## Homework 1: Measure Theory

OSE Lab 2019, Jan Ertl Wouter van der Wielen

**Exercise 1.3 (a)**  $\mathcal{G}_1$  is not an algebra (and hence not a  $\sigma$ -algebra).  $\mathcal{G}_1$  is not closed under complements. Fix  $a \in \mathbb{R}$  and let  $A = (-\infty, a)$  be an open set in  $\mathbb{R}$ . Then  $A^c = [a, \infty)$  is not an open set in  $\mathbb{R}$ . Therefore, we have that  $A \in \mathcal{G}_1$  but  $A^c \notin \mathcal{G}_1$ , which violates the definition of an algebra.

- (b)  $\mathcal{G}_2$  is an algebra but not a  $\sigma$ -algebra. We first show that  $\mathcal{G}_2$  is an algebra. Let  $a = b \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then  $(a, b] = \emptyset \in \mathcal{G}_2$ .  $\mathcal{G}_2$  is also closed under complements. To see this, fix  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then  $(a, b]^c = (-\infty, a] \cup (b, \infty) \in \mathcal{G}_2$ . Furthermore,  $(-\infty, b]^c = (b, \infty) \in \mathcal{G}_2$ , and  $(a, \infty)^c = (-\infty, a] \in \mathcal{G}_2$ . Finally, observe that  $\mathcal{G}_2$  is closed under finite unions. A finite union of intervals of the form  $(a, b], (-\infty, b]$ , and  $(a, \infty)$  still results in a finite union of intervals of the same form. Therefore,  $\mathcal{G}_2$  is an algebra. However,  $\mathcal{G}_2$  is not a  $\sigma$ -algebra. An infinite (countable) union of intervals of the form  $(a, b], (-\infty, b]$ , and  $(a, \infty)$  does not belong to  $\mathcal{G}_2$ , by definition. Thus  $\mathcal{G}_2$  is not a  $\sigma$ -algebra.
- (c)  $\mathcal{G}_3$  is an algebra and a  $\sigma$ -algebra. The proof that  $\emptyset \in \mathcal{G}_3$  and  $\mathcal{G}_3$  is closed under complements is the same as the proof for  $\mathcal{G}_2$ . However,  $\mathcal{G}_3$  contains countable unions of intervals of the form  $(a, b], (-\infty, b]$ , and  $(a, \infty)$  by definition; therefore  $\mathcal{G}_3$  is closed under countable unions and is a  $\sigma$ -algebra.

**Exercise 1.7** Let X be a nonempty set and  $\mathcal{A}$  be a  $\sigma$ -algebra of X. The definition of a  $\sigma$ -algebra requires  $\emptyset \in \mathcal{A}$ . Furthermore, a  $\sigma$ -algebra is closed under complements, which implies that  $\emptyset^c = X \in \mathcal{A}$ . Therefore, to satisfy the definition, any  $\sigma$ -algebra must contain both  $\emptyset$  and X, so that the set  $\{\emptyset, X\}$  is the smallest  $\sigma$ -algebra. The power set of X,  $\mathcal{P}(X)$ , is the largest possible  $\sigma$ -algebra because it contains all possible subset of X. Recall that a  $\sigma$ -algebra is a family of subsets of X. Therefore, the largest possible family of subsets of X contains all subsets of X, which is precisely  $\mathcal{P}(X)$ .

**Exercise 1.10** Let  $\{S_{\alpha}\}$  be a family of  $\sigma$ -algebras on X. We show that  $\cap_{\alpha} S_{\alpha}$  is also a  $\sigma$ -algebra. Observe that  $\emptyset \in S_{\alpha}$  for all  $\alpha$  because  $\{S_{\alpha}\}$  is a family of  $\sigma$ -algebras. Therefore,  $\emptyset \in \cap_{\alpha} S_{\alpha}$ .

Moreover, let  $A \in \cap_{\alpha} S_{\alpha}$ . Therefore,  $A \in S_{\alpha}$  for all  $\alpha$ . Each  $S_{\alpha}$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra, which implies that  $A^c \in S_{\alpha}$  for all  $\alpha$ . Therefore,  $A^c \in \cap_{\alpha} S_{\alpha}$ . Thus,  $A \in \cap_{\alpha} S_{\alpha}$  implies  $A^c \in \cap_{\alpha} S_{\alpha}$ , so that  $\cap_{\alpha} S_{\alpha}$  is closed under complements.

