

Math 6337 - Homework 5 - Caitlin Beecham

Question 1

Let E be a m'ble subset of \mathbb{R}^n with $|E| < \infty$ and $f : E \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be m'ble. Let

$$\omega(\alpha) = |\{f > \alpha\}|, \quad 0 \leq \alpha < \infty$$

be its distribution function. Let $0 < p < \infty$. Prove that

$$\int_E f^p < \infty$$

if and only if

$$\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} 2^{kp} \omega(2^k) < \infty.$$

Hint: You may use Lemma 5.38.

Now, we have a slight problem with trying to bound $\int_E f^p$ be our desired quantity but that problem can be solved by instead bounding above as

$$\int_E f^p \leq 2^p \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} 2^{kp} \omega(2^k) \quad (1)$$

because certainly $\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} 2^{kp} \omega(2^k) < \infty$ if and only if $2^p \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} 2^{kp} \omega(2^k) < \infty$ which means that we still get $\int_E f^p$. So, let's show Equation 1 or equivalently that

$$\int_E f^p \leq \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} 2^{(k+1)p} \omega(2^k). \quad (2)$$

We break our domain into the following regions $E_k := \{2^k < f \leq 2^{k+1}\}$.

Now, we note that since $f \geq 0$ and since $g(x) = x^p$ is monotonically increasing for all $x \geq 0$ we have for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$

$$\int_{E_k} f^p \leq \int_{E_k} (2^{k+1})^p.$$

which implies that

$$\int_E f^p = \int_{\cup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} E_k} f^p \quad (3)$$

$$= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_{E_k} f^p \quad (4)$$

$$\leq \int_E \chi_{E_k}(x) (2^{k+1})^p$$

$$\int_E f^p \leq \int_E \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \chi_{E_k}(x) (2^{k+1})^p \quad (5)$$

Now, we let $G_N(x) = \sum_{k=-N}^N \chi_{E_k}(x)(2^{k+1})^p$ and note that $G_N(x) \nearrow$ as $N \nearrow$.

Then, by Equation 5 and noting that $G(x) := \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \chi_{E_k}(x)(2^{k+1})^p = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} G_N(x)$, the fact that $G_N \nearrow G$ tells us by the Monotone Convergence Theorem that

$$\int_E \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sum_{k=-N}^N \chi_{E_k}(x)(2^{k+1})^p \right) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \int_E \left(\sum_{k=-N}^N \chi_{E_k}(x)(2^{k+1})^p \right). \quad (6)$$

Then, Lemma 5.4 tells us that

$$\int_E \left(\sum_{k=-N}^N \chi_{E_k}(x)(2^{k+1})^p \right) = \sum_{k=-N}^N (2^{k+1})^p |E_k| \quad (7)$$

which along with Equation 6 means that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_E \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \chi_{E_k}(x)(2^{k+1})^p &= \\ \int_E \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sum_{k=-N}^N \chi_{E_k}(x)(2^{k+1})^p \right) &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sum_{k=-N}^N (2^{k+1})^p |E_k| \right) \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

$$\int_E \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \chi_{E_k}(x)(2^{k+1})^p = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} (2^{k+1})^p |E_k| \quad (9)$$

and recall that Equation 5 says that

$$\int_E f^p \leq \int_E \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \chi_{E_k}(x)(2^{k+1})^p,$$

meaning that all together we have

$$\int_E f^p \leq \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} (2^{k+1})^p |E_k|. \quad (10)$$

Finally, since $E_k \subseteq \{f > 2^k\}$ and $\omega(2^k) = |\{f > 2^k\}|$ we have by monotonicity that $|E_k| \leq \omega(2^k)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ meaning that

$$\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} (2^{k+1})^p |E_k| \leq \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} (2^{k+1})^p \omega(2^k). \quad (11)$$

Now, we note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} (2^{k+1})^p \omega(2^k) &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=-N}^N (2^{k+1})^p \omega(2^k) \\
&= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \int_E \sum_{k=-N}^N (2^{k+1})^p \chi_{\{f > 2^k\}} \\
&= \int_E \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=-N}^N (2^{k+1})^p \chi_{\{f > 2^k\}} \tag{12}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\geq \int_E \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sum_{k=-N}^N (2^{k+1})^p \chi_{\{2^{k+1} \geq f > 2^k\}} \right) \tag{13}$$

$$= \int_E \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sum_{k=-N}^N (2^{k+1})^p \chi_{E_k} \right) \tag{14}$$

$$\geq \int_E f^p. \tag{15}$$

where Equation 12 holds by the Monotone Convergence Theorem, Equation 13 holds since $\chi_{\{f > 2^k\}} \geq \chi_{\{2^{k+1} \geq f > 2^k\}}$, Equation 14 holds by definition of E_k , and Equation 15 holds by Equation 5 which is what we set out to prove, namely that

$$\int_E f^p \leq \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} (2^{k+1})^p \omega(2^k),$$

which proves implication in one direction, namely that $\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} 2^{kp} \omega(2^k) < \infty$ implies that $\int_E f^p < \infty$.

Now, we would like to prove that

$$\int_E f^p < \infty$$

implies that

$$\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} 2^{kp} \omega(2^k) < \infty$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} 2^{kp} \omega(2^k) &= \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} 2^{kp} \left(\sum_{i=k}^{\infty} |E_i| \right) \\
&= \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} (|E_i| \sum_{k=-\infty}^i 2^{kp}) \\
&= \sum_{i=-\infty}^{-1} (|E_i| \sum_{k=-\infty}^i 2^{kp}) + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (|E_i| \sum_{k=-\infty}^i 2^{kp}) \\
&= \sum_{i=-\infty}^{-1} (|E_i| \sum_{k=-\infty}^i 2^{kp}) + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |E_{-i}| \left(\sum_{k=-\infty}^{-1} 2^{kp} + \sum_{k=0}^i 2^{kp} \right) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (|E_{-i}| \sum_{k=i}^{\infty} 2^{-kp}) + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |E_i| \left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^{-kp} + \sum_{k=0}^i 2^{kp} \right) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (|E_{-i}| \sum_{k=i}^{\infty} (\frac{1}{2^k})^p) + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |E_i| \left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (\frac{1}{2^k})^p + \sum_{k=0}^i 2^{kp} \right) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (|E_{-i}| \left((\frac{1}{2^i})^p \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (\frac{1}{2^k})^p \right)) \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |E_i| \left(\left((\frac{1}{2^i})^p \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (\frac{1}{2^k})^p \right) + \sum_{k=0}^i 2^{kp} \right) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (|E_{-i}| \left((\frac{1}{2^i})^p 2^p \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (\frac{1}{2^k})^p \right)) \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |E_i| \left(\left((\frac{1}{2^i})^p 2^p \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (\frac{1}{2^k})^p \right) + \sum_{k=0}^i 2^{kp} \right) \\
\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} 2^{kp} \omega(2^k) &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (|E_{-i}| \left((\frac{1}{2^{i-1}})^p \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (\frac{1}{2^k})^p \right)) \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |E_i| \left(\left((\frac{1}{2^{i-1}})^p \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (\frac{1}{2^k})^p \right) + \sum_{k=0}^i 2^{kp} \right), \tag{16}
\end{aligned}$$

and for $p \geq 1$ we have $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (\frac{1}{2^k})^p \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^k} = 1$ so that

