

ALBERTI'S RANK ONE THEOREM AND QUASICONFORMAL MAPPINGS IN METRIC MEASURE SPACES

PANU LAHTI

ABSTRACT. We investigate a version of Alberti's rank one theorem in Ahlfors regular metric spaces, as well as a connection with quasiconformal mappings. More precisely, we give a proof of the rank one theorem that partially follows along the usual steps, but the most crucial step consists in showing for $f \in \text{BV}(X; Y)$ that at $\|Df\|^s$ -a.e. $x \in X$, the mapping f "behaves non-quasiconformally".

1. INTRODUCTION

Alberti's rank one theorem [1] states that for a function of bounded variation $f \in \text{BV}(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R}^k)$, with $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\frac{dDf}{|Df|}(x)$ has rank one for $|D^s f|$ -a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Other proofs and generalizations have been given in [4, 5, 21]. It is well known that proving the rank one theorem can be reduced to the case of functions $f \in \text{BV}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2)$; note that a nonzero 2×2 -matrix having rank one is equivalent to it not having full rank.

Quasiconformal mappings are defined as homeomorphisms $f \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,n}(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R}^n)$, $n \geq 2$, for which $|\nabla f(x)| \leq K |\det \nabla f(x)|$ for a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and some constant $K < \infty$. In particular, ∇f has full rank a.e. Heuristically, the rank one theorem thus states that at $|D^s f|$ -a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, f behaves in a "non-quasiconformal" way. Quasiconformal mappings can also be defined between two metric spaces (X, d) and (Y, d_Y) . For a mapping $f: X \rightarrow Y$, for every $x \in X$ and $r > 0$ one defines

$$L_f(x, r) := \sup\{d_Y(f(y), f(x)) : d(y, x) \leq r\}$$

and

$$l_f(x, r) := \inf\{d_Y(f(y), f(x)) : d(y, x) \geq r\},$$

and

$$H_f(x, r) := \frac{L_f(x, r)}{l_f(x, r)};$$

we interpret this to be ∞ if the denominator is zero. Then one defines

$$h_f(x) := \liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} H_f(x, r).$$

Date: March 17, 2023.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 30L99, 30L10, 26B30.

Key words and phrases. Alberti's rank one theorem, function of bounded variation, quasiconformal mapping, Ahlfors regular metric measure space.

A homeomorphism $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is said to be (metric) *quasiconformal* if there is a number $1 \leq H < \infty$ such that $h_f(x) \leq H$ for all $x \in X$. In Euclidean spaces and sufficiently regular metric measure spaces, this is equivalent with the earlier mentioned “analytic” definition, see e.g. [11, Theorem 9.8].

All of this raises the question of whether one can formulate a precise connection between quasiconformal mappings and Alberti’s rank one theorem, and whether a formulation of the latter exists in metric measure spaces. In this paper we will give a proof of the rank one theorem that partially follows along the usual steps, but the most crucial step is proved in very general metric measure spaces using a notion of quasiconformality. To this end, for a mapping $f: X \rightarrow Y$ we define a variant of h_f by

$$h'_f(x) := \liminf_{r \rightarrow 0, d(y,x) < r} \frac{L_f(y, 5r)}{l_f(y, r)}, \quad x \in X. \quad (1.1)$$

Given a BV function $f = (f_1, f_2) \in \text{BV}(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{R}^2)$, for every Lebesgue point x of $\frac{dDf}{d|Df|}$ with respect to $|Df|$ we have that $\frac{dDf}{d|Df|}$ is close to a constant in a small neighborhood of x . Intuitively, for this reason it is sufficient to consider the following type of f . Let C_1, C_2 be closed cones with $C_1 \cap C_2 = \{0\}$ and $-C_1 \cap C_2 = \{0\}$, and suppose $f'_1, f'_2 \in \text{BV}(\Omega)$ with $\frac{dDf'_1}{d|Df'_1|}(x) \in C_1$ for $|Df'_1|$ -a.e. $x \in \Omega$ and $\frac{dDf'_2}{d|Df'_2|}(x) \in C_2$ for $|Df'_2|$ -a.e. $x \in \Omega$. Then let $f_1(y) := f'_1(y) + v_1 \cdot y$, $f_2(y) := f'_2(y) + v_2 \cdot y$, and $f = (f_1, f_2)$. Denote by f^* the so-called precise representative of f ; definitions will be given in Section 2.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be open and convex, and suppose $f \in \text{BV}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$ is as above. Then f^* is injective, and for $|Df|$ -a.e. $x \in \Omega$, if $h'_{f^*}(x) = \infty$ then $\frac{dDf}{d|Df|}(x)$ has rank one.*

This theorem says that if f is “non-quasiconformal” at a point, then $\frac{dDf}{d|Df|}(x)$ has rank one. Thus the problem is reduced to proving such “non-quasiconformal” behavior. It turns out that this can be shown in very general metric measure spaces.

Theorem 1.3. *Suppose (X, d, μ) and (Y, d_Y, ν) are Ahlfors Q -regular spaces with $1 < Q < \infty$, and X is locally compact. Let $\Omega \subset X$ be open, and suppose $f \in \text{BV}(\Omega; Y)$ is bounded and injective. Then $h'_f(x) = \infty$ for $\|Df\|^s$ -a.e. $x \in \Omega$.*

This theorem demonstrates that the essence of the rank one theorem is manifest also in metric measure spaces. We do not know whether the injectivity assumption is necessary here.

As a corollary of these two theorems combined with the well-known reductions, we obtain the rank one theorem.

Corollary 1.4. *Let $f \in \text{BV}(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R}^k)$ with $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $\frac{dDf}{d|Df|}(x)$ has rank one for $|D^s f|$ -a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$.*

Quasiconformal mappings have $W_{\text{loc}}^{1,n}(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R}^n)$ -regularity; Theorem 1.3 is in the spirit of an extensive literature in the theory of quasiconformal mappings, whose message is that

h_f being sufficiently small implies that f has at least some Sobolev regularity. See e.g. Gehring [8, 9], Balogh–Koskela–Rogovin [3], Fang [7], Kallunki–Koskela [13], Kallunki–Martio [14], Margulis–Mostow [19], and Williams [23]. As we will discuss in some more detail at the end of the paper, heuristically the rank one theorem thus turns out to be a special case of this quasiconformal theory.

2. NOTATION AND DEFINITIONS

In this section we introduce the notation, definitions, and assumptions that are employed in the paper.

Throughout the paper, we consider two separable metric measure spaces (X, d, μ) and (Y, d_Y, ν) , where μ and ν are Borel regular outer measures. We assume X to be also locally compact, and we assume that both X and Y consist of at least 2 points, that is, $\text{diam } X > 0$ and $\text{diam } Y > 0$. In Section 3, we will work with $X = Y = \mathbb{R}^2$ equipped with the Euclidean distance and the Lebesgue measure \mathcal{L}^2 . For $x \in X$ and $r > 0$, an open ball is $B(x, r) := \{y \in X : d(y, x) < r\}$ and a closed ball is $\overline{B}(x, r) := \{y \in X : d(y, x) \leq r\}$. Usually we work with open balls. We assume every ball to have nonzero and finite measure, in both spaces. For a ball $B = B(x, r)$, we sometimes denote $2B := B(x, 2r)$. Note that in a metric space, a ball (as a set) might not have a unique center and radius, but when using this abbreviation we will work with balls for which these have been specified. If a property holds outside a set of zero μ -measure, we say that it holds μ -a.e.

Given $1 < Q < \infty$, we say that (X, d, μ) is Ahlfors Q -regular if there is a constant $1 \leq C_A < \infty$ such that

$$C_A^{-1}r^Q \leq \mu(B(x, r)) \leq C_A r^Q$$

for all $x \in X$ and $0 < r < 2 \text{diam } X$.

A continuous mapping from a compact interval into X is said to be a rectifiable curve if it has finite length. A rectifiable curve γ always admits an arc-length parametrization, so that we get a curve $\gamma: [0, \ell_\gamma] \rightarrow X$ (for a proof, see e.g. [10, Theorem 3.2]). We will only consider curves that are rectifiable and arc-length parametrized. If $\gamma: [0, \ell_\gamma] \rightarrow X$ is a curve and $g: X \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ is a Borel function, we define

$$\int_\gamma g \, ds := \int_0^{\ell_\gamma} g(\gamma(s)) \, ds.$$

Let $\Omega \subset X$ be open. A mapping $f: \Omega \rightarrow Y$ is said to be μ -measurable if $f^{-1}(W)$ is a μ -measurable set for every open set $W \subset Y$. By the Kuratowski embedding theorem, see e.g. [12, p. 100], the metric space Y can be isometrically embedded into a Banach space $(V, \|\cdot\|_V)$. We understand such an embedding to be fixed. We say that $f \in L^1(\Omega; Y)$ if f is μ -measurable and $\|f(\cdot)\|_V \in L^1(\Omega)$.

