

**SELECTED SOLUTIONS FOR TERENCE TAO'S BOOK
"AN INTRODUCTION TO MEASURE THEORY"**

HO BOON SUAN

1. PROLOGUE: THE PROBLEM OF MEASURE

Exercise in the proof of Lemma 1.1.2. We prove that

$$|I| = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \#(I \cap \frac{1}{N} \mathbf{Z}).$$

Since $[a, b] \cap \frac{1}{N} \mathbf{Z} \cong [Na, Nb] \cap \mathbf{Z} = \{[Na], \dots, [Nb]\}$, we have

$$\#(I \cap \frac{1}{N} \mathbf{Z}) = [Nb] - [Na] + 1.$$

Since $Nb < [Nb] + 1 \leq Nb + 1$ and $Na \leq [Na] < Na + 1$, we have

$$Nb - Na - 1 < [Nb] - [Na] + 1 \leq Nb - Na + 1,$$

so

$$b - a - \frac{1}{N} < \frac{[Nb] - [Na] + 1}{N} \leq b - a + \frac{1}{N}.$$

The result follows from the squeeze theorem by sending $N \rightarrow \infty$.

Exercise 1.1.3. We first prove the result for $d = 1$. Suppose $m': \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{R}) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^+$ obeys non-negativity, finite additivity and translation invariance. For $n \geq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} c := m'([0, 1)) &= m'\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^n \left[\frac{i-1}{n}, \frac{i}{n}\right)\right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n m'\left(\left[\frac{i-1}{n}, \frac{i}{n}\right)\right) \quad \text{by finite additivity} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n m'\left(\left[0, \frac{1}{n}\right)\right) \quad \text{by translation invariance} \\ &= nm'\left(\left[0, \frac{1}{n}\right)\right), \end{aligned}$$

and so $m'([0, 1/n)) = c/n$. Thus $m'([0, k/n)) = ck/n$. Note that non-negativity and finite additivity imply monotonicity, which in turn implies that $m'(\{0\}) < 1/n$ for all n , so that $m'(\{x\}) = 0$ for all $x \in \mathbf{R}$ by translation invariance.

Since elementary sets are finite unions of disjoint boxes, it suffices to show that $m'(B) = cm(B)$ for all boxes B . Since singletons have zero measure as shown above, it suffices by translation invariance to prove the result for $B = [0, a)$ where $a > 0$. By writing $[0, a) = [0, [a]) \cup [[a], a)$, we see that it suffices to consider $0 < a < 1$. By considering a sequence in $\mathbf{Q} \cap [0, a)$ converging to a , monotonicity yields the bound $m'([0, a)) \geq ca$, and we may also obtain $m'([0, a)) \leq ca$ analogously.

For \mathbf{R}^d we find $m'([0, 1/n)^d) = c/n^d$ (recall $\bigcup_i A_i \times \bigcup_j B_j \approx \bigcup_{i,j} A_i \times B_j$). Similar arguments show that $m'(\prod_{1 \leq i \leq d} [0, k_i/n)) = (c/n^d)(\prod_{1 \leq i \leq d} k_i)$, and that

degenerate elementary sets (where one of the factor intervals is a singleton) have zero measure under m' . We may finish off with a similar limiting argument:

$$m' \left(\prod_{1 \leq i \leq d} [0, a_i] \right) \geq \sup \left\{ m' \left(\prod_{1 \leq i \leq d} [0, q_i] \right) : q_i \in \mathbf{Q} \cap [0, a_i] \right\} = c \prod_{1 \leq i \leq d} a_i.$$

Exercise 1.1.4. Suppose $E_1 \subset \mathbf{R}^{d_1}$ and $E_2 \subset \mathbf{R}^{d_2}$ are elementary sets. Then $E_1 = \bigcup_i B_i$ and $E_2 = \bigcup_j B_j$, where the B_i and B_j denote boxes, and thus $E_1 \times E_2 = \bigcup_{i,j} B_i \times B_j$. Since the product of boxes is a box, it follows that $E_1 \times E_2$ is elementary. To show $m^{d_1+d_2}(E_1 \times E_2) = m^{d_1}(E_1)m^{d_2}(E_2)$, we write E_1 and E_2 as unions of disjoint boxes B_i and B_j , so that $E_1 \times E_2 = \bigcup_{i,j} B_i \times B_j$ is a union of disjoint boxes. Then, we have

$$m^{d_1+d_2}(E_1 \times E_2) = \sum_{i,j} |B_i| |B_j| = \left(\sum_i |B_i| \right) \left(\sum_j |B_j| \right) = m^{d_1}(E_1) m^{d_2}(E_2)$$

as needed.

