

## Real Analysis Qual, Spring 2019

**Problem 1.** Let  $C([0, 1])$  denote the space of all continuous real-valued functions on  $[0, 1]$ .

(a) Prove that  $C([0, 1])$  is complete under the uniform norm  $\|f\|_u := \sup_{x \in [0, 1]} |f(x)|$ .

(b) Prove that  $C(0, 1]$  is not complete under the  $L^1$ -norm  $\|f\|_1 = \int_0^1 |f(x)| dx$ .

*Proof.* We begin with (a). Say that  $f_n \rightarrow f$  in the uniform norm. Take  $\epsilon > 0$ . Choose  $f_n$  such that  $\|f - f_n\|_u < \epsilon/4$ . Pick  $\delta > 0$  small enough so that for all  $x, y$  satisfying  $|x - y| < \delta$ , we have  $|f_n(x) - f_n(y)| < \epsilon/2$ . Now, take  $x, y \in [0, 1]$  satisfying  $|x - y| < \delta$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} |f(x) - f(y)| &\leq |f(x) - f(y) - (f_n(x) - f_n(y))| + |f_n(x) - f_n(y)| \\ &< |f(x) - f_n(x)| + |f(y) - f_n(y)| + \epsilon/2 \\ &\leq 2\|f - f_n\|_u + \epsilon/2 \\ &< \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

So,  $f$  is uniformly continuous on  $[0, 1]$ , and thus  $C([0, 1])$  is completed under the uniform norm.

Now, we show that  $C([0, 1])$  is not complete under the  $L^1$ -norm. Set  $a_n = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2n}$  and  $b_n = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2n}$ . Observe that  $a_n, b_n \rightarrow 1/2$ , and that  $(a_n) \subseteq [0, 1/2]$ ,  $(b_n) \subseteq [1/2, 1]$ . Define

$$f_n(x) := \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } x < a_n \\ (b_n - a_n)(x - a_n), & \text{if } a_n \leq x \leq b_n, \\ 1, & \text{if } b_n < x. \end{cases}$$

Then, each  $f_n$  is piecewise continuous. Moreover, at the points  $a_n, b_n$  we have equality of the left and right limits of the distinct component functions. Therefore,  $f_n$  is a continuous function for each  $n$ .

Moreover,  $f_n \rightarrow \mathbb{1}_{[1/2, 1]}$  pointwise a.e.. Indeed, if  $x < 1/2$ , then pick  $a_n$  so that  $a_n > x$ . Then,  $f_n(x) = 0$ . Otherwise, if  $x > 1/2$ , pick  $b_n$  so that  $b_n < x$ . We then obtain  $f_n(x) = 1$ . Thus,  $|f_n(x) - \mathbb{1}_{[1/2, 1]}| \rightarrow 0$  pointwise a.e.. Moreover,  $|f_n - \mathbb{1}_{[1/2, 1]}|$  is measurable function on  $[0, 1]$  dominated by 2. Therefore, by DCT, we obtain

$$\lim \int |f_n - \mathbb{1}_{[1/2, 1]}| dm = \int 0 dm = 0.$$

So,  $f_n \rightarrow \mathbb{1}_{[1/2, 1]}$  in the  $L^1$ -norm, and it follows that this sequence is Cauchy in  $C([0, 1])$  under the  $L^1$ -norm. However,  $\mathbb{1}_{[1/2, 1]}$  is discontinuous. In particular, at the point  $1/2$ , for every  $\delta$  ball we take around  $1/2$ , uncountably many points are sent to 0, and uncountably many are sent to 1. So, there is no redefinition on a null set making  $\mathbb{1}_{[1/2, 1]}$  continuous. Therefore,  $C([0, 1])$  is not complete under the uniform norm.  $\square$

**Problem 2.** Let  $\mathcal{B}$  denote the set of all Borel subsets of  $\mathbb{R}$  and  $\mu : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  denote a finite Borel measure on  $\mathbb{R}$ .

