

# Measure Theory

Felix Chen

## Contents

0.1	Generation of $\sigma$ -algebras . . . . .	1
0.2	Measurable maps and measurable functions . . . . .	3
1	Measure spaces . . . . .	7
1.1	The definition of measure and its properties . . . . .	7

### §0.1 Generation of $\sigma$ -algebras

Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be a nonempty collection of sets.

**Definition 0.1** (Generate rings). We say  $\mathcal{G}$  is the ring (algebra, etc.) generated by  $\mathcal{E}$ , if

- $\mathcal{G} \supseteq \mathcal{E}$ ;
- For any ring  $\mathcal{G}'$ ,  $\mathcal{G}' \supseteq \mathcal{E} \implies \mathcal{G}' \supseteq \mathcal{G}$

#### Proposition 0.2

The ring (or whatever) generated by  $\mathcal{E}$  always exists.

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbf{A}$  be the set consisting of the rings containing  $\mathcal{E}$ , then  $\bigcap_{\mathcal{G} \in \mathbf{A}} \mathcal{G}$  is the desired ring.  $\square$

Denote  $r(\mathcal{E}), m(\mathcal{E}), p(\mathcal{E}), l(\mathcal{E}), \sigma(\mathcal{E})$  the ring/monotone class/ $\pi$ -system/ $\lambda$ -system/ $\sigma$ -algebra generated by  $\mathcal{E}$ .

#### Theorem 0.3

Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be an algebra, then  $\sigma(\mathcal{A}) = m(\mathcal{A})$ .

*Proof.* Clearly  $\sigma(\mathcal{A}) \supseteq m(\mathcal{A})$ .

On the other hand, we only need to prove  $m(\mathcal{A})$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra.

Since  $\mathcal{A}$  is an algebra, so  $X \in \mathcal{A} \subset m(\mathcal{A})$ .

**For the completion:**

Let  $\mathcal{G} := \{A : A^c \in m(\mathcal{A})\}$ , we want to prove  $\mathcal{G} \supseteq m(\mathcal{A})$ .

Clearly  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{G}$ ; If  $A_1, A_2, \dots \in \mathcal{G}$ ,  $A_n \uparrow A$ , then

$$A_n^c \in m(\mathcal{A}) \implies A^c = \downarrow \lim_n A_n^c \in m(\mathcal{A}).$$

Similarly if  $A_n \downarrow A$ , we can also deduce  $A^c \in m(\mathcal{A})$ .

So  $\mathcal{G}$  is a monotone class containing  $\mathcal{A}$ , hence it must contain  $m(\mathcal{A}) \implies \forall A \in m(\mathcal{A}), A^c \in m(\mathcal{A})$ .

**For the intersection:**

- $\forall A \in \mathcal{A}, B \in m(\mathcal{A}), AB \in m(\mathcal{A})$  : If  $B \in \mathcal{A}$ , this clearly holds;

Moreover, such  $B$ 's constitute a monotone class:

**Claim 0.4.** Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a monotone class, then  $\forall C \in \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{G}_C = \{D : CD \in \mathcal{M}\}$  is a monotone class.

If  $D_1, D_2, \dots \rightarrow D$  satisfy  $C \cap D_i \in m(\mathcal{A})$ , then  $D \cap C = \lim_n D_i \cap C \in \mathcal{M}$ .

Therefore such  $B$ 's constitute a monotone class  $\mathcal{G}_A$  containing  $\mathcal{A} \implies \mathcal{G}_A \supseteq m(\mathcal{A})$ .

- All the  $A$ 's which satisfies the first condition constitute a monotone class:

Let  $\mathcal{G}_B = \{A : AB \in m(\mathcal{A})\}$ , then  $\mathcal{G} = \bigcup_{B \in m(\mathcal{A})} \mathcal{G}_B$  is a monotone class containing  $\mathcal{A}$ .

Hence  $\mathcal{G} \supseteq m(\mathcal{A}) \implies \forall A \in m(\mathcal{A}), \forall B \in m(\mathcal{A}),$  we have  $AB \in m(\mathcal{A})$ .

□

### Theorem 0.5 ( $\lambda$ - $\pi$ theorem)

Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a  $\pi$ -system, then  $\sigma(\mathcal{P}) = l(\mathcal{P})$ .

*Proof.* Obviously  $\sigma(\mathcal{P}) \supseteq l(\mathcal{P})$ .

We only need to check that  $l(\mathcal{P})$  is a  $\pi$ -system, i.e. closed under intersection.

