

## Werk

**Label:** Article

**Jahr:** 1976

**PURL:** [https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?31311157X\\_0101|log97](https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?31311157X_0101|log97)

## Kontakt/Contact

Digizeitschriften e.V.  
SUB Göttingen  
Platz der Göttinger Sieben 1  
37073 Göttingen

✉ [info@digizeitschriften.de](mailto:info@digizeitschriften.de)

## SETS OF $\sigma$ -POROSITY AND SETS OF $\sigma$ -POROSITY ( $q$ )

LUDĚK ZAJÍČEK, Praha

(Received July 11, 1975)

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The notion of a set of  $\sigma$ -porosity was defined by E. P. DOLŽENKO [1]. There exists a number of theorems in the theory of cluster sets which use this notion. (See [1], [2], [3], [4], [5].) It is easy to see that any set of  $\sigma$ -porosity is of the first category and of measure zero. The existence of a set of the first category and of measure zero which is not of  $\sigma$ -porosity is claimed without a proof in [1]. In the present article we shall prove this result.

N. YANAGIHARA [2] defined and used the notion of a set of  $\sigma$ -porosity ( $q$ ),  $0 < q \leq 1$ , which coincides with the notion of a set of  $\sigma$ -porosity for  $q = 1$ . We shall prove that the notions of a set of  $\sigma$ -porosity ( $q$ ) and  $\sigma$ -porosity ( $p$ ) coincide for any  $p, q$ ,  $0 < p, q < 1$ .

The main aim of the present article is to prove the results mentioned above and some other results on the sets of  $\sigma$ -porosity ( $q$ ) (in our notation on sets of  $(x^q)$ - $\sigma$ -porosity) in Euclidean spaces.

We shall generalize the notion of a set of  $\sigma$ -porosity ( $q$ ) and we shall formulate some results in a general metric space in order to clarify the proofs.

### 2. DEFINITIONS

Let  $(P, \rho)$  be a metric space. Then we define:

**2.1.** The open sphere with the centre  $x \in P$  and the radius  $r > 0$  is denoted by  $K(x, r)$ .

**2.2.** Let  $M \subset P$ ,  $x \in P$ ,  $R > 0$ . Then we denote the supremum of the set  $\{r > 0; \text{ for some } z \in P, K(z, r) \subset K(x, R) \text{ and } K(z, r) \cap M = \emptyset\}$  by  $\gamma(x, R, M)$ .

**2.3.** Let  $K(x, r) \subset P$ . Let  $f$  be an arbitrary function. Then we put  $f * K(x, r) = K(x, f(r))$  if  $f(r) > 0$ .

2.4. Let  $M \subset P$ . Let  $f$  be an arbitrary function. Then we put  $S(f, r, M) = \bigcup \{f * K; K \cap M = \emptyset, K = K(x, \sigma), \sigma < r \text{ and } f(\sigma) > 0\}$ .

2.5. We denote by  $G$  (resp.  $G_1$ , resp.  $G_2$ ) the system of all real functions which are increasing and continuous (resp. for which  $\infty > g'(x) \geq 1$ , resp. for which  $\infty > g'(x) \geq 1$  and  $g(x) > x$ ) on  $(0, \delta)$  for some  $\delta > 0$ .

2.6. We denote by  $G_3$  the system of all functions  $g \in G$  such that for any  $A > 0$  and  $e > 1$  there exists an integer  $r$  and  $\delta > 0$  such that

$$\underbrace{(eg) \circ \dots \circ (eg)}_{r\text{-times}}(x) \geq A g(x) \quad \text{for } 0 < x < \delta.$$

