Solution 4

- 1.* (Montone Convergence Lemmas for measures) Let $m: \widetilde{\mathcal{M}} \to [0, +\infty]$ be a measure, where $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ is an arbitrary σ -algebra. Show that
 - (a) if $E_n \uparrow E$ (with each $E_n \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}} \ \forall n$), i.e. $E = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E_n$ and $E_n \subseteq E_{n+1} \ \forall n$, then $m(E_n) \uparrow m(E)$;
 - (b) if $E_n \downarrow E$ (with each $E_n \in \widetilde{\mathcal{M}} \ \forall n$), i.e. $E = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E_n$ and $E_n \supseteq E_{n+1} \ \forall n$, then $m(E_n) \downarrow m(E)$ provided that $m(E_0) < +\infty$ for some n_0 . Provide a counter-example if the added condition is dropped.
 - **Solution.** (a) Clearly $\{m(E_n)\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is increasing. Let $B_1 = E_1$, $B_n = E_n \setminus E_{n-1}$ for $n \geq 2$. Then $\{B_n\}$ are pairwise disjoint and $\bigcup_{n=1}^N B_n = E_N$ for all N. Hence

$$m(E) = m(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n) = m(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n)$$
$$= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} m(B_n) = \lim_{N \to \infty} \sum_{n=1}^{N} m(B_n)$$
$$= \lim_{N \to \infty} m(E_N).$$

(b) Clearly $\{m(E_n)\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is decreasing. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $m(E_1) < +\infty$. Define $A_n = E_1 \setminus E_n$. Then $A_n \subseteq A_{n+1}$ and $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n = E_1 \setminus (\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n) = E_1 \setminus E$. By (a),

$$m(E_1 \setminus E) = \lim_{n \to \infty} m(A_n) = \lim_{n \to \infty} m(E_1 \setminus E_n). \tag{1}$$

Since $m(E_1) < +\infty$, we have $m(E), m(E_n) < +\infty$, and hence

$$m(E_1 \setminus E) = m(E_1) - m(E)$$
 and $m(E_1 \setminus E_n) = m(E_1) - m(E_n)$.

This together with (1) implies that

$$m(E_1) - m(E) = m(E_1) - \lim_{n \to \infty} m(E_n),$$

and hence $\lim_{n\to\infty} m(E_n) = m(E)$.

- 2. Let $\varphi := \sum_{i=1}^m a_i \chi_{E_i}$ (each $a_i \in \mathbb{R}$ and $E_i \in \mathcal{M}$) be a "simple function".
 - (a) Show by MI that range(φ) is a finite set (and so one can list all its non-zero values b_1, \ldots, b_N for some N, unless φ is the zero-function); show that

$$\varphi = \sum_{j=1}^{N} b_j \chi_{\varphi^{-1}(b_j)} \quad \text{where} \quad \varphi^{-1}(b_j) := \{x : \varphi(x) = b_j\}$$

and

$$\varphi = \sum_{j=0}^{N} b_j \chi_{\varphi^{-1}(b_j)} \quad \text{where} \quad b_0 = 0.$$

(Both representations can be referred as $\begin{cases} \text{canonical} & \\ \text{normal} & \text{representation of } \varphi.) \\ \text{standard} \end{cases}$

(b) Define $\int \varphi := \sum_{j=1}^N b_j m(\varphi^{-1}(b_j)) = \sum_{j=0}^N b_j m(\varphi^{-1}(b_j))$ (with the convention that $0 \cdot \infty = 0$

0) whenever $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}_0$ or $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}^+$ (meaning that the simple function φ is supported by a set of finite measure or $\varphi \geq 0$). Show that if $\varphi = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \chi_{E_i}$ with each $a_i \in \mathbb{R}$ and $m(E_i) < +\infty$, then $\int \varphi = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i m(E_i)$ provided that E_i 's are pairwise disjoint (the added condition can be dropped; see Q3 below).

Solution. (a) We prove by induction on m that $\varphi = \sum_{i=1}^{m} a_i \chi_{E_i}$ has $\#(\operatorname{range}(\varphi)) < \infty$. Here #(A) denotes the cardinality of A.

