# EXPONENTIAL MIXING FOR GIBBS MEASURES ON SELF-CONFORMAL SETS AND APPLICATIONS

JUNJIE HUANG, BING LI, AND SANJU VELANI

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we show that Gibbs measures on self-conformal sets generated by a  $C^{1+\alpha}$  conformal IFS on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  satisfying the OSC are exponentially mixing. We exploit this to obtain essentially sharp asymptotic counting statements for the recurrent and the shrinking target subsets associated with any such set. In particular, we provide explicit examples of dynamical systems for which the recurrent sets exhibit (unexpected) behaviour that is not present in the shrinking target setup. In the process of establishing our exponential mixing result we extend Mattila's rigidity theorem for self-similar sets to self-conformal sets without any separation condition and for arbitrary Gibbs measures.

#### 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background and motivation. Let  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$  be a probability space and let  $T : X \to X$  be a measurable map. We say that  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$  is a measure-preserving system if  $\mu$  is T-invariant in the sense that  $\mu(T^{-1}E) = \mu(E)$  for all  $E \in \mathcal{B}$ . Within the area of ergodic theory and dynamical systems, it is widely recognized that "mixing" in its various forms is a highly sought-after trait for a system to exhibit. In particular, the "rate" of mixing is closely linked to fundamental properties of the system; such as ergodicity. To some extent, an exponential rate represents the most desirable form of mixing and this exponential form of mixing together with its applications will be the main focus of this paper. We start by defining the weaker notion of  $\Sigma$ -mixing introduced in [51] and consider some of its consequences.

**Definition 1.1.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$  be a measure-preserving system. Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a collection of measurable subsets of X. For any integer  $n \geq 1$ , define

$$\phi(n) := \sup\left\{ \left| \frac{\mu(E \cap T^{-n}F)}{\mu(F)} - \mu(E) \right| : E \in \mathcal{C}, \ F \in \mathcal{B}, \ \mu(F) > 0 \right\}.$$

We say that  $\mu$  is  $\Sigma$ -mixing (short for summable-mixing) with respect to  $(T, \mathcal{C})$  if the sum  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \phi(n)$  converges. In particular, we say that  $\mu$  is exponentially mixing with respect to  $(T, \mathcal{C})$  if there exists  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  such that  $\phi(n) = O(\gamma^n)$ .

One powerful consequence of summable-mixing is that if  $\{E_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$  is a sequence of subsets in  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mu$  is  $\Sigma$ -mixing with respect to  $(T, \mathcal{C})$ , then in the language of probability theory, the sets

$$A_n := T^{-n} E_n \qquad (n \in \mathbb{N})$$

are essentially pairwise independent on average. More precisely, for any pair of positive integers a < b, it can be verified that

$$\sum_{a \le m, n \le b} \mu\left(A_m \cap A_n\right) \le \left(\sum_{a \le n \le b} \mu(A_n)\right)^2 + (2\kappa + 1) \sum_{a \le n \le b} \mu(A_n)$$
(1.1)

<sup>2020</sup> Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary: 37A25, 28D05; Secondary: 28A78.

Key words and phrases. exponentially mixing, Ruelle operator, Gibbs measures, self-conformal sets.

where  $\kappa := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \phi(n)$ . Note that without the second term on the right hand side of (1.1), we would have full independence as in the classical sense. Furthermore, observe that  $\mu(A_n) = \mu(E_n)$  since T is measure preserving and if the sum  $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mu(A_n)$  diverges (the interesting case), then the first term dominates and the second 'error' term is, up to constants, the square root of the main term. Independence is of course a well known fundamental notion in probability theory, as in statistics and the theory of stochastic processes.

With essentially full independence as (1.1) at our disposal, it is relatively straightforward to exploit the quantitative form of the Borel-Cantelli Lemma (see Section 7.1: Lemma 7.2<sup>1</sup>) to obtain the following elegant and essentially sharp asymptotic statement concerning the counting function

$$R(x, N) := \# \{ 1 \le n \le N : x \in A_n \} \qquad (x \in X, N \in \mathbb{N}).$$
(1.2)

Obviously, by definition, (1.2) is equivalent to  $R(x, N) = \# \{ 1 \le n \le N : T^n(x) \in E_n \}.$ 

**Theorem A.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$  be a measure-preserving dynamical system and  $\mathcal{C}$  be a collection of measurable subsets of X. Suppose that  $\mu$  is  $\Sigma$ -mixing with respect to  $(T, \mathcal{C})$  and let  $\{E_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence of subsets in  $\mathcal{C}$ . Then, for any given  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we have that

$$R(x, N) = \Psi(N) + O\left(\Psi^{1/2}(N) \ (\log \Psi(N))^{3/2 + \varepsilon}\right)$$
(1.3)

for  $\mu$ -almost all  $x \in X$ , where  $\Psi(N) := \sum_{n=1}^{N} \mu(A_n)$ .

The details of deriving (1.1) and in turn Theorem A from the notion of summable mixing, can be found in [51, Section 2]. The upshot of Theorem A is that if the rate of mixing is summable and the measure sum  $\Psi(N)$  diverges (as  $N \to \infty$ ), then for  $\mu$ -almost all  $x \in X$  the points x lie in the sets  $A_n$ , or equivalently the orbits  $\{T^n x\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  hit the target sets  $E_n$ , the 'expected' number of times. In particular,  $\lim_{N\to\infty} R(x, N) = \infty$  for  $\mu$ -almost all  $x \in X$  and so a simple consequence of the theorem is the following zero-full measure criterion for the associated lim sup set  $A_\infty := \limsup_{n\to\infty} A_n$ :

$$\mu(A_{\infty}) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_n) < \infty \\ 1 & \text{if } \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_n) = \infty. \end{cases}$$
(1.4)

For some readers, this "corollary" is maybe more familiar than its stronger quantitative form. It resembles, for example, the standard

- Borel-Cantelli Lemma in probability theory [13, 14],
- measure characterization of shrinking target and recurrent sets in ergodic theory and dynamical systems (see Section 1.3 below), and
- Khintchine-type theorems in metric number theory [12, 35, 45].

It is worth highlighting that the latter includes the Duffin-Schaeffer conjecture recently proved in the ground breaking work of Koukoulopoulos & Maynard [48]. In pursing a zero-full measure criterion such as (1.4), we can usually get away with a lot less than summable mixing. Indeed, if we already know by some other means (such as Kolmogorov's theorem [14, Theorems 4.5 & 22.3] or ergodicity [14, Section 24]) that the lim sup set  $A_{\infty}$ satisfies a zero-one law (that is to say that  $\mu(A_{\infty}) = 0$  or 1), then to show full measure it

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>We will also present a more versatile form of the familiar Lemma 7.2. The more versatile Lemma 7.7 is required for establishing one of our "application" results in Section 7.2 and is potentially of independent interest.

suffices to show that  $\mu(A_{\infty}) > 0$  when the measure sum diverges. To prove this, the main ingredient required is a significantly weaker form of mixing equivalent to the pairwise quasi-independent on average statement

$$\limsup_{N \to \infty} \frac{\left(\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mu(A_n)\right)^2}{\sum_{n,m=1}^{N} \mu(A_n \cap A_m)} > 0.$$
(1.5)

റ

For details of this and for the interested reader, its related converse see [13, Section 1.1] and references within. Clearly, (1.1) implies pairwise quasi-independent on average. For the sake of completeness and to give a concrete example, we mention that the lim sup set of well approximable numbers associated with the Duffin-Schaeffer conjecture satisfies a zero-one law and in short, Koukoulopoulos & Maynard established (1.5) to prove the conjecture. This independence has subsequently been strengthened [1, 49] to establish the quantitative form of the Duffin-Schaeffer conjecture in the spirit of Theorem A. This brings to an end our brief discussion demonstrating the "power of mixing". As mentioned at the start, mixing is a highly sought-after trait for a system to exhibit. It has various deep consequences. We have deliberately chosen to highlight Theorem A, since it is in line with the applications we have in mind of our main mixing result (see Theorem 1.2) for self-conformal dynamical systems – see Section 7.

Given the fact that exponential mixing is regarded as a desirable property for a dynamical system to possess, it is natural to ask: when do we have it? From this point onward, unless specified otherwise, we assume that X is a metric space and we will use the reasonably standard protocol to say that ' $\mu$  is exponentially mixing' to mean that  $\mu$ is exponentially mixing with respect to  $(T, \mathcal{C})$  with  $\mathcal{C}$  equal to the collection of balls in X. In other words, we simply say that  $\mu$  is exponentially mixing if there exist constants C > 0 and  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  such that

$$\left| \mu(B \cap T^{-n}F) - \mu(F)\mu(B) \right| \leq C \gamma^n \mu(F) \qquad \forall \ n \in \mathbb{N} \,, \tag{1.6}$$

for all balls B in X and  $\mu$ -measurable sets F in X. Note that in certain situations, such as when X is a subset of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\mu$  is a Radon measure, the above restriction to balls suffices to imply *strong-mixing*; that is

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \mu(E \cap T^{-n}F) = \mu(E)\mu(F) \qquad \forall \ E, F \in \mathcal{B}.$$

This in turn implies ergodicity. The following are examples of naturally occurring measure preserving systems in the literature that are known to possess the exponentially mixing property.

- Let X = [0, 1] and let  $T : X \to X$  where  $Tx = mx \mod 1$  with  $m \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}$ , or  $Tx = \beta x \mod 1$  with  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}_{>1}$  or  $Tx = \frac{1}{x} \mod 1$  is the continued fraction map. Accordingly, let  $\mu$  be Lebesgue measure, or Parry measure or Gauss measure. In 1967, Philipp [65] showed that for each of these situations the measure  $\mu$  is exponentially mixing.
- In 1981, Pommerenke [66] studied the ergodic properties of inner functions acting on the unit disc  $\mathbb{D}$  of the complex plane. Indeed, let  $f : \mathbb{D} \to \mathbb{D}$  be an inner function such that f(0) = 0 and f is not a rotation. Let  $f^* : \partial \mathbb{D} \to \partial \mathbb{D}$  denote the radial boundary extension of f and let  $\mu$  be normalised Lebesgue measure on  $\partial \mathbb{D}$ . Then a consequence of [66, Lemma 3] is that if |f'(0)| < 1, then  $\mu$  is exponentially mixing. In fact, Pommerenke's showed that this is true with f replaced by the composition  $f_n \circ \ldots \circ f_1$  of n inner functions.

- In 1996, Liverani, Saussol and Vaienti [54] considered a class of systems in abstract totally ordered sets that cover many one-dimensional systems. For convenience, we restrict our attention to the unit interval. Let X = [0, 1] and let  $T : X \to X$  be a piecewise monotonic transformation. Let  $\varphi$  be a contracting potential. Then, under various assumptions on T, their results [54, Theorem 3.1 and 3.2] implies that there exists a unique equilibrium state  $\mu_{\varphi}$  with respect to  $\varphi$  and that it is exponentially mixing. This generalizes the work of Philipp described above.
- In 2017, Wang, Wu and Xu [75, Lemma 3.2] proved that the Cantor measure on middle-third Cantor set is exponentially mixing with respect to the  $\times 3$  map:  $Tx = 3x \mod 1$ . This was subsequently extended to a range of self-similar sets on  $\mathbb{R}$  – see for instance [47, Section 7]
- In 2023, by exploiting a deep result of Saussol [68], Li, Liao, Velani and Zorin [51, Proposition 1] proved that for a certain class of expanding matrix transformations T of the d-dimensional torus  $\mathbb{T}^d$  there exists an absolutely continuous invariant measure  $\mu$  that is exponentially mixing. In particular, suppose T is a real, nonsingular  $d \times d$  matrix with all eigenvalues of modulus strictly greater than one. Then the "certain class" includes T if in addition it satisfies one of the following conditions: (i) all eigenvalues are of modulus strictly larger than  $1 + \sqrt{d}$ , (ii) T is diagonal, (iii) T is an integer matrix.

We highlight the fact that in all the aforementioned works, the focus is either on onedimensional systems or in higher dimensions on systems equipped with absolutely continuous invariant measures (with respect to Lebesgue measure). In short, we are not aware of any non-trivial situation in two-dimensions (let alone arbitrary dimensions) for which the invariant measure is fractal and exponentially mixing. By a fractal measure we mean a measure that is not absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure. By nontrivial, we mean that the support of the measure is not contained in the union of finitely many straight lines. This simply avoids the higher dimensional situation reducing to a known one-dimensional setup for which we have exponentially mixing.

The upshot of the above discussion is the following question.

**Question 1.1.** Let  $d \geq 2$  and X be a subset of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Is there a measure-preserving dynamical system  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$  for which  $\mu$  is a non-trivial fractal measure on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\mu$  is exponentially mixing?

This question is pretty much the motivating factor behind this paper. With this in mind, we show that Gibbs measures on a large class of self-conformal sets generated by iterated function schemes (IFS) on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  are exponentially mixing. The precise statement is given by Theorem 1.2.

Remark 1.1. Although not explicitly stated in the above discussion, it is worth emphasizing that unless stated otherwise the default metric in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  is the  $L^2$ -norm (i.e. the Euclidean norm). This is especially relevant within the context of Question 1.1. Indeed, if we had used the  $L^{\infty}$ -norm (i.e. the maximum norm), then by a non-trivial fractal measure we should also exclude the situation in which  $\mu$  is a product measure induced by one-dimensional measures that are exponentially mixing. The point is that it is relatively straightforward to demonstrate that such 'manufactured' higher-dimensional measures exhibit exponential mixing with respect to balls in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  where the balls are defined via the  $L^{\infty}$ -norm. For completeness we provide the details in Appendix A. Before describing the setup and formally stating our results, we say a few words concerning the closely related theory of decay of correlations. Let  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$  be a measurepreserving system. The correlation function  $C_{f_1, f_2} : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}$  associated with  $f_1, f_2 \in L^2(\mu)$ is defined as

$$C_{f_1, f_2}(n) := \int_X f_1 \cdot f_2 \circ T^n \, \mathrm{d}\mu - \int_X f_1 \, \mathrm{d}\mu \int_X f_2 \, \mathrm{d}\mu \,. \tag{1.7}$$

It is well known [74, Theorem 1.23] that  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$  is strong-mixing if and only if  $\lim_{n\to\infty} C_{f_1,f_2}(n) = 0$  for every  $f_1, f_2 \in L^2(\mu)$ . In general, nothing can be said regarding the decay rate of convergence for arbitrary  $L^2(\mu)$  functions, so it is usually the case that functions are restricted to smaller Banach spaces  $\mathcal{E}$  of functions. Indeed,  $\mathcal{E}$  is typically taken to be the space of (i)  $\alpha$ -Hölder continuous functions (e.g. [10, 17, 60]), (ii) functions of bounded variation for one dimensional systems (e.g. [54]), and (iii) quasi-Hölder functions for higher dimensional systems (e.g. [68]). In these cases, if the dynamical system satisfies suitable assumptions, it can be shown that the rate of decay of  $C_{f_1,f_2}(n)$ is exponential for all  $f_1 \in \mathcal{E}$  and  $f_2 \in L^1(\mu)$ . To the best of our knowledge, the existing results on the rate of decay do not address Question 1.1. For this, we would need to show the existence of a measure-preserving system  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$  where  $\mu$  is a non-trivial fractal measure on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  ( $d \geq 2$ ) and for which there exist constants C > 0 and  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  such that

$$|C_{f_1, f_2}(n)| \le C \gamma^n \cdot ||f_2||_{L^1(\mu)} \qquad \forall \ n \in \mathbb{N}$$

for all functions  $f_1 = \mathbb{1}_B$ ,  $f_2 = \mathbb{1}_F$  where *B* is any ball in *X* and  $F \in \mathcal{B}$ . The main issue in showing this lies in the fact that the characteristic function  $\mathbb{1}_B$  of a ball is not continuous and the sought after measure  $\mu$  is not absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure.

Remark 1.2. For the sake of completeness, it is worth mentioning that there is also an abundance of work on the decay of correlations for continuous-time dynamical systems (also called flows). In this setting the correlation function is defined similarly to that in (1.7), but with  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  replaced by  $t \in [0, +\infty)$  and  $T^n$  replaced by the 'flow'  $\phi^t$ . Anosov and Sinai [4] in sixties proved that any  $C^2$  Anosov flow that preserves Lebesgue measure is strong mixing unless the stable and unstable foliations are jointly integrable. Regarding the rate of decay of correlations, the Bowen-Ruelle conjecture essentially states that a mixing Anosov flow should have exponential decay for smooth functions. The original conjecture [16] dates back to the seventies and was made for the wider class of Axiom A flows but this was shown to be false soon after [67]. The modified conjecture for Anosov flows represents a fundamental problem in the area of continuous-time dynamical systems. It has been the catalyst for much groundbreaking research, see for example [5, 7, 20, 22, 23, 24, 30, 44, 53, 59, 73] and references within. To date, the Bowen-Ruelle conjecture remains unsolved. The introductions to [20, 73] are particularly informative of its current state.

1.2. Main results. Let  $(\Phi, K, \mu, T)$  be a self-conformal system on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . For the definition and basic properties see Section 2. In short, the set up considered is one in which:

- $\Phi = \{\varphi_j\}_{1 \le j \le m} \ (m \ge 2)$  is a  $C^{1+\alpha}$  conformal IFS on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  satisfying the open set condition (see Definition 2.3 in Section 2.2).
- $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  is the self-conformal set generated by  $\Phi$  (see (2.2) in Section 2.2).
- $\mu$  is a Gibbs measure on K (see Definition 2.5 in Section 2.4).
- $T : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$  is a natural map induced by  $\Phi$  such that  $T|_K : K \to K$  is conjugate to the shift map on the symbolic space  $\{1, 2, ..., m\}^{\mathbb{N}}$  (see (2.26) in Section 2.4).

In order to state our main results addressing Question 1.1, we introduce some standard notation that will be used throughout the paper. Given  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and a nonempty set  $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ , we denote the distance between  $\mathbf{x}$  and E as

$$\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x}, E) := \inf \left\{ |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}| : \mathbf{y} \in E \right\}.$$
(1.8)

The topological boundary of E under the usual topology on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  is denoted by  $\partial E$ . Given  $\rho > 0$ , the symbol

$$(E)_{\varrho} := \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x}, E) < \varrho \right\}$$

represents the  $\rho$ -neighborhood of E.

The following theorem provides a sufficient condition for a self-conformal system to exhibit exponentially mixing with respect to a given collection C of measurable subsets of K. As we shall see in Section 4, the statement is a relatively straightforward consequence of exponentially mixing restricted to cylinder sets.

**Theorem 1.1.** Let  $d \ge 1$  be an integer. Let  $(\Phi, K, \mu, T)$  be a self-conformal system on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a collection of  $\mu$ - measurable subsets in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and suppose there exist constants C > 0 and  $\delta > 0$  so that

$$\mu((\partial E)_{\varrho}) \leq C \, \varrho^{\delta}, \qquad \forall \, \varrho > 0, \quad \forall \, E \in \mathcal{C}.$$
(1.9)

Then  $\mu$  is exponentially mixing with respect to  $(T, \mathcal{C})$ .

In the case of balls, we show that (1.9) is satisfied and thus the following provides an affirmative answer to Question 1.1.

**Theorem 1.2.** Let  $d \ge 1$  be an integer. Let  $(\Phi, K, \mu, T)$  be a self-conformal system on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and let  $\mathcal{C}$  be the collection of balls in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Then  $\mu$  is exponentially mixing with respect to  $(T, \mathcal{C})$ .

Note that for balls, the left hand side of (1.9) corresponds to the  $\mu$ -measure of annuli and the desired upper bound is easily verified if  $\mu$  is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure or d = 1. However, non-trivial difficulties appear when  $\mu$  is a general measure in higher dimensional space. In short, it turns out that we need to fully utilize the geometric structure of self-conformal sets to estimate the measures of annuli. The following classification or equivalently rigidity of self-conformal sets is an important ingredient in obtaining the desired estimates and is potentially of independent interest. To state the result, we introduce the definition of analytic curve in the plane: the set  $\Gamma \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$  is said to be an *analytic curve* if there exist an open set  $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$  containing  $[0,1] \times \{0\}$  and a conformal map  $f : \mathcal{O} \to \mathbb{R}^2$  such that  $\Gamma = f([0,1] \times \{0\})$ .

**Theorem 1.3.** Let  $(\Phi, K, \mu, T)$  be a self-conformal system on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with  $d \geq 2$ . Given  $\ell \in \{1, ..., d-1\}$ , then one of the following statements hold:

- (i)  $\mu(K \cap M) = 0$  for any  $\ell$ -dimensional  $C^1$  submanifold  $M \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ ;
- (ii) K is contained in a  $\ell$ -dimensional affine subspace or  $\ell$ -dimensional geometric sphere;
- (iii) K is contained in a finite disjoint union of analytic curves and this may happen only when d = 2 and  $\ell = 1$ .

Remark 1.3. Mattila [55] obtained the analogous statement for self-similar sets satisfying the open set condition and with  $\mu$  being the Hausdorff measure. It is often referred to as Mattila's rigidity theorem for self-similar sets. Subsequently, Käenmäki [43] extended his work to self-conformal systems. Compared with their results, our statement is

- valid for a broader class of measures (namely Gibbs measures);
- valid without the open set condition (indeed, see Proposition 3.1 for the more general result from which Theorem 1.3 follows).

Furthermore, our result corrects an oversight in the statement of [43, Theorem 2.1]. Basically, Käenmäki claimed that K is contained in a single analytic curve when (i) or (ii) are not the case. However, this is not true even with the open set condition assumption and  $\mu$  restricted to Hausdorff measures. For details of a counterexample see Example 3.1 in Section 3.

1.3. Application to shrinking target and recurrent sets. In this section we discuss applications of Theorem 1.2 to the shrinking target and related recurrent problem for self-conformal dynamical systems. Further details including proofs of statements presented will be the subject of Section 7.

Throughout, (X, d) is a compact metric space and  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$  is an ergodic probability measure-preserving system. We start with describing the application of Theorem 1.2 to the shrinking target problem. For obvious reasons, from the onset, we restrict our attention the setup in which the "target sets" are balls rather than arbitrary measurable sets  $E_n$  as in the general setup of Theorem A. With this in mind, given a sequence of points  $\mathcal{Y} = \{y_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset X$ , and a real, positive function  $\psi : \mathbb{N} \to [0, +\infty)$  let

 $W(\mathcal{Y},\psi) := \{ x \in X : T^n x \in B(y_n,\psi(n)) \text{ for infinitely many } n \in \mathbb{N} \}$ 

denote the associated shrinking target set. If  $\psi = c$  (a constant) and  $\mathcal{Y}$  is contained in the support of  $\mu$ , the Ergodic Theorem implies that  $\mu(W(\mathcal{Y}, c)) = 1$ . In view of this, it is natural to ask: what is the  $\mu$ -measure of the set if  $\psi(n) \to 0$  as  $n \to \infty$ ? In turn, whenever the  $\mu$ -measure is zero, it is natural to ask about the Hausdorff dimension of the sets under consideration. The shrinking target problem was introduced in [39], with a focus on the dynamics of expanding rational maps. Subsequently, there has been activity encompassing a wide range of dynamical systems. We refer to [6, 11, 18, 28, 34, 51, 52, 62] and the references within for dimensional results and to [3, 29, 32, 46, 72] and the references within for measure-theoretical statements. Concentrating our attention solely on the  $\mu$ -measure question, note that

$$W(\mathcal{Y},\psi) = \limsup_{n \to \infty} A_n(\mathcal{Y},\psi)$$

where for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$A_n(\mathcal{Y}, \psi) := \{ x \in X : T^n x \in B(y_n, \psi(n)) \}$$
$$= T^{-n} \big( B(y_n, \psi(n)) \big).$$

Then, on combining Theorem 1.2 and Theorem A (with  $E_n := B(y_n, \psi(n))$ ) we immediately see that we have the following quantitative shrinking target statement for selfconformal dynamical systems.

**Theorem 1.4.** Let  $(\Phi, K, \mu, T)$  be a self-conformal system on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , let  $\psi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  be a real positive function and let  $\mathcal{Y} = \{\mathbf{y}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence of points in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Then, for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mathbb{1}_{B(\mathbf{y}_n,\psi(n))}(T^n \mathbf{x}) = \Psi(N) + O\left(\Psi(N)^{1/2} \log^{\frac{3}{2}+\epsilon}(\Psi(N))\right)$$
(1.10)

for  $\mu$ -almost all  $\mathbf{x} \in K$ , where

$$\Psi(N) := \sum_{n=1}^{N} \mu(B(\mathbf{y}_n, \psi(n))).$$
(1.11)

Several comments are in order. Given  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\mathbf{x} \in K$ , note that the left hand side of (1.10) is simply the counting function

$$W(\mathbf{x}, N; \mathcal{Y}, \psi) := \# \{ 1 \le n \le N : \mathbf{x} \in A_n(\mathcal{Y}, \psi) \}$$
  
$$= \# \{ 1 \le n \le N : T^n \mathbf{x} \in B(\mathbf{y}_n, \psi(n)) \}$$
(1.12)

and that the measure sum (1.11) is equivalent to

$$\Psi(N) := \sum_{n=1}^{N} \mu \left( A_n(\mathcal{Y}, \psi) \right).$$
(1.13)

Thus, the theorem shows that for  $\mu$ -almost all  $\mathbf{x} \in K$ , the asymptotic behaviour of the counting function  $W(\mathbf{x}, N; \mathcal{Y}, \psi)$  is determined by the behaviour of the measure sum  $\Psi(N)$  involving the sets  $A_n(\mathcal{Y}, \psi)$  associated with the lim sup set  $W(\mathcal{Y}, \psi)$ . This together with the fact that  $\Psi(N)$  is independent of  $\mathbf{x} \in K$ , is well worth keeping in mind for future comparison with the analogous recurrent problem. Next note that by definition,  $\mathbf{x} \in W(\mathcal{Y}, \psi)$  if and only if  $\lim_{N \to \infty} W(\mathbf{x}, N; \mathcal{Y}, \psi) = \infty$  and so an immediate consequence of Theorem 1.4 is the following zero-full measure criterion (which naturally is in line with (1.4) in the general setup of measurable sets).

**Corollary 1.1.** Let  $(\Phi, K, \mu, T)$  be a self-conformal system on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , let  $\psi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  be a real positive function and let  $\mathcal{Y} = \{\mathbf{y}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence of points in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Then,

$$\mu(W(\mathcal{Y},\psi)) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(B(\mathbf{y}_n,\psi(n))) < \infty, \\ 1 & \text{if } \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(B(\mathbf{y}_n,\psi(n))) = \infty. \end{cases}$$

We now consider the analogue of the shrinking target problem for the recurrence framework. As above, the general scene is one in which (X, d) is a compact metric space and  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$  is a probability measure-preserving system. We do not need the system to be ergodic to pose the recurrent problem. Given a real, positive function  $\psi: \mathbb{N} \to [0, +\infty)$ let

$$R(\psi) := \{ x \in X : T^n x \in B(x, \psi(n)) \text{ for infinitely many } n \in \mathbb{N} \}$$

denote the associated *recurrent set*. If  $\psi = c$  (a constant), the Poincaré Recurrence Theorem implies that  $\mu(R(c)) = 1$  and it is natural to determine the  $\mu$ -measure of the set  $R(\psi)$  if  $\psi(n) \to 0$  as  $n \to \infty$  and if it is zero, its size in terms of Hausdorff dimension. The first results date back to the pioneering work of Boshernitzan [15] who studied the case  $\psi(n) = n^{-1/\beta}$  ( $\beta > 0$ ). For subsequent activity we refer to [8, 9, 21, 41, 47] and references within for measure-theoretical statements and to [37, 40, 69, 71, 76] and references within for dimensional results. As with the shrinking target problem, we will concentrate our attention on the  $\mu$ -measure aspect of the recurrent problem. With this in mind, we first note that  $R(\psi)$  is clearly also a lim sup set; namely

$$R(\psi) = \limsup_{n \to \infty} R_n(\psi)$$

where for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$R_n(\psi) := \{ x \in X : T^n x \in B(x, \psi(n)) \} .$$
(1.14)

Furthermore, given  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $x \in X$ , if we consider the associated counting function

$$R(x, N; \psi) := \# \{ 1 \le n \le N : x \in R_n(\psi) \}$$
  
=  $\# \{ 1 \le n \le N : T^n x \in B(x, \psi(n)) \}$   
=  $\sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{1}_{B(x, \psi(n))}(T^n x),$  (1.15)

then in line with the shrinking target framework (and more generally that of quantitative Borel-Cantelli), it would not be particularly outrageous to suspect (under suitable but natural assumptions) that for  $\mu$ -almost all  $x \in X$ , the asymptotic behaviour of the counting function is determined by the behaviour of the  $\mu$ -measure sum of the sets  $R_n(\psi)$ . Let us make this precise in the setting of self-conformal dynamical systems.

**Claim F.** Let  $(\Phi, K, \mu, T)$  be a self-conformal system on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , let  $\psi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  be a real positive function and assume that  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(R_n(\psi))$  diverges. Then, for  $\mu$ -almost all  $\mathbf{x} \in K$ 

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mathbb{1}_{B(\mathbf{x},\psi(n))}(T^n \mathbf{x})}{\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mu(R_n(\psi))} = 1.$$
(1.16)

Such a claim was also alluded to in [50, Section 1] and it was shown to be true for a large class of piecewise linear maps in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . However, as we shall demonstrate, it turns out that in general the claim is false (hence the label "F") in a rather strong sense. Indeed, in Section 7.4 we provide explicit examples of self-conformal systems for which the  $\mu$ -measure of the lim sup set  $R(\psi)$  is one but the limit appearing in (1.16) is not even a constant let alone one (cf. Example ABB below). In other words, even after excluding a set of  $\mu$ -measure zero, the limit in (1.16) depends on x and thus for these self-conformal systems the associated recurrent sets exhibit (unexpected and extreme) behaviour that is not present for shrinking target sets. To the best of our knowledge this phenomena seems not to have been observed previously or at least not explicitly documented. The following summarises the counterexamples to the claim given in Section 7.4.

• In Example 7.1, we start with  $\Phi = \{\varphi_1, \varphi_2\}$  where  $\varphi_1 : [0,1] \rightarrow [0,1/3]$  and  $\varphi_2 : [0,1] \rightarrow [2/3,1]$  are given by

$$\varphi_1(x) = \frac{x}{3}, \qquad \varphi_2(x) = \frac{x+2}{3} \qquad \forall \ x \in [0,1].$$

This gives rise to the "natural" associated self-conformal system  $(\Phi, K, \mu, T)$  in which K is the standard middle-third Cantor set and  $\mu$  is the Cantor measure. Then, for the constant function  $\psi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  given by  $\psi(x) := \frac{1}{3} + \frac{2}{3^2}$ , we show that: for  $\mu$ -almost all  $x \in K$ 

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mathbb{1}_{B(x,\psi(n))}(T^n x)}{\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mu(R_n(\psi))} = \begin{cases} \frac{4}{5} & \text{if } x \in \left( \left[0, \frac{1}{9}\right] \cup \left[\frac{8}{9}, 1\right] \right) \cap K, \\ \frac{6}{5} & \text{if } x \in \left( \left[\frac{2}{9}, \frac{1}{3}\right] \cup \left[\frac{2}{3}, \frac{7}{9}\right] \right) \cap K. \end{cases}$$

• In Example 7.2 we start with  $\Phi = \{\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3, \varphi_4\}$  where  $\varphi_i$  (i = 1, 2, 3, 4) are defined on [0, 1] and given by

$$\varphi_1(x) = \frac{1}{4}x, \ \varphi_2(x) = \frac{1}{2(1+x)}, \ \varphi_3(x) = \frac{1+x}{2+x}, \ \varphi_4(x) = \frac{2}{2+x}.$$

We show that this gives rise to a self-conformal system  $(\Phi, K, \mu, T)$  in which K is the unit interval and  $\mu$  is the natural Gibbs measure supports on K that is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebsegue measure. In turn, for any real

positive function  $\psi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  such that  $\psi(x) \to 0$  as  $x \to \infty$  and  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(R_n(\psi))$  diverges, we show that: for  $\mu$ -almost all  $x \in [0, 1]$ 

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mathbb{1}_{B(x,\psi(n))}(T^n x)}{\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mu(R_n(\psi))} = \frac{2\log 2}{1+x}.$$

While the first more familiar "Cantor" example requires less sophisticated tools to setup and execute, it does rely on  $\psi$  being a constant function.

Remark 1.4. The counterexamples show that even though we have exponentially mixing (Theorem 1.2) we can not in general guarantee that the sets  $R_n(\psi)$  are pairwise independent on average (in the sense of (1.1)) as in the shrinking target framework. The point is that if it did then the quantitative form of the Borel-Cantelli Lemma (see Section 7.1: Lemma 7.2) would establish Claim F (very much in the same way we deduce Theorem A from (1.1)).

Note that in both Example 7.1 and 7.2, we still have that  $\lim_{N\to\infty} R(x, N; \psi) = \infty$  for  $\mu$ -almost all  $x \in X$  and so  $\mu(R(\psi)) = 1$ . Moreover, we highlight the fact that in both the measure  $\mu$  is Ahlfors regular and that for such measures this phenomena (under the assumption that  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(R_n(\psi))$  diverges) is known to hold for any self-conformal system (see [8]) and indeed for more general systems (see [41]). Recall, a measure  $\mu$  on a metric space (X, d) is  $\tau$ -Ahlfors regular if there exists a constant  $C \geq 1$  such that for any ball  $B(x, r) \subset X$  with  $x \in X$ 

$$C^{-1}r^{\tau} \le \mu(B(x,r)) \le Cr^{\tau}.$$

The upshot of the above is that given a self-conformal system  $(\Phi, K, \mu, T)$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  for which the Gibbs measure  $\mu$  is Ahlfors regular, and a real positive function  $\psi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ , then

$$\mu(R(\psi)) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(R_n(\psi)) < \infty, \\ 1 & \text{if } \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(R_n(\psi)) = \infty. \end{cases}$$
(1.17)

The convergent part is a straightforward consequence of the standard convergent Borel-Cantelli Lemma in probability theory. In view of this, it is tempting to suspect that at the coarser level of a zero-full measure criterion the analogue of Claim F is true; that is to say that (1.17) is true for any self-conformal system on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Clearly, such a statement would correspond to the analogue of Corollary 1.1 for recurrent sets. However, this turns out not to be the case. In a recent beautiful paper, Allen, Baker & Bárány [2] consider the recurrent problem within the symbolic dynamics setting for topologically mixing subshifts of finite type. More precisely, in this setting they provide sufficient conditions for  $\mu(R(\psi))$  to be zero or one when  $\mu$  is assumed to be a non-uniform Gibbs measure and thus is not Ahlfors regular. In terms of Bernoulli measures defined on the full shift, the condition on the measure means that the components of the defining probability vector are not all equal. As a consequence of their main result, in the introduction [2, Section 1] they provide a class of examples within the symbolic dynamics setting for which the sum of  $\mu(R_n(\psi))$  diverges but  $\mu(R(\psi))$  is equal to zero. In particular, these examples show that (1.17) is not true for non-uniform Gibbs measures associated with topologically mixing shifts of finite type. In the final section of [2], the authors outline how their theorems can be transferred, via a relatively standard argument involving the coding map, to the setting of dynamics on homogenous self-similar sets satisfying the strong separation condition and for which the corresponding Gibbs measures are assumed to be non-uniform. Although not explicitly mentioned, in the same spirit the examples from [2, Section 1] can also be

naturally transferred across and when specialised to the middle-third Cantor we obtain the following concrete example that shows that (1.17) is not true for any self-conformal system.

**Example ABB.** Let  $\Phi = \{\varphi_1, \varphi_2\}$ , T and K be as in Example 7.1. Recall, K is the standard middle-third Cantor. Now let  $\mu$  be the weighted Cantor measure associated with the probability vector  $(p_1, p_2)$  with  $p_1 \neq p_2$ . Let  $\alpha > 0$  and  $\psi_{\alpha}(n) = 3^{-\lfloor \alpha \log n \rfloor}$ . If

$$\frac{1}{-(p_1\log p_1 + p_2\log p_2)} < \alpha < \frac{1}{-\log(p_1^2 + p_2^2)}$$

then

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(R_n(\psi_{\alpha})) = \infty \quad \text{but} \quad \mu(R(\psi_{\alpha})) = 0.$$

*Remark* 1.5. To be precise, in the above example,  $\mu := \underline{\mu} \circ \pi^{-1}$  where  $\underline{\mu}$  is the Bernoulli measure on  $\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}} := \{1, 2\}^{\mathbb{N}}$  associated with the probability vector  $(p_1, p_2)$  with  $p_1 \neq p_2$  and  $\pi : \Sigma^{\mathbb{N}} \to K$  is the coding map associated to  $\Phi$  (see (2.19) for the definition).

A straightforward consequence of Example ABB is that for  $\mu$ -almost all  $x \in X$ 

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{1}_{B(x,\psi_{\alpha}(n))}(T^{n}x) \ll 1 \text{ and so } \lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mathbb{1}_{B(x,\psi_{\alpha}(n))}(T^{n}x)}{\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mu(R_{n}(\psi_{\alpha}))} = 0$$

In other words, even though the limit is a constant for  $\mu$ -almost all  $x \in X$ , it is not one (cf. Claim F). Note that Examples 7.1 and 7.2 show that Claim F is false even when  $\mu(R(\psi)) = 1$  and that for  $\mu$ -almost all  $x \in K$ , the limit under consideration is dependent on x and thus not a constant; that is to say that Claim F is false on a large scale!

Given that Claim F is false, it is natural to attempt to establish an appropriate "modified" statement that is true for the full range of dynamical systems under consideration (namely, self-conformal systems). Such a statement would obviously follow on establishing the analogue of Theorem 1.4 for recurrent sets. Indeed, this is the ultimate goal as it would provide an asymptotic result with an error term. With this in mind, in order to state our first main result (for recurrent sets) we need to introduce a particular function that will determine the appropriate setup and thus the asymptotic behaviour. As usual, let  $(\Phi, K, \mu, T)$  be a self-conformal system and a  $\psi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  be a real, positive function. Then for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we define the function

$$t_n(\cdot) = t_n(\cdot, \psi) : K \to \mathbb{R}_{>0}$$

by

$$t_n(\mathbf{x}) = t_n(\mathbf{x}, \psi) := \inf \{ r \ge 0 : \mu(B(\mathbf{x}, r)) \ge \psi(n) \}$$
 (1.18)

if  $\psi(n) \leq 1$  and we put  $t_n(\mathbf{x})$  equal to the diameter of the bounded set K otherwise. With the definition of  $t_n$  in mind, Theorem 1.2 enables us to establish the following analogue of Theorem 1.4 for recurrent sets.

**Theorem 1.5.** Let  $(\Phi, K, \mu, T)$  be a self-conformal system on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and let  $\psi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be a real positive function such that  $\psi(x) \to 0$  as  $x \to \infty$ . Furthermore, for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  let  $t_n : K \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  be given by (1.18). Then for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mathbb{1}_{B(\mathbf{x},t_n(\mathbf{x}))}(T^n \mathbf{x}) = \Psi(N) + O\left(\Psi(N)^{1/2} \log^{\frac{3}{2}+\epsilon}(\Psi(N))\right)$$
(1.19)

for  $\mu$ -almost all  $\mathbf{x} \in K$ , where

$$\Psi(N) := \sum_{n=1}^{N} \psi(n) \,. \tag{1.20}$$

Remark 1.6. Several comments are in order.

(i) It turns out (see Lemma 7.3 in Section 7.1) that for all  $\mathbf{x} \in K$  and all sufficiently large  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ 

$$\mu(B(\mathbf{x}, t_n(\mathbf{x}))) = \psi(n) \,. \tag{1.21}$$

Thus, up to an additive constant, the sum (1.20) is simply the sum of the  $\mu$ measure of the "target balls"  $B(\mathbf{x}, t_n(\mathbf{x}))$  associated with the modified counting function appearing on the left hand side of (1.19). In short, if the measure  $\mu$  is non-uniform then the measure of a ball  $B(\mathbf{x}, r)$  depends on its location  $\mathbf{x}$  and not just its radius r. In order to take this into account, for n large, the radii of the target balls within the framework of Theorem 1.5 are adjusted so that they all have the same measure (namely  $\psi(n)$ ) regardless of location.

(ii) Let  $\hat{R}_n(\mathbf{x}, N; \psi)$  denote the modified counting function appearing on the left hand side of (1.19). Then by definition,

$$\hat{R}_n(\mathbf{x}, N; \psi) = \# \left\{ 1 \le n \le N : \mathbf{x} \in \hat{R}_n(\psi) \right\}$$

where  $\hat{R}_n(\psi) := \{ \mathbf{x} \in K : T^n \mathbf{x} \in B(\mathbf{x}, t_n(\mathbf{x})) \}$ . It turns out (see Lemma 7.5 in Section 7.1) that there exists a constant  $0 < \gamma < 1$  such that

$$\mu(\hat{R}_n(\psi)) = \psi(n) + O(\gamma^n).$$

The upshot of this and the equality (1.21) appearing in (i) above is that the sum (1.20) appearing in the theorem and the measure sums  $\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mu(B(\mathbf{x}, t_n(\mathbf{x})))$  and  $\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mu(\hat{R}_n(\psi))$  are all equal up to an additive constant.

- (iii) The theorem is valid for any self-conformal system on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . The price we seemingly have to pay for this generality is that the radii of the target balls  $B(\mathbf{x}, t_n(\mathbf{x}))$ associated with the modified counting function  $\hat{R}_n(\mathbf{x}, N; \psi)$  are dependent on their centres  $\mathbf{x} \in K$ . This is clearly unlike the situation for the "pure" counting function  $R_n(\mathbf{x}, N; \psi)$  for which we know that Claim F is false for all self-conformal systems.
- (iv) A simple consequence of Theorem 1.5 is the following asymptotic statement that "fixes" Claim F: Let  $(\Phi, K, \mu, T)$  be a self-conformal system on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and let  $\psi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  be a real positive function such that  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \psi(n)$  diverges. Then for  $\mu$ -almost all  $\mathbf{x} \in K$

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mathbb{1}_{B(\mathbf{x}, t_n(\mathbf{x}))}(T^n \mathbf{x})}{\sum_{n=1}^{N} \psi(n)} = 1.$$
(1.22)

Note that in view of the discussion in (ii) above this "corrected" statement simply corresponds to Claim F in which the counting function  $R_n(\mathbf{x}, N; \psi)$  is replaced by the modified counting function  $\hat{R}_n(\mathbf{x}, N; \psi)$  and with  $R_n(\psi)$  replaced by  $\hat{R}_n(\psi)$ .

(v) Recently, under various growth conditions on the function  $\psi$ , Persson [63] has proved a result in a similar vein to (1.22) for a large class of dynamical systems with exponential decay of correlations on the unit interval. Subsequently, his work (with the various growth conditions) was extended by Sponheimer [70] to more general dynamical systems including Axiom A diffeomorphisms. We stress that Theorem 1.5, which implies (1.22), is free of growth conditions on  $\psi$  and provides an essentially optimal error term. At the point of completing this paper, the preprint [64] of Persson & Sponheimer appeared. In this, under a 'short return time assumption' and '3-fold exponential decay' they essentially remove the growth conditions on  $\psi$  imposed in their previous works.

