

HEREDITARILY NON UNIFORMLY PERFECT NON-AUTONOMOUS JULIA SETS

MARK COMERFORD, RICH STANKEWITZ, HIROKI SUMI

MARK COMERFORD

Department of Mathematics
University of Rhode Island
5 Lippitt Road, Room 102F
Kingston, RI 02881, USA

RICH STANKEWITZ

Department of Mathematical Sciences
Ball State University
Muncie, IN 47306, USA

HIROKI SUMI

Course of Mathematical Science
Department of Human Coexistence
Graduate School of Human and Environmental Studies
Kyoto University
Yoshida-nihonmatsu-cho, Sakyo-ku
Kyoto 606-8501, Japan

ABSTRACT. Hereditarily non uniformly perfect (HNUP) sets were introduced by Stankewitz, Sugawa, and Sumi in [19] who gave several examples of such sets based on Cantor set-like constructions using nested intervals. We exhibit a class of examples in non-autonomous iteration where one considers compositions of polynomials from a sequence which is in general allowed to vary. In particular, we give a sharp criterion for when Julia sets from our class will be HNUP and we show that the maximum possible Hausdorff dimension of 1 for these Julia sets can be attained. The proof of the latter considers the Julia set as the limit set of a non-autonomous conformal iterated function system and we calculate the Hausdorff dimension using a version of Bowen's formula given in the paper by Rempe-Gillen and Urbánski [15].

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 30D05, Secondary 28A80.

Key words and phrases. Hereditarily non Uniformly Perfect Sets, Non-Autonomous Iteration.

1. INTRODUCTION

Our paper is concerned with non-autonomous iteration of complex polynomials. This subject was started by Fornæss and Sibony [9] in 1991 and by Sester, Sumi and others who were working in the closely related area of skew-products [16, 20, 21, 22, 23]. There is also an extensive literature in the real variables case which is mainly focused on topological dynamics, chaos, and difference equations, e.g. [2, 3]. A key idea in our work is linking non-autonomous iteration to iterated function systems, most particularly Moran-set constructions. A good exposition on the classical version of this can be found in [24], but the non-autonomous version we make use of is described in the paper of Rempe-Gillen and Urbánski [15].

We begin with the basic definitions we need in order to state the main theorems of this paper. In the following sections, we then prove these theorems, together with some supporting results and make a few concluding remarks.

1.1. Polynomial Sequences. Let $\{P_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of polynomials where each P_m has degree $d_m \geq 2$. For each $0 \leq m$, let Q_m be the composition $P_m \circ \cdots \circ P_2 \circ P_1$ (where for convenience we set $Q_0 = Id$) and, for each $0 \leq m \leq n$, let $Q_{m,n}$ be the composition $P_n \circ \cdots \circ P_{m+2} \circ P_{m+1}$ (where we let each $Q_{m,m}$ be the identity). Such a sequence can be thought of in terms of the sequence of iterates of a skew product on $\widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ over the non-negative integers \mathbb{N}_0 or, equivalently, in terms of the sequence of iterates of a mapping F of the set $\mathbb{N}_0 \times \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$ to itself, given by $F(m, z) := (m + 1, P_{m+1}(z))$. Let the degrees of these compositions Q_m and $Q_{m,n}$ be D_m and $D_{m,n}$ respectively so that $D_m = \prod_{i=1}^m d_i$, $D_{m,n} = \prod_{i=m+1}^n d_i$.

For each $m \geq 0$ define the *mth iterated Fatou set* \mathcal{F}_m by

$$\mathcal{F}_m = \{z \in \widehat{\mathbb{C}} : \{Q_{m,n}\}_{n=m}^\infty \text{ is normal on some neighbourhood of } z\}$$

where we take our neighbourhoods with respect to the spherical topology on $\widehat{\mathbb{C}}$. We then define the *mth iterated Julia set* \mathcal{J}_m to be the complement $\widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \mathcal{F}_m$. At time $m = 0$ we call the corresponding iterated Fatou and Julia sets simply the *Fatou* and *Julia sets* for our sequence and designate them by \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{J} respectively.

One can easily show that the iterated Fatou and Julia sets are completely invariant in the following sense.

Theorem 1.1. *For each $0 \leq m \leq n$, $Q_{m,n}(\mathcal{F}_m) = \mathcal{F}_n$ and $Q_{m,n}(\mathcal{J}_m) = \mathcal{J}_n$ with components of \mathcal{F}_m being mapped surjectively onto components of \mathcal{F}_n .*

An important special case is when we have an integer $d \geq 2$ and real numbers $M \geq 0$, $K \geq 1$ for which our sequence $\{P_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ is such that

$$P_m(z) = a_{d_m,m}z^{d_m} + a_{d_m-1,m}z^{d_m-1} + \cdots + a_{1,m}z + a_{0,m}$$

is a polynomial of degree $2 \leq d_m \leq d$ whose coefficients satisfy

$$\frac{1}{K} \leq |a_{d_m,m}| \leq K, \quad m \geq 1, \quad |a_{k,m}| \leq M, \quad m \geq 1, \quad 0 \leq k \leq d_m - 1.$$

Such sequences are called *bounded sequences of polynomials* or simply *bounded sequences* (see e.g. [5, 6]), this definition being a slight generalization of that originally made by Fornæss and Sibony in [9] who considered bounded sequences of monic polynomials.

In what follows, for $z \in \mathbb{C}$ and $r > 0$, we use the notation $D(z, r)$ for the open disc with centre z and radius r , while the corresponding closed disc and boundary circle will be denoted by $\bar{D}(z, r)$ and $C(z, r)$ respectively. For $z \in \mathbb{C}$ and $0 < r < R$, we use $A(z, r, R)$ for the round annulus $\{w : r < |w - z| < R\}$ with centre z , inner radius r , and outer radius R , while we use $\bar{A}(z, r, R)$ for the corresponding closed annulus.

1.2. Hereditarily non Uniformly Perfect Sets. We call a doubly connected domain A in \mathbb{C} that can be conformally mapped onto a true (round) annulus $A(z, r, R)$, for some $0 < r < R$, a *conformal annulus* with the *modulus* of A given by $\text{mod } A = \log(R/r)$, noting that R/r is uniquely determined by A (see, e.g., the version of the Riemann mapping theorem for multiply connected domains in [1]).