Finally, let  $A_1, A_2, \ldots \in \cap_{\alpha} S_{\alpha}$ . Therefore,  $A_1, A_2, \ldots \in S_{\alpha}$  for all  $\alpha$ . Each  $S_{\alpha}$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra, which implies that  $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \in S_{\alpha}$  for all  $\alpha$ . Thus,  $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \in \cap_{\alpha} S_{\alpha}$ , which shows that  $\bigcap_{\alpha} S_{\alpha}$  is closed under countable unions.

Therefore, we have showed that  $\cap_{\alpha} S_{\alpha}$  is indeed a  $\sigma$ -algebra.

## **Exercise 1.22** Let $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$ be a measure space.

(a) Observe that we can write  $B = (B \cap A^c) \cup (B \cap A) = (B \cap A^c) \cup A$ , where the last inequality follows because  $A \subset B$ . By the definition of a measure, we have that  $\mu(B) = \mu(B \cap A^c) + \mu(A)$ , as  $(B \cap A^c)$  and  $(B \cap A) = A$  are clearly disjoint. Finally,

note that by definition, a measure is nonnegative, so  $\mu(B \cap A^c) \geq 0$ . Therefore,  $\mu(B) \geq \mu(A)$ .

(b) Let  $A = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i$  and define  $\{B_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$  as follows. Set  $B_1 = A_1$ ,  $B_2 = A_2 \cap A_1^c$ ,  $B_3 = A_3 \cap (A_1 \cup A_2)^c$ , and more generally,  $B_i = A_i \cap (\bigcup_{n=1}^{i-1} A_i)^c$ . Observe that  $A = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} B_i$ . Also observe  $B_i \subset A_i$ , as we form  $B_i$  by intersecting  $A_i$  with other sets. Additionally,  $B_i \cap B_j = \emptyset$  for all  $i \neq j$ , by construction. By monotonicity, proved above, we have that  $\mu(B_i) \leq \mu(A_i)$ . Therefore,

$$\mu(\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i) = \mu(\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} B_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu(B_i) \le \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_i)$$

The second inequality follows by the disjointness of  $B_i$  and  $B_j$  for all  $i \neq j$ , and the fourth inequality follows by monotonicity.

**Exercise 1.23** Let  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  be a measure space and  $B \in \mathcal{S}$ . Define  $\lambda : \mathcal{S} \to [0, \infty]$  by  $\lambda(A) = \mu(A \cap B)$ . By the definition of  $\lambda$ ,  $\lambda(\emptyset) = \mu(\emptyset \cap B) = \mu(\emptyset) = 0$ , because  $\mu$  is a measure.

Next, fix  $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty} \subset \mathcal{S}$  such that  $A_i \cap A_j = \emptyset$  for all  $i \neq j$ . By the definition of  $\lambda$ ,

$$\lambda(\cup_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i) = \mu((\cup_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i) \cap B)$$

$$= \mu(\cup_{i=1}^{\infty} (A_i \cap B))$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_i \cap B)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda(A_i \cap B)$$

The third equality follows because  $A_i \cap A_j = \emptyset$  for all  $i \neq j$  implies that  $(A_i \cap B) \cap (A_j \cap B) = \emptyset$  for all  $i \neq j$ . Thus, as  $\mu$  is a measure, we may break of the disjoint into a sum of the individual measures. Finally, the last inequality follows by the definition of  $\lambda$ .

**Exercise 1.26** We use the following lemma in our proof:

**Lemma 1.** If 
$$A_n \subset A_1$$
, then  $\mu(A_1) - \mu(A_n) = \mu(A_1 \setminus A_n)$ 

*Proof.* We can write  $A_1 = (A_1 \setminus A_n) \cup A_n$ , which is a disjoint union, because  $A_n \subset A_1$ . Therefore,  $\mu(A_1) = \mu(A_1 \setminus A_n) + \mu(A_n)$ . The lemma follows.

