

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/266990399>

# A Szpilrajn–Marczewski Type Theorem for Concentration Dimension on Polish Space

Article in *Canadian mathematical bulletin = Bulletin canadien de mathématiques* · June 2006

DOI: 10.4153/CMB-2006-025-1

---

CITATIONS

3

---

READS

96

3 authors, including:



[Tomasz Szarek](#)

University of Gdansk

81 PUBLICATIONS 933 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



[Maciej Ślęczka](#)

University of Silesia in Katowice

11 PUBLICATIONS 94 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)

# A SZPILRAJN - MARCZEWSKI TYPE THEOREM FOR CONCENTRATION DIMENSION ON POLISH SPACES

JÓZEF MYJAK, TOMASZ SZAREK AND MACIEJ ŚLĘCZKA

ABSTRACT. Let  $X$  be a Polish space. We will prove that

$$\dim_T X = \inf\{\dim_L X' : X' \text{ is homeomorphic to } X\},$$

where  $\dim_L X$  and  $\dim_T X$  stand for the concentration dimension and the topological dimension of  $X$ , respectively.

## 1. Introduction

In [11] a new concept of dimension of measures, defined by means of the Lévy concentration function (see [7]), has been investigated. This dimension, called concentration dimension, has some important properties. It is related to mass distribution principle (see [3]), it is relatively easy to calculate and it is also strongly related to the Hausdorff dimension. More precisely, the Hausdorff dimension is greater than or equal to the concentration dimension. Moreover, the Hausdorff dimension of a compact set  $K$  is equal to the supremum of the lower concentration dimension of measures  $\mu$  where the supremum is taken over all probability measures  $\mu$  such that  $\text{supp } \mu \subset K$ .

The connection between the Hausdorff dimension and the topological dimension was made evident in the case of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  space by V.G. Nöbeling (see [14]) and in more general setting by Szpilrajn in 1937 (see [9, 16]). Similar connections between the concentration dimension and the topological dimension have been established in [12] in the case of locally compact metric spaces. In this paper we will generalize these results to the case of Polish spaces. Note also that the relation between Hausdorff dimension and packing dimension was studied in [10] while the generic properties of concentration dimension have been investigated in [13].

---

*2000 Mathematics Subject Classification.* primary: 11K55; secondary: 28A78.

*Key words and phrases.* Hausdorff dimension, topological dimension, Lévy concentration function, concentration dimension.

## 2. Notation, preliminaries and auxiliary results

Throughout this paper  $(X, \rho)$  denotes a Polish (i.e. separable complete metric) space. By  $B(x, r)$  (resp.  $B^o(x, r)$ ,  $S(x, r)$ ) we denote the closed ball (resp. the open ball and the sphere) in  $X$  with center at  $x$  and radius  $r$ . By  $\dim_H X$  and  $\dim_T X$  we denote the Hausdorff dimension and the topological dimension of  $X$ , respectively.

By  $\mathcal{B}(X)$  we denote the  $\sigma$ -algebra of Borel subsets of  $X$  and by  $\mathcal{M}(X)$  the family of all finite Borel measures on  $X$ . Moreover, by  $\mathcal{M}_1(X)$  we denote the family of all  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X)$  such that  $\mu(X) = 1$  and by  $\mathcal{M}_{\leq 1}(X)$  the family of all measures  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X)$  such that  $0 < \mu(X) \leq 1$ .

Given a measure  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1(X)$  we define the *lower* and *upper concentration dimension* of  $\mu$  by the formulas

$$\underline{\dim}_L \mu = \liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\log Q_\mu(r)}{\log r},$$

$$\overline{\dim}_L \mu = \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\log Q_\mu(r)}{\log r},$$

where

$$Q_\mu(r) = \sup\{\mu(A) : \text{diam} A \leq r, A \in \mathcal{B}(X)\} \quad \text{for } r > 0.$$

Recall that  $Q_\mu$  is the well known Lévy concentration function frequently used in the theory of random variables (see [7]).

The *concentration dimension* of  $X$  is defined by the formula

$$(1) \quad \dim_L X = \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1(X)} \underline{\dim}_L \mu$$

Finally, recall that  $\dim_H \mu$  for  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1(X)$  denotes the Hausdorff dimension of  $\mu$ , i.e.,  $\dim_H \mu = \inf\{\dim_H A : A \in \mathcal{B}(X) \text{ and } \mu(A) = 1\}$ .

