

1. Suppose  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$  and  $(\mathbb{Y}, \mathcal{G})$  are measure spaces and  $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{Y}$ . Show that: a)  $I_{f^{-1}(A)}(\omega) = (I_A \circ f)(\omega)$  for all  $\omega$ ; b)  $f$  is measurable if, and only if,  $\sigma(\{f^{-1}(A) : A \in \mathcal{G}\}) \subset \mathcal{F}$ .

**Answer:** a) For any subset  $A \subset Y$ , we have  $f^{-1}(A) = \{\omega : f(\omega) \in A\}$ . Then,

$$I_{f^{-1}(A)}(\omega) = I_{\{\omega: f(\omega) \in A\}}(\omega) = I_A(f(\omega)) = (I_A \circ f)(\omega).$$

b) Since  $f$  is measurable,  $f^{-1}(\mathcal{G}) \subset \mathcal{F}$ . By monotonicity of  $\sigma$ -algebras,  $\sigma(f^{-1}(\mathcal{G})) = \sigma(\{f^{-1}(A) : A \in \mathcal{G}\}) \subset \mathcal{F}$ . Now,  $\sigma(f^{-1}(\mathcal{G})) = f^{-1}(\sigma(\mathcal{G})) = f^{-1}(\mathcal{G}) \subset \mathcal{F}$ . The last set containment implies measurability.

2. Show that for any function  $f : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{Y}$  and any collection of subsets  $\mathcal{G}$  of  $\mathbb{Y}$ ,  $f^{-1}(\sigma(\mathcal{G})) = \sigma(f^{-1}(\mathcal{G}))$

**Answer:**  $f^{-1}(\sigma(\mathcal{G}))$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra associated with  $\mathbb{X}$ . Since  $\mathcal{G} \subset \sigma(\mathcal{G})$ ,  $f^{-1}(\mathcal{G}) \subset f^{-1}(\sigma(\mathcal{G}))$  and consequently  $\sigma(f^{-1}(\mathcal{G})) \subset f^{-1}(\sigma(\mathcal{G}))$ .

Now, as in Theorem 3.1,  $\mathcal{U} = \{U \in 2^{\mathbb{X}} : f^{-1}(U) \in \sigma(f^{-1}(\mathcal{G}))\}$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra. By definition of  $\mathcal{U}$

$$f^{-1}(\mathcal{U}) \subset \sigma(f^{-1}(\mathcal{G})).$$

Also,  $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{U}$  since  $f^{-1}(\mathcal{G}) \subset f^{-1}(\mathcal{U}) \subset \sigma(f^{-1}(\mathcal{G}))$ . Since  $\mathcal{U}$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra we have that  $\sigma(\mathcal{G}) \subset \mathcal{U}$ . So,

$$f^{-1}(\sigma(\mathcal{G})) \subset f^{-1}(\mathcal{U}) \subset \sigma(f^{-1}(\mathcal{G})).$$

The last set containment combined with the reverse obtained on the last paragraph completes the proof.

3. Let  $i \in I$  where  $I$  is an arbitrary index set. Consider  $f_i : (\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{X}_i, \mathcal{F}_i)$ .

(a) Show that for all  $i$ , the smallest  $\sigma$ -algebra associated with  $\mathbb{X}$  that makes  $f_i$  measurable is given by  $f_i^{-1}(\mathcal{F}_i)$ .

(b) Show that  $\sigma\left(\bigcup_{i \in I} f_i^{-1}(\mathcal{F}_i)\right)$  is the smallest  $\sigma$ -algebra associated with  $\mathbb{X}$  that makes all  $f_i$  simultaneously measurable.

**Answer:** a)  $f_i$  is measurable if  $f_i^{-1}(\mathcal{F}_i) \subset \mathcal{F}$ . But by monotonicity of  $\sigma(\cdot)$  we have  $\sigma(f_i^{-1}(\mathcal{F}_i)) = f_i^{-1}(\mathcal{F}_i) \subset \mathcal{F}$  since  $f_i^{-1}(\mathcal{F}_i)$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra. b)  $f_i^{-1}(\mathcal{F}_i) \subset \mathcal{F}$  for all  $i \in I$  because  $f_i$  is measurable. But any sub- $\sigma$ -algebra of  $\mathcal{F}$  that makes all  $f_i$  measurable functions must contain all  $f_i^{-1}(\mathcal{F}_i)$ , i.e.,  $\bigcup_{i \in I} f_i^{-1}(\mathcal{F}_i)$ . However, unions of  $\sigma$ -algebras are not necessarily  $\sigma$ -algebras. Hence, we consider

$\sigma\left(\bigcup_{i \in I} f_i^{-1}(\mathcal{F}_i)\right)$ , the smallest  $\sigma$ -algebra that makes all  $f_i$  simultaneously measurable.

