

Solution 5

1.

- Prove that  $\mathcal{F}$  is a  $\sigma$ -field:

$\emptyset$  is countable  $\implies \emptyset, \Omega \in \mathcal{F}$ ;

$A \in \mathcal{F} \implies A$  or  $A^c$  is countable  $\implies A^c \in \mathcal{F}$ ;

If  $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty} \subset \mathcal{F}$ , then either each  $A_i$  is countable or there exists some  $A_j$  which is uncountable. In the first case,  $\bigcup A_i$  is countable. In the second case,  $A_j^c$  is countable, so  $(\bigcup A_i)^c = \bigcap A_i^c \subset A_j^c$  is countable. Hence in both case,  $\bigcup A_i \in \mathcal{F}$ .

- Prove that  $\mu$  is a measure:

$\mu(\emptyset) = 0$  since  $\emptyset$  is countable;

Suppose  $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty} \subset \mathcal{F}$  are disjoint. If each  $A_i$  is countable, then  $\bigcup A_i$  is countable, so  $\mu(\bigcup A_i) = 0 = \sum_i \mu(A_i)$ . If there exists some  $A_j$  is uncountable, then  $A_j^c$  is countable,  $\bigcup_{i \neq j} A_i \subset A_j^c$  is countable and hence for each  $i \neq j$ ,  $A_i$  is countable. So

$$\mu(\bigcup A_i) = 1 = \mu(A_j) + \mu(\bigcup_{i \neq j} A_i) = \sum \mu(A_i)$$

- Classify the measurable functions and  $\mu$ -integrable functions:

Claim:  $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$  is measurable  $\iff f$  is constant on some uncountable set.

Proof: " $\Leftarrow$ " is obvious since if  $f = a$  on uncountable set  $E$ , then  $\{f > b\}$  is countable if  $b \geq a$  and  $\{f > b\}^c = \{f \leq b\}$  is countable if  $b < a$ . In both case,  $\{f > b\} \in \mathcal{F}$ . Hence  $f$  is measurable.

" $\Rightarrow$ ": Note when  $f$  is measurable, there is atmost one point  $a \in \mathbb{F}$  such that  $\{f = a\}$  is uncountable, because if  $a \neq b$ , then  $\{f = a\}$  and  $\{f = b\}$  are disjoint sets in  $\mathcal{F}$  and atmost one of them is uncountable. For any  $n$ ,  $\{-n \leq f \leq n\} \in \mathcal{F}$  and  $\bigcup_n \{-n \leq f \leq n\} = f^{-1}(\mathbb{R}) = \Omega$ , so there exist some  $N$  such that  $\{-N \leq f \leq N\}$  is uncountable since  $\Omega$  is uncountable. Let  $[a_0, b_0] = [-N, N]$ . We construct a sequence of closed intervals  $[a_0, b_0] \supset [a_1, b_1] \supset [a_2, b_2] \supset \dots$  by induction such that  $\{a_i \leq f \leq b_i\}$  is uncountable.

$$\{a_i \leq f \leq b_i\} = \{a_i \leq f \leq (a_i + b_i)/2\} \cup \{(a_i + b_i) \leq f \leq b_i\}$$

is uncountable, so at least one of  $\{a_i \leq f \leq (a_i + b_i)/2\}$  and  $\{(a_i + b_i)/2 \leq f \leq b_i\}$  is uncountable. If  $\{a_i \leq f \leq (a_i + b_i)/2\}$  is uncountable, let  $[a_{i+1}, b_{i+1}] = [a_i, (a_i + b_i)/2]$ ; otherwise,  $[a_{i+1}, b_{i+1}] = [(a_i + b_i)/2, b_i]$ . Obviously,  $\{a_i \leq f \leq b_i\} - \{a_{i+1} \leq f \leq b_{i+1}\}$  is countable. Then  $\bigcap [a_i, b_i] = \{a\}$  and

$$\{a_0 \leq f \leq b_0\} - \{f = a\} = \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} (\{a_i \leq f \leq b_i\} - \{a_{i+1} \leq f \leq b_{i+1}\})$$

is countable, so  $\{f = a\}$  is uncountable.

