

LEBESGUE INTEGRAL THEORY

Measure Theory, Integration, and Hilbert spaces (modified)

Jaeho Shin

Department of Mathematical Sciences, KAIST

Contents

1	Measure Theory	3
1.1	Preliminaries	3
1.2	The exterior measure	7
1.3	Measurable sets and the Lebesgue measure	8
1.4	Measurable functions	9
1.5	Exercises	10
2	Integration Theory	11
2.1	The Lebesgue integral: basic properties and convergence theorems	11
2.2	The space L^1 of integrable functions	11
2.3	Fubini's theorem	11
2.4	A Fourier inversion formula	11
2.5	Exercises	11
3	Differentiation and Integration	12
3.1	Differentiation of the integral	12
3.2	Good kernels and approximations to the identity	12
3.3	Differentiability of functions	12
3.4	Rectifiable curves and the isoperimetric inequality	12
3.5	Exercises	12
4	Solution for exercises	13
4.1	Chapter 1	14
4.2	Section 2	33

Chapter 1

Measure Theory

The goal of this course, especially in this chapter, is to provide a notion of “size” for subsets of \mathbb{R}^d by constructing an appropriate function

$$m : \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}$$

satisfying the following properties:

- (1) $m(\emptyset) = 0$
- (2) $m([b, a]) = b - a$
- (3) If $E = \bigsqcup_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n$, then $m(E) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} m(E_n)$.
- (4) $m(E + h) = m(E)$ for all $h \in \mathbb{R}$

The third and fourth properties are called **countable additivity** and **translation invariance**, respectively. By regarding m as a function that measures the size of sets, it seems very natural that m should satisfy the above properties. However, this is just our intuition! As a math student, the natural follow-up question is as follows:

Does m exist? If it does, is m unique?

In fact, such a function m does not exist. Then, what can we do next? One way to resolve this problem is to restrict the domain of m . By removing certain pathological sets, we can define a function m which satisfies some nice properties. This domain will be called “measurable sets” and the function m will be called the “Lebesgue measure”.

1.1 Preliminaries

Recall that the collection $\{E_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}$ of subsets in \mathbb{R}^d is said to be disjoint if $E_\alpha \cap E_\beta = \emptyset$ whenever $\alpha \neq \beta$. We define the slightly weaker concept “almost disjoint” as follows:

Definition 1.1.1

Let $\{E_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}$ be a collection subsets in \mathbb{R}^d . Then $\{E_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}$ is said to be **almost disjoint** if $\{\text{Int}(E_\alpha)\}_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}$ is disjoint.

Note that a (closed) **rectangle** R in \mathbb{R}^d is given by the product of d one-dimensional closed and bounded intervals

$$R = [a_1, b_1] \times [a_2, b_2] \times \cdots \times [a_d, b_d],$$

where $a_j \leq b_j$ are real numbers, $j = 1, 2, \dots, d$. The **volume** of the rectangle R is denoted by $|R|$, and is defined to be

$$|R| = (b_1 - a_1) \cdots (b_d - a_d).$$

Also, a **cube** is a rectangle for which $b_1 - a_1 = b_2 - a_2 = \cdots = b_d - a_d$. So if $Q \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is a cube of common side length l , then $|Q| = l^d$.

Lemma 1.1.1

If a rectangle is the almost disjoint union of finitely many other rectangles, say $R = \bigcup_{k=1}^N R_k$, then

$$|R| = \sum_{k=1}^N |R_k|.$$

Proof. Consider the grid formed by extending indefinitely the sides of all rectangles R_1, \dots, R_N . This gives finitely many rectangles $\tilde{R}_1, \dots, \tilde{R}_M$, and a partition J_1, \dots, J_N of integers between 1 and M such that

$$R = \bigcup_{j=1}^M \tilde{R}_j \quad \text{and} \quad R_k = \bigcup_{j \in J_k} \tilde{R}_j \quad \text{for} \quad 1 \leq k \leq N$$

are almost disjoint.




Figure 1.1: The grid formed by the rectangles R_k

For the rectangle R , it is clear that $|R| = \sum_{j=1}^M |\tilde{R}_j|$. By the same reason, we also have $|R_k| = \sum_{j \in J_k} |\tilde{R}_j|$. Therefore, one can obtain

$$|R| = \sum_{j=1}^M |\tilde{R}_j| = \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{j \in J_k} |\tilde{R}_j| = \sum_{k=1}^N |R_k|.$$

□

Lemma 1.1.2

If R, R_1, \dots, R_N are rectangles, and $R \subseteq \bigcup_{k=1}^N R_k$, then

$$|R| \leq \sum_{k=1}^N |R_k|.$$

Proof. As we did in Lemma 1.1.1, we can find smaller rectangles $\tilde{R}_1, \dots, \tilde{R}_M$. Note that there exist $J_0 \subseteq \{1, \dots, M\}$ such that $R = \bigcup_{j \in J_0} \tilde{R}_j$. Let $R' := \bigcup_{j=1}^M \tilde{R}_j$. Again, we can find a partition J_1, \dots, J_N of $\{1, \dots, M\}$ such that

$$R_k = \bigcup_{j \in J_k} \tilde{R}_j \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq k \leq N.$$

Note that J_0, J_1, \dots, J_N need not be disjoint.