Definition 1.2. A conformal annulus A is said to *separate* a set $F \subset \mathbb{C}$ if $F \cap A = \emptyset$ and F intersects both components of $\mathbb{C} \setminus A$.

Definition 1.3. A compact subset $F \subset \mathbb{C}$ with two or more points is *uniformly perfect* if there exists a uniform upper bound on the moduli of all conformal annuli which separate F .

The concept of hereditarily non uniformly perfect was introduced in [19] and can be thought of as a thinness criterion for sets which is a strong version of failing to be uniformly perfect.

Definition 1.4. A compact set E is called *hereditarily non uniformly perfect* (HNUP) if no subset of E is uniformly perfect.

In our case we will show that the iterated Julia sets for suitably chosen polynomial sequences are HNUP by showing they satisfy the stronger property of *pointwise thinness*. A set $E \subset \mathbb{C}$ is called *pointwise thin* when for each $z \in E$ there exist $0 < r_n < R_n$ with $R_n/r_n \rightarrow +\infty$ and $R_n \rightarrow 0$ such that each true annulus $A(z, r_n, R_n)$ separates E . A conformal annulus of large modulus which separates a set E contains a round annulus of large modulus (see, e.g., Theorem 2.1 of [13]) which then also separates E . We thus have an equivalent formulation (that we shall use later), namely that E is pointwise thin if, for each $z \in E$, there exists a sequence of conformal annuli A_n each of which separates E , has z in the bounded component of its complement, and such that $\text{mod } A_n \rightarrow +\infty$ while the Euclidean diameter of A_n tends to zero.

Note that any pointwise thin compact set is HNUP. Stankewitz, Sugawa, and Sumi used pointwise thinness to establish the HNUP property for several examples in their paper [19]. However, they also pointed out that this property is stronger than HNUP and gave an example, originally due to Curt McMullen in [14], of a set of positive 2-dimensional Lebesgue measure which is HNUP but not pointwise thin.

1.3. Statements of the Main Results. The construction of the sequences of polynomials we consider in this paper begins with a sequence $\{c_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ in $\mathbb{C}^\mathbb{N}$ where we require that $|c_k| > 4$ for every k . Using this, we define a sequence $\{m_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ of natural numbers for which we have, for each $k \geq 1$,

$$(1) \quad 2^{2^{m_k}} \geq 2\sqrt{|c_k|}.$$

Since $|c_k| > 4$ for every k , we clearly then have the following weaker condition which will suffice for most of our results

$$(2) \quad 2^{2^{m_k}} > \sqrt{|c_k|} + 1.$$

Now set $M_0 = 0$, $M_k = \sum_{j=1}^k (m_j + 1)$ for each $k \geq 1$, and define a sequence of quadratic polynomials $\{P_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ by

$$P_m = \begin{cases} z^2 + c_k, & \text{if } m = M_k \text{ for some } k \geq 1 \\ z^2, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Hence each $Q_{M_{k-1}, M_{k-1}+m_k}(z) = z^{2^{m_k}}$, $Q_{M_{k-1}, M_k}(z) = z^{2^{m_k+1}} + c_k$, $Q_{M_k} = Q_{M_{k-1}, M_k} \circ \cdots \circ Q_{M_1, M_2} \circ Q_{M_0, M_1}$ has degree 2^{M_k} , and we have the following three observations.

Remark 1. (a) Note that (1) ensures that the image of the closed disc $\bar{D}(0, 2)$ under m_k iterations of z^2 , i.e., $Q_{M_{k-1}, M_{k-1}+m_k}$, will cover the disc $\bar{D}(0, 2\sqrt{|c_k|}) \supset \bar{D}(0, \sqrt{|c_k|} + 1)$. However, for all but the proof of Theorem 1.6, we only require the consequence of the weaker inequality (2) that gives that the image of the closed disc $\bar{D}(0, 2)$ under $Q_{M_{k-1}, M_{k-1}+m_k}$ will cover the disc $\bar{D}(0, \sqrt{|c_k|} + 1) \supset \bar{D}(\pm\sqrt{-c_k}, 1)$.

Since $|c_k| > 4$, we see that $\bar{D}(\sqrt{-c_k}, 1)$ lies outside $\bar{D}(0, 1)$, and so it follows that $Q_{M_{k-1}, M_{k-1}+m_k}^{-1}(\bar{D}(\sqrt{-c_k}, 1))$ consists of 2^{m_k} components, each of which is contained in $\bar{D}(0, 2) \setminus \bar{D}(0, 1)$. Similarly, by also considering $Q_{M_{k-1}, M_{k-1}+m_k}^{-1}(\bar{D}(-\sqrt{-c_k}, 1))$, we note that one can quickly conclude that the preimage under $Q_{M_{k-1}, M_{k-1}+m_k}$ of $\bar{D}(\sqrt{-c_k}, 1) \cup \bar{D}(-\sqrt{-c_k}, 1)$ consists of 2^{m_k+1} components, each differing from another by a rotation (about 0) by a multiple of $\frac{2\pi}{2^{m_k+1}}$.

(b) We also note that the preimage of $\bar{D}(0, 2)$ under $P_{M_k}(z) = z^2 + c_k$ with $|c_k| > 4$ consists of two components about $\pm\sqrt{-c_k}$ which are contained in the two discs $\bar{D}(\sqrt{-c_k}, 1)$, $\bar{D}(-\sqrt{-c_k}, 1)$. This is quickly seen by noting that the derivative of the inverse branches of P_{M_k} have modulus less than $1/2$ on $\bar{D}(0, 2)$.

(c) Since $|c_k| > 4$, the map Q_{M_{k-1}, M_k} has a full set of 2^{m_k+1} inverse branches on $\bar{D}(0, 4)$. Hence, by parts (a) and (b), we see that the set $Q_{M_{k-1}, M_k}^{-1}(\bar{D}(0, 2)) = Q_{M_{k-1}, M_{k-1}+m_k}^{-1}(P_{M_k}^{-1}(\bar{D}(0, 2)))$ is shown to consist of 2^{m_k+1} components, one for each branch, each of which is contained in $\bar{D}(0, 2) \setminus \bar{D}(0, 1)$. (See Figure 1.)

