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In 1998 Burago and Kleiner and (independently) McMullen gave examples of separated nets in Euclidean space which are non-bilipschitz equivalent to the integer lattice. We study weaker notions of equivalence of separated nets and demonstrate that such notions also give rise to distinct equivalence classes. Put differently, we find occurrences of particularly strong divergence of separated nets from the integer lattice. Our approach generalises that of Burago and Kleiner and McMullen which takes place largely in a continuous setting. Existence of irregular separated nets is verified via the existence of non-realisable density functions $\rho: [0,1]^d \to (0,\infty)$. In the present work we obtain stronger types of non-realisable densities.

1 Introduction

The question of whether two separated nets of a Euclidean space may carry inherently different metric structures has been considered by many authors. Indeed, Gromov’s 1993 question of whether any two such nets are necessarily bilipschitz equivalent remained open for several years, before being resolved negatively by McMullen [10] and Burago and Kleiner [2] in 1998. Whilst the aforementioned works provide examples of separated nets in $\mathbb{R}^d$ which are not bilipschitz equivalent to the integer lattice, the present article focuses on the extent to which this divergence can occur.

To permit finer description of how much separated nets may differ from the integer lattice we consider a natural generalisation of the notion of bilipschitz equivalence, as studied by McMullen [10]. Given two separated nets $X, Y \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ and a modulus of continuity $\omega$, a mapping $f: X \to Y$ is called a homogeneous $\omega$-mapping if there is a constant $K > 0$ such that

$$\|f(x_2) - f(x_1)\|_2 \leq KR\omega(R\|x_2 - x_1\|_2)$$

for all $R > 0$ and $x_1, x_2 \in X \cap B(0,R)$. The nets $X$ and $Y$ are said to be bi-$\omega$ equivalent if there is a bijection $f: X \to Y$ so that both $f$ and
$f^{-1}$ are homogeneous $\omega$-mappings. For the Lipschitz modulus of continuity $\omega(t) = t$ the class of homogeneous bi-$\omega$ bijections coincides with the class of bilipschitz bijections. However, for moduli of continuity asymptotically larger than any linear function, bi-$\omega$ equivalence is weaker than bilipschitz equivalence. Accordingly, determining the moduli of continuity $\omega$ with respect to which two nets $X$ and $Y$ are equivalent provides deeper insight into their metric structures.

Replacing bilipschitz equivalence with weaker forms inevitably reopens the question of whether such notions admit distinct equivalence classes. Indeed, McMullen [10] proves that any two separated nets are bi-Hölder equivalent. Hence, the notion of Hölder equivalence provides an upper bound on the divergence between any two nets. However, it is not known whether this bound is tight. This naturally invites investigation of the bi-$\omega$ equivalence classes of separated nets for moduli of continuity lying asymptotically between Hölder and Lipschitz. In the present article we verify existence of such moduli of continuity $\omega$ which admit distinct bi-$\omega$ equivalence classes of separated nets.

The most standard examples of moduli of continuity lying asymptotically between Lipschitz and Hölder are those of the form

$$\omega(t) = t \log \left( \frac{1}{t} \right)^{\alpha},$$

for $\alpha > 0$. The main objective of the present article is to provide examples of separated nets which are particularly far away from the integer lattice. We find examples of separated nets $X$ for which $X$ and $\mathbb{Z}^d$ not only belong to distinct bilipschitz equivalence classes, but also to distinct bi-$\omega$ equivalence classes for some $\omega$ of the form (1.1).

Non-equivalence of two nets $X$ and $Y$ may be naturally ordered according to the optimal asymptotic growth of the bilipschitz constants $\text{biLip}(f|_{B(0,R)})$ as $R \to \infty$ among bijections $f: X \to Y$, where

$$\text{biLip}(f) := \max \{ \text{Lip}(f), \text{Lip}(f^{-1}) \}.$$ Intuitively, if two nets $X$ and $Y$ are non-bilipschitz equivalent, but see slow asymptotic growth of $(\text{biLip}(f|_{B(0,R)}))_{R>0}$ for some bijection $f: X \to Y$, it means that high distortion is only seen by comparing very large portions of $X$ and $Y$. In general we note that a control on the growth of $(\text{biLip}(f|_{B(0,R)}))_{R>0}$ is a necessary condition for $X$ and $Y$ to be bi-$\omega$ equivalent. This follows from the easy observation that whenever two separated nets $X$ and $Y$ are bi-$\omega$ equivalent via $f: X \to Y$ we have

$$\text{biLip}(f|_{B(0,R)}) \leq KR\omega \left( \frac{1}{R} \right) \quad \text{for all } R > 0.$$ Now we state our main result:
Theorem 1.1. Let $d \geq 2$. Then there is $\alpha_0 = \alpha_0(d) > 0$ such that there are separated nets in $\mathbb{R}^d$ which are non-bi-$\omega$ equivalent to the integer lattice $\mathbb{Z}^d$ for the modulus of continuity $\omega(t) = t \log \left( \frac{1}{t} \right)^{\alpha_0}$. In particular, there are separated nets $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ for which any bijection $f : X \to \mathbb{Z}^d$ satisfies

$$\limsup_{R \to \infty} \frac{\text{bilip}(f|_{B(0,R)})}{(\log(R))^{\alpha_0}} = \infty.$$ 

Remark. In [7] and [8] the notion of bounded displacement equivalence of separated nets and uniformly discrete sets is considered. Two separated nets $X$ and $Y$ are said to be bounded displacement equivalent if there is a bijection $f : X \to Y$ such that the quantity

$$\sup_{x \in X} \|f(x) - x\|$$

is finite. Bounded displacement equivalence is a stronger notion than bilipschitz equivalence. Therefore, the separated nets provided by Theorem 1.1 are, in particular, non-equivalent to the integer lattice in the sense of bounded displacement. However, Theorem 1.1 actually says something stronger about these separated nets in the language of bounded displacement. For any separated net $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfying the assertions of Theorem 1.1 and any bijection $f : X \to \mathbb{Z}^d$ we have that

$$\limsup_{R \to \infty} \sup_{x \in X \cap B(0,R)} \frac{\|f(x) - x\|}{(\log(R))^{\alpha_0}} = \infty.$$ 

In other words, any bijection $f : X \to \mathbb{Z}^d$ displaces points inside the ball $B(0,R)$ by much more than $(\log(R))^{\alpha_0}$ for arbitrarily large $R$.

Our approach to proving Theorem 1.1 follows the strategy established by McMullen [10] and Burago, Kleiner [2], where existence of non-bilipschitz equivalent nets is established via the construction of non-realisable density functions. In the present work, we construct non-realisable density functions for a larger class of homeomorphisms.

We will use the notation $f : A \leftrightarrow B$ to signify an injective mapping $A \to B$. For such a mapping we write $f^{-1}$ for the inverse mapping $f^{-1} : f(A) \to A$. Given a strictly increasing function $\omega : (0, a) \to (0, \infty)$ with $\lim_{t \to 0} \omega(t) = 0$, we call a mapping $f : A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^k$ an $\omega$-mapping or $\omega$-continuous if there is a constant $K > 0$ such that

$$x, y \in A \implies \|f(y) - f(x)\| \leq K \omega(\|y - x\|).$$

We note that for pairs $x, y \in A$ such that $\|x - y\| \geq a$ we interpret the above requirement as void, that is, as not imposing any condition on $\|f(x) - f(y)\|$ directly. (Of course, an upper bound on the latter quantity.
may follow by the triangle inequality.) This is a general convention that we are going to apply whenever we use a bound involving $\omega$ or $\omega^{-1}$.

We call a mapping $f : A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ a bi-$\omega$-mapping if both $f$ and $f^{-1}$ are $\omega$-continuous. Put differently, $f$ is called a bi-$\omega$-mapping if there is a constant $K > 0$ such that the inequality

$$\frac{1}{K} \omega^{-1}(\|y - x\|_2) \leq \|f(y) - f(x)\|_2 \leq K \omega(\|y - x\|_2)$$

holds whenever $x, y \in A$.

In what follows, we use $I^d$ to denote the unit cube $[0,1]^d$.

**Theorem 1.2.** Let $d \geq 2$. Then there is $\alpha_0 = \alpha_0(d) > 0$ with the following property: Let $\omega : (0,a) \rightarrow (0,\infty)$ have the form

$$\omega(t) = t \log \left( \frac{1}{t} \right)^{\alpha_0}.$$  

Then the set of (positive) continuous functions $\rho : I^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for which the pushforward equation

$$f \rho f^* = f^* \rho f$$

admits a bi-$\omega$ solution $f : I^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ forms a $\sigma$-porous subset of the space $C(I^d)$ of continuous functions with the supremum norm.

The analogous result is true in the space $L^\infty(I^d)$ as well.

We will call a function $\rho$ as above which admits a bi-$\omega$ solution $f$ to (1.2) bi-$\omega$ realisable. McMullen [10] and Burago, Kleiner [2] constructed examples of measurable functions $\rho$ in the same form as in Theorem 1.2 that do not admit any bilipschitz solution $f : I^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ to (1.2). In fact, Burago and Kleiner [2] produced $\rho$ that is, in addition, continuous. In [5] the authors and Kopecká strengthened these results and established that the set of those continuous functions inside the space $C(I^d)$ with the supremum norm that admit a Lipschitz regular solution $f : I^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ to (1.2) is $\sigma$-porous. In this sense, almost all continuous functions are not Lipschitz regular realisable. In the same paper [5], they also showed that the set of $L^\infty$ densities that are bilipschitz realisable in the sense of (1.2) is $\sigma$-porous. Independently, results in this direction were also obtained by Viera [12]. We note that the aforementioned porosity result for Lipschitz regular mappings is not comparable to Theorem 1.2 in strength, since Lipschitz regular mappings are not homeomorphisms in general.

On the positive side, Burago and Kleiner [3] have established a sufficient criterion for two separated nets in $\mathbb{R}^d$ to be bilipschitz equivalent. In general, Rivièr e and Ye [11] showed that every continuous function $\rho$ with $\inf \rho > 0$ admits a solution $f$ to (1.2) that is bi-$\alpha$-Hölder for every $0 < \alpha < 1$. In the same paper, they also showed that $\rho \in L^\infty$ with $\inf \rho > 0$ admits a bi-$\beta$-Hölder solution to (1.2) for certain $\beta = \beta(\rho) > 0$ small enough.
2 Preliminaries and Notation.

We write $B(x, r)$ for the open euclidean ball of radius $r$ centred at $x$; the corresponding closed ball is denoted by $\overline{B}(x, r)$. Moreover, if $B = B(x, r)$, then by $cB$ we mean $B(x, cr)$. We extend this notation to tubular neighbourhoods of sets in a natural way. We write $\overline{A}$, $\operatorname{int} A$ and $\partial A$ for the closure, interior and boundary of $A$, respectively. The expression $\operatorname{diam}(A)$ stands for the diameter of the set $A$. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$; we denote by $[k]$ the set $\{1, \ldots, k\}$. We write $I^d$ for the unit cube $[0, 1]^d$. We use the symbol $:=\,$ to signify a definition by equality.

Throughout the article we use expressions of the type $\phi(x, y, z)$ to denote a parameter $\phi$ depending only on $x$, $y$ and $z$, but in some cases these dependencies are suppressed after the first appearance. We use the letter $\pi$ for a general purpose constant, that is we write $\pi(x, y, z)$, if $\pi$ is a positive and finite constant depending only on $x$, $y$ and $z$ whose precise value is irrelevant. In particular, we allow the value of $\pi(x, y, z)$ to change in each occurrence.

Moreover, we use the notation $\text{poly} (x)$ to denote a function of type $\Theta(x^\alpha)$, where the particular power $\alpha > 0$ is irrelevant, may depend on other objects present and change from occurrence to occurrence. In order to emphasize on which parameters the function of the form $\text{poly} (x)$ may depend and of which it is independent, we sometimes use the extended notation $\text{poly}_{a,b} (x)$. This denotes a function of $x$ in $\Theta(x^\alpha)$, where the value of $\alpha$ as well as the implicit multiplicative constant may depend on $a$ and $b$, but not on any other parameters present.

Given a mapping $f$ defined on a set $A$ and $B \subset A$, we denote by $f|_B$ the restriction of $f$ to $B$. We use the same notation for restrictions of measures as well. We write $\mathcal{L}_d$ for the $d$-dimensional Lebesgue measure. If the dimension is understood, we usually drop the subscript and write just $\mathcal{L}$. Given an integrable function $\rho: A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d \to [0, \infty)$, we write $\rho \mathcal{L}$ for the measure defined via the formula

$$\rho \mathcal{L}(S) := \int_S \rho \, d\mathcal{L}.$$  

Given a measurable mapping $f: A \to \mathbb{R}^d$, we define the pushforward of a measure $\nu$ as $f_* \nu(S) := \nu(f^{-1}(S))$.

Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$. We write $C(A)$ for the space of continuous functions $A \to \mathbb{R}$ with the supremum norm. We denote by $L^\infty(A)$ the space of essentially bounded functions $A \to \mathbb{R}$ with the $L^\infty$-norm.

Let $(X, d)$ be a metric space. We call a set $P \subseteq X$ porous if for every $x \in X$ there are $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ such that for every $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ there exists $y \in X$ satisfying $d(y, x) \leq \varepsilon$ and $B(y, \alpha \varepsilon) \cap P = \emptyset$. A set $E \subseteq X$ is called $\sigma$-porous if it may be expressed as a countable union of porous subsets of $X$. For the original definitions and more background on these sets, see [13].

