

### 4.A.1

Suppose  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  is a measure space and  $h : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is an  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable function. Prove that

$$\mu(\{x \in X : |h(x)| \geq c\}) \leq \frac{1}{c^p} \int |h|^p d\mu$$

for all positive numbers  $c$  and  $p$ .

*Proof.* Suppose  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  is a measure space and  $h : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is an  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable function. We'll break this into 3 cases (#1)  $c \geq 1$  and  $p > 0$ , (#2)  $0 < c < 1$  and  $0 < p < 1$ , and (#3)  $0 < c < 1$  and  $p \geq 1$ .

1. ( $c \geq 1$  and  $p > 0$ )

Note in this case  $1 < c \leq c^p$ , for all  $c, p$  being consider in this case, with that consider the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\{x \in X : |h(x)| \geq c\}) &= \frac{1}{c^p} \int_{\{x \in X : |h(x)| \geq c\}} c^p d\mu \\ &\leq \frac{1}{c^p} \int_{\{x \in X : |h(x)| \geq c\}} |h(x)|^p d\mu \\ &\leq \frac{1}{c^p} \int |h|^p d\mu \end{aligned}$$

the second-to-last inequality comes from  $|h| \geq c > 1$  implying  $|h|^p \geq c^p > 1$ . This is our result when  $c \geq 1$  and  $p > 0$ .

2. ( $0 < c < 1$  and  $0 < p < 1$ )

Note that in this case we also have  $c \leq c^p \leq 1$ , for all  $c, p$  being considered in this case, with that consider the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\{x \in X : |h(x)| \geq c\}) &= \frac{1}{c^p} \int_{\{x \in X : |h(x)| \geq c\}} c^p d\mu \\ &= \frac{1}{c^p} \int_{\{x \in X : 1 > |h(x)| \geq c\}} c^p d\mu + \frac{1}{c^p} \int_{\{x \in X : |h(x)| \geq 1 \geq c\}} c^p d\mu \\ &\leq \frac{1}{c^p} \int_{\{x \in X : 1 > |h(x)| \geq c\}} |h|^p d\mu + \frac{1}{c^p} \int_{\{x \in X : |h(x)| \geq 1\}} |h|^p d\mu \\ &\leq \frac{1}{c^p} \int |h|^p d\mu, \end{aligned}$$

the second equality comes from disjoint additivity of integrals, the second-to-last inequality comes from  $|h(x)| \geq c$  implying  $|h(x)|^p \geq c^p$  for the first term, for the second term if  $|h(x)| \geq 1$  then  $|h(x)|^p \geq 1$  giving us  $|h(x)|^p \geq c^p$ , the final inequality comes from the two set's being disjoint, hence we can employ additivity over the domain of integration. This proves our result when  $0 < c < 1$  and  $0 < p < 1$ .

3. ( $0 < c < 1$  and  $p \geq 1$ )

In this case we have  $0 < c^p \geq c < 1$  for all  $c, p$  considered in this case, with that in mind consider the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\{x \in X : |h(x)| \geq c\}) &= \frac{1}{c^p} \int_{\{x \in X : |h(x)| \geq c\}} c^p d\mu \\ &= \frac{1}{c^p} \left( \int_{\{x \in X : |h(x)| \geq 1 > c\}} c^p d\mu + \int_{\{x \in X : 1 > |h(x)| \geq c\}} c^p d\mu \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{c^p} \left( \int_{\{x \in X : |h(x)| \geq 1 > c\}} |h| d\mu + \int_{\{x \in X : 1 > |h(x)| \geq c\}} |h|^p d\mu \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{c^p} \left( \int_{\{x \in X : |h(x)| \geq 1 > c\}} |h|^p d\mu + \int_{\{x \in X : 1 > |h(x)| \geq c\}} |h|^p d\mu \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{c^p} \int |h|^p d\mu, \end{aligned}$$

the second equality comes from disjoint additivity of integrals, the second inequality comes from  $|h(x)| \geq 1 > c \geq c^p$  in the first term and the second term is using the fact that  $|h(x)| \geq c$  implies  $|h(x)|^p \geq c^p$ , the third inequality uses the fact that for the first term  $|h(x)| \leq |h(x)|^p$  for  $|h(x)| \geq 1$ , the final inequality is disjoint additivity of integrals. This gives us our result when  $0 < c < 1$  and  $p \geq 1$ .

