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## Notation

## 1. Lecture 6, conditional measures

1.1. Prelude. In probability theory, one often has a space, thought of as the collection of all possible "events" together with a probability measure, measuring which event is more likely to happen. Given these data, one can make predictions on "random variables". In mathematical terms, a random variable is just a (measurable) function and the "expectation" of this function is nothing but its integration.

Conditional expectations of a random variable means that we make predictions based on certain information. For instance, one might have another function $g$ on this space and we have perfect knowledge of what the value of $g$ is. So "conditional on" the value of $g$ taken, we make more refined predictions on our random variable.

Conditional expectations, just like expectations, can also be written as integration of the random variable against certain probability measures, known as conditional measures.

From a different perspective, one may also view conditional measures as "Fubini-type theorem".

The material of this lecture is mostly taken from [EW11, chapter 5].
1.2. Statement of the main theorem. Let $X$ be a compact metrizable topological space and $\mathscr{C}_{X}$ be its Borel $\sigma$-algebra. Let $\mu$ be a probability measure on $\left(X, \mathscr{B}_{X}\right)$. We refer the triple $\left(X, \mathscr{B}_{X}, \mu\right)$ as a compact Borel probability space.
Theorem 1.1. Let $\left(X, \mathscr{B}_{X}, \mu\right)$ be a compact Borel probability space and $\mathscr{A} \subset \mathscr{B}_{X}$ be a $\sigma$-subalgebra. Then there exist a subset $X^{\prime} \in \mathscr{A}$ of full $\mu$-measure (i.e. $\mu\left(X \backslash X^{\prime}\right)=0$ ) and a map $X^{\prime} \rightarrow \operatorname{Prob}\left(X, \mathscr{B}_{X}\right)$, denoted by $x \mapsto \mu_{x}^{\mathscr{A}}$, satisfying:
(1) for every $f \in C(X)$, the map $x \mapsto \int_{X} f(\omega) \mu_{x}^{\mathscr{A}}(\omega)$ from $X^{\prime}$ to $\mathbb{R}$ is measurable (w.r.t. $\mathscr{A} \cap X^{\prime}$ ) and

$$
\int_{A \cap X^{\prime}}\left(\int_{X} f(\omega) \mu_{x}^{\mathscr{A}}(\omega)\right) \mu(x)=\int_{A} f(\omega) \mu(\omega), \quad \forall A \in \mathscr{A}
$$

(2) for every $E \in \mathscr{B}_{X}$,

$$
x \mapsto \int_{X} \mathbf{1}_{E}(\omega) \mu_{x}^{\mathscr{A}}(\omega)
$$

is measurable on $\left(X^{\prime}, \mathscr{A} \cap X^{\prime}\right)$ and

$$
\int_{A \cap X^{\prime}}\left(\int_{X} \mathbf{1}_{E}(\omega) \mu_{x}^{\mathscr{A}}(\omega)\right) \mu(x)=\int_{A} \mathbf{1}_{E}(\omega) \mu(\omega), \quad \forall A \in \mathscr{A}
$$

[^0]or in different terms,
$$
\int_{A \cap X^{\prime}} \mu_{x}^{\mathscr{A}}(E) \mu(x)=\mu(A \cap E), \quad \forall A \in \mathscr{A}
$$
(3) If $Y \in \mathscr{A}$ is of full measure and $x \mapsto \nu_{x}^{\mathscr{A}}$ is another map from $Y$ to $\operatorname{Prob}\left(X, \mathcal{B}_{X}\right)$ satisfying for every $f$ in some dense subset of $C(X)$, the map $x \mapsto \int_{X} f(\omega) \mu_{x}^{\mathscr{A}}(\omega)$ from $Y$ to $\mathbb{R}$ is measurable (w.r.t. $\mathscr{B}_{X} \cap Y$ ) and
$$
\int_{A \cap Y}\left(\int_{X} f(\omega) \nu_{x}^{\mathscr{A}}(\omega)\right) \mu(x)=\int_{A} f(\omega) \mu(\omega), \quad \forall A \in \mathscr{A}
$$
then there exists $Y^{\prime} \subset X^{\prime} \cap Y$ in $\mathscr{A}$ of full measure such that $\mu_{x}^{\mathscr{A}}=\nu_{x}^{\mathscr{A}}$ for all $x \in Y^{\prime}$;
(4) If $\mathscr{A}$ is additionally assumed to be countably generated, then one can choose $X^{\prime \prime} \subset$ $X^{\prime}$ in $\mathscr{A}$ of full measure such that $\mu_{x}^{\mathscr{A}}\left([x]_{\mathscr{A}}\right)=1^{1}$ for every $x \in X^{\prime \prime}$ and $\mu_{y}^{\mathscr{A}}=\mu_{x}^{\mathscr{A}}$ whenever $[x]_{\mathscr{A}}=[y]_{\mathscr{A}} \subset X^{\prime \prime}$.
(5) If $\mathscr{A}_{1} \subset \mathscr{A}_{2} \subset \ldots$ is an increasing sequence of $\sigma$-subalgebras and $\mathscr{A}_{\infty}$ is the smallest $\sigma$-subalgebra containing all of them, then for every $E \in \mathscr{B}$, for $\mu$-almost all $x$, the relevant conditional measures are defined and
$$
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{x}^{\mathscr{A}_{n}}(E)=\mu_{x}^{\mathscr{A} \infty}(E)
$$