Given such a sequence, for each $k \geq 1$, we define the k th survival set \mathcal{S}_k at time 0 by

$$(3) \quad \mathcal{S}_k = Q_{M_k}^{-1}(\bar{D}(0, 2)) = Q_{M_0, M_1}^{-1}(\cdots \cdots (Q_{M_{k-1}, M_k}^{-1}(\bar{D}(0, 2))) \cdots).$$




FIGURE 1. How the survival sets \mathcal{S}_k are nested. The pictures show preimages of $\overline{D}(0, 2)$ at stages M_k (in red) and M_{k-1} (in blue) with $m_k = 3$. The dashed blue circle is $C(0, 2)$ while the unit circle is shown in black. Observe how $Q_{M_{k-1}, M_k}^{-1}(\overline{D}(0, 2)) \subset \overline{D}(0, 2) \setminus \overline{D}(0, 1)$ as in Remark 1(c) is shown in red in Stage M_{k-1} .

Remark 2. Note that the sets $\mathcal{S}_k \subset \overline{D}(0, 2) \setminus \overline{D}(0, 1)$ are decreasing in k by Remark 1(c). Also, $Q_{M_k}(\mathcal{S}_{k+1}) = Q_{M_k, M_{k+1}}^{-1}(\overline{D}(0, 2)) \subset \overline{D}(0, 2) \setminus \overline{D}(0, 1)$. Lastly, by repeatedly applying Remark 1(c), \mathcal{S}_k consists of 2^{M_k} components.

Given this, our first theorem is as follows:

Theorem 1.5. *For a sequence $\{P_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ as above, we have $\mathcal{J} = \bigcap_{k \geq 1} \mathcal{S}_k$. Consequently, for each $m \geq 0$,*

$$\mathcal{J}_m = Q_m \left(\bigcap_{k \geq 1} \mathcal{S}_k \right) = \bigcap_{k \geq 1} Q_m(\mathcal{S}_k).$$

Using this, we are able to prove the main result of our paper:

Theorem 1.6. *For a sequence $\{P_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ as above, \mathcal{J}_m is uniformly perfect for every $m \geq 0$ if and only if $\{c_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is bounded, and \mathcal{J}_m is pointwise thin and HNUP for every $m \geq 0$ if and only if $\{c_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is unbounded.*

We have the following three important observations.

- Remark 3.** (a) We note that the existence of a HNUP Julia set is a new phenomenon related to non-autonomous dynamics of unbounded sequences that is not present in classical rational iteration or (non-elementary) semigroup dynamics. In particular, the Julia set of a rational function of degree two or more is uniformly perfect (see [7, 10, 12]). Also, the Julia set of a bounded sequence of polynomials is uniformly perfect (see Theorem 1.6 of [22]).
- (b) Furthermore, by [17], the Julia set of any non-elementary rational semigroup G , which is allowed to contain or even consist of Möbius maps, is uniformly perfect when there is a uniform upper bound on the Lipschitz constants (with respect to the spherical metric) of the generators of G . Hence we justify our claim in (a) above as follows. Suppose that G is a non-elementary rational semigroup (i.e., its Julia set $J(G)$ is such that $\#J(G) \geq 3$), with no assumption regarding the Lipschitz constants of the generators. Since the repelling fixed points of the elements of G are then dense in $J(G)$ (see [18]), we may select distinct $a, b, c \in J(G)$ to be repelling fixed points of maps f, g, h in G . Denoting by $G' = \langle f, g, h \rangle$, the subsemigroup of G generated by f, g, h , we then must have that $J(G)$ contains the uniformly perfect set $J(G')$, and hence $J(G)$ is not HNUP.

- (c) If $J_1 \subset \mathbb{C}$ and $J_2 \subset \mathbb{C}$ are topological Cantor sets, J_1 is uniformly perfect, and $\varphi : \widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus J_1 \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus J_2$ is a quasiconformal homeomorphism, then J_2 is also uniformly perfect. Thus, if J_2 is a HNUP iterated Julia set (at some time $m \geq 0$) of some polynomial sequence (e.g. as in Theorem 1.6) and J_1 is a uniformly perfect iterated Julia set of some polynomial sequence (e.g. the Julia set of iteration of a single polynomial of degree two or more), then there exists no quasiconformal map $\varphi : \widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus J_1 \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus J_2$. In particular, this implies that none of the sequences in Theorem 1.6 with HNUP iterated Julia sets can be conjugate via quasiconformal mappings to a sequence whose Julia sets are uniformly perfect Cantor sets.

Since our sets \mathcal{J}_m are basically fractal constructions, it is of interest to know as much as possible about their Hausdorff dimensions $\text{HD}(\mathcal{J}_m)$.

Theorem 1.7. *For any sequence $\{P_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ as above, for each $m \geq 0$, $\text{HD}(\mathcal{J}_m) \leq 1$.*

On the other hand, hereditarily non uniformly perfect is a notion of thinness of sets and it is therefore interesting to find examples of HNUP sets which nevertheless have positive Hausdorff dimension as was done by Stankewitz, Sugawa, and Sumi in [19]. This is also the case with our examples, and the upper bound given in the statement of the above result can, in fact, be attained.

Theorem 1.8. *There exists a sequence $\{P_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ as above such that, for each $m \geq 0$, \mathcal{J}_m is pointwise thin and HNUP but $\text{HD}(\mathcal{J}_m) = 1$.*

The organization of the remainder of this paper is as follows. In Section 2, we state and prove some ancillary lemmas and give the proofs of Theorems 1.5 and 1.6. Roughly speaking, Theorem 1.5 says that the Julia set \mathcal{J} is the limit set of a suitable non-autonomous conformal iterated function system, as considered in the paper of Rempe-Gillen and Urbánski [15]. This is the point of view we will adopt in Section 3 when we turn to considering the Hausdorff dimensions of the iterated Julia sets. In particular, we use it to prove Theorem 1.7, and then, using Bowen's formula given in [15] (restated here as Theorem 3.4), we show that we can choose our sequence of constants $\{c_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ and integers $\{m_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ to prove Theorem 1.8, that is, to obtain the highest possible Hausdorff dimension.

2. PROOFS OF THEOREMS 1.5 AND 1.6

We first prove two small lemmas which will be of use to us in obtaining Theorems 1.5 and 1.6 on characterizing the iterated Julia sets and obtaining HNUP examples (respectively).

