arXiv:2111.00907v3 [math.CA] 6 Jan 2024

ON A CLASS OF HAUSDORFF MEASURE OF CARTESIAN PRODUCT SETS IN METRIC SPACES

NAJMEDDINE ATTIA, HAJER JEBALI, AND RIHEB GUEDRI

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we study, in a separable metric space, a class of Hausdorff measures $\mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{q,\xi}$ defined using a measure μ and a premeasure ξ. We discuss a Hausdorff structure of product sets. Weighted Hausdorff measures $\mathcal{W}_{\mu}^{q,\xi}$ appeared as an important tool when studying the product sets. When μ and ξ are blanketed, we prove that $\mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{q,\xi} = \mathcal{W}_{\mu}^{q,\xi}$. As an application, the case when ξ is defined as the Hausdorff function is considered.

Keywords: Hausdorff measures, weighted measures, product sets.

Mathematics Subject Classification: 28A78, 28A80.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $(\mathbb{X}, \rho)$ and $(\mathbb{X}', \rho')$ be two separable metric spaces. For $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X})$, the family of Borel probability measures on $\mathbb{X}$, and $a > 1$, we write

$$P_a(\mu) = \limsup_{r \searrow 0} \left(\sup_{x \in \operatorname{supp} \mu} \frac{\mu\big(B(x, ar)\big)}{\mu\big(B(x, r)\big)} \right).$$

We will now say that μ is a blanketed measure if there exists $a > 1$ such that $P_a(\mu) < \infty$. It is easily seen that the exact value of the parameter a is unimportant since $P_a(\mu) < \infty$, for some $a > 1$ if and only if $P_a(\mu) < \infty$, for all $a > 1$. Also, we will write $\mathcal{P}_D(\mathbb{X})$ for the family of blanketed Borel probability measures on $\mathbb{X}$. We can cite as classical examples of blanketed measures, the self-similar measures and the self-conformal ones [20].

Let $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X})$, $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X}')$, $q, t, s \in \mathbb{R}$ and denote by $\mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{q,t}$ the multifractal Hausdorff measure introduced in [20]. Then, there exists a finite positive constant γ such that

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mu\times\nu}^{q,t+s}(E \times F) \geq \gamma \mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{q,t}(E) \mathcal{H}_{\nu}^{q,s}(F), \tag{1.1}$$

for any $E \subseteq \mathbb{X}$ and $F \subseteq \mathbb{X}'$. This result has been proved in [21] for any subsets E and E' of Euclidean spaces $\mathbb{R}^d$ $(d \geq 1)$ provided that μ and ν are blanketed measures and in [2] by investigating some density results. The disadvantage of density approach includes the inability to handle sets of measure ∞. Moreover, if $q = 0$, then the inequality (1.1) was shown in [4] under certain conditions and in [18] without any restrictions. Similar results were proved for packing measure and Hewitt-Stromberg measure (see for example [13, 14, 16, 15, 10, 2, 12, 11, 3]). A generalized Hausdorff measure $\mathcal{H}_{\mu,\nu}^{q,t}$ was introduced by Cole in [5], where the author gave a general formalism for the multifractal analysis of a probability measure μ with respect to another measure ν, (see also [1] for more details about $\mathcal{H}_{\mu,\nu}^{q,t}$).

Let's denote by $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$ the family of closed balls on $\mathbb{X}$ and $\Phi(\mathbb{X})$ the class of premeasures, i.e., every increasing function $\xi : \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}) \to [0, +\infty]$ such that $\xi(\emptyset) = 0$. We will denote by $\Phi_D(\mathbb{X})$ the set of all premeasures $\xi \in \Phi(\mathbb{X})$ satisfying $\xi(B(x, 2r)) \leq K\xi(B(x, r))$ for some constant $K > 1$ and for all $x \in \mathbb{X}$ and $0 < r \leq 1$. We consider a general construction, in a separable metric space, of the Hausdorff measure $\mathcal{H}_\mu^{q,\xi}$ defined using a measure μ and a premeasure ξ and we prove in Subsection 4.2 that : if μ, ν, ξ and ξ' are blanketed and if $\mathcal{H}_\mu^{q,\xi}(E)$ and $\mathcal{H}_\nu^{q,\xi'}(E')$ are finite, then

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mu\times\nu}^{q,\xi_0}(E \times E') \geq \mathcal{H}_\mu^{q,\xi}(E)\mathcal{H}_\nu^{q,\xi'}(E'),$$

where ξ_0 is the cartesian product measure generated from the product of ξ and ξ' and defined on $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{X}')$ by $\xi_0(B \times B') = \xi(B)\xi'(B')$ (see Theorem 5).

We also introduce and study a weighted generalized Hausdorff measure $\mathcal{W}_\mu^{q,\xi}$, for $\xi \in \Phi(\mathbb{X})$, (see definition in Section 2). Weighted and centered covers of a set E are employed, in which non-negative weights are associated with the covering sets. They appeared as an important tool when studying product sets.

Throughout this paper, we allow the cartesian product measure ξ_0 to be defined on $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}) \times \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}')$ with the convention, that $0 \times \infty = \infty \times 0 = 0$. Next, we give our first main results on the weighted Hausdorff measure (Theorem A). Nevertheless, the equation (1.3) is not true in zero-infinite case, that is when one with zero and the other with infinite measure. To cover this case we shall require some restrictions. More precisely, we suppose that, for a given real q, $(\mathbb{X}, \xi, \mu)$ satisfy the following asymption

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{X} \text{ can be covered by countable numbers of balls } (B_i)_i \text{ of arbitrarily}\\ &\text{small diameters and } \mu(B_i)^q\xi(B_i) \text{ is finite.}\end{aligned} \tag{1.2}$$

Theorem A. *Let $q \in \mathbb{R}$, $\xi \in \Phi(\mathbb{X})$ and $\xi' \in \Phi(\mathbb{X}')$. Assume that $(\mathbb{X}, \xi, \mu)$ and $(\mathbb{X}', \xi', \nu)$ both satisfy* (1.2) *then for any $E \subseteq \mathbb{X}$ and $F \subseteq \mathbb{X}'$ we have*

$$\mathcal{W}_{\mu\times\nu}^{q,\xi_0}(E \times F) = \mathcal{W}_\mu^{q,\xi}(E)\mathcal{W}_\nu^{q,\xi'}(F). \tag{1.3}$$

It is natural to ask whether the wheighted and Hausdorff measures are equal. A sufficient condition is given in the following theorem.

Theorem B. *Let $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_D(\mathbb{X})$, $q \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\xi \in \Phi_D(\mathbb{X})$. then, for any $E \subseteq \mathbb{X}$ we have*

$$\mathcal{W}_\mu^{q,\xi}(E) = \mathcal{H}_\mu^{q,\xi}(E).$$

Now we are able to give our main result on the Hausdorff measure.

Theorem C. *Let $q \in \mathbb{R}$, $\xi \in \Phi(\mathbb{X})$ and $\xi' \in \Phi(\mathbb{X}')$. Assume that $(\mathbb{X}, \xi, \mu)$ and $(\mathbb{X}', \xi', \nu)$ both satisfy* (1.2) *then*

$$\mathcal{W}_\mu^{q,\xi}(E)\mathcal{H}_\nu^{q,\xi'}(F) \leq \mathcal{H}_{\mu\times\nu}^{q,\xi_0}(E \times F) \leq \mathcal{H}_\mu^{q,\xi}(E)\mathcal{H}_\nu^{q,\xi'}(F). \tag{1.4}$$

Let's remark that we can similarly prove that

$$\mathcal{H}_\mu^{q,\xi}(E)\mathcal{W}_\nu^{q,\xi'}(F) \leq \mathcal{H}_{\mu\times\nu}^{q,\xi_0}(E \times F) \leq \mathcal{H}_\mu^{q,\xi}(E)\mathcal{H}_\nu^{q,\xi'}(F).$$

The proofs of our main results are given in section 3. Theorems A and C may be compared with the results proved in [17] where the author uses, to cover a set E, any subsets of $\mathbb{X}$ not necessarily centered in E. The uses of centered covering makes the

regularity of Hausdorff and weighted Hausdorff measures not trivial. This fact will be discussed in Subsection 2.3. Let's also mention that results in [17] didn't include the case $q < 0$.