Thus we have shown the result holds for all  $c > 0$  and  $p > 0$ . □

## 4.A.2

Suppose  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  is a measure space with  $\mu(X) = 1$  and  $h \in \mathcal{L}^1(\mu)$ . Prove that

$$\mu \left( \left\{ x \in X : \left| h(x) - \int h \, d\mu \right| \geq c \right\} \right) \leq \frac{1}{c^2} \left( \int h^2 \, d\mu - \left( \int h \, d\mu \right)^2 \right)$$

for all  $c > 0$ .

*Proof.* Suppose  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  is a measure space with  $\mu(X) = 1$  and  $h \in \mathcal{L}^1(\mu)$ .

First, note that since  $h \in \mathcal{L}^1(\mu)$  we have that  $\int |h| \, d\mu < \infty$  and that  $h$  is  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable, implying both  $\int h \, d\mu$  is defined and  $|\int h \, d\mu| < \infty$  (3.23). Since we have that  $|\int h \, d\mu| < \infty$  we can conclude that  $\int h \, d\mu < \infty$ . So then we have that the function  $|h(x) - \int h \, d\mu| \in \mathcal{L}^1(\mathbb{R})$ . Furthermore, since  $\int |h| \, d\mu < \infty$  an application of the triangle inequality gives us:

$$\int \left| h(x) - \int h \, d\mu \right| \, d\mu < \infty.$$

Consider the case now where  $\int |h|^2 \, d\mu = \int h^2 \, d\mu = \infty$ . In which case, the inequality should immediately follow, since we have shown that  $\int h \, d\mu < \infty$ .

Now assume that  $\int |h|^2 \, d\mu = \int h^2 \, d\mu < \infty$ . Hence this function meets the hypotheses of 4.A.1, giving us the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\{x \in X : |h(x) - \int h \, d\mu| \geq c\}) &\leq \frac{1}{c^2} \int \left| h(x) - \int h \, d\mu \right|^2 \, d\mu \\ &= \frac{1}{c^2} \int \left( h(x) - \int h \, d\mu \right)^2 \, d\mu \\ &= \frac{1}{c^2} \int \left( h^2(x) - 2h(x) \int h \, d\mu + \left( \int h \, d\mu \right)^2 \right) \, d\mu \\ &= \frac{1}{c^2} \left( \int h^2 \, d\mu + \int (-2h \int h \, d\mu) + \int \left( \int h \, d\mu \right)^2 \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{c^2} \left( \int h^2 \, d\mu - 2 \left( \int h \, d\mu \right)^2 + \mu(X) \left( \int h \, d\mu \right)^2 \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{c^2} \left( \int h^2 \, d\mu - 2 \left( \int h \, d\mu \right)^2 + \left( \int h \, d\mu \right)^2 \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{c^2} \left( \int h^2 \, d\mu - \left( \int h \, d\mu \right)^2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

the inequality is an application of 4.A.1, the third equality uses integration distributing over addition and scalar multiplication and the fact that since  $\int |h|^2 < \infty$  and  $\int |h| < \infty$  any multiple of it must then also must be clearly finite when that scalar is finite. Combining the first line with last is the result we wished to prove!  $\square$

## 4.A.4

Show that the constant 3 in the Vitali Covering Lemma (4.4) cannot be replaced by a smaller positive constant.

**Lemma.** *If  $I = (a, b)$  is an open interval and  $c > 0$ , then  $c * I = (-\frac{c(b-a)}{2} + \frac{b+a}{2}, \frac{b+a}{2} + \frac{c(b-a)}{2})$  has the same center as  $I$  and  $c$ -times the length of  $I$ ; that is  $|I| = b - a$  and  $|c * I| = c(b - a)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $I = (a, b)$  and  $c > 0$  be fixed. Note that the mid-point of  $I$  is  $\frac{a+b}{2}$ . Moreover  $I$  is defined by all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  such that:  $a < x < b$ . We can rewrite this as all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$|x - \frac{b+a}{2}| < \frac{b-a}{2}$$

. So that scaling this open ball by  $c$  is as simple as

$$|x - \frac{b+a}{2}| < \frac{c(b-a)}{2} \iff -\frac{c(b-a)}{2} + \frac{a+b}{2} < x < \frac{a+b}{2} + \frac{c(b-a)}{2}.$$

Moreover the length of this interval is  $c(b-a)$  and has midpoint  $\frac{a+b}{2}$ . This is what we wished to prove!  $\square$

