DEFINITIONS OF QUASICONFORMALITY AND EXCEPTIONAL SETS

DIMITRIOS NTALAMPEKOS

Abstract. We present a new generalized metric definition of quasiconformality for Euclidean space, requiring that at each point there exists a sequence of uncentered open sets with bounded eccentricity shrinking to that point such that the images also have bounded eccentricity. This generalizes results of Gehring and Heinonen–Koskela on the metric definition of quasiconformality. We also study exceptional sets for this definition, in connection with sets that are negligible for extremal distance. We introduce the class of CNED sets, generalizing the notion of NED sets studied by Ahlfors–Beurling. A set $E$ is CNED if the conformal modulus of a curve family is not affected when one restricts to the subfamily intersecting $E$ at countably many points. We show as our main theorem that CNED sets are exceptional for the definition of quasiconformality. Our main theorem is an ultimate generalization of results of Gehring, Heinonen–Koskela, and Kallunki–Koskela. We prove that several classes of sets that were known to be exceptional are also CNED, including sets of $\sigma$-finite Hausdorff $(n−1)$-measure and boundaries of domains with $n$-integrable quasihyperbolic distance. Thus, this work puts in common framework many known results on the problem of quasiconformal removability and provides evidence that the CNED condition should also be necessary for removability. We prove that countable unions of closed $(C)NED$ sets are $(C)NED$, and therefore we enlarge significantly the known classes of quasiconformally removable sets. On the other hand, we present examples showing that unions of non-closed negligible or exceptional sets need not be negligible or exceptional, respectively. Finally, we give an application to the problem of rigidity of circle domains.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this work is to introduce a new definition of quasiconformality and study the exceptional sets for the definition of quasiconformality in connection with sets that are negligible for modulus or extremal distance. We start with some definitions and background before we formulate our results.

1.1. A new definition of quasiconformality. Throughout this work, we assume that \( n \geq 2 \). Let \( f \) be an orientation-preserving topological embedding of an open set \( \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) into \( \mathbb{R}^n \). We say that \( f \) is quasiconformal if \( f \) lies in the Sobolev space \( W^{1,n}_{loc}(\Omega) \) and there exists \( K \geq 1 \) such that

\[
\|Df(x)\|^n \leq KJ_f(x)
\]

for a.e. \( x \in \Omega \). In this case, we say that \( f \) is \( K \)-quasiconformal. This is known as the analytic definition of quasiconformality.

We define the distortion of \( f \) at a point \( x \in \Omega \) by

\[
H_f(x) = \limsup_{r \to 0} \frac{L_f(x,r)}{l_f(x,r)},
\]

where, for \( r > 0 \),

\[
L_f(x,r) = \sup\{|f(x) - f(y)| : y \in \Omega, \ |x - y| \leq r \} \quad \text{and} \quad l_f(x,r) = \inf\{|f(x) - f(y)| : y \in \Omega, \ |x - y| \geq r \}.
\]
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By a result of Gehring [Geh62b, Corollary 3, p. 379], \( f \) is quasiconformal if and only if there exists \( H \geq 1 \) such that \( H f(x) \leq H \) for every \( x \in \Omega \). This is known as the \textit{metric} definition of quasiconformality. Geometrically, it says that \( f \) maps all sufficiently small balls centered at \( x \) to topological balls with bounded \textit{eccentricity}. The eccentricity of a bounded open set \( A \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) is by definition

\[
E(A) = \inf \{ M \geq 1 : \text{there exists an open ball } B \text{ such that } B \subset A \subset MB \}.
\]

Observe that the eccentricity of a ball is 1 and if \( B(x,r) \subset B(x,r') \subset \Omega \), then

\[
E(f(B(x,r))) \leq \frac{L_f(x,r)}{l_f(x,r)}.
\]

The reverse inequality is not true in general. If \( f \) is quasiconformal then

\[
\limsup_{r \to 0} E(f(B(x,r)))
\]

is uniformly bounded in \( \Omega \).

A fundamental theorem proved by Heinonen–Koskela [HK95] is that the “limsup” in the definition of \( H_f \) in (1.1) can be replaced by “liminf”. Thus, only a sequence of balls centered at \( x \) and shrinking to \( x \) are required to be mapped under \( f \) to sets with bounded eccentricity. This significant result was immediately applied in rigidity problems in complex dynamics in the work of Przytycki–Rohde [PR99] and in further works that we mention below.

One natural question is whether one can define quasiconformality by requiring that arbitrary sets of bounded eccentricity and not necessarily balls are mapped to sets of bounded eccentricity. We prove here that this is indeed the case. We define the \textit{eccentric distortion of} \( f \) \textit{at} \( x \in \Omega \) \textit{at scale} \( r < \text{dist}(x, \partial \Omega)/3 \) by

\[
E_f(x,r) = \inf \{ M \geq 1 : \text{there exists an open set } A \text{ with } x \in A \text{ and diam}(A) \leq 2r \text{ such that } E(A) \leq M \text{ and } E(f(A)) \leq M \}.
\]

Observe that \( E_f(x,r) \) is increasing as \( r \) decreases, so \( \lim_{r \to 0} E_f(x,r) \) exists for each \( x \in \Omega \). Moreover,

\[
E_f(x,r) \leq \frac{L_f(x,r)}{l_f(x,r)}.
\]

**Theorem 1.1.** Let \( \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) be an open set and \( f : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^n \) be an orientation-preserving topological embedding. Suppose that there exists a constant \( H \geq 1 \) such that for all \( x \in \Omega \) we have

\[
\lim_{r \to 0} E_f(x,r) \leq H.
\]

Then \( f \) is quasiconformal in \( \Omega \).

One way to reformulate the assumption is to say that for each \( x \in \Omega \) there exists a sequence of open sets \( A_k, k \in \mathbb{N} \), containing \( x \) and shrinking to \( x \) such that \( A_k \) and \( f(A_k) \) have uniformly bounded eccentricity, not depending on \( k \) or \( x \). One advantage of this condition, compared to the classical metric definition, is that it is completely symmetric with respect to \( f \) and \( f^{-1} \):

\[
\lim_{r \to 0} E_f(x,r) = \lim_{r \to 0} E_{f^{-1}}(f(x),r).
\]

Another advantage is that the sets \( A_k \) shrinking to \( x \) are \textit{uncentered}, as opposed to the balls in the metric definition. This feature makes Theorem 1.1 very powerful.
We illustrate this with an application in the problem of rigidity of circle domains; see Theorem 1.9.

The proof of the theorem of Heinonen–Koskela, replacing “limsup” with “liminf” in (1.1), cannot be used for the proof of Theorem 1.1. The reason is that it relies crucially on the Besicovitch covering theorem (see Theorem 3.2), which roughly asserts that a cover by open balls can be replaced by a subcover that has bounded multiplicity. This powerful tool can be used only for coverings by geometric balls and not by arbitrary sets of bounded eccentricity. Thus, for the proof of Theorem 1.1 we need a new technical covering lemma, which is one of the innovations of the current work and we term the egg-yolk covering lemma. We present this lemma in Section 3.

Theorem 1.1 is a special case of the more general Theorem 1.2 in which we allow for some exceptional sets as well, instead of requiring (1.2) at all points. The reader who is only interested in the proof of Theorem 1.1 may skip to Sections 3 and 6.

1.2. Exceptional sets for the definition of quasiconformality. By a result of Gehring [Geh62b, Theorem 8, p. 379], in order to establish quasiconformality one does not need to verify condition (1.1) at all points $x \in \Omega$, but can allow for some exceptional sets. Namely, a mapping is quasiconformal if $H_f(x) < \infty$ at all points $x \in \Omega$ outside an exceptional set of $\sigma$-finite Hausdorff $(n-1)$-measure and $H_f(x)$ has a uniform upper bound for a.e. $x \in \Omega$. So, there are two types of exceptional sets: a set of $\sigma$-finite Hausdorff $(n-1)$-measure, where we could have $H_f = \infty$, and set of measure zero, where $H_f$ could be finite but unbounded. On the other hand, the result and methods of Heinonen–Koskela [HK95] do not allow for an exceptional set, if one replaces “limsup” with “liminf” in (1.1).

Later Kallunki–Koskela [KK00, KK03] proved a significant generalization of the theorems of Gehring and Heinonen–Koskela, replacing “limsup” with “liminf” in (1.1) and allowing for the same type of exceptional sets as Gehring’s theorem. The possibility of an exceptional set in the Heinonen–Koskela theorem was immediately exploited for resolving rigidity problems in complex dynamics by Graczyk–Smirnov [GS09], Haisinsky [Hai01], Kozlovski–Shen–van Stiren [KSvS07], and Smania [Sma07].

Our main result, Theorem 1.2 is a further generalization of the results of Gehring, Heinonen–Koskela, and Kallunki–Koskela. Roughly speaking, it states that sets that are “negligible for extremal distance” in some weak sense are exceptional for the definition of quasiconformality. We introduce some terminology before stating the result.

For an open set $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and two continua $F_1, F_2 \subset U$ the family of curves joining $F_1$ and $F_2$ inside $U$ is denoted by $\Gamma(F_1, F_2; U)$. For a set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ we denote by $\mathcal{F}_0(E)$ the family of curves in $\mathbb{R}^n$ that do not intersect $E$, except possibly at the endpoints, and by $\mathcal{F}_\sigma(E)$ the family of curves in $\mathbb{R}^n$ that intersect $E$ at countably many points.

A set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is negligible for extremal distances if for every pair of non-empty, disjoint continua $F_1, F_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ we have

$$\text{Mod}_n \Gamma(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^n) = \text{Mod}_n(\Gamma(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^n) \cap \mathcal{F}_0(E)).$$
In this case, we write \( E \in \text{NED} \); note that we suppress the dimension \( n \) in this notation. If, instead, there exists a uniform constant \( M \geq 1 \) such that
\[
\text{Mod}_n(\Gamma(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^n)) \leq M \cdot \text{Mod}_n(\Gamma(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^n) \cap F_0(E)),
\]
then we say that \( E \) is *weakly NED* and we write \( E \in \text{NED}^w \). We remark that we do not require \( E \) to be closed. There is plenty of literature on closed NED sets. Classically, one requires that the above equality holds for continua \( F_1 \) and \( F_2 \) that are disjoint from \( E \). We show in Section 2.5 that our definition agrees with the classical one for closed sets. Moreover, for closed sets, the classes \( \text{NED} \) and \( \text{NED}^w \) agree [AS74]. We will discuss later the role of NED sets in the theory of quasiconformal maps.

We introduce in this paper a significantly larger class of sets, which seem to be the optimal exceptional sets for the definition of quasiconformality. We say that a set \( E \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) is negligible for extremal distances with countable intersections if
\[
\text{Mod}_n(\Gamma(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^n)) = \text{Mod}_n(\Gamma(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^n) \cap F_0(E))
\]
for every pair of non-empty, disjoint continua \( F_1, F_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^n \). In this case we write \( E \in \text{CNED} \). As above, we also define the class \( \text{CNED}^w \) in the obvious manner. Again, \( E \) need not be closed and the dimension \( n \) is suppressed in this notation.

For closed sets we show in Theorem 7.1 that the classes \( \text{CNED} \) and \( \text{CNED}^w \) agree.

The monotonicity of modulus implies that
\[
\text{NED} \subset \text{CNED} \subset \text{CNED}^w.
\]
To the best of our knowledge, this is the first time that \( \text{CNED} \) sets are introduced. We will discuss their role and connections to other problems later. We now state our main theorem on exceptional sets for the definition of quasiconformality.

**Theorem 1.2.** Let \( \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) be an open set and \( f: \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^n \) be an orientation-preserving topological embedding. Let \( E, G \subset \Omega \) be sets such that one of the following conditions holds.

(i) \( E \in \text{CNED}^w \) and \( m_n(f(G)) = 0 \).

(ii) \( E \in \text{CNED}^w \), \( m_n(G) = 0 \), and \( E \) or \( G \) is relatively closed in \( \Omega \).

(iii) \( E \) has \( \sigma \)-finite Hausdorff \((n-1)\)-measure and \( m_n(G) = 0 \).

Suppose that there exists a constant \( H \geq 1 \) such that for all \( x \in \Omega \setminus (E \cup G) \) we have
\[
\lim_{r \to 0} E_f(x, r) \leq H,
\]
and for all \( x \in G \) we have
\[
\lim_{r \to 0} E_f(x, r) < \infty.
\]

Then \( f \) is \( K \)-quasiconformal in \( \Omega \), where \( K \) depends only on \( n, H \), and the \( \text{CNED}^w \) constant in the cases (i) and (iii).

We remark that the dependence of \( K \) on the \( \text{CNED}^w \) constant can be dropped if \( E \) is measurable, although this need not be the case in general; see Remark 6.3 and Proposition 9.10. If \( E = G = \emptyset \), then we obtain Theorem 1.1. As we will see below in Theorem 1.5 sets of \( \sigma \)-finite Hausdorff \((n-1)\)-measure are of class \( \text{CNED} \). Thus, (iii) would follow from (i) if one could replace the assumption \( m_n(f(G)) = 0 \) with \( m_n(G) = 0 \). However, as there is no reason to expect that this is possible, we
give different proofs for (1) and (iii). The proof of Theorem 1.2 is given in Section 6 and is based on Sections 3, 4, and 5.

We present an application of Theorem 1.2 in the problem of rigidity of circle domains (see Theorem 1.9), which illustrates the need to study non-closed NED and CNED sets and shows the power of using the eccentric distortion in the definition of quasiconformality. As was the case for the predecessors of Theorem 1.2 by Gehring, Heinonen–Koskela, and Kallunki–Koskela, we expect that this result will find further applications in rigidity problems in complex dynamics and in other areas.

1.3. Sets of class NED and CNED. Closed NED sets have been studied extensively in the plane by Ahlfors and Beurling in [AB50], where they proved that these sets coincide with the closed sets $E \subset \mathbb{C}$ that are removable for conformal embeddings; that is, every conformal embedding of $\mathbb{C} \setminus E$ into $\mathbb{C}$ is the restriction of a Möbius transformation. See also Pesin’s work [Pes56]. Equivalently, we may replace conformal with quasiconformal maps in this definition. Väisälä initiated the study of closed NED sets in higher dimensions [Väi62], proving that sets of Hausdorff $(n-1)$-measure zero are of class NED. The result of Ahlfors–Beurling was partially generalized in higher dimensions by Aseev–Syčev [AS74] and Vodopyanov–Goldshtein [VG77], who proved that if a closed set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 3$, is of class NED, then it is removable for quasiconformal embeddings. The converse is not known in dimensions $n \geq 3$. Finally, a characterization of closed NED sets in $\mathbb{R}^n$ was provided by Vodopyanov–Goldshtein [VG77], who proved that closed NED sets coincide with sets that are removable for the Sobolev space $W^{1,n}$. We direct the reader to the introduction of [Ase09] for a survey of the known results. NED sets are closely related to quasiextremal distance (QED) exceptional sets, introduced by Gehring–Mario [GM85]. As remarked, in the current work we will work with NED sets that are not necessarily closed.

If $E$ is closed and $G = \emptyset$ in Theorem 1.2, then we obtain the following result.

Corollary 1.3. Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a closed set of class CNED. Then every homeomorphism of $\mathbb{R}^n$ that is quasiconformal in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus E$, is quasiconformal in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Equivalently, we say that the closed set $E$ is removable for quasiconformal homeomorphisms. The difference to removable sets for quasiconformal embeddings that we discuss above is that here we study global homeomorphisms of $\mathbb{R}^n$, instead of topological embeddings of $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus E$. Moreover, note that if a set is removable for quasiconformal embeddings then it is removable for quasiconformal homeomorphisms. Although we have satisfactory characterizations of the former sets by Ahlfors–Beurling [AB50] in dimension 2, it is a notoriously difficult problem to characterize sets that are removable for quasiconformal homeomorphisms even in dimension 2.

There are many open problems related to these sets, one of which is the problem of local removability [Bis94, Question 4], [Nta19, Question 2]: if a closed set $E$ is removable for quasiconformal homeomorphisms, is it true that every topological embedding of an open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ into $\mathbb{R}^n$ that is quasiconformal in $\Omega \setminus E$, is quasiconformal in $\Omega$? For CNED sets the answer is provided by Theorem 1.2 since subsets of CNED sets are trivially CNED.

Corollary 1.4. Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a closed set of class CNED. Then $E$ is locally removable for quasiconformal homeomorphisms.
So far we have some general classes of removable sets for quasiconformal homeomorphisms. First, sets of $\sigma$-finite Hausdorff $(n-1)$-measure are removable by a result of Besicovitch [Bes31] in dimension 2 and by the result of Gehring [Geh62] in higher dimensions. Thus, we can say that such sets are removable for rectifiability reasons.

Next, it is known that sets with good geometry, such as quasicircles, are removable in dimension 2. More generally, boundaries of John domains are removable [Jon95], and even more generally, in all dimensions, boundaries of Hölder domains and domains with $n$-integrable quasihyperbolic distance are removable [JS00], [KN05]. Roughly speaking, all of these sets have either no outward cusps or some outward cusps, but not too many on average. Thus, these sets are removable for geometric reasons.

Finally, NED sets are removable as well due to [AB50] in dimension 2 and [AS74, VG77] in higher dimensions. Thus, one could say that NED sets are removable because they are small in a potential theoretic sense. Note that all NED sets are necessarily totally disconnected in dimension 2.

The three classes of sets are mutually singular in a sense. Namely, there are rectifiable sets that have bad geometry and are large from a potential theoretic point of view. For example, consider a rectifiable curve with a dense set of both inward and outward cusps. Likewise, there are sets with good geometry that are not rectifiable and are large for potential theoretic purposes. As an example, take a quasicircle with Hausdorff dimension larger than 1. Finally, there are sets that are small in a potential theoretic sense, but are large in terms of rectifiability and have bad geometry. For example, consider a Cantor set $E \subset \mathbb{R}$ that is not self-similar, has measure zero, and Hausdorff dimension 1, and then take the set $E \times E$; this is an NED set by [AB50, Theorem 10] since its projections to the coordinate directions have measure zero.

A natural question is whether one can reconcile these three different worlds. In other words, is there a common reason for which all of the above classes of sets are removable for quasiconformal homeomorphisms? We provide an affirmative answer to this question by proving that all above general classes of removable sets are CNED sets.

**Theorem 1.5.** The following sets are of class CNED in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

(i) Sets of class NED.
(ii) Sets of $\sigma$-finite Hausdorff $(n-1)$-measure.
(iii) Boundaries of domains with $n$-integrable quasihyperbolic distance.

The class of sets in (iii) is defined and discussed in Section 9.1, where we also give the proof. This theorem, combined with Corollary 1.3 provides a common framework for many of the known positive removability results. As discussed earlier, (i) is immediate; however, the other conclusions are new. The technique used for the proof of (ii) allows us to generalize a result of Väisälä [Väi62], stating that a closed set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with Hausdorff $(n-1)$-measure zero is of class NED, to non-closed sets.

**Theorem 1.6.** Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a set of Hausdorff $(n-1)$-measure zero. Then $E \in \text{NED}$.

Theorem 1.5 (ii) and Theorem 1.6 are restated in Section 9 and their proof is based on results from Sections 4 and 5.
Another open problem related to removable sets is whether the union of two removable closed sets is removable \cite{JS00}. While for disjoint sets the answer is affirmative, in general, for intersecting sets this is known only in the cases of totally disconnected sets and quasicircles \cite[Theorem 4]{You16}. We prove here that unions of closed NED and CNED sets are NED and CNED, respectively.

**Theorem 1.7.** Let $E_i, i \in \mathbb{N}$, be a countable collection of closed subsets of $\mathbb{R}^n$.

(i) If $E_i \in \text{NED}$ for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$, then $\bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} E_i \in \text{NED}$.

(ii) If $E_i \in \text{CNED}$ for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$, then $\bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} E_i \in \text{CNED}$.

The proof of this theorem is given in Section 8 and relies on an intricate characterization of NED and CNED sets from Section 7. Combining this theorem with Theorem 1.5 and Corollary 1.3, we obtain the following removability result.

**Theorem 1.8.** Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a closed set that admits a decomposition into countably many closed sets $E_i, i \in \mathbb{N}$, each of which is either NED, or has $\sigma$-finite Hausdorff $(n-1)$-measure, or is a subset of the boundary of a domain with $n$-integrable quasihyperbolic distance. Then $E \in \text{CNED}$ and is removable for quasiconformal homeomorphisms.

We present an application of Theorems 1.2 and 1.7 in the problem of rigidity of circle domains. A connected open set $\Omega$ in the Riemann sphere $\hat{\mathbb{C}}$ is a circle domain if each boundary component of $\Omega$ is either a circle or a point. A circle domain $\Omega$ is rigid if every conformal map from $\Omega$ onto another circle domain is the restriction of a Möbius transformation of $\hat{\mathbb{C}}$. He–Schramm \cite{HS94} proved that circle domains whose boundary has $\sigma$-finite Hausdorff 1-measure are rigid. Later, Younsi and the author \cite{NY20} proved the rigidity of circle domains with $n$-integrable quasihyperbolic distance (as in Theorem 1.5 (iii)). It is conjectured that rigidity of a circle domain is equivalent to removability of its boundary for quasiconformal homeomorphisms.

**Theorem 1.9.** Let $\Omega \subset \hat{\mathbb{C}}$ be a circle domain such that $\infty \in \Omega$ and $\partial \Omega \in \text{CNED}$. Then every conformal map from $\Omega$ onto another circle domain $\Omega'$ that extends to a homeomorphism from $\overline{\Omega}$ onto $\overline{\Omega'}$ is the restriction of a Möbius transformation.

If one could drop the assumption of the homeomorphic extension to $\overline{\Omega}$, then we would conclude that circle domains with CNED boundary are rigid. It seems very plausible that this is the case but we do not attempt to prove it in this paper for the sake of brevity. We give the proof of Theorem 1.9 in Section 11 in a slightly more general form in $n$ dimensions.

In Section 7 we prove several criteria for NED and CNED sets. We state here one of these criteria that is related to the Loewner property of Euclidean space. The relative distance $\Delta(F_1, F_2)$ of two non-degenerate sets is by definition their Euclidean distance divided by the diameter of the smallest of the two sets.

**Theorem 1.10.** Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a closed set. Then $E \in \text{NED}$ (resp. CNED) if and only if there exists a function $\phi: (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ such that for each $t > 0$ and for every pair of non-degenerate, disjoint continua $F_1, F_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\Delta(F_1, F_2) \leq t$
we have
\[ \text{Mod}_n(\Gamma(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^n) \cap F_0(E)) \geq \phi(t) \]
(resp. \( \text{Mod}_n(\Gamma(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^n) \cap F_\sigma(E)) \geq \phi(t) \)).

1.4. Non-negligible sets. We remark that in Theorem 1.7 we are not requiring that the union of the closed sets \( E_i \) be closed. However, both cases of the theorem fail without assuming that each individual set \( E_i \) is closed.

Theorem 1.11. There exist Borel sets \( E_1, E_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \) with \( E_1, E_2 \in \text{NED} \subset \text{CNED} \) such that \( E_1 \cup E_2 \) is a closed set that is not removable for quasiconformal homeomorphisms. In particular, \( E_1 \cup E_2 \notin \text{CNED} \) and \( E_1 \cup E_2 \notin \text{NED} \).

The proof of this theorem is given in Section 10. We will first present a more elementary example, in which \( E_1 \cup E_2 \notin \text{NED} \). In this example, the sets \( E_1 \) and \( E_2 \) are complementary subsets of \([0, 1]\) such that \( E_1 \) has measure zero and \( E_2 \) has full measure in \([0, 1]\). Since \( E_1 \cup E_2 = [0, 1] \), the union is not \( \text{NED} \). Moreover, it is remarkable that this example gives a full-measure subset of \([0, 1]\) that is of class \( \text{NED} \) in the plane.

Then, we will present the more complicated example with \( E_1 \cup E_2 \notin \text{CNED} \). Compared to \( \text{NED} \) sets, it is significantly harder to produce sets that are not of class \( \text{CNED} \). Using tools from the existing literature, and in particular from a work of Wu \([Wu98]\), we will construct \( \text{NED} \) sets \( E_1 \) and \( E_2 \) such that \( E_1 \cup E_2 \) is the product of a Cantor set in \( \mathbb{R} \) with \([0, 1]\). Such sets are not removable (see Carleson \([Car51]\) or the discussion in the Introduction of \([Nta20]\)) and thus they are not \( \text{CNED} \) by Corollary 1.3; this can be proved directly in this simple situation.

As a corollary to Theorem 1.11, we obtain that unions of exceptional sets, in the sense of Theorem 1.2, are not necessarily exceptional.

Corollary 1.12. There exist Borel sets \( E_1, E_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \) such that for each \( i \in \{1, 2\} \), every orientation-preserving homeomorphism \( f \) of \( \mathbb{R}^2 \) with
\[ \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus E_i} H_f(x) < \infty \]
is quasiconformal, but there exists an orientation-preserving homeomorphism \( g \) of \( \mathbb{R}^2 \) with
\[ \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus (E_1 \cup E_2)} H_g(x) < \infty \]
that is not quasiconformal.

Finally, we end the introduction with some remarks on non-removable sets. In dimension 2 it is known that all sets of positive area are non-removable \([KW96]\). There are Jordan curves of Hausdorff dimension 1 that are non-removable \([Bis94]\). Moreover, if \( C \subset \mathbb{R} \) is a Cantor set, then \( C \times [0, 1] \) is non-removable as we discussed above. More interestingly, Wu \([Wu98]\) proved that if \( E, F \subset \mathbb{R} \) are Cantor sets and \( E \notin \text{NED} \), then \( E \times F \) is non-removable; the converse is not true since \( \text{NED} \) sets can have positive length \([AB50]\). More recently, the current author studied the problem of removability for fractals with infinitely many complementary components and proved that the Sierpiński gasket is non-removable \([Nta19]\) and that all Sierpiński carpets are non-removable \([Nta21]\). The latter result was generalized to higher dimensional carpets, known as Sierpiński spaces, by the author and Wu \([NW20]\).

Gaskets and carpets fall into the general class of residual sets of packings. A packing \( \mathcal{P} \) in \( \mathbb{R}^n \) is a collection of bounded, connected open sets \( D_i, i \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}, \)
such that $D_i \subset D_0$ for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $D_i \cap D_j = \emptyset$ for $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ with $i \neq j$. The residual set of the packing $\mathcal{P}$ is the set

$$D_0 \setminus \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} D_i.$$ 

We observe in the following proposition that in many cases the residual sets of packings are not of class CNED.

**Proposition 1.13.** Let $\mathcal{P} = \{D_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}}$ be a packing in $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\partial D_i \cap \partial D_j$ is countable for each $i, j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ with $i \neq j$. Then the residual set of $\mathcal{P}$ is not of class CNED.

It was earlier observed that such residual sets in the plane can have Hausdorff dimension 1 but not $\sigma$-finite Hausdorff 1-measure [MN21]. Proposition 1.13 covers the Sierpiński gasket and all Sierpiński carpets.

Based on the results of this work, it is natural to propose the following problem, whose resolution would answer many of the open questions related to removable sets.

**Problem 1.14.** Is it true that removable sets for quasiconformal homeomorphisms coincide with closed CNED sets?

We may also formulate a series of questions for CNED sets, in the same spirit as the ones asked by Bishop [Bis94] for non-removable sets.

**Question 1.15.** If $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a closed set that is not CNED, does there exist a homeomorphism of $\mathbb{R}^n$ that is quasiconformal in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus E$ and maps $E$ to a set of positive $n$-measure?

A positive answer to this question would resolve Problem 1.14 and thus it would also resolve among others the problems of local removability and of removability of unions of removable sets mentioned earlier. For closed NED sets in the plane the answer to the corresponding question is already known to be positive by Ahlfors–Beurling [AB50]: if $E \notin NED$, then there exists a conformal embedding $f: \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus E \to \mathbb{R}^2$ such that the complement of $f(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus E)$ has positive area.

**Question 1.16.** Suppose that $E$ is a closed set that is not CNED. Does there exist a totally disconnected subset of $E$ that is not CNED?

If yes, it would suffice to answer Question 1.15 for totally disconnected sets, which could be more approachable. Note that NED sets in the plane are already totally disconnected, so this makes the study of these sets more accessible.

Finally, we propose another problem. We say that a closed set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is removable for continuous $W^{1,n}$ functions if every continuous function $f: \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ with $f \in W^{1,n}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus E)$ lies in $W^{1,n}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. We prove here that CNED sets are removable for continuous $W^{1,n}$ functions; see Theorem 7.8. Is the converse true?

**Problem 1.17.** Is it true that removable sets for continuous $W^{1,n}$ functions coincide with closed CNED sets?

Obviously, the answer would be positive if the answer to Problem 1.14 were positive. Finally, note that a positive answer to Problem 1.14 would also imply that removable sets for quasiconformal homeomorphisms coincide with removable sets for continuous $W^{1,n}$ functions. This is another open problem discussed in [Bis94,JS00].
1.5. Outline. We give in Section 2 the required preliminaries, which may be safely skipped by an experienced reader. Sections 3–6 form the first half of the paper, completing the proof of the main theorem, Theorem 1.2. Section 3 presents the egg-yolk covering lemma, one of the main ingredients of the proof of the main theorem.

In Section 4 we introduce the notion of a family of curve perturbations. Roughly speaking, such a family contains almost every parallel translate of a curve and almost every radial segment. The main theorem of that section is Theorem 4.4 which asserts that the modulus of a curve family remains unaffected, if one restricts to the intersection of that family with a family of curve perturbations. A result of independent interest in that section is a version of the Lebesgue differentiation theorem for line integrals; see Theorem 4.10.

In Section 5 we give examples of families of curve perturbations. In particular, in Theorem 5.1 we show that the family of curves avoiding a set of Hausdorff \( (n-1) \)-measure zero and the family of curves meeting a set of \( \sigma \)-finite Hausdorff \( (n-1) \)-measure in countably many points have this property. We present some further examples in Theorem 5.4 involving homeomorphisms. The examples in Section 5 form the basis for the proof of the main theorem of the paper, Theorem 1.2, which is given in Section 6.

In Section 7 we present necessary and sufficient criteria for a closed set to be of class NED and CNED. We give two criteria; one involving exceptional curve families, i.e., having modulus zero, and one involving families of curve perturbations, as introduced in Section 4. As an application, we establish the Sobolev removability of CNED sets in Theorem 7.8. The criteria are then used in Section 8 for the proof of Theorem 1.7 regarding the unions of NED and CNED sets.

In Section 9 we present many examples of NED and CNED sets. In particular, we show in Theorem 9.2 that boundaries of domains with \( n \)-integrable quasihyperbolic distance are CNED. We also show in Theorem 9.7 that planar sets (not necessarily closed) whose projection to each coordinate axis has measure zero are NED\( w \), generalizing the result for closed sets due to Ahlfors and Beurling [AB50, Theorem 10]. This result is crucially used in the example constructed for the proof of Theorem 1.11, which is given in Section 10. In Section 9.3 we present an example of a non-measurable set, constructed by Sierpiński, that is of class CNED. Section 10 also includes the proof of Proposition 1.13. The proof of the rigidity result of Theorem 1.9 is given in Section 11.

2. Preliminaries

2.1. Notation and definitions. We denote the Euclidean distance between points \( x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n \) by \( |x - y| \). For \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \) and \( 0 \leq r < R \) we denote by \( B(x, R) \) the open ball \( \{ y \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x - y| < R \} \) and by \( A(x; r, R) \) the open ring \( \{ y \in \mathbb{R}^n : r < |x - y| < R \} \). The corresponding closed ball and ring are denoted by \( \overline{B}(x, r) \) and \( \overline{A}(x; r, R) \), respectively. If \( B \) is an open (resp. closed) ball, then for \( \lambda > 0 \) we denote by \( \lambda B \) the open (resp. closed) ball with the same center as \( B \) and radius multiplied by \( \lambda \). We also set \( S^{n-1}(x, r) = \partial B(x, r) \). The open \( \varepsilon \)-neighborhood of a set \( E \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) is denoted by \( N_\varepsilon(E) \).

We use the notation \( m_n \) for the \( n \)-dimensional Lebesgue measure in \( \mathbb{R}^n \), \( m_n^* \) for the outer \( n \)-dimensional Lebesgue measure, and \( \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho(x) \, dx \) or simply \( \int \rho \) for the Lebesgue integral of a Lebesgue measurable extended function \( \rho : \mathbb{R}^n \to [-\infty, \infty] \),
if it exists. For such a function $\rho$, if $B$ is a measurable set with $m_n(B) \in (0, \infty)$, we define

$$\int_B \rho = \frac{1}{m_n(B)} \int_B \rho.$$ 

For simplicity, extended functions will be called functions. A non-negative function is assumed to take values in $[0, \infty]$.

The cardinality of a set $E$ is denoted by $\#E$. For quantities $A$ and $B$ we write $A \lesssim B$ if there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that $A \leq cB$. If the constant $c$ depends on another quantity $H$ that we wish to emphasize, then we write instead $A \lesssim c(H)B$ or $A \lesssim_H B$. Moreover, we use the notation $A \simeq B$ if $A \lesssim B$ and $B \lesssim A$. As previously, we write $A \simeq_H B$ to emphasize the dependence of the implicit constants on the quantity $H$. All constants in the statements are assumed to be positive even if this is not stated explicitly and the same letter may be used in different statements to denote a different constant.

For $s \geq 0$ the $s$-dimensional Hausdorff measure $\mathcal{H}^s(E)$ of a set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{H}^s(E) = \lim_{\delta \to 0} \mathcal{H}^s_{\delta}(E) = \sup_{\delta > 0} \mathcal{H}^s_{\delta}(E),$$

where

$$\mathcal{H}^s_{\delta}(E) = \inf \left\{ \frac{c}{\delta^s} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \text{diam}(U_j)^s : E \subset \bigcup_j U_j, \text{diam}(U_j) < \delta \right\}$$

for a normalizing constant $c(s) > 0$ so that the $n$-dimensional Hausdorff measure agrees with Lebesgue measure in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Note that $c(1) = 1$. The quantity $\mathcal{H}^s_{\delta}(E)$, $\delta \in (0, \infty)$, is called the $s$-dimensional Hausdorff $\delta$-content of $E$. If $\delta = \infty$ we simply call this quantity the $s$-dimensional Hausdorff content of $E$. The Hausdorff dimension of $E$ is defined by

$$\dim \mathcal{H}(E) = \inf \{ s \geq 0 : \mathcal{H}^s(E) = 0 \} = \sup \{ s \geq 0 : \mathcal{H}^s(E) = \infty \}.$$

An standard fact that we will use is that $\mathcal{H}^s(E) = 0$ if and only if $\mathcal{H}^s_{\infty}(E) = 0$.

