

Dimension of the harmonic measure of non-homogeneous Cantor sets

Athanasios BATAKIS

April 15, 2003

Abstract

We prove that the dimension of the harmonic measure of the complementary of a translation-invariant type of Cantor sets as a continuous function of the parameters determining these sets. This results extend a previous one of the author and do not use ergodic theoretic tools, not applicable to our case.

1 Introduction

The purpose of this work is to complement the study of the dimension of the harmonic measure of the complementary of (not necessarily self-similar) Cantor sets as a function of parameters assigned to these sets. In a previous work [5] we have proved that the parameters assigned to self-similar Cantor sets are continuity points for this function. A new method allows us to treat the continuity over the entire family of parameters determining these translation invariant Cantor sets. We restrain ourselves to sets in the plane for convenience, even though the proof can be applied to all “translation-invariant” Cantor sets in \mathbb{R}^n , $n \geq 2$.

Let us start by recalling the definition of the Hausdorff dimension of a measure; we will use the notation $\dim_{\mathcal{H}}$ for the Hausdorff dimension of sets.

Definition 1.1 *If μ is a measure on \mathbb{K} , we will denote by $\dim_*(\mu)$ the lower Hausdorff dimension of μ :*

$$\dim_* \mu = \inf\{\dim_{\mathcal{H}} E ; E \subset \mathbb{K} \text{ and } \mu(E) > 0\}$$

and by $\dim^(\mu)$ the upper Hausdorff dimension of μ :*

$$\dim^* \mu = \inf\{\dim_{\mathcal{H}} E ; E \subset \mathbb{K} \text{ and } \mu(\mathbb{K} \setminus E) = 0\}.$$

If, for a measure μ on \mathbb{K} , we have $\dim^(\mu) = \dim_*(\mu)$ then we note this common value $\dim(\mu)$. In the latter case the measure is called exact.*

⁰AMS Classification: 31A15, 28A80

⁰Key words: Harmonic measure, Cantor sets, fractals, Hausdorff dimension, entropy




Figure 1: A 4-corner Cantor set and its enumeration

For convenience and in order to fix ideas we consider a particular case of translation invariant Cantor sets; we study 4-corner Cantor sets constructed in the following way (see also [3]): let $\underline{A}, \overline{A}$ be two constants with $0 < \underline{A} \leq \overline{A} < \frac{1}{2}$ and let $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of real numbers with $\underline{A} \leq a_n \leq \overline{A}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

We replace the square $[0, 1]^2$ by four squares of sidelength a_1 situated in the four corners of $[0, 1]^2$. Each of these squares is then replaced by four squares of sidelength $a_1 a_2$ situated in its four corners. At the n th stage of the construction every square of the $(n - 1)$ th generation will be replaced by four squares of sidelength $a_1 \dots a_n$ situated in its four corners (see figure 1). Let \mathbb{K} be the Cantor set constructed by repeating the procedure.

Recall that the harmonic measure of a domain is supported by its boundary and can be seen as the distribution of the exit points of Brownian motion starting at some (any) point of the domain (for more details see [13], [16] and [11]). Carleson [12] has shown that for self-similar 4-corner Cantor sets (the sequence $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is constant) the dimension of the harmonic measure of their complementary is strictly smaller than 1. His proof, involving ergodic theory techniques, was improved by Makarov and Volberg [20] who showed that the dimension of the harmonic measure of any self-similar 4-corner Cantor set is strictly smaller than the dimension of the Cantor set. Volberg ([23], [24]) extended these results to a class of dynamic Cantor repellers. Other comparisons of harmonic and maximal measures for dynamical systems are proposed in [2], [18], [22]. More recently, a multifractal study of harmonic measure on simply connected domains and on Julia sets of polynomial mappings is carried out in [19], [10].

In [3] it is shown that the dimension of the harmonic measure of the complementary of 4-corner Cantor sets is strictly smaller than the Hausdorff dimension of the Cantor set, even when the sequence $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is not constant. In [4] we prove that small perturbations of the sidelength of the squares of the construction of \mathbb{K} do not alterate this property. This last result can also be seen as an immediate consequence of the following theorem.

Theorem 1.2 *Let $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{K}_{(a_n)}$ be the 4-corners Cantor set associated to a sequence a_n and $\mathbb{K}' = \mathbb{K}_{(a'_n)}$ a second Cantor set of the same type associated to the sequence $(a'_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. Let ω and ω' be the harmonic measures of $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathbb{K}$ and $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathbb{K}'$ respectively. Then for all $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a $\delta = \delta(\epsilon, \overline{A}, \underline{A}) > 0$ such that if $|a'_n - a_n| < \delta$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ then $|\dim \omega - \dim \omega'| < \epsilon$.*

When the sequence $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is constant the partial result is already established in [5] using ergodic theoretic tools, which are not applicable in the general case.

