

ON INDECOMPOSABLE SETS WITH APPLICATIONS

ANDREW LORENT

ABSTRACT. In this note we show that the closure \bar{F} of an indecomposable set F in the plane has the property that $\|\mathbb{1}_F - \mathbb{1}_{\bar{F}}\|_{BV(\mathbb{R}^2)} = 0$. We show by example this is false in dimension three and above. As a corollary to this result we show a set of finite perimeter S can be approximated by a closed subset S with the property that $H^1(\partial^M S \setminus \partial^M S) = 0$ and $\|\mathbb{1}_S - \mathbb{1}_{\bar{S}}\|_{BV(\mathbb{R}^2)} < \epsilon$, for any choice of $\epsilon > 0$. We apply this corollary to give a short proof that locally quasiminimising sets in the plane are BV_l extension domains.

1. INTRODUCTION

Sets of finite perimeter are the largest class of sets that permit a broad theory of analysis. They have wide application in the Calculus of Variations, PDE, image processing and fracture mechanics. In some sense the theory of sets of finite perimeter is an analogue for sets of what the theory of Sobolev functions is for functions. A very useful notion for Sobolev functions is the notion of *precise representative* for a function $f \in W^{1,p}$, this is a function $\tilde{f} \in W^{1,p}$ with $\|f - \tilde{f}\|_{W^{1,p}} = 0$ and \tilde{f} has additional smoothness and regularity properties. Another very useful result is Whitney's theorem that for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a smooth function \hat{f} such that $\|\hat{f} - f\|_{W^{1,p}} < \epsilon$. We prove analogous results for sets of finite perimeter in the plane and we apply them to give a short proof that quasiminimizing sets are BV_l extension domains.

Recall a set E is said to be of *finite perimeter* in domain Ω if

$$\text{Per}(E, \Omega) := \sup \left\{ \int_E \text{div} \phi : \phi \in [C_c^1(\Omega)]^N, \|\phi\|_\infty \leq 1 \right\} < \infty.$$

A set is simply called a *set of finite perimeter* if it is of finite perimeter in \mathbb{R}^n and we define $\text{Per}(E) := \text{Per}(E, \mathbb{R}^n)$.

A set of finite perimeter is called *indecomposable* iff for any disjoint subsets $A, B \subset E$ such that $E = A \cup B$ we have $\text{Per}(E) = \text{Per}(A) + \text{Per}(B)$ then either $|A| = 0$ or $|B| = 0$.

The main theorem we will establish in this note is the following.

Theorem 1. *If $F \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is an indecomposable set then the closure \bar{F} of F has the property*

$$\|\mathbb{1}_F - \mathbb{1}_{\bar{F}}\|_{BV(\mathbb{R}^2)} = 0.$$

A straightforward corollary to this is:

Corollary 2. *Suppose $E \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is a set of finite perimeter, then for any $\epsilon > 0$ we can find a closed subset $\mathbb{E} \subset E$ with finitely many indecomposable components such that $H^1(\partial^M \mathbb{E} \setminus \partial^M E) = 0$ and*

$$\|\mathbb{1}_E - \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{E}}\|_{BV(\mathbb{R}^2)} < \epsilon. \tag{1}$$

We will show by example that Theorem 1 is false for indecomposable sets of finite perimeter in \mathbb{R}^n for $n \geq 3$. Our example also shows that Theorem 7 of [Am-Lu-Ca 01] for saturated indecomposable sets in the plane does not hold true in dimension three and above. It is unclear to us if Corollary 2 is true in dimension three and above.

Theorem 3. *There exists a set of finite perimeter $S \subset Q = (-1, 1) \times (-1, 1) \times (-1, 1)$ with the following properties*

- (i) S is connected and S^c is connected. Hence S is an indecomposable saturated set.
- (ii) $|\tilde{S} \setminus S| > \frac{3999}{4000}$.
- (iii) $H^2(\partial^M S \setminus \phi(S^2)) > 0$ for any Lipschitz map $\phi : S^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$.

Our main application of Theorem 1 will be to show that local quasiminimisers in the plane are BV_1 extension domains. This is already known as a consequence of the work of David-Semmes, [Da-Se 98] however our proof is much shorter. Specifically we say a set E of finite perimeter is a K -quasiminimal set in Ω iff for all open $U \subset\subset \Omega$ and all Borel sets $F, G \subset U$ we have $\text{Per}(E, U) \leq K \text{Per}((E \cup F) \setminus G, U)$. And we say a set E of finite perimeter is locally K -quasiminimising if there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for any $x \in \partial E$ the set E is a K -quasiminimal in $B_\delta(x)$. In the case where E is bounded δ can be chosen depending on x .

Finally a set E of finite perimeter is a BV_1 extension domain if and only if there are constants $c \geq 1$ and $\delta > 0$ such that whenever $u \in BV(E)$ is such that the diameter of the support of u is smaller than δ , then there is a function $Tu \in BV$ such that $\|DTu\| \leq c\|Du\|(E)$ and $Tu = u$ on E .

Corollary 4. *If $E \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is a locally K -quasiminimising set then it is a BV_1 extension domain.*

Note also that if Corollary 2 were true in dimension three and above then the proof of Corollary 4 would work in these dimensions too. A generalization of Corollary 2 to higher dimensions could potentially be a useful technical tool in the study of sets of finite perimeter.

In addition we will obtain the following corollary which is also an easy corollary to Theorem 7 [Am-Lu-Ca 01]. Firstly some definitions, Ambrosio et al. [Am-Lu-Ca 01] (Definition 2) define a *hole* of a set of finite perimeter S to be an indecomposable component of S^c with finite measure. A set S is called *saturated* (again see Definition 2, [Am-Lu-Ca 01]) if it is the union of itself and all its holes.

Corollary 5 (To Theorem 1). *Suppose $S \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is a indecomposable saturated set then there exists an open set S such that $\|\mathbf{1}_S - \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{S}}\|_{BV(\mathbb{R}^2)} = 0$.*

Acknowledgements. I would thank N. Shanmugalingam; the application to quasiminimizing sets was worked out through discussions with her. In addition I thank R.L. Jerrard who essentially provide me with the example constructed in Theorem 3.

2. SKETCH OF PROOF OF MAIN THEOREM

The proof of the Theorem 1 follows from three basic steps. Each follows from the last in a fairly natural way. We will firstly state the steps then sketch the reasons they hold afterwards.

Note given an indecomposable set E we claim we can assume without loss of generality that

$$|B_r(x) \cap E| > 0 \text{ for any } x \in E, r > 0. \quad (2)$$

If this were not true we could just remove the points of E for which it is false and the set we are left with, call it \tilde{E} is such that $|E \Delta \tilde{E}| = 0$ and hence by Proposition 3.38 [Am-Fu-Pa 00], $\|\mathbf{1}_E - \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{E}}\|_{BV(\mathbb{R}^2)} = 0$. So the claim is established.

Step 1. Let $Z := \left\{ z \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{|E \cap B_r(z)|}{\pi r^2} \geq \frac{1}{2} \right\}$. We will show we can find a countable collection of balls $\{B_{r_n}(x_n) : x_n \in Z\}$ with the following properties.

- (i) $\left\{ B_{\frac{r_n}{5}}(x_n) : n \in \mathbb{N} \right\}$ are disjoint.
- (ii) $Z \subset \bigcup_n B_{r_n}(x_n)$
- (iii) $|B_{r_n}(x_n) \cap E| \geq \frac{\pi r_n^2}{4}$ for each n .
- (iv) $\Pi := \bigcup_n B_{r_n}(x_n)$ is connected.

Step 2. We will show that for H^1 a.e. $x \in \partial E \setminus Z$ there exists $r_x > 0$ such that

$$H^1(\partial E \cap B_r(x)) > \frac{r}{1600} \text{ for all } r \in (0, r_x]. \quad (3)$$

Step 3. We will show that $H^1(Z \setminus \partial E) = 0$.

Sketch of Step 1. By definition of Z for any $z \in Z$ we can find $r_z > 0$ such that $|B_r(z) \cap Z| \geq \frac{\pi r^2}{4}$ for all $r \in (0, r_z]$. So by the $5r$ Covering Theorem we can find a subcollection $\{B_{r_{z_n}}(z_n) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ such that $\{B_{\frac{r_{z_n}}{5}}(z_n) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ are pairwise disjoint and $Z \subset \bigcup_n B_{r_{z_n}}(z_n)$. The only remaining issue is to show that $\Pi := \bigcup_n B_{r_{z_n}}(z_n)$ is connected. Suppose it is not, so there are two non-empty disjoint connect components of Π_1 and Π_2 such that $\Pi = \Pi_1 \cup \Pi_2$. Letting $Q_0 = E \cap \Pi_0$ and $Q_1 = E \cap \Pi_1$ it is possible to show that $H^1(\partial^M Q_0 \cap \partial^M Q_1) = 0$ and this implies E is not an indecomposable set, contradiction. Thus Π is connected.

