



On the Existence of Doubling Measures with Certain Regularity Properties

Author(s): Per Bylund and Jaume Gudayol

Source: *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, Vol. 128, No. 11 (Nov., 2000), pp. 3317-3327

Published by: American Mathematical Society

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2668668>

Accessed: 06/02/2009 08:20

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=ams>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We work with the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



American Mathematical Society is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

ON THE EXISTENCE OF DOUBLING MEASURES WITH CERTAIN REGULARITY PROPERTIES

PER BYLUND AND JAUME GUDAYOL

(Communicated by Dale Alspach)

ABSTRACT. Given a compact pseudo-metric space, we associate to it upper and lower dimensions, depending only on the pseudo-metric. Then we construct a doubling measure for which the measure of a dilated ball is closely related to these dimensions.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let (X, ρ) be a compact metric space. Suppose that (X, ρ) is homogeneous. This means that there exists a doubling measure μ supported by X ; i.e. there is a constant c such that, for $x \in X$ and $R > 0$, one has $0 < \mu(B(x, R)) < \infty$ and

$$(1) \quad \mu(B(x, 2R)) \leq c\mu(B(x, R)).$$

Dynkin proved in [Dyn] that for certain subsets E of the unit sphere $\mathbb{T} \subset \mathbb{C}$ there exists a doubling measure on E , and he conjectured that any compact $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is homogeneous. This conjecture was proved in [V-K] by using a dimension first defined in [Lar] called the uniform metric dimension, in this paper denoted by $\Upsilon(E)$. More precisely, Volberg and Konyagin proved that (X, ρ) is homogeneous if and only if there is some $s < \infty$ such that any ball $B(x, kR)$ contains at most Ck^s points separated from each other by a distance of at least R . The uniform metric dimension $\Upsilon(X) = \Upsilon(X, \rho)$ is then defined as the infimum of such s . Furthermore, given $s < \infty$ in the condition above Volberg and Konyagin proved that for any $s' > s$ there exists a measure μ such that, for $0 < R \leq kR$,

$$(2) \quad \mu(B(x, kR)) \leq Ck^{s'}\mu(B(x, R)).$$

Clearly, any measure satisfying (2) is a doubling measure, and conversely, iterating (1) one gets (2) with $s' = \log_2 c$. In particular, Volberg and Konyagin proved Dynkin's conjecture by showing that on any compact $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ there exists a measure μ satisfying (2) with $s = n$ (in the maximum metric).

In this paper we generalize their result by showing the existence of a measure μ not only satisfying (2), but also the following analogous lower bound condition. Suppose there is a $t \geq 0$ such that any ball $B(x, kR)$ contains at least Ck^t points

Received by the editors May 14, 1998 and, in revised form, January 4, 1999.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 28C15; Secondary 54E45, 54F45.

The second author is partially supported by MEC grant PB95-0956-C02-01 and CIRIT grant GRQ94-2014.

separated from each other by a distance of at least R . Then for any $t' < t$ there exists a measure μ such that, for $0 < R \leq kR$,

$$(3) \quad Ck^{t'} \mu(B(x, R)) \leq \mu(B(x, kR)).$$

In [J-W] Jonsson and Wallin studied function spaces on subsets of \mathbb{R}^n supporting measures fulfilling both (2) and (3) in the special case $s' = t'$. Such sets are also called s -sets or Ahlfors-regular sets.

The general case $t' \leq s'$ was considered in [Jon].

The authors of this paper, independently of each other, also studied the general case $t' \leq s'$ in [Byl] and [Gud]. Each of these works contains the main result of this paper, in [Byl] formulated for Euclidean spaces and in [Gud] for metric spaces.

In this paper the result is stated in terms of pseudo-metric spaces.

2. DEFINITIONS AND STATEMENTS OF RESULTS

Throughout we denote by $X = (X, d)$ a compact pseudo-metric space, where $d : X \times X \mapsto [0, +\infty)$ is a pseudo-metric on X , i.e.

1. $d(x, y) = 0 \iff x = y$,
2. $d(x, y) = d(y, x), \quad \forall x, y \in X$,
3. there is a constant C_d such that $d(x, z) \leq C_d(d(x, y) + d(y, z)), \quad \forall x, y, z \in X$.

On X we consider the topology generated by the open pseudo-balls, and without loss of generality we assume that $\text{diam}(X) < 1$.

Given any ball $B(x, kR)$, $x \in X$ and $0 < R \leq kR$, denote by $N(x, R, k)$ the maximum number of points in $B(x, kR)$ separated by a distance greater than or equal to R from each other.

Definition 1. Define $X \in \Upsilon_s$ if there exists $C = C(s)$ such that, for $0 < R \leq kR$,

$$(U_s) \quad N(x, R, k) \leq Ck^s.$$

The upper dimension $\Upsilon(X)$ is then defined as

$$\Upsilon(X) = \inf\{s \mid X \in \Upsilon_s\}.$$

$\Upsilon(X)$ was introduced in [Lar] called the uniform metric dimension.

