## MA544: Qual Problems

### Carlos Salinas

### April 24, 2016

## Contents

Contents			1
1	Course Notes		<b>2</b>
	1.1	Functions of bounded variation and the Riemann–Stieltjes integral	2
	1.2	The Lebesgue integral	4
	1.3	Differentiation	5
	1.4	$L^p$ Classes	5
	1.5	$L^p$ Classes	8
<b>2</b>	MA	544 (Spring 2016)	10
	2.1	Exam 1 Prep	10
	2.2	Exam 1	14
	2.3	Exam 2 Prep	15
	2.4	Midterm 2	23
	2.5	Final Practice	26
Bi	Bibliography		

## Course Notes

These notes roughly correspond to chapters 2 through 8 of Wheeden and Zygmund's *Measure* and *Integration* [1].

This first portion corresponds to material covered before Exam 1.

### 1.1 Functions of bounded variation and the Riemann–Stieltjes integral

In this section, we introduce functions of bounded variation as well as the definition of the Riemann integral. We conclude with a proof that the

#### Functions of bounded variation

Let  $f: [a,b] \to \mathbb{R}$  be a real-valued function defined for all  $a \le x \le b$  and finite; let  $\Gamma = \{x_0, \ldots, x_m\}$  be a partition of [a,b], i.e., a collection of points  $x_i$ ,  $i=0,\ldots,m$ , satisfying  $x_0=a$  and  $x_m=b$ , and  $x_{i-1} < x_i$  for  $i=1,\ldots,m$ . To each partition  $\Gamma$ , we associated a sum

$$S_{\Gamma} := S_{\Gamma}[f; a, b] := \sum_{i=1}^{m} |f(x_i) - f(x_{i-1})|.$$
 (1)

The variation (or total variation) of f over [a, b] is defined as

$$V := V[f; a, b] := \sup_{\Gamma} S_{\Gamma}, \tag{2}$$

where the supremum is taken over all partitions  $\Gamma$  of [a,b]. If  $V < \infty$ , f is said to be of bounded variation on [a,b]; if  $V = \infty$ , f is of unbounded variation on [a,b].

Before going on to prove important properties about (2), let us look at some common examples (and nonexamples) of functions f of bounded variation.

**Examples 1.** Suppose f is monotone in [a,b]. Then, clearly, each  $S_{\Gamma}$  is equal to |f(a) - f(b)| for every partition  $\Gamma^*$ , and therefore V = |f(b) - f(a)|.

<sup>\*</sup>Carlos: This may not be clear at a first glance, but, upon closer inspection, this is true by monotoncity. If a < x < b, we have |f(b) - f(a)| = |f(b) - f(x)| + |f(x) - f(a)|. This holds for an arbitrary partitions  $\Gamma$ .

**Examples 2.** Suppose the graph of f can be split into a finite number of monotone arcs, i.e., suppose  $[a,b] = \bigcup_{i=1}^k [a_{i-1},a_i]$  and f is monotone in each  $[a_{i-1},a_i]$ . Then  $V = \sum_{i=1}^k |f(a_i)-f(a_{i-1})|$ . To see this, we use the result of Example 1 above and the fact, yet to be proven, than  $V = V[a,b] = \sum_{i=1}^k V[a_i,a_{i-1}]$ .

If  $\Gamma = \{x_0, \dots, x_m\}$  is a partition of [a, b], let  $|\Gamma|$ , called the *norm of*  $\Gamma$ , be defined as the length of the longest subinterval of  $\Gamma$ 

$$|\Gamma| := \max_{i} (x_i - x_{i-1}). \tag{3}$$

If f is continuous on [a, b] and  $\{\Gamma_j\}$  is a sequence of partitions of [a, b] with  $|\Gamma_j| \to 0$ , we shall see that  $V = \lim_{j \to \infty} S_{\Gamma_j}$ .

**Examples 3.** Let f be the *Dirichlet function*, defined by f(x) = 1 for x rational and f(x) = 0 for x irrational. Then, clearly,  $V[a,b] = \infty$  for any interval of [a,b].

**Examples 4.** A function that is continuous on an interval, however, need not be of bounded variation on that interval. Take for example the following construction: let  $\{a_j\}$  and  $\{d_j\}$ ,  $j=1,2,\ldots$ , be monotone decreasing sequences in (0,1] with  $a_1=\lim_{j\to\infty}a_j=\lim_{j\to\infty}d_j=0$  and  $\sum d_j=\infty$ . Construct a continuous function f as follows. On each subinterval  $[a_{j+1},a_j]$ , the graph of f consists of the sides of the isosceles triangle with base  $[a_{j+1},a_j]$  and height  $d_j$ . Thus,  $f(a_j)=0$ , and if  $m_j$  denotes the midpoint of  $[a_{j+1},a_j]$ , then  $f(m_j)=d_j$ . If we define f(0)=0, then f is continuous on [0,1]. Taking  $\Gamma_k$  to be the partition defined by the points 0,  $\{a_j\}_{j=1}^{k+1}$  and  $\{m_j\}_{j=1}^k$ , we see that  $S_{\Gamma}=2\sum_{j=1}^k d_j$ . Hence,  $V[f;0,1]=\infty$ .

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>†</sup>Carlos: By the density of  $\mathbb{Q}$  in  $\mathbb{R}$  (and by restriction, [a,b], since [a,b] is path-connected), for any positive integer N, we may choose a partition  $\Gamma$  of [a,b] containing N+1 rational numbers so  $S_{\Gamma}=N+1>N$ .

### 1.2 The Lebesgue integral

This portion corresponds to material covered before the second exam.

### 1.3 Differentiation

This portion of the notes corresponds to material covered before the final.

This section deals with questions of differentiability and culminates with a couple of results tying together the Lebesgue integral with the derivative à la the familiar fundamental theorem of calculus for Riemann integrals.

### The indefinite integral

If f is a Riemann integrable function on an interval [a,b] of  $\mathbb{R}$ , then the familiar definition for its indefinite integral is

$$F(x) = \int_{a}^{x} f(y)dy, \quad a \le x \le b. \tag{4}$$

The fundamental theorem of calculus then asserts that F' = f if f is continuous. In this section, we study the analogue of this result for Lebesgue integrable functions.

Since we want to generalize our results to  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , first we must find a suitable notion of indefinite integral for multivariable functions. In two dimensions we might, for instance, define the indefinite integral F of f to be

$$F(x_1, x_2) := \int_{a_1}^{x_1} \int_{a_2}^{x_2} f(y_1, y_2) \, dy_2 \, dy_1. \tag{5}$$

As it turns out, it is better to abandon the notion that the indefinite integral be a function of a point an instead let it be a function of a set. Therefore, given a function f, integrable on some measurable subset A of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , we define the *indefinite integral of* f to be the function

$$F(E) := \int_{E} f,\tag{6}$$

where E is a measurable subset of A.

