

On the change of variables in the multiple integrals.

By Setsuya SEKI

(Received July 25, 1952)

The well-known formula on the change of variables in the multiple integrals

$$(*) \int_{f(D)} g(y) dy = \int_D g(f(x)) \text{abs} \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \right| dx$$

has been proved by H. Rademacher and M. Tsuji under very general assumptions. They have shown that the functions f satisfying certain conditions are totally differentiable almost everywhere and consequently the Jacobian $\left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \right|$ can be defined almost everywhere. They have proved further that the above formula (*) holds for integrable functions g , and f satisfying these conditions. We shall give in the following lines another proof of the last fact. Namely we suppose f as a. e. totally differentiable, g as integrable and show the validity of (*). (For the exact formulation see below.) We treat further the case where f is not necessarily univalent.

Throughout this paper, we shall concern ourselves with subsets and mappings of the euclidean n -space E^n . f represents always a mapping defined on a certain subset of E^n . Letters like x, y, a, b represent points of E^n . $\|x-y\|$ denotes the distance between x and y .

§ 1. Preliminaries.

DEFINITION 1. A mapping $f(x)$ defined on a bounded domain $D(\subset E^n)$ is called an \mathfrak{A} -function on D , if it satisfies the following three conditions.

- (\mathfrak{A}_1) f maps D homeomorphically onto $f(D)$.
- (\mathfrak{A}_2) If $\mu(E)=0$ ($E \subset D$), then $\mu(f(E))=0$.
- (\mathfrak{A}_3) $f(x)$ is totally differentiable almost everywhere.

We can easily see that the set of all \mathfrak{A} -functions on D — we shall write this set by $\mathfrak{A}[D]$ — has the following properties.

- (1) If $D \supset D'$, then $\mathfrak{A}[D] \supset \mathfrak{A}[D']$.
- (2) $\mathfrak{A}[D]$ contains all non-singular linear transformations.
- (3) If $\mathfrak{A}[D] \ni f(x)$, $\mathfrak{A}[f(D)] \ni g(x)$ and $\mathfrak{A}[f(D)] \ni f^{-1}(x)$, then we have $gf(x) \in \mathfrak{A}[D]$.

DEFINITION 2. For $f(x) \in \mathfrak{A}[D]$, we define a measure $\mu[f]$ by the formula :

$$\mu[f](E) = \mu(f(E)).$$

When E is measurable, then $f(E)$ is also measurable by (\mathfrak{A}_1) and (\mathfrak{A}_2) . So $\mu(f(E))$ has a sense for every \mathfrak{A} -functions $f(x)$ and every measurable sets E . Furthermore, we can easily see that

- (i) $\mu = \mu[x]$ (x is the identity mapping),
- (ii) $\mu[f]$ is absolutely continuous with respect to $\mu = \mu[x]$.

By (ii) $\mu[f]$ has the density with respect to $\mu = \mu[x]$. Let us denote it by

$$D(f/x) = \frac{d\mu[f]}{d\mu[x]}.$$

Then we have clearly the following

THEOREM 1. If $\mathfrak{A}[D] \ni f(x)$, $\mathfrak{A}[f(D)] \ni g(x)$ and the one of the next two conditions is satisfied :

- (i) $g(x)$ is totally differentiable,
- (ii) $\mathfrak{A}[f(D)] \ni f^{-1}(x)$,

then we have

$$D(gf/x) = D(gf/f)D(f/x).$$

§ 2. Linear functions.

As we have remarked above, every non-singular linear transformation is an \mathfrak{A} -function for every domain D . We shall prove

THEOREM 2. For a non-singular linear \mathfrak{A} -function :

$$f(x) = Ax + b \quad (|A| \neq 0),$$

$D(f/x)$ is equal to $\text{abs } |A|$. ($\text{abs } |A|$ means the absolute value of the determinant $|A|$ of the $n \times n$ matrix A).

