

# Serie 3

## Optimal transport, Fall semester

EPFL, Mathematics section, Dr. Xavier Fernández-Real

**Exercise 3.1.** Let  $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a nonnegative lower semicontinuous function. Show that:

- (i)  $f$  admits a minimizer in every compact set  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ .
- (ii)  $f$  can be approximated from below monotonically (namely,  $f_\lambda(x) \uparrow f(x)$  for every  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ) by a sequence of functions  $f_\lambda$  as  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $f_\lambda$  is  $\lambda$ -Lipschitz.
- (iii) for every sequence of measures  $\mu_n \rightharpoonup \mu$  narrowly,

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f \, d\mu_n \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f \, d\mu.$$

*Hint:* For (ii), define  $f_\lambda(x) = \inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{f(y) + \lambda|x - y|\}$ .

### Solution:

(i) Let  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  be a compact set and  $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset K$  a minimizing sequence, i.e.

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(x_n) = \inf\{f(x) : x \in K\}.$$

Since  $K$  is compact, there is a converging subsequence  $\{x_{n_k}\}_{k=1}^\infty$  such that  $x_{n_k} \rightarrow x \in K$ . Then, since  $f$  is lower semicontinuous,

$$f(x) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} f(x_{n_k}) = \inf\{f(x) : x \in K\}.$$

Thus

$$f(x) \leq f(y) \quad \forall y \in K.$$

(ii) Define  $f_\lambda(x) = \inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{f(y) + \lambda|x - y|\}$ . We begin by showing that  $\{f_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}}$  is increasing in  $\lambda$  and bounded by  $f$ . Assume  $\lambda < \lambda'$ , then

$$f_\lambda(x) \leq f(y) + \lambda|x - y| \leq f(y) + \lambda'|x - y| \quad \text{for every } y \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Taking the infimum over  $y$ , we get  $f_\lambda(x) \leq f_{\lambda'}(x)$ . In addition due to the definition of  $f_\lambda$ , we get  $f_\lambda(x) \leq f(x)$ . Now we prove that  $f_\lambda$  is indeed  $\lambda$ -Lipschitz. We have

$$f_\lambda(x') \leq f(y) + \lambda|x' - y| \leq f(y) + \lambda|x - y| + \lambda|x' - x|.$$

Taking the infimum over  $y$ , we get  $f_\lambda(x') \leq f_\lambda(x) + \lambda|x' - x|$ . In a similar way, we can prove  $f_\lambda(x) \leq f_\lambda(x') + \lambda|x' - x|$ . Hence,  $|f_\lambda(x') - f_\lambda(x)| \leq \lambda|x - x'|$ , for all  $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , proving that  $f_\lambda$  is  $\lambda$ -Lipschitz.

Now finally, we prove that  $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} f_\lambda = f$ . Let  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Since  $f$  is lower semicontinuous, for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , there is  $\delta > 0$  so that for all  $y$  such that  $|x-y| \leq \delta$  we have  $f(y) \geq \min\{f(x)-\epsilon, \frac{1}{\epsilon}\}$ . In addition, since  $f$  is nonnegative  $f(y) + \lambda|x-y| \geq \delta\lambda$ , for all  $y$  such that  $|x-y| > \delta$ . We conclude

$$f_\lambda(x) \geq \min\{f(x) - \epsilon, \frac{1}{\epsilon}, \delta\lambda\}.$$

Letting  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ , we get

$$\liminf_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} f_\lambda(x) \geq \min\{f(x) - \epsilon, \frac{1}{\epsilon}\}.$$

Since  $\epsilon$  is arbitrary, we deduce  $\liminf_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} f_\lambda(x) \geq f(x)$ . Finally, since  $f_\lambda$  is bounded by  $f$ , we deduce

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} f_\lambda(x) = f(x).$$

(iii) Notice that the function  $\min\{f_\lambda, \lambda\}$  is continuous and bounded so that since  $\mu_n \rightharpoonup \mu$ ,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \min\{f_\lambda, \lambda\} d\mu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \min\{f_\lambda, \lambda\} d\mu_n \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f d\mu_n,$$

where the inequality follows from the fact that  $f_\lambda \leq f$ . Letting  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ , we get, due to the monotone convergence theorem,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f d\mu \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f d\mu_n.$$

