

Notation:

A measure defined on a Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra is called a Borel measure. Write  $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  for the Borel measures on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . If  $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , then  $\mathcal{M}(E)$  are the borel measures on  $E$ , but  $\mathcal{M}(E) \subset \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , by zero padding.

Definition: a positive finite measure  $\mu$  on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is regular if

1.  $\mu(E) = \inf\{\mu(U); U \text{ open}, U \supset E\}$
2.  $\mu(E) = \sup\{\mu(K); K \text{ compact}, K \subset E\}$

Every positive finite measure on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is regular. For every measure  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , for all  $E \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , there exists a sequence of open sets  $U_k \supset E$ , and compact sets  $K_n \subset E$  such that  $\nu(U_n) \rightarrow \nu(E)$  and  $\nu(K_n) \rightarrow \nu(E)$ .

Proof: ADD (add after looking at some topology, and reviewing metric space stuff)

Definition: we say a measure  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  is regular if each positive  $\nu_k$ , in the Jordan decomposition  $\nu = \sum_{k=0}^3 i^k \nu_k$ , is regular. By the last result, every  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  is regular and then the condition about sequences of sets holds.

If  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R})$ , we define its distribution function by  $F_\nu(x) = \nu((-\infty, x])$ .  $\nu \mapsto F_\nu$  is injective and linear on  $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R})$ .

Proof: Linearity is easy, to see that  $\nu \mapsto F_\nu$  is surjective, suppose  $F_\nu = 0$ , this means that  $F_\nu(x) = 0$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , so  $\nu((-\infty, x]) = 0$  for all  $x$ , so  $\nu((a, b]) = \nu((-\infty, b]) - \nu((-\infty, a]) = 0 - 0 = 0$ . Then because every open set in  $\mathbb{R}$  is a countable union of disjoint open intervals, and open intervals can be written as a countable union of disjoint half open intervals, every open set in  $\mathbb{R}$  has  $\nu$ -measure zero, and then by Jordan decomposition,  $\nu$  can be written as a sum of regular measures, which are then all zero measures, so  $\nu$  is the zero measure. Thus  $\text{Ker}(\nu \mapsto F_\nu) = \{0\}$ , and so  $\nu \mapsto F_\nu$  is surjective.

$F : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is of *bounded variation*, BV, or say  $F \in BV$ , if  $\text{Var}(F) < \infty$ , where  $\text{Var}(F) := \sup\{V_F(x); x \in \mathbb{R}\}$ , and  $V_F(x)$  is the *total variation function* of  $F$ ,

$$V_F(x) := \sup \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^n |F(x_k) - F(x_{k-1})|; x_0 < x_1 < \dots < x_n = x, (x_k) \in \mathbb{R}, n \in \mathbb{N} \right\}.$$

Def:  $F : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is in *NBV* if  $F \in BV$ ,  $F$  is right continuous at all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , and  $\lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} F(x) = 0$ ; normalized *BV*.

If  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}))$ , then  $F_\nu \in NBV$ .

Proof: Let  $x_0 < x_1 < \dots < x_n = x \in \mathbb{R}$ , then  $\sum_{k=1}^n |F_\nu(x_k) - F_\nu(x_{k-1})| = \sum_{k=1}^n |\nu([x_{k-1}, x_k])| \leq \sum_{k=1}^n |\nu|([x_{k-1}, x_k]) = |\nu|([x_0, x_n]) \leq |\nu|(\mathbb{R}) = \|\nu\| < \infty$ .

$$V_{F_\nu}(x) = \sup \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^n |\nu|([x_{k-1}, x_k])|; x_0 < x_1 < \dots < x_n = x, (x_k) \in \mathbb{R}, n \in \mathbb{N} \right\} \leq$$

$$\sup \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^n |\nu|((x_{k-1}, x_k]); x_0 < x_1 < \dots < x_n = x, (x_k) \in \mathbb{R}, n \in \mathbb{N} \right\} = V_{F_{|\nu|}}(x) \leq$$

