



---

Almost Fixed Sets: 10843

Author(s): Andrew Vince and Kenneth Schilling

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *The American Mathematical Monthly*, Vol. 108, No. 10 (Dec., 2001), pp. 981-982

Published by: [Mathematical Association of America](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2695433>

Accessed: 25/04/2012 13:43

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



*Mathematical Association of America* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The American Mathematical Monthly*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

for all  $x \in [0, 1)$ .

*Solution by M. L. Glasser, Clarkson University, Potsdam, NY.* We use the usual notation for the rising factorial  $a^{(k)} = a(a+1) \cdots (a+k-1)$  and the hypergeometric function

$${}_2F_1(a, b; c; z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{a^{(k)} b^{(k)} z^k}{c^{(k)} k!}.$$

The hypergeometric series are tabulated in section 7.3 of A. P. Prudnikov et al., *Integrals and Series*, Vol. 3, Gordon and Breach, 1990.

The left hand side is

$$\begin{aligned} 4(1-x^2)^{3/2} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1^{(k)} 1^{(k)} x^{2k}}{(1/2)^{(k)} k!} &= 4(1-x^2)^{3/2} {}_2F_1(1, 1; 1/2; x^2) \\ &= 4 \left( \sqrt{1-x^2} + x \arcsin x \right). \end{aligned}$$

Now consider the right hand side. Letting  $r = k - j$  we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^j \frac{2^{k-j+1}}{j! 2^j} \frac{(k-j)!}{(2k-2j)!} &= \frac{(-1)^k}{k! 2^{k-1}} \sum_{r=0}^k \frac{(-k)^{(r)} 1^{(r)}}{(1/2)^{(r)} r!} \\ &= \frac{(-1)^k}{k! 2^{k-1}} {}_2F_1(-k, 1; 1/2; 1) = \frac{(-1)^{k-1}}{k! 2^{k-1} (2k-1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore the right hand side is

$$\begin{aligned} &4 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} x^{2k} (2k)! \left( \sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^j \frac{2^{k-j+1}}{j! 2^j} \frac{(k-j)!}{(2k-2j)!} \right)^2 \\ &= 4 \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} x^{2k} (2k)! \frac{1}{2^{2k} (2k-1)^2 (k!)^2} \\ &= 4 \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{x^{2k} (-1/2)^{(k)} (-1/2)^{(k)}}{(1/2)^{(k)} k!} \\ &= 4 {}_2F_1(-1/2, -1/2; 1/2; x^2) = 4 \left( \sqrt{1-x^2} + x \arcsin x \right). \end{aligned}$$

*Editorial comment.* The equality of the left and right hand sides can also be derived less explicitly as a special case of Euler's identity

$$(1-z)^{c-a-b} {}_2F_1(c-a, c-b; c; z) = {}_2F_1(a, b; c; z).$$

The problem arose as follows. If  $(X, Y)$  is bivariate normal with mean 0, variance 1, and correlation  $x$ , then computing  $E(|XY|)$  in two different ways gives the two series.

Solved also by P. Bracken (Canada), B. Bradie, R. J. Chapman (U. K.), O. P. Lossers (The Netherlands), R. Richberg, J. Tyson, and the proposer.

### Almost Fixed Sets

**10843** [2000, 951]. *Proposed by Andrew Vince, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL.* Define a mapping  $f: [0, 1) \rightarrow [0, 1)$  by  $f(x) = 2x \pmod{1}$ . Find

$$\sup_{\lambda(A)=1/2} \lambda \left( A \cap f^{-1}(A) \right),$$

where  $\lambda$  denotes Lebesgue measure and the supremum is taken over all sets  $A$  that are the union of finitely many intervals and that satisfy  $\lambda(A) = 1/2$ .

*Solution by Kenneth Schilling, University of Michigan, Flint, MI.* The answer is  $1/2$ . For  $x \in [0, 1]$ , let  $M(x) = \sup_{\lambda(A)=x} \lambda(A \cap f^{-1}(A))$ . We show more generally that  $M(x) = x$ . In fact, the same arguments apply if we replace  $([0, 1], \lambda)$  and  $f$  by any nonatomic measure space  $X$  and any measure-preserving function  $f: X \rightarrow X$ , provided the sets  $A$  range over arbitrary measurable sets.

**Claim 1:** If  $0 \leq x_0 \leq x_1 \leq 1$ , then  $0 \leq M(x_1) - M(x_0) \leq 2(x_1 - x_0)$ . In particular,  $M$  is continuous.

