
Real Variables: Problem Set VI

Youngduck Choi
Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences
New York University
yc1104@nyu.edu

Abstract

This work contains solutions to the problem set VI of Real Variables 2015 at NYU.

1 Solutions

Question 9.10.

Solution. Let $\{X_n, \rho_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be a countable collection of metric spaces. We now define $(\prod_{n=1}^\infty X_n, p_*) = (X, p_*)$ such that for $x, y \in X$,

$$p_*(x, y) = \sum_{n=1}^\infty \frac{1}{2^n} \cdot \frac{p_n(x_n, y_n)}{1 + p_n(x_n, y_n)}.$$

First, we can show that p_* is well-defined via comparison test with the series $\sum_{n=1}^\infty \frac{1}{2^n}$, as $0 \leq \frac{p_n(x_n, y_n)}{1 + p_n(x_n, y_n)} \leq 1$ for all n .

As $p_n(x_n, y_n) \geq 0$ for all n , we have $p_*(x, y) \geq 0$ for all $x, y \in X$. If $p_*(x, y) = 0$, then $p_n(x_n, y_n) = 0$ for all n . As each p_n is a metric space $x_n = y_n$ for all n . Therefore, $x = y$. If $x = y$, then $x_n = y_n$ for all n . As each p_n is a metric space, $p_n(x_n, y_n) = 0$ for all n . Therefore, $p_*(x, y) = 0$.

Since $p_n(x_n, y_n) = p_n(y_n, x_n)$ for all n , for $x, y \in X$, we

$$\begin{aligned} p_*(x, y) &= \sum_{n=1}^\infty \frac{1}{2^n} \cdot \frac{p_n(x_n, y_n)}{1 + p_n(x_n, y_n)} \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^\infty \frac{1}{2^n} \cdot \frac{p_n(y_n, x_n)}{1 + p_n(y_n, x_n)} \\ &= p_*(y, x). \end{aligned}$$

Let $x, y, z \in X$. By the problem 6 and the triangle inequality of each metric space X_n , which gives $p_n(x_n, z_n) \leq p_n(x_n, y_n) + p_n(y_n, z_n)$ for each n , we have

$$\frac{p_n(x_n, z_n)}{1 + p_n(x_n, z_n)} \leq \frac{p_n(x_n, y_n)}{1 + p_n(x_n, y_n)} + \frac{p_n(y_n, z_n)}{1 + p_n(y_n, z_n)},$$

for all n . Hence, we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{p_n(x_n, z_n)}{1 + p_n(x_n, z_n)} \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{p_n(x_n, y_n)}{1 + p_n(x_n, y_n)} + \frac{p_n(y_n, z_n)}{1 + p_n(y_n, z_n)},$$

which can be written as

$$p_*(x, z) \leq p_*(x, y) + p_*(y, z).$$

Therefore, we have shown that all required properties of a metric space hold for (X, p_*) . (X, p_*) is a metric space. \square

Question 9.20.

Solution. Let E be a subset of a metric space X , and let $\text{int}E$ be the interior of E . We first show that $\text{int}E \subseteq E$. If $x \in X \setminus E$, then every ball of x contains a point in $X \setminus E$. Hence, $x \notin E$. Therefore, $\text{int}E \subseteq E$.

Now, we wish to show that $\text{int}E$ is open. For the first case, assume that $E = \text{int}E$. Let $x \in \text{int}E$. Since x is an interior point of E , there exists an open ball $B(x, r)$ contained in E . Since $E = \text{int}E$, the open ball $B(x, r)$ is contained in $\text{int}E$ as well. Hence, $\text{int}E$ is open in this case. For the remaining case, assume that $E \setminus \text{int}E \neq \emptyset$. Let $x \in \text{int}E$. Since x is an interior point of E , there exists an open ball $B(x, r)$ contained in E . Suppose that there exists $y \in B(x, r) \cap E \setminus \text{int}E$. Then, we have $d(x, y) < r$. Consider $B(y, r - d(x, y))$, which is valid since $r - d(x, y) > 0$. By the triangle inequality, for any point $z \in B(y, r - d(x, y))$,