Remark 1.3 Let $\mathcal{D} : \ell^\infty([\overline{A}, \underline{A}]) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be the function that assigns to a sequence $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset [\overline{A}, \underline{A}]$ the dimension of harmonic measure of the Cantor set associated to $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. By refining the estimations in the demonstration of the theorem, we can even show that \mathcal{D} is a Lipschitz continuous function. The proof of this statement is very technical but straightforward and therefore omitted.

In particular this refinement implies that if $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |a_n - a'_n| < \infty$ then the harmonic measures of the corresponding Cantor sets are of the same dimension, and even equivalent when we report them onto the abstract Cantor set $\{1, 2, 3, 4\}^{\mathbb{N}}$.

2 Notations and Preliminary results

In this section we establish some estimates on the harmonic measure of a Cantor set under perturbation, and recall some known results on the harmonic measure of Cantor-type sets. We also introduce the tools needed, such as the Hausdorff dimension and the entropy of a probability measure on a Cantor set.

Let \mathbb{K} be a 4-corner Cantor set as described in the introduction. We enumerate \mathbb{K} by identifying it to the abstract Cantor set $\{1, \dots, 4\}^{\mathbb{N}}$. We denote $I_{i_1 \dots i_n}$, where $i_j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ for $1 \leq j \leq n$, the 4^n squares of the n -th generation of the construction of \mathbb{K} with the enumeration shown in the figure 1 and the usual condition that $I_{i_1 \dots i_n}$ is the “father” of the sets $I_{i_1 \dots i_n i}$, $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. It is clear that $\overline{A} \geq \frac{\text{diam} I_{i_1 \dots i_n i}}{\text{diam} I_{i_1 \dots i_n}} = a_{n+1} \geq \underline{A}$, $i = 1, \dots, 4$.

The collection of the squares of the n -th generation of the construction of \mathbb{K} will be $\mathcal{F}_n = \{I_{i_1 \dots i_n} ; i_1, \dots, i_n = 1, \dots, 4\}$, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. For a square $I \in \mathcal{F}_n$ we note \widehat{I} the “father” of I , i.e. the unique square of \mathcal{F}_{n-1} containing I . If $I = I_{i_1 \dots i_k} \in \mathcal{F}_k$ and $J = I_{j_1 \dots j_n} \in \mathcal{F}_n$ we will note $IJ = I_{i_1 \dots i_k j_1 \dots j_n} \in \mathcal{F}_{n+k}$. Finally, for $x \in \mathbb{K}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let $I_n(x)$ be the unique square of \mathcal{F}_n containing x .

For a domain Ω , a point $x \in \Omega$ and a Borel set $F \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ we denote by $\omega(x, F, \Omega)$ the harmonic measure of $F \cap \partial\Omega$ (for the domain Ω) assigned to the point x . Clearly, F carries no measure if it does not intersect $\partial\Omega$. If Ω is not specified it will be $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathbb{K}$ and if x is the point at infinity we will simply note $\omega(F)$. Finally, for a Borel set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ we note $\dim E$ the Hausdorff dimension of the set E .

2.1 Dimension of measures

In this section we recall some known results on the dimensions of measures (see also [21], [9], [14], [25]). One can prove (see for instance [14], [17], [7]) that if μ is exact, i.e. if $\dim_* \mu = \dim^* \mu$, then

$$\dim \mu = \liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\log \mu(B(x, r))}{\log r}, \quad \mu\text{-almost everywhere.} \quad (1)$$

If the probability measure μ is supported by a 4-corner Cantor set, the balls $B(x, r)$ can be replaced by the squares of the construction of the Cantor set (see [8], [4]):

$$\dim \mu = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \mu(I_n(x))}{\log l(I_n(x))}, \quad \mu\text{-almost everywhere,} \quad (2)$$

where $l(I_n(x))$ is the sidelength of the square $I_n(x)$ and $\underline{A}^n \leq l(I_n) \leq \overline{A}^n$.