Given $A \subseteq X$ in the metric space $(X, d)$ and a number $r > 0$, we say that $A$ is $r$-separated if $d(a, a') \geq r$ for every $a \neq a' \in A$. We say that $A$ is an
Moduli of continuity. We use the term modulus of continuity to refer to a strictly increasing, continuous function \( \omega : (0, a) \to (0, \infty) \) with \( \lim_{t \to 0} \omega(t) = 0 \). For such \( \omega \) and a mapping \( f : A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^t \) we let

\[
\mathcal{L}_\omega(f) := \sup \left\{ \frac{\|f(y) - f(x)\|_2}{\omega(\|y - x\|_2)} : x, y \in A, \ 0 < \|y - x\|_2 < a \right\}.
\]

In the case that \( f \) is injective, we further define

\[
\text{bi}\mathcal{L}_\omega(f) := \max \left\{ \mathcal{L}_\omega(f), \mathcal{L}_\omega(f^{-1}) \right\}.
\]

Note that \( f \) is an \( \omega \)-mapping (as defined in the introduction) if and only if \( \mathcal{L}_\omega(f) < \infty \). Moreover, in the simplest case of \( \omega(t) = t \) the quantity \( \mathcal{L}_\omega(f) \) coincides with the Lipschitz constant of \( f \).

We will restrict our attention to moduli of continuity with various special properties. However, we show that this class of moduli is still diverse (see Lemma 2.1).

For \( 0 < a \leq 1 \) we call a function \( \phi : (0, a) \to (0, \infty) \) submultiplicative if

\[
\phi(st) \leq \phi(s)\phi(t)
\]

for all \( s, t \in (0, a) \).

Let \( \mathcal{M} \) denote the set of strictly increasing, concave and submultiplicative functions

\[
\omega : (0, a) \to (0, \infty)
\]

with \( a \leq 1 \), \( \lim_{t \to 0} \omega(t) = 0 \) and \( \omega(t) \geq t \) for all \( t \in (0, a) \). Given \( \omega \in \mathcal{M} \), we will denote by \( a_\omega \) the upper end of the domain of \( \omega \).

Note that whenever \( \omega \in \mathcal{M} \), then also \( \omega|_{(0, b)} \) belongs to \( \mathcal{M} \) for every \( b \in (0, a_\omega) \). However, any two such moduli define the same classes of \( \omega \)-mappings on any convex domain; this follows easily by the triangle inequality. Additionally, for every \( L \geq 1 \) and \( \omega \in \mathcal{M} \) the modulus \( L\omega \) belongs to \( \mathcal{M} \) as well. This means that \( f \) being an \( \omega \)-mapping with \( \mathcal{L}_\omega(f) \leq L \) is equivalent to \( f \) being an \( L\omega \)-mapping with \( \mathcal{L}_{L\omega} \leq 1 \).

It is clear that all Lipschitz and Hölder moduli, i.e., all functions \( t \mapsto t^{\alpha} \) with \( \alpha \in (0, 1] \), belong to the class \( \mathcal{M} \). Our aim is now to show that the class \( \mathcal{M} \) is even larger and contains a diverse spectrum of moduli lying inbetween Hölder and Lipschitz. Indeed we will show that the functions \( t \mapsto t \left( \log \left( \frac{1}{t} \right) \right)^{\alpha} \) for \( \alpha > 0 \) belong to \( \mathcal{M} \). The class of \( \omega \)-mappings \( f : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^n \) for such \( \omega \) is then larger than the class of Lipschitz mappings, but smaller than that of Hölder.
Lemma 2.1. For each $\alpha > 0$ there exists $a \in (0, 1)$ so that the function

$$\phi_\alpha : (0, a) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad t \mapsto t \left( \log \left( \frac{1}{t} \right) \right)^\alpha$$

belongs to $\mathcal{M}$.

Proof. Fix $\alpha > 0$. We determine sufficient conditions on $a \in (0, 1)$. First we require that $a < e^{-1}$ so that $\phi_\alpha(t) \geq t$ for all $t \in (0, a)$. Choosing $a > 0$ so that $\log(1/t) \geq \alpha$ for every $t \in (0, a)$, one can easily verify that $\phi_\alpha$ is concave and strictly increasing. It only remains to check that $\phi_\alpha$ is submultiplicative. We impose the condition $a \leq 1/e^2$. Then for $s, t \in (0, a)$ we have

$$\log(1/st) \leq \log(1/s) \log(1/t)$$

and therefore

$$\phi_\alpha(st) = st \left( \log \left( \frac{1}{st} \right) \right)^\alpha \leq s \left( \log \left( \frac{1}{s} \right) \right)^\alpha t \left( \log \left( \frac{1}{t} \right) \right)^\alpha = \phi_\alpha(s)\phi_\alpha(t).$$

We will also briefly use the Hausdorff dimension of a set $A$, which we denote by $\dim_H(A)$. The following classic lemma is an easy consequence of the definition of the Hausdorff dimension:

Lemma 2.2. Let $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be a continuous mapping that is $\alpha$-Hölder continuous for an $\alpha < 1$. Then for every $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ we have $\dim_H(f(A)) \leq \frac{1}{\alpha} \dim_H(A)$.

We shall use the following (standard) corollary of the lemma above to bound above the Lebesgue measure of neighbourhoods of $f$-images of sets under a bi-$\omega$ mapping $f$.

Corollary 2.3. Let $f : I^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be a homeomorphism that is $\alpha$-Hölder continuous for some $\alpha > \frac{d-1}{d}$. Then

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{L}(B(\partial f(I^d), \varepsilon)) = 0.$$

Proof. Since $f(\partial I^d) = \partial f(I^d)$, Lemma 2.2 implies that $\dim_H(\partial f(I^d)) < d$. This, in turn, means that for every $\delta > 0$ there is a collection $(B_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ of balls of radius at most $\delta$ covering $\partial f(I^d)$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \text{diam}(B_i)^d \leq \delta$. Moreover, $\partial f(I^d)$ is compact. Thus, we can assume that there is $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\partial f(I^d)$ is already covered by $B_1, \ldots, B_k$. Let $r := \min_{i \in [k]} \text{diam}(B_i)$. Then

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^{k} 2B_i \supseteq B(\partial f(I^d), r),$$

which implies that the Lebesgue measure of the latter set is at most $\pi \delta$ for an absolute constant $\pi$. \hfill $\square$
3 Proof of Main Results.

In this section we give a proof of our main results Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2, partially based on a geometric statement for bi-ω mappings $\mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$ which will be proved in the next section. Our first objective is to show that Theorem 1.1 is implied by Theorem 1.2. We will need one lemma on uniform convergence to a homeomorphism.

Lemma 3.1. Let $f: I^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$ be a homeomorphism and $g: I^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$ be continuous. Then $g(I^d) \Delta f(I^d) \subseteq \overline{\partial f(I^d), \|f - g\|_\infty}$, where the notation $\Delta$ denotes the set difference $E \Delta F := (E \setminus F) \cup (F \setminus E)$.

In the proof of the lemma, we will use the topological degree of Brouwer; for its definition and properties, see [4], for example. By $\deg(f, U, y)$ we denote the degree of a continuous mappings $f: U \to \mathbb{R}^d$ at the point $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with respect to the open set $U \subset \mathbb{R}^d$.

Proof of Lemma 3.1. It is clear that

$$g(I^d) \setminus f(I^d) \subseteq \overline{\partial f(I^d), \|f - g\|_\infty},$$

since $g(I^d) \subseteq \overline{f(I^d), \|f - g\|_\infty}$ and the distance from a point $y \in g(I^d) \setminus f(I^d)$ to the set $f(I^d)$ is realised on the boundary of $f(I^d)$, as the latter is compact.

For the other, less clear inclusion, we use the topological degree. The multiplication theorem for the degree (see, e.g. [4, Thm. 5.1]) implies that the degree of a homeomorphism is always $\pm 1$, i.e., $\deg(f, \text{int } I^d, \cdot)$ is constant equal to $\pm 1$. On the other hand, it is a basic property of the degree that $\deg(g, \text{int } I^d, y) = \deg(f, \text{int } I^d, y)$ whenever $\text{dist}(y, \partial f(I^d)) > \|f - g\|_\infty$; see [4, Thm. 3.1(d5)]. Another basic property is that the degree of any function with respect to a set is zero in every point which is not included in the image of that set; see [4, Thm. 3.1(d4)]. That is, every $y \in f(I^d)$ such that $\text{dist}(y, \partial f(I^d)) > \|f - g\|_\infty$ must be included in $g(I^d)$ as well. 

We will also need two auxiliary lemmas on weak convergence of measures which are probably a common part of knowledge in measure theory. Their proofs can be found in [5].

Lemma 3.2. Let $\nu$ and $(\nu_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ be finite Borel measures with support in a compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. Moreover, assume that there is, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, a finite collection $Q_n$ of Borel subsets of $K$ that satisfy the following:

1. $\nu(K \setminus \bigcup Q_n) = 0$ and $\nu_n(K \setminus \bigcup Q_n) = 0$.
2. $\sum_{Q \in Q_n} \nu(Q) = \nu(K)$ and $\sum_{Q \in Q_n} \nu_n(Q) = \nu_n(K)$. 
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3. \( \lim_{n \to \infty} \max_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n} \text{diam}(Q) = 0 \) and \( \max_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n} |\nu_n(Q) - \nu(Q)| \in o\left( \frac{1}{|\mathcal{Q}_n|} \right) \).

Then \( \nu_n \) converges weakly to \( \nu \).

**Lemma 3.3.** Let \( K \) be a compact set in \( \mathbb{R}^d \) and \( (\nu_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \) be a sequence of finite Borel measures on \( K \) converging weakly to a finite Borel measure \( \nu \). Let \( (h_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}, h_n: K \to \mathbb{R}^m, \) be a sequence of continuous mappings converging uniformly to a mapping \( h \). Then \( (h_n)_\#(\nu_n) \) converges weakly to \( h_\#(\nu) \).

The next lemma reduces Theorem 1.1 to Theorem 1.2. The statement and part of its proof are a completely straightforward adaptation of [2, Lem. 2.1] by Burago and Kleiner. However, the majority of the proof we give below consists of important details that are missing in [2] and have never been published. Moreover, these missing parts are especially relevant in our setting, where we consider less restrictive moduli of continuity than Lipschitz. In particular, the proof does not work for all natural moduli of continuity. In what follows we show that the reduction is valid for all moduli of continuity \( \omega \) which are sub-Hölder for sufficiently many Hölder moduli of continuity. The precise meaning of sufficiently many is determined by the dimension \( d \) of the space \( \mathbb{R}^d \).

**Lemma 3.4.** Let \( \omega \in \mathcal{M} \) be a modulus of continuity with the property that there is \( \delta > 0 \) and \( \alpha > \frac{d-1}{d} \) such that
\[
\omega(t) \leq \pi t^\alpha \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, \delta].
\]
Suppose that for every separated net \( X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d \) there exist constants \( L,U > 0 \) and a bijection \( g: X \to \mathbb{Z}^d \) satisfying
\[
LR\omega^{-1}\left( \frac{\|y-x\|_2}{R} \right) \leq \|g(y) - g(x)\|_2 \leq UR\omega\left( \frac{\|y-x\|_2}{R} \right)
\]
for all \( x,y \in B(0,R) \) and all \( R > 0 \). Then for any measurable density \( \rho: I^d \to \mathbb{R} \) with \( 0 < \inf \rho \leq \sup \rho < \infty \) there is a bi-\( \omega \)-mapping \( f: I^d \to \mathbb{R}^d \) satisfying
\[
f\#\rho \mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}|_{f(I^d)}.
\]

**Proof.** Fix a measurable density \( \rho: I^d \to \mathbb{R} \) with \( 0 < \inf \rho \leq \sup \rho < \infty \) and a strictly increasing sequence of natural numbers \( (l_k)_{k=1}^\infty \) on which we will impose further conditions in the course of the proof. Let \( \mathcal{S} = (S_k)_{k=1}^\infty \) be a sequence of axis parallel, pairwise disjoint cubes in \( \mathbb{R}^d \) such that each \( S_k \) has side length \( l_k \) and
\[
\bigcup_{i=1}^k S_i \subseteq B\left( 0, 2 \sum_{i=1}^k l_i \right)
\]
for all \( k \geq 1 \). Fix a sequence of natural numbers \( (m_k)_{k=1}^\infty \) satisfying
\[
\lim_{k \to \infty} m_k = \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{k \to \infty} \frac{m_k}{l_k} = 0.
\]
For each $k \geq 1$ we let $\phi_k: \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$ be the unique affine mapping sending $I^d$ onto $S_k$ with scalar linear part and define $\rho_k: S_k \to \mathbb{R}$ by $\rho_k := \rho \circ \phi_k^{-1}|_{S_k}$.

For each $k \geq 1$ we let $(T_{k,i})_{i=1}^{m_k^d}$ denote the standard partition of the cube $S_k$ into $m_k^d$ cubes of sidelength $l_k/m_k$. We further partition each cube $T_{k,i}$ into $n_{k,i}^d$ cubes $(U_{k,i,j})_{j=1}^{n_{k,i}^d}$ of equal sidelength, where $n_{k,i} \in \mathbb{N}$ is defined as the integer part of $\sqrt[3]{\int_{T_{k,i}} \rho_k \, d\mathcal{L}}$.

We construct a separated net $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ by placing one point at the centre of each cube $U_{k,i,j}$ and then adding all integer lattice points outside of the cubes $S_1, S_2, \ldots$. The set constructed is a separated net, because of the boundedness of $\rho$.

