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Abstract

We say a measure is $C^{1,\alpha}$ $d$-rectifiable if there is a countable union of $C^{1,\alpha}$ $d$-surfaces whose complement has measure zero. We provide sufficient conditions for a Radon measure in $\mathbb{R}^n$ to be $C^{1,\alpha}$ $d$-rectifiable, with $\alpha \in [0,1]$. We assume a priori the measure to have positive and finite upper density. The conditions involve a Bishop-Jones type square function and all statements are quantitative in that the $C^{1,\alpha}$ constants depend on such a function. Key tools for the proof come from Guy David and Tatiana Toro’s parametrization of Reifenberg flat sets (with holes) in the Hölder and Lipschitz categories.
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1 Introduction

1.1 Background

Recall that a set \( E \) in \( \mathbb{R}^n \) is \textit{Lipschitz image} \( d \)-rectifiable – countably \( d \)-rectifiable in Federer’s terminology – if there exist countably many Lipschitz maps \( f_i : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^n \) such that \( \mathcal{H}^d(E \setminus \bigcup_i f_i(\mathbb{R}^d)) = \mathcal{H}^d(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \bigcup_i f_i(\mathbb{R}^d)) = 0 \), where \( \mathcal{H}^d \) denotes the \( d \)-dimensional Hausdorff measure. In this paper, we investigate sets that can be covered by images of more regular maps (see Section 1.2 for the statements of the main results and Section 1.4 for motivations).

We say that a set \( E \) in \( \mathbb{R}^n \) is \( C^{1,\alpha} \) \( d \)-rectifiable if there exist countably many continuously differentiable Lipschitz maps \( f_i : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^n \) with \( \alpha \)-Hölder derivatives such that

\[
\mathcal{H}^d(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \bigcup_i f_i(\mathbb{R}^d)) = 0.
\]

(1.1)

For \textit{Lipschitz image} rectifiability, we could replace the class of Lipschitz images with bi-Lipschitz images, \( C^1 \) images, Lipschitz graphs, or \( C^1 \) graphs without changing the class of rectifiable sets; see Theorem 3.2.29 in [Fed69] and [Dav99] for proofs of these equivalences. From now on we will refer to \textit{Lipschitz image} rectifiability simply as rectifiability.

On the contrary, rectifiability of order \( C^{1,\alpha} \) does not imply rectifiability of order \( C^{1,\alpha'} \) for any \( 0 \leq \alpha < \alpha' \leq 1 \). More generally, \( C^{k-1,1} \) rectifiability is equivalent to \( C^k \) rectifiability (Proposition 3.2 in [AS94]), while there are \( C^{k,s} \) rectifiable sets that are not \( C^{m,t} \) rectifiable, whenever \( k, m \geq 1 \) and \( k + s < m + t \) (Proposition 3.3 in [AS94]). For completeness, we include the proofs of these results in the Appendix, as Propositions 6.1 and 6.2.

While rectifiability of sets has been widely studied and characterized, see [Mat95] for an exposition, a quantitative theory of rectifiability was only developed in the late 1980s to study connections between rectifiable sets and boundedness of singular integral operators. Peter Jones in [Jon90] gives a quantitative control on the length of a rectifiable curve in terms of a sum of \( \beta \) numbers. These numbers capture, at a given scale and location, how far a set is from being a line. Jones’ proof was generalized to \( 1 \)-dimensional objects in \( \mathbb{R}^n \) by K. Okikiolu in [Oki92] and in Hilbert spaces by R. Schul in [Sch07].

In [DT12] G. David and T. Toro prove that Reifenberg flat sets (with holes) admit a bi-Hölder parametrization, which is a refinement of Reifenberg’s original proof in [Rei60]. Moreover, if one also assumes square summability of the \( \beta \)’s the parametrization is actually bi-Lipschitz (see also [Tor95]). To better understand this, consider a variation of the usual snowflake. Start with the unit segment \([0,1]\), and let this be step 0. At each step \( i \) we create an angle of \( \alpha_i \) by adding to each segment of length \( 2^{-i+1} \) an isosceles triangle in the center, with basis \( 2^{-i+1}/3 \) and height \( 2^{-i+1}\alpha_i/6 \) (since the \( \alpha_i \)’s are small we can use a first order approximation). Then the resulting curve is rectifiable (i.e. has finite length) if and only if \( \sum_i \alpha_i^2 < \infty \) (see Exercise 10.16 in [BP17]).
Consider now a smoothened version of the snowflake where we stop after a finite number of iterations. This set is clearly $C^{1,1}$ rectifiable. Our goal is to prove a quantitative bound on the Lipschitz constants in term of the quantity $\sum_i \alpha_i^2/2^{-i} < \infty$. For a general Reifenberg flat set with holes $E$, this means that we can find a parametrization of $E$ via a $C^{1,1}$ map. The proofs of the parametrization results (Sections 3, 4 and 5) follow the steps of the proof in the paper [DT12]. However detailed knowledge of their paper will not be assumed. Instead specific references will be given for those interested in the proofs of the cited results.

1.2 Outline of the paper and main results

Throughout the paper, we will prove three different versions of the main theorem on parametrizations. For convenience we will now state only two of them, Theorems A and B. We state the more technical Theorems 3.4 and 3.5 in Section 3 after a few more definitions. Then we state Theorems I and II which are our rectifiability results. Let us recall the definition of the aforementioned $\beta$ numbers.

**Definition 1.1.** Let $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and $r > 0$. Define

\begin{equation}
\beta^E_{\infty}(x, r) = \frac{1}{r} \inf_{P} \left\{ \sup_{y \in E \cap B(x, r)} \text{dist}(y, P) \right\},
\end{equation}

if $E \cap B(x, r) \neq \emptyset$, where the infimum is taken over all $d$-planes $P$, and $\beta^E_{\infty}(x, r) = 0$ if $E \cap B(x, r) = \emptyset$. If $E$ is measurable, define

\begin{equation}
\beta^E_1(x, r) = \inf_{P} \left\{ \frac{1}{r^d} \int_{y \in E \cap B(x, r)} \frac{\text{dist}(y, P)}{r} d\mathcal{H}^d(y) \right\},
\end{equation}

for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $r > 0$, where the infimum is taken over all $d$-planes $P$.

Next, we need to define what it is meant by Reifenberg flat with holes.

**Definition 1.2.** Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $r > 0$. If $E, F \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ both meet $B(x, r)$ define normalized Hausdorff distances to be the quantities

\begin{equation}
d_{x,r}(E, F) = \frac{1}{r} \max_{y \in E \cap B(x, r)} \left\{ \sup_{y \in E \cap B(x, r)} \text{dist}(y, F), \sup_{y \in F \cap B(x, r)} \text{dist}(y, E) \right\}.
\end{equation}

**Definition 1.3.** Let $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ closed and let $\varepsilon > 0$. Define $E$ to be Reifenberg flat if the following conditions hold.

For $x \in E$, $0 < r \leq 10$ there is a $d$-plane $P(x, r)$ such that

\begin{equation}
\text{dist}(y, P(x, r)) \leq \varepsilon r, \quad y \in E \cap B(x, r),
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\text{dist}(y, E) \leq \varepsilon r, \quad y \in P(x, r) \cap B(x, r),
\end{equation}

**Definition 1.4.** Let $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ closed and let $\varepsilon > 0$. Define $E$ to be Reifenberg flat with holes if the following conditions (1)-(2) hold.
(1) For $x \in E$, $0 < r \leq 10$ there is a $d$-plane $P(x, r)$ such that
\[ \text{dist}(y, P(x, r)) \leq \varepsilon r, \quad y \in E \cap B(x, r). \]

(2) Moreover we require some compatibility between the $P(x, r)$'s:
\[
\begin{align*}
&d_{x, 10^{-k}}(P(x, 10^{-k}), P(x, 10^{-k+1})) \leq \varepsilon, \quad x \in E, \ k \geq 0, \\
&d_{x, 10^{-k+1}}(P(x, 10^{-k}), P(y, 10^{-k})) \leq \varepsilon, \quad x, y \in E, \ |x - y| \leq 10^{-k+2}, \ k \geq 0.
\end{align*}
\]

**Remark 1.5.** It is important to observe that the sets in Definition 1.3 are not allowed to have any holes, while the sets in Definition 1.4 are allowed holes of any size. The compatibility conditions in (2) are automatically satisfied by Reifenberg flat sets without holes.

Before we state our main results, let us recall some theorems of G. David and T. Toro [DT12].

**Theorem 1.6.** [G. David, T. Toro, Proposition 8.1 [DT12]] Let $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough and let $E \subseteq B(0, 1)$, where $B(0, 1)$ denotes the unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Assume $E$ is Reifenberg flat with holes. Then we can construct a map $f : \Sigma_0 \to \mathbb{R}^n$, where $\Sigma_0$ is a $d$-plane in $\mathbb{R}^n$, such that $E \subset f(\Sigma_0)$ and $f$ is bi-Hölder.

Set $r_k = 10^{-k}$.

**Theorem 1.7.** [G. David, T. Toro, Corollary 12.6 [DT12]] Let $E$ be as in Theorem 1.6 and moreover assume that
\begin{equation}
\sum_{k \geq 0} \beta_{\infty}^E(x, r_k)^2 \leq M, \quad \text{for all } x \in E.
\end{equation}
Then $f : \Sigma_0 \to \Sigma$ is bi-Lipschitz. Moreover the Lipschitz constants depend only on $n, d$, and $M$.

Moreover,

**Theorem 1.8.** [G. David, T. Toro, Corollary 13.1 [DT12]] Let $E$ measurable be as in Theorem 1.6 and moreover assume that
\begin{equation}
\sum_{k \geq 0} \beta_1^E(x, r_k)^2 \leq M, \quad \text{for all } x \in E.
\end{equation}
Then $f : \Sigma_0 \to \Sigma$ is bi-Lipschitz. Moreover the Lipschitz constants depend only on $n, d$, and $M$.

We are now ready to state our theorems.

**Theorem A.** Let $E \subseteq B(0, 1)$ be a Reifenberg flat set with holes and $\alpha \in (0, 1]$. Also assume that there exists $M < +\infty$ such that
\begin{equation}
\sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{\beta_{\infty}^E(x, r_k)^2}{r_k^\alpha} \leq M, \quad \text{for all } x \in E.
\end{equation}
Then the map $f : \Sigma_0 \to \Sigma$ constructed in Theorem 1.6 is invertible and differentiable, and both $f$ and its inverse are $C^{1, \alpha}$ maps. In particular, $f$ is continuously differentiable. Moreover the Hölder constants depend only on $n, d$, and $M$. 

Remark 1.10. The case $\alpha = 0$ is not included in the statement, as we do not get continuous differentiability, but this is simply Theorem 1.7, that is, $f$ and its inverse are $C^{0,1}$ maps (i.e. Lipschitz).

Even without assuming a higher regularity on our set $E$, such as Ahlfors regularity, we can prove a better sufficient condition involving the possibly smaller $\beta_1$ numbers.

**Theorem B.** Let $E \subseteq B(0,1)$ be a measurable Reifenberg flat set with holes and $\alpha \in (0,1]$. Also assume that there exists $M < +\infty$ such that

$$\sum_{k \geq 0} \beta_1^E(x,r_k)^2 \leq M, \quad \text{for all } x \in E.$$  

Then the map $f : \Sigma_0 \to \Sigma$ constructed in Theorem 1.6 is invertible and differentiable, and both $f$ and its inverse are $C^{1,\alpha}$ maps. In particular, $f$ is continuously differentiable. Moreover the Hölder constants depend only on $n$, $d$, and $M$.

Remark 1.12. As $\alpha$ is allowed to be 1 a particular case of Theorems A and B is that we can get a $C^{1,1}$ parametrization. Since we will later use directly the $C^{1,1}$ results to prove the more general $C^{1,\alpha}$ case, these are stated separately in Section 5 as Theorems 5.5 and 5.9.

We are now ready to state the theorems regarding rectifiability.

**Theorem I.** Let $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $0 < \theta^d(E,x) < \infty$, for $\mathcal{H}^d$ a.e. $x \in E$. Assume that for almost every $x \in E$,

$$J_{\infty,\alpha}^E(x) = \sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{\beta_{\infty}^E(x,r_k)^2}{r_k^\alpha} < \infty.$$  

Then $E$ is (countably) $C^{1,\alpha}$ $d$-rectifiable.

Remark 1.13. In Theorem I, we will use the assumptions on the upper density in order to prove that $E$ is rectifiable, using a Theorem of J. Azzam and X. Tolsa from [AT15]. We will need rectifiability in order to obtain (local) flatness. Note that, we can not weaken the assumptions on the density to be $\theta^d(E,x) > 0$ and $\theta^d(E,x) < \infty$ to obtain rectifiability, as in [ENV17] and [Tol17], because we will use that $\theta^d(E,x) < \infty$ to compare $\beta_{\infty}^E$ with $\beta_2^E$ in order to apply the aforementioned theorem of Azzam and Tolsa. See the proof of Theorem I for details.

