

## LEBESGUE SPACES AND THEIR DUALS

### 1. INTRODUCTION

In these notes we are concerned with study of duals of Lebesgue spaces of scalar valued functions. The first section discusses identification between  $L^q$  and dual to  $L^p$  for  $p \in (1, +\infty)$  provided that

$$\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$$

Next the second section introduces important classes of measure spaces, which are of independent interest. Next we study  $L^\infty$  as a dual to  $L^1$  under localizability assumption. In the next section we discuss nonatomic measures and as an immediate follow up we identify duals to  $L^p$  for  $p \in (0, 1)$ .

We rely on the material developed in our notes [Monygham, 2018a], [Monygham, 2019] and [Monygham, 2018b].

### 2. DUAL SPACES TO $L^p$ FOR $p \in (1, +\infty)$

Let  $(X, \Sigma, \mu)$  be a space with measure and let  $p$  be a real in  $(1, +\infty)$ . Define  $q \in (1, +\infty)$  to be the unique number which satisfies

$$\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$$

Assume that  $\mathbb{K}$  is either  $\mathbb{R}$  or  $\mathbb{C}$  with their usual absolute values. We start by stating the following consequence of Hölder inequality.

**Proposition 2.1.** *Let  $g : X \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$  be a  $\Sigma$ -measurable function and let  $f$  be a function in  $L^p(\mu, \mathbb{K})$ . Then*

$$\int_X |g \cdot f| d\mu \leq \|g\|_q \cdot \|f\|_p$$

*In particular, if  $g \in L^q(\mu, \mathbb{K})$ , then  $g \cdot f \in L^1(\mu, \mathbb{K})$ .*

*Proof.* We left the details to the reader. □

Next we prove so called extremal equality.

**Proposition 2.2.** *Let  $g$  be a function in  $L^q(\mu, \mathbb{K})$ . Then*

$$\|g\|_q = \sup \left\{ \left| \int_X g \cdot f d\mu \right| \in \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{0\} \mid f \in L^p(\mu, \mathbb{K}) \text{ such that } \|f\|_p = 1 \right\}$$

*Proof.* By Proposition 2.1 it suffices to prove that

$$\|g\|_q \leq \sup \left\{ \left| \int_X g \cdot f d\mu \right| \in \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{0\} \mid f \in L^p(\mu, \mathbb{K}) \text{ such that } \|f\|_p = 1 \right\}$$

under the assumption that  $\|g\|_q \neq 0$ . Define

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} \|g\|_q^{1-q} \cdot \frac{|g(x)|^q}{g(x)} & \text{if } g(x) \neq 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } g(x) = 0 \end{cases}$$

for  $x \in X$ . Then  $f \in L^p(\mu, \mathbb{K})$ . To be precise we have

$$\|f\|_p = \left( \int_X \|g\|_q^{(1-q) \cdot p} \cdot |g|^{(q-1) \cdot p} d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} = \left( \int_X \|g\|_q^{-q} \cdot |g|^q d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} = \left( \|g\|_q^{-q} \cdot \int_X |g|^q d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} = 1$$

Note that

$$\left| \int_X g \cdot f \, d\mu \right| = \int_X \|g\|_q^{(1-q)} \cdot |g|^q \, d\mu = \|g\|_q^{(1-q)} \cdot \int_X |g|^q \, d\mu = \|g\|_q^{(1-q)} \cdot \|g\|_q^q = \|g\|_q$$

and this completes the proof.  $\square$

The following theorem is the main result of this section.

**Theorem 2.3.** *Let  $\Lambda : L^p(\mu, \mathbb{K}) \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$  be a continuous  $\mathbb{K}$ -linear map. Then there exists  $g \in L^q(\mu, \mathbb{K})$  such that*

$$\Lambda(f) = \int_X g \cdot f \, d\mu$$

for every  $f \in L^p(\mu, \mathbb{K})$ . Moreover,  $g$  is uniquely defined up to a set of measure  $\mu$  equal to zero.

We start by the following observation.

**Lemma 2.3.1.** *Let  $\Lambda : L^p(\mu, \mathbb{K}) \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$  be a continuous  $\mathbb{K}$ -linear map. For each set  $S \in \Sigma$  we define*

$$\Lambda_S(f) = \Lambda(\mathbb{1}_S \cdot f)$$

for every  $f \in L^p(\mu, \mathbb{K})$ . Then the following assertions hold.

(1)  $\Lambda_S : L^p(\mu, \mathbb{K}) \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$  is a continuous  $\mathbb{K}$ -linear map.

(2) The inequality

$$\|\Lambda_S\| \leq \|\Lambda_T\| \leq \|\Lambda\|$$

holds for each  $S, T \in \Sigma$  such that  $S \subseteq T$ .

(3) There exists a  $\sigma$ -finite subset  $S$  in  $\Sigma$  such that  $\|\Lambda_S\| = \|\Lambda\|$ .

*Proof of the lemma.* Assertions (1) and (2) are left for the reader as exercises.

We prove (3). Suppose that  $f \in L^p(\mu, \mathbb{K})$  satisfies  $\|f\|_p \leq 1$ . Then there exists a nondecreasing sequence  $\{S_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of sets in  $\Sigma$  such that  $\mu(S_n)$  is finite for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\{\mathbb{1}_{S_n} \cdot f\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges to  $f$  in  $L^p(\mu, \mathbb{K})$ . Hence

$$\Lambda(f) = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \Lambda_{S_n}(f)$$

It follows that

$$\|\Lambda\| = \sup \{ \|\Lambda_S\| \mid S \in \Sigma \text{ such that } \mu(S) \text{ is finite} \}$$

Hence there exists a nondecreasing sequence  $\{S_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of sets in  $\Sigma$  such that  $\mu(S_n)$  is finite for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and

$$\|\Lambda\| = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \|\Lambda_{S_n}\|$$

Then the union

$$S = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} S_n$$

is a  $\sigma$ -finite set in  $\Sigma$  and satisfies  $\|\Lambda\| = \|\Lambda_S\|$ .  $\square$

We prove the theorem by gradually considering more general cases.

