Problem Set 2 Real Analysis II

Bennett Rennier barennier@gmail.com

January 15, 2018

Ex 12.2 Let μ be a signed measure. Define

$$\int f \, d\mu = \int f \, d\mu^+ - \int f \, d\mu^-$$

Prove that

$$\left| \int f \, d\mu \right| \le \int |f| \, d|\mu|$$

Proof. Firstly, we see that in general,

$$\int f d(\mu + \nu) = \int f d\mu + \int f d\nu$$

where $(\mu + \nu)(A) = \mu(A) + \nu(A)$. This can be proven easily using simple functions and then building up to arbitrary functions. Using this, we see that

$$\left| \int f \, d\mu \right| = \left| \int f \, d\mu^{+} - \int f \, d\mu^{-} \right| \le \left| \int f \, d\mu^{+} \right| + \left| \int f \, d\mu^{-} \right|$$

$$\le \int |f| \, d\mu^{+} + \int |f| \, d\mu^{-} = \int |f| \, d(\mu^{+} + \mu^{-}) = \int |f| \, d|\mu|$$

Ex 12.3 Let μ be a finite signed measure on (X, \mathcal{A}) . Prove that

$$|\mu|(A) = \sup\left\{ \left| \int_A f \, d\mu \right| : |f| \le 1 \right\}$$

Proof. In the last exercise, we proved that

$$\left| \int f \, d\mu \right| \le \int |f| \, d|\mu|$$

This means that

$$\left| \int_A f \, d\mu \right| = \left| \int f \chi_A \, d\mu \right| \le \int |f \chi_A| \, d|\mu| = \int_A |f| \, d|\mu| \le \int_A 1 \, d|\mu| = |\mu|(A)$$

if $|f| \leq 1$. This proves one inequality, that is that

$$\sup \left\{ \left| \int_A f \, d\mu \right| : |f| \le 1 \right\} \le |\mu|(A).$$

To prove the other inequality, we use the Hahns Decomposition Theorem. Let P and N be the positive and negative sets of μ in this decomposition, and let $f = \chi_P - \chi_N$. Since P and N are disjoint, we have that $|f| \leq 1$. We see that

$$\int_{A} f \, d\mu = \int \chi_{A}(\chi_{P} - \chi_{N}) \, d\mu = \int \chi_{A \cap P} \, d\mu + \int \chi_{A \cap N} \, d\mu = \mu(A \cap P) + \mu(A \cap N)$$
$$= \mu^{+}(A) + \mu^{-}(A) = |\mu|(A)$$

This proves that reverse inequality and thus the statement.

Ex 12.7 Suppose that μ is a signed measure on (X, \mathcal{A}) . Prove that if $A \in \mathcal{A}$, then

$$|\mu|(A) = \sup \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{n} |\mu(B_j)| : \text{each } B_j \in \mathcal{A}, \text{the } B_j \text{ are disjoint}, \bigcup_{j=1}^{n} B_j = A \right\}$$

Proof. Use the Hahns Decomposition to decompose X into P and N. Suppose $B_1 = A \cap P$ and $B_2 = A \cap N$. We see that $B_1 \cup B_2 = A$, that $B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{A}$, and that B_1 and B_2 are disjoint. Thus, the supremum on the right-hand side must be bigger than or equal to $|\mu(B_1)| + |m(B_2)| = |\mu(A \cap P)| + |\mu(A \cap N)| = \mu^+(A) + \mu^-(A) = |\mu|(A)$. This proves \leq .

For the reverse inequality, let $\{B_j\}_{j\leq n}$ be an finite arbitrary disjoint collection of measurable sets that union up to A. We see that

$$|\mu(B_j)| = |\mu(B_j \cap N) + \mu(B_j \cap P)| \le |\mu(B_j \cap N)| + |\mu(B_j \cap P)| = \mu^+(B_j) + \mu^-(B_j) = |\mu|(B_j).$$

This proves that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} |\mu(B_j)| \le \sum_{j=1}^{n} |\mu|(B_j) = |\mu|(\cup_j B_j) = |\mu|(A)$$

as the B_j 's were assumed to be disjoint. This proves \geq , and thus the statement.