**Claim 0.6.** If  $\mathcal{L}$  is a  $\lambda$ -system, then  $\forall C \in \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{G}_C$  is a  $\lambda$ -system, where

$$\mathcal{G}_C := \{D : CD \in \mathcal{L}\}.$$

*Proof of the claim.* First of all,  $X \in \mathcal{G}_C$  as  $CX = C \in \mathcal{G}_C$ .

Second, if  $D_1, D_2 \in \mathcal{G}_C$ ,

$$CD_1, CD_2 \in \mathcal{L} \implies C(D_1 - D_2) = CD_1 - CD_2 \in \mathcal{L} \implies D_1 - D_2 \in \mathcal{G}_C.$$

Lastly, if  $D_n \in \mathcal{G}_C, D_n \rightarrow D$ ,

$$CD_n \in \mathcal{L} \implies CD = \lim_n CD_n \in \mathcal{L} \implies D \in \mathcal{G}_C$$

□

The rest is similar to the previous theorem:

- $\forall A \in \mathcal{P}, B \in l(\mathcal{P}), AB \in l(\mathcal{P})$  : If  $B \in \mathcal{P}$  this clearly holds;

By the claim,  $\mathcal{G}_A = \{B : AB \in l(\mathcal{P})\}$  is a  $\lambda$ -system, so  $\mathcal{G}_A \supseteq l(\mathcal{P})$ .

- For  $B \in l(\mathcal{P})$ , let

$$\mathcal{G}_B = \{A : AB \in l(\mathcal{P})\}.$$

By our claim,  $\mathcal{G}_B$ 's are  $\lambda$ -systems. So  $\mathcal{G} = \bigcap_{B \in l(\mathcal{P})} \mathcal{G}_B$  is a  $\lambda$ -system.

Moreover  $\mathcal{G} \supseteq \mathcal{P}$  (This is proved above), so  $\mathcal{G} \supseteq l(\mathcal{P})$ .

This means  $\forall A, B \in l(\mathcal{P}), AB \in l(\mathcal{P})$ .

□

**Remark 0.7** — These two proofs are very similar. Note how we make use of the conditions.

Let  $X$  be a topological space,  $\mathcal{O}$  is the collection of all the open sets.

Let  $\mathcal{B}_X := \sigma(\mathcal{O})$  be the **Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra** on the space  $X$ ,  $B \in \mathcal{B}_X$  are called **Borel sets**, and  $(X, \mathcal{B}_X)$  is called the **topological measurable space**.

### Theorem 0.8

Let  $\mathcal{Q}$  be a semi-ring, then

$$r(\mathcal{Q}) = \mathcal{G} := \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^n A_k : A_1, \dots, A_n \in \mathcal{Q} \text{ and pairwise disjoint} \right\}.$$

**Remark 0.9** — If  $\mathcal{R}$  is a ring, then  $\mathcal{A} = a(\mathcal{R}) = \mathcal{R} \cup \{A^c : A \in \mathcal{R}\}$  can also be written out explicitly, while  $\sigma(\mathcal{A})$  usually cannot be expressed explicitly.

*Proof.* Since  $r(\mathcal{Q})$  is closed under finite unions, so  $r(\mathcal{Q}) \supseteq \mathcal{G}$ .

Reversely,  $\mathcal{G}$  is nonempty. In fact we only need to prove it's closed under subtraction, as

$$A \cap B = A \setminus (A \setminus B) \in \mathcal{G}, A \cup B = (A \setminus B) \cup (B \setminus A) \cup (A \cap B) \in \mathcal{G}.$$

Suppose  $A = \sum_{i=1}^n A_i, B = \sum_{j=1}^m B_j$ .

Then  $A_i \setminus B_1$  can be split to several disjoint sets  $C_k$  in  $\mathcal{Q}$ . Continue this process, each  $C_k$  can be split again into smaller set. When all of the  $B_j$ 's are removed, we end up with many tiny sets which are in  $\mathcal{Q}$  and pairwise disjoint. (This process can be formalized using induction)

Therefore  $A \setminus B \in \mathcal{G}$ , the conclusion follows.  $\square$

## §0.2 Measurable maps and measurable functions

For a map  $f : X \rightarrow Y$ , we say the **preimage** of  $B \subset Y$  is  $f^{-1}(B) := \{x : f(x) \in B\}$ .

