

CONVERGENCE OF RESISTANCES ON GENERALIZED SIERPIŃSKI CARPETS

SHIPING CAO AND ZHEN-QING CHEN

ABSTRACT. We positively answer the open question of Barlow and Bass about the convergence of renormalized effective resistance between opposite faces of Euclidean domains approximating a generalized Sierpiński carpet.

1. INTRODUCTION

Denote by \mathbb{N} , \mathbb{Z} and \mathbb{R} the set of all natural numbers, integers and real numbers, respectively. Let $(S_n)_{n \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}}$ be the simple random walk on \mathbb{Z}^d with $d \geq 1$, and $\mathbb{D}([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^d)$ the space of right continuous functions having left limits on $[0, \infty)$ taking values in \mathbb{R}^d equipped with the Skorohod topology. The well-known Donsker's invariance principle states that $\{n^{-1/2}S_{[nt]}; t \geq 0\}$ converges weakly as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in the Skorohod space $\mathbb{D}([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^d)$ to a Brownian motion on \mathbb{R}^d .

On generalized Sierpiński carpets (*GSCs*), an interesting question is whether an analogy to the Donsker's invariance principle holds, where instead of studying the scaling limit of random walks, a more natural choice is to consider the scaling limit of reflected Brownian motions on their approximation domains. The problem is difficult, but the picture becomes clearer over the times, with important contributions from [3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 26].

To describe the setting of this paper, we first recall the definition of *GSCs* and their approximation domains (also called pre-carpets in some literatures) from [7, 10]. In this paper, we use $:=$ as a way of definition. Let $d \geq 2$ and $L_F \geq 3$ be integers. Let $F_0 := [0, 1]^d$ be the unit cube in \mathbb{R}^d and set $\mathcal{Q}_0 := \{F_0\}$. For each integer $n \geq 1$, we divide F_0 into L_F^{nd} sub-cubes of length L_F^{-n} :

$$\mathcal{Q}_n := \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^d [(l_i - 1)/L_F^n, l_i/L_F^n] : 1 \leq l_i \leq L_F^n, i = 1, 2, \dots, d \right\}. \quad (1.1)$$

For each set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and $n \geq 0$, we denote

$$\mathcal{Q}_n(A) := \{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n : \text{int}(Q) \cap A \neq \emptyset\}, \quad (1.2)$$

where $\text{int}(Q)$ stands for the interior of Q in \mathbb{R}^d . Let $F_1 \subsetneq F_0$ be a union of cubes in \mathcal{Q}_1 , and iteratively, we define $F_n := \bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_1(F_1)} \Psi_Q(F_{n-1})$ for $n \geq 2$, where for each $Q \in \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{Q}_n$, Ψ_Q

Date: May 7, 2023.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 31E05, 60F17, 60J46; Secondary 31C25, 60G18, 46E36 .

Key words and phrases. Sierpiński carpets, Dirichlet form, Mosco convergence, weak convergence, energy measure, conductance, harmonic function, extension operator.

is an orientation preserving affine map of F_0 onto Q . We call $F := \bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} F_n$ a generalized Sierpiński carpet (*GSC*) if the following conditions (SC1)–(SC4) hold.

(SC1) (Symmetry) F_1 is preserved by all the isometries of the unit cube F_0 .

(SC2) (Connectedness) The interior $\text{int}(F_1)$ of F_1 is connected.

(SC3) (Non-diagonality) Let $n \geq 1$ and $B \subset F_0$ be a cube of side length $2L_F^{-n}$, which is the union of 2^d distinct elements of \mathcal{Q}_n . Then if $\text{int}(F_1 \cap B)$ is non-empty, it is connected.

(SC4) (Borders included) F_1 contains the line segments $\{x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d) : 0 \leq x_1 \leq 1, x_2 = x_3 = \dots = x_d = 0\}$.

Let $m_F := \#\mathcal{Q}_1(F)$. Then $d_f := \frac{\log m_F}{\log L_F}$ is the Hausdorff dimension of F . In words, F_1 is obtained from the unit cube F_0 by removing a symmetric pattern of $L_F^d - m_F$ number of sub-cubes of length L_F^{-1} , and we require F_1 to satisfy conditions (SC1)–(SC4). Then we repeat the procedure of removing a same pattern from surviving small cubes infinitely many times to get a compact set F . The standard Sierpiński carpet in \mathbb{R}^2 corresponds to the case of $L_F = 3$, $m_F = 8$ and F_1 being obtained from the unit square F_0 by removing the central square of length $1/3$; see Figure 1 for a picture of the standard *SC* in \mathbb{R}^2 and Figure 2 for its approximation domains F_0, F_1, F_2 . Figure 3 shows the Sierpiński sponge, which is an example of *GSC* in \mathbb{R}^3 .




FIGURE 1. The standard Sierpiński carpet in \mathbb{R}^2





FIGURE 2. Approximating domains F_0, F_1 and F_2 of the standard Sierpiński carpet

GSCs are infinitely ramified fractals. The study of Brownian motions on *GSCs* was initiated by Barlow and Bass [3] in 1989, where they constructed Brownian motions (also known as locally symmetric diffusions) on a planar *GSC* using a probabilistic approach as the scaling subsequential limits of reflected Brownian motions $W_t^{(F_n)}$ on F_n (more precisely, as the weak


 FIGURE 3. The Sierpiński sponge in \mathbb{R}^3

subsequential limits of $W_{\lambda_n t}^{(F_n)}$ for some constant time scaling factors $\lambda_n \in (0, \infty)$, $n \geq 0$). The same construction extends to higher dimensional cases in [7]. The scaling factor λ_n is given by

$$\lambda_n = (\rho_F m_F / L_F^2)^n \quad \text{for } n \geq 0, \quad (1.3)$$

where $\rho_F > 0$ is the resistance scaling factor for F . It is known [7, Proposition 5.1] that

$$\bar{\rho}_F := \rho_F m_F / L_F^2 \geq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_F \leq 2^{1-d} L_F. \quad (1.4)$$

Thus $\rho_F > 1$ for any GSC in \mathbb{R}^2 and $0 < \rho_F < 1$ for any GSC in \mathbb{R}^d with $d \geq 3$ and $L_F < 2^{d-1}$. But there is a GSC in \mathbb{R}^3 having $\rho_F > 1$; see [7, Section 9]. Using the resistance estimates [5, 28] and the elliptic Harnack inequalities [3, 7], Barlow and Bass [6, 7] established the sub-Gaussian heat kernel estimates for a Brownian motion on GSC s:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{c_1}{t^{d_f/d_w}} \exp\left(-c_2 \left(\frac{\rho(x, y)^{d_w}}{t}\right)^{1/(d_w-1)}\right) &\leq p(t, x, y) \\ &\leq \frac{c_3}{t^{d_f/d_w}} \exp\left(-c_4 \left(\frac{\rho(x, y)^{d_w}}{t}\right)^{1/(d_w-1)}\right) \quad \text{for } (t, x, y) \in (0, 1] \times F \times F, \end{aligned} \quad (1.5)$$

where

$$d_w := \log(\rho_F m_F) / \log L_F > 2$$

is called the walk dimension of F ; see [7, Theorem 1.3 and Remark 5.4] or [10, Remark 4.33].

In literature, $d_s := \frac{2d_f}{d_w} = \frac{2 \log m_F}{\log(\rho_F m_F)}$ is called the spectrum dimension of F . Note that $d_s < 2$ if and only if $\rho_F > 1$. Observe also that $\bar{\rho}_F$ in (1.4) can be expressed as

$$\bar{\rho}_F = L_F^{d_w-2} \quad \text{and so} \quad \lambda_n = \bar{\rho}_F^n = L_F^{(d_w-2)n}. \quad (1.6)$$

In [26], Kusuoka and Zhou used Dirichlet forms for random walks on fractal-like finite graphs to establish the existence of scale invariant (self-similar) diffusion processes on two-dimensional GSC s, which have the same type of heat kernel estimates. Recently, Grigoryan and Yang [22] gave a purely analytic construction of a self-similar local regular Dirichlet form on the two-dimensional standard Sierpiński carpet F using approximation of stable-like non-local closed forms on F .

Almost twenty years after [6], Barlow, Bass, Kumagai and Teplyaev [10, Theorem 1.2] established that strongly local, regular, irreducible, locally symmetric Dirichlet forms on F are unique up to a constant multiple. These strongly local, regular, irreducible, locally symmetric Dirichlet forms on F are exactly the Dirichlet forms associated with the locally symmetric diffusion processes constructed on GSCs in [3, 7, 26] up to to a constant time change. Since $\lambda_n = \bar{\rho}_F^n$ by (1.6), we define $X_t^{(F_n)} := W_{\bar{\rho}_F^n t}^{(F_n)}$ the normally reflected Brownian motion on F_n running with speed $\bar{\rho}_F^n = L_F^{(d_w-2)n}$. As mentioned earlier, it is proved in [3, 7] that for any subsequence of $\{X_t^{(F_n)}; n \geq 0\}$, there is a sub-subsequence that converges weakly in the space $C([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^d)$ to a Brownian motion on F . However, even with the unique result from [10], it remained open till now whether the sequence $\{X^{(F_n)}; n \geq 0\}$ itself converges; see [2, Remark 2.13]. The first main result of this paper is to show that the process $X^{(F_n)}$ converges weakly in the space $C([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^d)$ equipped with local uniform topology as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Throughout this paper, we use $X^{(F)}$ to denote the locally symmetric diffusion on a GSC F so that mean time of $X^{(F)}$ starting from $\mathbf{0} := (0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ to hit the faces of ∂F_0 not containing $\mathbf{0}$ is 1. We call $X^{(F)}$ a Brownian motion on F . The symmetric strongly local regular Dirichlet form on $L^2(F; \mu)$ associated with $X^{(F)}$ will be denoted as $(\mathcal{E}^{(F)}, \mathcal{F}^{(F)})$, which is irreducible and locally symmetric in the sense of [10, Definition 2.15]. Here μ is the d_f -dimensional Hausdorff measure on F normalized so that $\mu(F) = 1$.

Theorem 1.1. *There is a constant $c_0 > 0$ so that for each $x \in F$ and $x_n \in F_n, n \geq 0$ such that $x_n \rightarrow x$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, the law of $(X_t^{(F_n)})_{t \geq 0}$ starting from x_n converges weakly to some conservative continuous Markov process $(X_{t/c_0}^{(F)})_{t \geq 0}$ starting from x as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in the space $C([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^d)$ equipped with local uniform topology, and $X^{(F)}$ is a locally symmetric diffusion on the GSC F .*

Remark 1.2. Let τ_n denote the time that $X^{(F_n)}$ starting from $\mathbf{0}$ to hit the faces of ∂F_0 not containing $\mathbf{0}$. Then by Theorem 3.10, (3.10) and the proof of Theorem 1.1 of this paper, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_0^{(F_n)}[\tau_n]$ exists as a positive number and c_0 is this limit.

Our proof for Theorem 1.1 uses Mosco convergence of Dirichlet forms on varying spaces as developed in Kuwae and Shioya [27]. Denote by m the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R}^d . For $n \geq 0$, let μ_n be the normalized Lebesgue measure on F_n so that $\mu_n(F_n) = 1$; that is

$$\mu_n = m_F^{-n} L_F^{nd} m|_{F_n} = L_F^{(d-d_f)n} m|_{F_n}.$$

Denote by $W^{1,2}(F_n)$ the Sobolev space of order $(1, 2)$ on F_n :

$$W^{1,2}(F_n) := \{f \in L^2(F_n; m) : \nabla f \in L^2(F_n; m)\}.$$

The Dirichlet form of $X^{(F_n)}$ on $L^2(F_n; \mu_n)$ is $(\mathcal{E}^{(F_n)}, W^{1,2}(F_n))$, where

$$\mathcal{E}^{(F_n)}(f, g) = \frac{1}{2} L_F^{(d_w-d_f+d-2)n} \int_{F_n} \nabla f(x) \nabla g(x) m(dx) = \frac{1}{2} L_F^{(d_w-2)n} \int_{F_n} \nabla f(x) \nabla g(x) \mu_n(dx)$$

for $f, g \in W^{1,2}(F_n)$. It is a strongly local regular Dirichlet form on $L^2(F_n; \mu_n)$.

As mentioned in [10, Remark 5.4], which we will present as Theorem 3.10 and give a proof, there is a sequence of constants $\{\alpha_n; n \geq 0\}$ that are bounded between two positive

constants such that $\{X_{\alpha_n t}^{(F_n)}; t \geq 0\}$ converges weakly to $X^{(F)}$ in the space $C([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^d)$ equipped with local uniform topology. Consequently, we show in Theorem 3.12 that $\alpha_n \mathcal{E}^{(F_n)}$ is Mosco convergent to $\mathcal{E}^{(F)}$. There is a close relationship between the Mosco convergence of the Dirichlet forms and the convergence of finite-dimension distributions of the associated processes; see Theorem 2.13 below. So the crux work is to show the convergence of α_n .

Theorem 1.3. *The limit $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_n$ exists and equals the constant c_0 in Theorem 1.1. Moreover, the Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E}^{(F_n)}, W^{1,2}(F_n))$ on $L^2(F_n; \mu_n)$ is Mosco convergent to $(c_0^{-1} \mathcal{E}^{(F)}, \mathcal{F}^{(F)})$ on $L^2(F; \mu)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in the sense of Definition 2.12.*

This in particular answers a question raised by Barlow [2, p.9 and Remark 2.13] on the convergence of $\mathcal{E}^{(F_n)}$. The above two results are closely related to an open question of Barlow and Bass [5] concerning the asymptotic behavior of effective resistance. The effective resistance R_n between two opposite faces of F_n with respect to the Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E}^{(F_n)}, W^{1,2}(F_n))$ is defined by

$$R_n^{-1} := \inf \left\{ \mathcal{E}^{(F_n)}(f, f) : f \in W^{1,2}(F_n) \cap C(F_n), f|_{F_n \cap \{x_1=0\}} = 0, f|_{F_n \cap \{x_1=1\}} = 1 \right\}, \quad (1.7)$$

where for $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$, x_i stands for the i th coordinate of $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. It is shown in [5, Theorem 5.1] that for the standard Sierpiński carpet in \mathbb{R}^2 ,

$$1/4 \leq R_n \leq 4 \quad \text{for every } n \geq 1.$$

Note that our definition of the resistance R_n is the normalized version of the resistance defined in [5]; that is, our R_n is R_n/ρ^n in [5] with $\rho := \rho_F$. The open question posed as Problem 1 in Barlow and Bass [5] is whether the limit of R_n exists. The second main result of this paper answers this question affirmatively.

Theorem 1.4. *The limit $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} R_n$ exists as a positive real number.*

Theorems 1.1, 1.3 and 1.4 play a fundamental role in our study of stochastic homogenization on unbounded generalized Sierpiński carpets in our forthcoming paper [16].

A major step in our proof of the convergence of α_n and R_n is to construct a sequence of functions $h_n \in C(F_n) \cap W^{1,2}(F_n)$ that takes value 0 and 1 on a pair of opposite faces of F_n and is strongly convergent to h in L^2 with $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}^{(F_n)}(h_n) = c_0^{-1} \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(h)$, where h is the continuous function on F that takes 0 or 1 on a pair of opposite faces of F and is $\mathcal{E}^{(F)}$ -harmonic elsewhere. To construct such functions, we establish trace theorems on F and F_n , respectively, which extend an earlier result of Hino and Kumagai [23], and a property that the energy measures of $\mathcal{E}^{(F)}$ -harmonic functions within the ε -neighborhood of the boundary of a cell decays at a polynomial rate in $\varepsilon > 0$; see Theorems A.3, A.4 and B.1 in the two Appendices. We also establish several properties for GSCs that were previously either put as assumptions or were proved under some additional conditions in the literature. They include, for instance, Lemma 3.7, Lemma 3.8 and Corollary A.6. These results shed new lights on Brownian motions on the GSC F .

We remark that there are other ways to approximate a GSC, for example the cell graphs [26] and the graphical SC's [8]. The approach of this paper can be modified to establish the corresponding convergence results on these approximating spaces to F .

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we recall the definition of Mosco convergence of Dirichlet forms defined on varying spaces from [27]. We also carefully define various concepts of convergence of functions and present some of their properties that will be used in establishing Mosco convergence in this paper. In Section 3, we first recall the uniform elliptic Harnack inequalities from [7]. We then present lower bound estimates of effective resistances between a cell and the complement of its neighborhood and establish the Mosco convergence of $\alpha_m \mathcal{E}^{(F_m)}$ to $\mathcal{E}^{(F)}$. Sections 4 and 5 are the most important parts of the paper. In Section 4, we establish a uniform estimate of $|\sqrt{\mathcal{E}^{(F_n)}}(g_n) - \sqrt{\mathcal{E}^{(F)}}(g)|$ in terms of the Besov norms on the boundary and energy measure near the boundary, where $g_n \in W^{1,2}(F_n)$, $n \geq 0$ and $g \in \mathcal{F}^{(F)}$ are $\mathcal{E}^{(F_n)}$ - and $\mathcal{E}^{(F)}$ -harmonic functions having the same average values on level- m sub-faces of the boundary. We state the results in slightly more generality for future applications. In particular, Corollary 4.14 will not be used in this paper but will be needed in a forthcoming paper [16]. In Section 5, we construct the desired approximating functions h_n mentioned above and establish the energy estimates of h_n . The proofs for Theorems 1.1, 1.3 and 1.4 are given at the end of Section 5, which also use trace theorems and energy measure boundary decay property of $\mathcal{E}^{(F)}$ -harmonic functions. The proof of these results are given in two Appedixes. In Appendix A, we prove a trace theorem that relates energy measures near the boundary of F (see Figure 4 in Section 4) to some weighted Besov energies on the boundary of F . In Appendix B, for any continuous function in $\mathcal{F}^{(F)}$ that is $\mathcal{E}^{(F)}$ -harmonic in a cell of F , we show that its energy measure in the ε -neighborhood of the boundary of the cell in F decays at a polynomial rate in ε . This result extends a result of similar type in Hino and Kumagai [23, Proposition 3.8]. Our proof is different from theirs.

For the reader's convenience, the following is a list of notations used in this paper.

- F : generalized Sierpiński carpet in $[0, 1]^d$; Section 1
- F_n : stage n construction of the GSC F ; Section 1
- $\partial_o F := F \cap \partial F_0$ and $\partial_o F_m := F_m \cap \partial F_0$; Section 2
- $L_F \geq 3$: length scale of F ; Section 1
- \mathcal{Q}_n : sub-cubes of length L_F^{-n} defined in (1.1)
- $\mathcal{Q}_n(A) := \{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n : \text{int}(Q) \cap A \neq \emptyset\}$: defined in (1.2)
- Ψ_Q : orientation preserving affine map of $F_0 = [0, 1]^d$ onto $Q \in \cup_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{Q}_n$; Section 1
- $m_F := \#\mathcal{Q}_1(F)$: mass scale of F ; Section 1
- $m_I := \#\{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_1(F_1) : Q \cap \{x_1 = 0\} \neq \emptyset\}$; Section 2
- ρ_F : resistance scaling factor for F ; (1.3)
- $d_f := \frac{\log m_F}{\log L_F}$: Hausdorff dimension of F ; Section 1
- $d_w := \log(\rho_F m_F) / \log L_F \geq 2$: walk dimension of F ; Section 1
- $d_I := \frac{\log m_I}{\log L_F}$: Hausdorff dimension of the outer boundary $\partial_o F := F \cap \partial F_0$ of F ; Section 2
- μ_n : normalized Lebesgue measure on F_n so that $\mu_n(F_n) = 1$; Section 1
- μ : normalized d_f -dimensional Hausdorff measure on F so that $\mu(F) = 1$; Section 1
- $l(A)$: space of real-valued measurable functions on a measurable space A ; Section 2
- $F_Q := F \cap Q$ and $F_{m,Q} := F_m \cap Q$ for $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n$; Section 2
- $F_{\mathcal{A}} := \cup_{Q \in \mathcal{A}} F_Q$ and $F_{m,\mathcal{A}} := \cup_{Q \in \mathcal{A}} F_{m,Q}$ for $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{Q}_n$; Section 2
- $\partial_{i,s} F_Q$ and $\partial_{i,s} F_{m,Q}$: faces of cells. $\partial_{i,s} F := \partial_{i,s} F_{F_0}$ and $\partial_{i,s} F_m := \partial_{i,s} F_{m,F_0}$; Section 2

- $\partial_o F_Q := F_Q \cap \partial Q$ and $\partial_o F_{m,Q} := F_{m,Q} \cap \partial Q$: outer boundary of cells; Section 2
- ν : normalized d_I -dimensional Hausdorff measure on $\bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F)} \partial_o F_Q$ so that $\nu(\partial_o F) = 1$; Section 2
- ν_n : normalized $(d-1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure on $\bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F_m)} \partial_o F_{m,Q}$ so that $\nu_n(\partial_o F_n) = 1$; Section 2
- $[f]_{\mu|_A} := \frac{1}{\mu(A)} \int_A f(x) \mu(dx)$; Section 2
- $f_n \rightsquigarrow f$: Definition 2.8
- $\mathcal{E}^{(F_m, Q)}$: Dirichlet form on $F_{m,Q}$; (3.1)
- $(\mathcal{E}^{(F_Q)}, \mathcal{F}^{(F_Q)})$: Dirichlet form on F_Q ; (3.2)-(3.3)
- w_Q : a function in $C(F) \cap \mathcal{F}^{(F)}$ appeared in Lemma 3.6
- $\mathcal{S}_Q := \{Q' \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F) : Q' \cap Q \neq \emptyset\}$ for $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F), n \geq 1$; above Lemma 3.6
- $\mu_{(f)}$: energy measure of $f \in \mathcal{F}$; Section 3.4
- $\bar{\partial}_n F$ and $\bar{\partial}_n F_m$: collection of level n sub-faces of $\partial_o F$ and $\partial_o F_m$; Section 4
- $A \sim A'$ for $A \neq A' \in \bar{\partial}_k F$: $A \cap A' \neq \emptyset$ or $A, A' \subset B$ for some $B \in \bar{\partial}_{k-1} F$; (4.3) of Section 4
- $A \sim A'$ for $A \neq A' \in \bar{\partial}_k F_m$: $A \cap A' \neq \emptyset$ or $A, A' \subset B$ for some $B \in \bar{\partial}_{k-1} F_m$; Section 4
- $I_k[f]$: discrete energy defined with the average of $f \in L^2(\partial_o F; \nu)$ on $\bar{\partial}_k F$; Section 4
- $I_k^{(m)}[f]$: discrete energy defined with the average of $f \in L^2(\partial_o F_m; \nu_m)$ on $\bar{\partial}_k F_m$; Section 4
- $\Lambda_n[f] := \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} L_F^{k(d_w - d_f)} I_k[f]$; Section 4
- $\Lambda_k^{(m)}[f] := \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \varphi_m(L_F^{-k}) I_k^{(m)}[f]$; Section 4
- $\Lambda(\partial_o F)$ and $\Lambda^{(m)}(\partial_o F_m)$: Besov space on $\partial_o F$ and $\partial_o F_m$; Section 4
- $\mathcal{B}_n := \{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n : Q \cap \partial F_0 \neq \emptyset\}$, boundary shells; Section 4
- $\mathcal{B}_n(A) := \{Q \in \mathcal{B}_n : \text{int}(Q) \cap A \neq \emptyset\}$; Section 4
- \mathcal{C}_n : $(\#\bar{\partial}_n F)$ -dimensional linear subspace of $C(\partial_o F)$; Lemma 4.8
- $\mathcal{C}_{m,n}$: $(\#\bar{\partial}_n F)$ -dimensional linear subspace of $C(\partial_o F_m)$; Lemma 4.8
- $\mathcal{H}f$: harmonic extension of $f \in C(\partial_o F)$ to F ; Definition 4.11
- $\Theta_n^{(m)}$: linear maps from \mathcal{C}_n to $W^{1,2}(F_m) \cap C(F_m)$; Lemma 4.12

2. CONVERGENCE OF FUNCTIONS AND FORMS

In this section, we introduce several notions of convergence of functions (based on [27] and [13]). We also review the definition of Mosco convergence on varying state spaces from Kuwae and Shioya [27] adapted to our setting as a *GSC* and its approximation domains are embedded in \mathbb{R}^d , while [27, Section 2.2-2.6] are about general Hilbert spaces. The reader is referred to [29] for Mosco convergence of symmetric closed bilinear forms on a common Hilbert space.

Throughout this paper, (\mathcal{X}, ρ) is a locally compact separable metric space. We use $\text{int}(A)$ to denote the interior of $A \subset \mathcal{X}$ and \bar{A} its closure. For two subsets $A_1, A_2 \subset \mathcal{X}$, we denote by $\rho(A_1, A_2) := \inf_{x \in A_1, y \in A_2} \rho(x, y)$ the distance between them. We will simply abbreviate $\rho(\{x\}, A)$ to $\rho(x, A)$. The open ball (relative to $A \subset \mathcal{X}$) of radius r centered at x is denoted by $B_A(x, r) = \{y \in A : \rho(x, y) < r\}$, and we often omit A in the notation when there is no confusion about the underlying space.

For a measurable subset $A \subset \mathcal{X}$, we use the notation $l(A)$ to denote the space of real-valued measurable functions on A , and $C(A) = C(A, \rho)$ to denote the space of real-valued continuous functions on A equipped with the supremum norm $\|f\|_{\infty} := \sup_{x \in A} |f(x)|$. Denote by $C_c(A)$

the subspace of $C(A)$ consisting of continuous functions on A with compact supports in the metric space (A, ρ) , where the support of $f \in C(A)$ is defined to be the closure of $\{x \in A : f(x) \neq 0\}$.

If μ is a Radon measure on \mathcal{X} , we denote by $\mu|_A$ the restriction of μ on A , i.e. $\mu|_A(B) = \mu(B \cap A)$ for every Borel measurable $B \subset \mathcal{X}$. We can identify $L^2(\mathcal{X}; \mu|_A)$ with $L^2(A; \mu|_A)$, and abbreviate them to $L^2(A; \mu)$ from time to time.

If ν is a Radon measure on A and $f \in l(\mathcal{X})$ such that $f|_A \in L^1(A; \nu)$, we use the notation

$$[f]_\nu := \int_A f(x) \nu(dx) := \frac{1}{\nu(A)} \int_A f(x) \nu(dx)$$

for the ν -weighted average of f on A . In particular, if μ is a Radon measure on \mathcal{X} and $\mu|_A \neq 0$, then $[f]_{\mu|_A} := \frac{1}{\mu(A)} \int_A f(x) \mu(dx)$.

We assume the following setting throughout this section.

Basic setting: (\mathcal{X}, ρ) is a locally compact separable metric space. Let $\{A_n; n \geq 1\}$ and A be closed subsets of (\mathcal{X}, ρ) so that

$$\delta_H(A_n, A) < \infty \text{ for each } n \geq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \delta_H(A_n, A) = 0,$$

where $\delta_H(B, B') := \max \left\{ \sup_{x \in B'} \rho(x, B), \sup_{x \in B} \rho(x, B') \right\}$ is the Hausdorff metric between $B, B' \subset \mathcal{X}$. Let μ be a Radon measure on A , and let μ_n be a Radon measure on A_n for $n \geq 1$ so that μ_n converges weakly to μ on (\mathcal{X}, ρ) (viewing them as measures on \mathcal{X}) as $n \rightarrow \infty$, that is,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{A_n} f(x) \mu_n(dx) = \int_A f(x) \mu(dx) \quad \text{for every } f \in C_c(\mathcal{X}).$$

To apply the definition of strong and weak convergence in L^2 -spaces from [27], we introduce a sequence of auxiliary maps \mathcal{I}_n . However, we will show that the definition of strong and weak convergence in L^2 is in fact independent of the choice of \mathcal{I}_n .

Lemma 2.1. *There is a sequence of Borel measurable maps $\mathcal{I}_n : A_n \rightarrow A$ such that*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{x \in A_n} \rho(\mathcal{I}_n(x), x) = 0.$$

Proof. For each n , let $\{x_{n,m}\}_{m=1}^\infty$ be a countable $\frac{1}{n}$ -net of (\mathcal{X}, ρ) , that is, $\bigcup_{m=1}^\infty B_{\mathcal{X}}(x_{n,m}, 1/n) = \mathcal{X}$. Set

$$U_{n,m} = B_{\mathcal{X}}(x_{n,m}, 1/n) \setminus \bigcup_{k=1}^{m-1} B_{\mathcal{X}}(x_{n,k}, 1/n) \quad \text{for } n, m \geq 1.$$

Then, $\mathcal{X} = \bigsqcup_{m=1}^\infty U_{n,m}$ for every $n \geq 1$, where ‘ \bigsqcup ’ means disjoint union. Fix $n \geq 1$. For each $m \geq 1$ for which $U_{n,m} \cap A_n \neq \emptyset$, let $a_{n,m} \in A$ be such that $\rho(a_{n,m}, U_{n,m} \cap A_n) < \delta_H(A_n, A) + \frac{1}{n}$. Define $\mathcal{I}_n(x) = a_{n,m}$ for every $x \in U_{n,m} \cap A_n \neq \emptyset$. Since $\sup_{x \in U_{n,m} \cap A_n \neq \emptyset} \rho(\mathcal{I}_n(x), x) < \delta_H(A_n, A) + \frac{3}{n}$, the maps $\{\mathcal{I}_n; n \geq 1\}$ have the desired property. \square

2.1. Objects related to GSC . In this paper, we focus on GSC s and their approximation domains, which are embedded in \mathbb{R}^d . We denote the Euclidean metric on \mathbb{R}^d by ρ . We use the notation $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d)$ to denote a point in \mathbb{R}^d . From time to time, we use the notation tx to denote the point $tx = (tx_1, tx_2, \dots, tx_d)$, where $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

In the following, we introduce some notations about the cell structures and the measures on a GSC F and its approximation domains.

(**Cells**). (a) For $Q \in \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{Q}_n$, define $F_Q := Q \cap F$. For $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{Q}_n$, from time to time we also write $F_{\mathcal{A}} := \bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{A}} F \cap Q$. We call F_Q an n -cell of F if $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F)$.

(b) For $m \geq 0$ and $Q \in \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{Q}_n$, define $F_{m,Q} := Q \cap F_m$. For $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{Q}_n$, from time to time we write $F_{m,\mathcal{A}} := \bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{A}} F_m \cap Q$. We call $F_{m,Q}$ an n -cell of F_m if $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F_m)$.

Remark 2.2. $\mathcal{Q}_n(F_m) = \mathcal{Q}_n(F)$ for each $m \geq n \geq 0$.

Example 2.3. (a) Let $m \geq 0$ and $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{Q}_m(F)$. For $n \geq 0$, set $A_n = F_{n,\mathcal{A}}$ and $A = F_{\mathcal{A}}$. Clearly, A_n converges to A in the Hausdorff metric in \mathbb{R}^n . Also, $\mu_n|_{A_n}$ converges weakly to $\mu|_A$ on \mathbb{R}^d . Hence $\{A_n; \mu_n|_{A_n}; n \geq 0\}$ and $A; \mu|_A$ satisfy the **Basic Setting** laid out above Lemma 2.1, so does any subsequence $\{n_k; k \geq 1\}$.

(b) Throughout this paper, we use $\partial_o F$ and $\partial_o F_m$ to denote the outer faces of F and F_m ; that is, $\partial_o F := F \cap \partial F_0$ and $\partial_o F_m := F_m \cap \partial F_0$. We can also view $F_n \setminus \partial_o F_n, n \geq 0$ and $F \setminus \partial_o F$ as subsets in the metric space $(F_0 \setminus \partial F_0, \rho)$.

We introduce some more notations about the faces of cells.

(**Faces of cells**). (a). Let $n \geq 0, Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F), i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$ and $s \in \{0, 1\}$. We call $\partial_{i,s} F_Q := \Psi_Q(F \cap \{x_i = s\})$ a face of F_Q . When $Q = F_0$, we simply write $\partial_{i,s} F$ for $\partial_{i,s} F_Q$. In addition, we define $\partial_o F_Q := \Psi_Q(\partial_o F) = F_Q \cap \partial Q$.

(b). Let $n \geq 0, m \geq 0, Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F_m), i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$ and $s \in \{0, 1\}$. We call $\partial_{i,s} F_{m,Q} := \Psi_Q(F_{(m-n) \vee 0} \cap \{x_i = s\})$ a face of $F_{m,Q}$. When $Q = F_0$, we simply write $\partial_{i,s} F_m$ for $\partial_{i,s} F_{m,Q}$. In addition, we define $\partial_o F_{m,Q} := \Psi_Q(\partial_o F_{(m-n) \vee 0}) = F_{m,Q} \cap \partial Q$.

