$, in terms of the equality $d_{w,p} = p$. We remark that, in the statement of the theorem, we assume a slightly technical additional assumption that the limit space (X, d) is quasiconvex. This is used to construct a Lipschitz function with infinite \mathcal{E}_p -energy in the case $d_{w,p} > p$. It may be that this is not really needed, but for us this assumption is fairly harmless since the limit space (X, d) is quasiconvex under any of the three conditions in Theorem 4.9, which were

introduced as sufficient conditions for the conductive uniform property. In the following lemma we verify this in a slightly simplified setting. See Remark 7.11 for discussions on the more general case.

Lemma 7.8. *Assume that there is $a \in I$ and a path θ connecting $\phi_+(a)$ to $\phi_-(a)$ in G_1 of length $L_* = \text{dist}(I_+, I_-, d_{G_1})$. Then the limit space is quasiconvex.*

Proof. First, we show that

$$(7.9) \quad \text{dist}\left(I_+^{(n)}, I_-^{(n)}, d_{G_n}\right) \leq L_*^n$$

where $L_* = \text{dist}(I_+, I_-, d_{G_1})$. We argue by induction on n .

The case $n = 1$ is clear so we assume it holds for some m . Fix a path $\theta_m = [v_0, \dots, v_l]$ connecting $I_+^{(m)}$ to $I_-^{(m)}$ of length at most L_*^m , and denote $e_k := \{v_{k-1}, v_k\}$ for $k = 1, \dots, l$. By the gluing rules and the property of θ , the subset

$$(7.10) \quad \theta_{m+1} := \bigcup_{k=1}^l \sigma_{e_k, 1}(\theta) \subseteq V_{m+1}$$

is a set connecting $I_+^{(m+1)}$ to $I_-^{(m+1)}$. Moreover, it is a path of length at most L_*^{m+1} , which then shows $\text{dist}\left(I_+^{(m+1)}, I_-^{(m+1)}, d_{G_{m+1}}\right) \leq L_*^{m+1}$. This concludes the induction.

Next, we apply (7.9) to verify the quasiconvexity. Fix two distinct points $\chi((e_i)_{i=0}^\infty), \chi((e'_i)_{i=0}^\infty) \in X$ and let $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ be the smallest integer so that $e_n \cap e'_n \neq \emptyset$. For every $k \geq 0$, we fix vertices $v_{n+k} \in e_{n+k}$ and $w_{n+k} \in e'_{n+k}$. Using (7.9) and induction we have $d_{G_{n+k}}(v_{n+k}, w_{n+k}) \leq \sum_{m=0}^k 2C_{\text{diam}} L_*^{k-m} \leq 4C_{\text{diam}} L_*^k$. Thus, for every k , we can choose discrete sequence $x_{0, n+k}, \dots, x_{N_k, n+k}$ in X so that $x_{0, n+k} \in \text{Fib}(v_{n+k})$ and $x_{N_k, n+k} \in \text{Fib}(w_{n+k})$ and

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N_k-1} d(x_{i, n+k}, x_{i+1, n+k}) \leq 4C_{\text{diam}} L_*^{-n}.$$

By Arzela-Ascoli theorem, there is a path connecting $\chi((e_i)_{i=0}^\infty)$ to $\chi((e'_i)_{i=0}^\infty)$ with length at most $4C_{\text{diam}} L_*^{-n}$. Quasiconvexity now follows from the visual metric property (3.36). \square

Remark 7.11. It is clear that the assumption in Lemma 7.8 holds when the IGS satisfies (CUP-1). Furthermore, to verify that the limit space is quasiconvex, we only needed to show that the inequality (7.9) holds. This also holds when the IGS satisfies either of the two latter conditions in Theorem 4.9. We sketch the arguments here. First, assume that the symmetry condition (CUP-2) holds, and let θ be a path of length L_* connecting $\phi_+(a)$ to $\phi_-(b)$ for $a, b \in I$. If $a \neq b$, then the set given by (7.10) is not a path. To fix this, note that we can “reflect” θ by the symmetry to obtain a path θ' of length L_* connecting $\phi_+(b)$ to $\phi_-(a)$. The desired path in higher level graphs are now obtained by embedding both paths θ and θ' as in (7.10). If (CUP-3) holds, then for each $v \in I_+$ there is a path θ connecting v to I_- of length L_* . Using this, it is not hard to see that for every $v \in I_+^{(n)}$ there is a path θ of length L_*^n connecting v to $I_-^{(n)}$.

Now, we prove Theorem 1.24.

Proof of Theorem 1.24. Note that according to Lemma 4.12-(3), we always have $d_{w,p} \geq p$. Thanks to [17, Theorems 8.4.2 and 10.5.2] we know that if the L^p Besov critical exponent is equal to 1, which in our case means that $d_{w,p} = p$, then the Korevaar-Schoen-Sobolev space coincides with the Newton-Sobolev space with equivalent norms, as long as the following p -Poincaré inequality holds: There are constants $A, C \geq 1$ so that for all Lipschitz functions $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and balls $B(x, r) \subseteq X$ with $r > 0$ we have

$$(7.12) \quad \int_{B(x,r)} |f - f_{B(x,r)}| d\mu \leq Cr \left(\int_{B(x,Ar)} (\text{Lip } f)^p d\mu \right)^{1/p}.$$

Here $\text{Lip}(f)$ is the pointwise upper Lipschitz-constant function of f as defined in (1.26). Note that $\text{Lip } f < \infty$ since f is Lipschitz. Now if $d_{w,p} = p$, we obtain the desired p -Poincaré inequality (7.12) by combining (7.7) with the reverse Fatou lemma and Hölder's inequality.

Next assume $d_{w,p} > p$ and the quasiconvexity of (X, d) . To show $N^{1,p}(X, d, \mu) \neq \mathcal{F}_p$, it is sufficient to verify that there is a Lipschitz function $f \notin \mathcal{F}_p$. Fix any point $x_0 \in X$ and let $f(x)$ be the infimum of the lengths of all curves joining x and x_0 . Since X is quasiconvex, it follows from [17, Proposition 8.3.12] that f is Lipschitz. Moreover, f also satisfies

$$(\text{lip } f)(x) := \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \sup_{y \in B(x, \varepsilon)} \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|}{\varepsilon} \geq 1.$$

Hence, using (1.20), we conclude that $f \notin \mathcal{F}_p$. \square

Remark 7.13. The above proof in the case of $d_{w,p} = p$ relies only on (7.7) and the fact that (X, d, μ) is a complete metric space with doubling measure. The latter condition is needed to use [17, Theorem 8.4.2]. In particular, by [28, Proposition 5.28], we can conclude that the Sobolev space \mathcal{W}^p defined in Kigami's work [31] coincides with the Newton-Sobolev space $N^{1,p}$ when $d_{w,p} = p$. This gives a complete answer for the last question in [31, Problem 4 in p. 113] (β_p is used in [31] instead of $d_{w,p}$).

Remark 7.14. It is possible that \mathcal{F}_p contains Lipschitz functions even in the case $d_{w,p} > p$. For instance, it holds for the IGS-fractal in Figure 3.7 that \mathcal{U}_p is 1-Lipschitz. Indeed a direct computation shows that $|\nabla U_p| \leq L_*^{-1}$ and the rest follows from Proposition 5.7-(1).

7.3. Construction via partitions. Kusuoka and Zhou [35] introduced a construction of self-similar Dirichlet forms on self-similar sets including the Sierpiński carpet on the basis of subsequential scaling limits of discrete 2-energy forms. This construction on the Sierpiński carpet was recently extended for all $p \in (1, \infty)$ in [43, 50]. The most general construction of this type was introduced by Kigami in [31], which works for any compact metric space admitting a good *partition* [31, Definition 2.3 and Assumption 2.15] and satisfying the p -*conductive homogeneity* condition [31, Definition 3.4]. In our framework, the sequence of coverings $\{\{X_e\}_{e \in E_n}\}_{n=0}^\infty$ is a partition, and the Kusuoka-Zhou-type discrete p -energy of $f \in L^p(X, \mu)$,

$$(7.15) \quad \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_p^{(n)}(f) := \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} \sum_{\substack{e, e' \in E_n \\ e \cap e' \neq \emptyset}} |f_{X_e} - f_{X_{e'}}|^p.$$

The objective of this subsection is to verify that the Kusuoka-Zhou-type construction yields an equivalent p -energy to our p -energy form \mathcal{E}_p .

Theorem 7.16. *There is a constant $C \geq 1$ so that for every $f \in L^p(X, \mu)$ we have*

$$(7.17) \quad C^{-1} \mathcal{E}_p(f) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_p^{(n)}(f) \leq \sup_{n \geq 0} \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_p^{(n)}(f) \leq C \mathcal{E}_p(f).$$

In particular, for all $f \in L^p(X, \mu)$ it holds that

$$(7.18) \quad \sup_{n \geq 0} \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_p^{(n)}(f) \leq C^2 \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_p^{(n)}(f).$$

Proof. By Lemma 6.38-(2) $\Xi_{p,n}[f] \rightarrow f$ in $L^p(X, \mu)$. It then follows from the lower-semicontinuity of \mathcal{E}_p (Lemma 6.25) and Lemma 5.11-(1) that

$$\mathcal{E}_p(f) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_p(\Xi_{p,n}[f]) = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} \mathcal{E}_p(M_n[f]).$$

Next, we look at the value $\mathcal{E}_p(M_n[f])$. For any fixed $e = \{v, w\} \in E_n$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} |f_{X_v} - f_{X_w}| &= \left| \frac{1}{\deg(v)} \sum_{v \in e_v} \int_{X_{e_v}} f d\mu - \frac{1}{\deg(w)} \sum_{w \in e_w} \int_{X_{e_w}} f d\mu \right| \\ &\lesssim \sum_{\substack{v \in e_v \\ w \in e_w}} \left| \int_{X_{e_v}} f d\mu - \int_{X_{e_w}} f d\mu \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{v \in e_v} \left| \int_{X_{e_v}} f d\mu - \int_{X_e} f d\mu \right| + \sum_{w \in e_w} \left| \int_{X_{e_w}} f d\mu - \int_{X_e} f d\mu \right| \end{aligned}$$

Thus, using the fact that the degrees are uniformly bounded, we get

$$\mathcal{M}_p^{-n} \mathcal{E}_p(M_n[f]) \lesssim \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_p^{(n)}(f),$$

and we are done with the first inequality.

