

# Notes on Polish space

Rui Wang

Friday 31<sup>st</sup> May, 2019

## 1 Introduction

This document contains notes about Polish space which play an important role in probability and statistics. The materials are mainly from Cohn (2013), Chapter 8 and Dudley (2002), Chapter 13.

## 2 Polish space

**Exercise 1** (Cohn (2013), Exercise 8.1.3). *Let  $(X, \mathcal{A})$  be a measurable space, let  $Y$  be a separable metrizable space, and let  $f, g : X \rightarrow Y$  be measurable with respect to  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}(Y)$ . Then  $\{x \in X : f(x) = g(x)\} \in \mathcal{A}$ .*

*Proof.* For any  $A, B \in \mathcal{B}(Y)$ ,

$$\{x : (f(x), g(x)) \in A \times B\} = f^{-1}(A) \cap f^{-1}(B) \in \mathcal{A}.$$

Hence the map  $F : x \mapsto (f(x), g(x))$  is measurable with respect to  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}(Y) \times \mathcal{B}(Y)$ . Since  $Y$  is a separable metrizable space,  $\mathcal{B}(Y) \times \mathcal{B}(Y) = \mathcal{B}(Y \times Y)$ . Thus, the map  $F$  is measurable with respect to  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}(Y \times Y)$ . Let  $\Delta = \{(y_1, y_2) \in Y \times Y : y_1 = y_2\}$ . Then  $\Delta$  is a closed subset of  $Y \times Y$  and  $\{x \in X : f(x) = g(x)\} = F^{-1}(\Delta)$ . It follows that  $\{x \in X : f(x) = g(x)\} \in \mathcal{A}$ .  $\square$

**Exercise 2** (Cohn (2013), Exercise 8.2.1). *Let  $A$  be an uncountable analytic subset of the Polish space  $X$ . Then,*

(a)  *$A$  has a subset that is homeomorphic to  $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ .*

(b)  *$A$  has the cardinality of the continuum.*

*Proof.* From Cohn (2013), Corollary 8.2.8., there is a continuous function  $f$  from  $\mathcal{N}$  onto  $A$ . By the axiom of choice, there is a set  $S \subset \mathcal{N}$  such that the restriction of  $f$  on  $S$  is a bijection of  $S$  onto  $A$ . As a subspace of  $\mathcal{N}$ ,  $S$  is an uncountable separable metrizable space. Let  $S_0 \subset S$  be the set of all condensation points of the space  $S$ . From Cohn (2013), Lemma 8.2.12,  $S_0$  is uncountable

and each point of  $S_0$  is a condensation point of  $S_0$ . Let  $d_{\mathcal{N}}(\cdot, \cdot)$  be a metric on  $\mathcal{N}$  which metrize the topology of  $\mathcal{N}$ . Let  $d_X(\cdot, \cdot)$  be a metric on  $X$  which metrize the topology of  $X$ .

Now we construct a homeomorphism between a subset of  $X$  and  $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ . First, let  $x_0$  and  $x_1$  be two distinct points in  $S_0$ . Since the restriction of  $f$  on  $S_0$  is injective,  $f(x_0) \neq f(x_1)$ . Hence there exists  $0 < \epsilon_1 < 1$  such that  $\overline{B(x_0, \epsilon_1)} \cap \overline{B(x_1, \epsilon_1)} = \emptyset$  and  $f(\overline{B(x_0, \epsilon_1)}) \cap f(\overline{B(x_1, \epsilon_1)}) = \emptyset$ . For  $i = 0, 1$ , let  $C(i) = B(x_i, \epsilon_1)$ . Note that for  $i = 0, 1$ ,  $C(i) \cap S_0$  is uncountable and each point of  $C(i) \cap S_0$  is a condensation point of  $C(i) \cap S_0$ . Then there exist  $x_{i0}, x_{i1} \in C(i) \cap S_0$  ( $i = 0, 1$ ) and  $0 < \epsilon_2 < 1/2$  such that for  $j = 0, 1$ ,  $B(x_{ij}, \epsilon_2) \subset B(x_i, \epsilon_1)$ ,  $\overline{B(x_{i0}, \epsilon_2)} \cap \overline{B(x_{i1}, \epsilon_2)} = \emptyset$  and  $f(\overline{B(x_{i0}, \epsilon_2)}) \cap f(\overline{B(x_{i1}, \epsilon_2)}) = \emptyset$ . For  $i, j \in \{0, 1\}$ , let  $C(i, j) = B(x_{ij}, \epsilon_2)$ .

Inductively construct sets  $C(n_1, n_2, \dots, n_k)$ ,  $n_i \in \{0, 1\}$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then for  $\{n_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty} \in \mathcal{N}$ , consider the set  $\cap_{k=1}^{\infty} \overline{C(n_1, \dots, n_k)}$ . By the completeness of  $\mathcal{N}$ ,  $\cap_{k=1}^{\infty} \overline{C(n_1, \dots, n_k)} \neq \emptyset$ . Also, the diameter of  $\overline{C(n_1, \dots, n_k)}$  tends to 0. Then there exists a unique point in  $\cap_{k=1}^{\infty} \overline{C(n_1, \dots, n_k)}$ . Let  $g$  be the function from  $\mathcal{N}$  to  $X$  which maps  $\{n_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$  to the unique point of  $\cap_{k=1}^{\infty} \overline{C(n_1, \dots, n_k)}$ .

By the construction of  $C(n_1, \dots, n_k)$ ,  $g$  is continuous and injective. Then  $f \circ g$  is continuous. To see that  $f \circ g$  is injective, let  $\{n_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$  and  $\{m_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$  be two distinct points of  $\{0, 1\}^{\mathcal{N}}$ . Let  $k_0$  be the first  $k$  such that  $n_k \neq m_k$ . By the construction of  $C(\cdot, \dots, \cdot)$ ,  $f(\overline{C(n_1, \dots, n_{k_0})}) \cap f(\overline{C(m_1, \dots, m_{k_0})}) = \emptyset$ . Since  $g(\{n_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}) \in \overline{C(n_1, \dots, n_{k_0})}$ ,  $g(\{m_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}) \in \overline{C(m_1, \dots, m_{k_0})}$ . Then  $f \circ g(\{n_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}) \neq f \circ g(\{m_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty})$ .