To define the class of BV mappings, we consider the following definitions from Martio [20]. Given a family of curves Γ , we say that a sequence of nonnegative Borel functions

$\{\rho_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ is AM-admissible for Γ if

$$\liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \int_\gamma \rho_i ds \geq 1 \quad \text{for all } \gamma \in \Gamma.$$

Then we let

$$\text{AM}(\Gamma) := \inf \left\{ \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \int_X \rho_i d\mu \right\},$$

where the infimum is taken over all AM-admissible sequences $\{\rho_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$.

Definition 2.1. Let $\Omega \subset X$ be open. Given a mapping $f: \Omega \rightarrow Y$, we say that f is in the Dirichlet class $D^{\text{BV}}(\Omega; Y)$ if there exists a sequence of nonnegative functions $\{g_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ that is bounded in $L^1(\Omega)$, such that for AM-a.e. curve $\gamma: [0, \ell_\gamma] \rightarrow \Omega$, we have

$$d_Y(f(\gamma(t_1)), f(\gamma(t_2))) \leq \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\gamma|_{[t_1, t_2]}} g_i ds$$

for almost every $t_1, t_2 \in [0, \ell_\gamma]$ with $t_1 < t_2$. We also define the total variation

$$\|Df\|(\Omega) := \inf \left\{ \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \int_\Omega g_i d\mu \right\},$$

where the infimum is taken over sequences $\{g_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ as above. If also $f \in L^1(\Omega; Y)$, then we say that $f \in \text{BV}(\Omega; Y)$.

For an arbitrary set $A \subset X$, we define

$$\|Df\|(A) := \inf \{ \|Df\|(W) : A \subset W, W \subset X \text{ is open} \}.$$

If $f: \Omega \rightarrow Y$ and $\|Df\|(\Omega) < \infty$, then $\|Df\|$ is a Borel regular outer measure on Ω , see [20, Theorem 4.1]. In [20], real-valued functions were considered in place of Y -valued mappings, but the same proofs apply almost verbatim. See also [22, Theorem 3.4] for a proof of the measure property for Banach space valued BV mappings, with a slightly different definition of the total variation. When (X, d, μ) is an Ahlfors Q -regular space, the variation measure of $f \in \text{BV}(\Omega; Y)$ can be decomposed into the absolutely continuous and singular parts with respect to μ as $\|Df\| = \|Df\|^a + \|Df\|^s$, see e.g. [12, p. 82].

Next, we consider the Euclidean theory. We follow mostly the monograph Ambrosio–Fusco–Pallara [2]. The n -dimensional Lebesgue measure is denoted by \mathcal{L}^n , with $n \geq 1$. The s -dimensional Hausdorff content is denoted by \mathcal{H}_R^s , $0 < R \leq \infty$, and the corresponding Hausdorff measure by \mathcal{H}^s . We always work with the Euclidean norm $|\cdot|$ for vectors $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ as well as for matrices $A \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}$. The inner product of $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is denoted by $x \cdot y$.

For an open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, we denote by $C_c(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^l)$ the space of continuous \mathbb{R}^l -valued functions with compact support in Ω , $l \in \mathbb{N}$. We denote by $\mathcal{M}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^l)$ the Banach space of vector-valued finite Radon measures. By finite we mean that the total variation $|\nu|(\Omega)$ of $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^l)$ is finite. We denote the set of positive Radon measures by $\mathcal{M}^+(\Omega)$. For a vector-valued Radon measure $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^l)$ and a positive Radon measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega)$, we can write the Radon-Nikodym decomposition $\nu = \nu^a + \nu^s = \frac{d\nu}{d\mu} \mu + \nu^s$ of ν with respect to

μ , where $\frac{d\nu}{d\mu} \in L^1(\Omega, \mu; \mathbb{R}^l)$. For $\nu_j, \nu \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^l)$, weak* convergence $\nu_j \xrightarrow{*} \nu$ in Ω means

$$\int_{\Omega} \phi \cdot \frac{d\nu_j}{d|\nu_j|} d|\nu_j| \rightarrow \int_{\Omega} \phi \cdot \frac{d\nu}{d|\nu|} d|\nu|$$

for all $\phi \in C_c(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^l)$.

The following theory of BV functions is from [2, Section 3]. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open set. A function $f \in L^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^k)$ is a function of bounded variation, denoted $f \in \text{BV}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^k)$, if its weak derivative is an $\mathbb{R}^{k \times n}$ -valued Radon measure with finite total variation. This means that there exists a (unique) $Df \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{k \times n})$ such that for all $\varphi \in C_c^1(\Omega)$, the integration-by-parts formula

$$\int_{\Omega} f_j \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial y_l} d\mathcal{L}^n = - \int_{\Omega} \varphi d(Df_j)_l, \quad j = 1, \dots, k, \quad l = 1, \dots, n,$$

holds. If we do not know a priori that a function $f \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^k)$ is a BV function, then we consider

$$\text{Var}(f, \Omega) := \sup \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^k \int_{\Omega} f_j \text{div} \varphi_j d\mathcal{L}^n, \varphi \in C_c^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}), |\varphi| \leq 1 \right\}. \quad (2.2)$$

If $\text{Var}(f, \Omega) < \infty$, then the Radon measure Df exists and $\text{Var}(f, \Omega) = |Df|(\Omega)$ by the Riesz representation theorem, and $f \in \text{BV}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^k)$ provided that $f \in L^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^k)$. In the case $k = 1$, we denote $\text{BV}(\Omega) = \text{BV}(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$.

We have now defined two versions of the total variation. The following proposition shows that they are comparable in Euclidean spaces.

Proposition 2.3. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open set and let $f \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^k)$, with $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then*

$$C^{-1} \|Df\|(\Omega) \leq \text{Var}(f, \Omega) \leq C \|Df\|(\Omega)$$

for a constant $1 \leq C < \infty$ depending only on n, k .

Proof. Writing $f = (f_1, \dots, f_k)$, for all $j = 1, \dots, k$ we clearly have

$$\text{Var}(f_j, \Omega) \leq \text{Var}(f, \Omega) \leq \text{Var}(f_1, \Omega) + \dots + \text{Var}(f_k, \Omega).$$

The analogous property is straightforward to show also for $\|Df\|(\Omega)$. Thus it is enough to consider the case $k = 1$. Using Theorem 3.10 of Durand-Cartagena–Eriksson-Bique–Korte–Shanmugalingam [6] and localizing the proof of [6, Proposition 3.3], we obtain the comparability of $\|Df\|(\Omega)$ with Miranda's [22, Definition 3.1] definition of total variation. On the other hand, the latter agrees with $\text{Var}(f, \Omega)$, as noted in [22, Proposition 1.1]. \square

We denote the characteristic function of a set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ by $\chi_E: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$. If $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\text{Var}(\chi_E, \mathbb{R}^n) < \infty$, we say that E is a set of finite perimeter. We have the following relative isoperimetric inequality on the plane: for a set of finite perimeter $E \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$,

and $r > 0$, we have

$$\min\{\mathcal{L}^2(B(x, r) \cap E), \mathcal{L}^2(B(x, r) \setminus E)\} \leq r |D\chi_E|(B(x, r)). \quad (2.4)$$

The coarea formula states that for an open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and a function $u \in \text{BV}(\Omega)$, we have

$$|Du|(\Omega) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |D\chi_{\{u>t\}}|(\Omega) dt. \quad (2.5)$$

Here we abbreviate $\{u > t\} := \{x \in \Omega : u(x) > t\}$.