The function F is an example of a set function, by which we mean any real-valued function F defined on a  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\Sigma$  of measurable sets such that

- (i) F(E) is finite for every  $E \in \Sigma$ .
- (ii) F is countably additive; i.e., if E is the union of disjoint sets  $E_k \in \Sigma$ ,  $k = 1, 2, \ldots$ , then

$$F(E)\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}}F(E_k). \tag{7}$$

#### 1.4 $L^p$ Classes

Let's take a small detour to ch. 5 of [1] to talk about  $L^p$  spaces.

## The relation between the Riemann–Stieltjes integral and the Lebesgue integral, and the $L^p$ spaces, 0

As it turns out, there is a remarkably simple and useful representation of the Lebesgue integral (over measurable subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ) in terms of the Riemann–Stiltjes integrals (over measurable subset of  $\mathbb{R}$ ). In order to establish this relationship, we will need to study the function

$$\omega(\alpha) := \omega_{f,E}(\alpha) := |\{ \mathbf{x} \in E : f(\mathbf{x}) > \alpha \}|, \tag{8}$$

where f is a measurable function on E and  $-\infty < \alpha < \infty$ . We call  $\omega_{f,E}$  (or simply  $\omega$ ) the distribution function of f on E.

The function  $\omega$  is clearly not affected by changing f in a set of measure zero, and is decreasing. As  $\alpha \nearrow \infty$ , we have

$$\{\mathbf{x} \in E : f(\mathbf{x}) > \alpha\} \setminus \{\mathbf{x} \in E : f(\mathbf{x}) = \infty\}.$$

hence, assuming that f is finite a.e. in E, by Theorem 3.62(ii),  $\lim_{\alpha\to\infty}\omega=0$ , unless  $\omega(\alpha)\equiv\infty$ . Similarly, we have  $\lim_{\alpha\to-\infty}\omega=|E|$ . For now, let us assume that the measure of E is finite; this will ensure that  $\omega$  is bounded.

In the following results, we assume that f is a measurable function that is finite a.e. in E,  $|E| < \infty$ , and write

$$\omega(\alpha) = \omega_{f,E}(\alpha), \quad \{f > a\} = \{\mathbf{x} \in E : f(\mathbf{x}) > \alpha\},\$$

etc.

**Lemma 1** (5.38). If  $\alpha < \beta$ , then  $|\{\alpha \le f \le \beta\}| = \omega(\alpha) - \omega(\beta)$ .

*Proof.* For  $\alpha < \beta$ , we have  $\{f > \beta\} \subset \{f > \alpha\}$  and  $\{\gamma < f \leq \beta\} = \{f > \alpha\} \setminus \{f > \beta\}$ . Since  $|\{f > \beta\}| < \infty$ , the lemma follows from Corollary 3.25.

Given  $\alpha$ , let

$$\omega(\alpha+) := \lim_{\varepsilon \searrow 0} \omega(\alpha+\varepsilon) \qquad \omega(\alpha-) := \lim_{\varepsilon \searrow 0} \omega(\alpha-\varepsilon).$$

denote the limits of  $\omega$  from the right and left at  $\alpha$ .

Lemma 2 (5.39).

- (a)  $\omega(\alpha+) = \omega(\alpha)$ ; i.e.,  $\omega$  is continuous from the right.
- (b)  $\omega(\alpha -) = |\{ f \ge \alpha \}|.$

Corollary 3 (5.40).

- (a)  $\omega(\alpha -) \omega(\alpha) = |\{f = \alpha\}|$ ; in particular,  $\omega$  is continuous at  $\alpha$  if and only if  $|\{f = \alpha\}| = 0$ .
- (b)  $\omega$  is constant in an open interval  $(\alpha, \beta)$  if and only if  $|\{\alpha < f < \beta\}| = 0$ , that is, if and only if f takes almost no values between  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ .

The rest of this section establishes the relations between the Lebesgue and Riemann–Stieltjes integrals. As always, we assume f is measurable and finite a.e. in E,  $|E| < \infty$  and  $\omega = \omega_{E,f}$ .

**Theorem 4** (5.41). If  $a \le f(\mathbf{x}) \le b$  (a and b are finite) for all  $\mathbf{x} \in E$ , then

$$\int_{E} f = -\int_{a}^{b} \alpha \, d\omega(\alpha).$$

*Proof.* The Lebesgue integral on the left-hand side exists since f is bounded and  $|E| < \infty$ . The Riemann–Stieltjes integral on the right-hand side exists by Theorem 2.24. To show that they are equal, let us partition the interval the interval [a,b] by  $a = \alpha_0 < \alpha_1 < \cdots < \alpha_k = b$  and let

 $E_j = \{, \alpha_{j-1} < f \le \alpha_j \}$ . The  $E_j$  are disjoint and  $E = \bigcup_{j=1}^k E_j$ . Hence,  $\int_E f = \sum_{j=1}^k \int_{E_j} f$  and, therefore

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \alpha_{j-1} |E_j| \le \int_E f \le \sum_{j=1}^k \alpha_j |E_j|.$$

By Lemma 5.38,  $|E_j| = \omega(\alpha_j)\omega(\alpha_j) = -[\omega(\alpha_j) - \omega(\alpha_{j-1})]$ . Hence, the sums are Riemann–Stieltjes sums for  $-\int_a^b \alpha \, d\omega(\alpha)$ . Since the sums must converge to  $-\int_a^b \alpha \, d\omega(\alpha)$  as the norm of the partition tends to zero, the conclusion follows.

We can extend the conclusion of Theorem 5.41 to the case when f is not bounded as follows.

**Theorem 5** (5.42). Let f be any measurable function on E, and let  $E_{ab} := \{ \mathbf{x} \in E : a < f(\mathbf{x}) < b \}$  (a and b finite). Then,

$$\int_{E_{ab}} f = -\int_{a}^{b} \alpha \, d\omega(\alpha).$$

Sketch of proof. Take  $\omega_{ab}(\alpha) := |\{ \mathbf{x} \in E_{ab} : f(\mathbf{x}) > \alpha \}|$ . By Theorem 5.41, we have

$$\int_{E_{ab}} f = -\int_{a}^{b} \alpha \, d\omega_{ab}(\alpha).$$

Taking the limit of Riemann–Stieltjes sums that approximate the integrals, it suffices to show that  $\omega_{ab}(\alpha) - \omega_{ab}(\beta) = \omega(\alpha) - \omega(\beta)$ . Then The expression on the right-hand side of the equation above, is seen to be  $\int_a^b \alpha \, d\omega(\alpha)$ .

