

Differentiation properties of class $L^1([0, 1]^2)$ with respect to two different basis of rectangles

Michihiro Hirayama^{*1} and Davit Karagulyan^{†2}

¹Department of Mathematics, University of Tsukuba, Tennodai, Ibaraki 305-8571, Japan

²KTH Royal Institute of Technology, SE-100 44 Stockholm, Sweden

Abstract

It is a well known result by Saks [8] that there exist a function $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ so that for almost every $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$

$$\lim_{\substack{\text{diam} R \rightarrow 0, \\ (x, y) \in R \in \mathcal{R}}} \left| \frac{1}{|R|} \int_R f(x, y) dx dy \right| = \infty,$$

where $\mathcal{R} = \{[a, b] \times [c, d] : a < b, c < d\}$. In this note we address the following question: assume we have two different collections of rectangles; under which conditions there exists a function $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ so that its integral averages are divergence with respect to one collection and convergence with respect to another? More specifically, let $\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{C} \subset (0, 1]$ and consider rectangles with side lengths in \mathcal{D} and respectively in \mathcal{C} . We show that if the sets \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{C} are sufficiently “far” from each other, then such a function can be constructed. We also show that in the class of positive functions our condition is also necessary for such a function to exist.

1 Introduction

Let $\mathcal{R} = \{[a, b] \times [c, d]\}$ be the set of all rectangles with their sides parallel to the coordinate axis. Given a collection $\mathcal{C} \subset (0, 1]$, let $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{C}} \subset \mathcal{R}$ be the collection of all rectangles $[a, b] \times [c, d]$ so that $b - a \in \mathcal{C}$ and $d - c \in \mathcal{C}$.

Definition 1.1. *A family of rectangles $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{R}$ is said to be a basis of differentiation (or simply a basis), if for any point $z \in \mathbb{R}^2$ there exists a sequence of rectangles $R_k \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $z \in R_k$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\text{diam} R_k \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$.*

Let $\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D} \subset (0, 1]$ be two collections. Thus $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{C}}$ and $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{D}}$ will be basis of differentiation if and only if $\liminf \mathcal{C} = 0$ and $\liminf \mathcal{D} = 0$. Let $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{R}$ be a differentiation basis. For any function $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ we define

$$\delta_{\mathcal{M}}(z, f) = \limsup_{\substack{\text{diam} R \rightarrow 0, \\ z \in R \in \mathcal{M}}} \left| \frac{1}{|R|} \int_R f dm - f(z) \right|.$$

^{*}hirayama@math.tsukuba.ac.jp

[†]davitk@kth.se

Here and below, we denote by m or $|\cdot|$ the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R}^2 . The function $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ is said to be differentiable at a point $z \in \mathbb{R}^2$ with respect to the basis \mathcal{M} , if $\delta_{\mathcal{M}}(z, f) = 0$. Denote

$$\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{M}) = \{f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^2) : \delta_{\mathcal{M}}(z, f) = 0, m\text{-a.e. } z \in \mathbb{R}^2\}.$$

Let $\Phi: \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ be a convex function. Denote by $\Phi(L)(\mathbb{R}^2)$ the class of measurable functions f defined on \mathbb{R}^2 such that $\Phi(|f|) \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$. If Φ satisfies the Δ_2 -condition $\Phi(2x) \leq k\Phi(x)$, then $\Phi(L)(\mathbb{R}^2)$ turns to be an Orlicz space with the norm

$$\|f\|_{\Phi} = \inf \left\{ c > 0 : \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \Phi\left(\frac{|f|}{c}\right) dm \leq 1 \right\}.$$

The following classical theorems of Jessen, Marcinkiewicz, and Zygmund [5], and Saks [8] determine the optimal Orlicz space, which functions have a.e. differentiable integrals with respect to the entire family of rectangles \mathcal{R} is the space

$$L(1 + \log L)(\mathbb{R}^2) \subset L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$$

corresponding to the case $\Phi(t) = t(1 + \log^+ t)$. See also [2].

Theorem 1.2 (Jessen-Marcinkiewicz-Zygmund [5]). *If*

$$f \in L(1 + \log L)(\mathbb{R}^2),$$

then

$$\delta_{\mathcal{R}}(z, f) = 0$$

for m -almost every $z \in \mathbb{R}^2$.

Theorem 1.3 (Saks [8]). *If*

$$\Phi(t) = o(t \log t) \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty,$$

then $\Phi(L)(\mathbb{R}^2) \not\subset \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{R})$. Moreover, there exists a positive function $f \in \Phi(L)(\mathbb{R}^2)$ such that $\delta_{\mathcal{R}}(z, f) = \infty$ everywhere.

In this paper, we are interested in differentiability property of class $L^1([0, 1]^2)$ with respect to two basis $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{C}}$ and $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{D}}$. We investigate conditions under which there exists a function $f \in L^1([0, 1]^2)$, so that

$$\delta_{\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{C}}}(z, f) = 0 \text{ for } m\text{-almost every } z \in [0, 1]^2$$

and

$$\delta_{\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{D}}}(z, f) \neq 0 \text{ for } m\text{-almost every } z \in [0, 1]^2.$$

To the best of the authors knowledge there is only one result that has some relation to the problem considered in this note. In [7] the authors study equivalence of differentiation basis of dyadic rectangles. More specifically consider the basis

$$\mathcal{R}^{\text{dyadic}} = \left\{ \left[\frac{i-1}{2^n}, \frac{i}{2^n} \right) \times \left[\frac{j-1}{2^m}, \frac{j}{2^m} \right) : i, j, n, m \in \mathbb{Z} \right\}. \quad (1)$$

Let $\Delta = \{\nu_k : k = 1, 2, \dots\}$ be an increasing sequence of positive integers. This sequence generates the rare basis $\mathcal{R}_{\Delta}^{\text{dyadic}}$ of dyadic rectangles of the form (1) with $n, m \in \Delta$. This kind of bases have

also been considered in several papers [3, 4, 6, 9]. In [7] the authors study under which conditions the basis $\mathcal{R}^{\text{dyadic}}$ will be equivalent to the basis given by $\mathcal{R}_{\Delta}^{\text{dyadic}}$. We remark that although in [7] one only considers dyadic rectangles, this case can be compared with $\mathcal{D} = [0, 1] \setminus \mathcal{C}$ in our case.

Unlike the results considered above, in this note we consider the problem in full generality, namely we are interested in all rectangles with their sides in \mathcal{C} or \mathcal{D} that contain the point of differentiation.

The paper is self contained and uses some methods from analysis and probability theory.

2 Main results

Intuitively, in order to have divergence and convergence phenomena simultaneously, the two set \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} have to be far from each other. We now formalize this intuition. For each $x \in \mathcal{D}$, we define the following two numbers

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{x} &= \sup \{a \in \mathcal{C} : a < x\}, \\ \underline{x} &= \inf \{a \in \mathcal{C} : a > x\}.\end{aligned}$$

The ratios \bar{x}/x and x/\underline{x} denote that distance of x from the set \mathcal{C} from below and above. We prove the following theorem.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D} \subset (0, 1]$ and assume*

$$\liminf_{x \rightarrow 0, x \in \mathcal{D}} \left(\max \left\{ \frac{\bar{x}}{x}, \frac{x}{\underline{x}} \right\} \right) = 0.$$

Then there exists a function $f \in L^1([0, 1]^2, m)$ so that for m -almost all $z \in [0, 1]^2$

$$\delta_{\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{C}}}(z, f) = 0,$$

and

$$\delta_{\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{D}}}(z, f) = \infty.$$

The function that will be constructed in Theorem 2.1 is unbounded both from above and below. This leads as to the following question

Question. *Does there exist a positive function f satisfying the conditions of Theorem 2.1?*

We have the following theorem in the opposite direction

Theorem 2.2. *Let $\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D} \subset (0, 1]$ and assume that*

$$\liminf_{x \rightarrow 0, x \in \mathcal{D}} \left(\max \left\{ \frac{\bar{x}}{x}, \frac{x}{\underline{x}} \right\} \right) > 0.$$

Let $f \in L^1([0, 1]^2, m)$, with $f \geq 0$ almost surely. If

$$\delta_{\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{C}}}(z, f) = 0 \quad \text{for } m\text{-almost every } z \in [0, 1]^2,$$

then

$$\delta_{\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{D}}}(z, f) = 0 \quad \text{for } m\text{-almost every } z \in [0, 1]^2.$$

The proof of Theorem 2.1 is based on the following theorem.

Theorem 2.3. *For every $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$ and $n > 0$, there exist a function $f \in L^\infty([0, 1]^2, m)$, $\eta = \eta(\varepsilon, \delta, n) \in (0, \delta)$ and a set $Q \subset [0, 1]^2$, so that*

$$\|f\|_{L^1(m)} \leq 4 + o(1), \quad (2)$$

and $|Q| > 1 - \varepsilon$ such that

(i) *If $z \in Q$ and $z \in A \in \mathcal{R}_C$, then*

$$\left| \frac{1}{|A|} \int_A f dm \right| \leq 2.$$

(ii) *If $z \in Q$, then there exists $B \in \mathcal{R}_D$, with $z \in B$ and $|B| > \eta$, so that*

$$\left| \frac{1}{|B|} \int_B f dm \right| > n.$$

(iii) *For every $R \in \mathcal{R}$ with $|R| > \delta$, we have*

$$\left| \frac{1}{|R|} \int_R f dm \right| < 1.$$

3 Preliminaries

3.1 Auxiliary construction

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Given a decreasing sequence $b_1 > b_2 > \dots > b_n > \dots > b_{2n}$, let

$$B_1 = [0, b_1] \times [0, b_{2n}], B_2 = [0, b_2] \times [0, b_{2n-1}], \dots, B_n = [0, b_n] \times [0, b_{n+1}].$$

Here the first factor is the height and the second one is the width. Suppose that the sequence (b_j) satisfies

$$b_1 b_{2n} \leq b_2 b_{2n-1} \leq \dots \leq b_{n-1} b_{n+2} \leq b_n b_{n+1}. \quad (3)$$

In other words, we suppose that

$$|B_1| \leq |B_2| \leq \dots \leq |B_{n-1}| \leq |B_n|.$$

For $j = 1, \dots, n-1$, let $q_j \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $q_j = \lfloor |B_{j+1}| / |B_j| \rfloor$.