Given an arbitrary function  $f : A \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ , where  $A$  is a Borel subset of  $\mathbb{R}$ , we denote by  $\mathcal{F}_f$  the set of all Borel measurable functions  $\phi : A \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  such that  $\phi(\lambda) \geq f(\lambda)$  for  $\lambda \in A$ . By the upper integral of  $f$  we mean the value

$$\overline{\int}_A f(\lambda) d\lambda = \inf_{\phi \in \mathcal{F}_f} \int_A \phi(\lambda) d\lambda.$$

The following result can be found in [11].

**Proposition 1.** *For every  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1(X)$  we have*

$$\dim_H \mu \geq \underline{\dim}_L \mu.$$

Moreover

$$\dim_H X \geq \dim_L X.$$

The following property of outer measures will be useful for further considerations.

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $\mu$  be a nontrivial outer measure. Then there exists a compact set  $K \subset X$  such that  $\mu(K) > 0$ .*

*Proof.* For  $A \subset X$  and  $\delta > 0$  define

$$\mu_\delta(A) = \inf \left\{ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(U_n) : A \subset \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} U_n, \right. \\ \left. \text{where } U_n \text{ are closed sets with } \text{diam } U_n \leq \delta \right\}$$

and

$$\mu_0(A) = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \mu_\delta(A).$$

It is easy to check that  $\mu_0$  is a nontrivial outer metric measure (see [15]). Therefore  $\mu_0$  restricted to all Borel sets is a measure. From Ulam's theorem (see [1]) it follows that there exists a compact set  $K$  such that  $\mu_0(K) > 0$ . Hence there exists  $\delta_0 > 0$  such that  $\mu_{\delta_0}(K) > 0$ . Consequently, since  $K$  is compact, there exists  $x \in K$  such that  $\mu(K \cap B(x, \delta_0/2)) > 0$ .  $\square$

### 3. Results

We are in a position to formulate the crucial result for our work. It is similar in spirit to Frostman's lemma which says that if  $\mathcal{H}^\alpha(K) > 0$ , where  $\mathcal{H}^\alpha$  denotes the  $\alpha$ -Hausdorff measure and  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  is a closed set, then there exists a nonzero Borel measure  $\mu$  supported on  $K$  such that  $\mu(D) \leq (\text{diam } D)^\alpha$  for all Borel sets  $D$  (see [6]). Much simpler than Frostman's original proof (based on the MaxFlow-MinCut Theorem) can be found in [5]. Our approach depends on Banach limits and the Riesz representation theorem (for further discussion see [8]).

**Proposition 3.** *Suppose that  $\dim_T X \geq d$ , where  $d \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ . Then there exists a Borel measure  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{\leq 1}(X)$  such that*

$$(2) \quad \mu(B(x, r)) \leq r^d \quad \text{for every } x \in X \quad \text{and } r > 0.$$

*Proof.* We use an induction argument with respect to  $d$ . For  $d = 0$  condition (2) obviously holds for every measure  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{\leq 1}(X)$ . Assume that the statement of Proposition 3 holds for  $d = k$ . We will prove that it holds for  $d = k + 1$ . By the definition of topological dimension (see [2]) there exists  $x_0 \in X$  and  $\lambda_0 > 0$  such that  $\dim_T S(x_0, \lambda) \geq k$  for every  $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0]$ . Without any loss of generality we can assume that  $\lambda_0 < 1$ . Fix arbitrary  $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0]$  and set  $X_\lambda = S(x_0, \lambda)$ . By the induction hypothesis there exists a nontrivial Borel measure  $\tilde{\mu}_\lambda$  on  $X_\lambda$  such that

$$(3) \quad \tilde{\mu}_\lambda(X_\lambda) \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\mu}_\lambda(B_\lambda(x, r)) \leq r^k$$

for every  $x \in X_\lambda$  and  $r > 0$ , where  $B_\lambda(x, r)$  stands for the closed ball in the space  $X_\lambda$  with the center at  $x \in X_\lambda$  and radius  $r$ .

