

**Math 205A - Fall 2016**  
**Homework #3**  
**Solutions**

**Problem 1:** (i) Show that step functions and continuous functions are dense in  $L^p[0, 1], 1 \leq p < \infty$ . Is this true for  $L^\infty$ ?

(ii) Show that if  $f$  is integrable in  $E$ , then  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \int_E |f(x+t) - f(x)| dx = 0$ .

(i) A step function is a function of the form  $\sum_1^n c_i \chi_{A_i}$ , where  $A_i$ 's are finitely many disjoint intervals.

Let  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{C}$  be the vector spaces of step functions and of continuous functions in  $[0, 1]$  respectively. (Note that finite linear combinations of step functions are again step functions, and the same holds true for continuous functions.)

Want to show that  $L^p = \bar{\mathcal{S}}$  and  $L^p = \bar{\mathcal{C}}$ , where closure is taken w.r.t. the  $L^p$  norm.

$\bar{\mathcal{S}} = L^p$ : Note that  $\mathcal{S} \subset L^p$ , so  $\bar{\mathcal{S}} \subset L^p$ . For the reverse inclusion  $L^p \subset \bar{\mathcal{S}}$ , we show first that characteristic functions lie in  $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$ , then extend the result to simple functions, and finally conclude the proof using their density in  $L^p$ .

In deed,  $\chi_A \in \bar{\mathcal{S}}$  for  $A \subset [0, 1]$  measurable: given  $\epsilon$ ,  $A \subset U$  for some open  $U$ , with  $m(U - A) < \epsilon^p/2$ .  $U$  is a countable union of disjoint intervals  $I_i$ . Pick finitely many of those to ensure  $m(U - \cup_1^n I_i) \leq \epsilon^p/2$ , so  $m(A - \cup_1^n I_i) \leq \epsilon^p$ . Then  $\|\chi_A - \sum_1^n \chi_{U_i}\|_p = m(A - \cup_1^n U_i)^{1/p} \leq \epsilon$ . Hence,  $\chi_A$  can be approximated by step functions.

The same is true for simple functions, because if  $f = \sum_1^\infty c_i \chi_{A_i}$  for disjoint  $A_i$ 's and  $c_i \neq 0$ , we can pick finitely many of those to ensure  $\|f - \sum_1^n c_i \chi_{A_i}\|_p < \epsilon/2$ , and then approximate each  $\chi_{A_i}$  by the step function  $s_i$  such that  $\|f - s_i\|_p < 2^{-(i+1)} c_i^{-1} \epsilon$ .  $s = \sum_1^n s_i$  is again a step function, and  $\|f - s\|_p < \epsilon$ .

So simple functions are included in  $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$ , and since their closure in  $L^p$  is  $L^p$  itself, then  $L^p \subset \bar{\mathcal{S}}$ .

$\bar{\mathcal{C}} = L^p$ : Exactly the same reasoning, up to an interpolation argument, works, because the step functions themselves can be approximated by continuous functions (in the  $L^p$  norm). Indeed, given  $\epsilon$  and an interval  $[a, b] \subset [0, 1]$ , the function  $f$  that equals 0 on  $[a, b]^c$ , 1 on some  $[a', b'] \subset [a, b]$  with  $m([a, b] \setminus [a', b']) < \epsilon^p$ , and linear interpolation in between, satisfies  $\|\chi_{[a, b]} - f\|_p < \epsilon$ . So continuous functions are dense in the step functions, and hence,  $L^p$ .

Step functions are not dense in  $L^\infty$ : let  $f = \sum_{n=2}^\infty \chi_{[\frac{1}{2n+1}, \frac{1}{2n}]}$ .  $f \in L^\infty$ , but  $\|f - s\|_\infty \geq 1/2$  for any step function  $s$ . Continuous functions are not dense in  $L^\infty$ , because  $[0, 1]$  is compact, and uniform ( $L^\infty$ ) limits of uniformly continuous functions are continuous.