Let Θ be the set of $(\theta_{n-1}, \theta_{n-2}, \dots, \theta_2, \theta_1)$ with $\theta_j \in \{0, 1, \dots, q_j\}$ satisfying the following condition: if $\theta_k = 0$ for some k , then $\theta_l = 0$ for every $l \in \{k, k-1, \dots, 1\}$. For each $\theta = (\theta_{n-1}, \theta_{n-2}, \dots, \theta_1) \in \Theta$, let

$$|\theta| = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if all } \theta_j \neq 0 \\ \max\{1 \leq j \leq n-1 : \theta_j = 0\} + 1, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and define rectangles $B(\theta)$ as follows. For $\theta \in \Theta$ with $|\theta| = n$, that is $\theta_{n-1} = 0$, we let

$$B(\theta) = [0, b_n] \times [0, b_{n+1}] = B_n.$$

For $\theta \in \Theta$ with $|\theta| \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$, we let

$$B(\theta) = [0, b_{|\theta|}] \times \left[\sum_{j=|\theta|}^{n-1} (\theta_j - 1)b_{2n+1-j}, \sum_{j=|\theta|}^{n-1} (\theta_j - 1)b_{2n+1-j} + b_{2n+1-|\theta|} \right],$$

where note that $\theta_{n-1} \in \{1, \dots, q_{n-1}\}$ as $|\theta| \neq n$. Note also that for each $\theta \in \Theta$, one has $|B(\theta)| = b_{|\theta|}b_{2n+1-|\theta|}$.

Define subsets of $[0, 1]^2$ by

$$E = \bigcup_{\theta \in \Theta} B(\theta) \quad \text{and} \quad F = \bigcup_{\substack{\theta \in \Theta: \\ |\theta| < n}} B(\theta).$$

One has

$$\begin{aligned} E &= \bigcup_{j=1}^n \bigcup_{|\theta|=j} B(\theta) = \left(\bigcup_{j=1}^{n-1} \bigcup_{|\theta|=j} B(\theta) \right) \cup B_n, \\ F &= \bigcup_{j=1}^{n-1} \bigcup_{|\theta|=j} B(\theta), \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where for every $j \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ there are $q_{n-1} \cdots q_j$ -many rectangles $B(\theta)$ of $|\theta| = j$.

3.2 Area estimates

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose that there is $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ such that $b_{k+1}/b_k < \lambda$ for every $k = 1, \dots, 2n-1$. Then one has*

$$\frac{1}{n} + \frac{1-\lambda}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \frac{q_{n-1} \cdots q_j}{(q_{n-1}+1) \cdots (q_j+1)} \leq \frac{|E|}{n|B_n|} \leq 1, \tag{5}$$

and

$$\frac{1-\lambda}{n-1} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \frac{q_{n-1} \cdots q_j}{(q_{n-1}+1) \cdots (q_j+1)} \leq \frac{|F|}{(n-1)|B_n|} \leq 1. \tag{6}$$

Proof. By construction, one has

$$\begin{aligned} |E| &= b_n b_{n+1} + q_{n-1} b_{n+2} (b_{n-1} - b_n) + q_{n-1} q_{n-2} b_{n+3} (b_{n-2} - b_{n-1}) \\ &\quad + \cdots + q_{n-1} \cdots q_1 b_{2n} (b_1 - b_2) \\ &= |B_n| + q_{n-1} |B_{n-1}| + q_{n-1} q_{n-2} |B_{n-2}| + \cdots + q_{n-1} \cdots q_1 |B_1| \\ &\quad - (q_{n-1} b_{n+2} b_n + q_{n-1} q_{n-2} b_{n+3} b_{n-1} + \cdots + q_{n-1} \cdots q_1 b_{2n} b_2). \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$q_{n-1} \cdots q_{j+1} q_j |B_j| \leq q_{n-1} \cdots q_{j+1} |B_{j+1}| \leq \cdots \leq q_{n-1} |B_{n-1}| \leq |B_n|$$

for every $j = 1, \dots, n-1$, it follows that $|E| \leq n|B_n|$.

On the other hand, one has

$$\frac{|E|}{n|B_n|} = \frac{|B_n| + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} q_{n-1} \cdots q_j b_{2n+1-j} (b_j - b_{j+1})}{n|B_n|}$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \frac{q_{n-1} \cdots q_j b_{2n+1-j} (b_j - b_{j+1})}{|B_n|}.$$

Since

$$|B_n| \leq (q_{n-1} + 1) |B_{n-1}| \leq \cdots \leq (q_{n-1} + 1) \cdots (q_j + 1) |B_j|$$

for each $j = 1, \dots, n-1$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{q_{n-1} \cdots q_j b_{2n+1-j} (b_j - b_{j+1})}{|B_n|} &\geq \frac{q_{n-1} \cdots q_j}{(q_{n-1} + 1) \cdots (q_j + 1)} \frac{b_{2n+1-j} (b_j - b_{j+1})}{b_j b_{2n+1-j}} \\ &= \frac{q_{n-1} \cdots q_j}{(q_{n-1} + 1) \cdots (q_j + 1)} \left(1 - \frac{b_j}{b_{j+1}}\right) \\ &\geq \frac{q_{n-1} \cdots q_j}{(q_{n-1} + 1) \cdots (q_j + 1)} (1 - \lambda), \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\frac{|E|}{n|B_n|} \geq \frac{1}{n} + \frac{1 - \lambda}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \frac{q_{n-1} \cdots q_j}{(q_{n-1} + 1) \cdots (q_j + 1)}.$$

We have obtained (5). Since the proof of (6) is same as that of (5), we omit it. \square

Let

$$\begin{aligned} K_E &= \left(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{1 - \lambda}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \frac{q_{n-1} \cdots q_j}{(q_{n-1} + 1) \cdots (q_j + 1)} \right)^{-1}, \\ K_F &= \left(\frac{1 - \lambda}{n-1} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \frac{q_{n-1} \cdots q_j}{(q_{n-1} + 1) \cdots (q_j + 1)} \right)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Then it follows from (5) and (6) in Lemma 3.1 that

$$K_E^{-1} \frac{n}{n-1} \leq \frac{|E|}{|F|} \leq K_F \frac{n}{n-1}. \quad (7)$$

Notice that $K_E, K_F \geq 1$ and they can be arbitrarily close to one by taking $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ small and (b_n) relevantly.

4 Main Lemma

Without loss of generality we can assume that \mathcal{D} is a sequence, i.e. $\mathcal{D} = \{b_n\}_{n \geq 1}$. For each $b_n \in \mathcal{D}$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{a}_n &= \sup \{a \in \mathcal{C} : a < b_n\}, \\ \underline{a}_n &= \inf \{a \in \mathcal{C} : a > b_n\}. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that we are given $\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D} \subset (0, 1]$, where $\mathcal{D} = \{b_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, and assume

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\max \left\{ \frac{\bar{a}_n}{b_n}, \frac{b_n}{\underline{a}_n} \right\} \right) = 0. \quad (8)$$

Throughout this section, we assume (8). In this section, we prove the following lemma which will play a fundamental role for the proof of Theorems.

Lemma 4.1. *Given $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exist sets $F, D \subset [0, 1]^2$, a function $h \in L^1([0, 1]^2, m)$, and $\eta = \eta(\varepsilon, \delta, n) \in (0, \delta)$ satisfying $|D| \leq \varepsilon|F|$ and*

$$\frac{\|h\|_{L^1(m)}}{|F|} = 2 + o(1), \quad (9)$$

such that for every $z \in [0, 1]^2$ we have the following.

(i) *If $z \notin D$ and $z \in A \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{C}}$, then*

$$\left| \frac{1}{|A|} \int_A h \, dm \right| \leq 1.$$

(ii) *If $z \in F$, then there exists $B \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{D}}$, with $z \in B$ and $|B| > \eta$, so that*

$$\left| \frac{1}{|B|} \int_B h \, dm \right| > n.$$

(iii) *For every $R \in \mathcal{R}$ with $|R| > \delta$, we have*

$$\left| \frac{1}{|R|} \int_R h \, dm \right| < 1/2.$$

4.1 Proof of Lemma 4.1

We start with construction of a function and sets in the following two sections. Then we complete the proof of Lemma 4.1 in Section 4.1.3.

