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Let $T$ be a simple arc in the Cartesian plane. For each real $t$ let $p(t)$ [q(t)] be the number of points in $T$ whose first [second] coordinate is $t$. It follows easily from Banach's theorem (see, e.g., [1], 6.4, p. 280) that the length of $T$ is finite, if and only if $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (p(t) + q(t)) \, dt < \infty$. The main purpose of this paper is to show that this assertion fails, if we replace the assumption that $T$ is a simple arc by the assumption that $T$ is compact. We construct a plane compact set $T$ such that each horizontal or vertical line intersects $T$ in at most one point and that the $\alpha$-dimensional measure of $T$ is infinite for each (positive) $\alpha < 2$. (See theorems 9 and 20.)

We write $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, \ldots\}$, $\mathbb{R} = (-\infty, \infty)$, $\mathbb{R}^2 = \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$. If $a = (a_1, a_2), b = (b_1, b_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and if $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, we get

$$
\text{dist}(a, b) = \max\{|b_1 - a_1|, |b_2 - a_2|\},
$$

$$
\text{dist}(A, B) = \inf\{\text{dist}(a, b); a \in A, b \in B\}.
$$

If $\emptyset \neq C \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, we define $\text{diam} C$ (diameter of $C$) as $\sup\{\text{dist}(c, c^*); c, c^* \in C\}$; further we set $\text{diam} \emptyset = 0$.

1. Let $-\infty < a < b < \infty$, $I = [a, b], 0 < \alpha < 1$; let $m, j$ be integers, $0 \leq j < m$. We define

$$
\gamma(m, j, \alpha, I) = [a + j(b - a)/m, a + (j + \alpha)(b - a)/m].
$$
Notice that \( \gamma(m, k, \alpha, I) \) \((k = 0, \ldots, m - 1)\) are pairwise disjoint subintervals of \( I \); each of them has length \( \alpha(b - a)/m \).

2. Let \( a, b, I, \alpha, m, j \) be as before; let \( k \) be an integer, \( 0 \leq k < m \). Let 
\[ t \in \gamma(m, j, \alpha, I), \; v \in \gamma(m, k, \alpha, I). \] Then 
\[ |v - t| \geq (|k - j| - \alpha)(b - a)/m. \] (Easy.)

3. Throughout this paper, \( r_n \) are integers and \( q_n \) are numbers such that \( 2 \leq r_0 \leq r_1 \leq \ldots, q_1 > q_0 > q_1 > \ldots, r_n \to \infty, q_n \to 1 \) \((n \to \infty)\) and \( q_{n-1}(r_n - 1) \geq r_n \) \((n = 0, 1, \ldots)\). We set \( R_0 = 1, \; R_n = r_1 \cdots r_n, \; \mu_n = r_{n-1}/R_n \) \((n \in \mathbb{N})\).

4. Let \( n \in \mathbb{N} \). Then \( q_{n-2}(r_{n-1} - 1)/R_n \geq \mu_n > 1/R_n \geq \mu_{n+1} \). (Easy.)

5. Let \( I = [0, q_{-1}r_0], \; J = [0, q_0] \). If \( v_j, w_j \) are integers such that \( 0 \leq v_j < r_{2j-2}r_{2j-1}, \; 0 \leq w_j < r_{2j-1}r_{2j} \) \((j \in \mathbb{N})\), we set
\[
I(v_1) = \gamma(r_0r_1, q_1, q_{-1}r_0, I), \quad J(w_1) = \gamma(r_1r_2, q_1, q_2, q_0, J),
\]
\[
I(v_1, v_2) = \gamma(r_2r_3, q_2, q_3, q_1, I(v_1)), \quad J(w_1, w_2) = \gamma(r_3r_4, q_2, q_3, q_2, J(w_1))
\]
e tc.; in general,
\[
I(v_1, \ldots, v_j) = \gamma(r_{2j-2}r_{2j-1}, v_j, q_{2j-1}q_{2j-3}, I(v_1, \ldots, v_{j-1})),
\]
\[
J(w_1, \ldots, w_j) = \gamma(r_{2j-1}r_{2j}, w_j, q_{2j}q_{2j-2}, J(w_1, \ldots, w_{j-1})).
\]

