

DEFINITIONS OF QUASIREGULARITY

M. Cristea

University of Bucharest, Faculty of Mathematics,
Str. Academiei 14, R-70109 Bucharest, Romania.

Abstract. We show that if $D \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ is open, $f: D \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$ is continuous, open and discrete such that for some $h > 0$ the linear dilatation satisfies $h(x, f) < h$ for every $x \in D$, then f is $K(h, n)$ -quasiregular. Here “lim inf” is used in the definition for $h(x, f)$. A removability result on quasiregular mappings is obtained, and we enlarge the notion of the discrete modulus introduced by J. Heinonen and P. Koskela in [7]. We also give some bounds for the discrete modulus.

1. Introduction

In a recent paper [7], J. Heinonen and P. Koskela showed that if $f: \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$ is a homeomorphism such that for some $h > 0$, $h(x, f) < h$ holds for every $x \in \mathbf{R}^n$, then f is $K(h, n)$ -quasiconformal. Here

$$\begin{aligned}L(x, f, r) &= \sup_{|y-x|=r} |f(y) - f(x)|, \\l(x, f, r) &= \inf_{|y-x|=r} |f(y) - f(x)|, \\h(x, f) &= \liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{L(x, f, r)}{l(x, f, r)}, \\H(x, f) &= \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{L(x, f, r)}{l(x, f, r)}.\end{aligned}$$

This generalizes the classical result which says that f is quasiconformal if $H(x, f)$ is uniformly bounded. In [3] we introduced the inferior linear dilatation $h(x, f)$ for mappings $f: D \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$, $D \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ open, f continuous, open and discrete, and we studied some properties of such mappings. We show now that if $D \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ is open, $n \geq 2$, $f: D \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$ is continuous, open and discrete such that there exists $h > 0$ such that $h(x, f) < h$ for every $x \in D$, then f is $K(h, n)$ -quasiregular and $H(x, f) = h(x, f)$ a.e. in D . In this way, the problem of finding the best constant of quasiregularity $K(h, n)$ is reduced to the classical case when $H(x, f) < H$ for every $x \in D$.

A removability result of J. Heinonen and P. Koskela [7] shows that if $n \geq 2$, $f: \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$ is a homeomorphism such that there exists a closed set $H \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ such that f is K -quasiconformal on $\mathbf{R}^n \setminus H$ and $a > 1$ such that for every $x \in H$ there

exists a sequence $r_j \rightarrow 0$ depending on x such that $(B(x, ar_j) \setminus \bar{B}(x, r_j)) \cap H = \emptyset$ for every $j \in \mathbf{N}$, then it follows that f is K -quasiconformal. We shall show that if $D \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ is open, $n \geq 2$, $f: D \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$ is continuous such that there exists $H \subset D$ closed in D such that f is K -quasiregular on $D \setminus H$ and there exists $0 < a < 1$ and $\mathcal{B} = (B_i)_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$ an a -porous base of H , then, if f is open and discrete or if $\text{int } f(H) = \emptyset$, it follows that f is K -quasiregular on D . Here, if $D \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ is open, $n \geq 2$, $A \subset D$, $0 < a < 1$, and $\mathcal{B} = (B_i)_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$ is a covering of A , we say that \mathcal{B} is an a -porous covering of A if $(B_i \setminus a\bar{B}_i) \cap A = \emptyset$ for every $i \in \mathbf{N}$ and we say that \mathcal{B} is an a -porous base of A if \mathcal{B} is an a -porous covering of A and for every $x \in A$ and $U \in V(x)$, there exists $i \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $x \in B_i \subset U$.

We showed in [5] that if $D \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ is open, $n \geq 2$, $f: D \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$ is continuous, open and discrete such that there exists $0 < a \leq 1$ and $H > 0$ with $\limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} d(f(B(x, ar)))^n / \mu_n(f(B(x, r))) \leq H$ for every $x \in D$, then f is $K(H, n, a)$ -quasiregular. We shall partially generalize this result, giving at the same time a generalization of the removability result of J. Heinonen and P. Koskela from [7]. We show that if $D \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ is open, $n \geq 2$, $f: D \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$ is continuous, open and discrete, there exists $K \subset D$ and $h, t > 0$ such that for every $x \in D \setminus K$, $\liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} d(f(B(x, r)))^n / \mu_n(f(B(x, r))) < h$, and there exists $0 < a < 1$ and $\mathcal{B} = (B_i)_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$ an a -porous base of K such that $d(f(aB_i))^n / \mu_n(f(B_i)) < t$ for every $i \in \mathbf{N}$, then it follows that f is $K(h, t, n)$ -quasiregular and $K_0(f) < V_n \cdot H$, where $H = \max\{h, t\}$.

As in [7], the principal instrument used in proving such theorems is the new discrete modulus introduced by J. Heinonen and P. Koskela. We give a slightly modified version of this notion, and obtain bounds for this class of discrete modulus. For these bounds we modify some covering theorems from [10] and, for the sake of completeness, we give a detailed proof of one of them (Theorem 3).

We use the notation from [15], [9] and [12]. If $f: D \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$ is a map, $D \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ is open, $x \in D$, $U(x, f, r)$ is the component of $f^{-1}(B(f(x), r))$ containing x . For $D \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ open and $f: D \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$ a map, we say that f is discrete if $f^{-1}(y)$ is isolated for every $y \in \mathbf{R}^n$, and we say that f is light if $f^{-1}(y)$ is a set of topological dimension zero for every $y \in \mathbf{R}^n$.

For $x \in \mathbf{R}^n$ we denote by $|x| = (\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2)^{1/2}$, and if $A, B \subset \mathbf{R}^n$, we denote by $d(A) = \sup_{x, y \in A} |x - y|$ and by $d(A, B) = \inf_{x \in A, y \in B} |x - y|$. If $A \in L(\mathbf{R}^n, \mathbf{R}^n)$, let $|A| = \sup_{|h|=1} |A(h)|$, and $l(A) = \inf_{|h|=1} |A(h)|$.

If $D \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ is a domain, $n \geq 2$, and $f: D \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$ is a map, we say that f is quasiregular if f is ACLⁿ and there exists $K \geq 1$ such that $|f'(x)|^n \leq K \cdot J_f(x)$ a.e. in D . For a quasiregular map we also have $J_f(x) \leq K' \cdot l(f'(x))^n$ a.e. in D for some $K' \geq 1$, and we denote by $K_0(f)$ the smallest $K \geq 1$ such that $|f'(x)|^n \leq K \cdot J_f(x)$ a.e. in D , and by $K_I(f)$ the smallest $K \geq 1$ such that $J_f(x) \leq K \cdot l(f'(x))^n$ a.e. in D . We say that a quasiregular map $f: D \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$, $n \geq 2$, is K -quasiregular if $K_0(f) \leq K$, $K_I(f) \leq K$.

If Γ is a path family, we denote by

$$F(\Gamma) = \left\{ \rho: \overline{\mathbf{R}^n} \rightarrow [0, \infty] \text{ a Borel map} : \int_{\gamma} \rho ds \geq 1 \text{ for every } \gamma \in \Gamma \right\}$$

and by $M(\Gamma) = \inf_{\rho \in F(\Gamma)} \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} \rho^n(x) dx$.

