

# Math 564: Real Analysis and Measure Theory Notes

Ale Suarez Serrano

October 11, 2025

Let me know if you spot any mistakes!

---

# Contents

---

<b>1 Motivation for Measure Theory</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1 Probability . . . . .	4
1.2 Geometry . . . . .	4
1.3 Analysis . . . . .	5
<b>2 Measures, Their Construction, and Properties</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1 Polish Spaces . . . . .	6
2.2 Sigma Algebras . . . . .	9
2.3 Measures and Pmeasures . . . . .	11
2.4 Finitely Additive Measures and Pmeasures . . . . .	13
2.5 Construction of Pmeasures . . . . .	14
2.5.1 Bernoulli Pmeasures . . . . .	14
2.5.2 Lebesgue Pmeasure on $\mathbb{R}^d$ . . . . .	16
2.6 Caratheodory Extension . . . . .	19
2.6.1 Caratheodory's Theorem: Existence . . . . .	20
2.6.2 Caratheodory's Extension: Uniqueness . . . . .	24
2.7 Null and Measurable Sets . . . . .	26
2.8 Non-measurable Sets . . . . .	28
2.9 Pocket Tools for Working with Measures . . . . .	29
2.10 Measure Exhaustion . . . . .	32
2.11 Approximating Measurable Sets . . . . .	34
2.11.1 99% Lemma . . . . .	34
2.11.2 Application: Ergodicity . . . . .	35
2.12 Regularity of Measures . . . . .	37
2.13 Tightness . . . . .	40
<b>3 Measurable Functions and Integration</b>	<b>43</b>
3.1 Measurable Functions . . . . .	43
3.2 Pushforward Measures . . . . .	46
3.3 Borel/Measure Isomoprism Theorems . . . . .	48

# CHAPTER 1

---

## Motivation for Measure Theory

---

### 1.1 Probability

We understand well the probability theory of  $n$  coin tosses where the probability of the coin showing up 1 is some  $p \in (0, 1)$  and it showing up 0 is  $1 - p$ . Then for every word  $w \in 2^n := \{0, 1\}^n$ , the probability of coin tosses resulting in this word is

$$\mathbb{P}_p(w) = p^{\text{number of 1's in } w} \cdot (1 - p)^{\text{number of 0's in } w}.$$

What if  $n = \infty$ ? In other words, we consider the space  $2^{\mathbb{N}} = \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$  of infinite binary sequences, with the same probabilities of tossing 1 or 0. Then how do we define the probability of “event” in this space?

### 1.2 Geometry

We would like to have a robust notion of volume in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  for  $d \geq 1$ , i.e. we would like to determine the volume of a large class of subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . We know that the volume of a **box**

$$B := I_1 \times I_2 \times \cdots \times I_d \subset \mathbb{R}^d$$

(where  $I_j \subset \mathbb{R}$  is an interval) should be

$$\text{Volume}(B) = \ln(I_1)\ln(I_2) \cdots \ln(I_d)$$

where  $\ln(I)$  is the difference of the right and left endpoints of  $I$ . We want to extend this to a class of sets which are closed under countable operations: compliments, countable unions, countable intersections.

## 1.3 Analysis

The class of Riemann integrable functions is not closed under pointwise limits; indeed, even a pointwise limit of continuous functions on  $[0, 1]$  is typically not Riemann integrable. But the whole subject of Analysis is about approximations/limits, so we would like to extend the class of integrable functions so it becomes closed under countable pointwise limits. Clearly, for a subset  $B \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ , the integral of its indicator function  $\mathbb{1}_B$  will simply be  $volume(B)$ , so this task subsumes the previous task about volume.

# CHAPTER 2

---

## Measures, Their Construction, and Properties

---

### 2.1 Polish Spaces

We now define a very robust class of metric spaces that we will be working with throughout and that arise naturally in analysis and related fields.

**Definition 2.1.1.** A metric space  $(X, d)$  is called **Polish** if  $d$  is a **complete metric** (every  $d$ -Cauchy sequences converges) and  $X$  is **separable** (i.e. there is a countable dense set).

**Definition 2.1.2.** In a metric space  $X$ , a **topological basis** is a collection  $\mathcal{U}$  of open subsets of  $X$  such that every open set is a union (maybe uncountable) of sets in  $\mathcal{U}$ .

**Proposition 1.** A metric space  $X$  is separable  $\iff$  it is **2nd countable**, i.e. it has a countable basis of open sets.

*Proof.* Homework. □

**Example 1** (Examples of Polish Spaces).

- (a)  $\mathbb{R}$  or more generally,  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with the metric

$$d_\infty(\vec{x}, \vec{y}) := \max_{i=1}^d |x_i - y_i|.$$

We know from undergrad analysis that this is a complete metric. Also, rationals are dense and countable, so  $\mathbb{Q}^d \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  is dense and countable. Note that open intervals with rational endpoints form a countable basis for  $\mathbb{R}$  and thus open boxes form a countable basis for  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .

We can also equip  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with other equivalent complete metrics (two metrics are **equivalent** if they induce the same open sets), namely, for  $1 \leq p < \infty$ :

$$d_p(\vec{x}, \vec{y}) := \left( \sum_{i=1}^d |x_i - y_i|^p \right)^{1/p}.$$

One can show that  $d_p$  is **bi-Lipschitz equivalent** to  $d_\infty$ , i.e. There is a constant  $C_p \leq 0$  such that

$$\frac{1}{C_p} \cdot d_\infty \leq d_p \leq C_p \cdot d_\infty.$$

In particular, the spaces  $(\mathbb{R}^d, d_p)$  are Polish, for  $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ . It's also easy to see that  $\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} d_p = d_\infty$  (homework).

- (b) If  $(X, d)$  is a polish metric space, then any closed subset is still Polish with the same metric (indeed, closedness ensures completeness of  $d$  and any subspace of a 2nd countable space is 2nd countable). What about open subsets, say  $(0, 1)$  in  $\mathbb{R}$ ? The same metric won't work because it won't be complete, but maybe we can take a different equivalent metric that is complete. Indeed,  $d_\infty$  is complete in  $\mathbb{R}$  and  $\mathbb{R}$  "looks like"  $(0, 1)$ , i.e. they are **homeomorphic** (i.e. there is a bijective continuous function with a continuous inverse between the two spaces). Thus, we can "copy" the complete metric from  $(0, 1)$  via any homeomorphism. More concretely,

$$d(x, y) = d_\infty(x, y) + \left| \frac{1}{d_\infty(x, \{0, 1\})} - \frac{1}{d_\infty(y, \{0, 1\})} \right|$$

is a complete metric on  $(0, 1)$  equivalent to  $d_\infty$ . Such sets are called **Polishable**, and it is a theorem of Descriptive Set Theory that a subset of a Polish space is Polishable if and only if it is  $C_\delta$  (countable intersection of open sets).

- (c) The space  $C([0, 1])$  of continuous functions on  $[0, 1]$  with the **uniform metric** :

$$d_u(f, g) = \max \sup_{x \in [0, 1]} |f(x) - g(x)|,$$

is Polish. Indeed, we know from undergrad analysis that a uniformly Cauchy sequence of continuous functions converges to a continuous function, so  $d_u$  is complete.

## 8CHAPTER 2. MEASURES, THEIR CONSTRUCTION, AND PROPERTIES

As for separability, polynomials with rational coefficients form a countable dense set (by the Weistrass theorem), or more precisely, piece-wise linear functions (with finitely many pieces) with rational breakpoints form a countable dense set.

- (d) The tree spaces: Cantor space  $2^{\mathbb{N}}$  and Baire space  $\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ .

Let  $A$  be a nonempty countable set (e.g.  $A = 2 := \{0, 1\}$  or  $A = \mathbb{N}$ ). Let  $X = A^{\mathbb{N}}$  be the set of infinite sequences of elements of  $A$ . We depict  $A^{\mathbb{N}}$  as the infinite branches through the tree  $A^{<\mathbb{N}} :=$  the set of finite sequences in  $A$ .

*INCLUDE TREE DRAWING.*

We equip  $A^{\mathbb{N}}$  with the following metric: If  $x \neq y \in A^{\mathbb{N}}$ , then:

$$d(x, y) = 2^{-\Delta(x, y)}$$

where  $\Delta(x, y) := \min_{i \in \mathbb{N}} i$  with  $x_i \neq y_i$ , and  $d(x, y) = 0$  if  $x = y$ .

This  $d$  is indeed a metric on  $A^{\mathbb{N}}$ , and in fact it's an ultrametric (hw). Also  $d$  is a complete metric (hw) and for a fixed  $a_o \in A$ , the set of sequences which are eventually  $a_0$  form a countable dense set. Thus  $A^{\mathbb{N}}$  is Polish.

We may also talk about the topology (i.e. the collection of open sets of  $A^{\mathbb{N}}$ ). For  $2^{-n} < r \leq 2^{-(n-1)}$ , the open ball

$$\begin{aligned} B(x, r) &:= \{y \in A^{\mathbb{N}} : d(y, x) < r\} \\ &= \{y \in A^{\mathbb{N}} : d(y, x) \leq 2^{-n}\} \\ &= \{y \in A^{\mathbb{N}} : y|_n = x|_n\} \\ &= [x|_n] \end{aligned}$$

where  $n = 0, 1, \dots, n - 1$ , and where the last term denotes the cylinder with base  $x|_n \in A^{\mathbb{N}}$ . More generally, for a finite word  $w \in A^{<\mathbb{N}}$ , let

$$[w] = \{y \in A^{\mathbb{N}} : y \supseteq w\} := \{y \in A^{\mathbb{N}} : y|_{l_n(w)} = w\}$$

denote the **cylinder with base  $w$** . Each cylinder is an open ball, as well as a closed ball (indeed a compliment of a cylinder is a countable union of disjoint cylinders), whose center is any element of it (the realtor's metric).

Thus, every open set is a union of cylinders, hence the cylinders form a countable basis for  $A^{\mathbb{N}}$ . When working with  $A^{\mathbb{N}}$ , we work with this basis. Cylinders are clopen, which makes  $A^{\mathbb{N}}$  totally disconnected, in fact, 0-dimensional.

**Proposition 2.**  $A^{\mathbb{N}}$  is compact  $\iff A$  is finite,

*Proof.* Uses Konigs lemma, and is left as a (HW).  $\square$

The nice thing about the space  $A^{\mathbb{N}}$  is that since it is so disconnected, it behaves like a discrete space, allowing us to do combinatorics on it, but also take limits!

## 2.2 Sigma Algebras

**Definition 2.2.1.** Let  $X$  be a set. A collection  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$  is called an **algebra** (resp.  **$\sigma$ -algebra**) if  $\emptyset \in \mathcal{A}$ , and  $\mathcal{A}$  is closed under compliments and finite unions (resp. countable unions).

**Definition 2.2.2.** A set  $X$  equipped with a  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{S}$  is called a **measurable space**.

- Example 2.**
- (a) For a nonempty set  $X$ ,  $\mathcal{P}(X)$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra.
  - (b) Let  $X$  be a set. The collection  $\mathcal{A}$  of finite and co-finite sets is an algebra (because finite sets are finite). The collection  $\mathcal{S}$  countable and co-countable sets is a  $\sigma$ -algebra.
  - (c) In a metric/topological space, the collection of clopen sets is an algebra, ad we call it the algebra of clopen sets.
  - (d) For a finite non-empty set  $A$ , the clopen sets of  $A^{\mathbb{N}}$  are exactly the finite disjoint union of cylinders, where the finiteness comes from the compactness of  $A^{\mathbb{N}}$  (HW).
  - (e) A compliment of a box  $B$  in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  os a finite disjoint union of boxes, so the collection of finite disjoint unions of boxes is an algebra (also we have a finite union of boxes is a finite disjoint union of boxes).

**Remark 1.** Notice that an arbitrary intersection of  $(\sigma)$ -algebras is itself a  $(\sigma)$ -algebra, i.e. if  $\mathcal{A}_i$  is a  $(\sigma)$ -algebra for  $i$  in some index set  $I$ , then  $\bigcap_{i \in I} \mathcal{A}_i$  is a  $(\sigma)$ -algebra.

This allows us to define the following notions:

**Definition 2.2.3.** Let  $X$  be a set and  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$ . The  **$(\sigma)$ -algebra generated by  $\mathcal{C}$**  is the smallest  $(\sigma)$ -algebra containing  $\mathcal{C}$ . Namely,

$$\langle \mathcal{C} \rangle = \bigcap \{ \mathcal{A} : \mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X), \mathcal{A} \text{ is an algebra}, \mathcal{A} \supseteq \mathcal{C} \}$$

and

$$\langle \mathcal{C} \rangle_\sigma = \bigcap \{ \mathcal{A} : \mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X), \mathcal{A} \text{ is an } \sigma\text{-algebra}, \mathcal{A} \supseteq \mathcal{C} \}$$

are the generated algebra of  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\sigma$ -algebra of  $\mathcal{C}$  respectively.

**Definition 2.2.4.** For a metric/topological space  $X$ , the  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{B}(X)$  generated by the open sets is called the **Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra** and its elements are called **Borel sets**.

