

MATH454 - Analysis 3

Based on lectures from Fall 2024 by Prof. Linan Chen.
Notes by Louis Meunier

Contents

1 Sigma Algebras and Measures	2
1.1 A Review of Riemann Integration	2
1.2 Sigma Algebras	2
1.3 Measures	4
1.4 Constructing the Lebesgue Measure on \mathbb{R}	6
1.5 Lebesgue-Measurable Sets	9
1.6 Properties of the Lebesgue Measure	11
1.7 Relationship between $\mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$ and \mathcal{M}	14
1.8 Some Special Sets	15
1.8.1 Uncountable Null Set?	15
1.8.2 Non-Measurable Sets?	17
1.8.3 Non-Borel Measurable Set?	20
2 Integration Theory	20
2.1 Measurable Functions	20
2.2 Approximation by Simple Functions	26
2.3 Convergence Almost Everywhere vs Convergence in Measure	30

§1 SIGMA ALGEBRAS AND MEASURES

§1.1 A Review of Riemann Integration

Let $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $[a, b] \subset \mathbb{R}$. Define a **partition** of $[a, b]$ as the set

$$\text{part}([a, b]) := \{a =: x_0 < x_1 < \dots < x_N =: b\}.$$

We can then define the upper and lower Riemann integrals of f over the region $[a, b]$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{upper:} \quad \int_a^b f(x) \, dx &:= \inf_{\text{part}([a, b])} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^N \sup_{x \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]} f(x) \cdot (x_i - x_{i-1}) \right\} \\ \text{lower:} \quad \int_a^b f(x) \, dx &:= \sup_{\text{part}([a, b])} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^N \inf_{x \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]} f(x) \cdot (x_i - x_{i-1}) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

We then say f **Riemann integrable** if these two quantities are equal, and denote this value by $\int_a^b f(x) \, dx$.

Many “nice-enough” (continuous, monotonic, etc.) functions are Riemann integrable, but many that we would like to be able to “integrate” are simply not, for instance Dirichlet’s function $x \mapsto \begin{cases} 1 & x \in \mathbb{Q} \cap [a, b] \\ 0 & x \in \mathbb{Q}^c \cap [a, b] \end{cases}$. Hence, we need a more general notion of integration.

§1.2 Sigma Algebras

↪ **Definition 1.1** (Sigma algebra): Let X be a *space* (a nonempty set) and \mathcal{F} a collection of subsets of X . \mathcal{F} a *sigma algebra* or simply σ -algebra of X if the following hold:

1. $X \in \mathcal{F}$
2. $A \in \mathcal{F} \Rightarrow A^c \in \mathcal{F}$ (closed under complement)
3. $\{A_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{F} \Rightarrow \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \in \mathcal{F}$ (closed under countable unions)

↪ **Proposition 1.1:**

4. $\emptyset \in \mathcal{F}$
5. $\{A_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{F} \Rightarrow \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \in \mathcal{F}$
6. $A_1, \dots, A_n \in \mathcal{F} \Rightarrow \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n, \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \in \mathcal{F}$
7. $A, B \in \mathcal{F} \Rightarrow A \setminus B, B \setminus A \in \mathcal{F}$

⊗ **Example 1.1:** The “largest” sigma algebra of a set X is the power set 2^X , the smallest the trivial $\{\emptyset, X\}$.

Given a set $A \subset X$, the set $\mathcal{F}_A := \{\emptyset, X, A, A^c\}$ is a sigma algebra; given two disjoint sets $A, B \subset X$, then $\mathcal{F}_{A,B} := \{\emptyset, X, A, A^c, B, B^c, A \cup B, A^c \cap B^c\}$ a sigma algebra.

↪ **Definition 1.2** (Generating a sigma algebra): Let X be a nonempty set, and \mathcal{C} a collection of subsets of X . Then, the σ -algebra *generated* by \mathcal{C} , denoted $\sigma(\mathcal{C})$, is such that

1. $\sigma(\mathcal{C})$ a sigma algebra with $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \sigma(\mathcal{C})$
2. if \mathcal{F}' a sigma algebra with $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{F}'$, then $\mathcal{F}' \supseteq \sigma(\mathcal{C})$

Namely, $\sigma(\mathcal{C})$ is the smallest sigma algebra “containing” (as a subset) \mathcal{C} .

↪ **Proposition 1.2:**

1. $\sigma(\mathcal{C}) = \bigcap \{ \mathcal{F} : \mathcal{F} \text{ a sigma algebra containing } \mathcal{C} \}$
2. if \mathcal{C} itself a sigma algebra, then $\sigma(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{C}$
3. if $\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2$ are two collections of subsets of X such that $\mathcal{C}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{C}_2$, then $\sigma(\mathcal{C}_1) \subseteq \sigma(\mathcal{C}_2)$

↪ **Definition 1.3** (The Borel sigma-algebra): The *Borel σ -algebra*, denoted $\mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$, on the real line is given by

$$\mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}} := \sigma(\{\text{open subsets of } \mathbb{R}\}).$$

We call sets in $\mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$ *Borel sets*.

↪ **Proposition 1.3:** $\mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$ is also generated by the sets

- $\{(a, b) : a < b \in \mathbb{R}\}$
- $\{(a, b] : a < b \in \mathbb{R}\}$
- $\{[a, b] : a < b \in \mathbb{R}\}$
- $\{[a, b) : a < b \in \mathbb{R}\} \oplus$
- $\{(-\infty, c) : c \in \mathbb{R}\}$
- $\{(-\infty, c] : c \in \mathbb{R}\}$
- etc.

PROOF. We prove just \oplus . It suffices to show that the generating sets of each σ -algebra is contained in the other σ -algebra. Let $a < b \in \mathbb{R}$. Then,

$$(a, b) = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \underbrace{\left[a + \frac{1}{n}, b \right)}_{\in \oplus} \in \sigma(\{[a, b)\}) \Rightarrow \mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}} \subseteq \sigma(\{[a, b)\}).$$

Conversely,

$$[a, b) = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(a - \frac{1}{n}, b \right) \in \mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}}.$$

■

↪ **Proposition 1.4:** All intervals (open, closed, half open, half closed, finite, etc) are Borel sets; any set obtained from countable set operations of intervals are Borel; all singletons are Borel; any finite and countable sets are Borel.

§1.3 Measures

↪ **Definition 1.4** (Measurable Space): Let X be a space and \mathcal{F} a σ -algebra. We call the tuple (X, \mathcal{F}) a *measurable space*.

↪ **Definition 1.5** (Measure): Let (X, \mathcal{F}) be a measurable space. A *measure* is a function $\mu : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ satisfying

- (i) $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$;
- (ii) if $\{A_n\} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ a sequence of (pairwise) disjoint sets, then

$$\mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n\right) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_n),$$

i.e. μ is *countably additive*. We further call μ

- *finite* if $\mu(X) < \infty$,
- a *probability measure* if $\mu(X) = 1$,
- σ -finite if $\exists \{A_n\} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ such that $X = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$ with $\mu(A_n) < \infty \forall n \geq 1$,

and call the triple (X, \mathcal{F}, μ) a *measure space*.

⊕ **Example 1.2:** The measure on $\mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$ given by

$$A \mapsto \begin{cases} |A| & \text{if } A \text{ finite} \\ \infty & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

is called the *counting measure*.

Fix $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, then the measure on $\mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$ given by

$$A \mapsto \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x_0 \in A \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

is called the *point mass at x_0* .

↪ **Theorem 1.1** (Properties of Measures): Fix a measure space (X, \mathcal{F}, μ) . The following properties hold:

1. (finite additivity) For any sequence $\{A_n\}_{n=1}^N \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ of disjoint sets,

$$\mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^N A_n\right) = \sum_{n=1}^N \mu(A_n).$$

2. (monotonicity) For any $A \subseteq B \in \mathcal{F}$, then $\mu(A) \leq \mu(B)$.
3. (countable/finite subadditivity) For any sequence $\{A_n\} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ (**not** necessarily disjoint),

$$\mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n\right) \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_n),$$

an analogous statement holding for a finite collection of sets A_1, \dots, A_N .

4. (continuity from below) For $\{A_n\} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ such that $A_n \subseteq A_{n+1} \forall n \geq 1$ (in which case we say $\{A_n\}$ “increasing” and write $A_n \uparrow$) we have

$$\mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n\right) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(A_n).$$

5. (continuity from above) For $\{A_n\} \subseteq \mathcal{F}, A_n \supseteq A_{n+1} \forall n \geq 1$ (we write $A_n \downarrow$) we have that if $\mu(A_1) < \infty$,

$$\mu\left(\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n\right) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(A_n).$$

Remark 1.1: In 4., note that since A_n increasing, that the union $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \supseteq A_m$ for any arbitrarily large m ; indeed, one could logically right $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_n = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$. This this notation, then, 4. simply states that we may interchange limit and measure. A similar argument can be viewed for 5. (how?).

Remark 1.2: The finiteness condition in 5. may be slightly modified such as to state that $\mu(A_n) < \infty$ for some n ; remark why this would suffice to ensure the entire rest of the sequence has finite measure.

PROOF.

1. Extend A_1, \dots, A_N to an infinite sequence by $A_n := \emptyset$ for $n > N$. Then this simply follows from countable additivity and $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$.
2. We may write $B = A \cup (B \setminus A)$; this is a disjoint union of sets. By finite additivity, then,

$$\mu(B) = \mu(A) + \mu(B \setminus A) \geq \mu(A),$$

since the measure is positive.