Even though Theorem 1.5 is in some sense a "complete" result, it fails to directly deal with the main purpose of Claim F. Indeed, it remains highly desirable to obtain asymptotic information regarding the behaviour of the "pure" counting function (1.15) in which the radii of the target balls are independent of their centres. We reiterate that this is not the case within the framework of Theorem 1.5. In short, our second main result (for recurrent sets) shows that we are in good shape for systems with Gibbs measures equivalent to restricted Hausdorff measures  $\mathcal{H}^{\tau}|_{K}$ . Here and throughout, we say that Borel measures  $\mu$ and  $\nu$  on a metric space (X, d) are equivalent if there exists a constant  $C \geq 1$  such that  $C^{-1}\nu(E) \leq \mu(E) \leq C\nu(E)$  for any Borel subset  $E \subseteq X$ . For reasons outlined above, the following is a more desirable analogue of Theorem 1.4 than Theorem 1.5 – even though it does not cover all self-conformal systems.

**Theorem 1.6.** Let  $(\Phi, K, \mu, T)$  be a self-conformal system on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with  $\mu$  being a Gibbs measure equivalent to  $\mathcal{H}^{\tau}|_K$  where  $\tau := \dim_{\mathrm{H}} K$ . Let  $\psi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  be a real positive function such that  $\psi(x) \to 0$  as  $x \to \infty$ . Then for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mathbb{1}_{B(\mathbf{x},\psi(n))}(T^{n}\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \mu \left( B(\mathbf{x},\psi(n)) \right) + O\left( \Psi(N)^{1/2} (\log \Psi(N))^{\frac{3}{2}+\epsilon} \right)$$
(1.23)

for  $\mu$ -almost all  $\mathbf{x} \in K$ , where

$$\Psi(N) := \sum_{n=1}^{N} \psi(n)^{\tau} \,. \tag{1.24}$$

Note that the theorem shows that for  $\mu$ -almost all  $x \in K$ , the asymptotic behaviour of the counting function  $R(\mathbf{x}, N; \psi)$  is determined by the behaviour of the measure sum

$$\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mu \left( B(\mathbf{x}, \psi(n)) \right), \qquad (1.25)$$

which, a priori, is dependent on x. The point is that if the measure  $\mu$  is non-uniform, the measure of the "target balls"  $B(\mathbf{x}, \psi(n))$  associated with  $R(\mathbf{x}, N; \psi)$  depends on x. This is unlike the situation in the shrinking target framework in which the measure of the "target balls"  $B(\mathbf{y}_n, \psi(n))$  associated with the counting function  $W(\mathbf{x}, N; \mathcal{Y}, \psi)$  are independent of  $\mathbf{x}$ . On a slightly different but related note, we point out that the Gibbs measures associated with the explicit counterexamples (Examples 7.1 & 7.2) to Claim F satisfy the conditions of Theorem 1.6. Thus, the  $\mu$ -measure sum (1.25) can not in general coincide with the  $\mu$ -measure sum involving the sets  $R_n(\psi)$  associated with the recurrent lim sup set  $R(\psi)$ . However, it is the case (see Lemma 7.9) that the sums (1.24), (1.25) and  $\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mu(R_n(\psi))$  are all comparable<sup>2</sup>; that is

$$\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mu \big( B(\mathbf{x}, \psi(n)) \big) \simeq \sum_{n=1}^{N} \mu \big( R_n(\psi) \big) \simeq \sum_{n=1}^{N} \psi(n)^{\tau}.$$
(1.26)

Thus, Theorem 1.6 implies the following corollary which validates (1.17) whenever  $\mu$  is equivalent to  $\mathcal{H}^{\tau}|_{K}$ .

 $<sup>^{2}</sup>$ For the sake of comparison, recall that in the setting of Theorem 1.5 the analogous three sums are asymptotically equivalent (see comment (ii) in Remark 1.6).

**Corollary 1.2.** Let  $(\Phi, K, \mu, T)$  be a self-conformal system on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with  $\mu$  being a Gibbs measure equivalent to  $\mathcal{H}^{\tau}|_K$  where  $\tau := \dim_{\mathrm{H}} K$ . Let  $\psi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  be a real positive function. Then

$$\mu(R(\psi)) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \psi(n)^{\tau} < \infty, \\ 1 & \text{if } \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \psi(n)^{\tau} = \infty. \end{cases}$$
(1.27)

In the case  $\mu = \mathcal{H}^{\tau}|_{K}$ , Corollary 1.2 coincides with the main result of Baker & Farmer in [8].

We now consider a special case of Theorem 1.6 in which the Gibbs measure is absolutely continuous with respect to *d*-dimensional Lebesgue measure  $\mathcal{L}^d$ . For convenience, let  $c_d := \mathcal{L}^d(B(0,1))$  and suppose that  $\mu$  is a Gibbs measure equivalent to  $\mathcal{L}^d|_K$  with density function *h*. Then, the Lebesgue density theorem implies that for  $\mu$ -almost all  $\mathbf{x} \in K$ 

$$\mu(B(\mathbf{x},\psi(n))) = (h(\mathbf{x}) + \epsilon_n(\mathbf{x})) \cdot c_d \,\psi(n)^d \,, \tag{1.28}$$

where  $\epsilon_n(\mathbf{x}) \to 0$  as  $n \to \infty$ . The upshot of this is the following rewording of Theorem 1.6 for absolutely continuous measures.

**Corollary 1.3.** Let  $(\Phi, K, \mu, T)$  be a self-conformal system on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and suppose that  $\dim_{\mathrm{H}} K = d$ . Let  $\mu$  be a Gibbs measure equivalent to  $\mathcal{L}^d|_K$  with density function h. Let  $\psi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  be a real positive function such that  $\psi(x) \to 0$  as  $x \to \infty$ . Then for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mathbb{1}_{B(\mathbf{x},\psi(n))}(T^{n}\mathbf{x}) = h(\mathbf{x})\Psi(N) + c_{d}\sum_{n=1}^{N} \epsilon_{n}(\mathbf{x})\psi(n)^{d} + O\left(\Psi(N)^{1/2}(\log\Psi(N))^{\frac{3}{2}+\epsilon}\right).$$
(1.29)

for  $\mu$ -almost all  $\mathbf{x} \in K$ , where  $\Psi(N) := c_d \sum_{n=1}^N \psi(n)^d$  and  $\epsilon_n(\mathbf{x}) \to 0$  as  $n \to \infty$  satisfies (1.28).

Note that in general we do not have any information regarding the rate at which  $\epsilon_n(\mathbf{x}) \to 0$ , so it is not possible to compare the size of the second and third terms appearing on the right hand side of (1.29). However, if  $\mu = \mathcal{L}^d$  then  $\epsilon_n(\mathbf{x}) = 0$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\mathbf{x} \in K$  and so the second term is zero. With this in mind, it follows that Corollary 1.3 is in line with the main result established in [50] for piecewise linear maps of  $[0, 1]^d$ . Furthermore, with Theorem 1.2 at our disposal, the implied asymptotic statement

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mathbb{1}_{B(\mathbf{x},\psi(n))}(T^n \mathbf{x})}{\Psi(N)} = h(x) \quad \text{for } \mu\text{-almost all } \mathbf{x} \in K,$$
(1.30)

can be directly derived from the recent impressive work of He [36]. In short, He obtains (1.30) for a class of measure-preserving systems for which  $\mu$  is exponentially mixing and absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure.

Remark 1.7. It is worth pointing out that in the case  $\mu$  is equivalent to  $\mathcal{H}^{\tau}|_{K}$ , Theorem 1.5 can be utilized to explicitly obtain information regarding the behaviour of the counting function (1.15). In order to state precisely what exactly can be obtained, we need to introduce the following notion of upper and lower densities. Let  $\psi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  be a real positive function. Then, for each  $\tau > 0$ , each probability measure  $\mu$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and each  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , we define the  $\tau$ -lower and  $\tau$ -upper densities of  $\mu$  at  $\mathbf{x}$  associated with  $\psi$  by

$$\Theta^{\tau}_{*}(\mu,\psi,\mathbf{x}) := \liminf_{n \to \infty} \frac{\mu(B(\mathbf{x},\psi(n)))}{\psi(n)^{\tau}}, \quad \Theta^{*\tau}(\mu,\psi,\mathbf{x}) := \limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{\mu(B(\mathbf{x},\psi(n)))}{\psi(n)^{\tau}}$$

With this in mind, the following can be deduced directly from Theorem 1.5. Clearly, it is a much weaker statement than Theorem 1.6. For the sake of completeness we will provide the details of its deduction from Theorem 1.5 in Section 7.3.

**Theorem 1.7.** Let  $(\Phi, K, \mu, T)$  be a self-conformal system on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with  $\mu$  being a Gibbs measure equivalent to  $\mathcal{H}^{\tau}|_K$  where  $\tau := \dim_{\mathrm{H}} K$ . Let  $\psi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  be a real positive function such that  $\psi(x) \to 0$  as  $x \to \infty$  and assume that  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \psi(n)^{\tau}$  diverges. Then, for  $\mu$ -almost all  $\mathbf{x} \in K$ 

$$\frac{\Theta_*^{\tau}(\mu, \psi, \mathbf{x})}{\Theta^{*\tau}(\mu, \psi, \mathbf{x})} \leq \liminf_{N \to \infty} \frac{\sum_{n=1}^N \mathbbm{1}_{B(\mathbf{x}, \psi(n))}(T^n \mathbf{x})}{\sum_{n=1}^N \mu(B(\mathbf{x}, \psi(n)))} \\ \leq \limsup_{N \to \infty} \frac{\sum_{n=1}^N \mathbbm{1}_{B(\mathbf{x}, \psi(n))}(T^n \mathbf{x})}{\sum_{n=1}^N \mu(B(\mathbf{x}, \psi(n)))} \leq \frac{\Theta^{*\tau}(\mu, \psi, \mathbf{x})}{\Theta_*^{\tau}(\mu, \psi, \mathbf{x})}.$$
(1.31)

It can be verified that this significantly weaker form of Theorem 1.6 is enough to imply Corollary 1.2 and also Corollary 1.3 without the error term.

We bring this section to an end with a brief discussion concerning the recurrent problem beyond self-conformal systems, or rather beyond the structure inherited by such systems. In view of Theorem A, we know that exponential mixing underpins the asymptotic behaviour of the counting function within the setup of the shrinking target problem. Currently, we see no obvious counterexample that shows that this is not enough within the recurrent framework. Adding a safety net, by restricting to Hausdorff measures, it remains plausible that the following "strengthening" of Theorem 1.6 is true. In short it would suggest that the key aspect of the system under consideration is that it is exponentially mixing and nothing else.

**Claim T.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$  be a measure-preserving dynamical system in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with  $\mu$  being a  $\tau$ -Ahlfors regular measure where  $\tau := \dim_{\mathrm{H}} X$ . Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a collection of balls in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and suppose that  $\mu$  is exponentially-mixing with respect to  $(T, \mathcal{C})$ . Let  $\psi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  be a real positive function such that  $\psi(x) \to 0$  as  $x \to \infty$ . Then, for any given  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we have that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mathbb{1}_{B(\mathbf{x},\psi(n))}(T^n \mathbf{x}) = \Psi(N, \mathbf{x}) + O\left(\Psi(N, \mathbf{x})^{1/2} \log^{\frac{3}{2}+\epsilon}(\Psi(N, x))\right)$$

for  $\mu$ -almost all  $\mathbf{x} \in K$ , where  $\Psi(N, \mathbf{x}) := \sum_{n=1}^{N} \mu \left( B(\mathbf{x}, \psi(n)) \right)$ .

Several comments are in order.

(i) It is easily versified that within the setup of self-conformal systems, the notion of  $\mu$  being equivalent to  $\mathcal{H}^{\tau}|_{X}$  and  $\mu$  being  $\tau$ -Ahlfors regular coincide (for the details, see the proof of Theorem 2.7 in [27]). In general, we only have that the latter implies the former.

- (ii) Clearly, under the assumption that  $\mu$  is a  $\tau$ -Ahlfors regular measure as in Claim T, we can replace the quantity  $\Psi(N, x)$  by  $\sum_{n=1}^{N} \psi(n)^{\tau}$  in the error term (as in Theorem 1.6) and thus making it independent of  $\mathbf{x} \in K$ . The reason that we have not done this is that there is a possibility that the conclusion of the claim is true without the Ahlfors regular assumption and in such generality the error may depend on  $\mathbf{x} \in K$ ; that is to say that  $\Psi(N, x)$  may not be comparable to a sum that is independent of  $\mathbf{x}$ .
- (iii) With the previous comment in mind, it is worth pointing out that (1.26) is in fact true under the hypothesis of Claim T (see [41, Lemma 2.5]). Indeed, it is easily checked that all that is essentially required to establish (1.26) is that  $\mu$  is  $\tau$ -Ahlfors regular and that  $\mu$  is exponentially-mixing.

Even if Claim T turns out to be false, it does not rule out the following strengthening of Corollary 1.2 which is of independent interest.

**Claim 0-1.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$  be a measure-preserving dynamical system in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with  $\mu$  being a  $\tau$ -Ahlfors regular measure where  $\tau := \dim_{\mathrm{H}} X$ . Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a collection of balls in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and suppose that  $\mu$  is exponentially-mixing with respect to  $(T, \mathcal{C})$ . Let  $\psi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  be a real positive function. Then

$$\mu(R(\psi)) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \psi(n)^{\tau} < \infty, \\ 1 & \text{if } \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \psi(n)^{\tau} = \infty. \end{cases}$$
(1.32)

As already mentioned, currently we see no obvious counterexample that shows that Claim T is false, let alone a counterexample to Claim 0-1.

Remark 1.8. As mentioned in the discussion leading up to Claim T, the actual statement of the claim is erring on the side of caution. Indeed, we see no obvious counter example to either Claim T or Claim 0-1 even if we remove the assumption that the measure  $\mu$  is Ahlfors regular. Obviously, without the latter assumption, in Claim 0-1 we would replace the sum appearing in (1.32) by  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(B(\mathbf{x}, \psi(n)))$ . It is worth pointing out that a relatively painless calculation shows that within the context of Example ABB, we have that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu \big( B(\mathbf{x}, \psi_{\alpha}(n)) \big) \, < \, \infty$$

for  $\mu$ -almost all  $\mathbf{x} \in K$  (see Proposition C.1 in Appendix C for the details). Thus, Example ABB is not a counterexample to the bolder statement in which the Ahlfors regular assumption is dropped. Finally, at the very basic level, as far as we are aware, it is not known whether or not  $\mu(R(\psi))$  satisfies a zero-one law; i.e.  $\mu(R(\psi)) = 0$  or 1.

1.4. Organizations of the paper. This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the background knowledge, including concepts and basic results regarding conformal maps, conformal iterated function schemes and Ruelle operators on symbolic spaces and self-conformal sets. In Section 3, we prove Theorem 1.3 in a more general framework that does not require the open set condition (by definition, this is implicit in the framework of a self-conformal system). In addition, with reference to Remark 1.3, we provide a counterexample to Käenmäki's result in dimension two. In Section 4, we prove Theorem 1.1 by utilizing the exponentially mixing property for cylinder sets. Sections 5 & 6 are devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.2 - our main result. In Section 7, we establish the statements presented in Section 1.3 regarding the applications of Theorem 1.2 to the

recurrent problem for self-conformal dynamical systems. This involves establishing a more versatile form of the standard quantitative Borel-Cantelli Lemma.

#### 2. Self conformal systems: the preliminaries

For convenience, various pieces of notation that are frequently used throughout the paper are listed below:

- $d \ge 1$  is an integer.
- For any  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, ..., x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , denote by  $|\mathbf{x}| := (x_1^2 + \cdots + x_d^2)^{1/2}$  the Euclidean norm of  $\mathbf{x}$ .
- If A is a  $d \times d$  real matrix, the maximal norm of A is denoted by

$$|A| := \sup\left\{|A\mathbf{x}| : |\mathbf{x}| = 1\right\}.$$

- For a function  $f \in C^1(\Omega)$  on an open set  $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ , the symbol  $f'(\mathbf{x})$  represents the Jacobian matrix of f at  $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$ . It is also common to use the notation  $D_{\mathbf{x}}f$ .
- The diameter of a set  $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  under the Euclidean norm is denoted by |E|, and we write  $\overline{E}$  for the closure of E in the topology induced by this norm.
- For any  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and r > 0, we use  $B(\mathbf{x}, r)$  to denote the open ball centered at  $\mathbf{x}$  with radius r under the Euclidean norm.

### 2.1. Conformal maps.

**Definition 2.1.** Let  $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  be an open set. We say that  $f \in C^1(\Omega)$  is *conformal* on  $\Omega$  if f is injective and

$$f'(\mathbf{x}) \neq 0$$
 and  $|(f'(\mathbf{x}))(\mathbf{y})| = |f'(\mathbf{x})| \cdot |\mathbf{y}|, \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \Omega, \ \forall \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^d.$ 

Let  $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  be a connected open set. We shall recall the rigidity of conformal maps on  $\Omega$ . When d = 1, a map  $f : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$  is a conformal map if and only if  $f \in C^1(\Omega)$ and  $f'(x) \neq 0$  for all  $x \in \Omega$ . When d = 2, if we view  $\mathbb{R}^2$  as the complex plane  $\mathbb{C}$ , then an injective map  $f : \Omega \to \mathbb{C}$  is conformal if and only if f is holomorphic (or antiholomorphic) on  $\Omega$ . When  $d \geq 3$ , by Liouville's theorem (see [33, Section 3.8]), a map  $f : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^d$  is conformal if and only if it is a restriction to  $\Omega$  of a Möbius transformation on  $\mathbb{R}^d := \mathbb{R}^d \cup \{\infty\}$ , that is

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{b} + \frac{c}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{a}|^{\epsilon}} \cdot A(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{a}),$$

where  $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^d, c \in \mathbb{R}, \epsilon \in \{0, 2\}$  and A is a  $d \times d$  orthogonal matrix. We end this section with the following useful result.

**Lemma 2.1.** Let  $d \ge 2$  be an integer and let  $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  be a bounded connected open set. Suppose  $\{f_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$  is a sequence of conformal maps on  $\Omega$  such that:

(i) there exists C > 1 so that for any  $n \ge 1$  we have

$$C^{-1}|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}| \le |f_n(\mathbf{x}) - f_n(\mathbf{y})| \le C |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|, \quad \forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \Omega$$

(ii)  $\{f_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$  is uniformly bounded on  $\Omega$ ; that is to say that there exists M > 0 so that for any  $n \ge 1$  we have

$$|f_n(\mathbf{x})| \le M$$
,  $\forall \mathbf{x} \in \Omega$ .

Then, there exist a subsequence  $\{f_{n_k}\} \subseteq \{f_n\}$  and a conformal map g on  $\Omega$  such that  $f_{n_k} \to g$  uniformly on  $\Omega$ .

Proof. Let  $\{f_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$  satisfy the above conditions (i) and (ii). Then by the Arzelà-Ascoli Theorem, there exist a subsequence  $\{f_{n_k}\} \subseteq \{f_n\}$  and a continuous map  $g: \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $f_{n_k} \to g$  uniformly on  $\Omega$ . We now show that g is conformal. When d = 2, we view  $\mathbb{R}^2$  as the complex plane  $\mathbb{C}$  and it follows from [19, Theorem III 1.3] that g is holomorphic on  $\Omega$ . By condition (i), we know that  $g'(z) \neq 0$  for all  $z \in \Omega$  and hence g is conformal. If  $d \geq 3$ , then  $\{f_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$  is a sequence of Möbius maps on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Moreover, by combining condition (i) and [33, Corollary 3.6.6], the sequence  $\{f_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$  is a normal family over  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . So we can assume that  $f_{n_k} \to g$  uniformly on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  under the chordal metric (see [33, Page 7] for the definition of chordal metric). Finally, we conclude that g is a Möbius map by means of [33, Theorem 3.6.7] and thus conformal.

2.2.  $C^{1+\alpha}$  conformal IFS. Let  $d \geq 1$  be an integer. In this section, we introduce the definition of a  $C^{1+\alpha}$  conformal IFS on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and bring together some simple but useful properties that are frequently used throughout the paper.

**Definition 2.2.** Let  $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  be an open set and  $\alpha > 0$ . Given a function  $f : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^d$ , we say that  $f \in C^{1+\alpha}(\Omega)$  if  $f \in C^1(\Omega)$  and f' is  $\alpha$ -Hölder continuous on  $\Omega$ ; that is, there exists some constant C > 0 such that

$$||f'(\mathbf{x})| - |f'(\mathbf{y})|| \le C |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|^{\alpha}, \quad \forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \Omega.$$

**Definition 2.3.** Fix an integer  $m \geq 2$ . We say that  $\Phi = \{\varphi_j\}_{1 \leq j \leq m}$  is a *conformal IFS* on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  if there exists a bounded connected open set  $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  such that each map  $\varphi_j$  is an injective and contractive conformal map on  $\Omega$  satisfying

$$\overline{\varphi_j(\Omega)} \subseteq \Omega$$
 and  $0 < \inf_{\mathbf{x}\in\Omega} |\varphi'_j(\mathbf{x})| \le \sup_{\mathbf{x}\in\Omega} |\varphi'_j(\mathbf{x})| < 1.$  (2.1)

In particular, we say that  $\Phi$  is a  $C^{1+\alpha}$  conformal IFS if each  $\varphi_j$  (j = 1, 2, ..., m) above belongs to  $C^{1+\alpha}(\Omega)$ .

It is well known (Hutchinson [42]) that there is a unique compact set  $K \subseteq \Omega$  such that

$$K = \bigcup_{j=1}^{m} \varphi_j(K) \,. \tag{2.2}$$

We call this set K the self-conformal set generated by  $\Phi$ . In particular, we say that  $\Phi$  satisfies the open set condition (OSC) if there is a nonempty open set  $V \subseteq \Omega$  such that  $\varphi_j(V) \subseteq V$  and  $\varphi_i(V) \cap \varphi_j(V) = \emptyset$  for any  $i \neq j \in \{1, ..., m\}$ .

Here and throughout, let  $\Sigma := \{1, 2, ..., m\}$  denote a finite alphabet composed of m elements. For any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , the set  $\Sigma^n$  consists of all words of length n over  $\Sigma$ , while  $\Sigma^*$  represents the collection of all finite words as follows

$$\Sigma^* := \bigcup_{k \ge 1} \Sigma^k \, .$$

Given a word  $I = i_1 \dots i_n$ , we define the associated map  $\varphi_I$  as the composition

$$\varphi_I := \varphi_{i_1} \circ \cdots \circ \varphi_{i_n} \,,$$

and let

$$K_I := \varphi_I(K)$$
18

denote the images of K under  $\varphi_I$ . The length of a finite word  $I \in \Sigma^*$  is denoted by |I|. The cylinder set associated with  $I = i_1 \cdots i_n$  is defined as

$$[I] = \{J = (j_1 j_2 \cdots) \in \Sigma^{\mathbb{N}} : j_1 = i_1, \dots, j_n = i_n\}.$$

Additionally, the composition of two finite words  $I = i_1 i_2 \cdots i_n$  and  $J = j_1 j_2 \cdots j_k$  is given by

$$IJ := i_1 \cdots i_n j_1 \cdots j_k$$
.

The following statements hold for any  $C^{1+\alpha}$  conformal IFS on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ :

• There exists  $C_1 > 1$  such that

$$\varphi'_{I}(\mathbf{x})| \leq C_{1} |\varphi'_{I}(\mathbf{y})|, \quad \forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \Omega, \ \forall I \in \Sigma^{*},$$

$$(2.3)$$

and hence

$$C_1^{-1} \|\varphi_I'\| \le |\varphi_I'(\mathbf{x})| \le C_1 \|\varphi_I'\|, \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \Omega, \ \forall I \in \Sigma^*,$$
(2.4)

where  $||f'|| := \sup_{x \in \Omega} |f'(\mathbf{x})|$ . For a proof, see [61, Lemma 2.1].

• There exists a bounded open set  $U \subseteq \Omega$  and a constant  $C_2 > 1$  such that

$$\overline{U} \subseteq \Omega, \quad \varphi_j(U) \subseteq U \qquad (j = 1, 2, ..., m)$$

and

$$C_2^{-1} \|\varphi_I'\| \cdot |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}| \le |\varphi_I(\mathbf{x}) - \varphi_I(\mathbf{y})| \le C_2 \|\varphi_I'\| \cdot |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|$$
(2.5)

for all  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in U$  and all  $I \in \Sigma^*$ . For a proof, see [61, Lemma 2.2].

• It follows directly from (2.5) that there exists  $C_3 > 1$  such that

$$C_3^{-1} \|\varphi_I'\| \le |K_I| \le C_3 \|\varphi_I'\|, \quad \forall I \in \Sigma^*.$$

$$(2.6)$$

Therefore, on letting

$$\kappa := \max\left\{ \|\varphi'_j\| : 1 \le j \le m \right\},\tag{2.7}$$

we have that

$$|K_I| \le C_3 \,\kappa^{|I|}, \quad \forall I \in \Sigma^* \,. \tag{2.8}$$

• By (2.4) and (2.6) and the fact that the equality

$$|(f \circ g)'(\mathbf{x})| = |f'(g(\mathbf{x}))| \cdot |g'(\mathbf{x})|$$

holds for any  $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$  and any pair of conformal mappings  $f, g : \Omega \to \Omega$ , there exists  $C_4 > 1$  such that

$$C_4^{-1}|K_I||K_J| \le |K_{IJ}| \le C_4 |K_I||K_J|, \quad \forall I, J \in \Sigma^*.$$
 (2.9)

Remark 2.1. With reference to Definition 2.3, it can be verified that the second condition in (2.1) can be weakened to the statement: there exists  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$0 < \inf_{\mathbf{x}\in\Omega} |\varphi_I'(\mathbf{x})| \le \sup_{\mathbf{x}\in\Omega} |\varphi_I'(\mathbf{x})| < 1, \quad \forall I \in \Sigma^{n_0}.$$
(2.10)

without effecting the results obtained in this paper. In other words, our theorems hold for the corresponding larger class of self conformal systems coming from the self-conformal IFS  $\{\varphi_I\}_{I\in\Sigma^{n_0}}$ . For a concrete example of this see Remark 7.1.

Remark 2.2. Let  $\Phi = \{\varphi_j : \Omega \to \Omega\}_{1 \le j \le m}$  be a conformal IFS (not necessarily  $C^{1+\alpha}$ ) on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with  $d \geq 2$ . It is easy to find a bounded connected open set  $U \subseteq \Omega$  such that

$$\overline{U} \subseteq \Omega, \quad \varphi_j(U) \subseteq U \quad (j = 1, 2, ..., m)$$

Then, by [57, Proposition 4.2.1], each  $\varphi_i$  (j = 1, 2, ..., m) is  $C^{1+\alpha}$  on U with  $\alpha = 1$ .

2.3. Ruelle operators on symbolic spaces. In this section, we introduce Ruelle operators on symbolic spaces. Fix an integer  $m \ge 2$ , let  $\Sigma = \{1, 2, ..., m\}$ . Define a metric on  $\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}$  as

$$\operatorname{dist}(I,J) := m^{-\sup\{k \ge 1: i_1 = j_1, \dots, i_k = j_k\}}, \quad \forall I = i_1 i_2 \cdots, \ J = j_1 j_2 \cdots \in \Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}, \tag{2.11}$$

where we set  $\sup \emptyset := 0$  and  $m^{-\infty} := 0$ . It is well known that  $\operatorname{dist}(\cdot, \cdot)$  is an ultrametric and that  $(\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}, \operatorname{dist})$  is a compact metric space. Let  $\sigma : \Sigma^{\mathbb{N}} \to \Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}$  be the shift map on  $\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}$ , that is  $\sigma(i_1i_2\cdots)=i_2i_3\cdots$  for any  $i_1i_2\cdots\in\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}$ .

Given  $g \in C(\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}})$ , we define  $\mathcal{S} : C(\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}) \to C(\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}})$  to be the Ruelle operator with *potential* q by setting

$$\mathcal{S}f(I) := \sum_{J \in \sigma^{-1}(I)} g(J)f(J), \qquad \forall f \in C(\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}), \ \forall I \in \Sigma^{N}.$$

It can be verified that the iterates of  $\mathcal S$  can be written as

$$\mathcal{S}^{n}f(I) = \sum_{J \in \sigma^{-1}(I)} g^{(n)}(J)f(J), \qquad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \ \forall f \in C(\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}), \ \forall I \in \Sigma^{\mathbb{N}},$$
  
e  $g^{(n)}(I) := g(I)g(\sigma I) \cdots g(\sigma^{n-1}I)$  for  $I \in \Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}$ . For any  $f \in C(\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}})$ , let

$$||f||_{\infty} := \sup_{I \in \Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}} |f(I)|$$

The norm of  $\mathcal{S}$  is defined as

wher

$$\|\mathcal{S}\|_{\infty} := \sup \left\{ \|\mathcal{S}f\|_{\infty} : f \in C(\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}), \ \|f\|_{\infty} = 1 \right\}.$$

It is clear that  $\|\mathcal{S}\|_{\infty} \leq m \|g\|_{\infty}$  and hence  $\mathcal{S}$  is a bounded linear operator on the Banach space  $(C(\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}), \|\cdot\|_{\infty})$ . We define the spectral radius of  $\mathcal{S}$  as

$$R := \lim_{n \to \infty} \|\mathcal{S}^n\|_{\infty}^{1/n}.$$
(2.12)

This limit exists since  $\|\mathcal{S}^{n+m}\|_{\infty} \leq \|\mathcal{S}^n\|_{\infty} \|\mathcal{S}^m\|_{\infty}$  (see [25, Corollary 1.3]).

Let  $\mathcal{M}(\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}})$  be the collection of all finite Borel signed measures. By the Riesz Representation Theorem [31, Theorem 7.17], we know that  $\mathcal{M}(\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}})$  can be viewed as the dual space of  $C(\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}})$ . We then define the dual operator  $\mathcal{S}^* : \mathcal{M}(\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}) \to \mathcal{M}(\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}})$  of  $\mathcal{S}$  by setting

$$\langle \mathcal{S}^*\nu, f \rangle = \langle \nu, \mathcal{S}f \rangle$$
for any  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}})$  and  $f \in C(\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}})$ , where  $\langle \nu, f \rangle := \int_{\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}} f \, \mathrm{d}\nu.$ 

$$(2.13)$$

Let  $\beta > 0$ . Denote by  $\mathcal{C}^{\beta}(\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}})$  the collection of all  $\beta$ -Hölder continuous functions. We are now in the position to introduce Ruelle's Theorem. In short, it provides us with the existence of 'good' measures on  $\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}$ .

**Theorem 2.1** (Ruelle [10, Theorem 1.5]). Let  $\beta > 0$ , let  $g: \Sigma^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  be a positive  $\beta$ -Hölder continuous function, let S be the Ruelle operator with potential g and let R be the spectral radius of S. Then, there exist unique positive  $h \in \mathcal{C}^{\beta}(\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}})$  and Borel probability measure  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}})$  such that

$$\mathcal{S}h = Rh, \quad \mathcal{S}^*\nu = R\nu, \quad \int_{\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}} h \, \mathrm{d}\nu = 1.$$
 (2.14)

The theorem naturally enables us to define "good" measures on symbolic spaces.

**Definition 2.4** (Gibbs measure on  $\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}$ ). Let  $\beta > 0$ , let  $g : \Sigma^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  be a positive  $\beta$ -Hölder continuous function and let  $\mathcal{S}$  be the Ruelle operator with potential g. Let h be the eigenfunction of  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\nu$  be the eigenmeasure of  $\mathcal{S}$  as in (2.14). We define the *Gibbs measure*  $\mu$  with respect to the  $\beta$ -Hölder potential g (or briefly, a *Gibbs measure* when  $\beta$  and g are not explicitly relevant) on  $\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}$  by

$$\mathrm{d}\mu := h \, \mathrm{d}\nu.$$

We now list various useful elementary properties regarding the Gibbs measure  $\mu$ :

• Let  $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}$  denote the normalized Ruelle operator; that is

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}f(I) := \sum_{J \in \sigma^{-1}(I)} \widetilde{g}(J)f(J) \quad \text{where} \quad \widetilde{g} := \frac{1}{R} \cdot \frac{g \cdot h}{h \circ \sigma} \,.$$

Then we have

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_1 \equiv 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{\mathcal{S}}^* \mu = \mu.$$
 (2.15)

- $\mu$  is  $\sigma$ -invariant.
- (*Gibbs property*) There exists  $C_5 > 1$  such that  $C_5^{-1}\tilde{g}^{(|I|)}(J) \leq \mu([I]) \leq C_5 \tilde{g}^{(|I|)}(J), \quad \forall I \in \Sigma^*, \ \forall J \in [I].$ (2.16)
- (quasi-Bernoulli property) There exists  $C_6 > 1$  such that

$$C_6^{-1}\mu([I])\mu([J]) \le \mu([IJ]) \le C_6\,\mu([I])\mu([J]), \quad \forall I, J \in \Sigma^*.$$
(2.17)

The identity (2.15) and the  $\sigma$ -invariance of  $\mu$  can be verified directly by definition. For a proof of the inequality (2.16), we refer to [17]. The quasi-Bernoulli property follows from (2.16) and the fact that  $\tilde{g}^{(|I|)}(J_1) \simeq \tilde{g}^{(|I|)}(J_2)$  for any  $I \in \Sigma^*$  and any  $J_1, J_2 \in [I]$ . The latter, can be proved by making use of the fact that  $\tilde{g}$  is positive and the  $\beta$ -Hölder continuity of log  $\tilde{g}$ .

The following well-known result states that any Gibbs measure on  $\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}$  exhibits exponentially decay of correlations for  $\beta$ -Hölder continuous functions. To state the result, we define the  $\beta$ -Hölder norm for  $f \in C^{\beta}(\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}})$  as

$$||f||_{\beta} := ||f||_{\infty} + \sup\left\{\frac{|f(I) - f(J)|}{\operatorname{dist}(I, J)^{\beta}} : I, J \in \Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}, I \neq J\right\}.$$

**Theorem 2.2** ([10, Theorem 1.6]). Let  $\beta > 0$  and let  $\mu$  be a Gibbs measure with respect to a  $\beta$ -Hölder potential on  $\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}$ . Then there exist C > 0 and  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  such that

$$\left| \int_{\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}} f_1 \cdot f_2 \circ \sigma^n \, \mathrm{d}\mu - \int_{\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}} f_1 \, \mathrm{d}\mu \cdot \int_{\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}} f_2 \, \mathrm{d}\mu \right| \leq C \gamma^n \cdot \|f_1\|_{\beta} \cdot \int_{\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}} |f_2| \, \mathrm{d}\mu$$
  
for any  $f_1 \in \mathcal{C}^{\beta}(\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}})$ , any  $f_2 \in L^1(\mu)$  and any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

The authors in [26] utilized Theorem 2.2 to prove the following result which says that any Gibbs measure on  $\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}$  is exponentially mixing with respect to  $(\sigma, \mathcal{C})$ , where  $\mathcal{C}$  is the collection of all balls in  $\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}$ .

**Theorem 2.3** ([26, Proposition 7.2]). Let  $\mu$  be a Gibbs measure on  $\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}$ . Then there exist C > 0 and  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  such that

$$\left|\mu\left([I] \cap \sigma^{-n}F\right) - \mu([I])\mu(F)\right| \leq C\gamma^{n}\mu(F)$$

for any  $I \in \Sigma^*$ , any measurable set  $F \subseteq \Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}$  and any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

This concludes our discussion concerning Ruelle operators and associated Gibbs measures on symbolic spaces. We now turn our attention to Ruelle operators on self-conformal sets.

2.4. Ruelle operators on  $C^{1+\alpha}$  conformal IFS. Let  $m \in \mathbb{N}_{>2}$ , let  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\alpha > 0$ and let  $\alpha' > 0$ . Throughout this section, let

$$\Phi = \{\varphi_j : \Omega \to \Omega\}_{1 \le j \le m}$$

be a  $C^{1+\alpha}$  conformal IFS on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , let  $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  be the self-conformal set generated by  $\Phi$ , and let

$$\{g_j:\varphi_j(\Omega)\to\mathbb{R}_{>0}\}_{1\leq j\leq m}$$

be positive  $\alpha'$ -Hölder continuous functions. Define the Ruelle operator  $\mathcal{L}: C(K) \to C(K)$ with potentials  $\{g_j\}_{1 \le j \le m}$  by setting

$$\left(\mathcal{L}f\right)(\mathbf{x}) := \sum_{j=1}^{m} g_j\left(\varphi_j(\mathbf{x})\right) f\left(\varphi_j(\mathbf{x})\right)$$
(2.18)

where  $f \in C(K)$  and  $\mathbf{x} \in K$ . The spectral radius of  $\mathcal{L}$  is defined similarly as in (2.12) with  $\mathcal{S}$  replaced by  $\mathcal{L}$  and  $\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}$  replaced by K. Let  $\mathcal{M}(K)$  be the collection of all finite Borel signed measures on K. The dual operator  $\mathcal{L}^* : \mathcal{M}(K) \to \mathcal{M}(K)$  corresponding to  $\mathcal{L}$  is defined similarly as in (2.13). We now construct the Ruelle operator  $\mathcal{S}$  on the symbolic space  $\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}} = \{1, ..., m\}^{\mathbb{N}}$  associated with  $\mathcal{L}$  via the functions  $\{g_i\}_{1 \le i \le m}$ . In turn, we investigate the relationship between the two operators  $\mathcal{L}$  and  $\mathcal{S}$ .

Fix  $\mathbf{x}_0 \in K$ . The coding map associated to  $\Phi$ , denoted by  $\pi : \Sigma^{\mathbb{N}} \to K$ , is defined as follows:

$$\pi(I) := \lim_{n \to \infty} \varphi_{i_1} \circ \cdots \circ \varphi_{i_n}(\mathbf{x}_0) \quad \text{where} \quad I = i_1 i_2 \cdots \in \Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}.$$
(2.19)

The above limit exists since the maps  $\varphi_j$   $(1 \leq j \leq m)$  are contractive, and its value is independent of the choice of  $\mathbf{x}_0 \in K$ . The Ruelle operator  $\mathcal{S}: C(\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}) \to C(\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}})$  associated with  $\{g_i\}_{1 \le j \le m}$  (or equivalently induced by  $\mathcal{L}$ ) is defined by

$$\mathcal{S}\underline{f}(I) := \sum_{J \in \sigma^{-1}(I)} \underline{g}(J) \underline{f}(J) \qquad \forall \underline{f} \in C(\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}), \ \forall I \in \Sigma^{N},$$
(2.20)

where we set

$$\underline{g}(I) := g_{i_1}(\pi(I)), \qquad \forall I = i_1 i_2 \dots \in \Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}.$$

A direct calculation yields that g is a  $\beta$ -Hölder continuous function on  $\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}$ , where

$$\beta := \frac{-\alpha' \log \kappa}{\log m} \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa \in (0, 1) \text{ is as in } (2.7).$$

It turns out that  $\mathcal{L}$  and  $\mathcal{S}$  should have some relations. Indeed, it can be verified that the operators  $\mathcal{L}$  and  $\mathcal{S}$  are naturally related via the coding map in the following manner:

$$\mathcal{S}(f \circ \pi) = (\mathcal{L}f) \circ \pi \qquad \forall f \in C(K) \,. \tag{2.21}$$

With this at hand, one can show that  $\mathcal{L}$  and  $\mathcal{S}$  share the same spectral radius which we denote by R. According to Theorem 2.1, there exist unique positive  $\underline{h} \in \mathcal{C}^{\beta}(\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}})$  and Borel probability measure  $\underline{\nu} \in \mathcal{M}(\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}})$  such that

$$S\underline{h} = R\underline{h}, \quad S^*\underline{\nu} = R\underline{\nu}, \quad \int_{\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}} \underline{h} \, \mathrm{d}\underline{\nu} = 1.$$
 (2.22)

In [27], Fan and Lau established the existence and uniqueness of the eigenfunction and eigenmeasure of the operator  $\mathcal{L}$  and also revealed their respective relationship to  $\underline{h}$  and  $\underline{\nu}$ . More precisely, this is summarised by the following statement. Clearly the first part is the analogue of Theorem 2.1 for self-conformal sets.

**Theorem 2.4** ([27, Proof of Theorem 1.1; Theorem 2.2]). Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be a Ruelle operator defined as in (2.18), and let R be the spectral radius of  $\mathcal{L}$ . Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be the Ruelle operator on  $\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}$  induced by  $\mathcal{L}$  (see (2.20)), and let  $\underline{h} \in \mathcal{C}^{\beta}(\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}})$  and  $\underline{\nu} \in \mathcal{M}(\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}})$  be as in (2.22). Then we have:

(i) There exist unique positive  $h \in C(K)$  and Borel probability measure  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(K)$  such that

$$\mathcal{L}h = Rh, \quad \mathcal{L}^*\nu = R\nu, \quad \int_K h \, \mathrm{d}\nu = 1.$$

(ii) Let h and  $\nu$  be the function and measure obtained in (i). Then

$$\underline{h} = h \circ \pi$$
 and  $\nu = \underline{\nu} \circ \pi^{-1}$ .

(iii) Let  $\nu$  be the measure obtained in (i). If  $\Phi$  (the IFS) satisfies the open set condition (OSC), then for all  $I, J \in \Sigma^*$  with |I| = |J| and  $I \neq J$  we have that

$$\nu(K_I \cap K_J) = 0.$$

In the same way that Theorem 2.1 enables us to naturally define "good" measures on symbolic spaces, the above theorem enables us to define "good" measures on self-conformal sets.

**Definition 2.5** (Gibbs measure on K). Let  $\alpha' > 0$ , let  $\{g_j : \varphi_j(\Omega) \to \mathbb{R}_{>0}\}_{1 \le j \le m}$  be positive  $\alpha'$ -Hölder continuous functions and let  $\mathcal{L}$  be the Ruelle operator with respect to  $\{g_j\}_{1 \le j \le m}$  as defined by (2.18). Let h be the eigenfuction of  $\mathcal{L}$  and  $\nu$  be the eigenmeasure of  $\mathcal{L}$  as in part (i) of Theorem 2.4. We define the *Gibbs measure*  $\mu$  with respect to the  $\alpha'$ -Hölder potentials  $\{g_j\}_{1 \le j \le m}$  (or briefly, a *Gibbs measure*) on K by

$$\mathrm{d}\mu := h \, \mathrm{d}\nu. \tag{2.23}$$

Now let  $\mu$  be the Gibbs measure with respect to the  $\alpha'$ -Hölder potentials  $\{g_j\}_{1 \leq j \leq m}$ . In turn, let  $\underline{h} \in C^{\beta}(\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}})$  and  $\underline{\nu} \in \mathcal{M}(\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}})$  be the eigenfunction and eigenmeasure of the Ruelle operator S associated with  $\{g_j\}_{1 \leq j \leq m}$  (see (2.22)), and let  $\underline{d\mu} := \underline{h} \underline{d\nu}$  be the Gibbs measure on  $\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}$  with respect to the  $\beta$ -Hölder potential  $\underline{g}$  (see Definition 2.4). Then, as a consequence of part (ii) of Theorem 2.4, we have that

$$\mu = \underline{\mu} \circ \pi^{-1}. \tag{2.24}$$

The upshot is that any Gibbs measure  $\mu$  on K is an image measure of a Gibbs measure  $\underline{\mu}$  on the symbolic space  $\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}$  under the coding map.