For every  $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0]$  fix a measure  $\tilde{\mu}_\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_{\leq 1}(X_\lambda)$  satisfying condition (3) and then define the measure  $\mu_\lambda : \mathcal{B}(X) \rightarrow [0, 1]$  by the formula

$$\mu_\lambda(A) = \tilde{\mu}_\lambda(A \cap X_\lambda) \quad \text{for } A \in \mathcal{B}(X).$$

Clearly  $\mu_\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_{\leq 1}(X)$ ,  $\text{supp } \mu_\lambda \subset S(x_0, \lambda)$  and

$$(4) \quad \mu_\lambda(B(x, r)) \leq 2^k r^k \quad \text{for every } x \in X \quad \text{and } r > 0.$$

Now define the function  $\varphi : \mathcal{B}(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by the formula

$$\varphi(A) = \overline{\int}_{(0, \lambda_0)} \mu_\lambda(A) d\lambda \quad \text{for } A \in \mathcal{B}(X).$$

Clearly  $\varphi(\emptyset) = 0$  and  $\varphi(X \setminus B(x_0, \lambda_0)) = 0$ . Moreover, from the definition of upper integrals, it follows that

$$\varphi(B(x_0, \lambda_0)) > 0$$

and

$$\varphi\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i\right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \varphi(A_i) \quad \text{for } A_i \subset X, i \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Now consider the function  $\tilde{\mu} : 2^X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  given by

$$\tilde{\mu}(E) = \inf \{ \varphi(A) : A \in \mathcal{B}(X), A \supset E \}.$$

It is routine to see that  $\tilde{\mu}$  is an outer measure and  $\tilde{\mu}(B(x_0, \lambda_0)) > 0$ . By Lemma 2 there exists a compact set  $K \subset B(x_0, \lambda_0)$  such that  $\tilde{\mu}(K) > 0$ . Obviously

$$(5) \quad \overline{\int}_{(0, \lambda_0)} \mu_\lambda(K) d\lambda > 0.$$

For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  we define

$$\alpha_{n,i} = \sup \left\{ \mu_\lambda(K) : \lambda \in \left( \frac{(i-1)\lambda_0}{n}, \frac{i\lambda_0}{n} \right] \right\}.$$

Let

$$(6) \quad \nu_n = \frac{\lambda_0}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_{\lambda_{n,i}} \quad \text{for } n \in \mathbb{N},$$

where  $\mu_{\lambda_{n,i}} = \mu_{\lambda_{n,i}}$  with  $\lambda_{n,i} \in \left( \frac{(i-1)\lambda_0}{n}, \frac{i\lambda_0}{n} \right]$  and such that

$$(7) \quad \mu_{\lambda_{n,i}}(K) \geq \frac{\alpha_{n,i}}{2}.$$

By (6) and (7) we have

$$(8) \quad 2\nu_n(K) = \frac{2\lambda_0}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_{n,i}(K) \geq \frac{\lambda_0}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{n,i}.$$

Consider the function  $\psi : (0, \lambda_0] \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  given by

$$\psi(\lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{n,i} \cdot 1_{\left(\frac{(i-1)\lambda_0}{n}, \frac{i\lambda_0}{n}\right]}(\lambda).$$

Clearly  $\psi$  is Borel measurable and  $\psi(\lambda) \geq \mu_\lambda(K)$  for  $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0]$ . Thus by (8), the definition of the upper integral and (5) we have

$$(9) \quad 2\nu_n(K) \geq \frac{\lambda_0}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{n,i} = \int_0^{\lambda_0} \psi(\lambda) d\lambda \geq \overline{\int}_{(0, \lambda_0)} \mu_\lambda(K) d\lambda > 0.$$

Define the positive linear functional  $\Lambda : C(K) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by the formula

$$\Lambda(f) = \mathbb{L} \left( \left( \int_K f d\nu_n \right) \right) \quad \text{for } f \in C(K),$$

where  $\mathbb{L}$  is a Banach limit (see [4]) and  $C(K)$  stands for the space of continuous functions  $f : K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . By the Riesz representation theorem there exists the unique measure  $\mu_*$  such that

$$\Lambda(f) = \int_K f d\mu_* \quad \text{for } f \in C(K).$$

From inequality (9) it follows that  $\Lambda \neq 0$  and consequently  $\mu_* \neq 0$ . To finish the proof it suffices to verify that the measure  $\mu = \mu_*/2^{k+1}$  satisfies condition (2) with  $d = k + 1$ . To this end, fix an arbitrary  $x \in X$  and  $r > 0$  and consider the ball  $B(x, r)$ . For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  define

$$\underline{i}(n) = \min J_n \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{i}(n) = \max J_n,$$

where

$$J_n = \{1 \leq i \leq n : B(x, r) \cap S(x_0, \lambda_{n,i}) \neq \emptyset\}.$$

If  $J_n = \emptyset$  we admit  $\underline{i}(n) = \bar{i}(n) = 0$ .