If $E, F \subset \mathbf{R}^n$, $D \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ is open such that $E \cup F \subset \overline{D}$, let $\Delta(E, F, D)$ be those paths, open or not, which join E with F in D . If $f: D \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$ is a map, we let $N(f, D) = \sup_{y \in \mathbf{R}^n} \text{Card } f^{-1}(y)$. A domain $A \subset \overline{\mathbf{R}^n}$ is a ring if CA has exactly two components, C_0 and C_1 , and we denote $A = R(C_0, C_1)$, C_0 being bounded, and $\Gamma_A = \Delta(C_0, C_1, A)$. For $r > 0$, let $\Phi_n(r)$ be the set of all rings $A = R(C_0, C_1)$ in $\overline{\mathbf{R}^n}$ such that $0 \in C_0$ and there exists $a \in C_0$ with $|a| = 1$ and such that $\infty \in C_1$, and there exists $b \in C_1$ with $|b| = r$, and we let $\mathcal{H}(r) = \inf M(\Gamma_A)$, the infimum being taken over all rings $A \in \Phi_n(r)$. We denote by V_n the volume of the unit ball in \mathbf{R}^n , by μ_n the Lebesgue measure in \mathbf{R}^n and by ω_{n-1} the area of the unit sphere from \mathbf{R}^n . For $0 < a < \lambda < 1$, we write $N(a, \lambda) = 2K \cdot (4/\lambda \cdot (\lambda - a))^n$, where $K = [\log \frac{1}{2}(1 - a)/\log \lambda] + 1$. For $\varepsilon > 0$ we let $N(\varepsilon) = (3 + \varepsilon)^n \cdot (\frac{1}{2}(2 + \varepsilon))^n$. In [10, p. 29] the following lemma is proved: There exists a positive integer $B(n)$ such that if $a_1, \dots, a_k \in \mathbf{R}^n$, $r_1, \dots, r_k \in (0, \infty)$, $a_i \notin B(a_j, r_j)$ for $i \neq j$, $i, j = 1, \dots, k$ and $\bigcap_{i=1}^k B(a_i, r_i) \neq \emptyset$, then it follows that $k \leq B(n)$. Throughout this paper we shall denote by $B(n)$ the number from this lemma.

2. Preliminaries

Theorem 1. *Let $D \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ be open, $A \subset D$ closed in D and such that A is bounded or $A = D$, \mathcal{B} a collection of balls from D such that every ball from \mathcal{B} is of the form $B(x, r)$ with $x \in A$ and $r \in I_x \subset \mathbf{R}$ with*

(a) $0 \in I'_x$ for every $x \in A$,

(b) if $x_k \in A$, $r_{x_k} \in I_{x_k}$ for $k \in \mathbf{N}$, $x_k \rightarrow x$, $r_{x_k} \rightarrow r$ and $\overline{B}(x, r) \subset D$, then $r \in I_x$.

Then there exists an at most countable collection of balls $(B_i)_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$ such that $B_i = B(x_i, r_i) \in \mathcal{B}$ for $i \in \mathbf{N}$, $A \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} B_i$, $r_k \geq r_{k+1}$ and $x_k \notin \bigcup_{i=1, i \neq k}^{\infty} B_i$ for $k \geq 1$. Hence every point from A belongs to at most $B(n)$ balls and $\frac{1}{2}B_i \cap \frac{1}{2}B_j = \emptyset$ for $i, j \in \mathbf{N}$, $i \neq j$.

Theorem 2. *Let $D \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ be open, $A \subset D$ such that either A is bounded or $A = D$, \mathcal{B} a collection of balls from D such that every ball $B \in \mathcal{B}$ is of the form $B = B(x, r)$ with $x \in A$ and $r \in I_x \subset \mathbf{R}_+$ such that $0 \in I'_x$ for every $x \in A$. Then, for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists an at most countable collection of balls $(B_i)_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$ such that $B_i = B(x_i, r_i) \in \mathcal{B}$ for $i \in \mathbf{N}$, $A \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} B_i$, $B_i/(2 + \varepsilon) \cap B_j/(2 + \varepsilon) = \emptyset$ for $i, j \in \mathbf{N}$, $i \neq j$ and every point from A belongs to at most $N(\varepsilon) \cdot B(n)$ balls B_i .*

Theorem 3. *Let $D \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ be open, $A \subset D$, $0 < a < 1$ and $\mathcal{B} = (B_i)_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$ an a -porous covering of A . Then, if A is bounded or if $A = D$ and \mathcal{B} is an a -porous base of A , for every $0 < a < \lambda < 1$ we can find $\mathcal{C} = (B_{i_k})_{k \in \mathbf{N}}$ a subcovering of A such that every point from A belongs to at most $N(a, \lambda)$ balls B_{i_k} and $\frac{1}{2}(\lambda - a)B_{i_k} \cap \frac{1}{2}(\lambda - a)B_{i_l} = \emptyset$ for $k, l \in \mathbf{N}$, $k \neq l$, where $N(a, \lambda) = 2k \cdot (4/\lambda(\lambda - a))^n$, with $k = \lceil \log \frac{1}{2}(1 - a) / \log \lambda \rceil + 1$.*

Proof. We suppose first that A is bounded. Hence we can suppose that $M = \sup_{i \in \mathbf{N}} r_i < \infty$, where $B_i = B(x_i, r_i)$ for $i \in \mathbf{N}$. Let $0 < a < \lambda < 1$ and

$$A_1 = \{x \in A \mid \text{there exists } i \in \mathbf{N} \text{ and } \lambda M < r_i \leq M \\ \text{such that } B(x_i, r_i) \in \mathcal{B} \text{ and } x \in B(x_i, r_i)\}.$$

If $A_1 \neq \emptyset$, we take $x_{11} \in D$ and $\lambda M < \rho_{11} \leq M$ such that $B(x_{11}, \rho_{11}) \in \mathcal{B}$ and $A \cap B(x_{11}, \rho_{11}) \neq \emptyset$. If $A_1 \not\subset B(x_{11}, \rho_{11})$, we take $x_{12} \in D$ and $\lambda M < \rho_{12} \leq M$ such that $B(x_{12}, \rho_{12}) \in \mathcal{B}$ and $(A_1 \setminus B(x_{11}, \rho_{11})) \cap B(x_{12}, \rho_{12}) \neq \emptyset$. If $A_1 \not\subset B(x_{11}, \rho_{11}) \cup B(x_{12}, \rho_{12})$, we continue the process and we show that this process must end in a finite number of steps. Indeed, let $B(x_i, r_i)$, $B(x_j, r_j)$ be two balls which cover A_1 obtained as before. Then there exists a point $x \in A$ such that $x \in B(x_j, r_j) \setminus B(x_i, r_i)$, hence $|x - x_j| \leq ar_j \leq aM$ (because $(B(x_j, r_j) \setminus \bar{B}(x_j, ar_j)) \cap A = \emptyset$) and $|x - x_i| > r_i \geq \lambda M$, which implies that

$$|x_i - x_j| \geq |x - x_i| - |x - x_j| > (\lambda - a)M.$$

Let $\rho = \frac{1}{2}(\lambda - a)$ and suppose that there exists a point $z \in B(x_j, \rho r_j) \cap B(x_i, \rho r_i)$. Then $2\rho M \geq \rho r_j + \rho r_i \geq |x_j - z| + |x_i - z| \geq |x_i - x_j| > (\lambda - a)M$, which represents a contradiction. It follows that $B(x_i, \frac{1}{2}(\lambda - a)r_i) \cap B(x_j, \frac{1}{2}(\lambda - a)r_j) = \emptyset$. Using the boundedness of A we can find $m(1) \in \mathbf{N}, x_{11}, \dots, x_{1m(1)} \in D$, real numbers $\rho_{11}, \dots, \rho_{1m(1)} \in (\lambda M, M]$ such that $B(x_{1l}, \rho_{1l}) \in \mathcal{B}$ for $l = 1, \dots, m(1)$, $(A_1 \setminus \bigcup_{l=1}^{k-1} B(x_{1l}, \rho_{1l})) \cap B(x_{1k}, \rho_{1k}) \neq \emptyset$ for $k = 2, \dots, m(1)$ and $A_1 \subset \bigcup_{l=1}^{m(1)} B(x_{1l}, \rho_{1l})$. Also, a point from A_1 may belong to at most $m = (4/\lambda(\lambda - a))^n$ balls $B(x_{1l}, \rho_{1l})$. Indeed, let $B(x_{1i}, \rho_{1i})$ be a fixed ball of this type and suppose that it is intersected by m balls $B(x_{1j}, r_{1j})$, $j \in C \subset \{1, \dots, m(1)\}$. Then every such ball is contained in $B(x_{1i}, 2M)$; hence

$$V_n \cdot (2M)^n = \mu_n(B(x_{1i}, 2M)) \geq \sum_{j \in C} \mu_n \left(\left(B(x_{1j}, \frac{1}{2}(\lambda - a)\rho_{1j}) \right) \right) \\ \geq V_n \cdot m \cdot \frac{1}{2^n} ((\lambda - a) \cdot \lambda M)^n$$

and this implies that $m \leq (4/\lambda(\lambda - a))^n$. We have completed the first step of our inductive process.