Sketch of Step 2. Now we can assume without loss of generality that $x \in E^0$. So we can find $p_x > 0$ such that $|E \cap B_r(x)| < \frac{r^2}{10000}$ for all $r \in (0, p_x)$. Note also by (3) for any $x \in \partial E$ we have that $|E \cap B_{\frac{r}{1000}}(x)| > 0$ for any $r > 0$. So let $r \in (0, p_x)$, by Step 1 we have a countable collection of balls $\{B_{r_n}(x_n) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ that satisfy (i), (ii), (iii), (iv). A subcollection of these balls $\{B_{r_{p_k}}(x_{p_k}) : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is such that $B_{r_{p_k}}(x_{p_k}) \cap B_r(x) \neq \emptyset$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $E \cap B_r(x) \subset \bigcup_k B_{r_{p_k}}(x_{p_k})$ and $\tilde{\Pi} := \bigcup_k B_{r_{p_k}}(x_{p_k})$ is a connected set. So $\tilde{\Pi}$ is a ‘tentacle’ of balls that reaches from the outside of $B_r(x)$ to $B_{\frac{r}{1000}}(x)$. And note that any ball $B_{r_{p_k}}(x_{p_k})$ has at least a quarter of its area is filled by E . On the otherhand most of $B_r(x)$ is empty of E . So assume for the moment for simplicity that the tentacle reaches into $B_{\frac{r}{1000}}(x)$ in something like a line, pick a direction v that is roughly orthogonal to the line. Now there must be a large set of lines in direction v running through $B_r(x)$ that start at some point in $E \cap B_r(x)$ and end in some point in $E^c \cap B_r(x)$. The variation of $\mathbb{1}_E$ restricted to any of these lines is at least 1, so integrating across these lines gives (3). Note the reason our proof works in \mathbb{R}^2 and does not work in higher dimension¹ is that a ‘tentacle’ in higher dimension has arbitrarily small surface area, where as in two dimension the surface area of a tentacle is $O(1)$.

Sketch of Step 3. Suppose $H^1(\partial E \setminus Z) > 0$. Assume for simplicity $H^1(\partial E \setminus Z) < \infty$. Let $\mu(A) := H^1(\partial^M E \cup (\partial E \setminus Z))$. We can find an open set U with $\partial^M E \subset U$ and a compact set $C \subset \partial^M E$ such that $\mu(U) \leq \mu(\partial^M E) + \epsilon$ and $\mu(C) \geq \mu(\partial^M E) - \epsilon$. We can assume ϵ is sufficiently small so that $\mu(\partial E \setminus U) > \frac{H^1(\partial E \setminus Z)}{2}$.

Now since $\delta = \text{dist}(\partial U, C) > 0$ we can find a countable collection of pairwise disjoint balls $\{B_{r_n}(x_n) : x_n \in \partial E \setminus U, r_n < \delta\}$ such that $\sum_n r_n \geq c_0 \mu(\partial E \setminus U)$ some constant $c_0 > 0$. By Step 2 we have that $\sum_n H^1(\partial^M E \cap B_{r_n}(x_n)) \geq \frac{c_0}{1600} \mu(\partial E \setminus U)$. Since $B_{r_n}(x_n) \cap C = \emptyset$ for all n we have

$$\sum_n H^1(\partial^M E \cap B_{r_n}(x_n)) + H^1(C) \geq \frac{c_0}{1600} \mu(\partial E \setminus U) + H^1(\partial^M E) - \epsilon$$

which is contradiction for small enough ϵ .

3. SKETCH OF PROOF OF THE APPLICATION TO QUASIMINISING SETS

As stated the main application of Theorem 1 is Corollary 4. So to establish this we will use the criteria for BV_I extension domains found in [Ba-Mo 08], [Bu-Ma 69]. Namely E is a BV_I

¹And recall indeed by the example constructed in Theorem 3 shows the result is false in higher dimension.

extension domain if for every set of finite perimeter $F \subset E$ with $\text{diam}(F) < \delta$ we can find \hat{F} with $F \subset \hat{F}$ and $\text{Per}(\hat{F}, \mathbb{R}^2) \leq C\text{Per}(F, E)$. We will take \hat{F} to be equal to F and it will suffice to show that

$$\text{Per}(\hat{F}, \mathbb{R}^2) \leq (1 + K)\text{Per}(F, E) \quad (4)$$

for any set of finite perimeter $F \subset E$ with $\text{diam}(F) < \delta$. We will achieve this by finding an open set Ω with $F \subset\subset \Omega$ and

$$H^1(\partial^M E \cap \Omega) \leq H^1(\partial^M E \cap \partial^M F) + \delta. \quad (5)$$

Then by the fact that E is a local F -quasiminimiser $\text{Per}(E, \Omega) \leq K\text{Per}(E \setminus F, \Omega)$. Now

$$\begin{aligned} H^1(\partial^M E \cap \partial^M F) &\leq H^1(\partial^M E \cap \Omega) \\ &= \text{Per}(E, \Omega) \\ &\leq K\text{Per}(E \setminus F, \Omega) \\ &= K \left(H^1(\partial^M F \cap E) + H^1 \left((\partial^M E \setminus \partial^M F) \cap \Omega \right) \right) \\ &\stackrel{(5)}{\leq} K\text{Per}(F, E) + K\delta. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

As this holds for arbitrary $\delta > 0$ we have inequality (4). Note this inequality can not work unless we can show (5) and hence establish $H^1((\partial^M E \setminus \partial^M F) \cap \Omega) < \delta$. Now for arbitrary sets of finite perimeter $F \subset E$ it is not true we can find Ω such that $F \subset\subset \Omega$ and (5) holds true. For a counter example let $E = B_1(0)$ and pick $z_0 \in \partial E$, let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and let ζ_k be the set of points with rational coordinates in $E \cap B_{\alpha 2^{-(1000+n)}}(\zeta_n) \cap E$ is a set of finite perimeter for which (5) is false for any open set Ω with $F \subset\subset \Omega$.

However we will be able to carry out this argument by replacing F by the set \mathbb{F} afforded to us by Corollary 2. The set \mathbb{F} has almost the same characteristics of F and we can find an open set Ω with $\mathbb{F} \subset\subset \Omega$ such that $H^1(\partial^M E \cap \Omega) \leq H^1(\partial^M E \cap \partial^M \mathbb{F}) + \delta$. So we can carry out the chain of inequalities to establish (6). Having established (6) for \mathbb{F} the same inequality follows for F with arbitrarily small error by (1). See Lemma 10 and Section 6.2 for full details.

4. PRELIMINARIES

As in Definition 3.60 [Am-Fu-Pa 00] we every $t \in [0, 1]$ we let E^t denote the set of points of t density, i.e.

$$E^t := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{|E \cap B_r(x)|}{\Gamma(n)r^n} = t \right\} \quad (7)$$

where $\Gamma(n) = |B_1(0)|$.

It is a fundamental result of Federer (see Theorem 3.61 [Am-Fu-Pa 00]) that if E is a set of finite perimeter in Ω , $H^{n-1} \left(\Omega \setminus \left(E^0 \cup E^{\frac{1}{2}} \cup E^1 \right) \right) = 0$.

The measure theoretic boundary is defined by

$$\partial^M E := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{|E \cap B_r(x)|}{|B_r(x)|} > 0 \text{ and } \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{|E^c \cap B_r(x)|}{|B_r(x)|} > 0 \right\}.$$

It is well known that $H^{n-1}(\partial^M E \setminus E^{\frac{1}{2}}) = 0$ and $|D\mathbb{1}_E| = H_{\partial^M E}^{n-1}$, see Theorem 3.59, Theorem 3.61 [Am-Fu-Pa 00].

5. PRELIMINARY LEMMAS

Lemma 6. *Suppose $E \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is BV indecomposable. Then we can find a countable collection*

$$\{B_{r_n}(x_n) : x_n \in E\}$$

such that

$$\left(\bigcup_n B_{r_n}(x_n) \right) \text{ is connected,} \quad (8)$$

$$|B_r(x_n) \cap E| > \frac{\pi r^2}{4} \text{ for all } r \in (0, r_n], n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (9)$$

As a consequence for H^1 a.e. $x \in \partial E \setminus (E^1 \cup \partial^M E)$ there exists $r_x > 0$ such that

$$H^1(\partial E \cap B_r(x)) > \frac{r}{1600} \text{ for all } r \in (0, r_x]. \quad (10)$$

Proof of Lemma 6. Let $Z = E^1 \cup E^{\frac{1}{2}}$. By Theorem 3.61 [Am-Fu-Pa 00]

$$H^1(E \setminus Z) = 0. \quad (11)$$

So for any $x \in Z$ there exists $r_x > 0$ such that

$$|B_r(x) \cap E| > \frac{\pi r^2}{4} \text{ for all } r \in (0, r_x]. \quad (12)$$

Step 1. By the $5r$ Covering Theorem (see Theorem 2.11 [Ma 95]) we can find a disjoint sub-collection $\{B_{\frac{r_{x_n}}{5}}(x_n) : x_n \in Z\}$ such that $Z \subset \bigcup_n B_{\frac{r_{x_n}}{5}}(x_n) =: \Pi$. We will show Π is connected.

Proof of Step 1. We argue by contradiction. Suppose Π is disconnected. Let Π_0 be a connected non-empty component of Π and let $\Pi_1 = \Pi \setminus \Pi_0$. Now define $Q_0 = E \cap \Pi_0$ and $Q_1 = E \cap \Pi_1$. These are both the intersection of two sets of finite perimeter and hence are sets of finite perimeter.