Since  $\{0, 1\}^{\mathcal{N}}$  is compact, the inverse of  $f \circ g$  is also continuous. This completes the proof of (a).

(a) implies that  $\text{card}(A) \geq \mathfrak{c}$ . On the other hand, Cohn (2013), Corollary 8.2.8. implies that  $\text{card}(A) \leq \mathfrak{c}$ . Thus,  $\text{card}(A) = \mathfrak{c}$ . □

**Exercise 3** (Cohn (2013), Exercise 8.2.2). *Let  $X$  be an uncountable Polish space. Then the collection of analytic subsets of  $X$  and the collection of Borel subsets of  $X$  have the cardinality of the continuum.*

*Proof.* Exercise 2 implies that the cardinality of  $X$  is  $\mathfrak{c}$ . Since each single point of  $X$  is a Borel set, the cardinality of the collection of Borel subsets of  $X$  is at least  $\mathfrak{c}$ . We only need to prove that the cardinality of the collection of analytic subsets of  $X$  is at most  $\mathfrak{c}$ .

Cohn (2013), Proposition 8.2.9 implies that it suffices to upper bound the cardinality of the collection of closed subsets of the Polish space  $\mathcal{N} \times X$ . Let  $\{U_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$  be a countable base of the topology of  $\mathcal{N} \times X$ . Then every closed subset of  $\mathcal{N} \times X$  is the intersection of certain  $U_i^c$ , that is,  $\cap_{i \in S} U_i^c$  where  $S$  is a subset of  $\mathbb{N}$ . Hence there is an injective map from the collection of closed subsets of  $\mathcal{N} \times X$  to  $2^{\mathbb{N}}$ . Thus, the cardinality of the collection of closed subsets of  $\mathcal{N} \times X$  is at most  $\mathfrak{c}$ . □

**Exercise 4** (Cohn (2013), Exercise 8.2.3).

(a) Let  $X$  be a nonempty zero-dimensional Polish space such that each nonempty open subset of  $X$  is not compact. Then  $X$  is homeomorphic to  $\mathcal{N}$ .

(b) the Space  $\mathcal{I}$  of irrational numbers in the interval  $(0, 1)$  is homeomorphic to  $\mathcal{N}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $d(\cdot, \cdot)$  be a complete metric for  $X$ . We begin by constructing a family  $\{C(n_1, \dots, n_k)\}$  of subsets of  $X$ , indexed by the set of all finite sequences  $\{(n_1, \dots, n_k)\}$  of positive integers, in such a way that

1.  $C(n_1, \dots, n_k)$  is nonempty, open, closed and noncompact,
2. the diameter of  $C(n_1, \dots, n_k)$  is at most  $1/k$ ,
3.  $\{C(n_1, \dots, n_{k-1}, n_k)\}_{n_k=1}^\infty$  are disjoint and  $C(n_1, \dots, n_{k-1}) = \bigcup_{n_k=1}^\infty C(n_1, \dots, n_k)$ ,
4.  $X = \bigcup_{n_1=1}^\infty C(n_1)$ .

We do this by induction on  $k$ .

First, suppose that  $k = 1$ . Since  $X$  is assumed to be not compact, Cohn (2013), Lemma 8.2.11 gives a sequence  $\{C(n_1)\}_{n_1=1}^\infty$  where terms are nonempty, open, closed and with diameter at most

1. By assumption, each  $C(n_1)$  is not compact.

Now suppose that  $k > 1$  and that  $C(n_1, \dots, n_{k-1})$  has already been chosen. It is easy to use a modification of the construction of the  $C(n_1)$ 's, now applied to  $C(n_1, \dots, n_{k-1})$  rather than to  $X$ , to produce sets  $C(n_1, \dots, n_k)$ ,  $n_k = 1, 2, \dots$  that satisfy conditions 1 to 4. With this, the induction step in our construction is complete.

We turn to the construction of a homeomorphism between  $\mathcal{N}$  and  $X$ . Let  $\mathbf{n} = \{n_k\}$  be an element of  $\mathcal{N}$ . Then the sets  $C(n_1)$ ,  $C(n_1, n_2)$ ,  $\dots$  are decreasing nonempty closed sets whose diameters approach to 0. Since  $X$  is complete, there is a unique element in  $\bigcap_{k=1}^\infty C(n_1, \dots, n_k)$ . We can define a function  $f : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow X$  by letting  $f(\mathbf{n})$  be the unique member of  $\bigcap_{k=1}^\infty C(n_1, \dots, n_k)$ . Note that if  $\mathbf{m}$  and  $\mathbf{n}$  are elements of  $\mathcal{N}$  such that  $m_i = n_i$  holds for  $i = 1, \dots, k$ , then  $d(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}) \leq 1/k$ . It follows that  $f$  is continuous. Also, it is obvious that  $f$  is bijective. It remains to prove that the inverse of  $f$  is continuous. Suppose  $f(\mathbf{n}^{(l)}) \rightarrow f(\mathbf{n})$ . Fix  $k > 0$ . Then if  $l$  is large enough,  $f(\mathbf{n}^{(l)}) \in C(n_1, \dots, n_k)$ . By the construction of  $f$ , this implies that  $n_i^{(l)} = n_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, k$ . Thus,  $\mathbf{n}^{(l)} \rightarrow \mathbf{n}$  as  $l \rightarrow \infty$ . This completes the proof of (a).

We turn to the proof of (b). The space  $\mathcal{I}$  is a  $G_\delta$  set of  $[0, 1]$ , and hence is a Polish space. The family of intervals  $(a_i, b_i)$  where  $a_i$  and  $b_i$  is rational is a base that consists of sets that are both open and closed. It follows that  $\mathcal{I}$  is zero-dimensional. Each interval  $(a, b)$  is the union of  $\{(a_i, b_i)\}_{i=1}^\infty$  where  $a_i, b_i$  are rational and  $a_i \downarrow a$  and  $b_i \uparrow b$ . Hence each interval of  $\mathcal{I}$  is not compact. Then the conclusion follows from (a).

□

**Exercise 5** (Cohn (2013), Exercise 8.2.3). *Each nonempty Polish space is the image of  $\mathcal{N}$  under a continuous open map.*

*Proof.* We mimic the proof of Cohn (2013), Proposition 8.2.7.

