

**MATH 5210, HW II**  
**JORDAN SAETHRE**

1) A metric space  $X$  is separable if it contains a dense countable set  $S$ . Prove that any open set  $V$  in  $X$  is a union of balls centered at points in  $S$  and with rational radii. (Since the set of such balls is countable, it follows that any open set is a countable union of balls).

*Proof.*  $X$  is a metric space with distance function  $d$ . Let  $v \in V$  where  $V$  is any open set in  $X$ . There exists  $r > 0$  such that  $B_d(v, r) \subset V$ . There is also a rational number  $q \in (0, r/2)$  and an  $s \in S$  such that  $d(v, s) < q/2$  since  $S$  is dense in  $X$ . This implies  $v \in B_d(s, q)$ . Let  $y \in B_d(s, q)$  also. This implies that  $d(y, v) \leq d(y, s) + d(s, v) < q + q/2 < 2q < r$ , which implies  $y \in B_d(v, r) \subset V$  and  $v \in B_d(s, q) \subset V$ .  $\square$

2) Let  $X = [0, 1]^2$ . Choose the distance on  $X$  wisely, and use the previous exercise to prove that any open set in  $X$  is Lebesgue measurable.

*Proof.* Choose the distance on  $X$  to be  $d(x, y) = \max\{|x_1 - y_1|, |x_2 - y_2|\}$ . A ball in this space with this metric is a rectangle. Note that  $X$  is a separable metric space since it contains  $\mathbb{Q} \cap [0, 1] \times \mathbb{Q} \cap [0, 1]$  which is a countable subset that is dense in  $X$ . By exercise (1) above any open set is the countable union of balls. A set is Lebesgue measurable if it is the countable union of rectangles.  $\square$

3) Let  $P = [0, 1]^2$ . If  $E$  and  $F$  are two elementary sets such that  $E \cup F = P$  then  $m(E \cap F) = m(E) + m(F) - 1$ . Now assume  $E = \cup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i$  and  $F = \cup_{j=1}^{\infty} F_j$ , disjoint unions of elementary sets each, and  $E \cup F = P$ . Observe that  $E \cap F$  is the disjoint union of  $E_i \cap F_j$ . Prove that

$$\sum_{i,j} m(E_i \cap F_j) = \sum_i m(E_i) + \sum_j m(F_j) - 1.$$

*Proof.* To show the equality above we first show that

$$\sum_{i,j} m(E_i \cap F_j) \leq \sum_i m(E_i) + \sum_j m(F_j) - 1.$$

It suffices to show that for all  $N$

$$\sum_{i,j \leq N} m(E_i \cap F_j) \leq \sum_i m(E_i) + \sum_j m(F_j) - 1.$$

Let  $F_j$ 's remain as they are and define the following new sets to remove some of the overlaps.

$$\begin{aligned} E'_1 &= E_1 \setminus ((E_1 \cap F_1) \cup (E_1 \cap F_2) \cup \cdots \cup (E_1 \cap F_N)) \\ E'_2 &= E_2 \setminus ((E_2 \cap F_1) \cup (E_2 \cap F_2) \cup \cdots \cup (E_2 \cap F_N)) \\ &\vdots \\ E'_N &= E_N \setminus ((E_N \cap F_1) \cup (E_N \cap F_2) \cup \cdots \cup (E_N \cap F_N)) \end{aligned}$$

Now we have

$$\sum_{i,j \leq N} m(E_i \cap F_j) = \sum_i m(E_i) + \sum_j m(F_j) - \left[ \sum_i m(E'_i) + \sum_j m(F_j) \right]$$

Since not all overlap was removed  $\sum_i m(E'_i) + \sum_j m(F_j) \geq 1$  which implies that

$$\sum_{i,j \leq N} m(E_i \cap F_j) \leq \sum_i m(E_i) + \sum_j m(F_j) - 1.$$

To show the other direction, that is

$$\sum_{i,j} m(E_i \cap F_j) \geq \sum_i m(E_i) + \sum_j m(F_j) - 1$$

Set  $E' = \cup_{i \leq N} E_i$  and  $F' = \cup_{j \leq N} F_j$ . We have that  $E' \cup F' \subset P$ . We know that

$$\begin{aligned} m(E') + m(F') - m(E' \cap F') &= m(E' \cup F') \\ \implies m(E') + m(F') - m(E' \cup F') &= m(E' \cap F') \end{aligned}$$

Now putting this all together we have

$$\sum_{i \leq N} m(E_i) + \sum_{j \leq N} m(F_j) - \sum_{i,j \leq N} m(E_i \cup F_j) = \sum_{i,j \leq N} m(E_i \cap F_j) \leq \sum_{i,j} m(E_i \cap F_j)$$

Using the fact that  $m(E' \cup F') \leq m(P) = 1$  this implies that

$$\sum_{i \leq N} m(E_i) + \sum_{j \leq N} m(F_j) - 1 \leq \sum_{i \leq N} m(E_i) + \sum_{j \leq N} m(F_j) - \sum_{i,j \leq N} m(E_i \cup F_j) \leq \sum_{i,j} m(E_i \cap F_j)$$

This is true for all  $N$ . Pass to the limit and we have

$$\sum_i m(E_i) + \sum_j m(F_j) - 1 \leq \sum_{i,j} m(E_i \cap F_j)$$

□

4) Let  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n$  be a series of non-negative real numbers. Show that its sum (which can be  $\infty$ ) is equal to the supremum of the set of sums  $\sum_{n \in S} x_n$  where  $S$  runs over all finite subsets of the set of natural numbers. Conclude that any sequence of non-negative numbers can be added in any order.

