

*Pacific
Journal of
Mathematics*

A_∞ AND THE GREEN FUNCTION

JANG-MEI GLORIA WU

Volume 157 No. 1

January 1993

A_∞ AND THE GREEN FUNCTION

JANG-MEI WU

Let $G(x)$ be the Green function in a domain $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ with a fixed pole, and Γ be an $(m-1)$ -dimensional hyperplane. We give conditions on Ω and $\Omega \cap \Gamma$ so that $|\nabla G|$ is A_∞ with respect to the $(m-1)$ -dimensional measure on $\Omega \cap \Gamma$. Certain properties of the Riemann mapping of a simply-connected domain in \mathbb{R}^2 are extended to the Green function of domains in \mathbb{R}^m .

In [3], Fernández, Heinonen and Martio have proved the following:

THEOREM A. *Let f be a conformal mapping from a simply-connected planar domain Ω onto the unit disk Δ and L be a line segment in Ω . Then $f(L)$ is a quasiconformal arc. Moreover, if L is a line segment on the boundary of a half plane contained in Ω , then $|f'| \in A_\infty(ds)$ on L with respect to the linear measure ds .*

If L is any line segment in Ω , $|f'|$ need not be in $A_\infty(ds)$ on L . In fact, Heinonen and Näkki [9] have proved the following:

THEOREM B. *Let f be a conformal mapping from a simply-connected domain Ω onto the unit disk Δ and L be a line segment in Ω . Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1) $|f'| \in A_\infty(ds)$ on L ,
- (2) $f|L$ is quasisymmetric,
- (3) there exists a chord arc domain $D \subseteq \Omega$ so that $L \subseteq \overline{D}$,
- (4) there exists a quasidisk $D \subseteq \Omega$ so that $L \subseteq \overline{D}$.

Let μ and ν be two measures on \mathbb{R}^m ($m \geq 2$). Recall that μ belongs to the Muckenhoupt class $A_\infty(d\nu)$ if there exist $\alpha, \beta \in (0, 1)$ such that whenever E is a measurable subset of a cube Q ,

$$(0.1) \quad \nu(E)/\nu(Q) < \alpha \text{ implies } \mu(E)/\mu(Q) < \beta.$$

If μ and ν have the doubling property, then $\mu \in A_\infty(d\nu)$ if and only if $\nu \in A_\infty(d\mu)$ ([2]). We say a function is in $A_\infty(d\nu)$ on L , provided that (0.1) holds with $d\mu = g d\nu$ for all cubes $Q \subseteq L$.

$f|L$ is quasisymmetric provided that for all $a, b, x \in L$, $|a-x| \leq |b-x|$ implies $|f(a)-f(x)| \leq c|f(b)-f(x)|$ for some constant $c > 0$.

Let G be the Green function for Ω with pole $f^{-1}(0)$ and $\delta(z)$ be $\text{dist}(z, \partial\Omega)$. From the distortion theorem, it follows that

$$(0.2) \quad |\nabla G(z)| \cong |f'(z)| \cong \frac{1 - |f(z)|}{\delta(z)} \cong \frac{G(z)}{\delta(z)}$$

when $f(z)$ is away from 0. Thus it is natural to study the analogue of Theorem B for general domains Ω in \mathbb{R}^m ($m \geq 2$), that is, to find conditions on Ω and the planar section $L \subseteq \Omega$, so that $|\nabla G| \in A_\infty(d\sigma)$ on L with respect to the $(m-1)$ -dimensional measure $d\sigma$. Because $|\nabla G|$ may vanish, we study $G(z)/\delta(z)$ instead.

From now on, Ω denotes a domain in \mathbb{R}^m ($m \geq 2$), G the Green function on Ω , P a fixed point in Ω and $G(x) = G(P, x)$. Let Γ be an $(m-1)$ -dimensional hyperplane in \mathbb{R}^m which does not contain P , and σ be the $(m-1)$ -dimensional measure on Γ . If L is a domain in Γ , denote by $\partial'L$ its boundary relative to Γ . We shall prove the following:

THEOREM 1. *Suppose that Ω is a nontangentially accessible (NTA) domain and that $L \subseteq \Omega$ is a uniform domain on the hyperplane Γ . Furthermore, there exists $0 < c < 1$ so that for each $x \in L$, at least one component of $B(x, c \text{dist}(x, \partial'L)) \setminus L$ is contained in Ω . Then $\frac{G(x)}{\delta(x)}|_L$ can be extended to become an $A_\infty(d\sigma)$ function on the entire hyperplane Γ .*

THEOREM 2. *Suppose that Ω is a quasiball and is a BMO_1 domain. Then $\frac{G(x)}{\delta(x)}|_{\Gamma \cap \Omega}$ can be extended to become an $A_\infty(d\sigma)$ function on the entire hyperplane Γ .*

The assumption that L is a uniform domain arises naturally in defining A_∞ and in extending $G(x)/\delta(x)$ by the method of reflection. The additional condition on L is needed in view of the following:

EXAMPLE. For each $m \geq 2$, there exists an NTA domain so that $\Omega \cap \{x_m = 0\}$ is an $(m-1)$ -dimensional cube, but $\frac{G(x)}{\delta(x)} \notin A_\infty(d\sigma)$ on $\Omega \cap \{x_m = 0\}$.

The additional condition on L is satisfied when $L \subseteq \bar{D}$ for some domain $D \subseteq \Omega$ whose complement $\mathbb{R}^m \setminus D$ has the linearly locally connected property (LLC). Examples of such D are quasidisks in \mathbb{R}^2 or domains quasiconformally equivalent to a ball in \mathbb{R}^m ($m \geq 3$), see [7] and [8].

In Theorem 2, no condition is imposed on $\Omega \cap \Gamma$, and it may be any open set. Lipschitz domains which are homeomorphic to a ball satisfy the conditions in Theorem 2. The theorem remains true for all quasidisks in \mathbb{R}^2 (Theorem B).

In the core of our proof is the following theorem, which in its most general form is proved by B. Davis [4] by probabilistic methods. Special cases and related results can be found in [5], [13] and [15].

THEOREM C. *Let Ω be a domain in \mathbb{R}^m , $m \geq 2$, and $\{D_j\}$ be a sequence of closed sets contained in Ω with $\text{dist}(D_i, D_j) > 0$ whenever $i \neq j$. Set $\Omega_j = \Omega \setminus \bigcup_{k \neq j} D_k$. If $\{D_j\}$ are uniformly separated in the sense:*

$$(0.3) \quad \inf_j \inf_{z \in D_j} \omega(z, \partial\Omega, \Omega_j) = a > 0,$$

then for any $x \in \Omega \setminus \bigcup D_j$,

$$\sum_j \omega(x, D_j, \Omega \setminus D_j) < \frac{1}{a} \omega\left(x, \bigcup D_j, \Omega \setminus \bigcup D_j\right).$$

1. Preliminary Theorems. For a domain Ω and a set S in \mathbb{R}^m , denote by $\delta(S)$ the distance from S to $\partial\Omega$, $d(S)$ the diameter of S and $l(S)$ the side length of S if S is a cube. If S is a ball, a cube or a square, denote by cS the ball, the cube, or the square on the same hyperplane, concentric to S , of diameter $cd(S)$. Denote by $B(x, r)$ the ball centered at x of radius r .

Ω is called a nontangentially accessible (NTA) domain [10], if it is bounded and there exist constants $r_0 > 0$, $M > 10$ and $N > 10$ depending on Ω so that the following conditions are satisfied:

(1.1) *Corkscrew condition:* for any $Z \in \partial\Omega$, $0 < r < r_0$, there exist $A = A_r(Z) \in \Omega$ such that $M^{-1}r < |A - Z| < r$ and $\text{dist}(A, \partial\Omega) > M^{-1}r$.

