Lecture Notes
MATH205A: Real Analysis I (Autumn 2020)
@ Stanford University

Tianyu Du

September 30, 2020

1 Measures

1.1 Motivation

Motivation of this course is to define a notion of *length* on subsets of $\mathbb{R}$ such that

1. $length([a, b]) = b - a$.
2. (countable additivity) $length(\bigcup^\infty A_i) = \sum^\infty length(A_i)$ where A_i's are disjoint.
3. (translation invariance) for all $a \in \mathbb{R}$, $length(A + a) = length(A)$.

Fact 1.1. it is impossible to construct such length for all subsets of $\mathbb{R}$.

Proof. This proof shows it is impossible to construct a notion of length on $[0, 1]$ with desired properties.

For $x, y \in [0, 1]$, define an equivalence relation as $x \sim y \iff x - y \in \mathbb{Q}$. By the axiom of choice, we may construct a set A containing exactly one element from each equivalence class of $x \in [0, 1]$. Obviously, $A \subseteq [0, 1]$.

For each $r \in [-1, 1] \cap \mathbb{Q}$, let $A_r := A + r$, and $A_r \subseteq [-1, 2]$. By translation invariance, $length(A_r) = length(A)$. Note that for any $y \in [0, 1]$, there exists some $x \in A$ such that $x \sim y$, therefore, $y \in A_{y-x} \subseteq \bigcup_r A_r$. Hence, $[0, 1] \subseteq \bigcup_r A_r$.

If the notion of length satisfies countable additivity, $length(\bigcup_r A_r)$ is either zero or infinity, which leads to a contradiction. ■

Lebesgue's Resolution: we only defines length for a subset of $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$, which contains *everything that may ever arrive in practice*, i.e., σ-algebras.

1.2 Algebras and σ-algebra

Definition 1.1. Let X be a set, a collection $\mathcal{A}$ of subsets of X is called an **algebra** if

1. $X \in \mathcal{A}$,

2. $A \in \mathcal{A} \implies A^c \in \mathcal{A}$,

3. $A, B \in \mathcal{A} \implies A \cup B \in \mathcal{A}$.

Consequently: (1) $A, B \in \mathcal{A} \implies A \cap B \in \mathcal{A}$; (2) $A_1, \dots, A_n \in \mathcal{A} \implies \bigcup_i A_i, \bigcap_i A_i \in \mathcal{A}$ (easily shown by induction); (3) $\varnothing \in \mathcal{A}$.

Definition 1.2. Let X be a set, a collection $\mathcal{A}$ of subsets of X is called a σ-**algebra** if

1. $X \in \mathcal{A}$,
2. $A \in \mathcal{A} \implies A^c \in \mathcal{A}$,
3. $A_1, A_2 \dots, \in \mathcal{A}, \implies \bigcup_i^\infty A_i \in \mathcal{A}$.

Example 1.1 (trivial examples)**.** The power set of X is a σ-algebra on X; $\{\varnothing, X\}$ is a σ-algebra on X.

Example 1.2 (finite/co-finite algebra)**.** Let X be an infinite set and $\mathcal{A}$ be the collection of subsets A such that either A is finite or A^c is finite. $\mathcal{A}$ is an algebra.

Proof. $X \in \mathcal{A}$ since $X^c = \varnothing$ is finite. For a $X \in \mathcal{A}$, if X is finite, then $X^c \in \mathcal{A}$. If X is infinite, X^c is finite and $X^c \in \mathcal{A}$. Let $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$, if both A and B are finite, $A \cup B$ is finite and in $\mathcal{A}$. If A is finite and B is co-finite, then $(A \cup B)^c = A^c \cap B^c \subseteq B^c$ is finite. If both A and B are co-finite, $(A \cup B)^c$ is finite so that $A \cup B \in \mathcal{A}$. ■

Note the $\mathcal{A}$ is not a σ-algebra if X is infinite: take distinct points $x_1, x_2, \dots \in \mathcal{A}$, then the union of them is neither finite or co-finite, and therefore not in $\mathcal{A}$.

Example 1.3 (countable/co-countable σ-algebra)**.** The collection of subsets $A \subseteq X$, such that either A is countable or A^c is countable, forms a σ-algebra.

Example 1.4. Let $X = \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ be the collection of all finite disjoint unions of half-open intervals (i.e., sets like $(a, b], (-\infty, b], (a, \infty)$), $\mathcal{A}$ is an algebra. (Not working for open intervals).

Example 1.5 (counter example)**.** Let X be an infinite set, $\mathcal{A}$ be the collection of finite subsets of X. Then, $\mathcal{A}$ is not an algebra.

Proposition 1.1. Let X be a set and $\{\mathcal{A}_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ be an arbitrary (not necessarily countable) collection of σ-algebras, then $\bigcap_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \mathcal{A}_i$ is a σ-algebra.

Proof. Since $X \in \mathcal{A}_i$ for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$ ■

Corollary 1.1. Let X be a set, and $\mathcal{P}$ is an arbitrary collection of subsets of X, then $\exists!$ smallest σ-algebra $\mathcal{A}$ containing $\mathcal{P}$. That is, for any σ-algebra $\mathcal{B} \supseteq \mathcal{P}$, $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$. $\mathcal{A}$ is defined as the σ-algebra **generated by** $\mathcal{P}$, denoted as $\sigma(\mathcal{P})$.

Proof. For any $\mathcal{P}$, the power set of X is obviously a σ-algebra containing $\mathcal{P}$. Then we can take $\mathcal{A}$ as the intersection of all σ-algebras containing $\mathcal{P}$. ■

1.3 Borel σ-algebra

Definition 1.3. The **Borel σ-algebra** of $\mathbb{R}$, denoted as $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$, is the σ-algebra generated by the set of open intervals in $\mathbb{R}$.

Fact 1.2. $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ is generated by the collection of all closed intervals as well.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{F}$ denote the σ-algebra generated by all closed intervals. Any open interval can be written as a countable union of closed sets: $(a,b) = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty}[a+1/n, b-1/n]$, therefore $(a,b) \in \mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}) \subseteq \mathcal{F}$.

