

Due Wed. 02/14/2018

NAME: Colin Roberts CSUID: 829773631

(20 points) *Problem 1.* Let $f_n(x)$ be a sequence of Riemann integrable functions on $[a, b]$ and $f_n(x)$ converges uniformly on $[a, b]$ to $f(x)$. Prove that $f(x)$ is also Riemann integrable and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_a^b f_n(x) dx = \int_a^b f(x) dx$.

(15 points) *Problem 2.* Let $A = \mathbb{Q} \cap [0, 1]$. If $\{I_n\}$ is a finite collection of open intervals covering A , then $\sum_n \lambda(I_n) \geq 1$.

(15 points) *Problem 3.* Check whether this “easier proof” for $\mu(A) \leq \mu^*(A)$ (Textbook Prop.3.7.4(iv)) is correct. Provide a correct proof if this one is incorrect.

Since $A \subseteq X$, the definition of μ^* as an infimum implies that there exist $A_n \in \mathcal{A}$ ($n \in \mathbb{N}$) such that $A \subseteq \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$ and $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_n) < \mu^*(A) + \varepsilon$.

By the monotonicity and countable subadditivity of μ as a measure, we have

$$\mu(A) \leq \mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n\right) \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_n) < \mu^*(A) + \varepsilon.$$

So for any $\varepsilon > 0$, we have

$$\mu(A) < \mu^*(A) + \varepsilon.$$

Letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ yields

$$\mu(A) \leq \mu^*(A).$$

(20 points) *Problem 4.* Textbook (p.69) Exercise 3.6.9.

(15 points) *Problem 5.* Let \mathcal{A} be an algebra of subsets of a nonempty set X and $\langle \mu_n \rangle_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of measures on \mathcal{A} . Assume $\mu_n(X) < +\infty, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$. For any $A \in \mathcal{A}$, define

$$\mu(A) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{3^n} \mu_n(A).$$

Prove that μ is a measure on \mathcal{A} .

(15 points) *Problem 6.* Assume μ is a measure defined on an algebra \mathcal{A} consisting of subsets of a fixed nonempty set X . Let μ^* be the outer measure induced by μ and \mathcal{S}^* be obtained through the Caratheodory condition. Prove that μ^* is countably additive on \mathcal{S}^* .

Problem 1. Let $f_n(x)$ be a sequence of Riemann integrable functions on $[a, b]$ and $f_n(x)$ converges uniformly on $[a, b]$ to $f(x)$. Prove that $f(x)$ is also Riemann integrable and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_a^b f_n(x) dx = \int_a^b f(x) dx$.

:

Proof. To see that f is Riemann integrable, fix $\epsilon > 0$. Let $0 < \eta$, $0 < \delta$, and $0 < \eta + \delta < \epsilon$. Note that $f_n \rightarrow f$ uniformly implies that $\exists N \in \mathbb{N} : n \geq N \implies |f_n(x) - f(x)| < \frac{\delta}{2(b-a)} \forall x$. Let P_m be a regular partition of $[a, b]$ into m segments. Letting $M_{i,n} = \sup_{x \in [x_i, x_{i+1}]}(f_n(x))$ and $m_{i,n} = \inf_{x \in [x_i, x_{i+1}]}(f_n(x))$, we then have $\forall n \exists m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} U(P_m, f_n) - L(P_m, f_n) &< \eta \\ \iff \sum_{i=1}^m (M_{i,n} - m_{i,n})(x_{i+1} - x_i) &< \eta. \end{aligned}$$

Note that uniform convergence implies that $\frac{\delta}{b-a} + M_{i,n} - m_{i,n} > M_i - m_i$ where $M_i = \sup_{x \in [x_i, x_{i+1}]}(f(x))$ and $m_i = \inf_{x \in [x_i, x_{i+1}]}(f(x))$. Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} U(P_m, f) - L(P_m, f) &= \sum_{i=1}^m (M_i - m_i)(x_{i+1} - x_i) \\ &< \left(\frac{\delta}{b-a} + M_{i,n} - m_{i,n} \right) (x_{i+1} - x_i) \\ &= \delta + \eta < \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Hence f is Riemann integrable. To see that this shows $\int_a^b f_n dx \rightarrow \int_a^b f dx$, note that the previous work shows that

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty, n \rightarrow \infty} |(U(P_m, f_n) - L(P_m, f_n)) - (U(P_m, f) - L(P_m, f))| = 0. \quad \square$$

Problem 2. Let $A = \mathbb{Q} \cap [0, 1]$. If $\{I_n\}$ is a finite collection of open intervals covering A , then $\sum_n \lambda(I_n) \geq 1$.