(**Dimension d_I**). Let $m_I := \#\{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_1(F) : Q \cap \{x_1 = 0\} \neq \emptyset\}$ and define $d_I := \frac{\log m_I}{\log L_F}$, which is the Hausdorff dimension of $\partial_o F$. Note that $d_I = 1$ when $d = 2$.

(**Measure on faces**). Let ν be the normalized d_I -dimensional Hausdorff measure on $\bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F)} \partial_o F_Q$ so that $\nu(\partial_o F) = 1$. For $m \geq 0$, let ν_m be the normalized $(d-1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure on $\bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F_m)} \partial_o F_{m,Q}$ so that $\nu_m(\partial_o F_m) = 1$.

Example 2.4. For each $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F)$, the **Basic setting** is satisfied for $\partial_o F_{m,Q}, \nu_m|_{\partial_o F_{m,Q}}$ for $m \geq 0$ and $\partial_o F_Q, \nu|_{\partial_o F}$; the **Basic setting** is satisfied for each $\partial_{k,s} F_{m,Q}, \nu_m|_{\partial_{k,s} F_{m,Q}}$ for $m \geq 0$ and $\partial_{k,s} F_Q, \nu|_{\partial_{k,s} F}$ with $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ and $k \in \{0, 1\}$ as well. The same holds for each subsequence $\{m_k; k \geq 1\}$.

2.2. Convergence of functions. In this subsection, we fix a sequence \mathcal{I}_n as in Lemma 2.1.

Lemma 2.5. $\mu_n \circ \mathcal{I}_n^{-1}$ converges weakly to μ on (A, ρ) . As a consequence,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f \circ \mathcal{I}_n\|_{L^2(A_n; \mu_n)} = \|f\|_{L^2(A; \mu)} \quad \text{for } f \in C_c(A).$$

Proof. Let $f \in C_c(A)$. Then by using the Tietze extension theorem and local compactness, we can find $g \in C_c(\mathcal{X})$ such that $g|_A = f$. By the assumption $\mu_n \Rightarrow \mu$ on (\mathcal{X}, ρ) , we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{A_n} g(x) \mu_n(dx) = \int_A g(x) \mu(dx) = \int_A f(x) \mu(dx).$$

In addition, by local compactness, we can find a compact neighborhood D of the support of g in \mathcal{X} such that $g(x) - f \circ \mathcal{I}_n(x) = 0$ for any large enough n and $x \in A_n \setminus D$. Hence,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \int_{A_n} (g(x) - f \circ \mathcal{I}_n(x)) \mu_n(dx) \right| \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n(D) \cdot \|g|_{A_n} - f \circ \mathcal{I}_n\|_\infty = 0,$$

where we use the facts that $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n(D) \leq \mu(D)$ and that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|g|_{A_n} - f \circ \mathcal{I}_n\|_\infty = 0$ by the uniform continuity of g . Combining the above equalities, we see that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_A f(x) \mu_n \circ \mathcal{I}_n^{-1}(dx) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{A_n} f \circ \mathcal{I}_n(x) \mu_n(dx) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{A_n} g(x) \mu_n(dx) = \int_A f(x) \mu(dx).$$

This finishes the proof of the lemma. \square

The following definition of strong and weak convergence is adapted from [27, Section 2.2], where these notions are defined for general Hilbert spaces.

Definition 2.6. Let $f_n \in L^2(A_n; \mu_n)$, $n \geq 1$ and let $f \in L^2(A; \mu)$.

- (a) We say $f_n \rightarrow f$ strongly in L^2 if and only if there is a sequence $\{u_j; j \geq 1\} \subset C_c(A)$ such that $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|u_j - f\|_{L^2(A; \mu)} = 0$ and

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f_n - u_j \circ \mathcal{I}_n\|_{L^2(A_n; \mu_n)} = 0. \quad (2.1)$$

- (b) We say $f_n \rightarrow f$ weakly in L^2 if and only if

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (f_n, g_n)_{L^2(A_n; \mu_n)} = (f, g)_{L^2(A; \mu)}.$$

for any $g_n \in L^2(A_n; \mu_n)$ that converges strongly in L^2 to $g \in L^2(A; \mu)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

In the following lemma, we see that the above definition of strong convergence reflects the fact that $A_n, n \geq 1$ and A are embedded in a same space. We will show in Lemma 2.7 that the definition of strong convergence in Definition 2.6 is independent of the choice of the maps $\{\mathcal{I}_n; n \geq 1\}$.

Lemma 2.7. Let $g \in C_c(\mathcal{X})$, then $g|_{A_n} \rightarrow g|_A$ strongly in L^2 . Moreover, for $f_n \in L^2(A_n; \mu_n)$, $n \geq 1$ and $f \in L^2(A; \mu)$, $f_n \rightarrow f$ strongly in L^2 if and only if there is a sequence $g_j \in C_c(\mathcal{X})$, $j \geq 1$ such that $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|g_j|_A - f\|_{L^2(A; \mu)} = 0$ and

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f_n - g_j|_{A_n}\|_{L^2(A_n; \mu_n)} = 0. \quad (2.2)$$

Proof. We first prove the first statement of the lemma. Let $f = g|_A$, then one can see that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|g|_{A_n} - f \circ \mathcal{I}_n\|_{L^2(A_n; \nu_n)} \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{\mu_n(D)} \cdot \|g|_{A_n} - f \circ \mathcal{I}_n\|_{\infty} = 0 \quad (2.3)$$

for some compact set $D \subset \mathcal{X}$ just as in the proof of Lemma 2.5. Hence, by taking $u_j = f$ for each $j \geq 1$ in (2.1), we can see that $g|_{A_n} \rightarrow g|_A$ strongly in L^2 .

For the second statement of the lemma, given $u_j \in C_c(A)$, by the Tietze extension theorem there is $g_j \in C_c(\mathcal{X})$ so that $g_j|_A = u_j$; conversely, given $g_j \in C_c(\mathcal{X})$, $u_j := g_j|_A \in C_c(A)$. Applying (2.3) to g_j and u_j , we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|g_j|_{A_n} - u_j \circ \mathcal{I}_n\|_{L^2(A_n; \mu_n)} = 0$. Thus

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f_n - g_j|_{A_n}\|_{L^2(A_n; \nu_n)} = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f_n - u_j \circ \mathcal{I}_n\|_{L^2(A_n; \mu_n)},$$

which shows the equivalence of (2.1) and (2.2). \square

The following is a natural analog of locally uniform convergence of functions. There is also a version of Arzelà–Ascoli theorem for it.

Definition 2.8. Let $f_n \in l(A_n)$, $n \geq 1$ and $f \in l(A)$. We say that $f_n \rightsquigarrow f$ if and only if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(x_n) = f(x)$ holds for any sequence $x_n \in A_n$, $n \geq 1$ and x such that $x_n \rightarrow x$.

Remark 2.9. If $A_n = A$ for all $n \geq 1$ and $\{f_n, n \geq 1\} \cup \{f\} \subset C(A)$, then $f_n \rightsquigarrow f$ if and only if f_n converges to f locally uniformly A .

Lemma 2.10. Let $f_n \in C(A_n)$, $n \geq 1$.

- (a) If $\{f_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ is locally uniformly bounded and equicontinuous, that is, if $\sup_{n \geq 1} \|f_n|_K\|_{\infty} < \infty$ and $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \sup\{|f_n(x) - f_n(y)| : n \geq 1, x, y \in A_n \cap K, \rho(x, y) < \delta\} = 0$ for every compact $K \subset \mathcal{X}$, then there are $f \in C(A)$ and a subsequence $\{f_{n_k}, k \geq 1\}$ so that $f_{n_k} \rightsquigarrow f$.
- (b) If $f_n \rightsquigarrow f$ for some $f \in l(A)$, then $f \in C(A)$. Let $g \in C(\mathcal{X})$ such that $g|_A = f$. Then, we can find $g_n \in C(\mathcal{X})$, $n \geq 1$ so that $g_n|_{A_n} = f_n$ for every $n \geq 1$ and $g_n \rightarrow g$ locally uniformly on \mathcal{X} (i.e. $\|g_n|_K - g|_K\|_{\infty} \rightarrow 0$ for each compact $K \subset \mathcal{X}$) as $n \rightarrow \infty$.
- (c) If there is $f \in C(A)$ such that for each subsequence f_{n_k} there is a further subsequence $f_{n_{k(l)}}$ such that $f_{n_{k(l)}} \rightsquigarrow f$ as $l \rightarrow \infty$, then $f_n \rightsquigarrow f$.

Proof. (a) follows from the same proof of [13, Lemma 2.2], where the separability of \mathcal{X} is used.

(b). The first claim follows from [13, Lemma 2.2(b)]. The second claim also follows by a similar argument of [13, Proposition 2.3]. Let

$$\tilde{A} := \left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} (\{1/n\} \times A_n) \right) \bigcup (\{0\} \times \mathcal{X}),$$

which is a closed subset of $\tilde{\mathcal{X}} := [0, 1] \times \mathcal{X}$ equipped with the product topology. Define $\tilde{f} \in C(\tilde{A})$ by

$$\tilde{f}(t, x) = \begin{cases} f_n(x), & \text{if } t = \frac{1}{n}, x \in A_n, \\ g(x), & \text{if } t = 0, x \in \mathcal{X}. \end{cases}$$

Then, by Tietze extension theorem, we can find $\tilde{g} \in C(\tilde{\mathcal{X}})$ such that $\tilde{g}|_{\tilde{A}} = \tilde{f}$. It suffices to take $g_n(x) = \tilde{g}(1/n, x)$ for $n \geq 1$.

(c) is proven by contradiction. If $f_n \not\rightarrow f$, we can find $x_n \in A_n, n \geq 1$ and $x \in A$ such that $x_n \rightarrow x$ but $f_n(x_n) \not\rightarrow f(x)$. Then, there is a subsequence $\{n_k; k \geq 1\}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $|f_{n_k}(x_{n_k}) - f(x)| > \varepsilon$ for every $k \geq 1$. This leads to a contradiction to the assumption of (c) as $\{f_{n_k}; k \geq 1\}$ does not have any subsequence $f_{n_k(l)} \rightarrow f$. \square

Since (\mathcal{X}, ρ) is a locally compact separable metric space, there is an increasing sequence of relatively compact open subsets $\{B_j; j \geq 1\}$ so that $\bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} B_j = \mathcal{X}$.

Lemma 2.11. (a) *Let $f_{m,n} \in C(A_n), n, m \geq 1, f_m \in C(A), m \geq 1$, and $f \in C(A)$. Suppose that $f_{m,n} \rightarrow f_m$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for each $m \geq 1$, and f_m converges to f locally uniformly as $m \rightarrow \infty$. Then there exist $\{m(n); n \geq 1\} \subset \mathbb{N}$ so that $m(n) \rightarrow \infty$ and $f_{m(n),n} \rightarrow f$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.*

(b) *Let $f_n \in C(A_n), n \geq 1$. If $f_n \rightarrow f \in C(A)$ and $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \geq 1} \|f_n\|_{L^2(A_n \setminus \bar{B}_j; \mu_n)} = 0$, then $f \in L^2(A; \mu)$ and $f_n \rightarrow f$ strongly in L^2 .*

Proof. (a). By Tietze extension theorem and Lemma 2.10 (b), there are $\{g; g_m, m \geq 1\} \subset C(\mathcal{X})$ and $\{g_{m,n}, m \geq 1\} \in C(A_n)$ so that $g|_A = f, g_m|_A = f_m$ for $m \geq 1$, and $g_{m,n}|_{A_n} = f_{m,n}$ for $n, m \geq 1$. In addition,

$$\begin{aligned} g_m &\rightarrow g \text{ locally uniformly as } m \rightarrow \infty, \\ g_{m,n} &\rightarrow g_m \text{ locally uniformly as } n \rightarrow \infty \text{ for every } m \geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the metric $\rho_{\infty}(h, h') := \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} 2^{-j} (\|(h - h')|_{\bar{B}_j}\|_{\infty} \wedge 1)$ characterizes the locally uniform convergence on \mathcal{X} . Define $m(n) := \max\{1 \leq m \leq n : \rho_{\infty}(g_{m(n),n}, g) \leq \frac{1}{m}\}$. Then $m(n) \rightarrow \infty$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{\infty}(g_{m(n),n}, g) = 0$. This establishes (a).

(b). We apply Lemma 2.10 (b) to $f_n \rightarrow f$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ to find $g_n \in C(\mathcal{X})$ and $g \in C(\mathcal{X})$ so that $f_n = g_n|_{A_n}$ for $n \geq 1, f = g|_A$ and $g_n \rightarrow g$ locally uniformly as $n \rightarrow \infty$. For each $j \geq 1$, we fix $u_j \in C_c(\mathcal{X})$ such that $u_j|_{\bar{B}_j} = 1$ and $0 \leq u_j \leq 1$. Denote the support of u_j by D_j . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f_n(u_j|_{A_n}) - (g u_j)|_{A_n}\|_{L^2(A_n; \mu_n)} &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|(g_n u_j)|_{A_n} - (g u_j)|_{A_n}\|_{L^2(A_n; \mu_n)} \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|g_n|_{D_j} - g|_{D_j}\|_{\infty} \sqrt{\mu_n(D_j)} = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

This in particular implies that $\sup_{n \geq 1} \|f_n\|_{L^2(A_n; \mu_n)} < \infty$. Combining (2.4) with the assumption $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \geq 1} \|f_n\|_{L^2(A_n \setminus \bar{B}_j; \mu_n)} = 0$, we get

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \geq 1} \|f_n - (g u_j)|_{A_n}\|_{L^2(A_n; \mu_n)} = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \geq 1} \|f_n - f_n(u_j|_{A_n})\|_{L^2(A_n; \mu_n)} = 0. \quad (2.5)$$

Next for each $j \geq 1, \|(g u_j)|_A\|_{L^2(A; \mu)} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f_n(u_j|_{A_n})\|_{L^2(A_n; \mu_n)} \leq \sup_{n \geq 1} \|f_n\|_{L^2(A_n; \mu_n)}$ by [27, Lemma 2.1(2),(5)], Lemma 2.7 and (2.4). Hence, $\sup_{j \geq 1} \|(g u_j)|_A\|_{L^2(A; \mu)} < \infty$, which implies that $f = g|_A \in L^2(A; \mu)$ and $(g u_j)|_A \rightarrow f$ in $L^2(A; \mu)$ norm. It follows by (2.5) and Lemma 2.7 that $f_n \rightarrow f$ strongly in L^2 . \square

When \mathcal{X} is compact, Lemma 2.11(b) in particular shows that uniform convergence ‘ \rightsquigarrow ’ implies strong convergence in L^2 . It is also known that strong convergence in L^2 implies weak convergence in L^2 by [27, Lemma 2.1 (4)].

2.3. Convergence of quadratic forms. Recall that the Basic Setting is in force, under which the sequence of closed sets $\{A_n; n \geq 1\}$ in (\mathcal{X}, ρ) converges to A in the Hausdorff metric and the sequence of measures μ_n on A_n converges weakly to the measure μ on A . The following definition of Mosco convergence is taken from [27, Definitions 2.8 and 2.11].

Definition 2.12 (Mosco convergence). *Let $\bar{\mathbb{R}} = \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\} \cup \{-\infty\}$ be the set of extended real numbers. Suppose that $\mathcal{E}^{(n)} : L^2(A_n; \mu_n) \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}$, $n \geq 1$, and $\mathcal{E} : L^2(A; \mu) \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}$. We say $\mathcal{E}^{(n)}$ is Mosco convergent to \mathcal{E} if and only if the following hold.*

(M1) *For any $f_n \in L^2(A_n; \mu_n)$ that converges weakly in L^2 to $f \in L^2(A; \mu)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have*

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}^{(n)}(f_n) \geq \mathcal{E}(f).$$

(M2) *For each $f \in L^2(A; \mu)$, there exists $f_n \in L^2(A_n; \mu_n)$ that converges strongly in L^2 to f as $n \rightarrow \infty$ with*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}^{(n)}(f_n) \leq \mathcal{E}(f).$$

We are in particular interested in quadratic forms. It is well-known that there is a one to one correspondence between non-negative lower-semicontinuous quadratic forms (with extended real values) on a Hilbert space H and closed symmetric non-negative definite bilinear forms (see [29, Section 1 (b)]) described as follows. Let $\mathcal{E} : H \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}$ be a non-negative lower-semicontinuous quadratic forms, then one can define a closed symmetric non-negative definite symmetric bilinear form $(\mathcal{E}, \text{Dom}(\mathcal{E}))$ by the parallelogram law: set $\text{Dom}(\mathcal{E}) = \{f \in H : \mathcal{E}(f) < +\infty\}$ and

$$\mathcal{E}(f, g) := \frac{1}{4} \left(\mathcal{E}(f + g) - \mathcal{E}(f - g) \right) \quad \text{for } f, g \in \text{Dom}(\mathcal{E}).$$

Conversely, given a closed symmetric non-negative definite bilinear form $(\mathcal{E}, \text{Dom}(\mathcal{E}))$, we can define a non-negative lower-semicontinuous quadratic forms by

$$\mathcal{E}(f) := \begin{cases} \mathcal{E}(f, f) & \text{if } f \in \text{Dom}(\mathcal{E}), \\ +\infty & \text{if } f \in H \setminus \text{Dom}(\mathcal{E}). \end{cases}$$

Throughout this paper, we do not distinguish in notation between a non-negative symmetric closed bilinear form and its associated non-negative lower-semicontinuous quadratic form. The following result taken from [27] extends the characterization of the Mosco convergence of the non-negative symmetric closed bilinear forms in terms of the strong semigroup (or resolvent) convergence from on a common Hilbert space to the setting on varying Hilbert spaces. See also [19, Appendix] and [25, Theorem 2.5] for related work.

Theorem 2.13 (Theorem 2.4 of [27]). *Let \mathcal{E} be a densely defined non-negative lower-semicontinuous quadratic form on $L^2(A; \mu)$, let $\{T_t; t \geq 0\}$ be the associated strongly continuous semigroup of symmetric contraction operators on $L^2(A; \mu)$, and let $U_\lambda = \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t} T_t dt$, $\lambda > 0$, be the resolvent operators. For $n \geq 1$, let $\mathcal{E}^{(n)}$ be a densely defined non-negative lower-semicontinuous*

quadratic form on $L^2(A_n; \mu_n)$, and let $\{T_t^{(n)}; t \geq 0\}$ be the associated strongly continuous semigroup of symmetric contraction operators on $L^2(A_n; \mu_n)$, and let $U_\lambda^{(n)} = \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t} T_t^{(n)} dt$, $\lambda > 0$, be the resolvent operators. The following statements are equivalent to each other.

- (a) $\mathcal{E}^{(n)}$ is Mosco convergent to \mathcal{E} .
- (b) $T_t^{(n)}$ strongly converges in L^2 to T_t for some $t > 0$.
- (c) $T_t^{(n)}$ strongly converges in L^2 to T_t for any $t \geq 0$.
- (d) $U_\lambda^{(n)}$ strongly converges in L^2 to U_λ for some $\lambda > 0$.
- (e) $U_\lambda^{(n)}$ strongly converges in L^2 to U_λ for any $\lambda > 0$.

Here, for $O_n : L^2(A_n; \mu_n) \rightarrow L^2(A_n; \mu_n)$, $n \geq 1$ and $O : L^2(A; \mu) \rightarrow L^2(A; \mu)$, we say O_n strongly converge in L^2 to O if $O_n f_n \rightarrow O f$ strongly in L^2 for any $f_n \in L^2(A_n; \mu_n)$, $n \geq 1$ and $f \in L^2(A; \mu)$ such that $f_n \rightarrow f$ strongly in L^2 .

We end this section with a criteria of strong convergence of operators.

Proposition 2.14. *Suppose that $U : L^2(A; \mu) \rightarrow L^2(A; \mu)$ is a bounded operator, and for each $n \geq 1$, $U^{(n)} : L^2(A_n; \mu_n) \rightarrow L^2(A_n; \mu_n)$ is a bounded operator with $\sup_{n \geq 1} \|U^{(n)}\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} < \infty$, where $\|U^{(n)}\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} := \sup\{\|U^{(n)} f\|_{L^2(A_n; \mu_n)} : f \in L^2(A_n; \mu_n), \|f\|_{L^2(A_n; \mu_n)} = 1\}$. Then, $U^{(n)}$ converges strongly in L^2 to U if and only if $U^{(n)}(g|_{A_n}) \rightarrow U(g|_A)$ strongly in L^2 for every $g \in C_c(\mathcal{X})$.*

Proof. The ‘only if’ part follows immediately from the definition of strong convergence of operators and Lemma 2.7.

It remains to prove the ‘if’ part. Let $f \in L^2(A; \mu)$ and $f_n \in L^2(A_n; \mu_n)$, $n \geq 1$ such that $f_n \rightarrow f$ strongly in L^2 . We need to show $U^{(n)} f_n \rightarrow U f$ strongly in L^2 . Since $f_n \rightarrow f$ strongly in L^2 , by Lemma 2.7, we can find a sequence $g_j \in C_c(\mathcal{X})$, $j \geq 1$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|g_j|_A - f\|_{L^2(A; \mu)} &= 0, \\ \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|g_j|_{A_n} - f_n\|_{L^2(A_n; \mu_n)} &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Then, since U is bounded and $\sup_{n \geq 1} \|U^{(n)}\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} < \infty$, we have

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|U(g_j|_A) - U f\|_{L^2(A; \mu)} = 0, \quad (2.6)$$

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|U^{(n)}(g_j|_{A_n}) - U^{(n)} f_n\|_{L^2(A_n; \mu_n)} = 0. \quad (2.7)$$

By the assumption (note that we are proving the ‘if’ part), for each $j \geq 1$, we have $U^{(n)}(g_j|_{A_n}) \rightarrow U(g_j|_A)$ strongly in L^2 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, by using Lemma 2.7 again, for each $j \geq 1$, we can find $h_j \in C_c(\mathcal{X})$ such that

$$\|h_j|_A - U(g_j|_A)\|_{L^2(A; \mu)} \leq 1/j, \quad (2.8)$$

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|h_j|_{A_n} - U^{(n)}(g_j|_{A_n})\|_{L^2(A_n; \mu_n)} \leq 1/j. \quad (2.9)$$

Combining (2.6) and (2.8) yields $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|h_j|_A - U f\|_{L^2(A; \mu)} = 0$; while (2.7) together with (2.9) gives $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|h_j|_{A_n} - U^{(n)} f_n\|_{L^2(A_n; \mu_n)} = 0$. Hence, $U^{(n)} f_n \rightarrow U f$ strongly in L^2 by Lemma 2.7, noticing that $h_j \in C_c(\mathcal{X})$ for each $j \geq 1$. \square

3. DIRICHLET FORMS ON GSCs

In this section, we first review some well-known properties of the Dirichlet form of Brownian motion on F and that of approximating reflected Brownian motions on F_n for $n \geq 0$, and recall the uniform elliptic Harnack inequalities from [7]. We then present lower bound estimates of effective resistances between a cell and the complement of its neighborhood and establish the Mosco convergence of $\alpha_m \mathcal{E}^{(F_m)}$ to $\mathcal{E}^{(F)}$ for some sequence of positive numbers $\{\alpha_m; m \geq 1\}$ that are bounded between two positive numbers.

Recall the definitions of cells, and measures μ and μ_n on F and F_n , respectively, from Subsection 2.1.

(Dirichlet forms on F_m). For each $n \geq 0$ and $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F_m)$, let $(\mathcal{E}^{(F_m, Q)}, W^{1,2}(F_m, Q))$ be the renormalized Dirichlet form on F_m, Q on $L^2(F_m, Q; \mu_m)$ defined by

$$\mathcal{E}^{(F_m, Q)}(f, g) = L_F^{(d_w - 2)m} \int_{F_m, Q} \nabla f(x) \nabla g(x) \mu_m(dx) \quad \text{for } f, g \in W^{1,2}(F_m, Q). \quad (3.1)$$

In particular, when $Q = F_0$,

$$\mathcal{E}^{(F_m)}(f, g) = L_F^{(d_w - 2)m} \int_{F_m} \nabla f(x) \nabla g(x) \mu_m(dx) \quad \text{for } f, g \in W^{1,2}(F_m).$$

(Dirichlet forms on F). Recall that $(\mathcal{E}^{(F)}, \mathcal{F}^{(F)})$ is the strongly local, regular, irreducible locally symmetric Dirichlet form on $L^2(F; \mu)$ associated with $X^{(F)}$ that has unit expected time of its first visit to the faces of ∂F_0 not containing $\mathbf{0}$ when starting from $\mathbf{0}$. For each $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F)$, $n \geq 0$, we define $(\mathcal{E}^{(F_Q)}, \mathcal{F}^{(F_Q)})$ by

$$\mathcal{F}^{(F_Q)} = \{f \in L^2(F_Q; \mu) : f \circ \Psi_Q \in \mathcal{F}^{(F)}\}, \quad (3.2)$$

$$\mathcal{E}^{(F_Q)}(f, g) = L_F^{n(d_w - d_f)} \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(f \circ \Psi_Q, g \circ \Psi_Q) \quad \text{for } f, g \in \mathcal{F}^{(F_Q)}. \quad (3.3)$$

Remark 3.1. With slight abuse of notations, for $f \in l(F)$ and $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F)$, $n \geq 0$, we abbreviate $f \circ (\Psi_Q|_F)$ to $f \circ \Psi_Q$; similarly, for $f \in l(F_m)$, $m \geq 0$ and $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F)$, $n \geq 0$, we abbreviate $f \circ (\Psi_Q|_{F_{(m-n) \vee 0}})$ to $f \circ \Psi_Q$.

Lemma 3.2. $(\mathcal{E}^{(F)}, \mathcal{F}^{(F)})$ is self-similar:

$$\mathcal{F}^{(F)} \cap C(F) = \left\{ f \in C(F) : f|_{F_Q} \in \mathcal{F}^{(F_Q)} \text{ for any } Q \in \mathcal{Q}_1(F) \right\}, \quad (3.4)$$

and

$$\mathcal{E}^{(F)}(f) = \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_1(F)} \mathcal{E}^{(F_Q)}(f|_Q) \quad \text{for any } f \in \mathcal{F}^{(F)}. \quad (3.5)$$

Proof. The lemma follows from the construction of Kusuoka-Zhou [26] and Corollary 1.3 of [10]. The second half of Kusuoka-Zhou's paper is under the strong recurrence assumption that $d_f < d_w$. However this condition can be dropped since we know the elliptic Harnack inequality holds by the coupling argument [7] on any GSC. One can also use the sub-Gaussian heat kernel estimate and Lemma 3.7 of this paper that $d_f - d_w > d_I$ to construct a strongly local, regular, irreducible, locally symmetric Dirichlet form on F satisfying (3.4) and (3.5)

using the method of [15, Section 4]. Then, by the uniqueness theorem from [10], we know it is the same as $(\mathcal{E}^{(F)}, \mathcal{F}^{(F)})$. \square

Remark 3.3. With some abuse of notations, we write $\mathcal{E}^{(F_Q)}(f)$ instead of $\mathcal{E}^{(F_Q)}(f|_{F_Q})$ for short. Similar notation will be used for $\mathcal{E}^{(F_m, Q)}$ later in this paper.

In the rest of the paper, $((X_t^{(F)})_{t \geq 0}, \mathbb{P}_x^{(F)})$ denotes the diffusion process associated with $(\mathcal{E}^{(F)}, \mathcal{F}^{(F)})$ on $L^2(F; \mu)$; for $m \geq 0$, and $((X_t^{(F_m)})_{t \geq 0}, \mathbb{P}_x^{(F_m)})$ denotes the diffusion process associated with $(\mathcal{E}^{(F_m)}, \mathcal{F}^{(F_m)})$ on $L^2(F_m; \mu_m)$. Since the two-sided sub-Gaussian heat kernel estimates (1.5) holds for $((X_t^{(F)})_{t \geq 0}, \mathbb{P}_x^{(F)})$ and the two-sided Gaussian heat kernel estimates holds for $((X_t^{(F_m)})_{t \geq 0}, \mathbb{P}_x^{(F_m)})$, $m \geq 0$, the diffusion processes $X^{(F)}$ and $X^{(F_m)}$ are Feller processes having strong Feller property. In particular, these processes can start from every point in F and F_m , respectively.

3.1. Uniform elliptic Harnack inequality (EHI). Barlow and Bass [7, Theorem 1.1] established a scale-invariant uniform elliptic Harnack principle on $F_m, m \geq 0$ by a coupling argument, The same idea works on F , see [10, Proposition 4.22]. We state their results here. (**Harmonic functions**). Let $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ be a regular Dirichlet form on $L^2(\mathcal{X}; \mu)$. Let $f \in \mathcal{F}$ and let $U \subset \mathcal{X}$ be an open subset. We say f is \mathcal{E} -harmonic in U if $\mathcal{E}(f, g) = 0$ for every $g \in C_c(\mathcal{X}) \cap \mathcal{F}$ whose support is contained in U .

There is a well-known probabilistic characterization of harmonic functions. Let $((X_t)_{t \geq 0}, \mathbb{P}_t)$ be the Hunt process associated with $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$,

$$\sigma_A := \inf\{t \geq 0 : X_t \in A\} \quad \text{and} \quad \dot{\sigma}_A := \inf\{t > 0 : X_t \in A\} \quad (3.6)$$

be the entry time and hitting time of A , respectively. Then, if $h \in \mathcal{F} \cap L^\infty(\mathcal{X}; \mu)$ is \mathcal{E} -harmonic in U and h is quasi-continuous, then $h(x) = \mathbb{E}_x[h(X_{\sigma_{\mathcal{X} \setminus U}})]$ for q.e. $x \in E_U := \{y \in U : \mathbb{P}_y(\sigma_{\mathcal{X} \setminus U} < \infty) = 1\}$. See [10, Proposition 2.5] for a proof. A more general equivalence result between the analytic and probabilistic notions of harmonicity can be found in [17].

Theorem 3.4 ([7, 10]). *There exists $C \in (1, \infty)$ depending only on F so that the following hold.*

(a) *For any $x \in F$, $r > 0$ and non-negative $h \in \mathcal{F}^{(F)}$ that is $\mathcal{E}^{(F)}$ -harmonic in $B_F(x, r)$,*

$$h(y) \leq C h(z) \quad \text{for every } y, z \in B_F(x, r/2).$$

(b) *For any $m \geq 0$, $x \in F_m$, $r > 0$ and non-negative $h \in W^{1,2}(F_m)$ that $\mathcal{E}^{(F_m)}$ -harmonic in $B_{F_m}(x, r)$,*

$$h(y) \leq C h(z) \quad \text{for every } y, z \in B_{F_m}(x, r/2).$$

3.2. Effective Resistances. There are two main ingredients in the construction of the Brownian motion on F : uniform elliptic Harnack inequality and resistance estimates. We quickly review resistance estimates in this part.

Lemma 3.5 ([5, 28]). *There exists $C \in [1, \infty)$ depending on F such that $C^{-1} < R_n < C$ for each $n \geq 0$, where R_n is the resistance of F_n defined by (1.7).*

The next result gives the lower bound estimates of resistances between a cell and the complement of its neighborhood. In the sequel, for $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F)$ with $n \geq 1$, we set

$$\mathcal{S}_Q := \{Q' \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F) : Q' \cap Q \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Lemma 3.6. *There is a constant C depending only on F such that the following hold.*

- (a) For each $n \geq 1$ and $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F)$, there is $w_Q \in C(F) \cap \mathcal{F}^{(F)}$ so that $0 \leq w_Q \leq 1$, $w_Q|_{F_Q} = 1$, $w_Q|_{F \setminus F_{\mathcal{S}_Q}} = 0$, and $\mathcal{E}^{(F)}(w_Q) \leq CL_F^{(d_w - d_f)n}$.
- (b) For each $n \geq 1$, $m \geq 0$ and $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F_m)$, there is $w_Q^{(m)} \in C(F_m) \cap W^{1,2}(F_m)$ so that $0 \leq w_{m,Q} \leq 1$, $w_Q^{(m)}|_{F_{m,Q}} = 1$, $w_Q^{(m)}|_{F_{Q'}} = 0$ if $Q' \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F_m)$ and $Q' \cap Q = \emptyset$, and $\mathcal{E}^{(F_m)}(w_Q^{(m)}) \leq C \varphi_m(L_F^{-n})$, where

$$\varphi_m(r) := \begin{cases} r^{d_f - d_w} & \text{if } r \geq L_F^{-m}, \\ L_F^{(d_w - d_f + d - 2)m} r^{d-2} & \text{if } 0 < r < L_F^{-m}. \end{cases} \quad (3.7)$$

Proof. (a) Note that there are at most N different types of $F_{\mathcal{S}_Q} = \bigcup_{Q' \in \mathcal{S}_Q} F_{Q'}$ in the following sense. There is an integer $N \geq 1$ and a finite collection $\{Q^{(i)} : 1 \leq i \leq N\} \subset \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{Q}_k(F)$ such that for any $\tilde{Q} \in \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{Q}_k(F)$, there are some $1 \leq j \leq N$ and a similarity map $\Psi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ so that $\Psi(F_{\tilde{Q}}) = F_{Q^{(j)}}$ and $\Psi(F_{\mathcal{S}_{\tilde{Q}}}) = F_{\mathcal{S}_{Q^{(j)}}}$. For each $1 \leq i \leq N$, we fix a function $w_i \in C(F) \cap \mathcal{F}^{(F)}$ such that $w_i = 1$ on $F_{Q^{(i)}}$ and some neighborhood of the support of w_i is contained in $F_{\mathcal{S}_{Q^{(i)}}}$. For a general $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F)$ with $n \geq 1$, let $1 \leq j \leq N$ and some similarity map $\Psi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be such that $\Psi(F_Q) = F_{Q^{(j)}}$ and $\Psi(F_{\mathcal{S}_Q}) = F_{\mathcal{S}_{Q^{(j)}}}$. Define w_Q by

$$w_Q(x) = \begin{cases} w_j \circ \Psi(x) & \text{if } x \in F_{\mathcal{S}_Q}, \\ 0 & \text{if } x \in F \setminus F_{\mathcal{S}_Q}. \end{cases}$$

By the self-similar property of $(\mathcal{E}^{(F)}, \mathcal{F}^{(F)})$, we see that $w_Q \in C(F) \cap \mathcal{F}^{(F)}$ and the desired estimate holds with C depending only $\{w_i; 1 \leq i \leq N\}$ and F .

