Math 564: Real analysis and measure theory Lecture

Theorem. Finite Bord weasures on Polish spaces are tight.

froof (whinned). For a Polish space X and a finite Borel measure μ on X, it is enough to show that for each $\xi \neq 0$ there is a compact $K \subseteq X$ with $\mu(K) \approx \mu(X)$. Fix $\xi > 0$.

Let $\Sigma_n := \frac{1}{n}$ and for each $n \in \mathbb{N}^{d}$, let $\{B_{\xi}^{\Sigma}\}_{\xi \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a all cover if X with closed balls of radius $\xi \Sigma_n$ (such a cover exists by separability). Because $X = \mathcal{D}(\bigcup B_{\xi}^{\Sigma n})$, we have $\mu(X) \approx_{\xi \in \mathbb{N}^{d}} (M + \mathbb{N}^{d})$ for a large enough, by monotone conveyence. Put $G_{\xi}^{\Sigma n} (M + \mathbb{N}^{d})$ so $G_{\xi}^{\Sigma n} (M + \mathbb{N}^{d})$ and $G_{\xi}^{\Sigma n} (M + \mathbb{N}^{d})$ and $G_{\xi}^{\Sigma n} (M + \mathbb{N}^{d})$ be a compact. Finally, $G_{\xi}^{\Sigma n} (M + \mathbb{N}^{d}) \in \mathcal{M}(M + \mathbb{N}^{d}) \in \mathcal{M}(M + \mathbb{N}^{d}) \in \mathcal{M}(M + \mathbb{N}^{d}) \in \mathcal{M}(M + \mathbb{N}^{d}) = 0$.

Cor (Strong regularity and hightness for locally time measures). Ut X be a Polish space. Then every locally finite Bonel measure on X is strongly regular and hight.

Proof. Polish spaces are 2nd MI, so local finiferess is equiv. to o-finiteness by open sets, i.e. X = V Un with each Un open and Finite measure. Thus, p is ifragely regular by a previous result for metric spaces and we only need to show tightness.

From DST (duscriptive set Meon), we know that open subsets of Polish spaces are Polish (with a different equivalent metric), so on each Un, we know that p is tight.

We leave the rest of the proof as HW

Measurable functions

Note let (X, X) and (Y, Y) be measurable spaces. A function $f: X \to Y$ is said to be:

(a) (X, T)-measurable if $f^{-1}(T) \in X$ for every $J \in Y$.

- (b) I-measurable (or just measurable if I is elear from the context) if Y is a metric space and f is (I, B(4)-measurable. and f is (I, B(4)-measurable.
- (c) Borel if X and Y are metric spaces and Fis (B(X), B(Y))-neasurable.

 (d) p-neasurable if p is a negsure on (X, I), Y is a metric space and

 f is Measy-neconcable, i.e. f (B) is p-neas for each Book B = Y,

Remark For functions folk -> IR we will view the left IR as the nearest space (IR, B(IR), s) and the right IR as a metric space, so the debrition of &-neastrable (or laberque measurable) is asymmetric: f (Bevel) is to measurable. This done because to get more fucifions be called measurable since the theory works for hem.

Prop. Let (K, X) and (Y, J) be measurable spaces and $f: X \to Y$, If for some $J_o \leq I$ which generates I as a J-algebra, we have $f^{-1}(J_o) \in X$ for all $J_o \in Y_o$, then f is (I, T)-meacurable.

Proof Let S := { Je J: f'(J) e X} and observe that S = 70 and S is a realget ra since preimages respect unions and complements. Here S= J.

Loc. Let (K, X) be a necessible upon (K, X) be a netric space, and let $f:X \to Y$. If $f^{-1}(V) \in X$ for each open $V \subseteq Y$, then f is \mathcal{X} -necessionable. In particular, workingous tructions are Borel broken $f^{-1}(open)$ is open.

The following is one of the reasons for building reasons throng.

Theorem. Pointwise limite of meach rable functions are measurable. More precisely, if (X, I) is a measurable space and Y is a separable metric space (e.g. R) then limbo is I-mersicable be any sequence of I-mersicable facilions

for X -> Y for lind linfo(x) exists for each x EX.

