

ON THE NOTION OF APPROXIMATELY LOWER PRE-OSCILLATORY SEQUENCES OF FUNCTIONS

ANDRIJA RAGUŽ

Zagreb School of Economics and Management, Croatia

ABSTRACT. In this paper we introduce the notion of an approximately lower pre-oscillatory (app LPO, for brevity) sequence of functions. When the domain is a compact interval and the sequence consists of absolutely continuous functions, a similar notion is introduced in the paper [26]. The generalization considered herein is twofold. On the one hand, we consider the case of a domain which is a measurable set of possibly infinite measure, and, on the other, we consider the case of a sequence of measurable functions. We adapt the definition accordingly, and we present some properties of the aforementioned notion of an app LPO sequence of functions. In particular, we study the cases when such an app LPO property is preserved under the outer or the inner composition with a suitable class of functions.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this introductory section, we outline the structure of the paper. In Section 2, we introduce the notation and terminology, define the notion of an approximately lower pre-oscillatory sequence of functions (referred to as an app LPO sequence of functions), explain the motivation, and describe the context for our considerations. In Section 3 (and Section 4, respectively), we state and prove the main results of the paper. These results pertain to the basic asymptotic properties of an app LPO sequence of functions defined on a domain that is an arbitrary measurable set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ and to the preservation of the app LPO property of a sequence of functions under the outer or inner composition of a function, respectively. In Section 5, we discuss the case where the domain $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ is a measurable set of finite measure. Appendix A provides an overview of classical results and may be skipped by experienced

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 26A99, 28A20, 28E99, 49J45.

Key words and phrases. Measurability, Banach indicatrix, approximate limit, bounded variation, absolute continuity.

readers. Appendix B contains results that are most likely known but are not easily found in the literature.

2. NOTATION AND TERMINOLOGY

In this paper we will distinguish between monotonic and strictly monotonic functions. By I (J , resp.) we always denote intervals in \mathbf{R} which are, unless otherwise specified, bounded or unbounded, open or closed (or neither open nor closed). If $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is a given function, where $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ is a given non-empty set, we define $\|u\|_{\infty, \Omega} := \sup_{s \in \Omega} |u(s)| \in [0, +\infty]$. By u_{ω} we denote the restriction of u on the set $\omega \subseteq \Omega$, while by $u^{\leftarrow}(\{\xi\})$ we denote the preimage of ξ with respect to u , i.e., $u^{\leftarrow}(\{\xi\}) := \{s \in \Omega : u(s) = \xi\}$. We say that $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is a Lipschitz function on Ω , and we write $u \in \text{Lip}(\Omega)$, if it holds that there exists $M \geq 0$ such that for every $s_1, s_2 \in \Omega$ we have $|u(s_1) - u(s_2)| \leq M|s_1 - s_2|$. By $\text{Lip}(u; \Omega)$ we denote the Lipschitz constant of u on Ω . We say that $u : \Omega \rightarrow D$ is a bi-Lipschitz function, if the following three conditions are fulfilled: (i) $u : \Omega \rightarrow D$ is a bijection; (ii) $u : \Omega \rightarrow D$ is a Lipschitz function on Ω , and (iii) $u^{-1} : D \rightarrow \Omega$ is a Lipschitz function on D . By $\text{card } S$ we denote the cardinality of a set S . For a given set $A \subseteq \mathbf{R}$, by \bar{A} we denote its closure. If an open set $U \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ satisfies $\bar{U} \subseteq \Omega$, we write $U \subseteq\subseteq \Omega$. If $\psi : (a, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is a given function, we recall that the limit inferior of ψ at $+\infty$ is defined by $\liminf_{\xi \rightarrow +\infty} \psi(\xi) := \inf\{\liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \psi(\xi_n) : \xi_n \rightarrow +\infty \text{ as } n \rightarrow +\infty\}$.

The following definitions, pertaining to various notions of measurable functions, are stated in accordance with subsection 5.2 in [12] (in particular, cf. Definition 5.38 and subsequent comments therein).

We recall that, if by (X, Σ_X) ((Y, Σ_Y) , resp.) we denote a measurable space, given a non-empty set X (Y , resp.), which is equipped with σ -algebra Σ_X (Σ_Y , resp.), we say that a function $\phi : X \rightarrow Y$ is (Σ_X, Σ_Y) -measurable if for every $F \in \Sigma_Y$ it holds that $\phi^{\leftarrow}(F) \in \Sigma_X$. If (X_i, Σ_i) , where $i = 1, 2, 3$, are given measurable spaces, if $\psi : (X_1, \Sigma_1) \rightarrow (X_2, \Sigma_2)$ is (Σ_1, Σ_2) -measurable, and if $u : (X_2, \Sigma_2) \rightarrow (X_3, \Sigma_3)$ is (Σ_2, Σ_3) -measurable, then the composition $u \circ \psi : (X_1, \Sigma_1) \rightarrow (X_3, \Sigma_3)$ is (Σ_1, Σ_3) -measurable. By $\Sigma_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathbf{R})$ we denote the Borel σ -algebra on \mathbf{R} (i.e., the smallest σ -algebra which contains all open sets in \mathbf{R}), and if $E \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathbf{R})$, we say that E is a Borel set. By $\lambda : \Sigma_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathbf{R}) \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$ we denote the Lebesgue measure on \mathbf{R} (where $\Sigma_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathbf{R})$ stands for σ -algebra of Lebesgue measurable sets on \mathbf{R} , i.e., for the completion of $\Sigma_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathbf{R})$ with respect to the Lebesgue measure), while by $\lambda^* : \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{R}) \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$ (where $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{R})$ stands for the power set of \mathbf{R}) we denote the outer Lebesgue measure on \mathbf{R} . A Lebesgue measurable function $u : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is a function which is $(\Sigma_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathbf{R}), \Sigma_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathbf{R}))$ -measurable. We point out that we have the strict inclusion $\Sigma_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathbf{R}) \subset \Sigma_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathbf{R})$ (since there are examples of $\Sigma_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathbf{R})$ -measurable sets which are not $\Sigma_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathbf{R})$ -measurable (cf. Exercise

5.19 in [12]), and that $(\Sigma_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathbf{R}), \Sigma_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathbf{R}))$ -measurability actually differs from $(\Sigma_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathbf{R}), \Sigma_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathbf{R}))$ -measurability (since there are examples of $(\Sigma_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathbf{R}), \Sigma_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathbf{R}))$ -measurable functions u and $\Sigma_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathbf{R})$ -measurable sets $E \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ for which $u^{\leftarrow}(E)$ is not a $\Sigma_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathbf{R})$ -measurable set (cf. Exercise 5.41 in [12])). We say that $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ is a measurable set if it is Lebesgue measurable (i.e., if $\Omega \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathbf{R})$). Given a measurable set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$, we say that $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is a measurable function on Ω if u is measurable in the sense of Lebesgue, meaning that for every open set $U \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ it holds that $u^{\leftarrow}(U)$ is a measurable set (i.e., it holds that $u^{\leftarrow}(U) \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathbf{R})$). In particular, $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is a measurable function on Ω iff for every $a \in \mathbf{R}$ it follows that $u^{\leftarrow}(a, +\infty)$ ($u^{\leftarrow}[a, +\infty)$, resp.) is a measurable set. We mention here that, in this paper, the definition of measurability of a real function u is always meant irrespective of the image of u . For example, if we say that $u : \Omega \rightarrow D$ is a measurable function, where $\Omega, D \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ are measurable sets, we mean that $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is a measurable function in the usual sense of Lebesgue, and that $\{u(s) : s \in \Omega\} = D$. By stating that “ $u : \Omega \rightarrow D$ is a bijection such that u is a measurable function”, rather than “ $u : \Omega \rightarrow D$ is a measurable bijection”, we avoid a possible ambiguity in the statements of our results. As a consequence of the aforementioned definitions, in our terminology, the composition of two measurable functions in general is not a measurable function (a classical counterexample follows from Exercise 3.77 and Exercise 1.33 in [21]). This fact raises the issues which are discussed in Section 4.

If $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ is a measurable set, and if $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is a measurable function, the essential infimum (the essential supremum, resp.) of u on Ω is defined by

$$\operatorname{ess\,inf}_{s \in \Omega} u(s) := \sup \left\{ \alpha \in \mathbf{R} : \lambda(\{x \in \Omega : u(x) < \alpha\}) = 0 \right\}$$

$$\left(\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{s \in \Omega} u(s) := \inf \left\{ \alpha \in \mathbf{R} : \lambda(\{s \in \Omega : u(s) > \alpha\}) = 0 \right\}, \text{ resp.} \right).$$

By $\int_{\Omega} u(\sigma) d\sigma$ ($\int_{\Omega} u$, resp.) we denote the Lebesgue integral of the function u over the set Ω . In particular, if $a, b \in \mathbf{R}$ and $a \leq b$, by $\int_a^b u(\sigma) d\sigma$ ($\int_a^b u$, resp.) we denote the Lebesgue integral of the function u over the interval $(a, b) := \{\sigma \in \mathbf{R} : a < \sigma < b\}$. A measurable function $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is said to be Lebesgue integrable on the measurable set Ω iff $\int_{\Omega} |u(\sigma)| d\sigma < +\infty$. A measurable function $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is said to be locally integrable if it is Lebesgue integrable on every compact set $K \subseteq \Omega$. If two measurable functions $u, v : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ are equal outside of the set $N \subseteq \Omega$ such that $\lambda(N) = 0$, we say that u and v are equal almost everywhere on Ω , and we write $u(s) = v(s)$ (a.e. $s \in \Omega$). Following [6] (cf. Definition 1.14 and the subsequent comments therein), we do not identify two measurable functions $u, v : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ which are equal almost everywhere on Ω . Instead, if two measurable functions $u, v : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ are equal almost everywhere on Ω , we say that v is a representative of u , and by $[u]$ we denote the set of all representatives of u . The set of

all Lebesgue integrable functions (locally integrable functions, resp.) on Ω is denoted by $\mathcal{L}^1(\Omega)$ ($\mathcal{L}_{loc}^1(\Omega)$, resp.). We define $L^1(\Omega) := \{[u] : u \in \mathcal{L}^1(\Omega)\}$ ($L_{loc}^1(\Omega) := \{[u] : u \in \mathcal{L}_{loc}^1(\Omega)\}$, resp.), and $L^\infty(\Omega) := \{[u] : \|u\|_{\infty, \Omega} < +\infty\}$ ($L_{loc}^\infty(\Omega) := \{[u] : \|u\|_{\infty, K} < +\infty \text{ for every compact } K \subseteq \Omega\}$, resp.), which is the usual notation in the literature. In particular, if $K \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ is a compact set, then we have $\mathcal{L}_{loc}^1(K) = \mathcal{L}^1(K)$ ($L_{loc}^1(K) = L^1(K)$, resp.). By $C(\Omega)$ ($C^\infty(\Omega)$, resp.) we denote the set of all continuous functions on the open set Ω (all functions $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ which are differentiable infinitely many times, resp.). $C_c(\Omega)$ ($C_c^\infty(\Omega)$, resp.) denotes the space of all functions in $C(\Omega)$ (all functions in $C^\infty(\Omega)$, resp.) whose support is compact, while $C_0(\Omega)$ denotes the closure of $C_c(\Omega)$ with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\infty, \Omega}$. The set of all finite signed Radon measures on Ω , denoted by $\mathcal{M}_b(\Omega)$ (cf. Definition B.107 and Definition B.110 in [21]), is identified with the dual of $C_0(\Omega)$ (cf. Theorem B.111 in [21]), while by $|\mu|$ we denote the total variation measure of $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_b(\Omega)$ (cf. Definition B.69 and Proposition B.72 in [21]). A more thorough review of these two notions is included in Appendix A. We write "WLG" as an abbreviation instead of the expression "without loss of generality". Throughout the paper, given an open set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$, by $BV(\Omega)$ we denote the set of all real functions of bounded variation on Ω (cf. [6], p. 166, or [21], Definition 14.1, p. 459), which is defined as follows.

DEFINITION 2.1. *Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ be an open set. We define the space of functions of bounded variation on Ω , denoted by $BV(\Omega)$, as the space of all functions $u \in \mathcal{L}^1(\Omega)$ whose distributional first-order derivative is a finite signed Radon measure; that is, there exists a finite signed measure $\mu : \Sigma_{\mathcal{B}}(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ such that $\int_{\Omega} u \varphi' = - \int_{\Omega} \varphi d\mu$ for all $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$, where $\int_{\Omega} \varphi d\mu$ stands for the integral of φ over Ω with respect to the measure μ . The measure μ is called the weak, or distributional, derivative of u and it is denoted by Du . Here $\Sigma_{\mathcal{B}}(\Omega)$ is the Borel σ -algebra on Ω . By $BV_{loc}(\Omega)$ we denote the set of all $u \in \mathcal{L}_{loc}^1(\Omega)$ which satisfy $u \in BV(U)$ for all open sets $U \subseteq \subseteq \Omega$.*

REMARK 2.2. To distinguish between the classical derivative and the distributional derivative, by u' (Du , resp.) we denote the classical derivative (the distributional derivative, resp.) of the function u . We recall that a distributional derivative is a generalized concept of differentiation that extends the classical derivative to functions that may not be differentiable in the usual sense. If $u \in \mathcal{L}_{loc}^1(\Omega)$, the distributional derivative Du is defined via its action on the so-called test functions $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ as follows: $\langle Du, \varphi \rangle := -\langle u, \varphi' \rangle$, where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the duality pairing between a distribution Du (an element of the dual of $C_c^\infty(\Omega)$) and a test function φ . A rigorous definition of the notion of a distribution can be found in chapter 10 in [21], or in [3]. Roughly speaking, this definition uses integration by parts and avoids requiring u to

be differentiable. Instead, it relies on how u interacts with smooth test functions. If u is differentiable in the classical sense, its distributional derivative coincides with the classical one.

On the other hand, if $I \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ is an interval, by $\text{BPV}(I)$ we denote the set of all real functions of bounded pointwise variation on I (cf. [21], Definition 2.1, p. 29), which is defined as follows.

DEFINITION 2.3. *Given an interval $I \subseteq \mathbf{R}$, a partition of I is a finite set $P := \{s_0, \dots, s_n\} \subset I$, where $s_0 < \dots < s_n$. The pointwise variation of a function $u : I \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ on the interval I is defined by $\text{Var}(u; I) := \sup \sum_{i=1}^n |u(s_i) - u(s_{i-1})|$, where the supremum is taken over all partitions $P := \{s_0, \dots, s_n\}$ of I , where $n \in \mathbf{N}$. A function $u : I \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ has finite or bounded pointwise variation on I if it holds that $\text{Var}(u; I) < +\infty$. When no confusion is possible, we write $\text{Var}(u)$ instead of $\text{Var}(u; I)$. The set of all functions $u : I \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ of bounded pointwise variation is denoted by $\text{BPV}(I)$. A function $u : I \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ has locally finite or locally bounded pointwise variation if it holds that $\text{Var}(u; [a, b]) < +\infty$ for all compact intervals $[a, b] \subseteq I$. The set of all functions $u : I \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ of locally bounded pointwise variation is denoted by $\text{BPV}_{loc}(I)$.*

REMARK 2.4. If I is a singleton, then it admits no partitions. In such a case, we set $\text{Var}(u; I) := 0$. If $\inf I \in I$ and/or $\sup I \in I$, then, in the definition of $\text{Var}(u; I)$, it suffices to consider partitions $P := \{s_0, \dots, s_n\}$ such that $s_0 = \inf I$ and/or $s_n = \sup I$ (cf. Remark 2.3 in [21]). If I is a compact interval, then it holds that $\text{BPV}_{loc}(I) = \text{BPV}(I)$.

Connection between Definition 2.1 and Definition 2.3 is explained in Appendix A (cf. Theorem A.20). Given an interval $I \subseteq \mathbf{R}$, by $\text{AC}(I)$ we denote the set of all absolutely continuous functions $u : I \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ (cf. Definition A.12). We adopt the standard notation for the Sobolev space $H^1(0, 1)$. We define

$$H^1(0, 1) := \{\theta \in L^2(0, 1) : D\theta \in L^2(0, 1)\},$$

where $L^2(0, 1) := \{[u] : u \in \mathcal{L}^2(0, 1)\}$, and where $\mathcal{L}^2(0, 1)$ denotes the set of all measurable functions $u : (0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ such that $\int_0^1 |u|^2 < +\infty$. We recall that every $\theta \in H^1(0, 1)$ admits an absolutely continuous representative (cf. Theorem 7.16 in [21]). The reader is cautioned that, without further mention, we consistently regard each element of $H^1(0, 1)$ as its absolutely continuous representative.

The presentation is quite technical, and we aimed to keep technical details to a minimum. The reader is encouraged to read Section 2 first, followed by the appendices, before diving into technicalities of the main part of the paper. Most of the technical work references the results of [6] and [21], but we have attempted to provide a self-sufficient presentation of the topic as far as possible. In this paper, we use notation compatible with that in [6]

and [21]. We mention that, in the recent literature, there is occasionally a discrepancy in the notation used (for example, in [2], $\theta \in L^1([a, b])$ is said to belong to $\text{BPV}([a, b])$ if it allows a representative which is a $\text{BPV}([a, b])$ -function (cf. p. 165 therein)). The statement of the Banach-Zaretsky theorem (cf. Theorem A.16) already illustrates the fact that the choice of the suitable representative affects validity of the results considered, whereby the set $\text{BPV}([a, b])$ in general cannot be replaced by $\text{BV}([a, b])$. The importance of difference between the sets $\text{BV}(I)$ and $\text{BPV}(I)$ can also be inferred, for example, from the statements of Corollary 5.3 and Corollary 5.6 (whose proof uses the set $\text{BPV}(I)$) on the one hand, and on the other, from the statements of Corollary 4.5 and Corollary 5.10 (which pertain to the set $\text{BV}(I)$).