We can also state a version of Theorem I for rectifiability of measures. If $\mu$ is a Radon measure, define

$$\beta_p^\mu(x,r) = \inf_P \left\{ \frac{1}{r^d} \int_{y \in B(x,r)} \left( \frac{\text{dist}(y,P)}{r} \right)^p d\mu(y) \right\}^{1/p},$$  

for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $r > 0$, where the infimum is taken over all $d$-planes $P$. Moreover, define

$$J_{p,\alpha}^\mu(x) = \sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{\beta_p^\mu(x,r_k)^2}{r_k^\alpha}.$$  

We are now ready to state our result concerning rectifiability of measures.
Theorem II. Let $\mu$ be a Radon measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that $0 < \theta^{d^*}(\mu, x) < \infty$ for $\mu$-a.e. $x$. Assume that for $\mu$-a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$(1.13) \quad J_{2,\alpha}^{\mu}(x) < \infty. \quad (\text{countably} \ C^{1,\alpha} \ d\text{-rectifiable}).$$

Remark 1.14. Note that the assumption $J_{2,\alpha}^{\mu}(x) < \infty$ implies $J_{1,\alpha}^{\mu}(x) < \infty$ (see Lemma 2.10), condition we will need to apply Theorem B, and also that $\int_0^1 \beta_{\mu,2}(x,r)^2 \frac{dr}{r} < \infty$ which is going to be used to apply the result in [AT15] (see Remark 2.9 for a more detailed discussion). Also in this case, we will use the finiteness of the upper density in Lemma 2.10.

Corollary 1.15. Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $0 < \theta^{d^*}(E,x) < \infty$. Assume that for $\mathcal{H}^d$ a.e. $x \in E$,

$$(1.14) \quad J_{\infty,1}^{E}(x) < \infty. \quad (\text{countably} \ C^2 \ d\text{-rectifiable}).$$

Corollary 1.16. Let $\mu$ be a Radon measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that $0 < \theta^{d^*}(\mu, x) < \infty$. Assume that for $\mu$ almost every $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$(1.15) \quad J_{2,1}^{\mu}(x) < \infty. \quad (\text{countably} \ C^2 \ d\text{-rectifiable}).$$

Remark 1.17. The corollaries follow immediately from the Theorems by setting $\alpha = 1$ and recalling $C^{1,1}$ rectifiability coincides with $C^2$ rectifiability (see Proposition 6.1).

1.3 Plan of the paper

Because of the technical nature of the proofs of Theorems A and B, in Section 2 we first prove Theorems I and II using Theorems A and B. After that, we introduce the main tools for the proof in Section 3 and after stating the technical Theorems 3.4 and 3.5, we construct a parametrization for our set $E$ using a so-called coherent collection of balls and planes (CCBP). In Section 4 we proceed to prove Theorems 3.4 and 3.5 stated in Section 3. In Section 5 we provide proofs of Theorems A and B stated above. Finally, in the Appendix we include the aforementioned results from [AS94] together with additional examples and remarks on the main Theorems.

1.4 Motivation and related work

As mentioned before, Peter Jones [Jon90] proved that given a collection of points in the plane we can join them with a curve whose length is directly proportional to a sum of squares of $\beta$ numbers (and the diameter). In particular, the length is independent of the number of points. This was the starting point of a series of results seeking to characterize, in a quantitative way, which sets are rectifiable. The motivation came from harmonic analysis, more specifically, the study of singular integral operators. It became clear that the classical notion of rectifiability does not capture quantitative aspects of the operators (such as boundedness)
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and a quantitative notion of rectifiability was needed. A theory of uniform rectifiability was developed and it turned out that uniformly rectifiable sets are the natural framework for the study of $L^2$ boundedness of singular integral operators with an odd kernel (see [DS93; DS91; Tol14]). The theory is developed for sets of any dimension, but a necessary condition for a set to be uniformly rectifiable is that it is $d$-Ahlfors regular, where $d \in \mathbb{N}$. That is, the $d$-dimensional Hausdorff measure of a ball is comparable to its radius to the $d$-th power.

Peter Jones’ Traveling Salesman Theorem works only for 1-dimensional sets, but does not assume any regularity. Several attempts have been made to prove similar analogues for sets (or measures) of dimension more than 1. In [Paj96] a version for 2-dimensional sets is proved. Menger curvature was also introduced to attempt to characterize rectifiability (see, among others, [Lég99; LW11; LW09; KS13; BK12; Kol11; Meu18; Goe18]). Other approaches can be found in [Mer16; Del08; San17]). J. Azzam and R. Schul [AS18] prove a higher dimensional version of the Traveling Salesman Theorem, that is, they estimate the $d$-dimensional Hausdorff measure of a set using a sum of $\beta$ numbers with no assumptions of Ahlfors regularity. Using this, together with [DT12], M. Villa [Vil17] proves a characterization of tangent points of a Jordan curve in term of $\beta$ numbers.

We say that a Radon measure $\mu$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ is $d$-rectifiable if there exist countably many Lipschitz maps $f_i: \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$\mu \left( \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \bigcup_i f_i(\mathbb{R}^d) \right) = 0.$$ 

Note that a set $E$ is $d$-rectifiable if and only if $\mathcal{H}^d \cap E$ is a $d$-rectifiable measure.

For measures which are absolutely continuous with respect to the Hausdorff measure, the above definition coincides which Lipschitz graphs rectifiability. That is, if we require the sets to be almost covered by Lipschitz graphs instead of images, we get an equivalent definition. J. Garnett, R. Kilip, and R. Schul [GKS10] proved that this is not true for general measures, even if we require the doubling condition (that is, the measure of balls is comparable if we double the radius). They exhibit a doubling measure supported in $\mathbb{R}^2$, singular with respect to Hausdorff measure, which is Lipschitz image rectifiable but is not Lipschitz graph rectifiable.

D. Preiss, X. Tolsa, and T. Toro [PTT09] fully describe the Hölder regularity of doubling measures in $\mathbb{R}^n$ for measures supported on any (integer) dimension. M. Badger and V. Vellis [BV17] extended part of the work to lower order rectifiable measures. They prove that the support of a Radon measure can be parametrized by a $(1/s)$-Hölder map, under assumptions on the $s$-dimensional lower density. M. Badger, L. Naples and V. Vellis [BNV18] establish sufficient conditions that ensure a set of points is contained in the image of a $(1/s)$-Hölder continuous map. Badger and R. Schul [BS15; BS17] characterize 1-dimensional (Lipschitz) rectifiable measures in terms of positivity of the lower density and finiteness of a Bishop-Jones type square function. H. Martikainen and T. Orponen [MO18] later proved that the density hypothesis above is necessary.

Recently, N. Edelen, A. Naber, and D. Valtorta [ENV17] proved that, for an $n$-dimensional Radon measure with positive upper density and finite lower density, finiteness of a Bishop-Jones type function involving $\beta_2$ numbers implies rectifiability. The same authors [ENV18] study effective Reifenberg theorems for measures in a Hilbert or Banach space. J. Azzam and X. Tolsa [Tol15; AT15] characterized rectifiability of $n$-dimensional Radon measures using the
same Bishop-Jones type function under the assumption that the upper density is positive and finite. Note that the density condition in [ENV17] is less restrictive (see [Tol17]). X. Tolsa [Tol17] obtains an alternative proof of the result in [ENV17] using the techniques from [Tol15; AT15]. For a survey on generalized rectifiability of measures, including classical results and recent advances, see [Bad18].

S. Kolasiński [Kol16] provides a sufficient condition in terms of averaged discrete curvatures, similar to integral Menger curvatures, for a Radon measure with positive lower density and finite upper density to be $C^{1,\alpha}$ rectifiable. Moreover, sharpness of the order of rectifiability of the result is obtained using the aforementioned example from [AS94]. This result is very similar in flavor to the result we prove in this paper. In fact, if the measure is Ahlfors regular G. Lerman and T. Whitehouse [LW11; LW09] proved that Menger curvature and a Bishop-Jones type square function involving $L^2 \beta$'s numbers are comparable on balls. However, for measures which are not Ahlfors regular, the two quantities are not known to be directly comparable.

Given such distinctions it is natural to investigate different types of rectifiability (e.g. Lipschitz image and Lipschitz graph rectifiability, $C^2$ and $C^{1,\alpha}$ rectifiability). There has been some progress in this direction concerning rectifiability of sets (by e.g. [AS94]) but the tools involved rely heavily on the Euclidean structure of $\mathcal{H}^d$ and give qualitative conditions. J. R. Dorronsoro [Dor85a; Dor85b] obtains a characterization for potential spaces and Besov spaces in terms of coefficients which are analogue to higher order of Peter Jones’s $\beta$ numbers. Several recent works concerning connections between rectifiability and $\beta$ numbers seem to have been inspired by these results. There has been a great deal of interest in developing tools which allow further generalizations to rectifiability of measures which provide quantitative results. Using the techniques from [DT12] we develop such tools with the use of $\beta$ numbers and obtain results for $C^2$ and $C^{1,\alpha}$ rectifiability.

The main tool used in our proof is one of several results about parametrization of Reifenberg flat sets. E. R. Reifenberg [Re60] proves that a “flat” set (what is today known as “Reifenberg flat” set) can be parametrized by a Hölder map. In [DKT01], G. David, C. Kenig, and T. Toro prove that a $C^{1,\alpha}$ parametrization for Reifenberg flat sets (without holes) with vanishing constants can be achieved under a pointwise condition on the $\beta$’s (their conditions are stronger than our conditions).

Among the results involving Menger curvature, in [KS13], S. Kolasiński and M. Szumańska prove that $C^{1,\alpha}$ regularity, with appropriate $\alpha$’s, implies finiteness of functionals closely related to Menger curvature. In [BK12], S. Blatt and S. Kolasiński prove that a compact $C^1$ manifold has finite integral Menger curvatures (a higher dimensional version of Menger curvature) if and only if it can be locally represented by the graph of some Sobolev type map.

In [Kol15], a bound on Menger curvature together with other regularity assumptions leads to a pointwise bound on $\beta$ numbers; this is the same bound which appears in [DKT01]. If in addition the set is fine, which among other things implies Reifenberg flatness allowing for small holes, then the same conclusion as in [DKT01] holds, that is, the set can be parametrized by a $C^{1,\alpha}$ map.

It is interesting to note that in [DKT01] Reifenberg flatness, which does not allow for any holes, is used. On the other hand, in [Kol15] they allow small holes, that is, of size bounded by $\beta$. In contrast, we only require the set to be Reifenberg flat with holes, which does not impose any restrictions on the size of the holes.
In the last few years, C. Fefferman, A. Israel, and G.K. Luli [FIL16] have been investigating Whitney type extension problems for $C^k$ maps, finding conditions to fit smooth functions to data.

1.5 Further developments

Clearly, it is interesting to ask whether there exist analogous necessary conditions for higher order rectifiability. See the Appendix for some observations. The author believes similar results for $C^{k,\alpha}$ regularity hold with an appropriate generalization of the Jones $\beta$ numbers and of Reifenberg flatness of higher order. By appropriate generalization we mean to use polynomials instead of $d$-planes to approximate the set. This idea is not new, see for instance [Dor85a; Dor85b] and, more recently, [Pra17], Section 2.2.
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2 Proof of Theorems I and II on $C^{1,\alpha}$ rectifiability

As mentioned in the introduction, we will start by using Theorems A and B to prove Theorems I and II. The former will be then proved in the later sections.

2.1 A sufficient condition involving $\beta_\infty$ numbers

Before proving our result, let us recall the definition of density of a measure.

**Definition 2.1.** Let $0 \leq s < \infty$ and let $\mu$ be a measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$. The upper and lower $n$-densities of $\mu$ at $x$ are defined by

\begin{equation}
\theta^s_*(\mu, x) = \limsup_{r \to 0} \frac{\mu(B(x, r))}{r^s}, \quad \theta^s(\mu, x) = \liminf_{r \to 0} \frac{\mu(B(x, r))}{r^s}.
\end{equation}

If they agree, their common value is called the $s$-density of $\mu$ at $x$ and denoted by

\begin{equation}
\theta^s(\mu, x) = \theta^s_*(\mu, x) = \theta^s(\mu, x).
\end{equation}

If $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, we define the upper and lower $s$-densities of $E$ at $x$ as $\theta^s(E, x) = \theta^s(\mathcal{H}^s \llcorner E, x)$ and $\theta^s_*(E, x) = \theta^s_*(\mathcal{H}^s \llcorner E, x)$, respectively.

To prove Theorem I we need to recall a result from [AT15]. Let us first define an $L^2$ version of $\beta$ numbers.
Definition 2.2. Given a closed ball $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, with radius $r(B)$, and an integer $0 < d < n$, let

$$
(2.3) \quad \beta_2^d (B)^2 = \inf_P \frac{1}{r(B)^d} \int_B \left( \frac{\text{dist}(y, P)}{r(B)} \right)^2 d\mu(y),
$$

where the infimum is taken over all $d$-planes $P$.