(a) Prove that if  $\{F_k\}$  is a sequence of Borel sets for which  $F_k \supseteq F_{k+1}$  for all  $k$ , then

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mu(F_k) = \mu \left( \bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} F_k \right).$$

(b) Suppose  $\mu$  has the property that  $\mu(E) = 0$  for every  $E \in \mathcal{B}$  with Lebesgue measure  $m(E) = 0$ . Prove that for every  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists a  $\delta > 0$  so that if  $E \in \mathcal{B}$  with  $m(E) < \delta$ , then  $\mu(E) < \epsilon$ .

*Proof.* We start with (a). Let  $(E_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$  be a sequence of Borel sets such that  $E_j \subseteq E_{j+1}$ . Set  $F_k = E_k \setminus \bigcup_{n=1}^{k-1} E_n$ . Observe that  $\bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} F_k = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n$ . Moreover,  $E_n = \bigcup_{k=1}^n F_k$ . Since the  $F_k$  are disjoint, we in fact have  $\mu(E_n) = \sum_{k=1}^n \mu(F_k)$ . Now, again by disjointness of the  $F_k$ ,

$$\mu \left( \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n \right) = \mu \left( \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} F_k \right) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mu(F_k).$$

Observe that since  $\mu$  is finite, then this sum is finite. In particular, the series is Cauchy, so there exists some  $j$  large enough such that for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , we obtain  $\sum_{k=j}^{\infty} \mu(F_k) < \epsilon$ . Thus, for all  $\epsilon > 0$ , for  $j$  large enough, we have

$$\mu \left( \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n \right) - \epsilon < \sum_{k=1}^j \mu(F_k) = \mu(E_j).$$

Since  $\mu(E_j) \leq \mu(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n)$ , we obtain  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mu(E_j) = \mu(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n)$ . Now, say that  $(F_k)_{k=1}^{\infty}$  satisfies  $F_k \supseteq F_{k+1}$ . Set  $E_n = F_1 \setminus F_n$ . Since  $F_n \supseteq F_{n+1}$  for each  $n$ , then  $E_n \subseteq E_{n+1}$ . Therefore, using that  $\mu$  is a finite measure, we have

$$\mu(F_1) - \mu \left( \bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} F_k \right) = \mu \left( F_1 \setminus \bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} F_k \right) = \mu \left( \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} (F_1 \setminus F_k) \right) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mu(E_k) = \mu(F_1) - \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mu(F_k).$$

After the proper manipulations we have  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mu(F_k) = \mu(\bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} F_k)$ .

Now we prove (b). Suppose that the statement does not hold. So, there is an  $\epsilon > 0$  such that for every  $\delta$  there exists an  $E \in \mathcal{B}$  such that  $m(E) < \delta$  but  $\mu(E) > \epsilon$ . Construct a sequence of sets  $E_n$  by choosing  $E_n$  so that  $m(E_n) < 2^{-n}$  but  $\mu(E_n) > \epsilon$ . Define  $F_k = \bigcup_{n=k}^{\infty} E_n$ . Observe that  $F_k \supseteq F_{k+1}$ . Moreover,

$$m(F_1) \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} m(E_n) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{-n} = 1.$$

Therefore,  $m$  restricted to  $F_1$  is a finite measure space. By (b), we obtain  $m(\bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} F_k) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} m(F_k) = 0$ . On the other hand, also by (b), we have  $\mu(\bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} F_k) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mu(F_k)$ . Since  $\mu(F_k) \geq \epsilon$  for each  $k$ , then  $\mu(\bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} F_k) \geq \epsilon$ . A contradiction, for we have found a set  $A$  such that  $m(A) = 0$ , but  $\mu(A) \neq 0$ .  $\square$

**Problem 3.** Let  $(f_k)$  be any sequence of functions in  $L^2([0, 1])$  satisfying  $\|f_k\|_2 \leq M$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Prove that if  $f_k \rightarrow f$  almost everywhere, then  $f \in L^2([0, 1])$  with  $\|f\|_2 \leq M$  and

$$\lim \int_0^1 f_k(x) dx = \int_0^1 f(x) dx.$$

Hint: Try using Fatou's Lemma to show that  $\|f\|_2 \leq M$  and then try applying Egorov's Theorem.