Let $g: X \to \mathbb{Z}^d$ be a bijection satisfying (3.1). For each $k \geq 1$ we let $X_k := \phi_k^{-1}(X \cap S_k) = \phi_k^{-1}(X) \cap I^d$. We also set $R_k := 2 \sum_{i=1}^{k} l_i$ and fix a point $z_k \in X_k$. Then we define $f_k: X_k \to \mathbb{R}^d$ by

$$f_k(x) = \frac{1}{l_k}(g \circ \phi_k(x) - g \circ \phi_k(z_k)), \quad x \in X_k. \quad (3.3)$$

To obtain an estimate for the modulus of continuity of $f_k$, we fix $x, y \in X_k$ and observe that

$$\frac{R_k}{l_k} \omega^{-1} \left( \frac{l_k \|y - x\|_2}{R_k} \right) \leq \|f_k(y) - f_k(x)\|_2 \leq U \frac{R_k}{l_k} \omega \left( \frac{l_k \|y - x\|_2}{R_k} \right)$$

We now require a condition on the sequence $(l_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ to ensure that the ratio $R_k/l_k$ is bounded. Since $R_k = R_{k-1} + 2l_k$, it is sufficient to take $l_k \geq R_{k-1}$ for all $k$. Then $R_k/l_k \leq 3$. Thus we get

$$L \omega^{-1} \left( \frac{\|y - x\|_2}{3} \right) \leq \|f_k(y) - f_k(x)\|_2 \leq 3U \omega(\|y - x\|_2) \quad (3.4)$$

for all $k$. Thus, using the supermultiplicativity of $\omega^{-1}$, each $f_k$ is a bi-$\omega$-mapping. Next we use [1, Thm. 1.12] to extend $f_k$ to the whole unit cube $I^d$ so that the extension is $\omega$-continuous with $\Sigma_\omega(f_k) \leq 3U$. We denote the extension by $f_k$ as well. By the Arzelà-Ascoli theorem, we may pass to a subsequence of $(f_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ which converges uniformly to an $\omega$-mapping $f: I^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\Sigma_\omega(f) \leq 3U$.

We will show now that $f$ is a bi-$\omega$-mapping. There are positive constants $s = s(\rho), b = b(\rho)$ such that $X$ is an $s$-separated, $b$-net in $\mathbb{R}^d$. It follows that each set $X_k$ is an $s/l_k$-separated, $b/l_k$-net in $I^d$. We fix $x \neq y \in I^d$ with $\|y - x\|_2 < a_\omega$ and seek to verify the $\omega$-continuity of $f^{-1}$. Let $x_k, y_k \in X_k$ with $\|x_k - x\|_2, \|y_k - y\|_2 \leq b/l_k$. We take $k$ large enough so that $x_k \neq y_k$ and $\|y_k - x_k\|_2 < a_\omega$. Then we may estimate

$$\|f(y) - f(x)\|_2 \geq \|f_k(y_k) - f_k(x_k)\|_2 - 2 \|f_k - f\|_\infty - \pi \omega \left( \frac{b}{l_k} \right)$$

$$\geq \pi \omega^{-1} \left( \|y - x\|_2 - \frac{2b}{l_k} \right) - 2 \|f_k - f\|_\infty - \pi \omega \left( \frac{b}{l_k} \right).$$
Letting \( k \to \infty \) we verify the \( \omega \)-continuity of \( f^{-1} \).

We now prove (3.2). For \( k \geq 1 \), define a measure \( \mu_k \) on \( I^d \) by

\[
\mu_k(A) := \frac{1}{l_k^d} |A \cap X_k| \quad \forall A \subseteq I^d,
\]

Claim 3.4.1. The measure \( \mu_k \) converges weakly to \( \rho L|_{I^d} \).

Proof. This follows immediately from Lemma 3.2. Note that the required collection \( Q_k \) can be defined as \( \{\phi_k^{-1}(T_{k,i}) : i \in [m_k^d]\} \). Then \( \text{diam}(\phi_k^{-1}(T_{k,i})) \leq 1/m_k \to 0 \) as \( k \to \infty \). Moreover, we have that

\[
\mu_k(\phi_k^{-1}(T_{k,i})) = \frac{m_k^d}{l_k^d} \leq \frac{1}{l_k} \int_{T_{k,i}} \rho_k \, dL = \rho L(\phi_k^{-1}(T_{k,i}))
\]

and similarly, using the Binomial theorem,

\[
\mu_k(\phi_k^{-1}(T_{k,i})) \geq \frac{1}{l_k} \left( \frac{\int_{T_{k,i}} \rho_k \, dL}{l_k} - 1 \right)^d
\]

\[
\geq \rho L(\phi_k^{-1}(T_{k,i})) - \frac{2^d \rho_{\text{sup}}}{l_k m_k^{d-1}},
\]

for all \( k \) large enough. Since \( \frac{m_k}{l_k} \to 0 \), this proves that

\[
|\mu_k(\phi_k^{-1}(T_{k,i})) - \rho L(\phi_k^{-1}(T_{k,i}))| \in o\left(\frac{1}{m_k^d}\right).
\]

The claim above also implies, by Lemma 3.3, that \( (f_k)_\sharp \mu_k \) converges weakly to \( f_\sharp \rho L \), since \( f_k \) converges uniformly to \( f \).

It remains to show that \( (f_k)_\sharp \mu_k \) converges weakly to \( L|_{f(I^d)} \). To this end we compare \( (f_k)_\sharp \mu_k \) with the standard normalised counting measure on \( \frac{1}{l_k} \mathbb{Z}^d \)

\[
\nu_k(A) := \frac{1}{l_k^d} |A \cap \frac{1}{l_k} \mathbb{Z}^d|, \quad A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d,
\]

which clearly converges weakly to the Lebesgue measure. By the uniqueness of weak limits, it suffices to show that the signed measure \( \nu_k|_{f(I^d)} - (f_k)_\sharp \mu_k \) converges weakly to \( 0 \). In other words, for a given continuous function \( \varphi : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R} \) with compact support we need to verify

\[
\left| \int_{f(I^d)} \varphi \, d\nu_k - \int_{f_k(I^d)} \varphi \, d(f_k)_\sharp \mu_k \right| \to 0 \quad (3.5)
\]
We bound the expression in (3.5) above by the sum of two terms:
\[
\left| \int_{f(I^d)} \varphi \, dv_k - \int_{f_k(I^d)} \varphi \, dv_k \right| + \left| \int_{f_k(I^d)} \varphi \, dv_k - \int_{f(I^d)} \varphi \, d(\phi_k)_\mu k \right| \tag{3.6}
\]
The first term is at most \( \| \varphi \|_\infty \nu_k(f(I^d) \Delta f_k(I^d)) \), which vanishes as \( k \to \infty \) due to Lemma 3.1, Corollary 2.3 and the weak convergence of \( \nu_k \) to \( \mathcal{L} \). The second term may be bounded above by
\[
\frac{\| \varphi \|_\infty}{l_k} |A_k|, \quad \text{where} \quad A_k := f_k(I^d) \cap \frac{1}{l_k} \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus f_k(X_k). \tag{3.7}
\]
We will argue that
\[
A_k \subseteq B \left( \partial f(I^d), \| f_k - f \|_\infty \right) \tag{3.8}
\]
for all \( k \) sufficiently large. Once this is established the quantity of (3.7) is seen to be at most
\[
\| \varphi \|_\infty \mathcal{L} \left( B \left( \partial f(I^d), \| f_k - f \|_\infty + \frac{\sqrt{d}}{l_k} \right) \right),
\]
which converges to zero as \( k \to \infty \) by Corollary 2.3. Hence, to complete the verification of \((f_k)_\mu k \to \mathcal{L}|_{f(I^d)}\), we prove (3.8). Since the formula (3.3) allows us to view \( f_k \) as a bijection \( \phi_k^{-1}(X) \to \frac{1}{l_k} \mathbb{Z}^d \) and \( X_k = \phi_k^{-1}(X) \cap I^d \), any point in \( A_k \) has the form \( f_k(x) \) for some \( x \in \phi_k^{-1}(X) \setminus I^d \). If \( f_k(x) \notin f(I^d) \) then \( f_k(x) \in f_k(I^d) \setminus f(I^d) \), and therefore, \( \text{dist}(f_k(x), \partial f(I^d)) \leq \| f_k - f \|_\infty \).

In the remaining case we have \( f_k(x) = f(y) \) for some \( y \in I^d \). By the definition of \( A_k \), there must also be \( v \in I^d \) such that \( f_k(x) = f_k(v) \). Because \( X_k \) is a \( b/l_k \)-net of \( I^d \), there is \( v' \in X_k \) such that \( \| f_k(v) - f_k(v') \|_2 = \| f_k(x) - f_k(v') \|_2 \leq 3U \omega(b/l_k) \) thanks to \( \Sigma_\omega(f_k) \leq 3U \). We now wish to use an estimate of the form of (3.4) to bound the distance between the points \( x, v' \in \phi_k^{-1}(X) \). Note that (3.4) is valid up until multiplication by some constant \( \pi \) for points in \( \phi_k^{-1}(X \cap B(0, \pi R_k)) \). Therefore, we will verify below that \( x \in \phi_k^{-1}(X \cap B(0, \pi R_k)) \). Then the generalised form of (3.4) gives
\[
\| x - v' \|_2 \leq \pi \omega \left( \frac{\| f_k(x) - f_k(v') \|_2}{L} \right) \leq \pi \omega \left( \frac{\pi U \omega(b/l_k)}{L} \right), \tag{3.9}
\]
which goes to zero as \( k \) goes to infinity.

To see that \( x \in \phi_k^{-1}(X \cap B(0, \pi R_k)) \), we rearrange the expression (3.3) for \( f_k(x) \) to obtain
\[
\phi_k(x) = g^{-1}(l_k f_k(x) + g(\phi_k(z_k))). \tag{3.10}
\]
This representation allows us to bound the norm of \( \phi_k(x) \) via the following reasoning. In the argument that follows we call on a basic property of homogeneous \( \omega \)-mappings, namely that any homogeneous \( \omega \)-mapping may increase
norms by at most some constant factor. In what follows, this fact will be referred to as the ‘scaling property’. The verification of this property is an easy exercise in the definition of homogeneous ω-mapping which we leave to the reader.

Since \( f_k(x) \in f(I^d) \) we have

\[
\|l_k f_k(x)\|_2 \leq l_k \max \left\{ \|f(u)\|_2 : u \in I^d \right\} = \pi l_k,
\]

assuming, as we may, that \( k \) is sufficiently large. Further, by the scaling property of \( g \) and \( \phi_k(z_k) \in S_k \subseteq B(0, R_k) \), we have \( \|g(\phi_k(z_k))\|_2 \leq \pi R_k \). Thus the expression inside the argument of \( g^{-1} \) in (3.10) has norm at most \( \pi(l_k+R_k) \leq \pi R_k \). Now by the scaling property of \( g^{-1} \) we get \( \|\phi_k(x)\|_2 \leq \pi R_k \), as required for (3.9).

To conclude the argument, it is helpful to prescribe that the mappings \( f_k \) and \( f \), that we have up until now considered as mappings of \( I^d \), were actually defined on some fixed larger set containing \( I^d \) in its interior, say on \( \overline{B}(0, 2\sqrt{d}) \).

This is clearly possible by a trivial modification of the construction of \( f \). Since the formula (3.3) for \( f_k \) makes sense at all points \( x \in \phi_k^{-1}(X) \), not just \( x \in X_k \), we can extend each \( f_k \) to an ω-continuous mapping on \( \overline{B}(0, 2\sqrt{d}) \) instead of \( I^d \) in the Arzelà-Ascoli argument that follows. Then, we get an embedding \( f : \overline{B}(0, 2\sqrt{d}) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \).

Let us now complete the argument to show that \( \text{dist}(f_k(x), \partial f(I^d)) \leq \|f_k - f\|_{\infty} \). We may assume that \( k \) is sufficiently large so that the upper bound of (3.9) is smaller than \( \sqrt{d} \). Then \( x \in B(0, \sqrt{d}) \subseteq \overline{B}(0, 2\sqrt{d}) \) and we have that the embedding \( f \) is defined at \( x \). Note that \( f(x) \notin f(I^d) \), because \( x \notin I^d \) and \( f : \overline{B}(0, 2\sqrt{d}) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \) is an embedding. Hence

\[
\text{dist}(f_k(x), \partial f(I^d)) \leq \|f_k(x) - f(x)\|_2 \leq \|f_k - f\|_{\infty},
\]
as required.

It now only remains to prove Theorem 1.2. We provide an argument based on the following geometric statement, proved in Section 4. The statement is an amalgamation of Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2. Constructions of non-realisable densities based on statements of this type have already been written in great detail in [5] and originally in [2]. Therefore, following Lemma 3.5 we only give an informal sketch of the proof of Theorem 1.2.

**Lemma 3.5.** Let \( d \geq 2 \). Then there is \( \alpha_0 = \alpha_0(d) \) such that for \( \omega \in \mathcal{M} \) of the form

\[
\omega(t) \leq t \log \left( \frac{1}{t} \right)^{\alpha_0}, \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, a_\omega),
\]

the following statement holds:

Let \( k \in \mathbb{N}, c \in (0, a_\omega), \varepsilon \in (0, 1) \) and \( L \geq 1 \). Then there exists \( r = r(d, L\sqrt{k}, \omega, \varepsilon, c) \in \mathbb{N} \) such that for every non-empty open ball \( U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d \) of radius
at least 2c there exist finite tiled families \( S_1, S_2, \ldots, S_r \) of cubes contained in \( U \) with the following properties:

1. For each \( 1 \leq i < r \) and each cube \( S \in S_i \)
   \[
   \mathcal{L} \left( S \cap \bigcup_{j=i+1}^{r} S_j \right) \leq \text{poly} (\varepsilon) \mathcal{L}(S).
   \]

2. For any \( k \)-tuple \( (h_1, \ldots, h_k) \) of bi-\( \omega \)-mappings \( h_j: U \to \mathbb{R}^d \) for which \( \max \text{biL}_\omega (h_j) \leq L \) there exist \( i \in [r] \) and \( e_1 \)-adjacent cubes \( S, S' \in S_i \) such that
   \[
   \frac{|\mathcal{L}(h_j(S)) - \mathcal{L}(h_j(S'))|}{\mathcal{L}(S)} \leq \kappa(\varepsilon) \tag{3.11}
   \]
   for all \( j \in [k] \), where \( \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \kappa(\varepsilon) = 0 \).

We note that the upper bounds in Statements 1 and 2 depend on \( d, \omega, k, L \) and \( c \).