**Theorem 6** (5.43). If either  $\int_E f$  or  $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \alpha d\omega(\alpha)$  exist and is finite, then the other exists and is finite, and

$$\int_{E} f = -\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \alpha \, d\omega(\alpha).$$

Two measurable functions f and g are said to be equimeasurable, or equidistributed, if

$$\omega_{f,E}(\alpha) = \omega_{q,E}(\alpha)$$

for all  $\alpha$ .

We may intuitively think of equimeasurable functions as being *rearrangements* of each other. For such functions, we have

$$|\{a < f < b\}| = |\{a < q < b\}| \quad |\{f = a\}| = |\{g = a\}|,$$

etc. We also gave the following immediate corollary of Theorem 5.43.

Corollary 7 (5.44). If f and q are equimeasurable on E and  $f \in L(E)$ , then  $q \in L(E)$  and

$$\int_{E} f = \int_{E} g.$$

The method used to derive Theorem 5.41 through 5.43 illustrates a basic difference between the Lebesgue and the Riemann integral. The Riemann integral is defined by a limiting process whose initial step involves partitioning the domain of f. On the other hand, the Lebesgue integral can be obtained from a process that partitions the range of f. In order to define the process more clearly, let f be a nonnegative measurable function that is finite a.e. in E,  $|E| < \infty$ . Let  $\Gamma = \{0 = \alpha_0 < \alpha_1 < \cdots\}$  be a partition of the positive ordinate axis by a countable number of points  $\alpha_k \to \infty$ , and let  $|\Gamma| = \sup_k (\alpha_{k+1} - \alpha_k)$ . Set  $E_k := \{\alpha_k \le f < \alpha_{k+1}\}$  and  $E := \{f = \infty\}$ . Then the  $E_k$  are measurable and disjoint, |E| = 0 and  $E := \{\bigcup E_k\} \cup Z$ , so that  $|E| = \sum_k |E_k|$ . Let

$$S_{\Gamma} := \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \alpha_k |E_k|, \quad S_{\Gamma} := \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \alpha_{k+1} |E_k|.$$

### 1.5 $L^p$ Classes

Let's talk about  $L^p$  classes now and some important results about  $L^p$  spaces.

#### Definition of $L^p$

If E is a measurable subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and satisfies  $0 , then <math>L^p(E)$  denotes the collection of measurable f for which  $\int_E |f|^p$  is finite, i.e.,

$$L^{p}(E) := \left\{ f : \int_{E} |f|^{p} < \infty \right\}$$

$$\tag{9}$$

for 0 . Here, <math>f may be complex-valued, in which case, if  $f = f_1 + if_2$  for measurable real-valued  $f_1$  and  $f_2$ , we have  $|f|^2 = f_1^2 + f_2^2$ , so that

$$|f_1|, |f_2| \le |f| \le |f_1| + |f_2|.$$

It follows that  $f \in L^p(E)$  if and only if both  $f_1, f_2 \in L^p(E)$ .

We shall write

$$||f||_{p,E} := \left(\int_{F} |f|^{p}\right)^{1/p},$$

for  $0 . Thus, <math>L^p(E)$  is the set of measurable f for which  $||f||_{p,E}$  is finite. Whenever it is clear from context, we will omit E in  $L^p(E)$  and  $||f||_{p,E}$ , and instead write  $L^p$  and  $||f||_p$ . Also note that  $L = L^1$ .

In order to define  $L^{\infty}(E)$ , let f be real-valued and measurable on a set E of positive measure. Define the essential supremum of f on E to be

$$\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{E} f := \inf \{ \alpha : |\{ \mathbf{x} \in E : f(\mathbf{x}) > \alpha \}| = 0 \}. \tag{10}$$

In words, this the essential supremum of f is the least upper bound of f outside of a set of measure zero. It can be restated as such: ess sup f is the smallest number M,  $-\infty \le M \le \infty$ , such that  $f(\mathbf{x}) \le M$  almost everywhere in E.

In the definition of ess sup f, we have made the explicit assumption that the measure of E is nonzero. Otherwise, ess sup  $f = -\infty$  which can result in awkward or incorrect statements of results involving  $L^p$  spaces. Therefore, we shall adopt the convention that ess sup f = 0 if |E| = 0.

A real or complex-valued measurable f is said to be essentially bounded, or simply bounded almost everywhere on E if ess  $\sup |f|$  is finite. The class of all functions that are essentially bounded on E is denoted by  $L^{\infty}(E)$ . Clearly,  $f \in L^{\infty}(E)$  if and only if its real and imaginary parts belong to  $L^{\infty}(E)$ . We shall use the notation  $||f||_{\infty}$  synonymously with ess  $\sup f$ .

The following theorem gives some good motivation for the use the notation  $||f||_{\infty}$ , at least in the case  $|E| < \infty$ .

**Theorem 8** (8.1). If  $|E| < \infty$ , then  $||f||_{\infty} = \lim_{p \to \infty} ||f||_{p}$ .

Sketch of proof. We may assume that |E| > 0, for otherwise we have a trivial statement, i.e.,  $||f||_p = 0$  for all p and by convention  $||f||_{\infty} = 0$  so clearly  $||f||_p \to ||f||_{\infty}$  as  $p \to \infty$ . Set  $M := ||f||_{\infty}$ . If M' < M,

# MA 544 (Spring 2016)

### 2.1 Exam 1 Prep

**Problem 2.1.** Let  $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be a measurable set,  $r \in \mathbb{R}$  and define the set  $rE = \{ r\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{x} \in E \}$ . Prove that rE is measurable, and that  $|rE| = |r|^n |E|$ .

*Proof.* Define a linear map  $T: \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$  by  $\mathbf{x} \mapsto r\mathbf{x}$ . Using the standard basis for  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , this map has the matrix presentation

$$T\mathbf{x} = \begin{bmatrix} r & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & r \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \tag{11}$$

which has determinant det  $T = r^n$ . By 3.35, we have  $|E| = |T(E)| = r^n |E| = |rE|$ .