We note that if $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a connected set, then

$$\mathcal{H}^1(E) \geq \mathcal{H}^1_{\infty}(E) \geq \text{diam}(E).$$

See [BBI01] Lemma 2.6.1, p. 53 for a proof.

2.2. Rectifiable paths. A path or curve is a continuous function $\gamma : I \to \mathbb{R}^n$, where $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ is a compact interval. The trace of a path $\gamma$ is the image $\gamma(I)$ and will be denoted by $|\gamma|$. The endpoints of a path $\gamma : [a, b] \to \mathbb{R}^n$ are the points $\gamma(a), \gamma(b)$ and we set $\partial \gamma = \{ \gamma(a), \gamma(b) \}$. We say that a path $\tilde{\gamma}$ is a weak subpath of a path $\gamma$ if $\#\gamma^{-1}(x) \leq \#\tilde{\gamma}^{-1}(x)$ for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. In particular, this implies that $|\tilde{\gamma}| \subset |\gamma|$. A path $\tilde{\gamma}$ is a (strong) subpath of a path $\gamma : I \to \mathbb{R}^n$ if $\tilde{\gamma}$ is the restriction of $\gamma$ to a closed subinterval of $I$. Note that a strong subpath is always a weak subpath, but not vice versa. A path $\gamma$ is simple if it is injective. Equivalently, $\#\gamma^{-1}(x) = 1$ for each $x \in |\gamma|$. It is well-known that every path has a simple weak subpath with the same endpoints [Wil70] Theorem 3.1.2, p. 219.

If $\gamma$ is a path and $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a set, then we say that $\gamma$ avoids the set $E$ if $E \cap |\gamma| = \emptyset$ and intersects $E$ at (e.g.) finitely many points if $E \cap |\gamma|$ is a finite set; note that we are not taking into account the multiplicity in the latter case.
If \( \gamma_i: [a_i, b_i] \to \mathbb{R}^n, i = 1, 2 \), are paths such that \( \gamma_1(b_1) = \gamma_2(a_2) \), then we can define the concatenation of the two paths to be the path \( \gamma: [a_1, b_2] \to \mathbb{R}^n \) such that \( \gamma|_{[a_1, b_1]} = \gamma_1 \) and \( \gamma|_{[a_2, b_2]} = \gamma_2 \). If \( x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n \), then we denote the line segment from \( x \) to \( y \) by \([x, y]\).

The length of a path \( \gamma \) is the total variation of the function \( \gamma \) and is denoted by \( \ell(\gamma) \). A path is rectifiable if it has finite length. Let \( \gamma: [a, b] \to \mathbb{R}^n \) be a path and \( s: [c, d] \to [a, b] \) be an increasing or decreasing continuous surjection. Then the path \( \gamma \circ s: [c, d] \to \mathbb{R}^n \) is called a reparametrization of \( \gamma \) (by the function \( s \)). Every rectifiable path \( \gamma \) admits a unique reparametrization \( \tilde{\gamma}: [0, \ell(\gamma)] \to \mathbb{R}^n \) by an increasing function so that \( \ell(\tilde{\gamma})|_{[0, t]} = t \) for all \( t \in [0, \ell(\gamma)] \). The path \( \tilde{\gamma} \) is called the arclength parametrization of \( \gamma \).

If \( \rho: \mathbb{R}^n \to [0, \infty] \) is a Borel function and \( \gamma \) is a rectifiable path, then one can define the line integral \( \int_{\gamma} \rho \, ds \) using the arclength parametrization of \( \gamma \); see [Väi71] Chapter 1, pp. 8–9]. Namely, if \( \gamma: [0, \ell(\gamma)] \to \mathbb{R}^n \) is parametrized by arclength, then

\[
\int_{\gamma} \rho \, ds = \int_{0}^{\ell(\gamma)} \rho(\gamma(t)) \, dt.
\]

We gather some properties of line integrals below.

**Lemma 2.1.** Let \( \gamma \) be a rectifiable path, \( \tilde{\gamma} \) be a weak subpath of \( \gamma \), and \( \rho: \mathbb{R}^n \to [0, \infty] \) be a Borel function. The following statements are true.

1. \( \int_{\gamma} \rho \, ds = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho(x) \# \gamma^{-1}(x) \, d\mathcal{H}^1(x) \).
2. \( \int_{[\gamma]} \rho \, d\mathcal{H}^1 \leq \int_{\gamma} \rho \, ds \) with equality if \( \gamma \) is simple.
3. \( \int_{\tilde{\gamma}} \rho \, ds \leq \int_{\gamma} \rho \, ds \).
4. If \( G \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) is a Borel set such that \( \mathcal{H}^1(G \cap \gamma) = 0 \), then

\[
\int_{\gamma} \rho \, ds = \int_{\gamma} \rho \chi_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus G} \, ds.
\]

In particular, the above statements hold for \( \rho = 1 \), in which case \( \int_{\gamma} \rho \, ds = \ell(\gamma) \).

**Proof.** Part (i) follows from [Fed69] Theorem 2.10.13, p. 177]. The inequality and equality in (ii) follow from (i). Since \( \tilde{\gamma} \) is a weak subpath of \( \gamma \), we have \( \# \tilde{\gamma}^{-1}(x) \leq \# \gamma^{-1}(x) \). Thus (i) implies (iii). Part (iv) also follows from (i) immediately upon observing that \( \chi_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus G}(x) \# \gamma^{-1}(x) = \# \tilde{\gamma}^{-1}(x) \) for \( x \notin G \cap \gamma \) and thus for \( \mathcal{H}^1 \)-a.e. \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \).

\[ \square \]

2.3. **Modulus.** Let \( \Gamma \) be a family of curves in \( \mathbb{R}^n \). A Borel function \( \rho: \mathbb{R}^n \to [0, \infty] \) is admissible for the path family \( \Gamma \) if

\[
\int_{\gamma} \rho \, ds \geq 1
\]

for all rectifiable paths \( \gamma \in \Gamma \). For \( p \geq 1 \) we define the \( p \)-modulus of \( \Gamma \) as

\[
\text{Mod}_p \Gamma = \inf_{\rho} \int \rho^p,
\]
where the infimum is taken over all admissible functions $\rho$ for $\Gamma$. By convention, $\text{Mod}_p \Gamma = \infty$ if there are no admissible functions for $\Gamma$.

The modulus $\text{Mod}_p$ is an outer measure in the space of all curves in $\mathbb{R}^n$. In particular, it obeys the monotonicity law that if $\Gamma_1 \subset \Gamma_2$, then
\[
\text{Mod}_p \Gamma_1 \leq \text{Mod}_p \Gamma_2
\]
and the subadditivity law, that
\[
\text{Mod}_p \left( \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \Gamma_i \right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \text{Mod}_p \Gamma_i
\]
for curve families $\Gamma_i$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$, in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Moreover, modulus obeys the serial law: if $\Gamma_i$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$, are curve families supported in disjoint Borel sets, then
\[
\text{Mod}_p \left( \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \Gamma_i \right) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \text{Mod}_p \Gamma_i.
\]
If every path of a family $\Gamma_1$ has a subpath lying in a family $\Gamma_2$, then
\[
\text{Mod}_p \Gamma_1 \leq \text{Mod}_p \Gamma_2.
\]
See [V"ai71, Chapter 1, pp. 16–20] for more details about modulus and proofs of these facts.

We record some further immediate properties. Suppose that $\text{Mod}_p \Gamma = 0$. Then the family of rectifiable curves that have a weak subpath contained in $\Gamma$ has $p$-modulus zero (by Lemma 2.1 (iii)). Moreover, the family of curves that have a reparametrization contained in $\Gamma$ also has $p$-modulus zero. The following lemmas are elementary.

**Lemma 2.2.** Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a set with $m_n(E) = 0$. Let $\Gamma_0$ be the family of paths $\gamma$ such that $\mathcal{H}^1(|\gamma| \cap E) > 0$. Then $\text{Mod}_p \Gamma_0 = 0$.

**Proof.** We replace $E$ with a Borel superset that also has measure zero. We let $\rho = \infty \cdot \chi_E$, which is a Borel function. Then $\rho$ is admissible for $\Gamma_0$ by Lemma 2.1 (ii) On the other hand, $\int \rho^p = 0$ since $m_n(E) = 0$.

For a path $\gamma : I \to \mathbb{R}^n$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we define $\gamma + x$ to be the path $I \ni t \mapsto \gamma(t) + x$.

**Lemma 2.3.** Let $\Gamma$ be a family of paths in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with $\text{Mod}_p \Gamma = 0$.

(i) For each rectifiable path $\gamma$ and for a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we have $\gamma + x \notin \Gamma$.

(ii) For each line segment $L$ parallel to a direction $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and for $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}$-a.e. $x \in \{v\}^\perp$ we have $L + x \notin \Gamma$.

(iii) For each $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $w \in S^{n-1}(0,1)$ define $\gamma_w(t) = x + tw$, $t \geq 0$. Then for $0 < r < R$ we have $\gamma_w([r,R]) \notin \Gamma$ for $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}$-a.e. $w \in S^{n-1}(0,1)$.

**Proof.** For each $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a function $\rho$ that is admissible for $\Gamma$ with $\int \rho^p < \varepsilon$.

For (i), let $\gamma$ be a rectifiable path in $\mathbb{R}^n$, parametrized by arclength. Let $r > 0$ and $G_r$ be the set of $x \in B(0,r)$ such that $\gamma + x \in \Gamma$. Then by Chebychev’s inequality and Fubini’s theorem we have
\[
m_n^*(G_r) \leq m_n \left( \left\{ x \in B(0,r) : \int_{\gamma + x} \rho \, ds \geq 1 \right\} \right) \leq \int_{B(0,r)} \int_0^{||\gamma||_{L^1(B(0,r))}} \rho(\gamma(t) + x) \, dt \, dx
\]
\[
= \int_0^{||\gamma||_{L^1(B(0,r))}} \int_{B(0,r)} \rho(\gamma(t) + x) \, dx \, dt \leq \|\gamma\| \|\rho\|_{L^1(B(0,r))},
\]
where \( B(0, R) \) is a large ball such that \(|\gamma + x| \subset B(0, R)\) for all \( x \in B(0, r)\). As \( \varepsilon \to 0 \), we have \( \|\rho\|_{L^p(B(0,R))} \to 0 \), so \( \|\rho\|_{L^1(B(0,R))} \to 0 \). This shows that \( m_n(G_r) = 0 \) for all \( r > 0 \). Thus, \( \gamma + x \notin \Gamma \) for a.e. \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \).

For part (ii), let \( G_r \) be the set of \( x \in B(0, r) \cap \{v\}^\perp \) such that \( L + x \in \Gamma \). Then

\[
\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(G_r \cap \{v\}^\perp) \leq \mathcal{H}^{n-1}\left( \left\{ x \in B(0, r) \cap \{v\}^\perp : \int_{L+x} \rho \, ds \geq 1 \right\} \right) \leq \|\rho\|_{L^1(D)},
\]

where \( D \) is the cylinder of radius \( r \) with axis \( L \). We now let \( \varepsilon \to 0 \) to obtain the conclusion.

Finally, for (iii), let \( G \) be the set of \( w \in S^{n-1}(0,1) \) such that \( \gamma_w|_{[r,R]} \in \Gamma \). Then, using polar integration we have

\[
\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(G) \leq \mathcal{H}^{n-1}\left( \left\{ w \in S^{n-1}(0,1) : \int_{\gamma_w|_{[r,R]}} \rho \, ds \geq 1 \right\} \right)
\]

\[
\leq \int_{S^{n-1}(0,1)} \int_{r}^R \rho(x + tw) \, dt \, d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(w)
\]

\[
\lesssim n \, r^{-n+1} \|\rho\|_{L^1(B(x,R))}.
\]

As before, we let \( \varepsilon \to 0 \) to obtain the conclusion. \( \square \)

In this work we will only be interested in the conformal exponent \( p = n \), in which case \( \text{Mod}_n \) is invariant under conformal maps \( \mathbb{S} \). Theorem 8.1, p. 25. Unless otherwise stated, throughout the paper, paths are considered to be rectifiable. Note that unrectifiable paths do not affect modulus.

### 2.4. Elementary properties of NED and CNED sets.

We first recall the definitions. For an open set \( U \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) and for any two closed sets \( F_1, F_2 \subset U \) the family of curves joining \( F_1 \) and \( F_2 \) inside \( U \) is denoted by \( \Gamma(F_1, F_2; U) \). In other words, this family contains the curves \( \gamma : [a,b] \to U \) with \( \gamma(a) \in F_1 \), \( \gamma(b) \in F_2 \), and \( \gamma((a,b)) \subset U \). For a set \( E \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) we denote by \( \mathcal{F}_0(E) \) the family of curves in \( \mathbb{R}^n \) that do not intersect \( E \), except possibly at the endpoints; that is, \( \mathcal{F}_0(E) \) contains the curves \( \gamma : [a,b] \to \mathbb{R}^n \) such that \( |\gamma| \setminus \gamma((a,b)) \) does not intersect \( E \). Moreover, we define \( \mathcal{F}_\sigma(E) \) to be the family of curves in \( \mathbb{R}^n \) that intersect \( E \) in countably many points; that is, the set \( E \cap |\gamma| \) is countable (finite or infinite).

Let \( E \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) be a set and \( \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) be an open set. The set \( E \) lies in NED(\( \Omega \)) if for every pair of non-empty, disjoint continua \( F_1, F_2 \subset \Omega \) we have

\[
\text{Mod}_n \left( \Gamma(F_1, F_2; \Omega) \right) = \text{Mod}_n \left( \Gamma(F_1, F_2; \Omega) \cap \mathcal{F}_0(E) \right).
\]

If we have instead

\[
\text{Mod}_n \left( \Gamma(F_1, F_2; \Omega) \right) \leq M \cdot \text{Mod}_n \left( \Gamma(F_1, F_2; \Omega) \cap \mathcal{F}_0(E) \right)
\]

for a uniform constant \( M \geq 1 \), then \( E \) lies in NED"(\( \Omega \)). A set \( E \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) lies in CNED(\( \Omega \)) and CNED"(\( \Omega \)) if the above equality and inequality, respectively, hold with \( \mathcal{F}_\sigma(E) \) in place of \( \mathcal{F}_0(E) \). In case \( \Omega = \mathbb{R}^n \), we simply use the notation NED, NED", CNED, and CNED".

We remark that NED and CNED sets are not assumed to be Lebesgue measurable. In fact, there exists a non-measurable set, constructed by Sierpiński for a different purpose, that is of class CNED; see the discussion in Section 9.3.

We will use the notation \( \mathcal{NED}(\Omega) \) and \( \mathcal{F}_*(E) \) for NED(\( \Omega \)) or CNED(\( \Omega \)) and for \( \mathcal{F}_0(E) \) or \( \mathcal{F}_\sigma(E) \), respectively. Similarly, we will use the notation \( \mathcal{NED}"(\Omega) \) for
NED\(^w\)(Ω) or CNED\(^w\)(Ω). By the monotonicity of modulus, if \(E \in \ast\text{NED}(\Omega)\) (resp. \(\ast\text{NED}^w(\Omega)\)) and \(F \subset E\), then \(F\) lies in \(\ast\text{NED}(\Omega)\) (resp. \(\ast\text{NED}^w(\Omega)\)). Moreover, if \(E \in \ast\text{NED}^w(\Omega)\), it is immediate from the definitions that \(E \cap \Omega\) must have empty interior.

A set is non-degenerate if it contains more than one points. For two non-degenerate sets \(F_1, F_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^n\) we define the relative distance \(\Delta(F_1, F_2)\) to be
\[
\frac{\text{dist}(F_1, F_2)}{\min\{\text{diam}(F_1), \text{diam}(F_2)\}}.
\]

**Lemma 2.4.** Let \(E \subset \mathbb{R}^n\) be a Lebesgue measurable set. Suppose that there exist constants \(t, \phi > 0\) such that for each \(x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n\) there exists \(r_0 > 0\) with the property that for every pair of non-degenerate, disjoint continua \(F_1, F_2 \subset B(x_0, r_0)\) with \(\Delta(F_1, F_2) \leq t\) we have
\[
\text{Mod}_n(\Gamma(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^n) \cap \mathcal{F}_s(E)) \geq \phi.
\]
Then \(m_n(E) = 0\).

*Proof.* Since \(E\) is measurable, it differs from a Borel subset by a set of measure zero. Thus, we assume that \(E\) is Borel itself. Suppose that \(m_n(E) > 0\) and that \(x_0\) is a Lebesgue density point of \(E\). Let \(r_0\) be as in the assumption and consider \(r < r_0\). Define \(F_1 = \partial B(x_0, r)\) and \(F_2 = \partial B(x_0, ar)\), where \(a \in (0, 1)\) is chosen so that
\[
\Delta(F_1, F_2) = \frac{1-a^2}{a^2} \leq t.
\]
Consider the function
\[
\rho(x) = \frac{1}{|x-x_0| \log(a^{-1})} \chi_{A(x_0;ar,r)}(x).
\]
Then \(\rho\) is admissible for \(\Gamma(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^n)\); see for example [Hei01, 7.14, pp. 52–53]. We set \(\rho_1 = \rho \chi_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus E}\), which is Borel measurable. We note that \(\rho_1\) is admissible for \(\Gamma(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^n) \cap \mathcal{F}_s(E)\). Indeed, if \(\gamma\) is a curve joining \(F_1\) and \(F_2\) and intersecting \(E\) at countably many points, then by Lemma 2.1 (iv) we have
\[
\int_{\gamma} \rho_1 \, ds = \int_{\gamma} \rho \, ds \geq 1.
\]
By the assumption and the admissibility of \(\rho_1\), we have
\[
\phi \leq \text{Mod}_n(\Gamma(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^n) \cap \mathcal{F}_s(E)) \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus E} \rho^n \leq \frac{m_n(B(x_0, r) \setminus E)}{(\log(a^{-1})^n a^n r^n)}.
\]
Letting \(r \to 0\) gives a contradiction to the assumption that \(x_0\) is a density point of \(E\). \(\square\)

**Lemma 2.5.** Let \(\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n\) be an open set and \(E \subset \Omega\) be a Lebesgue measurable set with \(E \in \ast\text{NED}^w(\Omega)\). Then \(m_n(E) = 0\). If, in addition, \(E\) is closed, then it satisfies the assumption of Lemma 2.4.

It was proved by Väisälä [Väis62, Theorem 1] that closed NED sets have measure zero.
Proof. Since $E$ is measurable, it suffices to show that every closed subset of $E$ has measure zero. Note that every subset of $E$ lies also in $\star\text{NED}^w(\Omega)$. Thus, we may assume that $E$ is closed and it suffices to show that the assumption of Lemma 2.4 is satisfied. If $x_0 \notin E$, since $E$ is closed, there exists a ball $B(x_0, r_0) \subset \mathbb{R}^n \setminus E$. For any pair of non-degenerate, disjoint continua $F_1, F_2 \subset B(x_0, r_0)$ we have

$$\text{Mod}_n(\Gamma(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^n) \cap \mathcal{F}_s(E)) \geq \text{Mod}_n(\Gamma(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^n) \cap \mathcal{F}_s(B(x_0, r_0)))$$

by the monotonicity of modulus. If $x_0 \in E$, consider a ball $B(x_0, r_0) \subset \Omega$. Since $E \in \star\text{NED}^w(\Omega)$, there exists a uniform constant $M \geq 1$ such that for $F_1, F_2 \subset B(x_0, r_0)$ as above, we have

$$\text{Mod}_n(\Gamma(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^n) \cap \mathcal{F}_s(E)) \geq M^{-1} \cdot \text{Mod}_n(\Gamma(F_1, F_2; \Omega) \cap \mathcal{F}_s(E))$$

$$\geq M^{-1} \cdot \text{Mod}_n(\Gamma(F_1, F_2; B(x_0, r_0))).$$

Therefore, it suffices to find a uniform lower bound for $\text{Mod}_n(\Gamma(F_1, F_2; B(x_0, r_0)))$, provided that $\Delta(F_1, F_2) \leq 1$. This follows immediately from the fact that each open ball in Euclidean space is a Loewner space [Hei01, Example 8.24 (a), p. 65]. \[QED\]

2.5. **Comparison to classical definition of NED sets.** According to the classical definition, a closed set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is NED if for every pair of non-empty, disjoint continua $F_1, F_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^n \setminus E$ we have

$$\text{Mod}_n(\Gamma(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^n) \cap \mathcal{F}_s(E)) = \text{Mod}_n(\Gamma(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^n \setminus E) \cap \mathcal{F}_s(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus E)).$$

In the definition that we gave, we required the stronger condition that the above equality holds for all disjoint continua $F_1, F_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ regardless of whether they intersect the set $E$. The reason for allowing such a generality in our approach is that we do not impose any topological assumptions on $E$, which could be even dense in $\mathbb{R}^n$; therefore it would be too restrictive and unnatural to work with continua $F_1, F_2$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus E$.

We show that the two definitions agree. The proof relies on some results relating $n$-modulus with $n$-capacity. Let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open set and $F_1, F_2 \subset \overline{U}$ be disjoint continua. The $n$-capacity of the condenser $(F_1, F_2; U)$ is defined as

$$\text{Cap}_n(F_1, F_2; U) = \inf_u \int_U |\nabla u|^n,$$

where the infimum is taken over all functions $u$ that are continuous in $U \cup F_1 \cup F_2$, ACL in $U$ [Val91, Section 26, p. 88], with $u = 0$ in a neighborhood of $F_1$ and $u = 1$ in a neighborhood of $F_2$ [Hes75, Theorem 3.3]. Equivalently, one can replace in this definition continuous ACL functions with the Dirichlet space $L^{1,n}(U)$ of locally integrable functions in $U$ with distributional derivatives of first order lying in $L^n(U)$. It has been shown by Hesse [Hes75, Theorem 5.5] that whenever $F_1, F_2$ are continua in $U$ (specifically, not intersecting $\partial U$), then

$$\text{Cap}_n(F_1, F_2; U) = \text{Mod}_n(\Gamma(F_1, F_2; U)).$$

This result was generalized to the case that $F_1, F_2 \subset \overline{U}$, provided that $U$ is a QED domain, by Herron–Koskela [HK90]; see also the work of Shlyk [Shl93] for a more general result. By definition, a connected open set $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a QED domain if there exists a constant $M \geq 1$ such that

$$\text{Mod}_n(\Gamma(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^n)) \leq M \cdot \text{Mod}_n(\Gamma(F_1, F_2; U))$$
for all pairs of non-empty, disjoint continua \( F_1, F_2 \subset U \). Note that if \( E \) is an NED set according to the classical definition, then \( U = \mathbb{R}^n \setminus E \) is a QED domain, whose closure is \( \mathbb{R}^n \); classical NED sets have empty interior \( \text{[Vei62]} \). Thus,

\[
\text{Cap}_n(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^n) = \text{Mod}_n \Gamma(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^n \setminus E)
\]

for all non-empty, disjoint continua \( F_1, F_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^n \). Summarizing, in order to show the equivalence of the classical definition to the current one, it suffices to show that

\[
\text{Cap}_n(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^n) = \text{Cap}_n(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^n \setminus E)
\]

for all non-empty, disjoint continua \( F_1, F_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^n \). Observe that this equality already holds if \( F_1, F_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^n \setminus E \). Hence, \( E \) is removable for \( n \)-capacity, in the sense of Vodopyanov–Goldshtein \( \text{[VG77]} \). By \( \text{[VG77, Theorem 3.1, p. 46]} \), such sets coincide with the sets that are removable for the Dirichlet space \( L^{1,n} \). That is, \( m_n(E) = 0 \) and if \( u \in L^{1,n}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus E) \), then \( u \in L^{1,n}(\mathbb{R}^n) \) and the distributional derivatives of \( u \) are the same in both spaces.

Now, let \( F_1, F_2 \) be any non-empty, disjoint continua in \( \mathbb{R}^n \); in particular, they might intersect the set \( E \), as in the current definition of NED sets. We trivially have

\[
\text{Cap}_n(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^n \setminus E) \leq \text{Cap}_n(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^n)
\]

for all non-empty, disjoint continua \( F_1, F_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^n \). Observe that this equality already holds if \( F_1, F_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^n \setminus E \). Hence, \( E \) is removable for the Dirichlet space \( L^{1,n} \), we also have the reverse inequality, completing the proof.

3. The egg-yolk covering lemma

3.1. Known covering results. We first state a classical covering result. A proof can be found in \( \text{[Hei01, Theorem 1.2, p. 2]} \).

\textbf{Lemma 3.1} (5B-covering lemma). Let \( X \) be a metric space and \( \mathcal{B} \) be a collection of open balls in \( X \) with uniformly bounded radii. Then there exists a disjointed subcollection \( \mathcal{B}' \) of \( \mathcal{B} \) such that

\[
\bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{B}} B \subset \bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{B}'} 5B.
\]

Recall that for a ball \( B = B(x_0, r_0) \) and \( \lambda > 0 \) we denote by \( \lambda B \) the ball \( B(x_0, \lambda r_0) \). Note that in metric spaces the center and radius of a ball need not be unique, so we regard the ball \( B(x_0, r_0) \) not only as a set, but also as a pair \((x_0, r_0)\). Then there is no ambiguity in the definition of \( \lambda B \).

The power of the 5B-covering lemma lies on the fact that it allows us to replace arbitrary covers by balls with covers by essentially disjoint balls. One drawback of the 5B-covering lemma, however, is that if \( f \) is an arbitrary homeomorphism on \( X \), then the lemma gives no relation between the sizes of \( f(B) \) and \( f(5B) \). In particular, it is not true in general that rescaling the family \( \{f(5B)\}_{B \in \mathcal{B}'} \) by a uniform fixed factor will give a disjointed family. For this reason, when working with homeomorphisms of Euclidean space, one can instead use the Besicovitch covering theorem.

\textbf{Theorem 3.2} (Besicovitch covering theorem). Let \( A \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) be a bounded set and \( \mathcal{B} \) be a family of closed balls such that each point of \( A \) is the center of a ball in \( \mathcal{B} \).
Then there exists a subcollection $B'$ of $B$ such that

$$A \subset \bigcup_{B \in B'} B \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{B \in B'} \chi_B \leq c(n).$$

Proofs can be found in [Zie89] Theorem 1.3.5] and [Mat95] Theorem 2.7]. Obviously, if $f$ is a homeomorphism of $\mathbb{R}^n$, then the family $\{f(B)\}_{B \in B'}$ covers $f(A)$ and

$$\sum_{B \in B'} \chi_{f(B)} \leq c(n).$$

Hence, unlike the $5B$-covering lemma, here we obtain information for both $\{B\}_{B \in B'}$ and $\{f(B)\}_{B \in B'}$. The drawback of this theorem is that it only works with geometric balls in Euclidean space and there is no generalization for covers by sets of bounded eccentricity, as defined in the Introduction, or for balls in metric spaces.

The egg-yolk covering lemma that we prove in this section can be regarded as a generalization of the $5B$-covering lemma and the Besicovitch covering theorem, giving favorable covers that encode geometric information both in the domain and the range of a homeomorphism between metric spaces.

Before moving to the statement of the egg-yolk covering lemma, we state a well-known inequality that will be used often in combination with covering lemmas.

**Lemma 3.3 ([Boj88]).** Let $p \geq 1$ and $\lambda > 0$. Suppose that $\{B_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a collection of balls in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $a_i$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$, is a sequence of non-negative numbers. We have

$$\left\| \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} a_i \chi_{B_i} \right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq c(n,p,\lambda) \left\| \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} a_i \chi_{B_i} \right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$  

**3.2. Egg-yolk pairs.** Let $(X,d)$ be a connected metric space. For a ball $B = B(x_0,r_0) \subset X$, we define $r(B) = r_0$. We always have $\text{diam}(B) \leq 2r(B)$ and if $X \setminus B \neq \emptyset$, then $X$ is connected, we have

$$r(B) \leq \text{diam}(B) \leq 2r(B).$$

Let $A \subset X$ be a bounded open set and $M \geq 2$. Suppose that there exists an open ball $B = B(x_0,r_0) \subset X$ such that $B \subset 2B \subset A \subset MB$. Then we call $(A,B)$ an $M$-egg-yolk pair; see Figure 1. If $(A,B)$ is an $M$-egg-yolk pair, we have the following immediate properties.

(EY1) $\text{diam}(A) \leq 2Mr(B)$.

(EY2) If $X \setminus A \neq \emptyset$, then

$$\text{diam}(B) \leq 2r(B) \leq \text{diam}(2B) \leq \text{diam}(A) \leq 2Mr(B) \leq 2M \text{diam}(B).$$

(EY3) If $X \setminus A \neq \emptyset$, then $\text{dist}(B,X \setminus A) \geq r(B)$.

(EY4) If $x \in B$ and $y \in \overline{A}$, then $d(x,y) \leq (M+1)r(B)$.

Moreover, the following statements are true.

(EY5) Let $(A_i,B_i)$ be $M$-egg-yolk pairs, for $i = 1, 2$, such that $B_1 \cap B_2 \neq \emptyset$ and $A_2 \not\subset A_1$. Then

$$\text{diam}(A_2) \geq c(M) \text{diam}(A_1).$$

**Proof.** If $A_2 = X$ there is nothing to prove, so we assume that $X \setminus A_2 \neq \emptyset$. Also, since $A_2 \not\subset A_1$, we cannot have $A_1 = X$; thus $X \setminus A_1 \neq \emptyset$. If $(M+1)r(B_2) <
dist\((B_1, X \setminus A_1)\), then for \(x \in B_1 \cap B_2\) and \(y \in \overline{A}_2\) we have \(d(x, y) \leq (M+1)r(B_2) < \) \(\text{dist}(B_1, X \setminus A_1)\). Thus,

\[
\text{dist}(y, X \setminus A_1) \geq \text{dist}(B_1, X \setminus A_1) - d(x, y) > 0.
\]

It follows that \(B_2 \subset A_1\), a contradiction. Therefore, \((M+1)r(B_2) \geq \text{dist}(B_1, X \setminus A_1)\), as desired.

\[\square\]

(EY6) Let \((A_i, B_i), i \in I\), be a family of \(M\)-egg-yolk pairs and suppose that there exists \(i_0 \in I\) such that \(A_i \cap A_{i_0} \neq \emptyset\) and \(\text{diam}(A_i) \leq a \text{diam}(A_{i_0})\) for each \(i \in I\) and for some \(a > 0\). We set \(A_I = \bigcup_{i \in I} A_i\). Then \((A_I, B_{i_0})\) is a \(c(a, M)\)-egg-yolk pair.

Proof. Note that \(B_{i_0} \subset 2B_{i_0} \subset A_{i_0} \subset A_I\) and \(A_i \subset (2a + 1)MB_{i_0}\) for each \(i \in I\). Thus, \(A_I \subset (2a + 1)MB_{i_0}\).

\[\square\]

3.3. The egg-yolk covering lemma.

Lemma 3.4 (Egg-yolk covering lemma). Let \(X, Y\) be compact, connected metric spaces, \(f: X \to Y\) be a homeomorphism, and \(M \geq 2\). Let \(\{(A_i, B_i)\}_{i \in I}\) and \(\{(A_i', B_i')\}_{i \in I}\) be families of \(M\)-egg-yolk pairs in \(X\) and \(Y\), respectively, with \(f(A_i) = A_i'\) for each \(i \in I\). Then there exists a set \(J \subset I\) and families \(\{(D_j, B_j)\}_{j \in J}\) and \(\{(D_j', B_j')\}_{j \in J}\) of \(c(M)\)-egg-yolk pairs in \(X\) and \(Y\), respectively, such that

(i) \(\bigcup_{j \in J} D_j = \bigcup_{i \in I} A_i\),

(ii) \(f(D_j) = D_j'\) for each \(j \in J\), and

(iii) the balls \(B_j, j \in J\), are pairwise disjoint and the balls \(B_j', j \in J\), are pairwise disjoint.

It is crucial for the application of the lemma that we are not requiring \(B_i\) to be related to \(B_i'\); we are only assuming that \(f(A_i) = A_i'\). In the case that \(X = Y\), \(f\) is the identity map, and \(B_i' = B_i\), this lemma is very similar to the 5\(B\)-covering lemma (Lemma 3.1).
The main idea of the proof is to create the sets $D_k$ by clustering together sets $A_i, A_j$, with the aid of property (EY6) whenever $B_i \cap B_j \neq \emptyset$. The essential difficulty is that the diameters of $A_i$ and $A_j$ might not be comparable. We first establish an auxiliary result, which allows us to reduce to the case that $A_i$ and $A_j$ have comparable diameters whenever $B_i \cap B_j \neq \emptyset$.

**Lemma 3.5.** Under the assumptions of Lemma 3.4, there exists a set $J \subset I$ and families $\{(F_j, B_j)\}_{j \in J}$ and $\{(F'_j, B'_j)\}_{j \in J}$ of $c(M)$-egg-yolk pairs in $X$ and $Y$, respectively, such that

1. $\bigcup_{j \in J} F_j = \bigcup_{i \in I} A_i$,
2. $f(F_j) = F'_j$ for each $j \in J$, and
3. if $B_i \cap B_j \neq \emptyset$ (resp. $B'_i \cap B'_j \neq \emptyset$) for some $i, j \in J$, then $c(M)^{-1} \leq \frac{\text{diam}(F_i)}{\text{diam}(J_j)} \leq c(M)$ (resp. $c(M)^{-1} \leq \frac{\text{diam}(F'_i)}{\text{diam}(F'_j)} \leq c(M)$).

We remark that $\{B_j\}_{j \in J}$ and $\{B'_j\}_{j \in J}$ are just subcollections of $\{B_i\}_{i \in I}$ and $\{B'_i\}_{i \in I}$, respectively, which are given in the assumptions of Lemma 3.4.

If $I$ were a finite index set, then one could choose $\{F_j\}_{j \in J}$ to be a subcollection of $\{A_i\}_{i \in I}$ satisfying (ii) and with the property that $F_i \not\subseteq F_j$ whenever $i \neq j$. Then (EY5) would immediately give the crucial property (iii). In the case that $I$ is infinite, the idea is the same, but the proof is more involved.