Remark 2.1 If μ is an arbitrary (not necessarily monodimensional) probability measure we get

$$\dim_* \mu \leq \liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\log \mu(B(x, r))}{\log r} \leq \dim^* \mu \quad \mu\text{-almost everywhere.} \quad (3)$$

Moreover $\dim^* \mu = \sup_{\mu} \liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\log \mu(B(x, r))}{\log r}$ and $\dim_* \mu = \inf_{\mu} \liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\log \mu(B(x, r))}{\log r}$.

Some results of the following section are stated without demonstration since they are already proved in [3] and in [5].

2.2 Estimating perturbations of the harmonic measure

Suppose that the 4-corner Cantor set \mathbb{K} is associated to the sequence $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and let \mathbb{K}' be another Cantor set associated to the sequence $(a'_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. Let $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the collections of squares associated to \mathbb{K} and $(\mathcal{F}'_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ those associated to \mathbb{K}' .

For $I \in \mathcal{F}_n$ and $I' \in \mathcal{F}'_m$ we will write $I \overset{\text{cod}}{\sim} I'$ if $n = m$ and if I and I' have the same encoding (with respect to the identification to the abstract Cantor set $\{1, 2, 3, 4\}^{\mathbb{N}}$).

Finally, if $I \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is a square of sidelength ℓ and c is a positive number we note $c\dot{I}$ the square of sidelength $c\ell$ having the same barycenter as I . If ω is the harmonic measure of $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathbb{K}$ and ω' the harmonic measure of $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathbb{K}'$ we have established the following theorem.

Theorem 2.2 (cf. [5]) For all $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a $\delta = \delta(\epsilon, \overline{A}, \underline{A}) > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |a_n - a'_n| < \delta \Rightarrow \left| \frac{\omega(I)}{\omega(\widehat{I})} : \frac{\omega'(I')}{\omega'(\widehat{I}')} - 1 \right| < \epsilon, \quad (4)$$

for all $I \in \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{F}_n$ and $I' \in \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{F}'_n$ with $I \overset{\text{cod}}{\sim} I'$.




Figure 2: A different type of translation-invariant Cantor set

We will also need the following estimations of the harmonic measure of cylinders (see also [12] and [20] for a version adapted to self-similar sets). The proof uses the ideas already explored in [5].

Lemma 2.3 *For every $I, I' \in \mathcal{F}_n$, $J \in \mathcal{F}_k$ and every $L \in \mathcal{F}_m$, $n, k, m \in \mathbb{N}$*

$$\left| \frac{\omega(IJL)}{\omega(IJ)} : \frac{\omega(I'JL)}{\omega(I'J)} - 1 \right| < C q^k \quad (5)$$

where the constants $C > 0$ and $q \in (0, 1)$, depend only on $\underline{A}, \overline{A}$.

Let us give the proof of this statement.

Proof of lemma 2.3 To begin with we need the following Harnack principle (see also [4], [1]).

Lemma 2.4 (cf. [12], [20]) *Let Ω be a domain containing ∞ and let $A_1 \subset B_1 \subset A_2 \subset B_2 \subset \dots \subset A_n \subset B_n$ be conformal discs such that the annuli $B_i \setminus A_i$ are contained in Ω , for $1 \leq i \leq n$. If the moduli of the annuli are uniformly bounded away from zero and if $\infty \in \Omega \setminus B_n$ then, for all pairs of positive harmonic functions u, v vanishing on $\partial\Omega \setminus A_1$ and for all $x \in \Omega \setminus B_n$ we have*

$$\left| \frac{u(x)}{v(x)} : \frac{u(\infty)}{v(\infty)} - 1 \right| \leq K q^n \quad (6)$$

where $q < 1$ and K are two constants that depend only on the lower bound of the moduli of the annuli.

We use this result to prove the following:

Lemma 2.5 *There are constants $K > 0$ and $0 < q < 1$ depending only on \underline{A}, \bar{A} such that for all $i, j, k \in \mathbb{N}$ and for all squares $I \in \mathcal{F}_i, J \in \mathcal{F}_j, K \in \mathcal{F}_k$ of the construction of \mathbb{K} , if $Q = c_0 \cdot I$,*

$$\left| \frac{\omega(x, IJK, Q \setminus \mathbb{K})}{\omega(x, IJ, Q \setminus \mathbb{K})} : \frac{\omega(IJK)}{\omega(IJ)} - 1 \right| < Kq^j \text{ for all } x \in \partial \left\{ \frac{1+c_0}{2} \cdot I \right\}. \quad (7)$$

The result applies also to the Cantor set \mathbb{K}' .