In the following, we assume that  $\Phi$  satisfies the OSC. Let  $\tilde{K}$  be the set of points with unique symbolic representation; that is

$$\widetilde{K} := \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in K : \#(\pi^{-1}(\mathbf{x})) = 1 \right\}.$$

Then by part (iii) of Theorem 2.4, we have that

$$\mu\left(\widetilde{K}^c\right) = 0. \tag{2.25}$$

With this in mind, consider the map  $T : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$  defined by

$$T(\mathbf{x}) := \begin{cases} \pi \circ \sigma \circ \pi^{-1}(\mathbf{x}) & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in \widetilde{K}, \\ \mathbf{x} & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \notin \widetilde{K}. \end{cases}$$
(2.26)

By (2.24), (2.25) and the  $\sigma$ -invariance of  $\underline{\mu}$  (see Section 2.3), it can be verified that  $\mu$  is *T*-invariant. Indeed, since  $\mu = \underline{\mu} \circ \pi^{-1}$ , then (2.25) implies that  $\underline{\mu}((\pi^{-1}\widetilde{K})^c) = 0$ . Moreover, by the definitions of  $\widetilde{K}$  and *T*, we have that

$$\widetilde{K} \cap T^{-1}F = \pi^{-1}\widetilde{K} \cap \sigma^{-1}(\pi^{-1}F)$$

for any  $\mu$ -measurable set  $F \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ . This together with the fact that  $\underline{\mu}$  is  $\sigma$ -invariant in mind, implies that

$$\mu(T^{-1}F) = \mu(\widetilde{K} \cap T^{-1}F)$$

$$= \underline{\mu}(\pi^{-1}\widetilde{K} \cap \sigma^{-1}(\pi^{-1}F))$$

$$= \underline{\mu}(\sigma^{-1}(\pi^{-1}F))$$

$$= \underline{\mu}(\pi^{-1}F)$$

$$= \mu(F)$$

as desired. Next, given any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , any  $I \in \Sigma^*$  and any  $\mu$ -measurable subset  $F \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ , the following relation follows directly via the definitions of  $\widetilde{K}$  and T

$$\pi^{-1}\left(K_I \cap T^{-n}F \cap \widetilde{K}\right) = [I] \cap \sigma^{-n}(\pi^{-1}F) \cap \pi^{-1}\widetilde{K}.$$

Then on using (2.25), we find that

$$\mu(K_I \cap T^{-n}F) = \underline{\mu}\left([I] \cap \sigma^{-n}(\pi^{-1}F)\right).$$
(2.27)

In particular, if we put F = K in (2.27), it follows that

$$\mu(K_I) = \underline{\mu}([I]), \qquad \forall I \in \Sigma^*.$$
(2.28)

The upshot of the above is that on combining (2.24), (2.27), (2.28) with the  $\sigma$ -invariance of  $\mu$  and Theorem 2.3, we obtain the following statement that plays a crucial role in the proof of Theorem 1.1. It can be viewed as the the analogue of Theorem 2.3 for self-conformal sets.

**Corollary 2.1.** Let  $\Phi$  be a  $C^{1+\alpha}$  conformal IFS satisfying the OSC on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , let K be the self-conformal set generated by  $\Phi$ , let  $\mu$  be a Gibbs measure supported on K and let T be defined as in (2.26). Then there exist C > 0 and  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  such that

$$\mu(K_I \cap T^{-n}F) - \mu(K_I)\mu(F) \le C\gamma^n\mu(F)$$

for any  $n \geq 1$ , any  $I \in \Sigma^*$  and any  $\mu$ -measurable set  $F \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ .

For the sake of completeness, we end this section by describing two concrete and well known examples of Gibbs measures on self-conformal sets K. The first example shows that any self-similar measure is a Gibbs measure. The second example shows the existence of Gibbs measures that are equivalent to the restricted Hausdorff measure on K.

**Example 2.1.** Let  $\Phi = \{\varphi\}_{1 \leq j \leq m}$  be a self-similar IFS on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and K be the self-similar set generated by  $\Phi$ . Let  $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, ..., p_m)$  be a probability vector. Then  $\mathbf{p}$  induces on K the self-similar measure

$$\mu = \sum_{j=1}^m p_j \, \mu \circ \varphi_j^{-1} \, .$$

Let  $\mathcal{L}: C(K) \to C(K)$  be the Ruelle operator defined by

$$(\mathcal{L}f)(\mathbf{x}) := \sum_{j=1}^{m} p_j f(\varphi_j(\mathbf{x})).$$

Then a straightforward calculation shows that the spectral radius of  $\mathcal{L}$  is 1 and

$$\mathcal{L}1 \equiv 1$$
 and  $\mathcal{L}^*\mu = \mu$ .

The upshot is that any self-similar measure is a Gibbs measure.

**Example 2.2.** Let  $\Phi = \{\varphi_j\}_{1 \le j \le m}$  be a  $C^{1+\alpha}$  conformal IFS on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  satisfying the OSC, and let K be the self-conformal set generated by  $\Phi$ . Let  $\tau := \dim_{\mathrm{H}} K$ . Let  $\mathcal{L} : C(K) \to \mathcal{L}$ C(K) be the Ruelle operator defined by

$$(\mathcal{L}f)(\mathbf{x}) := \sum_{j=1}^{m} |\varphi_j'(\mathbf{x})|^{\tau} f(\varphi_j(\mathbf{x})).$$

Then by [27, Theorems 2.7 and 2.9], the spectral radius of  $\mathcal{L}$  is 1 and the unique eigenmeasure  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(K)$  (the existence is guaranteed by part (i) of Theorem 2.4) is given by the normalized restricted Hausdorff measure

$$\nu := \frac{\mathcal{H}^{\tau}|_{K}}{\mathcal{H}^{\tau}(K)} \quad \text{which satisfies} \quad \mathcal{L}^{*}\nu = \nu.$$

By definition, the corresponding Gibbs measure  $\mu$  is given by  $d\mu = h d\nu$  for some positive continuous function  $h \in C(K)$  and it is easily verified that there exists C > 1 such that

$$C^{-1}\mathcal{H}^{\tau}(E) \leq \mu(E) \leq C \mathcal{H}^{\tau}(E)$$
 for all Borel sets  $E \subseteq K$ .

In other words,  $\mu$  is equivalent to  $\mathcal{H}^{\tau}|_{K}$  - the restricted Hausdorff measure on K.

## 3. Self-conformal sets: rigidity without separation conditions and the PROOF OF THEOREM 1.3

In this section, we will prove Theorem 1.3. As alluded in Remark 1.3, and indeed the title of this section, we will in fact prove a stronger statement that does not require the OSC assumption that is implicit in the definition of a self-conformal system. Let  $\underline{\mu}$ be a Borel probability measure on the symbolic space  $\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}} = \{1, 2, ..., m\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ . Recall, that  $(\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}, \text{dist})$  is a compact metric space where dist is given by (2.11). With this in mind, we say that  $\underline{\mu}$  is *doubling* if there exists C > 1 such that

$$0 < \underline{\mu} \big( B(I, 2r) \big) \le C \, \underline{\mu} \big( B(I, r) \big) < \infty \qquad \forall \ I \in \Sigma^{\mathbb{N}} \quad \text{and} \quad r > 0 \, .$$

It can be verified that this standard definition is equivalent to the statement that there exists  $\eta \in (0, 1)$  such that

$$\underline{\mu}([Ij]) > \eta \cdot \underline{\mu}([I]) \quad \forall \quad I \in \Sigma^* \quad \text{and} \quad 1 \le j \le m \,, \tag{3.1}$$

where [Ij] denotes the cylinder set

$$\left\{J = j_1 j_2 \dots \in \Sigma^{\mathbb{N}} : j_1 j_2 \dots j_{|I|} = I, \ j_{|I|+1} = j \right\}.$$

A direct consequence of (2.17) is that any Gibbs measure on  $\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}$  is doubling and so the following statement implies Theorem 1.3.

**Proposition 3.1.** Let  $\Phi = \{\varphi_j\}_{1 \le j \le m}$  be a  $C^{1+\alpha}$  conformal IFS (without any separation condition) on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with  $d \ge 2$ , let K be the self-conformal set generated by  $\Phi$  and let  $\pi$  be the coding map (see (2.19)). Let  $\underline{\mu}$  be a doubling Borel probability measure on  $\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}} = \{1, ..., m\}^{\mathbb{N}}$  and  $\mu = \underline{\mu} \circ \pi^{-1}$ . Given any  $\ell \in \{1, ..., d-1\}$ , then one of the following statements hold:

- (i)  $\mu(K \cap M) = 0$  for any  $\ell$ -dimensional  $C^1$  submanifold  $M \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ ;
- (ii) K is contained in a  $\ell$ -dimensional affine subspace or  $\ell$ -dimensional geometric sphere;
- (iii) K is contained in a finite disjoint union of analytic curves and this may happen only when d = 2 and  $\ell = 1$ .

Before giving the proof we mention a useful generic fact concerning submanifolds of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ that will be exploited in the course of establishing the proposition. Let  $\ell \in \{1, ..., d-1\}$ and let  $M \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  be a  $\ell$ -dimensional  $C^1$  submanifold. Given  $\mathbf{p} \in M$ , there exists an open set  $U \subseteq M$  (under the topology of M) with  $\mathbf{p} \in U$  such that we can find a diffeomorphism  $\varphi: U \to \varphi(U)$  from U into an open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^\ell$ . Let

$$\psi := \varphi^{-1} : \varphi(U) \to U$$

be the inverse map of  $\varphi$  on  $\varphi(U)$ . Then, the tangent space of M at **p** is given by

$$T_{\mathbf{p}}M := \left\{ \left( \psi'(\varphi(\mathbf{p})) \right)(\mathbf{x}) : \ \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{\ell} \right\}.$$
(3.2)

It is easy to check that this definition is independent of the choice of the diffeomorphism  $\varphi$ . In the proof of Proposition 3.1, we will utilize the following simple observation which follows directly on utilizing Taylor's formula: For any  $\mathbf{p} \in M$  and any  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists  $r_0 = r_0(\mathbf{p}, \epsilon) > 0$  such that for any  $0 < r < r_0$ , we have

$$B(\mathbf{p}, r) \cap M \subseteq (\mathbf{p} + T_{\mathbf{p}}M)_{\epsilon r}.$$
(3.3)

Proof of Proposition 3.1. Let  $\ell \in \{1, ..., d-1\}$ . Throughout the proof, we assume that there exists a  $\ell$ -dimensional  $C^1$  submanifold  $M \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  such that

$$\mu(K \cap M) > 0.$$

With this in mind, the proof boils down to showing that either (ii) or (iii) of Proposition 3.1 hold.

Since  $\mu = \underline{\mu} \circ \pi^{-1}$ , then in view of the assumption we have that  $\underline{\mu}(\pi^{-1}(K \cap M)) > 0$ . With this at hand, on combining the doubling property of  $\underline{\mu}$  with the Lebesgue differentiation theorem for doubling measure [38, Theorem 1.8], it follows that there exists  $I = i_1 i_2 \cdots \in \pi^{-1}(K \cap M)$  such that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\underline{\mu} \left( [i_1 \cdots i_n] \cap \pi^{-1} (K \cap M) \right)}{\underline{\mu} ([i_1 \cdots i_n])} = 1.$$
(3.4)

Throughout, fix  $I = i_1 i_2 \cdots \in \pi^{-1}(K \cap M)$  that satisfies (3.4) and let  $\mathbf{z}_0 := \pi(I)$ . Now with the notation and language of Section 2.2 in mind, for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $I_n := i_1 \cdots i_n$  and consider the map given by

$$\psi_n(\mathbf{z}) := \| \varphi'_{I_n} \|^{-1} (\mathbf{z} - \varphi_{I_n}(\mathbf{z}_0)) + \mathbf{z}_0, \quad \forall \, \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

To ease notation, let  $V := \mathbf{z}_0 + T_{\mathbf{z}_0}M$  where the last term is the tangent space at  $\mathbf{z}_0$  (see (3.2) above). We claim that

$$\inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \max_{\mathbf{x} \in K} \mathbf{d} \big( \psi_n \circ \varphi_{I_n}(\mathbf{x}), \psi_n(V) \big) = 0.$$
(3.5)

For the moment let us assume the validity of (3.5). Then, there exists a subsequence  $\{n_k\}_{k\geq 1} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$\max_{\mathbf{x}\in K} \mathbf{d}\big(\psi_{n_k} \circ \varphi_{I_{n_k}}(\mathbf{x}), \psi_{n_k}(V)\big) \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad k \to +\infty.$$
(3.6)

Let  $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  be the bounded connected open set appearing above (2.5). Then by (2.5), we have that

$$C_2^{-1}|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}| \le |\psi_n \circ \varphi_{I_n}(\mathbf{x}) - \psi_n \circ \varphi_{I_n}(\mathbf{y})| \le C_2|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|, \qquad \forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in U, \ \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$$

This together with the fact that  $\mathbf{z}_0$  is a fixed point of  $\psi_n \circ \varphi_{I_n}$  implies that  $\{\psi_n \circ \varphi_{I_n}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded on U. Therefore, in view of Lemma 2.1 and by passing to a subsequence of  $\{\psi_{n_k} \circ \varphi_{n_k}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ , there exists a conformal map  $f: U \to \mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $\psi_{n_k} \circ \varphi_{I_{n_k}} \to f$ uniformly on U. This together with (3.6), implies that

$$\max_{\mathbf{x}\in K} \mathbf{d}(f(\mathbf{x}), \psi_{n_k}(V)) \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad k \to +\infty.$$
(3.7)

Now, let  $A(d, \ell)$  be the collection of all  $\ell$ -dimensional affine subspaces in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . It is well known that  $A(d, \ell)$  can be viewed as a locally compact metric subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^{d^2+d}$ , see [56, Section 3.16]. By (3.7) and the compactness of f(K), the sequence  $\{\psi_{n_k}(V)\}_{k\geq 1}$  is bounded on  $A(d, \ell)$ . Then by the locally compactness of  $A(d, \ell)$  and passing to a subsequence if necessary, we may assume that there exists  $W \in A(d, \ell)$  such that  $\psi_{n_k}(V) \to W$ . This together with (3.7), implies that  $f(K) \subseteq W$  and hence

$$K \subseteq f^{-1}(W \cap f(U)).$$

Recall, that f is conformal, so  $f^{-1}$  is also a conformal map on its domain f(U).

- When  $d \geq 3$ , we note that a conformal map in a connected open set can be extended to a Möbius transformation in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Thus, it follows that  $f^{-1}(W \cap f(U))$ is contained in either a  $\ell$ -dimensional affine subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  or a  $\ell$ -dimensional geometric sphere.
- When d = 2, we note that a conformal map in a connected open set is a holomorphic (or anti-holomorphic) map. Thus, it follows that  $f^{-1}(W \cap f(U))$  is contained in countable many analytic curves. Since K is compact, it follows that K is contained in at most finitely many analytic curves.

The upshot is that part (ii) or (iii) of Proposition 3.1 hold under the assumption that (3.5) is valid.

We now prove (3.5). If it is not true, then

$$\delta_0 := \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \max_{\mathbf{x} \in K} \mathbf{d} \big( \psi_n \circ \varphi_{I_n}(\mathbf{x}), \psi_n(V) \big) > 0.$$

Therefore, for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , on making use of (2.6), it follows that there exists  $\mathbf{x}_n \in K$  such that

$$\mathbf{d}(\varphi_{I_n}(\mathbf{x}_n), V) = \|\varphi'_{I_n}\| \cdot \mathbf{d}(\psi_n \circ \varphi_{I_n}(\mathbf{x}_n), \psi_n(V))$$
  

$$\geq \delta_0 \cdot \|\varphi'_{I_n}\|$$
  

$$\geq C_3^{-1} \delta_0 \cdot |K_{I_n}|. \qquad (3.8)$$

Fix  $\epsilon \in (0, C_3^{-1}\delta_0)$ . Then, by (3.3) there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for all n > N, we have that

$$K_{I_n} \cap M \subseteq B(\mathbf{z}_0, |K_{I_n}|) \cap M \subseteq (V)_{\epsilon |K_{I_n}|}.$$

$$(3.9)$$

For any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , choose  $j_1^{(n)} j_2^{(n)} \cdots \in \pi^{-1}(\mathbf{x}_n)$ . Then for any  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and n > N, by (2.9) and (3.8), it follows that

$$\mathbf{d}(K_{I_{n}j_{1}^{(n)}\cdots j_{m}^{(n)}}, V) \geq \mathbf{d}(\varphi_{I_{n}}(\mathbf{x}_{n}), V) - |K_{I_{n}j_{1}^{(n)}\cdots j_{m}^{(n)}}| \\
\geq \left(C_{3}^{-1}\delta_{0} - C_{4}|K_{j_{1}^{(n)}\cdots j_{m}^{(n)}}|\right) \cdot |K_{I_{n}}|.$$
(3.10)

Choose  $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  large enough so that

$$C_3^{-1}\delta_0 - C_4 \cdot \max_{J \in \Sigma^{m_0}} |K_J| \ge \epsilon$$
.

Then, it follows that from (3.10) and (3.9), that

$$\left[I_n j_1^{(n)} \cdots j_{m_0}^{(n)}\right] \subseteq \left(\left[I_n\right] \cap \pi^{-1}(K \cap M)\right)^c$$

for any n > N. Hence, for any n > N,

$$\underline{\mu}\big([I_n] \cap \pi^{-1}(K \cap M)\big) \leq \underline{\mu}([I_n]) - \underline{\mu}([I_n j_1^{(n)} \cdots j_{m_0}^{(n)}]).$$

Since  $\underline{\mu}$  is doubling (see (3.1)), there exists  $\eta \in (0, 1)$  such that for any n > N

$$\underline{\mu}([I_n j_1^{(n)} \cdots j_{m_0}^{(n)}]) \ge \eta \cdot \underline{\mu}([I_n]),$$

and so it follows that

$$\underline{\mu}([I_n] \cap \pi^{-1}(K \cap M)) \le (1 - \eta) \cdot \underline{\mu}([I_n]), \qquad \forall n > N.$$

However, this contradicts (3.4) and so (3.5) is true as desired.

As mentioned in the introduction (more precisely Remark 1.3) a similar result to our Theorem 1.3, equivalently Proposition 3.1 with the OSC and  $\mu$  a Gibbs measure, was obtained by Käenmäki [43, Theorem 2.1] in which  $\mu$  is restricted to Hausdorff measures  $\mathcal{H}^s$  and part (iii) of the theorem is replaced with the statement that K is contained in a single analytic curve. However, this is not true as the following example demonstrates. In short, it shows that one can construct a self-conformal set  $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$  satisfying the OSC such that there exists a straight line L with  $\mathcal{H}^{\tau}(K \cap L) > 0$  (where  $\tau = \dim_{\mathrm{H}} K$ ), but Kis contained in two different straight lines. So trivially (i) and (ii) are not satisfied and we can not claim that K is contained in a single analytic curve.

**Example 3.1.** (Counterexample to [43, Theorem 2.1]). In this example, we view  $\mathbb{R}^2$  as the complex plane  $\mathbb{C}$ . Let i be the imaginary unit, that is the solution of the equation  $x^2 + 1 = 0$ . Given  $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ , there exist unique r > 0 and  $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$  such that  $z = re^{i\theta}$ , and we let  $\arg(z) := \theta$ . For any  $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$ , denote

$$L_{\theta} := \{ z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{ 0 \} : \arg(z) = \theta \}.$$

Let K be the self-similar set generated by

$$\Phi = \{\varphi_1, \varphi_2\} = \left\{\frac{1}{3}z - \frac{2}{3}i, \frac{1}{3}z + \frac{2}{3}i\right\}.$$

It is straightforward to verify that

$$\varphi_1\big([-1,1]^2\big) \cap \varphi_2\big([-1,1]^2\big) = \emptyset$$

Then  $\Phi$  satisfies the strong separation condition and hence the open set condition. In fact, K is exactly a similarity of the middle-third Cantor set, and so

$$\tau := \dim_{\mathrm{H}} K = \log 2 / \log 3.$$

Moreover, K satisfies the following facts:

(i)  $0 \notin K$ ; (ii)  $K \subseteq L_{\frac{3\pi}{2}} \cup L_{\frac{\pi}{2}}$ ; (iii)  $\mathcal{H}^{\tau}\left(K \cap L_{\frac{3\pi}{2}}\right) > 0$  and  $\mathcal{H}^{\tau}\left(K \cap L_{\frac{\pi}{2}}\right) > 0$ .

Now consider the function  $f: z \mapsto \sqrt{z}$ . Then f is a conformal map on  $\mathbb{C} \setminus ([0, +\infty) \times \{0\})$ . Let K' := f(K). Then K' is a self-conformal set generated by the conformal IFS

$$\Phi' = \{ f \circ \varphi_1 \circ f^{-1}, \ f \circ \varphi_2 \circ f^{-1} \} = \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}z^2 - \frac{2}{3}} \mathbf{i}, \ \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}z^2 + \frac{2}{3}} \mathbf{i} \right\}$$

which is defined on the open upper half-plane

$$\Omega := \{ z = a + bi : a \in \mathbb{R}, b \in (0, +\infty) \}.$$

Clearly,  $\Phi'$  satisfies the strong separation condition. Since f is conformal then it is locally bi-Lipschitz. This implies that

$$\dim_{\mathrm{H}} K' = \dim_{\mathrm{H}} K = \tau.$$

Note that

$$f(L_{\frac{3\pi}{2}}) \subseteq L_{\frac{3\pi}{4}}$$
 and  $f(L_{\frac{\pi}{2}}) \subseteq L_{\frac{\pi}{4}}$ 

This together with the above fact (iii) implies the

$$K' \subseteq L_{\frac{3\pi}{4}} \cup L_{\frac{\pi}{4}} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{H}^{\tau}\left(K' \cap L_{\frac{3\pi}{4}}\right) > 0, \quad \mathcal{H}^{\tau}\left(K' \cap L_{\frac{\pi}{4}}\right) > 0.$$

Thus parts (i) and (ii) of Theorem 1.3 are not satisfied and obviously, the two lines  $L_{\frac{3\pi}{4}}$  and  $L_{\frac{\pi}{4}}$  are not contained in the same analytic curve.

### 4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Assume the hypothesis in Theorem 1.1. Let  $\mu$  be a Gibbs measure on K, and  $\mathcal{C}$  be a collection of  $\mu$ -measurable sets in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  that satisfy the inequality (1.9). Working on the associated symbolic space (see Section 2.2), with  $\kappa$  defined as in (2.7) we have via (2.8) that

$$|K_I| \le C_3 \,\kappa^{|I|} \,, \qquad \forall \, I \in \Sigma^*$$

Throughout, fix  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $E \in \mathcal{C}$ . Let  $q = q(n) \in \mathbb{N}$  that will be determined later and let  $\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J} \subseteq \Sigma^q$  be given by

$$\mathcal{I} := \{ I \in \Sigma^q : K_I \subseteq E \}, \mathcal{J} := \{ J \in \Sigma^q : K_J \cap E \neq \emptyset, \ K_J \cap E^c \neq \emptyset \}$$

Then it is easily verified that

$$K_J \subseteq (\partial E)_{2|K_J|} \subseteq (\partial E)_{2C_3\kappa^q}, \quad \forall J \in \mathcal{J}$$

and hence

$$\bigcup_{I \in \mathcal{I}} K_I \subseteq E \cap K \subseteq \left( \bigcup_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{I} \\ 29}} K_I \right) \cup (\partial E)_{2C_3 \kappa^q}.$$

$$(4.1)$$

Now let  $\gamma \in (0,1)$  be as in Corollary 2.1, and let  $\delta > 0$  be as in inequality (1.9). In the following, we do not distinguish between the constants C > 0 appearing in the inequality (1.9) and the Corollary 2.1. Let  $F \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  be a  $\mu$ -measurable set. On combining (1.9), part (iii) of Theorem 2.4, Corollary 2.1 and (4.1), we obtain that

$$\mu(E \cap T^{-n}F) \leq \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I} \cup \mathcal{J}} \mu(K_I \cap T^{-n}F)$$
  
$$\leq \left(\sum_{I \in \mathcal{I} \cup \mathcal{J}} \mu(K_I) + Cm^q \gamma^n\right) \mu(F)$$
(4.2)

$$\leq \left(\mu(E) + \mu\left((\partial E)_{2C_3\kappa^q}\right) + Cm^q\gamma^n\right)\mu(F) \tag{4.3}$$

$$\leq \left(\mu(E) + C \cdot (2C_3)^{\delta} \kappa^{\delta q} + Cm^q \gamma^n\right) \mu(F)$$

and that

$$\mu(E \cap T^{-n}F) \geq \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \mu(K_I \cap T^{-n}F)$$
  
$$\geq \left(\sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \mu(K_I) - Cm^q \gamma^n\right) \mu(F)$$
(4.4)

$$\geq \left(\mu(E) - \mu\left((\partial E)_{2C_{3}\kappa^{q}}\right) - Cm^{q}\gamma^{n}\right)\mu(F)$$

$$\geq \left(\mu(E) - C \cdot (2C_{3})^{\delta}\kappa^{\delta q} - Cm^{q}\gamma^{n}\right)\mu(F).$$

$$(4.5)$$

The upshot is that

$$\left|\mu(E \cap T^{-n}F) - \mu(E)\mu(F)\right| \le C\left((2C_3)^{\delta}\kappa^{\delta q} + m^q\gamma^n\right)\mu(F).$$
(4.6)

We now set

$$q = q(n) := \left\lfloor \frac{-n \log \gamma}{2 \log m} \right\rfloor,$$

where |x| denote the largest integer that is not greater than x. Then, it follows that

$$m^q \gamma^n \le \gamma^{n/2}$$
 and  $\kappa^{\delta q} \le \kappa^{\delta \cdot (\frac{-n \log \gamma}{2 \log m} - 1)}$ ,

and this together with (4.6) implies that

$$\left|\mu(E \cap T^{-n}F) - \mu(E)\mu(F)\right| \le \widetilde{C}\,\widetilde{\gamma}^n\mu(F),$$

where we set

$$\widetilde{C} := 2C \cdot \max\{(2C_3 \kappa^{-1})^{\delta}, 1\} > 0, \qquad \widetilde{\gamma} := \max\{\kappa^{\frac{-\delta \log \gamma}{2\log m}}, \gamma^{1/2}\} \in (0, 1).$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.1.

## 5. Proof of Theorem 1.2

Given Theorem 1.1, the strategy for establishing Theorem 1.2 is simple enough: we establish (1.9) for balls. In order to do this we make use of the rigidity theorem (namely Theorem 1.3) to prove the following result which provides the desired upper bound estimate in essentially all cases. Throughout given a self-conformal system  $(\Phi, K, \mu, T)$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , we let

$$\ell_K := \min \left\{ 1 \le \ell \le d \; \middle| \; \begin{array}{c} \text{There exists a } \ell \text{-dimensional } C^1 \text{ submanifold} \\ M \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d \text{ such that } \mu(K \cap M) > 0 \, . \end{array} \right\} \,. \tag{5.1}$$

Note that  $\ell_K$  exists since we always have that  $\mu(K \cap \mathbb{R}^d) = 1$ . Trivially, when d = 1 we have that  $\ell_K = 1 = d$ . For  $d \ge 2$ , the statement  $\ell_K = d$  is equivalent to the statement that K satisfies (i) of Theorem 1.3 for all  $\ell \le d - 1$ .

**Theorem 5.1.** Let  $(\Phi, K, \mu, T)$  be a self-conformal system on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .

(i) There exists C > 0, s > 0 and such that

$$\mu(B(\mathbf{x},r)) \le Cr^s \quad \forall \ \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d, \ \forall \ r > 0.$$
(5.2)

(ii) There exists C > 0,  $\delta > 0$  and  $r_0 > 0$  such that

$$\mu((\partial B(\mathbf{x}, r))_{\varrho}) \le C \varrho^{\delta} \qquad \forall \ \mathbf{x} \in K, \ \forall \ 0 < r \le r_0, \ \forall \ \varrho > 0.$$
(5.3)

Furthermore, let  $\ell_K$  be as in (5.1) and suppose that

- (a)  $\ell_K = d$ . Then (5.3) holds for any  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , any r > 0 and any  $\varrho > 0$ ;
- (b)  $\ell_K < d$  where  $d \ge 2$  and part (ii) of Theorem 1.3 holds with  $\ell = \ell_K$ . Then (5.3) holds for any  $\mathbf{x} \in S$ , any r > 0 and any  $\varrho > 0$  where  $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  is the  $\ell_K$ -dimensional affine subspace or geometric sphere associated with part (ii) of Theorem 1.3.

Note that (5.3) in part (ii) of Theorem 5.1 together with Theorem 1.1 is not enough to establish Theorem 1.2 since we need (5.3) to hold for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  (not just K) and all r > 0 (not just  $r \leq r_0$ ). Nevertheless, we shall see in the course of proving Theorem 1.2, that the furthermore part of (ii) together with Theorem 1.3 allows us to do precisely this in all cases except when d = 2 and K satisfies the statement in part (iii) of Theorem 1.3; that is, K is contained within a finite disjoint union of analytic curves. For this "remaining" case we verify the desired exponentially mixing property directly.

We now establish Theorem 1.2 assuming the validity of Theorem 5.1. The proof of Theorem 5.1 will be the subject of Section 6.

Proof of Theorem 1.2 modulo Theorem 5.1. Throughout, C is the collection of balls in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\ell_K$  is as in (5.1). Then in view of Theorem 1.3, we can split the proof of the theorem into three cases:

- Case 1:  $\ell_K = d;$
- Case 2:  $d \ge 2$ ,  $\ell_K < d$  and K satisfies part (ii) of Theorem 1.3 with  $\ell = \ell_K$ ;

Case 3: d = 2,  $\ell_K = 1$  and K satisfies part (iii) of Theorem 1.3.

To see this, simply note that when d = 1, then by definition  $\ell_K = 1$  and we are in Case 1.

• Dealing with Case 1. In view of part (ii.a) of Theorem 5.1 and the fact that  $\mu$  is a Borel measure, any ball in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  is  $\mu$ -measurable and satisfies the upper bound estimate (1.9). This together with Theorem 1.1 implies that  $\mu$  is exponentially mixing with respect to  $(T, \mathcal{C})$ .

• Dealing with Case 2. Let  $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  an arbitrary ball in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and let  $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  be the  $\ell_K$ dimensional affine subspace or geometric sphere associated with part (ii) of Theorem 1.3. It can be verified that the intersection  $B \cap S$  is either: (i) the empty set; (ii) equal to S(which happens possibly only when S is a geometric sphere); (iii) a single point; (iv) a set with boundary being a  $(\ell_K - 1)$ -dimensional geometric sphere.

- Suppose that  $B \cap S$  satisfies any one of the first three cases. Since  $\mu$  has no atom and is supported on  $K \subseteq S$ , we know that  $\mu(B) = 0$  or 1. It follows that the term in the left hand side of the inequality (1.6) equals zero and hence the desired exponential mixing inequality (1.6) trivially holds for this ball.
- Suppose that  $B \cap S$  satisfies case (iv). Let  $m \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}$  be the number of elements in the conformal IFS  $\Phi$ , and let  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  be as in Corollary 2.1. For any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let

$$q_n := \left\lfloor \frac{-n \log \gamma}{\log m} \right\rfloor \tag{5.4}$$

and let

$$\mathcal{I}_n := \{ I \in \Sigma^{q_n} : K_I \subseteq B \}$$

Similar to (4.1), it is easily verified that

$$\bigcup_{I \in \mathcal{I}_n} K_I \subseteq B \cap K \subseteq \left(\bigcup_{I \in \mathcal{I}_n} K_I\right) \cup \left(\partial(B \cap S)\right)_{2C_3 \kappa^{q_n}}.$$

Then on adapting the arguments used to derive (4.3) and (4.5) from (4.1), we find that

$$|\mu(B \cap T^{-n}F) - \mu(B)\mu(F)| = O\left(\mu\left((\partial(B \cap S))_{2C_3\kappa^{q_n}}\right) + \gamma^{n/2}\right)\mu(F)$$
(5.5)

for all  $\mu$ -measurable subsets  $F \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ , where the big-O constant does not depend on B and F. Since B satisfies (iv), then  $\partial(B \cap S)$  is a  $\ell_K$ -1-dimensional geometric sphere in S, and hence there exist  $\mathbf{z} \in S$  and r > 0 such that

$$\partial(B \cap S) = (\partial B(\mathbf{z}, r)) \cap S \subseteq \partial B(\mathbf{z}, r).$$
(5.6)

This together with part (ii.b) of Theorem 5.1 implies that there exists  $\delta > 0$  for which

$$\mu\big((\partial(B\cap S))_{2C_{3}\kappa^{q_{n}}}\big) \leq \mu\big((\partial B(\mathbf{z},r))_{2C_{3}\kappa^{q_{n}}}\big) = O\left(\kappa^{\delta \cdot q_{n}}\right).$$

With this in mind, by (5.5) we have that

$$|\mu(B \cap T^{-n}F) - \mu(B)\mu(F)| = O(\tilde{\gamma}^n) \,\mu(F)$$

for any  $\mu$ -measurable subset  $F \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  and any ball  $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  in case (iv), where  $\widetilde{\gamma} \in (0, 1)$  is given by

$$\widetilde{\gamma} := \max\left\{\kappa^{\frac{\delta \log(1/\gamma)}{\log m}}, \gamma^{1/2}\right\}$$
.

The upshot of the above is that in Case 2, the measure  $\mu$  is exponentially mixing with respect to  $(T, \mathcal{C})$ .

• Dealing with Case 3. Let  $k \ge 1$  be an integer. Suppose that

$$K \subseteq \bigsqcup_{i=1}^{k} \Gamma_{i},$$

where each  $\Gamma_i \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$   $(1 \leq i \leq k)$  is an analytic curve. It is easily verified that there exists  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for any  $I \in \Sigma^{n_0}$ , the corresponding cylinder set  $K_I$  is contained within an analytic curve  $\Gamma_i$  for some  $1 \leq i \leq k$ . So by iterating the IFS up to  $n_0$  if necessary, without loss of generality, we can assume that each  $\varphi_j(K)$  (j = 1, 2, ..., m) is contained within an analytic curve  $\Gamma_i$  for some  $1 \leq i \leq k$ . Furthermore, in order to establish the desired exponential mixing inequality (1.6), without loss of generality, we can assume that B is an open ball in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . The point is that the desired inequality for closed ball follows

on using the fact that any closed ball can be written as an intersection of a decreasing sequence of open balls and then applying the obvious limiting argument.

For any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and any open ball  $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ , let  $q_n$  be defined as in (5.4) and let

$$\mathcal{I}_n(B) := \{ I \in \Sigma^{q_n} : K_I \subseteq B \}, \mathcal{J}_n(B) := \{ J \in \Sigma^{q_n} : K_J \cap B \neq \emptyset, \ K_J \cap B^c \neq \emptyset \}.$$

Then it is easily verified that

$$\bigcup_{I \in \mathcal{I}_n(B)} K_I \subseteq B \cap K \subseteq \left(\bigcup_{I \in \mathcal{I}_n(B)} K_I\right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{J \in \mathcal{J}_n(B)} K_J\right)$$

By adapting the arguments used in deriving (4.2) and (4.4) from (4.1), it follows from the above that

$$|\mu(B \cap T^{-n}F) - \mu(B)\mu(F)| = O\left(\sum_{J \in \mathcal{J}_n(B)} \mu(K_J) + \gamma^{n/2}\right)\mu(F)$$
(5.7)

for all open balls  $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$  and all  $\mu$ -measurable subsets  $F \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ , where the big-O constant does not depend on B and F. To estimate the measure sum term in (5.7), let

$$\mathcal{K}(B) := \{ 1 \le i \le k : B \cap \Gamma_i \ne \emptyset \} \,.$$

Since for any  $1 \leq i \leq k$ , the map  $f_i$  is injective on [0,1] and  $f'_i(t) \neq 0$  for all  $t \in [0,1]$ , it follows that each map  $f_i : [0,1] \to \Gamma_i$  is bi-Lipschitz. With this in mind, it is easy to check that for any open ball  $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$  and any  $J \in \mathcal{J}_n(B)$ , there exists  $i \in \mathcal{K}(B)$  so that:

- $\circ K_J \subseteq \Gamma_i \text{ and } \Gamma_i \cap \partial B \neq \emptyset;$
- There exists  $\mathbf{x} \in \Gamma_i \cap \partial B$  and C > 0 (independent of B and J) such that  $K_J \subseteq B(\mathbf{x}, C\kappa^{q_n})$ , where  $\kappa$  is defined as in (2.7).

On combining these two facts with part (i) of Theorem 5.1, we find that there exists s > 0 such that for any open ball  $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ 

$$\sum_{J \in \mathcal{J}_n(B)} \mu(K_J) = O\Big(\kappa^{s \cdot q_n} \cdot \max\left\{\#(\Gamma_i \cap \partial B) : i \in \mathcal{K}(B)\right\}\Big),\tag{5.8}$$

where the implied big-O constant does not depend on B. We claim that

$$\sup_{B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2 \text{ an open ball}} \max\{\#(\Gamma_i \cap \partial B) : i \in \mathcal{K}(B)\} < +\infty.$$
(5.9)

If (5.9) is true, then together with (5.7) and (5.8) we have that the measure  $\mu$  is exponentially mixing with respect to  $(T, \mathcal{C})$  and we are done. The proof of (5.9) is the subject of Lemma 5.1 below.

**Lemma 5.1.** Let  $k \ge 1$  be an integer and let  $\Gamma_i$   $(1 \le i \le k)$  be disjoint analytic curves in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . For any set  $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ , denote

$$\mathcal{K}(E) := \{ 1 \le i \le k : \Gamma_i \cap E \ne \emptyset \} .$$

Then we have

$$\sup_{B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2 \text{ an open ball}} \max\{\#(\Gamma_i \cap \partial B) : i \in \mathcal{K}(B)\} < +\infty.$$
(5.10)

*Proof.* Since  $\Gamma_i$   $(1 \le i \le k)$  are analytic curves, we note that for each  $1 \le i \le k$  we can write

$$\Gamma_i = g_i([0,1] \times \{0\}) \text{ where } g_i : \mathcal{O} \to \mathbb{R}^2$$

is a conformal map on an open set  $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$  containing  $[0,1] \times \{0\}$ . In turn, for each  $1 \leq i \leq k$ , we define the map  $f_i : t \mapsto g_i(t,0)$  on the unit interval. Then each  $f_i$  is an injective real analytic map with  $f'_i(t) \neq 0$   $(t \in [0,1])$ .

Now observe that given any open ball  $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$  and any  $1 \leq i \leq k$  for which  $\Gamma_i$  is an arc of a circle, the set  $\Gamma_i \cap \partial B$  is either: (i) equal to  $\Gamma_i$ , (ii) the empty set, (iii) a single point, (iv) a set with two points.

- If (i) is the case,  $\Gamma_i \cap B = \emptyset$  since B is open and so  $i \notin \mathcal{K}(B)$ .
- In the last three cases, we have that  $\#(\Gamma_i \cap \partial B) \leq 2$ .

The upshot of this is that if  $\Gamma_i$  is a part of a circle, then

$$\#(\Gamma_i \cap \partial B) \le 2$$

for any open ball  $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$  for which  $i \in \mathcal{K}(B)$ . In particular, it shows that (5.10) is valid if every  $\Gamma_i$  (i = 1, 2, ..., k) is an arc of a circle. Thus, from this point onwards, we assume that not every  $\Gamma_i$  (i = 1, 2, ..., k) and so proving (5.10) boils down to showing that

$$\sup \left\{ \#(\Gamma_i \cap \partial B) : B \text{ is an open ball in } \mathbb{R}^2 \right\} < +\infty$$
(5.11)

for any  $1 \leq i \leq k$  for which  $\Gamma_i$  is not contained in any circle. Fix such an *i*, call it  $i_0$ . We prove, by contradiction, that (5.11) is true for  $\Gamma_{i_0}$ . Suppose that (5.11) is not true, then for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , there are  $\mathbf{x}_n \in \mathbb{R}^2$  and  $r_n > 0$  such that

$$\# \big( \Gamma_{i_0} \cap \partial B(\mathbf{x}_n, r_n) \big) \geq n., \tag{5.12}$$

or equivalently, for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , there are  $0 \leq t_1^{(n)} < t_2^{(n)} < \cdots < t_n^{(n)} \leq 1$  that satisfy

$$\Gamma_{i_0} \cap \partial B(\mathbf{x}_n, r_n) \supseteq \left\{ f_{i_0}(t_1^{(n)}), f_{i_0}(t_2^{(n)}), ..., f_{i_0}(t_n^{(n)}) \right\}.$$
(5.13)

By passing to a subsequence if necessary, we may assume that

$$\mathbf{x}_n \to \mathbf{x}_\infty \in \mathbb{R}^2 \cup \{\infty\}$$
 &  $r_n \to r_\infty \in [0, +\infty]$   $(n \to +\infty)$ .

If  $(\mathbf{x}_{\infty}, r_{\infty}) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \{+\infty\}$  or  $(\mathbf{x}_{\infty}, r_{\infty}) \in \{\infty\} \times [0, +\infty)$ , then it is easy to verify that  $\Gamma_{i_0} \cap \partial B(\mathbf{x}_n, r_n) = \emptyset$  for *n* sufficiently large, which contradicts (5.12). Therefore, for (5.12) to hold, it is necessary that

$$(\mathbf{x}_{\infty}, r_{\infty}) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times [0, +\infty)$$
 or  $\mathbf{x}_{\infty} = \infty$  and  $r_{\infty} = +\infty$ 

We deal with these two case separately.

