

Uniform Fatou's Lemma

April 9, 2015

Eugene A. Feinberg ¹, Pavlo O. Kasyanov ², and Michael Z. Zgurovsky ³

Abstract

Fatou's lemma is a classic fact in real analysis that states that the limit inferior of integrals of functions is greater than or equal to the integral of the inferior limit. This paper introduces a stronger inequality that holds uniformly for integrals on measurable subsets of a measurable space. The necessary and sufficient condition, under which this inequality holds for a sequence of finite measures converging in total variation, is provided. This statement is called the uniform Fatou's lemma, and it holds under the minor assumption that all the integrals are well-defined. The uniform Fatou's lemma improves the classic Fatou's lemma in the following directions: the uniform Fatou's lemma states a more precise inequality, it provides the necessary and sufficient condition, and it deals with variable measures. Various corollaries of the uniform Fatou's lemma are formulated. The examples in this paper demonstrate that: (a) the uniform Fatou's lemma may indeed provide a more accurate inequality than the classic Fatou's lemma; (b) the uniform Fatou's lemma does not hold if convergence of measures in total variation is relaxed to setwise convergence.

Keywords: finite measure, convergence, Fatou's lemma, Radon-Nikodym derivative

MSC 2010: 28A33, 60B10

PACS: 02.30.Cj, 05.10.Gg

1 Introduction and Main Results

Fatou's lemma is an important fact in real analysis that has significant applications in various fields. It provides the inequality that relates the limit inferior of integrals of functions and the integral of the inferior limit. This paper introduces the uniform Fatou's lemma for a sequence of finite measures converging in total variation, describes the necessary and sufficient condition for the validity of this statement, and provides corollaries and counter-examples.

¹Department of Applied Mathematics and Statistics, State University of New York at Stony Brook, Stony Brook, NY 11794-3600, USA, eugene.feinberg@sunysb.edu

²Institute for Applied System Analysis, National Technical University of Ukraine "Kyiv Polytechnic Institute", Peremogy ave., 37, build, 35, 03056, Kyiv, Ukraine, kasyanov@i.ua

³National Technical University of Ukraine "Kyiv Polytechnic Institute", Peremogy ave., 37, build, 1, 03056, Kyiv, Ukraine, zgurovsm@hotmail.com

For a measurable space (\mathbb{S}, Σ) , let $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{S})$ denote the family of finite measures on (\mathbb{S}, Σ) . Let \mathbb{R} be a real line and $\overline{\mathbb{R}} := \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$. A function $f : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ is called measurable if $\{s \in \mathbb{S} : f(s) < \alpha\} \in \Sigma$ for each $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. For $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{S})$ and a measure ν on \mathbb{S} , consider the distance in total variation

$$\text{dist}(\mu, \nu) := \sup \left\{ \left| \int_{\mathbb{S}} f(s) \mu(ds) - \int_{\mathbb{S}} f(s) \nu(ds) \right| : f : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow [-1, 1] \text{ is measurable} \right\}.$$

We recall that a sequence of finite measures $\{\mu^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$ on \mathbb{S} converges in total variation to a measure μ on \mathbb{S} if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{dist}(\mu^{(n)}, \mu) = 0$. Of course, if a sequence of finite measures $\{\mu^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$ on \mathbb{S} converges in total variation to a measure μ on \mathbb{S} , then $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{S})$ and $\mu^{(n)}(\mathbb{S}) \rightarrow \mu(\mathbb{S})$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

For $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{S})$ consider the vector space $L^1(\mathbb{S}; \mu)$ of all measurable functions $f : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$, whose absolute values have finite integrals, that is, $\int_{\mathbb{S}} |f(s)| \mu(ds) < +\infty$. The following theorem is the main result of this paper.

Theorem 1.1. (Necessary and Sufficient Conditions for Uniform Fatou's Lemma for Variable Measures and Unbounded Below Functions) *Let (\mathbb{S}, Σ) be a measurable space, $\{\mu^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots} \subset \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{S})$ converge in total variation to a measure μ on \mathbb{S} , $f \in L^1(\mathbb{S}; \mu)$, and $f^{(n)} \in L^1(\mathbb{S}; \mu^{(n)})$ for each $n = 1, 2, \dots$. Then the inequality*

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{S \in \Sigma} \left(\int_S f^{(n)}(s) \mu^{(n)}(ds) - \int_S f(s) \mu(ds) \right) \geq 0 \quad (1.1)$$

holds if and only if the following two statements hold:

(i) for each $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\mu(\{s \in \mathbb{S} : f^{(n)}(s) \leq f(s) - \varepsilon\}) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (1.2)$$

and, therefore, there exists a subsequence $\{f^{(n_k)}\}_{k=1,2,\dots} \subseteq \{f^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$ such that

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} f^{(n_k)}(s) \geq f(s) \quad \text{for } \mu\text{-a.e. } s \in \mathbb{S}; \quad (1.3)$$

(ii) the inequality

$$\liminf_{K \rightarrow +\infty} \inf_{n=1,2,\dots} \int_{\mathbb{S}} f^{(n)}(s) \mathbf{I}\{s \in \mathbb{S} : f^{(n)}(s) \leq -K\} \mu^{(n)}(ds) \geq 0 \quad (1.4)$$

holds.

Remark 1.2. Let (\mathbb{S}, Σ) be a measurable space, $\{f^{(n)}, f\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$ be a sequence of measurable functions, μ be a measure on \mathbb{S} . We note that if (1.2) holds for each $\varepsilon > 0$, then (1.3) holds; see Lemma 2.1.

We recall that the classic Fatou's lemma can be formulated in the following form.

Fatou's lemma. *Let (\mathbb{S}, Σ) be a measurable space, μ be a measure on (\mathbb{S}, Σ) and $\{f, f^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$ be a sequence of measurable nonnegative functions. Then the inequality*

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} f^{(n)}(s) \geq f(s) \text{ for } \mu\text{-a.e. } s \in \mathbb{S} \quad (1.5)$$

implies

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{S}} f^{(n)}(s) \mu(ds) \geq \int_{\mathbb{S}} f(s) \mu(ds). \quad (1.6)$$

Note that there are generalizations of Fatou's lemma to functions that can take negative values. For example, the conclusions of Fatou's lemma hold if all the functions have a common integrable minorant.

