

A9) GIVEN  $f(x) = \frac{(x-\pi)^2}{4}$ ,  $x \in [0, 2\pi]$

WE HAVE ALREADY COMPUTED THAT  $\forall k \in \mathbb{Z}^* = \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$ ,

$$\hat{f}(k) = \frac{1}{2k^2}$$

AND  $\hat{f}(0) = \frac{\pi^2}{12}$ .

SINCE  $f \in L^2([0, 2\pi])$ , FROM PARSEVAL'S IDENTITY, WE HAVE

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} |f(t)|^2 dt &= \|f\|_{L^2}^2 = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} |\hat{f}(k)|^2 \\ &= |\hat{f}(0)|^2 + 2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(2k^2)^2} \\ &= \frac{\pi^4}{144} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k^4} \end{aligned}$$

--- (\*)

ALSO,  $\|f\|_{L^2}^2 = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{(x-\pi)^4}{16} dx = \frac{1}{32\pi} \cdot \frac{(x-\pi)^5}{5} \Big|_0^{2\pi} = \frac{\pi^4}{80}$

THEREFORE, FROM (\*), WE HAVE

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k^4} = 2 \left( \frac{\pi^4}{80} - \frac{\pi^4}{144} \right) = \frac{\pi^4}{90}$$

A10)  $f_k(t) = \sin(kt)$ ,  $g_k(t) = \cos(kt)$ ,  $h_k(t) = e^{ikt}$

(i)  $\langle f_k, f_k \rangle = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \sin(kt) \sin(kt) dt$   
 $= \frac{1}{4\pi} \left[ \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \cos((k-l)t) dt - \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \cos((k+l)t) dt \right]$

(USING THE IDENTITY  $2 \sin \theta \sin \varphi = \cos(\theta - \varphi) - \cos(\theta + \varphi)$ )

IF  $k \neq 0$ , WE THEN HAVE

$$\langle f_k, f_k \rangle = \frac{1}{4\pi} \left[ \frac{\sin((k-l)t)}{k-l} \Big|_{-\pi}^{\pi} - \frac{\sin((k+l)t)}{k+l} \Big|_{-\pi}^{\pi} \right]$$

IF  $k = \pm l$ , THEN IT CAN BE EASILY CHECKED THAT

$$\langle f_k, f_l \rangle = \pm \frac{l}{2}.$$

$$\therefore \boxed{f_k \perp f_l \quad \forall k \neq \pm l}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(ii)} \quad \langle f_k, g_l \rangle &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \sin(kt) \cos(lt) dt \\ &= \frac{1}{4\pi} \left[ \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \sin((k+l)t) dt + \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \sin((k-l)t) dt \right] \end{aligned}$$

IF  $k \neq \pm l$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle f_k, g_l \rangle &= \frac{1}{4\pi} \left[ -\frac{1}{k+l} \cos((k+l)t) \right]_{-\pi}^{\pi} - \frac{1}{k-l} \cos((k-l)t) \right]_{-\pi}^{\pi} \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

SIMILARLY WE CAN SHOW THAT IF  $k = \pm l$ ,

$$\langle f_k, g_l \rangle = 0.$$

$$\therefore \boxed{\langle f_k, g_l \rangle = 0 \quad \forall k, l}$$

A10) (iii) LET  $k, l \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \text{WE HAVE THAT } \langle h_k, h_l \rangle &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} e^{ikt} \overline{e^{ilt}} dt \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} e^{i(k-l)t} dt \end{aligned}$$

CASE 1:  $k = l$

$$\text{THEN } \langle h_k, h_l \rangle = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} e^0 dt = 1.$$

CASE 2:  $k \neq l$

WE USE THE FACT THAT  $t \mapsto e^{i(k-l)t}$  IS  $2\pi$ -PERIODIC WITH ZERO MEAN.

$$\begin{aligned} \langle h_k, h_l \rangle &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \left\{ \underbrace{\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \cos((k-l)t) dt}_0 + i \underbrace{\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \sin((k-l)t) dt}_0 \right\} \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

$$\therefore \boxed{h_k \perp h_l \quad \forall k \neq l}$$

ALL (i) CLEARLY  $\mu_1 : 2^X \rightarrow [0, \infty) \cup \{\infty\}$ , AS THE NUMBER OF ELEMENTS OF  $A \subset X$  IS EITHER FINITE OR INFINITE.

