

## OUTER MEASURES ON A COMMUTATIVE RING INDUCED BY MEASURES ON ITS SPECTRUM

DARIUSZ DUDZIK, MARCIN SKRZYŃSKI\*

**Abstract.** On a commutative ring  $R$  we study outer measures induced by measures on  $\text{Spec}(R)$ . The focus is on examples of such outer measures and on subsets of  $R$  that satisfy the Carathéodory condition.

### 1. Preliminaries and introduction

Throughout the note,  $R$  stands for a nonzero commutative ring with identity and  $R^\times$  denotes the set of invertible elements of  $R$ . We define  $\text{Spec}(R)$  to be the spectrum of  $R$ , i.e., the family of all prime ideals  $\wp \subset R$ . The family of all maximal ideals of  $R$  will be denoted by  $\text{Max}(R)$ . Recall that  $\text{Max}(R) \subseteq \text{Spec}(R)$  and

$$\bigcup \text{Spec}(R) = R \setminus R^\times = \bigcup \text{Max}(R).$$

By “measure” we always mean a “non-negative  $\sigma$ -additive measure”. The power set of a set  $X$  is denoted by  $2^X$ . We use the following definition of an outer measure.

---

*Received: 03.08.2016. Accepted: 18.11.2016. Published online: 07.02.2017.*

(2010) Mathematics Subject Classification: 13A15, 28A12.

*Key words and phrases:* outer measure, commutative ring, prime ideal, Carathéodory’s condition, ring of functions, unique factorization domain.

\*Corresponding author.

DEFINITION 1.1. A function  $\varphi: 2^X \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$  is said to be an *outer measure* on a set  $X$ , if it satisfies two conditions:

- (i)  $\varphi(A) \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \varphi(B_n)$  for every sequence  $\{B_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  of subsets of  $X$  and every set  $A$  such that  $A \subseteq \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n$ ,
- (ii)  $\varphi(\emptyset) = 0$ .

We refer to [1] for more information about commutative rings and to [3, 4] for elements of measure theory.

Consider a family  $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \text{Spec}(R)$  such that  $\bigcup \mathcal{P} = R \setminus R^\times$ . Consider also a  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathfrak{M}$  of subsets of  $\mathcal{P}$ . Let  $\mu: \mathfrak{M} \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$  be a measure. Given any set  $A \subseteq R$ , we define

$$\Omega(A) = \left\{ \mathcal{S} \in \mathfrak{M} : \bigcup \mathcal{S} \supseteq A \setminus R^\times \right\}.$$

In [2] we proved that

$$\mu^*: 2^R \ni A \mapsto \inf_{\mathcal{S} \in \Omega(A)} \mu(\mathcal{S}) \in [0, +\infty]$$

is an outer measure on the ring  $R$ . This outer measure will be referred to as the outer measure induced by  $\mu$ . The main theorem of [2] shows that  $\mu^*$  behaves well with respect to elementwise multiplication of sets.

The present note is a continuation of [2]. Our purpose is twofold: to characterize subsets of  $R$  that satisfy the Carathéodory condition with respect to  $\mu^*$  and to discuss some quite general examples of the outer measures induced by measures on spectra.

## 2. Some measures on spectra and the outer measures induced by them

For any element  $a \in R$ , we define  $(a)$  to be the principal ideal of the ring  $R$  generated by  $a$ . Suppose that  $R$  is a unique factorization domain and is not a field. Let  $E$  be the set of all irreducible elements of  $R$ . Notice that, by the definition of an irreducible element,  $E \subseteq R \setminus (R^\times \cup \{0\})$ . Moreover, since  $R$  is not a field, we have  $E \neq \emptyset$ . Let us define  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{irr}}(R) = \{(a) : a \in E\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{irr}}(R) \subseteq \text{Spec}(R)$  and

$$\bigcup \mathcal{P}_{\text{irr}}(R) = R \setminus R^\times$$

(because  $R$  is a unique factorization domain).

Consider now a nonempty set  $F \subseteq E$  and the map  $\Phi: F \ni a \mapsto (a) \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{irr}}(R)$ . If  $\mathfrak{N}$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra of subsets of  $F$  and  $\nu: \mathfrak{N} \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$  is a measure, then  $\mathfrak{M} = \{\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{P}_{\text{irr}}(R) : \Phi^{-1}(\mathcal{S}) \in \mathfrak{N}\}$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra of subsets of  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{irr}}(R)$  and

$$\mu: \mathfrak{M} \ni \mathcal{S} \mapsto \nu(\Phi^{-1}(\mathcal{S})) \in [0, +\infty]$$

is a measure. Let us take a closer look on the outer measure  $\mu^*: 2^R \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$ .