Digression: Could we have a result along the lines of this? Let $S \subset \{1, \dots, d\}$ and write $\pi_S(\mathbf{R}^d) := \{(x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbf{R}^d : x_i \neq 0 \text{ implies } i \in S\}$. Then $\pi_S(\mathbf{R}^d) \approx \mathbf{R}^{|S|}$ canonically, and so, writing $T = \{1, \dots, d\} - S$, we have $\mathbf{R}^d \approx \pi_S(\mathbf{R}^d) \times \pi_T(\mathbf{R}^d)$ canonically. For example with $\{1, 3\} \subset \mathbf{R}^3$, we have $\pi_{\{1,3\}}(\mathbf{R}^3) = \{(x, 0, z) \in \mathbf{R}^3\}$ and so there is a natural identification of boxes $[a, b] \times [c, d] \approx [a, b] \times \{0\} \times [c, d]$. Further, together with the complementary identification $\pi_{\{2\}}(\mathbf{R}^3) = \{(0, y, 0) \in \mathbf{R}^3\}$ and its associated correspondence of boxes $[e, f] \approx \{0\} \times [e, f] \times \{0\}$, there is a correspondence of products of boxes in a canonical way where products of boxes from both identified subspaces correspond to boxes in \mathbf{R}^3 .

Exercise 1.1.5. To show (1) implies (2), suppose E is Jordan measurable, and let $\epsilon > 0$. Then there exist elementary sets $A \subset E \subset B$ with $m(A) > m(E) - \epsilon/2$ and $m(B) < m(E) + \epsilon/2$, so that $m(B - A) = m(B) - m(A) \leq \epsilon$ by finite additivity of elementary measure.

To show (2) implies (3), let $A \subset E \subset B$ be elementary sets with $m(B - A) \leq \epsilon$. Then $B \triangle A = B - A \supset B - E$, and so

$$m^{*,(J)}(B \triangle E) = \inf_{\substack{S \supset B-E \\ S \text{ elem.}}} m(S) \leq m(B - A) \leq \epsilon.$$

To show (3) implies (1), let A be an elementary set with $m^{*,(J)}(A \triangle E) \leq \epsilon/4$. Then there exists an elementary set $B \supset A \triangle E$ with $m(B) < \epsilon/2$. This gives us two elementary sets $A - B \subset E \subset A \cup B$. Since

$$m^{*,(J)}(E) \geq m(A - B) \geq m(A) - m(B) > m(A) - \epsilon/2$$

and

$$m_{*,(J)}(E) \leq m(A \cup B) \leq m(A) + m(B) < m(A) + \epsilon/2,$$

we obtain $m^{*,(J)}(E) - m_{*,(J)}(E) < \epsilon$. It follows that E is Jordan measurable.

Exercise 1.1.6. (1) We begin by proving that $E \cup F$ is Jordan measurable. By exercise 1.1.5(2), there exist elementary sets A, B, A', B' with $A \subset E \subset B$, $A' \subset F \subset B'$, $m(B - A) \leq \epsilon/2$, and $m(B' - A') \leq \epsilon/2$. Then $A \cup A' \subset E \cup F \subset B \cup B'$. Since $B \cup B' - A \cup A' \subset (B - A) \cup (B' - A')$, it follows from already established properties of elementary measure that

$$\begin{aligned} m(B \cup B' - A \cup A') &\leq m((B - A) \cup (B' - A')) \\ &\leq m(B - A) + m(B' - A') \\ &\leq \epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

and so applying exercise 1.1.5(2) again shows that $E \cup F$ is Jordan measurable. Showing that $E \cap F$ is Jordan measurable is quite similar — one uses the inclusion

$$B \cap B' - A \cap A' = (B \cap B' - A) \cup (B \cap B' - A') \subset (B - A) \cup (B' - A').$$

Showing that $E - F$ is Jordan measurable uses the fact that $A - B' \subset E - F \subset B - A'$ and

$$(B - A') - (A - B') \subset (B - A) \cup (B' - A').$$

Finally, $E \triangle F = E \cup F - E \cap F$ and is thus Jordan measurable.

