

# Homework

Frederick Robinson

7 April 2010

## 1 Problem 3

### 1.1 Question

A set of real numbers is said to be a  $G_\delta$  set if it is the countable intersection of open sets

Show that for any bounded set  $E \subset \mathbb{R}$ , there is a  $G_\delta$  set for which

$$E \subseteq G \quad \text{and} \quad m^*(G) = m^*(E).$$

### 1.2 Answer

*Proof.* By the definition of outer measure for any  $\epsilon = 1/n$  there exists some open cover of  $E$  say  $G_n$  such that

$$m^*(E) < \sum_{I \in G_n} l(I) \leq m^*(E) + \epsilon$$

If we let  $G = \bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} G_i$  I claim that  $G$  is  $G_\delta$  and moreover that it has  $E \subseteq G$  and  $m^*(G) = m^*(E)$ .

It is clear that  $G$  is  $G_\delta$  since it is defined as the intersection of countably many open covers. Moreover, since each  $G_n$  has  $E$  as a subset (by definition of cover) their intersection must also have  $E \subseteq G$ .

Finally, we must verify that  $m^*(G) = m^*(E)$ . Since  $E \subseteq G$  we have by a proof in class that  $m^*(G) \geq m^*(E)$ . By definition of  $G$  we have that  $G \subseteq G_n$  for all  $n$ . So,  $m^*(G) \leq m^*(G_n)$ . Therefore, since given  $\delta$  there is some  $G_n$  with  $m^*(G_n) - m^*(E) < \delta$  it follows that  $m^*(G) \leq m^*(E)$ . Hence  $m^*(E) = m^*(G)$  as desired.  $\square$

## 2 Problem 6

### 2.1 Question

Let  $E \subset \mathbb{R}$  be a measurable set with  $m(E) > 0$ . Prove that for any  $\alpha < 1$  there is an open interval  $I \subset \mathbb{R}$  such that  $m(E \cap I) > \alpha m(I)$ .

### 2.2 Answer

*Proof.* First consider the case where  $m(E) < \infty$ . By definition of outer measure, for any  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists some open cover of  $E$  say  $\{A_k\}$  such that

$$m(E) \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} l(A_k) < \epsilon + m(E)$$

Moreover, we can reduce any such open cover to a open cover by disjoint open sets  $\{A'_k\}$  by taking  $A'_1 = A_1$  and  $A'_i = A_i \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} A_j$ . Finally we can take each  $A'_i$  to be an interval since all open sets in  $\mathbb{R}$  are countable unions of open intervals and countable collections of countable things are countable.

Suppose towards a contradiction that there exists  $\alpha < 1$  such that  $m(E \cap I) \leq \alpha m(I)$  for all open intervals  $I$ . Since each  $A'_i$  is an interval they are all measurable. Hence  $E \cap A'_i$  is measurable for all  $i$ , and by the countable additivity of measurable sets we have

$$m(E) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} m(E \cap A'_i) \leq \alpha \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} m(A'_i) < \alpha(\epsilon + m(E))$$

Since  $\epsilon > 0$  was arbitrary and  $\alpha < 1$  this is a contradiction.

In the case where  $m(E) = \infty$  consider the set  $E'_x = E \cap (-x, x)$  for  $x \in \mathbb{R}^+$ . For any  $x$  this set is measurable since intervals are always measurable and the intersection of two measurable sets is measurable. Moreover, there must be some  $x$  such that  $m(E'_x) \neq 0$  since the measure of  $E$  is nonzero. Fixing one such  $E'_x$  we can apply the proof from the first case to demonstrate that there exists some interval such that  $m(E \cap I) > \alpha m(I)$  for any  $\alpha < 1$ .  $\square$

### 3 Problem 7

#### 3.1 Question

Let  $E \subset \mathbb{R}$  be a measurable set with  $m(E) > 0$ . Prove that the set

$$E - E = \{x - y : x, y \in E\}$$

contains an interval.

**Hint:** take  $\alpha > 3/4$  and let  $I$  be as in the previous exercise. Then  $E - E$  contains  $(-\frac{1}{2}m(I), \frac{1}{2}m(I))$ .

#### 3.2 Answer

*Proof.* By the previous exercise there exists some interval  $I = (a, b) \subset \mathbb{R}$  such that  $m(I \cap E) > 3/4m(I)$ . I claim that  $(-\frac{1}{2}m(I), \frac{1}{2}m(I)) \subset E - E$ . Assume towards a contradiction that there is some  $x \in (-\frac{1}{2}m(I), \frac{1}{2}m(I))$  such that  $x \notin E - E$ . Then for any  $y \in E \cap I$  we have  $y - x \notin E \cap I$  and  $y + x \notin E \cap I$ .

Since the measure is invariant under translation we know  $m(I \cap E + x) = m(I \cap E) > 3/4m(I)$ . These are disjoint sets, each of which is measurable, so  $m(I \cap E + x) + m(I \cap E) = m((I \cap E + x) \cup (I \cap E)) > 3/2m(I) = 3/2(b - a)$ . Yet  $(I \cap E + x) \cup (I \cap E) \subset (a, b + x)$  and  $m(a, b + x) = b + x - a < 3/2(b - a)$ . Contradiction.  $\square$