**Exercise 3.2.** The support of a nonnegative measure  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathbb{R}^n)$  is defined as the smallest closed set on which  $\mu$  is concentrated, i.e.

$$spt(\mu) := \bigcap \{C \subset \mathbb{R}^n \text{ closed} : \mu(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus C) = 0\}.$$

Let us take a sequence of nonnegative measures  $\mu_j \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathbb{R}^n)$  such that  $\mu_j \xrightarrow{*} \mu$ . Prove the following fact: for every  $x \in spt(\mu)$ , there exists a sequence of points  $x_j \in spt(\mu_j)$  such that  $x_j \rightarrow x$ .

**Solution:** Suppose by contradiction that for some  $\epsilon > 0$  there is a sequence  $j_k \rightarrow \infty$  for which  $spt(\mu_{j_k}) \subset \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_\epsilon(x)$ . Let us consider a test function  $\varphi \in C_c(B_\epsilon(x))$  such that

$$\begin{cases} \varphi \geq 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n, \\ \varphi = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_\epsilon(x), \\ \varphi = 1 & \text{in } B_{\epsilon/2}(x). \end{cases}$$

Since  $x \in spt(\mu)$ ,  $\mu(B_{\epsilon/2}(x)) > 0$ . Testing the weak\* convergence of  $\mu_{j_k}$  to  $\mu$  with  $\varphi$ , we get

$$0 = \int \varphi d\mu_{j_k} \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} \int \varphi d\mu \geq \mu(B_{\epsilon/2}(x)) > 0,$$

a contradiction.

**Exercise 3.3** (Characterizations of weak-\* convergence). Let  $\mu_j, \mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  be probability measures in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

i) Show that  $\mu_j \rightharpoonup \mu$  narrowly if and only if one of the following properties hold:

a) For every open set  $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ :

$$\liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mu_j(A) \geq \mu(A).$$

b) For every closed set  $C \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ :

$$\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mu_j(C) \leq \mu(C).$$

c) For every set  $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  such that  $\mu(\partial E) = 0$ :

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mu_j(E) = \mu(E).$$

ii) Give an example of a sequence of probability measures  $\mu_j \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  such that  $\mu_j \xrightarrow{*} \mu$  for some measure  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_+(\mathbb{R}^n)$  and an open set  $A$  such that

$$\liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mu_j(A) > \mu(A).$$

*Hint:* For one implication in (i), use Exercise 3.1. For the other, use the layer-cake formula

$$\int \varphi d\mu = \int_0^\infty \mu(\{\varphi > t\}) dt \quad \text{for every } \varphi \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^n), \varphi \geq 0.$$

**Solution:**

(i) We will prove the following chain of implications:

$$\mu_j \rightharpoonup \mu \text{ narrowly} \implies a) \implies b) \implies c) \implies \mu_j \rightharpoonup \mu \text{ narrowly}.$$

$\mu_j \rightharpoonup \mu \text{ narrowly} \implies a)$ . Let  $\mu_j \rightharpoonup \mu$  narrowly and take  $A$  an open set. Notice that the function  $\mathbb{1}_A$  is lower semicontinuous since  $A$  is open. Thus, using Exercise 3.1

$$\liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mu_j(A) = \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int \mathbb{1}_A d\mu_j \geq \int \mathbb{1}_A d\mu = \mu(A).$$

a)  $\implies$  b). Now assume a) holds true and take  $C$  a closed set. Then  $A := \mathbb{R}^n \setminus C$  is open, therefore, by a):

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mu_j(C) &= \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} (1 - \mu_j(A)) = 1 - \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mu_j(A) \\ &\leq 1 - \mu(A) = \mu(C). \end{aligned}$$

b)  $\implies$  c). Assume b) holds true. With the same argument as above we can easily show that a) holds true as well. Let  $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be a set so that  $\mu(\partial E) = 0$ . We call  $A := E \setminus \partial E$

and  $C := \overline{E}$ , and note that  $A$  is open and  $C$  is closed. Then, using a), b) and  $\mu(\partial E) = 0$  we obtain the following chain of inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mu_j(E) &\leq \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mu_j(C) \leq \mu(C) = \mu(E) = \\ &= \mu(A) \leq \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mu_j(A) \leq \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mu_j(E). \end{aligned}$$