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (|E_{-i}| \left((\frac{1}{2^{i-1}})^p \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (\frac{1}{2^k})^p \right)) + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |E_i| \left(\left((\frac{1}{2^{i-1}})^p \left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (\frac{1}{2^k})^p \right) + \sum_{k=0}^i 2^{kp} \right) \right) \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (|E_{-i}| (\frac{1}{2^{i-1}})^p) + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \left(|E_i| \left((\frac{1}{2^{i-1}})^p + \sum_{k=0}^i 2^{kp} \right) \right) \tag{17} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (|E_{-i}| (\frac{1}{2^{i-1}})^p) + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \left(|E_i| \left((\frac{1}{2^{i-1}})^p + \sum_{k=0}^i \frac{2^{ip}}{2^{ip}} 2^{kp} \right) \right) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (|E_{-i}| (\frac{1}{2^{i-1}})^p) + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \left(|E_i| \left((\frac{1}{2^{i-1}})^p + 2^{ip} \sum_{k=0}^i \frac{2^{kp}}{2^{ip}} \right) \right) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (|E_{-i}| (\frac{1}{2^{i-1}})^p) + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \left(|E_i| \left((\frac{1}{2^{i-1}})^p + 2^{ip} \sum_{k=0}^i 2^{(k-i)p} \right) \right) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (|E_{-i}| (\frac{1}{2^{i-1}})^p) + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \left(|E_i| \left((\frac{1}{2^{i-1}})^p + 2^{ip} \sum_{l=0}^i 2^{-lp} \right) \right) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (|E_{-i}| (\frac{1}{2^{i-1}})^p) + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \left(|E_i| \left((\frac{1}{2^{i-1}})^p + 2^{ip} 2^p \sum_{l=1}^i 2^{-lp} \right) \right) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (|E_{-i}| (\frac{1}{2^{i-1}})^p) + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \left(|E_i| \left((\frac{1}{2^{i-1}})^p + 2^{ip} 2^p \sum_{l=1}^i 2^{-lp} \right) \right) \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (|E_{-i}| (\frac{1}{2^{i-1}})^p) + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \left(|E_i| \left((\frac{1}{2^{i-1}})^p + 2^{ip} 2^p \right) \right) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (|E_{-i}| (\frac{1}{2^{i-1}})^p) + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \left(|E_i| \left((\frac{1}{2^{i-1}})^p + 2^{(i+1)p} \right) \right) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (|E_{-i}| (\frac{1}{2^{i-1}})^p) + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \left(|E_i| \left((\frac{1}{2^{i-1}})^p + 2^{(i+1)p} \right) \right) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (|E_{-i}| 2^{-(i-1)p}) + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \left(|E_i| \left((\frac{1}{2^{i-1}})^p + 2^{(i+1)p} \right) \right) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (|E_{-i}| 2^{(-i+1)p}) + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \left(|E_i| \left((\frac{1}{2^{i-1}})^p + 2^{(i+1)p} \right) \right) \\
&= \sum_{i=-\infty}^{-1} (|E_i| 2^{(i+1)p}) + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \left(|E_i| \left((\frac{1}{2^{i-1}})^p + 2^{(i+1)p} \right) \right) \\
&= \sum_{i=-\infty}^{-1} \int_{E_i} 2^{(i+1)p} + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \int_{E_i} \left((\frac{1}{2^{i-1}})^p + 2^{(i+1)p} \right) \\
&\leq \sum_{i=-\infty}^{-1} \int_{E_i} 2^{(i+1)p} + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \int_{E_i} \left(2^{(i+1)p} + 2^{(i+1)p} \right) \\
&= \sum_{i=-\infty}^{-1} \int_{E_i} 2^{(i+1)p} + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \int_{E_i} \left(2^{((i+1)p) \frac{5}{4}} \right) \\
&= \sum_{i=-\infty}^{-1} 2^p \int_{E_i} 2^{ip} + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} 2^{p+1} \int_{E_i} \left(2^{ip} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

and quickly recalling that we are assuming throughout this calculation that $p \geq 1$ we continue on to get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sum_{i=-\infty}^{-1} 2^{p+1} \int_{E_i} 2^{ip} + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} 2^{p+1} \int_{E_i} (2^{ip}) \\
&= 2^{p+1} \left(\sum_{i=-\infty}^{-1} \int_{E_i} 2^{ip} + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \int_{E_i} (2^{ip}) \right) \\
&= 2^{p+1} \left(\sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{E_i} 2^{ip} \right) \\
&\leq 2^{p+1} \left(\sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{E_i} f^p \right) \\
&= 2^{p+1} \left(\int_{\bigcup_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} E_i} f^p \right) \\
&= 2^{p+1} \left(\int_E f^p \right)
\end{aligned}$$

So, finally, throughout that whole calculation, what we concluded is that for $p \geq 1$ we have that

$$\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} 2^{kp} \omega(2^k) \leq 2^{p+1} \left(\int_E f^p \right), \quad (18)$$

which means that if $\int_E f^p < \infty$ then of course $2^{p+1} \left(\int_E f^p \right) < \infty$ and in turn $\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} 2^{kp} \omega(2^k) < \infty$, which concludes the proof of the reverse implication if $p \geq 1$.

Now, what if $p < 1$. In such a case, we cannot use $\frac{1}{2}^p \leq \frac{1}{2}$ which was crucial in Equation 17.

However, we have a similar result. Pick $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{2^k}\right)^{\frac{1}{n}} &= \sum_{a=0}^{\infty} \sum_{b=0}^{n-1} \left(\frac{1}{2^{an+b}}\right)^{\frac{1}{n}} \\
&\leq \sum_{a=0}^{\infty} \sum_{b=0}^{n-1} \left(\frac{1}{2^{an}}\right)^{\frac{1}{n}} \\
&= \sum_{a=0}^{\infty} \sum_{b=0}^{n-1} \frac{1}{2^a} \\
&= \sum_{a=0}^{\infty} \frac{n}{2^a} \\
&= n \sum_{a=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^a} \\
&= 2n \\
\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{2^k}\right)^{\frac{1}{n}} &\leq 2n.
\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

Now, we adjust this inequality slightly to note

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{2^k}\right)^{\frac{1}{n}} &= \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{2^k}\right)^{\frac{1}{n}} \right) - 1 \\
&\leq 2n - 1 \\
\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{2^k}\right)^{\frac{1}{n}} &\leq 2n - 1.
\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

So, find $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\frac{1}{n_0} < p \leq \frac{1}{n_0-1}$. Then, we have that $\left(\frac{1}{2^k}\right)^{\frac{1}{n_0}} \geq \left(\frac{1}{2^k}\right)^p$ for all $k \geq 1$. So, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{2^k}\right)^p &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{2^k}\right)^{\frac{1}{n_0}} \\
&\leq 2n_0 - 1.
\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

and

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{2^k}\right)^p \leq 2n_0. \tag{22}$$