4.1.1 Construction of the function

Define $\Theta^* = \{\theta \in \Theta : |\theta| = 1\}$. For $\tau \in (0, b_{2n})$ and $\theta \in \Theta^*$, define a subset of $B(\theta)$ by

$$B_\tau(\theta) = [0, \tau] \times \left[\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} (\theta_j - 1)b_{2n+1-j}, \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} (\theta_j - 1)b_{2n+1-j} + \tau \right].$$

Namely $B_\tau(\theta)$ is the square with side lengths τ at the bottom left corner of $B(\theta)$ for $\theta \in \Theta^*$. Define also $\sigma: \Theta^* \rightarrow \{1, -1\}$ by

$$\sigma(\theta) = \begin{cases} +1, & \text{if } \theta_{n-1} \text{ is odd,} \\ -1, & \text{if } \theta_{n-1} \text{ is even.} \end{cases}$$

Then define $h: [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$h(z) = \begin{cases} \sigma(\theta) \frac{n|B_n|}{\tau^2 q_1 \cdots q_{n-1}}, & \text{if } z \in B_\tau(\theta) \text{ for some } \theta \in \Theta^*, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

Lemma 4.2. *For every $\theta \in \Theta$, one has*

$$n \leq \frac{1}{|B(\theta)|} \left| \int_{B(\theta)} h \, dm \right| \leq n \prod_{j=|\theta|}^{n-1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{q_j} \right).$$

Proof. By construction, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{B(\theta)} h \, dm \right| &= \frac{n|B_n|}{\tau^2 q_1 \cdots q_{n-1}} \times |B(\theta) \cap \text{supp}h| \\ &= \frac{n|B_n|}{\tau^2 q_1 \cdots q_{n-1}} \times \begin{cases} \tau^2 q_1 \cdots q_{|\theta|-1}, & |\theta| > 1 \\ \tau^2, & |\theta| = 1 \end{cases} \\ &= \frac{n|B_n|}{q_{|\theta|} \cdots q_{n-1}}, \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\frac{1}{|B(\theta)|} \left| \int_{B(\theta)} h \, dm \right| = \frac{1}{|B(\theta)|} \frac{n|B_n|}{q_{|\theta|} \cdots q_{n-1}} \geq \frac{n|B_n|}{|B_n|} = n.$$

Since $|B_n| \leq (q_{n-1} + 1)|B_{n-1}| \leq \cdots \leq (q_{n-1} + 1) \cdots (q_{|\theta|} + 1)|B(\theta)|$, one also has

$$\frac{1}{|B(\theta)|} \left| \int_{B(\theta)} h \, dm \right| = \frac{1}{|B(\theta)|} \frac{n|B_n|}{q_{|\theta|} \cdots q_{n-1}} \leq n \prod_{j=|\theta|}^{n-1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{q_j} \right).$$

□

Lemma 4.3. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then we have*

$$2 \leq \frac{\|h\|_{L^1(m)}}{|E|} \leq 2K_E, \quad (11)$$

and

$$2K_E^{-1} \frac{n}{n-1} \leq \frac{\|h\|_{L^1(m)}}{|F|} \leq 2K_E K_F \frac{n}{n-1}. \quad (12)$$

Proof. Note first that

$$\|h\|_{L^1([0,1]^2, m)} = 2 \int_F |h| \, dm.$$

It follows from the construction that

$$\int_F |h| \, dm = \frac{n|B_n|}{\tau^2 q_1 \cdots q_{n-1}} \times |F \cap \text{supp}h| = \frac{n|B_n|}{\tau^2 q_1 \cdots q_{n-1}} \times \tau^2 q_1 \cdots q_{n-1} = n|B_n|,$$

and hence Lemma 3.1-(5) implies (11). By using (7), we have (12) from (11). □

4.1.2 Construction of the exceptional set D

Let h be the function of the form (10) defined in Section 4.1.1. In this section, we will construct a set D while examining the integral averages of h with respect to $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{C}}$ by making use of the condition (8). Indeed, one uses the following property on the two sets \mathcal{C} and $\mathcal{D} = \{b_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$. The proof is a direct consequence of the condition (8), and is omitted.

Lemma 4.4. *Assume the condition (8). Given $b_1 > \dots > b_n$, and $\lambda_k \in (0, 1)$ for $k = 1, \dots, n$, one can choose $b_{n+1} > \dots > b_{2n}$ such that*

$$\frac{\bar{a}_{n+k}}{b_{n+k}} \leq \lambda_k \frac{b_{n-k+1}}{\bar{a}_{n-k}},$$

and

$$\frac{b_{n+k}}{\underline{a}_{n+k}} \leq \lambda_k \frac{\bar{a}_{n-k+1}}{b_{n-k+1}}$$

for $k = 1, \dots, n$, where $\bar{a}_0 = 1$ as a convention.

Henceforth, we denote rectangles with side lengths x and y by A_{xy} , where x is the length of vertical side and y is that of the horizontal one. In other words, we assume that x is the height and y is the width of our rectangle. Let

$$\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{C}} = \{A_{xy} \subset [0, 1]^2 : A_{xy} \cap \text{supp} h \neq \emptyset, x, y \in \mathcal{C}\}.$$

We primarily divide our argument into the following cases with respect to the heights of $A_{xy} \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{C}}$: 1) $x \leq b_{n+1}$, 2) $x \in (b_n, b_1]$, 3) $x > b_1$, and 4) $x \in (b_{n+1}, b_n]$.

Case 1) $x \leq b_{n+1}$: By assumption (8), take b_{n+1} so that

$$\frac{\bar{a}_{n+1}}{b_{n+1}} \ll b_n.$$

(Here and below, we will sometimes write $X \ll Y$ if for a given $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ one can take X so small that $X \leq \lambda Y$.) Then for every $y \in (0, 1]$ one has

$$xy \leq x \leq \bar{a}_{n+1} \ll b_n b_{n+1} = |B_n|.$$

Let

$$D_1 = \bigcup_{A_{xy} \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{C}}} \{\text{int} A_{xy} : (x, y) \in (0, b_{n+1}] \times (0, 1]\}.$$

Case 2) $b_n < x \leq b_1$: There is $r = r(x) \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ such that

$$b_{r+1} < x \leq b_r.$$

We consider two cases depending on the side y .

2-i) The case $y > b_{2n-r}$. We begin with the case where $A = A_{xy}$ contains $B(\theta) \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{D}}$ with $|\theta| = r+1$, that is height b_{r+1} and width b_{2n-r} . More precisely, there is $p = p(y) \in \mathbb{N}$ such

that A contains p -many disjoint copies of $B_{|\theta|} = B_{r+1}$ and does not contain $(p+1)$ -many disjoint copies of it. We then have by Lemma 4.2 that

$$\int_A h \, dm \leq |B(\theta)|(p+2)n \prod_{j=r+1}^{n-1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{q_j}\right).$$

Since A contains a rectangle of height x and width pb_{2n-r} , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{|A|} \int_A h \, dm &\leq \frac{(p+2)nb_{r+1}b_{2n-r}}{xpb_{2n-r}} \prod_{j=r+1}^{n-1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{q_j}\right) \\ &= n \frac{p+2}{p} \frac{b_{r+1}}{x} \prod_{j=r+1}^{n-1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{q_j}\right) \\ &\leq n \frac{p+2}{p} \frac{b_{r+1}}{\underline{a}_{r+1}} \prod_{j=r+1}^{n-1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{q_j}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Next, suppose that A contains no rectangles $B(\theta) \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{D}}$ with $|\theta| = r+1$, that is the case of $p = 0$. One still has

$$\frac{1}{|A|} \int_A h \, dm \leq \frac{2nb_{r+1}b_{2n-r}}{xy} \prod_{j=r+1}^{n-1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{q_j}\right) \leq 2n \frac{b_{r+1}}{\underline{a}_{r+1}} \frac{b_{2n-r}}{\underline{a}_{2n-r}} \prod_{j=r+1}^{n-1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{q_j}\right). \quad (14)$$

2-ii) The case $y \leq b_{2n-r}$. By definition, one has

$$\frac{y}{b_{2n-r}} \leq \frac{\bar{a}_{2n-r}}{b_{2n-r}} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{b_{r+1}}{x} \geq \frac{b_{r+1}}{\bar{a}_r}.$$

By applying Lemma 4.4 with $k = n - r$, one obtains

$$\frac{\bar{a}_{2n-r}}{b_{2n-r}} \leq \lambda \frac{b_{r+1}}{\bar{a}_r},$$

and thus

$$\frac{y}{b_{2n-r}} \leq \frac{\bar{a}_{2n-r}}{b_{2n-r}} \leq \lambda \frac{b_{r+1}}{\bar{a}_r} \leq \lambda \frac{b_{r+1}}{x},$$

which means $xy \leq \lambda b_{r+1} b_{2n-r} = |B_{r+1}|$.

Let

$$D_2 = \bigcup_{r=1}^{n-1} \bigcup_{A_{xy} \in \mathcal{A}_C} \{\text{int} A_{xy} : (x, y) \in (b_{r+1}, b_r] \times (b_{2n-r+1}, b_{2n-r}]\}.$$

Case 3) $x > b_1$: We divide into two cases as follows.

3-i) The case $y > b_{2n}$. By the same argument as Case 2-i), one can show the convergence of integral averages of h over A_{xy} .

3-ii) The case $y \leq b_{2n}$. As in Case 2-ii), one obtains

$$\frac{y}{b_{2n}} \leq \frac{\bar{a}_{2n}}{b_{2n}} \leq \lambda \frac{b_1}{\bar{a}_0} \leq \lambda \frac{b_1}{x}$$

with making use of Lemma 4.4 with $k = n$, and hence $xy \leq \lambda b_1 b_{2n} = \lambda |B_1|$. Let

$$D_3 = \bigcup_{A_{xy} \in \mathcal{A}_C} \{\text{int} A_{xy} : (x, y) \in (b_1, 1] \times (0, b_{2n}]\}.$$

Case 4) $b_{n+1} < x \leq b_n$: We divide into two cases as follows.