Hence the previous inequalities must be all equalities proving that  $\mu_j(E) \rightarrow \mu(E)$ , as desired.

c)  $\Rightarrow \mu_j \rightharpoonup \mu$  narrowly. Assume that c) holds true and let  $\varphi \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^n)$  be a nonnegative bounded continuous function. Observe that for almost every  $t > 0$ , the set  $E_t := \{\varphi > t\}$  is such that  $\mu(\partial E_t) = 0$ . Hence, by c):

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mu_j(E_t) = \mu(E_t) \quad \text{for almost every } t > 0.$$

Therefore, using the layer cake formula, together with the dominated convergence theorem we get

$$\int \varphi d\mu = \int_0^{\max \varphi} \mu(E_t) dt = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^{\max \varphi} \mu_j(E_t) dt = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int \varphi d\mu_j.$$

This proves that  $\mu_j \rightharpoonup \mu$  narrowly.

(ii) Let  $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be a sequence of points such that  $|x_j| \rightarrow \infty$  as  $j \rightarrow \infty$ . For any  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , we define  $\mu_j = \delta_{x_j}$ . Now for any  $\varphi \in C_c(\mathbb{R}^n)$ ,

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int \varphi d\mu_j = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(x_j) = 0 \quad \text{since} \quad |x_j| \rightarrow \infty.$$

Hence,  $\mu_j \xrightarrow{*} \mu$ , where  $\mu$  is the null measure. Now taking  $A = \mathbb{R}^n$  we get

$$1 = \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mu_j(\mathbb{R}^n) > \mu(\mathbb{R}^n) = 0.$$

**Exercise 3.4.** Let  $\{\mu_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$  be a sequence of probability measures with  $\mu_n \rightharpoonup \mu$  narrowly. Define  $F_n(x) := \mu_n((-\infty, x])$ ,  $F(x) := \mu((-\infty, x])$ .

(i) Prove that  $\mu$  is a probability measure.

(ii) Prove that

$$\limsup_n F_n(x) \leq F(x) \quad \text{for every } x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

(iii) Prove that

$$\lim_n F_n(x) = F(x) \quad \text{for every } x \in \mathbb{R} \text{ at which } F \text{ is continuous.}$$

(iv) Give an example of a sequence of measures  $\mu_n \rightharpoonup \mu$  narrowly and an  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  for which

$$\limsup_n F_n(x) < F(x).$$

**Solution:**

- (i) To prove that  $\mu$  is a probability measure, use the definition of narrow convergence with the test function  $f \equiv 1$ .
- (ii) We have the following

$$\begin{aligned}\limsup_n F_n(x) &= \limsup_n (1 - \mu_n((x, \infty))) \\ &= 1 - \liminf_n \mu_n((x, \infty)) \\ &\leq 1 - \mu((x, \infty)) = F(x),\end{aligned}$$

which gives the thesis.

- (iii) Let us fix a point  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\delta > 0$ : we take a continuous non increasing function  $f$  such that  $f(t) \equiv 1$  for  $t \leq x$  and  $f(t) \equiv 0$  for every  $t \geq x + \delta$ , then we have

$$F(x + \delta) \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x) d\mu(x) = \lim_n \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x) d\mu_n(x) \geq \limsup_n F_n(x).$$

Now consider a non increasing function  $f$  such that  $f(t) \equiv 1$  for  $t \leq x - \delta$  and  $f(t) \equiv 0$  for every  $t \geq x$ , then we have

$$F(x - \delta) \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x) d\mu(x) = \lim_n \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x) d\mu_n(x) \leq \liminf_n F_n(x),$$

the thesis follows from the continuity of  $F$  in  $x$ .

- (iv) For the example consider  $\mu_n = \delta_{1/n}$ ,  $\mu = \delta_0$  and  $x = 0$ .