Define  $B_n = A_1 \setminus A_n$  for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and let  $B = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n$ . Observe that  $\{B_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  forms an increasing sequence because  $A_n \supset A_{n+1}$  for all n is a decreasing sequence of sets. Let  $A = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$ . Then,

$$\mu(A_1) - \mu(A) = \mu(A_1 - A)$$

$$= \mu(B)$$

$$= \lim_{n \to \infty} \mu(B_n)$$

$$= \lim_{n \to \infty} (\mu(A_1) - \mu(A_n))$$

Therefore, because  $\mu(A_1) < \infty$ , we may subtract  $\mu(A_1)$  from both sides of the above sequence of equations to find that,

$$\mu(A) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \mu(A_n)$$

**Exercise 2.10** Recall that  $\mu^*$  is countably subadditive. Write  $B \subset X$  as  $B = (B \cap E) \cup (B \cap E^c)$ . By countable subadditivity, we have that  $\mu^*(B) \leq \mu^*(B \cap E) + \mu^*(B \cap E^c)$ . Therefore, if  $\mu^*(B) = \mu^*(B \cap E) + \mu^*(B \cap E^c)$ , then it follows that  $\mu^*(B) \geq \mu^*(B \cap E) + \mu^*(B \cap E^c)$ . Therefore, satisfying the equality condition implies the condition (\*) in Theorem 2.8.

Exercise 2.14 Recall that  $\sigma(\mathcal{O})$  := the smallest  $\sigma$ -algebra containing all open sets of X. We call  $\sigma(\mathcal{O})$  the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra of X written as  $\mathcal{B}(X)$ . Next, by the Carathéodory Construction,  $\mathcal{M}$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra. Additionally,  $\mathcal{M}$  is the collection of all Lebesgue measurable sets. The collection of all Lebesgue measurable sets contains open sets. Therefore, because  $\mathcal{B}(X)$  is defined as the intersection of all  $\sigma$ -algebra containing open sets, we must have that  $\mathcal{B}(X) \subset \mathcal{M}$ .

**Exercise 3.1** Let  $A = \{a_1, a_2, \ldots\}$  be a countable subset of the real line. Fix  $\epsilon > 0$ . We construct a sequence of intervals  $\{I_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  as follows. Let  $I_1 = (a_1 - \frac{\epsilon}{2}, a_1 + \frac{\epsilon}{2})$ , which has length  $\epsilon$ . Similarly, let  $I_2 = (a_2 - \frac{\epsilon}{4}, a_2 + \frac{\epsilon}{4})$ , which has length  $\frac{\epsilon}{2}$ . For a general interval n, we write  $I_n = (a_n - \frac{\epsilon}{2^n}, a_n + \frac{\epsilon}{2^n})$ , which has length  $\frac{\epsilon}{2^{n-1}}$ . Now, the sum of the lengths of the intervals is,

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\epsilon}{2^{n-1}} = 2\epsilon$$

By definition, the Lebesgue (outer) measure of A is,

$$\mu(A) = \inf \left[ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (d_n - c_n) : A \subset \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} (c_n, d_n) \right]$$

Above, we demonstrated an open cover of A such that the sum of the intervals is arbitrarily small. Therefore, the measure of this open cover is arbitrarily small (yet weakly positive) and hence 0. Thus,  $\mu(A) = 0$ .

## Exercise 3.7

We show that the following conditions are equivalent:

- 1.  $\{x \in X : f(x) < a\} \in \mathcal{M}$
- 2.  $\{x \in X : f(x) \ge a\} \in \mathcal{M}$ 
  - (1)  $\Longrightarrow$  (2): Suppose  $\{x \in X : f(x) < a\} \in \mathcal{M}$ . Observe that  $f^{-1}([a, \infty)) = (f^{-1}(-\infty, a))^c$ .  $\mathcal{M}$  is closed under complements, therefore  $f^{-1}([a, \infty)) \in \mathcal{M}$ .
- 3.  $\{x \in X : f(x) > a\} \in \mathcal{M}$ 
  - (2)  $\Longrightarrow$  (3): Suppose  $\{x \in X : f(x) \geq a\} \in \mathcal{M}$ . Observe that  $f^{-1}((a, \infty)) = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} f^{-1}([a \frac{1}{n}, \infty))$ . By assumption, each of the sets in this intersection is in  $\mathcal{M}$ .  $\mathcal{M}$  is closed under countable intersections. Therefore,  $f^{-1}(a, \infty) \in \mathcal{M}$ .
- 4.  $\{x \in X : f(x) \le a\} \in \mathcal{M}$ 
  - (3)  $\Longrightarrow$  (4): Suppose  $\{x \in X : f(x) > a\} \in \mathcal{M}$ . Observe that  $f^{-1}((-\infty, a]) = (f^{-1}(a, \infty))^c$ .  $\mathcal{M}$  is closed under complements, therefore  $f^{-1}((-\infty, a]) \in \mathcal{M}$ .
  - (4)  $\Longrightarrow$  (1): Suppose  $\{x \in X : f(x) \leq a\} \in \mathcal{M}$ . Observe that  $f^{-1}((-\infty, a)) = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} f^{-1}((-\infty, a + \frac{1}{n}))$ . By assumption, each of the sets in this intersection is in  $\mathcal{M}$ .  $\mathcal{M}$  is closed under countable intersections. Therefore,  $f^{-1}((a, \infty)) \in \mathcal{M}$ .

