

## Lecture 28

### Absolute continuity

Def. If  $\nu$  signed,  $\mu$  positive measures on  $(X, \mathcal{M})$ , then  $\nu \ll \mu$  (absolutely continuous w.r.t.  $\mu$ ) provided

$$\mu(E) = 0 \Rightarrow \nu(E) = 0. \quad (\Rightarrow E \text{ null for } \nu)$$

Rem.  $\nu \ll \mu \Leftrightarrow |\nu| \ll \mu \Leftrightarrow \nu^+, \nu^- \ll \mu$ . (HW)

Thm 1. Assume  $\nu$  finite, signed and  $\mu$  positive measures. Then

$$\nu \ll \mu \Leftrightarrow \forall \varepsilon > 0 \exists \delta > 0 \text{ s.t. } \mu(E) < \delta \Rightarrow |\nu|(E) < \varepsilon.$$

Pf. Suffices to consider the special case where  $\nu$  also positive. " $\Leftarrow$ " is obvious. We prove " $\Rightarrow$ ".

Suppose not. Then  $\exists \varepsilon > 0$  and  $E_n \in \mathcal{M}$   
s.t.  $\mu(E_n) \leq 2^{-n}$  but  $\nu(E_n) \geq \varepsilon$ .

Let  $F_n = \bigcup_{k=n}^{\infty} E_k$  (decreasing),  $F = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} F_n$

$$\Rightarrow \begin{cases} \nu(F_n) \geq \nu(E_n) \geq \varepsilon \\ \mu(F_n) \leq \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \mu(E_k) \leq 2^{-n+1} \end{cases}$$

Since  $F \subseteq F_n, \forall n, \Rightarrow \mu(F) \leq 2^{-n+1} \rightarrow 0$   
 $n \rightarrow \infty$

$$\Rightarrow \mu(F) = 0.$$

Since  $\nu$  finite,  $\underbrace{F_n \searrow F}_{\text{cont.}}$  from above  $\Rightarrow$

$$\nu(F) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu(F_n) \geq \varepsilon.$$

$\Rightarrow \nu \not\ll \mu$ . Thus,  $\nu \ll \mu \Rightarrow$   
 $\varepsilon$ - $\delta$  statement.



## Lebesgue-Radon-Nikodym Theorem Let

$\nu$  be  $\sigma$ -finite signed,  $\mu$   $\sigma$ -finite positive measure on  $(X, \mathcal{M})$ . Then,  $\exists$  unique  $\sigma$ -finite signed measures  $\lambda, \rho$  s.t.

$$\nu = \lambda + \rho \text{ and } \lambda \perp \mu, \rho \ll \mu.$$

Moreover, there is an extended  $\mu$ -integrable

$f: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  ( $f^+$  or  $f^-$  in  $L^1$ ) s.t.  $d\rho = f d\mu$   
(i.e.  $\rho(E) = \int_E f d\mu$ ) and  $f$  is unique  $\mu$ -a.e.

Rem. • If  $\nu \ll \mu$ , then LRN  $\Rightarrow$

$d\nu = f d\mu$ . The ( $\mu$ -a.e. defined) func  $f$  is called Radon-Nikodym derivative of  $\nu$  w.r.t.  $\mu$ :  $f = \frac{d\nu}{d\mu}$ .

• Have  $\int g d\nu = \int g \frac{d\nu}{d\mu} d\mu$ .

• "Chain rule": If  $\nu \ll \rho$ ,  $\rho \ll \mu \Rightarrow$

$$\nu \ll \mu \text{ and } \frac{d\nu}{d\mu} = \frac{d\nu}{d\rho} \cdot \frac{d\rho}{d\mu}$$

• See Prop 3.9 in Folland for details.

Pr of LRN: We shall do the special case where  $\nu, \mu$  both finite and positive.  
 Going from finite to  $\sigma$ -finite proceeds along "standard lines", and allowing  $\nu$  to be signed utilizes the Jordan decomposition  $\nu = \nu^+ - \nu^-$ . Details are DIY or see Folland.

Consider the family (which contains  $f \equiv 0$ )

$$\mathcal{F} = \left\{ f: X \rightarrow [0, \infty]: \int_E f d\mu \leq \nu(E) \text{ for all } E \in \mathcal{M} \right\}$$

and let  $\alpha = \sup_{\mathcal{F}} \int_X f d\mu$  ( $\leq \nu(X) < \infty$ ).

We take  $f_n \in \mathcal{F}$  s.t.  $\int_X f_n d\mu \nearrow \alpha$ .

Note. If  $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{F}$ , then  $g = \max(f_1, f_2)$  is also in  $\mathcal{F}$ . To see this, let  $A = \{x: f_1(x) \leq f_2(x)\}$ . Thus,  $g|_A = f_2$  and  $g|_{X \setminus A} = f_1$ .