**Problem 2.2.** Let  $\{E_k\}$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  be a collection of measurable sets. Define the set

$$\liminf_{k \to \infty} E_k = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \left( \bigcap_{n=k}^{\infty} E_n \right).$$

Show that

$$\left| \liminf_{k \to \infty} E_k \right| \le \liminf_{k \to \infty} |E_k|.$$

*Proof.* If the  $\liminf |E_k| = \infty$  the inequality holds trivially. Hence, we may, without loss of generality, assume that  $\liminf |E_k| < \infty$ . By 3.20, the set  $\liminf E_k$  is measurable and we have

$$\left| \liminf_{k \to \infty} E_k \right| = \left| \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} F_k \right|, \tag{12}$$

where  $F_k = \bigcap_{n=k}^{\infty} E_n$ . Now, note that the collection of sets  $F'_k = \bigcup_{\ell=1}^k F_\ell$  forms an increasing sequence of measurable sets  $F'_k \nearrow F'$ , where  $F' = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} F_k = \liminf E_k$ . Then, by 3.26 (i), we have

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} |F_k'| = |F'| = \left| \liminf_{k \to \infty} E_k \right|. \tag{13}$$

Hence, it suffices to show that  $|F'_k| \leq |E_k|$  for all k, but this follows by monotonicity of the outer measure, 3.3, since  $F'_k \subset E_k$ . Thus, we have the desired inequality

$$\left| \liminf_{k \to \infty} E_k \right| \le \liminf_{k \to \infty} |E_k|. \tag{14}$$

**Problem 2.3.** Consider the function

$$F(x) = \begin{cases} |B(\mathbf{0}, x)| & x > 0\\ 0 & x = 0 \end{cases}$$

Here  $B(\mathbf{0}, r) = \{ \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\mathbf{y}| < r \}$ . Prove that F is monotonic increasing and continuous.

*Proof.* That F is increasing is immediate from the monotonicity of the outer measure since for x < x' we have  $B(\mathbf{0}, x) \subset B(\mathbf{0}, x')$  so, by 3.2, we have

$$|F(x)|B(\mathbf{0},x)| \le |B(\mathbf{0},x')| = F(x')$$

as desired.

To see that F is continuous, we will prove the following lemma

**Lemma 9.** For any x > 0, xB(0,1) = B(0,x).

Proof of lemma. If  $\mathbf{y} \in xB(\mathbf{0}, 1)$  then  $\mathbf{y} = x\mathbf{y}'$  for  $\mathbf{y}' \in B(\mathbf{0}, 1)$ . Thus,  $|\mathbf{y}'| = |\mathbf{y}|/x < 1$  so  $|\mathbf{y}| < x$  implies that  $\mathbf{y} \in B(\mathbf{0}, x)$ . Hence, we have the containment  $xB(\mathbf{0}, 1) \subset B(\mathbf{0}, x)$ .

On the other hand, if  $\mathbf{y} \in B(\mathbf{0}, x)$  then  $|\mathbf{y}| < x$  so  $|\mathbf{y}/x| < 1$ . Hence,  $\mathbf{y}/x \in B(\mathbf{0}, 1)$  so  $x(\mathbf{y}/x) = \mathbf{y} \in B(\mathbf{0}, x)$ . Thus,  $B(\mathbf{0}, x) \subset xB(\mathbf{0}, 1)$  and equality holds.

In light of Lemma 9 and 3.35, for x > 0, we have

$$F(x) = |B(\mathbf{0}, x)| = |xB(\mathbf{0}, 1)| = x^n |B(\mathbf{0}, 1)|. \tag{15}$$

It is clear that F is continuous on the interval  $[0,\infty)$  since F is a polynomial in x.

**Problem 2.4.** Let  $f: \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$  be a function. Let C be the set of all points at which f is continuous. Show that C is a set of type  $G_{\delta}$ .

*Proof.* From the topological definition of continuity, f is continuous at  $x \in C$  if and only if for every neighborhood U of f(x), the preimage  $f^{-1}(U)$  is a neighborhood of x. Now,

Let  $x \in C$ . Then, by the definition of continuity, for every natural number n > 0 there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that  $|x - x'| < \delta$  implies

$$|f(x) - f(x')| < \frac{1}{2n}. (16)$$

Let  $x'', x' \in B(x, \delta)$ . Then, by the triangle inequality, we have

$$|f(x') - f(x)''| = |f(x') - f(x) - (f(x'') - f(x))|$$

$$\leq |f(x') - f(x)| + |f(x'') - f(x)|$$

$$< \frac{1}{2n} + \frac{1}{2n}$$

$$= \frac{1}{n}.$$
(17)

In view of these estimates, define the set

$$A_n = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R} : \text{there exists } \delta > 0 \text{ such that } x', x'' \in B(x, \delta) \text{ implies } |f(x') - f(x'')| < \frac{1}{n} \right\}. \tag{18}$$

Good Lord, that was a long definition! We claim that  $C = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$  and that  $A_n$  is open for all n. First, let us show that  $C = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$ . Let  $x \in C$ . Then for every n > 0, there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that  $|x-x'| < \delta$  implies |f(x)-f(x')| < 1/n. Thus,  $x \in A_n$  for all n so  $x \in \bigcap A_n$ . On the other hand, if  $x \in \bigcap A_n$  for every n > 0, there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that  $|x-x'| < \delta$  implies |f(x)-f(x')| < 1/n. Fix  $\varepsilon > 0$ . By the Archimedean principle, there exists N > 0 such that  $\varepsilon > 1/N$ . Then, since  $x \in A_N$  it follows that for some  $\delta' > 0$ ,  $|x-x'| < \delta'$  implies  $|f(x)-f(x')| < 1/N < \varepsilon$ . Thus,  $x \in C$  and we conclude that  $C = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$ .

Lastly, we show that  $A_n$  is open. Let  $x \in A_n$ . Then there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that  $|x - x'| < \delta$  implies |f(x) - f(x')| < 1/n. In particular, this means that  $B(x, \delta) \subset A_n$  for any  $x' \in B(x, \delta)$  satisfies |f(x) - f(x')| < 1/n. Thus,  $A_n$  is open and we conclude that  $C = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$  is a  $G_{\delta}$  set.

**Problem 2.5.** Let  $f: \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$  be a function. Is it true that if the sets  $\{f = r\}$  are measurable for all  $r \in \mathbb{R}$ , then f is measurable?

*Proof.* No. Recall that, by definition, or 4.1, f is measurable if and only if  $\{f > a\}$  for all  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ .

**Problem 2.6.** Let  $\{f_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$  be a sequence of measurable functions on  $\mathbb{R}$ . Prove that the set  $\{x: \lim_{k\to\infty} f_k(x) \text{ exists}\}$  is measurable.