Definition 2. A positive Borel measure $\mu \in U_s$ if there exists $C = C(s)$ such that, for $x \in X$ and $0 < R \leq kR$,

$$(U_s) \quad \mu(B(x, kR)) \leq Ck^s \mu(B(x, R)).$$

The dimension $U(X)$ is then defined as

$$U(X) = \inf\{s \mid U_s \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Note that by taking $k = 1/R$ in (U_s) one gets the weaker condition

$$(U'_s) \quad \mu(B(x, R)) \geq CR^s, \quad x \in X, \quad 0 < R.$$

Also note that if $\mu \in U_s$, for some s , then $\text{supp}(\mu) = X$. As mentioned in the introduction, μ is doubling precisely when $\mu \in U_s$ for some $s < \infty$. We will write $\mathcal{U} = \bigcup_s U_s$ for the set of all doubling measures on X .

Volberg and Konyagin proved ([V-K]) that $\Upsilon(X) \leq U(X)$, and furthermore:

Theorem 1 (Volberg-Konyagin). *Let X be a compact metric space. If $X \in \Upsilon_s$, then for any $s' > s$ there exists a measure $\mu \in U_{s'}$. Consequently, $\Upsilon(X) = U(X)$.*

Our main result is Theorem 2 extending Theorem 1 to the analogue lower dimension. Note that Theorem 2 is stated for pseudo-metric spaces.

We start by defining the concept of the lower dimension.

The lower dimension.

Definition 3. Define $X \in \Lambda_t$ if there exists $C = C(t)$ such that, for $x \in X$ and $0 < R \leq kR$,

$$(L_t) \quad N(x, R, k) \geq Ck^t.$$

The lower dimension $\Lambda(X)$ is then defined as

$$\Lambda(X) = \sup\{t \mid X \in \Lambda_t\}.$$

$\Lambda(X)$ was introduced in ([Lar]) called the minimal dimension. Note that $X \in \Lambda_0$ is trivial.

Definition 4. A positive Borel measure $\mu \in L_t$ if there exists $C = C(t)$ such that, for $x \in X$ and $0 < R \leq kR$,

$$(L_t) \quad \mu(B(x, kR)) \geq Ck^t \mu(B(x, R)).$$

As before, by taking $k = 1/R$ in (L_t) one gets the weaker condition

$$(L'_t) \quad \mu(B(x, R)) \leq CR^t, \quad x \in X, \quad 0 < R.$$

Now, observe that defining the lower dimension as

$$L(X) = \sup\{t \mid L_t \neq \emptyset\}$$

will not work since $\mu \in L_t$ does not imply $\text{supp}(\mu) = X$, so this will say nothing about $X \setminus \text{supp}(\mu)$. The appropriate definition is as follows.

Definition 5. Define the lower dimension $L(X)$ as

$$L(X) = \sup\{t \mid L_t \cap \mathcal{U} \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Note that L_0 poses no restriction on $\mu \in \mathcal{U}$.

The main theorem. We now state the main result of this paper. Note that in the special case $t = 0$ one can take $t' = t = 0$.

Theorem 2. *Let $X \in \Upsilon_s \cap \Lambda_t$, $0 \leq t \leq s < +\infty$, be a compact pseudo-metric space. Then for any $s' > s$ and $t' < t$ there is a probability measure $\mu \in U_{s'} \cap L_{t'}$.*

From Theorem 2 and Propositions 4 and 5 below we then get

Corollary 3. *If $\Upsilon(X) < +\infty$, then $\Upsilon(X) = U(X)$ and $\Lambda(X) = L(X)$.*

3. PROOF OF THE THEOREM

To prove Theorem 2 we construct a sequence of measures with certain properties and the desired measure μ will be a limit point of this sequence.

We start by proving the trivial inequalities $\Upsilon(X) \leq U(X)$ and $\Lambda(X) \geq L(X)$.

3.1. The trivial inequalities.

Proposition 4. *If $\mu \in U_s$, then $X \in \Upsilon_s$, i.e. $\Upsilon(X) \leq U(X)$.*

Proof. Let $\mu \in U_s$, fix any $x \in X$ and let x_1, \dots, x_N be points in $B(x, kR)$ with $d(x_i, x_j) \geq R$ for $i \neq j$. Since $\mu \in U_s$ and $B(x, 2C_d kR) \subset B(x_i, 4C_d^2 kR)$,

$$\mu(B(x, 2C_d kR)) \leq \mu(B(x_i, 4C_d^2 kR)) \leq C8^s C_d^{3s} k^s \mu(B(x_i, \frac{R}{2C_d})).$$

Also, the balls $B(x_i, R/(2C_d))$ are disjoint and lie in $B(x, 2C_d kR)$, so

$$\mu(B(x, 2C_d kR)) \geq \sum_{i=1}^N \mu(B(x_i, \frac{R}{2C_d})) \geq N \frac{\mu(B(x, 2C_d kR))}{C8^s C_d^{3s} k^s}.$$