3. We prove only for a countable union; use the technique from 1. to extend to finite. We first “disjointify” the sequence such that we can use the countable additivity

axiom. Let $B_1 = A_1, B_n = A_n \setminus \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{n-1} A_i\right)$ for $n \geq 2$. Remark then that $\{B_n\} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ is a disjoint sequence of sets, and that $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$. By countable additivity and subadditivity,

$$\mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n\right) = \mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n\right) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(B_n) \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_n).$$

4. We again “disjointify” the sequence $\{A_n\}$. Put $B_1 = A_1, B_n = A_n \setminus A_{n-1}$ for all $n \geq 2$ (remark that this is equivalent to the construction from the previous proof because the sets are increasing). Then, again, $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$, and in particular, for all $N \geq 1, \bigcup_{n=1}^N B_n = A_N$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n\right) &= \mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n\right) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(B_n) \\ &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n=1}^N \mu(B_n) \\ &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^N B_n\right) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mu(A_N). \end{aligned}$$

5. We yet again disjointify, backwards (in a way) from the previous case. Put $B_n = A_1 \setminus A_n$ for all $n \geq 1$. Then, $\{B_n\} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$, B_n increasing, and $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n = A_1 \setminus \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$. Then, by continuity from below,

$$\mu\left(A_1 \setminus \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n\right) = \mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n\right) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(B_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(A_1 \setminus A_n)$$

and also

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(A_1) &= \mu\left(A_1 \setminus \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n\right) + \mu\left(\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n\right) \\ &= \mu(A_1 \setminus A_n) + \mu(A_n), \end{aligned}$$

and combining these two equalities yields the desired result. ■

§1.4 Constructing the Lebesgue Measure on \mathbb{R}

↪ **Definition 1.6** (Lebesgue outer measure): For all $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, define

$$m^*(A) := \inf \left\{ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \ell(I_n) : A \subseteq \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} I_n, I_n \text{ open intervals} \right\},$$

called the *Lebesgue outer measure* of A (where $\ell(I)$ is the length of interval I , i.e. the absolute value of the difference of its endpoints, if finite, or ∞ if not).

↪ **Proposition 1.5:** The following properties of m^* hold:

1. $m^*(A) \geq 0$ for all $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, and $m^*(\emptyset) = 0$.
2. (monotonicity) For $A \subseteq B$, $m^*(A) \leq m^*(B)$.
3. (countable subadditivity) For $\{A_n\}, A_n \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, $m^*(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n) \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} m^*(A_n)$.¹
4. If $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ an interval, then $m^*(I) = \ell(I)$.
5. m^* is translation invariant; for any $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}, x \in \mathbb{R}$, $m^*(A) = m^*(A + x)$ where $A + x := \{a + x : a \in A\}$.
6. For all $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, $m^*(A) = \inf\{m^*(B) : A \subseteq B \subseteq \mathbb{R}, B \text{ open}\}$.
7. If $A = A_1 \cup A_2 \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ with $d(A_1, A_2) > 0$,² then $m^*(A_1) + m^*(A_2) = m^*(A)$.
8. If $A = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} J_k$ where J_k 's are "almost disjoint intervals" (i.e. share at most endpoints), then $m^*(A) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} m^*(J_k) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \ell(J_k)$.

PROOF.

3. If $m^*(A_n) = \infty$, for any n , we are done, so assume wlog $m^*(A_n) < \infty$ for all n . Then, for each n and $\varepsilon > 0$, one can choose open intervals $\{I_{n,i}\}_{i \geq 1}$ such that $A_n \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} I_{n,i}$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \ell(I_{n,i}) \leq m^*(A_n) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2^n}$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n &\subseteq \bigcup_{n=1, i=1}^{\infty} I_{n,i} \\ \Rightarrow m^*\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n\right) &\leq \sum_{n,i=1}^{\infty} \ell(I_{n,i}) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \ell(I_{n,i}) \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(m^*(A_n) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2^n}\right) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} m^*(A_n) + \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

and as ε arbitrary, the statement follows.

4. We prove first for $I = [a, b]$. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, set $I_1 = (a - \varepsilon, b + \varepsilon)$; then $I \subseteq I_1$ so $m^*(I) \leq \ell(I_1) = (b - 1) + 2\varepsilon$ hence $m^*(I) \leq b - a = \ell(I)$. Conversely, let $\{I_n\}$ be any open-interval converging of I (wlog, each of finite length; else the statement holds trivially). Since I compact, it can be covered by finitely many of the I_n 's, say $\{I_n\}_{n=1}^N$, denoting $I_n = (a_n, b_n)$ (with relabelling, etc). Moreover, we can pick the a_n, b_n 's such that $a_1 < a, b_N > b$, and generally $a_n < b_{n-1} \forall 2 \leq n \leq N$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \ell(I_n) &\geq \sum_{n=1}^N \ell(I_n) = b_1 - a_1 + \sum_{n=2}^N (b_n - a_n) \\ &\geq b_1 - a_1 + \sum_{n=2}^N (b_n - b_{n-1}) \\ &= b_N - a_1 \geq b - 1 = \ell(I), \end{aligned}$$

hence since the cover was arbitrary, $m^*(A) \geq \ell(I)$, and equality holds.

Now, suppose I finite, with endpoints $a < b$. Then for any $\frac{b-a}{2} > \varepsilon > 0$, then

$$[a + \varepsilon, b - \varepsilon] \subseteq I \subseteq [a - \varepsilon, b + \varepsilon],$$

¹More generally, any set function on $2^{\mathbb{R}}$ that satisfies 1., 2., and 3. is called an *outer measure*.

²Remark: this is a stronger requirement than disjointness!

hence by monotonicity and the previous part of this proof

$$m^*([a + \varepsilon, b - \varepsilon]) = b - a - 2\varepsilon \leq m^*(I) \leq b - a + 2\varepsilon = m^*([a - \varepsilon, b + \varepsilon]),$$

from which it follows that $m^*(I) = b - a = \ell(I)$.

Finally, suppose I infinite. Then, $\forall M \geq 0, \exists$ closed, finite interval I_M with $I_M \subseteq I$ and $\ell(I_M) \geq M$. Hence, $m^*(I) \geq m^*(I_M) \geq M$ and thus as M arbitrary it must be that $m^*(I) = \infty = \ell(I)$.

6. Denote $\tilde{m}(A) := \inf\{m^*(B) : A \subseteq B \subseteq \mathbb{R}, B \text{ open}\}$. For any $A \subseteq B \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ with B open, monotonicity gives that $m^*(A) \leq m^*(B)$, hence $m^*(A) \leq \tilde{m}(A)$. Conversely, assuming wlog $m^*(A) < \infty$ (else holds trivially), then for all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\{I_n\}$ such that $A \subseteq \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} I_n$ with $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \ell(I_n) \leq m^*(A) + \varepsilon$. Setting $B := \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} I_n$, we have that $A \subseteq B$ and $m^*(B) = m^*(\bigcup I_n) \leq$ (by finite subadditivity) $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} m^*(I_n) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \ell(I_n) \leq m^*(A) + \varepsilon$ hence $m^*(B) \leq m^*(A)$ for all B . Thus $m^*(A) \geq \tilde{m}(A)$ and equality holds.

7. Put $\delta := d(A_1, A_2) > 0$. Clearly $m^*(A) \leq m^*(A_1) + m^*(A_2)$ by finite subadditivity. wlog, $m^*(A) < \infty$ (and hence $m^*(A_i) < \infty, i = 1, 2$) (else holds trivially). Then $\forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists \{I_n\} : A \subseteq \bigcup I_n$ and $\sum \ell(I_n) \leq m^*(A) + \varepsilon$. Then, for all n , we consider a “refinement” of I_n ; namely, let $\{I_{n,i}\}_{i \geq 1}$ such that $I_n \subseteq \bigcup_i I_{n,i}$ and $\ell(I_{n,i}) < \delta$ and $\sum_i \ell(I_{n,i}) \leq \ell(I_n) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2^n}$. Relabel $\{I_{n,i} : n, i \geq 1\} \rightsquigarrow \{J_m : m \geq 1\}$ (both are countable). Then, $\{J_m\}$ defines an open-interval cover of A , and since $\ell(J_m) < \delta$ for each m , J_m intersects at most one A_i . For each m and $p = 1, 2$, put

$$M_p := \{m : J_m \cap A_p \neq \emptyset\},$$

noting that $M_1 \cap M_2 = \emptyset$. Then $\{J_m : m \in M_p\}$ is an open covering of A_p , and so

$$\begin{aligned} m^*(A_1) + m^*(A_2) &\leq \sum_{m \in M_1} \ell(J_m) + \sum_{m \in M_2} \ell(J_m) \\ &\leq \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \ell(J_m) = \sum_{n,i=1}^{\infty} \ell(I_{n,i}) \\ &\leq \sum_n \left(\ell(I_n) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2^n} \right) \\ &= \sum_n \ell(I_n) + \varepsilon \\ &\leq m^*(A) + 2\varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

and hence equality follows.

8. If $\ell(J_k) = \infty$ for some k , then since $J_k \subseteq A$, subadditivity gives us that $m^*(J_k) \leq m^*(A)$ and so $m^*(A) = \infty = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \ell(J_k)$ (since if any J_k infinite, the sum of the lengths of all of them will also be infinite).

Suppose then $\ell(J_k) < \infty$ for all k . Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Then for all $k \geq 1$, choose $I_k \subseteq J_k$ such that $\ell(J_k) \leq \ell(I_k) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2^k}$. For any $N \geq 1$, we can choose a subset $\{I_1, \dots, I_N\}$ of intervals such that all are disjoint, with strictly positive distance between them, and so

$$\begin{aligned}
\bigcup_{k=1}^N I_k &\subseteq \bigcup_{k=1}^N I_k \subseteq A \\
\Rightarrow m^*(A) &\geq m^*\left(\bigcup_{k=1}^N I_k\right) \geq \sum_{k=1}^N \ell(I_k) \\
&\geq \sum_{k=1}^N \left(\ell(J_k) - \frac{\varepsilon}{2^k}\right) \\
&\geq \sum_{k=1}^N \ell(J_k) - \varepsilon \\
\Rightarrow m^*(A) &\geq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \ell(J_k),
\end{aligned}$$

the second inequality following from finite subadditivity. The converse of the final inequality holds trivially. ■

§1.5 Lebesgue-Measurable Sets

↪ **Definition 1.7:** $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is m^* -measurable if $\forall B \subseteq \mathbb{R}$,

$$m^*(B) = m^*(B \cap A) + m^*(B \cap A^c).$$

Remark 1.3: By subadditivity, \leq always holds in the definition above.