**Exercise 3.10** We prove  $\min(f, g)$ ,  $\max(f, g)$  and |f| directly from the definition of measurable functions and use results from Exercise 3.7 to rewrite the condition for measurability in equivalent forms to make the proofs easier.

- 1. Consider F(f(x) + g(x)) = f(x) + g(x). Then F is continuous and by part 4 of Theorem 3.9, measurable. Therefore, f + g is measurable.
- 2. Consdier F(f(x) + g(x)) = f(x)g(x). Then F is continuous and by part 4 of Theorem 3.9, measurable. Therefore,  $f \cdot g$  is measurable.
- 3. Because f and g are measurable functions on  $(X, \mathcal{M})$ , we have that for all  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\{x \in X : f(x) < a\} \in \mathcal{M}$  and  $\{x \in X : g(x) < a\} \in \mathcal{M}$ . Therefore, it follows that  $\{x \in X : \max(f(x), g(x)) < a\} = \{x \in X : f(x) < a\} \cap \{x \in X : g(x) < a\}$ .  $\mathcal{M}$  is closed under countable intersections, therefore,  $\{x \in X : \max(f(x), g(x)) < a\} \in \mathcal{M}$ , so that  $\max(f(x), g(x))$  is measurable.
- 4. The proof that  $\min(f,g)$  is measurable is analogous to the proof of (3). The key observation here is that  $\{x \in X : \min(f(x), g(x)) > a\} = \{x \in X : f(x) > a\} \cap \{x \in X : g(x) > a\}$ .  $\mathcal{M}$  is closed under countable intersections, therefore,  $\{x \in X : \min(f(x), g(x)) > a\} \in \mathcal{M}$ , so that  $\min(f(x), g(x))$  is measurable.
- 5. Observe that  $\{x \in X : |f(x)| > a\} = \{x \in X : f(x) < -a\} \cup \{x \in X : f(x) > a\}$ . Both of these sets are in  $\mathcal{M}$ .  $\mathcal{M}$  is closed under countable unions, therefore,  $\{x \in X : |f(x)| > a\} \in \mathcal{M}$ , so that |f(x)| is measurable.

**Exercise 3.17** Let f be bounded, and fix  $\epsilon > 0$ . Then, there exists an  $M \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $|f(x)| \leq M$  for all  $x \in X$ . Therefore,  $x \in E_i^M$  for some i and all  $x \in X$ . Observe

that there is an  $N \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $N \geq M$  such that  $\frac{1}{2^N} < \epsilon$ . Therefore, for all  $x \in X$  and  $n \geq N$ ,  $||s_n(x) - f(x)|| < \epsilon$ . Therefore, the convergence in part (1) of Theorem 3.13 is uniform.

**Exercise 4.13** To show that  $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(\mu, E)$ , we must show that both  $\int_E f^+ d\mu$  and  $\int_E f^- d\mu$  are finite.

Recall that  $||f|| = f^+ + f^-$ . Also note that  $0 \le f^+$  and  $0 \le f^-$  by definition. Because ||f|| < M on E, then  $0 \le f^+ < M$  and  $0 \le f^- < M$  on E. Then, because  $\mu(E) < \infty$ , we have that,

$$\int_{E} f^{+} d\mu < M\mu(E) < \infty$$

$$\int_{E} f^{-} d\mu < M\mu(E) < \infty$$

Therefore, both  $\int_E f^+ d\mu$  and  $\int_E f^- d\mu$  are finite. Hence, by definition,  $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(\mu, E)$ .

