

**2.4 18**

(i) By definition of outer measure (where it is the infimum of measure of all open interval coverings) for any  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists a covering of  $E$  by open intervals  $I_k$

$$E \subseteq \bigcup I_k = U$$

with

$$m^*(U) - m^*(E) < \epsilon$$

Let  $U_\epsilon$  denote such an open set. We have the  $G_\delta$  set

$$G = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} U_{1/n}$$

Notice that since  $E \subseteq U_{1/n}$  for all  $n$ ,  $E \subseteq G$ . Also notice  $G \subseteq U_{1/n}$  for all  $n$ . Thus for every  $n > 0$

$$m^*(E) \leq m^*(G) \leq m^*(E) + \frac{1}{n}$$

Thus  $m^*(G) = m^*(E)$

(ii) ( $\Rightarrow$ ): From Theorem 11 there exists  $F_\sigma$  set  $F$  where

$$F \subseteq E$$

$$m^*(E \setminus F) = 0$$

Since  $F$  is a measurable set from disjoint union additivity (which holds if only one of the disjoint sets is measurable) we have the desired result

$$m^*(E) = m^*(F \cup (E \setminus F)) = m^*(F) + m^*(E \setminus F) = m^*(F)$$

( $\Leftarrow$ ): If there exists an  $F_\sigma$  set  $F \subseteq E$  where  $m^*(F) = m^*(E)$  then since  $F$  is measurable

$$m^*(E) = m^*(F \cup (E \setminus F)) = m^*(F) + m^*(E \setminus F)$$

and thus  $m^*(E \setminus F) = 0$ . We have that all sets of outer measure 0 are measurable and thus  $E$  is the union of measurable sets (and thus measurable)

$$E = F \cup (E \setminus F)$$

**2.4 19**

From problem 18 we know that there is a  $G_\delta$  set  $G = \bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} U_k$  where

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} m^* \left( \bigcap_{k=1}^N U_k \right) = m^*(G) = m^*(E)$$

Thus for any  $\epsilon > 0$  and sufficiently large  $N$  we have

$$m^* \left( \bigcap_{k=1}^N U_k \right) < m^*(E) + \epsilon$$

Letting  $\mathcal{O}_N = \bigcap_{k=1}^N U_k$  be this open set we have

$$m^*(\mathcal{O}_N) - m^*(E) < \epsilon$$

From subadditivity

$$m^*(\mathcal{O}_N \setminus E) \geq m^*(\mathcal{O}_N) - m^*(E)$$

If we had equality for every  $\mathcal{O}_N$  however, for every  $\epsilon > 0$  we can choose a  $\mathcal{O}_N$  as described above so that

$$m^*(\mathcal{O}_N \setminus E) < \epsilon$$

which from Theorem 11 establishes  $E$  to be measurable. Thus equality cannot be the case for each  $\mathcal{O}_N$

## 2.4 20

( $\Leftarrow$ ): This follows directly from the definition of measurable with the set in question  $(a, b)$

( $\Rightarrow$ ): From the definition of outer measure for any  $\epsilon > 0$  we can cover  $E$  by a countable collection of open intervals  $I_k$  such that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} m^*(I_k) < m^*(E) + \epsilon$$

From hypothesis

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} m^*(I_k) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} m^*(E \cap I_k) + m^*(I_k \setminus E) \geq m^* \left( \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} E \cap I_k \right) + m^* \left( \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} I_k \setminus E \right)$$

Denoting  $U = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} I_k$  the open set, the above statement is equal to

$$m^*(U \cap E) + m^*(U \setminus E)$$

since  $E \subseteq U$ ,  $U \cap E = E$  so tracing back from our first inequality yields

$$m^*(E) + \epsilon > m^*(E) + m^*(U \setminus E)$$

Thus  $m^*(U \setminus E) < \epsilon$  which from Theorem 11 establishes  $E$  to be measurable

**2.5 25**

Consider the example

$$B_1 = \mathbb{R}$$

$$B_n = (n, \infty)$$

We have that

$$\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n = \emptyset \Rightarrow m^* \left( \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n \right) = 0$$

while for each  $B_n$ ,  $m^*(B_n) = \infty$  so

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} m^*(B_n) = \infty$$

**2.5 26**

We have that

$$A \cap \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} E_k = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} A \cap E_k$$

From subadditivity we have

$$m^* \left( \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} A \cap E_k \right) \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} m^*(A \cap E_k)$$

We have that for all  $N > 0$ ,

$$m^* \left( \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} A \cap E_k \right) \geq m^* \left( \bigcup_{k=1}^N A \cap E_k \right) = \sum_{k=1}^N m^*(A \cap E_k)$$

The second equality follows from Proposition 6. Since this is the case for all  $N$ , we can conclude

$$m^* \left( \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} A \cap E_k \right) \geq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} m^*(A \cap E_k)$$

Thus since we have light inequalities both ways, we can conclude equality.

**2.5 28**

For any countable collection of disjoint measurable sets  $\{E_1, E_2, \dots\}$  we can form an ascending chain of measurable sets by setting

$$A_k = \bigcup_{i=1}^k E_i$$

We have that

$$m^* \left( \bigcup_{s=1}^k E_s \right) = m^* \left( \bigcup_{s=1}^k A_s \right) = m^*(A_k) = \sum_{i=1}^k m^*(E_i)$$

And thus from the continuity property

$$m^* \left( \bigcup_{s=1}^{\infty} E_s \right) = m^* \left( \bigcup_{s=1}^{\infty} A_s \right) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} m^*(A_k) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} m^*(E_i)$$