

# MAT320 Practice Problems Answer Key

10/9/2023

**Problem.** A *rectangle* is a subset  $(a, b) \times (c, d) \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  where  $b > a$  and  $d > c$ . We write

$$l((a, b) \times (c, d)) = (b - a)(d - c).$$

For a subset  $S \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ , define

$$\mu^*(S) = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \ell(R_i) \mid R_i \text{ a rectangle for } i = 1, \dots; S \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} R_i \right\}.$$

For  $a = (a_1, a_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$  and  $r > 0$ , write

$$B(a, r) = \{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid \sqrt{(x_1 - a_1)^2 + (x_2 - a_2)^2} \leq r\}.$$

Prove that  $\mu^*(B(a, r)) = r^2 \mu^*(B((0, 0), 1))$ .

*Proof.* Given a set  $S \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ , write

$$bS = \{bs : s \in S\} \text{ for } b \in \mathbb{R}, \text{ and}$$

$$S + v = \{s + v : s \in S\} \text{ for } v \in \mathbb{R}^2.$$

The map

$$R \mapsto rR + a$$

(where  $r$  and  $a$  are as in the problem statement) defines a bijection  $\phi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ , where  $\mathcal{S}$  is the set of rectangles. If  $T \subset S$  then  $bT + v \subset bS + v$ ; and if  $T_i \subset S$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots$ , then

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} (bT_i + v) = b \left( \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} T_i \right) + v;$$

as such, the bijection  $\phi$  induces a bijection

$$\begin{aligned} \left\{ \{R_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty} \mid R_i \text{ a rectangle, } S \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} R_i \right\} &\mapsto \left\{ \{rR_i + a\}_{i=1}^{\infty} \mid R_i \text{ a rectangle, } S \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} R_i \right\} \\ &= \left\{ \{R'_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty} \mid R'_i \text{ a rectangle, } rS + a \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} R'_i \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Setting  $S = B((0,0),1)$ , we see that  $rS + a = B(a,r)$ . Moreover  $\ell(rR + a) = r^2\ell(R)$  for any rectangle  $R$ . As such, we see that

$$\left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} r^2\ell(R_i) \mid R_i \text{ a rectangle, } B((0,0),1) \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} R_i \right\} = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \ell(R'_i) \mid R'_i \text{ a rectangle, } B(a,r) \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} R'_i \right\}$$

as sets. So the infima of the left hand side and the right hand side are equal; but this is what we were trying to show.  $\square$

### Problem.

Find the measure of the set of all numbers  $x \in [0,1]$  for which there are no 4s in any decimal expansion of  $x$ .

*Proof.* We describe the set in a way analogous to the Cantor set. The set of numbers  $x \in [0,1]$  which have a 4 in the first digit of some decimal expansion is  $[4/10, 5/10]$ . The set of numbers which have a 4 in the second digit of some decimal expansion is

$$[0.04, 0.05] \cup [0.14, 0.15] \cup \dots \cup [0.94, 0.95].$$

In general, the set of numbers which have a 4 in the  $k$ -th digit of some decimal expansion is of the form

$$[0.0\dots 04, 0.0\dots 05] \cup [0.0\dots 14, 0.0\dots 15] \cup \dots \cup [0.9\dots 94, 0.9\dots 95]$$

where there are  $10^{k-1}$  separate intervals in the above disjoint union.

Write  $F_{10}^k \subset [0,1]$  to be the set of numbers which do *not* have a 4 in the first  $k$  digits of any of their decimal expansions. Then  $F_{10}^0 = [0,1]$  since the condition is vacuous, and  $F_{10}^k$  comes from removing a finite collection of closed intervals from  $F_{10}^{k-1}$ , each of measure  $1/(10)^k$ . In particular, the set of numbers  $F$  described in the problem is a countable intersection of measurable sets, and is thus measurable.

