

# Notes on Measure Theory

Tianyu Du

June 13, 2020

## Contents

1	Sigma Algebra	1
2	Measurable Spaces and Measurable Maps	4
3	Lebesgue Measures and Lebesgue Integrals	5

## 1 Sigma Algebra

**Definition 1.1.** For a set  $X$ , a set  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$  is a  $\sigma$ -**algebra** if it satisfies the following properties:

1.  $\emptyset, X \in \mathcal{A}$ ;
2. for all  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $A^c \in \mathcal{A}$  as well;
3. for a sequence in  $\mathcal{A}$ ,  $\{A_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ , the union  $\bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} A_i \in \mathcal{A}$  as well.

An element  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  is called a  $\mathcal{A}$ -**measurable set**.

**Remark 1.1.** It's easy to show that the largest  $\sigma$ -algebra of set  $X$  is the power set  $\mathcal{P}(X)$ , and the smallest  $\sigma$ -algebra is  $\{\emptyset, X\}$ .

**Theorem 1.1.** Let  $\{\mathcal{A}_i\}_{i \in I}$  be the collection of all  $\sigma$ -algebra on  $X$ . Then,  $\bigcap_{i \in I} \mathcal{A}_i$  is also a  $\sigma$ -algebra on  $X$ .

*Proof.* Clearly,  $\emptyset, X \in \bigcap_{i \in I} \mathcal{A}_i$  given that every  $\mathcal{A}_i$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra.

For  $A \in \bigcap_{i \in I} \mathcal{A}_i$ ,  $A \in \mathcal{A}_i$  for all  $i \in I$ . Hence  $A^c \in \mathcal{A}_i$  for all  $i \in I$ . Therefore,  $A^c \in \bigcap_{i \in I} \mathcal{A}_i$ .

Let  $\{F_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence such that  $F_j \in \bigcap_{i \in I} \mathcal{A}_i$  for every  $j$ . Then  $F_j \in \mathcal{A}_i$  for all  $i, j$  since  $\mathcal{A}_i$ 's are  $\sigma$ -algebra. Hence,  $\bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} F_j \in \mathcal{A}_i$  for all  $i \in I$ , and  $\bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} F_j \in \bigcap_{i \in I} \mathcal{A}_i$ . ■

**Remark 1.2.** The union of  $\sigma$ -algebra are not necessarily a  $\sigma$ -algebra. For example, consider

$$X = \{a, b, c\} \tag{1}$$

$$\mathcal{A}_1 = \{\emptyset, \{a\}, \{b, c\}, X\} \tag{2}$$

$$\mathcal{A}_2 = \{\emptyset, \{b\}, \{a, c\}, X\} \tag{3}$$

$$\mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}_2 = \{\emptyset, \{a\}, \{b\}, \{b, c\}, \{a, c\}, X\} \tag{4}$$

Both  $\mathcal{A}_1$  and  $\mathcal{A}_2$  are  $\sigma$ -algebra, but  $\mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}_2$  is not a  $\sigma$ -algebra because  $\{a\} \cup \{b\} \notin \mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}_2$ .

**Definition 1.2.** For  $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$  ( $\mathcal{M}$  is not necessarily a  $\sigma$ -algebra), the smallest  $\sigma$ -algebra (by taking intersections) containing  $\mathcal{M}$  is defined as the  **$\sigma$ -algebra generated by  $\mathcal{M}$** . The generated  $\sigma$ -algebra is simply the intersection of all  $\sigma$ -algebra that are supersets of  $\mathcal{M}$ .

$$\sigma(\mathcal{M}) = \bigcap_{\mathcal{A} \supseteq \mathcal{M} \text{ s.t. } \mathcal{A} \text{ is } \sigma\text{-algebra}} \mathcal{A} \quad (5)$$

The  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by  $\mathcal{M}$  is therefore the smallest  $\sigma$ -algebra containing  $\mathcal{M}$ .

**Definition 1.3.** Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a topological space, then the **Borel algebra** is  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by the collection of open sets  $\tau$ .

$$\mathcal{B}(X) := \sigma(\tau) \quad (6)$$

**Remark 1.3.** We do not use the entire power set for analysis because it's too large to construct a sensible measure on (see Theorem 1.2).

