

Lesson 38

38.1

Theorem: Let $f \in BV([a, b])$.

Then

$$\int_a^b |f'(x)| \, d\lambda(x) \leq V_f(b)$$

Proof:

Consider first the case when

f is non-decreasing.

We extend f by defining $f(x) = f(b)$, $x > b$.

Define:

$$g_i(x) = \frac{f(x + \frac{1}{i}) - f(x)}{\frac{1}{i}}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots \quad (1)$$

Since f is non-decreasing then:

f is continuous except possibly on a countable set.

Recall the following:

Lemma: If $g: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous except on a set of measure zero then g is Lebesgue measurable.

Indeed, to see that the Lemma is true

we write $\mathbb{R}^1 = C \cup D$, where $\lambda(D) = 0$.

(38.2)

Since g restricted to C is continuous in the relative topology, we define:

$$\tilde{g} = g|_C.$$

Then, for every open interval (c, d) : $\tilde{g}^{-1}(c, d)$ is open in C , and thus:

$$\tilde{g}^{-1}(c, d) = U \cap C, \quad U \subset \mathbb{R}^1 \text{ open set.}$$

Note that:

$$\begin{aligned} g^{-1}(c, d) &= [\tilde{g}^{-1}(c, d) \cap C] \cup [g^{-1}(c, d) \cap D] \\ &= \tilde{g}^{-1}(c, d) \cup [g^{-1}(c, d) \cap D] \\ &= [U \cap C] \cup [g^{-1}(c, d) \cap D] \end{aligned}$$

Note that $U \cap C$ is Lebesgue measurable and $g^{-1}(c, d) \cap D$ is also Lebesgue measurable because it has measure zero. Hence we conclude that f is Lebesgue measurable. \blacksquare

Going back to our non-decreasing f , since f is continuous almost everywhere then, by Lemma, f is Lebesgue measurable. Actually, f is Borel measurable since in this case the set D in the Lemma is countable (and hence Borel) and thus $f^{-1}(a, b)$ is Borel.

38.3

Since f is Borel, then g_i is Borel and hence:

$u(x) := \limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty} g_i(x)$ is Borel measurable

and

$v(x) := \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} g_i(x)$ is Borel measurable.

Since f is non-decreasing we proved earlier that:

f is differentiable λ -almost everywhere.

Hence

$$f'(x) = u(x) = v(x), \quad \lambda\text{-a.e. } x$$

Thus, u is Borel measurable and hence Lebesgue measurable. Since $f' = u$ λ -a.e., we conclude that f' is Lebesgue measurable (but we can not conclude that f' is Borel measurable).

In the general case, if $f \in BV([a, b])$ then we write:

$$f = f_1 - f_2, \quad f_1, f_2 \text{ non-decreasing}$$

and from the above discussion we conclude:

(a) f is Borel measurable

38.4

(b) f' is Lebesgue measurable since:

$$f'(x) = f_1'(x) - f_2'(x), \quad \lambda\text{-a.e. } x$$

and f_1', f_2' are Lebesgue measurable

We now proceed to estimate:

$$\int_a^b |f'(x)| d\lambda(x).$$

We consider again first the case when f is non-decreasing. Then, using (1):

$$\int_a^b \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} g_i d\lambda(x) \leq \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \int_a^b g_i(x) d\lambda(x), \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{using} \\ \text{Fatou's} \\ \text{since} \\ g_i \geq 0 \end{array}$$

||

$$\int_a^b f'(x) d\lambda(x)$$

$$\therefore \int_a^b f'(x) d\lambda(x) \leq \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} i \int_a^b \left[f\left(x + \frac{1}{i}\right) - f(x) \right] d\lambda(x)$$

$$= \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} i \left[\int_{a+1/i}^{b+1/i} f(x) d\lambda(x) - \int_a^b f(x) d\lambda(x) \right]; \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{By a} \\ \text{change} \\ \text{of vari-} \\ \text{ables for} \\ \text{Riemann} \\ \text{integrals} \end{array}$$

$$= \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} i \left[\int_b^{b+1/i} f(x) d\lambda(x) - \int_a^{a+1/i} f(x) d\lambda(x) \right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \int_a^b f'(x) d\lambda(x) &\leq \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} i \left[\int_b^{b+1/i} f(b) d\lambda(x) - \int_a^{a+1/i} f(a) d\lambda(x) \right] \\
 &= \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} i \left[\frac{f(b)}{i} - \frac{f(a)}{i} \right] \\
 &= f(b) - f(a)
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$(2) \quad \boxed{\int_a^b f'(x) d\lambda(x) \leq f(b) - f(a)}, \quad f \text{ non-decreasing.}$$