We claim that the measure of  $F$  is

$$1 - \left( \frac{1}{10} + \frac{9}{100} + \frac{9*9}{1000} + \frac{9*9*9}{10000} + \dots \right). \quad (1)$$

In other words, we first remove all the numbers with a 4 in its first decimal digit. The remaining numbers all have some digit other than 4 in their first digit (for any decimal expansion); so there are 9 remaining possible first digits, and we remove all numbers with a 4 in the second digit and any one of these first digits. The remaining numbers have, for their first two digits in their decimal expansions, some two digit number with no 4s; there are  $9*9$  of these. So we remove all the numbers with any of these choices for their first two digits of their decimal expansions, and a 4 in the third digit. This process goes on: there are  $9^{k-1}$  strings of  $k-1$  digits containing no 4s, and to get  $F_{10}^k$  from  $F_{10}^{k-1}$  we remove  $9^{k-1}$  intervals each of length  $10^k$  from  $F_{10}^{k-1}$ .

It remains to sum (1). To do this we write this as

$$1 - \frac{1}{10} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left( \frac{9}{10} \right)^k = 1 - \frac{1}{10} \left( \frac{1}{1 - \frac{9}{10}} \right) = 1 - \frac{1}{10}(10) = 0.$$

This may seem surprising, but heuristically, the probability that the  $k$ -th digit is a 4 has probability  $1/10$ , and these events are independent, so the probability that none of the digits is a 4 should be  $\prod_{k=1}^{\infty} (9/10)^k = 0$ . The above computation is simply a more careful version of this argument.  $\square$

**Problem.** Let  $A_i$  be subsets of a metric space  $X$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots$ . Prove that if  $B = \cup_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i$  then  $\overline{B} \supset \cup_{i=1}^{\infty} \overline{A_i}$ . Show that the latter inclusion does not have to be an equality.

*Proof.* Let  $x \in X$ . If for every  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $B(x, \epsilon)$  contains a point of  $A_j$  for some fixed  $j$  independent of  $\epsilon$ , then  $B(x, \epsilon)$  clearly contains a point of  $B$  as well. So if  $x$  is a point of closure of  $A_j$  then it is a point of closure of  $B$ . This proves the first claim in the problem.

For the second part of the problem, let  $A_j = \{1/j\} \cup \{1/j + 1/k : k = 1, 2, \dots\}$ . Then each  $A_j$  is closed so  $\overline{A_j} = A_j$ . Set  $B = \cup_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i$ . Then  $B$  is not closed. Indeed,  $0 \notin B$  since every element of  $A_j$  is strictly positive for any  $j$ . But  $1/j \in B$  for  $j = 1, 2, \dots$ . So  $0$  is a point of closure of  $B$  that is not in  $B$ .  $\square$

**Problem.** An  $F_{\delta}$  set is a set that is a countable union of closed sets. Show that continuous functions  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  map  $F_{\delta}$  sets to  $F_{\delta}$  sets.

(Hint: show first that the image of a compact set under a continuous function is compact.)

*Proof.* Let  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  be continuous. Given a countable collection of closed sets  $F_i \subset X$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots$ , we first note that if  $F_i$  is bounded, then it is compact; and then  $f(F_i)$  is also compact and thus closed. Indeed, given any cover of  $f(F_i)$ , if there is an open cover  $\{U_{\alpha}\}_{\alpha \in I}$  of  $f(F_i)$ , then  $\{f^{-1}(U_{\alpha})\}_{\alpha \in I}$  is an open cover of  $f(F_i)$  by the continuity of  $f$ . As such the latter has a finite subcover, say  $\{f^{-1}(U_1), \dots, f^{-1}(U_r)\}$ . But  $f(f^{-1}(T)) = T$  for any  $T \subset \mathbb{R}$ ; so if

$$F_i \subset f^{-1}(U_1) \cup \dots \cup f^{-1}(U_r) \text{ then } f(F_i) \subset U_1 \cup \dots \cup U_r.$$

In other words, there was a finite subcover of the cover  $\{U_{\alpha}\}_{\alpha \in I}$  of  $f(F_i)$ . So we have shown that continuous functions take compact sets to compact sets.

