

Criterion for the absolute continuity of curves in metric spaces

V. I. Bakhtin

Belarusian State University, Minsk, Belarus (e-mail: bakhtin@tut.by)

It is proved that a parameterized curve in a metric space X is absolutely continuous if and only if its composition with any Lipschitz function on X is absolutely continuous.

Keywords: *absolutely continuous curve, metric space, Lipschitz function*

2020 MSC: 51F30, 53C23

This article was written solely due to the brilliant report by A. I. Tyulenev presented on April 29, 2024 at a seminar led by V. G. Krotov at the Belarusian State University. There was proved a criterion for the absolute continuity of curves in metric spaces satisfying a certain doubling condition (which implies automatically finiteness of the Hausdorff dimension of the spaces under consideration).

While thinking about the necessity of the above mentioned doubling condition I was very surprised to discover it could simply be omitted. Had been informed about this, A. I. Tyulenev replied that he had also discovered this, but his proof is indirect.

A mapping $\gamma: [a, b] \rightarrow X$ of a segment $[a, b] \subset \mathbb{R}$ to a metric space (X, ρ) is called *absolutely continuous* (notation $\gamma \in AC([a, b], X)$, see [1, p. 108], [2, p. 252], [3, p. 128] for the case of real-valued function) if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for any finite collection of pairwise disjoint intervals $(a_i, b_i) \subset [a, b]$ the following implication is valid:

$$\sum_i (b_i - a_i) < \delta \implies \sum_i \rho(\gamma(a_i), \gamma(b_i)) < \varepsilon.$$

Theorem 1 *A continuous mapping $\gamma: [a, b] \rightarrow X$ is absolutely continuous if and only if for any Lipschitz function $h: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the composition $h \circ \gamma$ is absolutely continuous.*

The necessary part of this theorem is obvious. To prove its sufficient part, we need the following three lemmas.

Lemma 2 *Suppose a real-valued function h defined on a certain subset $X' \subset X$ satisfies Lipschitz condition with constant L' :*

$$|h(x') - h(x'')| \leq L' \rho(x', x''), \quad x', x'' \in X'.$$

Then for each $L \geq L'$ the functions

$$h_L^+(x) = \inf_{x' \in X'} \{h(x') + L\rho(x', x)\}, \quad x \in X, \quad (1)$$

$$h_L^-(x) = \sup_{x' \in X'} \{h(x') - L\rho(x', x)\}, \quad x \in X \quad (2)$$

have the following properties:

- their restrictions to X' coincide with h ;
- they are L -Lipschitz (satisfy Lipschitz condition with constant L);
- for all $x \in X$ we have

$$h_L^+(x) - h_L^-(x) \geq 2(L - L')\rho(x, X'). \quad (3)$$

Proof. If $x \in X'$ then the infimum in (1) is attained at $x' = x$ and coincides with $h(x)$. Similarly, the supremum in (2) is attained at $x' = x$ and coincides with $h(x)$. This proves a).

Property b) is obvious. To prove c) consider the difference

$$h_L^+(x) - h_L^-(x) = \inf_{x', x'' \in X'} \{h(x') - h(x'') + L\rho(x', x) + L\rho(x'', x)\}. \quad (4)$$

Note that in the case $\rho(x', x'') \leq 2\rho(x, X')$ we have

$$h(x') - h(x'') + L\rho(x', x) + L\rho(x'', x) \geq -L'\rho(x', x'') + 2L\rho(x, X') \geq 2(L - L')\rho(x, X'),$$

and in the case $\rho(x', x'') \geq 2\rho(x, X')$ we have

$$h(x') - h(x'') + L\rho(x', x) + L\rho(x'', x) \geq -L'\rho(x', x'') + L\rho(x', x'') \geq 2(L - L')\rho(x, X').$$

