

Ondřej Zindulka*, Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Civil Engineering,
Czech Technical University, Thákurova 7, 160 00 Prague 6, Czech Republic
(e-mail: zindulka@mat.fsv.cvut.cz)

Packing measures and cartesian products

Abstract

If $E \subseteq X \times Y$ is a subset of a cartesian product of two separable metric spaces, then

$$\int^* \nu^t(E_x) d\mathcal{P}^s(x) \leq \mathcal{P}^{s+t}(E),$$

where ν^t and \mathcal{P}^s denote, respectively, the Hewitt-Stromberg and packing measures. It follows that $\underline{\dim}_{\mathbb{P}} X + \underline{\dim}_{\mathbb{P}} Y \leq \underline{\dim}_{\mathbb{P}} X \times Y$. Moreover, if X is finitely dimensional, then

$$\inf\{\overline{\dim}_{\mathbb{P}} X \times Y - \overline{\dim}_{\mathbb{P}} Y : \overline{\dim}_{\mathbb{P}} Y < \infty\} = \liminf_{X_n \nearrow X} \underline{\dim}_{\mathbb{B}} X_n.$$

This solves a problem of Hu and Taylor [6].

1 Introduction

Let X and Y be two *fractals*, i.e. subsets of the real line, or, more generally, two separable metric spaces, viewed by a geometric measure theorist. Consider their cartesian product $X \times Y$ equipped with the maximum metric: If d_X is the metric on X and d_Y that on Y , the distance d on $X \times Y$ is given by

$$d((x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2)) = \max(d_X(x_1, x_2), d_Y(y_1, y_2)).$$

One may think about how various fractal dimensions of the product $X \times Y$ and those of the coordinate spaces X , Y are related. Many inequalities are known. We focus on the one due to Howroyd [5]:

$$\overline{\dim}_{\mathbb{P}} X \times Y \geq \dim_{\mathbb{H}} X + \overline{\dim}_{\mathbb{P}} Y. \quad (1)$$

Key Words: packing measure, Hewitt-Stromberg measure packing dimension, lower packing dimension, cartesian product

Mathematical Reviews subject classification: 28A78, 28A80

*The autor was supported by Research project MSM:6840770006 of the Ministry of Education of Czech Republic.

Here $\overline{\dim}_{\mathbb{P}}$ denotes the packing dimension (whose definition will be recalled right away) and $\dim_{\mathbb{H}}$ the Hausdorff dimension. Our goal is to improve this inequality.

Fix, once and for all, a separable metric space X .

Box and packing dimensions

We first review the notions of box-counting and packing dimensions. A *box-counting function* of a set $E \subseteq X$ is defined by

$$N_E(\delta) = \sup\{\#(D) : D \subseteq E \text{ and } d(x, y) > \delta \text{ for all } x \neq y \text{ in } D\}. \quad (2)$$

$\#(D)$ denotes the cardinality of D . Thus $N_E(\delta)$ is the maximal number of points in E that are apart each other.

Upper and *lower box dimensions* measure the exponential rate of change of the box-counting function:

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\dim}_{\mathbb{B}} E &= \limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\log N_E(\delta)}{|\log \delta|} \\ \underline{\dim}_{\mathbb{B}} E &= \liminf_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\log N_E(\delta)}{|\log \delta|} \end{aligned}$$

Given a cover $\{E_n\}$ of E by countably many sets, the equation

$$\overline{\dim}_{\mathbb{B}} \bigcup_n E_n = \sup_n \overline{\dim}_{\mathbb{B}} E_n$$

may fail; and the corresponding equation for $\underline{\dim}_{\mathbb{B}}$ may fail even for finitely many sets E_n . A further step is required to overcome this imbalance: *Upper* and *lower packing dimensions* are defined thus.

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\dim}_{\mathbb{P}} E &= \inf\left\{\sup_n \overline{\dim}_{\mathbb{B}} E_n : \bigcup_n E_n = X\right\} \\ \underline{\dim}_{\mathbb{P}} E &= \inf\left\{\sup_n \underline{\dim}_{\mathbb{B}} E_n : \bigcup_n E_n = X\right\} \end{aligned}$$

Upper packing dimension is often called just *packing dimension* and denoted $\dim_{\mathbb{P}}$.

Hu & Taylor's question

Howroyd's inequality (1) may be understood this way: Fix a separable metric space X . Then for all separable metric spaces Y we have

$$\dim_{\mathbb{H}} X \leq \overline{\dim}_{\mathbb{P}} X \times Y - \overline{\dim}_{\mathbb{P}} Y.$$

Motivated by this, Hu and Taylor [6] introduced a new dimension of $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}$

$$\text{aDim } X = \inf\{\overline{\dim}_{\mathbb{P}} X \times Y - \overline{\dim}_{\mathbb{P}} Y : Y \subseteq \mathbb{R}\}$$

and asked: Obviously $\text{aDim } X \geq \dim_{\mathbb{H}} X$. Is $\text{aDim } X = \dim_{\mathbb{H}} X$ for all $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}$? Both the definition and the question easily generalize to subspaces of \mathbb{R}^n . Almost immediately two papers of Bishop and Peres [1] and Xiao [10] answered the question in negative:

