Homework 3 Solutions

C Katy Craig, 2024

 \bigcirc First, suppose $\mu^*(A) = +\infty$. Then we must have $\mu(B) = +\infty$ for all B s.t. $A \subseteq B$, $B \notin \mathcal{A}$. In particular, $B = \chi$ atlains the infimum.

Now, suppose u*(A) <+00. Take a minimizing sequence, that is a sequence Bn s.t.) A = Bn, Bn + cd and u(Bn)<+00 HnelN. WLOG, we may assume





Thus, equality must hold throughout, so Cathains the minimum.

(b) To see $\mu^{*}(\phi)=0$, take B=0 in the definition of μ^{*} . If ESF, then the constraintset for F (i.e. the collection of sets { Bifing GAS.t. F= VBi) is contained in the constraintset for E. Thus, the inflower the larger set is smaller: $\mu^*(E) = \mu^*(F)$. Fix EA; Si=1 = 2^x. Choose EB; Si=1=cA that attain the minimum in the definof u*(Ai). Then, since $\bigcup_{i=1}^{+\infty} A_i \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{+\infty} B_i \in A_i$, $\stackrel{+\infty}{\underset{i=1}{+\infty}} (\bigcup_{i=1}^{+\infty} A_i) \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{+\infty} Countable subadditivity of <math>M$ $M^*(\bigcup_{i=1}^{+\infty} A_i) \subseteq \mu(\bigcup_{i=1}^{+\infty} B_i) \subseteq \sum_{i=1}^{+\infty} \mu(B_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{+\infty} \mu(A_i).$ This shows no is an outer measure. (c) Suppose A∈cA. Fix arbitrary E = X. Choose F that attains the minimum in the defn of u^{*}(E). Then, $\mu^{*}(E) = \mu(F) = \mu(F \cap A) + \mu(F \cap A^{c})$ FOA ECA FOACEEA
ENASFOA ENACSEDAC (\mathcal{K}) = m(ENA) + m(ENA)

so A is μ^* -measurable. Choosing E=A, in equation (#), we obtain $\mu^{*}(A) = \mu(F \cap A) + \mu(F \cap A^{c}) \ge \mu(A).$ = $\mu(A)$, since $E \in F$ The opposite inequality is true by defn of No. choose Bi=B, Bn=@ Un>1 d) By definition, $\tilde{\mu}^*(A) \leq \mu^*(A)$, so it suffices to show the opposite inequality. Fix $A \subseteq X$. Choose $\{B_i\}_{i=1}^{+\infty} \subseteq A$ s.t. $A \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} B_i$. Then, $+\infty$ countable subadditudy $\sum_{i=1}^{+\infty} \mu(B_i) \ge \mu(\bigcup_{i=1}^{+\infty} B_i) \ge \mu^*(A)$. Taking the infimum over the left hand side gives the result.

Define M:= sup{ µ* (B): B ≤ A, Bµ*-meas. (X) Since µ*(A)<+00, monotonicity ensures M<+00. Furthermore, since u*(B)ZOYB, we have m zO. Let Bn be a maximizing sequence, that is Bn SA, Bn ut - meas Vn E/N and lim ut (Bn) = M. Define B = UBn. Then B is μ^* -measurable $B \leq A$, and $Bn \leq B$. Thus $M \geq \mu^*(B) \geq \mu^*(Bn)$. Taking limits gives, $M \ge \mu^*(B) \ge \lim_{n \to \infty} \mu^*(Bn) = M.$ Thus, B atlains the maximum in (*).

Consider the set S = A \ B. Since B is permeasurable and A=SUB, Smust not be u*-measurable, or else A would be, too. Thus, u* (S)>0. Suppose TZS and Tis ut-measurable. Then BUTS A and BUT is ut-measurable, so by definition of M, $M \ge \mu^{*}(BUT)$. On the other hand, by the imeasurability of B, of 15, $M^{2}\mu^{*}(BUT) = \mu^{*}(BUT)AB + \mu^{*}(BUT)AB^{c})$ JT = A B $=\mu^{\ast}(B)+\mu^{\ast}(T)$ $=M+\mu^{*}(T).$ Thus, $\mu^*(T) = 0$.

CLAIM: If pige 6, pzg, then A+p NA+g=0 Pfol CLAIM: Suppose Ix EAtplAtg. Then x=a-p=az-q for a, az EA, a, Faz. This contradicts the definition of A as a set with the property that for every XEIR, there is exactly one y EA s.t. x-y EQ. By (LAIM, V A+q is a disjoint union and (0, 1] = U A+q geo By countable stadditivity, and translation invariance of Lebesque outer measure, $1 = \lambda^{*}((0, 1)) \leq \lambda^{*}(\bigcup A + q) = \sum \lambda^{*}(A + q) = \sum \lambda^{*}(A)$ Thus, 2(A) =0.



By countable additivity, monotonicity, and translation invariance of Lebesgue measure, $\frac{2}{2}\lambda(5) = \frac{2}{2}\lambda(5+\frac{1}{n}) = \lambda(\frac{0}{2}S+\frac{1}{n}) = \lambda((-1,2)=3)$ n=1 S+れ SA+れ SEO1]+れ Thus, 2(5)=0

© Suppose A were Lebesque measurable. Then part @ ensures 2(A)=0. This is a contradiction.



