

# Sep. 6 Lecture 4

(8) If  $A = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} J_k$  where  $J_k$ 's are almost disjoint intervals (at most sharing end points)  
 then  $m^*(A) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} l(J_k)$

Proof: W.L.O.G. assume  $l(J_k) < \infty \quad \forall k \geq 1$ . Fix an arbitrary  $\varepsilon > 0$ .

for each  $k \geq 1$ , choose open interval  $I_k \subset J_k$  s.t.  $l(J_k) \leq l(I_k) + \varepsilon/2^k$

For each integer  $N > 1$ ,  $I_1, \dots, I_N$  are disjoint with a positive distance from one another. By (7) (induction to  $N$  times),

$$m^*\left(\bigcup_{k=1}^N I_k\right) = \sum_{k=1}^N l(I_k) \geq \sum_{k=1}^N l(J_k) - \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{\varepsilon}{2^k} \geq \sum_{k=1}^N l(J_k) - \varepsilon$$

$$\text{Since } \bigcup_{k=1}^N I_k \subset A, \quad m^*(A) \geq \sum_{k=1}^N l(J_k) - \varepsilon \xrightarrow{\text{as } N \rightarrow \infty} m^*(A) \geq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} l(J_k) - \varepsilon.$$

On the other hand,  $m^*(A) \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} l(J_k)$  by (countable subadditivity)  $\square$ .

Despite of all the properties above,  $m^*$  doesn't support " $m^*(A \cup B) = m^*(A) + m^*(B)$ "

for arbitrary disjoint sets  $A, B$ . Consider restricting  $m^*$  to the "good" sets.

Step 2: Define measurable sets

Definition A set  $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  is  $m^*$ -measurable if  $\forall B \subseteq \mathbb{R}$   
$$m^*(B) = m^*(B \cap A) + m^*(B \cap A^c)$$

Otherwise,  $A$  is a non-measurable set.

Remark: By subadditivity, we know that  $\forall A, B \subseteq \mathbb{R}$

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

So,  $m^*$ -measurability of  $A$  is about whether or not " $<$ " could occur.

Theorem (Carathéodary's Theorem) Let  $\mathcal{M} := \{A \subseteq \mathbb{R} : A \text{ is } m^*\text{-measurable}\}$

Then,  $\mathcal{M}$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra (of subsets of  $\mathbb{R}$ ). Define  $m: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$

by  $\forall A \in \mathcal{M} \quad m(A) = m^*(A)$ . Then,  $m$  is a measure on  $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{M})$

$m$  is called the Lebesgue measure, and  $A \in \mathcal{M}$  is a (Lebesgue) measurable set.

Proof: It follows immediately from the definition of  $m^*$ -measurability

that  $\mathbb{R} \in \mathcal{M}$ , and if  $A \in \mathcal{M}$  then  $A^c \in \mathcal{M}$ .

Next, we will show  $\mathcal{M}$  is closed under finite union, i.e. if  $A_1, \dots, A_N \in \mathcal{M}$ ,

then  $\bigcup_{n=1}^N A_n \in \mathcal{M}$ . It's sufficient to treat the case  $N=2$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Given } A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{M}, \forall B \subseteq \mathbb{R} \quad m^*(B) &= m^*(B \cap A_1) + m^*(B \cap A_1^c) \\ &= m^*(B \cap A_1) + m^*(B \cap A_1^c \cap A_2) + m^*(B \cap A_1^c \cap A_2^c) \\ &\stackrel{\text{subadditivity}}{\geq} m^*(B \cap (A_1 \cup A_2)) + m^*(B \cap (A_1 \cup A_2)^c) \end{aligned}$$

Subadditivity implies the reverse inequality. So, we have proven that

$$\forall B \subseteq \mathbb{R}, \quad m^*(B) = m^*(B \cap (A_1 \cup A_2)) + m^*(B \cap (A_1 \cup A_2)^c) \Rightarrow A_1 \cup A_2 \in \mathcal{M}.$$

Now, consider a sequence  $\{A_n : n \geq 1\} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ . We want to show that  $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \in \mathcal{M}$ .