Ex 14.2 If f is integrable and real-valued, $a \in \mathbb{R}$, and

$$F(x) = \int_{a}^{x} f(y) \, dy$$

prove that F is of bounded variation and is absolutely continuous.

Proof. Recall from Lemma 14.14 that if a function is absolutely continuous, then it is of bounded variation. Thus, we only need to prove that F(x) is absolutely continuous. Suppose that F(x) is not absolutely continuous. This means that we can find a finite collection of disjoint intervals $\{(a_i, b_i)\}$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^k |b_i - a_i|$ can be as small as we want, but $\sum_{i=1}^k |f(b_i) - f(a_i)| > M$ for some $M \in \mathbb{R}$. We see that

$$|F(b_i) - F(a_i)| = \left| \int_a^{b_i} f(y) \, dy - \int_a^{a_i} f(y) \, dy \right| = \left| \int_{a_i}^{b_i} f(y) \, dy \right| \le \int_{a_i}^{b_i} |f(y)| \, dy$$

which means that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} |f(b_i) - f(a_i)| \le \sum_{i=1}^{k} \int_{a_i}^{b_i} |f(y)| \, dy = \int_{\bigcup_i (a_i, b_i)} |f(y)| \, dy$$

We see though that if $\sum_{i=1}^{k} |b_i - a_i| \to 0$, then this implies that $\sum_{i=1}^{k} m((a_i, b_i)) = m(\bigcup_i (a_i, b_i)) \to 0$. This means that

$$\lim_{m(\cup_i(a_i,b_i))\to 0} \int_{\cup_i(a_i,b_i)} |f(y)| \, dy = \int \lim_{m(\cup_i(a_i,b_i))\to 0} \chi_{\cup_i(a_i,b_i)} |f(y)| \, dy = 0$$

by the Dominated Convergence Theorem. Therefore, there can be no such M, which proves that F(x) must be absolutely continuous.

Ex 14.3 Suppose that f is a real-valued continuous function on [0,1] and that $\varepsilon > 0$. Prove that there exists a continuous function g such that g'(x) exists and equals 0 for almost every x and

$$\sup_{x \in [0,1]} |f(x) - g(x)| < \varepsilon$$

Proof. Since f is continuous on a compact set, this means that f is uniformly continuous. Using this, let $\delta > 0$ such that

$$|x - y| \le \delta \implies |f(x) - f(y)| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

We are going to use δ to partition [0,1]. Suppose $x \in [n\delta, (n+1)\delta]$. We let $g(x) = f(n\delta) + C((x-n\delta)/\delta)(f((n+1)\delta) - f(n\delta))$, where C(x) is the Cantor-Lebesgue function. Intuitively, we are breaking f into pieces small enough that they can be approximated by a scaled version of the Cantor-Lebesgue function.

We see that for each interval, that g(x) is continuous as C(x) is continuous. We also see that at each endpoint $n\delta$, the two definitions agree, which means that g(x) is well-defined and continuous as a whole.

Also, on each interval, We see that g'(x) = 0 almost everywhere, as the only nonconstant part of g(x) is a scaled version of C(x). This proves that g'(x) = 0 almost everywhere on [0,1] as well.

Finally, we see that for $x \in [n\delta, (n+1)\delta]$,

$$|f(x) - g(x)| = |f(x) - f(n\delta) + C((x - n\delta)\delta)(f((n+1)\delta) - f(n\delta))|$$

Since $x \in [n\delta, (n+1)\delta]$, we see that $|x - n\delta| \le \delta$ and that $|(n+1)\delta - n\delta| \le \delta$, which means that $|f(x) - f(n\delta)| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ and that $|f((n+1)\delta) - f(n\delta)| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$. This proves that

$$|f(x) - g(x)| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + C((x - n\delta)\delta)\frac{\varepsilon}{2} \le \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} = \varepsilon$$

since $0 \le C(x) \le 1$. This proves the statement.