

Real Analysis

Azure

2021

Contents

1	Day 1: Ordered Sets & Fields	5
1.1	Ordered Sets and Bounds	5
1.2	Least Upper Bound Property	6
1.3	Fields	7
1.4	Ordered Fields	8
2	Day 2: Complex Field & Euclidean Spaces	10
2.1	nth Root	10
2.2	Decimals	11
2.3	Extended Reals	11
2.4	Complex Numbers	11
2.5	Euclidean Spaces	13
2.6	Cauchy-Schwarz	13
3	Day 3: Existence of \mathbb{R}	15
4	Day 4: Cardinality	17
4.1	Cardinality	17
4.2	Set of Sets	18
5	Day 5: Metric Spaces and Closed/Open	21
5.1	Metric Spaces	21
5.2	Intervals and Balls	25
6	Day 6: Open Relative and Compactness	26
6.1	Closure	26
6.2	Open Relative	26
6.3	Compact Sets	27
7	Day 7: Perfect & Connected Sets	31
7.1	Perfect Sets	31
7.2	Connected Sets	32
8	Day 8: Convergence & Cauchy	33
8.1	Convergent Sequences	33
8.2	Subsequences	35
8.3	Cauchy Sequences	36
9	Day 9: Limits & Special Sequences	39
9.1	Upper and Lower Limits	39

9.2	Special Sequences	40
10	Day 10: Series & Convergence Tests	41
10.1	Series	41
10.2	Non-negative Series	42
10.3	The Number e	43
10.4	Root and Ratio Tests	44
10.5	Power Series	45
10.6	Summation By Parts	45
10.7	Absolute Convergence	46
10.8	Addition & Multiplication	46
11	Day 11: Continuity	48
11.1	Limits of Functions	48
11.2	Continuous Functions	49
11.3	Continuity and Compactness	51
11.4	Continuity and Connectedness	52
11.5	Discontinuities	53
11.6	Monotonic Functions	53
11.7	Infinite Limits / Limits at Infinity	54
12	Day 12: Differentiation	55
12.1	Derivative of a Function	55
12.2	Mean Value Theorems	56
12.3	Continuity of Derivatives	57
12.4	L'Hospital's Rule	58
12.5	Derivative of Higher Order	58
12.6	Taylor's Theorem	59
12.7	Differentiation of Vector-Valued Functions	59
13	Day 13: Riemann-Stieltjes Integral	60
13.1	Riemann-Stieltjes Integral	60
13.2	Riemann-Integrable Functions	63
13.3	Integral Properties	64
13.4	Change of Variable	66
13.5	Fundamental Theorem of Calculus	68
13.6	Vector-Valued Functions	70
13.7	Line Integrals	71
14	Day 14: Sequences \ Series of Functions	72
14.1	Convergence	72
14.2	Uniform Convergence	72

14.3	Continuity	74
14.4	Integration	76
14.5	Differentiation	77
14.6	Equicontinuous	78
14.7	Stone-Weierstrass	80
15 Day 15:	Special Functions	83
15.1	Power Series	83
15.2	Exponential and Logarithmic Functions	85
15.3	Trigonometric Function	87
15.4	Algebraic Completeness of the Complex Field	88
15.5	Fourier Series	89
16 Day 16:	Multivariable Functions	95
16.1	Linear Transformations	95
16.2	Differentiation	100
16.3	The Contraction Principle	105
16.4	Inverse Function Theorem	106
16.5	Implicit Function Theorem	107
17 Day 17:	Lebesgue Integral	109
17.1	Regulated Integral	109
17.2	Outer Measure	112
17.3	Lebesgue Measure	115
17.4	Lebesgue Integral	117
17.5	Lebesgue Integral of Bounded Functions	119
18 Day 18:	Convergence Theorems	122
18.1	Bounded Convergence Theorem	122
18.2	Integral of Unbounded Functions	123
18.3	Dominated Convergence Theorems	124
18.4	General Lebesgue Integral	126
19 Day 19:	L^2 Space	129
19.1	L^2 : Square Integrable Functions	129
19.2	Convergence in L^2	131
19.3	Hilbert Space: \mathcal{H}	133
19.4	Fourier Series	135

1 Ordered Sets and Fields

1.1 Ordered Sets and Bounds

Definition 1.1.1: Ordered Set

An **order** is:

- **Trichotomy**: For all $x, y \in S$, only one holds true:
 - $x < y$
 - $x = y$
 - $x > y$
- **Transitivity**: If $x < y$ and $y < z$, then $x < z$.