Some properties of preimage:

$$\begin{aligned} f^{-1}(\emptyset) &= \emptyset, \quad f^{-1}(Y) = X; \\ B_1 \subset B_2 &\implies f^{-1}(B_1) \subset f^{-1}(B_2), \quad (f^{-1}(B))^c = f^{-1}(B^c); \\ f^{-1}\left(\bigcup_{t \in T} A_t\right) &= \bigcup_{t \in T} f^{-1}(A_t), \quad f^{-1}\left(\bigcap_{t \in T} A_t\right) = \bigcap_{t \in T} f^{-1}(A_t). \end{aligned}$$

### Proposition 0.10

Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a  $\sigma$ -algebra on  $Y$ , then  $f^{-1}(\mathcal{T})$  is also a  $\sigma$ -algebra on  $X$ .

Furthermore, for  $\mathcal{E}$  on  $Y$ ,

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

*Proof.*  $f^{-1}(\mathcal{E}) \subset f^{-1}(\sigma(\mathcal{E})) \implies f^{-1}(\sigma(\mathcal{E})) \supseteq \sigma(f^{-1}(\mathcal{E}))$ .

Again, let

$$\mathcal{G} := \{B \subset Y : f^{-1}(B) \in \sigma(f^{-1}(\mathcal{E}))\}.$$

We need to prove  $\mathcal{G}$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra. This can be checked easily by previous properties, so I leave them out. Hence  $\mathcal{G} \supseteq \mathcal{E} \implies \mathcal{G} \supseteq \sigma(\mathcal{E}) \implies f^{-1}(\sigma(\mathcal{E})) \subset \sigma(f^{-1}(\mathcal{E}))$ .  $\square$

**Definition 0.11** (Measurable maps). Let  $(X, \mathcal{F})$  and  $(Y, \mathcal{S})$ , and  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  a map. We say  $f$  is **measurable** if  $f^{-1}(\mathcal{S}) \subset \mathcal{F}$ , i.e. the preimage of measurable sets are also measurable, denoted by

$$f : (X, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow (Y, \mathcal{S}) \quad \text{or} \quad (X, \mathcal{F}) \xrightarrow{f} (Y, \mathcal{S}) \quad \text{or} \quad f \in \mathcal{F}.$$

Clearly the composition of measurable maps is measurable as well.

A map  $f$  is measurable is equivalent to  $\sigma(f) \subset \mathcal{F}$ , where

$$\sigma(f) := f^{-1}(\mathcal{S})$$

is the smallest  $\sigma$ -algebra which makes  $f$  measurable, called the generate  $\sigma$ -algebra of  $f$ .

**Theorem 0.12**

Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be a nonempty collection on  $Y$ , then

$$f : (X, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow (Y, \sigma(\mathcal{E})) \iff f^{-1}(\mathcal{E}) \subset \mathcal{F}.$$

*Proof.* Trivial. □

**Definition 0.13** (Generalize real numbers). Let  $\overline{\mathbb{R}} := \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, +\infty\}$ . Similarly we can assign an order to  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$ .

For the calculations, we assign 0 to  $0 \cdot \pm\infty$ , and  $\infty - \infty$ ,  $\frac{\infty}{\infty}$  is undefined.

For all  $a \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ , define  $a^+ = \max\{a, 0\}$ ,  $a^- = \max\{-a, 0\}$ , so  $a = a^+ - a^-$ .  
Define the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra on  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$ :

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

For any set  $A$ ,  $A \in \mathcal{B}_{\overline{\mathbb{R}}} \iff A = B \cup C$ , where  $B \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$ ,  $C \subset \{+\infty, -\infty\}$ .

**Definition 0.14** (Measurable functions). We say a function  $f$  is **measurable** if

$$f : (X, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow (\overline{\mathbb{R}}, \mathcal{B}_{\overline{\mathbb{R}}}).$$

A **random variable (r.v.)** is a measurable map to  $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}})$ .

Measurable functions are in fact random variables that can take  $\pm\infty$  as its value.

**Theorem 0.15**

Let  $(X, \mathcal{F})$  be a measurable space,  $f : X \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  if and only if

$$\{f \leq a\} \in \mathcal{F}, \quad \forall a \in \mathbb{R}.$$

*Proof.* Just note that these sets can generate  $\mathcal{B}_{\overline{\mathbb{R}}}$ .