The second inequality in (7.17) is trivial, so we will move on to the last one. First, assume that $f \in \mathcal{C}_p$, and fix edges $e, e' \in E_n$ so that $v \in e \cap e'$. Then we compute using the Poincaré inequality (6.14) that

$$|f_{X_e} - f_{X_{e'}}|^p \lesssim |f_{X_e} - V_n[f](v)|^p + |f_{X_{e'}} - V_n[f](v)|^p \lesssim \mathcal{E}_p(f \circ F_e) + \mathcal{E}_p(f \circ F_{e'}).$$

By applying this for every pair of edges with a common vertex, we can estimate using Theorem 6.3-(4),

$$\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_p^{(n)}(f) = \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} \sum_{\substack{e, e' \in E_n \\ e \cap e' \neq \emptyset}} |f_{X_e} - f_{X_{e'}}|^p \lesssim \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} \sum_{e \in E_n} \mathcal{E}_p(f \circ F_e) = \mathcal{E}_p(f).$$

This inequality extends to every $f \in L^p(X, \mu)$. Indeed, it trivially holds for $f \in L^p(X, \mu) \setminus \mathcal{F}_p$, and for $f \in \mathcal{F}_p$, we can take an approximating sequences of continuous functions. \square

Remark 7.19. The inequality (7.18) is sometimes referred as *weak monotonicity*. See e.g. [35, Theorem 5.4], [31, Lemma 3.12], [43, Theorem 6.13]. This condition alongside with some other analytic conditions, such as regularity, is typically enough to ensure the existence of a well-behaving p -energy form. Nevertheless, with this approach, many challenges tend to arise beyond the construction itself. Ensuring that the p -energy form satisfies the desired analytic properties seems to require multiple steps of suitable subsequential limits. We avoided this trouble thanks to

the strong monotonicity principle (Theorem 4.30). This approach via weak monotonicity is also difficult when the exponent p is small. For instance, the arguments in [43] heavily depend on the fact that $Q - d_{w,p} < 1$. While this is not an issue for the standard Sierpiński carpet (it holds for all $p \in (1, \infty)$) this is no longer the case for e.g. the higher dimensional Sierpiński carpets (see [43, Problem 10.1]). In Theorem 7.20, we verify that this restriction in the exponent does not occur in our framework.

Theorem 7.20. *For every $p \in (1, \infty)$ there is an IGS satisfying Assumption 3.3 so that $Q - d_{w,p}$ is arbitrary large.*

Proof. Notice that $Q - d_{w,p} = \frac{\log(\mathcal{M}_p)}{\log(L_*)}$, so it suffices to argue that we can construct IGSs with arbitrary large \mathcal{M}_p while preserving L_* . There are multiple ways to do this. For instance, we can use Proposition 4.21 to construct an IGS where the number of edge disjoint paths Θ from I_+ to I_- is arbitrarily large for any $L_* \geq 3$. We also describe this construction in Figure 4.23. This increases the Hausdorff dimension Q and preserves the p -walk dimension $d_{w,p} = p$. To construct example with $d_{w,p} > p$, we can do a similar gluing procedure with the Laakso diamond in the following manner. We glue multiple copies of the generators of the Laakso diamond in Figure 1.4 by identifying all copies of the vertex $v = 3$ in different copies as one vertex. The gluing rules are naturally inherited from the gluing rules of the distinct copies. It is easy to check using p -harmonicity that this satisfies the conductive uniform property and that its p -capacity constant is $k \cdot \mathcal{M}_p$ where k is the number of copies and \mathcal{M}_p is the p -capacity constant of Laakso diamond. Since $L_* = 4$ for all k , the value $Q - d_{w,p}$ can be made arbitrarily large by increasing the number of copies. \square

8. SINGULARITIES OF ENERGY MEASURES AND SOBOLEV SPACES

Up to this point, we have covered general theory that applies to all examples in our framework. Different sub-classes of IGS-fractals, however, admit a variety of distinct analytic behaviors, and the differences between these classes can be understood through their optimal potentials and optimal flows. One way to classify IGS fractals is through the behaviors of energy measures and Sobolev spaces as the exponent p varies. Indeed, we seek to understand the following problem.

Problem 8.1. *Let $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty)$ be two distinct exponents. Do the following objects have any relation with each other?*

- (1) *The energy measures $\Gamma_p\langle f \rangle$ and the reference measure μ ?*
- (2) *The energy measures for distinct exponents $\Gamma_{p_1}\langle f_{p_1} \rangle$ and $\Gamma_{p_2}\langle f_{p_2} \rangle$?*
- (3) *The Sobolev spaces \mathcal{F}_{p_1} and \mathcal{F}_{p_2} ?*

In the classical setting of $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ where $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is a bounded domain, the answer to Problem 8.1 is simple. The energy measures are absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure, and $\mathcal{F}_{p_2} \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{p_1}$ when $p_1 < p_2$ due to Hölder's inequality. For fractals however, these questions tend to be challenging. See e.g. [26] and [43, Section 10].

In this section, we study this problem in our framework and give a complete answer to the first two questions in Problem 8.1, and a partial answer for the last one. First, we develop additional tools to study energy measures in Subsection

8.1. These are applied in the following three subsections, which are devoted to discussing the each of the three questions in Problem 8.1 respectively.

8.1. Energy dominant measures. Due to the classical Radon-Nikodym theorem, studying a large family of measures is far more tractable when there is a well-behaving dominating measure. The primary goal of this subsection is to understand when such a measure exists for p -energy measures. To this end, in Theorem 8.4, we propose (8.5) as a sufficient and necessary condition for this existence problem. In the affirmative case, we introduce a natural notion of a weak derivative.

We first introduce and study minimal energy dominant measures. The definition is due to [20, 43].

Definition 8.2. Let $p \in (1, \infty)$. A Radon measure ν on (X, d) is a *minimal p -energy dominant measure* if it satisfies the following two conditions.

- (1) For all $f \in \mathcal{F}_p$ it holds that $\Gamma_p \langle f \rangle \ll \nu$.
- (2) If κ is another measure satisfying the previous condition, then $\nu \ll \kappa$.

When the exponent is clear from the context, we sometimes say that ν is a *minimal energy dominant measure*.

In the following proposition, we present a simple method for constructing minimal energy dominant measures. Similar approach is used in [43, Lemma 9.20] and [20, Lemma 2.3]. We consider the family of functions

$$\mathcal{C}_p(\mathbb{Q}) := \{\mathcal{U}_{p,n}[g] : n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\} \text{ and } g : V_n \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}\} \subseteq \mathcal{F}_p.$$

It is routine to verify that $\mathcal{C}_p(\mathbb{Q}) \subseteq \mathcal{F}_p$ is a denumerable dense subset using Proposition 5.12 and Theorem 6.35.

Proposition 8.3. Let $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ be an enumeration of $\mathcal{C}_p(\mathbb{Q})$ and $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ a sequence of positive real numbers so that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i \mathcal{E}_p(f_i) < \infty.$$

Then the Radon measure Λ_p given by

$$\Lambda_p(A) := \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i \Gamma_p \langle f_i \rangle(A)$$

is a minimal energy dominant measure. Moreover, if $A \subseteq X$ is a Borel set of full $\Gamma_p \langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle$ -measure, then the set

$$\tilde{A} := \bigcup_{e \in E_\#} F_e(A)$$

is a Borel set of full Λ_p -measure.

Proof. Using the density of $\mathcal{C}_p(\mathbb{Q}) \subseteq \mathcal{F}_p$ and Lemma 6.44, Λ_p is easily seen to dominate all p -energy measures. The minimality of Λ_p follows from the fact that it is an infinite linear combination of p -energy measures.

Now, let $A, \tilde{A} \subseteq X$ be as given in the statement of the current proposition. We prove that \tilde{A} is of full Λ_p -measure by showing that

$$\Gamma_p \langle f \rangle(X_e \setminus F_e(A)) = 0 \text{ for all } e \in E_n$$

for all $f := \mathcal{U}_{p,n}[g]$ and $g : V_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. The claim $\Lambda_p(X \setminus \tilde{A}) = 0$ would then be clear from the constructions of Λ_p and \tilde{A} . By using (6.53) we obtain

$$\Gamma_p\langle f \rangle(X_e \setminus F_e(A)) = \Gamma_p\langle f \rangle(F_e(X \setminus A)) = \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} |\nabla g(e)|^p \Gamma_p\langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle(X \setminus A) = 0.$$

□

The minimal p -energy dominant measure Λ_p proposed in Proposition 8.3 is not a suitable one for applying the Radon-Nikodym theorem. In fact, its primary purpose is something else. In the following theorem, we use the dominating measures Λ_p to uncover a curious dichotomy phenomenon, providing an answer to the existence problem of a tractable minimal p -energy dominant measure. In Remark 8.7, we address the connection of this result to the attainment problem of Ahlfors regular conformal dimension. Recall, that a subset $A \subset X$ is *porous*, if there exists a constant $c > 0$ so that for all $x \in A$ and all $r \in (0, \text{diam}(X))$ there exists $y \in B(x, r)$ with $B(y, cr) \cap A = \emptyset$. The constant c is called the *porosity constant*. The set A is called σ -*porous* if it is a countable union of porous subsets (possibly each with a different porosity constants). If μ is a doubling measure and $A \subset X$ is porous, then we always have $\mu(A) = 0$. This follows from Lebesgue differentiation applied to the characteristic function of A ; see also [41, Proposition 3.5]. Consequently, doubling measures do not charge σ -porous subsets.