We recall that a sequence of measures $\{\mu^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$ from $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{S})$ converges setwise (weakly) to $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{S})$ if for each bounded measurable (bounded continuous) function f on \mathbb{S}

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}} f(s) \mu^{(n)}(ds) \rightarrow \int_{\mathbb{S}} f(s) \mu(ds) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

If $\{f, f^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots} \subset L^1(\mathbb{S}; \mu)$, then for $\mu^{(n)} = \mu$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$, inequality (1.1) is the uniform version of inequality (1.6) of the Fatou's lemma. There are generalized versions of Fatou's lemmas for weakly and setwise converging sequences of measures; see Royden [4, p. 231], Serfoso [5], Feinberg et al. [1], and references in [1]. Theorem 1.1 provides necessary and sufficient conditions for inequality (1.1), when variable finite measures $\{\mu^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$ converge in total variation to μ . We note that: (a) inequality (1.5) implies statement (i) from Theorem 1.1, but not vice versa (see Example 3.1); (b) inequality (1.4) always holds for nonnegative functions $\{f^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$; and (c) the assumption that the convergence of $\{\mu^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots} \subset \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{S})$ to a measure μ on \mathbb{S} takes place in total variation is essential and cannot be relaxed to setwise convergence; see Examples 3.2 – 3.4.

Theorem 1.1 implies the following two corollaries.

Corollary 1.3. (Necessary and Sufficient Conditions for Uniform Fatou's Lemma for Variable Measures and Nonnegative Functions) *Let (\mathbb{S}, Σ) be a measurable space, the sequence $\{\mu^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots} \subset \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{S})$ converge in total variation to a measure μ on \mathbb{S} , $f^{(n)} \in L^1(\mathbb{S}; \mu^{(n)})$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$, be nonnegative functions and $f \in L^1(\mathbb{S}; \mu)$. Then inequality (1.1) holds if and only if statement (i) from Theorem 1.1 takes place.*

Corollary 1.4. (Necessary and Sufficient Conditions for Uniform Fatou's Lemma for Unbounded Below Functions) *Let (\mathbb{S}, Σ) be a measurable space, $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{S})$, and $\{f, f^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots} \subset L^1(\mathbb{S}; \mu)$. Then the inequality*

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{S \in \Sigma} \left(\int_S f^{(n)}(s) \mu(ds) - \int_S f(s) \mu(ds) \right) \geq 0 \quad (1.7)$$

holds if and only if statement (i) from Theorem 1.1 takes place and

$$\liminf_{K \rightarrow +\infty} \inf_{n=1,2,\dots} \int_{\mathbb{S}} f^{(n)}(s) \mathbf{I}\{s \in \mathbb{S} : f^{(n)}(s) \leq -K\} \mu(ds) \geq 0. \quad (1.8)$$

Remark 1.5. For each $a \in \mathbb{R}$ we denote $a^+ := \max\{a, 0\}$ and $a^- := a^+ - a$. Note that $a = a^+ - a^-$ and $|a| = a^+ + a^-$. For a measure μ on \mathbb{S} and functions $f, g \in L^1(\mathbb{S}; \mu)$,

$$\inf_{S \in \Sigma} \left(\int_S g(s) \mu(ds) - \int_S f(s) \mu(ds) \right) = - \int_{\mathbb{S}} (g(s) - f(s))^- \mu(ds) \leq 0.$$

Therefore, inequality (1.7) is equivalent to

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{S}} (f^{(n)}(s) - f(s))^- \mu(ds) = 0.$$

Each of the Corollaries 1.3 and 1.4 implies the following statement.

Corollary 1.6. (Necessary and Sufficient Conditions for Uniform Fatou's Lemma for Nonnegative Functions) *Let (\mathbb{S}, Σ) be a measurable space, $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{S})$, $f \in L^1(\mathbb{S}; \mu)$, and $\{f^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots} \subset L^1(\mathbb{S}; \mu)$ be a sequence of nonnegative functions. Then inequality (1.7) holds if and only if statement (i) from Theorem 1.1 takes place.*

Remark 1.7. Under the assumptions of Corollary 1.6, inequality (1.7) is equivalent to $(f^{(n)} - f)^- \xrightarrow{\mu} 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. This follows from Remark 1.5, the dominated convergence theorem, Chebyshev's inequality, and because each function $(f^{(n)} - f)^-, n = 1, 2, \dots$, is majorated above by $f^+ \in L^1(\mathbb{S}, \mu)$. Statement (i) from Theorem 1.1 holds if and only if $(f^{(n)} - f)^- \xrightarrow{\mu} 0, n \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, Corollary 1.6 also follows from classic results. Furthermore, the assumption, that the measure μ is finite, can be omitted from Corollary 1.6.

Corollary 1.8. (Necessary and Sufficient Conditions for Uniform Dominated Convergence Theorem for Variable Measures) *Let (\mathbb{S}, Σ) be a measurable space, the sequence $\{\mu^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots} \subset \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{S})$ converge in total variation to a measure μ on \mathbb{S} , $f \in L^1(\mathbb{S}; \mu)$, and $f^{(n)} \in L^1(\mathbb{S}; \mu^{(n)})$ for each $n = 1, 2, \dots$. Then the equality*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{S \in \Sigma} \left| \int_S f^{(n)}(s) \mu^{(n)}(ds) - \int_S f(s) \mu(ds) \right| = 0 \quad (1.9)$$

holds if and only if the following two statements hold:

(i) *the sequence $\{f^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$ converges in measure μ to f , and, therefore, there is a subsequence $\{f^{(n_k)}\}_{k=1,2,\dots} \subseteq \{f^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$ that converges μ -a.e. to f ;*

(ii) *the following equality holds:*

$$\lim_{K \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{n=1,2,\dots} \int_{\mathbb{S}} |f^{(n)}(s)| \mathbf{I}\{s \in \mathbb{S} : |f^{(n)}(s)| \geq K\} \mu^{(n)}(ds) = 0. \quad (1.10)$$

We remark that, for uniformly bounded functions $\{f^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$, condition (ii) from Corollary 1.8 always holds and therefore is not needed. The necessary part of Corollary 1.8 for probability measures $\{\mu^{(n)}, \mu\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$ and uniformly bounded measurable functions $\{f^{(n)}, f\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$, defined on a standard Borel space \mathbb{S} , was introduced in Feinberg et al. [2, Theorem 5.5]. This necessary condition was used in Feinberg et al. [2, 3] for the analysis of control problems with incomplete observations, and it can be interpreted as a converse to a version of Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem for a sequence of measures converging in total variation. The understanding of Feinberg et al. [2, Theorem 5.5] was the starting point for formulating and investigating the uniform Fatou's lemma.

