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#### Abstract

We are interested in the preservation of doubling properties along the Hutchinson orbit generated by successive applications of contraction mappings on a metric measure space. We construct some elementary examples, built on Muckenhoupt weights, showing that even when the initial and the limit points of the orbit are doubling, no iteration of the IFS remains doubling. We also obtain positive results under some quantitative assumptions on the separation of the images through the IFS. We also explore the completeness, in the Hausdorff-Kantorovich metric, of a version of the doubling property which is suitable for the application of Hutchinson type contractions.


## Introduction

The basic scheme of the Banach fixed point theorem applied by Hutchinson in [7] to contractions acting on the Hausdorff metric space (the set $\mathcal{K}$ of all compact sets equipped with the Hausdorff distance), relies deeply on the completeness of this space. In [1] the authors consider the complete space $\mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{P}$, where $\mathcal{K}$ is the Hausdorff space of compact subsets of the fixed underlying compact metric space $(X, d)$, and $\mathcal{P}$ is the set of probability measures on $X$ with the Kantorovich distance for the weak star convergence. From the real analytical point of view (see [3]) we are specially interested in the subset of those pairs in $\mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{P}$ which are spaces of homogeneous type. It easy to see that this subset it is not complete. We provide a simple example in Section 2. So that the Banach fixed point theorem can not be directly applied to this family.

The results in [9] show that typically the limit fractal provided by the Hutchinson iteration scheme and equipped with the invariant measure, is a (normal) space of homogeneous type. In this note we construct examples showing that no point in the orbit has the doubling property even when the starting point, and the limit point, have both the doubling property. These examples show that the loose of the doubling property by iteration is related to the distance of the images of the starting set under the given family of contractions. We also prove the completeness of a version of the doubling property which, under the assumption of finite metric (Assouad) dimension, coincides with the classical doubling property. Moreover, we obtain sufficient conditions on an iterated function system (IFS) in such a way that this complete doubling classes are preserved by Hutchinson's algorithm. As a corollary we obtain uniform doubling orbits associated to such IFS.

In the first section we introduce the basic notation and definitions. Section 2 is devoted to prove, under the assumption of finiteness of metric dimension, that the

[^0]doubling property is equivalent to a control by neighboring balls. We also prove in Section 2 that this version of the doubling property is closed as a subset of $\mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{P}$ and hence complete. Section 3 contains, for two classical IFS in dimensions one and two, examples showing that it may happen, for some starting doubling measures, that no point of the orbit is a space of homogeneous type. In Section 4 we prove our positive result and we illustrate it with Cantor and Sierpinski type sets.

## 1. Basic definitions and notation

Throughout this paper $(X, d)$ shall be a compact metric space. We shall use $B_{d}(x, r)$ to denote the ball $\{y \in X: d(x, y)<r\}, r>0$. With $\bar{B}_{d}(x, r)$ we shall denote the "closed" ball $\{y \in X: d(x, y) \leq r\}$.

Let $\mathcal{K}=\{K \subseteq X: K \neq \emptyset, K$ compact $\}$. With $[A]_{\varepsilon}$ we shall denote the $\varepsilon$ enlargement of the set $A \subset X$; i.e. $[A]_{\varepsilon}=\bigcup_{x \in A} B_{d}(x, \varepsilon)=\{y \in X: d(y, A)<\varepsilon\}$. Here $d(x, A)=\inf \{d(x, y): y \in A\}$. Given $A$ and $B$ two sets in $\mathcal{K}$ the Hausdorff distance from $A$ to $B$ is given by

$$
d_{H}(A, B)=\inf \left\{\varepsilon>0: A \subseteq[B]_{\varepsilon} \text { and } \mathrm{B} \subseteq[\mathrm{~A}]_{\varepsilon}\right\}
$$

Let us now introduce the Kantorovich-Hutchinson distance on the set of all Borel regular probability measures on the quasi-metric space $(X, d)$. Let

$$
\mathcal{P}(X)=\{\mu: \mu \text { is a positive Borel measure on } X \text { and } \mu(X)=1\}
$$

and let $\mathcal{C}(X)$ be the space of continuous real valued functions on $X$. Let $\operatorname{Lip}_{1}$ be the space of all Lipschitz continuous functions defined on $X$ with Lipschitz constant less than or equal to one, i.e. $f \in \operatorname{Lip}_{1}$ if and only if $|f(x)-f(y)| \leq d(x, y)$ for every $x$ and $y \in X$.

Since $(X, d)$ is compact, $d_{K}(\mu, \nu)=\sup \left\{\left|\int f d \mu-\int f d \nu\right|: f \in \operatorname{Lip}_{1}\right\}$ gives a distance on $\mathcal{P}(X)$ such that the $d_{K}$-convergence of a sequence is equivalent to its weak star convergence to the same limit (see [5]).

We are now in position to describe the basic metric space introduced in [1] whose structure is of our interest. Let $\mathscr{X}=\mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{P}$. Given two elements $\left(Y_{i}, \mu_{i}\right)$ of $\mathscr{X}$, $i=1,2$, define

$$
\delta\left(\left(Y_{1}, \mu_{1}\right),\left(Y_{2}, \mu_{2}\right)\right)=d_{H}\left(Y_{1}, Y_{2}\right)+d_{K}\left(\mu_{1}, \mu_{2}\right),
$$

so that $(\mathscr{X}, \delta)$ becomes a complete metric space. Let

$$
\mathcal{E}=\{(Y, \mu) \in \mathscr{X}: \operatorname{supp}(\mu) \subseteq Y\}
$$

The basic result regarding the completeness of $(\mathcal{E}, \delta)$ is given in the following statement.

Theorem 1.1. The set $\mathcal{E}$ is closed in $(\mathscr{X}, \delta)$. Hence $(\mathcal{E}, \delta)$ is a complete quasimetric subspace of $(\mathscr{X}, \delta)$.

The basic tool in Hutchinson method for the construction of self-similar fractals is the Banach fixed point theorem.