• Case (i):  $(\mathbf{x}_{\infty}, r_{\infty}) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times [0, +\infty)$ . For any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $F_n : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  be defined by setting

$$F_n(t) := |f_{i_0}(t) - \mathbf{x}_n|^2 \qquad (t \in [0, 1])$$

Also consider the map on [0,1] given by

$$F_{\infty}: t \mapsto |f_{i_0}(t) - \mathbf{x}_{\infty}|^2 \qquad (t \in [0, 1]).$$

Clearly,  $F_{\infty}$  and  $\{F_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$  are analytic functions on [0, 1]. Moreover, in view of the fact that  $\mathbf{x}_n \to \mathbf{x}_{\infty}$  as  $n \to \infty$  and the analyticity of  $f_{i_0}$ , it is easily verified that for any  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ , the limit

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}^k F_n}{\mathrm{d}t^k}(t) \to \frac{\mathrm{d}^k F_\infty}{\mathrm{d}t^k}(t) \qquad (n \to \infty) \tag{5.14}$$

holds uniformly with respect to  $t \in [0,1]$ . In view of (5.13), we have  $F_n(t_j^{(n)}) = r_n^2$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and any  $j \in \{1, ..., n\}$ . For any  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\mathcal{T}_j$  be the set of limit points of  $\{t_j^{(n)}\}_{n\geq j}$ , and let  $\mathcal{T}$  represents the union of  $\mathcal{T}_j$  over  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then, for any  $t \in \mathcal{T}$ , there exist  $j_0 = j_0(t) \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $n_1 < n_2 < n_3 < \cdots$  such that  $t_{j_0}^{(n_k)} \to t \ (k \to \infty)$ , and hence

$$F_{\infty}(t) = \lim_{k \to \infty} |f_{i_0}(t_{j_0}^{(n_k)}) - \mathbf{x}_{n_k}|^2 = \lim_{k \to \infty} r_{n_k}^2 = r_{\infty}^2.$$
(5.15)

Subcase (i):  $\#\mathcal{T} = +\infty$ . In view of (5.15), in this subcase there are infinitely many  $t \in [0, 1]$  that satisfy  $F_{\infty}(t) = r_{\infty}^2$ . Then, since the function  $F_{\infty}$  is analytic it follows

$$F_{\infty}(t) \equiv r_{\infty}^2 \qquad (t \in [0,1]) \,.$$

This implies that  $\Gamma_{i_0}$  is a subset of the circle  $\partial B(\mathbf{x}_{\infty}, r_{\infty})$ , which is a contradiction.

Subcase (ii):  $\#\mathcal{T} < +\infty$ . In this subcase, there exists  $t_0 \in \mathcal{T}$  such that  $t_0 \in \mathcal{T}_j$  for infinitely many  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ . Without the loss of generality, we assume that  $t_0 \in \mathcal{T}_j$  for all  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ . Throughout this subcase, fix an arbitrary integer  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then there exists a subsequence  $n_1 < n_2 < n_3 < \cdots$  such that  $t_j^{(n_\ell)} \to t_0$  ( $\ell \to \infty$ ) for any j = 1, 2, ..., k + 1. Recall that  $F_n(t_j^{(n)}) = r_n^2$  for any  $n, j \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $1 \leq j \leq n$ . So by Rolle's theorem, there exists  $\xi_n \in (t_1^{(n)}, t_{k+1}^{(n)})$  for each  $n \geq k+1$  such that

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}^k F_n}{\mathrm{d}t^k}(\xi_n) = 0$$

In view of the fact that  $\xi_{n_{\ell}} \in (t_1^{(n_{\ell})}, t_{k+1}^{(n_{\ell})})$  and  $t_1^{(n_{\ell})} \to t_0, t_{k+1}^{(n_{\ell})} \to t_0$  as  $\ell \to \infty$ , we have that  $\xi_{n_{\ell}} \to t_0$  as  $\ell \to \infty$ . This together with the uniformly convergent property of the k-th derivatives of  $F_n$  (see (5.14)) implies that

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}^k F_\infty}{\mathrm{d} t^k}(t_0) = \lim_{\ell \to \infty} \frac{\mathrm{d}^k F_{n_\ell}}{\mathrm{d} t^k}(\xi_{n_\ell}) = 0.$$

Now  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  is arbitrary and  $F_{\infty}$  is analytic within [0, 1], so it follows that

$$F_{\infty}(t) \equiv F_{\infty}(t_0) = r_{\infty}^2 \qquad (t \in [0, 1]),$$

which implies that  $\Gamma_{i_0}$  is a subset of the circle  $\partial B(\mathbf{x}_{\infty}, r_{\infty})$ . This contradicts the assumption that  $\Gamma_{i_0}$  is not an arc of any circle.

• Case (ii):  $\mathbf{x}_{\infty} = \infty$  and  $r_{\infty} = +\infty$ . We identify  $\mathbb{R}^2$  with the complex plane  $\mathbb{C}$ . For any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , fix a point  $\mathbf{z}_n \in \Gamma_{i_0} \cap \partial B(\mathbf{x}_n, r_n)$ . It is easily verified that

$$\Gamma_{i_0} \cap \partial B(\mathbf{x}_n, r_n) \subseteq B(\mathbf{z}_n, 2|\Gamma_{i_0}|) \cap \partial B(\mathbf{x}_n, r_n)$$

and so the right hand side is an arc of the circle  $\partial B(\mathbf{x}_n, r_n)$ . Since  $r_n \to +\infty$  as  $n \to \infty$ , it follows that for all sufficiently large  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exist  $\theta_1^{(n)}, \theta_2^{(n)} \in [-2\pi, 2\pi]$  such that

$$0 < \theta_2^{(n)} - \theta_1^{(n)} < \tau$$

and

$$h_n((0,1)) = B(\mathbf{z}_n, 2|\Gamma_{i_0}|) \cap \partial B(\mathbf{x}_n, r_n),$$

where we set

$$h_n(s) =: \mathbf{x}_n + r_n e^{i\left((1-s)\,\theta_1^{(n)} + s\,\theta_2^{(n)}\right)} \qquad (s \in \mathbb{R})$$

Without the loss of generality, we suppose that this fact holds for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . We claim that

$$0 < \inf\left\{r_n\left(\theta_2^{(n)} - \theta_1^{(n)}\right) : n \in \mathbb{N}\right\} \le \sup_{35}\left\{r_n\left(\theta_2^{(n)} - \theta_1^{(n)}\right) : n \in \mathbb{N}\right\} < +\infty$$
(5.16)

and hence

$$\theta_2^{(n)} - \theta_1^{(n)} \to 0 \qquad (n \to \infty).$$
 (5.17)

To prove the upper bound of the supremum term in (5.16), just note that

$$r_{n} \left(\theta_{2}^{(n)} - \theta_{1}^{(n)}\right) \leq \pi r_{n} \sin \frac{\theta_{2}^{(n)} - \theta_{1}^{(n)}}{2}$$

$$= \frac{\pi}{2} \left|h_{n}(1) - h_{n}(0)\right|$$

$$\leq 2\pi \left|\Gamma_{i_{0}}\right|$$
(5.19)

for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , where we use the fact that  $\sin x \geq 2x/\pi$  ( $x \in [0, \pi/2]$ ) in deriving (5.18), and inequality (5.19) holds since the points  $h_n(0)$  and  $h_n(1)$  belong to the closure of  $B(\mathbf{z}_n, 2|\Gamma_{i_0}|)$ . For the lower bound of the infimum term in (5.16), we note that

$$\begin{aligned} r_n \left(\theta_2^{(n)} - \theta_1^{(n)}\right) &= \mathcal{H}^1(h_n(0, 1)) \\ &\geq |h_n(1) - h_n(0)| \\ &= 2 \cdot \sqrt{4 |\Gamma_{i_0}|^2 - \left(r_n - r_n \cos \frac{\theta_2^{(n)} - \theta_1^{(n)}}{2}\right)^2} \\ &\propto 2 \cdot \sqrt{4 |\Gamma_{i_0}|^2 - \frac{1}{64} (r_n (\theta_2^{(n)} - \theta_1^{(n)}))^2 \cdot (\theta_2^{(n)} - \theta_1^{(n)})^2} \\ &\to 4 |\Gamma_{i_0}| \quad (n \to \infty). \end{aligned}$$

With (5.16) and (5.17) at hand, we now show, by passing to a subsequence if necessary, that there exist  $\mathbf{a}_{\infty} \in \mathbb{C}$  and  $\mathbf{b}_{\infty} \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$  such that for any  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ , the following limit

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\mathrm{d}^k h_n}{\mathrm{d}s^k}(s) = \frac{\mathrm{d}^k h_\infty}{\mathrm{d}s^k}(s) \qquad (h_\infty(s) := \mathbf{a}_\infty + \mathbf{b}_\infty s)$$
(5.20)

holds uniformly with respect to  $s \in [0, 1]$ . To prove this statement, for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $s \in [0, 1]$ , note that by the definition of  $h_n$ ,

$$h_{n}(s) - h_{n}(0) = r_{n} \left( e^{i \left( (1-s) \,\theta_{1}^{(n)} + s \,\theta_{2}^{(n)} \right)} - e^{i \,\theta_{1}^{(n)}} \right)$$
  
$$= r_{n} \cdot s \cdot (\theta_{2}^{(n)} - \theta_{1}^{(n)}) \cdot \frac{e^{i \left( (1-s) \,\theta_{1}^{(n)} + s \,\theta_{2}^{(n)} \right)} - e^{i \,\theta_{1}^{(n)}}}{s \cdot (\theta_{2}^{(n)} - \theta_{1}^{(n)})}.$$
(5.21)

By (5.16), (5.17) and the boundedness of  $\{\theta_1^{(n)}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $\{h_n(0)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ , there exists a subsequence  $n_1 < n_2 < \cdots$  on  $\mathbb{N}$  that satisfies

$$r_{n_k}(\theta_2^{(n_k)} - \theta_1^{(n_k)}) \to \ell_{\infty}, \quad \theta_1^{(n_k)} \to \theta_{\infty}, \quad h_{n_k}(0) \to \mathbf{z}_{\infty} \quad (k \to \infty)$$
(5.22)

for some  $\ell_{\infty} > 0$  and  $\theta_{\infty} \in [-2\pi, 2\pi]$ , and that the limit

$$\frac{e^{i\left((1-s)\theta_1^{(n_k)}+s\theta_2^{(n_k)}\right)} - e^{i\theta_1^{(n_k)}}}{s \cdot (\theta_2^{(n_k)} - \theta_1^{(n_k)})} \to \left. \frac{d(e^{i\theta})}{d\theta} \right|_{\theta=\theta_\infty} = e^{i\left(\theta_\infty + \frac{\pi}{2}\right)} \quad (k \to \infty)$$
(5.23)

holds uniformly with respect to  $s \in [0, 1]$ . Then on combining (5.21), (5.22) and (5.23), we obtain that the limit

$$h_{n_k}(t) \to \mathbf{a}_{\infty} + \mathbf{b}_{\infty} t \qquad (n \to \infty)$$
holds uniformly with respect to  $t \in [0, 1]$ , where  $\mathbf{a}_{\infty} \in \mathbb{C}$  and  $\mathbf{b}_{\infty} \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$  is defined as

$$\mathbf{a}_{\infty} := \mathbf{z}_{\infty}, \ \mathbf{b}_{\infty} := \ell_{\infty} e^{\mathrm{i}\left(\theta_{\infty} + \frac{\pi}{2}\right)}$$

This proves (5.20) when k = 0. In view of (5.22) and (5.23), it is easily verified that for any integer  $j \ge 2$ , the limits

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} \frac{\mathrm{d} h_{n_k}}{\mathrm{d} t}(t) = \mathbf{b}_{\infty} = \frac{\mathrm{d} h_{\infty}}{\mathrm{d} t}(t), \qquad \lim_{k \to \infty} \frac{\mathrm{d}^j h_{n_k}}{\mathrm{d} t^j}(t) = 0 = \frac{\mathrm{d}^j h_{\infty}}{\mathrm{d} t^j}(t)$$

hold uniformly with respect to  $t \in [0, 1]$ . The upshot is that the desired limit (5.20) is true on the subsequence  $\{h_{n_k}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ . Without the loss of generality, assume that (5.20) holds for  $\{h_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ .

The foundations are now in place to show that

$$\Gamma_{i_0} \subset L := h_{\infty}(\mathbb{R}) \,. \tag{5.24}$$

By definition, L is a straight line so the above implies that  $\#(\Gamma_{i_0} \cap \partial B) \leq 2$  for any ball B in  $\mathbb{C}$ , which contradicts (5.12) and so (5.11) is true as desired. To prove (5.24), we start by recalling that  $\mathcal{T}_j$   $(j \in \mathbb{N})$  is the set of limit points of  $\{t_j^{(n)}\}_{n\geq j}$  and  $\mathcal{T}$  represents the union of  $\mathcal{T}_j$  over  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ . For each  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $n \geq j$ , since  $f_{i_0}(t_j^{(n)}) \in h_n((0,1))$ , then there exists  $s_j^{(n)} \in (0,1)$  such that  $f_{i_0}(t_j^{(n)}) = h_n(s_j^{(n)})$ . Since  $s_j^{(n)}$  are bounded, we know that for any  $t \in \mathcal{T}$ , there exist  $j_0 = j_0(t) \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $n_1 < n_2 < n_3 < \cdots$  such that

$$t_{j_0}^{(n_k)} \to t \quad \text{and} \quad s_{j_0}^{(n_k)} \to s \quad (k \to \infty)$$

$$(5.25)$$

for some  $s \in [0, 1]$ . Then, by the uniformly convergent property (5.20) associated with  $\{h_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ , we have

$$f_{i_0}(t) = \lim_{k \to \infty} f_{i_0}(t_{j_0}^{(n_k)}) = \lim_{k \to \infty} h_{n_k}(s_{j_0}^{(n_k)}) = h_{\infty}(s) \in L.$$
(5.26)

In view of (5.26) and the fact that  $h_{\infty}$  is invertible, we have  $s = h_{\infty}^{-1} \circ f_{i_0}(t)$ . We continue by considering the following two subcase.

Subcase (i):  $\#\mathcal{T} = +\infty$ . In this subcase, with (5.26) in mind, there are infinitely many  $t \in [0, 1]$  such that  $f_{i_0}(t) \in L$ , then by the analyticity of  $f_{i_0}$ , the curve  $\Gamma_{i_0} = f_{i_0}([0, 1])$  is contained in the straight line L.

Subcase (ii):  $\#\mathcal{T} < +\infty$ . In this subcase, there exists  $t_0 \in \mathcal{T}$  such that there are infinitely many  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  for which  $t_0 \in \mathcal{T}_j$ . Without the loss of generality, we assume that  $t_0 \in \mathcal{T}_j$  for all  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $s_0 := h_{\infty}^{-1} \circ f_{i_0}(t_0)$ . Recall that

$$g_{i_0}: \mathcal{O} \to g_{i_0}(\mathcal{O})$$

is a conformal map on an open set

$$\mathcal{O} \supseteq [0,1] \times \{0\}$$

such that  $g_{i_0}(t,0) = f_{i_0}(t)$   $(t \in [0,1])$  and  $g_{i_0}^{-1}$  is also conformal on the domain  $g_{i_0}(\mathcal{O})$ . With the uniformly convergent property (5.20) associated with  $\{h_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$  and the fact that  $h_{\infty}(s_0) \in g_{i_0}(\mathcal{O})$  in mind, it is easily verified that there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that

$$h_n([s_0-\delta,s_0+\delta]) \subseteq g_{i_0}(\mathcal{O}), \quad h_\infty([s_0-\delta,s_0+\delta]) \subseteq g_{i_0}(\mathcal{O}) \quad (n \in \mathbb{N}).$$

It follows that the functions

$$G_n(s) := \operatorname{Im}\left(g_{i_0}^{-1} \circ h_n(s)\right), \quad G_\infty(s) := \operatorname{Im}\left(g_{i_0}^{-1} \circ h_\infty(s)\right) \qquad (n \in \mathbb{N})$$

are real analytic with respect to  $s \in [s_0 - \delta, s_0 + \delta]$ , where Im(z) denotes the imaginary part of  $z \in \mathbb{C}$ .

Now fix a  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ . Recall our assumption that  $t_0 \in \mathcal{T}_j$  for any  $j \geq 1$ ; that is to say that  $t_0$  is a limit point of  $\{t_j^{(n)}\}_{n\geq j}$  for any  $j\geq 1$ . Then there exists a subsequence  $k_1 < k_2 < k_3 < \cdots$  such that  $t_j^{(k_\ell)} \to t_0$   $(\ell \to \infty)$  for any  $j = 1, 2, ..., n_0 + 1$ . On the other hand, concerning the sequence  $s_j^{(k_\ell)}$ , by passing to a subsequence if necessary, we know that for any  $j = 1, 2, ..., n_0 + 1$ , there exists  $s_j \in [0, 1]$  such that  $s_j^{(k_\ell)} \to s_j$   $(\ell \to \infty)$ . In view of (5.26) and the fact that  $h_\infty$  is invertible, we obtain that  $s_j = h_\infty^{-1} \circ f_{i_0}(t_0) = s_0$ for any  $j = 1, 2, ..., n_0 + 1$ . Therefore, it follows that when  $\ell$  is sufficiently large, we have  $s_j^{(k_\ell)} \in [s_0 - \delta, s_0 + \delta]$  for any  $j = 1, 2, ..., n_0 + 1$ , which means that  $s_j^{(k_\ell)}$  lies in the domains of  $G_n$  and  $G_\infty$ . For any such  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ , by the definitions of  $s_j^{(k_\ell)}$  and  $t_j^{(k_\ell)}$ , we have

$$G_{k_{\ell}}(s_j^{(k_{\ell})}) = \operatorname{Im}\left(g_{i_0}^{-1} \circ h_{k_{\ell}}(s_j^{(k_{\ell})})\right) = \operatorname{Im}(t_j^{(k_{\ell})}) = 0, \qquad \forall j = 1, 2, ..., n_0 + 1.$$

With this in mind, on applying Rolle's theorem  $n_0$  times to the function  $G_{k_\ell}$ , it follows that there exists  $\xi_{k_\ell} \in \left(\min_{1 \le j \le n_0+1} s_j^{(k_\ell)}, \max_{1 \le j \le n_0+1} s_j^{(k_\ell)}\right)$  such that

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}^{n_0} G_{k_\ell}}{\mathrm{d}s^{n_0}}(\xi_{k_\ell}) = 0 \,.$$

Since  $\xi_{k_{\ell}} \to s_0 \ (\ell \to \infty)$  and the limit  $\frac{\mathrm{d}^j h_k}{\mathrm{d}s^j} \to \frac{\mathrm{d}^j h_\infty}{\mathrm{d}s^j} \ (k \to \infty)$  holds uniformly on [0, 1] for any  $j = 0, 1, ..., n_0$ , we have that

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}^{n_0} G_\infty}{\mathrm{d}s^{n_0}}(s_0) = 0$$

Now since  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  is arbitrary and  $G_{\infty}$  is analytic in the domain of interest, we obtain that

$$G_{\infty}(s) \equiv G_{\infty}(s_0) = 0, \qquad \forall \ s \in [s_0 - \delta, s_0 + \delta].$$

The upshot of this is that there exists  $\epsilon > 0$  such that  $f_{i_0}([t_0 - \epsilon, t_0 + \epsilon]) \subseteq L$ . Since  $f_{i_0}$  is analytic, the curve  $\Gamma_{i_0} = f_{i_0}([0, 1])$  is contained in the straight line L.

## 6. PROOF OF THEOREM 5.1

Theorem 5.1 is easily seen to be a direct consequence of the following proposition by On observing that any Gibbs measure on  $\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}$  is doubling and K is not a singleton if the OSC is satisfied.

**Proposition 6.1.** Let  $\Phi = {\varphi_j}_{1 \le j \le m}$  be a  $C^{1+\alpha}$  conformal IFS (without any separation condition) on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , let K be the self-conformal set generated by  $\Phi$  and let  $\pi$  be the coding map. Let  $\underline{\mu}$  be a doubling Borel probability measure on  $\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}} = {1, ..., m}^{\mathbb{N}}$  and  $\mu := \underline{\mu} \circ \pi^{-1}$ .

(i) If K is not a singleton, then there exists C > 0 and s > 0 such that

$$\mu(B(\mathbf{x},r)) \le Cr^s \quad \forall \ \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d, \ \forall \ r > 0.$$
(6.1)

(ii) If K is not a singleton, then there exist C > 0,  $\delta > 0$  and  $r_0 > 0$  such that

$$\mu \big( (\partial B(\mathbf{x}, r))_{\varrho} \big) \le C \varrho^{\delta}, \quad \forall \, \mathbf{x} \in K, \; \forall \, 0 < r \le r_0, \; \forall \, \varrho > 0.$$
(6.2)

Furthermore, let  $\ell_K$  be as in (5.1) and suppose that

(a)  $\ell_K = d$ . Then (6.2) holds for any  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , any r > 0 and any  $\varrho > 0$ ;

- (b)  $\ell_K < d$  where  $d \ge 2$  and part (ii) of Proposition 3.1 holds with  $\ell = \ell_K$ . Then (6.2) holds for any  $\mathbf{x} \in S$ , any r > 0 and any  $\varrho > 0$  where  $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  is the  $\ell_K$ -dimensional affine subspace or geometric sphere associated with part (ii) of Proposition 3.1.
- (c) d = 2,  $\ell_K = 1$  and K is contained in a single analytic curve. Then (6.2) holds for any  $\mathbf{x} \in \Gamma$ , any r > 0 and any  $\varrho > 0$ , where  $\Gamma \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$  is the corresponding analytic curve.

Before providing the proof we introduce some useful notation. For any two subsets A,  $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ , define the distance between A and B as

$$\mathbf{d}(A, B) := \inf \left\{ \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x}, B) : \mathbf{x} \in A \right\}.$$

For any  $\rho > 0$ , let

$$\Lambda_{\varrho} := \left\{ I \in \Sigma^* : |K_I| < \varrho \le |K_{I^-}| \right\},\$$

where

$$I^{-} := \begin{cases} i_{1}i_{2}\cdots i_{n-1}, & \text{if } I = i_{1}i_{2}\cdots i_{n} \text{ and } n \geq 2, \\ \\ \emptyset, & \text{if } |I| = 1. \end{cases}$$

In the above, the symbol  $\emptyset$  is used to denote the empty word and we define  $K_{\emptyset} := K$ . Given any  $I \in \Sigma^*$  and  $\varrho > 0$ , we let

$$\Lambda_{\varrho}(I) := \left\{ J \in \Sigma^* : IJ \in \Lambda_{\varrho|K_{I^-}|} \right\}.$$

Let  $C_4 > 1$  be the constant appearing in (2.9) and let

$$\varrho_0 := C_4^{-1} \cdot \min_{1 \le i \le m} |K_i| \,. \tag{6.3}$$

Then in view of (2.9), given any  $0 < \rho < \rho_0$ , it is easily verified that

$$\Lambda_{\varrho}(I) \neq \emptyset \quad \& \quad [I] = \bigsqcup_{J \in \Lambda_{\varrho}(I)} [IJ] \qquad \forall I \in \Sigma^* \,, \tag{6.4}$$

where we use the symbol ' $\sqcup$ ' to denote a disjoint union. Furthermore, denote

$$M_{\varrho}(I) := \sup\{|J| : J \in \Lambda_{\varrho}(I)\}.$$

Then by (2.8) and (2.9), we have

$$\sup_{I \in \Sigma^*} M_{\varrho}(I) < +\infty \,. \tag{6.5}$$

6.1. **Proof of Proposition 6.1: part (i).** With the above notation in mind, we start by proving the following statement regarding the distance between points in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and cylinder sets within the self-conformal set K. It is essential for proving part (i) of Proposition 6.1. Throughout, let  $\rho_0 > 0$  be as in (6.3).

**Lemma 6.1.** Under the setting of Proposition 6.1, there exists  $\varrho \in (0, \varrho_0)$  that satisfies the following statement: given any  $I \in \Sigma^*$  and any  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , there exists  $J \in \Lambda_{\varrho}(I)$  such that

$$\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x}, K_{IJ}) \underset{39}{>} \varrho \left| K_{I^{-}} \right|.$$

*Proof.* Fix  $\mathbf{z}_0 \in K$ . For any  $I \in \Sigma^*$ , denote

$$\psi_I(\mathbf{z}) := \|\varphi_I'\|^{-1}(\mathbf{z} - \varphi_I(\mathbf{z}_0)) + \mathbf{z}_0, \quad \forall \, \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$
(6.6)

We claim that

$$\delta := \inf_{I \in \Sigma^*} \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d} \sup_{\mathbf{z} \in K} |\mathbf{x} - \psi_I \circ \varphi_I(\mathbf{z})| > 0.$$
(6.7)

Indeed, if (6.7) is not true, then there exist  $\{I_k\}_{k\geq 1} \subseteq \Sigma^*$  and  $\{\mathbf{x}_k\}_{k\geq 1} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  such that

$$\sup_{\mathbf{z}\in K} |\mathbf{x}_k - \psi_{I_k} \circ \varphi_{I_k}(\mathbf{z})| \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty.$$
(6.8)

Let  $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  be the bounded connected open set associated with (2.5). In view of (2.5), it follows that

$$C_2^{-1}|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}| \le |\psi_I \circ \varphi_I(\mathbf{x}) - \psi_I \circ \varphi_I(\mathbf{y})| \le C_2|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}| \qquad (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in U, \ I \in \Sigma^*).$$
(6.9)

Moreover, since  $\mathbf{z}_0$  is a fixed point of  $\psi_I \circ \varphi_I$ , then  $\{\psi_I \circ \varphi_I\}_{I \in \Sigma^*}$  is uniformly bounded on U. Therefore, according to Lemma 2.1 and by passing to a subsequence if necessary, we may assume that there exists a conformal map  $f: U \to \mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $\psi_{I_k} \circ \varphi_{I_k} \to f$ uniformly on U. With this and (6.8) in mind, we have

$$\sup_{\mathbf{z}\in K} |\mathbf{x}_k - f(\mathbf{z})| \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty.$$
(6.10)

It follows that the sequence  $\{\mathbf{x}_k\}_{k\geq 1}$  is bounded. Then, by passing to a subsequence, we may assume that  $\mathbf{x}_k \to \mathbf{x}$  for some  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . This together with (6.10) implies that  $f(K) = \{\mathbf{x}\}$ . Now, with this and the fact that f is conformal in mind, we conclude that K is a singleton, which contradicts our setting. This proves (6.7).

Now fix an arbitrary  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $I \in \Sigma^*$ . Then by the compactness of K and the definition of  $\delta$ , there exists  $\mathbf{z} \in K$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{x} - \varphi_{I}(\mathbf{z})| &= \|\varphi_{I}'\| \cdot |\psi_{I}(\mathbf{x}) - \psi_{I} \circ \varphi_{I}(\mathbf{z})| \\ &\geq \delta \|\varphi_{I}'\| \\ &\geq C_{3}^{-1}\delta |K_{I}| \\ &\geq C_{3}^{-1}C_{4}^{-1}\delta \cdot \left(\min_{1 \leq i \leq m} |K_{i}|\right) \cdot |K_{I^{-}}|, \end{aligned}$$
(6.12)

where inequality (6.11) follows from (2.6) and (6.12) follows from (2.9). Let  $\rho > 0$  be a small number that will be determined later. For any  $j_1 j_2 \cdots \in \pi^{-1}(\mathbf{z})$ , there exists unique  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $J = j_1 \cdots j_{n_0} \in \Lambda_{\rho}(I)$ . By (6.12), we have

$$\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x}, K_{IJ}) \geq |\mathbf{x} - \varphi_{I}(\mathbf{z})| - |K_{Ij_{1}\cdots j_{n_{0}}}|$$

$$> |\mathbf{x} - \varphi_{I}(\mathbf{z})| - \varrho |K_{I^{-}}|$$

$$\geq \left( C_{3}^{-1} C_{4}^{-1} \delta \cdot \left( \min_{1 \leq i \leq m} |K_{i}| \right) - \varrho \right) \cdot |K_{I^{-}}|.$$
(6.13)

Now choose  $\rho \in (0, \rho_0)$  to be a sufficiently small number (independent of the choices of  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $I \in \Sigma^*$ ) such that

$$C_3^{-1}C_4^{-1}\delta \cdot \left(\min_{1 \le i \le m} |K_i|\right) \ge 2 \varrho.$$

Then in view of the inequality (6.13), we obtain the desired lower bound

$$\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x}, K_{IJ}) > \varrho \left| K_{I^{-}} \right|.$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 6.1.

We are now in the position to establish part (i) of Proposition 6.1. Let  $\varrho \in (0, \varrho_0)$  be as in Lemma 6.1. To prove (6.1), we first show that there exist s > 0 and  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$\mu(B(\mathbf{x}, \varrho^k)) \le \varrho^{ks} \quad (\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d, \ k \ge N).$$
(6.14)

Throughout, fix an arbitrary  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and let

$$\mathcal{A}_1 := \{ I \in \Lambda_{\varrho} : K_I \cap B(\mathbf{x}, \varrho) \neq \emptyset \} .$$

For any  $I \in \Sigma^*$  and any integer  $k \ge 1$ , let

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{A}_k(I) &:= \left\{ J \in \Lambda_{\varrho}(I) : K_{IJ} \cap B(\mathbf{x}, \varrho^k) \neq \emptyset \right\}, \\
E_k &:= \bigcup_{I_1 \in \mathcal{A}_1} \bigcup_{I_2 \in \mathcal{A}_2(I_1)} \cdots \bigcup_{I_k \in \mathcal{A}_k(I_1 I_2 \cdots I_{k-1})} [I_1 I_2 \cdots I_k].
\end{aligned}$$

Roughly speaking,  $E_k$  is the union of those cylinder sets [I] in the symbolic space such that the associated cylinder sets  $K_I$  within the self-conformal set satisfy

$$|K_I| \simeq \varrho^k$$
 and  $K_I \cap B(\mathbf{x}, \varrho^k) \neq \emptyset$ .

In view of (6.4), it can be verified that the unions in the definition of  $E_k$  are disjoint. Also, it is easily seen that  $E_{k+1} \subseteq E_k$  for any  $k \ge 1$ . Now given any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and any

$$I_1 \in \mathcal{A}_1, I_2 \in \mathcal{A}_2(I_1), \ldots, I_k \in \mathcal{A}_k(I_1I_2\cdots I_{k-1}),$$

on applying Lemma 6.1 to  $I = I_1 I_2 \cdots I_k$  and **x**, we obtain that there exists  $J \in \Lambda_{\varrho}(I_1 I_2 \cdots I_k)$  such that

$$\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x}, K_{I_1 \cdots I_k J}) > \varrho \left| K_{I_1 I_2 \cdots I_k^-} \right|.$$
(6.15)

It can be verified that  $|K_{I_1I_2\cdots I_k^-}| \ge \rho^k$  by the choices of  $I_1, I_2, \dots, I_k$ . Then by (6.15), we have that

$$\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x}, K_{I_1 \cdots I_k J}) > \varrho^{k+1}$$

which implies that

$$[I_1I_2\cdots I_kJ]\cap E_{k+1}=\emptyset.$$

The upshot is that

$$\underline{\mu}([I_1I_2\cdots I_k]\cap E_{k+1}) \leq \underline{\mu}([I_1I_2\cdots I_k]) - \underline{\mu}([I_1I_2\cdots I_kJ]).$$
(6.16)

In view of the fact that  $\underline{\mu}$  is doubling and that the sequence  $\{M_{\varrho}(I)\}_{I \in \Sigma^*}$  is bounded (see (6.5)), there exists  $\eta \in (0, 1)$  such that

$$\underline{\mu}([IJ]) \ge \eta \cdot \underline{\mu}([I]), \qquad \forall I \in \Sigma^*, \ \forall J \in \Lambda_{\varrho}(I)$$

This together with (6.16) implies that

$$\underline{\mu}([I_1I_2\cdots I_k]\cap E_{k+1}) \le (1-\eta) \ \underline{\mu}([I_1I_2\cdots I_k]).$$
(6.17)

On combining (6.17) with the fact that  $E_{k+1} \subseteq E_k$ , we have that for any  $k \ge 1$ 

$$\underline{\mu}(E_{k+1}) = \mu(E_k \cap E_{k+1})$$

$$= \sum_{I_1 \in \mathcal{A}_1} \sum_{I_2 \in \mathcal{A}_2(I_1)} \cdots \sum_{I_k \in \mathcal{A}_k(I_1 I_2 \cdots I_{k-1})} \underline{\mu}([I_1 I_2 \cdots I_k] \cap E_{k+1})$$

$$\leq (1 - \eta) \cdot \sum_{I_1 \in \mathcal{A}_1} \sum_{I_2 \in \mathcal{A}_2(I_1)} \cdots \sum_{I_k \in \mathcal{A}_k(I_1 I_2 \cdots I_{k-1})} \underline{\mu}([I_1 I_2 \cdots I_k])$$

$$= (1 - \eta) \cdot \underline{\mu}(E_k).$$
(6.18)

Then, by iterating inequality (6.18), we obtain that

$$\underline{\mu}(E_k) \le (1-\eta)^{k-1} \qquad \forall k \ge 1.$$
(6.19)

Furthermore, by the definition of  $E_k$ , we have

$$\pi^{-1}(B(\mathbf{x},\varrho^k)\cap K)\subseteq E_k, \quad \forall k\geq 1.$$

This together with (6.19) and the fact that  $\mu = \underline{\mu} \circ \pi^{-1}$  implies that

$$\mu(B(\mathbf{x}, \varrho^{k})) = \underline{\mu}(\pi^{-1}(K \cap B(\mathbf{x}, \varrho^{k})))$$

$$\leq \underline{\mu}(E_{k})$$

$$\leq (1 - \eta)^{k - 1}$$

$$= \varrho^{k \cdot \frac{(k - 1)\log(1 - \eta)}{k \log \varrho}}$$

$$\leq \varrho^{k \cdot \frac{\log(1 - \eta)}{2 \log \varrho}} \quad \forall k \geq 2.$$
(6.20)

This proves (6.14) with N = 2 and

$$s := \frac{\log(1-\eta)}{2\log\varrho}.$$
(6.21)

To complete the proof, we need to consider the  $\mu$ -measure of balls  $B(\mathbf{x}, r)$ ) with arbitrary radius r > 0. For this we consider the following two cases.

• If  $r \leq \rho^2$ , then there exists unique integer  $k \geq 2$  such that  $\rho^{k+1} < r \leq \rho^k$ . From this and the inequality (6.20), we have

$$\mu(B(\mathbf{x},r)) \leq \left(\frac{r}{\varrho}\right)^{\frac{\log(1-\eta)}{2\log\varrho}}.$$
(6.22)

• If  $r > \varrho^2$ , then

$$\mu(B(\mathbf{x},r)) \leq 1 < \left(\frac{r}{\varrho^2}\right)^{\frac{\log(1-\eta)}{2\log\varrho}}.$$
(6.23)

On combining (6.22) and (6.23), we obtain the desired inequality (6.1) with s given by (6.21) and

 $C = \varrho^{-\log(1-\eta)/\log \varrho}.$ 

This completes the proof of part (i) of Proposition 6.1.

6.2. **Proof of Proposition 6.1: part (ii).** We first establish the "Furthermore" part of the statement. As we shall see in Section 6.2.4, this together with the rigidity statement Proposition 3.1 implies (6.2) in essentially all situations.

6.2.1. Proof of part (a) of Proposition 6.1 (ii). Let d = 1. Then, for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , r > 0 and  $\varrho > 0$ , we have  $(\partial B(x, r))_{\varrho} = B(x - r, \varrho) \cup B(x + r, \varrho)$ . Thus, part (i) of Proposition 6.1 implies that

$$\mu\big((\partial B(x,r))_{\varrho}\big) \le 2C \cdot \varrho^s.$$

This is precisely the desired inequality (6.2) for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , all r > 0 and all  $\rho > 0$ .

Without loss of generality, we assume that  $d \ge 2$ . Then, in view of the definition of  $\ell_K$  and Proposition 3.1, the statement  $\ell_K = d$  is equivalent to that K is not contained in any (d-1)-dimensional  $C^1$  submanifold.

We start the  $d \ge 2$  proof with establishing the following lemma concerning the tangent plane of a geometric sphere. It is required in estimating the lower bound of the distance between cylinder sets and the boundary of balls (namely in proving Lemma 6.3).

**Lemma 6.2.** Let  $d \ge 2$ ,  $\ell \in \{1, ..., d-1\}$  and  $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  be a  $\ell$ -dimensional geometric sphere with radius R. Then then for any  $\varrho \in (0, 1)$ , any  $r \in (0, \varrho R]$  and any  $\mathbf{x} \in S$ , we have

$$S \cap B(\mathbf{x}, r) \subseteq (\mathbf{x} + T_{\mathbf{x}}S)_{\varrho r}$$
.

*Proof.* Let S be a  $\ell$ -dimensional geometric sphere with radius R and let  $\mathbf{x} \in S$ . After applying an isometry if necessary, we may assume that

 $S = \left\{ \mathbf{y} = (y_1, ..., y_{\ell+1}, 0, ..., 0) \in \mathbb{R}^d : y_1^2 + y_2^2 + \dots + y_{\ell+1}^2 = R^2 \right\}$ 

and that  $\mathbf{x} = (R, 0, ..., 0)$ . Then

$$\mathbf{x} + T_{\mathbf{x}}S = \left\{ \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^d : y_1 = R, \, y_{\ell+2} = \dots = y_d = 0 \right\}.$$

Let  $\rho \in (0,1)$  and  $r \in (0,\rho R)$ . For any  $\mathbf{y} \in S \cap B(\mathbf{x},r)$ , a straightforward calculation yields that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{d}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x} + T_{\mathbf{x}}S) &= R - y_1 = R - \sqrt{R^2 - y_2^2 - \dots - y_{\ell+1}^2} \\ &= \frac{y_2^2 + \dots + y_{\ell+1}^2}{R + \sqrt{R^2 - y_2^2 - \dots - y_{\ell+1}^2}} \leq \frac{r^2}{R} \leq \varrho \, r \,. \end{aligned}$$
tes the proof.

This completes the proof.

The following result can be viewed as an analogue of Lemma 6.1. Throughout, let  $\rho_0 > 0$  be as in (6.3).

**Lemma 6.3.** Suppose that K is not contained in any (d-1)-dimensional  $C^1$  submanifold, then there exists  $\rho \in (0, \rho_0)$  that satisfies the following statement: given any  $I \in \Sigma^*$  and any ball  $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ , there exists  $J \in \Lambda_{\rho}(I)$  such that

$$\mathbf{d}(K_{IJ},\partial B) > \varrho \left| K_{I^{-}} \right|.$$

*Proof.* We adapt the proof of Lemma 6.1. Fix  $\mathbf{z}_0 \in K$ . For any  $I \in \Sigma^*$ , define  $\psi_I : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$  as in (6.6). We first show under the setting of Lemma 6.3 that

$$\delta := \inf_{I \in \Sigma^*} \inf_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^d} \inf_{r>0} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in K} \mathbf{d}(\psi_I \circ \varphi_I(\mathbf{x}), \partial B(\mathbf{z}, r)) > 0.$$
(6.24)

Suppose by contradiction that (6.24) is not true, then there exist  $\{I_k\}_{k\geq 1} \subseteq \Sigma^*$ ,  $\{\mathbf{z}_k\}_{k\geq 1} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\{r_k\}_{k\geq 1} \subseteq (0, +\infty)$  such that

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x}\in K} \mathbf{d}(\psi_{I_k} \circ \varphi_{I_k}(\mathbf{x}), \partial B(\mathbf{z}_k, r_k)) \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty.$$
(6.25)

Let  $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  be the bounded connected open set associated with (2.5). In view of (6.9), the uniformly boundedness of  $\{\psi_I \circ \varphi_I\}_{I \in \Sigma^*}$  and Lemma 2.1, we may assume that there exists a conformal map  $f : U \to \mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $\psi_{I_k} \circ \varphi_{I_k} \to f$  uniformly on U. Then it follows from (6.25) that

$$\sup_{x \in K} \mathbf{d}(f(\mathbf{x}), \partial B(\mathbf{z}_k, r_k)) \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty.$$
(6.26)

By passing to a subsequence if necessary, we may assume that

$$\mathbf{z}_k \to \mathbf{z}_\infty, \qquad r_k \to r_\infty \qquad \text{as} \qquad k \to \infty$$

for some  $\mathbf{z}_{\infty} \in \mathbb{R}^d \cup \{\infty\}$  and  $r_{\infty} \in [0, +\infty]$ . If  $(\mathbf{z}_{\infty}, r_{\infty}) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \{+\infty\}$  or  $(\mathbf{z}_{\infty}, r_{\infty}) \in \{\infty\} \times [0, +\infty)$ , then it can be verified that

$$\limsup_{k \to \infty} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in K} \mathbf{d}(f(\mathbf{x}), \partial B(\mathbf{z}_k, r_k)) = +\infty$$
(6.27)

which contradicts (6.26). Therefore, for (6.25) to hold, it is necessary

 $(\mathbf{z}_{\infty}, r_{\infty}) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times [0, +\infty) \text{ or } \mathbf{z}_{\infty} = \infty \text{ and } r_{\infty} = +\infty.$ 

We deal with these two case separately

• Suppose that  $\mathbf{z}_{\infty} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $r_{\infty} \in [0, +\infty)$ . Then it follows from (6.26) that

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x}\in K} \mathbf{d}(f(\mathbf{x}), \partial B(\mathbf{z}_{\infty}, r_{\infty})) = 0,$$

which implies that  $K \subseteq f^{-1}(\partial B(\mathbf{z}, r) \cap f(U))$ . In turn, this means that K is a subset of a (d-1)-dimensional  $C^1$  manifold which contradicts the hypothesis of the lemma.

• Suppose that  $\mathbf{z}_{\infty} = \infty$  and  $r_{\infty} = +\infty$ . In this case,

$$\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{z}_k, f(K)) \to +\infty \quad \text{and} \quad r_k \to +\infty, \text{ as } k \to +\infty.$$
 (6.28)

Then, on combining (6.26) and (6.28) with Lemma 6.2, we can find a sequence  $\{\mathbf{x}_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}\subseteq\mathbb{R}^d$  that satisfies the following two statements:

- (i) for each  $k \ge 1$ , we have that  $\mathbf{x}_k \in \partial B(\mathbf{z}_k, r_k)$ .
- (ii) for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists N > 0 such that for all k > N, we have  $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{x}_k, f(K)) < \epsilon$  and

$$f(K) \subseteq \left(\mathbf{x}_k + T_{\mathbf{x}_k} \partial B(\mathbf{z}_k, r_k)\right)_{\epsilon}.$$
(6.29)

Note that the sequence  $\{\mathbf{x}_k\}_{k\geq 1}$  is bounded. Thus, the sequence

$$\{\mathbf{x}_k + T_{\mathbf{x}_k} \partial B(\mathbf{z}_k, r_k)\}_{k \ge 1}$$

is bounded in A(d, d-1), where A(d, d-1) denotes the collection of all (d-1)dimensional affine subspaces in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  (see for example [56, Section 3.16]). With this and (6.29) in mind, it follows that there exists a (d-1)-dimensional affine subspace  $V \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $f(K) \subseteq (V)_{\epsilon}$  for any  $\epsilon > 0$ . Letting  $\epsilon$  approach to zero, we have  $f(K) \subseteq V$  and thus  $K \subseteq f^{-1}(V \cap f(U))$ . It implies that K is contained in a (d-1)-dimensional  $C^1$  submanifold, which is a contradiction.