↪ **Theorem 1.2** (Carathéodary's Theorem): Let

$$\mathcal{M} := \{A \subseteq \mathbb{R} : A \text{ } m^* \text{-measurable}\}.$$

Then, \mathcal{M} is a σ -algebra of subsets of \mathbb{R} .

Define $m : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$, $m(A) = m^*(A)$. Then, m is a measure on \mathcal{M} , called the *Lebesgue measure* on \mathbb{R} . We call sets in \mathcal{M} *Lebesgue-measurable* or simply *measurable* (if clear from context) accordingly. We call $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{M}, m)$ the *Lebesgue measure space*.

PROOF. The first two σ -algebra axioms are easy. We have for any $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ that

$$m^*(B \cap \mathbb{R}) + m^*(B \cap \mathbb{R}^c) = m^*(B) + m^*(B \cap \emptyset) = m^*(B)$$

so $\mathbb{R} \in \mathcal{M}$. Further, $A \in \mathcal{M} \Rightarrow A^c \in \mathcal{M}$ by the symmetry of the requirement for sets to be in \mathcal{M} .

The final axiom takes more work. We show first \mathcal{M} closed under finite unions; by induction it suffices to show for 2 sets. Let $A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{M}$. Then, for all $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
m^*(B) &= m^*(B \cap A_1) + m^*(B \cap A_1^c) \\
&= m^*(B \cap A_1) + m^*(B \cap A_1^c \cap A_2) + m^*(B \cap A_1^c \cap A_2^c) \\
&= m^*(B \cap A_1) + m^*(B \cap A_1^c \cap A_2) + m^*(B \cap (A_1 \cup A_2)^c)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $(B \cap A_1) \cup (B \cap A_1^c \cap A_2) = B \cap (A_1 \cup A_2)$, hence by subadditivity,

$$m^*(B) \geq m^*(B \cap (A_1 \cup A_2)) + m^*(B \cap (A_1 \cup A_2)^c),$$

and since the other direction of the inequality comes for free, we conclude $A_1 \cup A_2 \in \mathcal{M}$.

Let now $\{A_n\} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$. We “disjointify” $\{A_n\}$; put $B_1 := A_1$, $B_n := \frac{A_n}{\bigcup_{i=1}^{n-1} A_i}$, $n \geq 2$, noting $\bigcup_n A_n = \bigcup_n B_n$, and each $B_n \in \mathcal{M}$, as each is but a finite number of set operations applied to the A_n ’s, and thus in \mathcal{M} as demonstrated above. Put $E_n := \bigcup_{i=1}^n B_i$, noting again $E_n \in \mathcal{M}$. Then, for all $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned} m^*(B) &= m^*\left(\underbrace{B \cap E_n}_{\text{chop up } B_n}\right) + m^*\left(\underbrace{B \cap E_n^c}_{E_n \subseteq \bigcup B_n \Rightarrow E_n^c \supseteq (\bigcup B_n)^c}\right) \\ &\geq m^*\left(B \cap \underbrace{E_n \cap B_n}_{=B_n}\right) + m^*\left(B \cap \underbrace{E_n \cap B_n^c}_{=E_{n-1}}\right) + m^*\left(B \cap \left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n\right)^c\right) \\ &\geq m^*(B \cap B_n) + m^*\left(\underbrace{B \cap E_{n-1}}_{\text{chop up } B_{n-1}}\right) + m^*\left(B \cap \left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n\right)^c\right) \\ &\geq m^*(B \cap B_n) + m^*(B \cap E_{n-1} \cap B_{n-1}) \\ &\quad + m^*(B \cap E_{n-1} \cap B_{n-1}^c) + m^*\left(B \cap \left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n\right)^c\right). \end{aligned}$$

Notice that the last line is essentially the second applied to B_{n-1} ; hence, we have a repeating (essentially, “descending”) pattern in this manner, which we repeat until $n \rightarrow 1$. We have, thus, that

$$m^*(B) \geq \sum_{i=1}^n [m^*(B \cap B_i)] + m^*\left(B \cap \left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n\right)^c\right),$$

so taking $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} m^*(B) &\geq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} [m^*(B \cap B_i)] + m^*\left(B \cap \left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n\right)^c\right) \\ &\geq m^*\left(B \cap \left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n\right)\right) + m^*\left(B \cap \left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n\right)^c\right). \end{aligned}$$

As usual, the inverse inequality comes for free, and thus we can conclude $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n$ also m^* -measurable, and thus so is $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$. This proves \mathcal{M} a σ -algebra.

We show now m a measure. By previous propositions, we have that $m \geq 0$ and $m(\emptyset) = 0$ (since $m = m^*|_{\mathcal{M}}$), so it remains to prove countable subadditivity.

Let $\{A_n\} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ -disjoint. Following precisely the same argument as above, used to prove that \mathcal{M} closed under countable unions, shows that for any $n \geq 1$

$$m\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^n A_i\right) = \sum_{i=1}^n m(A_i),$$

that is, finite additivity holds, and thus by subadditivity

$$m\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i\right) \geq m\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^n A_i\right) = \sum_{i=1}^n m(A_i),$$

and so taking the limit of $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$m\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i\right) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} m(A_i),$$

with the converse inequality coming for free. Thus, m indeed a measure on \mathcal{M} . ■

↪ **Proposition 1.6:** \mathcal{M}, m translation invariant; for all $A \in \mathcal{M}, x \in \mathbb{R}, x + A = \{x + a : a \in A\} \in \mathcal{M}$ and $m(A) = m(A + x)$.

Remark 1.4: We would like this to hold, heuristically, since if we shift sets on the real line, we should expect their length to remain constant.

PROOF. For all $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, we have (since m^* translation invariant)

$$\begin{aligned} m^*(B) &= m^*(B - x) = m^*\left(\underbrace{(B - x) \cap A}_{=B \cap (A+x)}\right) + m^*\left(\underbrace{(B - x) \cap A^c}_{=B \cap (A^c+x)=B \cap (A+x)^c}\right) \\ &= m^*(B \cap (A + x)) + m^*(B \cap (A + x)^c), \end{aligned}$$

thus $A + x \in \mathcal{M}$, and since m^* translation invariant, it follows that m is. ■

↪ **Theorem 1.3:** $\forall a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ with $a < b$, $(a, b) \in \mathcal{M}$, and $m((a, b)) = b - a$.

Remark 1.5: Again, we'd like this to hold, heuristically, since we would like the measure of an interval to simply be its length; we'd moreover like to be able to measure intervals, i.e. have intervals be contained in \mathcal{M} .

↪ **Corollary 1.1:** $\mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$

PROOF. $\mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$ is generated by open intervals of the form (a, b) . All such intervals are in \mathcal{M} by the previous theorem, and hence the proof. ■

§1.6 Properties of the Lebesgue Measure

↪ **Proposition 1.7** (Regularity Assumptions on m): For all $A \in \mathcal{M}$, the following hold.

- For all $\varepsilon > 0$, $\exists G$ open such that $A \subseteq G$ and $m(G \setminus A) < \varepsilon$.
- For all $\varepsilon > 0$, $\exists F$ -closed such that $F \subseteq A$ and $m(A \setminus F) \leq \varepsilon$.
- $m(A) = \inf\{m(G) : G \text{ open}, G \supseteq A\}$.
- $m(A) = \sup\{m(K) : K \text{ compact}, K \subseteq A\}$.
- If $m(A) < \infty$, then for all $\varepsilon > 0$, $\exists K \subseteq A$ compact, such that $m(A \setminus K) < \varepsilon$.
- If $m(A) < \infty$, then for all $\varepsilon \geq 0$, \exists finite collection of open intervals I_1, \dots, I_N such that $m\left(A \Delta \left(\bigcup_{n=1}^N I_n\right)\right) \leq \varepsilon$.

↪ **Proposition 1.8** (Completeness of m): $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{M}, m)$ is *complete*, in the sense that for all $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, if $\exists B \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $A \subseteq B$ and $m(B) = 0$, then $A \in \mathcal{M}$ and $m(A) = 0$.

Equivalently, any subset of a null set is again a null set.

Remark 1.6: In general, $A \in \mathcal{F}, B \subseteq A \not\Rightarrow B \in \mathcal{F}$.

↪ **Proposition 1.9:** Up to rescaling, m is the unique, nontrivial measure on $(\mathbb{R}, \mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}})$ that is finite on compact sets and is translation invariant, i.e. if μ another such measure on $(\mathbb{R}, \mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}})$ with $\mu = c \cdot m$ for $c > 0$, then $\mu = m$.

Remark 1.7: Such a c is simply $c = \mu((0, 1))$.

To prove this proposition, we first introduce some helpful tooling:

↪ **Theorem 1.4** (Dynkin's π -d): Given a space X , let \mathcal{C} be a collection of subsets of X . \mathcal{C} is called a π -system if $A, B \in \mathcal{C} \Rightarrow A \cap B \in \mathcal{C}$ (that is, it is closed under finite intersections).

Let $\mathcal{F} = \sigma(\mathcal{C})$, and suppose μ_1, μ_2 are two finite measures on (X, \mathcal{F}) such that $\mu_1(X) = \mu_2(X)$ and $\mu_1 = \mu_2$ when restricted to \mathcal{C} . Then, $\mu_1 = \mu_2$ on all of \mathcal{F} .

↪ **Proposition 1.10:** $\{\emptyset\} \cup \{(a, b) : a < b \in \mathbb{R}\}$ a π -system.