*Proof.* Assume that  $\mu$  is finite measure. Then

$$\Sigma \ni A \mapsto \Lambda(\mathbb{1}_A) \in \mathbb{K}$$

is a  $\mathbb{K}$ -valued measure absolutely continuous with respect to  $\mu$ . According to Radon-Nikodym there exists  $g \in L^1(\mu, \mathbb{K})$  such that

$$\Lambda(\mathbb{1}_A) = \int_X g \cdot \mathbb{1}_A \, d\mu$$

for every  $A$  in  $\Sigma$ . It follows that

$$\Lambda(f) = \int_X g \cdot f \, d\mu$$

for every  $f \in L^\infty(\mu, \mathbb{K})$ . For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$  define  $A_n = \{x \in X \mid |g(x)| \leq n\}$  and consider a measurable and bounded function  $f_n : X \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$  given by formula

$$f_n(x) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{1}_{A_n}(x) \cdot \frac{|g(x)|^q}{g(x)} & \text{if } g(x) \neq 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_X \mathbb{1}_{A_n} \cdot |g|^q \, d\mu &= \int_X g \cdot f_n \, d\mu = \Lambda(f_n) \leq \|\Lambda\| \cdot \|f_n\|_p = \\ &= \|\Lambda\| \cdot \|\mathbb{1}_{A_n} \cdot |g|^{q-1}\|_p = \|\Lambda\| \cdot \left( \int_X \mathbb{1}_{A_n} \cdot (|g|^{q-1})^p \, d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} = \|\Lambda\| \cdot \left( \int_X \mathbb{1}_{A_n} \cdot |g|^q \, d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\left( \int_X \mathbb{1}_{A_n} \cdot |g|^q \, d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq \|\Lambda\|$$

By monotone convergence we have

$$\|g\|_q = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \left( \int_X \mathbb{1}_{A_n} \cdot |g|^q \, d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq \|\Lambda\|$$

Hence  $g \in L^q(\mu, \mathbb{K})$ . It follows that

$$L^p(\mu, \mathbb{K}) \ni f \mapsto \int_X g \cdot f \, d\mu \in \mathbb{K}$$

is continuous  $\mathbb{K}$ -linear map, which coincides with  $\Lambda$  on the space of  $\mu$ -simple functions. Since  $\mu$ -simple functions are dense in  $L^p(\mu, \mathbb{K})$ , we derive that

$$\Lambda(f) = \int_X g \cdot f \, d\mu$$

for every  $f \in L^p(\mu, \mathbb{K})$ .

Next assume that  $\mu$  is  $\sigma$ -finite measure. Since  $\mu$  is  $\sigma$ -finite, there exist a nondecreasing sequence  $\{X_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of sets in  $\Sigma$  such that their union is  $X$  and  $\mu(X_n)$  is finite for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . According to the case considered above and Lemma 2.3.1 for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  there exists  $g_n \in L^q(\mu, \mathbb{K})$  such that

$$\Lambda_{X_n}(f) = \int_X g_n \cdot f \, d\mu$$

for every  $f \in L^p(\mu, \mathbb{K})$ . We may also assume that  $g_n|_{X \setminus X_n} = 0$  and  $g_{n+1}|_{X_n} = g_n|_{X_n}$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $g$  be a pointwise limit of a sequence  $\{g_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ . Then  $g : X \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$  is a measurable with respect to  $\Sigma$ . Moreover, we have  $g_n = \mathbb{1}_{X_n} \cdot g$  for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Proposition 2.2 and monotone convergence imply that

$$\|g\|_q = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \|g_n\|_q = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \|\Lambda_{X_n}\| \leq \|\Lambda\|$$

This implies that  $g \in L^q(\mu, \mathbb{K})$ . Fix  $f \in L^p(\mu, \mathbb{K})$ . Then sequence  $\{\mathbb{1}_{X_n} \cdot f\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges to  $f$  in  $L^p(\mu, \mathbb{K})$  and hence

$$\Lambda(f) = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \Lambda(\mathbb{1}_{X_n} \cdot f) = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \Lambda_{X_n}(f)$$

On the other hand by dominated convergence theorem

$$\int_X g \cdot f \, d\mu = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \int_X g_n \cdot f \, d\mu = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \Lambda_{X_n}(f)$$

This completes the proof for  $\sigma$ -finite case.

According to Lemma 2.3.1 there exists a  $\sigma$ -finite set  $S$  in  $\Sigma$  such that  $\|\Lambda_S\| = \|\Lambda\|$ . According to previous case there exists  $g \in L^q(\mu, \mathbb{K})$  such that

$$\Lambda_S(f) = \int_X g \cdot f \, d\mu$$

for every  $f \in L^p(\mu, \mathbb{K})$ . We may also assume that  $g|_{X \setminus S} = 0$ . Suppose now that  $T$  is a  $\sigma$ -finite set in  $\Sigma$  such that  $S \subseteq T$ . Then there exists  $g_T \in L^q(\mu, \mathbb{K})$  such that

$$\Lambda_T(f) = \int_X g_T \cdot f \, d\mu$$

for every  $f \in L^p(\mu, \mathbb{K})$ . We may assume that  $\mathbb{1}_S \cdot g_T = g$ . Proposition 2.2 implies that

$$\|\Lambda\| = \|\Lambda_S\| = \|g\|_q \leq \|g_T\|_q \leq \|\Lambda_T\| \leq \|\Lambda\|$$

Thus  $\|g\|_q = \|g_T\|_q$  and this proves that  $g_T = g$  up to set of measure  $\mu$  equal to zero. Fix now  $f \in L^p(\mu, \mathbb{K})$  and consider

$$T = \{x \in X \mid f(x) \neq 0\} \cup S$$

Then  $T$  is a  $\sigma$ -finite set in  $\Sigma$  and  $S \subseteq T$ . Hence

$$\Lambda(f) = \Lambda_T(f) = \int_X g_T \cdot f \, d\mu = \int_X g \cdot f \, d\mu$$

Since  $f \in L^p(\mu, \mathbb{K})$  is arbitrary, the proof is completed.  $\square$

### 3. LOCALIZABLE MEASURE SPACES

We start with a series of definitions.

**Definition 3.1.** Let  $(X, \Sigma, \mu)$  be a space with measure. We define binary relation  $\sqsubseteq_\mu$  on domain  $\Sigma$  as follows

$$A \sqsubseteq_\mu B \Leftrightarrow \mu(A \setminus B) = 0$$

for all  $A, B \in \Sigma$ . Clearly  $\Sigma$  together with  $\sqsubseteq_\mu$  is a preorder.

**Definition 3.2.** Let  $(X, \Sigma, \mu)$  be a space with measure. If  $(\Sigma, \sqsubseteq_\mu)$  admits least upper bounds for arbitrary subfamilies of  $\Sigma$ , then  $\mu$  is a *Dedekind complete measure*.

