

# MAT3006\*: Real Analysis

## Homework 1

李肖鹏 (116010114)

**Due date:** Jan. 17, 2020

**Page 24, Problem 44.** Let  $p$  be a natural number greater than 1, and  $x$  a real number,  $0 < x < 1$ . Show that there is a sequence  $\{a_n\}$  of integers with  $0 \leq a_n < p$  for each  $n$  such that  $x = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_n}{p^n}$  and that this sequence is unique except when  $x$  is of the form  $q/p^n$ , in which case there are exactly two such sequences. Show that, conversely, if  $\{a_n\}$  is any sequence of integers with  $0 \leq a_n < p$ , the series  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_n}{p^n}$  converges to a real number  $x$  with  $0 \leq x \leq 1$ .

Notice that  $p$  is integer at least 2, so given any  $x \in (0, 1)$ , in the first step, we divide  $(0, 1)$  into  $p$  disjoint subintervals  $I_{1,i}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, p$  with equal length  $1/p$ . Notice that each  $I_{1,i}$  is open and if  $x$  is equal to one of two end points of  $I_{1,i}$ , then  $x$  must be of the form  $q/p$  for some integer  $1 \leq q \leq p-1$ . In this case we can either set  $a_1 = q$  and set all other  $a_n = 0$  or set  $a_1 = q-1$  and set all other  $a_n = p-1$ . If  $x$  is none of the end points of those subintervals, then  $x$  must lie in  $I_{1,i}$  for some  $i$ , and we let  $a_1 = i-1$ .

In the second step, we divide  $I_{1,a_1+1}$  into  $p$  disjoint subintervals  $I_{2,i}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, p$  with equal length  $1/p$ . Then we repeat exactly the same thing as in step one, if  $x$  is one of end points of  $I_{2,i}$ , then it has a form of  $q/p^2$  and all  $a_n$  will be defined in two different ways, so we can stop. If not, then we obtain  $a_2$  and continue. Therefore, in the end, if  $x$  is the end point of any subinterval  $I_{k,i}$  for  $k = 1, 2, \dots$  and  $i = 1, 2, \dots, p$ , we can obtain two different sequences  $\{a_n\}$ . If not, then we can still obtain  $\{a_n\}$  which satisfies

$$\frac{a_1}{p} + \dots + \frac{a_n}{p^n} < x < \frac{a_1}{p} + \dots + \frac{a_n}{p^n} + \frac{1}{p^n}$$

Since LHS and RHS are both nondecreasing and bounded by a geometric series, so they are both convergent and if we take the limit  $n \rightarrow \infty$  on both sides, we can obtain  $x = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_n}{p^n}$ .

Now it suffices to show that if we do not consider the case when there exists some  $n_0$  such that  $a_n = p-1$  for all  $n \geq n_0$ , which only appears when  $x = q/p^n$ , for each  $x \in (0, 1)$ , the  $a_n$  we can obtain is unique. Suppose

$$x = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_n}{p^n} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{b_n}{p^n}$$

but  $a_1 \geq b_1 + 1$ , then

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{b_n}{p^n} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_n}{p^n} \geq \frac{1}{p} + \frac{b_1}{p} + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{a_n}{p^n} \implies \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{b_n - a_n}{p^n} \geq \frac{1}{p}$$

However, we also have

$$\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{b_n - a_n}{p^n} \leq \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{p-1}{p^n} = \frac{1}{p}$$

Therefore,  $b_n - a_n = p - 1$  for all  $n \geq 2$ , which shows  $b_n = p - 1$  and  $a_n = 0$  for all  $n \geq 2$ . This means there exists some  $n_0$  such that  $a_n = p - 1$  for all  $n \geq n_0$ , which is excluded by us. Similarly we can derive the same contradiction for  $a_1 \leq b_1 - 1$ . Thus,  $a_1 = b_1$ . Similarly, we can obtain  $a_n = b_n$  for all  $n \geq 1$ .