Let us first prove the

LEMMA. *An absolutely continuous measure $\nu(E)$ on Borel family \mathfrak{B} of E^n is invariant under any translation in E^n , if and only if $\nu(E) = c\mu(E)$ for some constant c .*

PROOF OF LEMMA. "If"-part is clear. We have only to show the "only if"-part. The unit cube E_0 is measurable by ν , as $E_0 \in \mathfrak{B}$. Put $\nu(E_0) = c$. Any rational interval, for example,

$$I = \left\{ (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n); \frac{n_i}{m} < x_i < \frac{n'_i}{m}, i=1, 2, \dots, n \right\},$$

where m, n_i, n'_i are integers, is built up by cutting E_0 in m^n equal parts, and then arranging $11_{i=1}^{n'_i - n_i}$ small pieces together in a good form by translations. Thus we see easily $\nu(I) = c\mu(I)$ and so $\nu(E) = c\mu(E)$ by the absolute continuity of ν .

PROOF OF THEOREM 2. For $f(x) = Ax + b$, we shall take $f_1 = x + b$ and $f_2 = Ax$, so that

$$f = f_1 f_2$$

$$D(f/x) = D(f_1 f_2 / f_2) D(f_2 / x) = D(f_2 / x)$$

So we can assume $b = 0$ without loss of generality. Let T_a denote the translation: $x \rightarrow x + a$. Then we have

$$\mu(f(T_a(E))) = \mu(T_{Aa}(f(E))) = \mu(f(E)).$$

So $\mu[f]$ is invariant under any translation in E^n . From our lemma follows then that there exists a constant $c(A)$ depending solely on the matrix A , such that

$$\mu[f] = c(A)\mu.$$

Obviously we have

$$c(AB) = c(A) \cdot c(B),$$

and we have $c(U) = 1$ for any orthogonal matrix U , since any sphere is invariant under rotation around the centre. (The invariance of Lebesgue measure under motions of rigid bodies!)

Now any matrix A can be brought into the form: $UA_0A_1 \cdots A_n$, where U is an orthogonal matrix and A_i ($i=0, 1, 2, \dots, n$) have the following forms:

$$A_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & & 0 \\ & \ddots & \\ 0 & & a_{nn} \end{pmatrix},$$

$$A_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 & a_{1n} \\ & \ddots & & & \vdots \\ & & & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & & & & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \dots, A_{n-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ & \ddots & & & \vdots \\ & & & 0 & 0 \\ & & & & a_{n-1n} \\ 0 & & & & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$A_n = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & \dots & a_{1\ n-1} & 0 \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \vdots \\ a_{n-1\ 1} & \dots & a_{n-1\ n-1} & 0 \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

In fact, we can find a U such that

$$U^{-1}A = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & \dots & a_{1\ n-1} & a_{1n} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \vdots \\ a_{n-1\ 1} & \dots & a_{n-1\ n-1} & a_{n-1\ n} \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & a_{nn} \end{pmatrix} \quad (a_{nn} \neq 0).$$

A_i are then defined by these a_{jk} . Let us denote the rotation with the matrix U by ρ , and the linear transformation with the matrix A_i by f_i . Then we have $f = \rho f_0 f_1 \dots f_n$ and

$$D(f/x) = D(\rho/x) D(f_0/x) \dots D(f_n/x).$$

Now we have $D(\rho/x) = 1$, $D(f_0/x) = |a_{nn}|$ and $D(f_i/x) = 1$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$, as these f_i are essentially 1 or 2 dimensional transformations and in these cases the theorem is almost evident. We may proceed by induction with respect to n and assume

$$D(f_n/x) = \text{asb } |A_n|.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} D(f/x) &= |a_{nn}| \text{abs } |A_n| \\ &= \text{abs } |A|. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof.

§ 3. \mathfrak{A} -functions.

In this section we shall prove that for any \mathfrak{A} -function f

$$D(f/x) = \text{abs } \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \right|$$

holds. First we shall prove some lemmas.

LEMMA 1. *The functions*

$$\epsilon_n(x) = \sup_{\|x' - x\| < 1/n} \|f(x') - f(x) - (\text{grad } f(x), x' - x)\| / \|x' - x\|$$

$$(n=1, 2, 3, \dots)$$

are all measurable, and have finite values almost everywhere.