**Exercise 4.14** We prove the contrapositive of this statement. To that end, suppose there exists a measurable set  $\hat{E} \subset E$  such that f is infinite on  $\hat{E}$ . Here, we assume that f reaches positive infinity (without loss of generality, the proof for negative infinity or mixed between positive and negative infinity is analogous). It follows that,

$$\infty = \int_{\hat{E}} f d\mu \le \int_{E} f d\mu \le \int_{E} ||f|| d\mu$$

The first inequality is proved below. However, this implies that  $f \notin \mathcal{L}^1(\mu, E)$ .

**Exercise 4.15** Let  $f,g \in \mathcal{L}^1(\mu,E)$ . Define the set of simple functions  $B(f) = \{s : 0 \le s \le f, s \text{ simple, measurable}\}$ . Let  $f \le g$ . If follows that  $f^+ \le g^+$  and  $f^- \ge g^-$ . Then, we have that  $B(f^+) \subset B(g^+)$  and  $B(g^-) \subset B(f^-)$ . These two relationships imply that  $\int_E f^+ d\mu \le \int_E g^+ d\mu$  and  $\int_E f^- d\mu \ge \int_E g^- d\mu$ . Then by the definition of the Lebesgue integral, we observe that,

$$\int_{E} f d\mu = \int_{E} f^{+} d\mu - \int_{E} f^{-} d\mu \le \int_{E} g^{+} d\mu - \int_{E} g^{-} d\mu = \int_{E} g d\mu$$

Therefore,

$$\int_{E} f d\mu \le \int_{E} g d\mu$$

**Exercise 4.16** Fix a simple function  $s(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} c_i \chi_{E_i}$ , where  $E_i \in \mathcal{M}$ . Let  $A \subset E \in \mathcal{M}$ . Then, by the monotonicity of measures, we have that  $\mu(A \cap E_i) \leq \mu(E \cap E_i)$  for all i. Therefore, combining this result with Definition 4.1, we have that,

$$\int_{A} s d\mu = \sum_{i=1}^{N} c_{i} \mu(A \cap E_{i}) \le \sum_{i=1}^{N} c_{i} \mu(E \cap E_{i}) = \int_{E} s d\mu$$
 (1)

Now, it follows that,

$$\int_A f d\mu = \sup \left[ \int_A s d\mu : 0 \le s \le f, s \text{ simple, measurable} \right]$$

and

$$\int_E f d\mu = \sup \left[ \int_E s d\mu : 0 \le s \le f, s \text{ simple, measurable} \right]$$

Now because our choice of s was arbitrary, we have by Equation (1) that,

$$\int_{A} f d\mu \le \int_{E} f d\mu \tag{2}$$

Because  $f \in \mathscr{L}^1(\mu, E)$ , by definition we have that  $\int_E ||f|| d\mu < \infty$ . Therefore,  $\int_E f d\mu < \infty$ . Finally, it follows that  $\int_A f d\mu < \infty$ , which in turn implies  $\int_A f^+ d\mu < \infty$  and  $\int_A f^- d\mu < \infty$ , so that  $f \in \mathscr{L}^1(\mu, A)$ .

**Exercise 4.21** Let  $A, B \in \mathcal{M}$ ,  $B \subset A$ ,  $\mu(A - B) = 0$ , and  $f \in \mathcal{L}^1$ . Then, by Proposition 4.6. we have that,

$$\int_{A-B} f d\mu = 0.$$

Recall that  $f^+$  and  $f^-$  are non-negative  $\mathcal{M}$ -measurable functions because  $f \in \mathcal{L}^1$ . By Theorem 4.19, we have that  $\mu_1(A) = \int_A f^+ d\mu$  and  $\mu_2(A) = \int_A f^- d\mu$  are measures on  $\mathcal{M}$ . Therefore, by the definition of the Lesbesgue integral,

$$\int_{A} f d\mu = \int_{A} f^{+} d\mu - \int_{A} f^{-} d\mu = \mu_{1}(A) - \mu_{2}(A)$$

Now, consider the disjoint union  $A = (A - B) \cup B$ . Because both  $\mu_1(A)$  and  $\mu_2(A)$  are measures, we have that  $\mu_i(A) = \mu_i(A - B) + \mu_i(B)$  for i = 1, 2, because measures are additively separable on disjoint sets. Therefore, we have that  $\mu_i(A) = \mu_i(B)$  for i = 1, 2 because  $\mu(A - B) = 0$ . Therefore,

$$\int_{A} f d\mu = \mu_1(B) - \mu_2(B) = \int_{B} f d\mu$$

This result clearly implies that

$$\int_{A} f d\mu \le \int_{B} f d\mu$$