For $m=1, \ \varphi=a_1\chi_{E_1}$, and hence $\#(\operatorname{range}(\varphi))\leq 2<\infty$. Suppose the statement is true for m=k. For m=k+1, let $\psi=\sum_{i=1}^k a_i\chi_{E_i}$. By induction assumption, $\operatorname{range}(\psi)=\{b_1,\ldots,b_N\}$ for some $N<\infty$. Since $\varphi=\psi+a_{k+1}\chi_{E_{k+1}}$, we have

range(
$$\varphi$$
) $\subseteq \{b_1, \dots, b_N, b_1 + a_{k+1}, \dots b_N + a_{k+1}\},\$

so that $\#(\operatorname{range}(\varphi)) \leq 2N < \infty$. Thus the statement is true by MI.

Since range(φ) is a finite set, we can list all its non-zero values b_1, \ldots, b_N for some N, and write $b_0 = 0$. Then clearly

$$\varphi = \sum_{i=0}^{N} b_j \chi_{\varphi^{-1}(b_j)}.$$

(b) Let $\varphi = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \chi_{E_i}$ with $a_i \in \mathbb{R}$, E_i pairwise disjoint and $m(E_i) < +\infty$ for each i. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $a_i \neq 0 \ \forall i$. Let $\varphi = \sum_{j=1}^N b_j \chi_{\varphi^{-1}(b_j)}$ be its canonical representation. Then

$$\bigcup_{i:a_i=b_j} E_i = \varphi^{-1}(b_j) \quad \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, N,$$

and hence

$$\int \varphi := \sum_{j=1}^{N} b_j m(\varphi^{-1}(b_j)) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} b_j \sum_{i:a_i = b_j} m(E_i)$$
$$= \sum_{j=1}^{N} \sum_{i:a_i = b_j} a_i m(E_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i m(E_i).$$

3. Let $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{S}_0$ with their canonical presentations $\varphi = \sum_{j=0}^N b_j \chi_{\varphi^{-1}(b_j)}$ and $\psi = \sum_{k=0}^M c_k \chi_{\psi^{-1}(c_k)}$. Show that $\int (\varphi + \psi) = \int \varphi + \int \psi$.

Solution. Let $B_j := \varphi^{-1}(b_j)$ and $C_k := \psi^{-1}(c_k)$. Since $\{C_0, \dots C_M\}$ is a partition of \mathbb{R} , we have $\sum_{k=0}^M \chi_{C_k} = 1$. Then

$$\varphi = \sum_{j} b_j \chi_{B_j} = \sum_{j} b_j (\sum_{k} \chi_{C_k} \cdot \chi_{B_j}) = \sum_{j} \sum_{k} b_j \chi_{B_j \cap C_k}.$$

Similarly

$$\psi = \sum_{k} c_k \chi_{C_k} = \sum_{k} c_k (\sum_{j} \chi_{B_j} \cdot \chi_{C_k}) = \sum_{j} \sum_{k} c_k \chi_{B_j \cap C_k}.$$

Hence $\varphi + \psi = \sum_{j} \sum_{k} (b_j + c_k) \chi_{B_j \cap C_k} \in \mathcal{S}_0$. Since $\{B_j \cap C_k\}_{1 \leq j \leq N, 1 \leq k \leq M}$ are pairwise disjoint, it follows from Q2 that

$$\int (\varphi + \psi) = \sum_{j} \sum_{k} (b_j + c_k) m(B_j \cap C_k)$$
$$= \sum_{j} \sum_{k} b_j m(B_j \cap C_k) + \sum_{j} \sum_{k} c_k m(B_j \cap C_k) = \int \varphi + \int \psi.$$

4.* (3rd: P.70, Q21)

- (a) Let D and E be measurable sets and f a function with domain $D \cup E$. Show that f is measurable if and only if its restrictions to D and E are measurable.
- (b) Let f be a function with measurable domain D. Show that f is measurable if and only if the function g defined by g(x) = f(x) for $x \in D$ and g(x) = 0 for $x \notin D$ is measurable.