(1.2) $\mathbb{R}^m \setminus \overline{\Omega}$ satisfies the corkscrew condition.

(1.3) *Harnack chain condition:* if X_1 and X_2 are in Ω , $\text{dist}(X_i, \partial\Omega) > \varepsilon > 0$, $i = 1, 2$, and $|X_1 - X_2| \leq 10M\varepsilon$, then there exist balls $B_j = B(Y_j, r_j)$, $1 \leq j \leq n$ with $n \leq N$, so that $Y_1 = X_1$ and $Y_n = X_2$ and that the balls satisfy

$$M^{-1}r_j < \text{dist}(B_j, \partial\Omega) < Mr_j, \quad 1 < j < n,$$

and

$$B\left(Y_j, \frac{r_j}{2}\right) \cap B\left(Y_{j+1}, \frac{r_{j+1}}{2}\right) \neq \emptyset, \quad 1 \leq j \leq n-1.$$

Suppose Ω is an NTA domain. For $Z \in \partial\Omega$, denote by $\Delta(Z, r)$ the surface ball $B(Z, r) \cap \partial\Omega$. Let P be a fixed point in Ω . Then the Green function in Ω and the harmonic measure ω on $\partial\Omega$ have the following properties, [10]:

(1.4) *Doubling property of ω* : there exists $C > 0$ depending only on Ω and P so that

$$\omega(P, \Delta(Z, 2r), \Omega) \leq C\omega(P, \Delta(Z, r), \Omega)$$

for any surface ball $\Delta(Z, r) \equiv B(Z, r) \cap \partial\Omega$.

(1.5) *Relation between ω and G* : suppose that $A \in \Omega$, $Z \in \partial\Omega$ with $c^{-1}\delta(A) \leq |A - Z| \leq c\delta(A)$; then there exists $C > 0$ depending on Ω , P and c only so that

$$C^{-1} \leq \frac{G(P, A)\delta(A)^{m-2}}{\omega(P, \Delta(Z, \delta(A)), \Omega)} \leq C.$$

Let Ω be an NTA domain, Q be a cube in Ω satisfying $\text{dist}(P, Q) \geq \delta(Q) \geq d(Q) \geq \frac{1}{2}\delta(Q)$, and Γ be an $(m-1)$ -dimensional hyperplane in \mathbb{R}^m passing through the center of Q . Following the arguments in [10], we may find constants $c, C > 0$ depending on Ω and P , so that

$$(1.6) \quad \begin{aligned} C^{-1}\omega(P, Q, \Omega \setminus Q) &\leq G(P, x)\delta(x)^{m-2} \\ &\leq C\omega(P, Q, \Omega \setminus Q), \quad x \in Q, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(1.7) \quad \omega(x, \partial\Omega \setminus \Gamma, \Omega \setminus (\Gamma \setminus Q)) > c, \quad x \in \frac{1}{2}Q.$$

Ω is called a *uniform domain* if it satisfies the interior corkscrew condition (1.1) and the interior Harnack chain condition (1.2) in the definition of NTA domain. It is also called a BMO extension domain because of its characterization in terms of extension properties of $\text{BMO}(\Omega)$ by Jones [11]. For properties of uniform domains, see [7]. In \mathbb{R}^2 , a simply-connected uniform domain is a quasidisk.

A bounded domain $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ is called a BMO_1 domain if its boundary is given locally in some C^∞ coordinate system as the graph of a function ϕ with $\nabla\phi \in \text{BMO}$. BMO_1 domains are defined and studied by Jerison and Kenig in [10]. They are NTA domains and can be regarded as the analogue of chord arc domains in \mathbb{R}^m ($m \geq 3$); note that the graph of $y = \phi(x)$ is a chord arc curve if $\phi' \in \text{BMO}(\mathbb{R}^1)$. It is proved in [10] that

THEOREM D. *If Ω is a BMO_1 domain, then the harmonic measure ω on $\partial\Omega$ belongs to $A_\infty(d\sigma)$.*

An extension of Hall's Lemma is proved in [19]; it is stated here with constants given more precisely.

THEOREM E. *Let Ω be a BMO_1 domain and $C_0 > 1$ be given. There exist constants $\lambda, c > 0$ depending on Ω and C_0 only, so that for any point $A \in \Omega$ and closed set $E \subseteq \Omega \cap B(A, C_0\delta(A))$,*

$$\omega(A, E, \Omega \setminus E) \geq c(M_{m-1}(E)\delta(A)^{-m+1})^\lambda,$$

where M_{m-1} is the $(m - 1)$ -dimensional content.

The α -dimensional content $M_\alpha(E)$ of a set E is defined to be $\inf \sum_n r_n^\alpha$, with the infimum taken over all coverings of E consisting of countably many balls with radii r_n .

We also need the following estimate of harmonic measures [19], which is first proved by Carleson [1] for the half plane. Again, the constants are described more precisely here.

THEOREM F. *Let Ω be a BMO_1 domain in \mathbb{R}^m ($m \geq 3$), $C_0 > 1$, $A \in \Omega$ and E be a closed set in $\Omega \cap B(A, C_0\delta(A))$. Let \mathcal{M} be the family of positive measures ν on E , which satisfy, for each cube Q in Ω with $16d(Q) \leq \delta(Q) \leq 256d(Q)$,*

$$\nu(Q) \leq \text{cap}(E \cap Q)l(Q);$$

and for each cube Q in \mathbb{R}^m that meets $\partial\Omega$,

$$\nu(Q) < l(Q)^{m-1}.$$

Then there exist constants $\gamma, c > 0$, depending only on Ω and C_0 so that

$$\omega(A, E, \Omega \setminus E) \geq c \sup_{\mathcal{M}} (\nu(E)\delta(A)^{-m+1})^\gamma.$$

Here cap is the Newtonian capacity.

Let $\Phi: \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ be a K -quasiconformal mapping. Following are some properties of Φ due to Gehring and Väisälä [17]; all constants depend on m and K only unless otherwise mentioned.

LEMMA 1. *There exists $c_0 > 0$ so that if $0 < c < c_0$, B_1 and B_2 are balls with $d(B_1) < cd(B_2)$ and $\text{dist}(B_1, B_2) < cd(B_1)$, then $d(\Phi(B_1)) < c_0 c^\alpha d(\Phi(B_2))$ for some $\alpha > 0$ depending only on K .*

LEMMA 2. *Let B be a ball with center X ; then there exist balls B' and B'' with center $\Phi(X)$, so that $B'' \subseteq \Phi(B) \subseteq B'$ and $d(B') < Cd(B'')$.*

The next theorem is due to Gehring [6].

THEOREM G. *The Jacobian of Φ is in $A_\infty(dx)$ on \mathbb{R}^m . Thus there exists $\alpha > 0$ so that*

$$\frac{|\Phi(F)|}{|\Phi(B)|} \leq C \left(\frac{|F|}{|B|} \right)^\alpha,$$

for any ball B and $F \subseteq B$.

LEMMA 3. *There exists $a > 1$ depending on K so that if U is a ring $\{x: r < |x - x_0| < ar\}$ then $\Phi(U)$ contains a ring in the form $\{x: \rho < |x - \Phi(x_0)| < 2\rho\}$ for some $\rho > 0$.*

Proof. Let $B_1 = B(x_0, r)$ and $B_2 = B(x_0, ar)$. Then there exist balls B'_1, B''_1, B'_2, B''_2 centered at $\Phi(x_0)$ so that $B''_1 \subseteq \Phi(B_1) \subseteq B'_1$, $B''_2 \subseteq \Phi(B_2) \subseteq B'_2$, $\text{diam } B'_1 \leq C \text{diam } B''_1$ and $\text{diam } B'_2 \leq C \text{diam } B''_2$. Because of Theorem G, $(\text{diam } B'_1 / \text{diam } B'_2) \leq Ca^{-\alpha}$. Hence $\text{diam } B'_1 \leq ca^{-\alpha} \text{diam } B''_2$ and $\Phi(U)$ contains the ring $B''_2 \setminus \overline{B'_1}$ provided that a is sufficiently large.

