

# Math 217 Fall 2013 Homework 8 Solutions

DUE THURSDAY NOV. 14, 2013 5PM

- This homework consists of 6 problems of 5 points each. The total is 30.
- You need to fully justify your answer for each problem.
- Please read this week's lecture notes before working on the problems.

**Question 1.** Let  $A := \{(x, y) \in [0, 1]^2 \mid x \in \mathbb{Q}, y \notin \mathbb{Q}\}$ . Is  $A$  Jordan measurable? Justify.

**Solution.** Since both  $\mathbb{Q} \cap [0, 1]$  and  $[0, 1] - \mathbb{Q}$  are dense in  $[0, 1]$ ,  $A$  is dense in  $[0, 1]^2$ . Therefore  $\bar{A} = [0, 1]^2$  and  $\mu_{\text{out}}(A) = 1$ .

On the other hand,  $A^c = \{(x, y) \in [0, 1]^2 \mid x \notin \mathbb{Q}, y \in \mathbb{Q}\}$  is also dense in  $[0, 1]^2$  so  $A^\circ = \emptyset$ . Consequently  $\mu_{\text{in}}(A) = 0$ .

So  $A$  is not Jordan measurable.

**Question 2.** Let  $A := \left\{ \left( \frac{1}{m}, \frac{1}{n} \right) \mid m, n \in \mathbb{N} \right\}$ . Prove that  $\mu(A) = 0$ .

**Solution.** We have

$$\bar{A} \subseteq A \cup (\{0\} \times [0, 1]) \cup ([0, 1] \times \{0\}). \quad (1)$$

Now for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , define

$$I := \left[ 0, \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \right] \times [0, 1]; \quad J := [0, 1] \times \left[ 0, \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \right]. \quad (2)$$

Then

$$\bar{A} \subseteq Q := (I \cup J) \cup \left\{ \left( \frac{1}{m}, \frac{1}{n} \right) \mid m < \frac{4}{\varepsilon}, n < \frac{4}{\varepsilon} \right\}. \quad (3)$$

Clearly  $Q$  is a simple graph with  $\mu(Q) = \frac{\varepsilon}{2} < \varepsilon$ . So  $\mu(A) = 0$ .

**Question 3.** Let  $f(x)$  be Riemann integrable on  $[a, b]$ . Let  $A := \{(x, f(x)) \mid x \in [a, b]\}$ . Prove that  $\mu(A) = 0$ . Is the converse -  $\mu(A) = 0 \implies f$  Riemann integrable - true? Justify.

**Solution.** Since  $f$  is Riemann integrable then for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there is a partition  $P = \{x_0 = a < x_1 < \dots < x_m = b\}$  such that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \left( \sup_{x \in [x_j, x_{j+1}]} f(x) \right) (x_{j+1} - x_j) - \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \left( \inf_{x \in [x_j, x_{j+1}]} f(x) \right) (x_{j+1} - x_j) < \varepsilon. \quad (4)$$

But if we denote for each  $j \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, m-1\}$ ,

$$J_j := [x_j, x_{j+1}] \times \left[ \inf_{x \in [x_j, x_{j+1}]} f(x), \sup_{x \in [x_j, x_{j+1}]} f(x) \right]. \quad (5)$$

We have

$$A \subseteq \bigcup_{j=0}^{m-1} J_j \quad (6)$$

which leads to

$$\bar{A} \subseteq \bigcup_{j=0}^{m-1} J_j \quad (7)$$

since  $\cup_{j=0}^{m-1} J_j$  is closed. Now (4) gives

$$\sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \mu(J_j) < \varepsilon. \quad (8)$$

Thus  $\mu(A) = 0$ .

The converse is not true. For example let  $f(x)$  be the Dirichlet function. It is not integrable but its graph has closure  $[0, 1] \times (\{0\} \cup \{1\})$  which clearly has Jordan measure 0. However see the following problem.