The following theorem is Theorem 1.1 in [AT15].

Theorem 2.3. Let $\mu$ be a finite Borel measure in $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that $0 < \theta^d(*)(\mu, x) < \infty$ for $\mu$-a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. If

$$
(2.4) \quad \int_0^1 \beta_{\mu,2}(x,r)^2 \frac{dr}{r} < \infty \quad \text{for } \mu\text{-a.e. } x \in \mathbb{R}^n,
$$

then $\mu$ is $d$-rectifiable.

We are now ready to prove Theorem I.

Theorem I. Let $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $0 < \theta^d(E, x) < \infty$, for $\mathcal{H}^d$ a.e. $x \in E$. Assume that for almost every $x \in E$,

$$
(2.5) \quad J^E_{\infty,\alpha}(x) = \sum_k \frac{\beta^E_{\infty}(x,r_k)^2}{r_k^\alpha} < \infty.
$$

Then $E$ is (countably) $C^{1,\alpha}$ d-rectifiable.

Lemma 2.4. Let $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $0 < \theta^s(E, x) < \infty$, for a.e. $x \in E$. Set $\mu = \mathcal{H}^d \ll E$. If for a.e. $x \in E$

$$
(2.6) \quad J^E_{\infty}(x) = \sum_k \beta^E_{\infty}(x,r_k)^2 < \infty.
$$

then

$$
(2.7) \quad \int_0^1 \beta_{\mu,2}(x,r)^2 \frac{dr}{r} < \infty \quad \text{for } \mu\text{-a.e. } x \in \mathbb{R}^n,
$$

and hence $E$ is rectifiable, that is, there exist countably many Lipschitz images $\Gamma_i$ such that $\mathcal{H}^d(E \setminus \bigcup_i \Gamma_i) = 0$.

Proof. We want to prove that, for a.e. $x \in E$, there exists $r_x > 0$ such that if $r < r_x$, that

$$
(2.8) \quad \beta_{\mu,2}(x,r) \leq C(x) \beta^E_{\infty}(x,r).
$$

It is enough to prove that, for a.e. $x \in E$, there exists $r_x > 0$ such that if $r < r_x$,

$$
(2.9) \quad \frac{\mathcal{H}^d(B \cap E)}{r^d} \leq C(x).
$$

This follows immediately by the assumption $\theta^d(*)(E, x) < \infty$. The conclusion follows from Theorem 2.3. \qed
Remark 2.5. Note that the set $E$ that satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem I satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 2.4, as if $J^E_{\infty,\alpha}(x) < \infty$, then $J^E_{\infty}(x) < \infty$.

Let us restate, for convenience of the reader, a Sard-type theorem (Theorem 7.6 in [Mat95]).

**Theorem 2.6.** If $g: \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is a Lipschitz map, then

$$
(2.10) \quad \mathcal{H}^d\{g(x) \mid \dim_H(g'(x)\mathbb{R}^d) < d\} = 0.
$$

**Lemma 2.7.** If $f: \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is a Lipschitz map and $\Gamma = \text{Im}(f)$, then $\Gamma = \Gamma_b \cup \bigcup_{q} A_q$, where each $A_q$ admits a coherent collection of balls and planes (CCBP, see Definition 3.1 in the following section) and $\mathcal{H}^d(\Gamma_b) = 0$.

**Proof.** By Theorem 3.2.39 in [Fed69] (Lipschitz and $C^1$ rectifiabilities are equivalent notions for measures absolutely continuous to Hausdorff measure), we know that there exists countably many $C^1$ maps $g_i: \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\Gamma \subseteq \bigcup g_i(\mathbb{R}^d)$. To simplify notations, let $g = g_i$, for some $i$, for the time being. For $\mathcal{H}^d$-almost every $z \in \text{Im}(g)$, we know by Theorem 2.6 that $\text{rank}(Dg(x)) = d$ where $x$ is such that $g(x) = z$. Because $g$ is a continuously differentiable map, for any $\varepsilon' > 0$, we know that there exists a small enough neighborhood $U_z \ni x$ such that the rank stays $d$ and

$$
(2.11) \quad |Dg(x) - Dg(y)| < \varepsilon',
$$

for every $y \in U_z$. We want to construct a CCBP. for $g(U_z)$. Let $\{x_{j,k}\}$ be a $10^{-k}$-net for $g(U_z)$. For each $j, k$ let $P_{j,k}$ be the unique tangent $d$-plane to $g(U_z)$ at $x_{j,k}$. We need to establish that

$$
d_{x_{i,k},100r_k}(P_{i,k}, P_{j,k}) \leq \varepsilon \quad \text{for } k \geq 0 \text{ and } i, j \in J_k \text{ such that } x_{i,k} - x_{j,k} \leq 100r_k,
$$

$$
d_{x_{i,0},100}(P_{i,0}, \Sigma_0) \leq \varepsilon \quad \text{for } i \in J_0,
$$

$$
d_{x_{i,20r_k}}(P_{i,k}, P_{j,k+1}) \leq \varepsilon \quad \text{for } k \geq 0, i \in J_k \text{ and } j \in J_{k+1} \text{ s.t. } |x_{i,k} - x_{j,k+1}| \leq 2r_k.
$$

By choosing $\varepsilon' > 0$ above small enough all conditions are satisfied, as the derivative varies smoothly and so do the planes $P_{j,k}$’s.

Because the choices of $g_i$ and $z$ are arbitrary we can repeat the same procedure for all the maps. Note we can choose countably many $z_i$ and still obtain a cover for $g_i(\mathbb{R}^d)$. We then have a collection of neighborhoods $U_{z_i}^j$ so that each $g_i(U_{z_i}^j)$ admits a CCBP and $\Gamma \subseteq \bigcup_{i,x} g_i(U_{z_i}^j)$ up to $\mathcal{H}^d$ measure zero. Re-indexing the collection by $A_q$, we obtain the desired result. □

Let $E_{i,q} = E \cap (\Gamma_i)_q$, where we applied Lemma 2.7 to each $\Gamma_i$ and obtained $A_q = (\Gamma_i)_q$, and define

$$
(2.12) \quad E_{i,q,p} = \{x \in E_{i,q} \mid J_{\infty,\alpha}(x) \leq p\}.
$$

**Lemma 2.8.** Each of the $E_{i,q,p}$ satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem A and hence it can be parametrized by a $C^{1,\alpha}$ surface.

The lemma follows immediately from Lemma 2.7. Because $E = E_b \cup \bigcup_{i,q,p} E_{i,q,p}$, where $E_b$ has $\mathcal{H}^d$-measure zero, Theorem I follows.
2.2 A sufficient condition involving $\beta_1$ numbers

We can also state a version of Theorem I for rectifiability of measures. If $\mu$ is a Radon measure, and $1 \leq p < \infty$, define

$$\beta^p_\mu(x, r) = \inf_P \left\{ \frac{1}{r^d} \int_{y \in B(x, r)} \left( \frac{\text{dist}(y, P)}{r} \right)^p d\mu(y) \right\}^{1/p},$$

for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $r > 0$, where the infimum is taken over all $d$-planes $P$. Moreover, define,

$$J^\mu_{p, \alpha}(x) = \sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{\beta^p_\mu(x, r_k)^2}{r_k^\alpha}.$$

**Theorem II.** Let $\mu$ be a Radon measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that $0 < \theta^{ds}(\mu, x) < \infty$ for $\mu$-a.e. $x$. Assume that for $\mu$-a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$J^{\mu}_{2, \alpha}(x) < \infty.$$

Then $\mu$ is (countably) $C^{1, \alpha}$ $d$-rectifiable.

**Remark 2.9.** Condition 2.15 is slightly stronger than what we actually need. In fact, it implies that $J^\mu_{1, \alpha}(x) < \infty$ (see Lemma 2.10 below). We use the latter condition to apply Theorem B. It also implies that $\int_0^1 \beta_\mu,2(x, r)^2 dr < \infty$, which is a necessary hypothesis for applying Theorem 2.3. Notice that assuming only boundedness of the $L^1$ Bishop-Jones square function would not guarantee the set to be rectifiable (see [Tol17]).

Moreover, let us note that the density assumptions in Theorem II are the same as the ones in Theorem I. We will again use that $0 < \theta^{ds}(\mu, x) < \infty$ in order to apply Theorem 2.3. We will need to use the a priori stronger assumption $0 < \theta^d_\mu(x, x)$ in order to be able to compare $\beta$-numbers computed with respect to $\mu$ and those computed using $\mathcal{H}^d$. However, we do not need to assume that, as the lower bound on the lower density also follows from Theorem 2.3, as a rectifiable set has positive lower density almost everywhere.

**Lemma 2.10.** Let $\mu$ be a Radon measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$ and let $x$ such that $\theta^{ds}(\mu, x) < \infty$ and $J^\mu_{2, \alpha}(x) < \infty$. Then, $J^\mu_{1, \alpha}(x) < \infty$.

**Proof.** It is enough to prove there exists $r_x > 0$ such that if $r < r_x$,

$$\beta_{\mu, 1}(x, r) \leq C(x) \beta_{\mu, 2}(x, r).$$

By Hölder’s inequality we get

$$\frac{1}{r^d} \int_{B(x, r)} \frac{d(y, P)}{r} d\mu \leq \left( \frac{\mu(B(x, r))}{r^d} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \frac{1}{r^d} \int_{B(x, r)} \left( \frac{d(y, P)}{r} \right)^2 d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Because $\theta^{ds}(\mu, x) < \infty$, we get $\frac{\mu(B(x, r))}{r^d} \leq C(x)$ and we are done. \qed
We would like to proceed as in the proof of Theorem I. Because of our assumptions (see Remark 2.9), it follows from Lemma 2.4 and Theorem 2.3 that $\mu$ is $d$-rectifiable, that is, there exist countably many Lipschitz graphs $\Gamma_i$ such that $\mu (E \setminus \cup_i \Gamma_i) = 0$.

Let $E = \text{supp} \mu \cap \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid J^\mu_{2,\alpha}(x) < \infty \}$. From Lemma 2.7 we get that each $E_{i,q} = E \cap (\Gamma_i)_q$ admits a CCBP. To apply Theorem B we need to ensure that the “Euclidean” $\beta_1$ numbers (i.e. the $\beta_1$ numbers computed with respect to the $d$-dimensional Hausdorff measure) satisfy the hypothesis of Theorem B.

In the following lemma we denote by $\beta^{Hd}_1$ these “Euclidean” $\beta$ numbers, which we have in previous chapters denoted by $\beta^E_1$, to emphasize the difference between them and the $\beta^{\mu}_1$.

**Lemma 2.11.** Let $E_{i,q}$ be as above. There exists a countable collections of subsets $E_{i,q,N,m}$ such that for every $x \in E_{i,q,N,m}$ there exist numbers $C_x > 0$ and $r_x > 0$ such that for every $r_k < r_x$ we have

\[
\sum_k \beta^{Hd}_1 \mathcal{L} E_{i,q,N,m}(x,r_k)^2 \leq C_x.
\]

**Proof.** By our assumptions on $\mu$ we know that for every $x \in E_{i,q}$ there exist numbers $C_x > 0$ and $r_x > 0$ such that for every $r_k < r_x$ we have

\[
\sum_k \beta^{\mu}_1 \mathcal{L} E_{i,q}(x,r_k)^2 \leq C_x.
\]

Define $E_{i,q,N,m}$ by

\[
E_{i,q,N,m} = \left\{ x \in E_{i,q} \mid \frac{1}{N} \leq \frac{\mu(B \cap E_{i,q})}{r^d} \leq N \text{ for } r < 2^{-m} \right\},
\]

where $B = B(x,r)$.

In order to prove the statement is enough to prove that each $\beta^{Hd}_1 \mathcal{L} E_{i,q,N,m}(x,r)$ is bounded above by a constant multiple of $\beta^{\mu}_1 \mathcal{L} E_{i,q}(x,r)$. To obtain this, it is enough to prove that, for some constant $C$, we have

\[
\mathcal{H}^d (E_{i,q,N,m} \cap B) \leq C 5^d N \mu(E_{i,q} \cap B).
\]

By definition of Hausdorff measure we can find a collection of balls $B_\alpha(x,r)$ centered on $E_{i,q,N,m}$ with radius $r < 2^{-m}$ such that $\mathcal{H}^d (E_{i,q,N,m} \cap B) \leq C \sum_\alpha (r_{B_\alpha})^d$. By applying a standard 5r-covering theorem (see Theorem 2.1 in [Mat95]) we can choose a collection of disjoint balls $B_l$ such that $\bigcup_l B_\alpha \subset \bigcup_l 5B_l$. Without loss of generality we can assume that each $B_l$ is also centered on $E_{i,q,N,m}$ with radius $r < 2^{-m}$ (by possibly shrinking the balls $B_\alpha$).
We then have

\[ (2.22) \quad \mathcal{H}^d(E_{i,q,N,m} \cap B) \leq C \sum_{\alpha} (r_{B_{\alpha}})^d \leq C 5^d \sum_i (r_{B_i})^d \leq C 5^d N \sum_i \mu(E_{i,q} \cap B_i) \leq C 5^d N \mu(E_{i,q} \cap B), \]

where the last two inequalities follow from the density assumption and definition of $E_{i,q,N,m}$ and because the balls $B_i$ are disjoint.