*Proof.* Since  $f_k \rightarrow f$  pointwise a.e., then  $f_k^2$  is a sequence of nonnegative measurable functions converging pointwise a.e. to  $f^2$ . Moreover,  $\|f_k\|_2^2 \leq M^2$ . So, in particular, the functions  $f_k^2$  are dominated by  $M^2$  on  $[0, 1]$ . Since  $M^2$  is integrable on  $[0, 1]$ , then by DCT we have

$$\lim \int_0^1 f_k^2 dx = \int_0^1 f^2 dx.$$

We take the square root of both sides, and observe that by continuity of the square root, we have the convergence  $\|f_k\|_2 \rightarrow \|f\|_2$ , and thus  $\|f\|_2 \leq M$ . In particular,  $f \in L^2([0, 1])$ .

Now, choose  $E$  so that  $f_k \rightarrow f$  uniformly on  $E^c$ , and  $m(E) < \epsilon$ . Pick  $k$  large enough so that  $|f_k - f| < \epsilon$ . Then,

$$\int_0^1 |f_k - f| dx = \int_{E^c} |f_k - f| dx + \int_E |f_k - f| dx < \int_{E^c} \epsilon dx + \int_0^1 \mathbb{1}_E |f_k - f| dx.$$

Moreover, by Cauchy-Schwarz,

$$\int_0^1 \mathbb{1}_E |f_k - f| dx \leq \|\mathbb{1}_E\|_2 \cdot (\|f_k - f\|_2) \leq m(E)(\|f_k\|_2 + \|f\|_2) < 2\epsilon M.$$

Therefore,

$$\int_0^1 |f_k - f| < \int_0^1 \epsilon dx + 2\epsilon M = \epsilon + 2\epsilon M.$$

So,  $f_k \rightarrow f$  in  $L^1$ . Moreover,

$$\lim \left| \int_0^1 f_k - f dx \right| \leq \lim \int_0^1 |f_k - f| dx = 0.$$

So,  $\lim \int_0^1 f_k dx = \int_0^1 f dx$ . □

**Note: The following problem is a common problem. It can also be found as Problem 5 in the Fall 2018 Qual.**

**Problem 4.** Let  $f$  be a nonnegative function on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\mathcal{A} = \{(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} : 0 \leq t \leq f(x)\}$ . Prove the validity of the following two statements.

- (a)  $f$  is a Lebesgue measurable function on  $\mathbb{R}^n \iff \mathcal{A}$  is Lebesgue measurable on  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ .
- (b) If  $f$  is a Lebesgue measurable function on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , then

$$m(\mathcal{A}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x) dx = \int_0^\infty m(\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : f(x) \geq t\}) dt.$$

*Proof.* We begin with (a). If  $\mathcal{A}$  is measurable, then each  $t$ -section  $\mathcal{A}^t$  is measurable. Now,  $\mathcal{A}^t = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : f(x) \geq t\} = f^{-1}([t, \infty))$ . Therefore, the pre-images of  $[t, \infty)$  are measurable for each  $t \in [0, \infty)$ . Since the intervals  $[t, \infty)$  generate a sub-algebra of Lebesgue measurable sets consisting of all nonnegative sets, and  $f^{-1}(B) = \emptyset$  for  $B \subseteq (-\infty, 0)$ , then  $f$  is measurable on this sub-algebra, and thus Lebesgue measurable. Suppose on the contrary that  $f$  is not measurable. Define the set  $B = \{(y, t) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0} : y \geq t\}$ . Observe that  $B$  is the pre-image of  $[0, \infty)$  for the measurable function  $(y, t) \mapsto y - t$ , and thus  $B$  is measurable, so  $\mathbb{1}_B$  is a measurable function. Moreover,  $(f(x), t)$  is a product of measurable functions and thus measurable, so  $g : (x, t) \mapsto \mathbb{1}_B(f(x), t)$  is a measurable function. Now, the pre-image  $g^{-1}(\{1\})$  consists of all those points satisfying  $\mathbb{1}_B(f(x), t) = 1$ , which is all points satisfying  $f(x) \geq t \geq 0$ , and this is  $\mathcal{A}$ . Since  $\{1\}$  is measurable, then  $\mathcal{A}$  is measurable.

