

# 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  $\mathcal{M}$  its 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

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

## Existence of non-measurable sets

Consider  $E = (0, 1]$  with addition “+” modulo 1, and Lebesgue measure  $\mu$  is still translation invariant modulo 1.

Consider the subgroup  $Q = E \cap \mathbb{Q}$  of  $E$  and declare  $x \sim y$  if  $x - y \in Q$ . This gives equivalence classes  $[x] = \{y \in E : x \sim y\}$  on  $E$ . Assuming the axiom of choice, we can select a representative of  $[x]$ , and denote by  $S$  the set of selections running over all equivalence classes. Then we can partition  $E$  into the union of its cosets,

$$E = \bigcup_{q \in Q} (S + q)$$

a disjoint union.

Assume  $S$  is a Borel set (in  $\mathcal{B}(E)$ ), then  $S + q$  is also a Borel set for all  $q \in Q$ , and we can write (by countable additivity and translation invariance)

$$1 = \mu(E) = \mu\left(\bigcup_{q \in Q} (S + q)\right) = \sum_{q \in Q} \mu(S + q) = \sum_{q \in Q} \mu(S)$$

which is a contradiction. So  $S \notin \mathcal{B}(E)$ .

One can further show that  $\mu$  cannot extend to  $\mathcal{P}(E)$ ,

**Theorem** (Banach, Kuretwski). *Assuming the continuum hypothesis, there exists no measure on  $([0, 1])$  such that  $\mu((0, 1]) = 1$  and  $\mu(\{x\}) = 0$  for all  $x \in (0, 1]$ .*

*Proof.* Not given [see Dudley, 2002]. □

## Probability Spaces

If  $(E, \mathcal{E}, \mu)$  (a measure space) is such that  $\mu(E) = 1$ , we often call it a *probability space* and write  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ , where  $\Omega$  is the set of outcomes/the sample space;  $\mathcal{F}$  is the set of events and  $\mathbb{P}$  is the probability measure.

The axioms of probability theory (Kolmogorov, 1933) are

1.  $\mathbb{P}(\Omega) = 1$
2.  $0 \leq \mathbb{P}(E) \leq 1, \forall E \in \mathcal{F}$
3. If  $(A_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$  are disjoint,  $A_n \in \mathcal{F}$ , then  $\mathbb{P}(\bigcup_n A_n) = \sum_n \mathbb{P}(A_n)$  [so  $\mathbb{P}$  is a measure on a  $\sigma$ -algebra]

We further say that  $(A_i : i \in I)$  are *independent* if for all  $J \subseteq I$  finite, we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \bigcap_{j \in J} A_j \right) = \prod_{j \in J} \mathbb{P}(A_j)$$

We further say  $\sigma$ -algebras  $(\mathcal{A}_i : i \in I)$  are *independent* if for any  $A_j \in \mathcal{A}_j$ ,  $j \in J$ ,  $J \subseteq I$  finite, the  $A_j$ 's are independent.

**Proposition.** Let  $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2$  be  $\pi$ -systems of sets in  $\mathcal{F}$ , and suppose  $\mathbb{P}(A_1 \cap A_2) = \mathbb{P}(A_1)\mathbb{P}(A_2)$  for all  $A_1 \in \mathcal{A}_1$ ,  $A_2 \in \mathcal{A}_2$ . Then the  $\sigma$ -algebras  $\sigma(\mathcal{A}_1), \sigma(\mathcal{A}_2)$  are independent.

*Proof.* Exercise. □

### The Borel-Cantelli Lemmas

For a sequence  $(A_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$ ,  $A_n \in \mathcal{F}$ , define

$$\limsup_n A_n = \bigcap_n \bigcup_{m \geq n} A_m = \{A_n \text{ infinitely often "i.o."}\}$$

$$\liminf_n A_n = \bigcup_n \bigcap_{m \geq n} A_m = \{A_n \text{ eventually}\}$$

**Lemma** (1st Borel-Cantelli Lemma). *If  $A_n \in \mathcal{F}$  are such that  $\sum_n \mathbb{P}(A_n) < \infty$  then  $\mathbb{P}(A_n \text{ i.o.}) = 0$*

*Proof.*

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \bigcap_n \bigcup_{m \geq n} A_m \right) \leq \mathbb{P} \left( \bigcup_{m \geq n} A_m \right) \leq \sum_{m \geq n} \mathbb{P}(A_m) \rightarrow 0$$

□

**Remark:** the proof actually works for any measure  $\mu$ .

**Lemma** (2nd Borel-Cantelli Lemma). *Suppose  $A_n \in \mathcal{F}$  are independent and  $\sum_n \mathbb{P}(A_n) = \infty$ . Then  $\mathbb{P}(A_n \text{ i.o.}) = 1$ .*

*Proof.* By independence, for any  $N \geq n$  and using  $1 - a \leq e^{-a}$ ,

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \bigcap_{m=n}^N A_m^c \right) = \prod_{m=n}^N (1 - \mathbb{P}(A_m)) \leq \exp \left( - \sum_{m=n}^N \mathbb{P}(A_m) \right) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty$$

Since  $\bigcap_{m=n}^N A_m^c \downarrow \bigcap_{m \geq n} A_m^c$ , by countable additivity we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \bigcap_{m \geq n} A_m^c \right) = 0$$

But then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(A_n \text{ i.o.}) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_n \bigcap_{m \geq n} A_m\right) = 1 - \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_n \bigcap_{m \geq n} A_m^c\right) \\ &\geq 1 - \sum_n \underbrace{\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{m \geq n} A_m^c\right)}_{=0} = 1\end{aligned}$$

□

## 2 Measurable functions

Let  $(E, \mathcal{E})$ ,  $(G, \mathcal{G})$  be measurable spaces and let  $f : E \rightarrow G$ . We say that  $f$  is  $\mathcal{E}$ - $\mathcal{G}$ -measurable if  $f^{-1}(A) \in \mathcal{E}$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{G}$ . If  $G = \mathbb{R}$  with  $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ , we just say  $f : (E, \mathcal{E}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is *measurable*.

Moreover, if  $E$  is a topological space and  $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{B}(E)$ , we say  $f$  is *Borel measurable*.

Preimages preserve set operations:  $f^{-1}(\bigcup_i A_i) = \bigcup_i f^{-1}(A_i)$  and  $f^{-1}(G \setminus A) = E \setminus f^{-1}(A)$ , which implies that  $\{f^{-1}(A) : A \in \mathcal{G}\}$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra over  $E$ , and likewise  $\{A : f^{-1}(A) \in \mathcal{E}\}$  is also a  $\sigma$ -algebra over  $G$ .

This implies that if  $\mathcal{A}$  is a collection of subsets of  $G$  generating  $\mathcal{G}$  and such that  $f^{-1}(A) \in \mathcal{E}$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ , then  $\{A : f^{-1}(A) \in \mathcal{E}\}$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra containing  $\mathcal{A}$ , and hence  $\mathcal{G}$ . In particular, it suffices to check  $f^{-1}(A) \in \mathcal{E}$ ,  $\forall A \in \mathcal{A}$  to conclude that  $f$  is measurable.