We denote by $\mathcal{F}$ the set of all Hausdorff functions, that is, the set of all right continuous and monotonic increasing functions h defined for $r \in [0, +\infty]$ with $h(0) = 0$ and $h(r) > 0$, for all $r > 0$. If $\xi \in \Phi(\mathbb{X})$ is defined by a Hausdorff function h, that is, $\xi(\emptyset) = 0$ and, for all $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$,

$$\xi(B) = h(\operatorname{diam}_\rho B), \quad \text{if } B \neq \emptyset,$$

then ξ will denoted by ξ_h. Here $\operatorname{diam}_\rho B$ designs the diameter of B with respect to ρ, when there is no confusion we will simply denote $\operatorname{diam} B$. The generalized Hausdorff and weighted Hausdorff measures generated from a Hausdorff function h will be denoted by $\mathcal{H}_\mu^{q,h}$ and $\mathcal{W}_\mu^{q,h}$ respectively. For, $h, h' \in \mathcal{F}$, we define the Hausdorff function $h \times h'$ by

$$h \times h'(r) = h(r)h'(r), \qquad \text{for all } r \geq 0.$$

As an application of Theorem C, we will prove in Section 4 that

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mu\times\nu}^{q,h\times h'}(E \times F) \geq \mathcal{H}_{\mu\times\nu}^{q,\xi_0}(E \times F) \geq \mathcal{W}_\mu^{q,h}(E)\mathcal{H}_\nu^{q,h'}(F).$$

2. Construction of generalized measures

2.1. **Generalized Hausdorff measure.** Let $\delta > 0$, a sequence of closed balls $\{B_i\}_i$ is called a centered $\delta-$cover of a set E if, for all $i \geq 1$, B_i is centered in E, $\operatorname{diam} B_i \leq 2\delta$ and $E \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^\infty B_i$. Let $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X})$, $\xi \in \Phi(\mathbb{X})$ and $q \in \mathbb{R}$, we write

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mu,\delta}^{q,\xi}(E) = \inf\Big\{ \sum_i \mu\big(B(x_i, r_i)\big)^q \xi\big(B(x_i, r_i)\big);\ \Big(B(x_i, r_i)\Big)_i \text{ is a centered } \delta\text{-cover of } E\Big\},$$

if $E \neq \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{H}_{\mu,\delta}^{q,\xi}(\emptyset) = 0$, with the conventions $0^q = \infty$ for $q \leq 0$ and $\mathcal{H}_{\mu,\delta}^{q,\xi}(E)$ is given infinite value if no centered δ-cover of E exists. Now we define

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mu,0}^{q,\xi}(E) = \sup_{\delta>0} \mathcal{H}_{\mu,\delta}^{q,\xi}(E)$$

and

$$\mathcal{H}_\mu^{q,\xi}(E) = \sup_{F\subseteq E} \mathcal{H}_{\mu,0}^{q,\xi}(F).$$

We will prove that the function $\mathcal{H}_\mu^{q,\xi}$ is a metric outer measure and thus a measure on the Borel family of subsets of $\mathbb{X}$. The measure $\mathcal{H}_\mu^{q,\xi}$ is of course a generalization of the centered Hausdorff measure $\mathcal{C}^t$ and multifractal Hausdorff measure $\mathcal{H}_\mu^{q,t}$ [22, 20] or $\mathcal{H}_{\mu,\nu}^{q,t}$ [1].

Theorem 1. *Let $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X})$, $q \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\xi \in \Phi(\mathbb{X})$. Then*

1. *$\mathcal{H}_\mu^{q,\xi}$ is a metric outer measure on $\mathbb{X}$ and thus measure on the Borel family of subsets of $\mathbb{X}$;*
2. *for any $E \subseteq \mathbb{X}$, we can find a Borel set B such that $E \subseteq B$ and*

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mu,0}^{q,\xi}(B) = \mathcal{H}_{\mu,0}^{q,\xi}(E).$$

Proof. The proof of this Theorem is straightforward and mimics that in Theorem 2. □

2.2. **Weighted generalized Hausdorff measure.** In the following we define the weighted generalized Hausdorff measure. A sequence $(c_i, B_i)_{i\geq 1}$ of pairs, with c_i a nonnegative real number and B_i a closed ball of $\mathbb{X}$, is said to be a weighted cover of E if

$$\chi_E \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} c_i \chi_{B_i}$$

that is for all points x of E we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \Big\{ c_i \ ; \ x \in B_i \Big\} \geq 1. \tag{2.1}$$

In addition, for $\delta > 0$, we say that $(c_i; B_i)_{i\geq 1}$ is a weighted and centered $\delta-$cover of E if

- it is a weighted cover of E;
- for all $i \geq 1$, B_i is centered in E and $\operatorname{diam} B_i \leq 2\delta$.

We denote the family of all weighted and centered δ-covers of E by $\Upsilon_\delta(E)$. Write

$$\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu,\delta}(E) = \inf \Big\{ \sum_i c_i \mu(B_i)^q \xi(B_i); \quad (c_i, B_i)_i \in \Upsilon_\delta(E) \Big\} \tag{2.2}$$

if $E \neq \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu,\delta}(\emptyset) = 0$, with the convention that $\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu,\delta}(E)$ is given infinite value if no weighted and centered δ-cover of E exists. Now, by applying the standard construction we obtain the weighted generalized Hausdorff $\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}$ defined by

$$\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu,0}(E) = \sup_{\delta>0} \mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu,\delta}(E) = \lim_{\delta\to 0} \mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu,\delta}(E)$$
$$\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}(E) = \sup_{F\subseteq E} \mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu,0}(F).$$

Remark 1. *If the weights c_i are restricted to the value unity, then* (2.1) *requires, only, that each point of E be covered once. That is covered in the normal sense. It follows that*

$$\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu,\delta}(E) \leq \mathcal{H}^{q,\xi}_{\mu,\delta}(E) \quad \textit{and then} \quad \mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}(E) \leq \mathcal{H}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}(E).$$

Theorem 2. *Let $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X})$, $q \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\xi \in \Phi(\mathbb{X})$. Then*

(1) *$\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}$ is a metric outer measure on $\mathbb{X}$ and thus measure on the Borel family of subsets of $\mathbb{X}$;*
(2) *for any $E \subseteq \mathbb{X}$, we can find a Borel set B such that $E \subseteq B$*

$$\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu,0}(B) = \mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu,0}(E).$$

Proof. (1) It is clear that $\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}$ is increasing and satisfies $\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}(\emptyset) = 0$. Therefore, to prove that $\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}$ is an outer measure, we only have to prove that, for any sequence $\{E_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ of subsets of $\mathbb{X}$, we have

$$\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}\Big(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n \Big) \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}(E_n). \tag{2.3}$$

Let $\epsilon > 0$ and $\delta > 0$. For each $n \geq 1$, let $\widetilde{E}_n \subseteq E_n$. Then we can find a weighted and centered δ-cover $(c_{ni}, B_{ni})_{i\geq 1}$ of $\widetilde{E}_n$ such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} c_{ni} \mu(B_{ni})^q \xi(B_{ni}) \leq \mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu,\delta}(\widetilde{E}_n) + \frac{\epsilon}{2^n}.$$

Since $(c_{ni}, B_{ni})_{n,i\geq 1}$, reordered as a single sequence, forms a weighted and centered δ-cover of $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \widetilde{E}_n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu,\delta}\Big(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty}\widetilde{E}_n\Big) &\leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} c_{ni}\mu(B_{ni})^q\xi(B_{ni}) \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu,\delta}(\widetilde{E}_n)+\epsilon.\\ &\leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu,0}(\widetilde{E}_n)+\epsilon \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}(E_n)+\epsilon.\end{aligned}$$

By letting δ and ϵ to zero we obtain $\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu,0}\Big(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty}\widetilde{E}_n\Big) \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}(E_n)$. Consequently (2.3) holds, so that $\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}$ is an outer measure.

Now we will prove that the measure $\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}$ is metric. For this, let $E, F \subseteq \mathbb{X}$ such that $\rho(E,F) = \inf\{\rho(x,y), x\in E, y\in F\} > 0$. Since $\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}$ is an outer measure, it suffices to prove that

$$\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}\Big(E\bigcup F\Big) \geq \mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}(E)+\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}(F). \tag{2.4}$$

We may assume that $\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}\Big(E\bigcup F\Big)$ is finite. Let $E_1 \subseteq E$, $F_1 \subseteq F$ and (c_i, B_i) be a weighted and centered δ-cover of $E_1 \cup F_1$ such that $2\delta < \rho(E,F)$. Let

$$I = \Big\{i;\ B_i\bigcap E_1 \neq \emptyset\Big\} \qquad \text{and} \qquad J = \Big\{i;\ B_i\bigcap F_1 \neq \emptyset\Big\}.$$

It is clear that $\{c_i, B_i\}_{i\in I}$ is a weighted and centered δ-cover of E_1 and $\{c_i, B_i\}_{i\in J}$ is a weighted and centered δ-cover of F_1. It follows that

$$\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu,\delta}\Big(E_1\bigcup F_1\Big) \geq \mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu,\delta}(E_1)+\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu,\delta}(F_1)$$

and then

$$\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}\Big(E\bigcup F\Big) \geq \mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu,0}\Big(E_1\bigcup F_1\Big) \geq \mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu,0}(E_1)+\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu,0}(F_1).$$

Since E_1 is arbitrary subset of E and F_1 is arbitrary subset of F we get (2.4).