**Remark** (The role of the parameter \( k \) in Lemma 3.5). We will only require Lemma 3.5 for the case \( k = 1 \), that is, we only apply it to single bi-\( \omega \) transformations and not to \( k \)-tuples of bi-\( \omega \) transformations. However, the work [5] shows that such statements for \( k \)-tuples can be very useful and so we prove Lemma 3.5 for general \( k \) in case it finds future application.

**Proof of Theorem 1.2.** Let \( \mathcal{G}_L \) be the set of those positive continuous functions \( \rho: I^d \to \mathbb{R} \) for which the pushforward equation (1.2) admits a bi-\( \omega \) solution \( f: I^d \to \mathbb{R}^d \) with \( \text{biL}_\omega (f) \leq L \). We want to argue that for any \( \rho \in \mathcal{G}_L \) and every \( \xi > 0 \) there is \( \tilde{\rho} \in C(I^d) \) with \( \|\rho - \tilde{\rho}\|_\infty \leq \xi \) and such that the ball \( B(\tilde{\rho}, \xi/\pi) \) in the space \( C(I^d) \) is disjoint from \( \mathcal{G}_L \) for some fixed \( \pi \) large enough.

We will describe the argument here only informally, since the argument of [5, Thm. 4.8] could be used here essentially without a change, only replacing the use of [5, Lem. 3.1] with its stronger form Lemma 3.5 presented above and making the construction continuous as in [5, Lem. 4.6].

Note that for every \( \xi > 0 \) and every sequence of tiled families \( S_1, \ldots, S_r \) as in statement 1 of Lemma 3.5, there is a continuous function \( \psi: I^d \to \mathbb{R} \) with \( \|\psi\|_\infty \leq \xi \) with the following properties:

1. \( \psi(x) = 0 \) for every \( x \in I^d \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{r} \bigcup S_i \),
2. for every \( i \in [r] \) and every \( e_1 \)-adjacent \( S, S' \in S_i \)
   \[
   \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}(S)} \left| \int_S \psi \, d\mathcal{L} - \int_{S'} \psi \, d\mathcal{L} \right| \geq \xi.
   \]

This is easy to see: Start by defining a chessboard function with values \( \pm \xi \) on the tiled family \( S_1 \). Then modify this function on the tiled family \( S_2 \), creating
a chessboard pattern of $\pm \xi$ values there and repeat for the remaining tiled families $S_3, \ldots, S_r$. Call the final function $\psi$. Provided that $\varepsilon$ is chosen small enough relative to $\xi$, statement 1 of Lemma 3.5 ensures that for every $i \in [r]$ the $\pm \xi$ values of $\psi$ on the cubes in $S_j$ for $j > i$ have negligible impact on the average value of $\psi$ on the much larger cubes from $S_i$. Thus, the final function $\psi$ satisfies (2). Continuity of $\psi$ is taken care of by smoothing in a small enough neighbourhood of the boundaries of the cubes in each step; see [5, Lem. 4.6].

Now applying Lemma 3.5 with $U$ small enough, $0 < c < \text{diam}(U)/2$, $L, k = 1, \omega$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough so that $\kappa(\varepsilon)$ becomes smaller than, say, $\xi/4$, one gets $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and tiled families $S_1, \ldots, S_r$ contained in $U$. Applying the construction sketched above to these tiled families $S_1, \ldots, S_r$ and the given $\xi$, we get $\psi$ and define the desired $\hat{\rho}$ as $\hat{\rho} := \rho + \psi$.

Choosing $U$ small enough, $\rho$ is almost constant on $U$, and thus, any continuous function $\phi$ with $\|\hat{\rho} - \phi\|_{\infty} \leq \xi/\pi$ must follow essentially the same chessboard pattern as $\psi$ in (2), just with $\xi$ replaced with $\xi/2$ (for $\pi$ large enough and $U$ small enough). However, this is incompatible with statement 2 from Lemma 3.5.

The proof for the space $L^\infty(I^d)$ follows a similar pattern as sketched above, with a slightly different method to create the chessboard pattern in a $\xi$-neighbourhood of $\rho$ (this is described in [5, Lem. 4.9]). The proof of [5, Thm. 4.8] applies almost literally in this case.

4 Geometric properties of homeomorphisms of prescribed modulus of continuity.

The present section is an extensive refinement of [5, Sec. 3] and is based on a construction of Burago and Kleiner in [2]. Lemma 4.2 and Subsection 4.3 are entirely new; the remaining proofs follow the structure of their analogues in [5]. The present construction is dependent on many parameters, whose precise or even asymptotic values were mostly irrelevant in [5]. On the other hand, in this work it is crucial to analyse the dependence between various parameters; this is the reason why we have to present the constructions here in full detail and cannot only refer to [5, Sec. 3]. Inside some of the proofs of the present section, parts of the arguments of [5] transfer without any change. Although it would be possible to refer the reader at these places to the relevant parts of [5], we will include these passages here with references for the reader’s convenience.

Notation. For mappings $h : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^n$ we denote by $h^{(1)}, \ldots, h^{(n)}$ the coordinate functions of $h$. For a cube $S \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ we write $\ell(S)$ for its sidelength.

The main result of this section will be the following lemma:
Lemma 4.1. Let $\alpha > 0$ and $\omega \in \mathcal{M}$ satisfy
\[ \omega(t) \leq t \log \left( \frac{1}{t} \right)^{\alpha}, \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, a_\omega). \]

Let $d, k \in \mathbb{N}$, $d \geq 2$, $c \in (0, a_\omega)$, $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $L \geq 1$. Then there exists $r = r(d, L, \sqrt{\kappa}, \varepsilon, c) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for every non-empty open ball $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ of radius at least $2c$ there exist finite tiled families $S_1, S_2, \ldots, S_r$ of cubes contained in $U$ with the following properties:

1. For each $1 \leq i < r$ and each cube $S \in S_i$
\[ L \left( S \cap \bigcup_{j=i+1}^r \bigcup S_j \right) \leq \text{poly}(\varepsilon) L(S). \]

2. For any $k$-tuple $(h_1, \ldots, h_k)$ of bi-$\omega$-mappings $h_j : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ for which $\max L_\omega(h_j) \leq L$ there exist $i \in [r]$ and $e_1$-adjacent cubes $S, S' \in S_i$ such that
\[ \frac{|L(h_j(S)) - L(h_j(S'))|}{L(S)} \leq v(d, \omega, L, k, \varepsilon, \ell(S)) \]
for all $j \in [k]$, where
\[ v(d, \omega, L, k, \varepsilon, \ell(S)) := \pi(d, L, k) \frac{\omega(\varepsilon \omega(\ell(S)))^d}{\ell(S) \omega(\varepsilon \omega(\ell(S)))^{d-1}}. \]

The behaviour of the right-hand side of the inequality in statement 2 depends on $\omega$; the statement is most powerful for those moduli $\omega$, for which the expression goes to zero with $\varepsilon$. The work of [2] (see also [5]) implies that for Lipschitz moduli, i.e., those that satisfy $\omega(x) \leq Lx, L \geq 1$, it indeed goes to zero. On the other hand, it follows from the work of Rivière and Ye [11, Thm. 1] that for any $\alpha < 1$ the expression cannot go to zero for any $\omega(x) \geq x^\alpha$, i.e., for Hölder moduli of continuity. This is because otherwise one could use a construction similar to that of Theorem 1.2 to construct continuous Hölder non-realisable densities, which, however, do not exist by [11] (see also McMullen [10, Sec. 5]). We will show that the right-hand side of the inequality in statement 2 converges to zero for some moduli lying strictly between the Lipschitz and the Hölder moduli of continuity. The next lemma refers to the notation of Lemma 4.1. The parameter $\kappa$ below represents the weakest possible upper bound of statement 2 in Lemma 4.1.

Lemma 4.2. Let $d \geq 2$. There is $\alpha_0 = \alpha_0(d) > 0$ such that for $\omega \in \mathcal{M}$ of the form
\[ \omega(t) \leq t \log \left( \frac{1}{t} \right)^{\alpha_0}, \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, a_\omega), \]
and
\[ \kappa(\varepsilon) := \kappa(d, \omega, L, k, \varepsilon, c) := \sup_{i \in [r], S \in S_i} v(d, \omega, L, k, \varepsilon, \ell(S)) \]
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we have
\[ \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \kappa(\epsilon) = 0. \]

**Proof.** It suffices to show that for every \( \alpha > 0 \) small enough the expression \( \kappa(d, \omega, L, k, \epsilon, c) \) is bounded above by \( \text{poly}(\epsilon) \), and thus, goes to zero with \( \epsilon \). In order to simplify the formulas a bit, we write \( \tau(\epsilon, S) := \omega(\epsilon \omega(\ell(S))) \).

Then the right-hand side of the inequality in statement 2 of Lemma 4.1 reads asymptotically as
\[ \frac{\omega(\tau(\epsilon, S))}{\ell(S) \tau(\epsilon, S)^{d-1}} = \frac{\tau(\epsilon, S)}{\ell(S)} \frac{\omega(\tau(\epsilon, S))}{\tau(\epsilon, S)^d} \leq \frac{\tau(\epsilon, S)}{\ell(S)} \left( \log \left( \frac{1}{\tau(\epsilon, S)} \right) \right)^{\alpha d}. \]

The fraction \( \frac{\tau(\epsilon, S)}{\ell(S)} \) can be bounded as
\[ \frac{\tau(\epsilon, S)}{\ell(S)} \leq \frac{\epsilon \omega(\ell(S)) \log \left( \frac{1}{\epsilon \omega(\ell(S))} \right)^\alpha}{\ell(S)} \leq \epsilon \log \left( \frac{1}{\ell(S)} \right)^\alpha \log \left( \frac{1}{\epsilon \omega(\ell(S))} \right)^\alpha. \]

The last term can be bounded above by \( \epsilon \left( \log \left( \frac{1}{\epsilon \ell(S)} \right) \right)^{2\alpha}. \)

Next, we would like to bound below the term \( \tau(\epsilon, S) \):
\[ \tau(\epsilon, S) = \omega(\epsilon \omega(\ell(S))) \geq \epsilon \omega(\ell(S)) \geq \epsilon \ell(S). \]

Combining the two bounds above, we infer
\[ \frac{\omega(\tau(\epsilon, S))}{\ell(S) \tau(\epsilon, S)^{d-1}} \leq \epsilon \left( \log \left( \frac{1}{\epsilon \ell(S)} \right) \right)^{2\alpha d}. \quad (4.1) \]

Set \( \gamma = 1 \) and take \( \alpha \in (0, 1] \). In Corollary 4.10 we deduce that for every \( S \in \bigcup_{i=1}^r S_i \)
\[ \ell(S) \geq (c \text{poly}_d(\epsilon))^{(r+1)^2}. \]

This means that \( \epsilon \ell(S) \) can be bounded below as \( (c \text{poly}_d(\epsilon))^{(r+1)^2} \), too. In Lemma 4.11 below, we calculate that
\[ r := r(d, \omega, \epsilon, c) \leq \frac{1}{c \text{poly}_d(\epsilon)}. \]

We emphasise that the \( \text{poly}_d(\epsilon) \) expressions above are independent of \( \alpha \in (0, 1] \) and \( c \). Plugging these two bounds in the inequality (4.1), we get that
\[ \frac{\omega(\tau(\epsilon, S))}{\ell(S) \tau(\epsilon, S)^{d-1}} \leq \epsilon \left( \log \left( c \text{poly}_d(\epsilon)^{-(r+1)^2} \right)^{2\alpha d} \right. \]
\[ \leq \epsilon \left( (r+1)^2 \log \left( \frac{1}{c \text{poly}_d(\epsilon)} \right) \right)^{2\alpha d} \]
\[ \leq \pi(d, c) \epsilon \left( \text{poly}_d(\epsilon)^{-1} \right)^{2\alpha d} \]
for \( \epsilon > 0 \) small enough. The last expression vanishes as \( \epsilon > 0 \) goes to zero provided \( \alpha > 0 \) is chosen smaller than some threshold determined solely by \( d \).
4.1 A Dichotomy.

We begin by proving a dichotomy statement for bi-$\omega$ mappings on which the proof of Lemma 4.1 will be based. The dichotomy will be established first in dimension $d = 1$ and then extended to higher dimensions by induction.

**Lemma 4.3.** Let $\omega \in \mathcal{M}$, $0 < c < a_\omega$, $\varepsilon > 0$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$ with $N \geq 2$. Moreover, let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $h: [0, c] \to \mathbb{R}^n$ be an $\omega$-mapping with $\Sigma_\omega(h) \leq 1$. Then for any values of the parameters $\varphi$ and $M \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$0 \leq \varphi \leq \frac{\varepsilon^3}{120} \quad M \geq \frac{1}{\omega^{1/2}} \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{4}\right),$$

at least one of the following statements holds:

1. There exists a set $\Omega \subset [N - 1]$ with $|\Omega| \geq (1 - \varepsilon)(N - 1)$ such that for all $i \in \Omega$ and for all $x \in \left[0, \frac{(N-1)c}{N}\right]$,

$$\left\| h \left( x + \frac{c}{N} \right) - h(x) - \frac{1}{N} (h(c) - h(0)) \right\|_2 \leq \varepsilon \omega \left( \frac{c}{N} \right).$$

2. There exists $z \in \frac{c}{NM} \mathbb{Z} \cap [0, c - \frac{c}{NM}]$ such that

$$\left\| \frac{h(z + \frac{c}{NM}) - h(z)}{\frac{c}{NM}} \right\|_2 > (1 + \varphi) \left\| h(c) - h(0) \right\|_2.$$ 

**Proof.** Let $M \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varphi \in (0, 1)$ be parameters to be determined later in the proof. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $h: [0, c] \to \mathbb{R}^n$ be an $\omega$-mapping. The assertion of the Lemma holds for $h$ if and only if the assertion holds for $\rho \circ h$, where $\rho: \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is any distance preserving transformation. Therefore, we may assume that $h(0) = (0, 0, \ldots, 0)$ and $h(c) = (A, 0, \ldots, 0)$ where $A := \left\| h(c) - h(0) \right\|_2$. Assume that the second statement does not hold for $h$. In other words we have that

$$\left\| h(x + \frac{c}{NM}) - h(x) \right\|_2 \leq (1 + \varphi) \frac{A}{c} \tag{4.2}$$

for all $x \in \frac{c}{NM} \mathbb{Z} \cap [0, c - \frac{c}{NM}]$. We complete the proof, by verifying that the first statement holds for $h$.