4-i) The case $y > b_{n+1}$. For such an $A = A_{xy} \in \mathcal{A}_C$, it follows from the definition of h (10) that either $\int_A h \, dm = 0$ or there are at most two $\theta, \theta' \in \Theta$ with $|\theta| = |\theta'| = n - 1$ such that

$$\left| \int_A h \, dm \right| \leq \int_A |h| \, dm \leq \int_{B(\theta)} |h| \, dm + \int_{B(\theta')} |h| \, dm.$$

In the latter case, one has

$$\frac{1}{|A|} \left| \int_A h \, dm \right| \leq \frac{2}{|A|} \int_{B(\theta)} |h| \, dm \leq 2 \frac{|B(\theta)|}{|A|} n \left(1 + \frac{1}{q_{n-1}} \right)$$

by Lemma 4.2. Since

$$|B(\theta)| = b_{|\theta|} b_{2n+1-|\theta|} = b_{n-1} b_{n+2} \leq b_{n+2}$$

it follows that

$$\frac{1}{|A|} \left| \int_A h \, dm \right| \leq 4n \frac{b_{n+2}}{|A|} \leq 4n \frac{b_{n+2}}{b_{n+1}^2}. \quad (15)$$

4-ii) The case $y \leq b_{n+1}$. One has $xy \ll b_n b_{n+1} = |B_n|$ by (8). Let

$$D_4 = \bigcup_{A_{xy} \in \mathcal{A}_C} \{\text{int} A_{xy} : (x, y) \in (b_{n+1}, b_n] \times (0, b_{n+1}]\}.$$

Now we set

$$D = D_1 \cup D_2 \cup D_3 \cup D_4. \quad (16)$$

Observe here that D_4 is covered by D_2 , hence one has $D = D_1 \cup D_2 \cup D_3$.

Lemma 4.5. *Given $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, one can define F and D such that $|D| \leq \varepsilon |F|$.*

Proof. We see that D_1 is covered by a rectangle R with height $2(\bar{a}_{n+1} + \tau q_{n-1})$ and width 1. Then by the assumption (8),

$$|D_1| \leq |R| = 2(\bar{a}_{n+1} + \tau q_{n-1}) \ll 2(b_n b_{n+1} + \tau q_{n-1}) = 2(|B_n| + \tau q_{n-1}).$$

Next, we estimate $|D_2|$. As we have seen in Case 2-ii), the area of each rectangle A_{xy} with $(x, y) \in (b_{r+1}, b_r] \times (b_{2n-r+1}, b_{2n-r}]$ is estimated as

$$|A_{xy}| = xy \leq \bar{a}_r \bar{a}_{2n-r} \leq \lambda |B_{r+1}|$$

for each $r \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$. Here, it follows from Lemma 4.4 with $k = n-r$ that

$$\bar{a}_r \bar{a}_{2n-r} \leq \lambda b_{r+1} b_{2n-r}$$

and

$$b_{r+1} b_{2n-r} \leq \lambda \bar{a}_{r+1} \underline{a}_{2n-r}.$$

Since $\underline{a}_{2n-r} \leq \bar{a}_{2n-r-1}$ by definition, one has

$$\bar{a}_r \bar{a}_{2n-r} \leq \lambda^2 \bar{a}_{r+1} \bar{a}_{2n-r-1} \quad (17)$$

for each $r \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$. Note also that

$$\frac{\bar{a}_{r+1}}{\bar{a}_r} = \frac{\bar{a}_{r+1} b_{r+1}}{b_{r+1} \bar{a}_r} \leq \frac{\bar{a}_{r+1} b_{r+1}}{b_{r+1} \underline{a}_{r+1}} \ll 1 \quad (18)$$

by (8). By making use of (18) and (17), we can apply the same argument for the proof of Lemma 3.1 to the sequence $\{\bar{a}_1, \dots, \bar{a}_{n-1}, \bar{a}_{n+1}, \dots, \bar{a}_{2n-1}\}$. As a result, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |D_2| &\leq (n-1) \left| \cup_{A_{xy} \in \mathcal{A}_C} \{A_{xy} : (x, y) \in (b_{r+1}, b_r] \times (b_{2n-r+1}, b_{2n-r}]\} \right| \\ &\ll (n-1) \left| \cup_{|\theta|=r+1} B(\theta) \right| \leq (n-1) |B_n|. \end{aligned}$$

In the same way as above, we have $|D_3| \ll |B_n|$.

Consequently, we have

$$|D| \leq |D_1| + |D_2| + |D_3| \ll |B_n| + (n-1)|B_n| + |B_n| \leq \frac{n+1}{n} K_E |E|$$

by Lemma 3.1-(5), and thus

$$|D| \ll K_E K_F \frac{n+1}{n-1} |F|$$

by (7). □

4.1.3 Proof of Lemma 4.1

Lemma 4.6. *Let R be a rectangle with $|R| > 4n|B_n|$. Then one has*

$$\frac{1}{|R|} \left| \int_R h \, dm \right| < \frac{1}{2}.$$

Proof. We have

$$\frac{1}{|R|} \left| \int_R h \, dm \right| \leq \frac{1}{|R|} \|h\|_{L^1(m)} = \frac{2}{|R|} n |B_n| < \frac{1}{2}. \quad \square$$

Proof of Lemma 4.1. One can suppose, with the aid of (8), that $b_1 > \dots > b_n > b_{n+1} > \dots > b_{2n}$ will satisfy

1. Condition (3),

$$2. \frac{b_n}{\underline{a}_n} < \dots < \frac{b_1}{\underline{a}_1} < \frac{1}{3n2^{n-1}},$$

3. Lemma 4.4,

$$4. \delta > 4nb_nb_{n+1},$$

$$5. b_{n+2} < \frac{b_{n+1}^2}{4n}.$$

For such a sequence, let F and D be the sets and h be the function defined as (4), (16) and (10), respectively. Then we have Lemma 4.5, and the property (9) follows from (12). Let $\eta = |B_1|$. Then $\eta \in (0, \delta)$, and the property (ii) follows from Lemma 4.2.

The property (i) follows from the consequences of Cases 2-i), 3-i), and 4-i). Indeed, we have for (13) that

$$\frac{1}{|A|} \int_A h \, dm \leq n \frac{p+2}{p} \frac{b_{r+1}}{\underline{a}_{r+1}} \prod_{j=r+1}^{n-1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{q_j}\right) \leq 3n \frac{1}{3n2^{n-1}} 2^{n-r-1} < 1$$

for every $r \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ by the condition 2. Similarly, we have for (14) that

$$\frac{1}{|A|} \int_A h \, dm \leq 2n \frac{b_{r+1}}{\underline{a}_{r+1}} \prod_{j=r+1}^{n-1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{q_j}\right) < 1$$

for every $r \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ by the condition 2. For (15), it follows from by the condition 5 that

$$\frac{1}{|A|} \int_A h \, dm \leq 4n \frac{b_{n+2}}{b_{n+1}^2} < 1.$$

Lemma 4.6 yields the property (iii). Lemma 4.1 is obtained. \square

5 Proof of Theorem 2.3

5.1 Random translations

Let

$$\omega = (\alpha, \beta),$$

where α and β are uniformly distributed on $[0, 1]^2$. Let $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_N$ be a set of independent, uniformly distributed vectors on $[0, 1]^2$. For $z \in [0, 1]^2$ and $\omega = (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_N)$, consider the product

$$f_N(z, \omega) = \prod_{k=1}^N (1 - \mathbb{1}_F(z + \omega_k)).$$

Note that $f_N(z, \omega) = 0$ if and only if $1 - \mathbb{1}_F(z + \omega_k) = 0$ for some k , i.e., $z \in F + \omega_k$. Hence $\text{supp} f_N(\cdot, \omega) \subset [0, 1]^2$ is the set which is not covered by the set

$$F_0(\omega) = \bigcup_{k=1}^N \{F + \omega_k\}.$$

Therefore, the support of $1 - f_N(\cdot, \omega)$ will be the set that is covered by the set $F_0(\omega)$. Next, consider also

$$g_N(z, \omega) = \prod_{k=1}^N (1 - \mathbb{1}_D(z + \omega_k)),$$

and denote

$$D_0(\omega) = \bigcup_{k=1}^N \{D + \omega_k\}.$$

Note that the support of the function $((1 - f_N) \cdot g_N)(\cdot, \omega)$ is the set of points that is covered by $F_0(\omega)$ but not by $D_0(\omega)$, namely $F_0(\omega) \setminus D_0(\omega)$. Denote $Q_0(\omega) = F_0(\omega) \setminus D_0(\omega)$. For each $\omega = (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_N)$, let $|Q_0|(\omega) = |Q_0(\omega)|$. Then we have

$$|Q_0|(\omega) = \int_{[0,1]^2} ((1 - f_N) \cdot g_N)(z, \omega) dm(z).$$

Below, we denote the integration with respect to $\omega = (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_N)$ by \mathcal{E} for notational simplicity. Namely,

$$\mathcal{E}(u) = \int_{([0,1]^2)^N} u(\omega) d\omega = \int_{[0,1]^2} \cdots \int_{[0,1]^2} u(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_N) d\omega_1 \dots d\omega_N \quad (19)$$

for a function u on $([0, 1]^2)^N$.

Remark 5.1. *Precisely, the integral (19) above should be written as*

$$\mathcal{E}(u) = \int_Y u(\omega(y)) dP(y) = \int_{([0,1]^2)^N} u dP^\omega$$

where (Y, P) denotes the underlying probability space on which the N -tuple $\omega = (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_N)$ of independent random variables is defined, and P^ω is the joint distribution. By independency,

$$\mathcal{E}(u) = \int_{([0,1]^2)^N} u dP^\omega = \int_{[0,1]^2} \cdots \int_{[0,1]^2} u dP^{\omega_1} \dots dP^{\omega_N}, \quad (20)$$

and denote (20) by (19) for an abuse of notation.

Henceforth, we construct a function defined on (a neighborhood of) a set $Q_0(\omega) = F_0(\omega) \setminus D_0(\omega)$ with suitably chosen ω . Here we have the following lemma on such ω .

