

ON RANDOM COVERING OF THE CIRCLE WITH NON-UNIFORMLY DISTRIBUTED CENTERS

MICHIHIRO HIRAYAMA AND DAVIT KARAGULYAN

ABSTRACT. The classical Dvoretzky covering problem asks for conditions on the sequence of lengths $\{\ell_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ so that the random intervals $I_n := (\omega_n - (\ell_n/2), \omega_n + (\ell_n/2))$ where ω_n is a sequence of i.i.d. uniformly distributed random variable, covers any point on the circle \mathbb{T} infinitely often. We consider the case when ω_n are absolutely continuous with a density function f . When $m_f = \text{ess\,inf}_{\mathbb{T}} f > 0$ and the set K_f of its essential infimum points satisfies $\overline{\dim}_{\mathbb{B}} K_f < 1$, where $\overline{\dim}_{\mathbb{B}}$ is the upper box-counting dimension, we show that the following condition is necessary and sufficient for \mathbb{T} to be μ_f -Dvoretzky covered

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{\ell_1 + \cdots + \ell_n}{\ln n} \right) \geq \frac{1}{m_f}.$$

Under more restrictive assumptions on $\{\ell_n\}$ the above result is true if $\dim_H K_f < 1$. We next show that as long as $\{\ell_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and f satisfy the above condition and $|K_f| = 0$, then a Menshov type result holds, i.e. Dvoretzky covering can be achieved by changing f on a set of arbitrarily small Lebesgue measure. This, however, is not true for the uniform density.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
1.1. Non-uniform Dvoretzky covering	3
2. Some definitions	5
3. Necessary condition for non-uniform Dvoretzky covering of \mathbb{T}	6
3.1. Necessary condition of Shepp type	6
3.2. Almost sure convergence for convolution operators and approximate identities	7
3.3. Necessary condition of Kahane-Hawkes type: Proof of Theorem 1-(a)	18
3.4. Comparison between uniform and non-uniform Dvoretzky coverings	19
4. Proof of Theorem 1	20
5. Proof of Theorem 2	20
5.1. Proof of Theorem 2-(a)	20
5.2. Proof of Theorem 2-(b): Part I	24
5.3. Proof of Theorem 2-(b): Part II	26
6. Proof of Theorem 3	28
7. Proof of Theorem 4	34
References	34

Date: October 15, 2021.

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

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $(\ell_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of positive numbers with $0 < \ell_n < 1$ and $\{\omega_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ a sequence of i.i.d. random variables on the circle $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$. Consider the random intervals

$$I_n := (\omega_n - (\ell_n/2), \omega_n + (\ell_n/2)).$$

If $\{\omega_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ are uniformly distributed on \mathbb{T} , the Borel-Cantelli lemma assures that Lebesgue almost every (a.e. for short) point on \mathbb{T} is covered infinitely often with probability one if and only if $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \ell_n = \infty$. Moreover, $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \ell_n < \infty$ implies that Lebesgue a.e. point in \mathbb{T} is covered finitely often with probability one. In [3], Dvoretzky asked the question whether $\mathbb{T} = \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} I_n(\omega)$ a.s. This condition means that every point on \mathbb{T} is covered infinitely often with the intervals I_n . Kahane [9] proved that $\mathbb{T} = \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} I_n(\omega)$ a.s. when $\ell_n = \frac{c}{n}$ with $c > 1$, but this is not the case with $0 < c < 1$ as was proved by Billard [1]. The case $\ell_n = \frac{1}{n}$ was solved by Mandelbrot [15]. A complete answer was obtained by Shepp [17]: $\mathbb{T} = \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} I_n(\omega)$ a.s. if and only if

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2} \exp(\ell_1 + \dots + \ell_n) = \infty.$$

We remark that in [5] the authors extend this result to the case of all absolutely continuous measures: more specifically they show that for the absolutely continuous measure with the density f there is Dvoretzky covering for the sequence $\ell_n = \frac{c}{n}$ if and only if $m_f c \geq 1$, where m_f is the essential infimum of f .

The Dvoretzky covering problem has also been studied for compact sets F . It is known that a compact sets $F \subset \mathbb{T}$ is covered if and only if

$$(1.1) \quad \text{Cap}(F) = 0$$

where (1.1) means that for any Borel probability measure σ supported on F we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \Phi(t, s) d\sigma(t) d\sigma(s) = +\infty,$$

where

$$\Phi(t, s) = \exp \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (\ell_n - |t - s|)_+ \right).$$

This is called *Kahane's condition*, which was obtained by J-P. Kahane [11]. If (1.1) does not hold we write $\text{Cap}(F) > 0$.

For further information on the Dvoretzky random covering, please refer to [10]. The Hausdorff dimension of the set that is covered infinitely often by the sequence $\ell_n = 1/n^\alpha$ was first calculated by Fan and Wu [7]. The Hausdorff dimensions of the set of the form $I(x) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} J_n(x)$, where $J_n(x) = (x_n - r_n, x_n + r_n)$ and $x_{n+1} = 2x_n \pmod{1}$, was calculated by Fan, Schmeling and Troubetzkoy in [6]. Persson and Rams [16] considered the same problem for general piecewise expanding maps. In [18], J. Tang found the optimal exponent t for covering for the sequence $1/n^t$ and for any measure μ in the sense of Dvoretzky. We remark that when μ is absolutely continuous, the optimal covering exponent t is 1.

1.1. Non-uniform Dvoretzky covering. Let μ be the distribution of ω_n . In this paper, we study the Dvoretzky covering problem when μ admits a density. Note that when the density is the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{T} , then it is the classical Dvoretzky covering problem mentioned above. To distinguish the classical and non-classical cases we will denote the probability measure admitting a (non-uniform) density $f \in L^1(\mathbb{T})$ by μ_f and will say that \mathbb{T} is μ_f -Dvoretzky covered if $\mathbb{T} = \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} I_n(\omega)$ a.s..

The study of non-uniform Dvoretzky covering problem was first carried out in the aforementioned literature [5]. For the uniform density one can use techniques such as Poisson coverings. However, these methods are based on the homogeneity property of the uniform density and they are less practical for non-uniform densities. In [5] the authors introduce a comparison principle which helps to verify Dvoretzky covering at different parts of the circle and give a sufficient condition for covering when $m_f > 0$ as follows: if the conditions

$$(1.2) \quad \text{for all } a > m_f, \quad \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2} e^{a(\ell_1 + \dots + \ell_n)} = \infty;$$

and

$$(1.3) \quad \text{Cap}_{m_f}(K_f) = 0,$$

are fulfilled, then the circle \mathbb{T} is μ_f -Dvoretzky covered ([5, Proposition 5.2]). Here $K_f \subset \mathbb{T}$ is the set of essential infimum points of f , and Cap_{m_f} is the capacity with respect to $\Phi^{(m_f)}$. (See Section 2 for definitions.) It is then natural to ask whether these two conditions are also necessary for covering. In this paper, we study several aspects of this issue.

1.1.1. Statement of results. In [5], the authors also show that if f is sufficiently “flat” (for example Lipschitz) around the set K_f , then the conditions (1.2) and (1.3) are also necessary for a μ_f -Dvoretzky covering of \mathbb{T} ([5, Corollary 1.1-(2)]). In this paper we prove results which do not impose any regularity assumptions on the function f . The assumptions are rather imposed on the “size” of the set K_f or the properties of $\{\ell_n\}_{n \geq 1}$. We now state our first Theorem:

Theorem 1. *Let $f \in L^1(\mathbb{T})$ be a probability density function, and $\{\ell_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a decreasing sequence of positive numbers with $0 < \ell_n < 1$.*

(a) *Then the following condition is necessary for μ_f -Dvoretzky covering:*

$$(1.4) \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{\ell_1 + \dots + \ell_n}{\ln n} \right) \geq \frac{1}{m_f},$$

with the convention that $1/m_f = \infty$ when $m_f = 0$.

(b) *If $m_f > 0$ and $\overline{\dim}_B K_f < 1$, then (1.4) is necessary and sufficient for covering.*

Here $\overline{\dim}_B$ denotes the upper box-counting dimension. Note that the condition (1.4) in Theorem 1 is, in fact, equivalent to condition (1.2) (see Lemma 5). In other words, the condition (1.3) can be omitted when K_f is “small” in terms of upper box-counting dimension. On the other hand, we will see that (1.2) is a necessary condition for covering (see Proposition 1, Section 3.1).

Remark 1. Theorem 1 is also true under the weaker assumption $\dim_{\mathbb{P}} K_f < 1$, where $\dim_{\mathbb{P}}$ is the packing dimension. (We refer the reader to [4, Section 3.4] for its definition and properties.) By [4, Proposition 3.8] we have $\dim_{\mathbb{P}} F = \inf\{\sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \overline{\dim}_{\mathbb{B}} F_i : F \subset \cup F_i\}$, where the infimum is taken over all countable covers $\{F_i\}$ of F . Therefore, once Theorem 1 is obtained one can replace $\overline{\dim}_{\mathbb{B}} K_f < 1$ with $\dim_{\mathbb{P}} K_f < 1$. We will omit the details of the proof.

It seems natural to ask whether the result above is true under the assumption $\overline{\dim}_{\mathbb{B}} K_f = 1$ or a (much) weaker assumption $\dim_{\mathbb{H}} K_f < 1$, where $\dim_{\mathbb{H}}$ denotes the Hausdorff dimension (recall that $\dim_{\mathbb{H}} K_f \leq \underline{\dim}_{\mathbb{B}} K_f$). The following result shows that the answer to this question is negative:

Theorem 2. *We have the following claims.*

- (a) *Theorem 1-(b) is not true under the assumption $\dim_{\mathbb{H}} K_f < 1$, that is, there exist a probability density function f with $m_f > 0$ and $\dim_{\mathbb{H}} K_f < \overline{\dim}_{\mathbb{B}} K_f = 1$, and a sequence $\{\ell_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfying (1.4) such that there is no μ_f -Dvoretzky covering for \mathbb{T} .*
- (b) *For the sequence $\ell_n = \frac{1}{m_f} \left(\frac{1}{n} - \frac{1+\beta}{n \ln n} \right)$ ($\beta > 1$) and every density function f , with $m_f > 0$ and $\dim_{\mathbb{H}} K_f < 1$ the circle is μ_f -Dvoretzky covered if and only if (1.4) holds. However, there also exists f , with $m_f > 0$ and $\dim_{\mathbb{H}} K_f = 1$, for which (1.4) is fulfilled but \mathbb{T} is not μ_f -Dvoretzky covered.*

Remark 2. The first half of Theorem 2-(b) also holds when $m_f > 0$, $\dim_{\mathbb{H}} K_f < 1$ and $\dim_{\mathbb{H}} K_f < \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} m_f n \ell_n$ and $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} m_f n \ell_n < \infty$.

It is clear from Theorem 2 that condition (1.4) is not always sufficient for covering. Nevertheless, we show that (1.4) is in fact a “generic” condition for μ_f -Dvoretzky covering when $|K_f| = 0$. (Here and below, we denote by $|\cdot|$ the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{T} .) Namely, when $|K_f| = 0$, Dvoretzky covering can be achieved by changing f on a set of arbitrarily small Lebesgue measure. Note that the case $m_f = 0$ is allowed in the following result.

Theorem 3. *Let f be a probability density function and $\{\ell_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a decreasing sequence of positive numbers with $0 < \ell_n < 1$ satisfying (1.4). Assume that there is no μ_f -Dvoretzky covering. If $|K_f| = 0$, then for every $\varepsilon > 0$ one can find a density function f_0 so that $m_{f_0} = m_f$, $K_{f_0} = K_f$,*

$$|\{x \in \mathbb{T} : f(x) \neq f_0(x)\}| \leq \varepsilon,$$

and the circle is μ_{f_0} -Dvoretzky covered for $\{\ell_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$.

Remark 3. Theorem 3 is not true when $|K_f| > 0$. In Corollary 1 below we show that if for a sequence $\{\ell_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ there is no Dvoretzky covering in the classical sense, then there can be no covering with respect to any absolute continuous measure, even if (1.4) is fulfilled.

When $m_f < 1$, some additional assumptions on K_f and f might be needed, since we may have $f(x) = 0$, for all $x \in [a, b]$.

As a corollary from Theorems 3 and 2, we arrive at the following result:

Theorem 4. *Condition (1.2) is necessary for μ_f -Dvoretzky covering, but (1.3) can be dropped in certain cases, i.e. there exists a sequence $\{\ell_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and a probability density function f , such that $\text{Cap}_{m_f}(K_f) > 0$ but \mathbb{T} is μ_f -Dvoretzky covered.*

In Section 3.1 we show the necessity of the Shepp type condition (1.2) for non-uniform Dvoretzky covering (Proposition 1), and in Section 3.3 we obtain another necessary condition of Kahane-Hawkes type (Proposition 3) which, in fact, is equivalent to (1.2).

2. SOME DEFINITIONS

Essential infimum. For a function $f: \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $J \subset \mathbb{T}$ with $|J| > 0$, define the *essential infimum* of f on J by

$$\text{ess inf}_J f = \sup\{a \in \mathbb{R} : f(x) \geq a \text{ for Lebesgue almost every } x \in J\}.$$

We denote $m_f = \text{ess inf}_{\mathbb{T}} f$. Then the *set of essential infimum points* is defined by

$$K_f = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{T} : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{ess inf}_{B(x, 1/n)} f = m_f \right\},$$

where $B(x, r)$ denotes the ball centered at x of radius r . For every Borel measurable function $f: \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the set K_f is non-empty and compact ([5, Proposition 2.1]).

Hausdorff dimension and box dimension. We recall briefly the notion of Hausdorff dimension and box dimension. See, for example, [4].

