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## 1. Introduction

Let $A$ be one-dimensional Hausdorff measure in C. Let $B$ be a continuum in $\mathbf{C}$ of finite linear measure, i.e., $\Lambda(B)<\infty$. Denote the components of the complement of $B$ in the Riemann sphere by $\left\{V_{j}\right\}$; each $V_{j}$ is simply connected. Let $f_{j}: \mathbf{D} \rightarrow V_{j}$ be a Riemann map, where $\mathbf{D}$ is the open unit disk.

## Theorem.

$$
2 \Lambda(B)=\sum_{j} \int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left|f_{j}^{\prime}\left(e^{i \theta}\right)\right| d \theta
$$

The problem of establishing this identity was raised by Ch. Pommerenke in a letter to the author. The proof has two parts. First we show that the $j^{\text {th }}$ integral in the theorem is equal to the integral with respect to $\Lambda$ of the multiplicity function of $f_{j}$; this is (I). The second part, (II), is to show that the sum of the multiplicity functions is equal to 2 a.e. on $B$ with respect to $\Lambda$.

After the proof of the theorem we shall indicate a generalization. This is a decomposition of the restriction of $\Lambda$ to $B$ as a sum of measures on the boundaries of the $V_{j}$.

Finally I want to thank Professor Ch. Pommerenke for writing to me about this problem. A related inequality had been treated in [1].

## 2.

We begin with some general measure theory. For a measurable set $A \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ we denote its Lebesgue measure by $|A|$.

Lemma 1. Let u be a real-valued absolutely continuous function on an interval ( $a, b$ ). Then, for every measurable set $A \subseteq(a, b), u(A)$ is measurable and

$$
\begin{equation*}
|u(A)| \leqq \int_{A}\left|u^{\prime}(x)\right| d x \tag{*}
\end{equation*}
$$

In particular, if $u^{\prime}=0$ a.e. on $A$, then $|u(A)|=0$.
Remark. This is just a case of Sard's lemma. For completeness we shall indicate an outline of a proof.

Proof. Let $I$ be an open subinterval such that $\bar{I} \leqq(a, b)$. Then $u(I)$ is an interval with endpoints $u(c)$ and $u(d)$ for points $c$ and $d$ in $\bar{I}$. Hence $|u(I)|=|u(d)-u(c)|=$ $\left|\int_{c}^{d} u^{\prime}(x) d x\right| \leqq \int_{I}\left|u^{\prime}(x)\right| d x$.

Now if $W$ is an open subset of $(a, b), W=\bigcup I_{j}$ where the $I_{j}$ are disjoint open intervals. Hence $|u(W)| \leqq \sum\left|u\left(I_{j}\right)\right| \leqq \sum \int_{I_{j}}\left|u^{\prime}\right| d x=\int_{W}\left|u^{\prime}\right| d x$. From this it follows that if $N \subseteq(a, b)$ is a null set then $u(N)$ is a null set. Standard arguments then show that $u(A)$ is measurable if $A$ is measurable and then $\left(^{*}\right.$ ) follows easily.

Next, we need the converse to the Sard lemma; cf. [5], p. 322.
Lemma 2. Let $u$ be a real-valued absolutely continuous function on an interval $(a, b)$. If $K$ is a compact subset of $(a, b)$ such that $|u(K)|=0$, then $u^{\prime}=0$ a.e. on $K$.

