

# 1 Measures

Let  $E$  be any set. A collection  $\mathcal{E}$  of subsets of  $E$  is called a  $\sigma$ -algebra if the following holds:

1.  $\emptyset \in \mathcal{E}$ .
2. If  $A \in \mathcal{E}$ , then  $A^c = E \setminus A \in \mathcal{E}$ .
3. If  $(A_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$ ,  $A_n \in \mathcal{E}$ , then  $\bigcup_n A_n \in \mathcal{E}$ .

**Examples.**

- $\mathcal{E} = \{\emptyset, E\}$
- $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{P}(E)$ , the set of all subsets of  $E$ .

Note that  $\bigcap_n A_n = (\bigcup_n A_n^c)^c$ , any  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{E}$  is also closed under countable intersection of its elements. Also  $B \setminus A = B \cap A^c \in \mathcal{E}$  whenever  $A, B \in \mathcal{E}$ .

Any set  $E$  with a choice of  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{E}$  is called a *measurable space*, and the elements of  $\mathcal{E}$  are called *measurable sets*.

A *measure*  $\mu$  is a set-function  $\mu : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  such that  $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$ , and for any  $(A_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$ ,  $A_n \in \mathcal{E}$  pairwise disjoint ( $A_n \cap A_m = \emptyset$  for all  $n \neq m$ ) then

$$\mu\left(\bigcup_n A_n\right) = \sum_n \mu(A_n) \quad (\text{countable additivity of } \mu)$$

If  $\mathcal{E}$  is countable, then for any  $A \in \mathcal{P}(E)$  and a measure  $\mu$

$$\mu(A) = \mu\left(\bigcup_{x \in A} \{x\}\right) = \sum_{x \in A} \mu(\{x\})$$

hence there is a one-to-one correspondence between measures and mass functions on  $E$ .

For any collection  $\mathcal{A}$  of subsets of  $E$ , we define the  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\sigma(\mathcal{A})$  generated by  $\mathcal{A}$  as

$$\sigma(\mathcal{A}) = \{A \subseteq E : A \in \mathcal{E} \text{ } \forall \sigma\text{-algebras } \mathcal{E} \supseteq \mathcal{A}\}$$

which equals (Example sheet)

$$\sigma(\mathcal{A}) = \bigcap_{\sigma\text{-algebras } \mathcal{E} \supseteq \mathcal{A}} \mathcal{E}$$

To construct good ‘generators’ we define

1.  $\mathcal{A}$  is called a *ring over  $E$*  if  $\emptyset \in \mathcal{A}$ ; if  $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$  then  $B \setminus A \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $A \cup B \in \mathcal{A}$ .

2.  $\mathcal{A}$  is called an *algebra over  $E$*  if  $\emptyset \in \mathcal{A}$ ; if  $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$  then  $A^c \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $A \cup B \in \mathcal{A}$ .

Notice that in a ring  $A \Delta B = (B \setminus A) \cup (A \setminus B) \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $A \cap B = (A \cup B) \setminus (A \Delta B) \in \mathcal{A}$ . Also,  $B \setminus A = B \cap A^c = (B^c \cup A)^c \in \mathcal{A}$ , so an algebra is a ring.

**Fact:** If  $\bigcup_n A_n$ ,  $A_n \in \mathcal{E}$ ,  $\mathcal{E}$  some  $\sigma$ -algebra (or a ring if the union is finite) - then we can find  $B_n \in \mathcal{E}$  disjoint such that  $\bigcup_n A_n = \bigcup_n B_n$ . Indeed, define  $\tilde{A}_n = \bigcup_{j \leq n} A_j$ , and set  $B_n = \tilde{A}_n \setminus \tilde{A}_{n-1}$ , then the fact follows. [“disjointification of countable unions”]

**Definition.** A *set function* on any collection  $\mathcal{A}$  of subsets of  $E$  (where  $\emptyset \in \mathcal{A}$ ) is a map  $\mu : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  such that  $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$ . We say  $\mu$  is