2.7. Let  $f \in G$ ,  $M \subset P$ ,  $x \in P$ . Then we say that  $x$  is a point of  $(f)$ -porosity of  $M$  if

$$\limsup_{R \rightarrow 0+} \frac{1}{R} f(\gamma(x, R, M)) > 0.$$

2.8. Let  $f \in G$ ,  $M \subset P$ ,  $x \in P$ ,  $c > 0$ . Then we say that  $x$  is a point of  $(f, c)$ -porosity of  $M$  if

$$\limsup_{R \rightarrow 0+} \frac{1}{R} f(\gamma(x, R, M)) \geq c.$$

2.9. Let  $g \in G$ ,  $H \subset G$ ,  $M \subset P$ ,  $x \in P$ . Then we say that  $x$  is a point of  $\langle g \rangle$ -porosity of  $M$  if  $x \in \bigcap \{S(g, r, M); r > 0\}$ . We say that  $x$  is a point of  $\langle H \rangle$ -porosity of  $M$  if it is a point of  $\langle h \rangle$ -porosity of  $M$  for any  $h \in H$ .

2.10. Let  $V$  be one of the symbols  $(f)$ ,  $(f, c)$ ,  $\langle h \rangle$ ,  $\langle H \rangle$ . Let  $M \subset P$ ,  $N \subset P$ . Then we say that  $M$  is of  $V$ -porosity if any point  $x \in M$  is a point of  $V$ -porosity of  $M$ . We say that  $N$  is a set of  $V$ - $\sigma$ -porosity if it is the union of a sequence of sets of  $V$ -porosity.

2.11. We shall write "porosity" instead of " $(x)$ -porosity" and " $\sigma$ -porosity" instead of " $(x)$ - $\sigma$ -porosity".

Let us note:

2.12. The notions of a set of  $(x^q)$ -porosity and of a set of  $(x^q)$ - $\sigma$ -porosity coincide with the notions of N. YANAGIHARA of a set of porosity  $(q)$  and of a set of  $\sigma$ -porosity  $(q)$ .

2.13. Let  $V$  be one of the symbols  $(f)$ ,  $(f, c)$ ,  $\langle h \rangle$ ,  $\langle H \rangle$ . Then the system of all sets of  $V$ -porosity is an ideal of sets and the system of all sets of  $V$ - $\sigma$ -porosity is a  $\sigma$ -ideal of sets.

2.14. A point  $x \in R^k$  is a point of  $(x, 1/2)$ -porosity of a set  $M \subset R^k$  iff there exists a sequence of spheres  $\{K(s_n, r_n)\}$  such that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n = x$ ,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varrho(x, s_n)/r_n = 1$  and  $K(s_n, r_n) \cap M = \emptyset$  for  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ .

**2.15.** Evidently, we may always write  $(af, ac)$  instead of  $(f, c)$  if  $a > 0$ .

**2.16.** A point  $x \in P$  is a point of  $\langle h \rangle$ -porosity of a set  $M \subset P$  iff there exists a sequence of spheres  $\{K(s_n, r_n)\}$  such that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n = x$ ,  $K(s_n, r_n) \cap M = \emptyset$  and  $h(r_n) > \varrho(x, s_n)$  for  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ .

**2.17.** Let  $V$  be one of the symbols  $(f)$ ,  $(f, c)$ ,  $\langle h \rangle$ ,  $\langle H \rangle$ . Let  $x \in P$ ,  $M \subset P$ . Then the point  $x$  is a point of  $V$ -porosity of the set  $M$  iff it is a point of  $V$ -porosity of the set  $\bar{M}$ .

### 3. SEVERAL LEMMAS

**3.1. Lemma.** Let  $(P, \varrho)$  be a metric space,  $M \subset P$ ,  $f \in G$ . Then:

- (i) If  $x \in P$  is a point of  $(f, 2)$ -porosity of  $M$  then it is a point of  $\langle f \rangle$ -porosity of  $M$ .
- (ii) If  $x \in M$  is a point of  $\langle f \rangle$ -porosity of  $M$  then it is a point of  $(2f, 1)$ -porosity of  $M$ .

*Proof.* The assertion (i) immediately follows from the continuity of  $f$  on  $(0, \delta)$  and from the definitions. The assertion (ii) follows from the fact that if  $K(y, h) \subset P - M$ ,  $x \in f * K(y, h)$  and  $h$  is sufficiently small then  $f(\gamma(x, R, M)) > R/2$  where  $R = 2\varrho(x, y)$ .