*Proof.* Certainly  $\sum_{n \in S} x_n \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n$ . We also have that  $\sup\{\sum_{n \in S} x_n\} \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n$  this implies that there exists a  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\sum_{n=1}^N x_n \leq \sup\{\sum_{n \in S} x_n\}$ . Now pass to the limit and we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n=1}^N x_n \leq \sup \left( \sum_{n \in S} x_n \right)$$

Thus we have shown that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x_n = \sup \left( \sum_{n \in S} x_n \right)$$

□

5) In the following exercises,  $\mathcal{M}$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra of a non-empty set  $X$ , that is, a family of subsets of  $X$  closed under complements and countable unions, and  $\mu$  is a  $\sigma$ -measure. Let  $A_1 \supseteq A_2 \supseteq \dots$  be a sequence of sets in  $\mathcal{M}$ . Let  $A = \bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i$ . Prove that  $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mu(A_i) = \mu(A)$ , assuming that  $\mu(X) = 1$ .

*Proof.*  $A_i$ 's are not disjoint. Set  $B_i = A_i \setminus A_{i+1} = A_i \cap (A_{i+1})^c$ .  $B_i$ 's are pairwise disjoint.

$$\begin{aligned} \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} B_i &= \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} (A_i \cap (A_{i+1})^c) \\ &= \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} (A_i) \cap (\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} (A_{i+1})^c) \quad (\text{union is distributive}) \\ &= A_1 \cap (\bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} A_{i+1})^c \quad (\text{since sets are nested and by Demorgan's Laws}) \\ &= A_1 \cap (A)^c \quad (\text{by definition of } A) \\ &\implies (\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} B_i) \cup A = A_1 \end{aligned}$$

$\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} B_i$  and  $A$  are disjoint therefore

$$\mu(\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} B_i) \cup A = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu(B_i) + \mu(A) = \mu(A_1)$$

Which implies

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(A) &= \mu(A_1) - \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu(B_i) \\ &= \mu(A_1) - \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} [\mu(A_i) - \mu(A_{i+1})] \\ &= \mu(A_1) - [(\mu(A_1) - \mu(A_2)) + (\mu(A_2) - \mu(A_3)) + \dots] \\ &= \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mu(A_i) \end{aligned}$$

□

6) A subset of  $X$  is called measurable if it belongs to  $\mathcal{M}$ . Let  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  prove that  $\{x|f(x) < c\}$  is measurable  $\forall c \in \mathbb{R}$  if and only if  $\{x|f(x) \leq c\}$  is measurable  $\forall c \in \mathbb{R}$ .

*Proof.* ( $\implies$ ) First assume that  $\{x|f(x) < c\}$  is measurable  $\forall c \in \mathbb{R}$ . Let  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , then  $\{x|f(x) < c + \frac{1}{k}\}$  is measurable.  $\cap_k \{x|f(x) < c + \frac{1}{k}\}$  is also measurable since it is a union of measurable sets.

( $\impliedby$ ) Now assume that  $\{x|f(x) \leq c\}$  is measurable  $\forall c \in \mathbb{R}$ . Let  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , then  $\{x|f(x) \leq c - \frac{1}{k}\}$  is measurable.  $\cap_k \{x|f(x) \leq c - \frac{1}{k}\}$  is measurable since it is a union of measurable sets.

Since both directions were proved we can conclude that  $\{x|f(x) < c\}$  is measurable  $\forall c \in \mathbb{R}$  if and only if  $\{x|f(x) \leq c\}$  is measurable  $\forall c \in \mathbb{R}$   $\square$

7) Let  $f_n : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a sequence of measurable functions on  $X$ . Prove that

$$g(x) = \inf\{f_1(x), f_2(x), \dots\} \text{ and } G(x) = \sup\{f_1(x), f_2(x), \dots\}$$

are measurable functions.

*Proof. Supremum:*

First we will show that  $G(x)$  is measurable. Let  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ . We want to show that  $\{x|G(x) > c\} = \cup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{x|f_n(x) > c\}$ , i.e. that  $\{x|G(x) > c\}$  is a countable union of measurable sets.