**Definition 1.4.** For a measurable space  $(X, \mathcal{A})$ , a map  $\mu : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  is a **measure** if  $\mu$  satisfies

1.  $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$ .
2. ( $\sigma$ -additivity)  $\mu(\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_i)$ , where  $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$  for all  $i$  and  $A_i \cap A_j = \emptyset$  for all  $i \neq j$ .

**Example 1.1.** For an element  $x \in X$ , the **Dirac measure**,  $\delta_x$ , on a measurable space  $(X, \mathcal{A})$  is defined as

$$\delta_x(A) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \in A \\ 0 & \text{if } x \notin A \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

**Definition 1.5.** For a measurable space  $(X, \mathcal{A})$  and a measure  $\mu$  defined on it, the triple  $(X, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$  is a **measure space**.

**Theorem 1.2.** There is no measure  $\mu$  on  $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}))$  satisfying the following two conditions: (i)  $\mu((a, b]) = b - a$  for every  $a < b$  and (ii)  $\mu(x + A) = \mu(A)$  for all  $a \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $A \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$ .

*Proof.* Suppose, for contradiction, there exists such a measure  $\mu$ , then  $\mu((0, 1]) = 1 < \infty$ .

Claim: the only measure on  $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}))$  satisfying  $\mu((0, 1]) < \infty$  and  $\mu(x + A) = \mu(A)$  is the zero measure.

To prove the claim, let  $I := (0, 1]$  and define the following equivalence relation on  $I$ :

$$x \sim y \iff x - y \in \mathbb{Q} \quad (8)$$

the corresponding equivalence class of  $x$  on  $I$  can be written as

$$[x] = \{x + r : r \in \mathbb{Q} \wedge x + r \in I\} \quad (9)$$

The collection of all such equivalence classes,  $\mathcal{A}$ , is a disjoint decomposition of  $I$ . (for every  $x \in I$ ,  $[x]$  must in  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $x \in [x]$  trivially. If there exists different  $[x] \neq [y]$  but  $[x] \cap [y] \neq \emptyset$ , take  $z \in [x] \cap [y]$ , by the transitivity of equivalence relation,  $x \sim z \sim y$ . Therefore,  $[x] = [y]$ , contradiction.)

For each  $[x] \in \mathcal{A}$ , take exactly one  $a_x \in [x]$  and define set  $A := \{a_x : [x] \in \mathcal{A}\}$ . As a result, set  $A$  satisfies the following two properties:

1.  $\forall x \in I, \exists a_x \in A$  s.t.  $a_x \in [x]$ .
2.  $\forall x, y \in A, x \sim y \implies x = y$ .

Since  $\mathbb{Q} \cup (-1, 1]$  is countable, let  $(r_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be an enumeration of all elements in it.

For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , define  $A_n := r_n + A$ .

Note that for any  $m, n$  such that  $A_m \cap A_n \neq \emptyset$ , take  $x \in A_m \cap A_n$ . By definition,

$$x = r_n + a_n \tag{10}$$

$$x = r_m + a_m \tag{11}$$

where  $a_n, a_m \in A$  and  $r_n, r_m \in \mathbb{Q}$ . Consequently,

$$a_n - a_m = r_m - r_n \in \mathbb{Q} \tag{12}$$

Therefore,  $a_n \sim a_m$ . By the second property of  $A$ ,  $a_n = a_m$ . Thus,  $r_m = r_n$  and  $m = n$ .

Take the counterposition of what we just proved,  $m \neq n \implies A_m \cap A_n = \emptyset$ .

Let  $z \in (0, 1]$ , there exists some  $a \in A$  such that  $z \in [a]$ . That is,  $z = x + r$  for some  $r \in \mathbb{Q} \cap (-1, 1]$ . There must exist some  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $r_m = r$ , and consequently,  $z \in A_m$ .