Let (X, d) be a metric space and $\alpha \geq 0$. For $Y \subset X$, set

$$\mathcal{H}_\delta^\alpha(Y) = \inf \left\{ \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} (\text{diam} V_i)^\alpha \right\},$$

where the infimum is taken over all covers of Y by a countable collection of subsets $V_i \subset X$ with $\text{diam} V_i \leq \delta$. The α -dimensional Hausdorff measure of Y is defined as

$$\mathcal{H}^\alpha(Y) = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{H}_\delta^\alpha(Y).$$

The limit exists and \mathcal{H}^α defines an outer measure. The *Hausdorff dimension* $\dim_{\text{H}} Y$ of Y is defined by

$$\dim_{\text{H}} Y = \sup \{\alpha : \mathcal{H}^\alpha(Y) = \infty\} = \inf \{\alpha : \mathcal{H}^\alpha(Y) = 0\}.$$

For any non-empty bounded set $Z \subset X$ and $\delta \in (0, \infty)$, let $M(Z, \delta)$ be the smallest number of δ -balls needed to cover Z . The *lower* and *upper box dimensions* of Z are defined as

$$\underline{\dim}_{\text{B}} Z = \liminf_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\ln M(Z, \delta)}{-\ln \delta}$$

and

$$\overline{\dim}_{\text{B}} Z = \limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\ln M(Z, \delta)}{-\ln \delta},$$

respectively. If these are equal, then the common value is referred to as the *box-counting* or *box dimension* of Z and denoted by $\dim_{\text{B}} Z$. (There are several equivalent definitions of box dimension.) It is sometimes referred to as the *Minkowski dimension*.

It is known that $\dim_{\text{H}} Z \leq \underline{\dim}_{\text{B}} Z \leq \overline{\dim}_{\text{B}} Z$, and these inequalities can be strict.

Capacity. For $a > 0$, define

$$\Phi^{(a)}(t, s) = \exp \left\{ a \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (\ell_n - |t - s|)_+ \right\},$$

where $(d)_+ = \max\{d, 0\}$. Let $F \subset \mathbb{T}$ be a compact set. We say F has zero capacity with respect to $\Phi^{(a)}$ and denote by $\text{Cap}_a(F) = 0$ if

$$\int_F \int_F \Phi^{(a)}(t, s) d\sigma(t) d\sigma(s) = \infty$$

for every Borel probability measure σ supported on F .

3. NECESSARY CONDITION FOR NON-UNIFORM DVORETZKY COVERING OF \mathbb{T}

3.1. Necessary condition of Shepp type. In this section, we prove the following result which gives a necessary condition of Shepp type for non-uniform Dvoretzky covering of \mathbb{T} .

Proposition 1. *Assume for a sequence $\{\ell_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ there is μ_f -Dvoretzky covering for a probability density function f . Then condition (1.2) is necessary for covering, i.e.*

$$\text{for all } a > m_f, \quad \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2} e^{a(\ell_1 + \dots + \ell_n)} = \infty.$$

Remark that Proposition 1 was proven in [5] under the following assumption

$$(3.1) \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n\ell_n}{\ell_1 + \dots + \ell_n} < 1.$$

In Section 3.2 we show that (3.1) is a condition on the kernel of a convolution operator. This part is of independent interest.

3.1.1. Set up. Fix some $b < 1$ very close to 1 and for each $q \geq 0$ define

$$\nu_q = \#\{n \in \mathbb{N} : b^{q+1} < \ell_n \leq b^q\}.$$

Then we define the sequence

$$\ell'_n = b^{q+1}$$

if $\nu_0 + \dots + \nu_q < n < \nu_0 + \dots + \nu_{q+1}$. We also set $r'_n = \ell'_n/2$. One can easily check that

$$b\ell'_n \leq \ell_n \leq \ell'_n.$$

Note that if there is μ_f -Dvoretzky covering for the sequence $\{\ell_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, then there will also be μ_f -Dvoretzky covering for the sequence $\{\ell'_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. For $\varepsilon > 0$ small we define the set

$$F = \{x \in \mathbb{T} : f(x) \leq m_f + \varepsilon\}.$$

Then $|F| > 0$. Next define a function

$$(3.2) \quad g(x) = \begin{cases} f(x) & \text{if } x \notin F, \\ m_f + \varepsilon & \text{if } x \in F. \end{cases}$$

Notice that $m_g = m_f + \varepsilon$.

3.2. Almost sure convergence for convolution operators and approximate identities. We now discuss the main idea of the proof of Proposition 1. For the actual proof, one can skip over this section, and proceed to Section 3.2.1.

First, recall the local version of Billard's criterion proven in [5]:

Proposition 2 (Local Billard criterion). [5, Theorem 3.1] *Let $F \subset \mathbb{T}$ be a non-empty compact set. Suppose that μ is a probability measure on \mathbb{T} such that*

$$(3.3) \quad \sup_{t \in F} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(B(t, r_n))^2 < \infty.$$

Then for F there is no μ -Dvoretzky covering if there exists a probability measure σ supported on F such that

$$(3.4) \quad \int_F \int_F \exp \left\{ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(B(t, r_n) \cap B(s, r_n)) \right\} d\sigma(t) d\sigma(s) < \infty.$$

Proposition 3.3 tells us that the integral in (3.4) should be divergent. Our goal is for arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$ to find a subset $F \subset \mathbb{T}$ so that

$$\int_F \int_F \exp \left\{ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu_f(B(t, r'_n) \cap B(s, r'_n)) \right\} dt ds \leq C \int_F \int_F \exp \left\{ (m_f + \varepsilon) \left(\sum_{k=1}^N \ell'_k - |t - s| \right) \right\} dt ds.$$

For this one needs to compare the quantities

$$(3.5) \quad \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mu_f(B(t, r'_k) \cap B(s, r'_k))}{\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (\ell'_k - |t - s|)} \leq (m_f + \varepsilon).$$

For $\ell'_{n+1} < r \leq \ell'_n$, let

$$A_r(u) = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{I_{k,r}}(u)}{\sum_{k=1}^n (\ell'_k - |u|)_+},$$

where

$$I_{k,r}(u) = \mathbf{1}_{\left[\frac{\ell'_k - r}{2}, \frac{\ell'_k + r}{2}\right)}(u).$$

Next, define the function

$$(3.6) \quad \psi_r(u) = A_r\left(u + \frac{r}{2}\right).$$

Note that

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}} \psi_r(u) du = 1$$

and for every $\delta > 0$ we have that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \int_{-\delta}^{\delta} \psi_r(u) du = 1.$$

Thus ψ_r is an *approximate identity*. Observe now that if $r = |t - s|$, then

$$\frac{\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu_f(B(t, r'_n) \cap B(s, r'_n))}{\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (\ell'_n - |t - s|)_+} = \int_{\mathbb{T}} f(s - t) \psi_r(t) dt = f * \psi_r(s).$$

If one shows that $f * \psi_r(s)$ converges to $f(s)$, as $r \rightarrow 0$ almost everywhere on \mathbb{T} and chooses F to be the set where f is less than $m_f + \varepsilon$ then the estimate (3.5)

would follow with a little extra work (e.g. applying Egoroff's theorem to make the convergence uniform etc.).

We note that the convergence properties of operators of type $f * \psi_n(s)$, where ψ_n is an approximate identity and can also be singular, has long been a subject of studies in mathematics. We refer the reader to [14] for an overview of results on convergence of convolution operators and some new results. The operators $f * \psi_r(s)$ can both exhibit convergence and divergence phenomena even for absolutely continuous measures. The most classical result where almost sure divergence is obtained for discrete measures ψ_r is due to Bourgain [2].

Note that $\psi_r(u)$ is symmetric around the point $u = r/2$ and its mass is mostly concentrated at that point. But the strongest concentration happens for $r = b^q$ at the point $u = b^q/2$, for $q \geq 1$. Observe, however, if we didn't have the drift term $r/2$ in (3.6) and ψ_r was symmetric around the point $u = 0$, then one could write

$$f * \psi_r(s) \leq CMf(s),$$

where M is the Hardy-Littlewood maximal function, i.e.

$$Mf(x) = \sup_{I: x \in I=[a,b]} \frac{1}{|I|} \int_I |f(x)| dx.$$

Since Mf is of weak $(1,1)$ type then we would get the same property for $f * \psi_r(s)$ and the pointwise convergence would follow. However, the fact that the point of symmetry of $\psi_r(s)$ is at $u = r/2$ changes the situation drastically. We remark that in [12] the authors consider convergence properties of operators of the form $f * \psi_r$. They show [Theorem 2.1 [12]], that when $\limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} r/2 \|\psi_r\|_\infty < \infty$, then $f * \psi_r(s)$ converges to $f(s)$ almost surely. In our case this is equivalent to the condition that there exists some $C > 0$ so that for all $\ell_{n+1} < r \leq \ell_n$ we have

$$\frac{r/2n}{\sum_{k=1}^N (\ell'_k - r)} < C.$$

Since $r \leq \ell'_n$, a quick computation shows that the above is equivalent to

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n\ell'_n}{\sum_{k=1}^N \ell'_k} < 1.$$

The attentive reader can recognize this condition as (3.1). However, (3.1) is not always fulfilled in our case. In [13] the authors show that the operators $f * \psi_n(s)$ can be divergent almost surely for a characteristic function f if

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow 0} \frac{n\ell'_n}{\ell'_1 + \dots + \ell'_n} = 1.$$

This, however, is not possible in our case either. The reason that pointwise convergence fails is due to the huge concentration of the bulk of $\psi_r(u)$ near the point $u \approx b^q/2$, for $r \approx b^q$, i.e. when the ν_q are very large. We remark that the main purpose of introducing the parameter b and defining the sequence ℓ'_n was to isolate the bad times where the strong concentration occurs. In this case ψ_r behaves like a Dirac mass at $b^q/2$ and we get that $f * \psi_r(s) \approx f(s + r/2)$. Almost sure divergence is then possible due to [2].

In order to overcome this difficulty we are going to consider different collection of pairs (t, s) or (s, r) . In the first collection we put the set of all (s, r) for which $r = |t - s|$ remains uniformly far from b^k , that is for some $c < 1$ we assume that $r/b^k < c$. The next collection is the set (s, r) for which for some $\delta_0 < 1$ we have

$$(3.7) \quad \frac{n\ell'_n}{\ell'_1 + \cdots + \ell'_n} \leq \delta_0.$$

In the two collections of (t, s) considered above we restrict the strong concentration of mass, thus obtaining convergence for the operators $f * \psi_r$ (we don't show this explicitly). Next, if for some $a > 0$ the series in (1.2) is convergent, we obtain a bound on the growth rate of the sequence ν_q (even under this bound property (3.7) may fail). As a consequence of this analysis we show that if c and δ_0 are sufficiently close to 1 (depending on the value of b), the measure of the remaining pairs (s, r) is so small that the integral (3.4) is divergent on the corresponding set.

Since our analysis fails to obtain convergence for all $r \rightarrow 0$, we thus have the following question:

Question 5. *Assume for some $a > 0$ we have*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{\ell_1 + \cdots + \ell_n}{\ln n} \right) < \infty.$$

Does it follow that for almost every $x \in \mathbb{T}$

$$f * \psi_r(x) \rightarrow f(x), \quad r \rightarrow 0?$$

3.2.1. *Auxiliary estimates.* For all $s \in F$, let

$$A_n(s) := \frac{\mu_g(B(s, r_n))}{\ell_n} = \frac{1}{\ell_n} \int_{s-r_n}^{s+r_n} g(x) dx.$$

By the Lebesgue differentiation theorem, one has $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_n(s) = g(s)$ for Lebesgue almost every $s \in F$. Then, by Egorov's theorem, there exists a compact set $F_0 \subset F$ with $|F_0| > |F|/2 > 0$ such that A_n converges to g uniformly on F_0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, there is an integer $N_0 = N_0(\varepsilon) > 1$ such that for every $n \geq N_0$ one has

$$|A_n(s) - g(s)| < \varepsilon$$

for every $s \in F_0$. It follows that for $n \geq N_0$ and $s \in F_0$ one has

$$(3.8) \quad \mu_g(B(s, r_n)) < (g(s) + \varepsilon) \ell_n = (m_f + 2\varepsilon) \ell_n.$$

Lemma 1. *For every $n \geq N_0$, $s \in F_0$, and $t \in \mathbb{T}$ one has*

$$(3.9) \quad \mu_g(B(t, r_n) \cap B(s, r_n)) \leq m_g(\ell_n - |t - s|)_+ + \varepsilon \ell_n.$$

Proof. Note that for all $s, t \in \mathbb{T}$, one has

$$(3.10) \quad \mu_g(B(t, r_n) \cap B(s, r_n)) \leq m_g(\ell_n - |t - s|)_+ + (\mu_g(B(s, r_n)) - m_g \ell_n).$$

Indeed, if $|t - s| > \ell_n$, then this inequality reads as

$$\mu_g(B(t, r_n) \cap B(s, r_n)) = 0 \leq 0 + \mu_g(B(s, r_n)) - m_g \ell_n,$$

and this will follow as

$$\mu_g(B(s, r_n)) = \int_{B(s, r_n)} g dx \geq m_g \ell_n.$$

For $s, t \in \mathbb{T}$ such that $|t - s| \leq \ell_n$, the inequality (3.10) reads as

$$\mu_g(B(t, r_n) \cap B(s, r_n)) \leq -m_g|t - s| + \mu_g(B(s, r_n)),$$

and this will follow since

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_g(B(s, r_n)) &= \mu_g(B(t, r_n) \cap B(s, r_n)) + \mu_g(B(s, r_n) \setminus B(t, r_n)) \\ &\geq \mu_g(B(t, r_n) \cap B(s, r_n)) + m_g|t - s|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence (3.10) is obtained. It follows from (3.8) and (3.10) that for $n \geq N_0$, $s \in F_0$, and $t \in \mathbb{T}$ one has

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_g(B(t, r_n) \cap B(s, r_n)) &\leq m_g(\ell_n - |t - s|)_+ + (m_f + 2\varepsilon - m_g)\ell_n \\ &= m_g(\ell_n - |t - s|)_+ + \varepsilon\ell_n. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma is proved. □

Let $N > N_0$, and $s \in F_0$, $t \in \mathbb{T}$ such that $\ell_{N+1} < |t - s| \leq \ell_N$. Then

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu_g(B(t, r_n) \cap B(s, r_n)) = \sum_{n=1}^N \mu_g(B(t, r_n) \cap B(s, r_n))$$

as $B(t, r_n) \cap B(s, r_n) = \emptyset$ for $n \geq N + 1$, and by (3.9) one has