The upshot of the above is that inequality (6.24) is true. Let  $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  be a ball and fix  $I \in \Sigma^*$ . Then by the definition of  $\delta$ , there exists  $\mathbf{x} \in K$  such that

$$\mathbf{d}(\varphi_{I}(\mathbf{x}), \partial B) = \|\varphi_{I}'\| \cdot \mathbf{d}(\psi_{I} \circ \varphi_{I}(\mathbf{x}), \psi_{I}(\partial B))$$

$$\geq \delta \|\varphi_{I}'\|$$

$$\geq C_{3}^{-1} \delta |K_{I}| \qquad (6.30)$$

$$\geq C^{-1} C^{-1} \delta \cdot (\min_{I} |K_{I}|) \cdot |K_{I}| \qquad (6.31)$$

$$\geq C_3^{-1} C_4^{-1} \delta \cdot \left( \min_{1 \le i \le m} |K_i| \right) \cdot |K_{I^-}|, \qquad (6.31)$$

where inequality (6.30) follows from (2.6) and the inequality (6.31) is a consequence of (2.9). Let  $\rho \in (0, \rho_0)$  be a small number that will be determined later. For any infinite word  $j_1 j_2 \cdots \in \pi^{-1}(\mathbf{x})$ , there exists unique  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that the finite word  $J = j_1 \cdots j_{n_0} \in \Lambda_{\rho}(I)$ . By (6.31) and the definition of  $\Lambda_{\rho}(I)$ , we have

$$\mathbf{d}(K_{IJ}, \ \partial B) \geq \mathbf{d}(\varphi_{I}(\mathbf{x}), \partial B) - |K_{IJ}|$$
  
> 
$$\mathbf{d}(\varphi_{I}(\mathbf{x}), \partial B) - \varrho |K_{I^{-}}|$$
  
$$\geq \left(C_{3}^{-1}C_{4}^{-1}\delta \cdot \left(\min_{1 \leq i \leq m} |K_{i}|\right) - \varrho\right) \cdot |K_{I^{-}}|.$$
(6.32)

Let  $\rho \in (0, \rho_0)$  be sufficiently same so that

$$C_3^{-1}C_4^{-1}\delta \cdot \left(\min_{1 \le i \le m} |K_i|\right) - \varrho \ge \varrho.$$

Then the inequality (6.32) yields the desired lower bound  $\mathbf{d}(K_{IJ}, \partial B) > \varrho |K_{I^-}|$ .

We are now in the position to establish part (a) of Proposition 6.1 (ii) when  $d \ge 2$ . The proof is an adaptation of the proof of Proposition 6.1 (i). Recall that under the setting of part (a) with  $d \ge 2$ , the self-conformal set K is not contained in any d-1 dimensional  $C^1$  submanifold. This means that K satisfies the hypothesis of Lemma 6.3. Let  $\varrho > 0$  be the constant associated with that lemma. Note that, to prove part (a), it suffices to find  $\delta > 0$  and  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$\mu((\partial B)_{\rho^k}) \le \varrho^{k\delta} \tag{6.33}$$

for any ball  $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  and any  $k \ge N$  (for arbitrary r > 0 we simply follow the arguments used at the end of the proof of Proposition 6.1 (i)). So with this in mind, fix a ball  $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  and define

$$\mathcal{A}_1 := \{ I \in \Lambda_{\varrho} : K_I \cap (\partial B)_{\varrho} \neq \emptyset \} \,.$$

For any  $I \in \Sigma^*$  and positive integer  $k \ge 2$ , define

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{A}_{k}(I) &:= \left\{ J \in \Lambda_{\varrho}(I) : K_{IJ} \cap (\partial B)_{\varrho^{k}} \neq \emptyset \right\}, \\
E_{k} &:= \bigcup_{I_{1} \in \mathcal{A}_{1}} \bigcup_{I_{2} \in \mathcal{A}_{2}(I_{1})} \cdots \bigcup_{I_{k} \in \mathcal{A}_{k}(I_{1}I_{2}\cdots I_{k-1})} [I_{1}I_{2}\cdots I_{k}]
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the above definitions of  $\mathcal{A}_1$ ,  $\mathcal{A}_k(I)$  and  $E_k$  are slightly different from those appearing in the proof of Proposition 6.1 (i) even though we use the same symbols. In terms of (6.4), it can be verified that the unions in the definition of  $E_k$  are all disjoint. Also, it is easily seen that  $E_{k+1} \subseteq E_k$  for any  $k \ge 1$ . Now, by Lemma 6.3, we know that for any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and any

$$I_1 \in \mathcal{A}_1, I_2 \in \mathcal{A}_2(I_1), \dots, I_k \in \mathcal{A}_k(I_1I_2\cdots I_{k-1}),$$

there exists  $J \in \Lambda_{\varrho}(I_1 I_2 \cdots I_k)$  such that

$$\mathbf{d}(K_{I_1\cdots I_kJ}, \ \partial B) > \varrho \left| K_{I_1I_2\cdots I_k^-} \right|$$

Furthermore, we have that  $|K_{I_1I_2\cdots I_k}| \ge \rho^k$  by the choices of  $I_1, I_2, \dots, I_k$ . Then

$$\mathbf{d}(K_{I_1\cdots I_kJ},\ \partial B) > \varrho^{k+1}$$

and thus  $J \notin \mathcal{A}_{k+1}(I_1 \cdots I_k)$ , which in turn implies that

$$[I_1I_2\cdots I_kJ]\cap E_{k+1}=\emptyset.$$

The above discussion shows that

$$\underline{\mu}([I_1I_2\cdots I_k]\cap E_{k+1}) \leq \underline{\mu}([I_1I_2\cdots I_k]) - \underline{\mu}([I_1I_2\cdots I_kJ]).$$
(6.34)

Now since  $\underline{\mu}$  is doubling and the sequence  $\{M_{\varrho}(I)\}_{I \in \Sigma^*}$  is bounded (see (6.5)), there exists  $\eta \in (0, 1)$  such that

$$\underline{\mu}([IJ]) \geq \eta \cdot \underline{\mu}([I]), \quad \forall I \in \Sigma^*, \, \forall J \in \Lambda_{\varrho}(I)$$

With this and (6.34) in mind, it follows that

$$\underline{\mu}([I_1I_2\cdots I_k]\cap E_{k+1}) \leq (1-\eta) \ \underline{\mu}([I_1I_2\cdots I_k]).$$

Since  $E_{k+1} \subseteq E_k$ , the upshot of the above is that

$$\underline{\mu}(E_{k+1}) = \mu(E_k \cap E_{k+1})$$

$$= \sum_{I_1 \in \mathcal{A}_1} \sum_{I_2 \in \mathcal{A}_2(I_1)} \cdots \sum_{I_k \in \mathcal{A}_k(I_1 I_2 \cdots I_{k-1})} \underline{\mu}([I_1 I_2 \cdots I_k] \cap E_{k+1})$$
  

$$\leq (1-\eta) \cdot \sum_{I_1 \in \mathcal{A}_1} \sum_{I_2 \in \mathcal{A}_2(I_1)} \cdots \sum_{I_k \in \mathcal{A}_k(I_1 I_2 \cdots I_{k-1})} \underline{\mu}([I_1 I_2 \cdots I_k])$$
  

$$= (1-\eta) \cdot \underline{\mu}(E_k).$$

Therefore, for any  $k \ge 1$ ,

$$\underline{\mu}(E_k) \le (1-\eta)^{k-1}.$$

Combining this inequality with the following easily verified inclusion

$$\pi^{-1}(K \cap (\partial B)_{\varrho^k}) \subseteq E_k, \quad \forall k \ge 1,$$

we obtain that

$$\mu((\partial B)_{\varrho^k}) = \underline{\mu} \left( \pi^{-1} \left( K \cap (\partial B)_{\varrho^k} \right) \right)$$
  
$$\leq \underline{\mu}(E_k)$$
  
$$\leq (1-\eta)^{k-1}$$
  
$$= \varrho^{k \cdot \frac{(k-1)\log(1-\eta)}{k\log\varrho}}$$
  
$$\leq \varrho^{k \cdot \frac{\log(1-\eta)}{2\log\varrho}}, \quad \forall \ k \ge 2.$$

This shows (6.33) with  $\delta = \log(1 - \eta)/(2 \log \varrho)$  and N = 2, and thus the proof of part (a) of Proposition 6.1 (ii) is complete.

6.2.2. Proof of part (b) of Proposition 6.1 (ii). Under the setting of part (b), the selfconformal set K is contained in a  $\ell_K$  dimensional affine space or  $\ell_K$  dimensional geometric sphere, and not contained in any  $(\ell_K - 1)$ -dimensional  $C^1$  submanifold.

The following result can be viewed as an analogue of Lemma 6.3. Throughout, we define  $\mathbf{d}(A, \emptyset) := +\infty$  for a non-empty subset  $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  and let  $\varrho_0 > 0$  be as in (6.3).

**Lemma 6.4.** Let  $d \geq 2$  and let  $\ell \in \{1, ..., d-1\}$ . Suppose that  $K \subseteq S$  where S is a  $\ell$ -dimensional geometric sphere or a  $\ell$ -dimensional affine hyperplane in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , and K is not contained in any  $(\ell - 1)$ -dimensional  $C^1$  submanifold. Then there exists  $\varrho \in (0, \varrho_0)$  that satisfies the following statement: given any  $I \in \Sigma^*$  and any ball  $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  centered at K, there exists  $J \in \Lambda_{\varrho}(I)$  such that

$$\mathbf{d}(K_{IJ},(\partial B)\cap S) > \varrho \left| K_{I^{-}} \right|. \tag{6.35}$$

*Proof.* The proof is similar to that of Lemma 6.3. Firstly, under the setting of Lemma 6.4, we shall show that

$$\delta := \inf_{I \in \Sigma^*} \inf_{\mathbf{z} \in K} \inf_{r>0} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in K} \mathbf{d}(\psi_I \circ \varphi_I(\mathbf{x}), \psi_I(\partial B(\mathbf{z}, r) \cap S)) > 0,$$
(6.36)

where  $\psi_I$  is defined as in (6.6). Let  $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  be the set described in the statement of Lemma 6.4. When S is a  $\ell$ -dimensional affine hyperplane, the set K can be viewed as a self-conformal set in  $\mathbb{R}^{\ell}$  and thus the proof of (6.36) is the same as that of (6.24). When S is a  $\ell$ -dimensional geometric sphere, the proof remains largely the same with only minor modifications. Nevertheless, we sketch the proof of (6.36) in the latter case.

Assume that  $K \subseteq S$  where S is a  $\ell$ -dimensional geometric sphere with radius R, and K is not contained in any  $\ell - 1$ -dimensional  $C^1$  submanifold. Suppose in contradiction that

(6.36) is not true, then there exist  $\{I_k\}_{k\geq 1} \subseteq \Sigma^*$ ,  $\{\mathbf{z}_k\}_{k\geq 1} \subseteq K$  and  $\{r_k\}_{k\geq 1} \subseteq (0, +\infty)$  such that

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x}\in K} \mathbf{d}(\psi_{I_k} \circ \varphi_{I_k}(\mathbf{x}), \psi_{I_k}(\partial B(\mathbf{z}_k, r_k) \cap S)) \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty.$$

Let  $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  be the bounded connected open set associated with (2.5). By (6.9), the uniformly boundedness of  $\{\psi_I \circ \varphi_I\}_{I \in \Sigma^*}$  and Lemma 2.1, we may assume that there exists a conformal map  $f: U \to \mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $\psi_{I_k} \circ \varphi_{I_k} \to f$  uniformly on U. Then

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x}\in K} \mathbf{d}(f(\mathbf{x}), \psi_{I_k}(\partial B(\mathbf{z}_k, r_k) \cap S)) \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty.$$
(6.37)

Since  $\#(\partial B(\mathbf{z}, r) \cap S) \leq 1$  when  $\mathbf{z} \in S$  and  $r \geq 2R$ , we may assume that  $\{r_k\}_{k\geq 1} \subseteq (0, 2R)$ . Thus,  $\partial B(\mathbf{z}_k, r_k) \cap S$  is a  $(\ell - 1)$ -dimensional geometric sphere for any  $k \geq 1$ . Let

$$S^{\ell-1} := \left\{ (x_1, \dots, x_\ell, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^d : \sum_{i=1}^\ell x_i^2 = 1 \right\}.$$

Let O(d) denote the collection of all  $d \times d$  orthogonal matrices. Then for any  $k \ge 1$ , there exist  $\rho_k > 0$ ,  $O_k \in O(d)$  and  $\mathbf{b}_k \in \mathbb{R}^d$  such that

$$\psi_{I_k}(\partial B(\mathbf{z}_k, r_k) \cap S) = \rho_k O_k(S^{\ell-1}) + \mathbf{b}_k.$$

By passing to a subsequence if necessary, we may assume that

$$\rho_k \to \rho_\infty, \quad \mathbf{b}_k \to \mathbf{b}_\infty, \quad O_k \to O_\infty \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty$$

for some  $\rho_{\infty} \in [0, +\infty]$ ,  $\mathbf{b}_{\infty} \in \mathbb{R}^d \cup \{\infty\}$  and  $O_{\infty} \in O(d)$ . In view of (6.37), this is only possible if  $(\rho_{\infty}, \mathbf{b}_{\infty}) \in [0, +\infty) \times \mathbb{R}^d$  or  $(\rho_{\infty}, \mathbf{b}_{\infty}) \in \{+\infty\} \times \{\infty\}$ . On following the arguments used after (6.27), in both these cases we find that K is contained in a  $\ell - 1$ -dimensional  $C^1$  submanifold. This is a contradiction and thus establishes (6.36). With inequality (6.36) at hand, the desired inequality (6.35) can be proved for  $\varrho \in (0, \varrho_0)$ sufficiently small enough via calculations analogous to those used in deriving (6.31) and (6.32).

We are in a position to establish part (b) of Proposition 6.1 (ii). Under the setting of part (b), recall that  $K \subseteq S$  where S is a  $\ell_K$ -dimensional affine hyperplane or a  $\ell_K$ dimensional geometric sphere, but K is not contained in any  $(\ell_K - 1)$ -dimensional  $C^1$ submanifold. To ease notation, in the following we simply write  $\ell$  for  $\ell_K$ .

If S is a  $\ell$ -dimensional affine hyperplane, then we can view K as a self-conformal set in  $\mathbb{R}^{\ell}$ and the proof to establish part (b) follows the same line of argument as that appearing in Section 6.2.1. Thus, without loss of generality, we assume that S is a  $\ell$ -dimensional sphere with radius R.

First, we show that there exists C > 0 such that for any  $\mathbf{z} \in S$ ,  $r \leq 2R$  and  $\rho > 0$ 

$$(\partial B(\mathbf{z}, r))_{\varrho} \cap S \subseteq (\partial B(\mathbf{z}, r) \cap S)_{5\sqrt{2R}\sqrt{\varrho}}.$$
(6.38)

With this immediate goal in mind, fix an arbitrary point  $\mathbf{x} \in (\partial B(\mathbf{z}, r))_{\varrho} \cap S$ . By applying an isometric mapping on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  if necessary, we can assume, without loss of generality, that

$$S = \left\{ (y_1, \dots, y_{\ell+1}, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^d : \sum_{i=1}^{\ell+1} y_i^2 = R^2 \right\}$$

and that

$$\mathbf{z} = (0, R, 0, ..., 0), \text{ and } \mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, 0, ..., 0) \text{ with } x_1 \ge 0$$

Then since  $\mathbf{x} \in S$ , a straightforward calculation shows that

$$\mathbf{x} = \left( |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}| \cdot \sqrt{1 - \frac{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}|^2}{4R^2}}, R - \frac{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}|^2}{2R}, 0, ..., 0 \right).$$

To prove (6.38), we need to show that

$$\mathbf{x} \in \left(\partial B(\mathbf{z}, r) \cap S\right)_{2\sqrt{2R}\sqrt{\varrho}};\tag{6.39}$$

that is to find  $\mathbf{y} \in \partial B(\mathbf{z}, r) \cap S$  such that  $|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}| \leq 5\sqrt{2R}\sqrt{\varrho}$ . To do this, let

$$\mathbf{y} = \left(r \cdot \sqrt{1 - \frac{r^2}{4R^2}}, R - \frac{r^2}{2R}, 0, ..., 0\right) \,.$$

Then  $\mathbf{y} \in \partial B(\mathbf{z}, r) \cap S$  and

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}| &\leq \left| |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}| \cdot \sqrt{1 - \frac{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}|^2}{4R^2}} - r \cdot \sqrt{1 - \frac{r^2}{4R^2}} \right| + \frac{||\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}| - r| \cdot (|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}| + r)}{2R} \\ &\leq r \cdot \left| \sqrt{1 - \frac{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}|^2}{4R^2}} - \sqrt{1 - \frac{r^2}{4R^2}} \right| + ||\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}| - r| \cdot \sqrt{1 - \frac{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}|^2}{4R^2}} \\ &+ 2 \left| |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}| - r \right| \\ &\leq \frac{||\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}|^2 - r^2|}{\sqrt{4R^2 - |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}|^2} + \sqrt{4R^2 - r^2}} + 3 ||\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}| - r| \\ &= \frac{||\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}| + r| \cdot ||\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}| - r|}{\sqrt{(2R + |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}|)(2R - |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}|)} + \sqrt{(2R + r)(2R - r)}} + 3 ||\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}| - r| \\ &\leq 2\sqrt{2R} \cdot \frac{||\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}| - r|}{\sqrt{2R - |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}|} + \sqrt{2R - r}} + 3 ||\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}| - r| \end{aligned}$$
(6.40)  
$$&\leq 5\sqrt{2R}\sqrt{||\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}| - r|} \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq 5\sqrt{2R}\sqrt{\varrho}. \tag{6.42}$$

In the above, inequality (6.40) follows since

 $|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}| + r \le 4R, \quad 2R + |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}| \ge 2R, \quad 2R + r \ge 2R \qquad (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z} \in S, r \le 2R)$ 

and inequality (6.41) is a consequence of the fact that

$$\frac{\left|\left|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{z}\right|-r\right|}{\sqrt{2R-\left|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{z}\right|}+\sqrt{2R-r}} \le \sqrt{\left|\left|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{z}\right|-r\right|}$$

and

$$\left|\left|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{z}\right|-r\right| = \left(\sqrt{\left|\left|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{z}\right|-r\right|}\right)^2 \le \sqrt{2R} \cdot \sqrt{\left|\left|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{z}\right|-r\right|}.$$

The last inequality (6.42) follows since  $\mathbf{x} \in (\partial B(\mathbf{z}, r))_{\varrho}$  and so  $||\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}| - r| \leq \varrho$ . The upshot of the above is that (6.39) is true and thus we have established (6.38) as desired.

Now by Lemma 6.4 and on following the arguments used in the proof of part (a) of Proposition 6.1 (ii) with  $\partial B$  replaced by  $\partial B(\mathbf{z}, r) \cap S$ , we find that there exists constants C > 0 and  $\delta > 0$  such that

$$\mu\big((\partial B(\mathbf{z},r)\cap S)_{\varrho}\big) \le C\varrho^{\delta}$$

for any  $\mathbf{z} \in S$ , any r > 0 and any  $\rho > 0$ . This together with (6.38), implies that

$$\mu((\partial B(\mathbf{z}, r))_{\varrho}) \le C \cdot 5^{\delta} (2R)^{\delta/2} \varrho^{\delta/2}$$
(6.43)

for any  $\mathbf{z} \in S$ , any  $r \leq 2R$  and any  $\rho > 0$ . If  $\mathbf{z} \in S$  and r > 2R, note that

$$(\partial B(\mathbf{z},r))_{\varrho} \cap S = \begin{cases} \emptyset, & \text{if } r-\varrho > 2R, \\ (\partial B(\mathbf{z},2R))_{\varrho-r+2R} \cap S, & \text{if } r-\varrho \le 2R \end{cases}$$

and thus (6.43) also holds when r > 2R. In other words (6.2) holds for any  $\mathbf{z} \in S$ , any r > 0 and any  $\rho > 0$ . This completes the proof of part (b) of Proposition 6.1 (ii).

6.2.3. Proof of part (c) of Proposition 6.1 (ii). We start by establishing various preliminary lemmas regarding the properties of multivariate analytic functions. The first result is concerned with the cardinality of the level sets associated with such functions.

**Lemma 6.5.** Let  $F : [a, b] \times [c, d] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be real analytic.

(i) If 
$$F(t, \cdot) \neq 0$$
 for any  $t \in [a, b]$ , then  

$$\sup_{t \in [a, b]} \# \{ s \in [c, d] : F(t, s) = 0 \} < +\infty.$$
(6.44)

(ii) If  $F(t, \cdot)$  is not a constant function for any  $t \in [a, b]$ , then

$$\sup_{p \in \mathbb{R}} \sup_{t \in [a,b]} \# \{ s \in [c,d] : F(t,s) = p \} < +\infty.$$
(6.45)

*Proof.* (i) Suppose on the contrary that the left-hand-side of (6.44) equals infinity. Then for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exist  $t_n \in [a, b]$  and distinct points  $s_1^{(n)}, \dots, s_n^{(n)} \in [c, d]$  such that

$$F(t_n, s_i^{(n)}) = 0, \ \forall i = 1, 2, ..., n.$$
 (6.46)

Without loss of generality, we assume that  $t_n \to t_0$  for some  $t_0 \in [a, b]$  as  $n \to \infty$ . Given an integer  $i \ge 1$ , denote by  $S_i$  the set of limit points of  $\{s_i^{(n)} : n \ge i\}$ . Let

$$\mathcal{S} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{S}_i$$
 .

Since F is real analytic, it follows by (6.46) and the definition of  $\mathcal{S}$ , that

$$F(t_0, s) = 0, \qquad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}.$$
(6.47)

We now proceed by considering two case.

Case 1:  $\#S = +\infty$ . In this case, there exist infinitely many  $s \in [c, d]$  such that  $F(t_0, s) = 0$ . Note that  $F(t_0, \cdot)$  is real analytic on [c, d], then in view of it follows that  $F(t_0, \cdot) \equiv 0$  on [c, d], which is a contradiction.

Case 2:  $\#S < +\infty$ . In this case, there exists  $s_0 \in S$  such that  $s_0 \in S_i$  for infinitely many  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ . Without loss of generality, we assume that  $s_0 \in S_i$  for all  $i \ge 1$ . We now show that

$$\frac{\partial^k F}{\partial s^k}(t_0, s_0) = 0, \qquad \forall \ k \ge 0.$$
(6.48)

By (6.47), the formula in (6.48) holds when k = 0. Fix any  $k \ge 1$ . By passing to a subsequence, we assume that

$$s_i^{(n)} \to s_0 \ (n \to \infty), \quad \forall i = 1, 2, ..., k+1.$$
 (6.49)

We denote

u

$${n = \min \left\{ {s_i^{\left( n \right)}:i = 1,2,...,k + 1} \right\},\ v_n = \max \left\{ {s_i^{\left( n \right)}:i = 1,2,...,k + 1} \right\}}$$

for any  $n \ge k+1$ . By (6.49), we have

$$u_n \to s_0, \ v_n \to s_0 \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$
 (6.50)

Given  $n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq k+1}$ , note that  $s_1^{(n)}, s_2^{(n)}, \dots, s_{k+1}^{(n)}$  are all distinct, then by (6.46) and Rolle's Theorem, there exists  $\xi_n \in (u_n, v_n)$  such that

$$\frac{\partial^k F}{\partial s^k}(t_n,\xi_n) = 0.$$

Letting  $n \to \infty$ , we obtain from (6.50) and the continuity of  $\frac{\partial^k F}{\partial s^k}$  that

$$\frac{\partial^k F}{\partial s^k}(t_0, s_0) = 0.$$

This establishes (6.48). Now since k is arbitrary, (6.48) together with the fact that  $F(t_0, \cdot)$  is analytic on [c, d] implies that  $F(t_0, \cdot) \equiv 0$  on [c, d]. This contradicts the hypothesis of part (i) and so we are done.

(ii) The proof is a modification of that of part (i). Suppose that (6.45) is not true. Then for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exist  $p_n \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $t_n \in [a, b]$  such that

$$\# \{ s \in [c,d] : F(t_n,s) = p_n \} \ge n \, ;$$

that is to say, there exist distinct points  $s_1^{(n)}, s_2^{(n)}, \dots, s_n^{(n)} \in [c, d]$  such that

$$F(t_n, s_i^{(n)}) = p_n, \qquad \forall i = 1, 2, ..., n.$$
 (6.51)

Note that F is real analytic on a compact set, hence the range of F is bounded and so is  $\{p_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ . Therefore, without loss of generality, we may assume that

$$a_n \to t_0, \qquad p_n \to p_0 \qquad (n \to \infty)$$

for some  $t_0 \in [a, b]$  and  $p_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ . Given an integer  $i \geq 1$ , denote by  $S_i$  the set of limit points of  $\{s_i^{(n)} : n \geq i\}$ . Let S be the union of  $S_i$   $(i \geq 1)$ . Since F is real analytic, it follows by (6.51) and the definition of S, that

$$F(t_0, s) = p_0, \qquad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}.$$
(6.52)

As in the proof of (i), we proceed by considering two case.

Case 1:  $\#S = +\infty$ . In this case, by (6.52), there exist infinitely many  $s \in [c, d]$  such that  $F(t_0, s) = p_0$ . Note that  $s \mapsto F(t_0, s)$  is real analytic on [c, d], then it follows that  $F(t_0, \cdot) \equiv p_0$  on [c, d], which is a contradiction.

Case 2:  $\#S < +\infty$ . Similar to Case 2 in the proof of part (i), there exists  $s_0 \in S$  such that

$$\frac{\partial^k F}{\partial s^k}(t_0, s_0) = 0, \qquad \forall \, k \ge 1.$$

Then by the analyticity of the map  $s \mapsto F(t_0, s)$  ( $s \in [c, d]$ ), we have  $F(t_0, s) = F(t_0, s_0) = p_0$  for any  $s \in [c, d]$ , which is a contradiction.

The next lemma is concerned with bounding from below the derivatives of analytic functions.

**Lemma 6.6.** If  $F : [a, b] \times [c, d] \to \mathbb{R}$  is real analytic and  $F(t, \cdot) \not\equiv 0$  for any  $t \in [a, b]$ , then there exist  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\delta_0 > 0$  such that

$$\max_{0 \le i \le n_0} \left| \frac{\partial^i F}{\partial s^i}(t,s) \right| \ge \delta_0, \quad \forall \, (s,t) \in [a,b] \times [c,d].$$

*Proof.* Suppose on the contrary the result is not true. Then for any integer  $n \ge 1$ , we can find  $(s_n, t_n) \in [a, b] \times [c, d]$  such that

$$\left|\frac{\partial^{i} F}{\partial s^{i}}(t_{n}, s_{n})\right| < \frac{1}{n}, \quad \forall i = 0, 1, ..., n.$$

$$(6.53)$$

By passing to a subsequence if necessary, we can assume that  $(t_n, s_n) \to (t_0, s_0)$  for some  $(t_0, s_0) \in [a, b] \times [c, d]$ . Then letting  $n \to \infty$  on both sides of (6.53), gives

$$\frac{\partial^i F}{\partial s^i}(t_0, s_0) = 0, \quad \forall i \ge 0$$

This together with the analyticity of  $F(t_0, \cdot)$  implies that  $F(t_0, \cdot) \equiv 0$ , which contradicts the assumption that  $F(t, \cdot) \neq 0$  for any  $t \in [a, b]$ .

Given a function  $F : [a, b] \times [c, d] \to \mathbb{R}$ , for any  $t \in [a, b]$  and any  $-\infty < r_1 < r_2 < +\infty$ , let

$$\mathcal{F}(t, r_1, r_2) := \{ s \in [c, d] : r_1 < F(t, s) < r_2 \}$$

and denote by  $\mathcal{I}(t, r_1, r_2)$  the collection of all connected components of  $\mathcal{F}(t, r_1, r_2)$ . The next result show that cardinalities of the sets  $\mathcal{I}(t, r_1, r_2)$  associated with analytic functions are bounded.

**Lemma 6.7.** If  $F : [a,b] \times [c,d] \to \mathbb{R}$  is real analytic and  $F(t, \cdot) : [c,d] \to \mathbb{R}$  is not a constant function for any  $t \in [a,b]$ , then

$$\sup \left\{ \# \mathcal{I}(t, r_1, r_2) : t \in [a, b], -\infty < r_1 < r_2 < +\infty \right\} < +\infty.$$

Proof. Fix  $t \in [a, b]$  and fix  $r_1 < r_2$ . Let  $r_0 \in (r_1, r_2)$ . Note that since F is analytic,  $\mathcal{I}(t, r_1, r_2)$  is a collection of disjoint (relatively) open intervals on [c, d]. For brevity of notation, in the following we write  $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}(t, r_1, r_2)$ .

The goal is to estimate the number of elements in  $\mathcal{I}$ . To do this, we partition  $\mathcal{I}$  into three parts:

$$\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}_1 \cup \mathcal{I}_2 \cup \mathcal{I}_3$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_1 &:= & \left\{ I \in \mathcal{I} : c \in \overline{I} \text{ or } d \in \overline{I} \right\}, \\ \mathcal{I}_2 &:= & \left\{ I \in \mathcal{I} \setminus \mathcal{I}_1 : \exists s \in I \text{ s.t. } F(t,s) = r_0 \right\}, \\ \mathcal{I}_3 &:= & \mathcal{I} \setminus (\mathcal{I}_1 \cup \mathcal{I}_2). \end{aligned}$$

It is obvious that  $\#\mathcal{I}_1 \leq 2$ . Note that  $F(t', \cdot)$  is not a constant function for any  $t' \in [a, b]$ . Thus, by the definition of  $\mathcal{I}_2$  and applying part (ii) of Lemma 6.5 to the function F, we have

$$#\mathcal{I}_{2} \leq \sup_{t' \in [a,b]} \# \{ s \in [c,d] : F(t',s) = r_{0} \}$$
  
$$\leq \sup_{p \in \mathbb{R}} \sup_{t' \in [a,b]} \# \{ s \in [c,d] : F(t',s) = p \}$$
  
$$< +\infty.$$

It remains to estimate the number of elements of  $\mathcal{I}_3$ . If  $I \in \mathcal{I}_3$ , then its closure  $\overline{I} \subseteq (c, d)$ and  $r_0 \notin F(t, I)$ . We claim that there must be  $s \in I$  such that

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial s}(t,s) = 0$$

If not, then  $F(t, \cdot)$  is monotone on I. Write I = (p, q) where  $c . Without the loss of generality, we assume that <math>F(t, \cdot)$  is increasing on I. Under this assumption, since  $r_0 \notin F(t, I)$ , we have

$$F(t,s) \ge r_0 > r_1$$
 or  $F(t,s) \le r_0 < r_2$   $(s \in I)$ .

In the above former case, by the continuity of  $F(t, \cdot)$ , there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that  $(p - \delta, q) \subseteq (c, d)$  and  $F(t, (p - \delta, q)) \subseteq (r_1, r_2)$ , which contradicts the fact that I = (p, q) is a connected component of  $\mathcal{F}(t, r_1, r_2)$ . The latter case can be treated similarly. So we have proven the claim that any interval in  $\mathcal{I}_3$  must contain at least one zero of  $\frac{\partial F}{\partial s}(t, \cdot)$ . Recall that  $F(t', \cdot)$  is not a constant function for any  $t' \in [a, b]$ , so  $\frac{\partial F}{\partial s}(t', \cdot) \not\equiv 0$  for any  $t' \in [a, b]$ . With this in mind, on applying part (i) of Lemma 6.5 to the real analytic function  $\frac{\partial F}{\partial s}$ , we have

$$\#\mathcal{I}_3 \le \sup_{t' \in [a,b]} \#\left\{s \in [c,d] : \frac{\partial F}{\partial s}(t',s) = 0\right\} < +\infty.$$

The upshot of the above is that

$$\begin{aligned} \#\mathcal{I} &\leq 2 + \sup_{p \in \mathbb{R}} \sup_{t' \in [a,b]} \#\left\{s \in [c,d] : F(t',s) = p\right\} \\ &+ \sup_{t' \in [a,b]} \#\left\{s \in [c,d] : \frac{\partial F}{\partial s}(t',s) = 0\right\} \\ &< +\infty, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof.

The following rather elementary result while be useful in obtaining lower bounds for the integral of analytic functions (namely in proving the subsequent Lemma 6.9).

**Lemma 6.8.** Let  $n \ge 1$  be an integer. Then there exists  $\gamma = \gamma(n) > 0$  such that

$$\int_{-1}^{1} |a_0 + a_1 x + \dots + a_n x^n| \, \mathrm{d}x \ge \gamma \cdot \max_{0 \le i \le n} |a_i|$$
  
for all  $(a_0, a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{P}_n([-1,1])$  be the collection of all polynomials on [-1,1] with coefficients in  $\mathbb{R}$  and degrees at most n, then  $\mathcal{P}_n([-1,1])$  is a (n+1)-dimensional (real) vector space under addition and scalar multiplication. Given  $f(x) = a_0 + a_1x + \cdots + a_nx^n \in \mathcal{P}_n([-1,1])$ , we define

$$||f||_1 := \int_{-1}^1 |f(x)| \, \mathrm{d}x,$$
  
$$||f||_2 := \max_{0 \le i \le n} |a_i|.$$

It is easy to show that both  $\|\cdot\|_1$  and  $\|\cdot\|_2$  are norms on  $\mathcal{P}_n([-1,1])$ . Since any two norms on a finite dimensional vector space are equivalent, there exists  $\gamma > 0$  such that

$$||f||_1 \ge \gamma ||f||_2, \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{P}_n([-1,1]),$$

which proves the lemma.

**Lemma 6.9.** Let  $F : [a,b] \times [c,d] \to \mathbb{R}$  be real analytic and suppose that  $F(t,\cdot) \not\equiv 0$  for any  $t \in [a,b]$ . Then there exist C > 0 and  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for any  $t \in [a,b]$  and any sub-interval  $I \subseteq [c,d]$ , we have

$$\int_{I} |F(t,s)| \, \mathrm{d}s \ge C |I|^{n_0}. \tag{6.54}$$

*Proof.* By Lemma 6.6, there exist  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\delta_0$  such that

$$\max_{0 \le i \le n_0 - 1} \left| \frac{\partial^i F}{\partial s^i}(t, s) \right| \ge \delta_0, \quad \forall (t, s) \in [a, b] \times [c, d].$$
(6.55)

Let

$$M := \max\left\{ \left| \frac{\partial^{n_0} F}{\partial s^{n_0}}(t,s) \right| : (t,s) \in [a,b] \times [c,d] \right\}.$$

Throughout, let I be a sub-interval of [c, d] and let  $s_I$  be the center of I. Also, we fix an arbitrary point  $t \in [a, b]$ . By Taylor's theorem,

$$F(t,s) = \sum_{i=0}^{n_0-1} \frac{1}{i!} \cdot \frac{\partial^i F}{\partial s^i}(t,s_I) \cdot (s-s_I)^i + \epsilon(t,s), \quad \forall (t,s) \in [a,b] \times [c,d], \quad (6.56)$$

where the error term  $\epsilon(t, s)$  satisfies

$$|\epsilon(t,s)| \le \frac{M}{(n_0+1)!} \cdot |s-s_I|^{n_0}.$$

To ease notation, let

$$G(t,s) := \sum_{i=1}^{n_0-1} \frac{1}{i!} \cdot \frac{\partial^i F}{\partial s^i}(t,s_I) \cdot (s-s_I)^i.$$

Then by (6.56) and the triangle inequality, we have

$$\int_{I} |F(t,s)| \, \mathrm{d}s \geq \int_{I} |G(t,s)| \, \mathrm{d}s - \int_{I} |\epsilon(t,s)| \, \mathrm{d}s$$
  
=:  $I_1 - I_2,$  (6.57)

where we set

$$I_1 := \int_I |G(t,s)| \, \mathrm{d}s, \qquad I_2 := \int_I |\epsilon(t,s)| \, \mathrm{d}s.$$

We first estimate the lower bound of  $I_1$ . Let  $\gamma > 0$  be as in Lemma 6.8 with  $n = n_0 - 1$ . Then on combining (6.55) and Lemma 6.8, we have

$$I_{1} = \int_{I} |G(t,s)| ds$$

$$= \frac{|I|}{2} \int_{-1}^{1} |G(t,s_{I} + \frac{|I|}{2}s)| ds$$

$$= \frac{|I|}{2} \int_{-1}^{1} |\sum_{i=0}^{n_{0}-1} \frac{1}{i!} \cdot \frac{\partial^{i}F}{\partial s^{i}}(t,s_{I}) \cdot \left(\frac{|I|}{2}s\right)^{i}| ds$$

$$\geq \frac{|I|}{2} \cdot \gamma \cdot \max_{0 \le i \le n_{0}-1} \left\{ \frac{1}{i!} \cdot \left| \frac{\partial^{i}F}{\partial s^{i}}(t,s_{I}) \right| \cdot \left(\frac{|I|}{2}\right)^{i} \right\}$$

$$\geq \frac{\gamma}{2^{n_0}(n_0-1)!} \cdot \max_{0 \leq i \leq n_0-1} \left\{ \left| \frac{\partial^i F}{\partial s^i}(t,s_I) \right| \right\} \cdot \min\{|I|^{n_0},|I|\}$$
  
$$\geq \frac{\gamma \delta_0}{2^{n_0}(n_0-1)!} \cdot \min\{|I|^{n_0},|I|\}.$$
(6.58)

Next we obtain an upper bound for  $I_2$ :

$$I_{2} = \int_{I} |\epsilon(t,s)| \, \mathrm{d}s$$
  

$$\leq \int_{I} \frac{M}{n_{0}!} \cdot |s - s_{I}|^{n_{0}} \, \mathrm{d}s$$
  

$$= \frac{M}{2^{n_{0}}(n_{0} + 1)!} \cdot |I|^{n_{0} + 1}. \quad (6.59)$$

In the following, let

 $r_0 := \min \left\{ \gamma \delta_0(n_0 + 1)(n_0 + 2)/(2M), d - c, 1 \right\}.$ 

We continue with estimating the integral of  $|F(t, \cdot)|$  over I by considering two cases:

• If  $|I| \le r_0$ , then by (6.57), (6.58) and (6.59), we have that

$$\int_{I} |F(t,s)| \, \mathrm{d}s \geq \frac{1}{2^{n_{0}}(n_{0}-1)!} \left(\gamma \delta_{0} - \frac{M|I|}{n_{0}(n_{0}+1)}\right) \cdot |I|^{n_{0}} \\
\geq \frac{\gamma \delta_{0}}{2^{n_{0}+1}(n_{0}-1)!} \cdot |I|^{n_{0}}.$$
(6.60)

• If  $|I| > r_0$ , let  $I' \subseteq I$  be a subinterval with  $|I'| = r_0$ . Then on applying (6.60) to the interval I', we have that

$$\int_{I} |F(t,s)| \, ds \geq \int_{I'} |F(t,s)| \, ds \\
\geq \frac{\gamma \delta_{0}}{2^{n_{0}+1}(n_{0}-1)!} \cdot r_{0}^{n_{0}} \\
= \frac{\gamma \delta_{0}}{2^{n_{0}+1}(n_{0}-1)!} \cdot \left(\frac{r_{0}}{|I|}\right)^{n_{0}} \cdot |I|^{n_{0}} \\
\geq \frac{\gamma \delta_{0}}{2^{n_{0}+1}(n_{0}-1)!} \cdot \left(\frac{r_{0}}{d-c}\right)^{n_{0}} \cdot |I|^{n_{0}}.$$
(6.61)

The proof of (6.54) is complete by combining (6.60) and (6.61).

We are now finally in the position to exploit the preparatory lemmas to prove part (c) of Proposition 6.1 (ii). Recall that if  $g : \mathcal{O} \to \mathbb{R}^2$  is a conformal map on an open set  $\mathcal{O} \supseteq [0,1] \times \{0\}$ , then the map  $t \mapsto g(t,0)$  is injective and real analytic with non-zero derivative with respect to  $t \in [0,1]$ . With this in mind, within the context of part (c), there exists an one-to-one real analytic function  $f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^2$  such that  $f'(t) \neq 0$  for any  $t \in [0,1]$  and  $K \subseteq \Gamma := f([0,1])$ . Let  $f(t) = (f_1(t), f_2(t))$  and define  $F : [0,1] \times [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$  as

$$F(t,s) := \left| f(t) - f(s) \right|^2 = \left( f_1(t) - f_1(s) \right)^2 + \left( f_2(t) - f_2(s) \right)^2.$$

It is clear that F is also real analytic. Furthermore,  $F(t, \cdot)$  is not a constant function for any  $t \in [0, 1]$ . Otherwise, there exists  $t_0 \in [0, 1]$  such that  $F(t_0, s) = F(t_0, t_0) = 0$  for all  $s \in [0, 1]$  and thus  $f(t) \equiv f(t_0)$  for all  $t \in [0, 1]$ , which is a contradiction. For any  $t \in [0, 1]$ and  $r_1 < r_2$ , let

$$\mathcal{F}(t, r_1, r_2) := \left\{ s \in [0, 1] : r_1 < F(t, s) < r_2 \right\}$$

and let  $\mathcal{I}(t, r_1, r_2)$  be the collection of connected components of  $\mathcal{F}(t, r_1, r_2)$ .

Throughout, fix  $\mathbf{x} \in \Gamma$ . Let  $t \in [0, 1]$  so  $\mathbf{x} = f(t)$ . Then for any r > 0 and  $\varrho > 0$ , we have

$$(\partial B(\mathbf{x},r))_{\varrho} \cap K \subseteq \bigcup_{I \in \mathcal{I}\left(t, (r-\varrho)_{+}^{2}, (r+\varrho)^{2}\right)} f(I) \cup \{\mathbf{x}\}$$

where, as usual,  $(x)_+ := \max\{x, 0\}$ . Hence

$$\mu\left((\partial B(\mathbf{x},r))_{\varrho}\right) \leq \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}\left(t, (r-\varrho)_{+}^{2}, (r+\varrho)^{2}\right)} \mu\left(f(I)\right).$$
(6.62)

Recall, our goal is to establish (6.2) and so n view of (6.62) we now estimate  $\mu(f(I))$  for any  $I \in \mathcal{I}(t, (r-\varrho)^2_+, (r+\varrho)^2)$ .

