

# Analysis I

Thomas Fleming

September 28, 2021

## Contents

### Lecture 10: Measure Theory (2) and Lebesgue Measure

Thu 23 Sep 2021 12:58

**Definition 0.1.** A set  $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  is **measurable/Lebesgue measurable** if for every  $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\mu^*(A) = \mu^*(A \cap S) + \mu^*(A \cap S^c).$$

It actually suffices to show only

$$\mu^*(A) \geq \mu^*(A \cap S) + \mu^*(A \cap S^c).$$

**Proposition 0.1.** Every set  $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  with  $\mu^*(S) = 0$  is measurable.

*Proof.* For every  $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mu^*(A \cap S) \leq \mu^*(S) = 0$ . Similarly,  $\mu^*(A \cap S^c) = 0$ .  $\square$

**Definition 0.2.** A set  $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  with  $\mu^*(S) = 0$  is said to have measure 0.

**Lemma 0.1.** For each  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $(a, \infty)$  is measurable.

. Given  $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we find  $\{I_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \in J(A)$  such that

$$\mu^*(A) \geq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \ell(I_n) - \varepsilon.$$

Since  $A \cap (a, \infty) \subseteq \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (I_n \cap (a, \infty))$  and

$$A \cap (a, \infty)^c \subseteq \left( \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (I_n \cap (-\infty, a)) \right) \cup (a - \varepsilon, a + \varepsilon).$$

It follows that  $\mu^*(A \cap (a, \infty)) \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \ell(I_n \cap (a, \infty))$  and  $\mu^*(A \cap (a, \infty)^c) \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \ell(I_n \cap (-\infty, a)) + 2\varepsilon$ . As  $\ell(I_n) = \ell(I_n \cap (a, \infty)) + \ell(I_n \cap (-\infty, a))$  as the

singular point  $a$  will not change the length. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\mu^*(A) &\geq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \ell(I_n \cap (a, \infty)) + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \ell(I_n \cap (-\infty, a) - \varepsilon \\ &\geq \mu^*(A \cap (a, \infty)) + \mu^*(A \cap (a, \infty)^c) - 3\varepsilon.\end{aligned}$$

□

**Proposition 0.2.** The collection of Lebesgue measurable sets in  $\mathbb{R}$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{L}$  containing all Borel sets.

*Proof.* If the measurable sets form of  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{L}$ , then  $\mathcal{L}$  must contain all open and closed subsets of  $\mathbb{R}$ , since it contains all intervals of the form  $(a, \infty)$ . To show that the measurable sets form a  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{L}$  we first note that  $(a, a) = \emptyset$  and the complement of each measurable set are both measurable sets. This is due to the symmetry in the definition of measurability

$$\mu^*(A) \geq \mu^*(A \cap S) + \mu^*(A \cap S^c).$$

Now, suppose  $\{S_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  is a countable collection of measurable sets. Let  $S = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} S_n$ , then we need only show  $S$  is measurable.

Given  $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ , we define a sequence with  $A_1 = A$ ,  $A_{n+1} = A \cap (\bigcap_{k=1}^n S_k^c)$ . Hence,  $A_2 = A \cap S_1^c$ ,  $A_3 = A \cap (S_1^c \cap S_2^c)$ . Now, note that  $A_{n+1} = A_n \cap S_n^c$ , hence the sequence is decreasing in size. And  $A \cap S = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} (A_k \cap S_k)$ . We present a short proof of this claim.

Note that for  $x \in A \cap S$ , there is a smallest positive integer  $k$  such that  $x \in S_k$ . If  $k = 1$ , then  $x \in A_1 \cap S_1$ , if  $k > 1$ , then  $x \notin S_n$  for any  $n < k$ , consequently  $x \in A_k$  by construction. Hence,  $x \in A_k \cap S_k$ , so  $A \cap S \subseteq \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} (A_k \cap S_k)$ .

