# Real Analysis Qualifying Exam Solutions

# D. Zack Garza

# Friday 19<sup>th</sup> June, 2020

# Contents

1	Spri	ng 2020	3
	1.1	1	3
	1.2	2	4
		1.2.1 a	4
		1.2.2 b	5
	1.3	3	5
		1.3.1 a	5
		1.3.2 b	6
		1.3.3 c	7
	1.4	4	7
	1.5	5	8
	1.6	6	8
2	Spri	ng 2019	9
	2.1	1	9
		2.1.1 a	9
		2.1.2 b	9
	2.2		10
		2.2.1 a	10
		2.2.2 b	10
	2.3	3	11
	2.4	4	11
		2.4.1 a	11
		2.4.2 b	11
	2.5	5	12
		2.5.1 a	12
		2.5.2 b	12
3	Eall	2019	14
3			
	3.1		14
	3.2		14
	3.3		15 16
	3.4	2	16

	3.5	3			 		 		 															 	16
		3.5.1 a																							16
		3.5.2 b		•	 	•	 	•	 	•	 •	 •		•		•	 •	•	•		•	•	•	 	17
		3.5.3 c			 		 		 															 	17
	3.6	4																							17
	5.0																								
		3.6.1 a		•	 	•	 	•	 	•	 •	 •		•		•	 •	•	•		•	•	•	 	_
		3.6.2 b			 		 		 															 	18
	3.7	5																							19
		-																							
	3.8	a		•	 	•	 	•	 	•	 •	 •		•		•	 •	•	•		•	•	•	 	19
	3.9	b			 		 		 															 	19
4	Spri	ng 2018																							20
•																									
	4.1	1		•	 	•	 	•	 	•	 •	 •		•		•	 •	•	•		•	•	•	 	20
	4.2	2			 		 		 															 	21
		4.2.1 a																							21
		4.2.2 b		•	 	•	 	•	 	•	 •	 ٠		٠		•	 •	•	•		•	٠	•	 	
	4.3	3			 		 		 															 	22
	4.4	4																							22
	4.5	$5 \ldots$		•	 	•	 	•	 	•	 •	 ٠		•		•	 •	٠	•		•	•	•	 	23
5	Fall	2018																							24
	5.1	1			 		 		 															 	24
	5.2	2																							
	5.3	3		•	 	•	 		 	•	 •	 •		٠		•	 •	•	•		•	•	•	 	
	5.4	4			 		 		 															 	25
	5.5	5																							25
	0.0	J		•	 	•	 	•	 	•		 •		•		•	 •	٠	•		•	·		 	_ ~
6	Spri	ng 2017																							26
U	-	_																							
	6.1	1			 		 		 							•	 •				•		•	 	26
	6.2	2			 		 		 															 	27
		6.2.1 a																							27
		6.2.2 b		•	 		 	•	 	•	 •	 •		٠		•	 •	٠	•		•	•	•	 	
	6.3	3			 		 		 															 	28
		6.3.1 a																							28
		0.0.1		•	 	•	 	•	 		 •	 •		•	•	•	 •	•	•		•	•	•	 •	
	6.4	4			 		 		 															 	28
	6.5	5			 		 		 															 	28
7	Fall	2017																							29
•																									_
	7.1	1																							
	7.2	2			 		 		 															 	29
		7.2.1 a	_		 _								_							_				_	29
	_																								
	7.3	3			 		 		 															 	30
	7.4	4			 		 		 																31
		7.4.1 a		•	 		 	•	 	•	 •	 ٠		٠		•	 •	٠	•		•	•	•	 	31
		7/19 h																							

Contents 2

		5.1 a	
8	Spri	2016	34
9	<b>Fall</b> 9.1	016 	<b>34</b> 34
		2014	<b>34</b> 34

## 1 Spring 2020

### 1.1 1

Concepts used:

- DCT
- Weierstrass Approximation Theorem

Suppose p is a polynomial, then

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} \int_0^1 kx^{k-1} p(x) \, dx = \lim_{k \to \infty} \int_0^1 \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial x} x^k \right) p(x) \, dx$$

$$= \lim_{k \to \infty} \left[ x^k p(x) \Big|_0^1 - \int_0^1 x^k \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial x} p(x) \right) \, dx \right] \quad \text{integrating by parts}$$

$$= p(1) - \lim_{k \to \infty} \int_0^1 x^k \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial x} p(x) \right) \, dx,$$

and thus it suffices to show that

$$\lim_{k \longrightarrow \infty} \int_0^1 x^k \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \, p(x) \right) dx = 0.$$

Integrating by parts a second time yields

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} \int_0^1 x^k \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial x} p(x) \right) dx = \lim_{k \to \infty} \frac{x^{k+1}}{k+1} p'(x) \Big|_0^1 - \int_0^1 \frac{x^{k+1}}{k+1} \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} p(x) \right) dx$$

$$= -\lim_{k \to \infty} \int_0^1 \frac{x^{k+1}}{k+1} \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} p(x) \right) dx$$

$$= -\int_0^1 \lim_{k \to \infty} \frac{x^{k+1}}{k+1} \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} p(x) \right) dx \quad \text{by DCT}$$

$$= -\int_0^1 0 \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} p(x) \right) dx$$

$$= 0.$$

The DCT can be applied here because f'' is continuous and [0,1] is compact, so f'' is bounded on [0,1] by a constant M and  $\int_0^1 \left| x^k f''(x) \right| \le \int_0^1 1 \cdot M = M < \infty$ .

We now use the Weierstrass approximation theorem: if  $f:[a,b] \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is continuous, then for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists a polynomial  $p_{\varepsilon}(x)$  such that  $||f - p_{\varepsilon}||_{\infty} < \varepsilon$ . Thus

$$\left| \int_{0}^{1} kx^{k-1} p_{\varepsilon}(x) dx - \int_{0}^{1} kx^{k-1} f(x) dx \right| = \left| \int_{0}^{1} kx^{k-1} (p_{\varepsilon}(x) - f(x)) dx \right|$$

$$\leq \left| \int_{0}^{1} kx^{k-1} \| p_{\varepsilon} - f \|_{\infty} dx \right|$$

$$= \| p_{\varepsilon} - f \|_{\infty} \cdot \left| \int_{0}^{1} kx^{k-1} dx \right|$$

$$= \| p_{\varepsilon} - f \|_{\infty} \cdot x^{k} \Big|_{0}^{1}$$

$$= \| p_{\varepsilon} - f \|_{\infty} \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \longrightarrow 0} 0$$

and the integrals are equal. Finally, the first integral is equal to  $p_{\varepsilon}(1)$  for each  $\varepsilon$ , which converges to f(1) since uniform convergence implies pointwise convergence.

### 1.2 2

Concepts used:

- Definition of outer measure:  $m_*(E) = \inf_{\{Q_j\} \rightrightarrows E} \sum |Q_j|$  where  $\{Q_j\}$  is a countable collection of closed cubes.
- Break  $\mathbb{R}$  into  $\coprod_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}[n,n+1)$ , each with finite measure.

### 1.2.1 a

Suppose  $m_*(E) = N < \infty$ .

Since  $m_*(E)$  is an infimum, by definition, for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists a covering by closed cubes  $\{Q_i(\varepsilon)\}_{i=1}^{\infty} \rightrightarrows E$  such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |Q_i(\varepsilon)| < N + \varepsilon.$$

Set  $\varepsilon_n = \frac{1}{n}$  to produce such a collection  $\{Q_i(\varepsilon_n)\}$  and set  $B_n := \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} Q_i(\varepsilon_n)$ . Then (theorem) the outer measure of cubes is *equal* to the sum of their volumes, so

$$m_*(B_n) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |Q_i(\varepsilon_n)| < N + \varepsilon_n = N + \frac{1}{n}.$$

Now set 
$$B := \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n$$
.

- Since  $E \subseteq B_n$  for every  $n, E \subseteq B$
- Since B is a countable intersection of countable unions of closed sets, B is Borel.
- Since  $B_n \subseteq B$  for every n, we can apply subadditivity to obtain the inequality

$$E \subseteq B \subseteq B_n \implies N \le m_*(B) \le m_*(B_n) < N + \frac{1}{n} \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{Z}^{\ge 1}.$$

This forces  $m_*(E) = m_*(B)$ .

If  $m_*(E) = \infty$ , then take  $B = \mathbb{R}^n$  since  $m(\mathbb{R}^n) = \infty$ .

### 1.2.2 b

Suppose  $m_*(E) < \infty$ .