**Exercise 3.5.**

- (i) Find a sequence of functions  $f_n : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that  $(f_n)_{\#}(\mathcal{L}^1 \llcorner [0, 1]) = (\mathcal{L}^1 \llcorner [0, 1])$  but  $f_n$  weakly converge to  $1/2$ .
- (ii) What is the weak limit of  $(\text{id}, f_n)_{\#} \mathcal{L}^1 \llcorner [0, 1]$ ?
- (iii) (✿) Can these functions be taken  $C^1$ ?

*Hint:* For (i), use piecewise affine oscillating functions.

**Solution:**

- (i) Define  $\phi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  on  $[0, 1]$  by

$$\phi(x) = \begin{cases} 2x & \text{if } x \in [0, 1/2]; \\ 2(1 - x) & \text{if } x \in (1/2, 1], \end{cases}$$

and extend it to  $\mathbb{R}$  by 1-periodicity. Define  $f_n: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  by

$$f_n(x) = \phi(nx).$$

From the Riemann-Lebesgue theorem, it is clear that  $f_n$  converges weakly to  $1/2$ . In order to prove  $(f_n)_\#(\mathcal{L}|_{[0,1]}) = (\mathcal{L}|_{[0,1]})$  we need to show that

$$(\mathcal{L}|_{[0,1]})(f_n^{-1}(A)) = (\mathcal{L}|_{[0,1]})(A) \text{ for any } A \subseteq \mathbb{R} \text{ Borel set.} \quad (1)$$

Since the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra is generated by sets of the form  $A = (a, \infty)$  it suffices to show the previous equality for sets of this form. First we have

$$\phi^{-1}((a, \infty)) = \bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} (m + a/2, m + 1 - a/2) \quad \text{if } a \in [0, 1).$$

If  $a \geq 1$ , then  $\phi^{-1}((a, \infty)) = \emptyset$  and if  $a < 0$ , then  $\phi^{-1}((a, \infty)) = \mathbb{R}$ . From this we deduce that

$$f_n^{-1}((a, \infty)) = \bigcup_{m=0}^{n-1} \left( \frac{m}{n} + \frac{a}{2n}, \frac{m+1}{n} - \frac{a}{2n} \right) \quad \text{if } a \in [0, 1).$$

In addition,  $f_n^{-1}((a, \infty)) = \emptyset$  if  $a \geq 1$  and  $f_n^{-1}((a, \infty)) = [0, 1]$  if  $a < 0$ . Thus the equation (1) is satisfied if  $a \geq 1$  or  $a < 0$ . Now considering the case when  $a \in [0, 1)$ , we have

$$(\mathcal{L}|_{[0,1]})(f_n^{-1}((a, \infty))) = (\mathcal{L}|_{[0,1]}) \left( \bigcup_{m=0}^{n-1} \left( \frac{m}{n} + \frac{a}{2n}, \frac{m+1}{n} - \frac{a}{2n} \right) \right) = \sum_{m=0}^{n-1} \frac{1-a}{n} = 1-a.$$

which implies (1). In conclusion, since (1) holds for any set of the form  $A = (a, \infty)$  and the family of these sets generate the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra, (1) holds for any Borel set which proves that

$$(f_n)_\#(\mathcal{L}|_{[0,1]}) = (\mathcal{L}|_{[0,1]}).$$

(ii) Let  $\varphi \in C_c(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})$ . We will show

$$\int \varphi(x, y) d(\text{id}, f_n)_\# \mathcal{L}|_{[0,1]} \rightarrow \int \varphi(x, y) d\mathcal{L}^2|_{[0,1]^2} \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Fix any  $\epsilon > 0$ . Since  $\varphi$  is uniformly continuous there is  $\delta > 0$  such that if  $|x - y| < \delta$ , then  $|\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)| < \epsilon$ . Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  be large enough so that  $2/n < \delta$ . Now we will consider a grid covering  $[0, 1]^2$  composed by  $2n^2$  rectangles of the form

$$R_{ij} = \left[ \frac{i}{2n}, \frac{i+1}{2n} \right] \times \left[ \frac{j}{n}, \frac{j+1}{n} \right] \quad i = 0, \dots, 2n-1, j = 0, \dots, n-1.$$

Notice that all  $R_{ij}$  have a diameter smaller than  $\delta$ . Now for any  $k = 0, \dots, 2n^2 - 1$ , denote  $i_k, j_k$  the unique integers such that

$$\left( \frac{2k+1}{4n^2}, f_n \left( \frac{2k+1}{4n^2} \right) \right) \in R_{i_k j_k}$$