Thus $N \leq Ck^s$, i.e. $\Upsilon(X) \leq U(X)$. □

Proposition 5. *If $\mu \in L_t \cap \mathcal{U}$, then $X \in \Lambda_t$, i.e. $\Lambda(X) \leq L(X)$.*

Proof. Let $\{x_1, \dots, x_N\}$ be a maximal set of points in $B(x, kR)$ separated by a distance greater than or equal to R . Fix any $\mu \in L_t \cap \mathcal{U}$. Then, since μ is doubling and $B(x_i, kR) \subset B(x, 2C_d kR)$ for all i ,

$$C\mu(B(x, kR)) \geq \mu(B(x, 2C_d kR)) \geq \mu(B(x_i, kR)) \geq Ck^t \mu(B(x_i, R)).$$

Also, $B(x, kR) \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^N B(x_i, R)$, since $\{x_1, \dots, x_N\}$ is maximal, i.e.

$$\mu(B(x, kR)) \leq \sum_{i=1}^N \mu(B(x_i, R)) \leq \frac{N}{Ck^t} \mu(B(x, kR)).$$

Thus, $N \geq Ck^t$, i.e. $X \in \Lambda_t$. □

3.2. The main lemma. Assume that $X \in \Lambda_t \cap \Upsilon_s$. Let C_d be the constant associated to the pseudo-metric d , C_t the constant appearing in Λ_t and C_s the one in Υ_s . Given $t' < t$ and $s' > s$, choose $A \geq 16C_d^4$ large enough such that $A^{s'-s} > C_s$ and $A^{t-t'} > 4^t C_d^{2t} C_t^{-1}$. For each non-negative integer j , let S_j be a maximal set of points in X separated by a distance greater than or equal to A^{-j} .

Define mappings $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_m : S_{m+1} \rightarrow S_m$ for $m \geq 0$ as follows. For $g \in S_{m+1}$ choose one of the points $e \in S_m$ for which $d(g, e) = d(g, S_m)$, and denote it by $e = \mathcal{E}(g)$. Then for $e \in S_m$ let

$$S_{e,m+1} = \{g \in S_{m+1}, e = \mathcal{E}(g)\}.$$

It is easy to see that $\{S_{e,m+1} \mid e \in S_m\}$ form a partition of S_{m+1} .

The desired measure μ will be a limit of measures μ_m supported by S_m . Lemma 7 below will allow us to perform the inductive step that constructs μ_{m+1} from μ_m . First though we need the following preparatory lemma.

Lemma 6. *Let $e \in S_m$. Then*

$$A^{t'} \leq \#(S_{e,m+1}) \leq A^{s'},$$

where $\#$ denotes the cardinality of a set.

Proof. Fix any $e \in S_m$. Clearly $S_{e,m+1} \subset B(e, A^{-m})$ since S_m is maximal. Therefore, and since $X \in \Upsilon_s$ and $A^{s'-s} > C_s$,

$$\#(S_{e,m+1}) \leq \#(S_{m+1} \cap B(e, A^{-m})) \leq N(e, A^{-m-1}, A) \leq C_s A^s \leq A^{s'},$$

which proves the right inequality of the lemma.

For the left inequality, we first note that there exists $g \in S_{m+1}$ for which $d(g, e) < A^{-m-1}$, and as $A > 2C_d$ it is clear that $e = \mathcal{E}(g)$ for such g .

Also, for $e' \neq e''$ we have $B(e', A^{-m}/2C_d) \cap B(e'', A^{-m}/2C_d) = \emptyset$. Thus,

$$(*) \quad S_{m+1} \cap B(e, A^{-m}/(2C_d)) \subset S_{e, m+1}.$$

Next, for $\{g_i\}_{i=1}^n = S_{m+1} \cap B(e, A^{-m}/2C_d)$ we have

$$(\dagger) \quad n \geq N(e, A^{-m-1}, A/2C_d^2 - 1).$$

To check it, suppose the contrary, that is, suppose that

$$n < N(e, A^{-m-1}, A/2C_d^2 - 1) = n_1.$$

Then there would exist points x_1, \dots, x_{n_1} in $B(e, (A/2C_d^2 - 1)A^{-m-1})$ separated from each other by a distance greater than or equal to A^{-m-1} .

But, for $g \in S_{m+1} \setminus (S_{m+1} \cap B(e, A^{-m}/2C_d))$ we have

$$d(g, x_i) \geq \frac{1}{C_d}d(g, e) - d(e, x_i) \geq \frac{A}{2C_d^2}A^{-m-1} - \left(\frac{A}{2C_d^2} - 1\right)A^{-m-1} = A^{-m-1},$$

which means that the set

$$S'_{m+1} = (\{x_i\}_{i=1}^{n_1} \cup S_{m+1}) \setminus (S_{m+1} \cap B(e, \frac{A}{2C_d}A^{-m-1}))$$

fulfills $\#(S'_{m+1}) > \#(S_{m+1})$, a contradiction to the maximality of S_{m+1} .