Our analysis in the forthcoming sections is somewhat related to the classical counterexamples in analysis and measure theory. Cantor's function c (cf. Example 1.31 in [21]) is a well-known example of a function with the following properties: $c \in C([0, 1])$, c is increasing on $[0, 1]$, $c \in \text{BPV}([0, 1])$, $c'(s) = 0$ (a.e. $s \in [0, 1]$) (therefore c' is Lebesgue integrable on $[0, 1]$), but the fundamental theorem of calculus (cf. Theorem A.14) does not hold for c (cf. [5] for a detailed presentation of properties of Cantor's function). As a consequence of the Banach-Zaretsky theorem, Cantor's function c does not satisfy the Luzin (N) property (cf. Definition 3.34 and Example 3.35 in [21]), that is, c fails to map sets of measure zero onto sets of measure zero. Weil's function is even more pathological, and, in our context, it can be viewed as a refinement of Cantor's function (cf. Remark A.15). A more comprehensive list of similar counterexamples in analysis and measure theory can be found in [11] and [16].

While the importance of the Luzin (N) property (cf. Definition A.1) has been well-established (cf. Theorem A.16), the Banach (S) property (cf. Definition B.1) is less explored in the literature, yet it plays an important role in the considerations in this paper. Herein we also introduce an intermediate property, dubbed (F) property (cf. Definition B.5), which, in a manner of speaking, lies between the Luzin (N) property and the Banach (S) property (cf. Proposition B.6).

To simplify the statements of our main results, we introduce the following terminology (cf. [26]).

DEFINITION 2.5. *Consider a non-empty measurable set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$. We say that (K_{η_j}) increases to Ω with respect to the measure λ as $j \rightarrow +\infty$, and we write $K_{\eta_j} \nearrow \Omega$ as $j \rightarrow +\infty$, if there exists a decreasing sequence of positive real numbers (η_j) such that $\eta_j \rightarrow 0$ as $j \rightarrow +\infty$, and a sequence of measurable sets (K_{η_j}) such that $K_{\eta_j} \subseteq \Omega$, and such that there exists $j_0 \in \mathbf{N}$ such that for every $j \geq j_0$ we have $\lambda(\Omega \setminus K_{\eta_j}) \leq \eta_j$.*

REMARK 2.6. We note that in the definition above we do not require that (η_j) is strictly decreasing, nor do we require that $K_{\eta_j} \subseteq K_{\eta_{j+1}}$. For simplicity,

in the rest of the paper we omit explicitly stating that the aforementioned property of sets (K_{η_j}) is meant with respect to the measure λ . When no confusion is possible, we write $K_\eta \nearrow \Omega$ as $\eta \searrow 0$ instead of $K_{\eta_j} \nearrow \Omega$ as $\eta_j \searrow 0$.

At this point we recall the definition of an LPO sequence, which was introduced in [26] (cf. Definition 2.2, (i) therein).

DEFINITION 2.7. *Consider a measurable set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ such that $\lambda(\Omega) > 0$. We say that a sequence of functions $u_n : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is a lower pre-oscillatory sequence (an LPO sequence, for short) on Ω if (u_n) is a sequence of measurable functions, and if there exists a sequence of measurable sets (K_η) such that $K_\eta \nearrow \Omega$ as $\eta \searrow 0$, and such that there exists $0 < \bar{\eta} < \lambda(\Omega)$ with the following property: for every $0 < \eta \leq \bar{\eta}$ we have*

$$(2.1) \quad \liminf_{\xi \rightarrow +\infty} \liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \text{card} |u_n \llcorner K_\eta|^{\leftarrow}(\{\xi\}) = 0 .$$

The motivation for the introduction of the notion of such an LPO property comes from the asymptotic analysis of certain classes of finite-energy sequences of one-dimensional Cahn-Hilliard functional (cf. [1, 20, 25, 26]). We recall that Cahn-Hilliard functional in its simplest form is defined by

$$(2.2) \quad J_0^\varepsilon(u) := \int_0^1 \left(\varepsilon u'^2(s) + \varepsilon^{-1} W(u(s)) \right) ds ,$$

where a small parameter ε tends to zero (meaning that the small parameter ε is defined only for countably many values $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_n$ for a sequence (ε_n) such that $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow +\infty$), $u \in H^1(0, 1)$, W is a non-negative continuous function with suitable behavior at infinity such that $W(\zeta) = 0$ if and only if $\zeta \in \{-1, 1\}$ holds true (in short, W is the two-well potential with symmetrically placed wells). We say that a sequence (u_ε) in $H^1(0, 1)$ is a finite-energy sequence (or an FE sequence) for (J_0^ε) if it holds that $\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} J_0^\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon) < +\infty$. The aforementioned Cahn-Hilliard functionals are primary examples of integral functionals with singularly perturbed non-convex integrands, whose minimizers exhibit rather intrinsic behavior, involving oscillation and/or concentration effects, as small parameter ε tends to zero. Further examples of similar integral functionals are studied in [24] and [28].

We also recall that we say that an FE sequence (u_ε) for (2.2) is uniformly normal FE sequence (or an UN FE sequence) for (2.2) on $(0, 1)$ if there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ and a measurable set $G \subseteq (0, 1)$ such that $\lambda(G) > 0$ with the property: for every measurable set $A \subseteq G$ such that $\lambda(A) > 0$ it holds that $\sup_{0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0} \inf_A |u_\varepsilon| < +\infty$ (cf. Definition 2.1 in [26]). Thus, the uniform normality is a kind of generalized boundary condition imposed on (u_ε) . In Proposition 4.2 in [26] it was shown that every UN FE sequence for (2.2) is an LPO sequence on $(0, 1)$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. While the conclusion of Proposition 4.2 in [26] is correct, it is not of interest because of the following observations.

PROPOSITION 2.8. *Consider a family $\mathcal{F} := \{A_\alpha : \alpha \in I\}$ of disjoint measurable sets in \mathbf{R} , where I is a set of indices. If for every $\alpha \in I$ we have $\lambda(A_\alpha) > 0$, then \mathcal{F} is at most countable.*

PROOF. Since the Lebesgue measure is σ -finite, there exists a sequence of measurable sets (X_n) in \mathbf{R} such that $\mathbf{R} = \cup_{n=1}^{+\infty} X_n$, where for every $n \in \mathbf{N}$ it holds that $\lambda(X_n) < +\infty$. We set $\mathcal{F}_{n,k} := \{A \in \mathcal{F} : \lambda(A \cap X_n) \geq \frac{1}{k}\}$, where $k \in \mathbf{N}$. Then for every $A \in \mathcal{F}$ there exist $k \in \mathbf{N}$ and $n \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $A \in \mathcal{F}_{n,k}$, which gives $\cup_{n=1}^{+\infty} \cup_{k=1}^{+\infty} \mathcal{F}_{n,k} = \mathcal{F}$. To prove that \mathcal{F} is a countable family, it suffices to show that $\mathcal{F}_{n,k}$ is a finite family for every $k \in \mathbf{N}$ and every $n \in \mathbf{N}$. To this end, we argue as follows. If finitely many sets $A_{\alpha_1}, \dots, A_{\alpha_m}$ belong to $\mathcal{F}_{n,k}$, we get $\frac{m}{k} \leq \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda(A_{\alpha_i} \cap X_n) = \lambda((\cup_{i=1}^m A_{\alpha_i}) \cap X_n) \leq \lambda(X_n)$, getting $m \leq k\lambda(X_n)$. Thus the cardinality of $\mathcal{F}_{n,k}$ does not exceed $k\lambda(X_n)$, which completes the proof. \square

REMARK 2.9. If an uncountable family \mathcal{C} of measurable subsets of \mathbf{R} with strictly positive Lebesgue measure is given, then there exists an uncountable sub-collection \mathcal{D} of \mathcal{C} such that each pair of sets belonging to \mathcal{D} has an intersection with strictly positive Lebesgue measure. This observation follows from results proved in [13]. On the other hand, such a conclusion is not true in the case of non-measurable sets. More precisely, there exists a continuum of pairwise disjoint subsets of the interval $[0, 1]$ such that each of these subsets has the outer Lebesgue measure equal to 1 (cf. [22]).

THEOREM 2.10. *Consider a measurable set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ such that $\lambda(\Omega) > 0$, and an arbitrary sequence of measurable functions $u_n : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$. Then (u_n) is an LPO sequence on Ω .*

PROOF. By Proposition 2.8 for every fixed $n \in \mathbf{N}$ the set of values $y \in \mathbf{R}$ such that $|u_n|^\leftarrow(\{y\})$ has positive measure is at most countable. Hence for all $k \in \mathbf{N}$ there exists $y_{k,n} \in [k, k+1)$ such that $\lambda(|u_n|^\leftarrow(\{y_{k,n}\})) = 0$. We define $\Omega_0 := \Omega \setminus \bigcup_{n \in \mathbf{N}} \bigcup_{k \in \mathbf{N}} |u_n|^\leftarrow(\{y_{k,n}\})$. Then it holds that $\lambda(\Omega \setminus \Omega_0) = 0$ and the sets $|u_n|(\Omega_0)$ and $\{y_{k,n}, k \in \mathbf{N}, n \in \mathbf{N}\}$ are mutually disjoint. We observe that there exists a subsequence $y_{k_m, m}$ such that $\lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} y_{k_m, m} = +\infty$ and such that $\lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} k_m = +\infty$, and such that sets $\cup_{n=1}^{+\infty} |u_n(\Omega_0)|$ and $\{\xi_m : m \in \mathbf{N}\}$, where $\xi_m := y_{k_m, m}$, are mutually disjoint. Thus, for every $m \in \mathbf{N}$ it holds that $\xi_m \notin \cup_{n=1}^{+\infty} |u_n(\Omega_0)|$, and we get $\liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \text{card } |u_n \upharpoonright \Omega_0|^\leftarrow(\{\xi_m\}) = 0$, which completes the proof. \square

Therefore, it is necessary to replace the notion of an LPO sequence of functions by a more suitable notion, which can capture the underlying asymptotic behavior of a given sequence of measurable functions (u_n) at infinity. In this paper we introduce the notion of an approximately LPO sequence (an app LPO sequence, for short) of functions (cf. Definition 2.16), which is a modification of the LPO property, and we propose it as a tool for studying

the aforementioned asymptotic behavior at infinity. To begin with, we recall the notions of one-sided right approximate limits of a given function (which in general can be non-measurable) $g : (a, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ at point $s_0 \in (a, +\infty)$ (cf. Section 2.9.12 in [8]).

DEFINITION 2.11. *Let $g : (a, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be a given function, and let $s_0 \in (a, +\infty)$ be a given point.*

(i) *We write $L_0 = \text{app liminf}_{s \rightarrow s_0+} g(s)$ if it holds that*

$$(2.3) \quad L_0 := \sup\{L \in \{-\infty\} \cup \mathbf{R} : \lim_{r \rightarrow 0+} \frac{\lambda^*(\{g \geq L\} \cap (s_0, s_0 + r))}{r} = 1\},$$

where λ^ is the outer Lebesgue measure on \mathbf{R} .*

(ii) *We write $\bar{L}_0 = \text{app limsup}_{s \rightarrow s_0+} g(s)$ if it holds that*

$$(2.4) \quad \bar{L}_0 := \inf\{L \in \mathbf{R} \cup \{+\infty\} : \lim_{r \rightarrow 0+} \frac{\lambda^*(\{g \leq L\} \cap (s_0, s_0 + r))}{r} = 1\}.$$

(iii) *If $L_0 = \bar{L}_0$, we write $L_0 = \text{app lim}_{s \rightarrow s_0+} g(s)$ and we say that L_0 is one-sided right approximate limit of g at s_0 .*

DEFINITION 2.12. *Let $g : (a, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be a given function, and let $s_0 \in (a, +\infty)$ be a given point.*

(i) *One-sided left approximate limit inferior (limit superior, resp.) of g at s_0 is defined by replacing $(s_0, s_0 + r)$ (s_0+ , resp.) by $(s_0 - r, s_0)$ (s_0- , resp.) in (2.3) ((2.4), resp.).*

(ii) *A proper (or two-sided) approximate limit inferior (limit superior, resp.) of g at s_0 exists if both corresponding one-sided approximate limit inferiors (limit superiors, resp.) exist and have the same value, which is denoted by $\text{app liminf}_{s \rightarrow s_0} g(s)$ ($\text{app limsup}_{s \rightarrow s_0} g(s)$, resp.).*

(iii) *Finally, if two-sided approximate limit inferior and two-sided approximate limit superior of g at s_0 are equal, the joint value is denoted by $\text{app lim}_{s \rightarrow s_0} g(s)$ and it is said to be the approximate limit of g at s_0 .*

REMARK 2.13. In the case when g is a measurable function, in the definitions above the outer Lebesgue measure λ^* is replaced by the Lebesgue measure λ (cf. subsection 1.7.2 in [5]). However, since this paper considers approximate limits of functions that are not necessarily measurable, we adopt the definitions involving the outer Lebesgue measure λ^* .

The notion of an approximate limit and its variants are used to define the approximate continuity and the approximate differentiability, and were first utilized by A. Denjoy and A. Ya. Khinchin to study the properties of the Lebesgue integral and the Denjoy-Khinchin integral (cf. Theorem 14.11 in [14]). If the pointwise limit of g exists at s_0 , it coincides with the corresponding two-sided approximate limit of g at s_0 , but the converse is not true (cf. Remark 2.15). If $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ is a measurable set and if $g : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is a

measurable function, then it holds that $\text{app lim}_{z \rightarrow s} g(z) = g(s)$ (a.e. $s \in \Omega$), in which case we say that g is an approximately continuous function at almost every point of Ω . The converse is also true: the almost everywhere approximate continuity of a function is in fact a characterization of measurability (this result is known as the Stepanov-Denjoy theorem, cf. Theorem 2.9.13 in [8]).

While the notion of approximate limit is a classical topic in textbooks in measure theory (cf. [4, 6, 8, 23, 27, 29]), it is not particularly often used within the context of the study of the behavior of a function (or a sequence of functions) at infinity. We were not able to find such examples in the available literature. In the next step, we define the notions of an approximate limit inferior at $+\infty$, an approximate limit superior at $+\infty$ and an approximate limit at $+\infty$ of a given function (which is not necessarily measurable).

DEFINITION 2.14. *If a function $g : (a, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is given, where $a > 0$, we define*

$$(2.5) \quad \text{app liminf}_{s \rightarrow +\infty} g(s) := \text{app liminf}_{\sigma \rightarrow 0^+} \tilde{g}(\sigma) ,$$

$$(2.6) \quad \text{app limsup}_{s \rightarrow +\infty} g(s) := \text{app limsup}_{\sigma \rightarrow 0^+} \tilde{g}(\sigma) ,$$

where $\tilde{g}(\sigma) := g(\frac{1}{\sigma})$, $\sigma \in (0, \frac{1}{a})$. If (2.5) and (2.6) have the joint value L_0 , we write $L_0 = \text{app lim}_{s \rightarrow +\infty} g(s)$, and we say that g has the approximate limit at $+\infty$ which is equal to L_0 .

REMARK 2.15. If g and h are two functions defined on $(a, +\infty)$ such that $g = h$ almost everywhere, we immediately observe their respective approximate limits at $+\infty$ defined by (2.5) and (2.6) coincide. If the pointwise limit of g at $+\infty$ exists, it coincides with the corresponding approximate limit of g at $+\infty$. The converse is not true. For example, if we set $g(s) = \chi_{\mathbf{R} \setminus \mathbf{Q}}(s)$, where $s \in \mathbf{R}$, then for every $s_0 \in \mathbf{R}$ we have $\text{app lim}_{s \rightarrow s_0} g(s) = 1$, and $\text{app lim}_{s \rightarrow +\infty} g(s) = 1$, while g has no pointwise limit at any point $s_0 \in \mathbf{R}$, nor does g have a pointwise limit at infinity. We conclude that the approximate limit at $+\infty$, as defined in Definition 2.14, is a proper notion for studying the asymptotic behavior of a given function $g : (a, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ at $+\infty$. In quite the same way we can define the corresponding approximate limits of a function $g : (-\infty, -a) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ at $-\infty$, where $a > 0$.

DEFINITION 2.16. *Consider a measurable set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ such that $\lambda(\Omega) > 0$. We say that a sequence of functions $u_n : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is an approximately lower pre-oscillatory sequence (an app LPO sequence, for short) on Ω if (u_n) is a sequence of measurable functions, and if there exists a sequence of measurable sets (K_η) such that $K_\eta \nearrow \Omega$ as $\eta \searrow 0$, and such that there exists $0 < \bar{\eta} < \lambda(\Omega)$ with the following property: for every $0 < \eta \leq \bar{\eta}$ we have*

$$(2.7) \quad \text{app liminf}_{\xi \rightarrow +\infty} \liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \text{card } |u_n \llcorner K_\eta|^{\leftarrow}(\{\xi\}) = 0 .$$

If we want to specify the choice of the sequence (K_η) , we say that (u_n) is an app LPO sequence via the choice of the sequence of subsets (K_η) .

In accordance with the latter definition, we introduce the following class of functions.

DEFINITION 2.17. Consider a measurable set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ such that $\lambda(\Omega) > 0$. We say that a function $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is an approximately lower pre-oscillatory function (an app LPO function, for short) on Ω if u is a measurable function, and if there exists a sequence of measurable sets (K_η) such that $K_\eta \nearrow \Omega$ as $\eta \searrow 0$, and such that there exists $0 < \bar{\eta} < \lambda(\Omega)$ with the following property: for every $0 < \eta \leq \bar{\eta}$ we have

$$(2.8) \quad \text{app} \liminf_{\xi \rightarrow +\infty} \text{card} |u \llcorner K_\eta|^{\leftarrow}(\{\xi\}) = 0.$$

If we want to specify the choice of the sequence (K_η) , we say that u is an app LPO function via the choice of the sequence of subsets (K_η) .

We observe that, if the sequence (u_n) is an app LPO sequence on Ω , and if there exists a measurable function $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ such that for every $n \in \mathbf{N}$ we have $u_n = u$, it follows that u is an app LPO function on Ω .

REMARK 2.18. We make the following initial remarks.