Corollary 1.2. If $T: \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ is a contraction mapping and $\left(Y_{0}, \mu_{0}\right) \in \mathcal{E}$, then $\left(Y_{\infty}, \mu_{\infty}\right)=\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} T^{n}\left(\left(Y_{0}, \mu_{0}\right)\right)$ belongs to $\mathcal{E}$, and it is the unique point in $\mathcal{E}$ which satisfies $T\left(\left(Y_{\infty}, \mu_{\infty}\right)\right)=\left(Y_{\infty}, \mu_{\infty}\right)$.

Like in the now classical theory of Hutchinson, the basic examples of application of Corollary 1.2 are induced by iterated function systems (IFS) $\Phi=\left\{\phi_{1}, \ldots, \phi_{M}\right\}$ of contractions on $(X, d)$. This means that there exist $a_{1}, a_{2}, \ldots, a_{M}>1$ such that

$$
d\left(\phi_{i}(x), \phi_{i}(y)\right) \leq \frac{1}{a_{i}} d(x, y)
$$

for every $x, y \in X$. Given an IFS $\Phi$, let $T: \mathscr{X} \rightarrow \mathscr{X}$ the application defined by $T(Y, \mu)=\left(T_{1} Y, T_{2} \mu\right)=\left(Y^{\prime}, \mu^{\prime}\right)$, where

$$
Y^{\prime}=\bigcup_{i=1}^{M} \phi_{i}(Y)
$$

and

$$
\mu^{\prime}(B)=\sum_{i=1}^{M} p_{i} \mu\left(\phi_{i}^{-1}\left(B \cap \phi_{i}(Y)\right)\right)
$$

for some probabilistic sequence $0<p_{i}<1, \sum_{i=1}^{M} p_{i}=1$ and every Borel subset $B$ of $Y^{\prime}$. This transformation $T$ is called the transformation induced by $\Phi$ associated with the probabilities $\left\{p_{i}\right\}$. As usual, it is easy to see that $T$ is contractive on $(\mathscr{X}, \delta)$ with contractivity factor $\lambda=1 / a$, where $a=\min _{i} a_{i}$, and that $\mathcal{E}$ is invariant under $T$.

With our notation we have that $T_{1}$ is a contraction on $\mathcal{K}$ and hence we obtain, as in Theorem 2.6 in [5], a fixed point $Y_{\infty}$ for $T_{1}$ which is the only compact set in $X$ satisfying

$$
Y_{\infty}=\bigcup_{i=1}^{M} \phi_{i}\left(Y_{\infty}\right)
$$

On the other hand $T_{2}$ is a contraction on $\mathcal{P}$ and we obtain, as in Theorem 2.8 in [5], a fixed point $\mu_{\infty}$ for $T_{2}$ which is the only probabilistic Borel measure such that

$$
\mu_{\infty}(B)=\sum_{i=1}^{M} p_{i} \mu_{\infty}\left(\phi_{i}^{-1}(B)\right)
$$

for every Borel set B.

## 2. SUBSPACES OF $\mathcal{E}$ : THE DOUBLING PROPERTY

Given $(Y, \mu) \in \mathcal{E}$, we say that $(Y, \mu)$ is a space of homogeneous type (s.h.t.), or that $\mu$ is a doubling measure on $Y$ if the inequalities

$$
0<\mu\left(B_{d}(y, \alpha r)\right) \leq A \mu\left(B_{d}(y, r)\right)
$$

hold for every $y \in Y$ and $r>0$ and some constants $A \geq 1$ and $\alpha>1$. We shall write $(Y, \mu) \in \mathcal{D}(\alpha, A)$ to keep record of the quantitative parameters of this doubling property.

Notice also that if $(Y, \mu) \in \mathcal{E}$ is a space of homogeneous type, then $\operatorname{supp}(\mu)=Y$. In fact, from the very definition of $\mathcal{E}$, we have that $\operatorname{supp}(\mu) \subseteq Y$. On the other hand, if $y \notin \operatorname{supp}(\mu)$ then there exists an open set $G$ containing $y$ with $\mu(G)=0$. So that for some ball $B$ in $Y$ we should have $\mu(B)=0$, which is impossible.

We shall introduce the doubling property of a measure on a metric space in another way. In Euclidean spaces the doubling property can be detected through the behavior of the measures of neighboring balls of similar size. This property is no longer true in general metric spaces. The basic property of $\mathbb{R}^{n}$ which makes this possible is the finiteness of its (metric) dimension.

Given constants $A \geq 1$ and $\alpha>1$, we shall say that $(Y, \mu) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}(\alpha, A)$ if $(Y, \mu) \in \mathcal{E}$ and for every choice of $y_{1}, y_{2} \in Y$ and $r>0$ with $d\left(y_{1}, y_{2}\right)<\alpha r$, we have that

$$
\mu\left(B_{d}\left(y_{1}, r\right)\right) \leq A \mu\left(\bar{B}_{d}\left(y_{2}, r\right)\right)
$$

A metric space $(X, d)$ satisfies the weak homogeneity property, or it has finite metric (or Assouad) dimension, if there exists a constant $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that no ball of radius $r>0$ contains more than $N$ points of any $r / 2$-disperse (or separated) subset of $X$ (see [4] and [2]). Let us point out that the expression "finite metric dimension" corresponds to the finiteness of the following concept of dimension. The metric dimension of $X$ is the infimum of all those positive numbers $s$ such that the inequality

$$
\operatorname{card}(B(x, \lambda r) \cap A) \leq C \lambda^{s}
$$

holds for some constant $C$, every $\lambda \geq 1$, every $x \in X$, every $r$-disperse subset $A$ of $X$ and every $r>0$.

The next result shows that $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}$ can be regarded as a different way of describing a space of homogeneous type when $(X, d)$ has finite metric dimension.

Theorem 2.1. Let $\alpha>1$ and $A \geq 1$ be given constants. Then
(1) $\mathcal{D}(\alpha, A) \subseteq \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}(\alpha, \widetilde{A})$ for some constant $\widetilde{A}$;
(2) if $(X, d)$ has finite metric dimension, then $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}(\alpha, A) \subseteq \mathcal{D}\left(\alpha, A^{\prime}\right)$, for some constant $A^{\prime}$ depending only on $A$ and $N$.