Let  $\mathcal{E} = \{[-\infty, a] : \forall a \in \mathbb{R}\}$ . Then

$$f \text{ measurable} \iff \sigma(f) = f^{-1}\mathcal{B}_{\overline{\mathbb{R}}} = f^{-1}\sigma(\mathcal{E}) \subset \mathcal{F} \iff \sigma(f^{-1}\mathcal{E}) \subset \mathcal{F}.$$

□

**Example 0.16**

The constant functions are measurable; the indicator functions of a measurable set are measurable  $\implies$  *step functions* are measurable.

We say a function  $f$  is **Borel function** if it's a measurable function from Borel measurable space to itself.

**Corollary 0.17**

If  $f, g$  are measurable functions, then  $\{f = a\}, \{f > g\}, \dots$  are measurable sets.

**Theorem 0.18**

The arithmetic of measurable functions are also measurable functions (if they are well-defined).

*Proof.* Here we only proof  $f + g$  is measurable for  $f, g$  measurable. For all  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ , decompose  $\{f + g < a\}$  to  $A_1 \cup A_2 \cup A_3$ :

$$A_1 := \{f = -\infty, g < +\infty\} \cup \{g = -\infty, f < +\infty\} \in \mathcal{F};$$

$$A_2 := \{f = +\infty, g > -\infty\} \cup \{g = +\infty, f > -\infty\} \in \mathcal{F};$$

$$A_3 := \{f < a - g\} \cap \{f, g \in \mathbb{R}\} = \left( \bigcup_{r \in \mathbb{Q}} (\{f < r\} \cap \{g < a - r\}) \right) \cap \{f, g \in \mathbb{R}\} \in \mathcal{F}.$$

□

**Remark 0.19** — All the measurable functions (or random variables) constitute a vector space.

**Theorem 0.20**

The limit inferior and limit superior of measurable functions are measurable.

*Proof.* If  $f_1, f_2, \dots$  are measurable, then  $\inf f_n$  is measurable:

$$\left\{ \inf_{n \geq 1} f_n \geq a \right\} = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \{f_n \geq a\}.$$

**Remark 0.21** — In particular,  $f$  measurable  $\implies f^+, f^-$  measurable.

Hence

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{n \geq N} f_n = \sup_{N \geq 1} \inf_{n \geq N} f_n,$$

which is clearly measurable. □

**Remark 0.22** — The inferior or superior of **countable** many measurable functions are measurable as well.

**Definition 0.23** (Simple functions). Let  $(X, \mathcal{F})$  be a measurable space. A **measurable partition** of  $X$  is a collection of subsets  $\{A_1, \dots, A_n\}$  with  $\sum_{i=1}^n A_i = X$ , and  $A_i \in \mathcal{F}$ .

A **simple function** is defined as

$$f = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \mathbf{I}_{A_i}.$$

where  $\{A_1, \dots, A_n\}$  is a measurable partition of  $X$ , and  $a_i \in \mathbb{R}$ .

It's clear that simple functions are measurable.

**Theorem 0.24**

Let  $f$  be a measurable function, there exists simple functions  $f_1, \dots$  s.t.  $f_n \rightarrow f$ .

- If  $f \geq 0$ , we have  $0 \leq f_n \leq f$ ;
- If  $f$  is bounded, we have  $f_n \rightrightarrows f$ .

*Proof.* This is a standard truncation. For  $f \geq 0$ , let

$$f_n = \sum_{k=0}^{n2^n-1} \frac{k}{2^n} \mathbf{I}_{\{k \leq 2^n f \leq k+1\}} + n \mathbf{I}_{f \geq n}.$$

It's clear that  $f_n \geq 0$ ,  $f_n \uparrow$ , and  $f_n(x) \rightarrow f(x)$ :

$$0 \leq f(x) - f_n(x) \leq \frac{1}{2^n}, \quad f(x) < n;$$

$$n = f_n(x) \leq f(x), \quad f(x) \geq n.$$

Therefore if  $f$  is bounded, when  $n > \max f(x)$  we have  $|f_n(x) - f(x)| < \frac{1}{2^n}$  for all  $x \in X$ .

For general measurable functions, just decompose  $f$  to  $f^+ - f^-$ . □

**Theorem 0.25**

Let  $g : (X, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow (Y, \mathcal{S})$ . Let  $h$  be a map  $X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .

Then  $h : (X, g^{-1}\mathcal{S})$  iff  $h = f \circ g$ , where  $f : (Y, \mathcal{S}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}})$ .