The one-dimensional version of the well-known Area Formula (see for example [58, Theorem 3.7]) states that if  $g : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$  is Lipschitz, then for any measurable set  $A \subseteq [0,1]$ , we have

$$\int_{A} |g'(s)| \, \mathrm{d}s = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \# \left\{ s \in A : g(s) = p \right\} \, \mathrm{d}p \,. \tag{6.63}$$

Applying (6.63) to  $A = \mathcal{F}(t, (r-\varrho)^2, (r+\varrho)^2)$  and g(s) = F(t, s), we obtain that

$$\int_{\mathcal{F}(t, (r-\varrho)_{+}^{2}, (r+\varrho)^{2})} \left| \frac{\partial F}{\partial s}(t, s) \right| \, \mathrm{d}s = \int_{(r-\varrho)_{+}^{2}}^{(r+\varrho)^{2}} \# \left\{ s \in [0, 1] : F(t, s) = p \right\} \, \mathrm{d}p \,. \tag{6.64}$$

Next, we estimate the two integrals appearing in (6.64). Recall that  $F(t, \cdot)$  is not a constant function for any  $t \in [0, 1]$ , then by part (ii) of Lemma 6.5, we find that

$$M := \sup_{p \in \mathbb{R}} \sup_{t' \in [0,1]} \# \{ s \in [0,1] : F(t',s) = p \} < +\infty.$$

Furthermore, note that  $|F(t',s)| \leq |\Gamma|^2$  for all  $(t',s) \in [0,1]^2$ , so it follows that

r.h.s. of (6.64) = 
$$\int_{[(r-\varrho)^2_+, (r+\varrho)^2] \cap [0, |\Gamma|^2]} \# \{ s \in [0, 1] : F(t, s) = p \} dp$$
  

$$\leq M \cdot \mathcal{L} \left( [(r-\varrho)^2_+, (r+\varrho)^2] \cap [0, |\Gamma|^2] \right)$$
  

$$\leq M \cdot \max \{ |\Gamma|, \varrho \} \cdot \varrho , \qquad (6.65)$$

where  $\mathcal{L}$  denotes the Lebesgue measure on [0, 1]. On the other hand, by Lemma 6.9, there exists  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  and C > 0 (independent of  $t \in [0, 1]$ , r > 0 and  $\rho > 0$ ) such that

l.h.s. of (6.64) = 
$$\sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}\left(t, (r-\varrho)_{+}^{2}, (r+\varrho)^{2}\right)} \int_{I} \left| \frac{\partial F}{\partial s}(t,s) \right| ds$$
$$\geq C \cdot \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}\left(t, (r-\varrho)_{+}^{2}, (r+\varrho)^{2}\right)} |I|^{n_{0}}.$$
(6.66)

On combining (6.64), (6.65) and (6.66) with the fact that  $|I| \leq 1$ , it follows that

$$|I| \ll \varrho^{1/n_0}$$

for any  $I \in \mathcal{I}(t, (r-\varrho)^2_+, (r+\varrho)^2)$ . Since f is injective and  $f'(t) \neq 0$  for any  $t \in [0, 1]$ , it is easily verified that  $f:[0,1] \to \Gamma$  is bi-Lipschitz, and thus f(I) is contained in a ball with radius approximately  $\rho^{1/n_0}$ . Then by part (i) of Proposition 6.1, there exists s > 0such that

$$\mu(f(I)) \ll \varrho^{s/n_0} \tag{6.67}$$

for any  $I \in \mathcal{I}(t, (r-\varrho)^2_+, (r+\varrho)^2)$ . In view of Lemma 6.7, we know that

$$\sup \left\{ \# \mathcal{I}(t, (r-\varrho)_+^2, (r+\varrho)^2) : t \in [0,1], r > 0, \varrho > 0 \right\} < +\infty$$

This together with (6.62) and (6.67) shows that

$$\mu\big((\partial B(\mathbf{x},r))_{\varrho}\big) \ll \varrho^{s/n_0} \tag{6.68}$$

for any  $\mathbf{x} \in \Gamma$ , any r > 0 and any  $\rho > 0$ , where the implied constant does not depend on **x**, r and  $\rho$ . This completes the proof of part (c) of Proposition 6.1 (ii).

In order to complete the proof of Proposition 6.1 (ii) it remains to establish (6.2) in the cases not covered by parts (a), (b) or (c).

6.2.4. Completing the proof of Proposition 6.1 (ii). Let  $\ell_K$  be as in (5.1). Then, in view of Proposition 3.1, we divide the proof of (6.2) into the following cases:

Case A:  $\ell_K = d$ ;

Case B:  $d \ge 2$ ,  $\ell_K < d$  and part (ii) of Proposition 3.1 holds with  $\ell = \ell_K$ ;

Case C: d = 2 and K is contained in an analytic curve;

Case D: d = 2 and K is contained in a disjoint union of at least two analytic curves.

To see this, simply note that when d = 1, then  $\ell_K = 1$  and thus we are in Case A. The first three cases have been considered respectively in Sections 6.2.1 - 6.2.3. Thus it remains to establish the desired inequality (6.2) for Case D. So suppose that

$$K \subseteq \bigsqcup_{i=1}^{k} \Gamma_i \,,$$

where  $k \geq 2$  and each  $\Gamma_i$  (i = 1, 2, ..., k) is an analytic curve. For each i = 1, 2, ..., k, denote by  $\mu_i := \mu|_{\Gamma_i}$  the restriction of  $\mu$  supported on the analytic curve  $\Gamma_i$ . Then, on naturally adapting the arguments used in deriving (6.68), we find that there exist C > 0and  $\delta > 0$  such that

$$\mu_i\big((\partial B(\mathbf{x},r))_\varrho\big) \le C\varrho^\delta$$

for any  $1 \leq i \leq k$ , any  $\mathbf{x} \in \Gamma_i$ , any r > 0, and any  $\rho > 0$ . Note that  $\Gamma_i$  (i = 1, 2, ..., k) are disjoint closed sets, thus there exists  $r_0 > 0$  such that

$$\mathbf{d}(\Gamma_i, \Gamma_j) > 2 r_0, \qquad \forall \ 1 \le i \ne j \le k.$$

With this in mind, it follows that for any  $1 \leq i \leq k$  and any  $\mathbf{x} \in \Gamma_i$ ,

$$(\partial B(\mathbf{x},r))_{\varrho} \cap K \subseteq (\partial B(\mathbf{x},r))_{\varrho} \cap \Gamma_i, \qquad \forall \ 0 < r \le r_0, \ \forall \ 0 < \varrho \le r_0.$$

The upshot of the above is that for any  $\mathbf{x} \in K$ ,

$$\mu((\partial B(\mathbf{x}, r))_{\varrho}) \le C \varrho^{\delta}, \qquad \forall \ 0 < r \le r_0, \ \forall \ 0 < \varrho \le r_0.$$

If  $\rho > r_0$ , then since  $\mu$  is a probability measure, we have that for any r > 0,

$$\mu((\partial B(\mathbf{x},r))_{\varrho}) \le 1 < \left(\frac{\varrho}{r_0}\right)^{\delta}.$$

Thus, it follows that for any  $\mathbf{x} \in K$ , any  $0 < r \leq r_0$  and any  $\rho > 0$ , we obtain the desired inequality

$$\mu((\partial B(\mathbf{x},r))_{\varrho}) \leq \widetilde{C} \, \varrho^{\delta} \quad \text{where} \quad \widetilde{C} := \max\left\{C, \frac{1}{r_0^{\delta}}\right\} \,.$$

## 7. Applications: proving the statements appearing in Section 1.3

In this section we establish the applications of Theorem 1.2 to the recurrent sets stated in Section 1.3. This will involve establishing a more versatile form of the standard quantitative Borel-Cantelli Lemma (see Lemma 7.2) that is required when proving Theorem 1.6. The final section is devoted to providing the details of the two counterexamples to Claim F discussed in Section 1.3.

For the sake of clarity and convenience, we list several facts concerning self-conformal systems  $(\Phi, K, \mu, T)$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  that will be frequently used in the proof of Theorems 1.5 & 1.6. In the following, with (2.24) in mind,  $\underline{\mu}$  is the Gibbs measure with respect to a  $\beta$ -Hölder potential on the symbolic space  $\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}$  such that  $\mu = \underline{\mu} \circ \pi^{-1}$ .

- (P1) In view of Theorem 2.2, Corollary 2.1 and Theorem 1.2, there exist C > 0 and  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  that satisfy the following:
  - (i) For any  $f_1 \in \mathcal{C}^{\beta}(\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}})$ , any  $f_2 \in L^1(\mu)$  and any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\left| \int_{\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}} f_1 \cdot f_2 \circ \sigma^n \,\mathrm{d}\underline{\mu} - \int_{\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}} f_1 \,\mathrm{d}\underline{\mu} \cdot \int_{\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}} f_2 \,\mathrm{d}\underline{\mu} \right| \leq C \,\gamma^n \cdot \|f_1\|_{\beta} \cdot \int_{\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}} |f_2| \,\mathrm{d}\underline{\mu} \,.$$
(7.1)

(ii) For any  $I \in \Sigma^*$ , any measurable subset  $F \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  and any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\mu(K_I \cap T^{-n}F) - \mu(K_I)\mu(F) \Big| \le C \gamma^n \mu(F).$$

$$(7.2)$$

(iii) For any ball  $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ , any measurable subset  $F \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  and any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\left|\mu(B \cap T^{-n}F) - \mu(B)\mu(F)\right| \le C \gamma^n \mu(F).$$
(7.3)

(P2) Let  $\kappa \in (0, 1)$  be as in (2.7). Then (2.8) states that there is a constant  $C_3 > 1$  such that

$$|K_I| \le C_3 \,\kappa^{|I|}, \quad \forall I \in \Sigma^*.$$
(7.4)

(P3) Part (ii) of Theorem 5.1 states that there exist  $r_0 > 0$ , C > 0 and  $\delta > 0$  such that for any  $\mathbf{x} \in K$ ,

$$\mu((\partial B(\mathbf{x}, r))_{\varrho}) \leq C \varrho^{\delta}, \quad \forall \ 0 < r \leq r_0, \ \forall \ \varrho > 0.$$
(7.5)

The following is essentially a consequence of (7.2).

**Lemma 7.1.** Let C > 0 and  $\gamma \in (0,1)$  be as in (P1). Then for any  $n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ , any  $I, J \in \Sigma^k$  with  $k \ge n_1$ , and any Borel set  $F \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ 

$$\left| \mu(K_I \cap T^{-n_1} K_J \cap T^{-n_2} F) - \mu(K_I \cap T^{-n_1} K_J) \, \mu(F) \right| \le C \, \gamma^{n_2} \mu(F) \,. \tag{7.6}$$

*Proof.* Recall that  $\widetilde{K}$  is the set of those  $\mathbf{x} \in K$  with which  $\#(\pi^{-1}(\mathbf{x})) = 1$  and that  $T(\mathbf{x}) = \pi \circ \sigma \circ \pi^{-1}(\mathbf{x})$  when  $\mathbf{x} \in \widetilde{K}$ . With this in mind, it follows that

$$K_{I} \cap T^{-n_{1}}K_{J} \cap \widetilde{K} = \begin{cases} K_{Ij_{k-n_{1}+1}\cdots j_{k}} \cap \widetilde{K}, & \text{if } i_{n_{1}+1}\cdots i_{k} = j_{1}\cdots j_{k-n_{1}} \\ \emptyset, & \text{if } i_{n_{1}+1}\cdots i_{k} \neq j_{1}\cdots j_{k-n_{1}} \end{cases}$$
(7.7)

for any  $n_1, k \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $k \ge n_1$  and any  $I = i_1 \cdots i_k, J = j_1 \cdots j_k \in \Sigma^k$ . Then (7.6) is an immediate consequence of (7.2) and (7.7).

## 7.1. Proof of Theorem 1.5.

The following statement [35, Lemma 1.5] represents an important tool in the theory of metric Diophantine approximation for establishing counting statements. It has its bases in the familiar variance method of probability theory and can be viewed as the quantitative form of the (divergence) Borel-Cantelli Lemma [12, Lemma 2.2]. As we shall see it is an essential ingredient in the proof of Theorem 1.5.

**Lemma 7.2.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$  be a probability space. Let  $\{f_n(x)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence of measurable functions on X, and  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}, \{\phi_n\}_{\mathbb{N}}$  be sequences of numbers such that

$$0 \le f_n \le \phi_n \ (n = 1, 2, ...).$$

Suppose that there exists C > 0 such that for any pair of positive integers a < b, we have

$$\int_X \left(\sum_{n=a}^b (f_n(x) - f_n)\right)^2 \, \mathrm{d}\mu(x) \le C \sum_{n=a}^b \phi_n$$

Then for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^{N} f_n(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} f_n + O\left(\Psi(N)^{1/2} (\log(\Psi(N) + 1))^{\frac{3}{2} + \epsilon} + \max_{1 \le k \le N} f_k\right)$$

for  $\mu$ -almost every  $x \in X$ , where  $\Psi(N) := \sum_{n=1}^{N} \phi_n$ .

In the next section we shall state and prove a more general form (namely Lemma 7.7) of this well known statement.

We now lay the foundations for applying Lemma 7.2 within the context of Theorem 1.5. With this in mind, we first show that the function  $t_n$  appearing in the statement of Theorem 1.5 is Lipschitz continuous.

**Lemma 7.3.** Assume the setting in Theorem 1.5. Then, for any  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in K$ , we have that

$$|t_n(\mathbf{x}) - t_n(\mathbf{y})| \le |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|.$$

Moreover, there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\mu(B(\mathbf{x}, t_n(\mathbf{x}))) = \psi(n)$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in K$  and n > N.

*Proof.* Fix any  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in K$  with  $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{y}$  and fix  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Note that  $B(\mathbf{x}, t_n(\mathbf{x})) \subseteq B(\mathbf{y}, t_n(\mathbf{x}) + |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|)$ , then by the definition of  $t_n(\cdot)$ , we have

$$\mu(B(\mathbf{y}, t_n(\mathbf{x}) + |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|)) \ge \psi(n),$$

and hence  $t_n(\mathbf{y}) \leq t_n(\mathbf{x}) + |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|$ , again by definition. Similarly, we find that  $t_n(\mathbf{x}) \leq t_n(\mathbf{y}) + |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|$  and this complete the proof of first part.

To prove the moreover part, note that by part (i) of Theorem 5.1 and the fact that  $\psi(x) \to 0 \ (x \to \infty)$ , there exists N > 0 such that  $t_n(\mathbf{x}) < r_0$  for all n > N and  $\mathbf{x} \in K$ , where  $r_0$  is as in (5.3). On the other hand, by (5.3), we have  $\mu(\partial B(\mathbf{x}, r)) = 0$  for all  $0 < r \le r_0$  and all  $\mathbf{x} \in K$ , and hence for any fixed  $\mathbf{x} \in K$ , the map  $r \mapsto \mu(B(\mathbf{x}, r))$  is continuous over the interval  $[0, r_0)$ . On combining these observations, we obtain that  $\mu(B(\mathbf{x}, t_n(\mathbf{x}))) = \psi(n)$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in K$  and n > N.

For any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let

|T|

$$\hat{R}_n = \hat{R}_n(\psi) := \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in K : |T^n \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}| < t_n(\mathbf{x}) \right\}.$$

The following is an extremely useful statement and is a straightforward application of the triangle inequality. In short, it provides a mechanism for "locally" representing  $R_n$  as the inverse image of a ball. In turn this allows us to exploit mixing. Throughout, given  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  we let

$$(x)_+ := \max\{x, 0\}.$$

**Lemma 7.4.** Given any  $I \in \Sigma^*$ , fix a point  $\mathbf{z}_I \in K_I$ . Then for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $I \in \Sigma^*$ , we have that

$$K_I \cap T^{-n}B(\mathbf{z}_I, (t_n(\mathbf{z}_I) - |K_I|)_+) \subseteq K_I \cap \hat{R}_n \subseteq K_I \cap T^{-n}B(\mathbf{z}_I, t_n(\mathbf{z}_I) + 2|K_I|).$$
 (7.8)

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbf{x} \in K_I \cap \hat{R}_n$ . Then, by the triangle inequality we have that

$$\begin{aligned} {}^{n}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}_{I}| &\leq |T^{n}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}| + |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}_{I}| \\ &\leq t_{n}(\mathbf{x}) + |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}_{I}| \\ &\leq t_{n}(\mathbf{z}_{I}) + 2|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}_{I}| \quad \text{(by Lemma 7.3)} \\ &\leq t_{n}(\mathbf{z}_{I}) + 2|K_{I}|. \end{aligned}$$

In other words,  $T^{(\mathbf{x})} \in B(\mathbf{z}_{I}, t_{n}(\mathbf{z}_{I}) + 2|K_{I}|)$  and so  $\mathbf{x} \in T^{-n}B(\mathbf{z}_{I}, t_{n}(\mathbf{z}_{I}) + 2|K_{I}|)$ . Hence,  $K_{I} \cap \hat{R}_{n} \subseteq K_{I} \cap T^{-n}B(\mathbf{z}_{I}, t_{n}(\mathbf{z}_{I}) + 2|K_{I}|)$  which is precisely the right hand side of the desired statement. A similar calculation yields the left hand side inclusion in (7.8).  $\Box$ 

The next two lemmas are concerned with "precisely" estimating the  $\mu$ -measure of  $R_n$  and their pairwise intersections. They are crucial in successfully being able to apply Lemma 7.3 in order to prove Theorem 1.5. Let  $r_0$  be as in (P3). Then, without the loss of generality, we may assume that

$$t_n(\mathbf{x}) \le r_0, \quad \forall \, n \ge 1, \, \forall \, \mathbf{x} \in K, \tag{7.9}$$

so that we can use (7.5) freely. Indeed, as we have already observed in the proof of Lemma 7.3, since  $\psi(x) \to 0$   $(x \to \infty)$  in the setting in Theorem 1.5, then by part (i) of Theorem 5.1 and the definition of  $t_n$ , there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  for which (7.9) holds for any  $\mathbf{x} \in K$  and any  $n \geq N$ .

**Lemma 7.5.** Assume the setting in Theorem 1.5. Then there exists  $\tilde{\gamma} \in (0, 1)$  such that  $\mu(\hat{R}_n) = \psi(n) + O(\tilde{\gamma}^n).$ 

*Proof.* For any  $I \in \Sigma^*$ , fix a point  $\mathbf{z}_I \in K_I$ . Let  $\delta > 0$  be as in (P3). Note that by Lemma 7.3 and (7.5), we have that for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , any  $\mathbf{x} \in K$  and any  $\rho > 0$ ,

$$\mu \left( B(\mathbf{x}, t_n(\mathbf{x}) + \varrho) \right) = \mu \left( B(\mathbf{x}, t_n(\mathbf{x})) \right) + O\left( \mu \left( (\partial B(\mathbf{x}, t_n(\mathbf{x}))_{\varrho} \right) \right)$$
  
$$= \psi(n) + O\left( \varrho^{\delta} \right)$$
(7.10)

This together with (7.2), (7.4) and the right hand side of (7.8) implies that for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , any  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$  and any  $I \in \Sigma^{\ell}$ ,

$$\mu(K_{I} \cap \hat{R}_{n}) \leq \mu\left(K_{I} \cap T^{-n}B(\mathbf{z}_{I}, t_{n}(\mathbf{z}_{I}) + 2|K_{I}|)\right)$$

$$= \left(\mu(K_{I}) + O(\gamma^{n})\right)\mu\left(B(\mathbf{z}_{I}, t_{n}(\mathbf{z}_{I}) + 2|K_{I}|)\right)$$

$$= \left(\mu(K_{I}) + O(\gamma^{n})\right)\left(\psi(n) + O(|K_{I}|^{\delta})\right)$$

$$= \left(\mu(K_{I}) + O(\gamma^{n})\right)\left(\psi(n) + O(\kappa^{\delta\ell})\right)$$

$$= \mu(K_{I})\left(\psi(n) + O(\kappa^{\delta\ell})\right) + O(\gamma^{n}),$$

where the big-O constants are independent of  $n \in \mathbb{N}, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $I \in \Sigma^{\ell}$ . On exploiting the left hand side of (7.8), a similar calculation shows that

$$\mu(K_I \cap \hat{R}_n) \ge \mu(K_I) \big( \psi(n) + O(\kappa^{\delta \ell}) \big) + O(\gamma^n)$$

for any  $I \in \Sigma^{\ell}$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Therefore, we conclude that

$$\mu(K_I \cap \hat{R}_n) = \mu(K_I) \big( \psi(n) + O(\kappa^{\delta \ell}) \big) + O(\gamma^n), \qquad \forall I \in \Sigma^{\ell}.$$

On summing over all  $I \in \Sigma^{\ell}$ , it follows that

$$\mu(\hat{R}_n) = \psi(n) + O(\kappa^{\delta\ell} + m^\ell \gamma^n), \qquad (7.11)$$

where  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  is the number of elements in the  $C^{1+\alpha}$  conformal IFS  $\Phi$  under consideration. Now let

$$\ell = \ell(n) := \left\lfloor \frac{n \log(1/\gamma)}{2 \log m} \right\rfloor$$

Then  $m^{\ell}\gamma^n \simeq \gamma^{n/2}$  and it follows via (7.11) that  $\mu(\hat{R}_n) = \psi(n) + O(\tilde{\gamma}^n)$ , where  $\widetilde{\gamma} = \max\left\{\gamma^{1/2}, \kappa^{\frac{\delta \log(1/\gamma)}{2 \log m}}\right\}$ 

and thereby completes the proof.

**Lemma 7.6.** Assume the setting in Theorem 1.5. Then there exist C > 0 and  $\eta \in (0, 1)$ such that for any pair of positive integers a < b, we have

$$\sum_{a \le n_1 < n_2 \le b} \mu(\hat{R}_{n_1} \cap \hat{R}_{n_2}) \le \sum_{a \le n_1 < n_2 \le b} \mu(\hat{R}_{n_1}) \mu(\hat{R}_{n_2}) + C \cdot \sum_{n=a}^{b} \left( \mu(\hat{R}_n) + \eta^n \right).$$
(7.12)

*Proof.* Let  $\gamma \in (0,1)$  be as in (P1) and  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  be the number of elements in conformal IFS  $\Phi$ . Let · / · / )

$$M := \frac{\log(1/\gamma)}{4\log m} \,.$$

Without the loss of generality, we may assume that M < 1 since  $\gamma$  can be taken to be as close to 1 as we wish. For any  $I \in \Sigma^*$ , fix a point  $\mathbf{z}_I \in K_I$ . To ease notation, we write

$$B_p(I) \equiv B(\mathbf{z}_I, t_p(\mathbf{z}_I) + 2|K_I|)$$

for any  $I \in \Sigma^*$  and  $p \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $\delta > 0$  be as in (P3). Then it follows from (7.4) and (7.10) that

$$\mu(B_p(I)) = \psi(p) + O(\kappa^{\delta|I|}).$$
(7.13)

Given positive integers  $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$ , the overarching goal is to obtain a sharp upper bound for  $\mu(\hat{R}_n \cap \hat{R}_{n+k})$ . With this in mind, we start by observing the right hand side of (7.8) implies that for any  $I \in \Sigma^*$  and any  $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$K_{I} \cap \hat{R}_{n} \cap \hat{R}_{n+k} \subseteq K_{I} \cap T^{-n} B_{n}(I) \cap T^{-(n+k)} B_{n+k}(I).$$
(7.14)

We proceed by considering two cases depending on the size of k.

n

• Estimating  $\mu(\hat{R}_n \cap \hat{R}_{n+k})$  when  $k > \frac{n+1}{M}$ . Let  $\ell_1 = \ell_1(n,k) := |(n+k)M|$ .

It is easily verified that

$$< \ell_1$$
 and  $m^{2\ell_1} \asymp \gamma^{-\frac{n+k}{2}}$ 

For any  $p \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $I \in \Sigma^*$ , let

$$\mathcal{J}(p,I) := \left\{ J \in \Sigma^{|I|} : K_J \cap B_p(I) \neq \emptyset \right\}.$$

Then by (7.14), for any  $I \in \Sigma^{\ell_1}$  we have that

$$\mu\left(K_{I} \cap \hat{R}_{n} \cap \hat{R}_{n+k}\right) \leq \mu\left(K_{I} \cap T^{-n}B_{n}(I) \cap T^{-(n+k)}B_{n+k}(I)\right) \\
\leq \sum_{J \in \mathcal{J}(n,I)} \mu\left(K_{I} \cap T^{-n}K_{J} \cap T^{-(n+k)}B_{n+k}(I)\right). \quad (7.15)$$

Then Lemma 7.1 together with (7.13), (7.15) and the fact that  $n < \ell_1$ , implies that

$$\mu\left(K_{I}\cap\hat{R}_{n}\cap\hat{R}_{n+k}\right) \leq \sum_{J\in\mathcal{J}(n,I)}\left(\mu(K_{I}\cap T^{-n}K_{J})+O(\gamma^{n+k})\right)\mu(B_{n+k}(I)) \\
= \sum_{J\in\mathcal{J}(n,I)}\left(\mu(K_{I}\cap T^{-n}K_{J})+O(\gamma^{n+k})\right)\left(\psi(n+k)+O(\kappa^{\delta\ell_{1}})\right).$$

Then on summing over  $I \in \Sigma^{\ell_1}$  and using the fact that  $m^{2\ell_1} \simeq \gamma^{-\frac{n+k}{2}}$ , it follows that

$$\mu(\hat{R}_n \cap \hat{R}_{n+k}) \leq \left(\sum_{I \in \Sigma^{\ell_1}} \sum_{J \in \mathcal{J}(n,I)} \mu(K_I \cap T^{-n} K_J) + O(m^{2\ell_1} \gamma^{n+k})\right) \left(\psi(n+k) + O(\kappa^{\delta\ell_1})\right) \\
= \left(\mu\left(\bigcup_{I \in \Sigma^{\ell_1}} \bigcup_{J \in \mathcal{J}(n,I)} (K_I \cap T^{-n} K_J)\right) + O(\gamma^{\frac{n+k}{2}})\right) \left(\psi(n+k) + O(\kappa^{\delta\ell_1})\right). \quad (7.16)$$

For the moment, we focus on estimating the  $\mu$ -measure term appearing within the first bracket in (7.16). Let

$$\ell_2 = \ell_2(n) := \lfloor 2nM \rfloor.$$

It can be verified that

J

 $\ell_1 > \ell_2$  and  $m^{\ell_2} \gamma^n \asymp \gamma^{-n/2}$ 

Let  $C_3 > 0$  be the constant in (P2). Then, for any  $I \in \Sigma^{\ell_1}$ , by the definition of  $\mathcal{J}(n, I)$ and the inequality (7.4), we have

$$\bigcup_{\in \mathcal{J}(n,I)} (K_I \cap T^{-n} K_J) \subseteq K_I \cap T^{-n} B(\mathbf{z}_I, t_n(\mathbf{z}_I) + 3C_3 \kappa^{\ell_1}).$$
(7.17)

Given any positive integers  $p \leq q$  and any  $I = i_1 \cdots i_q \in \Sigma^q$ , let  $I_p := i_1 \cdots i_p$ . With this notation in minf, if **x** is in the set on the right-hand-side of (7.17), then  $\mathbf{x} \in K_{I_{\ell_2}}$  (since  $\ell_1 > \ell_2$ ) and

$$|T^{n}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}_{I_{\ell_{2}}}| \leq |T^{n}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}_{I}| + |\mathbf{z}_{I} - \mathbf{z}_{I_{\ell_{2}}}|$$
$$\leq t_{n}(\mathbf{z}_{I}) + 3C_{3}\kappa^{\ell_{1}} + |K_{I_{\ell_{2}}}|$$

$$\leq t_{n}(\mathbf{z}_{I}) + 3C_{3}\kappa^{\ell_{1}} + C_{3}\kappa^{\ell_{2}}$$
  

$$\leq t_{n}(\mathbf{z}_{I_{\ell_{2}}}) + |\mathbf{z}_{I_{\ell_{2}}} - \mathbf{z}_{I}| + 4C_{3}\kappa^{\ell_{2}} \quad \text{(by Lemma 7.3)}$$
  

$$\leq t_{n}(\mathbf{z}_{I_{\ell_{2}}}) + 5C_{3}\kappa^{\ell_{2}}.$$

The upshot of above is that

$$\bigcup_{I \in \Sigma^{\ell_1}} \bigcup_{J \in \mathcal{J}(n,I)} (K_I \cap T^{-n} K_J) \subseteq \bigcup_{I \in \Sigma^{\ell_2}} (K_I \cap T^{-n} B(\mathbf{z}_I, t_n(\mathbf{z}_I) + 5C_3 \kappa^{\ell_2})), \quad (7.18)$$

Then by (7.2), (7.10), (7.18), and the fact that  $m^{\ell_2}\gamma^n \simeq \gamma^{-n/2}$ , it follows that

$$\mu\left(\bigcup_{I\in\Sigma^{\ell_1}}\bigcup_{J\in\mathcal{J}(n,I)}(K_I\cap T^{-n}K_J)\right) \leq \sum_{I\in\Sigma^{\ell_2}}\mu\left(K_I\cap T^{-n}B(\mathbf{z}_I,t_n(\mathbf{z}_I)+5C_3\kappa^{\ell_2})\right) \\
= \sum_{I\in\Sigma^{\ell_2}}\left(\mu(K_I)+O(\gamma^n)\right)\mu\left(B(\mathbf{z}_I,t_n(\mathbf{z}_I)+5C_3\kappa^{\ell_2})\right) \\
= \sum_{I\in\Sigma^{\ell_2}}\left(\mu(K_I)+O(\gamma^n)\right)\left(\psi(n)+O(\kappa^{\delta\ell_2})\right) \\
= \left(1+O(m^{\ell_2}\gamma^n)\right)\left(\psi(n)+O(\kappa^{\delta\ell_2})\right) \\
= \left(1+O(\gamma^{n/2})\right)\left(\psi(n)+O(\kappa^{\delta\ell_2})\right).$$
(7.19)

Let  $\tilde{\gamma} \in (0,1)$  be as in Lemma 7.5. Now feeding (7.19) into (7.16) and then using Lemma 7.5, we find that

$$\mu(\hat{R}_n \cap \hat{R}_{n+k}) \leq \left(\psi(n) + O(\gamma^{n/2} + \kappa^{\delta\ell_2})\right) \cdot \left(\psi(n+k) + O(\kappa^{\delta\ell_1})\right)$$
$$= \left(\mu(\hat{R}_n) + O(\gamma_1^n)\right) \cdot \left(\mu(\hat{R}_{n+k}) + O(\gamma_1^{n+k})\right), \tag{7.20}$$
$$= \max\{\widetilde{\alpha}, \alpha^{1/2}, \kappa^{\delta M}\} \in (0, 1)$$

where  $\gamma_1 := \max\{\widetilde{\gamma}, \gamma^{1/2}, \kappa^{\delta M}\} \in (0, 1).$ 

• Estimating  $\mu(\hat{R}_n \cap \hat{R}_{n+k})$  when  $1 \leq k \leq \frac{n+1}{M}$ . Recall that  $\ell_2 = \ell_2(n) := \lfloor 2nM \rfloor$  and  $m^{\ell_2} \gamma^n \asymp \gamma^{-n/2}$ . So given the range of k under consideration, it follows that

$$\ell_2 = \frac{2M^2}{M+1}(n+k) + O(1).$$
(7.21)

For any  $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $1 \leq k \leq \frac{n+1}{M}$  and any  $I \in \Sigma^{\ell_2}$ , by (7.2), (7.3) (7.13) and (7.14), we have that

$$\mu\left(K_{I} \cap \hat{R}_{n} \cap \hat{R}_{n+k}\right) \leq \mu\left(K_{I} \cap T^{-n}B_{n}(I) \cap T^{-(n+k)}B_{n+k}(I)\right)$$

$$= \left(\mu(K_{I}) + O(\gamma^{n})\right) \cdot \mu\left(B_{n}(I) \cap T^{-k}B_{n+k}(I)\right)$$

$$= \left(\mu(K_{I}) + O(\gamma^{n})\right) \cdot \left(\mu(B_{n}(I)) + O(\gamma^{k})\right) \cdot \mu(B_{n+k}(I))$$

$$= \left(\mu(K_{I}) + O(\gamma^{n})\right) \cdot \left(\psi(n) + O(\kappa^{\delta\ell_{2}} + \gamma^{k})\right) \cdot \left(\psi(n+k) + O(\kappa^{\delta\ell_{2}})\right)$$

On summing over  $I \in \Sigma^{\ell_2}$ , we obtain that

$$\mu(\hat{R}_n \cap \hat{R}_{n+k}) \leq \left(1 + O(m^{\ell_2} \gamma^n)\right) \cdot \left(\psi(n) + O(\kappa^{\delta \ell_2} + \gamma^k)\right) \cdot \left(\psi(n+k) + O(\kappa^{\delta \ell_2})\right)$$

$$= \left(1 + O(\gamma^{n/2})\right) \cdot \left(\psi(n) + O(\kappa^{\delta \ell_2} + \gamma^k)\right) \cdot \left(\psi(n+k) + O(\kappa^{\delta \ell_2})\right)$$

$$= \left(1 + O(\gamma^{n/2})\right) \cdot \left(\psi(n) + O(\kappa^{\delta \ell_2} + \gamma^k)\right) \cdot \left(\psi(n+k) + O(\kappa^{\delta \ell_2})\right)$$

$$= \left(\psi(n) + O(\gamma^{n/2} + \kappa^{\delta\ell_2} + \gamma^k)\right) \cdot \left(\psi(n+k) + O(\kappa^{\delta\ell_2})\right)$$

$$= \left(\mu(\hat{R}_n) + O(\tilde{\gamma}^n + \gamma^{n/2} + \kappa^{\delta\ell_2} + \gamma^k)\right) \cdot \left(\mu(\hat{R}_{n+k}) + O(\tilde{\gamma}^{n+k} + \kappa^{\delta\ell_2})\right)$$

$$= \left(\mu(\hat{R}_n) + O(\tilde{\gamma}^{kM} + \gamma^{kM/2} + \kappa^{\delta\cdot\frac{2M^2}{M+1}(n+k)} + \gamma^k)\right)$$

$$\times \left(\mu(\hat{R}_{n+k}) + O(\tilde{\gamma}^{n+k} + \kappa^{\delta\cdot\frac{2M^2}{M+1}(n+k)})\right)$$

$$= \left(\mu(\hat{R}_n) + O(\gamma_2^k)\right) \cdot \left(\mu(\hat{R}_{n+k}) + O(\gamma_2^{n+k})\right), \qquad (7.22)$$

where

$$\gamma_2 := \max\{\widetilde{\gamma}^M, \gamma^{\min\{1, M/2\}}, \kappa^{2\delta M^2/(M+1)}\} \in (0, 1)$$

In the above we use the fact that  $m^{\ell_2} \simeq \gamma^{-n/2}$  to go from the first to second line. Then we use Lemma 7.5 to from the third to the fourth line and finally we use (7.21) and the fact that  $n \ge kM - 1$  to go from the fourth to the fifth line.

Everything is now in place to prove the desired pairwise independent on average inequality (7.12). For any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let

$$\mathcal{F}_1(n) := \left[1, \frac{n+1}{M}\right] \cap \mathbb{N} \text{ and } \mathcal{F}_2(n) := \left(\frac{n+1}{M}, +\infty\right) \cap \mathbb{N}$$

Then for any pair of positive integers  $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$  with a < b, by (7.20) and (7.22), it follows that

$$\sum_{a \le n_1 < n_2 \le b} \mu(\hat{R}_{n_1} \cap \hat{R}_{n_2}) = \sum_{n=a}^{b-1} \sum_{k=1}^{b-n} \mu(\hat{R}_n \cap \hat{R}_{n+k})$$

$$= \sum_{n=a}^{b-1} \sum_{k \in [1,b-n] \cap \mathcal{F}_1(n)} \mu(\hat{R}_n \cap \hat{R}_{n+k}) + \sum_{n=a}^{b-1} \sum_{k \in [1,b-n] \cap \mathcal{F}_2(n)} \mu(\hat{R}_n \cap \hat{R}_{n+k})$$

$$\leq \sum_{n=a}^{b-1} \sum_{k \in [1,b-n] \cap \mathcal{F}_1(n)} \left( \mu(\hat{R}_n) + O(\gamma_2^k) \right) \cdot \left( \mu(\hat{R}_{n+k}) + O(\gamma_2^{n+k}) \right)$$

$$+ \sum_{n=a}^{b-1} \sum_{k \in [1,b-n] \cap \mathcal{F}_2(n)} \left( \mu(\hat{R}_n) + O(\gamma_1^n) \right) \cdot \left( \mu(\hat{R}_{n+k}) + O(\gamma_1^{n+k}) \right)$$

$$= \sum_{a \le n_1 < n_2 \le b} \mu(\hat{R}_{n_1}) \mu(\hat{R}_{n_2}) + O\left(\sum_{n=a}^{b} \left( \mu(\hat{R}_n) + \eta^n \right) \right),$$
ere  $\eta = \max\{\gamma_1, \gamma_2\} \in (0, 1).$  The proof is complete.

where  $\eta = \max{\{\gamma_1, \gamma_2\}} \in (0, 1)$ . The proof is complete.

We are now in a position to prove Theorem 1.5 utilizing Lemma 7.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.5. Let  $\eta \in (0,1)$  be as in Lemma 7.6. We shall use Lemma 7.2 with X = K and

$$f_n(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbb{1}_{\hat{R}_n}(\mathbf{x}), \quad f_n = \mu(\hat{R}_n), \quad \phi_n = \mu(\hat{R}_n) + \eta^n \qquad (n = 1, 2, ...).$$

By Lemma 7.6, there exist a constant C > 0 such that for any positive integers a < b, we have

$$\begin{split} \int_{K} \left( \sum_{n=1}^{b} \left( \mathbb{1}_{\hat{R}_{n}}(\mathbf{x}) - \mu(\hat{R}_{n}) \right) \right)^{2} \mathrm{d}\mu(\mathbf{x}) &= \sum_{a \leq n_{1} \leq n_{2} \leq b} \mu(\hat{R}_{n_{1}} \cap \hat{R}_{n_{2}}) - \left( \sum_{n=a}^{b} \mu(\hat{R}_{n}) \right)^{2} \\ &= \sum_{n=a}^{b} \mu(\hat{R}_{n}) + 2 \sum_{a \leq n_{1} < n_{2} \leq b} \mu(\hat{R}_{n_{1}} \cap \hat{R}_{n_{2}}) \\ &- \sum_{n=1}^{b} \mu(\hat{R}_{n})^{2} - 2 \sum_{a \leq n_{1} < n_{2} \leq b} \mu(\hat{R}_{n_{1}}) \mu(\hat{R}_{n_{2}}) \\ &\leq \sum_{n=a}^{b} \mu(\hat{R}_{n}) + 2 \sum_{a \leq n_{1} < n_{2} \leq b} \mu(\hat{R}_{n_{1}}) \mu(\hat{R}_{n_{2}}) \\ &+ C \sum_{n=a}^{b} \left( \mu(\hat{R}_{n}) + \eta^{n} \right) - \sum_{n=1}^{b} \mu(\hat{R}_{n})^{2} \\ &- 2 \sum_{a \leq n_{1} < n_{2} \leq b} \mu(\hat{R}_{n_{1}}) \mu(\hat{R}_{n_{2}}) \\ &= \sum_{n=a}^{b} \mu(\hat{R}_{n}) - \sum_{n=1}^{b} \mu(\hat{R}_{n})^{2} + C \sum_{n=a}^{b} \left( \mu(\hat{R}_{n}) + \eta^{n} \right) \end{split}$$

$$\leq (1+C)\sum_{n=a}^{b} \left(\mu(\hat{R}_n) + \eta^n\right).$$

By Lemma 7.2, for any given  $\epsilon > 0$ , we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mathbb{1}_{B(\mathbf{x},t_n(\mathbf{x}))}(T^n \mathbf{x}) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \mathbb{1}_{\hat{R}_n}(\mathbf{x}) = \Psi(N) + O\left(\Psi(N)^{1/2} \log^{\frac{3}{2}+\epsilon}(\Psi(N))\right)$$
(7.23)

for  $\mu$ -almost every  $\mathbf{x} \in K$ , where  $\Psi(N) := \sum_{n=1}^{N} (\mu(\hat{R}_n) + \eta^n)$ . However, by Lemma 7.5, we have

$$\Psi(N) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \psi(n) + O(1).$$

So the term  $\Psi(N)$  in (7.23) can be replaced by the summation  $\sum_{n=1}^{N} \psi(N)$ . This completes the proof of Theorem 1.5

## 7.2. Proof of Theorem 1.6.

Although the proof of Theorem 1.6 follows the same line of attack as that used in establishing Theorem 1.5, it is more involved chiefly due to the fact that the asymptotic behaviour of the counting function is dependent on  $\mathbf{x} \in K$ . Indeed, the quantitative form of the Borel-Cantelli Lemma (i.e. Lemma 7.2), which is a key ingredient in the proof of Theorem 1.5, is not applicable as it stands. In short we need to work with more versatile form in which the sequence  $\{f_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$  in Lemma 7.2 is allowed to depend on  $\mathbf{x} \in K$ .

**Lemma 7.7.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$  be a probability space. let  $\{f_n(x)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $\{g_n(x)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be sequences of measurable functions on X, and let  $\{\phi_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\subseteq\mathbb{R}$  be a sequence of real numbers. Suppose that

$$0 \le g_n(x) \le \phi_n, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \forall x \in X$$
(7.24)

and that there exists C > 0 with which

$$\int_{X} \left( \sum_{n=a}^{b} (f_n(x) - g_n(x)) \right)^2 d\mu(x) \le C \sum_{n=a}^{b} \phi_n$$
(7.25)

for any pair of integers 0 < a < b. Then for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^{N} f_n(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} g_n(x) + O\left(\Psi(N)^{\frac{1}{2}} (\log(\Psi(N)))^{\frac{3}{2}+\epsilon} + \max_{1 \le k \le N} g_k(x)\right)$$
(7.26)

for  $\mu$ -almost every  $x \in X$ , where  $\Psi(N) := \sum_{n=1}^{N} \phi_n$ .

In the case  $\{g_n(x)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$  is a sequence independent of x, the above lemma coincides with Lemma 7.2. The proof of Lemma 7.7 essentially follows that of Lemma 7.2 with natural modification. For completeness, the proof is given in Appendix B.

Let  $\psi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  be a real positive function such that  $\psi(x) \to 0$  as  $x \to \infty$ . For any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , as in the introduction (see (1.14)), let

$$R_n(\psi) := \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in K : T^n \mathbf{x} \in B(\mathbf{x}, \psi(n)) \right\}.$$

Let  $r_0$  be as in (P3). Then, without the loss of generality, we may assume that

$$\psi(n) \leq r_0, \quad \forall n \geq 1,$$

so that we can use (7.5) freely. The following is the analogue of Lemma 7.4 and allows us to "locally" represent  $R_n$  as the inverse image of a ball.

**Lemma 7.8.** For each  $I \in \Sigma^*$ , fix  $\mathbf{z}_I \in K_I$ . Then for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and any  $I \in \Sigma^*$ , we have that

$$K_I \cap T^{-n} \big( B(\mathbf{z}_I, (\psi(n) - |K_I|)_+) \big) \subseteq K_I \cap R_n(\psi) \subseteq K_I \cap T^{-n} \big( B(\mathbf{z}_I, \psi(n) + |K_I|) \big).$$

*Proof.* The proof makes use of the triangle inequality and is similar to that used to prove (7.8). So we omit the details. 

The overarching goal is to obtain precise enough estimates on the  $\mu$ -measures of  $R_n(\psi)$ and their pairwise intersections, and the integrals of the functions

$$\mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathbb{1}_{R_{n_1}(\psi)}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \mu(B(\mathbf{x}, \psi(n_2))) \qquad (n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{N})$$
(7.27)

in order to apply Lemma 7.7 to prove Theorem 1.6. We start with dealing with the  $\mu$ -measure of  $R_n(\psi)$ .

