

**Problem 3.5.12**

It is clear by elementary calculus that the function

$$F(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & x = 0 \\ x^2 \sin(1/x^2) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

is differentiable everywhere with derivative

$$F'(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & x = 0 \\ 2x \sin(1/x^2) - \frac{2 \cos(1/x^2)}{x} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

We now need to show that  $F'$  is not integrable on  $[-1, 1]$ . First we note that  $F'$  is symmetric about the origin so that

$$\int_{-1}^1 |F'(x)| dx = 2 \int_0^1 |F'(x)|$$

We will show that the integral on the right diverges. The intuition is that near the origin  $\sin(1/x^2)$  and  $\cos(1/x^2)$  oscillate too rapidly and add infinitely much “area” under the curve. More formally, consider the set of points

$$x_j = \left\{ \frac{2}{(2j+1)\pi} \right\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$$

It is clear that  $x_j \rightarrow 0$  as  $j \rightarrow \infty$  and so it suffices to show that

$$\int_{x_N}^1 |F'(x)| dx \rightarrow \infty \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty$$

We will break the domain into smaller intervals of the form  $[x_j, x_{j+1}]$  and observe that

$$\int_{x_N}^1 = \sum_{j=1}^N \int_{x_{j+1}}^{x_j} |F'(x)| dx$$

Then note that

$$\int_{x_{j+1}}^{x_j} |F'(x)| dx = \int_{\sqrt{\frac{1}{2(j+1)\pi}}}^{x_j} F'(x) \pm \int_{x_{j+1}}^{\sqrt{\frac{1}{2j\pi}}} F'(x) = \pm 2 \int_{\sqrt{\frac{1}{2j\pi}}}^{x_j} F'(x)$$

Where the sign is chosen to make the value positive. We then evaluate each term in the partial sum

$$\int_{\sqrt{\frac{1}{2j\pi}}}^{x_j} F'(x) = F(x) \Big|_{\sqrt{\frac{1}{2j\pi}}}^{x_j} = \frac{1}{(2j+1)\pi}$$

So that

$$\int_{x_N}^1 |F'(x)| = \frac{4}{\pi} \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{1}{(2j+1)}$$

Which diverges as  $N \rightarrow \infty$  by comparison with the harmonic series. Hence,  $F'$  is not integrable on  $[-1, 1]$ .

**Problem 3.5.16**

(a)

(b)

**Problem 3.5.17**

We proceed similarly to the proof of Theorem 3.21. We note that

$$|(f * K_\epsilon)(x)| = \left| \int f(x-y)K_\epsilon(y)dy \right| \leq \int |f(x-y)||K_\epsilon(y)|dy$$

We break the integral on the right up into

$$\int_{|y|<\epsilon} |f(x-y)||K_\epsilon(y)|dy + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_{|y| \in [2^{k-1}\epsilon, 2^k\epsilon]} |f(x-y)||K_\epsilon(y)|dy$$

For the first term, we note that

$$\int_{|y|<\epsilon} |f(x-y)||K_\epsilon(y)|dy \leq A\epsilon^{-d} \int_{|x-y|<\epsilon} |f(y)|dy$$

We then note that  $|x-y| < \epsilon$  describes precisely the ball with radius  $\epsilon$  about the origin. As a result we see that

$$\sup_{\epsilon>0} \int_{|x-y|<\epsilon} |f(y)| \leq m(B_\epsilon) \sup_{r>0} \frac{1}{m(B_r)} \int_{B_r} |f(y)|dy$$

This gives

$$\int_{|y|<\epsilon} |f(x-y)||K_\epsilon(y)|dy \leq A c_d f^*(x)$$

Where  $c_d$  is a constant depending on the volume of the unit ball in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . To estimate

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_{|y| \in [2^{k-1}\epsilon, 2^k\epsilon]} |f(x-y)||K_\epsilon(y)|dy$$

We restrict our attention to the partial sums and observe that

$$\int_{|y| \in [2^{k-1}\epsilon, 2^k\epsilon]} |f(x-y)||K_\epsilon(y)|dy \leq \frac{2^{(1-k)(d+1)}}{\epsilon^{d+1}} \int_{|y| \leq 2^k\epsilon} |f(x-y)|dy$$

By the same reasoning as the first case (multiply by volume of appropriate ball and canceling powers), this gives

$$2^d 2^{1-k} \epsilon^{-1} c_d f^*(x)$$

As a result of this

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_{|y| \in [2^{k-1}\epsilon, 2^k\epsilon]} |f(x-y)| |K_{\epsilon}(y)| dy &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^d 2^{1-k} \epsilon^{-1} c_d f^*(x) \\ &\leq 2^{d+1} \epsilon^{-1} c_d f^*(x) \end{aligned}$$

So in total we have that

$$|(f * K_{\epsilon})(x)| \leq (2^{d+2} c_d A) f^*(x)$$

as desired.