At step j , we take

$$A_j = \left\{ x \in A \setminus \bigcup_{k=1}^{j-1} \bigcup_{l=1}^{m(k)} B(x_{1l}, \rho_{1l}) \mid \text{there exists } i \in \mathbf{N} \right. \\ \left. \text{and } \lambda^j M < r_i \leq \lambda^{j-1} \cdot M \text{ such that } B(x_i, r_i) \in \mathcal{B} \text{ and } x \in B(x_i, r_i) \right\}.$$

If $A_j \neq \emptyset$, we take $x_{j1} \in A_j$ and $\lambda^j \cdot M < \rho_{j1} \leq \lambda^{j-1} \cdot M$ such that $B(x_{j1}, \rho_{j1}) \in \mathcal{B}$ and $A_j \cap B(x_{j1}, \rho_{j1}) \neq \emptyset$. If $A_j \not\subset B(x_{j1}, \rho_{j1})$, we continue the process from step j , and if $A_j \not\subset \bigcup_{l=1}^{k-1} B(x_{jl}, \rho_{jl})$, we take $x_{jk} \in D$ and $\lambda^j \cdot M < \rho_{jk} \leq \lambda^{j-1} \cdot M$ such that $B(x_{jk}, \rho_{jk}) \in \mathcal{B}$ and $(A_j \setminus \bigcup_{l=1}^{k-1} B(x_{jl}, \rho_{jl})) \cap B(x_{jk}, \rho_{jk}) \neq \emptyset$.

Using the boundedness of A_j , we see as in step 1 that this process must end in a finite number of steps. Hence we find $m(j) \in \mathbf{N}$, $x_{j1}, \dots, x_{jm(j)} \in D$, $\rho_{j1}, \dots, \rho_{jm(j)} \in (\lambda^j \cdot M, \lambda^{j-1} \cdot M]$ such that $B(x_{jl}, \rho_{jl}) \in \mathcal{B}$, $l = 1, \dots, m(j)$,

$$\left(A_j \setminus \bigcup_{l=1}^{k-1} B(x_{jl}, \rho_{jl}) \right) \cap B(x_{jk}, \rho_{jk}) \neq \emptyset$$

for $k = 1, \dots, m(j)$ and $A_j \subset \bigcup_{l=1}^{m(j)} B(x_{jl}, \rho_{jl})$.

The process will have an infinite number of steps. We show that $A \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{l=1}^{m(j)} B(x_{jl}, \rho_{jl})$. Indeed, if this is not true, we can find a point $x \in A \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{l=1}^{m(j)} B(x_{jl}, \rho_{jl})$. Since $(B_i)_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$ is a covering of A , we can find $i \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $x \in B_i$ and $j \in \mathbf{N}$ with $\lambda^j \cdot M < r_i \leq \lambda^{j-1} \cdot M$. Using the definition of A_j , we obtain that $x \in A_j$, which represents a contradiction, since $x \notin \bigcup_{l=1}^{m(j)} B(x_{jl}, \rho_{jl})$ and we proved that $A_j \subset \bigcup_{l=1}^{m(j)} B(x_{jl}, \rho_{jl})$. It follows that $A \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{l=1}^{m(j)} B(x_{jl}, \rho_{jl})$.

Let now $k \in \mathbf{N}$ be such that $a \leq -2\lambda^k + 1$. We show that two balls $B(x_{il}, \rho_{il})$, $B(x_{jq}, \rho_{jq})$, $l \in \{1, \dots, m(i)\}$, $q \in \{1, \dots, m(j)\}$ with $j - i - 1 \geq k$ cannot have a common point from A . Indeed, suppose that this is not true and pick two balls as before, $B(x_{il}, \rho_{il})$, $B(x_{jq}, \rho_{jq})$, with $j - i - 1 \geq k$ such that there exists a point $x \in A \cap B(x_{il}, \rho_{il}) \cap B(x_{jq}, \rho_{jq})$. From the construction of the balls $B(x_{kl}, \rho_{kl})$ we can find a point $z \in (A \setminus B(x_{il}, \rho_{il})) \cap B(x_{jq}, \rho_{jq})$, and since $A \cap (B(x_{il}, \rho_{il}) \setminus \bar{B}(x_{il}, a \cdot \rho_{il})) = \emptyset$, we see that the point $x \in B(x_{il}, a \cdot \rho_{il})$. Then $2M \cdot \lambda^{j-1} \geq 2\rho_{jq} \geq |x - z| \geq (1 - a)\rho_{il} > (1 - a)M \cdot \lambda^i$, and hence $\frac{1}{2}(1 - a) < \lambda^{j-i-1} < \lambda^k$, i.e., $a > -2\lambda^k + 1$, which contradicts the way we chose k . It follows that if $j - i - 1 \geq k$, then any two balls $B(x_{il}, \rho_{il})$, $B(x_{jq}, \rho_{jq})$ with $j - i - 1 \geq k$ cannot have a common point with A . Since we showed that any point from A_j can belong to at most $(4/\lambda(\lambda - a))^n$ balls $B(x_{jl}, \rho_{jl})$, $j \in \mathbf{N}$, $l = 1, \dots, m(j)$, it follows that any point from A can belong to at most $2k \cdot (4/\lambda(\lambda - a))^n$ balls $B(x_{il}, \rho_{il})$, $i \in \mathbf{N}$, $l \in \{1, \dots, m(i)\}$, where $k = \lceil \log \frac{1}{2}(1 - a) / \log \lambda \rceil + 1$. As in step 1, we show that $\frac{1}{2}(\lambda - a) \cdot B(x_{il}, \rho_{il}) \cap \frac{1}{2}(\lambda - a) \cdot B(x_{jq}, \rho_{jq}) = \emptyset$, for $i \neq j$, $l \in \{1, \dots, m(i)\}$, $q \in \{1, \dots, m(j)\}$ and the theorem is proved if A is bounded.

If $A = D$ and \mathcal{B} is an a -porous base of A , we leave the proof to the reader.

3. Discrete modulus. Bounds for discrete modulus

We shall use, now in a slightly enlarged form, the concept of the discrete modulus introduced by J. Heinonen and P. Koskela in [7]. If $D \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ is open and $\mathcal{B} = (B_i)_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$ is a covering with balls of D , we say that \mathcal{B} is a (λ, μ) -covering of D if every point of D belongs to at most λ balls B_i and $\mu B_i \cap \mu B_j = \emptyset$ for $i, j \in \mathbf{N}$, $i \neq j$ and $0 < \mu < 1$. From Theorem 1, we always have $(B(n), \frac{1}{2})$ coverings of an open set $D \subset \mathbf{R}^n$; hence we always have (λ, μ) -coverings of an open set $D \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ if $\lambda \geq B(n)$, $0 < \mu \leq \frac{1}{2}$, and we denote by $E(\lambda, \mu, D)$ all the (λ, μ) -coverings of the open set D from \mathbf{R}^n . If $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}^1 \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{B}^m$ is a covering with balls of D , $0 < \mu < 1$, D open in \mathbf{R}^n , $\mathcal{B}^k = (B_i^k)_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$, $k = 1, \dots, m$, such that every point from D belongs to at most λ balls B_i^k for $k = 1, \dots, m$, and for every $k \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, we have $\mu B_i^k \cap \mu B_j^k = \emptyset$, $i, j \in \mathbf{N}$, $i \neq j$, we say that \mathcal{B} is a (m, λ, μ) -covering of D and we denote by $E(m, \lambda, \mu, D)$ all the (m, λ, μ) -coverings of D . In this definition it is possible that some families of balls \mathcal{B}^i , \mathcal{B}^j are the same. If Γ is a path family such that $\text{Im } \gamma \subset D$ for every $\gamma \in \Gamma$ and $\mathcal{B} = (B_i)_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$ is a collection of balls from D , a subcollection $\mathcal{A} = (B_i)_{i \in I}$ with $I \subset \mathbf{N}$ will be called a chain of balls from the collection \mathcal{B} along the path γ if $\text{Im } \gamma \cap B_i \neq \emptyset$ for every $i \in I$ and $\text{Im } \gamma \subset \bigcup_{i \in I} B_i$.