So, now we return to the result given in Equation 16 which did not depend on the value of p . Namely, we concluded that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} 2^{kp} \omega(2^k) &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (|E_{-i}| \left(\left(\frac{1}{2^{i-1}} \right)^p \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{2^k} \right)^p \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |E_i| \left(\left(\left(\frac{1}{2^{i-1}} \right)^p \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{2^k} \right)^p \right) + \sum_{k=0}^i 2^{kp} \right) \end{aligned}$$

which along with Equation 21 gives

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} 2^{kp} \omega(2^k) &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (|E_{-i}| \left(\left(\frac{1}{2^{i-1}} \right)^p \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{2^k} \right)^p \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |E_i| \left(\left(\left(\frac{1}{2^{i-1}} \right)^p \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{2^k} \right)^p \right) + \sum_{k=0}^i 2^{kp} \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (|E_{-i}| \left(\left(\frac{1}{2^{i-1}} \right)^p \left(2n_0 - 1 \right) \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |E_i| \left(\left(\left(\frac{1}{2^{i-1}} \right)^p \left(2n_0 - 1 \right) \right) + \sum_{k=0}^i 2^{kp} \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (|E_{-i}| \left(\left(\frac{1}{2^{i-1}} \right)^p \left(2n_0 - 1 \right) \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |E_i| \left(\left(\frac{1}{2^{i-1}} \right)^p \left(2n_0 - 1 \right) \right) + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |E_i| \left(\sum_{k=0}^i 2^{kp} \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (|E_{-i}| \left(\left(\frac{1}{2^{i-1}} \right)^p \left(2n_0 - 1 \right) \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |E_i| \left(\left(\frac{1}{2^{i-1}} \right)^p \left(2n_0 - 1 \right) \right) + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |E_i| \left(\sum_{k=0}^i 2^{kp} \right). \quad (23) \end{aligned}$$

Now, let $K := \max \left(1, (2n_0 - 1) \right)$.

Then, we continue on from Equation 23 to get

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (|E_{-i}| \left(\left(\frac{1}{2^{i-1}} \right)^p \left(2n_0 - 1 \right) \right)) \\
&+ \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |E_i| \left(\left(\frac{1}{2^{i-1}} \right)^p \left(2n_0 - 1 \right) \right) + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |E_i| \left(\sum_{k=0}^i 2^{kp} \right) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (|E_{-i}| \left(\left(\frac{1}{2^{i-1}} \right)^p \left(K \right) \right)) \\
&+ \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |E_i| \left(\left(\frac{1}{2^{i-1}} \right)^p \left(K \right) \right) + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |E_i| \left(\sum_{k=0}^i 2^{kp} \right) K \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (|E_{-i}| \left(\left(\frac{1}{2^{i-1}} \right)^p \left(K \right) \right)) \\
&+ \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |E_i| \left(\left(\frac{1}{2^{i-1}} \right)^p \left(K \right) \right) + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |E_i| \left(\sum_{k=0}^i 2^{kp} \right) K \\
&= \sum_{i=-\infty}^{-1} (|E_i| \left(\left(\frac{1}{2^{-i-1}} \right)^p \left(K \right) \right)) \\
&+ \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |E_i| \left(\left(\frac{1}{2^{i-1}} \right)^p \left(K \right) \right) + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |E_i| \left(\sum_{k=0}^i 2^{kp} \right) K \\
&= \sum_{i=-\infty}^{-1} (|E_i| \left(\left(\frac{1}{2^{-i-1}} \right)^p \left(K \right) \right)) \\
&+ \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |E_i| \left(\left(\frac{1}{2^{i-1}} \right)^p + \sum_{k=0}^i 2^{kp} \right) K \\
&= K \sum_{i=-\infty}^{-1} (|E_i| \left(\left(\frac{1}{2^{-i-1}} \right)^p \right)) \\
&+ K \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |E_i| \left(\left(\frac{1}{2^{i-1}} \right)^p + \sum_{k=0}^i 2^{kp} \right) \\
&= K \sum_{i=-\infty}^{-1} (|E_i| (2^{i+1})^p) \\
&+ K \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |E_i| \left(\left(\frac{1}{2^{i-1}} \right)^p + \sum_{k=0}^i 2^{kp} \right) \\
\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} 2^{kp} \omega(2^k) &\leq K \sum_{i=-\infty}^{-1} (|E_i| (2^{i+1})^p) \\
&+ K \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |E_i| \left(\left(\frac{1}{2^{i-1}} \right)^p + \sum_{k=0}^i 2^{kp} \right), \tag{24}
\end{aligned}$$

and finally, note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=0}^i 2^{kp} &= 2^{ip} \sum_{k=0}^i \frac{1}{2^{kp}} \\
&= 2^{ip} \sum_{k=0}^i \left(\frac{1}{2^k}\right)^p,
\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

which along with Equation 22 gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=0}^i 2^{kp} &= 2^{ip} \sum_{k=0}^i \left(\frac{1}{2^k}\right)^p, \\
&\leq 2^{ip} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{2^k}\right)^p \\
&\leq 2^{ip} (2n_0) \\
\sum_{k=0}^i 2^{kp} &\leq 2^{ip} (2n_0).
\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

(Please recall that n_0 depends solely on p which we are viewing as a fixed constant; namely it is the number $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\frac{1}{n_0} < p \leq \frac{1}{n_0-1}$).

Now, plugging the result of Equation 26 into Equation 24 gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} 2^{kp} \omega(2^k) &\leq K \sum_{i=-\infty}^{-1} (|E_i| (2^{i+1})^p) \\
&\quad + K \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |E_i| \left(\left(\frac{1}{2^{i-1}} \right)^p + \sum_{k=0}^i 2^{kp} \right) \\
&\leq K \sum_{i=-\infty}^{-1} (|E_i| (2^{i+1})^p) \\
&\quad + K \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |E_i| \left(\left(\frac{1}{2^{i-1}} \right)^p + (2^{ip} (2n_0)) \right) \\
&= K \sum_{i=-\infty}^{-1} (|E_i| 2^p (2^i)^p) \\
&\quad + K \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |E_i| \left(\left(\frac{1}{2^{i-1}} \right)^p + (2^{ip} (2n_0)) \right) \\
&\leq K \sum_{i=-\infty}^{-1} (|E_i| 2^p (2^i)^p) \\
&\quad + K \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |E_i| \left((1 + (2^{ip} (2n_0))) \right) \\
&\leq K \sum_{i=-\infty}^{-1} (|E_i| 2^p (2^i)^p) \\
&\quad + K \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |E_i| \left((1 + (2^{ip} (2n_0))) \right) \\
&\leq K \sum_{i=-\infty}^{-1} (|E_i| 2^p (2^i)^p) \\
&\quad + K \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |E_i| \left(((2^{ip} (2n_0)) + (2^{ip} (2n_0))) \right) \\
&= K \sum_{i=-\infty}^{-1} (|E_i| 2^p (2^i)^p) \\
&\quad + K \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |E_i| \left((4n_0) 2^{ip} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

Now, let $R := \max(2^p, 4n_0)$ and continue on to get

$$\begin{aligned}
&= K \sum_{i=-\infty}^{-1} \left(|E_i| 2^p (2^i)^p \right) \\
&+ K \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |E_i| \left((4n_0) 2^{ip} \right) \\
&\leq K \sum_{i=-\infty}^{-1} \left(|E_i| R (2^i)^p \right) \\
&+ K \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |E_i| \left(R 2^{ip} \right) \\
&= KR \sum_{i=-\infty}^{-1} \left(|E_i| (2^{ip}) \right) \\
&+ KR \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |E_i| \left(2^{ip} \right) \\
&= KR \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} \left(|E_i| (2^{ip}) \right) \\
&= KR \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{E_i} (2^{ip}) \\
&\leq KR \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{E_i} f^p \\
&= KR \int_{\bigcup_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} E_i} f^p \\
&= KR \int_E f^p \\
\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} 2^{kp} \omega(2^k) &\leq KR \int_E f^p. \tag{27}
\end{aligned}$$

Since, K, R are constants depending only on p and n_0 , really that means that K, R depend only on p since n_0 depends only on p . So, indeed if for fixed p we have that

$$\int_E f^p < \infty,$$

then certainly

$$KR \int_E f^p < \infty,$$

and thus

$$\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} 2^{kp} \omega(2^k) < \infty,$$

which is what we set out to prove, namely that $\int_E f^p$ finite implies that $\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} 2^{kp} \omega(2^k)$ is finite.