Proof. Suppose that $(Y, \mu)$ belongs to $\mathcal{D}(\alpha, A)$ for some constants $\alpha>1$ and $A \geq 1$, and take $y_{1}, y_{2} \in Y$ and $r>0$ satisfies $d\left(y_{1}, y_{2}\right)<\alpha r$. Then for every positive integer $n \geq \log _{\alpha}(1+\alpha)$ we have

$$
\mu\left(B_{d}\left(y_{1}, r\right)\right) \leq \mu\left(B_{d}\left(y_{2},(\alpha+1) r\right)\right) \leq A^{n} \mu\left(B_{d}\left(y_{2}, r\right)\right)
$$

Hence $(Y, \mu) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}\left(\alpha, A^{n}\right)$.
For the converse, suppose that $(Y, \mu) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}(\alpha, A)$. For fixed $y \in Y$ and $r>0$, we define

$$
C(y, r)=B_{d}(y, \alpha r)-B_{d}(y, r) .
$$

Let $E$ be a fixed maximal $r$-disperse subset of $C(y, r)$. By the finiteness of the Assouad dimension of $X$, there exists a natural number $N_{0}$ which does not depend on $y$ and $r$ such that $N=\operatorname{card}(E) \leq N_{0}$, let us say $E=\left\{y_{1}, y_{2}, \ldots, y_{N}\right\}$. We claim that

$$
C(y, r) \subseteq \bigcup_{\ell=1}^{N} B\left(y_{\ell}, r\right)
$$

In fact, is not, for some $z \in C(y, r)$ we would have that $d\left(z, y_{l}\right) \geq r$ for all $\ell=$ $1,2 \ldots, N$. But it can not be possible since $E$ is a maximal $r$-disperse set. Since
$d\left(y, y_{\ell}\right)<\alpha r$ for each $\ell=1,2, \ldots, N$, we have $\mu\left(B_{d}\left(y_{\ell}, r\right)\right) \leq A \mu\left(\bar{B}_{d}(y, r)\right)$. Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mu\left(B_{d}(y, \alpha r)\right) & \leq \mu\left(B_{d}(y, r)\right)+\sum_{l=1}^{N} \mu\left(B_{d}\left(y_{l}, r\right)\right) \\
& \leq\left(1+A N_{0}\right) \mu\left(\bar{B}_{d}(y, r)\right) \\
& \leq\left(1+A N_{0}\right) \mu\left(B_{d}(y, \theta r)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

for every $1<\theta<\alpha$. In other words, $(Y, \mu)$ belongs to $\mathcal{D}\left(\alpha / \theta, 1+A N_{0}\right)$, and the results holds taking $A^{\prime}=\left(1+A N_{0}\right)^{p}$, where $p$ is a positive integer such that $\alpha \leq(\theta / \alpha)^{p}$.

We are interested in the subspace of $\mathcal{E}$ of all those $(Y, \mu) \in \mathcal{E}$ which are spaces of homogeneous type. This subspace of $\mathcal{E}$ is not closed in $\mathcal{E}$ in general, and this fact does not allow the application of the Banach fixed point theorem. In fact the set $\mathcal{D}(\alpha, \infty)=\bigcup_{A \geq 1} \mathcal{D}(\alpha, A)$ is not closed in $\mathcal{E}$. For example, consider $X=[0,1]$ with $d$ the usual distance. Take $Y_{n}=[0,1]$ for each $n$ and $\mu_{n}$ the measure with density $f_{n}(t)=n-1+1 / n$ on $[0,1 / n]$ and $f_{n}(t)=1 / n$ on $(1 / n, 1]$. It is easy to see that $\mu_{n} \xrightarrow{\delta_{K}} \delta_{0}$, and that each $\left(Y_{n}, \mu_{n}\right) \in \mathcal{D}\left(2, A_{n}\right)$, with $A_{n}=2 n(n-1+1 / n)$ as a possible doubling constant. Actually it is also easy to show that $A_{n}$ can not be bounded above, since by taking the balls $B(x, r)=B(2 / n, 1 / n)$ we see that $A_{n} \geq \frac{n^{2}-n+4}{2}$. Since in each space of homogeneous type atoms are isolated (see [8]), the space ( $[0,1],|\cdot|, \delta_{0}$ ) can not be a space of homogeneous type.

Nevertheless if $\alpha$ and $A$ are fixed, then the class $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}(\alpha, A)$ is complete with the distance $\delta$.

Theorem 2.2. For every constants $A \geq 1$ and $\alpha>1$ given, the space $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}(\alpha, A)$ is a closed subset of $(\mathscr{X}, \delta)$.

Proof. Notice that after Theorem 1.1, to check that $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}(\alpha, A)$ is closed we only have to prove that given a sequence $\left\{\left(Y_{n}, \mu_{n}\right): n \in \mathbb{N}\right\}$ in $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}(\alpha, A)$ such that $\left(Y_{n}, \mu_{n}\right) \xrightarrow{\delta}(Y, \mu)$, we have that

$$
\mu\left(B_{d}(y, r)\right) \leq A \mu\left(B_{d}(z, r+\varepsilon)\right)
$$

for every $y, z \in Y$ and $r>0$ with $d(y, z)<\alpha r$ and $\varepsilon>0$.
Now, for every natural number $m$ let $\varphi^{m}$ be the continuous function defined on $\mathbb{R}^{+} \cup\{0\}$ such that $\varphi^{m} \equiv 1$ on $[0,1], \varphi^{m} \equiv 0$ out of $[0,1+1 / m)$ and $\varphi^{m}$ is linear on $[1,1+1 / m]$. Then for each $s>0$ we have that $\varphi^{m}(d(y, x) / s)=1$ for every $x \in B_{d}(y, s)$ and that the set where $\varphi^{m}(d(y, \cdot) / s)$ is not zero is contained in $B_{d}(y, s+s / m)$.

