

Q: Consider  $A \times B \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  be Borel. Let  $s, t \in [0, 1]$

Suppose  $\dim_{\mathcal{H}}(A) \leq s$  and  $\dim_{\mathcal{H}}(B) \leq t$

$$\mathcal{H}^{s+t}(A \times B) = \mathcal{H}^s(A) \cdot \mathcal{H}^t(B) = (\mathcal{H}^s \times \mathcal{H}^t)(A \times B) \quad ?$$

A: No,

Let  $\{n_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty} \subset \mathbb{N}$

and  $\{m_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty} \subset \mathbb{N}$  s.t.  $\{n_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty} \cap \{m_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty} = \emptyset$ .

$$\{n_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty} \cup \{m_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty} = \mathbb{N}$$

Let  $A = \{x \in [0, 2] \mid \text{the } n_k^{\text{th}} \text{ place of the decimal expansion of } x \text{ is zero for all } k\}$ .

$B = \{x \in [0, 1] \mid \text{the } m_k^{\text{th}} \text{ place of the decimal expansion of } x \text{ is zero for all } k\}$ .

Claim: For all  $x \in [0, 1]$ ,  $\exists a \in A, b \in B$  s.t.

$$x = a + b.$$

Consider the function  $F: \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined by

$$F(x, y) = x + y$$

Then  $F$  is a linear function and

$$[0, 1] \subset F(A \times B). \Rightarrow \mathcal{H}^1(F(A \times B)) \geq 1.$$

Linear functions do not increase Hausdorff dimension (HW)

and  $\mathcal{H}^1(A \times B) \geq c \mathcal{H}^2(F(A \times B))$  for some  $c > 0$ .

However, one can choose  $\{n_k\}$  and  $\{m_k\}$  so that  $\dim_{\mathcal{H}}(A)$  and  $\dim_{\mathcal{H}}(B)$  are arbitrarily small (Exercise).

# Differentiation of Measures

## Signed Measures

Def: Let  $(X, \mathcal{M})$  be a measurable space. A signed measure on  $(X, \mathcal{M})$  is a function

$$\nu: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty] \text{ s.t.}$$

- $\nu(\emptyset) = 0$
- $\nu$  assumes at most one of  $-\infty$  or  $+\infty$
- If  $\{E_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty} \subset \mathcal{M}$  then  
$$\nu\left(\bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} E_j\right) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \nu(E_j)$$
 where the convergence is absolute.

Notes: ① Let  $\{E_j\} \subset \mathcal{M}$ . If  $E_j \subset E_{j+1}$ , then

$$\nu\left(\bigcup E_j\right) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \nu(E_j)$$

If  $E_j \supset E_{j+1}$ , then

$$\nu\left(\bigcap E_j\right) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \nu(E_j).$$

Def: Null, (Negative and Positive Sets)

a set  $E \in \mathcal{M}$  is positive if for all  $F \in \mathcal{M}$ ,  $F \subset E$ ,

$$\nu(F) \geq 0$$

$E$  is negative if  $\forall F \in \mathcal{M}$ ,  $F \subset E$ ,  $\nu(F) \leq 0$

$E$  is null if  $\forall F \in \mathcal{M}$ ,  $F \subset E$ ,  $\nu(F) = 0$ .

## Hahn Decomposition Theorem

Thm: If  $\nu$  is a signed measure on  $(X, \mathcal{M})$ , there

exist a positive set  $P$  and a negative set  $N$  for  $\nu$  such that  $P \cup N = X$ ,  $P \cap N = \emptyset$ . Moreover,  $P$  and  $N$  are unique up to null sets.

PF: Suppose  $\nu(E) < \infty$  for all  $E \in \mathcal{M}$

Let  $m = \sup \{ \nu(F) \mid F \text{ positive} \}$ .

$\Rightarrow \exists \{ F_k \}_{k=1}^{\infty}$   $F_k$  positive such that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \nu(F_k) = m$$

Let  $P = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} F_k$ .

Then  $P$  is positive, Let  $N = X \setminus P$

Claim: If  $\infty > \nu(E) > 0$ , then  $\exists A \subset E$  s.t.  $\nu(A) > 0$  and  $A$  is positive.

Proof of claim: If  $E$  is not positive, Let  $\epsilon_1 \in [0, 1]$

be the largest number s.t.  $\exists F \subset E$  s.t.  $\nu(F) < -\epsilon_1$ .

Let  $E_1$  be such that  $\nu(E_1) < -\epsilon_1/2$

If  $E \setminus E_1$  is not positive let  $\epsilon_2 \in [0, 1]$  be s.t.

$\exists E_2 \subset E \setminus E_1$  s.t.  $\nu(E_2) < -\epsilon_2/2$

Inductively define  $\epsilon_k$  and  $E_k$  and let  $A = E \setminus \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} E_k$ .

Then  $\nu(E) = \nu(A) + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \nu(E_k) \Rightarrow \nu(A) > \nu(E) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \epsilon_k$

If  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \epsilon_k = \infty$  then  $\nu(A) = \infty$  and  $\nu(\bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} E_k) = -\infty$  which is

a contradiction.

If  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \epsilon_k < \infty$ , then  $\epsilon_k \rightarrow 0$  which implies that

there are no sets,  $B \subset A \subset E$ , such that  $\nu(B) < 0$ .

Otherwise we would contradict the maximality of  $\epsilon_k$ .

The claim implies that  $N$  must be negative since  $P$  is

The claim implies that  $N$  must be negative since  $P$  is  
maximally positive  $\square$ .

---