

MATH2068 MATHEMATICAL ANALYSIS II (2024-25, SECOND TERM)

CHI-WAI LEUNG

1. DIFFERENTIATION

Throughout this section, let I be an open interval (not necessarily bounded) and let f be a real-valued function defined on I .

Definition 1.1. Let $c \in I$. We say that f is differentiable at c if the following limit exists:

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow c} \frac{f(x) - f(c)}{x - c}.$$

In this case, we write $f'(c)$ for the above limit and we call it the derivative of f at c . We say that if f is differentiable on I if $f'(x)$ exists for every point x in I .

Proposition 1.2. Let $c \in I$. Then $f'(c)$ exists if and only if there is a function φ defined on I such that the function φ is continuous at c and

$$f(x) - f(c) = \varphi(x)(x - c)$$

for all $x \in I$.

In this case, $\varphi(c) = f'(c)$.

Proof. Assume that $f'(c)$ exists. Define a function $\varphi : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\varphi(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{f(x) - f(c)}{x - c} & \text{if } x \neq c; \\ f'(c) & \text{if } x = c. \end{cases}$$

Clearly, we have $f(x) - f(c) = \varphi(x)(x - c)$ for all $x \in I$. We want to show that the function φ is continuous at c . In fact, let $\varepsilon > 0$, by the definition of the limit of a function, there is $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\left| f'(c) - \frac{f(x) - f(c)}{x - c} \right| < \varepsilon$$

whenever $x \in I$ with $0 < |x - c| < \delta$. Therefore, we have $|f'(c) - \varphi(x)| < \varepsilon$ as $x \in I$ with $0 < |x - c| < \delta$. Since $\varphi(c) = f'(c)$, we have $|f'(c) - \varphi(x)| < \varepsilon$ as $x \in I$ with $|x - c| < \delta$, hence the function φ is continuous at c as desired.

The converse is clear since $\varphi(x) = \frac{f(x) - f(c)}{x - c}$ if $x \neq c$. The proof is complete. \square

Proposition 1.3. Using the notation as above, if f is differentiable at c , then f is continuous at c .

Proof. By using Proposition 1.2, if $f'(c)$ exists, then there is a function φ defined on I such that the function φ is continuous at c and we have $f(x) - f(c) = \varphi(x)(x - c)$ for all $x \in I$. This implies that $\lim_{x \rightarrow c} f(x) = f(c)$, so f is continuous at c as desired. \square

Remark 1.4. In general, the converse of Proposition 1.3 does not hold, for example, the function $f(x) := |x|$ is a continuous function on \mathbb{R} but $f'(0)$ does not exist.

Proposition 1.5. *Let f and g be the functions defined on I . Assume that f and g both are differentiable at $c \in I$. We have the following assertions.*

- (i) $(f + g)'(c)$ exists and $(f + g)'(c) = f'(c) + g'(c)$.
- (ii) The product $(f \cdot g)'(c)$ exists and $(f \cdot g)'(c) = f'(c)g(c) + f(c)g'(c)$.
- (iii) If $g(c) \neq 0$, then we have $(\frac{f}{g})'(c)$ exists and $(\frac{f}{g})'(c) = \frac{f'(c)g(c) - f(c)g'(c)}{g(c)^2}$.

Proof. Part (i) clearly follows from the definition of the limit of a function.

For showing Part (ii), note that we have

$$\frac{f(x)g(x) - f(c)g(c)}{x - c} = \frac{f(x) - f(c)}{x - c}g(x) + f(c)\frac{g(x) - g(c)}{x - c}$$

for all $x \in I$ with $x \neq c$. From this, together with Proposition 1.3, Part (ii) follows.

For Part (iii), by using Part (ii), it suffices to show that $(\frac{1}{g})'(c) = -\frac{g'(c)}{g(c)^2}$. In fact, $g'(c)$ exists, so g is continuous at c . Since $g(c) \neq 0$, there is $\delta_1 > 0$ so that $g(x) \neq 0$ for all $x \in I$ with $|x - c| < \delta_1$. Then we have

$$\frac{1}{x - c} \left(\frac{1}{g(x)} - \frac{1}{g(c)} \right) = \frac{1}{x - c} \left(\frac{g(c) - g(x)}{g(x)g(c)} \right)$$

for all $x \in I$ with $0 < |x - c| < \delta_1$. By taking $x \rightarrow c$, we see that $(\frac{1}{g})'(c)$ exists and $(\frac{1}{g})'(c) = \frac{-g'(c)}{g(c)^2}$. The proof is complete. \square

Proposition 1.6. (Chain Rule): *Let f, g be functions defined on \mathbb{R} . Let $d = f(c)$ for some $c \in \mathbb{R}$. Suppose that $f'(c)$ and $g'(d)$ exist. Then the derivative of composition $(g \circ f)'(c)$ exists and $(g \circ f)'(c) = g'(d)f'(c)$.*

Proof. By using Proposition 1.2, we want to find a function $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$g \circ f(x) - g \circ f(c) = \varphi(x)(x - c)$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and the function $\varphi(x)$ is continuous at c , and so $(g \circ f)'(c) = \varphi(c)$.

Let $y = f(x)$. By using Proposition 1.2 again, there is a function $\beta(y)$ so that $g(y) - g(d) = \beta(y)(y - d)$ for all $y \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\beta(y)$ is continuous at d . Similarly, there is a function $\alpha(x)$ we have $f(x) - f(c) = \alpha(x)(x - c)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\alpha(x)$ is continuous at c . These two equations imply that

$$g \circ f(x) - g \circ f(c) = \beta(f(x))(f(x) - f(c)) = \beta(f(x))\alpha(x)(x - c)$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $\varphi(x) := \beta(f(x)) \cdot \alpha(x)$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Since $\beta(d) = g'(d)$ and $\alpha(c) = f'(c)$, we see that $\varphi(c) = \beta(f(c))\alpha(c) = g'(d)f'(c)$. It remains to show that the function φ is continuous at c . In fact, $f'(c)$ exists, so f is continuous at c , and hence the composition $\beta \circ f(x)$ is continuous at c . In addition, the function α is continuous at c . Therefore, the function $\varphi := (\beta \circ f) \cdot \alpha$ is continuous at c , and so $(g \circ f)'(c)$ exists with $(g \circ f)'(c) = \varphi(c) = g'(d)f'(c)$. The proof is complete. \square

Proposition 1.7. *Let I and J be open intervals. Let f be a strictly increasing continuous function from I onto J . Let $d = f(c)$ for $c \in I$. Assume that $f'(c)$ exists. Let $g := f^{-1}$. If $f'(c) \neq 0$, then $g'(d)$ exists and $g'(d) = \frac{1}{f'(c)}$.*

Proof. Let $y = f(x)$. Note that by using Proposition 1.2, there is a function F on I such that $f(x) - f(c) = F(x)(x - c)$ for all $x \in I$ and F is continuous at c with $F(c) = f'(c) \neq 0$. F is continuous at c , so there are open intervals I_1 and J_1 such that $c \in I_1 \subseteq I$ and $d \in f(I_1) = J_1$, moreover, $F(x) \neq 0$ for all $x \in I_1$. Note that since $f(x) - f(c) = F(x)(x - c)$, we have $y - d = f(g(y)) - f(g(c)) = F(g(y))(g(y) - g(d))$ for all $y \in J_1$. Since $F(x) \neq 0$ for all $x \in I_1$, we have $g(y) - g(d) = F(g(y))^{-1}(y - d)$ for all $y \in J_1$. Note that the function $F(g(y))^{-1}$ is continuous at d . Thus, $g'(d)$ exists and $g'(d) = F(g(d))^{-1} = \frac{1}{f'(c)}$ as desired. \square

Definition 1.8. Let D be a non-empty subset of \mathbb{R} and let g be a real-valued function defined on D .

(i) We say that g has an absolute maximum (resp. absolute minimum) at a point $c \in D$ if $g(c) \geq g(x)$ (resp. $g(c) \leq g(x)$) for all $x \in D$.

In this case, c is called an absolute extreme point of g .

(ii) We say that g has a local maximum (resp. local minimum) at a point $c \in D$ if there is $r > 0$ such that $(c - r, c + r) \subseteq D$ and $g(c) \geq g(x)$ (resp. $g(c) \leq g(x)$) for all $x \in (c - r, c + r)$.

In this case, c is called a local extreme point of g .

Remark 1.9. Note that an absolute extreme point of a function g need not be a local extreme point, for example if $g(x) := x$ for $x \in [0, 1]$, then g has an absolute maximum point at $x = 1$ of g but 1 is not a local maximum point of g .

Proposition 1.10. Let I be an open interval and let f be a function on I . Assume that f has a local extreme point at $c \in I$ and $f'(c)$ exists. Then $f'(c) = 0$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume that f has local minimum at c . Then there is $r > 0$ such that $f(x) \geq f(c)$ for $x \in (c - r, c + r) \subseteq I$. Since $f'(c)$ exists, by using Proposition 1.2, there is a function φ defined on I such that $f(x) - f(c) = \varphi(x)(x - c)$ for all $x \in I$ and φ is continuous at c with $\varphi(c) = f'(c)$. Thus, we have $\varphi(x)(x - c) \geq 0$ for all $x \in (c - r, c + r)$. From this we see that $\varphi(x) \geq 0$ as $x \in (c, c + r)$, similarly, $\varphi(x) \leq 0$ as $x \in (c - r, c)$. The function φ is continuous at c , so $\varphi(c) = 0$ and hence $f'(c) = \varphi(c) = 0$ as desired. \square

Proposition 1.11. Rolle's Theorem: Let $f : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function. Assume that $f'(x)$ exists for all $x \in (a, b)$ and $f(a) = f(b)$. Then there is a point $c \in (a, b)$ such that $f'(c) = 0$.

Proof. Recall a fact that every continuous function defined on a compact set attains absolute points, that is, there are c_1 and c_2 such that $f(c_1) = \min_{x \in [a, b]} f(x)$ and $f(c_2) = \max_{x \in [a, b]} f(x)$, hence, $f(c_1) \leq f(x) \leq f(c_2)$ for all $x \in [a, b]$. If $f(c_1) = f(c_2)$, then $f(x) \equiv f(c_1) = f(c_2)$ for all $x \in [a, b]$, so $f'(x) \equiv 0$ for all $x \in (a, b)$.

Otherwise, suppose that $f(c_1) < f(c_2)$. Since $f(a) = f(b)$, we have $c_1 \in (a, b)$ or $c_2 \in (a, b)$. We may assume that $c_1 \in (a, b)$. Then $x = c_1$ is a local minimum point of f . Therefore, $f'(c_1) = 0$ by using Proposition 1.10. \square

Theorem 1.12. Mean Value Theorem: If $f : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous function and is differentiable on (a, b) , then there is a point $c \in (a, b)$ such that $f(b) - f(a) = f'(c)(b - a)$.

Proof. Define a function $\varphi : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\varphi(x) = f(x) - f(a) - \frac{f(b) - f(a)}{b - a}(x - a)$$

for $x \in [a, b]$. Note that the function φ is continuous on $[a, b]$ with $\varphi(a) = \varphi(b) = 0$, in addition, $\varphi'(x)$ exists for all $x \in (a, b)$. The Rolle's Theorem implies that there is a point $c \in (a, b)$ such that

$$0 = \varphi'(c) = f'(c) - \frac{f(b) - f(a)}{b - a}.$$

The proof is complete. \square

Corollary 1.13. Assume that $f : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous function and is differentiable on (a, b) . If $f' \equiv 0$ on (a, b) , then f is a constant function.

Proof. Fix any point $z \in (a, b)$. Let $x \in (z, b]$. By using the Mean Value Theorem, there is a point $c \in (z, x)$ such that $f(x) - f(z) = f'(c)(x - z)$. If $f' \equiv 0$ on (a, b) , so $f(x) = f(z)$ for all $x \in [z, b]$. Similarly, we have $f(x) = f(z)$ for all $x \in [a, z]$. The proof is complete. \square

Definition 1.14. We call a function f is a C^1 -function on I if $f'(x)$ exists and continuous on I . In addition, we define the n -derivatives of f by $f^{(n)}(x) := f^{(n-1)}(x)$ for $n \geq 2$, provided it exists. In this case, we say that f is a C^n -function on I . In particular, we call f a C^∞ -function (or smooth function) if f is a C^n -function for all $n = 1, 2, \dots$

For example, the exponential function $\exp x$ is a very important example of smooth function on \mathbb{R} .

Corollary 1.15. Inverse Mapping Theorem: Let f be a C^1 -function on an open interval I and let $c \in I$. Assume that $f'(c) \neq 0$. Then there is $r > 0$ such that the function f is a strictly monotone function on $(c - r, c + r) \subseteq I$. If we let $J := f(c - r, c + r)$, then the inverse function $g := f^{-1} : J \rightarrow (c - r, c + r)$ is also a C^1 -function.

Proof. We may assume that $f'(c) > 0$. $f'(x)$ is continuous on I , so there is $r > 0$ such that $f'(x) > 0$ for all $x \in (c - r, c + r) \subseteq I$. For any x_1 and x_2 in $(c - r, c + r)$ with $x_1 < x_2$, by using the Mean Value Theorem, we have $f(x_2) - f(x_1) = f'(v)(x_2 - x_1)$ for some $v \in (x_1, x_2)$, and hence $f(x_2) > f(x_1)$. Therefore the restriction of f on $(c - r, c + r)$ is a strictly increasing function, thus, it is an injection. Let $J := f((c - r, c + r))$. Then J is an interval by the Intermediate Value Theorem. Moreover, J is an open interval because f is strictly increasing. Also, if we let $g = f^{-1}$ on J , then g is continuous on J due to the fact that every continuous bijection on a compact set is a homeomorphism. Therefore, by Proposition 1.7, we see that $g'(y)$ exists on J and $g'(y) = \frac{1}{f'(x)}$ for $y = f(x)$ and $x \in (c - r, c + r)$. Therefore, g is a C^1 function on J . The proof is complete. \square

Proposition 1.16. Cauchy Mean Value Theorem: Let $f, g : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be continuous functions with $g(a) \neq g(b)$. Assume that f, g are differentiable functions on (a, b) and $g'(x) \neq 0$ for all $x \in (a, b)$. Then there is a point $c \in (a, b)$ such that $\frac{f(b)-f(a)}{g(b)-g(a)} = \frac{f'(c)}{g'(c)}$.

Proof. Define a function ψ on $[a, b]$ by $\psi(x) = f(x) - f(a) - \frac{f(b)-f(a)}{g(b)-g(a)}(g(x) - g(a))$ for $x \in [a, b]$. Then by using the similar argument as in the Mean Value Theorem, the result follows. \square

Theorem 1.17. Lagrange Remainder Theorem: Let f be a $C^{(n+1)}$ function defined on (a, b) . Let $x_0 \in (a, b)$. Then for each $x \in (a, b)$, there is a point c between x_0 and x such that

$$f(x) = \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{f^{(k)}(x_0)}{k!} (x - x_0)^k + \frac{f^{(n+1)}(c)}{(n+1)!} (x - x_0)^{n+1}.$$

Proof. We may assume that $x_0 < x < b$. **Case:** We first assume that $f^{(k)}(x_0) = 0$ for all $k = 0, 1, \dots, n$. Put $g(t) = (t - x_0)^{n+1}$ for $t \in [x_0, x]$. Then $g'(t) = (n+1)(t - x_0)^n$ and $g(x_0) = 0$. Then by the Cauchy Mean Value Theorem, there is $x_1 \in (x_0, x)$ such that $\frac{f(x)}{g(x)} = \frac{f(x)-f(x_0)}{g(x)-g(x_0)} = \frac{f'(x_1)}{g'(x_1)}$. Using the same step for f' and g' on $[x_0, x_1]$, there is $x_2 \in (x_0, x_1)$ such that $\frac{f'(x_1)}{g'(x_1)} = \frac{f'(x_1)-f'(x_0)}{g'(x_1)-g'(x_0)} = \frac{f^{(2)}(x_2)}{g^{(2)}(x_2)}$. To repeat the same step, there are x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n+1} in (a, b) such that $x_k \in (x_0, x_{k-1})$ for $k = 1, 2, \dots, n+1$ and

$$\frac{f(x)}{g(x)} = \frac{f'(x_1)}{g'(x_1)} = \dots = \frac{f^{(n+1)}(x_{n+1})}{g^{(n+1)}(x_{n+1})}.$$

In addition, note that $g^{n+1}(x_{n+1}) = (n+1)!$. Therefore, we have $\frac{f(x)}{g(x)} = \frac{f^{(n+1)}(x_{n+1})}{(n+1)!}$, and hence $f(x) = \frac{f^{(n+1)}(x_{n+1})}{(n+1)!} (x - x_0)^{n+1}$. Note $x_{n+1} \in (x_0, x)$ and thus, the result holds for this case.

For the general case, put $G(x) = f(x) - \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{f^{(k)}(x_0)}{k!} (x - x_0)^k$ for $x \in (a, b)$. Note that we have $G(x_0) = G'(x_0) = \dots = G^{(n)}(x_0) = 0$. Then by the Claim above, there is a point $c \in (x_0, x)$ such that $G(x) = \frac{G^{(n+1)}(c)}{(n+1)!}$. Since $G^{(n+1)}(c) = f^{(n+1)}(c)$, $f(x) = \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{f^{(k)}(x_0)}{k!} (x - x_0)^k + \frac{f^{(n+1)}(c)}{(n+1)!}$. The proof is complete. \square

Example 1.18. Recall that the exponential function e^x is defined by

$$e^x := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{x^k}{k!} := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{x^k}{k!}$$

for $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Note that the above limit always exists for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ (shown in the last chapter).