Now we have proven both direction of the implication and we are done.

Question 2

(a) Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be measurable and such that for a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $\{y : (x, y) \in E\}$ has \mathbb{R}^1 -measure 0. Show that E has measure 0 and for a.e. $y \in \mathbb{R}$, $\{x : (x, y) \in E\}$ has \mathbb{R}^1 -measure 0.

First I show that E has measure 0.

Plan:

We first assume $|E| < \infty$, then apply Fubini's Theorem (Lemma 6.6). We showed that $\int_E 1 = |E|$ for any Lebesgue measurable set E .

Then, Fubini tells us that

$$\int \int_E 1 dx dy = \int \int_E \chi_E dx dy = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \chi_E(x, y) dy \right) dx.$$

We then use Theorem 5.10 (b) as described below.

Namely, let $F := \{x \in E : |\{y : (x, y) \in E\}| \neq 0\}$ and let $E' = E \setminus F$.

Then, we note that $\chi_E(x, y) = \chi_{E'}(x, y)$ except for those $x \in F$.

Note that for $x_0 \in E'$ we have that $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \chi_E(x, y) dy \Big|_{x_0} = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \chi_{E'}(x, y) dy \Big|_{x_0}$.

If $x_0 \in F$ we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \chi_E(x, y) dy \Big|_{x_0} \neq \int_{\mathbb{R}} \chi_{E'}(x, y) dy \Big|_{x_0},$$

possibly.

If we let

$$f(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \chi_E(x, y) dy \Big|_{x_0}$$

and

$$g(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \chi_{E'}(x, y) dy \Big|_{x_0}$$

then Theorem 5.10 tells us that since $f(x) = g(x)$ a.e. we have that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x) dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(x) dx$$

or using the old notation that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \chi_E(x, y) dy \right) dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \chi_{E'}(x, y) dy \right) dx.$$

Then, recall that for $x \in E'$ we have that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \chi_{E'}(x, y) dy = 0.$$

Thus,

$$\int \int_E 1 dx dy = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \chi_{E'}(x, y) dy \right) dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}} (0) dx = 0.$$

Now, we note that if $|E| = \infty$ we can now consider $B_k := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : k \leq |x| < k+1\}$ and define $E_k = E \cap B_k$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, by monotonicity we have that $|E_k| < \infty$ for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, meaning that the result stands for each E_k . Finally note that

$$|E| = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \int \int_{E_k} \chi_{E_k}(x, y) dx dy = 0.$$

Now, it still remains to show that for a.e. $y \in \mathbb{R}$ that $|\{x : (x, y) \in E\}| \neq 0$ has \mathbb{R}^1 measure 0.

Otherwise, assume for contradiction that the set $G := \{y : |\{x : (x, y) \in E\}| \neq 0\}$ has nonzero measure $|G| > 0$.

Once again we reduce to the case in which $|E|$ finite in order to apply Fubini's theorem. Then, we examine the integral

$$\int \int \chi_E(x, y) dy dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \chi_E(x, y) dy \right) dx \geq \int_G \int_{\mathbb{R}} \chi_E(x, y) dy dx = |\{(x, y) \in E : y \in G\}|.$$

Now, $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \chi_E(x, y) dy > 0$ for all $x \in G$ means that $\int_G \int_{\mathbb{R}} \chi_E(x, y) dy dx > 0$ (since $|G| = 0$ by assumption), so that $\int \int \chi_E(x, y) dy dx > 0$, which is a contradiction.

Now, for the case in which $|E| = \infty$ we once again write $E = \bigsqcup_{k=0}^{\infty} E_k$ and note that

$$\int \int \chi_E(x, y) dy dx = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \int \int \chi_{E_k}(x, y) dy dx \geq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \int_G \int_{\mathbb{R}} \chi_{E_k}(x, y) dy dx > 0,$$

which again gives the result.

(b) Let f be a non-negative m'ble function on \mathbb{R}^2 . Suppose that for a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $f(x, y)$ is finite for a.e. y . Show that for a.e. $y \in \mathbb{R}$, $f(x, y)$ is finite for a.e. x .

Let $E = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : f(x, y) = \infty\}$. Note that E is m'ble since $S = \{(x, y) : f(x, y) \neq \infty\} = f^{-1}((-\infty, \infty))$ is m'ble since f is m'ble. Then $E = \overline{S}$ is measurable as well. Then, the condition "for a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $f(x, y)$ is finite for a.e. y " implies that for a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $\{y : (x, y) \in E\}$ has \mathbb{R}^1 -measure 0. Then, the results from part (a) give that for a.e. $y \in \mathbb{R}$, $\{x : (x, y) \in E\}$ has \mathbb{R}^1 -measure 0 or that for a.e. y , $|\{x : f(x, y) = \infty\}| = 0$, or equivalently that for a.e. y , $f(x, y)$ is finite for a.e. x .

Question 3

Let $g : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be m'ble and $h : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be m'ble.

First, we define some notation.

Let $G_1 := \{(x, y) \in E : g(x) \geq 0, h(y) \geq 0\}$
and $G_2 := \{(x, y) \in E : g(x) < 0, h(y) < 0\}$.
Then, let $G = G_1 \sqcup G_2$.

Furthermore, let $L_1 := \{x \in E : g(x) \geq 0, h(y) < 0\}$
and let $L_2 := \{x \in E : g(x) < 0, h(y) \geq 0\}$.
Finally, let $L := L_1 \sqcup L_2$.

(a) Prove that $f = gh : \mathbb{R}^{m+n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is m'ble. You may assume that if E is a m'ble set in \mathbb{R}^m and F is a m'ble set in \mathbb{R}^n , then $E \times F$ is m'ble in \mathbb{R}^{m+n} .

Break \mathbb{R}^{n+m} into G_1, G_2, L_1, L_2 as defined in above the statement of Question 3, Part (a).

Now, for G_1, G_2 we use a sequence of functions approximating $g(x)$.

Namely, for $k \geq 1$ and $g(x) \leq 0$:

Let

$$g_k(x) = \frac{-r+1}{2^k} \text{ if } \left(\frac{-r+1}{2^k} \geq g(x) > \frac{-r}{2^k} \text{ and } g(x) \geq -k \right),$$

and $g_k(x) = -k$ otherwise.

Likewise, for $g(x) \geq 0$:

Let

$$g_k(x) = \frac{r-1}{2^k} \text{ if } \left(\frac{r-1}{2^k} \leq g(x) < \frac{r}{2^k} \text{ and } g(x) \leq k \right),$$

and $g_k(x) = k$ otherwise.

