# MATH 7310 Homework 3

#### James Harbour

### February 13, 2022

### Problem 2

Let  $(X, \Sigma, \mu)$  be a measure space. We say that  $E \subseteq X$  is an atom if

- $E \in \Sigma$ ,
- $\mu(E) > 0$ ,
- $\{\mu(F): F \subseteq E, F \in \Sigma\} = \{0, \mu(E)\}.$

We say the  $\mu$  is diffuse if it has no atoms.

(a) Let  $(X, d, \mu)$  be a metric measure space. Assume that  $\mu$  is outer regular, and that

$$\mu(E) = \sup \{ \mu(K) : K \subseteq E \text{ compact} \} \text{ for all Borel } E \subseteq X.$$

If  $\mu(\{p\}) = 0$  for all  $p \in X$ , show that  $\mu$  is diffuse.

*Proof.* Suppose, for the sake of contradiction, that  $\mu$  is not diffuse. Then there exists an atom  $E \subseteq X$ .

(b) Let  $F : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$  be an increasing, right-continuous function. Show that for  $p \in \mathbb{R}$  we have that  $\{p\}$  is an atom of  $\mu_F$  if and only if F is discontinuous at p. Show that  $\mu_F$  is diffuse if and only if F is continuous.

# Problem 4

Let  $(X, \Sigma, \mu)$  be a diffuse  $\sigma$ -finite measure space. For  $A \in \Sigma$ , show that:

$$\{\mu(B): B \subseteq A, B \in \Sigma\} = [0, \mu(A)].$$

Suggestions: Reduce to the finite case. It might be helpful to first show that for every  $E \in \Sigma$  with  $\mu(E) > 0$ , we have  $0 = \inf\{\mu(B) : B \subseteq E \text{ and } \mu(B) > 0\}$ .

Proof.

(reduction to finite case): Write  $X = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} X_i$  where  $X_i \in \Sigma$  and  $\mu(X_i) < +\infty$ .

Suppose that  $E \in \Sigma$  with  $\mu(E) > 0$ . Since  $\mu$  is diffuse, there exists a  $B_1 \subseteq E$  such that  $B_1 \in \Sigma$  and  $0 < \mu(B_1) < \mu(E)$ . Note that either  $\mu(B_1)$  or  $\mu(E \setminus B_1)$  is less than  $2^{-1}\mu(E)$ , so without loss of generality assume that  $\mu(B_1) < 2^{-1}\mu(E)$ . Now, again as  $\mu$  is diffuse, there exists a  $B_2 \subseteq B_1$  such that  $B_2 \in \Sigma$  and  $0 < \mu(B_2) < \mu(B_1) < \mu(E)$ . Again, we may assume without loss of generality that  $\mu(B_2) < 2^{-1}\mu(B_1) < 2^{-1}\mu(B_1) < 2^{-1}\mu(B_2)$ 

 $2^{-2}\mu(E)$ . Continuing as such, we obtain a decreasing sequence of sets  $E\supset B_1\supset B_2\supset \cdots$  such that  $0<\mu(B_n)<2^{-n}\mu(E)$ . It follows that

$$0 = \inf\{\mu(B) : B \subseteq E \text{ and } \mu(B) > 0\}. \tag{1}$$

Suppose, for the sake of contradiction, that the claim is false. Then there exists an  $A \in \Sigma \setminus \{\emptyset\}$  and  $b \in (0, \mu(A))$  such that  $\mu(B) \neq b$  for all  $B \subseteq A$  with  $B \in \Sigma$ . We proceed via transfinite induction on following statement:

 $P(\alpha): \exists (B_{\eta})_{\eta \in \alpha} \text{ in } \Sigma, \text{ pairwise disjoint subsets of } A, \text{ such that}$ 

$$0 \notin \mu(\{B_{\eta} : \eta \in \alpha\}), \quad \bigsqcup_{\eta \in \alpha} B_{\eta} \in \Sigma, \text{ and } b - \mu\left(\bigsqcup_{\eta \in \alpha} B_{\eta}\right) > 0$$

First, note that we may choose  $B_0$  such that  $0 < \mu(B_0) < b$ , so P(0) holds. Suppose now that  $\alpha$  is an ordinal and  $P(\alpha)$  is true. Then there is a collection of pairwise disjoint elements  $(B_{\eta})_{\eta \in \alpha}$  of  $\Sigma$  which are subsets of A such that  $\mu(B_{\eta}) > 0$  for all  $\eta \in \alpha$ ,  $\bigsqcup_{\eta \in \alpha} B_{\eta} \in \Sigma$ , and  $b - \mu\left(\bigsqcup_{\eta \in \alpha} B_{\eta}\right) > 0$ . By (1), there exists a  $B_{\alpha} \in \Sigma$  with  $B_{\alpha} \subseteq A \setminus \bigsqcup_{\eta \in \alpha} B_{\eta}$  such that

$$0 < \mu(B_{\alpha}) < b - \mu\left(\bigsqcup_{\eta \in \alpha} B_{\eta}\right) \implies b - \mu\left(\bigsqcup_{\eta \in \alpha + 1} B_{\eta}\right) > 0$$

and  $B_{\alpha} \sqcup \bigsqcup_{\eta \in \alpha} B_{\eta} \in \Sigma$ . Hence,  $P(\alpha + 1)$  holds.

Now, suppose that  $\delta$  is a limit ordinal.