An ordered set is a set with an order.

Definition 1.1.2: Bounds

Let S be an ordered set and $E \subset S$.

An **upper bound** of E is a $\beta \in S$ such that $x \leq \beta$ for all $x \in E$.

If such a β exists, then E is bounded from above.

A **lower bound** of E is a $\alpha \in S$ such that $x \geq \alpha$ for all $x \in E$.

If such a α exists, then E is bounded from below.

Definition 1.1.3: Infimum & Supremum

Let S be an ordered set.

Let $E \subset S$ be bounded from above. **Least upper bound** $\beta \in S$ exists if:

- β is an upper bound for E
- If $\gamma < \beta$, then γ is not an upper bound for E .

Then $\beta = \sup(E)$

Let $E \subset S$ be bounded from below. **Greatest lower bound** $\alpha \in S$ exists if:

- α is a lower bound for E
- If $\gamma > \alpha$, then γ is not a lower bound for E .

Then $\alpha = \inf(E)$

Even if $\sup(E)$ exists, it may or may not exist at S .

If $\sup(E)$ exists, then $\sup(E)$ is unique. Statement also holds true for $\inf(E)$.

Example

Let $S = (1, 2) \cup [3, 4) \cup (5, 6)$ with the order $<$ from \mathbb{R} . For subsets E of S :

- $E = (1, 2)$ is bounded above with $\sup(E) = 2$ and not bounded below
- $E = [3, 4)$ is bounded below with $\inf(E) = 3$, but $\sup(E) = \text{DNE}$
- $E = (5, 6)$ is not bounded above or below so $\inf(E), \sup(E) = \text{DNE}$

1.2 Least Upper Bound Property

Theorem 1.2.1: Least Upper Bound Property

An ordered set S has a least upper bound property if:

For every nonempty subset $E \subset S$ that is bounded from above:

$$\sup(E) \in S$$

Example

\mathbb{Q} doesn't have a least upper bound property. Take for example, $\sqrt{2}$. Let $x^2 = 2$.

If x was rational, there is a rational $\frac{p}{q}$ where $x = \frac{p}{q}$ where p and q are not both even.

$$\left(\frac{p}{q}\right)^2 = 2 \quad \Rightarrow \quad p^2 = 2q^2$$

Since $2q^2$ is even, then p^2 is even so p is even. Thus, p is divisible by 2 so p^2 is divisible by 4 so q^2 is divisible by 2 so q is even. Thus, both p and q must be even which is a contradiction so $x = \sqrt{2}$ cannot be rational.

So if $\sqrt{2} < \frac{a}{b}$ for some rational $\frac{a}{b}$, there is always another rational $\frac{p}{q}$:

$$\sqrt{2} < \frac{p}{q} < \frac{a}{b}$$

and there will never be a rational $\frac{p}{q}$ such that $\sqrt{2} = \frac{p}{q}$ since $\sqrt{2}$ is not rational.

Proof

Let $z = y - \frac{y^2-2}{y+2} = \frac{2y+2}{y+2}$, then take $z^2 - 2 = \frac{2(y^2-2)}{(y+2)^2}$.

Let set $A = \{y > 0 \in \mathbb{Q} \text{ where } y^2 < 2\}$ and set $B = \{y > 0 \in \mathbb{Q} \text{ where } y^2 > 2\}$

- If $y^2 - 2 < 0$, then $z > y$ where $z \in A$. So, y is not an upper bound.
Since for any y , there is $z > y$ where $z \in A$, then $\sup(A)$ doesn't exist in \mathbb{Q} .
- If $y^2 - 2 > 0$, then $z < y$ where $z \in B$. So, y is an upper bound, but not $\sup(B)$.
Since for any y , there is $z < y$ where $z \in B$, then $\inf(B)$ doesn't exist in \mathbb{Q} .

Thus, \mathbb{Q} doesn't have the least upper bound or greatest lower bound property.

Theorem 1.2.2: Least Upper Bound + Lower Bound implies Greatest Lower Bound

Let S be a ordered set with the least upper bound property and non-empty $B \subset S$ be bounded below. Let L be the set of all lower bounds of B .

$$\alpha = \sup(L) \in S$$

Proof

L is non-empty since B is bounded from below.