If \( k_n \) are integers such that \( 0 \leq k_n < r_n \) \((n \in \mathbb{N})\), we set \( L(k_1) = I(r_0k_1) \times J, \)
\[
L(k_1, k_2) = I(r_0k_1) \times J(k_1 + r_1k_2),
\]
\[
L(k_1, k_2, k_3) = I(r_0k_1, k_2 + r_2k_3) \times J(k_1 + r_1k_2),
\]
\[
L(k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4) = I(r_0k_1, k_2 + r_2k_3) \times J(k_1 + r_1k_2, k_3 + r_3k_4)
\]
e tc.; in general, \( L(k_1, \ldots, k_n) = V \times W \), where
\[
V = I(r_0k_1, k_2 + r_2k_3, \ldots, k_{n-4} + r_{n-4}k_{n-3}, k_{n-2} + r_{n-2}k_{n-1}),
\]
\[
W = J(k_1 + r_1k_2, k_3 + r_3k_4, \ldots, k_{n-3} + r_{n-3}k_{n-2}, k_{n-1} + r_{n-1}k_n)
\]
for \( n \) even and
\[
V = I(r_0k_1, k_2 + r_2k_3, \ldots, k_{n-3} + r_{n-3}k_{n-2}, k_{n-1} + r_{n-1}k_n),
\]
\[
W = J(k_1 + r_1k_2, k_3 + r_3k_4, \ldots, k_{n-4} + r_{n-4}k_{n-3}, k_{n-2} + r_{n-2}k_{n-1})
\]
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for $n$ odd ($n > 2$).

Notice that $L(k_1) \supset L(k_1, k_2) \supset \ldots$.

6. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $V, W$ be as in 5, $V = [a, b], W = [c, d]$. Then $b - a = q_{n-1}/R_{n-1}, d - c = q_n/R_n$ for $n$ even and $b - a = q_n/R_n, d - c = q_{n-1}/R_{n-1}$ for $n$ odd. (Easy.)

7. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $k_j, k_j^*$ be integers, $0 \leq k_j < r_j, 0 \leq k_j^* < r_j$ ($j = 1, \ldots, n$).
Set $K = L(k_1, \ldots, k_n), K^* = L(k_1^*, \ldots, k_n^*)$. Then either $k_j = k_j^*$ ($j = 1, \ldots, n$) or $\text{dist}(K, K^*) > \mu_n$.

Proof. (1) Let $n = 1$. Then $K = I(r_0 k_1) \times J, K^* = I(r_0 k_1^*) \times J, I(r_0 k_1) = \gamma(r_0 r_1, r_0 k_1, q_1/q_1, I), I(r_0 k_1^*) = \gamma(r_0 r_1, r_0 k_1^*, q_1/q_1, I)$.

We may suppose that $k_1 \neq k_1^*$. Applying 2 and 4 we get $\text{dist}(K, K^*) > (r_0 |k_1^* - k_1| - 1)q_1 r_0/r_0 r_1 = (r_0 - 1)q_1/r_1 \geq \mu_1$.

(2) Let $n > 1$. Suppose that our assertion holds, if $n$ is replaced by $n - 1$. Let, e.g., $n$ be odd. Suppose first that $k_1 = k_1^*, \ldots, k_{n-1} = k_{n-1}^*, k_n \neq k_n^*$. Set

$$U = I(r_0 k_1, \ldots, k_{n-3} + r_{n-3} k_{n-2}) \quad (= I(r_0 k_1) \text{ for } n = 3),$$
$$W = J(k_1 + r_1 k_2, \ldots, k_{n-2} + r_{n-2} k_{n-1}).$$

Then

$$K = \gamma(r_{n-1} r_n, k_{n-1} + r_{n-1} k_n, q_n/q_{n-2}, U) \times W,$$
$$K^* = \gamma(r_{n-1} r_n, k_{n-1} + r_{n-1} k_n^*, q_n/q_{n-2}, U) \times W.$$ 

It is easy to see that the length of $U$ is $q_{n-2}/R_{n-2}$. Applying 2 and 4 we get

$$\text{dist}(K, K^*) > (r_{n-1} |k_n^* - k_n| - 1)q_{n-2}/(R_{n-2} r_{n-1} r_n) \geq (r_{n-1} - 1)q_{n-2}/R_n \geq \mu_n.$$ 

If $k_j \neq k_j^*$ for some $j < n$, then, by induction assumption and by 4, $\text{dist}(K, K^*) > \mu_{n-1} > \mu_n$.