Proof By lemma 2.4,

$$\left| \frac{\omega(x, IJK)}{\omega(x, IJ)} : \frac{\omega(IJK)}{\omega(IJ)} - 1 \right| < Kq^j, \text{ for } x \notin \frac{1+c_0}{2} \cdot I \quad (8)$$

Let $A = \frac{\omega(IJK)}{\omega(IJ)}$. We have

$$\omega(x, IJK, Q \setminus \mathbb{K}) = \omega(x, IJK) - \int_{\partial Q} \omega(z, IJK) \omega(x, dz, Q \setminus \mathbb{K}),$$

for $x \in \partial \left\{ \frac{1+c_0}{2} \cdot I \right\}$.

By the equation (8),

$$A\omega(x, IJ) - Kq^j A\omega(x, IJ) \leq \omega(x, IJK) \leq A\omega(x, IJ) + Kq^j A\omega(x, IJ).$$

We get

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(x, IJK, Q \setminus \mathbb{K}) &\leq A\omega(x, IJ) + Kq^j A\omega(x, IJ) - \\ &\quad - \int_{\partial Q} \left(A\omega(z, IJ) - Kq^j A\omega(z, IJ) \right) \omega(x, dz, Q \setminus \mathbb{K}) \\ &= A\omega(x, IJ) - \int_{\partial Q} A\omega(z, IJ) \omega(x, dz, Q \setminus \mathbb{K}) + \\ &\quad + Kq^j \left(A\omega(x, IJ) + \int_{\partial Q} A\omega(z, IJ) \omega(x, dz, Q \setminus \mathbb{K}) \right) \\ &= A\omega(x, IJ, Q \setminus \mathbb{K}) + Kq^j \left(A\omega(x, IJ) + \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{\partial Q} A\omega(z, IJ) \omega(x, dz, Q \setminus \mathbb{K}) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{\omega(x, IJK, Q \setminus \mathbb{K})}{\omega(x, IJ, Q \setminus \mathbb{K})} \leq A + Kq^j A \frac{\omega(x, IJ) + \int_{\partial Q} \omega(z, IJ) \omega(x, dz, Q \setminus \mathbb{K})}{\omega(x, IJ, Q \setminus \mathbb{K})} \quad (10)$$

It suffices now to show that the quantity

$$\frac{\omega(x, IJ) + \int_{\partial Q} \omega(z, IJ) \omega(x, dz, Q \setminus \mathbb{K})}{\omega(x, IJ, Q \setminus \mathbb{K})}$$

is smaller than a given constant. Take $x_0 \in \partial \left\{ \frac{1+c_0}{2} \cdot I \right\}$ such that

$$\omega(x_0, IJ) = \max \left\{ \omega(x, IJ) ; x \notin \left\{ \frac{1+c_0}{2} \cdot I \right\} \right\}.$$

Using the maximum principle we get

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(x_0, IJ, Q \setminus \mathbb{K}) &= \omega(x_0, IJ) - \int_{\partial Q} \omega(z, IJ) \omega(x_0, dz, Q \setminus \mathbb{K}) \\ &\geq \omega(x_0, IJ) - \int_{\partial Q} \omega(x_0, IJ) \omega(x_0, dz, Q \setminus \mathbb{K}) \\ &= \omega(x_0, IJ) (1 - \omega(x_0, \partial Q, Q \setminus \mathbb{K})) \end{aligned}$$

By standard capacity techniques one can verify (see [3]) that $1 - \omega(x_0, \partial Q, Q \setminus \mathbb{K})$ is greater than a constant $c > 0$ depending only on $\underline{A}, \overline{A}$.

By using Harnack's principle we get

$$1 - \omega(x, \partial Q, Q \setminus \mathbb{K}) \geq c, \text{ for all } x \in \partial \left\{ \frac{1+c_0}{2} \cdot I \right\},$$

for a new constant $c > 0$.

Hence, $\frac{\omega(x, IJ) + \int_{\partial Q} \omega(z, IJ) \omega(x, dz, Q \setminus \mathbb{K})}{\omega(x, IJ, Q \setminus \mathbb{K})} \leq \frac{2}{c}$ and therefore, by relation (10),

$$\frac{\omega(x, IJK, Q \setminus \mathbb{K})}{\omega(x, IJ, Q \setminus \mathbb{K})} \leq A \left(1 + \frac{2}{c} K q^j \right) \quad (11)$$