*Proof.* The idea here should be to rewrite

$$E = \left\{ x : \lim_{k \to \infty} f_k(x) \text{ exists} \right\}$$
 (19)

as a countable union/intersection of measurable sets. Let  $x \in E$ . By the Cauchy criterion, for every N > 0 there exists a positive integer M such that  $m, n \ge M$  implies  $|f_n(x) - f_m(x)| < 1/N$ . With this in mind, define

$$E_N = \left\{ x : \text{there exists } M \text{ such that } m, n \ge M \text{ implies } |f_n(x) - f_m(x)| < \frac{1}{N} \right\}.$$
 (20)

Then, like for Problem 1.4, it is not too hard to see that the  $E_n$ 's are open and that  $E = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n$ . Thus, E is a  $G_{\delta}$  set and therefore measurable.

**Problem 2.7.** A real valued function f on an interval [a,b] is said to be *absolutely continuous* if for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists a  $\delta > 0$  such that for every finite disjoint collection  $\{(a_k,b_k)\}_{k=1}^N$  of open intervals in (a,b) satisfying  $\sum_{k=1}^N b_k - a_k < \delta$ , one has  $\sum_{k=1}^N |f(b_k) - f(a_k)| < \varepsilon$ . Show that an absolutely continuous function on [a,b] is of bounded variation on [a,b].

*Proof.* Suppose  $f: [a, b] \to \mathbb{R}$  is absolutely continuous. Then for fixed  $\varepsilon = 1$ , there exists a  $\delta > 0$  such that for every finite disjoint collection  $\{(a_k b_k)\}_{k=1}^N$  of open intervals in (a, b) satisfying  $\sum_{k=1}^N b_k - a_k < \delta$ , we have  $\sum_{k=1}^N |f(b_k) - f(a_k)| < \varepsilon$ . Let  $\Gamma = \{x_k\}_{k=1}^N$  be a partition of [a, b] into closed intervals such that  $x_{k+1} - x_k < \delta$ , then by absolute continuity we have

$$V[f;\Gamma] = \sum_{k=1}^{N} |f(x_{k+1}) - f(x_k)|$$
< 1. (21)

Thus, f is b.v. on [a, b].

**Problem 2.8.** Let f be a continuous function from [a,b] into  $\mathbb{R}$ . Let  $\chi_{\{c\}}$  be the characteristic function of a singleton  $\{c\}$ , i.e.,  $\chi_{\{c\}}(x) = 0$  if  $x \neq c$  and  $\chi_{\{c\}}(c) = 1$ . Show that

$$\int_{a}^{b} f d\chi_{\{c\}} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } c \in (a, b) \\ -f(a) & \text{if } c = a \\ f(a) & \text{if } c = b \end{cases}.$$

Proof.

### 2.2 Exam 1

### 2.3 Exam 2 Prep

**Problem 2.9.** Define for  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} |\mathbf{x}|^{-(n+1)} & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}, \\ 0 & \text{if } \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}. \end{cases}$$

Prove that f is integrable outside any ball  $B_{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{0})$ , and that there exists a constant C>0 such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{0})} f(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x} \le \frac{C}{\varepsilon}.$$

*Proof.* Recall that a real-valued function  $f: \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$  is (Lebesgue) integrable over a subset E of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  (or, alternatively, f belongs to L(E)) if

$$\int_{E} f(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x} < \infty.$$

Put  $E = \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{0})$ . Then, to show that f belongs to L(E) it suffices to prove the inequality

$$\int_{E} f(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x} < \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \tag{22}$$

for some appropriate constant C. We proceed by directly computing the Lebesgue integral of f and employing Tonelli's theorem:

$$\int_{E} f(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} = \int_{E} \frac{d\mathbf{x}}{|\mathbf{x}|^{n+1}}$$

$$= \int \cdots \int_{E} \frac{dx_{1} \cdots dx_{n}}{(x_{1}^{2} + \cdots + x_{n}^{2})^{(n+1)/2}}$$

let  $E_i$  denote the projection of E onto its i-th coordinate and make the trigonometric substitution  $x_1 = \sqrt{x_2^2 + \dots + x_n^2} \tan \theta$ ,  $dx_1 = \sqrt{x_2^2 + \dots + x_n^2} \sec^2 \theta d\theta$  with  $\theta \in (-\pi/2, -\tan^{-1}(\varepsilon)) \cup (\tan^{-1}(\varepsilon), \pi/2)$  giving us the integral

$$= \int_{E_n} \cdots \int_{E_2} \left[ \frac{\cos^{n-1} \theta}{(x_2^2 + \cdots + x_n^2)^{n/2}} d\theta \right] dx_2 \cdots dx_n$$

which, by Tonelli's theorem, is

$$= \int_{E_n} \cdots \int_{E_2} \frac{dx_2 \cdots dx_n}{(x_2^2 + \cdots + x_n^2)^{n/2}} \left[ \int_{E_\theta} \cos^{n-1} \theta d\theta \right]$$

where the integral

$$\int_{E_{\theta}} \cos^{n-1} \theta d\theta < \infty. \tag{23}$$

Proceeding in this manner, we eventually achieve the inequality

$$\int \cdots \int_{E} f(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} < C' \int_{E_{n}} \frac{dx_{n}}{x_{n}^{2}}$$

$$= 2C' \int_{\varepsilon}^{\infty} \frac{dx_{n}}{x_{n}^{2}}$$

$$= \frac{C}{\varepsilon}$$
(24)

as desired.

**Problem 2.10.** Let  $\{f_k\}$  be a sequence of nonnegative measurable functions on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , and assume that  $f_k$  converges pointwise almost everywhere to a function f. If

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f = \lim_{k \to \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f_k < \infty,$$

show that

$$\int_{E} f = \lim_{k \to \infty} \int_{E} f_k$$

for all measurable subsets E of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Moreover, show that this is not necessarily true if  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f = \lim_{k \to \infty} f_k = \infty$ .

*Proof.* This is probably some theorem I can't remember right now. But anyway, first we shall establish that the limit f of  $\{f_k\}$  must be nonnegative a.e. in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . For assume otherwise. Then there exists a collection of points  $\mathbf{x}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  of nonzero  $\mathbb{R}^n$ -Lebesgue measure such that  $f(\mathbf{x}) < 0$ . But  $f_k(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Set  $0 < \varepsilon < |f(\mathbf{x})|$  then we have

$$|f(\mathbf{x}) - f_k(\mathbf{x})| > |f(\mathbf{x})| > \varepsilon$$
 (25)

for all k which contradicts our assumption that  $f_k \to f$  a.e. on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Therefore, the set of points  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  where  $f(\mathbf{x}) < 0$  must have measure zero.