In both cases, these inequalities and (4) imply (3). \square

Corollary 3 *Under the conditions of Lemma 2 the function h extends to an L -Lipschitz function on $X' \cup \{x\}$ when given any value $h(x) \in [h_L^-(x), h_L^+(x)]$.*

Lemma 4 *Suppose h is an L' -Lipschitz function defined on a certain subset $X' \subset X$, and $\gamma: [a, b] \rightarrow X$ is a continuous mapping satisfying the condition $\rho(\gamma[a, b], X') > 0$. Then for any constant $L > L'$ there exist a partition $T = \{t_0, t_1, \dots, t_n\}$ of the segment $[a, b]$ (i. e., $a = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_n = b$) and an L -Lipschitz extension of h to $X' \cup \gamma(T)$ such that*

$$\text{var}(h \circ \gamma, T) := \sum_{i=1}^n |h(\gamma(t_{i-1})) - h(\gamma(t_i))| \geq L\rho(\gamma(a), \gamma(b)). \quad (5)$$

Proof. Let $h_L^\pm(x)$ be the functions defined in Lemma 2. Then, by point c) of this lemma, $h_L^+(x) > h_L^-(x)$ for all $x \in \gamma([a, b])$.

Starting from $t_0 = a$, we will sequentially choose t_i and define alternating values

$$h(\gamma(t_{2i})) = h_L^-(\gamma(t_{2i})), \quad h(\gamma(t_{2i+1})) = h_L^+(\gamma(t_{2i+1})), \quad (6)$$

except the last point $t_n = b$, where it will be

$$h_L^-(\gamma(t_n)) \leq h(\gamma(t_n)) \leq h_L^+(\gamma(t_n)), \quad (7)$$

according to the next rule: for even i we take

$$t_{i+1} = \sup\{t \in [t_i, b] : h_L^-(\gamma(t_i)) + L\rho(\gamma(t_i), \gamma(t)) \leq h_L^+(\gamma(t))\}, \quad (8)$$

$$h(\gamma(t_{i+1})) = h_L^-(\gamma(t_i)) + L\rho(\gamma(t_i), \gamma(t_{i+1})), \quad (9)$$

and for odd i we take

$$t_{i+1} = \sup\{t \in [t_i, b] : h_L^+(\gamma(t_i)) - L\rho(\gamma(t_i), \gamma(t)) \geq h_L^-(\gamma(t))\}, \quad (10)$$

$$h(\gamma(t_{i+1})) = h_L^+(\gamma(t_i)) - L\rho(\gamma(t_i), \gamma(t_{i+1})). \quad (11)$$

Since the mapping $\gamma: [a, b] \rightarrow X$ is uniformly continuous, and the functions $h_L^+(x)$ and $h_L^-(x)$ are L -Lipschitz (see point b) of Lemma 2), this procedure will reach $t_n = b$ in a finite number of steps.

Now (6), (9), (11) imply the equalities

$$|h(\gamma(t_{i-1})) - h(\gamma(t_i))| = L\rho(\gamma(t_{i-1}), \gamma(t_i)), \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (12)$$

Summing them up, we obtain (5).

Let us check Lipschitz condition for the restriction of h to $\gamma(T)$. For any pair of adjacent points $\gamma(t_{i-1}), \gamma(t_i)$ it is proved in (12). Consider an arbitrary pair of points $\gamma(t_i), \gamma(t_j)$, where $j \geq i + 2$. If i is even, then (6) and (8) imply that

$$h(\gamma(t_j)) \leq h_L^+(\gamma(t_j)) \leq h(\gamma(t_i)) + L\rho(\gamma(t_i), \gamma(t_j)). \quad (13)$$

If i is odd these inequalities are true all the more, because in this case $h(\gamma(t_i)) = h_L^+(\gamma(t_i))$, and the function $h_L^+(x)$ is L -Lipschitz.