**Question 4.** Let  $f(x) \geq 0$  be Riemann integrable on  $[a, b]$  and let  $A := \{(x, y) \mid x \in [a, b], y \leq f(x)\}$ . Prove that  $A$  is Jordan measurable and

$$\mu(A) = \int_0^1 f(x) dx. \quad (9)$$

Is the converse –  $A$  is Jordan measurable  $\implies f$  is Riemann integrable – true? Justify.

**Solution.** From Question 4 we see that  $\mu(\partial A) = 0$  so  $A$  is Jordan measurable. Define

$$g(x) = f(x) + 1, \quad B := \{(x, y) \mid x \in [a, b], y \leq g(x)\}. \quad (10)$$

Then it suffices to prove

$$\mu(B) = \int_0^1 g(x) dx. \quad (11)$$

Take any partition of  $[a, b]$ ,  $P = \{x_0 = a < x_1 < \dots < x_n = b\}$ . Fix any  $0 < \varepsilon < 1/2$ . For every  $i = 0, \dots, n-1$ , Define

$$I_i := [x_i + \varepsilon(x_{i+1} - x_i), x_{i+1} - \varepsilon(x_{i+1} - x_i)] \times \left[ \varepsilon, \inf_{[x_i, x_{i+1}]} g - \varepsilon \right]. \quad (12)$$

We see that  $I_i \subseteq B^\circ$  and

$$\mu(I_i) = (1 - 2\varepsilon)(x_{i+1} - x_i) \left( \inf_{[x_i, x_{i+1}]} g - 2\varepsilon \right). \quad (13)$$

This means

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(B) &\geq \mu(\cup I_i) \\ &\geq \sum \mu(I_i) \\ &= (1 - 2\varepsilon) \sum_i (x_{i+1} - x_i) \left( \inf_{[x_i, x_{i+1}]} g - 2\varepsilon \right) \\ &= (1 - 2\varepsilon) \left[ \sum_i \left( \inf_{[x_i, x_{i+1}]} g \right) (x_{i+1} - x_i) - 2\varepsilon(b - a) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

By the arbitrariness of  $\varepsilon$  we have

$$\mu(B) \geq \sum_i \left( \inf_{[x_i, x_{i+1}]} g \right) (x_{i+1} - x_i). \quad (15)$$

Taking supreme over all partitions we have

$$\mu(B) \geq \int_a^b g(x) dx. \quad (16)$$

Similarly we have

$$\mu(B) \leq \sum_i \left( \sup_{[x_i, x_{i+1}]} g \right) (x_{i+1} - x_i), \quad (17)$$

taking infimum we have

$$\mu(B) \leq \int_a^b g(x) dx. \quad (18)$$

Thus ends the proof.

The converse is true this time. Assume  $A$  is Jordan measurable. Then for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  there are simple graphs  $B, C$  such that  $B \subseteq A^\circ, \bar{A} \subseteq C$ , with  $\mu(B) \geq \mu(A) - \varepsilon, \mu(C) \leq \mu(A) + \varepsilon$ .

Now write  $B = \cup_{i=1}^n I_i$  with  $I_i^\circ \cap I_j^\circ = \emptyset$ . Denote  $I_i = [a_i, b_i] \times [c_i, d_i]$ . Then we have

$$I_i \subseteq A \implies [a_i, b_i] \subseteq [a, b], [c_i, d_i] \subseteq \left[ 0, \inf_{x \in [a_i, b_i]} f(x) \right]. \quad (19)$$

Define

$$h(x) := \max_{i=1, \dots, n, x \in [a_i, b_i]} d_i. \quad (20)$$

Note that the maximum is taken over all  $i$ 's such that  $x \in [a_i, b_i]$ . Also note that  $h$  is a piecewise constant function.