Since $R \subseteq \bigcup_{k=1}^N R_k$, we have $J_0 \subseteq \bigcup_{k=1}^N J_k$. Therefore, we can obtain

$$|R| = \sum_{j \in J_0} |\tilde{R}_j| \leq \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{j \in J_k} |\tilde{R}_j| = \sum_{k=1}^N |R_k|.$$

This completes the proof. □

Theorem 1.1.3

Every open set $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ can be written uniquely as a countable union of disjoint open intervals.

Proof. For each $x \in U$, there exists an open interval, which contains x , contained in U . If $a_x = \inf\{a < x : (a, x) \subseteq U\}$ and $b_x = \sup\{b > x : (x, b) \subseteq U\}$, then

$$x \in I_x := (a_x, b_x) \subseteq U.$$

Hence, we get $U = \bigcup_{x \in U} I_x$. Moreover, note that I_x is the largest open interval, which contains x , contained in U .

Suppose that two intervals I_x and I_y intersect. Then we have

$$x \in I_x \cup I_y \subseteq U;$$

by the maximality of I_x , we conclude that $(I_x \cup I_y) \subseteq I_x$. By the same argument, since $(I_x \cup I_y) \subseteq I_y$, we finally have $I_x = I_y$. Therefore, any two distinct intervals in $\mathcal{C} := \{I_x\}_{x \in U}$ is disjoint.

We claim that \mathcal{C} is countable, i.e., it has countably many disjoint open intervals. Since each I_x contains a rational number, any two distinct intervals must contain distinct rationals. Hence, the collection \mathcal{C} must be countable. \square

However, in \mathbb{R}^d for $d \geq 2$, the direct analogue of Theorem 1.1.3 is not valid (see Exercise 1.12). Instead, there is a substitute result as follows:

Theorem 1.1.4

Every open subset $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq 1$, can be written as a countable union of almost disjoint closed cubes.

Proof.

\square

1.2 The exterior measure

1.3 Measurable sets and the Lebesgue measure

1.4 Measurable functions

1.5 Exercises

Chapter 2

Integration Theory

- 2.1 The Lebesgue integral: basic properties and convergence theorems
- 2.2 The space L^1 of integrable functions
- 2.3 Fubini's theorem
- 2.4 A Fourier inversion formula
- 2.5 Exercises

Chapter 3

Differentiation and Integration

- 3.1 Differentiation of the integral
- 3.2 Good kernels and approximations to the identity
- 3.3 Differentiability of functions
- 3.4 Rectifiable curves and the isoperimetric inequality
- 3.5 Exercises

Chapter 4

Solution for exercises

MAS441: Lebesgue Integral Theory Homework Problems

Solutions for the selected exercises

Jaeho Shin

Department of Mathematical Sciences, KAIST

4.1 Chapter 1

Exercise 1.5

Suppose E is a given set, and \mathcal{O}_n is the open set:

$$\mathcal{O}_n = \{x : d(x, E) < 1/n\}.$$

Show:

- (a) If E is compact, then $m(E) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} m(\mathcal{O}_n)$.
- (b) However, the conclusion in (a) may be false for E closed and unbounded; or E open and bounded.

Proof. (a) We first prove that \mathcal{O}_n is open for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. For any $x \in \mathcal{O}_n$, since $d(x, E) < \frac{1}{n}$, there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that $d(x, E) + \epsilon < \frac{1}{n}$. For any $y \in B_d(x, \epsilon)$, by the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} d(y, E) &= \inf\{d(y, z) : z \in E\} \\ &\leq \inf\{d(y, x) + d(x, z) : z \in E\} \\ &< \epsilon + \inf\{d(x, z) : z \in E\} \\ &= \epsilon + d(x, E) < \frac{1}{n}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we conclude that $x \in B_d(x, \epsilon) \subseteq \mathcal{O}_n$, that is, \mathcal{O}_n is open.

Recall that all open sets are measurable and the countable intersection of measurable sets is measurable. Then

$$\mathcal{O} := \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{O}_n = \{x : d(x, E) = 0\}$$

is measurable. It is clear that $E \subseteq \mathcal{O}$, by definition. However, since the compactness of E implies that $\bar{E} = E$, note that

$$\begin{aligned} d(x, E) = 0 &\iff \forall \epsilon > 0, \exists y \neq x \text{ such that } y \in E \cap B_d(x, \epsilon) \\ &\iff x \in \bar{E} \\ &\iff x \in E \quad (\because E \text{ is compact.}) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we get $\mathcal{O} = E$. Moreover, since $\mathcal{O}_n \supseteq \mathcal{O}_{n+1}$, for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, we have $\mathcal{O}_n \searrow \mathcal{O}$.