1. *increasing* if  $\mu(A) \leq \mu(B)$  whenever  $A \subseteq B$ ;  $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$
2. *additive* if  $\mu(A \cup B) = \mu(A) + \mu(B)$  whenever  $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$ ;  $A \cup B \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $A \cap B = \emptyset$ .
3. *countably additive* if  $\mu(\bigcup_n A_n) = \sum_n \mu(A_n)$  for any  $(A_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$  where  $A_n \in \mathcal{A}$  disjoint and  $\bigcup_n A_n \in \mathcal{A}$ .
4. *countably sub-additive* if  $\mu(\bigcup_n A_n) \leq \sum_n \mu(A_n)$  for all  $(A_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$  such that  $\bigcup_n A_n \in \mathcal{A}$

**Remark:** one can show that a measure  $\mu$  on a  $\sigma$ -algebra satisfies 1-4 above.

**Theorem** (Caratheodory). *Let  $\mu$  be a countably additive set function on a ring  $\mathcal{A}$  of subsets of  $E$ . Then there exists a measure  $\mu^*$  on  $\sigma(\mathcal{A})$  such that  $\mu^*|_{\mathcal{A}} = \mu$ .*

*Proof.* For  $B \subseteq E$  define the *outer measure*  $\mu^*$  as

$$\mu^*(B) = \inf \left\{ \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mu(A_n) : A_n \in \mathcal{A}, B \subseteq \bigcup_n A_n \right\}$$

and set  $\mu^*(B) = \infty$  if the set within the infimum is empty.

Define

$$\mathcal{M} = \{A \subseteq E : \mu^*(B) = \mu^*(B \cap A) + \mu^*(B \cap A^c) \forall B \subseteq E\}$$

the “ $\mu^*$ -measurable” sets.

Step 1:  $\mu^*$  is countably sub-additive on  $\mathcal{P}(E)$ . For any  $B \subseteq E$  and  $B_n \subseteq E$  such that  $B \subseteq \bigcup_n B_n$  we have

$$\mu^*(B) \leq \sum_n \mu^*(B_n) \quad (\dagger)$$

WLOG we assume  $\mu^*(B_n) < \infty$  for all  $n$  so for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $A_{nm}$  such that  $B_n \subseteq \bigcup_m A_{nm}$  and

$$\mu^*(B_n) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2^n} \geq \sum_m \mu(A_{nm})$$

Now since  $\mu^*$  and since  $B \subseteq \bigcup_n B_n \subseteq \bigcup_{n,m} A_{nm}$ , hence

$$\mu^*(B) \leq \mu^*\left(\bigcup_{n,m} A_{nm}\right) \leq \sum_{n,m} \mu(A_{nm}) \leq \sum_n \mu^*(B_n) + \underbrace{\sum_n \frac{\varepsilon}{2^n}}_{=\varepsilon}$$

so  $(\dagger)$  follows since  $\varepsilon$  was arbitrary.

Step 2:  $\mu^*$  extends  $\mu$ . Let  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ . Clearly  $A = A \cup \emptyset \cup \dots \cup \emptyset$ , so by definition of  $\mu^*$ ,  $\mu^*(A) \leq \mu(A) + 0 + \dots + 0$ . So we need to prove  $\mu(A) \leq \mu^*(A)$ . Again, assume  $\mu^*(A) < \infty$  WLOG, and let  $A_n \in \mathcal{A}$  be such that  $A \subseteq \bigcup_n A_n$ . Then  $A = \bigcup_n \underbrace{(A \cap A_n)}_{\in \mathcal{A}}$ , and since  $\mu$  is countably sub-additive on  $\mathcal{A}$ , we have

$$\mu(A) = \mu\left(\bigcup_n (A \cap A_n)\right) \leq \sum_n \underbrace{\mu(A \cap A_n)}_{\subseteq A_n} \leq \sum_n \mu(A_n)$$

so since the  $(A_n)$  were arbitrary, by taking infima, we have  $\mu(A) \leq \mu^*(A)$ .