Note in passing that $|g_k(x)| \leq |g(x)|$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and that for fixed $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we have that $|g_k(x)| \nearrow$ as $k \nearrow$.

We note that $g_k(x) \nearrow g(x)$ wherever $g(x) \geq 0$ (so on G_1, L_1).

So, note that on G_1 since $h(y) \geq 0$, we have that $g_k(x)h(y) \nearrow g(x)h(y) = f((x, y))$ on G_1 .

Also, since $h(y) < 0$ on L_1 , we have that $g_k(x)h(y) \searrow g(x)h(y) = f((x, y))$ on L_1 .

Furthermore we have that $g_k(x) \searrow g(x)$ on G_2, L_2 which means that $g_k(x)h(y) \nearrow g(x)h(y) = f((x, y))$ on G_2

and $g_k(x)h(y) \searrow g(x)h(y) = f((x, y))$ on L_2 .

Define $F_{G_1}^k((x, y)) = \chi_{G_1}((x, y))g_k(x)h(y)$,
 $F_{G_2}^k((x, y)) = \chi_{G_2}((x, y))g_k(x)h(y)$,
 $F_{L_1}^k((x, y)) = \chi_{L_1}((x, y))g_k(x)h(y)$,
and $F_{L_2}^k((x, y)) = \chi_{L_2}((x, y))g_k(x)h(y)$.

Now, we expand $f = gh$ in terms of the sets G_1, G_2, L_1, L_2 enumerated above. We note

$$\begin{aligned} f((x, y)) &= f((x, y)) \left(\chi_{G_1}((x, y)) + \chi_{G_2}((x, y)) + \chi_{L_1}((x, y)) + \chi_{L_2}((x, y)) \right) \\ &= \chi_{G_1}((x, y))f((x, y)) + \chi_{G_2}((x, y))f((x, y)) \\ &\quad + \chi_{L_1}((x, y))f((x, y)) + \chi_{L_2}((x, y))f((x, y)) \\ &= \chi_{G_1}((x, y))(g(x)h(y)) + \chi_{G_2}((x, y))(g(x)h(y)) \\ &\quad + \chi_{L_1}((x, y))(g(x)h(y)) + \chi_{L_2}((x, y))(g(x)h(y)). \end{aligned}$$

Now, recall that on G_1, G_2 we have that $g_k(x)h(y) \nearrow g(x)h(y) = f((x, y))$. Also, we have that on L_1, L_2 we have that $g_k(x)h(y) \searrow g(x)h(y) = f((x, y))$.

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} f((x, y)) &= \chi_{G_1}((x, y))(g(x)h(y)) + \chi_{G_2}((x, y))(g(x)h(y)) \\ &\quad + \chi_{L_1}((x, y))(g(x)h(y)) + \chi_{L_2}((x, y))(g(x)h(y)) \\ &= \chi_{G_1}((x, y)) \left(\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} g_k(x)h(y) \right) + \chi_{G_2}((x, y)) \left(\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} g_k(x)h(y) \right) \\ &\quad + \chi_{L_1}((x, y)) \left(\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} g_k(x)h(y) \right) + \chi_{L_2}((x, y)) \left(\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} g_k(x)h(y) \right) \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \chi_{G_1}((x, y))(g_k(x)h(y)) + \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \chi_{G_2}((x, y))(g_k(x)h(y)) \\ &\quad + \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \chi_{L_1}((x, y))(g_k(x)h(y)) + \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \chi_{L_2}((x, y))(g_k(x)h(y)) \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} F_{G_1}^k((x, y)) + \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} F_{G_2}^k((x, y)) \\ &\quad + \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} F_{L_1}^k((x, y)) + \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} F_{L_2}^k((x, y)) \tag{28} \end{aligned}$$

Provided we can show that $F_{G_1}^k((x, y)), F_{G_2}^k((x, y)), F_{L_1}^k((x, y))$, and $F_{L_2}^k((x, y))$ are all measurable functions, then we can use the fact that a monotone limit of measurable functions is measurable. Then, indeed since the sum of measurable functions is measurable, we will have that $f((x, y))$ is measurable.

So, how do we show that each of $F_{G_1}^k((x, y)), F_{G_2}^k((x, y)), F_{L_1}^k((x, y))$, and $F_{L_2}^k((x, y))$ is measurable?

Let us first show that for each of the sets G_1, G_2, L_1, L_2 in the domain we have that $g_k(x)h(y)$ is measurable for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

We want to show that for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ we have that $\{g_k(x)h(y) > \alpha\}$ is measurable. Note first that $g_k(x)$ is a simple function and in particular we can split up the domain E into $E = \left(\bigsqcup_{r \in I} \left\{ \frac{r-1}{2^k} \leq |g| < \frac{r}{2^k}, |g| \leq k \right\} \right) \sqcup \left(\{|g| > k\} \right)$

$$g_k(x) = \left(\sum_{r \in I} \chi_{\left\{ \frac{r-1}{2^k} \leq |g| < \frac{r}{2^k}, |g| \leq k \right\}} \frac{r-1}{2^k} \right) + k \chi_{\{|g| > k\}} \quad (29)$$

(where I just indicates some indexing set, and I am taking the union over $r \in I$ to be over the set where $\frac{r-1}{2^k} \leq |g| < \frac{r}{2^k}$ and $|g| \leq k$, which means that I will be a finite indexing set).

Then, note that $\{g_k(x)h(y) > \alpha\} = \{h(y) > \frac{\alpha}{g_k(x)}\}$. So, we aim to determine systematically what the set $\{h(y) > \frac{\alpha}{g_k(x)}\}$ is. By Equation 29, we note that for (x, y) with $g(x) \geq 0$ we have that $h(y) > \frac{\alpha}{g_k(x)} = \alpha(g_k(x))^{-1}$ if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} h(y) &> \alpha \left(\left(\sum_{r \in I} \chi_{\left\{ \frac{r-1}{2^k} \leq |g| < \frac{r}{2^k}, |g| \leq k \right\}} \frac{r-1}{2^k} \right) + k \chi_{\{|g| > k\}} \right)^{-1} \\ &= \alpha \left(\left(\sum_{r \in I} \chi_{\left\{ \frac{r-1}{2^k} \leq |g| < \frac{r}{2^k}, |g| \leq k \right\}} \frac{2^k}{r-1} \right) + \frac{1}{k} \chi_{\{|g| > k\}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

So,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\{ h(y) > \frac{\alpha}{g_k(x)} \right\} &= \left(\bigcup_{r \in I} \left(\left\{ \frac{r-1}{2^k} \leq |g| < \frac{r}{2^k}, |g| \leq k \right\} \cap \left\{ h(y) > \frac{\alpha(2^k)}{r-1} \right\} \right) \right) \\ &\quad \bigcup \left(\{|g| > k\} \cap \left\{ h(y) > \frac{\alpha}{k} \right\} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Now, since for all $r \in I$ we have that each of

$$\left\{ \frac{r-1}{2^k} \leq |g| < \frac{r}{2^k}, |g| \leq k \right\} = \left\{ \frac{r-1}{2^k} \leq |g| < \frac{r}{2^k} \right\} \cap \{|g| \leq k\},$$

$$\left\{ h(y) > \frac{\alpha(2^k)}{r-1} \right\},$$

$$\{|g| > k\},$$

and

$$\left\{ h(y) > \frac{\alpha}{k} \right\},$$

are measurable, we know that indeed $\{h(y) > \frac{\alpha}{g_k(x)}\} \cap \{g(x) \geq 0\}$ is measurable, which means that $F_{G_1}^k((x, y))$ and $F_{L_1}^k((x, y))$ are measurable functions.