One more thing we need to check is whether $m(\mathcal{O}_1)$ is finite or not. Note that the compactness of E implies that it is bounded, i.e., there exists $N > 0$ such that $E \subseteq B_d(\mathbf{0}, N)$ where $\mathbf{0}$ is the origin. Then, the triangle inequality implies that $\mathcal{O}_1 \subseteq B_d(\mathbf{0}, N+1)$; therefore,

$$m(\mathcal{O}_1) \leq m(B_d(\mathbf{0}, N+1)) < \infty.$$

Then, by Corollary 1.3.3 in the Textbook, since $\{\mathcal{O}_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ are the measurable sets satisfying $\mathcal{O}_n \searrow E$ and $m(\mathcal{O}_1) < \infty$, we conclude that

$$m(E) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} m(\mathcal{O}_n).$$

(b) We first consider the case when E is closed and unbounded. Let $E = \mathbb{Z} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, then it is closed but it is unbounded. Note that

$$\mathcal{O}_n = \bigcup_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} \left(x - \frac{1}{n}, x + \frac{1}{n} \right) \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{Z}^+.$$

Although each interval $(x - 1/n, x + 1/n)$ has length (or measure) $2/n$, but since there are infinitely many integers, $m(\mathcal{O}_n)$ is infinite for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$.

On the other hand, since \mathbb{Z} is the countable union of singletons, $\{x\}$ with $x \in \mathbb{Z}$, and since each singleton has measure zero, it follows that \mathbb{Z} is measurable. Moreover, since these singletons are disjoint measurable sets, we have

$$m(\mathbb{Z}) = m\left(\bigcup_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} \{x\}\right) = \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} m(\{x\}) = 0.$$

Therefore, we can obtain $m(E) \neq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} m(\mathcal{O}_n)$, in this case.

Likewise, let's consider the case when E is open and bounded. Since $[0, 1] \cap \mathbb{Q}$ contains countably many elements, let's label them r_i where $i \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ so that $\{r_1, r_2, \dots\} = [0, 1] \cap \mathbb{Q}$. Under this notation, define

$$E := \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(r_k - \frac{1}{2^{k+2}}, r_k + \frac{1}{2^{k+2}} \right)$$

which is open by being countable union of open intervals.

Recall that $\mathcal{O}_n = \{x : d(x, E) < \frac{1}{n}\}$. Hence, we clearly have $\mathcal{O}_n \supseteq \mathcal{O}_{n+1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$; moreover, each \mathcal{O}_n is measurable by being an open set. Let

$$\mathcal{O} := \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{O}_n = \{x : d(x, E) = 0\},$$

then, as we did before, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d(x, E) = 0 &\iff \forall \epsilon > 0, \exists y \neq x \text{ such that } y \in E \cap B_d(x, \epsilon) \\ &\iff x \in \bar{E}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we conclude that $\mathcal{O} = \bar{E}$. This implies that $\mathcal{O}_n \searrow \bar{E}$ where $m(\mathcal{O}_1) < \infty$ (since E is bounded, so is \mathcal{O}_1); therefore, we get

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} m(\mathcal{O}_n) = m(\bar{E}).$$

Here, since \bar{E} is a well-defined closed set, so it is measurable. Hence, this proves the existence of $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} m(\mathcal{O}_n)$.

For any $x \in [0, 1]$ and $n \geq 1$, if $x + \frac{1}{n} \leq 1$, then there exists $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $r_m \in (x, x + \frac{1}{n})$ so that $x \in \mathcal{O}_n$; likewise, if $x + \frac{1}{n} > 1$, then there exists $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $r_m \in (x - \frac{1}{n}, x)$ so that $x \in \mathcal{O}_n$. Hence, we have $[0, 1] \subseteq \mathcal{O}_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Then the monotonicity gives

$$1 = m([0, 1]) \leq m(\mathcal{O}_n) \quad \text{for all } n \geq 1.$$

Therefore, we conclude that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} m(\mathcal{O}_n) \geq 1$.

However, from the definition of E , the countable subadditivity gives that

$$m(E) \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} m\left(\left(r_k - \frac{1}{2^{k+2}}, r_k + \frac{1}{2^{k+2}}\right)\right) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^{k+1}} = \frac{1}{2}.$$

Hence, we proved that

$$m(E) \neq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} m(\mathcal{O}_n).$$

□

Exercise 1.8

Suppose L is a linear transformation on \mathbb{R}^d . Show that if E is measurable subset of \mathbb{R}^d , then so is $L(E)$, by proceeding as follows:

- (a) Note that if E is compact, so is $L(E)$. Hence if E is an F_σ set, so is $L(E)$.
- (b) Because L automatically satisfies the inequality

$$|L(x) - L(x')| \leq M|x - x'|$$

for some M , we can see that L maps any cube of side length l into a cube of side length $c_d Ml$, with $c_d = 2\sqrt{d}$. Now if $m(E) = 0$, there is a collection of cubes $\{Q_j\}$ such that $E \subset \bigcup_j Q_j$, and $\sum_j m(Q_j) < \epsilon$. Thus $m_*(L(E)) \leq c'\epsilon$, and hence $m(L(E)) = 0$. Finally, use Corollary 3.5.