Similarly, $[a,b] = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty}(a-1/n, b+1/n)$, hence $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ is a σ-algebra contains all closed sets. Therefore, $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$. ■

Fact 1.3. $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ is generated by

1. all open sets,
2. all closed sets,
3. all half-open intervals.

Example 1.6 (counter example)**.** $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ is not generated by the collection of singletons.

Proof. ■

Definition 1.4. The Borel algebra of $\mathbb{R}^d$, $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, is the σ-algebra generated by

1. all open sets in $\mathbb{R}^d$,
2. all closed sets in $\mathbb{R}^d$,
3. all closed cubes (regions) in $\mathbb{R}^d$: $\prod_{i=1}^{d}[a_i, b_i]$.

1.4 Measures

Definition 1.5. For a set X and a σ-algebra $\mathcal{A}$ of X, the pair $(X, \mathcal{A})$ is called a **measurable space**.

Definition 1.6. A **measure** μ on a measurable space $(X, \mathcal{A})$ is a map $\mu : \mathcal{A} \to [0, \infty]$ such that

1. $\mu(\varnothing) = 0$,
2. $\mu(\cup_i^{\infty} A_i) = \sum_i^{\infty} \mu(A_i)$ for disjoint sequence (A_i)

For now, we don't require the translation invariance property.

The triple $(X, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$ is called a **measure space**.

Example 1.7 (counting measure)**.**

Example 1.8 (point-mass measure)**.**

Proposition 1.2. A measure μ possesses the following basic properties:

1. (Monotonicity) $A \subseteq B \implies \mu(A) \leq \mu(B)$.
2. (Sub-additivity) $\mu(\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_i)$.
3. Let $A_1 \subseteq A_2 \subseteq \dots$ be an increasing set, let $\cup_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i$ denoted $A_i \nearrow A$, $\mu(A) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mu(A_n)$.
4. If $A_1 \searrow A \equiv \cap_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i$, and there exists $\mu(A_i) < \infty$, then $\mu(A) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mu(A_n)$.

Proof. ■

Example 1.9 (counter example)**.** Let $X = \mathbb{Z}$, $\mathcal{A} = 2^{\mathbb{Z}}$ and μ be the counting measure. Define $A_i = \{i, i+1, \dots\}$, then $A_i \searrow A = \varnothing$, but $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mu(A_n) = \infty \neq \mu(\varnothing)$.

1.5 Outer Measure

Definition 1.7. Let X be a set, $\mu^* : 2^X \to [0, \infty]$ is an **outer measure** if

1. $\mu^*(\varnothing) = 0$.
2. $\mu^*(A) \leq \mu^*(B)$ whenever $A \subseteq B$.
3. (countable sub-additivity) $\mu^*(\cup_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu^*(A_i)$.

Key difference between outer measure and measure:

1. Outer measure does not require countable additivity,
2. outer measure is defined on 2^X instead of a σ-algebra .

Example 1.10.

1.6 Lebesgue Measure on $\mathbb{R}$

Definition 1.8. Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, define the **Lebesgue outer measure**:

$$\lambda^*(A) = \inf \left\{ \sum_{i\in\mathbb{N}} b_i - a_i : A \subseteq \bigcup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} (a_i, b_i) \right\} \tag{1}$$

The Lebesgue outer measure of a set A is simply in the infimum of total lengths (the conventional notion of length) of open intervals cover A.

Proposition 1.3. The Lebesgue measure satisfies the following properties:

1. λ^* is an outer measure on $\mathbb{R}$,
2. $\lambda^*([a, b]) = b - a$ for all $a < b$.

Proof. (1.1) $\lambda^*(\varnothing) = 0$ since $(-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$ covers $\varnothing$ for arbitrarily small ε.

(1.2) Let $A \subseteq B$, Ω_A and Ω_B be collection of sequences of open intervals covering A and B respectively. Then, any cover of B must be a cover of A, that is, $\Omega_A \subseteq \Omega_B$. Therefore, $\lambda^*(A) \leq \lambda^*(B)$.

(1.3) Let $A_1, A_2, \cdots \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and $A = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i$. For all i, we may find (a_{ij}, b_{ij}) covers A_i such that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}(b_{ij} - b_{ij}) \leq \lambda^*(A_i) + \varepsilon 2^{-i} \tag{2}$$

Also, $\{(a_{ij}, b_{ij})\}_{i,j}$ is a countable union of open intervals that covers A.

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^*(A) &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}(b_{ij} - a_{ij}) && (3) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty}(\lambda^*(A_i) + \varepsilon 2^{-i}) && (4) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\lambda^*(A_i) + \varepsilon && (5) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\lambda^*(A) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\lambda^*(A_i)$.

(2) Note that $[a, b] \subseteq (a - \varepsilon, b + \varepsilon)$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$. Therefore,

$$\lambda^*([a, b]) \leq \inf_{\varepsilon > 0} \lambda^*(a - \varepsilon, b + \varepsilon) = b - a \tag{6}$$

Now show $\lambda^*([a, b]) \geq b - a$. We want to show that $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}(b_i - a_i) \geq b - a$ for all possible covering of $[a, b]$, which implies the infimum of them is at least $b - a$.

Take an arbitrary covering $\{(a_i, b_i)\}_i$ of $[a, b]$. Since $[a, b]$ is compact, there exists a finite covering $[a, b] \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{n}(a_i, b_i)$ (reindexed), it suffices to show the finite sum $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}(b_i - a_i) \geq b - a$.

(1) We firstly define an *interval* to be any open, closed or half-open intervals. The *length* of an interval is the difference between two end points.

Note that if an interval I contains a finite collection of disjoint sub-intervals, then the length of I is at least the sum of lengths of sub-intervals. The equality holds when I is exactly finite union of disjoint sub-intervals.

(2) Suppose $[a, b] \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{n}(a_i, b_i)$, let $I_i = [a, b] \cap (a_i, b_i)$. Easy to verify that the length of $I_i \leq$ length of $(a_i, b_i) = b_i - a_i$. Moreover, $\bigcup_{i=1}^{n} I_i = [a, b] \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{n}(a_i, b_i) = [a, b]$.