We now prove (b). First, note that  $\mathbb{1}_A(x, t) = \mathbb{1}_{(0, f(x))}(t) = \mathbb{1}_B(f(x), t) = g(x, t)$ . Therefore, applying Tonelli, we have

$$m(A) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} \mathbb{1}_A d(m_n \times m)(x, t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}} g(x, t) d(m_n \times m)(x, t) = \int_0^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} g(x, t) dx dt.$$

For  $t$  fixed,  $g(x, t) = \mathbb{1}_{[t, \infty)}(f(x))$ . So, with  $t \geq 0$  fixed,  $g$  is an indicator function of the set  $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : f(x) \geq t\}$ . Therefore,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} g dx = m(\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : f(x) \geq t\}), \text{ so } m(A) = \int_0^\infty m(\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : f(x) \geq t\}) dt.$$

We may again apply Tonelli's Theorem to switch the order of integration. We have,

$$m(A) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_0^\infty g(x, t) dt dx.$$

Now, for  $x$  fixed,  $g(x, t) = \mathbb{1}_{[0, f(x))}(t)$ . That is,  $g(x, t)$  is the indicator function of the interval  $[0, f(x))$ . So,

$$\int_0^\infty g(x, t) dt = \int_0^\infty \mathbb{1}_{[0, f(x))}(t) dt = m([0, f(x))) = f(x).$$

Therefore,

$$m(A) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_0^\infty g(x, t) dt dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x) dx.$$

This completes the proof. □

### Problem 5.

- (a) Show that  $L^2([0, 1]) \subseteq L^1([0, 1])$  and argue that  $L^2([0, 1])$  in fact forms a dense subset of  $L^1([0, 1])$ .
- (b) Let  $\Lambda$  be a continuous linear functional on  $L^1([0, 1])$ .

Prove the *Riesz Representation Theorem* for  $L^1([0, 1])$  by following the steps below:

- (i) Establish the existence of a function  $g \in L^2([0, 1])$  which represents  $\Lambda$  in the sense that

$$\Lambda(f) = \int_0^1 f(x) \overline{g(x)} dx \text{ for all } f \in L^2([0, 1]).$$

- (ii) Argue that the  $g$  obtained above must in fact belong to  $L^\infty([0, 1])$  and represent  $\Lambda$  in the sense that

$$\Lambda(f) = \int_0^1 f(x) \overline{g(x)} \, dx \text{ for all } f \in L^1([0, 1])$$

with

$$\|g\|_{L^\infty([0,1])} = \|\Lambda\|_{L^1([0,1])^*}.$$

*Proof.* We first prove (a). Take  $f, 1 \in L^2([0, 1])$ . Then,  $|f| \in L^2([0, 1])$ . Therefore, applying Cauchy-Schwarz, we have

$$\|f\|_1 = \int_0^1 |f| \cdot 1 \, dm \leq \|f\|_2 \|1\|_2 = \|f\|_2 < \infty.$$

Thus,  $f \in L^1([0, 1])$ . Density follows, since simple functions are dense in both  $L^1([0, 1])$  and  $L^2([0, 1])$ , and thus  $L^2([0, 1])$  is dense in  $L^1([0, 1])$ .

We now prove (b). So, we show that  $\Lambda$  is a bounded linear functional on  $L^2([0, 1])$ . Since  $L^2([0, 1])$  is a subspace of  $L^1([0, 1])$ , then  $\Lambda$  is at least a linear functional on  $L^2([0, 1])$ . Moreover, it is bounded, since for all  $f \in L^2([0, 1])$ , we have

$$|\Lambda(f)| \leq \|\Lambda\|_{L^1([0,1])^*} \|f\|_1 \leq \|\Lambda\|_{L^1([0,1])^*} \|f\|_2$$

since in (a) we showed that  $\|f\|_1 \leq \|f\|_2$ . Therefore,  $\Lambda$  is a bounded linear functional on  $L^2([0, 1])$ . So, by the Riesz Representation Theorem, there exists some  $g \in L^2([0, 1])$  such that

$$\Lambda(f) = \int_0^1 f \bar{g} \, dm$$

for all  $f \in L^2([0, 1])$ .