Thus, from $(*)$, (\dagger) , the choice of A and the fact that $X \in \Lambda_t$, we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \#(S_{e, m+1}) &\geq \#(S_{m+1} \cap B(e, A^{-m}/2C_d)) \geq N(e, A^{-m-1}, A/2C_d^2 - 1) \\ &\geq C_t (A/2C_d^2 - 1)^t \geq C_t A^t (4C_d^2)^{-t} \geq A^{t'}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 7. *Let f_0 be a measure on S_m such that for any $e, e' \in S_m$ we have*

$$f_0(e') \leq C_1 f_0(e)$$

whenever $d(e, e') \leq C_2 A^{-m}$, with $C_1 = A^{s'-t'}$, and $C_2 = 8C_d^3$. Then there is a measure f_1 on S_{m+1} with the following properties:

(a) $f_1(g') \leq C_1 f_1(g)$ for any $g, g' \in S_{m+1}$ with $d(g, g') \leq C_2 A^{-m-1}$.

(b) If $g \in S_{e, m+1}$, then $A^{-s'} f_0(e) \leq f_1(g) \leq A^{-t'} f_0(e)$.

(c) $f_0(X) = f_1(X)$.

(d) *The construction of the measure f_1 from the measure f_0 can be regarded as a transfer of mass from the points in S_m to those of S_{m+1} , with no mass transferred over a distance greater than $2C_d A^{-m}$. This means that if $g \in S_{m+1}$ receives mass from $e \in S_m$, then $d(g, e) \leq 2C_d A^{-m}$.*

Proof of the lemma. Let f_{00} be the measure obtained by homogeneously distributing the mass of each $e \in S_m$ on the points in $S_{e, m+1}$. By doing so, we obtain a measure satisfying **(b)** (because of Lemma 6), **(c)** and **(d)**. If f_{00} satisfies **(a)**, then let $f_1 = f_{00}$ and we are done.

Assume that f_{00} does not satisfy **(a)**. Let $\{g'_i, g''_i\}_{i=1}^T$ be all the pairs of points in S_{m+1} with $d(g'_i, g''_i) \leq C_2 A^{-m-1}$. We will construct a finite sequence of measures $\{f_{0j}, j = 1, \dots, T\}$, such that f_{0j} will satisfy **(a)** for all the pairs $\{(g'_i, g''_i)\}_{i=1}^j$, and as we will see $f_1 = f_{0T}$ is the desired measure.

The construction of $f_{0_{j+1}}$ from f_{0_j} is as follows:

If $C_1^{-1}f_{0_j}(g''_{j+1}) \leq f_{0_j}(g'_{j+1}) \leq C_1f_{0_j}(g''_{j+1})$, then let $f_{0_{j+1}} = f_{0_j}$. Otherwise, only one of these inequalities can fail, and without loss of generality we may assume that $f_{0_j}(g'_{j+1}) > C_1f_{0_j}(g''_{j+1})$. Then we move mass from g'_{j+1} to g''_{j+1} by defining $f_{0_{j+1}}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} f_{0_{j+1}}(g'_{j+1}) &= f_{0_j}(g'_{j+1}) - \frac{f_{0_j}(g'_{j+1}) - C_1f_{0_j}(g''_{j+1})}{C_1 + 1}; \\ f_{0_{j+1}}(g''_{j+1}) &= f_{0_j}(g''_{j+1}) + \frac{f_{0_j}(g'_{j+1}) - C_1f_{0_j}(g''_{j+1})}{C_1 + 1}; \\ f_{0_{j+1}}(g) &= f_{0_j}(g) \quad \text{if } g \notin \{g'_{j+1}, g''_{j+1}\}. \end{aligned}$$

With this definition $f_{0_{j+1}}(g'_{j+1}) = C_1f_{0_{j+1}}(g''_{j+1})$, which means that **(a)** is true for $f_{0_{j+1}}$ with respect to (g'_{j+1}, g''_{j+1}) . In particular, note that **(a)** is true for f_{0_1} with respect to (g'_1, g''_1) .

We are now going to check condition **(b)** for $f_{0_{j+1}}$. To do so, suppose that **(b)** holds for f_{0_j} , i.e. suppose that

$$A^{-s'}f_0(e) \leq f_1(g) \leq A^{-t'}f_0(e), \quad g \in S_{e,m+1}.$$

If $f_{0_{j+1}} = f_{0_j}$ or $g \notin \{g'_{j+1}, g''_{j+1}\}$, then there is nothing to check. Otherwise, as before we can assume that $f_{0_j}(g'_{j+1}) > C_1f_{0_j}(g''_{j+1})$. Let $e' = \mathcal{E}(g'_{j+1})$ and $e'' = \mathcal{E}(g''_{j+1})$. It is clearly enough to prove that $f_{0_{j+1}}(g'_{j+1}) \geq A^{-s'}f_0(e')$ and $f_{0_{j+1}}(g''_{j+1}) \leq A^{-t'}f_0(e'')$ (because $f_{0_{j+1}}(g'_{j+1}) < f_{0_j}(g'_{j+1}) \leq A^{-t'}f_0(e')$ and $f_{0_{j+1}}(g''_{j+1}) > f_{0_j}(g''_{j+1}) \geq A^{-s'}f_0(e'')$). Now