*Proof.* Let  $0 < c < 3$  be fixed and  $\epsilon = 1 - \frac{c}{3}$  (notice  $\epsilon > 0$ ). Let  $I_1 = (-1, +1)$  so that  $c * I = (-c, c)$ . Now let  $I_2 = (1 - \epsilon, c + \epsilon)$ . So that  $c * I_2 = (-\frac{c(c+2\epsilon-1)}{2} + \frac{c+1}{2}, \frac{c+1}{2} + \frac{c(c-1+2\epsilon)}{2})$ . Now note that  $I_1 \cup I_2 = (-1, c + \epsilon)$  and that  $I_1 \cap I_2 \neq \emptyset$ . So because these are not disjoint the only list of disjoint sets are  $(I_1)$  and  $(I_2)$ . So since  $c < c + \epsilon$  we have  $I_1 \cup I_2 \not\subset c * I_1$ . To finish the proof, we'll show that  $-1 < \frac{-c(c+2\epsilon-1)}{2} + \frac{c+1}{2}$ , to do this in a somewhat natural way we'll show that this statement is logically equivalent to  $c^2 < 9$

which is true for all  $0 < c < 3$ . So consider the following:

$$\begin{aligned} -1 &< \frac{-c(c + 2\epsilon - 1) + c + 1}{2} \\ \iff -2 &< -c^2 - 2c\epsilon + 2c + 1 \\ \iff 0 &< -c^2 + 2c(1 - \epsilon) + 3 \\ \iff 0 &< -c^2 + 2c\frac{c}{3} + 3 \\ \iff 0 &< \frac{-c^2}{3} + 3 \\ \iff c^2 &< 9, \end{aligned}$$

because this last statement is true for all  $0 < c < 3$ , we have that are first statement is true. This implies  $I_1 \cup I_2 \not\subset c * I_2$ .

So since  $0 < c < 3$  is arbitrary, we have that the Vitali Covering Lemma cannot hold for anything less than 3, so 3 is the least constant that works for the lemma.  $\square$

## 4.A.6

Verify the formula in Example 4.7 for the Hardy-Littlewood maximal function of  $\chi_{[0,1]}$ .

*Proof.* First, note that we have for any  $b \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $h \in \mathcal{L}^1(\mathbb{R})$

$$h^*(b) = \sup_{t>0} \frac{1}{2t} \int_{b-t}^{b+t} |h| \leq \sup_{t>0} \sup_{[b-t, b+t]} |h| = \sup_{\mathbb{R}} |h|.$$

In this particular case of  $h = \chi_{[0,1]}$  we'll have  $\chi_{[0,1]}^*(b) \leq 1$  for all  $b \in \mathbb{R}$ .

Next note that we get the following from the definition of the integral over a subset and the definition of a characteristic function:

$$\chi_{[0,1]}^* = \sup_{t>0} \frac{1}{2t} \int_{b-t}^{b+t} \chi_{[0,1]} = \sup_{t>0} \frac{1}{2t} \int \chi_{[b-t, b+t]} \chi_{[0,1]} = \sup_{t>0} \frac{1}{2t} \int \chi_{[0,1] \cap [b-t, b+t]} = \sup_{t>0} \frac{1}{2t} \lambda([0, 1] \cap [b-t, b+t]).$$

We'll then determine the values of this on the intervals:  $(0, 1)$ ,  $(-\infty, 0]$ ,  $[1, \infty)$ . Note that we'll only go through the explanation for  $(-\infty, 0]$ , but that the same reasoning will apply to  $[1, \infty)$  instead with a  $b+t=1$  replaced with  $b-t=0$ .

1.  $(b \in (0, 1))$

Note that in this case whatever the value of  $b$ , we may choose a  $t > 0$  such that  $[b-t, b+t] \subseteq [0, 1]$ , so that by the preceding paragraph:

$$\frac{1}{2t} \lambda([b-t, b+t] \cap [0, 1]) = \frac{1}{2t} (b+t - b+t) = 1.$$

Since we have that  $\chi_{[0,1]}^*(b)$  is the sup of all such values determined in this way, and we have  $\chi_{[0,1]}^*(b) = 1$  for all  $0 < b < 1$ .