Fix $y, z \in Y$ and $r>0$ with $d(y, z)<\alpha r, \varepsilon>0$ and $\eta>0$. Let $\varepsilon_{0}=$ $\min \left\{\frac{\alpha r-d(y, z)}{2}, \eta\right\}>0$. Since $Y_{n} \xrightarrow{d_{H}} Y$, there exists $N=N\left(\varepsilon_{0}\right)$ such that $Y \subseteq$ $\left[Y_{n}\right]_{\varepsilon_{0}}$ if $n \geq N$, and from compacity for every $n \geq N$ we can choose $y_{n}, z_{n} \in Y_{n}$ such that $d\left(y_{n}, y\right)<\varepsilon_{0}$ and $d\left(z_{n}, z\right)<\varepsilon_{0}$. Then $d\left(y_{n}, z_{n}\right)<\alpha r$ for every $n \geq N$. Also we have that $d\left(y_{n}, y\right)<\eta$ and $d\left(z_{n}, z\right)<\eta$ for every $s>0$ and $n \geq N$, then $B_{d}\left(y_{n}, s\right) \subseteq B_{d}(y, s+\eta), B_{d}(y, s) \subseteq B_{d}\left(y_{n}, s+\eta\right), B_{d}\left(z_{n}, s\right) \subseteq B_{d}(z, s+\eta)$ and $B_{d}(z, s) \subseteq B_{d}\left(z_{n}, s+\eta\right)$. Hence for $m \geq 1$ we have

$$
\mu\left(B_{d}(y, r)\right) \leq \int \varphi^{m}\left(\frac{d(y, x)}{r}\right) d \mu(x)
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \int \varphi^{m}\left(\frac{d(y, x)}{r}\right) d \mu_{n}(x) \\
& \leq \liminf _{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{n}\left(B_{d}(y, r(1+1 / m))\right) \\
& \leq \liminf _{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{n}\left(B_{d}\left(y_{n}, r(1+1 / m)+\eta\right)\right) \\
& \leq A \liminf _{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{n}\left(B_{d}\left(z_{n}, r(1+1 / m)+2 \eta\right)\right) \\
& \leq A \liminf _{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{n}\left(B_{d}(z, r(1+1 / m)+3 \eta)\right) \\
& \leq A \liminf _{n \rightarrow \infty} \int \varphi^{m}\left(\frac{d(z, x)}{r(1+1 / m)+3 \eta}\right) d \mu_{n}(x) \\
& =A \int \varphi^{m}\left(\frac{d(z, x)}{r(1+1 / m)+3 \eta}\right) d \mu(x) \\
& \leq A \mu\left(B_{d}(z,(1+1 / m)[r(1+1 / m)+3 \eta])\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

The desired inequality is obtained by taking $m \geq \frac{3(r+3)}{\varepsilon}$ and $\eta=\frac{1}{m}$.

## 3. Non-DOUbling Orbits Starting at doubling spaces

As we have already mentioned, the results in [9] show that the usual self-similar fractals, constructed from the iteration and fixed point technique introduced by Hutchinson in [7], are typically spaces of homogeneous type.

Let us show now that it may happen that the only point in the orbit satisfying the doubling property is $\left(Y_{0}, \mu_{0}\right)$ and of course the limit space $\left(Y_{\infty}, \mu_{\infty}\right)$ but no other $T^{n}\left(Y_{0}, \mu_{0}\right), n \in \mathbb{N}$, is a space of homogeneous type. In these constructions we shall use Muckenhoupt type weights. Let us review the basic properties of the $A_{p}$ classes (see [6]). Let $(X, d, \mu)$ be a space of homogeneous type and let $1<p<\infty$. We say that a non-negative locally integrable function $w$ defined on $X$ belongs to $A_{p}=A_{p}(X, d, \mu)$ if there exists a constant $C$ for which the inequality

$$
\left(\int_{B} w d \mu\right)\left(\int_{B} w^{-\frac{1}{p-1}} d \mu\right)^{p-1} \leq C(\mu(B))^{p}
$$

holds for every $d$-ball $B$ of $X$. We have that if $w \in A_{p}$, then $(X, d, w d \mu)$ is also a space of homogeneous type. In fact, denote $d \nu=w d \mu$ en let $x \in X$ and $r>0$ be given. From Hölder inequality and Muckenhoupt condition we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mu\left(B_{d}(x, r)\right) & =\int_{B_{d}(x, r)} w^{\frac{1}{p}} w^{-\frac{1}{p}} d \mu \\
& \leq\left(\int_{B_{d}(x, r)} w d \mu\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}\left(\int_{B_{d}(x, 2 r)} w^{-\frac{1}{p-1}} d \mu\right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \\
& \leq \nu\left(B_{d}(x, r)\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}\left(\frac{C}{\int_{B_{d}(x, 2 r)} w d \mu}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \mu\left(B_{d}(x, 2 r)\right) \\
& =\left(C \frac{\nu\left(B_{d}(x, r)\right)}{\nu\left(B_{d}(x, 2 r)\right)}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \mu\left(B_{d}(x, 2 r)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Then

$$
\frac{\nu\left(B_{d}(x, r)\right)}{\nu\left(B_{d}(x, 2 r)\right)} \geq \frac{1}{C}\left(\frac{\mu\left(B_{d}(x, r)\right)}{\mu\left(B_{d}(x, 2 r)\right)}\right)^{p} \geq \frac{1}{C A^{p}}
$$

where $A$ is the doubling constant for $\mu$. Then $\nu$ is doubling with constant $C A^{p}$. A particular case is obtained by taking $(X, d, \mu)=\left(\mathbb{R}^{n},|\cdot|, d x\right)$. If $w$ is any weight in $A_{p}$, then $\left(\mathbb{R}^{n},|\cdot|, w d x\right)$ is a space of homogeneous type.

We shall consider the Cantor type IFS

$$
\begin{equation*}
\phi_{1}(x)=\frac{1}{k} x, \quad \phi_{2}(x)=\frac{1}{k} x+\frac{k-1}{k} . \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

defined on $X=[0,1]$ with the usual distance $d(x, y)=|x-y|$, where $k$ a fixed positive number. Let $T_{c}$ be the application induced on $\mathscr{X}$ by this IFS with $p_{1}=$ $p_{2}=1 / 2$.