Proof. Suppose not. Then, by replacing $K$ by a smaller set, we may assume, without loss of generality, that $u^{\prime}$ exists and is strictly positive at every point of $K$. We denote the characteristic function of $K$ by $\chi_{K}$. Almost every point of $K$ is a Lebesgue point for $\left|u^{\prime}\right|$ and also for $\left|u^{\prime}\right| \chi_{K}$. Choose such a point $c \in K$. Let $J_{\varepsilon}=$ $(c-\varepsilon, c+\varepsilon)$. Set $\eta=u^{\prime}(c) ; \eta>0$. Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
Q(\varepsilon) & : \equiv \frac{1}{2 \varepsilon} \int_{J_{\varepsilon} \backslash K}\left|u^{\prime}\right| d x \\
& =\frac{1}{2 \varepsilon} \int_{J_{\varepsilon}}\left|u^{\prime}\right| d x-\frac{1}{2 \varepsilon} \int_{J_{\varepsilon}}\left|u^{\prime}\right| \chi_{K} d x .
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0, Q(\varepsilon) \rightarrow \eta-\eta=0$.
We have $u(t)=u(c)+(t-c) \eta(1+\sigma(t))$ where $\sigma(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow c$. Choose $\varepsilon$ so small that $|\sigma(c \pm \varepsilon)|<\frac{1}{3}$. Then $u\left(J_{8}\right) \supseteqq(u(c-\varepsilon), u(c+\varepsilon)) \supseteqq\left(u(c)-\varepsilon \eta\left(1-\frac{1}{3}\right), u(c)+\right.$
$\left.\varepsilon \eta\left(1-\frac{1}{3}\right)\right)$. Hence $\left|u\left(J_{\varepsilon}\right)\right| \geqq 2 \varepsilon \cdot \eta \cdot \frac{2}{3}$. By Lemma 1 we have

$$
\left|u\left(J_{\ell} \backslash K\right)\right| \leqq \int_{J_{\varepsilon} \backslash K}\left|u^{\prime}\right| d x \leqq 2 \varepsilon Q(\varepsilon) .
$$

Now $u\left(K \cap J_{\varepsilon}\right) \supseteqq u\left(J_{\varepsilon}\right) \backslash u\left(J_{\varepsilon} \backslash K\right)$ and therefore

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|u\left(K \cap J_{\varepsilon}\right)\right| & \geqq\left|u\left(J_{\mathcal{E}}\right)\right|-\left|u\left(J_{\varepsilon} \backslash K\right)\right| \\
& \geqq 2 \varepsilon \eta \frac{2}{3}-2 \varepsilon Q(\varepsilon) \\
& =2 \varepsilon(2 \eta / 3-Q(\varepsilon)) .
\end{aligned}
$$

If we choose $\varepsilon$ so small that $Q(\varepsilon)<\eta / 3$ we get $\left|u\left(K \cap J_{\varepsilon}\right)\right|>2 \varepsilon \frac{\eta}{3}>0$. This contradicts $|u(K)|=0$. Q.E.D.

For $z=x+i y \in \mathbf{C}$, we have the coordinate projections: $\pi_{1}(z)=x$ and $\pi_{2}(z)=y$.
Lemma 3. ("Projection lemma.") Let B be a continuum in $\mathbf{C}$ with $\Lambda(B)<\infty$. Let $K$ be a compact subset of $B$ with $\Lambda(K)>0$. Then either $\left|\pi_{1}(K)\right|>0$ or $\left|\pi_{2}(K)\right|>0$.

Remark. Besicovitch ([2], [3]) has constructed sets of positive $\Lambda$ measure whose projections on all lines have zero measure. By the lemma, these sets are not contained in continua of finite linear measure. A proof of the lemma can also be obtained from [8], Corollary 3.15 and Theorem 6.10.

Proof. First we consider the special case when $B$ is a rectifiable Jordan arc. Let $F:[0, L] \rightarrow B$ parametrize $B$ by arclength. Then $\left|F\left(t_{2}\right)-F\left(t_{1}\right)\right| \leqq\left|t_{2}-t_{1}\right|$ for $0 \leqq t_{1} \leqq t_{2} \leqq L$; so $F$ is a Lipschitz function, therefore absolutely continuous; $\left|F^{\prime}(t)\right|=1$ a.e. on $[0, L]$. Let $K_{0}=F^{-1}(K)$, then $\left|K_{0}\right|=\Lambda(K)>0$.