Similarly, using (6) and (10) we obtain the inequalities

$$h(\gamma(t_j)) \geq h_L^-(\gamma(t_j)) \geq h(\gamma(t_i)) - L\rho(\gamma(t_i), \gamma(t_j)), \quad (14)$$

which, along with (13), give the Lipschitz condition for the restriction of h to $\gamma(T)$.

Finally, for any $t_i \in T$ and $x' \in X'$ by virtue of (6), (7) and Corollary 3 we have

$$|h(\gamma(t_i)) - h(x')| \leq L\rho(\gamma(t_i), x').$$

This proves that the function h is L -Lipschitz on the whole $X' \cup \gamma(T)$. \square

Lemma 5 *Suppose h is an L' -Lipschitz function defined on a finite subset $X' \subset X$, and $\gamma: [a, b] \rightarrow X$ is an injective continuous mapping. Then for any constants $L > L'$ and $\theta \in (0, 1)$ there exist a partition $T = \{t_0, t_1, \dots, t_n\}$ of the segment $[a, b]$ and an L -Lipschitz extension of h to $X' \cup \gamma(T)$ such that*

$$\text{var}(h \circ \gamma, T) = \sum_{i=1}^n |h(\gamma(t_{i-1})) - h(\gamma(t_i))| \geq \theta L\rho(\gamma(a), \gamma(b)). \quad (15)$$

Below (in Lemma 8) the requirement for γ to be injective will be removed.

Proof. Evidently, the set $\gamma^{-1}(X')$ is finite. Adding to it the points a, b , we obtain some partition $S = \{s_0, s_1, \dots, s_m\}$ of the segment $[a, b]$. We may choose so long segments $[a_i, b_i]$ in the intervals (s_{i-1}, s_i) as to ensure the inequalities

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \rho(\gamma(a_i), \gamma(b_i)) \geq \sum_{i=1}^m \sqrt{\theta} \rho(\gamma(s_{i-1}), \gamma(s_i)) \geq \sqrt{\theta} \rho(\gamma(a), \gamma(b)). \quad (16)$$

By construction, all the images $\gamma([a_i, b_i])$ do not intersect with each other and with X' .

Let us fix numbers

$$\max\{L', \sqrt{\theta}L\} < L_1 < L_2 < \dots < L_m < L. \quad (17)$$

Sequentially applying Lemma 4, we construct some partitions T_i of the segments $[a_i, b_i]$ and L_i -Lipschitz extensions of h to the sets $X' \cup \gamma(T_1) \cup \dots \cup \gamma(T_i)$ such that

$$\text{var}(h \circ \gamma, T_i) \geq L_i \rho(\gamma(a_i), \gamma(b_i)), \quad i = 1, \dots, m. \quad (18)$$

Now set $T = \{a\} \cup T_1 \cup \dots \cup T_m \cup \{b\}$. Then summing up (18) and taking into account (16), (17), we obtain (15). \square

Lemma 5 enables us to prove the sufficient part of Theorem 1 in the case of injective mapping $\gamma: [a, b] \rightarrow X$. The proof will be by contradiction. Namely, assume that $\gamma \notin AC([a, b], X)$. Then there exists an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for any natural number n there is a

finite set of disjoint intervals $I_n = \{(a_i, b_i)\}$ lying in the segment $[a, b]$ and satisfying the conditions

$$\sum_{(a_i, b_i) \in I_n} (b_i - a_i) < \frac{1}{n}, \quad \sum_{(a_i, b_i) \in I_n} \rho(\gamma(a_i), \gamma(b_i)) > \varepsilon. \quad (19)$$

Let us put $I = \bigcup_n I_n$ and introduce a total numbering for all intervals from I by one natural index i , so that $I = \{(a_i, b_i)\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$.

