

# Problems in Riemann integration

Justin H. Le

Department of Electrical & Computer Engineering

University of Nevada, Las Vegas

lejustin.lv@gmail.com

November 10, 2016

## 1 Introduction

**Proposition 1.1.** *Let  $x \in [0, 1]$  and define*

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & x \text{ irrational} \\ \frac{1}{n} & x = \frac{m}{n} \end{cases}, \quad (1)$$

*where  $m$  and  $n$  are integers with no factors in common (except 1). Then  $f$  is Riemann integrable.*

*Proof.* Define a partition of  $[0, 1]$  such that  $0 = x_0 < x_1 < \dots < x_k = 1$  and

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 - x_0 &< \frac{\epsilon}{k} \\ x_2 - x_1 &< \frac{\epsilon}{k} \\ &\vdots \\ x_k - x_{k-1} &< \frac{\epsilon}{k}. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Let  $P$  be the set of all the above intervals for a fixed  $k$ . As  $k$  increases, the intervals grow smaller,  $\epsilon$  decreases, and we say that “the partition  $P$  grows finer”.

To satisfy Riemann integrability, we’d like to show that  $\inf_P U_P(f) = \sup_P L_P(f)$ , where

$$L_P(f) = \sum_{i=0}^k m_i(x_k - x_{k-1}) \quad (3)$$

$$U_P(f) = \sum_{i=0}^k M_i(x_k - x_{k-1}) \quad (4)$$

$$m_i = \inf_{[x_i, x_{i-1})} f(x) \quad (5)$$

$$M_i = \sup_{[x_i, x_{i-1})} f(x) \quad (6)$$

Since an irrational number lies in every interval  $[x_i, x_{i-1})$ , the infimum of  $f$  on each interval is 0. So,  $m_i = 0$  for all  $i$  and  $L_P(f) = 0$ . Then  $\sup_P L_P(f) = 0$ . Now, we only need to show that  $\inf_P U_P(f) = 0$ .

Since a rational number lies in every interval, the supremum of  $f$  on each interval is the supremum of  $1/n$ , which is 1. So,  $M_i = 1$  for all  $i$ . Then, by the partition that we defined in ??, we have

$$U_P(f) = \sum_{i=0}^k M_i(x_k - x_{k-1}) = 1 \cdot (k \cdot \frac{\epsilon}{k}) = \epsilon. \quad (7)$$

As the partition becomes finer, the intervals grow smaller and  $\epsilon$  tends to zero. So, we've shown that  $U_P(f)$  tends to 0. That is,  $\inf_P U_P(f) = 0$ . Then  $\inf_P U_P(f) = \sup_P L_P(f) = 0$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 1.2.** *Let  $x \in [0, 1]$  and define*

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & x \neq \frac{1}{2} \\ 2 & x = \frac{1}{2} \end{cases}. \quad (8)$$

*Then  $f$  is Riemann integrable.*

*Proof.* Define a partition of  $[0, 1]$  such that  $0 = x_0 < x_1 < \dots < x_k = 1$  and

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 - x_0 &< \epsilon \\ x_2 - x_1 &< \epsilon \\ &\vdots \\ x_k - x_{k-1} &< \epsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Let the partition  $P$  denote the set of all the above intervals for a fixed  $k$ .

The infimum of each interval is 1, regardless of whether the interval contains  $x = \frac{1}{2}$ . Knowing this, let's determine whether there exists a partition  $P$  such that  $U_P(f) - L_P(f) < \epsilon$  for any  $\epsilon$ , as in Lemma ??.