It can be verify that

$$(10) \quad \frac{\lambda_0}{n} (\bar{i}(n) - \underline{i}(n)) \leq 2r + \frac{\lambda_0}{n}.$$

Further, by (6) and the construction of measure  $\mu_{n,i}$  we have

$$\nu_n(B(x, r)) = \frac{\lambda_0}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_{n,i}(B(x, r)) = \frac{\lambda_0}{n} \sum_{i=\underline{i}(n)}^{\bar{i}(n)} \mu_{n,i}(B(x, r))$$

and now, using (4) and (10) we obtain

$$(11) \quad \nu_n(B(x, r)) \leq \frac{\lambda_0}{n} 2^k r^k (\bar{i}(n) - \underline{i}(n) + 1) \leq 2^{k+1} r^{k+1} + \frac{\lambda_0}{n} 2^{k+1} r^k.$$

Fix  $\eta \in (0, r)$  and let  $f \in C(K)$ ,  $|f| \leq 1$ , be such that  $f(y) = 1$  for  $y \in B(x, r - \eta) \cap K$  and  $f(y) = 0$  for  $y \notin B(x, r) \cap K$ . Then

$$\mu_*(B(x, r - \eta)) \leq \Lambda(f) = \mathbb{L} \left( \left( \int_K f d\nu_n \right) \right) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu_n(B(x, r))$$

Consequently, by (11) we have

$$\mu_*(B(x, r - \eta)) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( 2^{k+1} r^{k+1} + \frac{\lambda_0}{n} 2^{k+1} r^k \right) = 2^{k+1} r^{k+1},$$

and since  $\eta \in (0, r)$  and  $r > 0$  were arbitrary, we have

$$\mu_*(B(x, r)) \leq 2^{k+1} r^{k+1} \quad \text{for all } r > 0.$$

Keeping in mind the definition of  $\mu$  we obtain

$$\mu(B(x, r)) \leq r^{k+1}.$$

Since  $x \in X$  was arbitrary, the proof is complete.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.** *Let  $X$  be a Polish space with  $\dim_T X < \infty$ . Then there exists a measure  $\mu_* \in \mathcal{M}_1(X)$  such that*

$$\underline{\dim}_L \mu_* \geq \dim_T X.$$

*Proof.* We can assume that  $X \neq \emptyset$ . Set  $d = \dim_T X$ . By Proposition 3 there exists a measure  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{\leq 1}(X)$  such that  $\mu(B(x, r)) \leq r^d$  for every  $x \in X$  and  $r > 0$ . Define  $\mu_* = \mu/\mu(X)$ . Clearly  $\mu_* \in \mathcal{M}_1(X)$  and

$$\mu_*(B(x, r)) \leq (\mu(X))^{-1} r^d \quad \text{for every } x \in X \quad \text{and } r > 0.$$

Hence

$$Q_{\mu_*}(r) \leq (\mu(X))^{-1} r^d \quad \text{for } r > 0$$

and consequently

$$\underline{\dim}_L \mu_* = \liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\ln Q_{\mu_*}(r)}{\ln r} \geq \liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{d \ln r - \ln \mu(X)}{\ln r} = d. \quad \square$$

