Abstract. We study subsets of $\mathbb{R}^d$ which are thin for doubling measures or isotropic doubling measures. We show that any subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$ with Hausdorff dimension less than or equal to $d - 1$ is thin for isotropic doubling measures. We also prove that a self-affine set that satisfies OSCH (open set condition with holes) is thin for isotropic doubling measures. For doubling measures, we prove that Barański carpets are thin for doubling measures.
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1. Introduction

A Borel regular measure $\mu$ on metric space $X$ is called doubling if there is a constant $C \geq 1$ such that

$$0 < \mu(B(x, 2r)) \leq C \mu(B(x, r)) < \infty,$$

for any $x \in X$ and $0 < r < \infty$. We call $C$ the doubling constant of $\mu$. Denoted by $D(X)$ all the doubling measures on $X$. A closely related concept with doubling measures is a doubling metric space. A metric space is called doubling metric space if there exist positive integer $N$ such that any ball of radius $r$ can be covered by a collection of $N$ balls of radius $r/2$. It’s easy to see that $D(X) \neq \emptyset$ implies $X$ is doubling. On the other hand, if the space $X$ is doubling and complete, then $D(X) \neq \emptyset$, for more details see [10] [13] [26] [30]. A subset $E$ of $X$ is called thin for doubling measures if $\mu(E) = 0$ for every $\mu \in D(X)$. Being thin for isotropic doubling measures is defined analogously. In this paper we are going to investigate some subsets of $\mathbb{R}^d$ are thin for doubling measures or isotropic doubling measures. First we recall a useful estimate for doubling measures, see [8] Chapter 13 [29].

Lemma 1.1. Let $\mu \in D(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $Q_1, Q_2$ be two cubes with $Q_1 \subset Q_2$. Then

$$C^{-1} \left( \frac{|Q_1|}{|Q_2|} \right)^\beta \leq \frac{\mu(Q_1)}{\mu(Q_2)} \leq C \left( \frac{|Q_1|}{|Q_2|} \right)^\alpha,$$

(1.1)
where \(|E|\) means the diameter of \(E\) and \(C, \alpha, \beta\) are positive constants which only depend on \(\mu\).

Lemma 1.1 implies that every subset \(E\) of \(\mathbb{R}^d\) with Hausdorff dimension zero is thin for doubling measures (the same argument as mass distribution principle, see [5, Chapter 4]). Various examples of thin sets for doubling measures relate to the concept of porosity, see [9, 21, 23, 24, 29]. Doubling measures give zero weight to any smooth hyper-surface, see [25, p.40]. But for every \(d \geq 2\), there exist rectifiable curve in \(\mathbb{R}^d\) which is not thin, see [7]. In [27] the authors asked that: Is the graph of continuous function thin for doubling measures? This question was negatived answered in [22]. We will show that rectifiable curves and graphs of continuous function are thin for isotropic doubling measures. The following definition is from [12].

**Definition 1.2.** A Borel measure \(\mu\) on \(\mathbb{R}^d\) is isotropic doubling if there is a constant \(A \geq 1\) such that

\[
A^{-1} \leq \frac{\mu(R_1)}{\mu(R_2)} \leq A,
\]

whenever \(R_1\) and \(R_2\) are congruent rectangular boxes with nonempty intersection.

We denote by \(\mathcal{ID}(\mathbb{R}^d)\) all isotropic doubling measures on \(\mathbb{R}^d\). Isotropic doubling measures arise from the study of \(\delta\)-monotone mappings. We refer to [12] for more details about isotropic doubling measures and \(\delta\)-monotone mappings. In [12] they proved that isotropic doubling measures are absolutely continuous to \(\mathcal{H}^{d-1}\) (Hausdorff measure) and for every \(d \geq 2\), there exists an isotropic doubling measure on \(\mathbb{R}^d\) which is singular with respect to the Lebesgue measure. The following question of [12] arises naturally. Is it true that every isotropic doubling measure on \(\mathbb{R}^d, d \geq 2\), is absolutely continuous with respect to the \(s\)-dimensional Hausdorff measure for all \(s < d\)? This question was one of the motivations of this work. We don’t know the answer. However by applying a similar estimate as Lemma 1.1 to isotropic doubling measures, we get the following result.

**Proposition 1.3.** Let \(E \subset \mathbb{R}^d\) with \(\dim_H E \leq d - 1\), then \(E\) is thin for isotropic doubling measures on \(\mathbb{R}^d\).

Motivated by the above question of [12], we consider the self-affine sets. By adding the condition OSCH (see Definition 3.1) on self-affine sets, we have the following result.