Therefore,  $(0, 1] \subseteq \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n \subseteq (-1, 2]$  (the second relation is obvious). Moreover,

$$\mu((0, 1]) \leq \mu\left(\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n\right) \leq \mu((-1, 2]) = \mu((-1, 0]) + \mu((0, 1]) + \mu((1, 2]) = 3\mu((0, 1]) \tag{13}$$

Note that we just proved  $\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n$  is a disjoint union, hence,

$$\mu((0, 1]) \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_n) \leq 3\mu((0, 1]) \tag{14}$$

$$\implies ((0, 1])\mu \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(A + r_n) \leq 3\mu((0, 1]) \tag{15}$$

$$\implies \mu((0, 1]) \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(A) \leq 3\mu((0, 1]) \tag{16}$$

Since  $\mu((0, 1])$  is finite, the only value  $\mu(A)$  can take is zero, and  $\mu(I) = 0$  as well. Consequently, for any set  $S \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$ , if  $S \subseteq I$ , then  $\mu(S) \leq \mu(I)$  and  $\mu(S) = 0$ . Otherwise, let  $l = \lfloor \inf(S) \rfloor$  and

$$u = \lceil \sup(S) \rceil.$$

$$I \subseteq S \subseteq \bigcup_{n=l}^u (n, n+1] \quad (17)$$

Therefore,

$$0 \leq \mu(S) \leq \sum_{n=l}^u \mu(n + (0, 1]) = \sum_{n=l}^u \mu((0, 1]) = 0 \quad (18)$$

It's shown that  $\mu(S) = 0$  for every  $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$ .

This leads to a contradiction to the first property required ( $\mu((a, b]) = b - a$ ). ■

## 2 Measurable Spaces and Measurable Maps

**Definition 2.1.** Let  $(X_1, \mathcal{A}_1)$  and  $(X_2, \mathcal{A}_2)$  be two measurable spaces. A function  $f : X_1 \rightarrow X_2$  is a **measurable map** with respect to  $\mathcal{A}_1$  and  $\mathcal{A}_2$  (sometimes written as  $f : (X_1, \mathcal{A}_1) \rightarrow (X_2, \mathcal{A}_2)$ ) if

$$f^{-1}(A_2) \in \mathcal{A}_1 \quad \forall A_2 \in \mathcal{A}_2 \quad (19)$$

That is, the pre-image of every set in  $\mathcal{A}_2$  is an element in  $\mathcal{A}_1$  as well.

**Theorem 2.1.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{A})$  be a measurable space, then the indicator (characteristic) function for any  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $\mathcal{X}_A : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , is measurable with respect to  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ .

$$\mathcal{X}_A(x) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \in A \\ 0 & \text{if } x \notin A \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

*Proof.* Since  $\mathcal{X}_A$  can only take values from  $\{0, 1\}$ , the pre-image of any set  $\not\subseteq \{0, 1\}$  is undefined. We only need to consider pre-images of subsets of  $\{0, 1\}$ :

$$\mathcal{X}_A^{-1}(\emptyset) = \emptyset \quad (21)$$

$$\mathcal{X}_A^{-1}(\{0, 1\}) = X \quad (22)$$

$$\mathcal{X}_A^{-1}(\{0\}) = A^c \quad (23)$$

$$\mathcal{X}_A^{-1}(\{1\}) = A \quad (24)$$

Therefore,  $\mathcal{X}_A$  is measurable. ■

**Theorem 2.2.** The composition of measurable maps is measurable.

*Proof.* For measurable spaces  $(X_1, \mathcal{A}_1)$ ,  $(X_2, \mathcal{A}_2)$ , and  $(X_3, \mathcal{A}_3)$ , let  $f : (X_1, \mathcal{A}_1) \rightarrow (X_2, \mathcal{A}_2)$  and  $g : (X_2, \mathcal{A}_2) \rightarrow (X_3, \mathcal{A}_3)$  be two measurable functions.

Let  $A_3 \in \mathcal{A}_3$ ,  $A_2 := g^{-1}(A_3) \in \mathcal{A}_2$ . Similarly,  $A_1 := f^{-1}(A_2) \in \mathcal{A}_1$  as well. Note that  $A_1 = (g \circ f)^{-1}(A_3)$ , therefore,  $g \circ f$  is measurable. ■

**Theorem 2.3.** For measurable spaces  $(X, \mathcal{A})$  and  $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}))$  and measurable maps  $f, g : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $f + g$ ,  $f - g$  and  $|f|$  are measurable.

