
Analysis IV
Spring 2011
Exercises 6 / Answers

(1) Show: If E_1 and E_2 are measurable, $E_1 \cup E_2$ is measurable.

Hint. If E_2 is measurable, the condition of Definition 2.7 holds for $A \cap (\mathbb{R} \setminus E_1)$.

* * *

We know that a set $E \subset \mathbb{R}$ is said to be measurable, if for every other set $A \subset \mathbb{R}$ the following holds:¹

$$m^*(A) = m^*(A \cap E) + m^*(A \setminus E).$$

Because we want to show that $E_1 \cup E_2$ is measurable, we want to show that

$$m^*(A) = m^*(A \cap (E_1 \cup E_2)) + m^*(A \setminus (E_1 \cup E_2)).$$

for all $A \subset \mathbb{R}$. As always, we know " \leq " holds (subadditivity), so we only have to show " \geq ".

First, since E_2 is measurable, we have for the set $A \cap (\mathbb{R} \setminus E_1)$, where $A \subset \mathbb{R}$, the following:

$$\begin{aligned} & m^*(A \cap (\mathbb{R} \setminus E_1)) \\ &= m^*(A \cap (\mathbb{R} \setminus E_1) \cap E_2) \\ & \quad + m^*(\underbrace{(A \cap (\mathbb{R} \setminus E_1)) \setminus E_2}_{=A \cap (\mathbb{R} \setminus E_1) \cap (\mathbb{R} \setminus E_2)}). \end{aligned}$$

Second, since $A \cap (E_1 \cup E_2) = (A \cap E_1) \cup (A \cap E_2 \cap (\mathbb{R} \setminus E_1))$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & m^*(A \cap (E_1 \cup E_2)) \\ & \leq m^*(A \cap E_1) + m^*(A \cap E_2 \cap (\mathbb{R} \setminus E_1)). \end{aligned}$$

¹Some books write this as $m^*(A) = m^*(A \cap E) + m^*(A \cap (\mathbb{R} \setminus E))$, which is the same thing written in a different way. Whichever way seems more elegant to you is fine.

Third, since E_1 is measurable,

$$\begin{aligned} & m^*(A \cap (E_1 \cup E_2)) \\ & \quad + m^*(A \cap (\mathbb{R} \setminus E_1) \cap (\mathbb{R} \setminus E_2)) \\ & \leq m^*(A \cap E_1) + m^*(A \cap E_2 \cap (\mathbb{R} \setminus E_1)) \\ & \quad + m^*(A \cap (\mathbb{R} \setminus E_1) \cap (\mathbb{R} \setminus E_2)) \\ & = m^*(A \cap E_1) + m^*(A \cap (\mathbb{R} \setminus E_1)) = m^*(A). \end{aligned}$$

Note. This could be generalized to show $\bigcup_{i=1}^n E_i$ is measurable. The union of countable measurable sets is also measurable, but this would be more difficult to show.

- (2) Assuming (a, ∞) is measurable for all $a \in \mathbb{R}$, show that all other real intervals are measurable.

Hint. Because $E_1 \cap E_2 = \mathbb{R} \setminus ((\mathbb{R} \setminus E_1) \cup (\mathbb{R} \setminus E_2))$, the previous problem and Theorem 2.8 imply that $E_1 \cap E_2$ is measurable.

* * *

It is shown on p. 59 of Royden's book that (a, ∞) is measurable for all $a \in \mathbb{R}$.

- (a) Since every interval (a, ∞) is measurable, their complements, the intervals $(-\infty, a]$, are measurable.
 (b) Since every interval $(-\infty, a]$ is measurable, their countable intersections

$$\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} (-\infty, a + 1/n] = (-\infty, a)$$

are measurable.

- (c) Since every interval $(-\infty, a)$ is measurable, their complements, the intervals $[a, \infty)$, are measurable.
 (d) Since $(-\infty, b)$ and (a, ∞) are measurable for any $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, we know

$$(a, b) = (-\infty, b) \cap (a, \infty)$$

is measurable. Here $a < b$.