On the other hand $A = \frac{\omega(IJK)}{\omega(IJ)}$; we obtain

$$\frac{\omega(x, IJK, Q \setminus \mathbb{K})}{\omega(x, IJ, Q \setminus \mathbb{K})} : \frac{\omega(IJK)}{\omega(IJ)} - 1 < \frac{2}{c} K q^j, \text{ for all } x \in \partial \left\{ \frac{1+c_0}{2} \cdot I \right\},$$

The left hand inequality and hence the lemma 2.5 is established in the same way . •

It is now evident that

$$\frac{\omega(x, IJK, Q \setminus \mathbb{K})}{\omega(x, IJ, Q \setminus \mathbb{K})} = \frac{\omega(x, I'JK, Q' \setminus \mathbb{K})}{\omega(x, I'J, Q' \setminus \mathbb{K})},$$

for any square $I' \in \mathcal{F}_n$, where $Q' = c_0 \cdot I'$. The proof of lemma 2.3 is complete. •

Corollary 2.6 *There is a constant $\tilde{C} > 1$ such that for any $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$, all $I, I' \in \mathcal{F}_n$ and every $J \in \mathcal{F}_k$ we have*

$$\frac{\omega(IJ)}{\omega(I)} \leq \tilde{C} \frac{\omega(I'J)}{\omega(I')} \quad (12)$$

where the constant $\tilde{C} > 0$ depends only on $\underline{A}, \overline{A}$.

The proof of the corollary is an easy application of lemma 2.3.

3 Proof of the main result.

We will make use of the following known version of the theorem of large numbers (see for instance [15]).

Lemma 3.1 *Let X_n be a sequence of uniformly bounded real random variables on a probability space $(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{B}, P)$ and let $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be an increasing sequence of σ -subalgebra of \mathbb{B} such that X_n is measurable with respect to \mathcal{F}_n for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n (X_k - \mathbb{E}(X_k | \mathcal{F}_{k-1})) = 0 \quad P\text{-almost surely} \quad (13)$$

The following elementary lemma is also useful; the proof is left to the reader.

Lemma 3.2 *Let $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ be real numbers such that $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i = 0$. Then, for any choice of real values h_1, \dots, h_n , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} |\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i h_i| &\leq \max \left\{ \sum_{\{i; \alpha_i > 0\}} \alpha_i, - \sum_{\{i; \alpha_i < 0\}} \alpha_i \right\} \left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} h_i - \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} h_i \right) \\ &= \sum_{\{i; \alpha_i > 0\}} \alpha_i \left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} h_i - \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} h_i \right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof of theorem 1.2 For $p \in \mathbb{N}$ consider the sequence of σ -algebras $(\mathcal{R}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ where \mathcal{R}_n is generated by \mathcal{F}_{np} .

The hypothesis of lemma 3.1 can be easily verified to hold for the sequence of random variables $(X_n^p)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ given by $X_n^p(x) = \frac{1}{p} \left| \log \left(\frac{\omega(I_{np}(x))}{\omega(I_{(n-1)p}(x))} \right) \right|$ and the sequence of σ -algebras $(\mathcal{R}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$.

We get

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \left[X_k^p - \mathbb{E}_\omega(X_k^p | \mathcal{R}_{k-1}) \right] = 0 \quad \omega\text{-almost everywhere.} \quad (14)$$

On the other hand, on $I \in \mathcal{R}_{n-1}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathbb{E}_\omega(X_n^p | \mathcal{R}_{n-1}) = \frac{1}{p} \sum_{J \in \mathcal{F}_p} \frac{\omega(IJ)}{\omega(I)} \left| \log \left(\frac{\omega(IJ)}{\omega(I)} \right) \right|.$$

We show that this quantity is almost constant on $x \in \mathbb{K}$ if p is taken sufficiently large.

Take $\epsilon > 0$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $I \in \mathcal{F}_n$. For $j, k \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\sum_{J \in \mathcal{F}_{j+k}} \frac{\omega(IJ)}{\omega(I)} \log \left(\frac{\omega(IJ)}{\omega(I)} \right) = \sum_{J \in \mathcal{F}_j} \sum_{K \in \mathcal{F}_k} \frac{\omega(IJK)}{\omega(I)} \log \left(\frac{\omega(IJK)}{\omega(I)} \right) =$$

$$= \sum_{J \in \mathcal{F}_j} \sum_{K \in \mathcal{F}_k} \frac{\omega(IJK)}{\omega(IJ)} \log \left(\frac{\omega(IJK)}{\omega(IJ)} \right) \frac{\omega(IJ)}{\omega(I)} + \sum_{J \in \mathcal{F}_j} \frac{\omega(IJ)}{\omega(I)} \log \left(\frac{\omega(IJ)}{\omega(I)} \right) \quad (15)$$