The definitions of  $\langle \mathcal{C} \rangle$  and  $\langle \mathcal{C} \rangle_\sigma$  are top-down, and we give their bottom-up equivalent:

**Proposition 3.** Let  $X$  be a set and  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$ . Then:

(a)  $\langle \mathcal{C} \rangle = \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{C}_n$  where  $\mathcal{C}_0 := \mathcal{C}$  and

$$\mathcal{C}_{n+1} := \{B^c : B \in \mathcal{C}_n\} \cup \left\{ \bigcup_{i < k} B_i : B_i \in \mathcal{C}_n, k \in \mathbb{N} \right\}.$$

(b)

(c)  $\langle \mathcal{C} \rangle_\sigma = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \omega_1} \mathcal{C}_\alpha$  where  $\mathcal{C}_0 := \mathcal{C}$  and

$$\mathcal{C}_{n+1} := \{B^c : B \in \mathcal{C}_\beta, \beta < \alpha\} \cup \left\{ \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} B_i : B_i \in \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} \mathcal{C}_\beta \right\},$$

where  $\omega_1$  is the smallest uncountable cardinal.

*Proof.* (a) is left as homework and (b) is optional.  $\square$

**Remark 2.** In a metric/topological space, for any countable basis  $\mathcal{U}$ , the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by  $\mathcal{U}$  is  $\mathcal{B}(X)$ .

*Proof.* Indeed, every open set  $\mathcal{O}$  is a union of sets in  $\mathcal{U}$ , hence a countable union of sets in  $\mathcal{U}$ , and as such  $\mathcal{O} \in \langle \mathcal{U} \rangle_\sigma$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra containing all open sets, hence  $\mathcal{B}(X) \subseteq \langle \mathcal{U} \rangle_\sigma$ . But also  $\langle \mathcal{U} \rangle_\sigma \subseteq \mathcal{B}(X)$  because  $\mathcal{U}$  is a collection of open sets.  $\square$

## 2.3 Measures and Premeasures

**Definition 2.3.1.** Let  $X$  be a set and  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$ . A function

$$\mu : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$$

is said to be **finitely additive** if

$$\mu \left( \bigsqcup_{i < k} A_i \right) = \sum_{i < k} \mu(A_i)$$

whenever  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\bigsqcup_{i < k} A_i \in \mathcal{C}$ . Moreover, we say  $\mu$  is **countably additive** if

$$\mu \left( \bigsqcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} A_i \right) = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mu(A_i)$$

whenever  $A_i \in \mathcal{C}$  and  $\bigsqcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} A_i \in \mathcal{C}$ .

**Definition 2.3.2.** For a measurable space  $(X, \mathcal{S})$ , a **measure** on  $(X, \mathcal{S})$  is a countably additive function

$$\mu : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$$

such that  $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$ . The triple  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  is called a **measure space**.

**Remark 3.** People also deal with **finitely additive measures** on algebras, but a finitely additive measure (even on a  $\sigma$ -algebra) is not generally a measure (since it may not be countably additive).

**Definition 2.3.3.** A measure  $\mu$  on a measurable space  $(X, \mathcal{S})$  is called:

- A **probability measure** if  $\mu(X) = 1$ .
- **finite** if  $\mu(X) < \infty$ .
- **$\sigma$ -finite** if  $X = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} B_n$ , where  $B_n \in \mathcal{S}$  and  $\mu(B_n) < \infty$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

**Proposition 4.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{S})$  be a measurable space.

- (a) Any countable non-negative linear combination of measures on  $(X, \mathcal{S})$  is a measure, i.e. if  $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n$  are measures and  $a_n \geq 0$ , then

$$\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \mu_i$$

is a measure.

12CHAPTER 2. MEASURES, THEIR CONSTRUCTION, AND PROPERTIES

- (b) Any convex combination of probability measures on  $(X, \mathcal{S})$  is a probability measure, i.e. if  $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n$  are measures and  $a_i \geq 0$ , with  $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i = 1$ , then

$$\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \mu_i$$

is a probability measure.

**Example 3.** (a) The **Dirac (delta) measure** (or point-measure): Let  $X$  be a set and fix some point  $x_0 \in X$ . Then define a measure

$$\delta_{x_0} : \mathcal{P}(X) \rightarrow [0, 1]$$

by:

$$\delta_{x_0}(B) := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } x_0 \in B \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

This is called the Dirac measure at  $x_0$ .

- (b) The **zero measure**: On any set  $X$ , the zero measure is

$$\zeta : \mathcal{P}(X) \rightarrow \{0\}.$$

- (c) **The counting measure**: On any set  $X$ , the counting measure is the map

$$\chi : \mathcal{P}(X) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$$

via

$$\chi(B) := \begin{cases} |B|, & \text{if } B \text{ is finite} \\ \infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Note that when  $X$  is countable, then

$$\chi = \sum_{x \in X} \delta_x.$$

Moreover,  $\chi$  is finite when  $X$  is finite and  $\sigma$ -finite when  $X$  is countable. If  $X$  is uncountable then  $X$  is not  $\sigma$  finite.

- (d) Given a set  $X$ , define a measure  $\mu$  on the  $\sigma$ -algebra of countable and co-countable subsets of  $X$  as follows:

$$\mu(B) := \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } B \text{ is countable} \\ 1, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

If  $X$  is countable, then  $\mu$  is the zero-measure.

**Definition 2.3.4.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  be a measure space. A set  $B \in \mathcal{S}$  is called an **atom** (or  $\mu$ -atom) if  $\mu(B) > 0$  and for all  $A \subseteq B$ , with  $A \in \mathcal{S}$ , we have that either  $\mu(A) = 0$  or  $\mu(A) = \mu(B)$ .

**Definition 2.3.5.** A measure space  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  is called:

- **Atomic** (or purely-atomic) if every positive measure set in  $\mathcal{S}$  contains an atom.
- **Atomless** if there are no atoms.

**Remark 4.** The zero measure is both atomic and atomless. Also notice that all measures in the previous examples are atomic. To define interesting atomless measures, we'll need to define them on a algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  and extend them to the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by  $\mathcal{A}$ .

## 2.4 Finitely Additive Measures and Premeasures

**Definition 2.4.1.** Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be an algebra on a set  $X$ . A function

$$\mu : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$$

is called a **finitely additive measure** (resp. a countably additive measure or **premeasure**) if  $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$  and  $\mu$  is finitely (resp. countably) additive.

**Proposition 5** (Disjointification Trick). For an algebra  $\mathcal{A}$ , any countable union  $\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n$  of sets  $A_n \in \mathcal{A}$  is equal to a countable disjoint union  $\bigsqcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A'_n$  of sets  $A'_n \in \mathcal{A}$ .

*Proof.* Take  $A'_0 = A_0$  and  $A'_k = A_k \setminus [\bigcup_{i < n} A_i]$ . □

**Proposition 6** (Properties of Finitely Additive Measures). Let  $\mu$  be a finitely additive measure on an algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  on a set  $X$ . Then,

- (a)  $\mu$  is monotone: If  $A \subseteq B$  then  $\mu(A) \leq \mu(B)$  for all  $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$ .
- (b)  $\mu$  is countably super additive:

$$\mu\left(\bigsqcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n\right) \geq \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mu(A_n)$$

for all  $A_n \in \mathcal{A}$  with  $\bigsqcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n \in \mathcal{A}$ .

(c)  $\mu$  is finitely-subadditive:

$$\mu\left(\bigcup_{n < N} A_n\right) \leq \sum_{n < N} \mu(A_n)$$

for all  $A_n \in \mathcal{A}$ . Moreover, if  $\mu$  is a premeasure (i.e. countably additive) then it is countably subadditive, i.e.

$$\mu\left(\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n\right) \leq \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mu(A_n)$$

for all  $A_n \in \mathcal{A}$  with  $\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n \in \mathcal{A}$ .

*Proof.* (a):  $\mu(B) = \mu((B \setminus A) \cup A) = \mu(B \setminus A) + \mu(A) \geq \mu(A)$ .

(b):

$$\begin{aligned} \mu\left(\bigsqcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n\right) &= \mu\left(\bigsqcup_{n \leq N} A_n \sqcup \bigsqcup_{n > N} A_n\right) \\ &= \sum_{n \leq N} \mu(A_n) + \mu\left(\bigsqcup_{n > N} A_n\right) \\ &\geq \sum_{n \leq N} \mu(A_n). \end{aligned}$$

Taking  $N \rightarrow \infty$  yields our desired inequality.

(c): We use the disjointification trick:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu\left(\bigcup_{n < N} A_n\right) &= \mu\left(\bigsqcup_{n < N} A'_n\right) \\ &= \sum_{n < N} \mu(A'_n) \\ &\leq \sum_{n < N} \mu(A_n). \end{aligned}$$

Using the same logic we can prove countable subadditivity for premeasures.  $\square$

## 2.5 Construction of Premeasures

### 2.5.1 Bernoulli Premeasures

Let  $X = 2^{\mathbb{N}}$ , where  $2 := \{0, 1\}$ . Any probability measure on  $2$  is of the form  $\nu_p(1) = p$  and  $\nu_p(0) = 1 - p$  for  $p \in (0, 1)$ . We will define a premeasure on the

algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  of clopen sets in  $2^{\mathbb{N}}$  which from the homework is the algebra of finite disjoint unions of cylinders. This premeasure  $\mu_p$  will satisfy

$$\mu_p([w]) = \nu_p(1)^{\text{number of 1's in } w} \cdot \nu_p(0)^{\text{number of 0's in } w}$$

and will be called the **bernoulli( $p$ ) measure**.

We first define  $\mu_p$  on a cylinder  $[w]$ , where  $w \in 2^{<\mathbb{N}}$  by:

$$\tilde{\mu}_p([w]) = p^{\text{number of 1's in } w} \cdot (1-p)^{\text{number of 0's in } w}.$$

For instance,  $\tilde{\mu}_p([01100]) = p^2 \cdot (1-p)^3$ . Then for each  $B \in \mathcal{A}$ , we “define”

$$\mu_p(B) := \sum_{n < N} \tilde{\mu}_p[w_n],$$

where  $B = \bigsqcup_{n < N} [w_n]$ . We first need to show this is well defined, i.e. that it does not depend on how  $B$  is partitioned as a disjoint union of cylinders.

**Proposition 7.**  $\tilde{\mu}_p$  is finitely additive on equal-length cylinders, i.e. for any cylinder  $[w]$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ :

$$\tilde{\mu}_p([w]) = \sum_{u \in 2^n} \tilde{\mu}_p([wu]).$$

*Proof.* One can show this by induction on  $n$ , but it is enough to verify just the base case  $n = 1$ :

$$\tilde{\mu}_p([w0]) + \tilde{\mu}_p([w1]) = \tilde{\mu}_p([w]) \cdot (1-p) + \tilde{\mu}_p([w]) \cdot p = \tilde{\mu}_p([w]).$$

□

**Proposition 8.** Let  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ , and  $\mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}_2$  be two finite partitions of  $A$  into finite cylinders. Then,

$$\sum_{d_1 \in \mathcal{D}_1} \tilde{\mu}_p(d_1) = \sum_{d_2 \in \mathcal{D}_2} \tilde{\mu}_p(d_2).$$

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{R}$  be a **common refinement** of  $\mathcal{D}_1$  and  $\mathcal{D}_2$  (i.e. take all the non-empty intersections of their cylinders). Clearly this is still a finite partition. Now, we may take every cylinder in  $\mathcal{R}$  to have the same length (by splitting

each cylinder into a finite partitions of cylinders bigger base length). Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{D_1 \in \mathcal{D}_1} \tilde{\mu}_p(D_1) &= \sum_{D_1 \in \mathcal{D}_1} \sum_{\substack{R \in \mathcal{R} \\ R \subseteq D_1}} \tilde{\mu}_p(R) \\
&= \sum_{R \in \mathcal{R}} \tilde{\mu}_p(R) \\
&= \sum_{D_2 \in \mathcal{D}_2} \sum_{\substack{R \in \mathcal{R} \\ R \subseteq D_2}} \tilde{\mu}_p(R) \\
&= \sum_{D_2 \in \mathcal{D}_2} \tilde{\mu}_p(D_2).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Our second claim shows that  $\mu_p$  is well defined on  $\mathcal{A}$  and also implies the following corollary:

**Corollary 2.5.1.**  $\mu_p$  is finitely additive.

*Proof.* Homework. □

**Proposition 9.**  $\mu_p$  is a premeasure (i.e. countably additive)

*Proof.* This follows automatically from compactness. If a clopen set (hence closed, hence compact) is a disjoint union of other clopen (hence open) sets  $\bigsqcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{U}_n$ , then all but finitely many of these cylinders have to be empty (because there is a finite subcover of  $\{\mathcal{U}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ ). □

This construction equally works for  $A^{\mathbb{N}}$ , for any finite non-empty  $A$ , and any probability measure on  $A$ . We obtain a premeasure  $\mu = \nu^{\mathbb{N}}$  on the algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  of clopen subsets of  $A^{\mathbb{N}}$  satisfying:

$$\mu([w]) = \nu(w_0) \cdot \nu(w_1) \cdot \dots \cdot \nu(w_{n-1}),$$

for every  $w \in A^{\mathbb{N}}$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

### 2.5.2 Lebesgue Premeasure on $\mathbb{R}^d$ .

Analogously to Bernoulli measures on  $A^{\mathbb{N}}$ , we define a premeasure on the algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  generated by the boxes in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Note that elements of  $\mathcal{A}$  are finite disjoint unions of boxes, just like the clopen sets in  $A^{\mathbb{N}}$ , for a finite  $A$ , are finite disjoint unions of cylinders.

We first define a premeasure on boxes:

$$\tilde{\lambda}(I_1 \times \dots \times I_d) := \prod_{n=1}^d \ln(I_n),$$

where  $\ln(I_n)$  is equal to the difference between its right and left endpoint. As convention, we set  $0 \cdot \infty = 0$ .

