

# MATH 6320 - Functions of One Real Variable

## Homework 7

Joel Sleeba

October 31, 2024

1. **Solution:** Consider the sequence of functions

$$g_{n,k}(x) = n\chi_{[\frac{k}{2^n}, \frac{k+1}{2^n}]}(x), \quad \text{where } k \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, 2^n - 1\}, n \in \mathbb{N}$$

Order then with the lexicographic ordering to get  $f_1, f_2, f_3, \dots$ . Let  $f_r = g_{n,k}$ . Since each  $f_n$  is simple, they are Reimann integrable and

$$\int f_r \, dm = \int n\chi_{[\frac{k}{2^n}, \frac{k+1}{2^n}]} \, dm = \frac{n}{2^n}$$

Since each  $n$  has only finitely many elements  $k \in \{1, 2, 3, \dots, 2^n - 1\}$ , we see that as  $r \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Thus

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \int f_r \, dm = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n}{2^n} = 0$$

But then we see that for any  $x \in [0, 1]$  and  $M \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exist  $k_0 < 2^{M+1} \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$  such that  $\frac{k_0}{2^{M+1}} \leq x \leq \frac{k_0+1}{2^{M+1}}$ . Thus we see that  $g_{(M+1),k_0}(x) = M+1 > M$ . Then for all  $x \in [0, 1]$ ,

$$\sup_{r \in \mathbb{N}} f_r(x) = \infty$$

Hence if  $g = \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} f_n$ , then  $g = \infty\chi_X$ , which clearly is not in  $L^1(m)$  as  $\int g \, dm = \infty$ .

Next, to get a sequence of continuous functions  $f_r$  which satisfy with the same property as above, let

$$K_{n,k} = \left[ \frac{k}{2^n}, \frac{k+1}{2^n} \right], \quad \text{where } k \in \{0, 1, \dots, 2^n - 1\}, n \in \mathbb{N}$$

and

$$U_{n,k} = \begin{cases} [0, \frac{2}{2^n}), & k = 0 \\ (\frac{k-1}{2^n}, \frac{k+2}{2^n}), & 1 \leq k < 2^n - 1 \\ (\frac{2^n-2}{2^n}, 1], & k = 2^n - 1 \end{cases}$$

Then we notice that each  $K_{n,k}$  is compact and  $U_{n,k}$  is open, with  $K_{n,k} \subset U_{n,k}$ . Since  $[0, 1]$  is compact, it is also locally compact and by Urysohn's lemma, there are continuous functions  $h_{n,k}$  such that

$$\chi_{K_{n,k}} \prec h_{n,k} \prec \chi_{U_{n,k}}$$

Let  $g_{n,k} = nh_{n,k}$ . Then we see that  $g_{n,k}$  are continuous with

$$\int g_{n,k} \, dm = n \int h_{n,k} \, dm \leq n \int \chi_{U_{n,k}} \, dm = \frac{3n}{2^n}$$

Now index  $g_{n,k}$  by the lexicographic ordering on  $(n, k)$  to get a sequence  $f_1, f_2, \dots$ . Then by the same arguments as in the previous choice for  $f_r$ , we see that

$$\sup_{r \in \mathbb{N}} f_r(x) = \infty$$

and

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \int f_r \, dm = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{3n}{2^n} = 0$$

2. **Solution:** Let  $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n$  be any partition of  $X$  where each  $A_j$  is measurable. Define a simple function

$$s = \sum_{j=1}^n \chi_{A_j} \sup_{x \in A_j} f(x)$$

Since each  $A_j$  is measurable, we see that  $s$  is measurable. Moreover  $f < s$  since  $f < s$  in each of the set  $A_j$ . Then,

$$\int f \, d\mu \leq \int s \, d\mu = \sum_{j=1}^n \mu(A_j) \sup_{x \in A_j} f(x)$$

Since  $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n$  was an arbitrary partition of  $X$  into measurable sets, the above inequality holds for all such finite partitions. Then taking the infimum

among all such partitions preserve the inequality. Thus we get

$$\int f \, d\mu \leq \inf \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^n \mu(A_j) \sup_{x \in A_j} f(x) : A_j \text{'s partition } X \right\}$$

Now consider the sequence of functions

$$s_n(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & x < 0 \\ (k+1)2^{-n}, & k2^{-n} < x \leq (k+1)2^{-n}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N} \end{cases}$$

Then  $s_1 \geq s_2 \geq \dots$ . We notice that  $s_n$  is a slight variation of the familiar 'staircase-to-plateau' function. We also observe that each  $s_n$  is measurable and  $s_n$  converge pointwise to the identity function in the positive part of the real numbers.

Then consider the sequence  $\phi_n = s_n \circ f$ . Since  $s_n, f$  are measurable functions,  $\phi_n$  is also a measurable function. Since  $f$  is bounded, there is an  $M \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $f(x) \in [0, M]$  for all  $x \in X$ . Hence  $\phi_n$  can take at most  $2^n M$  values. Therefore  $\phi_n$  are simple measurable functions. Hence

$$\phi_n = \sum_{i=1}^m a_i \chi_{A_i}$$

where  $A_i$ s are measurable sets partition  $X$ . Moreover by virtue of the definition, we see that  $a_i = \sup_{x \in A_i} f(x)$ . Hence

$$\phi_n = \sum_{i=1}^m \chi_{A_i} \sup_{x \in A_i} f(x)$$

Again, since  $s_n(r) \geq s_{n+1}(r)$  for all  $r \in \mathbb{R}$ , we see that  $s_n(f(x)) \geq s_{n+1}(f(x))$  for all  $x \in X$ . Hence  $\phi_1 \geq \phi_2 \geq \phi_3 \geq \dots \geq f$ . Since  $s_n$  converge pointwise to the identity on  $[0, \infty)$ , and  $f$  is bounded,  $\phi_n$  converge pointwise to  $f$ .