- By (a), find a Borel set  $B \supseteq E$  such that  $m_*(B) = m_*(E)$
- Note that  $E \subseteq B \implies B \cap E = E$  and  $B \cap E^c = B \setminus E$ .
- By assumption,

$$m_*(B) = m_*(B \cap E) + m_*(B \cap E^c)$$

$$m_*(E) = m_*(E) + m_*(B \setminus E)$$

$$m_*(E) - m_*(E) = m_*(B \setminus E) \quad \text{since } m_*(E) < \infty$$

$$\implies m_*(B \setminus E) = 0.$$

- So take  $N = B \setminus E$ ; this shows  $m_*(N) = 0$  and  $E = B \setminus (B \setminus E) = B \setminus N$ .
- If  $m_*(E) = \infty$ 
  - Apply result to  $E_R := E \bigcap [R, R+1)^n \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  for  $R \in \mathbb{Z}$ , so  $E = \coprod_R E_R$  Obtain  $B_R, N_R$  such that  $E_R = B_R \setminus N_R$ ,  $m_*(E_R) = m_*(B_R)$ , and  $m_*(N_R) = 0$ .

  - - \*  $B := \bigcup B_R$ , which is a union of Borel sets and thus still Borel

$$* E = \bigcup_{R}^{R} E_{R}$$

- $* N := B \setminus E$
- \*  $N' := \bigcup N_R$  which is a union of null sets and thus still null
- Since  $E_R \subset B_R$  for every R, we have  $E \subset B$
- We can compute

$$N = B \setminus E = \left(\bigcup_R B_R\right) \setminus \left(\bigcup_R E_R\right) \subseteq \bigcup_R \left(B_R \setminus E_R\right) = N'$$

where  $m_*(N) = 0$  and thus subadditivity forces  $m_*(N) = 0$ .

### 1.3 3

### 1.3.1 a

Stated integral equality:

- Let  $\varepsilon > 0$
- $C_c(\mathbb{R}^n) \hookrightarrow L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$  is dense so choose  $\{f_n\} \longrightarrow f$  with  $||f_n f||_1 \longrightarrow 0$ .
- Since  $\{f_n\}$  are compactly supported, choose  $N_0 \gg 1$  such that  $f_n$  is zero outside of  $B_{N_0}(\mathbf{0})$ .
- Then

$$N \ge N_0 \implies \int_{|x|>N} |f| = \int_{|x|>N} |f - f_n + f_n|$$

$$\le \int_{|x|>N} |f - f_n| + \int_{|x|>N} |f_n|$$

$$= \int_{|x|>N} |f - f_n|$$

$$\le \int_{|x|>N} |f - f_n|$$

$$\le \int_{|x|>N} |f - f_n|$$

$$= ||f_n - f||_1 \left( \int_{|x|>N} 1 \right)$$

$$\stackrel{n \to \infty}{\longrightarrow} 0 \left( \int_{|x|>N} 1 \right)$$

$$= 0$$

$$\stackrel{N \to \infty}{\longrightarrow} 0.$$

To see that this doesn't force  $f(x) \longrightarrow 0$  as  $|x| \longrightarrow \infty$ :

- Take f(x) to be a train of boxes of height 1 and area  $1/2^{j}$  centered on even integers.
- Then the

$$\int_{|x|>N} |f| = \sum_{i=N}^{\infty} 1/2^{i} \xrightarrow{N \longrightarrow \infty} 0$$

as the tail of a convergent sum.

• However f(x) = 1 for infinitely many even integers x > N, so  $f(x) \not\longrightarrow 0$  as  $|x| \longrightarrow \infty$ .

### 1.3.2 b

• Since f is decreasing on  $[1, \infty)$ , for any  $t \in [x - n, x]$  we have

$$x - n < t < x \implies f(x) < f(t) < f(x - n).$$

• Integrate over [x, 2x], using monotonicity of the integral:

$$\int_{x}^{2x} f(x) \, dt \le \int_{x}^{2x} f(t) \, dt \le \int_{x}^{2x} f(x-n) \, dt \implies x f(x) \le \int_{x}^{2x} f(t) \, dt \le x f(x-n).$$

- By (a),  $\lim_{x \to \infty} \int_{x}^{2x} f(t) dt = 0$  (?)
- So the LHS term  $\lim_{x \to \infty} x f(x) = 0$ .
- Since x > 1,  $|f(x)| \le |xf(x)|$

• Thus  $f(x) \longrightarrow 0$  as well.

Alternatively showing  $f(x) \stackrel{x \longrightarrow \infty}{0}$ :

- Toward a contradiction, suppose not.
- If  $f(x) \longrightarrow -\infty$ , then  $f \notin L^1(\mathbb{R})$ : choose  $x \gg 1$  so that |f(x)| > 1, then

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} |f| \ge \int_{x}^{\infty} f(t) \, dt \ge \int_{x}^{\infty} 1 = \infty.$$

- WLOG replace f with -f to make f increasing (since  $||f||_1 = ||f||_2$ ).
- Otherwise  $f(x) \longrightarrow L$  with  $L < \infty$ . Fix  $\varepsilon > 0$ .
- Choose  $x \gg 1$  so that  $t \geq x \implies L \varepsilon \leq f(t) \leq L$
- Then  $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f \ge \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (L \varepsilon) = \infty$ .

### 1.3.3 c

- No: take  $f(x) = \frac{1}{x \ln x}$
- Then  $\int f = \ln(\ln(x)) \longrightarrow \infty$  is unbounded, so  $f \notin L^1([1,\infty))$ . But  $xf(x) = 1/\ln(x) \longrightarrow 0$

### 1.4 4

Relevant concepts:

- Tonelli: non-negative and measurable yields measurability of slices and equality of iterated
- Fubini:  $f(x,y) \in L^1$  yields integrable slices and equality of iterated integrals
- F/T: apply Tonelli to |f|; if finite,  $f \in L^1$  and apply Fubini to f

$$\begin{split} \|(f*g)(x)\|_1 &= \left\| \int_{\mathbb{R}} H(x,y) \, dy \right\|_1 \\ &\coloneqq \left\| \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(y) g(x-y) \, dy \right\|_1 \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} \|f(y) g(x-y)\|_1 \, dy \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} |f(y)| \cdot \|g(x-y)\|_1 \, dy \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} |f(y)| \cdot \|g\|_1 \, dy \\ &\leq \|g\|_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}} |f(y)| \, dy \\ &\leq \|g\|_1 \|f\|_1 \\ &< \infty \quad \text{by assumption} \quad . \end{split}$$

Todo:

- Change of variables for x y?
- How to justify F/T?

### 1.5 5

Note that

$$\lim_{n} \left( 1 + \frac{x^2}{n} \right)^{-(n+1)} = \frac{1}{\lim_{n} \left( 1 + \frac{x^2}{n} \right)^1 \left( 1 + \frac{x^2}{n} \right)^n}$$
$$= \frac{1}{1 \cdot e^{x^2}}$$
$$= e^{-x^2}.$$

If passing the limit through the integral is justified, we will have  $\int_0^\infty e^{-x^2} = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2}$ . Computing the integral:

$$\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-x^2} dx\right)^2 = \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-x^2} dx\right) \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-y^2} dx\right)$$

$$= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-(x+y)^2} dx$$

$$= \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{\infty} e^{-r^2} r dr d\theta \qquad u = r^2$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{\infty} e^{-u} du d\theta$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{2\pi} 1$$

and now use the fact that the function is even.

Todo:

• Justify, MCT? Possible have

$$f_n(x) \coloneqq \frac{1}{\left(1 + \frac{x^2}{n}\right)^{n+1}} \nearrow e^{-x^2}.$$

### 1.6 6

Concepts used:

• For  $e_n(x) := 2^{2\pi i n x}$ , the set  $\{e_n\}$  is an orthonormal basis for  $L^2([0,1])$ .

• For any orthonormal set in a Hilbert space, Bessel's inequality:

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |\langle x, e_k \rangle|^2 \le ||x||^2.$$

- When a basis, the above is an inequality (Parseval)
- Arguing uniform convergence: since  $\{\widehat{f}(n)\}\in \ell^1(\mathbb{Z})$ , we should be able to apply the M test.

Want to show

$$\int_0^1 |f(x)|^2 dx \le \int_0^1 |f(x)| dx$$
$$\sum_{n=1}^\infty |c_n|^2 \le \sum_{n=1}^\infty |c_n|.$$

- First inequality: ?
- Second inequality: break into 2 pieces?