Write $F=u+i v$. Suppose that $\left|\pi_{1}(K)\right|=0$ and $\left|\pi_{2}(K)\right|=0$. Then $u\left(K_{0}\right)=$ $\pi_{1}(K)$ and so $\left|u\left(K_{0}\right)\right|=0$. By Lemma 2, $u^{\prime}=0$ a.e. on $K_{0}$. Likewise $v^{\prime}=0$ a.e. on $K_{0}$. Hence $F^{\prime}=0$ a.e. on $K_{0}$. But $\left|F^{\prime}\right|=1$ a.e. on $K_{0}$ and $\left|K_{0}\right|>0$. This is a contradiction and we conclude that $\left|\pi_{1}(K)\right|>0$ or $\left|\pi_{2}(K)\right|>0$.

In the general case of a continuum $B$ of finite linear measure, Besicovitch ([2], [3]) has shown that $B$ is a disjoint union of a countable set of Jordan arcs and a $\Lambda$-null set. Therefore $K \subseteq B$ must meet one of these Jordan arcs in a set $K_{1}$ of positive measure. By the first part of the proof, $\left|\pi_{1}\left(K_{1}\right)\right|>0$ or $\left|\pi_{2}\left(K_{1}\right)\right|>0$. Q.E.D.

Suppose that $F:(a, b) \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ is continuous. For $z \in \mathbf{C}$, define $\varphi(z)=$ $\#\{t \in(a, b): F(t)=z\}$, here \# denotes the number of elements in a set. This is the so-called crude multiplicity function. It is known to be measurable under very general conditions; see [6]. For completeness we shall give the proof in our simple setting.

Lemma 4. $\varphi$ is a Borel measurable function on $\mathbf{C}$.

Proof. Let $\Pi$ be a finite partition of $(a, b)$ by intervals $J$ which are disjoint, say all of the form $(c, d]$ except the right-most interval. As each $J$ is $\sigma$-compact, $F(J)$ is $\sigma$-compact and so is a Borel set. Hence

$$
\psi_{\Pi}: \equiv \sum\left\{\chi_{F(J)}: J \in \Pi\right\}
$$

is Borel measurable. If $\Pi_{n}$ is a nested set of partitions whose maximal interval has length converging to zero, it is straightforward that $\psi_{n_{n}} \uparrow \varphi$ on C. Q.E.D.

Let $V$ be a simply connected plane domain with $\Lambda(\partial V)<\infty$ and let $f: \mathbf{D} \rightarrow V$ be a Riemann map (one-to-one, conformal, onto). It is known that $f$ is continuous on $\overline{\mathbf{D}}$ and that $f^{\prime}$ is in the Hardy space $H^{1}$. Also $f \mid \partial \mathbf{D}$ is of bounded variation and its variation, denoted by $\operatorname{var}(f)$, is equal to $\int_{0}^{2 \pi}\left|f^{\prime}\left(e^{i \theta}\right)\right| d \theta$. Set $\varphi(z)=\#\left\{e^{i \theta}: f\left(e^{i \theta}\right)=\right.$ $=z$ \}. By Lemma 4, $\varphi$ is Borel measurable on C. We shall see below (Lemma 8) that $\varphi \leqq 2, \Lambda$ a.e.

Consider a partition $\Pi$ of $\partial \mathbf{D}$ consisting of a finite number of disjoint halfopen subarcs $I$. Fix an $I \in \Pi$ with endpoints $\alpha_{I}$ and $\beta_{I}$. Let $J=f(I)$, an arcwise connected subset of $\partial V$. By an argument of Besicovitch ([2], p. 311) there exists a Jordan arc in $J$ connecting $f\left(\alpha_{I}\right)$ to $f\left(\beta_{I}\right)$. Let $g_{I}: I \rightarrow J$ parametrize such a Jordan arc. Since $g_{I}$ maps $I$ onto the Jordan arc $g_{I}(I)$, it follows that the variation of $g_{I}$ on $I$, denoted var $\left(g_{I}\right)$, equals the length of $g_{I}(I)=\Lambda\left(g_{I}(I)\right)$.