Lemma 2.1. *For a sequence $\{P_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ as above, we have the following.*

(a) *For any $k \geq 1$ and any $n \geq 2$, if $|z| > 2^n$, then*

$$|Q_{M_{k-1}, M_k}(z)| > 2^{n+1}.$$

(b) *For each $z_0 \in \bigcap_{k \geq 1} \mathcal{S}_k$, the orbit $\{Q_m(z_0)\}_{m=0}^\infty$ lies entirely outside of the closed unit disk.*

Proof. For part (a), we first note that $f(x, y) = 2^{xy} - 2^y - 2^{x+1} \geq f(2, 4) > 0$ for all $(x, y) \in R := [2, +\infty) \times [4, +\infty)$, which is an immediate consequence of the mean value theorem and the fact that the partial derivatives f_x and f_y are each strictly positive on R .

Now let $|z| > 2^n$ where $n \geq 2$. Since $|c_k| < 2^{2^{m_k+1}}$ by inequality (2), applying the above using $x = n$ and $y = 2^{m_k+1}$ gives $|Q_{M_{k-1}, M_k}(z)| = |z^{2^{m_k+1}} + c_k| > (2^n)^{2^{m_k+1}} - 2^{2^{m_k+1}} > 2^{n+1}$.

We let $z_0 \in \bigcap_{k \geq 1} \mathcal{S}_k$, and prove part (b) by contradiction. Suppose not, and call m_0 the smallest index such that $Q_{m_0}(z_0) \in \overline{D}(0, 1)$. If m_0 is not equal to any M_k (note that, since $M_0 = 0$, in particular this implies that $m_0 \geq 1$), then $P_{m_0}(z) = z^2$ and we have a contradiction (to the minimality of m_0) since that would imply $Q_{m_0-1}(z_0) \in \overline{D}(0, 1)$ (else we could not have $P_{m_0}(Q_{m_0-1}(z_0)) = Q_{m_0}(z_0) \in \overline{D}(0, 1)$). However, if $m_0 = M_{k_0}$ for some $k_0 \geq 0$, then we see that, since $z_0 \in \mathcal{S}_{k_0+1}$, Remark 2 gives that $Q_{M_{k_0}}(\mathcal{S}_{k_0+1}) = Q_{M_{k_0}, M_{k_0+1}}^{-1}(\overline{D}(0, 2)) \subset \overline{D}(0, 2) \setminus \overline{D}(0, 1)$, which yields a contradiction. \square

Lemma 2.2. *Let $\{P_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of quadratic polynomials as above:*

(a) *For $0 \leq m < n$ and $z \in Q_m(\bigcap_{k \geq 1} \mathcal{S}_k)$, we have $|Q'_{m,n}(z)| \geq 2^{n-m}$.*

(b) *Let $k \geq 1$ and let $f(z) = (z - c_k)^{1/2^{m_k+1}}$ be any inverse branch of Q_{M_{k-1}, M_k} , which is defined on $D(0, 4)$. Then, for $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq 1$, we have*

$$\sup\{|f'(z)| : z \in \overline{D}(0, 2 + \varepsilon)\} = \frac{1}{2^{m_k+1}}(|c_k| - 2 - \varepsilon) \binom{\frac{1}{2^{m_k+1}} - 1}{-1} \leq \eta_\varepsilon,$$

where $\eta_\varepsilon := \frac{1}{2^{1+1}}(2 - \varepsilon)^{\left(\frac{1}{2^{1+1}} - 1\right)}$. In particular, using $\varepsilon = 0$ gives

$$\sup\{|f'(z)| : z \in \overline{D}(0, 2)\} = \frac{1}{2^{m_k+1}}(|c_k| - 2)^{\left(\frac{1}{2^{m_k+1}} - 1\right)} \leq \eta = 2^{-\frac{11}{4}} < 1.$$

Proof. Part (a) follows immediately by Lemma 2.1(b) and the fact that the absolute value of the derivative of any quadratic of the form $z^2 + c$ is greater than 2 at any point outside the closed unit disk.

To prove part (b), note that $|f'(z)| = \frac{1}{2^{m_k+1}}|z - c_k|^{\left(\frac{1}{2^{m_k+1}} - 1\right)}$. Since $|c_k| > 4$ and $m_k \geq 1$, we then have that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup\{|f'(z)| : z \in D(0, 2 + \varepsilon)\} &= \frac{1}{2^{m_k+1}}(|c_k| - 2 - \varepsilon)^{\left(\frac{1}{2^{m_k+1}} - 1\right)} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2^{m_k+1}}(2 - \varepsilon)^{\left(\frac{1}{2^{m_k+1}} - 1\right)} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2^{1+1}}(2 - \varepsilon)^{\left(\frac{1}{2^{1+1}} - 1\right)} = \eta_\varepsilon. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Theorem 1.5. We first prove the result for $m = 0$, basing our proof on showing that $\bigcap_{k \geq 1} \mathcal{S}_k$ is precisely the set of points whose orbits do not escape locally uniformly to infinity.

Suppose first that $z \notin \bigcap_{k \geq 1} \mathcal{S}_k$, i.e., $|Q_{M_k}(z)| > 2$ for some k . From (2) we then get that $|Q_{M_k+m_{k+1}}(z)| > \sqrt{|c_{k+1}|} + 1$ and so, since $|c_{k+1}| > 4$, we obtain $|Q_{M_{k+1}}(z)| > 5 > 4$. It then follows easily from Lemma 2.1(a) that $Q_{M_j}(z) \rightarrow \infty$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$. Note that, for each $j \geq k$ and $0 \leq N \leq m_{j+1}$, since $Q_{M_j, M_j+N}(z) = z^{2^N}$, we see that $|Q_{M_j+N}(z)| = |Q_{M_j, M_j+N}(Q_{M_j}(z))| > |Q_{M_j}(z)|$. From this it clearly follows that $Q_m(z) \rightarrow \infty$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$, and at a rate which is locally uniform, whence we must have that $z \in \mathcal{F}$.

On the other hand, let $z \in \bigcap_{k \geq 1} \mathcal{S}_k$. Then $|Q_{M_k}(z)| \leq 2$ for every k , while Lemma 2.2(a) yields that $|Q'_{M_k}(z)| > 2^{M_k} \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. This shows that no subsequence of $\{Q_{M_k}\}$ can converge locally uniformly (to what would have to be a holomorphic function) in any neighbourhood of z , whence $z \in \mathcal{J}$ as desired.

