

# Real Analysis

## Homework 8

score:10

National Taiwan University, Department of Mathematics  
R06221012 Yueh-Chou Lee

May 14, 2019

---

### EXERCISE 11.5

---

Let  $f$  be monotone increasing and right continuous on  $\mathbb{R}^1$ .

- (a) Show that  $\Lambda_f$  is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure if and only if  $f$  is absolutely continuous on  $\mathbb{R}^1$ . (By absolutely continuous on  $\mathbb{R}^1$ , we mean absolutely continuous on every compact interval.)
  - (b) If  $\Lambda_f$  is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure, show that its Radon–Nikodym derivative equals  $df/dx$ .
- 

*Proof.*

(a)  $(\Rightarrow)$

By **Theorem 10.34**, since  $\Lambda_f$  is absolutely continuous on  $\mathbb{R}^1$ .

Let  $[a, b] \subset \mathbb{R}^1$ , then  $\forall \varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that  $\Lambda_f(A) < \varepsilon$  for any measurable  $A \subset [a, b]$  with  $|A| < \delta$ .

Let  $\{[a_k, b_k]\}$  be nonoverlapping subintervals of  $[a, b]$  and  $\sum_k (b_k - a_k) < \delta$ . Then

$$\sum_k |f(b_k) - f(a_k)| = \sum_k \Lambda_f((a_k, b_k]) = \Lambda_f(\cup_k (a_k, b_k]) < \varepsilon$$

Hence,  $f$  is absolutely continuous.

$(\Leftarrow)$

Let  $[a, b] \subset \mathbb{R}^1$  and  $\{[a_k, b_k]\}$  be nonoverlapping subintervals of  $[a, b]$ .

Since  $f$  is absolutely continuous, then  $\forall \varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that  $\sum_k |f(b_k) - f(a_k)| < \varepsilon$  with  $\sum_k (b_k - a_k) < \delta$ .

Let  $|A| < \delta$  such that  $A \subset \cup_k [a_k, b_k]$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_f(A) &\leq \Lambda_f(\cup_k [a_k, b_k]) \leq \sum_k \Lambda_f([a_k, b_k]) \\ &= \sum_k (f(b_k) - f(a_k^-)) = \sum_k (f(b_k) - f(a_k)) < \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $\Lambda_f$  is absolutely continuous.

(b) Let  $[a, b] \subset \mathbb{R}^1$ .

By **Theorem 10.39 (Radon–Nikodym)**, we know that there exists a unique  $g \geq 0$  such that  $\Lambda_f(A) = \int_A g dx$ ,  $\forall A \subset \mathbb{R}^1$ .

By **Exercise 11.5 (a)**, since  $\Lambda_f$  is absolutely continuous, then  $f$  is also absolutely continuous.

Also, by **Theorem 7.29**, since  $f$  is absolutely continuous, then  $f'$  exists a.e. in  $[a, b]$  and  $f'$  is integrable on  $[a, b]$ . So

$$\Lambda_f([a, b]) = f(b) - f(a) = \int_a^b f'(x) dx$$

Hence, Radon-Nikodym derivative of  $\Lambda_f$  is  $f' = df/dx$ .

### EXERCISE 11.7

If  $f$  is monotone increasing and continuous from the right on  $\mathbb{R}^1$ , show that  $\Lambda_f^*(A) = \Lambda_f^{o*}(A)$ , where  $\Lambda_f^{o*}$  is defined in the same way as  $\Lambda_f^*$  except that we use *open* intervals  $(a_k, b_k)$ .

**Proof.**

Let the countable collections  $\{(a_k, b_k]\}$  such that  $A \subset \cup_k (a_k, b_k]$ . So for  $\Lambda_f^*(A)$ , we know that

$$\Lambda_f^*(A) = \inf_k \sum \lambda(a_k, b_k] = \inf_k \sum [f(b_k) - f(a_k)].$$

For all collections  $\{(a_k, b_k^+)\}$ , we have

$$\sum_k \lambda(a_k, b_k^+) = \sum_k [\lambda(a_k, b_k] + \lambda(b_k, b_k^+)].$$

Since  $f$  is monotone increasing and continuous from the right, then  $\lambda \geq 0$  and  $f(x) = f(x^+)$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^1$ . Also,  $0 \leq \lambda(b_k, b_k^+) \leq \lambda(b_k, b_k] = f(b_k^+) - f(b_k) = 0 \Rightarrow \lambda(b_k, b_k^+) = 0$  for all  $k$ . Thus,

$$\sum_k \lambda(a_k, b_k^+) = \sum_k \lambda(a_k, b_k].$$

Hence

$$\Lambda_f^*(A) = \inf_k \sum \lambda(a_k, b_k] = \inf_k \sum \lambda(a_k, b_k^+) = \Lambda_f^{o*}(A).$$

### EXERCISE 11.8

If  $f$  is monotone increasing and continuous from the right, derive formulas for  $\Lambda_f([a, b])$  and  $\Lambda_f((a, b))$ .