Let $\Omega = \Phi(B(0, 1))$ and Φ^* be the quasiconformal reflection about $\partial\Omega$ defined by

$$(1.8) \quad \Phi^*(x) = \Phi \left(\frac{\Phi^{-1}(x)}{\|\Phi^{-1}(x)\|^2} \right).$$

Then Ω is an NTA domain [10], and Φ^* is quasiconformal on $\{c^{-1} < |x - \Phi(0)| < c\}$. Denote by S^* the reflection $\Phi^*(S)$.

LEMMA 4. *Given $c_1, c_2 > 1$ there exists $c = c(c_1, c_2, K) > 1$ so that if Q is a cube in $\{c_1^{-1} < |x - \Phi(0)| < c_1\}$ which does not meet $\partial\Omega$ and satisfies $c_2^{-1} < l(Q)/\delta(Q) < c_2$ then*

$$c^{-1} < \frac{d(Q^*)}{\delta(Q^*)} < c.$$

Moreover, there exists a ball $B \subseteq Q^*$ so that

$$d(Q^*) \cong l(Q) \cong d(B).$$

And if Q is a cube in $\{c_1^{-1} < |x - \Phi(0)| < c_1\}$ that meets $\partial\Omega$, then $d(Q^*) \leq cl(Q)$.

By $a \cong b$, we mean a/b is bounded above and below by positive constants.

This lemma is a simple consequence of Lemmas 1, 2 and 3.

LEMMA 5. *Let $h > 3$ and H be the circular right cylinder $\{x: \sum_1^{m-1} x_j^2 < 1$ and $0 < x_m < h\}$. Let E be the base $\{x: \sum_1^{m-1} x_j^2 \leq 1$ and $x_m = 0\}$ of H , and A be the point $(0, 0, \dots, 0, h - 1)$. Then there exists $c > 0$ depending on m, h and K only so that*

$$(1.9) \quad \omega(\Phi(A), \Phi(E), \Phi(H)) > c.$$

Proof. Note that each $\Phi(\{x: \sum_1^{m-1} x_j^2 < 1, j < x_m < j + 2\})$ is a C -quasiball ($0 \leq j \leq h - 2$). Hence (1.9) follows from successive applications of the Harnack inequality.

2. Proof of Theorem 1. Constants in this section depend on Ω, L, D, P and $\text{dist}(P, \Gamma)$.

Assume from now on that $\Gamma = \{x_m = 0\}$ and fix a partition $\mathcal{E} = \{S_j\}$ of $\Gamma \cap \Omega$ so that S_j 's are $(m - 1)$ -dimensional closed dyadic squares on Γ with mutually disjoint interiors and that

$$(2.1) \quad 0 < c < \frac{l(S_j)}{\delta(S_j)} \leq \frac{1}{10}.$$

Let Y_j be the center of S_j , $B_j = B(Y_j, \frac{1}{10}l(S_j))$ and $D_j = B_j \cap \Gamma$.

Let $\{S_j\}_J$ be any subcollection of \mathcal{E} . Because Ω is an NTA domain, it follows from (2.1) and the exterior corkscrew condition (1.2) that the disks $\{D_j\}_J$ are uniformly separated as in (0.3). It follows from Theorem C and the maximum principle that for any $x \in \Omega \setminus \bigcup_J D_j$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_J \omega(x, S_j, \Omega \setminus S_j) &\cong \sum_J \omega(x, D_j, \Omega \setminus D_j) \\ &\leq c\omega\left(x, \bigcup_J D_j, \Omega \setminus \bigcup_J D_j\right) \\ &\leq c\omega\left(x, \bigcup_J S_j, \Omega \setminus \bigcup_J S_j\right). \end{aligned}$$

The last two inequalities can easily be reversed; thus

$$(2.2) \quad \sum_J \omega(x, S_j, \Omega \setminus S_j) \cong \omega\left(x, \bigcup_J S_j, \Omega \setminus \bigcup_J S_j\right)$$

which is a weak substitute for the additivity and is essential in our proof.

Suppose that I is a dyadic square on Γ with center in $\Gamma \cap \Omega$ and that

$$(2.3) \quad I \cap \Omega = \bigcup_J S_j \quad \text{for some } \{S_j\}_J \subseteq C.$$

Then $\delta(I) \leq C_3 l(I)$ for some $c_3 > 1$, because $\delta(I) \leq \delta(S_j) \cong l(S_j) \leq l(I)$ for any $j \in J$. Let Z be a point on $\partial\Omega$ that satisfies $\text{dist}(Z, I) = \delta(I)$, and let $B \equiv B(Z, 4C_3 d(I))$, $\Delta = B \cap \partial\Omega$. Clearly that $I \subseteq \frac{1}{2}B$. Because of (1.1), we may choose and fix a point $A \in \Omega \setminus \Gamma$ with

$$8c_3 l(I) \leq |A - Z| \leq cl(I)$$

and $\delta(A) \cong l(I)$. We claim that

$$(2.4) \quad \omega(P, S_j, \Omega \setminus S_j) \cong \omega(P, \Delta, \Omega) \omega(A, S_j, \Omega \setminus S_j)$$

for each $j \in J$. If S_j were on $\partial\Omega$, (2.4) would follow from Lemma 4.11 in [10]. Since S_j is interior to Ω , (2.4) can be obtained by modifying the proof of that lemma; or by applying it to the NTA domain $\Omega \setminus \overline{B_j}$ and then using the Harnack inequality.

Suppose that $F = \bigcup_{\tilde{J}} S_j$ for some $\tilde{J} \subseteq J$. It follows from (2.2) and (2.4) that

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \omega(P, F, \Omega \setminus F) &\cong \sum_{\tilde{J}} \omega(P, S_j, \Omega \setminus S_j) \\ &\cong \sum_{\tilde{J}} \omega(P, \Delta, \Omega) \omega(A, S_j, \Omega \setminus S_j) \\ &\cong \omega(P, \Delta, \Omega) \omega(A, F, \Omega \setminus F). \end{aligned}$$

So far, only the NTA assumption on Ω is used; this part of the proof also applies to Theorem 2. *To localize the problem, we need the estimate $\omega(P, I \cap \Omega, \Omega \setminus I) \cong \omega(P, \Delta, \Omega)$ which may not hold even when $\Omega \cap \Gamma$ is a square (example in §4).*

Let

$$(2.6) \quad \mu(F) = \int_F \frac{G(x)}{\delta(x)} d\sigma(x) \quad \text{for } F \subseteq \Gamma \cap \Omega.$$

LEMMA 6. *There exist $\alpha, \beta \in (0, 1)$ so that if I is a closed square on Γ centered in \bar{L} and $F \subseteq I \cap L$ then*

$$(2.7) \quad \frac{\sigma(F)}{\sigma(I \cap L)} > \alpha \Rightarrow \frac{\mu(F)}{\mu(I \cap L)} > \beta.$$

Proof. Suppose that I is a dyadic square. Then either $I \subseteq S_{j_0}$ for some $S_{j_0} \in \mathcal{C}$ or (2.3) holds.

When $I \subseteq S_{j_0}$, from the Harnack inequality, it follows that

$$\mu(F)/\mu(I \cap L) \cong \sigma(F)/\sigma(I \cap L);$$

and thus (2.7).