Fix an infinite sequence of real numbers

$$1 = L_1 < L_2 < L_3 < \dots < L = 2. \quad (20)$$

Set $T_1 = \{a_1, b_1\}$, $X'_1 = \gamma(T_1)$ and define an L_1 -Lipschitz function h on X'_1 by the rule

$$h(\gamma(a_1)) = 0, \quad h(\gamma(b_1)) = \rho(\gamma(a_1), \gamma(b_1)).$$

Sequentially applying Lemma 5, we may construct finite partitions T_i of the segments $[a_i, b_i]$ and L_i -Lipschitz extensions of h to the sets $X'_i = \gamma(T_1) \cup \dots \cup \gamma(T_i)$ such that

$$\text{var}(h \circ \gamma, T_i) \geq \theta L_i \rho(\gamma(a_i), \gamma(b_i)), \quad i = 2, 3, \dots \quad (21)$$

As a result, we obtain an L -Lipschitz function h defined on the set $X' = \bigcup_i X'_i$, which by means of Lemma 2 extends to an L -Lipschitz function on X .

Summing up (21) over all $(a_i, b_i) \in I_n$ and taking into account (20), (19), we obtain

$$\sum_{(a_i, b_i) \in I_n} \text{var}(h \circ \gamma, T_i) \geq \sum_{(a_i, b_i) \in I_n} \theta L_i \rho(\gamma(a_i), \gamma(b_i)) > \theta \varepsilon.$$

On the other hand, due to the left inequality in (19), the total length of all segments of the partitions T_i involved in the last formula is less than $1/n$. Therefore the composition $h \circ \gamma$ is not absolutely continuous, and Theorem 1 is proved.

Note that if Lemma 5 did not require γ to be injective, then the same reasoning would serve as a proof of Theorem 1 in the general case. To get rid of this injectivity requirement, we will make a suitable piecewise injective modification of γ .

A *piecewise injective curve* is any continuous mapping $\gamma: A \rightarrow X$ that has the following properties:

- a) it is defined on a compact subset A of the real axis;
- b) if $\gamma(c) = \gamma(d)$, where $c, d \in A$, then the interval (c, d) does not intersect with A ;
- c) for each segment $[c, d]$ the set $\gamma([c, d] \cap A)$ is connected.

From b) it follows that the mapping γ can take the same values at no more than two different points, and only at the ends of a 'hole' in its domain A .

A *piecewise injective modification* of the continuous mapping $\gamma: [a, b] \rightarrow X$ is any piecewise injective curve that is a restriction of γ to some compact subset $A \subset [a, b]$ containing the points a, b .

Lemma 6 *Every continuous mapping $\gamma: [a, b] \rightarrow X$ has a piecewise injective modification.*

Proof. Let $A_1 = [a, b]$. Then for each $i = 1, 2, \dots$ we take the longest segment $[c_i, d_i] \subset A_i$ for which $\gamma(c_i) = \gamma(d_i)$ (if there are many of them, then take the leftmost one) and set $A_{i+1} = A_i \setminus (c_i, d_i)$.

Set $A = \bigcap_i A_i$. Then the restriction of γ to A is a piecewise injective curve.

Let us check this. First, the set A is compact.

Secondly, assume that $\gamma(c) = \gamma(d)$ for a pair of different points $c, d \in A$. Then take the largest $i \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $d_i - c_i \geq d - c$. If $[c, d] \neq [c_j, d_j]$ for every $j = 1, \dots, i$ then by construction $[c, d] \cap [c_j, d_j] = \emptyset$ and, therefore, $[c, d] \subset A_{i+1}$, which contradicts the choice of i . It follows that the segment $[c, d]$ coincides with one of $[c_j, d_j]$, and then, by construction, the interval (c, d) does not intersect with A .

Thirdly, by means of standard topological arguments it is verified that for any segment $[c, d]$ the sets $\gamma([c, d] \cap A_i)$ are connected. It follows that the set $\gamma([c, d] \cap A)$, being the intersection of a sequence of nested connected compact sets $\gamma([c, d] \cap A_i)$, is compact and connected. \square

Now we state and prove an analogue to Lemma 4 for a piecewise injective curve.