In the general case, take $f \in BV([a, b])$.

Recall that:

$$V_f(x) = \sup \sum_{i=1}^k |f(t_i) - f(t_{i-1})|, \text{ where}$$

the sup is taken over all partitions $a = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_k = x$.

Since $x \mapsto V_f(x)$ is non-decreasing then:

$V_f'(x)$ exists for λ -a.e. x .

Recall that:

$$f = f_1 - f_2,$$

where

$$(3) \quad \boxed{f_1 = \frac{1}{2}(V_f + f), \quad f_2 = \frac{1}{2}(V_f - f)}$$

Claim: $|f'| = V_f'$ λ -a.e.

38.6

We first show that $|f'(x)| \leq V_f'(x)$ for λ -a.e. x . Indeed we compute, for λ -a.e. x :

$$|f'(x)| = |f_1'(x) - f_2'(x)| \leq |f_1'(x)| + |f_2'(x)|$$

$$= f_1'(x) + f_2'(x)$$

Since f_1, f_2 non-decreasing \Rightarrow

$$f_1', f_2' \geq 0$$

$$= \frac{1}{2}(V_f'(x) + f'(x))$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2}(V_f'(x) - f'(x)); \text{ by (3)}$$

$$= V_f'(x).$$

$$\therefore |f'(x)| \leq V_f'(x), \lambda\text{-a.e. } x. \rightarrow (4)$$

To prove the other inequality we consider the set:

$$E = [a, b] \cap \{t : V_f'(x) > |f'(x)|\}$$

We refer to the book for the proof that:
 $\lambda(E) = 0$.

Hence:

$$V_f'(x) \leq |f'(x)| \text{ for } \lambda\text{-a.e. } x \rightarrow (5)$$

$$(4) + (5) \Rightarrow \boxed{|f'(x)| = V_f'(x), \lambda\text{-a.e. } x.}$$

Finally, from (2) and previous claim we compute:

(38.7)

$$\int_a^b |f'(x)| d\lambda(x) = \int_a^b V_{f'}(x) d\lambda(x), \text{ by Claim}$$

$$= \int_a^b [f_1'(x) + f_2'(x)] d\lambda(x); \text{ by (3)}$$

$$= \int_a^b f_1'(x) d\lambda(x) + \int_a^b f_2'(x) d\lambda(x)$$

$$\leq f_1(b) - f_1(a) + f_2(b) - f_2(a); \text{ by (2)}$$

$$= [f_1(b) + f_2(b)] - [f_1(a) + f_2(a)]$$

$$= V_f(b) - V_f(a); \text{ Since } V_f = f_1 + f_2 \text{ by (3).}$$

$$= V_f(b) - 0; \text{ since } V_f(a; a) = 0$$

Hence, we conclude the desired estimate:

$$\int_a^b |f'(x)| d\lambda(x) \leq V_f(b).$$

Thm (The Fundamental Theorem of Calculus)

$$\begin{aligned}
 & f: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\
 & \text{Absolutely Continuous} \iff f' \text{ exists a.e., } f' \in L^1([a, b]) \text{ and} \\
 & f(x) - f(a) = \int_a^x f'(t) d\lambda(t), \forall x \in [a, b]
 \end{aligned}$$

Proof:

Let $f \in AC([a, b])$

Then $f \in BV([a, b])$

Hence, f' exists a.e. From previous Theorem we have:

$$\int_a^b |f'(x)| d\lambda(x) \leq V_f(b)$$

Hence $f' \in L^1([a, b])$.