**PROPOSITION 2.1.** *In the situation described above, assume additionally that the map  $\Phi$  is bijective. Then, for any  $A \subseteq R$ , we have  $\mu^*(A) = \inf_{G \in \tilde{\mathfrak{N}}} \nu(G)$ , where*

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{N}} = \{G \in \mathfrak{N} \mid \forall x \in A \setminus R^\times \exists g \in G : g \text{ is a divisor of } x\}.$$

**PROOF.** By the surjectivity of  $\Phi$  and the definition of a principal ideal, a set  $\mathcal{S} \in \mathfrak{M}$  belongs to  $\Omega(A)$  if and only if

$$\forall x \in A \setminus R^\times \exists g \in \Phi^{-1}(\mathcal{S}) : g \text{ is a divisor of } x.$$

Pick an arbitrary  $G \subseteq F$ . The injectivity of  $\Phi$  yields that  $\Phi^{-1}(\Phi(G)) = G$ , and hence  $\Phi(G) \in \mathfrak{M}$  if and only if  $G \in \mathfrak{N}$ . We thus obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \{\mu(\mathcal{S}) : \mathcal{S} \in \Omega(A)\} \\ &= \{\nu(\Phi^{-1}(\mathcal{S})) \mid \mathcal{S} \in \mathfrak{M}, \forall x \in A \setminus R^\times \exists g \in \Phi^{-1}(\mathcal{S}) : g \text{ is a divisor of } x\} \\ &= \{\nu(G) \mid G \in \mathfrak{N}, \forall x \in A \setminus R^\times \exists g \in G : g \text{ is a divisor of } x\} \\ &= \{\nu(G) : G \in \tilde{\mathfrak{N}}\}. \end{aligned}$$

In view of the definition of  $\mu^*$ , the proof is complete.  $\square$

In fact, the bijectivity assumption above means that the set  $F$  contains precisely one element from each class of associate elements of the set  $E$ .

**EXAMPLE 2.2.** Let  $R = \mathbb{Z}$ , the ring of integers,  $F = \mathbb{P}$ , the set of prime numbers, and  $\nu$  be the counting measure on  $\mathbb{P}$ . Observe that

$$\mathcal{P}_{\text{irr}}(\mathbb{Z}) = \{(p) : p \in \mathbb{P}\} = \text{Max}(\mathbb{Z}).$$

Therefore,  $\Phi: \mathbb{P} \ni p \mapsto (p) \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{irr}}(\mathbb{Z})$  is a bijection and the measure  $\mu$  coincides with the counting measure on  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{irr}}(\mathbb{Z})$ .

Consider next the set  $A = \{-14, -5, -1, 0, 6, 9, 15, 28\}$ . Define

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{N}} = \{G \subseteq \mathbb{P} \mid \forall x \in A \setminus \mathbb{Z}^\times \exists g \in G : g \text{ is a divisor of } x\}$$

and recall that  $\mathbb{Z}^\times = \{-1, 1\}$ . Since  $3 \in \mathbb{P}$ ,  $5 \in \mathbb{P}$  and  $9 = 3^2$ , we get that  $\{3, 5\} \subseteq G$  for any  $G \in \tilde{\mathfrak{N}}$ . However, neither 3 nor 5 is a divisor of 28, and hence  $\{3, 5\} \notin \tilde{\mathfrak{N}}$ . It is evident that  $\{2, 3, 5\} \in \tilde{\mathfrak{N}}$  and  $\{3, 5, 7\} \in \tilde{\mathfrak{N}}$ . By Proposition 2.1, we obtain

$$\mu^*(A) = \inf_{G \in \tilde{\mathfrak{N}}} \nu(G) = \nu(\{2, 3, 5\}) = 3.$$

Let us turn to function rings. Consider a nonempty set  $X$  and a field  $\mathbb{F}$ . We denote by  $\mathbb{F}^X$  the ring of all functions  $f: X \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$  (pointwise operations). Let  $R$  be a subring of  $\mathbb{F}^X$  such that every constant function belongs to  $R$  (in other words,  $\mathbb{F} \subseteq R$ ) and  $R^\times = \{f \in R : f(x) \neq 0 \text{ for all } x \in X\}$ . If  $x \in X$ , then  $\wp_x = \{f \in R : f(x) = 0\}$  is a maximal ideal of the ring  $R$ . Notice also that