We claim that $\operatorname{var}\left(g_{I}\right) \leqq \operatorname{var}(f \mid I)$. In fact, the construction of $g_{I}$ proceeds as follows: Choose the largest subarc $\gamma \subseteq I$ such that the values of $f$ coincide at the endpoints of $\gamma$. Set $g_{r}$ to be the constant value on $\gamma$ which agrees with $f$ at the endpoints of $\gamma$. Continue inductively in this way to modify $f$ on open subarcs until a one-to-one function is obtained. This is $g_{I}$. It is then clear that $\operatorname{var}\left(g_{I}\right) \leqq \operatorname{var}(f \mid I)$. We have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|f\left(\beta_{I}\right)-f\left(\alpha_{I}\right)\right| \leqq \Lambda\left(g_{I}(I)\right) \leqq \operatorname{var}(f \mid I) \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now define $f_{\Pi}: \partial \mathbf{D} \rightarrow \partial V$ by $f_{\Pi} \mid I=g_{I}$ for each $I \in \Pi$. Let $\varphi_{\Pi}(z)=$ $\#\left\{e^{i \theta}: f_{\Pi}\left(e^{i \theta}\right)=z\right\}$. Then $f_{\Pi}$ is continuous and $\varphi_{\Pi}$ is Borel measurable. Since the $g_{I I}$ are one-to-one and the $\{I\}$ are disjoint, it follows that $\varphi_{\Pi}=\sum_{I \in \Pi} \chi_{g_{I}(I)}$. Hence

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{I} \Lambda\left(g_{I}(I)\right)=\sum_{I} \int \chi_{g_{I}(I)} d \Lambda=\int\left(\sum_{I} \chi_{g_{I}(I)}\right) d \Lambda=\int \varphi_{\Pi} d \Lambda \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Summing in (1), using (2), we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{I \in \Pi}\left|f\left(\beta_{I}\right)-f\left(\alpha_{I}\right)\right| \leqq \int \varphi_{\Pi} d \Lambda \leqq \operatorname{var}(f) \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Denote the sum in (3) by var $(f, \Pi)$.
Choose a sequence of partitions $\Pi_{n}$ so that $\operatorname{var}\left(f, \Pi_{n}\right) \rightarrow \operatorname{var}(f)$. Set

$$
\psi_{n}=\varphi_{I_{n}}
$$

and $F_{n}=f_{I_{n}}$. Then $F_{n} \rightarrow f$ uniformly on $\partial \mathrm{D}$. By (3),

$$
\operatorname{var}\left(f, \Pi_{n}\right) \leqq \int \psi_{n} d \Lambda \leqq \operatorname{var}(f)
$$

It follows that $\int \psi_{n} d \Lambda \rightarrow \operatorname{var}(f)$. Also, for any partition $\Pi$ and $I \in \Pi, g_{I}(I) \subseteq f(I)$, hence $\chi_{g(I)} \leqq \chi_{f(I)}$. Summing over $I$ we get $\varphi_{I} \leqq \sum_{I} \chi_{f(I)} \leqq \varphi$. Taking $\Pi=\Pi_{n}$ we get $\psi_{n} \leqq \varphi$ for all $n$. We have proved the following

Lemma 5. $\int \psi_{n} d \Lambda \rightarrow \operatorname{var}(f)$.
We set $\psi=\lim \inf \psi_{n}$, then $\psi \leqq \varphi$.
Lemma 6. $\psi=\varphi$ holds $A$ a.e.
Proof. We suppose not, arguing by contradiction. Then there exists a compact subset $K$ of $\partial V$ such that $\Lambda(K)>0$ and $\psi<\varphi$ on $K$. Let $E=f^{-1}(K) \subseteq \partial \mathbf{D}$. Then $|E|>0$. In fact, by Lemma 3, we may suppose that $\left|\pi_{1}(K)\right|>0$, then $|u(E)|>0$ and so, by Lemma $1, \int_{E}\left|u^{\prime}\right| d \theta \geqq|u(E)|>0$; i.e. $|E|>0$. By shrinking $K$ we may assume also that the derivative $f^{\prime}$ exists at each point of $E$. Finally set $N(t)=$ $\#\{z \in \partial V: \operatorname{Re} z=t\}$ for $t \in \mathbf{R}$. Since $\Lambda(\partial V)<\infty$, it is known that $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} N(t) d t<\infty$. Hence $N(t)<\infty$ a.e. Again by shrinking $K$, we may suppose that $N(t)<\infty$ for each $t \in \pi_{1}(K)\left(\left|\pi_{1}(K)\right|>0\right)$.