**Remark 0.26** — For  $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$  or  $[a, b]$ , this theorem also holds.

*Proof.* There's a typical method for proving something related to measurable functions:

We'll prove the statement for  $h \in \mathcal{H}_i$  in order:

- $\mathcal{H}_1$ : indicator functions  $h = \mathbf{I}_A, \forall A \in g^{-1}\mathcal{S}$ ;
- $\mathcal{H}_2$ : non-negative simple functions;
- $\mathcal{H}_3$ : non-negative measurable functions;

- $\mathcal{H}_4$  : measurable functions.

When  $h \in \mathcal{H}_1$ , suppose  $h = \mathbf{I}_A$ , then

$$A = g^{-1}B, B \in \mathcal{S} \implies f = \mathbf{I}_B \text{ suffices.}$$

When  $h = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \mathbf{I}_{A_i} \in \mathcal{H}_2$ , since  $A_i \in g^{-1}\mathcal{S}$ ,

$$\exists B_i \in \mathcal{S} \text{ s.t. } A_i = \{h = a_i\} = g^{-1}B_i.$$

Thus  $f = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \mathbf{I}_{B_i}$  is the desired function.

When  $h \in \mathcal{H}_3$ ,  $\exists h_1, h_2, \dots \uparrow h$ .

Assume  $h_n = f_n \circ g$ , let

$$f(y) := \begin{cases} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(y), & \text{if it exists;} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

**Remark 0.27** — Here we still need to prove  $f$  is measurable.

Hence for any  $x \in X$ ,

$$h(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} h_n(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(g(x)) = f(g(x)),$$

as  $f_n$ 's limit must exist at  $y = g(x)$ .

So for general  $h$ , let  $h = h^+ - h^-$  and we're done. NOTE: We need to assert that  $\infty - \infty$  doesn't occur.  $\square$

**Remark 0.28** — This is the typical method we'll use frequently in measure theory: to start from simple functions and extend to general functions.

## §1 Measure spaces

### §1.1 The definition of measure and its properties

The concept of “measure” is frequently used in our everyday life: length, area, weight and even probability. They all share a similarity: the measure of a whole is equal to the sum of the measure of each part.

In the language of mathematics, let  $\mathcal{E}$  be a collection of sets, and there's a function  $\mu : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  which stands for the measure.

**countable additivity**: Let  $A_1, A_2, \dots \in \mathcal{E}$  be pairwise disjoint sets, and  $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i \in \mathcal{E}$ , then

$$\mu \left( \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i \right) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_i).$$

**Definition 1.1** (Measure). Suppose  $\emptyset \in \mathcal{E}$ , if a non-negative function

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

satisfies countable additivity, and  $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$ , then we say  $\mu$  is a **measure** on  $\mathcal{E}$ .

If  $\mu(A) < \infty$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{E}$ , we say  $\mu$  is finite. (In practice we'll just simplify this to  $\mu(X) < \infty$ )  
 If  $\exists A_1, A_2, \dots \in \mathcal{E}$  are pairwise disjoint sets, s.t.

$$X = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n, \quad \mu(A_n) < \infty, \forall n.$$

Then we say  $\mu$  is  $\sigma$ -finite.

There's a weaker version of countable additivity, that is **finite additivity**: If  $A_1, \dots, A_n \in \mathcal{E}$ , pairwise disjoint, and  $\sum A_i \in \mathcal{E}$ ,

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

then we say  $\mu$  is finite additive.

Subtractivity:  $\mu(B - A) = \mu(B) - \mu(A)$ , where  $A, B, B - A \in \mathcal{E}$ , and  $\mu(A) < \infty$ .

### Proposition 1.2

Measure satisfies finite additivity and subtractivity.

### Example 1.3 (Counting measure)

Let  $\mu(A) = \#A$ ,  $\forall A \in \mathcal{T}_X$ . Then  $\mu$  is a measure.

### Example 1.4 (Point measure)

Let  $(X, \mathcal{F})$  be a measurable space, define  $\delta_x(A) = \mathbf{I}_A(x)$ . Then we can define a measure

$$\mu(A) = \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \delta_{x_i}(A)$$

### Example 1.5 (Length)

Let  $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{R}} = \{(a, b] : a, b \in \mathbb{R}\}$ ,  $a \leq b$ , then  $\mu((a, b]) = b - a$  gives a measure.

Another classical example is the so-called "coin space":

Let  $X = \{x = (x_1, x_2, \dots) : x_i \in \{0, 1\}, \forall n\}$ .

$$C_{i_1, \dots, i_n} := \{x : x_1 = i_1, \dots, x_n = i_n\},$$

Let

$$\mathcal{Q} = \{\emptyset, X\} \cup \{C_{i_1, \dots, i_n} : n \in \mathbb{N}, i_1, \dots, i_n \in \{0, 1\}\}$$

be a semi-ring. Then  $\mu(C_{i_1, \dots, i_n}) = \frac{1}{2^n}$  gives a measure.