Now define

$$B' := \{(x, y) \mid x \in [a, b], 0 \leq y \leq h(x)\}. \quad (21)$$

Then we have  $h(x) \leq f(x)$  and

$$B \subseteq B' \subseteq A, \quad \mu(B') = \int_a^b h(x) dx \leq L(f, [a, b]) \quad (22)$$

where  $L(f, [a, b])$  is the lower integral of  $f$  over  $[a, b]$ . This gives

$$\mu(A) - \varepsilon \leq \mu(B) \leq \mu(B') = \int_a^b h(x) dx \leq L(f, [a, b]). \quad (23)$$

Similarly we can prove

$$\mu(A) + \varepsilon \geq \mu(C) \geq U(f, [a, b]). \quad (24)$$

Thus

$$U(f, [a, b]) - L(f, [a, b]) \leq 2\varepsilon \quad (25)$$

for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Consequently  $U(f, [a, b]) = L(f, [a, b]) = \mu(A)$  and the conclusion follows.

**Question 5.** Find a bounded open set that is not Jordan measurable. Justify your answer.

**Solution.** List all rational numbers in  $[0, 1]$  and  $r_1, r_2, \dots$ . Define

$$A := \left[ \cup_{i=1}^{\infty} \left( r_i - \frac{1}{2^{i+2}}, r_i + \frac{1}{2^{i+2}} \right) \right] \cap [0, 1]. \quad (26)$$

Clearly  $A$  is open. Assume  $A$  is Jordan measurable. Then since  $\bar{A} = [0, 1]$  we have  $\mu(A) = 1$ .

On the other hand, since  $A$  is Jordan measurable, there is a simple graph  $B \subseteq A^\circ = A$ , with  $\mu(B) \geq \frac{3}{4}$ . Note that  $B$  is compact, so there are finitely many  $i_1, \dots, i_n$  such that

$$B \subseteq \cup_{k=1}^n \left( r_{i_k} - \frac{1}{2^{i_k+2}}, r_{i_k} + \frac{1}{2^{i_k+2}} \right). \quad (27)$$

This means

$$\mu(B) \leq \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{2^{i_k+1}} \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} = \frac{1}{2}. \quad (28)$$

Contradiction.

**Question 6.** Prove *by definition* that  $f(x, y) = \sin(xy)$  is Riemann integrable on  $I := [0, 1] \times [0, 1]$ .

**Solution.** We try to prove  $U(f, I) = L(f, I)$ .

For any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , set  $I_{ij} := \left[\frac{i}{n}, \frac{i+1}{n}\right] \times \left[\frac{j}{n}, \frac{j+1}{n}\right]$  for  $i, j \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$ . Let

$$f_{ij} := \min_{(x,y) \in I_{ij}} f(x, y), \quad F_{ij} := \max_{(x,y) \in I_{ij}} f(x, y). \quad (29)$$

Since  $f(x, y) = \sin(xy)$  is continuous over  $I_{ij}$ , there are  $(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2)$  such that

$$\sin(x_1 y_1) = f_{ij}, \quad \sin(x_2 y_2) = F_{ij}. \quad (30)$$

Now (single variable) MVT gives

$$|F_{ij} - f_{ij}| = |\cos(\xi)| |x_2 y_2 - x_1 y_1| \leq |x_2 - x_1| |y_2| + |y_2 - y_1| |x_1| \leq \frac{2}{n}. \quad (31)$$

Next define simple functions:

$$h_n(x, y) := \min_{i,j} f_{ij} 1_{I_{ij}}(x, y); \quad g_n(x, y) := \max_{i,j} F_{ij} 1_{I_{ij}}(x, y). \quad (32)$$

We have  $h_n(x, y) \leq f(x, y) \leq g_n(x, y)$  on  $I$  and furthermore

$$\int_I [g_n(x, y) - h_n(x, y)] d(x, y) = \sum_{i,j} (F_{ij} - f_{ij}) \frac{1}{n^2} \leq \frac{2}{n}. \quad (33)$$

This gives

$$U(f, I) - L(f, I) \leq \frac{2}{n}. \quad (34)$$

Since  $U(f, I) - L(f, I) \geq 0$  by definition, the arbitrariness of  $n$  now gives  $U(f, I) - L(f, I) = 0$  and integrability follows.