2.  $(b \in [1, \infty))$

In this case we can rule out that the supremum occurs for any  $t > 0$  such that  $b+t \leq 0$ , since the value of the integral will be 0 for such  $b+t$ . So consider  $b+t > 0$ . Then the maximization problem becomes:

$$\sup_{t>0} \frac{1}{2t} \lambda([0, b+t] \cap [0, 1]).$$

Note that we can rule out that the supremum occurs to the right of 1, since the integral won't become larger for  $b+t > 1$ . So consider  $0 < b+t \leq 1$ , then  $\lambda([0, b+t] \cap [0, 1]) = b+t \leq 1$ . Then the problem becomes:

$$\sup_{t>0} \frac{b+t}{2t} = \sup_{t>0} \frac{b}{2t} + \frac{1}{2}.$$

Since we have  $b \in (-\infty, 0]$ , the quantity  $\frac{b}{2t}$  will only become larger as  $t > 0$  increases. Meaning that it will attain a maximum at  $b + t = 1$ , that is when  $t = 1 - b$ . Hence the maximization problem is solved for this value of  $t > 0$ , giving us:

$$\chi_{[0,1]}^*(b) = \frac{1}{2(1-b)}$$

for all  $b \in (-\infty, 0]$ .

3. ( $b \in [1, \infty)$ )

Almost identical reasoning can be applied here as was employed in the previous case. Except that  $b - t$  is the variable in question, and the quantity in question will similarly attain a maximum at  $b - t = 0$ , giving us

$$\chi_{[0,1]}^*(b) = \frac{1}{2b}$$

for all  $b \in [1, \infty)$ .

Hence we have:

$$\chi_{[0,1]}^*(b) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } b \in (0, 1) \\ \frac{1}{2(1-b)} & \text{if } b \in (-\infty, 0] \\ \frac{1}{2b} & \text{if } b \in [1, \infty) \end{cases}.$$

□



### 4.A.7

Find a formula for the Hardy-Littlewood maximal function of the characteristic function of  $[0, 1] \cup [2, 3]$ .

*Proof.* Let  $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be defined by  $h(x) = \chi_{[0,1]}(x) + \chi_{[2,3]}(x)$ . Define  $T(b, t) = \frac{1}{2t} \int_{b-t}^{b+t} |h|$ . Then I claim then that

$$h^*(b) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{3-b} & -\infty < b < -1 \\ \frac{1}{2(1-b)} & -1 \leq b \leq 0 \\ 1 & 0 < b < 1 \text{ or } 2 < b < 3 \\ 1 - \frac{1}{2b} & 1 \leq b \leq \frac{3}{2} \\ \frac{5-2b}{2(3-b)} & \frac{3}{2} \leq b \leq 2 \\ \frac{1}{2(b-2)} & 3 \leq b \leq 4 \\ \frac{1}{b} & 4 < b < \infty \end{cases}$$

1.  $(-\infty < b < -1)$

For such a  $b$ , note that  $\frac{1}{2t} \int_{b-t}^{b+t} |h| = 0$  until  $b+t > 0$ . So that for  $b+t < 1$ , we'll have

$$A(b, t) = \frac{1}{2t} \int_0^{b+t} 1 = \frac{b+t}{2t} = \frac{b}{2t} + \frac{1}{2},$$

since  $b < 0$  this quantity increases as  $t$  increases, so that we must have at least  $b+t \geq 1$ . Note that  $1 \leq b+t < 2$  would gain us no area under the integral and would only decrease the value of  $A(b, t)$ , so we'll consider when  $b+t > 2$ , giving us:  $\frac{1}{2t}(1 + \int_2^{b+t} 1) = \frac{1}{2t}(b+t-1) = \frac{b}{t} + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2t}$ . Clearly the area gained by the integral will increase until  $b+t = 3$ , so that  $A(b, 3-b) = \frac{1}{3-b}$ . Notice that this is greater than  $A(b, 1-b) = \frac{1}{2(1-b)} = \frac{1}{2-2b}$ , to show this concretely notice that for  $b < -1$ :

$$3-b < 2-2b \iff 1-b < -2b \iff \frac{1}{-b} + 1 < 2,$$

with this last statement being true we must have  $3 - b < 2 - 2b$  hence  $A(b, 1 - b) < A(b, 3 - b)$ . Moreover, notice that it was at these two points that the most area was accumulated in the preceding intervals. Implying that the supremum over  $t$  of  $A(b, t)$  must occur either when  $t = 3 - b$  or  $t = 1 - b$ . By the preceding argument, we have then that  $h^*(b) = \frac{1}{3 - b}$  for all  $-\infty < b < -1$ .