**Proof.**

(i) By **Theorem 11.10**, since  $f$  is monotone increasing and continuous from the right, then

$$\Lambda_f((a, b]) = f(b) - f(a).$$

In particular,  $\Lambda(\{a\}) = f(a) - f(a^-)$ . So

$$\Lambda_f([a, b]) = \Lambda_f(\{a\}) + \Lambda_f((a, b]) = [f(a) - f(a^-)] + [f(b) - f(a)] = f(b) - f(a^-).$$

(ii) Also,

$$\Lambda_f((a, b)) = \Lambda_f((a, b]) - \Lambda_f(\{b\}) = [f(b) - f(a)] - [f(b) - f(b^-)] = f(b^-) - f(a).$$

---

**EXERCISE 11.10**

---

Show that in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $n > 1$ , the Hausdorff outer measure  $H_n$  is not identical to Lebesgue outer measure. (For example, let  $n = 2$ , and write  $A = \cup A_k$ ,  $\delta(A_k) < \varepsilon$ . Enclose  $A_k$  in a circle  $C_k$  with the same diameter, and show that  $\sum \delta(A_k)^2 \geq (4/\pi)|A|_e$ . Thus,  $H_2^\varepsilon(A) \geq (4/\pi)|A|_e$ .)

---

**Proof.**

Follow the hint, let  $n = 2$ , and write  $A = \cup A_k$ ,  $\delta(A_k) < \varepsilon$ . Enclose  $A_k$  in a circle  $C_k$  with the same diameter. Then

$$|C_k| = \left(\frac{\delta(C_k)}{2}\right)^2 \pi = \left(\frac{\delta(A_k)}{2}\right)^2 \pi.$$

So

$$\sum_k \delta(A_k)^2 = \sum_k \frac{4}{\pi} |C_k| \geq \frac{4}{\pi} \sum_k |A_k|_e \geq \frac{4}{\pi} |\cup_k A_k|_e = \frac{4}{\pi} |A|_e.$$

Thus,

$$H_2^\varepsilon(A) \geq (4/\pi)|A|_e.$$

This counterexample is sufficient to show that in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $n > 1$ , the Hausdorff outer measure  $H_n$  is not identical to Lebesgue outer measure.

---

**EXERCISE 11.11**

---

If  $A$  is a subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , define the *Hausdorff dimension* of  $A$  as follows: If  $H_\alpha(A) = 0$  for all  $\alpha > 0$ , let  $\dim A = 0$ ; otherwise, let

$$\dim A = \sup\{\alpha : H_\alpha(A) = +\infty\}.$$

- (a) Show that  $H_\alpha(A) = 0$  if  $\alpha > \dim A$  and that  $H_\alpha(A) = +\infty$  if  $\alpha < \dim A$ . Show that in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  we have  $\dim A \leq n$ . See **Exercise 11.19** in order to determine the Hausdorff dimension of the Cantor set.
  - (b) If  $\dim A_k = d$  for each  $A_k$  in a countable collection  $\{A_k\}$ , show that  $\dim(\cup A_k) = d$ . Hence, show that every countable set has Hausdorff dimension 0.
- 

**Proof.**

- (a) (i) Let  $\alpha > \dim A$ .  
If  $H_\alpha(A) = +\infty \Rightarrow \dim A \geq \alpha > \dim A$  ( $\rightarrow \leftarrow$ ).  
So  $H_\alpha(A) < +\infty$ . Then we choose  $\alpha > \alpha_0 > \dim A \Rightarrow H_{\alpha_0}(A) < +\infty$ .  
By **Theorem 11.13 (i)**, if  $H_{\alpha_0}(A) < +\infty$ , then

$$H_\alpha(A) = 0 \quad \text{for } \alpha > \alpha_0.$$

- (ii) Since  $\dim A = \sup\{\alpha : H_\alpha(A) = +\infty\}$ , then for all  $\alpha > 0$  with  $H_\alpha(A) = +\infty$ , we have  $\dim A \geq \alpha$ . Hence,

$$H_\alpha(A) = +\infty \quad \text{for all } \alpha < \dim A.$$

- (iii) By **Theorem 11.16 (ii)**, if  $\alpha > n$ , then  $H_\alpha(A) = 0$ ,  $\forall A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ . So we have  $\dim A \leq n$ .

(b) (i) If  $\alpha > d = \dim A_k$ , then by (a) we have  $H_\alpha(A_k) = 0$ . So

$$0 \leq H_\alpha(\cup_k A_k) \leq \sum_k H_\alpha(A_k) = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \dim(\cup_k A_k) \leq d.$$

If  $\alpha < d = \dim A_k$ , then by (a) we have  $H_\alpha(A_k) = \infty \leq H_\alpha(\cup_k A_k)$ . So

$$\dim(\cup_k A_k) \geq d.$$

Hence,  $\dim(\cup_k A_k) = d$ .

(ii) If  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , then  $x \in B_\varepsilon(x)$ . So

$$H_\alpha(\{x\}) = \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \sum_k \delta(A_k)^\alpha \leq 0.$$