(b) The case that $m > n$ is an immediate consequence of [28, Theorem 5.8] and Lemma 3.5. The case that $m \leq n$ is trivial. \square

Next, we establish the following estimate using Lemmas 3.5 and 3.6, which was assumed as condition (A7) in [23, p.582].

Lemma 3.7. $d_I > d_f - d_w$.

Proof. Let $m \geq 2$. For each $1 \leq k \leq m$, let

$$A_k := [1 - L_F^{-k+1} + L_F^{-k}, 1 - L_F^{-k+1} + 2L_F^{-k}] \times [0, 1]^{d-1},$$

and define $h_{m,k} \in C(F_m) \cap W^{1,2}(F_m)$ by

$$h_{m,k}(x) = \max \left\{ w_Q^{(m)}(x) : Q \in \mathcal{Q}_k(F_m \cap A_k) \right\}, \quad x \in F_m,$$

where $w_Q^{(m)}$ is the function in Lemma 3.6(b). Note that $h_{m,k} = 1$ on $F_m \cap A_k$, $0 \leq h_{m,k} \leq 1$ and

$$\#\mathcal{Q}_k(F_m \cap A_k) = m_I^{k-1} \cdot \mathcal{Q}_1(F \cap A_1).$$

We have by Lemma 3.6(b) that that $\mathcal{E}^{(F_m)}(h_{m,k}) \leq C_1 \cdot m_I^k \cdot L_F^{(d_w - d_f)k}$ for some constant C_1 depending only on F .

Next, for $1 \leq k \leq m$, define $g_{m,k}$ by

$$g_{m,k}(x) = \begin{cases} h_{m,k}(x) & \text{if } x \in F_m \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : x \leq 1 - L_F^{-k+1} + L_F^{-k}\}, \\ 1 & \text{if } x \in F_m \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : x > 1 - L_F^{-k+1} + L_F^{-k}\}, \end{cases}$$

which is in $C(F_m) \cap W^{1,2}(F_m)$. By the strong local property of $(\mathcal{E}^{(F_m)}, W^{1,2}(F_m))$, we have

$$\mathcal{E}^{(F_m)}(g_{m,k}) \leq \mathcal{E}^{(F_m)}(h_{m,k}) \leq C_1 m_I^k \cdot L_F^{(d_w - d_f)k} = C_1 L_F^{(d_w - d_f + d_I)k}.$$

Finally, we let $f_m = \sum_{k=1}^m \frac{1}{k} g_{m,k} \in C(F_m) \cap W^{1,2}(F_m)$. Note that $f_m = 0$ on $\partial_{1,0}F$, $f_m = \sum_{k=1}^m \frac{1}{k}$ on $\partial_{1,1}F_m$, and, by the strong local property of $(\mathcal{E}^{(F_m)}, W^{1,2}(F_m))$,

$$\mathcal{E}^{(F_m)}(f_m) = \sum_{k=1}^m \frac{1}{k^2} \mathcal{E}^{(F_m)}(g_{m,k}) \leq C_1 \sum_{k=1}^m \frac{1}{k^2} L_F^{(d_w - d_f + d_I)k}. \quad (3.8)$$

Finally, by Lemma 3.5 and the definition of R_m , we have

$$C^{-1} \leq R_m \leq \frac{\mathcal{E}^{(F_m)}(f_m)}{(\sum_{k=1}^m 1/k)^2} \quad \text{for every } m \geq 1,$$

where $C \geq 1$ is a constant independent of n . It follows that $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}^{(F_m)}(f_m) = \infty$ and hence by (3.8) we have $d_w - d_f + d_I > 0$. \square

Recall that for an open subset $O \subset F$, its $\mathcal{E}^{(F)}$ -capacity of O is defined as $\text{Cap}^{(F)}(O) = \inf\{\mathcal{E}_1^{(F)}(f) : f \in \mathcal{F}, f|_O \geq 1 \text{ } \mu\text{-a.e. on } O\}$, where $\mathcal{E}_1^{(F)}(f) := \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(f) + \|f\|_{L^2(F;\mu)}^2$. For a general Borel subset $A \subset F$, $\text{Cap}^{(F)}(A) := \inf\{\text{Cap}^{(F)}(O) : O \text{ is an open subset of } F, A \subset O\}$.

Lemma 3.8. *There is a constant $c > 0$ so that*

$$\nu(K) \leq c \text{Cap}^{(F)}(K) \quad \text{for every compact subset } K \subset \partial_o F. \quad (3.9)$$

Consequently, the normalized d_I -dimensional Hausdorff measure ν charges no subset of $\partial_o F$ having zero $\mathcal{E}^{(F)}$ -capacity and the boundary $\partial_o F$ has positive $\mathcal{E}^{(F)}$ -capacity and

Proof. Property (3.9) follows directly from Lemma 3.7 and [23, Proposition 4.2(b)]. This shows that F is of positive $\mathcal{E}^{(F)}$ -capacity as $\nu(\partial_o F) = 1$, and ν does not charge on sets of zero $\mathcal{E}^{(F)}$ -capacity and hence is a smooth measure of $(\mathcal{E}^{(F)}, \mathcal{F}^{(F)})$ in the sense of [18, 20]. \square

Remark 3.9. The second part of Lemma 3.8 was assumed as condition (A8) in [23, p.583]. It is shown in [23, Theorem, 4.2] that (3.9) holds under the assumption of $d_I > d_f - d_w$.

3.3. Mosco convergence. In this subsection, we will show that $\alpha_m \mathcal{E}^{(F_m)}$ is Mosco convergent to $\mathcal{E}^{(F)}$.

Theorem 3.10. *There exists a sequence $\{\alpha_k; k \geq 0\}$ with*

$$0 < \inf_{k \geq 0} \alpha_k \leq \sup_{k \geq 0} \alpha_k < \infty,$$

so that for any $x_k \in F_k$, $k \geq 1$, with $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} x_k = x \in F$, $(X_{\alpha_k t}^{(F_k)})_{t \geq 0}$ under $\mathbb{P}_{x_k}^{(F_k)}$ converges weakly in $C([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^d)$ to $(X_t^{(F)})_{t \geq 0}$ under $\mathbb{P}_x^{(F)}$.

Proof. This result is essentially stated in [10, Remark 5.4]. For reader's convenience, we spell out a detailed proof here. It is established in [3, 7] that $\{Y^{(n)} := (W_{\bar{\rho}_F^n t}^{(F_n)})_{t \geq 0}; n \geq 1\}$ is tight both in probability law (in the sense of [3, Theorem 5.1]) and in resolvents (in the sense of [3, Propositions 6.1 and 6.2], where $\bar{\rho}_F = L_F^{d_w - 2}$). As mentioned previously, these results from [3] hold for $d \geq 3$ as well due to the elliptic Harnack inequality established in [7]. Denote by τ the first hitting time of the faces of ∂F_0 not containing the origin $\mathbf{0} := (0, \dots, 0)$. Let $a_n := \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{0}}^{Y^{(n)}} \tau$. Then in view of tightness of the 0-resolvents from [3, Proposition 6.1] with $f = 1$ and the non-degeneracy of any sub-sequential limit process, $\{a_n; n \geq 1\}$ are bounded between two positive constants.

For every subsequence, there is a sub-subsequence $\{Y^{(n_{k_j})}\}$ that converges to a limit process Y in the above two senses. By the convergence of the 0-resolvents (cf. [3, Proposition 6.1]), we have $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} a_{n_{k_j}} = a := \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{0}}^Y \tau$. It follows that $\{Y_{t/a_{n_{k_j}}}^{(n_{k_j})}; t \geq 0\}$ converges weakly to $Z := \{Y_{t/a}; t \geq 0\}$. Note that the mean time of Z starting from $\mathbf{0}$ to hit the faces of ∂F_0 not containing $\mathbf{0}$ is 1 and that the Dirichlet form of Z on $L^2(F; \mu)$ is strongly local, regular, irreducible and locally symmetric. Hence by the uniqueness result from [10], the process Z has the same distribution as $X^{(F)}$. Since this holds for any subsequence, we conclude that for any $x_k \in F_k$, $k \geq 1$, with $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} x_k = x \in F$, $\{(Y_{\lambda_n t/a_n}^{(n)})_{t \geq 0}; n \geq 1\}$ under $\mathbb{P}_{x_n}^{Y^{(n)}}$ converges weakly in $C([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^d)$ to $(X_t^{(F)})_{t \geq 0}$ under $\mathbb{P}_x^{(F)}$. This proves the theorem with $\alpha_k = 1/a_k$. \square

The main goal of the paper is to show that $\{\alpha_k; k \geq 0\}$ in Theorem 3.10 has a limit and thus one could take $\alpha_j \equiv \alpha$ for all $j \geq 1$ there. A consequence of this result is that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{0}}^{(F_k)} \tau = \alpha^{-1} = \alpha^{-1} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{0}}^{(F)} \tau. \quad (3.10)$$

It will further imply the convergence of the resistance R_n defined by (1.7); that is, $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} R_k$ exists as a finite positive number. This gives an affirmative answer to a long standing open problem raised by Barlow and Bass [5, Problem 1]. This property will play a key role in our study of quenched invariance principle on generalized unbounded Sierpiński carpets in i.i.d. uniformly elliptic random environments.

For $\lambda > 0$, denote by $U_\lambda^{(F)}$ the λ -resolvent operator for $((X_t^{(F)})_{t \geq 0}, \mathbb{P}_x^{(F)})$; for $m \geq 0$, denote by $U_\lambda^{(F_m)}$ to denote the λ -Resolvent operator for $((X_{\alpha_m t}^{(F_m)})_{t \geq 0}, \mathbb{P}_x^{(F_m)})$. The following lemma is proven in [10, Section 3.1] using the uniform elliptic Harnack inequality in Theorem 3.4 and exit time estimates from [7, Proposition 5.5].

Lemma 3.11. *For each $\lambda > 0$, the class of functions*

$$\{U_\lambda^{(F_m)} f_m : m \geq 0, f_m \in L^\infty(F_m; \mu_m), \|f_m\|_\infty \leq 1\}$$

is uniformly bounded and equicontinuous.

Theorem 3.12. $\alpha_m \mathcal{E}^{(F_m)}$ on $L^2(F_m; \mu_m)$ is Mosco convergent to $\mathcal{E}^{(F)}$ on $L^2(F; \mu)$ in the sense of Definition 2.12 as $m \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. We fix $\lambda > 0$ and show that (d) of Theorem 2.13 holds true. For each $g \in C(F_0)$ and $m \geq 0$, $U_\lambda^{(F_m)}(g|_{F_m}) \in C(F_m)$ and $U_\lambda(g|_F) \in C(F)$ by the strong Feller property of $X^{(F_m)}$ and $X^{(F)}$. Moreover, $U_\lambda^{(F_m)}(g|_{F_m}) \rightarrow U_\lambda^{(F)}(g|_F)$ by Theorem 3.10. Since F_0 is compact and μ_m and μ are probability measures on F_m and F , respectively, $U_\lambda^{(F_m)}(g|_{F_m}) \rightarrow U_\lambda^{(F)}(g|_F)$ strongly in L^2 by Lemma 2.11 (b). Noting that $\|U_\lambda^{(F)}\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} \leq \lambda^{-1}$ and $\|U_\lambda^{(F_m)}\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} \leq \lambda^{-1}$ for each $m \geq 0$, it follows from Proposition 2.14 that $U_\lambda^{(F_m)}$ converges strongly to $U^{(F)}$. \square

3.4. Energy measures. We end this section with a quick review of energy measures and Poincaré inequalities.

(**Energy measure**). Let $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ be a strongly local regular Dirichlet form on $L^2(\mathcal{X}; \mu)$. For $f \in L^\infty(\mathcal{X}; \mu) \cap \mathcal{F}$, we define the energy measure $\mu_{\langle f \rangle}$ as the unique Radon measure on K such that

$$\int_K g(x) \mu_{\langle f \rangle}(dx) = \mathcal{E}(f, fg) - \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{E}(f^2, g), \quad g \in C_c(\mathcal{X}) \cap \mathcal{F}. \quad (3.11)$$

For general $f \in \mathcal{F}$, we define $\mu_{\langle f \rangle} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{\langle f_n \rangle}$ with $f_n = (f \wedge n) \vee (-n)$, whose limit is known to exist (see [18, 20]). Note that our choice is different from [20] by a constant multiplier $\frac{1}{2}$ so that $\mu_{\langle f \rangle}(\mathcal{X}) = \mathcal{E}(f)$ for $f \in \mathcal{F}$.

We use the notation $(\mathcal{E}^{(*)}, \mathcal{F}^{(*)})$ (sometimes we use $W^{1,2}(\ast)$ instead of $\mathcal{F}^{(*)}$), where \ast usually represents the underlying space, to denote various Dirichlet forms. The corresponding energy measure of $f \in \mathcal{F}^{(*)}$ is denoted as $\mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(*)}$. We will also use the notation $(\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(*)}, \mathcal{F}^{(*)})$ (or $(\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(*)}, W^{1,2}(\ast))$) from time to time, and use $\bar{\mu}_{\langle f \rangle}^{(*)}$ for the associated energy measure of $f \in \mathcal{F}^{(*)}$ (or $f \in W^{1,2}(\ast)$).

Lemma 3.13. *There are constants $C > 0$ and $c \in (0, 1)$ such that the following hold.*

(a) *For each $f \in \mathcal{F}^{(F)}$, $x \in F$ and $r \in (0, 1]$,*

$$r^{d_f - d_w} \int_{B_F(x, cr)} (f(y) - [f]_{\mu|_{B_F(x, cr)}})^2 \mu(dy) \leq C \mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F)}(B_F(x, r)).$$

(b) *For each $m \geq 0$, $f \in W^{1,2}(F_m)$, $x \in F_m$ and $r \in (0, 1]$,*

$$\varphi_m(r) \int_{B_{F_m}(x, cr)} (f(y) - [f]_{\mu_m|_{B_{F_m}(x, cr)}})^2 \mu_m(dy) \leq C \mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F_m)}(B_{F_m}(x, r)).$$

Proof. (a) follows from the heat kernel estimates (1.5) for $X^{(F)}$ and its stable characterization (see, e.g., [1, 9, 21]). (b) follows from [7, Theorem 7.3]. \square

4. HARMONIC FUNCTIONS WITH ASSIGNED MEAN BOUNDARY VALUES

In this section, we prove a key result, Proposition 4.4, of the paper. The other two key results, trace theorems and a theorem about decreasing rate of energy measures near the boundary of cells, are proved in appendixes.

We start with a result that will be needed in the sequel. It asserts that every boundary point in $\partial_o F$ is regular for $\partial_o F$ with respect to the Brownian motion $X^{(F)}$ on F , that is, $\mathbb{P}_x^{(F)}(\dot{\sigma}_{\partial_o F} = 0) = 1$ for every $x \in \partial_o F$, where the notation $\dot{\sigma}_A$ is defined in (3.6).

Proposition 4.1. *Every point of $\partial_o F$ is a regular point for $\partial_o F_0$ with respect to $X^{(F)}$.*

Proof. For each $n \geq 2$, define $\mathcal{B}_n(F) = \{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F) : Q \cap \partial_o F \neq \emptyset\}$ and $A_n = F_{\mathcal{Q}_n(F) \setminus \mathcal{B}_n(F)} \cap F_{\mathcal{B}_n(F)}$. Note that $\sigma_{A_n} = \sigma_{F_{\mathcal{Q}_n(F) \setminus \mathcal{B}_n(F)}}$ $\mathbb{P}_x^{(F)}$ -a.s. for each $x \in \partial_o F$ and $n \geq 2$. It suffices to show that there is a constant $C_1 \in (0, 1)$ so that

$$\mathbb{P}_z^{(F)}(\sigma_{\partial_o F} < \sigma_{A_{n-1}}) \geq C_1 \quad \text{for } n \geq 3 \text{ and } z \in A_n. \quad (4.1)$$

Indeed, assuming (4.1), we have by the strong Markov property of $X^{(F)}$ that for each $x \in \partial_o F$ and $n \geq 3$,

$$\mathbb{P}_x^{(F)}(\dot{\sigma}_{\partial_o F} < \sigma_{\sigma_{A_{n-1}}}) \geq \mathbb{P}_x^{(F)}(\sigma_{\partial_o F} \circ \theta_{\sigma_{A_n}} < \sigma_{A_{n-1}} \circ \theta_{\sigma_{A_n}}) \geq C_1,$$

where θ is the time shift operator for $X^{(F)}$: $X_t^{(F)} \circ \theta_s = X_{t+s}^{(F)}$ for every $t, s \geq 0$. The above inequality holds due to the fact that $\mathbb{P}_x^{(F)}$ -a.s.

$$\sigma_{A_{n-1}} \circ \theta_{\sigma_{A_n}} + \sigma_{A_n} = \sigma_{A_{n-1}} \quad \text{and} \quad \dot{\sigma}_{\partial_o F} \leq \sigma_{\partial_o F} \circ \theta_{\sigma_{A_n}} + \sigma_{A_n}.$$

Since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_{A_n} = \sigma_{F \setminus \partial_o F} = 0$ $\mathbb{P}_x^{(F)}$ -a.s., we have $\mathbb{P}_x^{(F)}(\dot{\sigma}_{\partial_o F} = 0) \geq C_1 > 0$. Hence by Blumenthal's zero-one law, $\mathbb{P}_x^{(F)}(\dot{\sigma}_{\partial_o F} = 0) = 1$, proving that x is a regular point for $\partial_o F$.

We now proceed to show (4.1). Let

$$E := \bigcup \{ \partial_{i,s} F : i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}, s \in \{0, 1\} \text{ and } (i, s) \neq (1, 0) \},$$

and fix a closed set $D \subset \partial_{1,0} F$ such that $\nu(D) > 0$ and $\rho(D, E) > 0$. In view of (3.9), both D and E have positive capacity. Define

$$h(z) := \mathbb{P}_z^{(F)}(\sigma_D < \sigma_E) \quad \text{for } z \in F.$$

Observe that $h \in \mathcal{F}^{(F)}$, $h = 0$ on E , $h = 1$ on D and h is $\mathcal{E}^{(F)}$ -harmonic in $F \setminus (D \cup E)$. By EHI (Theorem 3.4) and the connectivity of $F \setminus \partial_o F$, $h(z) > 0$ for each $z \in F \setminus \partial_o F$. Fix a $z_o \in F \setminus \partial_o F$ so that $\rho(z_o, \partial_{1,0} F_0) > 1/2$.

Let $n \geq 3$ and $z \in A_n$. Take $Q \in \mathcal{B}_n(F)$ so that there are $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}, s \in \{0, 1\}$ such that $z \in \partial_{i,s} F_Q$ and $\partial_{i,1-s} F_Q \subset \partial_o F$. Define

$$h_z(y) := \mathbb{P}_y^{(F)}(\sigma_{\partial_{i,1-s} F_Q} < \sigma_{A_{n-1}}) \quad \text{for } y \in F.$$

Denote by $\Psi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ the similarity map such that $\Phi(F) = F_Q$ and $\Psi(\partial_{1,0}F) = \partial_{i,1-s}F_Q$ (so $\Psi(D) \subset \partial_{i,1-s}F_Q \subset \partial_oF$, and $\Psi(E)$ disconnect F_Q from other n -cells), then

$$h_z(y) \geq \bar{h}_z(y) := \mathbb{P}_y^{(F)}(\sigma_{\Psi(D)} < \sigma_{\Psi(E)}) = h(\Psi^{-1}(y)) \quad \text{for } y \in F_Q \setminus \partial_oF_Q,$$

where we use self-similarity of $X^{(F)}$ under Ψ in the last equality. In particular, we have

$$h_z(\Psi(z_o)) \geq \bar{h}_z(\Psi(z_o)) = h(z_o) > 0.$$

Noticing that $\Psi(\{y \in F : \rho(y, \partial_{0,1}F_0)\} \geq 1/2)$ is connected (by a same proof of Lemma A.1), by using EHI (we can find a chain of balls of radius $\frac{1}{4}L_F^{-n}$ connecting $\Psi(z_o)$ and z , and the number of balls has a uniform upper bound independent of $z \in A_n$, we conclude that $h_z(z) \geq C_1$ for some $C_1 > 0$ depending only on F , which is (4.1). \square

For the development of a forthcoming paper about some quenched invariance principle, we state the result in slightly more general setting (with the assumptions to be verified there). We assume in this subsection that $(\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)}, W^{(1,2)}(F_m))$, $m \geq 0$ is a sequence of strongly local regular Dirichlet forms on $L^2(F_m; \mu_m)$ such that

$$C_0^{-1}\mathcal{E}^{(F_m)} \leq \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)} \leq C_0\mathcal{E}^{(F_m)} \quad \text{for every } m \geq 0, \quad (4.2)$$

for some $C_0 \in [1, \infty)$ and $\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)}$ is Mosco convergent to $\mathcal{E}^{(F)}$.

Remark 4.2. The above assumption can be imposed for a subsequence $\{m_k; k \geq 1\}$ instead of for the whole sequence $\{m; m \geq 1\}$. The following assumptions (A1), (A2) and (A3) will then be assumed for the corresponding subsequence only. In this case, all the results in this section hold for this subsequence $\{m_k, k \geq 1\}$ with the same proof.

(A1) For each $g_m \in C(F_m) \cap W^{1,2}(F_m)$, there is $h_m \in C(F_m) \cap W^{1,2}(F_m)$ such that $h_m|_{\partial_oF_m} = g_m|_{\partial_oF_m}$ and h_m is $\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)}$ -harmonic in $F_m \setminus \partial_oF_m$.

Suppose that $h_m \in C(F_m) \cap W^{1,2}(F_m)$ is $\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)}$ -harmonic in $F_m \setminus \partial_oF_m$ for each $m \geq 0$, and $h_m|_{\partial_oF_m}, m \geq 0$ are uniformly bounded and equicontinuous. Then, for each subsequence $\{m_k; k \geq 1\}$, there is a sub-subsequence $\{m_{k(l)}; l \geq 1\}$ so that $h_{m_{k(l)}} \rightharpoonup h$ for some $h \in C(F)$.

(A2) Let $n \geq 1$, $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F)$, $f_m \in L^2(F_m; \mu_m)$, $m \geq 1$, and $f \in L^2(F; \mu)$. If $f_m \rightarrow f$ strongly in L^2 , then $\liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\mu}_{\langle f_m \rangle}^{(F_m)}(F_m, Q) \geq \mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F)}(F_Q)$.

(A3) $\{\bar{U}_\lambda^{(F_m)} f : m \geq 0, f \in L^\infty(F_m; \mu_m), \|f\|_\infty \leq 1\}$ is equicontinuous, where $\bar{U}_\lambda^{(F_m)}$ is the resolvent operator associated with $(\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)}, W^{1,2}(F_m))$ on $L^2(F_m; \mu_m)$.

Conditions (A1)-(A3) hold for $\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)} = \alpha_m \mathcal{E}^{(F_m)}$, where α_m is the constant in Theorem 3.10 as well as in Theorem 3.12. Indeed in this case, (A3) is just Lemma 3.11, while (A1) is proved in Lemma 4.5 by using Proposition 4.1. It is shown at the beginning of Section 5 that condition (A2) holds for a suitable sub-sequence, and then it holds for the whole sequence after we have established that the limit of $\{a_m; m \geq 1\}$ exists in (5.12) in view of Theorem 3.12.

When F is a GSC equipped with the uniformly elliptic i.i.d random conductance as considered in [16], conditions (A1) and (A3) can be shown to hold using the stability theorem

of elliptic Harnack inequality [11, 12]. Condition (A2) holds in this case as well and its proof will be given in the forthcoming paper [16].

To state the main result of this section, we need some notation.

(**Sub-faces**). Let $m, n \geq 0$.

(a) Denote by $\partial_n F$ the collection of level n sub-faces of $\partial_o F$:

$$\partial_n F = \{\partial_{i,s} F_Q : Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F), i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}, s \in \{0, 1\} \text{ such that } \partial_{i,s} F_Q \subset \partial_o F\}.$$

(b) Denote by $\partial_n F_m$ the collection of level n sub-faces of $\partial_o F_m$:

$$\partial_n F_m = \{\partial_{i,s} F_{m,Q} : Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F_m), i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}, s \in \{0, 1\} \text{ such that } \partial_{i,s} F_{m,Q} \subset \partial_o F_m\}.$$

Recall that ν is the normalized d_I -dimensional Hausdorff measure on $\bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F)} \partial_o F_Q$ with $\nu(\partial_o F) = 1$ and ν_m is the normalized $(d-1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure on $\bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F_m)} \partial_o F_{m,Q}$ with $\nu_m(\partial_o F_m) = 1$.

(**Discrete energy on sub-face graphs**). Let $m \geq 0, k \geq 1$.

(a) For $A, A' \in \partial_k F$ such that $A \neq A'$, we say $A \sim A'$ if

$$A \cap A' \neq \emptyset \text{ or } A, A' \subset B \text{ for some } B \in \partial_{k-1} F. \quad (4.3)$$

For each $f \in L^1(\partial_o F; \nu)$, define

$$I_k[f] = \sum_{\substack{A, A' \in \partial_k F \\ A \sim A'}} ([f]_{\nu|_A} - [f]_{\nu|_{A'}})^2.$$

(b) For $A, A' \in \partial_k F_m$ such that $A \neq A'$, we say $A \sim A'$ if $A \cap A' \neq \emptyset$ or $A, A' \subset B$ for some $B \in \partial_{k-1} F_m$. For each $f \in L^1(\partial_o F_m; \nu_m)$, define

$$I_k^{(m)}[f] = \sum_{\substack{A, A' \in \partial_k F_m \\ A \sim A'}} ([f]_{\nu_m|_A} - [f]_{\nu_m|_{A'}})^2.$$

Remark 4.3. We need to consider two possibilities when defining the relation \sim because $\partial_o F$ may not be connected. We remark that the graphs $(\partial_1 F, \sim)$ and $(\partial_1 F_m, \sim)$ are always connected.

(**Besov type spaces on faces**). (a) For each $n \geq 1$ and $f \in L^1(\partial_o F; \nu)$, define

$$\Lambda_n[f] := \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} L_F^{k(d_w - d_f)} I_k[f],$$

and the space

$$\Lambda(\partial_o F) := \{f \in L^2(\partial_o F; \nu) : \Lambda_1[f] < \infty\}. \quad (4.4)$$

(b) For each $m \geq 0, n \geq 1$ and $f \in L^1(\partial_o F_m; \nu_m)$, define (where φ_m is defined in (3.7))

$$\Lambda_n^{(m)}[f] := \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \varphi_m(L_F^{-k}) I_k^{(m)}[f],$$

and the space

$$\Lambda^{(m)}(\partial_o F_m) := \{f \in L^2(\partial_o F_m; \nu_m) : \Lambda_1^{(m)}[f] < \infty\}. \quad (4.5)$$

(**Boundary shells**). For $n \geq 0$, define $\mathcal{B}_n := \{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n : Q \cap \partial F_0 \neq \emptyset\}$. For $n \geq 0$ and $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, let $\mathcal{B}_n(A) := \{Q \in \mathcal{B}_n : \text{int}(Q) \cap A \neq \emptyset\}$.

Note that $\mathcal{B}_n(F_m) = \mathcal{B}_n(F)$ if $n \leq m$. See Figure 4 for the pictures of $F_{\mathcal{B}_n(F)} = \bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{B}_n(F)} F_Q$ of the standard Sierpiński carpet F for $n = 1, 2, 3$.




FIGURE 4. $F_{\mathcal{B}_1(F)}$, $F_{\mathcal{B}_2(F)}$ and $F_{\mathcal{B}_3(F)}$ of the standard Sierpiński carpet F in \mathbb{R}^2

The following is the main result of this section.

Proposition 4.4. *Let $n \geq 1$ and assume that (A1), (A2), (A3) hold. Then, there are positive finite constants C depending only on the constant C_0 in (4.2) and $N \geq n$ (which depends on n and $\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)}$, $m \geq 0$) such that*

$$\left| \sqrt{\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)}(g_m)} - \sqrt{\mathcal{E}^{(F)}(g)} \right| \leq C \left(\sqrt{\mu_{(g)}^{(F)}(F_{\mathcal{B}_{n-1}(F)})} + \sqrt{\Lambda_n^{(m)}[g_m|_{\partial_o F_m}]} \right)$$

for any $m \geq N$, any $g \in \mathcal{F}^{(F)} \cap C(F)$ that is $\mathcal{E}^{(F)}$ -harmonic in $F \setminus \partial_o F$, and any $g_m \in W^{1,2}(F_m) \cap C(F_m)$ that is $\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)}$ -harmonic in $F_m \setminus \partial_o F_m$ having

$$\int_{A_m} g_m d\nu_m = \int_A g d\nu \quad \text{for every } A \in \bar{\partial}_n F \text{ and } A_m \in \bar{\partial}_n F_m \text{ with } A \subset A_m.$$

The proof of this proposition will be given in subsection 4.3, after a series of preparations. Our proof also needs some trace theorems, which are given in Appendix A.

4.1. Good approximation sequence of harmonic functions. In this subsection, we show that under condition (A1) and (A3), every $h \in \mathcal{F}^{(F)} \cap C(F)$ that is $\mathcal{E}^{(F)}$ -harmonic in $F \setminus \partial_o F$ can be approximated by some nice functions in $W^{1,2}(F_m) \cap C(F_m)$; see Lemma 4.6. First we show that condition (A1) holds when $\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)} = \alpha_m \mathcal{E}^{(F_m)}$ for every $m \geq 0$.

Lemma 4.5. *(A1) holds for $(\alpha_m \mathcal{E}^{(F_m)}, W^{1,2}(F_m))$ with $m \geq 0$.*

Proof. Since F_m are Lipschitz domains, it is well known that each $x \in \partial F_m$ is regular for ∂F_m with respect to the normally reflected Brownian motion on F_m . Thus for every $g \in C(F_m) \cap W^{1,2}(F_m)$, $h(x) = \mathbb{E}_x[g(X_{\sigma_{\partial_o F_m}^{(F_m)}})]$ is a continuous function on F_m with $h = g$ on $\partial_o F_m$. On the other hand, since F_m is compact, it follows from [18, 20] that $h \in W^{1,2}(F_m)$.

Suppose that for each $m \geq 0$, $h_m \in C(F_m) \cap W^{1,2}(F_m)$ is $\mathcal{E}^{(F_m)}$ -harmonic in $F_m \setminus \partial_o F_m$ and $h_m|_{\partial_o F_m}$ is uniformly bounded and equicontinuous. For each subsequence $\{m_k; k \geq 1\}$,

by (EHI) (Theorem 3.4) and Lemma 2.10(a), there is a sub-subsequence $\{m_{k(l)}; l \geq 1\}$ so that $h_{m_{k(l)}}|_{F_{m_{k(l)}} \setminus \partial_o F_{m_{k(l)}}} \rightsquigarrow h|_{F \setminus \partial_o F}$ and $h_{m_{k(l)}}|_{\partial_o F_{m_{k(l)}}} \rightsquigarrow h|_{\partial_o F}$ as $l \rightarrow \infty$ for some bounded function h on F that is continuous on $F \setminus \partial_o F$ and on $\partial_o F$. In view of Theorem 3.10, we can further assume that the constants $\{\alpha_{m_{k(l)}}; l \geq 1\}$ there converge to a positive number α . If we can show that

$$\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} h_{m_{k(l)}}(x_{m_{k(l)}}) = h(x) \quad \text{for every } x_{m_{k(l)}} \in F_{m_{k(l)}} \text{ that converges to } x \in \partial_o F, \quad (4.6)$$

then $h_{m_k} \rightsquigarrow h$ and so $h \in C(F)$ by Lemma 2.10(b). This would establish (A1).