$$\begin{aligned} d(e', e'') &\leq C_d d(e', g'_{j+1}) + C_d^2 d(g'_{j+1}, g''_{j+1}) + C_d^2 d(g''_{j+1}, e'') \\ &\leq C_d A^{-m} + C_2 C_d^2 A^{-m-1} + C_d^2 A^{-m} \leq C_2 A^{-m}, \end{aligned}$$

so $f_0(e') \leq C_1 f_0(e'')$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} f_{0_{j+1}}(g''_{j+1}) &= C_1^{-1}f_{0_{j+1}}(g'_{j+1}) \leq C_1^{-1}f_{0_j}(g'_{j+1}) \\ &\leq C_1^{-1}A^{-t'}f_0(e') \leq A^{-t'}f_0(e''). \end{aligned}$$

Analogously, $f_0(e'') \geq C_1^{-1}f_0(e')$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} f_{0_{j+1}}(g'_{j+1}) &= C_1f_{0_{j+1}}(g''_{j+1}) \geq C_1f_{0_j}(g''_{j+1}) \\ &\geq C_1A^{-s'}f_0(e'') \geq A^{-s'}f_0(e'). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, since **(b)** holds for f_{0_0} it is clear that it holds for $f_1 = f_{0_T}$ as well.

We are now going to check that when a pair satisfies **(a)** with respect to f_{0_j} , it also does with respect to $f_{0_{j+1}}$. To this end, pick any pair (g_1, g_2) , $d(g_1, g_2) \leq C_2A^{-m-1}$, for which

$$C_1^{-1}f_{0_j}(g_1) \leq f_{0_j}(g_2) \leq C_1f_{0_j}(g_1).$$

If (g_1, g_2) and (g'_{j+1}, g''_{j+1}) have no point in common or if $f_{0_{j+1}} = f_{0_j}$, then we are done. Otherwise, $f_{0_{j+1}} \neq f_{0_j}$ and $f_{0_j}(g'_{j+1}) > C_1f_{0_j}(g''_{j+1})$. Then the two pairs have only one point in common, say g_1 . In this case $f_{0_{j+1}}(g_2) = f_{0_j}(g_2)$.

We have two possible cases to consider, either $g_1 = g'_{j+1}$ or $g_1 = g''_{j+1}$:

1. If $g_1 = g''_{j+1}$, then $f_{0j+1}(g_1) > f_{0j}(g_1)$. Thus, in this case it is enough to prove that $f_{0j+1}(g_1) \leq C_1 f_{0j+1}(g_2)$. Let $e' = \mathcal{E}(g'_{j+1})$ and $e_2 = \mathcal{E}(g_2)$. Then

$$(4) \quad \begin{aligned} d(e', e_2) &\leq C_d d(e', g'_{j+1}) + C_d^3 d(g'_{j+1}, g_1) + C_d^3 d(g_1, g_2) + C_d^2 d(g_2, e_2) \\ &\leq C_d A^{-m} + 2C_d^3 C_2 A^{-m-1} + C_d^2 A^{-m} \leq C_2 A^{-m}, \end{aligned}$$

so $f_0(e') \leq C_1 f_0(e_2)$. Also, since we already know that **(b)** is true, we have $f_0(e_2) \leq A^{s'} f_{0j+1}(g_2)$ and $f_{0j+1}(g'_{j+1}) \leq A^{-t'} f_0(e')$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} f_{0j+1}(g_1) &= f_{0j+1}(g''_{j+1}) = C_1^{-1} f_{0j+1}(g'_{j+1}) \leq C_1^{-1} A^{-t'} f_0(e') \\ &\leq A^{-t'} f_0(e_2) \leq A^{s'-t'} f_{0j}(g_2) = A^{s'-t'} f_{0j+1}(g_2) = C_1 f_{0j+1}(g_2). \end{aligned}$$

2. Otherwise, if $g_1 = g'_{j+1}$, then $f_{0j+1}(g_1) < f_{0j}(g_1)$. Thus, it is enough to check that $f_{0j+1}(g_1) \geq C_1^{-1} f_{0j+1}(g_2)$. But, for $e'' = \mathcal{E}(g''_{j+1})$, then as in (4), $d(e'', e_2) \leq C_2 A^{-m}$. Also, $f_{0j+1}(g_1) = C_1 f_{0j+1}(g''_{j+1})$. Thus, from **(b)** we then get

$$\begin{aligned} f_{0j+1}(g_1) &= C_1 f_{0j+1}(g''_{j+1}) \geq C_1 A^{-s'} f_0(e'') \geq A^{-s'} f_0(e_2) \\ &\geq A^{t'-s'} f_{0j+1}(g_2) = C_1^{-1} f_{0j+1}(g_2). \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof that **(a)** is true for f_1 .

Clearly $f_{0j+1}(X) = f_{0j}(X)$, so **(c)** is also true for f_1 .