Show that the natural base e is an irrational number.

Put $f(x) := e^x$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$. It is a known fact f is a C^∞ function and $f^{(n)}(x) = e^x$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Fix any $x > 0$. Then by the Lagrange Theorem, for each positive integer n , there is $c_n \in (0, x)$ such that

$$f(x) = \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{x^k}{k!} + \frac{e^{c_n}}{(n+1)!} x^{n+1}.$$

In particular, taking $x = 1$, we have

$$0 < \frac{e^{c_n}}{(n+1)!} = e - \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{1}{k!} < \frac{3}{(n+1)!}$$

for all positive integer n . Now if $e = p/q$ for some positive integers p and q , and thus, we have

$$0 < \frac{p}{q} - \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{1}{k!} < \frac{3}{(n+1)!}$$

for all $n = 1, 2, \dots$. Now we can choose n large enough such that $(n!) \frac{p}{q} \in \mathbb{N}$. It leads to a contradiction because we have

$$0 < (n!) \frac{p}{q} - (n!) \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{1}{k!} < \frac{3(n!)}{(n+1)!} = \frac{3}{n+1} < 1.$$

Therefore, e is irrational.

Proposition 1.19. Let f be a C^2 function on an open interval I and $x_0 \in I$. Assume that $f'(x_0) = 0$. Then f has local maximum (resp. local minimum) at x_0 if $f^{(2)}(x_0) < 0$ (resp. $f^{(2)}(x_0) > 0$).

Proof. We assume that $f^{(2)}(x_0) > 0$. We want to show that x_0 is a local minimum point of f . The proof of another case is similar. Now since f is C^2 -function and $f^{(2)}(x_0) > 0$, we can find $r > 0$ such that $(x_0 - r, x_0 + r) \subseteq (a, b)$ and $f^{(2)} > 0$ on $(x_0 - r, x_0 + r)$. Note that for any $x \in (x_0 - r, x_0 + r) \setminus \{x_0\}$. Then by the Lagrange Theorem, there is a point c between x_0 and x such that

$$f(x) = f(x_0) + f'(x_0)(x - x_0) + \frac{1}{2} f^{(2)}(c)(x - x_0)^2 = f(x_0) + \frac{1}{2} f^{(2)}(c)(x - x_0)^2.$$

Therefore, we have

$$f(x) = f(x_0) + \frac{1}{2} f^{(2)}(c)(x - x_0)^2 \geq f(x_0)$$

for all $x \in (x_0 - r, x_0 + r)$ and thus, x_0 is a local minimum point of f as desired. \square

Proposition 1.20. L'Hospital's Rule: Let f and g be the differentiable functions on (a, b) and let $c \in (a, b)$. Assume that $f(c) = g(c) = 0$, in addition, $g'(x) \neq 0$ and $g(x) \neq 0$ for all $x \in (a, b) \setminus \{c\}$. If the limit $L := \lim_{x \rightarrow c} \frac{f'(x)}{g'(x)}$ exists, then so does $\lim_{x \rightarrow c} \frac{f(x)}{g(x)}$, moreover, we have $L = \lim_{x \rightarrow c} \frac{f(x)}{g(x)}$.

Proof. Fix $c < x < b$. Then by the Cauchy Mean Value Theorem, there is a point $x_1 \in (c, x)$ such that

$$\frac{f(x)}{g(x)} = \frac{f(x) - f(c)}{g(x) - g(c)} = \frac{f'(x_1)}{g'(x_1)}$$

$x_1 \in (c, x)$, so if $L := \lim_{x \rightarrow c} \frac{f'(x)}{g'(x)}$ exists, then $\lim_{x \rightarrow c^+} \frac{f(x)}{g(x)}$ exists and is equal to L .

Similarly, we also have $\lim_{x \rightarrow c^-} \frac{f(x)}{g(x)} = L$. The proof is finished. \square

Proposition 1.21. Let f be a function on (a, b) and let $c \in (a, b)$.

(i) If $f'(c)$ exists, then the following limit exists (also called the symmetric derivatives of f at c):

$$f'(c) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(c+t) - f(c-t)}{2t}.$$

(ii) If $f^{(2)}(c)$ exists, then

$$f^{(2)}(c) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(c+t) - 2f(c) + f(c-t)}{t^2}.$$

Proof. For showing (i), note that we have

$$f'(c) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{f(c+t) - f(c)}{t} = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^-} \frac{f(c+t) - f(c)}{t}.$$

Putting $t = -s$ into the second equality above, we see that

$$f'(c) = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{f(c-s) - f(c)}{-s}.$$

To sum up the two equations above, we have

$$f'(c) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{f(c+t) - f(c-t)}{2t}.$$

Similarly, we have $f'(c) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^-} \frac{f(c+t) - f(c-t)}{2t}$. Part (i) follows.

For showing Part (ii), let $h(t) := f(c+t) - 2f(c) + f(c-t)$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Then $h(0) = 0$ and $h'(t) = f'(c+t) - f'(c-t)$. By using the L'Hospital's Rule and Part (i), we have

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(c+t) - 2f(c) + f(c-t)}{t^2} = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{h'(t)}{(t^2)'} = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{f'(c+t) - f'(c-t)}{2t} = f^{(2)}(c).$$

The proof is complete. \square

Definition 1.22. A function f defined on (a, b) is said to be convex if for any pair $a < x_1 < x_2 < b$, we have

$$f((1-t)x_1 + tx_2) \leq (1-t)f(x_1) + tf(x_2)$$

for all $t \in [0, 1]$.

Proposition 1.23. Let f be a C^2 function on (a, b) . Then f is a convex function if and only if $f^{(2)}(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in (a, b)$.

Proof. For showing (\Rightarrow): assume that f is a convex function. Fix a point $c \in (a, b)$. f is convex, so we have $f(c) = f(\frac{1}{2}(c+t) + \frac{1}{2}(c-t)) \leq \frac{1}{2}f(c+t) + \frac{1}{2}f(c-t)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ with $c \pm t \in (a, b)$. By Proposition 1.21, we have

$$f^{(2)}(c) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(c+t) - 2f(c) + f(c-t)}{t^2}.$$

Therefore, we have $f^{(2)}(c) \geq 0$.

For (\Leftarrow), assume that $f^{(2)}(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in (a, b)$. Fix $a < x_1 < x_2 < b$ and $t \in [0, 1]$. Let $c := (1-t)x_1 + tx_2$. Then by the Lagrange Remainder Theorem, there are points $z_1 \in (x_1, c)$ and $z_2 \in (c, x_2)$ such that

$$f(x_2) = f(c) + f'(c)(x_2 - c) + \frac{1}{2}f^{(2)}(z_2)(x_2 - c)^2$$

and

$$f(x_1) = f(c) + f'(c)(x_1 - c) + \frac{1}{2}f^{(2)}(z_1)(x_1 - c)^2.$$

These two equations implies that

$$(1-t)f(x_1) + tf(x_2) = f(c) + (1-t)\frac{1}{2}f^{(2)}(z_1)(x_1 - c)^2 + t\frac{1}{2}f^{(2)}(z_2)(x_2 - c)^2 \geq f(c).$$

since $f^{(2)}(z_1)$ and $f^{(2)}(z_2)$ both are non-negative. Thus, f is convex. \square

Corollary 1.24. *Let $p > 0$. The function $f(x) := x^p$ is convex on $(0, \infty)$ if and only if $p \geq 1$.*

Proof. Note that $f^{(2)}(x) = p(p-1)x^{p-2}$ for all $x > 0$. Then the result follows immediately from Proposition 1.23. \square

Proposition 1.25. Netwon's Method: *Let f be a continuous real-valued function defined on $[a, b]$ with $f(a) < 0 < f(b)$ and $f(z) = 0$ for some $z \in (a, b)$. Assume that f is a C^2 function on (a, b) and $f'(x) \neq 0$ for all $x \in (a, b)$. Then there is $\delta > 0$ with $J := [z - \delta, z + \delta] \subseteq [a, b]$ which have the following property:*

if we fix any $x_1 \in J$ and let

$$(1.1) \quad x_{n+1} := x_n - \frac{f(x_n)}{f'(x_n)}$$

for $n = 1, 2, \dots$, then we have $z = \lim x_n$.

Proof. We first choose $r > 0$ such that $[z - r, z + r] \subseteq (a, b)$. We fix any point $x_1 \in (z - r, z + r)$ with $x_1 \neq z$. Then by the Lagrange Remainder Theorem, there is a point ξ between z and x_1 such that

$$0 = f(z) = f(x_1) + f'(x_1)(z - x_1) + \frac{1}{2}f^{(2)}(\xi)(z - x_1)^2.$$

This, together with Eq 1.1 above, we have

$$x_2 - x_1 = -\frac{f(x_1)}{f'(x_1)} = z - x_1 + \frac{f^{(2)}(\xi)}{2f'(x_1)}(z - x_1)^2.$$

Therefore, we have

$$(1.2) \quad x_2 - z = \frac{f^{(2)}(\xi)}{2f'(x_1)}(z - x_1)^2.$$

Note that the functions $f'(x)$ and $f^{(2)}(x)$ are continuous on $[z - r, z + r]$ and $f'(x) \neq 0$, hence, there is $M > 0$ such that $|\frac{f^{(2)}(u)}{2f'(v)}| \leq M$ for all $u, v \in [z - r, z + r]$. Then the Eq 1.2 implies that

$$(1.3) \quad |x_2 - z| = \left| \frac{f^{(2)}(\xi)}{2f'(x_1)} (z - x_1)^2 \right| \leq M(z - x_1)^2.$$

Choose $\delta > 0$ such that $M\delta < 1$ and $J := [z - \delta, z + \delta] \subseteq (z - r, z + r)$. Note that Now we take any $x_1 \in J$. Eq 1.3 implies that $|x_2 - z| \leq M \cdot |z - x_1|^2 \leq (M\delta) \cdot |x_1 - z|$. By using Eq 1.1 inductively, we have a sequence (x_n) in J such that

$$|x_{n+1} - z| \leq M \cdot |z - x_n|^2 \leq (M\delta) \cdot |x_n - z|$$

for all $n = 1, 2, \dots$. Therefore, we have

$$|x_{n+1} - z| \leq (M\delta)^n \cdot |x_1 - z|$$

for all $n = 1, 2, \dots$, thus, $\lim x_n = z$. The proof is complete. \square

Appendix: Differentiability on \mathbb{R}^n

Recall that for each element $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ in \mathbb{R}^n , write $\|x\| := \sqrt{|x_1|^2 + \dots + |x_n|^2}$ (call the *norm* of x). And for $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $r > 0$, put $B(a, r) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|x - a\| < r\}$.

Lemma 1.26. *Every linear map on \mathbb{R}^n is continuous.*

Proof. Let $T : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ be a linear map and let $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ be the natural basis for \mathbb{R}^n . It suffices to show that the map T is continuous at 0 (why?). Let (x_i) be a sequence in \mathbb{R}^n that converges to 0. If we write $x_i := \sum_{k=1}^n t_i(k)e_k$, then $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} t_i(k) = 0$ for all $k = 1, \dots, n$. This implies that

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} T(x_i) = \sum_{k=1}^n \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} t_i(k) T e_k = 0 \text{ as desired.} \quad \square$$

Remark 1.27. *Notice that a linear map on an infinite dimensional space may not be continuous. For example, we consider an infinite dimensional vector space $E := \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{R}^n$ whose norm is given by $\|x\| = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} x(k)^2$ for $x = (x(k))_{k=1}^{\infty} \in E$. Define $T : E \rightarrow E$ by $Tx(k) := kx(k)$ for $k = 1, 2, \dots$ for $x \in E$. Then T is a linear map but it is discontinuous at 0 (why?).*

If you want to know more details about the infinite dimensional case, take the course of Functional Analysis in future.

Definition 1.28. *Let U be an open subset of \mathbb{R}^n and let $f : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ be a mapping. We say that f is differentiable at a point $a \in U$ if there is a (continuous) linear map $L(a) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ such that*

$$(1.4) \quad \lim_{v \rightarrow 0} \frac{\|f(a+v) - f(a) - L(a)(v)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}}{\|v\|_{\mathbb{R}^n}} = 0.$$

$L(a)$ is called a differential of f at a . f is said to be differentiable on U if it is differentiable at every point in U .

Proposition 1.29. *We keep the notation as given in Definition 1.28. Then we have the followings.*

(i) *f is differentiable at $a \in U$ if and only if there are a linear map $L(a) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ and a function $\alpha(a, \cdot) : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ such that*

$$(1.5) \quad f(x) = f(a) + L(a)(x - a) + \alpha(a, x) \quad \text{for all } x \in U \text{ and } \lim_{x \rightarrow a} \frac{\|\alpha(a, x)\|}{\|x - a\|} = 0.$$

- (ii) If f is differentiable at a , then f is continuous at a .
 (iii) A differential of f at $a \in U$ is unique if it exists.

From now on, we write $f'(a)$ for the differential of f at a .

Proof. For Part (i)(\Rightarrow), if f is differentiable at a , then we put

$$\alpha(a, x) := f(x) - f(a) - L(a)(x - a)$$

for $x \in U$. Then Eq 1.4 implies that $\lim_{x \rightarrow a} \frac{\|\alpha(a, x)\|}{\|x - a\|} = 0$ as desired. The converse is clear.

For Part (ii), we keep the notation as in Part (i). Since $\lim_{x \rightarrow a} \frac{\|\alpha(a, x)\|}{\|x - a\|} = 0$, we have $\lim_{x \rightarrow a} \|\alpha(a, x)\| = 0$. Thus, $\lim_{x \rightarrow a} (f(x) - f(a)) = 0$ by Eq 1.5 because every linear map is continuous. For showing (iii), let $L_1(a)$ and $L_2(a)$ be the linear maps from \mathbb{R}^n to \mathbb{R}^m . Let $\alpha_1(a, \cdot)$ and $\alpha_2(a, \cdot)$ be the functions given as in Part (i). From this we have

$$L_1(a)(x - a) + \alpha_1(a, x) = L_2(a)(x - a) + \alpha_2(a, x)$$

for all $x \in U$. Now choose $r > 0$ such that $B(a, r) \subseteq U$ and so we have $L_1(a)(v) + \alpha_1(a, a + v) = L_2(a)(v) + \alpha_2(a, a + v)$ for all $v \in B(0, r)$. Now if we fix $0 \neq v \in B(0, r)$, then we have

$$L_1(a)(tv) + \alpha_1(a, a + tv) = L_2(a)(tv) + \alpha_2(a, a + tv)$$

for all $0 < t \leq 1$. From this, taking $t \rightarrow 0+$, we have $L_1(a)(\frac{v}{\|v\|}) = L_2(a)(\frac{v}{\|v\|})$ and thus, $L_1(a)(v) = L_2(a)(v)$ for all $0 \neq v \in B(0, r)$. Then by the linearity of $L_1(a)$ and $L_2(a)$, we conclude that $L_1(a)(v) = L_2(a)(v)$ for all $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$. The proof is complete. \square

Proposition 1.30. Chain Rule: Let $f : U \rightarrow V$ and $g : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^l$ be the mappings where U and V are the open subsets of \mathbb{R}^n and \mathbb{R}^m respectively. Let $a \in U$ and put $b := f(a)$. If $f'(a)$ and $g'(b)$ both exist, then $(g \circ f)'(a)$ exists and $(g \circ f)'(a) = g'(b) \circ f'(a) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^l$.

Proof. Put $y = f(x)$. Let $\alpha(a, \cdot) : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ and $\beta(b, \cdot) : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^l$ be the functions given as in Proposition 1.29 above. Notice that we have

$$f(x) = f(a) + f'(a)(x - a) + \alpha(a, x)$$

for all $x \in U$ and

$$g(y) = g(b) + g'(b)(y - b) + \beta(b, y)$$

for all $y \in V$. From this we have

$$\begin{aligned} g \circ f(x) &= g \circ f(a) + g'(b)(f(x) - f(a)) + \beta(f(a), f(x)) \\ &= g \circ f(a) + g'(b)f'(a)(x - a) + g'(b)(\alpha(a, x)) + \beta(f(a), f(x)) \end{aligned}$$

for all $x \in U$. Let

$$\gamma(a, x) := g'(b)(\alpha(a, x)) + \beta(f(a), f(x))$$

for $x \in U$. Then by Proposition 1.29, we need to show that

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow a} \frac{\|\gamma(a, x)\|}{\|x - a\|} = 0.$$

Since $\lim_{x \rightarrow a} \frac{\alpha(a, x)}{\|x - a\|} = 0$ and every linear map is continuous, we have $\lim_{x \rightarrow a} g'(b)(\frac{\alpha(a, x)}{\|x - a\|}) = 0$. Hence, it suffices to show that $\lim_{x \rightarrow a} \frac{\beta(b, y)}{\|x - a\|} = 0$.