One can show that $m(L(E)) = |\det L|m(E)$; see Problem 4 in the next chapter.

Proof. (a) Since we know that every linear transformation on \mathbb{R}^d is Lipschitz, thus L is a continuous map. Hence, it maps a compact set E to a compact set, that is, $L(E)$ is compact.

Assume that E is an F_σ set, i.e. $E = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} F_n$ where $\{F_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ are closed sets in \mathbb{R}^d . We now claim that $L(E)$ is also compact. To prove this, we first prove the following lemma:

Lemma. Every closed in \mathbb{R}^d is a countable union of compact sets.

Proof. Let F be a closed set in \mathbb{R}^d . For each $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, let

$$K_m := F \cap \overline{B_d(\mathbf{0}, m)}.$$

Since K_m is closed and bounded in \mathbb{R}^d , thus it is compact. Also, it is clear that

$$F = \bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} K_m;$$

therefore, any closed set F can be written as a countable union of compact sets. \square

By lemma, each closed set F_n can be written as

$$F_n = \bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} K_{n,m}$$

where each $K_{n,m}$ is compact. Thus we get

$$E = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} K_{n,m}.$$

Then, $L(E)$ can be expressed as

$$L(E) = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} L(K_{n,m})$$

where each $L(K_{n,m})$ is compact, by the above conclusion. Therefore, this implies that $L(E)$ is a countable union of compact sets (which are closed in \mathbb{R}^d) so that it is a F_σ set.

(b) If $m(E) = 0$, then there exist a collection of closed cubes $\{Q_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ such that

$$E \subseteq \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} Q_j \quad \text{and} \quad 0 \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |Q_j| < \epsilon.$$

Let l_j be the side length of Q_j , for each j , then $L(Q_j)$ is contained in a cube Q'_j of side length $c_d M l_j$ where $c_d = 2\sqrt{d}$. Since

$$L(E) \subseteq \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} L(Q_j) \subseteq \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} Q'_j$$

thus

$$m_*(L(E)) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |Q'_j| = (c_d M)^d \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} l_j^d < \epsilon (c_d M)^d.$$

This proves that $m_*(L(E)) = 0$.

Note that since E is measurable, by Corollary 1.3.5, there exist an F_σ set F such that

$$m(E \triangle F) = 0.$$

Then, by part (a), $L(F)$ is also F_σ set and since we have

$$L(E) \triangle L(F) \subseteq L(E \triangle F),$$

in general, thus

$$0 \leq m_*(L(E) \triangle L(F)) \leq m_*(L(E \triangle F)).$$

Since $m(E \triangle F) = 0$ implies that $m_*(L(E \triangle F)) = 0$, we get

$$m_*(L(E) \triangle L(F)) = 0.$$

This implies that $L(E)$ differs from an F_σ set $L(F)$ by a set of measure zero; therefore, $L(E)$ is measurable and we conclude that $m(L(E)) = 0$. \square

Exercise 1.11

Let A be the subset of $[0, 1]$ which consists of all numbers which do not have the digit 4 appearing in their decimal expansion. Find $m(A)$.

Proof. Let A_n denote the set

$$A_n := \{x \in [0, 1] : \text{first } n \text{ digits of } x \text{ do not contain } 4\}.$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Then $A_{n+1} \subseteq A_n$, for all n , and

$$A = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n.$$

This implies that $A_n \searrow A$.

Note that each A_n is a finite union of intervals. For instance, since A_1 is

$$A_1 = \left[0, \frac{4}{10}\right) \cup \left[\frac{5}{10}, 1\right],$$

thus it is measurable and has measure $9/10$. Similarly, A_2 is obtained from A_1 by removing 9 subintervals of length $1/100$, corresponding to numbers whose second digit is 4. Therefore, we get $m(A_2) = (9/10)^2$. By repeating this procedure, we have

$$m(A_n) = \left(\frac{9}{10}\right)^n \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{Z}^+.$$

By Corollary 1.3.3, since $\{A_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ are measurable sets with $A_n \searrow A$ and $m(A_1) < \infty$, thus we have

$$m(A) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} m(A_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{9}{10}\right)^n = 0.$$

□

Exercise 1.12

Theorem 1.3 states that every open set in \mathbb{R} is the disjoint union of open intervals. The analogue in \mathbb{R}^d , $d \geq 2$, is generally false. Prove the following:

- (a) An open disc in \mathbb{R}^2 is not the disjoint union of open rectangles.
[Hint: What happens to the boundary of any of these rectangles?]
- (b) An open connected set Ω is the disjoint union of open rectangles if and only if Ω is itself an open rectangle.