Theorem 8.4. *For all $p \in (1, \infty)$ exactly one of the following conditions hold.*

(1) *If the optimal potential function satisfies*

$$(8.5) \quad |\nabla U_p(e)| \neq 0 \text{ for all } e \in E_1,$$

then $\Gamma_p\langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle$ is a minimal p -energy dominant measure that is also doubling.

(2) *If (8.5) does not hold, then there is a σ -porous Borel subset \tilde{A} which is of full $\Gamma_p\langle f \rangle$ -measure for all Sobolev functions $f \in \mathcal{F}_p$. In particular, none of the p -energy measures are doubling.*

Proof. (1): Assume that the optimal potential function satisfies (8.5). We first show that $\Gamma_p\langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle$ is minimal energy dominant. By Proposition 8.3 it is sufficient to prove that $\Gamma_p\langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle$ dominates the p -energy measures of Sobolev functions of the form $f := \mathcal{U}_{p,n}[g]$ for some $g : V_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

By Corollary 4.17 and (8.5) we clearly have $|\nabla U_{p,n}(e)| \neq 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. From this and Theorem 6.51, we see that $\Gamma_p\langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle(X_e) \neq 0$ for all $e \in E_\#$. We now conclude using (6.52) and (6.53) that

$$\Gamma_p\langle f \rangle \upharpoonright_{X_e} = \frac{\mathcal{M}_p^{-n} |\nabla g(e)|^p}{\Gamma_p\langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle(X_e)} \Gamma_p\langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle \upharpoonright_{X_e} \text{ for all } e \in E_n.$$

From this expression, it is clear that $\Gamma_p\langle f \rangle \ll \Gamma_p\langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle$.

Next, we prove that $\Gamma_p\langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle$ is doubling. Our first step is to prove the following claim by induction on $n \in \mathbb{N}$: There is a constant $C \geq 1$ so that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $e, e' \in E_n$ so that $e \cap e' \neq \emptyset$ we have

$$(8.6) \quad \Gamma_p\langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle(X_e) \leq C \Gamma_p\langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle(X_{e'}).$$

We fix the constants

$$a := \max_{e \in E_1} \Gamma_p\langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle(X_e) \text{ and } b := \min_{e \in E_1} \Gamma_p\langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle(X_e),$$

and set $C := a/b$. Note that C is well-defined thanks to (8.5) and (6.52). The base case $n = 1$ is trivial, so we assume the claim holds for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $e, e' \in E_{n+1}$ so that $e \cap e' \neq \emptyset$. The case $\pi_{n+1}(e) = \pi_{n+1}(e')$ is clear since the pre-energy measure $\mathfrak{m}_p \langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle$ is a Bernoulli measure. Thus, assume $\pi_{n+1}(e) = e_n \neq e'_n = \pi_{n+1}(e')$, and write $e = e_n \cdot e_1$ and $e' = e'_n \cdot e'_1$. By (SM2) and the gluing rules, we have $e_n \cap e'_n \neq \emptyset$ and $\{e_1, e'_1\} = \{\mathfrak{c}(\phi_-(a)), \mathfrak{c}(\phi_+(a))\}$ for some $a \in I$. By (2.11), the conductive uniform property and (6.52), we have $\Gamma_p \langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle (X_{e_1}) = \Gamma_p \langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle (X_{e'_1})$. We thus compute

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_p \langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle (X_e) &= \Gamma_p \langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle (X_{e_n}) \Gamma_p \langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle (X_{e_1}) \\ &\stackrel{\text{IH}}{\leq} C \Gamma_p \langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle (X_{e'_n}) \Gamma_p \langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle (X_{e_1}) \\ &= C \Gamma_p \langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle (X_{e'_n}) \Gamma_p \langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle (X_{e'_1}) \\ &= C \Gamma_p \langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle (X_{e'}). \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof of (8.6).

The final step in proving the doubling property is to use (8.6) to derive estimates for measures of balls. This can be done using a similar argument as in [2, Lemma 3.31], which regards the Ahlfors regularity of the limit space. The argument is also sketched in the end of the proof of Proposition 3.42. See also [30, Theorem 3.3.4].

(2): Now, we assume that (8.5) fails. Fix any edge $\tilde{e} \in E_1$ so that $|\nabla U_p(\tilde{e})| = 0$, and consider subset

$$A := X \setminus \left(\bigcup_{e \in E_\#} F_e(X_{\tilde{e}}) \right).$$

It follows from (6.52) that $\Gamma_p \langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle (A) = 0$. Then we consider the sets

$$A_n := \bigcup_{k=0}^n \bigcup_{e \in E_k} F_e(A) \text{ for } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

We will argue that the subsets $A_n \subseteq X$ are porous. This is essentially a generalized version of the argument in [2, Lemma 6.4] which shows that $A = A_0$ is a porous subset of the limit space in Example 3.6. Let $x \in A_n$, $r < L_*^{-n}$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ be so that $L_*^{-m-1} \leq r < L_*^{-m}$. If $e \in E_m$ so that $x \in X_e$, we use Proposition 3.42-(2) to show that there is $y \in F_e(X_{\tilde{e}})$ so that $B(y, cr) \cap A_n = \emptyset$, where $c \in (0, 1)$ is a uniform constant. Thus the sets A_n are porous. Moreover, it now follows from Proposition 8.3 that the set

$$\tilde{A} := \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} A_n \subseteq X$$

is a σ -porous subset of full $\Gamma_p \langle f \rangle$ -measure for all Sobolev functions $f \in \mathcal{F}_p$. \square

Remark 8.7. We briefly discuss the connection of Theorem 8.4 to the *attainment problem of Ahlfors regular conformal dimension* of the metric space (X, d) . Without getting too deep into the details (an interested reader may survey [2, Introduction]), the attainment problem of Ahlfors regular conformal dimension asks whether (X, d) admits an “optimal metric” to study quasiconformal geometry of (X, d) . In general, this is a highly non-trivial problem, and the outcome is open for many interesting metric spaces such as the Sierpiński carpet. Nevertheless, what should be true in general is that answers to many deep geometric questions, including the attainment problem, should be observable through the “correct” Sobolev spaces and energy

measures. For the Sierpiński carpet, this was observed in [43]. In fact, this is exactly what happens in our framework. When $p = Q_* \in (1, \infty)$ is the Ahlfors regular conformal dimension, it is verified in the ongoing work by the first two authors and Rainio [3] that, within our framework, the positive answer to the attainment problem is equivalent to the condition (8.5). According to Theorem 8.4, this condition is equivalent to the existence of a (harmonic) function $f \in \mathcal{F}_{Q_*}$ with doubling Q_* -energy measure $\Gamma_{Q_*}\langle f \rangle$. This answers, in the IGS a version of [43, Conjecture 12.9]. This has major impact to the structure of the Sobolev space \mathcal{F}_{Q_*} and Q_* -energy measures $\Gamma_{Q_*}\langle f \rangle$, and yields an analytic reasoning why the attainment fails for the IGS-fractal in Example 3.6. While the attainment problem exclusively regards the case $p = Q_*$, this observation suggests that our approach yields good Sobolev spaces and energy measures for all $p \in (1, \infty)$ that contains deep geometric information.

Example 8.8. It is worth to note that whether (8.5) holds or not can depend on the exponent p . For the IGSs in Figure 8.9 this condition holds if and only if $p \neq 2$. To see this, the functions in the figure are 2-harmonic on their respective graphs, and therefore equal to the 2-energy minimizer U_2 . If e is any vertical edge in the figure, we clearly have that $|\nabla U_2(e)| = 0$. On the other hand, for every other p , it is easy to check using p -harmonicity that (8.5) holds. Furthermore, the Ahlfors




FIGURE 8.9. Figures of IGSs for which the condition (8.5) holds if and only if $p \neq 2$. The functions in the figure are the 2-energy minimizers $U_{2,+}$.

regular conformal dimension of the IGS-fractal associated to the graph in the right is equal to 2. This follows from the fact that $\mathcal{M}_2 = 1$ (see the proof of [2, Theorem 5.2]). Thus, the associated IGS-fractal does not attain its Ahlfors regular conformal dimension (see the explanation in Remark 8.7). On the other hand, the IGS-fractal in the left of Figure 8.9 does attain its Ahlfors regular conformal dimension since the value is strictly smaller than 2, for which (8.5) holds.