Likewise, we note that for (x, y) with $g(x) < 0$ we have that $g_k(x)h(y) > \alpha$ if and only if $h(y) < \frac{\alpha}{g_k(x)} = \alpha(g_k(x))^{-1}$ if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} h(y) &< \alpha \left(\left(\sum_{r \in I} \chi_{\{\frac{r-1}{2^k} \leq |g| < \frac{r}{2^k}, |g| \leq k\}} \frac{-(r-1)}{2^k} \right) + (-k) \chi_{\{|g| > k\}} \right)^{-1} \\ &= \alpha \left(\left(\sum_{r \in I} \chi_{\{\frac{r-1}{2^k} \leq |g| < \frac{r}{2^k}, |g| \leq k\}} \frac{2^k}{-(r-1)} \right) + \frac{1}{-k} \chi_{\{|g| > k\}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then, we observe that

$$\left\{ h(y) < \frac{\alpha}{g_k(x)} \right\} = \left(\bigcup_{r \in I} \left(\left\{ \frac{r-1}{2^k} \leq |g| < \frac{r}{2^k}, |g| \leq k \right\} \cap \left\{ h(y) < \frac{\alpha 2^k}{-(r-1)} \right\} \right) \right) \quad (30)$$

$$\bigcup \left(\left\{ |g| > k \right\} \cap \left\{ h(y) < \frac{\alpha}{-k} \right\} \right). \quad (31)$$

Now, since for all $r \in I$ we have that each of

$$\begin{aligned} \left\{ \frac{r-1}{2^k} \leq |g| < \frac{r}{2^k}, |g| \leq k \right\} &= \left\{ \frac{r-1}{2^k} \leq |g| < \frac{r}{2^k} \right\} \cap \left\{ |g| \leq k \right\}, \\ \left\{ h(y) < \frac{\alpha 2^k}{-(r-1)} \right\}, \\ \left\{ |g| > k \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\left\{ h(y) < \frac{\alpha}{-k} \right\},$$

are measurable, we know that indeed $\{h(y) > \frac{\alpha}{g_k(x)}\} \cap \{g(x) < 0\}$ is measurable, which means that $F_{G_2}^k((x, y))$ and $F_{L_2}^k((x, y))$ are measurable functions.

Recall that now, having shown that $F_{G_1}^k((x, y)), F_{G_2}^k((x, y)), F_{L_1}^k((x, y))$, and $F_{L_2}^k((x, y))$ are measurable function, now we can use the fact that these monotonically increase or decrease to $f(x)h(y)$ on their respective supports (I believe support means input for which the function is non-zero).

Precisely, $F_{G_i}^k((x, y)) \nearrow \chi_{G_i}((x, y))f((x, y))$ for $i \in [2]$ means that $\chi_{G_i}((x, y))f((x, y))$ is measurable for $i \in [2]$.

Also, $F_{L_i}^k((x, y)) \searrow \chi_{L_i}((x, y))f((x, y))$ for $i \in [2]$ means that $\chi_{L_i}((x, y))f((x, y))$ is measurable for $i \in [2]$.

Thus, by Equation 28 we have shown that $f((x, y))$ is measurable.

(b) Assume that both g, h are integrable. Show that $f = gh$ defined by $f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = g(\mathbf{x})h(\mathbf{y})$ is integrable over \mathbb{R}^{m+n} and that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{m+n}} gh = \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} g \right) \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} h \right).$$

Hint: first use Tonelli's Theorem, then Fubini's Theorem.

By part (a) we know that f is measurable which means that $\{f \geq 0\}$ and $\{f \leq 0\}$ are both measurable. Thus, the integrals $\int_{\{f \geq 0\}} f^+$ and $\int_{\{f \leq 0\}} f^-$ exist if and only if f^+ and f^- are measurable which indeed they are.

Then, we note that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\{\mathbb{R}^{n+m}\}} f &= \int_{\{\mathbb{R}^{n+m}\}} (f^+ - f^-) \\ &= \int_{\{\mathbb{R}^{n+m}\}} (f^+) + \int_{\{\mathbb{R}^{n+m}\}} (-f^-) \\ &= \int_{\{f \geq 0\}} (f^+) + \int_{\{f \leq 0\}} (-f^-) \\ &= \int_{\{f \geq 0\}} (f^+) - \int_{\{f \leq 0\}} (f^-)\end{aligned}$$

Then, since $f \geq 0$ on $\{f \geq 0\}$ and $f^- \geq 0$ on $\{f \leq 0\}$ we can apply Tonelli's theorem.

Now, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\{f \geq 0\}} (f^+) - \int_{\{f \leq 0\}} (f^-) &= \int_{\{f \geq 0\}} (f^+) - \int_{\{f \leq 0\}} (f^-) \\
&= \int_{\{f \geq 0\}} (f) - \int_{\{f \leq 0\}} (-f) \\
&= \int_G (f) - \int_L (-f) \\
&= \int_G (gh) - \int_L (-gh) \\
&= \int_{\{h \geq 0\}} \int_{\{g \geq 0\}} g(x)h(y)dx dy + \int_{\{h < 0\}} \int_{\{g < 0\}} g(x)h(y)dx dy \\
&\quad - \int_{\{h \leq 0\}} \int_{\{g \geq 0\}} -g(x)h(y)dx dy - \int_{\{h \geq 0\}} \int_{\{g < 0\}} -g(x)h(y)dx dy \\
&= \int_{\{h \geq 0\}} \int_{\{g \geq 0\}} g(x)h(y)dx dy - \int_{\{h \geq 0\}} \int_{\{g < 0\}} -g(x)h(y)dx dy \\
&\quad + \int_{\{h < 0\}} \int_{\{g < 0\}} g(x)h(y)dx dy - \int_{\{h \leq 0\}} \int_{\{g \geq 0\}} -g(x)h(y)dx dy \\
&= \int_{\{h \geq 0\}} \int_{\{g \geq 0\}} g(x)h(y)dx dy - \int_{\{h \geq 0\}} \int_{\{g < 0\}} -g(x)h(y)dx dy \\
&\quad + \int_{\{h < 0\}} \int_{\{g < 0\}} g(x)h(y)dx dy - \int_{\{h < 0\}} \int_{\{g \geq 0\}} -g(x)h(y)dx dy \\
&= \int_{\{h \geq 0\}} \left(\int_{\{g \geq 0\}} g(x)h(y)dx - \int_{\{g < 0\}} -g(x)h(y)dx \right) dy \\
&\quad + \int_{\{h < 0\}} \left(\int_{\{g < 0\}} g(x)h(y)dx - \int_{\{g \geq 0\}} -g(x)h(y)dx \right) dy \\
&= \int_{\{h \geq 0\}} \left(\left(h(y) \right) \left(\int_{\{g \geq 0\}} g(x)dx - \int_{\{g < 0\}} -g(x)dx \right) \right) dy \\
&\quad + \int_{\{h < 0\}} \left(\left(h(y) \right) \left(\int_{\{g < 0\}} g(x)dx - \int_{\{g \geq 0\}} -g(x)dx \right) \right) dy \\
&= \int_{\{h \geq 0\}} \left(\left(h(y) \right) \left(\int_{\{g \geq 0\}} g(x)dx + \int_{\{g < 0\}} g(x)dx \right) \right) dy \\
&\quad + \int_{\{h < 0\}} \left(\left(h(y) \right) \left(\int_{\{g < 0\}} g(x)dx + \int_{\{g \geq 0\}} g(x)dx \right) \right) dy
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \int_{\{h \geq 0\}} \left(\left(h(y) \right) \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} g(x) dx \right) \right) dy \\
&+ \int_{\{h < 0\}} \left(\left(h(y) \right) \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} g(x) dx \right) \right) dy \\
&= \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} g(x) dx \right) \int_{\{h \geq 0\}} \left(\left(h(y) \right) \right) dy \\
&+ \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} g(x) dx \right) \int_{\{h < 0\}} \left(\left(h(y) \right) \right) dy \\
&= \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} g(x) dx \right) \left(\int_{\{h \geq 0\}} \left(h(y) \right) dy \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \int_{\{h < 0\}} \left(h(y) \right) dy \right) \\
&= \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} g(x) dx \right) \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left(h(y) \right) dy \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Question 4