Step 3:  $\mathcal{M} \supseteq \mathcal{A}$ . Let  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ , then  $B \subseteq (B \cap A) \cup (B \cap A^c) \cup \emptyset \dots \cup \emptyset = \bigcup_n B_n$  so by  $(\dagger)$  we have

$$\mu^*(B) \leq \mu^*(B \cap A) + \mu^*(B \cap A^c) + 0 \dots + 0$$

so we need to prove  $\mu^*(B) \geq \mu^*(B \cap A) + \mu^*(B \cap A^c)$ . Again, WLOG assume  $\mu^*(B) < \infty$ , and so for all  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exist  $A_n \in \mathcal{A}$  such that  $B \subseteq \bigcup_n A_n$  and

$$\mu^*(B) + \varepsilon \geq \sum_n \mu(A_n) \quad (\circ)$$

now  $B \cap A \subseteq \bigcup_n \underbrace{(A_n \cap A)}_{\in \mathcal{A}}$  and  $B \cap A^c \subseteq \bigcup_n \underbrace{(A_n \cap A^c)}_{A_n \setminus A \in \mathcal{A}}$ . Therefore by definition of inf in  $\mu^*$  and additivity of  $\mu$

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^*(B \cap A) + \mu^*(B \cap A^c) &\leq \sum_n (\mu(A_n \cap A) + \mu(A_n \cap A^c)) \\ &= \sum_n \mu(A_n) \\ &\underbrace{\leq}_{\circ} \mu^*(B) + \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

since  $\varepsilon$  was arbitrary,  $\mu^*(B) = \mu^*(B \cap A) + \mu^*(B \cap A^c)$ , so  $A \in \mathcal{M}$ .

Step 4:  $\mathcal{M}$  is an algebra. Clearly  $\emptyset \in \mathcal{M}$ , and by the definition of  $\mathcal{M}$  it's obvious that  $A^c \in \mathcal{M}$  whenever  $A \in \mathcal{M}$ . So let  $A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{M}$

$$\mu^*(B) = \mu^*(B \cap A_1) + \mu^*(B \cap A_1^c), \text{ since } A_1 \in \mathcal{M}$$

$$= \mu^*(B \cap A_1 \cap A_2) + \mu^*(B \cap A_1 \cap A_2^c) + \mu^*(B \cap A_1^c), \text{ since } A_2 \in \mathcal{M}$$

Clearly  $A_1 \cap A_2^c = (A_1 \cap A_2^c) \cap A_1$  and  $A_1^c = (A_1 \cap A_2)^c \cap A_1^c$  so

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^*(B) &= \mu^*(B \cap A_1 \cap A_2) + \mu^*(B \cap (A_1 \cap A_2)^c \cap A_1) + \mu^*(B \cap (A_1 \cap A_2)^c \cap A_1^c) \\ &= \mu^*(B \cap A_1 \cap A_2) + \mu^*(B \cap (A_1 \cap A_2)^c), \text{ since } A_1 \in \mathcal{M} \end{aligned}$$

so  $A_1 \cap A_2 \in \mathcal{M}$ , and  $\mathcal{M}$  is an algebra.

Step 5: Let  $A = \bigcup_n A_n$ ,  $A_n \in \mathcal{M}$ , WLOG  $A_n$  disjoint (disjointification). Want  $A \in \mathcal{M}$  and  $\mu^*(A) = \sum_n \mu^*(A_n)$ . By  $(\dagger)$  we clearly have

$$\mu^*(B) \leq \mu^*(B \cap A) + \mu^*(B \cap A^c) + 0 \dots + 0$$

and

$$\mu^*(A) \leq \sum_n \mu^*(A_n)$$

so we only need two converse inequalities. Similar to before

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mu^*(B) &= \mu^*(B \cap A_1) + \mu^*(B \cap A_1^c) \\
 &= \mu^*(B \cap A_1) + \mu^*(B \cap \underbrace{A_1^c \cap A_2}_{=A_2 \text{ as disjoint}}) + \mu^*(B \cap A_1^c \cap A_2^c) \\
 &= \sum_{n \leq N} \mu^*(B \cap A_n) + \mu^*(B \cap A_1^c \cap \dots \cap A_N^c)
 \end{aligned}$$

since  $\bigcup_{n \leq N} A_n \subseteq A$  so  $\bigcap_{n \leq N} A_n^c \supseteq A^c$ , taking limits

$$\mu^*(B) \geq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu^*(B \cap A_n) + \mu^*(B \cap A^c)$$

and by (†)

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

so  $A \in \mathcal{M}$ . Applying the previous with  $B = A$ , we see

$$\mu^*(A) \geq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu^*(A \cap A_n) + \mu^*(A \cap A^c) = \sum_n \mu^*(A_n)$$

□

**Definition.** A collection  $\mathcal{A}$  of subsets of  $E$  is called a  $\pi$ -system if  $\emptyset \in \mathcal{A}$  and if  $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$ , then  $A \cap B \in \mathcal{A}$ .