We claim

$$H^1((E \setminus Q_0) \setminus Q_1) = 0. \quad (13)$$

So let $\omega = E \setminus Z$, note $H^1(\omega) \stackrel{(11)}{=} 0$ and $E \setminus (Q_0 \cup Q_1) = E \setminus \Pi \subset (Z \cup \omega) \setminus \Pi \subset \omega$. So inequality (13) follows. We also claim

$$Q_1 \setminus (E \setminus Q_0) = \emptyset. \quad (14)$$

Now $(Q_1 \cup Q_0) \setminus E = \Pi \cap E \setminus E = \emptyset$ so (14) is immediate. So we actually have

$$H^1(Q_1 \triangle (E \setminus Q_0)) = 0. \quad (15)$$

By Proposition 3.38 [Am-Fu-Pa 00] this is more than enough to conclude

$$\text{Per}(Q_1) = \text{Per}(E \setminus Q_0). \quad (16)$$

We will show

$$H^1\left(Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \cap Q_1^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) = 0. \quad (17)$$

Now if $x \in Q_1^{\frac{1}{2}}$ we must have

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{|E \cap \Pi_1 \cap B_r(x)|}{\pi r^2} = \frac{1}{2}$$

so

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{|E \cap B_r(x)|}{\pi r^2} \geq \frac{1}{2}. \quad (18)$$

Hence (18) together with Theorem 3.61 [Am-Fu-Pa 00] implies

$$H^1\left(Q_1^{\frac{1}{2}} \setminus Z\right) = 0$$

so

$$H^1(Q_1^{\frac{1}{2}} \setminus \Pi) = 0. \quad (19)$$

Now note that if $x \in Q_1^{\frac{1}{2}} \cap \Pi$ we can not have $x \in \Pi_2$ because Π_2 is open and so $B_\delta(x) \subset \Pi_2$ for some $\delta > 0$. By the fact $x \in Q_1^{\frac{1}{2}}$ also we must be able to find $y \in B_\delta(x) \cap Q_1$ which contradicts the fact Π_1, Π_2 are disjoint. Thus

$$Q_1^{\frac{1}{2}} \cap \Pi \subset Q_1^{\frac{1}{2}} \cap \Pi_1. \quad (20)$$

And in the same way since Π_1 is open for all small enough r we have that $B_r(x) \subset \Pi_1$. Thus if $x \in Q_1^{\frac{1}{2}} \cap \Pi_1$ by definition of $Q_1^{\frac{1}{2}}$, $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{|(E \cap \Pi_1)^c \cap B_r(x)|}{\pi r^2} = \frac{1}{2}$ we actually have

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{|E^c \cap B_r(x)|}{\pi r^2} = \frac{1}{2}$$

hence $x \in E^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Thus

$$Q_1^{\frac{1}{2}} \cap \Pi_1 \subset E^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (21)$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} & H^1(Q_1^{\frac{1}{2}} \setminus (E^{\frac{1}{2}} \cap \Pi_1)) \\ & \leq H^1(Q_1^{\frac{1}{2}} \setminus \Pi) + H^1(Q_1^{\frac{1}{2}} \cap \Pi \setminus Q_1^{\frac{1}{2}} \cap \Pi_1) + H^1(Q_1^{\frac{1}{2}} \cap \Pi_1 \setminus E^{\frac{1}{2}} \cap \Pi_1) \\ & \stackrel{(19), (20), (21)}{=} 0. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Now going in the opposite direction if $x \in E^{\frac{1}{2}} \cap \Pi_1$ again since Π_1 is open for all small enough r we have that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{|B_r(x) \cap E|}{\pi r^2} = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{|B_r(x) \cap E \cap \Pi_1|}{\pi r^2} = \frac{1}{2}$$

and

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{|B_r(x) \cap E^c|}{\pi r^2} = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{|B_r(x) \cap (E \cap \Pi_1)^c|}{\pi r^2} = \frac{1}{2}.$$

So $E^{\frac{1}{2}} \cap \Pi_1 \subset (E \cap \Pi_1)^{\frac{1}{2}} = Q_1^{\frac{1}{2}}$ hence putting this together with (22) we have established

$$H^1\left(E^{\frac{1}{2}} \cap \Pi_1 \Delta Q_1^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) = 0.$$

In exactly the same way we can show that $H^1(E^{\frac{1}{2}} \cap \Pi_2 \Delta Q_2^{\frac{1}{2}}) = 0$. Since Π_1, Π_2 are disjoint this completes the proof of (17).

Now $E = Q_0 \cup Q_1$ and $\text{Per}(Q_0) = H^1(Q_0^{\frac{1}{2}})$, $\text{Per}(Q_1) = H^1(Q_1^{\frac{1}{2}})$ and $\text{Per}(E) = \text{Per}(Q_0) + \text{Per}(Q_1) \stackrel{(16)}{=} \text{Per}(Q_0) + \text{Per}(E \setminus Q_0)$. So as $Q_0, E \setminus Q_0$ are both sets of finite perimeter this contradicts the fact E is indecomposable. This concludes the proof of Step 1.

Step 2. We will establish (10).

Proof of Step 2. Firstly by Theorem 3.61 [Am-Fu-Pa 00] we can assume $x \in E^0$. Now recall from the sketch of the proof (see property (2)), for any $y \in E$ we have $|B_r(y) \cap E| > 0$ for any

$r > 0$. Thus since $x \in \partial E$ it has the same property. Now since $x \in E^0$ we can find $p_x > 0$ such that

$$|E \cap B_r(x)| < \frac{r^2}{100000} \text{ for all } r \in (0, p_x). \quad (23)$$

However we must also have that $|E \cap B_{\frac{r}{1000}}(x)| > 0$. So by property (i) we have established in Step 1 we can find a countable collection

$$\left\{ B_{r_k}(x_k) : x_k \in E, r_k < \frac{r}{1000} \right\}$$

such that $E^1 \cup E^{\frac{1}{2}} \subset \bigcup_k B_{r_k}(x_k)$ and $(\bigcup_k B_{r_k}(x_k))$ is connected. Now pick a point $x_0 \in E^1 \cap B_{\frac{r}{1000}}(x)$ and a point $y_0 \in E^1 \setminus B_r(x)$. Since $\bigcup_k B_{r_k}(x_k)$ is open and connected it is path connected and so we must be able to find a path $\phi : [0, t] \rightarrow \bigcup_k B_{r_k}(x_k)$ with $\phi(0) = x_0$, $\phi(t) = y_0$. Let $s \in (0, t)$ be the smallest number such that $\phi(s) \in \partial B_{\frac{r}{4}}(x)$, by compactness clearly this number exists. So

$$\{\phi(w) : 0 \leq w \leq s\} \subset B_{\frac{r}{4}}(x). \quad (24)$$

Let $v = \frac{\phi(s) - x_0}{|\phi(s) - x_0|}$. Note that for every k

$$H^1 \left(P_{\langle v \rangle} (B_r(x_k) \cap E) \right) \geq \frac{r}{16} \text{ for all } r \in (0, r_k] \quad (25)$$

since if this was not true we would have that $|B_r(x_k) \cap E| \leq \frac{r^2}{8}$ which contradicts (9).

We know $\phi([0, t]) \subset \bigcup_k B_{r_k}(x_k)$, let $\{B_{r_{p_k}}(x_{p_k}) : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be a subcollection defined by

$$\{\phi(w) : 0 \leq w \leq s\} \cap B_{r_{p_k}}(x_{p_k}) \neq \emptyset \text{ for any } k. \quad (26)$$

So

$$\{\phi(w) : 0 \leq w \leq s\} \subset \bigcup_k B_{r_{p_k}}(x_{p_k}). \quad (27)$$

And

$$\bigcup_k B_{r_{p_k}}(x_{p_k}) \stackrel{(26),(24)}{\subset} B_{\frac{r}{3}}(x). \quad (28)$$

Now since

$$P_{\langle v \rangle} (\{\phi(w) : w \in [0, s]\}) \stackrel{(27)}{\subset} \bigcup_k P_{\langle v \rangle} (B_{r_{p_k}}(x_{p_k})) \quad (29)$$

by the 5r Covering Theorem (see Theorem 2.11 [Ma 95]) we can find a subcollection

$$\{B_{r_{q_k}}(x_{q_k}) : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$$

such that

$$\{P_{\langle v \rangle} (B_{r_{p_k}}(x_{p_k})) : k \in \mathbb{N}\} \subset \{P_{\langle v \rangle} (B_{r_{q_k}}(x_{q_k})) : k \in \mathbb{N}\} \quad (30)$$

and

$$\{P_{\langle v \rangle} (B_{\frac{r_{q_k}}{5}}(x_{q_k})) : k \in \mathbb{N}\} \text{ are disjoint.} \quad (31)$$

Now as $H^1\left(P_{\langle v \rangle}(\{\phi(w) : w \in [0, s]\})\right) \geq \frac{r}{5}$ so putting this together with (29), (31) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_k r_{q_k} &\stackrel{(31)}{=} \sum_k 2^{-1} H^1\left(P_{\langle v \rangle}(B_{r_{p_k}}(x_{p_k}))\right) \\ &\stackrel{(29)}{\geq} 2^{-1} H^1\left(P_{\langle v \rangle}(\{\phi(w) : w \in [0, s]\})\right) \\ &\geq \frac{r}{10}. \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

So let $\mathcal{O} := \bigcup_k B_{\frac{r_{q_k}}{5}}(x_{q_k}) \cap E$. By (25), (31) and (32) we have

$$\begin{aligned} H^1\left(P_{\langle v \rangle}(\mathcal{O})\right) &\stackrel{(31)}{=} \sum_k H^1\left(P_{\langle v \rangle}\left(B_{\frac{r_{q_k}}{5}}(x_{q_k}) \cap E\right)\right) \\ &\stackrel{(25)}{\geq} \sum_k \frac{r_{q_k}}{80} \\ &\stackrel{(32)}{\geq} \frac{r}{800}. \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

Now by (28) $\mathcal{O} \subset B_{\frac{r}{3}}(x)$. We claim we can find a subset $\Pi \subset P_{\langle v \rangle}(\mathcal{O})$ with $|\Pi| \geq \frac{r}{1600}$ such that

$$H^1\left(P_{\langle v \rangle}^{-1}(\omega) \cap E^c \cap A\left(x, \frac{r}{3}, r\right)\right) > 0 \text{ for any } \omega \in \Pi. \tag{34}$$

Suppose this is not true. So there is a set $\Lambda \subset P_{\langle v \rangle}(\mathcal{O})$ where $|\Lambda| \geq \frac{r}{1600}$ such that $H^1(P_{\langle v \rangle}^{-1}(\omega) \cap E^c \cap A(0, \frac{r}{3}, r)) = 0$ for all $\omega \in \Lambda$. Let $\Xi = \bigcup_{\omega \in \Lambda} P_{\langle v \rangle}^{-1}(\omega) \cap E \cap A(0, \frac{r}{3}, r)$ and by Fubini $|\Xi| \geq |\Lambda| \frac{2r}{3} \geq \frac{r^2}{2400}$ and $|\Xi \cap E^c| = 0$ and this contradicts (23). We have established (34).