(ii) Note that the problem makes sense only if  $f$  is defined on  $E' := E + (-\delta, \delta) : \{x+t : x \in E, t \in (-\delta, \delta)\}$  and all the  $t$ 's in consideration are  $|t| < \delta$ , so let's extend  $f$  by 0 outside  $E$ .  $f$  is integrable on  $E'$ , hence in  $L^1(E')$ . Step functions are dense there, so given  $\epsilon$ , pick  $s$  a step function on  $E'$ , such that  $\|f - s\|_{L^1(E')} < \epsilon$ . Since  $f = 0$  on  $E' \setminus E$ , we can take w.l.o.g.  $s = 0$  there too. Because

$$\int_E |f(x+t) - f(x)| \leq \int_E |f(x+t) - s(x+t)| + \int_E |s(x+t) - s(x)| + \int_E |f(x) - s(x)| < 2\epsilon + \int_E |s(x+t) - s(x)|,$$

it's enough to prove the statement for the step functions  $s = \sum_1^n c_i \chi_{[a_i, b_i]}$  in  $E$  ( $f \in L^1$  implies  $s \in L^1$ , so all the intervals must be bounded).  $|s(\cdot+t) - s(\cdot)|$  are dominated by  $2 \sum_1^n |c_i| \chi_{[a_i-\delta, b_i+\delta]}$ , which is integrable, and they converge pointwise to 0 a.e., so by dominated convergence  $\int_E |s(x+t) - s(x)| \rightarrow 0$  as  $t \rightarrow 0$ .  $\square$

**Problem 2:** Show that if  $\mu(E) < \infty$  and  $f_n \rightarrow f$  a.e., then the followings are equivalent:

(i)  $f_n$  are uniformly integrable, (ii)  $\int |f_n - f| \rightarrow 0$ , (iii)  $\int |f_n| \rightarrow \int |f|$ .

We will assume in this problem that  $f$  is integrable, otherwise one can come up with counterexamples for the equivalence (for example  $f_n = n \chi_{[0, 1/n]} + 1/x \chi_{(1/n, 1)} \rightarrow 1/x = f$  a.e., and  $\int_{[0, 1]} |f_n| \rightarrow \int_{[0, 1]} |f| = \infty$ , but  $f_n$  are not uniformly integrable).

(i)  $\implies$  (ii): Let  $\epsilon > 0$ . From uniform integrability there exists an  $\alpha_\epsilon$  such that  $\int_{\{|f_n| \geq \alpha_\epsilon\}} |f_n| < \epsilon/4$ . Now pick

$\delta < \frac{\epsilon}{4\alpha_\epsilon}$  such that  $\mu(A) \leq \delta \implies \int_A |f| \leq \epsilon/4$ . From Egorov's theorem, exists a measurable set  $E_\epsilon \subset E$  such that

$\mu(E \setminus E_\epsilon) \leq \min\{\epsilon/4, \delta\}$ , and  $f_n \rightarrow f$  uniformly in  $E_\epsilon$ . This implies that exists some  $N_\epsilon$  such that for all  $n > N_\epsilon$ ,  $\int_{E_\epsilon} |f_n - f| < \epsilon/4$ , and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \int_E |f_n - f| &\leq \int_{E_\epsilon} |f_n - f| + \int_{E \setminus E_\epsilon} |f_n| + \int_{E \setminus E_\epsilon} |f| \\ &\leq \frac{\epsilon}{4} + \int_{\{|f_n| \geq \alpha_\epsilon\}} |f_n| + \int_{\{|f_n| < \alpha_\epsilon\} \cap \{E \setminus E_\epsilon\}} |f_n| + \frac{\epsilon}{4} \\ &\leq \frac{\epsilon}{2-4} + \alpha_\epsilon \mu(E \setminus E_\epsilon) + \frac{\epsilon}{4} + \frac{\epsilon}{4} \leq \frac{3\epsilon}{4} + \alpha_\epsilon \cdot \delta \leq \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

This proves that  $\lim \int |f_n - f| \leq \epsilon$  for all  $\epsilon$ , hence (ii).

(ii)  $\implies$  (iii):  $\limsup \int |f_n| \leq \lim \int (|f_n - f| + |f|) = \int |f|$ . On the other hand,  $\int |f| \leq \int |f_n - f| + \int |f_n|$ , so  $\int |f| \leq \liminf \int |f_n - f| + \liminf \int |f_n| = \liminf \int |f_n|$ . Hence,  $\lim \int |f_n - f|$  exists and equals  $\int |f|$ .

(iii)  $\implies$  (i): Suppose not. Then there exists an  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $\alpha_k \rightarrow \infty$  and a sequence of  $n_k$ 's such that  $\int_{|f_{n_k}| \geq \alpha_k} |f_{n_k}| \geq \epsilon$ .

