

**MAT 324: Real Analysis, Fall 2017**  
**Solutions to Midterm**

**Problem 1 (10pts)**

- (a) Give a definition of  $\sigma$ -field on a set  $X$ .
- (b) Describe all  $\sigma$ -fields on the set  $X \equiv \{a, b\}$  of two elements; explain why there are no others.

(a; **5pts**) A  $\sigma$ -field on  $X$  is a collection  $\mathcal{F}$  of subsets of  $X$  such that

$$(i) X \in \mathcal{F} \quad (ii) \text{ if } E \in \mathcal{F}, \text{ then } E^c \equiv X - E \in \mathcal{F} \quad (iii) \text{ if } E_1, E_2, \dots \in \mathcal{F}, \text{ then } \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n \in \mathcal{F}$$

(b; **5pts**) The  $\sigma$ -fields on the set  $X \equiv \{a, b\}$  are

$$\mathcal{F} = \{\emptyset, X\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{F} = 2^X = \{\emptyset, X, \{a\}, \{b\}\}.$$

By (i) and (ii) above, every  $\sigma$ -field  $\mathcal{F}$  on  $X$  contains  $X$  and  $X^c = \emptyset$ . If  $\mathcal{F}$  also contains  $\{a\}$ , then it contains  $\{a\}^c = \{b\}$  as well. So, there are no other  $\sigma$ -fields on  $X$ .

**Problem 2 (10pts)**

Let  $(X, \mathcal{F}, \mu)$  be a measure space.

- (a) Given a definition of what it means for a function  $f: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  to be measurable.
- (b) Suppose  $f, g: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  are measurable functions and  $A, B \in \mathcal{F}$  are disjoint subsets such that  $A \cup B = X$ . Show that the function

$$h: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad h(x) = \begin{cases} f(x), & \text{if } x \in A; \\ g(x), & \text{if } x \in B; \end{cases}$$

is measurable.

(a; **3pts**) A function  $f: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is measurable if  $f^{-1}(I) \in \mathcal{F}$  for every interval  $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ .

(b; **7pts**) Let  $I \subset \mathbb{R}$  be an interval. Then,

$$h^{-1}(I) = (f^{-1}(I) \cap A) \cup (g^{-1}(I) \cap B) \subset X.$$

Since  $f$  and  $g$  are measurable functions,  $f^{-1}(I), g^{-1}(I) \in \mathcal{F}$ . Since  $\mathcal{F}$  is a  $\sigma$ -field, it is closed under countable intersections and unions. Since  $A, B \in \mathcal{F}$ , it follows that

$$f^{-1}(I) \cap A, g^{-1}(I) \cap B \in \mathcal{F} \quad \implies \quad h^{-1}(I) \in \mathcal{F}.$$

**Problem 3 (20pts)**

Let  $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a smooth function,  $A \subset \mathbb{R}$  be a null subset, and

$$f(A) \equiv \{f(x): x \in A\}.$$

- (a) Show that  $f(A)$  is a null set if  $A$  is bounded (i.e.  $A \subset [-R, R]$  for some  $R \in \mathbb{R}^+$ ).  
(b) Show that  $f(A)$  is a null set (whether or not  $A$  is bounded).

(a; **15pts**) Suppose  $A \subset [-R, R]$ . Let

$$M = \max_{[-R, R]} \{|f'(x)|: x \in [a, b]\} + 1.$$

By the Fundamental Theorem of Calculus or the Mean Value Theorem,

$$|f(x) - f(x')| \leq M|x - x'| \quad \forall x, x' \in [-R, R]. \quad (1)$$

Let  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Since  $A$  is a null set, there exists a countable collection  $\{I_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^+}$  of intervals such that

$$A \subset \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} I_n, \quad \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \ell(I_n) < \frac{\varepsilon}{M}.$$

Along with (1), this implies that

$$\begin{aligned} f(A) &\subset f\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} I_n\right) = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} f(I_n) = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} [\min_{I_n} f, \max_{I_n} f], \\ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \ell([\min_{I_n} f, \max_{I_n} f]) &\leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} M \ell(I_n) < M \cdot \frac{\varepsilon}{M} = \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $A$  is a null set.