Solution. (a) (\Rightarrow): Suppose f is measurable. Then $\{x \in D \cup E : f(x) > \alpha\}$ is measurable for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. Fix $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. Then

$$\{x \in D : f|_D(x) > \alpha\} = \{x \in D \cup E : f(x) > \alpha\} \cap D$$

which is measurable. Similarly $\{x \in E : f\big|_E(x) > \alpha\}$ is measurable. Since $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ is arbitrary, we have that $f\big|_D$ and $f\big|_E$ are measurable.

 (\Leftarrow) : It follows immediately from the following equation:

$$\{x \in D \cup E : f(x) > \alpha\} = \{x \in D : f|_{D}(x) > \alpha\} \cup \{x \in E : f|_{E}(x) > \alpha\}.$$

(b) (\Rightarrow) : Suppose f is measurable. Then

$$\{x:g(x)>\alpha\} = \begin{cases} \{x\in D:f(x)>\alpha\} & \text{if } \alpha\geq 0,\\ \{x\in D:f(x)>\alpha\}\cup D^c & \text{if } \alpha<0, \end{cases}$$

which is measurable in either cases. Hence q is measurable.

(\Leftarrow): The converse follows immediately from (a) by taking $E=D^c$ and noting that $g|_D=f$.

5.* (3rd: P.71, Q22)

- (a) Let f be an extended real-valued function with measurable domain D, and let $D_1 = \{x : f(x) = \infty\}$, $D_2 = \{x : f(x) = -\infty\}$. Then f is measurable if and only if D_1 and D_2 are measurable and the restriction of f to $D \setminus (D_1 \cup D_2)$ is measurable.
- (b) Prove that the product of two measurable extended real-valued function is measurable.
- (c) If f and g are measurable extended real-valued functions and α is a fixed number, then f+g is measurable if we define f+g to be α whenever it is of the form $\infty-\infty$ or $-\infty+\infty$.

- (d) Let f and g be measurable extended real-valued functions that are finite almost everywhere. Then f+g is measurable no matter how it is defined at points where it has the form $\infty \infty$.
- **Solution.** (a) (\Rightarrow): Suppose f is measurable. Then D_1 and D_2 are measurable as usual. Hence $D \setminus (D_1 \cup D_2)$ is measurable, and so is $f|_{D \setminus (D_1 \cup D_2)}$ by 4(a).
 - (\Leftarrow): Suppose D_1 and D_2 are measurable and $f_{D\setminus (D_1\cup D_2)}$ is measurable. Then $f\big|_{D_1}$ and $f\big|_{D_2}$ are measurable. It then follows from 4(a) that f is measurable.
- (b) Let f and g be measurable extended real-valued functions defined on D. Let $D_1 = \{fg = \infty\}$ and $D_2 = \{fg = -\infty\}$. Then

$$D_1 = \{f = \infty, g > 0\} \cup \{f = -\infty, g < 0\} \cup \{f > 0, g = \infty\} \cup \{f < 0, g = -\infty\},\$$

which is measurable. Similarly, D_2 is measurable. Let $h = fg|_{D\setminus (D_1\cup D_2)}$ and let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. If $\alpha \geq 0$, then

$$\{x:h(x)>\alpha\}=\{x:f\big|_{D\backslash\{f=\pm\infty\}}\cdot g\big|_{D\backslash\{g=\pm\infty\}}>\alpha\},$$

which is measurable; if $\alpha < 0$, then

$$\{x:h(x)>\alpha\}=\{x:f(x)=0\}\cup\{x:g(x)=0\}\cup\{x:f\big|_{D\backslash\{f=\pm\infty\}}\cdot g\big|_{D\backslash\{g=\pm\infty\}}>\alpha\},$$

which is also measurable. Hence fg is measurable by (a).