*Proof.* ■

### 3 Lebesgue Measures and Lebesgue Integrals

**Definition 3.1.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$  be a measure space and for any  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ , the **Lebesgue integral** of indicator function  $\mathcal{X}_A$  on  $X$  is defined to be  $\mu(A) \in [0, \infty]$ .

$$\int_X \mathcal{X}_A d\mu := \mu(A) \quad (25)$$

**Definition 3.2.** A function  $f : (X, \mathcal{A}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}))$  is a **simple function** (also termed step function and stair-case function) if there exists finitely many  $A_1, \dots, A_n \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $c_1, \dots, c_n \in \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$f = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \mathcal{X}_{A_i} \quad (26)$$

That is, a function  $f$  is simple if it can be expressed as a linear combination of *finitely* many indicators.

Let  $\mathbb{S}^+$  denote the set of non-negative simple functions.

$$\mathbb{S}^+ := \{f : (X, \mathcal{A}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})) \mid f \text{ is simple and } f \geq 0\} \quad (27)$$

Since simple functions only take finitely many values, every  $f \in \mathbb{S}^+$  can be written as

$$f = \sum_{t \in f(X)} t \mathcal{X}_{\{x \in X \mid f(x)=t\}} = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \mathcal{X}_{A_i}, \quad c_i \geq 0 \quad (28)$$

**Theorem 3.1.** Simple functions are measurable.

**Definition 3.3** (Lebesgue integral for  $\mathbb{S}^+$ ). For  $f \in \mathbb{S}^+$  such that  $f = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \mathcal{X}_{A_i}$  with  $c_i \geq 0$ , the **Lebesgue integral** of  $f$  with respect to  $\mu$  is

$$I(f) = \int_X f d\mu := \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \mu(A_i) \in [0, \infty] \quad (29)$$

**Theorem 3.2.** The Lebesgue integral of  $f, g \in \mathbb{S}^+$  satisfies

1.  $I(\alpha f + \beta g) = \alpha I(f) + \beta I(g)$  for  $\alpha, \beta \geq 0$ ,
2.  $f \leq g \implies I(f) \leq I(g)$ .

*Proof.* ■

**Definition 3.4** (Lebesgue integral for non-negative functions). For  $f \geq 0$ , the **Lebesgue integral** of  $f$  with respect to measure  $\mu$  is

$$I(f) = \int_X f \, d\mu := \sup \left\{ \int_X s \, d\mu : s \in \mathbb{S}^+ \text{ and } s \leq f \right\} \quad (30)$$

**Definition 3.5.** A function  $f$  is  $\mu$ -**integrable** if  $\int_X f \, d\mu < \infty$ .

**Theorem 3.3.** Let  $f, g : (X, \mathcal{A}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}))$  be measurable functions, if  $0 \leq f = g$  except a  $\mu$ -measure-zero set, that is,

$$\mu(\{x \in X \mid f(x) \neq g(x)\}) = 0 \quad (31)$$

then  $\int_X f \, d\mu = \int_X g \, d\mu$ .

**Lemma 3.1.** Let  $h : X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  be a simple function, for any  $\tilde{X} \subseteq X$  such that  $\mu(\tilde{X}^c) = 0$ ,  $\int_X h \, d\mu$  is independent from the value of  $h$  on  $\tilde{X}^c$ .

*Proof. of Lemma 3.1.* Since  $h$  is a simple function, it takes only finitely many values and can be written as

$$h = \sum_{t \in h(X)} t \mathcal{X}_{\{x \in X \mid h(x)=t\}} = \sum_{t \in h(X) \setminus \{0\}} t \mathcal{X}_{\{x \in X \mid h(x)=t\}} \quad (32)$$

define

$$\tilde{h} = \begin{cases} h(x) & \text{if } x \in \tilde{X} \\ a & \text{if } x \in \tilde{X}^c \end{cases} \quad (33)$$

where  $a \in [0, \infty)$  takes an arbitrary value, and  $\tilde{h} \in \mathbb{S}^+$  as well.