(b; **5pts**) Let  $A_n = A \cap [-n, n]$ . By (a),  $f(A_n)$  is a null set. Thus,

$$f(A) = f\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n\right) = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} f(A_n)$$

is also a null set.

*Note:* It is not sufficient to assume that  $f$  is continuous. The Lebesgue function  $F$  defined on page 20 is continuous, non-decreasing, and takes the Cantor set  $C$  (which is a null set) onto the entire interval  $[0, 1]$ ; see Problem 5 on PS1.

**Problem 4 (20pts)**

Denote by  $\mathcal{M} \subset 2^{\mathbb{R}}$  the collection of Lebesgue measurable subsets and by  $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{M}$  the collection of Borel subsets. Let  $A \subset \mathbb{R}$ . Show that

- (a)  $A \in \mathcal{M}$  if and only if  $\inf \{m^*(B-A) : B \in \mathcal{B}, A \subset B\} = 0$ ;  
 (b)  $A \in \mathcal{M}$  if and only if  $\inf \{m^*(A-B) : B \in \mathcal{B}, B \subset A\} = 0$ .

If  $A \in \mathcal{M}$ , there exist  $C, \mathcal{O} \subset \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$C, \mathcal{O} \in \mathcal{B}, \quad C \subset A \subset \mathcal{O}, \quad m^*(A-C), m^*(\mathcal{O}-A) = 0.$$

This is basically Theorems 2.17 and 2.29;  $C$  is a countable union of closed sets, while  $\mathcal{O}$  is a countable intersection of open sets. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \inf \{m^*(B-A) : B \in \mathcal{B}, A \subset B\} &= m^*(\mathcal{O}-A) = 0, \\ \inf \{m^*(A-B) : B \in \mathcal{B}, B \subset A\} &= m^*(A-C) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

This establishes one direction in each part.

Suppose  $\inf \{m^*(B-A) : B \in \mathcal{B}, A \subset B\} = 0$ . For each  $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ , let  $B_n \in \mathcal{B}$  be such that  $A \subset B_n$  and  $m^*(B_n - A) < 1/n$ . Thus,

$$B \equiv \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n \in \mathcal{B}, \quad A \subset B, \quad m^*(B-A) \leq m^*(B_n - A) \leq \frac{1}{n} \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{Z}^+.$$

Thus,  $B-A$  is a null set and so  $B-A \in \mathcal{M}$ . Since  $\mathcal{M}$  is closed under differences,

$$A = B - (B-A) \in \mathcal{M}.$$

This establishes the other direction in (a).

Suppose  $\inf \{m^*(A-B) : B \in \mathcal{B}, B \subset A\} = 0$ . For each  $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ , let  $B_n \in \mathcal{B}$  be such that  $B_n \subset A$  and  $m^*(A-B_n) < 1/n$ . Thus,

$$B \equiv \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n \in \mathcal{B}, \quad B \subset A, \quad m^*(A-B) \leq m^*(A-B_n) \leq \frac{1}{n} \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{Z}^+.$$

Thus,  $A-B$  is a null set and so  $A-B \in \mathcal{M}$ . Since  $\mathcal{M}$  is closed under countable unions,

$$A = B \cup (A-B) \in \mathcal{M}.$$

This establishes the other direction in (b).

**Problem 5 (20pts)**

For each  $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ , define

$$f_n, g_n : [0, \infty) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad f_n(x) = \frac{n^2 x e^{-nx}}{1+x^2}, \quad g_n(x) = \frac{x e^{-x}}{1+x^2/n^2}.$$

(a) Find  $\int_0^\infty \left( \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n \right) dx$  and  $\int_0^\infty \left( \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g_n \right) dx$ .

(b) Show that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \int_0^\infty f_n dx \right) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \int_0^\infty g_n dx \right)$$

and find this limit.