PROOF. Since the function under sup-symbol is continuous with respect to x' , we obtain the same sup-value, when we make x' vary only the points such that $x' - x$ have rational coordinates. So we have

$$\epsilon_n(x) = \sup_a f_a^{(n)}(x),$$

where

$$f_a^{(n)}(x) = \|f(x+a) - f(x) - (\text{grad } f(x), a)\| / \|a\|$$

and a is a rational point whose norm is less than $1/n$. But $f_a^{(n)}(x)$ is a measurable function and $\{f_a^{(n)}(x)\}$ is a countable set for any fixed n . So $\epsilon_n(x)$ is a measurable function for any n . The latter assertion on $\epsilon_n(x)$ follows from the total-differentiability of $f(x)$.

LEMMA 2. *If $f(x)$ is an \mathfrak{A} -function on D , i. e. $\mathfrak{A}[D] \ni f(x)$, and there exist two numbers K, k such that*

$$K \geq \text{abs} \left| \frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x} \right| \geq k$$

for $x \in E$, where E is a measurable set $\subset D$, then $K \geq D(f/x) \geq k$ almost everywhere on E .

PROOF. If $\mu(E) = 0$, the lemma is trivial. So we can assume that $\mu(E) > 0$. We shall consider separately the cases: (i) $k > 0$ and (ii) $k = 0$.

(i) $k > 0$. By the absolute continuity of $\mu[f]$, there exists for any given positive number ϵ a positive number δ such that,

$$\mu[f](E) < \epsilon$$

for any measurable set E whose Lebesgue measure is less than δ . As $\{\epsilon_n(x)\}$ is a sequence of measurable functions converging to zero almost everywhere, we can find by Egoroff's theorem an open set A whose measure is less than δ such that $\{\epsilon_n(x)\}$ converges uniformly to zero on $D - A$. On the other hand, we can also find, since the partial

derivatives of f are all measurable on D , an open set B whose measure is less than δ such that these partial derivatives are all continuous on $D-B$. Furthermore, we can find a closed set F such that

- (i) $E - A \cup B \supset F$,
- (ii) $\mu((E - A \cup B) - F) < \epsilon$.

For a sufficiently large natural number n_0 , we obtain

$$\epsilon_n(x) < \epsilon \quad (n > n_0)$$

on $D-A$. Now we cover F by a countable number of closed cubic intervals I_i with the side length s_i such that $\mu(I_i \cap I_j) = 0$ ($i \neq j$) and

$$\mu(\cup_{i=1}^{\infty} I_i - F) < \delta.$$

In each I_i we select a point x_0 of F and define

$$\bar{f}(x) = f(x_0) + (\text{grad } f(x_0), x - x_0).$$

Construct now two intervals K_i^1 and K_i^2 for each I_i , such that

$$K_i^1 \supset I_i \supset K_i^2.$$

Since $\bar{f}(x)$ is a linear function, the image of these intervals are all parallelograms with parallel faces, and we have

$$\bar{f}(K_i^1) \supset \bar{f}(I_i) \supset \bar{f}(K_i^2).$$

We adjust the size of the intervals so that the distances between the corresponding faces of $\bar{f}(K_i^1)$ and $\bar{f}(I_i)$, resp. of $\bar{f}(I_i)$ and $\bar{f}(K_i^2)$ are all equal to $2\epsilon s_i$ (supposing ϵ not too large).

Then there exists a constant M such that

$$\mu(\bar{f}(K_i^1) - \bar{f}(K_i^2)) \leq \epsilon s_i^n M.$$

Henceforth we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(f(I_i)) &\geq \mu(\bar{f}(K_i^1)) = \mu(\bar{f}(I_i - (I_i - K_i^2))) \\ &= \mu(\bar{f}(I_i)) - \mu(\bar{f}(I_i - K_i^1)) \\ &\geq \mu(\bar{f}(I_i)) - \epsilon s_i^n M \\ &\geq k\mu(I_i) - \epsilon s_i^n M, \\ \mu(f(I_i)) &\leq K\mu(I_i) + \epsilon s_i^n M. \end{aligned}$$