Now,  $\bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} (A_k \cap S_k) \subseteq A \cap S$ , as each  $A_k \in A$  and  $S_k \in S$ , hence their intersection and subsequent union are also contained. Hence the equality is shown

$$A \cap S = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} (A_k \cap S_k).$$

By measurability of  $S_n$ , we know any set  $A$  has

$$\mu^*(A_n) = \mu^*(A_n \cap S_n) + \underbrace{\mu^*(A_n \cap S_n^c)}_{A_{n+1}}$$

Hence, by induction, we have  $\mu^*(A) = \mu^*(A_1) = \sum_{k=1}^n \mu^*(A_k \cap S_k) + \mu^*(A_{n+1})$ . Since  $A \cap (\bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} S_k^c) = A \cap S^c \subseteq A_{n+1}$  for any  $n$ .

Hence,

$$\mu^*(A) \geq \sum_{k=1}^n \mu^*(A_k \cap S_k) + \mu^*(A \cap S^c).$$

Finally, as  $\bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} (A_k \cap S_k) = A \cap S$  and since  $\mu^*$  is countably subadditive, we

obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mu^*(A) &\geq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mu^*(A_k \cap S_k) + \mu^*(A \cap S^c) \\
 &\geq \mu^*\left(\bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} (A_k \cap S_k)\right) + \mu^*(A \cap S^c) \\
 &= \mu^*(A \cap S) + \mu^*(A \cap S^c).
 \end{aligned}$$

□

**Definition 0.3** (Lebesgue Measure). The **Lebesgue Measure** of a measurable set  $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ , denoted by  $\mu^*(S)$  is defined by  $\mu(S) = \mu^*(S)$ . The set function  $\mu : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  is called the **Lebesgue Measure**.

**Theorem 0.1.** The Lebesgue measure  $\mu$  is a measure on  $\mathcal{L}$  such that

- $\mu(I) = \ell(I)$  for every interval  $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ .
- $\mu$  is translation invariant.
- $\mu$  is countably additive.

*Proof.* 1. As  $\mu^*$  has the interval property,  $\mu$  trivially inherits this,  
 2. Similarly, as  $\mu^*$  was translationally invariant, we see  $\mu$  inherits this.  
 3. Let  $\{S_k : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$  be a countable, disjoint collection of measurable sets and define  $T_n = \bigcup_{k=n}^{\infty} S_k$  for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .  
 Since,  $T_{n+1} = T_n \cap S_n^c$  we have

$$\mu(T_n) = \mu(T_n \cap S_n) + \mu\left(\underbrace{T_n \cap S_n^c}_{=T_{n+1}}\right)$$

by measurability of  $S_n$ .

Consequently,  $\mu(T_1) = \sum_{k=1}^n \mu\left(\underbrace{T_k \cap S_k}_{=S_k}\right) + \mu(T_{n+1}) \geq \sum_{k=1}^n \mu(S_k)$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Thus  $T_1 = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} S_k$  gives  $\mu\left(\bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} S_k\right) \geq \sum_{k=1}^n \mu(S_k)$ . And as we already know the inequality goes in the other direction by subadditivity of  $\mu^*$ , we see equality holds.

□

**Corollary 1.** Every countable set of real numbers is measurable with measure 0.

*Proof.* Let  $C$  be our countable sets and note that  $C = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \{x_k\}$  with  $x_k \neq x_m$  for  $k \neq m$ . Then, we see that

$$\mu \left( \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \{x_k\} \right) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mu(\{x_k\}) = 0.$$

□

**Theorem 0.2** (Properties of Lebesgue Measure). Let  $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ , the following are equivalent

1.  $S$  is measurable.
2. For each  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there is an open set  $O$  and a closed set  $C$  such that  $C \subseteq S \subseteq O$  and  $\mu(O \setminus C) < \varepsilon$ .
3. There is a  $G_\delta$  set  $G$  and a  $F_\sigma$  set  $F$  such that  $F \subseteq S \subseteq G$  and  $\mu(G \setminus F) = 0$ .
4. For each  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there are measurable sets  $G$  and  $F$  such that  $F \subseteq S \subseteq G$  and  $\mu(G \setminus F) < \varepsilon$ .