Now by Theorem 3.103 [Am-Fu-Pa 00] we know that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{r}{1600} &\leq \int_{w \in \Pi} V\left(\mathbb{1}_{E, P_{\langle v \rangle}^{-1}(w) \cap B_r(x)}\right) dw \\ &\leq V(\mathbb{1}_E, B_r(x)) \\ &= H^1(\partial^M E, B_r(x)). \end{aligned}$$

So this establishes (10). \square

Proof of Theorem 1. Firstly as before, without loss of generality we can assume that for any $x \in F$, $|F \cap B_\delta(x)| > 0$ for all $\delta > 0$.

Step 1. We will show $H^1(\bar{F} \setminus (\partial^M F \cup F_I)) = 0$.

Proof of Step 1. Suppose

$$H^1(\bar{F} \setminus (\partial^M F \cup F_I)) > 0. \tag{35}$$

Let $Z = \bar{F} \setminus (\partial^M F \cup F_I)$. Note that $Z \cap \text{Int}(F) = \emptyset$ because if $x \in Z \cap \text{Int}(F)$ then $x \in F_I$ which contradicts the definition of Z . So as $Z \subset \bar{F}$ we know that $Z \subset \partial F$ and thus $Z \subset \partial F \setminus \partial^M F$.

Let $\epsilon > 0$. If $H^1(Z) = \infty$ pick $B \subset Z$ with $H^1(B) = 1$ and define $S = B \cup \partial^M F$ otherwise define $S = (\bar{F} \setminus F_I) \cup \partial^M F$. Let $\mu(A) := H^1(A \cap S)$. Note

$$\mu(\partial F \setminus \partial^M F) \geq \min\left\{H^1(\bar{F} \setminus (F_I \cup \partial^M F)), H^1(B)\right\} = \beta > 0. \tag{36}$$

Measure μ is Radon so we can find an open set U such that $\partial^M F \subset U$ such that

$$\mu(U) < \mu(\partial^M F) + \epsilon \tag{37}$$

and we can find a compact set $C \subset \partial^M F$ such that

$$\mu(C) > \mu(\partial^M F) - \epsilon. \quad (38)$$

And so

$$\text{dist}(C, \partial U) = \delta > 0. \quad (39)$$

We can take $\omega > 0$ and a subset $\Gamma_0 \subset \partial F \setminus U$ with

$$H^1((\partial F \setminus U) \setminus \Gamma_0) < \epsilon \quad (40)$$

and for any $r \in (0, \omega), x \in \Gamma_0$ we have that $\mu(B_r(x)) = H^1(B_r(x) \cap S) \leq 2r$. By Lemma 6 we can find $\sigma > 0, \Gamma_1 \subset \Gamma_0$ such that

$$H^1(\partial^M F \cap B_r(x)) > \frac{r}{1600} \text{ for all } x \in \Gamma_1, r \in (0, \sigma). \quad (41)$$

And

$$H^1(\Gamma_0 \setminus \Gamma_1) < \epsilon. \quad (42)$$

Now by Vitali covering theorem (see Theorem 2.8 [Ma 95]) we can find a pairwise disjoint collection

$$\{B_{r_k}(x_k) : x_k \in \Gamma_1\}$$

such that

$$\mu(\Gamma_1 \setminus (\bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} B_{r_k}(x_k))) = 0 \quad (43)$$

and

$$\sup \{r_k : k \in \mathbb{N}\} < \min \left\{ \frac{\delta}{2}, \omega, \sigma \right\}. \quad (44)$$

Note

$$\begin{aligned} \beta &\leq \mu(\partial F \setminus \partial^M F) \\ &= \mu(\partial F \setminus U) + \mu(\partial F \cap U \setminus \partial^M F) \\ &\leq \mu(\partial F \setminus U) + \mu(U \setminus \partial^M F) \\ &\stackrel{(37)}{\leq} \mu(\partial F \setminus U) + \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

So $\mu(\partial F \setminus U) > \beta - \epsilon$. Now

$$\sum_k \mu(B_{r_k}(x_k)) \stackrel{(43),(42),(40)}{\geq} \mu(\partial F \setminus U) - 2\epsilon \stackrel{(37)}{\geq} \mu(\partial F \setminus \partial^M F) - 3\epsilon. \quad (45)$$

By (41) and the fact $x_k \in \Gamma_1, r_k < \sigma$ we have

$$1600H^1(\partial^M F \cap B_{r_k}(x_k)) \geq r_k \text{ for all } k.$$

Since we choose $r_k < \omega$ and $x_k \in \Gamma_1 \subset \Gamma_0$ be definition of $\Gamma_0, \mu(B_{r_k}(x_k)) \leq 2r_k$ so

$$\mu(B_{r_k}(x_k)) \leq 3200H^1(\partial^M F \cap B_{r_k}(x_k)) \quad (46)$$

thus putting this together with (45) we have

$$\sum_k 3200H^1(\partial^M F \cap B_{r_k}(x_k)) \geq \mu(\partial F \setminus \partial^M F) - 3\epsilon \stackrel{(36)}{\geq} \frac{\beta}{2}. \quad (47)$$

Now since $x_k \in \Gamma_1 \subset \partial F \setminus U$ by (39) and (44) we know that $C \cap B_{r_k}(x_k) = \emptyset$ for any k , so

$$\begin{aligned} H^1(\partial^M F) &\geq H^1(C) + \sum_k H^1(B_{r_k}(x_k) \cap \partial^M F) \\ &\stackrel{(47),(38)}{\geq} H^1(\partial^M F) + \frac{\beta}{6400} - \epsilon \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

which is a contradiction assuming k is small enough.

Step 2. We will show that \bar{F} is a set of finite perimeter and $D\mathbb{1}_{\bar{F}} = D\mathbb{1}_F$.

Proof of Step 2. By Step 1 $|\bar{F} \setminus \partial^M F \cup F_I| = |\bar{F} \setminus F| = 0$. So by Proposition 3.38 [Am-Fu-Pa 00] we have $\text{Per}(\bar{F}) = \text{Per}(F)$ and hence \bar{F} is a set of finite perimeter and $D\mathbb{1}_{\bar{F}} = D\mathbb{1}_F$. \square

6. THE APPLICATIONS

6.1. Quasiminimising sets. The following lemmas hold true in \mathbb{R}^n without additional complexity, so we state them in \mathbb{R}^n .

Lemma 7. *Given as set of finite perimeter S , suppose $H^{n-1}(A) = 0$ then $\text{Per}(S, A) = 0$.*

Proof Lemma 7. By Theorem 1.9 (2), Corollary 1.11 [Ma 95] measure μ defined by

$$\mu(H) := H^{n-1}(\partial^M S \cap H)$$

is a Radon measure.

Suppose set A has the property $H^{n-1}(A) = 0$. Then $\mu(A) = 0$, so

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \inf \{ \mu(V) : A \subset V, V \text{ is open} \} \\ &= \inf \{ \text{Per}(S, V) : A \subset V, V \text{ is open} \} \\ &= \text{Per}(S, A). \end{aligned}$$

Using the fact $A \rightarrow \text{Per}(S, A)$ is also Radon measure, see Proposition 3.38(a), Proposition 1.43 [Am-Fu-Pa 00].

Lemma 8. *Let E, F be a sets of finite perimeter in \mathbb{R}^n , $F \subset E$. Then*

$$\text{Per}(F, \partial^M E) = H^{n-1}(\partial^M F \cap \partial^M E). \quad (49)$$

and

$$\text{Per}(E, \partial^M F) \geq H^{n-1}(\partial^M F \cap \partial^M E). \quad (50)$$

Hence

$$\text{Per}(F, \partial^M E) \leq \text{Per}(E, \partial^M F). \quad (51)$$

Proof of Lemma 8. Note that the measure $\nu(A) := H^{n-1}(\partial^M F \cap A)$ is a Radon measure. Letting $\sigma > 0$ be some small number. Pick open Ω with

$$\partial^M E \cap \partial^M F \subset \Omega \quad (52)$$

such that

$$\nu(\Omega) = H^{n-1}(\partial^M F \cap \Omega) < H^{n-1}(\partial^M E \cap \partial^M F) + \sigma = \nu(\partial^M E) + \sigma. \quad (53)$$

Step 1. We will establish (49).