**Proposition 3.3.** Each  $\sigma$ -finite measure is Dedekind complete.

*Proof.* Let  $\mu$  be a measure on  $(X, \Sigma)$  and assume first that it is finite. Fix an arbitrary subfamily  $\mathcal{J}$  of  $\Sigma$ . consider

$$s = \sup_{I \in \mathcal{J}} \mu(I)$$

Then there exists a sequence  $\{I_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of elements in  $\mathcal{J}$  such that  $I_n \subseteq I_{n+1}$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\mu(I_n) \rightarrow s$  for  $n \rightarrow +\infty$ . Define

$$S = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} I_n$$

Then  $S \in \Sigma$  and  $\mu(S) = s$ . Moreover,  $\mu(I \setminus S) = 0$  for every  $I \in \mathcal{J}$ . It follows that  $I \sqsubseteq_\mu S$  for every  $I \in \mathcal{J}$ . On the other hand if  $T \in \Sigma$  is such that  $I \sqsubseteq_\mu T$  for every  $I \in \mathcal{J}$ . Then  $\mu(I_n \setminus T) = 0$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Hence  $\mu(S \setminus T) = 0$  and thus  $S \sqsubseteq_\mu T$ . This proves that  $S$  is a least upper bound of  $\mathcal{J}$  in  $\Sigma$  with respect to  $\sqsubseteq_\mu$ . Therefore,  $\mu$  is Dedekind complete.

In order to prove the result for  $\sigma$ -finite measures note that each  $\sigma$ -finite measure is a sum of countably many finite measures and apply the finite case proved above. The details are left for the reader.  $\square$

**Definition 3.4.** Let  $(X, \Sigma, \mu)$  be a space with measure and let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a family of  $\mathbb{C}$ -valued functions defined on some subsets of  $X$ . For each  $f$  in  $\mathcal{F}$  we denote by  $D_f$  the domain of  $f$ . Suppose that the following assertions hold.

- (1)  $D_f \in \Sigma$  for each  $f \in \mathcal{F}$ .
- (2) Functions in  $\mathcal{F}$  are measurable.
- (3) If  $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{F}$ , then  $f_1|_{D_{f_1} \cap D_{f_2}}$  and  $f_2|_{D_{f_1} \cap D_{f_2}}$  are equal  $\mu$ -almost everywhere.

Then  $\mathcal{F}$  is a  $\mu$ -local family.

The next theorem is an important result concerning Dedekind complete measures.

**Theorem 3.5.** *Let  $(X, \Sigma, \mu)$  be a space with Dedekind complete measure and let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a  $\mu$ -local family. Then there exists a measurable  $\mathbb{C}$ -valued function  $F$  on  $(X, \Sigma)$  such that  $F|_{D_f}$  and  $f$  are equal  $\mu$ -almost everywhere for each  $f \in \mathcal{F}$ .*

For the proof we need the following special case of our result.

**Lemma 3.5.1.** *Let  $(X, \Sigma, \mu)$  be a space with Dedekind complete measure and let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a  $\mu$ -local family. If functions in  $\mathcal{F}$  are  $\{0, 1\}$ -valued, then there exists a measurable and  $\{0, 1\}$ -valued function  $F$  on  $(X, \Sigma)$  such that  $F|_{D_f}$  and  $f$  are equal  $\mu$ -almost everywhere for each  $f \in \mathcal{F}$ .*

*Proof of the lemma.* We define  $A_f = f^{-1}(1)$  for  $f \in \mathcal{F}$ . Clearly  $\{A_f\}_{f \in \mathcal{F}}$  is a family of sets in  $\Sigma$ . Let  $A$  be a least upper bound of  $\{A_f\}_{f \in \mathcal{F}}$  with respect to  $\sqsubseteq_\mu$ . We claim for every  $f \in \mathcal{F}$  sets  $A \cap D_f$  and  $A_f$  differ by the set of measure  $\mu$  equal to zero. In order to prove the claim note that  $(A \setminus D_f) \cup A_f$  is an upper bound of  $\{A_f\}_{f \in \mathcal{F}}$  with respect to  $\sqsubseteq_\mu$ . Hence

$$A \sqsubseteq_\mu (A \setminus D_f) \cup A_f$$

It follows  $A \cap D_f \sqsubseteq_\mu A_f$ . On the other hand  $A_f \sqsubseteq_\mu A \cap D_f$ . Thus  $A \cap D_f$  and  $A_f$  are equivalent in  $(\Sigma, \sqsubseteq_\mu)$ . This proves the claim. Now it follows from that claim that  $F = \mathbb{1}_A$  satisfies the assertion.  $\square$

*Proof of the theorem.* It suffices to prove the result under the additional assumption that all functions in  $\mathcal{F}$  take values in nonnegative reals. Indeed, the theorem for  $\mathbb{C}$ -valued  $\mu$ -local families can be reduced to the case of  $\mathbb{R}$ -valued families by means of decomposing each function in the family on its real and imaginary parts and the statement for  $\mathbb{R}$ -valued  $\mu$ -local families in turn reduces to the result for nonnegative  $\mu$ -local families.

Let us then assume that all functions in  $\mathcal{F}$  take values in nonnegative real numbers. For each  $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $f \in \mathcal{F}$  we define

$$A_{k,n,f} = \left\{ x \in X \mid \frac{k}{2^n} \leq f(x) \leq \frac{k+1}{2^n} \right\}$$

For fixed  $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$  family  $\left\{ \mathbb{1}_{A_{k,n,f}|D_f} \right\}_{f \in \mathcal{F}}$  is  $\mu$ -local. By Lemma 3.5.1 it follows that there exist  $A_{k,n} \in \Sigma$  such that functions  $\mathbb{1}_{A_{k,n}|D_f}$  and  $\mathbb{1}_{A_{k,n,f}|D_f}$  are equal  $\mu$ -almost everywhere for each  $f \in \mathcal{F}$ . Fix  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and define a function

$$s_n(x) = \begin{cases} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{k}{2^n} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{A_{k,n}}(x) & \text{if the series is finite} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Then  $s_n$  is nonnegative valued and measurable function on  $(X, \Sigma)$ . Similarly, for each  $f \in \mathcal{F}$  consider a function

$$s_{n,f} = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{k}{2^n} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{A_{k,n,f}|D_f}$$

Note that  $s_{n,f}$  is measurable and defined on  $D_f$  for every  $f \in \mathcal{F}$ . Moreover,  $s_n|_{D_f}$  and  $s_{n,f}$  are equal  $\mu$ -almost everywhere for all  $f \in \mathcal{F}$ . Next we set

$$F(x) = \begin{cases} \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} s_n(x) & \text{if the limit exists and is finite} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Since  $\{s_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  are measurable and nonnegative valued functions on  $(X, \Sigma)$ , we deduce that  $F$  is measurable and nonnegative valued function on  $(X, \Sigma)$ . Observe that

$$f = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} s_{n,f}$$

for each  $f \in \mathcal{F}$ . This implies that  $F|_{D_f}$  and  $f$  are equal  $\mu$ -almost everywhere for each  $f \in \mathcal{F}$ .  $\square$

The converse of Theorem 3.5 may be proved under some additional and mild assumption. We introduce it now as a separate notion, since it plays important role in taxonomy of measure spaces.