Given a \mathcal{L}^n -measurable set $D \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with nonzero and finite Lebesgue measure, and a function $f \in L^1(D)$, we denote

$$f_D := \int_D f d\mathcal{L}^n := \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}^n(D)} \int_D f d\mathcal{L}^n.$$

Let $f \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$. We will often consider a particular pointwise representative, namely the precise representative

$$f^*(x) := \inf \left\{ t \in \mathbb{R} : \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathcal{L}^n(B(x, r) \cap \{f > t\})}{\mathcal{L}^n(B(x, r))} = 0 \right\}, \quad x \in \Omega. \quad (2.6)$$

For $f \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^k)$, we also define $f^* := (f_1^*, \dots, f_k^*)$. We say that $x \in \Omega$ is a Lebesgue point of $f \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^k)$ if

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \int_{B(x, r)} |f(y) - \tilde{f}(x)| d\mathcal{L}^n(y) = 0$$

for some $\tilde{f}(x) \in \mathbb{R}^k$. We denote by $S_f \subset \Omega$ the set where this condition fails and call it the approximate discontinuity set. Given a unit vector $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and $r > 0$, we define the half-balls

$$B_\nu^+(x, r) := \{y \in B(x, r) : (y - x) \cdot \nu > 0\},$$

$$B_\nu^-(x, r) := \{y \in B(x, r) : (y - x) \cdot \nu < 0\}.$$

We say that $x \in \Omega$ is an approximate jump point of f if there exist a unit vector $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and distinct vectors $f^+(x), f^-(x) \in \mathbb{R}^k$ such that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \int_{B_\nu^+(x, r)} |f(y) - f^+(x)| d\mathcal{L}^n(y) = 0$$

and

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \int_{B_\nu^-(x, r)} |f(y) - f^-(x)| d\mathcal{L}^n(y) = 0.$$

The set of all approximate jump points is denoted by J_f . For $f \in \text{BV}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^k)$, we have that $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(S_f \setminus J_f) = 0$, see [2, Theorem 3.78].

We write the Radon-Nikodym decomposition of the variation measure of $f \in \text{BV}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^k)$ into the absolutely continuous and singular parts with respect to \mathcal{L}^n as $Df = D^a f + D^s f$.

Furthermore, we define the Cantor and jump parts of Df by

$$D^c f := D^s f \llcorner (\Omega \setminus S_f), \quad D^j f := D^s f \llcorner J_f;$$

here

$$D^s f \llcorner J_f(A) := D^s f(J_f \cap A), \quad \text{for } D^s f\text{-measurable } A \subset \Omega.$$

Since $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(S_f \setminus J_f) = 0$ and $|Df|$ vanishes on \mathcal{H}^{n-1} -negligible sets, we get the decomposition (see [2, Section 3.9])

$$Df = D^a f + D^c f + D^j f.$$

For the jump part, there is a unit vector $\nu_f: J_f \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ such that (note that $(f^+ - f^-) \otimes \nu_f$ is a $k \times n$ -matrix)

$$D^j f = (f^+ - f^-) \otimes \nu_f \mathcal{H}^{n-1} \llcorner J_f. \quad (2.7)$$

If we have a sequence $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \subset \text{BV}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^k)$ and $f_i \rightarrow f$ in $L^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^k)$ and $|Df_i|(\Omega) \rightarrow |Df|(\Omega)$, then we say that $f_i \rightarrow f$ strictly in $\text{BV}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^k)$.

The (Sobolev) 1-capacity of a set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is defined by

$$\text{Cap}_1(A) := \inf \|u\|_{W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)},$$

where the infimum is taken over Sobolev functions $u \in W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfying $u \geq 1$ in a neighborhood of A .

Given $v \in \mathbb{R}^2$ with $|v| = 1$ and $0 < a \leq 1$, we define a closed cone by

$$C(v, a) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2: x \cdot v \geq a|x|\}.$$

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

In this section we prove Theorem 1.2.

We start with some preliminary results. As noted in the introduction, our proof of the rank one theorem follows partially along the usual steps and in particular relies on the following two propositions that essentially reduce the problem to monotone functions $f: \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$; see [4, Proposition 1.3, Proposition 5.1].

Proposition 3.1. *The rank one theorem (Corollary 1.4) holds if and only if for every $f \in \text{BV}(B(0, 1); \mathbb{R}^2)$, $\frac{dDf}{d|Df|}(x)$ has rank one for $|D^s f|$ -a.e. $x \in B(0, 1)$.*

Proposition 3.2. *Let $v \in \mathbb{R}^2$ with $|v| = 1$ and $a > a' > 0$, suppose $u \in \text{BV}(B(x, r)) \cap L^\infty(B(x, r))$ for a ball $B(x, r) \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, and let*

$$A := \left\{ y \in B(x, r): \frac{dDu}{d|Du|}(y) \in C(v, a) \right\}.$$

Then there exists $w \in \text{BV}(B(x, r)) \cap L^\infty(B(x, r))$ such that $|Du| \llcorner_A \ll |Dw|$ in $B(x, r)$, and

$$\frac{dDw}{d|Dw|}(y) \in C(v, a') \quad \text{for } |Dw|\text{-a.e. } y \in B(x, r).$$

Lemma 3.3. *Let $A \subset \mathbb{R}^2$. Then $\mathcal{H}_\infty^1(A) \leq 10 \text{Cap}_1(A)$.*

Proof. We can assume that $\text{Cap}_1(A) < \infty$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. We find a function $u \in W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ such that $u \geq 1$ in a neighborhood of A , and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u| d\mathcal{L}^2 \leq \text{Cap}_1(A) + \varepsilon.$$

Here $u \in W^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^2) \subset \text{BV}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ with $|Du|(\mathbb{R}^2) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u| d\mathcal{L}^2$, and then by the coarea formula (2.5) we find a set $E := \{u > t\}$ for some $0 < t < 1$, for which

$$|D\chi_E|(\mathbb{R}^2) \leq |Du|(\mathbb{R}^2) \leq \text{Cap}_1(A) + \varepsilon,$$

and A is contained in the interior of E . Then necessarily $\mathcal{L}^2(E) < \infty$, and for every $x \in A$ we find $r_x > 0$ such that

$$\frac{\mathcal{L}^2(B(x, r_x) \cap E)}{\mathcal{L}^2(B(x, r_x))} = \frac{1}{2}.$$

From the relative isoperimetric inequality (2.4), we get

$$\frac{\pi r_x^2}{2} = \min\{\mathcal{L}^2(B(x, r_x) \cap E), \mathcal{L}^2(B(x, r_x) \setminus E)\} \leq r_x |D\chi_E|(B(x, r_x)).$$

In particular, the radii r_x are uniformly bounded from above by $(2/\pi)|D\chi_E|(\mathbb{R}^2)$. By the 5-covering theorem (see e.g. [12, p. 60]), we can choose a finite or countable collection $\{B(x_j, r_j)\}_j$ of pairwise disjoint balls such that the balls $B(x_j, 5r_j)$ cover A . Then

$$\mathcal{H}_\infty^1(A) \leq \sum_j 10r_j \leq \frac{20}{\pi} \sum_j |D\chi_E|(B(x_j, r_j)) \leq 10|D\chi_E|(\mathbb{R}^2) \leq 10(\text{Cap}_1(A) + \varepsilon).$$

Letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, we get the result. \square

For $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$, let $p(x) := |x|$.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $A \subset \mathbb{R}^2$. Then we have $\mathcal{L}^1(p(A)) \leq 10 \text{Cap}_1(A)$.*

Proof. Note that p is a 1-Lipschitz function. Thus we estimate

$$\mathcal{L}^1(p(A)) = \mathcal{H}_\infty^1(p(A)) \leq \mathcal{H}_\infty^1(A) \leq 10 \text{Cap}_1(A)$$

by Lemma 3.3. \square

The following is a special case of [17, Theorem 3.10].

Theorem 3.5. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be open and suppose that $u_i \rightarrow u$ strictly in $\text{BV}(\Omega)$. Then we find a subsequence of u_i (not relabeled) such that for every compact set $K \subset \Omega \setminus S_u$ and every $\varepsilon > 0$, there is an open set $G \subset \Omega$ such that $\text{Cap}_1(G) < \varepsilon$ and $u_i^* \rightarrow u^*$ uniformly in $K \setminus G$.*

Proposition 3.6. *Suppose $u_i \rightarrow u$ strictly in $\text{BV}(B(0, R))$ with $R > 0$, and that $S_u = \emptyset$. Then we find a subsequence (not relabeled) such that for a.e. $0 < r < R$, $u_i^* \rightarrow u^*$ uniformly in $\partial B(0, r)$.*

Proof. Choose a subsequence (not relabeled) given by Theorem 3.5. We find open sets $G_j \subset B(0, R)$ such that $\text{Cap}_1(G_j) < 1/j$ and $u_i^* \rightarrow u^*$ uniformly in $\overline{B}(0, R - 1/j) \setminus G_j$. By Lemma 3.4, we have $\mathcal{L}^1(p(G_j)) < 10/j$, and so $u_i^* \rightarrow u^*$ uniformly in $\partial B(0, r)$ for all $r \in (0, R - 1/j) \setminus p(G_j)$, with $\mathcal{L}^1((0, R - 1/j) \setminus p(G_j)) > R - 11/j$. Thus $u_i^* \rightarrow u^*$ uniformly in $\partial B(0, r)$ for a.e. $0 < r < R$. \square