**Corollary 5.** *Let  $X$  be a Polish space. Then*

$$\dim_L X \geq \dim_T X.$$

*Proof.* In the case  $\dim_T X < \infty$  the assertion follows immediately from Proposition 4. If  $\dim_T X = \infty$ , then from Proposition 3 it follows that for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  there exists  $\mu_n \in \mathcal{M}_1(X)$  such that  $\mu_n(B(x, r)) \leq r^n$  for arbitrary  $x \in X$  and  $r > 0$ . Hence  $\tilde{\mu}_n = \mu_n / \mu_n(X)$  satisfies

$$\underline{\dim}_L \tilde{\mu}_n \geq n$$

and consequently

$$\dim_L X = \infty. \quad \square$$

**Corollary 6.** *(Szpilrajn, [16]). Let  $X$  be a Polish space. Then*

$$\dim_H X \geq \dim_T X.$$

*Proof.* From inequality  $\dim_H X \geq \dim_H \mu$ ,  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1(X)$ , Proposition 3 and the definition of the concentration dimension of  $X$  it follows that  $\dim_H X \geq \dim_L X$ . From this and Corollary 5 the statement follows.  $\square$

**Proposition 7.** *If  $\dim_T X = \infty$ , then there exists  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1(X)$  such that  $\dim_H \mu = \infty$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $(\mu_n)_{n \geq 1}$ ,  $\mu_n \in \mathcal{M}_1(X)$ , be such that  $\underline{\dim}_L \mu_n \geq n$ . Such measures exist by virtue of Proposition 3. Define

$$\mu = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu_n / 2^n$$

and observe that

$$\dim_H \mu \geq \dim_H \mu_n \quad \text{for } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Indeed, fix  $A \in \mathcal{B}(X)$  such that  $\mu(A) = 1$ . Clearly  $\mu_n(A) = 1$  for arbitrary  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Thus

$$\dim_H A \geq \dim_H \mu_n \geq \underline{\dim}_L \mu_n \quad \text{for } n \in \mathbb{N}$$

and consequently  $\dim_H A \geq n$ . Since  $A \in \mathcal{B}(X)$  with  $\mu(A) = 1$  was arbitrary, hence  $\dim_H \mu \geq n$ . In turn, since  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  was arbitrary, it follows that  $\dim_H \mu = \infty$ .  $\square$



**Theorem 8.** *Let  $X$  be a Polish space. Then*

$$\dim_T X = \inf\{\dim_L X' : X' \text{ is homeomorphic to } X\}.$$

*Proof.* Set  $d = \dim_T X$ . We can assume that  $d < \infty$ . By Proposition 4 for every  $X'$  homeomorphic to  $X$ , we have

$$(12) \quad \dim_L X' \geq d.$$

On the other hand, it follows from [9, Theorem VII.5] that if we let  $X'$  range over all the spaces homeomorphic to a given space  $X$ , then

$$(13) \quad \inf\{\dim_H X'\} = d.$$

The assertion of Theorem 8 follows immediately from Proposition 1 and relations (12) and (13).  $\square$

Finally we will show that the assumption  $\dim_T X < \infty$  in Proposition 4 can not be dropped. Indeed, we have the following counterexample.

**Counterexample.** Let  $((\hat{X}_n, \hat{\rho}_n))_{n \geq 1}$  be a sequence of compact metric spaces such that  $\dim_T \hat{X}_n = n$ . From Theorem 8 it follows that for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  there exists a space  $(X_n, \rho_n)$  homeomorphic to  $(\hat{X}_n, \hat{\rho}_n)$  such that

$$(14) \quad \dim_L X_n \leq n + 1.$$

Without loss of generality we can assume that  $\rho_n(x, y) < \frac{1}{2}$  for  $x, y \in X_n$ . Set

$$X = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} X_n$$

and define  $\rho : X \times X \rightarrow [0, 1]$  by the formula

$$\rho(x, y) = \begin{cases} \rho_n(x, y) & \text{if } x, y \in X_n \text{ for some } n \in \mathbb{N}, \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It is easy to check that  $\rho$  is a metric on  $X$ ,  $\dim_T X = \infty$  and  $\{X_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  is a family of closed disjoint subsets of  $(X, \rho)$ .