Let ϕ be a bounded measurable function on \mathbb{R}^n such that $\phi(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ for $|\mathbf{x}| \geq 1$ and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \phi = 1.$$

For $\varepsilon > 0$, let

$$\phi_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}) = \varepsilon^{-n} \phi(\mathbf{x}/\varepsilon), x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Let $f \in L(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and define

$$f * \phi_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \phi_\varepsilon(\mathbf{y}) d\mathbf{y}.$$

Show that for \mathbf{x} in the Lebesgue set of f , we have

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} f * \phi_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}) = f(\mathbf{x}).$$

(You may assume the substitution rule for integrals of functions of one variable applied repeatedly).

Note

$$\begin{aligned} f * \phi_\varepsilon(x) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x - y) \phi_\varepsilon(y) dy \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (f(x - y) - f(x) + f(x)) \phi_\varepsilon(y) dy \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left((f(x - y) - f(x)) \phi_\varepsilon(y) + (f(x) \phi_\varepsilon(y)) \right) dy \\ f * \phi_\varepsilon(x) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left((f(x - y) - f(x)) \phi_\varepsilon(y) \right) dy + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left((f(x) \phi_\varepsilon(y)) \right) dy. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Now, we note that we can pull out the $f(x)$ in the right-most term to get

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (f(x) \phi_\varepsilon(y) dy) = f(x) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \phi_\varepsilon(y) dy.$$

Now, letting $y = \varepsilon w$ we see that $\phi_\varepsilon(y) = \varepsilon^{-n} \phi(y/\varepsilon) = \varepsilon^{-n} \phi(w)$. Also, note that (I believe dy denotes the infinitesimal domain for volume) $dy = \varepsilon^n dw$. So,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (f(x) \phi_\varepsilon(y) dy) &= f(x) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \phi_\varepsilon(y) dy \\ &= f(x) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varepsilon^{-n} \phi(y/\varepsilon) dy \\ &= f(x) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varepsilon^{-n} \phi(w) \varepsilon^n dw \\ &= f(x) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \phi(w) dw \\ &= f(x) \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

Now, we deal with the first term on the RHS, namely $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left((f(x-y) - f(x))\phi_\epsilon(y) \right) dy$. Note

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left((f(x-y) - f(x))\phi_\epsilon(y) \right) dy &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left((f(x-y) - f(x))\epsilon^{-n}\phi(y/\epsilon) \right) dy \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left((f(x-y) - f(x))\frac{1}{\epsilon^n}\phi(y/\epsilon) \right) dy \\ &= \frac{1}{\epsilon^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left((f(x-y) - f(x))\phi(y/\epsilon) \right) dy \quad (34) \end{aligned}$$

Let $C_x(\epsilon) = [x_1 - \epsilon, x_1 + \epsilon] \times \cdots \times [x_n - \epsilon, x_n + \epsilon]$ and then note that $B(x, \epsilon) = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n : |y| < \epsilon\} \subseteq C_x(\epsilon)$ and note that $|C_x(\epsilon)| = 2^n \epsilon^n$.

So, since $\phi(x)$ is bounded, we know there exists $M \in \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $\phi(x) \leq M$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Now,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\epsilon^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left((f(x-y) - f(x))\phi(y/\epsilon) \right) dy &\leq \frac{1}{\epsilon^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left| \left((f(x-y) - f(x))\phi(y/\epsilon) \right) \right| dy \\ &= \frac{1}{\epsilon^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left| (f(x-y) - f(x)) \right| \left| \phi(y/\epsilon) \right| dy \\ &= \frac{1}{\epsilon^n} \int_{\{| \phi(y/\epsilon) | \geq 0\}} \left| (f(x-y) - f(x)) \right| \left| \phi(y/\epsilon) \right| dy \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\epsilon^n} \int_{B(0, \epsilon)} \left| (f(x-y) - f(x)) \right| \left| \phi(y/\epsilon) \right| dy \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\epsilon^n} \int_{C_0(\epsilon)} \left| (f(x-y) - f(x)) \right| \left| \phi(y/\epsilon) \right| dy \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\epsilon^n} \int_{C_0(\epsilon)} \left| (f(x-y) - f(x)) \right| M dy \\ &= M \frac{1}{\epsilon^n} \int_{C_0(\epsilon)} \left| (f(x-y) - f(x)) \right| dy \quad (35) \end{aligned}$$

Now, let $w = x - y$. So, then $y \in C_0(\epsilon) = [-\epsilon, \epsilon]^n$ if and only if $x - y \in C_x(\epsilon)$. So, finally, noting that if $w = x - y$, then $dy = -dw$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}
M \frac{1}{\epsilon^n} \int_{C_0(\epsilon)} \left| (f(x-y) - f(x)) \right| dy &= M \frac{1}{\epsilon^n} \int_{C_x(\epsilon)} \left| (f(w) - f(x)) \right| dw \\
&= -M \frac{1}{\epsilon^n} \int_{C_x(\epsilon)} \left| (f(w) - f(x)) \right| dw \\
&= -M \frac{2^n}{2^n \epsilon^n} \int_{C_x(\epsilon)} \left| (f(w) - f(x)) \right| dw \\
&= -M \frac{2^n}{|C_x(\epsilon)|} \int_{C_x(\epsilon)} \left| (f(w) - f(x)) \right| dw
\end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

Finally, we note that by the definition of a Lebesgue point we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \left(-M \frac{2^n}{|C_x(\epsilon)|} \int_{C_x(\epsilon)} \left| (f(w) - f(x)) \right| dw \right) &= -2^n M \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \left(\frac{1}{|C_x(\epsilon)|} \int_{C_x(\epsilon)} \left| (f(w) - f(x)) \right| dw \right) \\
&= -2^n M(0) \\
&= 0
\end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

So, to summarize, if one wishes to calculate

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} f * \phi_\epsilon(x).$$

One notes that by Equation 32 we have

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} f * \phi_\epsilon(x) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left((f(x-y) - f(x)) \phi_\epsilon(y) \right) dy + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left((f(x) \phi_\epsilon(y)) \right) dy \right),$$

and then, by Equations 33, 34, 35, 36, and 37 we indeed get that

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} f * \phi_\epsilon(x) &= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left((f(x-y) - f(x)) \phi_\epsilon(y) \right) dy + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left((f(x) \phi_\epsilon(y)) \right) dy \right) \\
&= 0 + f(x) \\
&= f(x),
\end{aligned}$$

which is what we set out to prove.