Put

$$h_k(IJ) = -\frac{1}{k} \sum_{K \in \mathcal{F}_k} \frac{\omega(IJK)}{\omega(IJ)} \log \left(\frac{\omega(IJK)}{\omega(IJ)} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta_j^k(I) = \max_{J \in \mathcal{F}_j} h_k(IJ) - \min_{J \in \mathcal{F}_j} h_k(IJ).$$

Lemma 3.3 *For all $\epsilon > 0$, if $j, k \in \mathbb{N}$ are big enough (depending only on \underline{A} and \overline{A}) then for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $I \in \mathcal{F}_n$ we have $\Delta_j^k(I) < \epsilon$.*

We first proceed with the proof of this sub-lemma.

Proof of lemma 3.3 We can rewrite formula (15):

$$(j+k)h_{j+k}(I) = \sum_{J \in \mathcal{F}_j} k \frac{\omega(IJ)}{\omega(I)} h_k(IJ) + j h_j(I) \quad (16)$$

By applying formula (16) to a cylinder $I = I_1 I_2$ with $I_1 \in \mathcal{F}_{i_1}$ and $I_2 \in \mathcal{F}_{i_2}$ we have

$$(j+k)h_{j+k}(I_1 I_2) = \sum_{J \in \mathcal{F}_j} k \frac{\omega(I_1 I_2 J)}{\omega(I_1 I_2)} h_k(I_1 I_2 J) + j h_j(I_1 I_2)$$

Now take j big enough to have $Kq^j < \epsilon$ and afterwards choose k in order to have that $\frac{j}{k+j} < \epsilon$. Remark that, by lemma 2.3, $h_k(I_1 I_2' J) - h_k(I_1 I_2 J) < 2\epsilon$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{i_2}^{k+j}(I_1) &= \max_{I_2 \in \mathcal{F}_{i_2}} h_{k+j}(I_1 I_2) - \min_{I_2 \in \mathcal{F}_{i_2}} h_{k+j}(I_1 I_2) \\ &\leq 5\epsilon + \max_{I_2, I_2' \in \mathcal{F}_{i_2}} \left[\sum_{J \in \mathcal{F}_j} \frac{\omega(I_1 I_2 J)}{\omega(I_1 I_2)} h_k(I_1 I_2 J) - \sum_{J \in \mathcal{F}_j} \frac{\omega(I_1 I_2' J)}{\omega(I_1 I_2')} h_k(I_1 I_2' J) \right] \\ &\leq 10\epsilon + \max_{I_2, I_2' \in \mathcal{F}_{i_2}} \sum_{J \in \mathcal{F}_j} \left(\frac{\omega(I_1 I_2 J)}{\omega(I_1 I_2)} - \frac{\omega(I_1 I_2' J)}{\omega(I_1 I_2')} \right) h_k(I_1 I_2 J). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

We can now apply lemma 3.2 to get

$$\Delta_{i_2}^{k+j}(I_1) \leq 10\epsilon + \max_{I_2, I_2' \in \mathcal{F}_{i_2}} \sum_{J \in \mathcal{S}_{i_1}^j(I_2, I_2')} \left(\frac{\omega(I_1 I_2 J)}{\omega(I_1 I_2)} - \frac{\omega(I_1 I_2' J)}{\omega(I_1 I_2')} \right) \Delta_j^k(I_1 I_2) \quad (18)$$

where $\mathcal{S}_{i_1}^j(I_2, I_2')$ is the set of cylinders $J \in \mathcal{F}_j$ such that $\frac{\omega(I_1 I_2 J)}{\omega(I_1 I_2)} > \frac{\omega(I_1 I_2' J)}{\omega(I_1 I_2')}$.

The following lemma is easy to prove:

Lemma 3.4 *There is a constant $0 < \zeta < 1$ such that for all $i_1, i_2, j \in \mathbb{N}$, all $I_1 \in \mathcal{F}_{i_1}$ and all $I_2, I_2' \in \mathcal{F}_{i_2}$ we have*

$$\sum_{J \in \mathcal{S}_{I_1}^j(I_2, I_2')} \left(\frac{\omega(I_1 I_2 J)}{\omega(I_1 I_2)} - \frac{\omega(I_1 I_2' J)}{\omega(I_1 I_2')} \right) < \zeta$$

where $\mathcal{S}_{I_1}^j(I_2, I_2')$ is the set of cylinders $J \in \mathcal{F}_j$ such that $\frac{\omega(I_1 I_2 J)}{\omega(I_1 I_2)} > \frac{\omega(I_1 I_2' J)}{\omega(I_1 I_2')}$.

