

## GRADIENTS OF BOREL FUNCTIONS

BY

B. BONGIORNO AND P. VETRO (PALERMO)

In the last years the problem of characterizing functions (of a point or of a set) having a.e. finite derivatives or having derivatives belonging to the space  $L^1$  was studied by various authors (e.g., L. Albano and N. Fedele, V. Aversa, B. Bongiorno, P. de Lucia, R. Fiorenza, U. Oliveri, B. Pettineo, P. Vetro, H. Wright and W. S. Snyder).

In a recent paper [1] we have considered functions defined on an open bounded subset of  $R^n$ , continuous separately with respect to each variable, and we have found conditions under which the gradient exists a.e. and belongs to the space  $L^p$  for  $p > 0$ .

The aim of this paper\* is to extend the results of [1] to the case of Borel functions defined on a bounded Borel set. So our results will cover also the case of approximate gradient.

**1. Notation.** We shall denote by  $R^n$  the  $n$ -dimensional Euclidean space, by  $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$  its elements, by  $\|\cdot\|$  the norm, by  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  the scalar product in  $R^n$ , by  $R_+$  and  $R_+^n$  the positive cones in  $R$  and  $R^n$  (respectively), and by  $\{e_j\}$  the canonical base of  $R^n$ .

Moreover, for  $x \in R^n$  and  $\lambda \in R_+^n$  we shall denote by  $[x, \lambda]$  the closed interval having  $x$  as a point with the smallest coordinates and  $x + \lambda$  as a point with the greatest coordinates, and for  $\lambda \in R_+^n$  we put

$$r(\lambda) = (\max_{1 \leq j \leq n} \langle \lambda, e_j \rangle)^{-n} \prod_{j=1}^n \langle \lambda, e_j \rangle.$$

So for each  $x \in R^n$  and  $\lambda \in R_+^n$  the number  $r(\lambda)$  is equal to the parameter of regularity of the interval  $[x, \lambda]$ .

For each  $X \subset R^n$  and  $s \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ ,  $\mu_s(X)$  will denote the  $s$ -dimensional Lebesgue measure of  $X$ . For a real-valued function  $f$  defined on a set  $X \subset R^n$ , we shall denote by  $\text{grad} f(x)$  ( $\text{grad}_{\text{ap}} f(x)$ ) the gradient (the approximate gradient) of  $f$  at  $x$ .

---

\* This paper was supported by G.N.A.F.A.

For each interval  $[x, \lambda]$  such that  $x \in X$ ,  $x + \langle \lambda, e_j \rangle e_j \in X$  for  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ , and for every  $p > 0$  we put

$$F_{p,j}(x) = |f(x + \langle \lambda, e_j \rangle e_j) - f(x)|^p \cdot |\langle \lambda, e_j \rangle|^{n-p}.$$

## 2. Lemmas.

**LEMMA 1.** *Let  $E$  be a  $\mu_n$ -measurable subset of  $R^n$  and let  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . For almost every  $x \in E$  there exists  $c(x) > 0$  such that if  $h \in (0, c(x))$  is a number fulfilling the condition  $x + he_i \in E$  for some  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ , then there exists an interval  $[x, \lambda]$  having the parameter of regularity greater than  $\alpha$  and such that*

$$x + \langle \lambda, e_j \rangle e_j \in E \text{ for every } j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\} \quad \text{and} \quad h = \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} \langle \lambda, e_j \rangle.$$

**Proof.** Let  $\tilde{E}$  be the subset of  $E$  consisting of the points  $x$  fulfilling the following condition: for every  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  the set

$$E(x, j) = \{t \in R_+ : x + te_j \in E\}$$

is  $\mu_1$ -measurable and has zero as a right-hand point of density. It is well known (see [3]) that  $\mu_n(E - \tilde{E}) = 0$ . If  $x \in \tilde{E}$ , then there exists  $c(x) > 0$  such that for every  $\gamma \in (0, c(x))$  and  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  we have

$$\mu_1\{t \in (0, \gamma) : x + te_j \in E\} > (1 - \alpha^{1/(n-1)})\gamma.$$

Let  $h \in (0, c(x))$  be such that  $x + he_i \in E$  for some  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . Then we have

$$\{t \in (\alpha^{1/(n-1)}h, h) : x + te_j \in E\} \neq \emptyset \quad \text{for every } j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}.$$

Let  $\lambda_j \in (\alpha^{1/(n-1)}h, h)$  ( $j \neq i$ ) be such that  $x + \lambda_j e_j \in E$  and let  $\lambda$  be the vector having  $\lambda_j$  as the  $j$ -th coordinate and  $h$  as the  $i$ -th coordinate. It is easy to verify that the interval  $[x, \lambda]$  satisfies the required condition.