Let now $m, \lambda \in \mathbf{N}$, $0 < \mu < 1$, $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}^1 \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{B}^m$, $\mathcal{B} \in E(m, \lambda, \mu, D)$ and $v_k: \mathcal{B}^k \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be set functions which assign to each ball $B_i^k \in \mathcal{B}^k$ a positive number for $k = 1, \dots, m$. We say that $v = (v_1, \dots, v_m)$ is (m, λ, μ, D) -admissible for the (m, λ, μ) covering of D ,

$$\mathcal{B} = (B_i)_{i \in \mathbf{N}}, \quad \mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}^1 \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{B}^m, \quad \mathcal{B}^k = (B_i)_{i \in I_k}, \quad k = 1, \dots, m$$

and for the path family Γ such that $\text{Im } \gamma \subset D$ for every $\gamma \in \Gamma$, if

$$\sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{i \in I_k \cap I} v_k(B_i) \geq 1,$$

for every $\mathcal{A} = (B_i)_{i \in I}$ chain of balls along some path $\gamma \in \Gamma$. We denote by $F_{(m, \lambda, \mu, D)}(\mathcal{B}, \Gamma)$ the class of all (m, λ, μ, D) -admissible m -tuples of set functions $v = (v_1, \dots, v_m)$ for the collection $\mathcal{B} \in E(m, \lambda, \mu, D)$ and the path family Γ . For $\delta > 0$ we denote by

$$\delta - \text{Mod}_{(m, \lambda, \mu)}(\Gamma) = \inf_{\mathcal{B} \in E(m, \lambda, \mu, D)} \sum_{v=(v_1, \dots, v_m) \in F_{(m, \lambda, \mu, D)}(\mathcal{B}, \Gamma)} \sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{i \in I_k} v_k(B_i)^n,$$

where the infimum is taken along all the collections

$$\mathcal{B} \in E(m, \lambda, \mu, D), \quad \mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}^1 \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{B}^m, \quad \mathcal{B} = (B_i)_{i \in \mathbf{N}}, \quad \mathcal{B}^k = (B_i)_{i \in I_k},$$

$k = 1, \dots, m$, and all the (m, λ, μ, D) -admissible m -tuples of set functions $v = (v_1, \dots, v_m) \in F_{(m, \lambda, \mu, D)}(\mathcal{B}, \Gamma)$, D being any open set in \mathbf{R}^n such that $\text{Im } \gamma \subset D$

for every $\gamma \in \Gamma$ and $d(B_i) < \delta$ for $i \in \mathbf{N}$. The function $\delta \rightarrow \delta - \text{Mod}_{(m,\lambda,\mu)}(\mathcal{B}, \Gamma)$ is clearly decreasing; hence it has a limit in 0 and we denote by $\text{Mod}_{(m,\lambda,\mu)}(\Gamma) = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \delta - \text{Mod}_{(m,\lambda,\mu)}(\Gamma)$ and call the number $\text{Mod}_{(m,\lambda,\mu)}(\Gamma)$ the (m, λ, μ) discrete modulus of the path family Γ . Of course, this notion has sense if $E(m, \lambda, \mu, D) \neq \emptyset$. For $\lambda \geq B(n)$ and $0 < \mu \leq \frac{1}{2}$, $m \in \mathbf{N}$, the (m, λ, μ) discrete modulus is defined. For $m = 1$ we note $\text{Mod}_{(\lambda,\mu)}(\Gamma)$ instead of $\text{Mod}_{(1,\lambda,\mu)}(\Gamma)$ and by $F_{(\lambda,\mu,D)}(\mathcal{B}, \Gamma)$ instead of $F_{(1,\lambda,\mu,D)}(\mathcal{B}, \Gamma)$ for $\mathcal{B} \in E(\lambda, \mu, D)$.

Using the method from [7], we can prove the following relation between the classical modulus and the (m, λ, μ) discrete modulus:

Theorem 4. *Let Γ be a path family in \mathbf{R}^n . Then there exists a constant $R(n, m, \mu)$ such that $M(\Gamma) \leq R(n, m, \mu) \cdot \text{Mod}_{(m,\lambda,\mu)}(\Gamma)$, where $R(n, m, \mu) = V_n \cdot 2^n \cdot n^{n^2} (3^n / (\mu(n-1))^n \cdot m \cdot n)^{n-1}$.*

Theorem 5. *Let $n \geq 2$, $D \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ be open, $K \subset D$, $f: D \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$ continuous such that there exists $h > 0$ with*

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{d(f(B(x, r)))^n}{\mu_n(f(B(x, r)))} < h$$

for every $x \in D \setminus K$ and $N(f, D) < \infty$. If $K = \emptyset$, for $E, F \subset \bar{D}$, we have

$$\text{Mod}_{(B(n), 1/2)}(\Delta(E, F, D)) \leq h \cdot N(f, D) \cdot B(n) \cdot \frac{\mu_n(f(D))}{d(f(E), f(F))^n}.$$

If $K \neq \emptyset$, D is bounded and there exists $t > 0$ and $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ such that for an α -porous base of K , $\tilde{\mathcal{B}} = (B(x_i, r_i))_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$ the inequality

$$\frac{d(f(\alpha \cdot B(x_i, r_i)))^n}{\mu_n(f(B(x_i, r_i)))} < t$$

holds for $i \in \mathbf{N}$, then, for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and $0 < \alpha < \lambda < 1$ it follows that

$$\text{Mod}_{(2, M, P)}(\Delta(E, F, D)) \leq 2H \cdot N(f, D) \cdot M \cdot \frac{\mu_n(f(D))}{d(f(E), f(F))^n},$$

where

$$P = \min \left\{ \frac{1}{2 + \varepsilon}, \frac{\lambda - \alpha}{2} \right\}, \quad H = \max\{h, t\}, \quad M = \max\{B(n) \cdot N(\varepsilon), N(\alpha, \lambda)\}.$$

Proof. Suppose first that $K = \emptyset$. We may assume that $r = d(f(E), f(F)) > 0$, since otherwise the theorem is clear. If $x \in D$, let

$$I_x = \left\{ r \in \mathbf{R}_+ \mid \frac{d(f(B(x, r)))^n}{\mu_n(f(B(x, r)))} < h \right\}.$$

Then $0 \in I'_x$, and let $\mathcal{B}^1 = \bigcup_{x \in D, r \in I_x} B(x, r)$. We define for $B \in \mathcal{B}^1$ a set function v by $v(B) = d(f(B))/d(f(E), f(F))$. Now \mathcal{B}^1 satisfies the conditions from Theorem 1, hence, if $\delta > 0$ is fixed, we can find $\mathcal{B} \in E(B(n), \frac{1}{2}, D)$, $\mathcal{B} = (B_i)_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$, a subcollection of \mathcal{B}^1 such that $d(B_i) < \delta$, $\bar{B}_i \subset D$, $d(f(B_i))^n / \mu_n(f(B_i)) < h$ for $i \in \mathbf{N}$.

Let $\gamma \in \Delta(E, F, D)$ and $\mathcal{A} = (B_i)_{i \in I}$ be a chain of balls from the collection \mathcal{B} along the path γ . Then $\bigcup_{i \in I} f(B_i)$ is a connected set which covers the path $\Gamma = f \circ \gamma$, hence $\sum_{i \in I} d(f(B_i)) \geq l(\Gamma) \geq d(f(E), f(F))$, and this implies that $\sum_{i \in I} v(B_i) \geq 1$ for every $\mathcal{A} = (B_i)_{i \in I}$ chain of balls from the collection \mathcal{B} along every path $\gamma \in \Delta(E, F, D)$, i.e., $v \in F_{(B(n), 1/2, D)}(\mathcal{B}, \Delta(E, F, D))$.

