

Solution Set #3

Section 7.1

1. Suppose that $A \setminus B$ were a set of measure zero. Then, the union of two sets of measure set, $A \setminus B \cup B$ would again be a set of measure zero. But the union would be A which was given as not a set of measure zero.
2. (a) Suppose that $[a,b]$ could be covered by a finite union of intervals I_1, I_2, \dots, I_n such that $|I_k| = b_k - a_k$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$ and the sum of the lengths $\sum_{k=1}^n b_k - a_k < b-a$. Wolog we may suppose that no interval $I_k \subset I_j$ for $k \neq j$ and that the intervals I_k are ordered by their left endpoints, i.e., $a_1 < a_2 < \dots < a_n$. Furthermore, we may assume that no interval $I_k \subset I_{k-1} \cup I_{k+1}$, $k = 2, 3, \dots, n-1$. Therefore, we must have that $a \in I_1$. If $x \in I_1$, then $x-a < b_1 - a_1$. In particular, $a_2 \in I_1$. If $x \in I_2$, then $x - a_2 < b_2 - a_2$. Therefore, combining the above two facts $x - a < (x - a_2) + (a_2 - a) < (b_2 - a_2) + (b_1 - a_1) < b - a$. Proceeding inductively we have that if $x \in I_k$, then $x - a_k < b_k - a_k$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
 (*) \quad x - a &< (x - a_k) + (a_k - a_{k-1}) + (a_{k-1} - a_{k-2}) + \dots + (a_3 - a_2) + (a_2 - a) \\
 &< (b_k - a_k) + (b_{k-1} - a_{k-1}) + (b_{k-2} - a_{k-2}) + \dots + (b_2 - a_2) + (b_1 - a_1) < b - a.
 \end{aligned}$$

Specifically, b must belong to one of the intervals since the union of the intervals covers $[a,b]$. But, then by (*) we would have $b - a < b - a$.

- (b) Suppose that $[a,b]$ were of measure zero. Then, given any $\varepsilon > 0$ (in particular, $\varepsilon = (b - a)/2$) there would exist a collection of intervals $\{ I_\alpha \}$, $\alpha \in A$, such that $[a,b]$ could be covered by $\bigcup_{\alpha \in A} I_\alpha$ and $\sum_{\alpha \in A} |I_\alpha| < \varepsilon$. But since $[a,b]$ is compact, then there would exist a finite subcollection which would cover $[a,b]$ for which the sum of the lengths would be even smaller. But, this latter assertion is impossible by part (a) of the problem.
3. This is a direct consequence of problems 1 and 2 above with $A = [a,b]$ and $B = \{a,b\}$.
4. (a) Since the rationals are a countable set, then corollary 7.1C applies and asserts that the rationals are a set of measure zero.

(b) This is a direct consequence of problems 1 and 4(a) above with $A = \mathbf{R}^1$ and $B = \mathbf{Q}$, where \mathbf{Q} is the set of rationals.
5. False. Let $f(x) = 0$ on $[0,1]$. Let $g(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & x \text{ is irrational} \\ 1 & x \text{ is rational} \end{cases}$, $x \in [0,1]$. Then $f \equiv g$ on $[0,1]$ a.e., but g is not continuous anywhere on $[0,1]$.

Section 7.2

$$1. \quad U[f, \sigma] = \frac{1}{3} \cdot \frac{1}{3} + \frac{2}{3} \cdot \frac{1}{3} + 1 \cdot \frac{1}{3} = \frac{2}{3}$$

$$L[f, \sigma] = 0 \cdot \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{3} \cdot \frac{1}{3} + \frac{2}{3} \cdot \frac{1}{3} = \frac{1}{3}$$

$$2. \quad U[f, \sigma] = \frac{1}{n} \cdot \frac{1}{n} + \frac{2}{n} \cdot \frac{1}{n} + \dots + \frac{n}{n} \cdot \frac{1}{n} = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{k=1}^n k = \frac{\frac{n(n+1)}{2}}{n^2}$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} U[f, \sigma] = \frac{1}{2}$$

6. (a) Since f is continuous on $[a, b]$ which is compact, then by theorem 6.8C f is uniformly continuous on $[a, b]$.

(b) Since f is uniformly continuous on $[a, b]$, then by the definition of uniform continuity given $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that

$$|f(x) - f(y)| < \frac{\varepsilon}{b-a} \quad \text{whenever} \quad |x - y| < \delta.$$

(c) Choose $n \geq \lceil \frac{b-a}{\delta} \rceil + 1$ and let σ be the subdivision of $[a, b]$ given by $\sigma = \{a, a+1/n, a+2/n, \dots, a+(n-1)/n, b\}$. Then, each component interval I_k satisfies $|I_k| = 1/n$. Hence, for any $x, y \in I_k$ we have $|x - y| < \delta$ and by (b) we have $|f(x) - f(y)| < \varepsilon/(b-a)$. Hence,

$$M[f, I_k] - m[f, I_k] < \varepsilon/(b-a). \quad (*)$$

(d) Since $(*)$ holds for each k , then if we sum $(**)$ over k we have

$$U[f, \sigma] - L[f, \sigma] = \sum_{k=1}^n (M[f, I_k] - m[f, I_k]) |I_k| < \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{\varepsilon}{b-a} |I_k| = \varepsilon \quad (**)$$

(e) Since for each $\varepsilon > 0$ given in (b) there exists a subdivision σ given in (c) so that $(**)$ holds, then by theorem 7.2G we have the $f \in \mathcal{R}[a, b]$.