$$\sup \left\{ |\nu|((-\infty, x_0]) + \sum_{k=1}^n |\nu|((x_{k-1}, x_k]); x_0 < x_1 < \dots < x_n = x, (x_k) \in \mathbb{R}, n \in \mathbb{N} \right\} \leq |\nu|((-\infty, x])$$

so  $V_{F_\nu}(x) \leq V_{F_{|\nu|}}(x) \leq |\nu|((-\infty, x]) \leq \|\nu\| < \infty$ . So  $V_{F_\nu}(x)$  is bounded by a constant in  $x$ ,  $\|\nu\|$ , so  $\sup(\{V_{F_\nu}(x); x \in \mathbb{R}\}) \leq \|\nu\|$ , so  $\text{Var} F_\nu \leq \|\nu\|$ , so  $F_\nu \in BV$ .

For  $x \in [-\infty, \infty)$ , pick  $x_n \searrow x$ , take Jordan decomposition of  $\nu$ , to get  $\nu = \nu_+ - \nu_-$ , with  $\nu_\pm$  positive finite measures, then  $\nu_\pm((-\infty, x_n]) \rightarrow \nu_\pm(\cap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} (-\infty, x_k]) = \nu_\pm((-\infty, x])$ , by continuity from above, so  $\nu_\pm((-\infty, x_n]) \rightarrow \nu((-\infty, x_n])$ . Thus  $\lim_n F_\nu(x_n) = F_\nu(x)$ , so  $F_\nu(-\infty) = 0$ , and  $F_\nu$  is right continuous by definition.

(Folland 3.28) If  $F \in BV$  then  $\lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} V_F(x) = 0$  and  $F \in BV \Rightarrow V_F \in NBV$ .

Proof: ADD

Properties of  $BV$ ,

- 1) If  $F, G : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ , then  $V_{F+G}(x) \leq V_F(x) + V_G(x)$  and  $V_{cF}(x) = |c|V_F(x)$ . Hence  $BV$  is a vector space and if  $F, G \in BV$ , then  $\text{Var}(F+G) \leq \text{Var}(F) + \text{Var}(G)$  and  $\text{Var}(cF) = |c|\text{Var}(F)$ .  $NBV$  is a subspace of  $BV$ .
- 2) If  $F \in BV$ , then  $V_F(x)$  is an increasing function of  $x$ , bounded above by  $\text{Var}(F)$ .
- 3) a) Moreover, if  $x < y$ , then  $V_F(y) - V_F(x) = \sup(\{\sum_{k=1}^n |F(x_k) - F(x_{k-1})|; x \leq x_0 < x_1 < \dots < x_n = y\})$ .  
b) special case:  $|F(y) - F(x)| \leq V_F(y) - V_F(x) \leq V_F(y) \leq \text{Var}(F)$ .  
c) consequence:  $F \in BV \Rightarrow F$  is bounded.
- 4) An increasing  $F : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is in  $BV$  iff  $F$  is bounded.
- 5)  $F : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \in BV$  iff  $F = F_1 - F_2$ , where  $F_1, F_2 : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  are bdd and increasing.
- 6)  $F : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \in BV$  iff  $\text{Re } F, \text{Im } F \in BV$ .
- 7)  $F \in BV \Rightarrow F$  continuous except at countable many points, and for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $F(x+) = \lim_{t \rightarrow x+} F(t)$  and  $F(x-) = \lim_{t \rightarrow x-} F(t)$ , and  $\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} F(x)$  and  $\lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} F(x)$  all exist and are in  $\mathbb{R}$ .
- 8)  $F \in BV \Leftrightarrow F = F_1 - F_2 + iF_3 - iF_4$ , where  $F_k : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , increasing, bounded, right continuous, and  $\lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} F_k(x) = 0$  for all  $k$ .

Proof: ADD

The linear map  $T = \nu \mapsto F_\nu$  from  $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R})$  to  $NBV$  is an isomorphism. Thus it is bijective and  $\text{Var}(F_\nu) = \|\nu\|$  for all  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R})$ , which implies that  $NBV$  is a Banach space with norm  $\|F\| = \text{Var}(F)$ ,  $\|T(\nu)\| = \|\nu\|$ . This also applies to  $\mathcal{M}([a, b])$  and  $NBV([a, b])$ , by zero padding  $F(x)$  and replacing  $\nu$  by  $\nu_{[a, b]}(E) := \nu(E \cap [a, b])$ .