# 2 Spring 2019

## 2.1 1

### 2.1.1 a

Let  $\{f_k\}$  be a Cauchy sequence in C(I). For each fixed  $x \in [0,1]$ , the sequence of real numbers  $\{f_k(x)\}$  is Cauchy in  $\mathbb{R}$ , which is complete, since

$$x_0 \in I \implies |f_k(x_0) - f_j(x_0)| \le \sup_{x \in I} |f_k(x) - f_j(x)| = ||f_k - f_j||_{\infty} \longrightarrow 0,$$

so we can define  $f(x) := \lim_{k} f_k(x)$ .

We also have

$$||f_k - f||_{\infty} = \left| |f_k - \lim_{j \to \infty} f_j| \right|_{\infty} = \lim_{j \to \infty} ||f_k - f_j||_{\infty} \to 0.$$

Finally, f is the uniform limit of continuous functions and thus continuous.

### 2.1.2 b

It suffices to produce a Cauchy sequence that does not converge to a continuous function. Take

$$f_k(x) = \begin{cases} (x + \frac{1}{2})^k & x \in [0, \frac{1}{2}) \\ 1 & x \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1] \end{cases} \xrightarrow{k \to \infty} f(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & x \in [0, \frac{1}{2}) \\ 1 & x \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1] \end{cases},$$

which is Cauchy, but there is no  $g \in L^1$  that is continuous such that  $||f - g||_1 = 0$ .

### 2.2 2

### 2.2.1 a

Lemma 1: 
$$\mu(\coprod_{k=1}^{\infty} E_k) = \lim_{N \to \infty} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \mu(E_k)$$
.  
Lemma 2:  $A = A \setminus B \coprod A \cap B$ .

Let  $A_k = F_k \setminus F_{k+1}$ , so the  $A_k$  are disjoint, and let  $A = \coprod_k A_k$ .

Let 
$$F = \bigcap_{k} F_{k}$$
. Then  $F_{1} = F \coprod A$  by lemma 2, so

$$\begin{split} \mu(F_1) &= \mu(F) + \mu(A) \\ &= \mu(F) + \lim_{N \longrightarrow \infty} \sum_{k}^{N} \mu(A_k) \quad \text{by Lemma 1} \\ &= \mu(F) + \lim_{N \longrightarrow \infty} \sum_{k}^{N} \mu(F_k) - \mu(F_{k+1}) \\ &= \mu(F) + \lim_{N \longrightarrow \infty} \left( \mu(F_1) - \mu(F_N) \right) \quad \text{(Telescoping)} \\ &= \mu(F) + \mu(F_1) - \lim_{N \longrightarrow \infty} \mu(F_N), \end{split}$$

and since the measure is finite,  $\mu(F_1) < \infty$  and can be subtracted, yielding

$$\mu(F_1) = \mu(F) + \mu(F_1) - \lim_{N \to \infty} \mu(F_N)$$

$$\implies \mu(F) = \lim_{N \to \infty} \mu(F_N).$$

#### 2.2.2 b

Suppose toward a contradiction that there is some  $\varepsilon > 0$  for which no such  $\delta$  exists.

This means that we can take any sequence  $\delta_n \longrightarrow 0$  and produce sets  $A_n$  such  $m(A) < \delta_n$  but  $\mu(A) > \varepsilon$ .

So choose the sequence  $\delta_n = \frac{1}{2^n}$  and define  $A_n$  accordingly, and let

$$A = \limsup_{n} A_n = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{k=n}^{\infty} A_k.$$

Since

$$\mu\left(\bigcup_{k=n}^{\infty} A_k\right) \le \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \mu(A_k) \approx \frac{1}{2^n} \longrightarrow 0,$$

by part (a) we have m(A) = 0. Now by assumption, we should thus have  $\mu(A) = 0$  as well.

However, again by part (a), we have

$$\mu(A) = \lim_{n} \mu\left(\bigcup_{k=n}^{\infty} A_k\right) \ge \lim_{n} \mu(A_n) = \lim_{n} \varepsilon = \varepsilon > 0.$$

### 2.3 3

Since  $f_k \longrightarrow f$  almost everywhere, we have  $\liminf_k f_k(x) = f(x)$  and since  $|f|^2 \in L^+$  we can apply Fatou:

$$||f||_2^2 = \int |f(x)|^2$$

$$= \int \liminf_k |f_k(x)|^2$$

$$\leq \lim_k \inf_k \int |f_k(x)|^2$$

$$= M^2.$$

so  $||f|| \le M < \infty$  and  $f \in L^2$ .

Let I = [0, 1]. Applying Egorov's theorem to produce sets  $F_{\varepsilon}$  such that  $f_k \xrightarrow{u} f$  on  $F_{\varepsilon}$  and taking  $F = \bigcap F_{\varepsilon}$ , we have

$$\int_{I} f_{k} = \int_{F_{\varepsilon}} f_{k} + \int_{F_{\varepsilon}^{c}} f_{k} \stackrel{\varepsilon \longrightarrow 0}{\longrightarrow} \int_{F} f_{k} + 0 \stackrel{k \longrightarrow \infty}{\longrightarrow} \int_{F} f,$$

using that fact that uniform converges allows commuting limits and integrals.

### 2.4 4

### 2.4.1 a

 $\implies$ 

Idea: 
$$A = \{f(x) - t \ge 0\} \bigcap \{t \ge 0\}.$$

Define F(x,t) = f(x), G(x,t) = t, and H(x,y) = F(x,t) - G(x,t), which are all measurable functions.

Then  $\mathcal{A} = \{H \geq 0\} \bigcap \{G \geq 0\}$  which is an intersection of measurable sets.

 $\Leftarrow$ 

By F.T., for almost every  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , the x-slices are measurable, so

$$\mathcal{A}_x := \left\{ t \in \mathbb{R} \mid (x, t) \in \mathcal{A} \right\} = [0, f(x)] \implies m(\mathcal{A}_x) = f(x)$$

But  $x \mapsto m(A_x)$  is a measurable function, and is exactly to  $x \mapsto f(x)$ , so f is measurable.

### 2.4.2 b

We first note

$$\mathcal{A} = \left\{ (x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \mid 0 \le t \le f(x) \right\}$$
$$\mathcal{A}_t = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid t \le f(x) \right\}.$$

Then,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x) \ dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_0^{f(x)} 1 \ dt \ dx$$

$$= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \chi_{\mathcal{A}} \ dt \ dx$$

$$\stackrel{F.T.}{=} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \chi_{\mathcal{A}} \ dx \ dt$$

$$= \int_0^{\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \chi_{\mathcal{A}} \ dx \ dt$$

$$= \int_0^{\infty} m(\mathcal{A}_t) \ dt,$$

where we just note that  $\iint \chi_{\mathcal{A}} = m(\mathcal{A})$ , and by F.T., all of these integrals are equal.

### 2.5 5

### 2.5.1 a

By Holder's inequality with p = q = 2, we have

$$||f||_1 = ||f \cdot 1||_1 \le ||f||_2 ||1||_2 = ||f||_2 m(X)^{\frac{1}{2}} = ||f||_2,$$

since  $X = [0, 1] \implies m(X) = 1$ .

So  $L^2(X) \subseteq L^1(X)$ , and since simple functions are dense in both spaces,  $L^2$  is dense in  $L^1$ .

### 2.5.2 b

**Step 1** Let  $\Lambda \in L^1(X)^{\vee}$ ; we'll show that in fact  $\Lambda \in L^2(X)^{\vee}$ , and by Riesz Representation for  $L^2$  there will be a  $g \in L^2$  such that  $\Lambda(f) = \langle f, g \rangle$ .

**Lemma**:  $m(X) < \infty \implies L^p(X) \subset L^2(X)$ .

*Proof:* Write Holder's inequality as  $||fg||_1 \le ||f||_a ||g||_b$  where  $\frac{1}{a} + \frac{1}{b} = 1$ , then

$$||f||_p^p = |||f|^p||_1 \le |||f|^p||_a ||1||_b.$$

Now take  $a = \frac{2}{p}$  and this reduces to

$$||f||_p^p \le ||f||_2^p \ m(X)^{\frac{1}{b}}$$
  
$$\implies ||f||_p \le ||f||_2 \cdot O(m(X)) < \infty.$$

Let  $f \in L^2$  be arbitrary – by the lemma,  $||f||_1 \le C||f||_2$  for some constant C = O(m(X)).