- (e) Similarly, the intervals

$$[b, a] = (-\infty, b] \cap [a, \infty)$$

are measurable.

- (3) Assuming $E_n \subset \mathbb{R}$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$, are disjoint, show that

$$m\left(\bigcup_n E_n\right) = \sum_n m(E_n).$$

Hint. Clearly $\bigcup_{i=1}^n E_i \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i$ holds for any finite n .
* * *

1. Proof for $n = 1, 2, \dots, N$. By induction. If $N = 1$, clearly

$$m\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^1 E_n\right) = m(E_1) = \sum_{n=1}^1 m(E_n).$$

Assume the statement holds for $n = N - 1$. In the case $n = N$, since the sets E_n are disjoint, we have

$$\bigcup_{n=1}^N E_n \cap E_N = E_N$$

and

$$\bigcup_{n=1}^N E_n \setminus E_N = \bigcup_{n=1}^{N-1} E_n.$$

Because E_N is measurable,

$$\begin{aligned} m^*\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^N E_n\right) &= m^*\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^N E_n \cap E_N\right) + m^*\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^N E_n \setminus E_N\right) \\ &= m^*(E_N) + m^*\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{N-1} E_n\right) \\ &= m^*(E_N) + \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} m^*(E_n). \end{aligned}$$

2. For any finite n we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n m(E_i) = m\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^n E_i\right) \leq m\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i\right).$$

As the right-hand side does not depend on n ,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} m(E_i) \leq m\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i\right).$$

The opposite inequality comes from subadditivity.

- (4) Let f and g be measurable functions. Show that $\max\{f, g\}$ is a measurable function.

* * *

Because f and g are measurable, $f - g$ is measurable (see Theorem 2.17). Because $f - g$ is measurable, $(f - g)^+$ is measurable. Because g and $(f - g)^+$ are measurable, $g + (f - g)^+$ is measurable.

Since

$$\begin{aligned} g + (f - g)^+ &= g + \max\{f - g, 0\} \\ &= \begin{cases} g + f - g & \text{if } f \geq g \\ g + 0 & \text{if } f < g \end{cases} = \max\{f, g\}, \end{aligned}$$

$\max\{f, g\}$ is measurable.

- (5) Let $f : E \rightarrow \hat{\mathbb{R}}$ be a measurable function. Show that $\{x \in E \mid f(x) = r\}$ is a measurable set.

* * *

Sets $\{x \mid f(x) \geq r\}$ and $\{x \mid f(x) \leq r\}$ are measurable. Their intersection, too.

11. Lemma: *The interval (a, ∞) is measurable.*

Proof: Let A be any set, $A_1 = A \cap (a, \infty)$, $A_2 = A \cap (-\infty, a]$. Then we must show $m^*A_1 + m^*A_2 \leq m^*A$. If $m^*A = \infty$, then there is nothing to prove. If $m^*A < \infty$, then, given $\epsilon > 0$, there is a countable collection $\{I_n\}$ of open intervals which cover A and for which

$$\sum l(I_n) \leq m^*A + \epsilon.$$

Let $I'_n = I_n \cap (a, \infty)$ and $I''_n = I_n \cap (-\infty, a]$. Then I'_n and I''_n are intervals (or empty) and

$$l(I_n) = l(I'_n) + l(I''_n) = m^*I'_n + m^*I''_n.$$

Since $A_1 \subset \bigcup I'_n$, we have

$$m^*A_1 \leq m^*(\bigcup I'_n) \leq \sum m^*I'_n,$$

and, since $A_2 \subset \bigcup I''_n$, we have

$$m^*A_2 \leq m^*(\bigcup I''_n) \leq \sum m^*I''_n.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} m^*A_1 + m^*A_2 &\leq \sum (m^*I'_n + m^*I''_n) \\ &\leq \sum l(I_n) \leq m^*A + \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

But ϵ was an arbitrary positive number, and so we must have $m^*A_1 + m^*A_2 \leq m^*A$. ■