**Definition 3.6.** Let  $(X, \Sigma, \mu)$  be a space with measure. Suppose that for every  $B \in \Sigma$  with  $\mu(B) > 0$  there exists  $A \in \Sigma$ ,  $A \subseteq B$  such that  $\mu(A) \in \mathbb{R}_+$ . Then  $\mu$  is a *semifinite measure*.

The following fact relates semifiniteness and essential containment.

**Fact 3.7.** Let  $(X, \Sigma, \mu)$  be a space with semifinite measure and let  $A, B \in \Sigma$  be sets. If

$$A \cap E \sqsubseteq_\mu B \cap E$$

for every  $E \in \Sigma$  such that  $\mu(E)$  is finite, then  $A \sqsubseteq_\mu B$ .

*Proof.* Suppose that  $A \not\sqsubseteq_\mu B$ . Then  $\mu(A \setminus B) > 0$ . By semifiniteness of  $\mu$  there exists  $E \in \Sigma$  such that  $\mu(E) \in \mathbb{R}_+$  and  $E \subseteq A \setminus B$ . Then

$$E \subseteq (A \setminus B) \cap E = (A \cap E) \setminus (B \cap E)$$

and hence  $A \cap E \not\sqsubseteq_\mu B \cap E$ .  $\square$

Now we prove the aforementioned converse of Theorem 3.5.

**Theorem 3.8.** Let  $(X, \Sigma, \mu)$  be a space with semifinite measure. Assume that for each  $\mu$ -local family  $\mathcal{F}$  there exists a measurable  $\mathbb{C}$ -valued function  $F$  on  $(X, \Sigma)$  such that  $F|_{D_f}$  and  $f$  are equal  $\mu$ -almost everywhere for each  $f \in \mathcal{F}$ . Then  $\mu$  is a Dedekind complete measure.

*Proof of the theorem.* Suppose that  $\mathcal{I}$  is an arbitrary subfamily in  $\Sigma$ . According to Proposition 3.3 for each set  $E \in \Sigma$  with  $\mu(E) \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{R}_+$  there exists a set  $S_E \in \Sigma$  such that  $S_E$  is a least upper bound of

$$\mathcal{I}_E = \{I \cap E \mid I \in \mathcal{I}\}$$

with respect to  $\sqsubseteq_\mu$ . Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be a family of all sets in  $\Sigma$  with finite measure  $\mu$ . Then  $\{\mathbb{1}_{S_E|_E}\}_{E \in \mathcal{E}}$  is a  $\mu$ -local family of functions. Hence there exists a measurable  $\mathbb{C}$ -valued function  $F$  on  $(X, \Sigma)$  such that  $F|_E$  and  $\mathbb{1}_{S_E|_E}$  are equal  $\mu$ -almost everywhere for each  $E \in \mathcal{E}$ . Pick  $S = F^{-1}(1)$ . Since  $S \cap E$  and  $S_E$  differ by the set of measure  $\mu$  equal to zero, we derive that  $S \cap E$  is a least upper bound of  $\mathcal{I}_E$  with respect to  $\sqsubseteq_\mu$  for every  $E \in \mathcal{E}$ . Fact 3.7 implies that  $S$  is a least upper bound of  $\mathcal{I}$  with respect to  $\sqsubseteq_\mu$ .  $\square$

**Definition 3.9.** Let  $(X, \Sigma, \mu)$  be a space with a semifinite and Dedekind complete measure. Then  $\mu$  is *localizable*.

4. DUAL TO  $L^1$ 

Let  $(X, \Sigma, \mu)$  be a space with measure. Assume that  $\mathbb{K}$  is either  $\mathbb{R}$  or  $\mathbb{C}$  with their usual absolute values. We begin by proving the version of Hölder inequality for  $L^\infty$ -norm.

**Proposition 4.1.** *Let  $g : X \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$  be a  $\Sigma$ -measurable function and let  $f$  be a function in  $L^1(\mu, \mathbb{K})$ . Then*

$$\int_X |g \cdot f| d\mu \leq \|g\|_\infty \cdot \|f\|_1$$

*In particular, if  $g \in L^\infty(\mu, \mathbb{K})$ , then  $g \cdot f \in L^1(\mu, \mathbb{K})$ .*

*Proof.* Note that the set

$$\{x \in X \mid \|g\|_\infty < |g(x)|\}$$

is in  $\Sigma$  and is of measure  $\mu$  zero. Thus

$$\int_X |g \cdot f| d\mu \leq \int_X |g| \cdot |f| d\mu \leq \|g\|_\infty \cdot \|f\|_1$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

Next we prove the version extremal equality.

**Proposition 4.2.** *Let  $g$  be a function in  $L^\infty(\mu, \mathbb{K})$ . Then*

$$\sup \left\{ \left| \int_X g \cdot f d\mu \right| \in \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{0\} \mid f \in L^1(\mu, \mathbb{K}) \text{ such that } \|f\|_1 = 1 \right\} \leq \|g\|_\infty$$

*If  $\mu$  is semifinite, then*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup \left\{ \left| \int_X g \cdot f d\mu \right| \in \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{0\} \mid f \in L^1(\mu, \mathbb{K}) \text{ such that } \|f\|_1 = 1 \right\} = \\ & = \sup \left\{ \left| \int_X g \cdot f d\mu \right| \in \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{0\} \mid f \in L^1(\mu, \mathbb{K}) \cap L^\infty(\mu, \mathbb{K}) \text{ such that } \|f\|_1 = 1 \right\} = \|g\|_\infty \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Proposition 4.1 implies that

$$\left| \int_X g \cdot f d\mu \right| \leq \int_X |g| \cdot |f| d\mu \leq \|g\|_\infty \cdot \|f\|_1 = \|g\|_\infty$$

for every  $f \in L^1(\mu, \mathbb{K})$ . Hence

$$\sup \left\{ \left| \int_X g \cdot f d\mu \right| \in \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{0\} \mid f \in L^1(\mu, \mathbb{K}) \text{ such that } \|f\|_1 = 1 \right\} \leq \|g\|_\infty$$

This proves the first part of the assertion.