In fact, let $\varepsilon > 0$, then by the construction of $\beta(b, y)$, there is $\delta_1 > 0$ such that

$$\frac{\|\beta(b, y)\|}{\|b - y\|} < \varepsilon \quad \text{whenever} \quad 0 < \|y - b\| < \delta_1.$$

Since f is continuous at a , there is $\delta_2 > 0$ such that $\|y - b\| < \delta_1$ whenever $0 < \|x - a\| < \delta_2$. On the other hand, we have

$$\frac{b - y}{\|x - a\|} = f'(a)\left(\frac{x - a}{\|x - a\|}\right) + \frac{\alpha(a, x)}{\|x - a\|}.$$

for all $x \in U \setminus \{a\}$. Since $f'(a) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ is continuous and the unit sphere $S_{n-1} := \{v \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|v\| = 1\}$ is compact, we have

$$\|f'(a)\left(\frac{x - a}{\|x - a\|}\right)\| \leq \sup_{v \in S_{n-1}} \|f'(a)(v)\| < \infty$$

for all $x \in U \setminus \{a\}$. Also, there is $0 < \delta < \delta_2$ such that $x \in U$ and $\frac{\|\alpha(a, x)\|}{\|x - a\|} < 1$ as $0 < \|x - a\| < \delta$. Thus, there is $M > 0$ such that $\frac{\|b - y\|}{\|x - a\|} \leq M$ whenever $0 < \|x - a\| < \delta$. This implies that if $y = f(x) \neq b$ and $0 < \|x - a\| < \delta$, then we have

$$\frac{\|\beta(b, y)\|}{\|x - a\|} = \frac{\|\beta(b, y)\|}{\|b - y\|} \frac{\|b - y\|}{\|x - a\|} \leq \varepsilon M.$$

Notice that $\beta(b, y) = 0$ if $y = b$. Therefore, if $0 < \|x - a\| < \delta$, then we have

$$\frac{\|\beta(b, y)\|}{\|x - a\|} \leq \varepsilon M.$$

The proof is complete. \square

To end this appendix, we are going to define the higher order differentials of f . Before giving the definition, let us recall the notation of multilinear maps. Let E and F be vector spaces. A mapping $T : E \times \cdots \times E$ (r -copies) $\rightarrow F$ is called a r -linear map if T is linear for each variable, more precisely, for $1 \leq k \leq r$ and $x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_r \in E$, the map $x \in E \mapsto T(x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}, x, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_r) \in F$ is linear. Write $L^{(r)}(E, F)$ for the set of all r -linear maps. Clearly, $L^{(r)}(E, F)$ is a vector space.

Lemma 1.31. $L^{(r)}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^m) = \mathbb{R}^{n^r m}$ for $r = 1, 2, \dots$. Consequently, the space $L^{(r)}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^m)$ have the norm structure induced by $\mathbb{R}^{n^r m}$.

Proof. Clearly, we have $L^{(1)}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^m) = M_{m \times n}(\mathbb{R}) = \mathbb{R}^{nm}$. Notice that we have $L^{(2)}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^m) = L^{(1)}(\mathbb{R}^n, L^{(1)}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^m))$ and so, $L^{(2)}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^m) = \mathbb{R}^{n^2 m}$. Using induction on r , we see that $L^{(r)}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^m) = \mathbb{R}^{n^r m}$. \square

Definition 1.32. We keep the notation as in Definition 1.28. Notice that if f is differentiable on U , then the differential of f gives a map

$$f' : a \in U \mapsto f'(a) \in L^{(1)}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^m).$$

Note that the space $L^{(1)}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^m)$ have the natural norm structure given by Lemma 1.31, that is, $L^{(1)}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^m) = \mathbb{R}^{nm}$. If f' is differentiable on U in the sense of Definition 1.28, then for each $a \in U$, it is naturally led to define

$$f^{(2)}(a) := (f')'(a) \in L^{(1)}(\mathbb{R}^n, L^{(1)}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^m)) = L^{(2)}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^m) = \mathbb{R}^{n^2 m}.$$

Thus, one can define inductively the r -th differential of f at a as the following

$$f^{(r)}(a) := (f^{(r-1)})'(a) \in L^{(r)}(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^m).$$

2. RIEMANN INTEGRABLE FUNCTIONS

We will use the following notation throughout this chapter.

- (i): All functions f, g, h, \dots are bounded real valued functions defined on $[a, b]$ and $m \leq f \leq M$ on $[a, b]$.
- (ii): Let $P : a = x_0 < x_1 < \dots < x_n = b$ denote a partition on $[a, b]$; Put $\Delta x_i = x_i - x_{i-1}$ and $\|P\| = \max \Delta x_i$.
- (iii): $M_i(f, P) := \sup\{f(x) : x \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]\}$; $m_i(f, P) := \inf\{f(x) : x \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]\}$.
Set $\omega_i(f, P) = M_i(f, P) - m_i(f, P)$.
- (iv): (the *upper sum* of f): $U(f, P) := \sum M_i(f, P)\Delta x_i$
(the *lower sum* of f): $L(f, P) := \sum m_i(f, P)\Delta x_i$.

Remark 2.1. *It is clear that for any partition on $[a, b]$, we always have*

- (i) $m(b - a) \leq L(f, P) \leq U(f, P) \leq M(b - a)$.
- (ii) $L(-f, P) = -U(f, P)$ and $U(-f, P) = -L(f, P)$.

The following lemma is the critical step in this section.

Lemma 2.2. *Let P and Q be the partitions on $[a, b]$. We have the following assertions.*

- (i) *If $P \subseteq Q$, then $L(f, P) \leq L(f, Q) \leq U(f, Q) \leq U(f, P)$.*
- (ii) *We always have $L(f, P) \leq U(f, Q)$.*

Proof. For Part (i), we first claim that $L(f, P) \leq L(f, Q)$ if $P \subseteq Q$. By using the induction on $l := \#Q - \#P$, it suffices to show that $L(f, P) \leq L(f, Q)$ as $l = 1$. Let $P : a = x_0 < x_1 < \dots < x_n = b$ and $Q = P \cup \{c\}$. Then $c \in (x_{s-1}, x_s)$ for some s . Notice that we have

$$m_s(f, P) \leq \min\{m_s(f, Q), m_{s+1}(f, Q)\}.$$

So, we have

$$m_s(f, P)(x_s - x_{s-1}) \leq m_s(f, Q)(c - x_{s-1}) + m_{s+1}(f, Q)(x_s - c).$$

This gives the following inequality as desired.

$$(2.1) \quad L(f, Q) - L(f, P) = m_s(f, Q)(c - x_{s-1}) + m_{s+1}(f, Q)(x_s - c) - m_s(f, P)(x_s - x_{s-1}) \geq 0.$$

Now by considering $-f$ in the Inequality 2.1 above, we see that $U(f, Q) \leq U(f, P)$.

For Part (ii), let P and Q be any pair of partitions on $[a, b]$. Notice that $P \cup Q$ is also a partition on $[a, b]$ with $P \subseteq P \cup Q$ and $Q \subseteq P \cup Q$. So, Part (i) implies that

$$L(f, P) \leq L(f, P \cup Q) \leq U(f, P \cup Q) \leq U(f, Q).$$

The proof is complete. □

The following notion plays an important role in this chapter.

Definition 2.3. *Let f be a bounded function on $[a, b]$. The upper integral (resp. lower integral) of f over $[a, b]$, write $\overline{\int_a^b} f$ (resp. $\underline{\int_a^b} f$), is defined by*

$$\overline{\int_a^b} f = \inf\{U(f, P) : P \text{ is a partation on } [a, b]\}.$$

(resp.

$$\int_a^b f = \sup\{L(f, P) : P \text{ is a partition on } [a, b]\}.)$$

Notice that the upper integral and lower integral of f must exist by Remark 2.1.

Remark 2.4. Appendix: We call a partially set (I, \leq) a *directed set* if for each pair of elements i_1 and i_2 in I , there is $i_3 \in I$ such that $i_1 \leq i_3$ and $i_2 \leq i_3$.

A *net* in \mathbb{R} is a real-valued function f defined on a directed set I , write $f = (x_i)_{i \in I}$, where $x_i := f(i)$ for $i \in I$.

We say that a net (x_i) converges to a point $L \in \mathbb{R}$ (call a limit of (x_i)) if for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is $i_0 \in I$ such that $|x_i - L| < \varepsilon$ for all $i \geq i_0$.

Using the similar argument as in the sequence case, a limit of (x_i) is unique if it exists and we write $\lim_i x_i$ for its limits.

Example 2.5. Appendix: Using the notation given as before, let

$$I := \{P : P \text{ is a partition on } [a, b]\}.$$

We say that $P_1 \leq P_2$ for $P_1, P_2 \in I$ if $P_1 \subseteq P_2$. Clearly, I is a directed set with this order. If we put $u_P := U(f, P)$, then we have

$$\lim_P u_P = \int_a^b f.$$

In fact, let $\varepsilon > 0$. Then by the definition of an upper integral, there is $P_0 \in I$ such that

$$\int_a^b f \leq U(f, P_0) \leq \int_a^b f + \varepsilon.$$

Lemma 2.2 tells us that whenever $P \in I$ with $P \geq P_0$, we have $U(f, P) \leq U(f, P_0)$. Thus we have $|u_P - \int_a^b f| < \varepsilon$ whenever $P \geq P_0$ as desired.

Proposition 2.6. *Let f and g both are bounded functions on $[a, b]$. With the notation as above, we always have*

(i)

$$\int_a^b f \leq \int_a^b f.$$

(ii) $\int_a^b (-f) = -\int_a^b f.$

(iii)

$$\int_a^b f + \int_a^b g \leq \int_a^b (f + g) \leq \int_a^b (f + g) \leq \int_a^b f + \int_a^b g.$$

Proof. Part (i) follows from Lemma 2.2 at once.

Part (ii) is clearly obtained by $L(-f, P) = -U(f, P)$.

For proving the inequality $\int_a^b f + \int_a^b g \leq \int_a^b (f + g) \leq$ first. It is clear that we have $L(f, P) + L(g, P) \leq L(f + g, P)$ for all partitions P on $[a, b]$. Now let P_1 and P_2 be any partition on $[a, b]$. Then by Lemma 2.2, we have

$$L(f, P_1) + L(g, P_2) \leq L(f, P_1 \cup P_2) + L(g, P_1 \cup P_2) \leq L(f + g, P_1 \cup P_2) \leq \int_a^b (f + g).$$

So, we have

$$(2.2) \quad \int_a^b f + \int_a^b g \leq \int_a^b (f + g).$$

As before, we consider $-f$ and $-g$ in the Inequality 2.2, we get $\overline{\int_a^b (f + g)} \leq \overline{\int_a^b f} + \overline{\int_a^b g}$ as desired. \square

The following example shows the strict inequality in Proposition 2.6 (iii) may hold in general.

Example 2.7. Define a function $f, g : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \in [0, 1] \cap \mathbb{Q}; \\ -1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

and

$$g(x) = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } x \in [0, 1] \cap \mathbb{Q}; \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then it is easy to see that $f + g \equiv 0$ and

$$\int_0^1 f = \int_0^1 g = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_0^1 f = \int_0^1 g = -1.$$

So, we have

$$-2 = \int_a^b f + \int_a^b g < \int_a^b (f + g) = 0 = \overline{\int_a^b (f + g)} < \overline{\int_a^b f} + \overline{\int_a^b g} = 2.$$

We can now reaching the main definition in this chapter.

Definition 2.8. Let f be a bounded function on $[a, b]$. We say that f is Riemann integrable over $[a, b]$ if $\overline{\int_a^b f} = \underline{\int_a^b f}$. In this case, we write $\int_a^b f$ for this common value and it is called the Riemann integral of f over $[a, b]$.

Also, write $R[a, b]$ for the class of Riemann integrable functions on $[a, b]$.

Proposition 2.9. With the notation as above, $R[a, b]$ is a vector space over \mathbb{R} and the integral

$$\int_a^b : f \in R[a, b] \mapsto \int_a^b f \in \mathbb{R}$$

defines a linear functional, that is, $\alpha f + \beta g \in R[a, b]$ and $\int_a^b (\alpha f + \beta g) = \alpha \int_a^b f + \beta \int_a^b g$ for all $f, g \in R[a, b]$ and $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof. Let $f, g \in R[a, b]$ and $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$. Notice that if $\alpha \geq 0$, it is clear that $\overline{\int_a^b \alpha f} = \alpha \overline{\int_a^b f} = \alpha \int_a^b f = \alpha \underline{\int_a^b f} = \underline{\int_a^b \alpha f}$. Also, if $\alpha < 0$, we have $\overline{\int_a^b \alpha f} = \alpha \underline{\int_a^b f} = \alpha \int_a^b f = \alpha \overline{\int_a^b f} = \underline{\int_a^b \alpha f}$. Therefore, we have $\int_a^b \alpha f = \alpha \int_a^b f$ for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. For showing $f + g \in R[a, b]$ and $\int_a^b (f + g) = \int_a^b f + \int_a^b g$, these will follow from Proposition 2.6 (iii) at once. The proof is finished. \square

The following result is the important characterization of a Riemann integrable function. Before showing this, we will use the following notation in the rest of this chapter.

For a partition $P : a = x_0 < x_1 < \cdots < x_n = b$ and $1 \leq i \leq n$, put

$$\omega_i(f, P) := \sup\{|f(x) - f(x')| : x, x' \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]\}.$$

It is easy to see that $U(f, P) - L(f, P) = \sum_{i=1}^n \omega_i(f, P)\Delta x_i$.

Theorem 2.10. *Let f be a bounded function on $[a, b]$. Then $f \in R[a, b]$ if and only if for all $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a partition $P : a = x_0 < \cdots < x_n = b$ on $[a, b]$ such that*

$$(2.3) \quad 0 \leq U(f, P) - L(f, P) = \sum_{i=1}^n \omega_i(f, P)\Delta x_i < \varepsilon.$$

Proof. Suppose that $f \in R[a, b]$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Then by the definition of the upper integral and lower integral of f , we can find the partitions P and Q such that $U(f, P) < \overline{\int_a^b} f + \varepsilon$ and $\underline{\int_a^b} f - \varepsilon < L(f, Q)$. By considering the partition $P \cup Q$, we see that

$$\underline{\int_a^b} f - \varepsilon < L(f, Q) \leq L(f, P \cup Q) \leq U(f, P \cup Q) \leq U(f, P) < \overline{\int_a^b} f + \varepsilon.$$

Since $\int_a^b f = \overline{\int_a^b} f = \underline{\int_a^b} f$, we have $0 \leq U(f, P \cup Q) - L(f, P \cup Q) < 2\varepsilon$. So, the partition $P \cup Q$ is as desired.

Conversely, let $\varepsilon > 0$, assume that the Inequality 2.3 above holds for some partition P . Notice that we have

$$L(f, P) \leq \underline{\int_a^b} f \leq \overline{\int_a^b} f \leq U(f, P).$$

So, we have $0 \leq \overline{\int_a^b} f - \underline{\int_a^b} f < \varepsilon$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$. The proof is finished. \square

Remark 2.11. *Theorem 2.10 tells us that a bounded function f is Riemann integrable over $[a, b]$ if and only if the “size” of the discontinuous set of f is arbitrary small. See the Appendix 3 below for details.*

Example 2.12. *Let $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the function defined by*

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{p} & \text{if } x = \frac{q}{p}, \text{ where } p, q \text{ are relatively prime positive integers;} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then $f \in R[0, 1]$.

(Notice that the set of all discontinuous points of f , say D , is just the set of all $(0, 1] \cap \mathbb{Q}$. Since the set $(0, 1] \cap \mathbb{Q}$ is countable, we can write $(0, 1] \cap \mathbb{Q} = \{z_1, z_2, \dots\}$. So, if we let $m(D)$ be the “size” of the set D , then $m(D) = m(\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \{z_i\}) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} m(\{z_i\}) = 0$, in here, you may think that the size of each set $\{z_i\}$ is 0.)

Proof. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. By Theorem 2.10, it aims to find a partition P on $[0, 1]$ such that

$$U(f, P) - L(f, P) < \varepsilon.$$

Notice that for $x \in [0, 1]$ such that $f(x) \geq \varepsilon$ if and only if $x = q/p$ for a pair of relatively prime positive integers p, q with $\frac{1}{p} \geq \varepsilon$. Since $1 \leq q \leq p$, there are only finitely many pairs of relatively prime positive integers p and q such that $f(\frac{q}{p}) \geq \varepsilon$. So, if we let $S := \{x \in [0, 1] : f(x) \geq \varepsilon\}$, then S is a finite subset

of $[0, 1]$. Let L be the number of the elements in S . Then, for any partition $P : a = x_0 < \cdots < x_n = 1$, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \omega_i(f, P) \Delta x_i = \left(\sum_{i:[x_{i-1}, x_i] \cap S = \emptyset} + \sum_{i:[x_{i-1}, x_i] \cap S \neq \emptyset} \right) \omega_i(f, P) \Delta x_i.$$

Notice that if $[x_{i-1}, x_i] \cap S = \emptyset$, then we have $\omega_i(f, P) \leq \varepsilon$ and thus,

$$\sum_{i:[x_{i-1}, x_i] \cap S = \emptyset} \omega_i(f, P) \Delta x_i \leq \varepsilon \sum_{i:[x_{i-1}, x_i] \cap S = \emptyset} \Delta x_i \leq \varepsilon(1 - 0).$$

On the other hand, since there are at most $2L$ sub-intervals $[x_{i-1}, x_i]$ such that $[x_{i-1}, x_i] \cap S \neq \emptyset$ and $\omega_i(f, P) \leq 1$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$, so, we have

$$\sum_{i:[x_{i-1}, x_i] \cap S \neq \emptyset} \omega_i(f, P) \Delta x_i \leq 1 \cdot \sum_{i:[x_{i-1}, x_i] \cap S \neq \emptyset} \Delta x_i \leq 2L \|P\|.$$

We can now conclude that for any partition P , we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \omega_i(f, P) \Delta x_i \leq \varepsilon + 2L \|P\|.$$

So, if we take a partition P with $\|P\| < \varepsilon/(2L)$, then we have $\sum_{i=1}^n \omega_i(f, P) \Delta x_i \leq 2\varepsilon$.