Now, based on pointwise convergence a.e. to f, given  $\varepsilon > 0$  for a.e.  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  we have the following estimate

$$|f(\mathbf{x}) - f_k(\mathbf{x})| < \varepsilon \tag{26}$$

for sufficiently large k; say k greater than or equal to some index  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ . Moreover, we are given convergence in  $L(\mathbb{R}^n)$  of  $f_k$  to f

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f_k \to \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f < \infty. \tag{27}$$

By monotonicity of the Lebesgue integral (Theorem 5.5(iii)), this implies that

$$\int_{E} f \le \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f < \infty \tag{28}$$

and

$$\int_{E} f_k \le \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f_k < \infty \tag{29}$$

for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . By Theorem 5.5(ii), f and the  $f_k$ 's are finite a.e. in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  so for some sufficiently large real number M,  $|f|, |f_k| \leq M$  for a.e.  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . In particular, for any measurable subset E of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $|f|, |f_k| \leq M$  for a.e.  $\mathbf{x} \in E$  so, by the bounded convergence theorem, we have the desired convergence

$$\int_{E} f_k \to \int_{E} f < \infty. \tag{30}$$

However, if f does not belong to  $L(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , i.e., its integral over  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is infinity, there is no guarantee that f will be finite a.e. in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . This means that the bounded convergence theorem will fail to ensure convergence in integral for any measurable subset E of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Let us demonstrate this with an example. Consider the sequence of functions

**Problem 2.11.** Assume that E is a measurable set of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , with  $|E| < \infty$ . Prove that a nonnegative function f defined on E is integrable if and only if

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} |\{\mathbf{x} \in E : f(\mathbf{x}) \ge k\}| < \infty.$$

*Proof.* If f is integrable over a measurable subset E of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , then

$$\int_{E} f(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} < \infty. \tag{31}$$

Set  $E_k = \{ \mathbf{x} \in E : k+1 > f(\mathbf{x}) \geq k \}$  and  $F_k = \{ \mathbf{x} \in E : f(\mathbf{x}) \geq k \}$ . Note the following properties about the sets we have just defined: first, the  $E_k$ 's are pairwise disjoint and the  $F_k$ 's are nested in the following way  $F_{k+1} \subset F_k$ ; second,  $E = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} E_k$  and  $E_k = F_k \setminus F_{k+1}$ . By Theorem 3.23, since the  $E_k$ 's are disjoint, we have

$$|E| = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |E_k| < \infty. \tag{32}$$

Now, since  $k\chi_{E_k}(\mathbf{x}) \leq f(\mathbf{x}) \leq (k+1)\chi_{E_k}(\mathbf{x})$  on  $E_k$ , we have

$$k|E_k| \le \int_{E_k} f(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} \le (k+1)|E_k|. \tag{33}$$

Then we have the following upper and lower estimates on the integral of f over E

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} k|E_k| \le \int_E f(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} \le \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (k+1)|E_k|. \tag{34}$$

But note that  $|E_k| = |F_k \setminus F_{k+1}| = |F_k| - |F_{k+1}|$  by Corollary 3.25 since the measures of  $E_k$ ,  $F_k$ , and  $F_{k+1}$  are all finite. Hence, (34) becomes

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} k(|F_k| - |F_{k+1}|) \le \int_E f(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} \le \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (k+1)(|F_k| - |F_{k+1}|). \tag{35}$$

A little manipulation of the series in the leftmost estimate gives us

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} k(|F_k| - |F_{k+1}|) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k|F_k| - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k|F_{k+1}|$$

$$= |F_1| + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} k|F_k| - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k|F_{k+1}|$$

$$= |F_1| + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (k+1)|F_{k+1}| - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k|F_{k+1}|$$

$$= |F_1| + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |F_{k+1}|$$

$$= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |F_{k+1}|$$
(36)

and

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (k+1)(|F_k| - |F_{k+1}|) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (k+1)|F_k| - \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (k+1)|F_{k+1}|$$

$$= |F_0| + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (k+1)|F_k| - \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (k+1)|F_{k+1}|$$

$$= |F_0| + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (k+2)|F_{k+1}| - \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (k+1)|F_{k+1}|$$

$$= |F_0| + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} |F_{k+1}|$$

$$= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} |F_k|.$$
(37)

Thus, from (36) and (37)

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |F_k| \le \int_E f(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} \le \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} |F_k| \tag{38}$$

so the integral  $\int_E f$  converges if and only if the sum  $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} |F_k|$  converges.

**Problem 2.12.** Suppose that E is a measurable subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , with  $|E| < \infty$ . If f and g are measurable functions on E, define

$$\rho(f,g) = \int_{E} \frac{|f-g|}{1+|f-g|}.$$

Prove that  $\rho(f_k, f) \to 0$  as  $k \to \infty$  if and only if  $f_k$  converges to f as  $k \to \infty$ .

*Proof.*  $\Longrightarrow$ : First note that  $\rho$  is strictly greater than or equal to zero since it is the integral of a nonnegative function. Suppose that  $\rho(f_k, f) \to 0$  as  $k \to \infty$ . Then, given  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exist an

sufficiently large index N such that for every  $k \geq N$  we have

$$\rho(f_k, g) = \int_E \frac{|f_k - f|}{1 + |f_k - f|} < \varepsilon. \tag{39}$$

By Theorem 5.11, this means that the map

$$\frac{|f_k - f|}{1 + |f_k - f|}$$

is zero a.e. in E which happens if  $|f_k - f| = 0$  a.e. in E.

 $\Leftarrow$ : Suppose that  $f_k \to f$  as  $k \to \infty$ .

I don't know how to solve this. This is the intended solution:

 $\implies$ : Given  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $\rho(f_k, f) \to 0$  implies that

$$\int_{\{x \in E: |f_k(x) - f(x)| > \varepsilon\}} \frac{|f_k - f|}{1 + |f_k - f|} dx \longrightarrow 0.$$

Observe that the function  $\Phi \colon \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}$  given by  $\Phi(x) = x/(1+x)$  is increasing on  $\mathbb{R}^+$  and  $0 < \Psi(x) < 1$ , hence

$$\int_{\{x \in E: |f_k(x) - f(x)| > \varepsilon\}} \frac{|f_k - f|}{1 + |f_k - f|} dx \ge \int_{\{x \in E: |f_k(x) - f(x)| > \varepsilon\}} \frac{\varepsilon}{1 + \varepsilon} dx$$

$$= \frac{\varepsilon}{1 + \varepsilon} |\{x \in E: |f_k(x) - f(x)| > \varepsilon\}|.$$

Therefore,

$$|\{x \in E : |f_k(x) - f(x)| > \varepsilon\}| \le \frac{1+\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \int_{\{x \in E : |f_k(x) - f(x)| > \varepsilon\}} \frac{|f_k - f|}{1 + |f_k - f|} dx \longrightarrow 0$$

as  $k \to \infty$ .

