

## The Lebesgue density theorem in separable metric spaces

D.H.FREMLIN

*University of Essex, Colchester, England*

**Proposition** Let  $X$  be a separable metrizable space and  $\mu$  a locally finite quasi-Radon measure on  $X$ . Then there is a metric  $\rho$  on  $X$ , compatible with its topology, such that for every measurable  $E \subseteq X$  there is a negligible set  $F$  such that

$$\lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \frac{\mu(E \cap B(x, \delta))}{\mu B(x, \delta)} = 1$$

for every  $x \in E \setminus F$ , where  $B(x, \delta) = \{y : \rho(x, y) \leq \delta\}$ .

**proof (a)** Since  $X$  is Lindelöf and  $\mu$  is locally finite, there is a sequence of open sets of finite measure covering  $X$ . It follows at once that  $\mu$  is  $\sigma$ -finite; and since  $\mu$  is inner regular with respect to the closed sets, it is also outer regular with respect to the open sets (FREMLIN 03, 412Wb).

Let  $\mathfrak{A}$  be the family of subsets of  $X$  with negligible boundaries; then  $\mathfrak{A}$  is an algebra of subsets of  $X$  (the ‘Jordan algebra’ of  $(X, \mu)$ ). Because  $\mu$  is complete and measures every open set, it measures every member of  $\mathfrak{A}$ . Let  $\mathbb{A}$  be the family of finite partitions of  $X$  into sets belonging to  $\mathfrak{A}$ . For  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}' \in \mathbb{A}$  say that  $\mathcal{A} \preceq \mathcal{A}'$  if  $\mathcal{A}$  refines  $\mathcal{A}'$ , that is, every member of  $\mathcal{A}$  is included in some member of  $\mathcal{A}'$ . Then  $\preceq$  is a partial order on  $\mathbb{A}$  under which  $\mathbb{A}$  is downwards-directed (because if  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}' \in \mathbb{A}$  then  $\{A \cap A' : A \in \mathcal{A}, A' \in \mathcal{A}'\}$  belongs to  $\mathbb{A}$ ). If  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a bounded continuous function, then  $\{\gamma : \mu f^{-1}[\{\gamma\}] > 0\}$  must be countable, and for all but countably many  $\gamma$  the sets  $\{x : f(x) < \gamma\}$  and  $\{x : f(x) \leq \gamma\}$  belong to  $\mathfrak{A}$ . So for any  $\epsilon > 0$  there is an  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathbb{A}$  such that  $f[A]$  has diameter at most  $\epsilon$  for every  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ .

Because  $X$  is second-countable and completely regular, there is a sequence  $\langle f_n \rangle_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of continuous functions from  $X$  to  $[0, 1]$  such that whenever  $G \subseteq X$  is open and  $x \in G$  there is an  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $f_n(x) = 1$  and  $f_n(y) = 0$  for  $y \in X \setminus G$ .

**(b)** Choose families  $\langle \mathcal{A}_n \rangle_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ ,  $\langle g_{nA} \rangle_{n \in \mathbb{N}, A \in \mathcal{A}_n}$ ,  $\langle H_n \rangle_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $\langle F_n \rangle_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  as follows. Start with  $\mathcal{A}_0 = \{X\}$  and  $F_0 = \emptyset$ . Given that  $F_n$  is a finite family of continuous functions from  $X$  to  $[0, 1]$  and that  $\mathcal{A}_n \in \mathbb{A}$ , let  $H_n$  be an open set, including  $\bigcup_{A \in \mathcal{A}_n} \partial A$ , of measure at most  $2^{-n} \min\{\mu A : A \in \mathcal{A}_n, \mu A > 0\}$ . Then  $A \setminus H_n$  is closed and  $A \cup H_n$  is open for every  $A \in \mathcal{A}_n$ . Because  $X$  is normal, we can choose  $\langle g_{nA} \rangle_{A \in \mathcal{A}_n}$  such that each  $g_{nA}$  is a continuous function from  $X$  to  $[0, 1]$ ,  $g_{nA}(x) = 1$  for  $x \in A \setminus H_n$  and  $g_{nA}(x) = 0$  for  $x \notin A \cup H_n$ . Set  $F_{n+1} = F_n \cup \{f_n\} \cup \{g_{nA} : A \in \mathcal{A}_n\}$ . Because  $\mathbb{A}$  is downwards-directed there is a  $\mathcal{A}_{n+1} \in \mathbb{A}$ , refining  $\mathcal{A}_n$ , such that  $\text{diam } f[A] \leq 2^{-n}$  for every  $f \in F_{n+1} \cup \{f_{n+1}\}$  and  $A \in \mathcal{A}_{n+1}$ . Continue.

