

Lebesgue Differentiation Theorem

Definition: Let $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. For each $x \in \mathbb{R}$, define

- $D^+ f(x) = \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{f(x+h) - f(x)}{h}$
- $D_+ f(x) = \liminf_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{f(x+h) - f(x)}{h}$
- $D^- f(x) = \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0^-} \frac{f(x+h) - f(x)}{h}$
- $D_- f(x) = \liminf_{h \rightarrow 0^-} \frac{f(x+h) - f(x)}{h}$

and note that $D_+ f(x) \leq D^+ f(x)$ and $D_- f(x) \leq D^- f(x)$. We say that f is differentiable at x if

$$D^+ f(x) = D_+ f(x) = D^- f(x) = D_- f(x) \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

If f is differentiable at x , then the derivative of f at x , denoted by $f'(x)$.

Theorem: (Lebesgue Differentiation Theorem). If $f: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a non-decreasing function, then f is differentiable λ -almost everywhere, f' is Lebesgue measurable, $f' \geq 0$ λ -almost everywhere, and

$$\int_{[a, b]} f' d\lambda \leq f(b) - f(a).$$

Proof: Extend f to a function on \mathbb{R} by setting

$f(x) = \begin{cases} f(a) & \text{if } x < a \\ f(b) & \text{if } x > b. \end{cases}$ Then f is non-decreasing so $f^{-1}((a, \infty))$ is always an interval and thus, f is measurable.

To see that f is differentiable a.e., we must

check for all $s, t \in \{+, -\}$ that

$\{x : D^s f(x) \neq D^t f(x)\}$, $\{x : D^+ f(x) \neq D^- f(x)\}$, and $\{x : D_+ f(x) \neq D_- f(x)\}$ all have measure 0, in which case these are Lebesgue measurable, and outside of these sets, $D^+ f(x) \neq \pm \infty$. (*)

Let us check that (*) has λ measure 0. The other are similar.

For each $p, q \in \mathbb{Q}$ with $p > q$, let

$$E_{p,q} = \{x : D^+ f(x) > p > q > D^- f(x)\}.$$

$$F_{p,q} = \{x : D^- f(x) > p > q > D^+ f(x)\}.$$

Then we have that

$$\{x : D^+ f(x) \neq D^- f(x)\} = \left(\bigcup_{\substack{p, q \in \mathbb{Q} \\ p > q}} E_{p,q} \right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{\substack{p, q \in \mathbb{Q} \\ p > q}} F_{p,q} \right)$$

Hence, it suffices to show that $\lambda^*(E_{p,q}) = 0$ by subadditivity and $\lambda^*(F_{p,q}) = 0$. We will check for $F_{p,q}$.

Let $p, q \in \mathbb{Q}$ with $p > q$. Let $r = \lambda^*(F_{p,q}) \leq \lambda^*([a, b])$ and let $\varepsilon > 0$. Then there exists an open $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ such that $E_{p,q} \subseteq U$ and

$$\lambda(U) \leq \lambda(F_{p,q}) + \varepsilon = r + \varepsilon.$$

Note if $x \in A \subseteq F_{p,q}$, then

$$\inf_{\delta > 0} \sup_{0 < h < \delta} \frac{f(x-h) - f(x)}{-h} = \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0^-} \frac{f(x+h) - f(x)}{h} = D^- f(x) > p.$$

Thus for all $x \in A$ and $\delta > 0$ there is $h_{x,\delta} > 0$ such that $0 < h_{x,\delta} < \delta$ and $\frac{f(x) - f(x-h)}{h} > p$. As the collection of intervals of the form $[x - h_{x,\delta}, x] \subseteq \bigcup_{j=1}^n I_j$ form a Vitali

covering of A . By the VCL $\exists m \in \mathbb{N}$, $y_1, \dots, y_m \in A$ and

$l_1, \dots, l_m > 0$ such that if $J_k = (y_k - l_k, y_k)$ then

$J_k \subseteq \bigcup_{j=1}^n I_j$, $\{J_k\}_{k=1}^m$ are pairwise disjoint,

$\lambda^*(A \setminus \bigcup_{k=1}^m J_k) < \varepsilon$, and $f(y_k) - f(y_k - l_k) > p l_k$. Let

$$B = A \cap \left(\bigcup_{k=1}^m J_k \right) \subseteq \bigcup_{j=1}^n I_j. \quad A = B \cup \left(A \setminus \bigcup_{k=1}^m J_k \right)$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} r - \varepsilon &\leq \lambda^*(A) \leq \lambda^*(B) + \lambda^*\left(A \setminus \bigcup_{k=1}^m J_k\right) \\ &\leq \lambda^*(B) + \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

so $\lambda^*(B) \geq r - 2\varepsilon$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^m f(y_k) - f(y_k - l_k) &> p \sum_{k=1}^m l_k \\ &= p \sum_{k=1}^m \lambda(J_k) \\ &= p \lambda\left(\bigcup_{k=1}^m J_k\right) \\ &\geq p \lambda^*(B) \\ &\geq p(r - 2\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