A *partition of a set* $A \subset \mathbb{R}$ we call any finite collection of points $T = \{t_0, t_1, \dots, t_n\} \subset A$ going in ascending order: $t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_n$.

Lemma 7 *Suppose h is an L' -Lipschitz function defined on a certain subset $X' \subset X$, and $\gamma: A \rightarrow X$ is a piecewise injective curve satisfying the condition $\rho(\gamma(A), X') > 0$. Then for each $L > L'$ there exist a partition $T = \{t_0, t_1, \dots, t_n\}$ of A and an L -Lipschitz extension of the function h to $X' \cup \gamma(T)$ such that*

$$\text{var}(h \circ \gamma, T) = \sum_{i=1}^n |h(\gamma(t_{i-1})) - h(\gamma(t_i))| \geq L \text{diam}(\gamma(A)). \quad (22)$$

Proof is in essence the same as for Lemma 4. Let $h_L^\pm(x)$ be the functions from Lemma 2. Then, by point c) of this lemma, $h_L^+(x) > h_L^-(x)$ for all $x \in \gamma(A)$.

Take two points $a, b \in A$ such that

$$\rho(\gamma(a), \gamma(b)) = \text{diam}(\gamma(A)), \quad a < b. \quad (23)$$

Starting from $t_0 = a$, we will sequentially choose t_i and define alternating values

$$h(\gamma(t_{2i})) = h_L^-(\gamma(t_{2i})), \quad h(\gamma(t_{2i+1})) = h_L^+(\gamma(t_{2i+1})), \quad (24)$$

except the last point $t_n = b$, where it will be

$$h_L^-(\gamma(t_n)) \leq h(\gamma(t_n)) \leq h_L^+(\gamma(t_n)), \quad (25)$$

according to the next rule: for even i we take

$$t_{i+1} = \sup\{t \in [t_i, b] \cap A : h_L^-(\gamma(t_i)) + L\rho(\gamma(t_i), \gamma(t)) \leq h_L^+(\gamma(t))\}, \quad (26)$$

$$h(\gamma(t_{i+1})) = h_L^-(\gamma(t_i)) + L\rho(\gamma(t_i), \gamma(t_{i+1})), \quad (27)$$

and for odd i we take

$$t_{i+1} = \sup\{t \in [t_i, b] \cap A : h_L^+(\gamma(t_i)) - L\rho(\gamma(t_i), \gamma(t)) \geq h_L^-(\gamma(t))\}, \quad (28)$$

$$h(\gamma(t_{i+1})) = h_L^+(\gamma(t_i)) - L\rho(\gamma(t_i), \gamma(t_{i+1})). \quad (29)$$

By the definition of a piecewise injective curve, the set $\gamma([t_{i+1}, b] \cap A)$ is connected. It follows that in the case $t_{i+1} < b$, depending on the parity of i , the inequalities in the right-hand sides of (26), (28) turns into equalities at the point $t = t_{i+1}$:

$$h_L^\mp(\gamma(t_i)) \pm L\rho(\gamma(t_i), \gamma(t_{i+1})) = h_L^\pm(\gamma(t_{i+1})).$$

By virtue of (27) and (29), they are equivalent to (24).

Since the mapping $\gamma: A \rightarrow X$ is uniformly continuous, and the functions $h_L^+(x)$ and $h_L^-(x)$ are L -Lipschitz, this procedure in a finite number of steps will reach the point $t_n = b$, at which inequalities (25) are satisfied.