We claim that  $\underline{\dim}_L \mu < \infty$  for arbitrary  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1(X)$ . Suppose, for a contradiction, that  $\underline{\dim}_L \mu = \infty$  for some  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1(X)$ . Since

$$1 = \mu(X) = \mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} X_n\right) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(X_n),$$

there exists  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\mu(X_{n_0}) > 0$ . Set  $X_0 = X_{n_0}$  and consider the measure  $\hat{\mu} \in \mathcal{M}_1(X_0)$  given by

$$\hat{\mu}(A) = \mu(A) / \mu(X_0) \quad \text{for } A \in \mathcal{B}(X_0).$$

For  $x_0 \in X_0$  and  $r \in (0, 1)$  let  $B_{X_0}(x_0, r)$  and  $B_X(x_0, r)$  stand for the balls in  $X_0$  and  $X$ , respectively. Clearly

$$\hat{\mu}(B_{X_0}(x_0, r)) = \frac{\mu(B_X(x_0, r) \cap X_0)}{\mu(X_0)} \leq \frac{\mu(B_X(x_0, r))}{\mu(X_0)} \leq \frac{Q_\mu(2r)}{\mu(X_0)}.$$

It follows that  $\underline{\dim}_L \hat{\mu} \geq \underline{\dim}_L \mu = \infty$  and consequently  $\dim_L X_{n_0} = \infty$ , which contradicts (14).  $\square$

*Acknowledgements* T. Szarek and M. Ślęczka were supported by Foundation for Polish Science. Tomasz Szarek was also supported by a Marie Curie Fellowship of the European Community program *Improving the Human Research Potential and the Socio-Economic Knowledge Base* under contract number HPMF-CT-2000-00824.

## REFERENCES

- [1] P. Billingsley, *Convergence of Probability Measures*, John Wiley, New York, 1968.
- [2] R. Engelking, *Dimension Theory*, Biblioteka Matematyczna, Warszawa, 1981.
- [3] K.J. Falconer, *Techniques in Fractal Geometry*, John Wiley and Sons, Chichester New York - Toronto, 1997.
- [4] S.R. Foguel, *The Ergodic Theory of Markov Processes*, van Nostrand Reinhold, New York, 1969.
- [5] L.R. Ford and R.D. Fulkerson, *Maximal flow through a network*, *Canad. J. Math.* **8** (1956), 399–404.
- [6] O. Frostman, *Potential d'équilibre et capacité des ensembles avec quelques applications á la théorie des fonctions*, *Maddel. Lunds Univ. Mat. Sem.* **3** (1935), 1–118.
- [7] W. Hengartner and R. Theodorescu, *Concentration Functions*, Academic Press, New York - London, 1973.
- [8] J.D. Howroyd, *On dimension and on the existence of sets of finite positive Hausdorff measure*, *Proc. London Math. Soc.* **70** (1995), 581–604.
- [9] W. Hurewicz and H. Wallman, *Dimension Theory*, Princeton, 1941.
- [10] H. Joyce, *A relationship between packing and topological dimensions*, *Mathematika* **45** (1998), 43–53.
- [11] A. Lasota and J. Myjak, *On a dimension of measures*, *Bull. Polish Acad. Math.* **50** (2002), 221–235.
- [12] J. Myjak and T. Szarek, *Szpilrajn type theorem for concentration dimension*, *Fund. Math.* **172** (2002), 19–25.
- [13] J. Myjak and T. Szarek, *Some generic properties of concentration dimension of measure*, *Boll. Un. Mat. Ital.* **(8), 6-B** (2003), 211–219.
- [14] V.G. Nöbeling, *Hausdorffische und mengentheoretische Dimension*, in K. Menger, *Ergebnisse eines Mathematischen Kolloquiums*, Edited by E. Dierker, K.Sigmund, Springer, Wien New Yorke, 1998, pp. 24–25.
- [15] C.A. Rogers, *Hausdorff Measures*, Cambridge University Press, 1970.
- [16] E. Szpilrajn, *La dimension et la mesure*, *Fund. Math.* **27** (1937), 81–89.

*Dipartimento di Matematica Pura ed Applicata, Università di L'Aquila, Via Vetoio, 67100 L'Aquila, Italy and WMS AGH al. Mickiewicza 30, 30-059 Kraków, Poland; e-mail: myjak@univaq.it (JM)*

*Institute of Mathematics, Polish Academy of Science, Bankowa 14, 40-007 Katowice Poland and Institute of Mathematics, Silesian University, Bankowa 14, 40-007 Katowice, Poland; e-mail: szarek@ux2.math.us.edu.pl (TS)*

*Institute of Mathematics, Silesian University, Bankowa 14, 40-007 Katowice, Poland; e-mail: slęczka@ux2.math.us.edu.pl (MŚ)*