Proof: ADD

We say  $F : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is *absolutely continuous*, or say  $F \in AC$  if given  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists a  $\delta > 0$  such that  $a_1 < b_1 < a_2 < b_2 < \dots < a_n < b_n$  and  $\sum_{k=1}^n (b_k - a_k) < \delta \Rightarrow \sum_{k=1}^n |F(b_k) - F(a_k)| < \epsilon$ . If  $n = 1$  then this is uniformly continuous, so  $F \in AC \Rightarrow F$  is uniformly continuous, also  $AC \subset BV$ . Define  $NAC := NBV \cap AC$ . Again this can apply to  $F : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .

Proof: ADD

$F \in NAC \Leftrightarrow \mu_F \ll \lambda$ , where  $\mu_F$  is the Lebesgue-Stieltjes measure from  $F$ , and  $\lambda$  is the Lebesgue measure.

Proof: ADD

(a Vitali covering lemma) Suppose  $W \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ ,  $W \subset \cup_{i=1}^n B(x_i, r_i)$ , where  $B(x, r)$  is the ball centered at  $x \in \mathbb{R}^k$ , with radius  $r > 0$ , then there exists  $S \subset \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  such that:

a)  $B(x_i, r_i) \cap B(x_j, r_j) = \emptyset$  if  $i, j \in S$ ,  $i \neq j$ .

b)  $W \subset \cup_{i \in S} B(x_i, 3r_i)$

c)  $\lambda(W) \leq 3^k \sum_{i \in S} \lambda(B(x_i, r_i))$

Proof: ADD

For  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^k)$ ,  $x \in \mathbb{R}^k$ ,  $r > 0$ , define  $(Q_r \mu)(x) = \frac{\mu(B(x, r))}{\lambda(B(x, r))}$ . Call  $M_\mu(x) := \sup\{(Q_r \mu)(x); 0 < r < \infty\}$ , the *maximal function* of  $\mu$ ,  $M_\mu : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ . A special case, for  $F \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^k, \lambda)$ ,  $\mu(E) := \int_E F d\lambda$ , in this case write  $M_F$  for  $M_\mu$ .

$F : \Omega \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty]$  is called *lower semi continuous* (lsc) if  $F^{-1}((t, \infty])$  is open for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , this makes sense if  $\Omega$  is any topological space.

$\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^k) \Rightarrow M_\mu$  is lower semi continuous.

Proof: ADD

(Hardy Littlewood theorem) If  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^k)$ ,  $a < t < \infty$  then  $\lambda(\{x \in \mathbb{R}^k; M_\mu(x) > t\}) \leq 3^k \|\mu\| \div t$ .

Proof: ADD

A function  $f : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$  is called *locally integrable*, or  $f \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^k, \lambda)$  if  $F|_K \in L^1(K, \lambda)$  for all compact  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ .

If  $f \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^k, \lambda)$ ,  $x \in \mathbb{R}^k$  is called a *Lebesgue point* for  $f$  if

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\lambda(B(x, r))} \int_{B(x, r)} |f(y) - f(x)| d\lambda(y) = 0.$$

If  $x$  is a Lebesgue point for  $f$  then

$$f(x) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\lambda(B(x, r))} \int_{B(x, r)} f(y) d\lambda(y).$$

Proof: ADD

For  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^k)$ , define the *symmetric derivative* of  $\mu$  as  $D_\mu(x) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu(B(x,r))}{\lambda(B(x,r))}$ , wherever this limit exists,  $x \in \mathbb{R}^k$ .

Define

$$f^*(x) = \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\lambda(B(x,r))} \int_{B(x,r)} |f(y) - f(x)| d\lambda(y).$$

then

- 1)  $(f + g)^* \leq \int f^* + g^*$  for all  $f, g \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^k, \lambda)$
- 2) If  $g$  is continuous at  $x$  then  $g^*(x) = 0$ .
- 3) If  $f, g \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^k, \lambda)$ ,  $g$  continuous then  $f^* = (f^* - g + g) \leq (f - g)^* + g^* = (f - g)^*$
- 4) If  $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^k, \lambda)$  then  $f^* \leq |f| + M_f$ .