To show (4.6), fix $x \in \partial_o F$ and $x_{m_{k(l)}} \in F_{m_{k(l)}}, l \geq 1$ such that $x_{m_{k(l)}}$ converges to x . By Lemma 2.10 (b), there are $f_{m_{k(l)}} \in C(\partial F_0), l \geq 1$ and $f \in C(\partial F_0)$ such that $h_{m_{k(l)}}|_{\partial_o F_{m_{k(l)}}} = f_{m_{k(l)}}|_{\partial_o F_{m_{k(l)}}, l \geq 1, h|_{\partial_o F} = f|_{\partial_o F}$ and $\|f_{m_{k(l)}} - f\|_\infty \rightarrow 0$. So,

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \left| h_{m_{k(l)}}(x_{m_{k(l)}}) - \mathbb{E}_{x_{m_{k(l)}}} \left[f(X_{\sigma_{\partial_o F_{m_{k(l)}}}^{(F_{m_{k(l)})}}}) \right] \right| \\ &= \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \left| \mathbb{E}_{x_{m_{k(l)}}} \left[(h_{m_{k(l)}} - f)(X_{\sigma_{\partial_o F_{m_{k(l)}}}^{(F_{m_{k(l)})}}}) \right] \right| \leq \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \|f_{m_{k(l)}} - f\|_\infty = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

Recall that $\sigma_{\partial F_0}(\omega) := \inf\{t \geq 0 : \omega(t) \in \partial F_0\}$ and $\tau_{B(x,r)} := \inf\{t \geq 0 : \omega(t) \notin B(x,r)\}$ for $\omega \in C([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^d)$. As $\{\sigma_{\partial F_0} \geq \varepsilon\}$ is a closed set in $C([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^d)$, we have by Theorem 3.10 that

$$\limsup_{l \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{x_{m_{k(l)}}}^{(F_{m_{k(l)})}}(\sigma_{\partial F_0} \geq \varepsilon / \alpha_{m_{k(l)}}) \leq \mathbb{P}_x^{(F)}(\sigma_{\partial F_0} \geq \varepsilon) = 0.$$

On the other hand, for any $r > 0, \{\tau_{B(x,r)} > \varepsilon\}$ is an open set in $C([0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^d)$, we have by Theorem 3.10 again that

$$\liminf_{l \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{x_{m_{k(l)}}}^{(F_{m_{k(l)})}}(\tau_{B(x,r)} > \varepsilon / \alpha_{m_{k(l)}}) \geq \mathbb{P}_x^{(F)}(\tau_{B(x,r)} > \varepsilon).$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \liminf_{l \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{x_{m_{k(l)}}}^{(F_{m_{k(l)})}} \left(X_{\sigma_{\partial F_0}^{(F_{m_{k(l)})}}^{(F_{m_{k(l)})}}) \in B(x,r) \right) \\ & \geq \liminf_{l \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{x_{m_{k(l)}}}^{(F_{m_{k(l)})}} \left(\left\{ \sigma_{\partial F_0} < \varepsilon / \alpha_{m_{k(l)}} \right\} \cap \left\{ \tau_{B(x,r)} > \varepsilon / \alpha_{m_{k(l)}} \right\} \right) \\ & \geq \liminf_{l \rightarrow \infty} \left(\mathbb{P}_{x_{m_{k(l)}}}^{(F_{m_{k(l)})}} \left(\tau_{B(x,r)} > \varepsilon / \alpha_{m_{k(l)}} \right) - \mathbb{P}_{x_{m_{k(l)}}}^{(F_{m_{k(l)})}} \left(\sigma_{\partial F_0} \geq \varepsilon / \alpha_{m_{k(l)}} \right) \right) \\ & \geq \mathbb{P}_x^{(F)}(\tau_{B(x,r)} > \varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

Since $X^{(F)}$ has right continuous sample paths, $\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \mathbb{P}_x^{(F)}(\tau_{B(x,r)} > \varepsilon) = \mathbb{P}_x^{(F)}(\tau_{B(x,r)} > 0) = 1$ for every $r > 0$ and so

$$\liminf_{l \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_{x_{m_{k(l)}}}^{(F_{m_{k(l)})}} \left(X_{\sigma_{\partial F_0}^{(F_{m_{k(l)})}}^{(F_{m_{k(l)})}}) \in B(x,r) \right) = 1.$$

Since this holds for every $r > 0$, we conclude that $X_{\sigma_{\partial F_0}}^{(F_{m_k(l)})}$ converges to x in law as $l \rightarrow \infty$. This combined with (4.7) yields that

$$\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} h_{m_k(l)}(x_{m_k(l)}) = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{x_{m_k(l)}} \left[f(X_{\sigma_{\partial F_0}}^{(F_{m_k(l)})}) \right] = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{x_{m_k(l)}} \left[f(X_{\sigma_{\partial F_0}}^{(F_{m_k(l)})}) \right] = f(x) = h(x),$$

which is (4.6). \square

By Proposition 4.1, each point $x \in \partial_o F$ is regular for $\partial_o F$ with respect to $X^{(F)}$. So, by the Harnack inequality (Theorem 3.4) and its implication, for $g \in C(F) \cap \mathcal{F}^{(F)}$, the function

$$h(x) := \mathbb{E}_x \left[g(X_{\sigma_{\partial_o F}}^{(F)}) \right], \quad x \in F,$$

is in $C(F) \cap \mathcal{F}^{(F)}$ and is $\mathcal{E}^{(F)}$ -harmonic in $F \setminus \partial_o F$ with $h|_{\partial_o F} = g|_{\partial_o F}$.

Lemma 4.6. *Assume that (A1) and (A3) hold, and $h \in C(F) \cap \mathcal{F}^{(F)}$ is $\mathcal{E}^{(F)}$ -harmonic in $F \setminus \partial_o F$. Then there exist $h_m \in W^{1,2}(F_m) \cap C(F_m)$, $m \geq 0$, so that*

- (i) h_m is $\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)}$ -harmonic in $F_m \setminus \partial_o F_m$.
- (ii) $h_m \rightarrow h$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$.
- (iii) $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)}(h_m) = \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(h)$.

Proof. By the Mosco convergence of $\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_n)}$ to $\mathcal{E}^{(F)}$, there is $f_n \in W^{1,2}(F_n)$ so that $f_n \rightarrow h$ strongly in L^2 and $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_n)}(f_n) \leq \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(h)$. Replacing f_n by $(-\|h\|_\infty) \vee (f_n \wedge \|h\|_\infty)$ if needed, we may and do assume that $\|f_n\|_\infty \leq \|h\|_\infty$. By the Mosco convergence of $\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_n)}$ to $\mathcal{E}^{(F)}$ and Theorem 2.13, for each $m \geq 1$, $\bar{U}_m^{(F_n)} f_n \rightarrow U_m^{(F)} h$ strongly in L^2 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, by (A3) and Lemma 2.10, $\bar{U}_m^{(F_n)} f_n \rightarrow U_m^{(F)} h$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Next, as $m U_m^{(F)} h \rightarrow h$ uniformly as $m \rightarrow \infty$, by Lemma 2.11(a), there is an increasing subsequence $\{m_n; n \geq 0\}$ so that $g_n \rightarrow h$, where $g_n := m_n \bar{U}_{m_n}^{(F_n)} f_n$, which by condition (A3) is continuous on F_n . Applying Lemma 2.10(b) by taking $A_n = \partial_o F_n$ and $A = \partial_o F$, we conclude from Remark 2.9 that

$$\{g_n|_{\partial_o F_n}; n \geq 0\} \text{ are equicontinuous and } g_n|_{\partial_o F_n} \rightarrow h|_{\partial_o F} \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (4.8)$$

Moreover, as $\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_n)}(g_n) \leq \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_n)}(f_n)$ for each $n \geq 1$, we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_n)}(g_n) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_n)}(f_n) \leq \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(h).$$

Let $h_m \in W^{1,2}(F_m) \cap C(F_m)$ be the unique function such that $h_m|_{\partial_o F_m} = g_m|_{\partial_o F_m}$ and h_m is $\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)}$ -harmonic in $F_m \setminus \partial_o F_m$, so (i) holds. By (4.8) and condition (A1), there is a subsequence $\{m_k; k \geq 1\}$ such that $h_{m_k} \rightarrow \tilde{h}$ for some $\tilde{h} \in C(F) \cap \mathcal{F}^{(F)}$. Hence by (4.8) and Lemma 2.11(b) that

$$\tilde{h} = h \quad \text{on } \partial_o F \quad (4.9)$$

and $h_{m_k} \rightarrow \tilde{h}$ strongly in L^2 as $k \rightarrow \infty$. By the Mosco convergence of $\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)}$,

$$\mathcal{E}^{(F)}(\tilde{h}) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_{m_k})}(h_{m_k}) \leq \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_{m_k})}(g_{m_k}) = \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(h). \quad (4.10)$$

Since h is the unique function in $C(F) \cap \mathcal{F}^{(F)}$ that minimizes the energy among $\{f \in C(F) \cap \mathcal{F}^{(F)} : f|_{\partial_o F} = h|_{\partial_o F}\}$, we conclude from (4.9) that $\tilde{h} = h$ and, consequently, $h_{m_k} \rightarrow h$ and

$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_{m_k})}(h_{m_k}) = \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(h)$. Since the above argument works for any subsequence as well, by Lemma 2.11(a), we have (ii) and (iii). \square

4.2. A finite dimensional kernel. In this subsection, we show that we can find continuous harmonic functions with assigned mean values on every level- n sub-face, that almost minimizes the energies. Recall that $\bar{\partial}_n F$ and $\bar{\partial}_n F_m$ are the collections of level n sub-faces of $\partial_o F$ and $\partial_o F_m$, respectively.

In the remainder of this paper, the following elementary lemma will be used several times. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a locally finite graph, where V is a finite or countable set and $E \subset \{(x, y) : x, y \in V\}$ is the set of undirected edges. We assume that G has bounded degrees, that is there is some constant $N \geq 1$ so that

$$\deg(x) := \#\{y \in V : (x, y) \in E\} \leq N \quad \text{for every } x \in V.$$

Let d_G be the graph distance between $x, y \in V$, i.e.

$$d_G(x, y) := \min \left\{ L : \text{there exists } \{x^{(0)}, x^{(1)}, x^{(2)}, \dots, x^{(L)}\} \subset V \text{ such that} \right. \\ \left. x^{(0)} = x, x^{(L)} = y \text{ and } (x^{(l-1)}, x^{(l)}) \in E \text{ for each } 1 \leq l \leq L \right\}.$$

Lemma 4.7. *for every $L \geq 1$ and $f \in l(V)$,*

$$\sum_{x \in V} \sum_{\substack{y \in V \\ d_G(x, y) \leq L}} (f(x) - f(y))^2 \leq L(N+1)^{2(L-1)} \sum_{x, y \in V : (x, y) \in E} (f(x) - f(y))^2. \quad (4.11)$$

Proof. For each $x, y \in V$ with $d_G(x, y) \leq L$, there is a geodesic path $x^{(0)}, x^{(1)}, x^{(2)}, \dots, x^{(d_G(x, y))}$ connecting x and y , and so by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$(f(x) - f(y))^2 \leq L \sum_{l=1}^{d_G(x, y)} (f(x^{(l-1)}) - f(x^{(l)}))^2.$$

For each directed edge (a, b) in E to be within a geodesic path from some $x \in V$ to $y \in V$ with $d_G(x, y) \leq L$, x and y have to be within distance $L-1$ from a and b , respectively. There are at most $(N+1)^{L-1}$ of such x and at most $(N+1)^{L-1}$ of such y . Hence each directed edge (a, b) can be used no more than $(N+1)^{2(L-1)}$ times in directed geodesics of length at most L . This establishes (4.11) where x and y are un-ordered on both sides. \square

Lemma 4.8. *There is a positive finite constant C such that the following hold.*

- (a) *For each $n \geq 0$, there is a $(\#\bar{\partial}_n F)$ -dimensional linear subspace $\mathcal{C}_n \subset C(\partial_o F)$ that contains constant functions so that*
 - (a.1) *for each $u \in l(\bar{\partial}_n F)$, there is a unique $f \in \mathcal{C}_n$ so that $\int_A f(x) \nu(dx) = u(A)$ for every $A \in \bar{\partial}_n F$. Moreover, $\|f\|_\infty \leq C\|u\|_\infty$.*
 - (a.2) $\Lambda_n[f] \leq CL_F^{n(d_w - d_f)} I_n[f]$ *for every $f \in \mathcal{C}_n$.*
- (b) *For each $m \geq n \geq 0$, there is a $(\#\bar{\partial}_n F_m = \#\bar{\partial}_n F)$ -dimensional linear subspace $\mathcal{C}_{m,n} \subset C(\partial_o F_m)$ that contains constant functions so that*
 - (b.1) *for each $u \in l(\bar{\partial}_n F_m)$, there is a unique $f \in \mathcal{C}_{m,n}$ so that $\int_A f(x) \nu_m(dx) = u(A)$ for every $A \in \bar{\partial}_n F_m$. Moreover, $\|f\|_\infty \leq C\|u\|_\infty$.*

$$(b.2) \quad \Lambda_n^{(m)}[f] \leq CL_F^{n(d_w-d_f)} I_n^{(m)}[f] \text{ for every } f \in \mathcal{C}_{m,n}.$$

Remark 4.9. If $u = c$ in $l(\partial_n F)$ for some constant c , then by the uniqueness, the corresponding function $f = c$ in both (a.1) and (b.1)

Proof of Lemma 4.8. Here, we only give a proof for (a), as (b) follows by a similar argument. Fix $u \in l(\partial_n F)$. We construct a good $f_u \in C(\partial_o F)$ in two steps. The function f_u will depend on u linearly so we get a linear space \mathcal{C}_n .

Step 1. For each $A \in \partial_n F$, let Q_A be the unique cube in $\mathcal{Q}_n(F_n)$ such that $A \subset Q_A$, and $g_A := w_{Q_A} \in C(F) \cap \mathcal{F}^{(F)}$ be as in Lemma 3.6 for which we fix one, so

$$g_A = 1 \text{ on } F_{Q_A}, \quad g_A = 0 \text{ on } F \setminus F_{\mathcal{S}_{Q_A}}, \quad 0 \leq g_A \leq 1 \text{ and } \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(g_A) \leq C_1 L_F^{(d_w-d_f)n},$$

where C_1 the constant in Lemma 3.6 and $\mathcal{S}_{Q_A} := \{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F) : Q \cap Q_A \neq \emptyset\}$. For each $A \in \partial_n F$, define

$$g_A^* := \frac{g_A}{(\sum_{B \in \partial_n F} g_B) \vee 1} \in C(F) \cap \mathcal{F}^{(F)}.$$

Observe that $\sum_{A \in \partial_n F} g_A^* = 1$ on F . Recall that

$$\mathcal{B}_n(F) := \{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n : Q \cap \partial F_0 \neq \emptyset \text{ and } \text{int}(Q) \cap F \neq \emptyset\}.$$

For each $Q \in \mathcal{B}_n(F) \cap \mathcal{S}_A$, by the strongly local and derivation properties of the energy measure $\mu_{\langle u \rangle}^{(FQ)}$ for $\mathcal{E}^{(FQ)}$ (see, e.g. [18, Theorem 4.3.7]),

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{\langle g_A^* \rangle}^{(F)}(FQ) &\leq \mu_{\langle g_A \rangle}^{(F)}(FQ) + 2\mu_{\langle (\sum_{B \in \partial_n F} g_B) \vee 1 \rangle}^{(F)}(FQ) \\ &\leq 2\mu_{\langle g_A \rangle}^{(F)}(FQ) + 2\mu_{\langle \sum_{B \in \partial_n F} g_B \rangle}^{(F)}(FQ) \\ &\leq 2\mu_{\langle g_A \rangle}^{(F)}(FQ) + 2\mu_{\langle \sum_{B \in \partial_n F: Q \in \mathcal{S}_{Q_B}} g_B \rangle}^{(F)}(FQ) \\ &\leq (2 + 2C_2^2) C_1 L_F^{(d_w-d_f)n}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\#\{B \in \partial_n F : Q \subset \mathcal{S}_{Q_B}\} \leq C_2 = 3^d$.

Let $f_u^* = \sum_{A \in \partial_n F} u(A)g_A^*|_{\partial_o F}$. Clearly,

$$\min_{B \in \partial_n F: A \cap B \neq \emptyset} u(B) \leq f_u^*(x) \leq \max_{B \in \partial_n F: A \cap B \neq \emptyset} u(B) \quad \text{for } A \in \partial_n F \text{ and } x \in A. \quad (4.12)$$

Set $g_u^* = \sum_{A \in \partial_n F} u(A)g_A^*$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{\langle g_u^* \rangle}^{(F)}(F_{\mathcal{B}_n(F)}) &\leq \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{B}_n(F)} \mu_{\langle g_u^* \rangle}^{(F)}(FQ) = \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{B}_n(F)} \mu_{\langle g_u^* - u(A_Q) \rangle}^{(F)}(FQ) \\ &= \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{B}_n(F)} \mu_{\langle \left(\sum_{B \in \partial_n F: Q \in \mathcal{S}_{Q_B}} (u(B) - u(A_Q))g_B^* \right) \rangle}^{(F)}(FQ) \\ &\leq C_2 (2 + 2C_2^2) C_1 L_F^{(d_w-d_f)n} \sum_{A \in \partial_n F} \sum_{B \in \partial_n F: B \cap Q_A \neq \emptyset} (u(B) - u(A))^2 \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq 2C_2^2 C_2 (2 + 2C_2^2) C_1 L_F^{(d_w - d_f)n} \cdot \sum_{A, B \in \partial_n F: A \cap B \neq \emptyset} (u(A) - u(B))^2,$$

where in the first and second lines for each $Q \in \mathcal{B}_n(F)$, $A_Q \in \partial_n F$ so that $A_Q \subset Q$, and (4.11) is used in the last line. Thus by Theorem A.3(a) there is some constant $C_3 > 0$ depending only on F so that

$$\Lambda_{n+1}[f_u^*] \leq C_3 L_F^{(d_w - d_f)n} \sum_{A, B \in \partial_n F: A \sim B} (u(A) - u(B))^2. \quad (4.13)$$

Step 2. Applying Lemma 3.6 to $(n+1)$ -cells, for each $A \in \partial_n F$, there is (and we fix one) $g_A^{**} \in C(F) \cap \mathcal{F}^{(F)}$ such that

$$g_A^{**}|_{F \setminus Q_A} = 0, \quad [g_A^{**}]_{\nu|_A} = 1, \quad \|g_A^{**}\|_\infty \leq C_4 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(g_A^{**}) \leq C_4 L_F^{(d_w - d_f)n}$$

for some constant C_4 depending only on F . Let $f_u = f_u^* + f_u^{**}$, where $f_u^{**} = \sum_{A \in \partial_n F} (u(A) - [f_u^*]_{\nu|_A}) g_A^{**}$. Clearly, $[f_u]_{\nu|_A} = u(A)$ for $A \in \partial_n F$. In addition, $\|f_u^*\|_\infty \leq \|u\|_\infty$ by (4.12). On the other hand, $\|f_u^{**}\|_\infty \leq 2C_4 \|u\|_\infty$ by the property of g_A^{**} for $A \in \partial_n F$ and (4.12). Hence, $\|f_u\|_\infty \leq (2C_4 + 1)\|u\|_\infty$. Note that $u \mapsto f_u$ is one-to-one on $l(\partial_n F)$. Indeed, if $f_u = f_v$ for $u, v \in l(\partial_n F)$, then for each $A \in \partial_n F$,

$$u(A) = \int_A f_u(x) \nu(dx) = \int_A f_v(x) \nu(dx) = v(A);$$

that is, $u \equiv v$. Let \mathcal{C}_n denote the collection of such constructed f_u with $u \in l(\partial_n F)$. Since $l(\partial_n F) \ni u \mapsto f_u \in C(\partial_o F)$ is linear, \mathcal{C}_n is a finite dimensional linear subspace of $C(\partial_o F)$ with basis $\{f_{u_A}; A \in \partial_n F\}$, where $u_A(A) := 1$ and $u_A(B) := 0$ for $B \in \partial_n F \setminus \{A\}$. Note that when $u = 1$ on $\partial_o F$, by the above construction $f_u = 1$ on F so constants are in the space \mathcal{C}_n . This establishes (a.1).

For (a.2), it follows from (4.12), the local property of $\mathcal{E}^{(F)}$ and the energy estimates of g_A^{**} that

$$\mathcal{E}^{(F)}(f_u^{**}) \leq C_5 L_F^{n(d_w - d_f)} \sum_{A, B \in \partial_n F: A \sim B} (u(A) - u(B))^2 = L_F^{n(d_w - d_f)} I_n[f_u]$$

for some constant $C_5 > 0$ depending only on F . So by Theorem A.3(a), $\Lambda_{n+1}[f_u^{**}] \leq C_6 L_F^{n(d_w - d_f)} I_n[f_u]$ for some $C_6 > 0$ depending only on F . Combining the estimate with (4.13) gives $\Lambda_n[f_u] \leq (2C_3 + 2C_6 + 1) L_F^{n(d_w - d_f)} I_n[f_u]$. \square

Remark 4.10. Lemma 4.10(a) implies that $\Lambda(\partial_o F) \cap C(\partial_o F)$ is dense in $\Lambda(\partial_o F)$ with respect to the norm $\sqrt{\Lambda_1[\cdot] + \|\cdot\|_{L^2(\partial_o F; \nu)}^2}$. This improves [23, Theorem 2.6], where the inequality stated in our Lemma 3.7 is assumed as a condition and there is a discrepancy between two Besov spaces $\widehat{\Lambda}_{2,2}^\beta(L)$ and $\Lambda_{2,2}^\beta(L)$ there.

In the sequel, for each $n \geq 0$, we fix a finite dimensional linear subspace \mathcal{C}_n of $C(\partial_o F)$ as in Lemma 4.8 (a); for each $m \geq n \geq 0$, we fix a finite dimensional linear subspace $\mathcal{C}_{m,n}$ of $C(\partial_o F_m)$ as in Lemma 4.8 (b).

Definition 4.11. For each $n \geq 0$ and $f \in \mathcal{C}_n$, let $\mathcal{H}f$ be the unique function in $C(F) \cap \mathcal{F}^{(F)}$ such that $\mathcal{H}f = f$ on $\partial_o F$ and $\mathcal{H}f$ is $\mathcal{E}^{(F)}$ harmonic in $F \setminus \partial_o F$.

4.3. Proof of Proposition 4.4. We finish the proof of Proposition 4.4 in this subsection. The key idea is that we have some uniform control over approximating sequences of finite dimensional cores $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{C}_n)$ by compactness, which translates to general cases by trace theorems.

Lemma 4.12. *Assume (A1) and (A3). For every $m \geq n \geq 0$, there is a linear map $\Theta_n^{(m)} : \mathcal{C}_n \rightarrow W^{1,2}(F_m) \cap C(F_m)$ such that the following hold for every $f \in \mathcal{C}_n$.*

- (1) $\Theta_n^{(m)} f$ is $\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)}$ -harmonic in $F_m \setminus \partial_o F_m$ and $\Theta_n^{(m)} 1 = 1$.
- (2) $\int_{A_m} \Theta_n^{(m)} f(x) \nu_m(dx) = \int_A f(x) \nu(dx)$ for each $m \geq n \geq 0$ and $A \in \bar{\partial}_n F, A_m \in \bar{\partial}_n F_m$ with $A \subset A_m$.
- (3) For each $n \geq 0$, $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)}(\Theta_n^{(m)} f) = \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(\mathcal{H}f)$.
- (4) For each $n \geq 0$, $\Theta_n^{(m)} f \rightarrow \mathcal{H}f$ strongly in L^2 as $m \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. Fix $n \geq 0$, and let $\{f^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^{\#\bar{\partial}_n F}$ be a basis of the linear subspace \mathcal{C}_n , which contains the constant function 1. We simply let $f^{(1)} = 1$. Write $h^{(i)} = \mathcal{H}f^{(i)}$. In particular, $h^{(1)} = 1$.

We first define a map $\Theta_n^{(m)}$ on $\{f^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^{\#\bar{\partial}_n F}$. Define $\Theta_n^{(m)} f^{(1)} = 1$ for $m \geq n$. For $2 \leq i \leq \#\bar{\partial}_n F$, by Lemma 4.6 there is a sequence of functions $h_m^{(i)} \in C(F_m) \cap W^{1,2}(F_m)$ that is $\mathcal{E}^{(F_m)}$ -harmonic in $F_m \setminus \partial_o F_m$ and

$$h_m^{(i)} \rightarrow h^{(i)} \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (4.14)$$

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)}(h_m^{(i)}) = \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(h^{(i)}). \quad (4.15)$$

Let $u_m^{(i)} \in l(\bar{\partial}_n F_m)$ be such that $u_m^{(i)}(A_m) = [h_m^{(i)}]_{\nu_m|_{A_m}} - [h^{(i)}]_{\nu|_A}$ for each $A_m \in \bar{\partial}_n F_m$ and $A \in \bar{\partial} F$ with $A \subset A_m$. Let $g_m^{(i)}$ be the $\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)}$ -harmonic extension of the unique $f_m^{(i)} \in \mathcal{C}_{m,n}$ associated with $u_m^{(i)}$ as in Lemma 4.8 (b.1). By Lemma 2.10(b), (4.14) and Lemma 4.8(b.1),

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \|f_m^{(i)}\|_\infty \leq C_1 \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \|u_m^{(i)}\|_\infty = 0. \quad (4.16)$$

It follows from (4.16) that $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} L_F^{(d_w - d_f)k} I_k^{(m)}[f_m^{(i)}] = 0$ for each $k \geq 1$ as there are no more than $2dL_F^{(d-1)k}$ many sub-faces in $\bar{\partial}_k F_m$. Then, by Lemma 4.8(b.2),

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \Lambda_1^{(m)}[g_m^{(i)}|_{\partial_o F_m}] &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} L_F^{(d_w - d_f)k} I_k^{(m)}[f_m^{(i)}] + \Lambda_n^{(m)}[f_m^{(i)}] \right) \\ &\leq \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} L_F^{(d_w - d_f)k} I_k^{(m)}[f_m^{(i)}] + C_1 I_n^{(m)}[f_m^{(i)}] \right) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence by Theorem A.4(b),

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)}(g_m^{(i)}) = 0. \quad (4.17)$$

Define $\Theta_n^{(m)} f^{(i)} = h_m^{(i)} + g_m^{(i)}$ for $m \geq n$. Then on $\{f^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^{\#\bar{\partial}_n F}$, properties (1) and (2) hold by the construction, (3) holds by (4.15) and (4.17), and (4) holds by (4.14), (4.16) and Lemma

2.11(b). We extend the definition of $\Theta_n^{(m)}$ linear to \mathcal{C}_n , that is, define

$$\Theta_n^{(m)}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\#\partial_n F} c_i f^{(i)}\right) := \sum_{i=1}^{\#\partial_n F} c_i \Theta_n^{(m)}(f^{(i)}) \quad \text{for every } m \geq n \text{ and } \{c_i\}_{i=1}^{\#\partial_n F} \subset \mathbb{R}.$$

Properties (1), (2) and (4) clearly hold on \mathcal{C}_n , while (3) follows directly from the following property. If $f_m \rightarrow f$ weakly in L^2 , $g_m \rightarrow g$ weakly in L^2 , $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)}(f_m) = \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(f)$ and $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)}(g_m) = \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(g)$, then

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)}(f_m + g_m) = \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(f + g). \quad (4.18)$$

Indeed, since $f_m + g_m$ and $f_m - g_m$ converges weakly in L^2 to $f + g$ and $f - g$, respectively, it follows from the Mosco convergence of $\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)}$ to $\mathcal{E}^{(F)}$ that

$$\liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)}(f_m + g_m) \geq \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(f + g), \quad \liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)}(f_m - g_m) \geq \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(f - g).$$

On the other hand, by the parallelogram equality, we know that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)}(f_m + g_m) + \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)}(f_m - g_m) &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} 2\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)}(f_m) + 2\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)}(g_m) \\ &= 2\mathcal{E}^{(F)}(f) + 2\mathcal{E}^{(F)}(g) = \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(f + g) + \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(f - g). \end{aligned}$$

So identity (4.18) must hold. \square

Lemma 4.13. *Let $n \geq 1$.*

- (a) *There is a constant $C \in (0, 1)$ such that $\mu_{\langle \mathcal{H}f \rangle}^{(F)}(F_{\mathcal{B}_{n-1}}) \geq C \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(\mathcal{H}f)$ for each $f \in \mathcal{C}_n$.*
- (b) *Suppose that (A1) and (A3) hold. There is a sequence of positive numbers $\{C_m \geq 1; m \geq n\}$ such that $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} C_m = 1$ and*

$$C_m^{-1} \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(\mathcal{H}f) \leq \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)}(\Theta_n^{(m)} f) \leq C_m \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(\mathcal{H}f) \quad \text{for every } f \in \mathcal{C}_n.$$

- (c) *Suppose that (A1), (A2) and (A3) hold. There is a sequence of positive numbers $\{C'_m \geq 1; m \geq n\}$ such that $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} C'_m = 1$ and*

$$\bar{\mu}_{\langle \Theta_n^{(m)} f \rangle}^{(F_m)}(F_{m, \mathcal{B}_{n-1}}) \leq C'_m \mu_{\langle \mathcal{H}f \rangle}^{(F)}(F_{\mathcal{B}_{n-1}}) \quad \text{for every } f \in \mathcal{C}_n.$$

Proof. Let $M_n = \{f \in \mathcal{C}_n : \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(\mathcal{H}f) = 1, \int_{\partial_o F} f(x) \nu(dx) = 0\}$, which is a compact subset of the finite dimensional vector space $\mathcal{C}_n \subset C(\partial_o F)$.

(a) By compactness, we only need to show $\mu_{\langle \mathcal{H}f \rangle}^{(F)}(F_{\mathcal{B}_{n-1}}) > 0$ for each $f \in M_n$. Since $\mathcal{H}f$ is continuous on F and the form $(\mathcal{E}^{(F_Q)}, \mathcal{F}^{(F_Q)})$ is irreducible for each $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{n-1}$, it suffices to show $\mathcal{H}f$ not constant on $F_Q = F \cap Q$ for some $Q \in \mathcal{B}_{n-1}$. We prove this by contradiction. Suppose that there is a function $f \in M_n$ so that $\mathcal{H}f$ is constant on F_Q , so in particular f is constant on $F_Q \cap \partial_o F$, for each $Q \in \mathcal{B}_{n-1}$. In this case, we take $Q, Q' \in \mathcal{B}_{n-1}$ such that

$$f|_{A_Q} = \min_{x \in \partial_o F} f(x) < f|_{A_{Q'}} = \max_{x \in \partial_o F} f(x),$$

where $A_Q = F \cap Q \cap \partial_o F$ and $A_{Q'} = F \cap Q' \cap \partial_o F$. By Proposition 4.1 and strong Markov property,

$$\mathbb{P}_x^{(F)} \left(X_{\tau_{A_{Q'}}}^{(F)} < X_{\tau_{A_Q}}^{(F)} \right) > 0 \quad \text{for } x \in (F \setminus \partial_o F) \cap Q,$$

which implies that $\mathcal{H}f(x) > f|_{A_Q}$ for $x \in (F \setminus \partial_o F) \cap Q$. Hence $\mathcal{H}f$ is not a constant on $F \cap Q$, which is a contradiction. Thus we get $\mu_{\langle \mathcal{H}f \rangle}^{(F)}(F_{\mathcal{B}_{n-1}}) > 0$ for every $f \in M_n$.