Lemma 5.2. *Let $N = \lceil 1/|F| \rceil \in \mathbb{N}$. There is an open set $\Omega \subset ([0, 1]^2)^{\lceil 1/|F| \rceil}$ with $|\Omega| > 0$ such that for any $\omega \in \Omega$ we have*

$$|Q_0|(\omega) = |F_0 \setminus D_0|(\omega) \geq \frac{99}{100} \left(\frac{1}{(2e)^\varepsilon} - \frac{1}{e} \right) > 0$$

for sufficiently small $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$.

In fact, we will prove a more general result which will be of independent interest. See also Remark 5.6.

Proposition 5.3. *Let $A, B \subset [0, 1]^2$ be sets such that $0 < |B| \leq c|A|$ for some $c > 0$, and let $N = \lceil 1/|A| \rceil \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose that for any $\omega \in ([0, 1]^2)^N$ we have $|A \cap (B + \omega)| \leq \varepsilon|A|$ for some $\varepsilon \in (0, \min\{1, c_0\})$ where $c_0 = |B|/|A| \in (0, c]$. Then there exist $\kappa = \kappa(c_0|A|) \in (0, 1)$ and an open set $\Omega \subset ([0, 1]^2)^N$ with $|\Omega| > 0$ such that for any $\omega \in \Omega$ we have*

$$\left| \bigcup_{k=1}^N \{A + \omega_k\} \setminus \bigcup_{k=1}^N \{B + \omega_k\} \right| > \frac{99}{100} \left(\frac{1}{(\kappa^{-1}e)^{c_0}} - \frac{1}{e^{(1+c_0-\varepsilon)}} \right).$$

Note that $\kappa = \kappa(c_0|A|) \in (0, 1)$ in Proposition 5.3 can be taken such that $\kappa \rightarrow 1$ as $c_0|A| \rightarrow 0$. Once Proposition 5.3 is obtained, we have Lemma 5.2.

Proof of Lemma 5.2. Take $A = F$ and $B = D$ in Proposition 5.3. One can take $c = \varepsilon$ by Lemma 4.5. Hence Proposition 5.3 yields the result with $\kappa = 1/2$. \square

We postpone the proof of Proposition 5.3 for a short while, and proceed the argument. Henceforth, we let $N = \lceil 1/|F| \rceil$. Fix sufficiently small $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, and set

$$\chi = \frac{99}{100} \left(\frac{1}{(2e)^\varepsilon} - \frac{1}{e} \right) > 0.$$

As a result, we obtain the following lemma.

Lemma 5.4. *Let $\delta > 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. There exist a function $h_0 \in L^1([0, 1]^2, m)$ with*

$$\|h_0\|_{L^1} \leq 4K_E K_F \frac{n}{n-1},$$

a set $Q_0 \subset [0, 1]^2$ with $|Q_0| > \chi$, and $\eta = \eta(\varepsilon, \delta, n) \in (0, \delta)$ such that we have the following.

(i) *If $z \in Q_0$ and $z \in A \in \mathcal{R}_C$, then*

$$\left| \frac{1}{|A|} \int_A h_0 dm \right| \leq 2.$$

(ii) *If $z \in Q_0$, then there exists $B \in \mathcal{R}_D$ with $B \ni z$ and $|B| > \eta$ such that*

$$\left| \frac{1}{|B|} \int_B h_0 dm \right| > n.$$

(iii) *For every $R \in \mathcal{R}$ with $|R| > \delta$, we have*

$$\left| \frac{1}{|R|} \int_R h dm \right| < 1.$$

Proof. Let Ω be the set as in Lemma 5.2. Define

$$\Omega_0 = \{\omega \in \Omega : |\omega_i - \omega_j| \notin \{b_1, \dots, b_n\}\}.$$

We see $|\Omega_0| = |\Omega| > 0$.

Since $\omega \mapsto Q_0(\omega) = F_0(\omega) \setminus D_0(\omega)$ is continuous with respect to the Hausdorff metric on the space of all closed subsets of $[0, 1]^2$, there exists $\omega_0 = ((\omega_0)_1, \dots, (\omega_0)_N) \in \Omega_0$ such that for any

rectangle $A = A_{xy}$ with sides $x, y \in \mathcal{C}$ containing $z \in Q_0(\omega_0)$, there will be cancellations for all but at most two rectangles from \mathcal{R}_D , say $B = B(\theta) + (\omega_0)_i$ and $B' = B(\theta') + (\omega_0)_j$ for some $\theta, \theta' \in \Theta$ and $i, j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$. Namely, let

$$h_0 = h_{F+(\omega_0)_1} + \dots + h_{F+(\omega_0)_N},$$

then it follows that either $\int_A h_0 dm = 0$ or

$$\left| \frac{1}{|A|} \int_A h_0 dm \right| \leq \left| \frac{1}{|A|} \int_{A \cap B} h_{F+(\omega_0)_i} dm(z) \right| + \left| \frac{1}{|A|} \int_{A \cap B'} h_{F+(\omega_0)_j} dm \right| \leq 2$$

by Lemma 4.1-(i). Hence the first property follows.

The argument same as above shows the third property by Lemma 4.1-(iii).

Since $\omega_0 \in \Omega_0$, Lemma 4.1-(ii) yields the property (ii) by taking $\tau > 0$ small if necessary. (Recall that $\tau > 0$ determines the height of the support of h_0 .)

One has

$$\begin{aligned} \|h_0\|_{L^1(m)} &\leq \|h_{F+(\omega_0)_1}\|_{L^1(m)} + \dots + \|h_{F+(\omega_0)_N}\|_{L^1(m)} \\ &\leq 2K_E K_F |F| \frac{n}{n-1} \left(\frac{1}{|F|} + 1 \right) \leq 4K_E K_F \frac{n}{n-1} \end{aligned}$$

by (12) and (7) with noting $N = \lceil 1/|F| \rceil$. Hence Lemma holds for $Q_0 = Q_0(\omega_0)$ and h_0 defined as above. \square

5.1.1 Proof of Proposition 5.3

In this section, we denote $X = [0, 1]^2$ for notational simplicity. Given $\omega = (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_N) \in X^N$, denote

$$A_0(\omega) = \bigcup_{k=1}^N \{A + \omega_k\} \quad \text{and} \quad B_0(\omega) = \bigcup_{k=1}^N \{B + \omega_k\}.$$

For each $\omega = (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_N)$, let $|A_0 \setminus B_0|(\omega) = |A_0(\omega) \setminus B_0(\omega)|$.

Lemma 5.5. *We have*

$$\mathcal{E}(|A_0 \setminus B_0|) \geq (1 - c_0|A|)^N - (1 - (1 + c_0 - \varepsilon)|A|)^N. \quad (21)$$

Proof. We see

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(|A_0 \setminus B_0|) &= \int_{X^N} |A_0 \setminus B_0|(\omega) d\omega \\ &= \mathcal{E} \left(\int_X b_N(z, \omega) dm(z) \right) - \mathcal{E} \left(\int_X (a_N \cdot b_N)(z, \omega) dm(z) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where

$$a_N(z, \omega) = \prod_{k=1}^N (1 - \mathbb{1}_A(z + \omega_k)) \quad \text{and} \quad b_N(z, \omega) = \prod_{k=1}^N (1 - \mathbb{1}_B(z + \omega_k)).$$

For the first term in the right-hand side of (22), by the Fubini theorem,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}\left(\int_X b_N(z, \omega) dm(z)\right) &= \mathcal{E}\left(\int_X \prod_{k=1}^N (1 - \mathbb{1}_B(z + \omega_k)) dm(z)\right) \\ &= \int_X \mathcal{E}\left(\prod_{k=1}^N (1 - \mathbb{1}_B(z + \omega_k))\right) dm(z).\end{aligned}$$

Since $|B| = c_0|A|$ by assumption, we obtain

$$\mathcal{E}\left(\prod_{k=1}^N (1 - \mathbb{1}_B(z + \omega_k))\right) = (1 - |B|)^N = (1 - c_0|A|)^N$$

for every $z \in X$, and thus

$$\mathcal{E}\left(\int_X b_N(z, \omega) dm(z)\right) = (1 - c_0|A|)^N. \quad (23)$$

Next, for the second term in the right-hand side of (22), by the Fubini theorem again, one has

$$\mathcal{E}\left(\int_X (a_N \cdot b_N)(z, \omega) dm(z)\right) = \int_X \mathcal{E}(a_N \cdot b_N)(z) dm(z),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}(a_N \cdot b_N)(z) &= \mathcal{E}\left(\left(\prod_{k=1}^N (1 - \mathbb{1}_A(z + \omega_k))\right) \prod_{k=1}^N (1 - \mathbb{1}_B(z + \omega_k))\right) \\ &= \mathcal{E}\left(\prod_{k=1}^N (1 - \mathbb{1}_A(z + \omega_k) - \mathbb{1}_B(z + \omega_k) + \mathbb{1}_{A \cap B}(z + \omega_k))\right) \\ &= (1 - |A| - |B| + |A \cap B|)^N \\ &\leq (1 - |A| - c_0|A| + \varepsilon|A|)^N\end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

for every $z \in [0, 1]^2$. Hence we have

$$\mathcal{E}\left(\int_X (a_N \cdot b_N)(z, \omega) dm(z)\right) \leq (1 - (1 + c_0 - \varepsilon)|A|)^N \quad (25)$$