We need to check the countable additivity, but actually this can be realized as a compact space and the  $C$ 's are open sets, so in fact we only need to check finite additivity. (Or we can prove this explicitly)

Another more complex example: finite markov chain.



**Proposition 1.6**

Let  $X = \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$ .  $F : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is non-decreasing, right continuous, then  $\mu((a, b]) = F(b) - F(a)$  gives a measure on  $\mathcal{E}$ .

*Proof.* First  $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$ , suppose

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (a_i, b_i] = (a, b].$$

Since every partial sum has measure at most  $F(b_{n+1}) - F(a_1) < F(b) - F(a)$ ,  
 $\implies \sum_{i=1}^n \mu((a_i, b_i]) \leq \mu((a, b])$ .

For the reversed inequality, first we prove that for intervals

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^n (c_i, d_i] \supseteq (a, b] \implies \sum_{i=1}^n \mu((c_i, d_i]) \geq \mu((a, b]).$$

This can be easily proved by induction, WLOG  $b_{n+1} = \max_i b_i$ .

Our idea is to extend each  $(a_i, b_i]$  a little bit to apply above inequality.

For all  $\varepsilon > 0$ , take  $\delta_i > 0$  s.t.

$$\tilde{b}_i := b_i + \delta_i, \quad F(\tilde{b}_i) - F(b_i) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

Hence for all  $\delta > 0$ ,  $\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} (a_i, \tilde{b}_i) \supseteq [a + \delta, b]$ , by compactness exists a finite open cover.

$$F(b) - F(a + \delta) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \left( F(\tilde{b}_i) - F(a_i) \right) \leq \varepsilon + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (F(b) - F(a)).$$

Let  $\varepsilon, \delta \rightarrow 0$  to conclude. □

**Definition 1.7** (Measure space). A triple  $(X, \mathcal{F}, \mu)$  is called a **measure space**, if  $(X, \mathcal{F})$  is a measurable space and  $\mu$  is a measure on  $\mathcal{F}$ .

If  $N \in \mathcal{F}$  s.t.  $\mu(N) = 0$ , we say  $N$  is a **null set**.

A probability space is a measure space  $(X, \mathcal{F}, P)$  with  $P(X) = 1$ .

**Example 1.8** (Discrete measure)

If  $X$  is countable,  $p : X \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ ,  $\mu(A) := \sum_{x \in A} p(x)$ .

There are other important properties which we think a sensible measure would have:

- Monotonicity: If  $A, B \in \mathcal{E}$ ,  $A \subset B$ , then  $\mu(A) \leq \mu(B)$ .
- Countable subadditivity:  $A_1, A_2, \dots \in \mathcal{E}$ ,

$$\mu \left( \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i \right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_i).$$

- Lower continuity:  $A_1, A_2, \dots \in \mathcal{E}$  and  $A_n \uparrow A \in \mathcal{E}$ .

$$\mu(A) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(A_n).$$

- Similarly there's upper continuity (which requires  $\mu(A_1) < \infty$ ).

**Theorem 1.9**

The measure on a semi-ring has all the above properties.

*Proof.* We'll prove that:

- Finite additivity  $\implies$  monotonicity, subtractivity;
- Countable additivity  $\implies$  subadditivity, upper and lower continuity.

Here we only prove the subadditivity, since others are trivial.

Let  $A_1, A_2, \dots \in \mathcal{Q}$ , and  $\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i \in \mathcal{Q}$ .

$$B_n := A_n \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{n-1} A_i \in r(\mathcal{Q}) \implies B_n = \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} C_{n,k}, \quad C_{n,k} \in \mathcal{Q}.$$

$$A_n \setminus B_n \in r(\mathcal{Q}) \implies A_n \setminus B_n = \sum_{l=1}^{l_n} D_{n,l}, \quad D_{n,l} \in \mathcal{Q}.$$

Thus by countable additivity,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu \left( \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i \right) &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(B_n) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left( \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} \mu(C_{n,k}) \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left( \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} \mu(C_{n,k}) + \sum_{l=1}^{l_n} \mu(D_{n,l}) \right) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_n). \end{aligned}$$

Using similar technique we can deduce the upper and lower continuity. □