(b) Note that by the irreducibility of the reflected Brownian motion on F_m , for each $m \geq n$ and $f \in \mathcal{C}_n$, $\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)}(\Theta_n^{(m)} f) = 0$ if and only if $\Theta_n^{(m)} f$ is a constant on F_m by (4.2), which happens if and only if f is a constant in view of Lemma 4.12(2) and Remark 4.9. On the other hand, $\mathcal{E}^{(F)}(\mathcal{H}f) = 0$ if and only if $\mathcal{H}f$ is constant, which happens if and only if f is constant on $\partial_o F$. For two functions f, g on $\partial_o F$, if we define them to be equivalent, denoted by $f \sim g$, if and only if they differ by a constant, then both $f \mapsto \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)}(\Theta_n^{(m)} f)^{1/2}$ and $f \mapsto \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(\mathcal{H}f)^{1/2}$ are norms on the quotient space \mathcal{C}_n / \sim , which is a linear finite dimensional space. Hence there is a constant $C_m \geq 1$ so that

$$C_m^{-1} \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(\mathcal{H}f) \leq \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)}(\Theta_n^{(m)} f) \leq C_m \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(\mathcal{H}f) \quad \text{for every } f \in \mathcal{C}_n. \quad (4.19)$$

Next, we introduce a norm on the finite dimensional space \mathcal{C}_n as follows, which will also be used in the proof of (c). Let $\{f^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^{\#\partial_n F}$ be a basis of \mathcal{C}_n as in the proof of Lemma 4.12, and we define the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{C}_n}$ by

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^{\#\partial_n F} c_i f^{(i)} \right\|_{\mathcal{C}_n} := \sum_{i=1}^{\#\partial_n F} |c_i| \quad \text{for each } c_1, c_2, \dots, c_{\#\partial_n F} \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (4.20)$$

By Lemma 4.12(3), there exists $C_1^* > 0$ so that

$$\sup_{m \geq n} \sqrt{\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)}(\Theta_n^{(m)} f^{(i)})} \leq C_1^* \quad \text{for each } i = 1, 2, \dots, \#\partial_n F. \quad (4.21)$$

Since $\sqrt{\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)}(\Theta_n^{(m)} \bullet)}$ is a seminorm on \mathcal{C}_n , we have by (4.20), (4.21) and the triangle inequality that for any $f = \sum_{i=1}^{\#\partial_n F} c_i f^{(i)} \in \mathcal{C}_n$

$$\sup_{m \geq n} \sqrt{\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)}(\Theta_n^{(m)} f)} \leq C_1^* \|f\|_{\mathcal{C}_n}. \quad (4.22)$$

Hence

$$\left| \sqrt{\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)}(\Theta_n^{(m)} f)} - \sqrt{\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)}(\Theta_n^{(m)} g)} \right| \leq \sqrt{\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)}(\Theta_n^{(m)}(f - g))} \leq C_1^* \|f - g\|_{\mathcal{C}_n}$$

for any $f, g \in \mathcal{C}_n$ and $m \geq n$, which means that $\sqrt{\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)}(\Theta_n^{(m)} \bullet)}$ is equicontinuous on \mathcal{C}_n .

Since by Lemma 4.12(3), $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)}(\Theta_n^{(m)} f)} = \sqrt{\mathcal{E}^{(F)}(\mathcal{H}f)} = 1$ for every $f \in M_n$ and M_n is compact, it follows that the converges is uniform on M_n . So we can take the constant $C_m \geq 1$ in (4.19) in such a way that it converges to 1 as $m \rightarrow \infty$.

(c) Let $f \in M_n$, and set $h_m := \Theta_n^{(m)} f$ for $m \geq n$ and $h := \mathcal{H}f$ for short. Since h_m converges to h strongly in L^2 by Lemma 4.12(4), it follows from the fact that each $\bar{\mu}_{\langle h_m \rangle}^{(F_m)}$ does not

charge on sets having zero Lebesgue measure from (4.2) and condition (A2) that

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\mu}_{\langle h_m \rangle}^{(F_m)}(F_m \setminus F_{m, \mathcal{B}_{n-1}}) &= \liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{n-1} \setminus \mathcal{B}_{n-1}} \bar{\mu}_{\langle h_m \rangle}^{(F_m)}(F_m, Q) \\ &\geq \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{n-1} \setminus \mathcal{B}_{n-1}} \mu_{\langle h \rangle}^{(F)}(F_Q) \geq \mu_{\langle h \rangle}^{(F)}(F \setminus F_{\mathcal{B}_{n-1}}). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 4.12(3)

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\mu}_{\langle h_m \rangle}^{(F_m)}(F_m) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)}(h_m) = \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(h) = \mu_{\langle h \rangle}^{(F)}(F).$$

Hence

$$\limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\mu}_{\langle \Theta_n^{(m)} f \rangle}^{(F_m)}(F_{m, \mathcal{B}_{n-1}}) \leq \mu_{\langle \mathcal{H}f \rangle}^{(F)}(F_{\mathcal{B}_{n-1}}) \quad \text{for every } f \in M_n. \quad (4.23)$$

Note that for every Borel subset $A \subset F_m$,

$$\bar{\mu}_{\langle f, g \rangle}^{(F_m)}(A) := L_F^{(d_w - 2)n} \int_A \nabla f(x) \nabla g(x) \mu_m(dx)$$

is a non-negative symmetric bilinear form in $f, g \in W^{1,2}(F_m)$ with $\bar{\mu}_{\langle f, f \rangle}^{(F_m)} = \bar{\mu}_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F_m)}$. This together with (4.22) implies that for any $f, g \in \mathcal{C}_n$ and $m \geq n$,

$$\left| \sqrt{\bar{\mu}_{\langle \Theta_n^{(m)} f \rangle}^{(F_m)}(F_{m, \mathcal{B}_{n-1}})} - \sqrt{\bar{\mu}_{\langle \Theta_n^{(m)} g \rangle}^{(F_m)}(F_{m, \mathcal{B}_{n-1}})} \right| \leq \sqrt{\bar{\mu}_{\langle \Theta_n^{(m)}(f-g) \rangle}^{(F_m)}(F_{m, \mathcal{B}_{n-1}})} \leq C_1^* \|f - g\|_{\mathcal{C}_n}.$$

Hence $\{\bar{\mu}_{\langle \Theta_n^{(m)} f \rangle}^{(F_m)}(F_{m, \mathcal{B}_{n-1}})^{1/2}; m \geq n\}$ is equi-continuous on \mathcal{C}_n . The desired conclusion follows from this and (4.23) \square

Proof of Proposition 4.4. By Lemma 4.13, there is an integer $N \geq n$ such that for every $m \geq N$ and $f \in \mathcal{C}_n$,

$$|\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)}(\Theta_n^{(m)} f) - \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(\mathcal{H}f)| \leq C \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(\mathcal{H}f) \leq \mu_{\langle \mathcal{H}f \rangle}^{(F)}(F_{\mathcal{B}_{n-1}}), \quad (4.24)$$

$$\bar{\mu}_{\langle \Theta_n^{(m)} f \rangle}^{(F_m)}(F_{m, \mathcal{B}_{n-1}}) \leq 2\mu_{\langle \mathcal{H}f \rangle}^{(F)}(F_{\mathcal{B}_{n-1}}), \quad (4.25)$$

where $C \in (0, 1)$ is the constant in Lemma 4.13(a).

Let $m \geq N$, and let $g \in \mathcal{F}^{(F)}$ and $g_m \in W^{1,2}(F_m)$ satisfy the assumption of the proposition. Take $f \in \mathcal{C}_n$ so that $[f]_{\nu|_A} = [g]_{\nu|_A}$ for every $A \in \mathfrak{D}_n F$. For notational convenience, set $h := \mathcal{H}f$ and $h_m := \Theta_n^{(m)} f$. We need to estimate $\mathcal{E}^{(F)}(g - h)$, $|\mathcal{E}^{(F)}(h) - \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)}(h_m)|$ and $\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)}(h_m - g_m)$. By Lemma 4.8 (a) and the definition of I_n and Λ_n ,

$$\Lambda_n[h|_{\partial_o F}] = \Lambda_n[f] \leq C_1 L_F^{n(d_w - d_f)} I_n[f] = C_1 L_F^{n(d_w - d_f)} I_n[g|_{\partial_o F}] \leq C_1 \Lambda_n[g|_{\partial_o F}], \quad (4.26)$$

where $C_1 > 0$ denotes the constant C in Lemma 4.8(a). As $g - h \in C(F) \cap \mathcal{F}^{(F)}$ is $\mathcal{E}^{(F)}$ -harmonic in $F \setminus \partial_o F$, by Theorem A.4(a) with the positive constant C there denoted by C_2

below and the fact that $[g - h]_{\nu|_A} = 0$ for every $A \in \check{\partial}_n F$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}^{(F)}(g - h) &\leq C_2 \Lambda_1[(g - h)|_{\partial_o F}] \\
&= C_2 \Lambda_n[(g - h)|_{\partial_o F}] \\
&\leq 2C_2 (\Lambda_n[g|_{\partial_o F}] + \Lambda_n[h|_{\partial_o F}]) \\
&\leq 2C_2 (\Lambda_n[g|_{\partial_o F}] + C_1 \Lambda_n[g|_{\partial_o F}]) \\
&\leq 2(C_1 + 1)C_2 C_3 \mu_{\langle g \rangle}^{(F)}(F_{\mathcal{B}_{n-1}}),
\end{aligned} \tag{4.27}$$

where in the last line, we used Theorem A.3(a) with the positive constant C there denoted by C_3 . Thus by (4.24) and (4.27),

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathcal{E}^{(F)}(h) - \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)}(h_m)| &\leq \mu_{\langle \mathcal{H}f \rangle}^{(F)}(F_{\mathcal{B}_{n-1}}) \\
&\leq 2\mu_{\langle g \rangle}^{(F)}(F_{\mathcal{B}_{n-1}}) + 2\mathcal{E}^{(F)}(g - h) \\
&\leq (2 + 4(C_1 + 1)C_2 C_3) \mu_{\langle g \rangle}^{(F)}(F_{\mathcal{B}_{n-1}}).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.28}$$

Since $g_m - h_m \in C(F_m) \cap W^{1,2}(F_m)$ are $\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)}$ -harmonic in $F_m \setminus \partial_o F_m$, by (4.2), Theorem A.4(b), the fact $[g_m - h_m]_{\nu_m|_{A_m}} = 0$ for every $A_m \in \check{\partial}_n F_m$ and Theorem A.3(b), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)}(h_m - g_m) &\leq C_2 C_0 \Lambda_1^{(m)}[(h_m - g_m)|_{\partial_o F_m}] \\
&= C_2 C_0 \cdot \Lambda_n^{(m)}[(h_m - g_m)|_{\partial_o F_m}] \\
&\leq C_2 C_0 2(\Lambda_n^{(m)}[h_m|_{\partial_o F_m}] + \Lambda_n^{(m)}[g_m|_{\partial_o F_m}]) \\
&\leq C_2 C_0 2(C_3 C_0 \cdot \bar{\mu}_{\langle h_m \rangle}^{(F_m)}(F_{m, \mathcal{B}_{n-1}}) + \Lambda_n^{(m)}[g_m|_{\partial_o F_m}]) \\
&\leq C_2 C_0 \cdot 2(2C_3 C_0 \cdot \mu_{\langle h \rangle}^{(F)}(F_{\mathcal{B}_{n-1}}) + \Lambda_n^{(m)}[g_m|_{\partial_o F_m}]) \\
&\leq C_4 \cdot (\mu_{\langle g \rangle}^{(F)}(F_{\mathcal{B}_{n-1}}) + \Lambda_n^{(m)}[g_m|_{\partial_o F_m}]),
\end{aligned} \tag{4.29}$$

where we used (4.25) in the second to the last inequality, and a part of (4.28) in the last inequality with the constant $C_4 > 0$ being a polynomial of C_1, C_2, C_3 and C_0 . The proposition follows by combining (4.27), (4.28) and (4.29). \square

We end this section with a corollary that will not be used in this paper, but will be needed in a forthcoming paper [16].

Corollary 4.14. *Let $(\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m,1)}, W^{1,2}(F_m))$ and $(\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m,2)}, W^{1,2}(F_m))$ be two sequences of strongly local regular Dirichlet forms on $L^2(F_m; \mu_m)$ such that the following hold for $i = 1, 2$.*

- (i) $C_0^{-1} \mathcal{E}^{(F_m)} \leq \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m,i)} \leq C_0 \mathcal{E}^{(F_m)}$ for every $m \geq 0$;
- (ii) $\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m,i)}$ Mosco converges to $\mathcal{E}^{(F)}$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$;
- (iii) (A1), (A2) and (A3) hold for $\{(\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m,i)}, W^{1,2}(F_m)); m \geq 0\}$.

Then for each $n \geq 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist $M \geq n$ (depending on $n, \varepsilon, \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m,1)}, \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m,2)}$) and $C > 0$ (independent of $n, \varepsilon, \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m,1)}, \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m,2)}$ but dependent on F and C_0) such that

$$\left| \sqrt{\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m,1)}(h_1)} - \sqrt{\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m,2)}(h_2)} \right| \leq C \left(\varepsilon \sqrt{\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m,1)}(h_1)} + \sqrt{\bar{\mu}_{\langle h_1 \rangle}^{(F_m,1)}(F_{m, \mathcal{B}_n})} \right)$$

for any $m \geq M$ and $h_i \in W^{1,2}(F_m) \cap C(F_m)$, $i \in \{1, 2\}$ that is $\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m, i)}$ -harmonic in $F_m \setminus \partial_o F_m$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ with $h_1|_{\partial_o F_m} = h_2|_{\partial_o F_m}$.

Proof. For $n \geq 1$, let \mathcal{C}_n be the finite dimensional linear subspace of $C(\partial_o F)$ in Lemma 4.8(a). Since $\mu_{(g)}^{(F)}(\partial_o F) = 0$ for each $g \in \mathcal{F}^{(F)}$ by Corollary A.6, there is some $n_1 \geq n + 2$ such that

$$\mu_{(\mathcal{H}f)}^{(F)}(F_{\mathcal{B}_{n_1-1}}) \leq \varepsilon^2 \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(\mathcal{H}f) \quad \text{for every } f \in \mathcal{C}_{n+1}, \quad (4.30)$$

where $\mathcal{H}f$ is the $\mathcal{E}^{(F)}$ -harmonic extension of f . For $i = 1, 2$, let $N_i \geq n_1$ be the constant Proposition of 4.4 with $\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m, i)}$, $m \geq 0$ and n_1 in place of $\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)}$, $m \geq 0$ and n there. Define $N = N_1 \vee N_2$.

Fix $m \geq N$. Let h_1, h_2 be the functions in the statement of this corollary. Let f be the unique function in \mathcal{C}_{n+1} so that $[f]_{\nu|_A} = [h_1]_{\nu_m|_{A_m}}$ for every $A \in \bar{\partial}_{n+1}F$ and $A_m \in \bar{\partial}_{n+1}F_m$ with $A \subset A_m$. Set $h = \mathcal{H}f$. Then by Theorem A.3 (a), there are positive constants C_1, C_2, C_3 depending on F and C_0 so that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(h) &\leq C_1 \Lambda_1[h|_{\partial_o F}] = C_1 \Lambda_1[f] \\ &= C_1 \left(\sum_{k=1}^n L_F^{k(d_w - d_f)} I_k[f] + \Lambda_{n+1}[f] \right) \\ &\leq C_1 \sum_{k=1}^n L_F^{k(d_w - d_f)} I_k^{(m)}[h_1|_{\partial_o F_m}] + C_1 C_2 L_F^{(n+1)(d_w - d_f)} I_{n+1}^{(m)}[h_1|_{\partial_o F_m}] \\ &\leq (C_1 \vee C_1 C_2) \Lambda_1^{(m)}[h_1|_{\partial_o F_m}] \\ &\leq C_3 \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m, 1)}(h_1), \end{aligned} \quad (4.31)$$

where we used Lemma 4.8(a.2) and the fact that $I_k[f] = I_k^{(m)}[h_1|_{\partial_o F}]$ for $1 \leq k \leq n + 1$ in second inequality, and Theorem A.4 (b) in the last inequality.

Next, let \tilde{f} be the unique function in \mathcal{C}_{n_1} such that $[\tilde{f}]_{\nu|_A} = [h_1]_{\nu_m|_{A_m}}$ for each $A \in \bar{\partial}_{n_1}F$ and $A_m \in \bar{\partial}_{n_1}F_m$ with $A \subset A_m$. Set $\tilde{h} := \mathcal{H}\tilde{f}$. Then by Theorem A.3(a),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(h - \tilde{h}) &\leq C_1 \Lambda_1[(h - \tilde{h})|_{\partial_o F}] = C_1 \Lambda_1[f - \tilde{f}] \\ &= C_1 \Lambda_{n+1}[f - \tilde{f}] \\ &\leq 2C_1 \Lambda_{n+1}[f] + 2C_1 \Lambda_{n+1}[\tilde{f}] \\ &\leq 4(C_1 \vee C_1 C_2) I_{n+1}^{(m)}[h_1|_{\partial_o F_m}] \\ &\leq 4C_3 \bar{\mu}_{(h_1)}^{(F_m, 1)}(F_{m, \mathcal{B}_n(F_m)}), \end{aligned} \quad (4.32)$$

where the third inequality holds by a similar argument as that for (4.31), while the last inequality is due to Theorem A.4(b). It follows from (4.30), (4.31) and (4.32) that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{(\tilde{h})}^{(F)}(F_{\mathcal{B}_{n_1-1}(F)}) &\leq 2\mu_{(h)}^{(F)}(F_{\mathcal{B}_{n_1-1}(F)}) + 2\mathcal{E}^{(F)}(h - \tilde{h}) \\ &\leq 2\varepsilon^2 C_3 \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m, 1)}(h_1) + 4C_3 \bar{\mu}_{(h_1)}^{(F_m, 1)}(F_{m, \mathcal{B}_n(F_m)}). \end{aligned} \quad (4.33)$$

By Proposition 4.4 applied to the pairs (h_1, \tilde{h}) and (h_2, \tilde{h}) , condition (i) and $h_1|_{\partial_o F_m} = h_2|_{\partial_o F_m}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \sqrt{\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m,1)}(h_1)} - \sqrt{\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m,2)}(h_2)} \right| \\
& \leq \left| \sqrt{\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m,1)}(h_1)} - \sqrt{\mathcal{E}^{(F)}(\tilde{h})} \right| + \left| \sqrt{\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m,2)}(h_2)} - \sqrt{\mathcal{E}^{(F)}(\tilde{h})} \right| \\
& \leq C_4 \left(\sqrt{\mu_{\tilde{h}}^{(F)}(F_{\mathcal{B}_{n_1-1}(F)})} + \sqrt{\Lambda_{n_1}^{(m,1)}[h_1|_{\partial_o F_m}] + \sqrt{\Lambda_{n_1}^{(m,2)}[h_2|_{\partial_o F_m}]} \right) \\
& \leq C_5 \left(\sqrt{\mu_{\tilde{h}}^{(F)}(F_{\mathcal{B}_{n_1-1}(F)})} + \sqrt{\Lambda_{n_1}^{(m,1)}[h_1|_{\partial_o F_m}] \right) \\
& \leq C_6 \left(\sqrt{\mu_{\tilde{h}}^{(F)}(F_{\mathcal{B}_{n_1-1}(F)})} + \sqrt{\mu_{(h_1)}^{(F_m,1)}(F_{m, \mathcal{B}_{n_1-1}(F_m)})} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to Theorem A.3(b). The corollary then follows from this, (4.33) and that $n_1 \geq n + 2$. \square

5. CONVERGENCE OF RESISTANCES

In this section, we present the proof for Theorems 1.1, 1.3 and 1.4. Recall from Theorem 3.10 and Theorem 3.12 that $\{\alpha_m; m \geq 1\}$ is a sequence of real numbers that are bounded between two positive constants so that $\alpha_m \mathcal{E}^{(F_m)}$ on $L^2(F_m; \mu_m)$ is Mosco convergent to $\mathcal{E}^{(F)}$ on $L^2(F; \mu)$. Let

$$\alpha := \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_m.$$

In the rest of the section, we fix a subsequence $\{m_k; k \geq 1\}$ so that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_{m_k} = \alpha. \quad (5.1)$$

Hence $\alpha \mathcal{E}^{(F_{m_k})}$ is Mosco convergent to $\mathcal{E}^{(F)}$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. For $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F_n)$ with $n \geq 1$, $F_{m_k, Q}$ is similar to F_{m_k-n} when k is sufficiently large. Hence by self-similarity, $\alpha_{m_k-n} \mathcal{E}^{(F_{m_k, Q})}$ is Mosco convergent to $\mathcal{E}^{(F_Q)}$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Thus for any $f_{m_k} \in W^{1,2}(F_{m_k})$, $k \geq 1$, and $f \in \mathcal{F}^{(F)}$ so that $f_{m_k} \rightarrow f$ strongly, we have

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \alpha \mathcal{E}^{(F_{m_k, Q})}(f_{m_k}) \geq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_{m_k-n} \mathcal{E}^{(F_{m_k, Q})}(f_{m_k}) \geq \mathcal{E}^{(F_Q)}(f).$$

This shows that condition (A2) holds for $(\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(k)}, \bar{\mathcal{F}}^{(k)}) := (\alpha \mathcal{E}^{(F_{m_k})}, W^{1,2}(F_{m_k}))$ for $k \geq 1$.

In the case that $\partial_o F \neq \partial F_0$, we need one more preparation for the proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.4.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $n, m \geq 0$ and $h \in \mathcal{F}^{(F)} \cap C(F)$ that is $\mathcal{E}^{(F)}$ -harmonic in $F \setminus \partial_o F$. Then there exists $g = g_{m,n} \in W^{1,2}(F_{n+m}) \cap C(F_{n+m})$ such that the following hold for some constant $C > 0$ independent of m, n and h .*

(i) For each $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F_n)$, $A \in \mathfrak{D}_m F$ and $A_m \in \mathfrak{D}_m F_m$ with $A \subset A_m$,

$$\int_{\Psi_Q(A_m)} g(x) \nu_{m+n}(dx) = \int_{\Psi_Q(A)} h(x) \nu(dx).$$

(ii)
$$\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F_n)} \Lambda_m^{(m)}[(g \circ \Psi_Q)|_{\partial_o F_m}] \leq C \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F_n)} L_F^{(d_w - d_f)m} I_m[(h \circ \Psi_Q)|_{\partial_o F}]$$

$$\leq C \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F_n)} \Lambda_m[(h \circ \Psi_Q)|_{\partial_o F}].$$

(iii) For each $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F_n)$, $x \in F_Q$, $y \in F_{m+n,Q}$,

$$|h(x) - g(y)| \leq C \max_{x', y' \in F_{\mathcal{S}_Q}} |h(x') - h(y')|,$$

where $\mathcal{S}_Q := \{Q' \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F_n) : Q' \cap Q \neq \emptyset\}$.

(iv) g is $\mathcal{E}^{(F_{m+n})}$ -harmonic in $\Psi_Q(F_m \setminus \partial_o F_m) = F_{m+n,Q} \setminus \partial_o F_{m+n,Q}$ for every $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F_n)$.

Proof. We first record two observations. With a slight abuse of notations, in this proof, ν_0 also denotes the Lebesgue measure on $[0, 1]^{d-1}$, which is the same as the normalized $(d-1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure on $[0, 1]^{d-1}$.

Observation 1. For each function u defined on $\{0, 1\}^{d-1}$, it can be uniquely extended to be a continuous function v_u on $[0, 1]^{d-1}$ that is linear on each line segment parallel to a coordinate axis, i.e. $v_u(ta + (1-t)b) = tv_u(a) + (1-t)v_u(b)$ for any $0 \leq t \leq 1$ and $a, b \in [0, 1]^{d-1}$ such that $\#\{i \in \{1, \dots, d-1\} : a_i \neq b_i\} = 1$. Indeed, the uniqueness of such v_u is clear as u uniquely determines by linearity the values of v_u on each faces of the unit hypercube $[0, 1]^{d-1}$, which in turn uniquely determine the values of v_u in the interior of $[0, 1]^{d-1}$. For the existence, we can define v_u recursively as follows. Let $u_0 = u$, and for $1 \leq k \leq d-1$, define $u_k \in C([0, 1]^k \times \{0, 1\}^{d-k-1})$ by

$$u_k(a, t, b) = (1-t)u_{k-1}(a, 0, b) + tu_{k-1}(a, 1, b) \quad \text{for } (a, t) \in [0, 1]^{k-1} \times [0, 1], b \in \{0, 1\}^{d-k-1},$$

with the convention that for a set A , $A^0 := \emptyset$. Then the function $v_u = u_{d-1}$ is a continuous function $[0, 1]^{d-1}$ that has the desired property. In particular,

$$\int_{[0, 1]^{d-1}} v_u(x) \nu_0(dx) = 2^{1-d} \sum_{y \in \{0, 1\}^{d-1}} u(y).$$

The restriction of v_u on a face of $[0, 1]^{d-1}$ depends only on the values of u on the corner points in the face, so, we can glue such functions on copies of $[0, 1]^{d-1}$. Another useful property, which can be easily seen through induction, is that

$$|\nabla v_u(x)| \leq (d-1) \max_{\substack{y, z \in \{0, 1\}^d \\ |y-z|=1}} |u(y) - u(z)| \quad \text{for } x \in (0, 1)^{d-1}.$$

Observation 2. Let $w^* \in C^1([0, 1]^{d-1})$ be such that $w^* = 0$ on $\partial([0, 1]^{d-1}) := [0, 1]^{d-1} \setminus (0, 1)^{d-1}$ and $\int_{[0, 1]^{d-1}} w^*(x) \nu_0(dx) = 1$. For each $u \in l(\{0, 1\}^{d-1})$ and $a \in \mathbb{R}$, define

$$w_{u,a}(x) = v_u(x) + 2^{1-d} \sum_{y \in \{0, 1\}^{d-1}} (a - u(y)) w^*(x) \quad \text{for } x \in [0, 1]^{d-1}, \quad (5.2)$$

where $u_v \in C[2^{-d+1}]$ is the function in *Observation 1*. Clearly, $w_{u,a} \in C^1([0,1]^{d-1})$ with $w_{u,a}|_{\partial([0,1]^{d-1})} = u_v|_{\partial([0,1]^{d-1})}$, $[w_{u,a}]_{\nu_0|_{[0,1]^{d-1}}} = a$, and for some constant $C_1 > 0$ depending only on d ,

$$|\nabla w_{u,a}(x)| \leq C_1 \max_{y \in \{0,1\}^{d-1}} |u(y) - a| \quad \text{for } x \in (0,1)^{d-1}. \quad (5.3)$$

Fix $n, m \geq 0$. We will use (5.2) to construct a function g as follows. For $k \geq 0$, we let

$$\mathcal{A}_k = \{\Psi_Q(B) : Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F_n), B \in \check{\partial}_{m+k}F_m\},$$

and, for each $A \in \mathcal{A}_0$, let $\Phi_A : [0,1]^{d-1} \rightarrow A$ be an affine map (here the orientation is not important). Let $V_A = \Phi_A(\{0,1\}^{d-1})$ for each $A \in \mathcal{A}_0$ and $V = \bigcup_{A \in \mathcal{A}_0} V_A$.

Let $h \in \mathcal{F}^{(F)} \cap C(F)$ that is $\mathcal{E}^{(F)}$ -harmonic in $F \setminus \partial_o F$.

Step 1. We construct g^* on V first. For each $x \in V$, let

$$g^*(x) = \frac{1}{\#\{S \in \mathcal{A}_0, x \in V_S\}} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{A}_0: x \in V_S} [h]_{\nu|_{S \cap F}}.$$

Step 2. We extend g^* to $g^{**} \in C(\bigcup_{A \in \mathcal{A}_0} A)$ using *Observation 2* as follows. For each $S \in \mathcal{A}_0$, let $v_S := g^*|_{V_S} \circ \Phi_S$, $a_S := \int_{S \cap F} h(x) \nu(dx)$, and

$$g^{**}|_S := w_{v_S, a_S} \circ \Phi_S^{-1}, \quad (5.4)$$

where w_{v_S, a_S} is defined as in (5.2). By the construction of g^* in Step 1 and (5.3), there is some constant $C_2 > 0$ depending only on d so that

$$\max_{y \in [0,1]^{d-1}} |\nabla w_{v_S, a_S}(y)| \leq C_2 \max_{S' \in \mathcal{A}_0: S \cap S' \neq \emptyset} |[h]_{\nu|_{S \cap F}} - [h]_{\nu|_{S' \cap F}}|. \quad (5.5)$$

Step 3. Let g be the unique function in $W^{1,2}(F_{n+m})$ so that $g = g^{**}$ on $\bigcup_{A \in \mathcal{A}_0} A$ and g is harmonic in $F_{m+n} \setminus \bigcup_{A \in \mathcal{A}_0} A$. Since every point on $\bigcup_{A \in \mathcal{A}_0} A$ is regular for $\bigcup_{A \in \mathcal{A}_0} A$ and $g^{**} \in C(\bigcup_{A \in \mathcal{A}_0} A)$, we have $g \in C(F_{n+m})$.

From the construction, we see immediately that $g_{n,m} := g$ enjoys properties (i) and (iv) of the Lemma.

To see (iii), fix $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F_n)$ and $x \in F_Q$. Then, for each $y \in \partial_o F_{m+n, Q}$ and $S \in \mathcal{A}_0$ such that $y \in S \subset \partial_o F_{m+n, Q}$, we have by (i), (5.4) and (5.5) that

$$\begin{aligned} |g(y) - [h]_{\nu|_{S \cap F}}| &= |g^{**}(y) - [g^{**}]_{\nu_0|_S}| = |w_{v_S, a_S}(\Phi_S^{-1}(y)) - [w_{v_S, a_S}]_{\nu_0|_{[0,1]^{d-1}}}| \\ &\leq \sqrt{d-1} \sup_{z \in [0,1]^{d-1}} |\nabla w_{v_S, a_S}(z)| \\ &\leq C_2 \sqrt{d-1} \max_{S' \in \mathcal{A}_0: S \cap S' \neq \emptyset} |[h]_{\nu|_{S \cap F}} - [h]_{\nu|_{S' \cap F}}|. \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

Hence

$$|h(x) - g(y)| \leq |h(x) - [h]_{\nu|_{S \cap F}}| + |g(y) - [h]_{\nu|_{S \cap F}}| \leq (1 + C_2 \sqrt{d-1}) \max_{x', y' \in F_{S_Q}} |h(x') - h(y')|.$$

Property (iii) now follows immediately since g is harmonic in $F_{m+n, Q} \setminus \bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F_n)} \partial_o F_{m+n, Q}$.

It remains to show (ii). For $k \geq 0$ and $A, B \in \mathcal{A}_k$, we say $A \sim B$ if there is $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F_n)$ such that $A, B \subset Q$ and $\Psi_Q^{-1}(A) \sim \Psi_Q^{-1}(B)$ in the sense of (4.3) but with $m+k$ in place of k there. Then

$$\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F_n)} I_{m+k}^{(m)} [(g \circ \Psi_Q)|_{\partial_o F_m}] = \sum_{A, B \in \mathcal{A}_k: A \sim B} ([g]_{\nu_{m+n}|_A} - [g]_{\nu_{m+n}|_B})^2.$$

Next, for $A \in \mathcal{A}_k$ with $k \geq 1$ and $S \in \mathcal{A}_0$ such that $A \subset S$

$$\begin{aligned} |g^{**}(y) - [g^{**}]_{\nu_0|_A}| &= |w_{v_S, a_S}(\Phi_S^{-1}(y)) - [w_{v_S, a_S}]_{\nu_0|_{\Phi_S^{-1}(A)}}| \\ &\leq L_F^{-k} \sqrt{d-1} \sup_{z \in [0,1]^{d-1}} |\nabla w_{v_S, a_S}(z)| \\ &\leq L_F^{-k} C_2 \sqrt{d-1} \max_{T \in \mathcal{U}(S)} |[h]_{\nu|_{S \cap F}} - [h]_{\nu|_{T \cap F}}|, \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

where in the first inequality we used the fact that $\Phi_S^{-1}(A)$ is a $(d-1)$ -dimensional cube with side length L_F^{-k} , and in the second inequality we used (5.5) with $\mathcal{U}_S := \{T \in \mathcal{A}_0 : T \cap S \neq \emptyset\}$ for $S \in \mathcal{A}_0$. Fix $k \geq 1$ and $A, B \in \mathcal{A}_k$ such that $A \sim B$. Let $S, S' \in \mathcal{A}_0$ be such that $A \subset S$, $B \subset S'$. Then either $S = S'$ or $S \cap S' \neq \emptyset$. Then there are positive constants C_3 and C_4 depending only on d so that

$$\begin{aligned} &|[g]_{\mu_{m+n}|_A} - [g]_{\mu_{m+n}|_B}|^2 \\ &\leq C_3 L_F^{-2k} \left(\sum_{T \in \mathcal{U}_S} ([h]_{\nu|_{T \cap F}} - [h]_{\nu|_{S \cap F}})^2 + \sum_{T \in \mathcal{U}_{S'}} ([h]_{\nu|_{T \cap F}} - [h]_{\nu|_{S' \cap F}})^2 \right) \\ &\leq C_4 L_F^{-2k} \left(\sum_{T, T' \in \mathcal{U}_S: T \sim T'} ([h]_{\nu|_{T \cap F}} - [h]_{\nu|_{T' \cap F}})^2 + \sum_{T, T' \in \mathcal{U}_{S'}: T \sim T'} ([h]_{\nu|_{T \cap F}} - [h]_{\nu|_{T' \cap F}})^2 \right), \end{aligned} \quad (5.8)$$

where we used (5.7) (by taking $y \in S \cap S'$) in the first inequality, while for the second inequality, we used (SC3) on the non-diagonality of $GSC F$, which implies that if $T \cap S \neq \emptyset$, there are $S = S_1, S_2, \dots, S_l = T \in \mathcal{A}_0$ with $l \leq 2^{2d}$ so that $S \cap S_i \neq \emptyset$ for every $i \in \{1, \dots, l\}$ and $S_i \cup S_{i+1} \subset Q$ for some $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{m+n}(F)$ (so $S_i \sim S_{i+1}$) for every $i \in \{1, \dots, l-1\}$.