The proof is finished. \square

Proposition 2.13. *Let f be a function defined on $[a, b]$. If f is either monotone or continuous on $[a, b]$, then $f \in R[a, b]$.*

Proof. We first show the case of f being monotone. We may assume that f is monotone increasing. Notice that for any partition $P : a = x_0 < \cdots < x_n = b$, we have $\omega_i(f, P) = f(x_i) - f(x_{i-1})$. So, if $\|P\| < \varepsilon$, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \omega_i(f, P) \Delta x_i = \sum_{i=1}^n (f(x_i) - f(x_{i-1})) \Delta x_i < \|P\| \sum_{i=1}^n (f(x_i) - f(x_{i-1})) = \|P\| (f(b) - f(a)) < \varepsilon (f(b) - f(a)).$$

Therefore, $f \in R[a, b]$ if f is monotone.

Suppose that f is continuous on $[a, b]$. Then f is uniform continuous on $[a, b]$. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is $\delta > 0$ such that $|f(x) - f(x')| < \varepsilon$ as $x, x' \in [a, b]$ with $|x - x'| < \delta$. So, if we choose a partition P with $\|P\| < \delta$, then $\omega_i(f, P) < \varepsilon$ for all i . This implies that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \omega_i(f, P) \Delta x_i \leq \varepsilon \sum_{i=1}^n \Delta x_i = \varepsilon(b - a).$$

The proof is complete. \square

Proposition 2.14. *We have the following assertions.*

(i) *If $f, g \in R[a, b]$ with $f \leq g$, then $\int_a^b f \leq \int_a^b g$.*

(ii) *If $f \in R[a, b]$, then the absolute valued function $|f| \in R[a, b]$. In this case, we have $|\int_a^b f| \leq \int_a^b |f|$.*

Proof. For Part (i), it is clear that we have the inequality $U(f, P) \leq U(g, P)$ for any partition P . So, we have $\int_a^b f = \overline{\int_a^b f} \leq \overline{\int_a^b g} = \int_a^b g$.

For Part (ii), the integrability of $|f|$ follows immediately from Theorem 2.10 and the simple inequality $||f|(x') - |f|(x'')| \leq |f(x') - f(x'')|$ for all $x', x'' \in [a, b]$. Thus, we have $U(|f|, P) - L(|f|, P) \leq$

$U(f, P) - L(f, P)$ for any partition P on $[a, b]$.

Finally, since we have $-f \leq |f| \leq f$, by Part (i), we have $|\int_a^b f| \leq \int_a^b |f|$ at once. \square

Lemma 2.15. *Let g be a convex function defined on $[a, b]$. Then for $a < c < x < d < b$, we have*

$$\frac{g(x) - g(c)}{x - c} \leq \frac{g(d) - g(x)}{d - x}.$$

Consequently, if $a < x_1 < x_2 < x_3 < x_4 < b$, we have

$$(2.4) \quad \frac{g(x_2) - g(x_1)}{x_2 - x_1} \leq \frac{g(x_4) - g(x_3)}{x_4 - x_3}.$$

Proof. Let $\ell(x)$ be the straight line between the points $(c, g(c))$ and $(d, g(d))$. Then we have $g(x) \leq \ell(x)$ for all $x \in [c, d]$ by the convexity. This implies the following that we desired.

$$\frac{g(x) - g(c)}{x - c} \leq \frac{\ell(x) - \ell(c)}{x - c} = \frac{\ell(d) - \ell(x)}{d - x} \leq \frac{g(d) - g(x)}{d - x}.$$

\square

Proposition 2.16. (Jensen's inequality): *Let $g : [a', b'] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a convex function and $f \in R([0, 1])$ such that $f([0, 1]) \subseteq [a, b] \subseteq [a', b']$ and $g \circ f \in R([0, 1])$. Then we have*

$$g\left(\int_0^1 f(x)dx\right) \leq \int_0^1 (g \circ f)(x)dx.$$

Proof. Notice that if we let $c := \int_0^1 f$, then $c \in [a, b]$ and hence, $g(c)$ is defined. Notice that by Eq2.4 above the set $\{\frac{g(c)-g(x)}{c-x} : a' < x < c\}$ is bounded above and so, $s := \sup\{\frac{g(c)-g(y)}{c-y} : a' < y < c\}$ is defined. Thus, we have

$$g(c) - g(y) \leq s(c - y) \quad \text{for all } a' < y < c.$$

On the other hand, if $c < y_1 < b'$, then by Eq2.4 again we have

$$\frac{g(c) - g(y)}{c - y} \leq \frac{g(y_1) - g(c)}{y_1 - c} \quad \text{for all } a' < y < c.$$

Hence, we have $s \leq \frac{g(y_1) - g(c)}{y_1 - c}$ for all $c < y_1 < b'$. Thus, we have

$$(2.5) \quad g(c) - g(y) \leq s(c - y) \quad \text{for all } a' < y < b' \text{ with } y \neq c.$$

Note that Eq 2.5 clearly holds for $y = c$. Thus, Eq2.5 is true for all $a' < y < b'$. Now if put $y = f(x)$, then we have $g(c) + s(f(x) - c) \leq (g \circ f)(x)$ for all $x \in [0, 1]$. This gives

$$g(c) = g(c) + s \int_0^1 (f(x) - c)dx \leq \int_0^1 (g \circ f)(x)dx.$$

The proof is complete. \square

Example 2.17. *Let a_1, \dots, a_n be any real numbers. Let $p > 1$. Then we have*

$$\left(\frac{|a_1| + \dots + |a_n|}{n}\right)^p \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n |a_k|^p.$$

To see this, , the results obtained by applying the Jensen's inequality for the convex function $g(x) = x^p$ for $x \geq 0$ and $f(t) := |a_k|$ for $t \in [(k-1)/n, k/n]$ for $k = 1, \dots, n$.

Proposition 2.18. *Let $a < c < b$. We have $f \in R[a, b]$ if and only if the restrictions $f|_{[a, c]} \in R[a, c]$ and $f|_{[c, b]} \in R[c, b]$. In this case we have*

$$(2.6) \quad \int_a^b f = \int_a^c f + \int_c^b f.$$

Proof. Let $f_1 := f|_{[a, c]}$ and $f_2 := f|_{[c, b]}$.

It is clear that we always have

$$U(f_1, P_1) - L(f_1, P_1) + U(f_2, P_2) - L(f_2, P_2) = U(f, P) - L(f, P)$$

for any partition P_1 on $[a, c]$ and P_2 on $[c, b]$ with $P = P_1 \cup P_2$.

From this, we can show the sufficient condition at once.

For showing the necessary condition, since $f \in R[a, b]$, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a partition Q on $[a, b]$ such that $U(f, Q) - L(f, Q) < \varepsilon$ by Theorem 2.10. Notice that there are partitions P_1 and P_2 on $[a, c]$ and $[c, b]$ respectively such that $P := Q \cup \{c\} = P_1 \cup P_2$. Thus, we have

$$U(f_1, P_1) - L(f_1, P_1) + U(f_2, P_2) - L(f_2, P_2) = U(f, P) - L(f, P) \leq U(f, Q) - L(f, Q) < \varepsilon.$$

So, we have $f_1 \in R[a, c]$ and $f_2 \in R[c, b]$.

It remains to show the Equation 2.6 above. Notice that for any partition P_1 on $[a, c]$ and P_2 on $[c, b]$, we have

$$L(f_1, P_1) + L(f_2, P_2) = L(f, P_1 \cup P_2) \leq \int_a^b f = \int_a^b f.$$

So, we have $\int_a^c f + \int_c^b f \leq \int_a^b f$. Then the inverse inequality can be obtained at once by considering the function $-f$. Then the result is obtained by using Theorem 2.10. \square

Proposition 2.19. *Let f and g be Riemann integrable functions defined on $[a, b]$. Then the pointwise product function $f \cdot g \in R[a, b]$.*

Proof. We first show that the square function f^2 is Riemann integrable. In fact, if we let $M = \sup\{|f(x)| : x \in [a, b]\}$, then we have $\omega_k(f^2, P) \leq 2M\omega_k(f, P)$ for any partition $P : a = x_0 < \dots < x_n = b$ because we always have $|f^2(x) - f^2(x')| \leq 2M|f(x) - f(x')|$ for all $x, x' \in [a, b]$. Then by Theorem 2.10, the square function $f^2 \in R[a, b]$.

This, together with the identity $f \cdot g = \frac{1}{2}((f+g)^2 - f^2 - g^2)$. The result follows. \square

Remark 2.20. *In the proof of Proposition 2.19, we have shown that if $f \in R[a, b]$, then so is its square function f^2 . However, the converse does not hold. For example, if we consider $f(x) = 1$ for $x \in \mathbb{Q} \cap [0, 1]$ and $f(x) = -1$ for $x \in \mathbb{Q}^c \cap [0, 1]$, then $f \notin R[0, 1]$ but $f^2 \equiv 1$ on $[0, 1]$.*

Remark 2.21. *The composition of integrable functions need not be integrable. For example, if we put f is given as in Example 2.12 and $g(x) = x$ for $x = 1/n, n = 1, 2, \dots$; otherwise $g(x) = 0$. Then $f, g \in R[0, 1]$ but $g \circ f \notin R[0, 1]$.*

Proposition 2.22. *Assume that $f : [a, b] \rightarrow [c, d]$ is integrable and $g : [c, d] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous. Then the composition $g \circ f \in R[a, b]$.*

Proof. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Note that g is uniformly continuous on $[c, d]$ because g is continuous on $[c, d]$. Then there is $\delta > 0$ such that $|g(y) - g(y')| < \varepsilon$ whenever $y, y' \in [c, d]$ with $|y - y'| < \delta$. On the other hand, since $f \in R[a, b]$, there is a partition P on $[a, b]$ such that $\sum \omega_k(f, P)\Delta x_k < \varepsilon\delta$. Hence, we have

$$\delta \sum_{k:\omega_k(f,P) \geq \delta} \Delta x_k \leq \delta \sum_{k:\omega_k(f,P) \geq \delta} \omega_k(f, P)\Delta x_k < \varepsilon\delta.$$

This implies that

$$\sum_{k:\omega_k(f,P)\geq\delta} \Delta x_k < \varepsilon.$$

On the other hand, by the choice of δ , we see that $\omega_k(g \circ f, P) < \varepsilon$ whenever $\omega_k(f, P) < \delta$. Therefore, we can conclude that

$$\sum_k \omega_k(g \circ f, P) \Delta x_k = \sum_{k:\omega_k(f,P)<\delta} \omega_k(g \circ f, P) \Delta x_k + \sum_{k:\omega_k(f,P)\geq\delta} \omega_k(g \circ f, P) \Delta x_k < \varepsilon(b-a) + 2M\varepsilon$$

where $M := \sup |f(x)|$. The proof is complete. \square

Remark 2.23. Although Proposition 2.22) shows us that if $\phi \in R[a, b]$ and $f \in C[c, d]$, then $f \circ \phi \in R[a, b]$. However, this is not the case if $\phi \in C[a, b]$ and $f \in R[a, b]$. Before constructing this example, we need the following result first. From now on, for a subset E of \mathbb{R} let χ_E be the characteristic function of E , that is, $\chi_A(x) = 1$ when $x \in A$; otherwise, $\chi_A(x) = 0$. Also, we write $|I|$ for the length of an interval I .

Proposition 2.24. Let (J_k) be a disjoint sequence of open intervals in $[0, 1]$. Notice that for each n , $[0, 1] \setminus \bigcup_{k=1}^n J_k$ can be written as the disjoint union of closed intervals $\bigcup_{i=0}^n F_{n,i}$. We assume that

- (i) $\lim_n \max_{0 \leq i \leq n} |F_{n,i}| = 0$, where $|F_{n,i}|$ denotes the length of $F_{n,i}$;
- (ii) $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |J_k| := r < 1$.

Let (ϕ_k) be a sequence of continuous functions defined on $[0, 1]$ such that $0 < \phi_k \leq \frac{1}{2^k}$ on J_k and $\phi \equiv 0$ on $[0, 1] \setminus J_k$ for all k . Let $\phi := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \phi_k$. Put $h := \chi_{(0,1]} \circ \phi$. Notice that the function $\chi_{(0,1]} \in R[0, 1]$. Then $\phi \in C[0, 1]$ and $h \notin R[0, 1]$.

Proof. We first note that the continuity of ϕ is obtained by the M -test immediately (see [1, 9.4.6]). It remains to show $h \notin R[0, 1]$.

Let $F := [0, 1] \setminus \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} J_k$. We first claim that for any partition $P : 0 = x_0 < \dots < x_n = 1$, we have $[x_{k-1}, x_k] \not\subseteq F$ for all k . Suppose not. Assume that $[x_{k-1}, x_k] \subseteq F$ for some k . By the definition of F , we have $F = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} (\bigcup_{i=0}^n F_{n,i})$, so, $[x_{k-1}, x_k] \subseteq \bigcup_{i=0}^n F_{n,i}$ for all n . This implies that for all n , there is $0 \leq j \leq n$ such that $[x_{k-1}, x_k] \subseteq F_{n,j}$ because $(F_{n,i})_{0 \leq i \leq n}$ is a family of disjoint intervals. This contradicts to the condition (i) above. Thus, the claim follows.

Let

$$I := \{k : [x_{k-1}, x_k] \cap F = \emptyset\} \quad \text{and} \quad II := \{k : [x_{k-1}, x_k] \cap F \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Notice that $h = \chi_{[0,1] \setminus F}$. Thus, if $k \in II$, there is $t_1 \in [x_{k-1}, x_k] \cap F$. Hence, $h(t_1) = 0$. Also, by the claim above, there is $t_2 \in [x_{k-1}, x_k] \setminus F$, hence, $h(t_2) = 1$. Therefore, we have $\omega_k(h, P) = 1$ whenever $k \in II$. On the other hand, if $k \in I$, then $[x_{k-1}, x_k] \subseteq [0, 1] \setminus F = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} J_i$. Since J_i 's are disjoint intervals, we see that $[x_{k-1}, x_k] \subseteq J_l$ for some l . Then the assumption (ii) gives

$$\sum_{k \in II} \Delta x_k = 1 - \sum_{k \in I} \Delta x_k \geq 1 - \sum_i |J_i| = 1 - r.$$

Hence, we have

$$\sum_{k \in II} \omega_k(h, P) \Delta x_k = \sum_{k \in II} \Delta x_k \geq 1 - r > 0.$$

This implies that for any partition P , we have

$$\sum_k \omega_k(h, P) \Delta x_k \geq \sum_{k \in II} \omega_k(h, P) \Delta x_k = \sum_{k \in II} \Delta x_k \geq 1 - r > 0.$$

Thus, $h \notin R[0, 1]$. The proof is complete. \square

Example 2.25. We are going to construct of open sequence of intervals (J_k) in $[0, 1]$ satisfying the conditions (i) and (ii) in Proposition 2.24 above. By using Proposition 2.24 above, it gives an explicit example of showing that there are $f \in R[0, 1]$ and $\phi \in C[0, 1]$ such that $f \circ \phi \notin R[0, 1]$.

From now on, a middle subinterval J of a given interval I means that when I is divided into three subintervals and J is the middle one whose mid-point coincides with the mid-point of I .

We are going to construct inductively a sequence of open subintervals and closed subintervals of $[0, 1]$. As $n=1$, $[0, 1]$ is divided three into equal subintervals. Let C_1 be the middle open interval of $[0, 1]$. Then $[0, 1] \setminus C_1$ is a disjoint union of closed subinterval, say F_1 . Let p_1 be the length of C_1 and q_1 be the length of each subinterval of F_1 . In fact, $p_1 = q_1 = 1/3$ in this case.

As $n = 2$, let C_2 be the union of two middle open intervals of each subinterval of F_1 and the length of each such open middle interval, say p_2 , is $\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{3} q_1$. Let $F_2 := [0, 1] \setminus (C_1 \cup C_2)$. Then F_2 is the disjoint union of disjoint closed subintervals of $[0, 1]$. Put q_2 the length of each closed disjoint subintervals of F_2 . Note that $q_2 \leq 1/3$ and $|q_2| = 4$.

As $n = 3$, let C_3 be the union of 4 middle open intervals in each subintervals of F_2 and the length of each open middle interval, say p_3 , is $\frac{1}{2^2} \frac{1}{3} q_2$. Notice that if we put \widehat{p}_3 the total length of such middle open intervals, then $\widehat{p}_3 = 2^2 p_3 = \frac{1}{3} q_2 < \frac{1}{3^2} q_1 < \frac{1}{3^3}$. Moreover, let $F_3 := [0, 1] \setminus (C_1 \cup C_2 \cup C_3)$. Then F_3 is the union of 2^3 disjoint closed subintervals of equal length. If we let q_3 be the length of each subinterval, then $q_3 < \frac{1}{3} q_2 < \frac{1}{3^2}$.

To repeat the same procedure, we obtain the sequences (C_n) and (F_n) inductively. Then by the construction above, each C_n is the disjoint union of 2^{n-1} open intervals and each is of equal length p_n . Also, each F_n is the disjoint union of 2^n closed intervals and each is of length q_n . Moreover, we have

$$p_{n+1} = \frac{1}{2^n} \frac{1}{3} q_n \quad \text{and} \quad q_{n+1} < \frac{1}{3} q_n.$$

From this we have $q_n < \frac{1}{3^{n-1}}$ for all n . Also, we see that the total length of intervals in C_n , say \widehat{p}_n , is $2^{n-1} p_n$. Thus, we have

$$\widehat{p}_{n+1} = 2^n p_n = \frac{1}{3} q_n < \frac{1}{3^n}.$$

Therefore, $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \widehat{p}_n \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{3^n} = \frac{1}{2}$. Now let ϕ_n be a continuous function on $[0, 1]$ such that $0 < \phi_n \leq \frac{1}{2^n}$ on C_n and is 0 outside the set C_n .