(3) For all i, define $I_i' = I_i \backslash (I_1 \cup I_2 \cup \cdots \cup I_{i-1})$. This procedure allows us to express $[a, b]$ as a finite union of disjoint sub-intervals: $[a, b] = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} I_i'$. Each I_i' is a finite union of disjoint intervals as well, the conventional notion of I_i' is well-defined. Then $b - a =$ sum of lengths of I_i'.

However, $\ell(I_i') \leq \ell(I_i) \leq b_i - a_i$ and sum of lengths of $I_i' \leq$ sum of lengths of $I_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i - a_i$. Therefore, $b - a \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i - a_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} b_i - a_i$. Hence, $b - a = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} b_i - a_i$ and $\lambda^*[a, b] = b - a$ consequently. ∎

1.7 Construct Lebesgue Measure

Definition 1.9. Let X be a set with outer measure μ^*. A set $B \subseteq X$ is μ^*-**measurable** if

$$\forall A \subseteq X, \mu^*(A) = \mu^*(A \cap B) + \mu^*(A \cap B^c) \tag{7}$$

Theorem 1.1. For any set X with outer measure μ^* on it, let $\mathcal{M}_{\mu^*}$ denote the set of all μ^*-**measurable** sets. Then, $\mathcal{M}_{\mu^*}$ is a σ-algebra and $\mu^*|_{\mathcal{M}_{\mu^*}}$ (μ^* restricted to $\mathcal{M}_{\mu^*}$) is a measure.

Proof. To show B is μ^*-measurable, it suffices to show that $\forall A \subseteq X, \mu^*(A) \geq \mu^*(A \cap B) + \mu^*(A \cap B^c)$, because the opposite inequality always holds by sub-additivity.

(1.1) Let $A \subseteq X$, $\mu^*(A \cap \varnothing) + \mu^*(A \cap \varnothing^c) = \mu^*(A \cap \varnothing^c) = \mu^*(A)$, therefore, $\varnothing \in \mathcal{M}_{\mu^*}$.

(1.2) Let $A \subseteq X$ and $B \in \mathcal{M}_{\mu^*}$, $\mu^*(A) = \mu^*(A \cap B) + \mu^*(A \cap B^c) = \mu^*(A \cap (B^c)^c) + \mu^*(A \cap B^c)$. Hence, $B^c \in \mathcal{M}_{\mu^*}$.

(1.3.1) Let $B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{M}_{\mu^*}$, we are going to show $B_1 \cup B_2 \in \mathcal{M}_{\mu^*}$. Fix any $A \subseteq X$,

$$\mu^*(A \cap (B_1 \cup B_2)) = \mu^*(A \cap (B_1 \cup B_2) \cap B_1) + \mu^*(A \cap (B_1 \cup B_2) \cap B_1^c) \tag{8}$$

$$= \mu^*(A \cap B_1) + \mu^*(A \cap B_1^c \cap B_2) \tag{9}$$

Moreover,

$$\mu^*(A \cap (B_1 \cup B_2)^c) = \mu^*(A \cap B_1^c \cap B_2^c) \tag{10}$$

Therefore,

$$\mu^*(A \cap (B_1 \cup B_2)) + \mu^*(A \cap (B_1 \cup B_2)^c) = \mu^*(A \cap B_1) + \mu^*(A \cap B_1^c \cap B_2) + \mu^*(A \cap B_1^c \cap B_2^c) \tag{11}$$

$$= \mu^*(A \cap B_1) + \mu^*(A \cap B_1^c) \text{ since } B_2 \in \mathcal{M}_{\mu^*} \tag{12}$$

$$= \mu^*(A) \text{ since } B_1 \in \mathcal{M}_{\mu^*} \tag{13}$$

Therefore, $\mathcal{M}_{\mu^*}$ is an algebra.

(1.3.2) Now show that $\mathcal{M}_{\mu^*}$ is a σ-algebra . For any sequence of sets $A_i \in \mathcal{M}_{\mu^*}$, we can define $B_n := A_n \setminus \cup_{j=1}^{i-1} A_j$ such that $\cup B_i = \cup A_i$. Therefore, it is suffices to show $\mathcal{M}_{\mu^*}$ is closed under countable disjoint unions.

We are going to show the union $\cup B_i$ is μ^*-measurable for any disjoint sequence of μ^*-measurable B_i's.

Claim: let $A \subseteq X$, $\mu^*(A) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mu^*(A \cap B_i) + \mu^*(A \cap (\cup_{i=1}^n B_i)^c)$. The claim can be proved by induction on n.

When $n = 1$, $\mu^*(A) = \mu^*(A \cap B) + \mu^*(A \cap B^c)$ because B_1 is μ^*-measurable.

Suppose the claim holds for n, then

$$\mu^*(A \cap (\cup_{i=1}^n B_i)^c) = \mu^*(A \cap (\cup_{i=1}^n B_i)^c \cap B_{n+1}) + \mu^*(A \cap (\cup_{i=1}^n B_i)^c \cap B_{n+1}^c) \tag{14}$$

because $B_{n+1} \in \mathcal{M}_{\mu^*}$. Moreover, since all B_i's are disjoint, $B_{n+1} \subseteq B_i^c$ for all i. Hence,

$$B_{n+1} \subseteq \cap_{i=1}^n B_i^c = (\cup_{i=1}^n B_i)^c \tag{15}$$

Also,

$$(\cup_{i=1}^n B_i)^c \cap B_{n+1}^c = \cap_{i=1}^{n+1} B_i^c \tag{16}$$

Consequently,

$$\mu^*(A \cap (\cup_{i=1}^n B_i)^c) = \mu^*(A \cap B_{n+1}) + \mu^*(A \cap (\cup_{i=1}^{n+1} B_i)^c) \tag{17}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu^*(A) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \mu^*(A \cap B_i) + \mu^*(A \cap (\cap_{i=1}^n B_i^c)) && (18)\\
&\geq \sum_{i=1}^n \mu^*(A \cap B_i) + \mu^*(A \cap (\cap_{i=1}^\infty B_i^c)) && (19)\\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \mu^*(A \cap B_i) + \mu^*(A \cap (\cup_{i=1}^\infty B_i)^c) && (20)
\end{aligned}$$

Take $n \to \infty$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu^*(A) &\geq \sum_{i=1}^\infty \mu^*(A \cap B_i) + \mu^*(A \cap (\cup_{i=1}^\infty B_i)^c) && (21)\\
&\geq \mu^*(A \cap \cup_{i=1}^\infty B_i) + \mu^*(A \cap (\cup_{i=1}^\infty B_i)^c) && (22)
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\cup_{i=1}^\infty B_i$ is μ^*-measurable.