7. (a) Consider the component interval I_k . Since f is continuous on I_k , then by theorem 6.6F we have f obtains a maximum on I_k , i.e., there exists $x_{\max} \in I_k$ such that $M[f, I_k] = f(x_{\max})$, and we also have that f obtains a minimum on I_k , i.e., there exists $x_{\min} \in I_k$ such that $m[f, I_k] = f(x_{\min})$. Hence, for any $x_k^* \in I_k$ we must have

$$m[f, I_k] \leq f(x_k^*) \leq M[f, I_k] \quad (*)$$

If we multiply $(*)$ by $|I_k|$ and sum over k we obtain

$$L[f, \sigma_n] \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n f(x_k^*) \leq U[f, \sigma_n]. \quad (**)$$

(b) Let $\varepsilon > 0$. By the construction in problem 6 above, if n is chosen sufficiently large then σ_n is the partition described in 6(c) and from 6(d) we have

$U[f, \sigma_n] - L[f, \sigma_n] < \varepsilon$. Since $L[f, \sigma_n] < \int_a^b f$ we have that

$U[f, \sigma_n] - \int_a^b f < \varepsilon$. Since, on the other hand we always have

$0 \leq U[f, \sigma_n] - \int_a^b f$. Then, we can conclude that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} U[f, \sigma_n] = \int_a^b f$.

Similarly, since $\int_a^b f < U[f, \sigma_n]$ we have that $\int_a^b f - L[f, \sigma_n] < \varepsilon$. Likewise, we

always have $0 \leq \int_a^b f - L[f, \sigma_n]$. Hence, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} L[f, \sigma_n] = \int_a^b f$. But, since both

$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} U[f, \sigma_n] = \int_a^b f$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} L[f, \sigma_n] = \int_a^b f$, then (**) and the sandwich

(squeeze) theorem imply that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n f(x_k^*) = \int_a^b f$.

9. Note: by problem 7, for f continuous on $[a, b]$ we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n f(x_k^*) = \int_a^b f$

(a) Choose $f(x) = x^2$. Then, by problem 7, the indicated limit equals $\int_a^b f$ for the interval $[0, 1]$, which equals (from Calc I) $1/3$.

(b) Choose $f(x) = \sin \pi x$. Then, by problem 7, the indicated limit equals $\int_a^b f$ for the interval $[0, 1]$, which equals (from Calc I) $2/\pi$.

(c) Choose $f(x) = e^{3x}$. Then, by problem 7, the indicated limit equals $\int_a^b f$ for the interval $[0, 1]$, which equals (from Calc I) $(e^3 - 1)/3$.

Section 7.3

1. (a) Yes. f is continuous except on the set of points $\{0, 1/10, 2/10, \dots, 1\}$ which is a finite set, and, hence, of measure zero.

(b) Yes. f is continuous except on the set $\{0\}$, which is a finite set, and, hence, of measure zero.

(c) Yes. f is continuous except on the set rationals which is a countable set, and, hence, of measure zero.

(d) No. f is then not continuous anywhere on $[0, 1]$.

2. (a) $\omega[f, x] = 0$ for x not in $\{0, 1/10, 2/10, \dots, 1\}$ and $\omega[f, x] = 1$ for x in $\{0, 1/10, 2/10, \dots, 1\}$.

If x is not in $\{0, 1/10, 2/10, \dots, 1\}$ then there exists an open interval I_x which contains x and does not intersect $\{0, 1/10, 2/10, \dots, 1\}$. Hence, on I_x we have $f(x) \equiv 0$, which implies that $\omega[f, I_x] = 0$. Since $\omega[f, x] \leq \omega[f, I_x]$, then $\omega[f, x] = 0$.

If x is in $\{0, 1/10, 2/10, \dots, 1\}$, then for any open interval J which contains x we

would have $\omega[f, J] = 1$. Hence, $\omega[f, x] = 1$.

(b) $\omega[f, x] = 0$ for $x > 0$ and $\omega[f, 0] = 8$.

If x is not 0, then f is continuous at x and hence, $\omega[f, x] = 0$. If $x = 0$, then on any open interval J which contains 0, we have that there exists an integer k such $x_k = [(4k-1)\pi/2]^{-1} \in J$ which implies that $f(x_k) = -1$. Since, $f(0) = 7$, then $\omega[f, J] = 8$. Hence, $\omega[f, 0] = 8$.

3. If $f \in \mathcal{R}[a, b]$, then by theorem 7.3A f is continuous a.e. Let $E = \{x \in [a, b] : f \text{ is discontinuous at } x\}$. Let $E_1 = \{x \in [a, b] : |f| \text{ is discontinuous at } x\}$. Suppose that $y \in [a, b] \setminus E$. Then, by problem 5.1.4 we have that $|f|$ is continuous at y also. Therefore, the $E_1 \subset E$. Hence, E_1 is also a set of measure zero and $|f| \in \mathcal{R}[a, b]$.
4. False. The example in problem 7.1.5 illustrates the non-validity of the claim.
5. True. . Let $E = \{x \in [a, b] : f \text{ is discontinuous at } x\}$. Then, E is a set of measure zero. Let $E_1 = \{x \in [a, b] : g \text{ is discontinuous at } x\}$. Suppose $f = g$ on $[a, b]$ except for on a finite point set, say $S = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$. Then $E_1 \subset E \cup S$ because if $y \in [a, b] \setminus (E \cup S)$, then f is continuous at y and g agrees with f on a open interval I_y containing y which implies that g is also continuous at y . However, $E \cup S$ is a set of measure zero since both E and S are sets of measure zero. Hence, E_1 is a set of measure zero and by theorem 7.3A $g \in \mathcal{R}[a, b]$.