We have

$$(1) \quad \delta - \text{Mod}_{(B(n), 1/2)}(\Delta(E, F, D)) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} v(B_i)^n \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{d(f(B_i))^n}{d(f(E), f(F))^n}.$$

Now every point $y \in f(D)$ has at most $N(f, D)$ points $x_k \in D$ such that $f(x_k) = y$, and since such a point x_k may belong to at most $B(n)$ balls B_i , it follows that every point $y \in f(D)$ belongs to at most $B(n) \cdot N(f, D)$ sets $f(B_i)$. This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu_n(f(B_i)) &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \int_{f(D)} \mathcal{X}_{f(B_i)}(x) dx = \int_{f(D)} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{X}_{f(B_i)} \right)(x) dx \\ &\leq \int_{f(D)} B(n) \cdot N(f, D) dx = B(n) \cdot N(f, D) \cdot \mu_n(f(D)), \end{aligned}$$

and using (1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta - \text{Mod}_{(B(n), 1/2)}(\Delta(E, F, D)) &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{d(f(B_i))^n}{d(f(E), f(F))^n} \\ &\leq h \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu_n(f(B_i))}{d(f(E), f(F))^n} \\ &\leq h \cdot B(n) \cdot N(f, D) \cdot \frac{\mu_n(f(D))}{d(f(E), f(F))^n}. \end{aligned}$$

Letting δ tend to zero, we obtain that

$$\text{Mod}_{(B(n), 1/2)}(\Delta(E, F, D)) \leq h \cdot B(n) \cdot N(f, D) \cdot \frac{\mu_n(f(D))}{d(f(E), f(F))^n}.$$

Suppose now that $K \neq \emptyset$ and let $0 < \alpha < \lambda < 1$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ and let $\delta > 0$. Applying Theorem 2 to the base of balls $\mathcal{D} = \bigcup_{x \in D \setminus K, r \in I_x} B(x, r)$, we

can consider $\mathcal{B}^1 = (B_i^1)_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$ a subcovering of \mathcal{D} which covers $D \setminus K$ such that $d(B_i^1) < \delta$, $\bar{B}_i^1 \subset D$, $d(f(B_i^1))^n / \mu_n(f(B_i^1)) < h$ for $i \in \mathbf{N}$ and every point from $D \setminus K$ belongs to at most $N(\varepsilon) \cdot B(n)$ balls B_i^1 and $B_i^1 / (2 + \varepsilon) \cap B_j^1 / (2 + \varepsilon) = \emptyset$ for $i \neq j$, $i, j \in \mathbf{N}$.

Applying Theorem 3 to the α -porous covering of K , $\mathcal{C} = (B(x_i, r_i))_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$, we can consider $\mathcal{B}^2 = (B_i^2)_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$ a subcollection of \mathcal{C} which covers K such that

$$d(B_i^2) < \delta, \quad \bar{B}_i^2 \subset D, \quad \frac{d(f(\alpha B_i^2))^n}{\mu_n(f(B_i^2))} < t$$

for $i \in \mathbf{N}$, and every point from K belongs to at most $N(\alpha, \lambda)$ balls B_i^2 and $\frac{1}{2}(\lambda - \alpha) \cdot B_i^2 \cap \frac{1}{2}(\lambda - \alpha) \cdot B_j^2 = \emptyset$ for $i \neq j$, $i, j \in \mathbf{N}$. Since $(B_i^2 - \alpha \bar{B}_i^2) \cap K = \emptyset$ for $i \in \mathbf{N}$, we see that $(\alpha B_i^2)_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$ is also a covering of K ; hence $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}^1 \cup \alpha \mathcal{B}^2 \in E(2, M, P, D)$. We define set functions v_k on the balls B_i^k , $k = 1, 2$, $i \in \mathbf{N}$ by $v_1(B_i^1) = d(f(B_i^1)) / d(f(E), f(F))$ for $i \in \mathbf{N}$ and $v_2(\alpha B_i^2) = d(f(\alpha B_i^2)) / d(f(E), f(F))$ for $i \in \mathbf{N}$. Let us show that

$$v = (v_1, v_2) \in F_{(2, M, P, D)}(\mathcal{B}, \Delta(E, F, D)).$$

Indeed, let $\gamma \in \Delta(E, F, D)$ and let $\mathcal{A} = (B_i)_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$ be a chain of balls from \mathcal{B} along the path γ , where $I = I_1 \cup I_2$ and $B_i \in \mathcal{B}^1$ for $i \in I_1$, $B_i \in \alpha \mathcal{B}^2$ for $i \in I_2$. Then $\bigcup_{i \in I_1} f(B_i) \cup \bigcup_{i \in I_2} f(\alpha B_i)$ is a connected set which covers the path $\Gamma = f \circ \gamma$, hence $\sum_{i \in I_1} d(f(B_i^1)) + \sum_{i \in I_2} d(f(\alpha B_i^2)) \geq l(\Gamma) \geq d(f(E), f(F))$ and this implies that $v = (v_1, v_2) \in F_{(2, M, P, D)}(\mathcal{B}, \Delta(E, F, D))$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta - \text{Mod}_{(2, M, P)}(\Delta(E, F, D)) &\leq \sum_{i \in I_1} v_1(B_i^1)^n + \sum_{i \in I_2} v_2(\alpha B_i^2)^n \\ &= \sum_{i \in I_1} \frac{d(f(B_i^1))^n}{d(f(E), f(F))^n} + \sum_{i \in I_2} \frac{d(f(\alpha B_i^2))^n}{d(f(E), f(F))^n} \\ &\leq \frac{H}{d(f(E), f(F))^n} \left(\sum_{i \in I_1} \mu_n(f(B_i^1)) + \sum_{i \in I_2} \mu_n(f(B_i^2)) \right) \\ &\leq \frac{H \cdot M \cdot N(f, D)}{d(f(E), f(F))^n} \left(\mu_n \left(f \left(\bigcup_{i \in I_1} B_i^1 \right) \right) + \mu_n \left(f \left(\bigcup_{i \in I_2} B_i^2 \right) \right) \right) \\ &\leq \frac{2 \cdot H \cdot M \cdot N(f, D)}{d(f(E), f(F))^n} \cdot \mu_n(f(D)). \end{aligned}$$

Letting δ tend to zero, we complete the proof.

4. Conditions of quasiregularity and a removability result

We shall first prove the following theorem.

Theorem 6. *Let $D \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ be open, $n \geq 2$, $a > 1$, $x \in D$ and $r > 0$ such that $\bar{B}(x, a \cdot r) \subset D$ and $f: D \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$ continuous, open and discrete. If f is K -quasiregular on $B(x, a \cdot r) \setminus \bar{B}(x, r)$, then it follows that*

$$\frac{d(f(B(x, r)))^n}{\mu_n(f(B(x, a \cdot r)))} \leq C(a, K),$$

where $C(a, K) = 1/L(a, K)$ and

$$L(a, K) = \min \left\{ \frac{V_n}{2^n} \cdot \exp \left(\frac{-2K \cdot n \cdot \omega_{n-1}}{c_n \cdot (\log a)^{n-1}} \right), \frac{V_n \cdot n \cdot K \cdot \omega_{n-1}}{2^n \cdot c_n \cdot (\log a)^{n-1}} \cdot \exp \left(\frac{-2K \cdot n \cdot \omega_{n-1}}{c_n \cdot (\log a)^{n-1}} \right) \right\}.$$

Proof. Suppose first that $\mu_n(f(S(x, a \cdot r))) = 0$. Let $s = L(x, f, r)$, $\delta = K \cdot \omega_{n-1}/(\log a)^{n-1}$ and let $\alpha > 0$ be such that $2\delta = c_n \cdot \log(1/\alpha)$, where c_n is the constant from Theorem 10.12, [15, p. 31].

Now $\alpha = \exp(-2K \cdot \omega_{n-1}/c_n \cdot (\log a)^{n-1})$; hence $0 < \alpha < 1$.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mu_n(f(B(x, a \cdot r)))}{d(f(B(x, r)))^n} &\geq \frac{\mu_n(f(B(x, a \cdot r)))}{2^n \cdot L(x, f, r)^n} \\ &\geq V_n \cdot \frac{l(x, f, r)^n}{2^n \cdot L(x, f, r)^n} \geq V_n \cdot \frac{\alpha^n}{2^n} \geq L(a, K), \end{aligned}$$

if $L(x, f, r)/l(x, f, r) \leq 1/\alpha$. Suppose that $L(x, f, r)/l(x, f, r) > 1/\alpha$. If $Q = f(S(x, r))$, then $Q \cap S(f(x), t) \neq \emptyset$ for every $t \in [\alpha s, s]$ and let $Q_p, p \in P$ be the components of $Cf(\bar{B}(x, a \cdot r))$ which intersect $B(f(x), s) \setminus \bar{B}(f(x), \alpha s)$. Since $S(x, r) \subset \text{Int } \bar{B}(x, ar)$ and f is open, it follows that $Q \cap \partial Q_p = \emptyset$ for $p \in P$, and let $B_p = \{t \in (\alpha s, s) \mid S(f(x), t) \cap Q_p \neq \emptyset\}$, $p \in P$, $E = \bigcup_{p \in P} Q_p$ and $B = \{t \in (\alpha s, s) \mid S(f(x), t) \cap E \neq \emptyset\}$. Since B is open, $B = \bigcup_{i \in I} (a_i, b_i)$, $I \subset \mathbf{N}$ and $(a_i, b_i) \cap (a_j, b_j) = \emptyset$ for $i, j \in I$, $i \neq j$. When $i \in I$, we denote $D_i = B(f(x), b_i) \setminus \bar{B}(f(x), a_i)$ and