We distinguish two cases, namely $A = 0$ and $A > 0$. In the former we have $h(0) = h(c)$. Using (4.2), we get that $h(z) = h(0)$ for every $z \in \frac{c}{NM} \mathbb{Z} \cap [0, c]$. For any $x \in [0, c - \frac{c}{N}]$ we can find $z \in \frac{c}{NM} \mathbb{Z} \cap [0, c]$, $z \leq x$, such that $|x - z| \leq \frac{c}{NM}$. This, however, implies that

$$\left\| h \left( x + \frac{c}{N} \right) - h(x) - \frac{1}{N} (h(c) - h(0)) \right\|_2 \leq 2\varepsilon \omega \left( \frac{c}{NM} \right).$$

Taking $M \geq \frac{1}{\omega^{1/2}} \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{4}\right)$ and using the submultiplicativity of $\omega$, we verify that the last quantity is at most $\varepsilon \omega \left( \frac{c}{N} \right)$. Hence statement (1) holds with $\Omega := [N-1]$. 
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In the remainder of the proof, we assume the second case $A > 0$. The next passage of text (approximately one page) is from [5, p. 634]. For later use, we point out that (4.2) implies
\[ \| h(b) - h(a) \|_2 \leq (1 + \phi) \frac{A}{c} \| b - a \|_2 \] (4.3)
whenever $a, b \in \frac{c}{NM} \mathbb{Z} \cap [0, c]$. Let $S_i = \left[ \frac{(i-1)c}{N}, \frac{ic}{N} \right]$ for $i \in [N]$, $t := t(L, \varepsilon) \in (\phi, 1)$ be some parameter to be determined later in the proof and
\[ P := \left\{ x \in \frac{c}{NM} \mathbb{Z} \cap \left[ 0, c - \frac{c}{N} \right] : h^{(i)} \left( x + \frac{c}{N} \right) - h^{(1)}(x) > \frac{(1 - t)A}{N} \right\}. \]
For $x \in P$ we have
\[ \left| h^{(1)} \left( x + \frac{c}{N} \right) - h^{(1)}(x) - \frac{A}{N} \right| \leq \frac{tA}{N}. \]
This inequality follows from the definition of $P$, the inequality (4.3) and $t > \phi$. For the remaining co-ordinate functions we have
\[ \sum_{i=2}^{n} \left| h^{(i)} \left( x + \frac{c}{N} \right) - h^{(i)}(x) \right|^2 \leq \frac{(1 + \phi)^2 A^2}{N^2} - \frac{(1 - t)^2 A^2}{N^2} \leq \frac{4tA^2}{N^2}. \]
Combining the two inequalities above we deduce
\[ \left\| h \left( x + \frac{c}{N} \right) - h(x) - \frac{1}{N} (h(c) - h(0)) \right\|_2 \leq \frac{\sqrt{t^2 + 4tA^2}}{N} \leq \frac{\sqrt{5t}A}{N} \quad \forall x \in P. \] (4.4)
Let $\Gamma \subset [0, 1]$ be a maximal $c/N$-separated subset of $\frac{c}{NM} \mathbb{Z} \cap \left[ 0, c - \frac{c}{N} \right] \setminus P$ and let $x_1, \ldots, x_{|\Gamma|}$ be the elements of $\Gamma$. Then the intervals $([x_i, x_i + \frac{c}{N}])_{i=1}^{|\Gamma|}$ can only intersect in the endpoints. Therefore the set $[0, c] \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{|\Gamma|} [x_i, x_i + \frac{c}{N}]$ is a finite union of intervals with endpoints in $\frac{c}{NM} \mathbb{Z} \cap [0, c]$ and with total length $c - \frac{|\Gamma|c}{N}$. Using $\Gamma \cap P = \emptyset$ and (4.3) we deduce that
\[ A = h^{(1)}(c) - h^{(1)}(0) \leq |\Gamma| \left( \frac{1 - t}{N} A + (1 + \phi) \frac{A}{c} \left( c - \frac{|\Gamma|c}{N} \right) \right). \]
Since $A > 0$, we may rearrange this inequality to obtain
\[ |\Gamma| \leq \frac{\phi}{\phi + t} N \leq \frac{2\phi}{\phi + t} (N - 1), \]
where, for the last inequality, we apply $N \geq 2$. It follows that the set $\frac{c}{NM} \mathbb{Z} \cap [0, c - \frac{c}{N}] \setminus P$ can intersect at most $\frac{6\phi}{\phi + t} (N - 1)$ intervals $S_i$. Letting
\[ \Omega := \left\{ i \in [N - 1] : \frac{c}{NM} \mathbb{Z} \cap S_i \subseteq P \right\} \]
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we deduce that $|\Omega| \geq \left(1 - \frac{6\varphi}{\varphi + t}\right)(N - 1)$. Moreover for any $i \in \Omega$ and $x \in S_i$, we can find $x' \in P$ with $|x' - x| \leq c/\sqrt{NM}$. This allows us to apply (4.4) to get

$$\left\| h\left(x + \frac{c}{N}\right) - h(x) - \frac{1}{N}(h(c) - h(0)) \right\|_2 \\
\leq \left\| h\left(x' + \frac{c}{N}\right) - h(x') - \frac{1}{N}(h(c) - h(0)) \right\|_2 + 2\omega\left(\frac{c}{\sqrt{NM}}\right) \\
\leq \sqrt{5t\omega(c)} + 2\omega\left(\frac{c}{\sqrt{NM}}\right) \leq \sqrt{5t} + 2\omega\left(\frac{1}{M}\right)\omega\left(\frac{c}{N}\right).$$

In the final step, we used the concavity of $\omega$. To make the last quantity above at most $\varepsilon\omega\left(\frac{c}{N}\right)$, it suffices if \(\sqrt{5t} \leq \varepsilon\) and \(2\omega\left(\frac{1}{M}\right) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{5t}}\). Next, we have to check that \(\frac{6\varphi}{\varphi + t} < \varepsilon\). For this it suffices to take \(\varphi \leq \frac{\varepsilon^3}{120}\).

**Lemma 4.4.** Let \(d \in \mathbb{N}, \omega \in \mathcal{M}, 0 < c < a_\omega \) and \(\varepsilon > 0\). Then there exist parameters

$$\varphi = \varphi(d, \omega, \varepsilon), \quad N_0 = N_0(d, \omega, \varepsilon, c)$$

such that for all \(N \in \mathbb{N}, N \geq N_0\) there exists a parameter

$$M = M(d, \omega, \varepsilon, N, c) \in \mathbb{N}$$

such that for all \(n \geq d\) and all bi-$\omega$-mappings

$$h: [0, c] \times [0, c/N]^{d-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \quad \text{with} \quad \text{bi-L}_\omega(h) \leq 1$$

at least one of the following statements holds:

1. There exists a set \(\Omega \subset [N - 1]\) with \(|\Omega| \geq (1 - \varepsilon)(N - 1)\) such that for all \(i \in \Omega\) and for all \(x \in \left[\frac{c}{N}, \frac{c}{N}\right] \times \left[0, \frac{c}{\sqrt{NM}}\right]^{d-1}\)

$$\left\| h\left(x + \frac{c}{N}\right) - h(x) - \frac{1}{N}(h(c) - h(0)) \right\|_2 \leq \varepsilon\omega\left(\frac{c}{N}\right).$$

2. There exists \(z \in \left[0, c\right] \cap \left[0, c - \frac{\sqrt{NM}}{c}\right]^{d-1}\) such that

$$\frac{\sqrt{NM}}{c} \|h(z + \frac{c}{NM}e_1) - h(z)\|_2 > (1 + \varphi) \|h(c_1) - h(0)\|_2.$$  

**Proof.** In this proof we will sometimes add the superscript \(d\) or \(d - 1\) to objects such as the Lebesgue measure $\mathcal{L}$ or vectors $e_i, 0$ in order to emphasise the dimension of the Euclidean space to which they correspond. For \(d \geq 2\),
we will express points in $\mathbb{R}^d$ in the form $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_d)$. Given $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $s \in \mathbb{R}$ we let

$$\mathbf{x} \wedge s := (x_1, \ldots, x_d, s)$$

denote the point in $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ formed by concatenation of $\mathbf{x}$ and $s$.

The case $d = 1$ is dealt with by Lemma 4.3. Let $d \geq 2$ and suppose that the statement of the lemma holds when $d$ is replaced with $d-1$. We define an additional parameter $\theta := \theta(d, \omega, \varepsilon)$ whose precise value will be specified later. Given $\omega, \varepsilon$ and $c > 0$ we let $\varphi := \varphi(d, \omega, \varepsilon) \in (0, 1)$ and $N_0(d, \varepsilon) := N_0(d, \omega, \varepsilon, c) \in \mathbb{N}$ be parameters on which we impose various conditions in the course of the proof. For now, we just prescribe that $0 < \varphi < \frac{1}{2} \varphi(d - 1, \omega, \vartheta(d, \omega, \varepsilon))$ and $N_0(d, \varepsilon) \geq N_0(d - 1, \theta(d, \omega, \varepsilon))$.

Let $N \geq N_0(d, \varepsilon)$ and $M := M(N, d, \omega, \varepsilon, c)$ be a parameter to be determined later. For $M_d := M(N, d - 1, \omega, \theta(d, \omega, \varepsilon), c)$ we prescribe first that $M \in M_{d-1} \mathbb{Z}$, so that $M_{M_{d-1}^{-1}} \mathbb{Z} \subseteq M_{M_{d-1}^{-1}} \mathbb{Z}$.

Let $n \geq d$ and $h: [0, c] \times [0, c/N]^{d-1} \to \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bi-$\omega$-mapping. For each $s \in [0, c/N]$ we apply the induction hypothesis to the mapping $h \wedge s: [0, c] \times [0, c/N]^{d-2} \to \mathbb{R}^n$ defined by

$$h \wedge s(x) := h(x \wedge s) = h(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{d-1}, s).$$

Thus, we get that for each $s \in [0, c/N]$ at least one of the following statements holds:

(1s) There exists a set $\Omega_s \subset [N-1]$ with $|\Omega_s| \geq (1 - \theta)(N - 1)$ such that for all $i \in \Omega_s$ and $x \in \left[ \frac{(i-1)c}{N}, \frac{i}{N} \right] \times [0, \frac{c}{N}]^{d-2}$ it holds that

$$\left\| \frac{h \wedge s \left( x + \frac{c}{N} e_i^{d-1} \right) - h \wedge s(x) - \frac{1}{N} \left( h \wedge s \left( c e_i^{d-1} \right) - h \wedge s \left( 0^{d-1} \right) \right) }{2} \right\|_2 \leq \Theta \omega \left( \frac{c}{N} \right).$$

(2s) There exists $z_s \in \frac{c}{M_{d-1}} \mathbb{Z}^{d-1} \cap \left[ \left( 0, c - \frac{c}{M_{d-1}} \right] \times [0, \frac{c}{N}]^{d-2} \right]$ such that

$$\left\{ \frac{h \wedge s \left( z_s + \frac{c}{M_{d-1}} e_i^{d-1} \right) - h \wedge s(z_s)}{c} \right\} \geq (1 + 2\varphi) \left\{ \frac{h \wedge s \left( c e_i^{d-1} \right) - h \wedge s \left( 0^{d-1} \right) }{c} \right\}.$$

Suppose first that statement (2s) holds for some $s \in [0, c/N]$. We will show that statement 2 holds for $h$. Choose a number $s' \in \frac{c}{M} \mathbb{Z} \cap \left[ 0, \frac{c}{N} - \frac{c}{M} \right]$ with $s' \leq s$ and $|s' - s| \leq \frac{c}{M}$. Setting $w = z_s \wedge s'$ we note that $w$ is an
element of $\mathbb{Z}^d \cap [0, c - \frac{c}{NM-1}] \times [0, \frac{c}{N} - \frac{c}{NM}]$ for $\|w - z_s \cap s\|_2 \leq \frac{c}{NM}$ and $\|h \wedge (c(e_1^{d-1}) - h \wedge (0^{d-1}))\|_2 \geq \|h(e_1^{d}) - h(0^d)\|_2 - 2\omega (\frac{c}{N})$. We use these inequalities and the inequality of (2.4) to derive

$$\|h \left( w + \frac{c}{NM-1}e_1^{d} \right) - h(w) \|_2 \geq \|h \wedge (z_s + \frac{c}{NM-1}e_1^{d-1}) - h \wedge (z_s)\|_2 - 2\omega (\frac{c}{NM})$$

$$\geq (1 + 2\varphi) \left( \frac{\|h(e_1^{d}) - h(0^{d})\|_2 - 2\omega (\frac{c}{N})}{cNM-1} - 2\omega (\frac{c}{NM}) \right)$$

$$\geq (1 + 2\varphi - \frac{2(1 + 2\varphi)\omega}{\omega^{-1}(c)} - \frac{2\omega (\frac{c}{NM})}{\omega^{-1}(c)}) \frac{\|h(e_1^{d}) - h(0^{d})\|_2}{NM-1}$$

$$\geq (1 + \varphi) \frac{\|h(e_1^{d}) - h(0^{d})\|_2}{NM-1}.$$

To deduce the fourth inequality in the sequence above we use the $\omega^{-1}$-bound on $h$. In fact, this is the only place in the proof of Lemma 4.4 where we use that the mapping $h$ is bi-$\omega$-continuous and not just $\omega$-continuous. The final inequality is ensured by taking $N_0 = \frac{\|h(e_1^{d}) - h(0^{d})\|_2}{\omega^{-1}(c)}$ and $M$ sufficiently large. Specifically, using the submultiplicativity of $\omega$, it is sufficient to take

$$N_0 \geq \frac{1}{\omega^{-1}(\frac{\omega^{-1}(c)}{8})}, \quad M \geq \frac{1}{\omega^{-1}(\frac{1}{NM-1})}.$$

From the final inequality obtained for $\|h \left( w + \frac{c}{NM-1}e_1^{d} \right) - h(w) \|_2$, it follows that there exists $i \in \left[ \frac{M}{NM-1} \right]$ so that the point $z := w + \frac{c}{NM}e_1^{d}$ verifies statement 2 for $h$.