It remains to check **(d)**. When passing from f_0 to f_{00} no mass is moved over a distance exceeding A^{-m} , because $S_{e, m+1} \subset B(e, A^{-m})$, and when going from f_{0j} to f_{0j+1} no mass is moved over a distance exceeding $C_2 A^{-m-1}$, and $C_2/A < 1$. It therefore remains to prove that in the construction of f_1 from f_0 there are no pairs (g_1, g_2) and (g_2, g_3) in S_{m+1} for which mass is first moved from g_1 to g_2 and then at a subsequent step from g_2 to g_3 . To prove this, assume the opposite. Then

$$f_{00}(g_1) > C_1 f_{00}(g_2) \quad \text{and} \quad f_{00}(g_2) > C_1 f_{00}(g_3).$$

But, if $e_1 = \mathcal{E}(g_1)$ and $e_3 = \mathcal{E}(g_3)$, then as in (4), $d(e_1, e_3) \leq C_2 A^{-m}$, so by the hypothesis $C_1^{-1} f_0(e_1) \leq f_0(e_3) \leq C_1 f_0(e_1)$. Also,

$$A^{-s'} f_0(e_i) \leq f_{00}(g_i) \leq A^{-t'} f_0(e_i),$$

for $i = 1$ and $i = 3$. Adding these two inequalities, we would then get

$$f_0(e_1) \geq A^{t'} f_{00}(g_1) > C_1 A^{t'} f_{00}(g_2) > C_1^2 A^{t'} f_{00}(g_3) \geq C_1^2 A^{t'-s'} f_0(e_3),$$

contradicting $f_0(e_1) \leq C_1 f_0(e_3)$, as $d(e_1, e_3) \leq C_2 A^{-m}$ and $C_1 = A^{s'-t'}$. \square

3.3. Proof of the theorem. We will now use Lemma 7 to construct a sequence of probability measures and prove that any limit point of this sequence belongs to $L_{t'} \cap U_{s'}$.

We start by defining a probability measure μ_0 on S_0 (note that S_0 consists of one point only, by the assumption $\text{diam}(X) < 1$). Obviously μ_0 satisfies the hypothesis of Lemma 7. By using Lemma 7 to construct $\mu_{j+1} = f_1$ on S_{j+1} from $\mu_j = f_0$, $j \geq 0$, we then get a sequence $\{\mu_j\}_{j=0}^\infty$ of probability measures. This sequence belongs to the unit ball of the dual of the Banach space $\mathcal{C}(X)$, and thus has at least one weak limit point. Let μ be any limit point of this sequence. In the proof we will frequently use the following proposition, based on **(d)** of Lemma 7.

Proposition 8. *Let $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $r \geq 0$, $x \in X$ and put $C_3 = 2C_d^2/(1 - C_d/A)$. Then*

$$\mu_j(B(x, r)) \leq \mu(B(x, r + C_3A^{-j}))$$

and

$$\mu(B(x, r)) \leq \mu_j(B(x, r + C_3A^{-j})).$$

Proof. According to **(d)** of Lemma 7 no mass is moved at a distance exceeding $2C_dA^{-j}$ when constructing μ_{j+1} from μ_j . Thus, when passing from μ_j to μ_{j+k} , $k \geq 1$, no mass is moved at a distance exceeding

$$2C_d^2A^{-j} \sum_{n=0}^{k-1} (C_d/A)^n < \frac{2C_d^2}{1 - C_d/A} A^{-j} = C_3A^{-j},$$

which means that there is no mass transfer from $B(x, r)$ into the complement of $B(x, r + C_3A^{-j})$, and vice versa. Thus,

$$\mu_j(B(x, R)) \leq \mu_{j+k}(B(x, r + C_3A^{-j}))$$

and

$$\mu_{j+k}(B(x, r)) \leq \mu_j(B(x, r + C_3A^{-j})).$$

Now, as μ is a weak limit point of $\{\mu_{j+k}\}$, the same is true for μ as well. \square

We will now prove that $\mu \in L_{t'} \cap U_{s'}$. To this end, fix $x \in X$ and some R and k for which $0 < R \leq kR$. Then choose integers m and M such that

$$(5) \quad kR \leq A^{-m} < AkR \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{R}{A} \leq A^{-M} < R.$$

Denote by e_{M+1} one of the points in S_{M+1} closest to x (there may be several) and for $j = 0, \dots, M - m$ define $e_{M-j} = \mathcal{E}(e_{M-j+1}) \in S_{M-j}$.