Now set $\phi := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \phi_n$. Then by Proposition 2.25, we see that ϕ is continuous but $\chi_{(0,1]} \circ \phi \notin R[0, 1]$.

Proposition 2.26. (Mean Value Theorem for Integrals)

Let f and g be the functions defined on $[a, b]$. Assume that f is continuous and g is a non-negative Riemann integrable function. Then, there is a point $\xi \in (a, b)$ such that

$$(2.7) \quad \int_a^b f(x)g(x)dx = f(\xi) \int_a^b g(x)dx.$$

In particular, there is a point ξ in (a, b) such that $f(\xi) = \frac{1}{b-a} \int_a^b f(x)dx$.

Proof. By the continuity of f on $[a, b]$, there exist two points x_1 and x_2 in $[a, b]$ such that

$$f(x_1) = m := \min f(x); \quad \text{and} \quad f(x_2) = M := \max f(x).$$

We may assume that $a \leq x_1 < x_2 \leq b$. From this, since $g \geq 0$, we have

$$mg(x) \leq f(x)g(x) \leq Mg(x)$$

for all $x \in [a, b]$. From this and Proposition 2.19 above, we have

$$m \int_a^b g \leq \int_a^b fg \leq M \int_a^b g.$$

So, if $\int_a^b g = 0$, then the result follows at once.

We may now suppose that $\int_a^b g > 0$. The above inequality shows that

$$m = f(x_1) \leq \frac{\int_a^b fg}{\int_a^b g} \leq f(x_2) = M.$$

Therefore, there is a point $\xi \in [x_1, x_2] \subseteq [a, b]$ so that the Equation 2.7 holds by using the Intermediate Value Theorem for the function f . Thus, it remains to show that such element ξ can be chosen in (a, b) .

Let $a \leq x_1 < x_2 \leq b$ be as above.

If x_1 and x_2 can be found so that $a < x_1 < x_2 < b$, then the result is proved immediately since $\xi \in [x_1, x_2] \subset (a, b)$ in this case.

Now suppose that x_1 or x_2 does not exist in (a, b) , i.e., $m = f(a) < f(x)$ for all $x \in (a, b)$ or $f(x) < f(b) = M$ for all $x \in [a, b)$.

Claim 1: If $f(a) < f(x)$ for all $x \in (a, b)$, then $\int_a^b fg > f(a) \int_a^b g$ and hence, $\xi \in (a, x_2] \subseteq (a, b)$.

For showing **Claim 1**, put $h(x) := f(x) - f(a)$ for $x \in [a, b]$. Then h is continuous on $[a, b]$ and $h > 0$ on $(a, b]$. This implies that $\int_c^d h > 0$ for any subinterval $[c, d] \subseteq [a, b]$. (**Why?**)

On the other hand, since $\int_a^b g = \int_a^b g > 0$, there is a partition $P : a = x_0 < \cdots < x_n = b$ so that $L(g, P) > 0$. This implies that $m_k(g, P) > 0$ for some sub-interval $[x_{k-1}, x_k]$. Therefore, we have

$$\int_a^b hg \geq \int_{x_{k-1}}^{x_k} hg \geq m_k(g, P) \int_{x_{k-1}}^{x_k} h > 0.$$

Hence, we have $\int_a^b fg > f(a) \int_a^b g$. **Claim 1** follows.

Similarly, one can show that if $f(x) < f(b) = M$ for all $x \in [a, b)$, then we have $\int_a^b fg < f(b) \int_a^b g$.

This, together with **Claim 1** give us that such ξ can be found in (a, b) . The proof is finished. \square

Example 2.27. We have $\lim_n \int_0^{\pi/2} \sin^n x dx = 0$. To see this, for any $0 < \varepsilon < \pi/2$ and for each $n = 1, 2, \dots$, the Mean value theorem gives a point $\xi_n \in (0, \frac{\pi}{2} - \varepsilon)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < \int_0^{\pi/2} \sin^n x dx &= \left(\int_0^{\frac{\pi}{2}-\varepsilon} + \int_{\frac{\pi}{2}-\varepsilon}^{\pi/2} \right) \sin^n x dx \\ &\leq \sin^{n-1} \xi_n \int_0^{\frac{\pi}{2}-\varepsilon} \sin x dx + \int_{\frac{\pi}{2}-\varepsilon}^{\pi/2} \sin^n x dx \\ &< \sin^{n-1} \left(\frac{\pi}{2} - \varepsilon \right) + \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Taking $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have $\overline{\lim}_n \int_0^{\pi/2} \sin^n x dx = 0$. The proof is finished.

Now if $f \in R[a, b]$, then by Proposition 2.18, we can define a function $F : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$(2.8) \quad F(c) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } c = a \\ \int_a^c f & \text{if } a < c \leq b. \end{cases}$$

Theorem 2.28. Fundamental Theorem of Calculus: With the notation as above, assume that $f \in R[a, b]$, we have the following assertion.

- (i) If there is a continuous function F on $[a, b]$ which is differentiable on (a, b) with $F' = f$, then $\int_a^b f = F(b) - F(a)$. In this case, F is called an indefinite integral of f . (**note:** if F_1 and F_2 both are the indefinite integrals of f , then by the Mean Value Theorem, we have $F_2 = F_1 + \text{constant}$).
- (ii) The function F defined as in Eq. 2.8 above is continuous on $[a, b]$. Furthermore, if f is continuous on $[a, b]$, then F' exists on (a, b) and $F' = f$ on (a, b) .

Proof. For Part (i), notice that for any partition $P : a = x_0 < \dots < x_n = b$, then by the Mean Value Theorem, for each $[x_{i-1}, x_i]$, there is $\xi_i \in (x_{i-1}, x_i)$ such that $F(x_i) - F(x_{i-1}) = F'(\xi_i)\Delta x_i = f(\xi_i)\Delta x_i$. So, we have

$$L(f, P) \leq \sum f(\xi_i)\Delta x_i = \sum F(x_i) - F(x_{i-1}) = F(b) - F(a) \leq U(f, P)$$

for all partitions P on $[a, b]$. This gives

$$\int_a^b f = \int_a^b f \leq F(b) - F(a) \leq \overline{\int_a^b f} = \int_a^b f$$

as desired.

For showing the continuity of F in Part (ii), let $a < c < x < b$. If $|f| \leq M$ on $[a, b]$, then we have $|F(x) - F(c)| = |\int_c^x f| \leq M(x - c)$. So, $\lim_{x \rightarrow c^+} F(x) = F(c)$. Similarly, we also have $\lim_{x \rightarrow c^-} F(x) = F(c)$. Thus F is continuous on $[a, b]$.

Now assume that f is continuous on $[a, b]$. Notice that for any $t > 0$ with $a < c < c + t < b$, we have

$$\inf_{x \in [c, c+t]} f(x) \leq \frac{1}{t}(F(c+t) - F(c)) = \frac{1}{t} \int_c^{c+t} f \leq \sup_{x \in [c, c+t]} f(x).$$

Since f is continuous at c , we see that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{t}(F(c+t) - F(c)) = f(c)$. Similarly, we have $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^-} \frac{1}{t}(F(c+t) - F(c)) = f(c)$. So, we have $F'(c) = f(c)$ as desired. The proof is finished. \square

Definition 2.29. For each function f on $[a, b]$ and a partition $P : a = x_0 < \dots < x_n = b$, we call $R(f, P, \{\xi_i\}) := \sum_{i=1}^n f(\xi_i)\Delta x_i$, where $\xi_i \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]$, the Riemann sum of f over $[a, b]$.

We say that the Riemann sum $R(f, P, \{\xi_i\})$ converges to a number A as $\|P\| \rightarrow 0$, write $A = \lim_{\|P\| \rightarrow 0} R(f, P, \{\xi_i\})$, if for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is $\delta > 0$ such that

$$|A - R(f, P, \{\xi_i\})| < \varepsilon$$

whenever $\|P\| < \delta$ and for any $\xi_i \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]$.

Proposition 2.30. Let f be a function defined on $[a, b]$. If the limit $\lim_{\|P\| \rightarrow 0} R(f, P, \{\xi_i\}) = A$ exists, then f is automatically bounded.

Proof. Suppose that f is unbounded. Then by the assumption, there exists a partition $P : a = x_0 < \dots < x_n = b$ such that $|\sum_{k=1}^n f(\xi_k)\Delta x_k| < 1 + |A|$ for any $\xi_k \in [x_{k-1}, x_k]$. Since f is unbounded, we may assume that f is unbounded on $[a, x_1]$. In particular, we choose $\xi_k = x_k$ for $k = 2, \dots, n$. Also, we can choose $\xi_1 \in [a, x_1]$ such that

$$|f(\xi_1)|\Delta x_1 < 1 + |A| + \left| \sum_{k=2}^n f(x_k)\Delta x_k \right|.$$

It leads to a contradiction because we have $1 + |A| > |f(\xi_1)|\Delta x_1 - \left| \sum_{k=2}^n f(x_k)\Delta x_k \right|$. The proof is finished. \square

Lemma 2.31. $f \in R[a, b]$ if and only if for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is $\delta > 0$ such that $U(f, P) - L(f, P) < \varepsilon$ whenever $\|P\| < \delta$.

Proof. The converse follows from Theorem 2.10.

Assume that f is integrable over $[a, b]$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Then there is a partition $Q : a = y_0 < \dots < y_l = b$ on $[a, b]$ such that $U(f, Q) - L(f, Q) < \varepsilon$. Now take $0 < \delta < \varepsilon/l$. Suppose that $P : a = x_0 < \dots < x_n = b$ with $\|P\| < \delta$. Then we have

$$U(f, P) - L(f, P) = I + II$$

where

$$I = \sum_{i: Q \cap [x_{i-1}, x_i] = \emptyset} \omega_i(f, P) \Delta x_i;$$

and

$$II = \sum_{i: Q \cap [x_{i-1}, x_i] \neq \emptyset} \omega_i(f, P) \Delta x_i$$

Notice that we have

$$I \leq U(f, Q) - L(f, Q) < \varepsilon$$

and

$$II \leq (M - m) \sum_{i: Q \cap [x_{i-1}, x_i] \neq \emptyset} \Delta x_i \leq (M - m) \cdot 2l \cdot \frac{\varepsilon}{l} = 2(M - m)\varepsilon.$$

The proof is finished. \square

Theorem 2.32. $f \in R[a, b]$ if and only if the Riemann sum $R(f, P, \{\xi_i\})$ is convergent. In this case, $R(f, P, \{\xi_i\})$ converges to $\int_a^b f(x)dx$ as $\|P\| \rightarrow 0$.

Proof. For the proof (\Rightarrow): we first note that we always have

$$L(f, P) \leq R(f, P, \{\xi_i\}) \leq U(f, P)$$

and

$$L(f, P) \leq \int_a^b f(x)dx \leq U(f, P)$$

for any partition P and $\xi_i \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]$.

Now let $\varepsilon > 0$. Lemma 2.31 gives $\delta > 0$ such that $U(f, P) - L(f, P) < \varepsilon$ as $\|P\| < \delta$. Then we have

$$\left| \int_a^b f(x)dx - R(f, P, \{\xi_i\}) \right| < \varepsilon$$

as $\|P\| < \delta$ and $\xi_i \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]$. The necessary part is proved and $R(f, P, \{\xi_i\})$ converges to $\int_a^b f(x)dx$.

For (\Leftarrow): assume that there is a number A such that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is $\delta > 0$, we have

$$A - \varepsilon < R(f, P, \{\xi_i\}) < A + \varepsilon$$

for any partition P with $\|P\| < \delta$ and $\xi_i \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]$.

Note that f is automatically bounded in this case by Proposition 2.30.

Now fix a partition P with $\|P\| < \delta$. Then for each $[x_{i-1}, x_i]$, choose $\xi_i \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]$ such that $M_i(f, P) - \varepsilon \leq f(\xi_i)$. This implies that we have

$$U(f, P) - \varepsilon(b - a) \leq R(f, P, \{\xi_i\}) < A + \varepsilon.$$

Thus, we have shown that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a partition \mathcal{P} such that

$$(2.9) \quad \int_a^b f(x)dx \leq U(f, P) \leq A + \varepsilon(1 + b - a).$$

By considering $-f$, note that the Riemann sum of $-f$ will converge to $-A$. The inequality 2.9 will imply that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a partition P such that

$$A - \varepsilon(1 + b - a) \leq \int_a^b f(x)dx \leq \int_a^b f(x)dx \leq A + \varepsilon(1 + b - a).$$

The proof is complete. \square

Proposition 2.33. *Let $f \in C[c, d]$. Let $\phi : [a, b] \rightarrow [c, d]$ be a function with $\phi(a) = c$ and $\phi(b) = d$. Assume that ϕ is a C^1 function over $[a, b]$, that is, ϕ' can be extended to a continuous function on $[a, b]$. Then we have*

$$\int_c^d f(x)dx = \int_a^b f(\phi(t))\phi'(t)dt.$$

Proof. Notice that since f is continuous on $[c, d]$, the Fundamental Theorem of Calculus yields an indefinite integral F of f on $[c, d]$. Put $h(t) := F \circ \phi(t)$ for $t \in [a, b]$. Then by the chain rule, we see that $h'(t) = F'(\phi(t)) \cdot \phi'(t) = f(\phi(t)) \cdot \phi'(t)$ for $t \in (a, b)$. Using the Fundamental Theorem of Calculus again, we have

$$\int_a^b f(\phi(t)) \cdot \phi'(t)dt = \int_a^b h'(t)dt = h(b) - h(a) = F(d) - F(c) = \int_c^d f(x)dx.$$

The proof is finished. \square

The following theorem shows us that the assumption of the continuity of f in Proposition 2.33 can be replaced by a weaker condition.

Theorem 2.34. (Change of variable formula): *Let $f \in R[c, d]$. Let $\phi : [a, b] \rightarrow [c, d]$ be a C^1 function over $[a, b]$ with $\phi(a) = c$ and $\phi(b) = d$ satisfying $\phi' > 0$. Then $f \circ \phi \in R[a, b]$, moreover, we have*

$$\int_c^d f(x)dx = \int_a^b f(\phi(t))\phi'(t)dt.$$

Proof. Let $A = \int_c^d f(x)dx$. By using Theorem 2.32, we need to show that for all $\varepsilon > 0$, there is $\delta > 0$ such that

$$|A - \sum f(\phi(\xi_k))\phi'(\xi_k)\Delta t_k| < \varepsilon$$

for all $\xi_k \in [t_{k-1}, t_k]$ whenever $Q : a = t_0 < \dots < t_m = b$ with $\|Q\| < \delta$.

Now let $\varepsilon > 0$. Then by Lemma 2.31 and Theorem 2.32, there is $\delta_1 > 0$ such that

$$(2.10) \quad |A - \sum f(\eta_k)\Delta x_k| < \varepsilon$$

and

$$(2.11) \quad \sum \omega_k(f, P)\Delta x_k < \varepsilon$$

for all $\eta_k \in [x_{k-1}, x_k]$ whenever $P : c = x_0 < \dots < x_m = d$ with $\|P\| < \delta_1$.

Now put $x = \phi(t)$ for $t \in [a, b]$.

Note that there is $\delta > 0$ such that $|\phi(t) - \phi(t')| < \delta_1$ and $|\phi'(t) - \phi'(t')| < \varepsilon$ for all $t, t' \in [a, b]$ with $|t - t'| < \delta$.

Now let $Q : a = t_0 < \dots < t_m = b$ with $\|Q\| < \delta$. If we put $x_k = \phi(t_k)$, then $P : c = x_0 < \dots < x_m = d$ is a partition on $[c, d]$ with $\|P\| < \delta_1$ because ϕ is strictly increasing.

Note that the Mean Value Theorem implies that for each $[t_{k-1}, t_k]$, there is $\xi_k^* \in (t_{k-1}, t_k)$ such that

$$\Delta x_k = \phi(t_k) - \phi(t_{k-1}) = \phi'(\xi_k^*)\Delta t_k.$$

Now for any $\xi_k \in [t_{k-1}, t_k]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.12) \quad |A - \sum f(\phi(\xi_k))\phi'(\xi_k)\Delta t_k| &\leq |A - \sum f(\phi(\xi_k^*))\phi'(\xi_k^*)\Delta t_k| \\
&+ |\sum f(\phi(\xi_k^*))\phi'(\xi_k^*)\Delta t_k - \sum f(\phi(\xi_k))\phi'(\xi_k^*)\Delta t_k| \\
&+ |\sum f(\phi(\xi_k))\phi'(\xi_k^*)\Delta t_k - \sum f(\phi(\xi_k))\phi'(\xi_k)\Delta t_k|
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that inequality 2.10 implies that

$$|A - \sum f(\phi(\xi_k^*))\phi'(\xi_k^*)\Delta t_k| = |A - \sum f(\phi(\xi_k^*))\Delta x_k| < \varepsilon.$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\sum f(\phi(\xi_k^*))\phi'(\xi_k^*)\Delta t_k - \sum f(\phi(\xi_k))\phi'(\xi_k^*)\Delta t_k| \\
&\leq \sum \omega_k(f, P)\phi'(\xi_k^*)\Delta t_k \quad (\because \phi(\xi_k^*), \phi(\xi_k) \in [x_{k-1}, x_k]) \\
&\leq \sum \omega_k(f, P)\Delta x_k \\
&< \varepsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

Concerning about the last inequality in 2.12, since we have $|\phi'(\xi_k^*) - \phi'(\xi_k)| < \varepsilon$ for all $k = 1, \dots, m$, we have

$$|\sum f(\phi(\xi_k))\phi'(\xi_k^*)\Delta t_k - \sum f(\phi(\xi_k))\phi'(\xi_k)\Delta t_k| \leq M(b-a)\varepsilon$$

where $|f(x)| \leq M$ for all $x \in [c, d]$.