**Theorem 1.4.** A self-affine set that satisfies OSCH is thin for isotropic doubling measures.
For the doubling measures, things become more complicated. So we consider a special class of self-affine carpets on the plane. Barański [1] generalized the construction of Bedford-McMullen carpets to build a class of self-affine carpets. We call them Barański carpets, see Definition 3.6 or [1]. For Bedford-McMullen carpets, see [2, 5, 20]. For Barański carpets, we have the following result.

Theorem 1.5. Barański carpets are thin for doubling measures.
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2. ISOTROPIC DOUBLING MEASURES

We start from a useful lemma of [12].

Lemma 2.1. Let $\mu$ be a isotropic doubling measure on $\mathbb{R}^d, d \geq 2$ with doubling constant $A$. Then: (i) For any congruent rectangular boxes $R_1, R_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^d$.

$$A^{-m} \leq \frac{\mu(R_1)}{\mu(R_2)} \leq A^m,$$

(2.1)

where $m = \left\lfloor \frac{\text{dist}(R_2, R_2)}{\text{diam} R_1} \right\rfloor + 1$.

(ii) Let $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a cube, and let $F$ be a face of $Q$. The pushforward $\pi_\sharp \mu_Q$ of $\mu_Q$ under the orthogonal projection $\pi : Q \to F$ is comparable to $C_F^{d-1}$ with constants that depend only on $d$ and $A$.

The following is an analogue of Lemma 1.1 for isotropic doubling measures.

Lemma 2.2. Let $\mu \in \mathcal{ID}([0, 1]^d), d \geq 2$ with the doubling constant $A$ and $I$ be a cube in $[0, 1]^{d-1}$, and $J$ be interval in $[0, 1]$. Then

$$C^{-1}|I|^{d-1}|J|^\beta \leq \mu(I \times J) \leq C|I|^{d-1}|J|^\alpha,$$

(2.2)

where $\alpha, \beta$ and $C$ are positive constants depending only on $d$ and $A$.

Proof. Let $\nu(E) := \mu(I \times E)$ for $E \subset [0, 1]$. Then $\nu$ is a doubling measure on $[0, 1]$ with the doubling constant $A$. Applying Lemma 1.1 to $\nu$, we have

$$C_1^{-1}|J|^\beta \leq \frac{\nu(J)}{\nu([0, 1])} \leq C_1|J|^\alpha,$$

(2.3)

where $C_1, \alpha,$ and $\beta$ are positive constants depending only on $A$. Applying the second part of Lemma 2.1 we see that $\nu([0, 1])$ is comparable to $|I|^{d-1}$ with the constant depending on $d$ and $A$ only. Thus we have finished the proof. □
Applying Lemma 2.2 and the same argument as mass distribution principle (see [5, Chapter 4]), we arrive at the following corollary immediately.

**Corollary 2.3.** Let \( \mu \in \mathcal{ID}([0,1]^d) \), then there exist a positive constant \( \alpha \) which only depends on \( \mu \), such that \( \mu \) is absolutely continuous to \( H^{d-1+\alpha} \).

**Proof of Theorem 1.3.** Let \( \mu \in \mathcal{ID}([0,1]^d) \). If \( d = 1 \), then \( \mu \) is doubling measure on \([0,1]\) and \( E \) has Hausdorff dimension zero. By Lemma 1.1, we know that any set with Hausdorff dimension zero is thin for doubling measures. Thus we arrive at the result for \( d = 1 \).

For the case \( d \geq 2 \), applying the Corollary 2.3, there is positive \( \alpha \) such that \( \mu \) is absolutely continuous to \( H^{d-1+\alpha} \). Since \( \text{dim} H^E \leq d - 1 \), so \( H^{d-1+\alpha}(E) = 0 \) and thus \( \mu(E) = 0 \). We complete the proof by the arbitrary choice of \( \mu \in \mathcal{ID}([0,1]^d) \). \( \square \)

Since any \( k \)-rectifiable sets of \( \mathbb{R}^d \) ( [19, Chapter 15]) have Hausdorff dimension \( k \), for \( k < d \) they are thin for isotropic doubling measures on \( \mathbb{R}^d \). Let \( f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R} \) be a function. Recall that the graph of function \( f \) is \( G(f) := \{ (x,f(x)) : x \in [0,1] \} \). Now we are going to apply Lemma 2.2 to prove that the graphs of continuous functions are thin for isotropic doubling measures.

**Proposition 2.4.** Let \( f : [0,1]^d \to [0,1] \) be a continuous function. Then \( \mu(G(f)) = 0 \) for all \( \mu \in \mathcal{ID}([0,1]^{d+1}) \).

**Proof.** Let \( \mu \in \mathcal{ID}([0,1]^{d+1}) \), then there is positive \( C \) and \( \alpha \) such that the estimate (2.2) holds. Since \( f \) is continuous on \([0,1]^d\), it’s well known that \( f \) is uniformly continuous on \([0,1]^d\). Thus for any \( \epsilon > 0 \), there is \( \delta \) such that \( |f(x) - f(y)| \leq \delta \) for all \( x,y \in [0,1]^d \) with \( |x - y| \leq \delta \).