(2) Let $E \subseteq \mathbb{X}$. We may suppose that $\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}$ is finite, since, if this is not the case, we have $\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}(\mathbb{X}) = \mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}(E)$. Remark that the infimum of (2.2) remains the same when taken over strict weighted and centered δ-cover of E, that is, a weighted and centered δ-cover of E such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\Big\{c_i\ ;\ x\in B_i\Big\} > 1,$$

for all point $x \in E$. Now, consider, for each integer n, a strict weighted and centered δ-cover $\{c_{ni}, B_{ni}\}_{i\geq 1}$ of E such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} c_{ni}\mu(B_{ni})^q\xi(B_{ni}) \leq \mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu,\delta}(E)+\frac{1}{n}. \tag{2.5}$$

For each n, consider the set

$$B_n := \Big\{x:\ \sum_{\substack{i=1\\ x\in B_{ni}}}^{\infty} c_{ni} > 1\Big\}.$$

It is clear that $E \subseteq B_n$ and, by (2.3),

$$\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu,\delta}(B_n) \leq \mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu,\delta}(E) + \frac{1}{n}. \tag{2.6}$$

In addition, for $x \in B_n$, there exists $k = k(n,x)$ such that

$$\sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ x\in B_{ni}}}^{k} c_{ni} > 1,$$

and $x \in \bigcap_{\substack{i=1 \\ x\in B_{ni}}}^{k} B_{ni} \subseteq B_n$. Therefore, B_n can be expressed as the countable union of such finite intersection and thus, by taking $B = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n$ and using (2.6), we obtain,

$$\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu,\delta}(B) = \mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu,\delta}(E).$$

Therefore, we can choose, for each integer j a Borel set B_j such that $E \subseteq B_j$ and $\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu,1/j}(B_j) = \mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu,1/j}(E)$. Let $B = \bigcap_{j=1}^{\infty} B_j$ we get

$$E \subseteq B \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu,0}(B) = \mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu,0}(E).$$

□

Remark 2. *We can deduce from the proof of Theorem 2 that, for any sets $E, F \subseteq \mathbb{X}$,*

$$\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu,0}(E \cup F) \leq \mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu,0}(E) + \mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu,0}(F)$$

and we have the equality if $\rho(E,F) > 0$.

Lemma 1. *Let $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X})$, $q \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\xi \in \Phi_D(\mathbb{X})$. Then, for any $E \subseteq \mathbb{X}$ there exists a constant β such that*

$$\beta\, \mathcal{H}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}(E) \leq W^{q,\xi}_{\mu}(E). \tag{2.7}$$

provided that $q \leq 0$ or $q > 0$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_D(\mathbb{X})$. In particular, we have

$$\mathcal{H}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}(E) = +\infty \iff \mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}(E) = +\infty.$$

Proof. Let $\delta > 0$, $F \subseteq E \subseteq \mathbb{X}$ and $\{c_i, B_i\}_{i\geq 1}$ is a weighted and centered δ-covering of F, where $B_i := B(x_i, r_i)$. Using Corollary 4.4 in [8], there exists a subfamily $\{B_{i_j}\}_{j\geq 1}$ of balls such that $F \subseteq \bigcup_{j\geq 1} 3B_{i_j}$ and

$$\sum_{j\geq 1} \mu\big(B(x_{i_j}, r_{i_j})\big)^q \xi\big(B(x_{i_j}, r_{i_j})\big) \leq 8 \sum_{i\geq 1} c_i \mu\big(B(x_i, r_i)\big)^q \xi\big(B(x_i, r_i)\big),$$

where $3B_{i_j} := B(x_{i_j}, 3r_{i_j})$. Therefore, there exists a constant C such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}^{q,\xi}_{\mu,\delta}(F) &\leq \sum_{j\geq 1} \mu\big(B(x_{i_j}, 3r_{i_j})\big)^q \xi\big(B(x_{i_j}, 3r_{i_j})\big) \\ &\leq 8\, C \sum_{i\geq 1} c_i \mu\big(B(x_i, r_i)\big)^q \xi\big(B(x_i, r_i)\big) \end{aligned}$$

Now, taking the infimum over all weighted and centered δ-coverings $\{c_i, B_i\}_{i\geq 1}$ of F proves that

$$\mathcal{H}^{q,\xi}_{\mu,\delta}(F) \leq 8\, C\, \mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu,\delta}(F).$$

Letting $\delta \to 0$, to get

$$(8\,C)^{-1}\,\mathcal{H}^{q,\xi}_{\mu,0}(F) \leq\ \mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu,0}(F) \leq W^{q,\xi}_{\mu}(E).$$

Since F is arbitrarily chosen, we obtain $(8\,C)^{-1}\,\mathcal{H}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}(E) \leq W^{q,\xi}_{\mu}(E)$. □

Example 1. *In this example we take $\mathbb{X}$ to be satisfying the Besicovitch covering theorem (Theorem 6). Let $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X})$, and $\xi \in \Phi(\mathbb{X})$. Assume that there exist $p, a, b \geq 0$ such that $q \geq 1-p$ and an increasing continuous function $\varphi : [0,+\infty] \to [0,+\infty]$ with $\lim\limits_{r\to 0}\varphi(r) = 0$ such that*

$$a\ \mu(B(x,r))^p\varphi(r) \leq \xi(B(x,r)) \leq b\ \mu(B(x,r))^p\varphi(r) \tag{2.8}$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{X}$ and $r > 0$. This holds, for example, if

$$\xi(B(x,r)) = r^t, \qquad t > 0$$

or

$$\xi(B(x,r)) = \nu(B(x,r))^p h(r)$$

with $\mu \sim \nu$ and h is a Hausdorff function. Let $R > 0$, $0 < \delta < R$ and $E \subseteq B(0,R)$. By the Besicovitch covering theorem, we can extract from

$$\Big\{B(x,r),\ \ x \in E, 0 < r \leq \delta\Big\}$$

a centered δ-covering $\{B(x_i,r_i)\}$ of E with the overlap controlled by a constant γ. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}^{q,\xi}_{\mu,\delta}(E) &\leq \sum_i \mu\big(B(x_i,r_i)\big)^q\xi(B(x_i,r_i)) \leq b\ \varphi(\delta)\Big(\sum_i \mu\big(B(x_i,r_i)\big)\Big)^{q+p}\\ &\leq b\ \varphi(\delta)\gamma^q\Big(\mu\big(B(0,2R)\big)\Big)^{q+p}.\end{aligned}$$

It follows, by letting δ to 0, that for all $E \subseteq B(0,R)$, we have $\mathcal{H}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}(B(0,R)) = 0$ for all $R > 0$. Thus $\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}(\mathbb{X}) = \mathcal{H}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}(\mathbb{X}) = 0$. Therefore, for any $q \geq 1-p$ and $E \subseteq \mathbb{X}$, we have

$$\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}(E) = \mathcal{H}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}(E) = 0$$

2.3. **Regularity of the weighted generalized Hausdorff measure.** In the following, we will prove that $\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}$ is Borel regular measure, that is, for all $E \subseteq \mathbb{X}$ there exists a Borel set B such that

$$\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}(E) = \mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}(B).$$

This is done by the construction of new measure $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}$, in a similar manner to the weighted and centered generalized Hausdorff measure $\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}$ but using the class of all covering balls in the definition rather than the class of all centered balls. We will prove that $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}$ is Borel regular and $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}$ is comparable to $\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}$ (see (2.10)).

Theorem 3. *Let $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_D(\mathbb{X})$, $q \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\xi \in \Phi_D(\mathbb{X})$. Then $\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}$ and $\mathcal{H}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}$ are Borel regular. Moreover, if $q \leq 0$, then these measures are Borel regular even if μ is not not blanketed.*

Proof. We will prove the result for $\mathcal{W}_{\mu}^{q,\xi}$. The proof can be written in a similar way for $\mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{q,\xi}$. Let $(c_i, B_i)_{i\geq 1}$ be a weighted cover of a set E. For $\delta > 0$, $(c_i; B_i)_{i\geq 1}$ is said to be a weighted $\delta-$cover of E if, for all $i \geq 1$, $\operatorname{diam} B_i \leq 2\delta$. In this case, the center of B_i does not necessarily belong to E. We denote the family of all weighted δ-covers of E by $\widetilde{\Upsilon}_{\delta}(E)$. For $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X})$, $q \in \mathbb{R}$, $\xi \in \Phi(\mathbb{X})$, $E \subseteq \mathbb{X}$ and $\delta > 0$ we write

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_{\mu,\delta}^{q,\xi}(E) = \inf\left\{\sum_i c_i \mu(B_i)^q \xi(B_i);\ \ (c_i, B_i)_i \in \widetilde{\Upsilon}_{\delta}(E)\right\}, \tag{2.9}$$

if $E \neq \emptyset$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_{\mu,\delta}^{q,\xi}(\emptyset) = 0$. Now, we define

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_{\mu}^{q,\xi}(E) = \sup_{\delta>0} \widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_{\mu,\delta}^{q,\xi}(E) = \lim_{\delta\to 0} \widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_{\mu,\delta}^{q,\xi}(E)$$

Now, it is not difficult to prove that, $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_{\mu}^{q,\xi}$ is a metric outer measure on $\mathbb{X}$ and thus a measure on the Borel family of subsets of $\mathbb{X}$. In addition, $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_{\mu}^{q,\xi}$ is Borel regular. The proof is straightforward and mimics that in Theorem 2. Since there exists a positive constant α such that, for all set $E \subseteq \mathbb{X}$,

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_{\mu}^{q,\xi}(E) \leq \mathcal{W}_{\mu,0}^{q,\xi}(E) \ \text{ and } \ \mathcal{W}_{\mu}^{q,\xi}(E) \leq \alpha\, \widetilde{\mathcal{W}}_{\mu}^{q,\xi}(E), \tag{2.10}$$

then $\mathcal{W}_{\mu}^{q,\xi}$ is Borel regular (see Lemma 7 and Theorem 5 [23] for the key ideas of the proof). Moreover, if $q \leq 0$, then (2.10) holds even for μ not blanketed.