Let  $X$  be a nonempty Polish space, and let  $d$  be a complete metric for  $X$ . We begin by constructing a family  $\{C(n_1, \dots, n_k)\}$  of subsets of  $X$ , indexed by the set of all finite sequences  $\{n_1, \dots, n_k\}$  of positive integers, in such a way that

1.  $C(n_1, \dots, n_k)$  is nonempty and open,
2. the diameter of  $C(n_1, \dots, n_k)$  is at most  $1/k$ ,
3.  $\overline{C(n_1, \dots, n_{k-1}, n_k)} \subset C(n_1, \dots, n_{k-1})$  and  $C(n_1, \dots, n_{k-1}) = \bigcup_{n_k=1}^{\infty} C(n_1, \dots, n_k)$ ,
4.  $X = \bigcup_{n_1=1}^{\infty} C(n_1)$ .

We do this by induction on  $k$ .

First, suppose that  $k = 1$ , and let  $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$  be a sequence whose terms form a dense subset of  $X$ . The sequence  $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$  may have duplicated elements. Let  $\{C(n_1)\}_{n_1=1}^{\infty}$  be the collection of open balls which center at certain  $x_i$  and with rational radius not larger than  $1/2$ . Certainly each  $C(n_1)$  is open and nonempty and has diameter at most 1. Furthermore,  $X = \bigcup_{n_1=1}^{\infty} C(n_1)$ .

Now suppose that  $k > 1$  and that  $C(n_1, \dots, n_{k-1})$  has already been chosen. Let  $\{C(n_1, \dots, n_{k-1}, n_k)\}_{n_k=1}^{\infty}$  be the collection of open balls which center at certain  $x_i$  and with rational radius not larger than  $1/(2k)$  and whose closure is contained in  $C(n_1, \dots, n_{k-1})$ . Certainly each  $C(n_1, \dots, n_k)$  is open and nonempty and has diameter at most  $1/k$ . Now we prove that  $C(n_1, \dots, n_{k-1}) = \bigcup_{n_k=1}^{\infty} C(n_1, \dots, n_k)$ . Suppose  $x \in C(n_1, \dots, n_{k-1})$ . Since  $C(n_1, \dots, n_{k-1})$  is open, there is a open ball  $B(x, r) \subset C(n_1, \dots, n_{k-1})$  where  $r$  is rational and  $r < 1/k$ . Since  $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$  is dense in  $X$ , there is an  $x_i$  such that  $d(x, x_i) < r/3$ . Then the ball  $B(x_i, r/2)$  contains  $x$ . Also, the Closure of  $B(x_i, r/2)$  has radius not larger than  $1/(2k)$  and is contained in  $C(n_1, \dots, n_{k-1})$ . Thus,  $B(x_i, r/2) = C(n_1, \dots, n_k)$  for some  $n_k$ . With this, the induction step in our construction is complete.

We turn to the construction of a continuous function that maps  $\mathcal{N}$  onto  $X$ . Let  $\mathbf{n} = \{n_k\}$  be an element of  $\mathcal{N}$ . It follows from 3 that  $\bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} C(n_1, \dots, n_k) = \bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} \overline{C(n_1, \dots, n_k)}$  which is intersection of a decreasing sequence of nonempty closed subsets of  $X$  whose diameters approach 0. Thus there is a unique element in the intersection of these sets, and we can define a function  $f : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow X$  by letting  $f(\mathbf{n})$  be the unique member of  $\bigcap_k C(n_1, \dots, n_k)$ . Note that if  $\mathbf{m}$  and  $\mathbf{n}$  are elements on  $\mathcal{N}$  such that  $m_i = n_i$  holds for  $i = 1, \dots, k$ , then  $d(f(\mathbf{m}), f(\mathbf{n})) \leq 1/k$ . It follows that  $f$  is continuous. Also, 3 and 4 above imply that for each  $x$  in  $X$  there is an element  $\mathbf{n} = \{n_k\}$  of  $\mathcal{N}$  such that  $x \in \bigcap_k C(n_1, \dots, n_k)$  and hence such that  $x = f(\mathbf{n})$ . Thus  $f$  is surjective.

It remains to prove that  $f$  is an open map. Note that the sets of the form  $\{n_1\} \times \dots \times \{n_k\} \times \mathbb{N} \times \dots$  is a base for the topology of  $\mathcal{N}$ . By the construction of  $f$ , for any  $n_1, \dots, n_k$ ,  $f(\{n_1\} \times \dots \times \{n_k\} \times \mathbb{N} \times \dots) = C(n_1, \dots, n_k)$  is an open set. This completes the proof.

□

**Exercise 6** (Cohn (2013), Exercise 8.2.5). *Each Borel subset of a Polish space is the image under a continuous injective map of some Polish space.*

*Proof.* Let  $X$  be a Polish space. Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be the collection of Borel subsets of  $X$  which are the image under continuous injective maps of some Polish spaces. Then all open and closed subsets of  $X$  belong to  $\mathcal{A}$  since they are themselves Polish spaces.

Assume  $A_1, \dots, A_n, \dots \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $A_1, \dots, A_n, \dots$  are disjoint. For each  $A_i$ , there is a Polish space  $X_i$  and a continuous injective map  $f_i(\cdot)$  such that  $f_i(X_i) = A_i$ . Define  $f : \cup_{i=1}^{\infty} X_i \mapsto \cup_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i$  by  $f(x) = f_i(x)$  if  $x \in X_i$ . Here  $\cup_{i=1}^{\infty} X_i$  is the disjoint union of  $X_i$ . Then  $\cup_{i=1}^{\infty} X_i$  is Polish and  $f$  is injective and continuous. Then  $\cup_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i \in \mathcal{A}$ .

