

(by $\ell(I+x) = \ell(I) \forall \text{ interval } I \text{ and } \forall x \in \mathbb{R}$)

Let μ^* on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$ be $\mu^*: 2^{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$ is \uparrow ,
 trans-invariant, countably subadd. & that
 finite sets, countable sets are in \mathcal{M}_0
 where \mathcal{M}_0 denotes the family of all A with
 $\mu^*(A) = 0$. Also

$$\mu^*(I) = \ell(I) \quad \forall I \in \mathcal{I} \quad (\text{Ex.})$$

Define $E \in \mathcal{M}$ (measurable E) if

$$(*) \quad \mu^*(A) = \mu^*(A \cap E) + \mu^*(A \cap \tilde{E}) \quad \forall A \subseteq 2^{\mathbb{R}}$$

equivalently (by subadditivity of μ^* & noting
 $A = (A \cap E) \cup (A \cap \tilde{E})$)

$$(**) \quad \text{LHS of } (*) \geq \text{RHS} \quad \forall A \subseteq 2^{\mathbb{R}} \text{ with } \mu^*(A) < +\infty$$

Then we will establish :

Th. I. \mathcal{M} is a σ -algebra and $\mu := \mu^*|_{\mathcal{M}}$ is
 a measure such that $\mathcal{M}_0, \mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$, $\mu(I) = \ell(I) \quad \forall I \in \mathcal{I}$

proof of ~~λ~~ Th I. The tran-inv of \mathcal{M} follows from the corresponding property of m^* : $\forall A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$
 $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}, \forall E \in \mathcal{M}$ one has

$$\begin{cases} m^*(A \cap (E+x)) = m^*((A-x) \cap E) \\ m^*(A \cap \widetilde{(E+x)}) = m^*(A \cap \widetilde{E+x}) = m^*((A-x) \cap \widetilde{E}) \end{cases}$$

Since $E \in \mathcal{M}$, RHS of these two lines are equal so LHS of the two lines are equal, implying $E+x \in \mathcal{M}$. We already showed last week that \mathcal{M} is an algebra, and $\mathcal{M}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ (indeed, if $m^*(Z)=0$ then, $\forall A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ with $m^*(A) \leq +\infty$ one has

$$m^*(A \cap Z) + m^*(A \cap \widetilde{Z}) = m^*(A \cap \widetilde{Z}) \leq m^*(A) \text{ by } \uparrow$$

(zero as $m^* \uparrow \downarrow$ $m^*(E)=0$),

implying that $Z \in \mathcal{M}$)

Next to show that $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$, we need

only show that

$$I_a := (a, +\infty) \in \mathcal{M} \quad \forall a \in \mathbb{R}$$

(Why?). The essential technique^{is} based on the following device:

Any set A is divided into two parts

$$A' := (-\infty, a) \cap A$$

$$A'' := (a, \infty) \cap A$$

together with possibly $\{a\}$.

Now, $\forall A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ ^{with $m^*(A) < +\infty$} $\forall \varepsilon > 0$, \exists COIC

$\{I_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ of A s.t.

$$m^*(A) + \varepsilon > \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \ell(I_n) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \ell(I_n') + \ell(I_n'')$$

$$\geq m^*(A') + m^*(A'')$$

$$= m^*(A \cap (-\infty, a)) + m^*(A \cap (a, \infty))$$

$$= m^*(A \cap (-\infty, a]) + m^*(A \cap (a, \infty))$$

$$= m^*(A \cap \tilde{I}) + m^*(A \cap I),$$

implying that $I \in \mathcal{M}$ as $\varepsilon > 0$ arbitrary.

Therefore $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$. Provided that we can show that \mathcal{M} is indeed an σ -algebra, one then $\tau \subseteq \mathcal{M}$

by the Structure Theorem for open sets

(any open set G can be represented in the form $G = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} I_n$ with countable pairwise disjoint open intervals I_n , you Exercise to show this). To complete the proof of I, we need a series of lemmas. The 1st lemma below extends the definition of measurability of $E \in \mathcal{M}$ to $E_1 := E$ & $E_2 := \bar{E}$

Lemma 1. Let $E_1, E_2, \dots, E_n \in \mathcal{M}$ pairwise disjoint. Then $\forall A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ one has

$$(*) \quad m^*(A \cap \bigcup_{i=1}^n E_i) = \sum_{i=1}^n m^*(A \cap E_i).$$

Pf. By MI, we only do the case when $n=2$.