- $f$  is measurable  $\implies f$  is  $\mu$ -integrable:

If  $f$  is measurable, then there exists unique  $a$  such that  $E = \{f = a\}^c$  is countable, so  $f(\Omega) = \{a\} \cup f(E)$  is countable. For each  $x \in f(E)$ ,  $\{f = x\} \subset E$  is countable. Hence,

$$\int f d\mu = a\mu(E^c) + \sum_{x \in f(E)} x\mu(\{f = x\}) = a + 0 = a,$$

which means  $f$  is  $\mu$ -integrable.

## 2.

- By Lebesgue's Dominated Convergence Theorem,  $|f_n| \leq f_1$ ,  $f_1 \in L^1(\mu)$  and  $f = \lim_n f_n$  implies directly that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} f_n(x) \mu(dx) = \int_{\Omega} f(x) \mu(dx)$$

- If  $f_1 \in L^1(\mu)$  is omitted, take  $f_n = 1_{[n, \infty)}$ . Obviously,  $f_n \searrow 0 = f$ , but

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} f_n(x) \mu(dx) = \infty > 0 = \int_{\Omega} f(x) \mu(dx).$$

## 3.

- Let  $f_n = n \log[1 + (\frac{f}{n})^\alpha]$ ,  $E_\infty = \{f = \infty\}$ ,  $E_0 = \{f = 0\}$  and  $E_+ = \{0 < f < \infty\}$ . Then  $\int_\Omega f d\mu = c > 0$  implies that  $\mu(E_\infty) = 0$  and  $\mu(E_+) > 0$ . So  $\int_\Omega f d\mu = \int_{E_+} f d\mu$ .

If  $f(x) = 0$  or  $f(x) = \pm\infty$ , then obviously,  $\lim_n f_n(x) = f(x)$ . So

$$\lim_n \int_{E_\infty} f_n d\mu + \lim_n \int_{E_0} f_n d\mu = 0, \quad \lim_n \int_\Omega f_n d\mu = \lim_n \int_{E_+} f_n d\mu.$$

If  $0 < f(x) < \infty$ , then

$$\lim_n f_n = \lim_n n^{1-\alpha} \log[1 + \frac{f^\alpha(x)}{n^\alpha}]^{n^\alpha} = \log e^{f^\alpha(x)} \lim_n n^{1-\alpha} = f^\alpha(x) \lim_n n^{1-\alpha}$$

- Claim: If  $\alpha \geq 1$ , then  $\log[1 + y^\alpha] \leq \alpha y$  for all  $y \geq 0$ .  
Proof: Let  $g(y) = \alpha y - \log[1 + y^\alpha]$ . Then  $g(0) = 0$  and

$$g'(y) = \alpha - \frac{\alpha y^{\alpha-1}}{1 + y^\alpha} = \frac{\alpha(1 + y^{\alpha-1}(y - 1))}{1 + y^\alpha} \geq 0,$$

because if  $y \geq 1$ , then  $g'(y) \geq 0$  obviously; if  $0 \leq y < 1$ , then  $y^{\alpha-1}(1 - y) < 1$ , so we still have  $g'(y) > 0$ . Therefore,  $g(y) \geq 0$  for all  $y \geq 0$ .

- $0 < \alpha < 1$ : by Fatou Lemma,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_n \int_\Omega f_n d\mu &= \lim_n \int_{E_+} f_n d\mu \\ &\geq \int_{E_+} \liminf_n f_n d\mu = \int_{E_+} f^\alpha(x) \liminf_n n^{1-\alpha} \\ &= \int_{E_+} \infty = \infty \end{aligned}$$

- $\alpha = 1$ : for  $x \in E_+$ ,  $\lim_n f_n(x) = f(x)$ , and

$$0 \leq f_n = n \log[1 + \frac{f}{n}] \leq n \frac{f}{n} = f \in L^1(\mu).$$

By Lebesgue's Dominated Convergence Theorem,

$$\lim_n \int_\Omega f_n d\mu = \lim_n \int_{E_+} f_n d\mu = \int_{E_+} \lim_n f_n d\mu = \int_{E_+} f d\mu = c$$