4. Let  $F_\mu$  be as in problem 7 in Homework 1 - part 2. Show that  $\nu_{F_\mu}([a, b]) := F_\mu(b) - F_\mu(a)$  for all  $a < b$ ,  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$  has a unique extension to a measure in  $\mathcal{B}$  and conclude that  $\mu = \nu_{F_\mu}$ .

**Answer:** Recall that  $\mathcal{S} = \{[a, b] : a \leq b, a, b \in \mathbb{R}\}$  is a semi-ring (if  $a = b$ ,  $[a, a] = \emptyset$ ). Given  $F_\mu$ , we define  $\nu_{F_\mu} : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  as  $\nu_{F_\mu}([a, b]) = F_\mu(b) - F_\mu(a)$  for all  $a \leq b$ . Since  $F_\mu$  is monotonically increasing,  $F_\mu(b) - F_\mu(a) \geq 0$  and  $\nu_{F_\mu}([a, a]) = F_\mu(a) - F_\mu(a) = 0$ . Also,  $\nu_{F_\mu}$  is finitely additive since for  $a < c < b$ , we have that  $[a, b] = [a, c] \cup [c, b]$  and  $\nu_{F_\mu}([a, b]) = F_\mu(b) - F_\mu(a) = F_\mu(c) - F_\mu(a) + F_\mu(b) - F_\mu(c) = \nu_{F_\mu}([a, c]) + \nu_{F_\mu}([c, b])$ . We now show that  $\nu_{F_\mu}$  is  $\sigma$ -additive, i.e., for  $[a_n, b_n]$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  a disjoint collection such that  $[a, b] = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} [a_n, b_n]$ , we have  $\nu_{F_\mu}([a, b]) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \nu_{F_\mu}([a_n, b_n])$ . Fix  $\epsilon_n, \epsilon > 0$

and note that  $(a_n - \epsilon_n, b_n) \supset [a_n, b_n]$ . Hence,  $\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (a_n - \epsilon_n, b_n) \supset \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} [a_n, b_n] = [a, b] \supset [a, b - \epsilon]$ . Since  $\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (a_n - \epsilon_n, b_n)$  is an open cover for the compact set  $[a, b - \epsilon]$ , by the Heine-Borel Theorem, there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$\bigcup_{n=1}^N (a_n - \epsilon_n, b_n) \supset \bigcup_{n=1}^N [a_n, b_n] \supset [a, b - \epsilon] \supset [a, b - \epsilon]. \quad (1)$$

Now, since  $\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} [a_n, b_n] = [a, b]$  we have  $\bigcup_{n=1}^N [a_n, b_n] \subset [a, b]$  and

$$\nu_{F_\mu}([a, b]) \geq \nu_{F_\mu}(\bigcup_{n=1}^N [a_n, b_n]) = \sum_{n=1}^N \nu_{F_\mu}([a_n, b_n]) \text{ by finite additivity.}$$

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \nu_{F_\mu}([a, b]) - \sum_{n=1}^N \nu_{F_\mu}([a_n, b_n]) \\ &= \nu_{F_\mu}([a, b - \epsilon]) + \nu_{F_\mu}([b - \epsilon, b]) - \sum_{n=1}^N (\nu_{F_\mu}([a_n - \epsilon_n, b_n]) - \nu_{F_\mu}([a_n - \epsilon_n, a_n])) \\ &= \nu_{F_\mu}([a, b - \epsilon]) - \sum_{n=1}^N \nu_{F_\mu}([a_n - \epsilon_n, b_n]) \text{ this term } < 0 \text{ by (1)} \\ &\quad + \nu_{F_\mu}([b - \epsilon, b]) + \sum_{n=1}^N \nu_{F_\mu}([a_n - \epsilon_n, a_n]) \\ &\leq \nu_{F_\mu}([b - \epsilon, b]) + \sum_{n=1}^N \nu_{F_\mu}([a_n - \epsilon_n, a_n]) = F_\mu(b) - F_\mu(b - \epsilon) + \sum_{n=1}^N (F_\mu(a_n) - F_\mu(a_n - \epsilon_n)). \end{aligned}$$

By left-continuity of  $F_\mu$ , we can choose  $\epsilon$  such that  $F_\mu(b) - F_\mu(b - \epsilon) < \eta/2$  and  $\epsilon_n$  such that  $F_\mu(a_n) - F_\mu(a_n - \epsilon_n) < 2^{-n} \eta/2$ . Hence,

$$0 \leq \nu_{F_\mu}([a, b]) - \sum_{n=1}^N \nu_{F_\mu}([a_n, b_n]) \leq \frac{\eta}{2} \left( 1 + \sum_{n=1}^N 2^{-n} \right).$$

Letting  $N \rightarrow \infty$  we have that  $\nu_{F_\mu}([a, b]) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \nu_{F_\mu}([a_n, b_n])$ .