 $\Leftarrow$ : Conversely, given  $\delta > 0$ , we have

$$\rho(f_k, f) = \int_{\{x \in E: |f_k(x) - f(x)| > \delta\}} \frac{|f_k - f|}{1 + |f_k - f|} dx + \int_{\{x \in E: |f_k(x) - f(x)| \le \delta\}} \frac{|f_k - f|}{1 + |f_k - f|} dx \le |\{x \in E: |f_k(x) - f(x)| > \delta\}| + \frac{\delta}{1 + \delta} |E|.$$

Since  $|E| < \infty$  and  $\delta/(1+\delta) \searrow 0$ , then for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $\delta' > 0$  such that

$$\frac{\delta'}{1+\delta'}|E|<\frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

If  $f_k \to f$  as  $k \to \infty$  in measure, then for the above  $\delta'$  there is an index N > 0 such that  $k \ge N$  implies

$$|\{x \in E : |f_k(x) - f(x)| > \delta'\}| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

Therefore,  $f_k \to f$  in measure implies  $\rho(f_k, f) \to 0$  as  $k \to \infty$ .

**Problem 2.13.** Define the gamma function  $\Gamma \colon \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}$  by

$$\Gamma(y) = \int_0^\infty e^{-u} u^{y-1} du,$$

and the beta function  $\beta \colon \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}$  by

$$\beta(x,y) = \int_0^1 t^{x-1} (1-t)^{y-1} dt.$$

- (a) Prove that the definition of the gamma function is well-posed, i.e., the function  $u \mapsto e^{-u}u^{y-1}$  is in  $L(\mathbb{R}^+)$  for all  $y \in \mathbb{R}^+$ .
- (b) Show that

$$\beta(x,y) = \frac{\Gamma(x)\Gamma(y)}{\Gamma(x+y)}.$$

*Proof.* (a) Fix  $y \in \mathbb{R}^+$ . Then we must show that  $\Gamma(y) < \infty$ . First, since (0,1) and  $[1,\infty)$  are disjoint measurable subsets of  $\mathbb{R}$ , by Theorem 5.7 we can split the integral  $\Gamma(y)$  into

$$\Gamma(y) = \underbrace{\int_0^1 e^{-u} u^{y-1} du}_{I_1} + \underbrace{\int_1^\infty e^{-u} u^{y-1} du}_{I_2}.$$
 (40)

We will show, separately, that  $I_1$  and  $I_2$  are finite.

To see that  $I_1$  is finite, note that

$$e^{-u}u^{y-1} = e^{-u}e^{(y-1)\log u}$$

$$= e^{-u+(y-1)\log u}$$

$$\leq e^{(y-1)\log u}$$

$$= u^{y-1}$$
(41)

since 0 < u < 1

$$I_{1} = \int_{0}^{1} e^{-u} u^{y-1} du$$

$$\leq \int_{0}^{1} u^{y-1} du$$

$$= \left[ \frac{u^{y}}{y} \right]_{0}^{1}$$

$$= \frac{1}{y}$$

$$< \infty.$$

$$(42)$$

To see that  $I_2$  is finite, note that

$$e$$
 (43)

Intended solution:

**Problem 2.14.** Let  $f \in L(\mathbb{R}^n)$  and for  $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  define  $f_{\mathbf{h}} \colon \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$  be  $f_{\mathbf{h}}(\mathbf{x}) = f(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{h})$ . Prove that

$$\lim_{\mathbf{h}\to\mathbf{0}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |f_{\mathbf{h}} - f| = 0.$$

*Proof.* Note that by the triangle inequality, we have the following estimate on the integral

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |f_{\mathbf{h}}(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{x})| d\mathbf{x} \le \tag{44}$$

**Problem 2.15.** (a) If  $f_k, g_k, f, g \in L(\mathbb{R}^n)$ ,  $f_k \to f$  and  $g_k \to g$  a.e. in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $|f_k| \leq g_k$  and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} g_k \to \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} g,$$

prove that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f_k \to \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f.$$

(b) Using part (a) show that if  $f_k, f \in L(\mathbb{R}^n)$  and  $f_k \to f$  a.e. in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , then

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |f_k - f| \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty$$

if and only if

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |f_k| \to \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |f| \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty.$$

*Proof.* (a) Since  $f_k \to f$  and  $g_k \to g$  a.e. and  $|f_k| \le g_k$ , then by Fatou's theorem

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (g - f) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \liminf_{k \to \infty} g_k - f_k \le \liminf_{k \to \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} g_k - f_k,$$
$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} g + f \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \liminf_{k \to \infty} g_k + f_k \le \liminf_{k \to \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} g_k + f_k.$$

Since  $f_k, g_k, f, g \in L(\mathbb{R}^n)$  and  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} g_k \to \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} g$ , then using the similar argument as problem 2, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f \ge \limsup_{k \to \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f_k,$$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f \le \liminf_{k \to \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f_k.$$

Therefore,  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f_k \to \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f$ .

(b)  $\Longrightarrow$ : This direction is obvious by the inequality

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |f_k| - |f| \right| \le \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} ||f_k| - |f|| \le \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |f_k - f|.$$

 $\Longleftrightarrow : \text{Let } g_k = |f_k| + |f| \text{ and } g = 2|f|. \text{ Since } f_k, f \in L(\mathbb{R}^n) \text{ and } f_k \to f \text{ a.e., then } g_k, g \in L(\mathbb{R}^n) \text{ and } g_k \to g \text{ a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^n. \text{ By the assumption, } \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} g_k \to \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} g. \text{ Let } \tilde{f}_k = |f_k - f|. \text{ Then } \tilde{f}_k \to 0 \text{ a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^n \text{ and } \tilde{f}_k \leq g_k. \text{ Applying part (a) to } \tilde{f}_k \text{ we have } f_k = f_k - f_k \text{ and } f_k =$ 

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\tilde{f}_k=\lim_{k\to\infty}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}|f_k-f|=0.$$

### 2.4 Midterm 2

**Problem 2.16.** Assume that  $f \in L(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . Show that for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists a ball B, centered at the origin, such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B} |f| < \varepsilon.$$

*Proof.* Recall that  $f \in L(\mathbb{R}^n)$  if and only if  $|f| \in L(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . Let  $B_k = B(\mathbf{0}, k)$  for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\chi_{B_k}$  be the indicator function associated with  $B_k$ . Then, the sequence of maps  $\{|f_k|\}$  defined  $f_k = f\chi_{B_k}$  converge pointwise to  $|f_k|$ . Since  $|f| \in L(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , by the monotone convergence theorem, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |f_k| = \int_{B_k} |f| \longrightarrow \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |f|. \tag{45}$$

But this means, exactly, that for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists sufficiently large  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$\varepsilon > \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |f_k| - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |f| \right|$$

$$= -\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |f_k| + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |f|$$

$$= -\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |f| + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |f|$$

$$= -\int_{B_k} |f| + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |f|$$

$$= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_k} |f|$$
(46)

as desired.