**Definition.**  $\mathcal{A}$  is called a  $d$ -system if  $E \in \mathcal{A}$ , and if  $B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{A}$  such that  $B_1 \subseteq B_2$ , then  $B_2 \setminus B_1 \in \mathcal{A}$ , and if  $A_n \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $A_n \uparrow \bigcup_n A_n = A$ , then  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ .

One shows (Example sheet) that a  $d$ -system which is also a  $\pi$ -system is a  $\sigma$ -algebra.

**Lemma** (Dynkin). *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a  $\pi$ -system. Then any  $d$ -system that contains  $\mathcal{A}$  also contains  $\sigma(\mathcal{A})$ .*

*Proof.* Define

$$\mathcal{D} = \bigcap_{\mathcal{D}' \supseteq \mathcal{A} \text{ a } d\text{-system}} \mathcal{D}'$$

which is again a  $d$ -system (Example sheet). We show that  $\mathcal{D}$  is a  $\pi$ -system, hence a  $\sigma$ -algebra containing  $\mathcal{A}$ . Define

$$\mathcal{D}' = \{B \in \mathcal{D} : B \cap A \in \mathcal{D} \forall A \in \mathcal{A}\}$$

which contains  $\mathcal{A}$  as  $\mathcal{A}$  is a  $\pi$ -system. Next we show  $\mathcal{D}'$  is a  $d$ -system. Clearly  $E \cap A = A \in \mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ , so  $E \in \mathcal{D}'$ . Next let  $B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{D}'$  such that  $B_1 \subseteq B_2$  then  $(B_2 \setminus B_1) \cap A = \underbrace{(B_2 \cap A)}_{\in \mathcal{D}} \setminus \underbrace{(B_1 \cap A)}_{\in \mathcal{D}} \in \mathcal{D}$  and so  $B_2 \setminus B_1 \in \mathcal{D}'$ .

Next take  $B_n \uparrow B$ ,  $B_n \in \mathcal{D}'$  then  $\underbrace{B_n \cap A}_{\in \mathcal{D}} \uparrow B \cap A \in \mathcal{D}$  so  $B \in \mathcal{D}'$ .

Hence  $\mathcal{D}'$  is a  $d$ -system containing  $\mathcal{A}$ , so by minimality of  $\mathcal{D}$ ,  $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{D}'$ . Conversely, by construction  $\mathcal{D}' \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ , so  $\mathcal{D}' = \mathcal{D}$ .

Next define

$$\mathcal{D}'' = \{B \in \mathcal{D} : B \cap A \in \mathcal{D} \forall A \in \mathcal{D}\}$$

which by the preceding step ( $\mathcal{D}' = \mathcal{D}$ ) contains  $\mathcal{A}$ . Just as before, one shows that  $\mathcal{D}'' = \mathcal{D}$  and so  $\mathcal{D}$  is a  $\pi$ -system (as  $\mathcal{D}''$  is by construction).  $\square$

**Theorem** (Uniqueness of extension). *Let  $\mu_1, \mu_2$  be measures on  $(E, \mathcal{E})$  such that  $\mu_1(E) = \mu_2(E) < \infty$ , and suppose  $\mu_1 = \mu_2$  on a  $\pi$ -system  $\mathcal{A}$  such that  $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \sigma(\mathcal{A})$ . Then  $\mu_1 = \mu_2$  on  $\mathcal{E}$ .*

*Proof.* Define

$$\mathcal{D} = \{A : \mu_1(A) = \mu_2(A)\}$$

which contains  $\mathcal{A}$  by hypothesis. We show that  $\mathcal{D}$  is a  $d$ -system, and hence by Dynkin's Lemma, contains  $\sigma(\mathcal{A})$ , so the theorem follows.