Since  $\nu_{F_\mu}$  is a pre-measure on a semi-ring, by Carathéodory's Theorem, it has a unique extension to  $\sigma(\mathcal{S}) = \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ . Furthermore, since for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $[-n, n] \uparrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $\nu_{F_\mu}([-n, n]) = F_\mu(n) - F_\mu(-n) = \mu([0, n]) + \mu([-n, 0]) < \infty$ , this extension is unique.

It suffices to verify that  $\nu_{F_\mu} = \mu$  on  $\mathcal{S}$ , since  $\nu_{F_\mu}$  extends uniquely to  $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ . In fact,

Case 1 ( $0 \leq a < b$ ):  $\nu_{F_\mu}([a, b]) = F_\mu(b) - F_\mu(a) = \mu([0, b]) - \mu([0, a]) = \mu([0, a]) + \mu([a, b]) - \mu([0, a]) = \mu([a, b])$ , since  $[0, b] = [0, a] \cup [a, b]$ .

Case 2 ( $a < 0 < b$ ):  $\nu_{F_\mu}([a, b]) = F_\mu(b) - F_\mu(a) = \mu([0, b]) + \mu([a, 0]) = \mu([a, b])$ , since  $[a, b] = [a, 0] \cup [0, b]$ .

Case 3 ( $a < b \leq 0$ ):  $\nu_{F_\mu}([a, b]) = F_\mu(b) - F_\mu(a) = -\mu([b, 0]) + \mu([a, 0]) = \mu([a, b])$ , since  $[a, b] = [a, 0] - [b, 0]$ .

5. Consider the measurable space  $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}))$  and the one-dimensional Lebesgue measure  $\lambda^1$ . For any measure  $m$  on  $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}))$  a point  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  is called an atom if  $m(\{x\}) > 0$ . Show that every measure  $m$  with no atoms can be written as  $m$  in Theorem 3.4 in your notes, with  $\mu = \lambda^1$ . Hint: use question 4

in this homework.

**Answer:** Note that  $F_\mu$  from question 4 is not right-continuous. Let  $x \geq 0$ ,  $h_n > 0$  and  $A_n = [0, x + h_n)$ . Then  $A_1 \supseteq A_2 \supseteq \dots$  and  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_n = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n = [0, x] = [0, x) \cup \{x\}$ . Hence,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F_\mu(x + h_n) = \mu([0, x]) = F_\mu(x) + \mu(\{x\})$ . Also, if  $x < 0$ ,  $0 < h_n < -x$  and  $A_n = [x + h_n, 0)$ . Then,  $A_1 \subset A_2 \subset \dots$  and  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_n = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n = (x, 0) = [x, 0) - \{x\}$ . Hence,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F_\mu(x + h_n) = -\mu((x, 0)) = F_\mu(x) + \mu(\{x\})$ . Hence, unless  $\mu(\{x\}) = 0$  we have  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F_\mu(x + h_n) \neq F_\mu(x)$ . In fact, for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , a point of continuity of  $F_\mu$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\{x\}) &= \mu\left(\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \left[x, x + \frac{1}{n}\right)\right) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu\left(\left[x, x + \frac{1}{n}\right)\right) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F_\mu\left(x + \frac{1}{n}\right) - F_\mu(x) = 0 \text{ by right continuity of } F_\mu. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $F_\mu$  is continuous at  $x$  if, and only if,  $\mu(\{x\}) = 0$ .

In the notation of this question,  $F_m$  is continuous if if, and only if,  $m(\{x\}) = 0$ , that is, there are no atoms. Now,

$$\begin{aligned} m([a, b]) &= F_m(b) - F_m(a) = \lambda^1([F_m(a), F_m(b))) \\ &= \lambda^1(F_m([a, b])), \text{ by continuity} \\ &= (\lambda^1 \circ F_m)([a, b]). \end{aligned}$$

The last equality follows from defining the inverse map  $f^{-1}$  in Theorem 3.4 as the inverse function of  $F_m$  when it exists, or as the generalized inverse  $F_m^-$  as in your notes.

6. Prove Remark 4.3 in your class notes.

**Answer:** Since  $f$  is simple and  $f \leq f$  it is an admissible function in the set over which the supremum is being taken. Hence,  $I_\mu(f) \leq \int f d\mu$ . If  $g$  is simple and  $g \leq f$ ,  $I_\mu(g) \leq I_\mu(f)$  and

$$\int f d\mu = \sup\{I_\mu(g) : g \leq f\} \leq I_\mu(f).$$