Following the discussion of the attainment problem of Ahlfors regular conformal dimension in the previous remark, we discuss a major consequence of the condition (8.5) for general $p \in (1, \infty)$. When it holds, we can define a natural notion of a weak derivative $D_p\langle \cdot \rangle : \mathcal{F}_p \rightarrow L^p(X, \Gamma_p\langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle)$, which is a bounded linear operator

satisfying

$$(8.10) \quad \frac{d\Gamma_p\langle f \rangle}{d\Gamma_p\langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle} = |D_p\langle f \rangle|^p \text{ for all } f \in \mathcal{F}_p.$$

We define it as follows. For all $f \in \mathcal{F}_p$ and $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ we consider the linear operator $D_{p,n}\langle \cdot \rangle : \mathcal{F}_p \rightarrow L^p(X, \Gamma_p\langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle)$, given by

$$(8.11) \quad D_{p,n}\langle f \rangle := \sum_{\substack{e \in E_n \\ e=\{v,w\}}} \frac{\nabla V_n[f](v,w)}{\nabla U_{p,-,n}(v,w)} 1_{X_e}.$$

Recall that $\nabla g(v,w) = g(w) - g(v)$. Also, $D_{p,n}\langle f \rangle$ is well-defined due to (8.5).

Definition 8.12. The *weak derivative* of $f \in \mathcal{F}_p$ is the limit

$$D_p\langle f \rangle := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} D_{p,n}\langle f \rangle \in L^p(X, \Gamma_p\langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle).$$

Theorem 8.13. *Assume that (8.5) holds. Then for all $f \in \mathcal{F}_p$ the sequence $D_{p,n}\langle f \rangle$ converges to a function $D_p\langle f \rangle$ in $L^p(X, \Gamma_p\langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle)$ satisfying (8.10). Furthermore, $D_p\langle \cdot \rangle : \mathcal{F}_p \rightarrow L^p(X, \Gamma_p\langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle)$ is a bounded linear operator.*

Proof. Fix $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$, $e_n \in E_n, e_m \in E_m$ and $f \in \mathcal{F}_p$. During this proof, we orient all edges $e \in E_\#$ so that $e = (e^+, e^-)$, and define the *signed gradient* of g by $\nabla g(e) := g(e^-) - g(e^+)$. Note that $(e_n \cdot e_m)^\pm = e_n \cdot e_m^\pm$ holds by (3.20). Theorem 4.13 and the equality $U_{p,-,k} = 1 - U_{p,+,k}$ then imply that

$$\nabla U_{p,-,n+m}(e_n \cdot e_m) = \nabla U_{p,-,n}(e_n) \nabla U_{p,-,m}(e_m).$$

Similarly using (5.10) we get

$$\nabla V_{n+m}[\Psi_{p,n}[f]](e_n \cdot e_m) = \nabla V_n[f](e_n) \nabla U_{p,-,m}(e_m).$$

By using Theorem 6.51 and (8.5) we get

$$(8.14) \quad \mathcal{M}_p^{-n} = |\nabla U_{p,n}(e)|^{-p} \Gamma_p\langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle(X_e) \text{ for all } e \in E_n.$$

By using these three equalities, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{E}_p^{(n+m)}(\Psi_{p,n+m}[f] - \Psi_{p,n}[f]) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{e_n \in E_n \\ e_m \in E_m}} |\nabla V_{n+m}[f](e_n \cdot e_m) - \nabla V_n[f](e_n) \nabla U_{p,-,m}(e_m)|^p \mathcal{M}_p^{-n-m} \\ &= \sum_{\substack{e_n \in E_n \\ e_m \in E_m}} \left| \frac{\nabla V_{n+m}[f](e_n \cdot e_m)}{\nabla U_{p,-,n+m}(e_n \cdot e_m)} - \frac{\nabla V_n[f](e_n)}{\nabla U_{p,-,n}(e_n)} \right|^p \Gamma_p\langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle(X_{e_n \cdot e_m}) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{e_n \in E_n \\ e_m \in E_m}} \int_{X_{e_n \cdot e_m}} |D_{p,n+m}\langle f \rangle - D_{p,n}\langle f \rangle|^p d\Gamma_p\langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle \\ &= \int_X |D_{p,n+m}\langle f \rangle - D_{p,n}\langle f \rangle|^p d\Gamma_p\langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\Psi_{p,n}[f]$ is a Cauchy sequence in \mathcal{F}_p by Theorem 6.35, it follows from the computation above that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_X |D_{p,n+m}\langle f \rangle - D_{p,n}\langle f \rangle|^p d\Gamma_p\langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle &= \mathcal{E}_p^{(n+m)}(\Psi_{p,n+m}[f] - \Psi_{p,n}[f]) \\ &\leq \mathcal{E}_p(\Psi_{p,n+m}[f] - \Psi_{p,n}[f]) \xrightarrow{n,m \rightarrow \infty} 0. \end{aligned}$$

Using the completeness of $L^p(X, \Gamma_p\langle\mathcal{U}_p\rangle)$, we conclude that $D_{p,n}\langle f \rangle$ converges to some $D_p\langle f \rangle$ in $L^p(X, \Gamma_p\langle\mathcal{U}_p\rangle)$.

We move on to proving (8.10). It follows from (6.53) that for all $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $e_n \in E_n, e_m \in E_m$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_p\langle\Psi_{p,n}[f]\rangle(X_{e_n \cdot e_m}) &= \mathcal{M}_p^{-n-m} |\nabla V_n[f](e_n)|^p \mathcal{E}_p(\mathcal{U}_p \circ F_{e_m}) \\ &= \frac{|\nabla V_n[f](e_n)|^p}{|\nabla U_{p,n}(e_n)|^p} \Gamma_p\langle\mathcal{U}_p\rangle(X_{e_n \cdot e_m}) \\ &= \int_{X_{e_n \cdot e_m}} |D_{p,n}\langle f \rangle|^p d\Gamma_p\langle\mathcal{U}_p\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by Dynkin's π - λ theorem, the above equality holds for any Borel set, i.e.,

$$(8.15) \quad \Gamma_p\langle\Psi_{p,n}[f]\rangle(A) = \int_A |D_{p,n}\langle f \rangle|^p d\Gamma_p\langle\mathcal{U}_p\rangle \text{ for any Borel set } A \subseteq X.$$

Finally, using Lemma 6.44, and the facts that $\Psi_{p,n}[f] \rightarrow f$ in \mathcal{F}_p and $D_{p,n}\langle f \rangle \rightarrow D_p\langle f \rangle$ in $L^p(X, \Gamma_p\langle\mathcal{U}_p\rangle)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_p\langle f \rangle(A) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Gamma_p\langle\Psi_{p,n}[f]\rangle(A) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_A |D_{p,n}\langle f \rangle|^p d\Gamma_p\langle\mathcal{U}_p\rangle \\ &= \int_A |D_p\langle f \rangle|^p d\Gamma_p\langle\mathcal{U}_p\rangle \text{ for any Borel set } A \subseteq X. \end{aligned}$$

Lastly, to see that $D_p\langle \cdot \rangle : \mathcal{F}_p \rightarrow L^p(X, \Gamma_p\langle\mathcal{U}_p\rangle)$ is a bounded linear operator, note that $D_{p,n}\langle \cdot \rangle : \mathcal{F}_p \rightarrow L^p(X, \Gamma_p\langle\mathcal{U}_p\rangle)$ is clearly linear by (8.11). From (8.15) we see that

$$\int_X |D_{p,n}\langle f \rangle|^p d\Gamma_p\langle\mathcal{U}_p\rangle = \mathcal{E}_p(\Psi_{p,n}[f]) \leq \mathcal{E}_p(f).$$

Hence, the limit $D_p\langle \cdot \rangle$ is also bounded and linear. \square

For the main results of this paper, it seems to be enough to consider the operator $|D_p\langle \cdot \rangle|$ instead of the weak derivative itself. Thus, we leave the more detailed investigation of the weak derivative for future research.

Another curious direction is to study whether there is an analogous tool in the case (8.5) fails. In such situation, we most likely have to replace $\Gamma_p\langle\mathcal{U}_p\rangle$ with a (non-canonical) energy dominant measure. Nevertheless, at least in some occasions the condition (8.5) fails, it seems to be possible to construct a practically useful energy dominant measure. For the standard Vicsek set, the Lebesgue measure on the skeleton is an energy dominant measure that seems fit the role. Since the skeleton is a σ -porous subset of the Vicsek set, the situation closely resembles to ours when (8.5) fails. See [8] for details. Moreover, for our variant of the Vicsek set in Example 3.8, it is easily seen that (8.5) fails.

8.2. Singularity with the reference measure. In the case $p = 2$, it is known for many self-similar fractals that the natural Hausdorff measure is singular with the energy measures [9, 19, 23, 34]. This clearly never happens in the classical theory of Sobolev spaces, where the energy measures $A \mapsto \int_A |\nabla f|^p dx$ are absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure. Recall that two Borel measures μ and ν defined on a metric space X are *mutually singular* if there are two disjoint Borel sets $A, B \subseteq X$ so that $\mu(X \setminus A) = 0 = \nu(X \setminus B)$.

It was proven in [23] that, for $p = 2$, this singularity often depends solely on whether the walk dimension is equal to 2 or strictly greater than 2. It was posed

in [43, Problem 10.5] that the same should hold for general p . Nevertheless, there are virtually no prior results to this direction.

In the following theorem, we verify that within our framework, the singularity of p -energy measures with the reference measure μ depends only on the value of the p -walk dimension in the analogous manner suggested by the results in [23].