The family of measures $\left(\mu_{x}^{\mathscr{A}}\right)$ satisfying condition (1) and (2) as in the theorem are referred to as conditional measures.

There are two examples when the conclusion of the theorem (which we leave to the reader to fill in) might be more familiar to the reader.

Example 1.2. $\mathscr{A}$ is generated by a finite measurable partition $\left(P_{1}, P_{2}, \ldots, P_{n}\right)$ of $X$. If you prefer, you may even take $X$ to be a finite set to see what happens.
Example 1.3. $X=[0,1]^{2}$ and $\mu=\phi(x, y) \mathrm{dxdy}$ where $\phi(x, y)$ is a measurable nonnegative function with $\int \phi(x, y) \mathrm{dxdy}=1$. And

$$
\mathscr{A}:=\{A \times[0,1], A \text { is Borel measurable in }[0,1]\}
$$

1.3. The set $X^{\prime}$. We are going to construct the measure, thanks to Riesz representation theorem, by specifying the integrals of continuous functions.

First, we choose a countable dense subset $\mathscr{C} \subset C(X)$ containing the constant one function. Let

$$
\mathscr{C}_{\mathbb{Q}}:=\{\text { finite } \mathbb{Q} \text {-linear combinations of elements in } \mathscr{C}\}
$$

Thus $\mathscr{C}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ is a countable dense $\mathbb{Q}$-linear subspace of $C(X)$. Let $\pi_{\mathscr{A}}$ denote the orthogonal projection from $L^{2}\left(X, \mathscr{B}_{X}, \mu\right) \rightarrow L^{2}(X, \mathscr{A}, \mu)$. For every $f \in \mathscr{C}_{\mathbb{Q}}$, choose some representative $f^{\mathscr{A}}$ of $\pi_{\mathscr{A}}([f])^{2}$. Without loss of generality, for the constant one function $\mathbf{1}_{X}$, which is $\mathscr{A}$-measurable, choose $\mathbf{1}_{X}^{\mathscr{A}}:=\mathbf{1}_{X}$.

Lemma 1.4. For every $f \in \mathscr{C}_{\mathbb{Q}}$,

$$
\mu\left\{x\left|\left|f^{\mathscr{A}}(x)\right|>\|f\|_{\text {sup }}\right\}=0\right.
$$

Proof. The sets $A^{\star}:=\left\{x \mid \star f^{\mathscr{A}}(x)>\|f\|_{\text {sup }}\right\}$ for $\star=+$ or - are in $\mathscr{A}$. Thus their characteristic functions $\mathbf{1}_{A^{\star}}$ are contained in $L^{2}\left(X, \mathscr{B}_{X}, \mu\right)$. So if $\mu\left(A^{+}\right) \neq 0$,

$$
\|f\|_{\text {sup }} \mu\left(A^{+}\right) \geq\left\langle[f], \mathbf{1}_{A^{+}}\right\rangle=\left\langle\pi_{\mathscr{A}}([f]), \mathbf{1}_{A^{+}}\right\rangle>\|f\|_{\text {sup }} \mu\left(A^{+}\right)
$$

a contradiction. So $\mu\left(A^{+}\right)=0$. Similarly, $\mu\left(A^{-}\right)=0$ and hence $\mu(A)=0$.
Similarly, one shows that
Lemma 1.5. For every $f \in \mathscr{C}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ with $f \geq 0$, one has $\left\{x, f^{\mathscr{A}}(x) \geq 0\right\}$ is an element of $\mathscr{A}$ with full measure.