For the case $k=2$ we have $\Phi=\left\{\phi_{1}, \phi_{2}\right\}$ with $\phi_{1}(x)=x / 2$ and $\phi_{2}(x)=x / 2+1 / 2$, and the application $T_{c}$ is given by $T_{c}(Y, \mu)=\left(Y^{\prime}, \mu^{\prime}\right)$, where

$$
Y^{\prime}=\phi_{1}(Y) \cup \phi_{2}(Y)
$$

and

$$
\mu^{\prime}(B)=\frac{1}{2} \mu\left(\phi_{1}^{-1}\left(B \cap \phi_{1}(Y)\right)\right)+\frac{1}{2} \mu\left(\phi_{2}^{-1}\left(B \cap \phi_{2}(Y)\right)\right) .
$$

Let $\mu_{0}$ be the absolutely continuous measure given by $d \mu_{0}=\frac{1}{2} w(x) d x$, with $w(x)=x^{-1 / 2}$. It is not hard to check that it is a doubling measure on $[0,1]$ with respect to the standard Euclidean distance. Actually $w$ is a Muckenhoupt $A_{2}$ weight. In fact, let $0 \leq a<b \leq 1$. If $b-a \leq \frac{a}{2}$, then

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left(\int_{a}^{b} w(x) d x\right)\left(\int_{a}^{b} w^{-1}(x) d x\right) & =\left(\int_{a}^{b} x^{-1 / 2} d x\right)\left(\int_{a}^{b} x^{1 / 2} d x\right) \\
& \leq\left(\frac{b}{a}\right)^{1 / 2}(b-a)^{2} \\
& \leq\left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{1 / 2}(b-a)^{2} .
\end{aligned}
$$

On the other hand, if $b-a \geq \frac{a}{2}$ we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left(\int_{a}^{b} w(x) d x\right)\left(\int_{a}^{b} w^{-1}(x) d x\right) & \leq\left(\int_{0}^{b} x^{-1 / 2} d x\right)\left(\int_{0}^{b} x^{1 / 2} d x\right) \\
& =\frac{4}{3} b^{2} \\
& \leq 12(b-a)^{2} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Notice now that even when $\left(Y_{0}, \mu_{0}\right)=\left([0,1], \frac{1}{2} w(x) d x\right)$ is a space of homogeneous type, $T_{c}\left(\left(Y_{0}, \mu_{0}\right)\right)$ is not. In order to show the above statement, take $0<\varepsilon<1 / 4$, $E_{\varepsilon}=\left[\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon, \frac{1}{2}\right]$ and $F_{\varepsilon}=\left[\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon\right]$. Notice that $Y_{0}^{\prime}=Y_{0}=[0,1]$ and that $d \mu_{0}^{\prime}=\frac{\sqrt{2}}{4} v(x) d x$ with

$$
v(x)= \begin{cases}x^{-1 / 2} & \text { if } 0<x<1 / 2 \\ \left(x-\frac{1}{2}\right)^{-1 / 2} & \text { if } 1 / 2<x<1\end{cases}
$$



Figure 1: $T_{c}^{n}\left([0,1], \frac{1}{2} w d x\right)=\left([0,1], w_{n} d x\right)$
(see Figure 1). Hence $\mu_{0}^{\prime}\left(E_{\varepsilon}\right)=\frac{1}{2}(1-\sqrt{1-2 \varepsilon})$ and $\mu_{0}^{\prime}\left(F_{\varepsilon}\right)=\sqrt{2 \varepsilon} / 2$. Since $E_{\varepsilon}$ and $F_{\varepsilon}$ are balls with the same radii and non empty intersection, by taking $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ we realize the impossibility of the doubling for $\mu_{0}^{\prime}$. For the further iterations of $T_{c}$ acting on $\left([0,1], \frac{1}{2} w d x\right)$, let us say $T_{c}^{n}\left([0,1], \frac{1}{2} w d x\right)$, the same situation appears at each point of the form $j / 2^{n}, j=1,2, \ldots, 2^{n}-1$. Hence no $T_{c}^{n}\left([0,1], \frac{1}{2} w d x\right)$ is a space of homogeneous type for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. But from uniqueness in the Banach fixed point theorem

$$
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} T_{c}^{n}\left([0,1], \frac{1}{2} w d x\right)=([0,1], d x)
$$

which is, perhaps, the most elementary example of space of homogeneous type.

Notice that in the above example we have that $d\left(\phi_{1}\left([0,1], \phi_{2}([0,1])=0\right.\right.$, and also the attractor of the IFS is the initial set $[0,1]$. The second example is given by a similar construction associated to the classical Sierpinski contraction $T_{s}$, and shows that the difficulty for the doubling is in the contact and not in the invariance of the original set. In this case let $X$ be the triangle in $\mathbb{R}^{2}$ with vertices at $(0,0)$, $(1,0)$ and $(0,1)$, and take $d\left(\left(x_{1}, y_{1}\right),\left(x_{2}, y_{2}\right)\right)=\max \left\{\left|x_{1}-x_{2}\right|,\left|y_{1}-y_{2}\right|\right\}$ as the distance on $X$. Let

$$
\begin{gathered}
\phi_{1}(x, y)=(x / 2, y / 2) \\
\phi_{2}(x, y)=\phi_{1}(x, y)+(0,1 / 2), \\
\phi_{3}(x, y)=\phi_{1}(x, y)+(1 / 2,0) .
\end{gathered}
$$

Define $T_{s}$ on $\mathscr{X}$ by $T_{s}(Y, \mu)=\left(Y^{\prime}, \mu^{\prime}\right)$ with

$$
Y^{\prime}=\phi_{1}(Y) \cup \phi_{2}(Y) \cup \phi_{3}(Y):=Y_{1}^{\prime} \cup Y_{2}^{\prime} \cup Y_{3}^{\prime}
$$

and

$$
\mu^{\prime}(B)=\frac{1}{3}\left(\mu\left(\phi_{1}^{-1}\left(B \cap Y_{1}^{\prime}\right)\right)+\mu\left(\phi_{2}^{-1}\left(B \cap Y_{2}^{\prime}\right)\right)+\mu\left(\phi_{3}^{-1}\left(B \cap Y_{3}^{\prime}\right)\right)\right)
$$

for every Borel subset $B$ of $Y^{\prime}$.
Let us define a weight function $\widetilde{w}(x, y)$ on the basic triangle $X$, given by $\widetilde{w}(x, y)=$ $\frac{1}{2} w(y)$ where $w$ is the weight function defined on $[0,1]$ by $w(y)=y^{-1 / 2}$. Notice that
for $(x, y) \in X$ and $r>0, B_{d}\left((x, y), \frac{r}{2}\right)=\left(I_{1} \times I_{2}\right) \cap X$, where $I_{1}=\left(x-\frac{r}{2}, x+\frac{r}{2}\right)$ and $I_{2}=\left(y-\frac{r}{2}, y+\frac{r}{2}\right)$. Hence