**Proof.** Note that the collection $\{A_i\}_{i \in I}$ is partially ordered with respect to inclusion. By the Hausdorff maximal principle [Mun79] §1.11, p. 69], for each $k \in I$ there exists a maximal totally ordered set $W(k) = \{A_j\}_{j \in J(k)} \subset \{A_i\}_{i \in I}$ containing $A_k$. Since $f$ is injective and $f(A_i) = A_i'$, the collection $\{A_i\}_{j \in J(k)}$ is also a maximal totally ordered subcollection of $\{A_i\}_{i \in I}$. Define $A_W(k) = \bigcup_{j \in J(k)} A_j$ and $A'_W(k) = f(A_W(k)) = \bigcup_{j \in J(k)} A'_j$. Obviously, $\bigcup_{k \in I} A_W(k) = \bigcup_{i \in I} A_i$. We define

$$L(W(k)) = \sup\{\text{diam}(A_j) : A_j \in W(k)\}$$
and

$$L'(W(k)) = \sup\{\text{diam}(A'_j) : A_j \in W(k)\}.$$ Note that both numbers are finite since $A_j \subset X, A'_j \subset Y$, and $X, Y$ are bounded spaces. We fix $A_{i_1}, A_{i_2} \in W(k)$ such that $\text{diam}(A_{i_1}) \geq L(W(k))/2$ and $\text{diam}(A'_{i_2}) \geq L'(W(k))/2$. Since $W(k)$ is totally ordered, we have $A_{i_1} \supset A_{i_2}$ or $A_{i_2} \supset A_{i_1}$. Without loss of generality, assume that $A_{i_1} \supset A_{i_2}$. Since $f(A_{i}) = A'_{i}$ for each $i \in I$, we have $A'_{i_1} \supset A'_{i_2}$. Thus, $\text{diam}(A'_{i_1}) \geq \text{diam}(A'_{i_2}) \geq L'(W(k))/2$. Summarizing, there exists $A_{i(k)} \in W(k)$ such that $\text{diam}(A_{i(k)}) \geq L(W(k))/2$ and $\text{diam}(A'_{i(k)}) \geq L'(W(k))/2$. Note that $\text{diam}(A_j) \leq L(W(k)) \leq 2 \text{diam}(A_{i(k)})$ and $\text{diam}(A'_j) \leq L'(W(k)) \leq 2 \text{diam}(A'_{i(k)})$ for each $A_j \in W(k)$. Moreover, for each $A_j \in W(k)$, we have $A_j \cap A_{i(k)} \neq \emptyset$ and $A'_j \cap A'_{i(k)} \neq \emptyset$ by the total ordering of $W(k)$. By property (EY6) we conclude that $(A_W(k), B_{i(k)})$ and $(A'_W(k), B'_{i(k)})$ are $c(M)$-egg-yolk pairs for each $k \in I$.

If $A_W(k) = X$ for some $k \in I$, then we set $j = i(k), J = \{j\}, F_j = A_W(k), F'_j = f(F_j)$, and we have nothing to prove. Hence, we suppose that $X \setminus A_W(k) \neq \emptyset$, and thus $X \setminus A_k \neq \emptyset$, for each $k \in I$.

We claim that

$$(3.1) \quad \text{diam}(A_W(k)) \simeq_M \text{diam}(A_W(l)) \quad \text{whenever} \quad B_{i(k)} \cap B_{i(l)} \neq \emptyset.$$
The same is true for \( (A_{W(k)}, B_{W(k)}) \), \( k \in I \). To see this, suppose that \( B_{i(k)} \cap B_{i(l)} \neq \emptyset \). If \( \overline{A_{W(k)}} \subset A_{W(l)} = \bigcup_{j \in J(l)} A_j \), then by the compactness of \( \overline{A_{W(k)}} \) and the total ordering of \( W(l) \), there exists an open set \( A_j \in W(l) \) such that \( \overline{A_{W(k)}} \subset A_j \). If \( A_j \in W(k) \), then \( \overline{A_{W(k)}} = A_j \), so \( A_j \) is clopen. By the connectedness of \( X \), \( A_j = X \), a contradiction. Therefore, \( A_j \in W(l) \setminus W(k) \). This implies that \( W(k) \cup \{ A_j \} \) is totally ordered, which contradicts the maximality of \( W(k) \). Therefore, \( \overline{A_{W(k)}} \not\subset A_{W(l)} \) and by [EY5] we have \( \text{diam}(A_{W(k)}) \geq_M \text{diam}(A_{W(l)}) \). By reversing the roles of \( k \) and \( l \), we see that \( \text{diam}(A_{W(k)}) \simeq_M \text{diam}(A_{W(l)}) \).

If the mapping \( k \mapsto i(k) \) were injective on \( I \), then the proof would have been completed. In general, this might not be the case. For \( j \in J = \{ l \in I \} \choose 2 \), we define \( F_j \) to be the union of all sets \( A_{W(k)} \) such that \( i(k) = j \). Since \( (A_{W(k)}, B_j) \) is a \( c(M) \)-egg-yolk pair whenever \( i(k) = j \), we conclude by [EY2] that

\[
\text{diam}(A_{W(k)}) \simeq_M \text{diam}(B_j).
\]

By property [EY6], \( (F_j, B_j) \) is a \( c'(M) \)-egg-yolk pair. We also set \( F'_j = f(F_j) \) and similarly, \( (F'_j, B_j) \) is a \( c'(M) \)-egg-yolk pair. Without loss of generality, assume that \( X \setminus F_j \neq \emptyset \) for each \( j \in J \). We only have to justify [iii]. Suppose \( B_{j_1} \cap B_{j_2} \neq \emptyset \) for some \( j_1, j_2 \in J \) and consider \( k, l \in I \) with \( i(k) = j_1 \) and \( i(l) = j_2 \). Then, by [EY2] and [3.1], we have

\[
\text{diam}(F_{j_1}) \simeq_M \text{diam}(B_{j_1}) \simeq_M \text{diam}(A_{W(k)}) \simeq_M \text{diam}(A_{W(l)}) \simeq_M \text{diam}(F_{j_2}).
\]

The same argument applies to \( (F'_j, B'_j) \), \( j \in J \). This completes the proof.

**Proof of Lemma 3.4.** We will show that given \( \{(A_i, B_i)\}_{i \in I} \) and \( \{\{(A'_i, B'_i)\}_{i \in I} \) as in the statement, there exist families \( \{(D_j, E_j)\}_{j \in J} \) and \( \{(D'_j, E'_j)\}_{j \in J} \) of \( c(M) \)-egg-yolk pairs, where \( \{E_j\}_{j \in J} \) and \( \{E'_j\}_{j \in J} \) are subcollections of \( \{B_i\}_{i \in I} \) and \( \{B'_i\}_{i \in I} \), respectively, satisfying conclusions [i], [ii], and such that the sets \( \{E_j\}_{j \in J} \) are pairwise disjoint; that is, only one half of conclusion [iii] is satisfied. Then using this statement for \( f^{-1} \) and for the given \( \{(D_j, E_j)\}_{j \in J} \) and \( \{(D'_j, E'_j)\}_{j \in J} \) (in place of \( \{(A_i, B_i)\}_{i \in I} \) and \( \{\{(A'_i, B'_i)\}_{i \in I} \), we may find families \( \{\tilde{D}_j, \tilde{E}_j\}_{j \in J} \) and \( \{\tilde{D}'_j, \tilde{E}'_j\}_{j \in J} \) of \( \tilde{c}(M) \)-egg-yolk pairs, satisfying the full conclusions of the lemma.

By Lemma 3.5, we may assume that the given \( \{(A_i, B_i)\}_{i \in I} \) and \( \{\{(A'_i, B'_i)\}_{i \in I} \) are families of \( c(M) \)-egg-yolk pairs with \( f(A_i) = A'_i \) for each \( i \in I \) and with the additional property that

\[
\text{diam}(A'_i) \simeq_M \text{diam}(A'_j) \quad \text{whenever} \quad B'_i \cap B'_j \neq \emptyset.
\]

We set \( L = \sup_{i \in I} \text{diam}(A_i) \), which is finite, since the space \( X \) is bounded. Define \( \mathcal{F}_0 = \emptyset \) and \( k_0 = 0 \). Suppose that \( \mathcal{F}_j \subset I \) and \( k_j \in \mathbb{Z} \) have been defined for \( j \in \{0, \ldots, m\} \) such that \( k_j \) is increasing in \( j \in \{0, \ldots, m\} \) and suppose that we have obtained \( c(M) \)-egg-yolk pairs \( (D_i, E_i) \) and \( (D'_i, E'_i) \) for \( i \in \{1, \ldots, k_m\} \) such that

1. \( \mathcal{F}_0 \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{F}_m \subset \{ i \in I : \text{diam}(A_i) > 2^{-m} L \} \subset \{ i \in I : A_i \subset D_j \text{ for some } j \in \{1, \ldots, k_m\} \} \cup \bigcup_{i \in I, j} D_i \subset \bigcup_{i \in I} A_i \),
2. \( f(D_i) = D'_i, i \in \{1, \ldots, k_m\} \),
3. the sets \( E'_i, i \in \{1, \ldots, k_m\}, \) are pairwise disjoint, and
(4) \( \{ i \in I : B'_i \cap E'_j \neq \emptyset \text{ for some } j \in \{1, \ldots, k_m\} \} \subset \{ i \in I : A_i \subset D_j \text{ for some } j \in \{1, \ldots, k_m\} \} \).

Note that all of these statements are vacuously true for \( m = 0 \).

We define inductively
\[
F_{m+1} = \{ i \in I : 2^{-m-1}L < \text{diam}(A_i) \leq 2^{-m}L \text{ and } A_i \not\subset D_j, j \in \{1, \ldots, k_m\} \}.
\]

If \( F_{m+1} = \emptyset \), we define \( k_{m+1} = k_m \). Suppose that \( F_{m+1} \neq \emptyset \) and let \( i_1 \in F_{m+1} \).

Since \( A_{i_1} \not\subset D_j \) for all \( j \in \{1, \ldots, k_m\} \), we conclude by the induction assumption (4) that \( B'_{i_1} \cap E'_j = \emptyset \text{ for all } j \in \{1, \ldots, k_m\} \).

Suppose that \( B'_{i_1} \cap B'_j \neq \emptyset \) for some \( j \in I \) with \( A_j \not\subset D_i \) for \( i \in \{1, \ldots, k_m\} \).

By (5.2) we conclude that \( \text{diam}(A'_i) \approx_M \text{diam}(A'_j) \).

We define \( E'_{k_m+1} = B'_{i_1} \) and \( D'_{k_m+1} \) to be the union of \( A'_i \) with the sets \( A_j \) such that \( B'_{i_1} \cap B'_j \neq \emptyset \) and \( A_j \not\subset D_i \) for \( i \in \{1, \ldots, k_m\} \); see Figure (EY6).

By (EY6) we conclude that \( (D_{k_m+1}, E_{k_m+1}) \) is a \((M)\)-egg-yolk pair. Define \( D_{k_m+1} = f^{-1}(D'_{k_m+1}) \) and \( E_{k_m+1} = B'_{i_1} \). Note that \( D_{k_m+1} \) is the union of \( A_i \) with sets \( A_j \) such that \( A_i \cap \partial A_j = \emptyset \) (since \( A'_i \cap A'_j \cap B'_j \neq \emptyset \) and \( A_i \not\subset D_i \) for \( i \in \{1, \ldots, k_m\} \); thus, by the induction assumption (1) we have \( \text{diam}(A_j) \) \( \approx 2^{-m}L < 2 \text{diam}(A_i) \)).

It follows that \( (D_{k_m+1}, E_{k_m+1}) \) is a \((M)\)-egg-yolk pair by (EY6).

We remark that by construction we have \( \{ i \in I : B'_i \cap E'_{k_m+1} \neq \emptyset \} \subset \{ i \in I : A_i \subset D_j \text{ for some } j \in \{1, \ldots, k_m+1\} \} \).

We continue in the same way, by picking \( i_2 \in F_{m+1} \setminus \{ i_1 \} \) such that \( A_{i_2} \not\subset D_{k_m+1} \).

If no such \( i_2 \) exists, we define \( k_{m+1} = k_m + 1 \). Note that \( B'_{i_2} \cap E'_{k_m+1} = \emptyset \) by the choice of \( E'_{k_m+1} \), and \( B'_{i_2} \cap E'_j = \emptyset \) for each \( j \in \{1, \ldots, k_m\} \) by the induction assumption (4).

We define \( E'_{k_m+2} = B'_{i_2} \) and \( D'_{k_m+2} \) to be the union of \( A'_i \) with the sets \( A'_j \) such that \( B'_{i_2} \cap B'_j \neq \emptyset \) and \( A_j \not\subset D_i \) for \( i \in \{1, \ldots, k_m+1\} \). Also, set \( D_{k_m+2} = f^{-1}(D'_{k_m+2}) \) and \( E_{k_m+2} = B_{i_2} \). In this way we produce \((M)\)-egg-yolk pairs \( (D'_{k_m+2}, E'_{k_m+2}) \) and \( (D_{k_m+2}, E_{k_m+2}) \) such that \( E'_{k_m+2} \cap E'_j = \emptyset \text{ for } j \in \{1, \ldots, k_m+1\} \). As before, by construction we have \( \{ i \in I : B'_i \cap E'_{k_m+2} \neq \emptyset \} \subset \{ i \in I : A_i \subset D_j \text{ for some } j \in \{1, \ldots, k_m+2\} \} \).

We claim that this process will stop after finitely many steps. That is, there exists \( k_{m+1} > k_m \) with the property that there is no \( i \in F_{m+1} \setminus \{ i_1, \ldots, i_{k_m+1}, k_m \} \) such that \( A_i \not\subset D_j \) for each \( i \in \{k_m+1, \ldots, k_{m+1}\} \). Indeed, by the uniform continuity of \( f^{-1} \), we have

\[
\inf_{i \in F_{m+1}} \text{diam}(A'_i) > 0.
\]

Each \( E'_i, i = k_m + 1, k_m + 2, \ldots, \) is a ball of radius comparable to \( \text{diam}(D'_i) \); thus, \( \text{diam}(E'_i) \) is bounded below away from 0 by (3.3). Moreover, the balls \( E'_i \) are disjoint and are contained in the compact space \( Y \). This shows that this process will necessarily end after a number \( k_{m+1} - k_m \) of steps. We also conclude that if \( i \in F_{m+1} \setminus \{ i_1, \ldots, i_{k_m+1}, k_m \} \), then \( A_i \subset D_j \) for some \( j \in \{k_m+1, \ldots, k_{m+1}\} \); this is also trivially true for \( i \in \{1, \ldots, i_{k_m+1}, k_m \} \).

We first verify (1) for the index \( m + 1 \). By the definition of \( D_j, j \in \{k_m + 1, \ldots, k_{m+1}\} \), and the induction assumption (1) it is clear that \( \bigcup_{i=k_m+1}^{k_{m+1}} D_i \subset \bigcup_{i \in F_{m+1}} A_i \). This explains the last part of (4). If \( i \in F_{m+1} \), then by the definition of \( F_{m+1} \) we have \( \text{diam}(A_i) > 2^{-m-1}L \). If \( 2^{-m-1}L < \text{diam}(A_i) \leq 2^{-m}L \), then either \( i \in F_{m+1} \), so \( A_i \subset D_j \) for some \( j \in \{k_m + 1, \ldots, k_{m+1}\} \), or \( A_i \subset D_j \) for some \( j \leq k_m \). In combination with the induction assumption, this shows the inclusions in (1). By
construction and the induction assumption, [2] and [3] and [4] are automatically satisfied for the index \( m + 1 \). Thus, the proof of the inductive step is complete.

Let \( k_\infty = \lim_{m \to \infty} k_m \). By (1) we immediately obtain

\[
\bigcup_{i=1}^{k_\infty} D_i = \bigcup_{i \in I} A_i.
\]

This completes the proof. \( \Box \)

4. Families of curve perturbations

For a path \( \gamma : I \to \mathbb{R}^n \) and \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \) we define \( \gamma + x \) to be the path \( I \ni t \mapsto \gamma(t) + x \). Let \( \mathcal{F} \) be a family of paths in \( \mathbb{R}^n \). We define \( \partial \mathcal{F} \) to be the set of points \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \) that are endpoints of some path of \( \mathcal{F} \) and \( x \notin |\gamma| \setminus \partial \gamma \) for any path \( \gamma \in \mathcal{F} \). In other
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words, \( \partial F \) contains endpoints of paths in \( F \) that are not “interior” points of any path of \( F \).

For example, if \( F \) is the family \( \Gamma(F_1, F_2; U) \), where \( U \) is a ring \( A(0, r, R) \) and \( F_1, F_2 \) are the boundary components of \( U \), then \( \partial F = F_1 \cup F_2 \). Another example is the family \( F_0(E) \) for some set \( E \subset \mathbb{R}^n \); recall its definition from Section 2.4. Then, \( \partial F_0(E) \supset E \). Indeed, every point \( x \in E \) can be considered as a constant path in \( F_0(E) \); recall that paths of \( F_0(E) \) can have endpoints in \( E \). Moreover, if \( x \in E \), then \( x \notin |\gamma| \setminus \partial \gamma \) for any \( \gamma \in F_0(E) \); thus \( x \in \partial F_0(E) \).

**Definition 4.1.** We say that a path family \( F \) in \( \mathbb{R}^n \) is a family of curve perturbations, or else, a \( P \)-family, if

1. (P1) for all non-constant rectifiable paths \( \gamma \) in \( \mathbb{R}^n \) we have \( \gamma + x \in F \) for a.e. \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \),
2. (P2) for every \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \) and \( r > 0 \), the radial segment \( t \mapsto x + tw, 0 \leq t \leq r \), lies in \( F \) for \( \mathcal{H}^{n-1} \)-a.e. \( w \in S^{n-1}(0, 1) \),
3. (P3) \( F \) is closed under strong subpaths and reparametrizations, and
4. (P4) if two paths \( \gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in F \) have a common endpoint that does not lie in \( \partial F \), then the concatenation of \( \gamma_1 \) with \( \gamma_2 \) on that endpoint lies in \( F \).

Property (P4) holds always for families that are closed under concatenations; for example the family \( \mathcal{F}_\sigma(E) \) of curves intersecting a given set \( E \) at countably many points is such. The reason for requiring that the common endpoint of \( \gamma_1 \) and \( \gamma_2 \) does not lie in \( \partial F \) is that we wish to accommodate curve families such as \( F_0(E) \), which contains paths that do not intersect \( E \) except possibly at the endpoints. Since \( \partial F_0(E) \supset E \), we remark that \( F_0(E) \) always satisfies (P4). Finally, we note that (P3) always holds for \( F_0(E) \) and \( \mathcal{F}_\sigma(E) \). We summarize these remarks below.

**Remark 4.2.** Properties (P3) and (P4) always hold for the families \( F_0(E) \) and \( \mathcal{F}_\sigma(E) \), for each \( E \subset \mathbb{R}^n \).

**Lemma 4.3.** The intersection of countably many \( P \)-families \( F_i, i \in \mathbb{N} \), is again a \( P \)-family.

**Proof.** Let \( F = \bigcap_{i \in \mathbb{N}} F_i \). Properties (P1), (P2) and (P3) are immediate for \( F \). For (P4) note that every constant path in \( \mathbb{R}^n \) lies in \( F_i \) for each \( i \in \mathbb{N} \); this follows by combining (P2) with (P3). Thus, if \( x \in \partial F_i \) for some \( i \in \mathbb{N} \), then \( x \) is the endpoint of a (constant) path in \( F \). Moreover, \( x \notin |\gamma| \setminus \partial \gamma \) for any path \( \gamma \) of \( F_i \supset F \). This shows that

\[
\bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \partial F_i \subset \partial F.
\]

Now, if \( \gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in F \) have a common endpoint that does not lie in \( \partial F \), then it also does not lie in \( \partial F_i \) for any \( i \in \mathbb{N} \). Hence, by (P4) the concatenation of \( \gamma_1 \) with \( \gamma_2 \) lies in \( F_i \) for each \( i \in \mathbb{N} \). This proves that (P4) holds for \( F \). \( \square \)

In Section 5 we will see important examples of such families. Specifically, if \( \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(E) = 0 \), then the family \( F_0(E) \) is a \( P \)-family and if \( E \) has \( \sigma \)-finite Hausdorff \((n - 1)\)-measure, then \( \mathcal{F}_\sigma(E) \) is a \( P \)-family.

The main result of the current section is that \( n \)-modulus is not affected by restricting to the intersection of a curve family with a \( P \)-family.
**Theorem 4.4.** Let \( \mathcal{F} \) be a family of curve perturbations in \( \mathbb{R}^n \). Then for every open set \( U \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) and every pair of non-empty, disjoint continua \( F_1, F_2 \subset U \) we have

\[
\operatorname{Mod}_n \Gamma(F_1, F_2; U) = \operatorname{Mod}_n(\Gamma(F_1, F_2; U) \cap \mathcal{F})
\]

We first establish several auxiliary results.

**Lemma 4.5.** Let \( \mathcal{F} \) be a family of curve perturbations in \( \mathbb{R}^n \). Let \( A = A(0; r, R) \), \( 0 < 7r \leq R \), and \( F_1, F_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) be disjoint continua such that every sphere \( S^{n-1}(0, \rho) \), \( r < \rho < R \), intersects both \( F_1 \) and \( F_2 \). Then

\[
\operatorname{Mod}_n(\Gamma(F_1, F_2; A) \cap \mathcal{F}) \geq c(n) \log \left( \frac{R}{r} \right).
\]

The statement is also true for \( r < R < 7r \) but we will not include the proof for the sake of brevity. The statement without restricting to the family \( \mathcal{F} \) is classical and can be found in [Val71, Theorem 10.12, p. 31], where it is proved for all \( 0 < r < R \). Since we restrict to a family of curve perturbations, we need to provide a different proof. The proof relies on Lemma 2.1 from [KK00], which we state here.

**Lemma 4.6 ([KK00] Lemma 2.1).** Let \( u : \mathbb{R}^n \to [0, \infty] \) be a Borel function and \( F \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) be a continuum. Suppose that for each \( y \in F \) there exists a set \( D_y \subset S^{n-1}(y, 1) \) with \( \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(D_y) \geq a > 0 \) for some \( a > 0 \) such that

\[
\int_{[y, w]} u \, ds \geq 1
\]

for each \( w \in D_y \). Then

\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} u^n \geq c(n, a) \operatorname{diam}(F).
\]

**Proof of Lemma 4.5.** We will first prove the statement for \( R = 7r \). We will perform several normalizations and reductions. By the conformal invariance of \( n \)-modulus, we may assume that \( r = 1 \). Note that there are disjoint continua \( F'_i \subset F_i \cap \mathbb{A}(0; 4, 5) \) with \( \operatorname{diam}(F'_i) \geq 1/2 \) for \( i = 1, 2 \). These continua may also be taken so that they are contained in closed balls \( B_i = \overline{B}(z_i, 1/2) \) with \( z_i \in F'_i \), centered at \( S^{n-1}(0, 9/2) \). We will find a uniform lower bound for \( \operatorname{Mod}_n \Gamma(F'_1, F'_2; A) \), which will give a uniform lower bound for \( \operatorname{Mod}_n \Gamma(F_1, F_2; A) \) by the monotonicity of modulus. From now on, we denote \( F'_i \) by \( F_i \), \( i = 1, 2 \), for simplicity.

By applying a conformal transformation, we assume that \( B_1 \) and \( B_2 \) are symmetric with respect to the hyperplane \( \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \{0\} \) and their centers have non-negative first coordinate. The choice of the balls and of the normalization is such that for all points \( w \) lying in the \( (n - 1) \)-dimensional disk \( S = B((6, 0, \ldots, 0), 1) \cap \{\{6\} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}\} \) and for all \( y \in B_i, i = 1, 2 \), the line segment \([y, w]\) lies in the original ring \( A \); see Figure 3. To see this, note that by the normalization on \( B_1 \) and \( B_2 \), they lie outside the half-cone \( C \) of angle \( 2\pi/3 \), defined by \( x_2^2 + \cdots + x_n^2 \leq 3x_1^2, x_1 \leq 0 \). Then one checks that for any fixed point \( y \in \mathbb{A}(0; 4, 5) \backslash C \supset B_1 \cup B_2 \) and for \( w_0 = (6, 0, \ldots, 0) \in S \), the segment \([y, w_0]\) has distance larger than 2 from the origin, hence it lies outside \( \overline{B}(0, 1) \). Finally, for any point \( w \in S \), we have \(|w - w_0| < 1 \), so \( \operatorname{dist}(z, [y, w_0]) < 1 \) for each \( z \in [y, w] \). It follows that the distance from \([y, w]\) to the origin is larger than 1, so it lies outside \( \overline{B}(0, 1) \), as desired.

We remark that \( 1/2 \leq \operatorname{diam}(F_i) \leq 1 \), \( \operatorname{diam}(S) = 2 \), and \( 1 \leq \operatorname{dist}(F_i, S) \leq 14 = 2R \) for \( i = 1, 2 \). Thus, \( \operatorname{diam}(S) \simeq \operatorname{diam}(F_i) \simeq \operatorname{dist}(F_i, S) \simeq 1 \). For \( y \in F_1, w \in S \),
and \( z \in F_2 \) consider the concatenation \( \gamma(y, w, z) \) of the line segments \([y, w]\) and \([w, z]\). Note that \( \gamma(y, w, z) \subset A \) and \( \gamma(y, w, z) \in \Gamma(F_1, F_2; A) \cap \mathcal{F} \) for each \( y \in F_1 \), \( z \in F_2 \), and a.e. \( w \in S \), by the properties of a \( P \)-family. Indeed, (P2) and (P3) imply that for a.e. \( w \in S \) the segments \([y, w]\) and \([w, z]\) lie in \( \mathcal{F} \). Moreover, the same properties imply that a.e. \( w \in S \) does not lie in \( \partial \mathcal{F} \). Hence, by (P4), the concatenation of the segments \([y, w]\) and \([w, z]\) lies in \( \mathcal{F} \).

For each fixed \( y \in F_i \) consider the map \( S \ni w \mapsto \Phi_y(w) = w - y \frac{|w - y|}{|w - z|} \). By the relative position of \( y \) and \( S \), this map is uniformly bi-Lipschitz. Thus, if \( S' \subset S \) and \( \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(S') \geq a \) for some \( a > 0 \), then \( \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\Phi_y(S')) \gtrsim_n a \). We note that the implicit constants are independent of the point \( y \in F_i \).

Now, let \( \rho \) be an admissible function for \( \Gamma(F_1, F_2; A) \cap \mathcal{F} \). We have

\[
\int_{\gamma(y, w, z)} \rho \, ds \geq 1
\]

for all \( y \in F_1 \), \( z \in F_2 \) and a.e. \( w \in S \). Suppose that for each \( y \in F_1 \) there exists \( S_y \subset S \) with \( \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(S_y) \geq \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(S) \) such that we have

\[
\int_{[y, w]} \rho \, ds \geq 1/2
\]

for all \( w \in S_y \). Then for the set \( D_y = \Phi_y(S_y) \) we have \( \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(D_y) \gtrsim_n 1 \). Lemma 4.6 now implies that

\[
\int \rho^n \gtrsim_n 1.
\]

The other case is that there exists \( y \in F_1 \) such that there exists a subset \( S' \) of \( S \) with \( \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(S') \geq \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(S) \), and

\[
\int_{[y, w]} \rho \, ds < 1/2
\]
As before, Lemma 4.6 gives that

\[ \int_{[z,w]} \rho \, ds \geq 1/2. \]

As before, Lemma 4.6 gives that

\[ \int \rho^n \geq_n 1. \]

Therefore, we have shown that

\[ \text{Mod}_n(\Gamma(F_1, F_2; A) \cap \mathcal{F}) \geq c(n) > 0 \]

for a uniform constant \( c(n) \) depending only on \( n \), whenever \( R = 7r \).

In the general case, let \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) be the largest integer such that \( R \geq 7^k r \). Consider the rings \( A_i = A(0; 7^{i-1} r, 7^i r), i \in \{1, \ldots, k\} \). Then by the serial law \([2.1]\) we have

\[ \text{Mod}_n(\Gamma(F_1, F_2; A) \cap \mathcal{F}) \geq \sum_{i=1}^k \text{Mod}_n(\Gamma(F_1, F_2; A_i) \cap \mathcal{F}) \geq c(n)k. \]

Since \( R < 7^{k+1}r \), we have \( k \geq \log(R/r) \) and the conclusion follows.

The following lemma is elementary.

**Lemma 4.7.** Let \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \), \( R > 0 \), and \( \rho : \mathbb{R}^n \to [0, \infty] \) be a Borel function with \( \rho \in L^n(\mathbb{R}^n) \).

(i) For \( M > 0 \), let \( \Gamma_M \) be the family of paths \( \gamma \) that intersect the ball \( B(x, R) \) and satisfy \( \ell(\gamma) > M R \). Then \( \lim_{M \to \infty} \text{Mod}_n \Gamma_M = 0. \)

(ii) Let \( \Gamma \) be a path family with \( \text{Mod}_n \Gamma > a \) for some \( a > 0 \) such that each path \( \gamma \) intersects the ball \( B(x, R) \). Then there exists a path \( \gamma \in \Gamma \) with

\[ \int_{\gamma} \rho \, ds \leq c(n, a) \left( \int_{B(x, c(n,a)R)} \rho^a \right)^{1/n} \quad \text{and} \quad \ell(\gamma) \leq c(n, a)R. \]

**Proof.** Both statements are conformally invariant. Hence, using a conformal transformation, we may assume that \( x = 0 \) and \( R = 1 \). For \( M > 1 \), the family \( \Gamma_M \) is contained in the union of the families

\[ \Gamma_1 = \{ \gamma : \ell(\gamma) > M \quad \text{and} \quad |\gamma| \subset B(0, \sqrt{M}) \} \]

\[ \Gamma_2 = \{ \gamma : |\gamma| \cap \partial B(0, 1) \neq \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad |\gamma| \cap \partial B(0, \sqrt{M}) \neq \emptyset \} \]

By the subadditivity of modulus, it suffices to show that \( \text{Mod}_n \Gamma_i \) converges to 0 as \( M \to \infty \) for \( i = 1, 2 \). The function \( M^{-1}X_{B(0, \sqrt{M})} \) is admissible for \( \Gamma_1 \), so \( \text{Mod}_n \Gamma_1 \leq c(n)M^{-n/2} \).

The modulus of \( \Gamma_2 \) is given by the explicit formula \([\text{Hei01}] 7.14, \text{pp. 52–53}\). This proves part (i).

Now we prove part (ii). Let \( M = M(n, a) > 0 \) be sufficiently large, so that \( \text{Mod}_n \Gamma_M < a/2 \). Define \( \rho_1 = \rho X_{B(0,M+1)} \). Let \( \Gamma_1 \) be the family of paths \( \gamma \in \Gamma \) such that

\[ \int_{\gamma} \rho_1 \, ds > 2^{1/n} a^{-1/n} \| \rho_1 \|_{L^n(\mathbb{R}^n)}. \]

Then the function

\[ 2^{-1/n} a^{1/n} \| \rho_1 \|_{L^n(\mathbb{R}^n)}^{-1} \rho_1 \]
is admissible for $\Gamma_1$, provided that $\|\rho_1\|_{L^n(\mathbb{R}^n)} \neq 0$, in which case we have $\text{Mod}_n(\Gamma_1) \leq a/2$. If $\|\rho_1\|_{L^n(\mathbb{R}^n)} = 0$, then $\text{Mod}_n(\Gamma_1) = 0$. Also, let $\Gamma_2$ be the family of paths $\gamma \in \Gamma$ such that $\ell(\gamma) > M$, so $\text{Mod}_n(\Gamma_2) \leq \text{Mod}_n(\Gamma_M) < a/2$. By the subadditivity of modulus we have $\text{Mod}_n(\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2) < a < \text{Mod}_n(\Gamma)$. It follows that $\Gamma \setminus (\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2)$ has positive modulus, and in particular it is non-empty. Thus, there exists a path $\gamma \in \Gamma$ with $\ell(\gamma) \leq M$ and

$$\int_{\gamma} \rho_1 \, ds \leq 2^{1/n} a^{-1/n} \|\rho_1\|_{L^n(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$ 

Finally, note that $|\gamma| \subset B(0, M + 1)$ since $|\gamma| \cap B(0, 1) \neq \emptyset$ and $\ell(\gamma) \leq M$. Thus,

$$\int_{\gamma} \rho \, ds = \int_{\gamma} \rho_1 \, ds,$$

which completes the proof, with $c(n, a) = \max\{M(n, a) + 1, 2^{1/n} a^{-1/n}\}$.

For a continuum $F \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and $r > 0$ we define $F^r$ to be the continuum $F + \overline{B}(0, r) = \{x + y : x \in F, y \in \overline{B}(0, r)\}$.

**Lemma 4.8.** Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a family of curve perturbations in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then for every open set $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and every pair of non-empty, disjoint continua $F_1, F_2 \subset U$ we have

$$\text{Mod}_n(\Gamma(F_1, F_2; U) \cap \mathcal{F}) = \lim_{r \to 0} \text{Mod}_n(\Gamma(F_1^r, F_2^r; U) \cap \mathcal{F}) .$$

The proof is very similar to the proof of [Väi62, Lemma 2], where one uses Lemma 1.5 in place of [Väi62, Lemma 1]. See also [Geh62a, Lemma 2] for a similar statement. For the convenience of the reader, we include the argument.

**Proof.** Note that $\Gamma(F_1, F_2; U) \cap \mathcal{F} \subset \Gamma(F_1^r, F_2^r; U) \cap \mathcal{F}$ for every sufficiently small $r > 0$, so we immediately obtain one inequality from the monotonicity of modulus. If $\text{diam}(F_i) = 0$ for some $i = 1, 2$, then

$$\text{Mod}_n(\Gamma(F_1^r, F_2^r; U) \cap \mathcal{F}) \leq \text{Mod}_n(\Gamma(F_1^r, F_2^r; U))$$

and the latter converges to 0 as $r \to 0$. This follows from [Väi71, 7.8, p. 23], stating that the $n$-modulus of curves passing through a point is zero. Thus there is nothing to prove in this case.