For any  $P$ , there exists  $\ell$  such that  $\frac{1}{2} \in [x_{\ell-1}, x_\ell)$ . Then on this interval,  $M_\ell = 2$ . Computing the upper sum,

$$\begin{aligned} U_P(f) &= \sum_{i=1}^n M_i(x_i - x_{i-1}) \\ &= M_\ell(x_\ell - x_{\ell-1}) + \sum_{i=1, i \neq \ell}^n M_i(x_i - x_{i-1}) \\ &< 2\epsilon + 1 \cdot (n-1)\epsilon \\ &= \epsilon(n+1), \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where  $(n-1)$  arises from the fact that there are  $(n-1)$  terms in the sum remaining after excluding the interval that contains  $\frac{1}{2}$ . (Only one interval may contain  $\frac{1}{2}$ , by the definition of a partition.)

From the above expression, we can show that there exists  $n$  (and therefore a  $P$ ) such that Lemma ?? is satisfied. To satisfy the lemma, we must have

$$U_P(f) - L_P(f) < \epsilon(n+1) - 1 \leq \epsilon \quad (11)$$

So, given any  $\epsilon$ , there exists  $n \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon}$  that satisfies the above inequality. Then,  $f$  is Riemann integrable.  $\square$

**Proposition 1.3.** *Suppose that  $f$  is Riemann integrable on  $[a, b]$  and  $f(x) \geq 0$  for all  $x$ . Then*

$$(A) \quad \int_a^b f(x)dx \geq 0 \text{ and}$$

$$(B) \quad \text{if } \int_a^b f(x)dx = 0 \text{ and } f \text{ is continuous, then } f(x) = 0 \text{ for all } x \in [a, b].$$

*Proof.* Define a partition of  $[a, b]$  such that  $a = x_0 < x_1 < \dots < x_k = b$ . Let  $x_k^* \in [x_k, x_{k+1}]$ . Then, for all  $n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} S_n(f) &= \sum_{k=1}^n f(x_k^*)(x_k - x_{k-1}) \\ &\geq \sum_{k=1}^n 0 \cdot (x_k - x_{k-1}) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Since  $S_n(f) \rightarrow \int_a^b f(x)dx$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , the above result implies that  $\int_a^b f(x)dx \geq 0$ .

To prove (B), suppose that there exists  $x_0 \in [a, b]$  such that  $f(x_0) \neq 0$ . Without loss of generality, assume that  $f(x_0) > 0$ . Also, suppose that  $f$  is continuous on its domain, so that

$$\begin{aligned} \forall \epsilon > 0 \quad \exists \delta > 0 \quad \text{s.t.} \quad |x - x_0| \leq \delta &\Rightarrow |f(x) - f(x_0)| \leq \epsilon \\ &\Rightarrow f(x_0) - \epsilon \leq f(x). \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Then, we can show that the integral of  $f$  over its domain must be greater than zero.

$$\begin{aligned} \int_a^b f(x)dx &= \int_a^{x_0-\delta} f(x)dx + \int_{x_0-\delta}^{x_0+\delta} f(x)dx + \int_{x_0+\delta}^b f(x)dx \\ &= 0 + \int_{x_0-\delta}^{x_0+\delta} f(x)dx + 0 \\ &> \int_{x_0-\delta}^{x_0+\delta} f(x_0)dx \\ &> 2\delta f(x_0) \\ &> 0, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where the final line follows from the fact that both  $\delta$  and  $f(x_0)$  are greater than zero. So, the integral is non-zero, and (B) is proven by contraposition.  $\square$

## 2 Supplement

**Proposition 2.1.** *Let  $f$  be a continuous function on  $[a, b]$  and*

$$F(x) = \int_a^x f(t)dt . \quad (15)$$

*Then  $F$  is Lipschitz continuous on  $[a, b]$ .*

*Proof.* First, note that  $f$  is bounded, since it's continuous on a closed and bounded interval. That is,  $\exists M$  such that  $f(x) \leq M$  for all  $x$ .