Assume now that  $\mu$  is semifinite. For each  $r \in \mathbb{R}_+$  we denote

$$A_r = \{x \in X \mid |g(x)| \geq r\}$$

Fix now  $r \in \mathbb{R}_+$  such that  $\mu(A_r) > 0$ . Since  $\mu$  is semifinite, there exists  $B_r \in \Sigma$  such that  $B_r$  is a subset of  $A_r$  and  $m_r = \mu(B_r)$  is finite. We define a function

$$f_r(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{m_r} \cdot \frac{|g(x)|}{g(x)} & \text{if } x \in B_r \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Then  $f_r \in L^1(\mu, \mathbb{K}) \cap L^\infty(\mu, \mathbb{K})$  and  $\|f_r\|_1 = 1$ . We have

$$\left| \int_X g \cdot f_r d\mu \right| = \int_X g \cdot f_r d\mu = \int_{B_r} \frac{1}{m_r} \cdot |g| d\mu \geq r$$

Thus

$$\|g\|_\infty \leq \sup \left\{ \left| \int_X g \cdot f \, d\mu \right| \in \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{0\} \mid f \in L^1(\mu, \mathbb{K}) \cap L^\infty(\mu, \mathbb{K}) \text{ such that } \|f\|_1 = 1 \right\}$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

According to Proposition 4.2 for each  $g \in L^\infty(\mu, \mathbb{K})$  the map

$$L^1(\mu, \mathbb{K}) \ni f \mapsto \int_X g \cdot f \, d\mu \in \mathbb{K}$$

is continuous and  $\mathbb{K}$ -linear. We denote it by  $\Phi(g)$ . Then  $\Phi : L^\infty(\mu, \mathbb{K}) \rightarrow (L^1(\mu, \mathbb{K}))^*$  is well defined  $\mathbb{K}$ -linear map of topological vector space over  $\mathbb{K}$ . The remaining part of this section is devoted to investigation of properties of  $\Phi$ .

**Theorem 4.3.**  *$\Phi$  is an isometry if and only if  $\mu$  is semifinite.*

*Proof.* Proposition 4.2 implies that if  $\mu$  is semifinite, then  $\|\Phi(g)\| = \|g\|_\infty$  for every  $g \in L^\infty(\mu, \mathbb{K})$ . Hence if  $\mu$  is semifinite, then  $\Phi$  is an isometry.

Now suppose that  $\Phi$  is an isometry. Pick a set  $B \in \Sigma$  such that  $\mu(B) = +\infty$ . Then  $\|\Phi(\mathbb{1}_B)\| = \|\mathbb{1}_B\|_\infty = 1$ . It follows that

$$1 = \sup \left\{ \left| \int_X \mathbb{1}_B \cdot f \, d\mu \right| \in \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{0\} \mid f \in L^1(\mu, \mathbb{K}) \text{ such that } \|f\|_1 = 1 \right\}$$

In particular, there exist  $f \in L^1(\mu, \mathbb{K})$  with  $\|f\|_1 = 1$  such that

$$0 < \left| \int_X \mathbb{1}_B \cdot f \, d\mu \right| = \left| \int_B f \, d\mu \right| \leq \int_B |f| \, d\mu \leq \|f\|_1$$

For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we set

$$A_n = \left\{ x \in B \mid |f(x)| > \frac{1}{n+1} \right\}$$

Then  $A_n \in \Sigma$  for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and there exists  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\mu(A_{n_0}) > 0$ . Since  $f \in L^1(\mu, \mathbb{K})$ , we derive that  $\mu(A_{n_0})$  is finite. According to definition  $A_{n_0} \subseteq B$ . Therefore,  $\mu$  is semifinite.  $\square$

**Theorem 4.4.**  *$\Phi$  is surjective isometry if and only if  $\mu$  is localizable.*

*Proof.* Let  $\Lambda : L^1(\mu, \mathbb{K}) \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$  be a continuous  $\mathbb{K}$ -linear map.

Assume first that  $\mu$  is finite measure. Then

$$\Sigma \ni A \mapsto \Lambda(\mathbb{1}_A) \in \mathbb{K}$$

is a  $\mathbb{K}$ -valued measure absolutely continuous with respect to  $\mu$ . According to Radon-Nikodym there exists  $g \in L^1(\mu, \mathbb{K})$  such that

$$\Lambda(\mathbb{1}_A) = \int_X g \cdot \mathbb{1}_A \, d\mu$$

for every  $A$  in  $\Sigma$ . It follows that

$$\Lambda(f) = \int_X g \cdot f \, d\mu$$

for every  $f \in L^\infty(\mu, \mathbb{K})$ . Proposition 4.2 shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|g\|_\infty &= \sup \left\{ \left| \int_X g \cdot f \, d\mu \right| \in \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{0\} \mid f \in L^1(\mu, \mathbb{K}) \cap L^\infty(\mu, \mathbb{K}) \text{ such that } \|f\|_1 = 1 \right\} = \\ &= \sup \left\{ |\Lambda(f)| \in \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{0\} \mid f \in L^1(\mu, \mathbb{K}) \cap L^\infty(\mu, \mathbb{K}) \text{ such that } \|f\|_1 = 1 \right\} \leq \|\Lambda\| \end{aligned}$$



and hence  $g \in L^\infty(\mu, \mathbb{K})$ . Since  $\Phi(g)$  and  $\Lambda$  coincide on  $\mu$ -simple functions, we derive that  $\Phi(g) = \Lambda$ .

Now assume that  $\mu$  is arbitrary localizable measure. Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be a family of all subsets in  $\Sigma$  with finite measure  $\mu$ . For each  $E \in \mathcal{E}$  we consider  $\Lambda_E : L^1(\mu, \mathbb{K}) \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$  given by formula  $\Lambda_E(f) = \Lambda(\mathbb{1}_E \cdot f)$  for every  $f \in L^1(\mu, \mathbb{K})$ . Then  $\Lambda_E$  is a continuous  $\mathbb{K}$ -linear map and  $\|\Lambda_E\| \leq \|\Lambda\|$  for each  $E \in \mathcal{E}$ . By the case proved above for each  $E \in \mathcal{E}$  there exists  $g_E \in L^\infty(\mu, \mathbb{K})$  such that  $\Lambda_E = \Phi(g_E)$ ,  $g_E|_{X \setminus E} = 0$  and  $\|g_E\|_\infty = \|\Lambda_E\|$ . Theorem 4.3 and semifiniteness of  $\mu$  imply that if  $E_1, E_2 \in \mathcal{E}$ , then  $g_{E_1|E_1 \cap E_2}$  and  $g_{E_2|E_1 \cap E_2}$  are equal  $\mu$ -almost everywhere. Since  $\mu$  is Dedekind complete, Theorem 3.5 implies that there exists a measurable function  $g : X \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$  such that  $g|_E$  and  $g_{E|E}$  are equal  $\mu$ -almost everywhere for each  $E \in \mathcal{E}$ . Fix  $r \in \mathbb{R}_+$  such that  $r > \|\Lambda\|$  and assume that the set