Finally by inequality 2.12, we have

$$|A - \sum f(\phi(\xi_k))\phi'(\xi_k)\Delta t_k| \leq \varepsilon + \varepsilon + M(b-a)\varepsilon.$$

Finally, we have to show that $f \circ \phi \in R[a, b]$. To see this, we have shown that the function $f \circ \phi(t)\phi'(t) \in R[a, b]$ by above. Since $\phi' > 0$ is continuous on $[a, b]$, $\frac{1}{\phi'}$ is continuous on $[a, b]$ and thus $\frac{1}{\phi'} \in R[a, b]$. This implies that the function $f \circ \phi = \frac{1}{\phi'}(f \circ \phi \cdot \phi') \in R[a, b]$ as desired. The proof is complete. \square

Definition 2.35. Let $-\infty < a < b < \infty$.

(i) Let f be a function defined on $[a, \infty)$. Assume that the restriction $f|_{[a, T]}$ is integrable over

$[a, T]$ for all $T > a$. Put $\int_a^\infty f := \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \int_a^T f$ if this limit exists.

Similarly, we can define $\int_{-\infty}^b f$ if f is defined on $(-\infty, b]$.

(ii) If f is defined on $(a, b]$ and $f|_{[c, b]} \in R[c, b]$ for all $a < c < b$. Put $\int_a^b f := \lim_{c \rightarrow a^+} \int_c^b f$ if it exists.

Similarly, we can define $\int_a^b f$ if f is defined on $[a, b)$.

(iii) As f is defined on \mathbb{R} , if $\int_0^\infty f$ and $\int_{-\infty}^0 f$ both exist, then we put $\int_{-\infty}^\infty f = \int_{-\infty}^0 f + \int_0^\infty f$.

In the cases above, we call the resulting limits the improper Riemann integrals of f and say that the integrals are convergent.

Clearly, the Cauchy criterion will imply the following immediately.

Proposition 2.36. Let $f : [a, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function given as in Definition 2.35.

(i) The improper integral $\int_a^\infty f$ exists if and only if for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is $M > 0$ such that $|\int_A^B f| < \varepsilon$ whenever $M < A < B$.

(ii) Let g be a non-negative function defined on $[a, \infty)$ such that $|f| \leq g$ on $[a, \infty)$. If $\int_a^\infty g$ is convergent, then so is $\int_a^\infty f$.

(iii) Suppose that $0 \leq g \leq f$ on $[a, \infty)$. If $\int_a^\infty g$ is divergent, then so is $\int_a^\infty f$.

Similar assertion holds when f is defined on $(a, b]$.

Remark 2.37. By using the Cauchy Theorem, it is clear that if $\int_a^\infty |f|$ is convergent, then so is the integral $\int_a^\infty f$. However, the converse does not hold. It is quite different from the case when f is defined on $[a, b]$.

For example, if $f(x) = \frac{(-1)^{n-1}}{n}$ as $n \in [n-1, n)$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$, then $\int_a^\infty f$ is convergent (it will be shown in the last chapter) but $\int_a^\infty |f|$ is divergent.

Example 2.38. Define (formally) an improper integral $\Gamma(s)$ (called the Γ -function) as follows:

$$\Gamma(s) := \int_0^\infty x^{s-1} e^{-x} dx$$

for $s \in \mathbb{R}$. Then $\Gamma(s)$ is convergent if and only if $s > 0$.

Proof. Put $I(s) := \int_0^1 x^{s-1} e^{-x} dx$ and $II(s) := \int_1^\infty x^{s-1} e^{-x} dx$. We first claim that the integral $II(s)$ is convergent for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$.

In fact, if we fix $s \in \mathbb{R}$, then we have

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{x^{s-1}}{e^{x/2}} = 0.$$

So there is $M > 1$ such that $\frac{x^{s-1}}{e^{x/2}} \leq 1$ for all $x \geq M$. Thus we have

$$0 \leq \int_M^\infty x^{s-1} e^{-x} dx \leq \int_M^\infty e^{-x/2} dx < \infty.$$

Therefore we need to show that the integral $I(s)$ is convergent if and only if $s > 0$.

Note that for $0 < \eta < 1$, we have

$$0 \leq \int_\eta^1 x^{s-1} e^{-x} dx \leq \int_\eta^1 x^{s-1} dx = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{s}(1 - \eta^s) & \text{if } s - 1 \neq -1; \\ -\ln \eta & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Thus the integral $I(s) = \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0^+} \int_\eta^1 x^{s-1} e^{-x} dx$ is convergent if $s > 0$.

Conversely, we also have

$$\int_\eta^1 x^{s-1} e^{-x} dx \geq e^{-1} \int_\eta^1 x^{s-1} dx = \begin{cases} \frac{e^{-1}}{s}(1 - \eta^s) & \text{if } s - 1 \neq -1; \\ -e^{-1} \ln \eta & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

So if $s \leq 0$, then $\int_\eta^1 x^{s-1} e^{-x} dx$ is divergent as $\eta \rightarrow 0^+$. The result follows. \square

3. APPENDIX: LEBESGUE INTEGRABILITY THEOREM

Throughout this section, let f be a \mathbb{R} -valued function defined on $[a, b]$ and let $M := \sup |f(x)|$.

Definition 3.1. A subset A of \mathbb{R} is said to have measure zero (or null set) if for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a sequence of open intervals, (a_n, b_n) such that $A \subseteq \bigcup (a_n, b_n)$ and $\sum (b_n - a_n) < \varepsilon$.

Clearly we have the following assertion.

Lemma 3.2. *If (A_n) is a sequence of null sets, then so is $\bigcup A_n$. Consequently, all countable sets are null sets.*

From now on, we use the following notation in the rest of this section.

- (1) For each subset A of \mathbb{R} , put $\omega(f, A) := \sup\{|f(x) - f(x')| : x, x' \in A\}$.
- (2) For $c \in [a, b]$, put $\omega(f, c) := \inf\{\omega(f, B(c, r)) : r > 0\}$, where $B(c, r) := (c - r, c + r)$.

The following is easy shown directly from the definition.

Lemma 3.3. *The function f is continuous at $c \in [a, b]$ if and only if $\omega(f, c) = 0$.*

Theorem 3.4. Lebesgue integrability theorem: *Retains the notation as above. Let $D := \{c \in [a, b] : f \text{ is discontinuous at } c\}$. Then $f \in R[a, b]$ if and only if D has measure zero.*

Proof. For each positive integer n , let $D_n := \{x \in [a, b] : \omega(f, x) \geq \frac{1}{n}\}$. Then we have $D = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} D_n$.

For (\Rightarrow) , assume that $f \in R[a, b]$. Then by Lemma 3.2, it suffices to show that each D_n is a null set. Fix a positive integer m such that $D_m \neq \emptyset$. Now let $\varepsilon > 0$. Since $f \in R[a, b]$, there is a partition $P : a = x_0 < \cdots < x_n = b$ such that $\sum \omega_k(f, P) \Delta x_k < \frac{\varepsilon}{m}$. Notice that $c \in D_m$ if and only if $\omega(f, B(c, \delta)) \geq \frac{1}{m}$ for all $\delta > 0$, where $B(c, \delta) := (c - \delta, c + \delta)$. Thus, if $(x_{k-1}, x_k) \cap D_m \neq \emptyset$, then $\omega_k(f, P) \geq \frac{1}{m}$. This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\varepsilon}{m} &> \sum_{k=1}^n \omega_k(f, P) \Delta x_k \\ &\geq \sum_{k:(x_{k-1}, x_k) \cap D_m \neq \emptyset} \omega_k(f, P) \Delta x_k \\ &\geq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k:(x_{k-1}, x_k) \cap D_m \neq \emptyset} \Delta x_k. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have $D_m \subseteq \bigcup_{k:(x_{k-1}, x_k) \cap D_m \neq \emptyset} [x_{k-1}, x_k]$ and

$$\sum_{k:(x_{k-1}, x_k) \cap D_m \neq \emptyset} \Delta x_k < \varepsilon.$$

Thus, D_m is a null set for each positive integer m as desired.

Now for showing (\Leftarrow) , assume that the set D of all discontinuous points of f is a null set.

We first claim that each D_m is a closed set. To see this, note that a point $c \in D_m$ if and only if $\omega(f, B(c, r)) \geq \frac{1}{m}$ for all $r > 0$ if and only if for all $\eta > 0$ and for all $r > 0$, there are points $x', x'' \in B(c, r)$ such that $|f(x') - f(x'')| > \frac{1}{m} - \eta$. Now let (c_n) be a sequence in D_m converging to a point c . Let $r > 0$ and $\eta > 0$. Then there is c_N such that $|c_N - c| < \frac{r}{2}$. Since $c_N \in D_m$, there are $x', x'' \in B(c_N, \frac{r}{2})$ such that $|f(x') - f(x'')| > \frac{1}{m} - \eta$. Since $x', x'' \in B(c_N, \frac{r}{2})$, $x', x'' \in B(c, r)$. Thus, $c \in D_m$ is as desired. This shows that D_m is a closed subset of $[a, b]$, and hence it is compact.

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and let m be a positive integer such that $1/m < \varepsilon$. By the assumption $D = \bigcup_{l=1}^{\infty} D_l$ is a null set and so is the set D_m . Then there is a sequence of open intervals, say $\{(a_j, b_j)\}$, such that $D_m \subseteq \bigcup (a_j, b_j)$ and $\sum (b_j - a_j) < \varepsilon$. Since D_m is compact, there are finitely many (a_j, b_j) 's for $j = 1, \dots, K$ such that $D_m \subseteq \bigcup_{j=1}^K (a_j, b_j)$. Note that we may assume that the sequence $a_1 < b_1 <$

$a_2 < b_2 < \cdots < a_K < b_K$. Choose a partition $Q := (\{a_j, b_j : j = 1, \dots, K\} \cup \{a, b\}) \cap [a, b]$ on $[a, b]$ and rewrite Q as $a = x_0 < \cdots < x_n = b$.

Put $I := \{j : [x_{j-1}, x_j] \cap D_m = \emptyset\}$ and $II := \{j : [x_{j-1}, x_j] \cap D_m \neq \emptyset\}$.

Note that if $j \in I$, then $\omega(f, x) < \frac{1}{m}$ for all $x \in [x_{j-1}, x_j]$. Hence, for each $x \in [x_{j-1}, x_j]$, there is $\delta_x > 0$ such that $\omega(f, B(x, \delta_x)) < \frac{1}{m}$. Then by the compactness of $[x_{j-1}, x_j]$, there is a partition $P'_j : x_{j-1} = x'_0 < \cdots < x'_l = x_j$ on $[x_{j-1}, x_j]$ such that $\omega_{j'}(f, P'_j) < \frac{1}{m}$ for all $j' = 1, \dots, l$. Thus, we have $\sum_{j'} \omega_{j'}(f, P'_j) \Delta x_{j'} < \frac{1}{m} (x_j - x_{j-1}) < \varepsilon (x_{j-1} - x_j)$ whenever $j \in I$.

On the other hand, if $j \in II$, then $[x_{j-1}, x_j] \cap D_m \neq \emptyset$. Since $\sum_{j=1}^K (b_j - a_j) < \varepsilon$, we see that $\sum_{j \in II} \omega_j(f, Q) \Delta x_j < 2M\varepsilon$.

Now put $P := Q \cup \bigcup_{j \in I} P'_j : a = y_0 < \cdots < y_N = b$. From the above argument, we have shown that

$\sum_{i=1}^N \omega_i(f, P) \Delta y_i < \varepsilon(b - a) + 2M\varepsilon$. Thus $f \in R[a, b]$. The proof is complete. \square

4. SOME RESULTS OF SEQUENCES OF FUNCTIONS

Proposition 4.1. Let $f_n : (a, b) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a sequence of functions. Assume that it satisfies the following conditions:

- (i) : $f_n(x)$ point-wise converges to a function $f(x)$ on (a, b) ;
- (ii) : each f_n is a C^1 function on (a, b) ;
- (iii) : $f'_n \rightarrow g$ uniformly on (a, b) .

Then f is a C^1 -function on (a, b) with $f' = g$.

Proof. Fix $c \in (a, b)$. Then for each x with $c < x < b$ (similarly, we can prove it in the same way as $a < x < c$), the Fundamental Theorem of Calculus implies that

$$f_n(x) = \int_c^x f'_n(t)dt + f_n(c).$$

Since $f'_n \rightarrow g$ uniformly on (a, b) , we see that

$$\int_c^x f'_n(t)dt \rightarrow \int_c^x g(t)dt.$$

This gives

$$(4.1) \quad f(x) = \int_c^x g(t)dt + f(c).$$

for all $x \in (c, b)$. Similarly, we have $f(x) = \int_c^x g(t)dt + f(c)$ for all $x \in (a, b)$.

On the other hand, g is continuous on (a, b) since each f'_n is continuous and $f'_n \rightarrow g$ uniformly on (a, b) . Equation 4.1 will tell us that f' exists and $f' = g$ on (a, b) . The proof is finished. \square

Proposition 4.2. Let (f_n) be a sequence of differentiable functions defined on (a, b) . Assume that

- (i): there is a point $c \in (a, b)$ such that $\lim f_n(c)$ exists;
- (ii): f'_n converges uniformly to a function g on (a, b) .

Then

- (a): f_n converges uniformly to a function f on (a, b) ;
- (b): f is differentiable on (a, b) and $f' = g$.

Proof. For Part (a), we will make use the Cauchy theorem.

Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Then by the assumptions (i) and (ii), there is a positive integer N such that

$$|f_m(c) - f_n(c)| < \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad |f'_m(x) - f'_n(x)| < \varepsilon$$

for all $m, n \geq N$ and for all $x \in (a, b)$. Now fix $c < x < b$ and $m, n \geq N$. To apply the Mean Value Theorem for $f_m - f_n$ on (c, x) , then there is a point ξ between c and x such that

$$(4.2) \quad f_m(x) - f_n(x) = f_m(c) - f_n(c) + (f'_m(\xi) - f'_n(\xi))(x - c).$$

This implies that

$$|f_m(x) - f_n(x)| \leq |f_m(c) - f_n(c)| + |f'_m(\xi) - f'_n(\xi)||x - c| < \varepsilon + (b - a)\varepsilon$$

for all $m, n \geq N$ and for all $x \in (c, b)$. Similarly, when $x \in (a, c)$, we also have

$$|f_m(x) - f_n(x)| < \varepsilon + (b - a)\varepsilon.$$

So Part (a) follows.

Let f be the uniform limit of (f_n) on (a, b)

For Part (b), we fix $u \in (a, b)$. We are going to show

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow u} \frac{f(x) - f(u)}{x - u} = g(u).$$

Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Since (f'_n) is uniformly convergent on (a, b) , there is $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$(4.3) \quad |f'_m(x) - f'_n(x)| < \varepsilon$$

for all $m, n \geq N$ and for all $x \in (a, b)$

Note that for all $m \geq N$ and $x \in (a, b) \setminus \{u\}$, applying the Mean value Theorem for $f_m - f_N$ as before, we have

$$\frac{f_m(x) - f_N(x)}{x - u} = \frac{f_m(u) - f_N(u)}{x - u} + (f'_m(\xi) - f'_N(\xi))$$

for some ξ between u and x .

So Eq.4.3 implies that

$$(4.4) \quad \left| \frac{f_m(x) - f_m(u)}{x - u} - \frac{f_N(x) - f_N(u)}{x - u} \right| \leq \varepsilon$$

for all $m \geq N$ and for all $x \in (a, b)$ with $x \neq u$.

Taking $m \rightarrow \infty$ in Eq.4.4, we have

$$\left| \frac{f(x) - f(u)}{x - u} - \frac{f_N(x) - f_N(u)}{x - u} \right| \leq \varepsilon.$$

Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{f(x) - f(u)}{x - u} - f'_N(u) \right| &\leq \left| \frac{f(x) - f(u)}{x - u} - \frac{f_N(x) - f_N(u)}{x - u} \right| + \left| \frac{f_N(x) - f_N(u)}{x - u} - f'_N(u) \right| \\ &\leq \varepsilon + \left| \frac{f_N(x) - f_N(u)}{x - u} - f'_N(u) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

So if we can take $0 < \delta$ such that $\left| \frac{f_N(x) - f_N(u)}{x - u} - f'_N(u) \right| < \varepsilon$ for $0 < |x - u| < \delta$, then we have

$$(4.5) \quad \left| \frac{f(x) - f(u)}{x - u} - f'_N(u) \right| \leq 2\varepsilon$$

for $0 < |x - u| < \delta$. On the other hand, by the choice of N , we have $|f'_m(y) - f'_N(y)| < \varepsilon$ for all $y \in (a, b)$ and $m \geq N$. So we have $|g(u) - f'_N(u)| \leq \varepsilon$. This together with Eq.4.5 give

$$\left| \frac{f(x) - f(u)}{x - u} - g(u) \right| \leq 3\varepsilon$$

as $0 < |x - u| < \delta$, that is we have

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow u} \frac{f(x) - f(u)}{x - u} = g(u).$$

The proof is finished. □

Remark 4.3. *The uniform convergence assumption of (f'_n) in the Propositions above is essential.*

Example 4.4. *Let $f_n(x) := \frac{x}{1+n^2x^2}$ for $x \in (-1, 1)$. Then we have*

$$g(x) := \lim_n f'_n(x) := \lim_n \frac{1 - n^2x^2}{(1 + n^2x^2)^2} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \neq 0; \\ 1 & \text{if } x = 0. \end{cases}$$

On the other hand, $f_n \rightarrow 0$ uniformly on $(-1, 1)$. In fact, if $f'_n(1/n) = 0$ for all $n = 1, 2, \dots$, then f_n attains the maximal value $f_n(1/n) = \frac{1}{2n}$ at $x = 1/n$ for each $n = 1, \dots$ and hence, $f_n \rightarrow 0$ uniformly on $(-1, 1)$.

