

27. C : Cantor set.

$\Rightarrow C$ is compact, nowhere dense and totally disconnected.
 $\&$ C has no isolated points.

pf) ① C is countable intersection of closed sets $\Rightarrow$ closed.
 $\&$ bounded

$\therefore C$ is compact ($\odot$ closed & bounded subset of $\mathbb{R}$).

② $\forall x, y \in C$ with $x < y$.

$$\exists n \ni \frac{1}{3^{n+1}} < y - x \Rightarrow x < \frac{j}{3^{n+1}} < \frac{j+1}{3^{n+1}} < y.$$

for some j

$$\Rightarrow \left(\frac{j}{3^{n+1}}, \frac{j+1}{3^{n+1}} \right) \cap C = \emptyset.$$

$$\therefore \exists z \in \left(\frac{j}{3^{n+1}}, \frac{j+1}{3^{n+1}} \right) \& x < z < y. \quad z \notin C.$$

This shows C is totally disconnected.

and also C can not contain any open interval

$$\Rightarrow \text{interior of } C = \emptyset.$$

$\Rightarrow C$ is nowhere dense.

③ let $x \in C$. Then there are two cases.

$$(i) \quad x = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j \frac{1}{3^j} \quad \text{with } a_j \neq 1 \text{ for all } j \text{ and}$$

$a_j = 2$ for infinitely many j 's

Define $x_n = \sum_{j=1}^n a_j \frac{1}{3^j} \in \mathbb{C}$ and $x_n \rightarrow x$

(ii) $x = \sum_{j=1}^k a_j \frac{1}{3^j}$ for some k and $a_k = 2$.

Define $x_n = \sum_{j=1}^k a_j \frac{1}{3^j} + \frac{2}{3^n}$ for $n > k$.

Then $x_n \in \mathbb{C}$ and $x_n \rightarrow x$.

$\therefore \mathbb{C}$ has no isolated points.

20. F : increasing and right continuous. μ_F : associated measure.

Then.

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_F(\{a\}) &= \mu_F\left(\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} (a - \frac{1}{n}, a]\right) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_F\left((a - \frac{1}{n}, a]\right) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F(a) - F(a - \frac{1}{n}) \\ &= F(a) - F(a^-). \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_F([a, b)) &= \mu_F(\{a\} \cup (a, b)) = \mu_F(\{a\}) + \mu_F((a, b)) \\ &= \mu_F(\{a\}) + \mu_F((a, b] \setminus \{b\}) \\ &= \mu_F(\{a\}) + \mu_F((a, b]) - \mu_F(\{b\}) \\ &= F(a) - F(a^-) + F(b) - F(a) - F(b) + F(b^-) \\ &= F(b^-) - F(a^-) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_F([a, b]) &= \mu_F([a, b] \cup (a, b]) = \mu_F([a, b]) + \mu_F((a, b]) \\ &= F(a) - F(a^-) + F(b) - F(a) \\ &= F(b) - F(a^-).\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_F([a, b]) &= \mu_F([a, b] \cup [b, c]) = \mu_F([a, b]) + \mu_F([b, c]) \\ &= F(b) - F(a) + F(c) - F(b) \\ &= F(c) - F(a).\end{aligned}$$

29. E : Lebesgue measurable set.

a. If $E \subset \mathbb{N}$, N in $\mathcal{S}$, then $m(E) = 0$.

pf) let $R = \mathbb{Q} \cap [0, 1]$ and for each $r \in R$.

define,

$$E_r = \{x+r; x \in E \cap [0, 1-r]\} \cup \{x+r-1; x \in E \cap [1-r, 1]\}.$$

$\Rightarrow E_r$: measurable subset of $[0, 1]$ for all $r \in R$.

and $E_r \cap E_s = \emptyset$ if $r \neq s$.

moreover, $m(E) = m(E_r)$ for all $r \in R$. Since m is translation invariant.

let $F = \bigcup_{r \in R} E_r \Rightarrow F \subset [0, 1] \text{ \& measurable.}$

with

$$m(F) = m\left(\bigcup_{r \in R} E_r\right) = \sum_{r \in R} m(E_r) = \sum_{r \in R} m(E) \leq 1$$

$\therefore m(E) = 0$ (otherwise $m(F) = \infty < 1$ ~~*~~).

b. If $m(E) > 0$, then E contains a non measurable set.