Theorem 8.16. *For all $p \in (1, \infty)$ the following hold.*

- (1) *If $d_{w,p} = p$ then $\Gamma_p\langle\mathcal{U}_p\rangle = \mu$ and $\Gamma_p\langle f\rangle \ll \mu$ for all $f \in \mathcal{F}_p$.*
- (2) *If $d_{w,p} > p$ then $\Gamma_p\langle f\rangle \perp \mu$ for all $f \in \mathcal{F}_p$.*

Proof. (1): If $d_{w,p} = p$, then it follows from Lemma 4.12-(3) that $|\nabla U_p| \equiv L_*^{-1}$ and $\mathcal{M}_p = |E_1|/L_*^p$. By Proposition 6.47 the measure $\mathfrak{m}_p\langle\mathcal{U}_p\rangle$ is the Bernoulli measure satisfying

$$\mathfrak{m}_p\langle\mathcal{U}_p\rangle(\Sigma_e) = \mathcal{M}_p^{-1}|\nabla U_p(e)|^p = |E_1|^{-1} \text{ for all } e \in E_1.$$

Thus, $\Gamma_p\langle\mathcal{U}_p\rangle = \mu$, and $\Gamma_p\langle f\rangle \ll \mu$ for all $f \in \mathcal{F}_p$ by Theorem 8.4.

(2): Next, we assume $d_{w,p} > p$. We first show that the gradient $|\nabla U_p| : E_1 \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is not a constant function. Suppose the contrary, i.e., $|\nabla U_p| \equiv C > 0$. Since $L_* = \text{dist}(I_-, I_+, d_{G_1})$, we must have $C \geq L_*^{-1}$. A simple computation shows

$$\mathcal{M}_p = \mathcal{E}_p(U_p) \geq |E_1|/L_*^p,$$

and Lemma 4.12-(3) then implies $d_{w,p} = p$. Thus, $|\nabla U_p|$ cannot be a constant function. Now if $e_1, e_2 \in E_1$ so that $|\nabla U_p(e_1)| \neq |\nabla U_p(e_2)|$, by the definition of the pre-energy measure and (6.48) we have

$$\mathfrak{m}_p\langle\mathcal{U}_p\rangle(\Sigma_{e_1}) = \mathcal{M}_p^{-1}|\nabla U_p(e_1)| \neq \mathcal{M}_p^{-1}|\nabla U_p(e_2)| = \mathfrak{m}_p\langle\mathcal{U}_p\rangle(\Sigma_{e_2}).$$

It then follows from Proposition 6.47 that $\mathfrak{m}_p\langle\mathcal{U}_p\rangle$ is a Bernoulli measure with non-uniform weights. Since $\mathfrak{m}_{\text{unif}}$ is the uniform Bernoulli measure, it follows from a classical argument using the Strong law of large numbers that $\mathfrak{m}_p\langle\mathcal{U}_p\rangle \perp \mathfrak{m}_{\text{unif}}$. Similar argument was used in [47]. For the reader's convenience, we provide the details.

During this argument, it is convenient to identify Σ with the space of sequences $E_1^{\mathbb{N}}$ as it was discussed in Remark 3.29. Consider the subset $\Sigma_0 := \Sigma \setminus \chi^{-1}(\text{Fib}(X)) \subseteq \Sigma$. According to Proposition 6.50 and the Proposition 3.42-(1), $\text{Fib}(X)$ is a null set in both μ and $\mathfrak{m}_p\langle\mathcal{U}_p\rangle$. Thus,

$$(8.17) \quad \mathfrak{m}_p\langle\mathcal{U}_p\rangle(\Sigma_0) = \mathfrak{m}_{\text{unif}}(\Sigma_0) = 1,$$

and by Lemma 3.46, the restriction of the coding map $\chi|_{\Sigma_0}$ is injective. Then we define the Borel sets

$$A_1 := \left\{ (e_i)_{i=1}^{\infty} \in \Sigma_0 : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\{1 \leq j \leq n : e_j = e\}|}{n} = \mathfrak{m}_p\langle\mathcal{U}_p\rangle(\Sigma_e) \text{ for all } e \in E_1 \right\},$$

$$A_2 := \left\{ (e_i)_{i=1}^{\infty} \in \Sigma_0 : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\{1 \leq j \leq n : e_j = e\}|}{n} = |E_1|^{-1} \text{ for all } e \in E_1 \right\}.$$

Since $\mathfrak{m}_p\langle\mathcal{U}_p\rangle$ is a Bernoulli measure with non-uniform weights, we have $A_1 \cap A_2 = \emptyset$. It follows from the injectivity of $\chi|_{\Sigma_0}$ that the sets $\tilde{A}_1 := \chi(A_1)$ and $\tilde{A}_2 := \chi(A_2)$ also have an empty intersection. Thus, to conclude the desired singularity, we only now need to verify that these sets have full measures.

It follows from the Strong law of large numbers (see e.g. [4]) and (8.17) that

$$\Gamma_p\langle\mathcal{U}_p\rangle(\tilde{A}_1) = \mathfrak{m}_p\langle\mathcal{U}_p\rangle(A_1) = 1 = \mathfrak{m}_{\text{unif}}(A_2) = \mu(\tilde{A}_2).$$

Furthermore, we also have $F_e(\tilde{A}_1) \subseteq \tilde{A}_1$ for all $e \in E_\#$. To see this, it clearly follows from the definition of A_1 that $\sigma_e(A_1) \subseteq A_1$. Thus, we can compute

$$F_e(\tilde{A}_1) = F_e(\chi(A_1)) = \chi(\sigma_e(A_1)) \subseteq \chi(A_1) = \tilde{A}_1.$$

By Proposition 8.3, the set \tilde{A}_1 is of full $\Gamma_p\langle f \rangle$ -measure for all Sobolev functions $f \in \mathcal{F}_p$, so we conclude that $\Gamma_p\langle f \rangle \perp \mu$. \square

Remark 8.18. It is known for the Sierpiński gasket and some other post-critically finite self-similar fractals that for any $f \in \mathcal{F}_2$ the 2-energy measure $\Gamma_2\langle f \rangle$ and *any* self-similar measure are mutually singular [21, Theorem 2] (in [21] a self-similar measure is a push-forward of a Bernoulli measure with *positive weights*). The same is not true in our framework when the IGS satisfies (8.5) with $p = 2$. This is because $\Gamma_p\langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle$ is a self-similar measure (see also [21, Theorem 1-(i)]).

8.3. Singularity of energy measures for distinct exponents. Following the singularity result with the reference measure, we shall next study the singularity of energy measures for distinct exponents. Within our framework, we will give a complete characterization of this problem in Theorem 8.19 and answer to the question posed in [43, Problem 10.6] in Corollary 8.21.

At the time of writing this paper, the only other examples where this kind of singularity have been verified are the Sierpiński gasket and some other post-critically finite self-similar spaces in a recent ongoing work by Kajino and the third named author [25]. See [26] for a detailed explanation in the case of the Sierpiński gasket. In [25, 26], the authors show the singularity by establishing detailed local behaviors of p -harmonic functions. In contrast, we do not need such analyses in the present setting by virtue of (6.52).

Theorem 8.19. *Let $p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty)$ be distinct exponents, and assume that*

$$(8.20) \quad |\nabla U_{p_1}(e)| |\mathcal{J}_{p_1}(e)| \neq |\nabla U_{p_2}(e)| |\mathcal{J}_{p_2}(e)| \text{ for some } e \in E_1.$$

Then for all $f_{p_1} \in \mathcal{F}_{p_1}$ and $f_{p_2} \in \mathcal{F}_{p_2}$ we have $\Gamma_{p_1}\langle f_{p_1} \rangle \perp \Gamma_{p_2}\langle f_{p_2} \rangle$.

Proof. Recall from Proposition 6.47 that $\mathbf{m}_p\langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle$ is the Bernoulli measure with weights $|\nabla U_p(e)| |\mathcal{J}_p(e)|$. By (8.20) the pre-energy measures $\mathbf{m}_{p_1}\langle \mathcal{U}_{p_1} \rangle$ and $\mathbf{m}_{p_2}\langle \mathcal{U}_{p_2} \rangle$ are Bernoulli measures with different weights. The singularity of energy measures $\Gamma_{p_1}\langle f_{p_1} \rangle \perp \Gamma_{p_2}\langle f_{p_2} \rangle$ now follows from an identical argument using the Strong law of large numbers, as in the proof of Theorem 8.16-(2). \square

Corollary 8.21. *Let λ_p be a minimal p -energy dominant measure for each $p \in (1, \infty)$ and let $p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty)$ be any distinct exponents.*

- (1) *If (8.20) holds then $\lambda_{p_1} \perp \lambda_{p_2}$.*
- (2) *If (8.20) does not hold then λ_{p_1} and λ_{p_2} are mutually absolutely continuous.*

Proof. It is sufficient to consider the case of $\lambda_p = \Lambda_p$, where Λ_p is the minimal p -energy dominant measure constructed in Proposition 8.3, since any two minimal p -energy dominant measures are mutually absolutely continuous. If (8.20) holds then the singularity follows from Theorem 8.19 and the explicit form of the measures Λ_p . On the other hand, if (8.20) does not hold, then $\Gamma_p\langle \mathcal{U}_{p_1} \rangle = \Gamma_p\langle \mathcal{U}_{p_2} \rangle$. It then clearly follows from (6.53) that the energy measures $\Gamma_{p_1}\langle \mathcal{U}_{p_1, n}[g] \rangle$ and $\Gamma_{p_2}\langle \mathcal{U}_{p_2, n}[g] \rangle$ are mutually absolutely continuous for all $g : V_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. The mutual absolute continuity of Λ_{p_1} and Λ_{p_2} now follows from the explicit form of Λ_p . \square

8.4. Singularity of Sobolev spaces. Thanks to Theorem 8.19, we understand that the structure of the p -energy measures can vary significantly for distinct exponents p . Next, we investigate if the Sobolev spaces exhibit a similar behavior. We will see that, for some examples, the intersection $\mathcal{F}_{p_1} \cap \mathcal{F}_{p_2}$ for all pairs of distinct exponents p_1 and p_2 contains only constant functions, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{F}_{p_1} \cap \mathcal{F}_{p_2} = \{f \in L^p(X, \mu) : f \text{ is constant } \mu\text{-almost everywhere}\}.$$

When this holds, we say that the Sobolev spaces \mathcal{F}_{p_1} and \mathcal{F}_{p_2} are *mutually singular*.