[^1]Lemma 1.6. For every finite collection $\left(f_{0}, f_{1}, \ldots, f_{n}\right) \subset \mathscr{C}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ and finitely many $\left(q_{1}, \ldots, q_{n}\right) \subset$ $\mathbb{Q}$ such that

$$
f_{0}=\sum q_{i} f_{i}
$$

the set

$$
\left\{x \mid f_{0}^{\mathscr{A}}(x)=\sum q_{i} f_{i}^{\mathscr{A}}(x)\right\}
$$

is $\mathscr{A}$-measurable and has full measure.
As there are only countably many data, we can find a $\mathscr{A}$-measurable set $X^{\prime}$ of full measure such that for every $x \in X^{\prime}$,
(0) $\mathbf{1}_{X}^{\mathscr{A}}(x)=1$;
(1) $\left|f^{\mathscr{A}}(x)\right| \leq\|f\|_{\text {sup }}, \quad \forall f \in \mathscr{C}_{\mathbb{Q}}$;
(2) $f^{\mathscr{A}}(x) \geq 0, \quad \forall f \in \mathscr{C} \mathbb{Q}, f \geq 0$;
(3) $f_{0}^{\mathscr{A}}(x)=\sum_{i=1}^{n} q_{i} f_{i}^{\mathscr{A}}(x), \quad \forall\left(f_{i}\right)_{i=0}^{n} \subset \mathscr{C}_{\mathbb{Q}},\left(q_{i}\right) \subset \mathbb{Q}$ with $f_{0}=\sum_{i=1}^{n} q_{i} f_{i}$.
1.4. Construction of measures. For every $x \in X^{\prime}$ and $f \in C(X)$, find $\left(f_{n}\right) \subset \mathscr{C}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ converging to $f$ in sup-norm. We define $\Lambda_{x}: C(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $\Lambda_{x}(f):=\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} f_{n}^{\mathscr{A}}(x)$.
Lemma 1.7. For $x \in X^{\prime},\left(f_{n}^{\mathscr{A}}(x)\right)$ converges. Consequently, $\Lambda_{x}(f)$ is well-defined and independent of the choice of $\left(f_{n}\right)$.
Proof. Take $n, m \in \mathbb{Z}^{+}$with $\left\|f_{n}-f_{m}\right\|_{\text {sup }} \leq \varepsilon$. As $f_{n}-f_{m} \in \mathscr{C}$, we have

$$
\left|f_{n}^{\mathscr{A}}(x)-f_{m}^{\mathscr{A}}(x)\right|=\left|\left(f_{n}-f_{m}\right)^{\mathscr{A}}(x)\right| \leq\left\|f_{n}-f_{m}\right\|_{\text {sup }} \leq \varepsilon
$$

This shows that $\left(f_{n}^{\mathscr{A}}(x)\right)$ is a Cauchy sequence.
Also, one sees from the lemma that $\Lambda_{x}(f)$ is independent of the choice of $\left(f_{n}\right)$. Moreover,

Lemma 1.8. For $x \in X^{\prime}, \Lambda_{x}$ defines a positive bounded linear functional on $C(X)$ sending 1 to 1. Therefore, by Riesz representation theorem, there exists a unique Borel probability measure, denoted as $\mu_{x}^{\mathscr{A}}$, such that $\Lambda_{x}(f)=\int f(\omega) \mu_{x}^{\mathscr{A}}(\omega)$.

Part (1) of Theorem 1.1 is automatically true for $f \in \mathscr{C}_{\mathbb{Q}}$, the general case follows by, say, dominated convergence theorem.
1.5. Extending to measurable functions. Let $O$ be an open subset of $X$, by Urysohn lemma (see e.g. 2.12 of [Rud87, Chapter 2$]$ ), there exists a sequence of continuous functions $\left(f_{n}\right)$ that is uniformly bounded and converges to $\mathbf{1}_{O}$. Similarly, one can find a uniformly bounded sequence of continuous functions converging to the characteristic function of a closed subset.