For this, note that

$$m^*(A \cap (E_1 \cup E_2))$$

$$= m^* \left(\underbrace{(A \cap (E_1 \cup E_2))}_{A \cap E_2} \cap E_2 \right) + m^* \left(\underbrace{(A \cap (E_1 \cup E_2))}_{A \cap E_1} \cap \hat{E}_2 \right) \quad (\because E_2 \in \mathcal{M})$$

$$\quad \quad \quad (\because E_1 \cap \hat{E}_2 = \emptyset)$$

So (*) is established.

Lemma 2. Let $\{E_n: n \in \mathbb{N}\} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ pairwise disjoint.

Then, $\forall A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$

$$m^* \left(A \cap \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i \right) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} m^* (A \cap E_i)$$

Pf. By \uparrow of m^* and Lemma 1.

$$m^* \left(A \cap \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i \right) \geq m^* \left(A \cap \bigcup_{i=1}^n E_i \right) = \sum_{i=1}^n m^* (A \cap E_i)$$

$$\text{So } m^* \left(A \cap \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i \right) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} m^* (A \cap E_i)$$

(d hence equal as m^* is countably subadditive).

Lemma 3. Let $E := \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n$, where $\{E_1, E_2, \dots\}$ is pairwise disjoint family of measurable sets $E_n \in \mathcal{M} \forall n$. Then $E \in \mathcal{M}$.

proof. Let $m^*(A) < +\infty$ and. Since \mathcal{M} is an algebra,

$$\begin{aligned}
m^*(A) &= m^*\left(A \cap \bigcup_{i=1}^n E_i\right) + m^*\left(A \cap \widetilde{\bigcup_{i=1}^n E_i}\right) \\
&\stackrel{L1}{=} \sum_{i=1}^n m^*(A \cap E_i) + \quad " \\
&\geq \sum_{i=1}^n m^*(A \cap E_i) + m^*(A \cap \widetilde{E})
\end{aligned}$$

Letting $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned}
+\infty > m^*(A) &\geq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} m^*(A \cap E_i) + m^*(A \cap \widetilde{E}) \\
&\geq m^*\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} (A \cap E_i)\right) + m^*(A \cap \widetilde{E}) \quad \left(\text{countable subadd. of } m^*\right) \\
&= m^*\left(A \cap \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i\right) + m^*(A \cap \widetilde{E}) \\
&= m^*(A \cap E) + m^*(A \cap \widetilde{E}),
\end{aligned}$$

implying that E is measurable as $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is arbitrary with $m^*(A) < +\infty$ (your Exercise)

Lemma 4. \mathcal{M} is an σ -algebra and

$m := m^*|_{\mathcal{M}}$ is countably additive (letting $A = \mathbb{R}$ in

Lemma 2), so (\mathcal{M}, m) is a measure space

(i.e. \mathcal{M} is an σ -alg and m is a measure), and $\mathcal{M}_0, \tau, \mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$, generalizing $\lambda(I) = m(I) \forall I \in \mathcal{I}$

Th (Littlewood 小术人定理): 几乎所有的 $(\sigma\text{-algebra})$ 集都是好的 (指开集等). For any set $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, the following statements are equivalent:

- (i) $E \in \mathcal{M}$
- (ii) Outer-Regularity: $\forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists \text{ open } G \supseteq E$
s.t. $m^*(G \setminus E) < \varepsilon$.
- (iii) ^(also called) Outer-Regularity: $\exists G_\delta\text{-set } H \supseteq E$ s.t.
s.t. $m^*(H \setminus E) = 0$
- (iv) Inner-Regularity: $\forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists \text{ closed } F \subseteq E$
s.t. $m^*(E \setminus F) < \varepsilon$.
- (v) ^(also called) Inner-regularity: $\exists F_\sigma\text{-set}$
 $K \subseteq E$ s.t. $m^*(E \setminus K) = 0$

Moreover, if $m^*(E) < +\infty$ then each of (i)-(v)

implies

- (vi) $\forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists U := \bigcup_{i=1}^n I_i$, disjoint open intervals I_1, I_2, \dots, I_n
s.t. $m(E \Delta U) < \varepsilon$.

Finally (vi) implies each of (i) — (v).