We may now assume that the first statement (1.4) holds for all $s \in [0, c/N]$. We complete the proof by verifying statement 1 for $h$. Whenever $x \in [0, c] \times [0, c/N]^{d-2}$ and $s \in [0, c/N]$ satisfy the inequality of (1.4) we have that

$$\left\| h ((x \wedge s) + \frac{c}{N}e_1) - h(x \wedge s) - \frac{1}{N} (h(e_1) - h(0)) \right\| \leq \theta \omega \left( \frac{c}{N} \right) + \frac{2\omega (\frac{c}{N})}{N}.$$

The next passage of text (approximately one page) is from [5, p. 636–637]. Let $R := [0, c - \frac{c}{N}] \times [0, \frac{c}{N}]^{d-1}$ and

$$A := \left\{ x \in R: x \text{ satisfies (4.5) with } \varepsilon = \theta + \frac{2}{N} \right\}.$$
Moreover, for any $i$ and observe that
\[
F \text{ or each } L
\]
Combining the two inequalities derived above for $\theta$, we deduce
\[
\mathcal{L}^{d-1}(A\cap\{x: x_d = s\}) \geq (1-\theta)\mathcal{L}^{d-1}(R\cap\{x: x_d = s\}) \quad \text{for all } s \in [0, c/N].
\]
Therefore, by Fubini’s theorem,
\[
\mathcal{L}^{d}(A) \geq (1-\theta)\mathcal{L}^{d}(R).
\]
For each $i \in [N-1]$ we let $S_i := \left[\frac{(i-1)c}{N}, \frac{i}{N}\right] \times \left[0, \frac{c}{N}\right]^{d-1}$, define
\[
\Omega := \left\{i \in [N-1]: \mathcal{L}^{d}(A \cap S_i) \geq (1-\sqrt{\theta})\mathcal{L}^{d}(S_i)\right\}
\]
and observe that
\[
\mathcal{L}^{d}(A) \leq |\Omega| \frac{\mathcal{L}^{d}(R)}{N-1} + (N-1-|\Omega|)(1-\sqrt{\theta})\frac{\mathcal{L}^{d}(R)}{N-1}.
\]
Combining the two inequalities derived above for $\mathcal{L}^{d}(A)$ and requiring $\theta \leq \varepsilon^2$, we deduce
\[
\frac{|\Omega|}{N-1} \geq (1-\sqrt{\theta}) \geq 1-\varepsilon.
\]
Moreover, for any $i \in \Omega$ and any cube $Q \subseteq S_i$ with sidelenath $(2\sqrt{\theta}\mathcal{L}^{d}(S_i))^{1/2}$ we have $A \cap Q \neq \emptyset$. Therefore, for any $i \in \Omega$ and any $x \in S_i$ we can find $x' \in A \cap S_i$ with
\[
\|x' - x\|_2 \leq \sqrt{d}(2\sqrt{\theta}\mathcal{L}^{d}(S_i))^{\frac{d}{2}} \leq \frac{2\sqrt{d}\theta^{1/2}c}{N}.
\]
Using this approximation, we obtain
\[
\left\|h\left(x + \frac{c}{N}e_1\right) - h(x) - \frac{1}{N}(h(ce_1) - h(0))\right\|_2 \\
\leq \left\|h\left(x + \frac{c}{N}e_1\right) - h\left(x' + \frac{c}{N}e_1\right)\right\|_2 \\
+ \left\|h\left(x' + \frac{c}{N}e_1\right) - h(x') - \frac{1}{N}(h(ce_1) - h(0))\right\|_2 + \left\|h(x') - h(x)\right\|_2 \\
\leq 2\omega\left(2\sqrt{d}\theta^{1/2}c\right)N + \left(\theta + \frac{2}{N}\right)\omega\left(\frac{c}{N}\right) \\
\leq \left(2\omega\left(2\sqrt{d}\theta^{1/2}\right) + \theta + \frac{2}{N_0(d, \varepsilon)}\right)\omega\left(\frac{c}{N}\right) \leq \varepsilon\omega\left(\frac{c}{N}\right),
\]
where the final inequality is satisfied by taking $N_0(d, \varepsilon) \geq \frac{\theta}{\varepsilon}$ and
\[
\theta(d, \omega, \varepsilon) \leq \left(\frac{\omega^{-1}(\frac{1}{d})\omega^{-1}(\varepsilon)}{2\sqrt{d}}\right)^{2d}.
\]
This choice of $\theta$ also satisfies the requirement $\theta \leq \varepsilon^2$ imposed before. \hfill \Box
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4.2 Iterating Lemma 4.4

In this subsection we identify a certain subfamily \( M_0 \subseteq M \) with the property that for any modulus \( \omega \in M_0 \) we may iterate Lemma 4.4 a controlled number of times in order to eliminate conclusion 2 of the dichotomy. In the next subsection we verify that the subfamily \( M_0 \) contains all moduli considered by Lemma 4.1.

**Definition 4.5 (The family \( M_0 \)).** We use Lemma 4.4 to generate sequences of parameters. Given \( d \in \mathbb{N}, \omega \in M \) and \( \varepsilon, c > 0 \) we define sequences \((N_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}, (M_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}\) and \((c_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}\) by

\[
N_1 := N_0(d, \omega, \varepsilon, c), \quad N_i := N_0(d, \omega, \varepsilon, c_i), \quad i \geq 2, \\
c_1 := c, \quad c_i := \frac{c_{i-1}}{N_{i-1}M_{i-1}}, \quad i \geq 2, \quad \text{and} \\
M_j := M_0(d, \omega, \varepsilon, c_j) := M(N_j, d, \omega, \varepsilon, c_j) \in \mathbb{N}, \quad j \geq 1.
\]

Let \( M_0 \) be defined as the family of all moduli \( \omega \in M \) for which the following condition holds: For any \( d \in \mathbb{N}, c \in (0, a_\omega) \) and \( \varepsilon \in (0, 1) \) there exists \( r := r(d, \omega, \varepsilon, c) \in \mathbb{N} \) such that for the parameter \( \phi = \phi(d, \omega, \varepsilon) \) of Lemma 4.4 and the parameter sequence \((c_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}\) defined in the paragraph above, we have

\[
(1 + \phi)^r \omega^{-1}(c) \geq \frac{\omega(c_{r+1})}{c_{r+1}}.
\]

**Lemma 4.6.** Let \( d \in \mathbb{N}, \omega \in M_0, c \in (0, a_\omega), \varepsilon \in (0, 1), n \geq d \) and \( g: [0, c/N]^{d-1} \to \mathbb{R}^n \) be a bi-\( \omega \)-mapping with biL\( \omega \)(\( g \)) \( \leq 1 \). Let the parameters \((c_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}, (N_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}, (M_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}\) and \( r \) be defined according to Definition 4.5. Then there exists \( p \in [r] \) and

\[
z_1 = 0, \quad z_{i+1} \in c_{i+1}Z^d \cap [0, c_i - c_{i+1}] \times \left[0, \frac{c_i}{N} - c_{i+1}\right]^{d-1} \quad \text{for } i \in [p-1]
\]

such that statement 1 of Lemma 4.4 is valid for the mapping \( g_p: [0, c_p] \times [0, c_p/N_p]^{d-1} \to \mathbb{R}^n \) defined by

\[
g_p(x) := g \left(x + \sum_{i=1}^{p} z_i\right).
\]

**Proof.** The proof is a simple modification of [5, Proof of Lemma 3.5, p. 638]. Let \( \varphi := \phi(d, \omega, \varepsilon) \) be given by the conclusion of Lemma 4.4. We implement the following algorithm.

**Algorithm 4.7.** [5, Alg. B.1] Set \( i = 1, z_1 = 0 \) and \( g_1 = g \).

1. If statement 1 of Lemma 4.4 holds for \( h = g_i \) and \( c = c_i \) then stop. If not proceed to step 2.
2. Choose \( z_{i+1} \in c_{i+1}Z^d \cap [0, c_i - c_{i+1}] \times [0, \frac{c_i}{N} - c_{i+1}]^{d-1} \) such that
\[
\|g_{i} (z_{i+1} + c_{i+1} e_1) - g_{i} (z_{i+1})\|_{c_{i+1}} > (1 + \varphi) \|g_{i} (c_{i} e_1) - g_{i} (0)\|_{c_{i}}
\]
(4.11)
and define \( g_{i+1} : [0, c_{i+1}] \times [0, c_{i+1}/N]^{d-1} \to \mathbb{R}^k \) by
\[
g_{i+1}(x) := g_{i}(x + z_{i+1}) = g \left( x + \sum_{j=1}^{i+1} z_{j} \right).
\]

3. Set \( i = i + 1 \) and return to step 1.

At each potential iteration \( i \geq 1 \) of Algorithm 4.7, the conditions of Lemma 4.4 are satisfied for \( d, \omega, \varepsilon, M, \varphi, N_0, c = c_i, n, N \) and \( h = g_i : [0, c_i] \times [0, c_i/N]^{d-1} \to \mathbb{R}^n \). Therefore, whenever the algorithm does not terminate in step 1, we have that such a point \( z_{i+1} \) required by step 2 exists by Lemma 4.4.

To complete the proof, it suffices to verify that Algorithm 4.7 terminates after at most \( r \) iterations. This is clear, after rewriting (4.11) in the form
\[
\|g_{i+1} (c_{i+1} e_1) - g_{i+1} (0)\|_{c_{i+1}} > (1 + \varphi) \|g_{i} (c_{i} e_1) - g_{i} (0)\|_{c_{i}} > (1 + \varphi)^{i} \omega^{-1}(c),
\]
where the latter inequality follows by induction and the \( \omega \)-continuity of \( g^{-1} \).

If Algorithm 4.7 completed \( r+1 \) iterations then, the inequality above for \( i = r \) provides, in light of (4.9), a contradiction to the \( \omega \)-continuity of \( g_{r+1} \). ☐

4.3 Largeness of the subfamily \( \mathcal{M}_0 \).

The objective of this subsection is to prove that any \( \omega \in \mathcal{M} \) satisfying
\[
\omega(t) \leq L t \log \left( \frac{1}{t} \right)^{\alpha}, \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, a_\omega),
\]
for some \( \alpha > 0 \) and \( L \geq 1 \) belongs to the family \( \mathcal{M}_0 \) of Definition 4.5. The proof relies on establishing sufficiently good bounds on the parameters of Lemma 4.4 and Definition 4.5.

Throughout the work, the parameter \( c \) is usually treated as a constant. In this subsection, however, we are making the dependence on \( c \) explicit. The first reason for that is that we are going to apply the bounds derived here to sequences of parameters generated in Definition 4.5, that is, with \( c_i \) in place of \( c \). Another reason is that we want to make sure that the value of \( c \) does not influence the powers of \( \varepsilon \) in various bounds of the form \( \text{poly}(\varepsilon) \) below.

This is to ensure that the value of \( a_{0}(d) \) from Lemma 4.2 is independent of \( c \).
For technical reasons, we need to make sure that the bounds on various parameters established for the modulus $Lt \log(1/t)\gamma$ are also valid bounds for the values of the same parameters with respect to all moduli $\omega(t) \leq Lt \log(1/t)\gamma$.

**Lemma 4.8.** Let $\gamma > 0$, $L \geq 1$ and $\omega \in \mathcal{M}$ satisfy

$$\omega(t) \leq Lt \log \left(\frac{1}{t}\right)^\gamma,$$

for all $t \in (0, a \omega)$.