By dominated convergence theorem, Part (2) of Theorem 1.1 holds for $E$ being open or compact. Actually, the characteristic function of $E=O \cap C$, the intersection of some open subset and closed subset (for simplicity, we shall call such a set locally closed), can also be pointwisely approximated by a sequence of uniformly bounded continuous functions. Let
$\mathcal{R}:=\{$ subsets that can be written as a finite disjoint union of locally closed subsets $\}$.
Lemma 1.9. $\mathcal{R}$ is an algebra in the sense that it is closed under taking complements, finite intersections and finite unions.
Proof. For $C_{1}, C_{2}$ closed and $O_{1}, O_{2}$ open, we note that $\left(C_{1} \cap O_{1}\right) \cup\left(C_{2} \cap O_{2}\right)$ is a disjoint union of locally closed subsets:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left(C_{1} \cap O_{1}\right) \cup\left(C_{2} \cap O_{2}\right) \\
= & \left(\left(C_{1} \cap O_{1}\right) \cap\left(C_{2} \cap O_{2}\right)\right) \sqcup\left(C_{1} \cap O_{1}\right) \cap\left(C_{2} \cap O_{2}\right)^{c} \\
= & \left(\left(C_{1} \cap C_{2}\right) \cap\left(O_{1} \cap O_{2}\right)\right) \sqcup\left(\left(C_{1} \cap O_{1}\right) \cap\left(C_{2}^{c} \cup O_{2}^{c}\right)\right) \\
= & \left(\left(C_{1} \cap C_{2}\right) \cap\left(O_{1} \cap O_{2}\right)\right) \sqcup\left(C_{1} \cap O_{1} \cap C_{2}^{c}\right) \sqcup\left(C_{1} \cap O_{1} \cap O_{2}^{c} \cap C_{2}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

The rest follows from this.
On the other hand, let

$$
\mathcal{M}:=\left\{\text { subsets of } \mathscr{B}_{X} \text { that satisfy part (2) of Theorem } 1.1\right\}
$$

Lemma 1.10. Let $E_{1} \subset E_{2} \subset \ldots$ be an increasing sequence of elements in $\mathcal{M}$, then $E_{\infty}:=\bigcup E_{i}$ belongs to $\mathcal{M}$. If $E \in \mathcal{M}$, then $E^{c} \in \mathcal{M}$.

Proof. This follows from dominated convergence theorem.
Let $\sigma(\mathcal{R})$ denote the smallest $\sigma$-subalgebra of $\mathcal{B}_{X}$ containing $\mathcal{R}$. We have shown that $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{M}$. It is a general fact that if $\mathcal{M}$ is a subset of some $\sigma$-algebra satisfying the conclusion of Lemma 1.10 and contains some subalgebra $\mathcal{R}$ as in Lemma 1.9, then $\mathcal{M}$ contains $\sigma(\mathcal{R})$. In the current case, $\sigma(\mathcal{R})$ is $\mathcal{B}_{X}$, so they are equal.

Lemma 1.11. $\mathcal{M}=\sigma(\mathcal{R})$.
Proof. Let $\mathcal{M}_{0}$ be the smallest subset of $\mathcal{M}$ containing $\mathcal{R}$ such that the conclusion of Lemma 1.10 holds.

First take $E \in \mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{M}_{0}$, consider

$$
\mathcal{M}_{E}:=\left\{F \in \mathcal{M}_{0} \mid E \cap F, E \cup F, E^{c} \cap F, E^{c} \cup F \in \mathcal{M}_{0}\right\}
$$

are all contained in $\mathcal{M}_{0}$. Hence $\cup F_{i} \in \mathcal{M}_{E}$. If $F \in \mathcal{M}_{E}$, then the complements of

$$
E \cap F^{c}, E \cup F^{c}, E^{c} \cap F^{c}, E^{c} \cup F^{c}
$$

are contained $\mathcal{M}_{0}$. Thus they are also contained in $\mathcal{M}_{0}$, implying that $F^{c} \in \mathcal{M}_{E}$.
So we have shown that $\mathcal{M}_{E}$ satisfies the conclusion of Lemma 1.10. On the other hand, $\mathcal{M}_{E}$ contains $\mathcal{R}$ by Lemma 1.9. By minimality of $\mathcal{M}_{0}$, we get $\mathcal{M}_{E}=\mathcal{M}_{0}$.