Proof: ADD

(Lebesgue's theorem)

- a) If  $f \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^k, \lambda)$ , then a.e.  $x \in \mathbb{R}^k$  is a Lebesgue point.
- b)  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^k)$ ,  $\mu \ll \lambda \Rightarrow D_\mu = \frac{d\mu}{d\lambda}$ ,  $\lambda$ -a.e.

Proof: ADD

Corollary: If  $[f] \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^k, \lambda)$  then for any  $g \in [f]$ ,  $f(x) = g(x)$  for all Lebesgue points  $x$  for  $f$ . Thus, for all  $[f] \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^k, \lambda)$ , there is a cononical  $\hat{f} \in [f]$  such that all points in  $\mathbb{R}^k$  are lebesgue points for  $\hat{f}$ .

Proof: ADD

For  $x \in \mathbb{R}^k$ , a sequence  $(E_k)_{k=1}^\infty$  of measurable sets in  $\mathbb{R}^k$  is said to *shrink nicely* to  $x$  if there exists a  $C > 0$ , scalars  $r_k \searrow 0$  such that  $E_k \subset B(x, r_k)$  and  $\lambda(B(x, r_k)) \leq C\lambda(E_k)$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . In this case we write  $E_k \xrightarrow{s.n.} x$ .

If  $f \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^k, \lambda)$ , and  $x$  is a lebesgue point of  $f$  then

$$f(x) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\lambda(E_k)} \int_{E_k} f(y) d\lambda(y).$$

Proof: ADD

(first fundamental theorem of calculus)

If  $[g] \in L^1([a, b], \lambda)$  resp.  $[g] \in L^1(\mathbb{R}, \lambda)$ , let  $G(x) = \int_a^x g(t) dt = \int_{[a, b]} f d\lambda$  resp.  $G(X) = \int_{-\infty}^x g(t) dt = \int_{(-\infty, x)} g d\lambda$ , then  $G \in NAC([a, b])$  resp.  $F \in NAC$ , and  $G$  is differentialbe a.e. and  $G' = g$  a.e.

(second fundamental theorem of calculus, version 1)

- a)  $F \in AC \Leftrightarrow ( F \text{ is diff'able a.e. on } [a, b] \text{ and } F' \in L^1([a, b], \lambda) \text{ and } F(x) - F(a) = \int_a^x F'(t) dt \text{ for all } x \in [a, b] ).$
- b)  $F \in AC \Leftrightarrow ( F \text{ is diff'able a.e. on } \mathbb{R} \text{ and } F' \in L^1(\mathbb{R}, \lambda) \text{ and } F(x) - F(a) = \int_a^x F'(t) dt \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R} ).$
- c)  $F \in NAC$  or  $F \in NAC([a, b])$  then  $F' = \frac{d\mu_F}{d\lambda}$ .

Proof: ADD

If  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^k)$  then

- a)  $D_\mu(x)E$  exists for a.e.  $x \in \mathbb{R}^k$  and  $D_\mu = \frac{d\mu_a}{d\lambda}$   $\lambda$ -a.e., where  $\mu_a$  is the absolutely continuous part in the LDT of  $\mu$ .
- b) If  $\mu \perp \lambda$  Then  $D_\mu(x) = 0$   $\lambda$ -a.e. and for  $\lambda$ -a.e.  $x$ ,  $\lim_{k \rightarrow 0} \mu(E_k)/\lambda(E_k) = 0$  if  $E_k \xrightarrow{s.n.} x$ .
- c) For  $\lambda$ -a.e.  $x$ ,  $\lim_{k \rightarrow 0} \mu(E_k)/\lambda(E_k) = 0$  if  $E_k \xrightarrow{s.n.} x$ . ??? ADD.

Proof: ADD

Corollary: If  $F \in NBV$  then  $F' = \frac{d\mu_a}{d\lambda} = D_\mu$   $\lambda$ -a.e. where  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R})$  as  $F(x) = \mu((-\infty, x])$ . So a bigger class of functions is differentiable with this formula.