If $n$ is even, we proceed analogously. □

8. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let $\mathcal{T}_n$ be the system of all rectangles $L(k_1, \ldots, k_n)$, where $k_j$ are integers such that $0 \leq k_j < r_j$ ($j = 1, \ldots, n$). Let $T_n$ be the union of the system $\mathcal{T}_n$. Finally set $T = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} T_n$.

Notice that, by 7, $\mathcal{T}_n$ consists of $R_n$ pairwise disjoint rectangles.

9. Let $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Then there is at most one $x \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $(x, t) \in T$ and at most one $y \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $(t, y) \in T$. 361
Proof. Suppose that there are numbers $x, x^*$ such that $x \neq x^*, (x,t) \in T, (x^*,t) \in T$. There are even $n > 2$ for which $q_{n-1}/r_{n-1} < |x^* - x|$. There are integers $k_j, k_j^*$ such that $0 \leq k_j < r_j, 0 \leq k_j^* < r_j (j = 1, \ldots, n)$ and that $(x,t) \in L(k_1, \ldots, k_n), (x^*,t) \in L(k_1^*, \ldots, k_n^*)$. Then $t \in J(k_1 + r_1k_2, \ldots, k_{n-1} + r_{n-1}k_n)$ and also $t \in J(k_1^* + r_1k_2^*, \ldots, k_{n-1}^* + r_{n-1}k_n^*)$; thus $k_1 + r_1k_2 = k_1^* + r_1k_2^*, \ldots, k_{n-1} + r_{n-1}k_n = k_{n-1}^* + r_{n-1}k_n^*$. This easily implies that $k_1 = k_1^*, \ldots, k_n = k_n^*$. Therefore both $x$ and $x^*$ belong to the interval $I(r_0k_1, \ldots, k_{n-2} + r_{n-2}k_{n-1})$ whose length is $q_{n-1}/r_{n-1}$. This is a contradiction.

The second part of the theorem can be proved similarly.

10. For each set $M \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ and each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let $P_n(M)$ be the number of elements of $\mathbb{X}_n$ intersecting $M$ and let $p_n(M) = P_n(M)/R_n$.

11. Let $M \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ and let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $p_{n+1}(M) \leq p_n(M)$.

Proof. Each element of $\mathbb{X}_{n+1}$ lies in some element of $\mathbb{X}_n$ and each element of $\mathbb{X}_n$ contains $r_{n+1}$ elements of $\mathbb{X}_{n+1}$. Therefore $p_{n+1}(M) \leq r_{n+1}p_n(M)$ whence our assertion follows at once.

12. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $M \subset K \subset \mathbb{X}_n$. Then

$$P_{n+1}(M) \leq 1 + \mu_{n+1}^{-1} \text{diam } M.$$ 

Proof. Let $v = P_{n+1}(M)$. We may suppose that $v > 1$. Let $K_1, \ldots, K_v$ be all elements of $\mathbb{X}_{n+1}$ intersecting $M$. Let, e.g., $n$ be even. We may write $K = L(k_1, \ldots, k_n) = V \times W, K_s = \gamma(r_nr_{n+1}, k_n + r_nj_s, q_{n+1}/q_{n-1}, V) \times W (s = 1, \ldots, v)$ and we may suppose that $j_1 < j_2 < \ldots < j_v$. Choosing $(x_s, y_s) \in K_s (s = 1, v)$ we get, by 2, 6 and 4, diam $M \geq x_v - x_1 > (r_n(j_v - j_1) - 1)q_{n-1}/(R_{n-1}r_{n+1}) \geq (v - 1)(r_n - 1)q_{n-1}/R_{n+1} \geq (v - 1)\mu_{n+1}^{-1}$ whence $v < 1 + \mu_{n+1}^{-1}$ diam $M$.