$$\int_X \tilde{h} \, d\mu = \sum_{t \in \tilde{h}(X)} t \mu(\{x \in X \mid \tilde{h}(x) = t\}) \quad (34)$$

$$= a \underbrace{\mu(\tilde{X}^c)}_{=0} + \sum_{t \in h(\tilde{X}) \setminus \{0\}} t \mu(\{x \in \tilde{X} \mid h(x) = t\}) \quad (35)$$

$$= \sum_{t \in h(\tilde{X}) \setminus \{0\}} t \mu(\{x \in \tilde{X} \mid h(x) = t\}) \quad (36)$$

$$= \sum_{t \in h(\tilde{X}) \setminus \{0\}} t \mu(\{x \in \tilde{X} \mid h(x) = t\}) + \sum_{t \in h(\tilde{X}) \setminus \{0\}} t \underbrace{\mu(\{x \in \tilde{X}^c \mid h(x) = t\})}_{=0} \quad (37)$$

$$= \sum_{t \in h(\tilde{X}) \setminus \{0\}} t \mu(\{x \in \tilde{X} \mid h(x) = t\} \cup \{x \in \tilde{X}^c \mid h(x) = t\}) \quad (38)$$

$$= \sum_{t \in h(\tilde{X}) \setminus \{0\}} t \mu(\{x \in X \mid h(x) = t\}) + \sum_{t' \in h(X) \setminus (h(\tilde{X}) \cup \{0\})} t' \mu(\{x \in X \mid h(x) = t'\}) \quad (39)$$

Note that  $t'$ 's are values that are attained in  $\tilde{X}^c$  only, therefore,  $\{x \in X \mid h(x) = t'\} \subseteq \tilde{X}^c$  and have

measure zero.

$$(44) = \sum_{t \in h(X) \setminus \{0\}} t \mu(\{x \in X | h(x) = t\}) = \int_X h \, d\mu \quad (40)$$

Hence, the value of  $\int_X h \, d\mu$  is the same no matter how we change  $h$ 's values on  $\tilde{X}^c$ .  $\blacksquare$

*Proof. of Theorem 3.3.* Let  $\tilde{X} := \{x \in X : f(x) \neq g(x)\}$ , for each simple function  $h$  in above set, define

$$\tilde{h} = \begin{cases} h(x) & \text{if } x \in \tilde{X} \\ 0 & \text{if } x \in \tilde{X}^c \end{cases} \quad (41)$$

Then,

$$\int_X f \, d\mu = \sup \{I(h) \mid h \in \mathbb{S}^+, h \leq f \text{ on } X\} \quad (42)$$

$$= \sup \{I(\tilde{h}) \mid h \in \mathbb{S}^+, h \leq f \text{ on } X\} \quad (43)$$

$$= \sup \{I(\tilde{h}) \mid h \in \mathbb{S}^+, h \leq f \text{ on } \tilde{X}\} \quad (44)$$

$$= \sup \{I(\tilde{h}) \mid h \in \mathbb{S}^+, h \leq g \text{ on } \tilde{X}\} \quad (45)$$

$$= \int_X g \, d\mu \quad (46)$$

Where equation (44) holds because the value of  $h$  on  $\tilde{X}^c$  does not affect  $I(\tilde{h})$ .  $\blacksquare$

**Theorem 3.4.** Let  $f, g : (X, \mathcal{A}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}))$  be measurable functions, if  $0 \leq f \leq g$  except a  $\mu$ -measure-zero set, then  $\int_X f \, d\mu \leq \int_X g \, d\mu$ .

*Proof.* By definition of Lebesgue integral,

$$\int_X f \, d\mu = \sup \{I(h) \mid h \in \mathbb{S}^+, h \leq f \text{ on } X\} \quad (47)$$

Let  $\tilde{X} := \{x \in X : f(x) \leq g(x)\}$ , for each simple function  $h$  in above set, define

$$\tilde{h} = \begin{cases} h(x) & \text{if } x \in \tilde{X} \\ 0 & \text{if } x \in \tilde{X}^c \end{cases} \quad (48)$$

Then  $h \leq f \iff \tilde{h} \leq f$ , and  $I(h) = I(\tilde{h})$  by Lemma 3.1.

$$\sup \{I(h) \mid h \in \mathbb{S}^+, h \leq f \text{ on } X\} = \sup \{I(\tilde{h}) \mid h \in \mathbb{S}^+, h \leq f \text{ on } \tilde{X}\} \quad (49)$$

$$\leq \sup \{I(\tilde{h}) \mid h \in \mathbb{S}^+, h \leq g \text{ on } \tilde{X}\} \quad (50)$$

$$= \int_X g \, d\mu \quad (51)$$

Therefore,

$$\int_X f \, d\mu \leq \int_X g \, d\mu \quad (52)$$

■

**Theorem 3.5.** Let  $f : (X, \mathcal{A}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}))$  be measurable functions,  $f = 0$  except a  $\mu$ -measure-zero set if and only if  $\int_X f \, d\mu = 0$ .