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{n=1}^N \mu_g(B(t, r_n) \cap B(s, r_n)) \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{N_0-1} \mu_g(B(t, r_n) \cap B(s, r_n)) + \sum_{n=N_0}^N \mu_g(B(t, r_n) \cap B(s, r_n)) \\ &\leq \sum_{n=1}^{N_0-1} \mu_g(B(t, r_n) \cap B(s, r_n)) + \sum_{n=N_0}^N \{m_g(\ell_n - |t - s|)_+ + \varepsilon\ell_n\} \\ &\leq \sum_{n=1}^{N_0-1} \{m_g(\ell_n - |t - s|)_+ + \varepsilon\ell_n\} + \sum_{n=N_0}^N \{m_g(\ell_n - |t - s|)_+ + \varepsilon\ell_n\} + R_0 \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^N \{m_g(\ell_n - |t - s|)_+ + \varepsilon\ell_n\} + R_0, \end{aligned}$$

where we set $R_0 = \sum_{n=1}^{N_0-1} \mu_g(B(t, r_n) \cap B(s, r_n))$. Note that one can write

$$N = \nu_0 + \cdots + \nu_{K-1} + r$$

for some $K = K_N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $r \in \{1, \dots, \nu_K\}$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu_g(B(t, r_n) \cap B(s, r_n)) &= \sum_{n=1}^{\nu_0 + \cdots + \nu_{K-1}} \mu_g(B(t, r_n) \cap B(s, r_n)) \\ &\quad + \sum_{n=\nu_0 + \cdots + \nu_{K-1} + 1}^N \mu_g(B(t, r_n) \cap B(s, r_n)) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq m_g \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \nu_k (b^k - |t-s|)_+ + \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \varepsilon \nu_k b^k \\ &\quad + \sum_{n=\nu_0+\dots+\nu_{K-1}+1}^N \mu_g(B(t, r_n) \cap B(s, r_n)) + R_0. \end{aligned}$$

Note that for every $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, K-1\}$, one can see that

$$b^k(1-b) \leq b^k - b^K \leq b^k - |t-s|$$

as $b^{K-k} \leq b < 1$, and hence one has

$$\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \varepsilon \nu_k b^k \leq \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \varepsilon \nu_k \frac{b^k - |t-s|}{1-b}.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} (3.11) \quad \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu_g(B(t, r_n) \cap B(s, r_n)) &\leq \left(m_g + \frac{\varepsilon}{1-b}\right) \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \nu_k (b^k - |t-s|)_+ \\ &\quad + \sum_{n=\nu_0+\dots+\nu_{K-1}+1}^N \mu_g(B(t, r_n) \cap B(s, r_n)) + R_0. \end{aligned}$$

We now estimate the right-hand side of (3.11). We split estimates for the right-hand side of (3.11) into several cases. Fix $c \in (b, 1)$

Case 1) Consider the set $(t, s) \in \mathbb{T} \times F_0$, for which $b^{K+1} < |t-s| \leq cb^K$ for some $K \geq 1$.

Note that

$$b^K(1-c) \leq b^K - |t-s|$$

as $|t-s| \leq cb^K$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{n=\nu_0+\dots+\nu_{K-1}+1}^N \mu_g(B(t, r_n) \cap B(s, r_n)) \\ &\leq \nu_K \{m_g(b^K - |t-s|)_+ + \varepsilon b^K\} \\ &\leq \nu_K m_g(b^K - |t-s|)_+ + \nu_K \frac{\varepsilon}{1-c} (b^K - |t-s|)_+ \\ &= \nu_K \left(m_g + \frac{\varepsilon}{1-c}\right) (b^K - |t-s|)_+. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu_g(B(t, r_n) \cap B(s, r_n)) &\leq \left(m_g + \frac{\varepsilon}{1-b}\right) \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \nu_k (b^k - |t-s|)_+ \\ &\quad + \left(m_g + \frac{\varepsilon}{1-c}\right) \nu_K (b^K - |t-s|) + R_0 \\ &\leq \left(m_g + \frac{\varepsilon}{1-b} + \frac{\varepsilon}{1-c}\right) \sum_{k=0}^K \nu_k (b^k - |t-s|)_+ + R_0 \end{aligned}$$

$$= \left(m_g + \frac{\varepsilon}{1-b} + \frac{\varepsilon}{1-c} \right) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \nu_k (b^k - |t-s|)_+ + R_0.$$

as $(b^k - |t-s|)_+ = 0$ for $k > K$. Hence, for arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$ and c close to 1 we will have

$$\begin{aligned} & \iint_{\{(t,s) \in F_0 \times F_0 : b^{K+1} < |t-s| < cb^K\}} \exp \left\{ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu_g(B(t, r_n) \cap B(s, r_n)) \right\} dt ds \\ & \leq C_{\varepsilon, c} \iint_{\{(t,s) \in F_0 \times F_0 : b^{K+1} < |t-s| < cb^K\}} \exp \left\{ (m_g + \varepsilon) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \nu_k (b^k - |t-s|)_+ \right\} dt ds, \end{aligned}$$

for some $C_{\varepsilon, c} \in (0, \infty)$.

Case 2) Consider the set of $(t, s) \in \mathbb{T} \times F_0$, for which $b^{K+1} < |t-s| \leq b^K$ and such that for some $\delta \in (0, 1)$ we have

$$(3.12) \quad \frac{(\nu_0 + \dots + \nu_K) b^K}{\sum_{k=0}^K \nu_k b^k} \leq \delta.$$

(Compare this with (3.1).) By assumption (3.12), we have

$$(3.13) \quad \sum_{k=0}^K \nu_k (b^k - |t-s|)_+ \geq \sum_{k=0}^K \nu_k (b^k - b^K)_+ \geq (1 - \delta) \sum_{k=0}^K \nu_k b^k.$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=\nu_0+\dots+\nu_{K-1}+1}^N \mu_g(B(t, r_n) \cap B(s, r_n)) & \leq \sum_{n=\nu_0+\dots+\nu_{K-1}+1}^N (b^K - |t-s|)_+ + \varepsilon b^K \\ & = \nu_K (b^K - |t-s|)_+ + \varepsilon \nu_K, \end{aligned}$$

it follows from (3.11) and (3.13) that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu_g(B(t, r_n) \cap B(s, r_n)) & \leq m_g \sum_{k=0}^K \nu_k (b^k - |t-s|)_+ + \sum_{k=0}^K \varepsilon \nu_k b^k + R_0 \\ & \leq \left(m_g + \frac{\varepsilon}{1-\delta} \right) \sum_{k=0}^K \nu_k (b^k - |t-s|)_+ + R_0 \\ & = \left(m_g + \frac{\varepsilon}{1-\delta} \right) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \nu_k (b^k - |t-s|)_+ + R_0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we have

$$(3.14) \quad \begin{aligned} & \iint_{\{(t,s) \in F_0 \times F_0 : b^{K+1} < |t-s| \leq b^K, (3.12) \text{ holds for } K\}} \exp \left\{ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu_g(B(t, r_n) \cap B(s, r_n)) \right\} dt ds \\ & \leq C_{\varepsilon, \delta} \iint_{\{(t,s) \in F_0 \times F_0 : b^{K+1} < |t-s| \leq b^K, (3.12) \text{ holds for } K\}} \exp \left\{ (m_g + \varepsilon) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \nu_k (b^k - |t-s|)_+ \right\} dt ds \end{aligned}$$

for some $C_{\varepsilon, \delta} \in (0, \infty)$.

Case 3) We now take care of terms for which $cb^K < |t - s| \leq b^K$ and (3.12) fails. One has

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=\nu_0+\dots+\nu_{K-1}+1}^N \mu_g(B(t, r_n) \cap B(s, r_n)) &= \sum_{n=\nu_0+\dots+\nu_{K-1}+1}^N \int_{B\left(\frac{t+s}{2}, \frac{b^K-|t-s|}{2}\right)} g \, dx \\ &\leq \nu_K \int_{B\left(\frac{t+s}{2}, \frac{b^K-|t-s|}{2}\right)} g \, dx, \end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$(3.15) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu_g(B(t, r_n) \cap B(s, r_n)) &\leq \left(m_g + \frac{\varepsilon}{1-b}\right) \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \nu_k (b^k - |t-s|)_+ \\ &\quad + \nu_K \int_{B\left(\frac{t+s}{2}, \frac{b^K-|t-s|}{2}\right)} g \, dx + R_0. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 2. *Let $\gamma_n \in (0, 1]$ and $a_n \searrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then for every $h \in L^1(\mathbb{T})$ we have*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{a_n \gamma_n} \int_{[s+a_n(1-\gamma_n), s+a_n]} h \, dx = h(s),$$

for Lebesgue almost every $s \in \mathbb{T}$.

Proof. By Lebesgue's differentiation theorem, for Lebesgue almost every $s \in \mathbb{T}$ we have

$$\int_{[s, s+a_n]} h \, dx = (h(s) + o(1))a_n, \quad \int_{[s, s+a_n(1-\gamma_n)]} h \, dx = (h(s) + o(1))a_n(1-\gamma_n)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Hence

$$\int_{[s+a_n(1-\gamma_n), s+a_n]} h \, dx = (h(s) + o(1))a_n - (h(s) + o(1))a_n(1-\gamma_n) = h(s)a_n\gamma_n + o(1)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. \square

By Lemma 2, we have

$$\lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{(b^K - |t-s|)} \int_{B\left(\frac{t+s}{2}, \frac{b^K-|t-s|}{2}\right)} g \, dx = g(s) = m_g$$

for Lebesgue almost every $s \in F_0$. Here recall that $g(s) = m_g$ for $s \in F$. Using Egoroff's theorem, one has a compact set $F_1 \subset F_0$ with $|F_1| > |F_0|/2 > 0$ such that the sequence of averages converges to g uniformly on F_1 as $K \rightarrow \infty$. It follows that there is an integer $K_1 > 1$ such that for every $K \geq K_1$ and $s \in F_1$ one has

$$\int_{B\left(\frac{t+s}{2}, \frac{b^K-|t-s|}{2}\right)} g \, dx \leq 2m_g(b^K - |t-s|).$$

Since $b^K - |t-s| \leq b^K - cb^K$, we have

$$(3.16) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu_g(B(t, r_n) \cap B(s, r_n)) &\leq \left(m_g + \frac{\varepsilon}{1-b}\right) \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \nu_k (b^k - |t-s|)_+ \\ &\quad + 2m_g \nu_K b^K (1-c) + R_0 \end{aligned}$$

for every $s \in F_1$.

Let

$$\lambda_K = \frac{\nu_K}{\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \nu_k}.$$

Lemma 3. *Assume for a sub-sequence $\{K_q\}_{q \geq 1}$ we have that*

$$\lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(\nu_0 + \cdots + \nu_{K_q}) b^{K_q}}{\sum_{k=0}^{K_q} \nu_k b^k} = 1.$$

Then we have $\lambda_{K_q} \rightarrow \infty$, as $q \rightarrow \infty$ and

$$\frac{\nu_{K_q} b^{K_q}}{\sum_{k=0}^{K_q-1} \nu_k b^k} \geq (1 - o(1)) \left(\frac{1}{\lambda_{K_q}} + o(1) \right)^{-1}$$

as $q \rightarrow \infty$.

Lemma 4. *Assume that for some $a > 0$ we have*

$$(3.17) \quad \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2} e^{a(\ell_1 + \cdots + \ell_n)} < \infty.$$

Assume further that $\lambda_K = \nu_K / (\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \nu_k) \geq 1$ for some $K \in \mathbb{N}$, then there exists $C_0 > 0$, such that

$$\nu_K b^K \leq C_0 K.$$

We postpone the proofs of the lemmas above to Section 3.2.3 and proceed the argument. Given a small $\zeta > 0$, by Lemmas 3 and 4, one has

$$(3.18) \quad \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \nu_k (b^k - |t - s|)_+ \leq \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \nu_k b^k \leq \frac{1}{1 - \zeta} \left(\frac{1}{\lambda_K} + \zeta \right) \nu_K b^K \leq 2 \left(\frac{1}{\lambda_K} + \zeta \right) C_0 K.$$

It follows from (3.16) and (3.18) that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu_g(B(t, r_n) \cap B(s, r_n)) &\leq 2C_0 \left\{ \left(m_g + \frac{\varepsilon}{1-b} \right) \left(\frac{1}{\lambda_K} + \zeta \right) + m_g(1-c) \right\} K + R_0 \\ &\leq C_1 \left\{ \left(\frac{1}{\lambda_K} + \zeta \right) + (1-c) \right\} K + R_0, \end{aligned}$$

where we let $C_1 = 2C_0(m_g + (\varepsilon/(1-b))) > 0$. Hence for large K , one has

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu_g(B(t, r_n) \cap B(s, r_n)) \leq C_2 \left\{ \left(\frac{1}{\lambda_K} + \zeta \right) + (1-c) \right\} K$$

for some $C_2 > 0$.

