

# Homework 9

Mark Archual | MTH 515

Dr. Scott | Real Analysis

4/17/19

## Problem 7.2.4

### Original Solution

The upper sum of  $g$  is equal to the lower sum so  $\inf(g, P) = \sup(g, P)$ . If the infimum of a function is equal to the supremum, the the function's value is constant across its domain.

$g$  is integrable. The criterion for Riemann Integrability requires that  $U(g, P) - L(g, P) < \epsilon$  In this case,  $U(g, P) - L(g, P) = 0$  so  $g$  is Riemann Integrable.

The value of  $\int_a^b g(x) = \gamma * (b - a)$  where  $\gamma$  is the constant value of the function,  $g$ .

### Self-Evaluation

## Problem 7.2.6

### Original Solution

If  $f$  satisfies the given definition, then

$$L(f, P_o) \leq R(f, P_o) \leq U(f, P_o)$$

because  $m_k \leq c_k \leq M_k$ . This means that  $P_o$  is the result of a common refinement, so  $\exists$  partitions,  $P_1, P_2$  s.t.  $P_o = P_1 \cup P_2$ . It then follows that for these partitions,

$$U(f, P_1) \leq U(f) + \left(\frac{\epsilon}{2} - A\right)$$

$$L(f, P_2) \geq L(f) + \left(\frac{\epsilon}{2} - A\right)$$

Then ...

$$U(f, P_o) - L(f, P_o) \leq U(f, P_1) - L(f, P_2) < U(f) + \left(\frac{\epsilon}{2} - A\right) - (L(f) + \left(\frac{\epsilon}{2} - A\right)) < U(f) - L(f) + \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$

By definition 7.2.7 we know  $U(f) - L(f) = 0$  so the above expression reduces to

$$U(f, P_o) - L(f, P_o) < \epsilon$$

$\therefore f$  is integrable.

## Self-Evaluation

### Problem 7.3.2

#### Original Solution

##### *Part A*

By the Axiom of Completeness we know that every rational number is "surrounded" by two irrational numbers. Thus, for any partition,  $P$ , the  $\inf(f(x)), x \in P = 0$

##### *Part B*

Part B I struggled with because I wasn't sure how to go about finding the size of the set. I understood what values would be a part of the set, but I could not find a way to succinctly describe its size. I felt like there was maybe some implied information about the set that could have helped me get there, but I had a hard time seeing it.

##### *Part C*

This part depends on the question before it, so I am also not able to provide a complete answer. I can tell that the partition,  $P_\epsilon$  depends on the insights gained into the set from part B as knowing when  $t(x)$  exceeds  $\frac{\epsilon}{2}$  would be key for understanding how to construct  $P_\epsilon$ .

## Self-Evaluation

### Problem 7.4.5

#### Original Solution

##### *Part A*

$$U(f + g, P) = \sum (M_k) \Delta x_k, \text{ where } M_k = \sup(f(x) + g(x))$$

Then by the triangle inequality,

$$\sum \sup(f(x) + g(x)) \Delta x_k \leq \sum \sup(f(x)) \Delta x_k + \sum \sup(g(x)) \Delta x_k = U(f, P) + U(g, P)$$

for some partition,  $P$ .

For lower sums,

$$L(f + g, P) \geq L(f, P) + L(g, P)$$

The inequality is strict if  $f$  and  $g$  have counteracting behaviors over  $P$ . For example, if  $f$  is monotonically decreasing while  $g$  is monotonically increasing.

## Part B

$$\int_a^b (f + g) = \int_a^b f + \int_a^b g$$

$$\int_a^b (f + g) \text{ implies that } U(f + g) = L(f + g) \text{ for some partition, } P.$$

Then, using the relations found in *Part A* ...

$$U(f, P) + U(g, P) \geq U(f + g, P) \geq L(f + g, P) \geq L(f, P) + L(g, P)$$

Because  $f$  and  $g$  are known to be integrable,

$$U(f, P) = L(f, P)$$

and

$$U(g, P) = L(g, P)$$

which implies that

$$\int_a^b (f + g) = U(f + g, P) = L(f + g, P) = \int_a^b f + \int_a^b g$$

## Self-Evaluation

### Problem 7.4.8

### Original Solution

Using the Weierstrauss M-test, we see that

$$|h_n(x)| \leq \frac{1}{2^n} \forall x \in A$$

.

The geometric sum  $\sum \frac{1}{2^n}$  converges to 1, so  $\sum h_n(x)$  converges uniformly to  $H$  and is integrable.

$$\int_0^1 H = \sum \int_0^1 h_n(x) = \sum \frac{1}{2^n} * \frac{1}{2^n} = \sum \frac{1}{4^n} = \frac{1}{3}$$

## Self-Evaluation

## External References