Thus, by the least upper bound property of S , $\alpha = \sup(L)$ exists in S .

We claim that $\alpha = \inf(B)$.

If $\gamma < \alpha$, then γ is not an upper bound for L so $\gamma \notin B$ since all upper bounds for L are in B .

Thus, for every $x \in B$, $\alpha \leq x$.

If $\gamma \geq \alpha$, then γ is an upper bound of L so $\gamma \in B$. Thus, $\inf(B) = \alpha$.



1.3 Fields

Definition 1.3.1: Fields Axioms

- (a) Addition Axioms
- If $x, y \in F$, then $x+y \in F$
 - $x+y = y+x$ for all $x, y \in F$
 - $(x+y)+z = x+(y+z)$ for all $x, y, z \in F$
 - There exists $0 \in F$ such that $0+x = x$ for all $x \in F$
 - For every $x \in F$, there is $-x \in F$ where $x+(-x) = 0$
- (b) Multiplicative Axioms
- If $x, y \in F$, then $xy \in F$
 - $yx = xy$ for all $x, y \in F$
 - $(xy)z = x(yz)$ for all $x, y, z \in F$
 - There exists $1 \neq 0 \in F$ such that $1x = x$ for all $x \in F$
 - If $x \neq 0 \in F$, there is $\frac{1}{x} \in F$ where $x(\frac{1}{x}) = 1$
- (c) Distributive Law
- $x(y+z) = xy + xz$ hold for all $x, y, z \in F$

Theorem 1.3.2: Properties of a Field

- (a) If $x+y = x+z$, then $y = z$

Proof

$$y = 0+y = (-x)+x+y = (-x)+x+z = 0+z = z$$

- (b) If $x+y = x$, then $y = 0$

Proof

$$\text{From (a), let } z = 0$$

- (c) If $x+y = 0$, then $y = -x$

Proof

$$\text{From (a), let } z = -x$$

- (d) $-(-x) = x$

Proof

$$\text{From (c), let } x = -x \text{ and } y = x$$

- (e) If $x \neq 0$ and $xy = xz$, then $y = z$

Proof

$$y = 1y = \frac{1}{x}xy = \frac{1}{x}xz = 1z = z$$

- (f) If $x \neq 0$ and $xy = x$, then $y = 1$

Proof

$$\text{From (e), let } z = 1$$

- (g) If $x \neq 0$ and $xy = 1$, then $y = \frac{1}{x}$

Proof

$$\text{From (e), let } z = \frac{1}{x}$$

- (h) If $x \neq 0$, then $\frac{1}{1/x} = x$

Proof

$$\text{From (g), let } x = \frac{1}{x} \text{ and } y = x$$

(i) $0x = 0$

ProofSince $0x + 0x = (0+0)x = 0x = 0x + 0$, then $0x = 0$

(j) If $x, y \neq 0$, then $xy \neq 0$

ProofSuppose $xy = 0$, then $1 = \frac{1}{y} \frac{1}{x} xy = \frac{1}{y} \frac{1}{x} 0 = 0$. Then, $0 = 1$ is a contradiction.

(k) $(-x)y = -(xy) = x(-y)$

Proof $xy + (-x)y = (x+(-x))y = 0y = 0$. Then by part (c), $(-x)y = -(xy)$.
 $xy + x(-y) = x(y+(-y)) = x0 = 0$. Then by part (c), $x(-y) = -(xy)$.

(l) $(-x)(-y) = xy$

ProofBy part (k), then $(-x)(-y) = -[x(-y)] = -[-(xy)]$. By part (d), $-[-(xy)] = xy$

1.4 Ordered Fields

Definition 1.4.1: Ordered Field

An **ordered field** F is a field F which is also an ordered set for all $x, y, z \in F$

- If $y < z$, then $y+x < z+x$
- If $x, y > 0$, then $xy > 0$

\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{R} are ordered fields, but \mathbb{C} is not an ordered field since $i^2 = -1 \not> 0$.