2. ( $4 < b < \infty$ )

Notice that in this case, we can apply the same reasoning as in case 1. Except the maximum will occur when  $b - t = 0$  giving us the value of  $\frac{1}{2b}(1 + 1) = \frac{1}{b}$ .

3. ( $-1 \leq b \leq 0$ )

For  $b \in [-1, 0]$ , note that the value of  $A(b, t)$  will be 0 until  $b + t > 0$ . In fact for  $b + t \leq 1$  we'll have

$$\frac{1}{2t} \int_0^{b+t} 1 = \frac{(b+t)}{2t} = \frac{b}{2t} + \frac{1}{2},$$

since  $b \leq 0$  we'll have that as  $t$  increases  $b + t$  will increase. So that  $A(b, t)$  for  $1 \geq b + t > 0$  will attain a maximum at  $b + t = 1$ ; that is when  $t = 1 - b$ . Now, note that when  $1 < b + t \leq 2$ ,  $A(b, t)$  will only decrease, so we'll consider when  $b + t > 2$ . Consider now  $2 < b + t \leq 3$

$$\frac{1}{2t} (1 + \int_2^{b+t} 1) = \frac{b+t-1}{2t} = \frac{b}{2t} + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2t},$$

we'll also have that since  $b \leq 0$  that this quantity will only increase  $b + t \leq 3$  increases. Implying a maximum occurs for  $2 < b + t \leq 3$  occurs when  $b + t = 3$ , with a maximum of  $A(b, 3 - b) = \frac{1}{3 - b}$ . Now notice the similarity to the first case, however here we have that  $-1 \leq b \leq 0$ . So consider

$$2 - 2b \leq 3 - b \iff -b \leq 1,$$

this last statement is certainly true for  $-1 \leq b \leq 0$ , giving us that  $A(b, 1 - b) \geq A(b, 3 - b)$ . By our previous arguments, we've seen that these are the only two possibly points for the maximum. The above inequality implies  $h^*(b) = \frac{1}{2(1 - b)}$  for all  $b \in [-1, 0]$ .

4. ( $3 \leq b \leq 4$ )

Notice that the same reasoning will apply to this case as the previous, save for  $b + t$  being replaced with  $b - t$  and the maximum occurring at  $b - t = 2$ , giving us the value of  $h^*(b) = \frac{1}{2(b - 2)}$  for all  $b \in [3, 4]$ .

5.  $(0 < b < 1)$

Notice that by our work in 4.A.4 we showed the bound  $h^*(b) \leq \sup_{\mathbb{R}} |h|$ . Here  $\sup_{\mathbb{R}} |h| = 1$ . So notice that for any  $b \in (0, 1)$  we can choose  $t > 0$  such that  $b + t < 1$  and  $0 < b - t$ . So that  $A(b, t) = 1$ . Implying that  $h^*(b) = 1$  for all  $0 < b < 1$ .

6.  $(2 < b < 3)$

By the same argument in the previous case we get the same value,  $h^*(b) = 1$  for all  $b \in (2, 3)$ .

7.  $(1 \leq b \leq \frac{3}{2})$

For such  $b$ , note that  $A(b, t) = 0$  until  $b - t < 1$ . Since  $b$  is the left of  $\frac{1}{2}$ , this is guaranteed to occur before  $b + t > 2$ . So that for  $b - t < 1$  notice that previous arguments show that  $A(b, t)$  will increase as  $t > 0$  increases. So then consider when both  $b - t < 1$  and  $b + t > 2$ . Giving us

$$A(b, t) = \frac{1}{2t} \left( \int_{b-t}^1 1 + \int_2^{b+t} 1 \right) = \frac{1 - b + t + b + t - 2}{2t} = \frac{2t - 1}{2t}.$$

Since  $b > 0$ , this quantity will only decrease as  $t$  increases, implying as soon as  $b - t = 0$  we should stop increasing  $t$ . Giving us the value of  $h^*(b) = \frac{2b - 1}{2b}$  for all  $b \in [1, \frac{3}{2}]$ .

8.  $(\frac{3}{2} \leq b \leq 2)$

The same reasoning as the previous case applies here save for  $b + t = 3$ , giving us the value of  $h^*(b) = \frac{5 - 2b}{2(3 - b)}$  for all  $\frac{3}{2} \leq b \leq 2$ .