(2) We have $m(E) \geq m_{*,(J)}(E)$, which is a supremum over elementary measures of elementary sets, which are clearly non-negative by definition.

(3) Let $A \subset E \subset B$, $A' \subset F \subset B'$ be elementary sets with

$$m(B) - \epsilon/2 < m(E) < m(A) + \epsilon/2$$

and

$$m(B') - \epsilon/2 < m(F) < m(A') + \epsilon/2.$$

Then, $E \cup F \supset A \cup A'$, and so

$$m(E \cup F) \geq m(A \cup A') = m(A) + m(A') > m(E) + m(F) - \epsilon.$$

Similarly, $E \cup F \subset B \cup B'$, and we have

$$m(E \cup F) \leq m(B \cup B') \leq m(B) + m(B') < m(E) + m(F) + \epsilon.$$

Since ϵ was arbitrary, this gives $m(E \cup F) = m(E) + m(F)$ as required.

(4) We have $E \uplus (F - E) = F$, where \uplus denotes a disjoint union. By (1), $F - E$ is Jordan measurable, and so $m(E) + m(F - E) = m(F)$ by (3). Since $m(F - E) \geq 0$ by (2), we conclude that $m(E) \leq m(F)$.

(5) Since $E \cup F = E \uplus (F - E)$ and $F - E \subset F$, we have

$$m(E \cup F) = m(E) + m(F - E) \leq m(E) + m(F).$$

(6) This follows immediately from translation invariance of elementary sets — if $A \subset E$ with A elementary, then $A + x \subset E + x$ with $A + x$ elementary and $m(A + x) = m(A)$; similarly for $B \supset E$.

Exercise 1.1.7. (1) Let $f: B \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be a continuous function on a closed box $B \subset \mathbf{R}^d$, and denote by $\Gamma_f := \{(x, f(x)) : x \in B\} \subset \mathbf{R}^{d+1}$ its graph. Since the inner measure is at most the outer measure, the Jordan measurability of Γ_f is immediately established if we find for every $\epsilon > 0$ an elementary set of measure less than ϵ that contains Γ_f . Let $\epsilon > 0$. Since continuous functions on compact sets are uniformly continuous, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $|f(x) - f(y)| < \epsilon/m(B)$ whenever $\|x - y\| < \delta$ and $x, y \in B$. Partition B into boxes of diameter less than δ . Each of these boxes $B_\alpha \subset \mathbf{R}^d$ gives rise to a box $B_\alpha \times I_\alpha \subset \mathbf{R}^{d+1}$ containing $\{(x, f(x)) : x \in B'\} \subset \Gamma_f$ with $m(I_\alpha) < \epsilon/m(B)$ by uniform continuity. It follows that $\bigcup_\alpha (B_\alpha \times I_\alpha)$ is an elementary set of measure less than ϵ that contains Γ_f . We conclude that the graph of f is Jordan measurable with Jordan measure zero.

(2) This is essentially the fact that bounded continuous functions are Riemann integrable. Alternatively, letting $U := \{(x, t) : x \in B \text{ and } 0 \leq t \leq f(x)\} \subset \mathbf{R}^{d+1}$, one may consider the sets (as defined in (1))

$$U - \bigcup_\alpha (B_\alpha \times I_\alpha) \subset U \subset U \cup \bigcup_\alpha (B_\alpha \times I_\alpha),$$

which may be shown to be elementary.

Exercise 1.1.8. (1) Suppose AB is horizontal. Then we may translate AB onto the x -axis and use exercise 1.1.7(2) to prove that ABC is Jordan measurable. Note that if the x -coordinate of C does not lie between the x -coordinates of A and B , we may just regard ABC as the difference of two right-angled triangles $AC'C$ and

$BC'C$ where C' is C projected onto the x -axis. We must then add back the line BC , but this has Jordan measure zero by exercise 1.1.7(1).