Lemma 3.7. *Let $v_1, v_2 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ with $|v_1| = |v_2| = 1$ and let $a_1, a_2 > 0$ such that $C_1 \cap C_2 = \{0\}$ and $-C_1 \cap C_2 = \{0\}$ for $C_1 := C(v_1, a_1)$ and $C_2 := C(v_2, a_2)$. Then there exists $\delta > 0$, depending only on the two cones, such that for every $V \in \mathbb{R}^2$ we have $|V \cdot z| \geq \delta|V||z|$ either for all $z \in C_1$ or for all $z \in C_2$.*

Proof. Supposing the claim is false, then there exist $V \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $z_{1,j} \in C_1 \setminus \{0\}$ and $z_{2,j} \in C_2 \setminus \{0\}$ such that $|V \cdot z_{1,j}|/(|V||z_{1,j}|) \rightarrow 0$ and $|V \cdot z_{2,j}|/(|V||z_{2,j}|) \rightarrow 0$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$. We can assume that $|V| = |z_{1,j}| = |z_{2,j}| = 1$. Passing to subsequences (not relabeled) we get $z_{1,j} \rightarrow z_1 \in C_1$ and $z_{2,j} \rightarrow z_2 \in C_2$ with $|z_1| = |z_2| = 1$ and $|V \cdot z_1| = 0 = |V \cdot z_2|$. Thus either $z_1 = z_2$ or $z_1 = -z_2$, which contradicts the assumption $C_1 \cap C_2 = \{0\}$ and $-C_1 \cap C_2 = \{0\}$. \square

Given a positive Radon measure κ on \mathbb{R}^2 , for a fixed $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ we define for $r > 0$

$$[\kappa]_r(A) := \frac{\kappa(x + rA)}{\kappa(B(x, r))}, \quad A \subset B(0, 1). \quad (3.8)$$

The following is a special case of Larsen [18, Lemma 5.1].

Lemma 3.9. *Let κ be a positive Radon measure on an open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$. Then for κ -a.e. $x \in \Omega$, there is a sequence $r_j \searrow 0$ and a Radon measure κ' such that*

$$[\kappa]_{r_j} \xrightarrow{*} \kappa' \text{ in } B(0, 1) \text{ with } \kappa'(B(0, 1)) = 1.$$

In (1.1) we defined h'_f ; more explicitly, the definition reads

$$h'_f(x) := \inf \left\{ \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{L_f(y_j, 5r_j)}{l_f(y_j, r_j)} : r_j \rightarrow 0, y_j \rightarrow x, |y_j - x| < r_j \right\}.$$

In addition to the Euclidean norm $|A|$ for a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}$, we also consider the maximum norm

$$\|A\|_{\max} := \max_{v \in \mathbb{R}^n, |v|=1} |Av|.$$

The following is a restating of Theorem 1.2.

Theorem 3.10. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be open and convex. Let $v_1, v_2 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ with $|v_1| = |v_2| = 1$ and let $a_1, a_2 > 0$ such that $C_1 \cap C_2 = \{0\}$ and $-C_1 \cap C_2 = \{0\}$ for $C_1 := C(v_1, a_1)$ and $C_2 := C(v_2, a_2)$. Suppose $f'_1, f'_2 \in \text{BV}(\Omega)$ with $\frac{dDf'_1}{d|Df'_1|}(x) \in C_1$ for $|Df'_1|$ -a.e. $x \in \Omega$ and $\frac{dDf'_2}{d|Df'_2|}(x) \in C_2$ for $|Df'_2|$ -a.e. $x \in \Omega$. Let $f_1(y) := f'_1(y) + v_1 \cdot y$, $f_2(y) := f'_2(y) + v_2 \cdot y$, and $f = (f_1, f_2)$. Then f^* is injective, and for $|Df|$ -a.e. $x \in \Omega$, if $h'_{f^*}(x) = \infty$ then $\frac{dDf}{d|Df|}(x)$ has rank one.*

Proof. Denote standard mollifiers by ϕ_δ , $\delta > 0$, and consider the mollifications

$$f_\delta := \phi_\delta * f = (\phi_\delta * f_1, \phi_\delta * f_2) =: (f_{1,\delta}, f_{2,\delta}).$$

Denote $\Omega_\delta := \{y \in \Omega : \text{dist}(y, \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Omega) > \delta\}$. For every $\delta > 0$ we have $f_{1,\delta}, f_{2,\delta} \in C^\infty(\Omega_\delta)$ and

$$\nabla f_{1,\delta} = \phi_\delta * Df_1 = \phi_\delta * Df'_1 + v_1.$$

The analog holds for $f_{2,\delta}$. Let $x, y \in \Omega_\delta$ with $x \neq y$. Then $|(y-x) \cdot z| > 0$ either for all $z \in C_1 \setminus \{0\}$ or for all $z \in C_2 \setminus \{0\}$ by Lemma 3.7. We can assume that in fact $(y-x) \cdot z > 0$ for all $z \in C_1 \setminus \{0\}$. Now

$$\begin{aligned} f_{1,\delta}(y) - f_{1,\delta}(x) &= \int_0^1 \nabla f_{1,\delta}(x + t(y-x)) \cdot (y-x) dt \\ &= \int_0^1 \phi_\delta * Df'_1(x + t(y-x)) \cdot (y-x) + v_1 \cdot (y-x) dt \\ &\geq v_1 \cdot (y-x) > 0. \end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

We find a sequence $\delta_j \rightarrow 0$ such that $f_{\delta_j} \rightarrow f^*$ a.e. in Ω . For a.e. $x, y \in \Omega$, if $v_1 \cdot (y-x) > 0$, then by (3.11) we have

$$f_1^*(y) - f_1^*(x) \geq v_1 \cdot (y-x) > 0. \tag{3.12}$$

From the definition of the precise representative (2.6), this is then true for all $x, y \in \Omega$ such that $v_1 \cdot (y-x) > 0$. Similarly considering the other cases $v_1 \cdot (y-x) < 0$, $v_2 \cdot (y-x) > 0$, and $v_2 \cdot (y-x) < 0$, we conclude that f^* is injective.

Let $x \in \Omega$ such that $\frac{dDf}{d|Df|}(x)$ has rank two. Excluding a $|Df|$ -negligible set, we can assume that for the 2×2 -matrix of full rank $L' := \frac{dDf}{d|Df|}(x)$, we have the Lebesgue point property

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \int_{B(x,r)} \left| \frac{dDf}{d|Df|} - L' \right| d|Df| = 0. \tag{3.13}$$

We can also assume that the conclusion of Lemma 3.9 holds at x with the choice $\kappa = |Df|$. To complete the proof, we need to show that $h'_{f^*}(x) < \infty$.

Consider the blowups

$$f_r(z) := \frac{f(x + rz) - f_{B(x,r)}}{|Df|(B(x,r))/r}, \quad z \in B(0,1),$$

for all $r > 0$ such that $B(x,r) \subset \Omega$. Note that $(f_r)^* = (f^*)_r$, and so we can simply write f_r^* . For such r , just as in (3.8) we also define

$$[Df]_r(A) := \frac{Df(x + rA)}{|Df|(B(x,r))}, \quad A \subset B(0,1).$$

Then $Df_r = [Df]_r$ and $|Df_r| = |[Df]_r|$. Thus $|Df_r|(B(0,1)) = 1$. Then by the Poincaré inequality, the quantities $\|f_r\|_{L^1(B(0,1))}$ are also uniformly bounded. Thus by BV compactness, see e.g. [2, Theorem 3.23], passing to a subsequence $r_j \rightarrow 0$ we have $f_{r_j} \rightarrow$

$h \in \text{BV}(0,1)$ in $L^1(B(0,1))$ and also $Df_{r_j} \xrightarrow{*} Dh$, and by Lemma 3.9, passing to a further subsequence (not relabeled) we have $|Df_{r_j}| \xrightarrow{*} \mu$ with $\mu(B(0,1)) = 1$. We have $[Df]_{r_j} - L'[|Df|]_{r_j} \xrightarrow{*} 0$ by (3.13), and so $Df_{r_j} = [Df]_{r_j} \xrightarrow{*} L'\mu$. Thus $Dh = L'\mu$ with $|Dh| = |L'\mu| = \mu$, and then it is easy to see that $Dh = cL' d\mathcal{L}^2$ for some $c > 0$, see e.g. [4, Lemma 1.4]. Thus h is a linear mapping of full rank, and

$$|Dh|(B(0,1)) = |L'\mu|(B(0,1)) = 1,$$

and so in fact $f_{r_j} \rightarrow h$ strictly in $\text{BV}(B(0,1); \mathbb{R}^2)$. Denoting $f_{r_j} = (f_{1,r_j}, f_{2,r_j})$, using e.g. [2, Proposition 3.15] we have also that $f_{1,r_j} \rightarrow h_1$ and $f_{2,r_j} \rightarrow h_2$ strictly in $\text{BV}(B(0,1))$. Moreover, $h(z) = Lz$, with $L := cL'$. Note also that $L = (V_1, V_2)$ where $V_1 \in C_1 \setminus \{0\}$ and $V_2 \in C_2 \setminus \{0\}$.