The proof follows from the translation invariance of ω (corollary 2.6).

Proof of lemma 3.4 Remark that by lemma 2.3, if $C = \frac{K}{1-q}$, we have $\frac{\omega(IJ)}{\omega(I'J)} \leq C$ for all $I, I' \in \mathcal{F}_n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and all $J \in \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{F}_n$. Hence,

$$\sum_{J \in \mathcal{S}_{I_1}^j(I_2, I_2')} \left(\frac{\omega(I_1 I_2 J)}{\omega(I_1 I_2)} - \frac{\omega(I_1 I_2' J)}{\omega(I_1 I_2')} \right) \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{C}\right) \sum_{J \in \mathcal{S}_{I_1}^j(I_2, I_2')} \frac{\omega(I_1 I_2 J)}{\omega(I_1 I_2)} \leq 1 - \frac{1}{C},$$

which is the lemma conclusion for $\zeta = 1 - \frac{1}{C}$. •

By applying lemma 3.4 to relation (18) we conclude that there is $0 < \zeta < 1$ depending only on \underline{A}, \bar{A} such that

$$\Delta_{i_2}^{k+j}(I_1) \leq 10\epsilon + \zeta \Delta_j^k(I_1 I_2) \quad (19)$$

By repeating the same reasoning if we write $k = k_1 + k_2$ we can establish the inequalities

$$\Delta_j^{k_1+k_2}(I_1 I_2) < 10\epsilon + \zeta \Delta_{k_1}^{k_2}(I_1 I_2 J). \quad (20)$$

There are two cases:

1. If $\Delta_{k_1}^{k_2}(I_1 I_2 J) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{10}$ or $\Delta_j^k(I_1 I_2) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{10}$ then, trivially, $\Delta_{i_2}^{k+j} < \frac{\epsilon}{1-\zeta}$.
2. If $\Delta_{k_1}^{k_2}(I_1 I_2 J) \geq \frac{\epsilon}{10}$ and $\Delta_j^k(I_1 I_2) \geq \frac{\epsilon}{10}$ then

$$\Delta_{i_2}^{k+j}(I_1) \leq \left(\frac{1+\zeta}{2}\right)^2 \Delta_{k_1}^{k_2}(I_1 I_2 J).$$

The sequence $\Delta_l^m(I)$ being uniformly bounded we get, by repeating the procedure, that if k is big enough, $\Delta_{i_2}^{k+j} < \frac{\epsilon}{1-\zeta}$.

The proof is complete. •

We now apply lemma 3.1 to an adapted filtration \mathcal{R}_n : By the previous lemma we can choose j, k such that $\Delta_j^k(I) < \epsilon$. By formula (16), for this choice of j and k and for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there are constants c_n such that

$$\left| \frac{1}{k+j} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \sum_{\ell=1}^{k+j} X_{n+\ell}^1 \middle| \mathcal{F}_n \right\} - c_n \right| < \epsilon.$$

By lemma 3.1 and the relation (14) following it we then deduce (for $p = k + j$)

$$\left| \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n(k+j)} \sum_{\ell=1}^{n(k+j)} X_{\ell}^1 - \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^n c_{\ell} \right| < \epsilon, \quad \omega - \text{a.e. on } \mathbb{K}$$

This implies that

$$\left| \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{\log \omega(I_{n(k+j)}(x))}{\log \left(\prod_{i=1}^{n(k+j)} a_i \right)} \right| - \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{k+j}{\log \left(\prod_{i=1}^{n(k+j)} a_i \right)} \sum_{\ell=1}^n c_{\ell} \right| \right| < \epsilon, \quad \omega\text{-a.e. on } \mathbb{K}.$$

On the other hand, once we have fixed k, j we can use lemma 2.2 to choose δ in a way that, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$|c_n - c'_n| < \epsilon, \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{n} \left| \log \left(\prod_{i=1}^n a_i \right) - \log \left(\prod_{i=1}^n a'_i \right) \right| < \epsilon,$$

where c'_n is the same sequence associated to the harmonic measure ω' . We can finally use relation (2) to conclude that $|\dim \omega - \dim \omega'| < 4\epsilon$. •

4 Consequences and remarks

It is natural to ask whether the relation (4) suffices to conclude that the dimensions of two measures ω and ω' (not necessarily harmonic) are close. This is not the case. There are counterexamples (see [4]) even when the measures are doubling on $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and exact (cf [6]).