For the general case translate the triangle so that one point, call it A without loss of generality, lies on the x -axis, and the other two points are above it. Then this can be thought of as the area under a graph again with one or two right triangles removed and lines added appropriately, once again by exercise 1.1.7. It follows that solid triangles are Jordan measurable.

(2) This boils down to finding the area under a line $y = mx$ using the standard Riemann sums arguments.

Exercise 1.1.9. Suppose $P \subset \mathbf{R}^d$ be a compact convex polytope contained in a closed box B . We may write $P = \bigcap_i (B \cap H_i)$, where each $H_i := \{x \in \mathbf{R}^d : x \cdot v_i \leq c_i\}$ is a closed half-space, and so it suffices to prove that sets of the form $B \cap H_i$ are Jordan measurable. We may identify $\mathbf{R}^{d-1} \subset \mathbf{R}^d$ as the subset with $x_i = 0$. Pick an identification where, when the projection of the hyperplane defined by $x \cdot v = c$ onto the identified \mathbf{R}^{d-1} is surjective. Then, projecting the box B down to $\pi(B) \subset \mathbf{R}^{d-1}$, we may use exercise 1.1.7(2) to obtain our result by considering $B \cap H_i$ as the region under an appropriate graph.

Exercise 1.1.10. (1) To show that balls are Jordan measurable, it suffices to translate the standard ball $B(x, r)$ by r units in x_d so that it lies in the closed upper half space, then treat it as the difference of two graphs. For example, when $d = 2$, we consider the difference of the regions below the graphs of functions $r \pm \sqrt{r^2 - x^2}$.

Now, if we define the scaling by r of an interval $I = [a, b]$ by $rI := [ra, rb]$ (and similarly for open and half-closed intervals), then $m(rI) = rm(I)$. We may extend this to a box $B = \prod_{1 \leq j \leq d} I_j$ to get $rB := \prod_{1 \leq j \leq d} rI_j$ and $m(rB) = r^d m(B)$, and similarly to elementary sets $A = \bigcup_i B_i$ where $rA := \bigcup_i rB_i$ and $m(rA) = r^d m(A)$.

Denote the open ball of radius r of dimension d centered at 0 by $B_d(r) \subset \mathbf{R}^{d+1}$, and let $c_d := m(B_d(1))$. We will show that $m(B_d(r)) = c_d r^d$. Let $A \subset B_d(1) \subset B$ be elementary sets with

$$c_d - \epsilon/r^d < m(A) \quad \text{and} \quad m(B) < c_d + \epsilon/r^d.$$

Then, $rA \subset B_d(r) \subset rB$ are elementary sets, and so

$$\begin{aligned} c_d r^d - \epsilon &< r^d m(A) = m(rA) \\ &\leq m(B_d(r)) \\ &\leq m(rB) = r^d m(B) < c_d r^d + \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Since ϵ was arbitrary we conclude that $m(B_d(r)) = c_d r^d$ as needed.

(2) The bound

$$\left(\frac{2}{\sqrt{d}} \right)^d \leq c_d \leq 2^d$$

is easily established by inscribing and circumscribing cubes in the unit sphere. For the inner cube, note that its diameter is 2, so its side length is $2/\sqrt{d}$ and its volume is $(2/\sqrt{d})^d$. (In fact, $c_d = \frac{1}{d} \frac{2\pi^{d/2}}{\Gamma(d/2)}$.)

Exercise 1.1.11. (1) Recall that exercise 1.1.3 tells us that any map $m': \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ satisfying nonnegativity, finite additivity and translation invariance is necessarily a scalar multiple of elementary measure. We prove that $m \circ L$ satisfies these properties. The nonnegativity of $m \circ L$ follows immediately from the nonnegativity of m . If L is invertible, then $(m \circ L)(E \uplus F) = m(L(E) \uplus L(F)) = (m \circ L)(E) + (m \circ L)(F)$. Otherwise, we claim that $m \circ L = 0$. Indeed, $L(E)$ must be a bounded subset of a hyperplane $S \subsetneq \mathbf{R}^d$, and $L(E)$ must be contained in some closed box B , so $m(L(E)) \leq m(B \cap S)$. Choosing an appropriate identification $\mathbf{R}^{d-1} \subset \mathbf{R}^d$ as in exercise 1.1.9, we see that $B \cap S$ is the graph of a linear (and thus continuous)

function, and so $m(B \cap S) = 0$ by exercise 1.1.7(1). Finally, translation invariance is immediate from the linearity of L together with the translation invariance of m — we get $m(L(E+x)) = m(L(E) + L(x)) = m(L(E))$. We conclude that $m \circ L = Dm$ for some constant $D \geq 0$.