So Propositions 4.1 and 4.2 does not hold. Note that (f'_n) does not converge uniformly to g on $(-1, 1)$.

Proposition 4.5. (Dini's Theorem): Let A be a compact subset of \mathbb{R} and $f_n : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a sequence of continuous functions defined on A . Suppose that

- (i) for each $x \in A$, we have $f_n(x) \leq f_{n+1}(x)$ for all $n = 1, 2, \dots$;
- (ii) the pointwise limit $f(x) := \lim_n f_n(x)$ exists for all $x \in A$;
- (iii) f is continuous on A .

Then f_n converges to f uniformly on A .

Proof. Let $g_n := f - f_n$ defined on A . Then each g_n is continuous and $g_n(x) \downarrow 0$ pointwise on A . It suffices to show that g_n converges to 0 uniformly on A .

Method I: Suppose not. Then there is $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for all positive integer N , we have

$$(4.6) \quad g_n(x_n) \geq \varepsilon.$$

for some $n \geq N$ and some $x_n \in A$. From this, by passing to a subsequence we may assume that $g_n(x_n) \geq \varepsilon$ for all $n = 1, 2, \dots$. Then by using the compactness of A , there is a convergent subsequence (x_{n_k}) of (x_n) in A . Let $z := \lim_k x_{n_k} \in A$. Since $g_{n_k}(z) \downarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. So, there is a positive integer K such that $0 \leq g_{n_K}(z) < \varepsilon/2$. Since g_{n_K} is continuous at z and $\lim_i x_{n_i} = z$, we have $\lim_i g_{n_K}(x_{n_i}) = g_{n_K}(z)$. So, we can choose i large enough such that $i > K$

$$g_{n_i}(x_{n_i}) \leq g_{n_K}(x_{n_i}) < \varepsilon/2$$

because $g_m(x_{n_i}) \downarrow 0$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$. This contradicts to the Inequality 4.6.

Method II: Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Fix $x \in A$. Since $g_n(x) \downarrow 0$, there is $N(x) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $0 \leq g_n(x) < \varepsilon$ for all $n \geq N(x)$. Since $g_{N(x)}$ is continuous, there is $\delta(x) > 0$ such that $g_{N(x)}(y) < \varepsilon$ for all $y \in A$ with $|x - y| < \delta(x)$. If we put $J_x := (x - \delta(x), x + \delta(x))$, then $A \subseteq \bigcup_{x \in A} J_x$. Then by the compactness of A , there are finitely many x_1, \dots, x_m in A such that $A \subseteq J_{x_1} \cup \dots \cup J_{x_m}$. Put $N := \max(N(x_1), \dots, N(x_m))$. Now if $y \in A$, then $y \in J(x_i)$ for some $1 \leq i \leq m$. This implies that

$$g_n(y) \leq g_{N(x_i)}(y) < \varepsilon$$

for all $n \geq N \geq N(x_i)$. □

5. ABSOLUTELY CONVERGENT SERIES

Throughout this section, let (a_n) be a sequence of complex numbers.

Definition 5.1. We say that a series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n$ is absolutely convergent if $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |a_n| < \infty$.

Also a convergent series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n$ is said to be conditionally convergent if it is not absolute convergent.

Example 5.2. Important Example : The series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{n+1}}{n^\alpha}$ is conditionally convergent when $0 < \alpha \leq 1$.

This example shows us that a convergent improper integral may fail to the absolute convergence or square integrable property.

For instance, if we consider the function $f : [1, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$f(x) = \frac{(-1)^{n+1}}{n^\alpha} \quad \text{if} \quad n \leq x < n + 1.$$

If $\alpha = 1/2$, then $\int_1^\infty f(x)dx$ is convergent but it is neither absolutely convergent nor square integrable.

Notation 5.3. Let $\sigma : \{1, 2, \dots\} \rightarrow \{1, 2, \dots\}$ be a bijection. A formal series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_{\sigma(n)}$ is called an rearrangement of $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n$.

Example 5.4. In this example, we are going to show that there is an rearrangement of the series $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{i+1}}{i}$ is divergent although the original series is convergent. In fact, it is conditionally convergent.

We first notice that the series $\sum_i \frac{1}{2i-1}$ diverges to infinity. Thus for each $M > 0$, there is a positive integer N such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{2i-1} \geq M \quad \dots\dots\dots (*)$$

for all $n \geq N$. Then there is $N_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N_1} \frac{1}{2i-1} - \frac{1}{2} > 1.$$

By using (*) again, there is a positive integer N_2 with $N_1 < N_2$ such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N_1} \frac{1}{2i-1} - \frac{1}{2} + \sum_{N_1 < i \leq N_2} \frac{1}{2i-1} - \frac{1}{4} > 2.$$

To repeat the same procedure, we can find a positive integers subsequence (N_k) such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N_1} \frac{1}{2i-1} - \frac{1}{2} + \sum_{N_1 < i \leq N_2} \frac{1}{2i-1} - \frac{1}{4} + \dots\dots\dots - \sum_{N_{k-1} < i \leq N_k} \frac{1}{2i-1} - \frac{1}{2k} > k$$

for all positive integers k . So if we let $a_n = \frac{(-1)^{n+1}}{n}$, then one can find a bijection $\sigma : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that the series $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_{\sigma(i)}$ is an rearrangement of the series $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{i+1}}{i}$ and diverges to infinity. The proof is finished.

Theorem 5.5. Let $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n$ be an absolutely convergent series. Then for any rearrangement $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_{\sigma(n)}$

is also absolutely convergent. Moreover, we have $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_{\sigma(n)}$.

Proof. Let $\sigma : \{1, 2, \dots\} \rightarrow \{1, 2, \dots\}$ be a bijection as before.

We first claim that $\sum_n a_{\sigma(n)}$ is also absolutely convergent.

Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Since $\sum_n |a_n| < \infty$, there is a positive integer N such that

$$|a_{N+1}| + \dots\dots\dots + |a_{N+p}| < \varepsilon \quad \dots\dots\dots (*)$$

for all $p = 1, 2, \dots$. Notice that since σ is a bijection, we can find a positive integer M such that $M > \max\{j : 1 \leq \sigma(j) \leq N\}$. Then $\sigma(i) \geq N$ if $i \geq M$. This together with (*) imply that if $i \geq M$ and $p \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$|a_{\sigma(i+1)}| + \dots\dots\dots |a_{\sigma(i+p)}| < \varepsilon.$$

Thus the series $\sum_n a_{\sigma(n)}$ is absolutely convergent by the Cauchy criteria.

Finally we claim that $\sum_n a_n = \sum_n a_{\sigma(n)}$. Put $l = \sum_n a_n$ and $l' = \sum_n a_{\sigma(n)}$. Now let $\varepsilon > 0$. Then there is $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\left| l - \sum_{n=1}^N a_n \right| < \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad |a_{N+1}| + \cdots + |a_{N+p}| < \varepsilon \cdots \cdots (**)$$

for all $p \in \mathbb{N}$. Now choose a positive integer M large enough so that $\{1, \dots, N\} \subseteq \{\sigma(1), \dots, \sigma(M)\}$ and $\left| l' - \sum_{i=1}^M a_{\sigma(i)} \right| < \varepsilon$. Notice that since we have $\{1, \dots, N\} \subseteq \{\sigma(1), \dots, \sigma(M)\}$, the condition $(**)$ gives

$$\left| \sum_{n=1}^N a_n - \sum_{i=1}^M a_{\sigma(i)} \right| \leq \sum_{N < i < \infty} |a_i| \leq \varepsilon.$$

We can now conclude that

$$|l - l'| \leq \left| l - \sum_{n=1}^N a_n \right| + \left| \sum_{n=1}^N a_n - \sum_{i=1}^M a_{\sigma(i)} \right| + \left| \sum_{i=1}^M a_{\sigma(i)} - l' \right| \leq 3\varepsilon.$$

The proof is complete. \square

In view of Theorem 5.5, it is naturally to introduce the following definition.

Definition 5.6. A series $\sum x_n$ is said to be unconditionally convergent if whenever π is a bijection on \mathbb{Z}_+ the series $\sum_n x_{\pi(n)}$ is convergent.

Theorem 5.7. Let $\sum_n x_n$ be a series of numbers. Then the following are equivalent.

- (i) $\sum_n x_n$ is unconditionally convergent.
- (ii) For any subsequence of positive integers $n_1 < n_2 < \cdots$, the series $\sum_k x_{n_k}$ is convergent.
- (iii) For any choice of sign sequence (ε_n) , that is $\varepsilon_n = \pm 1$, the series $\sum_n \varepsilon_n x_n$ is convergent.
- (iv) For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a positive integer N such that $|\sum_{i \in A} x_i| < \varepsilon$ whenever A is a finite subset of \mathbb{Z}_+ with $N < \min A$.

Proof. The route of the proof is as the following.

$$(i) \Rightarrow (iv) \Rightarrow (ii) \Rightarrow (iv) \Rightarrow (i); \quad \text{and} \quad (ii) \Leftrightarrow (iii).$$

Part $(ii) \Leftrightarrow (iii)$ is clear.

For showing $(i) \Rightarrow (iv)$. Assume that (iv) does not hold. Hence, there is $\varepsilon > 0$ and there is a sequence of finite subsets (A_n) of \mathbb{Z}_+ such that $\max A_n < \min A_{n+1}$ and $|\sum_{i \in A_n} x_i| \geq \varepsilon$ for all n . From this we see that $A_n \cap A_m = \emptyset$ for all $m \neq n$ and there is a bijection $\pi : \mathbb{Z}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that each $A_n = \{\pi(i_n) < \pi(i_n + 1) < \cdots < \pi(i_n + p_n)\}$ for some positive integers i_n and p_n . Then by the construction of A_n , the series $\sum_n x_{\pi(n)}$ is divergent, hence (i) does not hold.

For showing $(iv) \Rightarrow (ii)$, let $\sum_k x_{n_k}$ be any subseries of $\sum_n x_n$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Then by the assumption of (iv) , there is a positive integer N such that $|\sum_{i \in A} x_i| < \varepsilon$ whenever A is a finite subset of \mathbb{Z}_+ with $\min A > N$. Choose K such that $n_k > N$ for all $k \geq K$. This implies that $|x_{n_{k+1}} + \cdots + x_{n_{k+p}}| < \varepsilon$ for all $k > K$ and for all $p = 1, 2, \dots$, so the series $\sum_k x_{n_k}$ is convergent.

For $(ii) \Rightarrow (iv)$, assume that (iv) does not hold. As in the proof of $(i) \Rightarrow (iv)$, there is $\varepsilon > 0$ and there is a subsequence (x_{n_i}) such that $|\sum_{n_i \in A_k} x_{n_i}| \geq \varepsilon$, thus, the subseries $\sum_i x_{n_i}$ is divergent.

For $(iv) \Rightarrow (i)$, let π be any bijection on \mathbb{Z}_+ . Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and let N be given as in (iv) . Take i_0 such that $\pi(i) > N$ for all $i \geq i_0$. This implies that $|\sum_{i_1 < i \leq i_2} x_{\pi(i)}| < \varepsilon$ for all $i_0 \leq i_1 < i_2$. Thus, (i) holds.

The proof is finished. \square

Remark 5.8. Notice that from the proof of Theorem 5.9, we see that the Theorem does still hold if the series $\sum x_n$ is taken in \mathbb{R}^N .

Corollary 5.9. Let (x_n) be a sequence of real numbers. Then $\sum_n x_n$ is absolutely convergent if and only if it is unconditionally convergent.

Proof. Part (\Rightarrow) has been shown in Theorem 5.5.

For (\Leftarrow) , assume that $\sum_n x_n$ is unconditionally convergent. For each n , let $\varepsilon_n := \pm 1$ such that $|x_n| = \varepsilon_n x_n$. Then by Theorem 5.9 (i) \Leftrightarrow (iii), the series $\sum |x_n| = \sum \varepsilon_n x_n$ is convergent as desired. The proof is finished. \square

6. POWER SERIES

Throughout this section, let

$$f(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i x^i \quad \dots\dots\dots (*)$$

denote a formal power series, where $a_i \in \mathbb{R}$.

Lemma 6.1. Suppose that there is $c \in \mathbb{R}$ with $c \neq 0$ such that $f(c)$ is convergent. Then

- (i) : $f(x)$ is absolutely convergent for all x with $|x| < |c|$.
- (ii) : f converges uniformly on $[-\eta, \eta]$ for any $0 < \eta < |c|$.

Proof. For Part (i), note that since $f(c)$ is convergent, then $\lim a_n c^n = 0$. So there is a positive integer N such that $|a_n c^n| \leq 1$ for all $n \geq N$. Now if we fix $|x| < |c|$, then $|x/c| < 1$. Therefore, we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |a_n| |x^n| \leq \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} |a_n| |x^n| + \sum_{n \geq N} |a_n c^n| |x/c|^n \leq \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} |a_n| |x^n| + \sum_{n \geq N} |x/c|^n < \infty.$$

So Part (i) follows.

Now for Part (ii), if we fix $0 < \eta < |c|$, then $|a_n x^n| \leq |a_n \eta^n|$ for all n and for all $x \in [-\eta, \eta]$. On the other hand, we have $\sum_n |a_n \eta^n| < \infty$ by Part (i). So f converges uniformly on $[-\eta, \eta]$ by the M -test. The proof is finished. \square

Remark 6.2. In Lemma 6.9(ii), notice that if $f(c)$ is convergent, it does not imply f converges uniformly on $[-c, c]$ in general.

For example, $f(x) := 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{x^n}{n}$. Then $f(-1)$ is convergent but $f(1)$ is divergent.

Definition 6.3. Call the set $\text{dom } f := \{x \in \mathbb{R} : f(x) \text{ is convergent}\}$ the domain of convergence of f for convenience. Let $0 \leq r := \sup\{|c| : c \in \text{dom } f\} \leq \infty$. Then r is called the radius of convergence of f .

Remark 6.4. Notice that by Lemma 6.9, then the domain of convergence of f must be the interval with the end points $\pm r$ if $0 < r < \infty$.

When $r = 0$, then $\text{dom } f = \{0\}$.

Finally, if $r = \infty$, then $\text{dom } f = \mathbb{R}$.

Example 6.5. If $f(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} n! x^n$, then $r = (0)$. In fact, notice that if we fix a non-zero number x and consider $\lim_n |(n+1)! x^{n+1}| / |n! x^n| = \infty$, then by the ratio test $f(x)$ must be divergent for any $x \neq 0$. So $r = 0$ and $\text{dom } f = (0)$.

Example 6.6. Let $f(x) = 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x^n/n^n$. Notice that we have $\lim_n |x^n/n^n|^{1/n} = 0$ for all x . So the root test implies that $f(x)$ is convergent for all x and then $r = \infty$ and $\text{dom } f = \mathbb{R}$.

Example 6.7. Let $f(x) = 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x^n/n$. Then $\lim_n |x^{n+1}/(n+1)| \cdot |n/x^n| = |x|$ for all $x \neq 0$. So by the ration test, we see that if $|x| < 1$, then $f(x)$ is convergent and if $|x| > 1$, then $f(x)$ is divergent. So $r = 1$. Also, it is known that $f(1)$ is divergent but $f(-1)$ is convergent. Therefore, we have $\text{dom } f = [-1, 1)$.

Example 6.8. Let $f(x) = \sum x^n/n^2$. Then by using the same argument of Example 6.7, we have $r = 1$. On the other hand, it is known that $f(\pm 1)$ both are convergent. So $\text{dom } f = [-1, 1]$.

Lemma 6.9. With the notation as above, if $r > 0$, then f converges uniformly on $(-\eta, \eta)$ for any $0 < \eta < r$.

Proof. It follows from Lemma 6.1 at once. □

Remark 6.10. Note that the Example 6.7 shows us that f may not converge uniformly on $(-r, r)$. In fact let f be defined as in Example 6.7. Then f does not converge uniformly on $(-1, 1)$. To see this if we let $s_n(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k x^k$, then for any positive integer n and $0 < x < 1$, we have

$$|s_{2n}(x) - s_n(x)| = \frac{x^{n+1}}{n+1} + \cdots + \frac{x^n}{2n}.$$

From this we see that if n is fixed, then $|s_{2n}(x) - s_n(x)| \rightarrow 1/2$ as $x \rightarrow 1^-$. So for each n , we can find $0 < x < 1$ such that $|s_{2n}(x) - s_n(x)| > \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{4} = \frac{1}{4}$. Thus f does not converges uniformly on $(-1, 1)$ by the Cauchy Theorem.

Proposition 6.11. With the notation as above, let $\ell = \overline{\lim} |a_n|^{1/n}$ or $\lim \frac{|a_{n+1}|}{|a_n|}$ provided it exists.

Then

$$r = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\ell} & \text{if } 0 < \ell < \infty; \\ 0 & \text{if } \ell = \infty; \\ \infty & \text{if } \ell = 0. \end{cases}$$

Proposition 6.12. With the notation as above if $0 < r \leq \infty$, then $f \in C^\infty(-r, r)$. Moreover, the k -derivatives $f^{(k)}(x) = \sum_{n \geq k} a_k n(n-1)(n-2) \cdots (n-k+1) x^{n-k}$ for all $x \in (-r, r)$.