First claim.

$$(6) \quad \mu_{m+2}(e_{m+2}) \leq \mu(B(x, kR)) \leq C_s 3^{s'} (1 + C_3)^s C_1 \mu_m(e_m).$$

Proof. By the definition of e_{M-j} and property 3 of the pseudo-metric d , we have

$$d(x, e_{m+2}) \leq C_d A^{-m-2} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (C_d/A)^j = \frac{C_d}{1 - C_d/A} A^{-m-2}.$$

Let $y \in B(e_{m+2}, C_3A^{-m-2})$. Then, by (5),

$$d(y, x) \leq C_d C_3 A^{-m-2} + \frac{C_d^2}{1 - C_d/A} A^{-m-2} \leq A^{-m-1} < kR,$$

i.e. $B(e_{m+2}, C_3A^{-m-2}) \subset B(x, kR)$. From Proposition 8 we then get

$$\mu_{m+2}(e_{m+2}) \leq \mu(B(e_{m+2}, C_3A^{-m-2})) \leq \mu(B(x, kR)),$$

proving the left inequality in (6). To prove the right inequality, note that (5) and Proposition 8 imply

$$\mu(B(x, kR)) \leq \mu_m(B(x, kR + C_3A^{-m})) \leq \mu_m(B(x, (1 + C_3)A^{-m})).$$

But, $d(x, e_m) \leq \frac{C_d}{1 - C_d/A} A^{-m}$. Thus, if $e \in S_m \cap B(x, (1 + C_3)A^{-m})$, then

$$d(e, e_m) \leq C_d(1 + C_3)A^{-m} + \frac{C_d^2}{1 - C_d/A} A^{-m} \leq C_2A^{-m},$$

so from Lemma 7 it follows that $\mu_m(e) \leq C_1\mu_m(e_m)$. Now,

$$\#(S_m \cap B(x, (1 + C_3)A^{-m})) \leq C_s(1 + C_3)^s,$$

so from Proposition 8 and the fact that $kR \leq A^{-m}$, we get

$$\mu(B(x, kR)) \leq \mu_m(B(x, (1 + C_3)A^{-m})) \leq C_s(1 + C_3)^s C_1\mu_m(e_{x,m}),$$

which concludes the proof of the first claim.

Second claim.

$$(7) \quad \mu_{M+1}(e_{M+1}) \leq \mu(B(x, R)) \leq C_s(1 + C_3)^{s'} A^{2s'} C_1\mu_{M+1}(e_{M+1}).$$

Proof. By the definition of e_{M+1} ,

$$d(e_{M+1}, x) = d(x, S_{M+1}) \leq A^{-M-1} < R/A.$$

Thus, for $y \in B(e_{x,M+1}, C_3A^{-M-1})$,

$$d(y, x) \leq C_d C_3 A^{-M-1} + C_d A^{-M-1} \leq A^{-M} < R.$$

Again by Proposition 8,

$$\mu_{M+1}(e_{M+1}) \leq \mu(B(e_{M+1}, C_3A^{-M-1})) \leq \mu(B(x, R)),$$

proving the left inequality in (7). To prove the right inequality, note that from Proposition 8 and the fact that $R \leq A^{-M+1}$, by the choice of M ,

$$\mu(B(x, R)) \leq \mu_{M-1}(B(x, R + C_3A^{-M+1})) \leq \mu_{M-1}(B(x, (1 + C_3)A^{-M+1})).$$

Also, for $g \in B(x, R + C_3A^{-M+1}) \cap S_{M-1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} d(g, e_{M-1}) &\leq C_d d(g, x) + C_d^3 d(x, e_{M+1}) + C_d^3 d(e_{M+1}, e_M) + C_d^2 d(e_M, e_{M-1}) \\ &\leq C_d(1 + C_3)A^{-M+1} + C_d^3 A^{-M-1} + C_d^3 A^{-M} + C_d^2 A^{-M+1} \leq C_2 A^{-M+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, from (a) and (b) of Lemma 7 we get (recalling $e_{M-j} = \mathcal{E}(e_{M-j+1})$),

$$\mu_{M-1}(g) \leq C_1\mu_{M-1}(e_{M-1}) \leq C_1 A^{2s'} \mu_{M+1}(e_{M+1}).$$

But,

$$\#(B(x, (1 + C_3)A^{-M+1}) \cap S_{M-1}) \leq C_s(1 + C_3)^s,$$

so

$$\mu(B(x, R)) \leq \mu_{M-1}(B(x, (1 + C_3)A^{-M+1})) \leq C_s(1 + C_3)^s A^{2s'} C_1\mu_{M+1}(e_{M+1}),$$

proving the second claim. To conclude the proof, note that

$$\mu(e_m) \leq A^{s'(M+1-m)} \mu_{M+1}(e_{M+1}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_{m+2}(e_{m+2}) \geq A^{t'(M-m-1)} \mu_{M+1}(e_{M+1})$$

by (b) in Lemma 7. Also note that $k < A^{M-m} \leq A^2 k$, by the choice of m and M .

Thus, from the two claims it follows that

$$\mu(B(x, kR)) \leq C\mu_m(e_m) \leq CA^{s'(M-m)} \mu_{M+1}(e_{M+1}) \leq Ck^{s'} \mu(B(x, R)),$$

and similarly,

$$\mu(B(x, kR)) \geq \mu_{m+2}(e_{m+2}) \geq CA^{t'(M-m)} \mu_{M+1}(e_{M+1}) \geq Ck^{t'} \mu(B(x, R)),$$

i.e. $\mu \in \Lambda_{t'} \cap \Upsilon_{s'}$.

