

**TERENCE TAO'S "AN EPSILON OF ROOM"  
CHAPTER 2 EXERCISES**

KELLER VANDEBOGERT

1. EXERCISE 1.2.1

Let  $s_n$  be an increasing sequence of simple functions tending to  $g$ .

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_X s_n dm_f &= \int_X \sum_i a_i \chi_{X_i} dm_f \\ &= \sum_i a_i \int_{X_i} f dm \\ &= \sum_i a_i \int_X \chi_{X_i} f dm \\ &= \int_X s_n f dm \end{aligned}$$

Letting  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , the monotone convergence theorem yields

$$\int_X g dm_f = \int_X g f dm$$

2. EXERCISE 1.2.2

If  $f = g$  a.e, then,

$$\int_X (f - g) dm = 0 \implies \int_X f dm = \int_X g dm$$

So that  $m_f = m_g$ . Conversely, suppose  $m_f = m_g$ . By  $\sigma$ -finiteness, it is of no loss of generality to assume  $m(X) < \infty$ . If  $f \neq g$  a.e, we can find a set of positive measure such that  $f - g > \epsilon > 0$ , in which case we

would see that  $m_f - m_g$  would also have to be positive, a contradiction. The result follows.

Choose any singleton set  $X$  with the discrete topology, and define  $\mu(X) = \infty$  and  $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$ . Given any two distinct  $f, g : X \rightarrow Y$ , we see that  $m_f = m_g = \infty$ , but  $f$  and  $g$  are not equal.

### 3. EXERCISE 1.2.3

Define  $\frac{d\mu}{dm}(x) := f(x)$ . Let  $\epsilon > 0$ , and choose  $h$  small enough such that  $|f(x + h) - f(x)| < \epsilon$ . Consider then:

$$\begin{aligned} |\mu([x, x + h] - f(x)h)| &= \left| \int_{[x, x+h]} d\mu - f(x)m([x, x + h]) \right| \\ &= \left| \int_{[x, x+h]} f(y)dm(y) - \int_{[x, x+h]} f(x)dm(y) \right| \\ &\leq \int_{[x, x+h]} |f(y) - f(x)|dm(y) \\ &< \epsilon h \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

As  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ . Hence, by definition of derivative,  $f(x) = \frac{d}{dx}\mu([0, x])$ .

### 4. EXERCISE 1.2.4

Let  $X$  be at most countable with measure  $\mu$  on the discrete  $\sigma$ -algebra.

Using the fact that  $\int_{\{x\}} d\# = 1$ , choose  $A \subset X$  arbitrary:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_A d\mu &= \int_A \int_{\{x\}} d\# d\mu \\ &= \int_{\{x\}} \int_A d\mu d\# \quad (\text{Fubini's}) \\ &= \int_{\{x\}} \sum_{x \in A} \int_{\{x\}} d\mu d\# \\ &= \sum_{x \in A} \int_{\{x\}} \int_{\{x\}} d\mu d\# \end{aligned}$$

From which we immediately deduce that  $\frac{d\mu}{d\#}(x) = \mu(\{x\})$ , so our derivative exists.

### 5. EXERCISE 1.2.5

Let  $\mu$  be a signed measure. Decompose  $X = X_+ \cup X_-$  as asserted by the Hahn decomposition theorem. Define  $\mu_+ := \mu|_{X_+}$ ,  $\mu_- := -\mu|_{X_-}$ . Clearly  $\mu = \mu_+ - \mu_-$ , it remains to prove uniqueness. Suppose that two such decompositions exists, that is,

$$\mu_+ - \mu_- = \eta_+ - \eta_-$$

for some other measures  $\eta_+$ ,  $\eta_-$ . By evaluating on all subsets on  $X_+$  and  $X_-$ , mutual singularity guarantees that  $\mu_+ = \eta_+$  and  $\mu_- = \eta_-$ , so uniqueness is immediate.