For each $t \in F_1$ and $K \in \mathbb{N}$, let $F_1(t, K) = \{s \in F_1 : cb^K < |t - s| \leq b^K\}$, and $F_1(t) = \cup_{K \notin \mathcal{G}} F_1(t, K)$, where \mathcal{G} is the set of $K \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the condition (3.12) is fulfilled for some $\delta > 0$. Then by the Fubini theorem,

$$\iint_{\{(t,s) \in F_1 \times F_1 : cb^{K+1} < |t-s| \leq b^K, K \notin \mathcal{G}\}} \exp \left\{ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu_g(B(t, r_n) \cap B(s, r_n)) \right\} dt ds$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \int_{F_1} \left[\int_{F_1(t)} \exp \left\{ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu_g(B(t, r_n) \cap B(s, r_n)) \right\} ds \right] dt \\
&\leq \sum_{K \notin \mathcal{G}} \int_{F_1} \left[\int_{F_1(t, K)} \exp \left[C_2 \left\{ \left(\frac{1}{\lambda_K} + \zeta \right) + (1-c) \right\} K \right] ds \right] dt \\
&\leq 2(1-c)|F_1| \sum_K b^K \exp \left[C_2 \left\{ \left(\frac{1}{\lambda_K} + \zeta \right) + (1-c) \right\} K \right]
\end{aligned}$$

as $|F_1(t, K)| \leq 2(1-c)b^K$. We now take $\zeta > 0$ small, $\lambda_K > 1$ large by Lemma 3, and $c \in (0, 1)$ so close to 1 that (recall that b is a fixed number $b \in (0, 1)$ arbitrarily close to 1)

$$C_2 \left\{ \left(\frac{1}{\lambda_K} + \zeta \right) + (1-c) \right\} \leq \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{1}{b}.$$

Therefore the expression above can be estimated as follows

$$\leq 2(1-c)|F_1| \sum_K e^{\frac{K}{2} \ln \frac{1}{b} - K \ln \frac{1}{b}} < \infty.$$

3.2.2. *Concluding the proof of Proposition 1.* Summarizing the above, we found a compact set $F_1 \subset \mathbb{T}$ of positive Lebesgue measure such that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.19) \quad &\iint_{F_1 \times F_1} \exp \left\{ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu_g(B(t, r_n) \cap B(s, r_n)) \right\} dt ds \\
&\leq C \iint_{F_1 \times F_1} \exp \left\{ (m_g + \varepsilon) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (\ell_n - |t-s|)_+ \right\} dt ds
\end{aligned}$$

for some $C \in (0, \infty)$ if it is assumed that for some $a > 0$ one has

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2} e^{a(\ell_1 + \dots + \ell_n)} < \infty.$$

(This is the assumption (3.17) in Lemma 4.) Obviously if no such $a > 0$ exists then the result in Proposition 1 follows. On the other hand, under the same assumption, we have

$$\sup_{s \in F_1} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu_g(B(s, r_n))^2 \leq (m_f + 2\varepsilon)^2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \ell_n^2 < \infty$$

by (3.8) and [5, Lemma 3.2]. Then by Proposition 2 (local Billard criterion) and the fact $f \leq g$ on \mathbb{T} one should have

$$\iint_{F_1 \times F_1} \exp \left\{ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu_g(B(t, r_n) \cap B(s, r_n)) \right\} dt ds = \infty.$$

Therefore it follows from (3.19) that

$$\iint_{F_1 \times F_1} \exp \left\{ (m_g + \varepsilon) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (\ell_n - |t-s|)_+ \right\} dt ds = \infty.$$

Which, in view of [5, Lemma 3.1], is equivalent to

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2} e^{(m_g + \varepsilon)(\ell'_1 + \dots + \ell'_n)} = \infty.$$

But note that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2} e^{(m_g + \varepsilon)(\ell'_1 + \dots + \ell'_n)} \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2} e^{\frac{1}{b}(m_f + 2\varepsilon)(\ell_1 + \dots + \ell_n)} = \infty$$

as $b\ell'_n \leq \ell_n$ and $m_g = m_f + \varepsilon$. Since $b \in (0, 1)$ is a number arbitrarily close to 1 and $\varepsilon > 0$ was arbitrary, one arrives at

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2} e^{a(\ell_1 + \dots + \ell_n)} = \infty$$

for every $a > m_f$. Proposition 1 is proven.

3.2.3. Proof of Lemma 3 and Lemma 4.

Proof of Lemma 3. Observe that the function

$$r \mapsto A_K(r) = \frac{(\nu_0 + \dots + \nu_{K-1} + r)b^K}{\sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \nu_k b^k + r b^K}$$

is increasing in r , hence $A_K|_{\{1, \dots, \nu_K\}}$ will reach its maximum value for $r = \nu_K$. Note that each $N \in \mathbb{N}$ can be written as

$$N = \nu_0 + \dots + \nu_{K-1} + r$$

for some $K \in \mathbb{N}$ and $r \in \{1, \dots, \nu_K\}$, and for such an N one has $\ell'_N = b^K$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{N\ell'_N}{\ell'_1 + \dots + \ell'_N} &= \frac{(\nu_0 + \nu_1 + \dots + \nu_{K-1} + r)b^K}{\nu_0 + \nu_1 b + \dots + \nu_{K-1} b^{K-1} + r b^K} \\ &\leq \frac{(\nu_0 + \nu_1 + \dots + \nu_{K-1} + r)b^K}{(\nu_0 + \nu_1 + \dots + \nu_{q-1})b^{K-1} + r b^K} \\ &= \frac{(\nu_0 + \dots + \nu_{K-1} + r)b}{(\nu_0 + \dots + \nu_{K-1}) + r b} \\ &\leq \frac{(\nu_0 + \dots + \nu_{K-1} + \lambda_K(\nu_0 + \dots + \nu_{K-1}))b}{(\nu_0 + \nu_1 + \dots + \nu_{K-1}) + \lambda_K(\nu_0 + \dots + \nu_{K-1})b} \\ &= \frac{(1 + \lambda_K)b}{1 + \lambda_K b} < 1 \end{aligned}$$

since $b < 1$. By assumption, there exists a sequence $\{\zeta_q\}$, with $\zeta_q \rightarrow 0$ as $q \rightarrow \infty$, such that

$$\frac{(\nu_0 + \dots + \nu_{K_q})b^{K_q}}{\sum_{k=0}^{K_q} \nu_k b^k} > 1 - \zeta_q$$

for every $q \in \mathbb{N}$. It follows from above that

$$(3.20) \quad \frac{(1 + \lambda_{K_q})b}{1 + \lambda_{K_q} b} \geq \frac{(\nu_0 + \dots + \nu_{K_q})b^{K_q}}{\sum_{k=0}^{K_q} \nu_k b^k} > 1 - \zeta_q,$$

or equivalently

$$\lambda_{K_q} > \frac{1 - \zeta_q - b}{\zeta_q b}.$$

Thus one has $\lambda_{K_q} \rightarrow \infty$ as ζ_q goes to zero when $q \rightarrow \infty$.

Since

$$\nu_0 + \cdots + \nu_{K_q-1} + \nu_{K_q} = \frac{\nu_{K_q}}{\lambda_{K_q}} + \nu_{K_q},$$

one also has

$$\left(\frac{\nu_{K_q}}{\lambda_{K_q}} + \nu_{K_q} \right) b^{K_q} \geq (1 - \zeta_q) \nu_{K_q} b^{K_q} + (1 - \zeta_q) \sum_{k=0}^{K_q-1} \nu_k b^k$$

by (3.20), or

$$\left(\frac{1}{\lambda_{K_q}} + \zeta_q \right) \nu_{K_q} b^{K_q} \geq (1 - \zeta_q) \sum_{k=0}^{K_q-1} \nu_k b^k,$$

and thus

$$\frac{\nu_{K_q} b^{K_q}}{\sum_{k=0}^{K_q-1} \nu_k b^k} \geq \frac{1 - \zeta_q}{\left(\frac{1}{\lambda_{K_q}} + \zeta_q \right)}$$

for such sequences $\{\zeta_q\}$ and $\{K_q\}$. □

Proof of Lemma 4. By definition

$$b\ell'_n \leq \ell_n \leq \ell'_n$$

for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2} e^{ab(\ell'_1 + \cdots + \ell'_n)} \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2} e^{a(\ell_1 + \cdots + \ell_n)}.$$

Then by assumption (3.17) it follows that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2} e^{ab(\ell'_1 + \cdots + \ell'_n)} < \infty.$$

Therefore

$$\frac{1}{(\nu_0 + \cdots + \nu_K)^2} e^{ab \sum_{k=0}^K \nu_k b^k} \rightarrow 0,$$

as $K \rightarrow \infty$. Then there exists $C > 0$ such that for all large $K \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\sum_{k=0}^K \nu_k b^k \leq C \ln(\nu_0 + \cdots + \nu_K).$$

It follows from the assumption on λ_K that

$$(3.21) \quad \nu_K b^K \leq \sum_{k=0}^K \nu_k b^k \leq C \ln(\nu_0 + \cdots + \nu_K) \leq C \ln(2\nu_K).$$

Note that in view of (3.17) we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \ell_n^2 < \infty,$$

by [5, Lemma 3.2]. Then we see that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (b\ell'_n)^2 = b^2 \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \nu_k b^{2k} \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \ell_n^2 < \infty$$

Hence $\nu_k b^{2k} \leq 1$, for all large values of k . It then follows from (3.21) that

$$\nu_K b^K \leq C \ln(2\nu_K) \leq \{2C \ln(2/b)\}K.$$

Letting $C_0 = 2C \ln(2/b) > 0$. Lemma is obtained. \square

3.3. Necessary condition of Kahane-Hawkes type: Proof of Theorem 1-(a).

In this section, we give a necessary condition of Kahane-Hawkes type for non-uniform Dvoretzky covering of \mathbb{T} . See [8, 10]. For a given sequence $\{\ell_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, let

$$(3.22) \quad D = D(\{\ell_n\}) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ell_1 + \cdots + \ell_n}{\ln n}.$$

Lemma 5. *Conditions (1.4) and (1.2) are equivalent.*

Proof. Assume we have (1.4). Then for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a sub-sequence $\{n_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ so that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(\ell_1 + \cdots + \ell_{n_k})}{\ln n_k} > \frac{1 - \varepsilon}{m_f}.$$

Fix an integer $r \geq 1$. We can assume that 2^r divides n_k , since for large n_k the remainder, after dividing by 2^r will be negligible with respect to n_k . Since ℓ_n is decreasing then

$$2^r \sum_{k=(2^r-1)m+1}^{2^r m} \ell_k \leq \sum_{k=1}^{2^r m} \ell_k.$$

Hence

$$\sum_{k=1}^{(2^r-1)m} \ell_k \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{2^r}\right) \sum_{k=1}^{2^r m} \ell_k.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=(2^r-1)m+1}^{2^r m} \frac{1}{n^2} e^{a(\ell_1 + \cdots + \ell_n)} &> e^{a(\ell_1 + \cdots + \ell_{(2^r-1)m})} \sum_{n=(2^r-1)m+1}^{2^r m} \frac{1}{n^2} \\ &\geq e^{a(1-\frac{1}{2^r})(\ell_1 + \cdots + \ell_{2^r m})} \frac{1}{2^{2^r m}} \\ &\geq e^{\frac{a(1-\varepsilon)}{m_f} (1-\frac{1}{2^r}) \ln 2^r m} \frac{1}{2^{2^r m}} = \frac{1}{2^r} (2^r m)^{\frac{a(1-\varepsilon)}{m_f} (1-\frac{1}{2^r}) - 1}. \end{aligned}$$

The last term is unbounded since for every $a > m_f$ one can choose $r \geq 1$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\frac{a(1-\varepsilon)}{m_f} (1 - \frac{1}{2^r}) - 1 > 0$.

Next, we show by contraposition that (1.2) implies (1.4). Assume

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ell_1 + \cdots + \ell_n}{\ln n} < \frac{1}{m_f}.$$

Then there is $\varepsilon > 0$ so that for all sufficiently large $n \geq 1$

$$\frac{\ell_1 + \cdots + \ell_n}{\ln n} \leq \frac{1 - \varepsilon}{m_f}.$$

Let $a > m_f$. Then

$$a(\ell_1 + \cdots + \ell_n) \leq \frac{a(1 - \varepsilon) \ln n}{m_f} = \rho \ln n$$

where we let $\rho = a(1 - \varepsilon)/m_f$. Note that if a is sufficiently close to m_f , then $\rho < 1$. Hence

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2} e^{a(\ell_1 + \cdots + \ell_n)} < \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2} e^{\rho \ln n} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^{2-\rho}} < \infty.$$

This contradicts (1.2). \square

By Proposition 1 and Lemma 5, we have the following result which is nothing short of Theorem 1-(a).

Proposition 3. *Assume for a sequence $\{\ell_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and a density function f there is μ_f -Dvoretzky covering for a probability density function f . Then the following condition is necessary for covering*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{\ell_1 + \cdots + \ell_n}{\ln n} \right) \geq \frac{1}{m_f},$$

with the convention that $1/m_f = \infty$ when $m_f = 0$.

3.4. Comparison between uniform and non-uniform Dvoretzky coverings.

Corollary 1. *If for a sequence $\{\ell_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ there is no Dvoretzky covering in the classical sense, i.e. when $f \equiv 1$, then there can be no Dvoretzky covering with respect to any absolute continuous measure μ_f . In particular, for the sequence $\{(\frac{1}{n} - \frac{\beta}{n \ln n})\}_{n \geq 1}$, with $\beta > 1$, and the uniform density, condition (1.4) is full-filled, but Theorem 3 fails.*

Proof. Assume the opposite. There exists a density function f for which there is μ_f -Dvoretzky covering, but no Dvoretzky covering in the classical sense, i.e.

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2} e^{(\ell_1 + \cdots + \ell_n)} < \infty.$$

Since $\int_{\mathbb{T}} f dt = 1$ and $f \not\equiv 1$, one has $m_f < 1$. Then for every a , with $m_f < a \leq 1$ we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2} e^{a(\ell_1 + \cdots + \ell_n)} < \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2} e^{(\ell_1 + \cdots + \ell_n)} < \infty.$$

This contradicts Proposition 1. Next we have that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2} e^{\sum_{k=1}^n (\frac{1}{k} - \frac{\beta}{k \ln k})} \approx \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2} e^{\ln n - \beta \ln \ln n} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n \ln^{\beta} n} < \infty,$$

whenever $\beta < 1$. Thus, the sequence $\{(\frac{1}{n} - \frac{\beta}{n \ln n})\}_{n \geq 1}$ satisfies condition (1.4), and for it there is no Dvoretzky covering in the classical sense. Hence, the uniform density cannot be modified to obtain Dvoretzky covering similar to Theorem 3. \square

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Theorem 1-(a) is proven in Proposition 3. Below, we will prove Theorem 1-(b). Let $f \in L^1(\mathbb{T})$ be a probability density function so that $m_f > 0$ and $\overline{\dim}_B K_f < 1$, and let $\{\ell_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence satisfying (1.4). It is enough to show the sufficiency of (1.4) for μ_f -Dvoretzky covering for \mathbb{T} . Set $D = D(\{\ell_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}})$ as in (3.22).

By Lemma 5, we have (1.2). Once we have (1.3), it follows from [5, Proposition 5.2] that the circle is μ_f -Dvoretzky covered for $\{\ell_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. Henceforth, we show the condition (1.3), that is, $\text{Cap}_{m_f}(K_f) = 0$.

Let $\widetilde{K}_f = m_f K_f = \{m_f x : x \in K_f\}$. Given a Borel probability measure σ supported on K_f , let $\tilde{\sigma} = \sigma \circ (m_f)^{-1}$, which defines a Borel probability measure supported on the scaled set \widetilde{K}_f . Then we see

$$\int_{K_f} \int_{K_f} \exp \left\{ m_f \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (\ell_k - |t - s|)_+ \right\} d\sigma(s) d\sigma(t) = \infty$$

is equivalent to

$$\int_{\widetilde{K}_f} \int_{\widetilde{K}_f} \exp \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (m_f \ell_k - |u - v|)_+ \right\} d\tilde{\sigma}(u) d\tilde{\sigma}(v) = \infty.$$

Namely, to show $\text{Cap}_{m_f}(K_f) = 0$ is equivalent to show $\text{Cap}(\widetilde{K}_f) = 0$, that is, the Kahane capacity of \widetilde{K}_f with respect to the sequence $\{m_f \ell_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is zero.