**3.2. Lemma.** Let  $g \in G_1$ . Then if  $d > 0$  is a sufficiently small number, the relations  $z \in g * I$ ,  $I = (t - r, t + r)$  and  $I \subset J = (u - d, u + d)$  imply  $z \in g * J$ .

*Proof.* Let  $d < \delta$ , where  $\delta$  is the number from the definition of the system  $G_1$  (see 2.5). Then

$$\varrho(z, u) \leq \varrho(z, t) + d - r < g(r) + d - r \leq g(d)$$

and therefore  $z \in g * J$ .

**3.3. Lemma.** Let  $M \subset (a, b)$  be a nowhere dense set. Let  $g \in G_2$ . Let  $\{I_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  be a sequence of pairwise disjoint open intervals such that  $(a, b) - \bar{M} = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} I_n$ . Let  $H$  be the set of all endpoints of intervals  $I_n$ . Let  $P$  be the set of all points of  $\langle g \rangle$ -porosity of  $M$  which lie in  $\bar{M} \cap (a, b)$ . Then

$$P = (H \cup \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} g * I_n) \cap (a, b).$$

*Proof.* Let  $z \in (H \cup \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} g * I_n) \cap (a, b)$ . If  $z \in H$ , then  $z \in P$ , since  $g(x) > x$  for sufficiently small  $x$ . If  $z \in \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} g * I_n$ , then evidently  $z \in P$ . Let  $y \in P - H$ . Then 2.16 and 3.2 clearly imply  $z \in \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} g * I_n$ .

**3.4. Lemma.** Let  $H \subset G$ ,  $f \in G$ ,  $c > 0$ . Let  $n$  be an integer and  $M \subset R^1$ . Put  $N = M \times R^n$ . Then  $N$  is a set of  $(f, c)$ - $\sigma$ -porosity or of  $(f, c)$ -porosity, or of  $(f)$ - $\sigma$ -porosity, or of  $(f)$ -porosity, or of  $\langle H \rangle$ - $\sigma$ -porosity, or of  $\langle H \rangle$ -porosity in the space  $R^{n+1}$  iff  $M$  is of the same type as a subset of  $R^1$ .

**Proof.** We shall prove only the part concerning  $(f, c)$ - $\sigma$ -porosity, the proofs of the other parts being quite similar. The implication "if" follows from the fact that  $\gamma((x, y), r, A \times R^n) \geq \gamma(x, r, A)$  for any  $x \in R^1$ ,  $y \in R^n$ ,  $A \subset R^1$  and  $r > 0$ . Now we shall prove the implication "only if". Let  $N = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} N_k$  where any  $N_k$  is a set of  $(f, c)$ -porosity. Let  $\{B_t\}_{t=1}^{\infty}$  be a basis of open sets in  $R^n$ . Denote by  $A_{k,t}$  the set of all points  $x \in M$  for which the set  $\{z; (x, z) \in N_k\}$  is dense in  $B_t$ . Clearly  $M = \bigcup_{k,t} A_{k,t}$  and therefore it is sufficient to prove that each set  $A_{k,t}$  is of  $(f, c)$ -porosity. Let  $x \in A_{k,t}$  and  $z \in B_t$  be such that  $(x, z) \in N_k$ . Clearly for any  $r > 0$  such that  $K(z, r) \subset B_t$ , the inequality  $\gamma((x, z), r, N_k) \leq \gamma(x, r, A_{k,t})$  holds. Since  $N_k$  is a set of  $(f, c)$ -porosity in  $R^{n+1}$ , the set  $A_{k,t}$  is a set of  $(f, c)$ -porosity in  $R^1$ .

**3.5. Lemma.** Let  $P$  be a metric space and  $f \in G$ . Let  $A \subset P$  be a set of  $(f)$ - $\sigma$ -porosity. Then  $A = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$  where  $A_n$  is a set of  $(f, c_n)$ -porosity for some  $c_n > 0$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ .

**Proof.** Let  $A = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} B_i$  where each set  $B_i$  is a set of  $(f)$ -porosity. For any  $i$  let  $B_{i,k}$  be the set of all points  $x \in B_i$  which are points of  $(f, 1/k)$ -porosity of the set  $B_i$ . Clearly  $B_i = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} B_{i,k}$  and each set  $B_{i,k}$  is a set of  $(f, 1/k)$ -porosity. Now it is sufficient to order the sets  $B_{i,k}$  in a sequence  $\{A_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ .

#### 4. SOME AFFIRMATIVE RESULTS

In the present part we shall prove that some properties like  $\sigma$ -porosity are equivalent with other, seemingly weaker properties of this type. We use only one method which is contained in the following basic proposition.

**4.1. Proposition.** Let  $h \in G$ ,  $f \in G$ . Let there exist an integer  $n$  and  $\delta > 0$  such that

$$(1) \quad h^{(n)}(x) = \underbrace{h \circ \dots \circ h}_{n\text{-times}}(x) \geq f(x) \quad \text{for } 0 < x < \delta.$$

Let  $P$  be a metric space and let  $M \subset P$  be a set of  $\langle f \rangle$ - $\sigma$ -porosity. Then  $M$  is a set of  $\langle h \rangle$ - $\sigma$ -porosity.

**Proof.** It is clearly sufficient to prove that if  $A$  is a set of  $\langle f \rangle$ -porosity then it is a set of  $\langle h \rangle$ - $\sigma$ -porosity. Put  $C_k = A \cap \bigcap_{r>0} S(h^{(k)}, r, A)$ , (see 2.4). Then  $A \subset C_n$  and

therefore  $A \subset \bigcup_{k=2}^n (C_k - C_{k-1}) \cup C_1$ . Since obviously  $C_1$  is a set of  $\langle h \rangle$ -porosity it is sufficient to prove that  $C_k - C_{k-1}$  is a set of  $\langle h \rangle$ - $\sigma$ -porosity for  $k = 2, \dots, n$ . Put  $T_{k,m} = C_k - S(h^{(k-1)}, 1/m, A)$  for  $k = 2, \dots, n$  and  $m = 1, 2, \dots$ . Since clearly  $C_k - C_{k-1} = \bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} T_{k,m}$ , it is sufficient to prove that any set  $T_{k,m}$  is a set of  $\langle h \rangle$ -porosity.

Let  $z \in T_{k,m}$ ,  $r > 0$ . Then there exists an open sphere  $K(y, t)$  such that  $t < \min(1/m, r)$ ,  $K(y, t) \cap A = \emptyset$  and  $z \in h^{(k)} * K(y, t)$ . Put  $K = h^{(k-1)} * K(y, t)$ . Then  $z \in h * K$  and  $K \cap T_{k,m} = \emptyset$  since  $K \subset S(h^{(k-1)}, 1/m, A)$ . Since the radius of the sphere  $K$  is arbitrarily small provided  $r$  is sufficiently small,  $z$  is a point of  $\langle h \rangle$ -porosity of the set  $T_{k,m}$ . Therefore  $T_{k,m}$  is a set of  $\langle h \rangle$ -porosity. Thus the proof is complete.

**4.2. Proposition.** Let  $h \in G$ ,  $f \in G$ . For any  $B > 0$ , let there exist  $A > 0$ ,  $\delta > 0$  and an integer  $r$  such that

$$(2) \quad \underbrace{(Ah) \circ \dots \circ (Ah)}_{r\text{-times}}(x) \geq Bf(x) \quad \text{for } 0 < x < \delta.$$

Let  $P$  be a metric space and let  $M \subset P$  be a set of  $(f)$ - $\sigma$ -porosity. Then  $M$  is a set of  $(h)$ - $\sigma$ -porosity.

**Proof.** By 3.5,  $M = \bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} M_m$  where  $M_m$  is a set of  $(f, c_m)$ -porosity,  $c_m > 0$ . By 2.15 and 3.1  $M_m$  is a set of  $\langle 2f/c_m \rangle$ -porosity. By 4.1 and (2) it is a set of  $\langle Ah \rangle$ - $\sigma$ -porosity for some  $A > 0$ . Therefore by 2.15 and 4.1 it is a set of  $(h)$ - $\sigma$ -porosity. Consequently  $M$  is of  $(h)$ - $\sigma$ -porosity.