Proof: ADD

If  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^k)$  then

- a) If  $F : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is increasing, then  $F$  is differentiable  $\lambda$ -a.e.
- b) if  $F \in BV$ , then  $F$  is differentiable  $\lambda$ -a.e.
- c) if  $F \in BV$  there exists a constant  $c$ , and  $G \in NBV$  such that  $F = C + G$  everywhere except at a countable number of points. May take  $C = \lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} F(x)$  and  $G(x) = \lim_{y \rightarrow x^+} F(y) - C$  for all  $x$ . Then  $F' = G' = D_\mu = \frac{d\mu_a}{d\lambda}$  a.e. where  $\mu$  is the measure on  $\mathbb{R}$  associated to  $G$ .

Proof: ADD

If  $H \in BV$ ,  $H \geq 0$  for all  $x$ ,  $H = 0$  except on a countable set, then  $H$  is differentiable a.e. and  $H' = 0$  a.e.

Proof: ADD

Remark: A function  $H : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $H' = 0$  a.e. is called a *singular function*. Note: take any  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R})$ ,  $\mu \perp \lambda$ , then defining  $F_\mu(x) = \mu((-\infty, x])$ , as usual, then  $F_\mu \in NBV$ , and  $F' = \frac{d\mu_a}{d\lambda} = 0$  a.e. so  $F_\mu$  is singular. Conversely, If  $H \in NBV$  is singular, ADD.

$$F \in BV[a, b]$$

5,1)  $F \in AC[a, b]$ , take  $F(x) = 0$  for  $x \notin [a, b]$ , then  $\lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} F(x) = 0$ , and  $F$  is continuous because it's uniformly continuous, and  $F \in BV[a, b]$ , so  $AC[a, b] \subset NBV$ , and so  $\mu_F \ll \lambda$  by theorem 5.1.6.  $\mu_F \ll \lambda \Leftrightarrow |\mu_F| \ll \lambda$  by prop 4.1.5.e.  $F$  is not necessarily in  $AC[a, b]$  because  $F(a)$  is not necessarily 0.

Now that  $|\mu_F| = \mu_{V_F}$ . let  $\alpha = \nu \mapsto |\nu|$ ,  $\beta = F \mapsto V_F$ ,  $\gamma = F \mapsto \mu_F$ , and  $\gamma$  is invertible by 5.1.4. Want to show that  $\alpha \circ \gamma = \gamma \circ \beta$ , but then  $\gamma^{-1} \circ (\alpha \circ \gamma) = \beta$ , which says that  $|\mu_F|((-\infty, x]) = V_F(x)$  for all  $x$ , which is true by last lines of proof of 5.1.4.

So  $|\mu_F| = \mu_{V_F} \ll \lambda$ .  $F \in NBV \Rightarrow V_F \in NBV$  by lemma before 8 in 5.1.3, then again theorem 5.1.6 says that  $\mu_{V_F} \ll \lambda \Rightarrow V_F \in NAC \Rightarrow V_F \in AC$ , and so  $V_F \in AC[a, b]$ .  $\square$

5,2) Suppose  $F \in NBV[a, b]$ ,  $F \geq 0$  and  $F$  is increasing,  $F(a) = 0$ . Let  $\mu$  be the measure associated to  $F$ , then by corollary 5.2.5,  $F' = \frac{d\mu_{F,a}}{d\lambda}$ , where  $\mu_F = \mu_{F,a} + \mu_{F,s}$ , from the Lebesgue decomposition theorem,  $\mu_{F,a} \ll \lambda$ . By 5.1.4,  $|\frac{d\mu_{F,a}}{d\lambda}| = \frac{d|\mu_{F,a}|}{d\lambda}$ , so that  $\int_{[a,b]} |F'| d\lambda = |\mu_{F,a}|((a, b])$ . Now  $F \geq 0 \Rightarrow \mu_F \geq 0 \Rightarrow \mu_{F,a}, \mu_{F,s} \geq 0$ , by the lebesgue decomposition theorem, so  $\mu_{F,a} \leq \mu_F \Rightarrow |\mu_{F,a}|(a, b) \leq |\mu_F|(a, b) = V_F(a, b)$ .