Proof. (a) Suppose not. Let \mathcal{C} be the collection of disjoint open rectangles whose union is an open disc in \mathbb{R}^2 . Consider $R \in \mathcal{C}$ and $x \in \text{bd}(R)$ which does not lie on the boundary of disc. Since $x \in D$, where D denotes the disc, there exist $R' \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $x \in R'$. Hence, there exist a basis element B (which is an ϵ -ball centered at x) such that

$$x \in B \subseteq R'.$$

Since $x \in \text{bd}(R) = \overline{R} \cap \overline{(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus R)}$ and B is a neighborhood of x , so B intersects R at some point y other than x . Since $y \in B \subseteq R'$ and $y \in R$, we have $R \cap R' \neq \emptyset$ which is a contradiction. Therefore, D cannot be the disjoint union of open rectangles.

(b) Suppose that $\Omega = \bigcup_{U \in \mathcal{C}} U$ where the elements of \mathcal{C} are disjoint open rectangles. Let $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{A} \subsetneq \mathcal{C}$. Then

$$\Omega = \left(\bigcup_{U \in \mathcal{A}} U \right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{U \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{A}} U \right)$$

gives a separation of Ω which contradicts to the connectedness of Ω . Therefore, such \mathcal{A} cannot exist, i.e., $|\mathcal{C}| = 1$ so that Ω is an open rectangle. The converse is trivial; hence, the proof is done. \square

Exercise 1.16

Suppose $\{E_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ is a countable family of measurable subsets of \mathbb{R}^d and that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} m(E_k) < \infty.$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned} E &= \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : x \in E_k, \text{ for infinitely many } k\} \\ &= \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} (E_k). \end{aligned}$$

(a) Show that E is measurable.

(b) Prove $m(E) = 0$.

[Hint: Write $E = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{k \geq n} E_k$.]

Proof. (a) Recall that $\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} (E_k)$ is obtained by

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} (E_k) = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{k=n}^{\infty} E_k.$$

This is because

$$\begin{aligned} x \in E_k \text{ for infinitely many } k &\iff x \in \bigcup_{k=n}^{\infty} E_k \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \\ &\iff x \in \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{k=n}^{\infty} E_k. \end{aligned}$$

Since each E_k is measurable, so is $\bigcup_{k=n}^{\infty} E_k$. Likewise, this implies that $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{k=n}^{\infty} E_k$ is also measurable. Therefore, we conclude that E is measurable.

(b) $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} m(E_k) < \infty$ implies that, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $N > 0$ such that

$$\sum_{k=N}^{\infty} m(E_k) < \epsilon.$$

Then, by the countable subadditivity, we have

$$m\left(\bigcup_{k=N}^{\infty} E_k\right) \leq \sum_{k=N}^{\infty} m(E_k) < \epsilon.$$

However, since the monotonicity implies that

$$m(E) = m\left(\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{k=n}^{\infty} E_k\right) \leq m\left(\bigcup_{k=N}^{\infty} E_k\right) < \epsilon,$$

we conclude that $m(E) = 0$. □

Exercise 1.17

Let $\{f_n\}$ be a sequence of measurable functions on $[0, 1]$ with $|f_n(x)| < \infty$ for a.e x . Show that there exists a sequence c_n of positive real numbers such that

$$\frac{f_n(x)}{c_n} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{a.e. } x$$

[Hint: Pick c_n such that $m(\{x : |f_n(x)/c_n| > 1/n\}) < 2^{-n}$, and apply the Borel-Cantelli lemma.]

Proof. The fact that $|f_n(x)| < \infty$ for a.e x implies that

$$m(\{x : |f_n(x)| = \infty\}) = 0.$$

Let A denote the set $\{x : |f(x)| = \infty\}$. If we let $A_k := \{x : |f_n(x)| > k/n\}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, then we have $A_k \searrow A$ since

$$A_{k+1} \subseteq A_k \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$$

and

$$\bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} A_k = \{x : |f_n(x)| = \infty\}.$$

Therefore, we get

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} m(A_k) = m(A) = 0.$$

This implies that there exists $c_n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $m(A_{c_n}) < 2^{-n}$, i.e.

$$m\left(\left\{x : |f_n(x)| > \frac{c_n}{n}\right\}\right) < 2^{-n}. \quad (*)$$

Define, for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$,

$$E_n = \left\{x : \left|\frac{f_n(x)}{c_n}\right| > \frac{1}{n}\right\}.$$

Then $(*)$ implies that $m(E_n) < 2^{-n}$ for all n . Note that $\{E_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is a countable family of measurable sets with

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} m(E_n) < \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^n} = 1 < \infty;$$

therefore, by the Borel-Cantelli lemma, we get $m(E) = 0$ where

$$E := \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (E_n).$$

For any $x \in E^c$, there exists $N > 0$ such that $x \notin E_n$ for all $n \geq N$. This implies that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{f_n(x)}{c_n} \right| = 0 \quad \text{for all } x \in E^c.$$

Therefore, $m(E) = 0$ implies that

$$\frac{f_n(x)}{c_n} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{a.e. } x.$$

□

Exercise 1.20

Show that there exist closed sets A and B with $m(A) = m(B) = 0$, but $m(A+B) > 0$:

- (a) In \mathbb{R} , let $A = \mathcal{C}$ (the Cantor set), $B = \mathcal{C}/2$. Note that $A + B \supset [0, 1]$.
- (b) In \mathbb{R}^2 , observe that if $A = I \times \{0\}$ and $B = \{0\} \times I$ (where $I = [0, 1]$), then $A + B = I \times I$.