It is time for a digression. I feel somewhat guilty for the handwavy treatment of the measure zero case both above and in exercise 1.1.9, so I shall make up for it to a small extent by providing some examples. Take \mathbf{R}^3 with

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad T' = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

These are rank 2 matrices; the projection of $\text{im}(T)$ onto the xy -plane is not surjective whereas the projection of $\text{im}(T')$ onto the xy -plane is surjective. If we have an elementary set $E \subset \mathbf{R}^3$, then $\text{im}_{T'}(E) \subset \text{im}(T') \cap B$, where $B = [a_1, b_1] \times [a_2, b_2] \times [a_3, b_3] \subset \mathbf{R}^3$ is a closed box containing $\text{im}_{T'}(E)$ (which exists, since linear maps are bounded). We may then define the closed box $\pi(B) := [a_1, b_1] \times [a_2, b_2] \subset \{(x, y, 0) \in \mathbf{R}^3 : x, y \in \mathbf{R}\} \approx \mathbf{R}^2$ and $f: \pi(B) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ defined by $f(x, y) := x + y$. Then $\text{im}_{T'}(E) \subset \Gamma_f \subset \text{im}(T')$, and so we have $m(\text{im}_{T'}(E)) \leq m(\Gamma_f) = 0$ by exercise 1.1.7(1). For $\text{im}(T)$ we may project onto the xz -plane instead, and our mapping will be $(x, z) \mapsto -x$. In general, if we are given a $(d-1)$ -dimensional subspace of \mathbf{R}^d represented as the image of a noninvertible linear operator T on \mathbf{R}^d , we can always find $d-1$ basis vectors $\{e_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq d; i \neq j}$ such that $\{Te_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq d; i \neq j}$ is independent. We may thus project onto $\{(x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbf{R}^d : x_j = 0\} =: S \approx \mathbf{R}^{d-1}$, and treat $\mathbf{R}^d \approx S \times \mathbf{R}$ using exercise 1.1.4. (I apologize for how sloppy/handwavy this treatment is. See also the appendix to this section for more thoughts.)

(2) Suppose $E \subset \mathbf{R}^d$ is Jordan measurable. If L is not invertible, then $L(E)$ is Jordan measurable with Jordan measure zero as argued in (1), and $D = 0$, so $m(L(E)) = Dm(E)$. Henceforth we may assume that L is invertible. Let $D > 0$ be such that $m(L(E')) = Dm(E')$, where E' denotes any elementary set. We first prove that $L(E)$ is Jordan measurable. Let $A \subset E \subset B$ be elementary sets with $m(B-A) \leq \epsilon/4D$, or $m(B) \leq m(A) + \epsilon/4D$. We have $L(A) \subset L(E) \subset L(B)$. Since $L(A)$ and $L(B)$ are Jordan measurable, we may choose elementary sets A' and B' such that $A' \subset L(A) \subset L(E) \subset L(B) \subset B'$ with

$$m(A') > m(L(A)) - \epsilon/2 = Dm(A) - \epsilon/2$$

and

$$m(B') < m(L(B)) + \epsilon/4 = Dm(B) + \epsilon/4 \leq Dm(A) + \epsilon/2.$$

It follows that

$$m(B' - A') = m(B') - m(A') < \epsilon.$$

Since ϵ was arbitrary, we conclude that $L(E)$ is Jordan measurable.