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{B_{d}\left((x, y), \frac{r}{2}\right)} \widetilde{w}(x, y) d x d y & \leq r \int_{I_{2}} w(y) d y \\
\int_{B_{d}\left((x, y), \frac{r}{2}\right)} \widetilde{w}^{-1}(x, y) d x d y & \leq r \int_{I_{2}} w^{-1}(y) d y
\end{aligned}
$$

After multiplying term by term the above inequalities and using the fact that $w \in A_{2}([0,1], d y)$, we obtain the $A_{2}(X, d, d x d y)$ condition for $\widetilde{w}$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left(\int_{B_{d}\left((x, y), \frac{r}{2}\right)} \widetilde{w}(x, y) d x d y\right)\left(\int_{B_{d}\left((x, y), \frac{r}{2}\right)} \widetilde{w}^{-1}(x, y) d x d y\right) \\
& \leq r^{2} \int_{I_{2}} w(y) d y \int_{I_{2}} w^{-1}(y) d y \\
& \leq \hat{C} r^{4} \\
& \leq \widetilde{C} \mu^{2}\left(B_{d}\left((x, y), \frac{r}{2}\right)\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

So that, in particular, $(X, d, \widetilde{w} d x d y)$ is a space of homogeneous type. Notice that $d\left(\phi_{i}(X), \phi_{j}(X)\right)=0$ for every $i, j=1,2,3$, and taking $Y_{0}=X$ again $T_{s}\left(Y_{0}, \widetilde{w} d x d y\right)$ is not a space of homogeneous type since precisely at each contact point of $\phi_{i}(X)$ and $\phi_{j}(X)$ for $i \neq j$, we have a singularity of $\widetilde{w}$ in one of these sets and boundedness on the other (see Figure 2). In fact, for $0<\varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{4}, E_{\varepsilon}=\left([0, \varepsilon] \times\left[\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon, \frac{1}{2}\right]\right) \cap \phi_{1}(X)$ and


Figure 2: $T_{s}^{n}\left(Y_{0}, \widetilde{w} d x d y\right)=:\left(Y_{n}, \widetilde{w}_{n} d x d y\right)$
$F_{\varepsilon}=[0, \varepsilon] \times\left[\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon\right]$, with $d \mu_{0}=\widetilde{w} d x d y$, we have $\mu_{0}^{\prime}\left(E_{\varepsilon}\right)=\frac{1}{6} \varepsilon\left(1-(1-2 \varepsilon)^{3 / 2}\right)$ and $\mu_{0}^{\prime}\left(F_{\varepsilon}\right)=\sqrt{2} \varepsilon^{3 / 2} / 2$. These formulas show that $T_{s}(X, \widetilde{w} d x d y)$ is not a space of homogeneous type, since $E_{\varepsilon}$ and $F_{\varepsilon}$ are two neighboring balls with the same radii and $\mu_{0}^{\prime}\left(F_{\varepsilon}\right) / \mu_{0}^{\prime}\left(E_{\varepsilon}\right)$ tends to infinity when $\varepsilon$ tend to zero. Again no $T_{s}^{n}(X, \widetilde{w} d x d y)$ is a space of homogeneous type and the limit space $\left(Y_{\infty}, \mu_{\infty}\right)$ is the Sierpinski triangle with the restriction of the Hausdorff measure of dimension $\log 3 / \log 2$, which
is doubling.
Our third example shows that even when some separation of the sets $\left\{\phi_{i}(X): i=\right.$ $1, \ldots, M\}$ holds, no uniform doubling property for the whole orbit can be expected. In fact, let us consider now the application $T_{c}$ induced by the IFS of Cantor type taking $k=5 / 2$ in (3.1), and with $p_{1}=p_{2}=1 / 2$. In other words, $\phi_{1}(x)=2 x / 5$ and $\phi_{2}(x)=2 x / 5+3 / 5$. Take again $w(x)=x^{-1 / 2}$ and $\left(Y_{0}, \mu_{0}\right)=\left([0,1], \frac{1}{2} w(x) d x\right)$ as the starting space. Notice that for any fixed $\alpha>1$, the space $\left(Y_{0}, \mu_{0}\right) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}(\alpha, A)$. We claim that if $T_{c}^{n}\left(Y_{0}, \mu_{0}\right)$ belongs to $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}\left(\alpha, A_{n}\right)$ for some constant $A_{n} \geq 1$, then $A_{n} \geq 2^{n / 2}$, for each natural number $n$. If fact, let us write $\left(Y_{n}, \mu_{n}\right)$ to denote $T_{c}^{n}\left(\bar{Y}_{0}, \mu_{0}\right)$. For a fixed $n$, take $y_{1}=\left(\frac{2}{5}\right)^{n}, y_{2}=\frac{3}{2}\left(\frac{2}{5}\right)^{n}$, and $r=d\left(y_{1}, y_{2}\right)=\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{2}{5}\right)^{n}$. Notice that $y_{1}$ and $y_{2}$ belong to $Y_{n}$ and they are the extreme points of the first "gap" of $Y_{n}$. It is easy to see that $\mu_{n}\left(B_{d}\left(y_{1}, r\right)\right)=C 5^{-n / 2}$ and $\mu_{n}\left(B_{d}\left(y_{2}, r\right)\right)=C\left(\frac{2}{5}\right)^{n / 2}$, where $C$ is a constant which does not depend on $n$. Then

$$
\frac{\mu_{n}\left(B_{d}\left(y_{2}, r\right)\right)}{\mu_{n}\left(B_{d}\left(y_{1}, r\right)\right)}=2^{n / 2}
$$

Hence $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}(\alpha, A)$ can not be invariant under $T_{c}$.