(2) Let $B_1, B_2, \ldots$ be a sequence of disjoint sets from $\mathcal{M}_{\mu^*}$. Using the above fact and take $A = \cup_{i=1}^\infty B_i$,

$$\mu^*(A) \geq \mu^*(\cup_{i=1}^\infty B_i) + \mu^*(\varnothing) = \mu^*(\cup_{i=1}^\infty B_i) \tag{23}$$

The opposite inequality holds by sub-additivity. Therefore, μ^* is a measure on $\mathcal{M}_{\mu^*}$. ■

Definition 1.10. Let λ^* be the Lebesgue outer measure on $\mathbb{R}$, then the collection $\mathcal{M}_{\lambda^*}$ of λ^*-measurable sets is called the **Lebesgue σ-algebra** . The restriction $\lambda = \lambda^*|_{\mathcal{M}_{\lambda^*}}$, which is a measure on $\mathcal{M}_{\lambda^*}$, is called the **Lebesgue measure**. Any set in $\mathcal{M}_{\lambda^*}$ is called a **Lebesgue measurable set**.

Theorem 1.2. $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{\lambda^*}$.

Proof. Note that $\{(-\infty, b] : b \in \mathbb{R}\}$ generates $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$, it suffices to show $\{(-\infty, b] : b \in \mathbb{R}\} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{\lambda^*}$.

Let $B = (-\infty, b]$, we are going to show B is λ^*-measurable. Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and (a_n, b_n) be a sequence of open intervals covers A. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\lambda^*((a_n,b_n)\cap B)+\lambda^*((a_n,b_n)\cap B^c)=\lambda^*((a_n,b_n)\cap(-\infty,b])+\lambda^*((a_n,b_n)\cap(b,\infty)) \tag{24}$$

Three cases follow:

1. $b > b_n$: $\lambda^*((a_n,b_n)\cap B)+\lambda^*((a_n,b_n)\cap B^c)=\lambda^*((a_n,b_n))=b_n-a_n$.
2. $b_n > b > a_n$: $\lambda^*((a_n,b_n)\cap B)+\lambda^*((a_n,b_n)\cap B^c)=\lambda^*((a_n,b])+\lambda^*((b,b_n])=b_n-a_n$.
3. $a_n > b$: $\lambda^*((a_n,b_n)\cap B)+\lambda^*((a_n,b_n)\cap B^c)=\lambda^*((a_n,b_n))=b_n-a_n$.

Therefore,

$$\lambda^*((a_n,b_n)\cap B)+\lambda^*((a_n,b_n)\cap B^c)=b_n-a_n \tag{25}$$

By monotonicity and sub-additivity:

$$\begin{align}
\lambda^*(A\cap B)+\lambda^*(A\cap B^c) &\le \lambda^*(\cup(a_n,b_n)\cap B)+\lambda^*(\cup(a_n,b_n)\cap B^c) \tag{26}\\
&\le \sum \lambda^*((a_n,b_n)\cap B)+\lambda^*((a_n,b_n)\cap B^c) \tag{27}\\
&= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_n-a_n \tag{28}
\end{align}$$

Take the infimum of all such covering, we can show

$$\lambda^*(A\cap B)+\lambda^*(A\cap B^c)\le\lambda^*(A) \tag{29}$$

Therefore, B is μ^*-measurable and $\mathcal{M}_{\lambda^*}$ is a σ-algebra containing all such intervals and $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{\lambda^*}$. ■

1.8 Lebesgue Measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$

Definition 1.11. Steps to construct Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$:

1. Define open cubes on $\mathbb{R}^d$ as a Cartesian product of open intervals: $Q := \prod_{i=1}^d (a_i,b_i)$. Define Lebesgue outer measure:

$$\lambda^*(A) := \inf\left\{\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\prod_{i=1}^{d}(b_{ni}-a_{ni}) : A \subseteq \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} Q_n\right\} \tag{30}$$

2. Show λ^* is an outer measure and $\lambda^*(Q)=\prod_{i=1}^d(b_i-a_i)$.
3. $\mathcal{M}_{\lambda^*}$ is the Lebesgue σ-algebra on $\mathbb{R}^d$. Restricting λ^* on $\mathcal{M}_{\lambda^*}$ defines the Lebesgue measure.
4. Show that any Borel set in $\mathbb{R}^d$ is Lebesgue measurable by showing that there is a generating set of $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is in $\mathcal{M}_{\lambda^*}$.

1.9 Uniqueness of the Lebesgue Measure

The next goal is to prove the uniqueness of Lebesgue measure on $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ subject to the criterion that the measure of any interval (cube) is the volume in the usual sense (product of side lengths).

Theorem 1.3. Let λ be the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$, then for any Lebesgue measurable set A,

1. $\lambda(A) = \inf\{\lambda(U) : \text{open } U \supseteq A\}$,
2. $\lambda(A) = \sup\{\lambda(K) : \text{compact } K \subseteq A\}$.

Proof. (1.1) WLOG $\lambda(A) < \infty$, by monotonicity, $\lambda(A) \leq \lambda(U)$ for any open cover, $\lambda(A) \leq \inf\{..\}$.

(1.2)Let $\varepsilon > 0$, $\exists$ a sequence of open intervals (R_i) such that

$$\lambda(A) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda(R_i) \leq \lambda(A) + \varepsilon \tag{31}$$

Let $U := \cup R_i$ open, hence $\inf\{..\} \leq \lambda(U) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda(R_i) \leq \lambda(A) + \varepsilon$. Since this ε can be arbitrarily small, we conclude $\inf\{..\} \leq \lambda(A)$.

(2.1) let A be a Lebesgue measurable set, assume A is bounded, so that $\lambda(A) < \infty$. Then there exists a compact $C \supseteq A$. $C \backslash A$ is Lebesgue measurable as well.

