1. (Compare to Problem 4 on Homework 4) Suppose A is a subset of the  $\mathbb{R}$  with  $m^*(A) < \infty$  and suppose E is a  $G_{\delta}$  set such that  $E \supset A$  and  $m^*(E) = m^*(A)$ . Prove that A is measurable if and only if  $m^*(E \setminus A) = 0$ .

An alternate construction of the  $\sigma$ -algebra of measurable sets uses the concept of *inner measure*. In this construction for  $\mathbb{R}$ , outer measure is defined as we have defined it for subsets of  $\mathbb{R}$  and the outer measure of open sets and compact sets is declared to be the *measure* of these sets, without proving any additional properties of measure (in contrast to outer measure) at this time, that is, if E is open or compact, then we write m(E) instead of (only)  $m^*(E)$ .

**Definition.** If A is any subset of  $\mathbb{R}$ , the *inner measure of* A, denoted  $m_*(A)$ , is defined by

 $m_*(A) = \sup\{m(K) : K \subset A \text{ and } K \text{ is compact}\}\$ 

**2.** Suppose A is a subset of  $\mathbb{R}$ . Show that A is closed if and only if  $A \cap [-n, n]$  is compact for every positive integer n.

- **3.** (a) Show that for any subset A of  $\mathbb{R}$ , we have  $m_*(A) \leq m^*(A)$ .
  - (b) Suppose U is an open subset of  $\mathbb{R}$ . Show that  $m_*(U) = m^*(U)$ .

**4.** Suppose A and B are disjoint subsets of  $\mathbb{R}$ . Show that  $m_*(A \cup B) \ge m_*(A) + m_*(B)$ .

5. A set E is called an  $F_{\sigma}$  set if it is the union of a countable number of closed sets. Note that all  $F_{\sigma}$  sets are in the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra.

- (a) Prove that every open set in  $\mathbb{R}$  is an  $F_{\sigma}$  set.
- (b) Show that if A is a subset of  $\mathbb{R}$ , there is an  $F_{\sigma}$  set E so that  $E \subset A$  and  $m_*(A) = m_*(E)$ .

**6.** Suppose  $m^*(A) < \infty$ . Prove that the set A is measurable if and only if  $m_*(A) = m^*(A)$ .

**Solution to Problem 5b.** Suppose first that  $m_*(A) < \infty$ . For each positive integer n, there is a compact set  $K_n$  with  $K_n \subset A$  and  $m(K_n) > m_*(A) - \frac{1}{n}$ . Let  $E = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} K_n$ . Then E is an  $F_{\sigma}$  set,  $E \subset A$ , and for each positive integer n,

$$m_*(A) - \frac{1}{n} \le m(K_n) \le m_*(E) \le m_*(A)$$

Since this is true for each positive integer n, we must have  $m_*(A) \leq m_*(E) \leq m_*(A)$ , or  $m_*(E) = m_*(A)$  as we wished to prove. (Remark: notice that because E is measurable, we have

$$m_*(A) - \frac{1}{n} \le m(K_n) \le m(E) \le m_*(A)$$

so that  $m(E) = m_*(A)$ .)

If  $m_*(A) = \infty$ , an analogous argument works with  $K_n$  satisfying  $K_n \subset A$  and  $m(K_n) > n$ .

## Solution to Problem 6.

First, notice that the revision  $m^*(A) < \infty$  is important:

Suppose P is a non measurable subset of [0, 1) as we constructed Tuesday. Let  $A = P \cup [3, \infty)$ . Then  $m_*(A) = m^*(A) = \infty$ , but A is not measurable because if it were,  $A \cap [0, 1) = P$  would be measurable, which it is not.

To prove the equivalence, first suppose  $m_*(A) = m^*(A) < \infty$ . By problem 5b (and the remark) above and problem 4 on Homework 4, there are an  $F_{\sigma}$  set F and a  $G_{\delta}$  set G so that  $F \subset A \subset G$  and  $m(F) = m_*(A) = m^*(A) = m(G)$ . Now, F, G, and  $G \setminus F = G \cap F^c$  are all measurable and  $G = F \cup (G \cap F^c)$ . Since the latter two sets are disjoint, we have  $m(G) = m(F) + m(G \cap F^c) = m(G) + m(G \cap F^c)$  which means  $m(G \cap F^c) = 0$ . Now  $A \cap F^c \subset G \cap F^c$ , so  $m^*(A \cap F^c) \leq m^*(G \cap F^c) = 0$ , so actually  $A \cap F^c$  is measurable and  $m(A \cap F^c) = 0$ . This means that  $A = F \cup (A \cap F^c)$  is measurable and m(A) = m(F) = m(G).

Conversely, suppose A is measurable and  $m(A) = m^*(A) < \infty$ . For each positive integer n, let  $A_n = A \cap [-n, n]$  so that each  $A_n$  is measurable,  $A_1 \subset A_2 \subset A_3 \subset \cdots$  and

$$A = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} A_k = A_n \cup \left(\bigcup_{k=n}^{\infty} (A_{k+1} \setminus A_k)\right)$$

where the latter union is a union of disjoint measurable sets. This means that, for each n, we have  $m(A) = m(A_n) + \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} m(A_{k+1} \setminus A_k)$ , so  $m(A) = \lim_{n \to \infty} m(A_n)$ . We can use  $A_n$  to get a compact subset of  $A_n$ , hence a subset of A, whose measure is close to  $m(A_n)$ , that is, close to m(A), which gives an estimate for the inner measure of A that is nearly  $m(A_n)$ .

The set  $[-n, n] \setminus A_n$  is measureable, so we can find a covering of  $[-n, n] \setminus A_n$  by open intervals  $(I_j)$  so that  $\sum \ell(I_j) < m^*([-n, n] \setminus A_n) + \frac{1}{n} = m([-n, n] \setminus A_n) + \frac{1}{n} = 2n - m(A_n) + \frac{1}{n}$ . Now, let  $K_n = [-n, n] \setminus (\cup I_j) = [-n, n] \cap (\cap I_j^c)$ . Clearly,  $K_n$  is compact,  $K_n \subset A_n$  and  $m(K_n) \ge m(A_n) - \frac{1}{n}$ . Thus,  $K_n \subset A$  for each positive integer n, so  $m(K_n) \le m(A)$  and  $\lim_{n\to\infty} m(K_n) = \lim_{n\to\infty} m(A_n) = m(A)$ . This means that  $m_*(A) = m(A) = m^*(A)$ , as we were to prove.