For general $E \in \mathcal{M}_{0}, \mathcal{M}_{F}=\mathcal{M}_{0}, \forall F \in \mathcal{R}$ implies that $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{M}_{E}$. Same arguments as above show that $\mathcal{M}_{E}$ satisfies the conclusion of Lemma 1.10. Again by minimality, $\mathcal{M}_{E}=\mathcal{M}_{0}$.

Now that $\mathcal{M}_{0}$ is closed under taking finite unions and intersections, one can directly verify that $\mathcal{M}_{0}$ is a $\sigma$-algebra. This forces $\mathcal{M}_{0}=\mathcal{M}=\sigma(\mathcal{R})$.

Remark 1.12. Similar arguments are used to prove the $\pi-\lambda$ theorem in measure theory.
1.6. Uniqueness. Now we turn to part (3) of Theorem 1.1.

So we have a dense subset $\mathscr{C}$ of $C(X)$ such that for every $f \in \mathscr{C}$ and $A \in \mathscr{A}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{A \cap Y}\left(\int_{X} f(\omega) \nu_{x}^{\mathscr{A}}(\omega)\right) \mu(x)=\int_{A} f(\omega) \mu(\omega)=\int_{A \cap Y}\left(\int_{X} f(\omega) \mu_{x}^{\mathscr{A}}(\omega)\right) \mu(x) \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $\mathscr{C}^{\prime} \subset \mathscr{C}$ be a countable subset that is still dense in $C(X)$. For each $f \in \mathscr{C}^{\prime}$, let

$$
\begin{aligned}
& D_{f}^{+}:=\left\{x \in X^{\prime} \cap Y \mid \mu_{x}^{\mathscr{A}}(f)>\nu_{x}^{\mathscr{A}}(f)\right\} \\
& D_{f}^{-}:=\left\{x \in X^{\prime} \cap Y \mid \mu_{x}^{\mathscr{A}}(f)<\nu_{x}^{\mathscr{A}}(f)\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

Applying Equa.(1) we see that both $D_{f}^{+}$and $D_{f}^{-}$has measure zero. Let $Y^{\prime}$ be the complement of their unions as $f$ varies in $\mathscr{C}^{\prime}$. Then $Y^{\prime}$ is full in $X$. And for every $x \in Y^{\prime}$ and every $f \in \mathscr{C}^{\prime}$,

$$
\int_{X} f(\omega) \mu_{x}^{\mathscr{A}}(\omega)=\int_{X} f(\omega) \nu_{x}^{\mathscr{A}}(\omega)
$$

which extends to all $f \in \mathscr{C}^{\prime}$ by dominated convergence theorem. So $\mu_{x}^{\mathscr{A}}=\nu_{x}^{\mathscr{A}}$ for all $x \in Y^{\prime}$.
1.7. Countably generated sigma-subalgebras. Now let $\mathscr{A}$ be a countably generated $\sigma$-subalgebra of $\mathcal{B}_{X}$. For $x \in X$, define

$$
[x]_{\mathscr{A}}:=\bigcap_{x \in A \in \mathscr{A}} A .
$$

33 We sometimes refer to $[x]_{\mathscr{A}}$ as the atom containing $x$.

Lemma 1.13. Take $\left(A_{1}, A_{2}, \ldots\right)$ be such that $\mathscr{A}$ is the smallest $\sigma$-subalgebra of $\mathcal{B}_{X}$ containing all $A_{i}$ 's. Fix $x \in X$ and let

$$
B_{i}:= \begin{cases}A_{i}, & \text { if } x \in A_{i} \\ A_{i}^{c}, & \text { if } x \notin A_{i} .\end{cases}
$$

Lemma 1.15. For $f \in L^{1}(X, \mathscr{B}, \mu)$ (in application, $f=\mathbf{1}_{E}-\mathbf{1}_{F}$ ) and $\lambda>0$, let

$$
E(\lambda):=\left\{x \in X^{\prime} \mid \max _{n \in \mathbb{Z}^{+}} \mu_{x}^{\mathscr{A}_{n}}(f)>\lambda\right\}
$$

