

[12]. We say that (f_n) is Cauchy in measure if, given $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists an N s.t. $m\{\lvert f_n - f_m \rvert \geq \varepsilon\} < \varepsilon$ whenever $m, n > N$. If (f_n) converges in measure, show that (f_n) is necessarily Cauchy in measure

pf: Since (f_n) converges in measure to f , then

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists N \text{ s.t. } m\{\lvert f_n - f \rvert \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\} < \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \text{ for all } n > N$$

Furthermore, we claim:

$$\{\lvert f_n - f_m \rvert \geq \varepsilon\} \subset \{\lvert f_n - f \rvert \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\} \cup \{\lvert f_m - f \rvert \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\}$$

$$\text{otherwise, } \lvert f_n - f_m \rvert \leq \lvert f_n - f \rvert + \lvert f_m - f \rvert \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} = \varepsilon$$

Therefore, for $n, m > N$

$$m\{\lvert f_n - f_m \rvert \geq \varepsilon\} \leq m\{\lvert f_n - f \rvert \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\} + m\{\lvert f_m - f \rvert \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\} < \varepsilon$$

[15] If $f_n \rightarrow f$ in L_1 , prove that there is a subseq of (f_n) that converges almost uniformly to f .

pf: By cor 19.5, we can find a subseq $(f_{n_k}) \xrightarrow{\text{a.e.}} f$. Then we can choose a further subseq g_{n_k} s.t. $\int \lvert g_{n_k} - f \rvert < 2^{-n}$ for all n .

Denote g_{n_k} by f_n without misunderstanding.

Now, we repeat the proof of Egorov's Theorem (Thm 17.13)

$$\text{Consider } E(1, k) = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \{x \in D : \lvert f_n(x) - f(x) \rvert \geq \frac{1}{k}\}$$

$$\text{Denote } E_{k,n} = \{x \in D : \lvert f_n(x) - f(x) \rvert \geq \frac{1}{k}\}$$

$$\text{Then } m(E_{k,n}) \cdot \frac{1}{k} \leq \int \lvert f_n - f \rvert < 2^{-n} \Rightarrow m(E_{k,n}) < 2^{-n} \cdot k$$

$$\Rightarrow m(E(1, k)) < \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{-n} \cdot k = k < +\infty$$

Then we can repeat the remaining part of the proof of Egorov's Theorem

16) Over a set of finite measure, we can actually describe convergence in measure in terms of a metric. For example, consider

$$d(f, g) = \int_0^1 \min\{|f(x) - g(x)|, 1\} dx$$

where f, g : measurable, real-valued functions on $[0, 1]$

(a) check that $d(f, g)$ is pseudometric, with $d(f, g) = 0$ iff $f = g$ a.e

(b) prove that (f_n) converges in measure to f on $[0, 1]$ iff $d(f_n, f) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$

(c) prove that (f_n) is d -Cauchy iff (f_n) is Cauchy in measure

Pf: (a) $\Rightarrow d(f, f) = 0 \quad \forall$

$$\Rightarrow d(f, g) = d(g, f) \quad \forall$$

$$\Rightarrow \text{claim: } \min\{|x-y|, 1\} \leq \min\{|x-z|, 1\} + \min\{|z-y|, 1\}$$

$$\text{if } |x-z| \geq 1 \text{ or } |z-y| \geq 1 \Rightarrow \min\{|x-y|, 1\} \leq 1 \leq \min\{|x-z|, 1\} + \min\{|z-y|, 1\}$$

$$\text{if } |x-z| \leq 1 \text{ and } |y-z| \leq 1 \Rightarrow \min\{|x-y|, 1\} \leq |x-y| \leq |x-z| + |z-y| \leq \min\{|x-z|, 1\} + \min\{|z-y|, 1\}$$

Hence,

$$d(f, g) \leq d(f, h) + d(h, g)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow d(f, g) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \min\{|f-g|(x), 1\} = 0 \text{ a.e.} \Leftrightarrow f = g \text{ a.e.}$$

(b) (only if): Since (f_n) converges in measure to f , $\forall \varepsilon, \exists N$, s.t.

