

**Exercise 8.** Show that  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{Z}_+)$  and  $\mathbb{R}$  have the same cardinality. [ *Hint:* you may use the fact that every real number has a decimal expansion, which is unique if expansions that end in an infinite string of 9s are forbidden. ]

*Proof.*

**Injection of  $\mathbb{R}$  into  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{Z}_+)$**

For all  $x \in [0, 1]$ , we admit that  $x$  has a unique proper base 2 development noted  $(0, x_1 x_2 \dots)_2$ , with  $x_i \in \{0, 1\}$  for all  $i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ , and such that for all  $i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  there exists  $j > i$  such that  $x_j = 0$ . Let

$$\begin{aligned}\phi : (0, 1) &\rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{Z}_+) \\ x = (0, x_1, x_2 \dots)_2 &\mapsto \{i \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \mid x_i = 1\}\end{aligned}$$

The unicity of the proper base 2 development of  $x$  implies that if  $x, y$  are elements of  $(0, 1)$  such that  $x \neq y$ , then there exists  $j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  such that  $x_j \neq y_j$ ; so that  $j \notin \phi(x) \cap \phi(y)$ , from which we deduce that  $\phi$  is injective.

Note that  $\phi$  is not surjective: suppose that there exists  $x = (0, x_1, x_2 \dots)_2$  such that  $\phi(x) = \mathbb{Z}_+$ . If  $x_i = 0$  for some  $i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ , then  $i \notin \phi(x) = \mathbb{Z}_+$ , which is a contradiction. Therefore  $x_i = 1$  for all  $i$ , so that  $(0, x_1 x_2 \dots)_2$  is not a proper base 2 development.

Let

$$\begin{aligned}\theta : \mathbb{R} &\rightarrow (0, 1) \\ x &\mapsto \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{\pi} \arctan(x)\end{aligned}$$

$\theta$  is a bijection, and thus  $\phi \circ \theta$  is an injection of  $\mathbb{R}$  into  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{Z}_+)$ .

**Injection of  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{Z}_+)$  into  $\mathbb{R}$**

Let  $X$  be a nonempty subset of  $\mathbb{Z}_+$ . For all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ , let

$$S_n(X) = \sum_{i \in X \cap \{1, \dots, n\}} 2^{-i}$$

We have

$$0 \leq S_n(X) \leq S_{n+1}(X) \leq \sum_{i \in \{1, \dots, n+1\}} 2^{-i} \leq 1$$

so that the sequence  $S_n(X)$  converges to some real number  $S(X)$  in  $[0, 1]$ . For all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ , let  $Q_n = \{i \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \mid i \geq n\}$ , and

$$\begin{aligned}\psi : \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{Z}_+) &\rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ X &\mapsto \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } X = \emptyset \\ S(X) & \text{if } Q_n \not\subset X \text{ for all } n \\ 1 + S(X) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

Let  $X, Y$  be subsets of  $\mathbb{Z}_+$  such that  $X \neq Y$ . Switching the roles of  $X$  and  $Y$  if necessary, we can suppose that  $X - Y \neq \emptyset$ . Let  $i \in X - Y$ ; if  $Y = \emptyset$ , then  $\psi(Y) = 0 < 2^{-i} \leq \psi(X)$ , so  $\psi(X) \neq \psi(Y)$ . Otherwise, if there is some  $n$  such that  $Q_n \subset Y$ , but for all  $n$ ,  $Q_n \not\subset X$ , then  $\psi(X) \leq 1 < 1 + \sum_{i \in Q_n} 2^{-i} \leq \psi(Y)$ , so that  $\psi(X) \neq \psi(Y)$ . The same reasoning applies if  $X$  contains some  $Q_n$  but  $Y$  does not contain any. Otherwise, suppose that neither  $X$  nor  $Y$  contains any  $Q_n$ , and let  $m = \min(X - Y)$ . Switching the roles of  $X$  and  $Y$  if necessary, we can suppose that  $x_m = 1$ . For all  $i < m$ , we have  $x_i = y_i$ , so that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq \psi(Y) &< \sum_{i \in \{1, \dots, m-1\} \cap Y} 2^{-i} + \sum_{i > m} 2^{-i} && \text{since } Q_{m+1} \not\subset Y \\ &= \sum_{i \in \{1, \dots, m-1\} \cap X} 2^{-i} + 2^{-m} && \text{since } x_i = y_i \text{ for } i < m \\ &\leq \psi(X) \end{aligned}$$

From this we deduce that  $\psi(X) \neq \psi(Y)$ .

The last case to check is when there is some positive  $n$  such that  $Q_n \subset X$  and some  $p$  such that  $Q_p \subset Y$ . Again let  $m = \min(X - Y)$ , and suppose that  $x_m = 1$ , switching the roles of  $X$  and  $Y$  if necessary. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(Y) &\leq 1 + \sum_{i \in \{1, \dots, m-1\} \cap Y} 2^{-i} + \sum_{i > m} 2^{-i} \\ &< 1 + \sum_{i \in \{1, \dots, m-1\} \cap X} 2^{-i} + 2^{-m} \\ &\leq \psi(X) \end{aligned}$$

and we have  $\psi(X) \neq \psi(Y)$ .

From the above, we deduce that  $\psi$  is injective.

Since there exists an injection of  $\mathbb{R}$  into  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{Z}_+)$ , and an injection of  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{Z}_+)$  into  $\mathbb{R}$ , there exists a bijection from  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{Z}_+)$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ , so that they have the same cardinality. □