We suppose that $\text{diam}(F_i) > 0$ for $i = 1, 2$. Let $\rho \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be admissible for $\Gamma(F_1, F_2; U) \cap \mathcal{F}$. We will show that for each $q < 1$ and for all sufficiently small $r > 0$ we have

$$\int_{\gamma} \rho \, ds \geq q$$

for all $\gamma \in \Gamma(F_1^r, F_2^r; U) \cap \mathcal{F}$. This will imply that

$$\lim_{r \to 0} \text{Mod}_n(\Gamma(F_1^r, F_2^r; U) \cap \mathcal{F}) \leq q^{-n} \int \rho^n .$$

Letting $q \to 1$ and then infimizing over $\rho$ gives

$$\lim_{r \to 0} \text{Mod}_n(\Gamma(F_1^r, F_2^r; U) \cap \mathcal{F}) \leq \text{Mod}_n(\Gamma(F_1, F_2; U) \cap \mathcal{F}) ,$$

completing the proof.
We argue by contradiction, assuming that there exists $0 < q < 1$ and a positive sequence $r_k \to 0$ such that for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a path $\gamma_{r_k} \in \Gamma(F^{r_k}_1, F^{r_k}_2; U) \cap \mathcal{F}$ with
\[
\int_{\gamma_{r_k}} \rho \, ds < q < 1.
\]
By passing to a subpath if necessary, we also assume that $|\gamma_{r_k}|$ is disjoint from $F_1 \cup F_2$; here we use property \text{[P3]}. We fix $R_0 > 0$ such that $F^{R_0}_i \subset U$, diam($F_i$) $> 2R_0$ for $i = 1, 2$, and $F^{R_0}_i$ is disjoint from $F^{R_0}_j$. For each $r_k < R_0$ and $i = 1, 2$, there exists a point $x_{i,k} \in F_i$ such that $|\gamma_{r_k}|$ connects the boundary components of the ring $A_{i,k} = A(x_{i,k}; r_k, R_0)$. Note that $F_i$ also connects the boundary components of the ring $A_{i,k}$, since diam($F_i$) $> 2R_0$ = diam($A_{i,k}$). By passing to a further subpath, we assume in addition that the endpoints of $\gamma_{r_k}$ lie in the inner boundary components of $A_{i,k}$.

We fix $\varepsilon = (1 - q)/2 > 0$. By Lemma \text{4.5} we have that if $r_k < R_0/7$, then
\[
\text{Mod}_n(\Gamma(|\gamma_{r_k}|, F_i; A_{i,k}) \cap \mathcal{F}) \geq c(n) \log(R_0/r_k).
\]
Lemma \text{4.7} implies that if $r_k$ is sufficiently small, depending on $\varepsilon$, then there exists a path $\gamma_i \in \Gamma(|\gamma_{r_k}|, F_i; A_{i,k}) \cap \mathcal{F}$ such that
\[
\int_{\gamma_i} \rho \, ds < \varepsilon.
\]
We concatenate $\gamma_i$, $i = 1, 2$, with a suitable subpath of $\gamma_{r_k}$; note that the endpoint of $\gamma_i$ that lies in $|\gamma_{r_k}|$ is not an endpoint of $\gamma_{r_k}$. By property \text{[P4]} the concatenation lies in $\mathcal{F}$. In this way, we obtain a path $\gamma \in \Gamma(F_1, F_2; U) \cap \mathcal{F}$ such that
\[
\int_{\gamma} \rho \, ds \leq \int_{\gamma_{r_k}} \rho \, ds + \int_{\gamma_1} \rho \, ds + \int_{\gamma_2} \rho \, ds < q + 2\varepsilon = 1.
\]
This contradicts the admissibility of $\rho$. $\square$

Remark 4.9. From the proof we see that Lemma \text{4.8} is valid more generally for families $\mathcal{F}$ satisfying \text{[P3]} \text{[P4]} and the conclusion of Lemma \text{4.5} (or a variant of it, such as Lemma 9.8 which uses cubical instead of spherical rings). Recall that $\mathcal{F}_*(E)$ always satisfies \text{[P3]} and \text{[P4]} see Remark 4.2.

Our ultimate preliminary result before the proof of Theorem \text{4.4} is the following theorem, which is a version of the Lebesgue differentiation theorem for line integrals, instead of functions.

Theorem 4.10. Let $\rho: \mathbb{R}^n \to [-\infty, \infty]$ be a Borel function with $\rho \in L^p_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for some $p > 1$. Then there exists a path family $\Gamma_0$ with $\text{Mod}_p \Gamma_0 = 0$ such that for every rectifiable path $\gamma \notin \Gamma_0$ we have $\int_\gamma |\rho| \, ds < \infty$ and
\[
\lim_{r \to 0} \frac{1}{B(0,r)} \int_{\gamma + x} \rho \, ds = \int_\gamma \rho \, ds.
\]

Proof. By the subadditivity of modulus, it suffices to prove the statement for paths $\gamma$ contained in a compact set. Thus, we may assume that $\rho \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$. For continuous functions $\rho$ with compact support the statement is trivially true by uniform
Proof of Theorem 4.4.

By the monotonicity of modulus, it suffices to prove that

$$
\limsup_{r \to 0} \left| \int_{B(0,r)} \int_{\gamma + x} \rho \, ds - \int_{\gamma} \rho \, ds \right| > \lambda.
$$

It suffices to show that $\text{Mod}_p \Gamma_{\lambda} = 0$ for each $\lambda > 0$. Let $\phi$ be a continuous function with compact support. Then, $\Gamma_{\lambda} \subset \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2$, where $\Gamma_1$ is the family of rectifiable paths $\gamma$ with

$$
\limsup_{r \to 0} \int_{B(0,r)} \int_{\gamma + x} |\rho - \phi| \, ds > \lambda/2
$$

and $\Gamma_2$ is the family of rectifiable paths $\gamma$ with

$$
\int_{\gamma} |\rho - \phi| \, ds > \lambda/2.
$$

We note that

$$
\text{Mod}_p \Gamma_2 \leq 2^p \lambda^{-p} \|\rho - \phi\|_{L^p(R^n)}^p.
$$

Moreover, if $\gamma$ is parametrized by arclength, we have

$$
\frac{1}{B(0,r)} \left( \int_{\gamma + x} |\rho - \phi| \, ds \right) dx = \int_0^{\ell(\gamma)} \left( \int_{B(\gamma(t), r)} |\rho - \phi| \, ds \right) dt \leq \int_{\gamma} M(\rho - \phi) \, ds,
$$

where $M(\cdot)$ denotes the usual centered Hardy–Littlewood maximal function. Hence, if $\gamma_1 \in \Gamma_1$, then

$$
\int_{\gamma} M(\rho - \phi) \, ds > \lambda/2.
$$

The Hardy–Littlewood maximal $L^p$-inequality [Zie89, Theorem 2.8.2, p. 84] implies that

$$
\text{Mod}_p \Gamma_1 \leq 2^p \lambda^{-p} \|M(\rho - \phi)\|_{L^p(R^n)} \leq c(n, p) 2^p \lambda^{-p} \|\rho - \phi\|_{L^p(R^n)}^p.
$$

Altogether,

$$
\text{Mod}_p \Gamma_{\lambda} \leq \text{Mod}_p \Gamma_1 + \text{Mod}_p \Gamma_2 \lesssim_{n, p, \lambda} \|\rho - \phi\|_{L^p(R^n)}^p.
$$

Since $\phi$ was arbitrary, we conclude that $\text{Mod}_p \Gamma_{\lambda} = 0$, as desired.

**Proof of Theorem 4.4.** By the monotonicity of modulus, it suffices to prove that

$$
\text{Mod}_n \Gamma(F_1, F_2; U) \leq \text{Mod}_n(\Gamma(F_1, F_2; U) \cap \mathcal{F}).
$$

By Lemma 4.8, it suffices to prove that

$$
\text{Mod}_n \Gamma(F_1, F_2; U) \leq \text{Mod}_n(\Gamma(F_1, F_2; U) \cap \mathcal{F})
$$

for all sufficiently small $r > 0$. We fix $r > 0$ so that $F_1^r, F_2^r \subset U$. Let $\rho : \mathbb{R}^n \to [0, \infty]$ be an admissible function for $\Gamma(F_1^r, F_2^r; U) \cap \mathcal{F}$ with $\rho \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Consider the curve family $\Gamma_0$ with $\text{Mod}_n \Gamma_0 = 0$, given by Theorem 4.10 and corresponding to $\rho$. Let $\gamma \in \Gamma(F_1, F_2; U) \setminus \Gamma_0$ be a rectifiable path. Since $\mathcal{F}$ is a family of curve perturbations, by [11] for a.e. $x \in B(0, r)$ we have $\gamma + x \in \Gamma(F_1^r, F_2^r; U) \cap \mathcal{F}$. Now, the admissibility of $\rho$ for $\Gamma(F_1^r, F_2^r; U) \cap \mathcal{F}$ and Theorem 4.10 imply that $\int_{\gamma} \rho \, ds \geq 1$, so $\rho$ is admissible for $\Gamma(F_1, F_2; U) \setminus \Gamma_0$. Therefore,

$$
\text{Mod}_n(\Gamma(F_1, F_2; U) \setminus \Gamma_0) \leq \text{Mod}_n(\Gamma(F_1, F_2; U) \cap \mathcal{F}).
$$
Since $\mathrm{Mod}_n \Gamma_0 = 0$, the proof is completed by the subadditivity of modulus.  

\[ \square \]

5. Examples of families of curve perturbations

The examples of this section will be used in the proof of the main theorem, Theorem 1.2, which is given in Section 6.

5.1. Examples involving Hausdorff measure. Recall that for a set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ we denote by $\mathcal{F}_0(E)$ the family of curves in $\mathbb{R}^n$ that do not intersect $E$ except possibly at the endpoints, and by $\mathcal{F}_\sigma(E)$ the family of curves in $\mathbb{R}^n$ that intersect $E$ at countably many points.

**Theorem 5.1.** Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a set.

(i) If $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(E) = 0$, then $\mathcal{F}_0(E)$ is a $P$-family.

(ii) If $E$ has $\sigma$-finite Hausdorff $(n-1)$-measure, then $\mathcal{F}_\sigma(E)$ is a $P$-family.

The case of Hausdorff $(n-1)$-measure zero, as in (i), has already been considered by Väisälä [Väis62, Lemma 5], where it is proved that for a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ the curve $\gamma + x$ avoids the set $E$, i.e., $\gamma + x \in \mathcal{F}_0(E)$; that is, (P1) is satisfied. Recall also that (P3) and (P4) are always satisfied for $\mathcal{F}_0(E)$ and $\mathcal{F}_\sigma(E)$; see Remark 4.2. We first prove two preliminary lemmas that will be used in the proof of both cases (i) and (ii) of the theorem.

**Lemma 5.2.** Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\gamma$ be a non-constant rectifiable path. For $N \in \mathbb{N}$, let $F_N$ be the set of $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $E \cap |\gamma + x|$ contains at least $N$ points. Then

\[
m_n^*(F_1) \leq c(n) \max\{\ell(\gamma), \mathrm{diam}(E)\} \mathrm{diam}(E)^{n-1} \quad \text{and} \quad m_n^*(F_N) \leq c(n) \ell(\gamma) N^{-1} \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(E).
\]

**Proof.** For the first inequality we consider two cases. Suppose that $\mathrm{diam}(|\gamma|) \leq 4 \mathrm{diam}(E)$. In this case, if $E \cap |\gamma + x| \neq \emptyset$, i.e., $x \in F_1$, then $|\gamma + x| \subset \overline{B}(x_0, 5 \mathrm{diam}(E))$ for a fixed $x_0 \in E$. Thus,

\[
m_n^*(F_1) \leq m_n(\overline{B}(x_0, 5 \mathrm{diam}(E))) = c(n) \mathrm{diam}(E)^n.
\]

Now, suppose that $\mathrm{diam}(|\gamma|) > 4 \mathrm{diam}(E)$. Let $x_0 \in E$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ be such that $\mathrm{diam}(|\gamma|) > 4 \mathrm{diam}(E) + 4\varepsilon$. Consider the ball $B_0 = B(x_0, \mathrm{diam}(E) + \varepsilon)$. If $E \cap |\gamma + x| \neq \emptyset$, then $|\gamma + x| \cap \partial B_0 \neq \emptyset$ and $|\gamma + x| \cap \partial(2B_0) \neq \emptyset$. Thus,

\[
\int_{|\gamma + x|} \chi_{2B_0} \, ds \geq \mathrm{diam}(E) + \varepsilon
\]

whenever $E \cap |\gamma + x| \neq \emptyset$. Using Chebychev’s inequality and Fubini’s theorem, we obtain

\[
m_n^*(F_1) \leq m_n \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \int_{|\gamma + x|} \chi_{2B_0} \, ds \geq \mathrm{diam}(E) + \varepsilon \right\}
\]

\[
\leq (\mathrm{diam}(E) + \varepsilon)^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{|\gamma + x|} \chi_{2B_0} \, ds \, dx
\]

\[= (\mathrm{diam}(E) + \varepsilon)^{-1} \ell(\gamma) m_n(2B_0) = c(n) \ell(\gamma) (\mathrm{diam}(E) + \varepsilon)^{n-1}.\]

Finally, we let $\varepsilon \to 0$ to obtain the conclusion.

Next, we show the second inequality. For $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we define $F_{N,k}$ to be the set of $x \in F_N$ such that $E \cap |\gamma + x|$ contains $N$ points with mutual distances bounded below by
Theorem 5.3. Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $r > 0$, and for $w \in S^{n-1}(0,1)$ define $\gamma_w(t) = x + tw$, $r/2 \leq t \leq r$. For $N \in \mathbb{N}$, let $F_N$ be the set of $w \in S^{n-1}(0,1)$ such that $E \cap |\gamma_w|$ contains at least $N$ points. Then

$$\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(F_1) \leq c(n)r^{-n+1}\min\{r, \text{diam}(E)\}^{n-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(F_N) \leq c(n)r^{-n+1}N^{-1}\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(E).$$

Proof. For the first inequality, note that $F_1$ is equal to the radial projection of $E \cap \{|y| : r/2 \leq |x-y| \leq r\}$ to the sphere $S^{n-1}(x,1)$. This projection is the composition of a uniformly Lipschitz map (projection of $\{|y| : r/2 \leq |x-y| \leq r\}$ to $S^{n-1}(x,r)$) with a scaling by $1/r$. Thus,

$$\text{diam}(F_1) \lesssim r^{-1}\text{diam}(E \cap \{|y| : r/2 \leq |x-y| \leq r\}) \lesssim r^{-1}\min\{r, \text{diam}(E)\}.$$

Moreover, $F_1$ is contained in the intersection of a ball $B_0 = \overline{B}(x_0, \text{diam}(F_1))$, where $x_0 \in F_1$, with $S^{n-1}(0,1)$. Thus,

$$\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(F_1) \leq \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(B_0 \cap S^{n-1}(0,1)) \lesssim n \text{diam}(F_1)^{n-1}.$$

Altogether,

$$\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(F_1) \lesssim n r^{-n+1}\min\{r, \text{diam}(E)\}^{n-1}.$$

For the second inequality, we proceed as in the proof of Lemma 5.2 by defining $F_{N,k}$ to be the set of $w \in S^{n-1}(0,1)$ such that $E \cap |\gamma_w|$ contains $N$ points with mutual distances bounded below by $1/k$. We define the function $\rho$ exactly as

$$\rho = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in I} \frac{1}{r_i} \chi_{2B_i}.$$
before, using an arbitrary cover of $E$ by sets $U_i$ and corresponding balls $B_i \supset U_i$ with $r_i = \text{diam}(U_i) < \frac{1}{2r} < \frac{5}{6}$. Note that if $w \in F_{N,k}$, then

$$\int_{\gamma_w} \rho \ ds = \int_{r/2}^r \rho(x + tw) \ ds \geq 1.$$

By Chebychev’s inequality and polar integration, it follows that

$$\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(F_{N,k}) \leq \int_{S^{n-1}(0,1)} \int_{r/2}^{r} \rho(x + tw) \ dtd\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(w)$$

$$\lesssim_n r^{-n+1}\|\rho\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} \simeq_n r^{-n+1} \sum_{i \in I} \text{diam}(U_i)^{n-1}.$$

We now proceed exactly as before, by infimizing over the covers of $E$ and then letting $k \to \infty$.

**Proof of Theorem 5.1.** By Remark 4.2, (P3) and (P4) are automatically satisfied for $F_0(E)$ and $F_{\sigma}(E)$. We will establish below properties (P1) and (P2).

Suppose first that $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(E) = 0$ as in (i). If $\gamma$ is a non-constant rectifiable path, by the second inequality of Lemma 5.2 (for $N = 1$) we have that $E \cap |\gamma + x| = \emptyset$, i.e., $\gamma + x \in F_0(E)$, for a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Hence, (P1) holds.

Next, if $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $r > 0$, and $w \in S^{n-1}(0,1)$, define $\gamma_w(t) = x + tw$, $0 \leq t \leq r$. By applying Lemma 5.3 countably many times (for $N = 1$) to the paths $\gamma_w([2^{-k}r,2^{-k+1}r])$, we have $E \cap \gamma_w([2^{-k}r,2^{-k+1}r]) = \emptyset$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and for a.e. $w \in S^{n-1}(0,1)$. Hence, $E \cap \gamma_w((0,r]) = \emptyset$ for a.e. $w \in S^{n-1}(0,1)$. Recall that a path in $F_0(E)$, by definition, is allowed to intersect $E$ only at the endpoints. Hence, $\gamma_w \in F_0(E)$ for a.e. $w \in S^{n-1}(0,1)$. This completes the proof of (P2) and thus of (i).

Next, we suppose that $E$ has $\sigma$-finite Hausdorff $(n-1)$ measure, as in (ii). We write $E = \bigcup_{k=1}^\infty E_k$, where $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(E_k) < \infty$ for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$. If we show that $F_{\sigma}(E_k)$ is a $P$-family for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, then $F_{\sigma}(E)$ will also be a $P$-family, since the intersection of countably many $P$-families is a $P$-family by Lemma 4.3. Hence, for (ii) it suffices to assume that $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(E) < \infty$.

Let $\gamma$ be a non-constant rectifiable path. We define $F$ to be the set of $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $E \cap |\gamma + x|$ is infinite and consider the set $F_N$ as in Lemma 5.2. Observe that $F = \bigcap_{N=1}^\infty F_N$. Since

$$m^*_n(F_N) \lesssim_n \ell(\gamma) N^{-1} \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(E),$$

by letting $N \to \infty$ we obtain $m_n(F) = 0$. This proves (P1).

For (P2) we fix $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $r > 0$, and for $w \in S^{n-1}(0,1)$ consider the segment $\gamma_w(t) = x + tw$, $0 \leq t \leq r$, as above. For fixed $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we apply Lemma 5.3 to the paths $\gamma_w([2^{-k}r,2^{-k+1}r])$ and conclude (by letting $N \to \infty$) that the set $E \cap \gamma_w([2^{-k}r,2^{-k+1}r])$ is finite for a.e. $w \in S^{n-1}(0,1)$. Hence, for a.e. $w \in S^{n-1}(0,1)$ the set $E \cap |\gamma_w|$ is countable, i.e., $\gamma_w \in F_{\sigma}(E)$.

**5.2. Examples involving homeomorphisms.** We present some further examples involving a topological embedding $f : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^n$ and the eccentric distortion $E_f(x,r)$. Recall that for $x \in \Omega$ and $r < \text{dist}(x,\partial\Omega)/3$,

$$E_f(x,r) = \inf\left\{ M \geq 1 : \text{there exists an open set } A \text{ with } x \in A \text{ and } \text{diam}(A) \leq 2r \right\} \text{ such that } E(A) \leq M \text{ and } E(f(A)) \leq M \right\},$$
We will show that
\[
\lim_{r \to 0} E_f(x, r) < \infty
\]
for every \( x \in E \).

(i) If \( m_n(E) = 0 \), then there exists a \( P \)-family \( F \) such that for all \( \gamma \in F \) we have
\[
\mathcal{H}^1(f(|\gamma| \cap E)) = 0.
\]

(ii) If \( m_n(f(E)) = 0 \), then there exists a path family \( \Gamma_0 \) with \( \text{Mod}_n \Gamma_0 = 0 \) such that for all \( \gamma \notin \Gamma_0 \) we have
\[
\mathcal{H}^1(f(|\gamma| \cap E)) = 0.
\]

The proof involves the egg-yolk covering lemma, Lemma 3.4.

**Proof.** Note that \( \Omega \) has countably many connected components. By Lemma 4.3, the intersection of countably many \( P \)-families is a \( P \)-family. Hence, by the subadditivity of \( \mathcal{H}^1 \) and modulus, it suffices to verify (i) and (ii) assuming that \( \Omega \) is connected.

First we prove (i). Let \( F \) be the family of paths in \( \mathbb{R}^n \) such that
\[
\mathcal{H}^1(f(|\gamma| \cap E)) = 0.
\]

We will show that \( F \) is a \( P \)-family. Note that \([P3]\) and \([P4]\) are trivially satisfied. Let \( \{V_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \) be an exhaustion of \( \Omega \) by connected open sets such that \( \overline{V_k} \subset \subset \Omega \) for each \( k \in \mathbb{N} \). We write \( E = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} E_k \), where
\[
E_k = \left\{ x \in E \cap V_k : \lim_{r \to 0} E_f(x, r) \leq k \right\}.
\]

For condition \([P1]\) let \( \gamma \) be a non-constant rectifiable path. It suffices to show that for each \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) and for a.e. \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \) we have
\[
\mathcal{H}^1(f(|\gamma + x| \cap E_k)) = 0.
\]

Equivalently, it suffices to show that for each \( \eta > 0 \) the set \( F_\eta \) of \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \) such that
\[
\mathcal{H}^1_{\infty}(f(|\gamma + x| \cap E_k)) > \eta
\]
has \( n \)-measure zero; recall the definition of the Hausdorff content from Section 2.

For \([P2]\) we argue as in the proof of Theorem 5.1. We fix \( x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n \) and \( R_0 > 0 \), and it suffices to show that for a.e. \( w \in S^{n-1}(0,1) \) the path \( \gamma_w(t) = x_0 + tw \), \( R_0/2 \leq t \leq R_0 \), satisfies
\[
\mathcal{H}^1(f(|\gamma_w| \cap E_k)) = 0
\]
for each \( k \in \mathbb{N} \). Equivalently, it suffices to prove that for each \( \eta > 0 \) the set \( F_\eta \) of \( w \in S^{n-1}(0,1) \) such that
\[
\mathcal{H}^1_{\infty}(f(|\gamma_w| \cap E_k)) > \eta
\]
has \( \mathcal{H}^{n-1} \)-measure zero.

We fix \( k \in \mathbb{N} \), \( \eta > 0 \), and we will estimate for the \( n \)-measure of \( F_\eta \) and the \( \mathcal{H}^{n-1} \)-measure of \( F_\eta \).

Let \( \varepsilon > 0 \) and \( U \) be an open set such that \( E_k \subset U \subset V_k \) and \( m_n(U) < \varepsilon \). By the definition of \( E_k \), for each \( x \in E_k \) there exists an open set \( A_x \subset U \subset V_k \) such that
\[
E(A_x) < 2k, \ E(f(A_x)) < 2k, \ \text{and} \ \text{diam}(A_x) < c_2(k)^{-1} \min \{\text{diam}(\gamma), R_0/2\},
\]
where \( c_2(k) \) is a positive constant, to be specified. The first two conditions imply that there exists an open ball \( B_x \) such that \( B_x \subset 2B_x \subset A_x \subset 4kB_x \) and an
We now obtain a similar estimate for $F$. By Chebychev’s inequality and Fubini’s theorem we have

$$\mathcal{H}^n(f(V_k)) \leq c_2(k)^{-1} \min \{\operatorname{diam}(|\gamma|), R_0/2\}.$$

We note that

$$A_i \subset c_1(k)B_i \quad \text{and} \quad A_i' \subset c_1(k)B_i'.$$

In addition, since $B_i'$ is a ball, we have

$$\operatorname{diam}(A_i')^n \leq c_1(k)^n \operatorname{diam}(B_i')^n \lesssim_{k,n} m_n(B_i').$$

We set $r_i$ to be the radius of the ball $B_i$, $i \in I$. Consider the Borel function

$$\rho = \sum_{i \in I} \frac{\operatorname{diam}(A_i')}{r_i} \chi_{(c_1(k)+1)B_i},$$

Note that if $A_i \cap |\gamma + x| \neq \emptyset$, then by (5.1) we have

$$\int_{\gamma + x} \chi_{(c_1(k)+1)B_i} \, ds \geq r_i,$$

provided that $|\gamma + x|$ is not contained in $(c_1(k)+1)B_i$. This is guaranteed if we choose $c_2(k) = c_1(k)+1$, so that $\operatorname{diam}(|\gamma|) > c_2(k) \operatorname{diam}(B_i) \geq (c_1(k)+1) \operatorname{diam}(B_i)$. Therefore,

$$\mathcal{H}^n(f(|\gamma + x| \cap E_k)) \leq \sum_{i: A_i \cap |\gamma + x| \neq \emptyset} \operatorname{diam}(A_i') \leq \int_{\gamma + x} \rho \, ds.$$

By Chebychev’s inequality and Fubini’s theorem we have

$$m_n^*(F_\eta) \leq m_n \left( \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \int_{\gamma + x} \rho \, ds > \eta \right\} \right) \leq \eta^{-1} \ell(\gamma) \|\rho\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

We now obtain a similar estimate for $F'_\eta$. If $A_i \cap |\gamma_w| \neq \emptyset$, then

$$\int_{\gamma_w} \chi_{(c_1(k)+1)B_i} \, ds \geq r_i,$$

since $|\gamma_w|$ is not contained in $(c_1(k)+1)B_i$, by the choice of $c_2(k)$. Thus,

$$\mathcal{H}^n(f(|\gamma_w| \cap E_k)) \leq \int_{\gamma_w} \rho \, ds.$$

By Chebychev’s inequality and polar integration we have

$$\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(F'_\eta) \leq \eta^{-1} \int_{S^{n-1}(0,1)} \int_{R_0/2}^{R_0} \rho(x_0 + tw) \, dt \, d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(w) \lesssim \eta^{-1} R_0^{-n+1} \|\rho\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

By (5.3) and (5.4), it suffices to show that the $L^1$ norm of $\rho$ converges to 0 as $\varepsilon \to 0$. 

3) in the compact, connected sets $\overline{V_k}$ and $f(\overline{V_k})$, respectively.

By the egg-yolk covering lemma, Lemma 3.4, there exist families $\{(A_i, B_i)\}_{i \in I}$ and $\{(A_i', B_i')\}_{i \in I}$ of $c_1(k)$-egg-yolk pairs in $V_k$ and $f(\overline{V_k})$, respectively, such that $A_i = f(A_i)$ for each $i \in I$, $E_k \subset \bigcup_{i \in I} A_i \subset U$, and the families $\{B_i\}_{i \in I}$ and $\{B_i'\}_{i \in I}$ are disjointed. Moreover, $\{B_i\}_{i \in I}$ is a subcollection of $\{B_x\}_{x \in E_k}$, so

$$\operatorname{diam}(B_i) < c_2(k)^{-1} \min \{\operatorname{diam}(|\gamma|), R_0/2\}.$$
Since the balls \( B_i, i \in I \), are disjoint and contained in \( U \), we have
\[
\sum_{i \in I} m_n(B_i) \leq m_n(U) < \varepsilon.
\]
Moreover, combining \([5.2]\) with the fact that the balls \( B'_i, i \in I \), are disjoint and contained in \( U \), we have
\[
\sum_{i \in I} \text{diam}(A'_i)^n \lesssim_{k,n} \sum_{i \in I} m_n(B'_i) \lesssim_{k,n} m_n(f(U)) \lesssim_{k,n} m_n(f(V_k)),
\]
which is finite, since \( f(V_k) \) is compact. Therefore,
\[
\int \rho \lesssim_{k,n} \sum_{i \in I} \text{diam}(A'_i) r_i^{n-1} \lesssim_{k,n} \left( \sum_{i \in I} \text{diam}(A'_i)^n \right)^{1/n} \left( \sum_{i \in I} m_n(B_i) \right)^{1-1/n} \lesssim_{k,n} m_n(f(V_k))^{1/n} \varepsilon^{1-1/n}.
\]
This converges to 0 as \( \varepsilon \to 0 \), as desired. This completes the proof of \([\text{ii}]\).

Next, we prove \((\text{ii})\). Using the previous notation for \( E_k \), by the subadditivity of modulus, it suffices to show that for each \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( \eta > 0 \) the family \( \Gamma_\eta \) of paths \( \gamma \) with \( \mathcal{H}_n^{\infty}(f(\gamma \cap E_k)) > \eta \) has \( n \)-modulus zero. Note that \( \Gamma_\eta \) does not contain any constant paths. By the subadditivity of modulus, it suffices to prove that for each \( \delta > 0 \) the family \( \Gamma_{\eta,\delta} \) of paths \( \gamma \in \Gamma_\eta \) with \( \text{diam}(\gamma) > \delta \) has \( n \)-modulus zero.

We fix \( \varepsilon > 0 \) and let \( U \) be an open set such that \( f(E_k) \subset U \subset f(V_k) \) and \( m_n(U) < \varepsilon \). As in the proof of \((\text{ii})\) using the egg-yolk covering lemma, we can find families \( \{(A_i, B_i)\}_{i \in I} \) of \( c_1(k) \)-egg-yolk pairs in \( V_k \) and \( f(V_k) \), respectively, such that \( A'_i = f(A_i) \) for each \( i \in I \), \( f(E_k) \subset \bigcup_{i \in I} A'_i \subset U \), the families \( \{B_i\}_{i \in I} \) and \( \{B'_i\}_{i \in I} \) are disjointed, and
\[
(5.5) \quad \text{diam}(B_i) < (c_1(k) + 1)^{-1} \delta
\]
for each \( i \in I \). Moreover, \([5.1]\) and \([5.2]\) are also true here.

We set \( r_i \) to be the radius of the ball \( B_i, i \in I \). Consider the function
\[
\rho = \sum_{i \in I} \frac{\text{diam}(A'_i)}{r_i} \chi_{(c_1(k) + 1)B_i},
\]
Note that if \( A_i \cap |\gamma| \neq \emptyset \) for some \( \gamma \in \Gamma_{\eta,\delta} \), then by \([5.1]\) we have
\[
\int_{\gamma} \chi_{(c_1(k) + 1)B_i} ds \geq r_i,
\]
since \( |\gamma| \) is not contained in \( (c_1(k) + 1)B_i \) by \((5.5)\). Thus, for \( \gamma \in \Gamma_{\eta,\delta} \) we have
\[
\eta < \mathcal{H}_n^{\infty}(f(|\gamma| \cap E_k)) \leq \sum_{i : A_i \cap |\gamma| \neq \emptyset} \text{diam}(A'_i) \leq \int_{\gamma} \rho ds.
\]
It follows that the function \( \eta^{-1}\rho \) is admissible for \( \Gamma_{\eta,\delta} \). Hence, by Lemma 3.3 the fact that \( \{B_i\}_{i \in I} \) is disjointed, \([5.2]\), and the fact that \( \{B'_i\}_{i \in I} \) is disjointed, we
Suppose that there exist constants $\epsilon > 0$ and $n > 0$ such that if $\rho = \frac{\log R}{1 - n}$ then
\[
\text{Mod}_n \Gamma_{\rho, \delta} \leq \eta^{-n} \int \rho^n \sum_{i \in I} \frac{\text{diam}(A'_i)}{r_i} \chi_{B_i} \lesssim_{k,n} \eta^{-n} \sum_{i \in I} \text{diam}(A'_i)^n \lesssim_{k,n} \eta^{-n} \sum_{i \in I} m_n(B'_i) \lesssim_{k,n} \eta^{-n} \eta^{-n} \epsilon.
\]
Finally, we let $\epsilon \to 0$. \qed

6. Proof of main theorem

In this section we prove Theorem 1.1 and the main theorem, Theorem 1.2. The proofs can be given by following the strategy of Heinonen–Koskela [HK95] and Kallunki-Koskela [KK00]. However, we will attempt to slightly streamline and simplify the argument, using Lemma 6.1 below.

A topological ring $\mathcal{R}$ is a bounded open set in $\mathbb{R}^n$ whose boundary has two components. For example, for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $0 < r < R$, the spherical ring $A(x; r, R)$ is a topological ring. For a topological ring $\mathcal{R}$ we denote by $\Gamma(\mathcal{R})$ the family of curves joining the boundary components of $\mathcal{R}$; that is, the curves of $\Gamma(\mathcal{R})$ are contained in $\mathcal{R}$, except for the endpoints, which lie in different components of $\partial \mathcal{R}$.

**Lemma 6.1.** Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open set and $f : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^n$ be a topological embedding. Suppose that there exist constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that for every spherical ring $A \subset \overline{A} \subset \Omega$ with $\text{Mod}_n \Gamma(A) \leq C_1$ we have $\text{Mod}_n f(\Gamma(A)) \leq C_2$. Then $f$ is $K$-quasiconformal for some $K \geq 1$ depending only on $C_1, C_2$, and $n$.

**Proof.** First, we show that there exists $C_3 > 0$, depending only on $C_1, C_2$ and $n$, such that if $A = A(x; r, R)$ is a ring with $\overline{A} \subset \Omega$ and $\text{Mod}_n \Gamma(A) \leq C_1$, then $\text{Mod}_n f(\Gamma(A)) \leq C_3 \text{Mod}_n \Gamma(A)$. By scaling and translating, we assume that $A = A(0; 1, R)$, so
\[
\text{Mod}_n \Gamma(A) = \omega_{n-1} (\log R)^{1-n} \leq C_1,
\]
where $\omega_{n-1}$ is the area of the unit sphere in $\mathbb{R}^n$; see for example [Hei01, 7.14, pp. 52–53]. We consider $L \in (1, R]$ such that $\omega_{n-1} (\log L)^{1-n} = C_1$. Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $L^N \leq R < L^{N+1}$ and for $j \in \mathbb{N}$ we set $A_j = \{x : L^j-1 < |x| < L^j\}$. Note that $\text{Mod}_n \Gamma(A_j) = C_1$ and, by assumption, we have $\text{Mod}_n f(\Gamma(A_j)) \leq C_2$ for each $j \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$.

For each $j \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$, let $\rho_j$ be an admissible function for $f(\Gamma(A_j))$, supported on $f(A_j)$. Then
\[
\rho = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \rho_j
\]
is admissible for $f(\Gamma(A))$. Thus,
\[
\text{Mod}_n f(\Gamma(A)) \leq N^{-n} \sum_{j=1}^N \rho_j^n.
\]
Infinimizing over $\rho_j$, $j \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$, we obtain

$$\text{Mod}_n f(\Gamma(A)) \leq N^{-n} \sum_{j=1}^N \text{Mod}_n f(\Gamma(A_j)) \leq C_2 N^{1-n}.$$ 

Finally, note that $N > (\log L)^{-1}\log R - 1$ so $N > 2^{-1}(\log L)^{-1}\log R$ because $N \geq 1$. It follows that

$$\text{(6.1)} \quad \text{Mod}_n f(\Gamma(A)) \leq C_1^{-1}C_2 2^{n-1} \text{Mod}_n \Gamma(A).$$

This proves the claim.