Choose \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), such that \( 2^{-n}\sqrt{d} \leq \delta \). Let \( \mathcal{D}_n \) denote all the dyadic cubes of \([0,1]^d\) with side-length \( 2^{-n} \). For each cube \( I \) of \( \mathcal{D}_n \), there is an interval \( I' \subset [0,1] \) with \( |I'| \leq \epsilon \) such that \( \{ (x,f(x)) : x \in I \} \subset I \times I' \). Whence

\[
G(f) \subset \bigcup_{I \in \mathcal{D}_n} I \times I'.
\]

By applying Lemma 2.2 we have

\[
\mu(G(f)) \leq \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_n} \mu(I \times I') \leq \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_n} C \epsilon^\alpha |I|^d \leq C \epsilon^\alpha (\sqrt{d})^d \quad (2.4)
\]

Let \( \epsilon \to 0 \), then we have \( \mu(G(f)) = 0 \). We finish the proof by the arbitrary choice of \( \mu \). \( \square \)
By using the same idea (applying Lusin theorem) as in [22], the result of Proposition 2.4 is also holds if we change continuous function to measurable function.

**Corollary 2.5.** Let \( f : [0, 1]^d \to [0, 1] \) be a measurable function with respect to Lebesgue measure. Then \( G(f) \) is thin for doubling measures on \([0, 1]^{d+1}\).

**Proof.** Applying Lusin theorem (and it’s normal corollary), for any \( \epsilon > 0 \), there is a continuous function \( g : [0, 1]^d \to [0, 1] \) such that
\[
L^d(\{x : f(x) \neq g(x)\}) < \epsilon. \tag{2.5}
\]
Let \( \mu \in ID([0, 1]^d) \). Lemma 2.1(ii) says that there is a constant \( C \) which depends on \( d \) and \( \mu \) only, such that
\[
\mu(A \times [0, 1]) \leq CL^d(A) \text{ for any } A \subset [0, 1]^d. \tag{2.6}
\]
Let \( D = \{x : f(x) \neq g(x)\}. \) Since
\[
G(f) = G(g) \cup (G(f) \setminus G(g)) \subset G(g) \cup (D \times [0, 1]),
\]
the estimate (2.6) and Proposition 2.4, we have \( \mu(G(f)) \leq C\epsilon. \) By the arbitrary choice of \( \epsilon \), we have \( \mu(G(f)) = 0. \) Thus \( G(f) \) is thin for isotropic doubling measures on \([0, 1]^{d+1}\). \( \square \)

## 3. Doubling measures and self-affine sets

Let \( \Lambda \) be the attractor of the self-affine IFS
\[
\mathcal{F} := \{f_i(x) = T_i x + t_i\}_{i=1}^m, x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{3.1}
\]
We always assume that the maps \( f_i \) are contractive and \( T_i \) are non-singular linear maps for each \( 1 \leq i \leq m. \) For more details on self-affine sets, see [5, Chapter 9]. The following condition is often used to avoid overlap of IFS. Recall that the IFS \( \mathcal{F} \) is said to satisfy the open set condition (OSC) if there exists a non-empty open set \( V \subset \mathbb{R}^d \) such that
\[
\begin{align*}
&\bullet f_i(V) \subset V \text{ holds for all } 1 \leq i \leq m; \\
&\bullet f_i(V) \cap f_j(V) = \emptyset \text{ for all } i \neq j.
\end{align*}
\]
We recall some standard notation for IFS. Let \( S = \{1, \cdots, m\}. \) Denote \( S^* := \cup_{k=1}^\infty S^k \) all the finite words and \( S^\infty \) all the infinite words. Let \( \sigma = (i_1, \cdots, i_k) \in S^k. \) Define \( f_\sigma := f_{i_1} \circ \cdots \circ f_{i_k}. \)

**Definition 3.1.** We say that the IFS \( \mathcal{F} \) satisfies the OSCH (open set condition with hole) if \( \mathcal{F} \) satisfies the OSC and for the open set \( V, \)
\[
V \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^m f_i(V) \text{ has non empty interior.}
\]
Definition 3.2. A map $f$ is called non-singular affine map on $\mathbb{R}^d$, if there is a non-singular linear map $T$ and a vector $t \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $f(x) = T(x) + t, x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. A map $f$ is called diagonal affine map on $\mathbb{R}^d$, if there is a diagonal matrix $D = D(\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_d)$ and a vector $t \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $f(x) = D(x) + t, x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Note that the diagonal maps and non-singular linear maps coincide when $d = 1$. We call a cube $Q$ stable if $Q \subset [0,1]^d$ and there is $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\rho > 0$ such that $Q = x + \rho [0,1]^d$.