Proof of Step 1. Define

$$B := \left\{ x \in (\partial^M F)^c : \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{H^{n-1}(\partial^M F \cap B_r(x))}{r^{n-1}} > 0 \right\} \quad (54)$$

and

$$D := \left\{ x \in \partial^M E : \liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} H^{n-1}(\partial^M E \cap B_r(x)) / r^{n-1} < 1 \right\}.$$

By Theorem 6.2 [Ma 95] we have that $H^{n-1}(B) = 0$ and since $\partial^M E$ is rectifiable by Theorem 16.2 [Ma 95] $H^{n-1}(D) = 0$.

So using Lemma 7 for the last equality

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Per}(F, \partial^M E) &= \text{Per}(F, \partial^M E \cap \partial^M F) + \text{Per}(F, \partial^M E \setminus \partial^M F) \\ &= \text{Per}(F, \partial^M E \cap \partial^M F) + \text{Per}(F, \partial^M E \setminus (\partial^M F \cup B \cup D)). \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

Note $H^{n-1}(\partial^M E) < C$. Let $\epsilon > 0$. We can find a decreasing sequence of number $\delta_m \rightarrow 0$ such that the sets

$$\mathcal{U}_m := \left\{ x \in \partial^M E \setminus (\partial^M F \cup B \cup D) : \begin{array}{l} \frac{H^{n-1}(\partial^M F \cap B_r(x))}{r^{n-1}} < \epsilon \\ \text{and } \frac{H^{n-1}(\partial^M E \cap B_r(x))}{r^{n-1}} \geq \frac{1}{2} \text{ for all } r \in (0, \delta_m) \end{array} \right\} \quad (56)$$

have the property that $\partial^M E \setminus (\partial^M F \cup B \cup D) \subset \bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{U}_m$.

Let $U_1 = \mathcal{U}_1 \setminus (\bigcup_{i=2}^{\infty} \mathcal{U}_i)$, $U_2 = \mathcal{U}_2 \setminus (\bigcup_{i=3}^{\infty} \mathcal{U}_i)$, ... $U_k = \mathcal{U}_k \setminus (\bigcup_{i=k+1}^{\infty} \mathcal{U}_i)$. Now U_l, U_k are disjoint for any l, k and

$$\partial^M E \setminus (\partial^M F \cup B \cup D) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} U_i = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{U}_i. \quad (57)$$

Since $\{U_1, U_2, \dots\}$ are pairwise disjoint

$$\sum_m H^{n-1}(U_m) \stackrel{(57)}{<} H^{n-1}(\partial^M E \setminus \partial^M F). \quad (58)$$

Pick m . Since by Section 5.1 [Ma 95] we have $S^1(U_m) \leq 2H^1(U_m)$ where S^1 denotes Spherical Hausdorff measure. So we can find a collection $\{B_{r_k}(z_k) : r_k < \delta_m\}$ such that $U_m \subset \bigcup_k B_{r_k}(z_k)$ and $\sum_k \Gamma(n-1) \left(\frac{r_k}{2}\right)^{n-1} \leq 2S^1(U_m)$. Now for each k we can pick $x_k \in B_{r_k}(z_k) \cap U_m$ and then we have a collection of balls

$$\{B_{r_k}(x_k) : x_k \in U_m, r_k < \delta_m\} \quad (59)$$

such that

$$U_m \subset \bigcup_k B_{r_k}(x_k) =: V_m \quad (60)$$

and

$$\sum_k r_k^{n-1} \leq cS^1(U_m) \leq cH^1(U_m). \quad (61)$$

Hence using the fact that $x_k \in U_m \subset \mathcal{U}_m$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} H^{n-1}(V_m \cap \partial^M F) &\stackrel{(60)}{\leq} \sum_k H^{n-1}(\partial^M F \cap B_{r_k}(x_k)) \\ &\stackrel{(59), (56)}{\leq} c \sum_k \epsilon r_k^{n-1} \\ &\stackrel{(61)}{\leq} c\epsilon H^{n-1}(U_m). \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Per}(F, \partial^M E \setminus (\partial^M F \cup B \cup D)) &\stackrel{(57),(60)}{\leq} \text{Per}\left(F, \bigcup_m V_m\right) \\
&\leq \sum_m H^{n-1}(V_m \cap \partial^M F) \\
&\stackrel{(62)}{\leq} \sum_m c\epsilon H^{n-1}(U_m) \\
&\stackrel{(58)}{\leq} c\epsilon H^{n-1}(\partial^M E \setminus \partial^M F). \tag{63}
\end{aligned}$$

Taking the limit as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ we have $\text{Per}(F, \partial^M E \setminus (\partial^M F \cup B \cup D)) = 0$. So putting this together (55) we have

$$\text{Per}(F, \partial^M E) = \text{Per}(F, \partial^M E \cap \partial^M F). \tag{64}$$

And

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Per}(F, \partial^M E \cap \partial^M F) &\stackrel{(52)}{\leq} \text{Per}(F, \Omega) \\
&\leq H^{n-1}(\partial^M F \cap \Omega) \\
&\stackrel{(53)}{\leq} H^{n-1}(\partial^M F \cap \partial^M E) + \sigma. \tag{65}
\end{aligned}$$

Now as σ is arbitrary, from (65) and (64), $\text{Per}(F, \partial^M E) \leq H^{n-1}(\partial^M F \cap \partial^M E)$. Conversely for any open set Ω with $\partial^M E \subset \Omega$ we have $\text{Per}(F, \Omega) \geq H^{n-1}(\partial^M F \cap \partial^M E)$. Thus by taking the infimum over all such open sets we have $\text{Per}(F, \partial^M E) \geq H^{n-1}(\partial^M F \cap \partial^M E)$ and this completes the proof of Step 1.

Step 2. We will establish (50).

Proof of Step 2. First note that $\partial^M E \cap \partial^M F$ is an $(n-1)$ rectifiable set. Let $\delta > 0$, for H^{n-1} a.e. $x \in \partial^M E \cap \partial^M F$ there exists $r_x > 0$ such that

$$\left| H^{n-1}(\partial^M F \cap \partial^M E \cap B_h(x)) - n\Gamma(n)h^{n-1} \right| < \delta h^{n-1} \text{ for any } h \in (0, r_x). \tag{66}$$

Let $\alpha > 0$. Defining $\Gamma_0 := \{x \in \partial^M F \cap \partial^M E : \alpha < r_x\}$ for all small enough $\alpha > 0$ we have that

$$H^{n-1}(\partial^M F \cap \partial^M E \setminus \Gamma_0) < \delta. \tag{67}$$

Since $A \rightarrow \text{Per}(E, A)$ is a Radon measure we can extract a compact subset $\Gamma_1 \subset \Gamma_0$ such that

$$\text{Per}(E, \Gamma_1) + \delta > \text{Per}(E, \Gamma_0).$$

And we can find a compact subset $\Gamma_2 \subset \Gamma_0$ such that $H^{n-1}(\Gamma_2) + \delta > H^{n-1}(\Gamma_0)$. Let $\Gamma_3 = \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2$. So Γ_3 is compact and has the properties

$$\text{Per}(E, \Gamma_3) + \delta > \text{Per}(E, \Gamma_0) \text{ and } H^{n-1}(\Gamma_3) + \delta > H^{n-1}(\Gamma_0). \tag{68}$$

And

$$\Gamma_3 \subset \Gamma_0 \subset \partial^M F \cap \partial^M E. \tag{69}$$

Again since we are dealing with a Radon measure we can find an open set U with $\Gamma_3 \subset U$ and

$$\text{Per}(E, U) < \text{Per}(E, \Gamma_3) + \delta. \tag{70}$$

Now $\text{dist}(\Gamma_3, U^c) =: \beta > 0$ by Vitali covering theorem we can find a collection of pairwise disjoint balls $\{B_{r_k}(x_k) : x_k \in \Gamma_3, k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ where

$$\sup \{r_k : k \in \mathbb{N}\} < \min \{\beta, \alpha\}$$

and

$$H^{n-1}(\Gamma_3 \setminus (\bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} B_{r_k}(x_k))) = 0. \quad (71)$$

Now since $\bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} B_{r_k}(x_k) \subset U$ we know

$$\text{Per} \left(E, \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} B_{r_k}(x_k) \right) \leq \text{Per}(E, U) \stackrel{(70)}{<} \text{Per}(E, \Gamma_3) + \delta. \quad (72)$$

But as $\Gamma_3 \subset \Gamma_0$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Per} \left(E, \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} B_{r_k}(x_k) \right) &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \text{Per}(E, B_{r_k}(x_k)) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} H^{n-1}(\partial^M E \cap B_{r_k}(x_k)) \\ &\stackrel{(66)}{\geq} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (n\Gamma(n) - \delta)r_k^{n-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (73)$$

Now recall $\Gamma_3 \subset \Gamma_0 \subset \partial^M E \cap \partial^M F$ so

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} n\Gamma(n)(1 + \delta)r_k^{n-1} &\stackrel{(66)}{\geq} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} H^{n-1}(\partial^M E \cap \partial^M F \cap B_{r_k}(x_k)) \\ &\stackrel{(69)}{\geq} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} H^{n-1}(\Gamma_3 \cap B_{r_k}(x_k)) \\ &\stackrel{(71)}{=} H^{n-1}(\Gamma_3) \\ &\stackrel{(68)}{\geq} H^{n-1}(\Gamma_0) - \delta \\ &\stackrel{(67)}{\geq} H^{n-1}(\partial^M E \cap \partial^M F) - 2\delta. \end{aligned} \quad (74)$$