By passing to a further subsequence (not relabeled), we can assume that $f_{r_j}^* \rightarrow h$ a.e. in $B(0,1)$. Choose $w \in B(0, 1/20)$ with $f_{r_j}^*(w) \rightarrow h(w)$. We find $1/2 < R < 19/20$ such that $|Dh|(\partial B(w, R)) = 0$, and then also $f_{1,r_j} \rightarrow h_1$ and $f_{2,r_j} \rightarrow h_2$ strictly in $B(w, R)$ (see [2, Example 1.63]). Passing to a further subsequence (not relabeled), by Proposition 3.6 we find $s \in (1/20, 1/10)$ such that $f_{r_j}^* \rightarrow h$ uniformly in $\partial B(w, s)$ and in $\partial B(w, 5s)$. Let $\delta > 0$ be the number from Lemma 3.7. Choose $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small that

$$\frac{5\|L\|_{\max}s + 2\varepsilon}{\delta \min\{|V_1|, |V_2|\}s - 2\varepsilon} \leq \frac{6\|L\|_{\max}}{\delta \min\{|V_1|, |V_2|\}} \quad (3.14)$$

By the uniform convergence, for large j we have

$$\sup_{z \in \partial B(w, s)} |f_{r_j}^*(z) - Lz| < \varepsilon, \quad \sup_{z \in \partial B(w, 5s)} |f_{r_j}^*(z) - Lz| < \varepsilon, \quad \text{and} \quad |f_{r_j}^*(w) - Lw| < \varepsilon. \quad (3.15)$$

Denote $y_j := x + r_j w$. Let $y \in B(y_j, 5r_j s)$. Let y'_1, y''_1 be two points on $\partial B(y_j, 5r_j s)$ that are in the v_1 - and $-v_1$ -directions from y , respectively. Then by (3.12), we have

$$f_1^*(y''_1) \leq f_1^*(y) \leq f_1^*(y'_1).$$

The analogous fact holds for $f_2^*(y)$, with points y'_2, y''_2 . Now

$$\begin{aligned} |f^*(y) - f^*(y_j)| &\leq |f_1^*(y) - f_1^*(y_j)| + |f_2^*(y) - f_2^*(y_j)| \\ &\leq |f_1^*(y'_1) - f_1^*(y_j)| + |f_1^*(y''_1) - f_1^*(y_j)| + |f_2^*(y'_2) - f_2^*(y_j)| + |f_2^*(y''_2) - f_2^*(y_j)| \\ &\leq |f^*(y'_1) - f^*(y_j)| + |f^*(y''_1) - f^*(y_j)| + |f^*(y'_2) - f^*(y_j)| + |f^*(y''_2) - f^*(y_j)|. \end{aligned}$$

Thus for large j ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{y \in \overline{B}(y_j, 5r_j s)} |f^*(y) - f^*(y_j)| &\leq 4 \sup_{y \in \partial B(y_j, 5r_j s)} |f^*(y) - f^*(y_j)| \\
&= 4 \frac{|Df|(B(x, r_j))}{r_j} \sup_{z \in \partial B(w, 5s)} |f_{r_j}^*(z) - f_{r_j}^*(w)| \\
&\leq 4 \frac{|Df|(B(x, r_j))}{r_j} \left(\sup_{z \in \partial B(w, 5s)} |Lz - Lw| + 2\varepsilon \right) \quad \text{by (3.15)} \\
&\leq 4 \frac{|Df|(B(x, r_j))}{r_j} (5\|L\|_{\max} s + 2\varepsilon).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

Then let $y \in \Omega \setminus B(y_j, r_j s)$. By Lemma 3.7, we can assume that $|(y - y_j) \cdot v| \geq \delta|y - y_j||v|$ for all $v \in C_1$. We can further assume that $(y - y_j) \cdot v > 0$ for all $v \in C_1$. Now $(y - y_j) \cdot v_1 > 0$ and $|(y - y_j) \cdot V_1| \geq \delta|y - y_j||V_1|$. Let $y' \in \partial B(y_j, r_j s)$ on the line intersecting y_j and y . Then also

$$\begin{aligned}
|((y' - x)/r_j - w) \cdot V_1| &= |((y' - x)/r_j - (y_j - x)/r_j) \cdot V_1| \\
&\geq \delta|(y' - y_j)/r_j||V_1| \\
&= \delta s|V_1|.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.17}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
|f^*(y) - f^*(y_j)| &\geq |f_1^*(y) - f_1^*(y_j)| \\
&\geq |f_1^*(y') - f_1^*(y_j)| \quad \text{by (3.12)} \\
&= \frac{|Df|(B(x, r_j))}{r_j} |f_{1, r_j}^*((y' - x)/r_j) - f_{1, r_j}^*(w)| \\
&\geq \frac{|Df|(B(x, r_j))}{r_j} (|V_1 \cdot (y' - x)/r_j - V_1 \cdot w| - 2\varepsilon) \quad \text{by (3.15)} \\
&\geq \frac{|Df|(B(x, r_j))}{r_j} (\delta|V_1|s - 2\varepsilon) \quad \text{by (3.17)} \\
&\geq \frac{|Df|(B(x, r_j))}{r_j} (\delta \min\{|V_1|, |V_2|\}s - 2\varepsilon).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\inf_{y \in \Omega \setminus B(y_j, r_j s)} |f^*(y) - f^*(y_j)| \geq \frac{|Df|(B(x, r_j))}{r_j} (\delta \min\{|V_1|, |V_2|\}s - 2\varepsilon). \tag{3.18}$$

Using (3.16) and (3.18), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{L_{f^*}(y_j, 5r_j s)}{l_{f^*}(y_j, r_j s)} &\leq \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sup_{y \in \overline{B}(y_j, 5r_j s)} |f^*(y) - f^*(y_j)|}{\inf_{y \in \Omega \setminus B(y_j, r_j s)} |f^*(y) - f^*(y_j)|} \\
&\leq 4 \frac{5 \|L\|_{\max} s + 2\varepsilon}{\delta \min\{|V_1|, |V_2|\} s - 2\varepsilon} \\
&\leq 4 \frac{6 \|L\|_{\max}}{\delta \min\{|V_1|, |V_2|\}} \quad \text{by (3.14)} \\
&< \infty,
\end{aligned}$$

and so $h'_{f^*}(x) < \infty$. □

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.3

In this section we prove Theorem 1.3 and then Corollary 1.4.

We start with the following lemma which is a variant of [16, Lemma 3.23]. The oscillation of $f: U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ in a set $U \subset \mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$\text{osc}_U f := \sup\{|f(x) - f(y)|, x, y \in U\}.$$

Lemma 4.1. *Let $f: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for some compact interval $[a, b] \subset \mathbb{R}$. Suppose that there is a sequence of at most countable unions of sets $W_i = \bigcup_j U_{i,j}$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$, where each $U_{i,j} \subset \mathbb{R}$ is open and bounded, such that $\chi_{W_i}(t) \rightarrow 1$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$ for all $t \in [a, b]$. Let $A \subset [a, b]$ with $\mathcal{L}^1([a, b] \setminus A) = 0$. Then for every $t_1, t_2 \in A$ with $t_1 < t_2$, we have*

$$|f(t_1) - f(t_2)| \leq \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \sum_j \text{osc}_{U_{i,j} \cap A} f.$$

Proof. Let $t_1, t_2 \in A$ with $t_1 < t_2$. First assume that f is bounded. Then, without loss of generality, we can also assume that $f(t_1) < f(t_2)$. Define

$$h(x) := \sup_{t \in [t_1, x] \cap A} f(t), \quad t_1 \leq x \leq t_2,$$

and let $h(x) := h(t_1)$ for $x \leq t_1$ and $h(x) := h(t_2)$ for $x \geq t_2$. Now h is an increasing function, and so $h \in \text{BV}_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R})$. Consider a bounded nonempty open set $U \subset \mathbb{R}$. We can represent U as an at most countable union of disjoint open intervals $U = \bigcup_l U_l$ with $U_l = (a_l, b_l)$. Since h is increasing, in each interval we can consider the one-sided limits $h(a_l+)$ and $h(b_l-)$. Moreover, in each interval U_l , define the truncation

$$f_l := \min\{h(b_l-), \max\{h(a_l+), f\}\}.$$

Since the intervals $(h(a_l+), h(b_l-))$ are disjoint, we have

$$\sum_l \text{osc}_{U_l \cap A} f_l \leq \text{osc}_{U \cap A} f.$$

Since h is increasing, for every interval U_l we clearly have

$$|Dh|(U_l) = h(b_l-) - h(a_l+).$$

On the other hand, we also have (in fact equality holds)

$$\text{osc}_{U_l \cap A} f_l \geq h(b_l-) - h(a_l+),$$

because $\inf_{U_l \cap A} f \leq h(a_l+)$, and either $h(b_l-) = h(a_l+)$ or $h(b_l-) = \sup\{f(y) : y \in U_l \cap A\}$.