**4.3. Theorem.** Let  $0 < q < p < 1$  and let  $M$  be a subset of a metric space. Then  $M$  is a set of  $(x^q)$ - $\sigma$ -porosity iff it is a set of  $(x^p)$ - $\sigma$ -porosity.

**Proof.** Let  $B > 0$ . Then the inequality (2) from Proposition 4.2 holds for  $A = 1$ ,  $h = x^p$ ,  $f = x^q$ , an integer  $r$  such that  $p^r < q$  and for a sufficiently small  $\delta > 0$ . Therefore the statement of the theorem follows from 4.2.

**4.4. Proposition.** Let  $P$  be a metric space and  $g \in G_3$  (see 2.6). Let  $M \subset P$  be a set of  $(g)$ - $\sigma$ -porosity and  $0 < c < \frac{1}{2}$ . Then  $M$  is a set of  $(g, c)$ - $\sigma$ -porosity.

**Proof.** By 3.5 it is sufficient to prove that any set  $N$  of  $(g, a)$ -porosity is a set of  $(g, c)$ - $\sigma$ -porosity. By 3.1,  $N$  is a set of  $\langle 2g/a \rangle$ -porosity. Put  $A = 2/a$  and  $e = 1/2c$ . Let  $r$  be the integer from 2.6. Then the inequality (1) from 4.1 holds for  $f = 2g/a$ ,  $h = g/2c$  and for sufficiently small  $\delta > 0$ . Therefore by 4.1,  $N$  is a set of  $\langle g/2c \rangle$ - $\sigma$ -porosity and consequently it is a set of  $(g, c)$ - $\sigma$ -porosity.

Since obviously  $x^q \in G_3$  for  $0 < q \leq 1$ , we have

**4.5. Theorem.** Let  $P$  be a metric space,  $0 < q \leq 1$ ,  $0 < c < \frac{1}{2}$ . Then a subset of  $P$  is a set of  $(x^q)$ - $\sigma$ -porosity iff it is a set of  $(x^q, c)$ - $\sigma$ -porosity.

## 5. SOME NEGATIVE RESULTS

In the present part we shall prove that some properties like  $\sigma$ -porosity are not equivalent with the others. We use only one method which is contained in the following basic proposition.

**5.1. Proposition.** Let  $f \in G$  and  $H \subset G_2$  (see 2.5). Let there exist a sequence  $\{h_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$  of functions from  $H$  and a sequence of positive numbers  $\{\varepsilon_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  such that

$$(3) \quad h_n \circ \dots \circ h_1(x) < f(x) \quad \text{for} \quad 0 < x < \varepsilon_n.$$

Then in any Euclidean space there exists a perfect set  $F$  of  $\langle f \rangle$ -porosity which is not a set of  $\langle H \rangle$ - $\sigma$ -porosity.

Along with 5.1, we shall prove the following proposition.

**5.2. Proposition.** Let  $g \in G$  and  $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0+} x/g(x) = 0$ . Then in any Euclidean space

there exists a perfect set  $F$  of  $(g, 1)$ -porosity and of measure zero which is not of  $\sigma$ -porosity.

**Proof.** 3.4 implies that it is sufficient to construct a set  $F$  on the line. Let  $\{k_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$  be an increasing sequence of integers such that  $k_1 = 1$ . Our construction depends on this sequence. For a proof of 5.1, the sequence  $\{k_i\}$  may be chosen in an arbitrary way but for a proof of 5.2 we must choose it in a special way. Given  $\{k_i\}$  define a sequence  $\{s_p\}_{p=1}^\infty$  by the relations  $k_{s_p} \leq p \leq k_{s_p+1}$ . We may and will assume that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon_n = 0$ .