Now putting (72), (73), (74) together we have

$$\text{Per}(E, \Gamma_3) \geq H^{n-1}(\partial^M E \cap \partial^M F) - 3\delta - c \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \delta r_k^{n-1}. \quad (75)$$

Now since the collection of balls $\{B_{r_k}(x_k) : x_k \in \Gamma_3, k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ are pairwise disjoint and $x_k \in \Gamma_3$ we know by (66) we know $\text{Per}(E, B_{r_k}(x_k)) \geq \frac{n\Gamma(n)r_k^{n-1}}{2}$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{n\Gamma(n)}{2} \sum_k r_k^{n-1} &\leq \sum_k \text{Per}(E, B_{r_k}(x_k)) \\ &\leq \text{Per}(E, \mathbb{R}^n). \end{aligned}$$

So

$$\sum_k r_k^{n-1} \leq c \text{Per}(E, \mathbb{R}^n). \quad (76)$$

Now putting (75) and (76) together we have

$$\text{Per}(E, \Gamma_3) \geq H^{n-1}(\partial^M E \cap \partial^M F) - 3\delta - c\delta \text{Per}(E, \mathbb{R}^n). \quad (77)$$

Since $\text{Per}(E, \partial^M F) \geq \text{Per}(E, \Gamma_3)$ and δ is arbitrarily small this establishes (50).

Proof of Lemma completed. By applying Step 1 and Step 2 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Per}(E, \partial^M F) &\stackrel{(50)}{\geq} H^{n-1}(\partial^M E \cap \partial^M F) \\ &\stackrel{(49)}{=} \text{Per}(F, \partial^M E) \quad \square \end{aligned} \tag{78}$$

Lemma 9. *We will show that if $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is an open set of finite perimeter and $\mathbb{F} \subset E$ is a relatively closed set of finite perimeter, then*

$$\partial^M(E \setminus \mathbb{F}) = (\partial^M \mathbb{F} \cap E) \cup (\partial^M E \setminus \partial^M \mathbb{F}). \tag{79}$$

Proof. The lemma above holds true for an arbitrary sets of finite perimeter E and $\mathbb{F} \subset E$, we will only need it for open set E and relatively closed set \mathbb{F} and as the proof is easier in this case we argue only this result.

Let

$$\Gamma_1 = \partial^M(E \setminus \mathbb{F}) \cap \mathbb{F} \text{ and } \Gamma_2 = \partial^M(E \setminus \mathbb{F}) \setminus \mathbb{F}. \tag{80}$$

Since \mathbb{F} is relatively closed, if $x \in \Gamma_2$ then for some small enough $\delta > 0$, $(B_\delta(x) \cap E) \cap \mathbb{F} = \emptyset$ so

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{|B_r(x) \cap (E \setminus \mathbb{F})|}{\Gamma(n)r^n} = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{|B_r(x) \cap E|}{\Gamma(n)r^n} = \frac{1}{2}$$

and thus $\Gamma_2 \subset \partial^M E$ and hence $\Gamma_2 \subset (\partial^M E \setminus \mathbb{F}) \subset \partial^M E \setminus \partial^M \mathbb{F}$. On the otherhand $\Gamma_1 \subset \mathbb{F} \subset E$ and E is open. By definition of $\partial^M(E \setminus \mathbb{F})$ for any $x \in \Gamma_1$, for all small enough r we have $|B_r(x) \cap (E \setminus \mathbb{F})| \approx \frac{\Gamma(n)r^n}{2}$ and $|B_r(x) \cap (E \setminus \mathbb{F})^c| \approx \frac{\Gamma(n)r^n}{2}$. But as E is open $B_r(x) \subset E$ for all small enough r so we must have $x \in \partial^M \mathbb{F}$. Thus $\Gamma_1 \subset \partial^M \mathbb{F} \cap E$ and hence as $\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2 = \partial^M(E \setminus \mathbb{F})$ this establishes (79). \square

Lemma 10. *Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a locally quasiminimising set and let $\mathbb{F} \subset E$ be a relatively closed subset of finite perimeter. Then*

$$\text{Per}(\mathbb{F}, \partial^M E) \leq K \text{Per}(\mathbb{F}, E). \tag{81}$$

Proof of Lemma 10. First note by Theorem 4.2 [Ki 13] we know the topological boundary ∂E is equal to the measure theoretic boundary $\partial^M E$.

Step 1. We will show there exists open set Ω with $\mathbb{F} \subset \Omega$ such that

$$H^{n-1}((\partial E \setminus \partial^M \mathbb{F}) \cap \Omega) \leq \epsilon. \tag{82}$$

Proof of Step 1. Let $\mu(A) := H^{n-1}(A \cap \partial E)$. So μ is a Radon measure on \mathbb{R}^n and hence we must be able to find open set U with $\partial E \cap \partial \mathbb{F} \subset U$ such that $\mu(U) \leq H^{n-1}(\partial E \cap \partial \mathbb{F}) + \epsilon$.

Note $\partial \mathbb{F} \cap \partial E$ is a closed set. So $\delta = \inf \{|x - y| : x \in \partial \mathbb{F} \cap \partial E, y \notin U\} > 0$. Let $\Pi = \bigcup_{x \in \partial \mathbb{F} \cap \partial E} B_\delta(x)$. Note

$$\mu(\Pi) \leq \mu(U) \leq H^{n-1}(\partial E \cap \partial^M F) + \epsilon. \tag{83}$$

Note by compactness there exists $\lambda > 0$ such that $N_\lambda(\partial E) \cap \mathbb{F} \subset \Pi$. Let $\Lambda = \bigcup_{x \in \mathbb{F} \setminus N_\lambda(\partial E)} B_{\frac{\lambda}{2}}(x)$. Note $\Lambda \cap \partial E = \emptyset$. And

$$\mathbb{F} = (\mathbb{F} \cap N_\lambda(\partial E)) \cup (\mathbb{F} \setminus N_\lambda(\partial E)) \subset \Pi \cup \Lambda.$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\Lambda \cup \Pi) &= \mu((\Lambda \cup \Pi) \cap \partial E) = \mu(\Pi \cap \partial E) \\ &\stackrel{(83)}{\leq} H^{n-1}(\partial E \cap \partial^M \mathbb{F}) + \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

So letting $\Omega = \Lambda \cup \Pi$, open set Ω satisfies (82).

Proof of Lemma completed. Note that for any open set \mathcal{O} with $E \subset \mathcal{O}$,

$$H^{n-1}(\partial^M \mathbb{F} \cap E \cap \Omega) \leq H^{n-1}(\partial^M \mathbb{F} \cap E) \leq \text{Per}(\mathbb{F}, \mathcal{O}).$$

Thus

$$\text{Per}(\mathbb{F}, E) \geq H^{n-1}(\partial^M \mathbb{F} \cap E \cap \Omega). \quad (84)$$

So using Lemma 8

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Per}(E \setminus \mathbb{F}, \Omega) &\stackrel{(79)}{=} H^1(\partial^M \mathbb{F} \cap E \cap \Omega) + H^1((\partial^M E \setminus \partial^M \mathbb{F}) \cap \Omega) \\ &\stackrel{(84), (82)}{\leq} \text{Per}(\mathbb{F}, E) + \epsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (85)$$

Now since $\mathbb{F} \subset \subset \Omega$ and E is a quasiminimiser

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Per}(E, \Omega) &\leq K \text{Per}(E \setminus \mathbb{F}, \Omega) \\ &\stackrel{(85)}{=} K(\text{Per}(\mathbb{F}, E) + \epsilon) \end{aligned} \quad (86)$$

And since \mathbb{F} is closed, $\partial^M \mathbb{F} \subset \mathbb{F}$ so

$$\text{Per}(\mathbb{F}, \partial^M E) \stackrel{(51)}{\leq} \text{Per}(E, \partial^M \mathbb{F}) \leq \text{Per}(E, \mathbb{F}), \quad (87)$$

thus

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Per}(\mathbb{F}, \partial^M E) + \text{Per}(E, \Omega \setminus \mathbb{F}) &\stackrel{(87)}{\leq} \text{Per}(E, \mathbb{F}) + \text{Per}(E, \Omega \setminus \mathbb{F}) \\ &= \text{Per}(E, \Omega) \\ &\stackrel{(86)}{\leq} K \text{Per}(\mathbb{F}, E) + K\epsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (88)$$

Since this gives

$$\text{Per}(\mathbb{F}, \partial^M E) \leq K \text{Per}(\mathbb{F}, E) + K\epsilon.$$

And as ϵ is arbitrary this establishes (81). \square

6.2. Proof of Theorem 4. As stated in Section 3 by the criteria for BV_I extension domain of [Ba-Mo 08], [Bu-Ma 69], E is a BV_I extension domain if for every set of finite perimeter $F \subset E$ with $\text{diam}(F) < \delta$ we can find \hat{F} with $F \subset \hat{F}$ with $\text{Per}(\hat{F}, \mathbb{R}^n) \leq (1 + K)\text{Per}(F, E)$. We will take $\hat{F} = F$ and we will show

$$\text{Per}(F, \mathbb{R}^2) \leq (1 + K)\text{Per}(F, E). \quad (89)$$

So start using Corollary 2 we can take closed subset $\mathbb{F} \subset F$ with $H^1(\partial^M \mathbb{F} \setminus \partial^M F) = 0$ and

$$\|\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{F}} - \mathbb{1}_F\|_{BV} < \epsilon. \quad (90)$$