On the other hand,  $g_k = |f_{n_k}| \chi_{\{|f_{n_k}| \geq \alpha_k\}} \rightarrow 0$  a.e. ( $\chi_{\{|f_{n_k}| \geq \alpha_k\}} \rightarrow 0$  because  $\int |f_n| \leq \int |f| + \delta$  after some  $N$ ).  $g_k \leq |f_{n_k}|$  and  $\int |f_{n_k}| \rightarrow \int |f|$ , so by problem 3,  $\int g_k \rightarrow 0$ , contradicting  $\int g_k = \int_{|f_{n_k}| \geq \alpha_k} |f_{n_k}| \geq \epsilon$   $\square$

**Problem 3:** (i) Show that if  $|f_n| \leq g \in L^1(\Omega)$ , then  $f_n$  are uniformly integrable in  $\Omega$ . Does there exist a uniformly integrable family  $\{f_n\}$  with no integrable  $g$  such that  $|f_n| < g$ ?

(ii) Let  $f_k$  and  $g_k$  be  $\mu$ -measurable, such that  $f_k \rightarrow f$   $\mu$ -a.e.,  $g_k \rightarrow g$   $\mu$ -a.e.,  $|f_k| \leq g_k$  and  $\int g_k \rightarrow \int g$ . Show that  $\int f_k \rightarrow \int f$ .

(i)  $\int_{|f_n| \geq \alpha} |f_n| \leq \int_{g \geq \alpha} g$  since  $|f_n| \leq g$ , and  $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \int_{g \geq \alpha} g = 0$  since  $g \geq 0$  is integrable.

Yes.  $f_n = \chi_{[n, n+1]}$  on  $\mathbb{R}$  are uniformly integrable (consider  $\alpha > 1$ ), and if  $f_n \leq g$ , then  $g \geq 1$  on  $(0, \infty)$ , which is not integrable.

(ii) Note that here we need to assume that  $g$  is integrable, otherwise the result is not true.

$|f_k| \leq g_k$  implies  $g_k - f_k \geq 0$  and  $g_k + f_k \geq 0$ . Apply Fatou's lemma to both:

$$\int (g - f) \leq \liminf \int (g_k - f_k) = \int g - \limsup \int f_k \implies \limsup \int f_k \leq \int f.$$

$$\int (f + g) \leq \liminf \int (f_k + g_k) = \liminf \int f + \int g \implies \liminf \int f_k \geq \int f.$$

Combining these gives the result.  $\square$

**Problem 4:** (i) Show that any increasing function is a sum of an absolutely continuous and a singular function.

(ii) Does there exist a strictly increasing singular function?

(i) Let  $f$  be a monotone function.  $f'$  exists a.e., so let  $g(x) = \int_0^x f'$ , and  $h = f - g$ . Then  $g$  is absolutely continuous, and  $h$  is singular.

(ii) Yes. Consider the strictly increasing function  $f(x) = \sum_{q_n \in \mathbb{Q}} 2^{-n} \chi_{(q_n, \infty)}$  from HW2, and let  $h$  be its singular part.  $h$  is increasing because  $h(y) - h(x) = f(y) - f(x) - \int_x^y f' \geq 0$  for  $y > x$ . If  $h$  wasn't strictly increasing, then it would be constant on some interval  $[x, y]$ , hence continuous there, so  $f = g + h$  would also be continuous on  $[x, y]$ , contradicting the discontinuity of  $f$  on a dense subset of  $[0, 1]$ .  $\square$

**Problem 5:** Construct an absolutely continuous strictly increasing function on  $[0, 1]$  such that  $g' = 0$  on a set of positive measure.

Consider the set  $E$  from HW1 with  $0 < m(E \cap I) < |I|$  for all intervals  $I$  in  $[0, 1]$ , and let  $f(x) = \int_0^x \chi_E$ .  $f$  is an indefinite integral, hence *absolutely continuous*. It is *strictly increasing* since for  $y > x$ ,  $f(y) - f(x) = m(E \cap [x, y]) > 0$ . This in turn implies that  $f' = \chi_E$ , so  $f' = 0$  on  $E^c$  with  $m(E^c) > 0$ .  $\square$

**Problem 6:** Show that there exist two countable sub-collections  $\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2$  of pairwise disjoint intervals, such that  $\mathcal{F}_1 \cup \mathcal{F}_2$  covers  $A$ .

We'll first cover  $A \cap (0, 1)$ , then extend the argument to the whole  $\mathbb{R}$ , so assume for now that  $A \subset (0, 1)$ . The strategy is to initially cover  $A$  inductively by a countable collection of intervals that are *not necessarily disjoint*; afterwards we'll rearrange these intervals into 2 sub-collections, each of them disjoint.

*Step 1.* Constructing a countable cover for  $A$ .