(c) Let f and g are measurable extended real-valued functions and α is a fixed number. Define f + g to be α whenever it is of the form $\infty - \infty$ or $-\infty + \infty$. Then

$$D_1 := \{ f + g = \infty \} = \{ f \in \mathbb{R}, g = \infty \} \cup \{ f = g = \infty \} = \{ f = \infty, g \in \mathbb{R} \}$$

is measurable, and so is $D_2 := \{f + g = -\infty\}$. Let $h = (f + g)|_{D \setminus (D_1 \cup D_2)}$ and let $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$. If $\beta \geq \alpha$, then

$$\{x:h(x)>\beta\}=\{x:f\big|_{D\backslash\{f=\pm\infty\}}+g\big|_{D\backslash\{g=\pm\infty\}}>\beta\},$$

which is measurable; if $\beta < 0$, then

$$\{x: h(x) > \beta\} = \{f = \infty, g = -\infty\} \cup \{f = -\infty, g = +\infty\}$$

$$\cup \{x: f\big|_{D\setminus\{f = \pm\infty\}} + g\big|_{D\setminus\{g = \pm\infty\}} > \beta\},$$

which is also measurable. Hence f + g is measurable by (a).

- (d) Let f and g are measurable extended real-valued functions that are finite a.e. Then the sets D_1 , D_2 , $\{x : h(x) > \beta\}$ can be written as unions of sets as in (c), possibly with an additional set of measure zero. Thus these sets are measurable and f + g is measurable.
- 6.* Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}_0$ and $E \in \mathcal{M}$. Define $\int_E \varphi := \int \varphi \cdot \chi_E$. Show that $\varphi \mapsto \int_E \varphi$ is linear:

$$\int_{E} (\alpha \varphi + \beta \psi) = \alpha \int_{E} \varphi + \beta \int_{E} \psi, \quad \forall \varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{S}_{0} \text{ and } \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Solution. Clearly, if $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}_0$ and $E \in \mathcal{M}$, then $\varphi \cdot \chi_E \in \mathcal{S}_0$. Using the result in Q3, we have

$$\int_{E} (\varphi + \psi) = \int (\varphi \cdot \chi_{E} + \psi \cdot \chi_{E}) = \int \varphi \cdot \chi_{E} + \int \psi \cdot \chi_{E} = \int_{E} \varphi + \int_{E} \psi, \quad \forall \varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{S}_{0}.$$

It remains to show that

$$\int \alpha \varphi = \alpha \int \varphi, \quad \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{S}_0 \text{ and } \alpha \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}_0$ with canonical presentations $\varphi = \sum_{j=0}^N b_j \chi_{B_j}$, where $B_j = \varphi^{-1}(b_j)$. Then $\alpha \varphi = \sum_{j=0}^N \alpha b_j \chi_{B_j}$, and hence, by Q2(b),

$$\int \alpha \varphi = \sum_{j=0}^{N} \alpha b_j m(B_j) = \alpha \sum_{j=0}^{N} b_j m(B_j) = \alpha \int \varphi.$$

7.* Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}_0$. Show that $A \mapsto \int_A \varphi$ is a linear "signed" measure on \mathcal{M} .

Solution. It suffices to show that if $\{A_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is a sequence of pairwise disjoint, measurable sets, then

$$\int_{\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n} \varphi = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_{A_n} \varphi.$$

Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}_0$ with canonical presentations $\varphi = \sum_{j=1}^N b_j \chi_{B_j}$, where $B_j = \varphi^{-1}(b_j)$. Since $\{A_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ are pairwise disjoint, we have

$$\int_{\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n} \varphi = \int \varphi \cdot \chi_{\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n} = \sum_{j=1}^{N} b_j m(B_j \cap \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n)$$

$$= \sum_{j=1}^{N} b_j \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} m(B_j \cap A_n) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{N} b_j m(B_j \cap A_n)$$

$$= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int \varphi \cdot \chi_{A_n} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_{A_n} \varphi.$$

Note that we can interchange the summation on the second line since the sum is absolutely convergent:

$$\sum_{j=0}^{N} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |b_j m(B_j \cap A_n)| \le \max_{1 \le j \le N} |b_j| \sum_{j=1}^{N} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} m(B_j \cap A_n) = \max_{1 \le j \le N} |b_j| m(\bigcup_{j=1}^{N} B_j) < \infty.$$