Note: I will let \bar{I} denote the closure of the open interval I .

:

Proof. First suppose that we have a finite covering of A with a single interval I . Then to contain all points in A , we must have that $I \supseteq [0, 1]$ and hence

$$\lambda(I) \geq 1.$$

Assume this is true up to a covering with $n - 1$ intervals and suppose there exists a covering with n intervals so that

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \lambda(I_k) < 1.$$

By density of the rationals and by the fact that $\lambda(\{x\}) = 0$, we have that for some $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ that $\bar{I}_i \cap \bar{I}_j = \{x\}$. It must be that $I_i \cup \{x\} \cup I_j = I_0$ is an open interval and hence we can create a new covering by removing I_i and I_j from the original covering $\{I_k\}_{k=1, \dots, n}$ and replacing with the interval I_0 . However, this new collection is then a covering of A using $n - 1$ sets, which contradicts our supposition. Hence, by induction, we must have that $\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda(I_n) \geq 1$ for any collection of open intervals covering A . \square

Problem 3. Check whether this “easier proof” for $\mu(A) \leq \mu^*(A)$ (Textbook Prop.3.7.4(iv)) is correct. Provide a correct proof if this one is incorrect.

Since $A \subseteq X$, the definition of μ^ as an infimum implies that there exist $A_n \in \mathcal{A}$ ($n \in \mathbb{N}$) such that $A \subseteq \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$ and $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_n) < \mu^*(A) + \varepsilon$.*

By the monotonicity and countable subadditivity of μ as a measure, we have

$$\mu(A) \leq \mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n\right) \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_n) < \mu^*(A) + \varepsilon.$$

So for any $\varepsilon > 0$, we have

$$\mu(A) < \mu^*(A) + \varepsilon.$$

Letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ yields

$$\mu(A) \leq \mu^*(A).$$

:

Solution. One mistake is that we must require that each A_i is mutually disjoint from any other A_j for $i \neq j$. We must also check the case for when $\mu^*(A) = +\infty$. In this case we surely have that $\mu^*(A) \geq \mu(A)$. Also, in order to apply monotonicity we must instead consider

$$\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} (A_n \cap A)$$

as opposed to $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} (A_n)$ since $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} (A_n) \supseteq A$ and thus could contain more than just A .

Also it should be that we let $\epsilon > 0$ be arbitrary in the beginning and then noting this fact instead of where the proof lets $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ would work. I think letting $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ is a fine way of saying it though! ■

Problem 4. Let $X = \mathbb{N}$, the set of natural numbers. For every finite set $A \subseteq X$, let $\#A$ denote the number of elements in A . Define for $A \subseteq X$,

$$\mu_n(A) := \frac{\#\{m : 1 < m < n, m \in A\}}{n}.$$

Show that μ_n is countably additive for every n on $P(X)$. In a sense, μ_n is the proportion of integers between 1 to n which are in A . Let $\mathcal{C} = \{A \subseteq X : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n(A) \text{ exists}\}$. Show that \mathcal{C} is closed under taking complements, finite disjoint unions and proper differences. Is it an algebra?

Note: I will let $|\cdot|$ denote the cardinality of a set and I will use \coprod as the notation for disjoint union.
:

Proof. To see that μ_n is countably additive, let $\{A_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a collection of disjoint sets from $P(X)$. Then we want to show that

$$\mu_n \left(\coprod_{m \in \mathbb{N}} A_m \right) = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \mu_n(A_m).$$

Now we have

$$\mu_n \left(\coprod_{m \in \mathbb{N}} A_m \right) = \mu_n \left(\coprod_{m \in \mathbb{N}} (A_m \cap \{1, \dots, n\}) \right).$$

Note that since the A_m are disjoint there are sets A_{m_i} with $i = 1, \text{dots}, n$ so that $A_{m_i} \cap \{1, \dots, n\}$ is possibly nonempty (there may be no sets that intersect $\{1, \dots, n\}$ or at most n). This means that we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_n \left(\coprod_{m \in \mathbb{N}} (A_m \cap \{1, \dots, n\}) \right) &= \mu_n \left(\coprod_{i=1}^n (A_{m_i} \cap \{1, \dots, n\}) \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{n} |A_{m_i} \cap \{1, \dots, n\}|, \end{aligned}$$

which holds since the cardinality of the finite union of disjoint sets is additive. Then

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{n} |A_{m_i} \cap \{1, \dots, n\}| = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{n} |A_m \cap \{1, \dots, n\}|,$$

which holds since all the other sets than the A_{m_i} have an empty intersection and hence the intersections of these sets has a cardinality of 0. Finally,

$$\sum_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{n} |A_m \cap \{1, \dots, n\}| = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \mu_n(A_m),$$

which shows the countable additivity.