□

3. Proofs of main results

3.1. **Proof of Theorem A.** Let $(\mathbb{X}, \rho)$ and $(\mathbb{X}', \rho')$ be two separable metric spaces. The cartesian product space $\mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{X}'$ is defined with the metric $\rho \times \rho'$ given by

$$\rho \times \rho'\Big((x_1, x_1'), (x_2, x_2')\Big) = \max\Big\{\rho(x_1, x_2), \rho'(x_1', x_2')\Big\}.$$

Let $\xi \in \Phi(\mathbb{X})$ and $\xi' \in \Phi(\mathbb{X}')$. Let's define the function ξ_0 on $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}) \times \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}')$ by :

$$\xi_0(B \times B') = \xi(B)\ \xi'(B').$$

The following lemma will be useful to study the zero-infinite case.

Lemma 2. *Let $q \in \mathbb{R}$, $\delta > 0$, $E \subseteq \mathbb{X}$ and $E' \subseteq \mathbb{X}'$. Assume that $(\mathbb{X}, \xi, \mu)$ and $(\mathbb{X}', \xi', \nu)$ satisfy* (1.2)*.*

1. *If $\mathcal{W}_{\mu,\delta}^{q,\xi}(E) = \infty$ and $\mathcal{W}_{\nu,\delta}^{q,\xi'}(E') = 0$ then $\mathcal{W}_{\mu\times\nu,\delta}^{q,\xi_0}(E \times E') = 0$.*
2. *If $\mathcal{H}_{\mu,\delta}^{q,\xi}(E) = \infty$ and $\mathcal{H}_{\nu,\delta}^{q,\xi'}(E') = 0$ then $\mathcal{H}_{\mu\times\nu,\delta}^{q,\xi_0}(E \times E') = 0$.*

Proof. We will only prove the first assertion. The other is a direct consequence, by taking each of the weights c_i and c'_{i_j} below to be unity. Let's consider $(c_i, B_i)_{i\geq 1}$ a weighted and centered δ-cover of E such that $(c_i \mu(B_i)^q \xi(B_i))$ is finite for each $i \geq 1$. Then, for $\epsilon > 0$, we may choose for each i, a weighted and centered δ-cover $(c'_{i_j}, B'_{i_j})_{j\geq 1}$ of E' such that

$$c_i\,(\mu(B_i))^q\,\xi(B_i) \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} c'_{i_j} \left(\nu(B'_{i_j})\right)^q \xi'(B'_{i_j}) < \frac{\epsilon}{2^i} \tag{3.1}$$

For each $(x, x') \in E \times E'$, we have

$$\sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ (x,x')\in B_i\times B'_{i_j}}}^{\infty} (c_i c'_{i_j}) = \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ x\in B_i}}^{\infty} \big(c_i \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ x'\in B'_{i_j}}}^{\infty} c'_{i_j}\big)$$
$$\geq \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ x\in B_i}}^{\infty} c_i \geq 1\,.$$

Consequently, $(c_i c'_{i_j}, B_i \times B'_{i_j})_{i,j\geq 1}$ is a weighted and centered δ-cover of $E \times E'$. Using (3.1), we get :

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi_0}_{\mu\times\nu,\delta}(E \times E') &\leq \sum_{i,j=1}^{\infty} c_i c'_{i_j} \mu \times \nu(B_i \times B'_{i_j})^q \xi_0(B_i \times B'_{i_j}) \\
&= \sum_{i,j=1}^{\infty} c_i c'_{i_j} \mu(B_i)^q \nu(B'_{i_j})^q \xi(B_i)\xi'(B'_{i_j}) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} c_i \mu(B_i)^q \xi(B_i)\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} c'_{i_j} \nu(B'_{i_j})^q \xi'(B'_{i_j})\Big) \\
&< \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\epsilon}{2^i} = \epsilon\,.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition 1. *Let $q \in \mathbb{R}$ and assume that $(\mathbb{X}, \xi, \mu)$ and $(\mathbb{X}', \xi', \nu)$ satisfy* (1.2)*, then for any $E \subseteq \mathbb{X}$ and $E' \subseteq \mathbb{X}'$, we have :*

$$\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi_0}_{\mu\times\nu,\delta}(E \times E') = \mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu,\delta}(E)\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi'}_{\nu,\delta}(E')\,, \quad \forall\, \delta > 0\,. \tag{3.2}$$

Proof. By Lemma 2, we may suppose that $\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu,\delta}(E)$ and $\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi'}_{\nu,\delta}(E')$ are not one zero and the other infinite. We start by proving that:

$$\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi_0}_{\mu\times\nu,\delta}(E \times E') \geq \mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu,\delta}(E)\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi'}_{\nu,\delta}(E')\,. \tag{3.3}$$

Without loss of generality, we may suppose that $\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi_0}_{\mu\times\nu,\delta}(E \times E')$ is finite and $\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi'}_{\nu,\delta}(E')$ is positive. Let $0 < p < \mathcal{W}^{q,\xi'}_{\nu,\delta}(E')$ and let $(c_i, B_i \times B'_i)$ be a weighted and centered δ-cover of $E \times E'$. It follows that, for any $x' \in E'$, we have

$$\sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ x'\in B'_i}}^{\infty} c_i = \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ (x,x')\in B_i\times B'_i}}^{\infty} c_i \geq 1.$$

Therefore, $(c_i, B'_i)_{i\geq 1}$ is a weighted and centered δ-cover of E'. We set, for each i,

$$u_i = c_i\, \nu(B'_i)^q\, \xi'(B'_i)/p,$$

then

$$p < \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} c_i \nu(B')^q \xi'(B'_i) \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ x\in B_i}}^{\infty} u_i > 1.$$

Since this holds for each $x \in E$, we get that $(u_i, B_i)_{i\geq 1}$ is a weighted and centered δ-cover of E and :

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} c_i \mu \times \nu(B_i \times B_i')^q \xi_0(B_i \times B_i') = p \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} u_i \mu(B_i)^q \xi(B_i) \geq p \mathcal{W}_{\mu,\delta}^{q,\xi}(E)$$

Since $(c_i, B_i \times B_i')$ and p are arbitrarily chosen, we obtain (3.3).

Now, we will prove that

$$\mathcal{W}_{\mu\times\nu,\delta}^{q,\xi_0}(E \times E') \leq \mathcal{W}_{\mu,\delta}^{q,\xi}(E) \mathcal{W}_{\nu,\delta}^{q,\xi'}(E'). \tag{3.4}$$

We may assume that $\mathcal{W}_{\mu,\delta}^{q,\xi}(E)\mathcal{W}_{\nu,\delta}^{q,\xi'}(E')$ is finite. Let $(c_i, B_i)_{i\geq 1}$ and $(c_i', B_i')_{i\geq 1}$ be weighted and centered δ-covers for E and E' respectively. Then for $(x, x') \in E \times E'$ we have

$$\sum_{\substack{i,j\geq 1 \\ (x,x')\in B_i\times B_j'}} c_i c_j' = \Big(\sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ x\in B_i}}^{\infty} c_i \Big) \Big(\sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ x'\in B_j'}}^{\infty} c_j' \Big) \geq 1.$$

so that $(c_i c_j', B_i \times B_j')_{i,j\geq 1}$ is a weighted and centered δ-cover for $E \times E'$. As a consequence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_{\mu\times\nu,\delta}^{q,\xi_0}(E \times E') &\leq \sum_{i,j=1}^{\infty} c_i c_j' \mu \times \nu(B_i \times B_j')^q \xi_0(B_i \times B_j') \\ &= \sum_{i,j=1}^{\infty} c_i c_j' \mu(B_i)^q \nu(B_j')^q \xi(B_i) \xi'(B_j') \\ &= \Big(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} c_i \mu(B_i)^q \xi(B_i) \Big) \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} c_j' \nu(B_i)^q \xi'(B_i') \Big). \end{aligned}$$