Finally, define

\[ (2.23) \quad E_{i,q,N,m,p} = \{ x \in E_{i,q,N,m} \mid J_{1,\alpha}(x) \leq p \}. \]

From the results above the following lemma follows immediately.

**Lemma 2.12.** Each $E_{i,q,N,m,p}$ satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem B and hence it can be parametrized by a $C^{1,\alpha}$ surface.

Because $E = E_b \cup \bigcup_{i,q,N,m,p} E_{i,q,N,m,p}$, where $E_b$ has $\mathcal{H}^d$-measure zero. The lemma below proves that $E_b$ has also $\mu$ measure zero, so Theorem II follows.

**Lemma 2.13.** Let $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\nu$ a Radon measure such that $\theta^d(x,\nu) < \infty$ for $\nu$-a.e. $x$. If $\mathcal{H}^d(A) = 0$, then $\nu(A) = 0$.

**Proof.** Define $A_{n,k} = \{ x \in A \mid \nu(A \cap B(x,r)) \leq kr^d, r < 2^{-n} \}$. Let $\delta > 0$ and choose a countable collection of balls $B_i$ such that $\sum_i r_i^d < \delta$ and $A_{n,k} \subset \bigcup_i B_i$; such a collection exists for any arbitrarily small $\delta$ as $\mathcal{H}^d(A) = 0$. We have

\[ (2.24) \quad \nu(A_{n,k}) \leq \nu(\bigcup_i B_i) \leq \sum_i \nu(B_i) \leq k \sum_i r_i^d \leq k\delta. \]

By letting $\delta$ go to zero and observing that $A = \bigcup_{n,k} A_{n,k}$ the claim follows.

## 3 Preliminaries for the technical proof

We now proceed to introduce the main tools for the proofs of Theorems A and B. In this section, we will construct the map $f$ and obtain distortion estimates for it. Sections 4 and 5 will be dedicated to the proofs of the main theorems.
3.1 More definitions and statements of the more technical results

Given a Reifenberg flat set with holes, we now want to construct a so-called coherent collection of balls and planes (CCBP) for \( E \) (for more details see the discussion after Theorem 12.1 in [DT12]).

Let \( E \) be as above and set \( r_k = 10^{-k} \). Choose a maximal collection of points \( \{x_{j,k}\} \subset E \), \( j \in J_k \) such that \( |x_{i,k} - x_{j,k}| \geq r_k \), for \( i, j \in J_k, i \neq j \). Let \( B_{j,k} \) be the ball centered at \( x_{j,k} \) with radius \( r_k \). For \( \lambda > 1 \), set

\[
V_k^\lambda = \bigcup_{j \in J_k} \lambda B_{j,k}.
\]

Because of our assumptions on the set \( E \) we can assume that the initial points \( \{x_{j,0}\} \) are close to a \( d \)-plane \( \Sigma_0 \), that is \( \text{dist}(x_{j,0}, \Sigma_0) \leq \varepsilon \), for \( j \in J_0 \). Moreover, for each \( k \geq 0 \) and \( j \in J_k \) we assume that there exists a \( d \)-plane \( P_{j,k} \) through \( x_{j,k} \) such that

\[
\begin{align*}
(3.2) & \quad d_{x_{j,k}, 10r_k}(P_{i,k}, P_{j,k}) \leq \varepsilon \text{ for } k \geq 0 \text{ and } i, j \in J_k \text{ such that } |x_{i,k} - x_{j,k}| \leq 10r_k, \\
(3.3) & \quad d_{x_{i,0}, 100}(P_{i,0}, \Sigma_0) \leq \varepsilon \text{ for } i \in J_0, \\
(3.4) & \quad d_{x_{i,k}, 20r_k}(P_{i,k}, P_{j,k+1}) \leq \varepsilon \text{ for } k \geq 0, i \in J_k \text{ and } j \in J_{k+1} \text{ s.t. } |x_{i,k} - x_{j,k+1}| \leq 2r_k.
\end{align*}
\]

**Definition 3.1.** A coherent collection of balls and planes for \( E \) is a pair \((B_{j,k}, P_{j,k})\) with the properties above. We assume that \( \varepsilon > 0 \) is small enough, depending on \( d \) and \( n \).

We will use this collection to construct the parametrization, as explained in the following section. Recall Theorem 1.6:

**Theorem 1.6.** [G. David, T. Toro, Proposition 8.1 [DT12]] Let \( \varepsilon > 0 \) small enough and let \( E \subset B(0,1) \), where \( B(0,1) \) denotes the unit ball in \( \mathbb{R}^n \). Assume \( E \) is Reifenberg flat with holes. Then we can construct a map \( f : \Sigma_0 \to \mathbb{R}^n \), where \( \Sigma_0 \) is a \( d \)-plane in \( \mathbb{R}^n \), such that \( E \subset f(\Sigma_0) \) and \( f \) is bi-Hölder.

We now define the coefficients \( \varepsilon_k \) which differ from classic \( \beta \) numbers in that they take into account neighbouring points at nearby scales. In section 5 the relationship between the two will be made explicit.

**Definition 3.2.** For \( k \geq 1 \) and \( y \in V_k^{10} \) define

\[
\varepsilon_k(y) = \sup \{d_{x_{i,l}, 100r_k}(P_{j,k}, P_{i,l}) \mid j \in J_k, \ l \in \{k - 1, k\}, i \in J_l, \ y \in 10B_{j,k} \cap 11B_{i,k} \}
\]

and \( \varepsilon_k(y) = 0 \), for \( y \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus V_k^{10} \).

**Theorem 3.3.** [G. David, T. Toro, Proposition 8.3 [DT12]] Let \( \varepsilon > 0 \) and \( E \) as above. If we also assume that there exists \( M < +\infty \) such that

\[
(3.6) \quad \sum_{k \geq 0} \varepsilon_k(f(z))^2 \leq M, \quad \text{for all } z \in \Sigma_0.
\]

then the map \( f : \Sigma_0 \to \Sigma \) constructed in Theorem 1.6 is bi-Lipschitz. Moreover the Lipschitz constants depend only on \( n, d, \) and \( M \).
As said before, we are interested in finding a condition on the \( \varepsilon_k \)'s to improve the results on the map \( f \). The theorems we want to prove are the following.

**Theorem 3.4.** Let \( E \subseteq B(0,1) \) as above, with \( \varepsilon > 0 \) small enough. Also assume that there exists \( M < +\infty \) such that

\[
\sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{\varepsilon_k (f(z))^2}{r_k} \leq M, \quad \text{for all } z \in \Sigma_0.
\]

Then the map \( f : \Sigma_0 \to \Sigma \) constructed in Theorem 1.6 is invertible and differentiable, and both \( f \) and its inverse have Lipschitz directional derivatives. In particular, \( f \) is continuously differentiable. Moreover the Lipschitz constants depend only on \( n, d, \) and \( M \).

**Theorem 3.5.** Let \( E \subseteq B(0,1) \) as above, with \( \varepsilon > 0 \) small enough. Also assume that there exists \( M < +\infty \) such that

\[
\sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{\varepsilon_k (f(z))^2}{r_k^\alpha} \leq M, \quad \text{for all } z \in \Sigma_0.
\]

Then the map \( f : \Sigma_0 \to \Sigma \) constructed in Theorem 1.6 is invertible and differentiable, and both \( f \) and its inverse have \( \alpha \)-Hölder directional derivatives. In particular, \( f \) is continuously differentiable. Moreover the Hölder constants depend only on \( n, d, \) and \( M \).

**Remark 3.6.** We will define \( f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n \) but we are only interested in its values on \( \Sigma_0 \) and \( \Sigma = f(\Sigma_0) \). The directional derivatives mentioned in the statements above are directional derivatives in the directions \( u \in \Sigma_0 \).

### 3.2 Construction of the parametrization

As in [DT12] \( f \) will be constructed as a limit. To construct the sequence we need a partition of unity subordinate to \( \{B_{j,k}\} \). Following the construction in Chapter 3 of [DT12], we can obtain functions \( \theta_{j,k}(y) \) and \( \psi_k(y) \) such that each \( \theta_{j,k} \) is nonnegative and compactly supported in \( 10B_{j,k} \), and \( \psi_k(y) = 0 \) on \( V_k^8 \). Moreover we have, for every \( y \in \mathbb{R}^n \),

\[
\psi_k(y) + \sum_{j \in J_k} \theta_{j,k}(y) \equiv 1.
\]

Note that, because \( \psi_k(y) = 0 \) on \( V_k^8 \), this means that

\[
\sum_{j \in J_k} \theta_{j,k}(y) \equiv 1, \quad \text{for every } y \in V_k^8.
\]

Finally we have that

\[
|\nabla^m \theta_{j,k}(y)| \leq C_m/r_k^m, \quad |\nabla^m \psi_k(y)| \leq C_m/r_k^m.
\]

Following [DT12], our plan is to define a map \( f \) on a \( d \)-plane \( \Sigma_0 \). We define \( f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n \) and later on we will only care about its values on \( \Sigma_0 \). With a slight abuse of notation we will
still denote the restricted map to $\Sigma_0$ as $f$. We define the sequence $\{f_k : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n\}$ inductively by

\[(3.12)\quad f_0(y) = y \quad \text{and} \quad f_{k+1} = \sigma_k \circ f_k,
\]

where

\[(3.13)\quad \sigma_k(y) = \psi_k(y) + \sum_{j \in J_k} \theta_{j,k}(y)\pi_j(y).
\]

where $\pi_{j,k}$ denotes the orthogonal projection from $\mathbb{R}^n$ to $P_{j,k}$. In the future we denote by $\pi_{j,k}^\perp$ the projection onto the $(n-d)$-plane perpendicular to $P_{j,k}$ (passing through the origin).

Next, we observe that the $f_k$’s converge to a continuous map $f$. We include below the proof of this fact from [DT12]. Note that

\[(3.14)\quad |\sigma_k(y) - y| \leq 10r_k \quad \text{for} \quad y \in \mathbb{R}^n
\]

because $\sum_{j \in J_k} \theta_{j,k}(y) \leq 1$ and $|\pi_{j,k}(y) - y| \leq 10r_k$ when $\theta_{j,k}(y) \neq 0$ ($\theta_{j,k}$ is compactly supported in $10B_{j,k}$, so that means $y \in 10B_{j,k}$). This implies that

\[(3.15)\quad \|f_{k+1} - f_k\|_{\infty} \leq 10r_k
\]

so that the maps $f_k$’s converge uniformly on $\mathbb{R}^n$ to a continuous map $f$.

**Remark 3.7.** Note that while $\pi_{j,k}$ is an affine map, $\pi_{j,k}^\perp$ is a linear map. We also denote by $\pi_{j,k}$ the projection onto the $d$-plane parallel to $P_{j,k}$ passing through the origin. From now on we will use the following convention for notation: if $u$ is a direction in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $\frac{\partial \pi_{j,k}}{\partial u} = \nabla \pi_{j,k} \cdot u = \pi_{j,k}(u)$.

Moreover if $v$ is another direction, then $\frac{\partial^2 \pi_{j,k}}{\partial u \partial v} = 0$, as $\frac{\partial \pi_{j,k}}{\partial u}$ is constant and thus has zero derivative in every direction.

By differentiating (3.13), we get that for $y \in V_k^{10}$ and $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $|u| = 1$, we have

\[(3.16)\quad \frac{\partial \sigma_k}{\partial u}(y) = \psi_k(y)u + \sum_{j \in J_k} \theta_{j,k}(y)\frac{\partial \pi_{j,k}}{\partial u} + y\frac{\partial \psi_k}{\partial u}(y) + \sum_{j \in J_k} \pi_j(y)\frac{\partial \theta_{j,k}}{\partial u}(y).
\]

Note that if $y \notin V_k^{10}$, then $\sigma_k(y) = y$ and also $\frac{\partial \sigma_k}{\partial u}(y) = u$. Then we also have $\frac{\partial^2 \sigma_k}{\partial u \partial v}(y) = 0$.