Since  $\|\Lambda\|_{1^{\vee}} := \sup_{\|f\|_1 = 1} |\Lambda(f)|$ , given an arbitrary  $f \in L^1$ , we can define  $\widehat{f} = f/\|f\|_1$ , so  $\|\widehat{f}\|_1 = 1$ , and obtain

$$\left|\Lambda(\widehat{f})\right| \leq \left\|\Lambda\right\|_{1^{\vee}},$$

since  $\|\Lambda\|_{1^{\vee}}$  is the *least* such bound over all  $f \in L^1$ , and thus

$$\begin{split} \frac{\left|\Lambda(f)\right|}{\left\|f\right\|_{1}} &= \left|\Lambda(\widehat{f})\right| \leq \left\|\Lambda\right\|_{1^{\vee}} \\ \Longrightarrow &|\Lambda(f)| \leq \left\|\Lambda\right\|_{1^{\vee}} \cdot \left\|f\right\|_{1} \\ &\leq \left\|\Lambda\right\|_{1^{\vee}} \cdot C \|f\|_{2}, \end{split}$$

which is finite by assumption. So  $\Lambda \in (L^2)^{\vee}$  since it is bounded and thus continuous. By Riesz Representation for  $L^2$ , there is a  $g \in L^2$  such that for all  $f \in L^2$ ,  $\Lambda(f) = \langle f, g \rangle$ 

### **Step 2** By Holder, we already have

$$\begin{split} \|\Lambda\|_{1^{\vee}} &= \sup_{\|f\|_{1}=1} |\Lambda(f)| \\ &= \sup_{\|f\|_{1}=1} \left| \int_{X} fg \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{\|f\|_{1}=1} \|fg\|_{1} \\ &\leq \sup_{\|f\|_{1}=1} \|f\|_{1} \|g\|_{\infty} \\ &= \|g\|_{\infty}, \end{split}$$

so it just remains to show that  $\|g\|_{\infty} \leq \|\Lambda\|_{1^{\vee}}$ .

Suppose otherwise, so  $\|g\|_{\infty} > \|\Lambda\|_{1^{\vee}}$ .

Then there exists some  $E \subseteq X$  with m(E) > 0 such that  $x \in E \implies |g(x)| > ||\Lambda||_{1^{\vee}}$ .

Define

$$h = \frac{1}{m(E)} \frac{\overline{g}}{|g|} \chi_E.$$

$$\begin{split} \Lambda(h) &= \int_X hg \\ &= \int_X \frac{1}{m(E)} \frac{g\overline{g}}{|g|} \chi_E \\ &= \frac{1}{m(E)} \int_E |g| \\ &\geq \frac{1}{m(E)} \|g\|_\infty m(E) \\ &= \|g\|_\infty \\ &> \|\Lambda\|_{1^\vee}, \end{split}$$

a contradiction.

3 Fall 2019

### 3.1 1

Cesaro mean/summation. Break series apart into pieces that can be handled separately.

### 3.2 a

Prove a stronger result:

$$a_n \longrightarrow A \implies \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} a_k \longrightarrow A.$$

Idea: once N is large enough,  $a_k \approx A$ , and all smaller terms will die off as  $N \longrightarrow \infty$ . See this MSE answer.

Suppose  $S_k \longrightarrow S.$  Choose  $\ell$  large enough such that

$$k \ge \ell \implies |S_k - S| < \varepsilon.$$

With  $\ell$  fixed, choose N large enough such that

$$k \le \ell \implies \frac{|S_k - S|}{N} < \varepsilon.$$

3.3 b

Then

$$\left| \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} S_k \right) - S \right| = \frac{1}{N} \left| \sum_{k=1}^{N} (S_k - S) \right|$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} |S_k - S|$$

$$= \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} \frac{|S_k - S|}{N} + \sum_{k=\ell+1}^{N} \frac{|S_k - S|}{N}$$

$$\longrightarrow 0.$$

### 3.3 b

Define

$$\Gamma_n := \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \frac{a_k}{k}.$$

Then  $\Gamma_1 = \sum_k \frac{a_k}{k}$  and each  $\Gamma_n$  is a tail of this series, so by assumption  $\Gamma_n \longrightarrow 0$ .

Then

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n}a_{k} = \frac{1}{n}(\Gamma_{0} + \Gamma_{1} + \dots + \Gamma_{n} - \Gamma_{n+1})$$

$$\longrightarrow 0$$

This comes from consider the following summation:

 $\Gamma_1:$   $a_1$   $+\frac{a_2}{2}$   $+\frac{a_3}{3}$   $+\cdots$   $\Gamma_2:$   $\frac{a_2}{2}$   $+\frac{a_3}{3}$   $+\cdots$ 

 $\Gamma_3$ :  $\frac{a_3}{3}$  +  $\cdots$ 

 $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \Gamma_i: \qquad a_1 \qquad +a_2 \qquad +a_3 \qquad +\cdots \qquad a_n \qquad +\frac{a_{n+1}}{n+1} \qquad +\cdots$ 

### 3.4 2

DCT, and bounding in the right place. Don't evaluate the actual integral!

Use the fact that  $\int_0^1 \cos(tx) dt = \sin(x)/x$ , then

$$\left| \frac{\partial^n}{\partial x} \sin(x)/x \right| = \left| \frac{\partial^n}{\partial x} \int_0^1 \cos(tx) \, dt \right|$$

$$= ? \left| \int_0^1 \frac{\partial^n}{\partial x} \cos(tx) \, dt \right|$$

$$= \left| \int_0^1 -t^n \sin(tx) \, dt \right| \quad \text{for } n \text{ odd}$$

$$\leq \int_0^1 |t^n \sin(tx)| \, dt$$

$$\leq \int_0^1 t^n \, dt$$

$$= \frac{1}{n+1}$$

$$< \frac{1}{n}.$$

Where the DCT is justified by noting that  $f(t) = \cos(tx)$  is dominated by g(t) = 1 on [0, 1], which integrates to 1.

3.5 3

Borel-Cantelli.

Use the following observation: for a sequence of sets  $X_n$ ,

$$\limsup_{n} X_{n} = \left\{ x \mid x \in X_{n} \text{ for infinitely many } n \right\} = \bigcap_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcup_{n \geq m} X_{n}$$

$$\liminf_{n} X_{n} = \left\{ x \mid x \in X_{n} \text{ for all but finitely many } n \right\} = \bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcap_{n \geq m} X_{n}.$$

And recall

$$\prod_{n} e^{x_n} = e^{\sum_{n} x_n} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{n} \log(x_n) = \log\left(\prod_{n} x_n\right).$$

3.5.1 a

The Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra is closed under countable unions/intersections/complements, and  $B = \limsup_{n} B_n$  is an intersection of unions of measurable sets.

3.6 4

#### 3.5.2 b

We'll use the fact that tails of convergent sums go to zero, so  $\sum_{n\geq M} \mu(B_n) \xrightarrow{M\longrightarrow\infty} 0$ , and  $B_M :=$ 

$$\bigcap_{m=1}^{M} \bigcup_{n>m} B_n \searrow B.$$

$$\mu(B_M) = \mu\left(\bigcap_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcup_{n \ge m} B_n\right)$$

$$\leq \mu\left(\bigcup_{n \ge m} B_n\right) \quad \text{for all } m \in \mathbb{N}$$

$$\longrightarrow 0,$$

and the result follows by continuity of measure.

### 3.5.3 c

To show  $\mu(B) = 1$ , we'll show  $\mu(B^c) = 0$ .

Let 
$$B_k = \bigcap_{m=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n=m}^{K} B_n$$
. Then

$$\mu(B_K^c) = \mu\left(\bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{n=m}^{K} B_n^c\right)$$

$$\leq \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \mu\left(\bigcap_{n=m}^{K} B_n^c\right) \quad \text{by subadditivity}$$

$$= \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \prod_{n=m}^{K} 1 - \mu(B_n)$$

$$\leq \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \prod_{n=m}^{K} e^{-\mu(B_n^c)} \quad \text{by hint}$$

$$= \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} e^{-\sum_{n=m}^{K} \mu(B_n^c)}$$

$$\longrightarrow 0$$

since  $\sum_{n=m}^K \mu(B_n^c) \longrightarrow \infty$ , and we can apply continuity of measure since  $B_K^c \xrightarrow{K \longrightarrow \infty} B^c$ .

### 3.6 4

Bessel's Inequality, surjectivity of Riesz map, and Parseval's Identity. Trick – remember to write out finite sum  $S_N$ , and consider  $||x - S_N||$ .