Proof. (a) It is clear that every number in $[0, 1]$ has a ternary expansion

$$x = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k 3^{-k}, \quad \text{where } a_k = 0, 1, \text{ or } 2.$$

The algorithm for finding a_k is as following: If $x = 1$, then $a_k = 2$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$; if $x < 1$, take $a_1 = \lfloor 3x \rfloor$ where $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ denotes the greatest integer less than or equal to x . Similarly, we take $a_2 = \lfloor 3(3x - a_1) \rfloor$ and by repeating this procedure, we have

$$a_n = \left\lfloor 3^n x - \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} a_k 3^{n-k} \right\rfloor \quad \text{for all } n \geq 2.$$

Note that the ternary expansion is not unique since, for example, $1/3 = \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} 2/3^k$.

Since $A = \mathcal{C}$, the Cantor set, A consists of all numbers which have a ternary expansion with $a_k \in \{0, 2\}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. By the same reason, since $B = \mathcal{C}/2$, it consists of all numbers which have a ternary expansion with $a_k \in \{0, 1\}$.

Now we claim that, for any $x \in [0, 1]$, there exist $a \in A$ and $b \in B$ such that $x = a + b$. Let $x = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k 3^{-k}$, where $a_k \in \{0, 1, 2\}$, be a ternary expansion of x . Likewise, let

$$a = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k 3^{-k} \quad \text{and} \quad b = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} b_k 3^{-k}$$

be ternary expansions of a and b , respectively. By letting,

$$a_k = \begin{cases} 2, & \text{if } x_k = 2 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad b_k = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } x_k = 1 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

we clearly have $x = a + b$ (since $x_k = a_k + b_k$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$). Therefore,

$$[0, 1] \subseteq A + B.$$

(b) Let $x = (x_1, x_2) \in A + B$, then $x = a + b$ for some $a \in A$ and $b \in B$. Since a and b are of the form $a = (a', 0)$ and $b = (0, b')$ where $a', b' \in I$. Then

$$(x_1, x_2) = (a', 0) + (0, b') \implies x_1 = a' \quad \text{and} \quad x_2 = b';$$

therefore, $(x_1, x_2) \in I \times I$.

Conversely, assume that $x = (x_1, x_2) \in I \times I$. Since each x_1 and x_2 belongs to I , it is clear that $(x_1, 0) \in A$, $(0, x_2) \in B$, and

$$x = (x_1, 0) + (0, x_2) \in A + B.$$

Therefore, we get $I \times I \subseteq A + B$ and this completes the proof.

In part (a), note that both A and B are closed with measure zero, but $A + B$ has positive measure since $A + B \supset [0, 1]$. Likewise, note that A and B in part (b) are also closed with measure zero, but $A + B = I \times I$ has positive measure, obviously. \square

Exercise 1.21

Prove that there is a continuous function that maps a Lebesgue measurable set to a non-measurable set.

[Hint: Consider a non-measurable subset of $[0, 1]$, and its inverse image in \mathcal{C} by the function F in Exercise 2.]

Proof. Let \mathcal{C} denote the Cantor set. Define a map $f : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ to be

$$f(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{b_k}{2^k} \quad \text{if } x = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k 3^{-k}, \text{ where } b_k = a_k/2.$$

In this definition, we choose the expansion of x in which $a_k = 0$ or 2 . We first claim that f is well-defined and continuous on \mathcal{C} , and moreover it is surjective.

(Well-definedness). Since we proved that every number in $[0, 1]$ has at least one ternary expansion, the only problem is that some numbers (such as $1/3$) have more than one ternary expansions. However, such a number can have a unique ternary expansion that consists of all 0's and 2's, because the only problem arises when one representation terminates while the other doesn't. If a representation terminates, then it must end with 2 (if it contains only 0's and 2's). However, then the other expansion ends with $1222\cdots$; therefore, it contains 1 in its expansion. This proves that each element of \mathcal{C} has the unique ternary expansion consists of only 0's and 2's; hence, the map f is well-defined.

(Continuity). For any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $1/2^n < \epsilon$. Let $\delta = 1/3^n$, then for any $x, y \in \mathcal{C}$ with $|x - y| < \delta$, first n digits of their ternary expansion must be the same. Otherwise, one must contain 1 in its expansion or their difference must be greater than or equal to δ . Therefore, for such x and y , we have

$$|f(x) - f(y)| < \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^k} = \frac{1}{2^n} < \epsilon.$$

Therefore, we conclude that f is continuous.