↪ **Proposition 1.11:** If μ a measure on $(\mathbb{R}, \mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}})$ such that for all intervals I , $\mu(I) = \ell(I)$, then $\mu = m$.

PROOF. Consider for all $n \geq 1$ $\mu|_{\mathfrak{B}_{[-n, n]}}$. Clearly, $\mu([-n, n]) = m([-n, n]) = 2n$, and for all $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mu((a, b) \cap [-n, n]) = \ell((a, b) \cap [-n, n]) = m((a, b) \cap [-n, n])$. Thus, by the previous theorem, μ must match m on all of $\mathfrak{B}_{[-n, n]}$.

Let now $A \in \mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$. Let $A_n := A \cap [-n, n] \in \mathfrak{B}_{[-n, n]}$. By continuity of m from below,

$$\begin{aligned}\mu(A) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(A_n) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} m(A_n) \\ &= m(A),\end{aligned}$$

hence $\mu = m$. ■

↪ **Proposition 1.12:** If μ a measure on $(\mathbb{R}, \mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}})$ assigning finite values to compact sets and is translation invariant, then $\mu = cm$ for some $c > 0$.

Remark 1.8: This proposition is also tacitly stating that $\mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$ translation invariant; this needs to be shown.

↪ **Lemma 1.1:** $\mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$ translation invariant; for any $A \in \mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}}, x \in \mathbb{R}, A + x \in \mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$.

PROOF. We employ the “good set strategy”; fix some $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and let

$$\Sigma := \{B \in \mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}} : B + x \in \mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}}\}.$$

One can check that Σ a σ -algebra, and so $\Sigma \subseteq \mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$. But in addition, its easy to see that $\{(a, b) : a < b \in \mathbb{R}\} \subseteq \Sigma$, since a translated interval is just another interval, and since these sets generate $\mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$, it must be further that $\mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}} \subseteq \Sigma$, completing the proof. ■

PROOF. (of the proposition) Let $c = \mu((0, 1])$, noting that $c > 0$ (why? Consider what would happen if $c = 0$).

This implies that $\forall n \geq 1, \mu\left(\left(0, \frac{1}{n}\right]\right) = \frac{c}{n}$ (obtained by “chopping up” $(0, 1]$ into n disjoint intervals); from here we can draw many further conclusions:

$$\forall m = 1, \dots, n-1, \mu\left(\left(0, \frac{m}{n}\right]\right) = \frac{m}{n}c$$

$$\Rightarrow \forall q \in \mathbb{Q} \cap (0, 1], \mu((0, q]) = qc$$

$$\Rightarrow \forall q \in \mathbb{Q}^+, \mu((0, q]) = q \cdot c \text{ (translate)}$$

$$\Rightarrow \forall a \in \mathbb{R}, \mu((a, a+q]) = q \cdot c$$

$$\Rightarrow \forall \text{ intervals } I, \mu(I) = c \cdot \ell(I) \text{ (continuity)}$$

$$\Rightarrow \forall n \geq 1, a, b \in \mathbb{R}, \mu((a, b) \cap [-n, n]) = c \cdot \ell((a, b) \cap [-n, n]) = c \cdot m((a, b) \cap [-n, n]),$$

but then, $\mu = c \cdot m$ on $\mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}[-n, n]}$, and by appealing again the Dynkin's, $\mu = c \cdot m$ on all of $\mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$. ■

↪ **Proposition 1.13 (Scaling):** m has the *scaling property* that $\forall A \in \mathcal{M}, c \in \mathbb{R}, c \cdot A = \{cx : x \in A\} \in \mathcal{M}$, and $m(c \cdot A) = |c| m(A)$.

PROOF. Assume $c \neq 0$. Given $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, remark that $\{I_n\}$ an open interval cover of A iff $\{cI_n\}$ and open interval cover of cA , and $\ell(cI_n) = |c| \ell(I_n)$, and thus $m^*(cA) = |c| m^*(A)$.

Now, suppose $A \in \mathcal{M}$. Then, we have for any $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned} m^*(B) &= |c| m^*\left(\frac{1}{c}B\right) = |c| m^*\left(\frac{1}{c}B \cap A\right) + |c| m^*\left(\frac{1}{c}B \cap A^c\right) \\ &= m^*(B \cap cA) + m^*(B \cap (cA)^c), \end{aligned}$$

so $cA \in \mathcal{M}$. ■

§1.7 Relationship between $\mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$ and \mathcal{M}

↪ **Definition 1.8:** Given (X, \mathcal{F}, μ) , consider the following collection of subsets of X ,

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

Put $\overline{\mathcal{F}} := \sigma(\mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{N})$; this is called the *completion* of \mathcal{F} with respect to μ .

↪ **Proposition 1.14:** $\overline{\mathcal{F}} = \{F \subseteq X : \exists E, G \in \mathcal{F} \text{ s.t. } \exists E \subseteq F \subseteq G \text{ and } m(G \setminus E) = 0\}$.

PROOF. Put \mathcal{G} the set on the right; one can check \mathcal{G} a σ -algebra. Since $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{N} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$, we have $\overline{\mathcal{F}} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$.

Conversely, for any $F \in \mathcal{G}$, we have $E, G \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $E \subseteq F \subseteq G$ with $m(G \setminus E) = 0$. We can rewrite

$$F = \underbrace{E}_{\in \mathcal{F}} \cup \underbrace{(F \setminus E)}_{\substack{\subseteq G \setminus E \\ \Rightarrow \mu(F \setminus E) = 0 \\ \Rightarrow G \setminus E \in \mathcal{N}}},$$

hence $F \in \mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{N}$ and thus in $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$, and equality holds. ■

↪ **Definition 1.9:** Given (X, \mathcal{F}, μ) , μ can be *extended* to $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$ by, for each $F \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}$ with $E \subseteq F \subseteq G$ s.t. $\mu(G \setminus E) = 0$, put

$$\mu(F) = \mu(E) = \mu(G).$$

We call then $(X, \overline{\mathcal{F}}, \mu)$ a *complete measure space*.

Remark 1.9: It isn't obvious that this is well defined a priori; in particular, the E, G sets are certainly not guaranteed to be unique in general, so one must check that this definition is valid regardless of choice of "sandwich sets".

↪ **Theorem 1.5:** $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{M}, m)$ is the completion of $(\mathbb{R}, \mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}}, m)$.

PROOF. Given $A \in \mathcal{M}$, then $\forall n \geq 1, \exists G_n$ -open with $A \subseteq G_n$ s.t. $m^*(G_n \setminus A) \leq \frac{1}{n}$ and $\exists F_n$ -closed with $F_n \subseteq A$ s.t. $m^*(A \setminus F_n) \leq \frac{1}{n}$.

Put $C := \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} G_n, B := \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} F_n$, remarking that $C, B \in \mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}}, B \subseteq A \subseteq C$, and moreover

$$\begin{aligned} m(C \setminus A) &\leq \frac{1}{n}, m(A \setminus B) \leq \frac{1}{n} \\ \Rightarrow m(C \setminus B) &= m(C \setminus A) + m(A \setminus B) \leq \frac{2}{n}, \end{aligned}$$

but n can be arbitrarily large, hence $m(C \setminus B) = 0$; in short, given a measurable set, we can “sandwich it” arbitrarily closely with Borel sets. Thus, $A \in \mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}} \Rightarrow \mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$. But recall that \mathcal{M} complete, so $\mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}} \subseteq \mathcal{M} \Rightarrow \overline{\mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}}} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{M}} = \mathcal{M}$, and thus $\overline{\mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}}} = \mathcal{M}$ indeed.

Heuristically, this means that any measurable set is “different” from a Borel set by at most a null set. ■

§1.8 Some Special Sets


1.8.1 Uncountable Null Set?

Remark that for any countable set $A \in \mathcal{M}, m(A) = 0$; indeed, one may write $A = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \{a_n\}$ for singleton sets $\{a_n\}$, and so

$$m(A) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} m(a_n) = 0.$$

One naturally asks the opposite question, does there exist a measurable, *uncountable* set with measure 0? We construct a particular one here, the Cantor set, C .

This requires an “inductive” construction. Define $C_0 = [0, 1]$, and define C_k to be C_{k-1} after removing the middle third from each of its disjoint components. For instance $C_1 = \left[0, \frac{1}{3}\right] \cup \left[\frac{2}{3}, 1\right]$, then $C_2 = \left[0, \frac{1}{9}\right] \cup \left[\frac{2}{9}, \frac{1}{3}\right] \cup \left[\frac{2}{3}, \frac{7}{9}\right] \cup \left[\frac{8}{9}, 1\right]$, and so on. This may be clearest graphically:



Remark that the $C_n \downarrow$. Put finally

$$C := \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} C_n.$$

↪ **Proposition 1.15:** The following hold for the Cantor set C :

1. C is closed (and thus $C \in \mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$);
2. $m(C) = 0$;
3. C is uncountable.

PROOF.

1. For each n , C_n is the countable (indeed, finite) union of 2^n -many disjoint, closed intervals, hence each C_n closed. C is thus a countable intersection of closed sets, and is thus itself closed.
2. For each n , each of the 2^n disjoint closed intervals in C_n has length $\frac{1}{3^n}$, hence

$$m(C_n) = \frac{2^n}{3^n} = \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^n.$$

Since $\{C_n\} \downarrow$, by continuity of m we have

$$m(C) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} m(C_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^n = 0.$$

3. This part is a little trickier. Notice that for any $x \in [0, 1]$, we can define a sequence (a_n) where each $a_n \in \{0, 1, 2\}$, and such that

$$x = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_n}{3^n};$$

in particular, this is just the base-3 representation of x , which we denote $(x)_3 = (a_1 a_2 \dots)$.