If $n$ is odd, we proceed analogously.

13. Let $\omega$ be a continuous increasing function on $[0, \infty)$, $\omega(0) = 0$, and let $M \subset \mathbb{R}^2$. For each $\varepsilon > 0$ define $\Lambda(\omega, M, \varepsilon) = \inf \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \omega(\text{diam } S_n)$, where $\mathbb{R}^2 \supset \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} S_n \supset M$, diam $S_n < \varepsilon (n \in \mathbb{N})$. If $0 < \varepsilon_1 < \varepsilon_2$, then $\Lambda(\omega, M, \varepsilon_1) \geq \Lambda(\omega, M, \varepsilon_2)$. Further we set $\Lambda(\omega, M) = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \Lambda(\omega, M, \varepsilon)$.

For each $\alpha > 0$ write $\Lambda_\alpha(M) = \Lambda(\omega, M, t^\alpha)$, where $\omega(t) = t^\alpha$ ($t \geq 0$).

We define the Hausdorff dimension of $M$ (H.d. $M$) as $\inf\{\alpha > 0; \Lambda_\alpha(M) = 0\}$. It is easy to prove that $\Lambda_\alpha(M) = 0$, if $\alpha > \text{H.d. } M$, and $\Lambda_\alpha(M) = \infty$, if $0 < \alpha < \text{H.d. } M$. 
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In what follows, \( \liminf \) will mean \( \liminf \); similarly for \( \limsup \) and \( \lim \).

14. Let \( \omega \) be as in 13. Then

\[
\Lambda(\omega, T) \leq \liminf_{n \to \infty} r_n R_n \omega(q_{n-1}/R_n).
\]

**Proof.** Let \( n \in \mathbb{N} \). According to 6, each element of \( T_n \) can be covered by \( r_n \) rectangles of diameter \( q_{n-1}/R_n \). Therefore \( \Lambda(\omega, T, q_{n-2}/R_n) \leq r_n R_n \omega(q_{n-1}/R_n) \). This easily implies (1).

\[\square\]

15. Throughout the paper, \( \varphi \) and \( \psi \) will be continuous increasing functions on \([0, \infty)\) such that \( \varphi(0) = \psi(0) = 0 \), \( \varphi(t)\psi(t) = t^2 \) and that the function \( \varphi(t)/t \) \( (= t/\psi(t)) \) is non-decreasing \( (t > 0) \).

16. Let \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) and let \( M \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2 \). Let \( \mu_{n+1} \leq \text{diam } M < \mu_n \). Then

\[
p_{n+2}(M) \leq (1 + r_n^{-1})P_{n-1}(\psi(1/R_n) + \psi(\mu_{n+1}))\varphi(\text{diam } M).
\]

**Proof.** Set \( \text{diam } M = \delta \). By 7, \( M \) intersects at most one element of \( T_n \). It follows from 12 that \( P_{n+1}(M) \leq 1 + \delta/\mu_{n+1} \). Thus (see 11)

\[
p_{n+2}(M) \leq p_{n+1}(M) \leq \frac{1}{R_{n+1}} + \frac{\delta}{r_n}.
\]

(1) Let \( \delta > 1/R_n \). Since \( \varphi(t)/t \) is non-decreasing, we have \( 1 \leq \frac{\varphi(\delta)}{\delta} \cdot \frac{\psi(x)}{x} \) for each \( x \in (0, \delta) \). For \( x = 1/R_n \) we get \( \delta/r_n \leq \varphi(\delta)R_{n-1}\psi(1/R_n) \); taking \( x = \mu_{n+1} \) and applying the inequality \( 1/\delta < R_n \) we get

\[
\frac{1}{R_{n+1}} \leq \frac{\varphi(\delta)}{\delta} \cdot \frac{\psi(\mu_{n+1})}{r_n} < \varphi(\delta)R_{n-1}\psi(\mu_{n+1}).
\]

This and (3) implies (2).