Using (6.1), we will show that $f$ is quasiconformal. Let $x \in \Omega$ and $x' = f(x)$. We will show that

$$\limsup_{r \to 0} \frac{L_{f^{-1}}(x', r)}{L_{f^{-1}}(x, r)} \leq H$$

for some $H \geq 1$ depending only on $C_1, C_2$, and $n$. This will imply that $f^{-1}$, and thus $f$, is quasiconformal, quantitatively [Vä71, Theorem 13.2, p. 42]. For small $r > 0$, so that $B(x', r) \subset f(\Omega)$, we set $L(r) = L_{f^{-1}}(x', r)$ and $l(r) = l_{f^{-1}}(x', r)$. Consider the ring $A_r = A(x; l(r), L(r))$, whose closure is contained in $\Omega$ for all sufficiently small $r > 0$. Then $f(A_r)$ is a topological ring whose boundary components intersect the sphere $S^{n-1}(x', r)$. The relative distance of the boundary components of $f(A_r)$ (i.e., the distance divided by the diameter of the inner component) is bounded above by 1. Since $\mathbb{R}^n$ is a Loewner space [Hei01, Theorem 8.2, p. 60], we have $\text{Mod}_n f(A_r) \geq c(n) > 0$ for some constant $c(n)$ depending only on $n$. By (6.1), we have

$$\omega_{n-1} \left( \log \frac{L(r)}{l(r)} \right)^{1-n} = \text{Mod}_n \Gamma(A_r) \geq c(n)2^{1-n}C_1C_2^{-1}.$$ 

Therefore,

$$\frac{L(r)}{l(r)} \leq \exp \left( 2(\omega_{n-1}c(n)C_1C_2^{-1})^{1/(1-n)} \right).$$

This is true for all sufficiently small $r > 0$, so the proof is complete. \qed

The proof of Theorem 6.2 relies on the following result, which is a more general version of Theorem 1.1.

**Theorem 6.2.** Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open set and $f: \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^n$ be an orientation-preserving topological embedding. Suppose that there exist constants $H, M \geq 1$ and a set $F \subset \Omega$ such that for all $x \in \Omega \setminus F$ we have

$$\lim_{r \to 0} E_f(x, r) \leq H$$

and for each topological ring $A \subset \overline{A} \subset \Omega$ we have

$$\text{Mod}_n \Gamma(A) \leq M \cdot \text{Mod}_n \overline{\Gamma}(A),$$

where $\overline{\Gamma}(A) = \{ \gamma \in \Gamma(A) : \mathcal{H}^1(f(\gamma \cap F)) = 0 \}$. Then $f$ is $K$-quasiconformal in $\Omega$, where $K$ depends only on $n, H$, and $M$.

**Proof.** Let $x_0 \in \Omega$ and $x_0' = f(x_0)$. Consider a ring $A' = A(x_0'; r, R)$ with $\overline{A'} \subset f(\Omega)$ and $R > 2r$. We will show that

$$\text{Mod}_n f^{-1}(\Gamma(A')) \leq C(n, H, M).$$
Then Lemma 6.1 will imply that $f^{-1}$ is quasiconformal, quantitatively, so $f$ will be quasiconformal and the proof will be complete. Moreover, for the topological ring $A = f^{-1}(\Gamma(A(x_0^r; r, 2r)))$, which is contained in $f^{-1}(\Gamma(A'))$, it suffices to show that

$$\text{Mod}_n \Gamma(A) \leq C(n, H, M),$$

since every path of $f^{-1}(\Gamma(A'))$ has a subpath in $A$.

Let $\delta$ be the distance of the boundary components of $A$. For each point $x \in A \setminus F$, by assumption, there exists an open set $A_x \subset A$ such that

$$E(A_x) < 2H, \quad E(f(A_x)) < 2H, \quad \text{and diam}(A_x) < c_2(H)^{-1}\delta,$$

where $c_2(H)$ is a positive constant, to be specified. The first two conditions imply that there exists an open ball $B_x$ such that $B_x \subset 2B_x \subset A_x \subset 4HB_x$ and an open ball $B'_x$ such that $B'_x \subset 2B'_x \subset A'_x \subset 4HB'_x$. Thus, $\{(A_x, B_x)\}_{x \in A \setminus F}$ and $\{(A'_x, B'_x)\}_{x \in A \setminus F}$ are families of $(4H)$-egg-yolk pairs (recall the definition from Section 3) in the compact, connected sets $\overline{A}$ and $\overline{A'}$, respectively.

By the egg-yolk covering lemma, Lemma 3.4, there exist families $\{(A_i, B_i)\}_{i \in I}$ and $\{(A'_i, B'_i)\}_{i \in I}$ of $(4H)$-egg-yolk pairs in $\overline{A}$ and $\overline{A'}$, respectively, such that $A'_i = f(A_i)$ for each $i \in I$, $A \setminus F \subset \bigcup_{i \in I} A_i \subset A$, and the families $\{B_i\}_{i \in I}$ and $\{B'_i\}_{i \in I}$ are disjointed. Moreover, $\{B_i\}_{i \in I}$ is a subcollection of $\{B_x\}_{x \in A \setminus F}$, so

$$\text{diam}(B_i) < c_2(H)^{-1}\delta.$$

We note that

$$(6.2) \quad A_i \subset c_1(H)B_i, \quad A'_i \subset c_1(H)B'_i, \quad \text{and diam}(A'_i)^n \lesssim_{n,H} m_n(B'_i)$$

for each $i \in I$.

We denote the radius of $B_i$ by $r_i$.

We define the Borel function

$$\rho = \frac{1}{r} \sum_{i \in I} \frac{\text{diam}(A'_i)}{r_i} \chi_{(c_1(H)+1)B_i}.$$

Note that for each $\gamma \in \Gamma(A)$ the path $f \circ \gamma$ joins the boundary components of $A(x_0^r; r, 2r)$. Thus, we have

$$\mathcal{H}^1_\infty(f(\{\gamma\})) \geq \text{diam}(f(\{\gamma\})) \geq r.$$

Consider the family $\overline{\Gamma}(A)$ of paths $\gamma \in \Gamma(A)$ such that $\mathcal{H}^1(f(\{\gamma\} \cap F)) = \mathcal{H}^1_\infty(f(\{\gamma\} \cap F)) = 0$. Therefore, $\mathcal{H}^1_\infty(f(\{\gamma\} \cap F)) \geq r$ for $\gamma \in \overline{\Gamma}(A)$. Moreover, if $A_i \cap |\gamma| \neq \emptyset$, then by (6.2) we have

$$\int_{\gamma} \chi_{(c_1(H)+1)B_i} ds \geq r_i,$$

provided that $\text{diam}(|\gamma|) > \text{diam}(c_1(H) + 1)B_i$; this is guaranteed by choosing $c_2(H) = c_1(H) + 1$, so that $\text{diam}(|\gamma|) \geq \delta > c_2(H) \text{diam}(B_i) \geq (c_1(H) + 1) \text{diam}(B_i)$. Therefore,

$$r \leq \mathcal{H}^1_\infty(f(\{\gamma\} \setminus F)) \leq \sum_{i : A_i \cap |\gamma| \neq \emptyset} \text{diam}(A'_i) \leq r \int_\gamma \rho ds.$$

This implies that $\rho$ is admissible for $\overline{\Gamma}(A)$. 
By Lemma 3.3, the fact that the collection \( \{ B_i \}_{i \in I} \) is disjointed, and the fact that \( \{ B'_i \}_{i \in I} \) is disjointed, we have

\[
\begin{align*}
\operatorname{Mod}_n \tilde{\Gamma}(A) &\leq \int \rho^n \lesssim_{n,H} \frac{1}{\rho^n} \int \left( \sum_{i \in I} \frac{\operatorname{diam}(A'_i)}{r_i} \chi_{B_i} \right)^n \\
&\sim_{n,H} \frac{1}{\rho^n} \int \sum_{i \in I} \frac{\operatorname{diam}(A'_i)}{r_i^n} \chi_{B_i} \sim_{n,H} \frac{1}{\rho^n} \sum_{i \in I} \operatorname{diam}(A'_i)^n \\
&\lesssim_{n,H} \frac{1}{\rho^n} \sum_{i \in I} m_n(B'_i) \lesssim_{n,H} \frac{1}{\rho^n} m_n(A(x'_i; r, 2r)) \\
&\sim_{n,H} 1.
\end{align*}
\]

By assumption, \( \operatorname{Mod}_n \Gamma(A) \leq M \cdot \operatorname{Mod}_n \tilde{\Gamma}(A) \), so

\[ \operatorname{Mod}_n \Gamma(A) \lesssim_{n,H,M} 1, \]

as desired. \( \square \)

We have completed the preparation for the proof of Theorem 1.2. We will use the fact that if \( A \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) is a topological ring with boundary components \( F_1, F_2 \) and \( \mathcal{F} \) is a family of curves that is closed under subpaths, then

\[ \operatorname{Mod}_n (\Gamma(A) \cap \mathcal{F}) = \operatorname{Mod}_n (\Gamma(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^n) \cap \mathcal{F}). \]

**Proof of Theorem 1.2.** We first show, under each of the assumptions \((i)\) and \((iii)\) that for each topological ring \( A \subset \overline{A} \subset \Omega \) we have \( \operatorname{Mod}_n \Gamma(A) \leq M \cdot \operatorname{Mod}_n \tilde{\Gamma}(A) \) for a uniform constant \( M \geq 1 \). Then by applying Theorem 6.2 with \( F = E \cup G \), we obtain the quasiconformality of \( f \) in the cases \((i)\) and \((iii)\). Let \( A \subset \overline{A} \subset \Omega \) be a topological ring and \( F_1, F_2 \) be the boundary components of \( A \).

Suppose that \( E \in \text{CNED}^w \) and \( m_n(f(G)) = 0 \), as in \((i)\). Then by Theorem 5.4 \((i)\) there exists a curve family \( \Gamma_0 = 0 \) with \( \operatorname{Mod}_n \Gamma_0 = 0 \) such that all \( \gamma \notin \Gamma_0 \) we have \( \mathcal{H}^1(f(\gamma \cap G)) = 0 \). Let \( \gamma \in \Gamma(A) \cap \mathcal{F}_\sigma(E) \setminus \Gamma_0 \). Since \( |\gamma| \cap E \) is countable, we have \( \mathcal{H}^1(f(\gamma \cap E)) = 0 \). Thus, \( \Gamma(A) \cap \mathcal{F}_\sigma(E) \setminus \Gamma_0 \subset \tilde{\Gamma}(A) \). Since \( \mathcal{F}_\sigma(E) \) is closed under subpaths, by the definition of a \( \text{CNED}^w \) set there exists a uniform \( M \geq 1 \) such that

\[
\begin{align*}
\operatorname{Mod}_n \Gamma(A) &= \operatorname{Mod}_n \Gamma(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^n) \leq M \cdot \operatorname{Mod}_n (\Gamma(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^n) \cap \mathcal{F}_\sigma(E)) \\
&= M \cdot \operatorname{Mod}_n (\Gamma(A) \cap \mathcal{F}_\sigma(E)) \\
&= M \cdot \operatorname{Mod}_n (\Gamma(A) \cap \mathcal{F}_\sigma(E) \setminus \Gamma_0) \\
&\leq M \cdot \operatorname{Mod}_n \tilde{\Gamma}(A).
\end{align*}
\]

This completes the proof of the theorem in the case \((i)\).

Suppose that \( E \) has \( \sigma \)-finite Hausdorff \((n - 1)\)-measure and \( m_n(G) = 0 \), as in \((iii)\). Let \( \mathcal{F} \) be the family of paths in \( \mathbb{R}^n \) such that \( \mathcal{H}^1(f(\gamma \cap E)) = 0 \) and \( \mathcal{H}^1(f(\gamma \cap G)) = 0 \). Note that \( \Gamma(A) \cap \mathcal{F} = \tilde{\Gamma}(A) \). By Theorem 5.1 \((ii)\) and Theorem 5.4 \((i)\) \( \mathcal{F} \) is a \( P \)-family of paths; recall that the intersection of \( P \)-families is a \( P \)-family by Lemma 4.3. Since \( \mathcal{F} \) is closed under subpaths, by Theorem 4.4 we have

\[
\begin{align*}
\operatorname{Mod}_n \Gamma(A) &= \operatorname{Mod}_n \Gamma(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^n) = \operatorname{Mod}_n (\Gamma(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^n) \cap \mathcal{F}) \\
&= \operatorname{Mod}_n (\Gamma(A) \cap \mathcal{F}) = \operatorname{Mod}_n \tilde{\Gamma}(A).
\end{align*}
\]
This proves the theorem in the case (iii).

Finally, suppose, as in (ii) that $G$ is relatively closed in $\Omega$. One applies case (i) (with $G = \emptyset$) to the domain $\Omega \setminus G$. It follows that $f$ is quasiconformal on $\Omega \setminus G$. Then one applies case (iii) (with $E = \emptyset$) to obtain quasiconformality on $\Omega$. If, instead, $E$ is relatively closed in $\Omega$, then one first applies (iii) (with $E = \emptyset$) to the domain $\Omega \setminus E$ to obtain quasiconformality of $f$ there. Then we apply (i) (with $G = \emptyset$) to obtain quasiconformality on $\Omega$. The proof is complete. \hfill \square

Remark 6.3. If $E$ is measurable in (i) and (ii), then one can show that $f$ is quasiconformal with $K$ depending only on $n$ and $H$, and not on the $\CNEDw$ constant $M$. Indeed, since $E \in \CNEDw$, by Lemma 2.5 we have $m_n(E) = 0$. Thus, by Lemma 2.2, $\Mod_n$-a.e. path $\gamma$ intersects $E$ at a set of Hausdorff 1-measure zero. Since $f$ is quasiconformal, it is absolutely continuous along $\Mod_n$-a.e. path $\gamma$. This shows that in the above proof we have $\Mod_n \Gamma(A) = \Mod_n \overline{\Gamma}(A)$ in the case (i) rather than $\Mod_n \Gamma(A) \leq M \cdot \Mod_n \overline{\Gamma}(A)$.

7. CRITERIA FOR NEGLIGIBILITY

In this section we prove criteria for membership of a closed set $E$ in $\NED$ or $\CNED$. The first of these criteria will be crucially used in the proof of Theorem 1.7 regarding the unions of $\NED$ and $\CNED$ sets. Recall that $\ast \NED$ denotes either $\NED$ or $\CNED$. Also, for an open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ recall the definitions of $\ast \NED(\Omega)$ and $\ast \NEDw(\Omega)$ from Section 2.4.

Let $\gamma : [a, b] \to \mathbb{R}^n$ be a non-constant path. If $[c, d] \subset (a, b)$, then the strong subpath $\gamma|_{[c, d]}$ of $\gamma$ is called strict. Recall that the relative distance of two non-degenerate sets $F_1, F_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is

$$\Delta(F_1, F_2) = \frac{\text{dist}(F_1, F_2)}{\min\{|\text{diam}(F_1)|, |\text{diam}(F_2)|\}}.$$ 

Theorem 7.1 (Main criterion). Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a closed set. The following are equivalent.

(I) $E \in \ast \NED(\Omega)$ for all open sets $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$.

(II) $E \in \ast \NED$.

(III) $E \in \ast \NEDw(\Omega)$ for some open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\Omega \supset E$.

(IV) There exist constants $t, \phi > 0$ such that for each $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ there exists $r_0 > 0$ with the property that for every pair of non-degenerate, disjoint continua $F_1, F_2 \subset B(x_0, r_0)$ with $\Delta(F_1, F_2) \leq t$ we have

$$\Mod_n(\Gamma(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^n) \cap \mathcal{F}_n(E)) \geq \phi.$$ 

(V) For each Borel function $\rho : \mathbb{R}^n \to [0, \infty]$ with $\rho \in L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ there exists a path family $\Gamma_0$ with $\Mod_n \Gamma_0 = 0$ such that Conclusion $[A]$ below holds for each rectifiable path $\gamma \notin \Gamma_0$ with distinct endpoints. Moreover, $\Gamma_0$ has the property that if $\{\eta_j\}_{j \in J}$ is a finite collection of paths outside $\Gamma_0$ and $\gamma$ is a path with $|\gamma| \subset \bigcup_{j \in J} |\eta_j|$, then $\gamma \notin \Gamma_0$.

(VI) For each Borel function $\rho : \mathbb{R}^n \to [0, \infty]$ with $\rho \in L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ there exists a path family $\Gamma_0$ with $\Mod_n \Gamma_0 = 0$ such that Conclusion $[B]$ below holds for each rectifiable path $\gamma \notin \Gamma_0$ with distinct endpoints.

(VII) $m_n(E) = 0$ and part (VI) is true for paths $\gamma$ with endpoints not lying in $E$. 
Moreover, the implications
\[(V) \Rightarrow (VI) \iff (VII) \Rightarrow (I) \Rightarrow (II) \Rightarrow (III)\]
are true for all measurable sets \(E\), not necessarily closed.

**Conclusion A** \((A(E, \rho, \gamma))\). For each open neighborhood \(U\) of \(|\gamma|\setminus \partial \gamma\) and for each \(\varepsilon > 0\) there exists a collection of paths \(\{\gamma_i\}_{i \in I}\) and a simple path \(\tilde{\gamma}\) such that
\[
(A-i) \quad \tilde{\gamma} \in \mathcal{F}_s(E),
\]
\[
(A-ii) \quad \partial \tilde{\gamma} = \partial \gamma, \quad |\tilde{\gamma}| \setminus \partial \gamma \subset (|\gamma| \setminus E) \cup \bigcup_{i \in I} |\gamma_i|, \text{ and } \bigcup_{i \in I} |\gamma_i| \subset U,
\]
\[
(A-iii) \quad \sum_{i \in I} \ell(\gamma_i) < \varepsilon, \text{ and }
\]
\[
(A-iv) \quad \sum_{i \in I} \int_{\gamma_i} \rho \, ds < \varepsilon.
\]
The paths \(\gamma_i, \ i \in I\), may be taken to lie outside a given path family \(\Gamma'\) with Mod\(_s\) \(\Gamma' = 0\). If \(E \cap \partial \gamma = \emptyset\), then \(I\) may be taken to be finite. In general, the trace of each strict subpath of \(\tilde{\gamma}\) intersects finitely many traces \(|\gamma_i|, \ i \in I\).

**Conclusion B** \((B(E, \rho, \gamma))\). For each open neighborhood \(U\) of \(|\gamma|\) and for each \(\varepsilon > 0\) there exists a simple path \(\tilde{\gamma}\) such that
\[
(B-i) \quad \tilde{\gamma} \in \mathcal{F}_s(E),
\]
\[
(B-ii) \quad \partial \tilde{\gamma} = \partial \gamma \text{ and } |\tilde{\gamma}| \subset U,
\]
\[
(B-iii) \quad \ell(\tilde{\gamma}) \leq \ell(\gamma) + \varepsilon, \text{ and }
\]
\[
(B-iv) \quad \int_{\tilde{\gamma}} \rho \, ds \leq \int_{\gamma} \rho \, ds + \varepsilon.
\]

Note that the implications \((I) \Rightarrow (II) \Rightarrow (III)\) are trivial. Conclusion \(B\) in \(V\) is only a less technical statement that follows easily from Conclusion \(A\) in \(V\). Indeed, \((B-iii)\) and \((B-iv)\) follow from \((A-ii)\) \((A-iii)\) and \((A-iv)\) using Lemma 2.1 (ii) Moreover, for closed sets \(E\), \((III) \Rightarrow (IV)\) follows immediately from Lemma 2.5. Hence, we will show the implications \((IV) \Rightarrow (V)\) which is the most technical one. \((VI) \iff (VII)\) and \((VI) \Rightarrow (I)\)

Roughly speaking, Conclusions \(A\) and \(B\) say that with small cost we can alter the path \(\gamma\) to bring it inside the curve family \(\mathcal{F}_s(E)\). The assumption that \(E\) is closed will be crucially used in the proof of \((IV) \Rightarrow (V)\) (see Lemma 7.4) and it is doubtful whether this implication holds without that assumption.

An immediate corollary of Theorem 7.1 is the quasiconformal and bi-Lipschitz invariance of closed \(*\text{NED}\) sets.

**Corollary 7.2.** Let \(E \subset \mathbb{R}^n\) be a closed \(*\text{NED}\) set, \(\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n\) be an open set with \(E \subset \Omega\), and \(f: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n\) be an orientation-preserving or -reversing quasiconformal embedding. Then \(f(E) \in *\text{NED}\). In particular, the statement is true if \(f\) is a bi-Lipschitz embedding.

**Proof.** Since \(f\) distorts the \(n\)-modulus of each curve family in \(\Omega\) by a bounded multiplicative factor, we see that \(f(E) \in *\text{NED}^w(\Omega)\). By Theorem 7.1 we conclude that \(f(E) \in *\text{NED}\).

Another consequence of Theorem 7.1 is Theorem 1.10.
Proof of Theorem 1.10. Suppose that \( E \in \ast \text{NED} \). Then, by definition, for every pair of non-degenerate, disjoint continua \( F_1, F_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) we have
\[
\text{Mod}_n(\Gamma(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^n) \cap \mathcal{F}_*(E)) = \text{Mod}_n(\Gamma(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^n)).
\]

The space \( \mathbb{R}^n \) is a Loewner space \([\text{Hei}01\, \text{Theorem 8.2, p. 60}]\). That is, there exists a function \( \phi: (0, \infty) \to (0, \infty) \) such that for each \( t > 0 \) and for every pair of non-degenerate, disjoint continua \( F_1, F_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) with \( \Delta(F_1, F_2) \leq t \) we have
\[
\text{Mod}_n(\Gamma(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^n)) \geq \phi(t).
\]

Conversely, Theorem 7.1 (IV) implies immediately that \( E \in \ast \text{NED} \). \( \square \)

We also prove an alternative criterion in terms of \( P \)-families; recall the definition of a \( P \)-family from Section 4.

Theorem 7.3 (\( P \)-family criterion). Let \( E \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) be a closed set. The following are equivalent.

(I) \( E \in \text{CNED} \).

(II) For each Borel function \( \rho: \mathbb{R}^n \to [0, \infty] \) with \( \rho \in L^n(\mathbb{R}^n) \) the following statements are true.

(II-1) For each rectifiable path \( \gamma \), for a.e. \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \), and for every strong subpath \( \eta \) of \( \gamma + x \) with distinct endpoints, Conclusion \( \mathbb{E}(E, \rho, \eta) \) is true.

(II-2) For \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \), \( 0 < r < R \), and \( w \in S^{n-1}(0,1) \) define \( \gamma_w(t) = x + tw \), \( t \in [r, R] \). Then for \( \mathbb{E}^{n-1} \) a.e. \( w \in S^{n-1}(0,1) \), and for every strong subpath \( \eta \) of \( \gamma_w \), Conclusion \( \mathbb{E}(E, \rho, \eta) \) is true.

(III) For each Borel function \( \rho: \mathbb{R}^n \to [0, \infty] \) with \( \rho \in L^n(\mathbb{R}^n) \) there exists a \( P \)-family \( \mathcal{F} \) such that if \( \gamma \in \mathcal{F} \) is a rectifiable path, then Conclusion \( \mathbb{E}(E, \rho, \eta) \) is true for each strong subpath \( \eta \) of \( \gamma \) with distinct endpoints.

The result is also true for the case of \( NED \) sets but we do not prove it here to avoid some technicalities.

7.1. Auxiliary results. We will need some auxiliary results before we prove Theorems 7.1 and 7.3.

Lemma 7.4. Let \( E \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) be a closed set with \( m_n(E) = 0 \). Then for each non-negative function \( \rho \in L^n_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n) \) and for each \( \lambda > 0 \)

(i) there exists a path family \( \Gamma_0 \) with \( \text{Mod}_n \Gamma_0 = 0 \) and

(ii) for each \( m \in \mathbb{N} \) there exists a family of balls \( \{B_{i,m} = B(x_{i,m}, r_{i,m})\}_i \) covering \( E \) with \( r_{i,m} < 1/m \), \( i \in I_m \), such that for every non-constant curve \( \gamma \notin \Gamma_0 \) we have
\[
\lim_{m \to \infty} \sum_{i:B_{i,m}(\gamma) \neq \emptyset} r_{i,m} \left( \int_{\lambda B_{i,m}} \rho^\mu \right)^{1/n} = 0, \quad \text{and}
\]
\[
\lim_{m \to \infty} \sum_{i:B_{i,m}(\gamma) \neq \emptyset} r_{i,m} = 0.
\]

For the proof we will use the following lemma, known as Fuglede’s lemma \([\text{Vai}71\, \text{Theorem 28.1, p. 94}]\).
Lemma 7.5. Let $\rho$ and $\rho_k$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, be Borel functions on $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that
\[ \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \|\rho_k - \rho\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} < \infty. \]
Then there exists a path family $\Gamma_0$ with $\text{Mod}_n \Gamma_0 = 0$ such that
\[ \lim_{k \to \infty} \int_\gamma |\rho_k - \rho| \, ds = 0 \]
for every curve $\gamma \notin \Gamma_0$.

Proof of Lemma 7.5. First, we reduce to the case that $E$ is compact. Suppose that we have proved the statement for compact sets. For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $A_k = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n : k - 1 \leq |x| \leq k \}$. Then for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a curve family $\Gamma_k$ with $\text{Mod}_n \Gamma_k = 0$ such that part (ii) is true for the set $E \cap A_k$. Namely, for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a family of balls $\{B_{i,m}\}_{i \in I_m,k}$ covering $E \cap A_k$, with radii bounded above by $1/m$, and such that (7.1) is true for non-constant paths $\gamma \notin \Gamma_k$. We discard the balls not intersecting $E \cap A_k$, if any. Let $I_m = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} I_{m,k}$ and $\Gamma_0 = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \Gamma_k$. Note that $\text{Mod}_n \Gamma_0 = 0$ by the subadditivity of modulus. We claim that (7.1) is true for the family of balls $\{B_{i,m}\}_{i \in I_m}$.

If $\gamma$ is a non-constant path outside $\Gamma_0$, then $\gamma$ is contained in the union of finitely many sets $A_k$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, there exists $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $B_{i,m} \cap |\gamma| = \emptyset$ for all $i \in I_{m,k}$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, and $k > k_0$. Thus, in (7.1), the sums over the indices $i \in I_{m,k}$ such that $B_{i,m} \cap |\gamma| \neq \emptyset$ are zero for all $k > k_0$. For $k \leq k_0$, the limits of the corresponding sums vanish, since $\gamma \notin \Gamma_k$. Since limits commute with finite sums, we obtain (7.1) for the family of balls $\{B_{i,m}\}_{i \in I_m}$.

Suppose now that $E$ is compact. We first establish a preliminary claim.

Claim 7.6. Let $g$ be non-negative function in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\lambda > 0$. For each $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that if $0 < r < \delta$ and $B_i = B(x_i,r)$, $i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$, is a family of pairwise disjoint balls centered at $E$, then
\[ \int_{\bigcup_{i=1}^N \lambda B_i} g \leq \varepsilon. \]

To see this, let $r > 0$ and consider a family of finitely many disjoint balls $B_i = B(x_i,r)$, $i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$, centered at $E$. Since all balls $\lambda B_i$ have the same radius and the balls $B_i$, $i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$, are disjoint, by volume comparison we see that each point of $\mathbb{R}^n$ can lie in at most $C(n, \lambda)$ balls $\lambda B_i$. That is, we have
\[ \sum_{i=1}^N X_{\lambda B_i} \leq C(n, \lambda) X_{\bigcup_{i=1}^N \lambda B_i}. \]
Moreover, we have
\[ \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{\lambda B_i} g = \int g \sum_{i=1}^N X_{\lambda B_i} \leq C(n, \lambda) \int_{\bigcup_{i=1}^N \lambda B_i} g. \]
Note that
\[ m_n \left( \bigcup_{i=1}^N \lambda B_i \right) \leq \lambda^n \sum_{i=1}^N m_n(B_i) = \lambda^n m_n \left( \bigcup_{i=1}^N B_i \right) \leq \lambda^n m_n \left( N_r(E) \right). \]
The latter converges to 0 as \( r \to 0 \), by the compactness of \( E \) and the assumption that \( m_n(E) = 0 \). Since \( g \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \), if \( r \) is sufficiently small, then

\[
\int \bigcup_{i=1}^{N} \lambda B_i g
\]

is also small. This proves the claim.

Now, we proceed with the proof of the lemma. Let \( g \in L^n(\mathbb{R}^n) \) be a non-negative function, to be specified later. By the 5B-covering lemma (Lemma 3.1) for each \( r > 0 \) we can find a cover of \( E \) by finitely many balls of radius \( r \) centered at \( E \) so that the balls with the same centers and radius \( r/5 \) are disjoint. Combining this with Claim 7.6 (for \( 5 \lambda \) in place of \( \lambda \)), for each \( m \in \mathbb{N} \) we may find a cover of \( E \) by balls \( B_{i,m} = B(x_{i,m}, r_m) \), \( i \in I_m \), centered at \( E \), such that \( r_m < 1/m \), the balls \( \frac{1}{5} B_{i,m} \) are disjoint, and

\[
\sum_{i \in I_m} \int_{\lambda B_{i,m}} g^n < \frac{1}{2^m}.
\]

For \( m \in \mathbb{N} \), we define the Borel function

\[
h_m = \sum_{i \in I_m} \left( \int_{\lambda B_{i,m}} g^n \right)^{1/n} \chi_{2B_{i,m}}.
\]

By Lemma 3.3, we have

\[
\sum_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \|h_m\|_{L^n(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim_n \sum_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \left( \sum_{i \in I_m} \int_{\lambda B_{i,m}} g^n \right)^{1/n} \chi_{2B_{i,m}} \lesssim_{n,\lambda} \sum_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{2^{m/n}} < \infty.
\]

By Lemma 7.5, there exists a curve family \( \Gamma_0 \) with \( \text{Mod}_n \Gamma_0 = 0 \) such that for each path \( \gamma \notin \Gamma_0 \) we have

\[
\lim_{m \to \infty} \int_{\gamma} h_m \, ds = 0.
\]

It is implicit that \( \Gamma_0 \) contains all curves that are not rectifiable.

Note that if \( \gamma \) is a non-constant rectifiable curve, \( B_{i,m} \cap \vert \gamma \vert \neq \emptyset \), and \( m \) is sufficiently large so that \( \text{diam}(\vert \gamma \vert) > 4m^{-1} > 4r_m \), then \( \vert \gamma \vert \) is not contained in \( 2B_{i,m} \), so

\[
\int_{\gamma} \chi_{2B_{i,m}} \, ds \geq r_m.
\]

Thus,

\[
\int_{\gamma} h_m \, ds \geq \sum_{i: B_{i,m} \cap \vert \gamma \vert \neq \emptyset} r_m \left( \int_{\lambda B_{i,m}} g^n \right)^{1/n}.
\]

We conclude that if \( \gamma \) is a non-constant curve outside \( \Gamma_0 \), then

\[
(7.2) \quad \lim_{m \to \infty} \sum_{i: B_{i,m} \cap \vert \gamma \vert \neq \emptyset} r_m \left( \int_{\lambda B_{i,m}} g^n \right)^{1/n} = 0.
\]
We finally set \( g = (\rho+1)\chi_{B(0,R)} \) in the above manipulations, where \( \rho \) is the given function from the statement and \( B(0,R) \) is a large ball containing the compact set \( E \). Note that for all large \( m \in \mathbb{N} \) we have \( \lambda B_{i,m} \subset B(0,R) \) for all \( i \in I_m \). Then for every non-constant curve \( \gamma \notin \Gamma \) we obtain \( \tilde{\gamma}_1 \) from (7.2). Observe that when \( E \) is compact, all the balls \( B_{i,m} \) can be taken to have the same radius \( r_m \). \( \square \)

**Lemma 7.7.** Let \( E \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) be a set, \( \rho: \mathbb{R}^n \to [0,\infty) \) be a Borel function, and \( \gamma \) be a rectifiable path with distinct endpoints such that \( \gamma \cap E \) is totally disconnected.

(i) Suppose that \( E \) is closed and that Conclusion A(\( E, \rho, \gamma \)) is true for each strict subpath \( \eta \) of \( \gamma \) with distinct endpoints that do not lie in the set \( E \). Then Conclusion A(\( E, \rho, \gamma \)) is also true.

(ii) The above statement is true for Conclusion \( B \) in place of Conclusion \( A \) without the assumption that \( E \) is closed.

**Proof.** We only present the argument for Conclusion A since the argument for Conclusion B is similar and less technical. Let \( U \) be an open neighborhood of \( |\gamma| \setminus \partial \gamma \) and \( \varepsilon > 0 \). It suffices to prove that a strong subpath of \( \gamma \) with the same endpoints satisfies Conclusion A. Consider a parametrization \( \gamma: [a, b] \to \mathbb{R}^n \). Then there exists an open subinterval \( J \) of \([a, b]\) such that \( \gamma(J) \subset U \) and \( \gamma|_J \) has the same endpoints as \( \gamma \). Without loss of generality, we assume that \( J = (0, 1) \) and we denote the path \( \gamma|_{[0, 1]} \) by \( \gamma \).

Suppose first that \( E \cap \partial \gamma = \emptyset \). This is the only instance in which we use the assumption that \( E \) is closed. Since \( E \) is closed, there exist paths \( \gamma|_{[0,t_1]}, \gamma|_{[t_1,t_2]} \) that do not intersect \( E \), and a strict subpath \( \eta = \gamma|_{[t_1,t_2]} \) with \( E \cap \partial \eta = \emptyset \). By assumption, there exists a simple path \( \tilde{\eta} \) with the same endpoints as \( \eta \) and finitely many paths \( \eta_i, i \in I, \) as in Conclusion A(\( E, \rho, \gamma \)). Concatenating \( \tilde{\eta} \) with \( \gamma|_{[0,t_1]} \) and \( \gamma|_{[t_2,1]} \), and then passing to a simple weak subpath, gives the desired path \( \tilde{\gamma} \) that verifies Conclusion A(\( E, \rho, \gamma \)).

