Problem 1

Let I_1 and I_2 be two intervals in \mathbb{R}^2 . Show the following elementary fact: $I_1 \cup I_2$ is a union of finitely many non-overlapping intervals J_k for k = 1, ..., N, with

$$\sum_{k=1}^{N} v(J_k) \le v(I_1) + v(I_2).$$

Solution

We will solve this problem by proving the more general case:

Theorem 1. Let I_1 and I_2 be two intervals in \mathbb{R}^n . Then, $I_1 \cup I_2$ is a union of finitely many non-overlapping intervals J_k for k = 1, ..., N, with

$$\sum_{k=1}^{N} v(J_k) \le v(I_1) + v(I_2).$$

Proof. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and let x_i denote the i^{th} component of x. Since I_1 and I_2 are both intervals, we will write them as

$$I_k = \prod_{i=1}^n [a_i^k, b_i^k].$$

From elementary set theory, we have

$$I_1 \cup I_2 = (I_1 - I_2) \cup I_2$$

In this way, we have written $I_1 \cup I_2$ as a union of finitely many non-overlapping sets. Thus, if we can write each of these sets as a finite union of non-overlapping intervals, our proof will be complete.

Since I_2 is already an interval, all we have to show is that $I_1 - I_2$ can be written as a finite union of intervals. We have

$$x \in I_1 - I_2 \iff x \in I_1 \land x \notin I_2$$

$$\iff (\forall i \in \{1, ..., n\})(a_i^1 \le x_i \le b_i^1) \land (\exists i \in \{1, ..., n\})(x_i < a_i^2 \land x > b_i^2).$$

This leads us to a very straightforward way of partitioning $I_1 - I_2$ into a finite number of non overlapping intervals: For each $i \in \{1, ..., n\}$, we have at most a choice of three 1-dimensional intervals:

$$L_1^i = [a_i^1 \le x_i \le b_i^1]$$

$$L_2^i = [a_i^1 \le x_i \le \min\{a_i^2, b_i^1\}]$$

$$L_3^i = [\max\{a_i^1, b_i^2\} \le x_i \le b_i^1].$$

We note, that depending on the exact overlap of I_1 and I_2 , some of these 1-dimensional intervals may be empty (in which case, we discard). To prevent duplicates, we note that if $a_i^2 \geq b_i^1$, we will remove L_i^2 , as this would mean $L_i^2 = L_i^1$. Likewise, in the event that $a_i^1 \geq b_i^2$, remove L_3^i .

Now, by taking cartesian products of the form

$$\prod_{i=1}^{n} L^{i} \text{ for } L^{i} \in \{L_{1}^{i}, L_{2}^{i}, L_{3}^{i}\}$$

and removing

$$\prod_{i=1}^{n} L_1^i,$$

we have created a set of at most $3^n - 1$ non-overlapping intervals who's union is equal to $I_1 - I_2$. We will call this number of intervals N - 1, and define $J_N = I_2$.

August 28, 2022

Putting all of this together, we can create a union of finitely many non-overlapping intervals J_k for $k \in \{1, ..., N\}$ such that

$$I_1 \cup I_2 = \sum_{k=1}^N J_k.$$

Now all that remains is to show

$$\sum_{k=1}^{N} v(J_k) \le v(I_1) + v(I_2).$$

We note right away, that since $J_N = I_2$, this amounts to showing

$$\sum_{k=1}^{N-1} v(J_k) \le v(I_1).$$

Conveniently, this follows directly from the fact that I_2 is a superset of a finite union of non-overlapping intervals:

$$I_2 \supseteq \bigcup_{k=1}^{N-1} J_k.$$

Thus, our proof is complete.

Problem 2

Part (i):

Show that if $f : [a, b] \to \mathbb{R}$ is continuous where $-\infty < a < b < \infty$, the its graph $E = \{(x, f(x) : x \in [a, b]\}$ as a subset of \mathbb{R}^2 has the Lebesgue measure zero.

Part (ii):

Show that if $f: \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is uniformly continuous then its graph $E = \{(x, f(x) : x \in \mathbb{R}\}$ as a subset of \mathbb{R}^2 has the Lebesgue measure zero.