We then “define” the potential measure on  $\mathcal{A}$  by

$$\lambda(A) = \sum_{B \in \mathcal{P}} \tilde{\lambda}(B)$$

where  $\mathcal{P}$  is any finite partition of  $A$  into boxes. As with Bernoulli, we need to show that this is well defined, i.e. that it does not depend on the choice of the partition  $\mathcal{P}$ . As with Bernoulli, we show that if a box is partitioned into a “homogeneous” collection of boxes, then  $\tilde{\lambda}$  is finitely additive. The notion of “homogeneous” for boxes are **grid-partitions**, namely, a partition  $\mathcal{P}$  of a box  $B = I_1 \times \dots \times I_d$  into ones of the following form: Each  $I_k$  is partitioned into finitely many intervals

$$I_k = \bigsqcup_{n < N_K} I_k^{(n)}$$

and

$$\mathcal{P} = \{I_1^{n_1} \times \dots \times I_d^{n_d} : (n_1, \dots, n_d) \in N_1 \times \dots \times N_d\}$$

where we view  $N := \{0, 1, \dots, N - 1\}$ .

**Proposition 10.** If  $\mathcal{P}$  is a grid-partition of a box  $B$ , then

$$\tilde{\lambda}(B) = \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \tilde{\lambda}(P).$$

*Proof.* This is trivial in  $d = 1$  and for  $d > 1$  apply induction using the distributive law, i.e.

$$(a_1 + \dots + a_k) \cdot (b_1 + \dots + b_l) = \sum_{\substack{i \leq k \\ j \leq l}} a_i b_j.$$

□

**Proposition 11.** If  $\mathcal{P}_1$  and  $\mathcal{P}_2$  are two finite partitions of a set  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  into boxes, then

$$\sum_{P_1 \in \mathcal{P}_1} \tilde{\lambda}(P_1) = \sum_{P_2 \in \mathcal{P}_2} \tilde{\lambda}(P_2).$$

*Proof.* Take a grid-partition of  $A$  that is a common refinement of  $\mathcal{P}_1$  and  $\mathcal{P}_2$ . The rest is left as homework.  $\square$

**Corollary 2.5.2.**  $\lambda$  on  $\mathcal{A}$  is well-defined and finitely additive.

**Proposition 12.**  $\lambda$  is countably additive on  $\mathcal{A}$ .

**Remark 5.** For  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ , we write  $a \approx_\varepsilon b$  if  $|a - b| \leq \varepsilon$ .

*Proof.* Because a finitely additive measure is always countably upperadditive, it is enough to prove countable subadditivity. We prove this in the vase where a bounded box  $B$  is written as a countable disjoint union of boxes

$$B = \bigsqcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} B_n.$$

The general case follows easily from this and is left as a small homework exercise.

In the case of cylinders of  $2^{\mathbb{N}}$ , we used that  $B$  is compact and the  $B_n$  are open, but for boxes neither is true in general. However, we can approximate  $B$  by closed boxes and  $B_n$  by open boxes. Fix  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Let  $B' \subseteq B$  be a closed box such that

$$\lambda(B') \approx_{\varepsilon/2} \lambda(B).$$

Also for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\tilde{B}_n \supseteq B_n$  be an open box such that

$$\lambda(\tilde{B}_n) \approx_{\varepsilon \cdot 2^{-(n+1)}} \lambda(B_n).$$

Then,  $\{\tilde{B}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is an open cover of the compact set  $B'$ , so there is a finite subcover  $\{\tilde{B}_n\}_{n < N}$ . Then:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(B) &\approx_{\varepsilon/2} \lambda(B') \\ &\leq \lambda\left(\bigcup_{n < N} \tilde{B}_n\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{n < N} \lambda(\tilde{B}_n) \\ &\leq \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda(\tilde{B}_n) \\ &\approx_{\varepsilon/2} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda(B_n), \end{aligned}$$

so:

$$\lambda(B) \leq \varepsilon + \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda(B_n)$$

which implies our desired inequality since  $\varepsilon$  was arbitrary.  $\square$

We call this premeasure  $\lambda$  on  $\mathcal{A}$  the **Lebesgue premeasure**.

## 2.6 Caratheodory Extension

To define measures, we always define a premeasure on some algebra and apply the following theorem, where we call a premeasure  $\mu$  on an algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  on  $X$   **$\sigma$ -finite** if  $X$  can be partitioned into countably many sets,  $\{A_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  such that  $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $\mu(A_i) < \infty$ .

**Theorem 2.6.1** (Caratheodory). Every premeasure  $\mu$  on an algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  on a set  $X$  admits an extension to a measure on the  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\sigma$ . Moreover:

- The outer measure  $\mu^*$  is such an extension and any extension  $\nu$  satisfies that  $\nu \leq \mu^*$ .
- If  $\mu$  is  $\sigma$ -finite, then the extension is unique and equal to  $\sigma^*$ .

To prove this, we need the following notion:

**Definition 2.6.1.** Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be an algebra on a set  $X$  and  $\mu$  a premeasure on  $\mathcal{A}$ . The **outer measure of  $\mu$**  is the function

$$\mu^* : \mathcal{P}(X) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$$

defined by: For every  $S \subseteq X$ .

$$\mu^*(S) := \inf \left\{ \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mu(A_n) : \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n \supseteq S \text{ and } \{A_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{A} \right\}.$$

**Proposition 13.** The outer measure has the following properties:

- Monotone:  $\mu^*(A) \leq \mu^*(B)$  for  $A \subseteq B \subseteq X$ .
- Countably subadditive:  $\mu^*(\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} S_n) \leq \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mu^*(S_n)$  for all  $S, S_n \subseteq X$ .

*Proof.* (a) follows from the definition of  $\mu^*$  because a cover of  $B$  is also a cover of  $A$ . The same is true for (b), since the union of covers of the  $S_n$  is a cover of  $\bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} S_i$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2.6.1.** For any premeasure  $\mu$  on an algebra  $\mathcal{A}$ , the outer measure  $\mu^*$  is on  $A$  is equal to  $\mu$ , i.e.

$$\mu^*|_{\mathcal{A}} = \mu.$$

*Proof.* Let  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ . and let  $\{A_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  be a cover of  $A$ . By disjointification, we may assume that all the  $A_n$  are disjoint; also by replacing  $A_n$  with  $A_n \cap A$ , we may assume that  $A = \bigsqcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n$ . But then, by countable additivity of  $\mu$ , we have that

$$\mu(A) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mu(A_n),$$

so even with the original  $A_n$ , we had that

$$\mu(A) \leq \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mu(A_n)$$

by monotonicity. □

### 2.6.1 Caratheodory's Theorem: Existence

Every premeasure  $\mu$  on an algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  on a set  $X$  admits an extension to a measure on the  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\sigma$ . In fact,  $\mu^*$  is such an extension.

In order to show  $\mu^*$  is countably additive on  $\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\sigma$ , it is enough to show that it is finitely additive since outer measures are countable subadditive, and finite additivity implies countable superadditivity.

#### Caratheodory's Proof:

**Definition 2.6.2.** A set  $B$  **conserves** a set  $S$  if

$$\mu^*(S) = \mu^*(S \cap B) + \mu^*(B^c \cap S).$$

Notice by that subadditivity of  $\mu^*$ , failure of this equality means the left hand side is strictly less than the right hand side.

Moreover, call  $B$  **conservative** if it conserves every set.

Let  $\mathcal{M}$  denote the collection of all conservative sets. Then, the proof goes as follows:

- (i)  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ .
- (ii)  $\mathcal{M}$  is a sigma algebra (hence contains  $\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\sigma$ ).
- (iii)  $\mu^*$  is (almost by definition of  $\mathcal{M}$ ) finitely additive on  $\mathcal{M}$ .

The verification of the proof is left as homework.

**Tao's Proof:**

This proof works only for  $\sigma$ -finite premeasures, so assume  $\mu$  is  $\sigma$ -finite on  $\mathcal{A}$ . We will first prove the result assuming that  $\mu$  is finite, and deduce the  $\sigma$ -finite case from this as a homework exercise.

We define a **pseudo-metric** (i.e. a metric where the axiom  $d(x, y) = 0$  implies that  $x = y$  does not hold):

$$d_{\mu^*} : \mathcal{P}(X) \rightarrow [0, \mu(X)]$$

by:

$$d_{\mu^*}(A, B) = \mu^*(A \Delta B).$$

**Remark 6** (The Secret of Symmetric Differences).  $\mathcal{P}(X)$  with  $\Delta$  is an abelian group, with  $\emptyset$  as the identity, and each element as its own inverse.

*Proof.* Just think of  $\mathcal{P}(X)$  as  $2^X$ , then  $\Delta$  is just coordinate wise addition mod 2.  $\square$

**Proposition 14.**  $d_{\sigma^*}$  is a pseudo-metric.

*Proof.* Symmetry hold by definition and as well as the fact that

$$d_{\mu^*}(A, A) = \mu^*(A \Delta A) = \mu^*(\emptyset) = 0.$$

As for the triangle inequality, let  $A, B, C \in \mathcal{P}(X)$  and observe:

$$A \Delta C = (A \Delta B) \Delta (B \Delta C) \subseteq (A \Delta B) \cup (B \Delta C).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mu^*}(A, C) &= \mu^*(A \Delta C) \\ &\leq \mu^*((A \Delta B) \cup (B \Delta C)) \\ &= \mu^*(A \Delta B) + \mu^*(B \Delta C) \\ &= d_{\mu^*}(A, B) + d_{\mu^*}(B, C). \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

Let now  $\mathcal{M} = \overline{\mathcal{A}}^{d_{\mu^*}}$ , i.e. the closure of  $\mathcal{A}$  inside  $\mathcal{P}(X)$  with respect to our pseudo-metric  $d_{\mu^*}$ . We will show that  $\mathcal{M}$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra (hence  $\mathcal{M} \supseteq \mathcal{A}$ ) and  $\mu^*$  is finitely additive on  $\mathcal{M}$ .

Let us first recall a familiar definition:

**Definition 2.6.3.** A function  $f$  from a metric space  $(X, d_X)$  to a metric space  $(Y, d_Y)$  is said to be  **$K$ -Lipschitz** if

$$d_Y(f(x), f(y)) \leq K \cdot d_X(x, y).$$

**Proposition 15.** The function

$$\mu^* : \mathcal{P}(X) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$$

via

$$A \mapsto \mu^*(A)$$

is continuous (with respect to  $d_{\mu^*}$ ) and in fact is 1-Lipschitz.

*Proof.* Just note that  $\mu^*(A) = \mu^*(A \triangle \emptyset) = d_{\mu^*}(A, \emptyset)$ , so:

$$|\mu^*(A) - \mu^*(B)| = |d_{\mu^*}(A, \emptyset) - d_{\mu^*}(B, \emptyset)| \leq d_{\mu^*}(A, B).$$

□

**Proposition 16.** The function

$$\mathcal{P}(X) \mapsto \mathcal{P}(X)$$

via

$$A \mapsto A^c$$

is continuous, and in fact an isometry (i.e. a distance preserving function).

*Proof.* Just note that  $A \triangle B = A^c \triangle B^c$ , so

$$d_{\mu^*}(A, B) = \mu^*(A^c \triangle B^c) = d_{\mu^*}(A^c, B^c).$$

□

This implies that  $\mathcal{M}$  is closed under compliments: if  $M \in \mathcal{M}$ , then there exists a sequence  $(A_n) \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  with  $A_n \rightarrow M$ , but by continuity,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_n^c = M^c$ , so  $M^c \in \mathcal{M}$ .

**Proposition 17.** The function

$$\mathcal{P}(X)^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X)$$

via

$$(A, B) \mapsto A \cup B$$

is continuous, in fact, 1-Lipschitz with respect to the  $d_{\mu^*} + d_{\mu^*}$  metric on  $\mathcal{P}(X)^2$ . The same holds for  $(A, B) \mapsto A \cap B$  because its a composition of 1-Lipschitz functions  $()^c$  of  $\cup$ .

*Proof.*

$$\begin{aligned}
 d_{\mu^*}(A_1 \cup B_1, A_2 \cup B_2) &= \mu^*((A_1 \cup B_1) \triangle (A_2 \cup B_2)) \\
 &\leq \mu^*((A_1 \triangle A_2) \cup (B_1 \triangle B_2)) && [\text{Monotonicity}] \\
 &\leq \mu^*(A_1 \triangle A_2) + \mu^*(B_1 \triangle B_2) && [\text{Subadditivity}] \\
 &= d_{\mu^*}(A_1, A_2) + d_{\mu^*}(B_1, B_2).
 \end{aligned}$$

We leave it as an exercise to check that

$$(A_1 \cup B_1) \triangle (A_2 \cup B_2) \subseteq (A_1 \triangle A_2) \cup (B_1 \triangle B_2).$$

□

This implies that  $\mathcal{M}$  is closed under finite unions, hence making it an algebra: Let  $A, B \in \mathcal{M}$ , then there exists two sequences  $(A_n), (B_n) \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  such that  $A_n \rightarrow A$  and  $B_n \rightarrow B$ , so by continuity:

$$\lim_n (A_n \cup B_n) = A \cup B,$$

hence  $A \cup B \in \mathcal{M}$ .