$$A_r = \{x \in X \mid |g(x)| \geq r\}$$

is of positive measure  $\mu$ . By semifiniteness of  $\mu$  there exists a set  $B_r \in \Sigma$  such that  $B_r \subseteq A_r$  and  $\mu(B_r) \in \mathbb{R}_+$ . Note that  $B_r \in \mathcal{E}$ . Since  $g_{B_r|B_r}$  and  $g|_{B_r}$  coincide  $\mu$ -almost everywhere, we derive that the set

$$\{x \in X \mid |g_{B_r}(x)| \geq r\}$$

is of positive measure  $\mu$ . On the other hand Theorem 4.3 shows that  $\|g_{B_r}\|_\infty = \|\Lambda_{B_r}\| \leq \|\Lambda\|$ . Since  $r > \|\Lambda\|$ , we derive contradiction. Hence  $\mu(A_r) = 0$  for every  $r > \|\Lambda\|$ . This shows that  $\|g\|_\infty \leq \|\Lambda\|$  and hence  $g \in L^\infty(\mu, \mathbb{K})$ . Pick now  $f \in L^1(\mu, \mathbb{K})$ . There exist a nondecreasing sequence  $\{E_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of disjoint sets in  $\mathcal{E}$  such that

$$\{x \in X \mid f(x) \neq 0\} = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E_n$$

Then the sequence  $\{\mathbb{1}_{E_n} \cdot f\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges to  $f$  in  $L^1(\mu, \mathbb{K})$  and hence we have

$$\Lambda(f) = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \Lambda(\mathbb{1}_{E_n} \cdot f) = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \int_X g_{E_n} \cdot f \, d\mu = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \int_X g \cdot \mathbb{1}_{E_n} \cdot f \, d\mu$$

On the other hand by dominated convergence

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \int_X g \cdot \mathbb{1}_{E_n} \cdot f \, d\mu = \int_X g \cdot f \, d\mu$$

Thus

$$\Lambda(f) = \int_X g \cdot f \, d\mu$$

Since  $f$  is arbitrary element of  $L^1(\mu, \mathbb{K})$ , we derive that  $\Lambda$  coincides with  $\phi(g)$ . This together with Theorem 4.3 proves that if  $\mu$  is localizable, then  $\Phi$  is surjective isometry.

Now suppose that  $\Phi$  is a surjective isometry. Pick a family of subsets  $\mathfrak{J}$  of  $\Sigma$ . Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be the family of all  $\sigma$ -finite subsets of  $X$  with respect to  $\mu$ . Suppose that  $S \in \mathcal{S}$ . According to Proposition 3.3 the family

$$\mathfrak{J}_S = \{I \cap S \mid I \in \mathfrak{J}\}$$

admits a least upper bound with respect to  $\sqsubseteq_\mu$ . Denote this upper bound by  $S_{\mathfrak{J}}$ . If  $S, T \in \mathcal{S}$  and  $S \cap T$ , then  $\mathbb{1}_{S_{\mathfrak{J}}}$  and  $\mathbb{1}_{T_{\mathfrak{J}}|S}$  are equal  $\mu$ -everywhere. Now for each  $f \in L^1(\mu, \mathbb{K})$  we define

$$S(f) = \{x \in X \mid f(x) \neq 0\}$$

Clearly  $S(f) \in \mathcal{S}$  for every  $f \in L^1(\mu, \mathbb{K})$ . Now we define a map  $\Lambda : L^1(\mu, \mathbb{K}) \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$  by formula

$$\Lambda(f) = \int_X \mathbb{1}_{S(f)} \cdot f \, d\mu$$

for every  $f \in L^1(\mu, \mathbb{K})$ . Fix now  $f \in L^1(\mu, \mathbb{K})$  and assume that  $T \in \mathcal{S}$  and  $S(f) \subseteq T$ . Since  $\mathbb{1}_{S(f)}$  and  $\mathbb{1}_{T_{\mathfrak{J}}|S(f)}$  are equal  $\mu$ -everywhere, we derive that

$$\Lambda(f) = \int_X \mathbb{1}_{T_{\mathfrak{J}}} \cdot f \, d\mu$$

Fix now  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathbb{K}$  and  $f_1, f_2 \in L^1(\mu, \mathbb{K})$ . Suppose that  $T \in \mathcal{S}$  contains  $S(f_1) \cup S(f_2)$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda(\alpha_1 \cdot f_1 + \alpha_2 \cdot f_2) &= \int_X \mathbb{1}_{T_3} \cdot (\alpha_1 \cdot f_1 + \alpha_2 \cdot f_2) d\mu = \\ &= \alpha_1 \cdot \int_X \mathbb{1}_{T_3} \cdot f_1 d\mu + \alpha_2 \cdot \int_X \mathbb{1}_{T_3} \cdot f_2 d\mu = \alpha_1 \cdot \Lambda(f_1) + \alpha_2 \cdot \Lambda(f_2) \end{aligned}$$

This proves that  $\Lambda$  is  $\mathbb{K}$ -linear. Now assume that  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a sequence of elements of  $L^1(\mu, \mathbb{K})$  which converge to  $f \in L^1(\mu, \mathbb{K})$ . Pick a set  $T \in \mathcal{S}$  which contains all sets  $\{S(f_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  and set  $S(f)$ . Then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \Lambda(f_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \int_X \mathbb{1}_{T_3} \cdot f_n d\mu = \int_X \mathbb{1}_{T_3} \cdot f d\mu = \Lambda(f)$$

Hence  $\Lambda$  is continuous. Since  $\Phi$  is surjective, there exists  $g \in L^\infty(\mu, \mathbb{K})$  such that  $\Phi(g) = \Lambda$ . Note that for every set  $E \in \Sigma$  such that  $\mu(E)$  is finite and for every  $f \in L^1(\mu, \mathbb{K})$  we have

$$\int_X \mathbb{1}_{E_3} \cdot f d\mu = \Lambda(\mathbb{1}_E \cdot f) = \int_X g \cdot \mathbb{1}_E \cdot f d\mu$$

It follows that  $\mathbb{1}_{E_3}$  and  $g$  are equal  $\mu$ -everywhere for each  $E \in \Sigma$  such that  $\mu(E)$  is finite. Hence  $g^{-1}(1) \cap E$  is a least upper bound of  $\mathfrak{J}_E$  with respect to  $\sqsubseteq_\mu$  for every  $E \in \Sigma$  with  $\mu(E)$  finite. Since  $\Phi$  is isometry, Theorem 4.3 shows that  $\mu$  is semifinite. Now Fact 3.7 implies that  $g^{-1}(1)$  is a least upper bound of  $\mathfrak{J}$  with respect to  $\sqsubseteq_\mu$ . Since  $\mathfrak{J}$  is arbitrary, we derive that  $\mu$  is Dedekind complete. Hence  $\mu$  is localizable.  $\square$

## 5. NONATOMIC MEASURES

This section introduces some structural theory concerning an interesting class of measures. First we make excursion into realm of metric spaces.

