### 18.175: Lecture 2

## Extension theorems: a tool for constructing measures
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- Could toss out the axiom of choice... but we don't want to. Instead we will only define measure for certain "measurable sets". We will construct a $\sigma$-algebra of measurable sets and let probability measure be function from $\sigma$-algebra to $[0,1]$.
- Price to this decision: for the rest of our lives, whenever we talk about a measure on any space (a Euclidean space, a space of differentiable functions, a space of fractal curves embedded in a plane, etc.), we have to worry about what the $\sigma$-algebra might be.
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- If the $\sigma$-algebra is something like the Borel $\sigma$-algebra (smallest $\sigma$-algebra containing all open sets) it's a pretty big collection of sets. How do we go about producing a measure (any measure) that's defined for every set in this family?
- Answer: use extension theorems.
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- Measure is function $\mu: \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $\mu(A) \geq \mu(\emptyset)=0$ for all $A \in \mathcal{F}$ and countable additivity: $\mu\left(\cup_{i} A_{i}\right)=\sum_{i} \mu\left(A_{i}\right)$ for disjoint $A_{i}$.
- Measure $\mu$ is probability measure if $\mu(\Omega)=1$.
- The Borel $\sigma$-algebra $\mathcal{B}$ on a topological space is the smallest $\sigma$-algebra containing all open sets.
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- Write $F(a)=P((-\infty, a])$.
- Theorem: for each right continuous, non-decreasing function $F$, tending to 0 at $-\infty$ and to 1 at $\infty$, there is a unique measure defined on the Borel sets of $\mathbb{R}$ with $P((a, b])=F(b)-F(a)$.
- If we're given such a function $F$, then we know how to compute the measure of any set of the form ( $a, b$ ].
- We would like to extend the measure defined for these subsets to a measure defined for the whole $\sigma$ algebra generated by these subsets.
- Seems clear how to define measure of countable union of disjoint intervals of the form ( $a, b$ ] (just using countable additivity). But are we confident we can extend the definition to all Borel measurable sets in a consistent way?
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- semi-algebra: collection $\mathcal{S}$ of sets closed under intersection and such that $S \in \mathcal{S}$ implies that $S^{c}$ is a finite disjoint union of sets in $\mathcal{S}$. (Example: empty set plus sets of form $\left.\left(a_{1}, b_{1}\right] \times \ldots \times\left(a_{d}, b_{d}\right] \in \mathbb{R}^{d}.\right)$
- One lemma: If $\mathcal{S}$ is a semialgebra, then the set $\bar{S}$ of finite disjoint unions of sets in $\mathcal{S}$ is an algebra, called the algebra generated by $\mathcal{S}$.
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- Say collection of sets $\mathcal{P}$ is a $\pi$-system if closed under intersection.
- Say collection of sets $\mathcal{L}$ is a $\lambda$-system if
- $\Omega \in \mathcal{L}$
- If $A, B \in \mathcal{L}$ and $A \subset B$, then $B-A \in \mathcal{L}$.
- If $A_{n} \in \mathcal{L}$ and $A_{n} \uparrow A$ then $A \in \mathcal{L}$.
- THEOREM: If $\mathcal{P}$ is a $\pi$-system and $\mathcal{L}$ is a $\lambda$-system that contains $\mathcal{P}$, then $\sigma(\mathcal{P}) \subset \mathcal{L}$, where $\sigma(\mathcal{A})$ denotes smallest $\sigma$-algebra containing $\mathcal{A}$.
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## Caratheéodory Extension Theorem

- Theorem: If $\mu$ is a $\sigma$-finite measure on an algebra $\mathcal{A}$ then $\mu$ has a unique extension to the $\sigma$ algebra generated by $\mathcal{A}$.
- Detailed proof is somewhat involved, but let's take a look at it.
- We can use this extension theorem prove existence of a unique translation invariant measure (Lebesgue measure) on the Borel sets of $\mathbb{R}^{d}$ that assigns unit mass to a unit cube. (Borel $\sigma$-algebra $\mathcal{R}^{d}$ is the smallest one containing all open sets of $\mathbb{R}^{d}$. Given any space with a topology, we can define a $\sigma$-algebra this way.)


## Extension theorem for semialgebras

- Say $\mathcal{S}$ is semialgebra and $\mu$ is defined on $\mathcal{S}$ with $\mu(\emptyset=0)$, such that $\mu$ is finitely additive and countably subadditive. [This means that if $S \in \mathcal{S}$ is a finite disjoint union of sets $S_{i} \in \mathcal{S}$ then $\mu(S)=\sum_{i} \mu\left(S_{i}\right)$. If it is a countable disjoint union of $S_{i} \in \mathcal{S}$ then $\mu(S) \leq \sum_{i} \mu\left(S_{i}\right)$.] Then $\mu$ has a unique extension $\bar{\mu}$ that is a measure on the algebra $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ generated by $\mathcal{S}$. If $\bar{\mu}$ is sigma-finite, then there is an extension that is a measure on $\sigma(S)$.