## 4. A positive Result

As a corollary of Theorem 2.2 and the Banach fixed point theorem, we have immediately the following result.
Corollary 4.1. Let $T: \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ be a contraction mapping. Then if $T: \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}(\alpha, A) \rightarrow$ $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}(\alpha, A)$ for some $\alpha>1$ and $A \geq 1$, there exists a unique fixed point $(Y, \mu)$ for $T$ in $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}(\alpha, A)$.

Let us next present an application of the above result to the special case of a finite family of contractive similitudes on a metric space which strictly separate images.
Proposition 4.2. Let $(X, d)$ be a compact metric space and let $\left\{\phi_{1}, \ldots, \phi_{M}\right\}$ be a finite sequence of contractive similitudes on $X$ :

$$
d\left(\phi_{i}(x), \phi_{i}(y)\right)=\frac{1}{a_{i}} d(x, y)
$$

for every $x, y \in X$, where $a_{i}>1$ for $i=1, \ldots, M$. Let $T$ be the mapping on $\mathscr{X}$ defined by $T(Y, \mu)=\left(Y^{\prime}, \mu^{\prime}\right)$, where

$$
\begin{gathered}
Y^{\prime}=\bigcup_{i=1}^{M} \phi_{i}(Y) \\
\mu^{\prime}(B)=\sum_{i=1}^{M} p_{i} \mu\left(\phi_{i}^{-1}\left(B \cap \phi_{i}(Y)\right)\right)
\end{gathered}
$$

for some probabilistic sequence $0<p_{i}<1, \sum_{i=1}^{M} p_{i}=1$ and every Borel subset $B$ of $Y^{\prime}$. If $\operatorname{diam}(X) \leq 1$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\max _{i=1, \ldots, M} a_{i}^{-1} \leq \min _{\substack{1 \leq i, j \leq M \\ i \neq j}}\left\{d\left(\phi_{i}(X), \phi_{j}(X)\right)\right\}=: D \tag{4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

then $T: \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}(2, A) \rightarrow \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}(2, A)$ for every $A \geq P:=\max \left\{p_{i}^{-1}: i=1, \ldots, M\right\}$.

Proof. Set $Y_{i}^{\prime}=\phi_{i}(Y)$ and $\mu_{i}^{\prime}(B)=p_{i} \mu\left(\phi_{i}^{-1}\left(B \cap Y_{i}^{\prime}\right)\right)$ for $i=1,2, \ldots, M$. Let us first prove that, for $A \geq P$ and every $i=1,2, \ldots, M$, the space $\left(Y_{i}^{\prime}, \mu_{i}^{\prime}\right) \in$ $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}(2, A)$ provided that $(Y, \mu) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}(2, A)$. In fact, for $(Y, d, \mu) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}(2, A)$, take $y, z \in Y_{i}^{\prime}$ and $r>0$ such that $d(y, z)<2 r$. Since each $\phi_{i}$ is one to one we have that $d\left(\phi_{i}^{-1}(y), \phi_{i}^{-1}(z)\right)=a_{i} d(y, z)<2 a_{i} r$, and that $\phi_{i}^{-1}\left(B_{d}(x, r) \cap Y_{i}^{\prime}\right)=$ $B_{d}\left(\phi_{i}^{-1}(x), a_{i} r\right) \cap Y$ for every $x \in X$. Then, for every $\varepsilon>0$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
p_{i}^{-1} \mu_{i}^{\prime}\left(B_{d}(y, r)\right) & =\mu\left(\phi_{i}^{-1}\left(B_{d}(y, r) \cap Y_{i}^{\prime}\right)\right) \\
& =\mu\left(B_{d}\left(\phi_{i}^{-1}(y), a_{i} r\right)\right) \\
& \leq A \mu\left(B_{d}\left(\phi_{i}^{-1}(z), a_{i} r+a_{i} \varepsilon\right)\right) \\
& =A \mu\left(\phi_{i}^{-1}\left(B_{d}(z, r+\varepsilon) \cap Y_{i}^{\prime}\right)\right) \\
& =p_{i}^{-1} A \mu_{i}^{\prime}\left(B_{d}(z, r+\varepsilon)\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

To prove that $\left(Y^{\prime}, \mu^{\prime}\right)$ belongs to $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}(2, A)$, take now $y, z \in Y^{\prime}$ and $r>0$ such that $d\left(x^{\prime}, y^{\prime}\right)<2 r$, and $\varepsilon>0$. Let us consider two cases:

1) $y$ and $z$ belong to the same $Y_{i}^{\prime}$;
2) $y \in Y_{i}^{\prime}$ and $z \in Y_{j}^{\prime}$ with $i \neq j$.

Case 1: If $B_{d}(y, r)$ and $B_{d}(z, r+\varepsilon)$ do not intersect any other $Y_{j}^{\prime}$ for $j \neq i$, we can use the fact that $\left(Y_{i}^{\prime}, \mu_{i}^{\prime}\right) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}(2, A)$ to obtain the desired estimate. On the other hand, if $B_{d}(y, r)$ or $B_{d}(z, r+\varepsilon)$ intersect $Y_{j}^{\prime}$ for some $j \neq i$, necessarily $r+\varepsilon \geq D$. Since we are assuming that $\operatorname{diam}(X) \leq 1$ we have that $\operatorname{diam}\left(Y_{i}^{\prime}\right) \leq a_{i}^{-1} \leq D$, so that $Y_{i}^{\prime} \subseteq B_{d}(z, r+\varepsilon)$ and $\mu^{\prime}\left(B_{d}(z, r+\varepsilon)\right) \geq p_{i}$. Hence

$$
\mu^{\prime}\left(B_{d}(y, r)\right) \leq 1 \leq p_{i}^{-1} \mu^{\prime}\left(B_{d}(z, r+\varepsilon)\right) \leq P \mu^{\prime}\left(B_{d}(z, r+\varepsilon)\right) \leq A \mu^{\prime}\left(B_{d}(z, r+\varepsilon)\right)
$$

which is the desired inequality.
Case 2: We may assume that $a_{i} \leq a_{j}$. Since $D \leq d(y, z)<2 r$, we have $r \geq D / 2$. If $r+\varepsilon \geq D$ we easily have that

$$
\mu^{\prime}\left(B_{d}(y, r)\right) \leq 1=p_{j}^{-1} \mu^{\prime}\left(Y_{j}^{\prime}\right) \leq A \mu^{\prime}\left(B_{d}(z, r+\varepsilon)\right)
$$