Proof. Fix $c \in (-r, r)$. By Lemma 6.9, one can choose $0 < \eta < r$ such that $c \in (-\eta, \eta)$ and f converges uniformly on $(-\eta, \eta)$.

It needs to show that the k -derivatives $f^{(k)}(c)$ exists for all $k \geq 0$. Consider the case $k = 1$ first.

If we consider the series $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (a_n x^n)' = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n a_n x^{n-1}$, then it also has the same radius r because $\lim_n |n a_n|^{1/n} = \lim_n |a_n|^{1/n}$. This implies that the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n a_n x^{n-1}$ converges uniformly on $(-\eta, \eta)$. Therefore, the restriction $f|_{(-\eta, \eta)}$ is differentiable. In particular, $f'(c)$ exists and $f'(c) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n a_n c^{n-1}$.

So the result can be shown inductively on k . □

Proposition 6.13. With the notation as above, suppose that $r > 0$. Then we have

$$\int_0^x f(t) dt = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \int_0^x a_n t^n dt = \sum_0^{\infty} \frac{1}{n+1} a_n x^{n+1}$$

for all $x \in (-r, r)$.

Proof. Fix $0 < x < r$. Then by Lemma 6.9 f converges uniformly on $[0, x]$. Since each term $a_n t^n$ is continuous, the result follows. \square

Theorem 6.14. (Abel) : *With the notation as above, suppose that $0 < r$ and $f(r)$ (or $f(-r)$) exists. Then f is continuous at $x = r$ (resp. $x = -r$), that is $\lim_{x \rightarrow r^-} f(x) = f(r)$.*

Proof. Note that by considering $f(-x)$, it suffices to show that the case $x = r$ holds.

Assume $r = 1$.

Notice that if f converges uniformly on $[0, 1]$, then f is continuous at $x = 1$ as desired.

Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Since $f(1)$ is convergent, then there is a positive integer such that

$$|a_{n+1} + \dots + a_{n+p}| < \varepsilon$$

for $n \geq N$ and for all $p = 1, 2, \dots$. Note that for $n \geq N$; $p = 1, 2, \dots$ and $x \in [0, 1]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (6.1) \quad s_{n+p}(x) - s_n(x) &= a_{n+1}x^{n+1} + a_{n+2}x^{n+2} + a_{n+3}x^{n+3} + \dots + a_{n+p}x^{n+p} \\ &\quad + a_{n+2}(x^{n+2} - x^{n+1}) + a_{n+3}(x^{n+3} - x^{n+2}) + \dots + a_{n+p}(x^{n+p} - x^{n+p-1}) \\ &\quad + a_{n+3}(x^{n+3} - x^{n+2}) + \dots + a_{n+p}(x^{n+p} - x^{n+p-1}) \\ &\quad \vdots \\ &\quad + a_{n+p}(x^{n+p} - x^{n+p-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Since $x \in [0, 1]$, $|x^{n+k+1} - x^{n+k}| = x^{n+k} - x^{n+k+1}$. So the Eq.6.1 implies that

$$|s_{n+p}(x) - s_n(x)| \leq \varepsilon(x_{n+1} + (x^{n+1} - x^{n+2}) + (x^{n+2} - x^{n+3}) + \dots + (x^{n+p-1} - x^{n+p})) = \varepsilon(2x^{n+1} - x^{n+p}) \leq 2\varepsilon.$$

So f converges uniformly on $[0, 1]$ as desired.

Finally for the general case, we consider $g(x) := f(rx) = \sum_n a_n r^n x^n$. Note that $\lim_n |a_n r^n|^{1/n} = 1$ and $g(1) = f(r)$. Then by the case above, we have shown that

$$f(r) = g(1) = \lim_{x \rightarrow 1^-} g(x) = \lim_{x \rightarrow r^-} f(x).$$

The proof is finished. \square

Remark 6.15. *In Remark 6.10, we have seen that f may not converge uniformly on $(-r, r)$. However, in the proof of Abel's Theorem above, we have shown that if $f(\pm r)$ both exist, then f converges uniformly on $[-r, r]$ in this case.*

7. REAL ANALYTIC FUNCTIONS

Proposition 7.1. *Let $f \in C^\infty(a, b)$ and $c \in (a, b)$. Then for any $x \in (a, b) \setminus \{c\}$ and for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there is $\xi = \xi(x, n)$ between c and x such that*

$$f(x) = \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{f^{(k)}(c)}{k!} (x-c)^k + \int_c^x \frac{f^{(n+1)}(t)}{n!} (x-t)^n dt$$

Call $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{f^{(k)}(c)}{k!} (x-c)^k$ (may not be convergent) the Taylor series of f at c .

Proof. It is easy to prove by induction on n and the integration by part. \square

Definition 7.2. A real-valued function f defined on (a, b) is said to be real analytic if for each $c \in (a, b)$, one can find $\delta > 0$ and a power series $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k(x - c)^k$ such that

$$f(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k(x - c)^k \quad \dots\dots\dots (*)$$

for all $x \in (c - \delta, c + \delta) \subseteq (a, b)$.

Remark 7.3.

(i) : Concerning about the definition of a real analytic function f , the expression $(*)$ above is uniquely determined by f , that is, each coefficient a_k 's is uniquely determined by f . In fact, by Proposition 6.12, we have seen that $f \in C^\infty(a, b)$ and

$$a_k = \frac{f^{(k)}(c)}{k!} \quad \dots\dots\dots (**)$$

for all $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$

(ii) : Although every real analytic function is C^∞ , the following example shows that the converse does not hold.

Define a function $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} e^{-1/x^2} & \text{if } x \neq 0; \\ 0 & \text{if } x = 0. \end{cases}$$

One can directly check that $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ and $f^{(k)}(0) = 0$ for all $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. So if f is real analytic, then there is $\delta > 0$ such that $a_k = 0$ for all k by the Eq.(**) above and hence $f(x) \equiv 0$ for all $x \in (-\delta, \delta)$. It is absurd.

(iii) **Interesting Fact** : Let D be an open disc in \mathbb{C} . A complex analytic function f on D is similarly defined as in the real case. However, we always have: f is complex analytic if and only if it is C^∞ .

Lemma 7.4. Let $(a_{jk})_{j,k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a set of real numbers. Assume that $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^k |a_{jk}| < \infty$. Then $L :=$

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^k a_{jk} \text{ exists and } L = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j \geq k} a_{jk}.$$

Proof. Note that $L := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^k a_{jk}$ exists due to the Cauchy theorem. Put $b_k := \sum_{j=0}^k |a_{jk}|$. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is $K_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\left| L - \sum_{k=0}^K \sum_{j=0}^k a_{jk} \right| < \varepsilon \text{ for all } K > K_1; \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{k > K_1} \sum_{j=0}^k |a_{jk}| < \varepsilon.$$

Let $J_1 = K_1$. Then for $J > J_1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| L - \sum_{j=0}^J \sum_{k \geq j} a_{jk} \right| &\leq \left| L - \sum_{j=0}^{J_1} \sum_{k \geq j} a_{jk} \right| + \left| \sum_{J_1 < j \leq J} \sum_{k \geq j} a_{jk} \right| \\ &\leq \left| L - \sum_{0 \leq j \leq J_1} \sum_{j \leq k \leq K_1} a_{jk} \right| + \left| \sum_{0 \leq j \leq J_1} \sum_{k > K_1} a_{jk} \right| + \left| \sum_{J_1 < j \leq J} \sum_{k \geq j} a_{jk} \right| \\ &< 3\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition 7.5. *Suppose that $f(x) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k(x-c)^k$ is convergent on some open interval I centered at c , that is $I = (c-r, c+r)$ for some $r > 0$. Then f is analytic on I .*

Proof. We first note that $f \in C^\infty(I)$. By considering the translation $x-c$, we may assume that $c=0$ and hence, $I = (-r, r)$. Now fix $z \in I$ and choose $\delta > 0$ such that $(z-\delta, z+\delta) \subseteq I$. We are going to show that

$$f(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{f^{(j)}(z)}{j!} (x-z)^j.$$

for all $x \in (z-\delta, z+\delta)$.

Notice that $|z| + |x-z| \in I$ for all $x \in (z-\delta, z+\delta)$ and thus, $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} |a_k|(|z| + |x-z|)^k < \infty$. Lemma 7.4 implies that

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k(x-z+z)^k \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k \sum_{j=0}^k \frac{k(k-1)\cdots(k-j+1)}{j!} (x-z)^j z^{k-j} \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{k \geq j} k(k-1)\cdots(k-j+1) a_k z^{k-j} \right) \frac{(x-z)^j}{j!} \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{f^{(j)}(z)}{j!} (x-z)^j \end{aligned}$$

for all $x \in (z-\delta, z+\delta)$. The proof is finished. □

Example 7.6. *Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. Recall that $(1+x)^\alpha$ is defined by $e^{\alpha \ln(1+x)}$ for $x > -1$. Now for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, put*

$$\binom{\alpha}{k} = \begin{cases} \frac{\alpha(\alpha-1)\cdots(\alpha-k+1)}{k!} & \text{if } k \neq 0; \\ 1 & \text{if } k = 0. \end{cases}$$

Then

$$(1+x)^\alpha = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \binom{\alpha}{k} x^k$$

whenever $|x| < 1$.

Consequently, $(1+x)^\alpha$ is analytic on $(-1, 1)$.

Proof. Considering the formal power series

$$F(x) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \binom{\alpha}{k} x^k.$$

The ratio test implies that the radius of the series $F(x)$ is $r=1$. Hence, the series $F(x)$ is convergent in $(-1, 1)$. In particular, $F(x)$ is analytic on $(-1, 1)$ by Proposition 7.5. We are going to show that $F(x) = (1+x)^\alpha$ for all $x \in (-1, 1)$. Notice that we have the following equation.

$$(7.1) \quad (1+x)F'(x) = \alpha F(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in (-1, 1).$$

To see this note that we have

$$F'(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n \binom{\alpha}{n} x^{n-1} = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (j+1) \binom{\alpha}{j+1} x^j.$$

This is obtained by the following direct calculation.

$$\begin{aligned} (1+x)F'(x) &= \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (j+1) \binom{\alpha}{j+1} x^j + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n \binom{\alpha}{n} x^n \\ &= \alpha + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \left\{ (j+1) \binom{\alpha}{j+1} + j \binom{\alpha}{j} \right\} x^j \\ &= \alpha + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \alpha \binom{\alpha}{j} x^j. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the Eq 7.1 holds. From this we have $F(x) \neq 0$ for all $x \in (-1, 1)$. To see this, if $F(c) = 0$ for some $c \in (-1, 1)$, then $F'(c) = 0$ by Eq 7.1. Differentiating the Eq 7.1, we get $F^{(2)}(c) = 0$. To repeat the same step, we have $F^{(n)}(c) = 0$ for all $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. Notice that since F is real analytic on $(-1, 1)$, $F(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{F^{(n)}(c)}{n!} (x-c)^n$ in some open subinterval J of $(-1, 1)$ that contains c and so $F \equiv 0$ on J . From this if we put the set $L(c) := \{-1 < \alpha < c : F(t) = 0; \forall t \in (\alpha, c]\}$, then $L(c) \neq \emptyset$. Hence, $a := \inf L(c)$ exists and so $-1 \leq a$. First we notice that $a \in L(c)$, that is $F|_{(a, c]} \equiv 0$. Next we want to show that $a = -1$. If not, assume $-1 < a$. Since $F(a) = \lim_{t \rightarrow a^+} F(t)$, we have $F(a) = 0$. As the reason above, there is an open subinterval J_1 of $(-1, 1)$ containing a satisfying $F|_{J_1} \equiv 0$ and so, there is a point $-1 < a_1 < a$ such that $F|_{(a_1, a]} \equiv 0$. This gives $a_1 \in L(c)$ and so, $a \leq a_1$ that contradicts to $a_1 < a$. Therefore, we have $F|_{(-1, c]} \equiv 0$. Similarly, one can also obtain $F|_{[c, 1)} \equiv 0$. Hence, $F \equiv 0$ on $(-1, 1)$. It is absurd. This and Eq 7.1 give

$$\int_0^x \frac{F'(t)}{F(t)} dt = \int_0^x \frac{\alpha}{1+t} dt$$

for all $x \in (-1, 1)$. This implies that $F(x) = (1+x)^\alpha$ as desired. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] R.G. Bartle and D.R. Sherbert, Introduction to real analysis, 4th-edition, John Wiley & Sons, Inc. (2011).

8. APPENDIX: A

For simply we may consider the unit interval $[0, 1]$ throughout this section. Before showing the main result in section, we introduce the following notion.

For any pair of numbers $a < b$, the length of the following intervals is defined by

$$|(a, b)| = |[a, b]| = |(a, b]| = |[a, b)| := b - a$$

Let \mathcal{E} be the collection of those subsets of $[0, 1]$ for which they can be expressed as the union of finitely many disjoint subintervals of $[0, 1]$. If $A \in \mathcal{E}$, the size of A , write $\mu(A)$, is naturally defined by the total length of such intervals, that is,

$$\mu(A) := \sum_{k=1}^l |J_k|$$

whenever $A = \bigsqcup_{k=1}^l J_k$ and J_1, \dots, J_l are pairwise disjoint subintervals of $[0, 1]$. Notice that $\mu(A)$ does not depend on the choice of such expression.

Lemma 8.1. *We keep the notation as above. Let (B_n) be a disjoint sequence in \mathcal{E} . If $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n = [0, 1]$, then $\sum_n \mu(B_n) = 1$.*

Proof. Clearly, we have $\sum_{n=1}^N \mu(B_n) \leq 1$ for all $N = 1, 2, \dots$ and hence, we have $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(B_n) \leq 1$. It suffices to show that if we fix any $0 < \theta < 1$, then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a positive integer N such that

$$\theta \leq \sum_{n=1}^N \mu(B_n) + \varepsilon \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(B_n) + \varepsilon.$$

To see this, fix $0 < a < b < 1$ such that $|[a, b]| = \theta$. Notice that since each B_n is the disjoint union of intervals, say J_k 's, we can enlarge each J_k slightly to an open interval \tilde{J}_k so that each $\tilde{J}_k \subseteq (0, 1)$ and $|\mu(\tilde{B}_n) - \mu(B_n)| < \varepsilon/2^n$, where $\tilde{B}_n := \bigcup \tilde{J}_k$. Notice that $[a, b] \subseteq (0, 1) = \bigcup_n \tilde{B}_n$ because $0 < a < b < 1$. Then by the compactness of $[a, b]$, then there is N such that $[a, b] \subseteq \bigcup_{n=1}^N \tilde{B}_n$. This implies that

$$\theta = |[a, b]| \leq \sum_{n=1}^N \mu(\tilde{B}_n) < \sum_{n=1}^N (\mu(B_n) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2^n}) < \sum_{n=1}^N \mu(B_n) + \varepsilon.$$

The proof is finished. \square

Proposition 8.2. *Let (f_n) be a sequence of Riemann integrable functions defined on $[0, 1]$. Assume that $f(x) := \lim f_n(x)$ exists for all $x \in [0, 1]$ and (f_n) is uniform bounded, that is, there is $M > 0$ such that $|f_n(x)| \leq M$ for all $x \in [0, 1]$ and for all $n = 1, 2, \dots$. If f is Riemann integrable, then we have*

$$\int_0^1 f(x) dx = \lim_n \int_0^1 f_n(x) dx.$$

Proof. Notice that since f_n and f are Riemann integrable, $g_n := |f_n - f|$ is Riemann integrable for all n . In addition by the assumption the sequence (g_n) is uniform bounded and we have $\lim_n g_n(x) = 0$ for all $x \in [0, 1]$. In this case, it suffices to show that

$$\lim_n \int_0^1 g_n(x) dx = 0.$$

Suppose not. Since $g_n \geq 0$ for n , by passing a subsequence of (g_n) , we may assume that there is $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\int_0^1 g_n(x) dx \geq \varepsilon$ for all n . We first consider the case when each g_n is a non-negative step

function for each n . Fix $\alpha > 0$. For each $n, m = 1, 2, \dots$, set

$$G(n, m) := \begin{cases} \{x \in [0, 1] : g_k(x) < \alpha; \text{ for all } n \leq k \leq m\} & \text{as } n \leq m; \\ \emptyset & \text{as } n > m. \end{cases}$$

Also, for each $l = 2, 3, \dots$, let

$$A_l := \bigcup_{n+m \leq l} G(n, m).$$

Notice that (A_l) is increasing. In addition, since $\lim g_k(x) = 0$ for all $x \in [0, 1]$, we see that

$$\bigcup_{l=2}^{\infty} A_l = [0, 1].$$

On the other hand, A_l can be written as the finitely many union of mutually disjoint intervals. Notice that if we set $B_1 := A_1$ and $B_k := A_k \setminus A_{k-1}$ for $k \geq 2$, then (B_k) is a pairwise disjoint sequence in \mathcal{E} and $\bigcup_k B_k = [0, 1]$. Then by Lemma 8.1, we have

$$\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \mu(A_l) = \sum_n \mu(B_n) = 1.$$

Thu, for any $\delta > 0$, there is N such that $\mu(A_N) > 1 - \delta$. □

Remark 8.3. Proposition 8.2 can be obtained directly by using the *Lebesgue Dominated Convergence Theorem*. In this case, f is *Lebesgue integrable*. The class of Lebesgue functions over $[a, b]$ contains the class $R[a, b]$. All the details about this topics can be found in many standard real analysis text books. However, the following example shows us that the pointwise limit of a sequence of Riemann integrable functions may not be Riemann integrable.

(Chi-Wai Leung) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, THE CHINESE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG, SHATIN, HONG KONG
Email address: cwleung@math.cuhk.edu.hk