From the segment  $\langle 0, 1 \rangle$  we shall delete in the  $k$ -th step a finite number of pairwise disjoint intervals,  $D$ -intervals of the order  $k$ . The points from  $\langle 0, 1 \rangle$  not contained in any  $D$ -interval will form the set  $F$ . For any integer  $k$  we shall define a system of remaining intervals ( $R$ -intervals) of the order  $k$ . Any  $R$ -interval will be closed. The system of all  $R$ -intervals of the order  $k$  and of all  $D$ -intervals of orders  $j \leq k$  will form a covering of  $\langle 0, 1 \rangle$  and any two members of this system will have disjoint interiors.

Define the  $D$ -intervals and the  $R$ -intervals by induction:

1. A  $D$ -interval of the order 1 does not exist. As the system of all  $R$ -intervals of the order 1, let us choose any covering of  $\langle 0, 1 \rangle$  by closed intervals of a length smaller than  $\varepsilon_2$  such that any two its members have disjoint interiors.

2. Let  $k$  be an integer. Let  $D$ -intervals and  $R$ -intervals of all orders smaller than  $k + 1$  be defined. Let  $R_1, \dots, R_{i_k}$  be all  $R$ -intervals of the order  $k$ . For  $j = 1, \dots, i_k$

define an open interval  $D_j \subset R_j$  by the relation  $(h_{s_k+1} \circ \dots \circ h_1) * \bar{D}_j = R_j$ . Define the system of all  $D$ -intervals of the order  $k+1$  as the system  $D_1, \dots, D_{i_k}$ . The endpoints of the intervals  $D_j$  and  $(h_t \circ \dots \circ h_1) * D_j$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, i_k$ ,  $t = 1, \dots, s_k + 1$  divide  $\langle 0, 1 \rangle$  to a finite number of closed intervals. Let  $A_1, \dots, A_{b_k}$  be all of these intervals which are disjoint with each  $D$ -interval of the order  $k+1$ .

For  $1 \leq r \leq b_k$  let  $C_r$  be a system of closed intervals of a length smaller than  $\varepsilon_{s_k+1+1}$  such that  $\bigcup \{X; X \in C_r\} = A_r$  and any two members of  $C_r$  have disjoint interiors. Define the system of all  $R$ -intervals of the order  $k+1$  as the system  $\bigcup_{r=1}^{b_k} C_r$ .

The following assertions are easily verified:

- (i)  $F$  is a perfect set of  $\langle f \rangle$ -porosity.
- (ii) Let  $R$  be an  $R$ -interval of an order  $k$  and let  $m \leq s_k$  be an integer. Then the set  $R - \bigcup \{(h_m \circ \dots \circ h_1) * D; D \subset R \text{ is a } D\text{-interval}\}$  is a nonempty perfect set. If a contiguous interval of this set lies in  $R$  then it is of the form  $(h_m \circ \dots \circ h_1) * D$ , where  $D \subset R$  is a  $D$ -interval.
- (iii) Let  $D$  be a  $D$ -interval of an order  $k$  and let  $m \leq s_{k-1} + 1$  be an integer. Let  $R$  be a  $R$ -interval such that  $\text{Int } R \cap D = \emptyset$ . Then either  $\text{Int } R \subset (h_m \circ \dots \circ h_1) * D$  or  $R \cap (h_m \circ \dots \circ h_1) * D = \emptyset$ .

Now suppose that  $F$  is a set of  $\langle H \rangle$ - $\sigma$ -porosity. Then  $F = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} P_i$  where each  $P_i$  is a set of  $\langle H \rangle$ -porosity. We shall define a sequence  $\{F_i\}_{i=0}^{\infty}$  of nonempty perfect sets such that  $F \supset F_{i-1} \supset F_i$  and  $F_i \cap P_i = \emptyset$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots$ . The existence of such a sequence yields a contradiction since it implies that there exists a point  $x \in \bigcap_{i=0}^{\infty} F_i \subset F$  which does not lie in  $\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} P_i = F$ . Each set  $F_i$  will have the form

$$(4) \quad F_i = R_i - \bigcup \{(h_i \circ \dots \circ h_1) * D; D \subset R_i \text{ is a } D\text{-interval}\},$$

where  $R_i$  is an  $R$ -interval of an order  $j \geq k_{i+1}$  and  $(h_0 \circ \dots \circ h_1) * D = D$ . By (ii) any set of the form (4) is a nonempty perfect set.