**Proof.** Every set of measure  $x_0$  is contained in a set of measure  $x_1$ , so  $0 \leq M(x_1) - M(x_0)$ . Suppose that  $\lambda(B) = x_1$ . Choose  $A \subset B$  with  $\lambda(A) = x_0$ . We have

$$A \cap f^{-1}(A) \supset (B \cap f^{-1}(B)) \setminus ((B \setminus A) \cup f^{-1}(B \setminus A)),$$

so  $M(x_0) \geq \lambda(A \cap f^{-1}(A)) \geq \lambda(B \cap f^{-1}(B)) - 2(x_1 - x_0)$ . Take the supremum over all sets  $B$  with  $\lambda(B) = x_1$  to get  $M(x_0) \geq M(x_1) - 2(x_1 - x_0)$ .  $\square$

**Claim 2:** If  $M(x_0) < x_0$ , then  $x_0 - M(x_0) \geq x - M(x)$  for all  $x \in [x_0, 2x_0 - M(x_0)]$ .

**Proof.** Suppose that  $x \in (x_0, 2x_0 - M(x_0)]$  and  $\lambda(A) = x_0$ . Since  $\lambda(A \cap f^{-1}(A)) \leq M(x_0)$ , we have  $\lambda(f^{-1}(A) \setminus A) \geq x_0 - M(x_0)$ . Since  $0 < x - x_0 \leq x_0 - M(x_0)$  there exists  $B \subset f^{-1}(A) \setminus A$  with  $\lambda(B) = x - x_0$ . Thus  $\lambda(A \cup B) = x$ , so

$$M(x) \geq \lambda((A \cup B) \cap f^{-1}(A \cup B)) \geq \lambda(A \cap f^{-1}(A)) + \lambda(B).$$

Take the supremum over all sets  $A$  with  $\lambda(A) = x_0$  to get  $M(x) \geq M(x_0) + (x - x_0)$ .  $\square$

**Main proof.** Now let  $N(x) = x - M(x)$ . Clearly  $N(0) = N(1) = 0$  and  $N(x) \geq 0$ . Suppose (for purposes of contradiction) that  $N$  is not identically zero. By Claim 1,  $N$  is continuous, so  $N$  takes on a maximum value  $y_1 > 0$ . Let  $x_1$  be the least  $x \in [0, 1]$  such that  $N(x) = y_1$ , and let  $x_0$  be the greatest  $x \in [0, x_1]$  such that  $N(x) = y_1/2$ . We then have  $N(x_0) < N(x)$  for  $x \in (x_0, x_1)$ , which contradicts Claim 2 when  $x > x_0$  but is close to  $x_0$ .

Solved also by M. Bowron, J. Feroe, A. Guetter, D. Huang, B. S. Kim (Korea), J. H. Lindsey II, O. P. Lossers (The Netherlands), R. Stong, GCHQ Problems Group (U. K.), NSA Problems Group, and the proposer.

## REVIVALS

### A Generalization of Hall's Theorem

**10701** [1998, 956; 2001, 79]. *Proposed by Fred Galvin, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS.* Let  $G$  be a (finite, undirected, simple) graph with vertex set  $V$ . Let  $C = \{C_x: x \in V\}$  be a family of sets indexed by the vertices of  $G$ . For  $X \subseteq V$ , let  $C_X = \cup_{x \in X} C_x$ . A set  $X \subseteq V$  is  $C$ -colorable if one can assign to each vertex  $x \in X$  a "color"  $c_x \in C_x$  so that  $c_x \neq c_y$  whenever  $x$  and  $y$  are adjacent in  $G$ .

(a) Prove that if  $|C_X| \geq |X|$  whenever  $X$  induces a connected subgraph of  $G$ , then  $V$  is  $C$ -colorable.

(b) Prove that if every proper subset of  $V$  is  $C$ -colorable and if  $|C_V| \geq |V|$ , then  $V$  is  $C$ -colorable.

(c) For every connected graph  $G$ , find a family  $C = \{C_x: x \in V\}$  showing that the condition  $|C_V| \geq |V|$  in part (b) cannot be weakened to  $|C_V| \geq |V| - 1$ .

*Editorial comment.* The proposer notes that part (a) is a corollary of part (b), and part (b) is a restatement of Lemma 4 on p. 256 of H. A. Kierstead, On the choosability of complete multipartite graphs with part size three, *Discrete Math.* 211 (2000) 255-259.