Since $\varphi$ takes on only the values 1 and 2 on $\partial V, \Lambda$ a.e., we may assume that one of the following two cases holds:
(a) $\psi \equiv 0$ on $K$ and $\varphi \equiv 1$ on $K$ or
(b) $\psi \leqq 1$ on $K$ and $\varphi \equiv 2$ on $K$.

First consider case (a). Take $\zeta \in E$ and let $z=f(\zeta) \in K$. Then $\psi_{n_{j}}(z)=0$ for some subsequence. Let $\delta$ be the distance from $z$ to the nearest other point of $\partial V \cap l$, where $l$ is the vertical line thru $z$; we know that $\partial V \cap l$ is finite. Let $\Delta$ be the disc centered at $z$ of radius $\delta / 2$. Choose a connected neighborhood $W$ of $\zeta$ in $\partial \mathbf{D}$ such that $f(W) \subseteq \Delta$. Since $F_{n_{j}} \rightarrow f$ uniformly on $\partial \mathbf{D}, F_{n_{j}}(W) \subseteq \Delta$ for $j$ large. But $z \notin F_{n_{j}}(W) \subseteq \partial V$ and since $\partial V \cap l \cap \Delta=\{z\}$ it follows that the connected set $F_{n_{j}}(W)$ lies on one side of $l$, for large $j$. Therefore also $f(W)$ lies on one side of $l$. It follows that $u=\operatorname{Re} f$ has a local maximum or minimum at $\zeta$. Therefore $u^{\prime}(\zeta)=0$. Hence $u^{\prime} \equiv 0$ on $E$. By Lemma $1,0=|u(E)|=\left|\pi_{1}(K)\right|$. This is a contradiction.

Now consider case (b). If $\psi=0$ on a subset of $K$ of positive measure, then the argument of case (a) carries over to show that $u^{\prime}=0$ on a set of positive measure. Just as above this yields a contradiction. Thus we may assume that $\psi \equiv 1$ on $K$ and $\varphi \equiv 2$ on $K$. Fix $z \in K$. Then $f^{-1}(z)$ consists of two points $\zeta^{\prime}$ and $\zeta^{\prime \prime}$. Choose a subsequence: $\psi_{n_{j}}(z)=1$ for all $j$. Then $F_{n_{j}}^{-1}(z)=\zeta_{j}$, a single point of $\partial \mathrm{D}$. By passing to a subsequence we may assume that $\left\{\zeta_{j}\right\}$ converges in $\partial \mathbf{D}$. The limit must be $\zeta^{\prime}$ or $\zeta^{\prime \prime}$ because $F_{n_{j}} \rightarrow f$ uniformly and so $f$ maps the limit point to $z$. Say $\zeta_{j} \rightarrow \zeta^{\prime}$.

Then $F_{n_{j}}$ does not take on the value $z$ near $\zeta^{\prime \prime}$. The connectedness argument of case (a) then shows that $u^{\prime}\left(\zeta^{\prime \prime}\right)=0$, just as before.

Let $A=E \cap\left\{\zeta \in \partial \mathbf{D}: u^{\prime}(\zeta)=0\right\}$. By the last paragraph, $f(A)=K$. Hence $|u(A)|=$ $\left|\pi_{1}(K)\right|>0$. But $u^{\prime}=0$ on $A$. This contradicts Lemma 1. Q.E.D.