$$J_i = \{j \in P \mid \text{there exists } t \in (a_i, b_i) \text{ such that } S(f(x), t) \cap Q_j \neq \emptyset\}$$

and let $U_i = \bigcup_{j \in J_i} \partial Q_j$. Let now $i \in I$ and $t \in (a_i, b_i)$. Then there exists $j \in J_i$ such that $S(f(x), t) \cap Q_j \neq \emptyset$. Since $S(f(x), t) \cap Q \neq \emptyset$ and $Q \subset f(\bar{B}(x, ar)) \subset CQ_j$, we see that $S(f(x), t) \cap CQ_j \neq \emptyset$; hence $S(f(x), t) \cap \partial Q_j \neq \emptyset$. If Δ_i is the family of all paths $\gamma: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$ which joins Q with U_i in D_i , then $D_i \cap U_i$ and

$D_i \cap Q$ are nonempty, disjoint sets which intersect $S(f(x), t)$ for every $t \in (a_i, b_i)$. Using Theorem 10.12, [15, p. 31], we obtain $M(\Delta_i) \geq c_n \cdot \log(b_i/a_i)$. Let now $\gamma \in \Delta_i$ be such that $\gamma(0) \in Q$, $\gamma(1) \in U_i$. We can find b_γ a subpath of γ , such that there exists a path $a_\gamma: [\alpha_\gamma, \beta_\gamma] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$ with $0 \leq \alpha_\gamma \leq \beta_\gamma \leq 1$, $a_\gamma(\alpha_\gamma) \in S(x, r)$, $a_\gamma(\beta_\gamma) \in S(x, ar)$, $a_\gamma(\alpha_\gamma, \beta_\gamma) \subset B(x, ar) \setminus \overline{B}(x, r)$ and $f \circ a_\gamma = b_\gamma$. If $\Gamma_i = \{a_\gamma \mid \gamma \in \Delta_i\}$, $\Gamma'_i = \{b_\gamma \mid \gamma \in \Delta_i\}$, then $\Gamma'_i = f(\Gamma_i)$ and the paths from Γ'_i are shorter than the paths from Δ_i , and let $\Gamma' = \bigcup_{i \in I} \Gamma'_i$, $\Gamma = \bigcup_{i \in I} \Gamma_i$ and A be the spherical ring $B(x, ar) \setminus \overline{B}(x, r)$.

Then $\Gamma' = f(\Gamma)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \delta &= \frac{K \cdot \omega_{n-1}}{(\log a)^{n-1}} = K \cdot M(\Gamma_A) \geq K \cdot M(\Gamma) \geq M(\Gamma') \geq \sum_{i \in I} M(\Gamma'_i) \\ &\geq \sum_{i \in I} M(\Delta_i) \geq \sum_{i \in I} c_n \cdot \log \frac{b_i}{a_i}. \end{aligned}$$

We used here a path inequality of Poleckii [11]. Let now $J \subset I$ be finite and suppose that $a_{i_1} < b_{i_1} \leq a_{i_2} < b_{i_2} \leq \dots \leq a_{i_p} < b_{i_p}$ is an ordering of the endpoints of the intervals counted by J . We take $b_{i_0} = \alpha s$, $a_{i_{p+1}} = s$, and since

$$c_n \cdot \sum_{j=1}^p \log \frac{b_{i_j}}{a_{i_j}} + c_n \cdot \sum_{j=0}^p \log \frac{a_{i_{j+1}}}{b_{i_j}} = c_n \cdot \log \frac{1}{\alpha} = 2\delta,$$

it follows that

$$c_n \cdot \sum_{j=0}^p \log \frac{a_{i_{j+1}}}{b_{i_j}} \geq \delta,$$

and let $A_J = \bigcup_{j=0}^p (\overline{B}(f(x), a_{i_{j+1}}) \setminus B(f(x), b_{i_j}))$. We take $\theta_j \in (b_{i_j}, a_{i_{j+1}})$ such that $\log(a_{i_{j+1}}/b_{i_j}) = (a_{i_{j+1}} - b_{i_j}) \cdot 1/\theta_j$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, p$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} V(A_J) &= V_n \cdot \sum_{j=0}^p (a_{i_{j+1}}^n - b_{i_j}^n) = V_n \cdot \sum_{j=0}^p (a_{i_{j+1}} - b_{i_j}) \cdot \left(\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} a_{i_{j+1}}^{n-k-1} \cdot b_{i_j}^k \right) \\ &\geq n \cdot V_n \cdot \alpha^{n-1} \cdot s^{n-1} \cdot \sum_{j=0}^p (a_{i_{j+1}} - b_{i_j}) \\ &= n \cdot V_n \cdot \alpha^{n-1} \cdot s^{n-1} \cdot \sum_{j=0}^p \theta_j \log \frac{a_{i_{j+1}}}{b_{i_j}} \\ &\geq n \cdot V_n \cdot \alpha^n \cdot s^n \cdot \sum_{j=0}^p \log \frac{a_{i_{j+1}}}{b_{i_j}} \geq \frac{n \cdot V_n \cdot \delta \cdot \alpha^n \cdot s^n}{c_n}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $A = \bigcap_{J \subset I} A_J$, $J \subset I$ being finite. Then A is Lebesgue measurable and $V(A) \geq n \cdot V_n \cdot \delta \cdot \alpha^n \cdot s^n / c_n$ and $A = \bigcap_{t \in (\alpha s, s] \setminus B} S(f(x), t)$, and we have

$$V(C) = V(A) \geq \frac{n \cdot V_n \cdot \delta \cdot \alpha^n \cdot s^n}{c_n},$$

if $C = \bigcap_{t \in (\alpha s, s] \setminus B} S(f(x), t)$. Since $S(f(x), t) \cap E = \emptyset$ for every $t \in (\alpha s, s] \setminus B$, it follows that $S(f(x), t) \subset f(\overline{B}(x, ar))$ for $t \in (\alpha s, s] \setminus B$; hence $C \subset f(\overline{B}(x, ar))$.

We have now that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mu_n(f(B(x, ar)))}{d(f(B(x, ar)))^n} &\geq \frac{\mu_n(f(\overline{B}(x, ar)))}{2^n \cdot L(x, f, r)^n} \geq \frac{V(C)}{2^n \cdot s^n} \\ &\geq n \cdot V_n \cdot \alpha^n \cdot s^n \cdot \frac{\delta}{c_n \cdot 2^n \cdot s^n} = n \cdot V_n \cdot \alpha^n \cdot \frac{\delta}{c_n \cdot 2^n} \geq L(a, K), \end{aligned}$$

i.e., $d(f(B(x, r)))^n / \mu_n(f(B(x, ar))) \leq C(a, K)$.

Finally, if $\mu_n(f(S(x, ar))) \neq 0$, we let $\varepsilon > 0$. Since f is K -quasiregular on $B(x, ar) \setminus \overline{B}(x, r)$, we have $\mu_n(f(S(x, (a - \varepsilon)r)) = 0$ and this implies that $d(f(B(x, r)))^n / \mu_n(f(B(x, (a - \varepsilon)r)) \leq C(a - \varepsilon, K)$. Letting ε tend to zero, we complete the proof.

Theorem 7. *Let $D \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ be open, $n \geq 2$, $f: D \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$ continuous, open and discrete such that there exists $K \subset D$, and $h, t > 0$ such that*

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{d(f(B(x, r)))^n}{\mu_n(f(B(x, r)))} < h$$

for every $x \in D \setminus K$, and there exists $0 < a < 1$ and $\mathcal{B} = (B_i)_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$ an a -porous base of K with $d(f(aB_i))^n / \mu_n(f(B_i)) < t$ for $i \in \mathbf{N}$. Then f is quasiregular and $K_0(f) \leq V_n \cdot H$ where $H = \max\{h, t\}$.