Lemma 3.3. Let $Q \subset [0,1]^d$ be stable cube and $\mu \in \mathcal{TD}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then there exist a positive constant $C$ (depending on $\mu$ and side-length of $Q$) such that for any diagonal affine map $f$, we have
\[
\mu(f(Q)) \geq C \mu([0,1]^d)). \tag{3.2}
\]

Proof. If $d = 1$, then we arrive at the estimate by applying the Lemma [1,1]. Now we consider the case $d \geq 2$. We assume that $Q = I_1 \times \cdots \times I_d$ where $I_i \subset [0,1]$. Denote by $a$ the side-length of $Q$ and $V_Q = I_1 \times [0,1]^{d-1}$. Let $\{Q_i\}_{i=1}^N$ be a sequence of closed cubes with the same edge length $a$ and disjoint interior. Furthermore we ask that $\{Q_i\}_{i=1}^N$ satisfies $V_Q \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^N Q_i \subset [-2,2]^d$ and for any $Q_i$ and $Q_j$, $i \neq j$, there exist $i_1, i_2, \cdots, i_n$ such that $Q_i = Q_{i_1}, Q_j = Q_{i_n}$ and $Q_{i_k} \cap Q_{i_{k+1}} \neq \emptyset$ for $1 \leq k \leq n - 1$. By a simple volume argument, $N \leq \left(\frac{4}{a}\right)^d$. Thus
\[
\mu(Q) \geq A^{-N} \mu(Q_i) \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq N. \tag{3.3}
\]

Summing both sides over index $i$, we have
\[
\mu(Q) \geq \frac{1}{N A^{N}} \mu(V_Q). \tag{3.4}
\]

Let $C_1 = \left(\frac{4}{a}\right)^d A^{-\left(\frac{d}{2}\right)d}$, then $\mu(Q) \geq C_1 \mu(V_Q)$.

Since $f$ is a diagonal map, we have that $f(Q_i)$ is a rectangle for $1 \leq i \leq N$. Applying the same argument as above, we have
\[
\mu(f(Q)) \geq A^{-N} \mu(f(Q_i)) \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq N, \tag{3.5}
\]
and $\mu(f(Q)) \geq C_1 \mu(f(V_Q))$.

Applying the same argument to $V_Q$ and $[0,1]^d$ (in place of $Q, V_Q$), we have $\mu(f(V_Q)) \geq C_2 \mu(f([0,1]^d))$ where $C_2$ is a positive constant that depends on $Q$ and the doubling constant $A$ only. Letting $C = C_1 C_2$ we complete the proof. \hfill \Box

Now we are going to show that the above result also holds for any non-singular linear map. We will use the polar decomposition of a matrix. The polar decomposition says that for any matrix $T$, there exists a symmetric matrix $S$ and orthogonal matrix $O$ such that $T = OS$. Furthermore if $T$ is non-singular, then $S$ is positive definite. For more details see [4, Chapter 3].
Proposition 3.4. Let $Q \subset Q'$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{ID}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then for any non-singular affine map $f$, we have

$$\mu(f(Q)) \geq C \mu(f(Q')),$$

where $C$ is a positive constant doesn’t depend on $f$.

Proof. If $d = 1$, then the non-singular map $f$ is the same as diagonal map. Thus we arrive at the estimate by applying Lemma 1.1 again. Now we consider $d \geq 2$. For a non-singular map $f$, there is a non-singular matrix $T$ and a vector $t \in \mathbb{R}^d$, such that $f(x) = Tx + t$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. For the convenience we use the same notations as above writing $T = OS$.

For positive definite matrix $S$, it’s well known that there exist a standard orthogonal basis $\{\xi_1, \cdots, \xi_d\}$ such that $S\xi_i = \lambda_i \xi_i$, and $\lambda_i > 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d$. Let $I(\xi_i) := \{t\xi_i : t \in [-1/2, 1/2]\}, 1 \leq i \leq d$ and $Q_S = I(\xi_1) \times \cdots \times I(\xi_d)$ be the unite cube. Let $\tilde{Q}(x, \rho) := x + \rho Q_S$. Denote by $a$ the side-length of $Q$ and $x_0$ the center of $Q$. By a simple geometric argument, we have

$$\tilde{Q}(x_0, \frac{a}{\sqrt{d}}) \subset B(x_0, \frac{a}{2}) \subset Q.$$

Denote by $a'$ the side-length of $Q'$ and $x_0'$ the center of $Q'$. Again by a simple geometric argument we have

$$Q' \subset B(x_0', \frac{a'\sqrt{d}}{2}) \subset \tilde{Q}'(x_0', a'\sqrt{d}).$$
Applying the same argument as in Lemma 3.3 to $\tilde{Q} \subset \tilde{Q}'$, there is a positive constant $C$ such that
\[ \mu(S\tilde{Q}) \geq C\mu(S\tilde{Q}'). \] (3.7)
Note that the estimate (3.7) still holds with the same constant $C$ after rotations and translations. Thus
\[ \mu(f(\tilde{Q})) \geq C\mu(f(\tilde{Q}')). \] (3.8)
This completes the proof since $f(\tilde{Q}) \subset f(Q)$ and $f(Q') \subset f(\tilde{Q}')$. \qed