So we obtain the inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} k\mu(\cup_{i=1}^{\infty} I_i) - \epsilon M \mu(\cup_{i=1}^{\infty} I_i) &\leq \mu(f(\cup_{i=1}^{\infty} I_i)) \\ &\leq K\mu(\cup_{i=1}^{\infty} I_i) + \epsilon M \mu(\cup_{i=1}^{\infty} I_i). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, from our assumption follows

$$\begin{aligned} |\mu(f(\cup_{i=1}^{\infty} I_i)) - \mu(f(E))| &\leq |\mu(f(E)) - \mu(f(E - A \cup B))| \\ &+ |\mu(f(E - A \cup B)) - \mu(f(F))| + |\mu(f(F)) - \mu(f(\cup_{i=1}^{\infty} I_i))| < 4\epsilon \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |\mu(\cup_{i=1}^{\infty} I_i) - \mu(E)| &\leq |\mu(E) - \mu(E - A \cup B)| \\ &+ |\mu(E - A \cup B) - \mu(F)| + |\mu(F) - \mu(\cup_{i=1}^{\infty} I_i)| < 4\delta. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned} k\mu(E) - 4(\epsilon M + \epsilon + \delta) &\leq \mu(f(E)) \\ &\leq k\mu(E) + 4(\epsilon M + \epsilon + \delta). \end{aligned}$$

So we obtain

$$k\mu(E) \leq \mu(f(E)) \leq K\mu(E),$$

since ϵ and δ are arbitrary. Similarly we have

$$k\mu(F) \leq \mu(f(F)) \leq K\mu(F)$$

for any measurable subset F in E . This is the required result.

(ii) $k=0$. First we shall assume that $K=0$. We form I_i by the same construction as above. Then $\bar{f}(I_i)$ is mapped into a hyperplane in this case, and there exists a constant M such that

$$\mu(\bar{f}(K_i^1)) < \epsilon S_i^n M.$$

So we obtain

$$\mu(f(I_i)) \leq \mu(f(K_i^1)) < \epsilon S_i^n M,$$

whence follows

$$\mu(f(\cup_{i=1}^{\infty} I_i)) < \epsilon \mu(\cup_{i=1}^{\infty} I_i) M,$$

and finally

$$\mu[f](E) = 0$$

by the same argument as above. Similarly we have $\mu[f](F) = 0$ for any subset F in E , so $D(f/x) = 0$ ($x \in E$) almost everywhere. When

$K > 0$, we subdivide the interval $[K, 0]$ into a countable number of intervals as follows :

$$[K, 0] = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} [K/2^{i-1}, K/2^i] \cup \{0\}.$$

As we have already proved the lemma for any of the subintervals $[K/2^{i-1}, K/2^i]$ or $\{0\}$, we see that the lemma is true also in this case.

THEOREM 3. *If $f(x)$ is an \mathfrak{A} -function on D , then we have*

$$D(f/x) = \text{abs} \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \right|$$

almost everywhere.

PROOF. If the proposition is false, then either

$$\mu \left\{ x; D(f/x) > \text{abs} \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \right| \right\} > 0$$

or

$$\mu \left\{ x; D(f/x) < \text{abs} \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \right| \right\} > 0$$

should hold. Since we may proceed in a similar way in either case, we shall assume that

$$\mu \left\{ x; D(f/x) > \text{abs} \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \right| \right\} > 0.$$

We can further assume that

$$\mu \left\{ x; \text{abs} \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \right| > 0 \right\} > 0,$$

as the theorem is trivial when $\left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \right| = 0$. In fact, we have then $D(f/x) = 0$ almost everywhere from the above lemma. Under these assumptions, there exists some natural number m such that the measure of the set

$$E_1 = \left\{ x; D(f/x) - \text{abs} \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \right| > \frac{1}{m} \right\}$$

is positive. Then we can take an interval $[a_1, a_2]$ such that

- (1) a_1 and a_2 are rational numbers,

$$(2) \quad a_2 - a_1 < \frac{1}{m},$$

$$(3) \quad \mu \left\{ x; \text{abs} \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \right| \in [a_1, a_2], x \in E_1 \right\} > 0.$$

From the above lemma follows

$$D(f/x) \in [a_1, a_2]$$

almost everywhere in

$$E_2 = \left\{ x; \text{abs} \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \right| \in [a_1, a_2], x \in E_1 \right\},$$

in contradiction to our assumption. So the theorem is proved.