If  $f$  takes real values, then

$$\mathcal{A} = \{(-\infty, y] : y \in \mathbb{R}\}$$

generates  $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$  (Example sheet), and so  $f$  will be measurable whenever  $f^{-1}((-\infty, y]) = \{x \in E : f(x) \leq y\} \in \mathcal{E}$  for all  $y \in \mathbb{R}$ . Moreover, if  $E$  is a topological space with  $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{B}(E)$ , then if  $f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is continuous, it is Borel measurable.

The indicator function

$$1_A(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{when } x \in A \\ 0 & \text{when } x \notin A \end{cases}$$

is measurable if and only if  $A \in \mathcal{E}$ .

One shows that compositions of measurable maps are measurable, and so are  $f_1 + f_2$ ,  $f_1 \cdot f_2$ ,  $\inf_n f_n$ ,  $\liminf_n f_n$ ,  $\limsup_n f_n$  whenever the  $f_n$  are.

Moreover, given a collection of maps  $\{f_i : E \rightarrow (G, \mathcal{G}), i \in I\}$  we can make them all measurable for

$$\sigma(f_i^{-1}(A) : A \in \mathcal{G}, i \in I)$$

**Theorem** (Monotone class theorem). *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a  $\pi$ -system generating the  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{E}$  over  $E$ . Let further  $\mathcal{V}$  be a vector space of bounded maps from  $E$  to  $\mathbb{R}$  such that*

1.  $1_E \in \mathcal{V}$ ,  $1_A \in \mathcal{V}$ ,  $\forall A \in \mathcal{A}$ .
2. If  $f$  is bounded and  $f_n \in \mathcal{V}$  is such that  $0 \leq f_n \uparrow f$  pointwise on  $E$ , then  $f \in \mathcal{V}$ .

Then  $\mathcal{V}$  contains all bounded measurable  $f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .

*Proof.* Define  $\mathcal{D} = \{A \in \mathcal{E} : 1_A \in \mathcal{V}\}$ . By hypothesis,  $\mathcal{D}$  contains the  $\pi$ -system  $\mathcal{A}$  and we now show it is also a  $d$ -system, so by Dynkin's lemma,  $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{D}$ . Indeed,  $E \in \mathcal{D}$  since  $1_E \in \mathcal{V}$  by hypothesis. Also if  $A \subseteq B$ ,  $A, B \in \mathcal{D}$ , then  $1_{B \setminus A} = 1_B - 1_A \in \mathcal{V}$  as  $\mathcal{V}$  is a vector space. Finally, if  $A_n \in \mathcal{D}$  and  $A_n \uparrow A$ , then  $1_{A_n} \uparrow 1_A$  pointwise and so  $1_A \in \mathcal{V}$  by hypothesis, so  $A \in \mathcal{D}$ . In particular  $A \in \mathcal{V}$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{E}$ .

Let now  $f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be bounded, non-negative and measurable. Define

$$f_n = \sum_{j=0}^{n2^n} \frac{j}{2^n} 1_{A_{n_j}}$$

where  $A_{n_j} = \{x \in E : \frac{j}{2^n} < f(x) \leq \frac{j+1}{2^n}\} = f^{-1}((\frac{j}{2^n}, \frac{j+1}{2^n}]) \in \mathcal{E}$  for  $j = 0, \dots, n2^n - 1$ , and  $A_{n_{n2^n}} = \{x \in E : f(x) > n\} = f^{-1}((n, \infty)) \in \mathcal{E}$ .

Clearly since  $f$  is bounded, for  $n > \|f\|_\infty$ , we see

$$f_n \leq f \leq f_n + 2^{-n}$$

so  $|f_n - f| \leq 2^{-n} \rightarrow 0$ . So by hypothesis  $f \in \mathcal{V}$ . For general  $f$  bounded and measurable, we can decompose  $f = f^+ - f^-$  where  $f^\pm \geq 0$ , and repeat the argument above.  $\square$

## Image Measures

If  $f : (E, \mathcal{E}) \rightarrow (G, \mathcal{G})$  is  $\mathcal{E}$ - $\mathcal{G}$  measurable, and  $\mu$  is a measure on  $\mathcal{E}$ , then the image measure  $\nu = \mu \circ f^{-1}$  is obtained from

$$\nu(A) = \mu(f^{-1}(A)), \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{G}$$

which is indeed a measure on  $\mathcal{G}$  (Example sheet).

**Lemma.** Let  $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a right-continuous, monotone increasing function, and set  $g(\pm\infty) = \lim_{z \rightarrow \pm\infty} g(z)$ . On  $I = (g(-\infty), g(\infty))$  define

$$f(x) = \inf\{y \in \mathbb{R} : x \leq g(y)\}, \quad x \in I$$

Then  $f$  is monotone increasing, left-continuous and

$$f(y) \leq y \iff x \leq g(y) \quad \forall x, y$$

*Proof.* Define  $J_x = \{y \in \mathbb{R} : x \leq g(y)\}$ . Since  $x > g(-\infty)$ ,  $J_x$  is non-empty and bounded below, so  $f(x) \in \mathbb{R}$ . Now if  $y \in J_x$  then  $y' \geq y$  implies  $y' \in J_x$  as well since  $g \uparrow$ . Moreover if  $y_n \downarrow y$ ,  $y_n \in J_x$ , then we can take limits in  $x \leq g(y_n)$  to see  $x \leq \lim_n g(y_n) = g(y)$  as  $g$  is right-continuous, so  $y \in J_x$ . We conclude that  $J_x = [f(x), \infty)$ , which shows the equivalence.

Moreover, if  $x \leq x'$ , then  $J_x \supseteq J_{x'}$  since  $g \uparrow$ . So by properties of the infimum  $f(x) \leq f(x')$ . Likewise if  $x_n \uparrow x$ , then  $J_x = \bigcap_n J_{x_n}$  so  $f(x_n) \rightarrow f(x)$  as  $x_n \rightarrow x$ .  $\square$

We call  $f$  the *generalised inverse of  $g$* .

**Theorem.** Let  $g$  be as in the above lemma. Then there exists a unique Radon measure  $\mu_g$  on  $\mathbb{R}$  such that  $\mu_g((a, b]) = g(b) - g(a)$  for all  $a < b$ . Every Radon measure on  $\mathbb{R}$  can be obtained in this way.

*Proof.* For  $f$  as defined in the previous lemma, note that for all  $z \in \mathbb{R}$

$$f^{-1}((-\infty, z]) = \{x : f(x) \leq z\} = \{x : x \leq g(y)\} = (g(-\infty), g(z)] \in \mathcal{B}(I)$$

Where the 2nd equality follows again from the lemma. So  $f$  is  $\mathcal{B}\text{-}\mathcal{B}(I)$  measurable, and the image measure  $\mu \circ f^{-1} = \mu_g$ , where  $\mu$  is the Lebesgue measure on  $I$ , exists.

Then for  $-\infty < a < b < \infty$  we have

$$\mu_g((a, b]) = \mu(f^{-1}((a, b])) = \mu(x \in I : a < f(x) \leq b) = \mu((g(a), g(b)]) = g(b) - g(a)$$

Which uniquely determines  $\mu_g$  by the same arguments as for the Lebesgue measure on  $\mathbb{R}$ . (Since  $g$  maps into  $\mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mu_g$  is a Radon measure).