### 6. EXERCISE 1.2.6

Suppose for sake of contradiction there exists some other measure  $\eta$  such that

$$-|\mu| < -\eta \leq \mu \leq \eta < |\mu|$$

Evaluating on  $X_+$  and  $X_-$ , respectively, we find that

$$\mu(X_+) \leq \eta(X_+) < \mu_+(X_+) = \mu(X_+)$$

$$-\mu(X_-) = -\mu_-(X_-) < -\eta(X_-) \leq \mu(X_-)$$

These contradictions imply that no such measure can exist.

### 7. EXERCISE 1.2.7

Since  $\mu$  is bounded by  $|\mu|$ ,  $\mu$  being infinite implies that  $|\mu|$  is infinite. Conversely, if  $\mu$  is infinite, then either  $\mu_-$  or  $\mu_+$  is infinite, in which case  $\mu$  must also be infinite.

Taking contrapositives yields  $|\mu| < \infty \iff \mu_-, \mu_+ < \infty$ .

### 8. EXERCISE 1.2.8

Suppose that  $\mu$  is  $\sigma$ -finite. Choose a sequence of finite measure subsets  $E_n$  increasing to  $X$ , so that there exists  $f_n$  such that  $\int_{\bigcup_{i=1}^n} d\mu = \int_{\bigcup_{i=1}^n} f_n dm + \mu_{ns}$ . Letting  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , suppose  $f_n \rightarrow f$ . The monotone convergence theorem yields

$$\int_X d\mu = \int_X f dm + \mu_s$$

We see that  $\mu_s \perp m$ , since  $\mu_{ns} \perp m$  for every  $n$ , whence the result follows.

### 9. EXERCISE 1.2.9

Define  $D := \{x \in X \mid \mu(\{x\}) > 0\}$ . By  $\sigma$ -finiteness, this set is countable, so we can enumerate  $D = \{x_1, x_2, \dots\}$ . If  $D$  is empty, we can take  $\mu_{pp} \equiv 0$  and employ the Radon-Nikodym-Lebesgue theorem.

Assume now that  $D \neq \emptyset$ , and define

$$\mu_{pp} := \sum_n \mu(\{x_n\}) \chi_{\{x_n\}}$$

and set  $\mu_c = \mu - \mu_{pp}$ . By construction,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_c(\{x\}) &= \mu(\{x\}) - \mu_{pp}(\{x\}) \\ &= \mu(\{x\}) - \mu(\{x\}) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

So that  $\mu_c$  is continuous. Now, by the Radon-Nikodym-Lebesgue theorem, there exists some  $f \in L^1(X, m)$  such that  $\mu_c = m_f + \mu_{sc}$ . Note that  $m_f$  is a continuous measure, and we deduce that  $\mu_{sc}$  must be continuous with  $m_f \perp \mu_{sc}$ . Hölder's inequality immediately gives that  $\mu_f \ll m$ , so we can set  $m_f := \mu_{ac}$ , and deduce that

$$\mu = \mu_{ac} + \mu_{sc} + \mu_{pp}$$

As desired.

#### 10. EXERCISE 1.2.10

Assume first that the function  $f(x) := \mu([0, x])$  is continuous. In view of the Hahn decomposition theorem, we may assume that  $\mu$  is unsigned. Since  $\{x\} \subset [x, x + h]$  for every  $h > 0$ ,

$$\mu(\{x\}) \leq \mu([x, x + h])$$

for all  $h$ . Letting  $h \rightarrow 0$ , we find that  $\mu(\{x\}) = 0$ .

Conversely, argue by contraposition. If  $\mu([0, x])$  is not continuous at some  $x \in X$ , we can find  $\epsilon > 0$  such that

$$\mu([x, x + h]) \geq \epsilon$$

for all  $h > 0$ . Discretizing,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu([x, x + 1/n]) = \mu(\{x\}) \geq \epsilon > 0$$

so that  $\mu(\{x\}) > 0$  for some  $x \in X$ .