$$\bigcup_{x \in X} \wp_x = R \setminus R^\times.$$

We now define  $\mathcal{P}_X(R) = \{\wp_x : x \in X\}$ . Consider the map  $\Psi: X \ni x \mapsto \wp_x \in \mathcal{P}_X(R)$ . If  $\mathfrak{N}$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra of subsets of  $X$  and  $\nu: \mathfrak{N} \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$  is a measure, then identically to the previous part of the section,  $\mathfrak{M} = \{\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{P}_X(R) : \Psi^{-1}(\mathcal{S}) \in \mathfrak{N}\}$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra of subsets of  $\mathcal{P}_X(R)$  and

$$\mu: \mathfrak{M} \ni \mathcal{S} \mapsto \nu(\Psi^{-1}(\mathcal{S})) \in [0, +\infty]$$

is a measure.

**PROPOSITION 2.3.** *In the situation described above, assume additionally that  $\Psi$  is an injection. Then, for any  $A \subseteq R$ , we have  $\mu^*(A) = \inf_{Y \in \mathfrak{N}_0} \nu(Y)$ , where*

$$\mathfrak{N}_0 = \{Y \in \mathfrak{N} \mid \forall f \in A \setminus R^\times : Y \cap f^{-1}(0) \neq \emptyset\}.$$

**PROOF.** The proof is completely analogous to the proof of Proposition 2.1. The crucial point is that a set  $\mathcal{S} \in \mathfrak{M}$  belongs to  $\Omega(A)$  if and only if

$$\forall f \in A \setminus R^\times \exists x \in \Psi^{-1}(\mathcal{S}) : f(x) = 0. \quad \square$$

The injectivity of  $\Psi$  means that  $R$  separates the points in the set  $X$ . Hence, if  $X$  is a normal topological space and  $\mathbb{F} \in \{\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}\}$ , then  $\mathcal{C}(X, \mathbb{F})$ , the ring of all continuous functions  $f: X \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ , satisfies the assumptions of Proposition 2.3. If  $n$  is a positive integer and  $\mathbb{F}$  is an algebraically closed field, then so does the polynomial ring  $\mathbb{F}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ . Proposition 2.3 can also be applied to various rings of differentiable or holomorphic functions. The proposition generalizes [2, Proposition 3].

Let us finally discuss an example showing that  $\mathcal{P}_X(R)$  does not have to coincide with  $\text{Max}(R)$ .

EXAMPLE 2.4. Suppose that  $X$  is an infinite set. Define  $I$  to be the family of all functions  $f: X \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$  with the property that

$$\exists Y \subseteq X : \begin{cases} Y \text{ is finite,} \\ f(x) = 0 \text{ for any } x \in X \setminus Y. \end{cases}$$

Then  $I$  is a proper ideal of the ring  $R = \mathbb{F}^X$ . Let  $Z$  be an infinite subset of  $X$  such that  $X \setminus Z$  is also infinite. Consider the function  $h \in R$  defined by

$$h(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } x \in Z, \\ 0, & \text{if } x \notin Z. \end{cases}$$

Since  $h \notin I$  and  $I + Rh$  is a proper ideal of  $R$ , we get  $I \notin \text{Max}(R)$ . However, obviously,  $I \subseteq \wp$  for some  $\wp \in \text{Max}(R)$ . Observe that

$$\forall x \in X \exists f \in I : f(x) \neq 0.$$

Consequently, no point  $x \in X$  has the property that  $f(x) = 0$  for all  $f \in \wp$ . This yields  $\wp \notin \mathcal{P}_X(R)$ .

### 3. $\mu^*$ -measurable sets

We begin with a very brief recapitulation of the Carathéodory condition. Let  $\varphi$  be an outer measure on a set  $X$ .

DEFINITION 3.1. A set  $A \subseteq X$  is said to be  $\varphi$ -measurable (or to satisfy the Carathéodory condition with respect to  $\varphi$ ), if

$$\forall T \subseteq X : \varphi(T) = \varphi(T \cap A) + \varphi(T \setminus A).$$

**THEOREM 3.2** (Carathéodory). *The totality  $\mathfrak{M}$  of  $\varphi$ -measurable subsets of  $X$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra. Moreover,*

- (i) *the restriction  $\varphi|_{\mathfrak{M}}$  is a measure,*
- (ii) *if  $\varphi(A) = 0$  for some  $A \subseteq X$ , then  $A \in \mathfrak{M}$ .*

It is obvious that  $\mathfrak{M} \supseteq \{A \in 2^X : \varphi(X \setminus A) = 0\}$ . The class of "obviously  $\varphi$ -measurable" sets is, in fact, a bit larger. We will say that a set  $A \subseteq X$  satisfies condition  $(\bullet)$  with respect to  $\varphi$ , if  $\varphi(B) \in \{0, +\infty\}$  for any  $B \subseteq A$ .