By conclusion of part (1), there exists a open set $U \supseteq C \backslash A$ such that

$$\lambda(C \backslash A) \leq \lambda(U) \leq \lambda(C \backslash A) + \varepsilon \tag{32}$$

Let $K = C \backslash U$, K is compact. Moreover, let $a \in K$, then $a \in C$ and $a \notin U$. Therefore, $a \notin C \backslash A$, it must be $x \in A$. Hence, $K \subseteq A$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda(K) &= \lambda(C \backslash U) && (33)\\
&\geq \lambda(C) - \lambda(U) && (34)\\
&\geq \lambda(C) - (\lambda(C \backslash A) + \varepsilon) && (35)\\
&= \lambda(C) - \lambda(C) + \lambda(A) - \varepsilon && (36)\\
&= \lambda(A) - \varepsilon && (37)
\end{aligned}$$

Take $\varepsilon \to 0$ and $\lambda(A) \leq \sup\{..\}$. By monotonicity, $\lambda(A) \geq \sup\{..\}$.

(2.2) Other cases: suppose A is unbounded and $\lambda(A) > 0$. Take an arbitrary $b < \lambda(A)$. We will show that $\sup\{..\} \geq b$, this will prove that $\lambda(A) \leq \sup\{...\}$.

To show $\sup\{..\} \geq b$, it suffices to show that there exists a compact set $K \subseteq A$ such that $\lambda(K) \geq b$.

Let $\{C_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of compact sets increasing to $\mathbb{R}^d$.

Then $A \cap C_j \uparrow A$ and $\lambda(A \cap C_1) < \infty$, which implies $\lambda(A) = \lim_{j \to \infty} \uparrow \lambda(A \cap C_j)$. Since $b < \lambda(A)$, there exists j such that $\lambda(A \cap C_j) \geq b$, where $A \cap C_j$ is compact. Hence, $b \leq \sup\{..\}$ and $\lambda(A) \leq \sup\{..\}$. $\lambda(A) \geq \sup\{..\}$ holds by monotonicity.

When $\lambda(A) = 0$, $0 \leq \lambda(K)$ for all K so that $0 \leq \sup\{..\}$. The opposite inequality holds by monotonicity. ■

Lemma 1.1. For each $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, define **dyadic cubes** in $\mathbb{R}^d$ as set in the following form:

$$\prod_{i=1}^{d} [j_i 2^{-k}, (j_i + 1)2^{-k}) \tag{38}$$

where $j_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ for every i. Let $\mathcal{D}$ denote the collection of dyadic cubes.

Then, any open set $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ can be expressed as a countable union of some members of $\mathcal{D}$.

A dyadic cube of side length 2^{-k} has a unique parent of side length 2^{-k+1} and a unique grandparent with side length 2^{-k+2}.

Proof. Given open set U, let $\mathcal{D}_U$ denote the set of all dyadic half open cubes D such that $D \subseteq U$ but the parent of U does not fully contain U.

Claim 1: $U = \bigcup_{D \in \mathcal{D}_U} D$. Obviously, $\bigcup_{D \in \mathcal{D}_U} \subseteq U$. To show the converse, take any $x \in U$, since U is open, there exists $D \in \mathcal{D}_U$ such that $x \in D \subseteq U$.

Let D_0 be the earliest ancestor of D such that $x \in D_0 \subseteq U$. Obviously, $D_0 \in \mathcal{D}_U$. Therefore, $U \subseteq \bigcup_{D \in \mathcal{D}_U} D$.

Claim 2: Two dyadic cubes can overlap if and only if one is the ancestor of the other. By construction, dyadic cubes in $\mathcal{D}_U$ are disjoint.

Claim 3: $\mathcal{D}_U$ is countable because $\mathcal{D}$ is itself countable. ■

Proposition 1.4. Lebesgue measure is the only measure on $(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ which assigns the *correct volume* to any d-dimensional intervals or even any d-dimensional dyadic cube.

Proof. Let λ denote the Lebesgue measure, let μ be another measure satisfying the desired property.

By lemma, for all open set U, $\mu(U) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mu(D_j) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda(D_j) = \lambda(U)$, where $\{D_j\}$ is a collection of disjoint dyadic cubes contains with union U. Therefore, $\lambda(A) = \mu(A)$ for all open Borel set A.

Let $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, let open $U \supseteq A$, then $\mu(A) \leq \mu(U) = \lambda(U)$ for all U. Taking the infimum over all $U \supseteq A$, we conclude $\mu(A) \leq \lambda(A)$ for all Borel set A.

Next, take any bounded Borel set A, let V be a bounded open set containing A. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(V) &= \mu(A) + \mu(V \backslash A) && (39) \\ &\leq \lambda(A) + \lambda(V \backslash A) && (40) \\ &= \lambda(V) && (41) \end{aligned}$$

But we also know that $\mu(V) = \lambda(V)$ since V is open, the inequality holds as equality. Moreover, the previous conclusion implies $\mu(A) \leq \lambda(A)$ and $\mu(V \backslash A) \leq \lambda(V \backslash A)$, it must be $\mu(A) = \lambda(A)$ and $\mu(V \backslash A) = \lambda(V \backslash A)$. Therefore, $\mu(A) = \lambda(A)$ for all bounded Borel set A.

Lastly, any Borel set can be written as a a countable disjoint union of bounded Borel set, therefore, $\mu(A) = \lambda(A)$ for all Borel set A. ■

Proposition 1.5. The Lebesgue outer measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$ is translation invariant. In particular, Lebesgue measure is translation invariant and any translation of Lebesgue measurable set is Lebesgue measurable.

Proof. $\lambda^*(A+x) = \lambda^*(A)$ follows the definition of λ^*: translate all covering intervals by $+x$ and the volumes of these intervals stay the same. Since λ is simply the restriction of λ^* on Lebesgue measurable sets, λ is translation invariant as well.