(Surjectivity). As we did in Exercise 1.20, every number in $[0, 1]$ also has a binary expansion

$$x = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} b_k 2^{-k}, \quad \text{where } b_k = 0 \text{ or } 1.$$

If $x < 1$, then $b_k = 1$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$; if $x < 1$, then $b_1 = \lfloor 2x \rfloor$ and

$$b_n = \left\lfloor 2^n x - \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} a_k 2^{n-k} \right\rfloor \quad \text{for all } n \geq 2.$$

Hence, for any $y \in [0, 1]$, it has a binary expression

$$y = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} b_k 2^{-k}.$$

Let $a_k := 2b_k$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Since a_k is either 0 or 2, for all k ,

$$x := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k 3^{-k}$$

belongs to \mathcal{C} . Moreover, it is clear that $f(x) = y$; therefore, f is surjective.

Note that the set \mathcal{N} defined in the Theorem 1.3.6 is non-measurable subset of $[0, 1]$. Let $E := f^{-1}(\mathcal{N}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}$. Since E is a subset of the measure zero set \mathcal{C} , we have $m(E) = 0$. This implies that E is measurable. Therefore, f is a continuous function which maps the Lebesgue measurable set E to a non-measurable set \mathcal{N} . \square

Exercise 1.22

Let $\chi_{[0,1]}$ be the characteristic function of $[0, 1]$. Show that there is no everywhere continuous function f on \mathbb{R} such that

$$f(x) = \chi_{[0,1]}(x) \quad \text{almost everywhere.}$$

Proof. Suppose that such a continuous function f exists. We first claim that

$$f(x) = 0 \quad \text{for all } x \in (-\infty, 0).$$

Assume that there exists $x_0 \in (-\infty, 0)$ such that $f(x_0) \neq 0$. Then, since f is continuous, for any $0 < \epsilon < |f(x_0)|$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$|x - x_0| < \delta \implies |f(x) - f(x_0)| < \epsilon.$$

Then, for any $x \in (x_0 - \delta, x_0]$, the triangle inequality implies that

$$|f(x)| \geq |f(x_0)| - |f(x) - f(x_0)| > |f(x_0)| - \epsilon > 0.$$

Thus, $(x_0 - \delta, x_0] \subseteq \{x : f(x) \neq \chi_{[0,1]}(x)\}$ so that

$$m(\{x : f(x) \neq \chi_{[0,1]}(x)\}) \geq \delta > 0$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore, we have $f|_{(-\infty, 0)} = 0$.

By the same argument, we can check that $f|_{(0,1)} = 1$. If there exists $x_0 \in (0, 1)$ such that $f(x_0) \neq 1$, then for any $0 < \epsilon < |f(x_0) - 1|$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$B_d(x_0, \delta) \subseteq (0, 1) \quad \text{and} \quad |f(x) - f(x_0)| < \epsilon \quad \text{for all } x \in B_d(x_0, \delta).$$

Therefore, for any $x \in B_d(x_0, \delta)$, the triangle inequality gives

$$|f(x) - 1| \geq |f(x_0) - 1| - |f(x) - f(x_0)| > |f(x_0) - 1| - \epsilon > 0.$$

Thus, $B_d(x_0, \delta) \subseteq \{x : f(x) \neq \chi_{[0,1]}(x)\}$ so that

$$m(\{x : f(x) \neq \chi_{[0,1]}(x)\}) \geq 2\delta > 0$$

which is again a contradiction. Therefore, we conclude that $f|_{(0,1)} = 1$.

However, since $f|_{(-\infty, 0)} = 0$ and $f|_{(0,1)} = 1$, it follows that f cannot be continuous at 0, no matter what value is assigned to $f(0)$. This contradicts to the assumption that f is a continuous function on \mathbb{R} . Therefore, we conclude that there is no everywhere continuous function f on \mathbb{R} such that $f(x) = \chi_{[0,1]}(x)$ almost everywhere. \square

Exercise 1.26

Suppose $A \subset E \subset B$, where A and B are measurable sets of finite measure. Prove that if $m(A) = m(B)$, then E is measurable.

Proof. Since A and B are measurable, so is $B \setminus A$. Note that A and $B \setminus A$ are disjoint measurable sets. Therefore, we have

$$m(B) = m(A \cup (B \setminus A)) = m(A) + m(B \setminus A),$$

and since $m(A) = m(B)$, we get $m(B \setminus A) = 0$.