Then (3.4) holds and this ends the proof. □

Now, we are able to give the proof of Theorem A. Let $E_1 \subseteq E$ and $E_1' \subseteq E'$. By letting $\delta \to 0$ in (3.2), we get :

$$\mathcal{W}_{\mu\times\nu,0}^{q,\xi_0}(E_1 \times E_1') = \mathcal{W}_{\mu,0}^{q,\xi}(E_1) \mathcal{W}_{\nu,0}^{q,\xi'}(E_1') \leq \mathcal{W}_{\mu}^{q,\xi}(E) \mathcal{W}_{\nu}^{q,\xi'}(E').$$

Therefore

$$\mathcal{W}_{\mu\times\nu}^{q,\xi_0}(E \times E') \leq \mathcal{W}_{\mu}^{q,\xi}(E) \mathcal{W}_{\nu}^{q,\xi'}(E').$$

Moreover,

$$\mathcal{W}_{\mu\times\nu}^{q,\xi_0}(E \times E') \geq \mathcal{W}_{\mu\times\nu,0}^{q,\xi_0}(E_1 \times E_1') = \mathcal{W}_{\mu,0}^{q,\xi}(E_1) \mathcal{W}_{\nu,0}^{q,\xi'}(E_1')$$

and then, by arbitrariness of E_1 and E_1',

$$\mathcal{W}_{\mu\times\nu}^{q,\xi_0}(E \times E') \geq \mathcal{W}_{\mu}^{q,\xi}(E) \mathcal{W}_{\nu}^{q,\xi'}(E') \tag{3.5}$$

as required.

Remark 3. (1) *Under our convention* $\infty \times 0 = 0 \times \infty = 0$*, the inequality* (3.5) *is true without the assumption* (1.2)*.*

(2) *Let $(\mathbb{X},\xi)$ and $(\mathbb{X}',\xi')$ be two separable metric spaces that satisfy :*
Any set E of $\mathbb{X}$ and any set E' of $\mathbb{X}'$ such that $\mathcal{H}_\mu^{q,\xi}(E)=0$ and $\mathcal{H}_\mu^{q,\xi'}(E')=0$, can be covered by countable numbers of balls $(B_i)_i$ and $(B'_j)_j$ of arbitrarily small diameters such that $\mu(B_i)^q\xi(B_i)=\mu(B'_j)^q\xi'(B'_j)=0$ for each i and j.

Then the previous results remain true. Indeed, we only have to verify Lemma 2 under the previous hypthesis instead of (1.2)*. In this case, we can choose a weighted and centered δ-cover $(c_i,B_i)_i$ and $(c'_j,B'_j)_j$ of E and E' such that, for each j, we have $\nu(B'_j)^q\xi'(B'_j)=0$. As in the proof of Lemma 2, $(c_ic'_j,B_i\times B'_j)$ is a weighted and centered δ-cover of $E\times E'$. thereby,*

$$\mathcal{W}_{\mu\times\nu}^{q,\xi}(E\times E')\leq\sum_{i,j=1}^{\infty}c_ic'_j\mu(B_i)^q\xi(B_i)\nu(B'_j)^q\xi'(B'_j)=0$$

which yield the desired result.

3.2. **Proof of Theorem B.** A set E is said to be regular if $\mathcal{W}_\mu^{q,\xi}(E)=\mathcal{H}_\mu^{q,\xi}(E)$. Therefore, it is interesting to give some characterizations of such sets. In this section, we will be concerned to give a sufficient condition to get the regularity of E. We start by an auxiliary result which is interesting in itself. We define, for $\epsilon>0$, the set

$$\Lambda_{\mu,\epsilon}^{q,\xi}=\Big\{x\in\mathbb{X},\ \exists\delta_x>0,\ \mathcal{H}_\mu^{q,\xi}\big(B(x,r)\big)\leq(1+\epsilon)\mu(B(x,r))^q\xi(B(x,r)),\ \forall r\leq\delta_x\Big\}.$$

Lemma 3. *Let $q\in\mathbb{R},\xi\in\Phi_D(\mathbb{X})$, $\epsilon>0$ and $\mu\in\mathcal{P}_D(\mathbb{X})$. Assume that $\mathcal{H}_\mu^{q,\xi}(\mathbb{X})<\infty$ then*

$$\mathcal{H}_\mu^{q,\xi}(\mathbb{X})=\mathcal{H}_\mu^{q,\xi}(\Lambda_{\mu,\epsilon}^{q,\xi}).$$

Proof. Let E be the set of all points $x\in\mathbb{X}$ that are not in $\Lambda_{\mu,\epsilon}^{q,\xi}$, which means , every $x\in\mathbb{X}$ such that there exists $0<r_j\leq\frac{1}{j}$ and

$$\mathcal{H}_\mu^{q,\xi}\big(B(x,r_j)\big)>(1+\epsilon)\mu\big(B(x,r_j)\big)^q\xi(B(x,r_j))\,,\ \forall\, j\in\mathbb{N}.$$

Suppose that there exists $F\subseteq E$ such that $\mathcal{H}_\mu^{q,\xi}(F)>0$. Then, there exists an open set U that satisfies $F\subseteq U$ and $\mathcal{H}_\mu^{q,\xi}(U)<\mathcal{H}_\mu^{q,\xi}(F)(1+\epsilon/4)$. Now, for $\delta>0$, let's consider

$$\mathcal{C}=\Big\{B(x,r_j)\subseteq U;\ \ j\geq5/\delta,\ x\in F\Big\}.$$

Then $\mathcal{C}$ is a fine cover of F (see definition 1). Moreover, by Theorem 7, there exists a family of pairwise disjoint balls $\mathcal{C}'\subseteq\mathcal{C}$ and

$$F\subseteq\bigcup_{B'\in\mathcal{C}'}5B'.$$

It follows, since $\mathcal{H}_\mu^{q,\xi}(\mathbb{X})<\infty$, that there exists a finite collection of balls $B_1\dots B_N\in\mathcal{C}'$ verifying

$$\sum_{B'\in\mathcal{C}'\setminus\{B_1,\dots,B_N\}}\mathcal{H}_\mu^{q,\xi}(B')<C^{-1}\mathcal{H}_\mu^{q,\xi}(F)\frac{\epsilon}{4},$$

where C satisfies $\mu(B(x,5r))\xi(B(x,5r))\leq C\mu(B(x,r))\xi(B(x,r))$, for all $x\in F$. Now, using again Theorem 7, we obtain

$$F\subseteq\bigcup_{j=1}^{N}B(x,r_j)\ \cup\bigcup_{B'\in\mathcal{C}'\setminus\{B_1,\dots,B_N\}}5B'.\tag{3.6}$$

Since for each $B' \in \mathcal{C}'$, $B' \subset U$, $\operatorname{diam}(5B') \leq 5\operatorname{diam}(B') \leq 2\delta$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{H}^{q,\xi}_{\mu,\delta}(F) &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{N} \mu(B(x,r_j))^q \xi(B(x,r_j)) + \sum_{B'\in\mathcal{C}'\setminus\{B_1,\dots,B_N\}} \mu(5B')^q \xi(5B') \\
&\leq \frac{1}{1+\epsilon}\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{N} \mathcal{H}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}(B(x,r_j)) + C \sum_{B'\in\mathcal{C}'\setminus\{B_1,\dots,B_N\}} \mathcal{H}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}(B')\Big) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{1+\epsilon}\Big(\mathcal{H}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}(U) + \mathcal{H}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}(E)\frac{\epsilon}{4}\Big) \\
&\leq \mathcal{H}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}(E)\frac{1+\epsilon/2}{1+\epsilon}.
\end{aligned}$$

By letting $\delta \to 0$ we obtain

$$\mathcal{H}^{q,\xi}_{\mu,0}(F) \leq \mathcal{H}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}(E)\frac{1+\epsilon/2}{1+\epsilon} < \mathcal{H}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}(E).$$

which is a contradiction since F is an arbitrary subset of E.