(2) Let \( \delta \leq 1/R_n \). By 12 we have \( P_{n+2}(K \cap M) \leq 1 + \delta/\mu_{n+2} \) for each \( K \in T_{n+1} \). Thus \( P_{n+2}(M) \leq (1 + \delta/\mu_{n+2})(1 + \delta/\mu_{n+1}) \) whence

\[
p_{n+2}(M) \leq \frac{\delta^2}{R_{n+2}\mu_{n+2}\mu_{n+1}} \left( \frac{\mu_{n+2}}{\delta} + 1 \right) \left( \frac{\mu_{n+1}}{\delta} + 1 \right)
\]

\[
\leq \frac{\varphi(\delta)\psi(\delta)R_{n+1}}{\mu_{n+1}r_n} \left( \frac{\mu_{n+2}}{\mu_{n+1}} + 1 \right) \left( \frac{\mu_{n+1}}{\delta} + 1 \right).
\]
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Obviously
\[ \frac{\mu_{n+2}}{\mu_{n+1}} = \frac{r_{n+1}}{R_{n+2}} \cdot \frac{R_{n+1}}{r_n} \leq \frac{1}{r_n}; \]
since \( \psi(t) \) is increasing and \( \psi(t)/t \) is non-increasing, we have \( \psi(\delta) \leq \psi(1/R_n) \), \( \psi(\delta) \delta^{-1} \mu_{n+1} \leq \psi(\mu_{n+1}) \) whence \( \psi(\delta)(\delta^{-1} \mu_{n+1} + 1) \leq \psi(1/R_n) + \psi(\mu_{n+1}) \). This and (4) implies (2).

17. Set \( A_n = R_{n-1}\psi(1/R_n), B_n = R_{n-1}\psi(1/R_n) + \psi(\mu_{n+1}) \) \((n \in \mathbb{N})\), \( \lambda = \liminf A_n^{-1}, \lambda^* = \liminf B_n^{-1} \). Then

\[ \frac{\lambda}{2} \leq \lambda^* \leq \Lambda(\varphi, T) \leq \lambda. \]

If \( \varphi(t)/t^\beta \) increases for some \( \beta > 1 \), then \( \Lambda(\varphi, T) = \lambda = \lambda^* \).

**Proof.** Obviously \( r_n R_n \varphi(q_{n-1}/R_n) \leq q_{n-1}^2 / A_n \). According to 14 we have \( \Lambda(\varphi, T) \leq \lambda \). Now let \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) and let \( \mathcal{G} \) be an open cover of \( T \) such that \( \text{diam } G < \mu_n \) for each \( G \in \mathcal{G} \). We may suppose that \( \mathcal{G} \) is finite. For each \( G \in \mathcal{G} \) there is an integer \( n_G \geq n \) such that \( \mu_{n_G+1} \leq \text{diam } G < \mu_{n_G} \). Let \( Q_n = \sup\{(1 + r_k^{-1})B_k; k \geq n\} \). There is an \( m \in \mathbb{N} \) such that \( m \geq n_G + 2 \) for each \( G \in \mathcal{G} \). Then by 11 and 16, \( p_m(G) \leq p_{n_G+2}(G) \leq Q_n \varphi(\text{diam } G) \) \((G \in \mathcal{G})\). Since each element of \( \mathcal{T}_m \) contains some element of \( T \), we have \( \sum_{G \in \mathcal{G}} p_m(G) \geq R_m \) whence \( \sum_{G \in \mathcal{G}} p_m(G) \geq 1 \). It follows that \( \sum_{G \in \mathcal{G}} \varphi(\text{diam } G) \geq Q_n^{-1}, \Lambda(\varphi, T, \mu_n) \geq Q_n^{-1}, \Lambda(\varphi, T) \geq \lim Q_n^{-1} = \lambda^* \). Since \( \mu_{n+1} \leq 1/R_n \), we have \( B_n < 2A_n \) whence \( \lambda^* > \lambda/2 \). This proves (5).