**Definition 5.1.** Let  $(X, \rho)$  be a metric space such that for every distinct  $x_1, x_2 \in X$  there exists  $z \in X \setminus \{x_1, x_2\}$  that satisfies

$$\rho(x_1, x_2) = \rho(x_1, z) + \rho(z, x_2)$$

Then  $(X, \rho)$  is a *convex metric space*.

**Theorem 5.2.** Let  $(X, \rho)$  be a convex and complete metric space. Then for every distinct points  $x_1, x_2 \in X$  with  $\theta = \rho(x_1, x_2)$  there exists an isometry  $\gamma : [0, \theta] \rightarrow X$  such that  $\gamma(0) = x_1$ ,  $\gamma(\theta) = x_2$ .

*Proof.* Consider the set  $\mathcal{F}$  of all isometries  $g : A \rightarrow X$  defined on metric subspaces  $A \subseteq [0, \theta]$  containing  $\{0, \theta\}$  such that  $g(0) = x_1$  and  $g(\theta) = x_1$ . For every pair  $g_1 : A_1 \rightarrow X, g_2 : A_2 \rightarrow X$  of elements of  $\mathcal{F}$  we define  $g_1 \preceq g_2$  if and only if  $A_1 \subseteq A_2$  and  $g_2|_{A_1} = g_1$ . Now  $(\mathcal{F}, \preceq)$  is a partially ordered set and every chain in  $\mathcal{F}$  admits upper bound. By Zorn's lemma there exists element  $\gamma : A \rightarrow X$  in  $\mathcal{F}$  which is maximal with respect to  $\preceq$ . Since  $\gamma$  is isometry and  $(X, \rho)$  is complete,  $\gamma$  can be extended to  $\mathbf{cl}(A) \subseteq [0, \theta]$ . This shows that  $A$  is a closed subset of  $[0, \theta]$ . If  $[0, \theta] \setminus A$  is nonempty, then it contains open interval  $(\theta_1, \theta_2)$  such that  $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in A$ . Pick  $z_i = \gamma(\theta_i)$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . Since  $\gamma$  is isometry,  $z_1, z_2$  are distinct. By convexity of  $(X, \rho)$  there exists  $z \in X \setminus \{z_1, z_2\}$  such that

$$\rho(z_1, z_2) = \rho(z_1, z) + \rho(z, z_2)$$

Assume that  $\rho(z_1, z) = s$ . Then  $\gamma$  can be extended to isometry by  $\theta_1 + s \mapsto z$ . This is a contradiction with maximality of  $\gamma$  in  $\mathcal{F}$  with respect to  $\preceq$ . This proves that  $A = [0, \theta]$  and hence  $\gamma$  satisfies the assertion.  $\square$

We shall use the result above to prove certain facts concerning some classes of measures. First we explain how each finite measure space give rise to certain metric space.

Suppose that  $(X, \Sigma, \mu)$  is a finite measure space. For any two sets  $A, B \in \Sigma$  we write  $A \equiv_\mu B$  if and only if  $\mu(A \Delta B) = 0$ . We denote by  $\Sigma_\mu$  the quotient of  $\Sigma$  with respect to  $\equiv_\mu$ . Next if  $A \in \Sigma$ , then we denote by  $[A]_\mu$  its class in  $\Sigma_\mu$ . Finally we define

$$\rho_\mu([A]_\mu, [B]_\mu) = \mu(A \Delta B)$$

for every  $A, B \in \Sigma$ .

**Proposition 5.3.** *Let  $(X, \Sigma, \mu)$  be a finite measure space. Then  $\rho_\mu : \Sigma_\mu \times \Sigma_\mu \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{0\}$  is a complete metric.*

*Proof.* First we define an equivalence relation  $\sim_\mu$  on  $L^1(\mu, \mathbb{R})$ . If  $f_1, f_2 \in L^1(\mu, \mathbb{R})$ , then  $f_1 \sim_\mu f_2$  if and only if  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  are equal  $\mu$ -almost everywhere. We denote by  $\mathcal{L}^1(\mu, \mathbb{R})$  the quotient of  $L^1(\mu, \mathbb{R})$  with respect to  $\sim_\mu$ . Next if  $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(\mu, \mathbb{R})$ , then we denote by  $[f]_\mu$  its class in  $\mathcal{L}^1(\mu, \mathbb{R})$ . There exists a structure of  $\mathbb{R}$ -linear normed space on  $\mathcal{L}^1(\mu, \mathbb{R})$  such that the quotient map  $L^1(\mu, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}^1(\mu, \mathbb{R})$  is an  $\mathbb{R}$ -linear isometry. In particular,  $\mathcal{L}^1(\mu, \mathbb{R})$  is a Banach space over  $\mathbb{R}$ . Note that there exists a map

$$\Sigma \ni A \mapsto \mathbb{1}_A \in L^1(\mu, \mathbb{R})$$

which induces an injective map  $\Sigma_\mu \rightarrow \mathcal{L}^1(\mu, \mathbb{R})$ . Hence we may view  $\Sigma_\mu$  as a subspace of  $\mathcal{L}^1(\mu, \mathbb{R})$  and the metric induced by  $\Sigma_\mu$  by norm of  $\mathcal{L}^1(\mu, \mathbb{R})$  coincides with  $\rho_\mu$ . Now suppose that  $\{[A_n]_\mu\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a sequence of  $\Sigma_\mu$  which converges to some element of  $\mathcal{L}^1(\mu, \mathbb{R})$ . Say that this element is represented by some  $f \in L^1(\mu, \mathbb{R})$ . Then  $\{\mathbb{1}_{A_n}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges to  $f$  in  $L^1(\mu, \mathbb{R})$ . By Riesz theorem ([Monygham, 2019]) on completeness of  $L^1(\mu, \mathbb{R})$  there exists a subsequence  $\{\mathbb{1}_{A_{n_k}}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  which converges  $\mu$ -almost everywhere to  $f$ . Hence  $f$  is  $\mu$ -almost everywhere equal to  $\mathbb{1}_A$  for some  $A \in \Sigma$ . This shows that  $\Sigma_\mu$  is a closed subspace of  $\mathcal{L}^1(\mu, \mathbb{R})$ . Hence  $\rho_\mu$  is complete.  $\square$

Now we introduce central notions of this section.