The result for all $m \geq 0$ then follows immediately from complete invariance (Theorem 1.1) and the fact that the sets \mathcal{S}_k are nested and compact. \square

Remark 4. The proofs presented for the previous results together with the results on Hausdorff dimension proved in Section 3 only require the weaker inequality in (2). Only in the next proof of the HNUP property do we employ the stronger inequality in (1).

Proof of Theorem 1.6. If the sequence $\{c_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is bounded, then the polynomial sequence $\{P_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ is bounded and it is well known that the iterated Julia sets for a bounded polynomial sequence are uniformly perfect. Moreover, if $\{P_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ is a sequence of rational maps such that $\deg(P_m) \geq 2$ for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and such that $\{P_m \mid m \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is relatively compact in the space Rat of all rational maps endowed with the topology of uniform convergence on the Riemann sphere, then the Julia set of the sequence $\{P_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly perfect. These results follow from Theorem 1.26 of [22] (where one considers the skew product on the Riemann sphere on the closure of $\{\sigma^n(P_1, P_2, \dots) \mid n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}\}$ where $\sigma : \text{Rat}^\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \text{Rat}^\mathbb{N}$ denotes the shift map on the infinite product space $\text{Rat}^\mathbb{N}$, which is a compact metric space).

Now suppose $\limsup |c_k| = +\infty$. We first show that \mathcal{J} is HNUP by showing it is pointwise thin as defined in Section 1.2 via the formulation in terms of conformal annuli.

Fix $k \geq 1$. As noted in Remark 1(b) and illustrated in Figure 1, $P_{M_k}^{-1}(\overline{D}(0, 2))$ consists of two components about $\pm\sqrt{-c_k}$ which are contained in the two discs $\overline{D}(\sqrt{-c_k}, 1)$, $\overline{D}(-\sqrt{-c_k}, 1)$. Hence the (round) annulus $A(\sqrt{-c_k}, 1, \sqrt{|c_k|})$ separates $P_{M_k}^{-1}(\overline{D}(0, 2))$. Consider an open slit plane $S = \mathbb{C} \setminus R$, where R is a ray emanating from the origin which does not meet either of the open disks $D(\sqrt{-c_k}, \sqrt{|c_k|})$, $D(-\sqrt{-c_k}, \sqrt{|c_k|})$. (For example, in the case that $c_k > 0$, R could be either $(-\infty, 0]$ or $[0, +\infty)$ as illustrated in Figure 2 where $k = 2$.)

Since S is simply connected and does not contain the origin, the map $Q_{M_{k-1}, M_{k-1}+m_k}(z) = z^{2^{m_k}}$ has 2^{m_k} inverse branches defined on S , with each differing by a factor of a 2^{m_k} -th root of unity. Call one such inverse branch f , and note $A_k := f(A(\sqrt{-c_k}, 1, \sqrt{|c_k|})) \subset f(D(\sqrt{-c_k}, \sqrt{|c_k|}))$ is a conformal annulus of modulus $\frac{\log |c_k|}{2}$ which, by (1) (see also Remark 1(a)), lies entirely in $D(0, 2)$ and separates one of the 2^{m_k+1} components of $Q_{M_{k-1}, M_k}^{-1}(\overline{D}(0, 2)) = Q_{M_{k-1}, M_{k-1}+m_k}^{-1}(P_{M_k}^{-1}(\overline{D}(0, 2)))$ from each of the other components. Clearly, by rotational symmetry about the origin, we can obtain a collection \mathcal{C} of 2^{m_k+1} such conformal annuli, each separating a different one of the 2^{m_k+1} components of the set $Q_{M_{k-1}, M_k}^{-1}(\overline{D}(0, 2))$ from each of the other components.




FIGURE 2. Schematic for the proof of Theorem 1.6 in the case where $\limsup |c_k| = +\infty$. Note how the round annulus $A(\sqrt{-c_k}, 1, \sqrt{|c_k|})$ at stage $M_{k-1} + m_k$ (in this case $M_1 + m_2$) is pulled back conformally first by the preimage branches of $Q_{M_{k-1}, M_{k-1} + m_k}$ to form half the members of the collection \mathcal{C} at Stage M_1 . Then the preimage branches of $Q_{M_{k-1}}$ pull back the annuli in \mathcal{C} (one of which is visible in the zoomed box) to conformal annuli which separate the components of \mathcal{S}_k at stage 0.

Now note that, by applying Remark 1(c) repeatedly, $Q_{M_{k-1}}$ has all $2^{M_{k-1}}$ of its inverse branches defined and univalent on a neighbourhood of $\overline{D}(0, 2)$ (for another perspective we will see later in Section 3, these are just the maps of the form $\varphi_\omega = \varphi_{\omega_1}^{(1)} \circ \cdots \circ \varphi_{\omega_{k-1}}^{(k-1)}$ for all $\omega = \omega_1 \dots \omega_{k-1} \in I^{k-1}$). Applying each such inverse branch to each annulus in \mathcal{C} generates a collection of $2^{M_{k-1}} \cdot 2^{m_k+1} = 2^{M_k}$ conformal annuli each having modulus $\frac{\log|c_k|}{2}$, separating one of the 2^{M_k} components of $Q_{M_k}^{-1}(\overline{D}(0, 2)) = \mathcal{S}_k$ from all other such components, and lying entirely in a component of $Q_{M_{k-1}}^{-1}(\overline{D}(0, 2)) = \mathcal{S}_{k-1}$. (Here, of course, we trivially set $\mathcal{S}_0 = \overline{D}(0, 2)$ to deal with the notation for the case $k = 1$.)

Pick arbitrary $z \in \mathcal{J}$. By the previous result, z must lie in the bounded component of the complement of a conformal annulus of modulus $\frac{\log|c_k|}{2}$, which separates \mathcal{S}_k (and therefore separates \mathcal{J} since every component of \mathcal{S}_k clearly contains a point of \mathcal{J}) and lies in a component of \mathcal{S}_{k-1} . Lemma 2.2(b), applied repeatedly, shows that each component of \mathcal{S}_{k-1} has diameter no larger than $4 \cdot \eta^{k-1}$, and so must shrink to zero as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Since $\limsup \frac{\log|c_k|}{2} = +\infty$, we must have pointwise thinness of \mathcal{J} .

