

# Analysis Prelim August 2013

Sarah Arpin  
University of Colorado Boulder  
Mathematics Department  
Sarah.Arpin@colorado.edu

## Problem 1

Prove the following “modified squeeze law”:

Suppose we have real numbers  $a_n$ ,  $b_{m,n}$ , and  $c_m$  such that

$$0 \leq a_n \leq b_{m,n} + c_m$$

for all  $m, n$  sufficiently large (say, greater than some fixed integer  $K$ ). If

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} c_m = 0$$

and, for any fixed  $m$ ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_{m,n} = 0$$

then  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = 0$ .

*Solution:*

Fix  $\epsilon > 0$

Since  $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} c_m = 0$ , there exists  $M \in \mathbb{N}$  such that if  $m \geq M$  then  $|c_m| < \epsilon/2$ . Fixing this  $M$ , we get:

$$0 \leq a_n \leq b_{M,n} + c_M \Rightarrow 0 \leq a_n \leq b_{M,n} + \epsilon/2$$

Taking the limit as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ :

$$0 \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_{M,n} + \epsilon/2$$

$$0 \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n \leq \epsilon/2 < \epsilon$$

Because  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_{M,n} = 0$  for any fixed  $M$ .

Since  $\epsilon$  was chosen arbitrarily,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = 0$ .

□

## Problem 2

Prove or disprove the following:

Let  $f, g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , and suppose the composite function  $f \circ g$  is continuous everywhere. If  $\lim_{u \rightarrow b} f(u) = c$  and

$\lim_{x \rightarrow a} g(x) = b$  (for  $b, c \in \mathbb{R}$ ), then  $\lim_{x \rightarrow a} f(g(x)) = c$ .

*Solution:*

False. Consider the function  $g(x) = 0$ , and the function  $f(x)$  defined:

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \neq 0 \\ 1 & \text{if } x = 0 \end{cases}$$

Then,  $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} g(x) = 0$ ,  $\lim_{u \rightarrow 0} f(u) = 0$ , but

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} f(g(x)) = f(0) = 1$$

□

### Problem 3

The *convolution*, denoted  $f * g$  of two functions  $f, g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is defined by

$$f * g(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x-y)g(y)dy$$

for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  such that the integral on the right exists (in the Lebesgue sense).

(a) Show that, if  $f, g \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ , then  $f * g(x)$  exists for all  $x$ , that  $f * g$  is bounded on  $\mathbb{R}$ , and that

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |f * g(x)| \leq \|f\|_2 \cdot \|g\|_2$$

(b) Show that, if  $f, g \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$ , then  $f * g(x)$  exists for all  $x$ , that  $f * g$  is bounded on  $\mathbb{R}$ , and that

$$\|f * g\|_1 \leq \|f\|_1 \cdot \|g\|_1$$

*Solution:*

(a)

$$\begin{aligned} |f * g(x)| &= \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x-y)g(y)dy \right| \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} |f(x-y)g(y)|dy \end{aligned}$$

By Hölder's Inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}} |f(x-y)|^2 dy \right)^{1/2} \cdot \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}} |g(y)|^2 dy \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \left( \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |f(x-y)|^2 dy \right)^{1/2} \cdot \|g\|_2 \end{aligned}$$

Using the change of variables  $s = x - y$  :

$$\begin{aligned} &= \left( - \int_{\infty}^{-\infty} |f(s)|^2 ds \right)^{1/2} \cdot \|g\|_2 \\ &= \left( \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |f(s)|^2 ds \right)^{1/2} \cdot \|g\|_2 \\ &= \|f\|_2 \cdot \|g\|_2 \end{aligned}$$

Taking the supremum of both sides does not affect the right side, so we get

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |f * g(x)| \leq \|f\|_2 \cdot \|g\|_2$$

(b)

$$\begin{aligned}\|f * g\|_1 &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} |f * g(x)| dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}} |f(x-y)g(y)| dy \right) dx\end{aligned}$$

We will justify switching order of integrals by Fubini's:

$$\begin{aligned}&= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}} |f(x-y)g(y)| dx \right) dy \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} |g(y)| \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}} |f(s)| ds \right) dy \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} |g(y)| \cdot \|f\|_1 dy \\ &= \|f\|_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}} |g(y)| dy \\ &= \|f\|_1 \cdot \|g\|_1\end{aligned}$$

Since  $f, g \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$ , this is finite and Fubini's theorem does indeed justify switching the order of integration.