Now take Lebesgue measurable B, for all$A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$:

$$\lambda^*(A) = \lambda^*(A \cap B) + \lambda^*(A \cap B^c) \tag{42}$$

$$\implies \lambda^*(A-x) = \lambda^*((A-x) \cap B) + \lambda^*((A-x) \cap B^c) \tag{43}$$

Note that

$$(A-x)+x = A \tag{44}$$

$$(A-x) \cap B + x = A \cap (B+x) \tag{45}$$

$$(A-x) \cap B^c + x = A \cap (B+x)^c \tag{46}$$

By translational invariance of λ^*,

$$\lambda^*(A) = \lambda^*(A \cap (B+x)) + \lambda^*(A \cap (B+x)^c) \tag{47}$$

Therefore, $B+x$ is Lebesgue measurable as well. ■

Theorem 1.4. Let μ be a non-zero measure on $(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, which is finite on bounded Borel sets and translation invariant. Then, $\mu(A) = c\lambda(A)$ for all $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, where λ is the Lebesgue measure.

Remark 1.1. Borel σ-algebra is closed under translation.

Proof. Let $c = \mu([0,1)^d) \in (0,\infty)$. Then $[0,1)^d$ is the disjoint union of 2^{dk} half-open dyadic intervals with side length 2^{-k}. All of these sub-intervals have the same μ since μ is translation invariant. Therefore, for every dyadic sub-interval with side length 2^{-k}, $\mu(D) = 2^{-dk}c$.

Let $\nu(A) = \frac{1}{c}\mu(A)$, then ν is a measure that is finite on bounded sets and agrees with λ on all half-open dyadic cubes. By the previous proposition, λ is the only measure assign correct volumes to dyadic cubes, therefore, $\nu = \lambda$. ■

Theorem 1.5. Under the axiom of choice, there exists a non-Lebesgue subset of $\mathbb{R}$.

Proof. Todo. ■

2 Functions

2.1 Measurable Functions

Definition 2.1. A function $f : (X, \mathcal{A}) \to (Y, \mathcal{B})$ is **measurable** if $f^{-1}(B) \in \mathcal{A}$ for all $B \in \mathcal{B}$.

In this course, we mainly consider $Y = [-\infty, \infty]$, denoted as $\mathbb{R}^*$.

Definition 2.2. The σ-algebra on $\mathbb{R}^*$ is defined to be the σ-algebra generated by $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}) \cup \{-\infty\} \cup \{\infty\}$.

Proposition 2.1.

$$\sigma(\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}) \cup \{-\infty\} \cup \{\infty\}) = \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}) \cup \{B \cup \{\infty\} : B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})\} \tag{48}$$
$$\cup \{B \cup \{-\infty\} : B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})\} \tag{49}$$
$$\cup \{B \cup \{-\infty, \infty\} : B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})\} \tag{50}$$

Proposition 2.2. Equivalently, f is measurable if for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\{x \in X : f(x) \leq t\} \in \mathcal{A} \tag{51}$$
$$\{x \in X : f(x) < t\} \in \mathcal{A} \tag{52}$$
$$\{x \in X : f(x) \geq t\} \in \mathcal{A} \tag{53}$$
$$\{x \in X : f(x) > t\} \in \mathcal{A} \tag{54}$$

More generally, to determine the measurability of $f : (X, \mathcal{A}) \to (Y, \mathcal{B})$, we only need to check whether $f^{-1}(C) \in \mathcal{A}$ for all C in a generating collection $\mathcal{C}$ of $\mathcal{B}$. The converse holds true trivially.

Proof. Let $(X, \mathcal{A}), (Y, \mathcal{B})$ be two measurable spaces, let $\mathcal{C}$ be a collection of subsets of Y generates $\mathcal{B}$.

($\Longrightarrow$) Let f be a measurable function, then for every $C \in \mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$. Obviously, $f^{-1}(C) \in \mathcal{A}$ by definition.

($\Longleftarrow$) Suppose $f^{-1}(C) \in \mathcal{A}$ for all $C \in \mathcal{C}$. Define

$$\mathcal{B}_0 := \{B \in \mathcal{B} : f^{-1}(B) \in \mathcal{A}\} \supseteq \mathcal{C} \tag{55}$$

It's easy to check $\mathcal{B}_0$ is in fact a σ-algebra : $f^{-1}(\varnothing) = \varnothing \in \mathcal{A}$, $f^{-1}(B^c) = (f^{-1}(B))^c$, and $f^{-1}(\bigcup B_i) = \bigcup f^{-1}(B_i)$. Therefore, $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_0$ and all $B \in \mathcal{B}$ satisfies $f^{-1}(B) \in \mathcal{A}$. ■

Example 2.1. $f(x) = \mathbb{1}\{x \in \mathbb{Q}\}$ is measurable.

2.2 Simple Functions

Definition 2.3. A function $f : (X, \mathcal{A}) \to (\mathbb{R}^*, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^*))$ is called **simple** if there exists finitely many disjoint sets $A_1, \ldots, A_n$ and real numbers $a_1, \ldots, a_n$ such that

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} a_i & \text{if } x \in A_i \\ 0 & \text{if } x \notin A_i \forall i \in [n] \end{cases} \tag{56}$$

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

Proposition 2.3. All simple functions are measurable.

Proof. For any subset of $\mathbb{R}^*$, the pre-image is either X or a union of some (potentially none) A_i's. ■

2.3 Properties of Measurable Functions

Example 2.2. Let $f : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$, then all of the following functions are measurable:

$$f(x, y) = x + y \tag{57}$$
$$f(x, y) = \max\{x, y\} \equiv x \vee y \tag{58}$$
$$f(x, y) = \min\{x, y\} \equiv x \wedge y \tag{59}$$
$$f(x, y) = x - y \tag{60}$$
$$f(x, y) = \alpha x \quad \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \tag{61}$$

Proposition 2.4. Let $f, g : (X, \mathcal{A}) \to (\mathbb{R}^*, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^*))$ be measurable, let $h(x) = (f(x), g(x)) \in \mathbb{R}^{*2}$, then f is measurable.

Proof.

$$h^{-1}([-\infty, t] \times [-\infty, s]) = f^{-1}([-\infty, t]) \cap g^{-1}([-\infty, s]) \in \mathcal{A} \tag{62}$$

And, $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^*)$ can be generated by sets with forms $[-\infty, t] \times [-\infty, s]$. ∎

Proposition 2.5. Let $(X, \mathcal{A}), (Y, \mathcal{B}), (Z, \mathcal{C})$ be measurable spaces, let $f : X \to Y$ and $g : Y \to Z$ be measurable functions. Then, the composite $g \circ f : X \to Z$ is measurable.