For $A, B \in \mathcal{A}_k$ such that $A \sim B$, take and then fix $S(A), S(B) \in \mathcal{A}_0$ so that $A \subset S(A)$ and $B \subset S(B)$. Summing (5.8) over all possible $A, B \in \mathcal{A}_k$ with $A \sim B$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F_n)} I_{m+k}^{(m)} [g \circ \Psi_Q|_{\partial_o F_m}] \\ &= \sum_{A, B \in \mathcal{A}_k: A \sim B} ([g]_{\nu_{m+n}|_A} - [g]_{\nu_{m+n}|_B})^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{\substack{A, B \in \mathcal{A}_k \\ A \sim B}} C_4 L_F^{-2k} \cdot \left(\sum_{\substack{T, T' \in \mathcal{U}_{S(A)} \\ T \sim T'}} ([h]_{\nu|_{T \cap F}} - [h]_{\nu|_{T' \cap F}})^2 + \sum_{\substack{T, T' \in \mathcal{U}_{S(B)} \\ T \sim T'}} ([h]_{\nu|_{T \cap F}} - [h]_{\nu|_{T' \cap F}})^2 \right) \\ &\leq 2C_4 L_F^{-2k} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{A}_0} \sum_{\substack{A \in \mathcal{A}_k \\ A \subset S}} \sum_{\substack{B \in \mathcal{A}_k \\ B \sim A}} \sum_{\substack{T, T' \in \mathcal{U}_S \\ T \sim T'}} ([h]_{\nu|_{T \cap F}} - [h]_{\nu|_{T' \cap F}})^2 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq C_5 L_F^{-2k} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{A}_0} \sum_{\substack{A \in \mathcal{A}_k \\ AC \bar{S}}} \sum_{\substack{T, T' \in \mathcal{U}_S \\ T \sim T'}} ([h]_{\nu|_{T \cap F}} - [h]_{\nu|_{T' \cap F}})^2 \\
&= C_5 L_F^{-2k} L_F^{(d-1)k} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{A}_0} \sum_{\substack{T, T' \in \mathcal{U}_S \\ T \sim T'}} ([h]_{\nu|_{T \cap F}} - [h]_{\nu|_{T' \cap F}})^2 \\
&= C_5 L_F^{(d-3)k} \sum_{\substack{T, T' \in \mathcal{A}_0 \\ T \sim T'}} \sum_{\substack{S \in \mathcal{A}_0 \\ T, T' \in \mathcal{U}_S}} ([h]_{\nu|_{T \cap F}} - [h]_{\nu|_{T' \cap F}})^2 \\
&\leq C_6 L_F^{(d-3)k} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F_n)} I_m[(h \circ \Psi_Q)|_{\partial_o F}]
\end{aligned}$$

for some C_5, C_6 depending only on d , where the third inequality is due to the fact that for each $A \in \mathcal{A}_k$ there are at most $3^d + L_F^{d-1}$ number of $B \in \mathcal{A}_k$ with $B \sim A$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F_n)} \Lambda_m^{(m)}[(g \circ \Psi_Q)|_{\partial_o F_m}] \\
&= \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F_n)} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \varphi_m(L_F^{-(m+k)}) I_{m+k}^{(m)}[(g \circ \Psi_Q)|_{\partial_o F_m}] \\
&\leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} L_F^{(d_w - d_f + d - 2)m} L_F^{-(d-2)(m+k)} C_6 L_F^{(d-3)k} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F_n)} I_m[(h \circ \Psi_Q)|_{\partial_o F}] \\
&= \frac{C_6}{1 - (1/L_F)} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F_n)} L_F^{(d_w - d_f)m} I_m[(h \circ \Psi_Q)|_{\partial_o F}] \\
&\leq \frac{C_6}{1 - (1/L_F)} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F_n)} \Lambda_m[(h \circ \Psi_Q)|_{\partial_o F}].
\end{aligned}$$

This establishes part (ii) of the Lemma. \square

Proof of Theorems 1.1, 1.3 and 1.4. Let h be the unique function that is $\mathcal{E}^{(F)}$ -harmonic in $F \setminus (\partial_{1,0}F \cup \partial_{1,1}F)$ having $h|_{\partial_{1,0}F} = 0$ and $h|_{\partial_{1,1}F} = 1$. For each $m, n \geq 0$, we construct a function $g_{m,n}$ using Lemma 5.1. Recall that $\{m_k, k \geq 1\}$ is the subsequence in (5.1), and without loss of generality, we assume $m_1 = 0$. For any integer $l \geq 0$, define

$$k(l) := \max\{k \geq 1 : m_k \leq l/2\}$$

and set

$$g_l := g_{m_{k(l)}, l - m_{k(l)}}.$$

We claim that $g_l \rightarrow h$ as $l \rightarrow \infty$. For this, we need to show $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} g_l(y_l) = h(x)$ for any $x \in F$ and $y_l \in F_l$ so that $y_l \rightarrow x$ as $l \rightarrow \infty$. Fix such $x \in F$ and $y_l \in F_l$. For $l \geq 0$, let $x_l \in F$ be such that x_l and y_l belong to the same $Q(l) \in \mathcal{Q}_{l - m_{k(l)}}(F_l) = \mathcal{Q}_{l - m_{k(l)}}(F)$. By Lemma 5.1(iii),

$$|g_l(y_l) - h(x_l)| \leq C_1' \max_{x', y' \in F_{S_{Q(l)}}} |h(x') - h(y')|.$$

Since $l - m_k(l) \geq l/2$ and h is uniform continuous on F , $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} |g_l(y_l) - h(x_l)| = 0$. In addition, $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} h(x_l) = h(x)$ because $\rho(x_l, x) \leq \rho(x_l, y_l) + \rho(y_l, x) \rightarrow 0$ as $l \rightarrow \infty$. Hence we have $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} g_l(y_l) = h(x)$. This proves the claim that $g_l \rightarrow h$ as $l \rightarrow \infty$.

We next estimate $\mathcal{E}^{(F_i)}(g_l)$. For each $n, n' \geq 0$, define $D_{n, n'} := \bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{n'}(F_{n'})} \Psi_Q(F_{\mathcal{B}_n(F)})$. By Lemma A.2 and by applying Theorem B.1 on each $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{n'}(F_{n'}) \setminus \mathcal{B}_{n'}(F)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{\langle h \rangle}^{(F)}(D_{n, n'}) &= \mu_{\langle h \rangle}^{(F)}(F_{\mathcal{B}_{n'}(F)}) + \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{n'}(F) \setminus \mathcal{B}_{n'}(F)} \mu_{\langle h \rangle}^{(F)}(\Psi_Q(F_{\mathcal{B}_n(F)})) \\ &\leq \mu_{\langle h \rangle}^{(F)}(F_{\mathcal{B}_{n'}(F)}) + C_1 e^{-c_1 n} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{n'}(F) \setminus \mathcal{B}_{n'}(F)} \mu_{\langle h \rangle}^{(F)}(F_{S_Q}) \\ &\leq \mu_{\langle h \rangle}^{(F)}(F_{\mathcal{B}_{n'}(F)}) + 3^d C_1 e^{-c_1 n} \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(h), \end{aligned} \quad (5.9)$$

where C_1 and c_1 are the positive constants from Theorem B.1 that depend only on F . In the last line we used the fact that each $Q' \in \mathcal{Q}_{n'}(F)$, $F_{Q'}$ is covered by at most 3^d number of F_{S_Q} with $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{n'}(F)$ as well as Corollary A.6. Note that (A1), (A2) and (A3) are satisfied for $(\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(k)}, \bar{\mathcal{F}}^{(k)}) = (\alpha \mathcal{E}^{(m_k)}, W^{1,2}(F_{m_k}))$ by Lemma 4.5, (5.1) and the first paragraph of this section, and Lemma 3.11, respectively. Note also that for non-negative a, b with $c := |a - b|$ and any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$,

$$a^2 \leq (b + c)^2 \leq (1 + \varepsilon)b^2 + (1 + \varepsilon^{-1})c^2. \quad (5.10)$$

Fix $n \geq 1$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. Since $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} k(l) = \infty$, applying Proposition 4.4 locally on F_Q for each $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{l-m_k(l)}(F)$ with sufficiently large l , we have for some constants $C_2, C_3 \geq 1$ depending only on F that

$$\begin{aligned} &\limsup_{l \rightarrow \infty} \left(\alpha \mathcal{E}^{(F_i)}(g_l) - (1 + \varepsilon) \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(h) \right) \\ &= \limsup_{l \rightarrow \infty} L_F^{(d_w - d_f)(l - m_k(l))} \cdot \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{l-m_k(l)}(F)} \left(\alpha \mathcal{E}^{(F_{m_k(l)})}(g_l \circ \Psi_Q) - (1 + \varepsilon) \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(h \circ \Psi_Q) \right) \\ &\leq \limsup_{l \rightarrow \infty} L_F^{(d_w - d_f)(l - m_k(l))} \cdot \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{l-m_k(l)}(F)} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \right) \left| \sqrt{\alpha \mathcal{E}^{(F_{m_k(l)})}(g_l \circ \Psi_Q)} - \sqrt{\mathcal{E}^{(F)}(h \circ \Psi_Q)} \right|^2 \\ &\leq \limsup_{l \rightarrow \infty} L_F^{(d_w - d_f)(l - m_k(l))} \cdot \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{l-m_k(l)}(F)} \frac{C_2}{\varepsilon} \left(\mu_{\langle h \circ \Psi_Q \rangle}^{(F)}(F_{\mathcal{B}_{n-1}}) + \Lambda_n^{(m_k(l))}[(g_l \circ \Psi_Q)|_{\partial_o F_{m_k(l)}}] \right) \\ &\leq \limsup_{l \rightarrow \infty} L_F^{(d_w - d_f)(l - m_k(l))} \cdot \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{l-m_k(l)}(F)} \frac{C_3}{\varepsilon} \mu_{\langle h \circ \Psi_Q \rangle}^{(F)}(F_{\mathcal{B}_{n-1}}) \\ &= \limsup_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{C_3}{\varepsilon} \mu_{\langle h \rangle}^{(F)}(D_{n-1, l-m_k(l)}) \\ &\leq \frac{C_3}{\varepsilon} 3^d C_1 e^{-c_1(n-1)} \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(h), \end{aligned}$$

where we used self-similarity in the first equality, (5.10) in the first inequality, Proposition 4.4 in the second inequality, Lemma 5.1(ii) and Theorem A.3(b) in the third inequality, self-similarity and Corollary A.6 in the second equality, and (5.9) and the fact that

$\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{(h)}^{(F)}(F_{\mathcal{B}_{l-m_k(l)}}) = \mu_{(h)}^{(F)}(\partial_o F) = 0$ from Corollary A.6 in the last inequality. By taking $n \rightarrow \infty$, we get $\limsup_{l \rightarrow \infty} \alpha \mathcal{E}^{(F_l)}(g_l) \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(h)$. Letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ yields

$$\limsup_{l \rightarrow \infty} \alpha \mathcal{E}^{(F_l)}(g_l) \leq \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(h).$$

On the other hand, since $g_l \rightharpoonup h$, $g_l \in C(F_l)$ and $h \in C(F)$, by Lemma 2.11, $g_l \rightarrow h$ strongly in L^2 as $l \rightarrow \infty$. Hence by the Mosco convergence (M1) of $\alpha_m \mathcal{E}^{(F_m)}$ to $\mathcal{E}^{(F)}$,

$$\liminf_{l \rightarrow \infty} \alpha \mathcal{E}^{(F_l)}(g_l) \geq \liminf_{l \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_l \mathcal{E}^{(F_l)}(g_l) \geq \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(h).$$

Thus we have

$$\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \alpha \mathcal{E}^{(F_l)}(g_l) = \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(h). \quad (5.11)$$

Now we show that $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_m = \alpha := \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_m$. Suppose not, then there is a subsequence $\{l_k; k \geq 1\}$ such that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_{l_k} = \delta < \alpha$. By the Mosco convergence (M1) of $\alpha_m \mathcal{E}^{(F_m)}$ to $\mathcal{E}^{(F)}$,

$$\delta \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}^{(F_{l_k})}(g_{l_k}) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_{l_k} \mathcal{E}^{(F_{l_k})}(g_{l_k}) \geq \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(h).$$

This contradicts (5.11). So we must have

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_m = \alpha. \quad (5.12)$$

This together with Theorems 3.10 and 3.12 and (3.10) establishes Theorems 1.1 and 1.3.

Finally, we show the convergence of the effective resistances. First, since $g_l \rightharpoonup h$ as $l \rightarrow \infty$, (5.11) implies that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} R_n \geq \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} (\mathcal{E}^{(F_l)}(g_l))^{-1} = \alpha (\mathcal{E}^{(F)}(h))^{-1}.$$

To see the other direction, let $h_l \in C(F_l) \cap W^{1,2}(F_l)$ be the unique function such that $h_l|_{\partial_{1,0}F_l} = 0$, $h_l|_{\partial_{1,1}F_l} = 1$ and h_l is $\mathcal{E}^{(F_l)}$ -harmonic in $F_l \setminus (\partial_{1,0}F_l \cup \partial_{1,1}F_l)$. Then, by the same proof of Lemma 4.5, for each subsequence $l_k, k \geq 1$ there is a further subsequence $\{l'_k, k \geq 1\}$ and $h' \in C(F)$ such that $h_{l'_k} \rightharpoonup h'$. As $h'|_{\partial_{1,0}F} = 0$ and $h'|_{\partial_{1,1}F} = 1$, by the Mosco convergence (M1),

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} R_{l'_k} = (\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}^{(F_{l'_k})}(h_{l'_k}))^{-1} \leq \alpha (\mathcal{E}^{(F)}(h'))^{-1} \leq \alpha / \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(h).$$

Since the argument works for each subsequence, we have $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} R_n \leq \alpha / \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(h)$ and so $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} R_n = \alpha / \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(h)$. This proves Theorem 1.4. \square

APPENDIX A. TRACE THEOREMS AND ENERGY MEASURES ON THE BOUNDARY

We prove some trace theorems in this appendix, based on the Poincaré inequalities in Lemma 3.13, the estimate $d_f - d_w < d_I$ from Lemma 3.7, and the capacity estimates in Lemma 3.8. For simplicity, the theorems are stated for continuous functions. The proof of the restriction part, Theorem A.3, is based on the method in [14], while the extension part, Theorem A.4, is proved by adapting the approach in [23] where part of the outer boundary $\partial_{1,0}F$ is considered as oppose to the whole outer boundary $\partial_o F$ in this paper. We also remark that the study of trace theorems on the boundary of fractals goes back to [24].

We begin with a lemma on the connectedness of certain subdomains of F and F_m .

Lemma A.1. *Suppose that $I \subset \{(i, s) : i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}, s \in \{0, 1\}\}$ and $j = 1, 2, \dots$. Set*

$$K = F \setminus \bigcup_{(i,s) \in I} \left\{ x \in F : \rho(x, \partial_{i,s} F_0) < L_F^{-j}/2 \right\},$$

$$K_m = F_m \setminus \bigcup_{(i,s) \in I} \left\{ x \in F_m : \rho(x, \partial_{i,s} F_0) < L_F^{-j}/2 \right\} \quad \text{for } m \geq 0.$$

Then K and $K_m, m \geq 0$ are pathwise connected.

Proof. We prove only for the case that $I = \{(1, 0)\}$. The general case follows by iterating the same argument. Let $x, y \in K \subset F$. Since F is pathwise connected, we can find a continuous path $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow F$ such that $\gamma(0) = x, \gamma(1) = y$. We let $\bar{\gamma} : [0, 1] \rightarrow K$ be defined as

$$\bar{\gamma}(t) = \begin{cases} \gamma(t), & \text{if } \gamma(t) \in K, \\ \Gamma \circ \gamma(t), & \text{if } \gamma(t) \notin K, \end{cases}$$

where $\Gamma : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is the reflection map $\Gamma(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_d) = (L_F^{-j} - z_1, z_2, \dots, z_d)$ with respect to the hyperplane $x_1 = L_F^{-j}/2$. Note that both F_m and F are symmetric with respect to $x_1 = 1/2$ so for each $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_j$, F_Q and $F_{m,Q}$ are symmetric with respect to the hyperplane passing through the center Q that is parallel to $x_1 = 0$. Thus $\bar{\gamma}$ is a continuous path in K connecting x, y . Hence, K is path connected. The same argument shows that K_m is path connected for each $m \geq 0$. \square

The next lemma considers the energy measure, where the second statement can be improved by replacing ' \geq ' with '=' by using Corollary A.6.

Lemma A.2. *For each $f \in \mathcal{F}^{(F)}$, $n \geq 1$ and Borel $A \subset F$,*

$$\mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F)}(A) = \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F)} \mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F_Q)}(A \cap F_Q).$$

In particular, if $A \subset F_Q$ for some $Q \in \cup_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{Q}_n(F)$, then $\mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F)}(A) \geq \mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F_Q)}(A)$.

Proof. By the inner regular property of Radon measures, it suffices to prove the lemma for compact subset $A \subset F$. Moreover, by the regularity of the Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E}^{(F)}, \mathcal{F}^{(F)})$ on $L^2(F; \mu)$, it suffices to consider $f \in \mathcal{F}^{(F)} \cap C(F)$. For each $m \geq 1$, let $g_m \in \mathcal{F}^{(F)} \cap C(F)$ such that $0 \leq g_m \leq 1$, $g_m|_A = 1$ and $g_m(x) = 0$ for each $x \in F$ satisfying $\rho(x, A) \geq \frac{1}{m}$. Then, by using the self-similar property of $(\mathcal{E}^{(F)}, \mathcal{F}^{(F)})$ from Lemma 3.2, we see

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F)}(A) &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \int_F g_m(x) \mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F)}(dx) \\ &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left(\mathcal{E}^{(F)}(g_m f, f) - \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(g_m^2, f) \right) \\ &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F)} \left(\mathcal{E}^{(F_Q)}(g_m f, f) - \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{E}^{(F_Q)}(g_m^2, f) \right) \\ &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F)} \int_{F_Q} g_m(x) \mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F_Q)}(dx) = \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F)} \mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F_Q)}(A \cap F_Q). \end{aligned}$$

□

Recall that $\mathcal{B}_k(F)$ and $\mathcal{B}_k(F_m)$ are the k -level boundary shells of F and F_m as defined in Section 4. For a subset \mathcal{A} of \mathcal{Q}_n , $F_{\mathcal{A}} := \cup_{Q \in \mathcal{A}} F_Q$ and $F_{m,\mathcal{A}} := \cup_{Q \in \mathcal{A}} F_{m,Q}$.

Theorem A.3. *There is a constant $C > 0$ depending on F only such that the following hold.*

- (a) $\Lambda_n[f|_{\partial_o F}] \leq C \mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F)}(F_{\mathcal{B}_{n-1}(F)})$ for each $f \in \mathcal{F}^{(F)} \cap C(F)$ and $n \geq 1$.
- (b) $\Lambda_n^{(m)}[f|_{\partial_o F_m}] \leq C \mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F_m)}(F_{m,\mathcal{B}_{n-1}(F_m)})$ for each $m \geq 0$, $f \in W^{1,2}(F_m) \cap C(F_m)$ and $n \geq 1$.

Proof. We will only give a proof for (b) as the proof for (a) is very similar. We introduce a few more notations. For $k \geq 1$ and $A \in \check{\partial}_k F_m$, let $Q_A \in \mathcal{B}_k(F_m)$ be such that $A \subset Q_A$, and define

$$U_{k,m,A} := F_{m,Q_A} \setminus F_{m,\mathcal{B}_{k+1}(F_m)},$$

and

$$u_0^{(m)}(f, A) := [f]_{\mu_m|_{U_{k,m,A}}} = \int_{U_{k,m,A}} f(x) \mu_m(dx). \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Define for $i \geq 0$,

$$\check{\partial}_{k+i} F_m(A) := \{B \in \check{\partial}_{k+i} F_m : B \subset A\}$$

and

$$u_i^{(m)}(f, A) := \frac{\sum_{B \in \check{\partial}_{k+i} F_m(A)} [f]_{\mu_m|_{U_{k+i,m,B}}}}{\#\check{\partial}_{k+i} F_m(A)}. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Observe that for $A \in \check{\partial}_k F_m$,

$$\#\check{\partial}_{k+i} F_m(A) = m_I^{i \wedge ((m-k) \vee 0)} L_F^{(d-1)(i-i \wedge ((m-k) \vee 0))}. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

By the continuity of f , we have

$$[f]_{\nu_m|_A} = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} u_i^{(m)}(f, A) = u_0^{(m)}(f, A) + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (u_i^{(m)}(f, A) - u_{i-1}^{(m)}(f, A)),$$

Define

$$D_{k,i}^{(m)}[f] = \begin{cases} \sum_{\substack{A, B \in \check{\partial}_k F_m \\ A \sim B}} (u_i^{(m)}(f, A) - u_i^{(m)}(f, B))^2 & \text{if } i = 0, \\ \sum_{\substack{A, B \in \check{\partial}_k F_m \\ A \sim B}} (u_i^{(m)}(f, A) - u_{i-1}^{(m)}(f, A) - u_i^{(m)}(f, B) + u_{i-1}^{(m)}(f, B))^2 & \text{if } i \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

By the triangle inequality for the l^2 -norm,

$$\sqrt{I_k^{(m)}[f|_{\partial_o F_m}]} \leq \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \sqrt{D_{k,i}^{(m)}[f]}. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

We next estimate $D_{k,i}^{(m)}[f]$.

Claim 1. Let $k \geq 1$ and $A, A' \in \mathfrak{B}_k F_m$ with $A \cap A' \neq \emptyset$. Let $Q, Q' \in \mathcal{B}_k(F_m)$ be such that $A \subset Q, A' \subset Q'$. Define

$$\begin{aligned} B' &= (F_{m,Q} \cup F_{m,Q'}) \setminus \{x \in F_m : \rho(x, \partial_o F_0) < L_F^{-k-1}/2\}, \\ B &= \{x \in F_m : \rho(x, B') < L_F^{-k-2}/2\}. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly,

$$B \subset \bigcup_{\substack{Q^* \in \mathcal{B}_{k-1}(F_m) \\ Q^* \cap (A \cup A') \neq \emptyset}} F_{m,Q^*} \setminus F_{m, \mathcal{B}_{k+2}(F_m)} \subset F_{m, \mathcal{B}_{k-1}(F_m)} \setminus F_{m, \mathcal{B}_{k+2}(F_m)}.$$

Then, for some C_1 depending only on F , we claim that

$$\varphi_m(L_F^{-k}) (u_0^{(m)}(f, A) - u_0^{(m)}(f, A'))^2 \leq C_1 \mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F_m)}(B). \quad (\text{A.5})$$

First, note that B' is connected by Lemma A.1. Indeed, $F_{m,Q} \setminus \{x \in F_{m,Q} : \rho(x, \partial_o F_0) < L_F^{-k-1}/2\}$ is a scaled version of $F_{(m-k)\vee 0}$ in Lemma A.1 (for some I and $j = 1$) and so is $F_{m,Q'} \setminus \{x \in F_{m,Q'} : \rho(x, \partial_o F_0) < L_F^{-k-1}/2\}$, and these two connected sets do intersect as $A \cap A' \neq \emptyset$.

Next, choose a $(c/8)L_F^{-k-2}$ -net $\{x^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^N$ of B' , where c is the constant in the Poincaré inequalities (Lemma 3.13 (b)), and $N \geq 2$ is an integer depending only on d and c . Let $B_i := B_{F_m}(x^{(i)}, L_F^{-k-2}/2)$ and $B'_i = B_{F_m}(x^{(i)}, cL_F^{-k-2}/2)$ for each $1 \leq i \leq N$. Recall the definition of φ_m from (3.7) and note that

$$\varphi_m(L_F^{-k-2}/2) \leq \varphi_m(L_F^{-k}) \leq (2L_F^2)^{(d-2)\vee(d_f-d_w)} \varphi_m(L_F^{-k-2}/2). \quad (\text{A.6})$$

By the Poincaré inequality from Lemma 3.13(b), there is a constant $C'_1 > 0$ depending only on F so that for $1 \leq i \leq N$,

$$\varphi_m(L_F^{-k}) \int_{B'_i} (f(x) - [f]_{\mu_m|_{B'_i}})^2 \mu_m(dx) \leq C'_1 \mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F_m)}(B_i). \quad (\text{A.7})$$

For each $1 \leq i, j \leq N$ such that $\rho(x^{(i)}, x^{(j)}) < cL_F^{-k-2}/4$,

$$B'_i \cap B'_j \supset B_{F_m}(x^{(i)}, cL_F^{-k-2}/4) \cup B_{F_m}(x^{(j)}, cL_F^{-k-2}/4).$$

Moreover, there is a constant $C'_2 > 0$ depending only on F such that

$$m(B_{F_m}(x^{(i)}, cL_F^{-k-2}/4)) \geq C'_2 \mu_m(B'_i) \quad \text{and} \quad m(B_{F_m}(x^{(j)}, cL_F^{-k-2}/4)) \geq C'_2 \mu_m(B'_j).$$

Thus by (A.7),

$$\begin{aligned} & \varphi_m(L_F^{-k})^{1/2} |[f]_{\mu_m|_{B'_i}} - [f]_{\mu_m|_{B'_j}}| \\ & \leq \frac{\varphi_m(L_F^{-k})^{1/2}}{\mu_m(B'_i \cap B'_j)} \int_{B'_i \cap B'_j} \left(|f(x) - [f]_{\mu_m|_{B'_i}}| + |f(x) - [f]_{\mu_m|_{B'_j}}| \right) \mu_m(dx) \\ & \leq \frac{\varphi_m(L_F^{-k})^{1/2}}{C'_2 \mu_m(B'_i)} \int_{B'_i} |f(x) - [f]_{\mu_m|_{B'_i}}| \mu_m(dx) + \frac{\varphi_m(L_F^{-k})^{1/2}}{C'_2 \mu_m(B'_j)} \int_{B'_j} |f(x) - [f]_{\mu_m|_{B'_j}}| \mu_m(dx) \\ & \leq C'_3 \sqrt{\mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F_m)}(B_i \cup B_j)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq C'_3 \sqrt{\mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F_m)}(B)}$$

for some C'_3 depending only on F . Next, noticing that B' is connected and $\{x^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^N$ is a $cL_F^{-k-3}/8$ net of B' , we have by the triangle inequality that

$$\varphi_m(L_F^{-k})^{1/2} |[f]_{\mu_m|_{B'_1}} - [f]_{\mu_m|_{B'_i}}| \leq C'_3 N \sqrt{\mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F_m)}(B)} \quad \text{for every } 1 \leq i \leq N. \quad (\text{A.8})$$

It follows from (A.7) and (A.8) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\varphi_m(L_F^{-k}) \int_{B'} (f(x) - [f]_{\mu_m|_{B'}})^2 \mu_m(dx) \right)^{1/2} \\ & \leq \left(\varphi_m(L_F^{-k}) \int_{B'} (f(x) - [f]_{\mu_m|_{B'_1}})^2 \mu_m(dx) \right)^{1/2} \\ & \leq \varphi_m(L_F^{-k})^{1/2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\mu_m(B'_i)}{\mu_m(B')} \int_{B'_i} (f(x) - [f]_{\mu_m|_{B'_1}})^2 \mu_m(dx) \right)^{1/2} \\ & \leq C'_4 \varphi_m(L_F^{-k})^{1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\left(\int_{B'_i} (f(x) - [f]_{\mu_m|_{B'_i}})^2 \mu_m(dx) \right)^{1/2} + |[f]_{\mu_m|_{B'_1}} - [f]_{\mu_m|_{B'_i}}| \right) \\ & \leq C'_4 \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\sqrt{C'_1 \mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F_m)}(B_i)} + C'_3 N \sqrt{\mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F_m)}(B)} \right) \\ & \leq C'_5 \sqrt{\mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F_m)}(B)}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.9})$$

where the constants C'_4 and C'_5 depend only on F . Recall that $u_0^{(m)}(f, A) := [f]_{\mu_m|_{U_{k,m,A}}}$. Notice that $B' \supset U_{k,m,A} \cup U_{k,m,A'}$, and there is a constant $C'_6 \in (0, 1)$ depending only on F so that $\mu_m(U_{k,m,A}) \geq C'_6 \mu_m(B')$ and $\mu_m(U_{k,m,A'}) \geq C'_6 \mu_m(B')$. We have by (A.9) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \varphi_m(L_F^{-k}) (u_0^{(m)}(f, A) - u_0^{(m)}(f, A'))^2 \\ & \leq 2\varphi_m(L_F^{-k}) \left(\left([f]_{\mu_m|_{U_{k,m,A}}} - [f]_{\mu_m|_{B'}} \right)^2 + \left([f]_{\mu_m|_{B'}} - [f]_{\mu_m|_{U_{k,m,A'}}} \right)^2 \right) \\ & \leq 2\varphi_m(L_F^{-k}) \left(\int_{U_{k,m,A}} (f(x) - [f]_{\mu_m|_{B'}})^2 \mu_m(dx) + \int_{U_{k,m,A'}} (f(x) - [f]_{\mu_m|_{B'}})^2 \mu_m(dx) \right) \\ & \leq \frac{4\varphi_m(L_F^{-k})}{C'_6} \int_{B'} (f(x) - [f]_{\mu_m|_{B'}})^2 \mu_m(dx) \\ & \leq \frac{4(C'_5)^2}{C'_6} \mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F_m)}(B). \end{aligned}$$

This proves the claim (A.5).

Claim 2. There is a constant $C_2 > 0$ depending only on F so that the following hold.

(2.a) Let $k \geq 1$ and $A, A' \in \partial_k F_m$ that there is some $Q \in \mathcal{B}_{k-1}(F_m)$ such that $A \cup A' \subset Q$. Then

$$\varphi_m(L_F^{-k}) \left(u_0^{(m)}(f, A) - u_0^{(m)}(f, A') \right)^2 \leq C_2 \mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F_m)}(F_{m,Q} \setminus F_{m,\mathcal{B}_{k+2}(F_m)}).$$

(2.b) Let $k \geq 1$ and $A \in \partial_k F_m$, $A' \in \partial_{k+1} F_m$ that there is some $Q \in \mathcal{B}_k(F_m)$ such that $A' \subset A \subset Q$. Then

$$\varphi_m(L_F^{-k-1}) \left(u_0^{(m)}(f, A) - u_0^{(m)}(f, A') \right)^2 \leq C_2 \mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F_m)}(F_{m,Q} \setminus F_{m,\mathcal{B}_{k+3}(F_m)}).$$

Claim 2 follows from an argument similar to that for Claim 1, by applying the Poincaré inequalities locally on $\mathcal{E}^{(F_m, Q)}$, which is essentially a rescaled version of $\mathcal{E}^{(F_{(m-k+1)\vee 0})}$ in (2.a) and $\mathcal{E}^{(F_{(m-k)\vee 0})}$ in (2.b).

Remark. For the proof of Theorem A.3 (a), we can still use the Poincaré inequalities locally on cells to prove a corresponding version of Claim 2 in view of Lemma A.2 and the self-similarity (3.3) of the Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E}^{(F)}, \mathcal{F}^{(F)})$.