**Problem 3.5.19**

(a) Let  $E \subset \mathbb{R}$  have measure 0. Pick some  $\epsilon > 0$  and use the absolute continuity of  $f$  to see that

$$\sum_{k=1}^N |b_k - a_k| < \delta \text{ implies } \sum_{k=1}^N |f(b_k) - f(a_k)| < \epsilon$$

We then use the fact that  $E$  has measure 0 to find some open set  $\mathcal{O} \supset E$  such that  $m(\mathcal{O}) < \delta$ . Because  $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathbb{R}$  we can write it as a disjoint union of open intervals  $I_k = (a_k, b_k)$  such that

$$\mathcal{O} = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} I_k$$

and then we note that

$$m(\mathcal{O}) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (b_k - a_k) < \delta$$

Moreover we have that the closure of  $\mathcal{O}$  also satisfies  $m(\overline{\mathcal{O}}) < \delta$  because the boundary of  $\mathcal{O}$  is countable and hence has measure 0. Now we look at the images of these closed intervals under  $f$ . Consider the points  $\{y_k\}_1^{\infty}$  and  $\{Y_k\}_1^{\infty}$  which are defined to be the points such that  $y_k = \inf_{x \in I_k} f(x)$  and  $Y_k = \sup_{x \in I_k} f(x)$ . Then set  $\{x_k = \{f^{-1}(y_k)\}$  and  $\{X_k = \{f^{-1}(Y_k)\}$ . We have that  $x_k, X_k \in \overline{I_k}$  because  $f$  is continuous and  $\overline{I_k}$  is compact. So then we have that

$$f(\mathcal{O}) \subset \bigcup_k [f(x_k), f(X_k)]$$

Because next note that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |X_k - x_k| \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |b_k - a_k| < \delta$$

because  $x_k, y_k \in I_k$  and so the absolute continuity of  $f$  implies that

$$m(\overline{\mathcal{O}}) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |f(X_k) - f(x_k)| < \epsilon$$

So

$$m(E) < m(\overline{O}) < \epsilon$$

Letting  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$  gives the result.

(b) Let  $E$  now be a measurable subset of  $\mathbb{R}$ . Then we know that  $E$  differs from an  $F_\sigma$  by a set of measure 0. So we can write

$$E = \left( \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{I}_k \right) \cup Z$$

Where  $Z$  is a set of measure 0 and each of the  $\mathcal{I}_k$  is closed (and bounded and hence, compact). Then the image under  $f$  gives

$$f(E) = \bigcup_k f(\mathcal{I}_k) \cup f(Z)$$

The first element in the union is a countable union of measurable sets, and hence, measurable and  $f(Z)$  has measure 0 by the previous part. Hence,  $f(E)$  is measurable.

### Problem 3.5.20

(a) The main hurdle to this exercise is that if  $F' = 0$  on any interval, then  $F$  is constant a.e. on that interval, and hence not strictly increasing. As a result, we are led to try to find a set with positive measure, but which contains no intervals, and then define  $F$  as an integral over such a set. We constructed such a set (the “fat” Cantor set) in a previous problem set. Let  $\mathcal{C}$  denote such a set (translated and dilated to appropriately sit in  $[a, b]$ ). Consider the function

$$D_{\mathcal{C}}(t) = d(t, \mathcal{C}) = \inf_{x \in \mathcal{C}} d(t, x)$$

It is clear that  $D_{\mathcal{C}}(t)$  is continuous and satisfies  $D_{\mathcal{C}}(t) \geq 0$  with equality iff  $t \in \mathcal{C}$ . As a result, the function

$$F(x) = \int_a^x D_{\mathcal{C}}(t) dt$$

is well-defined. Moreover,  $F$  is absolutely continuous on  $[a, b]$  because of the absolute continuity of the integral. We can see that  $F$  satisfies the requirements because  $F' = 0$  a.e. in  $\mathcal{C}$ , which is a set of positive measure. To see that  $F$  is strictly increasing, choose  $x, y \in [a, b]$  with  $x < y$ , then we just set  $y = x + h$  for some  $h$  and note that

$$F(y) - F(x) = \int_a^{x+h} D_{\mathcal{C}}(t) dt - \int_a^x D_{\mathcal{C}}(t) dt = \int_x^{x+h} D_{\mathcal{C}}(t) dt$$