To see this, note first that  $E \in \mathcal{D}$  by hypothesis. Next, by additivity and finiteness of  $\mu_1, \mu_2$ , for  $B_1 \subseteq B_2$ ,  $B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{D}$ .

$$\mu_1(B_2 \setminus B_1) = \mu_1(B_2) - \mu_1(B_1) = \mu_2(B_2) - \mu_2(B_1) = \mu_2(B_2 \setminus B_1)$$

so  $B_2 \setminus B_1 \in \mathcal{D}$ . Finally take  $B_n \uparrow B$ ,  $B_n \in \mathcal{D}$ . This implies  $B \setminus B_n \downarrow \emptyset$  and (by Example sheet)  $\mu_i(B \setminus B_n) \rightarrow \mu_i(\emptyset) = 0$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . This implies for  $\mu_i(B) < \infty$  that  $\mu_i(B_n) \rightarrow \mu_i(B)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  for both  $i = 1, 2$ . But then

$$\mu_1(B) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_1(B_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_2(B_n) = \mu_2(B)$$

and so  $B \in \mathcal{D}$ , and thus  $\mathcal{D}$  is a d-system.  $\square$

**Remark:** the above theorem applies to finite measures  $\mu$  such that  $\mu(E) < \infty$ . The above theorem extends (as we will see) to  $\sigma$ -finite measures  $\mu$  for which  $E = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E_n$  such that  $\mu(E_n) < \infty$ .

## Borel- $\sigma$ -algebras

**Definition.** Let  $E$  be a topological space (Hausdorff, or metric space). The  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by  $\mathcal{A} = \{B \subseteq E : B \text{ is open}\}$  is called the *Borel- $\sigma$ -algebra*, denoted by  $\mathcal{B}(E)$ , or just  $\mathcal{B}$  when  $E = \mathbb{R}$ . Elements of  $\mathcal{B}(E)$  are the Borel subsets of  $E$ . A measure  $\mu$  on  $(E, \mathcal{B}(E))$  is called a *Borel measure on  $E$* . A *Radon* measure  $\mu$  is a Borel measure such that  $\mu(K) < \infty$  for all  $K \subseteq E$  compact (closed in Hausdorff spaces, hence measurable).

## Construction of Lebesgue measure

We will (eventually) construct a unique Borel measure  $\mu$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  such that

$$\mu\left(\prod_{i=1}^d [a_i, b_i]\right) = \prod_{i=1}^d |b_i - a_i|, \quad a_i < b_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, d$$

We will do  $d = 1$  first.

**Theorem.** *There exists a unique Borel measure (called the Lebesgue measure)  $\mu$  on  $\mathbb{R}$  such that*

$$\mu((a, b]) = b - a, \quad \forall a < b \quad (\dagger)$$

*Proof.* Consider the collection  $\mathcal{A}$  of subsets of  $\mathbb{R}$  of the form

$$A = (a_1, b_1] \cup \dots \cup (a_n, b_n]$$

(intervals pairwise disjoint) which form a ring ( $\emptyset = ((a, a])$ , unions and differences are clear), which generates (Example sheet) generates the same  $\sigma$ -algebra on the open such intervals, and open intervals with rational endpoints generate  $\mathcal{B}$ , so  $\sigma(\mathcal{A}) \supseteq \mathcal{B}$ .

Define a set function  $\mu$  on  $\mathcal{A}$  by

$$\mu(A) = \sum_{i=1}^n (b_i - a_i)$$

$\mu$  is clearly additive, and well-defined since if  $A = \bigcup_j C_j$  and  $A = \bigcup_k D_k$  for distinct disjoint unions, then  $C_j = \bigcup_k (C_j \cap D_k)$  and  $D_k = \bigcup_j (D_k \cap C_j)$ , so

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(A) &= \mu\left(\bigcup_j C_j\right) = \sum_j \mu(C_j) = \sum_j \mu\left(\bigcup_k (C_j \cap D_k)\right) \\ &= \sum_{j,k} \mu(C_j \cap D_k) = \dots = \mu\left(\bigcup_k D_k\right) = \mu(A) \end{aligned}$$

by additivity of  $\mu$ . Now to prove existence of  $\mu$ , we apply Caratheodory's theorem and need to check that  $\mu$  is countably additive on  $\mathcal{A}$ . By the Example sheet, it suffices to show that for all  $A_n \in \mathcal{A}$  such that  $A_n \downarrow \emptyset$  we have  $\mu(A_n) \rightarrow 0$ .