Corollary 1.9. (Necessary and Sufficient Conditions for Uniform Dominated Convergence Theorem) *Let (\mathbb{S}, Σ) be a measurable space, $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{S})$, and $\{f, f^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots} \subset L^1(\mathbb{S}; \mu)$. Then the equality*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{S \in \Sigma} \left| \int_S f^{(n)}(s) \mu(ds) - \int_S f(s) \mu(ds) \right| = 0 \quad (1.11)$$

holds if and only if statement (i) from Corollary 1.8 holds and the sequence $\{f^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$ is uniformly integrable, that is,

$$\lim_{K \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{n=1,2,\dots} \int_{\mathbb{S}} |f^{(n)}(s)| \mathbf{I}\{s \in \mathbb{S} : |f^{(n)}(s)| \geq K\} \mu(ds) = 0. \quad (1.12)$$

Remark 1.10. Under the assumptions of Corollary 1.9

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{S \in \Sigma} \left| \int_S f^{(n)}(s) \mu(ds) - \int_S f(s) \mu(ds) \right| \\ &= \max \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{S}} (f^{(n)}(s) - f(s))^- \mu(ds), \int_{\mathbb{S}} (f^{(n)}(s) - f(s))^+ \mu(ds) \right\} \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, equality (1.11) is equivalent to

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{S}} |f^{(n)}(s) - f(s)| \mu(ds) = 0,$$

and Corollary 1.9 coincides with the classic criterion of strong convergence in $L^1(\mathbb{S}; \mu)$.

The following two corollaries describe the relation between convergence properties of a sequence of finite signed measures $\{\tilde{\mu}^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$ and the sequence of their Radon-Nikodym derivatives $\{\frac{d\tilde{\mu}^{(n)}}{d\mu^{(n)}}\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$ with respect to finite measures $\{\mu^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$ converging in total variation.

Corollary 1.11. *Let (\mathbb{S}, Σ) be a measurable space, $\{\mu^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots} \subset \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{S})$, μ be a measure on \mathbb{S} , and $\{\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\mu}^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$ be a sequence of finite signed measures on \mathbb{S} . Assume that $\tilde{\mu} \ll \mu$ and $\tilde{\mu}^{(n)} \ll \mu^{(n)}$ for each $n = 1, 2, \dots$. If the sequence $\{\mu^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$ converges in total variation to μ , then the inequality*

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{S \in \Sigma} \left(\tilde{\mu}^{(n)}(S) - \tilde{\mu}(S) \right) \geq 0$$

holds if and only if the following two statements hold:

(i) for each $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\mu(\{s \in \mathbb{S} : \frac{d\tilde{\mu}^{(n)}}{d\mu^{(n)}}(s) \leq \frac{d\tilde{\mu}}{d\mu}(s) - \varepsilon\}) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

and, therefore, there exists a subsequence $\{\frac{d\tilde{\mu}^{(n_k)}}{d\mu^{(n_k)}}\}_{k=1,2,\dots} \subseteq \{\frac{d\tilde{\mu}^{(n)}}{d\mu^{(n)}}\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$ such that

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d\tilde{\mu}^{(n_k)}}{d\mu^{(n_k)}}(s) \geq \frac{d\tilde{\mu}}{d\mu}(s) \quad \text{for } \mu\text{-a.e. } s \in \mathbb{S};$$

(ii) the inequality

$$\liminf_{K \rightarrow +\infty} \inf_{n=1,2,\dots} \tilde{\mu}^{(n)}(\{s \in \mathbb{S} : \frac{d\tilde{\mu}^{(n)}}{d\mu^{(n)}}(s) \leq -K\}) \geq 0.$$

holds.

We remark that, if $\{\tilde{\mu}^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots} \subset \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{S})$, then statement (ii) of Corollary 1.11 always holds because $\tilde{\mu}^{(n)}(\cdot) \geq 0$ for all $n = 1, 2, \dots$. Corollary 1.11 implies the following necessary and sufficient condition for the convergence in total variation of finite signed measures $\{\tilde{\mu}^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$.

Corollary 1.12. *Let (\mathbb{S}, Σ) be a measurable space, $\{\mu^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots} \subset \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{S})$, μ be a measure on \mathbb{S} , and $\{\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\mu}^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$ be a sequence of finite signed measures on \mathbb{S} . Assume that $\tilde{\mu} \ll \mu$ and $\tilde{\mu}^{(n)} \ll \mu^{(n)}$ for each $n = 1, 2, \dots$. If the sequence $\{\mu^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$ converges in total variation to μ , then the sequence $\{\tilde{\mu}^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$ converges in total variation to $\tilde{\mu}$, that is,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{S \in \Sigma} \left| \tilde{\mu}^{(n)}(S) - \tilde{\mu}(S) \right| = 0,$$

if and only if the following two statements hold:

(i) the sequence $\{\frac{d\tilde{\mu}^{(n)}}{d\mu^{(n)}}\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$ converges in measure μ to $\frac{d\tilde{\mu}}{d\mu}$, and, therefore, there exists a subsequence $\{\frac{d\tilde{\mu}^{(n_k)}}{d\mu^{(n_k)}}\}_{k=1,2,\dots} \subseteq \{\frac{d\tilde{\mu}^{(n)}}{d\mu^{(n)}}\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$ that converges μ -a.e. to $\frac{d\tilde{\mu}}{d\mu}$;

(ii) the following inequality holds:

$$\lim_{K \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{n=1,2,\dots} |\tilde{\mu}^{(n)}|(\{s \in \mathbb{S} : |\frac{d\tilde{\mu}^{(n)}}{d\mu^{(n)}}(s)| \geq K\}) = 0,$$

where $|\tilde{\mu}^{(n)}|(S) = \int_S |\frac{d\tilde{\mu}^{(n)}}{d\mu^{(n)}}(s)| \mu^{(n)}(ds)$, $S \in \Sigma$.

2 Proofs

For a measurable function $g : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$, real number K , and set $S \in \Sigma$, we denote:

$$S_{g \geq K} := \{s \in S : g(s) \geq K\}, \quad S_{g > K} := \{s \in S : g(s) > K\},$$

$$S_{g \leq K} := \{s \in S : g(s) \leq K\}, \quad S_{g < K} := \{s \in S : g(s) < K\}.$$

The proof of Theorem 1.1 consists of four auxiliary lemmas.