Now by Lemma 10

$$\text{Per}(\mathbb{F}, \partial^M E) \leq K \text{Per}(\mathbb{F}, E). \quad (91)$$

Note since \mathbb{F} is closed, $\text{Per}(\mathbb{F}, \mathbb{F}^c) = 0$. And note since $\mathbb{F} \subset E$ we know $H^1(E^0 \cap \mathbb{F}) = 0$ and so $\text{Per}(\mathbb{F}, E^0 \cap \mathbb{F}) = 0$ by Lemma 7. So

$$\text{Per}(\mathbb{F}, E^0) = \text{Per}(\mathbb{F}, E^0 \cap \mathbb{F}^c) + \text{Per}(\mathbb{F}, E^0 \cap \mathbb{F}) = 0. \quad (92)$$

Now again by Lemma 7

$$\text{Per}(\mathbb{F}, \mathbb{R}^2) \leq \text{Per}(\mathbb{F}, E^1) + \text{Per}(\mathbb{F}, \partial^M E) + \text{Per}(\mathbb{F}, E^0) \stackrel{(91), (92)}{\leq} (1 + K)\text{Per}(\mathbb{F}, E). \quad (93)$$

Hence

$$\text{Per}(F, \mathbb{R}^2) \stackrel{(90)}{\leq} \text{Per}(\mathbb{F}, \mathbb{R}^2) + \epsilon \stackrel{(93)}{\leq} (1 + K)\text{Per}(\mathbb{F}, E) + \epsilon. \quad (94)$$

For any open set \mathcal{O} with $E \subset \mathcal{O}$ we have

$$\text{Per}(\mathbb{F}, E) \leq \text{Per}(\mathbb{F}, \mathcal{O}) = H^1(\partial^M \mathbb{F}, \mathcal{O}) \leq H^1(\partial^M F, \mathcal{O}) = \text{Per}(F, \mathcal{O}).$$

As this is true for all open sets \mathcal{O} with $E \subset \mathcal{O}$ we have $\text{Per}(\mathbb{F}, E) \leq \text{Per}(F, E)$ thus putting this into (94) we have $\text{Per}(F, \mathbb{R}^2) \leq (1 + K)\text{Per}(F, E) + \epsilon$ and this holds for all $\epsilon > 0$, so this establishes (89). \square

6.3. Saturated indecomposable sets.

Proof of Corollary 5.

Step 1. First we show that $|S| < \infty$.

Proof of Step 1. By the isoperimetric inequality (see Theorem 3.46 [Am-Fu-Pa 00]) we have that

$$\min \left\{ |S|, \left| \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus S \right| \right\} \leq (4\pi)^{-1} \left(\text{Per}(S, \mathbb{R}^2) \right)^2$$

Now if $\left| \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus S \right| \leq (4\pi)^{-1} \left(\text{Per}(S, \mathbb{R}^2) \right)^2$ then $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus S$ must have an indecomposable component with finite measure which contradicts the definition of saturated, so this can not happen.

Step 2. Let

$$a = \inf \{ \tau > 0 : |D\mathbb{1}_S| (B_\tau(0)) > 0 \} \text{ and } b = \sup \{ \omega > 0 : |D\mathbb{1}_S| (\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus B_\omega(0)) > 0 \}.$$

We will show

$$H^1(\partial^M S \cap \partial B_s) > 0 \text{ or } H^1(S \cap \partial B_s) > 0 \text{ for all } s \in (a, b). \quad (95)$$

Proof of Step 2. Suppose not, so for some $s \in (a, b)$ we have that

$$H^1(\partial^M S \cap \partial B_s) = 0 \text{ and } H^1(S \cap \partial B_s) = 0. \quad (96)$$

Now by definition of a, b we know $\text{Per}(S, B_s) > 0$ and $\text{Per}(S, \bar{B}_s^c) > 0$. Now let $A = S \cap B_s$ and $B = S \cap \bar{B}_s^c$. So A, B are both sets of finite perimeter.

Now for H^1 a.e. $x \in \partial^M A \setminus \partial^M S$, since $A \subset S$ we must have $x \in S^1$ (recall definition (7)) and so $x \in \partial B_s$. Thus

$$H^1(\partial^M A \setminus (\partial^M S \cap \bar{B}_s \cup (S \cap \partial B_s))) = 0.$$

In the same way

$$H^1(\partial^M B \setminus (\partial^M S \cap B_s^c \cup (S \cap \partial B_s))) = 0.$$

Thus by (96) we have that $H^1(\partial^M A \cap \partial^M B) = 0$ and as $|A \cap B| = 0$ by Proposition 1 [Am-Lu-Ca 01] we have $\text{Per}(A) + \text{Per}(B) = \text{Per}(S)$ which contradicts the fact that S is indecomposable.

Now suppose $b = \infty$, then letting

$$H_1 := \left\{ s > a : H^1(\partial^M S \cap \partial B_s) > 0 \right\}. \quad (97)$$

and

$$H_2 := \left\{ s > a : H^1(S \cap \partial B_s) > 0 \right\}.$$

We have two cases to consider. Either $|H_1| = \infty$ or $|H_2| = \infty$. We will deal with each in turn. Firstly we will use a standard adaption of Theorem 3.103 [Am-Fu-Pa 00] we have that for any $u \in L^1(B_R(0))$

$$V(u, B_R(0)) = \int_0^R V(u, \partial B_s(0)) ds \quad (98)$$

where

$$V(u, \partial B_s(0)) = \sup \left\{ \int_0^{2\pi s} u \left(s \cos \left(\frac{\theta}{s} \right), s \sin \left(\frac{\theta}{s} \right) \right) \phi'(\theta) d\theta : \phi \in C_0^\infty([0, 2\pi s]) \right\}. \quad (99)$$

Now suppose $|H_1| = \infty$ then

$$V(\mathbb{1}_S, \mathbb{R}^2) \stackrel{(98),(97)}{\geq} \int_{H_1} V(\mathbb{1}_S, \partial B_s(0)) ds = \infty. \quad (100)$$

Which contradicts the fact that S a set of finite perimeter. Now suppose $|H_2| = \infty$. Let $B_2 := \{s \in H_2 : H^1(\partial B_s(0) \cap S) \geq \pi s\}$ then by the Coarea formula

$$\infty > |S| \geq \int_{s \in B_2} H^1(\partial B_s(0) \cap S) ds \geq \int_{s \in B_2} \pi s ds \geq |B_2 \cap \{x : x \geq 1\}|. \quad (101)$$

Hence $|B_2| < \infty$. Now for any $t \in H_2 \setminus B_2$ we must have $V(\mathbb{1}_S, \partial B_t(0)) \geq 1$. Thus as in (100), $V(\mathbb{1}_S, \mathbb{R}^2) \geq |H_2 \setminus B_2| = \infty$ which contradicts the fact S has finite perimeter. So in either case we have a contradiction, thus $b < \infty$.

Step 3. We will show $|\overline{B_b(0)}^c \cap S| = 0$.

Proof of Step 3. Since $|D\mathbb{1}_S|(\overline{B_b(0)}^c) = 0$ either $|\overline{B_b(0)}^c \cap S| = 0$ or $|\overline{B_b(0)}^c \cap S^c| = 0$ in the latter case S^c has an indecomposable component of finite measure which contradicts the fact that S is stratified.

Step 4. We will show S^c has only one indecomposable component.

Proof of Step 4. Let U_1, U_2, \dots be the indecomposable components of S^c . Since S is saturated, $|U_k| = \infty$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus $|U_k \cap B_b^c| > 0$ for all k . Since $H^1(\partial^M U_k \cap B_b^c) = 0$, thus $|D\mathbb{1}_{U_k}|(B_b^c) = 0$ so either $\mathbb{1}_{U_k} \equiv 1$ on B_b^c or $\mathbb{1}_{U_k} \equiv 0$ on B_b^c . As $|U_k \cap B_b^c| > 0$ the former is true and so $|B_b^c \setminus U_k| = 0$. Thus for every k, l we have $|U_k \cap U_l| > 0$ which is a contradiction. So there is only one indecomposable component.

Proof of Corollary completed. By Theorem 1, S^c can be represented by an indecomposable component $\tilde{\Pi}$ which is closed. So $S := (\tilde{\Pi})^c$ then S is open and $D\mathbb{1}_S = D\mathbb{1}_{S^c}$. \square

7. EXAMPLE: PROOF OF THEOREM 3

The construction. Let $\{\zeta_k : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be an enumeration of the points in the unit square in the e_1, e_2 plane with rational coordinates, i.e. points in the set $Q_1 := \{xe_1 + ye_2 : x, y \in [-1, 1]\}$ that can be written as $xe_1 + ye_2$ for some $x, y \in [-1, 1] \cap \mathbb{Q}$.

We will define a thin column in direction e_3 around ζ_k by

$$\Pi_k := \left\{ xe_1 + ye_2 + ze_3 + \zeta_k : \sqrt{(x - \zeta_k \cdot e_1)^2 + (y - \zeta_k \cdot e_2)^2} < 2^{-10000-k}, 0 < z \leq 1 \right\}.$$

And we define $\mathcal{O} = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \Pi_k$. Let

$$\mathcal{U} = \{(x, y, z) : -1 \leq x \leq 1, -1 \leq y \leq 1, -1 \leq z \leq 0\}.$$

Finally let

$$\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{O} \cup \mathcal{U}.$$

Step 1. We will show \mathcal{S} is path connected.