Let us suppose, finally, that there exists a \( \beta > 1 \) such that \( \varphi(t)/t^\beta \) increases and that \( \lambda^* < \lambda \). Then there are numbers \( A, B \) such that \( \limsup A_n < A < B < \limsup B_n \). We can find an \( n_0 \) such that \( A_n < A \) for each integer \( n > n_0 \). Now let \( n > n_0 \) and \( B_n > B \). Since \( \psi(t)t^{\beta-2} = t^\beta/\varphi(t) \) decreases, we have \( \psi(\mu_{n+1}) \mu_{n+1}^{\beta-2} < \psi(1/R_{n+1}) R_{n+1}^{2-\beta} \) whence

\[ \frac{B-A}{A} < \frac{B_n-A_n}{A_{n+1}} = \frac{R_{n-1}\psi(\mu_{n+1})}{R_n\psi(1/R_{n+1})} < \frac{1}{r_n} (\mu_{n+1} R_{n+1})^{2-\beta} = r_n^{1-\beta}. \]

Choosing \( n \) sufficiently great we get a contradiction. This completes the proof. \( \square \)

18. Let \( \alpha > 0 \). Then \( \Lambda_\alpha(T) = \liminf r_n R_n^{1-\alpha} \).

**Proof.** Set \( \varrho = \liminf r_n R_n^{1-\alpha} \). Obviously \( \varrho = \infty \) for \( \alpha < 1 \), \( \varrho = 0 \) for \( \alpha \geq 2 \).

Taking \( \omega(t) = t^\alpha \) we have \( r_n R_n \omega(q_{n-1}/R_n) = q_{n-1}^{\alpha} r_n R_n^{1-\alpha} \) so that, by 14, \( \Lambda_\alpha(T) \leq \varrho \). This proves our assertion for \( \alpha \geq 2 \). Now let \( 1 < \alpha < 2 \); set \( \varphi(t) = t^\alpha \), \( \psi(t) = t^{2-\alpha} \) and let \( A_n \) be as in 17. Then \( A_n^{-1} = r_n R_n^{1-\alpha} \) and it follows easily from 17 that \( \Lambda_\alpha(T) = \varrho \). If \( \alpha < 1 \), then \( \Lambda_\alpha(T) \geq \Lambda_1(T) = \infty \) so that \( \Lambda_\alpha(T) = \varrho \) again. \( \square \)
Example. Let \(a, b\) be integers, \(a, b > 1\), and let \(r_n = a^{6n} (n = 0, 1, \ldots)\). Define \(\alpha = 2 - b^{-1}\). Then \(r_n R_n^{1-\alpha} = a\) for each \(n\) so that \(\Lambda_\alpha(T) = \alpha\).

19. We have \(H.d. T = 1 + \lim \inf (\log r_n / \log R_n)\).

Proof. If \(\alpha > 1 + \lim \inf \ldots\), then \(1 > r_n R_n^{1-\alpha}\) for infinitely many numbers \(n\) so that, by 18, \(\Lambda_\alpha(T) \leq 1\); if \(\alpha < 1 + \lim \inf \ldots\), we find similarly that \(\Lambda_\alpha(T) \geq 1\). This completes the proof.

20. If \(r_n = 2^{n!} (n = 0, 1, \ldots)\), then \(H.d. T = 2\).

Proof. Obviously \(1! + 2! + \ldots + n! < n! + 2(n-1)!\) so that \(\log R_n / \log r_n < 1 + \frac{2}{n}\) \((n \in \mathbb{N})\). Now we apply 19.

21. Suppose that \(\varphi(t)/t \to 0\) \((t \downarrow 0)\).* Let \(0 \leq \lambda \leq \infty\). Then there are numbers \(r_n, q_n\) with properties listed in 3 such that the corresponding set \(T\) fulfills the relation

\[
\lambda/2 \leq \Lambda(\varphi, T) \leq \lambda.
\]

If \(\varphi(t)/t^\beta\) increases for some \(\beta > 1\), then (6) may be replaced by \(\Lambda(\varphi, T) = \lambda\).