□

Remark 4. *The result in Lemma 3 remains true if $q \leq 0$ even without the assumption $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_D(\mathbb{X})$.*

Now, we are able to give the proof of Theorem B. For this, we may assume by Lemma 1 that $\mathcal{H}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}(E) < \infty$. Let $\widetilde{E}$ be a Borel set such that $E \subseteq \widetilde{E}$ and $\mathcal{H}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}(E) = \mathcal{H}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}(\widetilde{E})$. Let $\epsilon > 0$. For each $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we set

$$W_j := \Big\{x \in \widetilde{E},\ \mathcal{H}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}(\widetilde{E}\cap B) \leq (1+\epsilon)\mu(B)^q\xi(B),\ \forall\, B \subset B(x,\frac{1}{j})\Big\}.$$

Then, $\{W_j\}_j$ is an increasing set. Fix $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $(c_k, B(x_k,r_k))_{k\geq 1}$ be a weighted and centered $(1/j)-$covering of E such that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} c_k\, \mu(B(x_k,r_k))^q \xi(B(x_k,r_k)) \leq \mathcal{W}^{q,\xi}_{\mu,1/j}(E) + \epsilon. \tag{3.7}$$

Then

$$E\cap W_j \subseteq \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} B(x_k,r_k)\cap W_j \quad \text{and} \quad \chi_{E\cap W_j} \leq \sum_{W_j\cap B(x_k,r_k)\neq\emptyset} c_k \chi_{\widetilde{E}\cap B(x_k,r_k)}\,.$$

Let $\mathcal{S} = \Big\{x \mid \sum_{W_j\cap B(x_k,r_k)\neq\emptyset} c_k\chi_{\widetilde{E}\cap B(x_k,r_k)}(x) \geq 1\Big\}$. Then, $\mathcal{S}$ is a Borel set that contains $E\cap W_j$, and $\chi_{\mathcal{S}} \leq \sum_{W_j\cap B(x_k,r_k)\neq\emptyset} c_k\chi_{\widetilde{E}\cap B(x_k,r_k)}$. Integrating with respect to $\mathcal{H}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}$ yields

$$\mathcal{H}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}(E\cap W_j) \leq \mathcal{H}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}(\mathcal{S}) \leq \sum_{W_j\cap B(x_k,r_k)\neq\emptyset} c_k \mathcal{H}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}(\widetilde{E}\cap B(x_k,r_k))\,.$$

For $k \geq 1$ such that $W_j \cap B(x_k,r_k) \neq \emptyset$, we have

$$\mathcal{H}^{q,\xi}_{\mu}(\widetilde{E}\cap B(x_k,r_k)) \leq (1+\epsilon)\mu(B(x_k,r_k))^q\xi(B(x_k,r_k))\,.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{q,\xi}(E\cap W_j) &\leq (1+\epsilon)\sum_{W_j\cap B(x_k,r_k)\neq\emptyset} c_k\mu(B(x_k,r_k))^q\xi(B(x_k,r_k))\\ &\leq (1+\epsilon)(\mathcal{W}_{\mu,1/j}^{q,\xi}(E)+\epsilon)\,.\end{aligned}$$

When ϵ tends to 0, we obtain $\mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{q,\xi}(E\cap W_j)\leq \mathcal{W}_{\mu,1/j}^{q,\xi}(E)\,.$

Using Lemma 3, we have

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{q,\xi}\Big(\widetilde{E}\setminus\bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty}W_j\Big)=0.$$

Moreover, $\mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{q,\xi}$ is a regular measure. Then,

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{q,\xi}(E)\leq\mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{q,\xi}\Big(E\cap\bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty}W_j\Big)=\lim_{j\to\infty}\mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{q,\xi}(E\cap W_j).$$

Thus, $\mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{q,\xi}(E)\ \leq \lim_{j\to+\infty}\mathcal{W}_{\mu,1/j}^{q,\xi}(E)=\mathcal{W}_{\mu,0}^{q,\xi}(E)\leq\mathcal{W}_{\mu}^{q,\xi}(E)\,.$

Remark 5. *The result in Theorem B remains true if $q\leq 0$ even without the assumption $\mu\in\mathcal{P}_D(\mathbb{X})$.*

3.3. **Proof of Theorem C.** Let $q\in\mathbb{R}$, $\mu\in\mathcal{P}_D(\mathbb{X})$, $\nu\in\mathcal{P}_D(\mathbb{X}')$, $\xi\in\Phi(\mathbb{X})$ and $\xi'\in\Phi(\mathbb{X}')$. Assume that $(\mathbb{X},\xi,\mu)$ and $(\mathbb{X}',\xi',\nu)$ satisfy (1.2). Let $E\subseteq\mathbb{X}$, $E'\subseteq\mathbb{X}'$ and $\delta>0$. It is clear that we only need to prove

$$\mathcal{W}_{\mu,\delta}^{q,\xi}(E)\mathcal{H}_{\nu,\delta}^{q,\xi'}(E')\leq\mathcal{H}_{\mu\times\nu,\delta}^{q,\xi_0}(E\times E')\leq\mathcal{H}_{\mu,\delta}^{q,\xi}(E)\mathcal{H}_{\nu,\delta}^{q,\xi'}(E'). \tag{3.8}$$

The right hand side of (3.8) may be inferred from the proof of (3.4) by taking c_i and c_i' to be unity. Therefore, we will only prove the left hand side. Without loss of generality, we can suppose that $\mathcal{H}_{\mu\times\nu,\delta}^{q,\xi_0}(E\times E')$ is finite and $\mathcal{H}_{\nu,\delta}^{q,\xi'}(E')$ is positive. Let p any number such that $0<p<\mathcal{H}_{\nu,\delta}^{q,\xi'}(E')$ and $(B_i\times B_i')_{i\geq1}$ be any centered δ-cover of $E\times E'$. It follows that $(B_i')_{i\geq1}$ is a centered δ-cover for E'. For each i, let $u_i=\nu(B_i')^q\xi'(B_i')/p$, then

$$p<\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\nu(B_i')^q\xi'(B_i')\quad\text{and}\quad\sum_{\substack{i=1\\ x\in B_i}}^{\infty}u_i>1\,.$$

Since this holds for each $x\in E$, we obtain a weighted and centered δ-cover $(u_i,B_i)_{i\geq1}$ of E and we have :

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\mu\times\nu(B_i\times B_i')^q\xi_0(B_i\times B_i') &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\mu(B_i)^q\xi(B_i)\nu(B_i')^q\xi'(B_i')\\ &= p\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}u_i\mu(B_i)^q\xi(B_i)\geq p\mathcal{W}_{\mu,\delta}^{q,\xi}(E)\,.\end{aligned}$$

Since $(B_i\times B_i')_{i\geq1}$ and p are arbitrarily chosen, we obtain

$$\mathcal{W}_{\mu,\delta}^{q,\xi}(E)\mathcal{H}_{\nu,\delta}^{q,\xi'}(E')\leq\mathcal{H}_{\mu\times\nu,\delta}^{q,\xi_0}(E\times E')\,.$$

4. APPLICATIONS

4.1. **Application 1 : Definition of ξ using Hausdorff function.** For any Hausdorff function h, we set $\xi_h \in \Phi(\mathbb{X})$ defined on $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X})$ by $\xi_h(B) = h(\mathrm{diam}_\rho(B))$ where $\mathrm{diam}_\rho(B)$ denotes the diameter of B with respect to ρ. Let $h, h' \in \mathcal{F}$. We define the function ξ_0, on the set $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}) \times \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}')$, by

$$\xi_0(B \times B') = \xi_h(B)\xi_{h'}(B') = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } B \times B' = \emptyset \\ \\ h(\mathrm{diam}_\rho(B))h'(\mathrm{diam}_{\rho'}(B')) & \text{if not.} \end{cases}$$

We recall that the Hausdorff function $h \times h'$ is defined by

$$h \times h'(r) = h(r)h'(r), \qquad \text{for all } r \in \mathbb{R}^+ .$$

Theorem 4. *For any $E \subseteq \mathbb{X}$ and any $F \subseteq \mathbb{X}'$, we have :*

$$\mathcal{W}^{q,h\times h'}_{\mu\times\nu}(E \times F) \geq \mathcal{W}^{q,h}_{\mu}(E)\mathcal{W}^{q,h'}_{\nu}(F) .$$

Assume that either $\mathcal{W}^{q,h}_{\mu}(E) = \mathcal{H}^{q,h}_{\mu}(E)$ or $\mathcal{W}^{q,h'}_{\nu}(F) = \mathcal{H}^{q,h'}_{\nu}(F)$, then

$$\mathcal{H}^{q,h\times h'}_{\mu\times\nu}(E \times F) \geq \mathcal{H}^{q,h}_{\mu}(E)\mathcal{H}^{q,h'}_{\nu}(F) . \tag{4.1}$$

Proof. First, we will prove a simple relation between the generalized measures generated by ξ_0 and those generated by $\xi_{h\times h'}$. Let $\delta > 0$, $E_1 \subseteq E$ and $F_1 \subseteq F$. We will prove that

$$\mathcal{W}^{q,h\times h'}_{\mu\times\nu,\delta}(E_1 \times F_1) \geq \mathcal{W}^{q,\xi_0}_{\mu\times\nu,\delta}(E_1 \times F_1) \tag{4.2}$$

Clearly, we may assume that $\mathcal{W}^{q,\xi_{h\times h'}}_{\mu\times\nu,\delta}(E_1 \times F_1)$ is finite. We consider a weighted and centered δ-cover $(c_i, B_i \times B'_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ for $E_1 \times F_1$ and, for each i, we set

$$d^\times(B_i \times B'_i) := \max(\mathrm{diam}_\rho(B_i), \mathrm{diam}_{\rho'}(B'_i)) .$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_{h\times h'}(B_i \times B'_i) = h \times h'(d^\times(B_i \times B'_i)) &= h(d^\times(B_i \times B'_i))\, h'(d^\times(B_i \times B'_i)) \\ &\geq h(\mathrm{diam}_\rho(B_i))\, h'(\mathrm{diam}_{\rho'}(B'_i)) \\ &= \xi_0(B_i \times B'_i). \end{aligned}$$