I claim now that

$$C = \{x \in [0, 1] : (x)_3 \text{ has no 1's}\}.$$

Indeed, at each stage n of the construction of the Cantor set, we get rid of the segment of the real line that would correspond to the $a_n = 1$. One should note that $(x)_3$ not necessarily unique; for instance $\left(\frac{1}{3}\right)_3 = (1, 0, 0, \dots) = (0, 2, 2, \dots)$, but if we specifically consider all x such that there *exists* a base three representation with no 1's, i.e. like $\frac{1}{3}$, then C indeed captures all the desired numbers.

Thus, we have that

$$\text{card}(C) = \text{card}(\{(a_n) : a_n = 0, 2\}).$$

Define now the function

$$f : C \rightarrow [0, 1], \quad x \mapsto \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_n}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{2^n}, \text{ where } (x)_3 = (a_n)$$

i.e., we “squish” the base-3 representation into a base-2 representation of a number.

This is surjective; for any $y \in [0, 1]$, $(b_n) := (y)_2$ contains only 0's and 1's, hence $(2b_n)$

contains only 0's and 1's, so let x be the number such that $(x)_3 = (2b_n)$. This necessarily exists, indeed, we simply take our definitions backwards:

$$x := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{2b_n}{3^n},$$

which maps to y under f and is contained in C . Hence, $\text{card}(C) \geq \text{card}([0, 1])$; but $[0, 1]$ uncountable, and thus so is C . ■

We can naturally extend the function f used here to map the entire interval $[0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ as follows

$$f(x) := \begin{cases} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_n}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{2^n} & \text{if } x \in C, (x)_3 = (a_n) \\ f(a) & \text{if } x \notin C \text{ then } x \in (a, b) \text{ s.t. } (a, b) \text{ removed from } [0, 1] \end{cases}.$$

This function is often called the *Devil's Staircase* or *Cantor-Lebesgue function*.

↪ **Proposition 1.16:**

1. $f(0) = 0, f(1) = 1, f \equiv \frac{1}{2}$ on $(\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}), f \equiv \frac{1}{4}$ on $(\frac{1}{9}, \frac{2}{9})$
2. $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ a surjection
3. f is nondecreasing
4. f is continuous

PROOF. 1., 2., clear from construction.

For 3., let $x_1 < x_2 \in C$, and suppose $(x_1)_3 = (a_n), (x_2)_3 = (b_n)$. Then, since $x_1 < x_2$, it must be that a_n, b_n can only be equal up to some finite N ; then the next $0 = a_{N+1} < b_{N+1} = 2$. Hence, it follows that the “modified binary expansion” that arises from f gives directly that $f(x_1) \leq f(x_2)$.

For 4., f is clearly continuous on $[0, 1] - C$, since it is piecewise-constant here. Also, f is “one-sided continuous” at each of the “boundary points” $\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}, \frac{1}{9}, \frac{2}{9}, \dots$. If $x \in C$, for any $n \geq 1$, there must be x_n, x_n' such that $x_n < x < x_n'$ (if $x = 0$, only need x_n' , if $x = 1$, only need x_n) and $f(x_n') - f(x_n) \leq \frac{1}{2^n}$. Then, f is continuous at x by monotonicity of f . ■

1.8.2 Non-Measurable Sets?

We've shown then that there is indeed an uncountable set of measure 0. Another question we may ask ourselves is, is there a $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ that is non-measurable? The answer to this turns out to be yes, but the construction requires invoking the axiom of choice:

Axiom 1 (Of Choice): If Σ a collection of nonempty sets, then \exists a function

$$S : \Sigma \rightarrow \bigcup_{A \in \Sigma} A,$$

such that $A \in \sigma, S(A) \in A$. Such a function is called a *selection function*, and $S(A)$ a *representative* of A .

We construct now a non-measurable set, assuming the above. Consider $[0, 1]$, and define an equivalence relation \sim on $[0, 1]$ by

$$a \sim b \Leftrightarrow a - b \in \mathbb{Q}.$$

Its easy to check that this is indeed an equivalence relation. Denote by E_a the equivalence class containing a , and set $\Sigma = \{E_a : a \in [0, 1]\}$. Note that for any $E_a \in \Sigma, E_a \neq \emptyset$.

Invoking the axiom of choice, we can select exactly one element S_a from E_a for each $E_a \in \Sigma$. Set

$$N := \{S_a : S_a \text{ is a representative of } E_a, E_a \in \Sigma\}.$$

Proposition 1.17: N , called a *Vitali set*, is non-measurable.

PROOF. Assume towards a contradiction that N indeed measurable, $N \in \mathcal{M}$. Consider $[-1, 1] \cap \mathbb{Q}$; this is countable, so we can enumerate it $\{q_k\}, k \geq 1$. For each k , put

$$N_k := N + q_k.$$

By the assumption of measurability and translation invariance of m , it must be that each N_k measurable and has the same measure as N .

We claim each N_k disjoint. Assume not, then $\exists k \neq \ell$ (i.e. $q_k \neq q_\ell$) and $S_a, S_b \in N$ such that $S_a + q_k = S_b + q_\ell$. But then $S_a - S_b = q_\ell - q_k \in \mathbb{Q}$, hence $S_a \sim S_b$. But we constructed N to have only one representative from each equivalence class, hence it must be that $S_a = S_b$, and so $S_a + q_k = S_a + q_\ell \Rightarrow q_k = q_\ell$, contradicting the assumed distinctness of the q 's; hence, the N_k 's indeed disjoint.

We claim next that $[0, 1] \subseteq \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} N_k$. Let $x \in [0, 1]$. Then, $x \sim S_a$ for some unique $S_a \in N$ and so $x - S_a \in \mathbb{Q}$. But also, $x, S_a \in [0, 1]$, hence $x - S_a \in [-1, 1]$ (moreover, $x - S_a \in [-1, 1] \cap \mathbb{Q}$) and there must exist a k such that $x - S_a = q_k$, since the q_k 's enumerate the entire $[-1, 1] \cap \mathbb{Q}$. Thus, $x \in N_k$ by the construction of the N_k 's. Thus, $[0, 1] \subseteq \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} N_k$ indeed.

On the other hand, $\bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} N_k \subseteq [-1, 2]$ and so we have the "bound"

$$[0, 1] \subseteq \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} N_k \subseteq [-1, 2].$$

Taking the measure of all sides then, we have the bound

$$1 \leq \mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} N_k\right) \leq 3.$$

Invoking the disjointness of the N_k 's, we can also use countable additivity to write

$$\mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} N_k\right) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} m(N_k) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} m(N),$$

but this final line is a sequence of positive, constant real numbers; hence, it is impossible for it to be within 1 and 3, and we have a contradiction. Hence, N indeed not measurable.

Remark that this proof also shows that $m^*(N_k) > 0$ so $m^*(N) > 0$ (given the interval bound on N we've found). ■

↪ **Proposition 1.18:** For every $A \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $m(A) > 0$, there exists $B \subseteq A$ such that B is non-measurable.

PROOF. Assume otherwise, that there is a $A \in \mathcal{M}$ with $m(A) > 0$ such that any subset B of A is also measurable.

Remark that $A \subseteq \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} A \cap [n, n+1]$. Then, there exists an n such that $m(A \cap [n, n+1]) > 0$ and thus, translating $A' := A \cap [n, n+1] - n$, $m(A') > 0$, noting that $A' \subseteq [0, 1]$. Now, for any $B' \subseteq A'$, $B' + n \subseteq A$. By assumption, then $B' + n$ must be measurable so B' measurable.

In summary, then, we have $A' \subseteq [0, 1]$ with $m(A') > 0$ such that (by assumption) B' measurable for all $B' \subseteq A'$.

Let $N, \{q_k\}, N_k$ be as in the previous proof. Set

$$A_k' := A' \cap N_k, k \geq 1.$$

Then, A_k' disjoint, and

$$A' = [0, 1] \cap A' \subseteq \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} (N_k \cap A') = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} A_k'.$$

Since $m(A') > 0$, there exists a k such that $m(A_k') > 0$. Set, for this k ,

$$L := \{\ell \geq 1 : q_\ell + q_k \in [-1, 1]\}.$$

This set is again countably infinite. We translate, obtaining a disjoint sequence of sets $\{q_\ell + A_k' : \ell \in L\}$; since $q_\ell + q_k \in [-1, 1] \cap \mathbb{Q}$, then $q_\ell + q_k = q_m$ for some unique m , and so $q_\ell + A_k' = q_\ell + A' \cap (N + q_k) \subseteq N_m$. Hence, we have on the one hand that by countable additivity

$$\bigcup_{\ell \in L} (q_\ell + A_k') \subseteq [-1, 2] \Rightarrow \sum_{\ell \in L} m(q_\ell + A_k') \leq 3,$$

and so it must be that $m(q_\ell + A_k') = m(A_k') = 0$ (else the series couldn't be finite), contradicting the finiteness assumption on $m(A_k')$. ■

1.8.3 Non-Borel Measurable Set?

We may ask, is there $A \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $A \notin \mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$?

Let $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be the Cantor-Lebesgue function, and put $g(x) = f(x) + x$; note that g is continuous and strictly increasing, and is defined $g : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 2]$. Remark that g bijective; the strictly increasing gives injective, and moreover $g(0) = 0, g(1) = 2$ hence by intermediate value theorem it is surjective. Hence, $g^{-1} : [0, 2] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ exists, and is also continuous, so in short g is a homeomorphism; it maps open to open, closed to closed. In particular, if $A \in \mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$, then $g(A) \in \mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$.

Recall that if (a, b) an open interval that gets removed from the construction of C , then f is constant and so g will map (a, b) to another open interval of the same length $b - a$. Thus,

$$m(g([0, 1] \setminus C)) = m([0, 1] \setminus C) = 1.$$

Hence, $m(g(C)) = 2 - 1 = 1 > 0$, since $g(C \cup [0, 1] \setminus C) = [0, 2]$. Hence, there exists a $B \subseteq G(C)$ such that $B \notin \mathcal{M}$, as per the previous proposition.