Proof. Set \(\delta(t) = \varphi(t)/t \((t > 0)\). Then \(\delta\) is non-decreasing, \(\delta(0+) = 0\) and

\[
k\delta(x/k) = x/\psi(x/k) \to \infty \quad (k \to \infty)
\]

for each \(x > 0\).

We will find integers \(r_n\) such that \(2 \leq r_0 \leq r_1 \leq \ldots, r_n \to \infty\) and that, setting \(R_n = r_1 \ldots r_n\) and \(C_n = r_n \delta(1/R_n)\), we have \(C_n \to \lambda \((n \to \infty)\). It is easy to see that \(C_n = A_n^{-1}\), where \(A_n\) are as in 17.

1. Let \(\lambda = 0\). Since \(\delta(0+) = 0\), there are integers \(k_s\) such that \(0 = k_0 < k_1 < \ldots\) and that, if we set \(r_0 = 2, r_n = s + 1\) for \(n = k_s - 1 + 1, \ldots, k_s\), we have \(\delta(1/R_{k_s}) < (s(s+2))^{-1} \((s \in \mathbb{N})\). Then \(1/s > (s+2)\delta(1/R_{k_s+1}) = C_{k_s+1} \geq \ldots \geq C_{k_s+1}\) so that \(C_n \to 0\).

2. Let \(0 < \lambda < \infty\). We find an \(m \in \mathbb{N}\) such that \(2\delta(2^{-m}) < \lambda\) and set \(r_k = 2\) for \(k = 0, \ldots, m\). Then \(C_m < \lambda\). Now suppose that \(n \geq m\) and that we have \(r_1, \ldots, r_n\) such that \(C_n < \lambda\). Let \(r\) be the greatest of all integers \(k\) for which \(k\delta((kR_n)^{-1}) < \lambda\) (see (7)). Obviously \(r \geq r_n\) and \(r\delta((rR_n)^{-1}) \leq \lambda \leq (r+1)\delta((r+1)R_n)^{-1}) < (r+1)\delta((rR_n)^{-1})\); therefore

\[
0 < \lambda - r\delta((rR_n)^{-1}) < \delta((rR_n)^{-1}) < \lambda/r.
\]

*See 15.
Set $r_{n+1} = r$. Since $(r_{n+1} + 1)\delta(1/R_{n+1}) > \lambda$ and $\delta(0+) = 0$, we have $r_{n+1} \to \infty$ and it follows from (8) that $C_{n+1} \to \lambda$.

(3) The case $\lambda = \infty$ may be left to the reader (see (7)).

Now we apply 17.
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EDITORIAL COMMENTS

Professor Jan Mařík died on January 6, 1994. He had no time to take into account the remarks of the referee to this paper.

The main result of the paper is given in Proposition 21 according to which for sufficiently reasonable functions $\varphi$ such that

$$t^2 = o(\varphi(t)), \quad t \to 0+,$$

there is a compact subset $T$ of the plane which intersects lines parallel to the axes in at most one point, nevertheless $\Lambda(\varphi, T) = \infty$ where $\Lambda(\varphi, T)$ is the Hausdorff measure of the set $T$ given by the function $\varphi$.

The paper is based on an interesting and simple construction. Even if the author emphasizes the result for $\alpha$-dimensional measures, i.e. the case $\varphi(t) = t^\alpha$, $\alpha < 0$ the most interesting case is the case of a general $\varphi$. The special result for $\varphi(t) = t^\alpha$ can be easily derived using recent results of P. Matilla from his paper: Hausdorff dimension and capacities of intersections of sets in $n$-space (Acta Math. Uppsala 152 (1984), 77–105). Corollary 6.12 on p. 101 of this paper of Matilla can be used to this reason. This corollary yields also that instead of the two directions parallel to the axes a finite number of directions can be taken into account.

Finally it would be useful to add some fundamental reference concerning Hausdorff measures, for example the book of C. A. Rogers (Hausdorff measures, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1970).

We are publishing this paper of Jan Mařík in its original form. The result is interesting even if, as J. Mařík wrote, the result in this form was ready twenty years ago and in the meantime a lot of things happened in the field.