Lemma 7. $\int \psi_{n} d \Lambda \rightarrow \int \varphi d \Lambda$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.
Proof. By Lemma 6, $\varphi=\lim \inf \psi_{n}$, a.e. Also, since $\psi_{n} \leqq \varphi$ for all $n$, $\lim \sup \psi_{n} \leqq \varphi$. It follows that $\lim \psi=\varphi, \Lambda$ a.e. The lemma then follows from the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem.

Now by Lemmas 5 and 7 we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int \varphi d \Lambda=\int_{\partial \mathbf{D}}\left|f^{\prime}\right| d \theta \tag{I}
\end{equation*}
$$

## 3.

We now let $A$ denote the restriction of one-dimensional Hausdorff measure to $B$. By assumption $0<\Lambda(B)<\infty$. We have $\overline{\mathbf{C}} \backslash B=\cup V_{j}$ and $f_{j}: \mathbf{D} \rightarrow V_{j}$ a fixed Riemann map. Let $\varphi_{j}(z)=\#\left\{\zeta \in \partial \mathbf{D}: f_{j}(\zeta)=z\right\}$ for $z \in B$. By Lemma 4, $\varphi_{j}$ is Borel measurable and therefore

$$
\Phi \equiv \sum_{j} \varphi_{j}
$$

is also Borel measurable. The second half of the proof of the theorem consists of showing that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Phi=2 \text { holds } A \text { a.e. } \tag{II}
\end{equation*}
$$

Lemma 8. $\Phi \leqq 2$ except on a countable set.
Remark. The case $\varphi_{j} \leqq 2$ except on a countable set for any $j$ was observed by Rudin [7]. We used this fact in the proof of Lemma 6.

Proof. Let $P=\{p \in B: \Phi(p) \geqq 3\}$. We construct a triod $T(p)$ at $p$ as follows. There are three cases:
(1) $\varphi_{j}(p) \geqq 1, \varphi_{k}(p) \geqq 1$ and $\varphi_{l}(p) \geqq 1$ for some $j, k$ and $l$ distinct.
(2) $\varphi_{j}(p) \geqq 2$ and $\varphi_{k}(p) \geqq 1$ for some $j \neq k$.
(3) $\varphi_{j}(p) \geqq 3$ for some $j$.

In Case 1 , there are points $\zeta_{j}, \zeta_{k}, \zeta_{l}$ in $\partial \mathrm{D}$ such that $f_{i}\left(\zeta_{i}\right)=p, i=j, k$ or $l$. Let $T(p)$ be the union of the image by $f_{i}$ of the half radius $\left\{r \zeta_{i}: \frac{1}{2} \leqq r \leqq 1\right\}$ for $i=j, k, l$.

In Case 2, we repeat this for $\zeta_{j} \neq \zeta_{j}^{\prime}$ and $\zeta_{k}$ in $\partial \mathbf{D}$ and in Case 3 for distinct $\zeta_{j}$, $\zeta_{j}^{\prime}, \zeta_{j}^{\prime \prime}$ in $\partial \mathbf{D}$.

We get in each a triod and as $p$ varies over $P$, these triods $T(p)$ are disjoint. It follows from a theorem of R. L. Moore [4] that $P$ is countable. Q.E.D.

Lemma 9. $\Phi>0$ holds $\Lambda$ a.e.
Proof. Define $B_{0}=\{z \in B: \Phi(z)=0\}$. Since $\varphi_{j}$ maps $\partial \mathbf{D}$ onto $\partial V_{j}, \varphi_{j} \geqq 1$ on $\partial V_{j}$ and so $B_{0}=B \backslash \bigcup \partial V_{j}$. Suppose $\Lambda\left(B_{0}\right)>0$. Then, by the projection lemma, $\left|\pi_{1}\left(B_{0}\right)\right|>0$ or $\pi_{2}\left|\left(B_{0}\right)\right|>0$. We may assume that $\left|\pi_{1}\left(B_{0}\right)\right|>0$. Choose $z \in B_{0}$ such that the vertical line $l$ through $z$ intersects $B$ only finitely often (cf. the proof of Lemma 6). Then some line segment contained in $l$ lies in some $V_{j}$ and has $z$ as an endpoint. Then $z \in \partial V_{j}$, a contradiction. Hence $\Lambda\left(B_{0}\right)=0$. Q.E.D.