Next, suppose that \( E \cap \partial \gamma \neq \emptyset \). We consider a sequence \( a_j \in (0, 1), j \in \mathbb{Z}, \) such that \( a_{j-1} < a_j \) for each \( j \in \mathbb{Z} \) and \( \bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} [a_{j-1}, a_j] = (0, 1) \). Let \( \gamma^j = \gamma|_{[a_{j-1}, a_j]} \), which is a strict subpath of \( \gamma \). Since \( \gamma((0, 1)) \) is disjoint from \( \{0, 1\} \), the points \( a_j \) can be chosen so that \( \gamma^j \) has distinct endpoints for each \( j \in \mathbb{Z} \). Since \( \gamma \cap E \) is totally disconnected, we may further choose the points \( a_j \) so that \( \gamma(a_j) \notin E \) for each \( j \in \mathbb{Z} \).

By assumption, the strict subpath \( \gamma^j \) of \( \gamma \) satisfies Conclusion A(\( E, \rho, \gamma^j \)) for each \( j \in \mathbb{Z} \). Thus, we obtain paths \( \tilde{\gamma} \) and \( \gamma^j_i, i \in \{1, \ldots, N_j\}, \) as in the conclusion, for \( \varepsilon 2^{-|j|} \) in place of \( \varepsilon \), and such that \( \bigcup_{i=1}^{N_j} |\gamma^j_i| \subset U \). In particular, by \( \text{(A-i)} \) we have \( \tilde{\gamma} \in \mathcal{F}_s(E) \). If \( \mathcal{F}_s(E) = \mathcal{F}_0(E) \), since the endpoints of \( \tilde{\gamma} \) do not lie in \( E \), we have \( |\tilde{\gamma}^j| \cap E = \emptyset \). By discarding some paths \( \gamma^j_i \), we assume that \( |\gamma^j_i| \) intersects \( |\gamma^j_j| \) for all \( i \in \{1, \ldots, N_j\} \).

We consider parametrizations \( \tilde{\gamma}^j: [a_{j-1}, a_j] \to U \) with \( \tilde{\gamma}^j(a_j) = \gamma^j(a_j), j \in \mathbb{Z} \). Then we create a curve \( \tilde{\gamma}: [0, 1] \to U \) such that \( \tilde{\gamma}((0, 1)) \subset U \), by concatenating these paths. Namely, we define \( \tilde{\gamma}(0) = \gamma(0), \tilde{\gamma}(1) = \gamma(1), \) and \( \tilde{\gamma}|_{[a_{j-1}, a_j]} = \tilde{\gamma}^j \) for \( j \in \mathbb{Z} \). Note that \( \ell(\tilde{\gamma}^j) \leq \ell(\gamma^j) + \varepsilon 2^{-|j|} \), which follows from Conclusion A and Lemma 2.1. We conclude that \( \text{diam}(\tilde{\gamma}^j) \to 0 \), as \( |j| \to \infty \), so \( \tilde{\gamma} \) is continuous. By passing to a weak subpath that has the same endpoints, we assume that \( \tilde{\gamma} \) is simple.
Property [A-ii] is immediate for \( \tilde{\gamma} \). Property [A-iii] also holds if \( \{\gamma_i\}_{i \in I} \) is the family \( \{\gamma_i^j\}_{j \in \mathbb{Z}, i \in \{1, \ldots, N_j\}} \), by the corresponding properties of the paths \( \tilde{\gamma}^j \). Indeed,

\[
|\tilde{\gamma}| \setminus \partial \tilde{\gamma} \subset \bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \tilde{\gamma}^j \subset \bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \left( (|\gamma_j^j| \setminus E) \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{N_j} |\gamma_i^j| \right) \subset (|\gamma| \setminus E) \cup \bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \bigcup_{i=1}^{N_j} |\gamma_i^j|
\]

and

\[
\bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \bigcup_{i=1}^{N_j} |\gamma_i^j| \subset U.
\]

Finally, we have

\[
\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_j} \ell(\gamma_i^j) \leq \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \varepsilon 2^{-|j|} = 3\varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_j} \int_{\gamma_i^j} \rho \, ds \leq 3\varepsilon.
\]

Thus [A-iii] and [A-iv] hold as well.

Now, we verify the last part of Conclusion A. The paths \( \gamma_i^j \) may be taken to lie outside a given curve family \( \Gamma' \) with \( \text{Mod}_n \Gamma' = 0 \), since they were obtained via Conclusion A. If \( \eta \) is a strict subpath of \( \tilde{\gamma} \), then \( |\eta| \) intersects \( \bigcup_{j=1}^{N_j} |\gamma_i^j| \) for finitely many \( j \in \mathbb{Z} \). Indeed, as \( |j| \to \infty \), the paths \( \{\gamma_i^j\}_{i \in \{1, \ldots, N_j\}} \) have arbitrarily small lengths by the above, and their traces intersect \( |\tilde{\gamma}| \), which is contained in arbitrarily small neighborhoods of the endpoints of \( \tilde{\gamma} \). Since \( |\eta| \) has positive distance from the endpoints of \( \tilde{\gamma} \), we conclude that \( |\gamma_i^j| \) cannot intersect \( |\eta| \) if \( |j| \) is sufficiently large. This completes the proof. \( \square \)

7.2. Proof of main criterion. As we have discussed, the implications [I] \( \Rightarrow \) [II] \( \Rightarrow \) [III] and [V] \( \Rightarrow \) [VI] are trivial even for sets \( E \) that are not closed. Moreover, the implication [III] \( \Rightarrow \) [IV] follows from Lemma 2.5 for closed sets. Hence, we will show the implications [VI] \( \iff \) [VII] and [VI] \( \Rightarrow \) [I] for measurable sets \( E \), and the implication [IV] \( \Rightarrow \) [V] which is the most technical one, for closed sets.

Proof of Theorem 7.1 [VI] \( \iff \) [VII]. Suppose that [VI] is true. For [VII] it suffices to show that \( m_n(E) = 0 \). Let \( G \) be a Borel subset of \( E \) with \( m_n(E \setminus G) = 0 \). Since \( F_*(E) \subset F_*(G) \), [VI] is true for the set \( G \) in place of \( E \). Consider the Borel function \( \rho = \chi_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus G} = 1 - \chi_G \), which lies in \( L^p_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n) \). Then there exists a path family \( \Gamma_0 \) with \( \text{Mod}_n \Gamma_0 = 0 \) such that Conclusion [III] \( G, \rho, \gamma \) is true for all paths \( \gamma \in \Gamma_0 \) with distinct endpoints. In particular, by Lemma 2.3 this is true for a.e. line segment parallel to a given coordinate direction. Let \( \gamma \) be such a line segment, so for each \( \varepsilon > 0 \) there exists a path \( \tilde{\gamma} \in F_*(G) \) with the same endpoints as \( \gamma \) and

\[
\int_{\tilde{\gamma}} \rho \, ds \leq \int_\gamma \rho \, ds + \varepsilon.
\]

By Lemma 2.1 [iv] we have \( \int_{\tilde{\gamma}} \chi_G \, ds = 0 \) since \( |\gamma| \cap G \) is countable. Thus,

\[
\ell(\gamma) \leq \ell(\tilde{\gamma}) = \int_{\tilde{\gamma}} 1 \, ds = \int_{\tilde{\gamma}} \rho \, ds \leq \int_\gamma \rho \, ds + \varepsilon = \ell(\gamma) - \int_\gamma \chi_G \, ds + \varepsilon.
\]

By letting \( \varepsilon \to 0 \), we obtain \( \int_\gamma \chi_G \, ds = 0 \), so \( \mathcal{H}^1(|\gamma| \cap G) = 0 \) by Lemma 2.1 [ii]. This is true for a.e. line segment \( \gamma \) parallel to a coordinate direction, so \( m_n(G) = 0 \) by Fubini’s theorem. This implies that \( m_n(E) = 0 \), as desired.
Next, suppose (VII) is true. Let \( \rho \in L^p_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n) \) be a non-negative Borel function. We consider an exceptional curve family \( \Gamma_0 \) with \( \text{Mod}_n \Gamma_0 = 0 \) such that Conclusion \( B(E, \rho, \gamma) \) is true for paths \( \gamma \notin \Gamma_0 \) with distinct endpoints not lying in \( E \). By enlarging this exceptional family, we assume that if \( \gamma \notin \Gamma_0 \), then all subpaths of \( \gamma \) also do not lie in \( \Gamma_0 \). In addition, since \( m_n(E) = 0 \), by Lemma 2.2 we further assume, by enlarging \( \Gamma_0 \), that for each \( \gamma \notin \Gamma_0 \) we have \( \mathcal{H}^1(\gamma \cap E) = 0 \). In particular, \( |\gamma| \cap E \) is totally disconnected. We still require that \( \text{Mod}_n \Gamma_0 = 0 \). Thus, if \( \gamma \notin \Gamma_0 \), then Conclusion \( B \) is true for every subpath of \( \gamma \) with distinct endpoints not lying in \( E \). By Lemma 7.7, Conclusion \( B(E, \rho, \gamma) \) is also true. This shows (VI).

Proof of Theorem 7.1: (VI) \( \Rightarrow \) (I). Let \( \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) be an open set and \( F_1, F_2 \subset \Omega \) be a pair of non-empty, disjoint continua. By the monotonicity of modulus, it suffices to show that

\[
\text{Mod}_n \Gamma(F_1, F_2; \Omega) \leq \text{Mod}_n(\Gamma(F_1, F_2; \Omega) \cap F_*(E)).
\]

Let \( \rho \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^n) \) be an admissible function for \( \Gamma(F_1, F_2; \Omega) \cap F_*(E) \). We consider an exceptional curve family \( \Gamma_0 \) with \( \text{Mod}_n \Gamma_0 = 0 \) as in (VI). Let \( \gamma \in \Gamma(F_1, F_2; \Omega) \setminus \Gamma_0 \), so Conclusion \( B(E, \rho, \gamma) \) is true. Thus, for any \( \varepsilon > 0 \) there exists a rectifiable path \( \tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma(F_1, F_2; \Omega) \cap F_*(E) \) with

\[
1 \leq \int_{\tilde{\gamma}} \rho \, ds \leq \int_{\gamma} \rho \, ds + \varepsilon.
\]

Letting \( \varepsilon \to 0 \) gives

\[
\int_{\gamma} \rho \, ds \geq 1.
\]

We conclude that \( \rho \) is admissible for \( \Gamma(F_1, F_2; \Omega) \setminus \Gamma_0 \). Since \( \text{Mod}_n \Gamma_0 = 0 \), the proof is completed.

Proof of Theorem 7.1: (IV) \( \Rightarrow \) (V). Let \( \rho: \mathbb{R}^n \to [0, \infty] \) be a Borel function in \( L^p_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n) \). By the assumption (IV), we have \( m_n(E) = 0 \). By Lemma 7.4 for each \( m \in \mathbb{N} \) there exists a family of balls \( \{ B_{i,m} \}_{i \in I_m} \) covering the set \( E \), with radii converging uniformly in \( I_m \) to 0 as \( m \to \infty \), and such that \( m \) is true for all paths outside an exceptional family with \( n \)-modulus zero and for a value of \( \lambda > 0 \) to be specified. Let \( \Gamma_0 \) be the exceptional family of paths \( \gamma \) that either do not satisfy (7.1), or \( \mathcal{H}^1(|\gamma| \cap E) > 0 \). By Lemma 7.4 and Lemma 2.2, \( \text{Mod}_n \Gamma_0 = 0 \). Note that the path family \( \Gamma_0 \) has the required property for (V) that if \( \{ \eta_j \}_{j \in J} \) is a finite collection of paths outside \( \Gamma_0 \) and \( \gamma \) is a path with \( |\gamma| \subset \bigcup_{j \in J} |\eta_j| \), then \( \gamma \notin \Gamma_0 \).

We will show that Conclusion \( A(E, \rho, \gamma) \) holds for all paths \( \gamma \notin \Gamma_0 \) with distinct endpoints. For \( \gamma \notin \Gamma_0 \), the set \( |\gamma| \cap E \) is totally disconnected. In view of Lemma 7.7, it suffices to show that Conclusion \( A(E, \rho, \eta) \) is true for each subpath \( \eta \) of \( \gamma \) with distinct endpoints not lying in the closed set \( E \). By the properties of the curve family \( \Gamma_0 \), all subpaths of \( \gamma \) also lie outside \( \Gamma_0 \). Summarizing, it suffices to show that Conclusion \( A(E, \rho, \gamma) \) is true for each path \( \gamma \notin \Gamma_0 \) with distinct endpoints not lying in \( E \).

Let \( \gamma \notin \Gamma_0 \) be a path with distinct endpoints not lying in \( E \). As a final reduction, we consider a simple weak subpath \( \eta \) of \( \gamma \) that has the same endpoints. Note that \( \eta \notin \Gamma_0 \) by the properties of \( \Gamma_0 \) and that is suffices to show Conclusion \( A(E, \rho, \eta) \),
which implies Conclusion $A(E, \rho, \gamma)$. Hence, we may impose the additional restriction that $\gamma$ is simple.

We fix a simple path $\gamma \notin \Gamma_0$ with distinct endpoints not lying in $E$, $\varepsilon > 0$, and an open neighborhood $U$ of $|\gamma| \setminus \partial \gamma$. We fix an injective parametrization $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ and note that $\gamma(0), \gamma(1) \notin E$ and $\gamma((0, 1)) \subset U$.

By the compactness of $|\gamma| \cap E$ and the assumption $\gamma \notin \Gamma_0$ there exists a finite cover of $|\gamma| \cap E$ by open balls $V_1, \ldots, V_L$ such that for every $i \in \{1, \ldots, L\}$ and for any non-degenerate, disjoint continua $F_1, F_2 \subset 2V_i$ with $\Delta(F_1, F_2) \leq t$ we have

\[
\text{Mod}_n(\Gamma(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^n) \cap \mathcal{F}_*(E)) \geq \phi.
\]

Observe that if $D$ is a set that intersects $|\gamma| \cap E$ and has sufficiently small diameter, namely $\text{diam}(D) \leq \min\{2^{-1}\text{diam}(V_i) : i \in \{1, \ldots, L\}\}$, then $D \subset 2V_i$ for some $i \in \{1, \ldots, L\}$. In particular, for any non-degenerate, disjoint continua $F_1, F_2 \subset D$ with $\Delta(F_1, F_2) \leq t$, (7.3) holds. We also fix $a > 1$ so that if $F_1, F_2$ are disjoint continua connecting the boundary components of a ring $A(x, r, ar)$, then

\[
\Delta(F_1, F_2) \leq \frac{2}{a - 1} \leq t.
\]

If $m \in \mathbb{N}$ is fixed and sufficiently large, by (7.1) we have

\[
\sum_{i:B_{i,m} \cap |\gamma| \neq \emptyset} r_{i,m} \left( \frac{\int_{\lambda B_{i,m}} \rho^n}{\lambda} \right)^{1/n} < \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i:B_{i,m} \cap |\gamma| \neq \emptyset} r_{i,m} < \varepsilon.
\]

By the compactness of $|\gamma| \cap E$, there exists a finite subcollection $D_1, \ldots, D_N$ of $\{B_{i,m}\}_{i \in m}$ covering the set $|\gamma| \cap E$. We also assume that $D_i$ intersects $|\gamma| \cap E$ for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$ and we denote the radius of $D_i$ by $r_i$. Since the endpoints of $\gamma$ do not lie in $E$, we have $|\gamma| \cap E \subset U$. Thus,

\[
\delta = \text{dist}(|\gamma| \cap E, \partial \gamma \cup \partial U) > 0.
\]

If $m$ is sufficiently large so that $2(a + \lambda)r_i < \delta$ for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$, we have

\[
\bigcup_{i=1}^N (a + \lambda)D_i \subset U \quad \text{and} \quad \bigcup_{i=1}^N aD_i \cap \partial \gamma = \emptyset.
\]

Finally, we choose an even larger $m$, so that for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$ and for any non-degenerate, disjoint continua $F_1, F_2 \subset (a + 1)D_i$ with $\Delta(F_1, F_2) \leq t$, (7.3) holds.

We set $\tilde{\gamma}_0 = \gamma$. We will define inductively simple paths $\tilde{\gamma}_k$, $k \in \{0, \ldots, N\}$, with the same endpoints as $\gamma$. Once $\tilde{\gamma}_{k-1}$ has been defined, $k \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$, we define $\tilde{\gamma}_k$ as follows. If $D_k \cap |\tilde{\gamma}_{k-1}| = \emptyset$, then we set $\tilde{\gamma}_k = \emptyset$ (i.e., the empty path) and $\tilde{\gamma}_k = \tilde{\gamma}_{k-1}$. Suppose $D_k \cap |\tilde{\gamma}_{k-1}| \neq \emptyset$. Consider an injective parametrization $\tilde{\gamma}_{k-1} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$. By (7.5) the endpoints of $\tilde{\gamma}_{k-1}$ do not lie in $aD_k$, thus there exist two moments $0 < s_1 < s_2 < 1$ such that $\tilde{\gamma}_{k-1}(s_1), \tilde{\gamma}_{k-1}(s_2) \in \partial D_k$ and $\tilde{\gamma}_{k-1}([0, 1] \setminus (s_1, s_2)) \cap D_k = \emptyset$. Moreover, there exist moments $s_1' < s_1$ and $s_2' > s_2$ such that $\tilde{\gamma}_{k-1}(s_1'), \tilde{\gamma}_{k-1}(s_2') \in \partial(aD_k)$, $G_1 = \tilde{\gamma}_{k-1}([s_1', s_1]) \subset aD_k \setminus D_k$ and $G_2 = \tilde{\gamma}_{k-1}([s_2', s_2]) \subset aD_k \setminus D_k$; see Figure 4. Note that $G_1$ and $G_2$ are disjoint since the path $\tilde{\gamma}_{k-1}$ is simple, and that they connect the boundary components of the ring $aD_k \setminus D_k$. Since $\Delta(G_1, G_2) \leq t$ (by the choice of $a$) and $G_1, G_2 \subset (a + 1)D_k$, by (7.3) we have

\[
\text{Mod}_n(\Gamma(G_1, G_2; \mathbb{R}^n) \cap \mathcal{F}_*(E)) \geq \phi.
\]
Note that if $\Gamma'$ is a given path family with $\text{Mod}_n \Gamma' = 0$ as in the end of Conclusion A, then we also have

$$\text{Mod}_n(\Gamma(G_1, G_2; \mathbb{R}^n) \cap \mathcal{F}_* (E) \setminus \Gamma') \geq \phi.$$

Each path of $\Gamma(G_1, G_2; \mathbb{R}^n) \cap \mathcal{F}_* (E) \setminus \Gamma'$ intersects the ball $(a + 1)D_k$. By Lemma 4.7 there exists a path $\gamma_k \in \Gamma(G_1, G_2; \mathbb{R}^n) \cap \mathcal{F}_* (E) \setminus \Gamma'$ such that

$$\int_{\gamma_k} \rho ds \lesssim n, \phi, a \ r_k \left( \int_{c(n, \phi, a) D_k} \rho^n \right)^{1/n} \quad \text{and} \quad \ell(\gamma_k) \leq c(n, \phi, a) r_k$$

for a constant $c(n, \phi, a) > 0$ depending only on $n$, $\phi$, and $a$. We now set $\lambda = c(n, \phi, a)$ and note that $|\gamma_k| \subset (a + \lambda)D_k \subset U$ by (7.5). Also, the endpoints of $\gamma_k$ lie in $|\tilde{\gamma}_{k-1}|$. We concatenate $\gamma_k$ with suitable subpaths of $\tilde{\gamma}_{k-1}$ that do not intersect $D_k$ to obtain a path $\tilde{\gamma}_k$ that the same endpoints as $\gamma$. If necessary, we replace $\tilde{\gamma}_k$ with a simple weak subpath that has the same endpoints. By construction we have

$$|\tilde{\gamma}_k| \subset (|\tilde{\gamma}_{k-1}| \setminus D_k) \cup (|\gamma_k| \setminus \partial \gamma_k).$$

Inductively, we see that

$$(7.6) \quad |\tilde{\gamma}_k| \subset \left( |\gamma| \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^k D_i \right) \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^k (|\gamma_i| \setminus \partial \gamma_i).$$

For $k = N$ we obtain a simple path $\tilde{\gamma} = \tilde{\gamma}_N$ with the same endpoints as $\gamma$. Since $|\gamma| \cap E \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^N D_i$, by (7.6) we have

$$(7.7) \quad |\tilde{\gamma}| \subset (|\gamma| \setminus E) \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^N (|\gamma_i| \setminus \partial \gamma_i) \quad \text{and} \quad |\tilde{\gamma}| \cap E \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^N (|\gamma_i| \setminus \partial \gamma_i) \cap E.$$

If $\mathcal{F}_* (E) = \mathcal{F}_0 (E)$, then $(|\gamma_i| \setminus \partial \gamma_i) \cap E = \emptyset$ since $\gamma_i \in \mathcal{F}_0 (E)$ for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$. Thus, $|\tilde{\gamma}| \cap E = \emptyset$ and $\tilde{\gamma} \in \mathcal{F}_0 (E)$. If $\mathcal{F}_* (E) = \mathcal{F}_\sigma (E)$, then $|\tilde{\gamma}_i| \cap E$ is countable for

\[\text{Figure 4. The construction of } \tilde{\gamma}_k \text{ from } \tilde{\gamma}_{k-1}.\]
each \( i \in \{1, \ldots, N\} \), so \(|\gamma| \cap E\) is countable and \(\tilde{\gamma} \in \mathcal{F}_s(E)\). Thus, (A-i) is satisfied. From (7.7) we obtain immediately

\[
|\tilde{\gamma}| \subseteq (|\gamma| \setminus E) \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{N} |\gamma_i|.
\]

By construction, we have (A-ii). Finally, by (7.4) we have

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{N} \ell(\gamma_i) \lesssim \sum_{i=1}^{N} r_i \lesssim \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=1}^{N} \int_{\gamma_i} \rho \, ds \lesssim \sum_{i=1}^{N} r_i \left( \int_{\Delta_{D_i}} \rho^n \right)^{1/n} \lesssim \varepsilon.
\]

These inequalities address (A-iii) and (A-iv). The last part of Conclusion A, asserting that the collection of paths \(\{\gamma_i\}_i\) is finite, whenever \(E \cap \partial\gamma = \emptyset\), is also true.

### 7.3. Proof of P-family criterion.

The proofs of the implications (I) \(\Rightarrow\) (II) and (III) \(\Rightarrow\) (I) are the same for NED and CNED sets.

**Proof of Theorem 7.3** (I) \(\Rightarrow\) (II). Let \(\rho\) be a non-negative Borel function with \(\rho \in L^n(\mathbb{R}^n)\). By Theorem 7.1 (VI), there exists a path family \(\Gamma_0\) with Mod\(_n\)\(\Gamma_0 = 0\) such that Conclusion A is true for all paths \(\gamma \notin \Gamma_0\) with distinct endpoints. Moreover, by enlarging \(\Gamma_0\) while still requiring that Mod\(_n\)\(\Gamma_0 = 0\), we may assume that if \(\gamma \notin \Gamma_0\), then all subpaths of \(\gamma\) also have this property. By Lemma 2.3, for each rectifiable path \(\gamma\) and for a.e. \(x \in \mathbb{R}^n\) we have \(\gamma + x \notin \Gamma_0\); in particular, the same holds for all strong subpaths of \(\gamma + x\), as required in part (II-1). Moreover, if \(\gamma_w\) is as in (II-2) by the same lemma, for \(\mathcal{H}^{n-1}\)-a.e. \(w \in S^{n-1}(0,1)\) the path \(\gamma_w\) and all of its strong subpaths lie outside \(\Gamma_0\). This completes the proof.

**Proof of Theorem 7.3** (III) \(\Rightarrow\) (I). Let \(\rho \in L^n(\mathbb{R}^n)\) be an admissible function for \(\Gamma(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^n) \cap \mathcal{F}_s(E)\). Consider the P-family \(\mathcal{F}\) with the given properties; note that \(\mathcal{F}\) depends on \(\rho\).

Let \(\gamma \in \Gamma(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^n) \cap \mathcal{F}\) be a rectifiable path. By the properties of \(\mathcal{F}\), each strong subpath of \(\gamma\) with distinct endpoints, and in particular \(\gamma\), satisfies Conclusion B. Hence, for each \(\varepsilon > 0\) there exists a rectifiable path \(\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^n) \cap \mathcal{F}_s(E)\) such that

\[
1 \leq \int_{\tilde{\gamma}} \rho \, ds \leq \int_{\gamma} \rho \, ds + \varepsilon.
\]

As \(\varepsilon \to 0\), this shows that \(\rho\) is admissible for \(\Gamma(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^n) \cap \mathcal{F}\). Hence,

\[
\text{Mod}_n(\Gamma(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^n) \cap \mathcal{F}) \leq \int \rho^n.
\]

Since \(\mathcal{F}\) is a P-family, by Theorem 4.4 we have

\[
\text{Mod}_n \Gamma(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^n) = \text{Mod}_n(\Gamma(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^n) \cap \mathcal{F}) \leq \int \rho^n.
\]

Infimizing over \(\rho\), gives

\[
\text{Mod}_n \Gamma(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^n) \leq \text{Mod}_n(\Gamma(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^n) \cap \mathcal{F}_s(E)).
\]

This completes the proof. \(\square\)
exists a Borel representative of $\nabla f$. For the proof of the last implication $\text{(II)} \Rightarrow \text{(III)}$ it will be important that $\mathcal{F}_\sigma(E)$ is closed under concatenations, a fact that is not true for $\mathcal{F}_0(E)$. Although the result is also true for $\mathcal{F}_0(E)$, the proof is more involved and we only present the argument for $\mathcal{F}_\sigma(E)$.

**Proof of Theorem 7.3**: $\text{(II)} \Rightarrow \text{(III)}$. First, one can show that $m_n(E) = 0$ with the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 7.1. Let $p$ be a non-negative Borel function in $L^n(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and let $\mathcal{F}$ be the family of rectifiable paths $\gamma$ such that $\text{Mod}_n(\gamma)$ holds for each strong subpath $\eta$ of $\gamma$ with distinct endpoints.

We conclude from Lemma 7.7 that $\eta$ is the concatenation of strong subpaths. The proof is more involved and we only present the argument $\text{(II)} \Rightarrow \text{(II)}$. First, we see that $\text{(P1)}$ is satisfied. That is, if $\gamma: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is a non-constant rectifiable path, then $\gamma + x \in \mathcal{F}$ for a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. This is true by the assumption $\text{(II-1)}$.

For $\text{(P2)}$, we fix $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $R > 0$, and we have to show that for a.e. $w \in S^{n-1}(0, 1)$ the radial segment $\gamma_w(t) = x + tw$, $t \in [0, R]$, lies in $\mathcal{F}$. By the assumption $\text{(II-2)}$ for each $0 < r < R$ and for a.e. $w \in S^{n-1}(0, 1)$ the radial segment $\gamma_w\big|_{[r, R]}$ lies in $\mathcal{F}$. For $r_k = 2^{-k}R$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we see that $\gamma_w\big|_{[r_k, R]} \in \mathcal{F}$ for a.e. $w \in S^{n-1}(0, 1)$ and for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. We fix $w \in S^{n-1}(0, 1)$ such that $\mathcal{M}_1(\gamma_w \cap E) = 0$.

If $m_n(E) = 0$, these statements hold for a.e. $w \in S^{n-1}(0, 1)$. Our goal is to show that Conclusion $\text{B}(E, \rho, \eta)$ is true for every strong subpath $\eta$ of $\gamma_w$; this will imply that $\gamma_w \in \mathcal{F}$, as desired. Every strict subpath of $\eta$ is a strong subpath of $\gamma_w|_{[r_k, R]}$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $\gamma_w|_{[r_k, R]} \in \mathcal{F}$, every strict subpath of $\eta$ satisfies Conclusion $\text{B}$. Since $\eta \cap E$ is totally disconnected, we conclude from Lemma 7.7 that $\eta$ satisfies Conclusion $\text{B}$.

From the definition of $\mathcal{F}$ it is clear that $\text{(P3)}$ is always satisfied. We finally have to prove $\text{(P4)}$. Note that $\mathcal{F}_\sigma(E) = \mathcal{F}_\sigma(E)$ in $\text{B-i}$. Let $\gamma_1, \gamma_2$ be two paths in $\mathcal{F}$ that have a common endpoint and let $\gamma$ be their concatenation. Consider a strong subpath $\eta$ of $\gamma$ that has distinct endpoints. Then $\eta$ is either a strong subpath of $\gamma_1$ or $\gamma_2$, or $\eta$ is the concatenation of strong subpaths $\eta_1$ of $\gamma_1$ and $\eta_2$ of $\gamma_2$. In the latter case, which is the nontrivial one, since $\eta_1$ and $\eta_2$ satisfy Conclusion $\text{B}$ and in particular $\text{B-i}$ there exists paths $\tilde{\eta}_1, \tilde{\eta}_2 \in \mathcal{F}_\sigma(E)$ as in Conclusion $\text{B}$ with the same endpoints as $\eta_1, \eta_2$, by $\text{B-ii}$. Concatenating $\tilde{\eta}_1$ with $\tilde{\eta}_2$ gives a path $\tilde{\eta} \in \mathcal{F}_\sigma(E)$, which shows that $\eta$ also satisfies Conclusion $\text{B}$. As already remarked, it is important here that $\mathcal{F}_\sigma(E)$ is closed under concatenations. \hfill $\square$

### 7.4. Application to Sobolev removability

We give an application of Theorem 7.3 towards establishing the removability of CNED sets for Sobolev spaces. Recall that a closed set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is removable for continuous $W^{1,n}$ functions if every continuous function $f: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $f \in W^{1,n}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus E)$ lies in $W^{1,n}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus E)$. In fact, removability is a local property; that is, one may replace $\mathbb{R}^n$ by an open subset in this definition. See the Introduction of [Nta20] for a discussion on this topic.

**Theorem 7.8.** Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a closed CNED set. Then every continuous function $f: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $f \in W^{1,n}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus E)$ lies in $W^{1,n}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

In fact, one only needs to assume that $f$ is continuous along every curve outside a curve family of $n$-modulus zero.

**Proof.** Let $f: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be continuous with $f \in W^{1,n}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus E)$. Then the classical gradient $\nabla f$ exists almost everywhere in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus E$. Since $E$ has $n$-measure zero, there exists a Borel representative of $|\nabla f|$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$. By Fuglede’s theorem [Vai71, Theorem 28.2, p. 95], there exists a curve family $\Gamma_1$ with $\text{Mod}_n \Gamma_1 = 0$ such that for each...
\( \gamma \notin \Gamma_1 \) we have \( \int_a^b |\nabla f| \, ds < \infty \) and the function \( f \) is absolutely continuous on every subpath \( \gamma|_{[a,b]} \) of \( \gamma \) with \( \gamma((a,b)) \subset \mathbb{R}^n \setminus E \). Moreover,

\[
|f(\gamma(b)) - f(\gamma(a))| \leq \int_{\gamma|_{(a,b)}} |\nabla f| \, ds.
\]

Let \( \gamma: [a, b] \to \mathbb{R}^n \) be a path outside \( \Gamma_1 \). The set \( (a, b) \setminus \gamma^{-1}(E) \) is a countable union of disjoint open intervals \( (a_i, b_i), \, i \in \mathbb{N} \). Using the continuity of \( f \) and the above inequality, we have

\[
m_1(f((\gamma| \setminus E)) \leq \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} m_1(f((\gamma|[a_i, b_i])) \leq \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} (\max_{[a_i, b_i]} f \circ \gamma - \min_{[a_i, b_i]} f \circ \gamma)
\]

\( (7.8) \)

\[
\leq \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \int_{\gamma|_{(a_i, b_i)}} |\nabla f| \, ds \leq \int_{\gamma} |\nabla f| \, ds.
\]

In particular, if \( \gamma \in \mathcal{F}_\sigma(E) \setminus \Gamma_1 \), then

\[
m_1(f(|\gamma|)) = m_1(f((\gamma| \setminus E)) \leq \int_{\gamma} |\nabla f| \, ds.
\]

(7.9)

Since \( m_\alpha(E) = 0 \), in order to show that \( f \in W^{1,n}(\mathbb{R}^n) \), it suffices to show that there exists a path family \( \Gamma_0 \) with \( \text{Mod}_\alpha \Gamma_0 = 0 \) such that \( f \) is absolutely continuous along each path \( \gamma \notin \Gamma_0 \). Let \( \Gamma_2 \) be the path family given by Theorem 7.1 (V) with \( \text{Mod}_\alpha \Gamma_2 = 0 \). Let \( \Gamma_0 = \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2 \). We will show that for each \( \gamma \notin \Gamma_0 \) and for each subpath \( \gamma|_{[a,b]} \) of \( \gamma \) we have

\[
|f(\gamma(b)) - f(\gamma(a))| \leq \int_{\gamma|_{(a,b)}} |\nabla f| \, ds.
\]

This implies that \( f \) is absolutely continuous along \( \gamma \), as desired.

We fix a subpath \( \beta = \gamma|_{[a,b]} \) of a path \( \gamma \notin \Gamma_0 \). Note that \( \beta \notin \Gamma_2 \) by the properties of \( \Gamma_2 \) in Theorem 7.1 (V). Hence, Conclusion (A) \( E, |\nabla f|, \beta \) is true. For each \( \varepsilon > 0 \) there exists a path \( \beta \in \mathcal{F}_\sigma(E) \) with the same endpoints as \( \beta \) and a collection of paths \( \beta_i \notin \Gamma_0, \, i \in I \), such that

\[
|\beta| \setminus \partial \beta \subset (|\beta| \setminus E) \cup \bigcup_{i \in I} |\beta_i|
\]

and

\[
\sum_{i \in I} \int_{\beta_i} |\nabla f| \, ds < \varepsilon.
\]

Thus, using (7.8) and (7.9), we have

\[
|f(\beta(b)) - f(\beta(a))| \leq m_1(f(|\beta|)) = m_1(f(|\beta| \setminus \partial \beta))
\]

\[
\leq m_1(f(|\beta| \setminus E)) + \sum_{i \in I} m_1(f(|\beta_i|))
\]

\[
\leq \int_{\beta} |\nabla f| \, ds + \sum_{i \in I} \int_{\beta_i} |\nabla f| \, ds
\]

\[
\leq \int_{\beta} |\nabla f| \, ds + \varepsilon.
\]

Letting \( \varepsilon \to 0 \) gives the desired conclusion. \( \square \)
8. Unions of negligible sets

In this section we prove Theorem 1.7, which asserts that the union of countably many closed \( \text{NED} \) (resp. \( \text{CNED} \)) sets is \( \text{NED} \) (resp. \( \text{CNED} \)). The proof is based on Theorem 7.1 from the preceding section. We first prove an auxiliary lemma.