- (i) By the aforementioned definition of an app LPO sequence of functions (u_n) , it is tacitly understood that (u_n) is a sequence of measurable functions. This fact is extensively used in the statements of our results in Section 4.
- (ii) In the statements of Definition 2.16 and Definition 2.17 (Definition 2.7, resp.), as well as in the statements of our results in Section 3 and Section 4, we always assume that $\lambda(\Omega) > 0$. This is because, according to Definition 2.5, if a measurable set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ satisfies $\lambda(\Omega) = 0$, and if $u_n : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is an arbitrary sequence of measurable functions, then (u_n) satisfies the condition (2.7) ((2.1), resp.) in an obvious way, namely via the choice of the sequence of subsets (K_η^0) , where, for an arbitrary $\eta > 0$, we set $K_\eta^0 := \emptyset$.
- (iii) If $\omega \subseteq \Omega$ is an arbitrary measurable set such that $\lambda(\omega) > 0$, and if (u_n) is an app LPO sequence on Ω , then it holds that $(u_n \llcorner \omega)$ ($(u_n \chi_\omega)$, resp.) is an app LPO sequence on ω (on Ω , resp.). On the other hand, if $u_n : \omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is an app LPO sequence on ω , then the extension $\bar{u}_n : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ defined by $\bar{u}_n(s) := u_n(s)$, if $s \in \omega$, and $\bar{u}_n(s) := 0$, if $s \in \Omega \setminus \omega$, is an app LPO sequence on Ω .
- (iv) Consider a non-empty measurable set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ such that $\lambda(\Omega) > 0$ and two measurable functions $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ and $v : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ such that $u(s) = v(s)$ (a.e. $s \in \Omega$). Then there exists a measurable set $E \subseteq \Omega$ such that $\lambda(E) = 0$, and such that for every $\xi \in \mathbf{R}$ we have

$\text{card } |u_{\perp}\Omega \setminus E|^{\leftarrow}(\{\xi\}) = \text{card } |v_{\perp}\Omega \setminus E|^{\leftarrow}(\{\xi\})$. As a consequence, u is an app LPO function on Ω iff v is an app LPO function on Ω .

If $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is a given function, the mapping $\xi \mapsto \text{card } u^{\leftarrow}(\{\xi\})$ is known as the Banach indicatrix of u (also known as the multiplicity function of u) on Ω (cf. [21], subchapter 2.7). For the research involving various properties of the Banach indicatrix function of classes of measurable functions and related questions, see, for example, [19] and references therein. In this paper we do not analyze measurability of the Banach indicatrix. This issue is addressed in Theorem 2.60 in [21]. From the geometric viewpoint, condition (2.7) is a kind of asymptotic flatness condition at infinity imposed on the sequence of functions (u_n) . In Section 2 in [25] a few similar properties based on the Banach indicatrix are introduced and analyzed (cf. Definition 2 therein), and functional-analytic aspects are discussed. In short, we can view app LPO sequences (u_n) as a class of sequences which allow some kind of leakage to infinity as $n \rightarrow +\infty$, resulting possibly in concentration at infinity, or in rapid oscillations, but which do not totally charge infinity. An elementary example of an app LPO sequence of functions (u_n) is a sequence of functions which satisfies $\limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \|u_n\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} < +\infty$ (cf. Lemma 2.19), where, for a measurable function $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$, we set $\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} := \text{ess sup}_{s \in \Omega} |u(s)|$. Therefore, the app LPO property (2.7) can be understood as an extension of the notion of boundedness of a sequence in L^∞ -norm (cf. Remark 2.21).

LEMMA 2.19. *Consider a non-empty measurable set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ such that $\lambda(\Omega) > 0$ and a sequence of measurable functions $u_n : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$. If (u_n) satisfies $\limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \|u_n\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} < +\infty$, then (u_n) is an app LPO sequence on Ω .*

PROOF. In the first step we show that, if $u \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, then there exists a measurable set $\Omega_0 \subseteq \Omega$ such that $\lambda(\Omega \setminus \Omega_0) = 0$ and such that

$$(2.9) \quad \text{app liminf}_{\xi \rightarrow +\infty} \text{card } |u_{\perp}\Omega_0|^{\leftarrow}(\{\xi\}) = 0.$$

We note that there exists a measurable set $E \subseteq \Omega$ such that $\lambda(E) = 0$ and such that $\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} = \|u\|_{\infty, \Omega \setminus E}$. We set $\Omega_0 := \Omega \setminus E$. Then $\Omega_0 \subseteq \Omega$ is a measurable set which satisfies $\lambda(\Omega \setminus \Omega_0) = 0$. Moreover, if we set $u_0 := u_{\perp}\Omega_0$ and $L_0 := \text{app liminf}_{\xi \rightarrow +\infty} \text{card } |u_0|^{\leftarrow}(\{\xi\})$, it holds that

$$L_0 = \sup\{L \in \{-\infty\} \cup \mathbf{R} : \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} r^{-1} \lambda^*(\{\tilde{C}_0 \geq L\} \cap (0, r)) = 1\},$$

where $\tilde{C}_0(z) := C_0(\frac{1}{z})$ and $C_0(\xi) := \text{card } |u_0|^{\leftarrow}(\{\xi\})$. We immediately observe that we have $L_0 \geq 0$. On the other hand, if we choose $L > 0$, for every $R > \|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$ it results that $\lambda^*\{\xi > R : C_0(\xi) \geq L\} = 0$. In turn, we get $\lambda^*\{0 < z < R^{-1} : \tilde{C}_0(z) \geq L\} = 0$, which gives

$$(2.10) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} r^{-1} \lambda^*\{z \in (0, r) : \tilde{C}_0(z) \geq L\} = 0.$$

Hence, by (2.10) we conclude that $L_0 = 0$, getting (2.9). In the second step, we consider a sequence of measurable functions $u_n : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ such that there exist $n_0 \in \mathbf{N}$ and $C \geq 0$ such that $\sup_{n \geq n_0} \|u_n\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C$. By the first step, for every $n \geq n_0$ there exists a measurable set $E_n \subseteq \Omega$ such that $\lambda(E_n) = 0$ and such that for every $L > 0$ we have

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} r^{-1} \lambda^* \{z \in (0, r) : \tilde{C}_n(z) \geq L\} = 0,$$

where $\tilde{C}_n(z) := C_n(\frac{1}{z})$ and $C_n(\xi) := \text{card } |u_n \lrcorner \Omega \setminus E_n|^\leftarrow(\{\xi\})$. We set $E_0 := \cup_{n=n_0}^{+\infty} E_n$ and $\Omega_0 := \Omega \setminus E_0$, whereby we obtain $\lambda(\Omega \setminus \Omega_0) = 0$ and

$$(2.11) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} r^{-1} \lambda^* \{z \in (0, r) : \tilde{C}_{n,0}(z) \geq L\} = 0,$$

where $n \geq n_0$, $\tilde{C}_{n,0}(z) := C_{n,0}(\frac{1}{z})$ and $C_{n,0}(\xi) := \text{card } |u_n \lrcorner \Omega_0|^\leftarrow(\{\xi\})$. We set $A_{L,n} := \{z \in (0, r) : \tilde{C}_{n,0}(z) \geq L\}$, where $L > 0$ and $n \geq n_0$. Since there exists $n_1 \geq n_0$ such that for every $n \geq n_1$ it holds that $\liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} A_{L,n} \subseteq A_{L,n}$, we get $\lambda^*(\liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} A_{L,n}) \leq \lambda^*(A_{L,n})$. Finally, by (2.11), the inclusion $\{z \in (0, r) : \liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \tilde{C}_{n,0}(z) \geq L\} \subseteq \liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} A_{L,n}$ yields the claim. \square

COROLLARY 2.20. *Consider a non-empty measurable set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ such that $\lambda(\Omega) > 0$ and a sequence of measurable functions $u_n : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ with the following property: there exists $\eta_0 > 0$ such that for every $0 < \eta \leq \eta_0$ we have $\limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \|u_n\|_{L^\infty(K_\eta)} < +\infty$, where a sequence of measurable sets (K_η) satisfies $K_\eta \nearrow \Omega$ as $\eta \searrow 0$. Then (u_n) is an app LPO sequence on Ω .*

PROOF. The assertion follows immediately from the definition of an app LPO sequence and from Lemma 2.19. \square

REMARK 2.21. We present several examples to illustrate key concepts. In particular, we demonstrate that the set of app LPO sequences strictly contains the set of sequences of functions bounded in L^∞ . Additionally, we show that there exist smooth functions that are not app LPO functions. The details of the calculations in the examples below are left to the interested reader.

- (i) We recall that a sequence $g_n : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ defined by $g_n(s) := n\chi_{(0, \frac{1}{n})}(s)$ is an example of a sequence of functions which, due to the concentration at the point $s = 0$, converges to zero (a.e. $s \in \mathbf{R}$) as $n \rightarrow +\infty$, but neither strong nor weak convergence in $L^1(\mathbf{R})$ occurs as $n \rightarrow +\infty$ (cf. [9], Chapter 6, Exercise 6.9). The sequence satisfies $\|g_n\|_{L^\infty(\mathbf{R})} \geq n$. If we set $K_\eta := (-\infty, 0) \cup (\eta, +\infty)$, it results that $K_\eta \nearrow \mathbf{R}$ as $\eta \searrow 0$ and $\|g_n\|_{L^\infty(K_\eta)} = 0$, where $0 < \eta < 1$ and $n \geq \frac{1}{\eta}$. Therefore, by Corollary 2.20, (g_n) is an obvious example of a sequence which is not bounded in $L^\infty(\mathbf{R})$ and which is an app LPO sequence on \mathbf{R} .
- (ii) An elementary example of a sequence of measurable functions $u_n : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ which is an app LPO sequence on Ω , but which is not bounded in $L^\infty(K_\eta)$ (where (K_η) is an arbitrary choice of a sequence

of measurable sets such that $K_\eta \nearrow \Omega$ as $\eta \searrow 0$) is as follows. We set $\Omega := [0, +\infty)$, and, for $n \in \mathbf{N}$, we define $u_n(s) := \max\{s, n\}$, where $s \in \Omega$. Then for every $n \in \mathbf{N}$ it results $\|u_n\|_{L^\infty(K_\eta)} \geq n$, which proves that a sequence (u_n) is not bounded in $L^\infty(K_\eta)$. Furthermore, for every $\xi \geq 1$ we have $\text{card } |u_n|^\leftarrow(\{\xi\}) = (+\infty)\chi_{\{n\}}(\xi) + \chi_{(n, +\infty)}(\xi)$, which shows that a sequence (u_n) is an app LPO sequence on Ω .

- (iii) On the other hand, the function $u : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ defined by $u(s) := s(1 + \sin(s^3))$ is an example of a smooth function such that for every $\xi \in \mathbf{R}$ we have $\text{card } u^\leftarrow(\{\xi\}) = +\infty$. Moreover, if we consider an arbitrary sequence of measurable sets (K_η) such that $K_\eta \nearrow \mathbf{R}$ as $\eta \searrow 0$, and arbitrary real numbers $L_0 > 0$ and $R_0 > 0$, then for every $L \geq L_0$ and every $R \geq R_0$ we get $\lambda^*\{\xi > R : \text{card } |u_\perp K_\eta|^\leftarrow(\{\xi\}) \geq L\} = +\infty$. This observation, in a similar way as in the proof of Lemma 2.19, eventually gives $\text{app } \liminf_{\xi \rightarrow +\infty} \text{card } |u_\perp K_\eta|^\leftarrow(\{\xi\}) = +\infty$. Thus, u is not an app LPO function on \mathbf{R} . In particular, it follows that the sequence $v_n : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ defined by $v_n(s) := \frac{s}{n}(1 + \sin(s^3))$ is an example of a sequence of functions which is not an app LPO sequence on \mathbf{R} , yet its pointwise limit on \mathbf{R} as $n \rightarrow +\infty$ is an app LPO function on \mathbf{R} .
- (iv) Conversely, if we consider a sequence of measurable functions $w_n : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ such that $w_n(s) \rightarrow u(s)$ (a.e. $s \in \mathbf{R}$) as $n \rightarrow +\infty$ and such that $w_n(\mathbf{R})$ is a countable set for every $n \in \mathbf{N}$, it follows that (w_n) is an example of an app LPO sequence on \mathbf{R} such that its limit is not an app LPO function on \mathbf{R} .
- (v) Finally, we note that function $z_n : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ defined by $z_n(s) := \max\{\min\{u(s), n\}, -n\}$, where $n \in \mathbf{N}$, is an app LPO function on \mathbf{R} for every $n \in \mathbf{N}$, the sequence (z_n) is not an app LPO sequence on \mathbf{R} as $n \rightarrow +\infty$, and the limit of (z_n) as $n \rightarrow +\infty$ is not an app LPO function on \mathbf{R} .

Next, we introduce an elementary sufficient condition for a measurable function C to have the quantity in (2.5) equal to zero. The following result can also be viewed as a measure-theoretic analogue of the so-called Barbălat's Lemma (cf. [7]).

PROPOSITION 2.22. *Let $C_0, Z : [\rho_0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ be measurable functions which satisfy the following conditions:*

- (I) $\int_{\rho_0}^{\infty} Z(\xi)C_0(\xi)d\xi \leq M_0 < \infty$,
- (D₁) *there exist constants $c > 0$ and $k_0 \geq \rho_0$ such that for every $k \geq k_0$ we have $\text{ess } \inf_{\xi \in [k, 2k]} Z(\xi) \geq \frac{c}{k^2}$.*

Then it holds that $\text{app } \liminf_{\xi \rightarrow \infty} C_0(\xi) = 0$.

PROOF. We set $L_0 := \text{app } \liminf_{\xi \rightarrow +\infty} C_0(\xi)$, and we assume that $L_0 > 0$. Then there exists $t_0 > 0$ such that for every $t \in [t_0, L_0)$ it holds that $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} r^{-1} \lambda\{z \in (0, r) : \tilde{C}_0(z) \geq t\} = 1$, where $\tilde{C}_0(z) := C_0(\frac{1}{z})$. Hence, it

results that we can choose a sufficiently small $\delta > 0$ such that

$$(2.12) \quad \lim_{R \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\lambda(A_{t_0, R} \cap [R, 2R])}{R} \geq \delta,$$

where $A_{t, R} := \{\xi > R : C_0(\xi) \geq t\}$. In effect, from (2.12) we deduce that for a sufficiently large $k_1 \in \mathbf{N}$ we have

$$(2.13) \quad \lambda(E_k) \geq \delta k,$$

where $E_k := A_{t_0, k} \cap [k, 2k]$ and where $k \geq k_1$. We set $k_2 := \max\{k_0, k_1\}$ and we consider an arbitrary $k \geq k_2$. Then on each E_k it holds that $C_0(s) \geq t_0$, whereby

$$(2.14) \quad \int_{E_k} Z(s)C_0(s)ds \geq t_0 \int_{E_k} Z(s)ds.$$

By the assumption (D₁), from $E_k \subset [k, 2k]$ we obtain

$$(2.15) \quad \int_{E_k} Z(s)ds \geq \frac{c}{k^2} \lambda(E_k).$$

Combining (2.14), (2.15) and (2.13) gives $\int_{E_k} Z(s)C_0(s)ds \geq ct_0\delta \cdot \frac{1}{k}$. Since the intervals $(k, 2k)$ are disjoint, for an arbitrary index $m \geq k_2$ we get

$$\int_{\rho_0}^{2m} Z(s)C_0(s)ds \geq \sum_{k=k_2}^m \int_{E_k} Z(s)C_0(s)ds \geq ct_0\delta \sum_{k=k_2}^m \frac{1}{k},$$

which contradicts the integrability assumption (I). □

In the final result of this section, we illustrate an application of the notion of an app LPO sequence. Specifically, the following theorem represents an improved version of Proposition 4.2 in [26]. In view of Lemma 2.19, it can also be interpreted as a variant of Theorem 1.3 in [20]. In particular, it provides a sufficient condition for the existence of app LPO FE sequences. By Lemma 3.2, choosing absolutely continuous representatives in $H^1(0, 1)$ entails no loss of generality in the statement of Theorem 2.23.

THEOREM 2.23. *We consider a two-well potential W and we define $V : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ by $V(\xi) := \min\{W(\zeta) : |\zeta| = \xi\}$. We assume that there exists $0 < \theta < 2$ such that V satisfies the condition (D_θ), which reads as follows:*

(D_θ) *there exists constants $c_\theta > 0$ and $k_\theta \geq \rho_0$ such that for every $k \geq k_\theta$ we have $\min_{\xi \in [k, 2k]} V(\xi) \geq \frac{c_\theta}{k^{2\theta}}$.*

Then every UN FE sequence (u_ε) for (J_0^ε) is an app LPO sequence on $(0, 1)$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

PROOF. By Corollary 2.20 WLG we can assume that for every sequence of measurable sets such that $K_\eta \nearrow [0, 1]$ as $\eta \searrow 0$ there exists $\eta_0 > 0$ such that for every $0 < \eta \leq \eta_0$ we have $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(K_\eta)} = +\infty$. We

choose a sequence $\bar{u}_\varepsilon \in C^1([0, 1])$ as in Proposition 5.2 in [25]. Hence, $\xi \mapsto \text{card} |\bar{u}_\varepsilon \lrcorner A|^{<}(\{\xi\})$ is a measurable function for an arbitrary measurable set $A \subseteq [0, 1]$. (cf. [12], Theorem 6.81, p. 385, or [6], Theorem 3.9, p. 122). We observe that it holds that (u_ε) is an UN FE sequence iff (\bar{u}_ε) is an UN FE sequence. Also, for every sequence of measurable sets such that $K_\eta \nearrow [0, 1]$ as $\eta \searrow 0$ there exists $\eta_0 > 0$ such that for every $0 < \eta \leq \eta_0$ we have $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|\bar{u}_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(K_\eta)} = +\infty$. As in the proof of Proposition 4.2 in [26], for an arbitrary $1 < p < +\infty$ and for every $0 < \eta \leq \eta_0 < 1$ there exists $\rho_0(\eta) > 1$ such that

$$(2.16) \quad +\infty > M_1 \geq \int_{\rho_0(\eta)}^{+\infty} \sqrt{V^p(\xi)} \cdot \bar{C}_\eta(\xi) d\xi,$$

where $\bar{C}_\eta(\xi) := \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \text{card} |\bar{u}_\varepsilon \lrcorner \tilde{K}_\eta|^{<}(\{\xi\})$, and where a sequence of suitably chosen measurable sets (\tilde{K}_η) satisfies $\tilde{K}_\eta \nearrow [0, 1]$ as $\eta \searrow 0$. We choose $p_0 > 1$ such that $\theta = \frac{2}{p_0}$, and we define $\bar{C}_{0,\eta}(\xi) := \bar{C}_\eta(\xi)$, if $\bar{C}_\eta(\xi) > 0$ ($\bar{C}_{0,\eta}(\xi) := V^{-\frac{p_0}{2}}(\xi)\xi^{-2}$, if $\bar{C}_\eta(\xi) = 0$, resp.), where $\xi > \rho_0(\eta)$. Since it holds that $\int_{\rho_0(\eta)}^{+\infty} \xi^{-2} d\xi < +\infty$, we obtain

$$(2.17) \quad +\infty > M_0 \geq \int_{\rho_0(\eta)}^{+\infty} \sqrt{V^{p_0}(\xi)} \cdot \bar{C}_{0,\eta}(\xi) d\xi.$$

We set $Z(\xi) := \sqrt{V^{p_0}(\xi)}$, getting the condition (D₁) for Z . By Proposition 2.22 it follows that $\text{app} \liminf_{\xi \rightarrow +\infty} \bar{C}_{0,\eta}(\xi) = 0$, and from $\bar{C}_{0,\eta}(\xi) \geq \bar{C}_\eta(\xi)$ we get $\text{app} \liminf_{\xi \rightarrow +\infty} \bar{C}_\eta(\xi) = 0$. Hence, it follows that (\bar{u}_ε) is an app LPO sequence on $(0, 1)$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. To proceed, we choose an arbitrary subsequence (u_{ε_n}) of the sequence (u_ε) such that $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow +\infty$, and, as we apply Proposition 3.5 to the sequences (u_{ε_n}) and $(\bar{u}_{\varepsilon_n})$, we conclude that (u_{ε_n}) is an app LPO sequence on $(0, 1)$. Finally, the assertion follows by an application of Lemma 3.3, (i). \square

3. BASIC ASYMPTOTIC PROPERTIES OF APP LPO SEQUENCES: THE CASE OF THE GENERAL DOMAIN Ω

In this section we present some basic properties of app LPO sequences, proofs of which do not go beyond elementary set-theoretic arguments. In the following, we consider a general non-empty measurable set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ such that $\lambda(\Omega) > 0$, including the case $\lambda(\Omega) = +\infty$.