**Proof of Theorem 1.4.** Let $\Lambda$ be the attractor of the self-affine IFS
\[ \{f_i(x) = T_i x + t_i\}_{i=1}^m, x \in \mathbb{R}^d \] which satisfies the OSCH. Since the IFS satisfies OSCH, there is an open set $V$ and a cube $Q$ with non empty interior such that $Q \subset V \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^m f_i(V)$. It's well known that (see [5, Chapter 9]) there is compact cube $Q'$ such that $f_i(Q') \subset Q', 1 \leq i \leq m, V \subset Q'$ and
\[ \Lambda = \bigcap_{k=1}^\infty \bigcup_{\sigma \in S^k} f_\sigma(Q'). \]
Since our IFS satisfies OSCH and by the position of $Q$, we have $f_\sigma(Q) \cap f_\tau(Q) = \emptyset$ for any $\sigma \neq \tau$ where $\sigma, \tau \in S^*$. For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, denote $G_k = \bigcup_{\sigma \in S^k} f_\sigma(Q)$. Let $\mu \in ID(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Note that $Q \subset Q'$ and $f_\sigma$ is non-singular affine map for any $\sigma \in S^*$. Thus by Proposition 3.4, there exists a positive constant $C$ such that
\[ \mu(f_\sigma(Q)) \geq C \mu(f_\sigma(Q')), \text{ for any } \sigma \in S^*. \] (3.9)
Since $f_\sigma(Q)$ are pair disjoint for $\sigma \in S^*$, we have
\[ \mu(G_k) = \sum_{\sigma \in S^k} \mu(f_\sigma(Q)). \]
Summing two sides of equation (3.9) over $\sigma \in S^k$, we get
\[ \mu(G_k) \geq C \sum_{\sigma \in S^k} \mu(f_\sigma(Q')) \geq C\mu(\Lambda), \] (3.10)
where the last inequality holds since $\Lambda \subset \bigcup_{\sigma \in S^k} f_\sigma(Q')$.
Since $\bigcup_{k=1}^\infty G_k \subset Q'$, and $G_i \cap G_j = \emptyset$ for $i \neq j$, together with inequality (3.10), we have
\[ \infty > \sum_{k=1}^\infty \mu(G_k) \geq C \sum_{k=1}^\infty \mu(\Lambda). \] (3.11)
Thus we have $\mu(\Lambda) = 0$. \qed
We don’t know whether Theorem 1.4 holds for doubling measures.

**Question 3.5.** Is the attractor of IFS satisfies OSCH thin for doubling measures?

Now we are going to prove Theorem 1.5. We first recall the construction of Barański carpets, see [1].

**Definition 3.6.** Let \( \{a_i\}_{i=1}^p \) and \( \{b_j\}_{j=1}^q \) be two sequences of positive numbers such that \( \sum_{i=1}^p a_i = 1 \) and \( \sum_{j=1}^q b_j = 1 \) where \( p, q \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( p, q \geq 2 \). We have a partition of the unit square by \( q \) horizontal lines and \( p \) vertical lines. We exclude a sub-collection of these rectangles to form \( E_1 \) (we assume that at least one rectangle was excluded to avoid the trivial case). Iterate this construction for each rectangle of \( E_1 \) as above, in other words we replace each rectangle of \( E_1 \) by an affine copy of \( E_1 \). In the end we have a limit set \( E \). For an example see Figure 2. Recall that the limit set \( E \) is called BM (Bedford-McMullen) carpet if \( a_i = 1/p \) for all \( 1 \leq i \leq p \) and \( b_j = 1/q \) for all \( 1 \leq j \leq q \), see [5, chapter 9].