Conversely, since  $0 \leq a_n \leq p - 1$ , we have

$$0 = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{0}{p^n} \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_n}{p^n} \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{p-1}{p^n} = 1$$

where the last equality is because

$$\sum_{n=1}^k \frac{p-1}{p^n} = \sum_{n=1}^k \frac{1}{p^{n-1}} - \sum_{n=1}^k \frac{1}{p^n} = \sum_{n=0}^{k-1} \frac{1}{p^n} - \sum_{n=1}^k \frac{1}{p^n} = 1 - \frac{1}{p^k} \rightarrow 1$$

as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Thus,  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_n}{p^n}$  is bounded by  $[0, 1]$ . Notice that  $a_n$  is nonnegative, so the partial sum of this series is nondecreasing, which means the series converges to some number in  $[0, 1]$ .

**Extra Problem 1.** Let  $A$  and  $B$  be sets. Suppose there exists injective mappings  $f : A \mapsto B$  and  $g : B \mapsto A$ . Prove that  $A \sim B$ .

Denote  $C = g(B)$  and  $D = f(A)$ . Let  $E = B \setminus D$ , and

$$S = g(E) \cup g[f \circ g(E)] \cup g[f \circ g \circ f \circ g(E)] \cup \dots$$

Define  $F : A \mapsto B$  by

$$F(a) = \begin{cases} f(a) & a \in A \setminus S \\ g^{-1}(a) & a \in S \end{cases}$$

Now we claim that  $F$  is bijective. First, we prove that  $F$  is surjective. Given  $b \in B$ ,  $g(b)$  is either in  $S$  or not in  $S$ . If  $g(b) \in S$ , then  $F(g(b)) = g^{-1}(g(b)) = b$ , which means such  $b$  can be attained by  $g(b) \in A$ . If  $g(b) \notin S$ , then  $b \in D$ . This means there exists  $a \in A$  such that  $f(a) = b$ . Furthermore,  $a \notin S$ , because if yes, then  $g \circ f(a) \in S$ , which means  $g(b) \in S$ , contradiction. Thus,  $a \in A \setminus S$ , and  $F(a) = f(a) = b$ . This implies that  $F$  is surjective.

To prove it is injective, suppose not, then there exists  $a_1 \in A \setminus S$  and  $a_2 \in S$  such that  $F(a_1) = F(a_2)$ , i.e.,  $f(a_1) = g^{-1}(a_2)$ , i.e.,  $g \circ f(a_1) = a_2$ . Since  $a_2 \in S$ ,  $g \circ f(a_1) \in S$ , and  $S = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i$ , where  $A_i$  denotes the  $i$ -th subset in the definition of  $S$ , e.g.,  $A_1 = g(E)$ , and  $A_2 = g[f \circ g(E)]$ . It is obvious that  $g \circ f(a_1)$  is not in  $A_1$  because  $f(a_1) \in D$  and  $g(D)$  and  $g(E)$  are disjoint. Then if  $g \circ f(a_1)$  is in  $A_2$ ,  $a_1 \in g(E) \subset S$ , which is contradiction to  $a_1 \in A \setminus S$ . Similarly, by induction, if  $g \circ f(a_1)$  is in  $A_k$ , we will obtain  $a_1 \in A_{k-1} \subset S$  for all  $k \geq 2$ , which is contradiction. Therefore, such  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  does not exist, which proves the injectivity of  $F$ .

**Extra Problem 2.** Let  $G_k$  ( $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$ ) be open and dense in  $\mathbb{R}$ . Prove that  $\bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} G_k$  is uncountable.

Since  $G_k$  is open and dense, its complement  $G_k^c$  is closed and nowhere dense. This is because  $G_k^c$  contains no open interval. Notice that if it contains an open interval  $I$ , then  $G_k$  is disjoint with  $I$ , then  $G_k$  cannot be dense because the middle point of  $I$  is not a limit point of  $G_k$ , which contradicts to the definition of dense set. Notice that  $G = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} G_k^c$  is of first category because it is countable

union of nowhere dense set. Since  $\mathbb{R}$  is of second category, so  $G^c$  is of second category. However, by De Morgan's Law,

$$G^c = \left( \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} G_k^c \right)^c = \bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} (G_k^c)^c = \bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} G_k$$

Therefore,  $\bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} G_k$  is of second category, but countable set must be of first category, so  $\bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} G_k$  is uncountable.