Assume  $A_1, \dots, A_n, \dots \in \mathcal{A}$ . For each  $A_i$ , there is a Polish space  $X_i$  and a continuous injective map  $f_i(\cdot)$  such that  $f_i(X_i) = A_i$ . Define  $f : \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} X_i \mapsto \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i$  by  $f(\{x_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}) = \{f_i(x_i)\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ . Then  $f$  is injective and continuous onto  $\prod_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i \subset \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} X_i$ . Let  $D = \{(x, x, \dots) : x \in X\}$ . Define  $g : D \mapsto X$  by  $g(x, x, \dots) = x$ . Then  $g$  is a homeomorphism between  $D$  and  $X$ . Consider  $g \circ f$  defined on  $f^{-1}(D)$ . Then  $g \circ f$  is injective and continuous from  $f^{-1}(D)$  onto  $\cap_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i$ . Since  $f^{-1}(D)$  is a closed subset of  $\prod_{i=1}^{\infty} X_i$ , it is Polish. Thus,  $\cap_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i \in \mathcal{A}$ .

From Cohn (2013), Lemma 8.2.4,  $\mathcal{A}$  contains all Borel subset of  $X$ . This completes the proof. □

**Exercise 7** (Cohn (2013), Exercise 8.2.6). *If  $X$  is an uncountable Polish space, then there is an analytic subset of  $X$  that is not a Borel set.*

*Proof.* Let  $X$  be an uncountable Polish space. From Cohn (2013), Proposition 8.2.13, there is a continuous injective map  $f : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow X$  such that  $X - f(\mathcal{N})$  is countable. From Cohn (2013), Corollary 8.2.17, there is an analytic set  $A \in \mathcal{N}$  that is not a Borel set. Then  $f(A)$  is not a Borel set of  $X$ , or else  $A = f^{-1}(f(A))$  would be a Borel set, a contradiction. On the other hand,  $f(A)$  is analytic. This completes the proof. □

**Exercise 8** (Cohn (2013), Exercise 8.3.1). *Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be Polish spaces, and let  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  be a function whose graph is an analytic subset of  $X \times Y$ . Then  $f$  is Borel measurable.*

**Remark 1.** It follows from this conclusion and Cohn (2013), Proposition 8.1.8 that  $f$  is Borel measurable iff the graph of  $f$  is a Borel subset of  $X \times Y$ . Then the graph of  $f$  can not be an analytic set which is not a Borel set.

*Proof.* Let  $G = \{(x, f(x)) : x \in X\}$  denote the graph of  $f$ . For any Borel subset  $B$  of  $Y$ , the sets  $G \cap (X \times B)$  and  $G \cap (X \times B^c)$  are analytic. Then the projection of these two sets on  $X$ , i.e.  $f^{-1}(B)$  and  $f^{-1}(B^c)$ , are also analytic. From separation theorem, i.e. Cohn (2013), Theorem 8.3.1,  $B$  and  $B^c$  are Borel sets. Hence  $f$  is Borel measurable. □

**Exercise 9** (Cohn (2013), Exercise 8.3.2). *Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be uncountable Polish spaces. Then the cardinality of the collection of Borel measurable functions from  $X$  to  $Y$  is that of the continuum.*

*Proof.* The cardinalities of  $X$  and  $Y$  are both  $\mathfrak{c}$ . For each  $y \in Y$ , the constant function  $f(x) \equiv y$  is Borel measurable. Hence the cardinality of the collection of Borel measurable functions from  $X$  to  $Y$  is at least  $\mathfrak{c}$ .

On the other hand, since the graph of Borel measurable function  $f$  is a Borel subset of  $X \times Y$ , and the collection of Borel subsets of an uncountable Polish space has cardinality  $\mathfrak{c}$ , the cardinality of the collection of Borel measurable functions from  $X$  to  $Y$  is at most  $\mathfrak{c}$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Exercise 10** (Cohn (2013), Exercise 8.3.2). *There is a Lebesgue measurable function  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that no real-valued Borel measurable function  $f_1$  satisfies  $f(x) \leq f_1(x)$  at each  $x$  in  $\mathbb{R}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $K$  be the Cantor set.  $K$  is an uncountable Polish space. According to the preceding exercise, there is a bijection  $x \mapsto g_x$  of  $K$  onto the set of real-valued Borel functions on  $K$ . Define  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} g_x(x) + 1 & \text{if } x \in K, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Since  $f(x) = 0$  a.e.,  $f$  is Lebesgue measurable. Suppose there is a real-valued Borel measurable function  $f_1$  satisfying  $f(x) \leq f_1(x)$  at each  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then the restriction of  $f_1$  on  $K$  is still Borel measurable. Hence there is an  $x_1 \in K$  such that  $f_1(x) = g_{x_1}(x)$  at each  $x \in K$ . Then  $g_{x_1}(x) \geq g_x(x) + 1$  at each  $x \in K$ . But this is impossible when  $x = x_1$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Exercise 11** (Cohn (2013), Exercise 8.3.3). *Let  $X$  be a Polish space, let  $\mu$  be a Borel measure on  $X$  such that  $\mu(X) = 1$ , and let  $\lambda$  be Lebesgue measure on the Borel subsets of  $[0, 1]$ . Then there is a Borel measurable function  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$  such that  $\mu = \lambda f^{-1}$ .*

*Proof.* If  $X$  is countably infinite, let  $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$  be an enumeration of the points of  $X$ . Then  $\sum_{i=1}^\infty \mu(\{x_i\}) = \mu(\cup_{i=1}^\infty \{x_i\}) = 1$ . We can construct  $f$  by letting  $f(t) = x_i$  if  $t \in [\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \mu(\{x_j\}), \sum_{j=1}^i \mu(\{x_j\})$ , and  $f(1) = x_1$ . Then  $\lambda f^{-1}(\{x_i\}) = \lambda([\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \mu(\{x_j\}), \sum_{j=1}^i \mu(\{x_j\})] \cap [0, 1]) = \mu(\{x_i\})$ . Hence  $\mu = \lambda f^{-1}$ . If  $X$  is finite, the construction of  $f$  is similar.