$$m\{x \in D : |f_n(x) - f(x)| \geq \varepsilon\} < \varepsilon \quad \text{for all } n > N$$

$$\text{Then } d(f_n, f) = \int_0^1 \min\{|f_n(x) - f(x)|, 1\} dx$$

$$\leq m([0, 1]) \cdot \varepsilon + 1 \cdot m\{x \in D : |f_n(x) - f(x)| > \varepsilon\} < 2\varepsilon.$$

(if): $\forall \varepsilon < 1, \exists N$, for $\forall n > N$, we have

$$d(f_n, f) = \int_0^1 \min\{|f_n(x) - f(x)|, 1\} dx < \varepsilon^2$$

$$\text{Then } m\{x \in D : |f_n(x) - f(x)| \geq \varepsilon\} \cdot \varepsilon \leq d(f_n, f) < \varepsilon^2$$

$$\Rightarrow m\{x \in D : |f_n(x) - f(x)| \geq \varepsilon\} < \varepsilon$$

(c) only if: if (f_n) is d Cauchy, $\therefore \epsilon$

$\forall \epsilon < 1, \exists N$ s.t. $\forall n, m > N$, we have

$$d(f_n, f_m) = \int_0^1 \min\{|f_n - f_m|, 1\} dx < \epsilon^2$$

$$\Rightarrow m\{x \in D : |f_n - f_m| \geq \epsilon\} \cdot \epsilon \leq d(f_n, f_m) < \epsilon^2 \Rightarrow m\{x \in D : |f_n - f_m| \geq \epsilon\} < \epsilon$$

if: if (f_n) is Cauchy in measure.

$\forall \epsilon > 0, \exists N$ s.t. $\forall n, m > N$, we have

$$m\{x \in D : |f_n - f_m| \geq \epsilon\} < \epsilon$$

$$\Rightarrow \int_0^1 \min\{|f_n - f_m|, 1\} dx < \epsilon \cdot 1 + m([0, 1]) \cdot \epsilon = 2\epsilon$$

$$\Rightarrow d(f_n, f_m) \rightarrow 0$$

19: In sharp contrast to convergence in measure, the topology of convergence pointwise a.e. can not, in general, be described by a metric. To see this,

prove that

(a) There is a sequence of meas functions (f_n) on $[0, 1]$ that fails to converge pointwise a.e. to 0, but such that every subseq of (f_n) has a further subseq that does converge pointwise a.e. to 0.

(b) There is no metric ρ on $L_0[0, 1]$ satisfying $\rho(f_n, f) \rightarrow 0$ iff $f_n \rightarrow f$ a.e.

pf = (a) For any $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, $\exists ! k, j$ s.t. $n = 2^k + j$ and $0 \leq j < 2^k$

$$\text{Define } A_n = \left[\frac{j}{2^k}, \frac{j+1}{2^k} \right], f_n(x) = \chi_{A_n}$$

① for $x \in \left[\frac{j}{2^k}, \frac{j+1}{2^k} \right)$ then $f_n(x) = 1$, for $n = 2^k + j$, but $f_{n+1}(x) = 0$

So (f_n) fails to converge pointwise a.e. to 0

② But every subseq of (f_n) has a further subseq that does converge pointwise a.e. to 0

Since $m(\{|f_n| \geq \epsilon\}) \rightarrow 0$ ($m(A_n) \rightarrow 0$), By Exercise 17

\Rightarrow every subseq of (f_n) has a further subseq that converges pointwise a.e. to 0

1b) Suppose a metric ρ existed on $L_0[0,1]$ such that $\rho(f_n, f) \rightarrow 0$

iff $f_n \rightarrow f$ pointwise almost everywhere. Then

(f_n) converges to zero a.e. \Leftrightarrow each subseq has a further convergent subseq

But by (a), contradiction!