**(c)** Define  $\rho : X \times X \rightarrow [0, 1]$  by setting

$$\rho(x, y) = \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \max_{f \in F_{n+1}} \min(2^{-n}, |f(x) - f(y)|)$$

for  $x, y \in X$ . Then  $\rho$  is a metric on  $X$ , defining its topology. **P** Directly from the form of its definition we see that  $\rho$  is a pseudometric. If  $G \subseteq X$  is open and  $x \in G$ , there is an  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $f_n(x) = 1$  and  $f[X \setminus G] = \{0\}$ ; now  $f_n \in F_{n+1}$  so  $\rho(x, y) \geq \min(2^{-n}, |f_n(x) - f_n(y)|) \geq 2^{-n}$  for every  $y \in X \setminus G$ . So every open set is  $\rho$ -open; it follows at once that  $\rho$  is a metric. If  $G \subseteq X$  is  $\rho$ -open and  $x \in G$ , there is an  $n \geq 1$  such that  $B(x, 2^{-n}) \subseteq G$ . But

$$\begin{aligned} B(x, 2^{-n}) &= \{y : \max_{f \in F_n} \min(2^{-n+1}, |f(x) - f(y)|) \leq 2^{-n}\} \\ &\supseteq \{y : |f(x) - f(y)| < 2^{-n} \text{ for every } f \in F_n\} \end{aligned}$$

is a neighbourhood of  $x$ , so  $G$  is a neighbourhood of  $x$ . Thus every  $\rho$ -open set is open and  $\rho$  is compatible with the given topology on  $X$ . **Q**

**(d)** Suppose that  $n \geq 1$ ,  $A \in \mathcal{A}_n$  and  $x \in A \setminus H_n$ .

**(i)** If  $y \in A \setminus H_n$ , then  $g_{nA}(x) = g_{nA}(y) = 1$  and  $g_{nA'}(x) = g_{nA'}(y) = 0$  for every  $A' \in \mathcal{A}_n \setminus \{A\}$ ; also  $|f(x) - f(y)| \leq 2^{-n+1}$  for every  $f \in F_n \cup \{f_n\}$ . But this means that  $|f(x) - f(y)| \leq 2^{-n+1}$  for every  $f \in F_{n+1}$ , so that  $\rho(x, y) \leq 2^{-n+1}$ .

(ii) If  $y \in A' \setminus H_n$  where  $A' \in \mathcal{A}_n \setminus \{A\}$ , then  $|g_{nA}(x) - g_{nA}(y)| = 1$  while  $g_{nA} \in F_{n+1}$  so  $\rho(x, y) \geq 2^{-n}$ .

(iii) So if  $2^{-n-1} \leq \delta < 2^{-n}$  then  $A \setminus H_n \subseteq B(x, \delta) \subseteq A \cup H_n$ . Consequently  $\mu(B(x, \delta) \Delta A) \leq 2^{-n} \mu A$  if  $\mu A > 0$ .

(e) Set  $\mathcal{A}^* = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{A}_n$ . Because  $\langle \mathcal{A}_n \rangle_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a sequence of partitions, each refining the previous one,  $\mathcal{A}^*$  is well-capped in the sense that every non-empty subset of  $\mathcal{A}^*$  has a maximal element. Consequently, if  $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{A}^*$  and  $\mathcal{J}$  is the set of maximal elements of  $\mathcal{I}$ ,  $\bigcup \mathcal{I} = \bigcup \mathcal{J}$ ; moreover, since for any two members of  $\mathcal{A}^*$  either they are disjoint or one is included in another,  $\mathcal{J}$  is a disjoint family.

(f) Set

$$H = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcup_{m \geq n} H_m \cup \bigcup \{A : A \in \mathcal{A}^*, \mu A = 0\}.$$

Then  $H$  is negligible. If  $x \in X \setminus H$  and  $\delta > 0$ , there is an  $n \geq 1$  such that  $2^{-n} \leq \delta$  and  $x \notin H_n$ ; now there is an  $A \in \mathcal{A}_n$  containing  $x$  and  $B(x, \delta) \supseteq A_n \setminus H_n$  has measure at least  $(1 - 2^{-n})\mu A > 0$ . On the other hand, there is an open set of finite measure containing  $x$ , so  $B(x, \delta)$  must have finite measure for all sufficiently small  $\delta$ . Accordingly we can speak of

$$\liminf_{\delta \downarrow 0} \frac{\mu(E \cap B(x, \delta))}{\mu B(x, \delta)}$$

whenever  $x \in X \setminus H$  and  $E \in \text{dom } \mu$ .