Note that the final constants C depend only on the given constants C_d, C_s, C_t and the choice of A, s' and t' . Also note that the last inequality depends on the fact that $\Upsilon(X) < +\infty$. □

4. THE NON-COMPACT CASE

In [L-S] Theorem 1 was generalized to a non-compact complete metric space X . It is easy to see that their proof holds for a pseudo-metric, too. We conclude this paper by showing that Theorem 2 combined with their proof gives the analogue generalization of Theorem 2 as well. Before that we just briefly sketch their proof, and refer to [L-S] for details:

Let $s' > s$ and cover $X \in \Upsilon_s$ with a countable collection of compact balls $X_n = B(x_0, n), n \in \mathbb{N}, x_0 \in X$. Every X_n carries a $\mu_n \in U_{s'}$, by Theorem 1.

By using the weak- $*$ compactness of the unit ball of $\mathcal{C}(X_n)$ and a Cantor's diagonal process they show the existence of a subsequence $\{\mu_j^*\}$ of $\{\mu_n\}$ such that, for every continuous $f \geq 0$ with compact support on $X_p, \int_{X_p} f d\mu_j^*$ converges to $\int_X f d\mu$ for some $\mu \in U_{s'}$.

Theorem 9. *Let $X \in \Upsilon_s \cap \Lambda_t$ be any complete pseudo-metric space. Then there exists a $\mu \in U_{s'} \cap L_{t'}$ for every $t' < t$ and $s' > s$.*

Proof. We use the notation above. It remains to prove $\mu \in L_{t'}$. From Theorem 2 it is clear that $\mu_j^* \in U_{s'} \cap L_{t'}$, where the constant C in $L_{t'}$ is the same for all j . Let $x \in X, r > 0, k > 1$. Let $0 < \varepsilon < (k - 1)/(k + 1)$ and pick continuous functions $0 \leq f, g \leq 1$ such that $f = 1$ on $B(x, (1 - \varepsilon)kr)$ and $g = 1$ on $B(x, r)$, and such that f and g have compact support on $B(x, kr)$ and $B(x, (1 + \varepsilon)r)$, respectively. Put $c^{-1} = Ck^{t'}((1 - \varepsilon)/(1 + \varepsilon))^{t'}$, choose p such that $B(x, kr) \subset X_p$ and choose j large enough that $|\int_{X_p} h d\mu - \int_{X_p} h d\mu_j^*| < \varepsilon$ for $h = f, g$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(B(x, r)) &\leq \int_{X_p} g d\mu \leq \int_{X_p} g d\mu_j^* + \varepsilon \leq \mu_j^*(B(x, (1 + \varepsilon)r)) + \varepsilon \\ &\leq c\mu_j^*(B(x, (1 - \varepsilon)kr)) + \varepsilon \leq c \int_{X_p} f d\mu_j^* + \varepsilon \\ &\leq c \int_{X_p} f d\mu + c\varepsilon + \varepsilon \leq c\mu(B(x, kr)) + c\varepsilon + \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

Letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ gives $Ck^{t'}\mu(B(x, r)) \leq \mu(B(x, kr))$, i.e. $\mu \in L_{t'}$. □

REFERENCES

[Byl] Per Bylund, *Besov spaces and measures on arbitrary closed sets*, Doctoral Thesis No 8, 1994, Department of Mathematics, University of Umeå, Sweden. MR **95k**:46046
 [Dyn] E. M. Dynkin, *Free interpolation by functions with derivatives in H^1* , J. Soviet Math. **27** (1984), 2475-2481.
 [Gud] Jaume Gedayol, *Boundary behaviour of functions in Hardy-Sobolev spaces*, doctoral dissertation, Universitat de Barcelona, 1997.
 [Jon] Alf Jonsson, *Besov spaces on closed subsets of \mathbb{R}^n* , Transactions of the AMS **41** (1994), no. 1, 355-370. MR **94c**:46065
 [J-W] Alf Jonsson and Hans Wallin, *Function spaces on subsets of \mathbb{R}^n* , Math. Reports Volume 2, Part 1, Harwood Academics Publ. GmbH, 1984.

- [Lar] D.G. Larman, *A new theory of dimension*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3rd series) **17** (1967), 178-192. MR **34**:3540
- [L-S] J. Luukkainen and E. Saksman, *Every complete doubling metric space carries a doubling measure*, Proceedings of the AMS **126** (1998), 531-534. MR **99c**:28009
- [V-K] A.L. Vol'berg and S.V. Konyagin, *On measures with the doubling condition*, Math. USSR Izvestiya **30** (1988), 629-638. MR **88i**:28006

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF UMEÅ, S-90187 UMEÅ, SWEDEN

E-mail address: Per.Bylund@math.umu.se

DEPARTAMENT DE MATEMÀTICA APLICADA I ANÀLISI, UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA, GRAN VIA 585, 08007 BARCELONA, SPAIN

E-mail address: godayol@mat.ub.es