Theorem 1.1. (i) ([1]) *If $X, Y \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ are compact, then $\underline{\dim}_{\mathbb{P}} X + \overline{\dim}_{\mathbb{P}} Y \leq \overline{\dim}_{\mathbb{P}} X \times Y$. Hence $\underline{\dim}_{\mathbb{P}} X \leq \text{aDim } X$.*

(ii) ([10]) *If $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, then $\text{aDim } X \leq \underline{\dim}_{\mathbb{B}} X$.*

So $\underline{\dim}_{\mathbb{P}} X \leq \text{aDim } X \leq \underline{\dim}_{\mathbb{B}} X$ holds at least for compact $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. So perhaps $\text{aDim } X = \underline{\dim}_{\mathbb{P}} X$ or $\text{aDim } X = \underline{\dim}_{\mathbb{B}} X$? No: There are examples in [1, 10] of both $\underline{\dim}_{\mathbb{P}} X < \text{aDim } X$ and $\text{aDim } X < \underline{\dim}_{\mathbb{B}} X$. So what does $\text{aDim } X$ equal to?

Packing measure

Packing dimension is often defined in terms of packing measure due to Tricot [9]. Recall its definition, as it appears e.g. in [7]. Given a set $E \subseteq X$ and $\delta > 0$, a collection of closed balls $\{B(x_i, r_i) : i \in I\}$ is called a δ -packing of E if $x_i \in E$, $r_i < \delta$ and $x_j \notin B(x_i, r_i)$ for $i \neq j$.

Given $s \geq 0$, the s -dimensional packing pre-measure of E is defined by

$$\mathcal{P}_0^s(E) = \inf_{\delta > 0} \sup \left\{ \sum_i (r_i)^s : \{B(x_i, r_i)\} \text{ is a } \delta\text{-packing of } E \right\}.$$

and the s -dimensional packing measure of E obtains from the pre-measure by ‘‘Method I’’ thus:

$$\mathcal{P}^s(E) = \inf \left\{ \sum_n \mathcal{P}_0^s(E_n) : E \subseteq \bigcup_n E_n \right\}$$

Properties of \mathcal{P}^s are well-known; in particular, the restriction of \mathcal{P}^s to the algebra of Borel sets is a Borel measure and $\mathcal{P}^s \geq 2^{-s} \mathcal{H}^s$, where \mathcal{H}^s denotes the s -dimensional Hausdorff measure.

Upper packing dimension may be alternatively defined by

$$\overline{\dim}_{\mathbb{P}} E = \inf\{s : \mathcal{P}^s(E) = 0\} = \sup\{s : \mathcal{P}^s(E) = \infty\}$$

and thus it follows exactly the pattern of the Hausdorff dimension definition.

2 Hewitt-Stromberg measure and integral inequalities

We would like to have a “lower packing measure” related to lower packing dimension the same way as packing measure is related to upper packing dimension. Such a measure is fortunately available, actually since 1965 – much longer than packing measure. It appears in [4, Exercise 10.51]. Haase pioneered its investigation, see [3], and called it *Hewitt-Stromberg*. By definition, the s -dimensional *Hewitt-Stromberg content* of $E \subseteq X$ is given by

$$\nu_0^s(E) = \liminf_{\delta \rightarrow 0} N_E(\delta) \cdot \delta^s$$

(recall (2)) and the s -dimensional *Hewitt-Stromberg measure* obtains from the content by “Method I”:

$$\nu^s(E) = \inf \left\{ \sum_n \nu_0^s(E_n) : E \subseteq \bigcup_n E_n \right\}$$

Our first proposition shows that this indeed is the right notion.

Proposition 2.1. $\underline{\dim}_{\mathbb{P}} E = \inf\{s : \nu^s(E) = 0\} = \sup\{s : \nu^s(E) = \infty\}$

Besides Hewitt-Stromberg measure we introduce a variation called *directed Hewitt-Stromberg pre-measure*

$$\underline{\nu}^s(E) = \liminf_{E_n \nearrow E} \nu_0^s(E_n) = \inf \{ \sup_n \nu_0^s(E_n) : E_n \nearrow E \}$$

and a related *directed packing dimension*

$$\underline{\dim}_{\mathbb{P}} E = \inf\{s : \underline{\nu}^s(E) = 0\} = \sup\{s : \underline{\nu}^s(E) = \infty\}.$$

The inequalities $\nu^s \leq \underline{\nu}^s \leq \nu_0^s$ are obvious, yielding $\underline{\dim}_{\mathbb{P}} X \leq \underline{\dim}_{\mathbb{P}} X \leq \underline{\dim}_{\mathbb{B}} X$. And there is an example of $\underline{\dim}_{\mathbb{P}} X < \underline{\dim}_{\mathbb{P}} X < \underline{\dim}_{\mathbb{B}} X$. The following establishes a simple relation between directed packing and lower box dimensions.