If, instead, $r+\varepsilon \leq D$ we have

$$
\begin{gathered}
\mu^{\prime}\left(B_{d}(y, r)\right)=\mu_{i}^{\prime}\left(B_{d}(y, r)\right)=\mu\left(B_{d}\left(\phi_{i}^{-1}(y), a_{i} r\right)\right) / M \\
\mu^{\prime}\left(B_{d}(z, r+\varepsilon)\right)=\mu_{j}^{\prime}\left(B_{d}(z, r+\varepsilon)\right)=\mu\left(B_{d}\left(\phi_{j}^{-1}(z), a_{j}(r+\varepsilon)\right)\right) / M
\end{gathered}
$$

So that, since $d(y, z) \leq 1 \leq 2 r / D \leq 2 a_{i} r$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mu^{\prime}\left(B_{d}(y, r)\right) & =p_{i} \mu\left(B_{d}\left(\phi_{i}^{-1}(y), a_{i} r\right)\right) \\
& \leq A p_{i} \mu\left(B_{d}\left(\phi_{j}^{-1}(z), a_{i}(r+\varepsilon)\right)\right) \\
& \leq A \frac{p_{j}}{P} \mu\left(B_{d}\left(\phi_{j}^{-1}(z), a_{j}(r+\varepsilon)\right)\right) \\
& \leq A \mu^{\prime}\left(B_{d}(z, r+\varepsilon)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Notice that the hypothesis $\operatorname{diam}(X) \leq 1$ is not restrictive in the sense that the results holds if now $D \geq \operatorname{diam}(X) / a_{i}$ for every $i=1, \ldots, M$.

Hence, under the hypotheses of the above theorem, any starting point $\left(Y_{0}, \mu_{0}\right)$ generates an orbit

$$
\mathcal{O}_{T}\left(Y_{0}, \mu_{0}\right)=\left\{T^{n}\left(Y_{0}, \mu_{0}\right): n \in \mathbb{N}_{0}\right\}
$$

which is completely contained in $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}(2, P)$. So that, in these cases, we obtain again the result of Mosco ([9], see also [10]). And actually $T^{n}\left(Y_{0}, \mu_{0}\right)$ are good approximations of the limit space $\left(Y_{\infty}, \mu_{\infty}\right)$, in the sense that each approximating space is a space of homogeneous type, with bounded doubling constant.

As a family of examples to which Proposition 4.2 applies, consider the Cantor type IFS defined in (3.1), with $k \geq 3$. The classical Cantor set $C$ is obtained when $k=3$ and $p_{1}=p_{2}=1 / 2$, and actually the invariant measure $\mu_{\infty}$ is the restriction to $C$ of $\mathcal{H}^{s}$ with $s=\frac{\log 2}{\log 3}$. Then for every $A \geq 2$ and every $\left(Y_{0}, \mu_{0}\right) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}(2, A)$, the whole orbit $\left\{T_{s}^{n}\left(Y_{0}, \mu_{0}\right): n \in \mathbb{N}\right\}$ is a uniform sequence of spaces of homogeneous type.

To give a higher dimensional example of application of Proposition 4.2, let us consider a Sierpinski type family of contractions. For each $k \geq 1$, let

$$
\begin{gathered}
\phi_{1}(x, y)=(x / k, y / k), \\
\phi_{2}(x, y)=\phi_{1}(x, y)+(0,1-1 / k), \\
\phi_{3}(x, y)=\phi_{1}(x, y)+(1-1 / k, 0) .
\end{gathered}
$$

Let $X$ be the triangle in $\mathbb{R}^{2}$ with vertices at $(0,0),(1,0)$ and $(0,1)$. Taking $d\left(\left(x_{1}, y_{1}\right),\left(x_{2}, y_{2}\right)\right)=\max \left\{\left|x_{1}-x_{2}\right|,\left|y_{1}-y_{2}\right|\right\}$ as the distance on $X$, we define $T_{s}$ on $\mathscr{X}$ by $T_{s}(Y, \mu)=\left(Y^{\prime}, \mu^{\prime}\right)$ with

$$
Y^{\prime}=\phi_{1}(Y) \cup \phi_{2}(Y) \cup \phi_{3}(Y):=Y_{1}^{\prime} \cup Y_{2}^{\prime} \cup Y_{3}^{\prime},
$$

and

$$
\mu^{\prime}(B)=\frac{1}{3}\left(\mu\left(\phi_{1}^{-1}\left(B \cap Y_{1}^{\prime}\right)\right)+\mu\left(\phi_{2}^{-1}\left(B \cap Y_{2}^{\prime}\right)\right)+\mu\left(\phi_{3}^{-1}\left(B \cap Y_{3}^{\prime}\right)\right)\right),
$$

for every Borel subset $B$ of $Y^{\prime}$. Hence from Proposition 4.2 , for $k \geq 3$ and $A \geq 3$ we have that $T_{s}: \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}(2, A) \rightarrow \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}(2, A)$. So that the whole orbit $\left\{T_{s}^{n}\left(Y_{0}, \mu_{0}\right): n \in \mathbb{N}\right\}$ is a uniform sequence of spaces of homogeneous type for every $\left(Y_{0}, \mu_{0}\right) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}(2, A)$. We can take for example $Y_{0}=X$ and $\mu_{0}$ to be twice the area Lebesgue measure on $X$. And of course also the limit $\left(Y_{\infty}, \mu_{\infty}\right)$ is a space of homogeneous type.
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