Now suppose  $X$  is uncountable, from Cohn (2013), Theorem 8.3.6, there is a bijection  $g$  from  $\mathbb{R}$  onto  $X$  which is Borel isomorphism. Then the measure  $\mu g$  is a probability measure on the Borel sets of  $\mathbb{R}$ . From Cohn (2013), Proposition 10.1.15, there is a Borel measurable function  $h$  from  $[0, 1]$  to  $\mathbb{R}$  such that  $\mu g = \lambda h^{-1}$ . Thus, for any  $A \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ ,

$$\mu(A) = \mu(gg^{-1}A) = \mu g(g^{-1}A) = \lambda h^{-1}(g^{-1}A) = \lambda(h^{-1}g^{-1}A) = \lambda((g \circ h)^{-1}A) = \lambda(g \circ h)^{-1}(A).$$

The conclusion follows by letting  $f = g \circ h$ .  $\square$

**Exercise 12** (Cohn (2013), Exercise 8.4.1). *Let  $(X, \mathcal{A})$  be a measurable space.*

(a) *A function  $f : X \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$  is  $\mathcal{A}_*$ -measurable if and only if for each finite measure  $\mu$  on  $(X, \mathcal{A})$  there are  $\mathcal{A}$ -measurable functions  $f_0, f_1 : X \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$  that satisfy  $f_0 \leq f \leq f_1$  everywhere on  $X$  and  $f_0 = f_1$   $\mu$ -almost surely.*

(b) *If  $f : X \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$  is  $\mathcal{A}_*$ -measurable and if the functions  $f_0$  and  $f_1$  in part (a) can be chosen independently of  $\mu$ , then  $f$  is  $\mathcal{A}$ -measurable.*

*Proof.* It is understood that  $\mathcal{A}_*$ -measurable means  $\mathcal{A}_*/\mathcal{B}([-\infty, +\infty])$  measurable.

Suppose  $f : X \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$  is  $\mathcal{A}_*$ -measurable. Then for each finite measure  $\mu$  on  $(X, \mathcal{A})$ , since  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{A}_\mu$ ,  $f$  is  $\mathcal{A}_\mu$  measurable. Then the existence of  $f_0, f_1$  is implied by Cohn (2013), Proposition 2.2.5. Conversely, suppose for each finite measure  $\mu$ , such  $f_0, f_1$  exist. Then Cohn (2013), Proposition 2.2.5 implies that  $f$  is  $\mathcal{A}_\mu$  measurable. Thus, for any  $A \in \mathcal{B}([-\infty, +\infty])$ ,  $f^{-1}(A) \in \cap_\mu \mathcal{A}_\mu = \mathcal{A}_*$ . This completes the proof of (a).

We turn to (b). Consider the set  $A = \{x : f_0(x) \neq f_1(x)\}$ . By assumption,  $\mu^*(A) = 0$  for any finite  $\mu$  on  $\mathcal{A}$ . If  $A$  is not empty, let  $x$  be a point of  $A$  and  $\delta_x$  be the point mass concentrated on  $x$ . Then  $\delta_x^*(A) = 1$ , a contradiction. It follows that  $A = \emptyset$ . Thus  $f = f_0$ , hence  $f$  is  $\mathcal{A}$ -measurable.  $\square$

**Exercise 13** (Cohn (2013), Exercise 8.4.2). *Let  $(X, \mathcal{A})$  be a measurable space. Then*

(a)  $(\mathcal{A}_*)_* = \mathcal{A}_*$ .

(b) *If  $\mu$  is a finite measure on  $(X, \mathcal{A})$ , then  $(\mathcal{A}_\mu)_* = \mathcal{A}_\mu$ .*

*Proof.* First we proof (b). It is clear that  $(\mathcal{A}_\mu)_* \supset \mathcal{A}_\mu$ . On the other hand,  $(\mathcal{A}_\mu)_* \subset (\mathcal{A}_\mu)_\mu = \mathcal{A}_\mu$ . This completes the proof of (b).

We turn to (a). It is clear that  $(\mathcal{A}_*)_* \supset \mathcal{A}_*$ . On the other hand, let  $\mu$  be any finite measure on  $\mathcal{A}$ . Then  $(\mathcal{A}_*)_* \subset (\mathcal{A}_\mu)_* = \mathcal{A}_\mu$ . Hence  $(\mathcal{A}_*)_* \subset \cap_\mu \mathcal{A}_\mu = \mathcal{A}_*$ .  $\square$

The following lemma is useful in proving the next two lemmas.

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $(X, \mathcal{A})$  and  $(Y, \mathcal{B})$  are two measurable spaces. Let  $f$  be an isomorphism between  $(X, \mathcal{A})$  and  $(Y, \mathcal{B})$ , that is,  $f$  is a bijection and  $f$  and  $f^{-1}$  are both measurable. Then for any finite measure  $\mu$  on  $\mathcal{A}$ ,  $f$  is also an isomorphism between  $(X, \mathcal{A}_\mu)$  and  $(Y, \mathcal{B}_{\mu f^{-1}})$ . Furthermore,  $f$  is an isomorphism between  $(X, \mathcal{A}_*)$  and  $(Y, \mathcal{B}_*)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\mu$  be any finite measure on  $\mathcal{A}$ . For any  $A \in \mathcal{A}_\mu$ , there exist  $A_0, A_1 \in \mathcal{A}$  such that  $A_0 \subset A \subset A_1$  and  $\mu(A_1/A_0) = 0$ . Then  $f(A_0), f(A_1) \in \mathcal{B}$ ,  $f(A_0) \subset f(A) \subset f(A_1)$  and  $\mu f^{-1}(f(A_1)/f(A_0)) = \mu(A_1/A_0) = 0$ . Then  $f(A) \in \mathcal{B}_{\mu f^{-1}}$ . Similarly, if  $B \in \mathcal{B}_{\mu f^{-1}}$ , then  $f^{-1}(B) \in \mathcal{A}_\mu$ . Thus,  $f$  is an isomorphism between  $(X, \mathcal{A}_\mu)$  and  $(Y, \mathcal{B}_{\mu f^{-1}})$ .

This is true for any finite measure  $\mu$  on  $\mathcal{A}$ . Hence  $f$  is an isomorphism between  $(X, \cap_\mu \mathcal{A}_\mu)$  and  $(Y, \cap_\mu \mathcal{B}_{\mu f^{-1}})$ . By definition,  $\cap_\mu \mathcal{A}_\mu = \mathcal{A}_*$ . On the other hand, for any finite measure  $\nu$  on  $\mathcal{B}$ ,  $\nu(B) = \nu(f \circ f^{-1}B) = \nu f(f^{-1}B) = (\nu f)f^{-1}(B)$ . Note that  $\nu f$  is a finite measure on  $\mathcal{A}$ . It follows that  $\cap_\mu \mathcal{B}_{\mu f^{-1}} = \cap_\nu \mathcal{B}_\nu = \mathcal{B}_*$ . This complemtes the proof.  $\square$

**Exercise 14** (Cohn (2013), Exercise 8.4.3). *There is a Lebesgue measurable subset of  $\mathbb{R}$  that is not universally measurable.*

*Proof.* Let  $C$  be the Cantor set on  $[0, 1]$  (see Cohn (2013), example 1.4.6), let  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  be the Cantor function (see Cohn (2013), example 2.1.10). It is known that  $f$  is nondecreasing and continuous.