LEMMA 3.1. *Consider a non-empty measurable set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ such that $\lambda(\Omega) > 0$ and a sequence of measurable functions $u_n : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$. Then the following conclusions hold.*

- (i) (u_n) is an app LPO sequence on Ω iff $(u_n \lrcorner \Omega \setminus E)$ is an app LPO sequence on $\Omega \setminus E$ for every measurable set $E \subset \Omega$ such that $\lambda(E) = 0$.

- (ii) If (u_n) is an app LPO sequence on Ω via the choice of the sequence of subsets (K_{η_l}) such that $K_{\eta_l} \nearrow \Omega$ as $l \rightarrow +\infty$, then (u_n) is an app LPO sequence via the choice of an arbitrary subsequence of subsets (K_{η_l}) .
- (iii) If (u_n) is an app LPO sequence on Ω via the choice of the sequence of subsets $(K_{\eta}^{(1)})$ and via the choice of the sequence of subsets $(K_{\eta}^{(2)})$, then (u_n) is an app LPO sequence via the choice of the sequence of subsets (K_{η}) , where $K_{\eta} := K_{\eta}^{(1)} \cap K_{\eta}^{(2)}$.
- (iv) If there exists a sequence of subsets (K_{η_m}) such that $K_{\eta_m} \nearrow \Omega$ as $m \rightarrow +\infty$ with the property that for every subsequence $(K_{\eta_{m_j}})$ it holds that (u_n) is an app LPO sequence on Ω via the choice of the sequence of subsets $(K_{\eta_{m_j}})$, then it follows that (u_n) is an app LPO sequence on Ω via the choice of the sequence of subsets (K_{η_m}) .
- (v) If (u_n) is an app LPO sequence via the choice of the sequence of subsets (K_{η}) , then there exists a subsequence (K_{η_m}) and an increasing sequence of sets \tilde{K}_{η_m} such that $\tilde{K}_{\eta_m} \subseteq K_{\eta_m}$ and such that (u_n) is an app LPO sequence via the choice of the sequence of subsets (\tilde{K}_{η_m}) .

PROOF. Assertions (i) and (ii) follow immediately from the definition of app LPO sequence. Assertion (iii) follows since we have $\lambda(\Omega \setminus K_{\eta}) \leq \lambda(\Omega \setminus K_{\eta}^{(1)}) + \lambda(\Omega \setminus K_{\eta}^{(2)})$, while assertion (iv) can be easily deduced by assuming the opposite. On the other hand, by the assertion (ii), we can choose a subsequence (K_{η_m}) of the sequence (K_{η}) such that $\sum_{m=1}^{+\infty} \lambda(\Omega \setminus K_{\eta_m}) < +\infty$ and such that there exists $m_0 \in \mathbf{N}$ such that for every $m \geq m_0$ we have

$$\text{app } \liminf_{\xi \rightarrow +\infty} \liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \text{card } |u_n \lrcorner K_{\eta_m}|^{\leftarrow}(\{\xi\}) = 0.$$

Furthermore, by iteration of (iii), we infer that an increasing sequence of measurable sets $\tilde{K}_{\eta_m} := \bigcap_{i=m}^{\infty} K_{\eta_i}$ has the following properties: $\tilde{K}_{\eta_m} \subseteq K_{\eta_m}$, $\tilde{K}_{\eta_m} \nearrow \Omega$ as $m \rightarrow +\infty$ and

$$\text{app } \liminf_{\xi \rightarrow +\infty} \liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \text{card } |u_n \lrcorner \tilde{K}_{\eta_m}|^{\leftarrow}(\{\xi\}) = 0,$$

which completes the proof of (v). □

LEMMA 3.2. Consider a non-empty measurable set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ such that $\lambda(\Omega) > 0$, and two sequences of measurable functions $u_n : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ and $v_n : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$. If there exists $n_0 \in \mathbf{N}$ such that for every $n \geq n_0$ it holds that $u_n(s) = v_n(s)$ (a.e. $s \in \Omega$), then (u_n) is an app LPO sequence on Ω iff (v_n) is an app LPO sequence on Ω . In particular, if there exists a measurable function $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ such that for every $n \geq n_0$ it holds that $u_n(s) = u(s)$ (a.e. $s \in \Omega$), then (u_n) is an app LPO sequence on Ω iff u is an app LPO function on Ω .

PROOF. By assumption, it follows that for every $n \geq n_0$ there exists a measurable set E_n such that $\lambda(E_n) = 0$ and such that $u_n \perp \Omega \setminus E_n = v_n \perp \Omega \setminus E_n$. If we set $E := \cup_{n=n_0}^{+\infty} E_n$, we get $\lambda(E) = 0$ and $u_n \perp \Omega \setminus E = v_n \perp \Omega \setminus E$, where $n \geq n_0$ is arbitrary. Hence, we recover the assertion by Lemma 3.1, (i). \square

To proceed, we note that, if (u_n) is an app LPO sequence, in general it does not follow that every subsequence of (u_n) is also an app LPO sequence. This is a consequence of the fact that \liminf as $n \rightarrow +\infty$ appears in the definition of the app LPO property (2.7). The simple counterexample is as follows. We define $u_{2k-1} := v_k$ ($u_{2k} := z_k$, resp.), where $k \in \mathbf{N}$, and where (v_k) is an app LPO sequence of functions, while (z_k) is a sequence of functions which is not an app LPO sequence. Then (u_n) is an app LPO sequence, but its subsequence (u_{n_k}) , where $n_k := 2k$, is not an app LPO sequence.

LEMMA 3.3. *Consider a non-empty measurable set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ such that $\lambda(\Omega) > 0$ and a sequence of measurable functions $u_n : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$. Then the following conclusions hold.*

- (i) *If there exists a subsequence (u_{n_m}) of the sequence (u_n) such that (u_{n_m}) is an app LPO sequence on Ω , then (u_n) is an app LPO sequence on Ω .*
- (ii) *(u_n) is an app LPO sequence on Ω iff there exists a sequence of measurable sets (K_η) such that $K_\eta \nearrow \Omega$ as $\eta \searrow 0$ and $\eta_0 > 0$ such that for every $0 < \eta \leq \eta_0$ it holds that (u_n) is an app LPO sequence on K_η .*

PROOF. The assertion (i) follows from the inequality

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \text{card} |u_n \perp K_\eta|^\leftarrow(\{\xi\}) \leq \liminf_{m \rightarrow +\infty} \text{card} |u_{n_m} \perp K_\eta|^\leftarrow(\{\xi\}).$$

Regarding the assertion (ii), it is clear that, if (u_n) is an app LPO sequence on Ω , then (u_n) is an app LPO sequence on K_η . To prove the converse, we consider a sequence $(\eta_0^{(k)})$ such that $\eta_0 > \eta_0^{(k)} > 0$ and such that for every $0 < \eta < \eta_0^{(k)}$ there exists a measurable set $(K_\eta^{(k)})$ such that $K_\eta^{(k)} \subseteq K_\eta$, $\lambda(K_\eta \setminus K_\eta^{(k)}) \leq \eta_0^{(k)}$ and

$$\text{app} \liminf_{\xi \rightarrow +\infty} \liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \text{card} |u_n \perp K_\eta^{(k)}|^\leftarrow(\{\xi\}) = 0.$$

In effect, there exists a sequence (η_k) of strictly positive real numbers such that $\eta_k \searrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$, and a sequence of measurable sets $(K_{\eta_k}^{(k)})$ in Ω such that for every $k \in \mathbf{N}$ we have that $\lambda(\Omega \setminus K_{\eta_k}^{(k)}) \leq \lambda(\Omega \setminus K_{\eta_k}) + \lambda(K_{\eta_k} \setminus K_{\eta_k}^{(k)}) \leq 2\eta_k$, whereby it holds that

$$\text{app} \liminf_{\xi \rightarrow +\infty} \liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \text{card} |u_n \perp K_{\eta_k}^{(k)}|^\leftarrow(\{\xi\}) = 0.$$

Finally, we observe that, by construction, we have $K_{\eta_k}^{(k)} \nearrow \Omega$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$, which shows that (u_n) is an app LPO sequence on Ω . \square

REMARK 3.4. If we do not assume measurability of (u_n) in the statement of Lemma 3.3, (ii), then we can only conclude that there exists a measurable set $\Omega_0 \subseteq \Omega$ such that $\lambda(\Omega \setminus \Omega_0) = 0$ and such that $(u_n \lfloor \Omega_0)$ is a sequence of measurable functions, where $\Omega_0 := \cup_{j=1}^{+\infty} K_{\eta_j}$ and $K_{\eta_j} \nearrow \Omega$ as $j \rightarrow +\infty$, and so it follows that (u_n) is an app LPO sequence on Ω_0 , but not necessarily on Ω .

Next, we sharpen Lemma 3.2.

PROPOSITION 3.5. *Consider a non-empty measurable set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ such that $\lambda(\Omega) > 0$, and two sequences of measurable functions $u_n : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ and $v_n : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \lambda\{s \in \Omega : u_n(s) \neq v_n(s)\} = 0$. Then (u_n) is an app LPO sequence on Ω iff (v_n) is an app LPO sequence on Ω .*

PROOF. We set $\Omega_n := \{s \in \Omega : u_n(s) = v_n(s)\}$. Then $\varepsilon_n := \lambda(\Omega \setminus \Omega_n)$ satisfies $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow +\infty$, and there exists a subsequence (ε_{n_k}) such that $\sum_{k=1}^{+\infty} \varepsilon_{n_k} < +\infty$. Thus, for every $0 < \delta < 1$ there exists $k_0 = k_0(\delta) \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\sum_{k=k_0}^{+\infty} \lambda(\Omega \setminus \Omega_{n_k}) \leq \delta$. Next, we set $\omega_\delta := \cap_{k=k_0}^{+\infty} \Omega_{n_k}$, getting $u_{n_k} \lfloor \omega_\delta = v_{n_k} \lfloor \omega_\delta$ for every $k \geq k_0(\delta)$ and $\lambda(\Omega \setminus \omega_\delta) \leq \delta$. Finally, we apply Lemma 3.3, (ii). \square

REMARK 3.6. We note that, if there exists a subsequence (u_{n_m}) ((v_{n_m}) , resp.) of the sequence (u_n) ((v_n) , resp.) such that $\lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} \lambda\{s \in \Omega : u_{n_m}(s) \neq v_{n_m}(s)\} = 0$, then it is not true that (u_n) is an app LPO sequence on Ω iff (v_n) is an app LPO sequence on Ω . In particular, the condition $\liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \lambda\{s \in \Omega : u_n(s) \neq v_n(s)\} = 0$ does not imply that the conclusion of Proposition 3.5 is true.

LEMMA 3.7. *Consider a non-empty measurable set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ such that $\lambda(\Omega) > 0$ and a sequence of measurable functions $u_n : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$. Suppose that every subsequence of (u_n) admits a further subsequence which is an app LPO sequence on Ω . Then we have the following:*

- (i) (u_n) is an app LPO sequence on Ω ,
- (ii) every subsequence of (u_n) is an app LPO sequence on Ω .

PROOF. By Lemma 3.3, (i), it remains to show the assertion (ii). To this end, we consider an arbitrary subsequence (u_{n_k}) of the sequence (u_n) , and we extract its subsequence $(u_{n_{k_j}})$ which is an app LPO sequence on Ω . But then Lemma 3.3, (i), once more implies that (u_{n_k}) is an app LPO sequence on Ω , which proves the assertion (ii). \square

The last theorem of this section refines Lemma 3.7.

THEOREM 3.8. *Consider a non-empty measurable set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ such that $\lambda(\Omega) > 0$ and a sequence of measurable functions $u_n : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$. If there exists a sequence of measurable sets (K_η) such that $K_\eta \nearrow \Omega$ as $\eta \searrow 0$ and*

$\eta_0 > 0$ such that for every $0 < \eta \leq \eta_0$ there exists a subsequence (u_{n_m}) (which possibly depends on η) such that (u_{n_m}) is an app LPO sequence on K_η , then it follows that (u_n) is an app LPO sequence on Ω . If every subsequence of the sequence (u_n) satisfies the aforementioned property, then every subsequence of (u_n) is an app LPO sequence on Ω .

PROOF. The assertion follows immediately from Lemma 3.3. \square

4. COMPOSITION OF FUNCTIONS AND APP LPO PROPERTY: THE CASE OF THE GENERAL DOMAIN Ω

In this section we deal with the problem of preservation of the app LPO property of a sequence of functions under the outer and the inner composition with a given function. The proofs of results in this section require using the intermediate level well-known results from measure theory (cf. Appendix A and Appendix B).

PROPOSITION 4.1. *Consider a non-empty measurable set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ such that $\lambda(\Omega) > 0$ and a sequence of measurable functions $u_n : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$. Then we have the following:*

- (i) *if (u_n) is an app LPO sequence on Ω , then for every strictly increasing bijection $\varphi : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ it holds that $\varphi \circ |u_n|$ is an app LPO sequence on Ω ,*
- (ii) *if there exists a strictly increasing bijection $\varphi : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ such that $(\varphi \circ |u_n|)$ is an app LPO sequence on Ω , then (u_n) is an app LPO sequence on Ω .*

PROOF. We note that $\varphi \circ |u_n|$ is a measurable function on Ω , since, by monotonicity of φ , for every $\alpha \geq 0$ we have

$$(4.18) \quad \{s \in \Omega : \varphi(|u_n(s)|) \geq \alpha\} = \{s \in \Omega : |u_n(s)| \geq \varphi^{-1}(\alpha)\}$$

(cf. Remark B.22 in [21]). By Definition 2.16, there exists a sequence of measurable sets (K_η) such that $K_\eta \nearrow \Omega$ as $\eta \searrow 0$ and $\eta_0 > 0$ such that for every $0 < \eta \leq \eta_0$ we have $\text{app liminf}_{\xi \rightarrow +\infty} C_\eta(\xi) = 0$, where we set $C_\eta(\xi) := \liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \text{card } |u_n \llcorner K_\eta| \llcorner (\{\xi\})$, and where $\xi \in [0, +\infty)$. We note that, by the assumption, we have $\varphi(0) = 0$, and φ can be extended to a strictly increasing bijection from \mathbf{R} to \mathbf{R} (which is not relabeled) such that $\lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} \varphi(x) = -\infty$, whereby we set $\varphi(-\infty) := -\infty$. By Definition 2.14 it holds that $\tilde{C}_\eta(z) := C_\eta(\frac{1}{z})$ satisfies $\text{app liminf}_{z \rightarrow 0^+} \tilde{C}_\eta(z) = 0$, i.e.,

$$\sup\{L \in \{-\infty\} \cup \mathbf{R} : \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\lambda^*(\{\tilde{C}_\eta \geq L\} \cap (0, r))}{r} = 1\} = 0.$$

Since φ is a strictly increasing bijection, we get $\{\tilde{C}_\eta \geq L\} = \{\varphi \circ \tilde{C}_\eta \geq \varphi(L)\}$, $\{L : L \in \{-\infty\} \cup \mathbf{R}\} = \{\varphi(L) : L \in \{-\infty\} \cup \mathbf{R}\}$, and

$$\sup\{\varphi(L) \in \{-\infty\} \cup \mathbf{R} : \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\lambda^*(\{\varphi \circ \tilde{C}_\eta \geq \varphi(L)\} \cap (0, r))}{r} = 1\} = \varphi(0),$$

which amounts to $\text{app liminf}_{z \rightarrow 0^+} \varphi(\tilde{C}_\eta(z)) = 0$, getting the assertion (i). The assertion (ii) follows in quite the same way. \square

REMARK 4.2. Regarding the statement (ii) of Proposition 4.1, we note that measurability of $|u_n|$ can be obtained from the identity (4.18), where $\alpha \geq 0$, and from the fact that φ is a bijection from $[0, +\infty)$ to $[0, +\infty)$. In particular, if (u_n) is a sequence of non-negative functions, the assumption of measurability of (u_n) in the statement (ii) can be avoided.