From (24), (27), (29) we obtain the equalities

$$|h(\gamma(t_{i-1})) - h(\gamma(t_i))| = L\rho(\gamma(t_{i-1}), \gamma(t_i)), \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (30)$$

Summing them up and taking into account (23), we get

$$\text{var}(h \circ \gamma, T) = \sum_{i=1}^n L\rho(\gamma(t_{i-1}), \gamma(t_i)) \geq L\rho(\gamma(a), \gamma(b)) = L \text{diam}(\gamma(A)).$$

Let us check Lipschitz condition for the restriction of h to $\gamma(T)$. For any pair of adjacent points $\gamma(t_{i-1}), \gamma(t_i)$ it is proved in (30). Consider an arbitrary pair of points $\gamma(t_i), \gamma(t_j)$, where $j \geq i + 2$. If i is even, then (24) and (26) imply that

$$h(\gamma(t_j)) \leq h_L^+(\gamma(t_j)) \leq h(\gamma(t_i)) + L\rho(\gamma(t_i), \gamma(t_j)). \quad (31)$$

If i is odd these inequalities are true all the more, because in this case $h(\gamma(t_i)) = h_L^+(\gamma(t_i))$, and $h_L^+(x)$ is L -Lipschitz. Similarly, using (24) and (28) we obtain the inequalities

$$h(\gamma(t_j)) \geq h_L^-(\gamma(t_j)) \geq h(\gamma(t_i)) - L\rho(\gamma(t_i), \gamma(t_j)), \quad (32)$$

which, along with (31), give the Lipschitz condition for the restriction of h to $\gamma(T)$.

Finally, for any $t_i \in T$ and $x' \in X'$ by virtue of (24), (25) and Corollary 3 we have

$$|h(\gamma(t_i)) - h(x')| \leq L\rho(\gamma(t_i), x').$$

This proves that the function h is L -Lipschitz on the whole $X' \cup \gamma(T)$. \square

Lemma 8 *Lemma 5 is valid for any continuous mapping $\gamma: [a, b] \rightarrow X$ (i. e., without the injectivity condition).*

Proof. Take a piecewise injective modification $\gamma: A \rightarrow X$ such that $a, b \in A$. Then the intersection $A \cap \gamma^{-1}(X')$ is finite. Adding to it the points a, b , we obtain some partition $S = \{s_0, s_1, \dots, s_m\}$ of A . Exploiting the connectivity of the sets $\gamma([s_{i-1}, s_i] \cap A)$, we may choose points $a_i, b_i \in (s_{i-1}, s_i) \cap A$ such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \rho(\gamma(a_i), \gamma(b_i)) \geq \sum_{i=1}^m \sqrt{\theta} \rho(\gamma(s_{i-1}), \gamma(s_i)) \geq \sqrt{\theta} \rho(\gamma(a), \gamma(b)). \quad (33)$$

By construction, all images $\gamma([a_i, b_i] \cap A)$ do not intersect with each other and with X' .

Let us fix numbers

$$\max\{L', \sqrt{\theta}L\} < L_1 < L_2 < \dots < L_m < L. \quad (34)$$

Applying Lemma 7 to the piecewise injective curves $\gamma: [a_i, b_i] \cap A \rightarrow X$, we sequentially construct some partitions T_i of the sets $[a_i, b_i] \cap A$ and some L_i -Lipschitz extensions of h to the sets $X' \cup \gamma(T_1) \cup \dots \cup \gamma(T_i)$ such that

$$\text{var}(h \circ \gamma, T_i) \geq L_i \rho(\gamma(a_i), \gamma(b_i)), \quad i = 1, \dots, m. \quad (35)$$

Define the partition $T = \{a\} \cup T_1 \cup \dots \cup T_m \cup \{b\}$ of the segment $[a, b]$. Summing up (35) and taking into account (33), (34), we obtain (15). \square

The sufficient part of Theorem 1 in the general case is proved in exactly the same way as in the case of the injective mapping γ , provided Lemma 8 is used instead of Lemma 5.

References

- [1] Royden, H. L., *Real Analysis (third ed.)*. Collier Macmillan, 1988.
- [2] Nielsen, O. A., *An introduction to integration and measure theory*. Wiley–Interscience, 1997.
- [3] Athreya, K. B.; Lahiri, S. N. *Measure theory and probability theory*. Springer, 2006.