Proceed with the assumption (2.3) and assume as we may that $l(I) \leq 4 \text{diam}(L)$. Because L is a uniform domain on Γ and the center of I is in \bar{L} , there exists a square $S \subseteq I \cap L$ satisfying

$$(2.8) \quad l(I) \cong l(S) \cong \text{dist}(S, \partial' L).$$

Notice that $\text{dist}(S, \partial\Omega) \leq cl(I)$ and that in general they are not comparable. To get around this difficulty, we deduce from the additional assumption on L that there exists a cube $Q \subseteq \Omega$ so that Q has one face lying on S and $l(Q) \cong l(S)$. Let A_0 be the center of Q ; thus $\delta(A_0) \cong l(Q) + \delta(S) \cong l(I)$.

It follows from (1.5), (1.6) and the Harnack inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(P, I \cap L, \Omega \setminus (I \cap L)) &\geq \omega(P, S, \Omega \setminus S) \geq cG(P, A_0)\delta(A_0)^{m-2} \\ &\cong \omega(P, \Delta, \Omega); \end{aligned}$$

and from Lemma 4.2 in [10] and $I \subseteq \frac{1}{2}B$ that

$$\omega(P, I \cap L, \Omega \setminus (I \cap L)) \leq c\omega(P, \Delta, \Omega).$$

Thus

$$(2.9) \quad \omega(P, I \cap L, \Omega \setminus (I \cap L)) \cong \omega(P, \Delta, \Omega).$$

Let $F = \bigcup_{\tilde{J}} S_j$ for some $\tilde{J} \subseteq J$. We deduce from (1.6), (2.5), and (2.9) and the Harnack inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(F) &\cong \sum_{\tilde{J}} G(P, Y_j)d(S_j)^{m-2} \cong \sum_{\tilde{J}} \omega(P, S_j, \Omega \setminus S_j) \\ &\cong \omega(P, I \cap L, \Omega \setminus (I \cap L))\omega(A, F, \Omega \setminus F). \end{aligned}$$

Note also from the Harnack inequality that

$$\omega(A, F, \Omega \setminus F) \cong \omega(A_0, F, \Omega \setminus F)$$

and that

$$\omega(A, I \cap L, \Omega \setminus (I \cap L)) \cong \omega(A_0, I \cap L, \Omega \setminus (I \cap L)) \geq 1/2m.$$

Thus,

$$\mu(F)/\mu(I \cap L) \cong \omega(A_0, F, \Omega \setminus F).$$

We note that

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(A_0, F, \Omega \setminus F) &\geq \omega(A_0, F, Q) \geq \omega(A_0, F \cap \frac{1}{2}(\partial Q \cap S), Q) \\ &\geq c \frac{\sigma(F \cap \frac{1}{2}(\partial Q \cap S))}{\sigma(\partial Q \cap S)}. \end{aligned}$$

Because $\sigma(\frac{1}{2}(\partial Q \cap S)) \geq c_4 \sigma(I \cap L)$ for some $c_4 > 0$, we conclude

$$\frac{\sigma(F \cap \frac{1}{2}(\partial Q \cap S))}{\sigma(\frac{1}{2}(\partial Q \cap S))} > c_4$$

provided that $\sigma(F)/\sigma(I \cap L) > 1 - c_4/2$. This implies (2.7) when $F = \bigcup_{\tilde{J}} S_j$.

Let α and β be the constants associated with (2.7) for all previously proved special cases.

In general, for $F \subseteq I \cap L$, we may write $F = \bigcup_{\tilde{J}} F_j$ where $F_j \subseteq S_j$ and $\tilde{J} \subseteq J$. Suppose that

$$\frac{\sigma(F)}{\sigma(I \cap L)} > \frac{1 + \alpha}{2}.$$

Let $\tilde{J}_1 = \{j \in \tilde{J} : \sigma(F_j)/\sigma(S_j) > (1 - \alpha)/2\}$ and $\tilde{J}_2 = \tilde{J} \setminus \tilde{J}_1$. Then

$$\sum_{\tilde{J}_2} \sigma(F_j) \leq \frac{1 - \alpha}{2} \sum_{\tilde{J}_2} \sigma(S_j) \leq \frac{1 - \alpha}{2} \sigma(I \cap L).$$

Since $\sum_{\tilde{J}_1} \sigma(F_j) \leq \sum_{\tilde{J}_1} \sigma(S_j)$, we have $\sum_{\tilde{J}_1} \sigma(S_j) \geq \alpha \sigma(I \cap L)$. Therefore $\sum_{\tilde{J}_1} \mu(S_j) \geq \beta \mu(I \cap L)$. It follows from the Harnack inequality and the choice of \tilde{J}_1 that

$$\mu(F) \geq \sum_{\tilde{J}_1} \mu(F_j) \geq c \sum_{\tilde{J}_1} \mu(S_j) \geq c\beta \mu(I \cap L).$$

This proves (2.7) for dyadic squares I .

For general I , (2.7) follows from the fact that L is a uniform domain and the following doubling property (2.10) of μ .

Doubling property: for any square I on Γ centered in \bar{L} ,

$$(2.10) \quad \mu(2I \cap L) \cong \mu(I \cap L).$$

Again, we assume as we may that $l(I) \leq 4 \operatorname{diam} L$. Let I_1 be the union of the squares in $\{S_j\}$ that meet $2I$, and S be a square in $I \cap L$ that satisfies (2.8). Then $l(I_1) \cong l(I) \cong l(S)$. If $\delta(I_1) > l(I_1)$, (2.10) follows from the Harnack principle. Otherwise, let Z_1 be a point on $\partial\Omega$ that satisfies $\operatorname{dist}(Z_1, I_1) = \delta(I_1)$, $B_1 \equiv B(Z_1, 4c_3d(I_1))$, $\Delta_1 = B_1 \cap \partial\Omega$ and A_1 be a point in Ω satisfying $8c_3d(I_1) \leq |A_1 - Z_1| \leq cd(I_1)$ and $\delta(A_1) \cong d(I_1)$. Following the argument before, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(I_1 \cap L) &\cong \omega(P, I_1 \cap \Omega, \Omega \setminus I_1) \cong \omega(P, \Delta_1, \Omega) \\ &\cong G(P, A_1)l(I)^{m-2} \cong \omega(P, S, \Omega \setminus S) \leq c\mu(I \cap L). \end{aligned}$$

This proves (2.10) and Lemma 6.

The extension of $\frac{G(x)}{\delta(x)}|_L$ to Γ follows from the next lemma.

LEMMA 7. *Let L be a uniform domain in \mathbb{R}^n and σ be the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R}^n . Let μ be a measure on L which is absolutely continuous with respect to σ , and satisfies the restricted doubling property on \bar{L} :*

$$\mu(2I \cap L) \leq c\mu(I \cap L)$$

for any cube I centered in \bar{L} , and the restricted A_∞ property on L : there exist $\alpha, \beta \in (0, 1)$ so that if I is a cube centered in \bar{L} and $F \subseteq I$, then

$$\frac{\sigma(F)}{\sigma(I \cap L)} > \alpha \Rightarrow \frac{\mu(F)}{\mu(I \cap L)} > \beta.$$

Then μ can be extended to \mathbb{R}^n so that $\mu \ll \sigma$, μ has the doubling property and $\mu \in A_\infty(d\sigma)$ on \mathbb{R}^n .