**Proposition 18.**  $\mu^*$  is finitely additive on  $\mathcal{M}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $A, B \in \mathcal{M}$  which are disjoint, in order to show that  $\mu^*(A \sqcup B) = \mu^*(A) + \mu^*(B)$ . There is some  $(A_n), (B_n) \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  with  $A_n \rightarrow A$  and  $B_n \rightarrow B$ . By the continuity of union,

$$\lim(A_n \cup B_n) = A \cup B = A \sqcup B.$$

By the continuity of  $\mu^*$ , we have that  $\lim \mu^*(A_n) = \mu^*(A)$ ,  $\lim \mu^*(B_n) = \mu^*(B)$  and  $\lim \mu^*(A_n \cup B_n) = \mu^*(A \sqcup B)$ . Recall that we have that  $\mu^*|_{\mathcal{A}} = \mu$  which is finitely additive, so we have that

$$\mu^*(A_n \cup B_n) = \mu^*(A_n) + \mu^*(B_n) - \mu^*(A_n \cap B_n).$$

But since intersection is continuous, we have that  $\lim A_n \cap B_n = A \cap B = \emptyset$ . Once again by the continuity of  $\mu^*$ , we have that

$$\lim \mu^*(A_n \cap B_n) = \mu^*(A \cap B) = \mu^*(A \cap B) = \mu^*(\emptyset) = 0.$$

Therefore,

$$\mu^*(A \sqcup B) = \lim \mu^*(A_n \cup B_n) = \lim \mu^*(A_n) + \lim \mu^*(B_n) = \mu^*(A) + \mu^*(B).$$

□

**Proposition 19.**  $\mathcal{M}$  contains all countable unions of sets in  $\mathcal{A}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $(A_n) \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ , to show that  $\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n \in \mathcal{M}$ . By disjointification, we may assume that the  $A_n$  are pairwise disjoint. It is enough to show that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \bigsqcup_{k \leq n} A_k \right) = \bigsqcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} A_k =: A.$$

Observe that

$$d_{\mu^*} \left( \bigsqcup_{k \leq n} A_k, A \right) = \mu^* \left( \bigsqcup_{k > n} A_k \right) \leq \sum_{k > n} \mu^*(A_k) \rightarrow 0$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  because the series

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mu^*(A_k)$$

converges; indeed: for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\sum_{k \leq n} \mu^*(A_k) = \sum_{k \leq n} \mu(A_k) = \mu \left( \bigsqcup_{k \leq n} A_k \leq \mu(X) < \infty \right),$$

which is the only place we use the finiteness of  $\mu$ .  $\square$

This implies that  $\mathcal{M}$  is closed under countable unions, thus making it a sigma algebra. indeed: if  $(M_n) \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ , let  $\varepsilon > 0$  and take  $A_n \in \mathcal{A}$  so  $A_n \approx_{\varepsilon \cdot 2^{-(n+1)}} M_n$ , i.e.

$$d_{\mu^*}(A_n, M_n) \leq 2^{-(n+1)} \cdot \varepsilon.$$

But then,  $\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n \in \mathcal{M}$  and

$$d_{\mu^*} \left( \bigcup_n A_n, \bigcup_n M_n \right) \leq \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} d_{\mu^*}(A_n, M_n) \leq \varepsilon$$

So  $\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is  $\varepsilon$ -close to an element of  $\mathcal{M}$ . But  $\varepsilon$  is arbitrary and  $\mathcal{M}$  is closed (topologically speaking), hence  $\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} M_n \in \mathcal{M}$ .

## 2.6.2 Caratheodory's Extension: Uniqueness

Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be an algebra on a set  $X$  and  $\mu$  a premeasure on  $\mathcal{A}$ . Then for each extension  $\nu$  of  $\mu$  to a measure of  $\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\sigma$ , we have that  $\nu \leq \mu^*$ . If  $\mu$  is  $\sigma$ -finite, then  $\nu = \mu^*$ .

*Proof.* Since  $\mu^*$  is defined as the infimum over covers by sets in  $\mathcal{A}$ , we fix a set  $S \in \langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\sigma$  and a cover  $\{A_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  of  $S$ , and we show that

$$\nu(S) \leq \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mu(A_n).$$

But this follows from the countable subadditivity of  $\nu$ :

$$\nu(S) \leq \nu \left( \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n \right) \leq \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \nu(A_n) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mu(A_n).$$

This gives us that  $\nu \leq \mu^*$ .

Now assume  $\nu$  is  $\sigma$ -finite. It is actually enough to show that  $\nu = \mu^*$  assuming  $\mu$  is finite because given a witness to  $\sigma$ -finiteness, i.e. a partition  $X = \bigsqcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} X_n$  with each  $X_n \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $\mu(X_n) < \infty$ , the fact that  $\nu|_{X_n} = \nu^*|_{X_n}$  for all  $n$  implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(S) &= \nu \left( \bigsqcup_n (S \cap X_n) \right) = \sum_n \nu(S \cap X_n) \\ &= \sum_n \mu^*(S \cap X_n) \\ &= \mu^* \left( \bigsqcup_n (S \cap X_n) \right) \\ &= \mu^*(S) \end{aligned}$$

For each  $S \in \langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\sigma$ .

Thus, suppose that  $\mu$  is finite. We show that the function

$$S \mapsto \nu(S) : \langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\sigma \rightarrow [0, \mu(X)]$$

is continuous with respect to the pseudo-metric  $d_{\mu^*}$ . indeed, it is 1-lipschitz:

$$\begin{aligned} |\nu(S_1) - \nu(S_2)| &\leq \nu(S_1 \setminus S_2) + \nu(S_2 \setminus S_1) \\ &= \nu(S_1 \Delta S_2) \\ &\leq \mu^*(S_1 \Delta S_2) \\ &= d_{\mu^*}(S_1, S_2). \end{aligned}$$

So  $\nu$  and  $\mu^*$  are continuous functions on  $\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\sigma$  which coincide on a set  $\mathcal{A}$  which is dense in  $\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\sigma$  with respect to  $d_{\mu^*}$  since  $\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\sigma \subseteq \bar{\mathcal{A}}^{d_{\mu^*}}$ . Thus,  $\nu = \mu^*$  everywhere on  $\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\sigma$ .  $\square$

As such, there are unique measures extending the Bernoulli and Lebesgue premeasures, and we call them Bernoulli and Lebesgue measures. By Bernoulli, we mean the premeasure obtained on clopen sets on  $A^{\mathbb{N}}$  for finite  $A$  and any probability measure  $m$  on  $A$ . The corresponding Bernoulli measure is denoted by  $m^{\mathbb{N}}$ .

**Definition 2.6.4.** For a metric/topological space  $X$ , a **Borel measure** is any measure defined on the borel  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{B}(X)$ .

**Example 4.** ADD EXAMPLES

## 2.7 Null and Measurable Sets

**Definition 2.7.1.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$  be a measure space. A set  $A \subseteq X$  is called  $\mu$ -null if there is some  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  such that  $A \subseteq B$  and  $\mu(B) = 0$ . Denote the family of all  $\mu$ -null sets by  $Null_{\mu}$ .

**Remark 7.**  $\mu$ -null sets form a  **$\sigma$ -ideal**, i.e. they are closed under subsets (downwards) and under countable unions. In particular, if  $Z$  is  $\mu$ -null then  $\mathcal{P}(Z) \subseteq Null_{\mu}$ .

*Proof.* If the  $Z_n$  are  $\mu$ -null, then  $Z_n \subseteq \tilde{Z}_n \in \mathcal{B}$  and  $\mu(\tilde{Z}_n) = 0$ , so

$$\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} Z_n \subseteq \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \tilde{Z}_n$$

and

$$\mu \left( \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \tilde{Z}_n \right) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mu(\tilde{Z}_n) = 0.$$

□

**Definition 2.7.2.** For any sets  $A, B \subseteq X$ , write  $A =_{\mu} B$  if  $A \Delta B$  is  $\mu$ -null. Call a set  $A \subseteq X$   **$\mu$ -measurable** if  $A =_{\mu} B$  for some  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ . Denote by  $Meas_{\mu}$  the collection of all  $\mu$ -measurable sets.

**Proposition 20.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$  be a measure space. Then,  $Meas_{\mu}$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra. In fact,

$$Meas_{\mu} = \langle \mathcal{B} \cup Null_{\mu} \rangle_{\sigma}.$$

*Proof.* For complements, we have that  $A \Delta B$  is null if and only if  $A^c \Delta B^c$  is null because  $A \Delta B = A^c \Delta B^c$ . As for countable unions, if  $A_n \Delta B_n$  is null and  $B_n \in \mathcal{B}$ , then:

$$\left( \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n \right) \Delta \left( \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} B_n \right) \subseteq \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (A_n \Delta B_n),$$

and the right hand side is null. Thus,  $\text{Meas}_\mu \supseteq \langle \mathcal{B} \cup \text{Null}_\mu \rangle_\sigma$  and the other inclusion follows by the definition of  $\mu$ -measurable sets (notice  $M = B \Delta (M \Delta B)$ ).  $\square$

**Remark 8.** One can show that  $\text{Meas}_\mu$  is what we obtain in both Caratheodory's and Tao's proof of Caratheodory extension (left as homework).

**Proposition 21.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$  be a measure space. Then,

$$\{B \sqcup Z : B \in \mathcal{B}, \text{ and } Z \text{ is } \mu\text{-null}\} = \text{Meas}_\mu = \{B \setminus Z : B \in \mathcal{B}, \text{ and } Z \text{ is } \mu\text{-null}\}$$

*Proof.* Since  $B \cup Z$  and  $B \setminus Z$  are  $\mu$ -measurable, it is enough to show that every  $\mu$ -measureable set is of those two forms. Let  $M$  be a  $\mu$ -measurable set, so  $M \Delta B =: Z$  is  $\mu$ -null for some  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ . Thus,  $M = B \Delta Z$ . Let  $\tilde{Z} \supseteq Z$  be in  $\mathcal{B}$  and such that  $\mu(\tilde{Z}) = 0$ . Let

$$B' = B \setminus \tilde{Z}$$

and

$$\tilde{B} = B \cup \tilde{Z}.$$

Then,

$$B' \sqcup (B \cap (\tilde{Z} \setminus Z)) \sqcup (B^c \cap Z) = M = \tilde{B} \setminus (B \cap Z) \setminus (B^c \cap (\tilde{Z} \setminus Z))$$

$\square$

**Corollary 2.7.1.** For any  $\mu$ -measurable set  $M$ , there are some  $B_0, B_1 \in \mathcal{B}$  such that  $B_1 \supseteq M \supseteq B_0$  and  $\mu(B_0) = \mu(B_1)$ , i.e.  $B_0 \Delta M$  and  $M \Delta B_1$  are  $\mu$ -null.

**Definition 2.7.3.** A measure space  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$  is called **complete** if  $\mathcal{B} = \text{Meas}_\mu$ .

**Proposition 22.** Every measure  $\mu$  on a measurable space  $(X, \mathcal{B})$  admits a unique **completion**, i.e. a unique extension to a measure on  $\text{Meas}_\mu$ .

*Proof.* **Existence:** Let  $M$  be  $\mu$ -measurable so  $M = B \Delta Z$  for some  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  and  $Z$  is  $\mu$ -null. Then define the extension as

$$\bar{\mu}(M) := \mu(B).$$

This is well defined since if  $M = B_0 \Delta Z_0 = B_1 \Delta Z_1$ , where  $B_i \in \mathcal{B}$  and  $Z_i$  are  $\mu$ -null, then

$$B_0 \Delta B_1 = (M \Delta Z_0) \Delta (M \Delta Z_1) = Z_0 \Delta Z_1 \subseteq Z_0 \cup Z_1,$$

so,  $B_0 =_{\mu} B_1$  and hence  $\mu(B_0) = \mu(B_1)$ .

**Uniqueness:** Any extension  $\nu$  satisfies that  $\nu(Z) = 0$  for all  $Z \in \text{Null}_{\mu}$  by monotonicity, so whenever  $M = B \Delta Z$  with  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  and  $Z \in \text{Null}_{\mu}$ , we must have that

$$\nu(M) = \nu(B) + \nu(Z) - 2\nu(Z \cap B) = \nu(B) = \mu(B).$$

□

## 2.8 Non-measurable Sets

We will give an example of a non-Lebesgue-measurable subset of  $\mathbb{R}$ .

**Definition 2.8.1.** Let  $E$  be an equivalence relation on a set  $X$ . A **transversal** for  $E$  is a set  $Y \subseteq X$  which meets each  $E$ -class in exactly one point. A **selector** for  $E$  is a map

$$s : X \rightarrow X$$

such that  $s(x) \in [x]_E$  and

$$xEy \iff s(x) = s(y),$$

for all  $x, y \in X$ . For a selector  $s$ , we can get a transversal  $Y := s(X)$ , and vice versa, from a transversal  $Y$ , we can get a selector by setting  $s(x)$  to be equal to the unique  $y \in Y \cap [x]_E$ .

Selectors and transversals exist by the Axiom of Choice, but this typically results in ill-behaved functions and sets, for example, non-measureability.

**Example 5.** Let  $E_{\mathbb{Q}}$  denote the **Vitali equivalence relation** on  $\mathbb{R}$  defined by

$$xE_{\mathbb{Q}}y \iff y - x \in \mathbb{Q}.$$

This is simply the coset equivalence relation of  $\mathbb{Q}$  as a subgroup of  $\mathbb{R}$  under addition. Also, this is the orbit equivalence relation of the action of  $\mathbb{Q}$  on  $\mathbb{R}$  by translation. For each  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , the class  $[x]_{E_{\mathbb{Q}}} = x + \mathbb{Q}$ , in particular, it intersects  $[0, 1]$ .