To extend this result to all the iterated Julia sets \mathcal{J}_m , we first observe that if we fix $k \geq 1$ and consider the truncated sequences $\{m_j\}_{j=k}^\infty$, $\{c_j\}_{j=k}^\infty$, then the corresponding polynomial sequence $\{P_m\}_{m=M_k+1}^\infty$ still trivially satisfies the same lower bound on the absolute values of the constants c_k and the same invariance condition (1). This allows us to conclude that the Julia set at time 0 for this truncated sequence, which is the same as \mathcal{J}_{M_k} (the iterated Julia set at time M_k for our *original sequence* $\{P_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$), satisfies the pointwise thinness property where we again know that our separating annuli in our collection \mathcal{C}_{M_k} of arbitrarily large modulus as above lie inside $\overline{D}(0, 2)$. Now pick $m \geq 0$ arbitrary and not equal to any M_j . Then choose k as small as possible so that $m < M_k$. The composition $Q_{m, M_k}(z) = z^{2^{M_k-m}} + c_k$ has a single critical value c_k which avoids $\overline{D}(0, 2)$. By Theorem 1.1, $Q_{m, M_k}^{-1}(\mathcal{J}_{M_k}) = \mathcal{J}_m$. The desired conclusion for \mathcal{J}_m then follows on taking the preimages under Q_{m, M_k} of the conformal annuli in \mathcal{C}_{M_k} which separate \mathcal{J}_{M_k} . \square

Remark 5. The pointwise thinness of \mathcal{J}_m can also be seen to follow from that of \mathcal{J} by using the complete invariance of Theorem 1.1 and noting that pointwise thinness property is preserved under analytic mappings. We leave the details to the reader.

3. RESULTS ON HAUSDORFF DIMENSION

In order to prove Theorems 1.7 and 1.8, we utilize the notion of a non-autonomous conformal iterated function system as presented in [15] showing, in particular, that \mathcal{J} is the limit set of such a system. The reason we can adopt this approach is that, in our case, the inverse branches of the key maps of our sequence are contractions on a suitable set containing the iterated Julia sets (which follows immediately from Theorem 1.5 and part (b) of Lemma 2.2).

Here X will always represent a compact subset of \mathbb{R}^d such that $\overline{\text{int}X} = X$ with X being such that ∂X is smooth or X is convex (our application below uses $X = \overline{D}(0, 2)$ with $\mathbb{R}^d = \mathbb{R}^2 = \mathbb{C}$). Given a conformal map $\varphi : X \rightarrow X$ we denote by $\varphi'(x)$ or $D\varphi(x)$ the derivative of φ evaluated at x , i.e., $\varphi'(x) : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is a similarity linear map. We also put $\|D\varphi\| = \|\varphi'\| = \sup\{|\varphi'(x)| : x \in X\}$, where $|\varphi'(x)|$ (or $|D\varphi(x)|$) denotes the scaling factor (i.e., matrix norm) of $\varphi'(x)$.

Definition 3.1. A *non-autonomous conformal iterated function system* (NCIFS) Φ on the set X is given by a sequence $\Phi^{(1)}, \Phi^{(2)}, \Phi^{(3)}, \dots$, where each $\Phi^{(j)}$ is a collection of functions $(\varphi_i^{(j)} : X \rightarrow X)_{i \in I^{(j)}}$ for which $I^{(j)}$ is a finite or countably infinite index set, such that the following hold.

(A) *Open set condition:* We have

$$\varphi_a^{(j)}(\text{int}(X)) \cap \varphi_b^{(j)}(\text{int}(X)) = \emptyset$$

for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and all distinct indices $a, b \in I^{(j)}$.

(B) *Conformality:* There exists an open connected set $V \supset X$ (independent of i and j) such that each $\varphi_i^{(j)}$ extends to a C^1 conformal diffeomorphism of V into V .

(C) *Bounded distortion:* There exists a constant $K \geq 1$ such that for any $k \leq l$ and any $\omega_k, \omega_{k+1}, \dots, \omega_l$ with each $\omega_j \in I^{(j)}$, the map $\varphi := \varphi_{\omega_k} \circ \varphi_{\omega_{k+1}} \circ \dots \circ \varphi_{\omega_l}$ satisfies

$$|D\varphi(x)| \leq K|D\varphi(y)|$$

for all $x, y \in V$.

(D) *Uniform contraction:* There is a constant $\eta < 1$ such that

$$\|D\varphi\| \leq \eta^m$$

for all sufficiently large m and all $\varphi = \varphi_{\omega_j} \circ \dots \circ \varphi_{\omega_{j+m-1}}$ where $j \geq 1$ and $\omega_k \in I^{(k)}$. In particular, this holds if

$$\|D\varphi_i^{(j)}\| \leq \eta$$

for all $j \geq 1, i \in I^{(j)}$.

Definition 3.2 (Words). For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we define the symbolic space

$$I^k := \prod_{j=1}^k I^{(j)}.$$

Note that k -tuples $(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_k) \in I^k$ may be identified with the corresponding word $\omega_1 \dots \omega_k$.

We now give the definition of the limit set of a NCIFS.

Definition 3.3. For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\omega = \omega_1 \dots \omega_k \in I^k$, we define $\varphi_\omega = \varphi_{\omega_1}^{(1)} \circ \dots \circ \varphi_{\omega_k}^{(k)}$ with

$$X_\omega := \varphi_\omega(X) \text{ and } X_k := \bigcup_{\omega \in I^k} X_\omega.$$

The *limit set* (or *attractor*) of Φ is defined as

$$J := J(\Phi) := \bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} X_k.$$

Note that, in the case where each index set $I^{(j)}$ is finite (as is the case with our NCIFS below), the limit set $J(\Phi)$ is compact since it is an intersection of a decreasing sequence of compact sets.

To compute the Hausdorff dimension via Bowen's formula we will employ the following.

Theorem 3.4 (Proposition 1.3 of [15]). *Suppose that Φ is a system such that both limits*

$$a := \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{k} \log \#I^{(k)}$$

and

$$b := \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty, j \in I^{(k)}} \frac{1}{k} \log \left(1 / \|D\varphi_j^{(k)}\| \right)$$

exist and are finite and positive. Then $HD(J(\Phi)) = a/b$.