Now, since the upper box-counting dimension is invariant under scaling, one has $\overline{\dim}_B \widetilde{K}_f = \overline{\dim}_B K_f < 1 \leq m_f D = D(m_f \ell_n)$. Then, in view of [10, Theorem 4 (1) (page 160)], there is a Dvoretzky covering (in the classical sense) of the set \widetilde{K}_f by the sequence $\{m_f \ell_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, and thus $\text{Cap}(\widetilde{K}_f) = 0$ follows by the Kahane criterion.

5. PROOF OF THEOREM 2

5.1. Proof of Theorem 2-(a). The idea is to keep the lower box-counting dimension of K_f larger than $(\ell_1 + \cdots + \ell_n) / \ln n$. Because of this K_f will always be too large to be covered by $\{\ell_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. When the expression $(\ell_1 + \cdots + \ell_n) / \ln n$ approaches $1/m_f$ and the sequence $\{\ell_k\}_{k=1}^n$ starts exhibiting strong covering properties, we increased the lower box-counting dimension of K_f at scales close to ℓ_n so that it will be even more closer to $1/m_f$. Thus, the sequence will not be strong enough to cover K_f at these scales. After this, we drop the value of $(\ell_1 + \cdots + \ell_n) / \ln n$ by creating long intervals without any ℓ_n 's in them. Then, we also drop the lower box-counting dimension of K_f in these scales, so that the Hausdorff dimension of K_f gets less than 1.

We now state a lemma:

Lemma 6. *Let $\{\varepsilon_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence so that $\varepsilon_k \searrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Then there exists a compact set $A \subset \mathbb{T}$ with $\dim_H A < \overline{\dim}_B A = 1$, a Borel probability measure σ_0 supported on A , and a sequence of disjoint intervals $\{[u_k, v_k]\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $u_k > 0$, $v_{k+1} < u_k$, and $u_k/v_k < c_0$ for some constant $c_0 > 0$ such that for all $t \in A$ and $r \in [u_k, v_k]$, $\sigma_0(B(t, r)) \leq c_1 r^{1 - (\varepsilon_k/4)}$ for some constant $c_1 > 0$.*

We postpone the proof of this lemma until the end of this section and proceed the argument. Let $f \in L^1(\mathbb{T})$ be a probability density function for which $m_f > 0$,

$K_f = A$ and f is Lipschitz on A . Then by [5, Corollary 1.1-(2)] the conditions (1.2) and (1.3) will both be necessary and sufficient for μ_f -Dvoretzky covering. However, we will show that $\text{Cap}_{m_f}(K_f) > 0$, for the sequence ℓ_n to be defined below. Hence there can be no μ_f -Dvoretzky covering.

Let $h(x) = \frac{1}{m_f} \frac{\ln x}{x}$. Choose an increasing sequence $\{n_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}}$ recursively as follows. Let $n_0 = 0$. Take n_1 to be a positive integer so that $h(n_1) \in [u_{j_1}/(1 - \varepsilon_{j_1}), v_{j_1}/(1 - \varepsilon_{j_1})]$ for some (large) $j_1 \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that this is possible since $h(n)/h(n+1) \rightarrow 1$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and $u_n/v_n < c_0$, so for large values of n , $h(n)$ cannot miss the intervals $\{[u_k, v_k]\}_{k \geq 1}$. Next, take $n_2 > n_1$ so that $h(n_2) \in [u_{j_2}/(1 - \varepsilon_{j_2}), v_{j_2}/(1 - \varepsilon_{j_2})]$ for some $j_2 \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that $j_2 > j_1$. Once $n_k \in \mathbb{N}$ is chosen, take $n_{k+1} \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n_{k+1} > n_k$ so that $h(n_{k+1}) \in [u_{j_{k+1}}/(1 - \varepsilon_{j_{k+1}}), v_{j_{k+1}}/(1 - \varepsilon_{j_{k+1}})]$ for some $j_{k+1} \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that $j_{k+1} > j_k$. During this procedure, one can choose $\{n_k\}$ to grow fast enough so that

$$n_1^{1-\varepsilon_{j_1}} \cdots n_k^{1-\varepsilon_{j_k}} \leq n_k^{1-(\varepsilon_{j_k}/2)}.$$

For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, define

$$b_k = \left(\frac{1 - \varepsilon_{j_k}}{m_f} \right) \frac{\ln n_k}{n_k},$$

and for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n_0 + n_1 + \cdots + n_k < n \leq n_0 + n_1 + \cdots + n_k + n_{k+1}$ for $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, define

$$\ell_n = b_{k+1} = \left(\frac{1 - \varepsilon_{j_{k+1}}}{m_f} \right) \frac{\ln n_{k+1}}{n_{k+1}}.$$

Note that if n_k grows fast enough, then

$$\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n_1+\cdots+n_q} \ell_k}{\ln(n_1 + \cdots + n_q)} = \frac{1}{m_f} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^q (1 - \varepsilon_{j_i}) \ln n_i}{\ln(n_1 + \cdots + n_q)} \geq \frac{1}{m_f} (1 - 2\varepsilon_{j_q}).$$

This implies (1.4). Note that for $(s, t) \in K_f \times K_f$ with $|t - s| \in (b_{q+1}, b_q]$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (\ell_k - |t - s|)_+ &= \sum_{k=1}^{n_1+\cdots+n_q} (\ell_k - |t - s|) \leq \sum_{k=1}^{n_1+\cdots+n_q} \ell_k \\ &= \frac{1}{m_f} \sum_{i=1}^q (1 - \varepsilon_{j_i}) n_i b_i \\ &= \frac{1}{m_f} \sum_{i=1}^q (1 - \varepsilon_{j_i}) \ln n_i \\ &\leq \frac{1}{m_f} (1 - (\varepsilon_{j_q}/2)) \ln n_q. \end{aligned}$$

Next, for $t \in K_f$ and $q \in \mathbb{N}$, let $A_t(q) = (t + b_{q+1}, t + b_q] \cup [t - b_q, t - b_{q+1})$. Note that $A_t(q) \subset B(t, q)$. It follows that for each $t \in K_f$

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{K_f} \exp \left\{ m_f \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (\ell_k - |t - s|)_+ \right\} d\sigma_0(s) \\ &= \sum_{q=1}^{\infty} \int_{K_f \cap A_t(q)} \exp \left\{ m_f \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (\ell_k - |t - s|)_+ \right\} d\sigma_0(s) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sum_{q=1}^{\infty} \int_{K_f \cap A_t(q)} \exp \left\{ (1 - (\varepsilon_{j_q}/2)) \ln n_q \right\} d\sigma_0(s) \\
&\leq \sum_{q=1}^{\infty} n_q^{1 - (\varepsilon_{j_q}/2)} \sigma_0(A_t(q)) \\
&\leq \sum_{q=1}^{\infty} n_q^{1 - (\varepsilon_{j_q}/2)} \sigma_0(B(t, b_q)) \\
&\leq \frac{c_1}{m_f} \sum_{q=1}^{\infty} n_q^{1 - (\varepsilon_{j_q}/2)} \left(\frac{\ln n_q}{n_q} \right)^{1 - (\varepsilon_{j_q}/4)} \\
&\leq \frac{c_1}{m_f} \sum_{q=1}^{\infty} \frac{\ln n_q}{(n_q \ln n_q)^{\varepsilon_{j_q}/4}} < \infty
\end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 6. Hence,

$$\int_{K_f} \int_{K_f} \exp \left\{ m_f \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (\ell_k - |t - s|)_+ \right\} d\sigma_0(s) d\sigma_0(t) < \infty,$$

and we thus obtain that $\text{Cap}_{m_f}(K_f) > 0$.

5.1.1. *Proof of Lemma 6.* We will define A as a Cantor set by a modification of the standard construction using nested sequence. (See [4] for instance.) For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\lambda_k = \sum_{i=1}^k 1/3^i$. Let $E^{(0)} = [0, 1]$. Define $E_0^{(1)}$ and $E_2^{(1)}$ by deleting from the middle of $E^{(0)}$ an open interval J_0 of length $\frac{1}{3}|E^{(0)}|$, namely $J_0 = (\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3})$, $E_0^{(1)} = [0, \frac{1}{3}]$ and $E_2^{(1)} = [\frac{2}{3}, 1]$, respectively. Continue this procedure up to k_1 -steps. Namely, if we have defined closed intervals $E_w^{(k)}$ for $w = w_1 \cdots w_k \in \{0, 2\}^k$, where $k \in \{1, \dots, k_1 - 1\}$, then define $E_{w_0}^{(k+1)}, E_{w_2}^{(k+1)}$ by deleting from the middle of $E_w^{(k)}$ an open interval J_{w_1} of length $\frac{1}{3}|E_w^{(k)}|$, that is $E_w^{(k)} = E_{w_0}^{(k+1)} \sqcup J_{w_1} \sqcup E_{w_2}^{(k+1)}$.

In the next step, define closed intervals $E_{w_0}^{(k_1+1)}, E_{w_2}^{(k_1+1)}$ for each $w \in \{0, 2\}^{k_1}$ by deleting from the middle of $E_w^{(k_1)}$ an open interval J_{w_1} of length $(1 - 2\lambda_{k_1+1})|E_w^{(k_1)}|$. Continue this procedure for the next k_2 -steps. That is, if we have defined closed intervals $E_w^{(k)}$ for $w = w_1 \cdots w_k \in \{0, 2\}^k$, where $k \in \{k_1 + 1, \dots, k_2 - 1\}$, then define $E_{w_0}^{(k+1)}, E_{w_2}^{(k+1)}$ by deleting from the middle of $E_w^{(k)}$ an open interval J_{w_1} of length $(1 - 2\lambda_{k+1})|E_w^{(k)}|$, that is $E_w^{(k)} = E_{w_0}^{(k+1)} \sqcup J_{w_1} \sqcup E_{w_2}^{(k+1)}$.

We will repeat the whole procedure above. Namely, for $k \in \{k_2 + 1, \dots, k_3\}$ we define E_w^k by deleting an open interval of length $\frac{1}{3}$ portion of previous, and for $k \in \{k_3 + 1, \dots, k_4\}$ we define E_w^k by deleting an open interval of length $(1 - 2\lambda_k)$ portion of previous, and so on. Define then

$$A = \bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{w \in \{0, 2\}^k} E_w^{(k)}.$$

For each integer $k \in \mathbb{N}$, denote the length of the intervals $E_w^{(k)}$, $w \in \{0, 2\}^k$ by δ_k . (Set $\delta_0 = 1$.) Let $T = \sqcup_{q=0}^{\infty} \{k_{2q} + 1, \dots, k_{2q+1}\} = \sqcup_{q=0}^{\infty} T_q$ and $H = \sqcup_{q=0}^{\infty} \{k_{2q+1} + 1, \dots, k_{2(q+1)}\} = \sqcup_{q=0}^{\infty} H_q$ with $k_0 = 0$. Then for $k \in T \sqcup H = \mathbb{N}$, there is a unique

$q = q(k) \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ such that $k \in T_q$ or $k \in H_q$. One can see that

$$(5.1) \quad \delta_k = \begin{cases} \left(\frac{1}{3}\right)^{k-k_{2q}} \delta_{k_{2q}}, & k \in T_q \\ \lambda_k \cdots \lambda_{k_{2q+1}+1} \delta_{k_{2q+1}}, & k \in H_q, \end{cases}$$

where

$$\lambda_k \cdots \lambda_{k_{2q+1}+1} = \prod_{j=k_{2q+1}+1}^k \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{3^j}\right) \approx \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{k-k_{2q+1}} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{3^{k_{2q+1}}} - \frac{1}{3^k}\right)\right\}$$

up to a uniform constant, and thus $\delta_k/\delta_{k-1} \in [1/3, 1/2)$. Note that $M(A, \delta_k) \leq 2^k$ in view of the obvious covering by $\{E_w^{(k)}\}_{w \in \{0,2\}^k}$. (Here and below, recall the definition of box-counting dimension from Section 2) Note also that given an interval of length δ_k there exist at most two intervals $E_w^{(k-1)}$ which intersect it, and hence $M(A, \delta_k) \geq 2^{k-1}$. Thus for a sequence k_q growing fast enough one can show that

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\dim}_B A &= \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln M(A, \delta_k)}{-\ln \delta_k} = \frac{\ln 2}{\ln 3} < 1, \\ \overline{\dim}_B A &= \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln M(A, \delta_k)}{-\ln \delta_k} = \frac{\ln 2}{\ln 2} = 1. \end{aligned}$$

But then $\dim_H A \leq \underline{\dim}_B A < \overline{\dim}_B A = 1$.

Next, we define a distribution function F on $[0, 1]$ to obtain a measure supported on the Cantor set A defined above, and it is accomplished in a similar way as defining the singular Cantor function. For completeness, it is outlined below. For $w \in \{0, 2\}$, let

$$\bar{w} = \begin{cases} 0, & w = 0, \\ 1, & w = 2. \end{cases}$$

Define for $x \in [0, 1] \setminus A$ by

$$F(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}, & x \in J_1, \\ \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{\bar{w}_i}{2^i} + \frac{1}{2^k}, & x \in J_{w_1 \cdots w_{k-1}}. \end{cases}$$

It can be extended to a continuous non-decreasing function on $[0, 1]$, and denote the resulting function by F as well. Let σ_0 be the associated probability measure supported on A , i.e.

$$\sigma_0((a, b)) = F(b) - F(a).$$

Then one can see that

$$\sigma_0(E_w^{(k)}) = \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^k$$

for every $w \in \{0, 2\}^k$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Taking $\#T_q < \#H_q$ and $\#H_q < \#H_{q+1}$ for all large $q \in \mathbb{N}$, it then follows from (5.1) that

$$\sigma_0(E_w^{(k)}) \lesssim \delta_k^{1-(\varepsilon_k/4)}$$

for $k \in H$ up to a uniform constant. Hence, there is a family of disjoint intervals $\{[u_k, v_k]\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $u_k > 0$, $v_{k+1} < u_k$, and $u_k/v_k < c_0$ for some constant $c_0 > 0$ such that for every $r \in [u_k, v_k]$ and $t \in A$ one has

$$\sigma_0(B(t, r)) \leq c_1 r^{1-(\varepsilon_k/4)}$$

for some constant $c_1 > 0$.