We define:

$$F(x) = \int_a^x f'(t) d\lambda(t)$$

Since f' is integrable, the first part of the fundamental Theorem of Calculus yields:

$$F'(x) = f'(x) \text{ for } \lambda\text{-a.e. } x \in [a, b]$$

38.9

We now consider the function:

$$F - f.$$

We have:

$$(F - f)'(x) = 0 \text{ for } \lambda\text{-a.e. } x \in [a, b]$$

We proved in a previous theorem that if the derivative of an absolute continuous function is zero λ -a.e., then that function must be constant. Since $f \in AC([a, b])$ we now proceed to show:

Claim: F is A.C.

Proof of claim: Let $\{[a_i, b_i]\}_{i=1}^k$ be a non-overlapping collection of intervals in $[a, b]$. Then:

$$F(b_i) - F(a_i) = \int_{a_i}^{b_i} f'(t) d\lambda(t).$$

$$\Rightarrow |F(b_i) - F(a_i)| \leq \int_a^b |f'(t)| d\lambda(t)$$

thus

$$\sum_{i=1}^k |F(b_i) - F(a_i)| \leq \int_{\cup [a_i, b_i]} |f'| d\lambda \rightarrow (6)$$

Define the measure:

38.10

$$\mu(E) = \int_E |f| d\lambda, \quad \forall E \subset [a, b], \\ E \text{ Lebesgue measurable}$$

Then μ is a measure and:

$$\mu \ll \lambda$$

Thus, $\forall \varepsilon > 0$, $\exists \delta > 0$ such that:

$$\lambda(E) < \delta \Rightarrow \mu(E) < \varepsilon \rightarrow (7)$$

Indeed, recall how we can prove (7):
Proceed by contradiction and suppose $\exists \varepsilon > 0$
and a sequence of measurable sets $\{E_k\}$
such that:

$$\lambda(E_k) < \frac{1}{2^k} \quad \text{and} \quad \mu(E_k) > \varepsilon, \quad \forall k$$

We apply Borel Cantelli and define:

$$F := \bigcap_{m=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{k=m}^{\infty} E_k$$

Then:

$$\lambda(F) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \lambda \left(\bigcup_{k=m}^{\infty} E_k \right) \\ \leq \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^k} \right) = 0$$

On the other hand:

38.11

$$\mu(F) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mu \left(\bigcup_{k=m}^{\infty} E_k \right) \geq \varepsilon,$$

which contradicts that $\mu \ll \lambda$.

We now use (6) and (7) to obtain:

$$\sum_{i=1}^k |b_i - a_i| < \delta \Rightarrow \mu \left(\bigcup [a_i, b_i] \right) = \int_{\bigcup [a_i, b_i]} |f'| d\lambda \leq \varepsilon$$

and

$$\sum_{i=1}^k |F(b_i) - F(a_i)| < \varepsilon.$$

We completed the proof of $F \in AC([a, b])$.

Therefore we had before:

$$(F - f)'(x) = 0 \text{ for } \lambda\text{-a.e. } x \in [a, b], \text{ and}$$

since now we have $F - f \in AC([a, b])$

we conclude:

$$\boxed{F - f = \text{constant}}$$

$$\therefore \boxed{F(x) - f(x) = F(a) - f(a), \quad \forall x \in [a, b]}$$

Since $F(a) = 0$ then $F(x) = f(x) - f(a)$, or:

$$\boxed{f(x) - f(a) = \int_a^x f'(t) d\lambda(t), \quad \forall x \in [a, b]}$$

We now prove the converse
of the Fundamental Theorem
of Calculus:

Assume f' exists a.e., $f' \in L^1([a, b])$
and:

$$f(x) - f(a) = \int_a^x f'(t) d\lambda(t), \quad \forall x \in [a, b].$$

We define:

$$F(x) = \int_a^x f'(t) d\lambda(t)$$

Then we proved earlier that

$$F \in AC([a, b])$$

$$\therefore f(x) - f(a) \in AC([a, b])$$

$$\therefore f \in AC([a, b]). \quad \square$$