Proof. Let $g: (1, \infty) \rightarrow (1, \infty)$ be defined by $g(t) = (t^n - 1)/(t - 1)^n$ for $t \in (1, \infty)$. Then $g'(t) < 0$ for $t > 1$, $\lim_{t \rightarrow 1} g(t) = \infty$, $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} g(t) = 1$, hence g is a bijection of $(1, \infty)$ onto $(1, \infty)$. Let $x \in D$ be fixed. We can find $U \in V(x)$, $V \in V(f(x))$ such that $f|_U: U \rightarrow V$ is a proper map, $f(\partial U) = \partial V$, \overline{U} is compact and $N(f, U) = |i(f, x)|$. Let $r > 0$ be small enough such that $\overline{B}(x, r) \cup U(x, f, L_\alpha) \subset U$, $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ and $L_\alpha = L(x, f, \alpha r)$, $l = l(x, f, r)$ and suppose that $L_\alpha/l \geq 1$. Let $A = B(f(x), L_\alpha) \setminus \overline{B}(f(x), l)$ and $B = U(x, f, L_\alpha) \setminus \overline{U}(x, f, l)$.

From [15, p. 9], for $r > 0$ small enough, B is also a ring of components $C_0 = \overline{U}(x, f, l)$, $C_1 = CU(x, f, L_\alpha)$ and $f(B) = A$. Also, the component C_0 contains the point x and a point a such that $|x - a| = r$ and the component C_1 contains ∞ and a point b such that $|x - b| = \alpha r$, hence from [15, p. 36] it follows that $M(\Gamma_B) \geq \mathcal{H}_n(|x - b|/|x - a|) = \mathcal{H}_n(\alpha)$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $0 < a < \lambda < 1$ and let $M = \max\{B(n) \cdot N(\varepsilon), N(a, \lambda)\}$, $P = \min\{1/(2 + \varepsilon), (\lambda - a)/2\}$.

Using Theorem 4 and Theorem 5, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_n(\alpha) &\leq M(\Gamma_B) \leq R(n, 2, P) \cdot \text{Mod}_{(2, M, P)}(\Gamma_B) \\ &\leq 2 \cdot R(n, 2, P) \cdot H \cdot N(f, B) \cdot M \cdot \frac{\mu_n(f(B))}{d(\overline{B}(f(x), l), CB(f(x), L_\alpha))^n)} \\ &\leq 2 \cdot R(n, 2, P) \cdot H \cdot M \cdot N(f, U) \cdot \frac{\mu_n(A)}{(L_\alpha - l)^n} \\ &= 2 \cdot R(n, 2, P) \cdot H \cdot M \cdot N(f, U) \cdot V_n \cdot \frac{(L_\alpha^n - l^n)}{(L_\alpha - l)^n} \\ &= 2 \cdot R(n, 2, P) \cdot H \cdot M \cdot N(f, U) \cdot V_n \cdot g(L_\alpha/l). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{H}_n(\alpha) = \infty$, we can find $0 < \alpha < 1$ small enough such that

$$\mathcal{H}_n(\alpha) > 2 \cdot R(n, 2, P) \cdot H \cdot M \cdot N(f, U) \cdot V_n.$$

Then

$$\frac{L_\alpha}{l} \leq g^{-1} \left(\frac{\mathcal{H}_n(\alpha)}{2 \cdot R(n, 2, P) \cdot H \cdot M \cdot N(f, U) \cdot V_n} \right).$$

We denote

$$C(n, h, t, \alpha, \lambda, \varepsilon, U) = \max \left\{ 1, g^{-1} \left(\frac{\mathcal{H}_n(\alpha)}{2 \cdot R(n, 2, P) \cdot H \cdot M \cdot N(f, U) \cdot V_n} \right) \right\}.$$

It follows that

$$\frac{L(x, f, \alpha r)}{l(x, f, r)} \leq C(n, h, t, \alpha, \lambda, \varepsilon, U)$$

for every $r > 0$ such that $\overline{B}(x, r) \cup U(x, f, L_\alpha) \subset U$. This yields that

$$H_\alpha(x, f) = \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{L(x, f, \alpha r)}{l(x, f, r)} \leq C(n, h, t, \alpha, \lambda, \varepsilon, U).$$

This inequality is also valid for every point $z \in U$; hence from Theorem 1 [4] it follows that f is quasiregular on U . We have therefore proved that f is locally quasiregular on D ; hence f is ACLⁿ on D and f is a.e. differentiable on D and $J_f(x) \neq 0$ a.e. in D .

Let us now fix a point $x \in D \setminus K$ such that f is differentiable in x and $J_f(x) \neq 0$ and let $0 < \varepsilon < |f'(x)|$ be fixed. Then there exists $r_\varepsilon > 0$ such that $|f(z) - f(x) - f'(x)(z - x)| \leq \varepsilon \cdot |z - x|$ for $|z - x| \leq r_\varepsilon$. Then

$$(2) \quad (|f'(x)| - \varepsilon) \cdot r \leq L(x, f, r) \quad \text{for } 0 < r < r_\varepsilon.$$

Since $J_f(x) \neq 0$, we have $l(f'(x)) > 0$, and let $s = (l(f'(x)) + \varepsilon)/l(f'(x))$ and $\varphi: \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$ be defined by $\varphi(z) = f(x) + f'(x)(z - x)$ for $z \in \mathbf{R}^n$.

We show that $f(B(x, r)) \subset \varphi(B(x, rs))$ for $0 < r \leq r_\varepsilon$. Indeed, let $0 < r < r_\varepsilon$ be fixed and $y \in f(B(x, r))$. Then there exists $a \in B(x, r)$ such that $y = f(a)$, and since $\varphi: \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$ is a bijection, we can find $z \in \mathbf{R}^n$ such that $y = \varphi(z)$.

We have

$$\begin{aligned} |z - a| &\leq |f'(x)(z - a)|/l(f'(x)) = |\varphi(z) - \varphi(a)|/l(f'(x)) \\ &= |f(a) - (f(x) - f'(x)(x - a))|/l(f'(x)) \\ &\leq \varepsilon \cdot |x - a|/l(f'(x)) < \varepsilon \cdot r/l(f'(x)); \end{aligned}$$

hence $|z - x| \leq |x - a| + |z - a| \leq r + r\varepsilon/l(f'(x)) = rs$, and this shows that $z \in B(x, rs)$. We proved that $y = f(a) = \varphi(z) \in \varphi(B(x, rs))$, and since y was arbitrary in $f(B(x, r))$, it follows that $f(B(x, r)) \subset \varphi(B(x, rs))$; hence $\mu_n(f(B(x, r))) \leq \mu_n(\varphi(B(x, rs))) = \mu_n(f'(x)(B(x, rs))) = V_n \cdot (rs)^n \cdot |J_f(x)|$. From (2) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{l(f'(x))^n \cdot (|f'(x)| - \varepsilon)^n}{(l(f'(x)) + \varepsilon)^n \cdot V_n \cdot |J_f(x)|} &= \frac{(|f'(x)| - \varepsilon)^n \cdot r^n}{V_n \cdot (rs)^n \cdot |J_f(x)|} \\ &\leq \frac{L(x, f, r)^n}{\mu_n(f(B(x, r)))} \leq \frac{d(f(B(x, r)))^n}{\mu_n(f(B(x, r)))} \end{aligned}$$

for $0 < r \leq r_\varepsilon$ and we obtain that

$$(3) \quad \frac{(|f'(x)| - \varepsilon)^n}{|J_f(x)|} \leq V_n \cdot \left(\frac{l(f'(x)) + \varepsilon}{l(f'(x))} \right)^n \cdot \frac{d(f(B(x, r)))^n}{\mu_n(f(B(x, r)))}$$

for $0 < r \leq r_\varepsilon$. Since $\liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} d(f(B(x, r)))^n / \mu_n(f(B(x, r))) \leq h$, we can find $r_p \rightarrow 0$ such that $d(f(B(x, r_p)))^n / \mu_n(f(B(x, r_p))) \leq h$ for every $p \in \mathbf{N}$; hence replacing r by r_p in (3) and letting p tend to infinite, we obtain that

$$\frac{(|f'(x)| - \varepsilon)^n}{|J_f(x)|} \leq V_n \cdot h \cdot \left(\frac{l(f'(x)) + \varepsilon}{l(f'(x))} \right)^n,$$

and letting now ε tend to zero, we find that $|f'(x)|^n / |J_f(x)| \leq V_n \cdot h$. Since $\mu_n(K) = 0$ (no point of K can be a point of density of K), f is a.e. differentiable in D and $J_f(x) \neq 0$ a.e. in D , it follows that $|f'(x)|^n \leq V_n \cdot h \cdot |J_f(x)|$ a.e. in D and since f is ACLⁿ, it follows from [9, p. 9] that f is quasiregular on D and $K_0(f) \leq V_n \cdot h$.