**Problem 2.17.** Let  $f \in L(E)$ , and let  $\{E_j\}$  be a countable collection of pairwise disjoint measurable subsets of E, such that  $E = \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} E_j$ . Prove that

$$\int_{E} f = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \int_{E_{i}} f.$$

*Proof.* First, since the  $E_j$ 's are pairwise disjoint, by Theorem 3.23, we have

$$|E| = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |E_j|. \tag{47}$$

Let  $\chi_{E_j}$  be the characteristic function of the subset  $E_j$  of E and define  $f_j = f\chi_{E_j}$  for  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ . Note that, since both f and  $\chi_{E_j}$  are measurable on E,  $f_j$  is measurable on E and  $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} f_j = f$ . Moreover, since  $E_j \subset E$ , by monotonicity of the integral we have

$$\int_{E} f = \int_{E_j} f + \int_{E \setminus E_j} f = \int_{E} f_j + \int_{E \setminus E_j} f. \tag{48}$$

Hence, because the  $E_j$ 's are disjoint  $(E \setminus E_k) \setminus E_\ell = (E \setminus E_\ell) \setminus E_k$  so

$$\int_{E} f = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \int_{E} f_{j} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \int_{E_{j}} f$$
(49)

as desired.

**Problem 2.18.** Let  $\{f_k\}$  be a family in L(E) satisfying the following property: For any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exits  $\delta > 0$  such that  $|A| < \delta$  implies

$$\int_{A} |f_k| < \varepsilon$$

for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Assume  $|E| < \infty$ , and  $f_k(x) \to f(x)$  as  $k \to \infty$  for a.e.  $x \in E$ . Show that

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} \int_E f_k = \int_E f.$$

(*Hint:* Use Egorov's theorem.)

*Proof.* Let  $\varepsilon > 0$  be given. Then, by the hypothesis, there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that such that  $|A| < \delta$  implies

$$\int_{A} |f_k| < \varepsilon \tag{50}$$

for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . By Egorov's theorem, there exists a closed subset F of E such that  $|E \setminus F| < \delta$  and  $f_k \to f$  uniformly on F. Then, by the uniform convergence theorem,

$$\int_{F} f_k \longrightarrow \int_{F} f \tag{51}$$

as  $k \to \infty$ . But by hypothesis, we have

$$\int_{E \setminus F} |f_k| < \varepsilon. \tag{52}$$

Letting  $\varepsilon \to 0$ , we achieved the desired convergence.

**Problem 2.19.** Let I = [0,1],  $f \in L(I)$ , and define  $g(x) = \int_x^1 t^{-1} f(t) dt$  for  $x \in I$ . Prove that  $g \in L(I)$  and

$$\int_{I} g = \int_{I} f.$$

*Proof.* By Lusin's theorem, there exists a closed subset F of I with  $|I \setminus F| < \varepsilon$  such that the restriction of f to  $F = I \setminus E$  is continuous. Now, since F is closed in I and I is compact, it follows that I is compact. Hence, by the Stone–Weierstraß approximation theorem, there exist a sequence of polynomials  $\{p_k\}$  such that  $p_k \to f$  uniformly on F. Then, by the uniform convergence theorem, we have

$$\int_{F} p_k \longrightarrow \int_{F} f \tag{53}$$

so

$$\int_{F} \left[ \int_{x}^{1} t^{-1} p_{k}(t) dt \right] dx = \int_{F} \left[ \int_{x}^{1} a t^{-1} + q_{k}(t) dt \right] dx$$

$$= \int_{F} q'_{k}(x) - a \log(x) dx$$

$$< \infty \tag{54}$$

for all k and converges uniformly to g so  $g \in L(I)$ . I don't know how to show that in fact  $\int_I g = \int_I f$ . Perhaps you show that the places where they differ is a set of measure zero.

### 2.5 Final Practice

**Problem 2.20.** Suppose  $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$  and that x is a point in the Lebesgue set of f. For r > 0, let

$$A(r) := \frac{1}{r} \int_{B(0,r)} |f(x-y) - f(x)| \, dy.$$

Show that:

- (a) A(r) is a continuous function of r, and  $A(r) \to 0$  as  $r \to 0$ ;
- (b) there exists a constant M > 0 such that  $A(r) \leq M$  for all r > 0.

Proof.

**Problem 2.21.** Let  $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be a measurable set,  $1 \le n < \infty$ . Assume  $\{f_k\}$  is a sequence in  $L^p(E)$  converging pointwise a.e. on E to a function  $f \in L^p(E)$ . Prove that

$$||f_k - f||_p \longrightarrow 0$$

if and only if

$$||f_k||_p \longrightarrow ||f||_p$$

as  $k \to \infty$ .

Proof.

**Problem 2.22.** Let  $1 , <math>f \in L^p(E)$ ,  $q \in L^{p'}(E)$ .

- (a) Prove that  $f * g \in C(\mathbb{R}^n)$ .
- (b) Does this conclusion continue to be valid when p=1 and  $p=\infty$ ?

Proof.

**Problem 2.23.** Let  $f \in L(\mathbb{R})$ , and let  $F(t) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x) \cos(tx) dx$ .

- (a) Prove that F(t) is continuous for  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ .
- (b) Prove the following Riemann-Lebesgue lemma:

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} F(t) = 0.$$

Proof.

**Problem 2.24.** Let f be of bounded variation on [a, b],  $-\infty < a < b < \infty$ . If f = g + h, with g absolutely continuous and h singular. Show that

$$\int_a^b \varphi \, df = \int_a^b \varphi f' dx + \int_a^b \varphi \, dh$$

for all functions  $\varphi$  continuous on [a, b].

Proof.

# Bibliography

[1] R. Wheeden, R.L. Wheeden, and A. Zygmund. *Measure and Integral: An Introduction to Real Analysis*. Chapman & Hall/CRC Pure and Applied Mathematics. Taylor & Francis, 1977. ISBN 9780824764999. URL https://books.google.com/books?id=YDkDmQ\_hdmcC.