After summation, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} c_i\mu \times \nu(B_i \times B'_i)^q h \times h'(d^\times(B_i \times B'_i)) &\geq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} c_i\mu \times \nu(B_i \times B'_i)^q \xi_0(B_i \times B'_i) \\ &\geq \mathcal{W}^{q,\xi_0}_{\mu\times\nu,\delta}(E_1 \times F_1). \end{aligned}$$

Which gives (4.2) and implies that $\mathcal{W}^{q,h\times h'}_{\mu\times\nu,0}(E_1 \times F_1) \geq \mathcal{W}^{q,\xi_0}_{\mu\times\nu,0}(E_1 \times F_1)$ for any subsets $E_1 \subseteq E$ and $F_1 \subseteq F$. Therefore,

$$\mathcal{W}^{q,h\times h'}_{\mu\times\nu}(E \times F) \geq \mathcal{W}^{q,\xi_0}_{\mu\times\nu}(E \times F).$$

Now, using (1.3), we obtain

$$\mathcal{W}^{q,h\times h'}_{\mu\times\nu}(E \times F) \quad \geq \quad \mathcal{W}^{q,h}_{\mu}(E)\mathcal{W}^{q,h'}_{\nu}(F)$$

Similarly, by taking c_i to be equal to 1, we obtain $\mathcal{H}_{\mu\times\nu}^{q,h\times h'}(E\times F)\geq \mathcal{H}_{\mu\times\nu}^{q,\xi_0}(E\times F)$. Moreover, using Theorem C and (1.4), we get

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mu\times\nu}^{q,h\times h'}(E\times F)\geq \begin{cases}\mathcal{W}_{\mu}^{q,h}(E)\mathcal{H}_{\nu}^{q,h'}(F)\\ \\ \mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{q,h}(E)\mathcal{W}_{\nu}^{q,h'}(F).\end{cases} \tag{4.3}$$

So, if we suppose that $\mathcal{W}_{\mu}^{q,h}(E)=\mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{q,h}(E)$ or $\mathcal{W}_{\mu}^{q,h'}(F)=\mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{q,h'}(F)$ we obtain

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mu\times\nu}^{q,h\times h'}(E\times F)\geq \mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{q,h}(E)\mathcal{H}_{\nu}^{q,h'}(F).$$

□

Remark 6. *As a consequence of theorem B, if h and μ (or h' and ν) are blanketed, then* (4.1) *holds.*

4.2. **Application 2.** Here we will consider an interesting case when ξ_0 is defined on $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{X}\times\mathbb{X}')$ by $\xi_0(B\times B')=\xi(B)\xi'(B')$. Our goal is to prove Theorem 5 using density approach. Let $\nu,\ \mu\in\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X})$, $x\in supp(\mu)$, $q\in\mathbb{R}$ and $h\in\mathcal{F}_D$, we define the upper (q,ξ)-density at x with respect to μ by

$$\overline{d}_{\mu}^{\,q,\xi}(x,\ \nu)=\limsup_{r\searrow 0}\frac{\nu\left(B(x,\ r)\right)}{\mu\left(B(x,\ r)\right)^{q}\,\xi\left(B(x,r)\right)}.$$

Lemma 4. *Let $\mu,\nu\in\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X}), q\in\mathbb{R},\xi\in\Phi_D(\mathbb{X})$ and $E\subseteq \operatorname{supp}\mu$.*

(i) *If $\mu\in\mathcal{P}_D(\mathbb{X})$ and $\mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{q,\xi}(E)<\infty$ then*

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{q,\xi}(E)\inf_{x\in E}\overline{d}_{\mu}^{\,q,\xi}(x,\ \nu)\leq\nu(E) \tag{4.4}$$

(ii) *If $\mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{q,\xi}(E)<\infty$ then*

$$\nu(E)\leq \mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{q,\xi}(E)\sup_{x\in E}\overline{d}_{\mu}^{\,q,\xi}(x,\ \nu). \tag{4.5}$$

Proof. The proof of this lemma is straightforward and mimics that in Theorem 2.14 in [20], when we use Theorem 7 instead of [9, Lemma 1.9]. □

An interesting consequence of Lemma 4 is the following Corollary which will be used to prove Theorem 5.

Corollary 1. *Let $\xi\in\Phi_D(\mathbb{X})$, $q\in\mathbb{R}$, $\mu\in\mathcal{P}_D(\mathbb{X})$ and $E\subseteq\operatorname{supp}\mu$ be a Borel set such that $\mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{q,\xi}(E)<+\infty$.*

(1) *If $\overline{d}_{\mu}^{q,\xi}(x,\mathcal{W}_{\mu}^{q,\xi}{}_{\llcorner E})=+\infty$ for $\mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{q,\xi}$-a.a. on E, then*

$$\mathcal{W}_{\mu}^{q,\xi}(E)=\mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{q,\xi}(E)=0.$$

(2) *If $\mathcal{W}_{\mu}^{q,\xi}(E)=0$ then*

$$\overline{d}_{\mu}^{q,\xi}(x,\mathcal{W}_{\mu}^{q,\xi}{}_{\llcorner E})=0\ \text{ for }\ \mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{q,\xi}-a.a.\ \text{ on }\ E.$$

(3) $\overline{d}_{\mu}^{q,\xi}(x,\mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{q,\xi}{}_{\llcorner E})=1$, $\mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{q,\xi}$*-a.a. on* E.

(4) *If there exists $\nu\in\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{X})$ such that $\sup_{x\in E}\overline{d}_{\mu}^{\,q,\xi}(x,\nu)\leq\gamma<\infty$ then*

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{q,\xi}(E)\geq\nu(E)/\gamma.$$

Proof. (1) We take $\theta = \mathcal{W}_\mu^{q,\xi}{}_{\llcorner E}$ and we set $F = \Big\{x \in E;\ \ \overline{d}_\mu^{q,\xi}(x,\theta) = +\infty\Big\}$ and we obtain from (4.4) that

$$\mathcal{H}_\mu^{q,\xi}(F) \inf_{x\in F} \overline{d}_\mu^{q,\xi}(x,\theta) \leq \theta(F) < +\infty.$$

This implies that $\mathcal{H}_\mu^{q,\xi}(F) = 0$ and $\mathcal{H}_\mu^{q,\xi}(E) = \mathcal{H}_\mu^{q,\xi}(F) + \mathcal{H}_\mu^{q,\xi}(E \setminus F) = 0$.

(2) We take $\theta = \mathcal{W}_\mu^{q,\xi}{}_{\llcorner E}$ and we consider, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the set

$$E_n = \Big\{x \in E;\ \ \overline{d}_\mu^{q,\xi}(x,\theta) \geq 1/n\Big\}.$$

Then (4.4) gives

$$\mathcal{H}_\mu^{q,\xi}(E_n) \leq n\,\theta(E_n) = 0, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

We therefore conclude that $\overline{d}_\mu^{q,\xi}(x,\theta) = 0$ for $\mathcal{H}_\mu^{q,\xi}$-a.a. on E.

(3) Take $\theta = \mathcal{H}_\mu^{q,\xi}{}_{\llcorner E}$. Put the set $F = \Big\{x \in E;\ \ \overline{d}_\mu^{q,\xi}(x,\theta) > 1\Big\}$, and for $m \in \mathbb{N}^*$

$$F_m = \left\{x \in E;\ \ \overline{d}_\mu^{q,\xi}(x,\theta) > 1 + \frac{1}{m}\right\}.$$

We therefore deduce from (4.4) that

$$\left(1 + \frac{1}{m}\right) \mathcal{H}_\mu^{q,\xi}(F_m) \leq \mathcal{H}_\mu^{q,\xi}(F_m).$$

This implies that $\mathcal{H}_\mu^{q,\xi}(F_m) = 0$. Since $F = \bigcup_m F_m$, we obtain $\mathcal{H}_\mu^{q,\xi}(F) = 0$, i.e.

$$\overline{d}_\mu^{q,\xi}(x,\theta) \leq 1 \quad \text{for} \quad \mathcal{H}_\mu^{q,\xi}\text{-a.a. } x \in E. \tag{4.6}$$

Now consider the set $\tilde{F} = \Big\{x \in E;\ \ \overline{d}_\mu^{q,\xi}(x,\theta) < 1\Big\}$, and for $m \in \mathbb{N}^*$

$$\tilde{F}_m = \left\{x \in E;\ \ \overline{d}_\mu^{q,\xi}(x,\theta) < 1 - \frac{1}{m}\right\}.$$

Using (4.5), we clearly have

$$\mathcal{H}_\mu^{q,\xi}(\tilde{F}_m) \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{m}\right) \mathcal{H}_\mu^{q,\xi}(\tilde{F}_m).$$

This implies that $\mathcal{H}_\mu^{q,\xi}(\tilde{F}_m) = 0$. Since $F = \bigcup_m \tilde{F}_m$, we obtain $\mathcal{H}_\mu^{q,\xi}(F) = 0$, i.e.

$$\overline{d}_\mu^{q,\xi}(x,\theta) \geq 1 \quad \text{for} \quad \mathcal{H}_\mu^{q,\xi}\text{-a.a. } x \in E. \tag{4.7}$$

The result follows from (4.6) and (4.7).