Recall that a subset \( E \subset \mathbb{R}^d \) is called porous if there exists \( \alpha \in (0, 1) \), such that for any ball \( B(x, r) \), there is a ball \( B(y, \alpha r) \subset B(x, r) \) satisfies \( B(y, \alpha r) \cap E = \emptyset \). The concept of porosity is closely related to the Assouad dimension. The connection is the following: A subset \( E \) of \( \mathbb{R}^d \) is porous if and only if \( \dim_A E < d \). For more details, we refer to [17, Theorem 5.2]. It’s well know that if a set \( E \subset \mathbb{R}^d \) is porous, then \( E \) is thin for doubling measures on \( \mathbb{R}^d \) (by applying the density argument for doubling measure on the porosity set, the same as [25, p.40]). Since the Assouad dimension of Barański carpets can be less than or equal to 2, see [6, 18], thus we can’t obtain Theorem 1.5 by apply the above
mentioned result: if a set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ has Assouad dimension less than 2, then $E$ is porous, and so $E$ is thin for doubling measures.

**Lemma 3.7.** Let $Q \subset [0,1]^2$ be a cube with edge length $a$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{D}([0,1]^2)$. Denoted by $V_Q$ the smallest vertical strip of $[0,1]^2$ which contains $Q$. Then there is a positive constant $C$ depending on $\mu$ and $a$ only, such that for any diagonal affine map $f(x) := D(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)(x) + t$ with $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 > 0$, we have

$$\mu(f(Q)) \geq C \mu(f(V_Q)). \quad (3.12)$$

**Proof.** Since $f$ is diagonal map, $f(Q)$ is a rectangle with sides $a\lambda_1$ and $a\lambda_2$. We are going to place a sequence of closed balls with the same diameter $a\lambda_2$ inside the rectangle $f(Q)$. We put the first ball $B_1$ at the left part of $f(Q)$ and touching the left boundary of $f(Q)$. We put the second ball $B_2$ touching the first ball $B_1$ with disjoint interior. We continue to put the balls in the above way, see Figure 3. In the end we have $\lfloor \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2} \rfloor$ balls inside $f(Q)$ where $\lfloor \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2} \rfloor$ is the integer part of $\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2}$. By a simple geometric estimate, we have that

$$f(V_Q) \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{\lfloor \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2} \rfloor} \frac{2}{a} B_i,$$

where $\rho B(x,r) := B(x,\rho r)$. Thus we have

$$\mu(f(V_Q)) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2} \rfloor} \mu(\frac{2}{a} B_i) \leq A \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2} \rfloor} \mu(B_i) \leq A \mu(f(Q)), \quad (3.13)$$
For each $R_{i,j}$ there is a hole $f_{i,j}(Q)$.

Thus we may write $R = \bigcup_{i=1}^{N(R)} I_{\sigma(i)} \times I_b$. Let $R_i := I_{\sigma(i)} \times I_b$ and $I_{\sigma(i)} \times I_b = \bigcup_{j=1}^{q_{|\sigma(i)|}} R_{i,j}$ where $R_{i,j}$ is $(n + |\sigma(i)|)$-level rectangle with $\text{int}(R_{i,j}) \cap \text{int}(R_{i,j'}) = \emptyset$ for $j \neq j'$. There is a cube $Q \subset [0,1]^2$ such that $Q \cap E_1 = \emptyset$. We use the same notation $V_Q$ as in Lemma 3.7. For each $R_{i,j}$, $1 \leq i \leq N(R), 1 \leq j \leq q_{|\sigma(i)|}$, denote by $f_{i,j}$ the affine map such that $f_{i,j}([0,1]^2) = R_{i,j}$. See Figure 4. Denote

$$G(R) := \bigcup_{i=1}^{N(R)} \bigcup_{j=1}^{q_{|\sigma(i)|}} f_{i,j}(Q).$$

Let $\mu \in \mathcal{D}([0,1]^2)$. By Lemma 3.7, there is a positive constant $C_1$ such that $\mu(f_{i,j}(Q)) \geq C_1 \mu(f_{i,j}(V_Q))$. Summing both sides over $j$ to get

$$\sum_{j=1}^{q_{|\sigma(i)|}} \mu(f_{i,j}(Q)) \geq C_1 \sum_{j=1}^{q_{|\sigma(i)|}} \mu(f_{i,j}(V_Q)).$$

(3.14)
Let \( \tilde{R}_i := \bigcup_{j=1}^{I_{\sigma(i)}} f_{i,j}(V_Q) \). Notice that the side-length of \( \tilde{R}_i \) are comparable with \(|I_{\sigma(i)}|\) for each \( 1 \leq i \leq N(R) \). Thus there is a positive constant \( C_2 \) such that \( \mu(\tilde{R}_i) \geq C_2 \mu(R_i) \). Summing both sides over \( i \), we have
\[
\sum_{i=1}^{N(R)} \mu(\tilde{R}_i) \geq C_2 \sum_{i=1}^{N(R)} \mu(R_i).
\] (3.15)

Combine the estimates (3.14) and (3.15), we arrive
\[
\mu(G(R)) \geq C_1 C_2 \mu(R).
\] (3.16)