Now we prove that $m(L(E)) = Dm(E)$. Let $A \subset E \subset B$ be elementary sets with $m(E) - \epsilon/D < m(A)$ and $m(B) < m(E) + \epsilon/D$. We have $L(A) \subset L(E) \subset L(B)$, and so

$$\begin{aligned} Dm(E) - \epsilon &< Dm(A) = m(L(A)) \\ &\leq m(L(E)) \\ &\leq m(L(B)) = Dm(B) < Dm(E) + \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Since ϵ was arbitrary, we conclude that $m(L(E)) = Dm(E)$.

(3) The case for dimension $d = 1$ is straightforward as all linear maps $\mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ are scalar multiplication. Henceforth fix $d \geq 2$. We first prove $m(L(E)) = |\det(L)|m(E)$ for Jordan measurable $E \subset \mathbf{R}^d$ and elementary matrices L as in Gaussian elimination. Recall the three classes of elementary matrices:

- (A) Row swapping. For $1 \leq i < j \leq d$, we define $A_{i,j}$ to be the linear operator that swaps entries i and j of an input vector.
- (B) Row scaling. For $\alpha \neq 0$ and $1 \leq i \leq d$, we define B_i^α to be the linear operator that scales row i of an input vector by α .
- (C) Row adding. For $\alpha \neq 0$ and $1 \leq i, j \leq d$, we define $C_{i,j}^\alpha$ to be the linear operator that adds α times row i to row j .

It suffices to prove that $m(L(I^d)) = |\det(L)|$, where $I^d = [0, 1]^d$ is the unit d -cube. For row swapping matrices $A_{i,j}$, we know $|\det(A_{i,j})| = |-1| = 1$ and $A_{i,j}(I^d) = I^d$. For row scaling matrices B_i^α , we know $|\det(B_i^\alpha)| = \alpha$ and

$$B_i^\alpha(I^d) = [0, 1]^{i-1} \times [0, \alpha] \times [0, 1]^{d-i},$$

so $m(B_i^\alpha(I^d)) = \alpha$. For row adding matrices $C_{i,j}^\alpha$, we first consider the 2-dimensional case. The image of a matrix like $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & \alpha \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ is a parallelogram that can be realized as a rectangle with two right triangles removed. In particular, the rectangle has vertices $(0, 0)$, $(\alpha + 1, 0)$, $(\alpha + 1, 1)$ and $(0, 1)$. The first triangle has vertices $(1, 0)$, $(\alpha + 1, 0)$ and $(\alpha + 1, 1)$, and the second triangle has vertices $(0, 0)$, $(0, 1)$ and $(\alpha, 1)$. The boundary lines have zero measure since they are graphs of appropriate functions, so the area of the parallelogram works out to be $(\alpha + 1) - \alpha/2 - \alpha/2 = 1$. This is the essential case — in higher dimensions, instead of working with triangles, we end up dealing with the product of triangles with cubes I^k . Let $d \geq 3$. If we define for $S \subset \{1, \dots, d\}$ the identified subspace

$$\pi_S(\mathbf{R}^d) := \{(x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbf{R}^d : x_i \neq 0 \text{ implies } i \in S\} \approx \mathbf{R}^{|S|},$$

then we obtain a canonical correspondence $\mathbf{R}^d \approx \pi_{\{i,j\}}(\mathbf{R}^d) \times \mathbf{R}^{d-2}$, where

$$\pi_{\{i,j\}}(C_{i,j}^\alpha) \approx \{(x_j + \alpha x_i, x_i) : x_i, x_j \in I\} =: P$$

is a parallelogram with measure one as argued in the 2-dimensional case. It follows that $C_{i,j}^\alpha \approx \pi_{\{i,j\}}(C_{i,j}^\alpha) \times I^{d-2}$ and thus has measure one as well. Since $\det(C_{i,j}^\alpha) = 1$, the result follows. We conclude that $m(L(E)) = |\det(L)|m(E)$ whenever L is elementary and E is Jordan measurable.

Notice that if $m(L(E)) = Dm(E)$ and $m(L'(E)) = D'm(E)$ for elementary L, L' , then $m(L(L'(E))) = Dm(L'(E)) = DD'm(E)$. By Gaussian elimination, we may write any invertible linear map L as the product $L_1 \dots L_k$ of elementary matrices. Since $|\det(AB)| = |\det(A)||\det(B)|$, we compute

$$m(L(E)) = m((L_1 \dots L_k)(E)) = \left(\prod_{1 \leq i \leq k} |\det(L_i)| \right) m(E) = |\det(L)|m(E),$$

and we are done.