Let  $x_1 \in [a, b]$  and  $x_2 \in [a, b]$ . Without loss of generality, let  $x_1 < x_2$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} |F(x_2) - F(x_1)| &= \left| \int_a^{x_2} f(x)dx - \int_a^{x_1} f(x)dx \right| \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \left| \int_a^{x_1} f(x)dx + \int_{x_1}^{x_2} f(x)dx - \int_a^{x_1} f(x)dx \right| \\ &= \left| \int_{x_1}^{x_2} f(x)dx \right| \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{<} \int_{x_1}^{x_2} |f(x)|dx \\ &\leq \int_{x_1}^{x_2} Mdx \\ &= M(x_2 - x_1) . \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Line (a) follows from Lemma ?? . Line (b) follows from Lemma ?? . By the assumption that  $x_1 < x_2$ , we see that  $x_2 - x_1$  is always positive. So, the final line implies that  $|F(x_2) - F(x_1)| < M|x_2 - x_1|$ , which proves the Lipschitzianity of  $F$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 2.2.** *Let  $f$  be a continuous function on  $[a, b]$  and*

$$\int_{x_1}^{x_2} f(x)dx = 0 , \quad (17)$$

*for every  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  in  $[a, b]$ . Then  $f(x) = 0$  for all  $x$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose that there exists  $x^* \in [a, b]$  such that  $f(x^*) \neq 0$ . Without loss of generality, let  $f(x^*) > 0$ . Since  $f$  is continuous on its domain, for all  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that  $|x - x^*| \leq \delta$  implies  $f(x) - f(x^*) \leq \epsilon$ . Then,  $f(x^*) - \epsilon \leq f(x)$ .

Now, suppose that  $x_1 = x^* - \delta$  and  $x_2 = x^* + \delta$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{x_1}^{x_2} f(x)dx &\geq \int_{x_1}^{x_2} f(x^*)dx \\ &= \int_{x^*-\delta}^{x^*+\delta} f(x^*)dx \\ &= (x^* + \delta - (x^* - \delta))f(x^*) \\ &= 2\delta f(x^*) \\ &> 0 \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Then there exists  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  such that the integral is non-zero, and the proposition is proven by contraposition.  $\square$

**Proposition 2.3.** *Let  $f$  be a continuous function on  $[a, b]$ . Then, there exists  $x_0 \in [a, b]$  such that*

$$f(x_0) = \frac{1}{b-a} \int_a^b f(x) dx . \quad (19)$$

*Proof.* Since  $f$  is continuous on a closed and bounded interval, it achieves its infimum and supremum on that interval. So, let  $c$  and  $d$  be in  $[a, b]$  such that  $c = \inf_{[a,b]} f(x)$  and  $d = \sup_{[a,b]} f(x)$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_a^b f(c) dx &\leq \int_a^b f(x) dx && \leq \int_a^b f(d) dx \\ (b-a)f(c) &\leq \int_a^b f(x) dx && \leq (b-a)f(d) \\ f(c) &\leq \frac{1}{b-a} \int_a^b f(x) dx && \leq f(d) \end{aligned}$$

Then, by the Intermediate Value Theorem, there exists  $x_0 \in [c, d]$  such that  $f(x_0) = \frac{1}{b-a} \int_a^b f(x) dx$ . Since  $[c, d] \subseteq [a, b]$ , it follows that  $x_0$  is also in  $[a, b]$ .  $\square$

## A Some useful results

**Lemma A.1.** *Let  $f$  be a bounded function on  $[a, b]$ . Suppose that for each  $\epsilon > 0$  there is a partition  $P$  such that*

$$U_P(f) - L_P(f) \leq \epsilon . \quad (20)$$

*Then  $f$  is Riemann integrable.*

**Lemma A.2.** *Let  $f$  be a continuous function on  $[a, b]$ . Then,*

$$\left| \int_a^b f(x) dx \right| \leq \int_a^b |f(x)| dx \quad (21)$$

**Lemma A.3.** *Let  $f$  be a continuous function on  $[a, b]$  and  $a \leq c \leq b$ . Then,*

$$\int_a^b f(x) dx = \int_a^c f(x) dx + \int_c^b f(x) dx \quad (22)$$