Then in addition to the conclusion of Lemma 4.4 the parameters

$$\varphi = \varphi(d, \omega, \varepsilon), \quad N_0 = N_0(d, \omega, \varepsilon, c), \quad M = M(N, d, \omega, \varepsilon, c), \quad M_0 = M_0(d, \omega, \varepsilon, c) := M(N_0, d, \omega, \varepsilon, c),$$

may be taken of the form

$$\varphi = \text{poly}_{d,\gamma,L}(\varepsilon), \quad N_0 = \frac{\text{poly}_{d,\gamma,L} \left( \log \left( \frac{1}{c} \right) \right)}{\text{poly}_{d,\gamma,L}(\varepsilon)}, \quad M = \frac{\text{poly}_{d,\gamma,L} (N)}{\text{poly}_{d,\gamma,L}(\varepsilon)}, \quad M_0 = \frac{\text{poly}_{d,\gamma,L} \left( \log \left( \frac{1}{c} \right) \right)}{\text{poly}_{d,\gamma,L}(\varepsilon)}. \quad (4.12)$$

**Proof.** We prove the lemma by induction on the dimension $d$. The case $d = 1$ comes immediately from Lemma 4.3. Assume now that $d \geq 2$ and that the statement of the lemma is valid for all smaller dimensions. We will be using the bound $\omega^{-1}(t) \geq \pi(\gamma, L)t^2$ at several places. For a parameter $\theta = \theta(d, \omega, \varepsilon)$, which in view of (4.7) may be taken of the form $\theta = \text{poly}(\varepsilon)$, the proof of Lemma 4.4 establishes the following sufficient conditions on the parameters $\varphi$, $N_0$ and $M$:

$$0 < \varphi < \frac{1}{2}\varphi(d-1, \omega, \theta) \quad (4.13)$$

$$N_0 \geq N_0(d-1, \omega, \theta, c), \quad N_0 \geq \frac{1}{\omega^{-1} \left( \frac{\varphi^{-1}(c)}{\theta \omega(c)} \right)}, \quad (4.14)$$

$$M \in M_{d-1} \mathbb{Z} \quad M \geq \frac{1}{\omega^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{NM_{d-1}} \right)}, \quad \text{with} \quad M_{d-1} := M(N, d-1, \omega, \theta, c). \quad (4.15)$$

We argue that these conditions are satisfied for a choice of $\varphi$, $N_0$, $M$ and $M_0$ of the form (4.12). From the induction hypothesis and $\theta = \text{poly}(\varepsilon)$, it is clear that (4.13) is satisfied for an appropriate choice of $\varphi = \text{poly}(\varepsilon)$. We fix $\varphi$ accordingly. Similarly, the induction hypothesis and $\theta = \text{poly}(\varepsilon)$ ensure that the first inequality of (4.14) may be satisfied by a choice of $N_0$ of the form of (4.12). We verify that such a choice may additionally satisfy the second
inequality of (4.14). To this end, we first use the supermultiplicativity of $\omega^{-1}$ and the bound $\omega^{-1}(t) \geq \pi(\gamma, L)t^2$ to observe a lower bound on the quantity $\frac{\omega^{-1}(c)}{\omega(c)}$.

\[
\frac{\omega^{-1}(c)}{\omega(c)} = \frac{\omega^{-1}(\omega(c)\frac{c}{\omega(c)})}{\omega(c)} \geq \pi(\gamma, L) \frac{\frac{c}{\log(\frac{1}{c})^2}}{c \log(\frac{1}{c})^2} = \frac{1}{\text{poly} \left( \log \left( \frac{1}{c} \right) \right)}. \tag{4.16}
\]

We apply this bound, the supermultiplicativity of $\omega^{-1}$ and $\omega^{-1}(t) \geq \pi(\gamma, L)t^2$ to derive

\[
\frac{1}{\omega^{-1} \left( \frac{\omega^{-1}(c)}{8\omega(c)} \right)} \leq \frac{1}{\omega^{-1} \left( \text{poly} \left( \varepsilon \right) \right) \omega^{-1} \left( \frac{\omega^{-1}(c)}{\omega(c)} \right)} \leq \frac{\text{poly} \left( \log \left( \frac{1}{c} \right) \right)}{\text{poly} \left( \varepsilon \right)}. \]

Hence, an appropriate choice of $N_0$ of the form (4.12) satisfies both inequalities of (4.14). We fix such an $N_0$ and show now that the choice of $M_0$ is possible. It is first necessary to consider the parameter $M$. By the induction hypothesis, the first condition of (4.15) may clearly be satisfied by a choice of $M$ of the form (4.12). To justify that the second part of (4.15) may also be satisfied by such a choice, we note the bound

\[
\frac{1}{\omega^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{N M_{d-1}} \right)} \leq \frac{1}{\omega^{-1} \left( \text{poly} \left( \varepsilon \right) \right) \text{poly} \left( \varepsilon \right)} \leq \frac{\text{poly} \left( N \right)}{\text{poly} \left( \varepsilon \right)}. \]

Finally, given that $M$ may be chosen of the form $M = \frac{\text{poly} \left( N \right)}{\text{poly} \left( \varepsilon \right)}$, it follows that a sufficient condition on $M_0$ is given by $M_0 \geq \frac{\text{poly} \left( N_0 \right)}{\text{poly} \left( \varepsilon \right)}$. The choice of $N_0$ then allows us to take $M_0 = \frac{\text{poly} \left( \log \left( \frac{1}{c} \right) \right)}{\text{poly} \left( \varepsilon \right)}$. \hfill \Box

**Lemma 4.9.** Let $\gamma > 0$, $L \geq 1$ and $\omega \in \mathcal{M}$ satisfy

\[
\omega(t) \leq L t \log \left( \frac{1}{t} \right)^\gamma, \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, a_\omega).
\]

Then the following inequality holds for all $i \geq 1$:

\[
c_i \geq \left( \text{poly}_{d, \gamma, L} \left( \varepsilon \right) \right)^{i^2}. \tag{4.17}
\]

In particular, the function $\text{poly}_{d, \gamma, L} \left( \varepsilon \right)$ is independent of $i$.

**Proof.** By Lemma 4.8, there are functions $\beta(\varepsilon), \beta(\varepsilon) = \text{poly} \left( \varepsilon \right)$ and a number $q > 0$, all depending only on $d, L$ and $\gamma$ such that

\[
c_{i+1} = \frac{c_i}{N_i M_i} \geq \frac{\beta(\varepsilon) c_i}{\log \left( \frac{1}{c_i} \right)^q} \geq \beta(\varepsilon) c_i^2, \quad i \geq 0, \tag{4.18}
\]
where the last inequality is achieved by choosing the polynomial $\beta$ carefully enough. By induction, this yields the bound

$$c_i \geq \beta(\varepsilon)^{2^i - 1 - 1} c^{2^i - 1}.$$  \hfill (4.19)

We use the recursion (4.18) to derive

$$c_i \geq \frac{\beta(\varepsilon)^{i-1} c_1}{\prod_{j=1}^{i-1} \log \left( \frac{1}{c_j} \right)^q}, \quad i \geq 1.$$  

Bounding each $c_j$ term in the denominator below by $c_i$, and applying a weaker form of the inequality of (4.19), namely

$$c_i \geq (\beta(\varepsilon) c)^{2^i}, \quad i \geq 1,$$

we obtain

$$c_i \geq \frac{\beta(\varepsilon)^{i-1} c_1}{\prod_{j=1}^{i-1} \log \left( \frac{1}{c_j} \right)^q} \geq \frac{\beta(\varepsilon)^{i-1} c}{\left(2^i \log \left( \frac{1}{\beta(\varepsilon) c} \right) \right)^q}, \quad i \geq 1,$$

from which (4.17) follows.

For $i \in [r]$ the tiled family of cubes $S_i$ fulfilling the assertions of Lemma 4.1 will be defined as a subfamily of $Q_{c_i/N_i}$. From the previous lemma we immediately obtain a lower bound on the sidelength $\frac{c_i}{N_i}$ of cubes in $Q_{c_i/N_i}$.

**Corollary 4.10.** Let $\gamma > 0$, $L \geq 1$ and $\omega \in \mathcal{M}$ satisfy

$$\omega(t) \leq L t \log \left( \frac{1}{t} \right) \gamma, \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, a_\omega).$$

Then

$$\text{sidelength}(S) = \frac{c_i}{N_i} \geq c_{i+1} \geq \left( \text{poly}_{d, \gamma, L}(\varepsilon) c \right)^{(i+1)^2}$$

for all cubes $S \in S_i \subseteq Q_{c_i/N_i}$.  

**Lemma 4.11.** Let $\gamma > 0$, $L \geq 1$ and $\omega \in \mathcal{M}$ satisfy

$$\omega(t) \leq L t \log \left( \frac{1}{t} \right) \gamma, \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, a_\omega).$$

Then $\omega \in \mathcal{M}_0$, and moreover, the parameter $r(d, \omega, \varepsilon, c)$ of Definition 4.5 witnessing this may be taken of the form

$$r(d, \omega, \varepsilon, c) = \frac{1}{c \cdot \text{poly}_{d, \gamma, L}(\varepsilon)},$$
Proof. We consider \(d, L\) and \(\gamma\) fixed. All terms in the subsequent calculation will depend implicitly on them and this dependence will no longer be mentioned explicitly. Thus, as shown in Lemma 4.8, we may write \(\varphi = \text{poly}(\varepsilon)\).

We wish to find minimal \(r := r(d, \omega, \varepsilon, c)\) such that for every \(i \geq r\) the following holds:

\[
(1 + \varphi)^i \omega^{-1}(c) = \omega^{-1}(c) (1 + \text{poly}(\varepsilon))^i \geq \frac{\omega(i+1)}{c(i+1)}
\]

(4.20)

By Lemma 4.9, part (ii), we can bound \(c(i+1) \geq \text{poly}(\varepsilon)c^2\). We emphasise particularly that the expression \(\text{poly}(\varepsilon)\) is independent of \(i\). Using this bound together with the bound \(\omega^{-1}(c) \geq 1 \text{poly}(\log(1/c))\) of (4.16) and the hypothesis \(\omega(\ell(S_i)) \leq L \log(1/d)\gamma\) we see that (4.20) is implied by the inequality

\[
\frac{1}{\text{poly}(\log(1/c))} (1 + \text{poly}(\varepsilon))^i \geq \log\left((c \text{poly}(\varepsilon))^{-2}\right)^\gamma.
\]

This inequality can be rewritten as

\[
i \log(1 + \text{poly}(\varepsilon)) \geq 2\gamma \log i + \gamma \log \left(\frac{1}{c \text{poly}(\varepsilon)}\right) + \pi \log \log \left(\frac{1}{c}\right)
\]

and using the bound \(2\gamma \log i \leq \pi \sqrt{i}\) one can easily see that \(i\) of size at least \(\pi c \log(1 + \text{poly}(\varepsilon))\) satisfies the inequality.

We note that \(\log(1 + \text{poly}(\varepsilon))\) behaves as \(\text{poly}(\varepsilon)\) as \(\varepsilon\) goes to zero. This yields the desired asymptotic upper bound on \(r\) of the form

\[
r \leq \frac{1}{c \cdot \text{poly}(\varepsilon)},
\]

which is valid for all \(\varepsilon > 0\) small enough.

\(\square\)

4.4 A volume bound.

The present subsection is devoted to establishing a volume bound on the difference of images of two bi-\(\omega\) mappings which are close with respect to the \(\|\cdot\|_\infty\) distance. This will allow us to derive statement 2 of Lemma 4.1 from the first conclusion 1 of the dichotomy of Lemma 4.4.

Lemma 4.12. Let \(d \in \mathbb{N}, \omega \in \mathcal{M}, \varepsilon \in (0, 1), 0 < c < a_\omega, N \in \mathbb{N}, h: [0, c] \times [0, c/N]^{d-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d\) be a bi-\(\omega\)-mapping with \(\text{biL}_\omega(h) \leq 1\) and \(i \in [N - 1]\). Suppose that \(h\) satisfies inequality (4.5) on \(S_i := \left[\left(i-1\right)c/N, \frac{i}{N}\right] \times [0, c/N]^{d-1}\).

Then

\[
|\mathcal{L}(h(S_i)) - \mathcal{L}(h(S_{i+1}))| \leq \pi(d) \left(\frac{\omega(\varepsilon \omega(\ell(S_i)))}{\ell(S_i) \omega(\ell(S_i))^{d-1}}\right) \mathcal{L}(S_i).
\]
The proof of Lemma 4.12 is a simple modification of that of [5, Lemma 3.4]. It is based on the following basic fact.

**Lemma 4.13.** Let $\omega \in \mathcal{M}$, $0 < \lambda < a_\omega$, $S \in \mathcal{Q}_\lambda^d$ and $f_1, f_2 : S \to \mathbb{R}^d$ be bi-$\omega$-mappings with $b_i \omega (f_i) \leq 1$ for $i = 1, 2$. Let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and suppose that

$$
\| f_2(x) - f_1(x) \|_\infty \leq \varepsilon \omega (\lambda). \tag{4.21}
$$

Then

$$
|\mathcal{L}(f_1(S)) - \mathcal{L}(f_2(S))| \leq \pi (d) \left( \frac{\omega (\varepsilon \omega (\lambda))^d}{\lambda \omega (\varepsilon \omega (\lambda))^{d-1}} \right) \mathcal{L}(S).
$$

**Proof.** For a set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ and $t > 0$ we introduce the set

$$
[A]_t := \{ x \in A : \text{dist}(x, \partial A) \geq t \}
$$

of all points in the interior of $A$, whose distance to the boundary of $A$ is at least $t$. Using (4.21) and the $\omega^{-1}$ bound on $f_2$ we deduce that

$$
f_1([S]_t) \subseteq \overline{B}(f_2([S]_t), \varepsilon \omega (\lambda)) \subseteq \overline{B}([f_2(S)]_{\omega^{-1}(t)}, \varepsilon \omega (\lambda))
$$

for all $t > 0$. For the second inclusion, we use Brouwer’s Invariance of Domain [6, Thm. 2B.3] in order to prove $f_2([S]_t) \subseteq [f_2(S)]_{\omega^{-1}(t)}$. It follows that

$$
f_1([S]_{\omega(\varepsilon \omega (\lambda))}) \subseteq f_2(S).
$$

Therefore

$$
|\mathcal{L}(f_1(S)) - \mathcal{L}(f_2(S))| \leq \mathcal{L}(f_1(S \setminus [S]_{\omega(\varepsilon \omega (\lambda))})).
$$

The set $S \setminus [S]_{\omega(\varepsilon \omega (\lambda))}$ can be covered by $\frac{\pi (d) \lambda^{d-1}}{\omega (\varepsilon \omega (\lambda))^{d-1}}$ cubes of side length $\omega (\varepsilon \omega (\lambda))$. Using the concavity of $\omega$, we get that the image of each of these cubes under $f_1$ is contained in a ball of radius $\sqrt{d} \omega (\varepsilon \omega (\lambda))$. Thus, the total measure of $f_1(S \setminus [S]_{\omega(\varepsilon \omega (\lambda))})$ is at most

$$
\pi (d) \left( \frac{\lambda}{\omega (\varepsilon \omega (\lambda))} \right)^{d-1} \omega (\varepsilon \omega (\lambda))^d.
$$

We conclude that

$$
|\mathcal{L}(f_1(S)) - \mathcal{L}(f_2(S))| \leq \pi (d) \left( \frac{\lambda}{\omega (\varepsilon \omega (\lambda))} \right)^{d-1} \omega (\varepsilon \omega (\lambda))^d = \pi (d) \left( \frac{\omega (\varepsilon \omega (\lambda))^d}{\lambda \omega (\varepsilon \omega (\lambda))^{d-1}} \right) \mathcal{L}(S).
$$

Since the above argument is completely symmetric with respect to $f_1$ and $f_2$, we also have

$$
|\mathcal{L}(f_2(S)) - \mathcal{L}(f_1(S))| \leq \pi (d) \left( \frac{\omega (\varepsilon \omega (\lambda))^d}{\lambda \omega (\varepsilon \omega (\lambda))^{d-1}} \right) \mathcal{L}(S).
$$

\[\square\]
We can now prove Lemma 4.12.