**Extra Problem 3.** Let  $3 \leq p < \infty$ . The Cantor-like set is constructed as follows: On the interval  $[0, 1]$ , first pick the middle point  $1/2$  and remove the  $1/p$  neighborhood of it. Denote the remaining part of  $[0, 1]$  by  $F_1$ . Now in the second stage, from each subinterval in  $F_1$ , remove the  $1/p^2$  neighborhood of its middle point. Denote the remaining part as  $F_2$ . Repeat this process we get  $F_n$ , which consists of  $2^n$  closed subintervals of equal length. Define  $C_p = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} F_n$ . Prove that

(i)  $C_p$  is nowhere dense;

For any  $x \in C_p$ , we want to show for all  $\delta > 0$ ,  $(x - \delta, x + \delta) \not\subset C_p$ . Since  $x \in C_p$ , for all  $n$ ,  $x \in F_n$ . Since  $F_n$  consists of closed and disjoint interval  $I_{n,i}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, 2^n$ , we assume  $x \in I_{n,i_n}$ . Then we obtain a sequence of closed interval  $I_{n,i_n}$  whose length is decreasing to zero. Therefore, we can take  $n$  large such that  $I_{n,i_n} \subset (x - \delta, x + \delta)$ . However, when construct  $F_{n+1}$ ,  $1/p^{n+1}$ -neighborhood of  $x$  in  $I_{n,i_n}$  is removed, so  $(x - \delta, x + \delta) \not\subset F_{n+1}$ , hence  $(x - \delta, x + \delta) \not\subset C_p$ .

(ii)  $C_p$  is a perfect set;

Since  $C_p$  is closed, we have  $C'_p \subset C_p$ . For all  $x \in C_p$ ,  $x \in F_n$  for all  $n \geq 1$ , so  $x \in I_{n,i_n}$  which has length

$$\frac{1 - \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{p^k}}{2^n} = \frac{p - 2 + p^{-n}}{2^n(p - 1)} \rightarrow 0$$

Therefore, if we denote  $x_n \in C_p$  be an end point of  $I_{n,i_n}$ ,  $d(x_n, x) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . This shows  $x$  is a limit point of  $C_p$ , so  $x \in C'_p$ , i.e.,  $C_p \subset C'_p$ . Thus,  $C_p = C'_p$  and  $C_p$  is a perfect set.

(iii) the total length of all open inverals removed is equal to  $\frac{1}{p-2}$ .

The total length of open inverals removed until step  $n$  is equal to

$$\frac{1}{p} + \frac{2^1}{p^2} + \frac{2^2}{p^3} + \dots = \frac{1}{p} \left( 1 + \left(\frac{2}{p}\right) + \left(\frac{2}{p}\right)^2 + \dots \right) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1 \cdot \left(1 - \left(\frac{2}{p}\right)^n\right)}{p - 2} = \frac{1}{p - 2}$$

Thus, the total length of all open inverals removed is equal to  $\frac{1}{p-2}$ .

**Extra Problem 4.** Let  $\{E_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  be a sequence of sets. Define

$$\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_n = \bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n=k}^{\infty} E_n, \quad \underline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_n = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{n=k}^{\infty} E_n$$

(i) Prove  $\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_n$  is equal to the set of points who belong to infinitely many  $E_n$ 's, and

$$\underline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_n = \{x \mid \exists \text{ integer } n_x \geq 1, \text{ s.t. } x \in E_n \text{ whenever } n \geq n_x\}$$