Then since $|Dh|$ is a Radon measure, we have

$$|Dh|(U) = \sum_l |Dh|(U_l) \leq \sum_l \text{osc}_{U_l \cap A} f_l \leq \text{osc}_{U \cap A} f. \quad (4.2)$$

Let $H_i := \bigcap_{k=i}^{\infty} \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} U_{k,j}$. Then by assumption, $\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} H_i = [a, b]$. Noting that $f(t_1) = h(t_1)$, and then using basic properties of the Radon measure $|Dh|$, we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} |f(t_2) - f(t_1)| &\leq h(t_2) - h(t_1) \\ &= |Dh|([t_1, t_2]) \\ &\leq \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} |Dh|(H_i \cap [t_1, t_2]) \\ &\leq \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \sum_j |Dh|(U_{i,j} \cap [t_1, t_2]) \\ &\leq \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \sum_j \text{osc}_{U_{i,j} \cap A} f \quad \text{by (4.2)}. \end{aligned}$$

In the general case, we consider the truncations $f_M := \min\{M, \max\{-M, f\}\}$. For sufficiently large M , we have

$$|f(a) - f(b)| = |f_M(a) - f_M(b)| \leq \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \sum_j \text{osc}_{U_{i,j} \cap A} f_M \leq \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \sum_j \text{osc}_{U_{i,j} \cap A} f.$$

□

Lemma 4.3. *Let $f : [a, b] \rightarrow Y$ for some compact interval $[a, b] \subset \mathbb{R}$. Suppose that there is a sequence of at most countable unions of sets $W_i = \bigcup_j U_{i,j}$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$, where each $U_{i,j} \subset \mathbb{R}$ is open and bounded, such that $\chi_{W_i}(t) \rightarrow 1$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$ for all $t \in [a, b]$. Let $A \subset [a, b]$ with $\mathcal{L}^1([a, b] \setminus A) = 0$. Then for every $t_1, t_2 \in A$ with $t_1 < t_2$, we have*

$$d_Y(f(t_1), f(t_2)) \leq \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \sum_j \text{diam } f(U_{i,j} \cap A).$$

Proof. Recall that we understand Y to be isometrically embedded into the Banach space $(V, \|\cdot\|_V)$. Denote the dual of V by V^* . We find $v^* \in V^*$ with $\|v^*\|_{V^*} = 1$ and $v^*(f(t_1) -$

$f(t_2)) = \|f(t_1) - f(t_2)\|_V$. Now we can consider the real-valued function $v^* \circ f$, and we get

$$\begin{aligned}
d_Y(f(t_1), f(t_2)) &= \|f(t_1) - f(t_2)\|_V \\
&= v^*(f(t_1) - f(t_2)) \\
&= v^*(f(t_1)) - v^*(f(t_2)) \\
&\leq \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \sum_j \operatorname{osc}_{U_{i,j} \cap A} v^* \circ f \quad \text{by Lemma 4.1} \\
&\leq \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \sum_j \operatorname{diam} f(U_{i,j} \cap A).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Observe that if $f: \Omega \rightarrow Y$ is injective, and $B(y_1, r_1) \subset \Omega$ and $B(y_2, r_2) \subset \Omega$ are disjoint, then from the definition of $l_f(\cdot, \cdot)$ and from the injectivity of f it follows that

$$B(f(y_1), l_f(y_1, r_1)) \cap B(f(y_2), l_f(y_2, r_2)) = \emptyset. \quad (4.4)$$

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Since f is bounded, there exist $y_0 \in Y$ and $0 < R < 2 \operatorname{diam} Y$ such that $f(\Omega) \subset B(y_0, R)$. There exists a μ -negligible set $H \subset \Omega$ such that $\|Df\|^s(\Omega \setminus H) = 0$. Note that $\{h'_f < \infty\} = \bigcup_{M=1}^{\infty} \{h'_f < M\}$. Fix $M \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Also choose an open set U such that $H \subset U \subset \Omega$ and $\mu(U) < \varepsilon^{Q/(Q-1)}$. For every $x \in H \cap \{h'_f < M\}$ we have that

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow 0, d(y,x) < r} \frac{L_f(y, 5r)}{l_f(y, r)} < M.$$

Thus we find $0 < r_x < \varepsilon$ and $y_x \in B(x, r_x)$ such that $\Omega \setminus B(y_x, r_x) \neq \emptyset$ (we can assume that Ω consists of at least 2 points), $B(y_x, r_x) \subset U$, $B(y_x, 6r_x) \subset \Omega$, and

$$\frac{L_f(y_x, 5r_x)}{l_f(y_x, r_x)} < M.$$

By the 5-covering theorem, we find finitely or countably many pairwise disjoint balls $B_j = B(y_j, r_j)$ such that the balls $B(y_j, 5r_j)$ cover $H \cap \{h'_f < M\}$, with

$$\frac{L_f(y_j, 5r_j)}{l_f(y_j, r_j)} < M. \quad (4.5)$$

Let

$$g := \sum_j \frac{L_f(y_j, 5r_j)}{r_j} \chi_{6B_j}. \quad (4.6)$$

Then for a curve $\gamma: [0, \ell_\gamma] \rightarrow \Omega$ with $\ell_\gamma > \varepsilon$, we have

$$\sum_{j, 5B_j \cap \gamma \neq \emptyset} \operatorname{diam} f(5B_j) \leq 2 \sum_{j, 5B_j \cap \gamma \neq \emptyset} L_f(y_j, 5r_j) \leq 2 \int_\gamma g \, ds. \quad (4.7)$$

With $1/Q + (Q - 1)/Q = 1$, by Young's inequality we have for any $b_1, b_2 \geq 0$ that

$$\begin{aligned} b_1 b_2 &= \varepsilon^{1/Q} b_1 \varepsilon^{-1/Q} b_2 \leq \frac{1}{Q} \varepsilon b_1^Q + \frac{Q-1}{Q} \varepsilon^{-1/(Q-1)} b_2^{Q/(Q-1)} \\ &\leq \varepsilon b_1^Q + \varepsilon^{-1/(Q-1)} b_2^{Q/(Q-1)}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

Denote $l_j := l_f(y_j, r_j)$. Ahlfors regularity holds with the exponent Q and with a constant C_A in both X and Y . Using the Ahlfors regularity, we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_j \frac{L_f(y_j, 5r_j)}{r_j} \mu(6B_j) \\ &\leq 6^Q C_A \sum_j L_f(y_j, 5r_j) r_j^{Q-1} \\ &\leq 6^Q C_A M \sum_j l_j r_j^{Q-1} \quad \text{by (4.5)} \\ &\leq 6^{Q^2} C_A^Q M^Q \varepsilon \sum_j l_j^Q + \varepsilon^{-1/(Q-1)} \sum_j r_j^Q \quad \text{by (4.8)} \\ &= 6^{Q^2} C_A^{Q+1} M^Q \varepsilon \sum_j \nu(B(f(y_j), l_j)) + C_A \varepsilon^{-1/(Q-1)} \sum_j \mu(B_j). \end{aligned}$$

Note that since $f(\Omega) \subset B(y_0, R)$ and $\Omega \setminus B(y_j, r_j) \neq \emptyset$, we have $l_j < 2R$. Using injectivity and (4.4), we estimate further

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_j \frac{L_f(y_j, 5r_j)}{r_j} \mu(6B_j) &\leq 6^{Q^2} C_A^{Q+1} M^Q \varepsilon \nu(B(y_0, 3R)) + C_A \varepsilon^{-1/(Q-1)} \mu(U) \\ &\leq 6^{Q^2} C_A^{Q+1} M^Q \varepsilon \nu(B(y_0, 3R)) + C_A \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

We can do this for $\varepsilon = 1/i$, $i = 1, 2, \dots$. Instead of e.g. y_j , we now denote $y_{i,j}$ to signify also the dependence on i . Using the definition (4.6), we get a sequence of functions $\{g_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$. For every $i \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\Omega g_i d\mu &\leq \sum_j \frac{L_f(y_{i,j}, 5r_{i,j})}{r_{i,j}} \mu(6B_{i,j}) \\ &\leq 6^{Q^2} C_A^{Q+1} M^Q (1/i) \nu(B(y_0, 3R)) + C_A/i \\ &\rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } i \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