Let \( G_n := \bigcup_{R \in E_n} G(R) \), then by estimate (3.16), we have that
\[
\mu(G_n) \geq C_1 C_2 \mu(E_n) \geq C_1 C_2 \mu(E).
\] (3.17)

Given \( n_k \), let \( \tilde{n}_k = \max\{N(R) : R \in E_n\} \) and \( n_{k+1} = n_k + \tilde{n}_k + 10 \). Let \( k = 1 \), then we have a sequence \( n_k \) and \( G_{n_k} \). By our choice of \( n_k \) and \( Q \cap E_1 = \emptyset \), we observe that the sets \( G_{n_k} \) are pairwise disjoint subsets of \([0,1]^2\). Applying estimate (3.17) to every \( G_{n_k} \), we obtain
\[
\infty > \mu\left( \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} G_{n_k} \right) \geq C_1 C_2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mu(E_{n_k}) \geq C_1 C_2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mu(E).
\]
Thus we have \( \mu(E) = 0 \). We complete the proof by the arbitrary choice of \( \mu \in \mathcal{D}([0,1]^2) \). \( \square \)

3.1. **Bedford-McMullen sponges in \( \mathbb{R}^3 \).** (Suggested by V. Suomala) Applying similar argument as in the proof of Theorem 1.5, we are going to prove that Bedford-McMullen (BM) sponges are thin for doubling measures on \([0,1]^3\). We show the construction of BM sponges first. Let \( p, q, u \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( 2 \leq p \leq q \leq u \). Divide \([0,1]^3\) into \( p \times q \times u \) rectangles of sides \( 1/p, 1/q \) and \( 1/u \). Select a subcollection of these rectangles to form \( E_1 \). Iterate this construction in the usual way, with each rectangle replaced by an affine copy of \( E_1 \), and let \( E = \bigcap_{n \geq 1} E_n \) be the limiting set obtained. Let \( Q \subset [0,1]^3 \) be a cube that \( Q \cap E_1 = \emptyset \) and \( V_Q := [0,1]^3 \cap \pi_{xy}(\pi_{xy}(Q)) \) where \( \pi_{xy} \) is the orthogonal projection from \( \mathbb{R}^3 \) to plane \( \mathbb{R}_{xy} \), here \( \mathbb{R}_{xy} = \{(x, y, z) : z = 0\} \).

**Proposition 3.8.** Let \( E \) be a BM sponge, then \( E \) is thin for doubling measures.

**Proof.** Let \( R \) be a \( n \)-th rectangle of \( E_n \). There is \( n(R) \in \mathbb{N} \) such that
\[
u^{-n} \leq p^{-n-n(R)} < \nu^{-n+1}.
\]
Divide $R$ (in the same way as the construction of $E_1$) $n(R)$ times into $(p \times q \times u)^{n(R)}$ rectangles. Let

$$I(R) := \{(i, j, k) : 1 \leq i \leq p^{n(R)}, 1 \leq j \leq q^{n(R)}, 1 \leq k \leq u^{n(R)}\}.$$ 

We may write $R = \bigcup_{\sigma \in I(R)} R_\sigma$. For $\sigma = (i, j, k)$ let $f_{i,j,k} = f_\sigma$. Denote $R_{i,j} = \bigcup_{k=1}^{u^{n(R)}} R_{i,j,k}$ and $R_i = \bigcup_{j=1}^{q^{n(R)}} R_{i,j}$. For each $R_\sigma, \sigma \in I(R)$, there is an affine map $f_\sigma$ such that $R_\sigma = f_\sigma([0, 1]^3)$.

Denote $G(R) = \bigcup_{\sigma \in I(R)} f_\sigma(Q)$. Let $\mu \in \mathcal{D}([0, 1]^3)$. We are going to prove $\mu(G(R)) \gtrsim \mu(R)$ where $\gtrsim$ means there is a constant $C$ depends on $\mu$ only such that $\mu(G(R)) \geq C \mu(R)$. For the convenience in what follows we will use notation $\gtrsim$ when there is a constant depending on $\mu$ only. Note that the constant may be different in different places.