**PROPOSITION 3.3.** *Let  $A \subseteq X$ . Suppose that either  $A$  or  $X \setminus A$  satisfies condition  $(\bullet)$  with respect to  $\varphi$ . Then  $A$  is a  $\varphi$ -measurable set.*

**PROOF.** Pick an arbitrary  $T \subseteq X$ . By the definition and the monotonicity of an outer measure,

$$\max\{\varphi(T \cap A), \varphi(T \setminus A)\} \leq \varphi(T) \leq \varphi(T \cap A) + \varphi(T \setminus A).$$

Hence,  $\varphi(T) = \varphi(T \setminus A)$  whenever  $\varphi(T \cap A) = 0$ , and  $\varphi(T) = \varphi(T \cap A)$  whenever  $\varphi(T \setminus A) = 0$ . It is obvious that  $\varphi(T) = +\infty$  whenever  $\varphi(T \cap A) = +\infty$  or  $\varphi(T \setminus A) = +\infty$ . Condition  $(\bullet)$  therefore implies that  $\varphi(T) = \varphi(T \cap A) + \varphi(T \setminus A)$ .  $\square$

Let us also recall some properties of the outer measure  $\mu^* : 2^R \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$  induced by a measure  $\mu$  on a suitable set  $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \text{Spec}(R)$ .

**PROPOSITION 3.4.** *If  $A, B \subseteq R \setminus R^\times$  and  $C \subseteq R$ , then*

- (i)  $\mu^*(AB) = \min\{\mu^*(A), \mu^*(B)\}$ ,
- (ii)  $\mu^*(C) = \mu^*(C \setminus R^\times)$ .

The above proposition is a part of [2, Theorem 1]. Notice that the set  $C$  is  $\mu^*$ -measurable whenever  $C \subseteq R^\times$  or  $C \supseteq R \setminus R^\times$ .

We are now ready to state and prove the main result of the note.

**THEOREM 3.5.** *Let  $A \subseteq R \setminus R^\times$  be such that  $0 < \mu^*(A) < +\infty$ . Assume moreover that  $0 < \mu^*(B) < +\infty$  for some  $B \subseteq R \setminus (A \cup R^\times)$ . Then the set  $A$  is not  $\mu^*$ -measurable.*

**PROOF.** Suppose, in order to derive a contradiction, that  $A$  is  $\mu^*$ -measurable. Pick arbitrary sets  $E \subseteq A$  and  $Z \subseteq R$ . Define  $T = EZ \cup A$ . Then

$$\mu^*(T) = \mu^*(T \cap A) + \mu^*(T \setminus A) = \mu^*(A) + \mu^*(EZ \setminus A).$$

If  $\mathcal{S} \in \Omega(A)$ ,  $a \in E$  and  $b \in Z$ , then  $a \in \wp$  for some  $\wp \in \mathcal{S}$  (because  $E \subseteq A$  and  $A \subseteq R \setminus R^\times$ ), and hence  $ab \in \wp$ . This proves that  $\Omega(A) \subseteq \Omega(EZ)$ . Consequently,  $\Omega(A) \subseteq \Omega(EZ \cup A) = \Omega(T)$ . We therefore obtain that

$$\mu^*(A) \geq \mu^*(T) = \mu^*(A) + \mu^*(EZ \setminus A).$$

Since  $\mu^*(A) < +\infty$ , the above inequality yields  $\mu^*(EZ \setminus A) = 0$ . Thus we have proved the following property:

$$\forall E \subseteq A \forall Z \subseteq R : \mu^*(EZ \setminus A) = 0.$$

Define now  $W = AB \cup B$ . Recall that  $B \cap A = \emptyset$ . Combining the property we have just proved with the  $\mu^*$ -measurability of  $A$ , we get

$$\mu^*(AB) = \mu^*(AB \cap A) + \mu^*(AB \setminus A) = \mu^*(AB \cap A).$$

Consequently,

$$\mu^*(W \cap A) = \mu^*((AB \cap A) \cup (B \cap A)) = \mu^*(AB \cap A) = \mu^*(AB).$$

Notice also that by the monotonicity of  $\mu^*$ ,

$$\mu^*(W \setminus A) = \mu^*((AB \setminus A) \cup (B \setminus A)) \geq \mu^*(B \setminus A) = \mu^*(B).$$