These values agree with our claim, this is the result we wished to prove!

□

## 4.A.8

Find a formula for the Hardy-Littlewood maximal function of the function  $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  defined by

$$h(x) = \begin{cases} x & \text{if } 0 \leq x \leq 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* Let  $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  defined by

$$h(x) = \begin{cases} x & \text{if } 0 \leq x \leq 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

1.  $(-\infty < b \leq 0)$

Notice that for such  $b$ , the value of the integral will be 0 until  $b + t < 0$ . At which point we'll have

$$\frac{1}{2t} \int_0^{b+t} x \, dx = \frac{1}{2t} \left. \frac{x^2}{2} \right|_{x=0}^{b+t} = \frac{(b+t)^2}{4t} = \frac{b^2 + 2bt + t^2}{4t} = \frac{b^2}{4t} + \frac{b}{2} + \frac{t}{4}.$$

Notice that  $b^2$  is positive, moreover  $\frac{b^2}{4t} < \frac{t}{4} \iff b^2 > t^2 < 0 \iff (b-t)(b+t) < 0$ ,

this last statement is true for all  $b + t > 0$ , hence we wish to maximize  $\frac{t}{4}$  primarily.

This will occur when  $b + t = 1 \implies t = 1 - b$ . Giving us the maximum of  $\frac{1}{4(1-b)}$ .

Hence  $h^*(b) = \frac{1}{4(1-b)}$  for all  $b \in (-\infty, -\frac{1}{2})$

2.  $(\frac{1}{2} \leq b < 1)$

Notice that in this case we can always choose a  $b + t < 1$  and  $0 < b - t$  so that

$$\frac{1}{2t} \int_{b-t}^{b+t} x \, dx = \frac{1}{4t} ((b+t)^2 - (b-t)^2) = \frac{4bt}{4t} = b,$$

so that since this value doesn't depend on  $t$ , and the integral gains no value for  $b+t > 1$  or  $b-t < 0$ , we can conclude that  $h^*(b) = b$  for all  $\frac{1}{2} < b < 1$ .

3.  $(b = 1)$

For this case consider when  $1 - t > 0$ , so that

$$\frac{1}{2t} \int_{1-t}^1 x \, dx = \frac{1}{4t} (1 - (1-t)^2) = \frac{1 - (1^2 - 2t + t^2)}{4t} = \frac{2-t}{4}.$$

It should be clear this is a maximum when  $t \rightarrow 0$ , giving us the value  $h^*(1) = \frac{1}{2}$ .

4. ( $b > 1$ )

For this  $b$ , this will be 0 until  $0 < b - t < 1$ . So that at this point we'll have:

$$\frac{1}{2t} \int_{b-t}^1 x \, dx = \frac{1}{4t} (1^2 - (b-t)^2) = \frac{1}{4t} (1 - (b^2 - 2bt - t^2)) = \frac{1 - b^2 + 2bt - t^2}{4t}.$$

We'll find the critical value of this over  $t > 0$ , taking the derivative and setting this to zero:

$$\frac{b^2 - 1}{4t^2} - \frac{1}{4} = 0 \iff b^2 = t^2 - 1 \iff t = \pm \sqrt{b^2 - 1},$$

we can reject the negative value giving an optimum at  $t = \sqrt{b^2 - 1}$ . We'll find by plugging this in that:

$$h^*(b) = \frac{1}{2(\sqrt{b^2 - 1})} \int_{\sqrt{b^2 - 1}}^1 x \, dx = \frac{1}{4\sqrt{b^2 - 1}} (1 - (b^2 - 1)) = \frac{-b^2}{4\sqrt{b^2 - 1}}.$$

This is wrong...

This covers all cases for  $b \in \mathbb{R}$ .

□

## 4.B.1

Suppose  $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(\mathbb{R})$ . Prove that

$$\lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{2t} \int_{b-t}^{b+t} |f - f_{[b-t, b+t]}| = 0$$

for almost every  $b \in \mathbb{R}$ .

*Proof.* Suppose  $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(\mathbb{R})$ . Define  $f_{[b-t, b+t]} = \frac{1}{2t} \int_{b-t}^{b+t} f$ .