Conversely, let  $\nu$  be any Radon measure on  $\mathbb{R}$ , define

$$g(y) = \begin{cases} \nu((0, y]) & y \geq 0 \\ -\nu((y, 0]) & y < 0 \end{cases}$$

Which is clearly increasing in  $y$  (since  $\nu$  is increasing). If  $y_n \downarrow y$ , then  $(0, y_n] \downarrow (0, y]$  so  $g(y_n) \rightarrow g(y)$  since  $\nu$  is countably additive, so  $g$  is right-continuous. Finally (assuming  $a < 0 < b$ , the other cases are similar),

$$\nu((a, b]) = \nu((a, 0]) + \nu((0, b]) = -g(a) + g(b) = g(b) - g(a)$$

And by uniqueness as before, the result follows.  $\square$

**Remark:** The  $\mu_g$  are called Lebesgue-Stieltjes measures, with Stieltjes distribution  $g$ .

For example, the Dirac measure  $\delta_x$  at  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , defined by

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

Which has Stieltjes distribution  $g = 1_{[x, \infty)}$ .

## Random Variables

Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  be a probability space, and  $(E, \mathcal{E})$  a measurable space.

**Definition.** An  $E$ -valued random variable  $X$  is any  $\mathcal{F}$ - $\mathcal{E}$  measurable map

$$X : \Omega \rightarrow E$$

When  $E = \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^d$  (with Borel  $\sigma$ -algebras) we call  $X$  a *random variable*, or random vector. The *law* or *distribution*  $\mu_X$  of a random variable is given by  $\mu_X = \mathbb{P} \circ X^{-1}$  (the image measure) with, for  $E = \mathbb{R}$  distribution function

$$F_X(z) = \mu_X((-\infty, z]) = \mathbb{P}(X^{-1}((-\infty, z])) = \mathbb{P}(\omega \in \Omega : X(\omega) \leq z) = \mathbb{P}(X \leq z)$$

which uniquely determines  $\mu_X$ .

Using properties of measures one shows that any distribution function satisfies

1.  $F_X \uparrow$
2.  $F_X$  is right-continuous
3.  $\lim_{z \rightarrow -\infty} F_X(z) = \mu_X(\emptyset) = 0$  and  $\lim_{z \rightarrow \infty} F_X(z) = \mu_X(\mathbb{R}) = \mathbb{P}(\Omega) = 1$

Given any distribution function  $F_X$  satisfying 1,2 & 3, we can on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}) = ((0, 1), \mathcal{B}(0, 1), \mu)$ , where  $\mu$  is the Lebesgue measure obtain a random variable  $X : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$X(\omega) = \inf\{x : \omega \leq F_X(x)\}$$

with distribution function  $F_X$ .



**Definition.** A countable collection  $(X_i : (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P} \rightarrow (E, \mathcal{E}))$  of random variables is said to be *independent* whenever the  $\sigma$ -algebras  $\sigma(X_i^{-1}(A) : A \in \mathcal{E})$  are independent. For  $(E, \mathcal{E}) = (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B})$  one shows (Example sheet) that this is equivalent (for  $I = \{1, \dots, n\}$ ) to

$$\mathbb{P}(X_1 \leq x_1, \dots, X_n \leq x_n) = \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}(X_i \leq x_i), \quad \forall x_i \in \mathbb{R}$$

We now construct on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}) = ((0, 1), \mathcal{B}, \mu|_{(0,1)})$  with  $\mu|_{(0,1)}$  the Lebesgue measure on  $(0, 1)$  an infinite sequence of independent random variables with prescribed distribution functions  $F_n$ .

Any  $\omega \in (0, 1)$  has a binary representation  $(\omega_i) \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ , where  $\omega = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \omega_i 2^{-i}$ , which is unique if we exclude sequences which terminate with infinitely many 0's (so rationals end in a sequence of 1's). Then we can define  $R_n(\omega) = \omega_n$  ("Radenmacher functions"), which are of the form

$$\begin{aligned} R_1(\omega) &= 1_{(1/2, 1)} \\ R_2(\omega) &= 1_{(1/4, 1/2]} + 1_{(3/4, 1)} \\ R_3(\omega) &= 1_{(1/8, 1/4]} + 1_{(3/8, 1/2]} + 1_{(5/8, 3/4]} + 1_{(7/8, 1)} \end{aligned}$$

So the  $R_n$  are random variables such that  $\mathbb{P}(R_n = 1) = \frac{1}{2} = \mathbb{P}(R_n = 0)$ , so the  $R_n$  are Bernoulli for all  $n$ . Moreover for  $(x_i)_{i=1}^n \in \{0, 1\}^n$

$$\mathbb{P}(R_1 = x_1, \dots, R_n = x_n) = 2^{-n} = \underbrace{\mathbb{P}(R_1 = x_1) \dots \mathbb{P}(R_n = x_n)}_{\frac{1}{2}}$$

So the  $R_n$  are all independent. Now take a bijection  $m : \mathbb{N}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  and define  $Y_{nk} = R_{m(n,k)}$  which are again independent and define

$$Y_n = \sum_k 2^{-k} Y_{nk}$$

which converge for all  $\omega \in \Omega$  since  $|Y_{nk}| \leq 1$  are still independent. To determine the law of  $Y_n$  we consider the  $\pi$ -system of intervals  $(\frac{i}{2^m}, \frac{i+1}{2^m}]$ ,  $i = 0, \dots, 2^m - 1$ ,  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , with dyadic endpoints, which generate  $\mathcal{B}$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(Y_n \in \left(\frac{i}{2^m}, \frac{i+1}{2^m}\right]\right) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{i}{2^m} < \sum_k 2^{-k} Y_{nk} \leq \frac{i+1}{2^m}\right) = 2^{-m} \\ &= \mu|_{(0,1)}\left(\left(\frac{i}{2^m}, \frac{i+1}{2^m}\right]\right) \end{aligned}$$

so the law  $\mu_{Y_n} = \mu|_{(0,1)}$  by the uniqueness theorem, and so the  $Y_n$ 's are an infinite sequence of independent uniform random variables. Now if  $F_n$  are probability distribution functions (satisfy axioms 1-3 from earlier), then taking the generalised inverse  $f_n = F_n^{-1}$  from the lemma, we see that the  $F_n^{-1}(Y_n)$  are independent and have distribution function  $F_n$ .

## Convergence of measurable functions

**Definition.** We say that a property defining a set  $A \in \mathcal{E}$  holds  $\mu$ -almost everywhere if  $\mu(A^c) = 0$  for a measure  $\mu$  on  $\mathcal{E}$ . If  $\mu = \mathbb{P}$ , we say it holds  $\mathbb{P}$ -almost surely, or with probability 1, if  $\mathbb{P}(A) = 1$ .

If  $f_n, f$  are measurable maps on  $(E, \mathcal{E}|_\mu)$  we say  $f_n \rightarrow f$   $\mu$ -almost always if

$$\mu(x \in E : f_n(x) \not\rightarrow f(x) \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty) = 0$$

We say  $f_n \rightarrow f$  in  $\mu$ -measure if for all  $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\mu(x \in E : |f_n(x) - f(x)| > \varepsilon) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

For random variables say  $X_n \rightarrow X$   $\mathbb{P}$ -almost surely or  $X_n \rightarrow X$  in  $\mathbb{P}$ -probability respectively.