Exercise 1.1.12. Suppose F is a Jordan null set and $E \subset F$ is an arbitrary subset. Then, we may find an elementary set $A \supset F$ with $m(A) \leq \epsilon$. It follows that $m^{*,(J)}(E) \leq \epsilon$. Since ϵ is arbitrary, it follows that $m^{*,(J)}(E) = 0$. But then $0 \leq m_{*,(J)}(E) \leq m^{*,(J)}(E)$, so the outer and inner measures are identically zero. We conclude that E is a Jordan null set.

Exercise 1.1.13. Recall that we have

$$m(E) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^d} \# \left(E \cap \frac{1}{N} \mathbf{Z}^d \right)$$

for elementary sets $E \subset \mathbf{R}^d$. We shall prove it for Jordan measurable sets.

Let $E \subset \mathbf{R}^d$ be Jordan measurable, and let $A \subset E \subset B$ be elementary sets with $m(B) \leq m(A) + \epsilon/2$. Pick large N with

$$\left| m(A) - \frac{1}{n^d} \# \left(A \cap \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{Z}^d \right) \right| < \frac{\epsilon}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \left| m(B) - \frac{1}{n^d} \# \left(B \cap \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{Z}^d \right) \right| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$

whenever $n \geq N$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} m(E) - \frac{1}{n^d} \# \left(E \cap \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{Z}^d \right) &\leq m(B) - \frac{1}{n^d} \# \left(A \cap \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{Z}^d \right) \\ &\leq m(A) - \frac{1}{n^d} \# \left(A \cap \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{Z}^d \right) + \epsilon/2 \\ &< \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} m(E) - \frac{1}{n^d} \# \left(E \cap \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{Z}^d \right) &\geq m(A) - \frac{1}{n^d} \# \left(B \cap \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{Z}^d \right) \\ &\geq m(B) - \frac{1}{n^d} \# \left(B \cap \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{Z}^d \right) - \epsilon/2 \\ &> -\epsilon \end{aligned}$$

whenever $n \geq N$. Since ϵ is arbitrary, the result follows.

Exercise 1.1.14.

Exercise 1.1.15.

Exercise 1.1.16.

APPENDIX TO SECTION 1: IDENTIFICATIONS OF SUBSPACES OF EUCLIDEAN SPACE

This section is a somewhat pedantic treatment of some issues that arise when one identifies a proper subspace of \mathbf{R}^d spanned by unit basis vectors e_{i_1}, \dots, e_{i_k} with \mathbf{R}^k . It is written primarily to assuage some of the author's discomforts concerning certain identifications. Suppose $\{S, T\}$ is a partition of $\{1, \dots, d\}$, so that $S \cup T = \{1, \dots, d\}$ and $S \cap T = \emptyset$. Define

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_S : \mathbf{R}^d &\rightarrow \{(x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbf{R}^d : x_i \neq 0 \text{ implies } i \in S\} \approx \mathbf{R}^{|S|} \\ (x_1, \dots, x_d) &\mapsto (x_1[1 \in S], \dots, x_d[d \in S]), \end{aligned}$$

where $[P(x)]$ denotes Iverson's bracket notation — it is equal to 1 if the proposition $P(x)$ is true, and 0 if it is false.

A *box* in $\pi_S(\mathbf{R}^d)$ is defined to be a set of the form

$$\prod_{1 \leq j \leq d} [j \in S] I_j,$$

where $c[a, b] := [ca, cb]$. For example, a box in $\pi_{\{1,3\}}(\mathbf{R}^3)$, more commonly known as the xz -plane in 3-dimensional space, is a set of the form $[a_1, b_1] \times \{0\} \times [a_3, b_3] \subset \pi_{\{1,3\}}(\mathbf{R}^3)$. There is a straightforward correspondence between boxes of $\pi_S(\mathbf{R}^d)$ and boxes of $\mathbf{R}^{|S|}$; the forward direction is obtained by removing all the $\{0\}$ factors. (So $[a_1, b_1] \times \{0\} \times [a_3, b_3] \subset \pi_{\{1,3\}}(\mathbf{R}^3)$ corresponds to $[a_1, b_1] \times [a_3, b_3] \in \mathbf{R}^2$.) We thus may define the *elementary measure* of a box in $\pi_S(\mathbf{R}^d)$ as the measure of the box in $\mathbf{R}^{|S|}$ it corresponds to. Given boxes $B \subset \pi_S(\mathbf{R}^d)$ and $B' \subset \pi_T(\mathbf{R}^d)$, we define the *product box* $B \bar{\times} B' \subset \mathbf{R}^d$ by