(g) Let  $E \subseteq X$  be a measurable set of finite measure,  $\gamma < 1$  and  $\epsilon > 0$ ; set  $\gamma' = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \gamma)$  and

$$E' = \{x : x \in E \setminus H, \liminf_{\delta \downarrow 0} \frac{\mu(E \cap B(x, \delta))}{\mu B(x, \delta)} < \gamma\}.$$

Now we have an open set  $G \supseteq E'$  such that  $\mu G \leq \epsilon + \mu^* E'$ . Consider  $\mathcal{I} = \{A : A \in \mathcal{A}^*, A \subseteq G, \mu^*(E \cap A) \leq \gamma' \mu A\}$ . Then  $E' \subseteq \bigcup \mathcal{I}$ . **P** Take  $x \in E'$ . There are  $i, n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$f_i(x) = 1, \quad f_i(y) = 0 \text{ for every } y \in X \setminus G,$$

$$n > i, \quad \gamma(1 + 2^{-n}) \leq \gamma', \quad x \notin \bigcup_{m \geq n} H_m.$$

Now there are an  $m > n$  and a  $\delta \in [2^{-m-1}, 2^{-m}[$  such that  $\mu(E \cap B(x, \delta)) \leq \gamma \mu B(x, \delta)$ . In this case, if  $A$  is the member of  $\mathcal{A}_m$  including  $x$ ,  $\mu A > 0$  (because  $x \notin H$ ) so  $\mu(A \Delta B(x, \delta)) \leq 2^{-m} \mu A$ , by (d-iii). We also know that  $f_i \in F_{m-1}$  so  $\text{diam } f_i[A] \leq 2^{-m} < 1$  and  $A \subseteq G$ . Now

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(E \cap A) &\leq \gamma \mu B(x, \delta) + 2^{-m} \mu A \leq \gamma(\mu A + 2^{-m} \mu A) + 2^{-m} \mu A \\ &\leq (\gamma + 2^{-n}) \mu A \leq \gamma' \mu A. \end{aligned}$$

So  $A \in \mathcal{I}$  and  $x \in \bigcup \mathcal{I}$ . **Q**

Let  $\mathcal{J}$  be the set of maximal members of  $\mathcal{I}$ ; then  $\mathcal{J}$  is disjoint and  $E' \subseteq \bigcup \mathcal{J}$ , by (e) above. So

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^* E' &\leq \mu(E \cap \bigcup \mathcal{J}) = \sum_{A \in \mathcal{J}} \mu(E \cap A) \\ &\leq \gamma' \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \mu A \leq \gamma' \mu G \leq \gamma'(\mu^* E' + \epsilon). \end{aligned}$$

At this point, recall that  $\epsilon > 0$  was arbitrary, so  $\mu^* E' \leq \gamma' \mu^* E'$  and  $\mu^* E' = 0$ .

Thus we see that

$$\{x : x \in E \setminus H, \liminf_{\delta \downarrow 0} \frac{\mu(E \cap B(x, \delta))}{\mu B(x, \delta)} < \gamma\}$$

is negligible. And  $\gamma < 1$  was arbitrary, so

$$\{x : x \in E \setminus H, \liminf_{\delta \downarrow 0} \frac{\mu(E \cap B(x, \delta))}{\mu B(x, \delta)} < 1\}$$

is negligible. As  $H$  is negligible,

$$\lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \frac{\mu(E \cap B(x, \delta))}{\mu B(x, \delta)} = 1$$

for almost every  $x \in E$ .

(h) Thus  $\rho$  has the declared property for measurable sets  $E$  of finite measure. But suppose now that  $E \subseteq X$  is any measurable set. As noted in (a), there is a sequence  $\langle G_n \rangle_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of open sets of finite measure covering  $X$ . Now (g) tells us that, for each  $n$ ,

$$\lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \frac{\mu(E \cap G_n \cap B(x, \delta))}{\mu B(x, \delta)} = 1 \text{ for almost every } x \in E \cap G_n,$$

that is,

$$\lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \frac{\mu(E \cap B(x, \delta))}{\mu B(x, \delta)} = 1 \text{ for almost every } x \in E \cap G_n.$$

So in fact we have

$$\lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \frac{\mu(E \cap B(x, \delta))}{\mu B(x, \delta)} = 1 \text{ for almost every } x \in E \cap \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} G_n,$$

that is,

$$\lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \frac{\mu(E \cap B(x, \delta))}{\mu B(x, \delta)} = 1 \text{ for almost every } x \in E,$$

which is what we wanted to know.

**Question** Suppose that  $X$  is Čech-complete, that is, there is some metric on  $X$ , defining its topology, with respect to which  $X$  is complete. Can we find  $\rho$ , as above, also making  $X$  complete? Note that the metric above is for practical purposes totally bounded. What if  $X = [0, 1] \setminus \mathbb{Q} \cong \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ ?

**Acknowledgement** Question by B.Weiss, email 21.9.16.

## Reference

Fremlin D.H. [03] *Measure Theory, Vol. 4: Topological Measure Spaces*. Torres Fremlin, 2003 (<https://www.essex.ac.uk>).