

# MAT320 Practice Problems Answer Key

10/8/2024

**Problem.** For every  $\epsilon > 0$ , given an example of an open set  $U_\epsilon \subset \mathbb{R}$  such that the Lebesgue measure of  $U_\epsilon$  is less than  $\epsilon$ , and such that  $U_\epsilon$  is dense in  $\mathbb{R}$ . Please justify your answer.

*Proof.* Let  $i \mapsto x_i$  be an enumeration of the rational numbers  $\mathbb{Q}$ , and let

$$U_\epsilon = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} (x_i - \epsilon/2^{i+3}, x_i + \epsilon/2^{i+3}).$$

Then  $U_\epsilon$  is open since it is a union of open sets, and it is dense since it contains the dense set  $\mathbb{Q} = \{x_i \mid i = 1, 2, \dots\}$ . Its measure is less than  $\epsilon$  since by the subadditivity of measure,

$$\mu(U_\epsilon) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu((x_i - \epsilon/2^{i+3}, x_i + \epsilon/2^{i+3})) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\epsilon}{2^{i+1}} = \epsilon/2 < \epsilon.$$

□

**Problem.** Cantor set problem on problem set 4.

*Proof.* (Sketch.) Closedness: We have that  $F_\alpha^0$  is closed and  $F_\alpha^{i+1}$  is  $F_\alpha^i$  minus an open set, thus all  $F_\alpha^i$  are closed by induction. So their intersection, namely  $F_\alpha$ , is closed. There is a bijection

$$f : 2^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow F_\alpha.$$

defined as follows: we take the infinite binary string  $S = x_1x_2x_3\dots$  to the unique element of the set  $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} F_\alpha^{i, S_i}$ , with notation as below. We write  $S_i = x_1\dots x_i$  for the first  $i$  symbols of  $S$ . We write  $F_\alpha^{i, S_i}$  for the  $(2^{i-1}x_1 + 2^{i-2}x_2 + \dots + x_i + 1)$ -th interval in the decomposition of  $F_\alpha^i$  into intervals, when ordered from the left (we make sense of this for  $i = 1$  by dropping all the terms except the last one). Thus for any infinite binary string  $S$ , the the sequence of intervals  $F_\alpha^{i, S_i}$  is a nested sequence of intervals of radius converging to zero, so their intersection is a single point (by the Nested Set Theorem). Thus the map  $f$  described above is well defined. It is a bijection because every  $x \in F_\alpha$  must for every  $i$  be contained in a unique one of the intervals  $F_\alpha^{i, S}$  ranging over strings  $S$  of length  $i$ , which lets us reconstruct the total infinite string  $S$  from  $x$ .

Thus we know that  $F_\alpha$  is uncountable. It's closed, so it's measurable; in fact, by continuity of measure we have that

$$m(F_\alpha) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} m(F_\alpha^n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} 1 - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\alpha 2^{n-1}}{3^n} = 1 - \alpha(1) = 1 - \alpha.$$

□

**Problem.** Show that the intersection of any collection of  $\sigma$ -algebras on  $X$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra. Do the extra credit problem on problem set 4!

*Proof.* Let  $X$  be a set and let  $\{\Sigma_i\}_{i \in I}$  be a collection of  $\sigma$ -algebras. We claim that  $\cap_{i \in I} \Sigma_i =: \Sigma$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra. Indeed, the empty set is an element of  $\Sigma_i$  for all  $i \in I$ , so it is an element of their intersection. If  $A$  is an element of  $\Sigma_i$  for all  $i \in I$ , then  $A^c$  is an element of  $\Sigma_i$  for every  $i \in I$ , and is thus an element of  $\Sigma$ . Finally, if  $\{A_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$  is a collection of sets such that  $A_j \in \Sigma_i$  for every  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $i \in I$ , then for every  $i \in I$ ,  $\cup_{j=1}^\infty A_j \in \Sigma_i$ , thus  $\cup_{j=1}^\infty A_j \in \Sigma$ .