So we are integrating over some interval  $I_x = [x, x + h]$ . We then note that  $\mathcal{C}$  contains no intervals and so there must be some interval  $\mathcal{I}_x \subset \mathcal{C}^\complement$  such that

$$\int_x^{x+h} D_{\mathcal{C}}(t) dt \geq \int_{\mathcal{I}_x} D_{\mathcal{C}}(t) dt > 0$$

Because  $D_{\mathcal{C}}(t) > 0$  when  $t \notin \mathcal{C}$ . Hence,  $F$  is strictly increasing and we are done.

(b) Define  $F$  as in part (a). Then we have that  $F$  is strictly increasing and absolutely continuous. We then set  $\mathcal{O} = [a, b] - \mathcal{C}$ . Then  $\mathcal{O}$  is open, as it is the complement of a closed set and so we can write

$$\mathcal{O} = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} I_k$$

Where the  $I_k$  are a collection of disjoint open intervals. Because  $F$  is increasing  $I_j \cap I_k = \emptyset$  implies that  $F(I_j) \cap F(I_k) = \emptyset$  and so we have that

$$F(\mathcal{O}) = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} F(I_k)$$

And so we have that

$$m(\mathcal{O}) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} m(I_k) = \int_{\mathcal{O}} D_{\mathcal{C}}(t) dt$$

We then note that  $\int_{\mathcal{C}} D_{\mathcal{C}}(t) dt = 0$  so that

$$\int_{\mathcal{O}} D_{\mathcal{C}}(t) dt = \int_{[a,b]} D_{\mathcal{C}}(t) dt = F(b) - F(a)$$

So we have that  $m(F(\mathcal{O})) = m(F([a, b]))$  and as a result  $m(F(\mathcal{C})) = 0$ . Consequently, if we take any other set  $U \subset \mathcal{C}$  we must have that  $m(F(U)) = 0$ . However, we also have that because  $m(\mathcal{C}) > 0$  that it contains a non-measurable subset,  $\mathcal{N}$ . But then  $F(\mathcal{N}) \subset F(\mathcal{C})$  and so  $m(F(\mathcal{N})) = 0$  however  $F^{-1}(F(\mathcal{N})) = \mathcal{N}$  is non-measurable and we are done.

(c)

### Problem 3.5.21

(a)

(b) Before we begin we need to prove the following fact

**Lemma.** *Let  $f$  and  $g$  absolutely continuous. Then*

$$(f \circ g)'(x) = (f' \circ g)(x)g'(x)$$

*almost everywhere.*

*Proof.* Because both functions are absolutely continuous we must have that they are differentiable almost everywhere. As a result, we can consider the set  $D$  where both  $f'$  and  $g'$  exist (it's complement has measure 0). Let

$$\Delta_h(u) = u(x+h) - u(x)$$

Then we note that

$$\Delta(f \circ g) = [(f \circ g) + o(\Delta(g))] \cdot \Delta_t(g)$$

Then divide by  $t$ . We then divide by  $t$  giving and apply the definition of the derivative to see that

$$(f \circ g)'(x) = (f' \circ g)(x)g'(x)$$

on  $D$ . And as a result, almost everywhere so we are done.  $\square$

To complete the proof we define the following function

$$h(x) = \int_{-\infty}^x f(t)dt$$

We know  $h$  is absolutely continuous because  $f$  is integrable. We then compute

$$\int_a^b (h \circ F)'(x)dx = (h \circ F)(b) - (h \circ F)(a) = \int_{-\infty}^{F(b)} f(y)dy - \int_{-\infty}^{F(a)} f(y)dy = \int_A^B f(y)dy$$

Applying the lemma to this identity gives the desired result.