Theorem 1.4.2: Properties of the Ordered Field

(a) If $x > 0$, then $-x < 0$ and vice versa

Proof $-x = -x + 0 < -x + x = 0$

(b) If $x > 0$ and $y < z$, then $xy < xz$

ProofSince $z-y > 0$, then $0 < x(z-y) = xz - xy$

(c) If $x < 0$ and $y < z$, then $xy > xz$

ProofSince $-x > 0$ and $z-y > 0$, then $0 < -x(z-y) = xy - xz$

(d) If $x \neq 0$, $x^2 > 0$

ProofIf $x > 0 \Rightarrow x^2 = x \cdot x > 0$. If $x < 0 \Rightarrow (-x)^2 = (-x) \cdot (-x) = x \cdot x = x^2 > 0$

(e) If $0 < x < y$, then $0 < 1/y < 1/x$

Proof $(\frac{1}{y})y = 1 > 0$ so $\frac{1}{y} > 0$. Since $x < y$, then $\frac{1}{y} = (\frac{1}{y})(\frac{1}{x})x < (\frac{1}{y})(\frac{1}{x})y = \frac{1}{x}$.

Theorem 1.4.3: \mathbb{R} is an ordered field

There exists a unique ordered field \mathbb{R} with the least upper bound property.

Also, $\mathbb{Q} \subset \mathbb{R}$ so \mathbb{Q} is also an ordered field.

Proof

The proof in Day 5 is a construction of \mathbb{R} by defining a specific order $<$.

Theorem 1.4.4: \mathbb{Q} is dense in \mathbb{R}

- (a) **Archimedean Property:** For $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$, if $x > 0$, there is $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ where $nx > y$.

Proof

Fix $x > 0$. Let $A = \{ nx : n = 1, 2, \dots \}$. Suppose there is a y where $nx \leq y$. Then, A is nonempty and bounded from above by y . By the least upper bound property of \mathbb{R} , $\alpha = \sup(A)$ exists in \mathbb{R} . Since $x > 0$, then $-x < 0$ so $\alpha - x < \alpha - 0 = \alpha$. So $\alpha - x$ is not an upper bound of A . So there is a $mx \in A$ such that $mx > \alpha - x$. Then $\alpha < (m+1)x$, but $(m+1)x \in A$ contradicting α is an upper bound for A .

- (b) **\mathbb{Q} is dense in \mathbb{R} :** For $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$, if $x < y$, there is a $p \in \mathbb{Q}$ where $x < p < y$.

Proof

Since $x < y$, then $y - x > 0$. Then by the Archimedean Property, there exists $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $n(y - x) > 1$. Thus, $ny > nx + 1 > nx$. Since there is a smallest $m \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that $m > nx$, then $m > nx \geq m - 1$ so $nx + 1 \geq m > nx$. Since $ny > nx + 1 \geq m > nx$, then $y > m/n > x$.

2 Roots, Complex Field, & Euclidean Spaces

2.1 nth Root

Theorem 2.1.1: nth Root

- (a) If $0 < t \leq 1$, then $t^n \leq t$

Proof

Since $t > 0$ and $t \leq 1$, then $t^2 \leq t$. Since $t^2 \leq t$, then $t^3 \leq t^2$ so $t^3 \leq t^2 \leq t$.
Applying the process n times, then $t^n \leq t$.

- (b) If $t \geq 1$, then $t^n \geq t$

Proof

Since $0 < 1 \leq t$, then $t \leq t^2$. Since $t \leq t^2$, then $t^2 \leq t^3$ so $t \leq t^2 \leq t^3$.
Applying the process n times, $t \leq t^n$.

- (c) If $0 < s < t$, then $s^n < t^n$

Proof

$$\underbrace{s \cdot s \cdot \dots \cdot s}_n < t \cdot s \cdot \dots \cdot s < t \cdot t \cdot \dots \cdot s < \dots < \underbrace{t \cdot \dots \cdot t}_n$$

Theorem 2.1.2: $y^n = x$ has a unique y

Fix $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. For every $x > 0$, there exists a unique $y \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $y^n = x$.

Also, such a y is written as $y = \sqrt[n]{x} = x^{\frac{1}{n}}$.

Proof

Uniqueness:

y is unique since if $y_1 < y_2$, then $x = y_1^n < y_2^n \neq x$.

Existence:

Let set $A = \{ t > 0 : t^n < x \}$.

$A \neq \emptyset$ since let $t_1 = \frac{x}{x+1} < 1$ so $t_1 < x$ and thus, $0 < t_1^n < t_1 < x$ so $t_1 \in A$.