Recall that we are keeping $M \in \mathbb{N}$ fixed. Denote

$$H_M := \Omega \cap \bigcap_{i=1}^\infty \bigcup_j 5B_{i,j}.$$

Note that H_M is a Borel set that contains $H \cap \{h'_f < M\}$. Fix $\delta > 0$. Using the measure property of $\|Df\|$, we get the following (see e.g. [12, Proposition 3.3.37]): there is an open set $W \supset H_M$ with $\|Df\|(W \setminus H_M) < \delta$, and there is a closed set $F \subset H_M$ with

$\|Df\|(H_M \setminus F) < \delta$. From the definition of BV mappings (Definition 2.1), there exists a sequence of nonnegative functions $\{h_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ such that for every curve γ in $W \setminus F$ outside a family Γ with $\text{AM}(\Gamma) = 0$, we have

$$d_Y(f(\gamma(t_1)), f(\gamma(t_2))) \leq \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\gamma|_{[t_1, t_2]}} h_i ds \quad (4.10)$$

for almost every $t_1, t_2 \in [0, \ell_\gamma]$ with $t_1 < t_2$, and

$$\int_{W \setminus F} h_i d\mu < \|Df\|(W \setminus F) + \delta < 3\delta \quad \text{for every } i \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (4.11)$$

We extend each h_i to W by letting $h_i = 0$ in F . Then consider a curve $\gamma: [0, \ell_\gamma] \rightarrow W$; excluding an AM-negligible family we can assume that no subcurve of γ is in Γ , as follows readily from the definition of AM-modulus. Note that $(0, \ell_\gamma) \setminus \gamma^{-1}(F)$ is an open set, and so it is the union of pairwise disjoint open intervals $\bigcup_{m=1}^\infty V_m$. By (4.10), there exists $A \subset [0, \ell_\gamma]$ with $\mathcal{L}^1([a, b] \setminus A) = 0$ and for every $t_1, t_2 \in V_m \cap A$ with $t_1 < t_2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{diam } f \circ \gamma(V_m \cap A) &= \sup_{t_1, t_2 \in V_m \cap A, t_1 < t_2} d_Y(f(\gamma(t_1)), f(\gamma(t_2))) \\ &\leq \sup_{t_1, t_2 \in V_m \cap A, t_1 < t_2} \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\gamma|_{[t_1, t_2]}} h_i ds \\ &\leq \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \int_{V_m} h_i(\gamma(s)) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\delta_\gamma > 0$. If

$$\text{diam } f \circ \gamma(V_m \cap A) \leq \int_{V_m} h_i(\gamma(s)) ds + 2^{-m} \delta_\gamma, \quad (4.12)$$

then let $V_{i,m} = V_m$, and otherwise let $V_{i,m} = \emptyset$. Note that for every m , we have $V_{i,m} = V_m$ for all sufficiently large i . Note also that $\gamma^{-1}(F)$ is covered, for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$, by the open sets $\gamma^{-1}(5B_{i,j})$. Now by Lemma 4.3, for every $t_1, t_2 \in A$ with $t_1 < t_2$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} &d_Y(f(\gamma(t_1)), f(\gamma(t_2))) \\ &\leq \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sum_{j, 5B_{i,j} \cap \gamma \neq \emptyset} \text{diam } f \circ \gamma(\gamma^{-1}(5B_{i,j})) + \sum_m \text{diam } f \circ \gamma(V_{i,m} \cap A) \right) \\ &\leq \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sum_{j, 5B_{i,j} \cap \gamma \neq \emptyset} \text{diam } f(5B_{i,j}) + \sum_m \text{diam } f \circ \gamma(V_{i,m} \cap A) \right) \\ &\leq \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \left(2 \int_\gamma g_i ds + \int_\gamma h_i ds + \delta_\gamma \right) \quad \text{by (4.7), (4.12)}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\delta_\gamma > 0$ was arbitrary, we get

$$d_Y(f(\gamma(t_1)), f(\gamma(t_2))) \leq \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \int_\gamma (2g_i + h_i) ds$$

for every $t_1, t_2 \in A$ with $t_1 < t_2$. Now by definition,

$$\|Df\|(W) \leq \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \int_W (2g_i + h_i) d\mu \leq 3\delta \quad \text{by (4.9), (4.11)}.$$

Thus $\|Df\|(H_M) \leq \|Df\|(W) \leq 3\delta$. Since $\delta > 0$ was arbitrary, we get $\|Df\|(H_M) = 0$ and so $\|Df\|(H \cap \{h'_f < M\}) = 0$, and so $\|Df\|(H \cap \{h'_f < \infty\}) = 0$. Thus

$$\|Df\|^s(\{h'_f < \infty\}) = \|Df\|^s(\Omega \setminus H) + \|Df\|^s(H \cap \{h'_f < \infty\}) = 0,$$

proving the result. \square

Remark 4.13. Note that in Theorem 1.3, we could in fact only assume $f \in D^{\text{BV}}(\Omega; Y)$ instead of $f \in \text{BV}(\Omega; Y)$, that is, we do not use the assumption $f \in L^1(\Omega; Y)$.

Proof of Corollary 1.4. By Proposition 3.1, it is enough to consider $f \in \text{BV}(B(0, 1); \mathbb{R}^2)$. By considering truncations, we can also assume that $f \in L^\infty(B(0, 1); \mathbb{R}^2)$. There exists a \mathcal{L}^2 -negligible set $H \subset B(0, 1)$ such that $|D^s f|(B(0, 1) \setminus H) = 0$. Let D be the subset of H where $\frac{dDf}{d|Df|}$ has rank 2. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. For $|Df|$ -a.e. $x \in D$, we find cones $C_1 = C(v_1, a_1)$ and $C_2 = C(v_2, a_2)$ with $C_1 \cap C_2 = \{0\}$ and $-C_1 \cap C_2 = \{0\}$, and an arbitrarily small radius $r_x > 0$ such that $|Df|(\partial B(x, r_x)) = 0$, and

$$|Df| \left(B(x, r_x) \cap D \cap \left\{ \frac{dDf_1}{d|Df|} \in C_1 \setminus \{0\} \right\} \right) > (1 - \varepsilon/2) |Df|(B(x, r_x))$$

and similarly for f_2 . Note that if $\frac{dDf_1}{d|Df|} \in C_1 \setminus \{0\}$, then also $\frac{dDf_1}{d|Df_1|} \in C_1 \setminus \{0\}$. By the Vitali covering theorem, see e.g. [2, Theorem 2.19], we can choose pairwise disjoint balls $B(x_j, r_j)$ covering $|Df|$ -almost all of D . Now for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we include the index j in the notation, so that there are disjoint cones $C_{1,j} = C(v_{1,j}, a_{1,j})$ and $C_{2,j} = C(v_{2,j}, a_{2,j})$. Let

$$A_j := B(x_j, r_j) \cap D \cap \left\{ \frac{dDf_1}{d|Df|} \in C_{1,j} \setminus \{0\} \right\} \cap \left\{ \frac{dDf_2}{d|Df|} \in C_{2,j} \setminus \{0\} \right\}.$$

Then $|Df|(A_j) \geq (1 - \varepsilon) |Df|(B(x_j, r_j))$.