Define the sets  $F_i$  by induction:

- A. Put  $F_0 = R_0 \cap F$  where  $R_0$  is an  $R$ -interval of the order 1.
- B. Suppose that we have defined the set  $F_i$ . We shall distinguish two cases:
  - B 1.  $F_i \not\subset \bar{P}_{i+1}$ . Then define  $R_{i+1}$  as an  $R$ -interval of an order  $j \geq k_{i+2}$  such that  $R_{i+1} \cap \bar{P}_{i+1} = \emptyset$  and  $R_{i+1} \cap F_i$  is an infinite set. Define the set  $F_{i+1}$  by (4).
  - B 2.  $F_i \subset \bar{P}_{i+1}$ . Then any point of  $P_{i+1}$  is a point of  $\langle h_{i+1} \rangle$ -porosity of  $F_i$ . Therefore by 3.3 and (ii) any point  $x \in \text{Int } R_i \cap P_{i+1}$  lies in an interval of the form

$$h_{i+1} * ((h_i \circ \dots \circ h_1) * D) = (h_{i+1} \circ \dots \circ h_1) * D,$$

where  $D \subset R_i$  is a  $D$ -interval. Therefore the nonempty perfect set  $A = R_i - \bigcup \{(h_{i+1} \circ \dots \circ h_1) * D; D \subset R_i\}$  and the set  $\text{Int } R_i \cap P_{i+1}$  are disjoint. Define  $R_{i+1}$



as an  $R$ -interval of an order  $j \geq k_{i+2}$  such that  $R_{i+1} \subset \text{Int } R_i$  and  $R_{i+1} \cap A$  is an infinite set. Then define the set  $F_{i+1}$  by (4). Since (iii) implies  $F_{i+1} = R_{i+1} \cap A$  we have  $F_{i+1} \cap P_{i+1} = \emptyset$ . Thus the proof of 5.1 is complete.

To prove 5.2 put  $f = g/2$  and  $H = \{6x\}$ . Then the assumptions of 5.1 are obviously fulfilled. If we denote by  $m_i$  the measure of the union of all  $R$ -intervals of the order  $k_i$ , then evidently

$$m_{i+1} = m_i(1 - 1/6^{i+1})^{k_{i+1} - k_i}$$

Therefore there exists a sequence  $\{k_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$  such that  $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} m_i = 0$  and consequently  $\mu F = 0$ . The set  $F$  is a set of  $\langle g/2 \rangle$ -porosity and therefore it is of  $(g, 1)$ -porosity. On the other hand,  $F$  is not a set of  $\langle 6x \rangle$ - $\sigma$ -porosity and therefore it is not a set of  $(3x, 1)$ - $\sigma$ -porosity. Now 4.5 implies that  $F$  is not a set of  $\sigma$ -porosity.

**5.3. Proposition.** Let  $h \in G_3$ ,  $f \in G_1$ . Let there exist  $B > 0$  such that for any  $A > 0$  and any integer  $r$  there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that

$$\underbrace{(Ah) \circ \dots \circ (Ah)}_{r\text{-times}}(x) < Bf(x) \quad \text{for } 0 < x < \delta.$$

Then in any Euclidean space there exists a perfect set of  $(f)$ -porosity which is not of  $(h)$ - $\sigma$ -porosity.

*Proof.* By 5.1, in any Euclidean space there exists a perfect set  $F$  of  $\langle Bf \rangle$ -porosity which is not of  $\langle 6h \rangle$ - $\sigma$ -porosity. Thus  $F$  is a set of  $(f)$ -porosity but not of  $(3h, 1)$ - $\sigma$ -porosity and by 4.4 it is not of  $(h)$ - $\sigma$ -porosity.

The following theorem is a consequence of 5.2.