Proof. Let $\mathcal{C} = \{Q_k\}$ be a dyadic Whitney decomposition of L , $\mathcal{C}' = \{T_j\}$ be a dyadic Whitney decomposition of $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \bar{L}$, and Q_1 be one of the largest cubes in \mathcal{C} . Following Jones ([11] and [12]), we define the reflection \tilde{T}_j of $T_j \in \mathcal{C}'$ as follows: If L is unbounded, \tilde{T}_j is chosen to be a cube Q_k in \mathcal{C} nearest to T_j and that $l(Q_k) \geq l(T_j)$; if L is bounded, define \tilde{T}_j as above provided that $l(T_j) \leq l(Q_1)$, otherwise define $\tilde{T}_j = Q_1$. Because L is a uniform domain, $\operatorname{dist}(T_j, \tilde{T}_j) \leq cl(T_j)$ and that $l(T_j) \cong l(\tilde{T}_j)$ unless $l(T_j) > l(Q_1)$. See [11] and [12] for detailed properties of this reflection.

Because L is a uniform domain, $\sigma(\partial L) = 0$ ([12]). Extend μ to \mathbb{R}^m by defining $\mu(\partial L) = 0$ and

$$d\mu = \frac{\mu(\tilde{T}_j)}{\sigma(\tilde{T}_j)} d\sigma \quad \text{on } T_j.$$

The proof of the doubling property and the A_∞ property of μ is based on the following observation: let I be a dyadic cube that meets ∂L ; then either $I \cap L$ or $I \setminus \bar{L}$ contains a large Whitney cube. More precisely, if $\frac{1}{3}I \cap \bar{L} \neq \emptyset$, then due to the fact that L is uniform, there exists a Whitney cube $Q_k \subseteq I \cap L$ with $l(Q_k) \geq cl(I)$; otherwise $\frac{1}{3}I \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \bar{L}$, and hence there exists $T_j \in \mathcal{E}'$ so that $T_j \subseteq I \setminus \bar{L}$ and $l(T_j) \geq cl(I)$. The rest of the proof is routine verification.

3. Proof of Theorem 2. Let $\Omega = \Phi(B(0, 1))$, where $\Phi: \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ is K -quasiconformal and $P = \Phi(0)$. When $m = 2$, Theorem 2 follows from Theorem B. We assume that $m \geq 3$ and constants depend on K , $\text{dist}(P, \Gamma)$, and $\text{dist}(P, \partial\Omega)$ only.

Assume $\Gamma = \{x_m = 0\}$ and $0 \in \Gamma \cap \Omega$. Let $\mathcal{E} = \{S_j\}$ be the partition of $\Gamma \cap \Omega$ in §2, M be the integer satisfying $32 \text{diam } \Omega \leq 2^M < 64 \text{diam } \Omega$, and D be the $(m-1)$ -dimensional square on Γ centered at 0 with sides parallel to the axes and of length 2^{M+1} . Let $\Omega' = \mathbb{R}^m \setminus \bar{\Omega}$ and $\mathcal{E}' = \{R_j\}$ be a partition of $\Gamma \cap \Omega'$ by dyadic squares with mutually disjoint interiors so that

$$0 < c < \frac{l(R_j)}{\delta(R_j)} \leq \frac{1}{10}$$

and $D \setminus \bar{\Omega} = \bigcup_{K_0} R_j$ for a subcollection $\{R_j\}_{K_0}$ of \mathcal{E}' .

Let Φ^* be the quasiconformal reflection about $\partial\Omega$ defined in (1.8), X_j be the center of R_j and $X_j^* = \Phi(X_j)$. Define μ on Γ so that

$$\mu(S) = \begin{cases} \int_S \frac{G(x)}{\delta(x)} dx, & S \subseteq \Gamma \cap \Omega, \\ \sum_j \frac{G(P, X_j^*)}{d(R_j)} \sigma(S \cap R_j), & S \subseteq D \cap \Omega', \\ \omega(P, S, \Omega), & S \subseteq \Gamma \cap \partial\Omega, \\ \sigma(S), & S \subseteq \Gamma \setminus D. \end{cases}$$

Let $U_j = B(X_j, \frac{1}{10}l(R_j))$, $V_j = U_j \cap \Gamma$ and $\{R_j\}_K$ be a subcollection of $\{R_j\}_{K_0}$. We note that $\{V_j^*\}_K$ lie on a quasisphere; and claim that $\{V_j^*\}_K$ are uniformly separated, that is,

$$(3.1) \quad \inf_K \inf_{x \in V_j^*} \omega(x, \partial\Omega, \Omega_j'') > c > 0$$

where $\Omega_j'' = \Omega \setminus \bigcup_{k \neq j, j \in K} V_k^*$.

To prove this, we fix $j \in K$ and recall that $\delta(R_j) \cong l(R_j) \leq C \text{diam } \Omega$. Recall also that Ω is a quasiball thus an NTA domain and that $\text{dist}(P, \partial\Omega) > c \text{diam } \Omega$. From these facts and elementary geometry, we may find a circular cylinder $H_j \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m \setminus \Gamma$, whose base has radius $r_j \cong l(R_j)$ and whose height is $h_j r_j$ ($3 < h_j < C$), joining U_j to Ω . Moreover, we may require one base E_j lying in Ω , and the point A_j which is on the axis of H_j and of distance r_j to the other base, lying in $U_j \setminus \Gamma$. Because $H_j \cap \Gamma = \emptyset$, we have $H_j^* \cap \Omega \subseteq \Omega_j''$. Applying Lemma 5 to Φ^* , H_j , h_j , we obtain from the maximum principle that

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(A_j^*, \partial\Omega, \Omega_j'') &\geq \omega(A_j^*, \partial\Omega \cap H_j^*, H_j^* \cap \Omega) \\ &\geq \omega(A_j^*, E_j^* \cap H_j^*, H_j^*) > c > 0. \end{aligned}$$

In view of Lemmas 1 and 5, we conclude (3.1) by applying the Harnack inequality to $\omega(x, \partial\Omega, \Omega_j'')$ on U_j^* .

Therefore Theorem C implies that

$$(3.2) \quad \sum_K \omega(x, V_j^*, \Omega \setminus V_j^*) \cong \omega\left(x, \bigcup_K V_j^*, \Omega \setminus \bigcup_K V_j^*\right) \quad \text{for } x \in \Omega \setminus \bigcup_K V_j^*.$$

Also note from (3.2), Lemmas 1 and 5 and the Harnack inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(R_j) &\cong G(P, X_j^*)(d(R_j))^{m-2} \\ &\cong \omega(P, U_j^*, \Omega \setminus U_j^*) \cong \omega(P, V_j^*, \Omega \setminus V_j^*). \end{aligned}$$

The last equivalence relation holds because $\omega(x, V_j^*, \Omega \setminus V_j^*) > c > 0$ on U_j^* .

Let I be a dyadic square in D . Then either $I \subseteq S_{j_0}$ for some $S_{j_0} \in \mathcal{C}$ or $I \subseteq R_{j_1}$ for some $R_{j_1} \in \mathcal{C}'$ or

$$(3.3) \quad I = (I \cap \partial\Omega) \cup \bigcup_J S_j \cup \bigcup_K R_j$$

for some $\{S_j\} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ and $\{R_j\}_K \subseteq \mathcal{C}'$. In the first two cases, by the Harnack inequality,

$$\frac{\mu(F)}{\mu(I)} \cong \frac{\sigma(F)}{\sigma(I)} \quad \text{for any } F \subseteq I.$$

We proceed with the assumption of (3.3), and denote by

$$I_* = (I \cap \partial\Omega) \cup \bigcup_J S_j \cup \bigcup_K R_j^*.$$

Let Z be a point on $\partial\Omega$ so that $\text{dist}(Z, I) = \delta(I)$. Because $\Omega = \Phi(B(0, 1))$, in view of Lemmas 1 and 5 we may find $c_5 > 0$ so that $I_* \cup I \subseteq B(Z, c_5 l(I))$; let $B \equiv B(Z, 4c_5 d(I))$, $\Delta = B \cap \partial\Omega$ and A be a point in Ω so that $\delta(A) \cong l(I)$ and $8c_5 d(I) \leq |A - Z| \leq Cl(I)$.