Lemma 5.5 follows from (22), (23) and (25). \square

Proof of Proposition 5.3. Since $1/|A| \leq N < (1 + |A|)/|A|$, it follows from Lemma 5.5 that

$$(1 - c_0|A|)^N \geq (1 - c_0|A|)^{(1+|A|)/|A|} \geq (\kappa \cdot e^{-1})^{c_0}$$

for some $\kappa = \kappa(c_0|A|) \in (0, 1)$ such that $\kappa \rightarrow 1$ as $c_0|A| \rightarrow 0$, and

$$(1 - (1 + c_0 - \varepsilon)|A|)^N \leq (1 - (1 + c_0 - \varepsilon)|A|)^{1/|A|} \leq e^{-(1+c_0-\varepsilon)}.$$

Hence, by Lemma 5.5, we arrive at

$$\mathcal{E}(|A_0 \setminus B_0|) = \int_{X^N} |A_0 \setminus B_0|(\omega) d\omega \geq \frac{1}{(\kappa^{-1}e)^{c_0}} - \frac{1}{e^{(1+c_0-\varepsilon)}}. \quad (26)$$

Since $\omega \mapsto |A_0 \setminus B_0|(\omega)$ is a non-negative and continuous function, it follows from (26) that there is an open set $\Omega \subset X^N = X^{\lceil 1/|A| \rceil}$ with $|\Omega| > 0$ such that for any $\omega \in \Omega$ we have

$$|A_0 \setminus B_0|(\omega) \geq \frac{99}{100} \left(\frac{1}{(\kappa^{-1}e)^{c_0}} - \frac{1}{e^{(1+c_0-\varepsilon)}} \right).$$

Proposition is obtained. \square

Remark 5.6. Proposition 5.3 concerns the case where $c_0 > 0$ (or c) is rather large. If $c > 0$ is small, this is exactly the case of Lemma 5.2, then we have a better upper bound

$$\mathcal{E}(a_N \cdot b_N)(z) \leq (1 - |A|)^N$$

in stead of (24), and thus

$$\mathcal{E}(|A_0 \setminus B_0|) \geq (1 - c|A|)^N - (1 - |A|)^N$$

in stead of (21).

5.2 Proof of Theorem 2.3

Proof. Denote $X_0 = [0, 1]^2$, and let $h_0 \in L^1(X_0)$ and $Q_0 = F_0(\omega_0) \setminus D_0(\omega_0) \subset X_0$ be as in Lemma 5.4. Hence $|Q_0| > \chi$ by Lemma 5.4. Let $h_0^* = |Q_0| h_0$. Then $\|h_0^*\|_{L^1(m)} \leq (4 + o(1))|Q_0|$. Since we fix such an $\omega_0 \in \Omega_0$, we will omit ω_0 and write, say D_0 instead of $D_0(\omega_0)$ for notational simplicity. By Lemma 4.5, one has

$$|D_0| \leq |D| \left(\frac{1}{|F|} + 1 \right) < \varepsilon_0 = \frac{\varepsilon}{2^3}.$$

Here and below, we let $\varepsilon_k = \varepsilon/2^{k+3}$ for $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$.

Let

$$Y_1 = X_0 \setminus (Q_0 \sqcup D_0) = X_0 \setminus (F_0 \cup D_0).$$

Since the boundary of the set $Q_0 \sqcup D_0$ consists of straight lines, we can partition Y_1 into squares of small size. Precisely, there exist $a_1 = a_1(\varepsilon) \in (0, 1)$ and a finite family of squares $S_{1,a}$ with side lengths $a \in [a_1, 1)$ such that

$$\left| Y_1 \setminus \bigsqcup_{a \geq a_1} S_{1,a} \right| < \varepsilon_0.$$

(Note that the disjoint union includes squares of same side lengths.) Let

$$X_1 = \bigsqcup_{a \geq a_1} S_{1,a}.$$

Inside each square $S_{1,a}$, we can find a function $h_{1,a} \in L^1(X_0)$ and a subset $Q_{1,a} = F_{1,a} \setminus D_{1,a} \subset S_{1,a}$ for which all the properties of Lemma 5.4 hold, and hence

$$\left| \bigsqcup_{a \geq a_1} Q_{1,a} \right| > \chi \left| \bigsqcup_{a \geq a_1} S_{1,a} \right| = \chi |X_1|.$$

Define

$$Q_1^* = \bigsqcup_{a \geq a_1} Q_{1,a} \quad \text{and} \quad D_1^* = \bigsqcup_{a \geq a_1} D_{1,a}.$$

Then $Q_1^*, D_1^* \subset X_1$, and one has

$$|D_1^*| < \varepsilon_1.$$

Notice that each support $\text{supp} h_{1,a}$ consists of finitely many horizontal line segments. Hence we may and do assume that the supports $\text{supp} h_{1,a}$ in different squares $S_{1,a}$ never lay on the same horizontal line. We may do assume further that no two such line segments, one from $\text{supp} h_0^*$ and the other from any of $\text{supp} f_{1,a}$, lay on the same horizontal line. In short, one can assume that any two horizontal line segments in $\text{supp} h_0^* \sqcup \{\text{supp} h_{1,a} : a \geq a_1\}$ have a “vertical gap”. Let

$$h_1^* = \sum_{a \geq a_1} |Q_{1,a}| h_{1,a} \in L^1(X_0).$$

Then, by construction, we still have all the properties of Lemma 5.4 for $Q_0 \sqcup Q_1^*$ and $h_0^* + h_1^*$ by the same argument of the proof for Lemma 5.4. Here each function $h_{1,a}$ is multiplied by the area $|Q_{1,a}|$ just to have $\|h_1^*\|_{L^1(m)} \leq (4+o(1))|Q_1^*|$. Hence it follows that $\|h_0^* + h_1^*\|_{L^1(m)} \leq (4+o(1))(|Q_0| + |Q_1^*|)$.

Next, define

$$Y_2 = X_1 \setminus (Q_1^* \sqcup D_1^*),$$

and repeat the procedure described above. Namely, there exist $a_2 = a_2(\varepsilon) \in (0, a_1)$ and a finite family of squares $S_{2,a}$ with side lengths $a \in [a_2, a_1)$ with

$$\left| Y_2 \setminus \bigsqcup_{a \in [a_2, a_1)} S_{2,a} \right| < \varepsilon_1$$

such that for each $S_{2,a}$, there are $h_{2,a} \in L^1(X_0)$ and $Q_{2,a} = F_{2,a} \setminus D_{2,a} \subset S_{2,a}$ for which all the properties of Lemma 5.4 hold such that

$$\left| \bigsqcup_{a \in [a_2, a_1)} Q_{2,a} \right| > \chi \left| \bigsqcup_{a \in [a_2, a_1)} S_{2,a} \right| \quad \text{and} \quad \left| \bigsqcup_{a \in [a_2, a_1)} D_{2,a} \right| < \varepsilon_2.$$

Define

$$X_2 = \bigsqcup_{a \in [a_2, a_1)} S_{2,a}, \quad Q_2^* = \bigsqcup_{a \in [a_2, a_1)} Q_{2,a}, \quad D_2^* = \bigsqcup_{a \in [a_2, a_1)} D_{2,a}.$$

Note that one has $Q_2^*, D_2^* \subset X_2$, and $|D_2^*| < \varepsilon_2$. We let

$$h_2^* = \sum_{a \in [a_2, a_1)} |Q_{2,a}| h_{2,a} \in L^1(X_0),$$

where $\text{supp}h_{2,a}$ are placed such that any two horizontal line segments in $\text{supp}h_0^* \sqcup \text{supp}h_1^* \sqcup \text{supp}h_2^*$ have a vertical gap. Hence, all the properties of Lemma 5.4 still hold for $Q_0 \sqcup Q_1^* \sqcup Q_2^*$ and $h_0^* + h_1^* + h_2^*$. Notice that $\|h_0^* + h_1^* + h_2^*\|_{L^1(m)} \leq (4 + o(1))(|Q_0| + |Q_1^*| + |Q_2^*|)$ holds.

Once X_k , and $Q_k^*, D_k^* \subset X_k$ are defined, by letting

$$Y_{k+1} = X_k \setminus (Q_k^* \sqcup D_k^*),$$

one can define $X_{k+1} \subset Y_{k+1}$, and $Q_{k+1}^*, D_{k+1}^* \subset X_{k+1}$ with

$$|Y_{k+1} \setminus X_{k+1}| < \varepsilon_k, \quad |Q_{k+1}^*| > \chi |X_{k+1}|, \quad |D_{k+1}^*| < \varepsilon_{k+1}$$

and a function $h_{k+1}^* \in L^1(X_0)$, with $\|h_{k+1}^*\|_{L^1(m)} \leq (4 + o(1))|Q_{k+1}^*|$, having the vertical gap property among $\text{supp}h_0^* \sqcup \text{supp}h_1^* \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \text{supp}h_{k+1}^*$ such that all the properties of Lemma 5.4 hold for $Q_0 \sqcup Q_1^* \sqcup \cdots \sqcup Q_{k+1}^*$ and $h_0^* + h_1^* + \cdots + h_{k+1}^*$.

Now, we show that the area of $\bigsqcup_{k=0}^{n-1} Q_k^*$, where $Q_0^* = Q_0$, can be arbitrarily close to one.

