

Homework 1 Solutions

5.1.0. (a) No. For example $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, given by $f(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & x \in [0, 1) \\ 1 & x = 1 \end{cases}$, is integrable (with integral 0, as we showed in the lecture) but is not continuous.

(b) No. For example, $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, given by $f(x) = \begin{cases} -1 & x \in \mathbb{Q} \\ 1 & x \notin \mathbb{Q} \end{cases}$, has $U(f) = 1$ and $L(f) = -1$, as is easily shown in the same fashion as for the Dirichlet function. Thus f is not Riemann integrable, but $|f| \equiv 1$ is a constant function and consequently is Riemann integrable.

(c) No. This is somewhat of a trick question: the integral $\int_a^b f(x) dx$ does not necessarily exist under the assumptions.

(d) No. The assumptions do not imply that f is bounded on $[a, b]$; for example $f : [-1, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, given by $f(x) = \begin{cases} -1/x & x \in [-1, 0) \\ 0 & x \in [0, 1] \end{cases}$, is not bounded above.

5.1.7. (a) In this part, I will use $U(f)$ instead of $(U) \int_a^b f(x) dx$, and analogous notation for other functions.

For any set A and real-valued functions f and g on A , we have, for any $x \in A$,

$$f(x) + g(x) \leq \sup_A f + \sup_A g$$

and so

$$\sup_A (f + g) \leq \sup_A f + \sup_A g.$$

It follows that for any partition P given by $a = x_0 < x_1 < \cdots < x_n = b$,

$$\begin{aligned} U(f + g, P) &= \sum_{j=1}^n \sup_{[x_{j-1}, x_j]} (f + g) \Delta x_j \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^n \left(\sup_{[x_{j-1}, x_j]} f + \sup_{[x_{j-1}, x_j]} g \right) \Delta x_j \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n \sup_{[x_{j-1}, x_j]} f \Delta x_j + \sum_{j=1}^n \sup_{[x_{j-1}, x_j]} g \Delta x_j \\ &= U(f, P) + U(g, P). \end{aligned}$$

Take any partitions P_1 and P_2 . We need to show that

$$U(f + g) \leq U(f, P_1) + U(g, P_2).$$

Then it will follow that $U(f + g) \leq \inf_{P_1} U(f, P_1) + \inf_{P_2} U(g, P_2) = U(f) + U(g)$. To show the above inequality, take $P = P_1 \cup P_2$; then

$$U(f + g) \leq U(f + g, P) \leq U(f, P) + U(g, P) \leq U(f, P_1) + U(g, P_2).$$

The proof for the lower integral is very similar (one can also use that $L(f) = -U(-f)$).

(b) Again, we prove this only for the upper integral. First we prove the (\geq) part. Take any partition P of $[a, b]$. Take the refinement $P' = P \cup \{c\}$. Then $P_1 = P' \cap [a, c]$ is a partition of $[a, c]$ and $P_2 = P' \cap [c, b]$ is a partition of $[c, b]$. Also, we can divide the sum for $U(f, P')$ into terms up to c and terms from c on to get $U(f, P') = U(f, P_1) + U(f, P_2)$. Then

$$U(f, P) \geq U(f, P') = U(f, P_1) + U(f, P_2) \geq (U) \int_a^c f + (U) \int_c^b f$$

and, as this is true for arbitrary P ,

$$(U) \int_a^b f \geq (U) \int_a^c f + (U) \int_c^b f.$$

Next we prove the (\leq) part. Take any partitions P_1 of $[a, c]$ and P_2 of $[c, b]$. Then $P = P_1 \cup P_2$ is a partition of $[a, b]$. Then,

$$(U) \int_a^b f \leq U(f, P) = U(f, P_1) + U(f, P_2),$$

and then after taking the infimum over P_1 and P_2 ,

$$(U) \int_a^b f \leq (U) \int_a^c f + (U) \int_c^b f.$$