$$\begin{aligned} d(x, z) &\leq d(x, y) + d(y, z) \\ &< r. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $B(y, r - d(x, y))$ is an open ball contained in $B(x, r)$, which is again contained in E , which contradicts the fact that $y \in E \setminus \text{int}E$. Hence, $B(x, r)$ is contained in $\text{int}E$. Therefore, $\text{int}E$ is open. As we covered all cases, $\text{int}E$ for any subset E of a metric space X is open.

Assume E is open. Let $x \in E$. As E is open, there exists an open ball around x contained in E . Therefore, $x \in \text{int}E$. Hence, $E \subseteq \text{int}E$. As we have $\text{int}E \subseteq E$ from above, we have shown that $E = \text{int}E$.

Assume $E = \text{int}E$. Let $x \in E$. Then, as $E = \text{int}E$, $x \in \text{int}E$. By the definition of interior point, there exists an open ball around x contained in E . Hence, E is open. \square

Question 9.32.

Solution. (a) We claim that f is 1-Lipschitz. Let $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$. Then, by the triangle inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(x, E) &\leq d(x, e) \\ &\leq d(x, y) + d(y, e), \end{aligned}$$

for all $e \in E$. By taking the inf over $e \in E$ on the RHS, we have

$$\text{dist}(x, E) \leq d(x, y) + \text{dist}(y, E).$$

Hence, it follows that

$$\text{dist}(x, E) - \text{dist}(y, E) \leq d(x, y).$$

By symmetry, we also obtain that

$$\text{dist}(y, E) - \text{dist}(x, E) \leq d(x, y).$$

Hence, it follows that

$$|\text{dist}(x, E) - \text{dist}(y, E)| \leq d(x, y).$$

Therefore, f is 1-Lipshitz, thus continuous.

(b) Let $x \in \overline{E}$. By the definition of closure, there exists a sequence $\{x_n\}$ from E such that $x_n \rightarrow x$. Since dist is continuous, we have $\text{dist}(x_n, E) \rightarrow \text{dist}(x, E)$. As $x_n \in E$, it follows that $\text{dist}(x_n, E) = 0$ for all n . Therefore, we have $\text{dist}(x, E) = 0$. Hence, we obtain

$$\overline{E} \subseteq \{x \in X \mid \text{dist}(x, E) = 0\}.$$

Let $x \in \{x \in X \mid \text{dist}(x, E) = 0\}$. Then, for all n , there exists $y \in E$ such that $\rho(x, y) > \frac{1}{n}$, which we label as x_n . Then, $\{x_n\}$ is a sequence from E such that $x_n \rightarrow x$. Hence, $x \in \overline{E}$. Consequently, we obtain

$$\{x \in X \mid \text{dist}(x, E) = 0\} = \overline{E},$$

as desired. \square

Question 9.43.

Solution.

Question 9.72.

Solution. Assume $A \cap B \neq \emptyset$. Then, there exists $x \in A \cap B$. Since $\rho(x, x) = 0$, we have $\text{dist}(A, B) = 0$. By contrapositive, we have shown that if $\text{dist}(A, B) > 0$, then $A \cap B = \emptyset$.

Assume $A \cap B = \emptyset$. Recall that A is compact and B is closed.

Hence, $\text{dist}(A, B) > 0$. \square

Question 9.77.

Solution. Let X and Y be separable metric spaces. Consider the standard product metric on $X \times Y$. Then, there exist a countable dense subset D_X in X and countable dense subset D_Y in Y . Observe that $D_X \times D_Y$ is countable. We claim that $D_X \times D_Y$ is a dense subset in $X \times Y$. Therefore, $X \times Y$ is separable. \square