If  $x$  belongs to infinitely many  $E_n$ 's, then there exists a subsequence  $n_k$  such that  $x \in E_{n_k}$  for all  $k \geq 1$  and  $n_k \rightarrow \infty$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Therefore,  $x \in \bigcup_{n=n_k}^{\infty} E_n$  for all  $k$ . Since  $n_k \geq k$ , so for all  $k \geq 1$ ,  $x \in \bigcup_{n=n_k}^{\infty} E_n \subset \bigcup_{n=k}^{\infty} E_n$ . This is sufficient to show that  $x \in \bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n=k}^{\infty} E_n$ . Conversely if  $x$  belongs to only finitely many  $E_n$ 's, then denote the maximum  $n$  as  $n_0$ , for all  $k \geq n_0 + 1$ ,  $x \notin \bigcup_{n=k}^{\infty} E_n$ , so  $x \notin \bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n=k}^{\infty} E_n$ . This proves that the set of points who belong to infinitely many  $E_n$ 's is equal to  $\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_n$ .

If there exists  $n_x \geq 1$  such that  $x \in E_n$  for all  $n \geq n_x$ , then  $x \in \bigcap_{n=n_x}^{\infty} E_n$ , and thus  $x \in \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{n=k}^{\infty} E_n$ . Conversely, if  $x \in \underline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_n$ , then there must exist a  $k_0$  such that  $x \in \bigcap_{n=k_0}^{\infty} E_n$ , which further means for all  $n \geq k_0$ ,  $x \in E_n$ . Thus, we prove the required statement.

(ii) Suppose  $E_1 \subset E_2 \subset E_3 \subset \dots \subset E_n \subset E_{n+1} \subset \dots$ , find  $\underline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_n$  and  $\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_n$ .

For each  $k \geq 1$ ,  $\bigcap_{n=k}^{\infty} E_n = E_k$ , therefore,  $\underline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_n = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} E_k$ . For each  $k \geq 2$ ,  $\bigcup_{n=k}^{\infty} E_n = E_k = \bigcup_{n=k-1}^{\infty} E_n$ , therefore,  $\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_n = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n$ . This shows that  $\underline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_n = \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_n$ .

(iii) Suppose  $E_n \cap E_m = \emptyset$ , if  $n \neq m$ . Find  $\underline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_n$  and  $\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_n$ .

Since each  $E_n$  is pairwise disjoint, for all  $k \geq 1$ ,  $\bigcap_{n=k}^{\infty} E_n = \emptyset$ , thus  $\underline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_n = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \emptyset = \emptyset$ . We claim that  $\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_n = \emptyset$ . Suppose there exists  $x \in \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_n$ , then for all  $k \geq 1$ ,  $x \in \bigcup_{n=k}^{\infty} E_n$ . This implies that there exists a unique  $n_k \geq k$  such that  $x \in E_{n_k}$  for all  $k \geq 1$ . However, if  $k = 1$ , there exists unique  $n_1 \geq 1$  such that  $x \in E_{n_1}$ , but if we take  $k = n_1 + 1$ , then there exists unique  $n_2 > n_1$  such that  $x \in E_{n_2}$ , which contradicts to the uniqueness of  $n_1$ . Therefore, there is no such  $x$ , that is to say  $\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_n = \emptyset$ .

(iv) Let all  $E_n \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ . Prove that

$$\left( \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_n \right)^c = \underline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} (E_n)^c, \quad \left( \underline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_n \right)^c = \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} (E_n)^c$$

Notice that De Morgan's Law can be generalized into infinite number of sets, so

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_n \right)^c &= \left( \bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n=k}^{\infty} E_n \right)^c = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \left( \bigcup_{n=k}^{\infty} E_n \right)^c = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{n=k}^{\infty} E_n^c = \underline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} (E_n)^c \\ \left( \underline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_n \right)^c &= \left( \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{n=k}^{\infty} E_n \right)^c = \bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} \left( \bigcap_{n=k}^{\infty} E_n \right)^c = \bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n=k}^{\infty} E_n^c = \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_n^c \end{aligned}$$

(v) Let  $f(x)$ ,  $\{f_n(x)\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  be defined on a set  $E \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ . Prove that

$$Z \triangleq \{x \in E \mid f_n(x) \not\rightarrow f(x) \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty\} = \bigcup_{l=1}^{\infty} \left( \overline{\lim}_{k \rightarrow \infty} E_l^k \right)$$

where  $E_l^k = \{x \in E \mid |f_k(x) - f(x)| \geq \frac{1}{l}\}$ .