Let  $X \subset R^n$  be a Borel set and let  $f: X \rightarrow R$  be a Borel function. For any real number  $k \geq 0$  and natural number  $m$  we denote by  $X_{m,k,f}$  the set of all points  $x \in X$  fulfilling the following condition:

$$|f(x + he_j) - f(x)| \leq hk$$

for every  $h \in (0, m^{-1})$  and for  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  such that  $x + he_j \in X$ .

**LEMMA 2.**  $X_{m,k,f}$  is a  $\mu_n$ -measurable set.

**Proof.** Observe that  $X \times (0, m^{-1})$  is a Borel set in  $R^{n+1}$ . Put

$$B_{m,j} = \{(x, h) \in X \times (0, m^{-1}) : x + he_j \in X\} \quad \text{for } j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}.$$

It is easy to see that the function  $\psi(x, h) = \varphi_X(x + he_j)$ , where  $\varphi_X$  is the characteristic function of  $X$ , is a Borel function.  $B_{m,j}$  is a Borel set, since

$$B_{m,j} = \{(x, h) : \psi(x, h) = 1\}.$$

Also  $h^{-1}|f(x+he_j)-f(x)|$  is a Borel function on  $B_{m,j}$ . Let  $\Delta_{m,j,k}$  be the projection of the set

$$\{(x, h) \in B_{m,j}: h^{-1}|f(x+he_j)-f(x)| > k\}$$

onto  $R^n$ .  $\Delta_{m,j,k}$  is a  $\mu_n$ -measurable set (see [2]) and

$$X_{m,k,f} = X - \bigcup_{j=1}^n \Delta_{m,j,k}.$$

Let now  $\chi: X \rightarrow R$  be a non-negative  $\mu_n$ -measurable function. For any natural number  $m$  we denote by  $X_{m,\chi,f}$  the set of all points  $x \in X$  fulfilling the following condition:

$$|f(x+he_j)-f(x)| \leq h\chi(x)$$

for every  $h \in (0, m^{-1})$  and for  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  such that  $x+he_j \in X$ .

**LEMMA 3.**  $X_{m,\chi,f}$  is a  $\mu_n$ -measurable set.

**Proof.** First step. Let  $\chi$  be a simple function,

$$\chi(x) = \sum_p k_p \varphi_{X_p}(x)$$

(where  $\varphi_{X_p}$  is the characteristic function of  $X_p$ ). Then we have

$$X_{m,\chi,f} = \bigcup_p (X_p \cap X_{m,k_p,f})$$

and we apply Lemma 2.

Second step. Let  $\chi$  be a bounded function and let  $\{g_s(x)\}$  be a decreasing sequence of simple functions pointwise convergent to  $\chi(x)$ . Then we have

$$X_{m,\chi,f} = \bigcap_{s \in N} X_{m,g_s,f}$$

and we apply the first step.

Third step. If  $\chi$  is an unbounded function, then we put

$$\chi_s(x) = \min(\chi(x), s).$$

We have

$$X_{m,\chi,f} = \bigcup_{s \in N} X_{m,\chi_s,f}$$

and we apply the second step.

### 3. Existence theorems.

**THEOREM 1.** *If  $X \subset R^n$  is a bounded Borel set and  $f: X \rightarrow R$  is a Borel function, then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) *grad  $f$  exists a.e. in  $X$ .*

(ii) For almost every  $x \in X$ , for every  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  and for every  $p \in \mathbb{R}_+$  there exist two positive numbers  $K_{\alpha,p}(x)$  and  $\eta(x)$  such that

$$(1) \quad F_{p,j}([x, \lambda]) \leq K_{\alpha,p}(x) \mu_n([x, \lambda])$$

holds for all  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  and for each  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$  satisfying  $\|\lambda\| < \eta(x)$ ,  $r(\lambda) > \alpha$  and  $x + \langle \lambda, e_j \rangle e_j \in X$  for every  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ .

(iii) For every  $\sigma > 0$ , for every  $p \in \mathbb{R}_+$  and for every  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  there exist a  $\mu_n$ -measurable set  $X_\sigma \subset X$  and two positive numbers  $M_{\sigma,p,\alpha}$  and  $\tau_\sigma$  such that

$$(2) \quad \mu_n(X - X_\sigma) < \sigma$$

and

$$(3) \quad \sum_h F_{p,j}([x_h, \lambda_h]) \leq M_{\sigma,p,\alpha}$$

holds for every  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  and for each finite sequence  $\{[x_h, \lambda_h]\}$  of pairwise disjoint intervals satisfying

$$(4) \quad r(\lambda_h) > \alpha, \quad \|\lambda_h\| < \tau_\sigma, \quad x_h \in X_\sigma, \quad x_h + \langle \lambda_h, e_j \rangle e_j \in X$$

for  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ .

Proof. (i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii). Let  $x \in X$  be such a point that  $\text{grad}f(x)$  exists and is finite. Put

$$H(x) = \max(2 \|\text{grad}f(x)\|, 1), \quad K_{\alpha,p}(x) = \frac{1}{\alpha} H^p(x).$$

Let  $\eta(x) > 0$  be such that the inequality

$$(5) \quad |f(x + \langle \lambda, e_j \rangle e_j) - f(x)| \leq H(x) \langle \lambda, e_j \rangle$$

holds for every  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$  satisfying the conditions

$$\|\lambda\| < \eta(x), \quad x + \langle \lambda, e_j \rangle e_j \in X \text{ for } j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}.$$

In virtue of (5) we have, for every  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ ,

$$|f(x + \langle \lambda, e_j \rangle e_j) - f(x)|^p |\langle \lambda, e_j \rangle|^{n-p} \leq H^p(x) |\langle \lambda, e_j \rangle|^n.$$

Then, if  $r(\lambda) > \alpha$ , we have

$$F_{p,j}([x, \lambda]) \leq H^p(x) \prod_{i=1}^n \langle \lambda, e_i \rangle \alpha^{-1} = K_{\alpha,p}(x) \mu_n([x, \lambda]).$$

(ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (iii). Using Lemma 2 we have

$$\mu_n(X - X_{m,m,f}) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{for } m \rightarrow \infty.$$

Hence for  $\sigma > 0$  there exists  $m_\sigma$  such that

$$\mu_n(X - X_{m_\sigma, m_\sigma, f}) < \sigma.$$

Put  $X_\sigma = X_{m_\sigma, m_\sigma, f}$  and  $\tau_\sigma = (m_\sigma)^{-1}$ . Let  $I$  be an interval containing  $X$  and such that the distance between its boundary and  $X$  is greater than 1. Put

$$M_{\sigma, p, \alpha} = \frac{1}{\alpha} (m_\sigma)^p \mu_n(I).$$

Then for each finite sequence  $\{[x_h, \lambda_h]\}$  of pairwise disjoint intervals satisfying (4) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_h F_{p, j}([x_h, \lambda_h]) &\leq (m_\sigma)^p \sum_h |\langle \lambda_h, e_j \rangle|^n \leq \frac{1}{\alpha} (m_\sigma)^p \sum_h \mu_n([x_h, \lambda_h]) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\alpha} (m_\sigma)^p \mu_n(I) = M_{\sigma, p, \alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

(iii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i). Let  $Y_j$  be the set of points in which  $f$  has an infinite right-hand upper derivative or infinite right-hand lower derivative with respect to  $x_j$ . Since  $f$  is a Borel function,  $Y_j$  is a  $\mu_n$ -measurable set; moreover, in virtue of the Denjoy-Young-Saks theorem, the finite derivative  $f'_{x_j}$  exists a.e. in  $X - Y_j$ . Therefore,  $\text{grad} f$  exists and is finite a.e. in  $X - \bigcup_{j=1}^n Y_j$ . We shall prove, under the assumption of (iii), that  $\mu_n(Y_j) = 0$  for every  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ .

Suppose that there exists  $j$  such that

$$(6) \quad \mu_n(Y_j) > 0.$$

Let  $0 < \sigma < \frac{1}{2} \mu_n(Y_j)$ . Then in virtue of (2) we have

$$(7) \quad \mu_n(Y_j \cap X_\sigma) > 0.$$

Let  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  be fixed. From Lemma 1 it follows that for almost every  $x \in Y_j \cap X_\sigma$  there exists a sequence  $\{[x, \lambda_\nu]\}$  of intervals such that

$$(8) \quad \begin{aligned} r(\lambda_\nu) > \alpha, \quad x + \langle \lambda_\nu, e_i \rangle e_i \in X, \quad \|\lambda_\nu\| \rightarrow 0, \quad \langle \lambda_\nu, e_i \rangle \leq \langle \lambda_\nu, e_j \rangle \\ \text{for } i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}, \end{aligned}$$

$$|f(x + \langle \lambda_\nu, e_j \rangle e_j) - f(x)| > \langle \lambda_\nu, e_j \rangle \left( \frac{2M_{\sigma, p, \alpha}}{\mu_n(Y_j \cap X_\sigma)} \right)^{1/p}.$$

Then in virtue of Vitali's theorem there exists a finite family of pairwise disjoint intervals  $\{[x_h, \lambda_h]\}$  of described type and such that

$$\sum_h \mu_n([x_h, \lambda_h]) > \frac{1}{2} \mu_n(Y_j \cap X_\sigma).$$

At last, from (8) it follows that

$$\sum_h F_{p,j}([x_h, \lambda_h]) > M_{\sigma,p,\alpha},$$

which contradicts (3).

**THEOREM 2.** *Let  $E$  be a  $\mu_n$ -measurable subset of  $R^n$  and let  $f: E \rightarrow R$  be a  $\mu_n$ -measurable function. The finite approximate gradient of  $f$  exists a.e. in  $E$  if and only if there exists a sequence  $\{C_m\}$  of closed sets such that*

$$(9) \quad \mu_n\left(E - \bigcup_m C_m\right) = 0$$

and  $\text{grad}(f|_{C_m})$  exists and is finite on  $C_m$  for every natural  $m$ .

This follows immediately from the theorem of Whitney (see [4]).

The following theorem is an immediate consequence of Theorems 1 and 2.

**THEOREM 3.** *Let  $E$  and  $f$  be as in Theorem 2. The finite approximate gradient of  $f$  exists a.e. in  $E$  if and only if the following condition is fulfilled:*

(iii)<sub>ap</sub> *For every  $\sigma > 0$ , for every  $p \in R_+$  and for every  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  there exist a  $\mu_n$ -measurable set  $E_\sigma$  and two positive numbers  $M_{\sigma,p,\alpha}$  and  $\tau_\sigma$  such that*

$$E_\sigma \subset E \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_n(E - E_\sigma) < \sigma$$

and inequality (3) holds for every  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  and for each finite sequence  $\{[x_h, \lambda_h]\}$  of pairwise disjoint intervals such that  $r(\lambda_h) > \alpha$ ,  $\|\lambda_h\| < \tau_\sigma$ ,  $x_h \in E_\sigma$  for each  $h$  and  $x_h + \langle \lambda_h, e_j \rangle e_j \in E_\sigma$  for each  $j$ .

#### 4. Integrability theorems.

**THEOREM 4.** *Let  $X$  and  $f$  be as in Theorem 1. For each  $p \in R_+$  the following conditions are equivalent:*

(i)'  $\text{grad} f \in L^p(X)$ .

(ii)' *There exist a set  $\tilde{X} \subset X$  with  $\mu_n(X - \tilde{X}) = 0$  and a  $\mu_n$ -measurable function  $\sigma(x): X \rightarrow R_+$  such that for every  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  there exists a positive constant  $M_{\alpha,p}$  such that*

$$\sum_h F_{p,j}([x_h, \lambda_h]) \leq M_{\alpha,p}$$

holds for each  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  and for each finite sequence  $\{[x_h, \lambda_h]\}$  of pairwise disjoint intervals satisfying  $r(\lambda_h) > \alpha$ ,  $\|\lambda_h\| < \sigma(x_h)$ ,  $x_h \in \tilde{X}$ ,  $x_h + \langle \lambda_h, e_j \rangle e_j \in X$  for every  $h$  and every  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ .

(iii)' *Condition (iii) holds and the constant  $M_{\sigma,p,\alpha}$  is independent of  $\sigma$ .*

**Proof.** (i)'  $\Rightarrow$  (ii)'. Let  $I$  be an interval including  $X$  and such that the distance between its boundary and  $X$  is greater than 1. Put

$$(10) \quad M_{\alpha,p} = \frac{1}{\alpha} \left[ 2^p \sum_{j=1}^n \int_{\tilde{X}} |f'_{x_j}(t)|^p d\mu_n(t) + n + \mu_n(I) \right]$$

and consider a pairwise disjoint sequence of closed sets  $\{C_m\}$  such that

$$\mu_n\left(X - \bigcup_m C_m\right) = 0$$

and  $\text{grad}(f|C_m)$  is continuous for each  $m$ . Let  $A_m$  be an open set containing  $C_m$  and satisfying

$$\mu_n(A_m - C_m) < 2^{-(m+2)} / \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \max_{x \in C_m} |f'_{x_i}|^p + 1 \right).$$

Since  $\text{grad} f$  is continuous on the compact set  $C_m$ ,  $|f'_{x_j}|^p$  is uniformly continuous on  $C_m$  for every  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . Let  $\sigma_m$  be a positive number smaller than the distance between  $C_m$  and the boundary of  $A_m$  and such that for every  $x, y \in C_m$  with  $\|x - y\| < \sigma_m$  we have

$$\left| |f'_{x_j}(x)|^p - |f'_{x_j}(y)|^p \right| < 2^{-(m+2)} / \mu_n(A_m) \quad \text{for } j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}.$$

If  $\{[x_h, \lambda_h]\}$  is a finite sequence of non-overlapping intervals such that  $x_h \in C_m$  and  $\|\lambda_h\| < \sigma_m$  for each  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} (11) \quad \sum_h |f'_{x_j}(x_h)|^p \mu_n([x_h, \lambda_h]) &\leq \sum_h \left( \min_{x \in C_m \cap [x_h, \lambda_h]} |f'_{x_j}(x)|^p \mu_n([x_h, \lambda_h]) + 2^{-(m+2)} \right) \\ &\leq \sum_h \left( \min_{x \in C_m \cap [x_h, \lambda_h]} |f'_{x_j}(x)|^p \mu_n([x_h, \lambda_h] \cap C_m) + \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \max_{x \in C_m} |f'_{x_j}(x)|^p \mu_n(A_m - C_m) + 2^{-(m+2)} \right) \\ &\leq \int_{C_m} |f'_{x_j}|^p + 2^{-(m+1)}. \end{aligned}$$

The function

$$\chi(x) = \max \{ 2 \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} |f'_{x_j}(x)|, 1 \}$$

is  $\mu_n$ -measurable, so, by Lemma 3,  $X_{m,x,f}$  is a  $\mu_n$ -measurable set and

$$\mu_n\left(X - \bigcup_{m'} X_{m',x,f}\right) = 0.$$

Put

$$\tilde{X} = \left( \bigcup_m C_m \right) \cap \left( \bigcup_{m'} X_{m',x,f} \right)$$

and let

$$\sigma(x) = \min \{ \sigma_m, [\inf \{ m' : x \in X_{m',x,f} \}]^{-1} \}, \quad x \in C_m.$$

Fix  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . Let  $\{[x_h, \lambda_h]\}$  be a finite sequence of pairwise disjoint intervals such that  $x_h \in \tilde{X}$ ,  $\|\lambda_h\| < \sigma(x_h)$ , and  $r(\lambda_h) > \alpha$  for each  $h$  and  $x_h + \langle \lambda_h, e_j \rangle e_j \in X$  for each  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . From (10) and (11), after

not difficult computations, we obtain

$$\sum_h F_{p,j}([x_h, \lambda_h]) \leq \frac{1}{a} \left( \sum_h \mu_n([x_h, \lambda_h]) \chi^p(x_h) \right) \leq M_{a,p}.$$