A is bounded above since if $t \geq x+1$, then $t > 1$ so $t^n \geq t \geq x+1 > x$ so $t \notin A$.

So $x+1$ is an upper bound of A .

Thus by the least upper bound property, $y = \sup(A)$ exists.

For $y^n = x$, show $y^n < x$ and $y^n > x$ cannot hold true.

*** (Not an upper bound of A if $<$ and not a least upper bound of A if $>$) ***

For $0 < \alpha < \beta$:

$$\beta^n - \alpha^n = (\beta - \alpha) \underbrace{(\beta^{n-1} + \beta^{n-2}\alpha + \dots + \alpha^{n-1})}_{< \beta^{n-1}} < (\beta - \alpha)n\beta^{n-1}$$

Suppose $y^n < x$. Pick $0 < h < 1$ and $h < \frac{x - y^n}{n(y+1)^{n-1}}$.

From inequality, let $\beta = y+h$ and $\alpha = y$.

$$(y+h)^n - y^n < hn(y+h)^{n-1} < hn(y+1)^{n-1} < x - y^n$$

Thus, $(y+h)^n < x$ so $y+h \in A$ and thus, not an upper bound of A which is a contradiction since $y = \sup(A)$.

Suppose $y^n > x$. Pick $0 < k = \frac{y^n - x}{ny^{n-1}} < \frac{y^n}{ny^{n-1}} = \frac{1}{n}y < y$.

Consider $t \geq y-k$, then: $y^n - t^n \leq y^n - (y-k)^n < kny^{n-1} = y^n - x$

Thus, $t^n > x$ so $t \notin A$. Then, $y-k$ is an upper bound of A which contradicts $y = \sup(A)$.

Since $y^n < x$ and $y^n > x$, then $y^n = x$.

Corollary 2.1.3: n-th root of product = product of n-th root

If $a, b > 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, then $(ab)^{\frac{1}{n}} = a^{\frac{1}{n}} b^{\frac{1}{n}}$

Proof

Let $A = a^{\frac{1}{n}}$, $B = b^{\frac{1}{n}}$. By **theorem 2.1.2**, since A is a root for $y_1^n = a$, then $A^n = a$. Similarly, B is a solution of $y_2^n = b$ so $B^n = b$. Thus:

$$\begin{aligned} ab &= A^n B^n = A_1 A_2 \dots A_n B_1 B_2 \dots B_n \\ &= A_1 A_2 \dots B_1 A_n B_2 \dots B_n = \dots = A_1 B_1 A_2 \dots A_{n-1} A_n B_2 \dots B_n \\ &= \dots = A_1 B_1 A_2 B_2 \dots A_n B_n = (AB)^n \end{aligned}$$

Then again by **theorem 2.1.2**, there is a unique $(ab)^{\frac{1}{n}} = AB = a^{\frac{1}{n}} b^{\frac{1}{n}}$.

2.2 Decimals**Definition 2.2.1: Decimals**

Let n_0 be the largest integer such that $n_0 \leq x$ for $x > 0 \in \mathbb{R}$.

Then let n_k be the largest integer such that $d_k = n_0 + \frac{n_1}{10} + \dots + \frac{n_k}{10^k} \leq x$

Let E be the set of d_k for $k = 0, 1, \dots, \infty$. Then, **decimal** $x = \sup(E)$.

2.3 Extended Reals**Definition 2.3.1: Extended Reals**

The **extended real number system** consist of \mathbb{R} and $\pm\infty$ such that:

$$-\infty < x < \infty \quad \text{for every } x \in \mathbb{R}$$

with the properties:

- $x \pm \infty = \pm\infty$
- $x / \pm\infty = 0$
- If $x > 0$, then $x(\pm\infty) = \pm\infty$. If $x < 0$, then $x(\pm\infty) = \mp\infty$

2.4 Complex Numbers**Definition 2.4.1: Complex Number**

A complex number is an ordered pair (a, b) where $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$. For $x, y \in \mathbb{C}$

- $x + y = (a, b) + (c, d) = (a + c, b + d)$
- $xy = (a, b)(c, d) = (ac - bd, ad + bc)$
- $\frac{1}{x} = (a^2 + b^2)^{-1}(a, -b)$

Thus, the axioms form a field where $(0, 0) = 0$ and $(1, 0) = 1$ and $(0, 1) = i$.