*Proof.* Similar to previous proofs. ■

**Theorem 3.6** (Monotone Convergence Theorem). For measure space  $(X, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$ , let  $(f_n : X \rightarrow [0, \infty))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence of measurable functions such that

1.  $f_n \leq f_{n+1}$  except for a  $\mu$ -measure-zero set,
2.  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n$  converges point-wisely to  $f$  except for a  $\mu$ -measure-zero set.

Then,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_X f_n \, d\mu = \int_X \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n \, d\mu = \int_X f \, d\mu \quad (53)$$

*Proof.* Since  $f_n \leq f_{n+1}$  almost everywhere, and  $f_n \rightarrow f$  point-wisely almost everywhere, therefore,

$$f_n \leq f_{n+1} \leq f \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ except a set with zero measure} \quad (54)$$

Consequently,

$$\int_X f_n \, d\mu \leq \int_X f_{n+1} \, d\mu \leq \int_X f \, d\mu \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N} \quad (55)$$

As a result,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_X f_n \, d\mu \leq \int_X f \, d\mu \quad (56)$$

Let  $h$  be a simple function such that  $0 \leq h \leq f$ , let  $\varepsilon > 0$ , define

$$X_n := \{x \in X \mid f_n(x) \geq (1 - \varepsilon)h(x)\} \quad (57)$$

$$\tilde{X} := \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} X_n \quad (58)$$

Note that  $f_{n+1} \geq f_n$  implies  $X_n \subseteq X_{n+1}$  and  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} X_n = \tilde{X}$ . Moreover, because the monotonicity and point-wise convergence happen almost everywhere in  $X$ , almost all  $x \in X$  are in some  $X_n$  with  $n$  sufficiently large, hence  $\mu(\tilde{X}^c) = 0$ .



Because  $X_n \subseteq X$  and  $f_n \geq 0$ , for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\int_X f_n d\mu \geq \int_{X_n} f_n d\mu \geq \int_{X_n} (1 - \varepsilon)h d\mu \quad (59)$$

$$\implies \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_X f_n d\mu \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{X_n} (1 - \varepsilon)h d\mu \quad (60)$$

$$= \int_{\tilde{X}} (1 - \varepsilon)h d\mu \quad (61)$$

$$= \int_X (1 - \varepsilon)h d\mu \quad (62)$$

Where the last equality holds because  $\mu(\tilde{X}^c) = 0$ .

Since this inequality holds for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_X f_n d\mu \geq \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \int_X (1 - \varepsilon)h d\mu = \int_X h d\mu \quad (63)$$

moreover, this inequality holds for all  $0 \leq h \leq f$ ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_X f_n d\mu \geq \int_X f d\mu \quad (64)$$

Results (56) and (64) lead to the conclusion. ■

**Corollary 3.1.** Let  $(g_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence of non-negative measurable functions,  $g_n : X \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ , then the integral of series equals the series of integrals:

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} g_n : X \rightarrow [0, \infty] \quad (65)$$

is measurable, and

$$\int_X \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} g_n d\mu = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_X g_n d\mu \quad (66)$$

*Proof.* Let  $g_k := \sum_{n=1}^k g_n$  and  $g = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} g_k$ . Since  $g_n \geq 0$ ,  $g_k \leq g_{k+1}$  for every  $k$ . By the

monotone convergence theorem,

$$\int_X \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} g_k = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_X g_k \, d\mu \quad (67)$$

$$\implies \int_X \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} g_n \, d\mu = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_X \sum_{n=1}^k g_n \, d\mu \quad (68)$$

$$= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n=1}^k \int_X g_n \, d\mu \quad (69)$$

$$= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_X g_n \, d\mu \quad (70)$$

■

**Proposition 3.1.** Infimum of measurable functions is measurable.

**Proposition 3.2.** Limit of measurable functions is measurable.