For  $E \in \mathcal{M}$

$$\int_E g d\mu = \int_{E \cap A} f_2 d\mu + \int_{E \cap (X \setminus A)} f_1 d\mu \leq \rightarrow$$

$$\leq \nu(E \cap A) + \nu(E \cap (X \setminus A)) = \nu(E).$$

Form  $g_n = \max(f_1, \dots, f_n) \in \mathcal{F}$ . Then,  $g_n \in L^+$  and  $g_n \uparrow$ . Define  $f(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g_n(x)$

$\Rightarrow f: X \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  and, by MCT,

$$\int_E f d\mu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_E g_n d\mu \leq \nu(E) \Rightarrow f \in \mathcal{F}.$$

$$\text{Since } \int_X f_n d\mu \leq \int_X g_n d\mu \Rightarrow \int f d\mu = \alpha.$$

Note that  $f \in L^+$ ,  $\int f d\mu = \alpha < \infty \Rightarrow \mu(f^{-1}(\{\infty\})) = 0 \Rightarrow$  change  $f$  on this set so that  $f: X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  w/  $f \in L^1$ .

Define  $\rho$  by  $d\rho = f d\mu$  and  $\lambda$  by  $d\lambda = d\nu - f d\mu \Rightarrow \rho = \lambda + \nu$ .

Claim.  $\lambda \perp \mu$ .

For the pf of Claim, we shall need:

Lemma. If  $\lambda \neq \mu$ , then  $\exists E$  s.t.  $\mu(E) > 0$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$  s.t.  $E$  is positive for  $\lambda - \varepsilon\mu$ .

Pf. Consider the signed measures  $\nu_n = \lambda - \frac{1}{n}\mu$ , and let  $X = \bigcup_n P_n$  be HD for each. Let  $P = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} P_n$ ,  $N = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} N_n = X - P$ .

$N$  is neg. for all  $\nu_n \Rightarrow \lambda(N) \leq \frac{1}{n}\mu(N)$   
for all  $N \Rightarrow \lambda(N) = 0$ . If  $\mu(P) = 0$ , then  $\lambda \perp \mu$ . If not, then we must have  $0 < \mu(P) \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(P_n) \Rightarrow \mu(P_n) > 0$  for some  $n$ . Then, taking  $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{n}$ ,  $E = P_n$  yields the other alternative.  $\square$

To prove claim, we note that if  $\lambda \neq \mu$ , then  $\exists E, \varepsilon > 0$  as in Lemma. Then,  $\forall E' \in \mathcal{M}$ ,  $E' \subseteq E$   
 $0 \leq \lambda(E') - \varepsilon\mu(E') = \int_{E'} d\lambda - \int_{E'} \varepsilon d\mu = \rightarrow$

$$= \int_{E'} d\nu - \int_{E'} (f + \varepsilon) d\mu \Rightarrow \int_{E'} (f + \varepsilon) d\mu \leq \nu(E').$$

Consider  $g = f + \varepsilon \chi_E$ . Let  $F \in \mathcal{M} \Rightarrow$

$$\int_F g d\mu = \int_{F \cap E} (f + \varepsilon) d\mu + \int_{F \cap E^c} f d\mu \leq \nu(F \cap E) +$$

$$+ \nu(F \cap E^c) = \nu(F) \Rightarrow g \in \mathcal{J}.$$

But then  $\int_X g d\mu = \int_X f d\mu + \varepsilon \mu(E) = \alpha + \varepsilon \mu(E)$

Since  $\alpha = \sup_{g \in \mathcal{J}} \int_X g d\mu$ , we have a contradiction

$\Rightarrow \lambda \perp \mu$ , which is the desired LRN-decomp.

The uniqueness is easy. If  $\nu = \lambda + \rho = \lambda' + \rho'$ , then  $d(\lambda - \lambda') = (\rho - \rho')$ . Since  $\lambda \perp \mu$ ,  $\lambda' \perp \mu$ , it is easy to see that  $\lambda - \lambda' \perp \mu$ .

But then  $d(\lambda - \lambda') \perp (\rho - \rho') d\mu \Rightarrow \lambda - \lambda' = 0$  and  $(\rho - \rho') d\mu = 0 \Rightarrow \rho - \rho' = 0$  *u.a.e.*

This completes the pf. □

## Concluding Remarks.

Consider Lebesgue-Stieltjes measure  $\mu_F$  on  $\mathbb{R}$ . Since  $\mu_F$  is defined by

$$\mu_F\left(\bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} (a_k, b_k]\right) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (F(b_k) - F(a_k))$$

disjoint

we see, by Thm 1, that abs. cont. of  $\mu_F$  wrt to  $m \Rightarrow \forall \varepsilon > 0 \exists \delta > 0$  s.t.

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |b_k - a_k| < \varepsilon \Rightarrow \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (F(b_k) - F(a_k)) < \infty$$

"  $|F(b_k) - F(a_k)|$

New notion of continuity! Call this absolute continuity of  $F$ . If we let  $F'$  be Radon-Nikodym derivative of  $F$ , then we have "Fundamental Thm of Calculus" for abs. cont. functions  $F$

$$\int_a^b F'(x) dx = F(b) - F(a).$$

Note:

$\mathcal{C}^1 \Rightarrow$  differentiable  $\Rightarrow$  abs. cont.  $\Rightarrow$  uniform cont.  $\Rightarrow$  cont.