Question 6

Show that

$$\lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{B \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^A \left[\int_0^B e^{-xy} \sin x \, dy \right] dx = \lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^A \frac{\sin x}{x} dx = \frac{\pi}{2}.$$

Note

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{B \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^A \left[\int_0^B e^{-xy} \sin x \, dy \right] dx &= \lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{B \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^A \left[\sin(x) \int_0^B e^{-xy} \, dy \right] dx \\ &= \lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{B \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^A \sin(x) \left(\frac{1}{-x} e^{-xy} \right) \Big|_{y=0}^B dx \\ &= \lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{B \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^A \frac{\sin(x)}{-x} \left(e^{-xB} - e^0 \right) dx \\ &= \lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{B \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^A \frac{\sin(x)}{-x} \left(e^{-xB} - 1 \right) dx \\ &= \lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{B \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^A \left(\frac{\sin(x)}{-xe^{Bx}} + \frac{\sin(x)}{x} \right) dx \\ &= \lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{B \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^A \left(\frac{\sin(x)}{-xe^{Bx}} + \frac{\sin(x)}{x} \right) dx \\ &= \lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{B \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int_0^A \frac{\sin(x)}{-xe^{Bx}} dx + \int_0^A \frac{\sin(x)}{x} dx \right) \\ &= \lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{B \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int_0^A \frac{\sin(x)}{-xe^{Bx}} dx + \int_0^A \frac{\sin(x)}{x} dx \right) \\ &= \lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{B \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int_0^A \frac{\sin(x)}{-xe^{Bx}} dx \right) + \lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{B \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int_0^A \frac{\sin(x)}{x} dx \right) \\ &= \lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{B \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int_0^A \frac{\sin(x)}{-xe^{Bx}} dx \right) + \lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int_0^A \frac{\sin(x)}{x} dx \right) \\ &= \lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{B \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int_0^A \frac{\sin(x)}{-xe^{Bx}} dx \right) + \lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int_0^A \frac{\sin(x)}{x} dx \right) \end{aligned}$$

Then, note that

$$\left| \frac{\sin(x)}{-xe^{Bx}} \right| \leq \phi(x) = \left| \frac{\sin(x)}{x} \right|.$$

Then, since $\phi(x)$ is integrable, we can apply Lebesgue's Dominated Convergence Theorem to get

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{B \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^A \frac{\sin(x)}{-xe^{Bx}} dx &= \lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^A \lim_{B \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sin(x)}{-xe^{Bx}} dx \\ &= \lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^A 0 dx \\ &= \lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} (0) \\ &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{B \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^A \left[\int_0^B e^{-xy} \sin x \, dy \right] dx = \lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int_0^A \frac{\sin(x)}{x} \, dx \right).$$

Also, we have that

$$\lim_{A \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sin(x)}{x} dx = \frac{\pi}{2}.$$

Does this mean that $\int_0^\infty \frac{\sin x}{x} dx$ exists as a Lebesgue integral? Hint: use Fubini's theorem.

No. We might like to apply Fubini's theorem to the function

$$f(x, y) = e^{-xy} \sin(x)$$

on the measurable set $E = [0, A] \times [0, B]$.

Successful application of the theorem would ensure that

$$\int_0^B e^{-xy} \sin x \, dy = \frac{\sin(x)}{-e^{-Bx}} + \frac{\sin(x)}{x}$$

exists and is integrable, meaning

$$\int_0^A \left| \frac{\sin(x)}{-e^{-Bx}} + \frac{\sin(x)}{x} \right| dx < \infty.$$

We expand

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^A \left| \frac{\sin(x)}{-e^{-Bx}} + \frac{\sin(x)}{x} \right| &= \int_0^A \left| \sin(x) \right| \left| \frac{1}{-e^{-Bx}} + \frac{1}{x} \right| dx \\
&= \int_0^A \left| \sin(x) \right| \left| \frac{x - e^{-Bx}}{-xe^{-Bx}} \right| dx \\
&= \int_0^A \left| \sin(x) \right| \frac{|x - e^{-Bx}|}{|-xe^{-Bx}|} dx \\
&= \int_0^A \left| \sin(x) \right| \frac{|x - e^{-Bx}|}{|x||e^{-Bx}|} dx \\
&= \int_0^A \frac{|\sin(x)|}{|x|} \frac{|x - e^{-Bx}|}{|e^{-Bx}|} dx \\
&= \int_0^A \left| \frac{\sin(x)}{x} \right| \frac{|x - e^{-Bx}|}{|e^{-Bx}|} dx \\
&= \int_0^A \left| \frac{\sin(x)}{x} \right| \frac{|e^{-Bx} - x|}{|e^{-Bx}|} dx \\
&\leq \int_0^A \left| \frac{\sin(x)}{x} \right| 1 dx \\
&\leq \int_0^A \left| \frac{\sin(x)}{x} \right| dx
\end{aligned}$$

In order to apply Fubini we would need that $f(x, y)$ is integrable, which I do not think it is. However, the string of equations above shows that we have an even bigger issue which is that even if Fubini applies still the nice consequence that $\int_0^A \left| \frac{\sin(x)}{-e^{-Bx}} + \frac{\sin(x)}{x} \right| < \infty$ does NOT imply that $\int_0^A \left| \frac{\sin(x)}{x} \right| dx < \infty$ (which is equivalent to the statement that $\frac{\sin(x)}{x}$ is integrable. Still it could happen theoretically that $\frac{\sin(x)}{x}$ is not integrable but the integral indeed exists. However, that cannot happen. Recall that we showed last homework that $\int_0^A \frac{\sin(x)}{x} dx = \int_0^A ((\frac{\sin(x)}{x})^+ - (\frac{\sin(x)}{x})^-) dx$ is finite as an improper riemann integral. However, that and the fact that as shown last homework $\frac{\sin(x)}{x}$ is not integrable or that $\int_0^\infty \left| \frac{\sin(x)}{x} \right| dx = \infty$. Note that $\infty = \int_0^\infty \left| \frac{\sin(x)}{x} \right| dx = \int_0^\infty (\frac{\sin(x)}{x})^+ + (\frac{\sin(x)}{x})^- dx$ which means that at least one of $\int_0^\infty (\frac{\sin(x)}{x})^+ dx$ or $\int_0^\infty (\frac{\sin(x)}{x})^- dx$ is infinite. But then the Improper Riemann integral being finite means that both $\int_0^\infty (\frac{\sin(x)}{x})^+ dx$ and $\int_0^\infty (\frac{\sin(x)}{x})^- dx$ are infinite since the improper riemann integral is $\int_0^\infty (\frac{\sin(x)}{x})^+ dx - \int_0^\infty (\frac{\sin(x)}{x})^- dx$ is finite (where indeed we are allowing the two terms there to be infinity, which may be an abuse of notation).