Claim 3. Let $k \geq 1$, $i \geq 1$, $A \in \partial_k F_m$ and $Q \in \mathcal{B}_k(F_m)$ such that $A \subset Q$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \varphi_m(L_F^{-k-i}) \left(u_i^{(m)}(f, A) - u_{i-1}^{(m)}(f, A) \right)^2 \\ & \leq C_2 (\#\partial_{k+i-1} F_m(A))^{-1} \mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F_m)}(Q \cap (F_{m,\mathcal{B}_{k+i-1}(F_m)} \setminus F_{m,\mathcal{B}_{k+i+2}(F_m)})). \end{aligned}$$

When $i = 1$, Claim 3 is an immediately consequence of part (2.b) of Claim 2. Indeed, as $u_1^{(m)}(f, A)$ is the average of $u_0^{(m)}(f, A')$ over $A' \in \partial_{k+1} F_m(A)$, we have by (2.b) of Claim 2 that

$$\begin{aligned} & \varphi_m(L_F^{-k-1}) \left(u_1^{(m)}(f, A) - u_0^{(m)}(f, A) \right)^2 \\ & \leq \max_{A' \in \partial_{k+1} F_m(A)} \varphi_m(L_F^{-k-1}) \left(u_0^{(m)}(f, A') - u_0^{(m)}(f, A) \right)^2 \\ & \leq C_2 \mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F_m)}(F_{m,Q} \setminus F_{m,\mathcal{B}_{k+3}(F_m)}) \\ & = C_2 \mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F_m)}(Q \cap (F_{m,\mathcal{B}_k(F_m)} \setminus F_{m,\mathcal{B}_{k+3}(F_m)})). \end{aligned} \tag{A.10}$$

For $i \geq 2$, by the definition of $u_i^{(m)}(f, A)$ in (A.1)-(A.2),

$$u_{i-1}^{(m)}(f, A) := \frac{\sum_{A' \in \partial_{k+i-1} F_m(A)} [f]_{\mu_m|_{U_{k+i-1, m, A'}}}}{\#\partial_{k+i-1} F_m(A)} = \frac{\sum_{A' \in \partial_{k+i-1} F_m(A)} u_0^{(m)}(f, A')}{\#\partial_{k+i-1} F_m(A)},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} u_i^{(m)}(f, A) & := \frac{\sum_{B \in \partial_{k+i} F_m(A)} [f]_{\mu_m|_{U_{k+i, m, B}}}}{\#\partial_{k+i} F_m(A)} \\ & = \frac{\sum_{A' \in \partial_{k+i-1} F_m(A)} \sum_{B \in \partial_{k+i} F_m(A')} u_0^{(m)}(f, B)}{\#\partial_{k+i} F_m(A)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{\sum_{A' \in \check{\delta}_{k+i-1} F_m(A)} u_1^{(m)}(f, A') (\#\check{\delta}_{k+i} F_m(A'))}{\#\check{\delta}_{k+i} F_m(A)} \\
&= \frac{\sum_{A' \in \check{\delta}_{k+i-1} F_m(A)} u_1^{(m)}(f, A')}{\#\check{\delta}_{k+i-1} F_m(A)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and (A.10),

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\#\check{\delta}_{k+i-1} F_m(A))^2 \cdot \varphi_m(L_F^{-k-i}) \cdot (u_i^{(m)}(f, A) - u_{i-1}^{(m)}(f, A))^2 \\
&= \varphi_m(L_F^{-k-i}) \left(\sum_{A' \in \check{\delta}_{k+i-1} F_m(A)} (u_1^{(m)}(f, A') - u_0^{(m)}(f, A')) \right)^2 \\
&\leq (\#\check{\delta}_{k+i-1} F_m(A)) \sum_{A' \in \check{\delta}_{k+i-1} F_m(A)} \varphi_m(L_F^{-k-i}) \left(u_1^{(m)}(f, A') - u_0^{(m)}(f, A') \right)^2 \\
&\leq (\#\check{\delta}_{k+i-1} F_m(A)) \sum_{A' \in \check{\delta}_{k+i-1} F_m(A)} C_2 \mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F_m)}(Q_{A'} \cap (F_{m, \mathcal{B}_{k+i-1}(F_m)} \setminus F_{m, \mathcal{B}_{k+i+2}(F_m)})) \\
&= C_2 (\#\check{\delta}_{k+i-1} F_m(A)) \mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F_m)}(Q \cap (F_{m, \mathcal{B}_{k+i-1}(F_m)} \setminus F_{m, \mathcal{B}_{k+i+2}(F_m)})),
\end{aligned}$$

where in the second inequality $Q_{A'} \in \mathcal{B}_{k+i-1}(F_m)$ is such that $Q_{A'} \supset A'$.

By Claim 1 and part (2.a) of Claim 2, there is a constant $C_3 > 0$ depending only on F so that

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi_m(L_F^{-k}) D_{k,0}^{(m)}[f] &= \varphi_m(L_F^{-k}) \sum_{\substack{A, B \in \check{\delta}_k F_m \\ A \sim B}} (u_0^{(m)}(f, A) - u_0^{(m)}(f, B))^2 \\
&\leq C_2 \sum_{\substack{A, B \in \check{\delta}_k F_m \\ A \sim B}} \mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F_m)} \left(\left(\bigcup_{\substack{Q \in \mathcal{B}_{k-1}(F_m) \\ Q \cap (A \cup B) \neq \emptyset}} F_{m, Q} \right) \setminus F_{m, \mathcal{B}_{k+2}(F_m)} \right) \\
&\leq C_3 \mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F_m)}(F_{m, \mathcal{B}_{k-1}(F_m)} \setminus F_{m, \mathcal{B}_{k+2}(F_m)}), \tag{A.11}
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality, we used the fact that for each $Q \in \mathcal{B}_{k-1}(F_m)$, there are at most $2(L_F + 2)^{d-1}(3^d + L_F^{d-1})$ number of ordered k -cells (A, B) from $\check{\delta}_k F_m$ so that $A \sim B$ and $Q \cap (A \cup B) \neq \emptyset$.

For $m \geq 0$, $k \geq 1$ and $i \geq 0$, define

$$\alpha_{m,k,i} := m_I^{i \wedge ((m-k) \vee 0)} L_F^{(d-1)(i - (i \wedge (m-k)) \vee 0)}.$$

Note that by (A.3), $\alpha_{m,k,i} = \#\check{\delta}_{k+i} F_m(A)$ for any $A \in \check{\delta}_k F_m$. Moreover, $\alpha_{m,k,0} = 1$ and $\alpha_{m,k,i}$ is uniformly comparable to $\alpha_{m,k,i-1}$ for $i \geq 1$. Thus it follows from Claim 3 and (A.11) that there is a constant $C_4 > 0$ depending on F only so that for any $m \geq 0$, $k \geq 1$ and $i \geq 0$,

$$\varphi_m(L_F^{-k-i}) D_{k,i}^{(m)}[f] \leq \frac{C_4}{\alpha_{m,k,i}} \mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F_m)}(F_{m, \mathcal{B}_{k+i-1}(F_m)} \setminus F_{m, \mathcal{B}_{k+i+2}(F_m)}). \tag{A.12}$$

It follows from the definition of φ_m in (3.7) that

$$\frac{\varphi_m(L_F^{-k})}{\varphi_m(L_F^{-k-i})} \frac{1}{\alpha_{m,k,i}} \leq \theta^i \quad \text{for every } m \geq 0, k \geq 1 \text{ and } i \geq 0,$$

where $\theta := L_F^{d-2-(d-1)} \vee L_F^{d_f-d_w-d_I} < 1$ by Lemma 3.7. Hence, we have from (A.12) that for every $m \geq 0, k \geq 1$ and $i \geq 0$,

$$\varphi_m(L_F^{-k}) D_{k,i}^{(m)}[f] \leq C_4 \theta^i \mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F_m)}(F_{m, \mathcal{B}_{k+i-1}(F_m)} \setminus F_{m, \mathcal{B}_{k+i+2}(F_m)}). \quad (\text{A.13})$$

Now for any $n \geq 1$ and $m \geq 0$, we have by (A.4) and (A.13),

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\Lambda_n^{(m)}[f] \right)^{1/2} &= \left(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \varphi_m(L_F^{-n-j}) I_{n+j}^{(m)}[f] \right)^{1/2} \\ &= \left\| \sqrt{\varphi_m(L_F^{-n-j})} I_{n+j}^{(m)}[f] \right\|_{l^2(\text{in } j \geq 0)} \\ &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \left\| \sqrt{\varphi_m(L_F^{-n-j})} D_{n+j,i}^{(m)}[f] \right\|_{l^2(\text{in } j \geq 0)} \\ &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (C_4 \theta^i)^{1/2} \left\| \sqrt{\mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F_m)}(F_{m, \mathcal{B}_{n+i+j-1}(F_m)} \setminus F_{m, \mathcal{B}_{n+i+j+2}(F_m)})} \right\|_{l^2(\text{in } j \geq 0)} \\ &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (C_4 \theta^i)^{1/2} \left\| \sqrt{\mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F_m)}(F_{m, \mathcal{B}_{n+j-1}(F_m)} \setminus F_{m, \mathcal{B}_{n+j+2}(F_m)})} \right\|_{l^2(\text{in } j \geq 0)} \\ &\leq \frac{\sqrt{C_4}}{1 - \sqrt{\theta}} \left\| \sqrt{\mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F_m)}(F_{m, \mathcal{B}_{n+j-1}(F_m)} \setminus F_{m, \mathcal{B}_{n+j+2}(F_m)})} \right\|_{l^2(\text{in } j \geq 0)} \\ &\leq \frac{\sqrt{3C_4}}{1 - \sqrt{\theta}} \sqrt{\mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F_m)}(F_{m, \mathcal{B}_{n-1}(F_m)})}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\|a_j\|_{l^2(\text{in } j \geq 0)} := \sqrt{\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j^2}$ denotes the l^2 -norm of the sequence $\{a_j; j \geq 0\}$. This proves Theorem A.3(b). \square

Recall that the Besov spaces $\Lambda(\partial_o F)$ and $\Lambda^{(m)}(\partial_o F_m)$ defined in (4.4) and (4.5), respectively.

Theorem A.4. *There is a constant $C > 0$ depending only on F such that the following hold.*

- (a) *There is an extension map $\mathfrak{E} : \Lambda(\partial_o F) \cap C(\partial_o F) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}^{(F)} \cap C(F)$ such that $\mathfrak{E}f|_{\partial_o F} = f$ and $\mathcal{E}^{(F)}(\mathfrak{E}f) \leq C \Lambda_1[f]$ for any $f \in \Lambda(\partial_o F) \cap C(\partial_o F)$. Moreover, $\mu_{\langle \mathfrak{E}f \rangle}^{(F)}(\partial_o F) = 0$ for any $f \in \Lambda(\partial_o F) \cap C(\partial_o F)$.*
- (b) *For each $m \geq 0$, there is an extension map $\mathfrak{E}_m : \Lambda^{(m)}(\partial_o F_m) \cap C(\partial_o F_m) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}^{(F_m)} \cap C(F_m)$ such that $\mathfrak{E}_m f|_{\partial_o F_m} = f$ and $\mathcal{E}^{(F_m)}(\mathfrak{E}_m f) \leq C \Lambda_1^{(m)}[f]$ for any $f \in \Lambda^{(m)}(\partial_o F_m) \cap C(\partial_o F_m)$.*

Proof. We will only present a proof for (a) as it has an additional statement. The proof for (b) is the same. For $k \geq 1$ and $A \in \partial_k F$, let $Q_A \in \mathcal{B}_k(F)$ be such that $A \subset F_{Q_A}$, and U_A be the closure of $F_{Q_A} \setminus F_{\mathcal{B}_{k+1}(F)}$. Define $\bar{u}_A \in C(F) \cap \mathcal{F}^{(F)}$ by

$$\bar{u}_A(x) := \max_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{k+2}(U_A)} w_Q(x). \quad \text{for } x \in F,$$

where $w_Q \in C(F) \cap \mathcal{F}^{(F)}$ is the non-negative function in Lemma 3.6(a). Define

$$\bar{u}_o = \begin{cases} \max_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_2(F \setminus F_{\mathcal{B}_1(F)})} w_Q & \text{if } F \setminus F_{\mathcal{B}_1(F)} \neq \emptyset, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Denote by $\text{supp}[f]$ the support of f . Note that for $A \in \partial_k F$ with $k \geq 1$,

$$U_A \subset \text{supp}[\bar{u}_A] \subset F_{S_{Q_A}} \setminus F_{\mathcal{B}_{k+2}(F)} \subset F_{\mathcal{B}_{k-1}(F)} \setminus F_{\mathcal{B}_{k+2}(F)} \quad (\text{A.14})$$

and

$$F \setminus F_{\mathcal{B}_1(F)} \subset \text{supp}[\bar{u}_o] \subset F \setminus F_{\mathcal{B}_2(F)}. \quad (\text{A.15})$$

See Figure 5 for an illustration.




FIGURE 5. An illustration of $\text{supp}[\bar{u}_A]$ for $A \in \partial_k F$ with $k = 1, 2, 3$: $\text{supp}[\bar{u}_A]$ is contained in the red area, while the blue area is $F_{\mathcal{B}_{k+2}(F)} \cup (F \setminus F_{\mathcal{B}_{k-1}(F)})$

For $n \geq 3$, let $g_n := \bar{u}_o + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \sum_{A \in \partial_k F} \bar{u}_A + \sum_{A \in \partial_n F} w_{Q_A}$ and define

$$u_o := \bar{u}_o / g_n \quad \text{and} \quad u_{A,n} := \begin{cases} \bar{u}_A / g_n & \text{for } A \in \partial_k F \text{ with } 1 \leq k \leq n-1, \\ w_{Q_A} / g_n & \text{for } A \in \partial_n F. \end{cases}$$

Note that $g_n \geq 1$ on F , and $g_{n+k}(x) = g_n(x)$ for each $n \geq 3$, $k \geq 1$ and $x \in F \setminus F_{\mathcal{B}_{n-1}(F)}$. Moreover, for $A \in \partial_k F$ with $k \leq n-2$,

$$u_{A,n+j} = u_{A,n} \quad \text{for every } j \geq 1. \quad (\text{A.16})$$

Now define a linear operator $\mathfrak{E}^{(n)}$ on $C(\partial_o F)$ for each $n \geq 3$ by

$$\mathfrak{E}^{(n)} f := [f]_{\nu|_{\partial_o F}} u_o + \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{A \in \partial_k F} [f]_{\nu|_A} u_{A,n} \quad \text{for } f \in C(\partial_o F).$$

For each $n \geq 3$ and $j \geq 0$, by (A.14) $\text{supp}[u_{A,n+j}] \subset \text{supp}[\bar{u}_A] \subset F_{\mathcal{B}_{n-2}(F)}$ for $A \in \check{\partial}_k F$ with $n-1 \leq k \leq n+j-1$, and $\text{supp}[u_{A,n+j}] \subset \text{supp}[w_{Q_A}] \subset F_{\mathcal{B}_{n-2}(F)}$ for $A \in \check{\partial}_{n+j} F$. Thus on $F \setminus F_{\mathcal{B}_{n-2}(F)}$, we have by (A.16)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{E}^{(n+j)} f &= [f]_{\nu|_{\partial_o F}} u_o + \sum_{k=1}^{n+j} \sum_{A \in \check{\partial}_k F} [f]_{\nu|_A} u_{A,n+j} \\ &= [f]_{\nu|_{\partial_o F}} u_o + \sum_{k=1}^{n-2} \sum_{A \in \check{\partial}_k F} [f]_{\nu|_A} u_{A,n+j} \\ &= [f]_{\nu|_{\partial_o F}} u_o + \sum_{k=1}^{n-2} \sum_{A \in \check{\partial}_k F} [f]_{\nu|_A} u_{A,n}. \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, for each $n \geq 3$ and $j \geq 0$,

$$\mathfrak{E}^{(n+j)} f = \mathfrak{E}^{(n)} f \quad \text{on } F \setminus F_{\mathcal{B}_{n-2}(F)}. \quad (\text{A.17})$$

On the other hand, we have by (A.14) and (A.15) that for $n \geq 4$, $j \geq 0$ and $x \in F_{\mathcal{B}_{n-2}(F)}$,

$$\mathfrak{E}^{(n+j)} f(x) = \sum_{k=n-3}^{n+j} \sum_{\substack{A \in \check{\partial}_k F \\ x \in \text{supp}[u_{A,n+j}]}} [f]_{\nu|_A} u_{A,n+j}(x).$$

Hence, if we fix $Q(x) \in \mathcal{B}_{n-3}(F)$ so that $x \in Q(x)$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\inf\{f(y) : y \in A', A' \in \check{\partial}_{n-3} F, A' \cap Q(x) \neq \emptyset\} \\ &\leq \mathfrak{E}^{(n+j)} f(x) \leq \sup\{f(y) : y \in A', A' \in \check{\partial}_{n-3} F, A' \cap Q(x) \neq \emptyset\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.18})$$

We conclude from (A.17) and (A.18) that

$$\|\mathfrak{E}^{(n+j)} f - \mathfrak{E}^{(n)} f\|_{\infty} \leq \text{Osc}(f, 2\sqrt{d}L_F^{3-n}) \quad \text{for each } n \geq 3 \text{ and } j \geq 0,$$

where $\text{Osc}(f, r) := \sup_{x,y \in F: \rho(x,y) \leq r} |f(x) - f(y)|$. Consequently, $\mathfrak{E}^{(n)} f$ converges uniformly on F as $n \rightarrow \infty$ to a bounded continuous $\mathfrak{E}f$ function on F with $\mathfrak{E}f = f$ on $\partial_o F$. In the rest of the proof, we fix $f \in C(\partial_o F) \cap \Lambda(\partial_o F)$, and write $h_n = \mathfrak{E}^{(n)} f$ with $n \geq 3$.

We first show that there is a constant C_1 depending only on F such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(u_o) \leq C_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(u_{A,n}) \leq C_1 L_F^{(d_w - d_f)k} \\ \text{for each } n \geq 3 \text{ and } A \in \check{\partial}_k F \text{ with } 1 \leq k \leq n. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.19})$$

Note that $\mathcal{E}^{(F)}(u_o) < \infty$ as $u_o \in \mathcal{F}^{(F)}$. So we only need to estimate $\mathcal{E}^{(F)}(u_{A,n})$. From now on, fix $1 \leq k < n$ (the case that $k = n$ follows by the same argument) and $A \in \check{\partial}_k F$. Since $g_n \geq 1$ on F ,

$$1/g_n \leq g_n \quad \text{and} \quad \left| \frac{1}{g_n(x)} - \frac{1}{g_n(y)} \right| \leq |g_n(x) - g_n(y)| \quad \text{for any } x, y \in F.$$

Thus by the proof of [18, Lemma 4.3.9], $\mu_{\langle 1/g_n \rangle}^{(F)} \leq \mu_{\langle g_n \rangle}^{(F)}$ on F . Hence for some constant $C'_1 > 0$ depending only on F ,

$$\mu_{\langle 1/g_n \rangle}^{(F)}(\text{supp}[\bar{u}_A]) \leq \mu_{\langle g_n \rangle}^{(F)}(\text{supp}[\bar{u}_A]) \leq C'_1 L_F^{(d_w - d_f)k},$$

where the second inequality is due to the definition of g_n , the energy estimates of w_{Q_A} from Lemma 3.6(a) and of \bar{u}_A by the proof of [18, Lemma 4.3.9], and the fact that there are no more than $(3^d - 1)m_F$ of functions among $\bar{u}_0, \bar{u}_A, w_{Q_A}$ in the definition of g_n that are non-zero on $\text{supp}[\bar{u}_A]$. By the strongly local property and the derivation property of $\mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F)}$ (see, e.g., [18, Proposition 4.3.1 and Lemma 4.3.6]),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(u_{A,n}) &= \mu_{\langle u_{A,n} \rangle}^{(F)}(F) = \mu_{\langle \bar{u}_A/g_n \rangle}^{(F)}(\text{supp}[\bar{u}_A]) \\ &\leq 2 \left(\mu_{\langle \bar{u}_A \rangle}^{(F)}(\text{supp}[u_A]) + \mu_{\langle 1/g_n \rangle}^{(F)}(\text{supp}[u_A]) \right) \leq C_1 L_F^{(d_w - d_f)k}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the first inequality we also used the facts that $\|\bar{u}_A\|_\infty \leq 1$ and $\|1/g_n\|_\infty \leq 1$. This proves the claim (A.19).

We next estimate the energy of $h_n := \mathfrak{E}^{(n)}f$. Let $A \in \partial_k F$ with $2 \leq k \leq n - 1$. Note that

$$h_n - [f]_{\nu|_A} = ([f]_{\nu|_{\partial_o F}} - [f]_{\nu|_A})u_o + \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{B \in \partial_j F} ([f]_{\nu|_B} - [f]_{\nu|_A})u_{B,n}.$$

By (A.14)-(A.15) and the strong local property of the energy measure $\mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F)}$ (see [18, Proposition 4.3.1]), there are positive constants C_2, C_3 depending only on F so that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{\langle h_n \rangle}^{(F)}(U_A) &= \mu_{\langle h_n(x) - [f]_{\nu|_A} \rangle}^{(F)}(U_A) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{B \in \partial_j F} ([f]_{\nu|_B} - [f]_{\nu|_A})^2 \mu_{\langle u_{B,n} \rangle}^{(F)}(U_A) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i \neq j=1}^n \sum_{B_1 \in \partial_i F, B_j \in \partial_j F} ([f]_{\nu|_{B_1}} - [f]_{\nu|_A})([f]_{\nu|_{B_2}} - [f]_{\nu|_A}) \mu_{\langle u_{B_1,n}, u_{B_2,n} \rangle}^{(F)}(U_A) \\ &\leq 3^d \sum_{j=k-1}^{k+1} \sum_{\substack{A' \in \partial_j F \\ A' \cap A \neq \emptyset}} ([f]_{\nu|_{A'}} - [f]_{\nu|_A})^2 \mu_{\langle u_{A',n} \rangle}^{(F)}(U_A). \end{aligned}$$

Thus by (A.19)

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{\langle h_n \rangle}^{(F)}(U_A) &\leq C_2 \sum_{j=k-1}^{k+1} \sum_{\substack{A' \in \partial_j F \\ A' \cap A \neq \emptyset}} L_F^{(d_w - d_f)j} ([f]_{\nu|_{A'}} - [f]_{\nu|_A})^2 \\ &\leq C_3 \sum_{j=k-1}^{k+1} L_F^{(d_w - d_f)j} \sum_{\substack{A' \in \partial_j F \\ A' \cap A \neq \emptyset}} \sum_{\substack{B \in \partial_j F \\ B \sim A'}} ([f]_{\nu|_{A'}} - [f]_{\nu|_B})^2, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.20})$$

where the last inequality is due to the observation that for any $i \geq 1$, $\tilde{A} \in \tilde{\partial}_{i-1}F$ and any $\tilde{B} \in \tilde{\partial}_{i-1}F$ with $\tilde{B} \supset \tilde{A}$,

$$|[f]_{\nu|\tilde{A}} - [f]_{\nu|\tilde{B}}|^2 \leq m_I \sum_{\substack{B \in \tilde{\partial}_i F \\ B \sim \tilde{A}}} |[f]_{\nu|\tilde{A}} - [f]_{\nu|B}|^2.$$

Summing (A.20) over $A \in \tilde{\partial}_k F$, we get for some positive constant C_4 depending only on F that

$$\mu_{\langle h_n \rangle}^{(F)}(F_{\mathcal{B}_k(F)} \setminus F_{\mathcal{B}_{k+1}(F)}) \leq C_4 \sum_{j=k-1}^{k+1} L_F^{(d_w-d_f)j} I_j[f] \quad \text{for } 2 \leq k \leq n-1. \quad (\text{A.21})$$

By the same arguments, we get that

$$\mu_{\langle h_n \rangle}^{(F)}(F_{\mathcal{B}_n(F)}) \leq C_4 \sum_{j=n-1}^n L_F^{(d_w-d_f)j} I_j[f] \quad (\text{A.22})$$

$$\mu_{\langle h_n \rangle}^{(F)}(F \setminus F_{\mathcal{B}_1(F)}) \leq C_4 L_F^{(d_w-d_f)} I_1[f] \quad (\text{A.23})$$

$$\mu_{\langle h_n \rangle}^{(F)}(F_{\mathcal{B}_1(F)} \setminus F_{\mathcal{B}_2(F)}) \leq C_4 \sum_{j=1}^2 L_F^{(d_w-d_f)j} I_j[f]. \quad (\text{A.24})$$

For example, for (A.22), following the same argument as that for (A.19) we have for each $A \in \tilde{\partial}_n F$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{\langle h_n \rangle}^{(F)}(F_{Q_A}) &\leq C'_2 \sum_{j=n-1}^n \sum_{\substack{A' \in \tilde{\partial}_j F \\ A' \cap A \neq \emptyset}} L_F^{(d_w-d_f)j} ([f]_{\nu|A'} - [f]_{\nu|A})^2 \\ &\leq C'_3 \sum_{j=n-1}^n L_F^{(d_w-d_f)j} \sum_{\substack{A' \in \tilde{\partial}_j F \\ A' \cap A \neq \emptyset}} \sum_{\substack{B \in \tilde{\partial}_j F \\ B \sim A'}} ([f]_{\nu|A'} - [f]_{\nu|B})^2. \end{aligned}$$

Estimate (A.22) follows by taking the summation over $A \in \tilde{\partial}_n F$.

By (A.21), (A.22), (A.23) and (A.25),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(h_n) &= \mu_{\langle h_n \rangle}^{(F)}(F \setminus F_{\mathcal{B}_1(F)}) + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \mu_{\langle h_n \rangle}^{(F)}(F_{\mathcal{B}_k(F)} \setminus F_{\mathcal{B}_{k+1}(F)}) + \mu_{\langle h_n \rangle}^{(F)}(F_{\mathcal{B}_n(F)}) \\ &\leq 3C_4 \sum_{j=1}^n L_F^{(d_w-d_f)j} I_j[f] \\ &\leq 3C_4 \Lambda_1[f]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.25})$$

In particular, we have $\sup_{n \geq 3} \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(h_n) < \infty$. Since h_n converges to $\mathfrak{E}f$ uniformly on F and hence in $L^2(F; \mu)$, there is a subsequence of $\{h_n; n \geq 1\}$ whose Cesàro means converges in $\sqrt{\mathcal{E}_1^{(F)}}$ -norm to $\mathfrak{E}f$. Thus in view of (A.25), $\mathfrak{E}f \in \mathcal{F}^{(F)} \cap C(F)$ with $\mathcal{E}^{(F)}(\mathfrak{E}f) \leq 3C_4 \Lambda_1[f]$. Moreover, for each $k \geq 1$, it follows from (A.21), (A.22), (A.23) and (A.25) that for $n \geq k \vee 3$,

$$\mu_{\langle h_n \rangle}^{(F)}(F_{\mathcal{B}_k(F)}) = \sum_{j=k}^{n-1} \mu_{\langle h_n \rangle}^{(F)}(F_{\mathcal{B}_j(F)} \setminus F_{\mathcal{B}_{j+1}(F)}) + \mu_{\langle h_n \rangle}^{(F)}(F_{\mathcal{B}_n(F)}) \leq 3C_4 \Lambda_{k-1}[f].$$

Consequently, we have $\mu_{\langle \mathfrak{E}f \rangle}^{(F)}(F_{\mathcal{B}_k(F)}) \leq 3C_4\Lambda_{k-1}[f]$ for every $k \geq 1$. Hence $\mu_{\langle \mathfrak{E}f \rangle}^{(F)}(\partial_o F) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{\langle \mathfrak{E}f \rangle}^{(F)}(F_{\mathcal{B}_k(F)}) = 0$. This completes the proof for part (a) of the theorem. \square

Remark A.5. After the proof of Theorem A.4, one can simply replace \mathfrak{E} and \mathfrak{E}_m there by the harmonic extension operators as harmonic extensions minimize the corresponding energies among those functions having the same boundary data.

The next result improves a corresponding result in [23, §5.3] where the $(d-1)$ -dimensional fractal $\partial_o F$ is additionally assumed to satisfy conditions (SC1)-(SC4); see [10, Remarks 2.16 and 5.3].

Corollary A.6. $\mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F)}(\partial_o F_Q) = 0$ for each $f \in \mathcal{F}^{(F)}$ and $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F)$ with $n \geq 0$. As a consequence, for each $n \geq 1$ and $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{Q}_n(F)$, we have $\mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F)}(F_{\mathcal{A}}) = \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{A}} \mathcal{E}^{(F_Q)}(f)$.

Proof. First for every $\varphi \in \mathcal{F}^{(F)} \cap C_c(F \setminus \partial_o F)$, by the strong local property of the energy measure from [18, Proposition 4.3.1], $\mu_{\langle \varphi \rangle}^{(F)}(\partial_o F) = 0$. Denote by $(\mathcal{E}^{(F)}, \mathcal{F}_{F \setminus \partial_o F}^{(F)})$ the Dirichlet form of the part process of the Brownian motion $X^{(F)}$ on F killed upon hitting $\partial_o F$. It is well known (see, e.g., [18, Theorem 3.39]) that $\mathcal{F}^{(F)} \cap C_c(F \setminus \partial_o F)$ is $\sqrt{\mathcal{E}_1^{(F)}}$ -dense in $\mathcal{F}_{F \setminus \partial_o F}^{(F)}$. Hence

$$\mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F)}(\partial_o F) = 0 \quad \text{for every } f \in \mathcal{F}_{F \setminus \partial_o F}^{(F)}.$$

For every $f \in \mathcal{F}^{(F)} \cap C(F)$, $f|_{\partial_o F} \in C(\partial_o F) \cap \Lambda(\partial_o F)$ by Theorem A.3. Thus $\varphi := f - \mathfrak{E}(f|_{\partial_o F}) \in \mathcal{F}^{(F)} \cap C(F)$ vanishes continuously on $\partial_o F$ and so $\varphi \in \mathcal{F}_{F \setminus \partial_o F}^{(F)}$. Thus it follows from Theorem A.4(a) that

$$\mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F)}(\partial_o F) \leq 2\mu_{\langle \varphi \rangle}^{(F)}(\partial_o F) + 2\mu_{\langle \mathfrak{E}(f|_{\partial_o F}) \rangle}^{(F)}(\partial_o F) = 0.$$

By the regularity of the Dirichlet form $(\mathcal{E}^{(F)}, \mathcal{F}^{(F)})$, $\mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F)}(\partial_o F) = 0$ for every $f \in \mathcal{F}^{(F)}$. This implies that for each $f \in \mathcal{F}^{(F)}$ and $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F)$ with $n \geq 1$,

$$\mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F_Q)}(\partial_o F_Q) = L_F^{n(d_w - d_f)} \mu_{\langle f \circ \Psi_Q \rangle}^{(F)}(\partial_o F) = 0 \quad (\text{A.26})$$

due to Lemma 3.2 and (3.3). It follows from Lemma A.2 and (A.26) that

$$\mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F)}(\partial_o F_Q) = \sum_{Q' \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F)} \mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F_{Q'})}(Q' \cap \partial_o F_Q) \leq \sum_{Q' \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F)} \mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F_{Q'})}(\partial_o F_{Q'}) = 0.$$

For any $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{Q}_n(F)$ with $n \geq 1$, again by Lemma A.2 and (A.26),

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F)}(F_{\mathcal{A}}) &= \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F)} \mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F_Q)}(F_Q \cap F_{\mathcal{A}}) \\ &= \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{A}} \mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F_Q)}(F_Q \cap F_{\mathcal{A}}) + \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F) \setminus \mathcal{A}} \mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F_Q)}(F_Q \cap F_{\mathcal{A}}) = \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{A}} \mathcal{E}^{(F_Q)}(f), \end{aligned}$$

where in the last equality, we used the facts that $F_Q \subset F_{\mathcal{A}}$ if $Q \in \mathcal{A}$ and $F_Q \cap F_{\mathcal{A}} \subset \partial_o F_Q$ if $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F) \setminus \mathcal{A}$. \square

APPENDIX B. AN ESTIMATE OF ENERGY MEASURE

In this appendix, we show that the energy measure on $\Psi_Q(F_{\mathcal{B}_n})$ of a function that is $\mathcal{E}^{(F)}$ -harmonic in a neighborhood of the boundary of a cell F_Q , decreases at an exponential rate in $n \rightarrow \infty$. A similar type result is given in [23, Proposition 3.8] as a preparation for the restriction theorem under some additional assumptions. Our approach is different from that in [23] and is based on the idea of trace theorems.

Theorem B.1. *There are positive finite constants C, c depending only on F such that for each $l \geq 1, Q^* \in \mathcal{Q}_l(F), n \geq 0$ and $f \in \mathcal{F}^{(F)} \cap C(F)$ that is $\mathcal{E}^{(F)}$ -harmonic in the interior of $F_{S_{Q^*}}$, where $S_{Q^*} = \{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_l(F) : Q \cap Q^* \neq \emptyset\}$, we have*

$$\mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F)}(\Psi_{Q^*}(F_{\mathcal{B}_n(F)})) \leq C e^{-cn} \mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F)}(F_{S_{Q^*}}).$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, we consider neighborhoods of one face, say, $\partial_{1,0}F_{Q^*} = \Psi_{Q^*}(\partial_{1,0}F)$. For $k \geq l$, let

$$\mathcal{G}_k := \{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_k(F) : Q \cap \partial_{1,0}F_{Q^*} \neq \emptyset\}.$$

So $F_{\mathcal{G}_k}$ is a neighborhood of $\partial_{1,0}F_{Q^*}$ in (F, ρ) . Let D_k be a closed L_F^{-k} -neighborhood of $\partial_{1,0}F_{0,Q^*}$ with respect to the L^∞ -metric; that is, if $\partial_{1,0}F_{0,Q^*} = [s_1] \times [s_2, s_2 + L_F^{-l}] \times \cdots \times [s_k, s_k + L_F^{-l}]$, then

$$D_k = [s_1 - L_F^{-k}, s_1 + L_F^{-k}] \times [s_2 - L_F^{-k}, s_2 + L_F^{-l} + L_F^{-k}] \times \cdots \times [s_k - L_F^{-k}, s_k + L_F^{-l} + L_F^{-k}].$$

Note that $\mathcal{G}_k = \mathcal{Q}_k(D_k \cap F)$.