Let  $A_1 = A$ ,  $\mathcal{G}_1 = \{I \in \mathcal{F} : I \subset (0, 1) \text{ and center of } I \text{ is in } A_1\}$ ,  $\alpha_1 = \sup\{|I| : I \in \mathcal{G}_1\} \leq 1$ . If  $A_1 = \emptyset$ , there's nothing to prove. Otherwise  $\alpha_1 \neq 0$  because of the non-degeneracy, so choose  $I_1 \in \mathcal{G}_1$  centered at  $x_1 \in A_1$  with  $|I_1| > 3/4\alpha_1$ .

Given  $A_i, \mathcal{G}_i, I_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ , define  $A_n = A \setminus \cup_{i=1}^{n-1} I_i$ ,  $\mathcal{G}_n = \{I \in \mathcal{F} : I \subset (0, 1) \text{ and center of } I \text{ is in } A_n\}$ , and  $\alpha_n = \sup\{|I| : I \in \mathcal{G}_n\}$ . If  $\alpha_n = 0$ , then  $A \subseteq \cup_{i=1}^{n-1} I_i$  (remember, the intervals are non-degenerate). Otherwise again pick  $I_n \in \mathcal{G}_n$  centered at  $x_n \in A_n$  with  $|I_n| > 3/4\alpha_n$ .

First,  $\alpha_n \rightarrow 0$ : In deed, if  $\alpha_n = 0$  for some  $n$ , we're done. Otherwise  $\alpha_{n+1} \leq \alpha_n$ , so say  $\alpha_n \downarrow \alpha \geq 0$ . If  $m > n$ , then  $x_m \notin I_n$ , so  $|x_m - x_n| \geq |I_n|/2 \geq 3/8\alpha_n \geq 3/8\alpha$ . Therefore we have an infinite sequence  $x_n$  of elements in  $(0, 1)$  with distance between any two  $\geq 3/8\alpha$ , which can only happen if  $\alpha = 0$ .

Now we claim that  $A \subseteq \cup I_n$ . If not, let  $x \in A \setminus (\cup I_n)$ , and  $I \subset (0, 1)$  any interval in  $\mathcal{F}$  centered at  $x$ . Since  $x \in A \setminus (\cup I_n)$ , then for all  $n$ ,  $x \in A_n$ , so  $I \in \mathcal{G}_n$ , therefore  $|I| \leq \alpha_n$ . But  $\alpha_n \rightarrow 0$ , hence  $|I| = 0$ , contradicting the non-degeneracy assumption.

*Step 2.* Getting rid of the 'redundant intervals'.

We'll now get a new sub-collection  $I'_n$  that has 'less' overlaps than the original one as follows: If  $A \subset \cup_2^\infty I_n$ , let  $I'_1 = \emptyset$ , otherwise  $I'_1 = I_1$ . In step  $n$ , if  $A \subset (\cup_1^{n-1} I'_i) \cup (\cup_{n+1}^\infty I_i)$ , let  $I'_n = \emptyset$ , otherwise  $I'_n = I_n$ . Then  $A \subset \cup I'_n$ , because by construction every point in  $A$  is contained only in finitely many of the  $I_n$ s (if  $x \in I_k$  for the first time, then  $\text{dist}(x, x_l) > 0$  for  $l > k$ , and  $|I_n| \downarrow 0$ ), so we could not have removed all of them.

What we achieved this way is that at most two of the non-empty  $I'_n$ 's overlap at any point, because if  $I_i, I_j, I_k$  all intersect, then one of them is included in the others, say  $I_i$ . But then  $I'_i = \emptyset$ , contradicting the non-emptiness.

*Step 3.* Obtaining  $\mathcal{F}_1$  and  $\mathcal{F}_2$ .

There are many ways to do this, but one nice way is using graph theory: let each  $I'_n$  be a vertex of a (possibly infinite) graph, and connect two vertexes iff the corresponding intervals overlap. By the remark above, this can have no cycles, so it's a tree, and hence bipartite. This means that the vertices can be arranged into two sets  $S_{1,2}$ , each of them with no edges in between. Then put the intervals belonging to the set  $S_i$  into  $\mathcal{F}_i$ !

*Step 4.* Covering  $A$  (not only  $A \cap (0, 1)$ ).

For each  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ , pick an interval  $J_n$  of radius  $< 1/2$  if  $n \in A$ , otherwise do nothing.  $\mathbb{R} \setminus (\cup J_n)$  is a disjoint union of open intervals, each  $\subseteq (n, n+1)$  for some  $n$ , so pick the disjoint collections  $\mathcal{F}_1^n, \mathcal{F}_2^n$ , also disjoint from the  $J_n$ 's. Then  $\mathcal{F}_1 = \cup_n \mathcal{F}_1^n \cup \{J_n\}_n$  and  $\mathcal{F}_2 = \cup_n \mathcal{F}_2^n$ .  $\square$