ⓐ WTS EEMbre (=> J AECAS.t. E⊆A, u*(A\E)=0. First, we show "E" Fix SSX. Then, for all 2>0, 7 BE EAS.t. SSBE and $\mu^*(S) \ge \mu(B_{\mathcal{E}}) - \varepsilon$ additivity of M = M(BENA) + M(BENA) - E $= \mu^*(B_{\epsilon} \cap A) + \mu^*(B_{\epsilon} \cap A) - \epsilon$ $= \mu^*(S \cap E) + \mu^*(S \cap A^c) - E$ $= \mu^*(S \cap E) + \mu^*(S \cap E') - \epsilon$. (\mathcal{K}) where the last inequality follows from the fact that subadd $\mu^*(S \cap E^{\circ}) \leq \mu^*(S \cap A^{\circ}) + \mu^*(S \cap E^{\circ} \cap A)$ $=\mu^*(S\cap A^c) + \mu^*(A \setminus E)$. O by assumption

Sending E=0 in (#) shows EE My.

Now, we show "=>". Choose B that attains the infimum in the definition of the outer measure (see HW3, Q2(a)), so

 $E \subseteq B$, $B \in CA$, $\mu^*(E) = \mu(B)$.

Then, $\mu(B) = \mu(B(E) + \mu(B(E))$ $= \mu^{*}(E) + \mu^{*}(B \setminus E).$ If u*(E)<+2, this gives the result. Finally, suppose $\mu^*(E) = +\infty$. Since $(\mu is \circ - finite, there exist$ $<math>\Xi E_i \overline{S_i} = i \in CA$ s.t. $\bigcup E_i = \chi$ and $\mu(E_i) < +\infty$.

By monotonicity, u*(ENEi) = i(Ei)=u(Ei)=u, and since ex)= mu* (HW3, QZ(c)), ENEIEMAN. By what we have just shown, J & Aizi=1=cAs.t. EINE SA: and $() = \mu^{*}(Ai \setminus (E: \cap E)) = \mu^{*}(A: \cap (E: \cup E^{c})).$ subadd $\mu^{*}(A \setminus E) = \mu^{*}(A \cap E^{c}) = \sum_{i} \mu^{*}(A_{i} \cap E^{c})$ monotonicity $\leq \sum_{i} \mu^{*}(A_{i} \cap (E_{i}^{c} \cup E^{c}))$ $= 0^{i}.$ \mathcal{D}



Thus ACEE and E=ACU(ELAS)

Furthermore, by HWZ, Q2(b), $\exists N \in A$ s.t. $E \setminus A^{c} \subseteq N$ and $\mu(N) = \mu^{*}(E \setminus A^{c}) = 0$.

This shows EE {AUB: AED and BENFORNED. Conversely, if E = AUB, for Aand B as above then defining F = AUN, we see E = F, $F \in A$ and $\mu^{*}(F \setminus E) = \mu^{*}((AUN) \cap (A^{c} \cap B^{c}))$ $=\mu^{*}(N\cap(A^{c}\cap B^{c}))$ $\leq \mu^*(N)$ $= \mu(N)$ =0, so E « Mu » by part@. (c) By 62/d), it is clear that $\mu_{\mathsf{F}}^{*}(\mathsf{A}) \stackrel{2}{=} \mu^{*}(\mathsf{A}),$ since we may take the Bi to be half open intervals. On the other hard, for any BZA, BEBR,

 $\mu_F^*(A) \leq \mu_F^*(B) = \mu(B).$ Taking the infimum over all such B gives $\mu_F^*(A) \leq \mu^*(A).$ (\mathbf{D}) (a) Define $\mathcal{F} = \{(a, too]: a \in \mathbb{R}\}$. We seek to show $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}} = \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{F})$. First, we show $B_{\overline{R}} = \mathcal{M}(\overline{\mathcal{F}}_{1})$. Fix $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ open It suffices to show UEM(F). Note that $\Lambda(i, +\infty] = \{+\infty\} \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{F})$. Likewise, $\left[\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \left[-i, +\infty \right] \right]^{c} \stackrel{i=1}{=} \left[\{-\infty\} \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{F}) \right]$. Thus, $(a, +\infty) = (a, +\infty) \setminus \{+\infty\} \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{F})$. By Q4 BR $\in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{F})$. Since $\xi + \infty, -\infty \xi = \xi \chi \in \mathbb{R} : -\infty < x < +\infty \xi$ is closed, UN Eta, - 203 is open in TR, hence open in TR. Thus

UZEBR GM(F1)

Thus, if {+a, -a} nu = \$, we are lone.

On the other hand, if either or both are in U we can use that Et al E-al E M(F) and that M(F) is closed under finite unions to obtain $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{F})$.

Conversely, to show Mb(F) & BR, it suffices to observe that all the sets in Frare open.

(b)First note that d:= EEER: ENREBRS is a or-algebra • IFAEOU, then ACMR = ((RUEtw3UE-w3)\A) MR = IRLA = IRL (ANIR) E BIR, since ANIRE BIR and 5-algebras are closed uncler complements. • If EAisiEiGH, then (FEI Ai) NR = E, (AINR) EBR, since AinREBR VielN and 5-algebras are dosed under countable unions.





Furthermore, YaeR, (a, +a) = [a, +00] NRECL. Thus BBECL.