If  $E = \mathbb{R}$ , we say  $X_n \xrightarrow{d} X$  in distribution if  $\mathbb{P}(X_n \leq x) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(X \leq x)$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $x \mapsto \mathbb{P}(X \leq x)$  is continuous. One shows  $X_n \xrightarrow{P} X$  implies  $X_n \xrightarrow{d} X$ .

**Theorem.** Let  $f_n : (E, \mathcal{E}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be measurable functions.

1. If  $\mu(E) < \infty$ , then whenever  $f_n \rightarrow 0$  a.e (almost everywhere) we have  $f_n \rightarrow 0$  in measure.
2. If  $f_n \rightarrow 0$  in measure, then  $f_{n_k} \rightarrow 0$  a.e along some subsequence  $n_k$ .

*Proof.*

1. For all  $\varepsilon > 0$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(|f_n| \leq \varepsilon) &\geq \mu\left(\bigcap_{m \geq n} \underbrace{\{|f_m| \leq \varepsilon\}}_{:= A_m}\right) \\ &\uparrow \mu\left(\bigcup_n \bigcap_{m \geq n} A_m\right) \\ &= \mu(|f_n| \leq \varepsilon \text{ eventually}) \\ &\geq \mu(f_n \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty) \\ &= \mu(E) \end{aligned}$$

so  $\liminf_n \mu(|f_n| \leq \varepsilon) \geq \mu(E)$ . So we see  $\limsup_n \mu(|f_n| > \varepsilon) \leq \mu(E) - \mu(E) = 0$ , so  $\mu(|f_n| > \varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  as desired.

2. By hypothesis, for all  $\varepsilon > 0$   $\mu(|f_n| > \frac{1}{k}) < \varepsilon$  for  $n$  large enough. So choosing  $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{k^2}$  we see that along some subsequence  $n_k$  we have  $\mu(|f_{n_k}| > \frac{1}{k}) \leq \frac{1}{k^2}$  so

$$\sum_k \mu(|f_{n_k}| > \frac{1}{k}) < \infty$$

and by the 1st Borel-Cantelli Lemma, we have  $\mu(|f_{n_k}| > \frac{1}{k} \text{ i.o.}) = 0$ , so  $f_{n_k} \rightarrow 0$  a.e.

□

**Remarks:** (1) is false if  $\mu(E) = \infty$ , as the example  $1_{(n,\infty)}$  on  $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ ,  $\mu$  Lebesgue measure shows. (2) is false without restricting to subsequences: take  $A_n$  independent such that  $\mathbb{P}(A_n) = \frac{1}{n}$  then  $1_{A_n} \rightarrow 0$  in  $\mathbb{P}$ -probability since  $\mathbb{P}(1_{A_n} > \varepsilon) = \mathbb{P}(A_n) = \frac{1}{n} \rightarrow 0$  but  $\sum_n \mathbb{P}(A_n) = \infty$ , so by the 2nd Borel-Cantelli Lemma,  $\mathbb{P}(1_{A_n} > \varepsilon \text{ i.o.}) = 1$ , so  $1_{A_n} \not\rightarrow 0$  a.s.

**Example.** Let  $(X_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$  be independent and identically distributed (iid) exponential random variables with  $\mathbb{P}(X_1 \leq x) = 1 - e^{-x}$ ,  $x \geq 0$ . Define  $A_n = \{X_n \geq \alpha \log n\}$ ,  $\alpha > 0$ , s.t  $\mathbb{P}(A_n) = n^{-\alpha}$  and  $\sum_n \mathbb{P}(A_n) < \infty$  if and only if  $\alpha > 1$ . So by the Borel-Cantelli lemmas, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{X_n}{\log n} \geq 1 \text{ i.o.}\right) = 1$$

while

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{X_n}{\log n} \geq 1 + \varepsilon \text{ i.o.}\right) = 0 \quad \forall \varepsilon > 0$$

So  $\limsup_n \frac{X_n}{\log n} = 1$  almost surely.

### Kolmogorov's 0-1 Law

For  $(X_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$  random variables, define  $\mathcal{T} = \sigma(X_{n+1}, X_{n+2}, \dots)$  and set  $\mathcal{T} = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{T}_n$ , the “tail  $\sigma$ -algebra” which contains all events in  $\mathcal{F}$  which depend only on the limiting behaviour of the sequence.

**Theorem.** For  $(X_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$  independent random variables, if  $A \in \mathcal{T}$  then  $\mathbb{P}(A) = 1$  or  $\mathbb{P}(A) = 0$ . Moreover if  $Y : (\Omega, \mathcal{T}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B})$  is measurable, then  $Y$  is constant almost surely.

*Proof.* Define  $\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma(X_1, \dots, X_n)$  which is a  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by the  $\pi$ -system of sets

$$A = (X_1 \leq x_1, \dots, X_n \leq x_n), \quad x_i \in \mathbb{R}$$

and note that the  $\pi$ -system of sets

$$B = (X_{n+1} \leq x_{n+1}, \dots, X_{n+k} \leq x_{n+k}), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}, \quad x_i \in \mathbb{R}$$

generates  $\mathcal{T}_n$ . By independence of  $X_n$ ,  $\mathbb{P}(A \cap B) = \mathbb{P}(A)\mathbb{P}(B)$ , so by the theorem from earlier we see that  $\mathcal{T}_n$  and  $\mathcal{F}_n$  are independent. If we set  $\mathcal{F}_\infty = \sigma(X_1, X_2, \dots)$ , then  $\bigcup_n \mathcal{F}_n$  is a  $\pi$ -system generating  $\mathcal{F}_\infty$ , and if  $A \in \bigcup_n \mathcal{F}_n$ , there exists  $\bar{n}$  such that  $B \in \mathcal{T}_{\bar{n}}$  is independent of  $A$ , in particular  $A$  is independent of elements in  $\mathcal{T} = \bigcap_{\bar{n}} \mathcal{T}_{\bar{n}}$ , hence as before  $\mathcal{F}_\infty$  is independent of  $\mathcal{T}$ . But clearly  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{F}_\infty$ , so if  $A \in \mathcal{T}$  it is independent to  $A \in \mathcal{F}_\infty$ ! Now  $\mathbb{P}(A) = \mathbb{P}(A \cap A) = \mathbb{P}(A)^2$ , so  $\mathbb{P}(A) = 0$  or  $1$ . Finally, if  $Y$  is  $\mathcal{T}$  measurable, then  $\{Y \leq y\}$  lies in  $\mathcal{T}$  for all  $y$ , hence have probability 1 or 0. Then let

$$c = \inf\{y : F_Y(y) = 1\}$$

so  $Y = c$  almost surely. □

## 3 Integration

For  $f : (E, \mathcal{E}, \mu) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  measurable or “integrable” we will define the integral with respect to  $\mu$ :

$$\mu(f) = \int_E f d\mu = \int_E f(x) d\mu(x)$$

and if  $X$  is a random variable, we define its (“mathematical”) expectation as

$$\mathbb{E}X = \int_{\Omega} X d\mathbb{P} = \int_{\Omega} X(\omega) d\mathbb{P}(\omega)$$

To start, call  $f : (E, \mathcal{E}, \mu) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  *simple* if it is of the form

$$f = \sum_{k=1}^m a_k 1_{A_k}, \quad a_k \geq 0, \quad A_k \in \mathcal{E}, \quad m \in \mathbb{N}$$

We define its  $\mu$ -integral to be

$$\mu(f) = \sum_{k=1}^m a_k \mu(A_k)$$

which is well-defined (Example sheet) and it satisfies the following properties:

1.  $\mu(\alpha f + \beta g) = \alpha \mu(f) + \beta \mu(g)$  for all  $\alpha, \beta \geq 0$  and  $f, g$  simple
2. If  $g \leq f$  then  $\mu(g) \leq \mu(f)$
3. If  $f = 0$  almost everywhere  $\mu(f)$

For general  $f : (E, \mathcal{E}, \mu) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  non-negative, we define its  $\mu$ -integral as

$$\mu(f) = \sup\{\mu(g) : g \leq f, \text{ } g \text{ simple}\}$$

which is consistent with the definition for simple functions, and takes values in  $[0, \infty]$ .