We claim that any transversal  $Y \subseteq [0, 1]$  of  $E_{\mathbb{Q}}$  is non-measurable with respect to the Lebesgue measure  $\lambda$ . Indeed, observe that

$$[0, 1] \subseteq \bigsqcup_{q \in \mathbb{Q} \cap [-1, 1]} q + Y \subseteq [-1, 2].$$

If  $Y$  was measurable, so would its translates  $q + Y$  (Lebesgue measure is translation-invariant) and so  $\lambda(q + Y) = \lambda(Y)$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \lambda([0, 1]) \leq \lambda \left( \bigsqcup_{q \in \mathbb{Q} \cap [-1, 1]} q + Y \right) \\ &= \sum_{q \in \mathbb{Q} \cap [-1, 1]} \lambda(q + Y) \\ &= \infty \cdot \lambda(Y) \\ &\leq \lambda([-1, 2]) \\ &= 3, \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction (think about it).

**Remark 9.** ADD REMARK

## 2.9 Pocket Tools for Working with Measures

**Proposition 23** (Monotone Convergence). Let  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$  be a measure space.

- (a)  $\mu(\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(A_n)$  for all  $\mu$ -measurable  $A_n$  with  $A_n \subseteq A_{n+1}$ .
- (b)  $\mu(\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} B_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(B_n)$  for all  $\mu$ -measurable  $B_n$  with  $B_n \supseteq B_{n+1}$  with  $\mu(B_0) < \infty$ .

**Remark 10.** Caution about (b)

*Proof.* (a): We disjointify:  $A'_0 := A_0$  and  $A'_n = A_n \setminus A_{n-1}$ , so

$$\bigsqcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A'_n = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n,$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu \left( \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n \right) &= \mu \left( \bigsqcup_n A'_n \right) \\
&= \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mu(A'_n) \\
&= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n \leq N} \mu(A'_n) \\
&= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mu \left( \bigsqcup_{n \leq N} A'_n \right) \\
&= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mu(A_N).
\end{aligned}$$

(b): The sets  $A_n := B_0 \setminus B_n$  are increasing, so by (a), we have that

$$\mu \left( \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n \right) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(A_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\mu(B_0) - \mu(B_n)) = \mu(B_0) - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(B_n),$$

where we used that  $\mu(B_n) \leq \mu(B_0) < \infty$  in the second equality. On the other hand:

$$\mu \left( \bigcup_n A_n \right) = \mu \left( B_0 \setminus \bigcap_n B_n \right) = \mu(B_0) - \mu \left( \bigcap_n B_n \right).$$

Rearranging the previous two equations yields our equality.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.9.1** (Borel-Cantelli Lemmas). Let  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$  be a measure space. Let  $(A_n)$  be a sequence of  $\mu$ -measurable sets.

- (a) If  $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mu(A_n) < \infty$ , then almost every  $x \in X$  is eventually not in  $A_n$ , i.e. the set

$$\limsup A_n = \{x \in X : \exists_n^\infty, x \in A_n\} = \bigcap_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcup_{n \geq m} A_m$$

is  $\mu$ -null (where  $\exists_n^\infty \equiv \forall m \exists n \geq m$ ).

- (b) Measure Compactness: Suppose  $\mu(X) < \infty$ . Then if there is some  $\delta > 0$  such that  $\mu(A_n) \geq \delta$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  then

$$\mu(\limsup A_n) \geq \delta.$$

*Proof.* (a): note taht  $\limsup A_n \subseteq \bigcup_{n \geq m} A_n$  for all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  (since  $\limsup$  is decreasing) so:

$$\mu(\limsup A_n) \leq \mu\left(\bigcup_{n \geq m} A_n\right) \leq \sum_{n \geq m} \mu(A_n) \rightarrow 0$$

as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ .

(b): Since  $\mu(X) < \infty$ , then

$$\mu(\limsup A_n) = \mu\left(\bigcap_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcup_{n \geq m} A_n\right) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mu\left(\bigcup_{n \geq m} A_n\right) \geq \delta$$

□

**Definition 2.9.1.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$  be a measure space. A sequence  $(V_n)$  of  $\mu$ -measurable sets is called **vanishing** (resp. **almost vanishing**) if  $(V_n)$  is decreasing and  $\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} V_n$  is empty (resp. null).

**Proposition 24.** Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a collection of  $\mu$ -measurable sets that is closed under countable unions. If  $\mathcal{F}$  contains positive measure sets of arbitrarily small measure, then  $\mathcal{F}$  contains an almost vanishing sequence of positive measure sets.

*Proof.* For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $A_n \in \mathcal{F}$  be a positive measure set with  $\mu(A_n) \leq 2^{-n}$ . The sets  $A_n$  may not be decreasing, but the sets  $V_n := \bigcup_{m \geq n} A_m$  are decreasing and

$$\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} V_n = \limsup A_n$$

which is null by Borel-cantelli because

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mu(A_n) < \infty.$$

□

**Definition 2.9.2.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$  be a measure space and  $P$  a property of points in  $X$ . Then, we say that  $P$  holds **almost everywhere** (abbreviated as **a.e**) in  $X$  if the set  $\{x \in X : x \text{ satisfies } P\}$  is co-null.

## 2.10 Measure Exhaustion

**Definition 2.10.1.** In a measure space, call a collection  $\mathcal{C}$  of sets **almost disjoint** if the pairwise intersections of sets in  $\mathcal{C}$  are null.

**Proposition 25** (Countable Pigeonhole principle). Let  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$  be a  $\sigma$ -finite measure space. Then any almost disjoint collection  $\mathcal{C}$  of  $\mu$ -measurable positive measure sets is countable.

*Proof.* We first prove it for the  $\mu(X) < \infty$  case. Then, for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$ , the set

$$\mathcal{C}_n = \{C \in \mathcal{C} : \mu(C) \geq 1/n\}$$

is finite (in fact it has at most  $n \cdot \mu(X)$  elements) and  $\mathcal{C} = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}^+} \mathcal{C}_n$ , so  $\mathcal{C}$  is countable.

For the general  $\sigma$ -finite case, let  $X = \bigsqcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} X_n$  where each  $X_n \in \mathcal{B}$  and is of finite measure. Define

$$\mathcal{D}_n = \{C \in \mathcal{C} : \mu(C \cap X_n) > 0\}.$$

Then by the finite case, each  $\mathcal{D}_n$  is countable and since  $\mathcal{C} = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{D}_n$ , it is countable.  $\square$

**Proposition 26** (Transfinite Measure Exhaustion). Let  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$  be a  $\sigma$ -finite measure space and let  $(A_\alpha)_{\alpha < \omega_1}$  be an increasing sequence of  $\mu$ -measurable sets where  $\omega_1$  is the first uncountable ordinal. Then the sequence almost stabilizes at some countable ordinal  $\gamma$ , i.e. for all  $\alpha \geq \gamma$ ,  $A_\alpha =_\mu A_\gamma$ .

*Proof.* We fist disjointify:  $A'_\alpha := A_\alpha \setminus [\bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} A_\beta]$ . So  $\{A'_\alpha\}_{\alpha < \omega_1}$  is an almost disjoint collection, hence all but countably many of  $A_\alpha$  are null by countable pigeonhole, i.e. there is some countable ordinal  $\gamma$  such that  $A'_\alpha$  is null for all  $\alpha > \gamma$ , hence  $A_\alpha =_\mu A_\gamma$  because  $A_\alpha \setminus A_\gamma = \bigcup_{\gamma < \beta < \alpha} A'_\beta$  is null being a countable union of null sets.  $\square$

**Remark 11.** This allows us to run transfinite algorithms which at each step handle a positive measure set. Then we know the algorithm will stop at a countable stage, having handled a co-null set.

We now discuss an important application. In a measure space with atoms, we can't achieve every value of measure between 0 and  $\mu(X)$ , but this is the only abstraction.

**Theorem 2.10.1** (Sierpinski Theorem). In an atomless measure space  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ , every value  $0 < r \leq \mu(X)$  is achieved, i.e. there is a  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  with  $\mu(B) = r$ .

First we prove a more humble statement.

**Proposition 27.** Every positive measure set  $Y$  contains positive measure sets of arbitrarily small measure.

*Proof.* Since  $Y$  is not an atom there is some  $X_\emptyset \subseteq Y$  with  $\mu(X_\emptyset) < \mu(Y)$ . We build a sequence  $(X_s)_{s \in 2^{<\mathbb{N}}}$  of positive measure sets such that  $X_s = X_{s0} \sqcup X_{s1}$  as follows: if  $X_s$  is already defined, it is not an atom, so there is some  $X_{s0} \subseteq X_s$  in  $\mathcal{B}$  with  $0 < \mu(X_{s0}) < \mu(X_s)$ . Let  $X_{s1} = X_s \setminus X_{s0}$ . For each  $s \in 2^{<\mathbb{N}}$ , one of  $X_{s0}$  and  $X_{s1}$  must have measure at most half of  $\mu(X_s)$ . Looking at the tree we get from the sequence, this gives an infinite branch  $(X_{s_n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  in the tree of positive measure with  $\mu(X_{s_n}) \leq 2^{-n}\mu(X_\emptyset)$ .  $\square$

Iteratively using the previous proposition, we now explicitly build a set  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  with  $\mu(B) = r$ . We present two proofs, one via transfinite exhaustion and the other via a 1/2-greedy algorithm, with the latter one being the more preferable one of the two.

*Proof Via transfinite exhaustion.* Define a sequence  $(A_\alpha)_{\alpha < \omega_1} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$  of pairwise disjoint sets such that  $\mu(\bigsqcup_{\alpha < \beta} A_\alpha) \leq r$  for each  $\beta < \omega_1$  by induction as follows: If  $(A_\alpha)_{\alpha < \beta}$  is already defined, let  $A_\beta$  be a positive measure subset of  $X \setminus \bigcup_{\alpha < \beta} A_\alpha$  of measure at most  $r - \mu(\bigsqcup_{\alpha < \beta} A_\alpha)$  if  $r - \mu(\bigsqcup_{\alpha < \beta} A_\alpha) > 0$ . Otherwise, put  $A_\beta := \emptyset$ . Now the proof of countable pigeonhole for measures (using the condition that  $\mu(\bigsqcup_{\alpha < \beta} A_\alpha) < r$ , for all  $\beta < \omega_1$ , instead of the finiteness of  $\mu$ ) gives that all but countably many of the  $A_\alpha$  are null, i.e. there is some  $\beta < \omega_1$  with  $A_\alpha$  being null for all  $\alpha \geq \beta$ . Thus,  $\mu(\bigsqcup_{\alpha < \beta} A_\alpha) = r$ .  $\square$

*proof via 1/2-greedy algorithm.* We inductively build a sequence  $(B_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$  of pairwise disjoint sets such that  $\mu(\bigsqcup_{i \leq n} B_i) \leq r$ . Suppose that  $(B_i)_{i < n}$  is already defined, then take  $B_n \in \mathcal{B}$  to be any set such that

$$\mu(B_n) \geq \frac{1}{2} \sup \left\{ B \in \mathcal{B} : B \subseteq X \setminus \bigsqcup_{i < n} B_i, \text{ and } \mu(B) \leq r - \mu(\bigsqcup_{i < n} B_i) \right\}.$$

Now that  $(B_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is defined, by monotone convergence,

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mu(B_n) = \mu \left( \bigsqcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} B_n \right) \leq r,$$

namely, the series is summable and so  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(B_n) = 0$ . We check that the set  $B_\infty := \bigsqcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} B_n$  has measure  $r$ . Indeed, otherwise,  $\mu(B_\infty) < r$ , so by the

previous proposition, there is some  $B' \subseteq X \setminus B_\infty$  in  $\mathcal{B}$  such that  $0 < \mu(B') < r - \mu(B_\infty)$ . But taking  $n$  to be large enough so that  $\mu(B_n) < 1/2\mu(B')$ , we get a contradiction with the choice of  $B_n$ .  $\square$

## 2.11 Approximating Measurable Sets

### 2.11.1 99% Lemma

We begin with the following observation.

**Proposition 28** (Percentage of Carrots in Soup). Let  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$  be a measure space and let  $A, B$  be  $\mu$ -measurable sets with  $0 < \mu(B) < \infty$ . Then for any (percentage)  $p \in (0, 1)$  and any (finite or countable) partition  $B = \bigsqcup_{n < N} B_i$ , where  $N \in \mathbb{N} \cup \infty$ , we have that if

$$\frac{\mu(A \cap B)}{\mu(B)} \geq p$$

then

$$\frac{\mu(A \cap B_n)}{\mu(B_n)} \geq p$$

for some  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

*Proof.* Notice that

$$\frac{\mu(A \cap B)}{\mu(B)} = \sum \frac{\mu(B_n)}{\mu(B)} \cdot \frac{\mu(A \cap B_n)}{\mu(B_n)}$$

and we know that

$$\sum \frac{\mu(B_n)}{\mu(B)} = 1$$

so it is a convex combination.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.11.1** (99% Lemma). Let  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$  be a  $\sigma$ -finite measure space and let  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$  be a collection of sets whose finite disjoint unions form an algebra generating  $\mathcal{B}$ . Then each positive measure set  $M \subseteq X$  admits a set  $C \in \mathcal{C}$  whose 99% is  $M$ , i.e. For all  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there is some  $C \in \mathcal{C}$  such that

$$\frac{\mu(M \cap C)}{\mu(C)} \geq 1 - \varepsilon.$$

*Proof.* By the uniqueness of Caratheodory theorem, we have that  $\mu = (\mu|_{\langle \mathcal{C} \rangle_\sigma})^*$  and thus

$$\mu(M) = \inf \left\{ \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mu C_k : \bigsqcup_k C_k \supseteq M, \text{ and } \{C_k\} \subseteq \mathcal{C} \right\}.$$

Using  $\sigma$ -finiteness,  $M$  has a  $\mu$ -measurable subset of positive finite measure, so by shrinking  $M$ , we may assume that  $\mu(M) < \infty$ . Then, there exists some  $\{C_k\} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  such that  $\bigsqcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} C_k \supseteq M$ , and that

$$\frac{\mu(M)}{\mu(\bigsqcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} C_k)} \geq 1 - \varepsilon,$$

so by Carrot-soup observation there is some  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$\frac{\mu(M \cap C_k)}{\mu(C_k)} \geq 1 - \varepsilon.$$

□

**Example 6.** Two familiar examples are:

- (a) For  $(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d), \lambda)$  we take  $\mathcal{C}$  to be the collection of boxes, therefore we get that every positive measure set contains 99% of a box  $C$ .
- (b) For  $(A^\mathbb{N}, \mathcal{B}(A^\mathbb{N}), \mu)$ , where  $A$  is finite and  $\mu$  is Bernoulli, we take  $\mathcal{C}$  to be the collection of cylinders, and thus every positive measure set contains 99% of a cylinder  $C$ .