Now for every  $F_i$ , writing  $F_i^j = F_i \cap [j, j+1]$  for  $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ , we see that  $F_i = \cup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} F_i^j$ . Thus

$$F = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} F_i = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} F_{ij};$$

so

$$f(F) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} f(F_i) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} f(F_{ij}).$$

The quantity on the right above is a countable union of closed sets.  $\square$

**Problem.** Royden Problem 2.4.19.

*Proof.* By theorem 2.4.11 of the textbook (also proven in class), a set  $E$  is measurable if and only if for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , there is an open set  $O \supset E$  such that  $m^*(O \setminus E) < \epsilon$  (here  $m^*$  is the outer measure as defined in the textbook, which we denoted by  $\mu^*$  in the lectures). Thus, if  $E$  is *not* measurable then there is an  $\epsilon > 0$  such that for *any* open set  $O \supset E$ , we have  $m^*(O \setminus E) \geq \epsilon$ . However, if  $E$  has finite outer measure  $m^*(E)$ , then for any  $\epsilon_2 > 0$  then there is an open set  $V \supset E$  such that  $m^*(V) < m^*(E) + \epsilon_2$ . In particular, letting  $\epsilon_2$  range over  $1/n$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ , and taking the intersection of the corresponding open sets, we see that there is a Borel set  $\tilde{V} \supset E$  such that  $m^*(V) = m^*(E)$ . Choose an open set  $U \supset \tilde{V}$  such that  $m^*(U) < m^*(\tilde{V}) + \epsilon = m^*(E) + \epsilon$ . Then

$$m^*(U \setminus E) \geq m^*(U \setminus \tilde{V}) = m^*(U) - m^*(\tilde{V}) < \epsilon$$

where the first inequality is by monotonicity of the outer measure. But  $U \supset \tilde{V} \supset E$ ; so this contradicts the non-measurability of  $E$ .  $\square$

**Problem.** Show that a function  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  that is continuous except at a finite number of points is measurable. (On the quiz, I would remind you of the definition of a measurable function.)

*Proof.* A function is measurable if the preimage of any open set is measurable. Write the set of points of continuity of  $f$  as

$$(-\infty, a_0) \cup (a_0, a_1) \cup \dots \cup (a_{r-1}, a_r) \cup (a_r, \infty),$$

and for shorthand write  $I_0 = (-\infty, a_0)$ ,  $I_\ell = (a_{\ell-1}, a_\ell)$  for  $\ell = 1, 2, \dots, r$ , and  $I_{r+1} = (a_r, \infty)$ . Write  $f_\ell$  for the restriction of  $f$  to  $I_\ell$ . Then for any open set  $U \subset \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$f^{-1}(U) = \left( \bigcup_{\ell=0}^{r+1} f^{-1}(U) \cap I_\ell \right) \cup (U \cap \{a_0, \dots, a_r\}).$$

Now  $(U \cap \{a_0, \dots, a_r\})$  is finite and so is measurable. Thus, if we show that  $f^{-1}(U) \cap I_\ell$  is measurable for each  $\ell = 0, \dots, r+1$ , we are done since finite unions of measurable sets are measurable. But  $f^{-1}(U) \cap I_\ell = f_\ell^{-1}(U)$ . Each  $f_\ell$  is a continuous function, and the preimage of an open set under a continuous function is continuous. So indeed  $f^{-1}(U) \cap I_\ell$  is open for each  $\ell = 1, \dots, r+1$ .  $\square$

**Problem.** Is the subset

$$\bigcup_{n=2}^{\infty} [1/n, 1 - 1/n] \times \{1/n\} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$$

compact? Here we use the standard distance metric on  $\mathbb{R}^2$  given by

$$d((v_1, v_2), (w_1, w_2)) = \sqrt{(v_1 - w_1)^2 + (v_2 - w_2)^2}.$$

*Proof.* No because it is not closed:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (1/2, 1/n) = (1/2, 0),$$

and the right hand side is not in the set while the terms in the limit in the left hand side are all in the set. Thus  $(1/2, 0)$  is a point of closure of the set which is not in the set.  $\square$