Proposition 2.2. $\underline{\dim}_{\mathbb{P}} E = \underline{\lim}_{E_n \nearrow E} \underline{\dim}_{\mathbb{B}} E_n$

Note a similar relation between upper packing and upper box dimensions $\overline{\dim}_{\mathbb{P}} E = \underline{\lim}_{E_n \nearrow E} \overline{\dim}_{\mathbb{B}} E_n$ (see [2, Proposition 3.8]).

Our main result follows:

Theorem 2.3. *Let X, Y be separable metric spaces. For any set $E \subseteq X \times Y$ and any $s, t \geq 0$ we have*

$$\int \underline{\nu}^s(E_x) d\mathcal{P}^t(x) \leq \mathcal{P}^{s+t}(E),$$

$$\int \nu^s(E_x) d\nu^t(x) \leq \nu^{s+t}(E).$$

Here E_x denotes a vertical section $E_x = \{y \in Y; (x, y) \in E\}$ of E , and \int^* denotes the upper Lebesgue integral, as the function $x \mapsto \underline{\nu}^s(E_x)$ need not be measurable and Lebesgue integral thus need not exist.

The proof is a bit involved; it will appear elsewhere. Note that both integral inequalities are particular instances of rather general formulas.

Here are some sample consequences of the above theorem.

Corollary 2.4. *For any separable metric spaces X, Y*

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{\dim}_{\mathbb{P}}(X \times Y) &\geq \underline{\dim}_{\mathbb{P}} X + \overline{\dim}_{\mathbb{P}} Y, \\ \underline{\dim}_{\mathbb{P}}(X \times Y) &\geq \underline{\dim}_{\mathbb{P}} X + \underline{\dim}_{\mathbb{P}} Y, \\ \dim_{\mathbb{P}}(X \times Y) &\geq \dim_{\mathbb{P}} X + \dim_{\mathbb{P}} Y.\end{aligned}$$

Corollary 2.5. *Let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be a Lipschitz map. For any $s \geq t \geq 0$*

$$\begin{aligned}\int^* \underline{\nu}^{s-t}(f^{-1}(y)) \, d\mathcal{P}^t(y) &\leq c \mathcal{P}^s(X), \\ \int^* \nu^{s-t}(f^{-1}(y)) \, d\nu^t(y) &\leq c \nu^s(X),\end{aligned}$$

where $c = \max(1, L^{s+t})$, L being the Lipschitz constant of f .

3 Hu & Taylor question revisited

By Corollary 2.4, Howroyd's inequality (1) improves to

$$\overline{\dim}_{\mathbb{P}} X \times Y \geq \underline{\dim}_{\mathbb{P}} X + \overline{\dim}_{\mathbb{P}} Y \tag{3}$$

that holds for any pair of separable metric spaces.

On the other hand, a rather involved construction based on the idea of the proof of 1.1(ii) yields the following converse. Recall that a metric space X is, by Larman [8], finite-dimensional if there is a constant K such that any ball in X can be covered by at most K many balls of halved radii.

Theorem 3.1. *If X is a finite-dimensional metric space, then there is a compact metric space Y such that*

$$\underline{\dim}_{\mathbb{P}} X + \overline{\dim}_{\mathbb{P}} Y = \overline{\dim}_{\mathbb{P}} X \times Y.$$

Therefore

$$\inf\{\overline{\dim}_{\mathbb{P}} X \times Y - \overline{\dim}_{\mathbb{P}} Y : \overline{\dim}_{\mathbb{P}} Y < \infty\} = \underline{\dim}_{\mathbb{P}} X.$$

In particular,

$$\text{aDim } X = \underline{\dim}_{\mathbb{P}} X$$

for all $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$.

This solves, in view of Proposition 2.2, the Hu & Taylor question completely.

References

- [1] Christopher J. Bishop and Yuval Peres, *Packing dimension and cartesian products*.
- [2] K. J. Falconer, *Fractal geometry — mathematical foundations and applications*, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1990.
- [3] Hermann Haase, *A contribution to measure and dimension of metric spaces*, Math. Nachr. **124** (1985), 45–55. MR 827889 (87g:54079)
- [4] E. Hewitt and K. Stromberg, *Real and abstract analysis*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1965.
- [5] J. D. Howroyd, *On hausdorff and packing dimension of product spaces*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc. **119** (1996), no. 3, 715–727.
- [6] Xiaoyu Hu and S. James Taylor, *Fractal properties of products and projections of measures in \mathbf{R}^d* , Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **115** (1994), no. 3, 527–544. MR 1269937 (95f:28013)
- [7] H. Joyce and D. Preiss, *On the existence of subsets of positive finite packing measure*, Mathematika **42** (1995), 14–24.
- [8] D. G. Larman, *A new theory of dimension*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (1967), no. 43, 292–302.
- [9] C. Tricot, *Two definitions of fractional dimension*, Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc. **91** (1982), 57–74.
- [10] Yimin Xiao, *Packing dimension, Hausdorff dimension and cartesian product sets*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc. **120** (1996), 535–546.