**Remark 12.** In both of these examples, we can take the box/cylinder  $C$  to be arbitrarily small (both small in diameter and small in measure because each box/cylinder partitions into arbitrarily small finitely many) boxes/cylinders, hence the carrot-soup observation applies.

### 2.11.2 Application: Ergodicity

**Definition 2.11.1.** Let  $(X, \mu)$  be a measure space and  $E$  be an equivalence relation on  $X$ . The relation  $E$  is called **ergodic** (with respect to  $\mu$ ) if every  $E$ -invariant (i.e. union of  $E$ -classes)  $\mu$ -measurable set is null or conull. In other words,  $X$  is not decomposable into two  $E$ -invariant positive measure sets.

**Example 7.** We start with a couple relevant examples of equivalence relations.

- (a) Let  $\Gamma$  be a countable group acting on a measure space  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$  so that  $\gamma \cdot B \in \mathcal{B}$  for all  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ , and  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ . For instance, translations actions  $\mathbb{Z} \curvearrowright \mathbb{R}$  or  $\mathbb{Q} \curvearrowright \mathbb{R}$ , or dialations  $(\mathbb{Q}^+, \cdot) \curvearrowright \mathbb{R}^d$ . Then the orbit equivalence relation on  $X$  of this action, denoted  $E_\Gamma$  and is defined by:

$$xE_\gamma y \iff x \text{ and } y \text{ are in the same } \Gamma\text{-orbit.}$$

- (b) Let  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$  be a measure space and  $T : X \rightarrow X$  not necessarily a bijection. We will assume that  $T$  is “ $\mu$ -measurable”. Its orbit equivalence relation, denoted  $E_T$ , is defined by

$$xE_Ty \iff T^n x = T^m y \text{ for some } n, m \in \mathbb{N}.$$

We draw an edge from  $X \rightarrow T(x)$ . Then the  $T$ -orbits are exactly the connected components of this graph, which is the graph of  $T$  as a subset of  $X \times X$ .

**Example 8.** Now we present some Ergodic and non Ergodic equivalence relations.

- (a) Non-ergodic: Let  $Z \curvearrowright \mathbb{R}$  by translation:  $z \times r = z + r$ , for  $z \in Z$  and  $r \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then the orbit equivalence relation is just the coset equivalence relation  $Z \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ . The orbit of  $y \in \mathbb{R}$  is  $x + \mathbb{Z}$ . Then,  $A := (0, 1/2) + \mathbb{Z} = \bigsqcup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} (n, n + 1/2)$  is  $E_Z$ -invariant, but it and its compliment have positive measure, so  $E_Z$  is not  $\lambda$ -ergodic, where  $\lambda$  is the Lebesgue measure. Note that  $E_Z$  admits a measurable transversal, for instance  $[0, 1)$ .
- (b) Ergodic: Let  $\mathbb{Q} \curvearrowright \mathbb{R}$  by translation, so its orbit equivalence relation  $E_{\mathbb{Q}}$  is the coset equivalence of  $\mathbb{Q} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ . Recall that  $E_{\mathbb{Q}}$  does not admit a measurable transversal(via the Vitali construction) and the reason for this is that  $E_{\mathbb{Q}}$  is ergodic, which we will prove using the 99% lemma.

**Proposition 29.**  $E_{\mathbb{Q}}$  is ergodic.

*Proof.* Suppose otherwise. So there is a positive measure set  $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  with  $B := \mathbb{R} \setminus A$  being of positive measure. By the 99% lemma, there is a positive interval  $J$  whose 99% is  $B$ . Once again by the 99% lemma, there is a positive measure interval  $I$  whose 99% is  $A$  and moreover,  $lh(I) < lh(J)$ . Using that rationals are dense, we can cover at least half of  $J$  by finitely many pairwise disjoint rational translates of  $I$ , i.e.  $\bigsqcup_{i < k} (q_i + I) \subseteq J$  and  $\mu(\bigsqcup_{i < k} q_i + I) \geq 1/2\lambda(J)$ . Since  $q_i + A = A$  for all  $i$ , we have that 99% of each  $q_i + I$  is still  $A$ . So at least half of 99% of  $J$  is  $A$ , contradicting that at most 1% of  $J$  is  $A$ .  $\square$

## 2.12 Regularity of Measures

**Definition 2.12.1.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$  be a measure space and  $X$  a metric space. Then  $\mu$  is called **regular** if each  $\mu$ -measurable set  $M$  satisfies the following two conditions:

- **Outer regularity:**  $\mu(M) = \inf\{\mu(\mathcal{U}) : \mathcal{U} \supseteq M \text{ is open}\}$ ,
- **Inner regularity:**  $\mu(M) = \sup\{\mu(C) : C \subseteq M \text{ is closed}\}$ .

Moreover,  $\mu$  is called **strongly regular** if

$$0 = \inf\{\mu(\mathcal{U} \setminus M) : \mathcal{U} \supseteq M \text{ is open}\} = \inf\{\mu(M \setminus C) : C \subseteq M \text{ is closed}\}.$$

**Remark 13.** All finite regular measures are strongly regular.

**Proposition 30.** If  $\mu$  is strongly regular, then every measurable set  $M$  is  $=_\mu$  to a  $G_\delta$  set and  $=_\mu$  to a  $F_\sigma$  set; More precisely, there is a  $G_\delta$  set  $G$  and a  $F_\sigma$  set  $F$  such that  $F \subseteq M \subseteq G$  and  $F =_\mu M =_\mu G$ .

*Proof.* By strong regularity, for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$ , there is an open set  $U_n$  and a closed set  $C_n$  such that  $C_n \subseteq M \subseteq U_n$  and  $\mu(M \setminus C_n)$ ,  $\mu(U_n \setminus M)$  are both at most  $1/n$ . Let

$$G := \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} U_n$$

and

$$F := \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} C_n.$$

Thus,  $F \subseteq M \subseteq G$  and

$$\mu(M \setminus F) \leq \mu(M \setminus C_n) \leq 1/n \rightarrow 0$$

and

$$\mu(G \setminus M) \leq \mu(U_n \setminus M) \leq 1/n \rightarrow 0,$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , and so  $\mu(F) = \mu(M) = \mu(G)$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 2.12.1.** Every finite Borel measure  $\mu$  on a metric space  $X$  is strongly regular.

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be the collection of all  $\mu$ -measurable sets  $M \subseteq X$  which satisfy:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \inf\{\mu(U \setminus M) : U \supseteq M \text{ is open}\} \\ &= \inf\{\mu(M \setminus C) : C \subseteq M \text{ is closed}\}. \end{aligned}$$

First, we claim  $\mathcal{S}$  contains all open sets.

Recall that open sets are  $F_\sigma$  in metric spaces, so for an open set  $U \subseteq X$ , we have that

$$U = \bigsqcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} C_n$$

where the  $C_n$  are closed. Replacing each  $C_n$  with

$$\bigcup_{i \leq n} C_i,$$

we may assume that  $U$  is an increasing union of  $C_n$ 's. But then by monotone convergence,  $\mu(U) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(C_n)$ .

Secondly, we show  $\mathcal{S}$  is an algebra: indeed, complement of open/closed is closed/open. Also finite unions of open/closed is open/closed.

Furthermore,  $\mathcal{S}$  is closed under countable unions, and is hence a  $\sigma$ -algebra. Let  $M := \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} M_n$  where  $M_n \in \mathcal{S}$ . Since  $\mathcal{S}$  is closed under finite unions, we may replace  $M_n$  with  $\bigcup_{i \leq n} M_i$  and assume that  $M$  is an increasing union of  $M_n$ 's.

For outer regularity, let  $U_n \subseteq M_n$  be open and such that

$$\mu(U_n \setminus M_n) \leq \varepsilon \cdot 2^{-(n+1)}$$

. Then,  $U := \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} U_n$  is open, and

$$\mu(U \setminus M) \leq \mu\left(\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} [U_n \setminus M_n]\right) \leq \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mu(U_n \setminus M_n) \leq \varepsilon.$$

For inner regularity, let  $C_n \subseteq M_n$  be closed and such that  $\mu(C_n) \approx_{1/n} \mu(M_n)$ . Because  $M$  is an increasing union, by monotone convergence we have that  $\mu(M) = \lim \mu(M_n)$  and so for large enough  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mu(M) - \mu(C_n)| &\leq |\mu(M) - \mu(M_n)| + |\mu(M_n) - \mu(C_n)| \\ &\leq \varepsilon/2 + \varepsilon/2 \\ &= \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $\mathcal{S}$  contains all Borel sets. For a  $\mu$ -measurable  $M \subseteq X$ , let  $B_0 \subseteq M \subseteq B_1$  be borel sets with  $B_0 =_\mu M =_\mu B_1$  and let  $U \supseteq B_1$  be an open set such that  $\mu(U) \approx_\epsilon \mu(B_1) = \mu(M)$ , and  $C \subseteq B_0$  a closed set such that  $\mu(C) \approx_\epsilon \mu(B_0) = \mu(M)$ . So  $\mathcal{S}$  contains all  $\mu$ -measurable sets.  $\square$

**Remark 14.** It is not true that  $\sigma$ -finite Borel measures on metric spaces are regular.

**Example 9.**  $\sigma$ -finite counter example:

*ADD MEEE*

**Definition 2.12.2.** Let  $X$  be a Hausdorff topological space (e.g. a metric space) and let  $\mu$  be a Borel measure on  $X$ . We say that  $\mu$  is

- **$\sigma$ -finite by open sets** if  $X = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} U_n$  where  $U_n$  is open and has finite  $\mu$ -measure.
- **finite on compact sets** if each compact set has finite  $\mu$ -measure.
- **locally finite** if every point  $x \in X$  admits a neighbourhood  $V$  (i.e.  $x \in \text{Int}(V)$ ) of finite  $\mu$ -measure (in particular, an open neighbourhood of finite measure).

**Corollary 2.12.1.** For a metric space  $X$ , every Borel measure that's  $\sigma$ -finite by open sets is strongly regular.

*Proof.* Let  $X = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} U_n$  where  $U_n$  is open and of finite measure. Let  $M \subseteq X$  be  $\mu$ -measurable. For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , viewing  $U_n$  as a metric space with  $\mu|_{U_n}$  a finite Borel measure, we get a set  $V_n \subseteq U_n$  open relative to  $U_n$  (hence open in  $X$  since  $U_n$  is open) such that  $V_n \supseteq M \cap U_n$ , and  $\mu(V_n) \approx_{\varepsilon, 2^{-(n+1)}} \mu(M \cap U_n)$ . Thus,  $V = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} V_n$  is open in  $X$  and

$$\mu(V \setminus M) \leq \mu\left(\bigcup_n [V \setminus M]\right) \leq \varepsilon.$$

This handles strong regularity outer regularity.

For strong inner regularity, let  $U \supseteq M^c$  be an open set with  $\mu(U \setminus M^c) \leq \varepsilon$ . But  $U^c$  is closed and  $U \setminus M^c = M \setminus U^c$ , hence  $\mu(M \setminus U^c) \leq \varepsilon$ .  $\square$

Since we will use the other two conditions as well, lets sort out the relationship between them.

**Proposition 31.** Let  $X$  be a Hausdorff topological space. For a Borel measure  $\mu$ , then consider the following conditions:

- (1)  $\mu$  is finite on compact sets.
- (2)  $\mu$  is locally finite.

(3)  $\mu$  is  $\sigma$ -finite by open sets.

Then, (3)  $\Rightarrow$  (2)  $\Rightarrow$  (1) always. Moreover, if  $X$  is locally compact(i.e. for all  $x \in X$  there is an open  $U$  and compact  $K$  such that  $x \in U \subseteq K$ .), (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2). If  $X$  is second countable, then (2)  $\Rightarrow$  (3).

*Proof.* (3)  $\Rightarrow$  (2): If  $X = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} U_n$ , where  $U_n$  is open and of finite measure, then for every  $x \in X$ ,  $x$  is contained in some  $U_n$ .

(2)  $\Rightarrow$  (1) : Let  $K$  be a compact set and for each  $x \in K$ , let  $U_x$  be an open neighbourhood of finite measure containing  $x$ . Then, the cover  $\{U_x\}_{x \in K}$  admits a finite subcover  $U_{x_1}, \dots, U_{x_n}$ , so  $K \subseteq \bigcup_{i \leq n} U_{x_i}$  and this union has finite measure.