While the statement and proof concerning the outer composition of the approximate LPO sequence are quite straightforward, the corresponding result for the inner composition is more involved. We emphasize that the results presented in the remainder of this section, as well as in the next, are derived under rather restrictive assumptions. Moreover, in statement (i) of Proposition 4.3, we do not assume that ψ is a measurable function, for simplicity. This is because the measurability of ψ follows from the assumptions imposed on ψ^{-1} . Similar observations extend to the other results pertaining to the inner composition and the app LPO property, namely Proposition 4.4, Corollary 4.5, Corollary 5.3, Corollary 5.7, Corollary 5.8, Corollary 5.9 and Corollary 5.10. We point out that, if $I, J \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ are intervals, then there exist a continuous increasing function $\psi : I \rightarrow J$ and a measurable function $g : J \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ such that $g \circ \psi : I \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is not measurable (compare Exercise 3.77 and Exercise 1.33 in [21]). In the results below, we focus on the analysis of the case where the function ψ , which appears as the inner function in the composition, is an injection. In particular, the formulation of Proposition 4.3 (Proposition 4.4, resp.) requires the notion of the Banach (S) property (the Luzin (N) property, resp.) which is introduced in Appendix B (cf. Definition B.1) (in Appendix A (cf. Definition A.1), resp.).

PROPOSITION 4.3. *Consider two non-empty measurable sets $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$, $D \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ such that $\lambda(\Omega) > 0$, $\lambda(D) > 0$, and a sequence of functions $u_n : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$. Then we have the following:*

- (i) *if (u_n) is an app LPO sequence on Ω , then for every bijection $\psi : D \rightarrow \Omega$ such that ψ^{-1} is a measurable function which satisfies the Banach (S) property on Ω it holds that $(u_n \circ \psi)$ is an app LPO sequence on D ,*
- (ii) *if there exists a bijection $\psi : D \rightarrow \Omega$ such that ψ is a measurable function which satisfies the Banach (S) property on D , and such that $(u_n \circ \psi)$ is an app LPO sequence on D , then (u_n) is an app LPO sequence on Ω .*

PROOF. In order to prove (i) ((ii), resp.), in the first step we address measurability of $u_n \circ \psi$ ((u_n) , resp.). For every open set $U \subseteq \mathbf{R}$, we have $(u_n \circ \psi)^{\leftarrow}(U) = \psi^{-1}(u_n^{\leftarrow}(U))$ ($u_n^{\leftarrow}(U) = \psi((u_n \circ \psi)^{\leftarrow}(U))$, resp.), where, since u_n ($u_n \circ \psi$, resp.) is a measurable function, it follows that $u_n^{\leftarrow}(U)$ ($(u_n \circ \psi)^{\leftarrow}(U)$, resp.) is a measurable set. Next, by Lemma B.2 and Proposition A.4, (ii),

we infer that for a measurable set $A := u_n^{\leftarrow}(U)$ ($B := (u_n \circ \psi)^{\leftarrow}(U)$, resp.), it follows that $\psi^{-1}(A)$ ($\psi(B)$, resp.) is also a measurable set. Hence, $u_n \circ \psi$ (u_n , resp.) is a measurable function.

In the second step, we argue as follows. If (u_n) is an app LPO sequence on Ω (if $(u_n \circ \psi)$ is an app LPO sequence on D , resp.), there exists $\eta_0 > 0$ such that for every $0 < \eta \leq \eta_0$ there exists a measurable set $K_\eta \subseteq \Omega$ ($Q_\eta \subseteq D$, resp.) such that $\lambda(\Omega \setminus K_\eta) \leq \eta$ ($\lambda(D \setminus Q_\eta) \leq \eta$, resp.), and such that we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{app } \liminf_{\xi \rightarrow +\infty} \liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \text{card } |u_n \lrcorner K_\eta|^{\leftarrow}(\{\xi\}) = 0 \\ & \left(\text{app } \liminf_{\xi \rightarrow +\infty} \liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \text{card } |(u_n \circ \psi) \lrcorner Q_\eta|^{\leftarrow}(\{\xi\}) = 0, \text{ resp.} \right). \end{aligned}$$

We define $Q_\eta := \psi^{-1}(K_\eta)$ ($K_\eta := \psi(Q_\eta)$, resp.). From $\lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \lambda(\Omega \setminus K_\eta) = 0$ ($\lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \lambda(D \setminus Q_\eta)$, resp.) we get

$$\lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \lambda(\psi^{-1}(\Omega \setminus K_\eta)) = 0 \quad \left(\lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \lambda(\psi(D \setminus Q_\eta)) = 0, \text{ resp.} \right).$$

Since it holds that $\psi^{-1}(\Omega \setminus K_\eta) = D \setminus Q_\eta$ ($\psi(D \setminus Q_\eta) = \Omega \setminus K_\eta$, resp.), this means that $K_\eta \nearrow \Omega$ ($Q_\eta \nearrow D$, resp.) as $\eta \searrow 0$ implies $Q_\eta \nearrow D$ ($K_\eta \nearrow \Omega$, resp.) as $\eta \searrow 0$. On the other hand, from the definition of K_η and Q_η , for every $\xi \in [0, +\infty)$ we deduce $|u_n \lrcorner K_\eta|^{\leftarrow}(\{\xi\}) = |(u_n \circ \psi) \lrcorner Q_\eta|^{\leftarrow}(\{\xi\})$, getting the assertion (i) ((ii), resp.). \square

To state further results, we introduce the following abbreviations for certain properties of a bijection $\psi : D \rightarrow \Omega$:

- (N.1) ψ satisfies the Luzin (N) property on D ,
- (N.2) ψ^{-1} satisfies the Luzin (N) property on Ω ,
- (B.1) $\psi \in \text{BV}(D)$,
- (B.2) $\psi^{-1} \in \text{BV}(\Omega)$,
- (S.1) ψ satisfies the Banach (S) property on D ,
- (S.2) ψ^{-1} satisfies the Banach (S) property on Ω .

PROPOSITION 4.4. *Consider two non-empty measurable sets $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$, $D \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ such that $\lambda(\Omega) > 0$, $\lambda(D) > 0$, and a sequence of functions $u_n : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$.*

- (i) *If (u_n) is an app LPO sequence on Ω , then for every bijection $\psi : D \rightarrow \Omega$ such that ψ^{-1} is a Lipschitz function on Ω it holds that $(u_n \circ \psi)$ is an app LPO sequence on D .*
- (ii) *If there exists a bijection $\psi : D \rightarrow \Omega$ such that ψ is a Lipschitz function on D , and such that $(u_n \circ \psi)$ is an app LPO sequence on D , then (u_n) is an app LPO sequence on Ω .*
- (iii) *If Ω is an open set, if (u_n) on Ω is an app LPO sequence, and if $\psi : D \rightarrow \Omega$ is an arbitrary bijection which satisfies (N.1), (N.2) and (B.2), then the following assertion holds:*

- (A) *there exists a sequence of measurable sets (D_k) such that for every $k \in \mathbf{N}$ we have the following properties: $D_k \subseteq D_{k+1} \subseteq D$, $\lambda(D_{k+1} \setminus D_k) > 0$, $(u_n \circ \psi)$ is an app LPO sequence on D_k .*
- (iv) *If D is an open set, if there exists a bijection $\psi : D \rightarrow \Omega$ which satisfies (N.1), (N.2) and (B.1), and such that $(u_n \circ \psi)$ is an app LPO sequence on D , then the following assertion holds:*
- (B) *there exists a sequence of measurable sets (Ω_k) such that for every $k \in \mathbf{N}$ we have the following properties: $\Omega_k \subseteq \Omega_{k+1} \subseteq \Omega$, $\lambda(\Omega_{k+1} \setminus \Omega_k) > 0$, (u_n) is an app LPO sequence on Ω_k .*

PROOF. To begin with, we note that, by Corollary A.9, (i), from assumptions (i) ((iii), resp.), it follows that $u_n \circ \psi$ is a measurable function on D (D_k , resp.). On the other hand, by Corollary A.9, (ii), from assumptions (ii) ((iv), resp.), it follows that u_n is a measurable function on Ω ($\Omega_k := \psi(D_k)$, resp.). Regarding the proof of (i) ((ii), resp.), we observe that it holds that $\lambda(\psi^{-1}(A)) \leq \text{Lip}(\psi^{-1}; \Omega)\lambda(A)$ ($\lambda(\psi(B)) \leq \text{Lip}(\psi; D)\lambda(B)$, resp.), where $A \subseteq \Omega$ ($B \subseteq D$, resp.) is an arbitrary measurable set and where $\text{Lip}(\psi^{-1}; \Omega)$ ($\text{Lip}(\psi; D)$, resp.) is the Lipschitz constant of ψ^{-1} on Ω (ψ on D , resp.). Hence, the assertion (i) ((ii), resp.) follows as in the second step of the proof of Proposition 4.3.

Regarding (iii), by Theorem 6.12 in [6], it follows that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a Lipschitz function $\Phi_\varepsilon : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ such that $\lambda\{s \in \Omega : \psi^{-1}(s) \neq \Phi_\varepsilon(s)\} \leq \varepsilon$. We choose a strictly decreasing sequence (ε_j) such that $\varepsilon_j \searrow 0$ as $j \rightarrow +\infty$. We set $\Omega_{\varepsilon_j} := \{s \in \Omega : \psi^{-1}(s) \neq \Phi_{\varepsilon_j}(s)\}$ and $\Omega_j := \cup_{i=1}^j \Omega_{\varepsilon_i}$. Then for every $j \in \mathbf{N}$ it follows that $\Omega_j \subseteq \Omega_{j+1}$ and $\lambda(\Omega_{j+1} \setminus \Omega_j) = \lambda(\Omega_{\varepsilon_{j+1}}) > 0$. Furthermore, we estimate $\text{Lip}(\psi^{-1}; \Omega_j) \leq \sum_{i=1}^j \text{Lip}(\psi^{-1}; \Omega_{\varepsilon_i})$, which shows that ψ^{-1} is Lipschitz function on Ω_j , where $j \in \mathbf{N}$ is arbitrary. Since ψ^{-1} satisfies the Luzin (N) property on Ω , it follows that $D_j := \psi^{-1}(\Omega_j)$ is a measurable set for every $j \in \mathbf{N}$, whereby for every $j \in \mathbf{N}$ we have $D_j \subseteq D_{j+1}$. On the other hand, since ψ has the Luzin (N) property on D , it follows that $\lambda(D_j) > 0$ for every $j \in \mathbf{N}$. We note that for every $j \in \mathbf{N}$ and every $k \in \mathbf{N}$ we have $|u_n \llcorner (K_\eta \cap \Omega_j)|^{\leftarrow}(\{\xi\}) = |(u_n \circ \psi) \llcorner (Q_\eta \cap D_j)|^{\leftarrow}(\{\xi\})$, where, for every $j \in \mathbf{N}$ we have $K_\eta \cap \Omega_{\varepsilon_j} \nearrow \Omega_{\varepsilon_j}$ and $Q_\eta \cap D_j \nearrow D_j$ as $\eta \searrow 0$. Since $\psi^{-1} \in \text{Lip}(\Omega_j)$, by (i), it follows that $(u_n \circ \psi)$ is an app LPO sequence on D_j for every $j \in \mathbf{N}$. Finally, we observe that $\psi(D_{j+1} \setminus D_j) = \Omega_{j+1} \setminus \Omega_j$, and, since ψ satisfies the Luzin (N) property on D , $\lambda(\Omega_{j+1} \setminus \Omega_j) > 0$ implies $\lambda(D_{j+1} \setminus D_j) > 0$. Hence, we get the assertion (iii). If we define $D_j := \cup_{i=1}^j D_{\varepsilon_i}$, $\Omega_j := \psi(D_j)$, where $D_{\varepsilon_j} := \{s \in D : \psi(s) = \Psi_{\varepsilon_j}(s)\}$, and where $\Psi_{\varepsilon_j} : D \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is a suitably chosen Lipschitz continuous function, the assertion (iv) is proved similarly as the assertion (iii). \square

COROLLARY 4.5. *Consider two non-empty measurable sets $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$, $D \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ such that $\lambda(\Omega) > 0$, $\lambda(D) > 0$, and a sequence of functions $u_n : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$.*

- (i) If $\psi : D \rightarrow \Omega$ is a bi-Lipschitz bijection, then we have the following equivalence: (u_n) is an app LPO sequence on Ω iff $(u_n \circ \psi)$ is an app LPO sequence on D .
- (ii) Suppose that Ω and D are open sets, and that $\psi : D \rightarrow \Omega$ is a bijection which satisfies (N.1), (N.2), (B.1) and (B.2). Then the assertions (A) and (B) in Proposition 4.4 are equivalent.

PROOF. The claim (i) ((ii), resp.) follows immediately from claims (i) and (ii) ((iii) and (iv), resp.) of Proposition 4.4. \square

5. THE CASE OF THE DOMAIN Ω OF FINITE LEBESGUE MEASURE

In this section we address the case when $\lambda(\Omega) < +\infty$, which provides a very different, and much simpler, setting for studying the app LPO property (2.7).

PROPOSITION 5.1. *If $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ is a measurable set such that $0 < \lambda(\Omega) < +\infty$, it follows that every measurable function $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is an app LPO function on Ω .*

PROOF. Indeed, by Luzin's Theorem, for every $0 < \eta < \lambda(\Omega)$ there exists a compact set $K_\eta \subseteq \Omega$ such that $u \in C(K_\eta)$ and $\lambda(\Omega \setminus K_\eta) \leq \eta$. Since any continuous function attains its extremal values on any non-empty compact set, we get $\sup_{s \in K_\eta} |u(s)| = \max_{s \in K_\eta} |u(s)| \leq C_\eta < +\infty$. By Lemma 2.19 it results that u is an app LPO function on K_η , which, by Lemma 3.3, (ii), shows that u is an app LPO function on Ω . \square

PROPOSITION 5.2. *Consider a measurable set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ such that $0 < \lambda(\Omega) < +\infty$. If, for a given sequence of measurable functions $u_n : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$, there exists $n_0 \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\sup_{n \geq n_0} |u_n(s)| < +\infty$ (a.e. $s \in \Omega$), then it follows that (u_n) is an app LPO sequence on Ω . In particular, we have the following:*

- (i) $\sup_{n \geq n_0} |u_n|$ is an app LPO function on Ω ,
- (ii) for every $n_1 \in \mathbf{N}$ $\inf_{n \geq n_1} |u_n|$ is an app LPO function on Ω ,
- (iii) $\limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} |u_n|$ is an app LPO function on Ω ,
- (iv) $\liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} |u_n|$ is an app LPO function on Ω .

PROOF. We note that $\sup_{n \geq n_0} |u_n|$ is a measurable function on Ω , and we apply Proposition 5.1, getting (i). In particular, from the proof of Proposition 5.1 it follows that (u_n) is an app LPO sequence on Ω . Assertions (ii), (iii) and (iv) follow by the same argument. \square

COROLLARY 5.3. *Consider two compact intervals $I, J \subseteq \mathbf{R}$, $I = [a, b]$, $J = [c, d]$, such that $\lambda(I) > 0$, $\lambda(J) > 0$, and a sequence of measurable functions $u_n : I \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$. Then we have the following:*

- (i) if (u_n) is an app LPO sequence on I , then for every strictly monotonic bijection $\psi : J \rightarrow I$ such that ψ^{-1} satisfies the Luzin (N) property on I it holds that $(u_n \circ \psi)$ is an app LPO sequence on J ,
- (ii) if there exists a strictly monotonic bijection $\psi : J \rightarrow I$ such that ψ satisfies the Luzin (N) property on J , and such that $(u_n \circ \psi)$ is an app LPO sequence on J , then (u_n) is an app LPO sequence on I .

PROOF. It is enough to show that, under the assumption in (i) ((ii), resp.), it follows that ψ^{-1} (ψ , resp.) satisfies the Banach (S) property on I (J , resp.). Indeed, we observe that, by Proposition 6.4.5 in [10], ψ (ψ^{-1} , resp.) is continuous on J (I , resp.). Hence, ψ^{-1} (ψ , resp.) is also continuous, strictly monotonic and bounded on I (J , resp.). By Proposition 2.11 in [21], it follows that $\psi^{-1} \in \text{BPV}([a, b])$ ($\psi \in \text{BPV}([c, d])$, resp.). Since by the assumption in (i) ((ii), resp.), ψ^{-1} (ψ , resp.) satisfies the Luzin (N) property, Banach-Zaretsky Theorem (cf. Theorem A.16) implies that ψ^{-1} (ψ , resp.) is absolutely continuous on $[a, b]$ (on $[c, d]$, resp.). By Theorem B.13 it results that ψ^{-1} (ψ , resp.) satisfies the Banach (S) property on $[a, b]$ (on $[c, d]$, resp.), and Proposition 4.3 applies. \square

PROPOSITION 5.4. Consider a measurable set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ such that $0 < \lambda(\Omega) < +\infty$, and a sequence of measurable functions $u_n : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$. Suppose that the following holds:

- (i) there exists a sequence of measurable sets (Ω_k) such that $\Omega_k \subseteq \Omega_{k+1} \subseteq \Omega$ and such that $\Omega = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \Omega_k \cup N$, where $\lambda(N) = 0$,
- (ii) for every $k \in \mathbf{N}$ it holds that (u_n) is an app LPO sequence on Ω_k .

Then it follows that (u_n) is an app LPO sequence on Ω .

PROOF. From the monotone convergence theorem it follows that $\lambda(\Omega) = \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \lambda(\Omega_k)$. Then, since we have $\lambda(\Omega \setminus \Omega_k) = \lambda(\Omega) - \lambda(\Omega_k)$, from $\lambda(\Omega) < +\infty$ it results that $\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \lambda(\Omega \setminus \Omega_k) = 0$, which shows that $\Omega_k \nearrow \Omega$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$. Now the assertion follows from Lemma 3.3, (ii). \square

REMARK 5.5. If we do not assume measurability of (u_n) in the statement of Proposition 5.4, then we can only conclude that there exists a measurable set $\Omega_0 \subseteq \Omega$ such that $\lambda(\Omega \setminus \Omega_0) = 0$ and such that $(u_n \lfloor \Omega_0)$ is a sequence of measurable functions, where $\Omega_0 := \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \Omega_k$, and so it follows that (u_n) is an app LPO sequence on Ω_0 , but not necessarily on Ω .