Roof By the last woollary, it is enough to show that for (U) & I for each open U & Y.
Note that the onemers of I gives the following: for XEX,
Note that he openness of U gives he following: for x ∈ X, $f(x) \in U \implies \forall n \ f_n(x) \in U \qquad (\forall n := \exists m \ \forall n \ge m)$
If the converse were also true, we would be done becase the
$f'(u) = \bigcup_{m \in IN} \int_{r_m} f_m(u)$
But the converse is in't have, for example, let $U=(0,1) \subseteq IR$ and $f_n(x):=\frac{1}{n}$, so
fulx) & U for all u, but the limit is O&U. The converse holds for closed sets
but U is open. However, wing reparability, we can find a presentation of U, which
behaves as both open and closed:
l e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e
Claim. UV k = U = UV k box some open V & SY.
KEW KCIN
Proof. Let DEY Le a Mb deux set and let 29:= {Byn (y): y & D, n & (N) , Byn (y)
€ UB, 10 P is old. Note hat if V∈ V, the V∈ U by detinition, so
it is enough to show Ut U = V V. Fix y EU, hence By (g) E y for large
emount well let well such that is with the let escire ye By (u)
Byz(5) = By (5) = U, 10 Byz(5) & D. Hence ye V.
UED (Claim)
We now finally have: Yx EX, f(x) & U <=> Jk Yn fa(x) & Vk.
Proof of =>: {(x) & (l = U) V x => 7 (x f(x) & V x => } } (x f(x) & V x => } } \frac{1}{2} (x) & \frac
Proof of La: 3k Yn fr(x) E Vk => 7k f(x) E Vk (by closedness of Vk) => f(x) EU.
\sim 1/\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \
Thus, $f^{-1}(V) = V \cup \bigcap_{k \in U} \bigcap_{k \in W} f^{-1}(V_k) \in \mathcal{X}$.

Prop. Let X, Y de metric spaces, where Y is 2rd Ml (e.g., Polish). Let p be a strong-

- ly regular Borel neasure on X (e.g. a livide neasure or T-file by open sets). Let F: X -5 Y be a princesurable function. Then
- (a) fix Bonel on a conull Bonel set, i.e. $f(x) : X' \rightarrow Y$ is a Bonel function for some conull Bonel X'. (Note: $B(x') = \{B \in Y(X) : B \leq X'\}$.)
- (b) Luzin's theorem 4270, fis workingers on a closed set C with $\mu(X \setminus C) < 2$, i.e. $flc: C \rightarrow Y$ is workingers.
- Proof Let Yu] Lew be Abl basis for Y, so it generates B(Y) as a realgebra.
- (a) $f^{-1}(V_n)$ is f-neasurable, had $f^{-1}(V_n) =_p B_n$ for some Bonel $B_n \subseteq X$.

 Let $Z := V (f^{-1}(V_n) \triangle B_n)$, so, Z is well, here $Z \subseteq Z$ there $Z \subseteq X$ to Bonel new and still wall. Pat $X' := X \setminus Z$, so X' is Bonel and concll. Then $\{f|_{X_i}\}^{-1}(V_n) =_p f^{-1}(V_n) \land X' =_p B_n \land X'$, which is Bonel.

 So $\{f|_{X_i}$ is Bonel.
- (6) $f^{-1}(V_N)$ is μ -measurable, hence by strong only regularity, $\exists U_n \subseteq X$ open such that $d\mu(U_n, f^{-1}(V_n)) := \mu(U_n \Delta f^{-1}(V_n)) \le \Sigma \cdot 2^{-(n+2)}$ (in fact, $U_n \ge f^{-1}(V_n)$, but we don't need this). Let $\xi := \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} U_n \Delta f^{-1}(V_n)$ so $\mu(\xi) \le \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \zeta \cdot 2^{-(n+2)} = \frac{\xi}{\xi}$. Again by only regularity, there is an open set $\widetilde{Z} \ge 2$ with $\mu(\widetilde{\xi} \setminus \widetilde{\xi}) \le \frac{5}{2}$, so $\mu(\widetilde{\xi}) \le \xi$. Take $C := X \setminus \widetilde{\xi}$, so it's closed and $\mu(X \setminus C) \le \Sigma$. Furthermore:

so (flc) (Vn) = f'(Vn) A (= Un A C, so (flc) (Vn) is open relative to C and hence flc is continuous.