COROLLARY. *If $f(x)$ is an \mathfrak{A} -function on D and $g(x)$ is integrable on $f(D)$, then we have*

$$\int_{f(E)} g(x) dx = \int_E g(f(x)) \cdot \text{abs} \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \right| dx,$$

where E is any measurable set.

§ 4. Generalized \mathfrak{A} -functions.

Now we shall examine the case, where transformation is not necessarily a homeomorphism.

DEFINITION 3. *A transformation $f(x)$ from a compact domain D into E^n is called a generalized \mathfrak{A} -function on D , if the following conditions are satisfied:*

(\mathfrak{A}_1') *$f(x)$ is a continuous mapping, locally homeomorphic in D except on a null-set E .*

(\mathfrak{A}_2) *If $\mu(F) = 0$ ($F \subset D$), then $\mu(f(F)) = 0$.*

(\mathfrak{A}_3) *$f(x)$ is totally differentiable in D almost everywhere.*

We shall consider in the following a fixed generalized \mathfrak{A} -function $f(x)$ on a compact set D , with a possible exceptional null-set E . We shall now proceed to evaluate the integral

$$\int_D \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \right| dx.$$

First, we shall prove some lemmas.

LEMMA 1. Denote with D^r the boundary of D . The inverse image of x_0 contains at most a finite number of points, if

- (1) $f(E)\bar{\ni}x_0$ (see (\mathfrak{A}_1')),
- (2) $f(D^r)\ni x_0$.

We shall denote with $m(x_0)$ the number of points contained in the inverse image of such x_0 .

PROOF. Since D is compact, so $f^{-1}(x_0)$ must have a cluster point x_1 , if it contains an infinite number of points. But as x_1 does not belong to $E \cup D^r$, so $f(x)$ is homeomorphic on some neighbourhood of x_1 ,—which is clearly a contradiction.

LEMMA 2. For a point x_0 such that

- (i) $f(E)\bar{\ni}x_0$,
- (ii) $f(D^r)\bar{\ni}x_0$,
- (iii) $f(D)\ni x_0$,

there exists a neighbourhood U of x_0 which satisfies:

- (1) $f^{-1}(U)$ is a direct sum of neighbourhoods $V_i (i=1, 2, \dots, m)$ of points x_1, \dots, x_m , where $f^{-1}(x_0) = \{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$ and $m = m(x_0)$,
- (2) $V_i (i=1, 2, \dots, m)$ is mapped onto U by $f(x)$ homeomorphically.

PROOF. If we take a sufficiently small neighbourhood U of x_0 , there exist clearly the open sets V_1, \dots, V_m in D , each of which is mapped onto U by $f(x)$ homeomorphically.

If $f^{-1}(U) \neq \sum_{i=1}^m V_i$, then we can find points x' in U , such that $f^{-1}(x') \not\subset \sum_{i=1}^m V_i$. We shall call such points "exceptional". If there are only a finite number of exceptional points, then we may substitute U by a small neighbourhood U' , not containing these exceptional points, and obtain a neighbourhood of required nature. Even if there are an infinite number of exceptional points, we can attain our purpose in the same way, if they do not accumulate around x_0 . Assume now there exists a sequence of exceptional points $x'_1, x'_2, \dots, x'_n, \dots$ converging to x_0 . Let a_i be a point in D , such that $a_i \in \sum_{i=1}^m V_i$ and $f(a_i) = x'_i$. $\{a_i\}$ has a cluster point a in the compact set $(D - \sum_{i=1}^m V_i)$. Then we must have $f(a) = x_0$ and $a \in f^{-1}(x_0)$, which is a contradiction.

LEMMA 3. If we put $f^{-1}f(E) = \bar{E}$, then

$$\int_{\bar{E}} \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \right| dx = 0.$$

PROOF. We shall prove that

$$\int_{\bar{E}} \text{abs} \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \right| dx = 0.$$

Since $\mu(E)=0$, this equation is equivalent to

$$\int_{\bar{E}-E} \text{abs} \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \right| dx = 0.$$

If $\mu(\bar{E}-E)=0$, then our proposition is trivial. So we assume $\mu(\bar{E}-E)>0$. Under this assumption, we have only to prove that for any closed subset F of $\bar{E}-E$

$$\int_F \text{abs} \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \right| dx = 0.$$

Now, every point of F has a neighbourhood, on which $f(x)$ is a homeomorphism, and as F is compact, F is covered by a finite number of such neighbourhoods as follows:

$$\cup_{i=1}^k U_i \supset F.$$

In each U_i , we have from the result of the last section,

$$0 = \mu(f(F \cap U_i)) = \int_{F \cap U_i} \text{abs} \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \right| dx.$$

Thus we obtain

$$0 \leq \int_F \text{abs} \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \right| dx \leq \sum_{i=1}^k \int_{F \cap U_i} \text{abs} \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \right| dx = 0.$$

This completes the proof.