COROLLARY 5.6. Conclusion (i) ((ii), resp.) of Corollary 5.3 holds in the case of non-empty open intervals $I = (a, b)$ and $J = (c, d)$ such that $0 < \lambda(I) < +\infty$ and $0 < \lambda(J) < +\infty$.

PROOF. We consider a representation of J (I , resp.) by a sequence of compact intervals (J_m) ((I_m) , resp.) such that for every $m \in \mathbf{N}$ we have $J_m \subseteq J_{m+1} \subseteq J$ ($I_m \subseteq I_{m+1} \subseteq I$, resp.), and such that $J = \bigcup_{m=1}^{+\infty} J_m$ ($I = \bigcup_{m=1}^{+\infty} I_m$, resp.). By Proposition 6.4.5 in [10], we deduce that ψ^{-1} (ψ ,

resp.) is continuous, strictly monotonic and bounded on the compact interval $\psi(J_m)$ ($\psi^{-1}(I_m)$, resp.), where $m \in \mathbf{N}$ is arbitrary. Hence, by Corollary 5.3, (i) ((ii), resp.), it follows that $(u_n \circ \psi)$ ((u_n) , resp.) is an app LPO sequence on J_m (I_m , resp.), while, by Proposition 5.4, we conclude that $(u_n \circ \psi)$ ((u_n) , resp.) is an app LPO sequence on J (I , resp.). \square

COROLLARY 5.7. *Consider two non-empty measurable sets $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$, $D \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ such that $0 < \lambda(\Omega) < +\infty$, $0 < \lambda(D) < +\infty$, and a sequence of functions $u_n : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$.*

- (i) *If Ω is an open set, and if (u_n) is an app LPO sequence on Ω , then for every bijection $\psi : D \rightarrow \Omega$ which satisfies (N.1), (N.2) and (B.2), it follows that $(u_n \circ \psi)$ is an app LPO sequence on D .*
- (ii) *If D is an open set, and if there exists a bijection $\psi : D \rightarrow \Omega$ which satisfies (N.1), (N.2) and (B.1), and such that $(u_n \circ \psi)$ is an app LPO sequence on D , then it follows that (u_n) is an app LPO sequence on Ω .*

PROOF. The claim (i) ((ii), resp.) follows by Proposition 5.4 and by Proposition 4.4 (iii), ((iv), resp.), since the measurability of $u_n \circ \psi$ (u_n , resp.) can be obtained by Corollary A.9 as in the proof of Proposition 4.4. Indeed, by using the same notation as in the proof of Proposition 4.4 (iii), ((iv), resp.)), we observe that $\Omega_0 := \cup_{j=1}^{+\infty} \Omega_j$ ($D_0 := \cup_{j=1}^{+\infty} D_j$, resp.) satisfies $\lambda(\Omega \setminus \Omega_0) = 0$ ($\lambda(D \setminus D_0) = 0$, resp.). We set $D_0 := \cup_{j=1}^{+\infty} D_j$ ($\Omega_0 := \cup_{j=1}^{+\infty} \Omega_j$, resp.), whereby $D \setminus D_0 = \psi^{-1}(\Omega \setminus \Omega_0)$ ($\Omega \setminus \Omega_0 = \psi(D \setminus D_0)$, resp.). Since $\psi^{-1} : \Omega \rightarrow D$ ($\psi : D \rightarrow \Omega$, resp.) satisfies the Luzin (N) property on Ω (on D , resp.), it results $\lambda(D \setminus D_0) = 0$ ($\lambda(\Omega \setminus \Omega_0) = 0$, resp.). Hence, while by Proposition 4.4 (iii), ((iv), resp.) it follows that for every $j \in \mathbf{N}$ we have that $(u_n \circ \psi)$ is an app LPO sequence on D_j ((u_n) is an app LPO sequence on Ω_j , resp.), by Proposition 5.4 we conclude that $(u_n \circ \psi)$ is an app LPO sequence on D_0 ((u_n) is an app LPO sequence on Ω_0 , resp.). In effect, we proved the assertion (i) ((ii), resp.). \square

COROLLARY 5.8. *Consider two non-empty open sets $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$, $D \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ such that $0 < \lambda(\Omega) < +\infty$, $0 < \lambda(D) < +\infty$, and a sequence of functions $u_n : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$. If $\psi : D \rightarrow \Omega$ is a bijection which satisfies (N.1), (N.2), (B.1) and (B.2), then we have the following equivalence: (u_n) is an app LPO sequence on Ω iff $(u_n \circ \psi)$ is an app LPO sequence on D .*

PROOF. The assertion follows directly from Corollary A.9, (iii), and from Corollary 5.7. \square

COROLLARY 5.9. *Consider two non-empty measurable sets $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$, $D \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ such that $\lambda(\Omega) > 0$, $\lambda(D) > 0$ and a sequence of functions $u_n : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$.*

- (i) *If Ω is an open set such that $\lambda(\Omega) < +\infty$, and if $\psi : D \rightarrow \Omega$ is a bijection which satisfies (N.1), (S.2), and (B.2), then we have the*

following implication: if (u_n) is an app LPO sequence on Ω , then $(u_n \circ \psi)$ is an app LPO sequence on D .

- (ii) If D is an open set such that $\lambda(D) < +\infty$, and if $\psi : D \rightarrow \Omega$ is a bijection which satisfies (S.1), (N.2), and (B.1), then we have the following implication: if $(u_n \circ \psi)$ is an app LPO sequence on D , then (u_n) is an app LPO sequence on Ω .

PROOF. The assertion (i) ((ii), resp.) follows directly from Proposition B.6, from Lemma B.2, and from Corollary 5.7, (i) ((ii), resp.). \square

COROLLARY 5.10. Consider two non-empty open sets $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$, $D \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ such that $\lambda(\Omega) > 0$, $\lambda(D) > 0$ and a sequence of functions $u_n : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$.

- (i) If $\lambda(\Omega) < +\infty$, if $\psi : D \rightarrow \Omega$ is a bijection which satisfies (N.1), (S.2), (B.1) and (B.2), then we have the following equivalence: (u_n) is an app LPO sequence on Ω iff $(u_n \circ \psi)$ is an app LPO sequence on D .
- (ii) If $\lambda(D) < +\infty$, if $\psi : D \rightarrow \Omega$ is a bijection which satisfies (S.1), (N.2), (B.1) and (B.2), then we have the following equivalence: (u_n) is an app LPO sequence on Ω iff $(u_n \circ \psi)$ is an app LPO sequence on D .

PROOF. The assertion (i) ((ii), resp.) follows directly from Proposition B.6, from Lemma B.2, and from Corollary 5.8, (i) ((ii), resp.). \square

APPENDIX A.

For convenience of the less experienced reader, in Appendix A we collected a number of the classical results in real analysis of functions of one variable and measure theory, which are relevant to understanding the choice of our definition of an app LPO sequence of functions. We refer the reader to the textbook [30] for further analysis of measurable sets, properties of measurable functions, and the related examples and counterexamples involving Cantor-type functions.

DEFINITION A.1. Consider a measurable set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$. We say that a function $g : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ satisfies the Luzin (N) property on Ω if the following holds: for every measurable set $E \subseteq \Omega$ it holds that $\lambda(E) = 0$ implies $\lambda(g(E)) = 0$.

REMARK A.2. Regarding Definition A.1, we make the following remarks.

- (i) We note that in Definition A.1 we do not assume that g is a measurable function,
- (ii) By the completeness of the Lebesgue measure λ , in Definition A.1, the condition " $\lambda(g(E)) = 0$ " can be replaced by the condition " $\lambda^*(g(E)) = 0$ " without changing the notion considered, where λ^* is the outer Lebesgue measure on \mathbf{R} .

DEFINITION A.3. Consider a measurable set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$. We say that a function $g : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ preserves measurability of sets in Ω if for every measurable set $E \subseteq \Omega$ it holds that $g(E)$ is a measurable set.

PROPOSITION A.4. Consider a measurable set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ such that $\lambda(\Omega) > 0$ and a function $g : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$. Then we have the following:

- (i) if g preserves measurability of sets in Ω , then g satisfies the Luzin (N) property on Ω ,
- (ii) if g is a measurable function and if g satisfies the Luzin (N) property on Ω , then g preserves measurability of sets in Ω ,
- (iii) if g is a measurable function, then g preserves measurability of sets in Ω iff g has the Luzin (N) property on Ω .

PROOF. If g preserves measurability of sets on Ω , we consider a measurable set $A \subseteq \Omega$ such that $\lambda(A) = 0$, and we show that $\lambda(g(A)) = 0$. To this end, we will show that every subset $D \subseteq g(A)$ is measurable, and the claim follows (here we used well-known fact that every set of positive measure contains a non measurable subset, cf. Corollary 5.22 in [12] or Corollary 3.39 in [30]). Since $D \subseteq g(A)$, we get $g^{\leftarrow}(D) \subseteq A$. Hence, by the completeness of λ , we have $\lambda(g^{\leftarrow}(D)) = 0$. In particular, $g^{\leftarrow}(D)$ is a measurable set. On the other hand, from $D = g(g^{\leftarrow}(D))$ we conclude that D is also a measurable set, which furnishes the proof of (i).

If g is a measurable function which satisfies the Luzin (N) property on Ω , we consider an arbitrary measurable subset $A \subseteq \Omega$, and we show that $g(A)$ is also a measurable set. We observe that we have $A = \cup_{n=1}^{+\infty} A_n$, where $A_n := A \cap (-n, n)$, and where $n \in \mathbf{N}$. Since it holds that $g(A) = \cup_{n=1}^{+\infty} g(A_n)$, it suffices to show that for every $n \in \mathbf{N}$ it holds that $g(A_n)$ is a measurable set. By the Luzin theorem, for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a compact set $F_\varepsilon^n \subseteq A_n$ such that $\lambda(A_n \setminus F_\varepsilon^n) \leq \varepsilon$ and such that $g \in C(F_\varepsilon^n)$. Then we have $A_n = \cup_{k=1}^{+\infty} F_{\frac{1}{k}}^n \cup M_n$, where $\lambda(M_n) = 0$. By continuity of g on $F_{\frac{1}{k}}^n$ it follows that $g(F_{\frac{1}{k}}^n)$ is a compact set for every $k \in \mathbf{N}$. On the other hand, by the Luzin (N) property of g , it follows that $\lambda(g(M_n)) = 0$. Hence, $g(A_n) = \cup_{k=1}^{+\infty} g(F_{\frac{1}{k}}^n) \cup g(M_n)$ is a measurable set, whereby the proof of (ii) is completed. \square

REMARK A.5. We note that the proof of the assertion (i) in Proposition A.4 does not require g to be measurable, while the proof of the assertion (ii) does require measurability of g (since we are using the Luzin theorem). When function g is a bijection, the setting is simpler, as discussed in Proposition A.7.

LEMMA A.6. Consider a measurable set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$, and two measurable functions $g_1, g_2 : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$. Assume that the following assumptions are fulfilled:

- (i) $g_1(s) = g_2(s)$ (a.e. $s \in \Omega$),
- (ii) g_1 satisfies the Luzin (N) property on Ω ,

(iii) g_2 satisfies the Luzin (N) property on Ω .

Then for every measurable set $A \subseteq \Omega$ we have $\lambda(g_1(A)) = \lambda(g_2(A))$.

PROOF. By (i) there exists a measurable set $N \subseteq \Omega$ such that where $\lambda(N) = 0$ and such that for every $s \in \Omega \setminus N$ we have $g_1(s) = g_2(s)$, getting $g_1(A \setminus N) = g_2(A \setminus N)$. On the other hand, by (ii) ((iii), resp.), we get $\lambda(g_1(A \cap N)) = 0$ ($\lambda(g_2(A \cap N)) = 0$, resp.), which proves the assertion. \square

To proceed, we address the problem of the measurability of the inverse of a given bijection. We point out that, since the definition of measurability requires the preimage (but not necessarily the image) of a measurable set to be measurable, the aforementioned problem is nontrivial. Here we focus on bijections ψ which are measurable in the sense of Lebesgue. In this setting it is not difficult to formulate rather strong assumptions on ψ that guarantee the measurability of its inverse. For example, if $\psi : D \rightarrow \Omega$ is a bi-Lipschitz function, where $D \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ and $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ are measurable sets, then $\psi^{-1} : \Omega \rightarrow D$ is obviously a measurable function. We note, however, that even smooth bijections from \mathbf{R} to \mathbf{R} need not have a locally Lipschitz inverse. An elementary counterexample is $\psi(s) := s^3$. We observe that, if $\psi : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is a continuous bijection, then (by an application of the Intermediate Value Theorem) it results that ψ is a strictly monotonic function on \mathbf{R} . Hence, ψ is a strictly monotonic continuous function. By Proposition 6.4.5 in [10], it follows that $\psi^{-1} : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is continuous and therefore measurable. In the next proposition we obtain a more general sufficient condition for measurability of the inverse of an injection defined on a general domain in \mathbf{R} (compare also Corollary B.14).

PROPOSITION A.7. Consider a measurable set $D \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ and an injection $\psi : D \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$. Then we have the following:

- (i) if ψ preserves measurability of sets in D , then ψ^{-1} is a measurable function,
- (ii) if $\Omega := \psi(D)$ is a measurable set, and if $\psi^{-1} : \Omega \rightarrow D$ is a measurable function which satisfies the Luzin (N) property on Ω , then ψ is a measurable function.

PROOF. To prove (i) ((ii), resp.), we consider an open set $U \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ and we note that we have $(\psi^{-1})^{\leftarrow}(U) = \psi(U \cap D)$ ($\psi^{\leftarrow}(U) = \psi^{-1}(U \cap \Omega$, resp.). Since for every open set $U \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ we have that $U \cap D$ ($U \cap \Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$, resp.) is a measurable set, by Proposition A.4, (i) ((ii), resp.) it follows that $(\psi^{-1})^{\leftarrow}(U)$ ($\psi^{\leftarrow}(U)$, resp.) is a measurable set. \square

REMARK A.8. We point out that, by the Luzin-Suslin theorem (cf. Theorem 15.2 in [17]), if $D \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ is a Borel set, and if $\psi : D \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is an injection, then $\Omega := \psi(D)$ is a Borel set. Such a conclusion is not true for measurable

sets D and Ω , and, in the statement (ii) of Proposition A.7, it is necessary to assume that $\Omega := \psi(D)$ is a measurable set.

COROLLARY A.9. *Consider two non-empty measurable sets $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ and $D \subseteq \mathbf{R}$, a function $g : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$, and a bijection $\psi : D \rightarrow \Omega$. Then the following conclusions hold.*

- (i) *If g is a measurable function on Ω , and if ψ^{-1} is a measurable function which satisfies the Luzin (N) property on Ω , then $g \circ \psi$ is a measurable function on D .*
- (ii) *If $g \circ \psi$ is a measurable function on D , if ψ is a measurable function which satisfies the Luzin (N) property on D , then g is a measurable function on Ω .*
- (iii) *In particular, if ψ satisfies the Luzin (N) property on D , and if ψ^{-1} satisfies the Luzin (N) property on Ω , then we have the following equivalence: g is a measurable function on Ω iff $g \circ \psi$ is a measurable function on D .*

PROOF. Regarding (i) ((ii), resp.), we consider an arbitrary open set $U \subseteq \mathbf{R}$, and we observe that we have $(g \circ \psi)^{\leftarrow}(U) = \psi^{-1}(g^{\leftarrow}(U))$ ($g = (g \circ \psi) \circ \psi^{-1}$ and $g^{\leftarrow}(U) = \psi((g \circ \psi)^{\leftarrow}(U))$, resp.). By measurability of g ($g \circ \psi$, resp.), it follows that $g^{\leftarrow}(U)$ ($(g \circ \psi)^{\leftarrow}(U)$, resp.) is a measurable set, while by measurability ψ^{-1} (ψ , resp.), by the Luzin (N) property of ψ^{-1} (ψ , resp.) and by Proposition A.4, (ii), it follows that $\psi^{-1}(g^{\leftarrow}(U))$ ($\psi((g \circ \psi)^{\leftarrow}(U))$, resp.) is also a measurable set. \square

REMARK A.10. It is not necessary to assume in (i) that ψ is a measurable function, since, by Proposition A.7, this follows from the assumption that ψ^{-1} is a measurable function which satisfies the Luzin (N) property on Ω .

COROLLARY A.11 (Preservation of Luzin (N) property under composition). *Consider two non-empty measurable sets $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ and $D \subseteq \mathbf{R}$, a measurable function $g : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$, and a bijection $\psi : D \rightarrow \Omega$. Then we have the following conclusion: If ψ satisfies the Luzin (N) property on D , if ψ^{-1} is a measurable function which satisfies the Luzin (N) property on Ω , and if g satisfies the Luzin (N) property on Ω , then $g \circ \psi$ is a measurable function which satisfies the Luzin (N) property on D .*

PROOF. By Corollary A.9, (i), it follows that $g \circ \psi$ is a measurable function on D . To show that $g \circ \psi$ satisfies the Luzin (N) property on D , we consider a measurable set $M \subseteq D$ such that $\lambda(M) = 0$. Then we have $(g \circ \psi)(M) = g(\psi(M))$, and the claim follows since ψ (g , resp.) satisfy the Luzin (N) property on D (Ω , resp.). \square

In the next definition, we recall the notion of an absolutely continuous function (cf. [21], chapter 3).

DEFINITION A.12. Let $I \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ be an interval. A function $g : I \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is said to be an absolutely continuous function on I , and we write $g \in \text{AC}(I)$, if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for every finite number of disjoint intervals (a_j, b_j) , $j = 1, \dots, N$, with $[a_j, b_j] \subseteq I$, it holds that $\sum_{j=1}^N |b_j - a_j| \leq \delta$ implies $\sum_{j=1}^N |g(b_j) - g(a_j)| \leq \varepsilon$. By $\text{AC}_{loc}(I)$ we denote the set of all functions $g : I \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ which satisfy $g \in \text{AC}([a, b])$ for every interval $[a, b] \subseteq I$.

In order to state and apply the classical characterization of AC-functions, we recall the notion of an equi-integrable measurable function.

DEFINITION A.13. Given a measurable function $\varphi : E \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$, where $E \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ is a measurable set, we say that φ is equi-integrable on E if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for every measurable set $F \subseteq E$ it holds that $\lambda(F) \leq \delta$ implies $\int_F |\varphi| \leq \varepsilon$.