Assume  $y \in \{x|G(x) > c\}$ , then  $G(y) > c$ . If  $f_n(y) \leq c$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  then  $c$  is an upper bound for  $\{f_n(y)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\}$ . This would imply that  $G(y) \leq c$ , but  $G(y) > c$  so  $f_m(y) > c$  for some  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , which means  $y \in \{x|f_m(x) > c\}$  and  $y \in \cup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{x|f_n(x) > c\}$ . This shows that  $\{x|G(x) > c\} \subseteq \cup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{x|f_n(x) > c\}$ .

Now assume  $z \in \cup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{x|f_n(x) > c\}$ , then  $z \in \{x|f_k(x) > c\}$  for some  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  which implies  $f_k(z) > c$ . Since  $G(z)$  is the least upper bound we have that  $G(z) \geq f_k(z) > c$ , hence  $z \in \{x|G(x) > c\}$ . This shows that  $\cup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{x|f_n(x) > c\} \subseteq \{x|G(x) > c\}$ .

Since both  $\cup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{x|f_n(x) > c\} \subseteq \{x|G(x) > c\}$  and  $\{x|G(x) > c\} \subseteq \cup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{x|f_n(x) > c\}$  are true we have that  $\{x|G(x) > c\} = \cup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{x|f_n(x) > c\}$  and therefore since  $c$  is arbitrary  $G(x)$  is measurable.

**Infimum:**

The proof that  $g(x)$  is measurable is almost identical to the above argument. Let  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ . We want to show that  $\{x|g(x) < c\} = \cup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{x|f_n(x) < c\}$ , i.e. that  $\{x|g(x) < c\}$  is a countable union of measurable sets.

Assume  $y \in \{x|g(x) < c\}$ , then  $g(y) < c$ . If  $f_n(y) \geq c$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  then  $c$  is a lower bound for  $\{f_n(y)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\}$ . This would imply that  $g(y) \geq c$ , but  $g(y) < c$  so  $f_m(y) < c$  for some  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , which means  $y \in \{x|f_m(x) < c\}$  and  $y \in \cup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{x|f_n(x) < c\}$ . This shows that  $\{x|g(x) < c\} \subseteq \cup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{x|f_n(x) < c\}$ .

Now assume  $z \in \cup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{x | f_n(x) < c\}$ , then  $z \in \{x | f_k(x) < c\}$  for some  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  which implies  $f_k(z) < c$ . Since  $g(z)$  is the greatest lower bound we have that  $g(z) \leq f_k(z) < c$ , hence  $z \in \{x | g(x) < c\}$ . This shows that  $\cup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{x | f_n(x) < c\} \subseteq \{x | g(x) < c\}$ .

Since both  $\cup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{x | f_n(x) < c\} \subseteq \{x | g(x) < c\}$  and  $\{x | g(x) < c\} \subseteq \cup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{x | f_n(x) < c\}$  are true we have that  $\{x | g(x) < c\} = \cup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{x | f_n(x) < c\}$  and therefore since  $c$  is arbitrary  $g(x)$  is measurable. □

8) Let  $f$  be an integrable function on  $X$ , such that  $f(x) \geq 0$  for all  $x \in X$ . Prove that  $\int_X f = 0$  if and only if the measure of  $A = \{x \in X | f(x) > 0\}$  is 0, that is  $f = 0$  almost everywhere. Hint, consider the sets  $A_n = \{x \in X | f(x) > 1/n\}$  for  $n = 1, 2, \dots$

*Proof.* Assume  $\int_X f = 0$ . Then by the Chebychev inequality

$$0 \leq \mu(\{x \in X | f(x) \geq \frac{1}{n}\}) \leq \frac{1}{n} \int_X f = 0$$

which implies that  $\mu(\{x \in X | f(x) \geq \frac{1}{n}\}) = 0$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , that is  $f = 0$  almost everywhere.

Now assume  $f = 0$  almost everywhere. Then every nonnegative simple function  $f_n$  approximating  $f$  from below is zero almost everywhere and is of the form  $f_n = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \chi_{A_i}$  where either  $c_i = 0$  or  $\mu(A_i) = 0$ . Then  $\int_X f_n = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \mu(A_i) = 0$ .

Therefore  $\int_X f = \sup\{\int_X f_n | f_n \text{ is simple, } f_n \leq f\} = 0$ . □

9) Let  $X = (0, 1]$ , with the usual measure, and let  $f(x) = 1/\sqrt{x}$ . Use the monotone convergence theorem to prove that  $f$  is integrable and compute its integral.

Let  $f_n(x) = f(x) \cdot \chi_{[\frac{1}{n}, 1]}$  so that  $f_1(x) \leq f_2(x) \leq \dots$ , i.e. a monotone sequence.

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{[\frac{1}{n}, 1]} f_n(x) &= \int_{\frac{1}{n}}^1 f = \int_{\frac{1}{n}}^1 \frac{1}{\sqrt{x}} dx = 2\sqrt{x} \Big|_{x=\frac{1}{n}}^{x=1} = 2 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} 2 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} &= 2 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore by the Monotone Convergence Theorem

$$\int_{(0,1]} \frac{1}{\sqrt{x}} = 2$$