

It follows that  $D_\mu v = \overline{D_\mu v} < \infty$   $\mu$ -a.e.,

CLAIM The function  $x \mapsto D_\mu v(x)$  is  $\mu$ -measurable.

We first show that for any fixed  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $r > 0$  we have

$$\limsup_{y \rightarrow x} \mu(B(y, r)) \leq \mu(B(x, r)).$$

That is:

$x \mapsto \mu(B(x, r))$  is upper semicontinuous ( $\Rightarrow$  Borel measurable)

Let  $y_k \xrightarrow[k \rightarrow \infty]{} x$  be any sequence. Let

$$f_k(y) = \chi_{B(y_k, r)}(y)$$

$$f(y) = \chi_{B(x, r)}(y), \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Because  $B(x, r)$  is closed, we have

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} f_k(y) \leq f(y) \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

It follows that

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} (1 - f_k(y)) \geq 1 - f(y) \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

By Fatou Lemma:

$$\int_{B(x, 2r)} (1 - f) d\mu \leq \int_{B(x, 2r)} \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} (1 - f_k) d\mu \stackrel{\text{Fatou}}{\leq}$$

$$\leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B(x, 2r)} (1 - f_k) d\mu$$

that is

$$\mu(B(x, 2r)) - \mu(B(x, r)) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left( \mu(B(x, 2r)) - \mu(B(y_k, r)) \right).$$

As  $\mu(B(x, 2r)) < \infty$  this is equivalent with

$$\mu(B(x, r)) \geq \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mu(B(y_k, r)).$$

We are ready to prove the claim. For  $r > 0$  let

$$f_r(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{\nu(B_r(x))}{\mu(B_r(x))} & \text{if } \mu(B_r(x)) > 0 \\ \infty & \text{if } \mu(B_r(x)) = 0. \end{cases}$$

The function  $x \mapsto f_r(x)$  is  $\mu$ -measurable.

Then also

$$D_{\mu} \nu = \lim_{r \downarrow 0} f_r = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} f_{1/k}$$

is  $\mu$ -measurable. □

Proof of Theorem 2. We can assume:  $\mu(\mathbb{R}^n) < \infty$ ,  $\nu(\mathbb{R}^n) < \infty$ .

Let  $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be  $\mu$ -measurable. There is  $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  such

$$\text{that } A \subset B \text{ and } \mu(B \setminus A) = 0 \quad \nu \ll \mu \quad \Rightarrow \quad \nu(B \setminus A) = 0$$

$\Rightarrow A$   $\nu$ -measurable.

Let

$$I = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n : D_{\mu} \nu(x) = \infty \right\} \quad \mu\text{-meas.}$$

$$Z = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n : D_{\mu} \nu(x) = 0 \right\} \quad \mu\text{-meas.}$$

From the Lemma we know that  $\mu(I) = 0 \Rightarrow \nu(I) = 0$   
 Moreover, we have

$$\nu(Z) \leq \alpha \mu(Z) \quad \forall \alpha > 0 \Rightarrow \nu(Z) = 0.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(I) = 0 &= \int_I D_\mu \nu \, d\mu \\ \nu(Z) = 0 &= \int_Z D_\mu \nu \, d\mu. \end{aligned}$$

Now let  $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be measurable. For  $m \in \mathbb{Z}$  let

$$A_m = \{x \in A; t^m \leq D_\mu \nu < t^{m+1}\}$$

where  $t > 1$  is fixed. Then

$$\nu\left(A \setminus \bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} A_m\right) = 0.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(A) &= \nu\left(\bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} A_m\right) = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \nu(A_m) \leq \\ &\leq \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} t^{m+1} \mu(A_m) \leq \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} t \int_{A_m} D_\mu \nu \, d\mu \\ &= t \int_{\bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} A_m} D_\mu \nu \, d\mu = t \int_A D_\mu \nu \, d\mu. \end{aligned}$$

With a similar proof:

$$v(A) \geq \frac{1}{t} \int_A D_{\mu} v \, d\mu,$$

Letting  $t \downarrow 1$  we obtain

$$v(A) = \int_A D_{\mu} v \, d\mu.$$

Definition We say that two Radon measures  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  are mutually singular (or "orthogonal") if there exists  $B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  Borel set such that

$$\mu(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \nu(B) = 0.$$

In this case, we write  $\mu \perp \nu$ .

### Theorem 3 (Decomposition)

Let  $\mu, \nu$  be Radon measures on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ,

(1) There are Radon measures  $\nu_{ac}$  and  $\nu_s$  on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  such that:

$$\nu = \nu_{ac} + \nu_s, \quad \nu_{ac} \ll \mu, \quad \text{and} \quad \nu_s \perp \mu.$$

(2) Moreover, we have  $D_{\mu} \nu = D_{\mu} \nu_{ac}$ ,  $D_{\mu} \nu_s = 0$  and

$$\nu(A) = \int_A D_{\mu} \nu_{ac} \, d\mu + \nu_s(A)$$

for any Borel set  $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ .

Proof. We assume  $\mu(\mathbb{R}^n) < \infty$ ,  $\nu(\mathbb{R}^n) < \infty$ .

Let

$$\mathcal{E} = \left\{ A \subset \mathbb{R}^n : A \text{ Borel set, } \mu(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus A) = 0 \right\}.$$

For any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  there exists  $B_k \in \mathcal{E}$  such that

$$\nu(B_k) \leq \inf_{A \in \mathcal{E}} \nu(A) + \frac{1}{k}.$$

The set

$$B = \bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} B_k$$

is a Borel set and

$$\mu(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B) = \mu\left(\bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_k\right) \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mu(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_k) = 0.$$

We therefore have  $B \in \mathcal{E}$ .

Let us define

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_{ac} &= \nu \llcorner B && \text{Radon measures.} \\ \nu_s &= \nu \llcorner (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B) \end{aligned}$$

We claim that  $\nu_{ac} \ll \mu$ . Let  $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be a Borel set such that  $\mu(A) = 0$ . Then  $B \cap (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus A) = B \setminus A \in \mathcal{E}$

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(B) = \min_{A \in \mathcal{E}} \nu(A) &\Rightarrow \nu(B) \leq \nu(B \setminus A) \\ &\parallel \\ &\nu(B \setminus A) + \nu(A \cap B) \end{aligned}$$

We deduce that

$$\nu_{ac}(A) = \nu(A \cap B) = 0.$$