Let  $\lambda$  be the Lebesgue measure on  $\mathbb{R}$ . Let  $\lambda_{[0,1]}$  be the Lebesgue measure on  $[0, 1]$ . Let  $\mu$  be the measure on  $[0, 1]$  with distribution function  $f$ . It is known that  $\mu(C) = 1$ . Define  $\mu_1 = \lambda + \mu$ . Then for  $x \in [0, 1]$ ,  $\mu_1([0, x]) = f(x) + x$ . Define  $g : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 2]$  by  $g(x) = f(x) + x$ . Then  $g$  is strict increasing and continuous. Thus,  $g$  is a Borel isomorphism from  $([0, 1], \mathcal{B}([0, 1]), \mu_1)$  to  $([0, 2], \mathcal{B}([0, 2]), \lambda)$ . Also,  $\lambda \circ g = \mu_1$ . From Lemma 1,  $g$  is also an isomorphism between the completion spaces  $([0, 1], \mathcal{B}([0, 1])_{\mu_1}, \mu_1)$  and  $([0, 2], \mathcal{B}([0, 2])_{\lambda}, \lambda)$ . It can be shown that  $\lambda(g(C^c)) = 1$ . Hence  $\lambda(g(C)) = 2 - 1 = 1$ . Then There is a Lebesgue **non**measurable subset  $D$  of  $g(C)$  (see Cohn (2013), exercise 1.4.6). Then  $g^{-1}(D)$  is a  $\mathcal{B}([0, 1])_{\mu_1}$ -nonmeasurable subset of  $C$ . Note also that  $g^{-1}(D)$  is Lebesgue measurable since  $g^{-1}(D)$  is a subset of  $C$  which has Lebesgue measure 0. Thus,  $g^{-1}(D)$  is a Lebesgue measurable subset of  $\mathbb{R}$  which is not universally measurable. □

**Exercise 15** (Cohn (2013), Exercise 8.4.4). *Each uncountable Polish space has a subset that is not universally measurable.*

*Proof.* Let  $X$  be an uncountable Polish space. From Cohn (2013), Theorem 8.3.6, there is a Borel isomorphism  $f$  between  $(X, \mathcal{B}(X))$  and  $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}))$ . From Lemma 1,  $f$  is an isomorphism between  $(X, \mathcal{B}(X)_*)$  and  $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})_*)$ . But there is an  $B \notin \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})_*$ , e.g., a Lebesgue nonmeasurable set. Then  $f^{-1}(B) \notin \mathcal{B}(X)_*$ . This completes the proof. □

**Exercise 16** (Cohn (2013), Exercise 8.4.5). *There is a measurable space  $(X, \mathcal{A})$  and an outer measure  $\mu^*$  on it such that there exists an increasing sequence  $\{A_n\}$  of subsets of  $X$ ,*

$$\mu^*(\cup_n A_n) = \lim_n \mu^*(A_n).$$

**Remark 2.** An outer measure  $\mu^*$  on  $(X, \mathcal{A})$  is a function from  $\mathcal{A}$  to  $[0, +\infty]$  such that

- (a)  $\mu^*(\emptyset) = 0$ .
- (b) if  $A \subset B \subset X$ , then  $\mu^*(A) \leq \mu^*(B)$ , and
- (c) if  $\{A_n\}$  is an infinite sequence of subsets of  $X$ , then  $\mu^*(\cup_n A_n) \leq \sum_n \mu^*(A_n)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $X = \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\mathcal{A} = 2^X$ . Let  $\mu^*(\emptyset) = 0$ ,  $\mu^*(X) = 2$  and  $\mu^*(A) = 1$  for  $A \neq \emptyset, X$ . It is an easy task to check  $\mu^*$  is an outer measure. Now consider  $A_n = \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$ . Then  $\cup_n A_n = X$ . And  $\mu^*(\cup_n A_n) = 2 > 1 = \lim_n \mu^*(A_n)$ . □



**Definition 1.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{A})$  and  $(Y, \mathcal{B})$  be measurable spaces. A function  $K : X \times \mathcal{B} \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$  is called a *kernel* from  $(X, \mathcal{A})$  to  $(Y, \mathcal{B})$  if

- (i) for each  $x \in X$  the function  $B \mapsto K(x, B)$  is a measure on  $(Y, \mathcal{B})$ , and
- (ii) for each  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  the function  $x \mapsto K(x, B)$  is  $\mathcal{A}$ -measurable.

**Exercise 17** (Cohn (2013), Exercise 2.4.7). Suppose that  $K$  is a kernel from  $(X, \mathcal{A})$  to  $(Y, \mathcal{B})$ , that  $\mu$  is a measure on  $(X, \mathcal{A})$ , and that  $f$  is a  $[0, +\infty]$ -valued  $\mathcal{B}$ -measurable function on  $Y$ . Then

- (a)  $B \mapsto \int K(x, B) \mu(dx)$  is a measure on  $(Y, \mathcal{B})$ ,
- (b)  $x \mapsto \int f(y) K(x, dy)$  is an  $\mathcal{A}$ -measurable function on  $X$ , and
- (c) if  $\nu$  is the measure on  $(Y, \mathcal{B})$  defined in part (a), then  $\int f(y) \nu(dy) = \int (\int f(y) K(x, dy)) \mu(dx)$ .