Let  $E = \{x \in [0, 1] : g(x) \neq 0\}$ . If  $m(E) = 0$ , then  $g$  is a.e. 0, so  $\Lambda$  is 0 on a dense subset of  $L^1([0, 1])$ , and thus the 0 functional. Otherwise, define  $h_A$  so that  $h_A|_{E^c} = 0$  and  $h_A|_E = \frac{\mathbb{1}_A g}{m(A)|g|}$  for  $A$  not a null set. Since  $E$  is measurable, then  $h_A$  is measurable for measurable  $A$ . Note that  $|h_A|$  is a simple function, so  $h_A$  is in  $L^2([0, 1])$ . Moreover,

$$\int_0^1 |h_A| \, dm = \int_E \frac{\mathbb{1}_A |g|}{m(A)|g|} \, dm = \frac{1}{m(A)} \int_E \mathbb{1}_A \, dm = \frac{1}{m(A)} \int \mathbb{1}_A \, dm = 1.$$

In particular,  $\|h_A\|_1 = 1$ . Take  $A \subseteq [0, 1]$  to be a non null set and suppose that  $g|_A \geq a > 0$ . Then,

$$\|\Lambda\|_{L^1([0,1])^*} \geq |\Lambda(h_A)| = \left| \int_E \frac{\mathbb{1}_A g}{m(A)|g|} \bar{g} \, dm \right| = \left| \int_E \frac{\mathbb{1}_A |g|}{m(A)} \, dm \right| \geq \int \frac{\mathbb{1}_A a}{m(A)} \, dm = a.$$

Therefore,  $\|g\|_\infty \leq \|\Lambda\|_{L^1([0,1])^*}$ . Thus,  $g \in L^\infty([0, 1])$ . Now we show that  $\|g\|_\infty = \|\Lambda\|_{L^1([0,1])^*}$ . So, for any  $f \in L^1([0, 1])$ , we have  $h_n \rightarrow f$  with  $h_n \in L^2([0, 1])$ . Thus,

$$|\Lambda(h_n)| = \left| \int_0^1 h_n \bar{g} \, dm \right| \leq \int_0^1 |h_n \bar{g}| \, dm \leq \int_0^1 |h_n| \|g\|_\infty \, dm = \|g\|_\infty \cdot \|h_n\|_1.$$

By continuity, we have  $|\Lambda(f)| = \lim |\Lambda(h_n)| \leq \lim \|g\|_\infty \|h_n\|_1 = \|g\|_\infty \|f\|_1$ . That is,  $\|\Lambda\|_{L^1([0,1])^*} \leq \|g\|_\infty$ , giving equality.

We prove the last part of (b). So, let  $f \in L^1([0,1])$ . By density of  $L^2([0,1])$ , taking  $h_n \rightarrow f$  with  $h_n \in L^2([0,1])$ , we obtain

$$\left| \int_0^1 f \bar{g} \, dm - \int_0^1 h_n \bar{g} \, dm \right| = \left| \int_0^1 (f - h_n) \bar{g} \, dm \right| \leq \|g\|_\infty \int_0^1 |f - h_n| \, dm.$$

Since  $h_n \rightarrow f$  in  $L^1([0,1])$ , then we have  $\Lambda(h_n) = \int_0^1 h_n \bar{g} \, dm \rightarrow \int_0^1 f \bar{g} \, dm$ . By the continuity of  $\Lambda$ , we also obtain  $\Lambda(h_n) \rightarrow \Lambda(f)$ . Therefore,

$$\Lambda(f) = \lim \Lambda(h_n) = \int_0^1 f \bar{g} \, dm,$$

completing the proof. □