Solution

Before we jump into the proof, we will prove a useful lemma.

Lemma 1. If $f:[a,b] \to \mathbb{R}$ is continuous, then f is uniformly continuous.

Proof. Suppose that f is not uniformly continuous. Then,

$$(\exists \epsilon > 0)(\forall \delta > 0)(\exists x, y \in [a, b])(|x - y| < \delta \land |f(x) - f(y)| \ge \epsilon).$$

Fix this ϵ . Using the axiom of choice, we can construct two sequences $\{x_k\}$ and $\{y_k\}$ such that

$$|x_k - y_k| < \frac{1}{k} \wedge |f(x_k) - f(y_k)| \ge \epsilon$$

for all k. By sequential compactness of [a, b], there exists a convergent subsequence $\{x_{k_j}\}$ of $\{x_k\}$ that converges to some $x \in [a, b]$. Let $\epsilon_0 > 0$. Since $\{x_{k_j}\}$ converges to x, there exists some $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$|x_{k_j} - x| < \frac{\epsilon_0}{2}$$

for all $j \geq N$. Choose K such that $1/K < \frac{\epsilon_0}{2}$ and $K \geq N$. Then, we have for all $j \geq K$

$$|y_{k_j} - x| \le |y_{k_j} - x_{k_j}| + |x_{k_j} - x|$$

$$< \frac{\epsilon_0}{2} + \frac{\epsilon_0}{2}$$

$$< \epsilon_0.$$

August 28, 2022 2

Thus, we have shown that $\{y_{k_j}\}$ converges to x as well.

By construction of $\{y_{k_i}\}$, we have $\{f(y_{k_i})\}$ is not Cauchy, and more precisely we have

$$\lim_{j \to \infty} f(y_{k_j}) \neq f(x).$$

Thus, we have shown that f is not continuous, and we have proven the contrapositive of the lemma.

We will now begin the main proof.

Proof. Part (i):

Suppose $f:[a,b] \to \mathbb{R}$ is continuous where $-\infty < a < b < \infty$. Then, by Lemma 1, f is uniformly continuous on [a,b]. Let $\epsilon > 0$. Then, by Lemma 1, f is uniformly continuous on [a,b], and there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that for all $x,y \in [a,b]$,

$$|x - y| < \delta \implies |f(x) - f(f)| < \frac{\epsilon}{b - a}$$

Let $\{x_0,...,x_N\}$ be a partition of [a,b] such that $|x_k-x_{k-1}|<\delta$ for all $k\in\mathbb{N}$. Define

$$m_k = \min\{f(x)|x_{k-1} \le x < x\}, \text{ and } M_k = \max\{f(x)|x_{k-1} \le x < x\}.$$

Then, we have

$$\{[x_{k-1}, x_k] \times [m_k, M_k] | k \in \{1, ..., N\} \}$$

forms a covering (made of closed intervals) of the graph, G, of f. By the definition of outer measure, we have

$$|G|_{e} \leq \sum_{k=1}^{N} |[x_{k-1}, x_{k}] \times [m_{k}, M_{k}]|_{e}$$

$$= \sum_{k=1}^{N} (x_{k} - x_{k-1})(M_{k} - m_{k})$$

$$< \sum_{k=1}^{N} (x_{k} - x_{k-1}) \frac{\epsilon}{b - a}$$

$$= \frac{\epsilon}{b - a} \sum_{k=1}^{N} (x_{k} - x_{k-1})$$

$$= \frac{\epsilon}{b - a} (b - a)$$

By definition of a partition

Taking the limit as ϵ goes to 0, we have the desired result.

Part (ii):

Suppose $f: \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is uniformly continuous. For every integer a, define

$$p_a = \{(x, f(x)) | a - 1 \le x \le a\}.$$

By part (i), each of these sets has measure zero. Then, we can write the graph of f as a countable union of measurable sets with measure zero:

$$\{(x, f(x))|x \in \mathbb{R}\} = \bigcup_{a \in \mathbb{Z}} p_a.$$

Thus, by Theorem 3.12 in our textbook,

$$|\{(x, f(x))|x \in \mathbb{R}\}| \le \sum_{a \in \mathbb{Z}} |p_a|$$

= 0.

August 28, 2022 3