Corollary 2.1. Let $f, g : X \to \mathbb{R}$ be measurable functions, then $f + g$, $f - g$, $f \vee g$, and $f \wedge g$ are all measurable.

Proof. $f+g$ and $f-g$ can be written as the composition of $h_1(x) = (f(x), g(x))$ and $h_2(x, y) = x \pm y$, which are all measurable.

$f \vee g$ and $f \wedge g$ are measurable as special cases of next proposition. ∎

Proposition 2.6. Let $f_1, f_2, \ldots$ be a sequence of measurable maps from $(X, \mathcal{A}) \to (\mathbb{R}^*, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^*))$, then $\sup_n f_n$ and $\inf_n f_n$ are measurable.

Proof. Note $\{x \in X : \sup_n f_n \leq t\} = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \{x \in X : f_n \leq t\} \in \mathcal{A}$. ∎

Corollary 2.2. $\limsup f_n$ and $\liminf f_n$ are measurable.

Proof. Let $g_k = \sup_{n \geq k} f_n$, g_k is measurable. $\limsup f_n = \inf_k g_k$ is measurable as well. Similar proof for the measurability of $\liminf f_n$. ∎

Lemma 2.1. Let $u, v : X \to \mathbb{R}^*$ be a measurable functions, then $\{x \in X : u(x) = v(x)\}$ is measurable.

Proof. Note that $\{x \in X : u(x) = v(x)\} = \{x \in X : u(x) \leq v(x)\} \cap \{x \in X : u(x) \geq v(x)\}$. ∎

Corollary 2.3. Let $\{f_n\}$ be a sequence of measurable functions from $(X, \mathcal{A}) \to (\mathbb{R}^*, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^*))$. Then,

$$\{x \in X : \lim_{n\to\infty} f_n(x) \text{ exists}\} \tag{63}$$

is measurable.

Proof. Note that $\{x \in X : \lim_{n\to\infty} f_n(x) \text{ exists}\} = \{x \in X : \liminf f_n(x) = \limsup f_n(x)\}$, the result follows from previous lemma. ■

Corollary 2.4. If $\{f_n\}$ is a sequence of measurable functions such that $\lim f_n(x)$ exists for all $x \in X$, then $\lim f_n$ is a measurable function on $(X, \mathcal{A})$.

Proof. In this case, $\{x \in X : \lim_{n\to\infty} f_n(x) \text{ exists}\} = X$, and $\lim f_n = \liminf f_n$ on X. ■

Corollary 2.5. If $\{f_n\}$ is a sequence of measurable function from X to $[0, \infty]$, then $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} f_n$ is measurable.

Proof. Follows the previous corollary directly. ■

3 Integrals

3.1 Integrating Simple Functions

Definition 3.1. Let $f \in \mathbb{S}^+$ with representation $\{(A_i, a_i)\}_{i=1}^n$. WLOG, $\bigcup_{i=1}^n A_i = X$. Then, define

$$\int_X f \, d\mu := \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \mu(A_i) \tag{64}$$

Proposition 3.1. The notion of integral on simple functions is well defined. Specifically, let $\{(A_i, a_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{(B_j, b_j)\}_{j=1}^m$ be any two representations of f, $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i\mu(A_i) = \sum_{j=1}^m b_j\mu(B_j)$.

Proof. First note that $\{A_i \cap B_j\}_{i,j}$ are disjoint sets with union X. Moreover, for any i, j, if $A_i \cap B_j \neq \varnothing$, take some $x \in A_i \cap B_j$, $f(x) = a_i = b_j$. Therefore, $a_i\mu(A_i \cap B_j) = b_i\mu(A_i \cap B_j)$ since either $a_i = b_j$ or $\mu(A_i \cap B_j) = \mu(\varnothing) = 0$.

$$\sum_{i=1}^n a_i\mu(A_i) = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \sum_{j=1}^m \mu(A_i \cap B_j) \tag{65}$$

$$= \sum_{j=1}^m b_j \sum_{i=1}^n \mu(A_i \cap B_j) \tag{66}$$

$$= \sum_{j=1}^m b_j\mu(B_j) \tag{67}$$

■

3.2 Integrating Measurable Functions

Definition 3.2. For a measurable function $f : X \to [0, \infty]$, define

$$\int f \, d\mu = \sup \left\{ \int g \, d\mu : g \text{ is a non-negative simple function such that } g \leq f \right\} \tag{68}$$

For any measruable $f : X \to [-\infty, \infty]$, let

$$f^+(x) = \max\{f(x), 0\} \tag{69}$$
$$f^-(x) = -\min\{f(x), 0\} \tag{70}$$

So that $f = f^+ - f^-$, where $f^+, f^- : X \to [0, \infty]$ are measurable. Define $\int f \, d\mu = \int f^+ \, d\mu - \int f^- \, d\mu$ provided that at least one term on the right is finite, otherwise, $\int f \, d\mu$ is undefined.

3.3 Properties of Integral of Non-negative Simple Functions

Proposition 3.2 (Linearity)**.** If f, g are non-negative simple functions, then

$$\int f + g \, d\mu = \int f \, d\mu + \int g \, d\mu \tag{71}$$

Moreover, for any $\alpha \geq 0$,

$$\int \alpha f \, d\mu = \alpha \int f \, d\mu \tag{72}$$

Proof. Let f and g be simple functions represented by $\{(A_i, a_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{(B_j, b_j)\}_{j=1}^m$. WLOG, $\cup A_i = \cup B_j = X$. Then $f + g$ is a simple function with representation $\{(A_i \cap B_j, a_i + b_j)\}_{i,j}$, where $\cup_{i,j} A_i \cap B_j = X$. ∎

Proposition 3.3. Let f, g be non-negative simple functions with $f \geq g$ everywhere. Then $\int f \, d\mu \geq \int g \, d\mu$.

Proof. Let f and g be simple functions represented by $\{(A_i, a_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{(B_j, b_j)\}_{j=1}^m$.

Claim: $a_i \mu(A_i \cap B_j) \geq b_j \mu(A_i \cap B_j)$ for every (i, j). If $A_i \cap B_j \neq \varnothing$, then taking some $x \in A_i \cap B_j$ implies $a_i \geq b_j$. If $A_i \cap B_j = \varnothing$, the equality holds trivially.