(1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2) : Suppose  $X$  is locally compact and (1) holds. Then every point  $x \in X$  has a compact neighbourhood(equivalent to previous definition when  $X$  is Hausdorff) and compact sets have finite measure.

(2)  $\Rightarrow$  (3): Suppose  $X$  is second countable and  $\mu$  is locally finite. Let  $\{U_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a countable basis for  $X$ . Then for each  $x \in X$ , there is an open neighbourhood  $U$  of finite measure containing  $x$ , hence there is some  $n_x \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $x \in U_{n_x} \subseteq U$ , so  $U_{n_x}$  has finite measure. But then  $X = \bigcup_{x \in X} U_{n_x}$  and this is a countable union.  $\square$

Thus, since  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and  $A^{\mathbb{N}}$ (for a finite  $A$ ) are locally compact second countable metric spaces, all these notions coincide for Borel measures on them. In particular:

**Corollary 2.12.2.** The Lebesgue measure on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and the Bernoulli measure on  $A^{\mathbb{N}}$ . with  $|A| < \infty$ , are strongly regular.

## 2.13 Tightness

**Definition 2.13.1.** A Borel measure  $\mu$  on a Hausdorff topological space is called **tight** if for every  $\mu$ -measurable set  $M \subseteq X$ ,

$$\mu(M) = \sup\{\mu(K) : K \subseteq M \text{ is compact}\}.$$

Before the next theorem, let us recall some equivalent definitions of compactness for metric spaces

**Theorem 2.13.1** (Compactness in metric spaces). For a metric space  $X$ , the following are equivalent:

(1)  $X$  is compact (every open cover has a finite subcover).

- (2)  $X$  is sequentially compact (every sequence has a convergent subsequence).
- (3)  $X$  is complete and totally bounded (for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  we can cover the whole space with finitely many  $\varepsilon$ -balls).

**Corollary 2.13.1.** In a complete metric space, compact is equivalent to closed and totally bounded.

**Theorem 2.13.2.** Finite Borel measures on Polish spaces are tight.

*Proof.* Since we know that a finite Borel measure  $\mu$  on a polish space  $X$  is strongly regular, every  $\mu$ -measurable set can be approximated from below by closed sets, so it is enough to show that closed sets can be approximated from below by compact sets. Let  $C \subseteq X$  be a closed set. Since  $C$  is Polish with the same metric, we may assume  $X = C$ . For a polish space  $X$  and a finite Borel measure  $\mu$  on  $X$ , it is enough to show that for each  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there is a compact  $K \subseteq X$  with  $\mu(K) \approx_\varepsilon \mu(X)$ . Fix  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Let  $\varepsilon_n = 1/n$  and for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$ , let  $\{B_l^{\varepsilon_n}\}_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a countable cover of  $X$  with closed balls of radius at most  $\varepsilon_n$  (such a cover exists by separability). Because

$$X = \bigcup_{L \in \mathbb{N}} \left( \bigcup_{l \leq L} B_l^{\varepsilon_n} \right),$$

(the outermost union is increasing), we have that

$$\mu(X) \approx_{\varepsilon \cdot 2^{-(n+1)}} \mu \left( \bigcup_{l < L_n} B_l^{\varepsilon_n} \right)$$

for  $L_n$  large enough, by monotone convergence. Put  $C_n := \bigcup_{l \leq L_n} B_l^{\varepsilon_n}$ , so  $C_n$  is closed and  $K := \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} C_n$  is still closed but also totally bounded by definition, hence compact. Finally,

$$\mu(X \setminus K) \leq \mu \left( \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} [X \setminus C_n] \right) \leq \varepsilon.$$

□

**Corollary 2.13.2** (Strong regularity and tightness for locally finite measures.). Let  $X$  be a Polish Space. Then, every locally finite Borel measure on  $X$  is strongly regular and tight.

*Proof.* Polish spaces are second countable, and so local finiteness is equivalent to  $\sigma$ -finiteness by open sets,i.e.  $X = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} U_n$ , where  $U_n$  is open and finite measure. Thus,  $\mu$  is strongly regular by a previous result for metric spaces and we only need to show tightness.

From DST, we know that open subsets of Polish spaces are Polish (with a different equivalent metric), so on each  $U_n$ , we know that  $\mu$  is tight. We leave the rest of the proof as homework.  $\square$

# CHAPTER 3

---

## Measurable Functions and Integration

---

### 3.1 Measurable Functions

**Definition 3.1.1.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{I})$  and  $(Y, \mathcal{J})$  be measurable spaces. A function  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  is said to be:

- (a)  **$(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})$ -measurable** if  $f^{-1}(J) \in \mathcal{I}$  for every  $J \in \mathcal{J}$ .
- (b)  **$\mathcal{I}$ -measurable** if  $Y$  is a metric space and  $f$  is  $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{B}(Y))$ -measurable.
- (c) **Borel** if  $X$  and  $Y$  are both metric spaces and  $f$  is  $(\mathcal{B}(X), \mathcal{B}(Y))$ -measurable.
- (d)  **$\mu$ -measurable** if  $\mu$  is a measure on  $(X, \mathcal{I})$ ,  $Y$  is a metric space and  $f$  is  $Meas_\mu$ -measurable, i.e.  $f^{-1}(B)$  is  $\mu$ -measurable for each Borel  $B \subseteq Y$ .

**Remark 15.** For functions  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we will view the left  $\mathbb{R}$  as the measure space  $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}), \lambda)$  and the right  $\mathbb{R}$  as a metric space, so the definition of  $\lambda$ -measurable is asymmetric: The preimage of Borel sets are  $\lambda$ -measurable. This is done because we get to call more functions measurable since the theory works for them.

**Proposition 32.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{I})$  and  $(Y, \mathcal{J})$  be measurable spaces and  $f : X \rightarrow Y$ . If for some  $\mathcal{J}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{J}$  which generates  $\mathcal{J}$  as a  $\sigma$ -algebra, we have that  $f^{-1}(J_0) \in \mathcal{I}$  for all  $J_0 \in \mathcal{J}_0$ , then  $f$  is  $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})$ -measurable.

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{S} = \{J \in \mathcal{J} : f^{-1}(J) \in \mathcal{I}\}$  and observe that  $\mathcal{S} \supseteq \mathcal{J}_0$  and  $\mathcal{S}$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra since preimages respect union and complements. Hence,  $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{J}$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 3.1.1.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{I})$  be a measurable space, and  $Y$  a metric space. Let  $f : X \rightarrow Y$ . If  $f^{-1}(V) \in \mathcal{I}$  for each open  $V \subseteq Y$ , then  $f$  is  $\mathcal{I}$ -measurable. In particular, continuous functions are Borel because the preimage of open sets are open.

The following is one of the reasons for building measure theory.

**Theorem 3.1.1.** Pointwise limits of measurable functions are measurable. More precisely, if  $(X, \mathcal{I})$  is a measurable space and  $Y$  is a separable metric space, then  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n$  is  $\mathcal{I}$ -measurable for any sequence of  $\mathcal{I}$ -measurable functions  $f_n : X \rightarrow Y$  for which  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n$  exists for each  $x \in X$ .

*Proof.* By the last corollary, it is enough to show that  $f^{-1}(U) \in \mathcal{I}$  for each open  $U \subseteq Y$ . Note that openness of  $U$  gives the following: for  $x \in X$ , if  $f(x) \in U$ , then  $\forall_n^\infty f_n(x) \in U$  ( $\forall_n^\infty := \exists m \forall n \geq m$ ). If the converse were also true we would be done because then

$$f^{-1}(U) = \bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcap_{n \geq m} f_n^{-1}(U).$$

Unfortunately, the converse isn't true, for instance, take  $U = (0, 1) \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  and  $f(x) := 1/n$ . So,  $f_n(x) \in U$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , but the limit is  $0 \notin U$ . The converse holds for closed sets but  $U$  is open. However, using separability, we can find a presentation of  $U$ , which behaves as both closed and open.

We claim that

$$\bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} V_k = U = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \overline{V}_k,$$

for some open  $V_k \subseteq Y$ . Let  $\mathcal{D} \subseteq Y$  be a countable dense set and

$$\mathcal{V} := \left\{ B_{1/n}(y) : y \in \mathcal{D}, n \in \mathbb{N}^+, \overline{B(y)_{1/n}} \subseteq U \right\}.$$

Clearly,  $\mathcal{V}$  is countable. Note that if  $V \in \mathcal{V}$ , then  $\overline{V} \subseteq U$ , and so it is enough to show that

$$U = \bigcup_{V \in \mathcal{V}} V.$$

Fix  $y \in U$ . Then for  $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$  large enough,  $\overline{B_{1/n}(y)} \subseteq U$ . Let  $y' \in \mathcal{D}$  such that  $y' \in B_{1/2n}(y)$ . Equivalently,  $y \in B_{1/2n}(y')$ . Moreover,

$$\overline{B_{1/2n}(y')} \subseteq \overline{B_{1/n}(y)} \subseteq U.$$

Thus,  $B_{1/2n}(y') \in \mathcal{V}$  and so

$$y \in \bigcup_{V \in \mathcal{V}} V.$$

Finally, we can have that for all  $x \in X$ ,

$$f(x) \in U \iff \exists k \forall_n^\infty f_n(x) \in \overline{V_k}.$$

$(\Rightarrow)$  :  $f(x) \in U = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} V_k$  and so there is some  $k$  such that  $f(x) \in V_k$ . Therefore,  $\exists k \forall_n^\infty f_n(x) \in V_k$ .

$(\Leftarrow)$  suppose that  $\exists k \forall_n^\infty f_n(x) \in V_k$ . Then, there is some  $k$  such that  $f(x) \in \overline{V_k}$  (by closedness). and so  $f(x) \in U$ . Therefore,

$$f^{-1}(U) = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcap_{n \geq m} f_n^{-1}(\overline{V_k}) \in \mathcal{I}.$$

□

**Proposition 33.** Let  $X, Y$  be metric spaces, where  $Y$  is second countable. Let  $\mu$  be a strongly regular Borel measure on  $X$ . Let  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  be a  $\mu$ -measurable function. Then,

- (a)  $f$  is Borel on a co-null Borel set, i.e.  $f : |_{X'} : X' \rightarrow Y$  is a Borel function for some co-null Borel  $X'$  (Note:  $\mathcal{B}(X') = \{B \in \mathcal{B}(X) : B \subseteq X'\}$ ).
- (b) **Luzin's Theorem:** For all  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $f$  is continuous on a closed set  $C$  with  $\mu(X \setminus C) < \varepsilon$ , i.e.  $f|_C : C \rightarrow Y$  is continuous.

*Proof.* Let  $\{V_n\}$  be a countable basis for  $Y$ , so it generates  $\mathcal{B}(Y)$  as a  $\sigma$ -algebra.

(a):  $f^{-1}(V_n)$  is  $\mu$ -measurable, hence  $f^{-1}(V_n) =_\mu B_n$  for some Borel  $B_n \subseteq X$ . Let

$$Z = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (f^{-1}(V_n) \Delta B_n),$$

so  $Z$  is null, hence  $Z \subseteq \tilde{Z}$  where  $\tilde{Z}$  is Borel and still null. Put  $X' := X \setminus \tilde{Z}$ . So  $X$  is Borel and co-null. then,

$$(f|_{X'})^{-1}(V_n) = f^{-1}(V_n) \cap X' = B_n \cap X'$$

which is Borel. So  $F|_{X'}$  is Borel.

(b):  $f^{-1}(V_n)$  is  $\mu$ -measurable, hence by strong outer regularity there is some open  $U_n \subseteq X$  such that

$$\mu(U_n \Delta f^{-1}(V_n)) \leq \varepsilon \cdot 2^{-(n+2)}.$$

Let

$$Z = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (f^{-1}(V_n) \Delta U_n).$$

So,

$$\mu(Z) \leq \varepsilon/2.$$

Again by outer regularity, there is an open set  $\tilde{Z} \supseteq Z$  with  $\mu(\tilde{Z} \setminus Z) \leq \varepsilon/2$ , so  $\mu(\tilde{Z}) \leq \varepsilon$ . Take  $C := X \setminus \tilde{Z}$ , so it is closed and  $\mu(X \setminus C) \leq \varepsilon$ . Moreover,

$$(f|_C)^{-1}(V_n) = f^{-1}(V_n) \cap C = U_n \cap C,$$

so  $f|_C$  is continuous relative to  $C$  and hence  $f|_C$  is continuous.  $\square$

## 3.2 Pushforward Measures

**Definition 3.2.1.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{I})$  and  $(Y, \mathcal{J})$  be measurable spaces and let  $\mu$  be a measure on  $\mathcal{I}$ . Let  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  be an  $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})$ -measurable function. Then, the  **$f$ -pushforward of  $\mu$**  is the measure  $f_*\mu$  defined by: For  $J \in \mathcal{J}$ ,

$$f_*\mu(J) := \mu(f^{-1}(J)).$$

**Example 10.** Here are a few examples of pushforward measures.

- (a) Let  $S^1 \subseteq \mathbb{C}$  denote the unit circle, which is usually considered a group under complex multiplication. This is identified with the group  $(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, +)$  as follows:  $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \cong [0, 1]$ , since  $[0, 1]$  is a transversal for the coset equivalence relation of  $\mathbb{Z} \leq \mathbb{R}$ . Define  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow S^1$  by the mapping  $x \mapsto e^{2\pi i x}$ , which is a group isomorphism between  $(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, +)$  and  $(S^1, \cdot)$ . Then,  $f_*\lambda$  is a Borel measure on  $S^1$ .
- (b) Let  $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$  be the group of positive reals under multiplication. Consider  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  by  $x \mapsto e^x$ , and take the pushforward measure  $f_*\lambda$ . In particular, for  $(a, b) \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ ,

$$f_*\lambda((a, b)) = \lambda((\log a, \log b)) = \log b - \log a.$$

**Definition 3.2.2.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{I}, \mu)$  be a measure space.

- For an  $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I})$  measurable function  $f : X \rightarrow X$ , we say that  $\mu$  is  **$f$ -invariant** or that  $f$  **preserves** if  $f_*\mu = \mu$ , i.e.  $\mu(B) = \mu(f^{-1}(B))$  for all  $B \in \mathcal{I}$ .
- For a group action  $\Gamma \curvearrowright X$  such that each group element acts as an  $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I})$ -measurable function, we say that  $\mu$  is  **$\Gamma$ -invariant** or  $\Gamma$  **preserves**  $\mu$  if for each  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ ,  $\gamma_*\mu = \mu$ .