Now denote with $A(x, f, D)$ the degree of mapping on D at x , and put

$$f(D)_m = \{x; A(x, f, D) = m\} \quad (m=0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots).$$

Then we have

$$\cup_{m=-\infty}^{+\infty} f(D)_m = f(D) - f(D^r).$$

THEOREM 4. *If $\mu(D^r)=0$, and $\text{abs} \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \right|$ is integrable on D , then we have*

$$\int_D \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \right| dx = \sum_{m=-\infty}^{+\infty} m \int_{f(D)_m} dx.$$

PROOF. Let us represent $f(D)_m - f(E)$ as the union of closed cubes I_i ($i=1, 2, \dots$) such that

- (i) $\mu(I_i \cap I_j) = 0$ if $i \neq j$,
- (ii) $f^{-1}(I_i)$ is the union of a finite number of disjoint closed domains J_j^i ($j=1, 2, \dots, \alpha_i$),
- (iii) J_j^i 's are mapped homeomorphically onto I_i by $f(x)$.

The existence of such J_j^i 's is assured by lemma 2. For $x \in I_i$ we have obviously

$$A(x, f, J_j^i) = \operatorname{sgn} \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \right|$$

and

$$A(x, f, (D - \sum_{j=1}^{\alpha_i} J_j^i)) = 0.$$

Furthermore, since we have

$$m = A(x, f, D) = \sum_{j=1}^{\alpha_i} A(x, f, J_j^i) + A(x, f, (D - \sum_{j=1}^{\alpha_i} J_j^i)),$$

we can easily see that

$$m \int_{I_i} dx = \sum_{j=1}^{\alpha_i} \int_{J_j^i} \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \right| dx$$

by theorem 3 of the last section. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} m \int_{f(D)_m} dx &= m \int_{f(D)_m - f(E)} dx = m \int_{\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} I_i} dx \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} m \int_{I_i} dx = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{\alpha_i} \int_{J_j^i} \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \right| dx \\ &= \int_{f^{-1}(f(D)_m) - f^{-1}f(E)} \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \right| dx. \end{aligned}$$

Now, as $\operatorname{abs} \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \right|$ is integrable,

$$S = \sum_{m=-\infty}^{+\infty} \int_{f^{-1}(f(D)_m) - f^{-1}f(E)} \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \right| dx$$

is finite. From the equation just proved follows then that

$$\sum_{m=-\infty}^{+\infty} m \int_{f(D)_m} dx$$

is also finite and equal to S . The last sum is equal to

$$\int_{D-f^{-1}J(E)-f^{-1}f(D^*)} \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \right| dx = \int_D \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \right| dx.$$

Thus our proposition is proved.

The following theorem can be proved in the same way.

THEOREM 5. *If one of the integrals:*

$$\int_D g(f(x)) \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \right| dx \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{m=-\infty}^{+\infty} m \int_{f(D)_m} g(y) dy$$

is finite, then the other is also finite and they are equal to each other.

COROLLARY. *Let $f(x)$ be a generalized \mathfrak{A} -function on D and S a hypersphere in D . If $f(x)$ maps S homeomorphically onto $f(S)$ and $\text{abs} \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \right|$ is integrable on D , then we have*

$$\int_{[f(S)]} g(y) dy = \text{sgn } A[x, f, D] \int_{[S]} g(f(x)) \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \right| dx,$$

where $[]$ represents the interior of $*$.*

This corollary may be regarded as a direct generalization of the well-known formula in the integral calculus:

$$\int_{f(a)}^{f(b)} g(y) dy = \int_a^b g(f(x)) f'(x) dx.$$

St. Paul's University, Tokyo.