W.L.O.G., we may assume  $A_n$ 's are disjoint. (Otherwise, we replace  $\{A_n : n \geq 1\}$  by

$\{B_n : n \geq 1\}$  where  $B_1 = A_1$ ,  $B_n = A_n \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{n-1} A_i$  for  $n \geq 2$ . Then,  $\{B_n : n \geq 1\} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$  (since

we have shown  $\mathcal{M}$  is closed under finite union and complement).  $B_n$ 's are disjoint.

and  $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$ . So, it's equivalent to show  $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n \in \mathcal{M}$ .)

For every  $n \geq 1$ , set  $E_n := \bigcup_{i=1}^n A_i$ . We already know that  $E_n \in \mathcal{M} \quad \forall n \geq 1$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
 \forall B \in \mathcal{R}. \quad m^*(B) &= m^*(B \cap E_n) + m^*(B \cap E_n^c) \\
 &\geq m^*(B \cap E_n) + m^*(B \cap (\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i)^c) \quad \downarrow \text{because } E_n \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i \\
 &\quad \cap A_n \quad \cap A_n^c \\
 &= m^*(B \cap E_n \cap A_n) + m^*(B \cap E_n \cap A_n^c) + m^*(B \cap (\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i)^c) \\
 &\quad B \cap A_n \quad B \cap E_n \\
 &= m^*(B \cap A_n) + m^*(B \cap E_{n-1}) + m^*(B \cap (\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i)^c) \\
 &\quad \cap A_{n-1} \quad \cap A_{n-1}^c \\
 &= m^*(B \cap A_n) + m^*(B \cap A_{n-1}) + m^*(B \cap E_{n-2}) + m^*(B \cap (\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i)^c) \\
 &\quad \vdots \\
 &= \sum_{i=1}^n m^*(B \cap A_i) + m^*(B \cap (\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i)^c)
 \end{aligned}$$

Since  $n$  is arbitrary,  $m^*(B) \geq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} m^*(B \cap A_n) + m^*(B \cap (\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n)^c)$

(Countable subadd.)  $\geq m^*(B \cap (\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n)) + m^*(B \cap (\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n)^c)$

Thus,  $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \in \mathcal{M}$ . We have proven that  $\mathcal{M}$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra.



Now, we move onto proving  $m = m^*|_{\mathcal{M}}$  is a measure.  $m(\emptyset) = m^*(\emptyset) = 0$  obviously.

Assume  $\{A_n : n \geq 1\} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$  is a sequence of disjoint measurable sets. First, by countable subadd. (of  $m^*$ )

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

Second, by monotonicity of  $m^*$ ,  $\forall n \geq 1$ .  $m\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n\right) = m^*\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n\right) \geq m^*\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^n A_i\right) = m\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^n A_i\right)$

Since  $A_1, \dots, A_n \in \mathcal{M}$  are disjoint, we can follow a similar argument as above to prove

$$m^*\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^n A_i\right) = \sum_{i=1}^n m^*(A_i) \quad \text{or equivalently} \quad m\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^n A_i\right) = \sum_{i=1}^n m(A_i)$$

Therefore,  $\forall n \geq 1$ .  $m\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i\right) \geq \sum_{i=1}^n m(A_i) \xrightarrow{\text{as } n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} m(A_i)$

We have proven  $m\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i\right) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} m(A_i)$  (countable add.)  $\Rightarrow m$  is a measure.

Proposition  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $m$  are translation invariant, i.e.,  $\forall A \in \mathcal{M}$ ,  $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $A+x \in \mathcal{M}$  and  $m(A) = m(A+x)$ .

Proof: Given  $A \in \mathcal{M}$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ .  $\forall B \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ .  $m^*(B) \stackrel{\text{translation invariance of } m^*}{=} m^*(B-x) = m^*((B-x) \cap A) + m^*((B-x) \cap A^c)$   
 $= m^*(B \cap (A+x)) + m^*(B \cap (A+x)^c)$

Therefore,  $A+x \in \mathcal{M}$ . Moreover,  $m(A) = m^*(A) \stackrel{\downarrow}{=} m^*(A+x) = m(A+x)$ .

Theorem.  $\forall a, b \in \mathbb{R} \quad a < b \quad (a, b) \in \mathcal{M} \quad \text{and} \quad m((a, b)) = b - a.$

Important corollary:  $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ , i.e. all Borel sets are Lebesgue measurable