Actually, the singularity of Sobolev spaces seems to be a far more involved question than the singularity of energy measures. We regret to write that, with the current state of the framework, we understand the singularity of Sobolev spaces only in the cases when it can be translated to a problem of energy measures. This requires some additional assumptions which do not always hold. We briefly discuss the more general case after the proof of Theorem 8.23.

Assumption 8.22. *The following two conditions hold.*

- (1) *For every edge $e \in E_1$ and $p \in (1, \infty)$ we have $|\nabla U_p(e)| \neq 0$.*
- (2) *For every edge $e \in E_1$ the value of the optimal flow $\mathcal{J}_p(e)$ does not depend on $p \in (1, \infty)$.*

The main result of this subsection is the equivalence of the two notions singularities under Assumption 8.22.

Theorem 8.23. *Assume that the conditions in Assumption 8.22 hold. Then for any pair of exponents $p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty)$ the following are equivalent.*

- (1) *The Sobolev spaces \mathcal{F}_{p_1} and \mathcal{F}_{p_2} are mutually singular.*
- (2) *The energy measures $\Gamma_{p_1}\langle \mathcal{U}_{p_1} \rangle$ and $\Gamma_{p_2}\langle \mathcal{U}_{p_2} \rangle$ are mutually singular.*

The key idea in the proof of Theorem 8.23 is to consider the measures

$$(8.24) \quad \mu_{p,n}\langle f \rangle(A) := \int_A |D_{p,n}\langle f \rangle| d\Gamma_p\langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle \text{ and } \mu_p\langle f \rangle(A) := \int_A |D_p\langle f \rangle| d\Gamma_p\langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle,$$

where $D_{p,n}\langle \cdot \rangle$ are the linear operators defined in (8.11) and $D_p\langle \cdot \rangle$ is the weak derivative as given in Definition 8.12. Note that the first condition in Assumption 8.22 are used to ensure that $\mu_{p,n}\langle f \rangle$ and $\mu_p\langle f \rangle$ are well-defined. Furthermore, with this approach, it is crucial to keep in mind that the extended discretization operators $V_n[\cdot] : \mathcal{F}_p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{V_n}$ introduced in Subsection 6.4 can depend on p . Therefore, we use the notation $V_{p,n}[\cdot]$ instead to emphasize this.

Lemma 8.25. *If Assumption 8.22-(1) holds then for all $f \in \mathcal{F}_p$ the measures $\mu_p\langle f \rangle$ and $\Gamma_p\langle f \rangle$ are mutually absolutely continuous.*

Proof. This is a direct corollary of Theorem 8.13 and (8.10). \square

We briefly discuss the most crucial detail in the proof of Theorem 8.23. First, observe that the expression of $D_{p,n}\langle f \rangle$ in (8.11) is a mixture of optimal flow and optimal potential. Indeed, recall that the discretization $V_{p,n}[\cdot]$ depends on the flow. On the other hand, $\mu_{p,n}\langle f \rangle$ admits an alternative expression involving only the flow. By using the definition of $D_{p,n}\langle \cdot \rangle$ in (8.11) and (6.52), we get

$$(8.26) \quad \mu_{p,n}\langle f \rangle(X_e) = \frac{|\nabla V_{p,n}[f](e)|}{|\nabla U_{p,n}(e)|} \Gamma_p\langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle(X_e) = |\nabla V_{p,n}[f](e)| \mathcal{J}_{p,n}(e)$$

for all $e \in E_n$. Using this observation, we will show in the next lemma that the measure $\mu_p \langle f \rangle$ does not depend on p under the second condition in Assumption 8.22.

Lemma 8.27. *Assume that Assumption 8.22 holds. If $p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty)$ and $f \in \mathcal{F}_{p_1} \cap \mathcal{F}_{p_2}$, then $\mu_{p_1} \langle f \rangle = \mu_{p_2} \langle f \rangle$.*

Proof. First, we will show that

$$(8.28) \quad V_{p_1, m} [f] = V_{p_2, m} [f] \text{ for all } m \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}.$$

Note that at the moment, we only know that this equality holds for continuous Sobolev functions simply due to Definition 5.1 and Corollary 6.39. We also do not know whether f can be approximated by a sequence of continuous functions that converge in both Sobolev norms. Our solution for this challenge is to consider the operators $M_n[\cdot]$ and $\Xi_{p, n}[\cdot]$, which were given in Definition 6.37, instead.

First, note that the averaging operators $V_{p, n, m}[\cdot]$ given in (4.24) do not depend on p by Assumption 8.22-(2). Using the tower rule (5.3), we get

$$(8.29) \quad V_{p_1, m} [\Xi_{p_1, n} [f]] = V_{p_1, n, m} [M_n [f]] = V_{p_2, n, m} [M_n [f]] = V_{p_2, m} [\Xi_{p_2, n} [f]]$$

for all $n \geq m$. Now, it follows from Lemma 6.38 that $\{\Xi_{p_i, n} [f]\}_{n=m}^{\infty}$ is a bounded sequence in \mathcal{F}_{p_i} , and that $\Xi_{p_i, n} [f] \rightarrow f$ in $L^{p_i}(X, \mu)$. According to Proposition 6.15, the limits

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} V_{p_i, m} [\Xi_{p_i, n} [f]]$$

exist in \mathbb{R}^{V_m} and, thanks to (8.29), coincide for $i = 1, 2$. To see that these limits are equal to $V_{p_i, m} [f]$, this can be proven using a similar argument using reflexivity of \mathcal{F}_p and Mazur's lemma as in the proof of Corollary 6.39. Thus, (8.28) follows.

We are now ready to show the equality of measures $\mu_{p_1} \langle f \rangle = \mu_{p_2} \langle f \rangle$. Observe that by (8.26), (8.28) and Assumption 8.22-(2), we have

$$\mu_{p_1, n} \langle f \rangle (X_e) = \mu_{p_2, n} \langle f \rangle (X_e) \text{ for all } e \in E_n.$$

Since the fibers are null-sets, we get

$$\mu_{p_1, n} \langle f \rangle (X_e) = \sum_{e' \in \pi_{n, m}^{-1}(e)} \mu_{p_1, n} \langle f \rangle (X_{e'}) = \mu_{p_2, n} \langle f \rangle (X_e)$$

for all $e \in E_m$ and $n \geq m$. Since $D_{p, n} \langle f \rangle \rightarrow D_p \langle f \rangle$ in $L^p(X, \Gamma_p \langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle)$ and $\Gamma_p \langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle$ is a probability measure, we obtain $\mu_{p_1} \langle f \rangle (X_e) = \mu_{p_2} \langle f \rangle (X_e)$ for all $e \in E_{\#}$ by letting $n \rightarrow \infty$. The equality $\mu_{p_1} \langle f \rangle (A) = \mu_{p_2} \langle f \rangle (A)$ for arbitrary Borel set $A \subseteq X$ now follows from Dynkin's π - λ theorem. \square

We are ready to prove Theorem 8.23.

Proof of Theorem 8.23. Let $p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty)$ be any pair of distinct exponents. First, assume that the measures $\Gamma_{p_1} \langle \mathcal{U}_{p_1} \rangle$ and $\Gamma_{p_2} \langle \mathcal{U}_{p_2} \rangle$ are mutually singular, and let $f \in \mathcal{F}_{p_1} \cap \mathcal{F}_{p_2}$. It follows from Lemma 8.25 and Theorem 8.4 that $\Gamma_{p_1} \langle f \rangle$ is absolutely continuous with respect to $\Gamma_{p_i} \langle \mathcal{U}_{p_i} \rangle$ for both $i = 1, 2$. But since $\Gamma_{p_i} \langle \mathcal{U}_{p_1} \rangle$ and $\Gamma_{p_i} \langle \mathcal{U}_{p_2} \rangle$ are mutually singular, $\Gamma_{p_1} \langle f \rangle$ has to be the trivial measure, i.e. $\mathcal{E}_{p_1} (f) = \Gamma_{p_1} \langle f \rangle (X) = 0$. According to Theorem 6.4-(1), this is possible if and only if f is constant μ -almost everywhere. Hence, the Sobolev spaces \mathcal{F}_{p_1} and \mathcal{F}_{p_2} are mutually singular.

Next, we assume that the measures $\Gamma_{p_1} \langle \mathcal{U}_{p_1} \rangle$ and $\Gamma_{p_2} \langle \mathcal{U}_{p_2} \rangle$ are not mutually singular, and show that the Sobolev spaces have a non-trivial intersection. Actually,

it easily follows that $\mathcal{U}_{p_1, \pm} = \mathcal{U}_{p_2, \pm}$. Nevertheless, by putting slightly more effort, we will show that if $p_1 < p_2$ then $\mathcal{F}_{p_2} \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{p_1}$.