(pf). Without loss of generality, we can assume $E \subset [0, 1]$.

$$\Rightarrow E = \bigcup_{r \in \mathbb{R}} E \cap N_r.$$

if $E \cap N_r$ is measurable for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$. Then.

$$m(E) = m\left[\bigcup_{r \in \mathbb{R}} (E \cap N_r)\right] = \sum_{r \in \mathbb{R}} m(E \cap N_r) = \sum_{r \in \mathbb{R}} 0 = 0.$$

(From a. $m(E \cap N_r) = 0$.)

but $m(E) > 0$. (~~*~~).

$\therefore$ at least one of $E \cap N_r$ should be non-measurable.

Problem 1.5.

1. μ : locally finite Borel measure on $\mathbb{R}$.

$$g(x) = \begin{cases} -\mu(x, 0] & \text{if } x < 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } x = 0 \\ \mu(0, x] & \text{if } x > 0. \end{cases}$$

g is non decreasing ; Trivial from the definition of g .

$$\inf_{x > a} g(x) = g(a) ; \quad \text{if } \underline{a} > 0$$

$$g(a) = \mu(0, a] = \mu\left(\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} (0, a + \frac{1}{n}]\right)$$

$$= \lim_{n \rightarrow 0} g(a + \frac{1}{n}) - 0$$

$$\therefore g(a) = \inf_{\lambda > a} g(\lambda) \quad (\textcircled{1} + g \text{ is nondecreasing}).$$

$$2. a = 0.$$

$$3. a < 0$$

Can be proved similarly.

2. a.

$$\mu_0 E = \sum_{j=1}^k [g(b_j) - \lim_{\lambda \downarrow a_j} g(\lambda)]$$

$$= \sum_{j=1}^k [g(b_j) - g(a_j)] \quad \leftarrow \textcircled{1} \quad g \text{ is right-continuous.}$$

$$\text{if } E = \cup (a_j, b_j]$$

$$\mu_0 E = \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} [g(b_j) - \lim_{\lambda \downarrow a_j} g(\lambda)] + \lim_{\lambda \uparrow \infty} (g(\lambda) - g(a_k))$$

$$= \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} [g(b_j) - g(a_j)] + \lim_{\lambda \uparrow \infty} (g(\lambda) - g(a_k)).$$

Then μ_0 is a premeasure. ; Almost same as Lebesgue measure
 $\Rightarrow$ Easy.

b. There is a unique (locally finite) Borel measure μ_g on $\mathbb{R}$
 such that $\mu_g(a, b] = g(b) - g(a).$

pf) Not base.

pf) let ν_g be another Borel measure on $\mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\nu_g((a, b]) = g(b) - g(a).$$

$\Rightarrow$ I want to show $\mu_g(B) = \nu_g(B)$ for all Borel sets B .

Since Borel Algebra is generated by open sets, it is enough to show

$$\mu_g(O) = \nu_g(O) \text{ for all open sets } O$$

and every open set $O = \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} I_j$, I_j : open interval.

in $\mathbb{R}$

$\Rightarrow$ It is enough to show that

$$\mu_g(I) = \nu_g(I) \text{ for all open intervals } I.$$

(i) $I = (a, b)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_g((a, b)) &= \mu_g((a, b] \setminus \{b\}) = \mu_g((a, b]) - \mu_g(\{b\}) \\ &= g(b) - g(a) - \mu_g\left(\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} (b - \frac{1}{n}, b]\right) \\ &= g(b) - g(a) - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_g((b - \frac{1}{n}, b]) \\ &= g(b) - g(a) - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} [g(b) - g(b - \frac{1}{n})] \\ &= \nu_g((a, b]) - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu_g((b - \frac{1}{n}, b]) \\ &= \nu_g((a, b]) - \nu_g\left(\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} (b - \frac{1}{n}, b]\right) \end{aligned}$$

$$= \mu_g([a, b]) - \mu_g(\{b\}) = \mu_g([a, b)).$$

(2). $I = (a, \infty)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_g((a, \infty)) &= \mu_g\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} (a, a+n]\right) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_g((a, a+n]) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (g(a+n) - g(a)) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_g((a, a+n]) \\ &= \mu_g(a, \infty) \end{aligned}$$

From (1), (2). $\mu_g = \nu_g$ as a Borel measure.

3. Lebesgue - Stieltjes measures are Borel regular.

pf. Refer Theorem 1.1f.