Note that the limit for b , when it exists, must exist independently of the choices of $j = j(k)$ taken from each $I^{(k)}$. In our application, we will see that the quantities $\|D\varphi_j^{(k)}\|$ will always be independent of j .

Our next step is to verify that we can obtain a NCIFS Φ whose limit set $J(\Phi)$ will be identical with $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{J}_0$. First we set $X := \overline{D}(0, 2)$. As noted in Remark 1(c), each map $Q_{M_{k-1}, M_k}(z) = z^{2^{m_k+1}} + c_k$ has the full set of 2^{m_k+1} branches of the inverse each defined on $D(0, 4) \supset X$. For each

fixed k , we denote this set of inverse functions by $\{\varphi_j^{(k)}\}_{j=1}^{2^{m_k+1}}$, which we choose as our $\Phi^{(k)}$, noting then that $\#I^{(k)} = 2^{m_k+1}$ in Definition 3.1. It then follows from the invariance condition Remark 1(c) that each of the maps $\varphi_j^{(k)}$, $j = 1, \dots, 2^{m_k+1}$ maps the set X into itself.

By Lemma 2.2(b), we see that

$$(4) \quad \|(\varphi_j^{(k)})'\| = \sup\{|(\varphi_j^{(k)})'(x)| : x \in X\} = \frac{1}{2^{m_k+1}}(|c_k| - 2)^{\left(\frac{1}{2^{m_k+1}} - 1\right)}.$$

Note that $\|(\varphi_j^{(k)})'\|$ is in particular independent of j and thus of the particular inverse branch used. Using the terminology given in Definition 4.1 on page 1993 of [15], we can thus say our system Φ is *balanced*.

We now quickly verify that conditions (A)-(D) of Definition 3.1 are met, thus giving that the associated Φ is indeed a NCIFS.

The open set condition (A) follows immediately from Remark 1(c) (see Figure 1 for an illustration). Note that the sets X_k from Definition 3.3 are identical with the sets \mathcal{S}_k in (3), and thus, by Remark 2, are a union of $\prod_{i=1}^k 2^{m_i+1} = 2^{M_k}$ mutually disjoint sets. As noted in [15], for dimension $d = 2$ the bounded distortion condition (C) follows from (B), shown below, and the standard distortion theorems for univalent functions, e.g., Theorem 1.6 of [4]. Since the maps $\varphi_j^{(k)}$ send X into itself, the uniform contraction condition (D) holds by Lemma 2.2(b) with $\eta = 2^{-\frac{11}{4}}$.

It remains to show the conformality condition (B), which we establish using Lemma 2.2(b) with $V = D(0, 2 + \varepsilon)$ for any small fixed $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\eta_\varepsilon < 1$. Fixing $k \geq 1$ and $j \in I^{(k)}$, gives that $\sup\{|(\varphi_j^{(k)})'(x)| : x \in V\} \leq \eta_\varepsilon$, which, combined with the convexity of V and the fact that $\varphi_j^{(k)}(X) \subseteq X$, yields that each point of $\varphi_j^{(k)}(V)$ must lie within a distance of $\eta_\varepsilon \cdot \varepsilon$ of $\varphi_j^{(k)}(X) \subseteq X$, and so $\varphi_j^{(k)}(V) \subseteq \overline{D}(0, 2 + \eta_\varepsilon \cdot \varepsilon) \subseteq V$.

Before embarking on proving Theorems 1.7 and 1.8, we remark that the limit set of the NCIFS Φ constructed above does indeed coincide with the Julia set \mathcal{J} , this being an immediate consequence of Theorem 1.5 and the fact that each $\mathcal{S}_k = X_k$.

Proof of Theorem 1.7. We prove the result for the case $m = 0$. Using part (a) of Proposition 3.3 of [8], the result for the other iterated Julia sets follows from complete invariance (Theorem 1.1) and the fact that the polynomials P_m are complex analytic and therefore 1-Hölder.

For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and any $j \in I^{(n)}$, by (4) we see that, since $|c_n| > 4$, we must have $\|(\varphi_j^{(n)})'\| \leq \frac{1}{2^{m_n+1}}$. For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\omega = \omega_1 \dots \omega_k \in I^k$, we then see that $\varphi_\omega = \varphi_{\omega_1}^{(1)} \circ \dots \circ \varphi_{\omega_k}^{(k)}$ satisfies $\|\varphi'_\omega\| \leq \frac{1}{2^{m_1+1}} \cdots \frac{1}{2^{m_k+1}} = \frac{1}{2^{M_k}}$. Hence, by the convexity of X , X_k is covered by 2^{M_k} sets $X_\omega = \varphi_\omega(X)$ with diameters $\text{diam}(X_\omega) \leq \frac{1}{2^{M_k}} \cdot \text{diam}(X) = \frac{4}{2^{M_k}}$.

Fix $\delta > 0$. We then choose k such that $\frac{4}{2^{M_k}} < \delta$, and note that, since $\mathcal{J} \subset X_k$, we have $\mathcal{H}_\delta^1(\mathcal{J}) \leq 2^{M_k} \cdot \frac{4}{2^{M_k}} = 4$. Letting $\delta \rightarrow 0$, we see that the Hausdorff 1-dimensional measure satisfies $\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{J}) \leq 4$, thus implying $\text{HD}(\mathcal{J}) \leq 1$. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.8. We first restrict ourself to the case where $m = 0$ and show we can construct our sequence $\{P_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ so that $\text{HD}(\mathcal{J}) = 1$.

Define two sequences of real numbers $\{a_k\}_{k=1}^\infty, \{b_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ by

$$(5) \quad a_k := \frac{1}{k} \log \#I^{(k)} = \frac{1}{k} \log 2^{m_k+1} = \frac{1}{k} (m_k + 1) \log 2,$$

and, using (4),

$$(6) \quad b_k := \frac{1}{k} \log \frac{1}{\|(\varphi_j^{(k)})'\|} = \frac{1}{k} \log \left(2^{m_k+1} (|c_k| - 2)^{\left(1 - \frac{1}{2^{m_k+1}}\right)} \right)$$

$$(7) \quad = \frac{1}{k} \left[(m_k + 1) \log 2 + \left(1 - \frac{1}{2^{m_k+1}}\right) \log(|c_k| - 2) \right]$$

$$(8) \quad = a_k + \frac{1}{k} \left[\left(1 - \frac{1}{2^{m_k+1}}\right) \log(|c_k| - 2) \right].$$

Now we show that we can choose $\{m_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ and $\{c_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ satisfying (1) with $|c_k| \rightarrow \infty$ (and each $|c_k| > 4$) so \mathcal{J} will be HNUP by Theorem 1.6.