**Proof of Lemma 4.12.** Define a translation \( \phi: h([0, c] \times [0, c/N])^{d-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \) by

\[
\phi(h(x)) := h(x) + \frac{1}{N}(h(c \mathbf{e}_1) - h(0)), \quad x \in [0, c] \times [0, c/N]^{d-1}.
\]

Let the mappings \( f_1: S_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d, f_2: S_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \) be defined by \( f_1 := \phi \circ h \) and \( f_2(x) := h(x + \frac{c}{N} \mathbf{e}_1) \). Then \( f_1, f_2 \) are both bi-\( \omega \)-mappings of the cube \( S_i \in \mathcal{Q}^{d/N}_c \) which satisfy \( \|f_1 - f_2\|_{\infty} \leq \varepsilon \omega \left( \frac{N}{N_c} \right) \), due to (4.5). Applying Lemma 4.13, we get that

\[
|\mathcal{L}(\phi(h(S_i))) - \mathcal{L}(h(S_{i+1}))| \leq \pi(d) \left( \frac{\omega(\varepsilon \omega(\ell(S_i)))^d}{\ell(S_i) \omega(\varepsilon \omega(\ell(S_i)))^{d-1}} \right) \mathcal{L}(S_i).
\]

Since \( \phi \) is a translation, this establishes the required inequality. \( \square \)

### 4.5 Proof of Lemma 4.1.

The following proof is an easy adaptation of the proof of [5, Lem. 3.1].

**Proof of Lemma 4.1.** Let \( \overline{\omega}(t) := L \sqrt{\kappa} \omega(t) \) with \( a_{\overline{\omega}} = a_{\omega} \). Then \( \overline{\omega} \) clearly belongs to \( \mathcal{M} \). Let the sequences \( (N_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}, (M_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}, (c_i)_{i=1}^{\infty} \) and the number \( r = r(d, \overline{\omega}, \varepsilon, c) \in \mathbb{N} \) be defined according to Definition 4.5, with all these values using \( \overline{\omega} \) instead of \( \omega \). Let \( U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d \) be an open ball of radius at least \( 2c \). Since the conclusion of Lemma 4.1 is invariant under translation of the set \( U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d \), we may assume that \( B(0, 2c) \subseteq U \) so that

\[
[0, c] \times [0, c/N]^{d-1} \subseteq U.
\]

We are now ready to define the families of cubes \( \mathcal{S}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{S}_r \), making use of the sequences \( (N_i)_{i=1}^{\infty} \) and \( (c_i)_{i=1}^{\infty} \).

**Definition 4.14.** For each \( i \in [r] \) we define the family \( \mathcal{S}_i \subseteq \mathcal{Q}_{c/N_i} \) as the collection of all cubes of the form

\[
\left( \sum_{j=1}^{i} z_j \right) + \left[ \frac{(l - 1)c_i}{N_i}, \frac{lc_i}{N_i} \right] \times \left[ 0, \frac{c_i}{N_i} \right]^{d-1}
\]

where \( z_1 := 0, z_{j+1} \in c_j + 1 \mathbb{Z}^d \cap [0, c_j - c_{j+1}] \times [0, \frac{c_j}{N_j} - c_{j+1}]^{d-1} \) and \( l \in [N_j] \) for each \( j \geq 1 \).

Let us verify that the above defined families \( \mathcal{S}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{S}_r \) satisfy condition 1 in the statement of Lemma 4.1. It is immediate from Definition 4.14 that

\[
\bigcup \mathcal{S}_r \subseteq \bigcup \mathcal{S}_{r-1} \subseteq \cdots \subseteq \bigcup \mathcal{S}_1.
\]
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Thus, given $1 \leq i < r$ and $S \in S_i$, we have that
\[
S \cap \bigcup_{j=i+1}^{r} S_j \subseteq S \cap S_{i+1}.
\]

Therefore, computing the volume of the latter set comes down to counting the number of cubes in $S_{i+1}$ that intersect $S$. For the simple counting argument required, we refer the reader to [5, p. 613–614]. It gives the bound
\[
\mathcal{L} \left( S \cap \bigcup_{j=i+1}^{r} S_j \right) \leq \frac{(M_i + 1)^d}{M_i^d N_{i+1}} \left( \frac{c_i}{N_i} \right)^d \leq 2^d \frac{1}{N_{i+1}} \mathcal{L}(S) \leq \text{poly} \left( \varepsilon \right) \mathcal{L}(S),
\]
where, for the latter two inequalities, we use $\mathcal{L}(S) = (c_i/N_i)^d$ and the bound $N_{i+1} \geq \text{poly} \left( \varepsilon \right)$ (see Lemma 4.8). Thus, statement 1 is satisfied.

Turning now to statement 2, we consider a $k$-tuple $(h_1, \ldots, h_k)$ of bi-ω-mappings $h_t: U \to \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\max_{i \in [k]} \text{bi-ω}(h_t) \leq L$. We define a combined mapping $g: U \to \mathbb{R}^{kd}$ co-ordinate-wise by
\[
g^{(i-1)d+j}(x) := h_{i}^{(j)}(x)
\]
for $i \in [k]$ and $j \in [d]$. It is straightforward to verify that $g$ is a bi-ω-mapping with $\text{bi-ω}(g) \leq L \sqrt{k}$. This, in turn, implies that $g$ is a bi-$\varpi$-mapping with $\text{bi-}\varpi(g) \leq 1$.

The conditions of Lemma 4.6 are now satisfied for $d, \varpi, \varepsilon, (N_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}, (M_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}, (c_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$, $n = kd$, $h: [0, c_1] \times [0, c_1/N_1]^{d-1} \to \mathbb{R}^{kd}$ and $r = r(d, \varpi, \varepsilon, c)$. Let $p \in [r]$ and $z_1, \ldots, z_p \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be given by the conclusion of Lemma 4.6. Then statement 1 of Lemma 4.4 holds for the mapping $g_p: [0, c_p] \times [0, c_p/N_p]^{d-1} \to \mathbb{R}^{kd}$ defined by (4.10). Let $\Omega \subseteq [N_p - 1]$ be given by the assertion of Lemma 4.4, statement 1 for $g_p$. The co-ordinate functions of the mapping $g_p: [0, c_p] \times [0, c_p/N_p]^{d-1} \to \mathbb{R}^{kd}$ are defined by
\[
g_p^{((i-1)d+s)}(x) = g^{((i-1)d+s)} \left( x + \sum_{j=1}^{p} z_j \right) = h_i^{(s)} \left( x + \sum_{j=1}^{p} z_j \right)
\]
for $t \in [k]$, $s \in [d]$. Therefore for each $i \in \Omega$ and each $h_{t,p}: [0, c_p] \times [0, c_p/N_p]^{d-1} \to \mathbb{R}^{kd}$ defined by $h_{t,p}(x) := h_t(x + \sum_{j=1}^{p} z_j)$ for $t \in [k]$, we have that $h = h_{t,p}$ satisfies inequality (4.5) on $S_i := \left[ \frac{(i-1)c_p}{N_p}, \frac{ic_p}{N_p} \right] \times \left[ 0, \frac{c_p}{N_p} \right]^{d-1}$.

We fix $i \in \Omega$. Then the conditions of Lemma 4.12 are satisfied for $\varpi, \varepsilon, d, N = N_p, c = c_p, h = h_{t,p}$ for each $t \in [k]$ and $i$. Hence, for $\lambda_p := \ell(S_i) = \frac{N_p}{c_p}$ we have
\[
|\mathcal{L}(h_{t,p}(S_i)) - \mathcal{L}(h_{t,p}(S_{i+1}))| \leq \pi(d) \left( \frac{\varpi(\varpi(\varpi(\lambda_p)))^d}{\lambda_p^d(\varpi(\varpi(\lambda_p)))^d} \right) \mathcal{L}(S_i),
\]
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which can be bounded above using the concavity of $\varpi$ and the trivial bound $\varpi \geq \omega$ as

$$\pi(d, L, k) \left( \frac{\omega(\varepsilon \omega(\lambda_p)))^d}{\lambda_p \omega(\varepsilon \omega(\lambda_p)))^{d-1}} \right) \mathcal{L}(S_i).$$

Set $S = \sum_{j=1}^p z_j + S_i$ and $S' = \sum_{j=1}^p z_j + S_{i+1}$. It is clear upon reference to Definition 4.14 that $S$ and $S'$ are $e_1$-adjacent cubes belonging to the family $S_p$. Moreover, we have $h_t(S) = h_t(S_i)$ and $h_t(S') = h_t(S_{i+1})$ for all $t \in [k]$. Therefore $S$ and $S'$ verify statement 2 of Lemma 4.1 for the $k$-tuple $(h_1, \ldots, h_k)$. This completes the proof of Lemma 4.1.

5 Discussion and open problems.

As we noted before, it was first proven by Rivière and Ye [11] that any continuous $\rho: I^d \to (0, \infty)$ admits solutions $f$ to the pushforward equation

$$f^* \rho \mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}|_{f^*(I^d)}$$

(5.1)

lying inside the intersection of all classes of bi-Hölder mappings with the Hölder exponent $\alpha < 1$. It is natural to ask what is the sharp threshold between realisability and non-realisability, say, for continuous functions.

We stated and proved our results only for certain special families of moduli of continuity. However, the only information about a modulus $\omega(t)$ that determines whether there is bi-$\omega$ solution $f$ to (5.1) or not is the rate of growth of $\omega(t)$ as $t$ goes to 0. It is clear that whenever one can find modulus $\omega(t)$ for which there is bi-$\omega'$ non-realisable density $\rho$ and, at the same time, there is $t_0 > 0$ such that $\omega(t) \leq \omega'(t)$ for every $t \in (0, t_0)$, then $\rho$ is bi-$\omega'$ non-realisable as well.

The techniques presented here yield that a generic continuous function $\rho$ is bi-$\omega$ non-realisable for $\omega(t) = t \log(1/t)^{\alpha_0}$, where $0 < \alpha_0 < 1$ is very small and depending on $d$. It seems unlikely to us that the same technique could be used to prove the existence of bi-$\omega$ non-realisable functions with respect to $\omega(t) = t \log(1/t)$, say. One of the key reason is that in order to argue that the expression $\kappa(\varepsilon) = \kappa(d, \omega, L, k, \varepsilon)$ from Lemma 4.2 stays at least bounded, one would need a very good upper bound on $r(\varepsilon)$, namely something as good as $O(1/\sqrt{\varepsilon})$, probably even better. But this seems out of the reach of the present technique, because the bound on $r(\varepsilon)$ we can obtain must be of order $\Omega\left(\frac{1}{\varphi(\varepsilon)}\right)$. And the best bound on $\varphi(\varepsilon)$ for the Lipschitz modulus $\omega(t) = t$, even in dimension $d = 1$, that we could come up with is of order $\Theta(\varepsilon^3)$. While it would obviously be possible to get tighter bounds on various parameters at several places, we believe that these improvements could at best provide a quantitative estimate on $\alpha_0$, which would be much less than 1 and could not settle the case of $\alpha_0 \geq 1$. 33
Question 5.1. Are there any bi-$\omega$ non-realisable continuous functions $I^d \to (0, \infty)$ for $\omega(t) = t\log(1/t)$?

Thanks to Lemma 3.4, a positive answer to the above question would immediately yield a separated net non-bi-$\omega$ equivalent to $\mathbb{Z}^d$. The same would be true if one provided a bi-$\omega$ non-realisable function $\rho \in L^\infty(I^d)$ with both its essential infimum and supremum in $(0, \infty)$.

In [5] the authors and Kopecká answered negatively a question of Feige [9, Quest. 2.12] (see also [5, Quest. 1.1]), by showing that the integer lattice $\mathbb{Z}^d$ contains finite sets which are in some sense arbitrarily far away from a regular grid. The result may be stated precisely as follows. For a set $S \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$ containing precisely $n^d$ points for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let $L_S$ denote the best Lipschitz constant of any (bijective) mapping of $S$ onto the regular grid $\{1, \ldots, n\}^d$.

Put differently, let

$$L_S := \inf \left\{ \text{Lip}(f) \mid f: S \to \{1, \ldots, n\}^d \text{ is a bijection} \right\}.$$ 

The main result (Theorem 1.2) of [5] states that the sequence

$$C_n := \sup \left\{ L_S : S \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d, |S| = n^d \right\}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N},$$

is unbounded.

We propose the name ‘Feige sequence’ for the sequence $(C_n)_{n=1}^\infty$. Whilst [5] verifies that the Feige sequence is unbounded, there are no non-trivial bounds on its rate of growth. However, the study of $\omega$-realisability of measurable densities initiated in the present work could lead to progress on this problem and provide lower bounds on $C_n$. We put forward the following strategy: Assume that $C_n$ grows asymptotically slower than $n\omega\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)$, where $\omega$ is a concave modulus of continuity satisfying some additional mild conditions (such as those imposed on the family $M$ in the present work). Then, modification of the argument of [5, Thm. 5.2] leads to the conclusion that for every measurable density $\rho: I^d \to (0, \infty)$ with $0 < \inf \rho \leq \sup \rho < \infty$ there is a $\omega$-continuous mapping $f: I^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfying (5.1). Thus, finding $\rho$ for which (5.1) has no $\omega$-continuous solutions provides a contradiction and delivers the asymptotic lower bound $C_n \geq n\omega\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)$ on the Feige sequence. In the present article, we have verified existence of densities $\rho$ excluding bi-$\omega$ solutions of (5.1); the next task is to exclude solutions in the much larger class of non-homeomorphisms.
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