For this proof only, we define for $n \geq k$,

$$\partial_n F_{\mathcal{G}_k} := \{\partial_{i,s}F_Q : Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n(F_{\mathcal{G}_k}), i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}, s \in \{0, 1\}, \partial_{i,s}F_Q \subset \partial D_k\}.$$

Observe that the union of the subfaces in $\partial_n F_{\mathcal{G}_k}$ contains the topological boundary of $F_{\mathcal{G}_k}$.

(Discrete energies).

(a) Similar to the definition of I_k , for $n > k \geq l$, we define

$$I_n(f, \mathcal{G}_k) = \sum_{A, A' \in \partial_n F_{\mathcal{G}_k} : A \sim A'} ([f]_{\nu|_A} - [f]_{\nu|_{A'}})^2,$$

where $A \sim A'$ if and only if $A \cap A' \neq \emptyset$ or there is $B \in \partial_{n-1}F_{\mathcal{G}_k}$ such that $A, A' \subset B$.

(b). For $n = k \geq l$, we define

$$I_k(f, \mathcal{G}_k) = \sum_{A, A' \in \partial_k F_{\mathcal{G}_k} : A \sim A'} ([f]_{\nu|_A} - [f]_{\nu|_{A'}})^2,$$

where $A \sim A'$ in $\partial_k F_{\mathcal{G}_k}$ if and only if $\nu(Q_A \cap Q_{A'}) > 0$, where $Q_A, Q_{A'} \in \mathcal{G}_k$ so that $A \subset Q_A, A' \subset Q_{A'}$.

We have two comments about (b) above.

- (1) If $Q_A \cap Q_{A'} \neq \emptyset$, then by (non-diagonality) condition, there is a sequences of cells $Q_A = Q_0, Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_{s-1}, Q_{A'} = Q_s$ in \mathcal{G}_k with $s < 2^d$ such that $\nu(Q_i \cap Q_{i-1}) > 0$.

- (2) A special case is when $Q_A \cap Q_{A'} \subset \partial_{1,0}F_{Q^*}$. In this case, A, A' are two sub-faces on the opposite sides of $\partial_{1,0}F_{Q^*}$, and we denote it as $A \sim^* A'$. Let

$$I_k^*(f, \mathcal{G}_k) = \sum_{A, A' \in \partial_k F_{\mathcal{G}_k}: A \sim^* A'} ([f]_{\nu|_A} - [f]_{\nu|_{A'}})^2,$$

$$\text{and } I_k^{**}(f, \mathcal{G}_k) = I_k(f, \mathcal{G}_k) - I_k^*(f, \mathcal{G}_k).$$

By the same arguments as that for Theorems A.3 and A.4, we have the following Claims 1 and 2, respectively.

Claim 1. There is a constant $C_1 \in (0, \infty)$ depending only on F so that for each $n \geq k \geq l$,

$$\mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F)}(F_{\mathcal{G}_k} \setminus F_{\mathcal{G}_{k+1}}) \geq C_1 \left(L_F^{(d_w - d_f)k} I_k^{**}(f, \mathcal{G}_k) + \sum_{n=k+1}^{\infty} L_F^{(d_w - d_f)n} I_n(f, \mathcal{G}_k) \right).$$

Claim 2. For some $C_2 \in (0, \infty)$ depending only on F ,

$$\mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F)}(F_{\mathcal{G}_k}) \leq C_2 \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} L_F^{(d_w - d_f)n} I_n(f, \mathcal{G}_k).$$

For each $k \geq 0$, let

$$J_k := \bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_k(F): Q \cap \partial_{1,0}F \neq \emptyset} F_Q = F \cap ([0, L_F^{-k}] \times [0, 1]^{d-1}).$$

Claim 3. We claim the following holds.

- (i) There is a positive finite constant C_3 depending only on F such that

$$\left| [g]_{\nu|_{\partial_{1,0}F}} - [g]_{\nu|_{F \cap \{x_1 = L_F^{-k}\}}} \right|^2 \leq C_3 L_F^{k(d_f - d_w - d_I)} \mu_{\langle g \rangle}^{(F)}(J_k) \quad \text{for every } g \in C(F) \cap \mathcal{F}^{(F)}.$$

- (ii) There is a positive finite constant $C_{4,k}$ depending on F and k such that

$$\left| [g]_{\nu|_{\partial_{1,1}F}} - [g]_{\nu|_{F \cap \{x_1 = L_F^{-k}\}}} \right|^2 \leq C_{4,k} \mu_{\langle g \rangle}^{(F)}(F \setminus J_{k+1}) \quad \text{for every } g \in C(F) \cap \mathcal{F}^{(F)},$$

where we used $F \setminus J_{k+1}$ instead of $F \setminus J_k$ because we want $F \cap \{x_1 = L_F^{-k}\}$ and $\partial_{1,1}F$ to be in the same connected component of $F \setminus J_{k+1}$.

We first show that there is a positive finite C'_3 depending only on F so that

$$|[g]_{\mu|_F} - [g]_{\mu|_{J_1}}|^2 \leq C'_3 \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(g). \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Let j be the smallest integer so that $\sqrt{d}L_F^{-j} < c_1$, where c_1 is the constant of the Poincaré inequalities in Lemma 3.13. For $Q, Q' \in \mathcal{Q}_j(F)$ with $Q \cap Q' \neq \emptyset$, take some $x_0 \in F_Q \cap F_{Q'}$. Note that $B(x_0, c_1) \supset F_Q \cup F_{Q'}$. By Lemma 3.13(a) with $r = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} |[g]_{\mu|_{F_Q}} - [g]_{\mu|_{F_{Q'}}}| &\leq |[g]_{\mu|_{F_Q}} - [g]_{\mu|_{B_F(x_0, c_1)}}| + |[g]_{\mu|_{F_{Q'}}} - [g]_{\mu|_{B_F(x_0, c_1)}}| \\ &\leq \sqrt{\int_{F_Q} (g(y) - [g]_{\mu|_{B_F(x_0, c_1)}})^2 \mu(dy)} + \sqrt{\int_{F_{Q'}} (g(y) - [g]_{\mu|_{B_F(x_0, c_1)}})^2 \mu(dy)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq 2 \sqrt{\frac{\mu(B_F(x_0, c_1))}{L_F^{-j d_f}} \int_{B_F(x_0, c_1)} (g(y) - [g]_{\mu|_{B_F(x_0, c_1)}})^2 \mu(dy)} \\ &\leq C'_4 \sqrt{\mathcal{E}^{(F)}(g)}, \end{aligned}$$

where $C'_4 > 0$ is a constant depending only on F . Since $\#\mathcal{Q}_j(F) = m_F^j$, and F is connected, we have for $k \geq 1$,

$$|[g]_{\mu|_{F_Q}} - [g]_{\mu|_{F_{Q'}}}| \leq (m_F^j - 1) C'_4 \sqrt{\mathcal{E}^{(F)}(g)} \quad \text{for any } Q, Q' \in \mathcal{Q}_j(F).$$

Since $\min_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_j(F)} [g]_{\mu|_{F_Q}} \leq [g]_{\mu|_F} \leq \max_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_j(F)} [g]_{\mu|_{F_Q}}$ and $\min_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_j(J_1)} [g]_{\mu|_{F_Q}} \leq [g]_{\mu|_{J_1}} \leq \max_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_j(J_1)} [g]_{\mu|_{F_Q}}$, we conclude that (B.1) holds with $C_3 = ((m_F^j - 1) C'_4)^2$, which depends only on F .

Applying (B.1) on F_Q and using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |[g]_{\mu|_{J_k}} - [g]_{\mu|_{J_{k+1}}}|^2 &= \left| \frac{1}{\#\mathcal{Q}_k(J_k)} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_k(J_k)} [g]_{\mu|_{F_Q}} - \frac{1}{\#\mathcal{Q}_k(J_k)} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_k(J_k)} [g]_{\mu|_{\Psi_Q(J_1)}} \right|^2 \\ &= \left| \frac{1}{\#\mathcal{Q}_k(J_k)} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_k(J_k)} ([g \circ \Psi_Q]_{\mu|_F} - [g \circ \Psi_Q]_{\mu|_{J_1}}) \right|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\#\mathcal{Q}_k(J_k)} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_k(J_k)} ([g \circ \Psi_Q]_{\mu|_F} - [g \circ \Psi_Q]_{\mu|_{J_1}})^2 \\ &\leq L_F^{-k d_I} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_k(J_k)} C'_3 \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(g \circ \Psi_Q) \\ &= L_F^{-k d_I} L_F^{k(d_f - d_w)} C'_3 \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_k(J_k)} \mathcal{E}^{(F_Q)}(g) \\ &\leq L_F^{k(d_f - d_w - d_I)} C'_3 \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(g), \end{aligned}$$

where we used the self-similarity (3.3) of $(\mathcal{E}^{(F)}, \mathcal{F}^{(F)})$ and Lemma 3.2 in the last two lines. As $d_f - d_w - d_I < 0$, we have for every $i \geq 1$,

$$|[g]_{\mu|_F} - [g]_{\mu|_{J_i}}| \leq \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} |[g]_{\mu|_{J_k}} - [g]_{\mu|_{J_{k+1}}}| \leq \frac{\sqrt{C'_3 \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(g)}}{1 - L_F^{(d_f - d_w - d_I)/2}}.$$

Since $[g]_{\nu|_{\partial_{1,0}F}} = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} [g]_{\mu|_{J_i}}$, it follows from the above that there is a constant $C'_5 > 0$ depending only on F so that

$$|[g]_{\nu|_{\partial_{1,0}F}} - [g]_{\mu|_F}|^2 \leq C'_5 \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(g),$$

By symmetry, we also have $|[g]_{\nu|_{\partial_{i,s}F}} - [g]_{\mu|_F}|^2 \leq C'_5 \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(g)$ for $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$ and $s \in \{0, 1\}$. Consequently,

$$|[g]_{\nu|_{\partial_{i,s}F}} - [g]_{\nu|_{\partial_{i',s'}F}}|^2 \leq 4C'_5 \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(g) \quad \text{for } i, i' \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\} \text{ and } s, s' \in \{0, 1\}. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

Hence for each $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_k(J_k)$,

$$|[g]_{\nu|_{\partial_{1,0}F_Q}} - [g]_{\nu|_{\partial_{1,1}F_Q}}|^2 \leq 4C'_5 \mathcal{E}^{(F_Q)}(g \circ \Psi_Q) \leq 4C'_5 L_F^{k(d_f-d_w)} \mathcal{E}^{(F_Q)}(g).$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| [g]_{\nu|_{\partial_{1,0}F}} - [g]_{\nu|_{F \cap \{x_1=L_F^{-k}\}}} \right|^2 \\ & \leq \left(\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_k(J_k)} \frac{\nu(\partial_{1,0}F_Q)}{\nu(\partial_{1,0}F)} |[g]_{\nu|_{\partial_{1,0}F_Q}} - [g]_{\nu|_{\partial_{1,1}F_Q}}| \right)^2 \\ & \leq \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_k(J_k)} \frac{\nu(\partial_{1,0}F_Q)}{\nu(\partial_{1,0}F)} |[g]_{\nu|_{\partial_{1,0}F_Q}} - [g]_{\nu|_{\partial_{1,1}F_Q}}|^2 \\ & \leq \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_k(J_k)} L_F^{-kd_I} 4C'_5 L_F^{k(d_f-d_w)} \mathcal{E}^{(F_Q)}(g) \\ & \leq 4C'_5 L_F^{k(d_f-d_w-d_I)} \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(g), \end{aligned}$$

where in the third inequality we used the fact that ν is a d_I -dimensional Hausdorff measure. This proves Claim 3(i).

For Claim 3(ii), we fix a pair $\tilde{Q}^*, \tilde{Q}^{**} \in \mathcal{Q}_{k+1}(F \setminus J_k)$ such that $F_{\tilde{Q}^*} \cap \{x_1 = L_F^{-k}\} \neq \emptyset$, $F_{\tilde{Q}^{**}} \cap \{x_1 = 1\} \neq \emptyset$. By Lemma A.2, $F \cap ([\frac{1}{2}L_F^{-k}, 1] \times [0, 1]^{d-1})$ is path connected. Thus by the (non-diagonality) condition of GSC , there is a sequence $\tilde{Q}^* = Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_J = \tilde{Q}^{**}$ in $\mathcal{Q}_{k+1}(F \setminus J_{k+1})$ with $J \leq \#\mathcal{Q}_{k+1}(F \setminus J_{k+1}) \leq L_F^{(k+1)d_f}$ and $\nu(F_{Q_j} \cap F_{Q_{j-1}}) > 0$ for each $j \in \{2, 3, \dots, J\}$ (i.e. each $F_{Q_j} \cap F_{Q_{j+1}}$ is a face of a $(k+1)$ -level cell in F). Applying (B.2) on each Q_j , we have by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| [g]_{\nu|_{F_{\tilde{Q}^*} \cap \{x_1=L_F^{-k}\}}} - [g]_{\nu|_{F_{\tilde{Q}^{**}} \cap \{x_1=1\}}} \right| \\ & \leq \left| [g]_{\nu|_{F_{\tilde{Q}^*} \cap \{x_1=L_F^{-k}\}}} - [g]_{\nu|_{F_{Q_1} \cap F_{Q_2}}} \right| + \sum_{j=2}^{J-1} \left| [g]_{\nu|_{F_{Q_{j-1}} \cap F_{Q_j}}} - [g]_{\nu|_{F_{Q_j} \cap F_{Q_{j+1}}}} \right| \\ & \quad + \left| [g]_{\nu|_{F_{Q_{J-1}} \cap F_{Q_J}}} - [g]_{\nu|_{F_{Q_J} \cap \{x_1=1\}}} \right| \\ & \leq 2\sqrt{C'_5} \sum_{j=1}^J \sqrt{\mathcal{E}^{(F)}(g \circ \Psi_{Q_j})} \\ & \leq 2\sqrt{C'_5} \sqrt{J} \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^J \mathcal{E}^{(F)}(g \circ \Psi_{Q_j})} \\ & \leq 2\sqrt{C'_5} L_F^{(k+1)d_f/2} L_F^{(k+1)(d_w-d_f)/2} \sqrt{\mu_{(g)}^{(F)}(F \setminus J_{k+1})}, \end{aligned} \tag{B.3}$$

where in the last inequality we used (3.3) and Lemma A.6. Since $\left| [g]_{\nu|_{\partial_{1,1}F}} - [g]_{\nu|_{F \cap \{x_1 = L_F^{-k}\}}} \right| \leq \max \left\{ |[g]_{\nu|_{F_{\tilde{Q}^*} \cap \{x_1 = L_F^{-k}\}}} - [g]_{\nu|_{F_{\tilde{Q}^{**}} \cap \{x_1 = 1\}}}| : \tilde{Q}^*, \tilde{Q}^{**} \in \mathcal{Q}_{k+1}(F \setminus J_k), F_{\tilde{Q}^*} \cap \{x_1 = L_F^{-k}\} \neq \emptyset, F_{\tilde{Q}^{**}} \cap \{x_1 = 1\} \neq \emptyset \right\}$, Claim 3(ii) follows from estimate (B.3).

For each $j \geq 1$ and each pair $A \sim^* A'$ in $\partial_k F_{\mathcal{G}_k}$, we define $\text{Pr}_j(A)$ and $\text{Pr}_j(A')$ to be the two parallel ‘faces’ between A and A' that are isometric to A and A' : $\text{Pr}_j(A)$ is on the A side, $\text{Pr}_j(A')$ is on the A' side, and the distance between $\text{Pr}_j(A)$ and $\text{Pr}_j(A')$ is $2L_F^{-k-j}$. More precisely, suppose without loss of generality that $A = \partial_{1,1}Q_A$ and $A' = \partial_{1,0}Q_{A'}$, then

$$\begin{cases} \text{Pr}_j(A) := \bigcup \{ \partial_{1,1}F_{\tilde{Q}} : \tilde{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}_{k+j}(F_{Q_A}) \text{ with } \tilde{Q} \cap \partial_{1,0}F_{Q^*} \neq \emptyset \}, \\ \text{Pr}_j(A') := \bigcup \{ \partial_{1,0}F_{\tilde{Q}} : \tilde{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}_{k+j}(F_{Q_{A'}}) \text{ with } \tilde{Q} \cap \partial_{1,0}F_{Q^*} \neq \emptyset \}. \end{cases}$$

Let $C_3 > 0$ and $C_{4,j} > 0$, $j \geq 1$, be the constants in Claim 3(i) and (ii), respectively. For any $k \geq l$ and $j \geq 1$, by Claim 3(ii),

$$\begin{aligned} & L_F^{(d_w - d_f)k} \sum_{\substack{A, A' \in \partial_k F_{\mathcal{G}_k} \\ A' \sim^* A}} \left(([f]_{\nu|_A} - [f]_{\nu|_{\text{Pr}_j(A)}})^2 + ([f]_{\nu|_{\text{Pr}_j(A')}} - [f]_{\nu|_{A'}})^2 \right) \\ & \leq \sum_{\substack{A, A' \in \partial_k F_{\mathcal{G}_k} \\ A' \sim^* A}} C_{4,j} \left(\mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F)}(F_{Q_A} \setminus F_{\mathcal{G}_{k+j+1}}) + \mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F)}(F_{Q_{A'}} \setminus F_{\mathcal{G}_{k+j+1}}) \right) \\ & \leq 2C_{4,j} \mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F)}(F_{\mathcal{G}_k} \setminus F_{\mathcal{G}_{k+j+1}}), \end{aligned} \tag{B.4}$$

where the first inequality is due to the fact that $F_{Q_A} \setminus F_{\mathcal{G}_{k+j+1}}$ is a scaled and rotated version of $F \setminus J_{j+1}$ and the self-similarity property (3.3), while the last inequality is due to Corollary A.6. For any $k \geq l$ and $j \geq 1$, we also have

$$\begin{aligned} & L_F^{(d_w - d_f)k} \sum_{\substack{A, A' \in \partial_k F_{\mathcal{G}_k} \\ A' \sim^* A}} ([f]_{\nu|_{\text{Pr}_j(A)}} - [f]_{\nu|_{\text{Pr}_j(A')}})^2 \\ & \leq L_F^{(d_w - d_f)k} \sum_{\substack{A, A' \in \partial_k F_{\mathcal{G}_k} \\ A' \sim^* A}} 2 \left(([f]_{\nu|_{\text{Pr}_j(A)}} - [f]_{\nu|_{F_{Q_A} \cap F_{Q_{A'}}}})^2 + ([f]_{\nu|_{F_{Q_A} \cap F_{Q_{A'}}}} - [f]_{\nu|_{\text{Pr}_j(A')}})^2 \right) \\ & \leq 2 \sum_{\substack{A, A' \in \partial_k F_{\mathcal{G}_k} \\ A' \sim^* A}} C_3 L_F^{(d_f - d_w - d_I)j} \left(\mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F)}(F_{Q_A} \cap F_{\mathcal{G}_{k+j}}) + \mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F)}(F_{Q_{A'}} \cap F_{\mathcal{G}_{k+j}}) \right) \\ & \leq 4C_3 L_F^{(d_f - d_w - d_I)j} \mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F)}(F_{\mathcal{G}_{k+j}}), \end{aligned} \tag{B.5}$$

where in the second inequality we used the fact that $F_{Q_A} \cap F_{\mathcal{G}_{k+j}}$ is a scaled and rotated version of J_j , the self-similarity (3.3) and Claim 3(i), while in the last inequality we used Corollary A.6.

Recall that

$$I_k^*(f, \mathcal{G}_k) = \sum_{\substack{\sum A, A' \in \mathfrak{F}_k F \mathcal{G}_k \\ A' \sim^* A}} ([f]_{\nu|_A} - [f]_{\nu|_{A'}})^2 \quad \text{and} \quad I_k^{**}(f, \mathcal{G}_k) = I_k(f, \mathcal{G}_k) - I_k^*(f, \mathcal{G}_k).$$

When $L_F^{(d_w - d_f)k} I_k^*(f, \mathcal{G}_k) \leq L_F^{(d_w - d_f)k} I_k^{**}(f, \mathcal{G}_k) + \sum_{n=k+1}^{\infty} L_F^{(d_w - d_f)n} I_n(f, \mathcal{G}_k)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & L_F^{(d_w - d_f)k} I_k^{**}(f, \mathcal{G}_k) + \sum_{n=k+1}^{\infty} L_F^{(d_w - d_f)n} I_n(f, \mathcal{G}_k) \\ & \geq \frac{1}{2} L_F^{(d_w - d_f)k} I_k^*(f, \mathcal{G}_k) + \frac{1}{2} \left(L_F^{(d_w - d_f)k} I_k^{**}(f, \mathcal{G}_k) + \sum_{n=k+1}^{\infty} L_F^{(d_w - d_f)n} I_n(f, \mathcal{G}_k) \right) \\ & = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} L_F^{(d_w - d_f)n} I_n(f, \mathcal{G}_k). \end{aligned} \tag{B.6}$$

By taking $j = 1$ in Claims 1 and 2, we have from (B.6) that there is a positive constant $C_5 \in (0, 1)$ depending only on F such that

$$\mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F)}(F \mathcal{G}_k \setminus F \mathcal{G}_{k+j}) \geq C_5 \mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F)}(F \mathcal{G}_k) \quad \text{for } k \geq l. \tag{B.7}$$

Consequently,

$$\mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F)}(F \mathcal{G}_{k+j}) \leq (1 - C_5) \mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F)}(F \mathcal{G}_k) \quad \text{for } k \geq l. \tag{B.8}$$

When $L_F^{(d_w - d_f)k} I_k^*(f, \mathcal{G}_k) > L_F^{(d_w - d_f)k} I_k^{**}(f, \mathcal{G}_k) + \sum_{n=k+1}^{\infty} L_F^{(d_w - d_f)n} I_n(f, \mathcal{G}_k)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & L_F^{(d_w - d_f)k} I_k^*(f, \mathcal{G}_k) \\ & > \frac{1}{2} L_F^{(d_w - d_f)k} I_k^*(f, \mathcal{G}_k) + \frac{1}{2} \left(L_F^{(d_w - d_f)k} I_k^{**}(f, \mathcal{G}_k) + \sum_{n=k+1}^{\infty} L_F^{(d_w - d_f)n} I_n(f, \mathcal{G}_k) \right) \\ & = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} L_F^{(d_w - d_f)n} I_n(f, \mathcal{G}_k). \end{aligned} \tag{B.9}$$

It follows from (B.5) and Claim 2 that

$$\begin{aligned} & L_F^{(d_w - d_f)k} \sum_{\sum A, A' \in \mathfrak{F}_k F \mathcal{G}_k : A' \sim^* A} ([f]_{\nu|_{\text{Pr}_j(A)}} - [f]_{\nu|_{\text{Pr}_j(A')}})^2 \\ & \leq 4C_3 L_F^{(d_f - d_w - d_I)j} \mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F)}(F \mathcal{G}_{k+j}) \\ & \leq 4C_3 L_F^{(d_f - d_w - d_I)j} \mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F)}(F \mathcal{G}_k) \\ & \leq 8C_3 C_2 L_F^{(d_f - d_w - d_I)j} L_F^{(d_w - d_f)k} I_k^*(f, \mathcal{G}_k). \end{aligned}$$

Hence there is $j \geq 2$ depending only on C_2C_3 and F so that

$$L_F^{(d_w-d_f)k} \sum_{\substack{A, A' \in \partial_k F_{\mathcal{G}_k} \\ A' \sim^* A}} ([f]_{\nu|_{\text{Pr}_{j-1}(A)}} - [f]_{\nu|_{\text{Pr}_{j-1}(A')}})^2 \leq \frac{1}{6} L_F^{(d_w-d_f)k} I_k^*(f, \mathcal{G}_k). \quad (\text{B.10})$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} & I_k^*(f, \mathcal{G}_k) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{A, A' \in \partial_k F_{\mathcal{G}_k} \\ A' \sim^* A}} ([f]_{\nu|_A} - [f]_{\nu|_{\text{Pr}_{j-1}(A)}} + [f]_{\nu|_{\text{Pr}_{j-1}(A)}} - [f]_{\nu|_{\text{Pr}_{j-1}(A')}} + [f]_{\nu|_{\text{Pr}_{j-1}(A')}} - [f]_{\nu|_{A'}})^2 \\ &\leq 3 \sum_{\substack{A, A' \in \partial_k F_{\mathcal{G}_k} \\ A' \sim^* A}} \left(([f]_{\nu|_A} - [f]_{\nu|_{\text{Pr}_{j-1}(A)}})^2 + ([f]_{\nu|_{\text{Pr}_{j-1}(A)}} - [f]_{\nu|_{\text{Pr}_{j-1}(A')}})^2 + ([f]_{\nu|_{\text{Pr}_{j-1}(A')}} - [f]_{\nu|_{A'}})^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

we have by (B.4), (B.10), Claim 2 and (B.9) that

$$\begin{aligned} & 2C_{4,j} \mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F)}(F_{\mathcal{G}_k} \setminus F_{\mathcal{G}_{k+j}}) \\ &\geq L_F^{(d_w-d_f)k} \sum_{\substack{A, A' \in \partial_k F_{\mathcal{G}_k} \\ A' \sim^* A}} \left(([f]_{\nu|_A} - [f]_{\nu|_{\text{Pr}_{j-1}(A)}})^2 + ([f]_{\nu|_{\text{Pr}_{j-1}(A')}} - [f]_{\nu|_{A'}})^2 \right) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{3} \left(1 - \frac{3}{6}\right) L_F^{(d_w-d_f)k} I_k^*(f, \mathcal{G}_k) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{12} \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} L_F^{(d_w-d_f)n} I_n(f, \mathcal{G}_k) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{12C_2} L_F^{(d_w-d_f)k} \mu_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F)}(F_{\mathcal{G}_k}). \end{aligned}$$

By decreasing the value of $C_5 \in (0, 1)$ if needed, (B.7) and hence (B.8) holds in this case as well. The theorem then follows by iterating the estimate (B.8) and taking the union over faces. \square

An analogous result holds on the approximation domain F_m of F as well with the same proof as that for Theorem B.1. We record it below, which will be used in a forthcoming paper [16].

Theorem B.2. *Suppose that $(\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)}, W^{1,2}(F_m))$ is a strongly local regular Dirichlet form on $L^2(F_m; \mu_n)$ so that $C_0^{-1} \mathcal{E}^{(F_m)} \leq \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)} \leq C_0 \mathcal{E}^{(F_m)}$, where $C_0 \in [1, \infty)$ is a constant independent of m . Then there are positive constants C and c depending only on F and C_0 such that for each $l \geq 1$, $Q^* \in \mathcal{Q}_l(F_m)$, $n \geq 0$ and $f \in W^{1,2}(F_m) \cap C(F_m)$ that is harmonic in the interior of $F_{m, \mathcal{S}_{Q^*}^{(m)}}$, where $\mathcal{S}^{(m)}(Q^*) := \{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_l(F_m) : Q \cap Q^* \neq \emptyset\}$, we have*

$$\bar{\mu}_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F_m)}(\Psi_{Q^*}(F_{m, \mathcal{B}_n(F_m)})) \leq C e^{-cn} \bar{\mu}_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F_m)}(F_{m, \mathcal{S}_{Q^*}^{(m)}}).$$

Here $\bar{\mu}_{\langle f \rangle}^{(F_m)}$ is the energy measure of f with respect to the Dirichlet form $(\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{(F_m)}, W^{1,2}(F_m))$.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Andres and M. T. Barlow, *Energy inequalities for cutoff functions and some applications*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **699** (2015), 183–215.
- [2] M. T. Barlow, *Analysis on the Sierpinski carpet*, Analysis and geometry of metric measure spaces, CRM Proc. Lecture Notes, vol. 56, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2013, pp. 27–53.
- [3] M. T. Barlow and R. F. Bass, *The construction of Brownian motion on the Sierpiński carpet*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist. **25** (1989), no. 3, 225–257.
- [4] ———, *Local times for Brownian motion on the Sierpiński carpet*, Probab. Theory Related Fields **85** (1990), no. 1, 91–104.
- [5] ———, *On the resistance of the Sierpiński carpet*, Proc. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A **431** (1990), no. 1882, 345–360.
- [6] ———, *Transition densities for Brownian motion on the Sierpiński carpet*, Probab. Theory Related Fields **91** (1992), no. 3-4, 307–330.
- [7] ———, *Brownian motion and harmonic analysis on Sierpinski carpets*, Canad. J. Math. **51** (1999), no. 4, 673–744.
- [8] M. T. Barlow and R. F. Bass, *Random walks on graphical Sierpinski carpets*, Random walks and discrete potential theory (Cortona, 1997), Sympos. Math., XXXIX, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1999, pp. 26–55.
- [9] M. T. Barlow, R. F. Bass, and T. Kumagai, *Stability of parabolic Harnack inequalities on metric measure spaces*, J. Math. Soc. Japan **58** (2006), no. 2, 485–519.
- [10] M. T. Barlow, R. F. Bass, T. Kumagai, and A. Teplyaev, *Uniqueness of Brownian motion on Sierpiński carpets*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) **12** (2010), no. 3, 655–701.
- [11] M. T. Barlow, Z.-Q. Chen and M. Murugan, *Stability of EHI and regularity of MMD spaces*, arXiv:2008.05152.
- [12] M. T. Barlow and M. Murugan, *Stability of the elliptic Harnack inequality*, Ann. Math. (2) **187** (2018), no. 3, 777–823.
- [13] S. Cao, *Convergence of energy forms on Sierpiński gaskets with added rotated triangle*, to appear in Potential Anal.
- [14] S. Cao and H. Qiu, *Dirichlet forms on unconstrained Sierpinski carpets*, arXiv:2104.01529.
- [15] ———, *A Sierpiński carpet like fractal without standard self-similar energy*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **151** (2023), 1087–1102.
- [16] S. Cao and Z.-Q. Chen, *Stochastic homogenization on generalized unbounded Sierpiński carpets*. In preparation.
- [17] Z.-Q. Chen, *On notions of harmonicity*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **137** (2009), no. 10, 3497–3510.
- [18] Z.-Q. Chen and M. Fukushima, *Symmetric Markov Processes, Time Change, and Boundary Theory*, London Mathematical Society Monographs Series, vol. 35, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2012.
- [19] Z.-Q. Chen, P. Kim and T. Kumagai, *Discrete approximation of symmetric jump processes on metric measure spaces*. Probab. Theory Relat. Fields **155** (2013), 703–749.
- [20] M. Fukushima, Y. Oshima, and M. Takeda, *Dirichlet Forms and Symmetric Markov Processes*, extended ed., De Gruyter Studies in Mathematics, vol. 19, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, 2011.
- [21] A. Grigor’yan, J. Hu, and K. Lau, *Generalized capacity, Harnack inequality and heat kernels of Dirichlet forms on metric measure spaces*, J. Math. Soc. Japan **67** (2015), no. 4, 1485–1549.
- [22] A. Grigor’yan and M. Yang, *Local and non-local Dirichlet forms on the Sierpiński carpet*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **372** (2019), no. 6, 3985–4030.
- [23] M. Hino and T. Kumagai, *A trace theorem for Dirichlet forms on fractals*, J. Funct. Anal. **238** (2006), no. 2, 578–611.
- [24] A. Jonsson, *A trace theorem for the Dirichlet form on the Sierpinski gasket*, Math. Z. **250** (2005), no. 3, 599–609.
- [25] P. Kim, *Weak convergence of censored and reflected stable processes*. Stochastic Process Appl. **116** (2006), 1792–1814.

- [26] S. Kusuoka and X. Zhou, *Dirichlet forms on fractals: Poincaré constant and resistance*, Probab. Theory Related Fields **93** (1992), no. 2, 169–196.
- [27] K. Kuwae and T. Shioya, *Convergence of spectral structures: a functional analytic theory and its applications to spectral geometry*, Comm. Anal. Geom. **11** (2003), no. 4, 599–673.
- [28] I. McGillivray, *Resistance in higher-dimensional Sierpiński carpets*, Potential Anal. **16** (2002), no. 3, 289–303.
- [29] U. Mosco, *Composite media and asymptotic Dirichlet forms*, J. Funct. Anal. **123** (1994), no. 2, 368–421.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON, SEATTLE, WA 98195, USA
Email address: spcao@uw.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON, SEATTLE, WA 98195, USA
Email address: zqchen@uw.edu