(ii)'  $\Rightarrow$  (iii)'. Observe that for every  $\sigma > 0$  there exists  $m \in N$  such that

$$\mu_n(\{x \in \tilde{X} : \sigma(x) \leq m^{-1}\}) < \sigma.$$

Put

$$X_\sigma = \{x \in \tilde{X} : \sigma(x) > m^{-1}\}, \quad \tau_\sigma = m^{-1}, \quad M_{\sigma,p,a} = M_{a,p}.$$

(iii)'  $\Rightarrow$  (i)'. In virtue of Theorem 1,  $\text{grad} f$  exists and is finite a.e. in  $X$ . Using the method similar to that in [1] (proof of  $(\gamma) \Rightarrow (\alpha)$ ) we infer that for every  $\sigma > 0$  there exists a closed set  $\Gamma_\sigma \subset X$  such that  $\mu_n(X - \Gamma_\sigma) < \sigma$  and

$$(12) \quad \int_{\Gamma_\sigma} |f'_{x_j}(t)|^p d\mu_n(t) \leq M_{\sigma,p,a} + \sigma \left( 2 + \frac{1}{a} (\text{diam} X + \sigma)^a \right).$$

Since  $M_{\sigma,p,a}$  is independent of  $\sigma$ , the required inequality follows when  $\sigma \rightarrow 0$  in (12).

**THEOREM 5.** *Let  $E$  and  $f$  be as in Theorem 2. For each  $p \in R_+$  the following conditions are equivalent:*

(i)''  $\text{grad}_{\text{ap}} f \in L^p(E)$ .

(ii)'' *There exists an increasing sequence  $\{C_m\}$  of closed sets satisfying (9) and such that, for each  $m \in N$ ,  $f$  fulfils on  $C_m$  condition (ii)' and the constant  $M_{a,p}$  is independent of  $m$ .*

(iii)'' *There exists an increasing sequence  $\{C_m\}$  of closed sets satisfying (9) and such that, for each  $m \in N$ ,  $f$  fulfils on  $C_m$  condition (iii)<sub>ap</sub> and the constant  $M_{\sigma,p,a}$  is independent of  $\sigma$  and  $m$ .*

**Proof.** (i)''  $\Rightarrow$  (ii)''. From Theorem 2 it follows that there exists an increasing sequence  $\{C_m\}$  of closed sets satisfying (9) and such that  $f|C_m$  has a finite gradient on  $C_m$ . Obviously,

$$\text{grad}(f|C_m)(x) = \text{grad}_{\text{ap}} f(x) \quad \text{for almost every } x \in C_m.$$

Now it suffices to apply Theorem 4.

(ii)''  $\Rightarrow$  (iii)''. For every  $m \in N$  and for every  $\sigma > 0$  put  $(C_m)_\sigma = \tilde{C}_m$ .

(iii)''  $\Rightarrow$  (i)''. Using Theorem 4, for every  $\sigma \in R_+$ , for every  $a \in (0, 1)$  and for every  $m \in N$  we have

$$\int_{(C_m)_\sigma} |(f|C_m)'_{x_j}(t)|^p d\mu_n(t) \leq M_{\sigma,p,a} \quad \text{for } j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}.$$

But  $M_{\sigma,p,a}$  is independent of  $\sigma$ . Hence

$$\int_{C_m} |(f|C_m)'_{x_j}(t)|^p d\mu_n(t) \leq M_{\sigma,p,a}$$

for every  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ , for every  $a \in (0, 1)$  and for every  $m \in N$ . Moreover, since  $\text{grad}(f|C_m)(x) = \text{grad}_{\text{ap}}f(x)$  for almost every  $x \in C_m$ , the conclusion follows from (9) in virtue of the independence of  $M_{\sigma,p,a}$  from  $m$ .

#### REFERENCES

- [1] B. Bongiorno and P. Vetro, *Funzioni a gradiente integrabile*, Rendiconti del Circolo Matematico di Palermo 23 (1974), p. 225-239.
- [2] N. Lusin, *Les ensembles analytiques*, Chelsea Publishing Company 1972.
- [3] S. Saks, *Theory of the integral*, Monografie Matematyczne, Warszawa-Lwów 1937.
- [4] H. Whitney, *On totally differentiable and smooth functions*, Pacific Journal of Mathematics 1 (1951), p. 143-159.

*Reçu par la Rédaction le 9. 10. 1976;  
en version modifiée le 26. 1. 1977*

---