Lemma 2.1. *Let (\mathbb{S}, Σ) be a measurable space, $\{f^{(n)}, f\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$ be a sequence of measurable functions, μ be a measure on \mathbb{S} , and (1.2) hold for each $\varepsilon > 0$. Then there exists a subsequence $\{f^{(n_k)}\}_{k=1,2,\dots} \subseteq \{f^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$ such that (1.3) holds.*

Proof. Fix an arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$. According to (1.2), there exists a sequence $\{n_k\}_{k=1,2,\dots}$ such that $\mu(\mathbb{S}_{f-f^{(n_k)} \geq \varepsilon}) \leq 2^{-k}$, $k = 1, 2, \dots$. Thus,

$$\mu(\cup_{k=K}^{\infty} \mathbb{S}_{f-f^{(n_k)} \geq \varepsilon}) \leq \sum_{k=K}^{\infty} \mu(\mathbb{S}_{f-f^{(n_k)} \geq \varepsilon}) \leq \sum_{k=K}^{\infty} 2^{-k} \leq 2^{-K+1},$$

$K = 1, 2, \dots$. Therefore, $\mu(\cap_{K=1}^{\infty} \cup_{k=K}^{\infty} \mathbb{S}_{f-f^{(n_k)} \geq \varepsilon}) = 0$, that is, for each $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\mu(\{s \in \mathbb{S} : \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} f^{(n_k)}(s) \leq f(s) - \varepsilon\}) = 0.$$

Thus, if (1.2) holds for each $\varepsilon > 0$, then (1.3) holds. \square

Lemma 2.2. *Let the assumptions of Theorem 1.1 hold. Then inequality (1.1) implies statement (i) from Theorem 1.1.*

Proof. On the contrary, if statement (i) from Theorem 1.1 does not hold, then there exist a sequence $\{n_k \rightarrow \infty\}_{k=1,2,\dots}$ and positive constants ε^* and δ^* such that

$$\mu(\mathbb{S}_{f-f^{(n_k)} \geq \varepsilon^*}) \geq \delta^*, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots \quad (2.1)$$

Since the sequence of finite measures $\{\mu^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$ converges in total variation to the finite measure μ , there exists $K_1 = 1, 2, \dots$, such that

$$\sup_{S \in \Sigma} \left| \mu^{(n_k)}(S) - \mu(S) \right| \leq \frac{\delta^*}{4}, \quad k = K_1, K_1 + 1, \dots \quad (2.2)$$

Therefore, inequalities (2.1) and (2.2) yield that

$$\mu^{(n_k)}(\mathbb{S}_{f-f^{(n_k)} \geq \varepsilon^*}) \geq \frac{3\delta^*}{4}, \quad k = K_1, K_1 + 1, \dots \quad (2.3)$$

Let us set $C := \int_{\mathbb{S}} |f(s)| \mu(ds)$. Note that $C < \infty$, because $f \in L^1(\mathbb{S}; \mu)$. Chebyshev's inequality yields that $\mu(\mathbb{S}_{|f| \geq M}) \leq \frac{C}{M}$ for each $M > 0$. Thus, inequality (2.2) implies

$$\mu^{(n_k)}(\mathbb{S}_{|f| \geq \frac{4C}{\delta^*}}) \leq \frac{\delta^*}{2}, \quad k = K_1, K_1 + 1, \dots \quad (2.4)$$

Moreover, inequalities (2.3) and (2.4) yield

$$\mu^{(n_k)}(\mathbb{S}_{f-f^{(n_k)} \geq \varepsilon^*} \setminus \mathbb{S}_{|f| \geq \frac{4C}{\delta^*}}) \geq \frac{\delta^*}{4}, \quad k = K_1, K_1 + 1, \dots \quad (2.5)$$

Indeed, for $k = K_1, K_1 + 1, \dots$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{3\delta^*}{4} &\leq \mu^{(n_k)}(\mathbb{S}_{f-f^{(n_k)} \geq \varepsilon^*}) \leq \mu^{(n_k)}(\mathbb{S}_{|f| \geq \frac{4C}{\delta^*}}) + \mu^{(n_k)}(\mathbb{S}_{f-f^{(n_k)} \geq \varepsilon^*} \setminus \mathbb{S}_{|f| \geq \frac{4C}{\delta^*}}) \\ &\leq \frac{\delta^*}{2} + \mu^{(n_k)}(\mathbb{S}_{f-f^{(n_k)} \geq \varepsilon^*} \setminus \mathbb{S}_{|f| \geq \frac{4C}{\delta^*}}), \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from (2.3), the second inequality follows from subadditivity of the finite measure $\mu^{(n_k)}$, and the third inequality follows from (2.4). Inequality (1.1) implies the existence of $K_2 = K_1, K_1 + 1, \dots$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{S}_{f-f^{(n_k)} \geq \varepsilon^*} \setminus \mathbb{S}_{|f| \geq \frac{4C}{\delta^*}}} f^{(n_k)}(s) \mu^{(n_k)}(ds) \\ &\quad - \int_{\mathbb{S}_{f-f^{(n_k)} \geq \varepsilon^*} \setminus \mathbb{S}_{|f| \geq \frac{4C}{\delta^*}}} f(s) \mu(ds) \geq -\frac{\varepsilon^* \delta^*}{8} \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

for each $k = K_2, K_2 + 1, \dots$. The definition of $\mathbb{S}_{f-f^{(n_k)} \geq \varepsilon^*}$ and inequalities (2.5) and (2.6) yield that for each $k = K_2, K_2 + 1, \dots$

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{\varepsilon^* \delta^*}{8} &\leq \int_{\mathbb{S}_{f-f^{(n_k)} \geq \varepsilon^*} \setminus \mathbb{S}_{|f| \geq \frac{4C}{\delta^*}}} f(s) \mu^{(n_k)}(ds) \\ &\quad - \int_{\mathbb{S}_{f-f^{(n_k)} \geq \varepsilon^*} \setminus \mathbb{S}_{|f| \geq \frac{4C}{\delta^*}}} f(s) \mu(ds) - \varepsilon^* \mu^{(n_k)}(\mathbb{S}_{f-f^{(n_k)} \geq \varepsilon^*} \setminus \mathbb{S}_{|f| \geq \frac{4C}{\delta^*}}) \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{S}_{f-f^{(n_k)} \geq \varepsilon^*} \setminus \mathbb{S}_{|f| \geq \frac{4C}{\delta^*}}} f(s) \mu^{(n_k)}(ds) - \int_{\mathbb{S}_{f-f^{(n_k)} \geq \varepsilon^*} \setminus \mathbb{S}_{|f| \geq \frac{4C}{\delta^*}}} f(s) \mu(ds) - \frac{\varepsilon^* \delta^*}{4}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for each $k = K_2, K_2 + 1, \dots$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{S}} f(s) \mathbf{I} \left\{ s \in \mathbb{S}_{f-f^{(n_k)} \geq \varepsilon^*} \setminus \mathbb{S}_{|f| \geq \frac{4C}{\delta^*}} \right\} \mu^{(n_k)}(ds) \\ &\quad - \int_{\mathbb{S}} f(s) \mathbf{I} \left\{ s \in \mathbb{S}_{f-f^{(n_k)} \geq \varepsilon^*} \setminus \mathbb{S}_{|f| \geq \frac{4C}{\delta^*}} \right\} \mu(ds) \geq \frac{\varepsilon^* \delta^*}{8}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