**Lemma 7.9.** There exist C > 0 and  $\tilde{\gamma} \in (0,1)$  such that for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have

$$\left| \mu \big( R_n(\psi) \big) - \int_K \mu \big( B(\mathbf{x}, \psi(n)) \big) \, \mathrm{d}\mu(\mathbf{x}) \right| \leq C \, \widetilde{\gamma}^n.$$
<sup>65</sup>

*Proof.* Let  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  be as in (P1), let  $\delta > 0$  be as in (7.5) and let  $m \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}$  be the number of elements in the conformal IFS  $\Phi$ . For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , denote

$$q_n := \left\lfloor \frac{n \log(1/\gamma)}{2 \log m} \right\rfloor.$$

By Lemma 7.8, we obtain that

$$R_n(\psi) \subseteq \bigcup_{I \in \Sigma^{q_n}} K_I \cap T^{-n} \big( B(\mathbf{z}_I, \psi(n) + |K_I|) \big)$$

and

$$R_n(\psi) \supseteq \bigcup_{I \in \Sigma^{q_n}} K_I \cap T^{-n} \left( B(\mathbf{z}_I, (\psi(n) - |K_I|)_+) \right).$$

These inclusions together with (P1) - (P3) imply that

$$\mu(R_{n}(\psi)) = \sum_{I \in \Sigma^{q_{n}}} \mu\left(K_{I} \cap T^{-n}\left(B(\mathbf{z}_{I},\psi(n))\right)\right) + O\left(\sum_{I \in \Sigma^{q_{n}}} \mu\left(K_{I} \cap T^{-n}\left(\partial B(\mathbf{z}_{I},\psi(n))\right)_{|K_{I}|}\right)\right) = \sum_{I \in \Sigma^{q_{n}}} \left(\mu(K_{I}) + O(\gamma^{n})\right) \cdot \mu\left(B(\mathbf{z}_{I},\psi(n))\right) + O\left(\sum_{I \in \Sigma^{q_{n}}} \left(\mu(K_{I}) + \gamma^{n}\right) \cdot \mu\left(\left(\partial B(\mathbf{z}_{I},\psi(n))\right)_{|K_{I}|}\right)\right) = \sum_{I \in \Sigma^{q_{n}}} \mu(K_{I}) \cdot \mu\left(B(\mathbf{z}_{I},\psi(n))\right) + O\left(m^{q_{n}}\gamma^{n} + \kappa^{\delta q_{n}} + m^{q_{n}}\gamma^{n}\kappa^{\delta q_{n}}\right) = \sum_{I \in \Sigma^{q_{n}}} \int_{K_{I}} \mu\left(B(\mathbf{z}_{I},\psi(n))\right) d\mu + O\left(m^{q_{n}}\gamma^{n} + \kappa^{\delta q_{n}} + m^{q_{n}}\gamma^{n}\kappa^{\delta q_{n}}\right) = \int_{K} \mu\left(B(\mathbf{x},\psi(n))\right) d\mu(\mathbf{x}) + O\left(m^{q_{n}}\gamma^{n} + \kappa^{\delta q_{n}} + m^{q_{n}}\gamma^{n}\kappa^{\delta q_{n}}\right)$$
(7.28)

Note that by the definition of  $q_n$ , we have  $m^{q_n}\gamma^n \asymp \gamma^{n/2}$ . Let

$$\widetilde{\gamma} := \max \left\{ \kappa^{\frac{\delta \log(1/\gamma)}{2 \log m}}, \gamma^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\}.$$

Then by (7.28), we obtain that

$$\mu(R_n(\psi)) = \int_{K_I} \mu(B(\mathbf{x}, \psi(n))) \,\mathrm{d}\mu(\mathbf{x}) + O(\widetilde{\gamma}^n)$$

as desired.

The next result is a technical lemma concerning the  $\beta$ -Hölder norm of bounded functions on the symbolic space. It will be subsequently required in calculating the integral of the

functions appearing in (7.27) (namely in proving Lemma 7.11) and in calculating the  $\mu$ measure of the pairwise intersections of the sets  $R_n(\psi)$  (namely in proving Lemma 7.12).

**Lemma 7.10.** Let M > 0 and let f be a function on  $\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}} = \{1, 2, ..., m\}^{\mathbb{N}}$  such that  $|f(I)| \leq M$  for all  $I \in \Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}$ . Then for any  $I \in \Sigma^*$ , the function  $f \cdot \mathbb{1}_{[I]}$  is  $\beta$ -Hölder continuous on  $\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}$  and moreover,

$$||f \cdot \mathbb{1}_{[I]}||_{\beta} < M \cdot (1 + m^{\beta|I|}).$$

*Proof.* Let  $I \in \Sigma^*$  and let  $J_1, J_2 \in \Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}$  be two arbitrary points such that  $J_1 \neq J_2$ . Now observe that

$$\circ \text{ if } \operatorname{dist}(J_1, J_2) > m^{|I|}, \text{ then either } J_1 \notin [I] \text{ or } J_2 \notin [I]. \text{ It follows that} \\ \frac{|f(J_1) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{[I]}(J_1) - f(J_2) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{[J_2]}(K)|}{\operatorname{dist}(J, K)^{\beta}} < M \cdot m^{\beta|I|}.$$

• if dist $(J_1, J_2) \leq m^{|I|}$ , then either  $J_1, J_2 \in [I]$  or  $J_1, J_2 \notin [I]$ . Therefore,  $|f(J_1) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{[I]}(J_1) - f(J_2) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{[I]}(J_2)| = 0.$ 

The upshot is that

$$\begin{split} \|f \cdot \mathbb{1}_{[I]}\|_{\beta} &= \|f \cdot \mathbb{1}_{[I]}\|_{\infty} \\ &+ \sup \left\{ \frac{|f(J_1) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{[I]}(J_1) - f(J_2) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{[I]}(J_2)|}{\operatorname{dist}(J_1, J_2)^{\beta}} : J_1, J_2 \in \Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}, \, J_1 \neq J_2 \right\} \\ &< M + M \cdot m^{\beta |I|}. \end{split}$$

This completes the proof.

**Lemma 7.11.** Assume the setting in Theorem 1.6. Let  $\tau := \dim_{\mathrm{H}} K$ . Then there exists  $\widetilde{\gamma} \in (0,1)$  which is independent of  $\psi$  such that for any  $n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ 

$$\int_{K} \mathbb{1}_{R_{n_{1}}(\psi)}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \mu \left( B(\mathbf{x}, \psi(n_{2})) \right) d\mu(\mathbf{x})$$
  
= 
$$\int_{K} \mu \left( B(\mathbf{x}, \psi(n_{1})) \right) \cdot \mu \left( B(\mathbf{x}, \psi(n_{2})) \right) d\mu(\mathbf{x}) + O\left(\widetilde{\gamma}^{n_{1}}\right) \psi(n_{2})^{\tau},$$

where the implied big O constant does not depend on the choices of  $n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ .

*Proof.* Under the setting of Theorem 1.6, it is easily versified that within the setup of self-conformal systems, the notion of  $\mu$  being equivalent to  $\mathcal{H}^{\tau}|_{K}$  and  $\mu$  being  $\tau$ -Ahlfors regular coincide (the details can be found within the proof of Theorem 2.7 in [27]). Thus, by definition there exists M > 1 such that

$$M^{-1}r^{\tau} \le \mu(B(\mathbf{x}, r)) \le M r^{\tau}, \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in K, \ \forall \ 0 \le r \le |K|.$$

Recall that  $\mu = \underline{\mu} \circ \pi^{-1}$  where  $\underline{\mu}$  is the Gibbs measure with respect to a  $\beta$ -Hölder potential on symbolic space  $\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}$ . Consider the function

$$l_n(\mathbf{x}) := \frac{\mu \left( B(\mathbf{x}, \psi(n)) \right)}{\psi(n)^{\tau}} \quad (n \in \mathbb{N}, \, \mathbf{x} \in K) \,.$$
(7.29)

Then

$$\mu\left(B(\mathbf{x},\psi(n))\right) = l_n(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \psi(n)^{\tau} \quad \text{and} \quad M^{-1} \leq l_n(\mathbf{x}) \leq M \quad (n \in \mathbb{N}, \, \mathbf{x} \in K).$$
(7.30)

Let  $\gamma \in (0,1)$  be as in (P1) and let  $\delta > 0$  be as in (7.5). In turn, for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let

$$q_n := \left\lfloor \frac{n \log(1/\gamma)}{4\beta \log m} \right\rfloor.$$

On using the left-hand side inclusion in Lemma 7.8, we obtain that for any  $n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\int_{K} \mathbb{1}_{R_{n_{1}}(\psi)} \left(\mathbf{x}\right) \cdot \mu\left(B(\mathbf{x},\psi(n_{2}))\right) d\mu(\mathbf{x})$$

$$= \sum_{I \in \Sigma^{q_{n_{1}}}} \int_{K} \mathbb{1}_{K_{I} \cap R_{n_{1}}(\psi)} \left(\mathbf{x}\right) \cdot \mu\left(B(\mathbf{x},\psi(n_{2}))\right) d\mu(\mathbf{x})$$

$$\geq \sum_{I \in \Sigma^{q_{n_{1}}}} \int_{K} \mathbb{1}_{K_{I} \cap T^{-n_{1}}B(\mathbf{z}_{I},\psi(n_{1})-|K_{I}|)} \left(\mathbf{x}\right) \cdot \mu\left(B(\mathbf{x},\psi(n_{2}))\right) d\mu(\mathbf{x}). \quad (7.31)$$

where for  $I \in \Sigma^*$  we fix some point  $\mathbf{z}_I \in K_I$  and  $B(\mathbf{x}, r)$  is the empty set if  $r \leq 0$ . On combining (7.31) with Lemma 7.10, the equality  $\mu = \underline{\mu} \circ \pi^{-1}$ , the properties (P1) – (P3) and (7.30), we obtain that for any  $n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\begin{split} \int_{K} \mathbb{I}_{Rn_{1}(\psi)} \left( \mathbf{x} \right) \cdot \mu \Big( B(\mathbf{x}, \psi(n_{2})) \Big) \, \mathrm{d}\mu(\mathbf{x}) \\ &= \sum_{I \in \Sigma^{q_{n_{1}}}} \left( \int_{K} \left( l_{n_{2}}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \mathbb{I}_{K_{I}}(\mathbf{x}) \right) \cdot \left( \mathbb{I}_{B(\mathbf{z}_{I}, \psi(n_{1}) - |K_{I}|)} \circ T^{n_{1}} \right) \left( \mathbf{x} \right) \, \mathrm{d}\mu(\mathbf{x}) \right) \cdot \psi(n_{2})^{\tau} \\ &= \sum_{I \in \Sigma^{q_{n_{1}}}} \left( \int_{\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}} \left( l_{n_{2}} \circ \pi \left( J \right) \cdot \mathbb{I}_{[I]} \left( J \right) \right) \cdot \left( \mathbb{I}_{\pi^{-1}B(\mathbf{z}_{I}, \psi(n_{1}) - |K_{I}|)} \circ \sigma^{n_{1}} \right) \left( J \right) \, \mathrm{d}\mu(J) \right) \cdot \psi(n_{2})^{\tau} \\ &= \sum_{I \in \Sigma^{q_{n_{1}}}} \left( \int_{\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}} l_{n_{2}} \circ \pi \left( J \right) \cdot \mathbb{I}_{[I]} \left( J \right) \, \mathrm{d}\mu(J) + O\left( \| l_{n_{2}} \circ \pi \cdot \mathbb{I}_{[I]} \|_{\beta} \cdot \gamma^{n_{1}} \right) \right) \\ &\times \left( \int_{\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}} \mathbb{I}_{\pi^{-1}B(\mathbf{z}_{I}, \psi(n_{1}) - |K_{I}|) \circ \sigma^{n_{1}} \, \mathrm{d}\mu \right) \cdot \psi(n_{2})^{\tau} \\ &= \sum_{I \in \Sigma^{q_{n_{1}}}} \left( \int_{K} l_{n_{2}}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \mathbb{I}_{K_{I}}(\mathbf{x}) \, \mathrm{d}\mu(\mathbf{x}) + O\left(m^{\beta \cdot q_{n_{1}}} \cdot \gamma^{n_{1}} \right) \right) \\ &\times \mu(B(\mathbf{z}_{I}, \psi(n_{1}) - |K_{I}|)) \cdot \psi(n_{2})^{\tau} \\ &= \left( \sum_{I \in \Sigma^{q_{n_{1}}}} \int_{k_{I}} \mu(B(\mathbf{z}_{I}, \psi(n_{1}) - |K_{I}|)) \cdot \mu(B(\mathbf{x}, \psi(n_{2}))) \, \mathrm{d}\mu(\mathbf{x}) \right) \\ &+ O\left(m^{2\beta \cdot q_{n_{1}}} \gamma^{n_{1}} \right) \cdot \psi(n_{2})^{\tau} \\ &= \left( \sum_{I \in \Sigma^{q_{n_{1}}}} \int_{k_{I}} \left( \mu(B(\mathbf{x}, \psi(n_{1}))) + O(\kappa^{\delta n_{1}}) \right) \cdot \mu(B(\mathbf{x}, \psi(n_{2}))) \, \mathrm{d}\mu(\mathbf{x}) \right) \\ &+ O\left(m^{2\beta \cdot q_{n_{1}}} \gamma^{n_{1}} \right) \cdot \psi(n_{2})^{\tau} \end{split}$$

$$= \left(\sum_{I \in \Sigma^{q_{n_1}}} \int_{k_I} \mu \left( B(\mathbf{x}, \psi(n_1)) \right) \cdot \mu \left( B(\mathbf{x}, \psi(n_2)) \right) d\mu(\mathbf{x}) \right) \\ + O\left( m^{2\beta \cdot q_{n_1}} \gamma^{n_1} + \kappa^{\delta n_1} \right) \cdot \psi(n_2)^{\tau}.$$

Now by the definition of  $q_n$ , we have  $m^{2\beta \cdot q_n} \gamma^n \simeq \gamma^{n/2}$ . Let

$$\widetilde{\gamma} := \max\left\{\kappa^{\frac{\delta \log(1/\gamma)}{4\beta \log m}}, \gamma^{\frac{1}{2}}\right\}$$

Then the above calculation ensures the existence of C > 0 such that

$$\int_{K} \mathbb{1}_{R_{n_{1}}(\psi)}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \mu \big( B(\mathbf{x}, \psi(n_{2})) \big) \, \mathrm{d}\mu(\mathbf{x})$$
  

$$\geq \int_{K} \mu \big( B(\mathbf{x}, \psi(n_{1})) \big) \cdot \mu \big( B(\mathbf{x}, \psi(n_{2})) \big) \, \mathrm{d}\mu(\mathbf{x}) - C \, \widetilde{\gamma}^{n_{1}} \, \psi(n_{2})^{\tau}$$

The complementary upper bound follows on using the same argument but with the left hand side inclusion in Lemma 7.8 replaced by the right hand side inclusion.  $\Box$ 

We are now in the position to provide a good upper bound the measure of the pairwise intersection of the sets  $R_n(\psi)$ .

**Lemma 7.12.** Assume the setting in Theorem 1.6. Let  $\tau := \dim_{\mathrm{H}} K$ . Then there exist C > 0 and  $\tilde{\gamma} \in (0, 1)$  such that for any  $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have

$$\mu \big( R_n(\psi) \cap R_{n+k}(\psi) \big) \leq \int_K \mu \big( B(\mathbf{x}, \psi(n)) \big) \, \mu \big( B(\mathbf{x}, \psi(n+k)) \big) \, \mathrm{d}\mu(\mathbf{x})$$
$$+ C \left( (\widetilde{\gamma}^n + \widetilde{\gamma}^k) \, \psi(n+k)^\tau + \widetilde{\gamma}^{n+k} \right).$$

*Proof.* Under the setting of Theorem 1.6, the Gibbs measure  $\mu$  is  $\tau$ -Ahlfors regular. For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , define the map  $\mathbf{x} \mapsto l_n(\mathbf{x})$  as in (7.29) and recall that there exists M > 1 such that (7.30) is satisfied. Let  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  be as in (P1). For any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let

$$q_n := \left\lfloor \frac{n \log(1/\gamma)}{4 \cdot \max\{\beta, 1\} \cdot \log m} \right\rfloor$$

For each  $I \in \Sigma^*$ , fix a point  $\mathbf{z}_I \in K_I$ . Then by Lemma 7.8, for any  $n_1, n_2, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$  it follows that

 $K_I \cap R_{n_1}(\psi) \cap R_{n_2}(\psi)$ 

$$\subseteq K_{I} \cap T^{-n_{1}}B(\mathbf{z}_{I},\psi(n_{1})+|K_{I}|) \cap T^{-n_{2}}B(\mathbf{z}_{I},\psi(n_{2})+|K_{I}|)$$
(7.32)

$$\subseteq \bigcup_{J \in \mathcal{J}(\ell, n_1, I)} K_I \cap T^{-n_1} K_J \cap T^{-n_2} B(\mathbf{z}_I, \psi(n_2) + |K_I|)$$
(7.33)

where

$$\mathcal{J}(\ell, n, I) := \left\{ J \in \Sigma^{\ell} : K_I \cap B(\mathbf{z}_I, \psi(n) + |K_I|) \neq \emptyset \right\} \qquad (\ell, n \in \mathbb{N}, I \in \Sigma^*).$$

We now estimate the measure of  $R_n(\psi) \cap R_{n+k}(\psi)$  by considering two cases.

• Estimating  $\mu(R_n \cap R_{n+k})$  when  $q_{n+k} \ge n$ . In this case, by means of the inclusion (7.33), Lemma 7.1 (with k "equal" to  $q_{n+k}$  and  $n_1 = n$ ) and the inequalities (7.4) and (7.5), it follows that

$$\mu(R_n(\psi) \cap R_{n+k}(\psi))$$

$$\leq \sum_{I \in \Sigma^{q_{n+k}}} \sum_{J \in \mathcal{J}(q_{n+k},n,I)} \mu \Big( K_I \cap T^{-n} K_J \cap T^{-(n+k))} B(\mathbf{z}_I, \psi(n+k) + |K_I|) \Big)$$

$$= \sum_{I \in \Sigma^{q_{n+k}}} \sum_{J \in \mathcal{J}(q_{n+k},n,I)} \Big( \mu (K_I \cap T^{-n} K_J) + O(\gamma^{n+k}) \Big) \mu \Big( B(\mathbf{z}_I, \psi(n+k) + |K_I|) \Big)$$

$$= \sum_{I \in \Sigma^{q_{n+k}}} \sum_{J \in \mathcal{J}(q_{n+k},n,I)} \Big( \mu (K_I \cap T^{-n} K_J) + O(\gamma^{n+k}) \Big)$$

$$= \sum_{I \in \Sigma^{q_{n+k}}} \sum_{J \in \mathcal{J}(q_{n+k},n,I)} \mu \Big( K_I \cap T^{-n} K_J \Big) \mu \Big( B(\mathbf{z}_I, \psi(n+k)) \Big)$$

$$+ O(\kappa^{\delta q_{n+k}}) \mu \left( \bigcup_{I \in \Sigma^{q_{n+k}}, J \in \mathcal{J}(q_{n+k},n,J)} K_I \cap T^{-n} K_J \right)$$

$$+ O\left( m^{q_{n+k}} \gamma^{n+k} \left( \psi(n+k)^{\tau} + \kappa^{\delta q_{n+k}} \right) + O\left( m^{q_{n+k}} \gamma^{n+k} \left( \psi(n+k)^{\tau} + \kappa^{\delta q_{n+k}} \right) + N \right)$$

$$+ O\left( m^{q_{n+k}} \gamma^{n+k} \left( \psi(n+k)^{\tau} + \kappa^{\delta q_{n+k}} \right) + N \right)$$

$$+ O\left( m^{q_{n+k}} \gamma^{n+k} \left( \psi(n+k)^{\tau} + \kappa^{\delta q_{n+k}} \right) + \kappa^{\delta q_{n+k}} \right)$$

$$+ O\left( m^{q_{n+k}} \gamma^{n+k} \left( \psi(n+k)^{\tau} + \kappa^{\delta q_{n+k}} \right) + \kappa^{\delta q_{n+k}} \right)$$

$$+ O\left( m^{q_{n+k}} \gamma^{n+k} \left( \psi(n+k)^{\tau} + \kappa^{\delta q_{n+k}} \right) + \kappa^{\delta q_{n+k}} \right)$$

$$+ O\left( m^{q_{n+k}} \gamma^{n+k} \left( \psi(n+k)^{\tau} + \kappa^{\delta q_{n+k}} \right) + \kappa^{\delta q_{n+k}} \right)$$

$$+ O\left( m^{q_{n+k}} \gamma^{n+k} \left( \psi(n+k)^{\tau} + \kappa^{\delta q_{n+k}} \right) + \kappa^{\delta q_{n+k}} \right)$$

$$+ O\left( m^{q_{n+k}} \gamma^{n+k} \left( \psi(n+k)^{\tau} + \kappa^{\delta q_{n+k}} \right) + \kappa^{\delta q_{n+k}} \right)$$

$$+ O\left( m^{q_{n+k}} \gamma^{n+k} \left( \psi(n+k)^{\tau} + \kappa^{\delta q_{n+k}} \right) + \kappa^{\delta q_{n+k}} \right)$$

$$+ O\left( m^{q_{n+k}} \gamma^{n+k} \left( \psi(n+k)^{\tau} + \kappa^{\delta q_{n+k}} \right) + \kappa^{\delta q_{n+k}} \right)$$

Next we estimate from above the main term in (7.34); that is

$$S_{n+k} := \sum_{I \in \Sigma^{q_{n+k}}} \sum_{J \in \mathcal{J}(q_{n+k},n,I)} \mu\left(K_I \cap T^{-n} K_J\right) \, \mu\left(B(\mathbf{z}_I, \psi(n+k))\right).$$

By (7.4) and (7.5), we have that

$$S_{n+k} = \sum_{I \in \Sigma^{q_{n+k}}} \sum_{J \in \mathcal{J}(q_{n+k},n,I)} \int_{K_I \cap T^{-n}K_J} \mu(B(\mathbf{z}_I,\psi(n+k))) \, d\mu(\mathbf{x})$$
  
$$= \sum_{I \in \Sigma^{q_{n+k}}} \sum_{J \in \mathcal{J}(q_{n+k},n,I)} \int_{K_I \cap T^{-n}K_J} \left( \mu(B(\mathbf{x},\psi(n+k))) + O(\kappa^{\delta q_{n+k}}) \right) \, d\mu(\mathbf{x})$$
  
$$= \int_{\bigcup_{I \in \Sigma^{q_{n+k}}} \bigcup_{J \in \mathcal{J}(q_{n+k},n,I)} K_I \cap T^{-n}K_J} \mu(B(\mathbf{x},\psi(n+k))) \, d\mu(\mathbf{x}) + O(\kappa^{\delta q_{n+k}})$$

For any

$$\mathbf{x} \in K_I \cap T^{-n} K_J \qquad (I \in \Sigma^{q_{n+k}}, \ J \in \mathcal{J}(q_{n+k}, n, I)),$$

by (7.4) and triangle inequality we have

$$|T^{n}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}| \leq |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}_{I}| + |\mathbf{z}_{I} - T^{n}\mathbf{x}|$$

$$< |K_{I}| + \psi(n) + |K_{J}|$$

$$\leq \psi(n) + 2C_{3}\kappa^{q_{n+k}}.$$

Therefore, on letting  $\widetilde{\psi}(n) := \psi(n) + 2 C_3 \kappa^{q_n} \ (n \in \mathbb{N})$ , we obtain that

$$\bigcup_{I \in \Sigma^{q_{n+k}}} \bigcup_{J \in \mathcal{J}(q_{n+k}, n, I)} K_I \cap T^{-n} K_J \subseteq R_{n+k}(\widetilde{\psi}).$$

Then by Lemma 7.11 there exists  $\gamma_1 \in (0, 1)$  such that

$$S_{n+k} \leq \int_{R_{n+k}(\widetilde{\psi})} \mu(B(\mathbf{x},\widetilde{\psi}(n+k))) d\mu(\mathbf{x}) + O(\kappa^{\delta q_{n+k}})$$

$$= \int_{K} \mu(B(\mathbf{x},\widetilde{\psi}(n))) \mu(B(\mathbf{x},\widetilde{\psi}(n+k))) d\mu(\mathbf{x})$$

$$+ O(\gamma_{1}^{n} \widetilde{\psi}(n+k)^{\tau} + \kappa^{\delta q_{n+k}})$$

$$= \int_{K} \left( \mu(B(\mathbf{x},\psi(n))) + O(\kappa^{\delta q_{n}}) \right)$$

$$\times \left( \mu(B(\mathbf{x},\psi(n+k))) + O(\kappa^{\delta q_{n+k}}) \right) d\mu(\mathbf{x})$$

$$+ O(\gamma_{1}^{n} \widetilde{\psi}(n+k)^{\tau} + \kappa^{\delta q_{n+k}})$$

$$= \int_{K} \mu(B(\mathbf{x},\psi(n))) \mu(B(\mathbf{x},\psi(n+k)) d\mu(\mathbf{x})$$

$$+ O((\gamma_{1}^{n} + \kappa^{\delta q_{n}}) \psi(n+k)^{\tau} + \kappa^{\tau q_{n+k}} + \kappa^{\delta q_{n+k}}). \quad (7.35)$$

Recall that by the definition of  $q_n$ , we have  $m^{q_n}\gamma^n \simeq \gamma^{n/2}$ . Let

$$\gamma_2 := \max\left\{\gamma^{1/2}, \kappa^{\frac{\min\{\delta,\tau\} \cdot \log(1/\gamma)}{4 \cdot \max\{\beta,1\} \cdot \log m}}, \gamma_1\right\} \,.$$

Then on combining (7.34) and (7.35) we find that there exists a constant C > 0 so that

$$\mu \big( R_n(\psi) \cap R_{n+k}(\psi) \big) \leq \int_K \mu \big( B(\mathbf{x}, \psi(n)) \big) \, \mu \big( B(\mathbf{x}, \psi(n+k)) \, \mathrm{d}\mu(\mathbf{x}) + C \, \big( \gamma_2^n \, \psi(n+k)^{\tau} + \gamma_2^{n+k} \big) \big)$$

for all  $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $q_{n+k} \ge n$ .

• Estimating  $\mu(R_n \cap R_{n+k})$  when  $q_{n+k} < n$ . By the inclusion (7.33) and the properties (P1) – (P3), namely (7.2), (7.3), (7.4), (7.5), we have that

$$\begin{split} \mu \big( R_n(\psi) \cap R_{n+k}(\psi) \big) \\ &\leq \sum_{I \in \Sigma^{q_n}} \mu \big( K_I \cap T^{-n} B(\mathbf{z}_I, \psi(n) + |K_I|) \cap T^{-(n+k)} B(\mathbf{z}_I, \psi(n+k) + |K_I|) \big) \\ &= \sum_{I \in \Sigma^{q_n}} \big( \mu(K_I) + O(\gamma^n) \big) \, \mu \big( B(\mathbf{z}_I, \psi(n) + |K_I|) \cap T^{-k} B(\mathbf{z}_I, \psi(n+k) + |K_I|) \big) \\ &= \sum_{I \in \Sigma^{q_n}} \big( \mu(K_I) + O(\gamma^n) \big) \, \big( \mu(B(\mathbf{z}_I, \psi(n) + |K_I|)) + O(\gamma^k) \big) \\ &\qquad \times \mu \big( B(\mathbf{z}_i, \psi(n+k) + |K_I|) \big) \\ &= \sum_{I \in \Sigma^{q_n}} \big( \mu(K_I) + O(\gamma^n) \big) \, \big( \mu(B(\mathbf{z}_I, \psi(n))) + O(\gamma^k + \kappa^{\delta q_n}) \big) \\ &\qquad \times \big( \mu(B(\mathbf{z}_I, \psi(n+k))) + O(\kappa^{\delta q_n}) \big) \\ &= \sum_{I \in \Sigma^{q_n}} \int_{K_I} \mu \big( B(\mathbf{z}_I, \psi(n)) \big) \, \mu \big( B(\mathbf{z}_I, \psi(n+k)) \big) \, \mathrm{d}\mu(\mathbf{x}) \end{split}$$

$$+ O\left(\gamma^{k}\psi(n+k)^{\tau} + \kappa^{\delta q_{n}} + m^{q_{n}}\gamma^{n}\right)$$

$$= \sum_{I \in \Sigma^{q_{n}}} \int_{K_{I}} \left(\mu(B(\mathbf{x},\psi(n))) + O(\kappa^{\delta q_{n}})\right)$$

$$\times \left(\mu(B(\mathbf{x},\psi(n+k))) + O(\kappa^{\delta q_{n+k}})\right) d\mu(\mathbf{x})$$

$$+ O\left(\gamma^{k}\psi(n+k)^{\tau} + \kappa^{\delta q_{n}} + m^{q_{n}}\gamma^{n}\right)$$

$$= \int_{K} \mu\left(B(\mathbf{x},\psi(n))\right) \mu\left(B(\mathbf{x},\psi(n+k))\right) d\mu(\mathbf{x})$$

$$+ O\left(\gamma^{k}\psi(n+k)^{\tau} + \kappa^{\delta q_{n}} + m^{q_{n}}\gamma^{n}\right)$$

$$= \int_{K} \mu\left(B(\mathbf{x},\psi(n))\right) \mu\left(B(\mathbf{x},\psi(n+k))\right) d\mu(\mathbf{x})$$

$$+ O\left(\gamma^{k}\psi(n+k)^{\tau} + \kappa^{\delta q_{n}} + \gamma^{n/2}\right)$$
(7.36)

In the case  $q_{n+k} < n$ , we have that

$$n > \frac{(n+k)\log(1/\gamma)}{4 \cdot \max\{\beta, 1\} \cdot \log m} - 1$$

and so it follows that

$$\kappa^{\delta q_n} = O\left(\kappa^{\delta \cdot \left(\frac{\log(1/\gamma)}{4 \cdot \max\{\beta, 1\} \cdot \log m}\right) \cdot (n+k)}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma^{n/2} = O\left(\gamma^{\frac{\log(1/\gamma)}{8 \cdot \max\{\beta, 1\} \cdot \log m} \cdot (n+k)}\right).$$

The upshot of this and (7.36) is that there exists a constant C > 0 so that

$$\mu \big( R_n(\psi) \cap R_{n+k}(\psi) \big) \leq \int_K \mu \big( B(\mathbf{x}, \psi(n)) \big) \, \mu \big( B(\mathbf{x}, \psi(n+k)) \big) \, \mathrm{d}\mu(\mathbf{x})$$
$$+ C \left( \gamma_3^k \, \psi(n+k)^\tau + \gamma_3^{n+k} \right)$$

for all  $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $q_{n+k} < n$ , where

$$\gamma_3 := \max\left\{\gamma, \, \kappa^{\delta \cdot \left(\frac{\log(1/\gamma)}{4 \cdot \max\{\beta, 1\} \cdot \log m}\right)^2}, \gamma^{\frac{\log(1/\gamma)}{8 \cdot \max\{\beta, 1\} \cdot \log m}}\right\}.$$

The above two case imply the desired upper bound estimate of the measure of the set  $R_n(\psi) \cap R_{n+k}(\psi)$  for any  $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Now we are in a position to prove Theorem 1.6 utilizing Lemma 7.7

Proof of Theorem 1.6. With Lemma 7.9, Lemma 7.11 and Lemma 7.12 at hand, it follows that there exist C > 0 and  $\tilde{\gamma} \in (0, 1)$  such that for any  $a < b \in \mathbb{N}$ 

$$\int_{K} \left( \sum_{a \le n \le b} \left( \mathbbm{1}_{R_{n}(\psi)}(\mathbf{x}) - \mu(B(\mathbf{x},\psi(n))) \right) \right)^{2} d\mu(\mathbf{x})$$

$$= \sum_{n=a}^{b} \mu(R_{n}(\psi)) + 2 \sum_{n=a}^{b-1} \sum_{k=1}^{b-n} \mu(R_{n}(\psi) \cap R_{n+k}(\psi))$$

$$- 2 \sum_{a \le n_{1}, n_{2} \le b} \int_{K} \mathbbm{1}_{R_{n_{1}}(\psi)}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \mu(B(\mathbf{x},\psi(n_{2}))) d\mu(\mathbf{x})$$

$$= 2 \sum_{a \le n_{1}, n_{2} \le b} \int_{K} \mathbbm{1}_{R_{n_{1}}(\psi)}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \mu(B(\mathbf{x},\psi(n_{2}))) d\mu(\mathbf{x})$$
$$\begin{split} &+ \sum_{a \leq n_1, n_2 \leq b} \int_K \mu(B(\mathbf{x}, \psi(n_1))) \, \mu(B(\mathbf{x}, \psi(n_2))) \, \mathrm{d}\mu(\mathbf{x}) \\ \leq & \sum_{n=a}^b \left( \int_K \mu(B(\mathbf{x}, \psi(n))) \, \mathrm{d}\mu(\mathbf{x}) + C \, \widetilde{\gamma}^n \right) \\ &+ 2 \sum_{n=a}^{b-1} \sum_{k=1}^{b-n} \left( \int_K \mu(B(\mathbf{x}, \psi(n))) \, \mu(B(\mathbf{x}, \psi(n+k))) \, \mathrm{d}\mu(\mathbf{x}) \right. \\ &+ C \left( (\widetilde{\gamma}^n + \widetilde{\gamma}^k) \, \psi(n+k)^\tau + \widetilde{\gamma}^{n+k} \right) \right) \\ &- 2 \sum_{a \leq n_1, n_2 \leq b} \left( \int_K \mu(B(\mathbf{x}, \psi(n_1))) \, \mu(B(\mathbf{x}, \psi(n_2))) \, \mathrm{d}\mu(\mathbf{x}) + C \, \widetilde{\gamma}^{n_1} \, \psi(n_2)^\tau \right) \\ &+ \sum_{a \leq n_1, n_2 \leq b} \int_K \mu(B(\mathbf{x}, \psi(n_1))) \, \mu(B(\mathbf{x}, \psi(n_2))) \, \mathrm{d}\mu(\mathbf{x}) \\ \ll & \sum_{n=a}^b \left( \psi(n)^\tau + \widetilde{\gamma}^n \right) \\ \approx & \sum_{n=a}^b \phi_n \quad \text{where} \quad \phi_n := \max_{\mathbf{x} \in K} \mu(B(\mathbf{x}, \psi(n))) + \, \widetilde{\gamma}^n. \end{split}$$

Applying Lemma 7.7 with X = K and

$$f_n(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbb{1}_{R_n(\psi)}(\mathbf{x}), \quad g_n(\mathbf{x}) = \mu(B(\mathbf{x}, \psi(n))), \quad \phi_n = \max_{\mathbf{x} \in K} \mu(B(\mathbf{x}, \psi(n))) + \widetilde{\gamma}^n$$

we obtain that for any  $\epsilon > 0$ 

$$\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mathbb{1}_{R_n(\psi)}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \mu(B(\mathbf{x}, \psi(n))) + O\left(\Psi(N)^{1/2} \left(\log(\Psi(N))\right)^{\frac{3}{2} + \epsilon}\right)$$
(7.37)

for  $\mu$ -almost every  $\mathbf{x} \in K$ , where  $\Psi(N) := \sum_{n=1}^{N} \phi_n$ . However, since  $\mu$  is  $\tau$ -Ahlfors regular, we have

$$\Psi(N) \asymp \sum_{n=1}^{N} \psi(n)^{\tau} \,,$$

so the term  $\Psi(N)$  appearing in the error term of (7.37) can be replaced by the summation  $\sum_{n=1}^{N} \psi(n)^{\tau}$ . This completes the proof of Theorem 1.6.

7.3. Proof of Theorem 1.7 directly via Theorem 1.5. Under the setting of Theorem 1.7, the measure  $\mu$  is  $\tau$ -Ahlfors regular and so by definition there exists C > 1 such that

$$C^{-1}r^{\tau} \leq \mu(B(\mathbf{x},r)) \leq Cr^{\tau}, \qquad \forall \ \mathbf{x} \in K, \ \forall \ 0 \leq r \leq |K| \,.$$

Hence, for any  $\mathbf{x} \in K$ ,

$$0 < \Theta^{\tau}_{*}(\mu, \psi, \mathbf{x}) \le \Theta^{*\tau}(\mu, \psi, \mathbf{x}) < +\infty.$$

Let  $\mathbb{Q}_+$  be the set of all positive rational numbers. For each  $q \in \mathbb{Q}_+$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , define  $\psi_q(n) := q \cdot \psi(n)^{\tau}$ . With this notation in mind, suppose that the sum of the sequence

 $\psi(n)^{\tau}$  is divergent. Then by Theorem 1.5 and the fact that  $\mathbb{Q}_+$  is countable, there exists  $K' \subseteq K$  such that  $\mu(K') = 1$  and

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mathbb{1}_{B(\mathbf{x}, t_n(\mathbf{x}, \psi_q))}(T^n \mathbf{x})}{\sum_{n=1}^{N} q \psi(n)^{\tau}} = 1, \qquad \forall \ \mathbf{x} \in K', \ \forall \ q \in \mathbb{Q}_+.$$
(7.38)

Fix an arbitrary point  $\mathbf{x} \in K'$  and any  $\epsilon > 0$ . Since  $\mathbb{Q}_+$  is dense in  $(0, +\infty)$ , there exist  $p = p(\mathbf{x}, \epsilon), q = q(\mathbf{x}, \epsilon) \in \mathbb{Q}_+$  such that

$$\Theta^{*\tau}(\mu,\psi,\mathbf{x})$$

With this in mind, it is easy to verify that there exists  $n_0 = n_0(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for all  $n > n_0$ , we have

$$\mu(B(\mathbf{x}, t_n(\mathbf{x}, \psi_q))) \le \mu(B(\mathbf{x}, \psi(n))) \le \mu(B(\mathbf{x}, t_n(\mathbf{x}, \psi_q)))$$

and thus

$$B(\mathbf{x}, t_n(\mathbf{x}, \psi_q)) \subseteq B(\mathbf{x}, \psi(n)) \subseteq B(\mathbf{x}, t_n(\mathbf{x}, \psi_p)).$$

This together with (7.38) implies that

$$\begin{split} \limsup_{N \to \infty} \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mathbbm{1}_{B(\mathbf{x},\psi(n))}(T^{n}\mathbf{x})}{\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mu(B(\mathbf{x},\psi(n)))} \\ &\leq \limsup_{N \to \infty} \left( \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mathbbm{1}_{B(\mathbf{x},t_{n}(\mathbf{x},\psi_{p}))}(T^{n}\mathbf{x})}{\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mu(B(\mathbf{x},t_{n}(\mathbf{x},\psi_{p})))} \cdot \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mu(B(\mathbf{x},t_{n}(\mathbf{x},\psi_{p})))}{\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mu(B(\mathbf{x},t_{n}(\mathbf{x},\psi_{p})))} \right) \\ &= \limsup_{N \to \infty} \left( \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mathbbm{1}_{B(\mathbf{x},t_{n}(\mathbf{x},\psi_{p}))}(T^{n}\mathbf{x})}{\sum_{n=1}^{N} p\psi(n)^{\tau}} \cdot \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{N} p\psi(n)^{\tau}}{\sum_{n=1}^{N} q\psi(n)^{\tau}} \right) \\ &= \limsup_{N \to \infty} \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{N} p\psi(n)^{\tau}}{\sum_{n=1}^{N} q\psi(n)^{\tau}} \\ &\leq \frac{(1+\epsilon) \cdot \Theta^{*\tau}(\mu,\psi,\mathbf{x})}{(1-\epsilon) \cdot \Theta^{*}_{*}(\mu,\psi,\mathbf{x})} \,. \end{split}$$

Since  $\epsilon > 0$  is arbitrary, it follows that

$$\limsup_{N \to \infty} \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mathbb{1}_{B(\mathbf{x},\psi(n))}(T^n \mathbf{x})}{\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mu(B(\mathbf{x},\psi(n)))} \le \frac{\Theta^{*\tau}(\mu,\psi,\mathbf{x})}{\Theta^{\tau}_{*}(\mu,\psi,\mathbf{x})}.$$

A similar argument, with obvious modifications, shows that

$$\liminf_{N \to \infty} \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mathbb{1}_{B(\mathbf{x},\psi(n))}(T^n \mathbf{x})}{\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mu(B(\mathbf{x},\psi(n)))} \geq \frac{\Theta_*^{\tau}(\mu,\psi,\mathbf{x})}{\Theta^{*\tau}(\mu,\psi,\mathbf{x})},$$

and thereby completes the proof.

7.4. Providing counterexamples to Claim F. We provide the details of the two counterexamples to Claim F discussed in Section 1.3.

**Example 7.1.** Consider the functions  $\varphi_1 : [0,1] \to [0,1/3]$  and  $\varphi_2 : [0,1] \to [2/3,1]$  given by

$$\varphi_1(x) = \frac{x}{3}, \qquad \varphi_2(x) = \frac{x+2}{3} \qquad \forall x \in [0,1].$$

Then  $\Phi = \{\varphi_1, \varphi_2\}$  is the well-known conformal IFS with the attractor K being the standard middle-third Cantor set. Let  $\mu := \mathcal{H}^{\tau}|_{K}$  ( $\tau = \log 2/\log 3$ ) be the standard Cantor measure, and let  $T: [0,1] \rightarrow [0,1]$  be the  $\times 3$  map:

$$Tx = 3x \mod 1$$
.