(4) A direct consequence of (4.5).

□

Theorem 5. *Let $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_D(\mathbb{X})$, $\nu \in \mathcal{P}_D(\mathbb{X}')$, $\xi \in \Phi_D(\mathbb{X})$, $\xi' \in \Phi(\mathbb{X}')$, $q \in \mathbb{R}$, E and E' be two Borel sets of* $\operatorname{supp}\mu$ *and* $\operatorname{supp}\nu$ *respectively. Assume that $\mathcal{H}_\mu^{q,\xi}(E) < +\infty$ and $\mathcal{H}_\nu^{q,\xi'}(E') < +\infty$. then*

$$\mathcal{H}_\mu^{q,\xi}(E)\mathcal{H}_\nu^{q,\xi'}(E') \leq \mathcal{H}_{\mu\times\nu}^{q,\xi_0}(E \times E').$$

Proof. Let θ_1 be the restriction of $\mathcal{H}_\mu^{q,\xi}$ to E and θ_2 be the restriction of $\mathcal{H}_\nu^{q,\xi'}$ to E'. We set

$$\widetilde{E} = \Big\{ x \in E, \quad \overline{d}_\mu^{q,\xi}(x, \theta_1) = 1 \Big\}$$

and

$$\widetilde{E}' = \Big\{ x \in E', \quad \overline{d}_\nu^{q,\xi'}(x, \theta_2) = 1 \Big\}.$$

Then, using corollary 1, we have $\theta_1(E) = \theta_1(\widetilde{E})$ and $\theta_2(E') = \theta_2(\widetilde{E}')$. Therefore, for $(x, y) \in \widetilde{E} \times \widetilde{E}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{d}_{\mu\times\nu}^{q,\xi_0}\Big((x,y), \theta_1 \times \theta_2\Big) &= \limsup_{r\to 0} \left[\frac{\theta_1\big(B(x,r)\big)}{\mu\big(B(x,r)\big)^q \xi(B(x,r))} \, \frac{\theta_2\big(B(y,r)\big)}{\nu\big(B(y,r)\big)^q \xi(B(x,r))} \right] \\ &\leq \overline{d}_\mu^{q,\xi}(x, \theta_1) \;\; \overline{d}_\nu^{q,\xi'}(y, \theta_2) = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by corollary 1,

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mu\times\nu}^{q,\xi_0}\big(\widetilde{E} \times \widetilde{E}'\big) \geq \theta_1 \times \theta_2\big(\widetilde{E} \times \widetilde{E}'\big) = \theta_1\big(\widetilde{E}\big)\theta_2\big(\widetilde{E}'\big) = \theta_1(E)\theta_2(E').$$

Hence,

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mu\times\nu}^{q,\xi_0}(E \times F) \geq \mathcal{H}_{\mu\times\nu}^{t+s}\big(\widetilde{E} \times \widetilde{F}\big) \geq \theta_1(E)\theta_2(E') = \mathcal{H}_\mu^{q,\xi}(E)\mathsf{H}_\nu^{q,\xi'}(E').$$

□

5. APPENDIX

Definition 1. [6]
A fine cover of a set E is a family $\mathcal{C}$ of closed balls $B(x,r)$ with $x \in E$ and $r > 0$ such that, for every $x \in E$ and every $\epsilon > 0$, there is $r > 0$ such that $r < \epsilon$ and $B(x,r) \in \mathcal{C}$.

Theorem 6 (Besicovitch covering Theorem)**.** [19].
There exists an integer $\gamma \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, for any subset A of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and any sequence $(r_x)_{x\in A}$ satisfying

(1) $r_x > 0, \quad \forall\, x \in A,$
(2) $\sup_{x\in A} r_x < \infty.$

Then, there exists γ countable or finite families $B_1, \ldots, B_\gamma$ of $\big\{B_x(r_x), \;\; x \in A\big\}$, such that

(1) $A \subset \bigcup_i \bigcup_{B\in B_i} B.$
(2) *B_i is a family of disjoint sets.*

Theorem 7 (Vitali 2)**.** [7] *Let X be a metric space, E a subset of X and $\mathcal{B}$ a family of fine cover of E. Then, there exists either*

(1) *an infinite (centered closed ball) packing $\big\{B_{x_i}(r_i)\big\}_i \subset \mathcal{B}$, such that $\inf\{r_i\} > 0$, or*
(2) *a countable (possibly finite) centered closed ball packing $\big\{B_{x_i}(r_i)\big\}_i \subset \mathcal{B}$, such that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$E \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{k} B_{x_i}(r_i) \subset \bigcup_{i\geq k} B_{x_i}(5r_i).$$

REFERENCES

[1] N. Attia, *relative multifractal spectrum*, Commun. Korean Math. Soc. **33** (2018), 459-471.

[2] N. Attia, H. Jebali and M. Ben Hadj Khlifa, *A note on fractal measures of cartesian product sets*, Bulletin of the Malaysian Mathematical Sciences Society. **44** (2021), 4383-4404.

[3] N. Attia and R. Guedri, *A note on the Regularities of Hewitt-Stromberg h-measures.*, ANNALI DELL'UNIVERSITA'DI FERRARA. **69(1)** (2023), 121-137.

[4] A.S. Besicovitch and P.A.P. Mohan, *The measure of product and cylinder sets*, J. Lond.Math. Soc. **20** (1945), 110-120.

[5] J. Cole. Relative multifractal analysis. Choas, Solitons and Fractals. **11** (2000), 2233-2250.

[6] G. A. Edgar, *Integral, probability, and fractal measures*, Springer-Verlag, New York, (1998).

[7] G. A. Edgar, *Centred densities and fractal measures*, New York J. Math **13** (2007), 33-87.

[8] B. Esmayli and P. H. Lasz *The Coarea inequality* , https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.00419v2

[9] K. J. Falconer, *The geometry of fractal sets: Mathematical Foundations and Applications*, John Wiley & Sons Ltd. (1990).

[10] O. Guizani, A. Mahjoub and N. Attia , *On the Hewitt Stromberg measure of product sets*. Annali di Matematica Pura ed Applicata (2020).

[11] N. Attia, R. Guedri and O. Guizani, *Note on the multifractal measures of cartesian product sets*, Commun. Korean Math. Soc. **37 (4)** (2022), 1073-1097.

[12] R. Guedri and N. Attia, *On the generalized Hausdorff and packing measures of product sets in metric space, Mathematical inequalities & applications Krag. J. Math.* **25 (2)** *(2022), 335-358.*

[13] H. Haase, Dimension of measures, Ada Universitatis Carolinae -Mathematica et Physica **31** *(1990), 29-34.*

[14] H. Haase, On the dimension of product measures, Mathematika **37** *(1990), 316-323.*

[15] J. D. Howroyd, On Hausdorff and packing dimension of product spaces, Math. Proc. Camb. Philos. Soc., **119** *(1996) 715-727*

[16] X. Hu and S. J. Taylor Fractal properties of products and projections of measures in R, Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc. **115** *(1994), 527-544*

[17] J. D. Kelly, A method for constructing measures appropriate for the study of Cartesian products, Proc. London Math. Soc

[18] J. M. Marstrand, The dimension of Cartesian product sets, Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc., **50** *(1954), 198-202.*

[19] P. Mattila, Geometry of sets and Measures in Euclidian Spaces: Fractals and Rectifiability, Cambridge University Press (1995).

[20] L. Olsen, A multifractal formalism. Advances in Mathematics, **116** *(1995), 82-196.*

[21] L. Olsen, Multifractal dimensions of product measures, Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc. **120** *(1996), 709-734.*

[22] X.S. Raymond and C. Tricot, Packing regularity of sets in n-space, Math. Proc. Camb. Philos. Soc. **103** *(1988), 133-145.*

[23] A. Schechter, On the centred Hausdorff measure, J. London Math. Soc. (2) **62** *(2000) 843-851.*

NAJMEDDINE ATTIA, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, FACULTY OF SCIENCES OF MONASTIR, UNIVERSITY OF MONASTIR, MONASTIR-5000, TUNISIA

Email address: najmeddine.attia@gmail.com

HAJER JEBALI, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, FACULTY OF SCIENCES OF MONASTIR, UNIVERSITY OF MONASTIR, MONASTIR-5000, TUNISIA

Email address: hajer.jebali@fsm.rnu.tn

RIHEB GUEDRI, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, FACULTY OF SCIENCES OF MONASTIR, UNIVERSITY OF MONASTIR, MONASTIR-5000, TUNISIA

Email address: rihabguedri096@gmail.com