5.2. Proof of Theorem 2-(b): Part I. In this section, we will prove the first half of Theorem 2-(b).

In the previous example we saw that if the sequence $m_f(\ell_1 + \dots + \ell_n)/\ln n$ has strong oscillations and $\{\ell_n\}$ tends to have many clusters, then non-covering phenomena can occur when $\dim_H K_f < 1$. In contrast, in this Section we show that if we restrict these oscillatory behaviour then μ_f -Dvoretzky covering can be achieved.

First, note that the necessity of (1.4) follows from Theorem 1-(a) (or Proposition 3) independently of the dimension of K_f and the specific form of the sequence ℓ_n . It is thus enough to show that \mathbb{T} is μ_f -Dvoretzky covered by the sequence $\ell_n = \frac{1}{m_f} \left(\frac{1}{n} - \frac{1+\beta}{n \ln n} \right)$. (Note that (1.4) is fulfilled by this sequence ℓ_n .) We will prove this for general sequences stated as in Remark 2, instead of the specific sequence above, for the sake of completeness. Namely, let $f \in L^1(\mathbb{T})$ be a probability density function so that $m_f > 0$ and $\dim_H K_f < 1$, and let $\{\ell_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence satisfying (1.4) and

$$(5.2) \quad \dim_H K_f < \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} m_f n \ell_n \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} m_f n \ell_n < \infty.$$

We then show \mathbb{T} is μ_f -Dvoretzky covered by sequences satisfying (1.4) and (5.2). Once it is shown, Theorem 2-(b) will follow since (5.2) is fulfilled by $\ell_n = \frac{1}{m_f} \left(\frac{1}{n} - \frac{1+\beta}{n \ln n} \right)$ for $m_f n \ell_n \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

To see \mathbb{T} is μ_f -Dvoretzky covered, we will use [5, Proposition 5.2]. We obtain (1.2) by Lemma 5. Henceforth, we will show (1.3), that is, $\text{Cap}_{m_f}(K_f) = 0$.

For $(s, t) \in K_f \times K_f$ with $|t - s| \in (\ell_{n+1}, \ell_n]$ one has

$$m_f \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (\ell_k - |t - s|)_+ = m_f \sum_{k=1}^n (\ell_k - |t - s|).$$

For $t \in K_f$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $A_t(n) = (t + \ell_{n+1}, t + \ell_n] \cup [t - \ell_n, t - \ell_{n+1})$. Let $\nu_* = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} m_f n \ell_n$ and $\nu^* = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} m_f n \ell_n$. By assumption, for some constant $c_0 \in (0, \nu^*)$ and $N_1 \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $m_f n \ell_n \leq c_0$ for every $n \geq N_1$. Take $\varepsilon > 0$ so small that $\nu_* - \varepsilon > \dim_H K_f$. There exists $N_2 = N_2(\varepsilon) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $n \geq N_2$ one has $m_f n \ell_n > \nu_* - \varepsilon$. Let $N_0 = \max\{N_1, N_2\}$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} I^{(m_f)}(\sigma) &= \int_{K_f} \int_{K_f} \exp \left\{ m_f \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (\ell_k - |t - s|)_+ \right\} d\sigma(s) d\sigma(t) \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_{K_f} \left[\int_{K_f \cap A_t(n)} \exp \left\{ m_f \sum_{k=1}^n (\ell_k - |t - s|) \right\} d\sigma(s) \right] d\sigma(t) \\ &\geq \sum_{n=1}^{N_0-1} \int_{K_f} \left[\int_{K_f \cap A_t(n)} \exp \left\{ m_f \sum_{k=1}^n (\ell_k - |t - s|) \right\} d\sigma(s) \right] d\sigma(t) \end{aligned}$$

$$(5.3) \quad + \sum_{n=N_0}^{\infty} \int_{K_f} \left[\int_{K_f \cap A_t(n)} \exp \left\{ m_f \sum_{k=1}^n \ell_k - c_0 \right\} d\sigma(s) \right] d\sigma(t),$$

where the first term in the right-hand side, denoted by R_0 , will be bounded from above for

$$0 \leq R_0 \leq \sum_{n=1}^{N_0-1} \int_{K_f} \left[\int_{K_f \cap A_t(n)} \exp \{ m_f n \ell_1 \} d\sigma(s) \right] d\sigma(t) \leq N_0 |K_f|^2 e^{m_f N_0} < \infty.$$

For the second term (5.3), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} m_f \sum_{k=1}^n \ell_k &= m_f \sum_{k=1}^{N_2-1} \ell_k + m_f \sum_{k=N_2}^n \ell_k \\ &\geq m_f \sum_{k=1}^{N_2-1} \ell_k + \sum_{k=N_2}^n \frac{\nu_* - \varepsilon}{k} \\ &= m_f \sum_{k=1}^{N_2-1} \ell_k - \sum_{k=1}^{N_2-1} \frac{\nu_* - \varepsilon}{k} + \sum_{k=1}^{N_2-1} \frac{\nu_* - \varepsilon}{k} + \sum_{k=N_2}^n \frac{\nu_* - \varepsilon}{k} \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{N_2-1} \left(m_f \ell_k - \frac{\nu_* - \varepsilon}{k} \right) + \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{\nu_* - \varepsilon}{k}, \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$(5.4) \quad \exp \left\{ m_f \sum_{k=1}^n \ell_k - c_0 \right\} \geq C_1 \exp \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{\nu_* - \varepsilon}{k} \right\} \geq C_1 n^{\nu_* - \varepsilon},$$

where $C_1 = C_1(\varepsilon) > 0$ is a bounded constant taken as

$$C_1 = e^{-c_0} \exp \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^{N_1-1} \left(m_f \ell_k - \frac{\nu_* - \varepsilon}{k} \right) \right\} \leq \exp \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^{N_1-1} m_f \ell_k \right\} \leq e^{m_f N_1} < \infty.$$

Note that for every $s \in A_t(n)$ and $n \geq N_0$, one has

$$(5.5) \quad n|t - s| \geq c_1 > 0$$

for some constant $c_1 = c_1(\varepsilon) > 0$ as

$$n|t - s| \geq n \ell_{n+1} = \frac{n}{n+1} (n+1) \ell_{n+1} \geq \frac{n}{n+1} \frac{\nu_* - \varepsilon}{m_f} > 0.$$

It follows from (5.3), (5.4), and (5.5) that

$$\begin{aligned} I^{(m_f)}(\sigma) &\geq R_0 + C_2 \sum_{n=N_0}^{\infty} \int_{K_f} \left[\int_{K_f \cap A_t(n)} \frac{1}{|t - s|^{\nu_* - \varepsilon}} d\sigma(s) \right] d\sigma(t) \\ &= R_0 + C_2 \left\{ \int_{K_f} \int_{K_f} \frac{1}{|t - s|^{\nu_* - \varepsilon}} d\sigma(t) d\sigma(s) - \iint_B \frac{1}{|t - s|^{\nu_* - \varepsilon}} d\sigma(t) d\sigma(s) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

where we let $C_2 = C_1 c_1^{\nu_* - \varepsilon} \in (0, \infty)$, and $B = \cup_{t \in K_f} \cup_{n=1}^{N_0-1} \{\{t\} \times (K_f \cap A_t(n))\} \subset K_f \times K_f$. Note that the double integral over B , denote it by R_1 , is bounded since

$$R_1 = \iint_B \frac{1}{|t-s|^{\nu_* - \varepsilon}} d\sigma(t) d\sigma(s) \leq \sigma \otimes \sigma(B) \frac{1}{\ell_{N_0}^{\nu_* - \varepsilon}} < \infty.$$

Thus we have

$$(5.6) \quad I^{(m_f)}(\sigma) \geq R_0 - C_2 R_1 + C_2 \int_{K_f} \int_{K_f} \frac{1}{|t-s|^{\nu_* - \varepsilon}} d\sigma(t) d\sigma(s).$$

The last integral in (5.6) is known as the Riesz energy of the measure σ supported on a compact set F :

$$(5.7) \quad I_s(\sigma) = \int_F \int_F \frac{1}{|t-s|^s} d\sigma(t) d\sigma(s).$$

It is known that if $I_s(\nu) < \infty$ for some ν , then $\dim_{\mathbb{H}} F \geq s$. (See [4, Proposition 4.13] for instance.) Hence, since $\nu_* - \varepsilon > \dim_{\mathbb{H}} K_f$, for every measure σ supported on K_f we will have $I_{\nu_* - \varepsilon}(\sigma) = \infty$, and thus $I^{(m_f)}(\sigma) = \infty$ by (5.6). This implies that $\text{Cap}_{m_f}(K_f) = 0$.

5.3. Proof of Theorem 2-(b): Part II. In this section, we will prove the second half of Theorem 2-(b). We show that there exist a compact set $A \subset \mathbb{T}$ with $\dim_{\mathbb{H}} A = 1$, and a probability density function $f \in L^1(\mathbb{T})$ with $m_f > 0$ and f is Lipschitz on A such that $K_f = A$. Then by [5, Corollary 1.1-(2)], we see that the conditions (1.2) and (1.3) will be both necessary and sufficient for μ_f -Dvoretzky covering. However, since we can show $\text{Cap}_{m_f}(K_f) > 0$ for the sequence $\ell_n = \frac{1}{m_f} \left(\frac{1}{n} - \frac{1+\beta}{n \ln n} \right)$, there can be no μ_f -Dvoretzky covering. It now remains to construct the set A .

Lemma 7. *There exists a Cantor set $A \subset \mathbb{T}$, with $\dim_{\mathbb{H}} A = 1$ and $|A| = 0$, admitting a Borel probability measure σ_0 supported on A for which*

$$(5.8) \quad \sigma_0(B) \leq c_0 |\ln \text{diam } B| \cdot \text{diam } B$$

for every ball $B \subset \mathbb{T}$ and some constant $c_0 > 0$.

We will prove this lemma at the end of this section, and proceed the argument to show $A (= K_f)$ has positive capacity with respect to $\Phi^{(m_f)}$, namely

$$(5.9) \quad I^{(m_f)}(\sigma_0) = \int_A \int_A \exp \left\{ m_f \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (\ell_k - |t-s|)_+ \right\} d\sigma_0(s) d\sigma_0(t) < \infty.$$

Note that for $(s, t) \in A \times A$ with $|t-s| \in (\ell_{n+1}, \ell_n]$ one has

$$m_f \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (\ell_k - |t-s|)_+ = m_f \sum_{k=1}^n (\ell_k - |t-s|) \leq m_f \sum_{k=1}^n \ell_k \approx \ln n - (1+\beta) \ln \ln n$$

up to a uniform constant. For $t \in A$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $A_t(n) = (t + \ell_{n+1}, t + \ell_n] \cup [t - \ell_n, t - \ell_{n+1})$. It follows that for each $t \in A$

$$\int_A \exp \left\{ m_f \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (\ell_k - |t-s|)_+ \right\} d\sigma_0(s)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_{A \cap A_t(n)} \exp \left\{ m_f \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (\ell_k - |t-s|)_+ \right\} d\sigma_0(s) \\
&\lesssim \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_{A \cap A_t(n)} \frac{n}{(\ln n)^{1+\beta}} d\sigma_0(s) \\
&\leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{n}{(\ln n)^{1+\beta}} \right) \sigma_0(A_t(n)).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\ell_n - \ell_{n+1} \lesssim 1/n^2$, it follows from (5.8) that

$$\sigma_0(A_t(n)) \lesssim 4c_0(\ln n) \cdot \frac{1}{n^2},$$

and thus

$$\int_A \exp \left\{ m_f \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (\ell_k - |t-s|)_+ \right\} d\sigma_0(s) \lesssim \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n(\ln n)^\beta}$$

for every $t \in A$. Consequently, one has

$$I^{(m_f)}(\sigma_0) \lesssim \sigma_0(A) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n(\ln n)^\beta} < \infty$$

for $\beta > 1$.

5.3.1. *Proof of Lemma 7.* First, define a Cantor set having Hausdorff dimension one and of Lebesgue measure zero by the standard construction using nested sequence. (See [4] for instance.) Let $E^{(1)} = E^{(2)} = [0, 1]$. Define $E_0^{(3)}$ and $E_2^{(3)}$ by deleting from the middle of $E^{(2)}$ an open interval J_1 of length $\frac{1}{3}|E^{(2)}|$, namely $J_1 = (\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3})$, $E_0^{(3)} = [0, \frac{1}{3}]$ and $E_2^{(3)} = [\frac{2}{3}, 1]$, respectively. In the next step, define closed intervals $E_{00}^{(4)}, E_{02}^{(4)}$ by deleting from the middle of $E_0^{(3)}$ an open interval J_{01} of length $\frac{1}{4}|E_0^{(3)}|$. By the same way, define closed intervals $E_{20}^{(4)}, E_{22}^{(4)}$ by deleting from the middle of $E_2^{(3)}$ an open interval J_{21} of length $\frac{1}{4}|E_2^{(3)}|$. If we have defined closed intervals $E_w^{(k+1)}$ for $w = w_1 \cdots w_{k-1} \in \{0, 2\}^{k-1}$, then define $E_{w0}^{(k+2)}, E_{w2}^{(k+2)}$ by deleting from the middle of $E_w^{(k+1)}$ an open interval J_{w1} of length $\frac{1}{k}|E_w^{(k+1)}|$, that is $E_w^{(k+1)} = E_{w0}^{(k+2)} \sqcup J_{w1} \sqcup E_{w2}^{(k+2)}$. Define

$$A = \bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{w \in \{0,2\}^k} E_w^{(k+2)}.$$

For each integer $k \geq 3$, all the intervals $E_w^{(k)}$, $w \in \{0, 2\}^{k-2}$, have the same length, and denote it by δ_k . (Set $\delta_1 = \delta_2 = 1$.) In fact, for $k \geq 3$ one has

$$\delta_k = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{k} \right) \delta_{k-1},$$

and thus $\delta_k/\delta_{k-1} \in [1/3, 1/2)$. It follows that for all large $k \in \mathbb{N}$

$$(5.10) \quad \delta_k = \prod_{j=3}^k \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{j} \right) \approx \left(\frac{1}{2} \right)^{k-2} e^{-\sum_{j=3}^k \frac{1}{j}} \approx \left(\frac{1}{2} \right)^{k-2} \frac{1}{k}$$

up to uniform constants. Hence one has $|A| = 0$. By [4, Example 4.6], one also has

$$\dim_{\text{H}} A \geq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln(2^k)}{-\ln\left(\frac{2}{k+1}\delta_k\right)} = 1.$$

Next, we define a distribution function F on $[0, 1]$ to obtain a measure supported on the Cantor set A defined above, and it is accomplished by the same way as in the proof of Lemma 6, hence we omit this part. Let σ_0 be the associated probability measure supported on A , i.e.

$$\sigma_0((a, b)) = F(b) - F(a).$$

Then one can see that

$$\sigma_0(E_w^{(k+2)}) = \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^k$$

for every $w \in \{0, 2\}^k$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $\text{diam}E_w^{(k+2)} = \delta_{k+2}$, it follows from (5.10) that

$$\sigma_0(E_w^{(k+2)}) \lesssim (k+2)\text{diam}E_w^{(k+2)} \lesssim -\ln(\text{diam}E_w^{(k+2)}) \cdot \text{diam}E_w^{(k+2)}$$

up to a uniform constant as $-\ln \delta_{k+2} = k \ln 2 + \ln(k+2)$. Given a ball B of diameter (length) $r > 0$, it is covered by at most two $E_w^{(k+2)}$ and $E_{w'}^{(k+2)}$ for some $w, w' \in \{0, 2\}^k$ where $k = k_r \in \mathbb{N}$ is chosen so that $\delta_{k+3} \leq r < \delta_{k+2}$. Thus it follows from above that

$$\sigma_0(B) \leq c_0 |\ln(\text{diam}B)| \cdot \text{diam}B$$

for some constant $c_0 > 0$.