For  $f : (E, \mathcal{E}, \mu) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  measurable (but not necessarily non-negative), we define  $f^+ = \max(f, 0)$ ,  $f^- = \max(-f, 0)$ , so that  $f = f^+ - f^-$  and  $|f| = f^+ + f^-$ . We say that  $f$  is  $\mu$ -integrable if  $\mu(|f|) < \infty$ . In this case we define

$$\mu(f) = \mu(f^+) - \mu(f^-)$$

which is well-defined (i.e not  $\infty - \infty$ ).

**Theorem** (Monotone Convergence Theorem). *Let  $f_n, f : (E, \mathcal{E}, \mu) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be measurable and non-negative such that  $0 \leq f_n \uparrow f$  (i.e  $f_n(x) \leq f_{n+1}(x) \leq f(x)$  and  $f_n(x) \rightarrow f(x)$  for all  $x \in E$ ). Then  $\mu(f_n) \rightarrow \mu(f)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .*

**Remark:** if we take the approximating sequence  $\tilde{f}_n (= \min(2^{-n} \lfloor 2^n f \rfloor, n))$  then  $0 \leq \tilde{f}_n \uparrow f$  so  $\mu(f) = \lim_n \mu(\tilde{f}_n)$ .

*Proof.* Recall  $\mu(f) = \sup\{\mu(g) : g \leq f, g \text{ simple}\}$ . Since  $0 \leq f_n \uparrow$  we have  $\mu(f_n) \uparrow \sup_n \mu(f_n) = M$ . But then since  $f_n \leq f$  we must have  $\mu(f_n) \leq \mu(f)$  so taking suprema  $M \leq \mu(f)$ , and if  $M < \infty$  we have  $\lim_n \mu(f_n) \leq \mu(f)$ .

We will now show  $\mu(g) \leq M$  for all simple functions  $g$  such that  $g \leq f$  so that taking suprema  $\mu(f) = \sup_g \mu(g) \leq M$  so  $\mu(f) = \lim_n \mu(f_n)$  follows.

We define  $g_n = \min(\bar{f}_n, g) = \bar{f}_n \wedge g$ , where  $\bar{f}_n$  is the approximation of  $f_n$  by simple functions from the monotone class theorem,  $[\bar{f}_n]_n = \bar{f}_n = \min(2^{-n} \lfloor 2^n f_n \rfloor, n)$ . Now since  $f_n \uparrow f$  we must have  $\bar{f}_n \uparrow f$  too, and so  $g_n \uparrow \min(f, g) = g$ , and since  $\bar{f}_n \leq f_n$  we also have  $g_n \leq f_n$  for all  $n$ .

Now let  $g$  be an arbitrary simple function, of the form

$$g = \sum_{k=1}^m a_k 1_{A_k}$$

with  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $a_k \geq 0$  and  $A_k \in \mathcal{E}$  disjoint (wlog). We define for  $\varepsilon > 0$  arbitrary

$$A_k(n) = \{x \in A_k : g_n(x) \geq (1 - \varepsilon)a_k\}$$

Since  $g = a_k$  on  $A_k$  and since  $g_n \uparrow g$ , we have  $A_k(n) \uparrow A_k$  for all  $k$ . Also since  $\mu$  is a measure, we must have  $\mu(A_k(n)) \uparrow \mu(A_k)$ . We have  $g_n 1_{A_k} \geq g_n 1_{A_k(n)} \geq (1 - \varepsilon)a_k 1_{A_k(n)}$  on  $E$ . Moreover

$$g_n = \sum_{k=1}^m g_n 1_{A_k}$$

since the  $A_k$ 's are disjoint and support  $g_n$  (if  $1_{A_n} = 0$  for all  $n$ , then  $g = 0$  and  $f_n = 0$ ). Now

$$\mu(g_n) = \sum_{k=1}^m \mu(g_n 1_{A_k}) \geq (1 - \varepsilon) \sum_{k=1}^m a_k \mu(A_k(n)) \uparrow (1 - \varepsilon) \sum_{k=1}^m a_k \mu(A_k) = (1 - \varepsilon) \mu(g)$$

So  $\mu(g) \leq \frac{1}{1 - \varepsilon} \limsup_n \mu(g_n) \leq \frac{1}{1 - \varepsilon} \limsup_n \mu(f_n) \leq \frac{M}{1 - \varepsilon}$ . Since  $\varepsilon$  was arbitrary we have  $\mu(g) \leq M$  as required.  $\square$

**Remarks:** we have shown  $\mu(f) = \mu(\lim_n f_n) = \lim_n \mu(f)$ , so we can interchange  $\int(\cdot)d\mu$  and the limit. If  $g_n \geq 0$ , then  $\mu(\sum_n g_n) = \sum_n \mu(g_n)$ . Moreover it suffices to require  $f_n \uparrow f$  almost everywhere and the  $f_n \geq 0$  hypothesis is not necessary as long as  $f_1$  is integrable (then just subtract  $f_1$  from all terms).

**Theorem.** Let  $f, g : (E, \mathcal{E}, \mu) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be measurable and non-negative. Then

1.  $\mu(\alpha f + \beta g) = \alpha \mu(f) + \beta \mu(g)$  for all  $\alpha, \beta \geq 0$
2. If  $g \leq f$  then  $\mu(g) \leq \mu(f)$

3.  $f = 0$  almost everywhere if and only if  $\mu(f) = 0$ .

*Proof.* If  $\tilde{f}_n, \tilde{g}_n$  are the approximations of  $f, g$  from the monotone class theorem, then  $\alpha\tilde{f}_n \uparrow \alpha f$ ,  $\beta\tilde{g}_n \uparrow \beta g$ ,  $\alpha\tilde{f}_n + \beta\tilde{g}_n \uparrow \alpha f + \beta g$ . And from earlier

$$\mu(\alpha\tilde{f}_n + \beta\tilde{g}_n) = \alpha\mu(\tilde{f}_n) + \beta\mu(\tilde{g}_n)$$

So taking limits the monotone convergence theorem implies

$$\mu(\alpha f + \beta g) = \alpha\mu(f) + \beta\mu(g)$$

(2) follows in a similar way. Now we show (3): if  $f = 0$  almost everywhere, then  $0 \leq \tilde{f}_n \leq f = 0$  a.e, so  $\tilde{f}_n = 0$  a.e for all  $n$ , so  $\mu(\tilde{f}_n) = 0$ , so  $\mu(\tilde{f}_n) \uparrow \mu(f) = 0$ . Conversely if  $\mu(f) = 0$  then  $0 \leq \mu(\tilde{f}) \uparrow \mu(f) = 0$  so  $\mu(\tilde{f}_n) = 0$  for all  $n$ , so  $\tilde{f}_n = 0$  a.e. Since  $0 \leq \tilde{f}_n \uparrow f$  we have that  $f = 0$  a.e.  $\square$

