## Math 55b: Honors Real and Complex Analysis

Homework Assignment #10 (1 April 2011): Integration in  $\mathbf{R}^k$ , and special functions

**Similarly**, *adv*.: At least one line of the proof of this case is the same as before.<sup>1</sup>

- 1.–2. Solve Problems 1 and 2 on page 288. Apropos #2, construct a bounded function  $f:[0,1]\times[0,1]\to\mathbf{R}$  such that: for each x, the function  $y\mapsto f(x,y)$  is Riemann integrable with  $\int_0^1 f(x,y)\,dy=0$  (from which it follows that  $\int_0^1 \left(\int_0^1 f(x,y)\,dy\right)\,dx=0$ ); but there exist y such that the function  $y\mapsto f(x,y)$  is not Riemann integrable (whence  $\int_0^1 \left(\int_0^1 f(x,y)\,dx\right)\,dy$  doesn't even make sense).
- 3.–7. Solve Problems 9 through 13 on pages 290–291. Generalize #13 to the integral of  $\prod_{i=1}^k x_i^{r_i}$  over the set of  $(x_1,\ldots,x_k)$  with each  $x_i\geq 0$  and  $\sum_{i=1}^k x_i^{s_i} \leq 1$ . The  $r_i,s_i$  can be any real numbers with  $r_i>-1$  and  $s_i>0$ . (The resulting formula is due to Dirichlet.) In particular, determine the volume of the unit ball in  $\mathbf{R}^k$  as a function of k; check that your answer agrees with the known cases k=1,2,3. Note what happens to this volume as  $k\to\infty$ !
- 8. Let  $Q: \mathbf{R}^n \to \mathbf{R}$  be a positive-definite form. Show that the integral of  $e^{-Q(x)}$  over  $x \in \mathbf{R}^n$  converges, and evaluate this integral. For  $y \in \mathbf{R}^n$  determine the integral of  $\exp(-Q(x) + i\langle x, y \rangle)$  over  $x \in \mathbf{R}^n$ , where  $\langle x, y \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i$  is the usual inner product.
- 9. Let n be a positive integer, V the vector space of symmetric  $n \times n$  matrices, and  $E \subset V$  the open set of positive-definite matrices. Prove that the function  $A \mapsto 1/\det(A)$  on E is logarithmically convex.

This problem set due Friday, April 8, at the beginning of class.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Definitions of Terms Commonly Used in Higher Math, R. Glover et al. Note that this does not define an equivalence relation.