*Proof.*

(a): As a function of  $x$ ,  $K(x, B)$  is  $\mathcal{A}$ -measurable. Hence  $\int K(x, B) \mu(dx)$  is well defined for each  $B$ . Clearly,  $\int K(x, \emptyset) \mu(dx) = \int 0 \mu(dx) = 0$ . Suppose  $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$  is an infinite sequence of disjoint sets that belongs to  $\mathcal{A}$ . Then

$$\int K(x, \cup_{i=1}^\infty A_i) \mu(dx) = \int \sum_{i=1}^\infty K(x, A_i) \mu(dx) = \sum_{i=1}^\infty \int K(x, A_i) \mu(dx),$$

where the last equality follows from the monotone convergence theorem.

(b): If  $f = \mathbf{1}_A$  for  $A \in \mathcal{B}$ , then  $\int f(y) K(x, dy) = K(x, A)$  is  $\mathcal{A}$ -measurable by the definition of kernel. It follows that  $\int f(y) K(x, dy) = K(x, A)$  is  $\mathcal{A}$ -measurable for every simple  $\mathcal{B}$ -measurable function  $f$ . Finally, let  $f : Y \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$  be an arbitrary  $\mathcal{B}$ -measurable function, and choose a sequence  $\{g_n\}$  of simple  $\mathcal{B}$ -measurable functions from  $Y$  to  $[0, +\infty)$  such that  $g_n(y) \uparrow f(y)$  for each  $y \in Y$ . Then the monotone convergence theorem implies that  $\int f(y) K(x, dy) = \int \lim_n g_n(y) K(x, dy) = \lim_n \int g_n(y) K(x, dy)$ . It follows that  $\int f(y) K(x, dy)$  is  $\mathcal{A}$ -measurable.

(c): If  $f = \mathbf{1}_A$  for  $A \in \mathcal{B}$ , then

$$\int f(y) \nu(dy) = \nu(A) = \int K(x, A) \mu(dx) = \int \int f(y) K(x, dy) \mu(dx).$$

By the linearity of integral, the conclusion holds for any  $[0, +\infty]$  valued simple  $\mathcal{B}$ -measurable function. Finally, the conclusion holds for any  $[0, +\infty]$ -valued  $\mathcal{B}$ -measurable function on  $Y$  by the monotone convergence theorem. □

**Exercise 18** (Cohn (2013), Exercise 8.4.6). Let  $(X, \mathcal{A})$  and  $(Y, \mathcal{B})$  be measurable spaces, and let  $K$  be a kernel from  $(X, \mathcal{A})$  to  $(Y, \mathcal{B})$  such that  $\sup \{K(x, Y), : x \in X\}$  is finite. For each  $x$  in  $X$  let  $B \mapsto \bar{K}(x, B)$  be the restriction to  $\mathcal{B}_*$  of the completion of the measure  $B \mapsto K(x, B)$ . Finally, for each finite measure  $\mu$  on  $(X, \mathcal{A})$  let  $\mu K$  be the measure on  $(Y, \mathcal{B})$  defined by  $(\mu K)(B) = \int K(x, B) \mu(dx)$ .

(a)  $x, B \mapsto \overline{K}(x, B)$  is a kernel from  $(X, \mathcal{A}_*)$  to  $(Y, \mathcal{B}_*)$ .

(b) Suppose that  $\mu$  is a finite measure on  $(X, \mathcal{A})$  and that  $\bar{\mu}$  and  $\overline{\mu K}$  are the restrictions to  $\mathcal{A}_*$  and  $\mathcal{B}_*$  of the completions of  $\mu$  and  $\mu K$ . Then  $\overline{\mu K} = \bar{\mu} \overline{K}$ , that is,

$$\overline{\mu K}(B) = \int \overline{K}(x, B) \bar{\mu}(dx)$$

holds for each  $B$  in  $\mathcal{B}_*$ .

*Proof.*

(a): By definition, for any fixed  $x \in X$ ,  $B \mapsto \overline{K}(x, B)$  is a measure on  $(Y, \mathcal{B})$ . We only need to prove that for each  $B \in \mathcal{B}_*$ , the function  $x \mapsto \overline{K}(x, B)$  is  $\mathcal{A}_*$ -measurable. We apply [Cohn (2013), Exercise 8.4.1(a)] to prove this claim. Fix  $B \in \mathcal{B}_*$ . We shall prove that for each finite measure  $\mu$  on  $(X, \mathcal{A})$  there are  $\mathcal{A}$ -measurable functions  $f_0, f_1 : X \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$  that satisfy  $f_0 \leq \overline{K}(x, B) \leq f_1$  everywhere on  $X$  and  $f_0 = f_1$   $\mu$ -almost everywhere.

From Cohn (2013), Exercise 2.4.7(a), the measure  $\mu K : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$  defined as  $A \mapsto \int K(x, A) \mu(dx)$  is well defined. Also  $\int K(x, Y) \mu(dx) \leq \int \sup_{x \in X} K(x, Y) \mu(dx) = \sup_{x \in X} K(x, Y) \mu(X) < \infty$ . Hence  $\mu K$  is a finite measure on  $\mathcal{B}$ . Since  $B$  is universally measurable, there exists  $B_0, B_1 \in \mathcal{B}$  such that  $B_0 \subset B \subset B_1$  and  $\mu K(B_0) = \mu K(B_1)$ . It follows that

$$\int K(x, B_1) - K(x, B_0) \mu(dx) = 0.$$

Hence  $K(x, B_1) = K(x, B_0)$   $\mu$ -almost everywhere. Note that  $K(x, B_0) \leq \overline{K}(x, B) \leq K(x, B_1)$ . This completes the proof.