□

## Problem 4

The *Fourier transform*, denoted  $\widehat{f}$ , of a function  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is defined by

$$\widehat{f}(s) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x)e^{-2\pi isx} dx$$

for any  $s \in \mathbb{R}$  such that the integral on the right exists (in the Lebesgue sense).

(a) Show that, if  $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$ , then  $\widehat{f}(s)$  exists for all  $s$ , that  $\widehat{f}$  is bounded and continuous and that

$$\sup_{s \in \mathbb{R}} |\widehat{f}(s)| \leq \|f\|_1$$

(b) Show that, if  $f, g \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$ , then

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \widehat{f}(u)g(u)du = \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(v)\widehat{g}(v)dv$$

*Solution:*

(a)

$$\begin{aligned}|\widehat{f}(s)| &= \left| \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x)e^{-2\pi isx} dx \right| \\ &\leq \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |f(x)e^{-2\pi isx}| dx \\ \text{And since } |e^{-2\pi isx}| &\leq 1 : \\ &\leq \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |f(x)| dx \\ &= \|f\|_1\end{aligned}$$

Taking the sup on both sides does not affect the right side, so we obtain:

$$\sup_{s \in \mathbb{R}} |\widehat{f}(s)| \leq \|f\|_1$$

The Fourier transform is a linear operator on  $L^1(\mathbb{R})$ , so boundedness is the same as continuity.

(b) Using the fact that  $\sup_{s \in \mathbb{R}} |\widehat{f}(s)| \leq \|f\|_1$  from part (a):

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \widehat{f}(u)g(u)du &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x)e^{-2\pi iux} dx \right) g(u)du \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x)e^{-2\pi iux} g(u)dx \right) du \end{aligned}$$

We wish to switch the order of integration.

We can justify this switch later by Fubini's.

$$\begin{aligned} &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x)e^{-2\pi iux} g(u)du \right) dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x) \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-2\pi iux} g(u)du \right) dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x)\widehat{g}(x)dx \end{aligned}$$

□

## Problem 5

Give an example of a subset of  $\mathbb{R}$  that is not a  $G_\delta$  set. (Recall that a  $G_\delta$  set in  $\mathbb{R}$  is a countable intersection of open subsets of  $\mathbb{R}$ .) Can such a set be countable? If so, give an example or show this. If not, explain why not.

*Solution:*

The set of rational numbers is not a countable intersection of open subsets of  $\mathbb{R}$ , so it is not a  $G_\delta$  set. We will show this by contradiction.

Suppose  $\mathbb{Q}$  is a countable intersection of open sets, say:

$$\mathbb{Q} = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{O}_n$$

Since  $\mathbb{Q}$  is dense in  $\mathbb{R}$ , each set  $\mathcal{O}_n$  must be dense in  $\mathbb{R}$ . The collection  $\{\mathcal{O}_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  is a countable collection of open, dense subsets of  $\mathbb{R}$ .

Let  $\{r_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  be an enumeration of the rationals. The sets  $\{\mathbb{R} \setminus \{r_k\}\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$  are dense in  $\mathbb{R}$ , and they are open sets since each set  $\{r_n\}$  is closed. Thus, the collection  $\{\mathbb{R} \setminus \{r_k\}\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$  is a countable collection of open, dense subsets of  $\mathbb{R}$ . The intersection of this collection of sets is the set of irrational numbers.

The union of two countable sets is countable, so  $\{\mathbb{R} \setminus \{r_k\}\}_{k=1}^{\infty} \cup \{\mathcal{O}_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  is a countable collection of open, dense subsets of  $\mathbb{R}$ .

However, the set of irrational numbers is the complement of the set of rational numbers, so the intersection of this collection of sets is empty. This is a contradiction of the Baire Category Theorem, as it says that in a complete metric space, the intersection of a countable number of dense sets is necessarily dense as well.

□

## Problem 6

Prove or disprove the following:

Let  $A$  be a measurable subset of  $\mathbb{R}$ . Let  $I = A \cap [a, b]$ , where  $[a, b]$  is a compact interval in  $\mathbb{R}$ , and let  $f : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Assume  $f$  is continuous on  $I$ , in the sense that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = x \Rightarrow \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(x_n) = f(x)$$

for  $x_n, x \in I$ . Then,  $f$  is bounded.

*Solution:*

**FALSE.** Let  $I = (a, b)$  and take  $f(x) = \frac{1}{x-a}$ .  $f$  is a continuous function on  $I$ , but  $f$  is not bounded, because  $f \rightarrow \infty$  as  $x \rightarrow a$ .

□