### 3.6.1 a

Claim:

$$0 \le \left\| x - \sum_{n=1}^{N} \langle x, u_n \rangle u_n \right\|^2 = \|x\|^2 - \sum_{n=1}^{N} |\langle x, u_n \rangle|^2$$
$$\implies \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |\langle x, u_n \rangle|^2 \le \|x\|^2.$$

Proof: Let  $S_N = \sum_{n=1}^N \langle x, u_n \rangle u_n$ . Then

$$0 \le \|x - S_N\|^2$$

$$= \langle x - S_n, x - S_N \rangle$$

$$= \|x\|^2 - \sum_{n=1}^N |\langle x, u_n \rangle|^2$$

$$\xrightarrow{N \to \infty} \|x\|^2 - \sum_{n=1}^N |\langle x, u_n \rangle|^2.$$

### 3.6.2 b

1. Fix  $\{a_n\} \in \ell^2$ , then note that  $\sum |a_n|^2 < \infty \implies$  the tails vanish.

2. Define

$$x := \lim_{N \to \infty} S_N = \lim_{N \to \infty} \sum_{k=1}^N a_k u_k$$

3.  $\{S_N\}$  Cauchy (by 1) and H complete  $\implies x \in H$ .

4.

$$\langle x, u_n \rangle = \left\langle \sum_k a_k u_k, u_n \right\rangle = \sum_k a_k \langle u_k, u_n \rangle = a_n \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$$

since the  $u_k$  are all orthogonal.

5.

$$||x||^2 = \left\| \sum_k a_k u_k \right\|^2 = \sum_k ||a_k u_k||^2 = \sum_k |a_k|^2$$

by Pythagoras since the  $u_k$  are normal.

Bonus: We didn't use completeness here, so the Fourier series may not actually converge to x. If  $\{u_n\}$  is **complete** (so  $x = 0 \iff \langle x, u_n \rangle = 0 \ \forall n$ ) then the Fourier series *does* converge to x and  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |\langle x, u_n \rangle|^2 = ||x||^2$  for all  $x \in H$ .

### 3.7 5

Continuity in  $L^1$  (recall that DCT won't work! Notes 19.4, prove it for a dense subset first). Lebesgue differentiation in 1-dimensional case. See HW 5.6.

### 3.8 a

Choose  $g \in C_c^0$  such that  $||f - g||_1 \longrightarrow 0$ .

By translation invariance,  $\|\tau_h f - \tau_h g\|_1 \longrightarrow 0$ .

Write

$$\|\tau f - f\|_{1} = \|\tau_{h} f - g + g - \tau_{h} g + \tau_{h} g - f\|_{1}$$

$$\leq \|\tau_{h} f - \tau_{h} g\| + \|g - f\| + \|\tau_{h} g - g\|$$

$$\longrightarrow \|\tau_{h} g - g\|,$$

so it suffices to show that  $\|\tau_h g - g\| \longrightarrow 0$  for  $g \in C_c^0$ .

Fix  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Enlarge the support of g to K such that

$$|h| \le 1$$
 and  $x \in K^c \implies |g(x-h) - g(x)| = 0$ .

By uniform continuity of g, pick  $\delta \leq 1$  small enough such that

$$x \in K, |h| \le \delta \implies |g(x-h) - g(x)| < \varepsilon,$$

then

$$\int_{K} |g(x-h) - g(x)| \le \int_{K} \varepsilon = \varepsilon \cdot m(K) \longrightarrow 0.$$

### 3.9 b

We have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} |A_h(f)(x)| \ dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| \frac{1}{2h} \int_{x-h}^{x+h} f(y) \ dy \right| \ dx$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2h} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{x-h}^{x+h} |f(y)| \ dy \ dx$$

$$=_{FT} \frac{1}{2h} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{y-h}^{y+h} |f(y)| \ \mathbf{dx} \ \mathbf{dy}$$

$$= \int_{\mathbb{R}} |f(y)| \ dy$$

$$= ||f||_{1}.$$

and (rough sketch)

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} |A_h(f)(x) - f(x)| \, dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| \left( \frac{1}{2h} \int_{B(h,x)} f(y) \, dy \right) - f(x) \right| \, dx$$

$$= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| \left( \frac{1}{2h} \int_{B(h,x)} f(y) \, dy \right) - \frac{1}{2h} \int_{B(h,x)} f(x) \, dy \right| \, dx$$

$$\leq_{FT} \frac{1}{2h} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{B(h,x)} |f(y - x) - f(x)| \, \mathbf{dx} \, \mathbf{dy}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2h} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \|\tau_x f - f\|_1 \, dy$$

$$\longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{by (a)}.$$

## 4 Spring 2018

### 4.1 1

We'll show that  $m(E) \cap [n, n+1] = 0$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ ; then the result will follow from that fact that

$$m(E) = m\left(\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} E \bigcap [n, n+1]\right) \le \sum m(E \bigcap [n, n+1]) = 0$$

By translation invariance of measure, it suffices to show  $m(E \cap [0,1]) = 0$ .

Define

$$E_j := \left\{ x \in [0, 1] \mid \exists p \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0} \text{ s.t. } \left| x - \frac{p}{j} \right| < \frac{1}{j^3} \right\}.$$

Note that we can write  $E_j$  is a union of intervals

$$E_{j} = \left(1, \frac{1}{j^{3}}\right)$$

$$\coprod B_{\frac{1}{j^{3}}}\left(\frac{1}{j}\right) \coprod B_{\frac{1}{j^{3}}}\left(\frac{2}{j}\right) \coprod \cdots \coprod B_{\frac{1}{j^{3}}}\left(\frac{j-1}{j}\right)$$

$$\coprod \left(1 - \frac{1}{j^{3}}, 1\right),$$

from which we can conclude that  $E_j$  is Borel and thus Lebesgue measurable, and that for each j, there are exactly j+1 possible choices for a numerator (corresponding to the j+1 sets appearing above.)

The first and last intervals are length  $\frac{1}{j^3}$  and the remaining (j+1)-2=j-1 intervals are length  $\frac{2}{j^3}$ , so we find that

$$m(E_j) = 2\left(\frac{1}{j^3}\right) + (j-1)\left(\frac{2}{j^3}\right) = \frac{2}{j^2}$$

We can then note that

$$\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} m(E_j) \le 2 \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{j^2} < \infty,$$

which converges by the p-test for sums.

Since  $\{E_j\}$  is a countable collection of measurable sets such that  $\sum_j m(E_j) < \infty$ , Borel-Cantelli applies and  $m(\limsup_j E_j) = 0$ , where we can just note that  $\limsup_j E_j = E \bigcap [0,1]$ .

4.2 2

4.2.1 a

Since  $x < 1 \implies x^n \longrightarrow 0$  and  $x > 1 \implies x^n \longrightarrow \infty$ , we have

$$f_n(x) = \frac{x}{1+x^n} \xrightarrow{n \to \infty} f(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & x = 0 \\ x, & x < 1 \\ \frac{1}{2}, & x = 1 \\ 0, & x > 0 \end{cases}.$$

If  $f_n \longrightarrow f$  uniformly on  $[0, \infty)$ , it would converge uniformly on every subset.

Butach  $f_n(x)$  is clearly continuous on  $(0, \infty)$ , and if the convergence was uniform then f would be continuous. However f has a clear discontinuity at x = 1.

4.2.2 b

If the DCT applies, we can interchange the limit and integral, and the value would be the area under the graph of f which is  $\int_0^1 x \, dx = \frac{1}{2}$ .

To justify the DCT, write

$$\int_0^\infty f_n(x) = \int_0^1 f_n(x) + \int_1^\infty f_n(x).$$

Then

$$x \in [0,1] \implies \frac{x}{1+x^n} < \frac{1}{1+x^n} < 1$$

and 
$$\int_0^1 1 \ dx = 1 < \infty$$
.

On the other hand,

$$x \in (1, \infty) \implies \frac{x}{1 + x^n} \approx O\left(\frac{1}{x^{n-1}}\right),$$

and so for n > 2 the integral will converge by the p-test.

### 4.3 3

Since  $|f(x)| \leq ||f||_{\infty}$  almost everywhere, we have

$$||f||_p^p = \int_X |f(x)|^p dx \le \int_X ||f||_\infty^p dx = ||f||_\infty^p \cdot m(X) = ||f||_\infty^p,$$

so  $||f||_p \le ||f||_{\infty}$  for all p and taking  $\lim_{n \to \infty}$  preserves this inequality.

Conversely, let  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Define

$$S_{\varepsilon} := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R} \mid |f(x)| \ge ||f||_{\infty} - \varepsilon \right\}.$$

Then

$$||f||_{p}^{p} = \int_{X} |f(x)|^{p} dx$$

$$\geq \int_{S_{\varepsilon}} |f(x)|^{p} dx$$

$$\geq \int_{S_{\varepsilon}} |||f||_{\infty} - \varepsilon|^{p} dx$$

$$= |||f||_{\infty} - \varepsilon|^{p} \cdot m(S_{\varepsilon})$$

$$\implies ||f||_{p} \geq |||f||_{\infty} - \varepsilon| \cdot m(S_{\varepsilon})^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

$$\stackrel{p \longrightarrow \infty}{\longrightarrow} |||f||_{\infty} - \varepsilon|$$

$$\stackrel{\varepsilon \longrightarrow 0}{\longrightarrow} ||f||_{\infty}.$$

So  $||f||_p \ge ||f||_{\infty}$ .