Then, using the fact that  $\varphi$  is uniformly continuous, we get

$$\left| \int_{\frac{k}{2n^2}}^{\frac{k+1}{2n^2}} \varphi(x, f_n(x)) dx - \frac{1}{2n^2} \varphi \left( \frac{2k+1}{4n^2}, f_n \left( \frac{2k+1}{4n^2} \right) \right) \right| < \frac{1}{2n^2} \epsilon \quad \forall k = 1, \dots, 2n^2 - 1$$

and

$$\left| \int_{R_{i_k j_k}} \varphi(x, y) dx dy - \frac{1}{2n^2} \varphi \left( \frac{2k+1}{4n^2}, f_n \left( \frac{2k+1}{4n^2} \right) \right) \right| < \frac{1}{2n^2} \epsilon \quad \forall k = 1, \dots, 2n^2 - 1.$$

Therefore, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int \varphi(x, y) d(\text{id}, f_n)_{\#} \mathcal{L}|_{[0,1]} - \frac{1}{2n^2} \sum_{k=1}^{2n^2-1} \varphi \left( \frac{2k+1}{4n^2}, f_n \left( \frac{2k+1}{4n^2} \right) \right) \right| \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2n^2} \sum_{k=1}^{2n^2-1} \left| \int_{\frac{k}{2n^2}}^{\frac{k+1}{2n^2}} \varphi(x, f_n(x)) dx - \varphi \left( \frac{2k+1}{4n^2}, f_n \left( \frac{2k+1}{4n^2} \right) \right) \right| < \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int \varphi(x, y) d\mathcal{L}|_{[0,1]^2} - \frac{1}{2n^2} \sum_{k=1}^{2n^2-1} \varphi \left( \frac{2k+1}{4n^2}, f_n \left( \frac{2k+1}{4n^2} \right) \right) \right| \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2n^2} \sum_{k=1}^{2n^2-1} \left| \int_{R_{i_k j_k}} \varphi(x, y) dx dy - \varphi \left( \frac{2k+1}{4n^2}, f_n \left( \frac{2k+1}{4n^2} \right) \right) \right| < \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

This proves that

$$\left| \int \varphi(x, y) d(\text{id}, f_n)_{\#} \mathcal{L}|_{[0,1]} - \int \varphi(x, y) d\mathcal{L}^2|_{[0,1]^2} \right| < 2\epsilon$$

when  $n$  is large enough. We conclude that  $(\text{id}, f_n)_{\#} \mathcal{L}|_{[0,1]}$  converges weakly to  $\mathcal{L}^2|_{[0,1]^2}$ .

(iii) Assume  $\varphi \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$  such that  $(\varphi)_{\#}(\mathcal{L}|_{[0,1]}) = \mathcal{L}|_{[0,1]}$ . For a contradiction, assume there is  $y \in (0, 1)$  such that  $\varphi'(y) = 0$ . For any  $\epsilon > 0$ , there is  $\delta > 0$  such that for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  with  $|x - y| < \delta$  we have  $|\varphi'(x)| < \epsilon$ . Thus, for all  $x$  such that  $|x - y| < \delta$ , we get

$$|\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)| < \epsilon|x - y| < \epsilon\delta$$

Then

$$(x - \delta, x + \delta) \subseteq \varphi^{-1}((\varphi(x) - \epsilon\delta, \varphi(x) + \epsilon\delta)),$$

so that

$$2\epsilon\delta = (\varphi)_{\#}(\mathcal{L}|_{[0,1]})((\varphi(x) - \epsilon\delta, \varphi(x) + \epsilon\delta)) = (\mathcal{L}|_{[0,1]})(\varphi^{-1}((\varphi(x) - \epsilon\delta, \varphi(x) + \epsilon\delta))) \geq 2\delta$$

which yields a contradiction when taking  $\epsilon < 1$ . This proves that  $\varphi'$  never vanishes on  $(0, 1)$  so that  $\varphi$  is either strictly increasing or strictly decreasing. Assume  $\varphi$  is strictly increasing

