

# Math 275A: Homework 2

Marcus Lucas

## 1 Bonus

Claim: Let  $m$  be a measure on the Borel set  $\mathcal{R}$ , with  $A \in \mathcal{R}$  such that  $m(A) < \infty$ . Let  $\epsilon > 0$ . Show that there is a finite collection of bounded intervals  $I_1, I_2, \dots, I_k$  such that

$$m(A \Delta (I_1 \cup \dots \cup I_k)) < \epsilon.$$

Proof: Lebesgue measure  $m$  is, by definition, the restriction of outer measure  $m^*$  to the  $m^*$ -measurable sets, themselves equivalent to  $\mathcal{R}$ . The explicit definition of  $m^*$  is

$$m^*(A) = \inf \left\{ \sum_i (b_i - a_i) : A \subset \cup_i (a_i, b_i], -\infty < a_i \leq b_i < \infty \right\}.$$

This implies that for any  $\epsilon$  and set  $A$  of finite measure, there exists a countable set of half-open intervals  $\{I_i\}_i$  covering  $A$  such that

$$m(A) + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \geq \sum_i m(I_i).$$

Since  $\sum_i m(I_i)$  converges, we can select an integer  $k$  such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^k m(I_i) + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \geq \sum_i m(I_i)$$

Note, that sets of half-open intervals  $I_i$  can be assumed to be disjoint, following from the fact that any two such overlapping intervals  $I_i$  and  $I_j$  can be rewritten as a pair of disjoint intervals, so that we can build collection of disjoint intervals from any generic collection. Thus

$$\sum_i m(I_i) = m(\cup_i I_i)$$

This equality lets us rewrite the previous inequalities as

$$m(A) + \frac{\epsilon}{2} > m(\cup_i I_i) \quad \text{and} \quad m(\cup_{i=1}^k I_i) + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \geq m(\cup_i I_i).$$

That  $A$  and  $\cup_{i=1}^k I_i$  are both subsets of  $\cup_i I_i$ , lets us use additivity to rewrite them again as

$$m(\cup_i I_i \setminus A) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad m(\cup_i I_i \setminus \cup_{i=1}^k I_i) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2},$$

thus implying that  $m(A \Delta \cup_{i=1}^k I_i) \leq \epsilon$ .

### 1.2.1

Claim: Suppose  $X$  and  $Y$  are random variables on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$  and let  $A \in \mathcal{F}$ . Show that if we let  $Z(\omega) = X(\omega)$  for  $\omega \in A$  and  $Z(\omega) = Y(\omega)$  for  $\omega \in A^c$ , then  $Z$  is a random variable.

Proof: We just need to show that  $Z^{-1}(B) \in \mathcal{F}$  for  $B \in \mathcal{R}$ . But given any such  $B$ ,

$$Z^{-1}(B) = (X^{-1}(B) \cap A) \cup (Y^{-1}(B) \cap A^c).$$

Each of the intersections are in  $\mathcal{F}$  since  $A \in \mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{F}$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra. Thus their union  $Z^{-1}(B)$  is also in  $\mathcal{F}$  for any  $B \in \mathcal{R}$  and  $Z(\omega)$  is a random variable.

### 1.3.3

Claim: Show that if  $f$  is continuous and  $X_n \rightarrow X$  a.s. then  $f(X_n) \rightarrow f(X)$  a.s.

Proof: Because  $f$  is continuous it is also measurable. Thus the functions  $f(X_n)$  and  $f(X)$  must all be random variables. One can use this fact to argue that the set

$$\Omega'_o := \{w : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(X_n) \text{ exists}\} = \{w : \limsup f(X_n) - \liminf f(X_n) = 0\}$$

is measurable, as the expressions  $\liminf X_n$  and  $\limsup X_n$  are themselves random variables. Lastly, for any given  $\omega \in \Omega_o \{w : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} X_n \text{ exists}\}$  it follows from continuity of  $f$  that  $f(X_n(\omega)) \rightarrow f(X(\omega))$ . This means that  $\Omega'_o$  contains  $\Omega_o$  which itself has measure equal to one. Thus  $P(\Omega'_o) = 1$  by monotonicity of measures and  $f(X_n)$  converges a.s.

### 1.4.1

Claim: Show that if  $f \geq 0$  and  $\int f d\mu = 0$  then  $f = 0$  a.e.