Note that $E \setminus A \subseteq B \setminus A$, thus we have

$$m_*(E \setminus A) \leq m_*(B \setminus A) = 0.$$

Since $m_*(E \setminus A) = 0$, it is measurable. Then, since $E = A \cup (E \setminus A)$ is a union of two measurable set, thus we conclude that E is also measurable. \square

Exercise 1.28

Let E be a subset of \mathbb{R} with $m_*(E) > 0$. Prove that for each $0 < \alpha < 1$, there exists an open interval I so that

$$m_*(E \cap I) \geq \alpha m_*(I).$$

Loosely speaking, this estimate shows that E contains almost a whole interval. [Hint: Choose an open set \mathcal{O} that contains E , and such that $m_*(E) \geq \alpha m_*(\mathcal{O})$. Write \mathcal{O} as the countable union of disjoint open intervals, and show that one of these intervals must satisfy the desired property.]

Proof. For any $0 < \alpha < 1$, let \mathcal{O} be an open set containing E such that $m_*(E) \geq \alpha m_*(\mathcal{O})$. Note that \mathcal{O} can be written as a countable union of disjoint open intervals so that

$$E = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} I_k$$

where $\{I_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ are disjoint open intervals. Then we have

$$E = E \cap \mathcal{O} = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} (E \cap I_k);$$

hence, by the countable subadditivity,

$$m_*(E) \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} m_*(E \cap I_k).$$

If there is no open interval I satisfying $m_*(E \cap I) \geq \alpha m_*(I)$, since $\{I_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ are disjoint open sets, we have

$$m_*(E) < \alpha \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} m_*(I_k) = \alpha m_*(\mathcal{O}) \leq m_*(E)$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore, there exist $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that

$$m_*(E \cap I_k) \geq \alpha m_*(I_k)$$

where I_k is an open interval in \mathbb{R} . □

Exercise 1.30

If E and F are measurable, and $m(E) > 0$, $m(F) > 0$, prove that

$$E + F = \{x + y : x \in E, y \in F\}$$

contains an interval.

Proof. Note that $-F = \{-x : x \in F\}$ is also measurable with $m(-F) > 0$ since F is measurable. By the Exercise 1.28, for any $0 < \alpha < 1$, there exist open intervals I_1 and I_2 such that

$$m(E \cap I_1) \geq \alpha m(I_1) \quad \text{and} \quad m(-F \cap I_2) \geq \alpha m(I_2).$$

Without loss of generality, assume that $m(I_2) \leq m(I_1)$. Then, since they are intervals, there exists $h \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $I_2 + h \subseteq I_1$. (Here, note that $I_2 + h := \{x + h : x \in I_2\}$.) For convenience, let $l = m(I_2) > 0$. Then, for any $0 < |r| < l$, we have

$$m(I_1 \cap (I_2 + h + r)) \geq l - |r| > 0.$$

This implies that

$$I_1 \cap (I_2 + h + r) \neq \emptyset;$$

hence, there exist $e \in E$, $f \in F$ such that

$$e = -f + h + r.$$

In other words, for any $0 < |r| < l$,

$$h + r = e + f$$

for some $e \in E$ and $f \in F$. Therefore, we conclude that

$$(h - l, h + l) \subseteq E + F,$$

that is, $E + F$ contains an interval. □

Exercise 1.37

Suppose Γ is a curve $y = f(x)$ in \mathbb{R}^2 , where f is continuous. Show that $m(\Gamma) = 0$.
 [Hint: Cover Γ by rectangles, using the uniform continuity of f .]

Proof. For each $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, define

$$\Gamma_n := \{(x, f(x)) : x \in [n, n+1]\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2.$$

Since f is continuous and $[n, n+1]$ is compact, thus f is uniformly continuous on $[n, n+1]$. This implies that, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$|x - y| < \delta \implies |f(x) - f(y)| < \epsilon.$$

Note that there exists $N \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $1/N < \delta$. Let

$$I_i := \left[n + \frac{i-1}{N}, n + \frac{i}{N} \right]$$

for each $1 \leq i \leq N$. Since, for any $x, y \in I_i$, we have $|f(x) - f(y)| < \epsilon$; thus

$$f(x) \in \left[f\left(n + \frac{i-1}{N}\right) - \epsilon, f\left(n + \frac{i-1}{N}\right) + \epsilon \right]$$

for all $x \in I_i$. Let

$$R_i := \left[f\left(n + \frac{i-1}{N}\right) - \epsilon, f\left(n + \frac{i-1}{N}\right) + \epsilon \right] \times I_i$$

for each $1 \leq i \leq N$. Then, we have

$$\Gamma_n \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^N R_i \implies m_*(\Gamma_n) \leq \sum_{i=1}^N m_*(R_i) = N \left(2\epsilon \cdot \frac{1}{N} \right) = 2\epsilon.$$

Since $\epsilon > 0$ is chosen arbitrarily, we have $m_*(\Gamma_n) = 0$, that is, Γ_n is measurable and $m(\Gamma_n) = 0$. Finally, since we have

$$\Gamma = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^+} \Gamma_n,$$

Γ is measurable and by countable subadditivity, we get

$$m(\Gamma) \leq \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} m(\Gamma_n) = 0$$

□

4.2 Section 2