Given  $x \in E$ ,  $f_n(x) \not\rightarrow f(x)$  is equivalent to say there exists  $l \in \mathbb{N}^+$  such that for all  $N \in \mathbb{N}^+$ , there exists  $k \geq N$ , such that  $|f_k(x) - f(x)| \geq \frac{1}{l}$ . In other words, it means that there exists  $l \in \mathbb{N}^+$  such that  $x \in E_l^k$  for infinitely many  $k$ , which by part (i), is equivalent to that  $x \in \overline{\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} E_l^k}$ . The existence of  $l$  is equivalent to  $x \in \bigcup_{l=1}^{\infty} \overline{\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} E_l^k}$ , so we prove the desired statement.

**Extra Problem 5.** Let  $E$  be a bounded closed subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Suppose  $\{f_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$  are continuous on  $E$  and  $f_k \rightarrow f$  uniformly for some  $f$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Prove that

$$f(E) = \bigcap_{j=1}^{\infty} \left( \overline{\bigcup_{k=j}^{\infty} f_k(E)} \right)$$

For  $y \in f(E)$ , there exists  $x \in E$  such that  $f(x) = y$ . Since  $f_k$  is uniformly convergent to  $f$ , so  $f_k(x) \rightarrow f(x) = y$ , which means  $y$  is a limit point of  $\bigcup_{k=j}^{\infty} f_k(E)$  for all  $j \geq 1$ . Therefore,  $y \in \bigcap_{j=1}^{\infty} \left( \overline{\bigcup_{k=j}^{\infty} f_k(E)} \right)$ .

For the other direction, if  $y \in \bigcap_{j=1}^{\infty} \left( \overline{\bigcup_{k=j}^{\infty} f_k(E)} \right)$ , then there exists a sequence  $a_k \subset \mathbb{N}^+$  such that  $f_{a_k}(x_{a_k}) \rightarrow y$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $x_{a_k} \in E$ . Since  $E$  is bounded subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , by Bolzano-Weierstrass, there exists a subsequence of  $x_{a_k}$  which converges in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and by closedness of  $E$ ,  $x_{a_{k_p}} \rightarrow x \in E$ . We claim that  $f(x) = y$ , and then  $y \in f(E)$ . Since  $f_k$  is continuous and uniformly convergent to  $f$ , so  $f$  is continuous. Also, by the definition of uniform convergence,  $\sup_{x \in E} |f_k(x) - f(x)| \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Consider

$$\begin{aligned} |f_{a_{k_p}}(x_{a_{k_p}}) - f(x)| &\leq |f_{a_{k_p}}(x_{a_{k_p}}) - f(x_{a_{k_p}})| + |f(x_{a_{k_p}}) - f(x)| \\ &\leq \sup_{x \in E} |f_{a_{k_p}}(x) - f(x)| + |f(x_{a_{k_p}}) - f(x)| \end{aligned}$$

Since  $a_{k_p} \rightarrow \infty$  and  $x_{a_{k_p}} \rightarrow x$  as  $p \rightarrow \infty$ , with the continuity of  $f$ , we conclude that the above two terms both converge to zero, i.e.,  $f_{a_{k_p}}(x_{a_{k_p}}) \rightarrow f(x)$ . However, since  $f_{a_{k_p}}(x_{a_{k_p}})$  is a subsequence of  $f_{a_k}(a_k)$  and  $f_{a_k}(a_k) \rightarrow y$ , these two limits must be equal, that is,  $f(x) = y$ .