- $\alpha > 1$ : for  $x \in E_+$ ,  $\lim_n f_n(x) = f^\alpha(x) \lim_n n^{1-\alpha} = 0$ , and

$$0 \leq f_n = n \log[1 + (\frac{f}{n})^\alpha] \leq n\alpha \frac{f}{n} = \alpha f \in L^1(\mu).$$

By Lebesgue's Dominated Convergence Theorem,

$$\lim_n \int_\Omega f_n d\mu = \lim_n \int_{E_+} f_n d\mu = \int_{E_+} \lim_n f_n d\mu = \int_{E_+} 0 d\mu = 0$$

4.

- (a) Let  $1_{A_n}$ 's are measurable and non-negative. By Fatou's Lemma,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\liminf_n A_n) &= \int_\Omega 1_{\liminf_n A_n} d\mu = \int_\Omega \liminf_n 1_{A_n} d\mu \\ &\leq \liminf_n \int_\Omega 1_{A_n} d\mu = \liminf_n \mu(A_n) \end{aligned}$$

- (b)  $\mu$  is finite implies that  $\int_\Omega 1_\Omega d\mu < \infty$ , namely,  $1_\Omega \in L^1(\mu)$ .

$$0 \leq 1_{A_n} \leq 1_\Omega \implies 0 \leq 1_{A_n^c} = 1_\Omega - 1_{A_n} \leq 1_\Omega.$$

By Fatou's Lemma and (a)

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\limsup_n A_n) &= \mu(\Omega - \liminf_n A_n^c) \\ &\geq \mu(\Omega) - \liminf_n \mu(A_n^c) \\ &= \limsup_n (\mu(\Omega) - \mu(A_n^c)) \\ &= \limsup_n \mu(A_n) \end{aligned}$$

5.

- (a)  $f$  is non-negative implies that  $\mu$  is non-negative on  $\mathcal{F}$ . Obviously,  $\mu(\emptyset) = \int_\emptyset f d\nu = 0$ ,  $\mu(\Omega) = \int_\Omega f d\nu < \infty$ . If  $\{A_i\} \subset \mathcal{F}$  are disjoint, then

$$\mu(\bigcup A_i) = \int_{\bigcup A_i} f d\nu = \sum \int_{A_i} f d\nu = \sum \mu(A_i).$$

Hence,  $\mu$  is a finite measure.

- (b) If  $\nu(B) = 0$ , then for any non-negative simple function  $h \leq f$ ,

$$\int_B h d\nu \leq \|h\|_\infty \nu(B) = 0.$$

By definition of  $\int_B f d\nu$ , we have  $\mu(B) = \int_B f d\nu = 0$ .

- (c) For each  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists some non-negative simple function  $h \leq f$  such that  $0 \leq \int_\Omega f d\nu - \int_\Omega h d\nu \leq \epsilon/2$ . Choose  $0 \leq \|h\|_\infty < M < \infty$ , and let  $\delta = \epsilon/(2M)$ . Then for any  $B \in \mathcal{F}$  satisfying  $\nu(B) < \delta$ ,

$$\mu(B) = \int_B f d\nu \leq \int_B h d\nu + \epsilon/2 \leq M\nu(B) + \epsilon/2 < \epsilon.$$

Therefore,  $\mu$  is absolutely continuous w.r.t  $\nu$ .

**6.** For any non-negative simple function  $h(x) \leq f(x)$ ,  $h(x-a)$  is also a non-negative simple function satisfying  $h(x-a) \leq f(x-a)$ . Since Borel measure is translation invariant, it is easy to show that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h(x-a) dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h(x) dx.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x) dx &= \inf \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h dx : 0 \leq h(x) \leq f(x), h \text{ simple} \right\} \\ &= \inf \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h(x-a) dx : 0 \leq h(x-a) \leq f(x-a), h \text{ simple} \right\} \\ &\geq \inf \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h' dx : 0 \leq h'(x) \leq f(x-a), h' \text{ simple} \right\} \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x-a) dx \end{aligned}$$

By symmetry,  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x-a) dx \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x-a-(-a)) dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x) dx$ . Hence

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x) dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x-a) dx$$