Note that $\int f$ and $\int g$ can be written as $\sum_{i,j} a_i \mu(A_i \cap B_j)$ and $\sum_{i,j} b_j \mu(A_i \cap B_j)$ respectively, therefore $\int f \geq \int g$ by the previous claim. ∎

Proposition 3.4. Let $f : X \to [0, \infty]$ be a measurable function. Then there exists an increasing sequence of **non-negative simple** functions f_n such that $f_n \leq f_{n+1}$ and

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} f_n(x) = f(x) \tag{73}$$

for all x.

Proof. For each n and $1 \leq k \leq n2^n$, let

$$A_{n,k} = \left\{ x \in X : \frac{k-1}{2^n} \leq f(x) < \frac{k}{2^n} \right\} \tag{74}$$

Define

$$f_n(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{k-1}{2^n} & \text{if } x \in A_{n,k} \\ n & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{75}$$

That is, for a $x \in X$, if $\frac{k-1}{2^n} \leq f(x) < \frac{k}{2^n}$ for some k, we take $f_n(x) = \frac{k-1}{2^n}$; if $f(x) \geq n$, we define $f_n(x) = n$. Clearly, each f_n is a simple function.

Claim 1: $f_n \leq f_{n+1}$. Easy to verify.

Claim 2: $\lim_{n\to\infty} f_n(x) = f(x)$. Let $x \in X$, (i) if $f(x) = \infty$, then $f_n(x) = n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty} f_n(x) = \infty = f(x)$.

(ii) if $f(x) < \infty$, then $\exists n_0$ such that $f(x) < n_0$. For every $n \geq n_0$, $x \in A_{n,k}$ for some k such that $f_n(x) = \frac{k-1}{2^n}$ and $\frac{k-1}{2^n} \leq f(x) < \frac{k}{2^n}$. Therefore, for all $n \geq n_0$, $|f_n(x) - f(x)| < \frac{1}{2^n}$, which implies $\lim_{n\to\infty} f_n(x) = f(x)$. ■

Proposition 3.5. Let f_n be a sequence of non-negative simple functions that increase to another non-negative simple function f at each point, then

$$\int f \, d\mu = \lim \int f_n \, d\mu \tag{76}$$

Proof. By monotonicity, $f_n \leq f$ for all n and $\int f \, d\mu \geq \lim \int f_n \, d\mu$.

Fix $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ and define $g = (1-\varepsilon)f$. Suppose f is represented by (A_i, a_i). Then for every n, i, define

$$A_{n,i} = \{x \in A_i : f_n(x) \geq (1-\varepsilon)a_i\} \tag{77}$$

Define

$$g_n(x) = \begin{cases} (1-\varepsilon)a_i & \text{if } x \in A_{n_i} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{78}$$

By construction, $g_n \le f_n$ and $\int g_n \, d\mu \le \int f_n \, d\mu$.

$$\lim \int f_n \, d\mu \ge \lim g_n \, d\mu \tag{79}$$

$$= \lim \sum_{i=1}^{K} (1-\varepsilon) a_i \mu(A_{n,i}) \tag{80}$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{K} (1-\varepsilon) a_i \mu(A_i) \text{ Since for all } i,\ A_{n,i} \uparrow A_i \text{ as } n \to \infty. \tag{81}$$

$$= (1-\varepsilon) \int f \, d\mu \tag{82}$$

Taking $\varepsilon \to 0$ completes the proof. ■

Proposition 3.6. Let $f : X \to [0, \infty]$ be a measurable function. Let f_n be a sequence of non-negative simple functions such that $f_n \uparrow f$ point-wise. Then

$$\int f \, d\mu = \lim \int f_n \, d\mu \tag{83}$$

Proof. The proof follows the previous proposition and the definition of $\int f \, d\mu$. Since $f_n \uparrow f$, $f_n \le f$ and $\int f_n \le \int f$ for all n. $\int f_n$ is a bounded monotone sequence, therefore $\lim \int f_n$ exists and $\le \int f$.

To show the other equality, it suffices to prove $\lim \int f_n \ge \int g$ for any non-negative simple functions $g \le f$.

Define $g_n = \min\{g, f_n\}$, easy to show that $g_n(x) \le g_{n+1}(x)$.

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} g_n(x) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \min\{g, f_n\} \tag{84}$$

$$= \min\{g(x), f(x)\} \tag{85}$$

$$= g(x) \tag{86}$$

since $f_n \uparrow f$ and $g \le f$.

By the previous proposition, $\int g \, d\mu = \lim \int g_n \, d\mu$ since g_n and g are non-negative simple functions. Since $g_n \le f_n$ everywhere, so $\int g_n \, d\mu \le \int f_n \, d\mu$. Taking limit on both sides implies $\int g \le \lim \int f_n$. ■

Proposition 3.7. Let $f, g : X \in [0, \infty]$ be measurable functions and $\alpha \ge 0$. Then

1. $\int f + g \, d\mu = \int f \, d\mu + \int g \, d\mu$.
2. $\int \alpha f \, d\mu = \alpha \int f \, d\mu$.
3. If $f \ge g$ everywhere, then $\int f \, d\mu \ge \int g \, d\mu$.

Proof. We know that there exists sequences of non-negative simple functions f_n and g_n such that

$f_n \uparrow f$ and $g_n \uparrow g$. Note that $f_n + g_n$ is a sequence of simple functions increases to $f+g$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int (f+g) d\mu &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \int (f_n + g_n)\ d\mu && (87)\\
&= \lim_{n\to\infty} \left(\int f_n\ d\mu + \int g_n\ d\mu \right) && (88)\\
&= \lim_{n\to\infty} \int f_n\ d\mu + \lim_{n\to\infty} \int g_n\ d\mu && (89)\\
&= \int f\ d\mu + \int g\ d\mu && (90)
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, taking $\alpha f_n \uparrow \alpha f$ leads to the second result.

Finally, if $f \geq g$ everywhere, then

$$\{h \in \mathbb{S}_+ \text{ and } h \leq g\} \subseteq \{h \in \mathbb{S}_+ \text{ and } h \leq f\} \tag{91}$$

Therefore, the supremum of integrals of functions from a larger collection is larger. ■