By (5) and (8), we see that by ensuring

- (i) $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{m_k}{k}$ exists as a finite and positive number, and
- (ii) $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log |c_k|}{k} = 0$,

it follows that $\{a_k\}$ and $\{b_k\}$ are convergent with the same finite and positive limit. Thus, we may apply Theorem 3.4 to conclude that $\text{HD}(J(\Phi)) = \text{HD}(\mathcal{J}) = 1$.

To see this can indeed happen, for each $k \geq 1$, we set $c_k = k + 4$ and $m_k = k + 1$. One can then check readily that the invariance condition

(1) is satisfied for all k . It is also easy to verify that both of the conditions (i) and (ii) above are met, whence the result follows.

We now complete the proof by considering an arbitrary $m_0 > 0$. Choose some $M_k > m_0$. By the complete invariance shown in Theorem 1.1, we have $Q_{m_0, M_k}(\mathcal{J}_{m_0}) = \mathcal{J}_{M_k}$. As was done in last part of the proof of Theorem 1.6, we apply the above argument to the truncated sequence $\{P_m\}_{m=M_k+1}^\infty$ to show $\text{HD}(\mathcal{J}_{M_k}) = 1$. Again applying part (a) of Proposition 3.3 in [8] for the 1-Hölder map Q_{m_0, M_k} , we then must have $1 = \text{HD}(\mathcal{J}_{M_k}) \leq \text{HD}(\mathcal{J}_{m_0}) \leq 1$, where the last inequality follows from Theorem 1.7. \square

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was partially supported by a grant from the Simons Foundation (#318239 to Rich Stankewitz).

The third author (Hiroki Sumi) was partially supported by JSPS Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (B) Grant number JP 19H01790.

REFERENCES

- [1] L. V. Ahlfors, *Complex Analysis*, McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, third edition, 1978. An introduction to the theory of analytic functions of one complex variable, International Series in Pure and Applied Mathematics.
- [2] Francisco Balibrea, On problems of topological dynamics in non-autonomous discrete systems, *Appl. Math. Nonlinear Sci.*, **1(2)** (2016), 391–404. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21042/AMNS.2016.2.00034>
- [3] E. Camouzis and G. Ladas, *Dynamics of Third-Order Rational Difference Equations with Open Problems and Conjectures*, Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2007.
- [4] Lennart Carleson and Theodore W. Gamelin, *Complex Dynamics*, Universitext: Tracts in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1993.
- [5] M. Comerford, A survey of results in random iteration, *Proceedings Symposia in Pure Mathematics*, American Mathematical Society, 2004.
- [6] M. Comerford, Hyperbolic non-autonomous Julia sets, *Ergodic Theory Dynamical Systems*, **26** (2006), 353–377.
- [7] A. Eremenko, Julia sets are uniformly perfect, Preprint, Purdue University, 1992.
- [8] Kenneth Falconer, *Fractal Geometry*, John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Chichester, third edition, 2014. Mathematical foundations and applications.
- [9] John Erik Fornæss and Nessim Sibony. Random iterations of rational functions, *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, **11(4)** (1991), 687–708.
- [10] A. Hinkkanen. Julia sets of rational functions are uniformly perfect, *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, **113(3)** (1993), 543–559.

- [11] S. Kolyada, L. Snoha. Topological entropy of nonautonomous dynamical systems, *Random Comput. Dynam.*, **(4)** (1996), 205–233.
- [12] R. Mañé and L. F. da Rocha. Julia sets are uniformly perfect, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **116(1)** (1992), 251–257.
- [13] Curtis T. McMullen. *Complex Dynamics and Renormalization*, Volume 135 of Annals of Mathematics Studies, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1994.
- [14] Curtis T. McMullen. Winning sets, quasiconformal maps and Diophantine approximation, *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, **20(3)** (2010), 726–740.
- [15] Lasse Rempe-Gillen and Mariusz Urbański. Non-autonomous conformal iterated function systems and Moran-set constructions, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **368(3)** (2016), 1979–2017.
- [16] O. Sester. Hyperbolicité des polynômes fibrés, (French) [Hyperbolicity of fibered polynomials], *Bull. Soc. Math. France*, **127(3)** (1999), 398–428.
- [17] Rich Stankewitz. Uniformly perfect sets, rational semigroups, Kleinian groups and IFS's, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **128(9)** (2000), 2569–2575.
- [18] Rich Stankewitz. Density of repelling fixed points in the Julia set of a rational or entire semigroup, II, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, **32(7)** (2012), 2583–2589.
- [19] Rich Stankewitz, Hiroki Sumi, and Toshiyuki Sugawa. Hereditarily non uniformly perfect sets, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst S*, **12(8)** (2019), 2391–2402. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3934/DCDSS.2019150>
- [20] Hiroki Sumi. Skew product maps related to finitely generated rational semigroups, *Nonlinearity*, **13** (2000), 995–1019.
- [21] Hiroki Sumi. Dynamics of sub-hyperbolic and semi-hyperbolic rational semigroups and skew products, *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, **21** (2001), 563–603.
- [22] Hiroki Sumi. Semi-hyperbolic fibered rational maps and rational semigroups, *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, **26(3)** (2006), 893–922.
- [23] Hiroki Sumi. Dynamics of postcritically bounded polynomial semigroups III: classification of semi-hyperbolic semigroups and random Julia sets which are Jordan curves but not quasircircles, *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, **30(6)** (2010), 1869–1902.
- [24] Wen Zhiying. Moran sets and Moran classes, *Chinese Sci. Bull.*, **46(22)** (2001), 1849–1856.

E-mail address: mcomerford@math.uri.edu

E-mail address: rstankewitz@bsu.edu

E-mail address: sumi@math.h.kyoto-u.ac.jp