### 4.4 4

Fix  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Since  $e^{2\pi ikx}$  is continuous on the compact interval [0,1], it is uniformly continuous, and is thus there is a sequence of polynomials  $P_{\ell}$  such that

$$P_{\ell,k} \stackrel{\ell \longrightarrow \infty}{\longrightarrow} e^{2\pi i k x}$$
 uniformly on [0, 1].

Note that by linearity,

$$\int f(x)x^n = 0 \ \forall n \implies \int f(x)P_{\ell,k}(x) = 0 \quad \forall \ell \in \mathbb{N}$$

4 SPRING 2018

22

4.5 5

But then the kth Fourier coefficient of f is given by

$$\langle f, e_k \rangle = \int_0^1 f(x) e^{-2\pi i k x} dx$$

$$= \int_0^1 f(x) \lim_{\ell \to \infty} P_{\ell}(x)$$

$$= \lim_{\ell \to \infty} \int_0^1 f(x) P_{\ell}(x) \quad \text{by uniform convergence}$$

$$= \lim_{\ell \to \infty} 0$$

$$= 0 \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{Z},$$

so  $\hat{f}$  is the zero function, and  $\hat{f} = 0 \iff f = 0$  almost everywhere.

4.5 5

Moral:  $\int |f_n - f| \longrightarrow \iff \int f_n = \int f$ .

Since if  $\int |f_n| \longrightarrow \int |f|$  then we can define

$$h_n = |f_n - f| \longrightarrow 0 \ a.e.$$
  
 $g_n = |f_n| + |f| \longrightarrow 2|f| \ a.e.$ 

$$\int 2|f| = \int \liminf (g_n - h_n)$$

$$= \int \liminf g_n - \int \liminf h_n$$

$$= \int 2|f| - \int \liminf h_n$$

$$\stackrel{Fatou}{\leq} \int 2|f| + \limsup \int h_n,$$

which forces  $\int h_n = \int |f_n - f| \longrightarrow 0$ .

But then

$$\left| \int f_n - \int f \right| = \left| \int f_n - f \right| \le \int |f_n - f| \longrightarrow 0,$$

so 
$$\int f_n \longrightarrow \int f$$
.

## 5 Fall 2018

Note: this is considered....not the most useful or representative exam of all time.

### 5.1 1

We'll show a stronger statement:  $f(x) = \frac{1}{x}$  is uniformly continuous on any interval of the form  $(c, \infty)$  where c > 0.

We can use that fact that  $x, y > c \implies xy > c^2 \implies \frac{1}{xy} < \frac{1}{c^2}$ .

Letting  $\varepsilon$  be arbitrary, choose  $\delta < \varepsilon c^2$ . Then

$$|f(x) - f(y)| = \left| \frac{1}{x} - \frac{1}{y} \right|$$

$$= \frac{|x - y|}{xy}$$

$$\leq \frac{\delta}{xy}$$

$$< \frac{\delta}{c^2}$$

$$< \varepsilon.$$

which shows uniform continuity since  $\delta$  does not depend on x or y.

To see that f is not uniformly continuous when c = 0, let  $\varepsilon < 1$  be arbitrary.

Let  $x_n = \frac{1}{n}$ . Then choose n large enough such that  $|x_n - x_{n+1}| = \frac{1}{n} - \frac{1}{n+1} < \delta$ . Then just note that  $f(x_n) = n$  and thus  $|f(x_n) - f(x_{n+1})| = n - (n+1) = 1 > \varepsilon$ .

#### 5.2 2

First consider the bounded case where  $m(E) < \infty$ .

E is measurable  $\iff$  for every  $\varepsilon$  there exist  $F_{\varepsilon} \subset E \subset G_{\varepsilon}$  with  $F_{\varepsilon}$  closed and  $G_{\varepsilon}$  open and  $m(G_{\varepsilon} \setminus E) < \varepsilon$  and  $m(E \setminus F_{\varepsilon}) < \varepsilon$ .

So take the sequence  $\varepsilon_n = \frac{1}{n} \longrightarrow 0$  to produce a sequence of closed sets  $F_n$  such that  $m(E \setminus F_n) < \frac{1}{n}$  for all n, and let  $F := \bigcup_n$ , which is clear an  $F_{\sigma}$  and thus Borel set.

Since  $F_n \subseteq F_{n+1}$ , we have  $F_n \nearrow F$  and so by continuity of measure,

$$m(F) = \lim_{n} m(F_n) < \lim_{n} \left(\frac{1}{n}\right) \longrightarrow 0.$$

If E is not bounded, let  $E_N = B_N(0) \cap E$  which is bounded. Then  $E_N \nearrow E$ , and for each N we can find an  $F_N$  by the previous case such that  $m(E_N \setminus F_N) = 0$ .

So take  $F := \bigcup_{N} F_{N}$  so  $F_{N} \nearrow F$ . Then

$$E_N \setminus F_N \nearrow E \setminus F \implies m(E \setminus F) = \lim_N m(E_N \setminus F_N) = 0.$$

### 5.3 3

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} F(t) = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x) \cos(xt) dx$$

$$\stackrel{DCT}{=} \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x) \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \cos(xt) dx$$

$$= \int_{\mathbb{R}} x f(x) \cos(xt) dx,$$

so it only remains to justify the DCT.

Fix t, then let  $t_n \longrightarrow t$  be any sequence. Then

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \cos(tx) := \lim_{t_n \to t} \frac{\cos(tx) - \cos(t_n x)}{t_n - t}$$

$$\stackrel{MVT}{=} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \cos(tx) \Big|_{t = \xi_n} \text{ for some } \xi_n \in [t, t_n] \text{ or } [t_n, t]$$

$$= x \sin(\xi_n x).$$

So we can define

$$h_n(x,t) = f(x) \left( \frac{\cos(tx) - \cos(t_n x)}{t_n - t} \right)$$

and note that  $h_n \longrightarrow \frac{\partial}{\partial t} [f(x)\cos(xt)]$  pointwise.

We then have  $|h_n| = |f(x)x\sin(\xi_n x)| \le |xf(x)|$  for every n by the above argument, and since  $g(x) := xf(x) \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$  by assumption, the DCT can be applied.

### 5.4 4

???

Apparently "easy" part: let  $f(x) = \chi_{[0,\pi]}$ , then  $\int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x)|\sin(nx)| = \int_0^{\pi} |\sin(nx)| = 2$ , and so  $\int_0^1 |\sin(nx)| = \frac{2}{\pi}$ , none of which depend on n.

Now approximate f by step functions.

### 5.5 5

???

## 6 Spring 2017

### 6.1 1

A is nowhere dense  $\iff$  every interval I contains a subinterval  $S \subseteq A^c$ .

### K is compact:

It suffices to show that  $K^c := [0,1] \setminus K$  is open; then K will be a closed and bounded subset of  $\mathbb{R}$  and thus compact by Heine-Borel.

We can identify  $K^c$  as the set of real numbers in [0,1] whose decimal expansion **does** use a 4. Let  $x \in K^c$ , and suppose a 4 occurs as the kth digit and write

$$x = 0.d_1d_2 \cdots d_{k-1} \ 4 \ d_{k+1} \cdots = \sum_{j=1}^k d_j 10^{-j} + 4 \cdot 10^{-k} + \sum_{j=k+1}^{\infty} d_j 10^{-j}.$$

Then if we set  $r < 10^{-k}$  and pick any  $y \in [0, 1]$  such that  $y \in B_r(x)$ , then  $|x - y| < 10^{-k}$ . If we write  $y = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} c_j 10^{-j}$ , this means that for all  $j \le k$  we have  $d_j = c_j$ , and in particular  $d_k = 4 = c_k$ , so y has a 4 in its decimal expansion.

But then  $K^c = \bigcup_{x} B_r(x)$  is a union of open sets and thus open.

### K is nowhere dense and m(K)=0:

Since K is closed, we'll show that K can not properly contain any interval, so  $(\overline{K})^{\circ} = \emptyset$ .

As in the construction of the Cantor set, let

- $K_1$  denote [0,1] with 1 interval [0.4,0.5] of length  $\frac{1}{10}$  deleted
- $K_2$  denote  $K_1$  with 9 intervals [0.04, 0.05], [0.14, 0.15],  $\cdots [0.94, 0.95]$  length  $\frac{1}{100}$  deleted
- $K_n$  denote  $K_{n-1}$  with  $9^{n-1}$  such intervals of length  $10^{-n}$  deleted.