6. PROOF OF THEOREM 3

Let g be a density function. Recall that $m_g = \text{essinf}_{\mathbb{T}} g$ and $K_g \subset \mathbb{T}$ is the set of essential infimum points of g .

6.1. Auxiliary covering. We begin with a generic inequality. Given a decreasing sequence of positive numbers with $\ell_n \in (0, 1)$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$, let $I_n = (\omega_n - (\ell_n/2), \omega_n + (\ell_n/2))$ and

$$U_N = \bigcup_{j=1}^N I_j.$$

Let A be a compact subset of \mathbb{T} . Given $\varepsilon > 0$, we consider a minimal system of balls of radius ε covering A , say $B(x_1, \varepsilon), \dots, B(x_M, \varepsilon)$ then $M = M(A, \varepsilon) \in \mathbb{N}$ is the ε -covering number of A . Since

$$A \subset \bigcup_{q=1}^M B(x_q, \varepsilon)$$

we have

$$\Pr(A \not\subset U_N) \leq \sum_{q=1}^M \Pr(B(x_q, \varepsilon) \not\subset U_N).$$

For every $N \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\Pr(B(x_q, \varepsilon) \not\subset U_N) = \prod_{j=1}^N \Pr(B(x_q, \varepsilon) \not\subset I_j) = \prod_{j=1}^N \Pr(\omega_j \notin I_{j,q}^\varepsilon),$$

where

$$(6.1) \quad I_{j,q}^\varepsilon = \{\omega_j \in \mathbb{T} : B(x_q, \varepsilon) \subset I_j\} = B\left(x_q, \frac{\ell_j}{2} - \varepsilon\right).$$

Suppose that we are given a probability density function $g \in L^1(\mathbb{T})$. Recall that μ_g denotes the distribution of ω_n so that $d\mu_g = g dt$. Then one has

$$\Pr(\omega_j \notin I_{j,q}^\varepsilon) = 1 - \mu_g(I_{j,q}^\varepsilon) = 1 - \int_{I_{j,q}^\varepsilon} g(t) dt,$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(B(x_q, \varepsilon) \not\subset U_N) &= \prod_{j=1}^N \Pr(\omega_j \notin I_{j,q}^\varepsilon) = \prod_{j=1}^N (1 - \mu_g(I_{j,q}^\varepsilon)) \\ &\leq \exp\left(-\sum_{j=1}^N \mu_g(I_{j,q}^\varepsilon)\right) \\ &= \exp\left(-\sum_{j=1}^N \int_{I_{j,q}^\varepsilon} g(t) dt\right) \end{aligned}$$

for each $q \in \{1, \dots, M\}$. Therefore one has

$$(6.2) \quad \Pr(A \not\subset U_N) \leq \sum_{q=1}^M \exp\left(-\sum_{j=1}^N \int_{I_{j,q}^\varepsilon} g(t) dt\right)$$

for every $N \in \mathbb{N}$.

Inequality (6.2) will be key in obtaining μ_g -Dvoretzky covered for the set K_g for some g , to be constructed below. Note that the assumption (1.4) implies that for any $a > m_f$

$$(6.3) \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \exp\{a(\ell_1 + \dots + \ell_n)\} = \infty.$$

Then there is an infinite set $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $n \in \Lambda$ one has $\ell_n > 1/(2n)$. Indeed, if we let $u_n = \frac{1}{n} \exp(\ell_1 + \dots + \ell_n)$ and $\Lambda = \{n \in \mathbb{N} : u_n \geq \sup_{m < n} u_m\}$, then it follows from (6.3) with $a = 1$ (note that $m_f < 1$) that $\#\Lambda = \infty$ and $\lim_{n \in \Lambda} u_n = \infty$, and hence for every $n \in \Lambda$ one has $\ell_n \geq \ln \frac{n}{n-1} > \frac{1}{2n}$ since $u_n \geq u_{n-1}$. We now state a key lemma:

Lemma 8. *Let $\rho \in [0, 1]$, $\{\ell_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a decreasing sequence with $\sum_{n=1}^\infty \ell_n = \infty$, and $A \subset \mathbb{T}$ a non-empty compact set with $|A| = 0$. Then there exist a probability density function $g \in L^1(\mathbb{T})$ with $m_g = \rho$ and $K_g = A$, a sequence of blocks of consecutive integers $\left\{ \left[n_1^{(k)}, n_2^{(k)} \right] \cap \mathbb{N} \right\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $n_2^{(k)} \in \Lambda$, and a sequence of collections of balls $\left\{ \mathcal{B}^{(k)} = \left\{ B_q^{(k)} \right\}_{q=1}^{M_k} \right\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ with radii $\{\varepsilon_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\varepsilon_k \in \left[\ell_{n_2^{(k)}}/4, \ell_{n_2^{(k)}}/2 \right)$ such that*

1) For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and some $C > 0$

$$K_f \subset \cup_{q=1}^{M_k} B_q^{(k)}$$

$$\text{and } M_k = \#\mathcal{B}^{(k)} \leq C \varepsilon_k^{-\overline{\dim}_B A}.$$

2) For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\frac{\ell_1 + \cdots + \ell_{n_1^{(k)}}}{\ell_{n_1^{(k)}} + \cdots + \ell_{n_2^{(k)}}} < \frac{1}{2^k}.$$

3) For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and every $j \in [n_1^{(k)}, n_2^{(k)}] \cap \mathbb{N}$, we have that

$$\int_{I_{j,q}^{\varepsilon_k}} g(t) dt \geq |I_{j,q}^{\varepsilon_k}|,$$

where $I_{j,q}^{\varepsilon_k} \subset B_q^{(k)}$ is the ball of the form (6.1) around x_q , where x_q is the center of the ball $B_q^{(k)} \in \mathcal{B}^{(k)}$.

We will postpone the proof of this lemma to Section 6.2.1, and proceed the argument for the proof of Theorem 3. We use inequality (6.2) with Lemma 8 to show that K_g is μ_g -Dvoretzky covered. For each family $\mathcal{B}^{(k)}$ of balls of radius ε_k , it follows from Lemma 8-(2,4) that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^N \int_{I_{j,q}^{\varepsilon_k}} g(t) dt &= \left(\sum_{j=n_1^{(1)}}^{n_2^{(1)}} + \sum_{j=n_1^{(2)}}^{n_2^{(2)}} + \cdots + \sum_{j=n_1^{(k)}}^{n_2^{(k)}} + \sum_{\substack{j=1, \\ j \notin D}}^N \right) \int_{I_{j,q}^{\varepsilon_k}} g(t) dt \\ &\geq \sum_{j=n_1^{(k)}}^{n_2^{(k)}} \int_{I_{j,q}^{\varepsilon_k}} g(t) dt \\ &\geq \sum_{j=n_1^{(k)}}^{n_2^{(k)}} (\ell_j - 2\varepsilon_k) \geq \frac{1}{1+2^{-k}} \sum_{j=1}^{n_2^{(k)}} \ell_j - \sum_{j=1}^{n_2^{(k)}} 2\varepsilon_k \end{aligned}$$

for every $N \in \mathbb{N}$, where $D = \cup_{i=1}^k ([n_1^{(i)}, n_2^{(i)}] \cap \mathbb{N})$. Hence by (6.2) one has

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(A \not\subset U_N) &\leq \sum_{q=1}^{M_k} \exp \left(- \sum_{j=1}^N \int_{I_{j,q}^{\varepsilon_k}} g(t) dt \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{q=1}^{M_k} \exp \left\{ - \left(\frac{1}{1+2^{-k}} \sum_{j=1}^{n_2^{(k)}} \ell_j - \sum_{j=1}^{n_2^{(k)}} 2\varepsilon_k \right) \right\} \\ (6.4) \quad &= \exp \left\{ - \left(\frac{1}{1+2^{-k}} \sum_{j=1}^{n_2^{(k)}} \ell_j - \sum_{j=1}^{n_2^{(k)}} 2\varepsilon_k \right) + \ln M_k \right\} \end{aligned}$$

for every $N \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n_2^{(k)} \in \Lambda$. Taking $\varepsilon_k = 1/(2n_2^{(k)})$, one has

$$-\frac{1}{1+2^{-k}} \sum_{j=1}^{n_2^{(k)}} \ell_j + \sum_{j=1}^{n_2^{(k)}} \frac{1}{n_2^{(k)}} + \ln M_k \leq -\frac{1}{1+2^{-k}} \sum_{j=1}^{n_2^{(k)}} \ell_j + 1 + \ln(2n_2^{(k)})$$

as $\overline{\dim_{\text{B}}} A \leq 1$. Since the right-hand side is less than zero by (1.4), it follows that $\Pr(A \not\subset U_N) \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$, that is K_g is μ_g -Dvoretzky covered.

6.2. Concluding the proof of Theorem 3. Henceforth, we will define a function f_0 having the desired properties as stated. We choose a set $B \subset \mathbb{T} \setminus K_f$ so that $|B| < \varepsilon/2$ and $f(x) \geq 1$ for all $x \in B$ (recall that $\|f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T})} = 1$). Since $|K_f| = 0$, we then take a covering $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i\}_{i=1}^k$ of K_f such that $|\cup_{i=1}^k U_i|/|B| < 1 - m_f$. Note that one can assume $B \cap \cup_{i=1}^k U_i = \emptyset$. By Lemma 8 with $\rho = m_f$ and $A = K_f \cap U_i$, one obtains a function g_i so that $m_{g_i} = m_f$ and $K_{g_i} = K_f \cap U_i$ for $i = \{1, \dots, k\}$. Let $U = \cup_{i=1}^k U_i$. Define

$$g_U = g_1|_{U_1} + \dots + g_k|_{U_k},$$

and set

$$g = g_U + f|_{\mathbb{T} \setminus U}.$$

Then one has $m_g = m_f$, $K_g = K_f$, and

$$\|g\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T})} = \|f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T})} - \int_U f \, dx + \int_U g_U \, dx = 1 - \int_U f \, dx + \int_U g_U \, dx.$$

Let $c = -\int_U f \, dx + \int_U g_U \, dx$, and define $f_0 = g - \frac{c}{|B|}\mathbb{1}_B$. Then we have

$$|\{x \in \mathbb{T}: f(x) \neq f_0(x)\}| \leq |U| + |B| < 2|B| < \varepsilon.$$

Next, we will show $m_{f_0} = m_f$ and $K_{f_0} = K_f$. If $c \leq 0$, then it is clear from the definition of f_0 that $f_0|_B \geq g|_B$ and $f_0|_U = g|_U = g_U$. Suppose $c > 0$. Note that $\int_U f \, dx < \int_U g_U \, dx \leq |U|$, and hence $c \leq |U|$. It follows that for $x \in B$ we have

$$(f_0|_B)(x) \geq f(x) - \frac{c}{|B|} \geq 1 - \frac{|U|}{|B|} > m_f.$$

This implies $m_{f_0} = m_f$ and $K_{f_0} = K_f$ in this case as well.

We also have

$$\|f_0\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T})} = \|g\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T})} - c = 1 + c - c = 1.$$

It remains to show that the circle \mathbb{T} is μ_{f_0} -Dvoretzky covered by a sequence satisfying (1.4). Note first that, by (1.4) and Lemma 5, one has

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2} \exp\{a(\ell_1 + \dots + \ell_n)\} = \infty$$

for every $a > m_{f_0} (= m_f)$. Thus by [5, Proposition 5.1] the set $\mathbb{T} \setminus K_{f_0}$ is μ_{f_0} -Dvoretzky covered. Next, note that $f_0|_U = g|_U = g_1|_{U_1} + \dots + g_k|_{U_k}$. Here, note also that $U = \cup_{i=1}^k U_i$ and $K_{g_i} = K_f \cap U_i = K_{f_0} \cap U_i$ is μ_{g_i} -Dvoretzky covered for each $i = \{1, \dots, k\}$ by the argument in Section 6.1. Hence K_{f_0} is μ_{f_0} -Dvoretzky covered.

6.2.1. Proof of lemma 8. For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$\mathcal{D}^{(k)} = \left\{ \left[\frac{i}{2^k}, \frac{i+1}{2^k} \right) \subset \mathbb{T}: i = 0, \dots, 2^k - 1 \right\}$$

and $\mathcal{D}_A^{(k)} = \{J \in \mathcal{D}^{(k)}: J \cap A \neq \emptyset\}$.