Even if the equality between the Hausdorff dimension and the entropy of the harmonic measure of self-similar Cantor sets plays a crucial role in the proof of theorem 1.2, we would like to point out that the measures constructed μ and ν in the example of [6] satisfy the relation

$$\left| \frac{\mu(I)}{\mu(\widehat{I})} : \frac{\mu(I)}{\mu(\widehat{I})} - 1 \right| < \delta,$$

with δ as small as we want, as well as the equalities $h_*(\mu) = \dim \mu$ and $h_*(\nu) = \dim \nu$. Nevertheless $|\dim \mu - \dim \nu| \geq \frac{1}{2}$.

References

- [1] A. Ancona. Principe de Harnack à la frontière et théorème de Fatou pour un opérateur elliptique dans un domaine Lipschitzien. *Annales de l'Institut Fourier, Grenoble*, **28** (4): 169–213, 1978.
- [2] Z. Balogh, I. Popovici, and A. Volberg. Conformally maximal polynomial-like dynamics and invariant harmonic measure. *Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems*, **17** (1): 1–27, 1997.
- [3] A. Batakis. Harmonic measure of some Cantor type sets. *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn.*, **21** : 255–270, 1996.
- [4] A. Batakis. *Théorie du potentiel : 1. Sur les domaines Poissoniens 2. Sur la mesure harmonique des ensembles de Cantor*. PhD thesis, Université de Paris-Sud, 1997.
- [5] A. Batakis. A continuity property of the dimension of harmonic measure of Cantor sets under perturbations. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.*, **36** (1): 87–107, 2000.
- [6] A. Batakis. On entropy and Hausdorff dimension of measures defined through a Markov process. Preprint, 2002.
- [7] A. Batakis and Y. Heurteaux. On relations between entropy and Hausdorff dimension of measures. *To appear in the Asian Journal of Mathematics*, 2002.
- [8] A. Beardon. On the Hausdorff dimension of general Cantor sets. *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, **61** : 679–694, 1965.
- [9] P. Billingsley. *Ergodic Theory and Information*. John Wiley & Sons, 1965.
- [10] I. Binder, N. Makarov, and S. Smirnov. Harmonic measure and polynomial Julia sets. to appear in *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 2002.
- [11] M. Brelot. *Axiomatique des fonctions harmoniques*. Les presses de l'Université de Montréal, 1969.
- [12] L. Carleson. On the support of harmonic measure for sets of Cantor type. *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn.*, **10** : 113–123, 1985.
- [13] J. L. Doob. *Classical Potential Theory and Its Probabilistic Counterpart*. Springer-Verlag New York, 1984.
- [14] A.H. Fan. Sur la dimension des mesures. *Studia Math.*, **111** : 1–17, 1994.
- [15] P. Hall and C. C. Heyde. *Martingale theory and its applications*. Probability and Mathematical Statistics. Academic Press (New York), 1980.
- [16] L. L. Helms. *Introduction to Potential Theory*. John Wiley & Sons, 1969.
- [17] Y. Heurteaux. Estimations de la dimension inférieure et de la dimension supérieure des mesures. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.*, **34** : 309–338, 1998.

- [18] M. Lyubich and A. Volberg. A comparison of harmonic and balanced measures on Cantor repellers. *Journal of Fourier Analysis and Applications (Special Issue J.-P. Kahane)*, pages 379–399, 1995.
- [19] N. Makarov. Fine structure of harmonic measure. *Saint Petersburg Mathematical Journal*, 10: 217–268, 1999.
- [20] N. Makarov and A. Volberg. On the harmonic measure of discontinuous fractals. Preprint LOMI E-6-86, Leningrad, 1986.
- [21] P. Mattila. *Geometric measure theory*. Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- [22] M. Urbanski and A. Zdunik. Hausdorff dimension of harmonic measure for self conformal maps. preprint IHES, Bures sur Yvette, 2000.
- [23] A. Volberg. On harmonic measure of self-similar sets in the plane. In *Harmonic Analysis and Discrete Potential theory*. Plenum Press, 1992.
- [24] A. Volberg. On the dimension of harmonic measure of Cantor-type repellers. *Michigan Mathematical Journal*, 40 : 239–258, 1993.
- [25] L. Young. Dimension, entropy and Lyapounov exponents. *Ergod. Th. & Dynam. Sys.*, 2 : 109–124, 1982.