Let $B_{1}=\{z: \Phi(z)=1\}$.
Lemma 10. $\Lambda\left(B_{1}\right)=0$.
Proof. For all $j$ define

$$
A_{j}=\left\{z \in B: \varphi_{j}(z)=1 \text { and } \varphi_{k}(z)=0 \text { if } k \neq j\right\}
$$

Then $B_{1}=\bigcup_{j} A_{j}$. It suffices to show $\Lambda\left(A_{j}\right)=0$ for all $j$. Without loss of generality, it suffices to show $\Lambda\left(A_{1}\right)=0$.

Suppose not. Take a compact $K \subseteq A_{1}$ such that $\Lambda(K)>0$. By the projection lemma, we may assume that $\left|\pi_{1}(K)\right|>0$. We may further assume that every vertical line which meets $K$ intersects $B$ only finitely often and that $u_{1}^{\prime}$ exists everywhere on $E=f_{1}^{-1}(K)$. Here $f_{1}=u_{1}+i v_{1}$. We know that $|E|>0$.

Fix $\zeta \in E$ and let $z=f(\zeta) \in K$. Let $l$ be the vertical line through $z$. Then $l$ meets $B$ only finitely often. Let $l_{1}$ and $l_{2}$ be the segments of $\lambda \backslash B$ which have $z$ as an endpoint. Then $l_{i}$ lies in some $V_{j}$ for $i=1,2$. Since $\varphi_{j}(z)=0$ for $j \neq 1$, we conclude that $l_{1}$ and $l_{2}$ are both contained in $V_{1}$. Let $p_{i}$ be an interior point of $l_{i}$ for $i=1,2$. Let $l_{3}$ be the closed line segment joining $p_{1}$ to $p_{2}$. Then $l_{3} \subseteq V_{1} \cup\{z\}$. Let $\gamma_{0}$ be a Jordan arc joining $p_{1}$ to $p_{2}$ in the simply connected domain $V_{1} \backslash l_{3}$. If $\gamma$ is the Jordan curve $\gamma_{0} \cup l_{3}$, then $\gamma \subseteq V_{1} \cup\{z\}$.

Consider $\sigma=f_{1}^{-1}(\gamma)$. Since $\varphi_{1}(z)=1, f_{1}^{-1}(z)=\{\zeta\}$ and $\sigma$ is a Jordan curve in $\mathbf{D} \cup\{\zeta\}$. The inside of $\sigma$ is mapped by $f_{1}$ onto the inside of $\gamma$. Hence the inside of $\gamma$ is disjoint from $B$. It follows that locally, near $z, B$ lies on one side only of $l$. This means that $u_{1}$ has a local maximum or minimum at $\zeta$. Hence $u_{1}^{\prime}(\zeta)=0$. Hence $u_{1}^{\prime} \equiv 0$ on $E$. As $|E|>0$ and $\left|u_{1}(E)\right|=\left|\pi_{1}(K)\right|>0$, this contradicts Lemma 1. We conclude that $\Lambda\left(A_{1}\right)=0$. Q.E.D.

Now (II) follows from Lemmas 8, 9 and 10.
Let $\chi_{j}$ be the characteristic function of $\partial V_{j}$.