**Example 11.** Let  $S : A^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow A^{\mathbb{N}}$  be the **left-shift map**, i.e.  $(x_n) \mapsto (x_{n+1})$ . Any Bernoulli measure  $\nu^{\mathbb{N}}$  is shift-invariant: indeed, it suffices to check on cylinders  $[w] : s^{-1}([w]) = \bigsqcup_{a \in A} [aw]$  so

$$\begin{aligned}\nu^{\mathbb{N}}(s^{-1}([w])) &= \sum_{a \in A} \nu^{\mathbb{N}}([aw]) \\ &= \sum_{a \in A} \nu(a) \cdot \nu^{\mathbb{N}}([w]) \\ &= \nu^{\mathbb{N}}([w])\end{aligned}$$

**Definition 3.2.3.** A **topological group** is a group  $G$  equipped with a topology making multiplication and inverse continuous. A Borel measure  $\mu$  on  $G$  is called **left-invariant** (resp. **right-invariant**) if it is invariant under the left-translation (resp. right-translation) action  $G \curvearrowright G$ , i.e.  $\mu(g \cdot B) = \mu(B)$  (resp.  $\mu(B \cdot g) = \mu(B)$ ).

**Theorem 3.2.1** (Haar). Every locally compact (Hausdorff) group admits a unique (up to scaling) locally finite (or equivalently finite on compact sets) left-invariant Borel measure (also a right-invariant Borel measure). This measure is called a **left Haar measure** (resp. **right Haar measure**).

**Example 12.** Here are a few examples of Haar measures:

- (a) For  $(\mathbb{R}^d, +)$ , the Lebesgue measure is a Haar measure.
- (b) For  $(\mathbb{R}_{>0}, \cdot)$ , the pushforward of Lebesgue by  $x \mapsto e^x : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  is a Haar measure because this function is a topological group isomorphism and Lebesgue is Haar for  $(\mathbb{R}, +)$ .
- (c) For  $(S^1, \cdot)$ , the pushforward of Lebesgue by  $x \mapsto e^{2\pi ix} : [0, 1] \rightarrow S^1$  is Haar because this function is a topological group isomorphism and the Lebesgue measure is Haar on  $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \cong [0, 1]$ . Note that this measure is a probability measure, hence this is the unique probability Haar measure.
- (d) Consider the group  $(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^{\mathbb{N}} \cong 2^{\mathbb{N}}$  as a compact group with the same topology as  $2^{\mathbb{N}}$ , under coordinate wise addition modulo 2. The Bernoulli half measure is the Haar probability measure on  $(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^{\mathbb{N}}$ . Incidentally, this is also the pushforward of the Lebesgue measure on  $[0, 1] \cong \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$  by:

$$f : [0, 1] \rightarrow 2^{\mathbb{N}} \cong (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^{\mathbb{N}}$$

by mapping points to their binary representation.

**Example 13.** One example of a non-Haar measure is the following: Consider the group  $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{R})$  of all invertible  $n \times n$  real matrices under multiplication, this group is locally compact when viewed as a subset of  $\mathbb{R}^{n^2}$ : indeed,  $M \in \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{R}) \iff \det(M) \neq 0$ , and the latter is an open condition, so  $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{R})$  is an open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^{n^2}$ . Furthermore, its complement, the  $\det = 0$  set, is “lower dimensional” closed set, and one can show that it is null. so  $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{R})$  is a Lebesgue conull open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^{n^2}$ . However, the Lebesgue measure on  $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{R})$  is not Haar because multiplication by a matrix such as  $\mathrm{diag}(2, \dots, 2)$  scales the Lebesgue measure by 2. The Haar measure on  $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{R})$  is defined using the Jacobian, i.e. the integral with  $1/\det$  in it.

We showed that the translation actions  $\mathbb{Q} \curvearrowright \mathbb{R}$  and  $\bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}) \curvearrowright \prod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$  are ergodic, and one can also similarly show that for an irrational  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ , the rotation by  $2\pi\lambda$  on  $S^1$  is ergodic, which is the same as the translation action of the (dense) subgroup  $\langle e^{2\pi i \lambda} \rangle \leq S^1$  on  $S^1$ . The following shows that this is a general phenomenon:

**Theorem 3.2.2.** Let  $G$  be a locally compact (Hausdorff) group and  $\Gamma \leq G$  a dense subgroup. Then the (left) translation action  $\Gamma \curvearrowright G$  is ergodic with respect to any Haar-measure.

### 3.3 Borel/Measure Isomoprhism Theorems

The following is one of the basic theorems in DST, which is used by many mathematicians (e.g. ergodic and probability theorists) all the time without mention.

**Theorem 3.3.1** (Borel Isomoprhism Theorem). Any two uncountable Polish spaces are Borel isomoprhic, i.e. there is a bijective function  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  such that  $f$  and  $f^{-1}$  are Borel.

We provide a proof sketch:

For an uncountable polish space  $X$ , it is enough to show that  $X$  is Borel isomorphic to  $2^{\mathbb{N}}$ . By the Borel version of the Cantor-Schroder-Berstein theorem, it is enough to show that there are Borel injections  $2^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow X$  and  $X \rightarrow 2^{\mathbb{N}}$ . The first injection is called the **Cantor-Bendixson theorem**: For each uncountable Polish  $X$ , there is a continuous embedding  $2^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow X$ .

**Lemma 3.3.1** (Binary Representation). Any second countable metric space  $X$  admits a Borel injection

$$b : X \rightarrow 2^{\mathbb{N}}$$

which we call a **binary representation** map.

*Proof.* Let  $(U_n)$  be a countable basis for  $X$ , so it separates points. then, define

$$b : X \rightarrow 2^{\mathbb{N}}$$

via

$$x \mapsto (1_{U_n}(x))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}.$$

To check that  $B$  is Borel, it is enough to observe that  $b^{-1}(V_n) = U_n$  is Borel, where  $V_n := \{x \in 2^{\mathbb{N}} : x(n) = 1\}$  because  $\{V_n\}$  generates  $\mathcal{B}(2^{\mathbb{N}})$  (indeed, every cylinder in  $2^{\mathbb{N}}$  is a finite intersection of these  $V_n$  and their complements)  $\square$

This finishes the sketch of the Borel isomorphism theorem.  $\diamond$

**Definition 3.3.1.** A measurable space  $(X, \mathcal{I})$  is called a **standard Borel space** if there is a polish metric on  $X$  such that  $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{B}(X)$ . In other words,  $X$  was a Polish space, but we forgot its topology and only kept the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra.

Thus, the Borel isomorphism theorem says that there is only one (up to isomorphism) standard Borel space.

**Definition 3.3.2.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{I}, \mu)$  and  $(Y, \mathcal{J}, \nu)$  be measure spaces. A function  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  is called a **measure isomorphism** if there are co-null sets  $X' \subseteq X$  and  $Y' \subseteq Y$  such that  $(f|_{X'}) : X' \rightarrow Y'$  is a bijection, and such that  $(f|_{X'})$  is  $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})$ -measurable, and  $(f|_{X'})^{-1}$  is  $(\mathcal{J}, \mathcal{I})$ -measurable, and  $f_*\mu = \nu$ .

**Theorem 3.3.2** (Measure Isomorphism). Every atomless Borel probability measure  $\mu$  on a Polish space  $X$  is isomorphic to  $([0, 1], \lambda)$ . In fact, there is a Borel isomorphism  $f : X \rightarrow [0, 1]$  with  $f_*\mu = \lambda$ .

*Proof.* Because  $X$  is atomless, then each singleton is  $\mu$ -null, and so  $X$  must be uncountable since otherwise  $\mu(X) = 0$ . By the Borel isomorphism theorem, there is a Borel isomorphism  $g : X \rightarrow [0, 1]$ . so by replacing  $X$  with  $[0, 1]$  and  $\mu$  with  $g_*\mu$ , we may assume that  $\mu$  is an atomless Borel probability measure on  $[0, 1]$ .

Let  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  be defined by  $x \mapsto \mu([0, x])$ . This is an increasing (maybe not strictly) and continuous function; indeed it is right continuous because of downward monotone convergence, i.e.

$$\mu([0, x]) = \lim_{x_n \rightarrow x^+} \mu([0, x_n]),$$

and left continuous because of upward monotone converge and atomlessness, i.e.

$$\mu([0, x]) = \mu([0, x)) = \lim_{x_n \rightarrow x^-} \mu([0, x_n]).$$

Furthermore,  $f^{-1}([0, y]) = [0, x]$  where  $\mu([0, x]) = y$ , and this  $x$  is a maximum such, so,

$$\lambda([0, y]) = y = \mu(f^{-1}[0, y]) = f_*\mu([0, y]).$$

Since the sets  $[0, y]$  generate the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra, the measures  $\lambda$  and  $f_*\mu$  coincide. It remains to show that  $f$  is a bijection on a conull set.  $f$  is not bijective as a whole because there might be intervals  $(a, b]$  on which  $f$  is constant, but then  $\mu((a, b]) = 0$  and there are only countably many such maximal intervals because these are pairwise disjoint and  $[0, 1]$  is separable. So the union  $Z$  of all these maximal intervals  $(a, b]$  is still  $\mu$ -null and  $f|_{X \setminus Z} : X \setminus Z \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is a bijection.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.3.1.** Every  $\sigma$ -finite Borel measure  $\mu$  on a Polish space  $X$  is isomorphic to  $(\mathbb{R}, \lambda)$ .

*Proof.* Write  $X$  as a countable disjoint union of finite positive measure pieces and use that each piece is isomorphic to an interval in  $\mathbb{R}$ . Details left as an exercise.  $\square$

**Definition 3.3.3.** A measure space  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$  is called **standard** if  $\mu$  is  $\sigma$ -finite and  $(X, \mathcal{B})$  is standard Borel.

**Remark 16.** In dynamics and probability theory, one mainly works with standard probability spaces (since we know that the atomless ones are all isomorphic).

We can restate as follows:

**Theorem 3.3.3.** A standard atomless infinite measure space is isomorphic to  $(\mathbb{R}, \lambda)$  and a standard atomless probability measure is isomorphic to  $([0, 1], \lambda)$ .

---

## Index

---

- ( $\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}$ )-measurable, 43  
( $\sigma$ )-algebra generated by  $\mathcal{C}$ , 9  
 $C_\delta$ , 7  
 $K$ -Lipschitz, 22  
 $\Gamma$ -invariant, 46  
 $\mathcal{I}$ -measurable, 43  
 $\mu$ -measurable, 26  
 $\mu$ -null, 26  
 $\mu$ -measurable function, 43  
 $\sigma$ -algebra, 9  
 $\sigma$ -finite, 11  
 $\sigma$ -finite by open sets, 39  
 $\sigma$ -ideal, 26  
 $f$ -invariant, 46  
 $f$ -pushforward of  $\mu$ , 46  
2nd countable, 6  
  
algebra, 9  
almost disjoint, 32  
almost everywhere, 31  
almost vanishing, 31  
atom, 13  
Atomic, 13  
Atomless, 13  
  
bernoulli( $p$ ) measure, 15  
bi-Lipschitz equivalent, 7  
binary representation, 48  
Borel, 43  
Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra, 10  
  
Borel measure, 26  
Borel sets, 10  
box, 4  
common refinement, 15  
complete measure space, 27  
complete metric, 6  
conservative, 20  
conserves, 20  
countably additive, 11  
cylinder with base  $w$ , 8  
Dirac (delta) measure, 12  
Equivalent metrics, 7  
ergodic, 35  
  
finite, 11  
finite on compact sets, 39  
finitely additive, 11  
finitely additive measure, 13  
grid-partitions, 17  
homeomorphic, 7  
Inner regularity:, 37  
Lebesgue premeasure, 19  
left Haar measure, 47  
left-invariant, 47  
left-shift map, 47

locally finite, 39  
measure, 11  
measure isomorphism, 49  
measure space, 11  
outer measure, 19  
Outer regularity:, 37  
Polish, 6  
Polishable, 7  
premeasure, 13  
preserves, 46  
probability measure, 11  
pseudo-metric, 21  
regular, 37  
right Haar measure, 47  
right-invariant, 47

selector, 28  
separable, 6  
standard Borel space, 49  
standard measure space, 50  
strongly regular, 37  
The counting measure:, 12  
tight, 40  
topological basis, 6  
topological group, 47  
transversal, 28  
uniform metric, 7  
vanishing, 31  
zero measure, 12