(c) Let  $F : [0, \infty) \longrightarrow [0, \infty]$  be a Lebesgue measurable function such that  $f_n \leq F$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ . Show that

$$\int_{[0,1]} F dm = \infty.$$

(a; **5pts**) Since  $f_n(0) = 0$  for all  $n$ ,  $f_n(0) \rightarrow 0$ . Since  $e^{-nx}$  with  $x > 0$  dominates every polynomial in  $n$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $f_n(x) \rightarrow 0$  for all  $x > 0$  as well. It is immediate that

$$g_n(x) \longrightarrow \frac{x e^{-x}}{1+0} = x e^{-x} \quad \text{as } n \longrightarrow \infty.$$

Thus,

$$\int_0^\infty \left( \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n \right) dx = \int_0^\infty 0 dx = 0, \quad \int_0^\infty \left( \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g_n \right) dx = \int_0^\infty x e^{-x} dx = \left( -x e^{-x} - e^{-x} \right) \Big|_0^\infty = 1.$$

(b; **8pts**) By the change of variables  $x \rightarrow nx$ ,

$$\int_0^\infty f_n dx = \int_0^\infty \frac{(nx) e^{-(nx)}}{1+(nx)^2/n^2} d(nx) = \int_{n \cdot 0}^{n \cdot \infty} \frac{x e^{-x}}{1+x^2/n^2} dx = \int_0^\infty g_n dx.$$

This implies that the two limits in the statement are the same. Since  $g_n(x) \geq 0$  and  $g_n(x) \nearrow x e^{-x}$  for all  $x \in [0, \infty)$ ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \int_0^\infty g_n dx \right) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \int_{[0, \infty)} g_n dm \right) = \int_{[0, \infty)} \left( \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g_n \right) dm = \int_{[0, \infty)} x e^{-x} dm = \int_0^\infty x e^{-x} dx = 1;$$

the second equality above holds by the Monotone Convergence Theorem.

(c; **7pts**) Since  $f_n \geq 0$ , the assumption implies that  $|f_n| \leq F$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ . If in addition  $\int_{[0,1]} F dm < \infty$ , then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \int_0^\infty f_n dx \right) = \int_0^\infty \left( \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n \right) dx = 0.$$

by the Dominated Convergence Theorem and part (a). However, this contradicts part (b).

**Problem 6 (20pts)**

- (a) State a definition of what it means for a bounded function  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  to be Riemann integrable.
- (b) State a definition of what it means for a bounded function  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  to be Lebesgue integrable.
- (c) Give an example of a bounded Lebesgue integrable function  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  which is not Riemann integrable. Justify your answer.
- (d) Show that every bounded Riemann integrable function  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  is also Lebesgue integrable.

(a; **5pts**) For a partition  $(0 = a_0 < a_1 < \dots < a_k = 1)$  of  $[0, 1]$ , let

$$s_P(f) = \sum_{n=1}^k \left( \inf_{[a_{n-1}, a_n]} f \right) (a_n - a_{n-1}), \quad S_P(f) = \sum_{n=1}^k \left( \sup_{[a_{n-1}, a_n]} f \right) (a_n - a_{n-1}).$$

The bounded function  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  is Riemann integrable if

$$\sup \{s_P(f) : P \text{ is partition of } [0, 1]\} = \inf \{S_P(f) : P \text{ is partition of } [0, 1]\}.$$

(b; **5pts**) A bounded function  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  is Lebesgue integrable if

$$\int_{[0,1]} f dm \equiv \sup \left\{ \sum_{n=1}^k a_n m(A_n) : A_n \in \mathcal{M}, A_n \subset [0, 1], A_n \cap A_{n'} = \emptyset \forall n \neq n', a_n \in \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}, a_n \leq \inf_{A_n} f \right\} < \infty.$$

(c; **5pts**) By Theorem 4.33(i), a bounded Riemann integrable function  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  is a.e. continuous. Since the bounded function

$$f = 1_{[0,1] \cap \mathbb{Q}} : \mathbb{Q} \rightarrow [0, \infty), \quad f(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } x \in [0, 1] \cap \mathbb{Q}; \\ 0, & \text{if } x \in [0, 1] - \mathbb{Q}; \end{cases}$$

is nowhere continuous, it is not Riemann integrable. Since  $f = 0$  a.e. on  $[0, 1]$  and the constant function 0 is Lebesgue integrable, so is the function  $f$ .

(d; **5pts**) By Theorem 4.33(i), a bounded Riemann integrable function  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  is a.e. continuous and is thus measurable. On the other hand,

$$0 \leq \int_{[0,1]} f dm \leq (\sup_{[0,1]} f) m([0, 1]) = \sup_{[0,1]} f < \infty,$$

since  $f$  is bounded. Thus,  $f$  is Lebesgue integrable on  $[0, 1]$ .