Applying the similar argument as in Lemma 3.7, it’s not hard to see

$$\mu(f_\sigma(Q)) \gtrsim \mu(f_\sigma(V_Q)), \sigma \in I(R).$$  \hfill (3.18)

Thus

$$\mu(R_{i,j}) \gtrsim \sum_{k=1}^{u^{n(R)}} \mu(f_{i,j,k}(Q)) \gtrsim \sum_{k=1}^{u^{n(R)}} \mu(f_{i,j,k}(V_Q)) = \mu(V_Q(i, j)), \quad \text{for each } \sigma \in I(R).$$  \hfill (3.19)

where $V_Q(i, j) := \bigcup_{k=1}^{u^{n(R)}} f_{i,j,k}(V_Q)$. Let $V_Q'(i, j) := R_{i,j} \cap \pi_{z^2}^{-1}(\pi_{z^2} V_Q(i, j))$. Applying the same argument as in Lemma 3.7 again, we get

$$\mu(V_Q(i, j)) \gtrsim \mu(V_Q'(i, j)) \quad \text{(3.20)}$$

and

$$\mu(\bigcup_{j=1}^{q^{n(R)}} V_Q'(i, j)) \gtrsim \mu(R_i). \quad \text{(3.21)}$$

Note that $f_\sigma(Q)$ are pair disjoint for $\sigma \in I(R)$. Combine the estimates (3.19), (3.20), and (3.21) we arrive

$$\mu(G(R)) \gtrsim \mu(R). \quad \text{(3.22)}$$

Let $G_n := \bigcup_{R \in E_n} G(R)$, then by estimate (3.22), we have that

$$\mu(G_n) \gtrsim \mu(E_n) \geq \mu(E). \quad \text{(3.23)}$$

Apply the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 1.5 we obtain the result. \hfill \square

**Remark 3.9.** It can be believed that high dimensional Bedford-McMullen self-affine sets are thin for doubling measures. Note that Bedford-McMullen self-affine sets in $\mathbb{R}^d, d \geq 2$ satisfies OSCH.
4. Purely atomic measures

We say that a measure is purely atomic, if it has full measure on a countable set. For the results related purely atomic doubling measures, see [3, 11, 15, 16, 28]. It was asked in [15] whether there exist compact set \( X \subset \mathbb{R} \) with positive Lebesgue measure so that all doubling measures \( \mu \) on \( X \) are purely atomic. The answer is negative given by [3, 16]. In [3, 16], they proved that any compact set of \( \mathbb{R}^d \) with positive Lebesgue measure carries a doubling measure which is not purely atomic. We extend their result in the following way.

**Proposition 4.1.** Let \( X \) be a closed subset of \( \mathbb{R}^d \) with positive Lebesgue measure, then every \( d \)-homogeneous measure on \( X \) is not purely atomic; furthermore, let \( E \subset X \) and \( L^d(E) > 0 \), then \( \mu(E) > 0 \) for every \( d \)-homogeneous measure \( \mu \) on \( X \).

A measure \( \mu \) is called an \( s \)-homogeneous measure on \( X \) if there is a constant \( C \) such that for any \( \lambda \geq 1, 0 < \mu(B(x, \lambda r)) \leq C\lambda^s\mu(B(x, r)) < \infty \).

Denote by \( D_s(X) \) all \( s \)-homogeneous measure on \( X \). It’s easy to see that \( D(X) = \bigcup_{s>0} D_s(X) \). The \( s \)-homogeneous measures are related to \( s \)-homogeneous spaces, see [14, 26].

**Proof of Proposition 4.1.** Let \( E \subset X \) and \( L^d(E) > 0 \). Let \( \mu \in D_d(X) \) (in [13] they proved that \( D_d(X) \neq \emptyset \)). We are going to prove that \( \mu(E) > 0 \) (this implies that \( \mu \) is not purely atomic).

We consider \( B(x, r) \) as an open ball of metric space \( X \) (induced metric from \( \mathbb{R}^d \)) in the following for the convenience. Let \( x_0 \in X \), then there exists \( n_0 \) such that \( L^d(E \cap B(x_0, n_0)) > 0 \). Since \( \mu \in D_d(X) \), there is constant \( C \) such that for any ball \( B(x, r) \subset B(x, n_0) \), we have

\[
\mu(B(x, n_0)) \leq C\left(\frac{n_0}{r}\right)^d\mu(B(x, r)).
\]

(4.1)

Applying the doubling property of \( \mu \), we have that there is a constant \( C_1 \) such that \( \mu(B(x_0, n_0)) \leq C_1\mu(B(x, n_0)) \) for any \( x \in B(x_0, n_0) \). Thus there is a positive constant \( C_2 \) such that

\[
\mu(B(x, r)) \geq C_2r^d \text{ for any } B(x, r) \subset B(x_0, n_0).
\]

(4.2)

It’s well known that (4.2) implies (see [19 p.95])

\[
\mu(A) \geq C_3L^d(A) \text{ for any } A \subset B(x_0, n_0),
\]

(4.3)

where \( C_3 \) is positive constant depends on \( \mu, d, n_0 \) only. By the monotone property of \( \mu \) and estimate (4.3), we have

\[
\mu(E) \geq \mu(E \cap B(x_0, n_0)) \geq C_3L^d(E \cap B(x_0, n_0)) > 0.
\]
We complete the proof by the arbitrary choice of $\mu \in D_d(X)$. □
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