We conclude that ~~there~~ no such metric ρ can exist

24] Show that equality holds in Hölder's ineq iff $A|f|^{p-1} = B|g|$ for some nonnegative constants A and B , not both zero, if and only if $C|f|^p = D|g|^q$ for some nonnegative constants C and D , not both zero

pf: In proof of 19.7, suppose $\|f\|_p > 0$ and $\|g\|_q = 0$ (o.w it's obvious)

The equality is achieved in Young's ineq iff $a^p = b^q$

\Rightarrow The equality is achieved in Hölder's ineq iff $\frac{|f(x)|^p}{\|f\|_p^p} = \frac{|g(x)|^q}{\|g\|_q^q}$

i.e. $C|f|^p = D|g|^q \Leftrightarrow A|f|^{p-1} = B|g|$

133] If f and g are disjointly supported elements of L_p , that is, if $fg = 0$ a.e., show

$$\|f+g\|_p^p = \|f\|_p^p + \|g\|_p^p$$

pf: Since $fg = 0$ a.e., then $|f+g|^p = |f|^p + |g|^p$ a.e.

$$\text{i.e. } \|f+g\|_p^p = \|f\|_p^p + \|g\|_p^p$$

39 Let $f, f_n \in L^p$, $1 \leq p < \infty$, and suppose that $f_n \rightarrow f$ a.e. show that

$$\|f_n - f\|_p \rightarrow 0 \text{ iff } \|f_n\|_p \rightarrow \|f\|_p$$

pf: **only if** :

since $\|f_n - f\|_p \rightarrow 0$, then $|\|f_n\|_p - \|f\|_p| \leq \|f_n - f\|_p$ by Minkowski's ineq

$$\Rightarrow \|f_n\|_p \rightarrow \|f\|_p$$

if : Defn $g_n(x) = 2^p(|f_n|^p + |f|^p) - |f_n - f|^p \geq 0 \Rightarrow g_n \rightarrow 2^{p+1}|f|^p$ a.e

By Fatou's Lemma.

$$2^{p+1} \int |f|^p \leq \liminf \int 2^p(|f_n|^p + |f|^p) - |f_n - f|^p$$

$$\leq \limsup \int 2^p(|f_n|^p + |f|^p) - \limsup \int |f_n - f|^p$$

$$\stackrel{\text{since } \|f_n\|_p \rightarrow \|f\|_p}{\leftarrow} = 2^{p+1} \int |f|^p - \limsup \int |f_n - f|^p$$

$$\text{Hence, } 0 \leq \liminf \int |f_n - f|^p \leq \limsup \int |f_n - f|^p \leq 0$$

$$\Rightarrow \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f_n - f\|_p \rightarrow 0$$

40 For $1 < p < \infty$ and $a, b > 0$, show that $a^p + b^p \leq (a+b)^p \leq 2^{p-1}(a^p + b^p)$ and the reverse inequalities hold when $0 < p < 1$.

pf: For $1 < p < \infty$, if $a=0$ or $b=0$, the inequality holds. Assume $a \geq b > 0$ - the above inequality is equivalent to

$$1 + \left(\frac{b}{a}\right)^p \leq \left(1 + \frac{b}{a}\right)^p \leq 2^{p-1} \left(1 + \left(\frac{b}{a}\right)^p\right)$$

$$\text{Define } \varphi(x) = \frac{(1+x)^p}{1+x^p}, \quad 0 \leq x \leq 1$$

$$\text{Then } \varphi'(x) = \frac{p(1+x)^{p-1}(1+x^p) - (1+x)^p \cdot px^{p-1}}{(1+x^p)^2} = \frac{p(1+x)^{p-1}(1+x^p - (1+x)x^{p-1})}{(1+x^p)^2}$$

$$= \frac{p(1+x)^{p-1}(1-x^{p-1})}{(1+x^p)^2} \geq 0$$

Then $\min_{x \in [0,1]} \varphi = 1$ $\max_{x \in [0,1]} \varphi = \frac{2^p}{2} = 2^{p-1}$. Then we can prove the inequality.

On the other hand, for $0 < p < 1$.

$$\varphi'(x) \leq 0$$

$$\Rightarrow \min_{x \in [0,1]} \varphi(x) = \varphi(1) = 2^{1-p} \quad - \quad \max_{x \in [0,1]} \varphi(x) = \varphi(0) = 1$$