Then

$$
\mu(E(\lambda)) \leq \lambda^{-1}\|f\|_{1}
$$

Proof. If all $\mathscr{A}_{i}$ 's are the same, this is just Minkowski inequality. In general, let

$$
\begin{aligned}
& F_{1}:=\left\{x \in X^{\prime} \mid \mu_{x}^{\mathscr{A}_{1}}(f)>\lambda\right\} \in \mathscr{A}_{1} \\
& F_{2}:=\left\{x \in X^{\prime} \backslash F_{1} \mid \mu_{x}^{\mathscr{A}_{2}}(f)>\lambda\right\} \in \mathscr{A}_{2} \\
& F_{3}:=\left\{x \in X^{\prime} \backslash\left(F_{1} \cup F_{2}\right) \mid \mu_{x}^{\mathscr{A}_{3}}(f)>\lambda\right\} \in \mathscr{A}_{3} \\
& \ldots \ldots .
\end{aligned}
$$

33 Then $E(\lambda)=\bigsqcup_{k=1}^{\infty} F_{k}$. For every $k \in \mathbb{Z}^{+}$,

$$
\lambda \mu\left(F_{k}\right) \leq \int_{F_{k}} \mu_{x}^{\mathscr{A}_{k}}(f) \mu(x)=\int_{F_{5}} f(\omega) \mu(\omega) \leq \int_{F_{k}}|f(\omega)| \mu(\omega)
$$

1

3 Proof of (5) of Theorem 1.1. Fix $E \in \mathscr{A}_{\infty}$ and we would like to show that $\mu_{x}^{\mathscr{A}_{n}}(E)$ con4 verges to $\mu_{x}^{\mathscr{A} \infty}(E)$ almost surely. So for $\varepsilon>0$, let

$$
E(\varepsilon):=\left\{x|\lim \sup | \mu_{x}^{\mathscr{A}_{n}}(E)-\mu_{x}^{\mathscr{A} \infty}(E) \mid>\varepsilon\right\} .
$$

It suffices to show that $\mu(E(\varepsilon)) \leq 4 \varepsilon$ for every $\varepsilon>0$.
Take $k=k(\varepsilon) \in \mathbb{Z}^{+}$and $F \in \mathscr{A}_{k}$ such that

$$
\left\|\mathbf{1}_{E}-\mathbf{1}_{F}\right\|_{2}<\varepsilon^{2}
$$

7
$\limsup \left|\mu_{x}^{\mathscr{A}_{n}}(E)-\mu_{x}^{\mathscr{A} \infty}(E)\right| \leq \lim \sup \left|\mu_{x}^{\mathscr{A}_{n}}(E)-\mu_{x}^{\mathscr{A}_{n}}(F)\right|+\lim \sup \left|\mu_{x}^{\mathscr{A}_{n}}(F)-\mu_{x}^{\mathscr{A}_{\infty}}(E)\right|$.
8 And for $n$ larger than $k, \mu_{x}^{\mathscr{A}_{n}}(F)=\mu_{x}^{\mathscr{\mathscr { A }}}(F)=\mathbf{1}_{F}(x)$ almost surely. So $E(\varepsilon) \subset F(\varepsilon) \cup G(\varepsilon)$ where

$$
\begin{aligned}
F(\varepsilon) & :=\left\{x\left|\limsup _{n}\right| \mu_{x}^{\mathscr{A}_{n}}(E)-\mu_{x}^{\mathscr{A}_{n}}(F) \mid>0.5 \varepsilon\right\}, \\
G(\varepsilon) & :=\left\{x| | \mu_{x}^{\mathscr{A} \infty}(F)-\mu_{x}^{\mathscr{A} \infty}(E) \mid>0.5 \varepsilon\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus,

$$
\mu(E(\lambda))=\sum \mu\left(F_{k}\right) \leq \lambda^{-1} \sum \int_{F_{k}}|f(\omega)| \mu(\omega) \leq \lambda^{-1}\|f\|_{1}
$$

Note that

By Lemma 1.15, we have

$$
\mu(F(\varepsilon)), \mu(G(\varepsilon)) \leq \frac{2}{\varepsilon}\left\|\mathbf{1}_{E}-\mathbf{1}_{F}\right\|_{1} \leq 2 \varepsilon
$$

Hence $\mu(E(\varepsilon)) \leq 4 \varepsilon$ as desired.
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