Lemma 5.7. *One can take $n \in \mathbb{N}$ so large that*

$$\left| \bigsqcup_{k=0}^{n-1} Q_k^* \right| > 1 - \varepsilon.$$

Proof. One has

$$|Q_0^*| = |Q_0| = |X_0| - |D_0| - |Y_1| > 1 - \varepsilon_0 - (|X_1| + \varepsilon_0) = 1 - |X_1| - 2\varepsilon_0,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |Q_0^* \sqcup Q_1^*| &= |Q_0^*| + |Q_1^*| > (1 - |X_1| - 2\varepsilon_0) + (|X_1| - |D_1^*| - |Y_2|) \\ &> 1 - 2\varepsilon_0 - \varepsilon_1 - |Y_2| \\ &> 1 - 2\varepsilon_0 - \varepsilon_1 - (|X_2| + \varepsilon_1) \\ &> 1 - |X_2| - 2\varepsilon_0 - 2\varepsilon_1. \end{aligned}$$

Hence by induction, one obtain

$$\left| \bigsqcup_{k=0}^{n-1} Q_k^* \right| > 1 - |X_n| - 2 \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \varepsilon_k = 1 - |X_n| - 2 \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{\varepsilon}{2^{k+3}} > 1 - |X_n| - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

Next, one sees that $|X_n|$ strictly decreases to 0 as n grows. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} |X_{n+1}| &\leq |Y_{n+1}| = |X_n| - |Q_n^*| - |D_n^*| \\ &< |X_n| - |Q_n^*| \\ &< |X_n| - \chi |X_n| \\ &= (1 - \chi)|X_n| < \cdots < (1 - \chi)^{n+1}|X_0| = (1 - \chi)^{n+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Take $n \in \mathbb{N}$ so large that $(1 - \chi)^n < \varepsilon/2$. Then it follows that

$$\left| \bigsqcup_{k=0}^{n-1} Q_k^* \right| > 1 - |X_n| - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} > 1 - \varepsilon.$$

Lemma is obtained. □

Take an $n \in \mathbb{N}$ so large as in Lemma 5.7. Letting $Q = \bigsqcup_{k=0}^{n-1} Q_k^*$ and $f = h_0^* + h_1^* + \cdots + h_{n-1}^*$ yields the Theorem 2.3. □

6 Proof of Theorem 2.1

6.1 Setup

To prove Theorem 2.1, we use Theorem 2.3 recursively to find sequences of sets $\{Q_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ and functions $\{f_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ as follows. Let $\varepsilon_1 = 1/2$, $\delta_1 = 1/2$, and $a_1 = 1$. Then there are $Q_1 \subset [0, 1]^2$ with $|Q_1| > 1 - \varepsilon_1$ and $f_1 \in L^\infty(m)$ with $\|f_1\|_{L^1(m)} \leq 2$ and $\eta_1 \in (0, \delta_1)$ such that

(i₁) If $z \in Q_1$ and $z \in A \in \mathcal{R}_C$, then

$$\left| \frac{1}{|A|} \int_A f_1 dm \right| \leq 2.$$

(ii₁) If $z \in Q_1$, then there exists $B \in \mathcal{R}_D$, with $z \in B$ and $|B| > \eta_1$, so that

$$\left| \frac{1}{|B|} \int_B f_1 dm \right| > a_1 (= 1).$$

(iii₁) For every $R \in \mathcal{R}$ with $|R| > \delta_1$, we have

$$\left| \frac{1}{|R|} \int_R f_1 dm \right| < 1.$$

Suppose that $Q_{n-1} \subset [0, 1]^2$, $f_{n-1} \in L^\infty(m)$ and $\eta_{n-1} > 0$ are defined such that the corresponding properties (i_{n-1}), (ii_{n-1}), (iii_{n-1}) hold. Let $\varepsilon_n = 1/(n+1)^2$, $\delta_n = \eta_{n-1}$, and

$$a_n = \left(2 \sup_{k \leq n-1} \|f_k\|_{L^\infty(m)} + n \right) n^2.$$

Then there are $Q_n \subset [0, 1]^2$ with $|Q_n| > 1 - \varepsilon_n$ and $f_n \in L^\infty(m)$ with $\|f_n\|_{L^1(m)} \leq 2$ and $\eta_n \in (0, \delta_n)$ such that

(i_n) If $z \in Q_n$ and $z \in A \in \mathcal{R}_C$, then

$$\left| \frac{1}{|A|} \int_A f_n dm \right| \leq 2.$$

(ii_n) If $z \in Q_n$, then there exists $B \in \mathcal{R}_D$, with $z \in B$ and $|B| > \eta_n$, so that

$$\left| \frac{1}{|B|} \int_B f_n dm \right| > a_n.$$

(iii_n) For every $R \in \mathcal{R}$ with $|R| > \delta_n$, we have

$$\left| \frac{1}{|R|} \int_R f_n dm \right| < 1.$$

Notice that $\delta_n > \eta_n = \delta_{n+1} > \eta_{n+1} = \delta_{n+2}$ by construction, and thus both η_n and δ_n are decreasing sequences in particular.

6.2 Proof of Theorem 2.1

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Define

$$f = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2} f_n.$$

Note that by property (2) of Theorem 2.3, we have

$$\left\| \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2} f_n \right\|_{L^1(m)} \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2} \|f_n\|_{L^1(m)} < \infty.$$

Hence f is well defined and $f \in L^1(m)$. By the Borel-Cantelli lemma, we also have that

$$m \left(\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} Q_n \right) = 1.$$

Since $f_k \in L^\infty(m)$, then by Theorem 1.2 we have that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there is $\Gamma_k \subset [0, 1]^2$ with $m(\Gamma_k) = 1$ such that

$$\lim_{\substack{\text{diam} R \rightarrow 0, \\ z \in R \in \mathcal{R}}} \frac{1}{|R|} \int_R f_k dm = f_k(z) \quad (27)$$

for every $z \in \Gamma_k$. It follows from (27) and Theorem 2.3-(i) that for every $z \in Q_k \cap \Gamma_k$ we have

$$|f_k(z)| \leq 2. \quad (28)$$

Denote $\Gamma_\infty = \bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} \Gamma_k$ and

$$\Lambda = \left(\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} Q_n \right) \cap \Gamma_\infty.$$

Clearly $m(\Lambda) = 1$.

First, we prove convergence, namely $\delta_{\mathcal{R}_c}(z, f) = 0$ for m -almost every $z \in [0, 1]^2$. Let $z \in \Lambda$. Hence there exists $M = M_z \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $z \in Q_n$ for all $n \geq M$. Then for every $A \in \mathcal{R}_c$ with $A \ni z$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{1}{|A|} \int_A f dm - f(z) \right| &= \left| \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2} \frac{1}{|A|} \int_A f_n dm - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{f_n(z)}{n^2} \right| \\ &\leq \left| \sum_{n=1}^M \frac{1}{n^2} \frac{1}{|A|} \int_A f_n dm - \sum_{n=1}^M \frac{f_n(z)}{n^2} \right| \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

$$+ \sum_{n=M+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2} \left| \frac{1}{|A|} \int_A f_n dm \right| + \sum_{n=M+1}^{\infty} \frac{|f_n(z)|}{n^2}. \quad (30)$$

Since $z \in Q_n \cap \Gamma_\infty$ for all $n \geq M$, it follows from (28) that $|f_n(z)| \leq 2$ for all $n \geq M$. Note also that

$$\left| \frac{1}{|A|} \int_A f_n dm \right| \leq 2$$

by the property (i_n). Thus for the last two terms (30), we have

$$\sum_{n=M+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2} \left| \frac{1}{|A|} \int_A f_n dm \right| + \sum_{n=M+1}^{\infty} \frac{|f_n(z)|}{n^2} \leq \sum_{n=M}^{\infty} \frac{4}{n^2} < \frac{4}{M-1}.$$

For the first term (29), since $x \in \Gamma_\infty$, then we have by (27) that

$$\lim_{\substack{\text{diam} A \rightarrow 0, \\ z \in A \in \mathcal{R}_c}} \left| \sum_{n=1}^M \frac{1}{n^2} \frac{1}{|A|} \int_A f_n dm - \sum_{n=1}^M \frac{f_n(z)}{n^2} \right| = 0.$$

Consequently, it follows that

$$\lim_{\substack{\text{diam} A \rightarrow 0, \\ z \in A \in \mathcal{R}_c}} \left| \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2} \frac{1}{|A|} \int_A f_n dm - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{f_n(z)}{n^2} \right| = 0.$$

In other words $\delta_{\mathcal{R}_c}(z, f) = 0$ for m -almost every $z \in [0, 1]^2$.

We now prove divergence. Let $z \in \Lambda$. Hence there exists $M_z \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $z \in Q_n$ for all $n \geq M$. Take $N > M_z$. Then by the property (ii_N), there exists $B \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{D}}$, with $z \in B$ and $|B| > \eta_N$ such that

$$\left| \frac{1}{|B|} \int_B f_N dm \right| > a_N.$$

Hence for such a rectangle $B \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{D}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{1}{|B|} \int_B f dm \right| &= \left| \frac{1}{|B|} \int_B \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2} f_n dm \right| \\ &> \left| \frac{1}{|B|} \int_B \frac{1}{N^2} f_N dm \right| - \left| \sum_{n \neq N} \frac{1}{n^2} \frac{1}{|B|} \int_B f_n dm \right| \\ &> \frac{a_N}{N^2} - \left| \sum_{n \neq N} \frac{1}{n^2} \frac{1}{|B|} \int_B f_n dm \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Here we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^{N-1} \frac{1}{n^2} \frac{1}{|B|} \int_B |f_n| dm \leq \left(\sup_{n \leq N-1} \|f_n\|_{L^\infty(m)} \right) \cdot \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} \frac{1}{n^2} \leq 2 \sup_{n \leq N-1} \|f_n\|_{L^\infty(m)}.$$

Notice that we have $|B| > \delta_n$ for all $n > N$ since $|B| > \eta_N = \delta_{N+1}$ and δ_k is a decreasing sequence in k . Thus by the property (iii_n) with $n > N$, we have

$$\left| \frac{1}{|B|} \int_B f_n dm \right| \leq 1$$

for all $n > N$, and hence

$$\left| \sum_{n > N} \frac{1}{n^2} \frac{1}{|B|} \int_B f_n dm \right| \leq \sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2} < \frac{1}{N}.$$