Let $A := g^{-1}(B)$; then $A \subseteq g^{-1}(g(C)) = C$. Since $m(C) = 0$, $A \in \mathcal{M}$ and $m(A) = 0$. But, $A \notin \mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$; if it were, then $g(A) = B \in \mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$, since g “maintains” Borel sets, but B is not even Lebesgue measurable and so this is a contradiction).

§2 INTEGRATION THEORY

§2.1 Measurable Functions

We will be considering functions f defined on \mathbb{R} or some subset of \mathbb{R} that could take positive or negative infinity as its value i.e.

$$f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}} := \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, \infty\},$$

where $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$ the *extended real line*; we say f is $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$ -valued. If f never takes $\infty, -\infty$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we say f finite-valued, or just \mathbb{R} -valued.

For all $a \in \mathbb{R}$, we consider inverse images

$$f^{-1}([-\infty, a)) := \{x \in \mathbb{R} : f(x) \in [-\infty, a)\} = \{f < a\},$$

remarking the inclusion of $-\infty$; similarly

$$f^{-1}((a, \infty]) := \{x \in \mathbb{R} : f(x) \in (a, \infty]\} = \{f > a\},$$

and so on, for any $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}$,

$$f^{-1}(B) := \{x \in \mathbb{R} : f(x) \in B\} = \{f \in B\}.$$

Remark that

$$f^{-1}(B^c) = (f^{-1}(B))^c$$

$$f^{-1}(A \cap B) = f^{-1}(A) \cap f^{-1}(B)$$

$$f^{-1}(A \cup B) = f^{-1}(A) \cup f^{-1}(B),$$

which extend naturally for countable unions/intersections.

↪ **Definition 2.1** (Measurable Function): $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ is *measurable* if $\forall a \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$f^{-1}([-\infty, a)) \in \mathcal{M}.$$

↪ **Proposition 2.1** (Equivalent Definitions of Measurability):

$$\begin{aligned} f \text{ is measurable} &\Leftrightarrow \forall a \in \mathbb{R}, f^{-1}([a, \infty]) \in \mathcal{M} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \forall a \in \mathbb{R}, f^{-1}((a, \infty]) \in \mathcal{M} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \forall a \in \mathbb{R}, f^{-1}([-\infty, a]) \in \mathcal{M} \end{aligned}$$

PROOF. We prove just the last equivalence. Notice that $\forall a \in \mathbb{R}$, we can use the commuting of inverse images with countable unions, intersections, complement to write

$$f^{-1}([-\infty, a)) = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} f^{-1}\left(\left[-\infty, a - \frac{1}{n}\right)\right)$$

and

$$f^{-1}([-\infty, a]) = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} f^{-1}\left(\left[-\infty, a + \frac{1}{n}\right]\right).$$

■

↪ **Proposition 2.2**: If f finite-valued, Then

$$\begin{aligned} f \text{ is measurable} &\Leftrightarrow \forall a < b \in \mathbb{R}, f^{-1}((a, b)) \in \mathcal{M} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \dots \quad f^{-1}((a, b]) \in \mathcal{M} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \dots \quad f^{-1}([a, b)) \in \mathcal{M} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \dots \quad f^{-1}([a, b]) \in \mathcal{M}. \end{aligned}$$

↪ **Definition 2.2** (Extended Borel Sigma Algebra): Define the Borel “extended” algebra $\mathfrak{B}_{\overline{\mathbb{R}}}$ of subsets of $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$, defined by

$$\mathfrak{B}_{\overline{\mathbb{R}}} := \sigma(\mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}} \cup \{-\infty\}, \{\infty\}).$$

↪ **Proposition 2.3**: $\mathfrak{B}_{\overline{\mathbb{R}}} = \sigma(\{[-\infty, a) : a \in \mathbb{R}\})$.

PROOF. For every $a \in \mathbb{R}$, we may write

$$[-\infty, a) = \underbrace{(-\infty, a)}_{\in \mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}}} \cup \{-\infty\} \in \mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}},$$

so $\sigma(\{[-\infty, a) : a \in \mathbb{R}\}) \subseteq \mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$.

Conversely, notice that

$$\{-\infty\} = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} [-\infty, -n),$$

and

$$\{\infty\} = \overline{\mathbb{R}} - \left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} [-\infty, n) \right),$$

so $\{-\infty\}, \{\infty\} \in \sigma(\{[-\infty, a) : a \in \mathbb{R}\})$. Hence, for any $a \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$(-\infty, a) = [-\infty, a) - \{-\infty\} \in \sigma(\{[-\infty, a) : a \in \mathbb{R}\}),$$

and so $\mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}} \subseteq \sigma(\{[-\infty, a) : a \in \mathbb{R}\})$. $\{-\infty\}, \{\infty\} \in \sigma(\{[-\infty, a) : a \in \mathbb{R}\})$ already, and thus $\mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}} \subseteq \sigma(\{[-\infty, a) : a \in \mathbb{R}\})$. ■

↪ **Proposition 2.4:** $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ measurable \Leftrightarrow for all $B \in \mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}}, f^{-1}(B) \in \mathcal{M}$.

PROOF. \Leftarrow is immediate. For \Rightarrow , let \mathcal{C} be a collection of subsets of $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$, then put

$$f^{-1}(\mathcal{C}) := \{f^{-1}(B) : B \in \mathcal{C}\}.$$

By an assignment question (2.6),

$$f^{-1}(\sigma(\mathcal{C})) = \sigma(f^{-1}(\mathcal{C})).$$

Take $\mathcal{C} = \{[-\infty, a) : a \in \mathbb{R}\}$. Then,

$$f^{-1}(\sigma(\mathcal{C})) = f^{-1}(\mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}}) = \sigma(f^{-1}(\{[-\infty, a) : a \in \mathbb{R}\})).$$

But f measurable, so $f^{-1}([- \infty, a)) \in \mathcal{M}$ for each $a \in \mathbb{R}$, hence $\sigma(f^{-1}(\{[-\infty, a) : a \in \mathbb{R}\})) \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ and so $f^{-1}(\sigma(\mathcal{C})) \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ completing the proof. ■

↪ **Corollary 2.1:** If f finite-valued, then f is measurable \Leftrightarrow for every $B \in \mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}}, f^{-1}(B) \in \mathcal{M}$.

↪ **Proposition 2.5:** Given $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$, define the *finite valued component* of f given by

$$f_{\mathbb{R}}(x) := \begin{cases} f(x) & : -\infty < f(x) < \infty \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Then, f measurable $\Leftrightarrow \forall B \in \mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}}, f_{\mathbb{R}}^{-1}(B) \in \mathcal{M}$ AND $\{f = \infty\}, \{f = -\infty\}$ both in \mathcal{M} .

PROOF. (\Leftarrow) For any $a \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$f^{-1}([- \infty, a)) = \{f = -\infty\} \cup f^{-1}((-\infty, a)) = \{f = -\infty\} \cup f_{\mathbb{R}}^{-1}((-\infty, a)),$$

a union of measurable sets and hence is itself measurable.

(\Rightarrow) Remark that $\{f = \infty\}, \{f = -\infty\} \in \mathcal{M}$ automatically. For any $B \in \mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$, we have $f_{\mathbb{R}}^{-1}(B) = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : f_{\mathbb{R}}(x) \in B\} = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : f(x) \in B, -\infty < f < \infty\} \cup \{x \in \mathbb{R} : 0 \in B, f(x) = \pm\infty\} \in \mathcal{M}$.

■

\hookrightarrow **Definition 2.3:** If a statement is true for every $x \in A$ where $A \in \mathcal{M}$ s.t. $m(A^c) = 0$, then we say the statement is true a.e. (almost everywhere).

\hookrightarrow **Proposition 2.6:** If $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ is measurable and $f = g$ a.e. then g is measurable.

\hookrightarrow **Corollary 2.2:** If f is finite-valued a.e., then f is measurable $\Leftrightarrow f_{\mathbb{R}}$ is measurable $\Leftrightarrow \forall a < b \in \mathbb{R}, f^{-1}((a, b)) \in \mathcal{M}$.

\hookrightarrow **Proposition 2.7:** If $f \equiv c$ then f measurable.

If $f = \mathbb{1}_A$ for some $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, then f is measurable $\Leftrightarrow A \in \mathcal{M}$.

PROOF. Assume $f \equiv c$. Then

$$f^{-1}([-\infty, a)) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{R} & \text{if } c < a \\ \emptyset & \text{if } c \geq a \end{cases} \in \mathcal{M}.$$

Assume now $f = \mathbb{1}_A$. For all $a \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$f^{-1}([-\infty, a)) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{R} & \text{if } a > 1 \\ A^c & \text{if } 0 < a \leq 1 \\ \emptyset & \text{if } a \leq 0 \end{cases} \in \mathcal{M} \Leftrightarrow A \in \mathcal{M}.$$

■

\hookrightarrow **Proposition 2.8:** If f is (finite-valued) continuous, then f is measurable.

PROOF. $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ continuous \Leftrightarrow for all $G \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ open, $f^{-1}(G)$ open. For all $a < b \in \mathbb{R}$, then $f^{-1}((a, b))$ open so $f^{-1}((a, b)) \in \mathcal{M}$ so f measurable.

In fact, if $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ continuous, then for all $B \in \mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}}, f^{-1}(B) \in \mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$;

$$f^{-1}(\mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}}) = f^{-1}(\sigma(\{\text{open sets}\})) = \sigma\left(\underbrace{f^{-1}(\{\text{open sets}\})}_{\text{all open}}\right) \subseteq \sigma(\{\text{open sets}\}) = \mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}}.$$

Moreover, if f^{-1} (inverse) exists and is continuous, then for any $B \in \mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}}, f(B) \in \mathfrak{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$. ■

↪ **Proposition 2.9:** If $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is measurable and $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous, then $g \circ f$ is measurable.

Remark 2.1: The order matters! The converse doesn't hold in general.