**Definition 5.4.** Let  $(X, \Sigma, \mu)$  be a space with measure. Consider a set  $A \in \Sigma$  such that  $\mu(A) > 0$ . Suppose that for every  $B \in \Sigma$  such that  $B \subseteq A$  and  $\mu(B) > 0$  it holds that  $\mu(A \setminus B) = 0$ . Then  $A$  is an atom of  $\mu$ .

**Definition 5.5.** Let  $(X, \Sigma, \mu)$  be a space with measure. If there are no atoms of  $\mu$ , then  $\mu$  is a nonatomic measure.

**Theorem 5.6.** *Let  $(X, \Sigma, \mu)$  be a space with finite measure. Then the following assertions are equivalent.*

- (i)  $\mu$  is nonatomic.
- (ii)  $\rho_\mu$  is a convex metric.

*Proof.* Assume that  $\mu$  is nonatomic. Pick  $A_1, A_2 \in \Sigma$  such that  $\mu(A_1 \Delta A_2) > 0$ . Since  $A_1 \Delta A_2$  is not an atom of  $\mu$  and  $\mu(A_1 \Delta A_2) > 0$ , we may assume without loss of generality that there exists  $E \in \Sigma$  such that  $E \subseteq A_1 \setminus A_2$  and  $0 < \mu(E) < \mu(A_1 \setminus A_2)$ . Consider  $B = A_2 \cup E$ . Then

$$\rho_\mu([A_1]_\mu, [A_2]_\mu) = \mu(A_1 \Delta A_2) = \mu(A_2 \Delta B) + \mu(B \Delta A_1) = \rho_\mu([A_1]_\mu, [B]_\mu) + \rho_\mu([B]_\mu, [A_2]_\mu)$$

and this proves that  $\rho_\mu$  is convex. Hence (i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii).

Now suppose that  $\rho_\mu$  is convex. Pick  $A \in \Sigma$  such that  $\mu(A) > 0$ . By convexity of  $\rho_\mu$  there exists  $B \in \Sigma$  such that  $[B]_\mu$  is distinct from  $[A]_\mu, [\emptyset]_\mu$  and we have

$$\rho_\mu([A]_\mu, [\emptyset]_\mu) = \rho_\mu([A]_\mu, [B]_\mu) + \rho_\mu([B]_\mu, [\emptyset]_\mu)$$

This equality means that

$$\mu(A) = \mu(A \Delta B) + \mu(B)$$

Hence  $\mu(B \setminus A) = 0$ . By subtracting from  $B$  a set of measure  $\mu$  zero we may assume that  $B \subseteq A$ . Since  $[B]_\mu$  is distinct from  $[A]_\mu, [\emptyset]_\mu$ , we derive that  $0 < \mu(B) < \mu(A)$ . Thus  $A$  is not an atom of  $\mu$ . This proves that (ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i).  $\square$

**Corollary 5.7.** *Let  $(X, \Sigma, \mu)$  be a space with measure. Fix  $A \in \Sigma$  such that  $u = \mu(A)$  is finite and assume that  $A$  does not contain atoms of  $\mu$ . Then there exists a mapping*

$$[0, u] \ni t \mapsto B_t \in \Sigma$$

*such that the following assertions hold.*

- (1)  $B_0 = \emptyset, B_u = A$ .
- (2)  $B_{t_1} \subseteq B_{t_2}$  for  $t_1, t_2 \in [0, \theta]$  such that  $t_1 \leq t_2$ .
- (3)  $\mu(B_t) = t$  for each  $t \in [0, \theta]$ .

*Proof.* Without loss of generality we may assume that  $\mu$  is finite and  $A = X$ . Denote  $\mu(X)$  by  $\theta$ . By Theorem 5.6 metric  $\rho_\mu$  is convex. According to Proposition 5.3 metric  $\rho_\mu$  is complete. Next by Theorem 5.2 there exists an isometry  $\gamma : [0, \theta] \rightarrow \Sigma_\mu$  such that  $\gamma(0) = [\emptyset]_\mu, \gamma(\theta) = [X]_\mu$ . For each  $t \in [0, \theta]$  pick representative  $C_t \in \Sigma$  of  $\gamma(t)$ . Moreover, we may assume that  $C_0 = \emptyset$ . Then the following assertions hold.

- (1)  $C_0 = \emptyset, C_u \equiv_\mu X$ .
- (2)  $C_{t_1} \sqsubseteq_\mu C_{t_2}$  for  $t_1, t_2 \in [0, \theta]$  such that  $t_1 \leq t_2$ .
- (3)  $\mu(C_t) = t$  for each  $t \in [0, \theta]$ .

Next we define

$$B_t = \bigcup_{r \in \mathbb{Q} \cap [0, t]} C_r$$

for every  $0 \leq t < u$  and  $B_u = X$ . Then  $\mu(B_t) = t$  for every  $t \in [0, u]$ . Hence  $\{B_t\}_{t \in [0, u]}$  satisfies the statement.  $\square$

## 6. DUAL SPACES TO $L^p$ FOR $p \in (0, 1)$

Let  $(X, \Sigma, \mu)$  be a space with measure and let  $p$  be a real in  $(0, 1)$ . Assume that  $\mathbb{K}$  is either  $\mathbb{R}$  or  $\mathbb{C}$  with their usual absolute values. We use results of previous section in order to identify duals to  $L^p(\mu, \mathbb{K})$ .

### REFERENCES

- [Monygham, 2018a] Monygham (2018a). Introduction to measure theory. *github repository: "Monygham/Pedo-mellon-a-minno"*.
- [Monygham, 2018b] Monygham (2018b). Radon-nikodym theorem, hahn-jordan decomposition and lebesgue decomposition. *github repository: "Monygham/Pedo-mellon-a-minno"*.
- [Monygham, 2019] Monygham (2019). Integration. *github repository: "Monygham/Pedo-mellon-a-minno"*.