Proposition. $1 \leqq \sum_{j} \chi_{j} \leqq 2 \quad \Lambda$ a.e., and hence $\Lambda(B) \leqq \sum \Lambda\left(\partial V_{j}\right) \leqq 2 \Lambda(B)$.
Remark. The second inequality on measure was obtained in [1].
Proof. Clearly $\chi_{j} \leqq \varphi_{j}$ for all $j$ and therefore $\sum \chi_{j} \leqq \Phi=2$ by (II). If $z \in B \backslash B_{0}$ then $z \in \partial V_{j}$ for some $j$ and so $1 \leqq \sum \chi_{j}(z)$. Hence $1 \leqq \sum \chi_{j}, \Lambda$ a.e. by the proof of Lemma 9. Q.E.D.

## 4. Proof of the theorem

Integrating (II) w.r.t. $\Lambda$ we get

$$
2 \Lambda(B)=\int \Phi d \Lambda=\sum_{j} \int \varphi_{j} d \Lambda
$$

by the monotone convergence theorem. Applying (I) to the last integrals gives the theorem.

## 5.

We now consider a refinement of the theorem. Let $f: \mathbf{D} \rightarrow V$ be a Riemann map as in Section 2 with $\Lambda(\partial V)<\infty$ and $\varphi(z)=\#\{\zeta \in \partial \mathbf{D}: f(\zeta)=z\}$. Define the "push-forward" measure $\mu=f_{*}\left(\left|f^{\prime}\right| d \theta\right)$ on $\partial V$ by $\int g(z) d \mu(z)=\int_{\partial \mathrm{D}} g \circ f\left|f^{\prime}\right| d \theta$ for every bounded Borel function $g$ on $\partial V$. By definition $\varphi \Lambda$ is the measure on $B$ given by $(\varphi \Lambda)(E)=\int_{E} \varphi(z) d \Lambda(z)$ for every Borel set $E \subseteq \partial V$.

Lemma 11. $\varphi \Lambda=\mu$.
Proof. For $S \subseteq \partial \mathbf{D}$ define, for $z \in \partial V, \varphi_{S}(z)=\#\{\zeta \in S: f(\zeta)=z\}$. If $J$ is a subarc of $\partial \mathbf{D}$ then the arguments of Lemmas 4,5,6 and 7 show that

$$
\int_{J}\left|f^{\prime}\right| d \theta=\int_{\partial V} \varphi_{J}(z) d \Lambda(z)
$$

Let $W$ be an open subset of $\partial V$, write $f^{-1}(W)=\bigcup J_{j}$ where the $J_{j}$ are disjoint subarcs of $\partial \mathbf{D}$. Then $\int_{f^{-1}(W)}\left|f^{\prime}\right| d \theta=\sum \int_{J_{j}}\left|f^{\prime}\right| d \theta=\sum \int \varphi_{J_{j}} d \Lambda=\int \sum \varphi_{J_{j}} d \Lambda=$ $\int \varphi_{f^{-1}(W)} d \Lambda$. It is clear that $\varphi_{f^{-1}(W)}=\varphi \cdot \chi_{W}$. Hence we get

$$
\mu(W)=\int_{f^{-1}(W)}\left|f^{\prime}\right| d \theta=\int_{W} \varphi d \Lambda
$$

for every open $W \subseteq \partial V$. This gives the lemma.
Now for every component $V_{j}$ of $\overline{\mathbf{C}} \backslash B$ we have $f_{j}: \mathbf{D} \rightarrow V_{j}$ and a $\varphi_{j}$. Define $\mu_{j}=f_{j^{*}}\left(\left|f_{j}^{\prime}\right| d \theta\right)$. By Lemma 11, $\varphi_{j} A=\mu_{j}$. Summing over $j$ and applying (II) gives the following decomposition of $\Lambda$ on $B$ :

$$
2 \Lambda=\sum_{j} \mu_{j}
$$

In this equality of Borel measures, the sum is taken in the strong norm sense. This decomposition is equivalent to saying that

$$
2 \int g d \Lambda=\sum_{j} \int_{\partial \mathrm{D}} g \circ f_{j}\left|f_{j}^{\prime}\right| d \theta
$$

for each bounded Borel function on $B$. Our theorem is just the case $g \equiv 1$.
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