Note that $L^{p_2}(X, \mu) \subseteq L^{p_1}(X, \mu)$ holds since μ is a probability measure. It follows from Assumption 8.22-(1) and the duality (2.11) that $|\mathcal{J}_p(e)| \neq 0$ for all $e \in E_1$. According to Theorem 8.19, since the energy measures are not singular and $|\mathcal{J}_{p_1}(e)| = |\mathcal{J}_{p_2}(e)|$, we must have

$$(8.30) \quad |\nabla U_{p_1}| = |\nabla U_{p_2}| \text{ and } \Gamma_{p_1} \langle \mathcal{U}_{p_1} \rangle = \Gamma_{p_2} \langle \mathcal{U}_{p_2} \rangle.$$

Furthermore, by the uniqueness of the energy minimizer U_p , it holds that $\mathcal{U}_{p_1} = \mathcal{U}_{p_2}$, and consequently $\mathcal{U}_{p_1, m}[\cdot] = \mathcal{U}_{p_2, m}[\cdot]$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. Now for a given $f \in \mathcal{F}_{p_2}$, it follows from Lemma 5.11-(1) that for all $n \geq m$ we have

$$\mathcal{E}_{p_1}^{(n)}(\Psi_{p_2, m}[f]) = \mathcal{E}_{p_1}^{(n)}(\mathcal{U}_{p_1, m}[V_{p_2, m}[f]]) = \mathcal{M}_{p_1}^{-m} \mathcal{E}_{p_1}(V_{p_2, m}[f]).$$

Then, we use (8.14), (8.30) and Jensen's inequality to estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{p_1}^{(n)}(\Psi_{p_2, m}[f])^{\frac{p_2}{p_1}} &= \left(\sum_{e \in E_n} \frac{|\nabla V_{p_2, n}[f](e)|^{p_1}}{|\nabla U_{p_1, n}(e)|^{p_1}} \Gamma_{p_1} \langle \mathcal{U}_{p_1} \rangle(X_e) \right)^{\frac{p_2}{p_1}} \\ &\leq \sum_{e \in E_n} \frac{|\nabla V_{p_2, n}[f](e)|^{p_2}}{|\nabla U_{p_2, n}(e)|^{p_2}} \Gamma_{p_2} \langle \mathcal{U}_{p_2} \rangle(X_e) = \mathcal{E}_{p_2}(\Psi_{p_2, n}[f]). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\Psi_{p_2, m}[f] \rightarrow f$ in \mathcal{F}_{p_2} by Theorem 6.35, it follows from the previous computation that $\Psi_{p_2, m}[f]$ is a bounded sequence in \mathcal{F}_{p_1} . Using Lemma 6.25 and the fact that $\Psi_{p_2, n}[f] \rightarrow f$ in $L^{p_1}(X, \mu)$, we now conclude that $f \in \mathcal{F}_{p_1}$, and $\mathcal{F}_{p_2} \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{p_1}$. \square

We are now ready to prove the singularity results for the Laakso diamond.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. It is a direct computation that the function given in Figure 1.23 is p -harmonic in $V_1 \setminus (I_+ \cup I_-)$. Thus, by Lemma 2.6, this function is the optimal potential. It is also easy to see that the flow in the same figure is the optimal flow. It is now clear that the conditions in Assumption 8.22 hold.

Hence, the singularity results follow from Theorems 8.16, 8.19 and 8.23. \square

Example 8.31. Here we provide another example of an IGS-fractal for which Theorem 1.1 holds. Consider the IGS whose generator is in Figure 8.32 and the gluing rules are given by the matching of the colors. The function in the figure is the optimal potential function (yet again by p -harmonicity). It is also clear that the optimal flow is independent of p . To see this, it is clear by symmetry that the optimal flow \mathcal{J}_p satisfies $|\mathcal{J}_p| \equiv 3^{-1}$ for the 6 edges containing a vertex in $I_+ \cup I_-$, and for the other edges $|\mathcal{J}_p| \equiv 2^{-1}$. Thus the claim follows, by the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Theorem 1.1 does not hold for general IGS-fractals. We conclude the subsection to verifying that the analytic behaviors of the Laakso diamond and the Laakso space (Example 3.4) in terms of Theorem 1.1 are *virtually opposite*.

Theorem 8.33. *The Laakso space in Example 3.4 satisfies the following properties.*

- (1) For all $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $f \in \mathcal{F}_p$ it holds that $\Gamma_p \langle f \rangle \ll \mu$.
- (2) For all $p \in (1, \infty)$ it holds that $\Gamma_p \langle \mathcal{U}_p \rangle = \mu$.
- (3) For all $p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty)$ so that $p_1 < p_2$ it holds that $\mathcal{F}_{p_2} \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{p_1}$.

In particular, none of the three statements in Theorem 1.1 hold in this case.




FIGURE 8.32. Figure of another IGS for which Theorem 1.1 holds. See Example 8.31 for an explanation.

Proof. It is clear from the p -harmonicity that the function given in the left of Figure 4.4 is the optimal potential function for all p . In particular, $d_{w,p} = p$, so the first two claims follow from Theorem 8.16. The last claim, the inclusion $\mathcal{F}_{p_2} \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{p_1}$ for $p_1 < p_2$, is verified in the proof of Theorem 8.23. \square

8.5. Interrelations between singularities. As we hinted in the previous subsection, Theorem 8.23 does not capture the whole scene of singularity of Sobolev spaces. To conclude the paper, we discuss potential refinements to the assumptions that might be able to characterize this phenomenon. We begin by remarking that the equivalence in Theorem 8.23 does not hold without the present assumptions.

Example 8.34. Consider the IGS whose generator is the graph in Figure 8.35, and the gluing rules are given by matching of the colors. We will give a brief argument why this IGS produces a self-similar space whose energy measures are singular and Sobolev spaces are not mutually singular for any pairs of distinct exponents.

First, observe that the function in the figure is the optimal potential function $U_{p,+}$ for all $p \in (1, \infty)$. To see this, it is easy to check that this function is p -harmonic in $V_1 \setminus (I_+ \cup I_-)$. Then, the duality relation (2.11) and a straightforward computation yields that $\mathcal{J}_{p_1,+} \neq \mathcal{J}_{p_2,+}$ for all distinct exponents $p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty)$. Since $U_{p,+}$ is independent of p , it follows that also $\mathcal{U}_{p,+}$ is independent of p . In particular, this function is contained in all Sobolev spaces, and the Sobolev spaces therefore are not singular. On the other hand, since $|\nabla U_p|$ is strictly positive and independent of p , and $|\mathcal{J}_{p_1}| \neq |\mathcal{J}_{p_2}|$ for all distinct exponents $p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty)$, it follows from Theorem 8.19 that $\Gamma_{p_1} \langle f_{p_1} \rangle \perp \Gamma_{p_2} \langle f_{p_2} \rangle$ for all distinct exponents p_1, p_2 .

The key feature in Example 8.34 why the Sobolev spaces are not singular is that the optimal potential function is independent of p . This is clearly a sufficient condition for the Sobolev spaces to have a non-trivial intersection. On the other hand, when the optimal potentials are not equal, then $\mathcal{U}_{p_1} \notin \mathcal{F}_{p_2}$. To see this, suppose that $U_{p_1,+} \neq U_{p_2,+}$. By the uniqueness of the energy minimizer, it holds that $\mathcal{E}_{p_1}(U_{p_2}) > \mathcal{M}_{p_1}$. By Corollary 4.17 we have $\mathcal{E}_{p_1}(U_{p_2,n}) = \mathcal{E}_{p_1}(U_{p_2})^n$, and therefore it holds that $\mathcal{E}_{p_1}(\mathcal{U}_{p_2}) = \infty$.

Now, given that a significant part of our analysis is based on the optimal potential function $\mathcal{U}_{p,+}$, and that there is a natural necessary condition for the singularity




FIGURE 8.35. Figure of an IGS that produces an IGS-fractal whose energy measures are singular but Sobolev spaces are not. The values in the figure indicate the optimal potential function.

of Sobolev spaces to hold, we propose our best guess towards a complete characterization.

Conjecture 8.36. *The Sobolev spaces \mathcal{F}_{p_1} and \mathcal{F}_{p_2} are mutually singular if and only if $U_{p_1,+} \neq U_{p_2,+}$.*

As we discussed, $U_{p_1,+} \neq U_{p_2,+}$ is a necessary condition for the singularity to hold. Note that we essentially verified Conjecture 8.36 under Assumption 8.22 during the proof of Theorem 8.23.

We conclude the paper in addressing another curious problem. In Theorem 1.1, we verified that both energy measures and Sobolev spaces are singular for the Laakso diamond. In Theorem 8.33, we saw that neither of the singularities hold for the Laakso space (Example 3.4). Thanks to the IGS given in Example 8.34, we know that it is possible that the energy measures are singular and the Sobolev spaces are not. Sadly, we do not have an example for the remaining case where Sobolev spaces are singular but energy measures are not.

Problem 8.37. *Is there an IGS-fractal so that for some pairs of distinct exponents $p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty)$ the Sobolev spaces \mathcal{F}_{p_1} and \mathcal{F}_{p_2} are mutually singular and $\Gamma_{p_1} \langle \mathcal{U}_{p_1} \rangle = \Gamma_{p_2} \langle \mathcal{U}_{p_2} \rangle$?*

If the answer to Problem 8.37 is positive, this means that the two singularity problems of energy measures and Sobolev spaces are *independent* of each other.