Since each function $s \rightarrow f(s)\mathbf{I}\left\{s \in \mathbb{S}_{f-f^{(n_k)} \geq \varepsilon^*} \setminus \mathbb{S}_{|f| \geq \frac{4C}{\delta^*}}\right\}$, $k = K_2, K_2 + 1, \dots$, is measurable and absolutely bounded by the constant $\frac{4C}{\delta^*}$ and the sequence of finite measures $\{\mu^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$ converges in total variation to $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{S})$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{S}} f(s)\mathbf{I}\left\{s \in \mathbb{S}_{f-f^{(n_k)} \geq \varepsilon^*} \setminus \mathbb{S}_{|f| \geq \frac{4C}{\delta^*}}\right\} \mu^{(n_k)}(ds) \\ & - \int_{\mathbb{S}} f(s)\mathbf{I}\left\{s \in \mathbb{S}_{f-f^{(n_k)} \geq \varepsilon^*} \setminus \mathbb{S}_{|f| \geq \frac{4C}{\delta^*}}\right\} \mu(ds) \rightarrow 0, \quad k \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

This contradicts (2.7). Therefore, inequality (1.1) implies statement (i) of Theorem 1.1. \square

Lemma 2.3. *Let (\mathbb{S}, Σ) be a measurable space, $\{\mu^{(n)}, \mu\}_{n=1,2,\dots} \subset \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{S})$, $f \in L^1(\mathbb{S}; \mu)$, and $f^{(n)} \in L^1(\mathbb{S}; \mu^{(n)})$, for each $n = 1, 2, \dots$. Then, inequality (1.1) and statement (i) from Theorem 1.1 imply statement (ii) from Theorem 1.1.*

Remark 2.4. According to Lemmas 2.2 and 2.3, if the assumptions of Theorem 1.1 hold, then inequality (1.1) implies statements (i) and (ii) from Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Lemma 2.3. For each $Q \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{S})$ and $g \in L^1(\mathbb{S}; Q)$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}_{g \leq -K}} g(s)Q(ds) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } K \rightarrow +\infty. \quad (2.8)$$

Therefore, statement (ii) of Theorem 1.1 is equivalent to the existence of a natural number N such that for each $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\liminf_{K \rightarrow +\infty} \inf_{n=N, N+1, \dots} \int_{\mathbb{S}_{f^{(n)} \leq -K}} f^{(n)}(s)\mu^{(n)}(ds) \geq -\varepsilon. \quad (2.9)$$

Let us fix an arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$ and verify (2.9). According to inequality (1.1), there exists $N_1 = 1, 2, \dots$ such that for $n = N_1, N_1 + 1, \dots$

$$\inf_{S \in \Sigma} \left(\int_S f^{(n)}(s)\mu^{(n)}(ds) - \int_S f(s)\mu(ds) \right) \geq -\frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

Then, for $n = N_1, N_1 + 1, \dots$ and $K > 0$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}_{f^{(n)} \leq -K}} f^{(n)}(s)\mu^{(n)}(ds) \geq \int_{\mathbb{S}_{f^{(n)} \leq -K}} f(s)\mu(ds) - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \quad (2.10)$$

Direct calculations imply that, for $n = N_1, N_1 + 1, \dots$ and for $K > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{S}_{f^{(n)} \leq -K}} f(s)\mu(ds) = \int_{\mathbb{S}_{f-f^{(n)} < 1} \cap \mathbb{S}_{f^{(n)} \leq -K}} f(s)\mu(ds) \\ & + \int_{\mathbb{S}_{f-f^{(n)} \geq 1} \cap \mathbb{S}_{f^{(n)} \leq -K}} f(s)\mu(ds) \geq - \int_{\mathbb{S}_{f \leq 1-K}} |f(s)|\mu(ds) \\ & - \int_{\mathbb{S}_{f^{(n)} - f \leq -1}} |f(s)|\mu(ds), \end{aligned} \quad (2.11)$$

where the inequality holds because $\mathbb{S}_{f-f^{(n)} < 1} \cap \mathbb{S}_{f^{(n)} \leq -K} \subseteq \mathbb{S}_{f \leq 1-K}$ and $\mathbb{S}_{f-f^{(n)} \geq 1} \cap \mathbb{S}_{f^{(n)} \leq -K} \subseteq \mathbb{S}_{f^{(n)} - f \leq -1}$. Due to (2.8)

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}_{f \leq -K+1}} |f(s)| \mu(ds) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } K \rightarrow +\infty. \quad (2.12)$$

Statement (i) of Theorem 1.1 yields that $\mu(\mathbb{S}_{f^{(n)} - f \leq -1}) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, since $f \in L^1(\mathbb{S}; \mu)$, there exists $N_2 = N_1, N_1 + 1, \dots$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}_{f^{(n)} - f \leq -1}} |f(s)| \mu(ds) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \quad n = N_2, N_2 + 1, \dots \quad (2.13)$$

Thus (2.10) – (2.13) imply the existence of a natural number N such that for each $\varepsilon > 0$ (2.9) holds. Therefore, inequality (1.1) and statement (i) from Theorem 1.1 imply statement (ii) from Theorem 1.1. \square

Lemma 2.5. *Let the assumptions of Theorem 1.1 hold. Then statements (i) and (ii) from Theorem 1.1 yield inequality (1.1).*

Proof. Additivity of integrals and the property, that an infimum of a sum of two functions is greater than or equal to the sum of infimums, imply that, for $n = 1, 2, \dots$ and $K > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{S \in \Sigma} \left(\int_S f^{(n)}(s) \mu^{(n)}(ds) - \int_S f(s) \mu(ds) \right) \\ & \geq \inf_{S \in \Sigma} \left(\int_{S_{f^{(n)} \leq -K}} f^{(n)}(s) \mu^{(n)}(ds) - \int_{S_{f^{(n)} \leq -K}} f(s) \mu(ds) \right) \\ & + \inf_{S \in \Sigma} \left(\int_{S_{f^{(n)} > -K}} f^{(n)}(s) \mu^{(n)}(ds) - \int_{S_{f^{(n)} > -K}} f(s) \mu(ds) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

Note that, for $n = 1, 2, \dots$ and $K > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{S \in \Sigma} \left(\int_{S_{f^{(n)} \leq -K}} f^{(n)}(s) \mu^{(n)}(ds) - \int_{S_{f^{(n)} \leq -K}} f(s) \mu(ds) \right) \\ & \geq \inf_{n=1,2,\dots} \int_{\mathbb{S}_{f^{(n)} \leq -K}} f^{(n)}(s) \mu^{(n)}(ds) - \int_{\mathbb{S}_{f^{(n)} \leq -K}} |f(s)| \mu(ds). \end{aligned} \quad (2.15)$$

Moreover, for $n = 1, 2, \dots$ and $K > 0$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}_{f^{(n)} \leq -K}} |f(s)| \mu(ds) \leq \int_{\mathbb{S}_{f \leq -K+1}} |f(s)| \mu(ds) + \int_{\mathbb{S}_{f-f^{(n)} \geq 1}} |f(s)| \mu(ds), \quad (2.16)$$

because, if $f^{(n)}(s) \leq -K$ and $f(s) > -K + 1$, then $f^{(n)}(s) < f(s) - 1$ and, thus, $f^{(n)}(s) \leq f(s) - 1$.