In the next two theorems, we provide a brief review of basic properties of absolutely continuous functions. The first theorem is a compact statement of both Theorem 3.29 and Corollary 3.43 in [21], and it is a version of the fundamental theorem of calculus. For a more detailed exposition on this topic, we refer the reader to chapter 3 of [21] (in particular, to Theorem 3.20, Theorem 3.25, Corollary 3.33 and Theorem 3.41), and to Theorem 3.35 in [9].

THEOREM A.14. Let $I \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ be an interval and let $g : I \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be a given function. Then the following equivalence holds: $g \in \text{AC}(I)$ if and only if

- (i) g is continuous on I ,
- (ii) g is differentiable almost everywhere in I , $g' \in \mathcal{L}_{loc}^1(I)$, and g' is equi-integrable on I ,
- (iii) for all $s, s_0 \in I$ such that $s_0 \leq s$ we have

$$g(s) = g(s_0) + \int_{s_0}^s g'(\sigma) d\sigma .$$

Moreover, the equivalence holds if (iii) is replaced by

- (iii') g satisfies the Luzin (N) property on I .

REMARK A.15. By Weil's Theorem (cf. Theorem 2.40 in [21]), there exists a Lipschitz continuous function $u : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$, which is everywhere differentiable, monotonic on no interval in $[0, 1]$, and such that u' is bounded on $[0, 1]$, but u' is not Riemann integrable over any interval in $[0, 1]$. Consequently, the statement (iii) of Theorem A.14 is necessarily meant with respect to the Lebesgue integral over $[s_0, s]$, and not with respect to the Riemann integral (cf. [30], subsection 5.4, for a detailed analysis of the connection between the Lebesgue integral and the Riemann integral). This fact raises additional technicalities in the proof of Proposition B.12. A thorough comparison between different types of integrals is given in [18].

The second theorem is a re-statement of Theorem 6.3.1 in [15] in terms of our notation (compare also Corollary 3.49 in [21], which is a local version of the theorem below).

THEOREM A.16 (Banach-Zaretsky). *Let $a, b \in \mathbf{R}$ and $a < b$. A function $g : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ belongs to $\text{AC}([a, b])$ if and only if the following holds:*

- (i) g is continuous on $[a, b]$,
- (ii) $g \in \text{BPV}([a, b])$,
- (iii) g satisfies the Luzin (N) property on $[a, b]$.

In the sequel, we define the notions necessary for the introduction of functions of bounded variation in some detail (cf. Definition 2.1). Further related terminology and results can be found in subchapters B.6 and B.9 in [21]. Let X be a non-empty set and Σ a σ -algebra of subsets of X . We say that a function $\mu : \Sigma \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$ is a signed measure on Σ if it has the following properties: (i) $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$; (ii) μ takes at most one of the two values $-\infty$ and $+\infty$, that is, either $\mu : \Sigma \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty)$ or $\mu : \Sigma \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$; (iii) for any countable collection $\{A_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ of pairwise disjoint sets in Σ , we have $\mu(\cup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_n)$, where the series on the right converges absolutely or conditionally in the extended real line. By the Jordan decomposition theorem (cf. Theorem B.71 in [21]), any signed measure μ can be uniquely written as the difference of two non-negative measures μ^+ and μ^- , i.e., $\mu = \mu^+ - \mu^-$. The measure μ^+ (μ^- , resp.) is called the upper variation (lower variation, resp.) of μ , while the measure $|\mu| := \mu^+ + \mu^-$ is called the total variation measure of μ . If $|\mu|$ is a finite measure, we say that the signed measure μ is finite.

DEFINITION A.17. *Consider a topological space X endowed with the Borel σ -algebra $\Sigma_{\mathcal{B}}(X)$. A measure $\nu : \Sigma_{\mathcal{B}}(X) \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$ is a Radon measure if the following conditions are fulfilled:*

- (i) for every compact set $K \subseteq X$ we have $\nu(K) < +\infty$,
- (ii) for every open set $A \subseteq X$ it holds that

$$\nu(A) = \sup\{\nu(K) : K \subseteq A, K \text{ compact}\},$$

- (iii) for every $A \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{B}}(X)$ it holds that

$$\nu(A) = \inf\{\nu(U) : A \subseteq U, U \text{ open}\}.$$

The latter definition simplifies if X is a locally compact Hausdorff space (cf. Proposition B.108 in [21]).

DEFINITION A.18. *We say that $\mu : \Sigma_{\mathcal{B}}(X) \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$ is a signed Radon measure if μ is a signed measure on $\Sigma_{\mathcal{B}}(X)$, and if its total variation measure is a Radon measure.*

By $\mathcal{M}_b(X)$ we denote the space of all finite signed Radon measures $\mu : \Sigma_{\mathcal{B}}(X) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$. It can be verified that $\mathcal{M}_b(X)$ is a Banach space with

the norm $\|\mu\|_{\mathcal{M}_b(X)} := |\mu|(X)$. Given an open set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$, we are able to define the set $\text{BV}(\Omega)$ as the set of all integrable functions u on Ω such that its distributional derivative Du is a finite signed Radon measure (compare Definition 2.1). We note that $\text{BPV}(\Omega)$ and $\text{BV}(\Omega)$ are quite similar classes of functions, but nevertheless different. If $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ is an open set, by Definition 5.1 (Definition 5.2, resp.) in [6], if $f \in \text{BV}(\Omega)$ ($f \in \text{BV}_{loc}(\Omega)$, resp.), then f is measurable, since by definition of $\text{BV}(\Omega)$ ($\text{BV}_{loc}(\Omega)$, resp.) we have $\text{BV}(\Omega) \subseteq \mathcal{L}^1(\Omega)$ ($\text{BV}_{loc}(\Omega) \subseteq \mathcal{L}_{loc}^1(\Omega)$, resp.) (cf. Definition 14.1 in [21]). On the other hand, if $I \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ is an interval, by Definition 2.1 (Remark 2.3, resp.) in [21], the space of functions $\text{BPV}(I)$ ($\text{BPV}_{loc}(I)$, resp.) is defined as the set of all functions $f : I \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ which satisfy $\text{Var}(f; I) < +\infty$ ($f \in \text{BPV}([a, b])$ for every compact interval $[a, b] \subseteq I$, resp.). Furthermore, if $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ is an arbitrary open set, the space of functions $\text{BPV}(\Omega)$ is in [21] defined as follows. If $\text{Var}(f; \Omega) := \sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} \text{Var}(f; I_n) < +\infty$, we write $f \in \text{BPV}(\Omega)$, where $\Omega = \cup_{n=1}^{+\infty} I_n$ is re-written as a countable union of pairwise disjoint open intervals (I_n) . We mention that, if $a, b \in \mathbf{R}$ and $a < b$, then $\text{BPV}_{loc}([a, b]) = \text{BPV}([a, b])$. In effect, we have the following:

LEMMA A.19. *Let $I \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ be an interval. If $f \in \text{BPV}(I)$, then*

- (i) *f is a measurable function,*
- (ii) *f is bounded, i.e., $\|f\|_{\infty, I} < +\infty$.*

PROOF. If $f \in \text{BPV}(I)$, by the Jordan decomposition theorem (cf. Theorem 5.2.15 in [15]), we have $f(s) = g(s) - h(s)$, where $s \in I$, and where $g : I \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ and $h : I \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ are increasing functions on I . Since g (h , resp.) is increasing, we conclude that for every $\alpha \geq 0$ the set $g^{\leftarrow}(\alpha, +\infty)$ ($h^{\leftarrow}(\alpha, +\infty)$, resp.) is either an interval or empty set, and therefore is measurable. Hence, g and h are measurable, and so is f . By Proposition 2.12 in [21], we get $\|f\|_{\infty, I} < +\infty$. \square

We note that, by Lemma A.19, if $I \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ is an interval, then we have the embeddings $\text{BPV}(I) \hookrightarrow L^\infty(I)$ and $\text{BPV}_{loc}(I) \hookrightarrow L_{loc}^\infty(I)$. If $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ is an open set, the difference between the spaces $\text{BPV}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L_{loc}^\infty(\Omega)$ and $\text{BV}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^1(\Omega)$ is specifically addressed in Theorem 7.2. in [21] (for consideration of the case $\Omega = \mathbf{R}$ compare also Theorem 3.27, (b), in [9]). Herein we quote such a result.

THEOREM A.20. *Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ be an open set. If $u \in \mathcal{L}^1(\Omega)$, and if $u \in \text{BPV}(\Omega)$, then $u \in \text{BV}(\Omega)$ and*

$$|Du|(\Omega) \leq \text{Var}(u; \Omega) .$$

Conversely, if $u \in \text{BV}(\Omega)$, then u admits a right continuous representative \bar{u} such that $\bar{u} \in \text{BPV}(\Omega)$ and such that

$$\text{Var}(\bar{u}; \Omega) = |Du|(\Omega) .$$

REMARK A.21. If $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ is an open set, and if $u \in \mathcal{L}_{loc}^1(\Omega)$, we set

$$V(u; \Omega) := \sup \left\{ \int_{\Omega} u \phi' : \phi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega), \|\phi\|_{\infty, \Omega} \leq 1 \right\}.$$

By the Riesz representation theorem in $C_0(\Omega)$ (cf. Theorem B.111 in [21]), we have the following (cf. Exercise 14.3. in [21]):

- (i) if $Du \in \mathcal{M}_b(\Omega)$, then $|Du|(\Omega) = V(u; \Omega)$,
- (ii) if $V(u; \Omega) < +\infty$, then $Du \in \mathcal{M}_b(\Omega)$.

In particular, if $u \in \mathcal{L}^1(\Omega)$, then $u \in \text{BV}(\Omega)$ iff $V(u; \Omega) < +\infty$.

APPENDIX B.

For easier reading, we assembled in Appendix B a number of results related to the Banach (S) property and absolute continuity. We keep the arguments in the proofs as simple as possible. Textbook [21] is a recommended source for further information about absolutely continuous functions.

We believe that most of the results in Appendix B are probably known, but not easily found in the literature.

DEFINITION B.1. *Consider a measurable set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$. We say that a function $g : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ satisfies the Banach (S) property on Ω if the following holds: for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for every measurable set $E \subseteq \Omega$ it holds that $\lambda(E) \leq \delta$ implies $\lambda^*(g(E)) \leq \varepsilon$.*

LEMMA B.2. *Consider a measurable set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ and a function $g : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$. Then we have the following:*

- (i) *if g satisfies the Banach (S) property on Ω , then it also satisfies the Luzin (N) property on Ω ,*
- (ii) *if g is a measurable function which satisfies the Banach (S) property on Ω , then g preserves measurability of sets in Ω . Therefore, in the case of measurable function g , in Definition B.1, the condition " $\lambda^*(g(E)) \leq \varepsilon$ " can be replaced WLG by the condition " $\lambda(g(E)) \leq \varepsilon$ ".*

PROOF. To prove (i), we assume the opposite. Then there exists a measurable set $E_0 \subseteq \Omega$ such that $\lambda(E_0) = 0$ and such that $\lambda^*(g(E_0)) > \varepsilon_0 > 0$. By the Banach (S) property it follows that for $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ there exists $\delta_0 = \delta_0(\varepsilon_0) > 0$ such that for every $0 < \delta \leq \delta_0$ and for every measurable set $E \subseteq \Omega$ we have that $\lambda(E) \leq \delta$ implies $\lambda^*(g(E)) \leq \varepsilon_0$. If we choose $E := E_0$, then for an arbitrary $\delta > 0$ we have $\lambda(E_0) \leq \delta$, which, by the Banach (S) property gives $\lambda^*(g(E_0)) \leq \varepsilon_0$, which is a contradiction. Now (ii) follows from (i) and from Proposition A.4, (ii). \square

REMARK B.3. We note that in Lemma B.2, (i), g need not be a measurable function, while in Lemma B.2, (ii), it is necessary to assume that g is a measurable function.

In the following proposition, we provide a characterization of the Banach (S) property.

PROPOSITION B.4. *Consider a measurable set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ such that $\lambda(\Omega) > 0$ and a measurable function $g : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$. Then the following equivalence holds: g satisfies the Banach (S) property on Ω iff for every sequence of measurable sets (E_m) in Ω such that $\lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} \lambda(E_m) = 0$, it follows that $\lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} \lambda(g(E_m)) = 0$.*

PROOF. To prove necessity, let $\varepsilon > 0$ be given. Then there exists $\delta = \delta_\varepsilon > 0$ such that for every measurable set $E \subseteq \Omega$ such that $\lambda(E) \leq \delta$ it follows that $\lambda(g(E)) \leq \varepsilon$. On the other hand, since $\lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} \lambda(E_m) = 0$, for the aforementioned $\delta_\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $m_0 = m_0(\varepsilon) \in \mathbf{N}$ such that for every $m \geq m_0$ we have $\lambda(E_m) \leq \delta_\varepsilon$. Hence, $\lambda(g(E_m)) \leq \varepsilon$. To prove sufficiency, we assume the opposite, i.e., that g does not satisfy the Banach (S) property. Then there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that for every $\delta > 0$ there exists a measurable set $E_\delta^0 \subseteq \Omega$ such that $\lambda(E_\delta^0) \leq \delta$ and $\lambda(g(E_\delta^0)) \geq \varepsilon_0 > 0$. We choose the sequence $\delta_m := \frac{1}{m}$ and we set $E_m := E_{\frac{1}{m}}^0$, where $m \in \mathbf{N}$. It results that $\lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} \lambda(E_m) = 0$ and $\liminf_{m \rightarrow +\infty} \lambda(g(E_m)) \geq \varepsilon_0 > 0$, which is a contradiction. \square

In the next definition, we introduce a new property of functions, which we were not able to find in the literature.

DEFINITION B.5. *Consider an arbitrary measurable set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ such that $\lambda(\Omega) > 0$, and a function $g : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$. We say that g satisfies (F) property on Ω , if for every measurable set $A \subseteq \Omega$ we have that $\lambda(A) < +\infty$ implies $\lambda(g(A)) < +\infty$.*

PROPOSITION B.6. *Consider an arbitrary measurable set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ such that $\lambda(\Omega) > 0$ and a function $g : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$. Then we have the following:*

- (i) *if g is a measurable function which satisfies (F) property on Ω , then g satisfies the Luzin (N) property on Ω ,*
- (ii) *if g is a measurable function which satisfies the Banach (S) property on Ω , then g satisfies (F) property on Ω .*

PROOF. To show (i), we note that, if g satisfies (F) property on Ω , then for every measurable set $A \subseteq \Omega$ it follows that $g(A)$ is measurable. If $A \subseteq \Omega$ is an arbitrary measurable set, we define $A_n := A \cap (-n, n)$, where $n \in \mathbf{N}$, getting $A = \cup_{n=1}^{+\infty} A_n$ and $g(A) = \cup_{n=1}^{+\infty} g(A_n)$. Hence, it results that $g(A)$ is a measurable set. Now the assertion (i) follows from Proposition A.4, (i). Next, we address the proof of (ii). Since g satisfies the Banach (S) property on Ω , by Lemma B.2, (i), and by Proposition A.4, (ii), it follows that for every measurable set $A \subseteq \Omega$ we have that $g(A)$ is measurable. Since $\lambda(A) < +\infty$, by the Luzin theorem, for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a compact set $K_\varepsilon \subseteq A$ such that $\lambda(A \setminus K_\varepsilon) < \varepsilon$ and such that $g \in C(K_\varepsilon)$. By Proposition B.4 we get

$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \lambda(g(A \setminus K_\varepsilon)) = 0$. On the other hand, since K_ε is compact, $g(K_\varepsilon)$ is also compact. Hence, for sufficiently small $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ we get

$$(B.19) \quad \lambda(g(K_{\varepsilon_0})) < +\infty, \quad \lambda(g(A \setminus K_{\varepsilon_0})) < +\infty,$$

which proves the assertion (ii). \square

REMARK B.7. We note that, if two measurable functions $g_1, g_2 : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ satisfy $g_1(s) = g_2(s)$ (a.e. $s \in \Omega$), and if g_1 satisfies the Banach (S) property ((F) property, resp.) on Ω , it does not follow that g_2 satisfies the Banach (S) ((F) property, resp.) property on Ω . However, we have the following:

LEMMA B.8. *Consider a measurable set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ and two measurable functions $g_1, g_2 : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$. Assume that the following assumptions are fulfilled:*

- (i) $g_1(s) = g_2(s)$ (a.e. $s \in \Omega$),
- (ii) g_1 satisfies the Banach (S) property ((F) property, resp.) on Ω ,
- (iii) g_2 satisfies the Luzin (N) property on Ω .

Then g_2 satisfies the Banach (S) property ((F) property, resp.) on Ω .

PROOF. By Lemma B.2 and Lemma A.6 it follows that for every measurable set $E \subseteq \Omega$ we have $\lambda(g_1(E)) = \lambda(g_2(E))$, and the claim follows (The assertion follows from Proposition B.6, (i), and from Lemma A.6, resp.). \square

The topic of the next corollary is a result regarding the preservation of the Banach (S) property and the (F) property under composition.