Since Ω is NTA, it follows from the argument for (2.4) that

$$(3.4) \quad \omega(P, V_j^*, \Omega \setminus V_j^*) \cong \omega(P, \Delta, \Omega) \omega(A, V_j^*, \Omega \setminus V_j^*).$$

We claim that there exist $\alpha, \beta \in (0, 1)$ so that if $F \subseteq I$,

$$(3.5) \quad \frac{\mu(F)}{\mu(I)} < \alpha \Rightarrow \frac{\sigma(F)}{\sigma(I)} < \beta.$$

Assume first that F is in one of the three forms: (1) $F \subseteq I \cap \partial\Omega$, (2) $F = \bigcup_{\tilde{J}} S_j$ for some $\tilde{J} \subseteq J$ or (3) $F = \bigcup_{\tilde{K}} R_j$ for some $\tilde{K} \subseteq K$.

If F is in the form (1) or (2), we deduce from theorems in [9] or arguments in §2 respectively, that

$$\mu(F) \cong \omega(P, F, \Omega \setminus F) \cong \omega(P, \Delta, \Omega) \omega(A, F, \Omega \setminus F).$$

If F is in the form (3), then it follows from (3.2), (3.4) and the Harnack inequality that

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \mu(F) &\cong \sum_{\tilde{K}} \omega(P, V_j^*, \Omega \setminus V_j^*) \\ &\cong \omega(P, \Delta, \Omega) \omega \left(A, \bigcup_{\tilde{K}} V_j^*, \Omega \setminus \bigcup_{\tilde{K}} V_j^* \right) \\ &\cong \omega(P, \Delta, \Omega) \omega(A, F^*, \Omega \setminus F^*) \\ &\cong \omega(P, \Delta, \Omega) \omega \left(A, \bigcup_{\tilde{K}} U_j^*, \Omega \setminus \bigcup_{\tilde{K}} U_j^* \right). \end{aligned}$$

Again the last two equivalence relations follow from

$$\omega \left(x, \bigcup_{\tilde{K}} V_j^*, \Omega \setminus \bigcup_{\tilde{K}} V_j^* \right) > c > 0$$

on F^* and on $\bigcup_{\tilde{K}} U_j^*$. Similarly,

$$(3.7) \quad \mu(I) \cong \omega(P, \Delta, \Omega) \omega(A, I_*, \Omega \setminus I_*).$$

Thus

$$(3.8) \quad \frac{\mu(F)}{\mu(I)} \geq c_6 \omega(A, F, \Omega \setminus F) \quad \text{or} \quad c_6 \omega(A, F^*, \Omega \setminus F^*)$$

depending on $F \subseteq \overline{\Omega}$ or $F \subseteq \Omega'$.

If $F \subseteq I \cap \partial\Omega$ and $\mu(F)/\mu(I) < \alpha$, then $\omega(A, F, \Omega) < c_6^{-1}\alpha$. Following the proof that ω is A_∞ with respect to the surface measure on the boundary of a BMO_1 domain [10, p. 133], we obtain

$$\frac{\sigma(F)}{\sigma(I)} < 1 - c_7 + c_7^{-1}(c_6^{-1}\alpha)^\lambda,$$

where $0 < c_7 < 1$ and $\lambda > 0$ depend only on the BMO_1 constant of Ω . Thus, if α is sufficiently small, $\sigma(F)/\sigma(I) < 1 - c_7/2$.

In the case $F = \bigcup_{\tilde{J}} S_j$, $\sigma(F) \cong M_{m-1}(F)$ because F is contained in an $(m - 1)$ -dimensional hyperplane Γ . In view of Theorem E, $\sigma(F)/\sigma(I) < c_7/4$ if $\mu(F)/\mu(I)$ is sufficiently small.

When $F = \bigcup_{\tilde{K}} R_j$, (3.5) would follow from Theorem E if we could prove that

$$(3.9) \quad M_{m-1}(F^*) \geq c\sigma(F).$$

In view of the examples in [14], [16] and [18] on contents, it is not clear whether (3.9) is true. We shall apply Theorem F, and define a measure ν on $E \equiv \bigcup_{\tilde{K}} U_j^*$ with support $\bigcup_{\tilde{K}} \{X_j^*\}$, so that

$$\nu(\{X_j^*\}) = l(R_j)^{m-1}.$$

Clearly $\nu(\bigcup_{\tilde{K}} U_j^*) \cong \sigma(F)$. We claim that $c\nu$ is in the class \mathcal{M} defined in Theorem F.

In fact, let Q be a cube in Ω satisfying $16d(Q) \leq \delta(Q) \leq 256d(Q)$. If $X_j^* \in Q$ for some j , then by Lemma 4, $d(Q) \cong \delta(Q) \cong \delta(X_j^*) \cong d(U_j^*) \cong d(R_j)$. Since each U_j^* contains a ball of diameter comparable to $d(U_j^*)$, there are at most C distinct X_j^* 's in Q ; thus $\nu(Q) \leq Cd(Q)^{m-1}$. Moreover, if $X_j^* \in Q$, then $\text{cap}(Q \cap U_j^*) \cong d(U_j^*)^{m-2} \cong d(Q)^{m-2}$. Hence

$$\nu(Q) \leq c \text{cap}(Q \cap E)l(Q).$$

Next, let Q be a cube that meets $\partial\Omega$, and note from Lemma 4 that $d(\Phi^*(Q)) \leq cd(Q)$. Note also that if $X_j^* \in Q$ then $X_j \in \Phi^*(Q \cap \Omega)$ and $\delta(R_j) \cong \delta(X_j) \leq d(\Phi^*(Q))$. Thus $\text{dist}(R_j, \Phi^*(Q \cap \Omega)) \leq d(R_j) + d(\Phi^*(Q)) \leq c\delta(R_j) + d(\Phi^*(Q)) \leq cd(\Phi^*(Q)) < cd(Q)$. Therefore

$$\nu(Q) = \sum_{X_j^* \in Q} l(R_j)^{m-1} \leq cd(Q)^{m-1}.$$

This shows that $c\nu \in \mathcal{M}$ for some $c > 0$. We conclude from Theorem F that

$$(3.10) \quad \omega(A, E, \Omega \setminus E) \geq c \left(\frac{\nu(E)}{\delta(A)^{m-1}} \right)^\gamma \geq c \left(\frac{\sigma(F)}{\sigma(I)} \right)^\gamma.$$

Recall from (3.6) that $\omega(A, E, \Omega \setminus E) \cong \omega(A, F^*, \Omega \setminus F^*)$. Thus in view of (3.8) and (3.10), $\sigma(F)/\sigma(I) < c_7/4$ if $\mu(F)/\mu(I)$ is sufficiently small.

To obtain (3.5) for general F , we follow the corresponding arguments in §2.

It follows from (3.5) that for dyadic $I \subseteq D$

$$(3.11) \quad \omega(A, I_*, \Omega \setminus I_*) > c > 0.$$

We extend (3.5) to all squares $I \subseteq D$ by the *doubling property*: let I be a dyadic square in D ,

$$(3.12) \quad \mu(2I) \leq c\mu(I).$$

In fact, when $5I \cap \partial\Omega = \emptyset$, (3.12) follows from the Harnack inequality; when $5I \cap \partial\Omega \neq \emptyset$, (3.12) follows from (1.4), (3.7) and (3.11).