Since $f \in L^1(\mathbb{S}; \mu)$, then $\mu(\mathbb{S}_{f \leq -K+1}) \rightarrow 0$ as $K \rightarrow +\infty$. Therefore,

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}_{f \leq -K+1}} |f(s)| \mu(ds) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } K \rightarrow +\infty. \quad (2.17)$$

Due to (1.2), $\mu(\mathbb{S}_{f-f^{(n)} \geq 1}) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Similar to (2.17),

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}_{f-f^{(n)} \geq 1}} |f(s)| \mu(ds) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (2.18)$$

According to (2.14) – (2.18), inequality (1.1) follows from statements (i) and (ii) of Theorem 1.1, if

$$\liminf_{K \rightarrow +\infty} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} I(n, K) \geq 0, \quad (2.19)$$

where, for $n = 1, 2, \dots$ and $K > 0$,

$$I(n, K) := \inf_{S \in \Sigma} \left(\int_{S_{f^{(n)} > -K}} f^{(n)}(s) \mu^{(n)}(ds) - \int_{S_{f > -K}} f(s) \mu(ds) \right).$$

The rest of the proof establishes inequality (2.19). We observe that for each $K > 0$

$$I(n, K) \geq I_1(n, K) + I_2(n, K) + I_3(n, K), \quad n = 1, 2, \dots, \quad (2.20)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I_1(n, K) &= \inf_{S \in \Sigma} \left(\int_{S_{|f^{(n)}| < K}} f^{(n)}(s) \mu^{(n)}(ds) - \int_{S_{|f^{(n)}| < K}} f^{(n)}(s) \mu(ds) \right), \\ I_2(n, K) &= \inf_{S \in \Sigma} \left(\int_{S_{|f^{(n)}| < K}} f^{(n)}(s) \mu(ds) - \int_{S_{|f^{(n)}| < K}} f(s) \mu(ds) \right), \\ I_3(n, K) &= \inf_{S \in \Sigma} \left(\int_{S_{f^{(n)} \geq K}} f^{(n)}(s) \mu^{(n)}(ds) - \int_{S_{f^{(n)} \geq K}} f(s) \mu(ds) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\{\mu^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$ converges in total variation to μ , then $I_1(n, K) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for each $K > 0$. Therefore,

$$\liminf_{K \rightarrow +\infty} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} I_1(n, K) = 0. \quad (2.21)$$

For $n = 1, 2, \dots$, $K > 0$, and $\varepsilon > 0$, the following inequalities hold:

$$\begin{aligned} I_2(n, K) &\geq \inf_{S \in \Sigma} \int_{S_{|f^{(n)}| < K} \cap S_{f^{(n)} - f > -\varepsilon}} (f^{(n)}(s) - f(s)) \mu(ds) \\ &\quad + \inf_{S \in \Sigma} \int_{S_{|f^{(n)}| < K} \cap S_{f - f^{(n)} > \varepsilon}} (f^{(n)}(s) - f(s)) \mu(ds) \\ &\geq -\varepsilon \mu(\mathbb{S}) - \int_{S_{|f^{(n)}| < K} \cap S_{f - f^{(n)} > \varepsilon}} |f^{(n)}(s)| \mu(ds) - \int_{S_{f - f^{(n)} > \varepsilon}} |f(s)| \mu(ds). \end{aligned}$$

and, therefore,

$$I_2(n, K) \geq -\varepsilon \mu(\mathbb{S}) - K \mu(S_{f - f^{(n)} > \varepsilon}) - \int_{S_{f - f^{(n)} > \varepsilon}} |f(s)| \mu(ds).$$

Thus, due to (1.2) and $f \in L^1(\mathbb{S}; \mu)$,

$$\liminf_{K \rightarrow +\infty} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} I_2(n, K) \geq 0. \quad (2.22)$$

For $n = 1, 2, \dots$ and $K > 0$, the following inequalities hold:

$$\begin{aligned} I_3(n, K) &\geq K \left(\mu^{(n)}(S_{f^{(n)} \geq K} \cap S_{f(s) \leq K}) - \mu(S_{f^{(n)} \geq K} \cap S_{f(s) \leq K}) \right) \\ &\quad - \sup_{S \in \Sigma} \int_{S_{f^{(n)} \geq K} \cap S_{f(s) > K}} f(s) \mu(ds) \geq -K \sup_{S \in \Sigma} |\mu^{(n)}(S) - \mu(S)| - \int_{S_{f(s) > K}} f(s) \mu(ds). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, since the sequence $\{\mu^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$ converges in total variation to μ and $f \in L^1(\mathbb{S})$, then

$$\liminf_{K \rightarrow +\infty} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} I_3(n, K) \geq 0. \quad (2.23)$$

Inequalities (2.20)–(2.23) yield (2.19). Therefore, statements (i) and (ii) of Theorem 1.1 imply inequality (1.1). \square

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Theorem 1.1 follows directly from Lemmas 2.1–2.5; see also Remark 2.4. \square

Proof of Corollary 1.3. Corollary 1.3 follows directly from Theorem 1.1 because inequality (1.4) holds for the sequence of nonnegative functions $\{f^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$. \square

Proof of Corollary 1.4. Corollary 1.4 follows directly from Theorem 1.1. \square

Proof of Corollary 1.6. Corollary 1.6 follows directly from Corollary 1.3. \square

Proof of Corollary 1.8. Theorem 1.1, being applied to the functions $\{f, f^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$ and $\{-f, -f^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$, yields Corollary 1.8. \square

Proof of Corollary 1.9. Corollary 1.4, being applied to the functions $\{f, f^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$ and $\{-f, -f^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$, \square