Let  $t \neq 0$ . Consider the following use of the triangle inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2t} \int_{b-t}^{b+t} |f - f_{[b-t, b+t]}| &= \frac{1}{2t} \int_{b-t}^{b+t} |f - f(b) + f(b) - f_{[b-t, b+t]}| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2t} \int_{b-t}^{b+t} |f - f(b)| + \frac{1}{2t} \int_{b-t}^{b+t} |f(b) - f_{[b-t, b+t]}| \\ &= \frac{1}{2t} \int_{b-t}^{b+t} |f - f(b)| + \frac{(b+t - b + t)}{2t} |f(b) - f_{[b-t, b+t]}|, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that since  $t \neq 0$  and  $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(\mathbb{R})$  to break up the integral in the first inequality. Finally taking the limit as  $t \downarrow 0$  of the first and last line's:

$$\lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{2t} \int_{b-t}^{b+t} |f - f_{[b-t, b+t]}| \leq \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \left( \frac{1}{2t} \int_{b-t}^{b+t} |f - f(b)| + |f(b) - f_{[b-t, b+t]}| \right),$$

by 4.21 the second term on the left goes to 0 and the first term goes to zero by the first version of Lebesgue's differentiation theorem. Giving us our result:

$$\lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{2t} \int_{b-t}^{b+t} |f - f_{[b-t, b+t]}| = 0.$$

□

### 4.B.3

Suppose  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a Lebesgue measurable function such that  $f^2 \in \mathcal{L}^1(\mathbb{R})$ . Prove that

$$\lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{2t} \int_{b-t}^{b+t} |f - f(b)|^2 = 0$$

for almost every  $b \in \mathbb{R}$ .

**Lemma.** *If  $f^2 \in \mathcal{L}^1(\mathbb{R})$  and  $S$  is a bounded subset of  $\mathbb{R}$ , then  $\chi_S f \in \mathcal{L}^1(\mathbb{R})$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $f^2 \in \mathcal{L}^1(\mathbb{R})$  and  $S$  be a bounded subset of  $\mathbb{R}$ . Define  $A = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : |f(x)| \geq 1\}$  and  $\mathbb{R} \setminus A = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : |f(x)| < 1\}$ .

Note then for all  $x \in A$  we'll have  $|f(x)| \leq |f(x)|^2$  so that  $\int_A |f| \leq \int_A |f|^2 < \infty$ . This implies that  $\int_A \chi_S |f| \leq \int_A \chi_S |f|^2 < \infty$ . To show that  $\chi_S |f|$  has a finite integral on the rest of  $\mathbb{R}$ , consider the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus A} \chi_S |f| &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \chi_{\mathbb{R} \setminus A} \chi_S |f| \\ &= \int \chi_{(\mathbb{R} \setminus A) \cap S} |f| \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus A \cap S} |f| \\ &\leq \int_S 1 \\ &= |S| < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

the first equality comes from the definition of the integral over a subset, the second equality comes from the definition of a characteristic function, the third equality again comes from the definition of the integral over a subset, and the inequality comes from the fact that  $|f(x)| \leq 1$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus A$ . Hence combining  $\int_A \chi |f| < \infty$  and  $\int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus A} \chi_S |f| < \infty$  we have that  $\chi_S f \in \mathcal{L}^1(\mathbb{R})$ , this is our desired result.  $\square$

*Proof.* Suppose  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a Lebesgue measurable function such that  $f^2 \in \mathcal{L}^1(\mathbb{R})$ .

Let  $0 < t < 1$ , and  $b \in \mathbb{R}$ , then define  $S = [b - t - 1, b + t + 1]$  so that  $[b - t, b + t] \subseteq$

$$[b - t - 1, b + t + 1],$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2t} \int_{b-t}^{b+t} |f - f(b)|^2 &\leq \frac{1}{2t} \int_{b-t}^{b+t} (f - f(b))^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2t} \int_{b-t}^{b+t} (f^2 - 2f(b)f + f(b)^2) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2t} \int_{b-t}^{b+t} (f^2 - 2f(b)f + f(b)^2) \\ &= \frac{1}{2t} \int_{b-t}^{b+t} (f^2 - 2f(b)f\chi_S + f(b)^2) \\ &= \frac{1}{2t} \left( \int_{b-t}^{b+t} f^2 - 2f(b) \int_{b-t}^{b+t} f\chi_S + \int_{b-t}^{b+t} f(b)^2 \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2t} \left( \int_{b-t}^{b+t} f^2 - 2f(b) \int_{b-t}^{b+t} \chi_S f + 2tf(b)^2 \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2t} \int_{b-t}^{b+t} f^2 - 2f(b) \frac{1}{2t} \int_{b-t}^{b+t} \chi_S f + f(b)^2, \end{aligned}$$