ALSO, (a)  $\mu_1(\emptyset) = 0$  AS  $\emptyset$  HAS NO ELEMENT

(A) IF  $A \subset \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} A_k$ , A HAS AT MOST AS MANY ELEMENTS

AS THE COLLECTION  $\{A_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  WHICH IF THE  $A_k$ 's ARE DISJOINT HAS  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mu_1(A_k)$  ELEMENTS.

$$\therefore \mu_1(A) \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mu_1(A_k)$$

(ii)  $\mu_2 : 2^X \rightarrow \{0, 1\} \cup [0, \infty) \cup \{\infty\}$ .

(a) BY DEFINITION,  $\mu_2(\emptyset) = 0$ .

(b) IF  $A \subset \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} A_k$ , EITHER  $A = \emptyset$  AND  $\mu_2(A) = 0 \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mu_2(A_k)$

OR  $A \neq \emptyset$  AND  $\exists k_0 \in \mathbb{N}^+$  SUCH THAT  $A_{k_0} \neq \emptyset$

(OTHERWISE  $A \subset \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} A_k = \emptyset$ , CONTRADICTION)

$$\therefore \mu_2(A) = 1 \leq \underbrace{\mu_2(A_{k_0})}_{=1} + \sum_{k \neq k_0} \mu_2(A_k)$$

(iii) LET  $A := \mathbb{Q} \cap [0, 1]$ . SINCE  $A \subset \bigcup_{k=1}^N (a_k, b_k)$  WITHOUT LOSS OF GENERALITY WE CAN ASSUME THAT

$$a_1 < 0 < b_1 \leq a_2 < b_2 \leq a_3 < \dots < b_{N-1} \leq a_N < 1 < b_N$$

CLAIM 1:  $\mu_3(A) \leq 1$

PROOF:  $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $A \subset \left(-\frac{1}{n}, 1 + \frac{1}{n}\right)$

$$\Rightarrow \mu_3(A) \leq \left| -\frac{1}{n} - \left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right) \right| = 1 + \frac{2}{n}$$

SINCE THIS IS TRUE FOR ALL  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . WE HAVE

$$\boxed{\mu_3(A) \leq 1} \quad (*)$$

CLAIM 2: IF  $A \subset \bigcup_{k=1}^N (a_k, b_k)$ , THEN  $b_{i-1} = a_i$ ,  $i=2, \dots, N$

PROOF: SUPPOSE ON THE CONTRARY,  $\exists i \in \{2, \dots, N\}$  SUCH THAT  $b_{i-1} < a_i$ .

SINCE  $\mathbb{Q}$  IS DENSE IN  $\mathbb{R}$ ,  $\exists q \in \mathbb{Q}$  SUCH THAT  $b_{i-1} < q < a_i$ .

BUT THIS IMPLIES  $q \notin \bigcup_{k=1}^N (a_k, b_k)$  AND HENCE  $A \not\subset \bigcup_{k=1}^N (a_k, b_k)$  WHICH IS A CONTRADICTION.

$$\therefore \boxed{b_{i-1} = a_i \quad \forall i \in \{2, \dots, N\}}$$

USING CLAIM 2, WE CONCLUDE THAT

$$a_1 < 0 < b_1 = a_2 < b_2 = a_3 < \dots < b_{N-1} = a_N < 1 < b_N$$

THEREFORE,  $\sum_{k=1}^N |a_k - b_k| = b_N - a_1 > 1$

$$\Rightarrow \boxed{\mu_3(A) > 1} \quad (**)$$

FROM (\*) AND (\*\*), WE THEN HAVE

$$\boxed{\mu_3(A) = 1}$$

NOW GIVEN ANY POINT  $x$ , WE CAN WRITE

$$\{x\} \subset (x - \frac{1}{n}, x + \frac{1}{n}) \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$$

$$\Rightarrow \mu_3(\{x\}) \leq \frac{2}{n} \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$$

$$\Rightarrow \boxed{\mu_3(\{x\}) = 0}$$

SINCE  $\mathbb{Q}$  IS COUNTABLE, WE CAN WRITE  $X = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \{q_k\}$

$$\text{BUT } \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mu_3(\{q_k\}) = 0 < 1 = \mu_3(A)$$

AND HENCE  $\mu_3$  IS NOT A MEASURE.

---

Q12) (i) IT FOLLOWS FROM AXIOM (ii) OF MEASURES WITH

$$A = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} A_k \subset \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} A_k$$

(ii) IF  $A \subset A$ , IT IS A PARTICULAR CASE OF AXIOM (ii) THAT  $\mu(A) \leq \mu(B)$  HOLDS.