To obtain (3.5) for all squares $I \subseteq \Gamma$, we use the facts that $\mu(D) \cong 1$ and $d\mu/d\sigma \cong 1$ on $\mathbb{R}^m \setminus \frac{1}{4}D$. This completes the proof of Theorem 2.

4. The example. The construction is given in \mathbb{R}^2 for simplicity; it can easily be extended to \mathbb{R}^m , $m \geq 3$. If one is only interested in an example in \mathbb{R}^2 , some steps can be further reduced.

Let $Y_{k,p}$ be the point $((p + \frac{1}{2})/2^k, \frac{3}{4}/2^k)$ in \mathbb{R}^2 and $B_{k,p}$ be the disk $B(Y_{k,p}, 2^{-k-10})$ for any integers k and p . Let

$$\Omega_0 = \{x: 0 < x_1 < 1, 0 < x_2 < 1\} \setminus \bigcup_{k,p} \overline{B}_{k,p}$$

and note that Ω_0 is an NTA domain. Note also that $\bigcup_{k,p} \overline{B}_{k,p}$ does not meet any line $x_2 = 2^{-k}$ or any line segment $\{x: x_1 = p/2^k \text{ and } 0 \leq x_2 \leq 2^{-k}\}$.

Let sequences $\{\delta_n\}$ and $\{A_n\}$ be given so that $\{\delta_n\} \subseteq \{2^{-k}: k \text{ positive integer}\}$, $\lim \delta_n = 0$, $A_n > 0$ and $\lim A_n = \infty$. Let $\{\lambda_n\} \subseteq \{2^{-k}: k \text{ positive integer}\}$ be another sequence with $\lambda_n < \delta_n 2^{-10}$. We shall construct a domain $\Omega \subseteq R^2$, by adding another part in the lower half-plane and restoring some of the disks $\overline{B}_{k,p}$ which were originally

removed. For each $n \geq 1$, let

$$\begin{aligned} S_n &= \{(x_1, 0) : 2^{-n} \leq x_1 \leq 2^{-n+1}\}, \\ U_n &= \{x : (x_1, 0) \in S_n, -\lambda_n 2^{-n} < x_2 < \delta_n 2^{-n}\}, \\ V_n &= \{x : (x_1, 0) \in (1 - 2\delta_n)S_n, \lambda_n 2^{-n} \leq x_2 \leq \delta_n 2^{-n-3}\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $(1 - 2\delta_n)S_n$ is the interval on $x_2 = 0$ concentric to S_n of length $(1 - 2\delta_n)2^{-n}$, and $W_n = U_n \setminus V_n$; and note that ∂W_n does not meet $\bigcup_{k,p} \overline{B}_{k,p}$. Let

$$\Omega = \text{interior of } \left(\Omega_0 \cup \bigcup_1^\infty W_n \right),$$

and P be the point $(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{9}{10})$. Then Ω is an NTA domain.

Denoting by $I_n = (1 - 2\delta_n)S_n$ and $J_n = (1 - \delta_n)S_n \setminus I_n$, we have the following lemma.

LEMMA 9. *Given $n \geq 1$, λ_n can be chosen sufficiently small depending on A_n and δ_n only, so that*

$$\omega(P, J_n, \Omega \setminus J_n) \geq A_n \omega(P, I_n, \Omega \setminus I_n).$$

Assume Lemma 9 for the moment and let $\Gamma = \{x_2 = 0\}$. Then $\Gamma \cap \Omega$ is the unit interval on Γ and $\delta(x) = \lambda_n 2^{-n}$ for $x \in I_n \cup J_n$. From the reasoning in §2, we note that $\omega(P, J_n, \Omega \setminus J_n) \cong \mu(J_n)$ and $\omega(P, I_n, \Omega \setminus I_n) \cong \mu(I_n)$ where μ is defined in (2.6). Thus

$$\mu(J_n) \geq (1 - CA_n^{-1})\mu(I_n \cup J_n),$$

while

$$\sigma(J_n) \leq 2\delta_n \sigma(I_n \cup J_n)$$

for all $n \geq 1$. Thus $\mu \notin A_\infty(d\sigma)$ on $\Gamma \cap \Omega$.

It remains to prove Lemma 9. Fix $n \geq 1$ and let $P_1 = (2^{-n}, 0)$ and $P_2 = (2^{-n+1}, 0)$ be the end points of S_n , and $P_3 = (2^{-n} + \delta_n 2^{-n}, 0)$, $P_4 = (2^{-n+1} - \delta_n 2^{-n}, 0)$, $P_5 = (2^{-n} + \delta_n 2^{-n-1}, 0)$ and $P_6 = (2^{-n+1} - \delta_n 2^{-n-1}, 0)$ be the end points of the two intervals in J_n . Note that $J_n = \overline{P_5 P_3} \cup \overline{P_4 P_6}$ and $I_n = \overline{P_3 P_4}$. Let $P_7 = P_5 - (0, \lambda_n 2^{-n})$, $P_8 = P_6 - (0, \lambda_n 2^{-n})$, $P_9 = P_5 + (0, \delta_n 2^{-n-1})$ and $P_{10} = P_5 + (0, \delta_n 2^{-n-1})$.

In view of the Markov property, it suffices to show that if λ_n is sufficiently small then

$$(4.1) \quad \omega(x, J_n, \Omega \setminus J_n) \geq A_n \omega(x, I_n, \Omega \setminus I_n)$$

for $x \in \overline{P_7P_9} \cup \overline{P_9P_{10}} \cup \overline{P_{10}P_8}$. Let D be the domain $\Omega \cap U_n$ and T be the domain $\Omega \cup \{x, x_1 \notin S_n\}$, and note that their configurations are independent of δ_j, A_j and λ_j for any $j \neq n$. In view of the maximum principle, it is enough to show that for sufficiently small λ_n ,

$$(4.2) \quad \omega(x, J_n, D \setminus J_n) \geq A_n \omega(x, I_n, T \setminus I_n)$$

for $x \in \overline{P_7P_9} \cup \overline{P_9P_{10}} \cup \overline{P_{10}P_8}$.

Consider first $x \in \overline{P_5P_7}$; and let $P_{11} = P_1 - (0, \lambda_n 2^{-n})$, $P_{13} = P_3 - (0, \lambda_n 2^{-n})$, H be the rectangle $P_1P_3P_{13}P_{11}$ and M be the semi-infinite strip $\{x: 2^{-n} < x_1 < 2^{-n} + \delta_n 2^{-n}, x_2 > -\lambda_n 2^{-n}\}$. It is easy to see that there exists ξ_n , $0 < \xi_n < \delta_n 2^{-10}$, depending only on δ_n and A_n , such that if $0 < \lambda_n \leq \xi_n$, then

$$\omega(x, \overline{P_5P_3}, H) \geq A_n \omega(x, \partial M \setminus \overline{P_{11}P_{13}}, M)$$

for $x \in \overline{P_5P_7}$. From the maximum principle, we obtain (4.2) for $x \in \overline{P_5P_7}$ provided that $0 < \lambda_n \leq \xi_n$. Similarly (4.2) holds on $\overline{P_6P_8}$ under the same assumptions.

Denote by $K = \overline{P_5P_9} \cup \overline{P_9P_{10}} \cup \overline{P_{10}P_6}$; it remains to prove (4.2) for $x \in K$. We note that

$$\omega(x, J_n, D \setminus J_n) > \tau_n > 0, \quad x \in K$$

for some τ_n depending only on δ_n .