**Lemma 3.8.** Let $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and $y \in V_k^{10}$. We have

\[(3.17)\quad \frac{\partial^2 \sigma_k}{\partial u \partial v}(y) = \frac{\partial \psi_k}{\partial v}(y)u + \frac{\partial \psi_k}{\partial u}(y)v + \sum_{j \in J_k} \theta_{j,k}(y)\frac{\partial \pi_{j,k}}{\partial u} + \sum_{j \in J_k} \theta_{j,k}(y)\frac{\partial \pi_{j,k}}{\partial v} + \frac{\partial^2 \psi_k}{\partial u \partial v}(y) + \sum_{j \in J_k} \pi_j(y)\frac{\partial^2 \theta_{j,k}}{\partial u \partial v}(y).
\]

Choose $i = i(y) \in J_k$ such that $y \in 10B_{i,k}$ and set

\[(3.18)\quad g_{u,v}(y) = \frac{\partial \psi_k}{\partial v}(y)\frac{\partial \pi_{i,k}^\perp}{\partial u} + \frac{\partial \psi_k}{\partial u}(y)\frac{\partial \pi_{i,k}^\perp}{\partial v} + (y - \pi_{i,k}(y))\frac{\partial^2 \psi_k}{\partial u \partial v}(y).
\]
Then
\[(3.19) \quad \left| \frac{\partial^2 \sigma_k}{\partial u \partial v}(y) - g_{u,v}(y) \right| \leq C\varepsilon/r_k,\]
where $C > 0$ is a constant.

**Remark 3.9.** Without loss of generality, we can assume that $|u| = |v| = 1$, so from now we will work under this assumption. For simplicity, in the future we will suppress the dependence of $g$ on $u, v$ from the notation.

**Proof.** We obtain (3.17) by differentiating (3.16). For the last statement, recalling (3.9), we have
\[(3.20) \quad g(y) = \frac{\partial \psi_k}{\partial v}(y) \left( u - \frac{\partial \pi_{i,k}}{\partial u} \right) + \frac{\partial \psi_k}{\partial u}(y) \left( v - \frac{\partial \pi_{i,k}}{\partial v} \right) + y \frac{\partial^2 \psi_k}{\partial u \partial v}(y) =\]
\[= \frac{\partial \psi_k}{\partial v}(y) u + \frac{\partial \psi_k}{\partial u}(y) v + \sum_{j \in J_k} \frac{\partial \theta_{j,k}}{\partial u}(y) \frac{\partial \pi_{i,k}}{\partial v} + \sum_{j \in J_k} \frac{\partial \theta_{j,k}}{\partial v}(y) \frac{\partial \pi_{i,k}}{\partial u} +\]
\[+ y \frac{\partial^2 \psi_k}{\partial u \partial v}(y) + \sum_{j \in J_k} \pi_{i,k}(y) \frac{\partial^2 \theta_{j,k}}{\partial u \partial v}(y).\]
Now, note that $\left| \frac{\partial^2 \theta_{j,k}}{\partial u \partial v}(y) \right| \leq C/r_k^2$, $|u| = |v| = 1$. Moreover by (3.2), for all nonzero terms, we have $\left| \frac{\partial \pi_{i,k}}{\partial u} - \frac{\partial \pi_{i,k}}{\partial v} \right| \leq C\varepsilon$, because $\theta_{j,k} = 0$ outside of $10B_{j,k}$, so that $y \in 10B_{j,k}$ and hence $|x_{i,k} - x_{j,k}| < 100r_k$ for our choice of $(i, k)$. Hence, we get
\[(3.21) \quad \left| \frac{\partial^2 \sigma_k}{\partial u \partial v}(y) - g(y) \right| \leq \sum_{j \in J_k} \left| \frac{\partial \theta_{j,k}}{\partial v}(y) \right| \left| \frac{\partial \pi_{j,k}}{\partial u} - \frac{\partial \pi_{i,k}}{\partial u} \right| + \sum_{j \in J_k} \left| \frac{\partial \theta_{j,k}}{\partial u}(y) \right| \left| \frac{\partial \pi_{j,k}}{\partial v} + \frac{\partial \pi_{i,k}}{\partial v} \right| +\]
\[+ \sum_{j \in J_k} \left| \frac{\partial^2 \theta_{j,k}}{\partial u \partial v}(y) \right| \left| \pi_{j,k}(y) - \pi_{i,k}(y) \right| \leq\]
\[\leq C/r_k \cdot C\varepsilon + C/r_k^2 \cdot C\varepsilon r_k = C\varepsilon/r_k.\]

**Corollary 3.10.** If $y \in V^8_k$, and $i$ as above,
\[(3.22) \quad \frac{\partial^2 \sigma_k}{\partial u \partial v}(y) = \sum_{j \in J_k} \frac{\partial \theta_{j,k}}{\partial v}(y) \frac{\partial \pi_{j,k}}{\partial u} + \sum_{j \in J_k} \frac{\partial \theta_{j,k}}{\partial u}(y) \frac{\partial \pi_{j,k}}{\partial v} + \sum_{j \in J_k} \pi_{j,k}(y) \frac{\partial^2 \theta_{j,k}}{\partial u \partial v}(y)\]
and
\[(3.23) \quad \left| \frac{\partial^2 \sigma_k}{\partial u \partial v}(y) \right| \leq C\varepsilon/r_k,\]
where $C > 0$ is a constant.
Proof. Note that $\psi_k(y) = 0$ for $y \in V^8_k$. Then $g(y) = 0$ so the two statements follow immediately from the previous lemma.

We now want to collect some more estimates. Let $\Sigma_k$ be the image of $\Sigma_0$ under $f_k$, i.e. $\Sigma_k = f_k(\Sigma_0) = \sigma_{k-1} \circ \ldots \circ \sigma_0(\Sigma_0)$. First, we need to recall some results from [DT12]. The main result is a local Lipschitz description of the $\Sigma_k$’s. For convenience we introduce the following notation for boxes.

**Definition 3.11** (Chapter 5, [DT12]). If $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $P$ is a $d$-plane through $x$ and $R > 0$, we define the box $D(x,P,R)$ by

$$D(x,P,R) = \left\{ z + w \mid z \in P \cap B(x,R) \text{ and } w \in P^\perp \cap B(0,R) \right\}.$$

Recall that for a Lipschitz map $A : P \to P^\perp$ the graph of $A$ over $P$ is $\Gamma_A = \{ z + A(z) \mid z \in P \}$.

**Proposition 3.12.** [Proposition 5.1 [DT12]] For all $k \geq 0$ and $j \in J_k$, there is a Lipschitz function $A_{j,k} : P_{j,k} \cap 49B_{j,k} \to P^\perp_{j,k}$ of class $C^2$, $|A_{j,k}(x_{j,k})| \leq C\varepsilon r_k$, with

$$\left| \frac{\partial A_{j,k}}{\partial u}(y) \right| \leq C\varepsilon, \quad u \in \mathbb{R}^n, |u| = 1$$

such that around $x_{i,j}$ $\Sigma_k$ coincides with the graph of $A_{j,k}$, that is

$$\Sigma_k \cap D(x_{j,k},P_{j,k},49r_k) = \Gamma_{A_{j,k}} \cap D(x_{j,k},P_{j,k},49r_k).$$

Moreover, we have that

$$|\sigma_k(y) - y| \leq C\varepsilon r_k \text{ for } y \in \Sigma_k$$

and, if $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $|u| = 1$,

$$\left| \frac{\partial \sigma_k}{\partial u}(y) - \frac{\partial \pi_{j,k}}{\partial u}(y) - \psi_k(y) \frac{\partial \pi^\perp_{j,k}}{\partial u}(y) \right| \leq C\varepsilon \text{ for } y \in \Sigma_k \cap 45B_{j,k}.$$

Proposition 3.12 provides a small Lipschitz graph (that is, a Lipschitz graph with a small constant) description for the $\Sigma_k$ around $x_{j,k}$. Note that, away from $x_{j,k}$, $\sigma_k = id$, so that $\Sigma_k$ stays the same so that it is not hard to get control there too. The proof of Proposition 3.12 is quite long and involved, and proceeds by induction. For $k = 0$, $\Sigma_0$ is a plane, and because $P_{j,k}$ and $P_{j,k+1}$ make small angles with each other, once we have a Lipschitz description of $\Sigma_k$ we can obtain one with a comparable constant for $\Sigma_{k+1}$. Using Proposition 3.12 we can get estimates on the second derivatives of the $\sigma_k$’s.

**Proposition 3.13.** For all $k \geq 0$, $j \in J_k$, $y \in \Sigma_k \cap 45B_{j,k}, u,v \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $|u| = |v| = 1$, we have

$$\left| \frac{\partial^2 \sigma_k}{\partial u \partial v}(y) - \frac{\partial \psi_k}{\partial u}(y) \frac{\partial \pi^\perp_{j,k}}{\partial v}(y) - \frac{\partial \psi_k}{\partial v}(y) \frac{\partial \pi_{j,k}}{\partial u}(y) \right| \leq C\varepsilon/r_k.$$
Proof. Let \( j \in J_k \) and \( y \in \Sigma_k \cap 45B_{j,k} \) be given. If \( y \notin V_{10}^k \), then \( \psi_k(y) = 1 \) and \( \frac{\partial^2 \sigma_k}{\partial u \partial v}(y) = 0 \), so there is nothing to prove. So we may assume that \( y \in V_{10}^k \) and choose \( i \in J_k \) such that \( |y - x_{i,k}| \leq 10r_k \). Recall that, by (3.19),

\[
(3.30) \quad \frac{\partial^2 \sigma_k}{\partial u \partial v}(y) - g(y) \leq C\varepsilon/r_k.
\]

We want to control

\[
(3.31) \quad B = g(y) - \frac{\partial \psi_k}{\partial u}(y) \frac{\partial \pi_{i,k}^\perp}{\partial v}(y) - \frac{\partial \psi_k}{\partial v}(y) \frac{\partial \pi_{j,k}^\perp}{\partial u}(y) = \frac{\partial \psi_k}{\partial u}(y) \left[ \frac{\partial \pi_{i,k}^\perp}{\partial v} - \frac{\partial \pi_{j,k}^\perp}{\partial v}(y) \right] + \frac{\partial \psi_k}{\partial v}(y) \left[ \frac{\partial \pi_{i,k}^\perp}{\partial u} - \frac{\partial \pi_{j,k}^\perp}{\partial u}(y) \right] + [y - \pi_{i,k}(y)] \frac{\partial^2 \psi_k}{\partial u \partial v}(y)
\]

In the construction of the coherent families of balls and planes, since \( y \in 45B_{j,k} \cap 10B_{i,k} \), (3.2) says that

\[
(3.32) \quad d_{x_{j,k},100r_k}(P_{i,k}, P_{j,k}) \leq \varepsilon
\]

and so, for \( u \in \mathbb{R}^n \), \( |u| = 1 \),

\[
(3.33) \quad \left| \frac{\partial \pi_{i,k}}{\partial u} - \frac{\partial \pi_{j,k}}{\partial u} \right| + \left| \frac{\partial \pi_{i,k}^\perp}{\partial u} - \frac{\partial \pi_{j,k}^\perp}{\partial u}(y) \right| \leq C\varepsilon.
\]

Recalling also that \( \left| \frac{\partial \psi_k}{\partial u}(y) \right| \leq C/r_k \), we can bound the first two terms of \( B \) by \( C\varepsilon/r_k \). Next

\[
(3.34) \quad \left| [y - \pi_{i,k}(y)] \frac{\partial^2 \psi_k}{\partial u \partial v}(y) \right| \leq \leq Cr_k^{-2} |y - \pi_{i,k}(y)| = Cr_k^{-2} \text{dist}(y, P_{i,k}) \leq \leq Cr_k^{-2} \text{dist}(y, P_{j,k}) + C\varepsilon/r_k.
\]

By the results in Proposition 3.12, we also have

\[
(3.35) \quad \text{dist}(y, P_{j,k}) \leq |A_{j,k}(x_{j,k})| + C\varepsilon r_k \leq C\varepsilon r_k.
\]

Then, finally,

\[
(3.36) \quad \left| \frac{\partial^2 \sigma_k}{\partial u \partial v}(y) - \frac{\partial \psi_k}{\partial u}(y) \frac{\partial \pi_{j,k}^\perp}{\partial v}(y) - \frac{\partial \psi_k}{\partial v}(y) \frac{\partial \pi_{j,k}^\perp}{\partial u}(y) \right| \leq \left| \frac{\partial^2 \sigma_k}{\partial u \partial v}(y) - g(y) \right| + |B| \leq C\varepsilon/r_k.
\]

\( \square \)

In the next lemmas from [DT12] we want to check how much the mappings \( f_k \) distort lengths and distances. We are only concerned with directions parallel to the tangent planes to \( \Sigma_k \). Lemma 3.14 is enough to obtain the original Hölder estimates in Theorem 1.6, but we need more precise estimates to obtain better estimates.
Lemma 3.14. [Lemma 7.1 [DT12]] For $k \geq 0$, $y \in \Sigma_k$, and $u \in T_y \Sigma_k$, $|u| = 1$, $\sigma_k : \Sigma_k \to \Sigma_{k+1}$ is a $C^2$ diffeomorphism,

$$\frac{\partial \sigma_k}{\partial u} : \Sigma_k \to \Sigma_{k+1}$$
is bijective and $(1 + C\varepsilon)$-biLipschitz.