Thus (vi) is a sufficient condition for $E \in \mathcal{M}$ but not a necessary condition (unless $m(E) < +\infty$).

Proof.

(i) \Rightarrow (ii): As an intermediate step we assume additionally $m^*(E) < +\infty$, so by (i), $m(E) < +\infty$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. By quasi-outer-regularity, $\exists G \in \mathcal{T}$ s.t. $G \supseteq E$ and $m^*(G) < m^*(E) + \varepsilon$, i.e. $m(G) < m(E) + \varepsilon$ (since we now know from I that $G \in \mathcal{M}$). Hence

$$m(G) - m(E) < \varepsilon$$

$$\parallel \\ m(G \setminus E) \quad \left(\begin{array}{l} \because m(G) = m(G \setminus E) + m(E) \\ \text{and } m(E) < +\infty \end{array} \right).$$

Thus (i) \Rightarrow (ii) if $m(E) < +\infty$. In general for $E \in \mathcal{M}$ we have $(\forall n \in \mathbb{N})$ some open

$$G_n \supseteq E \cap [-n, n] \text{ s.t. } m(G_n \setminus (E \cap [-n, n])) < \frac{\varepsilon}{2^n}$$

Let $G := \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} G_n \in \mathcal{T}$, $G \supseteq E$ and

$$G \setminus E \subseteq \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} (G_n \setminus (E \cap [-n, n]))$$

$$\text{so } m(G \setminus E) < \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\varepsilon}{2^n} = \varepsilon.$$

$\therefore (i) \Rightarrow (ii)$ in general

$(i) \Rightarrow (iii)$: By (ii), take open $G_n \supseteq E$

s.t. $m^*(G_n \setminus E) < \frac{1}{n}$. Set $H = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} G_n \supseteq E$.

We have G_δ -set $H \supseteq E$ and

$$m^*(H \setminus E) \leq m^*(G_n \setminus E) < \frac{1}{n} \quad \forall n$$

$$\text{so } m^*(H \setminus E) = 0$$

$(iii) \Rightarrow (i)$: By I, $H \setminus E \in \mathcal{M}$, $H \in \mathcal{M}$ so

$E = H \setminus (H \setminus E) \in \mathcal{M}$ as \mathcal{M} is an algebra

Thus $(i) \Leftrightarrow (ii) \Leftrightarrow (iii)$ ($m^*(E) = m(E)$ if $E \in \mathcal{M}$)

That $(i) \Leftrightarrow (iv) \Leftrightarrow (v)$ then easily follows

e.g. $(i) \Leftrightarrow (iii) \Rightarrow (iv)$: Let $E \in \mathcal{M}$. Then $\tilde{E} \in \mathcal{M}$

and $\forall \varepsilon > 0 \exists$ open $G \supseteq \tilde{E}$ s.t. $m(G \setminus \tilde{E}) < \varepsilon$

$$\parallel \\ m(E \setminus \tilde{G}) < \varepsilon$$

so (iv) holds with closed $F := \tilde{G}$.

$\therefore (i)-(v)$ mutually equivalent

(i) \Rightarrow (vi) Under additional assumption
 $m^*(E) < +\infty$.

Thus let $m(E) < +\infty$. We wish to establish (vi).

Let $\varepsilon > 0$. By Quasi-Outer-Regularity, \exists open $G \supseteq E$

s.t. $m(G) < m(E) + \varepsilon$. (so $m(G \setminus E) < \varepsilon$)

$$G = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} I_n \quad \left(\text{so } \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} m(I_n) < +\infty \right)$$

and take $N \in \mathbb{N}$ s.t.

$$\sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} m(I_n) < \varepsilon$$

Take $U = \bigcup_{n=1}^N I_n$. Then

$$E \Delta U \subseteq (G \setminus E) \cup \left(\bigcup_{n=N+1}^{\infty} I_n \right)$$

of measure $< 2\varepsilon$,

showing (vi)

(vi) \Rightarrow (i). Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $m^*(E \Delta U) < \varepsilon$ where U as in (vi). By Quasi-Outer Regularity, take open $G \supseteq E \Delta U (\supseteq E \setminus U)$ with $m(G) < \varepsilon$. Then $W := G \cup U \in \mathcal{T}$ contains E and

$$W \setminus E \subseteq G \cup (U \setminus E) \subseteq G \cup (U \Delta E) \text{ of outer-meas. } < \varepsilon + \varepsilon = 2\varepsilon$$