in the fourth line we used the fact that the function  $f\chi_S = f$  on  $[b-t, b+t]$ , in the fifth line we used that fact that  $f$  is a finite-valued function (there's no  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $f(x) = \infty$ ) and that  $\chi_S f \in \mathcal{L}^1(\mathbb{R})$  and  $f^2 \in \mathcal{L}^1(\mathbb{R})$  to split up the integral in line 5. Now we'll take the limit as  $t \downarrow 0$  of the last and first lines to give us our desired result:

$$\lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{2t} \int_{b-t}^{b+t} |f - f(b)|^2 \leq \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \left( \frac{1}{2t} \int_{b-t}^{b+t} f^2 - 2f(b) \int_{b-t}^{b+t} f + f(b)^2 \right).$$

Now we'll use the fact that  $f(x) = (\chi_S f)(x)$  for all  $x \in [b-t, b+t]$  and then  $\chi_S f, f^2 \in \mathcal{L}^1(\mathbb{R})$  to finally use 4.21 to get:

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{2t} \int_{b-t}^{b+t} |f - f(b)|^2 &\leq \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{2t} \int_{b-t}^{b+t} f^2 - 2f(b) \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \int_{b-t}^{b+t} \chi_S f + \lim_{t \downarrow 0} f(b)^2 \\ &= f^2(b) - 2f(b)(\chi_S f)(b) + f(b)^2 \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

This is our desired result! □



## 4.B.4

Prove that the Lebesgue Differentiation Theorem (4.19) still holds if the hypothesis that  $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |f| < \infty$  is weakened to the requirement that  $\int_{-\infty}^x |f| < \infty$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ .

*Theorem.* Let  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be an  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable function. Suppose  $\int_{-\infty}^x |f| < \infty$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ . Define  $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$g(x) = \int_{-\infty}^x f.$$

Then  $g'(b) = f(b)$  for almost every  $b \in \mathbb{R}$ . □

*Proof.* Let  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be an  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable function. Suppose  $\int_{-\infty}^x |f| < \infty$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ . Define  $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$g(x) = \int_{-\infty}^x f.$$

Then note that we have  $\int_{-\infty}^x |f| = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \chi_{(-\infty, x)} |f| < \infty$ , hence  $\chi_{(-\infty, x)} f \in \mathcal{L}^1(\mathbb{R})$  for every  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ . Importantly, for any  $b \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $t \neq 0$ , we can choose an  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $b + t < x$ . Let  $t \neq 0$ . With that consider the following

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{g(b+t) - g(b)}{t} - f(b) \right| &= \left| \frac{\int_b^{b+t} (f - f(b))}{t} \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{t} \int_b^{b+t} |f - f(b)| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{t} \int_{b-t}^{b+t} |f - f(b)| \end{aligned}$$

for all  $b \in \mathbb{R}$ . Since  $\chi_{(-\infty, x)} f \in \mathcal{L}^1(\mathbb{R})$ , we can adjust this without any change to the value in the following manner and let  $b + t < x$  be fixed:

$$\frac{1}{t} \int_{b-t}^{b+t} |f \chi_{(-\infty, x)} - f(b) \chi_{(-\infty, x)}| = \frac{1}{t} \int_{b-t}^{b+t} \chi_{(-\infty, x)} |f - f(b)| = \frac{1}{t} \int_{b-t}^{b+t} |f - f(b)|,$$

so that by 4.10, this last quantity has a limit of 0 as  $t \downarrow 0$  for almost every  $b \in \mathbb{R}$ . Thus  $g'(b) = f(b)$  for almost every  $b \in \mathbb{R}$ . □

## 4.B.6

Prove that if  $h \in \mathcal{L}^1(\mathbb{R})$  and  $\int_{-\infty}^s h = 0$  for all  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ , then  $h(s) = 0$  for almost every  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $h \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$  and define  $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by  $\int_{-\infty}^s h$  for  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ . Let  $\int_{-\infty}^s h = 0$  for all  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then by (4.19), the second version of Lebesgue's differentiation theorem tells us that  $g'(x) = f(x)$  for almost every  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ . Notice that the derivative of  $g(x) = 0$  is  $g'(x) = 0$ , hence  $f(x) = 0$  for almost every  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ .  $\square$