**Remark:** functions such as  $1_{\mathbb{Q}}$  have  $\mu(1_{\mathbb{Q}}) = 0$ , and are ‘identified’ with 0.

**Theorem.** Let  $f, g : (E, \mathcal{E}, \mu) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be integrable. Then

1.  $\mu(\alpha f + \beta g) = \alpha\mu(f) + \beta\mu(g)$  for all  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$
2.  $g \leq f$  implies  $\mu(g) \leq \mu(f)$
3. If  $f = 0$  almost everywhere then  $\mu(f) = 0$

*Proof.* Clearly if  $f$  is integrable, so is  $\alpha f$ , and  $\mu(-f) = -\mu(f)$ . And for  $\alpha \geq 0$ ,  $\mu(\alpha f) = \mu((\alpha f)^+) - \mu((\alpha f)^-) = \alpha\mu(f^+) - \alpha\mu(f^-) = \alpha\mu(f)$ . So we can restrict to  $\alpha = \beta = 1$ .

Define  $h = f + g = h^+ - h^- = f^+ - f^- + g^+ - g^-$ . This is the same as  $h^+ + f^- + g^- = h^- + f^+ + g^+$ , and all of these functions are non-negative. Hence by the previous theorem

$$\mu(h^+) + \mu(f^-) + \mu(g^-) = \mu(h^-) + \mu(f^+) + \mu(g^+)$$

so  $\mu(h) = \mu(f) + \mu(g)$  follows.

Now we show (2). Clearly  $0 \leq f - g$  so  $\mu(0) \leq \mu(f - g)$  by the previous theorem, and  $\mu(f - g) = \mu(f) - \mu(g)$  by (1) of this theorem.

Finally we show (3): if  $f = 0$  almost everywhere,  $f^+ = f^- = 0$  almost everywhere, so  $\mu(f) = \mu(f^+) - \mu(f^-) = 0 - 0$ .  $\square$

**Lemma (Fatou).** *Let  $f_n, f : (E, \mathcal{E}, \mu) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be measurable and non-negative. Then  $\mu(\liminf_n f_n) \leq \liminf_n \mu(f_n)$ .*

**Remark:** recall that for  $x_n \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\liminf_n x_n = \sup_n \inf_{m \geq n} x_m$$

$$\limsup_n x_n = \inf_n \sup_{m \geq n} x_m$$

In particular, if  $\limsup_n x_n = \liminf_n x_n$  then  $\lim_n x_n = \liminf_n x_n$ . Therefore if  $f = \lim_n f_n$  exists in Fatou's lemma, we have  $\mu(f) \leq \liminf_n \mu(f_n)$ .

*Proof.* We have  $\inf_{m \geq n} f_m \leq f_k$  for all  $k \geq n$ , and integrating this implies  $\mu(\inf_{m \geq n} f_m) \leq \mu(f_k)$  for all  $k \geq n$ . So

$$\mu(\inf_{m \geq n} f_m) \leq \mu(f_k)$$

$$\mu(\inf_{m \geq n} f_m) \leq \inf_{k \geq n} \mu(f_k) \leq \sup_n \inf_{k \geq n} \mu(f_k) = \liminf_n \mu(f_n)$$

Also,  $0 \leq \inf_{m \geq n} f_m \uparrow \sup_n \inf_{m \geq n} f_m$  so by the monotone convergence theorem

$$\mu(\liminf_n f_n) = \lim_n \mu(\inf_{m \geq n} f_m) \leq \liminf_n \mu(f_n)$$

□

**Theorem (Dominated convergence theorem).** *Let  $f_n, f : (E, \mathcal{E}, \mu) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be measurable such that  $|f_n| \leq g$  almost everywhere on  $E$  and  $g$  is  $\mu$ -integrable ( $\mu(g) < \infty$ ). Suppose  $f_n \rightarrow f$  pointwise (or almost everywhere) on  $E$ . Then  $f_n$  and  $f$  are integrable and  $\mu(f_n) \rightarrow \mu(f)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .*

*Proof.* Clearly  $\mu(|f_n|) \leq \mu(g) < \infty$  so the  $f_n$  are integrable and taking limits in  $|f_n| \leq g$  we have  $|f| \leq g$ , so  $\mu(|f|) < \infty$ .

Next

$$0 \leq g \pm f_n \xrightarrow{\text{ptws on } E} g \pm f$$

By Fatou's lemma

$$\mu(g) + \mu(f) = \mu(g + f) = \mu(\liminf_n (g + f_n)) \leq \liminf_n (\mu(g) + \mu(f_n)) = \mu(g) + \liminf_n \mu(f_n)$$

So  $\mu(f) \leq \liminf_n \mu(f_n)$ . Likewise

$$\mu(g) - \mu(f) = \mu(\liminf_n (g - f_n)) \leq \mu(g) - \limsup_n \mu(f_n)$$

So  $\limsup_n \mu(f_n) \leq \mu(f)$ . Therefore  $\limsup_n \mu(f_n) = \liminf_n \mu(f_n) = \lim_n \mu(f_n) = \mu(f)$ . □



**Example.** On  $E = [0, 1]$  with the Lebesgue measure, suppose  $f_n \rightarrow f$  pointwise and  $\sup_n \|f_n\|_\infty \leq g < \infty$ . Then since  $\mu(g) \leq g$  the dominated convergence theorem implies  $\mu(f_n) \rightarrow \mu(f)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  (no uniform convergence of  $f_n \rightarrow f$  required).

**Remark:** the proof of the Fundamental Theorem of Calculus (FTC) requires only  $\int_x^{x+h} dt = h$ . Therefore for any continuous  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

$$\underbrace{\int_0^x f(t) dt}_{\text{Riemann-integral}} = F(x) = \underbrace{\int_0^x f(t) d\mu(t)}_{\text{Lebesgue-integral}}, \quad x \in [0, 1]$$

So these integrals coincide for continuous maps.

One shows that all Riemann-integrable functions are  $\mu^*$ -measurable ( $\mu$  is Lebesgue measure) but that there exist Riemann-integrable functions that are not Borel measurable.

A bounded  $\mu^*$ -measurable function is Riemann-integrable if and only if

$$\mu(\{x \in [0, 1] : f \text{ is discontinuous at } x\}) = 0$$

All standard formulae for the Riemann-integral (substitution, integration, by parts etc) extend to all bounded measurable functions by the monotone class theorem (see Example sheet).

**Theorem.** Let  $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  be open,  $(E, \mathcal{E}, \mu)$  a measure space, and  $f : U \times E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that

- $x \mapsto f(t, x)$  for all  $t \in U$  is measurable
- $t \mapsto f(t, x)$  is differentiable for all  $x \in E$ , with  $\left| \frac{\partial f(t, x)}{\partial t} \right| \leq g(x)$  for all  $t \in U$  where  $g$  is  $\mu$ -integrable.