Proof of Step 1. From the construction it is clear that for any $p \in \mathcal{S}$, the line interval $[p, (p \cdot e_1)e_1 + (p \cdot e_2)e_2 - \frac{e_3}{2}] \subset \mathcal{U}$. Thus for any $p_1, p_2 \in \mathcal{O}$

$$L_1 = \left[p_1, (p_1 \cdot e_1)e_1 + (p_1 \cdot e_2)e_2 - \frac{e_3}{2} \right] \subset \mathcal{S} \quad (102)$$

and

$$L_2 = \left[p_2, (p_2 \cdot e_1)e_1 + (p_2 \cdot e_2)e_2 - \frac{e_3}{2} \right] \subset \mathcal{S}. \quad (103)$$

Finally

$$L_3 = \left[(p_1 \cdot e_1)e_1 + (p_1 \cdot e_2)e_2 - \frac{e_3}{2}, (p_2 \cdot e_1)e_1 + (p_1 \cdot e_2)e_2 - \frac{e_3}{2} \right] \subset \mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{S}. \quad (104)$$

So

$$L_1 \cup L_2 \cup L_3 \subset \mathcal{S}.$$

Thus p_1 and p_2 are connected in \mathcal{S} .

Step 2. We will show \mathcal{S}^c is connected.

Proof of Step 2. Let $Q = (-1, 1) \times (-1, 1) \times (-1, 1)$. If $p \in Q \setminus \mathcal{S}$ then $p + \lambda e_3 \notin \mathcal{S}$ for any $\lambda > 0$. Thus given any two points $p_1, p_2 \in Q \setminus \mathcal{S}$ we have $[p_1, p_2 + 2e_3] \subset \mathcal{S}^c$ and $[p_1, p_2 + 2e_3] \subset \mathcal{S}^c$ and thus the path

$$\mathcal{P} = [p_1, p_1 + 2e_3] \cup [p_1 + 2e_3, p_2 + 2e_3] \cup [p_2 + 2e_3, p_2] \subset \mathcal{S}^c,$$

thus \mathcal{P} is connected.

Step 3. We will show \mathcal{S} is a set of finite perimeter.

Proof of Step 3. Let $\mathcal{O}_N = \bigcup_{k=1}^N \Pi_k$ and define

$$\mathcal{S}_N = \mathcal{O}_N \cup \mathcal{U}.$$

Note that \mathcal{S}_N is a set of finite perimeter and

$$\text{Per}(\mathcal{S}_N) \leq \sum_{k=1}^N 2\pi 2^{-10000-k} + 17 \leq 18.$$

Now \mathcal{S}_N converges in measure to \mathcal{S} (see Remark 3.36 [Am-Fu-Pa 00]) so by Proposition 3.37 (b) we know $\text{Per}(\mathcal{S}) \leq 18$ and thus \mathcal{S} is a set of finite perimeter.

Step 4. For a.e. $p \in Q \setminus \mathcal{S}$ there exists $r_p > 0$ such that

$$|\mathcal{S} \cap B_r(p)| > 0, |\mathcal{S}^c \cap B_r(p)| > 0 \text{ for all } r \in (0, r_p) \quad (105)$$

and

$$\text{Per}(\mathcal{S}, B_r(p)) > 0 \text{ for any } r \in (0, r_p). \quad (106)$$

Proof of Step 4. By Lebesgue density theorem for a.e. $p \in Q \setminus \mathcal{S}$ there exists $r_p > 0$ such that

$$\frac{|B_r(p) \cap \mathcal{S}^c|}{|B_r(p)|} > \frac{1}{2} \text{ for any } r \in (0, r_p]. \quad (107)$$

Now for any $r \in (0, r_p]$ we can find $x, y \in Q$ such that $(x, y, p \cdot e_3) \in \mathcal{O} \cap B_{\frac{r}{4}}(p)$ and as \mathcal{O} is an open set for some $\rho \in (0, \frac{r}{4})$ we know

$$|B_\rho(p) \cap \mathcal{O}| > 0. \quad (108)$$

So (108) and (107) together establish (105).

Now arguing by contradiction and assuming $\text{Per}(\mathcal{S} \cap B_r(x)) = 0$ then as this means $|D\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{S}}|(B_r(x)) = 0$ so by Theorem 3.42, [Am-Fu-Pa 00] we have that $\int_{B_r(x)} \left| \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{S}} - (\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{S}})_{B_r(x)} \right| dz = 0$. However by (108), (107) and this is a contradiction. Thus (106) is established.

Step 5. We will show that $Q \setminus \mathcal{O} \subset \mathcal{S}$.

Proof of Step 5. For any $p \in Q \setminus \mathcal{O}$ either we have $p \in \mathcal{U}$ or $p \in (Q \setminus \mathcal{U}) \setminus \mathcal{S}$. So using (105) of Step 4 for the latter case we know that for a.e. $p \in Q \setminus \mathcal{O}$, $p \in \mathcal{S}$. So there exists a subset $\mathcal{G} \subset Q \setminus \mathcal{O}$ with $|(Q \setminus \mathcal{O}) \setminus \mathcal{G}| = 0$ and $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{S}$. Thus $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{S}$ and since $Q \setminus \mathcal{O} \subset \mathcal{G}$ this completes the proof of Step 5.

Proof of Theorem completed. By Step 1 and Step 2, \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{S}^c are connected. Since \mathcal{S} is a set of finite perimeter by Proposition 2 [Am-Lu-Ca 01] we have that \mathcal{S} is an indecomposable set. Since $H^2(\partial^M \mathcal{S}^c) = H^2(\partial^M \mathcal{S}) < \infty$ in the same way by Proposition 2, \mathcal{S}^c is indecomposable. Thus it is its own only indecomposable component. Hence (i) is established.

Now note by Step 5, $Q \setminus \mathcal{O} \subset \bar{\mathcal{S}}$ and

$$|Q \setminus \mathcal{S}| = 4 - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \pi(2^{-10000-k})^2 \geq \frac{3999}{4000},$$

so (ii) is established.

Finally by Step 4 we can find a set $\mathcal{G} \subset Q \setminus \mathcal{S}$ with $|(Q \setminus \mathcal{S}) \setminus \mathcal{G}| = 0$ and for every $p \in \mathcal{G}$ there exists $r_p > 0$ such that (106) holds true. So arguing by contradiction suppose there exists a Lipschitz map $\phi : S^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ such that $H^2(\partial^M \mathcal{S} \setminus \phi(S^2)) = 0$. Now by Theorem 3.59, Theorem 3.61 [Am-Fu-Pa 00],

$$H^2(\phi(S^2) \cap B_r(p)) = H^2(\partial^M \mathcal{S} \cap B_r(p)) = \text{Per}(\mathcal{S}, B_r(p)) > 0 \text{ for all } r \in (0, r_p).$$

So $p \in \phi(\bar{S}^2) = \phi(S^2)$. Thus $\mathcal{G} \subset \phi(S^2)$ but this is a contradiction because $H^2(\phi(S^2)) = (\text{Lip}(\phi))^2 H^2(S^2) = 4\pi(\text{Lip}(\phi))^2$. Thus we have established (iii) and completed the proof of the theorem. \square

Remark. The example constructed in Theorem 3 also shows that Theorem 7 of [Am-Lu-Ca 01] has no analogue in higher dimension. Note by property (i) there are no bounded components of \mathcal{S}^c so \mathcal{S} has no holes and is therefore saturated. Thus the set \mathcal{S} constructed is an example of a set Ambrosio et al. define as *simple* (see Definition 3, Definition 2 [Am-Lu-Ca 01]). And by property (iii) $\partial^M \mathcal{S}$ can not be almost everywhere covered by the Lipschitz image of the sphere.

REFERENCES

- [Am-Fu-Pa 00] L. Ambrosio; N. Fusco; D. Pallara. Functions of bounded variation and free discontinuity problems. Oxford Mathematical Monographs. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 2000.
- [Am-Lu-Ca 01] L. Ambrosio; V. Caselles; S. Masnou; J-M Morel. Connected components of sets of finite perimeter and applications to image processing. (English summary) J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) 3 (2001), no. 1, 3992.
- [Ba-Mo 08] A. Baldi; F. Montefalcone. A note on the extension of BV functions in metric measure spaces. (English summary) J. Math. Anal. Appl. 340 (2008), no. 1, 197208.
- [Bu-Ma 69] Yu. Burago; V.G. Maz'ya. Potential theory and function theory for irregular regions. Translated from Russian. Seminars in Mathematics, V. A. Steklov Mathematical Institute, Leningrad, Vol. 3 Consultants Bureau, New York 1969 vii+68 pp.
- [Da-Se 98] G. David; S. Semmes. Quasiminimal surfaces of codimension 1 and John domains. Pacific J. Math. 183 (1998), no. 2, 213277.
- [Ki 13] J. Kinnunen; R. Korte, A. Lorent, N. Shanmugalingam. Regularity of sets with quasiminimal boundary surfaces in metric spaces. To appear Journal of Geometric Analysis.
- [Ki 98] B. Kirchheim. Lipschitz minimizers of the 3-well problem having gradients of bounded variation. MIS.MPg. Preprint 12/1998
- [Ma 95] P. Mattila. Geometry of sets and measures in Euclidean spaces. Fractals and rectifiability. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, 44. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.

MATHEMATICS DEPARTMENT, UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI, 2600 CLIFTON AVE., CINCINNATI OH 45221
E-mail address: lorentaw@uc.edu