Extra credit problem:

Suppose that  $E \subset \mathbb{R}$  is Borel. We need to show that  $f^{-1}(E)$  is Borel, i.e. that  $E$  is contained in every  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\Sigma$  such that  $(a, b) \subset \Sigma$  for all  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$  (in other words, that  $\Sigma$  contains every interval). Write

$$f(X) = \{f(x) | x \in X\}$$

for any set  $X$  that is a subset of the domain of  $f$ ; thus  $f(X)$  is the image of  $X$  under  $f$ . We verify that for a collection of subsets  $F_i \subset \mathbb{R}$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots$ , that,

$$\cup_{i=1}^\infty f(F_i) = f(\cap_{i=1}^\infty F_i), f(\emptyset) = \emptyset, f(F_i^c) = f(F_i)^c.$$

Thus

$$f(\Sigma) := \{f(F) | F \in \Sigma\}$$

is a  $\sigma$ -algebra on  $\mathbb{R}$ . Clearly, if  $f^{-1}(E) \notin \Sigma$  then  $f(f^{-1}(E)) = E \notin f(\Sigma)$ . But we claim that  $f(\Sigma)$  contains all intervals. Indeed,  $f^{-1}((a, b))$  is an open subset of  $\mathbb{R}$ , thus a countable union of intervals; thus in particular it is contained in  $\Sigma$  since  $\Sigma$  contains all intervals and is a  $\sigma$ -algebra. But then  $f(f^{-1}((a, b))) = (a, b) \in f(\Sigma)$ , so  $f(\Sigma)$  contains all intervals, thus all Borel sets. This is a contradiction; we have shown that  $f^{-1}(E) \in \Sigma$ .  $\square$

**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.** Suppose that  $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  and  $\{y_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  are Cauchy sequences in a metric space  $(X, d)$ . Show that the sequence of real numbers  $d(x_n, y_n)$  converges as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . (Note: the metric space  $X$  is not assumed to be complete, and one should not use the existence of the completion of the metric space in this argument.)

*Proof.* By completeness of the real numbers, it suffices to show that the sequence  $c_n = d(x_n, y_n)$  is a Cauchy sequence. Given  $\epsilon > 0$ , choose  $N_1$  such that for  $n, m > N_1$ ,  $d(x_n, x_m) < \epsilon/3$ ; similarly, choose  $N_2$  such that for  $n, m > N_2$ ,  $d(y_n, y_m) < \epsilon/4$ . Then for  $n, m \geq \max(N_1, N_2) + 1 =: N$  we have

$$d(x_n, y_n) \leq d(x_n, x_N) + d(x_N, y_N) + d(y_N, y_n);$$

so

$$|d(x_n, y_n) - d(x_N, y_N)| \leq \epsilon/2.$$

The same of course holds for  $n$  replaced by  $m$ . Thus

$$|d(x_n, y_n) - d(x_m, y_m)| \leq |d(x_n, y_n) - d(x_N, y_N)| + |d(x_N, y_N) - d(x_m, y_m)| \leq 2\epsilon/2 = \epsilon.$$

Every inequality above is simply an application of the triangle inequality, together with the fact that distances are nonnegative. We have proven that the sequence  $\{c_n\}$  is Cauchy.  $\square$

**Problem.** Royden Problem 2.4.19.

*Proof.* By theorem 2.4.11 of the textbook, 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.** Give examples of subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^2$  that are

- Countable, compact:  $\{(0, 1/i) | i = 1, 2, \dots\} \cup \{(0, 0)\}$
- Uncountable, compact,  $[0, 1] \times \{0\}$ ,  $[0, 1] \times [0, 1]$ , anything closed and bounded (i.e. contained in a ball of finite radius)
- Uncountable, compact, have countably many pairwise distinct subsets which are simultaneously closed and open (with respect to the subspace metric):

$$(\{1/i | i = 1, 2, \dots\} \cup \{0\}) \times [0, 1].$$