Then if

$$F(t) = \int_E f(t, x) d\mu(x)$$

we have

$$F'(t) = \int_E \frac{\partial f}{\partial t}(t, x) d\mu(x)$$

*Proof.* By the MVT

$$|g_h(x)| := \left| \frac{f(t+h, x) - f(t, x)}{h} - \frac{\partial f}{\partial t}(t, x) \right| = \left| \frac{\partial f(\tilde{t}, x)}{\partial t} - \frac{\partial f(t, x)}{\partial t} \right|$$

For some  $\tilde{t} \in U$ . SO  $|g_h(x)| \leq 2g(x)$  which is  $\mu$ -integrable. By differentiability, we have  $g_h \rightarrow 0$  as  $h \rightarrow 0$ , so applying the dominated convergence theorem,  $\mu(g_h) \rightarrow \mu(0) = 0$ , or by linearity of  $\mu$

$$\mu(g_h) = \frac{\int_E (f(t+h, x) - f(t, x)) d\mu(x)}{h} - \int_E \frac{\partial f}{\partial t}(t, x) d\mu(x)$$

$$= \frac{F(t+h) - F(t)}{h} - F'(t) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } h \rightarrow 0$$

□

### Integrals with respect to image measures

For  $f : (E, \mathcal{E}, \mu) \rightarrow (G, \mathcal{G})$  measurable,  $g : G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  measurable and non-negative, we have

$$\mu \circ f^{-1}(g) = \int_G g d\mu \circ f^{-1} = \int_E g(f(x)) d\mu(x) = \mu(g \circ f)$$

On a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ , and for a  $G$ -valued random variable  $X$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}g(X) = \mu_X(g) = \int_\Omega g(X(\omega)) d\mathbb{P}(\omega) = \int_\Omega g d\mathbb{P}$$

### Measures with densities

If  $f : (E, \mathcal{E}, \mu) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is measurable and non-negative, we can define  $\nu_f(A) = \mu(f1_A)$  for any  $A \in \mathcal{E}$ , which is again a measure (by the monotone convergence theorem), and if  $g : (E, \mathcal{E}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is measurable, then  $\nu_f(g) = \int_E g(x)f(x)d\mu(x) = \int_E g d\nu_f$ . We call  $f$  the density of  $\nu_f$  with respect to  $\mu$ .

### Product measures

Let  $(E_1, \mathcal{E}_1, \mu_1)$  and  $(E_2, \mathcal{E}_2, \mu_2)$  be finite measure spaces. On  $E = E_1 \times E_2$ , we consider the  $\pi$ -system of ‘rectangles’  $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1 \times A_2 : A_1 \in \mathcal{E}_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{E}_2\}$ , which generates the  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\sigma(\mathcal{A}) \equiv \mathcal{E}_1 \otimes \mathcal{E}_2 = \mathcal{E}$ .

If  $E_1, E_2$  are topological spaces with a countable base, then  $\mathcal{B}(E_1 \times E_2)$  for the product topology on  $E_1 \times E_2$  coincides with  $\mathcal{B}(E_1) \otimes \mathcal{B}(E_2)$  (see Dudley).

**Lemma.** *Let  $f : (E, \mathcal{E}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be measurable. Then for all  $x_1 \in E_1$  fixed the map  $x_2 \mapsto f(x_1, x_2)$  is  $\mathcal{E}_2$ -measurable.*

*Proof.* Define a vector space

$$\mathcal{V} = \{f : (E, \mathcal{E}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \text{ bounded and measurable, s.t Lemma holds}\}$$

This is indeed a vector space, and contains  $1_E, 1_A$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ , since  $1_A = 1_{A_1}(x_1)1_{A_2}(x_2)$  is  $\mathcal{E}_2$  measurable as  $A_2 \in \mathcal{E}_2$ . Next let  $0 \leq f_n \uparrow f$ ,  $f_n \in \mathcal{V}$ , then  $f(x_1, \cdot) = \lim_n f_n(x_1, \cdot)$  hence is  $\mathcal{E}_2$ -measurable as the limit of a sequence of measurable functions, so by the monotone class theorem,  $\mathcal{V}$  contains all bounded measurable functions. This extends to all  $f$  (not necessarily bounded) by taking  $\min(\max(-n, f), n) \in \mathcal{V}$ , which converges to  $f$ .  $\square$

**Lemma.** *Let  $f : (E, \mathcal{E}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be measurable, such that either*

1.  *$f$  is bounded or;*
2.  *$f \geq 0$*

*Then  $x_1 \mapsto \int_{E_2} f(x_1, x_2) d\mu_2(x_2)$  is  $\mathcal{E}_1$  measurable, and is (in the case of 1) bounded on  $E_1$ , (in the case of 2)  $\geq 0$ , respectively.*

**Remarks:** in 2, the mapping may evaluate to  $\infty$ , but  $\{x_1 \in E_1 : \int_{E_2} f(x_1, x_2) d\mu(x_2) = \infty\} \in \mathcal{E}_1$

*Proof.* Define a vector space

$$\mathcal{V} = \{f : (E, \mathcal{E}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \text{ bounded and measurable, s.t Lemma holds}\}$$

Which is indeed a vector space, and contains  $1_E$  since  $1_{E_1} \mu(E_2) \geq 0$  is bounded and also  $1_A = 1_{A_1}(x_1) 1_{A_2}(x_2)$  since  $1_{A_1}(x_1) \mu_2(A_2)$  is  $\mathcal{E}_1$ -measurable, non-negative and bounded since  $0 \leq \mu_2(E_2) < \infty$ .

Now let  $0 \leq f_n \uparrow f$  be a sequence in  $\mathcal{V}$ . Then by the monotone convergence theorem,

$$\int_{E_2} \lim_n f_n(x_1, x_2) d\mu_2(x_2) = \lim_n \int_{E_2} f_n(x_1, x_2) d\mu_2(x_2)$$

which is  $\mathcal{E}_1$ -measurable as the limit of  $\mathcal{E}_1$ -measurable functions. Also (in the case of 1) it is bounded by  $\mu_2(E_2) \|f\|_\infty$  and non-negative, so  $f \in \mathcal{V}$ , so by the monotone class theorem,  $\mathcal{V}$  contains all bounded measurable functions. In the case of 2, we approximate  $f$  by  $\min(f, n) \in \mathcal{V}$ .  $\square$

**Theorem** (Product measure). *Let  $\mu_1(E_1), \mu_2(E_2) < \infty$ . Then there exists a unique measure  $\mu$  on  $(E_1 \times E_2, \mathcal{E}_1 \otimes \mathcal{E}_2)$  such that  $\mu(A_1 \times A_2) = \mu_1(A_1) \mu_2(A_2)$  for all  $A_1 \in \mathcal{E}_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{E}_2$ .*

*Proof.* By the uniqueness theorem and since  $\mathcal{A}$  generates  $\mathcal{E}_1 \otimes \mathcal{E}_2$ , there can only be one such measure. Define

$$\mu(A) = \int_{E_1} \left( \int_{E_2} 1_A(x_1, x_2) d\mu_2(x_2) \right) d\mu_1(x_1)$$

, so  $\mu(A_1 \times A_2) = \int_{E_1} 1_{A_1}(x_1) \mu_2(A_2) d\mu_1(x_1) = \mu_1(A_1) \mu_2(A_2)$ , and  $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$ , so to prove the theorem we need to show  $\mu$  is countably additive (and thus a measure). Let  $A_n \in \mathcal{E}_1 \otimes \mathcal{E}_2$  be disjoint, so  $1_{\bigcup_n A_n} = \sum_n 1_{A_n} = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n \leq N} 1_{A_n}$ . Thus

$$\mu\left(\bigcup_n A_n\right) = \int_{E_1} \left( \int_{E_2} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n \leq N} 1_{A_n}(x_1, x_2) d\mu_2(x_2) \right) d\mu_1(x_1)$$

