Časopis pro pěstování matematiky, roč. 97 (1972), Praha

A NOTE ON WEAKLY BOREL MEASURES

ZDENA RIEČANOVÁ, Bratislava

(Received March 16, 1970)

In [1] S. K. BERBERIAN compared several of the commonly used definitions of "regular measure". In Theorem 3 he proved that

if ϱ is a finite measure on the weakly Borel sets of a locally compact Hausdorff space X, the following conditions are equivalent:

(A) ϱ is inner regular,

(B) ϱ is biregular,

(C) ϱ is sesquiregular,

(D) ϱ is outer regular, and there exists a Borel set E such that $\varrho(X - E) = 0$.

In the present paper we show: 1. the assumption of the local compactness of X can be dropped, 2. the conditions (A) and (D) can be replaced by weaker ones, 3. the finiteness of ϱ can be replaced by $(\mathbf{U}, \sigma)$-finiteness.

Let X be an arbitrary nonvoid set of elements. Let $\mathbf{S}$ be the σ-ring of subsets of X, and $\mathbf{C}$ and $\mathbf{U}$ nonempty subfamilies of $\mathbf{S}$. Let μ be a measure defined on $\mathbf{S}$. Measure μ is said to be *inner $\mathbf{C}$-regular* on $\mathbf{S}$ if

$$\mu(A) = \sup \{\mu(C) : A \supset C \in \mathbf{C}\} \quad \text{for all sets} \quad A \in \mathbf{S},$$

outer $\mathbf{U}$-regular on $\mathbf{S}$ if

$$\mu(A) = \inf \{\mu(U) : A \subset U \in \mathbf{U}\} \quad \text{for all sets} \quad A \in \mathbf{S},$$

and *$(\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{U})$-regular* on $\mathbf{S}$ if it is both inner $\mathbf{C}$-regular and outer $\mathbf{U}$-regular on $\mathbf{S}$.

Troughout the paper X denotes an arbitrary Hausdorff space, $\mathbf{C}$ the family of all compact subsets of X, $\mathbf{D}$ the family of all closed subsets of X and $\mathbf{U}$ denotes the family of all open subsets of X. By $\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{C})$ and $\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{D})$ we denote the σ-rings generated by $\mathbf{C}$ and $\mathbf{D}$ respectively.

A measure μ on $\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{D})$ is said to be *$(\mathbf{U}, \sigma)$-finite* if $X = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} U_n$, $U_n \in \mathbf{U}$, $\mu(U_n) < \infty$ $(n = 1, 2, \ldots)$.

Remark 1. If μ is a σ-finite and outer $\mathbf{U}$-regular measure on $\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{D})$ then μ is $(\mathbf{U}, \sigma)$-finite. In fact, if $E \in \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{D})$ and $\mu(E) < \infty$ then there exists a set $U \in \mathbf{U}$ such that $U \supset E$ and $\mu(U) < \infty$.

We compare the following conditions:

(a) $\mu(U) = \sup\{\mu(D) : U \supset D \in \mathbf{D}\}$ for all sets $U \in \mathbf{U}$ and there exists a set $Y \in \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{C})$ such that $\mu(X - Y) = 0$,

(b) $\mu(U) = \sup\{\mu(C) : U \supset C \in \mathbf{C}\}$ for all sets $U \in \mathbf{U}$,

(c) μ is inner $\mathbf{C}$-regular on $\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{D})$,

(d) μ is sesquiregular on $\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{D})$ (i.e. μ is outer $\mathbf{U}$-regular on $\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{D})$ and satisfies the condition (b)),

(e) μ is $(\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{U})$-regular on $\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{D})$,

(f) μ is $(\mathbf{D}, \mathbf{U})$-regular on $\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{D})$ and there exists a set $Y \in \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{C})$ such that $\mu(X - Y) = 0$,

(g) μ is outer $\mathbf{U}$-regular on $\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{D})$ and there exists a set $Y \in \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{C})$ such that $\mu(X - Y) = 0$,

(h) $\mu(D) = \inf\{\mu(U) : D \subset U \in \mathbf{U}\}$ for all sets $D \in \mathbf{D}$ and there exists a set $Y \in \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{C})$ such that $\mu(X - Y) = 0$.

Theorem 1. *If X is an arbitrary Hausdorff topological space and μ is a $(\mathbf{U}, \sigma)$-finite measure on $\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{D})$, the conditions* (a)–(f) *are equivalent.*

Proof. (a) $\Rightarrow$ (f): Let $E \in \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{D})$ such that $E \subset U_0 \in \mathbf{U}$, $\mu(U_0) < \infty$. The formula $\mu^0(A) = \mu(A \cap U_0)$ defines a finite measure on $\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{D})$. If $U \in \mathbf{U}$ then

$$\mu^0(U) = \mu(U \cap U_0) = \sup\{\mu(D) : U \cap U_0 \supset D \in \mathbf{D}\} =$$
$$= \sup\{\mu^0(D) : U \cap U_0 \supset D \in \mathbf{D}\} \leqq \sup\{\mu^0(D) : U \supset D \in \mathbf{D}\} \leqq \mu^0(U).$$

By ([2], Theorem 8, p. 43, or example 3, p. 45) μ^0 is $(\mathbf{D}, \mathbf{U})$-regular on $\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{D})$. Hence

$$\mu(E) = \mu^0(E) = \sup\{\mu^0(D) : E \supset D \in \mathbf{D}\} = \sup\{\mu(D) : E \supset D \in \mathbf{D}\}$$

and

$$\mu(E) = \mu^0(E) = \inf\{\mu^0(U) : E \subset U \in \mathbf{U}\} = \inf\{\mu(U \cap U_0) : E \subset U \in \mathbf{U}\} \geqq$$
$$\geqq \inf\{\mu(U) : E \subset U \in \mathbf{U}\} \geqq \mu(E).$$

Let A be an arbitrary set of $\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{D})$. From the $(\mathbf{U}, \sigma)$-finiteness of μ it follows that $A = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} (A \cap U_n)$, where $U_n \in \mathbf{U}$, $U_n \subset U_{n+1}$ and $\mu(U_n) < \infty$, $n = 1, 2, \ldots$ According to what was said above, $A \cap U_n$ and hence also A (see the proof of Theorem 3, [5], p. 220) are $(\mathbf{D}, \mathbf{U})$-regular sets according to μ. Hence μ is $(\mathbf{D}, \mathbf{U})$-regular on $\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{D})$.

(f) $\Rightarrow$ (e): Let $E_0 \in \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{C})$ such that $E_0 \subset C \in \mathbf{C}$. Then

$$\mu(E_0) = \sup\{\mu(D) : E_0 \supset D \in \mathbf{D}\} = \sup\{\mu(C) : E_0 \supset C \in \mathbf{C}\},$$

since $D \in \mathbf{D}$, $D \subset E_0$ implies $D \in \mathbf{C}$.