**5.4. Theorem.** Let  $0 < q < 1$ . Then in any Euclidean space there exists a perfect set  $F$  of  $(x^q, 1)$ -porosity and of measure zero which is not of  $\sigma$ -porosity.

The existence of a perfect set of  $(x^q)$ -porosity which is not of  $\sigma$ -porosity follows also from the following easy theorem.

**5.5. Theorem.** Let  $0 < q < 1$ . Then in any Euclidean space there exists a perfect set  $D$  of  $(x^q)$ -porosity and of positive Lebesgue measure.

*Proof.* 3.4 implies that it is sufficient to construct the set  $D$  on the line. We shall define a sequence of sets such that  $S_k$  contains  $2^k$  disjoint closed intervals:

$$1. S_0 = \{ \langle 0, 1/2 \rangle \}.$$

2. Suppose that we have defined  $S_k = \{I_1, \dots, I_{2^k}\}$ . For  $j = 1, \dots, 2^k$  define closed disjoint intervals  $I'_j, I''_j$  such that

$$x^q * (I_j - (I'_j \cup I''_j)) = \text{Int } I_j.$$

Put  $S_{k+1} = \{I'_1, I''_1, \dots, I'_{2^k}, I''_{2^k}\}$ . Put  $D_k = \bigcup \{I; I \in S_k\}$  and  $D = \bigcap_{k=0}^{\infty} D_k$ . The set  $D$  is

clearly a perfect set of  $(x^q)$ -porosity. We have

$$\mu(I'_j \cup I''_j) = \mu I_j (1 - 2^{1-1/q} (\mu I_k)^{1/q-1}).$$

Since  $\mu I_j < 1/2^{n+1}$ , we have

$$\mu(I'_j \cup I''_j) > \mu I_j (1 - 2^{(1-1/q)(n+2)}).$$

If we denote  $\mu D_k = m_k$ , we have

$$m_{n+1} > m_n (1 - 2^{(1-1/q)(n+2)})$$

and therefore

$$m_{n+1} > \frac{1}{2} \prod_{k=0}^n (1 - 2^{(1-1/q)(k+2)})$$

and

$$\mu D \geq \frac{1}{2} \prod_{k=0}^{\infty} (1 - 2^{(1-1/q)(k+2)}) > 0.$$

Thus the proof is complete.

The following theorem justifies the complicated form of 5.1.

**5.6. Theorem.** *In any Euclidean space there exists a perfect set  $F$  of porosity which is not a set of  $(x, 1/2)$ - $\sigma$ -porosity.*

**Proof.** Let  $H = \{ax; a > 1\}$ . For an integer  $n$  put  $h_n = (1 + 1/n^2)x$ . Put  $c = \prod_{k=1}^{\infty} (1 + 1/k^2)$  and  $f(x) = 2cx$ . Then the assumption (3) from 5.1 is obviously fulfilled and therefore in any Euclidean space there exists a perfect set  $F$  of  $\langle 2cx \rangle$ -porosity which is not a set of  $\langle H \rangle$ - $\sigma$ -porosity. The set  $F$  is clearly a set of porosity but not of  $(x, 1/2)$ - $\sigma$ -porosity since a set is of  $(x, 1/2)$ -porosity iff it is of  $\langle H \rangle$ -porosity.

**5.7. Theorem.** *Let  $0 < q < 1$ . Then in any Euclidean space there exists a perfect set  $D$  which is not a set of  $(x^q)$ - $\sigma$ -porosity.*

**Proof.** The theorem immediately follows from 5.3 if we put  $h = x^q$ ,  $f = (\log(1/x))^{-1}$ ,  $B = 1$ .

## 6. SOME OPEN PROBLEMS

**6.1. Problem.** *Does there exist a (perfect) set on the line of the first category and of measure zero which is not a set of  $(x^q)$ - $\sigma$ -porosity for  $0 < q < 1$ ?*

**6.2. Problem.** *Does there exist  $f \in G$  such that any (perfect) set on the line of measure zero and of the first category is a set of  $(f)$ - $\sigma$ -porosity?*