Assume this is not the case, so there exists some  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $B_n \in \mathcal{A}$  such that  $B_n \downarrow \emptyset$  but  $\mu(B_n) \geq 2\varepsilon$  for all  $n$ . We can approximate  $B_n$  from within by  $C_n = \bigcup_{i=1}^{N_n} \left(a_{n_i} + \frac{\varepsilon 2^{-n}}{N_n}, b_{n_i}\right] \in \mathcal{A}$  such that  $\mu(B_n \setminus C_n) = \varepsilon 2^{-n} \cdot \frac{N_n}{N_n} = \varepsilon 2^{-n}$ .

Now since  $B_n \downarrow$ , we have  $B_N = \bigcap_{n \leq N} B_n$  and

$$B_N \setminus (C_1 \cap \dots \cap C_N) = B_N \cap \left(\bigcup_{n \leq N} C_n^c\right) = \bigcup_{n \leq N} B_N \setminus C_n \subseteq \bigcup_{n \leq N} B_n \setminus C_n$$

Hence since  $\mu$  is increasing

$$\mu(B_N \setminus (C_1 \cap \dots \cap C_N)) \leq \mu\left(\bigcup_{n \leq N} B_n \setminus C_n\right) \leq \sum_{n \leq N} \mu(B_n \setminus C_n) \leq \varepsilon$$

Hence the “length” of what was removed  $(C_1 \cap \dots \cap C_N)$  must be at least  $\varepsilon$ , i.e

$$\mu(C_1 \cap \dots \cap C_N) \geq \varepsilon > 0$$



This means that  $C_1 \cap \dots \cap C_N$  is non-empty for all  $N$ , and so is

$$K_N = \overline{C_1} \cap \dots \cap \overline{C_N}$$

( $\overline{C_i}$  denotes the closure of  $C_i$ ) Thus  $K_N$  is a nested sequence of non-empty closed intervals, so  $\emptyset \neq \bigcap_N K_N$ . But  $K_N \subseteq \overline{C_N} \subseteq B_N$ , so  $\emptyset \neq \bigcap_N K_N \subseteq \bigcap_N B_n = \emptyset$ , a contradiction. So a measure  $\mu$  satisfying  $(\dagger)$  must exist.

For uniqueness, suppose  $\mu, \lambda$  measures such that  $(\dagger)$  holds, and define  $\mu_n(A) = \mu(A \cap (n, n+1])$ ,  $\lambda(A) = \lambda(A \cap (n, n+1])$  for  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ , which are finite measures such that  $\mu_n(E) = 1 = \lambda_n(E)$  and  $\mu_n = \lambda_n$  on the  $\pi$ -system  $\mathcal{A}$ . So by the uniqueness theorem, we must have  $\mu_n = \lambda_n$  on  $\mathcal{B}$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(A) &= \mu\left(\bigcup_n A \cap (n, n+1]\right) = \sum_n \mu(A \cap (n, n+1]) = \sum_n \mu_n(A) \\ &= \sum_n \lambda_n(A) = \dots = \lambda(A) \end{aligned}$$

so  $\lambda = \mu$ . □

**Remarks:**

1. a set  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  is called a Lebesgue null set if  $\mu(B) = 0$ . Can write  $\{x\} = \bigcap_n (x - \frac{1}{n}, x]$  and so  $\mu(\{x\}) = \lim_n \frac{1}{n} = 0$ . In particular  $\mu((a, b)) = \mu((a, b]) = \mu([a, b])$ , and any countable set  $Q$  satisfies  $\mu(Q) = \mu\left(\bigcup_{q \in Q} \{q\}\right) = \sum_{q \in Q} \mu(\{q\}) = 0$ . But there exist  $C$  uncountable (and measurable) in  $\mathcal{B}$  such that  $\mu(C) = 0$  [Cantor set].
2. Translation invariance of  $\mu$ : let  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , then  $B + x = \{b + x : b \in B\}$  is in  $\mathcal{B}$  whenever  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  and we can define

$$\mu_x(B) = \mu(B + x)$$

and by uniqueness in the preceding theorem

$$\mu_x((a, b]) = \mu((a + x, b + x]) = (b + x) - (a + x) = b - a$$

so  $\mu_x = \mu$ .

3. Lebesgue-measurable sets: in the extension theorem,  $\mu$  was assigned on the class  $\mathcal{M}$ , which can be shown (Example sheet) to equal

$$\mathcal{M} = \{M = A \cup N : A \in \mathcal{B}, N \subseteq B \in \mathcal{B} \text{ s.t. } \mu(B) = 0\}$$