Then  $K = \bigcap K_n$ , and

$$m(K) = 1 - m(K^c) = 1 - \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{9^n}{10^{n+1}} = 1 - \frac{1}{10} \left( \frac{1}{1 - \frac{9}{10}} \right) = 0,$$

and since any interval has strictly positive measure, K can not contain any interval.

#### K has no isolated points:

A point  $x \in K$  is isolated iff there there is an open ball  $B_r(x)$  containing x such that  $B_r(x) \cap K = \emptyset$ , so every point in this ball has a 4 in its decimal expansion.

Note that  $m(K_n) = \left(\frac{9}{10}\right)^n \longrightarrow 0$  and that the endpoints of intervals are never removed and are thus elements of K. Then for every  $\varepsilon$ , we can choose n such that  $\left(\frac{9}{10}\right)^n < \varepsilon$ ; then there is an endpoint of a removed interval  $e_n$  satisfying  $|x - e_n| \le \left(\frac{9}{10}\right)^n < \varepsilon$ .

So every ball containing x contains some endpoint of a removed interval, and thus an element of K.

6.2 2

$$\lambda \ll \mu \iff E \in \mathcal{M}, \mu(E) = 0 \implies \lambda(E) = 0.$$

### 6.2.1 a

By Radon-Nikodym, if  $\lambda \ll \mu$  then  $d\lambda = f d\mu$ , which would yield

$$\int g \ d\lambda = \int g f \ d\mu.$$

So let E be measurable and suppose  $\mu(E) = 0$ . Then

$$\lambda(E) := \int_{E} f \ d\mu = \lim_{n} \left\{ \varphi_{n} := \sum_{j} c_{j} \mu(E_{j}) \right\},$$

where we take a sequence of simple functions increasing to f.

But since each  $E_j \subseteq E$ , we must have  $\mu(E_j) = 0$  for any such  $E_j$ , so every such  $\varphi_n$  must be zero and thus  $\lambda(E) = 0$ .

### 6.2.2 b

By Radon-Nikodym, there exists a positive f such that

$$\int g \ dm = \int g f \ d\mu,$$

where we can take  $g(x) = x^2$ , then the LHS is zero by assumption and thus so is the RHS.

Note that qf is positive.

Define  $A_k = \left\{ x \in X \mid gf\chi_E > \frac{1}{k} \right\}$ , then by Chebyshev

$$\mu(A_k) \le k \int_E gf \ d\mu = 0,$$

which holds for every k.

Then noting that  $A_k \searrow A := \{x \in E \mid x^2 > 0\}$ , and gf is positive, we have

$$x \in E \iff gf\chi_E(x) > 0 \iff x \in A,$$

so E = A and  $\mu(E) = \mu(A)$ .

But since  $m \ll \mu$  by construction, we can conclude that m(E) = 0.

### 6.3 3

### 6.3.1 a

Letting  $x_n := \frac{1}{n}$ , we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |f_k(x)| \ge |f_n(x_n)| = \left| ae^{-ax} - be^{-bx} \right| := M.$$

In particular,  $\sup_{x} |f_n(x)| \not\longrightarrow 0$ , so the terms do not go to zero and the sum can not converge.

### 6.3.2 b

?

### 6.4 4

Switching to polar coordinates and integrating over a half-circle contained in  $I^2$ , we have

$$\int_{I^2} f \ge \int_0^\pi \int_0^1 \frac{\cos(\theta)\sin(\theta)}{r^2} \ dr \ d\theta = \infty,$$

so f is not integrable.

### 6.5 5

See https://math.stackexchange.com/questions/507263/prove-that-c1a-b-with-the-c1-norm-is-a-banach-space

This is clearly a norm, which we'll write  $\|\cdot\|_{u}$ 

Let  $f_n$  be a Cauchy sequence and define a candidate limit  $f(x) = \lim_n f_n(x)$ .

Then noting that  $||f_n||_{\infty}$ ,  $||f'_n||_{\infty} \le ||f_n||_u < \infty$ , both  $f_n$ ,  $f_n$  are Cauchy sequences in  $C^0([a, b], ||\cdot||_{\infty})$ , which is a Banach space.

So  $f_n \longrightarrow f$  uniformly, and  $f'_n \longrightarrow g$  uniformly for some g, and moreover  $f, g \in C^0([a, b])$ .

We thus have

$$f_n(x) - f_n(a) \xrightarrow{u} f(x) - f(a)$$

$$\int_a^x f'_n \xrightarrow{u} \int_a^x g,$$

and by the FTC, the left-hand sides are equal, and by uniqueness of limits so are the right-hand sides, so f' = g.

Since  $f, f' \in C^0([a, b])$ , they are bounded, and so  $||f||_u < \infty$ . This means that  $||f_n - f||_u \longrightarrow 0$ , so  $f_n$  converges to f, which is in the same space.

### 7 Fall 2017

### 7.1 1

Note that  $f(x) = e^x$  is entire and thus equal to its power series. So  $f(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{j!} x^j$ .

Letting  $f_N(x) = \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{1}{j!} x^j$ , we have  $f_N(x) \longrightarrow f(x)$  pointwise on  $(-\infty, \infty)$ .

For any compact interval [-M, M], we have

$$||f_N(x) - f(x)||_{\infty} = \sup_{-M \le x \le M} \left| \sum_{j=N+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{j!} x^j \right|$$

$$\le \sup_{-M \le x \le M} \sum_{j=N+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{j!} |x|^j$$

$$\le \sum_{j=N+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{j!} M^j$$

$$\le \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{j!} M^j$$

$$= e^M$$

$$< \infty,$$

so  $f_N \longrightarrow f$  uniformly on [-M, M] by the M-test. Thus it converges on any bounded interval. It does not converge on  $\mathbb{R}$ , since  $x^N$  is unbounded.

### 7.2 2

### 7.2.1 a

It suffices to consider the bounded case, i.e.  $E \subseteq B_M(0)$  for some M. Then write  $E_n = B_n(0) \cap E$  and apply the theorem to  $E_n$ , and by subadditivity,  $m^*(E) = m^*(\bigcup_n E_n) \le \sum_n m^*(E_n) = 0$ .

**Lemma:**  $f(x) = x^2, f^{-1}(x) = \sqrt{x}$  are Lipschitz on any compact subset of  $[0, \infty)$ .

Proof: Let g = f or  $f^{-1}$ . Then  $g \in C^1([0, M])$  for any M, so g is differentiable and g' is continuous. Since g' is continuous on a compact interval, it is bounded, so  $|g'(x)| \leq L$  for all x. Applying the MVT,

$$|f(x) - f(y)| = f'(c)|x - y| \le L|x - y|$$

**Lemma:** If g is Lipschitz on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , then  $m(E) = 0 \implies m(g(E)) = 0$ .

*Proof:* If g is Lipschitz, then

$$q(B_r(x)) \subseteq B_{Lr}(x)$$
,

which is a dilated ball/cube, and so

$$m^*(B_{Lr}(x)) \le L^n \cdot m^*(B_r(x)).$$

Now choose  $\{Q_j\} \rightrightarrows E$ ; then  $\{g(Q_j)\} \rightrightarrows g(E)$ .

By the above observation,

$$|g(Q_j)| \le L^n |Q_j|,$$

and so

$$m^*(g(E)) \le \sum_j |g(Q_j)| \le \sum_j L^n |Q_j| = L^n \sum_j |Q_j| \longrightarrow 0.$$

Now just take  $g(x) = x^2$  for one direction, and  $g(x) = f^{-1}(x) = \sqrt{x}$  for the other.

### 7.2.2 b

Lemma: E is measurable iff  $E = K \coprod N$  for some K compact, N null.

Write  $E = K \coprod N$  where K is compact and N is null.

Then 
$$\varphi^{-1}(E) = \varphi^{-1}(K \coprod N) = \varphi^{-1}(K) \coprod \varphi^{-1}(N)$$
.

Since  $\varphi^{-1}(N)$  is null by part (a) and  $\varphi^{-1}(K)$  is the preimage of a compact set under a continuous map and thus compact,  $\varphi^{-1}(E) = K' \coprod N'$  where K' is compact and N' is null, so  $\varphi^{-1}(E)$  is measurable.

So  $\varphi$  is a measurable function, and thus yields a well-defined map  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R})$  since it preserves measurable sets. Restricting to  $[0, \infty)$ , f is bijection, and thus so is  $\varphi$ .

### 7.3 3

From homework: E is Lebesgue measurable iff there exists a finite union of closed cubes A such that  $m(E\Delta A) < \varepsilon$ .