PROOF. For all $a \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned} (g \circ f)^{-1}((-\infty, a)) &= \{x \in \mathbb{R} : g(f(x)) < a\} \\ &= \{x \in \mathbb{R} : f(x) \in g^{-1}((-\infty, a))\} \\ &= f^{-1}(g^{-1}((-\infty, a))) \in \mathcal{M}. \end{aligned}$$

■

↪ **Proposition 2.10:** If $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ is measurable, then:

1. for every $c \in \mathbb{R}$, cf is measurable (in particular $-f$ measurable);
2. $|f|$ is measurable;
3. for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, f^k is a measurable.

PROOF. We prove just 3. If $k = 0$ this is trivial. For any $a \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$(f^k)^{-1}([-\infty, a)) = \begin{cases} f^{-1}\left([-\infty, a^{\frac{1}{k}})\right) & \text{if } k \text{ is odd} \\ \emptyset & \text{if } k \text{ is even and } a \leq 0 \in \mathcal{M}. \\ f^{-1}\left([-a^{\frac{1}{k}}, a^{\frac{1}{k}})\right) & \text{if } k \text{ is even and } a > 0 \end{cases}$$

■

↪ **Proposition 2.11:** If f, g are two finite-valued measurable functions, then $f + g, f \cdot g, f \vee g := \max\{f, g\}, f \wedge g := \min\{f, g\}$ are measurable functions, where

$$(f \vee g)(x) = \max\{f(x), g(x)\}.$$

PROOF. For all $a \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned} (f + g)^{-1}([-\infty, a)) &= \{x \in \mathbb{R} : f(x) + g(x) < a\} \\ &= \{x \in \mathbb{R} : f(x) < a - g(x)\} \\ &= \bigcup_{q \in \mathbb{Q}} \{x \in \mathbb{R} : f(x) < q < a - g(x)\} \\ &= \bigcup_{q \in \mathbb{Q}} \underbrace{\{x \in \mathbb{R} : f(x) < q\}}_{\in \mathcal{M}} \cap \underbrace{\{x \in \mathbb{R} : g(x) < a - q\}}_{\in \mathcal{M}} \in \mathcal{M}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies, then, that $f - g$ measurable, as are $(f + g)^2$ and $(f - g)^2$, and thus

$$fg = \frac{1}{4}[(f+g)^2 - (f-g)^2]$$

is measurable.

We have too that

$$f \vee g = \frac{1}{2}(|f - g| + (f + g))$$

and so is measurable, and so

$$f \wedge g = -\max\{-f, -g\} = -(-f \vee -g)$$

is measurable. ■

↪ **Corollary 2.3:** If f is measurable, then $f^+ := f \vee 0 = \max\{f, 0\}$ and $f^- := -(f \wedge 0) = \max\{-f, 0\}$ are measurable, as is $f \wedge k$ for any $k \in \mathbb{R}$.

Remark 2.2: Notice that $f = f^+ - f^-$, even with “infinities”, and $|f| = f^+ + f^-$.

↪ **Proposition 2.12:** Let $\{f_n\}$ be a sequence of measurable functions. Then, $\sup_n f_n$, $\inf_n f_n$, $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n$, and $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n$ are all measurable (where $(\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n)(x) := \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(x) = \inf_{m \geq 1} \sup_{n \geq m} f_n(x) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{n \geq m} f_n(x)$).

PROOF. To show $\sup_n f_n$ measurable, we will show for all $a \in \mathbb{R}$ $\{\sup_n f_n \leq a\} \in \mathcal{M}$.

$$x \in \left\{ \sup_n f_n \leq a \right\} \Leftrightarrow \sup_n f_n(x) \leq a \Leftrightarrow f_n(x) \leq a \forall n \geq 1 \Leftrightarrow x \in \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \{f_n \leq a\},$$

hence $\{\sup_n f_n \leq a\} = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \underbrace{\{f_n \leq a\}}_{\in \mathcal{M}} \in \mathcal{M}$ and hence $\sup_n f_n$ is measurable. Note that using \leq was important; $\{\sup_n f_n < a\} \subsetneq \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \{f_n < a\}$, since the $\sup_n f_n$ could equal a . We could say the following, however:

$$\left\{ \sup_n f_n < a \right\} = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \left\{ \sup_n f_n \leq a - \frac{1}{k} \right\} = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \left\{ f_n \leq a - \frac{1}{k} \right\} \in \mathcal{M}.$$

Next, we have $\inf_n f_n = -\sup_n (-f_n)$ so we are done.

For \limsup , \liminf , we have

$$\limsup_n f_n = \inf_{m \geq 1} \underbrace{\sup_{n \geq m} f_n}_{:= g_m}.$$

g_m is measurable for each $m \geq 1$, hence $\inf_m g_m$ is measurable, hence $\limsup_n f_n$ is measurable. Similar logic follows for \liminf .

We could have show, more directly, that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\{ \limsup_n f_n < a \right\} &= \left\{ \inf_{m \geq 1} \sup_{n \geq m} f_n < a \right\} \\
&= \bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} \left\{ \sup_{n \geq m} f_n < a \right\} \\
&= \bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \left\{ \sup_{n \geq m} f_n \leq a - \frac{1}{k} \right\} \\
&= \bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{n=m}^{\infty} \left\{ f_n \leq a - \frac{1}{k} \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

■

↪ **Proposition 2.13:** Let $\{f_n\}$ be a sequence of measurable functions. Then, all of the following sets are also measurable:

$$\begin{aligned}
\{x \in \mathbb{R} : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(x) \text{ exists in } \mathbb{R}\} &=: \{\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n \text{ exists in } \mathbb{R}\}, \\
\{\lim f_n = \infty\}, \{\lim f_n = -\infty\}, \{\lim f_n = c \in \mathbb{R}\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n$ exists (in \mathbb{R} or as $\pm\infty$) a.e. with $f = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n$ a.e. then f is measurable.

PROOF. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\{\lim f_n \text{ exists in } \mathbb{R}\} &= \{\limsup f_n = \liminf f_n \text{ and } -\infty < \limsup f_n < \infty\} \\
&= \{-\infty < \liminf f_n < \infty\} \cap \{-\infty < \limsup f_n < \infty\} \cap \{\limsup f_n - \liminf f_n = 0\} \in \mathcal{M}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
\{\lim f_n = c\} &= \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R} : \forall k \geq 1, \exists n \geq 1 \text{ s.t. } \forall m \geq n, |f_m(x) - c| \leq \frac{1}{k} \right\} \\
&= \bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{m=n}^{\infty} \left\{ |f_m(x) - c| \leq \frac{1}{k} \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

■

§2.2 Approximation by Simple Functions

Given a function $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$, measurable, we may write

$$f = f^+ - f^-,$$

where f^+, f^- are non-negative measurable functions; so, it suffices to study non-negative measurable functions. For any $n \geq 1$, we have

$$f_n^+ := (f^+ \wedge n) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{[-n, n]},$$

i.e., we cap f^+ at n , and disregard values of f^+ outside of $[-n, n]$; hence we limit our view to a $2n \times n$ “box”. Then, f_n^+ is non-negative, measurable, bounded (by n), compactly supported (zero outside a bounded set), and in particular $f_n^+ \uparrow$, with limit

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n^+ = f^+.$$

An identical construction follows for f^- with

$$f_n^- := (f^- \wedge n) \mathbb{1}_{[-n, n]},$$

with $f_n^- \uparrow$ and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n^- = f^-.$$

Fix some n and consider f_n^+ . For $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, 2^n n$, define

$$A_{n,k} := \left\{ x \in [-n, n] : \frac{k}{2^n} \leq f_n^+(x) < \frac{k+1}{2^n} \right\} = \left\{ \frac{k}{2^n} \leq f^+ < \frac{k+1}{2^n} \right\} \cap [-n, n] \in \mathcal{M},$$

noting that $A_{n,k} \cap A_{n,\ell} = \emptyset$ if $k \neq \ell$. Set now

$$\varphi_n := \sum_{k=0}^{n \cdot 2^n} \mathbb{1}_{A_{n,k}} \frac{k}{2^n} = \sum_{k=0}^{n \cdot 2^n} \begin{cases} \frac{k}{2^n} & \text{if } x \in A_{n,k} \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}.$$

We call φ_n a “simple function”; more generally:

↪ **Definition 2.4:** φ is a *simple function* if $\varphi = \sum_{k=1}^L \mathbb{1}_{E_k} \cdot a_k$ where L a positive integer, a_k 's are constant, E_k 's are measurable sets of finite measure.

Moreover, note that $\varphi_n \uparrow$; at each new stage $n \rightarrow n+1$, the regions are cut in two, $A_{n,k} = A_{n+1,2k} \cup A_{n+1,2k+1}$. In addition, we have $\varphi_n \leq f_n^+ \leq f^+$ for all n . Moreover, we have the following:

↪ **Proposition 2.14:**

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_n(x) = f^+(x)$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

PROOF. For all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, for sufficiently large n we have that $x \in [-n, n]$ and so $f^+(x) = f^+(x) \mathbb{1}_{[-n, n]}(x)$. Assume for now $f^+ < \infty$. Then, for sufficiently large (r?) n , we can ensure $f^+(x) < n$ and so $f^+(x) = f_n^+(x)$ for such an x . Further, we have that $x \in A_{n,k}$ for some k so $\varphi_n(x) = \frac{k}{2^n}$ and $f_n^+(x) < \frac{k+1}{2^n}$ and thus

$$0 \leq f_n^+(x) - \varphi_n(x) < \frac{k+1}{2^n} - \frac{k}{2^n} = 2^{-n}$$

by construction and so $0 \leq f^+(x) - \varphi_n(x) \leq 2^{-n}$ and thus $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_n(x) = f^+(x)$.