However, note

$$\sum_{k: J_k \subseteq I_j} f(y_k) - f(y_k - l_k) \leq f(x_j + h_j) - f(x_j)$$

since the J_k are disjoint and f is nondecreasing, so

$$\begin{aligned} p(r - 2\varepsilon) &\leq \sum_{k=1}^m f(y_k) - f(y_k - l_k) \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^n f(x_j + h_j) - f(x_j) \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq q(r+\varepsilon).$$

so $pr \leq qr$, so $r=0$.

Hence, we have f is differentiable a.e, provided we allow $f'(x) = \pm\infty$. Note $f'(x) = -\infty$ is impossible as f is non-decreasing so $D^+f, D_-f \geq 0$, so $f' \geq 0$ a.e. if f' exists.

For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $g_n: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be defined by

$$g_n(x) = \frac{f(x+\frac{1}{n}) - f(x)}{1/n} \quad (**) \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}. \text{ Then } g_n \text{ is measurable}$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and converge pointwise almost everywhere to a function $g: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ which is f' provided that $g(x) \neq \infty$ a.e. Thus, g is measurable. Note

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{[a,b]} g \, d\lambda &\leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{[a,b]} g_n \, d\lambda \\ &= \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} n \int_{[a,b]} f(x+\frac{1}{n}) - f(x) \, d\lambda(x) \quad \left. \begin{array}{l} f \text{ is int.} \\ \text{as } f \text{ is} \\ \text{nondec.} \end{array} \right\} \\ &= \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} n \int_{[a,b]} f_{1/n} \, d\lambda - n \int_{[a,b]} f \, d\lambda \\ &= \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} n \int_{[a+\frac{1}{n}, b+\frac{1}{n}]} f \, d\lambda - n \int_{[a,b]} f \, d\lambda \\ &= \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} n \int_{[b, b+\frac{1}{n}]} f \, d\lambda - n \int_{[a, a+\frac{1}{n}]} f \, d\lambda \\ &= \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(b) - n \int_{[a, a+\frac{1}{n}]} f \, d\lambda \\ &= f(b) - \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} n \int_{[a, a+\frac{1}{n}]} f \, d\lambda \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{Note } n \int_{[a, a+\frac{1}{n}]} f \, d\lambda &\geq n \int_{[a, a+\frac{1}{n}]} f(a) \, d\lambda = f(a),) \\ &\leq f(b) - f(a). \end{aligned}$$

Remark: If f is non increasing, then $-f$ is nondecreasing so $(-f)' = -f'$ exists a.e. and is measure, so f' exists a.e and measurable.

Corollary: If $f: [a,b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is Lebesgue measurable a.e, and differentiable a.e, then f' is measurable.

Question: Can we get "=" instead of " \leq " in LDT?

No.

Example: Let $f: [0,1] \rightarrow [0,1]$ be the Cantor Ternary function. Then f is constant on each interval in \mathcal{C}^c , $f' = 0$ on \mathcal{C}^c , so $f' = 0$ a.e. However,

$$\int_{[0,1]} f' d\lambda = 0 < 1 = f(1) - f(0),$$

Bounded Variation

Definition: A function $f: [a,b] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is said to be of bounded variation if

$$V(f) = \sup_{x_0 < \dots < x_n} \sum_{k=1}^n |f(x_k) - f(x_{k-1})| < \infty$$

Remark: f is of bounded variation if and only if $\operatorname{Re}(f)$ and $\operatorname{Im}(f)$ are of bounded variation. Hence, we focus on real-valued functions.

Example: Let $f: [a,b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be differentiable such that there exists $M > 0$ such that $|f'(x)| \leq M$ for all $x \in (a,b)$.

By the MVT,

$$|f(x_k) - f(x_{k-1})| \leq M(x_k - x_{k-1}), \text{ so } V(f) \leq M(x_k - x_{k-1}).$$

Example: let $f: [0,1] \rightarrow [-1,1]$ be such that $f(0) = 0$ and $f(x) = x \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{2x}\right)$ for all $x \in [0,1]$. We claim that f is not of bounded variation. Indeed, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $x_0 = 0$, $x_k = \frac{1}{2n+2-k}$

Then

$$|f(x_k)| = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } k \text{ is odd} \\ \frac{1}{2n+2-k} & \text{if } k \text{ is even} \end{cases}$$

$$\text{so } \sum_{k=1}^n |f(x_k) - f(x_{k-1})| = 2 \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{1}{2n+2-2j} = \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{k}$$