Moreover,

$$\left| \frac{\partial \sigma_k}{\partial u}(y) \right| \leq 1 + C\varepsilon, \; y \in \Sigma_k.$$

Recall Definition 3.2,

$$(3.39) \quad \varepsilon_k(y) = \sup \{ d_{x_{i,l},100r_i}(P_{j,k}, P_{i,l}) \mid j \in J_k, \; l \in \{ k - 1, k \}, \; i \in J_l, \; y \in 10B_{j,k} \cap 11B_{i,k} \}$$

and $\varepsilon_k(y) = 0$, for $y \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus V_{10}^k$. The numbers $\varepsilon_k$ measure the angles between the planes $P_{j,k}$ and $P_{i,l}$ and, while we know that $\varepsilon_k(y) \leq \varepsilon$ by definition of CCBP we want to keep track of the places where they are much smaller and improve the estimates obtained before.

The next lemma provides improved distortion estimates for the tangent derivatives of $\sigma_k$, which will be useful when estimating $|f(x) - f(y)|$.

Lemma 3.15. [Lemma 7.3 + 7.4 [DT12]] For $k \geq 1$, $y \in \Sigma_k \cap V_8^k$, and $u \in T_y \Sigma_k$, $|u| = 1$,

$$\left| \frac{\partial \sigma_k}{\partial u}(y) \right| \leq 1 + C\varepsilon_k(y)^2 r_k.$$

$$\text{Angle}(T\Sigma_k(y), P_{i,k}) \leq C\varepsilon_k(y).$$

$$\left| \frac{\partial \sigma_k}{\partial u}(y) \right| \leq 1 + C\varepsilon_k(y)^2.$$

We now want to obtain similar estimates on the second derivatives of the $\sigma_k$.

Lemma 3.16. For $k \geq 0$, $y \in \Sigma_k \cap V_8^k$, and $u, v \in T_y \Sigma_k$, $|u| = |v| = 1$ we have

$$\left| \frac{\partial^2 \sigma_k}{\partial u \partial v}(y) \right| \leq C\varepsilon_k(y)/r_k.$$

Proof. Choose $i \in J_k$ such that $|y - x_{i,k}| \leq 10r_k$. Then

$$\frac{\partial^2 \sigma_k}{\partial u \partial v}(y) = \sum_{j \in J_k} \frac{\partial^2 \theta_j}{\partial u \partial v}(y) \left[ \frac{\partial \pi_{j,k}}{\partial u} - \frac{\partial \pi_{i,k}}{\partial u} \right] +$$

$$+ \sum_{j \in J_k} \frac{\partial \theta_j}{\partial u}(y) \left[ \frac{\partial \pi_{j,k}}{\partial v} - \frac{\partial \pi_{i,k}}{\partial v} \right] +$$

$$+ \sum_{j \in J_k} \frac{\partial^2 \theta_j}{\partial u \partial v}(y) \left[ \pi_{j,k}(y) - \pi_{i,k}(y) \right]$$
by (3.9). Because of our construction of the \( P_{j,k} \)'s, we have \(|\frac{\partial \pi_{j,k}}{\partial v} - \frac{\partial \pi_{i,k}}{\partial v}| \leq C \varepsilon_k(y)\). Moreover recall that \(|\frac{\partial \theta_{j,k}}{\partial u}(y) | \leq C/r_k\) and \(|\frac{\partial^2 \theta_{j,k}}{\partial u^2}(y) | \leq C/r_k^2\). Finally, we also have that \(|\pi_{i,k}(y) - \pi_{j,k}(y)| \leq C \varepsilon_k(y) r_k\), so that we get

\[(3.46) \quad \left|\frac{\partial^2 \sigma_k}{\partial u \partial v}(y)\right| \leq C/r_k \varepsilon_k(y) + C/r_k^2 \varepsilon_k(y) r_k \leq C \varepsilon_k(y)/r_k.\]

**Lemma 3.17.** For \(k \geq 0, y \in \Sigma_k \cap V^8_k\), and \(u,v \in T_y \Sigma_k, |u| = |v| = 1\) we have

\[(3.47) \quad \left|\frac{\partial^2 \sigma_k}{\partial u \partial v}(y)\right| \leq C \varepsilon_k(y)^2/r_k.\]

Finally, we are able to prove the key estimate for the \(\frac{\partial^2 \sigma_k}{\partial u \partial v}\)'s.

**Proof.** For \(y \in V^8_k\), choose \(i \in J_k\) such that \(|y - x_{i,k}| \leq 10r_k\). First we will show that

\[(3.48) \quad \left|\frac{\partial \pi_{i,k}}{\partial u} \circ \frac{\partial^2 \sigma_k}{\partial u \partial v}(y) \circ \frac{\partial \pi_{l,k}}{\partial u}\right| \leq C \varepsilon_k(y)^2/r_k,\]

and then use that to prove the claim. By (3.23), we have

\[(3.49) \quad \frac{\partial \pi_{i,k}}{\partial u} \circ \frac{\partial^2 \sigma_k}{\partial u \partial v}(y) \circ \frac{\partial \pi_{l,k}}{\partial u} = \sum_{j \in J_k} \frac{\partial \pi_{i,k}}{\partial u} \circ \pi_{j,k}(y) \frac{\partial^2 \theta_{j,k}}{\partial u \partial v}(y) \circ \frac{\partial \pi_{i,k}}{\partial u} +

\quad + \sum_{j \in J_k} \frac{\partial \theta_{j,k}}{\partial u}(y) \left[ \frac{\partial \pi_{i,k}}{\partial u} \circ \frac{\partial \pi_{j,k}}{\partial u} \circ \frac{\partial \pi_{i,k}}{\partial u} \right] +

\quad + \sum_{j \in J_k} \frac{\partial \theta_{j,k}}{\partial u}(y) \left[ \frac{\partial \pi_{i,k}}{\partial u} \circ \frac{\partial \pi_{j,k}}{\partial v} \circ \frac{\partial \pi_{i,k}}{\partial u} \right] =

\quad = A_1 + A_2 + A_3.\]

Now, recalling that \(\sum_{j \in J_k} \theta_{j,k}(y) = 1\) in \(V^8_k\) by (3.9), we have

\[(3.50) \quad |A_2| \leq \sum_{j \in J_k} \left|\frac{\partial \theta_{j,k}}{\partial v}(y) \left[ \frac{\partial \pi_{i,k}}{\partial u} \circ \frac{\partial \pi_{j,k}}{\partial u} \circ \frac{\partial \pi_{i,k}}{\partial u} - \frac{\partial \pi_{i,k}}{\partial u} \right] \right| =

\quad = \sum_{j \in J_k} \left|\frac{\partial \theta_{j,k}}{\partial v}(y) \left[ \frac{\partial \pi_{i,k}}{\partial u} \circ \frac{\partial \pi_{j,k}}{\partial u} - \frac{\partial \pi_{i,k}}{\partial u} \right] \circ \frac{\partial \pi_{i,k}}{\partial u} \right| \leq

\quad \leq C \varepsilon_k(y)^2 \sum_{j \in J_k} \left|\frac{\partial \theta_{j,k}}{\partial v}(y) \right| \leq

\quad \leq C \varepsilon_k(y)^2/r_k,\]

where we used (3.42) and that \(|\frac{\partial \theta_{j,k}}{\partial v}(y) | \leq C/r_k\), because the sum has a finite number of terms as the number of balls \(B_{i,k}\) that meet \(B_{j,k}\) is bounded by a constant that depends only on \(n\). A similar estimate holds for \(A_3\).
Now,

\[ |A_1| \leq \sum_{j \in J_k} \left| \frac{\partial \pi_{i,k}}{\partial u} \circ \pi_{j,k}(y) \frac{\partial^2 \theta_{j,k}}{\partial u \partial v} (y) \circ \frac{\partial \pi_{i,k}}{\partial u} \right| = \]

\[ = \sum_{j \in J_k} \left| \frac{\partial \pi_{i,k}}{\partial u} \circ \left[ \pi_{j,k}(y) - y \right] \frac{\partial^2 \theta_{j,k}}{\partial u \partial v} (y) \circ \frac{\partial \pi_{i,k}}{\partial u} \right| \leq \]

\[ \leq C\varepsilon_k(y)^2 r_k \sum_{j \in J_k} \left| \frac{\partial^2 \theta_{j,k}}{\partial u \partial v} (y) \right| \leq \]

\[ \leq C\varepsilon_k(y)^2 / r_k, \]

where we used (3.9) again and that \( \left| \frac{\partial^2 \theta_{j,k}}{\partial u \partial v} (y) \right| \leq C/r_k^2 \), together with (3.40). This proves (3.48).

Now write

\[ \frac{\partial^2 \sigma_k}{\partial u \partial v} (y) = w_1 + w_2 + w_3 \]

where

\[ w_1 = \frac{\partial \pi_{i,k}^\perp}{\partial u} \circ \frac{\partial^2 \sigma_k}{\partial u \partial v} (y) \]
\[ w_2 = \frac{\partial \pi_{i,k}}{\partial u} \circ \frac{\partial^2 \sigma_k}{\partial u \partial v} (y) \circ \frac{\partial \pi_{i,k}}{\partial u} \]
\[ w_3 = \frac{\partial \pi_{i,k}}{\partial u} \circ \frac{\partial^2 \sigma_k}{\partial u \partial v} (y) \circ \frac{\partial \pi_{i,k}^\perp}{\partial u}. \]

By (3.48) we know that \( |w_2| \leq C\varepsilon_k(y)^2 / r_k \). On the other hand, by Lemma 3.16 and (3.41) we get

\[ |w_1| \leq \left| \frac{\partial \pi_{i,k}^\perp}{\partial u} \circ \frac{\partial^2 \sigma_k}{\partial u \partial v} (y) \right| \leq \]

\[ \leq \left| \frac{\partial \pi_{i,k}^\perp}{\partial u} \right| C\varepsilon_k(y)/r_k \leq \]

\[ \leq \text{Angle}(T\Sigma_k(y), P_{i,k}) C\varepsilon_k(y)/r_k \leq \]

\[ \leq C\varepsilon_k(y)^2 / r_k, \]

because \( u \in T_y \Sigma_k \). Similarly we can obtain \( |w_3| \leq C\varepsilon_k(y)^2 / r_k \), which concludes the proof.

Before proceeding to prove the main theorems we will collect some estimates on the inverses of the \( \sigma_k \).

**Lemma 3.18.** Let \( u, v \) be unit vectors in \( \mathbb{R}^n \). Then

\[ \left| \frac{\partial \sigma_k^{-1}}{\partial u} (y) \right| \leq 1 + C\varepsilon_k^2(y), \]
(3.55) \[ \left| \frac{\partial^2 \sigma_k^{-1}}{\partial u \partial v}(y) \right| \leq C \varepsilon_k^2(y)/r_k \]

Proof. By Lemma 3.14 we know that \( \frac{\partial \sigma_k}{\partial u} \) is bounded below. In the same we obtain the upper bounds in Lemma 3.15 for \( \frac{\partial \sigma_k}{\partial u} \) we can obtain similar bounds for \( \frac{\partial \sigma_k^{-1}}{\partial u} \). Recalling that \( \sigma_k \circ \sigma_k^{-1}(x) = x \) for every \( x \in \Sigma_k \) and by taking the directional derivative we can conclude that (3.54) holds. Similarly, by taking one more derivative we get

(3.56) \[ \frac{\partial^2 \sigma_k}{\partial u \partial v} \frac{\partial \sigma_k^{-1}}{\partial u} + \frac{\partial \sigma_k}{\partial u} \frac{\partial^2 \sigma_k^{-1}}{\partial u \partial v} = 0 \]

from which (3.55) follows after a simple computation and using the estimates collected above. \( \square \)

4 Proof of the more technical results on parametrization

Finally, we proceed to prove Theorems 3.4 and 3.5 stated in the previous section.

4.1 Proof of Theorem 3.4

Theorem 3.4. Let \( E \subseteq B(0,1) \) as above, with \( \varepsilon > 0 \) small enough. Also assume that there exists \( M < +\infty \) such that

(4.1) \[ \sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{\varepsilon_k(f(z))^2}{r_k} \leq M, \quad \text{for all } z \in \Sigma_0. \]

Then the map \( f : \Sigma_0 \to \Sigma \) constructed in Theorem 1.6 is invertible and differentiable, and both \( f \) and its inverse have Lipschitz directional derivatives. In particular, \( f \) is continuously differentiable. Moreover the Lipschitz constants depend only on \( n, d, \) and \( M \).