Corollary 1. *Let $D \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ be open, $K \subset D$, $n \geq 2$, $f: D \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$ continuous, open and discrete such that there exists $h > 0$ such that $h(x, f) < h$ for every $x \in D \setminus K$, and there exists $t > 0$, $0 < a < 1$ and $\mathcal{B} = (B_i)_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$ an a -porous base of K with $d(f(aB_i))^n / \mu_n(f(B_i)) < t$ for every $i \in \mathbf{N}$. Then f is quasiregular and $H(x, f) = h(x, f) < h$ a.e. in D .*

Proof. From Theorem 10 it follows that f is quasiregular; hence f is a.e. differentiable and $J_f(x) > 0$ a.e. in D . Let $x \in D$ be fixed such that f is differentiable in x and $J_f(x) > 0$ and let $0 < \varepsilon < l(f'(x))$. Since f is differentiable in x , there exists $r_\varepsilon > 0$ such that $|f(z) - f(x) - f'(x)(z - x)| \leq \varepsilon \cdot |z - x|$ for $|z - x| \leq r_\varepsilon$. Then

$$(4) \quad \frac{|f'(x)| - \varepsilon}{l(f'(x)) + \varepsilon} \leq \frac{L(x, f, r)}{l(x, f, r)} \leq \frac{|f'(x)| + \varepsilon}{l(f'(x)) - \varepsilon}$$

for $0 < r \leq r_\varepsilon$. We can find $r_p \rightarrow 0$ such that $L(x, f, r_p)/l(x, f, r_p) \rightarrow h(x, f)$, and let $p_\varepsilon \in \mathbf{N}$ be such that $0 < r_p \leq r_\varepsilon$ for $p \geq p_\varepsilon$. From (4) we have for $p \geq p_\varepsilon$ that

$$\frac{|f'(x)| - \varepsilon}{l(f'(x)) + \varepsilon} \leq \frac{L(x, f, r_p)}{l(x, f, r_p)} \leq \frac{|f'(x)| + \varepsilon}{l(f'(x)) - \varepsilon},$$

and letting first p tend to ∞ and then letting ε tend to zero, we obtain that $|f'(x)|/l(f'(x)) = h(x, f)$. Using (4) again, we see that

$$\frac{|f'(x)| - \varepsilon}{l(f'(x)) + \varepsilon} \leq H(x, f) \leq \frac{|f'(x)| + \varepsilon}{l(f'(x)) - \varepsilon},$$

and letting ε tend to zero we obtain that $H(x, f) = |f'(x)|/l(f'(x))$; hence $H(x, f) = h(x, f)$. We have therefore proved that $H(x, f) = h(x, f)$ a.e. in D .

Remark. In 1994, at a seminar held in Helsinki, J. Väisälä raised the following problem:

It is known that if $f: \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$ is a homeomorphism such that there exists $h > 0$ such that $h(x, f) < h$ for every $x \in \mathbf{R}^n$, then f is $K(h, n)$ -quasiconformal (it is the result of J. Heinonen and P. Koskela from [7]). Find the best estimation of the constant of quasiconformality $K(h, n)$. Corollary 1 shows that this problem is reduced to the classical problem when the inferior linear dilatation $h(x, f)$ is replaced by the classical linear dilatation $H(x, f)$. Indeed, we proved that $H(x, f) = h(x, f)$ a.e. in D . Since f is ACLⁿ, hence a.e. differentiable in D , the problem of finding the best constant of quasiregularity $K = K(h, n)$ is reduced in this way to the known case when we have that $H(x, f) < H$ for every $x \in D$. For interesting estimations of this kind, see the papers of M. Vuorinen [1], [2], [13], [14].

As an open problem, we raise the following question: If $D \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ is open, $n \geq 2$, $f: D \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$ is continuous, open and discrete such that there exists $h > 0$ with $h(x, f) < h$ for every $x \in D$, does it follow that $H(x, f) < h$ for every $x \in D$? We can now prove the following generalization of a removability result of J. Heinonen and P. Koskela from [7]:

Theorem 8. *Let $D \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ be open, $n \geq 2$, $f: D \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$ continuous, such that there exists $H \subset D$ closed in D such that f is K -quasiregular on $D \setminus H$ and there exists $0 < a < 1$, and $\mathcal{B} = (B_i)_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$, an a -porous base of H . Then, if f is open and discrete, or if $\text{int } f(H) = \emptyset$, it follows that f is K -quasiregular on D .*

Proof. We see that $\mu_n(H) = 0$ and $\dim(H) = 0$, hence f is a light map. Suppose that $\text{int } f(H) = \emptyset$. Using the fact that f is quasiregular on $D \setminus H$, it follows that f is differentiable on $D \setminus H$ and $J_f(x) \geq 0$ in $D \setminus H$, and since $\text{int } f(H) = \emptyset$, we apply Theorem 10 [6] to obtain that f is open and discrete on D . Using Theorem 6, we can find a constant $C(a, K)$ such that $d(f(aB_i))^n / \mu_n(f(B_i)) \leq C(a, K)$ for every $i \in \mathbf{N}$. We apply now Theorem 7 to see that f is quasiregular on D . Since $\mu_n(H) = 0$ and f is K -quasiregular on $D \setminus H$, it follows that f is K -quasiregular on D .

Another generalization of the removability result from [7] may be found in [8].

Acknowledgement. I wish to thank the referee for his comments.

References

- [1] ANDERSON, G.D., M.K. VAMANAMURTHY, and M. VUORINEN: Dimension-free quasiconformal distortion in n -space. - Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 297, 1986, 687–706.
- [2] ANDERSON, G.D., M.K. VAMANAMURTHY, and M. VUORINEN: Inequalities for quasiconformal mappings in space. - Pacific J. Math. 160, 1993, 1–18.
- [3] CRISTEA, M.: Some properties of the maps in \mathbf{R}^n with applications to the distortion and singularities of quasiregular mappings. - Rev. Roumaine Math. Pures Appl. 36:7–8, 1991, 355–368.
- [4] CRISTEA, M.: Some conditions of quasiregularity I. - Rev. Roumaine Math. Pures Appl. 39:6, 1994, 587–597.
- [5] CRISTEA, M.: Some conditions of quasiregularity II. - Rev. Roumaine Math. Pures Appl. 39:6, 1994, 599–609.
- [6] CRISTEA, M.: A generalization of the theorem of the univalence on the boundary. - Rev. Roumaine Math. Pures Appl. 40:5–6, 1995, 435–448.
- [7] HEINONEN, J., and P. KOSKELA: Definitions of quasiconformality. - Invent. Math. 120, 1995, 61–79.
- [8] KAUFMAN, R., and JANG-MEI WU: On removable sets for quasiconformal mappings. - Ark. Mat. 34, 1996, 141–158.
- [9] MARTIO, O., S. RICKMAN, and J. VÄISÄLÄ: Definitions for quasiregular mappings. - Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math. 448, 1969, 1–40.
- [10] MATTILA, P.: Geometry of Sets and Measures in Euclidean Spaces. - Cambridge Studies in Advanced Math. 44, 1995.
- [11] POLECKII, E.A.: The modulus method for non-homeomorphic quasiconformal mappings. - Mat. Sb. 83, 1970, 261–272 (Russian).
- [12] RICKMAN, S.: Quasiregular Mappings. - Lecture Notes in Math. 26, Springer-Verlag, 1993.
- [13] VUORINEN, M.: On the distortion of n -dimensional quasiconformal mappings. - Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 96, 1986, 275–283.
- [14] VUORINEN, M.: Quadruples and spatial quasiconformal mappings. - Math. Z. 295, 1990, 617–628.
- [15] VÄISÄLÄ, J.: Lectures on n -dimensional Quasiconformal Mappings. - Lecture Notes in Math. 229, Springer-Verlag, 1971.

Received 16 September 1998