**Lemma 8.1.** Let \( G_i, i \in \mathbb{N} \), be a sequence of continua in \( \mathbb{R}^n \) with \( G_i \subset G_{i+1}, i \in \mathbb{N} \), and \( \sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{H}^1(G_i) < \infty \). If \( G = \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} G_i \), then \( \mathcal{H}^1(G) = 0 \). In particular if \( \gamma: [0, 1] \to G \) is a rectifiable path and \( \rho: \mathbb{R} \to [0, \infty] \) is a Borel function, then

\[
\int_\gamma \rho \, ds = \int_\gamma \rho \chi_G \, ds.
\]

**Proof.** Without loss of generality, \( \text{diam}(G_1) > 0 \). We let \( d = \text{diam}(G_1) \) and we fix \( k \in \mathbb{N} \). Since \( G_k \) is closed, for each \( x \in \overline{G} \setminus G \subset \overline{G} \setminus G_k \) there exists \( r_x > 0 \) such that \( B(x, r_x) \cap G_k = \emptyset \). By the 5B-covering lemma (Lemma 3.1), there exists family of balls \( B_i = B(x_i, r_i) \) with \( x_i \in \overline{G} \setminus G \) and \( r_i < d, i \in \mathbb{N} \), such that \( G \setminus G \subset \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} B_i \), the balls \( \frac{1}{5} B_i \) are pairwise disjoint, and \( \frac{1}{5} B_i \cap G_k = \emptyset \) for each \( i \in \mathbb{N} \).

Fix \( i \in \mathbb{N} \). Since \( x_i \in \overline{G} \), there exists a point \( y \in \frac{1}{10} B_i \cap G \). The sequence \( \{G_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \) is increasing, so there exists \( j > k \) such that \( y \in \frac{1}{10} B_i \cap G_j \). Since \( \text{diam}(G_j) \geq d > \text{diam}\left(\frac{1}{5} B_i\right) \) and \( G_j \) is a continuum, there exists a connected set in \( \frac{1}{5} B_i \cap G_j \) that connects \( \partial B(x_i, r_i/10) \) to \( \partial B(x_i, r_i/5) \). In combination with the fact that \( \frac{1}{5} B_i \cap G_k = \emptyset \), we obtain

\[
\mathcal{H}^1\left((G \setminus G_k) \cap \frac{1}{5} B_i\right) \geq \mathcal{H}^1\left(G_j \cap \frac{1}{5} B_i\right) \geq r_i/10.
\]

We now have

\[
\mathcal{H}^1(G \setminus G_k) \leq \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} 2r_i \leq 20 \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{H}^1\left((G \setminus G_k) \cap \frac{1}{5} B_i\right) \leq 20 \mathcal{H}^1(G \setminus G_k).
\]

Since \( \mathcal{H}^1(G) = \sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{H}^1(G_i) < \infty \) and \( G \setminus G_k \) decreases to the empty set as \( k \to \infty \), we have

\[
\mathcal{H}^1(G \setminus G_k) = \mathcal{H}^1(G \setminus G) = 0.
\]

This completes the proof of the first statement. The last statement follows from Lemma 2.1 (iv). \( \square \)

**Proof of Theorem 1.7.** Define \( E = \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} E_i \) and let \( \rho \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n) \) be a non-negative Borel function. For each \( i \in \mathbb{N} \) there exists an exceptional family \( \Gamma_i \) with \( \text{Mod}_n(\Gamma_i) = 0 \), given by Theorem 7.1 [V]. Also by Lemma 2.2 the family \( \Gamma' \) of paths \( \gamma \) with \( \mathcal{H}^1(\gamma \cap E) > 0 \) has \( n \)-modulus zero. Define \( \Gamma_0 = \Gamma' \cup \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \Gamma_i \). The path family \( \Gamma_0 \) has the property that if \( \{\eta_j\}_{j \in J} \) is a finite collection of paths outside \( \Gamma_0 \) and \( \gamma \) is a path with \( |\gamma| \subset \bigcup_{j \in J} |\eta_j| \), then \( \gamma \notin \Gamma_0 \). Moreover \( |\gamma| \cap E \) is totally disconnected for all paths \( \gamma \notin \Gamma_0 \).

Our goal is to show that Conclusion (E) \( (E, \rho, \gamma) \) is true for each \( \gamma \notin \Gamma_0 \). By the last part of Theorem 7.1 and [VI], this suffices for \( E \) to be \(* \text{NED} \). We fix a path \( \gamma \notin \Gamma_0 \) with distinct endpoints, \( \varepsilon > 0 \), and a neighborhood \( U \) of \( |\gamma| \). It suffices to show Conclusion (E) for a weak subpath of \( \gamma \) with the same endpoints; also all weak subpaths of \( \gamma \) lie outside \( \Gamma_0 \) by the properties of \( \Gamma_0 \). Thus, by replacing \( \gamma \) with a simple weak subpath, we assume that \( \gamma \) is simple and \( \gamma \notin \Gamma_0 \).

We introduce some notation. Define \( \mathcal{W}_\sigma = \bigcup_{m=1}^\infty \mathbb{N}^m \) and \( \mathcal{W}_0 = \mathbb{N} \). We denote \( \mathcal{W}_\sigma \) and \( \mathcal{W}_0 \) by \( \mathcal{W}_\ast \), depending on whether we are working with \( \text{CNED} \) or \( \text{NED} \).
sets, respectively. Each element \( w \in \mathbb{N}^m \subset \mathcal{W}_\sigma \) is called a word of length \( l(w) = m \).

For \( w \in \mathcal{W}_0 \) we also define \( l(w) = w \). The empty word \( \emptyset \) has length 0 by definition.

Set \( \gamma_0 = \alpha_0 = \gamma \) and note that \( \alpha_0 \notin \Gamma_0 \). Let \( U_0 \) be a neighborhood of \( |\alpha_0| \setminus \partial \alpha_0 \) with \( \text{diam}(U_0) \leq 2 \text{diam}(|\alpha_0|) \) and \( \overline{U_0} \subset U \). Suppose that for \( m \geq 0 \) we have defined simple paths \( \tilde{\gamma}_k, k \in \{0, \ldots, m\} \), and collections of paths \( \{\gamma_i\}_{i \in I_w} \) for \( l(w) \leq m - 1 \) such that

\[
\begin{align*}
(A-1) & \quad \tilde{\gamma}_k \in \mathcal{F}_* \left( \bigcup_{i=1}^k E_i \right) \text{ for } k \in \{0, \ldots, m\}, \\
(A-2) & \quad \partial \tilde{\gamma}_k = \partial \gamma \text{ and } |\tilde{\gamma}_k| \subset |\gamma| \cup \bigcup_{l(w) \leq k-1} \bigcup_{i \in I_w} |\gamma_i| \text{ for } k \in \{0, \ldots, m\}, \\
(A-3) & \quad \sum_{l(w) \leq m-1} \sum_{i \in I_w} \ell(\gamma_i) < \varepsilon, \text{ and} \\
(A-4) & \quad \sum_{l(w) \leq m-1} \sum_{i \in I_w} \int_{\gamma_i} \rho \, ds < \varepsilon.
\end{align*}
\]

Moreover, suppose we have defined the following objects:

\[
\begin{align*}
(A-5) & \quad \text{Simple paths } \{\alpha_w\}_{l(w) \leq m} \text{ such that } \{\alpha_w\}_{l(w) = k} \text{ is a collection of parametrizations of the closures of the components of } |\tilde{\gamma}_k| \setminus (E_1 \cup \cdots \cup E_k) \text{ for each } k \in \{0, \ldots, m\}. \text{ In addition, for } l(w) \leq m, \text{ each strict subpath of } \alpha_w \text{ lies outside } \Gamma_0. \text{ We remark that in the case of } \mathcal{W}_* = \mathcal{W}_0, \text{ there is only one component of } |\tilde{\gamma}_k| \setminus (E_1 \cup \cdots \cup E_k) \text{ and } \alpha_k = \gamma_k. \\
(A-6) & \quad \text{Open sets } \{U_w\}_{l(w) \leq m} \text{ such that } U_w \text{ is a neighborhood of } |\alpha_w| \setminus \partial \alpha_w \text{ with } \text{diam}(U_w) \leq 2 \text{diam}(|\alpha_w|) \text{ for } l(w) \leq m \text{ and the collection } \{U_w\}_{l(w) = k} \text{ is disjointed for each } k \in \{0, \ldots, m\}. \text{ Moreover, if } m \geq 1 \text{ and } l(w) \leq m - 1, \text{ then } U_{(w, j)} \subset U_w \text{ for } j \in \mathbb{N} \text{ in the case } \mathcal{W}_* = \mathcal{W}_0 \text{ and } U_{w+1} \subset U_w \text{ in the case } \mathcal{W}_* = \mathcal{W}_0. \text{ Finally, } \overline{U_w} \text{ does not intersect } E_1 \cup \cdots \cup E_{l(w)}, \text{ except possibly at the endpoints of } \alpha_w, \text{ for } l(w) \leq m.
\end{align*}
\]

Finally, we require the compatibility property

\[
\begin{align*}
(A-7) & \quad |\tilde{\gamma}_m| \setminus \bigcup_{l(w) = k} U_w = |\tilde{\gamma}_k| \setminus \bigcup_{l(w) = k} U_w \text{ for } k \in \{0, \ldots, m\}.
\end{align*}
\]

We now define \( \tilde{\gamma}_{m+1} \) as follows. Fix \( w \in \mathcal{W}_* \) with \( l(w) = m \). By \([A-5]\) each strict subpath \( \eta \) of \( \alpha_w \) avoids the path family \( \Gamma_0 \); thus Conclusion \([A]E_{m+1}, \rho, \eta\) is true. Observe that \( \mathcal{H}^1(\{|\alpha_w| \cap E_{m+1}\}) = 0 \), since by \([A-5]\) each strict subpath of \( \alpha_w \) lies outside \( \Gamma_0 \). Thus, \( \{|\alpha_w| \cap E_{m+1}\} \) is totally disconnected. By Lemma \([7.7]\), Conclusion \([A]E_{m+1}, \rho, \alpha_w\) is true. Thus, for each \( \delta_w > 0 \) there exists a simple path \( \tilde{\alpha}_w \) and paths \( \gamma_i \notin \Gamma_0, i \in I_w \), such that

\[
\begin{align*}
(A'-1) & \quad \tilde{\alpha}_w \in \mathcal{F}_*(E_{m+1}), \\
(A'-2) & \quad \partial \tilde{\alpha}_w = \partial \alpha_w \text{ and } |\tilde{\alpha}_w| \subset |\alpha_w| \cup \bigcup_{i \in I_w} |\gamma_i| \text{ and } \bigcup_{i \in I_w} |\gamma_i| \subset U_w, \\
(A'-3) & \quad \sum_{i \in I_w} \ell(\gamma_i) < \delta_w, \text{ and} \\
(A'-4) & \quad \sum_{i \in I_w} \int_{\gamma_i} \rho \, ds < \delta_w.
\end{align*}
\]

If we choose a sufficiently small \( \delta_w \), we can ensure that \([A-3]\) and \([A-4]\) are true for the index \( m+1 \) in place of \( m \). By \([A-2]\) the path \( \tilde{\alpha}_w \) is obtained by modifying \( \alpha_w \) within \( U_w \). By \([A-6]\) \( U_w \) does not intersect \( E_1 \cup \cdots \cup E_m \), except possibly at the endpoints of \( \alpha_w \). Therefore, \( \tilde{\alpha}_w \in \mathcal{F}_*(E_1 \cup \cdots \cup E_m) \). Combining this with \([A-1]\) we obtain \( \tilde{\alpha}_w \in \mathcal{F}_*(E_1 \cup \cdots \cup E_{m+1}) \).

Using \([A-5]\) we define \( \tilde{\gamma}_{m+1} \) by replacing each \( \alpha_w \) in \( \tilde{\gamma}_m \), where \( l(w) = m \), with \( \tilde{\alpha}_w \); see Figure 5. In the case \( \mathcal{W}_* = \mathcal{W}_0 \) we simply have \( \tilde{\gamma}_m = \alpha_m \) (see \([A-5]\)) and \( \tilde{\gamma}_{m+1} = \tilde{\alpha}_m \), so \( \tilde{\gamma}_{m+1} \in \mathcal{F}_0(E_1 \cup \cdots \cup E_{m+1}) \), as required in \([A-1]\). In the case of \( \mathcal{W}_* \), we first need to ensure that this procedure gives a path. Indeed, by \([A-2]\) and \([A-3]\) we have \( \ell(\tilde{\alpha}_w) \leq \ell(\alpha_w) + \delta_w \), so if \( \delta_w \) is sufficiently small, then we obtain
Figure 5. Construction of $\tilde{\gamma}_{m+1}$ from $\tilde{\gamma}_m$. Top figure: the case of $\mathcal{W}_0$. Bottom figure: the case of $\mathcal{W}_\sigma$. The red curve is $\tilde{\alpha}_w$ and the green points denote the set $(|\tilde{\gamma}_m| \cap E_{m+1}) \cap U_w$, which is countable. In fact, a large part of $\tilde{\alpha}_w$ should be shared with $\alpha_w$ by (A-2) but we do not indicate this to simplify the figure.

In the case of $\mathcal{W}_\sigma$, since $\tilde{\gamma}_m \in \mathcal{F}_\sigma(E_1 \cup \cdots \cup E_m)$ and $\tilde{\alpha}_w \in \mathcal{F}_\sigma(E_1 \cup \cdots \cup E_{m+1})$ for $l(w) = m$, we conclude that $\tilde{\gamma}_{m+1} \in \mathcal{F}_\sigma(E_1 \cup \cdots \cup E_{m+1})$, as required in (A-1).
By construction and (A'-2) we have

\[ |\gamma_{m+1}| \subset |\gamma_m| \cup \bigcup_{l(w)=m} U_w. \]

Thus, by the induction assumption we obtain (A-2) for the index \( m + 1 \).

Since \( \gamma_{m+1} \) is obtained by modifying \( \gamma_m \) in the open sets \( U_w, l(w) = m \), we have

\[ |\gamma_{m+1}| \setminus \bigcup_{l(w)=m} U_w = |\gamma_m| \setminus \bigcup_{l(w)=m} U_w. \]

By (A-6) for \( k \leq m \) we have \( \bigcup_{l(w)=k} U_w \supset \bigcup_{l(w)=m} U_w \), so

\[ |\gamma_{m+1}| \setminus \bigcup_{l(w)=k} U_w = |\gamma_m| \setminus \bigcup_{l(w)=k} U_w. \]

where the last equality follows from the induction assumption (A-7). This proves the equality in (A-7) for the index \( m + 1 \).

Next, we verify (A-5). Note that the paths \( \{\alpha_w\}_{l(w)=m} \), parametrize the closures of the components of \( |\gamma_{m+1}| \setminus (E_1 \cup \cdots \cup E_m) \); this follows from the construction and (A-5). For \( l(w) = m \), let \( \{\alpha_{(w,j)}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \) be a collection of simple paths parametrizing the closures of the components of \( |\alpha_w| \setminus E_{m+1} \); see Figure 5. Then \( \{\alpha_w\}_{l(w)=m+1} \) gives a collection that parametrizes the closures of the components of \( |\gamma_{m+1}| \setminus (E_1 \cup \cdots \cup E_{m+1}) \). This verifies the first part of (A-5). Moreover, if \( \mathcal{W}_* = \mathcal{W}_\sigma \), for \( l(w) = m \) and \( j \in \mathbb{N} \), each strict subpath \( \tilde{\eta} \) of \( \alpha_{(w,j)} \) is a strict subpath of \( \tilde{\alpha}_w \). If \( \mathcal{W}_* = \mathcal{W}_0 \), each strict subpath \( \tilde{\eta} \) of \( \alpha_{w+1} \) is a strict subpath of \( \alpha_w \). In either case, by (A-2) there exists a strict subpath \( \eta \) of \( \alpha_w \), such that \( |\eta| \subset |\eta| \cup \bigcup_{l(w) \leq m} |\gamma_i| \).

By the induction assumption (A-5), \( \eta \notin \Gamma_0 \). By the last part of Conclusion A (see the statement in Theorem 7.1), \( \eta \) intersects finitely many of the traces \( \gamma_i, i \in I_w \). The properties of the family \( \Gamma_0 \) imply that \( \tilde{\eta} \notin \Gamma_0 \). This completes the proof of the second part of (A-5).

We now discuss (A-6). If \( \mathcal{W}_* = \mathcal{W}_0 \), we define \( U_{m+1} \) to be a neighborhood of \( |\alpha_{m+1}| \setminus \alpha_{m+1} \) such that \( \text{diam}(U_{m+1}) \leq 2 \text{diam}(|\alpha_{m+1}|), U_{m+1} \subset U_m \), and \( U_{m+1} \) does not intersect \( E_1 \cup \cdots \cup E_{m+1} \), except possibly at the endpoints of \( \alpha_{m+1} \); this uses that \( |\alpha_{m+1}| \setminus \alpha_{m+1} \) is closed and does not intersect \( |\alpha_{m+1}| \), except possibly at the endpoints. If \( \mathcal{W}_* = \mathcal{W}_\sigma \), for \( l(w) = m \) we define \( U_{(w,1)} \) to be a neighborhood of \( |\alpha_{(w,1)}| \setminus \partial \alpha_{(w,1)} \) such that \( \text{diam}(U_{(w,1)}) \leq 2 \text{diam}(|\alpha_{(w,1)}|), U_{(w,1)} \subset U_w \), and \( U_{(w,1)} \) does not intersect \( E_1 \cup \cdots \cup E_{m+1} \), except possibly at the endpoints of \( \alpha_{(w,1)} \). Moreover, since \( \alpha_w \) is simple, we may require that \( U_{(w,1)} \) is disjoint from \( |\alpha_{(w,j)}| \setminus \partial \alpha_{(w,j)} \) for \( j > 1 \). Next, we define \( U_{(w,2)} \) to be a neighborhood of \( |\alpha_{(w,2)}| \setminus \partial \alpha_{(w,2)} \) with the same properties as \( U_{(w,1)} \) and with \( U_{(w,1)} \cap U_{(w,2)} = \emptyset \). Inductively, we define \( U_{(w,j)} \) for all \( j \in \mathbb{N} \) with the desired properties; (see Figure 5).

We have completed the proof of the inductive step.

Now we will show that Conclusion (E, \( \rho, \gamma \)) is true. For \( m \in \mathbb{N} \) define \( G_m = \bigcup_{k=0}^{m} \gamma_k \). This is a continuum, since \( \gamma_k \) contains the endpoints of \( \gamma \) for each \( k \in \mathbb{N} \).

We have \( G_m \subset G_{m+1} \) and

\[ G_m \subset |\gamma| \setminus \bigcup_{l(w) \leq m-1} \bigcup_{i \in I_w} |\gamma_i|. \]
for $m \in \mathbb{N}$. By Lemma 2.1 (ii) and property (A-5) we have
\[
\mathcal{H}^1(G_m) \leq \mathcal{H}^1(|\gamma|) + \sum_{l(w) \leq m-1} \sum_{i \in I_w} \mathcal{H}^1(|\gamma_i|) \\
\leq \ell(\gamma) + \sum_{l(w) \leq m-1} \sum_{i \in I_w} \ell(\gamma_i) \leq \ell(\gamma) + \varepsilon.
\]
Thus \(\sup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{H}^1(G_m) < \infty\), as in the assumptions of Lemma 8.1. We set \(G = \bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} G_m\).
Since \(\tilde{\gamma}_m\) is a simple path for each \(m \in \mathbb{N}\), by Lemma 2.1 (ii) we have
\[
\ell(\tilde{\gamma}_m) = \mathcal{H}^1(|\tilde{\gamma}_m|) \leq \mathcal{H}^1(G_m) \leq \ell(\gamma) + \varepsilon.
\]
By the Arzelà–Ascoli theorem, there exists a subsequence of \(\tilde{\gamma}_m\), parametrized by arclength, that converges uniformly to a path \(\tilde{\gamma}\) with the same endpoints as \(\gamma\) and
\[
\ell(\tilde{\gamma}) \leq \liminf_{m \to \infty} \ell(\tilde{\gamma}_m) \leq \ell(\gamma) + \varepsilon.
\]
Hence (B-iii) holds. Since \(|\tilde{\gamma}_m| \subset \overline{U}_0\) for each \(m \in \mathbb{N}\) by (A-6) we have \(|\tilde{\gamma}| \subset \overline{U}_0 \subset U\), as required in (B-ii). We assume that \(\tilde{\gamma}\) is simple by considering a weak subpath with the same endpoints if necessary. Since \(|\tilde{\gamma}| \subset \overline{G}\), by Lemma 8.1 and Lemma 2.1 (ii) we have
\[
\int_{\tilde{\gamma}} \rho \, ds = \int_{|\tilde{\gamma}| \cap G} \rho \, \mathcal{H}^1 \leq \int_{|\tilde{\gamma}|} \rho \, \mathcal{H}^1 \\
\leq \int_{|\gamma|} \rho \, ds + \sum_{w \in \mathcal{W}_*} \sum_{i \in I_w} \int_{|\gamma_i|} \rho \, \mathcal{H}^1 \\
\leq \int_{\gamma} \rho \, ds + \sum_{w \in \mathcal{W}_*} \sum_{i \in I_w} \int_{\gamma_i} \rho \, ds \leq \int_{\gamma} \rho \, ds + \varepsilon,
\]
where the last inequality follows from (A-4). This shows (B-iv).
Finally, we argue for (B-i). By (A-7) for \(m \geq k \geq 0\) we have
\[
|\tilde{\gamma}_m| = \left( |\tilde{\gamma}_m| \setminus \bigcup_{l(w) = k} U_w \right) \cup \left( |\tilde{\gamma}_m| \cap \bigcup_{l(w) = k} U_w \right) \\
= \left( |\tilde{\gamma}_k| \setminus \bigcup_{l(w) = k} U_w \right) \cup \left( |\tilde{\gamma}_m| \cap \bigcup_{l(w) = k} U_w \right) \subset |\tilde{\gamma}_k| \cup \bigcup_{l(w) = k} U_w.
\]
By (A-6) \(\text{diam}(U_w) \leq 2 \text{diam}(|\alpha_w|)\). If there are infinitely many non-empty sets \(U_w\) with \(l(w) = k\), only finitely many curves \(\alpha_w\) can have diameter larger than a given number; indeed by (A-5) these are subpaths of \(\tilde{\gamma}_k\) that have pairwise disjoint traces, except possibly at the endpoints. It follows that \(U_w\) is contained in a small neighborhood of \(|\tilde{\gamma}_k|\) for all but finitely many \(w\) with \(l(w) = k\). Hence, we see that
\[
\bigcup_{l(w) = k} U_w \subset |\tilde{\gamma}_k| \cup \bigcup_{l(w) = k} \overline{U}_w.
\]
We conclude that
\[
|\tilde{\gamma}| \subset |\tilde{\gamma}_k| \cup \bigcup_{l(w) = k} \overline{U}_w.
\]
In the case of $\mathcal{W}_\sigma$, the set in the right-hand side intersects $E_1 \cup \cdots \cup E_k$ at countably many points by (A-1) and (A-6). Thus, $\tilde{\gamma} /in \mathcal{F}_\sigma(E_1 \cup \cdots \cup E_k)$ for each $k /in \mathbb{N}$, so $\tilde{\gamma} /in \mathcal{F}_\sigma(E)$. In the case of $\mathcal{W}_0$, we have

$$|\tilde{\gamma}| \subset |\tilde{\gamma}_k| \cup \overline{U}_k \subset \overline{U}_k$$

and the set $\overline{U}_k$ does not intersect $E_1 \cup \cdots \cup E_k$, except possibly at the endpoints of $\alpha_k = \tilde{\gamma}_k$. Thus, $|\tilde{\gamma}|$ does not intersect $E_1 \cup \cdots \cup E_k$, except possibly at the endpoints. Since $k$ is arbitrary, we conclude that $\tilde{\gamma} /in \mathcal{F}_0(E)$. We have completed the verification of Conclusion B$(E, \rho, \gamma)$, and thus, the proof of Theorem 1.7. □

9. Examples of negligible sets

In this section we will discuss several examples of NED and CNED sets. Recall that all NED sets are also CNED. First, combining Theorem 5.1 with Theorem 4.4, we obtain the following result.

**Theorem 9.1.** Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a set.

(i) If $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(E) = 0$, then $E \in \text{NED}$.

(ii) If $E$ has $\sigma$-finite Hausdorff $(n-1)$-measure, then $E \in \text{CNED}$.

9.1. A quasihyperbolic condition for CNED sets. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a domain, i.e., a connected open set. For a point $x /in \Omega$, define $\delta_\Omega(x) = \text{dist}(x, \partial \Omega)$. We define the quasihyperbolic distance of two points $x_1, x_2 /in \Omega$ by

$$k_\Omega(x_1, x_2) = \inf_{\gamma} \int_\gamma \frac{1}{\delta_\Omega} \, ds,$$

where the infimum is taken over all rectifiable paths $\gamma /in \Omega$ that connect $x_1$ and $x_2$.

**Theorem 9.2.** Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a domain such that $k_\Omega(\cdot, x_0) \in L^1(\Omega)$ for some $x_0 /in \Omega$. Then $\partial \Omega \in \text{CNED}$. In particular, boundaries of John and Hölder domains are CNED.

See [SS90] for the definitions of the latter two classes of domains. The condition $k_\Omega(\cdot, x_0) \in L^n(\Omega)$ appeared in the work of Jones–Smirnov [JS00], where it is proved that this condition is sufficient for $\partial \Omega$ to be removable for quasiconformal homeomorphisms. This condition has also been used in recent work by the current author [Nta20] to establish the removability of certain fractals with infinitely many complementary components for Sobolev spaces; it also has appeared in work by the current author and Younsi [NY20] in establishing the rigidity of circle domains under this condition. We will use some auxiliary results from [NY20], which have been proved there in dimension 2, but the proofs apply to all dimensions.

**Remark 9.3.** Domains satisfying the condition of the theorem are bounded [NY20, Lemma 2.6] and in particular have finite $n$-measure. Using this, it can be easily shown that an equivalent condition is that $k_\Omega \in L^n(\Omega \times \Omega)$ and thus the base point $x_0$ is not of particular importance.
We will prepare the necessary background before proving the theorem. A simple curve \( \gamma: [0, 1] \to \overline{\Omega} \) with \( \gamma((0, 1)) \subset \Omega \) is called a quasihyperbolic geodesic if for all \( t_1, t_2 \in (0, 1) \) with \( t_1 < t_2 \) we have

\[
k_\Omega(\gamma(t_1), \gamma(t_2)) = \int_{\gamma|_{[t_1, t_2]}} \frac{1}{\delta_\Omega} \, ds,
\]

A compactness argument using the Arzelà–Ascoli theorem shows that for any two points \( x_1, x_2 \in \Omega \) there exists a quasihyperbolic geodesic that connects them; see e.g. [BBI01, Theorem 2.5.14]. For a domain \( \Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \) we also consider the Whitney cube decomposition \( \mathcal{W}(\Omega) \), which is a collection of closed dyadic cubes \( Q \subset \Omega \), called Whitney cubes, with the following properties:

1. the cubes of \( \mathcal{W}(\Omega) \) have disjoint interiors and \( \bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{W}(\Omega)} Q = \Omega \),
2. \( \text{diam}(Q) \leq \text{dist}(Q, \partial \Omega) \leq 4 \text{diam}(Q) \) for all \( Q \in \mathcal{W}(\Omega) \), and
3. if \( Q_1 \cap Q_2 \neq \emptyset \), then \( 1/4 \leq \text{diam}(Q_1)/\text{diam}(Q_2) \leq 4 \), for all \( Q_1, Q_2 \in \mathcal{W}(\Omega) \).

See [Ste70, Theorem 1 and Prop. 1, pp. 167–169] for the existence of the decomposition. We denote by \( \ell(\gamma) \) the side length of a cube \( Q \); this is not to be confused with the length \( \ell(\gamma) \) of a path \( \gamma \). Two Whitney cubes \( Q_1, Q_2 \in \mathcal{W}(\Omega) \) with \( \ell(Q_1) \geq \ell(Q_2) \) are adjacent if a face of \( Q_2 \) is contained in a face of \( Q_1 \).

**Lemma 9.4.** Let \( \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) be a domain and \( Q_1, Q_2 \in \mathcal{W}(\Omega) \) be adjacent cubes. Let \( F_1 \subset Q_1 \) and \( F_2 \subset Q_2 \) be continua with \( \text{diam}(F_i) \geq a/(Q_i) \) for some \( a > 0 \), \( i = 1, 2 \), and let \( \rho: \mathbb{R}^n \to [0, \infty) \) be a Borel function. Then there exists a rectifiable path \( \gamma \in \Gamma(F_1, F_2; \text{int}(Q_1 \cup Q_2)) \) such that

\[
\int_{\gamma} \rho \, ds \leq c(n, a) \left( \|\rho\|_{L^n(Q_1)} + \|\rho\|_{L^n(Q_2)} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \ell(\gamma) \leq c(n, a) (\ell(Q_1) + \ell(Q_2)).
\]

**Proof.** By Lemma 4.7, it suffices to show that \( \text{Mod}_n \Gamma(F_1, F_2; \text{int}(Q_1 \cup Q_2)) \) is uniformly bounded from below, depending only on \( n \) and \( a \). This can be proved using the fact that \( \text{int}(Q_1 \cup Q_2) \) is a Loewner space. The latter can be shown by mapping \( \text{int}(Q_1 \cup Q_2) \) with a uniformly bi-Lipschitz map onto an open ball, which is a Loewner space; see [Hei01] Chapter 8 for the definition and properties of Loewner spaces. Alternatively, one can give a proof very similar to the proof of Lemma 4.5 based on Lemma 4.6. We leave the details to the reader.

**Lemma 9.5.** Let \( \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) be a domain, \( \gamma: [0, 1] \to \overline{\Omega} \) be a path such that \( \gamma((0, 1)) \subset \Omega \) and \( \gamma(0), \gamma(1) \in \partial \Omega \), and \( \rho: \mathbb{R}^n \to [0, \infty] \) be a Borel function. Then there exists a path \( \gamma': [0, 1] \to \Omega \) with \( \gamma'(0) = \gamma(0) \), \( \gamma'(1) = \gamma(1) \), \( \gamma'(0, 1) \subset \bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{W}(\Omega)} Q \),

\[
\int_{\gamma'} \rho \, ds \leq c(n) \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{W}(\Omega)} \left( \int_{Q} \rho \right)^{1/n} \quad \text{and} \quad \ell(\gamma') \leq c(n) \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{W}(\Omega)} \ell(Q).
\]

**Proof.** The assumptions on \( \gamma \) imply that there exists a sequence \( Q_i, i \in \mathbb{Z} \), of distinct Whitney cubes such that \( Q_i \) is adjacent to \( Q_{i+1} \) for each \( i \in \mathbb{Z}, |\gamma| \cap Q_i \neq \emptyset \) for each \( i \in \mathbb{Z} \), and \( Q_i \to \gamma(0) \) as \( i \to -\infty \) and \( Q_i \to \gamma(1) \) as \( i \to \infty \); see [NY201, p. 143] for an argument.

Consider the adjacent cubes \( Q_0 \) and \( Q_1 \). Let \( F_1 \) be the face of \( Q_0 \) that is opposite to the common face of \( Q_0, Q_1 \) and \( F_2 \) be the corresponding face of \( Q_1 \). We apply Lemma 9.4 to obtain a path \( \gamma_0 \) in \( Q_0 \cup Q_1 \) connecting \( F_1 \) with \( F_2 \) and satisfying
the conclusions of the lemma with $a = 1/2$. We now consider $Q_1$ and $Q_2$. Let $F_1$ be a subcontinuum of $|\gamma_0|$ connecting opposite sides of $Q_1$ and let $F_2$ be the face of $Q_2$ opposite to the common face between $Q_1$ and $Q_2$. Applying Lemma 9.4 with $a = 1/2$, we obtain a path $\gamma_1$ connecting $F_1$ with $F_2$ in $Q_1 \cup Q_2$. Inductively, for each $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ we obtain a path $\gamma_i$ in $Q_i \cup Q_{i+1}$ as in the conclusions of Lemma 9.4 such that $|\gamma_i| \cap |\gamma_{i+1}| \neq \emptyset$. Since $\text{diam}(Q_i) \to 0$ as $|i| \to \infty$, we can concatenate the paths $\gamma_i$ to obtain a path $\gamma'$ with the desired properties.

Suppose that there exists a base point $x_0 \in \Omega$ such that $k_{\Omega}(\cdot, x_0) \in L^n(\Omega)$. Then each point of $\partial \Omega$ is the landing point of a quasihyperbolic geodesic starting at $x_0$ \[NY20\], Lemma 2.4. Furthermore, there exists a tree-like family $\mathcal{G}$ of curves starting at $x_0$ and landing at $\partial \Omega$ that behave essentially like quasihyperbolic geodesics and so that each point of $\partial \Omega$ is the landing point of a curve of $\mathcal{G}$; see the discussion in \[JS00\] pp. 273–274. For each cube $Q \in \mathcal{W}(\Omega)$ we define the shadow $SH(Q)$ of $Q$ to be the set of points $x \in \partial \Omega$ such that there exists a curve of $\mathcal{G}$ starting at $x_0$, passing through $Q$ and landing at $x$. We then define

$$s(Q) = \text{diam}(SH(Q)).$$

Then $SH(Q)$ is a compact subset of $\partial \Omega$ for each $Q \in \mathcal{W}(\Omega)$; see \[NY20\] Lemma 2.7. Moreover, it was shown in \[JS00\] p. 275 that

$$\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{W}(\Omega)} s(Q)^n \lesssim_h \int_\Omega k(x, x_0)^n \, dx. \quad (9.1)$$

**Lemma 9.6 \([NY20\) Lemma 2.10].** Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a domain such that $k_{\Omega}(\cdot, x_0) \in L^n(\Omega)$ for some $x_0 \in \Omega$. For each simple path $\gamma : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a finite collection of paths $\{\gamma_i : [0, 1] \to \Omega\}_{i \in I}$ such that

(i) $\partial \gamma_i \subset \partial \Omega$ and either $\gamma_i$ is constant or $\gamma_i([0, 1)) \subset \Omega$ for each $i \in I$,

(ii) there exists a path $\tilde{\gamma}$ with $\partial \tilde{\gamma} = \partial \gamma$ and $|\tilde{\gamma}| \subset (|\gamma| \setminus \partial \Omega) \cup \bigcup_{i \in I} |\gamma_i|$, 

(iii) if $Q \in \mathcal{W}(\Omega)$ is a Whitney cube with $|\gamma_i| \cap Q \neq \emptyset$ for some $i \in I$, then $|\gamma| \cap SH(Q) \neq \emptyset$ and $\ell(Q) \leq \varepsilon$,

(iv) $|\gamma_i|$ and $|\gamma_j|$ intersect disjoint sets of Whitney cubes $Q \in \mathcal{W}(\Omega)$ for $i \neq j$.