Since $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, (i) holds.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cor 1. } \mathcal{M} &= \{B \cup Z : B \in \mathcal{B}, \text{ and } Z \in \mathcal{M}_0\} \\ &= \{B \setminus Z : B \in \mathcal{B}, \text{ and } Z \in \mathcal{M}_0\} \end{aligned}$$

Pf. We now have $\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{M}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{M}$. Conversely let $E \in \mathcal{M}$. Then $\exists G_\delta$ -set $H \supseteq E$ ^(so $H \in \mathcal{B}$) with that

$Z := H \setminus E \in \mathcal{M}$ so $E = H \setminus Z$. Similarly $\exists F_\sigma$ -set

$$K \subseteq E \text{ s.t. } m(E \setminus K) = 0 \text{ and hence } E = \underbrace{(E \setminus K)}_{\mathcal{M}_0} \cup \underbrace{K}_{\mathcal{B}}$$

Cor 2. Define, $\forall A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned} m_*(A) &= \sup \{m(K) : F_\sigma\text{-set } K \subseteq A\} \neq m(A) \text{ if } A \in \mathcal{M} \\ &= \sup \{m(F) : \text{closed } F \subseteq A\}. \quad \left(\text{so } m_*(A) \leq m^*(A) \right) \end{aligned}$$

($m(F) \leq m(E)$ if $F \subseteq E \in \mathcal{M}$ so $\sup \dots \leq m(E)$). Moreover, $\forall \varepsilon > 0$, $m(E) - \varepsilon < m(F)$ for some F

Then $E \in \mathcal{M} \Rightarrow m_*(E) = m(E)$ ^{$\sup \dots$}

and the converse holds provided that $m(A) = m^*(A) < +\infty$

Pf. Suppose $m_*(A) = m^*(A) < +\infty$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Then $\exists F \subseteq A \subseteq G$ with $F \subseteq A \subseteq G$ s.t. with F closed & G open s.t. $m(F) > m_*(A) - \varepsilon$
 $m(G) < m^*(A) + \varepsilon$
 so $m(G \setminus F) = m(G) - m(F) < 2\varepsilon$. Setting $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2^n}$, we have $F_n \subseteq A \subseteq G_n$ $\forall n$.
 Setting

$H := \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} G_n$ and $K := \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \bar{F}_n$ we have $K \subseteq A \subseteq H$
and $H \setminus K \in \mathcal{M}_0$. Hence

$$A = \underbrace{K}_{\in \mathcal{B}} \cup (A \setminus K) \text{ with } K \in \mathcal{M} \text{ \& } A \setminus K (\subseteq H \setminus K) \in \mathcal{M}_0$$

Counter-example: if $m^*(A) = +\infty = m_*(A)$
but not nec. $A \in \mathcal{M}$.

e.g. $A = P \cup (-\infty, 0)$ where $P \subseteq (0, 1)$
non-measurable

Then $m_*(A) = +\infty = m^*(A)$ while $A \notin \mathcal{M}$.

Ex 1. $m^*(I) = l(I) \forall$ interval I .

Sol. Suppose $I = [a, b] (\subseteq \mathbb{R})$ special case. Then

$$I \subseteq \left(a - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, b + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) \quad (\varepsilon > 0) \Rightarrow m^*(I) \leq (b-a) + \varepsilon, \quad \forall \varepsilon > 0.$$

Hence $m^*(I) \leq l(I)$. By the Total length Th, $\forall COI \subset$

$\{I_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ one has $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} l(I_n) \geq l(I)$ so $m^*(I) \geq l(I)$

Done this special case. Moreover, \forall finite

interval I ($l(I) < +\infty$), $\underset{I_n}{\text{one}}$ has $m^*(I) = m^*(\bar{I})$ (why?)

and $l(I) = l(\bar{I})$; it follows from our result on the special case that $m^*(I) = l(I)$.

Finally consider the case when $l(I) = +\infty$.

Then, $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\exists I_n \stackrel{c}{\subset} I$ of length n s.t. $l(I_n) = n$.

Then

$$m^*(I) \geq m^*(I_n) = l(I_n) = n \rightarrow \infty$$

so $m^*(I) = \infty = l(I)$. Done all possible

cases for interval I : $m^*(I) = l(I)$.