In the case that $f^+(x) = \infty$, then $\varphi_n(x) = n$ for all sufficiently large n hence

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_n(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n = \infty = f^+(x).$$

■

↪ **Theorem 2.1:** If g is measurable and non-negative, there exists a sequence of simply functions $\{\varphi_n\}$ such that $\varphi_n \uparrow$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_n(x) = g(x)$ for every $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

We can repeat this same construction and proof for f^- with a sequence $\widetilde{\varphi}_n$. Even better:

↪ **Theorem 2.2:** If f is measurable, then \exists a sequence of simple functions $\{\psi_n\}$ such that $|\psi_n| \uparrow$ and $|\psi_n| \leq |f|$ for all n and for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \psi_n(x) = f(x)$.

PROOF. Take $\psi_n = \varphi_n - \widetilde{\varphi}_n$ as above; then for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, at least one of $\varphi_n(x), \widetilde{\varphi}_n(x)$ equals zero. Then

$$|\psi_n| = \varphi_n + \widetilde{\varphi}_n < f^+ + f^- = |f|,$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \psi_n(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_n(x) - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \widetilde{\varphi}_n(x) = f^+ - f^- = f.$$

■

↪ **Definition 2.5 (Step Function):** θ a *step function* if it takes the form

$$\theta(x) = \sum_{k=1}^L a_k \mathbb{1}_{I_k}(x),$$

where $L \in \mathbb{N}$, a_k 's constant, and I_k finite, open intervals.

↪ **Theorem 2.3:** If f is measurable, then there exists a sequence of step functions $\{\theta_n\}$ such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \theta_n(x) = f(x) \text{ for **almost every** } x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

In particular, we do not have pointwise convergence as for general simple functions, but we have convergence outside a zero-measure set.

PROOF. Assume, wlog, that f non-negative (by the previous construction, we can “split” f if not and approximate its positive, negative parts). Given $A \in \mathcal{M}$ with finite measure, recall that for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists finitely many finite open intervals I_1, \dots, I_N such that

$$m\left(A \triangle \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^N I_i\right)\right) < \varepsilon.$$

By renaming/rearranging I_i 's if necessary, we may assume that I_i 's are disjoint; hence

$$\mathbb{1}_{\bigcup_{i=1}^N I_i} = \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{1}_{I_i}.$$

Put

$$\theta_A := \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{1}_{I_i},$$

noting this is indeed a step function as the name suggests. Then, remark that

$$m(\underbrace{\{x \in \mathbb{R} : \mathbb{1}_A(x) \neq \theta_A(x)\}}_{=A \Delta (\bigcup_{i=1}^N I_i)}) < \varepsilon.$$

Since f measurable and non-negative, $\exists \{\varphi_n\}$ sequence of simple functions with limit f . In particular,

$$\varphi_n = \sum_{k=0}^{n2^n} \frac{k}{2^n} \mathbb{1}_{A_{n,k}}.$$

Applying our above analysis to each $A_{n,k}$, then, we have that for any $n \geq 1$ and $k = 0, 1, \dots, n2^n$ we can find a step function $\theta_{n,k}$ such that

$$m(\{x \in \mathbb{R} : \mathbb{1}_{A_{n,k}} \neq \theta_{n,k}(x)\}) < \frac{1}{2^n(n2^n + 1)} \quad (" = \varepsilon").$$

Put then

$$\theta_n := \sum_{k=0}^{n2^n} \frac{k}{2^n} \theta_{n,k},$$

which is itself a step function. Put

$$E_n := \{x \in \mathbb{R} : \theta_n(x) \neq \varphi_n(x)\}.$$

Then,

$$m(E_n) \leq m\left(\bigcup_{k=0}^{n2^n} \{\theta_{n,k} \neq \mathbb{1}_{A_{n,k}}\}\right) \leq \sum_{k=0}^{n2^n} m(\{\theta_{n,k} \neq \mathbb{1}_{A_{n,k}}\}) \leq 2^{-n}.$$

The φ_n 's are chosen such that $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}, |\varphi_n(x) - f_n(x)| \leq \frac{1}{2^n}$. Putting

$$F_n := \{x \in \mathbb{R} : |\theta_n(x) - f_n(x)| > 2^{-n}\},$$

then remark that $F_n \subseteq E_n$ so $m(F_n) \leq \frac{1}{2^n}$.

We claim now that for a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $\exists m \geq 1$ such that $\forall n \geq m, |\theta_n(x) - f_n(x)| \leq \frac{1}{2^n}$, remarking that such an m is *dependent* on x . Consider the complement of this statement; if this set has measure 0, we are done. The logical negation would be "for every $m \geq 1$, exist $n \geq m$ such that $|\theta_n(x) - f_n(x)| > 2^{-n}$ ", which is equivalent to the set

$$\bigcap_{m=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n=m}^{\infty} \{x \in \mathbb{R} : |\theta_n(x) - f_n(x)| > 2^{-n}\} = \bigcap_{m=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n=m}^{\infty} F_n.$$

Let $B_m := \bigcup_{n=m}^{\infty} F_n$; notice $B_m \downarrow$. Then, by continuity from above ****

$$m\left(\bigcap_{m=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n=m}^{\infty} F_n\right) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} m(B_m) \leq \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} m(F_n) \leq \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^n} = 0,$$

since the tail of a convergent series must converge to zero. Hence, the set has measure 0 as desired so for almost every $x \in \mathbb{R}$ there exists $m \geq 1$ such that for all $n \geq m$, $|\theta_n - f_n| \leq \frac{1}{2^n}$, hence almost everywhere $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\theta_n - f_n) = 0$. Therefore, almost everywhere,

$$\theta_n = (\theta_n - f_n) + f_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} f.$$

■

In this proof, we have proven (and then used) more generally:

↪ **Lemma 2.1** (Borel-Cantelli Lemma): If $\{F_n\} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ such that $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} m(F_n) < \infty$, then

$$m\left(\bigcap_{m=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n=m}^{\infty} F_n\right) = 0.$$

§2.3 Convergence Almost Everywhere vs Convergence in Measure

↪ **Definition 2.6** (Convergence Almost Everywhere): For measurable functions $\{f_n\}, f$ we say f_n converges to f a.e. and write $f_n \rightarrow f$ a.e. if for almost every $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(x) = f(x)$.

Similarly, we say $f_n \rightarrow f$ a.e. on A if $\exists B \subseteq A$ with $m(B) = 0$ such that $\forall x \in A - B$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(x) = f(x)$.

↪ **Definition 2.7** (Convergence in Measure): For measurable, finite-valued functions $\{f_n\}, f$ we say f_n converges to f in measure and write $f_n \rightarrow f$ in measure if for every $\delta > 0$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} m(\{x \in \mathbb{R} : |f_n(x) - f(x)| \geq \delta\}) = 0.$$

Similarly, we say $f_n \rightarrow f$ in measure on A if $\forall \delta > 0$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} m(\{x \in A : |f_n(x) - f(x)| \geq \delta\}) = 0$.

↪ **Proposition 2.15**: Given finite-valued measurable functions $\{f_n\}, f$ and $A \in \mathcal{M}$ with finite measure, then if $f_n \rightarrow f$ a.e. on A , then $f_n \rightarrow f$ in measure on A .

PROOF. For all $\delta > 0$,

$$\bigcap_{m=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n=m}^{\infty} \{x \in A : |f_n(x) - f(x)| > \delta\} \subseteq \{x \in A : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(x) \neq f(x)\}.$$

The set on the RHS has measure zero and thus so does the left one. Then,

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} m\left(\bigcup_{n=m}^{\infty} \{x \in A : |f_n(x) - f(x)| > \delta\}\right) = 0$$

by continuity, and

$$\{|f_m - f| > \delta\} \subseteq \bigcup_{n=m}^{\infty} \{|f_n - f| > \delta\}$$

hence $m(\{|f_m - f| > \delta\}) \leq m(\bigcup_{n=m}^{\infty} \{|f_n - f| > \delta\}) \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} 0$. ■

⊗ **Example 2.1:** We give an example of why the assumption that $m(A) < \infty$ is necessary. Let, $f_n = \mathbb{1}_{[n, \infty)}$ and $f \equiv 0$. Then, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(x) = f(x)$ for every $x \in \mathbb{R}$. But $m(\{x \in \mathbb{R} : |f_n(x) - f(x)| = 1\}) = m([n, \infty)) = \infty$.

In general, the converse statement $f_n \rightarrow f$ in measure does *not* imply that $f_n \rightarrow f$ almost everywhere, even on finite measure sets. Put $\varphi_{1,1} = \mathbb{1}_{[0,1)}$, $\varphi_{2,1} = \mathbb{1}_{[0, \frac{1}{2})}$, $\varphi_{2,2} = \mathbb{1}_{[\frac{1}{2}, 1)}$, $\varphi_{3,1} = \mathbb{1}_{[0, \frac{1}{3})}$, $\varphi_{3,2} = \mathbb{1}_{[\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3})}$, $\varphi_{3,3} = \mathbb{1}_{[\frac{2}{3}, 1)}$, or in general $\varphi_{k,j} = \mathbb{1}_{[\frac{j-1}{k}, \frac{j}{k})}$ for $j = 1, \dots, k$. Reorder $\varphi_{k,j}$ “lexicographically” into $\{f_n\}$. Then, we claim $f_n \rightarrow 0$ in measure on $[0, 1)$; for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$,

$$m(\{|f_n - 0| > \delta\}) = \frac{1}{k(n)} \rightarrow 0,$$

where $k(n)$ the “row” that f_n comes from. Hence, f_n converges in measure. However, f_n does not converge almost everywhere on $[0, 1)$. Indeed, for each $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $k \geq 1$, there exists a *unique* j such that $x \in [\frac{j-1}{k}, \frac{j}{k})$ hence $\varphi_{k,j}(x) = 1$, so in other notation there always exists an n such that $f_n(x) = 1$, and so precisely $f_n(x) = 1$ for infinitely many n . Hence, we do not have convergence everywhere (in fact, anywhere).