Moreover, if one replaces $\gamma_i$, for each $i \in I$, with a path $\gamma'_i : [0, 1] \to \overline{\Omega}$ such that $\gamma'_i(0) = \gamma_i(0)$, $\gamma'_i(1) = \gamma_i(1)$, and either $\gamma'_i$ is constant or $\gamma'_i([0, 1)) \subset \bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{W}(\Omega)} Q$, $|\gamma| \cap Q \neq \emptyset$ then conclusions (i), (iv) also hold for the collection $\{\gamma'_i\}_{i \in I}$.

See Figure 6 for an illustration. The formulation of this lemma in \[NY20\] Lemma 2.10] is slightly different; however, the proof of (i), (ii) and (iii) is identical. The paths $\gamma_i$ are concatenations of subpaths of paths in $\gamma$ and are replacing finitely many arcs of $\gamma$ that cover the set $|\gamma| \cap \partial \Omega$. Hence, using the path $\tilde{\gamma}$ arising from these replacements one essentially avoids the set $|\gamma| \cap \partial \Omega$, except at the endpoints of $\gamma_i$. We provide a sketch of the proof of (iv). One needs to concatenate appropriately the paths $\gamma_i$ that satisfy (i), (iii). If two paths $\gamma_i$, $\gamma_j$, $i \neq j$, meet a common Whitney cube $Q$, then one can concatenate these paths with a line segment inside $Q$. Then one considers a subpath $\gamma_{ij}$ of the concatenation so that (i) and (ii) are satisfied with $\gamma_{ij}$ in place of $\gamma_i$ and $\gamma_j$. After finitely many concatenations, one can obtain the family $\{\tilde{\gamma}_i\}_{i \in I}$ that satisfies all conditions (i), (iv). The last part of the lemma provides some extra freedom in the choice of the paths $\gamma_i$; conclusion (ii) for
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\[ \gamma(0) \quad \gamma(1) \]

\[ \gamma_1 \quad \gamma_2 \quad \gamma_3 \quad \gamma_4 \quad \gamma_5 \quad \gamma_6 \]

\[ \Omega \quad \partial \Omega \]

Figure 6. The path \( \gamma \) (blue) and the paths \( \gamma_i \) given by Lemma 9.6. There are three constant paths \( \gamma_i \). The path \( \tilde{\gamma} \) arises by replacing the arcs of \( \gamma \) between the endpoints of \( \gamma_i \) with \( \gamma_i \).

The collection \( \{ \gamma_i' \}_{i \in I} \) follows from the construction and the other conclusions are immediate since \( \partial \gamma_i' = \partial \gamma_i \) and the trace of the path \( \gamma_i' \) intersects no more Whitney cubes than \( \gamma_i \) does.

**Proof of Theorem 9.2.** We will prove this theorem using Theorem 7.3 (II). Let \( \rho : \mathbb{R}^n \to [0, \infty] \) be a Borel function with \( \rho \in L^n(\mathbb{R}^n) \). We check condition (II-1). The proof of (II-2) is very similar and we omit it. Let \( \gamma \) be a non-constant rectifiable path, and set \( g = \rho + \chi_{\Omega} \). Since \( \Omega \) is bounded (see Remark 9.3), we have \( g \in L^n(\mathbb{R}^n) \). By Lemma 5.2 we have

\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \sum_{\ell(Q) \leq \varepsilon} \left( \int_Q g^n \right)^{1/n} \, dx \\
= \sum_{\ell(Q) \leq \varepsilon} \left( \int_Q g^n \right)^{1/n} m_n(\{ x : |\gamma + x| \cap SH(Q) \neq \emptyset \}) \\
\lesssim_n \sum_{\ell(Q) \leq \varepsilon} \left( \int_Q g^n \right)^{1/n} \max\{ \ell(\gamma), s(Q) \} s(Q)^{n-1}.
\]

Since \( s(\cdot) \in \ell^n(W(\Omega)) \) by (9.1), we have \( s(Q) \leq \ell(\gamma) \) if \( \ell(Q) \leq \varepsilon \) and \( \varepsilon \) is sufficiently small. With this observation and with the aid of Hölder’s inequality, we bound the above sum by

\[
\ell(\gamma) \left( \sum_{\ell(Q) \leq \varepsilon} \int_Q g^n \right)^{1/n} \cdot \left( \sum_{\ell(Q) \leq \varepsilon} s(Q)^n \right)^{1-1/n}.
\]
As $\varepsilon \to 0$, this converges to 0. We conclude that for a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we have

$$(9.2) \quad \sum_{\ell(Q) \leq \varepsilon} \left( \int_Q \rho^n \right)^{1/n} = o(1) \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{\ell(Q) \leq \varepsilon} \ell(Q) = o(1)$$

as $\varepsilon \to 0$.

Let $\gamma$ be a rectifiable path and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be such that (9.2) holds for $\gamma + x$. Let $\eta$ be a strong subpath of $\gamma + x$. We claim that Conclusion $[3] \, \partial \Omega, \rho, \eta$ is true. It suffices to prove this for a simple weak subpath of $\eta$ with the same endpoints that we still denote by $\eta$.

For $\varepsilon > 0$ we apply Lemma 9.6 to the path $\eta$ and obtain a finite collection of paths $\{\eta_i\}_{i \in I}$. To each non-constant path $\eta_i$ we apply Lemma 9.5 and we obtain a path $\eta'_i$ satisfying the conclusions of that lemma; in particular, $\eta'_i$ has the same endpoints as $\eta_i$ and if $|\eta'_i| \cap Q \neq \emptyset$ for some $Q \in \mathcal{W}(\Omega)$, then $|\eta_i| \cap Q \neq \emptyset$. If $\eta_i$ is constant, we set $\eta'_i = \eta_i$. The last part of Lemma 9.6 allows us to replace each $\eta_i$ with $\eta'_i$ while retaining properties (i)–(iv). By Lemma 9.6(i) and (ii) there exists a simple path $\tilde{\eta}$ such that

1. $|\tilde{\eta}| \cap \partial \Omega$ is a finite set (only the endpoints of $\eta'_i$ can potentially lie in $\partial \Omega$), and
2. $\partial \eta = \partial \tilde{\eta}$ and $|\tilde{\eta}| \subset (|\eta| \setminus \partial \Omega) \cup \bigcup_{i \in I} |\eta'_i|$.

We discard the paths $\eta'_i$ whose trace does not intersect $|\tilde{\eta}|$. Furthermore, since the paths $\eta'_i$ satisfy the conclusions of Lemma 9.5 in combination with Lemma 9.6(iii) and (iv) we have

3. $\sum_{i \in I} \ell(\eta'_i) \leq c(n) \sum_{i \in I} \sum_{|\eta'_i| \cap Q \neq \emptyset} \ell(Q) \leq c(n) \sum_{\ell(Q) \leq \varepsilon} \ell(Q)$, and
4. $\sum_{i \in I} \int_{\eta'_i} \rho \, ds \leq c(n) \sum_{i \in I} \sum_{\ell(Q) \leq \varepsilon} \left( \int_Q \rho^n \right)^{1/n} \leq c(n) \sum_{\ell(Q) \leq \varepsilon} \left( \int_Q \rho^n \right)^{1/n}.$

Note that (1) implies [B-i] and (2), (3), (4), together with (9.2), imply [B-iii] and [B-iv]. Finally, given an open neighborhood $U$ of $|\eta|$, if $\varepsilon$ is sufficiently small, the sum of the lengths of $\eta'_i$ is small, and thus $\bigcup_{i \in I} |\eta'_i| \subset U$; this proves [B-ii] \hspace{1cm} \Box

9.2. Projections to axes and NED sets. We present a result for sets whose projection to the coordinate axes have measure zero. This result will be crucial for the proof of Theorem 1.11 which provides an example of negligible sets whose union is non-negligible.

**Theorem 9.7.** Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a set whose projection to each coordinate direction has 1-measure zero. Then $E \in \text{NED}^w$. If, in addition, $m_2(E) = 0$, then $E \in \text{NED}$.

This was proved for closed sets by Ahlfors–Beurling [AB50, Theorem 10]. For sets that are not closed the proof is substantially more complicated. Note that $E$ is not NED in general even if it has measure zero. For example take $E = \mathbb{Q} \times \{0\}$, which is NED either from Theorem 9.7 or from Theorem 9.1. However, its closure is $\overline{E} = \mathbb{R} \times \{0\}$, which has measure zero, but it is not NED since it is not totally disconnected.
The following lemma is very similar to Lemma 9.8. In 2 dimensions the proof is straightforward. There seems to be no immediate generalization of this lemma in higher dimensions and this is the only reason that we present Theorem 9.7 only in dimension 2.

**Lemma 9.8.** Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a set whose projection to each coordinate direction has 1-measure zero. For $t > 0$, denote by $Q_t$ the open square centered at the origin with side length $t$. Let $0 < r < R$ and suppose that $F_1, F_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ are disjoint continua such that $\partial Q_t$ intersects both $F_1$ and $F_2$ for every $r < t < R$. Then

$$\text{Mod}_2(\Gamma(F_1, F_2; Q_R) \cap \mathcal{F}_0(E)) \geq \frac{1}{4} \log \left(\frac{R}{r}\right).$$

**Proof.** Since the projections of $E$ to the coordinate directions have measure zero we have $\partial Q_t \cap E = \emptyset$ for a.e. $t \in (r, R)$. Let $\rho$ be an admissible function for $\Gamma(F_1, F_2; Q_R) \cap \mathcal{F}_0(E)$. Then

$$1 \leq \int_{\partial Q_t} \rho \, ds \leq \left(\int_{\partial Q_t} \rho^2 \, ds\right)^{1/2} \sqrt{4t}$$

for a.e. $t \in (r, R)$. By integration and Fubini’s theorem, we have

$$\frac{1}{4} \log \left(\frac{R}{r}\right) = \int_r^R \frac{1}{4t} \, dt \leq \int_{Q_R \setminus Q_r} \rho^2 \, ds.$$

Infimizing over $\rho$ gives the conclusion. \qed

The proof of the following lemma is exactly the same as the proof of Lemma 4.8 where one uses Lemma 9.8 in place of Lemma 4.5; see Remark 4.9. Since we only proved Lemma 9.9 for $n = 2$, we only state the next lemma in this case.

**Lemma 9.9.** Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be set whose projection to each coordinate direction has 1-measure zero. Then for every open set $U \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ and for every pair of non-empty, disjoint continua $F_1, F_2 \subset U$ we have

$$\text{Mod}_2(\Gamma(F_1, F_2; U) \cap \mathcal{F}_0(E)) = \lim_{r \to 0} \text{Mod}_2(\Gamma(F_1^r, F_2^r; U) \cap \mathcal{F}_0(E)).$$

Except for Lemma 9.9, none of the arguments in the proof of Theorem 9.7 below depend on the dimension.

**Proof of Theorem 9.7**. Let $F_1, F_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be non-empty, disjoint continua. We fix a small $r > 0$ so that $F_1^r \cap F_2^r = \emptyset$ and let $\rho: \mathbb{R}^2 \to [0, \infty]$ be a Borel function with $\rho \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ that is admissible for $\Gamma(F_1^r, F_2^r; \mathbb{R}^2) \cap \mathcal{F}_0(E)$.

Consider a sequence of open sets $\{V_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$, such that $E \subset V_{m+1} \subset V_m \subset N_{1/m}(E)$ and such that the projection of $V_m$ to each coordinate axis has measure less than $1/m$ for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Observe that $\bigcap_{m=1}^\infty V_m$ has 2-measure zero. For each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ define the closed set $X_m = (\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus V_m) \cup F_1^r \cup F_2^r$. Note that a.e. line parallel to a coordinate direction does not intersect the set $\bigcap_{m=1}^\infty V_m$. Hence, a.e. line parallel to a coordinate direction lies in $\bigcup_{m=1}^\infty X_m$. Moreover, if $\gamma$ is a rectifiable path in $X_m$ joining $F_1^r$ to $F_2^r$, then $\gamma$ has a subpath in $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus V_m \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus E$ joining $F_1^r$ to $F_2^r$. By the admissibility of $\rho$, we obtain

$$\int \rho \, ds \geq 1.$$
For each $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we define on $X_m$ the function
\[ g_m(x) = \min \left\{ \inf_{\gamma_x} \int_{\gamma_x} \rho \, ds, 1 \right\} \]
where the infimum is taken over all rectifiable paths $\gamma_x$ in $X_m$ that connect $F_1^r$ to $x$. By [101 Corollary 1.10], the function $g_m$ is Borel measurable; the fact that $X_m$ is closed, thus complete, is important here. One can alternatively argue using [15 Lemma 7.2.13, p. 187]. Moreover, we have $0 \leq g_m \leq 1$, $g_m = 0$ on $F_1^r$, and $g_m = 1$ on $F_2^r$. Next, we show that $\rho$ is an upper gradient of $g_m$. That is,
\[ |g_m(y) - g_m(x)| \leq \int_{\gamma} \rho \, ds \]
for every rectifiable path $\gamma : [0, 1] \to X_m$ with $\gamma(0) = x$ and $\gamma(1) = y$. Since the roles of $x$ and $y$ are symmetric, we will only show that
\[ g_m(y) - g_m(x) \leq \int_{\gamma} \rho \, ds. \]
If $g_m(y) = 1$, then this inequality is immediate, since then $g_m(y) - g_m(x) \leq 0$. Suppose $g_m(y) = \inf_{\gamma_y} \int_{\gamma_y} \rho \, ds$. We fix a curve $\gamma_x$ joining $F_1^r$ to $x$. Define a curve $\gamma_y$ by concatenating $\gamma_x$ with $\gamma$. Then
\[ g_m(y) \leq \int_{\gamma_y} \rho \, ds = \int_{\gamma_x} \rho \, ds + \int_{\gamma_x} \rho \, ds. \]
Infimizing over $\gamma_x$ gives the desired inequality.

The sequence of sets $\{X_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is increasing. Thus, if $k \geq m$, then $g_k$ is defined by infimizing over a larger collection of paths compared to the definition of $g_m$. It follows that $0 \leq g_k \leq g_m$ in $X_m$. Therefore, for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $g_k$ converges pointwise as $k \to \infty$ to a Borel function $g$ in $X_m$. Moreover, by the pointwise convergence, for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ the function $\rho$ is an upper gradient of $g$ in $X_m$, $0 \leq g \leq 1$ in $\bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} X_m$, $g = 0$ in a neighborhood of $F_1$, and $g = 1$ in a neighborhood of $F_2$. On $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} X_m \subset \bigcap_{m=1}^{\infty} V_m$ we define $g = 0$. Thus, we have extended $g$ to a Borel function in $\mathbb{R}^2$.

We claim that $g$ is absolutely continuous in a.e. line segment parallel to a coordinate direction. Let $L$ be a line segment parallel to $e_1 = (1, 0)$. By construction, for $\mathcal{H}^1$ a.e. $z \in \{e_1\}^\perp$ the line segment $L + z$ lies in $\bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} X_m$. Moreover, since $\rho \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$, we have $\int_{L + z} \rho \, ds < \infty$ for a.e. $z \in \{e_1\}^\perp$. By the upper gradient inequality we conclude that $g$ is absolutely continuous in $L + z$ for a.e. $z \in \{e_1\}^\perp$ and $|g_x| \leq \rho$ almost everywhere on $L + z$. This implies that $|g_x| \leq \rho$ a.e. Similarly, $|g_y| \leq \rho$ a.e. Thus, $g$ lies in the classical Sobolev space $W_{1,2}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and $|\nabla g| \leq \sqrt{2\rho}$ a.e. in $\mathbb{R}^2$; see [89, Theorem 2.1.4, p. 44].

If $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus E \neq \emptyset$, then each $x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus E$ has a bounded open neighborhood $Y$ that is disjoint from $V_m$ for sufficiently large $m$, since $V_m \subset N_{1/m}(E)$. Thus, $Y \subset X_m$ and $g \in W^{1,2}(Y)$. Since $\rho$ is an upper gradient of $g$ in $Y$, by [3 Corollary 7.15] we conclude that $|\nabla g| \leq \rho$, a.e. in $Y$. Therefore, $|\nabla g| \leq \rho$ a.e. in $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus E$. Summarizing, at a.e. point of $\mathbb{R}^2$ we have
\[ |\nabla g| \leq \rho \chi_{\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus E} + \sqrt{2\rho} \chi_{\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus E}. \]

Since $g = 0$ in a neighborhood of $F_1$ and $g = 1$ in a neighborhood of $F_2$, for each $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists (by mollification) a smooth function $g_\varepsilon$ on $\mathbb{R}^2$ with the same
properties and with \( \| \nabla g_c \|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 \leq \| \nabla g \|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 + \varepsilon \); see \cite{Zie89} Lemma 2.1.3, p. 43.

It is immediate that \( \| \nabla g_c \| \) is admissible for \( \Gamma(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^2) \). Thus,

\[
\text{Mod}_2 \Gamma(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^2) \leq \| \nabla g_c \|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 \leq \| \rho \|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2, E)}^2 + 2 \| \rho \|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 + \varepsilon.
\]

First we let \( \varepsilon \to 0 \), and then we minimize over \( \rho \) to obtain

\[
\text{Mod}_2 \Gamma(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^2) \leq c_0 \text{Mod}_2(\Gamma(F_1^*, F_2^*; \mathbb{R}^2) \cap F_0(E)),
\]

where \( c_0 = 1 \) if \( m_2(E) = 0 \) and \( c_0 = 2 \) otherwise. Now, we let \( r \to 0 \) and by Lemma \ref{lemma} we obtain

\[
\text{Mod}_2 \Gamma(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^2) \leq c_0 \text{Mod}_2(\Gamma(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^2) \cap F_0(E)).
\]

This completes the proof. \( \square \)

9.3. A non-measurable CNED set. Sierpiński \cite{Sie20} constructed a striking example of a non-measurable set \( E \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \) such that every line intersects \( E \) in at most two points. The construction involves the axiom of choice but not the continuum hypothesis. This example served at that time as a counterexample to the converse of Fubini’s theorem: if the slices of a planar set are measurable, then is the whole set measurable? We show here that Sierpiński’s set is CNED. Thus, it is necessary to impose the assumption of measurability in Lemma \ref{lemma} in order to derive that CNED sets have measure zero.

**Proposition 9.10.** There exists a non-measurable set \( E \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \) with \( E \in \text{CNED} \).

**Proof.** Let \( F_1, F_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \) be non-empty, disjoint continua. We will show that

\[
\text{Mod}_2 \Gamma(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^2) \leq \text{Mod}_2(\Gamma(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^2) \cap F_0(E)).
\]

According to a remarkable result of Aseev \cite{Asc09} Proposition 2.1], we have

\[
\text{Mod}_2 \Gamma(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^2) = \text{Mod}_2(\Gamma(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^2) \cap \mathcal{F}),
\]

where \( \mathcal{F} \) is the family of piecewise linear curves with respect to \( \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus (F_1 \cup F_2) \); that is, \( \gamma \in \mathcal{F} \) if each point of \( |\gamma| \setminus (F_1 \cup F_2) \) has a neighborhood \( V \) such that \( |\gamma| \cap V \) consists of finitely many straight line segments. Hence, it suffices to show that

\[
\Gamma(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^2) \cap \mathcal{F} \subset \Gamma(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^2) \cap F_0(E).
\]

Let \( \gamma \in \Gamma(F_1, F_2; \mathbb{R}^2) \cap \mathcal{F} \). By the properties of the set \( E \), and since \( \gamma \) is piecewise linear, the set \( |\gamma| \cap E \) is countable. Hence, \( \gamma \in F_0(E) \), as desired. \( \square \)

10. Examples of non-negligible sets

**Proof of Proposition 10.1** Let \( E \) be the residual set of a packing as in the statement. Let \( \Gamma_0 \) denote the family of curves whose trace intersects the countable set

\[
S = \bigcup_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}, i \neq j, i \neq j} (\partial D_i \cap \partial D_j).
\]

Since the family of curves passing through a point has \( n \)-modulus zero, by the subadditivity of modulus we obtain \( \text{Mod}_n \Gamma_0 = 0 \). Consider two non-empty continua \( F_1, F_2 \), contained in \( D_1, D_2 \), respectively. We claim that

\[
(10.1) \quad \Gamma(F_1, F_2; D_0) \cap F_0(E) \subset \Gamma_0.
\]
This will imply that \( E \notin \text{CNED}. \)

Let \( \gamma \in \Gamma(F_1, F_2; D_0) \setminus \Gamma_0. \) By considering a weak subpath, we assume that \( \gamma \) is a simple path with the same properties. We consider an injective parametrization \( \gamma: [0, 1] \rightarrow D_0. \) Let \( A \) be the set of \( t \in [0, 1] \) such that there exists \( \delta > 0 \) and \( i \in \mathbb{N} \) with the property that \( (t - \delta, t) \cup (t, t + \delta) \subseteq D_i \) and \( \gamma(t) \in \partial D_i; \) that is, \( \gamma \) “bounces” on \( \partial D_i \) at time \( t. \) Then \( A \) is countable and relatively open in \( \gamma^{-1}(E). \)

We claim that the compact set \( B = \gamma^{-1}(E) \setminus A \) is perfect. Let \( t \in B \) and let \( I \subset [0, 1] \) be an open interval containing \( t. \) We consider two cases. \textbf{Case 1:} Suppose that \( \gamma(I) \subset E. \) Since \( A \) is countable, there exists \( s \in I \setminus A, s \neq t, \) with \( \gamma(s) \in E. \) Hence \( (I \setminus \{ t \}) \cap B \neq \emptyset. \) \textbf{Case 2:} Suppose that \( \gamma(I) \) intersects \( D_{i_0} \) for some \( i_0 \in \mathbb{N}. \)

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{Case 2a:} If \( \gamma(t) \notin \partial D_{i_0}, \) there exists \( s \in I, \) say with \( s < t, \) such that \( \gamma(s) \in \partial D_{i_0} \) and \( \gamma((s,t)) \cap D_{i_0} = \emptyset. \) Thus, \( s \notin A. \) It also follows in this case that \( s \in I \cap B, \) so \( (I \setminus \{ t \}) \cap B \neq \emptyset. \) \textbf{Case 2b:} Finally, suppose that \( t \notin \partial D_{i_0}. \) Since \( t \notin A, \) there exists a subinterval of \( I, \) say \( J = (s,t) \) such that \( \gamma(J) \) intersects the complement of \( D_{i_0}. \)

If \( \gamma(J) \subset E, \) then by Case 1 we have \( (I \setminus \{ t \}) \cap B \neq \emptyset. \) Suppose that \( \gamma(J) \) intersects \( D_{i_1} \) for some \( i_1 \neq i_0. \) Then there exists \( s_1 \in J \) such that \( \gamma(s_1) \in \partial D_{i_1}. \) Since \( \gamma \notin \Gamma_0, \) we conclude that \( \gamma(s_1) \neq \gamma(t), \) so \( s_1 \neq t. \) It follows that \( (I \setminus \{ t \}) \cap B \neq \emptyset. \)

Since \( B \) is perfect, it is uncountable, and thus \( |\gamma| \cap E \) is uncountable. Hence, \( \gamma \notin \mathcal{F}_x(E) \) and we have completed the proof of (10.1).

\[ \square \]

\textbf{Remark 10.1.} One can relax the assumption of the proposition to requiring that \( \partial D_i \cap \partial D_j, i \neq j, \) has Sobolev \( n \)-capacity zero (see [HKST15, Section 7.2] for the definition). Then the family of curves passing through \( \partial D_i \cap \partial D_j \) has \( n \)-modulus zero.

Next, we proceed with the proof of Theorem \ref{thm1.11}. We establish a preliminary elementary result.

\textbf{Lemma 10.2.} Let \( U \subset \mathbb{R} \) be an open set and \( E \subset \mathbb{R} \) be a compact set with \( m_1(E) > 0. \) Then there exists a sequence of similarities \( \tau_i: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, i \in \mathbb{N}, \) and a set \( N \subset \mathbb{R} \) with \( m_1(N) = 0 \) such that

\[ U = N \cup \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \tau_i(E). \]

\textbf{Proof.} Suppose that \( E \subset (a, b) \) and set \( \lambda = m_1(E)/(b-a). \) Moreover, suppose that \( U \) is bounded. Let \( U_0 = U \) and let \( I_{0,i}, i \in \mathbb{N}, \) be the connected components of \( U_0, \) which are bounded open intervals. For each \( i \in \mathbb{N}, \) define \( \tau_{0,i} \) to be the similarity that maps \( (a, b) \) onto \( I_{0,i}. \) Then \( m_1(\tau_{0,i}(E))/m_1(I_{0,i}) = \lambda \) and

\[ m_1 \left( \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \tau_{0,i}(E) \right) = \lambda m_1(U_0). \]

We now define \( U_1 = U_0 \setminus \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \tau_{0,i}(E), \) which is open, and note that \( m_1(U_1) = (1-\lambda)m_1(U_0). \) We proceed in the same way to obtain similarities \( \tau_{1,i}, i \in \mathbb{N}, \) that map \( (a, \hat{b}) \) to the connected components of \( U_1. \) In the \( k \)-th step, we obtain the set

\[ U_k = U_0 \setminus \bigcup_{j=0}^{k-1} \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \tau_{j,i}(E) \]

with \( m_1(U_k) = (1-\lambda)^k m_1(U_0). \) Thus, \( N = U_0 \setminus \bigcup_{j=0}^{\infty} \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \tau_{j,i}(E) \) is a null set, as desired.
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If $U$ is unbounded, we can simply write it as a countable union of bounded open sets and apply the previous result to each of them. □

Proof of Theorem 1.11: Example with $E_1 \cup E_2 \notin NED$. Let $F \subset [0,1]$ be a compact NED set in the plane with $m_1(F) > 0$. Such sets were constructed by Ahlfors and Beurling [AB50, Theorem 17]. By Lemma 10.2, there exist countably many scaled and translated copies $F_i$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$, of $F$, such that the set $E_1 = [0,1] \setminus \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} F_i$ has 1-measure zero. By Theorem 1.6, the set $E_1$ is NED in the plane. Each $F_i$ is the image of $F$ under a conformal map of the plane. Thus, each $F_i$ is NED and compact. By Theorem 1.7, the set $E_2 = \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} F_i$ is NED. However, $E_1 \cup E_2 = [0,1]$, which is not NED, since NED sets in the plane are necessarily totally disconnected. □

Proof of Theorem 1.11: Example with $E_1 \cup E_2 \notin CNED$. According to a construction of Wu [Wu98, Example 2], there exist Cantor sets $G, F \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that $m_1(G) = 0$, $m_1(F) > 0$, and $G \times F$ is removable for the Sobolev space $W^{1,2}$. Thus, $G \times F$ is of class $NED \subset CNED$; this follows from [VG77].

Consider the sets $E_1$ and $E_2$ from the previous proof, constructed using the set $F$ from here. That is, $m_1(E_1) = 0$, $E_2$ is a countable union of scaled and translated copies $F_i$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$, of $F$, and $E_1 \cup E_2 = [0,1]$. We have

$$G \times [0,1] = G \times (E_1 \cup E_2) = (G \times E_1) \cup (G \times E_2).$$

The set $G \times [0,1]$ is non-removable for quasiconformal homeomorphisms (recall the discussion in the Introduction), so it is not CNED by Corollary 1.3; this can also be proved directly.

On the other hand, for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$ the set $G \times F_i$ is the quasiconformal image of $G \times F$, which is NED. Closed NED sets are invariant under quasiconformal maps by Corollary 7.2 (this also follows from [AB50, Theorem 4]). Thus, $G \times F_i$ is NED for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$. By Theorem 1.7 we conclude that

$$G \times E_2 = \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} G \times F_i \notin NED.$$

Finally, note that the projections of the set $G \times E_1$ to the coordinate axes have measure zero. Moreover, $\overline{G \times F_1} \subset G \times [0,1]$, and the latter has 2-measure zero. By Theorem 1.7 we conclude that $G \times E_1 \notin NED$. □

11. APPLICATION TO RIGIDITY OF CIRCLE DOMAINS

We define $\overline{\mathbb{R}^n} = \mathbb{R}^n \cup \{\infty\}$, i.e., the one point compactification of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Thus, $\overline{\mathbb{R}^n}$ is homeomorphic to an $n$-sphere. A domain $\Omega \subset \overline{\mathbb{R}^n}$ is called a spherical domain if each component of $\partial \Omega$ is an $(n-1)$-sphere or a point. We state a slightly more general version of Theorem 1.9.

**Theorem 11.1.** Let $\Omega, \Omega' \subset \overline{\mathbb{R}^n}$ be spherical domains such that $\infty \in \Omega$, $\infty \in \Omega'$, and $\partial \Omega \in CNED$, and let $K \geq 1$. Then every $K$-quasiconformal homeomorphism from $\Omega$ onto $\Omega'$ that extends to a homeomorphism from $\overline{\Omega}$ onto $\overline{\Omega'}$ is the restriction of a $K$-quasiconformal homeomorphism of $\overline{\mathbb{R}^n}$.

Since the maps under consideration map $\infty$ to $\infty$, quasiconformality in a domain $\Omega$ containing $\infty$ is to be understood as quasiconformality in $\Omega \setminus \{\infty\}$, in the usual sense.
Proof. Let \( f : \Omega \to \Omega' \) be a homeomorphism that is \( K \)-quasiconformal in \( \Omega \). The first step is to extend \( f \) to a homeomorphism of \( \mathbb{R}^n \). This can be achieved through reflections across the boundary spheres of \( \Omega \). A detailed proof in two dimensions can be found in [NY20] Section 7.1. Here we highlight the important features of the extension procedure.

We denote by \( S_i, i \in I \), the collection of \((n-1)\)-spheres in \( \partial \Omega \), by \( B_i \) the open ball bounded by \( S_i \) and by \( R_i \) the reflection across the sphere \( S_i, i \in I \). Consider the free discrete group generated by the family of reflections \( \{ R_i \}_{i \in I} \). This is called the Schottky group of \( \Omega \) and is denoted by \( \Gamma(\Omega) \). Each \( T \in \Gamma(\Omega) \) that is not the identity can be expressed uniquely as \( T = R_{i_1} \circ \cdots \circ R_{i_k} \), where \( i_j \neq i_{j+1} \) for \( j \in \{1, \ldots, k-1\} \).

Since \( f \) extends to a homeomorphism between \( \Omega \) and \( \Omega' \), there exists a natural bijection between \( \Gamma(\Omega) \) and \( \Gamma(\Omega') \), induced by \( f \). Namely, if \( R_i^* \) is the reflection across the sphere \( S_i^* = f(S_i) \), then for \( T = R_{i_1} \circ \cdots \circ R_{i_k} \) we define \( T^* = R_{i_1}^* \circ \cdots \circ R_{i_k}^* \).

By [NY20] Lemma 7.5, there exists a unique extension of \( f \) to a homeomorphism \( f \) of \( \mathbb{R}^n \) with the property that \( T^* = \tilde{f} \circ T \circ \tilde{f}^{-1} \) for each \( T \in \Gamma(\Omega) \). We will verify that \( \tilde{f} \) is \( K \)-quasiconformal. For simplicity, we use the notation \( f \) instead of \( \tilde{f} \).

For each point \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \) we have the following trichotomy; see Lemma 7.2 and Corollary 7.4 in [NY20].

(i) \( x \in T(\Omega) \) for some \( T \in \Gamma(\Omega) \).
(ii) \( x \in T(\partial \Omega) \) for some \( T \in \Gamma(\Omega) \).
(iii) There exists a sequence of indices \( \{ i_j \}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \) with \( i_j \neq i_{j+1} \) and disks \( D_0 = B_{i_1}, D_k = R_{i_1} \circ \cdots \circ R_{i_k}(B_{i_{k+1}}) \) such that \( D_{k+1} \subset D_k \) for each \( k \geq 0 \) and \( \{ x \} = \bigcap_{k=0}^{\infty} D_k \).

Note that at each point \( x \in \bigcup_{T \in \Gamma(\Omega)} T(\Omega) \) the mapping \( f \) is \( K \)-quasiconformal, so \( \lim_{r \to 0} E_f(x, r) \) is uniformly bounded, depending on \( n \) and \( K \). Next, each \( T \in \Gamma(\Omega) \) is (orientation-preserving or -reversing) conformal in a neighborhood of \( \partial \Omega \). Since \( \partial \Omega \in \text{CNED} \), by Corollary 7.2 we have \( T(\partial \Omega) \in \text{CNED} \). Theorem 1.7 implies that
\[
E := \bigcup_{T \in \Gamma(\Omega)} T(\partial \Omega) \in \text{CNED}.
\]

Finally, if \( x \in S = \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \left( \bigcup_{T \in \Gamma(\Omega)} T(\Omega) \cup T(\partial \Omega) \right) \), then by the trichotomy and the definition of \( f \), there exists a sequence of balls \( D_k, k \in \mathbb{N} \), shrinking to \( x \) such that \( f(D_k), k \in \mathbb{N} \), are balls shrinking to \( f(x) \). It follows that \( \lim_{r \to 0} E_f(x, r) = 1 \). By Theorem 1.2 we conclude that \( f \) is \( c(n, K) \)-quasiconformal.

In order to show that \( f \) is \( K \)-quasiconformal in \( \mathbb{R}^n \), since \( m_n(E) = 0 \) by Lemma 2.5 it suffices to verify that \( \|Df(x)\|^n \leq KJ_f(x) \) for a.e. \( x \in S \). Let \( x \in S \) be a point of differentiability of \( f \). Since there exists a sequence of balls \( D_k \) shrinking to \( x \) such that the balls \( f(D_k) \) shrink to \( f(x) \), it is elementary to show that \( Df(x) \) is a conformal linear map, i.e., \( \|Df(x)\|^n = |J_f(x)| \); see [BKM09] Lemma 6.1 for a proof of this fact. Finally, note that \( J_f(x) \geq 0 \) a.e. since \( f \) is orientation-preserving. This completes the proof and shows that \( f \) is in fact, conformal on the set \( S \). \( \square \)
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