

## Radon-Nikodym Differentiation

Lemma: Let  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  be finite <sup>positive</sup> measures.

Either  $\nu \perp \mu$  or there exists  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $E \in \mathcal{M}$  such that  $\mu(E) > 0$  and  $\nu \geq \varepsilon \mu$  on  $E$ .

(i.e.  $E$  is a positive set for  $\nu - \varepsilon \mu$ ).

Pf:

Let  $X = P_m \cup N_m$  be a Hahn decomposition

for  $\nu - \frac{1}{m} \mu$ ,  $P_m \subset P_{m+1}$ ,  $N_m \supset N_{m+1}$

$$\Rightarrow \nu(N_m) \leq \frac{\mu(N_m)}{m} \leq \frac{\mu(X)}{m} \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} 0$$

$$\Rightarrow \nu(P_m) \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} \nu(X) \Rightarrow \nu \Big|_{\bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} P_m} = \nu.$$

Assuming  $\nu$  and  $\mu$  are not mutually singular, therefore

$$\mu\left(\bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} P_m\right) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \exists m_0 \text{ s.t.}$$

$$\mu(P_{m_0}) > 0$$

$$\text{Let } E = P_{m_0} \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon = \frac{1}{m_0} \quad \square.$$

Thm: (Lebesgue-Radon-Nikodym thm)

Let  $\nu$  be a  $\sigma$ -finite signed measure and  $\mu$  a  $\sigma$ -finite positive measure on  $(X, \mathcal{M})$ .  $\exists!$   $\sigma$ -finite signed measures  $\lambda, \rho$  on  $(X, \mathcal{M})$  such that

$$\lambda \perp \mu, \quad \rho \ll \mu$$

$$\text{and} \quad \nu = \lambda + \rho.$$

Moreover,  $\exists g: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  measurable s.t.  $d\rho = g d\mu$   
 $g$  is unique up to sets of measure zero

Pf.: First, suppose that  $\nu$  and  $\mu$  are finite positive measures. Define

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

Note: If  $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$ , then  $\max(f, g) \in \mathcal{F}$ .

Let  $M = \sup \left\{ \int f d\mu \mid f \in \mathcal{F} \right\}$  and let  $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \subset \mathcal{F}$  be such that  $\int f_n d\mu \rightarrow M$ .

Define  $g_n := \max(f_1, \dots, f_n)$ .

Then  $g_n \leq g_{n+1}$ ,  $g_n \in \mathcal{F}$  so  $\int g_n d\mu \leq M$ .

and  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int g_n d\mu = M$ .

Let  $g = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g_n$ , MCT implies  $\int g d\mu = M$ .

Let  $\rho(E) := \int_E g d\mu$  for all  $E \in \mathcal{M}$

and  $\lambda := \nu - \rho$

Then  $\nu = \lambda + \rho$ ,  $\lambda$  is a positive measure, and  $\rho \ll \mu$ .

It remains to show that  $\lambda \perp \mu$

Suppose  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$  are not mutually singular. Then

by our lemma,  $\exists E \supset \emptyset$  and  $\exists E$ , s.t.  $\mu(E) > 0$  s.t.

$$\lambda \geq \varepsilon \mu \text{ on } E. \Rightarrow \varepsilon \mu|_E \leq \lambda$$

$$\Rightarrow \varepsilon \mu|_E \leq \nu - \rho \Rightarrow \varepsilon \mu|_E + \rho \leq \nu$$

$$\Rightarrow (\varepsilon \chi_{E+G}) d\mu \leq \nu. \Rightarrow \varepsilon \chi_{E+G} \in \mathcal{F}$$

but  $\int \varepsilon \chi_{E+G} d\mu = \varepsilon \mu(E) + M > M$   
 which contradicts the definition of  $M \downarrow$ .

The  $\sigma$ -finite case: Assume  $\nu$  and  $\mu$  are positive

$\sigma$ -finite measures.  $\exists \{X_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty} \subset \mathcal{M}$  s.t.  $\bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} X_j = X$

$X_j \cap X_i = \emptyset$  for  $i \neq j$ , and  $\nu(X_j) < \infty, \mu(X_j) < \infty$  for all  $j$

Then  $\nu = \sum \lambda_j + \sum \rho_j$ ,  $\sum \lambda_j \perp \mu$  and  $\sum \rho_j \ll \mu$ .

where  $\lambda_j$  and  $\rho_j$  are given by the finite case.

The signed case: Assume  $\nu$  is a signed measure  
 and let  $\nu^-$  and  $\nu^+$  be the Hahn decomp of  $\nu$ .

$$\text{Then } \nu = (\lambda^+ - \lambda^-) + (\rho^+ - \rho^-) \quad \square$$

### Some Terminology

For a signed measure,  $\nu$ , the decomposition

$$\nu = \lambda + \rho$$

where  $\lambda \perp \mu$  and  $\rho \ll \mu$

is called the Lebesgue decomposition of  $\nu$  with respect to  $\mu$ .

IF  $\nu \ll \mu$  then

$$\nu(E) = \int_E f d\mu \quad \text{for some } f \in L^1(\mu).$$

$f$  is called the Radon-Nikodym derivative of  $\nu$  with respect to  $\mu$ . We denote

$$\frac{d\nu}{d\mu} = f$$

$$\frac{d\nu}{d\mu} = f.$$

and  $d\nu = \frac{d\nu}{d\mu} d\mu.$

Corollary: Suppose that  $\nu$  is a  $\sigma$ -finite signed measure and  $\mu, \lambda$  are  $\sigma$ -finite measures on  $(X, \mathcal{M})$  such that  $\nu \ll \mu$  and  $\mu \ll \lambda$

a.) If  $g \in L^1(\nu)$ , then  $g \cdot \frac{d\nu}{d\mu} \in L^1(\mu)$  and

$$\int g d\nu = \int g \frac{d\nu}{d\mu} d\mu$$

b.)  $\nu \ll \lambda$  and  $\frac{d\nu}{d\lambda} = \frac{d\nu}{d\mu} \frac{d\mu}{d\lambda}$   $\lambda$ -a.e.

Q: In what sense is the Radon-Nikodym derivative a "derivative" in classical terms?

Recall: Fundamental theorem of calculus

$$\text{If } F(x) = \int_0^x f(t) dt \quad F'(x) = f(x).$$

$$\text{So if } \nu \ll \mu, \quad \nu(E) = \int_E \frac{d\nu}{d\mu} d\mu$$

does the following hold:

$$\frac{\nu(B(x, r))}{\mu(B(x, r))} \xrightarrow{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{d\nu}{d\mu}(x) ?$$