Which upon applying the monotone convergence theorem twice (once for each integral), in conjunction with the previous lemmas, gives

$$\mu\left(\bigcup_n A_n\right) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n \leq N} \int_{E_1} \left( \int_{E_2} 1_{A_n}(x_1, x_2) d\mu_2(x_2) \right) d\mu_1(x_1) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_n)$$

$\square$

**Theorem** (Fubini's Theorem). *Let  $(E, \mathcal{E}, \mu) = (E_1 \times E_2, \mathcal{E}_1 \otimes \mathcal{E}_2, \mu_1 \otimes \mu_2)$ . Then*

(a) *Let  $f : (E, \mathcal{E}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be measurable and non-negative. Then*

$$\mu(f) = \int_E f d\mu = \int_{E_1} \left( \int_{E_2} f(x_1, x_2) d\mu_2(x_2) \right) d\mu_1(x_1) \quad (\dagger)$$

$$= \int_{E_2} \left( \int_{E_1} f(x_1, x_2) d\mu_1(x_1) \right) d\mu_2(x_2) \quad (\circ)$$

(b) *If  $f : (E, \mathcal{E}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is  $\mu$ -integrable, then if*

$$A_1 = \left\{ x_1 \in E_1 : \int_{E_2} |f(x_1, x_2)| d\mu_2(x_2) < \infty \right\}$$

*and for  $f_1(x_1) = \int_{E_2} f(x_1, x_2) d\mu_2(x_2)$  for  $x_1 \in A_1$ , and  $f_1(x_1) = 0$  on  $A_1^c$ , we have  $\mu_1(A_1^c) = 0$ , and  $\mu(f) = \mu_1(f_1) = \mu_1(f_1 1_{A_1})$ .*

**Remark:** in (b), if  $f$  is bounded,  $A_1 = E_1$ . The same statement holds for  $f_2$ ,  $A_2$  with the obvious modifications in (b), so  $\mu_1(f_1) = \mu_2(f_2)$ . But for  $f(x_1, x_2) = \frac{x_1^2 - x_2^2}{(x_1^2 + x_2^2)}$  on  $(0, 1)^2$ , we have  $\mu_1(f_1) \neq \mu_2(f_2)$  but  $f$  is not Lebesgue measurable on  $(0, 1)^2$ .

*Proof.* By the construction of  $\mu(A)$  for rectangles  $A = A_1 \times A_2 \in \mathcal{A}$  generating  $\mathcal{E}$ , the identities  $(\dagger)$  and  $(\circ)$  hold for  $f = 1_A$ , and by uniqueness of extension, this extends to  $1_A$ ,  $A \in \mathcal{E}$ , and by linearity of the integral this extends to simple functions. By the monotone convergence theorem (applied 5 times) on simple functions  $0 \leq f_n \uparrow f$ , the result (a) follows.

If  $h(x_1) = \int_{E_2} |f(x_1, x_2)| d\mu_2(x_2)$ , then by (a)  $\mu_1(|h|) \leq \mu(|f|) < \infty$  since  $f$  is  $\mu$ -integrable. So  $f_1$  is  $\mu_1$ -integrable and  $\mu_1(A_1^c) = 0$ . Then  $f_1^\pm = \int_{E_2} f^\pm(x_1, x_2) d\mu_2(x_2)$  so  $\mu_1(f_1) = \mu_1(f_1^+) - \mu_1(f_1^-)$ . Thus

$$\mu(f) = \mu(f^+) - \mu(f^-) = \mu_1(f_1^+) - \mu_1(f_1^-) = \mu_1(f_1)$$

by (a). □

**Remark:** the preceding results for product measures extend to  $\sigma$ -finite measures  $\mu$ .

For  $(E_i, \mathcal{E}_i)$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$  with  $\sigma$ -finite  $\mu_i$ , then since

$$(\mathcal{E}_1 \otimes \mathcal{E}_2) \otimes \mathcal{E}_3 = \mathcal{E}_1 \otimes (\mathcal{E}_2 \otimes \mathcal{E}_3)$$

by a  $\pi$ -system argument and Dynkin's lemma, we can iterate the construction of product measures to obtain  $\mu_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mu_n$ , a unique product measure on  $(\bigotimes_{i=1}^n E_i, \bigotimes_{i=1}^n \mathcal{E}_i)$  such that  $\mu_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mu_n(A_1 \times \dots \times A_n) = \prod_{i=1}^n \mu_i(A_i)$ .

In particular, on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with Borel- $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n) = \bigotimes_{i=1}^n \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$  (product topology), we obtain the  $n$ -dimensional Lebesgue measure

$$\mu^n = \bigotimes_{i=1}^n \mu$$

and Fubini's theorem (applied  $n - 1$  times) implies

$$\mu^n(f) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f d\mu^n = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \dots \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x_1, \dots, x_n) d\mu(x_1) \dots d\mu(x_n)$$

whenever  $f$  is measurable and non-negative, or  $\mu^n$ -integrable.

## Product Probability Spaces & Independence

**Proposition.** Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  be a probability space, and  $(E, \mathcal{E}) = (\bigoplus_{i=1}^n E_i, \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathcal{E}_i)$ . Consider  $X : (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}) \rightarrow (E, \mathcal{E})$  measurable and such that  $X(\omega) = (X_1(\omega), \dots, X_n(\omega))$ . The following are equivalent:

- (i)  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  are independent
- (ii)  $\mu_X = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mu_{X_i}$
- (iii) For all  $f_i : E_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  bounded and measurable,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \prod_{i=1}^n f_i(X_i) \right] = \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} f_i(X_i)$$

*Proof.* First we show (i) implies (ii): for rectangles  $A = \times_{i=1}^n A_i$ ,  $A_i \in \mathcal{E}_i$ , we have (by the definition of image measure)

$$\mu_X(A_1, \dots, A_n) = \mathbb{P}(X_1 \in A_1, \dots, X_n \in A_n) = \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}(X_i \in A_i) = \prod_{i=1}^n \mu_{X_i}(A_i)$$

Now we show (ii) implies (iii): by Fubini's theorem,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \prod_{i=1}^n f_i(X_i) \right] &= \mu_X \left( \prod_{i=1}^n f_i(X_i) \right) = \int_{E_1} \dots \int_{E_n} f_1(x_1) \dots f_n(x_n) d\mu_{X_1}(x_1) \dots d\mu_{X_n}(x_n) \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^n \int_{E_i} f_i(x_i) d\mu_{X_i}(x_i) = \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} f_i(X_i) \end{aligned}$$

Finally we show (iii) implies (i): take  $f_i = 1_{A_i}$  for any  $A_i \in \mathcal{E}_i$ , which is bounded and measurable. So

$$\mathbb{P}(X_1 \in A_1, \dots, X_n \in A_n) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \prod_{i=1}^n 1_{A_i}(X_i) \right] = \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} 1_{A_i} = \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}(X_i \in A_i)$$

so  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  are independent.  $\square$