REFERENCES

- [1] ANTILA, R., AND ERIKSSON-BIQUE, S. Iterated graph systems and the combinatorial Loewner property. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.15692* (2024).
- [2] ANTILA, R., AND ERIKSSON-BIQUE, S. On constructions of fractal spaces using replacement and the combinatorial Loewner property. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.08062* (2024).
- [3] ANTILA, R., ERIKSSON-BIQUE, S., AND RAINIO, L. Conformal dimension and its attainment on self-similar Laakso-type fractal spaces. *In preparation*.
- [4] ASH, R. B., AND DOLÉANS-DADE, C. A. *Probability and measure theory*. Academic press, 2000.
- [5] BARLOW, M. T. Which values of the volume growth and escape time exponent are possible for a graph? *Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana* 20, 1 (2004), 1–31.

- [6] BARLOW, M. T., AND EVANS, S. N. Markov processes on vermiculated spaces. *Random walks and geometry* (2004), 337–348.
- [7] BAUDOIN, F. Korevaar–Schoen–Sobolev spaces and critical exponents in metric measure spaces. *Annales Fennici Mathematici* 49, 2 (2024), 487–527.
- [8] BAUDOIN, F., AND CHEN, L. Sobolev spaces and Poincaré inequalities on the Vicsek fractal. *Annales Fennici Mathematici* 48, 1 (2023), 3–26.
- [9] BEN-BASSAT, O., STRICHARTZ, R. S., AND TEPLYAEV, A. What is not in the domain of the Laplacian on Sierpinski gasket type fractals. *J. Funct. Anal.* 166, 2 (1999), 197–217.
- [10] BEZNEA, C., BEZNEA, L., AND RÖCKNER, M. Nonlinear Dirichlet forms associated with quasiregular mappings. *Potential Analysis* 62, 3 (2025), 509–533.
- [11] BJÖRN, A., AND BJÖRN, J. *Nonlinear potential theory on metric spaces*, vol. 17. European Mathematical Society, 2011.
- [12] CAO, S., GU, Q., AND QIU, H. p -energies on p.c.f self-similar sets. *Advances in Mathematics* 405 (2022), 108517.
- [13] CHEEGER, J., AND KLEINER, B. Realization of metric spaces as inverse limits, and bilipschitz embedding in L_1 . *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 23, 1 (2013), 96–133.
- [14] CHEEGER, J., AND KLEINER, B. Inverse limit spaces satisfying a Poincaré inequality. *Anal. Geom. Metr. Spaces* 3 (2015), 15–39.
- [15] DAVID, G. C., AND SCHUL, R. The analyst’s traveling salesman theorem in graph inverse limits. *Annales Fennici Mathematici* 42, 2 (2017), 649–692.
- [16] FUKUSHIMA, M., OSHIMA, Y., AND TAKEDA, M. *Dirichlet forms and symmetric Markov processes*, vol. 19. Walter de Gruyter, 2011.
- [17] HEINONEN, J., KOSKELA, P., SHANMUGALINGAM, N., AND TYSON, J. T. *Sobolev spaces on metric measure spaces. An approach based on upper gradients*, vol. 27 of *New Mathematical Monographs*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2015.
- [18] HERMAN, P. E., PEIRONE, R., AND STRICHARTZ, R. S. p -Energy and p -harmonic functions on Sierpinski gasket type fractals. *Potential Analysis* 20, 2 (2004), 125–148.
- [19] HINO, M. On singularity of energy measures on self-similar sets. *Probability theory and related fields* 132, 2 (2005), 265–290.
- [20] HINO, M. Energy measures and indices of Dirichlet forms, with applications to derivatives on some fractals. *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society* 100, 1 (2010), 269–302.
- [21] HINO, M., AND NAKAHARA, K. On singularity of energy measures on self-similar sets. II. *Bull. London Math. Soc.* 38, 6 (2006), 1019–1032.
- [22] HOLOPAINEN, I., AND SOARDI, P. M. p -harmonic functions on graphs and manifolds. *Manuscripta mathematica* 94, 1 (1997), 95–110.
- [23] KAJINO, N., AND MURUGAN, M. On singularity of energy measures for symmetric diffusions with full off-diagonal heat kernel estimates. *The Annals of Probability* 48, 6 (2020), 2920–2951.
- [24] KAJINO, N., AND MURUGAN, M. On the conformal walk dimension: quasisymmetric uniformization for symmetric diffusions. *Invent. Math.* 231, 1 (2023), 263–405.
- [25] KAJINO, N., AND SHIMIZU, R. On singularity of p -energy measures among distinct values of p for some p.-c.f. self-similar sets. *in preparation*.
- [26] KAJINO, N., AND SHIMIZU, R. p -Energy forms on fractals: recent progress. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.09002* (2023).
- [27] KAJINO, N., AND SHIMIZU, R. Contraction properties and differentiability of p -energy forms with applications to nonlinear potential theory on self-similar sets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.13668* (2024).
- [28] KAJINO, N., AND SHIMIZU, R. Korevaar–Schoen p -energy forms and associated p -energy measures on fractals. *to appear in Springer Tohoku Series in Mathematics, arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.13435* (2024).
- [29] KIGAMI, J. *Analysis on Fractals*. Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- [30] KIGAMI, J. *Geometry and analysis of metric spaces via weighted partitions*, vol. 2265 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer, Cham, [2020] ©2020.
- [31] KIGAMI, J. *Conductive homogeneity of compact metric spaces and construction of p -energy*, vol. 5 of *Memoirs of the European Mathematical Society*. European Mathematical Society (EMS), Berlin, [2023] ©2023.

- [32] KLEINER, B. The asymptotic geometry of negatively curved spaces: uniformization, geometrization and rigidity. In *International Congress of Mathematicians. Vol. II*. Eur. Math. Soc., Zürich, 2006, pp. 743–768.
- [33] KOREVAAR, N. J., AND SCHOEN, R. M. Sobolev spaces and harmonic maps for metric space targets. *Communications in Analysis and Geometry* 1, 4 (1993), 561–659.
- [34] KUSUOKA, S. Dirichlet forms on fractals and products of random matrices. *Publications of the Research Institute for Mathematical Sciences* 25, 4 (1989), 659–680.
- [35] KUSUOKA, S., AND ZHOU, X. Y. Dirichlet forms on fractals: Poincaré constant and resistance. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* 93, 2 (1992), 169–196.
- [36] KUWAE, K. $(1, p)$ -Sobolev spaces based on strongly local Dirichlet forms. *Math. Nachr.* 297, 10 (2024), 3723–3740.
- [37] LAAKSO, T. Ahlfors Q -regular spaces with arbitrary $Q > 1$ admitting weak Poincaré inequality. *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 10, 1 (2000), 111–123.
- [38] LAAKSO, T. J. Plane with A_∞ -weighted metric not bi-Lipschitz embeddable to \mathbb{R}^N . *Bull. London Math. Soc.* 34, 6 (2002), 667–676.
- [39] LANG, U., AND PLAUT, C. Bilipschitz embeddings of metric spaces into space forms. *Geom. Dedicata* 87, 1-3 (2001), 285–307.
- [40] LEE, J. R., AND NAOR, A. Embedding the diamond graph in L_p and dimension reduction in L_1 . *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 14, 4 (2004), 745–747.
- [41] MERA, M. E., MORÁN, M., PREISS, D., AND ZAJÍČEK, L. Porosity, σ -porosity and measures. *Nonlinearity* 16, 1 (2003), 247–255.
- [42] MURUGAN, M. Diffusions and random walks with prescribed sub-Gaussian heat kernel estimates. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.15611* (2024).
- [43] MURUGAN, M., AND SHIMIZU, R. First-order Sobolev spaces, self-similar energies and energy measures on the Sierpiński carpet. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math. (in press)* (2025).
- [44] NAKAMURA, T., AND YAMASAKI, M. Generalized extremal length of an infinite network. *Hiroshima Mathematical Journal* 6, 1 (1976), 95 – 111.
- [45] NEROLI, Z. Fractal dimensions for iterated graph systems. *Proceedings of the Royal Society A* 480, 2300 (2024), 20240406.
- [46] SASAYA, K. Construction of p -energy measures associated with strongly local p -energy forms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.10369* (2025).
- [47] SCHIOPPA, A. Poincaré inequalities for mutually singular measures. *Analysis and Geometry in Metric Spaces* 3, 1 (2015), 40–45, electronic only.
- [48] SCHIOPPA, A. The Poincaré inequality does not improve with blow-up. *Anal. Geom. Metr. Spaces* 4, 1 (2016), 363–398.
- [49] SHIMIZU, R. Characterizations of Sobolev functions via Besov-type energy functionals in fractals. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.15317* (2024).
- [50] SHIMIZU, R. Construction of p -energy and associated energy measures on Sierpiński carpets. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 377, 2 (2024), 951–1032.
- [51] STEINHURST, B. *Diffusions and Laplacians on Laakso, Barlow-Evans, and other fractals*. University of Connecticut, 2010.
- [52] YAKUBO, K., AND FUJIKI, Y. A general model of hierarchical fractal scale-free networks. *PLOS ONE* 17 (2022), e0264589.

(Riku Anttila) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ,
P.O. Box 35, FI-40014 JYVÄSKYLÄ, FINLAND
Email address: riku.t.anttila@jyu.fi

(Sylvester Eriksson-Bique) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF
JYVÄSKYLÄ, P.O. Box 35, FI-40014 JYVÄSKYLÄ, FINLAND
Email address: sylvester.d.eriksson-bique@jyu.fi

(Ryosuke Shimizu) WASEDA RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING, WASEDA
UNIVERSITY, 3-4-1 OKUBO, SHINJUKU-KU, TOKYO 169-8555, JAPAN.
Email address: r-shimizu@aoni.waseda.jp