Let $a'_{1,j} < a_{1,j}$ and $a'_{2,j} < a_{2,j}$ such that for $C'_{1,j} := C(v_{1,j}, a'_{1,j})$ and $C'_{2,j} = C(v_{2,j}, a'_{2,j})$, we still have $C'_{1,j} \cap C'_{2,j} = \{0\}$ and $-C'_{1,j} \cap C'_{2,j} = \{0\}$. Thus by Proposition 3.2, we find $f'_{1,j}, f'_{2,j} \in \text{BV}(B(x_j, r_j)) \cap L^\infty(B(x_j, r_j))$ such that

$$|Df| \llcorner_{A_j} \ll |Df_1| \llcorner_{A_j} \ll |Df'_{1,j}| \llcorner_{A_j} \ll |D^s f'_{1,j}|$$

and similarly $|Df| \llcorner_{A_j} \ll |D^s f'_{2,j}|$ in $B(x_j, r_j)$, and

$$\frac{dDf'_{1,j}}{d|Df'_{1,j}|}(x) \in C'_{1,j} \text{ for } |Df'_{1,j}| \text{-a.e. } x \in B(x_j, r_j),$$

and analogously for $f'_{2,j}$. Let $f_{1,j}(y) := f'_{1,j}(y) + v_{1,j} \cdot y$, $f_{2,j}(y) := f'_{2,j}(y) + v_{2,j} \cdot y$, and $f_j = (f_{1,j}, f_{2,j})$. Then by Theorem 1.2, f_j^* is injective. Note that still $|Df| \llcorner_{A_j} \ll |D^s f_{1,j}|$

and $|Df|_{\mathbb{L}_{A_j}} \ll |D^s f_{2,j}|$. Let

$$d\kappa := \min \left\{ \frac{d|D^s f_{1,j}|}{d|D^s f_j|}, \frac{d|D^s f_{2,j}|}{d|D^s f_j|} \right\} d|D^s f_j|.$$

Note that $|Df|_{\mathbb{L}_{A_j}} \ll \kappa$. Now for κ -a.e. $x \in B(x_j, r_j)$, we have $\frac{d|D^s f_{1,j}|}{d|D^s f_j|}(x) > 0$ and $\frac{d|D^s f_{2,j}|}{d|D^s f_j|}(x) > 0$, and so $\frac{dDf_j}{d|D^s f_j|}(x)$ has rank two for κ -a.e. $x \in B(x_j, r_j)$. For each j , by Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3 we have for $|D^s f_j|$ -a.e. $x \in B(x_j, r_j)$ that $\frac{dDf_j}{d|D^s f_j|}(x)$ has rank one; this is then true also for κ -a.e. $x \in B(x_j, r_j)$. Here we also rely on Proposition 2.3. Thus $\kappa(B(x_j, r_j)) = 0$, and so $|D^s f|(B(x_j, r_j) \cap A_j) = 0$. In total,

$$|Df|(D) = |D^s f|(D) \leq \sum_j |D^s f|(B(x_j, r_j) \setminus A_j) \leq \varepsilon \sum_j |Df|(B(x_j, r_j)) \leq \varepsilon |Df|(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

Letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, we get $|Df|(D) = 0$. □

Remark 4.14. In Theorem 1.2 we demonstrate a connection between $\frac{dDf}{d|Df|}$ having rank one and h'_{f^*} being infinite. A similar connection was proved in [16, Theorem 6.3], where it was shown for $f \in \text{BV}(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R}^n)$ that at $|Df|$ -a.e. point $\frac{dDf}{d|Df|}$ has full rank if and only if a slightly different variant of h_{f^*} is finite. It should be noted that the proof of this result relied on Alberti's rank one theorem. In any case, at least heuristically there is a connection between $\frac{dDf}{d|Df|}$ having full rank and f being “quasiconformal” at a point.

If $f: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is a homeomorphism and $h_f(x) \leq H < \infty$ for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, then f is a quasiconformal mapping; this can be taken as a definition of quasiconformal mappings. Quasiconformal mappings have, in particular, $W_{\text{loc}}^{1,n}$ -regularity. There has been wide interest in showing that if this pointwise condition is assumed in some relaxed sense, it follows that the mapping f has at least some lower regularity. For $1 \leq p \leq n$, and denoting $p^* = np/(n-p)$ for $1 \leq p < n$ and $p^* = \infty$ for $p = n$, if $f: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is a homeomorphism, $h_f \in L_{\text{loc}}^{p^*}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and $h_f < \infty$ outside a set of σ -finite \mathcal{H}^{n-1} -measure, then $f \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R}^n)$. For this, see Koskela–Rogovin [15, Corollary 1.3] and Kallunki–Martio [14, Theorem 2.2].

So at one extreme, h_f being uniformly bounded means quasiconformality and thus $W_{\text{loc}}^{1,n}$ -regularity; at the other extreme, h_f or a variant of it being merely finite in a set is enough to guarantee at least that the singular part of $\|Df\|$ does not charge this set, as given by Theorem 1.3. Or, f is “non-quasiconformal” at $\|Df\|^s$ -a.e. point. So heuristically, the rank one theorem is one extreme end point of this wider quasiconformal theory.

REFERENCES

- [1] G. Alberti, *Rank one property for derivatives of functions with bounded variation*, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A 123 (1993), no. 2, 239–274. [1](#)
- [2] L. Ambrosio, N. Fusco, and D. Pallara, *Functions of bounded variation and free discontinuity problems*. Oxford Mathematical Monographs. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 2000. [4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#), [10](#), [11](#), [18](#)

- [3] Z. Balogh, P. Koskela, and S. Rogovin, *Absolute continuity of quasiconformal mappings on curves*, *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 17 (2007), no. 3, 645–664. [3](#)
- [4] C. De Lellis, *A note on Alberti’s rank-one theorem*, *Transport equations and multi-D hyperbolic conservation laws*, 61–74, *Lect. Notes Unione Mat. Ital.*, 5, Springer, Berlin, 2008. [1](#), [7](#), [11](#)
- [5] G. De Philippis and F. Rindler, *On the structure of A -free measures and applications*, *Ann. of Math. (2)* 184 (2016), no. 3, 1017–1039. [1](#)
- [6] E. Durand-Cartagena, S. Eriksson-Bique, R. Korte, and N. Shanmugalingam, *Equivalence of two BV classes of functions in metric spaces, and existence of a Semmes family of curves under a 1-Poincaré inequality*, *Adv. Calc. Var.* 14 (2021), no. 2, 231–245. [5](#)
- [7] A. Fang, *The ACL property of homeomorphisms under weak conditions*, *Acta Math. Sinica (N.S.)* 14 (1998), no. 4, 473–480. [3](#)
- [8] F. W. Gehring, *Rings and quasiconformal mappings in space*, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 103 (1962), 353–393. [3](#)
- [9] F.W. Gehring, *The L^p -integrability of the partial derivatives of a quasiconformal mapping*, *Acta Math.* 130 (1973), 265–277. [3](#)
- [10] P. Hajłasz, *Sobolev spaces on metric-measure spaces*, *Heat kernels and analysis on manifolds, graphs, and metric spaces (Paris, 2002)*, 173–218, *Contemp. Math.*, 338, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2003. [3](#)
- [11] J. Heinonen, P. Koskela, N. Shanmugalingam, and J. Tyson, *Sobolev classes of Banach space-valued functions and quasiconformal mappings*, *J. Anal. Math.* 85 (2001), 87–139. [2](#)
- [12] J. Heinonen, P. Koskela, N. Shanmugalingam, and J. Tyson, *Sobolev spaces on metric measure spaces. An approach based on upper gradients*, *New Mathematical Monographs*, 27. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2015. xii+434 pp. [3](#), [4](#), [8](#), [16](#)
- [13] S. Kallunki and P. Koskela, *Exceptional sets for the definition of quasiconformality*, *Amer. J. Math.* 122 (2000), no. 4, 735–743. [3](#)
- [14] S. Kallunki and O. Martio, *ACL homeomorphisms and linear dilatation*, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 130 (2002), no. 4, 1073–1078. [3](#), [19](#)
- [15] P. Koskela and S. Rogovin, *Linear dilatation and absolute continuity*, *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math.* 30 (2005), no. 2, 385–392. [19](#)
- [16] P. Lahti, *Generalized Lipschitz numbers, fine differentiability, and quasiconformal mappings*, preprint 2022. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2202.05566> [13](#), [19](#)
- [17] P. Lahti, *Strict and pointwise convergence of BV functions in metric spaces*, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 455 (2017), no. 2, 1005–1021. [8](#)
- [18] C. Larsen, *Quasiconvexification in $W^{1,1}$ and optimal jump microstructure in BV relaxation*, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* 29 (1998), no. 4, 823–848. [9](#)
- [19] G. A. Margulis and G. D. Mostow, *The differential of a quasi-conformal mapping of a Carnot-Carathéodory space*, *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 5 (1995), no. 2, 402–433. [3](#)
- [20] O. Martio, *The space of functions of bounded variation on curves in metric measure spaces*, *Conform. Geom. Dyn.* 20 (2016), 81–96. [3](#), [4](#)
- [21] A. Massaccesi and D. Vittone, *An elementary proof of the rank-one theorem for BV functions*, *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)* 21 (2019), no. 10, 3255–3258. [1](#)
- [22] M. Miranda, Jr., *Functions of bounded variation on “good” metric spaces*, *J. Math. Pures Appl.* (9) 82 (2003), no. 8, 975–1004. [4](#), [5](#)
- [23] M. Williams, *Dilatation, pointwise Lipschitz constants, and condition N on curves*, *Michigan Math. J.* 63 (2014), no. 4, 687–700. [3](#)

PANU LAHTI, ACADEMY OF MATHEMATICS AND SYSTEMS SCIENCE, CHINESE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES,
BEIJING 100190, PR CHINA, panulahti@amss.ac.cn