It follows that

$$\left| \frac{1}{|B|} \int_B f dm \right| > \frac{a_N}{N^2} - 2 \sup_{n \leq N-1} \|f_n\|_{L^\infty(m)} - \frac{1}{N} = N - \frac{1}{N}.$$

Consequently, we have

$$\left| \frac{1}{|B|} \int_B f dm - f(z) \right| \geq \left| \frac{1}{|B|} \int_B f dm \right| - |f(z)| > N - \frac{1}{N} - |f(z)|.$$

Letting $N \rightarrow \infty$, the divergence property $\delta_{\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{D}}}(z, f) = \infty$ holds for m -almost every $z \in [0, 1]^2$. \square

7 Proof of Theorem 2.2

Proof. By assumption, one can take $c \in (0, 1)$ so small that

$$1 \geq \max \left\{ \frac{\bar{a}}{a}, \frac{a}{\underline{a}} \right\} > c > 0$$

holds for every sufficiently small $a \in \mathcal{D}$. Suppose $\delta_{\mathcal{R}_c}(z, f) = 0$ for m -almost every $z \in \mathbb{R}^2$. For a given $\delta > 0$ consider the set

$$E_\delta = \left\{ z \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \sup_{\substack{\text{diam} A < \delta, \\ z \in A \in \mathcal{R}_c}} \left| \frac{1}{|A|} \int_A f dm - f(z) \right| < 1 \right\}.$$

We have $|E_\delta| > 0$ for $\delta > 0$ small enough. Then for the characteristic function $\mathbb{1}_{E_\delta}$ of E_δ , we will have by Theorem 1.2, that almost all $z \in E_\delta$ are Lebesgue, namely for almost every $z \in E_\delta$ we have

$$\lim_{\substack{\text{diam} R \rightarrow 0, \\ z \in R \in \mathcal{R}}} \frac{|R \cap E_\delta|}{|R|} = 1.$$

Take $B \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{D}}$ with $z \in B$ and $\text{diam} B$ so small such that

$$\frac{|B \cap E_\delta|}{|B|} > 1 - c^2. \quad (31)$$

We now wish to cover the rectangle B with rectangles of sides $x, y \in \mathcal{C}$. More specifically, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 7.1. *There is a collection $\{A_k \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{C}}\}_{k=1}^n$ for some $n \leq (\frac{1}{c} + 1)^2$ such that*

- (i) $B \subset \bigcup_{q=1}^n A_q$,
- (ii) $|B \cap A_q| \geq c^2 |B|$ for every $q \in \{1, \dots, n\}$,
- (iii) $\frac{|A_q|}{|B|} \leq \frac{1}{c^2}$ for every $q \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.

Proof. Let $B = [s, s+a] \times [t, t+b]$ for some small $a, b \in \mathcal{D}$ and some $(s, t) \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Then by assumption, there exist $x, y \in \mathcal{C}$ such that

$$(1a) \quad 1 \geq \frac{x}{a} > c \quad \text{or} \quad (2a) \quad 1 \geq \frac{a}{x} > c,$$

and

$$(1b) \quad 1 \geq \frac{y}{b} > c \quad \text{or} \quad (2b) \quad 1 \geq \frac{b}{y} > c.$$

Hence, consider the following four cases. For the case where $x \in \mathcal{C}$ satisfies (2a) and $y \in \mathcal{C}$ does (2b), by taking

$$A_1 = [s, s+x] \times [t, t+y],$$

we have $|B \cap A_1| = |B|$ and

$$\frac{|A_1|}{|B|} = \frac{xy}{ab} < \frac{1}{c^2}.$$

For the case where $x \in \mathcal{C}$ satisfies (2a) and $y \in \mathcal{C}$ does (1b), we consider

$$A_\ell = [s, s+x] \times [t + (\ell-1)y, t + \ell y]$$

for $\ell \in \{1, \dots, \lfloor b/y \rfloor\}$, and also

$$A_{\lfloor b/y \rfloor + 1} = [s, s+x] \times [t + b - y, t + b]$$

to cover up. Then we have

$$\frac{|B \cap A_\ell|}{|B|} = \frac{ay}{ab} > c,$$

and

$$\frac{|A_\ell|}{|B|} = \frac{xy}{ab} \leq \frac{1}{c}$$

for every $\ell \in \{1, \dots, \lfloor b/y \rfloor + 1\}$. The case where $x \in \mathcal{C}$ satisfies (1a) and $y \in \mathcal{C}$ does (2b) is similar, hence omit this case.

For the case where $x \in \mathcal{C}$ satisfies (1a) and $y \in \mathcal{C}$ does (1b), we define

$$A_{k,\ell} = [s + (k-1)x, s + kx] \times [t + (\ell-1)y, t + \ell y]$$

for $k \in \{1, \dots, \lfloor a/x \rfloor\}$ and $\ell \in \{1, \dots, \lfloor b/y \rfloor\}$. Define also

$$A_{\lfloor a/x \rfloor + 1, \ell} = [s + a - x, s + a] \times [t + (\ell-1)y, t + \ell y]$$

for $\ell \in \{1, \dots, \lfloor b/y \rfloor\}$,

$$A_{k, \lfloor b/y \rfloor + 1} = [s + (k-1)x, s + kx] \times [t + b - y, t + b]$$

for $k \in \{1, \dots, \lfloor a/x \rfloor\}$, and

$$A_{\lfloor a/x \rfloor + 1, \lfloor b/y \rfloor + 1} = [s + a - x, s + a] \times [t + b - y, t + b]$$

Denote the whole $\{A_{k,\ell}\}$ by $\{A_q\}_{q=1}^n$, where we have

$$n \leq \left(\left\lfloor \frac{a}{x} \right\rfloor + 1 \right) \left(\left\lfloor \frac{b}{y} \right\rfloor + 1 \right) \leq \left(\frac{1}{c} + 1 \right)^2.$$

We also have

$$\frac{|B \cap A_q|}{|B|} = \frac{xy}{ab} > c^2,$$

and

$$\frac{|A_q|}{|B|} = \frac{xy}{ab} \leq 1$$

for every $q \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.

In all cases above, we have a collection $\{A_q \in \mathcal{R}_\mathcal{C}\}_{q=1}^n$ such that

$$B \subset \bigcup_{q=1}^n A_q.$$

Lemma is obtained. □

It follows from (31) and Lemma 7.1-(iii) that $E_\delta \cap A_q \neq \emptyset$ for all $q \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Hence

$$\left| \frac{1}{|A_q|} \int_{A_q} f \, dm \right| \leq 1 + f(z)$$

for all $q \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Thus we have by Lemma 7.1 that

$$\int_B f \, dm \leq \sum_{q=1}^n \int_{A_q} f \, dm \leq (1 + f(z)) \sum_{q=1}^n |A_q| \leq (1 + f(z)) \left(\frac{1}{c} + 1\right)^2 \frac{1}{c^2} |B|,$$

and which implies

$$\frac{1}{|B|} \int_B f \, dm \leq \left(\frac{1}{c} + 1\right)^2 \frac{1}{c^2} (1 + f(z)).$$

Consequently, we have

$$\limsup_{\substack{\text{diam} B \rightarrow 0, \\ z \in B \in \mathcal{R}_D}} \frac{1}{|B|} \int_B f \, dm < \infty.$$

Thus, for almost every Lebesgue points $z \in E_\delta$ we have that the upper differential is bounded. Then, due to a theorem of Besicovitch [1], it follows that $\delta_{\mathcal{R}_D}(z, f) = 0$ for m -almost every $z \in \mathbb{R}^2$. \square

Acknowledgments

The first author was supported by Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS) KAKENHI Grant Number 19K03558. The second author is supported by the Knut and Alice Wallenberg foundation (KAW).

References

- [1] A. S. Besicovitch, *On differentiation Lebesgue double integrals*, Fund. Math. **25** (1935), no. 2, 209–216, DOI 10.4064/fm-25-1-209-216.
- [2] Miguel de Guzmán, *Differentiation of integrals in R^n* , Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 481, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1975. With appendices by Antonio Córdoba, and Robert Fefferman, and two by Roberto Moriyón. MR0457661
- [3] K. Hagelstein, *A note on rare maximal functions*, Colloq. Math. **83** (2000), no. 2, 173–182, DOI 10.4064/cm-83-2-173-182. MR1758313
- [4] K. Hare and A. Stokolos, *On weak type inequalities for rare maximal functions*, Colloq. Math. **83** (2000), no. 2, 173–182, DOI 10.4064/cm-83-2-173-182. MR1758313
- [5] B. Jessen, J. Marcinkiewicz, and A. Zygmund, *Note of differentiability of multiple integrals*, Fund. Math. **25** (1935), no. 1, 217–234.
- [6] G. A. Karagulyan, *Equivalence of martingales and some related problems*, Izv. Nats. Akad. Nauk Armenii Mat. **48** (2013), no. 2, 15–38, DOI 10.3103/S1068362313020015 (Russian, with English and Russian summaries); English transl., J. Contemp. Math. Anal. **48** (2013), no. 2, 51–65. MR3112686
- [7] G. A. Karagulyan, D. A. Karagulyan, and M. H. Safaryan, *On an equivalence for differentiation bases of dyadic rectangles*, Colloq. Math. **146** (2017), no. 2, 295–307, DOI 10.4064/cm6629-1-2016. MR3622379
- [8] S. Saks, *Remark on the differentiability of the Lebesgue indefinite integral*, Fund. Math. **22** (1934), no. 2, 257–261, DOI 10.4064/fm-22-1-257-261.
- [9] A. M. Stokolos, *On weak type inequalities for rare maximal functions in \mathbb{R}^n* , Colloq. Math. **104** (2006), no. 2, 311–315, DOI 10.4064/cm104-2-7. MR2197080