Proof of Corollary 1.11. If $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{S})$, $\tilde{\nu}$ be a finite signed measure on \mathbb{S} , and $\tilde{\nu} \ll \nu$, then the Radon-Nikodym derivative $\frac{d\tilde{\nu}}{d\nu}$ is μ -integrable, that is, $\frac{d\tilde{\nu}}{d\nu} \in L^1(\mathbb{S}; \nu)$. This is true because $\int_{\mathbb{S}} |\frac{d\tilde{\nu}}{d\nu}| d\nu = \|\nu\| < \infty$. Set $f := \frac{d\tilde{\mu}}{d\mu}$, $f^{(n)} := \frac{d\tilde{\mu}^{(n)}}{d\mu^{(n)}}$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$. Then Theorem 1.1 yields Corollary 1.11. \square

Proof of Corollary 1.12. Corollary 1.11, being applied to $\{\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\mu}^{(n)}, \mu, \mu^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$ and $\{-\tilde{\mu}, -\tilde{\mu}^{(n)}, \mu, \mu^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$, yields Corollary 1.12. \square

3 Counterexamples

Example 3.1 describes a probability space $(\mathbb{S}, \Sigma, \mu)$ and a sequence $\{f, f^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$ of uniformly bounded nonnegative measurable functions on it such that: (a) $\{f, f^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$ satisfy inequality (1.7); (b) inequality (1.2) takes place for each $\varepsilon > 0$; (c) inequality (1.3) does not hold for the function f and the entire sequence $\{f^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$. This example also demonstrates that Corollary 1.6 is essentially a more exact statement than the classic Fatou's lemma.

Example 3.1. Let $\mathbb{S} = [0, 1]$, Σ be the Borel σ -field on \mathbb{S} , $\mu^{(n)} = \mu$ be the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{S} , $f \equiv 1$, and $f^{(n)}(s) = 1 - \mathbf{I}\{s \in [\frac{j}{2^k}, \frac{j+1}{2^k}]\}$, where $k = \lceil \log_2 n \rceil$, $j = n - 2^k$, $s \in \mathbb{S}$, and $n = 1, 2, \dots$. Then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{S}} (f^{(n)}(s) - f(s))^- \mu(ds) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2^{\lceil \log_2 n \rceil}} = 0,$$

and, according to Remark 1.5, inequality (1.7) holds. Moreover, for each $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\mu(\{s \in \mathbb{S} : f^{(n)}(s) \leq f(s) - \varepsilon\}) = \frac{1}{2^{\lceil \log_2 n \rceil}} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

that is, convergence in (1.2) takes place for each $\varepsilon > 0$. Moreover,

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} f^{(n)}(s) = 0 < 1 = f(s) \text{ for } \mu\text{-a.e. } s \in \mathbb{S},$$

that is, inequality (1.3) does not hold for the function f and for the entire sequence $\{f^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$.

Corollary 1.6 yields

$$1 = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{S}} f^{(n)}(s) \mu(ds) \geq \int_{\mathbb{S}} f(s) \mu(ds) = 1;$$

see equality (1.7) and Remark 1.5. But the classic Fatou's lemma implies

$$1 = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{S}} f^{(n)}(s) \mu(ds) \geq \int_{\mathbb{S}} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} f^{(n)}(s) \mu(ds) = 0.$$

Therefore, Corollary 1.6 is a more exact statement than the classic Fatou's lemma. \square

The following three examples demonstrate that the uniform Fatou's lemma does not hold, if convergence of measures in total variation is relaxed to setwise convergence. In particular, the necessary condition fails in Examples 3.2 and 3.3, and the sufficient condition fails in Example 3.4. As mention above, Fatou's lemma, which is a sufficient condition for inequality (1.5), which is weaker than inequality (1.1) in the uniform Fatou's lemma, holds for setwise converging measures and, if the notion of a limit of a function is appropriately modified, it also holds for weakly converging measures; see Royden [4, p. 231], Serfozo [5], Feinberg et al. [1], and references therein.

Example 3.2 demonstrates that, if convergence in total variation of finite measures $\{\mu^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$ to μ in Corollary 1.8 is relaxed to setwise convergence, equality (1.9) implies neither statement (i) nor statement (ii) from Theorem 1.1, and therefore neither statement (i) nor statement (ii) from Corollary 1.8 holds. Thus, inequality (1.1) does not yield either statement (i) or statement (ii) from Theorem 1.1, if the convergence in total variation of finite measures $\{\mu^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$ to μ in Theorem 1.1 is relaxed to setwise convergence.

Example 3.2. Let $\mathbb{S} = [0, 1]$, $\Sigma = \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{S})$ be a Borel σ -algebra on \mathbb{S} ,

$$g^{(n)}(s) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{n}, & \text{if } 2k/2^n < s < (2k+1)/2^n \text{ for } k = 0, 1, \dots, 2^{n-1} - 1; \\ 2 - \frac{1}{n}, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

$f^{(n)}(s) := -1/g^{(n)}(s)$, $s \in [0, 1]$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$, be the sequence of measurable functions, μ be the Lebesgue measure on $[0, 1]$, and $f \equiv -1$. Consider the sequence of probability measures $\mu^{(n)}$ on $[0, 1]$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$, defined as

$$\mu^{(n)}(S) := \int_S g^{(n)}(s) \mu(ds), \quad S \in \Sigma. \quad (3.1)$$

The sequence $\{\mu^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$ converges setwise to μ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Indeed, according to Feinberg et al. [3, Theorem 2.3], measures $\mu^{(n)}$ converge setwise to the measure μ , if $\mu^{(n)}(C) \rightarrow \mu(C)$ for each open set C in $[0, 1]$. Since $\mu^{(n)}(\{0\}) = \mu(\{0\}) = \mu^{(n)}(\{1\}) = \mu(\{1\})$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$, then $\mu^{(n)}(C) \rightarrow \mu(C)$ for each open set C in $[0, 1]$ if and only if $\mu^{(n)}(C) \rightarrow \mu(C)$ for each open set C in $(0, 1)$. Choose an arbitrary open set C in $(0, 1)$. Then C is a union of a countable set of open disjoint intervals (a_i, b_i) . Therefore, for each