We will prove this result next time, though it is completely trivial that  $3 \Rightarrow 4$ , so we will primarily focus on proving  $1 \Rightarrow 2$  and  $4 \Rightarrow 1$ .

## Lecture 11

Tue 28 Sep 2021 13:00

We prove the final theorem from last lecture.

*Proof.* •  $(1 \Rightarrow 2)$ . There are 2 cases,  $S$  being bounded and  $S$  being unbounded.

If  $S$  is bounded, there is an interval  $(a, b) \supseteq S$ ,  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then for any given  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we find  $\{I_k : k \in \mathbb{N}\} \in J(S)$  and  $\{J_k : k \in \mathbb{N}\} \in J([a, b] \setminus S)$  such that  $\mu(S) \geq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \ell(I_k) - \frac{\varepsilon}{3}$  and  $\mu([a, b] \setminus S) \geq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \ell(J_k) - \frac{\varepsilon}{3}$ . Let  $O = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} I_k$ ,  $U = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} J_k$  and  $C = [a, b] \setminus U$ . Then,  $C \subseteq S \subseteq O$ . Note that  $O, U$  are open and  $C$  is closed. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(S) &\geq \mu(O) - \frac{\varepsilon}{3} \\ \mu([a, b] \setminus S) &\geq \mu(U) - \frac{\varepsilon}{3}. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore,  $U, C$  are disjoint and  $\mu(U) < \infty$  (as it is an interval minus a measurable set) and  $[a, b] \subseteq U \cup C$ . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(C) &\geq \mu([a, b]) - \mu(U) \\ &= b - a - \mu(U). \end{aligned}$$

Then, since  $\mu(C) \leq \mu(S) < \infty$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mu(O \setminus C) &= \mu(O) - \mu(C) \\
 &\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{3} + \underbrace{\mu(S) - (b-a)}_{=-\mu([a,b] \setminus S)} + \mu(U) \\
 &= \frac{\varepsilon}{3} - \mu([a,b] \setminus S) + \mu(U) \\
 &\leq \frac{2\varepsilon}{3} \\
 &< \varepsilon.
 \end{aligned}$$

For a general  $S$ , let  $S_n = S \cap [n, n+1]$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Then, there are open  $O_n$  and closed  $C_n$  such that  $C_n \subseteq S_n \subseteq O_n$  and  $\mu(O_n \setminus C_n) < \frac{\varepsilon}{3 \cdot 2^{|n|}}$ . Let  $O = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} O_n$  and  $C = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} C_n$ . Then,  $O$  is open and  $C$  is closed by definition and we see  $O \setminus C = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} (O_n \setminus C_n)$  by demorgen and we have  $C \subseteq S \subseteq O$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mu(O \setminus C) &\leq \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \mu(O_n \setminus C_n) \\
 &< \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{\varepsilon}{3 \cdot 2^{|n|}} \\
 &= \varepsilon \text{ by geometric summation.}
 \end{aligned}$$

- (2  $\Rightarrow$  3). For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , there are closed  $C_n$  and open  $O_n$  such that  $C_n \subseteq S \subseteq O_n$  and  $\mu(O_n \setminus C_n) < \frac{1}{n}$ . Let  $F = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} C_n$  and  $G = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} O_n$ . Then,  $F$  is a  $F_\sigma$  set and  $G$  is a  $G_\delta$  set. Then, we have  $F \subseteq S \subseteq G$  and  $\mu(G \setminus F) \leq \mu(O_n \setminus C_n) < \frac{1}{n}$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Hence,  $\mu(G \setminus F) = 0$ .
- (3  $\Rightarrow$  4). This is immediately obvious as  $F_\sigma$  and  $G_\delta$  sets are measurable.
- (4  $\Rightarrow$  1). Let  $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Then  $S^c \subseteq G \cup (G \cap F^c)$ . Then,  $A$

□