Proof: It follows from our the assumptions that  $f < 1/n$  a.e. Assume otherwise, such that there exists a  $E \in \mathcal{F}$  for which  $f(E) \geq 1/n$  and  $\mu E > 0$ . Then we can define a simple function  $\phi = \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1}_E$ , less than  $f$  and with integral equal to  $\int \phi d\mu = \frac{1}{n} \mu E > 0$ . But we know from the properties we've derived for the integral that  $f > \phi$  implies  $\int f > \int \phi = \mu E > 0$ . Thus  $f$  must be less than any constant function  $\frac{1}{n}$  a.e.. Taking that limit as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  implies then that  $f = 0$  a.e.

### 1.4.3

Claim: Let  $g$  be an integrable function on  $\mathbb{R}$  and  $\epsilon > 0$ . (i) Use the definition of the integral to conclude there is a simple function  $\phi = \sum_k b_k \mathbf{1}_{A_k}$  with  $\int |g - \phi| dx < \epsilon$ . (ii) Approximate the  $A_k$  by finite unions of intervals to get a step function

$$q = \sum_{j=1}^k c_j \mathbf{1}_{(a_{j-1}, a_j)}$$

with  $a_0 < a_1 < \dots < a_k$ , so that  $\int |\phi - q| < \epsilon$ .

Proof: (i) First note that  $g = g^+ - g^-$  for two non-negative functions. Thus, we'll assume the  $g \geq 0$  without loss of generality.

We know by step 3 of the definition of the integral that for a given  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists a bounded function  $h$ , zero everywhere but a set  $E$  of finite measure, such that  $0 \leq h \leq g$  and  $\int h \, dx + \frac{\epsilon}{2} > \int g \, dx$ . This along with the other properties of the integral implies that  $\frac{\epsilon}{2} > \int g - h \, dx \geq 0$ .

Likewise, step 2 of the definition of the integral implies the existence of simple functions  $\psi > h > \phi \geq 0$  defined only on  $E$  such that  $\int \phi \, d\mu + \frac{\epsilon}{2} > \int h \, d\mu$  and  $\int h \, d\mu + \frac{\epsilon}{2} > \int \psi \, dx$ . These inequalities indicate that more generally, there always exists some function  $\varphi$  on  $E$  for which  $\int |h - \varphi| \, dx < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ .

Combined with the constraint derived for  $\int g - h \, dx$ , this last inequality shows that there always exists a simple function  $\phi$ , defined on a set  $E$  of finite measure, such that  $\int |g - \phi| \, dx < \epsilon$ .

(ii) We know that  $\phi$  is a simple function, defined over a finite collection of sets  $A_i$  such that  $\phi = \sum_{i=1}^n b_i \mathbf{1}_{A_i}$ . As shown in the bonus problem, we can cover each  $A_i$  with a finite collection of  $m_i$  bounded intervals  $I_{A_i}^j$ . Let  $b = \max_i \{b_i\}$ . Then for a given  $\epsilon$  we can select an interval set so that for  $I_i = I_{A_i}^1 \cup \dots \cup I_{A_i}^{m_i}$  we have  $\mu(A_i \Delta I_i) < \frac{\epsilon}{nb}$ .

We can define a similar set  $I_i$  satisfying the same bound for each set  $A_i$ . Define a set of simple functions  $q_i = b_i \mathbf{1}_{I_i}$  and then define  $q = \max_i q_i$ . The function  $q$  has the form suggested in the prompt (up to a finite, measure-zero set of points). We can see this by noting that  $\cup_i I_i$  is an open set and the endpoints of intervals comprising the sets  $I_i$  can be ordered and labeled as  $a_0 < a_1 < \dots < a_k$ . On each interval  $(a_i, a_{i+1})$ ,  $q$  just takes the maximum value between the two functions  $q_i$  active on it.

The way we've defined  $q$ , the difference  $\phi - q$  is zero on each set  $A_i$  excepting small sets where the intervals  $I_i$  overlap. On these sets,  $q$  equals at most  $b$ . Thus the integral  $\int |\phi - q|$  can be bounded by  $b * \sum_{i=1}^n \mu(A_i \Delta I_i) \leq bn \frac{\epsilon}{nb} = \epsilon$ . This completes the proof.