It suffices to show that S is dense in simple functions, and since simple functions are *finite* linear combinations of characteristic functions, it suffices to show this for  $\chi_A$  for A a measurable set.

Let  $s = \chi_A$ . By regularity of the Lebesgue measure, choose an open set  $O \supseteq A$  such that  $m(O \setminus A) < \varepsilon$ .

O is an open subset of  $\mathbb{R}$ , and thus  $O = \coprod_{j \in \mathbb{N}} I_j$  is a disjoint union of countably many open intervals.

Now choose N large enough such that  $m(O\Delta I_{N,n}) < \varepsilon = \frac{1}{n}$  where we define  $I_{N,n} := \coprod_{j=1}^{N} I_j$ .

Now define  $f_n = \chi_{I_{N,n}}$ , then

$$||s - f_n||_1 = \int |\chi_A - \chi_{I_{N,n}}| = m(A\Delta I_{N,n}) \xrightarrow{n \to \infty} 0.$$

7 FALL 2017

30

Since any simple function is a finite linear combination of  $\chi_{A_i}$ , we can do this for each i to extend this result to all simple functions. But simple functions are dense in  $L^1$ , so S is dense in  $L^1$ .

### 7.4 4

### 7.4.1 a

Let  $G(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} nx(1-x)^n$ . Applying the ratio test, we have

$$\left| \frac{(n+1)x(1-x)^{n+1}}{nx(1-x)^n} \right| = \frac{n+1}{n} |1-x| \stackrel{n \to \infty}{\longrightarrow} |1-x| < 1 \iff 0 \le x \le 2,$$

and in particular, this series converges on [0,2]. Thus its terms go to zero, and  $nx(1-x)^n \longrightarrow 0$  on  $[0,1] \subset [0,2]$ .

To see that the convergence is not uniform, let  $x_n = \frac{1}{n}$  and  $\varepsilon > \frac{1}{e}$ , then

$$\sup_{x \in [0,1]} |nx(1-x)^n - 0| \ge |nx_n(1-x_n)^n| = \left| \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^n \right| \stackrel{n \longrightarrow \infty}{\longrightarrow} e^{-1} > \varepsilon.$$

### 7.4.2 b

Note: could use the first part with  $\sin(x) \leq x$ , but then integral ends up more complicated.

Noting that  $sin(x) \leq 1$ , we have We have

$$\left| \int_0^1 n(1-x)^n \sin(x) \right| \le \int_0^1 |n(1-x)^n \sin(x)|$$

$$\le \int_0^1 |n(1-x)^n|$$

$$= n \int_0^1 (1-x)^n$$

$$= -\frac{n(1-x)^{n+1}}{n+1}$$

$$\stackrel{n \longrightarrow \infty}{\longrightarrow} 0.$$

### 7.5 5

#### 7.5.1 a

**Lemma:** If  $\varphi \in C_c^1$ , then  $(f * \varphi)' = f * \varphi'$  almost everywhere.

Silly Proof:

$$\mathcal{F}((f * \varphi)') = 2\pi i \xi \ \mathcal{F}(f * \varphi)$$

$$= 2\pi i \xi \ \mathcal{F}(f) \ \mathcal{F}(\varphi)$$

$$= \mathcal{F}(f) \cdot (2\pi i \xi \ \mathcal{F}(\varphi))$$

$$= \mathcal{F}(f) \cdot \mathcal{F}(\varphi')$$

$$= \mathcal{F}(f * \varphi').$$

Actual proof:

$$(f * \varphi)'(x) = (\varphi * f)'(x)$$

$$= \lim_{h \to 0} \frac{(\varphi * f)'(x+h) - (\varphi * f)'(x)}{h}$$

$$= \lim_{h \to 0} \int \frac{\varphi(x+h-y) - \varphi(x-y)}{h} f(y)$$

$$\stackrel{DCT}{=} \int \lim_{h \to 0} \frac{\varphi(x+h-y) - \varphi(x-y)}{h} f(y)$$

$$= \int \varphi'(x-y) f(y)$$

$$= (\varphi' * f)(x)$$

$$= (f * \varphi')(x).$$

To see that the DCT is justified, we can apply the MVT on the interval [0, h] to f to obtain

$$\frac{\varphi(x+h-y)-\varphi(x-y)}{h}=\varphi'(c)\quad c\in[0,h],$$

and since  $\varphi'$  is continuous and compactly supported,  $\varphi'$  is bounded by some  $M < \infty$  by the extreme value theorem and thus

$$\int \left| \frac{\varphi(x+h-y) - \varphi(x-y)}{h} f(y) \right| = \int \left| \varphi'(c) f(y) \right|$$

$$\leq \int |M| |f|$$

$$= |M| \int |f| < \infty,$$

since  $f \in L^1$  by assumption, so we can take g := |M||f| as the dominating function.

Applying this theorem infinitely many times shows that  $f * \varphi$  is smooth.

To see that  $f * \varphi$  is compactly supported, approximate f by a *continuous* compactly supported function h, so  $||h - f||_1 \xrightarrow{L^1} 0$ .

Now let  $g_x(y) = \varphi(x-y)$ , and note that  $\operatorname{supp}(g) = x - \operatorname{supp}(\varphi)$  which is still compact.

But since supp(h) is bounded, there is some N such that

$$|x| > N \implies A_x := \operatorname{supp}(h) \bigcap \operatorname{supp}(g_x) = \emptyset$$

and thus

$$(h * \varphi)(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \varphi(x - y)h(y) \ dy$$
$$= \int_{A_x} g_x(y)h(y)$$
$$= 0,$$

so  $\{x \mid f * g(x) = 0\}$  is open, and its complement is closed and bounded and thus compact.

### 7.5.2 b

$$||f * K_{j} - f||_{1} = \int \left| \int f(x - y)K_{j}(y) dy - f(x) \right| dx$$

$$= \int \left| \int f(x - y)K_{j}(y) dy - \int f(x)K_{j}(y) dy \right| dx$$

$$= \int \left| \int (f(x - y) - f(x))K_{j}(y) dy \right| dx$$

$$\leq \int \int \left| (f(x - y) - f(x)) \right| \cdot |K_{j}(y)| dy dx$$

$$\stackrel{FT}{=} \int \int \left| (f(x - y) - f(x)) \right| \cdot |K_{j}(y)| dx dy$$

$$= \int |K_{j}(y)| \left( \int \left| (f(x - y) - f(x)) \right| dx \right) dy$$

$$= \int |K_{j}(y)| \cdot ||f - \tau_{y}f||_{1} dy.$$

We now split the integral up into pieces.

- 1. Chose  $\delta$  small enough such that  $|y| < \delta \implies ||f \tau_y f||_1 < \varepsilon$  by continuity of translation in  $L^1$ , and
- 2. Since  $\varphi$  is compactly supported, choose J large enough such that

$$j > J \implies \int_{|y| > \delta} |K_j(y)| \ dy = \int_{|y| > \delta} |j\varphi(jy)| = 0$$

Then

$$||f * K_{j} - f||_{1} \leq \int |K_{j}(y)| \cdot ||f - \tau_{y}f||_{1} dy$$

$$= \int_{|y| < \delta} |K_{j}(y)| \cdot ||f - \tau_{y}f||_{1} dy + \int_{|y| \ge \delta} |K_{j}(y)| \cdot ||f - \tau_{y}f||_{1} dy$$

$$= \varepsilon \int_{|y| \ge \delta} |K_{j}(y)| + 0$$

$$\leq \varepsilon(1) \longrightarrow 0.$$

7 FALL 2017

### 7.6 6

### Should be supremum maybe..?

Let  $\{f_k\}$  be a Cauchy sequence, so  $||f_k|| < \infty$  for all k. Then for a fixed x, the sequence  $f_k(x)$  is Cauchy in  $\mathbb{R}$  and thus converges to some f(x), so define f by  $f(x) := \lim_{k \to \infty} f_k(x)$ .

Then  $||f_k - f|| = \max_{x \in X} |f_k(x) - f(x)| \stackrel{k \longrightarrow \infty}{\longrightarrow} 0$ , and thus  $f_k \longrightarrow f$  uniformly and thus f is continuous. It just remains to show that f has bounded norm.

Choose N large enough so that  $||f - f_N|| < \varepsilon$ , and write  $||f_N|| := M < \infty$ 

$$||f|| \le ||f - f_N|| + ||f_N|| < \varepsilon + M < \infty.$$

- 8 Spring 2016
- 8.1 1
- 9 Fall 2016
- 9.1 1
- 10 Spring 2014
- 10.1 1