Now, let $A \in \mathcal{C}$. Let $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n(A) = L$ and note that $L \in [0, 1]$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n(X) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\mu_n(A) + \mu_n(A^c)) \quad \text{by the countable (and hence finite) additivity of } \mu_n \\ &= L + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n(A^c) \\ \implies \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n(A^c) &= 1 - L. \end{aligned}$$

The limit existing shows $A^c \in \mathcal{C}$.

To see that finite disjoint unions are in \mathcal{C} it suffices to show that the union of two disjoint sets are in \mathcal{C} . Let $A, B \in \mathcal{C}$ so that $A \cap B = \emptyset$. Then letting $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n(A) = L_A$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n(B) = L_B$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n(A \coprod B) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\mu_n(A) + \mu_n(B)) && \text{by the countable (and hence finite) additivity of } \mu_n \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n(A) + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n(B) \\ &= L_A + L_B. \end{aligned}$$

Thus the finite disjoint union of two sets is in \mathcal{C} .

Finally, let $A, B \in \mathcal{C}$ be such that $B \subset A$ (proper subset). We wish to show that $A \setminus B \in \mathcal{C}$. To see this, we let $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n(A) = L_A$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n(B) = L_B$ and we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n(A) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n((A \setminus B) \cup B) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n(A \setminus B) + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n(B) && \text{by countable additivity} \\ \iff L_A - L_B &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n(A \setminus B). \end{aligned}$$

Thus the proper differences are in \mathcal{C} .

Lastly, I do think that \mathcal{C} is an algebra. But I've found proving this or finding a counter example is extremely hard!!! \square

Problem 5. Let \mathcal{A} be an algebra of subsets of a nonempty set X and $\langle \mu_n \rangle_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of measures on \mathcal{A} . Assume $\mu_n(X) < +\infty, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$. For any $A \in \mathcal{A}$, define

$$\mu(A) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{3^n} \mu_n(A).$$

Prove that μ is a measure on \mathcal{A} .

:

Proof. In order to show that μ is a measure, we must show that $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$ and that μ is countably additive. Note that \mathcal{A} is an algebra, and hence $\emptyset \in \mathcal{A}$ and since each μ_n is a measure we have that $\mu_n(\emptyset) = 0$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\emptyset) &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{3^n} \mu_n(\emptyset) \\ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

since each term in the series is identically 0. To see that μ is countably additive, let $\{A_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a countable and disjoint collection of subsets of \mathcal{A} which exists due to the fact \mathcal{A} is an algebra. Note, if \mathcal{A} is not infinite, then μ is vacuously countably additive. We want to show that

$$\mu\left(\coprod_{m \in \mathbb{N}} A_m\right) = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \mu(A_m).$$

Note that each μ_n is a measure and is countably additive which allows us to do the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu\left(\coprod_{m \in \mathbb{N}} A_m\right) &= \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{3^n} \mu_n\left(\coprod_{m \in \mathbb{N}} A_m\right) \\ &= \sum_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{3^n} \mu_n(A_m) \\ &= \sum_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \mu(A_m). \end{aligned}$$

□

Note the last equality and the ability to swap the summations is due to the fact that $\mu_n(A_m) < \infty$ for all n, m .

Problem 6. Assume μ is a measure defined on an algebra \mathcal{A} consisting of subsets of a fixed nonempty set X . Let μ^* be the outer measure induced by μ and \mathcal{S}^* be obtained through the Caratheodory condition. Prove that μ^* is countably additive on \mathcal{S}^* .

:

Proof. First note that we have μ^* is countably subadditive. Hence, it suffices to show for an arbitrary countable collection of disjoint subsets $\{A_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of \mathcal{S}^* that

$$\mu^* \left(\coprod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n \right) \geq \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mu^*(A_n).$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^* \left(\coprod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n \right) &= \mu^*(A_1) + \mu^*(A_1^c) \\ &= \mu^*(A_1) + \mu^*(A_1^c \cap A_2) + \mu^*(A_1^c \cap A_2^c) \\ &\vdots \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \mu^*(A_i) + \mu^* \left(\bigcap_{i=1}^n A_i^c \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \mu^*(A_i) + \mu^* \left(\left(\prod_{i=1}^n A_i \right)^c \right). \end{aligned}$$

Now we let $n \rightarrow \infty$ we we find

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^* \left(\coprod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n \right) &\geq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu^*(A_i) + \mu^* \left(\left(\prod_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i \right)^c \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu^*(A_i). \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have that μ^* is countably additive on \mathcal{S}^* .

Note: I did see this solution in the text. But I digested it and tried to simplify it some.

□