The same argument as in the previous part of the proof shows that  $\Omega(B) \subseteq \Omega(W)$ , and hence  $\mu^*(B) \geq \mu^*(W)$ . It follows therefore from the  $\mu^*$ -measurability of  $A$  that

$$\mu^*(B) \geq \mu^*(W) = \mu^*(W \cap A) + \mu^*(W \setminus A) \geq \mu^*(AB) + \mu^*(B).$$

Since  $\mu^*(B) < +\infty$ , the above inequalities yield  $\mu^*(AB) = 0$ . But by Proposition 3.4 (i) we have  $\mu^*(AB) = \min\{\mu^*(A), \mu^*(B)\} > 0$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

It seems worth noting that a set  $A \subseteq R$  is  $\mu^*$ -measurable if and only if so is  $A \setminus R^\times$  (this follows from the fact that every subset of  $R^\times$  is  $\mu^*$ -measurable). Recall also that  $A$  is  $\mu^*$ -measurable if and only if so is  $R \setminus A$ . In view of these two equivalences and Proposition 3.4 (ii), our main theorem implies the following corollary.

**COROLLARY 3.6.** *If  $A \subseteq R$  is a  $\mu^*$ -measurable set and neither  $A$  nor  $R \setminus A$  satisfies condition  $(\bullet)$  with respect to  $\mu^*$ , then  $\mu^*(A) = +\infty = \mu^*(R \setminus A)$ .*

As an easy consequence of the main theorem, we also obtain a complete characterization of  $\mu^*$ -measurable sets in the case where  $\mu^*(R) < +\infty$ .

COROLLARY 3.7. *Suppose that  $\mu^*$  is finite (i.e.,  $\mu^*(R) < +\infty$ ). Then  $A \subseteq R$  is a  $\mu^*$ -measurable set if and only if either  $\mu^*(A) = 0$  or  $\mu^*(R \setminus A) = 0$ .*

Let us conclude the note with an example concerning the case where  $\mu^*(R) = +\infty$ .

EXAMPLE 3.8. Consider the measure  $\mu: 2^{\text{Max}(\mathbb{Z})} \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$  defined by

$$\mu(\{(p)\}) = \begin{cases} +\infty, & \text{if } p = 2, \\ 1/p, & \text{if } p \in \mathbb{P} \setminus \{2\}. \end{cases}$$

We can apply Proposition 2.1 to the outer measure  $\mu^*: 2^{\mathbb{Z}} \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$ . If  $k \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{-1, 0, 1\}$  is neither a power of 2 nor the opposite of a power of 2, then  $\mu^*(\{k\}) = 1/p_k$ , where  $p_k$  stands for the largest prime divisor of  $k$ . Notice also that  $\mu^*(\{0\}) = 0$ . Therefore, a set  $A \in 2^{\mathbb{Z}}$  satisfies condition  $(\bullet)$  with respect to  $\mu^*$  if and only if

$$A \setminus \{-1, 0, 1\} \subseteq \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \{-2^n, 2^n\}.$$

Observe now that  $\mu^*(\mathbb{P}) = +\infty = \mu^*(\mathbb{Z} \setminus \mathbb{P})$ . It is obvious that  $\mathbb{P}$  and  $\mathbb{Z} \setminus \mathbb{P}$  do not satisfy condition  $(\bullet)$  with respect to  $\mu^*$ . Define  $T = \{3, 9\}$ . Then

$$\mu^*(T) = \mu^*(T \cap \mathbb{P}) = \mu^*(T \setminus \mathbb{P}) = 1/3.$$

Consequently,  $\mathbb{P}$  is not a  $\mu^*$ -measurable set.

## References

- [1] Atiyah M.F., MacDonald I.G., *Introduction to Commutative Algebra*, Addison–Wesley Publishing Company, Reading, 1969.
- [2] Dudzik D., Skrzyński M., *An outer measure on a commutative ring*, Algebra Discrete Math. **21** (2016), no. 1, 51–58.
- [3] Federer H., *Geometric Measure Theory*, Springer, Berlin, 1969.
- [4] Halmos P.R., *Measure Theory*, Springer, New York, 1976.

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS  
 PEDAGOGICAL UNIVERSITY OF CRACOW  
 PODCHORAŻYCH 2  
 30-084 KRAKÓW  
 POLAND  
 e-mail: dariusz.dudzik@gmail.com

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS  
 CRACOW UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY  
 WARSZAWSKA 24  
 31-155 KRAKÓW  
 POLAND  
 e-mail: pfskrzyn@cyf-kr.edu.pl