## Real Analysis 1, MATH 5210

## Homework 3, Sections 2.3 and 2.4

Due Friday September 26, 2014 at 1:30

Prove each of the following.

- **2.14.** Prove that if a set E has finite positive outer measure, then there is a bounded subset of E that also has positive outer measure. HINT: Consider the contrapositive.
- **2.15.** Prove that if E has finite measure and  $\varepsilon > 0$ , then E is the disjoint union of a finite number of measurable sets, each of which has measure at most  $\varepsilon$ . HINT: Cut set E into bounded pieces and a single unbounded piece which is small in measure.
- **2.17.** Prove that a set E is measurable if and only if for each  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there is a closed set F and open set  $\mathcal{O}$  for which  $F \subseteq E \subseteq \mathcal{O}$  and  $m^*(\mathcal{O} \setminus F) < \varepsilon$ . HINT: Use Theorem 2.11.
- 2.18. (REVISED from the text's version.) Let  $m^*(E) < \infty$ . Then if there exists  $F_{\sigma}$  set F and  $G_{\delta}$  set G with  $F \subseteq E \subseteq G$  and  $m * (F) = m^*(E) = m^*(G)$ , then E is measurable. NOTE: The text's statement is incorrect since it does not assume that E is measurable. We know (from page 3 of the class notes for Section 2.3) that there exist  $F_{\sigma}$  set F and  $G_{\delta}$  set G, called the inner approximation and outer approximation, such that  $\lambda_*(F) = \lambda_*(E) \le \lambda^*(E) = \lambda^*(G)$  (in terms of inner measure  $\lambda_*$  and outer measure  $\lambda^*$ ). So the text's conclusion holds only if set E is measurable (which it did not assume). HINT: You may assume this behavior of inner and outer measure.