For each $J \in \mathcal{D}_A^{(k)}$, choose an arbitrary point $y_J^{(k)} \in J \setminus A$, and let $Y^{(k)}$ be the collection of all such points, i.e.,

$$Y^{(k)} = \left\{ y_J^{(k)} \in \mathbb{T}: J \in \mathcal{D}_A^{(k)} \right\}.$$

Sometimes, we may denote $y \in Y^{(k)}$ by $y^{(k)}$ to specify its generation. Note that $\#Y^{(k)} \leq 2^k$. Let

$$\delta_k = d(Y^{(k)}, A).$$

Note that $\delta_k > 0$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we will define sequences of integers $n_1^{(k)}, n_2^{(k)} \in \mathbb{N}$, positive small numbers $\eta_k > 0$, $\varepsilon_k > 0$, and finite families $\mathcal{Y}^{(k)}$ and $\mathcal{B}^{(k)}$ of balls of radii η_k and ε_k , respectively. First, we take $n_1^{(1)} \in \mathbb{N}$ so large that $\ell_{n_1^{(1)}} \leq \delta_1/4$. We next choose $n_2^{(1)} \in \Lambda$ and blocks $(\ell_{n_1^{(1)}}, \dots, \ell_{n_2^{(1)}})$ so that

$$(6.5) \quad \frac{\ell_1 + \dots + \ell_{n_1^{(1)}}}{\ell_{n_1^{(1)}} + \dots + \ell_{n_2^{(1)}}} < \frac{1}{2}.$$

Note that such a choice is possible since $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \ell_n = \infty$. Take $\eta_1 \in (0, \delta_1/4]$, and let $\mathcal{Y}^{(1)} = \{B(y, \eta_1) : y \in Y^{(1)}\}$. Note that for every ball B of $\text{diam} B \leq \delta_1/4$ which intersects A , we have

$$(6.6) \quad B(y, \eta_1) \cap B = \emptyset$$

for every $B(y, \eta_1) \in \mathcal{Y}^{(1)}$. To conclude the first step of our construction, we take $\varepsilon_1 \in [\ell_{n_2^{(1)}}/4, \ell_{n_2^{(1)}}/2)$ to be the dyadic number so that $-\log_2 \varepsilon_1 \in \mathbb{N}$, and set $\mathcal{B}^{(1)} = \mathcal{D}_A^{(-\log_2 \varepsilon_1)}$. Hence $A \subset \sqcup \mathcal{B}^{(1)}$. Note that every $B \in \mathcal{B}^{(1)}$ fulfills (6.6) since

$$\text{diam} B = 2\varepsilon_1 < \ell_{n_2^{(1)}} < \ell_{n_1^{(1)}} \leq \delta_1/4.$$

One obtains a collection $\delta_1, n_1^{(1)}, n_2^{(1)}, \eta_1, \varepsilon_1, \mathcal{Y}^{(1)}, \mathcal{B}^{(1)}$.

Next, we take $n_1^{(2)} \in \mathbb{N}$ so large that $\ell_{n_1^{(2)}} \leq \delta_2/4$. Here one can assume $\delta_2 \leq \delta_1/2$.

Then choose $n_2^{(2)} \in \Lambda$ and blocks $(\ell_{n_1^{(2)}}, \dots, \ell_{n_2^{(2)}})$ so that

$$(6.7) \quad \frac{\ell_1 + \dots + \ell_{n_1^{(2)}}}{\ell_{n_1^{(2)}} + \dots + \ell_{n_2^{(2)}}} < \frac{1}{2^2}.$$

Take $\eta_2 \in (0, \delta_2/4]$, and define $\mathcal{Y}^{(2)} = \{B(y, \eta_2) : y \in Y^{(2)}\}$. It follows that for every ball B of $\text{diam} B \leq \delta_2/4$ which intersects A , we have

$$(6.8) \quad B(y^{(i)}, \eta_i) \cap B = \emptyset$$

for every $B(y^{(i)}, \eta_i) \in \mathcal{Y}^{(i)}$, $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Take $\varepsilon_2 \in [\ell_{n_2^{(2)}}/4, \ell_{n_2^{(2)}}/2)$ to be the dyadic number so that $-\log_2 \varepsilon_2 \in \mathbb{N}$, and set $\mathcal{B}^{(2)} = \mathcal{D}_A^{(-\log_2 \varepsilon_2)}$. Hence $A \subset \sqcup \mathcal{B}^{(2)}$. Note that every $B \in \mathcal{B}^{(2)}$ fulfills (6.8) since

$$\text{diam} B = 2\varepsilon_2 < \ell_{n_2^{(2)}} < \ell_{n_1^{(2)}} \leq \delta_2/4.$$

Note also that every $B \in \mathcal{B}^{(2)}$ fulfills (6.6) as well since

$$\text{diam} B < \delta_2/4 \leq \delta_1/8.$$

Hence we obtain a collection $\delta_2, n_1^{(2)}, n_2^{(2)}, \eta_2, \varepsilon_2, \mathcal{Y}^{(2)}, \mathcal{B}^{(2)}$.

Repeating the procedure above, we will define $\delta_k, n_1^{(k)}, n_2^{(k)}, \eta_k, \varepsilon_k, \mathcal{Y}^{(k)}, \mathcal{B}^{(k)}$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$. More specifically, on the k -th step, take $n_1^{(k)} \in \mathbb{N}$ so large that $\ell_{n_1^{(k)}} \leq \delta_k/4$. As

earlier, we can assume $\delta_k \leq \delta_{k-1}/2$. Then choose $n_2^{(k)} \in \Lambda$ and blocks $(\ell_{n_1^{(k)}}, \dots, \ell_{n_2^{(k)}})$ so that

$$(6.9) \quad \frac{\ell_1 + \dots + \ell_{n_1^{(k)}}}{\ell_{n_1^{(k)}} + \dots + \ell_{n_2^{(k)}}} < \frac{1}{2^k}.$$

Take $\varepsilon_k \in \left[\ell_{n_2^{(k)}}/4, \ell_{n_2^{(k)}}/2 \right)$ to be the dyadic number so that $-\log_2 \varepsilon_k \in \mathbb{N}$, and set a covering of K by $\mathcal{B}^{(k)} = \mathcal{D}_K^{(-\log_2 \varepsilon_k)}$. Let $\eta_k \in (0, \delta_k/4]$, and $\mathcal{Y}^{(k)} = \{B(y, \eta_k) : y \in Y^{(k)}\}$. Then we see that every ball B of $\text{diam} B \leq \delta_k/4$ which intersects A , we have

$$(6.10) \quad B(y^{(i)}, \eta_i) \cap B = \emptyset$$

for every $B(y^{(i)}, \eta_i) \in \mathcal{Y}^{(i)}$, $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. Every ball $B \in \mathcal{B}^{(k)}$ fulfills (6.10) as well.

Let $M(A, \varepsilon_k)$ be the minimum covering number for A by balls of radius ε_k . Then one has $\#\mathcal{B}_k/2 \leq M(A, \varepsilon_k) \leq \#\mathcal{B}_k$. Hence $\#\mathcal{B}_k \approx M(A, \varepsilon_k) \lesssim \varepsilon_k^{-\overline{\dim} B^A}$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

Now, we define a function $g \in L_+^1(\mathbb{T})$. For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\rho_k = \rho + (1/k)$. For $x \in \cup_{k=1}^{\infty} \cup \mathcal{Y}^{(k)}$, define

$$g(x) = \begin{cases} \rho_k(x), & \#\{k : x \in \cup \mathcal{Y}^{(k)}\} < \infty, \\ \rho, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $k(x) = \max\{k \in \mathbb{N} : x \in \cup \mathcal{Y}^{(k)}\}$. We set the value of g on $\mathbb{T} \setminus (\cup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \cup \mathcal{Y}^{(n)})$ to be the constant, say $\gamma > 0$, so that $\|g\|_{L^1} = 1$. Note that $\gamma \geq 1 \geq m_g$.

It remains to show item (3). Let $B(x_q, \varepsilon_k) \in \mathcal{B}^{(k)}$, and consider $I_{j,q}^{\varepsilon_k}$ for $j \in \{n_1^{(k)}, \dots, n_2^{(k)}\}$. Recall here that $I_{j,q}^{\varepsilon_k} = B(x_q, (\ell_j/2) - \varepsilon_k)$. Note that any ball $B(y^{(i)}, \eta_i) \in \mathcal{Y}^{(i)}$ for $i \leq k$ never intersects $I_{j,q}^{\varepsilon_k}$ since

$$\text{diam} I_{j,q}^{\varepsilon_k} = \ell_j - 2\varepsilon_k \leq \ell_{n_1^{(k)}} - 2\varepsilon_k < \ell_{n_1^{(k)}} \leq \delta_k/4.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{I_{j,q}^{\varepsilon_k}} g dt &= \int_{I_{j,q}^{\varepsilon_k} \cap (\cup_{i>k}^{\infty} \cup \mathcal{Y}^{(i)})} g dt + \int_{I_{j,q}^{\varepsilon_k} \setminus (\cup_{i>k}^{\infty} \cup \mathcal{Y}^{(i)})} g dt \\ &\geq \int_{I_{j,q}^{\varepsilon_k} \setminus (\cup_{i>k}^{\infty} \cup \mathcal{Y}^{(i)})} g dt \\ &\geq \gamma |I_{j,q}^{\varepsilon_k} \setminus (\cup_{i>k}^{\infty} \cup \mathcal{Y}^{(i)})| \\ &\geq \gamma \left(|I_{j,q}^{\varepsilon_k}| - \sum_{i>k}^{\infty} \sum_{B(y, \eta_i) \in \mathcal{Y}^{(i)}} |B(y, \eta_i)| \right) \\ &\geq \gamma \left(|I_{j,q}^{\varepsilon_k}| - \sum_{i>n}^{\infty} 2^i 2\eta_i \right) = \gamma |I_{j,q}^{\varepsilon_k}| \left(1 - \frac{\sum_{i>k}^{\infty} 2^{i+1} \eta_i}{|I_{j,q}^{\varepsilon_k}|} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Given $\zeta \in (0, 1)$, one can take $\{\eta_k\}_k$ so that $(\sum_{i>k}^{\infty} 2^{i+1} \eta_i)/|I_{j,q}^{\varepsilon_k}| < \zeta$, and thus item (3) is obtained.

7. PROOF OF THEOREM 4

Proof. Condition (1.2) is necessary due to Proposition 1. To see that (1.3) is not necessary, consider the density function h constructed in Theorem 2-(a). Consider also the sequence $\{\ell_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ constructed in Theorem 2-(a). We then have $\text{Cap}_{m_h}(K_h) > 0$. Note that $|K_h| = 0$. Hence, by applying Theorem 3 we can find a density function h_0 so that $m_{h_0} = m_h$, $K_{h_0} = K_h$ and for which there is μ_{h_0} -Dvoretzky covering. Thus, for h_0 and $\{\ell_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ above, there will be μ_{h_0} -Dvoretzky covering despite the fact that $\text{Cap}_{m_{h_0}}(K_{h_0}) = \text{Cap}_{m_h}(K_h) > 0$. Taking $f = h_0$, we obtain Theorem 4. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] P. Billard, *Séries de Fourier aléatoirement bornées, continues, uniformément convergentes*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (3) **82** (1965), 131–179 (French). MR0182832
- [2] J. Bourgain, *Almost sure convergence and bounded entropy*, Israel J. Math. **63** (1988), no. 1, 79–97, DOI 10.1007/BF02765022. MR959049
- [3] Aryeh Dvoretzky, *On covering a circle by randomly placed arcs*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. **42** (1956), 199–203, DOI 10.1073/pnas.42.4.199. MR79365
- [4] Kenneth Falconer, *Fractal geometry*, John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Chichester, 1990. Mathematical foundations and applications. MR1102677
- [5] Aihua Fan and Davit Karagulyan, *On μ -Dvoretzky random covering of the circle*, Bernoulli **27** (2021), no. 2, 1270–1290, DOI 10.3150/20-bej1273. MR4255234
- [6] Ai-Hua Fan, Jörg Schmeling, and Serge Troubetzkoy, *A multifractal mass transference principle for Gibbs measures with applications to dynamical Diophantine approximation*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3) **107** (2013), no. 5, 1173–1219, DOI 10.1112/plms/pdt005. MR3126394
- [7] Ai-Hua Fan and Jun Wu, *On the covering by small random intervals*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist. **40** (2004), no. 1, 125–131, DOI 10.1016/S0246-0203(03)00056-6 (English, with English and French summaries). MR2037476
- [8] John Hawkes, *On the covering of small sets by random intervals*, Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser. (2) **24** (1973), 427–432, DOI 10.1093/qmath/24.1.427. MR324748
- [9] Jean-Pierre Kahane, *Sur le recouvrement d'un cercle par des arcs disposés au hasard*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris **248** (1959), 184–186 (French). MR103533
- [10] ———, *Some random series of functions*, 2nd ed., Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 5, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1985. MR833073
- [11] ———, *Recouvrements aléatoires et théorie du potentiel*, Colloq. Math. **60/61** (1990), no. 2, 387–411, DOI 10.4064/cm-60-61-2-287-411 (French). MR1096386
- [12] G. A. Karagulyan and M. H. Safaryan, *On generalizations of Fatou's theorem for the integrals with general kernels*, J. Geom. Anal. **25** (2015), no. 3, 1459–1475, DOI 10.1007/s12220-014-9479-0. MR3358060
- [13] G. Karagulyan and M. Safaryan, *On a theorem of Littlewood*, Hokkaido Math. J. **1** (2017), no. 46, 87–106, DOI 10.14492/hokmj/1498788097. MR3677876
- [14] Sergey Kostyukovsky and Alexander Olevskii, *Compactness of families of convolution operators with respect to convergence almost everywhere*, Real Anal. Exchange **30** (2004/05), no. 2, 755–765. MR2177432
- [15] Benoît B. Mandelbrot, *On Dvoretzky coverings for the circle*, Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verw. Gebiete **22** (1972), 158–160, DOI 10.1007/BF00532734. MR309163
- [16] Tomas Persson and Michał Rams, *On shrinking targets for piecewise expanding interval maps*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **37** (2017), no. 2, 646–663, DOI 10.1017/etds.2015.49. MR3614042
- [17] L. A. Shepp, *Covering the circle with random arcs*, Israel J. Math. **11** (1972), 328–345, DOI 10.1007/BF02789327. MR295402
- [18] JunMin Tang, *Random coverings of the circle with i.i.d. centers*, Sci. China Math. **55** (2012), no. 6, 1257–1268, DOI 10.1007/s11425-011-4338-y. MR2925591