Ex 2. Let $I_i = (a_i, b_i)$ ($i=1,2$) and
 $\bar{z} \in I_1 \cap I_2$.

Let $a = \min\{a_1, a_2\}$ and $b = \max\{b_1, b_2\}$.

Suppose $a = a_1$ and $b = b_2$. Then

(#) $(a_1, \bar{z}) \subseteq I_1$ and $(\bar{z}, b_2) \subseteq I_2$

and hence that $(a, b) \subseteq I_1 \cup I_2 \subseteq (a, b)$ (*)

(i.e. $(a, b) = I_1 \cup I_2$). Thus $I_1 \cup I_2$ is

always an interval if they have a common point.

Sol. By assumptions a is the left-end-point of I_1 & $\bar{z} \in I_1$ so $(a, \bar{z}) \subseteq I_1$ so (#) is clear

and hence $(a, b) \subseteq I_1 \cup I_2$ while the 2nd inclusion in (*) is clear by definition of a, b .

The reader should check the last assertion.

Ex 3. Let \mathcal{C} be a collection of open intervals containing a common \bar{z} . Then the union \bigcup^W of members of \mathcal{C} is an interval.

Sol. Let $z_1 < x < z_2$ with $z_1, z_2 \in W$. By ... , it suffices to show that $x \in W$.

To do this, take $I_1, I_2 \in \mathcal{C}$ s.t.
 $z_1 \in I_1, z_2 \in I_2$. Then

$z_1, z_2 \in I_1 \cup I_2$ while $I_1 \cup I_2$

is an interval by Ex. as $\bar{z} \in I_1 \cap I_2$.

It follows from $z_1 < x < z_2$ that $x \in I_1 \cup I_2$
so $x \in W$.

Structure Theorem of Open Sets.:
Any open set G in \mathbb{R} can be expressed
as a disjoint, countable union of open

intervals.

Proof. Let $x \in G$ and let I_x denote the union of all open sets contained in G containing x . Then I_x is the largest open interval (why?) contained in G and containing x . Then $\forall x, y \in G$,

I_x either coincide with I_y or disjoint (as $I_x \cup I_y$ is also

an interval if $I_x \cap I_y \neq \emptyset$).

Thus $\{I_x : x \in G\}$ is a disjoint family with union equal to G ,

it is countable (not

meaning that G is countable).

because ^{from} each I_x : you can
then have a 1-1 map from this
family into \mathbb{Q} .

Ex 4. m^* and m are tran-inv.

Sol. That for m^* was noted

(If $\{I_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ covers A iff
 $\{I_n + x : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \cdots A + x \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}$
 and $\ell(I_n + x) = \ell(I_n)$.)

Suppose $E \in \mathcal{M}$ & $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Then

$E + x = \widetilde{E} + x$. Hence, $\forall A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$

$$m^*(A) = m^*(A \cap E) + m(A \cap \widetilde{E})$$

$$= m^*(A + x \cap (\widetilde{E} + x)) + m^*(A + x \cap (\widetilde{E} + x)),$$

Writing A for $A - x$, it follows
 that

$$m^*(A) = m^*(A \cap (\widetilde{E} + x)) + m^*(A \cap (\widetilde{E} + x))$$

and so $E + x \in \mathcal{M}$.

$\forall A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$

EX 5. $\mathcal{B} + x = \mathcal{B} \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}$.

Sol Easy to check that $\mathcal{B} + x$ is an σ -alg containing $\tau (= \tau + x)$ so

$\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{B} + x$ by the smallest property

of \mathcal{B} . Hence $\mathcal{B} - x \subseteq (\mathcal{B} + x) - x = \mathcal{B}$

$\forall x \in \mathbb{R}$. Replacing $(-x)$ by x , we have

$\mathcal{B} + x \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ (so equal).

3.2. Non-measurable sets

Let $m: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ with
translation-invariant σ -alg. \mathcal{A}
and translation-invariant measure
 m such that $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{A} \subseteq 2^{\mathbb{R}}$
and

$$m(I) = l(I) \quad \forall I \in \mathcal{I}.$$

Then $\mathcal{A} \subsetneq 2^{\mathbb{R}} : \exists P \subseteq \mathbb{R} \text{ d.}$
 $P \notin \mathcal{A}.$

Pf. Defer to the end of our
course.