Consider the constant function  $\psi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  given by

$$\psi(x) \ := \ \frac{1}{3} + \frac{2}{3^2}$$

Then, for  $\mu$ -almost all  $x \in K$ , we have

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mathbb{1}_{B(x,\psi(n))}(T^n x)}{\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mu(R_n(\psi))} = \begin{cases} \frac{4}{5} & \text{if } x \in \left(\left[0, \frac{1}{9}\right] \cup \left[\frac{8}{9}, 1\right]\right) \cap K, \\ \frac{6}{5} & \text{if } x \in \left(\left[\frac{2}{9}, \frac{1}{3}\right] \cup \left[\frac{2}{3}, \frac{7}{9}\right]\right) \cap K. \end{cases}$$
(7.39)

*Proof of* (7.39). We start with an observation. The condition that  $\psi(x) \to 0$  as  $x \to \infty$ imposed in the statement of Theorem 1.6 is used in its proof only to ensure that inequality (7.5) is valid; that is to guarantee that  $\psi(n) \leq r_0$  for n large enough. However, for the particular example under consideration, this inequality is valid for all r > 0 and thus the conclusion of the theorem and its corollary are valid for any constant function  $\psi$ . With this in mind, it follows via Theorem 1.6 that: for  $\mu$ -almost all  $x \in K$ 

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mathbb{1}_{B(x,\psi(n))}(T^n x)}{\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mu(B(x,\psi(n)))} = 1$$

Thus, for  $\mu$ -almost all  $\mathbf{x} \in K$ 

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mathbb{1}_{B(x,\psi(n))}(T^n x)}{\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mu(R_n(\psi))} = \lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mu(B(x,\psi(n)))}{\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mu(R_n(\psi))}.$$
 (7.40)

We now estimate  $\mu(B(x, \psi(n)))$  and  $\mu(R_n(\psi))$ . It follows from the definition of  $\psi$ , that

$$B(x,\psi(n)) \cap K = \begin{cases} [0,1/3] \cap K, & \text{if } x \in [0,1/9] \cap K \\ ([0,1/3] \cup [2/3,7/9]) \cap K, & \text{if } x \in [2/9,1/3] \cap K \\ ([2/9,1/3] \cup [2/3,1]) \cap K, & \text{if } x \in [2/3,7/9] \cap K \\ [2/3,1] \cap K, & \text{if } x \in [8/9,1] \cap K \end{cases}$$

for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Thus,

$$\mu(B(x,\psi(n))) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}, & \text{if } x \in ([0,1/9] \cup [8/9,1]) \cap K, \\ \frac{3}{4}, & \text{if } x \in ([2/9,1/3] \cup [2/3,7/9]) \cap K \end{cases}$$

for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . This together with Lemma 7.9 implies the existence of  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  such that

$$\mu(R_n(\psi)) = \int_0^1 \mu\Big(B\big(x,\psi(n)\big)\Big) \,\mathrm{d}\mu(x) + O(\gamma^n)$$
75

$$= \int_{([0,1/9]\cup[8/9,1])\cap K} \mu\Big(B\big(x,\psi(n)\big)\Big) d\mu(x) + \int_{([2/9,1/3]\cup[2/3,7/9])\cap K} \mu\Big(B\big(x,\psi(n)\big)\Big) d\mu(x) + O(\gamma^n) = \frac{5}{8} + O(\gamma^n).$$

It thus follows via (7.40) that: for  $\mu$ -almost all  $x \in K$ 

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mathbb{1}_{B(x,\psi(n))}(T^n x)}{\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mu(R_n(\psi))} = \lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{N \cdot \mu(B(x, 1/3 + 2/3^2))}{N \cdot 5/8 + O(1)}$$
$$= \frac{\mu(B(x, 1/3 + 2/3^2))}{5/8}$$
$$= \begin{cases} \frac{4}{5} & \text{if } x \in \left(\left[0, \frac{1}{9}\right] \cup \left[\frac{8}{9}, 1\right]\right) \cap K, \\ \frac{6}{5} & \text{if } x \in \left(\left[\frac{2}{9}, \frac{1}{3}\right] \cup \left[\frac{2}{3}, \frac{7}{9}\right]\right) \cap K. \end{cases}$$

As mentioned in the introduction (Section 1.3), the second example is slightly more sophisticated but it removes the need for the function  $\psi$  to be constant.

**Example 7.2.** Let  $\Phi = \{\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3, \varphi_4\}$  be a conformal IFS on [0, 1] given by

$$\varphi_1(x) = \frac{1}{4}x, \ \varphi_2(x) = \frac{1}{2(1+x)}, \ \varphi_3(x) = \frac{1+x}{2+x}, \ \varphi_4(x) = \frac{2}{2+x}$$

Then it can be easily verified that the self-conformal set generated by  $\Phi$  is exactly the unit interval [0, 1]; that is

$$[0,1] = \bigcup_{i=1}^{4} \varphi_i([0,1]).$$

Moreover, it is easily verified that

$$\varphi_i((0,1)) \cap \varphi_j((0,1)) = \emptyset, \qquad \forall \ 1 \le i \ne j \le 4$$

and hence  $\Phi$  satisfies open set condition. Define the Ruelle operator  $\mathcal{L} : C([0,1]) \to C([0,1])$  by setting

$$(\mathcal{L}f)(x) := \sum_{i=1}^{4} |\varphi'_i(x)| f(\varphi_i(x)) \quad \forall f \in C([0,1]) \text{ and } x \in [0,1].$$

By Example 2.2, the spectral radius of  $\mathcal{L}$  is 1. Let

$$h(x) := \frac{1}{\log 2} \cdot \frac{1}{1+x}$$
(7.41)

and let  $\lambda$  denote the Lebesgue measure on [0, 1]. Then a straightforward calculation shows that

$$\mathcal{L}h = h, \quad \mathcal{L}^*\lambda = \lambda, \quad \int_{[0,1]} h(x) \, \mathrm{d}x = 1;$$

that is to say that h and  $\lambda$  are the unique eigenfunction and eigenmeasure of  $\mathcal{L}$  guaranteed by part (i) of Theorem 2.4. Hence by definition, the measure  $d\mu := h \ d\lambda$  is the Gibbs measure with respect to  $\mathcal{L}$ . The IFS  $\Phi$  induces a transformation  $T : [0, 1] \to [0, 1]$  given by

$$Tx = \begin{cases} 4x, & \text{if } 0 \le x < \frac{1}{4}, \\ \frac{1}{2x} - 1, & \text{if } \frac{1}{4} \le x < \frac{1}{2}, \\ \frac{2x - 1}{1 - x}, & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} \le x < \frac{2}{3}, \\ \frac{2}{x} - 2, & \text{if } \frac{2}{3} \le x \le 1. \end{cases}$$

The upshot of the above discussion is that the IFS  $\Phi$  gives rise to a self-conformal system  $(\Phi, [0, 1], \mu, T)$  in which  $\mu$  is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure with density h given by (7.41).

Let  $\psi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  be a real positive function such that  $\psi(x) \to 0$  as  $x \to \infty$  and  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \psi(n) = +\infty$ . For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $R_n(\psi)$  be the set defined by (1.14) with X = [0, 1]. Now regrading the measure of  $R_n(\psi)$ , by Lemma 7.9, we obtain that there exists  $\tilde{\gamma} \in (0, 1)$  such that

$$\mu(R_{n}(\psi)) = \int_{0}^{1} \mu\left(B(x,\psi(n))\right) d\mu(x) + O(\tilde{\gamma}^{n})$$

$$= \int_{0}^{\psi(n)} h(x) \left(\int_{0}^{x+\psi(n)} h(y) d\mu(y)\right) d\mu(x)$$

$$+ \int_{\psi(n)}^{1-\psi(n)} h(x) \left(\int_{x-\psi(n)}^{x+\psi(n)} h(y) d\mu(y)\right) d\mu(x)$$

$$+ \int_{1-\psi(n)}^{1} h(x) \left(\int_{x-\psi(n)}^{1} h(y) d\mu(y)\right) d\mu(x) + O(\tilde{\gamma}^{n})$$

$$= \frac{1}{(\log 2)^{2}} \int_{0}^{1} \frac{1}{1+x} \left(\int_{x-\psi(n)}^{x+\psi(n)} \frac{1}{1+y} d\mu(y)\right) d\mu(x) + O(\tilde{\gamma}^{n} + \psi(n)^{2})$$

$$= \frac{\psi(n)}{(\log 2)^{2}} + O\left(\tilde{\gamma}^{n} + (\psi(n))^{2}\right).$$
(7.42)

We are now in the position to put everything together and show that the self-conformal system  $(\Phi, [0, 1], \mu, T)$  provides a counterexample to Claim F. Indeed, by Corollary 1.3, we have that for  $\mu$ -almost all  $x \in [0, 1]$ 

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mathbb{1}_{B(x,\psi(n))}(T^n x)}{\sum_{n=1}^{N} 2h(x)\psi(n)} = 1.$$
(7.43)

Recall that if  $\{a_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$  is a positive sequence of real numbers such that  $a_n \to 0$  and  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n = +\infty$ , then

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{N} a_n^2}{\sum_{n=1}^{N} a_n} = 0.$$

With this in mind, on combining (7.41), (7.42) and (7.43), we find that for  $\mu$ -almost all  $x \in K := [0, 1]$ 

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mathbb{1}_{B(x,\psi(n))}(T^n x)}{\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mu(R_n(\psi))} = \lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mathbb{1}_{B(x,\psi(n))}(T^n x)}{\sum_{n=1}^{N} 2h(x)\psi(n)} \cdot \lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{N} 2h(x)\psi(n)}{\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mu(R_n(\psi))}$$
$$= \lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{N} 2h(x)\psi(n)}{\sum_{n=1}^{N} \left(\frac{\psi(n)}{(\log 2)^2} + O\left(\gamma^n + (\psi(n))^2\right)\right)}$$
$$= 2(\log 2)^2 h(x)$$
$$= \frac{2\log 2}{1+x}.$$

The upshot is that Claim F is false.

*Remark* 7.1. In view of Remark 2.1, we could replace the IFS  $\Phi$  in Example 7.2 by the simpler IFS  $\Phi' = \{\phi_1, \phi_2\}$  where  $\phi_1 : [0, 1] \to [0, 1/2]$  and  $\phi_2 : [0, 1] \to [1/2, 1]$  are given by

$$\phi_1(x) = \frac{x}{2}, \qquad \phi_2(x) = \frac{1}{1+x} \qquad \forall \ x \in [0,1].$$

It is easily seen that  $\Phi$  corresponds to a single iteration of  $\Phi'$  and that the latter gives rise to a self-conformal system  $(\Phi', [0, 1], \mu, T)$  in which  $\mu$  is as in Example 7.2 and the transformation  $T : [0, 1] \to [0, 1]$  is given by

$$Tx = \begin{cases} 2x, & \text{if } 0 \le x < \frac{1}{2}, \\ \frac{1}{x} - 1, & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} \le x \le 1. \end{cases}$$

Note that  $\Phi'$  fails to meet the second condition of (2.1) since  $|\phi'_2(0)| = 1$  but it does satisfy the weaker condition (2.10) with  $n_0 = 2$ . The point being made in Remark 2.1 is that the results in this paper (such as Corollary 1.3) are in fact applicable to systems such as  $(\Phi', [0, 1], \mu, T)$  that do not necessarily satisfy the second condition of (2.1) but do satisfy the weaker condition (2.10).

## APPENDIX A. EXPONENTIALLY MIXING IN PRODUCT SYSTEMS

This appendix is motivated by the discussion centred around Remark 1.1 in the introduction, namely Section 1.1.

Throughout, let  $k \geq 2$  be an integer. For each  $1 \leq i \leq k$ , let  $(X_i, d_i)$  be a metric space and let  $(X_i, \mathcal{B}_i, \mu_i, T_i)$  be a measure-preserving system with  $\mu$  being exponentially mixing with respect to  $(T_i, \mathcal{C}_i)$ , where  $\mathcal{C}_i$  is the collection of balls in  $X_i$ . Now construct the metric space (X, d) and the measure-preserving system  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$  via  $\{(X_i, d_i)\}_{1 \leq i \leq k}$ and  $\{(X_i, \mathcal{B}_i, \mu_i, T_i)\}_{1 \leq i \leq k}$  respectively as follows:

• 
$$X := \prod_{i=1}^{k} X_i$$
.  
• For any  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, ..., x_k), \ \mathbf{y} = (y_1, ..., y_k) \in X$   
 $d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := \max\{d_i(x_i, y_i) : i = 1, 2, ..., k\}.$ 
<sup>78</sup>

•  $\mathcal{B} := \bigotimes_{i=1}^{k} \mathcal{B}_i$  is the  $\sigma$ -algebra on X generated by the sets of the form

$$\left\{\prod_{i=1}^k F_i: F_i \in \mathcal{B}_i, \ i = 1, 2, ..., k\right\}.$$

- $\mu := \bigotimes_{i=1}^{k} \mu_i$  is the product measure on X.
- The map  $T: X \to X$  is given by

$$T\mathbf{x} := (T_1 x_1, T_2 x_2, \dots, T_k x_k), \quad \forall \mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k) \in X.$$

**Theorem A.1.** Let (X, d) and  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$  be mentioned above. Then  $\mu$  is exponentially mixing with respect to  $(T, \mathcal{C})$ , where  $\mathcal{C}$  is the collection of balls in (X, d).

*Proof.* Since each  $\mu_i$  is exponentially mixing with respect to  $(T_i, \mathcal{C}_i)$ , then there exist  $C \ge 1$  and  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  such that for any i = 1, 2, ..., k,

$$\left|\mu_i(B_i \cap T^{-n}F_i) - \mu_i(B_i)\mu_i(F_i)\right| \le C\,\gamma^n\,\mu_i(F_i) \tag{A.1}$$

holds for any ball  $B_i \subseteq X_i$ , any  $F_i \in \mathcal{B}_i$  and any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Throughout, fix an arbitrary ball  $B \subseteq X$ . In view of the definition of metric in X, it is clear that B can be written as

$$B = \prod_{i=1}^{k} B_i \,,$$

where  $B_i \subseteq X_i$  is a ball in  $X_i$  for each i = 1, 2, ..., k. Next, consider the set

$$F = \prod_{i=1}^{k} F_i \,,$$

where  $F_i \in \mathcal{B}_i \ (i = 1, 2, ..., k)$ . Then, for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\mu(B \cap T^{-n}F) = \mu\left(\prod_{i=1}^{k} B_i \cap T_i^{-n}F_i\right)$$
$$= \prod_{i=1}^{k} \mu_i (B_i \cap T_i^{-n}F_i)$$
$$\leq \prod_{i=1}^{k} (\mu_i(B_i) + C\gamma^n) \ \mu_i(F_i) \qquad (by (A.1))$$
$$= \left(\prod_{i=1}^{k} (\mu_i(B_i) + C\gamma^n)\right) \cdot \mu(F)$$
$$\leq \left(\prod_{i=1}^{k} \mu_i(B_i) + 2^k C^k \gamma^n\right) \cdot \mu(F)$$
$$= (\mu(B) + 2^k C^k \gamma^n) \ \mu(F) .$$

A similar argument with obvious modifications shows that for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\mu \left( B \cap T^{-n} F \right) \geq \left( \mu(B) - 2^k C^k \gamma^n \right) \mu(F) \,.$$
<sup>79</sup>

The upshot of the above discussions is that for any  $F \in \mathcal{B}$  of the form

$$F = \prod_{i=1}^{k} F_i$$
  $(F_i \in \mathcal{B}_i, i = 1, 2, ..., k),$ 

we have

$$\left|\mu(B \cap T^{-n}F) - \mu(B)\mu(F)\right| \le 2^k C^k \gamma^n \,\mu(F) \,, \qquad \forall n \in \mathbb{N} \,. \tag{A.2}$$

We are going to prove (A.2) for any  $F \in \mathcal{B}$ . To do this, let

$$\mathcal{A}_B := \{ F \in \mathcal{B} : \text{the inequality (A.2) holds for } F \}$$

and let  $\mathcal{G}$  be the collection of finite disjoint unions of the sets in

$$\left\{ F = \prod_{i=1}^{k} F_i : F_i \in \mathcal{B}_i, \ i = 1, 2, ..., k \right\}.$$

Various properties of  $\mathcal{A}_B$  and  $\mathcal{G}$  are listed below:

- As was discussed above, we have  $\mathcal{A}_B \supseteq \mathcal{G}$ .
- $\mathcal{G}$  is an algebra which generates the  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{B}$ .
- $\mathcal{A}_B$  is a monotone class, that is to say that  $\mathcal{A}_B$  is closed under countable increasing unions and countable decreasing intersections.

On combining the above facts with the Monotone Class Lemma [31, Lemma 2.35], we have  $\mathcal{A}_B = \mathcal{B}$ , which is equivalent to the statement that any  $F \in \mathcal{B}$  satisfies the desired inequality (A.2). Since  $B \subseteq X$  is an arbitrary ball, then we have proved that  $\mu$  is exponentially mixing with respect to  $(T, \mathcal{C})$ .

## APPENDIX B. PROOF OF LEMMA 7.7

For convenience we restate the lemma under consideration.

**Lemma B.1.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$  be a probability space. let  $\{f_n(x)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $\{g_n(x)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be sequences of measurable functions on X, and let  $\{\phi_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  be a sequence of real numbers. Suppose that

$$0 \le g_n(x) \le \phi_n, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \ \forall x \in X$$
(B.1)

and that there exists C > 0 with which

$$\int_X \left( \sum_{n=a}^b (f_n(x) - g_n(x)) \right)^2 d\mu(x) \le C \sum_{n=a}^b \phi_n$$
(B.2)

for any pair of integers 0 < a < b. Then for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^{N} f_n(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} g_n(x) + O\left(\Psi(N)^{\frac{1}{2}} (\log(\Psi(N)))^{\frac{3}{2}+\epsilon} + \max_{1 \le k \le N} g_k(x)\right)$$
(B.3)

for  $\mu$ -almost every  $x \in X$ , where  $\Psi(N) := \sum_{\substack{n=1 \\ g_0}}^N \phi_n$ .

*Proof.* The proof is divided into two cases.

Case (i).  $\sup\{\Psi(N) : N \in \mathbb{N}\} < +\infty$ . By the inequalities (B.1) and (B.2) and Fatou's lemma, we have

$$\begin{split} \left\|\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} f_n\right\|_{L^2(\mu)} &\leq \left\|\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (f_n - g_n)\right\|_{L^2(\mu)} + \left\|\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} g_n\right\|_{L^2(\mu)} \\ &\leq \liminf_{N \to \infty} \left\|\sum_{n=1}^{N} (f_n - g_n)\right\|_{L^2(\mu)} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \phi_n \\ &\leq \left(C \cdot \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \Psi(N)\right)^{1/2} + \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \Psi(N) \\ &< +\infty. \end{split}$$

It implies that the sum of the sequence  $\{f_n(x)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$  converges for  $\mu$ -almost every  $x \in X$ . Then the asymptotic formula (B.3) holds trivially.

Case (ii).  $\sup{\{\Psi(N) : N \in \mathbb{N}\}} = +\infty$ . We start by introducing some useful notation. For each  $r \in \mathbb{N}$ , define a collection of dyadic intervals with integer endpoints as

$$L_r := \left\{ (t \cdot 2^s, (t+1) \cdot 2^s] : s = 0, 1, ..., r \text{ and } t = 0, 1, ..., 2^{r-s} - 1 \right\}.$$

Given an interval  $I \subseteq [0, +\infty)$  and  $x \in X$ , denote

$$F(I,x) := \sum_{k:\Psi(k)\in I} (f_k(x) - g_k(x)) \, .$$

For any  $r \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $x \in X$ , define

$$G(r,x) := \sum_{I \in L_r} |F(I,x)|^2.$$

Given any  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , let

$$n_j := \max\left\{k \in \mathbb{N} : \Psi(k) \le j\right\}$$

and consider the binary expansion

$$j = \sum_{s=0}^{\lfloor \log_2 j \rfloor} b(j,s) \cdot 2^s, \tag{B.4}$$

where b(j, s) = 0 or 1 for each  $s = 0, 1, ..., \lfloor \log_2 j \rfloor$ . Denote by

$$B(j) := \{ s \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \cap [0, \lfloor \log_2 j \rfloor] : b(j, s) = 1 \} = \{ s_{1,j} < s_{2,j} < \dots < s_{k_j,j} \}$$

By the equality (B.4), we obtain the following partition of the interval (0, j]:

$$(0,j] = (0,2^{s_{k_j,j}}] \sqcup \left( \bigsqcup_{\ell=1}^{k_j-1} \left( \sum_{i=\ell+1}^{k_j} 2^{s_{i,j}}, \sum_{i=\ell}^{k_j} 2^{s_{i,j}} \right) \right).$$
(B.5)

If we let

$$\mathcal{I}(j) := \{ (t_{i,j} \cdot 2^{s_{i,j}}, (t_{i,j}+1) \cdot 2^{s_{i,j}}] : i = 1, 2, ..., k_j - 1 \} \cup \{ (0, 2^{k_j, j}] \},$$

where  $t_{i,j}$   $(i = 1, 2, ..., k_j - 1)$  is defined by

$$t_{i,j} := \sum_{\substack{\ell=i+1\\81}}^{k_j} 2^{s_{\ell,j}-s_{i,j}},$$

then the partition (B.5) can be rewritten as

$$(0,j] = \bigsqcup_{I \in \mathcal{I}(j)} I. \tag{B.6}$$

For convenience, let  $\Psi(0) := 0$ . Throughout, we fix  $\epsilon > 0$ .

In view of inequality (B.2), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_X G(r,x) \, \mathrm{d}\mu(x) &= \sum_{I \in L_r} \int_X |F(I,x)|^2 \, \mathrm{d}\mu(x) \\ &\leq C \cdot \sum_{I \in L_r} \sum_{k: \Psi(k) \in I} \phi_k \\ &= C \cdot \sum_{s=0}^r \sum_{t=0}^{2^{r-s}-1} \left( \Psi\left(n_{(t+1)\cdot 2^s}\right) - \Psi\left(n_{t\cdot 2^s}\right) \right) \\ &= C \cdot (r+1) \cdot \Psi\left(n_{2^r}\right) \\ &\leq C \cdot (r+1) \cdot 2^r \end{aligned}$$

for any  $r \in \mathbb{N}$ . This together with Markov's inequality, implies that for any  $r \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\mu\Big(\{x \in X : G(r, x) > 2^r \cdot r^{2+\epsilon}\}\Big) \ll \frac{1}{r^{1+2\epsilon}},$$

where the implied constant is independent of  $r \in \mathbb{N}$ . Now  $\sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{r^{1+2\epsilon}} < +\infty$ , so by the (convergent) Borel-Cantelli Lemma, it follows that for  $\mu$ -almost every  $x \in X$ , there exists  $N = N(x) \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for all r > N(x), we have

$$G(r,x) \le 2^r \cdot r^{2+2\epsilon}. \tag{B.7}$$

Given any  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $x \in X$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{n=1}^{n_{j}} (f_{n}(x) - g_{n}(x)) \right| &\leq \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}(j)} \left| \sum_{k:\Psi(k) \in I} (f_{k}(x) - g_{k}(x)) \right| \\ &= \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}(j)} |F(I, x)| \\ &\leq \left( \# \mathcal{I}(j) \right)^{1/2} \cdot \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} |F(I, x)|^{2} \right)^{1/2} \end{aligned} \tag{B.8}$$

$$\leq \left( \# \mathcal{I}(j) \right)^{1/2} \cdot \left( \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}(j)} |F(I,x)|^2 \right)$$
(B.9)

$$\leq (\log_2 j)^{1/2} \cdot \left( \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}(j)} |F(I, x)|^2 \right)^{1/2},$$
 (B.10)

where the inequality (B.8) is a consequence of the definition of  $n_j$  and the partition (B.6), the inequality (B.9) is a consequence of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, and (B.10) holds since  $\#\mathcal{I}(j) \leq \lfloor \log_2 j \rfloor$ . Note that

$$\mathcal{I}(j) \subseteq \underset{82}{L_{\lfloor \log_2 j \rfloor + 1}}$$

and so

$$\left(\sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}(j)} |F(I,x)|^2\right)^{1/2} \leq \left(\sum_{I \in L_{\lfloor \log_2 j \rfloor + 1}} |F(I,x)|^2\right)^{1/2} \\ = G(\lfloor \log_2 j \rfloor + 1, x)^{1/2}.$$
(B.11)

Combining (B.7), (B.10) and (B.11), we obtain that

$$\left|\sum_{n=1}^{n_j} (f_n(x) - g_n(x))\right| = O\left(j^{\frac{1}{2}} (\log j)^{\frac{3}{2} + \epsilon}\right)$$
(B.12)

for  $\mu$ -almost every  $x \in X$ . Since  $\sup\{\Psi(N) : N \in \mathbb{N}\} = +\infty$ , we have that  $\Phi(n_j) > 0$ when  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  is sufficiently large. For such  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exists a positive integer  $r = r(j) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$r - 1 < \Psi(n_j) \le r.$$

Then by the definitions of  $n_j$  and  $n_r$ , we have  $n_j = n_r$ . Hence together with (B.12), it follows that

$$\left| \sum_{n=1}^{n_j} (f_n(x) - g_n(x)) \right| = \left| \sum_{n=1}^{n_r} (f_n(x) - g_n(x)) \right|$$
$$= O\left( r^{\frac{1}{2}} (\log r)^{\frac{3}{2} + \epsilon} \right)$$
$$= O\left( \Psi(n_j)^{\frac{1}{2}} (\log(\Psi(n_j) + 1))^{\frac{3}{2} + \epsilon} \right)$$
(B.13)

for  $\mu$ -almost every  $x \in X$ . This proves (7.26) when  $N = n_j$   $(j \in \mathbb{N})$ .

It remains to prove (7.26) for all  $N \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{n_j : j \in \mathbb{N}\}$ . Fix  $x \in X$  that satisfies (B.13) and let  $N \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{n_j : j \in \mathbb{N}\}$ . Then there exists  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  for which

$$n_j < N < n_{j+1}$$

It follows by the definitions of  $n_j$  and  $n_{j+1}$  that

$$\Psi(n_{j+1}) \le \Psi(n_j + 1) + 1. \tag{B.14}$$

In view of (B.13) and (B.14), there exists C = C(x) > 0 such that

$$\begin{split} \sum_{n=1}^{N} (f_n(x) - g_n(x)) &\leq \sum_{n=1}^{n_{j+1}} f_n(x) - \sum_{n=1}^{N} g_n(x) \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{n_{j+1}} \left( f_n(x) - g_n(x) \right) + \sum_{n=N+1}^{n_{j+1}} g_n(x) \\ &\leq C \cdot \left( \Psi(n_{j+1})^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \log(\Psi(n_{j+1}) + 1) \right)^{\frac{3}{2} + \epsilon} + \Psi(n_{j+1}) - \Psi(n_j + 1) \right) \\ &\leq C \cdot \left( (\Psi(N) + 1)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \log(\Psi(N) + 2) \right)^{\frac{3}{2} + \epsilon} + 1 \right) \end{split}$$

and that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{N} (f_n(x) - g_n(x)) \geq \sum_{n=1}^{n_j} f_n(x) - \sum_{n=1}^{N} g_n(x)$$
83

$$= \sum_{n=1}^{n_j} \left( f_n(x) - g_n(x) \right) - \sum_{n=n_j+1}^{N} g_n(x)$$

$$\geq -C \cdot \left( \Psi(n_j)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \log(\Psi(n_j) + 1) \right)^{\frac{3}{2} + \epsilon} + \left( \Psi(n_{j+1}) - \Psi(n_j) \right) \right)$$

$$\geq -C \cdot \left( \Psi(N)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \log(\Psi(N) + 1) \right)^{\frac{3}{2} + \epsilon} + \phi_{n_j+1} + 1 \right)$$

$$\geq -C \cdot \left( \Psi(N)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \log(\Psi(N) + 1) \right)^{\frac{3}{2} + \epsilon} + \max_{1 \le k \le N} \phi_k + 1 \right).$$

The proof is complete.

## APPENDIX C. EXAMPLE ABB IS NOT A COUNTEREXAMPLE

In this appendix we show that Example ABB is not a counterexample to Claim 0-1 without the Ahlfors regular assumption – see Remark 1.8 in Section 1.3 for the context.

**Proposition C.1.** Let  $\Phi = \{\varphi_1(x) = \frac{1}{3}x, \varphi_2(x) = \frac{1}{3}x + \frac{2}{3}\}$  and let K be the self-similar set generated by  $\Phi$ . Recall, K is the standard middle-third Cantor. Let  $\mu := \underline{\mu} \circ \pi^{-1}$  where  $\underline{\mu}$  is the Bernoulli measure on  $\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}} := \{1, 2\}^{\mathbb{N}}$  associated with the probability vector  $(p_1, p_2)$  with  $p_1 \neq p_2$ . Let  $\alpha > 0$  and let  $\psi_{\alpha}(n) = 3^{-\lfloor \alpha \log n \rfloor}$ . If

$$\alpha > \frac{1}{-(p_1 \log p_1 + p_2 \log p_2)},$$

then for  $\mu$ -almost all  $x \in X$ 

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(B(x,\psi_{\alpha}(n))) < +\infty$$

*Proof.* In the setup of third-middle Cantor set, note that for any  $I = i_1 i_2 \cdots \in \Sigma^{\mathbb{N}} = \{1, 2\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have that

$$\mu(B(\pi(I), 3^{-n})) = \mu(K_{i_1 i_2 \cdots i_n}) = p_{i_1} p_{i_2} \cdots p_{i_n}.$$

With this in mind, for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we obtain that

$$\mu(B(\pi(I),\psi_{\alpha}(n))) = p_{i_1}p_{i_2}\cdots p_{\lfloor \alpha \log n \rfloor}.$$
 (C.1)

Consider the map  $f: \Sigma^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathbb{R}$  given by

$$f(I) = \log p_{i_1} \qquad (I = i_1 i_2 \dots \in \Sigma^{\mathbb{N}})$$

and let  $\sigma$  be the shift map on  $\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ . Then it follows from (C.1) that

$$\log \mu \left( B(\pi(I), \psi_{\alpha}(n)) \right) = \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor \alpha \log n \rfloor} f(\sigma^{i-1}I) \,. \tag{C.2}$$

By the Birkoff Ergodic Theorem, we have that for  $\underline{\mu}$ -almost every  $I \in \Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}$ ,

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{\lfloor \alpha \log n \rfloor} \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor \alpha \log n \rfloor} f(\sigma^{i-1}I) = \int_{\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}} f(I) \,\mathrm{d}\underline{\mu}(I) = p_1 \log p_1 + p_2 \log p_2 \,. \tag{C.3}$$

In view of the range of  $\alpha$  under consideration, we can find  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$  such that

$$(1-\epsilon) \cdot \alpha \cdot (p_1 \log p_1 + p_2 \log p_2) < -1-\epsilon.$$
(C.4)

Now we fix  $I \in \Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}$  that satisfies (C.3) and fix  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$  that satisfies (C.4). Then on combining (C.2), (C.3) and (C.4), there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for all n > N, we have

$$\mu \big( B(\pi(I), \psi_{\alpha}(n)) \big) = e^{\log \mu (B(\pi(I), \psi_{\alpha}(n)))}$$

$$\leq e^{(1-\epsilon) \cdot \lfloor \alpha \log n \rfloor \cdot (p_1 \log p_1 + p_2 \log p_2)}$$

$$\leq e^{(1-\epsilon) \cdot (\alpha \log n - 1) \cdot (p_1 \log p_1 + p_2 \log p_2)}$$

$$< n^{-1-\epsilon} \cdot e^{-(1-\epsilon) \cdot (p_1 \log p_1 + p_2 \log p_2)}$$

and thus

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu \big( B(\pi(I), \psi_{\alpha}(n)) \big) < +\infty \,.$$

The upshot of the above is that for  $\mu$ -almost every  $x \in K$ , the sum of  $\mu(B(x, \psi_{\alpha}(n)))$  is convergent. This thereby completes the proof of Proposition C.1.

Acknowledgments. Huang and Li were supported by National Key R&D Program of China (No. 2024YFA1013700), NSFC 12271176 and Guangdong Natural Science Foundation 2024A1515010946.

## References

- [1] C. Aistleitner, B. Borda, and M. Hauke. On the metric theory of approximations by reduced fractions: a quantitative Koukoulopoulos–Maynard theorem. Compositio Mathematica, 159(2):207–231, 2023.
- [2] D. Allen, S. Baker, and B. Bárány. Recurrence rates for shifts of finite type. <u>Advances in Mathematics</u>, 460:110039, 2025.
- [3] D. Allen and B. Bárány. On the Hausdorff measure of shrinking target sets on self-conformal sets. Mathematika, 67(4):807-839, 2021.
- [4] D. V. Anosov and Y. G. Sinai. Some smooth ergodic systems. <u>Russian Mathematical Surveys</u>, 22(5):103, 1967.
- [5] V. Araújo, O. Butterley, and P. Varandas. Open sets of Axiom A flows with exponentially mixing attractors. Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society, 144(7):2971–2984, 2016.
- [6] M. Aspenberg and T. Persson. Shrinking targets in parametrised families. In <u>Mathematical</u> <u>Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society</u>, volume 166, pages 265–295. Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- [7] A. Avila, S. Gouëzel, and J.-C. Yoccoz. Exponential mixing for the Teichmüller flow. <u>Publications</u> Mathématiques de l'IHÉS, 104:143–211, 2006.
- [8] S. Baker and M. Farmer. Quantitative recurrence properties for self-conformal sets. <u>Proceedings of</u> the American Mathematical Society, 149(3):1127–1138, 2021.
- [9] S. Baker and H. Koivusalo. Quantitative recurrence and the shrinking target problem for overlapping iterated function systems. Advances in Mathematics, 442:109538, 2024.
- [10] V. Baladi. Positive transfer operators and decay of correlations, volume 16. World Scientific, 2000.
- B. Bárány and M. Rams. Shrinking targets on Bedford–McMullen carpets. Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society, 117(5):951–995, 2018.
- [12] V. Beresnevich, F. Ramírez, and S. Velani. Metric Diophantine approximation: aspects of recent work. In <u>Dynamics and Analytic Number Theory</u>, volume 437 of <u>London Math. Soc. Lecture Note</u> Ser., pages 1–95. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2016.
- [13] V. Beresnevich and S. Velani. The divergence Borel–Cantelli lemma revisited. <u>Journal of</u> <u>Mathematical Analysis and Applications</u>, 519(1), Mar. 2023. © 2022 The Author(s).
- [14] P. Billingsley. Probability and Measure. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics. Wiley, 1995.
- [15] M. D. Boshernitzan. Quantitative recurrence results. <u>Inventiones mathematicae</u>, 113(1):617–631, 1993.
- [16] R. Bowen and D. Ruelle. The ergodic theory of Axiom A flows. <u>Inventiones mathematicae</u>, 29:181–202, 1975.
- [17] R. E. Bowen. <u>Equilibrium states and the ergodic theory of Anosov diffeomorphisms</u>, volume 470. Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.

- [18] Y. Bugeaud and B.-W. Wang. Distribution of full cylinders and the Diophantine properties of the orbits in  $\beta$ -expansions. Journal of Fractal Geometry, 1(2):221–241, 2014.
- [19] R. Busam and E. Freitag. <u>Complex analysis</u>. Springer, 2009.
- [20] O. Butterley, K. War, et al. Open sets of exponentially mixing Anosov flows. Journal of the European <u>Mathematical Society</u>, 22(7):2253–2285, 2020.
- [21] Y. Chang, M. Wu, and W. Wu. Quantitative recurrence properties and homogeneous self-similar sets. <u>Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society</u>, 147(4):1453–1465, 2019.
- [22] N. I. Chernov. Markov approximations and decay of correlations for Anosov flows. <u>Annals of</u> <u>Mathematics</u>, 147(2):269–324, 1998.
- [23] D. Dolgopyat. On decay of correlations in Anosov flows. <u>Annals of Mathematics</u>, 147(2):357–390, 1998.
- [24] D. Dolgopyat, A. Kanigowski, and F. Rodriguez Hertz. Exponential mixing implies Bernoulli. <u>Annals of Mathematics</u>, 199(3):1225–1292, 2024.
- [25] K. J. Falconer. <u>Techniques in Fractal Geometry</u>, volume 3. Wiley Chichester, 1997.
- [26] A. H. Fan, T. Langlet, and B. Li. Quantitative uniform hitting in exponentially mixing systems. In Recent developments in fractals and related fields, pages 251–266. Springer, 2010.
- [27] A. H. Fan and K.-S. Lau. Iterated function system and Ruelle operator. <u>Journal of Mathematical</u> Analysis and Applications, 231(2):319–344, 1999.
- [28] L. Fang, M. Wu, and B. Li. Approximation orders of real numbers by β-expansions. <u>Mathematische</u> Zeitschrift, 296(1):13–40, 2020.
- [29] J. Fernández, M. Melián, and D. Pestana. Expanding maps, shrinking targets and hitting times. Nonlinearity, 25(9):2443, 2012.
- [30] M. Field, I. Melbourne, and A. Török. Stability of mixing and rapid mixing for hyperbolic flows. <u>Annals of Mathematics</u>, pages 269–291, 2007.
- [31] G. B. Folland. <u>Real analysis: modern techniques and their applications</u>, volume 40. John Wiley & Sons, 1999.
- [32] S. Galatolo, J. Rousseau, and B. Saussol. Skew products, quantitative recurrence, shrinking targets and decay of correlations. Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems, 35(6):1814–1845, 2015.
- [33] F. W. Gehring, G. J. Martin, and B. P. Palka. <u>An introduction to the theory of higher-dimensional quasiconformal mappings</u>, volume 216. American Mathematical Soc., 2017.
- [34] A. Ghosh and D. Nandi. Diophantine approximation, large intersections and geodesics in negative curvature. Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society, 128(2):e12581, 2024.
- [35] G. Harman. Metric Number Theory. Oxford University Press, 1998.
- [36] Y. He. Quantitative recurrence properties and strong dynamical Borel-Cantelli lemma for dynamical systems with exponential decay of correlations. <u>arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.10211</u>, 2024.
- [37] Y. He and L. Liao. Quantitative recurrence properties for piecewise expanding maps on [0, 1]<sup>d</sup>. <u>Annali</u> della Scuola Normale Superiore-Classe di Scienze, pages 40–40, 2022.
- [38] J. Heinonen. Lectures on analysis on metric spaces. Springer Science & Business Media, 2001.
- [39] R. Hill and S. L. Velani. The ergodic theory of shrinking targets. <u>Inventiones mathematicae</u>, 119(1):175–198, 1995.
- [40] Z. N. Hu and T. Persson. Hausdorff dimension of recurrence sets. <u>Nonlinearity</u>, 37(5), 2024.
- [41] M. Hussain, B. Li, D. Simmons, and B. Wang. Dynamical Borel–Cantelli lemma for recurrence theory. Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems, 42(6):1994–2008, 2022.
- [42] J. E. Hutchinson. Fractals and self similarity. <u>Indiana University Mathematics Journal</u>, 30(5):713– 747, 1981.
- [43] A. Käenmäki. On the geometric structure of the limit set of conformal iterated function systems. <u>Publicacions matematiques</u>, pages 133–141, 2003.
- [44] O. Khalil. Exponential mixing via additive combinatorics. arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.00527, 2023.
- [45] A. Khintchine. Einige Sätze über Kettenbrüche, mit Anwendungen auf die Theorie der Diophantischen Approximationen. Mathematische Annalen, 92(1):115–125, 1924.
- [46] D. H. Kim. The shrinking target property of irrational rotations. <u>Nonlinearity</u>, 20(7):1637, 2007.
- [47] D. Kleinbock and J. Zheng. Dynamical Borel–Cantelli lemma for recurrence under Lipschitz twists. Nonlinearity, 36(2):1434, 2023.
- [48] D. Koukoulopoulos and J. Maynard. On the Duffin-Schaeffer conjecture. <u>Annals of Mathematics</u>, 192(1):251–307, 2020.
- [49] D. Koukoulopoulos, J. Maynard, and D. Yang. An almost sharp quantitative version of the Duffin-Schaeffer conjecture. <u>Duke Mathematical Journal</u>, 2024.

- [50] J. Levesley, B. Li, D. Simmons, and S. Velani. Shrinking targets versus recurrence: the quantitative theory. arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.22993, 2024.
- [51] B. Li, L. Liao, S. Velani, and E. Zorin. The shrinking target problem for matrix transformations of tori: revisiting the standard problem. Advances in Mathematics, 421:108994, 2023.
- [52] B. Li, B.-W. Wang, J. Wu, and J. Xu. The shrinking target problem in the dynamical system of continued fractions. Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society, 108(1):159–186, 2014.
- [53] J. Li and W. Pan. Exponential mixing of geodesic flows for geometrically finite hyperbolic manifolds with cusps. Inventiones mathematicae, 231(3):931–1021, 2023.
- [54] C. Liverani, B. Saussol, and S. Vaienti. Conformal measure and decay of correlation for covering weighted systems. Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems, 18(6):1399–1420, 1998.
- [55] P. Mattila. On the structure of self-similar fractals. <u>Annales Fennici Mathematici</u>, 7(2):189–195, 1982.
- [56] P. Mattila. <u>Geometry of sets and measures in Euclidean spaces: fractals and rectifiability</u>. Number 44. Cambridge university press, 1999.
- [57] R. D. Mauldin and M. Urbanski. <u>Graph directed Markov systems: geometry and dynamics of limit sets</u>, volume 148. Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- [58] F. Morgan. Geometric measure theory: a beginner's guide. Academic press, 2016.
- [59] S. Nonnenmacher and M. Zworski. Decay of correlations for normally hyperbolic trapping. Inventiones mathematicae, 200:345–438, 2015.
- [60] W. Parry and M. Pollicott. Zeta functions and the periodic orbit structure of hyperbolic dynamics. Astérisque, 187(188):1–268, 1990.
- [61] N. Patzschke. Self-conformal multifractal measures. <u>Advances in Applied Mathematics</u>, 19(4):486– 513, 1997.
- [62] T. Persson. Inhomogeneous potentials, Hausdorff dimension and shrinking targets. <u>Annales Henri</u> Lebesgue, 2:1–37, 2019.
- [63] T. Persson. A strong Borel–Cantelli lemma for recurrence. Studia Mathematica, 268(1):75–89, 2023.
- [64] T. Persson and A. R. Sponheimer. Strong Borel–Cantelli lemmas for recurrence, 2025.
- [65] W. Philipp. Some metrical theorems in number theory. Pacific Journal of Mathematics, 20(1), 1967.
- [66] C. Pommerenke. On ergodic properties of inner functions. Mathematische Annalen, 256:43–50, 1981.
- [67] D. Ruelle. Flots qui ne mélangent pas exponentiellement. <u>Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences</u>
   <u>- Series I Mathematics</u>, 296(4):191–193, 1983.
- [68] B. Saussol. Absolutely continuous invariant measures for multidimensional expanding maps. <u>Israel</u> Journal of Mathematics, 116:223–248, 2000.
- [69] S. Seuret and B.-W. Wang. Quantitative recurrence properties in conformal iterated function systems. Advances in Mathematics, 280:472–505, 2015.
- [70] A. R. Sponheimer. A recurrence-type strong Borel–Cantelli lemma for Axiom A diffeomorphisms. Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems, 45(3):936–955, 2025.
- [71] B. Tan and B.-W. Wang. Quantitative recurrence properties for beta-dynamical system. <u>Advances</u> in Mathematics, 228(4):2071–2097, 2011.
- [72] J. Tseng. On circle rotations and the shrinking target properties. <u>Discrete and Continuous Dynamical</u> <u>Systems</u>, 20(4):1111–1122, 2008.
- [73] M. Tsujii and Z. Zhang. Smooth mixing Anosov flows in dimension three are exponentially mixing. Annals of Mathematics, 197(1):65–158, 2023.
- [74] P. Walters. <u>An introduction to ergodic theory</u>, volume 79. Springer Science & Business Media, 2000.
- [75] B.-W. Wang, J. Wu, and J. Xu. Dynamical covering problems on the triadic Cantor set. <u>Comptes</u> <u>Rendus Mathematique</u>, 355(7):738–743, 2017.
- [76] Y.-L. Wu and N. Yuan. Quantitative recurrence problem on some Bedford-McMullen carpets. <u>Journal</u> of Mathematical Analysis and Applications, 543(2):128938, 2025.

(J. Huang) School of Mathematics, South China University of Technology, Wushan Road 381, Tianhe District, Guangzhou, China

*Email address*: h1135778478@163.com

(B. Li) School of Mathematics, South China University of Technology, Wushan Road 381, Tianhe District, Guangzhou, China

 $Email \ address: \ \tt{scbingli@scut.edu.cn}$ 

(S. Velani) Department of Mathematics, University of York, Heslington, York, YO10 5DD, England.

Email address: sanju.velani@york.ac.uk