Moreover note that since  $f$  is bounded above by  $M$ , each  $\phi_n$  is bounded above by  $M$ . Hence  $|\phi_n| \leq M \chi_X$  and

$$\int M \chi_X \, d\mu = M \mu(X) < \infty$$

Then by dominated convergence theorem, we get

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int \phi_n \, d\mu = \int f \, d\mu$$

Thus we see that

$$\inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^m \chi_{A_i} \sup_{x \in A_i} f(x) : A_j \text{'s partition } X \right\} \leq \int f \, d\mu$$

which gives our equality.

To see that the above equality need not hold if  $f$  is not bounded, consider  $X = (0, 1)$  with the restricted Lebesgue measure. Consider the function  $f : (0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} := x \rightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{x}}$ . Then by the fact that Lebesgue and Riemann integral agrees for continuous function, we see that

$$\int f \, dm = 2$$

If  $A$  is any non-null measurable set containing a neighborhood of 0, we see that  $\mu(A) \sup_{x \in A} f(x) = \infty$ . Since null sets cannot finitely cover any neighborhood, we see that any finite partition of  $X$  must contain a non-null set that intersect all neighborhoods of 0. Thus we see that for any partition  $\{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n\}$  of  $X$

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \mu(A_j) \sup_{x \in A_j} f(x) = \infty$$

which gives us

$$\inf \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^n \mu(A_j) \sup_{x \in A_j} f(x) : A_j \text{'s partition } X \right\} = \infty \neq \int f \, dm$$

3. **Solution:** We need to show that the set  $f^{-1}((y_0, \infty))$  is open for all  $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ . But

$$\begin{aligned} f^{-1}((y_0, \infty)) \text{ is open} &\iff f^{-1}((-\infty, y_0]) \text{ is closed} \\ &\iff \{x \in \mathbb{R} : \mu(x + V) \leq y_0\} \text{ is closed} \end{aligned}$$

Let  $(x_n)_{n=1}^\infty \subset \{x \in \mathbb{R} : \mu(x + B) \leq y\}$  be a sequence such that  $x_n \rightarrow x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ . We need to show that  $\mu(x_0 + V) \leq y$ .

Since  $V$  is open and addition is a continuous function, we see that  $x_0 + V$  is also open. Now let

$$V_n = \{y \in x_0 + V : B_{\frac{1}{n}}(y) \subset x_0 + V\} = \bigcup_{\substack{y \in x_0 + V \\ B_{\frac{1}{n}}(y) \subset x_0 + V}} B_{\frac{1}{n}}(y)$$

Then it is clear that  $V_n$  is open for each  $V_n$  and  $V_1 \subset V_2 \dots V_n \subset V_{n+1} \dots$  since  $B_{\frac{1}{n+1}}(y) \subset B_{\frac{1}{n}}(y)$ . Since  $x_0 + V$  is open, each  $y \in x_0 + V$  is contained in an open ball  $B_{1/n}(y) \subset x_0 + V$  for some  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Thus we see that

$$\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} V_n = x_0 + V$$

Then by the continuity of the measure from below, we see that

$$\mu(V_n) \nearrow \mu(x_0 + V)$$

Now consider the set

$$\begin{aligned} D_n &= (x_n + V) \cap (x_0 + V) = \{y \in x_0 + V : y \in x_n + V\} \\ &= \{y \in x_0 + V : (y - x_n) + x_0 \in x_0 + V\} \\ &= \{y \in x_0 + V : y + (x_0 - x_n) \in x_0 + V\} \\ &\supseteq \{y \in x_0 + V : B_{2|x_0 - x_n|}(y) \subset x_0 + V\} \end{aligned}$$

Since  $x_n \rightarrow x_0$ , for each  $N$ , there is an  $N_N > N$  (we can demand  $N_N > N$ ) such that for all  $n > N_N$ , we have  $2|x_n - x_0| < \frac{1}{N}$ . Then for all  $n > N_N$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \{y \in x_0 + V : B_{2|x_0 - x_n|}(y) \subset x_0 + V\} &\supseteq \{y \in x_0 + V : B_{\frac{1}{N}}(y) \subset x_0 + V\} \\ &= V_N \end{aligned}$$

Therefore for all  $n > N_N$ , we get  $V_N \subset D_n \subset x_0 + V$  and

$$\mu(V_N) \leq \mu(D_n) \leq \mu(x_0 + V)$$

Since we know that  $\mu(V_N) \rightarrow \mu(x_0 + V)$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , we get

$$\mu(D_n) \rightarrow \mu(x_0 + V)$$

being sandwiched between  $\mu(V_N)$  and  $\mu(x_0 + V)$ . Again, since  $V_N \subset D_n \subset x_n + V$  for all  $n > N_N$ , we get

$$\mu(V_N) \leq \mu(D_n) \leq \mu(x_n + V)$$

for all  $n > N_N$ . Then, taking the limits must preserve the inequality and we see that

$$\mu(x_0 + V) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(V_n) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(x_n + V)$$

Now since  $\mu(x_n + V) \leq y$  for each  $x_n$ , we get

$$\mu(x_0 + V) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(x_n + V) \leq y$$

which proves our assertion.