$\varepsilon > 0$ there is a finite number n_ε of open intervals $\{(a_i, b_i) : i = 1, \dots, n_\varepsilon\}$ such that $\mu(C \setminus C_\varepsilon) \leq \varepsilon$, where $C_\varepsilon = \cup_{i=1}^{n_\varepsilon} (a_i, b_i)$. Due to $|g^{(n)}| \leq 2$, we obtain that $\mu^{(n)}(C \setminus C_\varepsilon) \leq 2\varepsilon$ for each $n = 1, 2, \dots$. Since $|\mu^{(n)}((a, b)) - \mu((a, b))| < 1/2^{n-1}$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$, for each interval $(a, b) \subseteq (0, 1)$, this implies that $|\mu(C_\varepsilon) - \mu^{(n)}(C_\varepsilon)| < \varepsilon$ if $n \geq N_\varepsilon$, where N_ε is each natural number satisfying $1/2^{N_\varepsilon-1} \leq \varepsilon$. Therefore, if $n \geq N_\varepsilon$ then $|\mu^{(n)}(C) - \mu(C)| \leq |\mu^{(n)}(C_\varepsilon) - \mu(C_\varepsilon)| + \mu(C \setminus C_\varepsilon) + \mu^{(n)}(C \setminus C_\varepsilon) < 4\varepsilon$. This implies that $\mu^{(n)}(C) \rightarrow \mu(C)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Thus $\mu^{(n)}$ converge setwise to μ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Observe that for $S_n = \cup_{k=0}^{2^{n-1}-1} [2k/2^n, (2k+1)/2^n]$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$,

$$\mu^{(n)}(S_n) - \mu(S_n) = -\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2n}\right). \quad (3.2)$$

So, the sequence $\{\mu^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$ does not converge in total variation to μ because

$$\text{dist}(\mu^{(n)}, \mu) \geq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2n}, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots$$

Equality (1.9) holds since

$$\int_S f^{(n)}(s) \mu^{(n)}(ds) = \int_S f(s) \mu(ds) \quad \text{for all } S \in \Sigma, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots, \quad (3.3)$$

which is stronger than (1.9). Thus, inequality (1.1) also holds.

Statement (i) from Theorem 1.1 does not hold since

$$\mu(\{s \in \mathbb{S} : f^{(n)}(s) \leq f(s) - 1\}) = \frac{1}{2}, \quad n = 2, 3, \dots$$

Thus statement (i) from Corollary 1.8 does not hold either.

Statement (ii) from Theorem 1.1 does not hold since

$$\inf_{n=1,2,\dots} \int_{\mathbb{S}} f^{(n)}(s) \mathbf{I}\{s \in \mathbb{S} : f^{(n)}(s) \leq -K\} \mu^{(n)}(ds) = \frac{1}{2}, \quad K > 1.$$

Thus statement (ii) from Corollary 1.8 does not hold either. \square

Example 3.3 demonstrates that, if convergence in total variation of finite measures $\{\mu^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$ to μ in Corollary 1.3, in which the functions $f^{(n)}$ are assumed to be nonnegative, is relaxed to setwise convergence, inequality (1.1) does not imply statement (i) from Theorem 1.1.

Example 3.3. Let $\mathbb{S} = [0, 1]$, $\Sigma = \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{S})$ be a Borel σ -algebra on \mathbb{S} ,

$$g^{(n)}(s) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}, & \text{if } 2k/2^n < s < (2k+1)/2^n \text{ for } k = 0, 1, \dots, 2^{n-1} - 1; \\ \frac{3}{2}, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (3.4)$$

$f^{(n)}(s) := 1/g^{(n)}(s)$, $s \in [0, 1]$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$, be the sequence of measurable functions, μ be the Lebesgue measure on $[0, 1]$, and $f \equiv 1$. For the functions $g^{(n)}$ from (3.4), consider the sequence of probability measures $\mu^{(n)}$ on $[0, 1]$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$, defined in (3.1).

The sequence $\{\mu^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$ converges setwise to μ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and (3.3) holds. These facts follows from the same arguments as in Example 3.2. In view of (3.3), inequality (1.1) holds. Statement (i) from Theorem 1.1 does not hold since $\mu(\{s \in \mathbb{S} : f^{(n)}(s) \leq f(s) - \frac{1}{3}\}) = \frac{1}{2}$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$. \square

Example 3.4 demonstrates that statements (i) and (ii) from Corollary 1.8 do not imply inequality (1.1) and therefore they do not imply equality (1.9), if convergence in total variation of finite measures $\{\mu^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$ to μ in Corollary 1.8 is relaxed to setwise convergence. Therefore, statements (i) and (ii) from Theorem 1.1 do not yield inequality (1.1), if the convergence in total variation of finite measures $\{\mu^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$ to μ in Theorem 1.1 is relaxed to setwise convergence.

Example 3.4. Consider a measurable space (\mathbb{S}, Σ) and a sequence $\{\mu^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots} \subset \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{S})$ that converges setwise to a measure μ on \mathbb{S} such that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{S \in \Sigma} \left(\mu^{(n)}(S) - \mu(S) \right) < 0.$$

For example, in view of (3.2), the measurable spaces and measures defined in Example 3.2 can be considered for this example. Let $f = f^{(n)} \equiv 1$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$.

Note that, statements (i) and (ii) from Corollary 1.8 hold. Thus statements (i) and (ii) from Theorem 1.1 hold. Moreover, since

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{S \in \Sigma} \left(\int_S f^{(n)}(s) \mu^{(n)}(ds) - \int_S f(s) \mu(ds) \right) = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{S \in \Sigma} \left(\mu^{(n)}(S) - \mu(S) \right) < 0,$$

then neither inequality (1.1) nor equality (1.9) holds. \square

We remark that the functions f and $f^{(n)}$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$, are nonnegative in Example 3.4. Therefore, unlike the case of measures converging in total variation described in Corollary 1.8, even for nonnegative functions f and $f^{(n)}$, the validity of statement (i) from Theorem 1.1 is not necessary for the validity of inequality (1.1) in the case of setwise converging measures.

Acknowledgement. Research of the first author was partially supported by NSF grant CMMI-1335296.

References

- [1] E.A. Feinberg, P.O. Kasyanov, N.V. Zadoianchuk, Fatou's lemma for weakly converging probabilities, *Theory Probab. Appl.* 58 (2014) 683–689.
- [2] E.A. Feinberg, P.O. Kasyanov, M.Z. Zgurovsky, Partially observable total-cost Markov decision processes with weakly continuous transition probabilities, *Mathematics of Operations Research* (to appear), arXiv:1401.2168.
- [3] E.A. Feinberg, P.O. Kasyanov, M.Z. Zgurovsky, Convergence of probability measures and Markov decision models with incomplete information, *Proceedings of the Steklov Institute of Mathematics* 287 (2014) 96–117.
- [4] H.L. Royden, *Real Analysis*, Second edition, Macmillan, New York, 1968.
- [5] R. Serfozo, Convergence of Lebesgue integrals with varying measures, *Sankhya - The Indian Journal of Statistics, Series A* 44 (1982) 380–402.