Proof. Recall \( \Sigma_0 \) is a \( d \)-plane, so for \( x, y \in \Sigma_0 \cap B(0,1) \) we can connect them through the curve \( \gamma(t) = tx + (1-t)y \) on \( I = [0,1] \). We have that

(4.2) \[ \frac{\partial f_m}{\partial u}(y) - \frac{\partial f_m}{\partial u}(x) = \int_I \frac{\partial^2 f_m}{\partial u \partial v}(\gamma(t))|\gamma'(t)| \, dt, \]

where \( v = \gamma'(t) \). Now, set \( A_k = \frac{\partial^2 f_k}{\partial u \partial v}(\gamma(t)) \) (note that \( A_0 = 0 \)), and let \( z_k = f_k(\gamma(t)) \). By the definition of the \( f_k \)'s we have

(4.3) \[ A_{k+1} = \frac{\partial^2 f_{k+1}}{\partial u \partial v}(\gamma(t)) = \frac{\partial^2 \sigma_k}{\partial u \partial v}(z_k) \cdot \frac{\partial f_k}{\partial u}(\gamma(t)) \cdot \frac{\partial f_k}{\partial v}(\gamma(t)) + \frac{\partial \sigma_k}{\partial u}(z_k) \cdot A_k. \]
We want to estimate $A_m$. If $0 < x < 1$ clearly $(1 + x)^2 \leq 1 + 3x$, so we have, by (3.43),

\begin{equation}
|A_m| \leq C \varepsilon_m (z_m)^2/r_m \prod_{0 \leq k < m} [1 + C \varepsilon_k (z_k)^2] + (1 + C \varepsilon_m (z_m)^2)|A_{m-1}|
\end{equation}

\begin{align*}
&\leq \varepsilon_m (z_m)^2/r_m \prod_{0 \leq k < m} [1 + C \varepsilon_k (z_k)^2] \\
&+ C(1 + C \varepsilon_m (z_m)^2) \left( \varepsilon_{m-1}(z_{m-1})^2/r_{m-1} \prod_{0 \leq k < m-1} [1 + C \varepsilon_k (z_k)^2] + \\
&+(1 + C \varepsilon_{m-1} (z_{m-1})^2)|A_{m-2}| \right)
\end{align*}

Recalling that $A_0 = 0$, we get

\begin{equation}
|A_m| \leq C \sum_{k=0}^{m} \left( \prod_{0 \leq i \leq m, i \neq k} [1 + C \varepsilon_i (z_i)^2] \right) \varepsilon_k (z_k)^2/r_k.
\end{equation}

Notice that if $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \varepsilon_k (f_k(z))^2/r_k$ is finite then surely $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \varepsilon_k (f_k(z))^2$ also is, so Theorem 3.3 holds and in particular $\prod_{0 \leq i \leq m, i \neq k} [1 + C \varepsilon_i (z_i)^2] \leq C(M)$ so

\begin{equation}
|A_m| \leq C \sum_{k=0}^{m} \varepsilon_k (z_k)^2/r_k.
\end{equation}

Then,

\begin{equation}
\left| \frac{\partial f_{m}}{\partial u} (y) - \frac{\partial f_{m}}{\partial u} (x) \right| \leq \int_I \left| \frac{\partial^2 f_{m}}{\partial u \partial v} (\gamma(t)) |\gamma'(t)| \right| \, dt = \int_I |A_m| |\gamma'(t)| \, dt \leq C \sum_{k=0}^{m} \varepsilon_k (z_k)^2/r_k |x - y| \leq C(M) |x - y|.
\end{equation}

where $C(M)$ is a constant that depends on $M$ but not on $m$. Since the bound is uniform in $m$, the same holds for $f$, which is the uniform limit of the $f_k$’s.

Now, we want to prove that, for $x', y' \in \Sigma$,

\begin{equation}
\left| \frac{\partial f^{-1}}{\partial u} (y') - \frac{\partial f^{-1}}{\partial u} (x') \right| \leq C(M) |x' - y'|.
\end{equation}

Let $x, y \in \Sigma_m$, where $m$ is such that $r_m \leq |x - y| \leq r_{m+1}$, $x = x_{j,m}$ and $y \in B(x_{j,m}, 49r_m)$, and $x \to x'$, $y' \to y$ as $m \to \infty$. Recall that by Proposition 3.12, we know that $\Sigma_m$ coincides
with a small Lipschitz graph in $B(x_{j,m}, 49r_m)$. Then there is a $C^2$ curve $\gamma: I \to \Sigma_m$ that goes from $x$ to $y$ with length bounded above by $(1 + C\varepsilon)|x - y|$. 

Now, we want to prove that

\begin{equation}
\left| \frac{\partial f_m^{-1}}{\partial u}(y) - \frac{\partial f_m^{-1}}{\partial u}(x) \right| \leq C(M)|x - y|.
\end{equation}

We may assume $m \geq 1$ as the result is obvious for $m = 0$, given $f_0(x) = x$. Then we can proceed exactly as in the first part of the proof. Write

\begin{equation}
\frac{\partial f_m^{-1}}{\partial u}(y) - \frac{\partial f_m^{-1}}{\partial u}(x) = \int_I \frac{\partial^2 f_m^{-1}}{\partial u \partial v}(\gamma(t))|\gamma'(t)|\ dt.
\end{equation}

Now recall the estimates (3.54) and (3.55) and use the fact that $\frac{\partial f_k}{\partial u}$ is bounded, so that we can carry the proof exactly as before, to get

\begin{equation}
\left| \frac{\partial^2 f_m^{-1}}{\partial u \partial v} \right| \leq C \sum_{k=0}^m \varepsilon_k(z_k)^2/r_k,
\end{equation}

where $z_k = f_k \circ f_m^{-1}(\gamma(t))$. Then,

\begin{equation}
\left| \frac{\partial f_m^{-1}}{\partial u}(y) - \frac{\partial f_m^{-1}}{\partial u}(x) \right| \leq \int_I \left| \frac{\partial^2 f_m^{-1}}{\partial u \partial v}(\gamma(t))|\gamma'(t)| \right| \ dt \leq
\begin{align*}
&\leq C \sum_{k=0}^m \varepsilon_k(z_k)^2/r_k |x - y| \\
&\leq C(M)|x - y|.
\end{align*}
\end{equation}

where $C(M)$ is a constant that depends on $M$ but not on $m$. Given our choices of $x, y$ we can conclude that, for $x', y' \in \Sigma$,

\begin{equation}
\left| \frac{\partial f^{-1}}{\partial u}(y') - \frac{\partial f^{-1}}{\partial u}(x') \right| \leq C(M)|x' - y'|,
\end{equation}

which concludes the proof. \hfill $\square$

4.2 Proof of Theorem 3.5

**Theorem 3.5.** Let $E \subseteq B(0,1)$ as above, with $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough. Also assume that there exists $M < +\infty$ such that

\begin{equation}
\sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{\varepsilon_k(f(z))^2}{r_k^\alpha} \leq M, \quad \text{for all } z \in \Sigma_0.
\end{equation}

Then the map $f: \Sigma_0 \to \Sigma$ constructed in Theorem 1.6 is invertible and differentiable, and both $f$ and its inverse have $\alpha$-Hölder directional derivatives. In particular, $f$ is continuously differentiable. Moreover the Hölder constants depend only on $n$, $d$, and $M$. 

Lemma 4.1. Suppose \( g_j \) is a sequence of continuous functions on \( B(0,1) \), that satisfy
\[
|g_j(x) - g_j(y)| \leq A^j |x - y| \quad \text{for some } A > 1,
\]
and
\[
|g_k(x) - g_{k+1}(x)| \leq a_k \quad \text{for } \{a_k(x)\} \ s.t. \ \sum_{k=j}^{\infty} a_k(x) \leq CB^{-j}, \quad \text{for some } B > 1.
\]
The limit \( g(x) = \lim_{j \to \infty} g_j(x) \) is \( \gamma \)-Hölder continuous, where \( \gamma = \frac{\log B}{\log(A B)} \).

The lemma is analogous to Lemma 2.8, Chapter 7 in [SS05].

Proof. First note that \( g(x) \) is the limit of the uniformly convergent series
\[
g(x) = g_1(x) + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (g_{k+1}(x) - g_k(x)).
\]
Then
\[
|g(x) - g_j(x)| \leq \sum_{k=j}^{\infty} |g_{k+1}(x) - g_k(x)| \leq \sum_{k=j}^{\infty} a_k(x) \leq CB^{-j}.
\]
By the triangle inequality we get
\[
|g(x) - g(y)| \leq |g(x) - g_j(x)| + |g_j(x) - g_j(y)| + |g(y) - g_j(y)| \leq C(A^j |x - y| + B^{-j}).
\]
Now, for fixed \( x \neq y \) we want to choose \( j \) so that the two terms on the right hand side are comparable. We want to choose \( j \) such that
\[
(AB)^j |x - y| \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad 1 \leq (AB)^{j+1} |x - y|.
\]
Let \( j = -\lfloor \log_{AB} |x - y| \rfloor \). Then the two inequalities are clearly satisfied. The first one gives
\[
A^j |x - y| \leq B^{-j}
\]
and by raising the second one to the power \( \gamma \), recalling that \( (AB)^\gamma = B \) by definition, we get that \( B^{-j} \leq |x - y|^\gamma \). This gives
\[
|g(x) - g(y)| \leq C(A^j |x - y| + B^{-j}) \leq CB^{-j} \leq C|x - y|^\gamma,
\]
which is what we wanted to prove. \( \square \)

Proof. (Theorem 3.5) Recall that by (4.6), we have that \( |A_m| \leq C \sum_{k=0}^{m} \varepsilon_k(z_k)^2 / r_k \). Then we have
\[
|A_m| \leq C \sum_{k=0}^{m} \frac{\varepsilon_k(z_k)^2}{r_k} \leq \left( \frac{1}{r_m} \right)^{1-\alpha} \sum_{k=0}^{m} \frac{\varepsilon_k(z_k)^2}{r_k^\alpha} \leq C(M)(10^{1-\alpha})^m
\]
so that, recalling \( r_k = 10^{-k} \),
\[
\left| \frac{\partial f_m}{\partial u}(y) - \frac{\partial f_m}{\partial u}(x) \right| \leq C(M)(10^{1-\alpha})^m |x - y|.
\]
Moreover we have
\begin{equation}
\left| \frac{\partial f_{m+1}}{\partial u}(x) - \frac{\partial f_m}{\partial u}(x) \right| = \left| \frac{\partial \sigma_m}{\partial u}(f_m(x)) \frac{\partial f_m}{\partial u}(x) - \frac{\partial f_m}{\partial u}(x) \right| \leq \leq C \varepsilon_m(x_m)^2 \left| \frac{\partial f_m}{\partial u}(x) \right| \leq C(M) \varepsilon_m(x_m)^2.
\end{equation}

Then we can apply Lemma 4.1, with $g_j = \frac{\partial f_j}{\partial u}$, $a_k = \varepsilon_m(x_m)^2$, $A = 10^{1-\alpha}$, and $B = 10^\alpha$, since we know, by (3.7), that
\begin{equation}
\sum_{k \geq j} \varepsilon_k(x_k)^2 \frac{r_k^\alpha}{r_k} \leq M
\end{equation}
\begin{equation}
\sum_{k \geq j} \varepsilon_k(x_k)^2 r_k^\alpha \leq M r_j^\alpha
\end{equation}
\begin{equation}
\sum_{k \geq j} \varepsilon_k(x_k)^2 \leq M r_j^\alpha.
\end{equation}

Then $\gamma = \frac{\log 10^\alpha}{\log(10)} = \alpha$ and the lemma hence gives that $\frac{\partial f}{\partial u}$ is $\alpha$-Hölder.

In a similar fashion, we can prove that $\frac{\partial f^{-1}}{\partial u}$ is $\alpha$-Hölder. 

5 Proof of Theorems A and B on $C^{1,\alpha}$ Parametrization

We now relate the coefficients $\varepsilon_k(y)$ and the $\beta$ numbers in order to prove Theorems A and B.

5.1 A Sufficient Condition Involving $\beta_{\infty}$ Numbers

Note that the sufficient conditions in Theorems 3.4 and 3.5 rely on the parametrization. We proceed to remove such dependence and in order to do so, we use some results from [DT12]. Recall that
\begin{equation}
\beta^E_{\infty}(x, r_k) = \frac{1}{r_k} \inf_{P} \left\{ \sup_{y \in E \cap B(x, r_k)} \operatorname{dist}(y, P) \right\},
\end{equation}
if $E \cap B(x, r_k) \neq \emptyset$, where the infimum is taken over all $d$-planes $P$, and $\beta^E_{\infty}(x, r_k) = 0$ if $E \cap B(x, r_k) = \emptyset$. Now recall Theorem 1.7:

**Theorem 1.7.** Let $E$ be as in Theorem 1.6 and moreover assume that
\begin{equation}
\sum_{k \geq 0} \beta^E_{\infty}(x, r_k)^2 \leq M, \quad \text{for all } x \in E.
\end{equation}

Then $f : \Sigma_0 \to \Sigma$ is bi-Lipschitz. Moreover the Lipschitz constants depend only on $n$, $d$, and $M$. 