COROLLARY B.9. *Consider two non-empty measurable sets $\Omega \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ and $D \subseteq \mathbf{R}$, a measurable function $g : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$, and a bijection $\psi : D \rightarrow \Omega$. Then we have the following conclusion: If ψ satisfies the Banach (S) property ((F) property, resp.) on D , if ψ^{-1} is a measurable function which satisfies the Luzin (N) property on Ω , and if g satisfies the Banach (S) property ((F) property, resp.) on Ω , then $g \circ \psi$ is a measurable function which satisfies the Banach (S) property ((F) property, resp.) on D .*

PROOF. By Corollary A.9, (i), it follows that $g \circ \psi$ is a measurable function on D . To show that $g \circ \psi$ satisfies the Banach (S) property ((F) property, resp.) on D , we consider a sequence of measurable sets (D_n) such that $D_n \subseteq D$ and such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \lambda(D_n) = 0$ (we consider a measurable set $A \subseteq D$ such that $\lambda(A) < +\infty$, resp.). Then we have $(g \circ \psi)(D_n) = g(\psi(D_n))$ ($(g \circ \psi)(A) = g(\psi(A))$, resp.), and the claim follows by Proposition B.4, since ψ satisfies the Banach (S) property on D and g satisfies the Banach (S) property on Ω (the claim follows since ψ satisfies (F) property on D and g satisfies (F) property on Ω , resp.). \square

LEMMA B.10. *If $\psi \in AC(\mathbf{R})$ is monotonic, then ψ satisfies the Banach (S) property on \mathbf{R} .*

PROOF. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be given. If ψ is increasing (decreasing, resp.) and continuous, we have $\psi((a, b)) = (\psi(a), \psi(b))$ ($\psi((a, b)) = (\psi(b), \psi(a))$, resp.) and $\lambda(\psi((a, b))) = \psi(b) - \psi(a)$ ($\lambda(\psi((a, b))) = \psi(a) - \psi(b)$, resp.), where $a, b \in \mathbf{R}$ satisfy $a < b$. On the other hand, since ψ is absolutely continuous, by Remark 3.2. in [21], there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for every sequence of pairwise disjoint open intervals (I_n) we have that $\sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} \lambda(I_n) \leq \delta$ implies $\sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} \lambda(\psi(I_n)) \leq \varepsilon$. We recall that, by the definition of the outer Lebesgue measure λ^* , we can find a sequence (J_n) of open intervals such that $E \subset \cup_{n=1}^{+\infty} J_n$ and $\sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} \lambda(J_n) \leq \lambda(E) + \frac{\delta}{2}$. Since $\cup_{n=1}^{+\infty} J_n$ is an open set, it can be rewritten as a union of disjoint open intervals (I_n) , getting $E \subseteq \cup_{n=1}^{+\infty} J_n = \cup_{n=1}^{+\infty} I_n$ and

$$\sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} \lambda(I_n) = \lambda(\cup_{n=1}^{+\infty} I_n) = \lambda(\cup_{n=1}^{+\infty} J_n) \leq \sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} \lambda(J_n) \leq \lambda(E) + \frac{\delta}{2}.$$

Therefore, if $\lambda(E) \leq \frac{\delta}{2}$, it results $\psi(E) \subset \cup_{n=1}^{+\infty} \psi(I_n)$ and $\sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} \lambda(\psi(I_n)) \leq \varepsilon$, and so we get $\lambda(\psi(E)) \leq \varepsilon$. \square

PROPOSITION B.11. *Consider two disjoint non-empty intervals U and V such that $\lambda(U) > 0$ and $\lambda(V) > 0$, and such that $U \cup V$ is an interval.*

- (i) *If it holds that $\psi \in C(U \cup V)$, $\psi \in AC(U)$ and $\psi \in AC(V)$, then we have $\psi \in AC(U \cup V)$.*
- (ii) *If ψ satisfies the Banach (S) property on U and on V , then ψ satisfies the Banach (S) property on $U \cup V$.*

PROOF. The assertion (i) follows directly from Theorem A.14. Indeed, since ψ is differentiable at almost every point in $U \cup V$, it suffices to verify the following three properties of ψ : (I) $\psi' \in \mathcal{L}_{loc}^1(U \cup V)$; (II) ψ' is equi-integrable on $U \cup V$; (III) ψ satisfies the Luzin (N) property on $U \cup V$. We set $\bar{U} \cap \bar{V} = \{a\}$. By Exercise 3.8 in [21] we get $\psi \in AC([a - \delta, a])$ and $\psi \in AC([a, a + \delta])$, where $\delta > 0$ is chosen sufficiently small, while by Corollary 3.10 in [21] we observe that we have $\psi' \in \mathcal{L}^1([a - \delta, a])$ and $\psi' \in \mathcal{L}^1([a, a + \delta])$. Thus, (I) follows since it holds that $\psi' \in \mathcal{L}_{loc}^1(\bar{U})$ and $\psi' \in \mathcal{L}_{loc}^1(\bar{V})$. Furthermore, (II) ((III), resp.) follows since ψ is equi-integrable on U and on V (since ψ satisfies the Luzin (N) property on U and on V , resp.). To prove the assertion (ii), we consider an arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$ and we choose an arbitrary measurable set $E \subseteq U \cup V$. We set $E_1 := E \cap U$ and $E_2 := E \cap V$. By the assumption, there exists $\delta_U > 0$ ($\delta_V > 0$, resp.) such that for every measurable set $F \subseteq U$ ($F \subseteq V$, resp.) which satisfies $\lambda(F) \leq \delta_U$ ($\lambda(F) \leq \delta_V$, resp.) we have $\lambda(\psi(F)) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$. We set $\delta := \min\{\delta_U, \delta_V\}$. If $E \subseteq U \cup V$ satisfies $\lambda(E) \leq \delta$, we conclude that $\lambda(\psi(E_i)) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$, where $i = 1, 2$. In effect, we get $\lambda(\psi(E)) \leq \lambda(\psi(E_1)) + \lambda(\psi(E_2)) \leq \varepsilon$, which completes the proof. \square

PROPOSITION B.12. *If $\psi \in AC(\mathbf{R})$, then ψ satisfies the Banach (S) property on \mathbf{R} .*

PROOF. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be given. The proof is divided in several steps.

In the first step, we observe that WLG we can assume that $\psi(0) = 0$ (otherwise, we consider the function $\psi(s) - \psi(0)$).

In the second step, we set $U := [0, +\infty)$ and $V := (-\infty, 0)$, and we note that $\psi_+ := \psi|_U$ ($\psi_- := \psi|_V$, resp.) can be written as the difference between two monotonic and absolutely continuous functions. Indeed, by Theorem A.14, there exists an equi-integrable function $f \in \mathcal{L}_{loc}^1(\mathbf{R})$ such that $\psi(s) = \int_0^s f(\sigma)d\sigma$, where $0 \leq s$ ($\psi(s) = \int_s^0 f(\sigma)d\sigma$, where $s < 0$, resp.). Since $f^+(\sigma) := \max\{f(\sigma), 0\} \geq 0$ and $f^-(\sigma) := -\min\{f(\sigma), 0\} \geq 0$ belong to $\mathcal{L}_{loc}^1(\mathbf{R})$ and are equi-integrable on \mathbf{R} , by Theorem A.14, we conclude that $\psi_1^+(s) := \int_0^s f^+(\sigma)d\sigma$ and $\psi_2^+(s) := \int_0^s f^-(\sigma)d\sigma$, where $s \geq 0$ ($\psi_1^-(s) := \int_s^0 f^+(\sigma)d\sigma$ and $\psi_2^-(s) := \int_s^0 f^-(\sigma)d\sigma$, where $s < 0$, resp.), are absolutely continuous on $[0, +\infty)$ ($(-\infty, 0)$, resp.) and increasing on $[0, +\infty)$ (decreasing on $(-\infty, 0)$, resp.), whereby $\psi_+ = \psi_1^+ - \psi_2^+$ on $[0, +\infty)$ ($\psi_- = \psi_1^- - \psi_2^-$ on $(-\infty, 0)$, resp.). At this point we note that we can extend ψ_1^+ and ψ_2^+ (ψ_1^- and ψ_2^- , resp.) on \mathbf{R} by zero, whereby the extensions (which we do not relabel) are monotonic on \mathbf{R} and, by Proposition B.11, (i), are absolutely continuous on \mathbf{R} .

In the next step, we recall that, by the same argument as in the proof of Lemma B.10, if $E \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ is a measurable set, then for every $\delta > 0$, there is a sequence (I_n) of pairwise disjoint open intervals such that $E \subseteq \cup_{n=1}^{+\infty} I_n$ and $\sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} \lambda(I_n) \leq \lambda(E) + \frac{\delta}{2}$.

In the last step, we show that ψ^+ (ψ^- , resp.) satisfies the Banach (S) property on $[0, +\infty)$ ($(-\infty, 0)$, resp.). To this end, we set $I_n := (a_n, b_n)$, and for every $s, t \in [a_n, b_n]$ we estimate $\psi_+(s) = \psi_1^+(s) - \psi_2^+(s) \leq \psi_1^+(b_n) - \psi_2^+(s) \leq \psi_1^+(b_n) - \psi_2^+(a_n)$, and so $|\psi_+(s) - \psi_+(t)| \leq \psi_1^+(b_n) - \psi_2^+(a_n) + \psi_2^+(b_n) - \psi_1^+(a_n) = \psi_1^+(b_n) - \psi_1^+(a_n) + \psi_2^+(b_n) - \psi_2^+(a_n)$. Since it holds that $\psi_+([a_n, b_n]) = [c_n, d_n]$, there exists $s_n \in [a_n, b_n]$ ($t_n \in [a_n, b_n]$, resp.) such that $\psi_+(s_n) = c_n$ ($\psi_+(t_n) = d_n$, resp.). It results that we have $\lambda(\psi_+(I_n)) \leq \psi_1^+(b_n) - \psi_1^+(a_n) + \psi_2^+(b_n) - \psi_2^+(a_n) = \lambda(\psi_1^+(I_n)) + \lambda(\psi_2^+(I_n))$. In a quite similar way we infer that $\lambda(\psi_-(I_n)) \leq \lambda(\psi_1^-(I_n)) + \lambda(\psi_2^-(I_n))$. By taking $\varepsilon_i > 0$, where $i = 1, 2$, from the proof of Lemma B.10 we infer that there exists $\delta_i^\pm > 0$, such that if $\sum \lambda(I_n) \leq \delta_i^\pm$, then $\sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} \lambda(\psi_i^\pm(I_n)) \leq \varepsilon_i$. It follows that $\sum \lambda(I_n) \leq \delta$ (where $\delta := \min\{\delta_1^-, \delta_1^+, \delta_2^-, \delta_2^+\}$), implies $\sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} \lambda(\psi_i^\pm(I_n)) \leq \varepsilon_i$, where $i = 1, 2$. If we choose $\varepsilon_1 := \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ and $\varepsilon_2 := \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$, we get $\sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} \lambda(\psi_\pm(I_n)) \leq \sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} \lambda(\psi_1^\pm(I_n)) + \sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} \lambda(\psi_2^\pm(I_n)) \leq \varepsilon$. Finally, we conclude that $\lambda(E) \leq \frac{\delta}{2}$ implies $\lambda(\psi_\pm(E)) \leq \varepsilon$ and the claim follows by Proposition B.11, (ii). \square

By the Banach-Zaretsky theorem (cf. Corollary 3.49 in [21]), if $I \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ is an interval, and if $\psi \in AC_{loc}(I)$, then ψ satisfies the Luzin (N) property on I . In the last theorem of the paper, we recover a more precise result.

THEOREM B.13. *Let $I \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ be an interval such that $\lambda(I) > 0$. If $\psi \in AC(I)$, then we have the following:*

- (i) ψ satisfies the Banach (S) property on I ,
- (ii) ψ preserves measurability of sets in I ,
- (iii) ψ satisfies (F) property on I .

PROOF. We note that we can extend ψ from I to \mathbf{R} in such a way that the extension $\bar{\psi} : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ satisfies $\bar{\psi} \in AC(\mathbf{R})$. Indeed, in the first step we extend ψ from I to its closure \bar{I} by continuity (such an extension $\Psi : \bar{I} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is absolutely continuous on \bar{I} , compare Exercise 3.8 in [21]). In the second step we extend Ψ from \bar{I} to \mathbf{R} by a constant function and by continuity. More precisely, if $\bar{I} = (-\infty, b]$ or $\bar{I} = [a, +\infty)$ (if $\bar{I} = [a, b]$ is a compact interval, resp.), we define $\bar{\Psi}(s) := \Psi(b)$, where $s \geq b$, or $\bar{\Psi}(s) := \Psi(a)$, where $s \leq a$ ($\bar{\Psi}(s) := \Psi(b)$, where $s \geq b$, and $\bar{\Psi}(s) := \Psi(a)$, where $s \leq a$, resp.). Hence, by Theorem A.14, we get $\bar{\Psi} \in AC(\mathbf{R})$. Finally, we apply Proposition B.12, getting (i). Assertion (ii) ((iii), resp.) follows from Lemma B.2 and from Proposition A.4, (iii) (from assertion (i) and from Proposition B.6, (ii), resp.). \square

As a corollary, we derive a result which connects continuity properties of an injection and measurability of its inverse.

COROLLARY B.14. *Let $I \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ be an interval such that $\lambda(I) > 0$. If $\psi \in AC_{loc}(I)$ is an injection, then ψ^{-1} is a measurable function.*

PROOF. In the first step we observe that, if $\psi \in AC(I)$ is an injection, by Theorem B.13 and Proposition A.7, (i), it results that ψ^{-1} is measurable. In the second step we assume that $\psi \in AC_{loc}(I)$ is an injection. WLG we can assume that I is an open (a semi-open, resp.) interval. Then there exists a sequence of compact intervals (I_m) such that $I = \cup_{m=1}^{+\infty} I_m$, and such that $I_m \subseteq I_{m+1} \subseteq I$, whereby we get $\psi(I) = \cup_{m=1}^{+\infty} \psi(I_m)$ and $\psi(I_m) \subseteq \psi(I_{m+1})$. By the first step, it follows that $(\psi \lfloor I_m)^{-1} : \psi(I_m) \rightarrow I_m$ is measurable for every $m \in \mathbf{N}$. Hence, ψ^{-1} is measurable. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] G. Alberti, *Variational models for phase transitions: an approach via Γ -convergence*, in: Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations (Pisa, 1996), Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2000, 95–114.
- [2] J. J. Benedetto and W. Czaja, *Integration and modern analysis*, Birkhäuser, Boston, 2009.
- [3] P. K. Bhattacharyya, *Distributions. Generalized functions with applications in Sobolev spaces*, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, 2012.

- [4] A. M. Bruckner, *Differentiation of real functions*, Springer, Berlin, 1978.
- [5] O. Dovgoshey, O. Martio, V. Ryazanov and M. Vuorinen, *The Cantor function*, *Expo. Math.* **24** (2006), 1–37.
- [6] L. C. Evans and R. F. Gariepy, *Measure theory and fine properties of functions*, CRC Press, Boca Raton, 2015.
- [7] B. Farkas and S.-A. Wegner, *Variations on Barbălat’s lemma*, *Amer. Math. Monthly* **123** (2016), 825–830.
- [8] H. Federer, *Geometric measure theory*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1969.
- [9] G. B. Folland, *Real analysis. Modern techniques and their applications*, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1984.
- [10] D. J. H. Garling, *A course in mathematical analysis, Volume I. Foundations and elementary real analysis*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2013.
- [11] B. R. Gelbaum and J. M. H. Olmsted, *Counterexamples in analysis*, Dover Publications, Mineola, 2003.
- [12] M. Giaquinta and G. Modica, *Mathematical analysis. Foundations and advanced techniques for functions of several variables*, Birkhäuser, 2009.
- [13] J. E. Gillis, *Some combinatorial properties of measurable sets*, *Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser. 7* (1936), 191–198.
- [14] R. Gordon, *The integrals of Lebesgue, Denjoy, Perron and Henstock*, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 1994.
- [15] C. Heil, *Introduction to real analysis*, Springer, Cham, 2019.
- [16] A. Kharazishvili, *Strange functions in real analysis. 2nd edition*, CRC Press, Boca Raton, 2006.
- [17] A. S. Kechris, *Classical descriptive set theory*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995.
- [18] D. S. Kurtz and C. W. Swartz, *Theories of integration. The integrals of Riemann, Lebesgue, Henstock-Kurzweil, and McShane*. World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd., Hackensack, 2012.
- [19] M. Kysiak, *Some remarks on indicatrices of measurable functions*, *Bull. Pol. Acad. Sci. Math.* **53** (2005), 281–284.
- [20] G. Leoni, *A remark on compactness for the Cahn-Hilliard functional*, *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.* **20** (2014), 517–523.
- [21] G. Leoni, *A first course in Sobolev Spaces*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, 2017.
- [22] N. Lusin and W. Sierpinski, *On a decomposition of an interval into a nondenumerably many non-measurable sets*, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris* **165** (1917), 422–424.
- [23] M. E. Munroe, *Introduction to measure and integration*, Addison-Wesley, Cambridge, 1953.
- [24] N. C. Owen, *Nonconvex variational problems with general singular perturbations*, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **310** (1988), 393–404.
- [25] A. Raguž, *A priori estimates for finite-energy sequences of one-dimensional Cahn-Hilliard functional with non-standard multi-well potential*, *Math. Commun.* **29** (2024), 39–59.
- [26] A. Raguž, *Some results in asymptotic analysis of finite-energy sequences of one-dimensional Cahn-Hilliard functional with non-standard two-well potential*, *Glas. Mat. Ser. III* **59(79)** (2024), 125–145.
- [27] S. Saks, *Theory of the integral*, Hafner, New York, 1937.
- [28] P. Sternberg, *The effect of a singular perturbation on non-convex variational problems*, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **101** (1988), 209–260.
- [29] B. S. Thomson, *Real functions*, Springer, Berlin, 1985.
- [30] R. L. Wheeden and A. Zygmund, *Measure and integral. An introduction to real analysis. 2nd edition*, CRC Press, Boca Raton, 2015.

A. Raguž
Department of Economics and Mathematics
Zagreb School of Economics and Management
Filipa Vukasovića 1, 10 000 Zagreb
Croatia
E-mail: araguz@zsem.hr
Received: 15.10.2024.
Revised: 17.11.2025.

O POJMU APROKSIMATIVNO DONJE PREOSCILATORNOGA NIZA FUNKCIJA

A. RAGUŽ

SAŽETAK. U ovom radu uvodimo pojam aproksimativno donje preoscilatornog (skraćeno app LPO) niza funkcija. Kada je domena kompaktna interval, a niz se sastoji od apsolutno neprekidnih funkcija, sličan je pojam uveden u radu [26]. Poopćenje koje se ovdje razmatra dvostruko je. S jedne strane, razmatramo slučaj domene koja je izmjeriv skup potencijalno beskonačne mjere, a s druge strane, razmatramo slučaj niza izmjerivih funkcija. Sukladno tome prilagođavamo definiciju te iznosimo neka svojstva spomenutog pojma app LPO niza funkcija. Posebno proučavamo slučajeve kada se takvo app LPO svojstvo očuvava pri vanjskoj ili unutarnjoj kompoziciji s odgovarajućom klasom funkcija.