Let γ_n be a number in the form 2^{-k} with $0 < \gamma_n < \delta_n 2^{-10}$, $P_{15} = P_3 + (\gamma_n 2^{-n}, 0)$ and $P_{16} = P_4 - (\gamma_n 2^{-n}, 0)$. The number γ_n can be chosen sufficiently small, depending on δ_n, A_n and ξ_n only, so that if $0 < \lambda_n \leq \xi_n$,

$$(4.3) \quad \omega(x, \overline{P_3P_{15}} \cup \overline{P_{16}P_4}, T \setminus (\overline{P_{13}P_{15}} \cup \overline{P_{16}P_4})) < \tau_n / (10A_n)$$

for $x \in K$. (First choose and fix γ_n so that (4.3) holds when $\lambda_n = \xi_n$; then extend (4.3) to $0 < \lambda_n < \xi_n$ by the maximum principle.)

To complete the proof, it remains to show that for sufficiently small λ_n ,

$$(4.4) \quad \omega(x, \overline{P_{15}P_{16}}, T \setminus \overline{P_{15}P_{16}}) < \tau_n / (10A_n) \quad \text{on } K.$$

Assume that $\lambda_n < 2^{-10} \min\{\xi_n, \gamma_n\}$, and let $R_0 = \overline{P_{15}P_{16}} = \{(x_1, 0): a \leq x_1 \leq b\}$ where $a = 2^{-n} + \delta_n 2^{-n} + \gamma_n 2^{-n}$ and $b = 2^{-n+1} - \delta_n 2^{-n} - \gamma_n 2^{-n}$. For $k \geq 1$, let R_k be the rectangle $\{x: a - \lambda_n 2^{-n+k} \leq x_1 \leq b + \lambda_n 2^{-n+k} \text{ and } -\lambda_n 2^{-n} \leq x_2 \leq \lambda_n 2^{-n+k}\}$. We note that T is an

NTA domain. By the exterior corkscrew condition of T , there exists a constant ε , $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, independent of k , so that

$$\omega(x, \partial R_k \cap T, T \setminus R_k) < \varepsilon \quad \text{on } \partial R_{k+1} \cap T$$

provided that $2^{k+5} \leq \gamma_n \lambda_n^{-1}$. From the Markov property it follows that

$$\omega(x, \overline{P_{15}P_{16}}, T \setminus \overline{P_{15}P_{16}}) < \varepsilon^{\log_2(\gamma_n/\lambda_n)-6}$$

for $x \in K$. Therefore (4.4) holds if λ_n is sufficiently small, depending only on δ_n and A_n . This completes the proof of Lemma 9.

REFERENCES

- [1] L. Carleson, *Estimates of harmonic measures*, Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn., **7** (1982), 25–32.
- [2] R. R. Coifman and C. Fefferman, *Weighted norm inequalities for maximal functions and singular integrals*, Studia Math., **51** (1974), 241–250.
- [3] J. Fernández, J. Heinonen and O. Martio, *Quasilines and conformal mappings*, J. Analyse Math., **52** (1989), 117–132.
- [4] J. B. Garnett, *Applications of Harmonic Measure*, Wiley, 1986.
- [5] J. B. Garnett, F. W. Gehring and P. W. Jones, *Conformally invariant length sums*, Indiana Univ. Math. J., **32** (1983), 809–829.
- [6] F. W. Gehring, *The L^p -integrability of the partial derivatives of a quasiconformal mapping*, Acta Math., **139** (1973), 265–277.
- [7] ———, *Uniform domains and the ubiquitous quasidisk*, Jber. d. Dt. Math.-Verein, **89** (1987), 88–103.
- [8] F. W. Gehring and J. Väisälä, *The coefficients of quasiconformality of domains in space*, Acta Math., **114** (1965), 1–70.
- [9] J. Heinonen and R. Näkki, *Quasiconformal distortion on arcs*, J. Analyse Math., (to appear).
- [10] D. Jerison and C. Kenig, *Boundary behavior of harmonic functions in nontangentially accessible domains*, Adv. in Math., **46** (1982), 80–147.
- [11] P. W. Jones, *Extension theorems for BMO*, Indiana Univ. Math. J., **29** (1980), 41–66.
- [12] ———, *Quasiconformal mappings and extendability of functions in Sobolev spaces*, Acta Math., **147** (1981), 71–88.
- [13] P. W. Jones and D. Marshall, *Critical points of Green's function, harmonic measure, and the corona problem*, Ark. Mat., **23** (1985), 281–314.
- [14] S. Mazurkiewicz and S. Saks, *Sur les projections d'un ensemble fermé*, Fund. Math., **8** (1926), 109–113.
- [15] Ch. Pommerenke, *On uniformly perfect sets and Fuchsian groups*, Analysis, **4** (1984), 299–321.
- [16] S. Saks, *Remarque sur la mesure linéaire des ensembles plans*, Fund. Math., **9** (1926), 16–24.
- [17] J. Väisälä, *Lectures on n -Dimensional Quasiconformal Mappings*, Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. **229**, Springer-Verlag, 1971.

- [18] A. G. Vituškin, L. D. Ivanov and M. S. Mel'nikov, *Incommensurability of the minimal linear measure with the length of a set*, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR, **115** (1963), 1256–1259; English transl. in Soviet Math. Dokl., **4** (1963), 1160–1164.
- [19] J.-M. Wu, *Content and harmonic measure: an extension of Hall's Lemma*, Indiana Univ. Math. J., **36** (1987), 403–420.

Received April 15, 1991. Partially supported by the National Science Foundation.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
URBANA, IL 61801

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

Founded by

E. F. BECKENBACH (1906–1982) F. WOLF (1904–1989)

EDITORS

V. S. VARADARAJAN
(Managing Editor)
University of California
Los Angeles, CA 90024-1555
vsv@math.ucla.edu

HERBERT CLEMENS
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, UT 84112
clemens@math.utah.edu

F. MICHAEL CHRIST
University of California
Los Angeles, CA 90024-1555
christ@math.ucla.edu

THOMAS ENRIGHT
University of California, San Diego
La Jolla, CA 92093
tenright@ucsd.edu

NICHOLAS ERCOLANI
University of Arizona
Tucson, AZ 85721
ercolani@math.arizona.edu

R. FINN
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305
finn@gauss.stanford.edu

VAUGHAN F. R. JONES
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720
vfr@math.berkeley.edu

STEVEN KERCKHOFF
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305
spk@gauss.stanford.edu

C. C. MOORE
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720

MARTIN SCHARLEMANN
University of California
Santa Barbara, CA 93106
mgscharl@henri.ucsb.edu

HAROLD STARK
University of California, San Diego
La Jolla, CA 92093

SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONS

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO
NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
STANFORD UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII
UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO
UNIVERSITY OF UTAH
WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

Volume 157 No. 1 January 1993

Permutation enumeration symmetric functions, and unimodality	1
FRANCESCO BRENTI	
On the analytic reflection of a minimal surface	29
JAIGYOUNG CHOE	
Contractive zero-divisors in Bergman spaces	37
PETER LARKIN DUREN, DMITRY KHAVINSON, HAROLD SEYMOUR SHAPIRO and CARL SUNDBERG	
On the ideal structure of positive, eventually compact linear operators on Banach lattices	57
RUEY-JEN JANG and HAROLD DEAN VICTORY, JR.	
A note on the set of periods for Klein bottle maps	87
JAUME LLIBRE	
Asymptotic expansion at a corner for the capillary problem: the singular case	95
ERICH MIERSEMANN	
A state model for the multivariable Alexander polynomial	109
JUN MURAKAMI	
Free Banach-Lie algebras, couniversal Banach-Lie groups, and more	137
VLADIMIR G. PESTOV	
Four manifold topology and groups of polynomial growth	145
RICHARD ANDREW STONG	
A remark on Leray's inequality	151
AKIRA TAKESHITA	
A_∞ and the Green function	159
JANG-MEI GLORIA WU	
Integral spinor norms in dyadic local fields. I	179
FEI XU	



0030-8730(1993)157:1;1-J