**Proof.**
Let us define, as in Chapter 12 of [DT12], new coefficients $\gamma_k(x)$ as follows

\begin{equation}
\gamma_k(x) = d_{x,r_k}(P_{k+1}(x), P_k(x)) + \sup_{y \in E \cap B(x, 35r_k)} d_{x,r_k}(P_k(x), P_k(y)).
\end{equation}

Then define, for $x \in E$,

\begin{equation}
\hat{J}_{\alpha,\gamma}(x) = \sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{\gamma_k(x)^2}{r_k^\alpha}.
\end{equation}

To prove Theorem 1.7 in [DT12], the following lemma is needed.

**Proposition 5.1.** [Corollary 12.5, [DT12]] If in addition to the hypotheses of Theorem 1.6 we have that

\begin{equation}
\hat{J}_{1,\gamma}(x) \leq M, \quad \text{for all } x \in E,
\end{equation}

then the map $f : \Sigma_0 \to \Sigma$ constructed in Theorem 1.6 is bi-Lipschitz. Moreover the Lipschitz constants depend only on $n$, $d$, and $M$.

Following the proof of Corollary 12.5 in [DT12], it is easy to check that under the assumption that $\hat{J}_\alpha$ is uniformly bounded, the sufficient conditions in Theorems 3.4 and 3.5 are satisfied. More specifically, we have (see page 71 of [DT12]),

**Lemma 5.2.** Let $z \in \Sigma_0$ and let $x \in E$ such that

\begin{equation}
|x - f(z)| \leq 2 \text{dist}(f(z), E).
\end{equation}

Then

\begin{equation}
\varepsilon_k(f_k(z)) \leq C(\gamma_k(x) + \gamma_{k-1}(x)).
\end{equation}

Using the lemma, the following results follow immediately.

**Proposition 5.3.** If in addition to the hypotheses of Theorem 1.6 we have that

\begin{equation}
\hat{J}_{1,\gamma}(x) \leq M, \quad \text{for all } x \in E,
\end{equation}

then the map $f$ constructed in Theorem 1.6 is invertible and differentiable, and both $f$ and its inverse have Lipschitz directional derivatives. In particular, $f$ is continuously differentiable. Moreover the Lipschitz constants depend only on $n$, $d$, and $M$.

**Proposition 5.4.** If in addition to the hypotheses of Theorem 1.6 we have that

\begin{equation}
\hat{J}_{\alpha,\gamma}(x) \leq M, \quad \text{for all } x \in E,
\end{equation}

then the map $f : \Sigma_0 \to \Sigma$ constructed in Theorem 1.6 is invertible and differentiable, and both $f$ and its inverse have $\alpha$-Hölder directional derivatives. In particular, $f$ is continuously differentiable. Moreover the Hölder constants depend only on $n$, $d$, and $M$. 
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We want to replace $\hat{J}_{\alpha,\gamma}$ with a more explicit Bishop-Jones type function involving $\beta_\infty$’s. Define

\begin{equation}
J^{E}_{\alpha,\infty}(x) = \sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{\beta^{E}_{\infty}(x,r_k)^2}{r_k^{\alpha}}.
\end{equation}

Finally, we can state the following theorems, which are an improved version of Theorems 3.4 and 3.5.

**Theorem 5.5.** Let $E \subseteq B(0,1)$ be a Reifenberg flat set with holes. Also assume that there exists $M < +\infty$ such that

\begin{equation}
\hat{J}^{E}_{1,\infty}(x) = \sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{\beta^{E}_{\infty}(x,r_k)^2}{r_k^{\alpha}} \leq M, \quad \text{for all } x \in E.
\end{equation}

Then the map $f: \Sigma_0 \rightarrow \Sigma$ constructed in Theorem 1.6 is invertible and differentiable, and both $f$ and its inverse have Lipschitz directional derivatives. In particular, $f$ is continuously differentiable. Moreover the Lipschitz constants depend only on $n, d,$ and $M$.

**Theorem A.** Let $E \subseteq B(0,1)$ be a Reifenberg flat set with holes and $\alpha \in (0,1]$. Also assume that there exists $M < +\infty$ such that

\begin{equation}
\sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{\beta^{E}_{\infty}(x,r_k)^2}{r_k^{\alpha}} \leq M, \quad \text{for all } x \in E.
\end{equation}

Then the map $f: \Sigma_0 \rightarrow \Sigma$ constructed in Theorem 1.6 is invertible and differentiable, and both $f$ and its inverse are $C^{1,\alpha}$ maps. In particular, $f$ is continuously differentiable. Moreover the Hölder constants depend only on $n, d,$ and $M$.

The proof of Corollary 12.6 in [DT12], which we restated as Theorem 1.7, can be used directly to prove the two theorems above, which are obtained as corollaries of Theorems 3.4 and 3.5, respectively.

### 5.2 A SUFFICIENT CONDITION INVOLVING $\beta_1$ NUMBERS

We would now like to replace $J^{E}_{\alpha,\infty}$ with $J^{E}_{\alpha,1}$ based on an $L^1$ version of the $\beta$ numbers. Usually such coefficients are used when the Hausdorff measure restricted to the set $E$ is Ahlfors regular. We will not need to assume such regularity, after observing that Reifenberg flatness implies lower regularity. The following is Lemma 13.2 in [DT12]. Let $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and define

\begin{equation}
\beta^{E}_1(x,r) = \inf_{P} \left\{ \frac{1}{r^d} \int_{y \in E \cap B(x,r)} \frac{\text{dist}(y,P)}{r} \ d\mathcal{H}^d(y) \right\},
\end{equation}

for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $r > 0$, where the infimum is taken over all $d$-planes $P$.

**Lemma 5.6.** [Lemma 13.2, [DT12]] Let $E \subseteq B(0,1)$ be a Reifenberg flat set. Then, for $x \in E$ and for small $r > 0$,

\begin{equation}
\mathcal{H}^d(E \cap B(x,r)) \geq (1 - C\varepsilon)\omega_d r^d,
\end{equation}

where $\omega_d$ denotes the measure of the unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^d$. 

Remark 5.7. We denote by \( \overline{E} \) the closure of \( E \), and notice that the Reifenberg flatness assumption implies that the set has no holes (otherwise the result would be clearly false).

Moreover, recall Theorem 1.8:

**Theorem 1.8.** Let \( E \) measurable be as in Theorem 1.6 and moreover assume that

\[
\sum_{k \geq 0} \beta^E_1(x, r_k)^2 \leq M, \quad \text{for all } x \in E.
\]

Then \( f : \Sigma_0 \to \Sigma \) is bi-Lipschitz. Moreover the Lipschitz constants depend only on \( n, d, \) and \( M \).

The following lemma is implied by the proof of Corollary 13.1 in [DT12].

**Lemma 5.8.** By changing the net \( x_{j,k} \) if necessary, we have that \( \varepsilon_k(x_k) \leq \beta^E_1(\tau, r_{k-3}) \), where \( \tau \in E \) is chosen appropriately.

Using the lemma, the two theorems below follow immediately from Theorems 3.4 and 3.5.

**Theorem 5.9.** Let \( E \subseteq B(0, 1) \) be a Reifenberg flat set with holes. Also assume that there exists \( M < +\infty \) such that

\[
J^E_{1,1}(x) = \sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{\beta^E_1(x, r_k)^2}{r_k} \leq M, \quad \text{for all } x \in E.
\]

Then the map \( f : \Sigma_0 \to \Sigma \) constructed in Theorem 1.6 is invertible and differentiable, and both \( f \) and its inverse have Lipschitz directional derivatives. In particular, \( f \) is continuously differentiable. Moreover the Lipschitz constants depend only on \( n, d, \) and \( M \).

**Theorem B.** Let \( E \subseteq B(0, 1) \) be a measurable Reifenberg flat set with holes and \( \alpha \in (0, 1] \). Also assume that there exists \( M < +\infty \) such that

\[
\sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{\beta^E_1(x, r_k)^2}{r_k^{\alpha}} \leq M, \quad \text{for all } x \in E.
\]

Then the map \( f : \Sigma_0 \to \Sigma \) constructed in Theorem 1.6 is invertible and differentiable, and both \( f \) and its inverse are \( C^{1,\alpha} \) maps. In particular, \( f \) is continuously differentiable. Moreover the Hölder constants depend only on \( n, d, \) and \( M \).

6 Appendix

As mentioned in the introduction, we now include some results with proof from Anzellotti and Serapioni, [AS94].

**Proposition 6.1.** [G. Anzellotti, R. Serapioni, Proposition 3.2 [AS94]] A \( C^{k-1,1} \) d-rectifiable set is \( C^k \) d-rectifiable.
Proof. Let $E$ be $C^{k-1,1}$-d-rectifiable. Up to a set of $\mathcal{H}^d$ measure zero, $E$ is contained in a countable union of images of $C^{k-1,1}$ functions. Let $f_j$ be such a function. By a Lusin type theorem (see [Fed69], 3.1.15), $f_j$ coincides with $g_j \in C^k$ outside of a set of arbitrarily small measure and so we are done. □

Proposition 6.2. [G. Anzellotti, R. Serapioni, Proposition 3.3 and Appendix [AS94]] Let $k, m \geq 1$ and $k + s < m + t$. Then there exist $C^{k,s}$ rectifiable sets that are not $C^{m,t}$ rectifiable.

Proof. Given $0 \leq s < t \leq 1$, we construct a function $f \in C^{1,s}$, $f: [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ which is not $C^{1,t}$ rectifiable. By successive integrations one can obtain examples for the $C^{k,s}$ case, $k > 1$. Let $f(x) = \int_0^x g(t) \, dt$, where $g$ is defined as follows.

Let

\begin{equation}
E = \bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} E_n,
\end{equation}

where $E_n$ is the disjoint union of $2^n$ intervals $I^n_j$ of length $l_n$. We define the $E_n$’s inductively:

$E_0 = [0, 1]$ and we obtain $E_{n+1}$ from $E_n$ by removing from $I^n_j$ the interval $(\xi_n - \frac{1}{2} a_n l_n, \xi_n + \frac{1}{2} a_n l_n)$, where $\xi_n$ is the center of $I^n_j$ and $a_n$ is a summable strictly decreasing sequence in $(0, 1)$ to be chosen. Then

\begin{equation}
|E| = \lim_{n \to \infty} |E_n| = \lim_{n \to \infty} (1 - a_n) > 0
\end{equation}

where $|\cdot|$ denotes the Lebesgue measure. Now set

\begin{equation}
g(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & x \in E \\ \text{dist}(x, E^c)^s & x \in E^c. \end{cases}
\end{equation}

Clearly $g \in C^{0,s}$ so that $f \in C^{1,s}$. However, for any $t > s$, and any $h \in C^{1,t}$ we have

\begin{equation}
|\{x \in [0,1] \mid h(x) = f(x)\}| = 0
\end{equation}

so that $f$ is not $C^{1,t}$ rectifiable. For a proof of (6.4), see the Appendix of [AS94]. □

We also record some observations in the direction of the converses of our theorems and those from [DT12].

Proposition 6.3. Let $G$ be a Lipschitz graph in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then

\begin{equation}
\sum_{k \geq 0} \beta^G_\infty (x, r_k)^2 \leq M, \quad \text{for all } x \in G.
\end{equation}

Proof. This follows from the Main Lemma in [Tol15], Lemma 2.1. □

Proposition 6.4. Let $\alpha, \alpha' \in (0, 1]$, $\alpha' > \alpha$ and let $G$ be a $C^{1,\alpha'}$ graph in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then there exists $M > 0$ such that

\begin{equation}
\sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{\beta^G_\infty (x, r_k)^2}{r_k^{\alpha'}} \leq M, \quad \text{for all } x \in G.
\end{equation}
**Proof.** The proof follows the steps from Example 3.1 in [ENV17]. Let $M$ be the graph of a $C^{1,\alpha'}$ function $f: \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^{n-d}$. By the Taylor expansion around $(x_0, f(x_0))$ we get

\begin{equation}
|f(x) - f(x_0) - \nabla f(x_0) \cdot (x - x_0)| \leq C|x - x_0|^{1+\alpha'}.
\end{equation}

Because $M$ is smooth we can choose the tangent plane at $x_0$ as best approximating plane in $\beta^G_\infty(x_0, r)$, for $r$ sufficiently small. Then we get

\begin{equation}
\beta^G_\infty(x_0, r)^2 \leq C r^{\alpha'}.
\end{equation}

This clearly implies that

\begin{equation}
\sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{\beta^G_\infty(x, r_k)^2}{r_k^{\alpha}} \leq M
\end{equation}

as $\alpha' - \alpha > 0$. \qed
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