(the other case is similar). Then for any  $a, b \in (0, 1)$ , we have

$$b - a = (\varphi)_\#(\mathcal{L}|_{[0,1]})((a, b)) = \mathcal{L}|_{[0,1]}((\varphi^{-1}(a), \varphi^{-1}(b))) = \varphi^{-1}(b) - \varphi^{-1}(a).$$

Thus, for any  $x, y \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\varphi(x) - \varphi(y) = x - y$ . We conclude  $\varphi(x) = x$  on  $(0, 1)$ . If we assume  $\varphi$  is strictly decreasing, then  $\varphi(x) = 1 - x$  on  $(0, 1)$ . We conclude by noting that any sequence of such functions cannot converge weakly to  $1/2$ .

**Exercise 3.6 (✳).** Let  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  be a probability measure. We say that a sequence of borel functions  $T_j : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  converge in  $\mu$ -measure to  $T : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  if<sup>1</sup>

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mu(\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |T_j(x) - T(x)| > \epsilon\}) = 0 \quad \text{for every } \epsilon > 0.$$

Denoting by  $\pi_j := (id, T_j)_\# \mu, \pi := (id, T)_\# \mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ , prove the following equivalence:

$$\pi_j \xrightarrow{*} \pi \iff T_j \text{ converges to } T \text{ in } \mu\text{-measure}$$

**Solution:** Assume first that  $T_j$  converges to  $T$  in  $\mu$ -measure. We wish to prove that  $(id, T_j)_\# \mu$  weakly-\* converge to  $(id, T)_\# \mu$ . Let  $\varphi \in C_c(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ . Then, from each subsequence  $j_k \nearrow \infty$ , we can extract a further subsequence  $j_{k_\ell} \nearrow \infty$  for which  $T_{j_{k_\ell}}$  converges to  $T$  pointwise  $\mu$ -almost everywhere, and so, by the change of variables formula and the dominated convergence theorem we obtain

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n} \varphi d(id, T_{j_{k_\ell}})_\# d\mu = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi(x, T_{j_{k_\ell}}(x)) d\mu \xrightarrow{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi(x, T(x)) d\mu = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n} \varphi d(id, T)_\# d\mu,$$

which gives the desired result.

Let us now assume that  $\pi_j = (id, T_j)_\# \mu$  weakly-\* converge to  $\pi = (id, T)_\# \mu$  (and hence narrowly, as all these measures have the same total mass), and prove that  $T_j$  converges to  $T$  in  $\mu$ -measure. Fix  $\epsilon > 0$ . By Lusin's Theorem, there exists a continuous map  $\tilde{T} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  such that  $\mu(\{\tilde{T} \neq T\}) < \epsilon$ . Let us then consider the continuous bounded test function  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined as

$$\varphi(x, y) := \min\{|y - \tilde{T}(x)|, 1\}.$$

By the change of variables formula and the narrow convergence,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \min\{|T_j(x) - \tilde{T}(x)|, 1\} d\mu &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n} \varphi d\pi_j \rightarrow \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n} \varphi d\pi \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \min\{|T(x) - \tilde{T}(x)|, 1\} d\mu \leq \mu(\{T \neq \tilde{T}\}) < \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

<sup>1</sup>By standard measure theory arguments one can easily prove that whenever  $T_j$  converges to  $T$  in  $\mu$ -measure, there is a subsequence  $j_k \nearrow \infty$  such that  $T_{j_k}$  converge to  $T$  pointwise  $\mu$ -almost everywhere.

Thus if  $j$  is large enough we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \min\{|T_j(x) - T(x)|, 1\} d\mu \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \min\{|T_j(x) - \tilde{T}(x)|, 1\} d\mu + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \min\{|T(x) - \tilde{T}(x)|, 1\} d\mu < 2\epsilon.$$

Finally, given any  $\delta > 0$ , using Markov's inequality, we get, for  $j$  large enough:

$$\mu(\{|T_j - T| > \delta\}) \leq \frac{1}{\delta} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \min\{|T_j(x) - T(x)|, 1\} d\mu \leq \frac{2\epsilon}{\delta},$$

and the thesis follows from the arbitrariness of  $\epsilon$ .