If  $F \in BV[a, b]$ , then by 5.2.6,  $F(x) = F(a) + G(x)$ , a.e. where  $G \in NBV[a, b]$ , and  $F' = G'$  a.e. so that  $\int_{[a,b]} |F'| d\lambda = \int_{[a,b]} |G'| d\lambda$ .

5,3) In 5.2, have  $\int_{[a,b]} |F'| d\lambda = |\mu_{F,a}|((a, b])$ , and  $\mu_F = \mu_{F,a} + \mu_{F,s}$ , but  $\mu_{F,s} = 0 \Leftrightarrow \mu_F \ll \lambda \Leftrightarrow F \in NAC[a, b]$ .

5,4) If  $F \in BV[a, b]$ , then by 5.2.6,  $F(x) = F(a) + G(x)$ , a.e. where  $G \in NBV[a, b]$ , and  $F' = G'$  a.e, so assume that  $F \in NBV[a, b]$ . In this case there is a  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R})$  such that  $\mu((-\infty, x]) = F(x)$  for all  $x$ . Apply lebesgue decomposition to obtain  $\mu = \mu_a + \mu_s$ , 5.2.6 says that  $F' = \frac{d\mu_a}{d\lambda} = D_\mu$  a.e. So  $|F'| = |D_\mu| = |\frac{d\mu_a}{d\lambda}| = \frac{d|\mu_a|}{d\lambda}$  by prop 1 in 4.1.7. Then again,

$$|F'| = \frac{d|\mu_a|}{d\lambda} = D_{|\mu|} = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{|\mu_a|(B(x, r))}{\lambda(B(x, r))} = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{V_F(x - r, x + r)}{2r} = V'_F(x) \quad \lambda - \text{a.e.}$$

$\square$

Folland 33)  $F : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , By 5.2.6a  $F$  is differentiable a.e.. Given  $a < b \in \mathbb{R}$ , replace  $F$  with  $F\mathbf{1}_{[a,b]}$ . By problem 4,  $F'$  is measurable. If  $F(x) < \infty$  then  $F(y) < \infty$  for all  $y \in [a, x]$  by  $F$  increasing; if  $F(x) = \infty$  some  $x \in [a, b]$  then  $F(b) - F(a) = \infty \geq \int_{[a,b]} F' d\lambda \in [-\infty, \infty]$  so the equality holds. assume  $F(x) \in \mathbb{R}$  for all  $x \in [a, b]$ . Then  $F$  is bounded by  $F(b)$ , so by 5.1.3b  $F \in BV[a, b]$ . By 5.2.6c  $F(x) = F(a) + G(x)$  a.e. where  $G \in NBV[a, b]$ , and  $G' = F'$  a.e., also then by problem 5,2)  $\int_{[a,b]} |F'| \leq V_F(a, b) < \infty$ , so  $G', F' \in L^1([a, b], \lambda)$ . Let  $\mu$  be the measure associated with  $F$  and  $G$ . This is the same measure for both  $F, G$ , because it is defined as the inf of sums of the numbers of the form  $F(b_k) - F(a_k)$ , but  $F(b_k) - F(a_k) = G(b_k) - G(a_k)$ . Now  $G(a) = 0$  and  $G$  is increasing, so  $G(x) \geq 0$  for  $x \in [a, b]$ , and  $G \in NBV[a, b]$ , so by the argument in problem 5,2,  $\mu_a \leq \mu$  and  $F' = \frac{d\mu_a}{d\lambda}$  a.e., so  $\int_{[a,b]} F' d\lambda = \mu_a([a, b])$ . On the other hand,  $F(b) - F(a) = \mu((a, b])$ , and  $\mu \geq \mu_a$  from the lebesgue decomposition, i.e.  $\mu = \mu_a + \mu_s$  and all these are positive finite measures, because  $G \geq 0$ . This gives  $F(b) - F(a) = \mu((a, b]) \geq \mu_a([a, b]) = \int_{[a,b]} F' d\lambda$ .  $a, b$  are arbitrary so this holds for all  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ .  $\square$