(b): For  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ ,  $\overline{\mu K}(B) = \mu K(B)$  by definition, and

$$\bar{\mu} \overline{K}(B) = \int \overline{K}(x, B) \bar{\mu}(dx) = \int K(x, B) \bar{\mu}(dx) = \int K(x, B) \mu(dx) = \mu K(B).$$

Thus  $\overline{\mu K} = \bar{\mu} \overline{K}$  on  $\mathcal{B}$ . Hence they agree on  $\mathcal{B}_*$ . □

**Proposition 1** (Cohn (2013), Proposition 8.4.4). *Let  $(X, \mathcal{A})$  be a measurable space, let  $Y$  be a Polish space, and let  $C$  be a subset of  $X \times Y$  that belongs to the product  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}(Y)$ . Then the projection of  $C$  on  $X$  is universally measurable with respect to  $(X, \mathcal{A})$ .*

**Corollary 1** (Cohn (2013), Corollary 8.5.4). *Let  $(X, \mathcal{A})$  be a measurable space, let  $Y$  be a Polish space, let  $C$  be a subset of  $X \times Y$  that belongs to the  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}(Y)$ , and let  $C_0$  be the projection of  $C$  on  $X$ . Then there is a function  $f : C_0 \rightarrow Y$  such that*

(a) *the graph of  $f$  is a subset of  $C$ , and*

(b)  *$f$  is measurable with respect to  $\mathcal{A}_*$  and  $\mathcal{B}(Y)$ .*

**Exercise 19** (Cohn (2013), Exercise 8.5.1). *The Polish space  $Y$  in Cohn (2013), Proposition 8.4.4 and Cohn (2013), Corollary 8.5.4 cannot be replaced with an arbitrary measurable space  $(Y, \mathcal{B})$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $(X, \mathcal{A})$  be  $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}))$ , let  $Y$  be a subset of  $\mathbb{R}$  that is not Lebesgue measurable, and let  $\mathcal{B}$  be the trace of  $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$  on  $Y$ . Let  $C = \{(x, y) \in X \times Y : x = y\}$ . From Cohn (2013), Lemma 7.2.2,  $(Y, \mathcal{B}) = (Y, \mathcal{B}(Y))$ . Since  $X$  and  $Y$  are both separable,  $\mathcal{B}(X) \times \mathcal{B}(Y) = \mathcal{B}(X \times Y)$ .  $C$  is a closed subset of  $X \times Y$ , hence belongs to  $\mathcal{B}(X \times Y) = \mathcal{B}(X) \times \mathcal{B}(Y)$ .

The projection of  $C$  on  $X$  is  $Y$  which is not Lebesgue measurable, hence does not belong to  $\mathcal{B}(X)_*$ .

The  $f$  must be  $f(x) = x$ . But  $f^{-1}(Y) = Y$  is not universally measurable in  $X$ . This completes the proof. □

**Exercise 20** (Cohn (2013), Exercise 8.5.2). *Let  $(X, \mathcal{A})$  be a measurable space, let  $Y$  be a Polish space, and let  $C$  be a subset of  $X \times Y$  such that*

- (i) *for each  $x$  in  $X$  the section  $C_x$  is closed and nonempty, and*
- (ii) *for each open subset  $U$  of  $Y$  the set  $\{x \in X : C_x \cap U \neq \emptyset\}$  belongs to  $\mathcal{A}$ .*

*Then there is a function  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  such that*

- (a)  *$f$  is measurable with respect to  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}(Y)$ , and*
- (b) *the graph of  $f$  is included in  $C$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $d$  be a complete metric for  $Y$ , and let  $D = \{x_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$  be a countable dense subset of  $Y$ . Let  $C(i) = B(y_i, 2^{-1})$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots$ . Suppose  $C(i_1, \dots, i_k)$  is defined for  $i_1, \dots, i_k \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$ , we define  $C(i_1, \dots, i_k, i) = B(y_i, 2^{-(k+1)}) \cap C(i_1, \dots, i_k)$ . Then  $C(i_1, \dots, i_k)$  are open sets in  $Y$  and  $\cup_{i=1}^\infty C(i) = Y$ ,  $\cup_{i=1}^\infty C(i_1, \dots, i_k, i) = C(i_1, \dots, i_k)$ . Define  $E(i_1, \dots, i_k) = \{x \in X : C_x \cap C(i_1, \dots, i_k) \neq \emptyset\}$  and recursively define  $E(i) = \{x \in X : C_x \cap C(i) \neq \emptyset\} \setminus E(i-1)$ . By assumption,  $\cup_{i=1}^\infty E(i) = X$ ,  $\cup_{i=1}^\infty C(i_1, \dots, i_k, i) = C(i_1, \dots, i_k)$  and  $E_n(i_1, \dots, i_k) \in \mathcal{A}$ . Let  $F(1) = E(1)$ ,  $F(i) = E(i) \setminus \cup_{j=1}^{i-1} E(j)$ ,  $i \geq 2$ . Suppose  $F(i_1, \dots, i_k)$  are defined, let

$$F(i_1, \dots, i_k, i) = F(i_1, \dots, i_k) \cap \left( E(i_1, \dots, i_k, i) \setminus \cup_{j=1}^{i-1} E(i_1, \dots, i_k, j) \right).$$

Then  $\{F(i_1, \dots, i_k, i)\}_{i=1}^\infty$  are disjoint and  $\cup_{i=1}^\infty F(i_1, \dots, i_k, i) = F(i_1, \dots, i_k)$ . For  $x \in F(i_1, \dots, i_k)$ , let  $f_k(x) = y_{i_k}$ . Then  $f_k(\cdot)$  is measurable. If  $x \in F(i_1, \dots, i_k)$ , then  $x \in E(i_1, \dots, i_k)$ , and then  $C_x \cap C(i_1, \dots, i_k) \neq \emptyset$ , and then  $d(f_k(x), C_x) < 2^{-k}$ . On the other hand, if  $x \in F(i_1, \dots, i_k, i_{k+1})$ , then  $C(i_1, \dots, i_k, i_{k+1}) \neq \emptyset$ , that is

$$B(y_{i_{k+1}}, 2^{-(k+1)}) \cap C(i_1, \dots, i_k) \neq \emptyset.$$

Hence

$$B(y_{i_{k+1}}, 2^{-(k+1)}) \cap B(y_{i_k}, 2^{-k}) \neq \emptyset.$$

That is,  $d(y_{i_k}, y_{i_{k+1}}) \leq 2^{-(k-1)}$ . Then  $d(f_{k+1}(x), f_k(x)) = d(y_{i_{k+1}}, y_{i_k}) \leq 2^{-(k-1)}$ . Since  $Y$  is complete, we can define  $f(\cdot)$  by  $f(x) = \lim_n f_n(x)$ . Since  $d(f_n(x), C_x) < 2^{-k}$  and  $C_x$  is closed,  $f(x) \in C_x$ . This completes the proof.

□

## References

- Cohn, D. L. (2013). *Measure Theory*. Birkhäuser, New York, 2nd edition.
- Dudley, R. M. (2002). *Real Analysis and Probability*. Cambridge University Press.