$$B \bar{\times} B' := \prod_{1 \leq j \leq d} I_j,$$

where

$$I_j = \begin{cases} \pi_j(B) & \text{if } j \in S; \\ \pi_j(B') & \text{if } j \in T. \end{cases}$$

Here $\pi_j : \mathbf{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is the projection onto the j -th factor defined by $(x_1, \dots, x_d) \mapsto x_j$. For example, the boxes $B = [a_1, b_1] \times \{0\} \times [a_3, b_3] \subset \pi_{\{1,3\}}(\mathbf{R}^3)$ and $B' = \{0\} \times [a_2, b_2] \times \{0\} \subset \pi_{\{2\}}(\mathbf{R}^3)$ have product $B \bar{\times} B' = [a_1, b_1] \times [a_2, b_2] \times [a_3, b_3]$. We also then define $\pi_S(\mathbf{R}^d) \bar{\times} \pi_T(\mathbf{R}^d) := \mathbf{R}^d$. To simplify our language, we will often say things like: “identifying the subspace S spanned by e_1 and e_3 with \mathbf{R}^2 , we see that

$\mathbf{R}^3 \approx S \times \mathbf{R}$. if $[a_1, b_1] \times [a_2, b_2]$ is a box in S and $[a_3, b_3] \in \mathbf{R}$, then the product of those boxes is $[a_1, b_1] \times [a_3, b_3] \times [a_2, b_2]$ under our identifications.”

Most importantly for our purposes, we may prove a useful generalization of exercises 1.1.4 and 1.1.7. Define elementary sets in $\pi_S(\mathbf{R}^d)$ as finite unions of boxes (where boxes in $\pi_S(\mathbf{R}^d)$ are defined above). We may then define the elementary measure of elementary sets in $\pi_S(\mathbf{R}^d)$. We then have the following results, which are proven in the same ways as their normal counterparts, just with clunkier notation:

Proposition. *If $E_1 \subset \pi_S(\mathbf{R}^d)$ and $E_2 \subset \pi_T(\mathbf{R}^d)$ are elementary sets, then $E_1 \bar{\times} E_2 \subset \pi_S(\mathbf{R}^d) \bar{\times} \pi_T(\mathbf{R}^d) = \mathbf{R}^d$ is elementary, and $m(E_1 \bar{\times} E_2) = m(E_1)m(E_2)$.*

Proposition. *Suppose $1 \leq i \leq d+1$, and define $S = \{i\}$, $T = \{1, \dots, d+1\} - \{i\}$. Let B be a closed box in $\pi_T(\mathbf{R}^{d+1})$, and let $f: \pi_T(\mathbf{R}^{d+1}) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be a continuous function.*

- (1) *The graph $\{(x, f(x)) \in \pi_T(\mathbf{R}^{d+1}) \times \pi_S(\mathbf{R}^{d+1}) = \mathbf{R}^{d+1} : x \in B\}$ is Jordan measurable in \mathbf{R}^{d+1} with Jordan measure zero.*
- (2) *The set $\{(x, t) : x \in B; 0 \leq t \leq f(x)\}$ is Jordan measurable.*

In conclusion, this whole business is rather pedantic and reminds me of how working mathematicians casually abuse identifications such as $\mathbf{Z} \subset \mathbf{Q} \subset \mathbf{R}$ (which appears to be very much justifiable); set theory also leads to things like $2 \in 3$ as ‘technical artefacts’ of sorts. I guess this is motivation for type theory?

2. LEBESGUE MEASURE

Exercise 1.2.1. To do...

Email address: boonsuan1@gmail.com