Theorem 2.4.2: Imaginary i and Form a + bi

Let $i = (0, 1)$. Then:

$$i^2 = -1 \quad (a, b) = a + bi$$

Proof

$$\begin{aligned} i^2 &= (0, 1)(0, 1) = (0 - 1, 0 + 0) = (-1, 0) = -1 \\ (a, b) &= (a, 0) + (0, b) = (a, 0) + (b, 0)(0, 1) = a + bi \end{aligned}$$

Definition 2.4.3: Conjugate

Let conjugate: $\bar{z} = a - bi$ where $\text{Re}(z) = a$, $\text{Im}(z) = b$.

Let $z = (a,b)$ and $w = (c,d)$:

(a) $\overline{z+w} = \bar{z} + \bar{w}$

Proof

$$\overline{z+w} = \overline{(a+c, b+d)} = (a+c, -b-d) = (a, -b) + (c, -d) = \bar{z} + \bar{w}$$

(b) $\overline{z\bar{w}} = \bar{z} w$

Proof

$$\overline{z\bar{w}} = \overline{(ac-bd, ad+bc)} = (ac-bd, -ad-bc) = (a, -b) (c, -d) = \bar{z} w$$

(c) $z + \bar{z} = 2 \text{Re}(z)$ $z - \bar{z} = 2i \text{Im}(z)$

Proof

$$\begin{aligned} z + \bar{z} &= (a,b) + (a,-b) = (2a,0) = 2 \text{Re}(z) \\ z - \bar{z} &= (a,b) - (a,-b) = (0,2b) = (0,2) b = 2i \text{Im}(z) \end{aligned}$$

(d) $z\bar{z} \geq 0$

Proof

$$z\bar{z} = (a,b)(a,-b) = (a^2 + b^2, -ab+ab) = a^2 + b^2 \geq 0$$

Definition 2.4.4: Absolute Value

Let absolute value: $|z| = \sqrt{z\bar{z}}$

Let $z = (a,b)$ and $w = (c,d)$:

(a) If $z \neq 0$, then $|z| > 0$.

Proof

$$\sqrt{z\bar{z}} = \sqrt{a^2 + b^2} \geq 0 \text{ where } |z| = 0 \text{ only if } a,b = 0 \text{ so only if } z = (0,0).$$

(b) $|\bar{z}| = |z|$

Proof

$$|\bar{z}| = \sqrt{a^2 + (-b)^2} = \sqrt{a^2 + b^2} = |z|$$

(c) $|zw| = |z| |w|$

Proof

$$\begin{aligned} |zw| &= |(ac-bd, ad+bc)| = \sqrt{(ac-bd)^2 + (ad+bc)^2} \\ &= \sqrt{a^2c^2 + b^2d^2 + a^2d^2 + b^2c^2} = \sqrt{(a^2 + b^2)(c^2 + d^2)} \\ &= \sqrt{a^2 + b^2} \sqrt{c^2 + d^2} = |z| |w| \end{aligned}$$

(d) $|\text{Re}(z)| \leq |z|$

Proof

$$|\text{Re}(z)| = |a| = \sqrt{a^2} \leq \sqrt{a^2 + b^2} = |z|$$

(e) $|z+w| \leq |z| + |w|$

Proof

$$\begin{aligned} |z+w|^2 &= (z+w)(\bar{z}+\bar{w}) = (z+w)(\bar{z}+\bar{w}) = z\bar{z} + z\bar{w} + w\bar{z} + w\bar{w} \\ &= |z|^2 + |w|^2 + 2 \text{Re}(z\bar{w}) \leq |z|^2 + |w|^2 + 2|z||w| \\ &= |z|^2 + |w|^2 + 2|z||w| = (|z| + |w|)^2 \end{aligned}$$

2.5 Euclidean Spaces

Definition 2.5.1: Euclidean Spaces

For each positive integer k , let \mathbb{R}^k be the set of all ordered k -tuples:

$$\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_k) \quad \text{for each } x_i \in \mathbb{R}$$

with the properties:

- $\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y} = (x_1 + y_1, \dots, x_k + y_k) \in \mathbb{R}^k$
- $c\mathbf{x} = (cx_1, \dots, cx_k) \in \mathbb{R}^k$

So, \mathbb{R}^n has a vector space structure. Similarly, for \mathbb{C}^n .

Definition 2.5.2: Inner Product for \mathbb{R}^k (Dot Product)

$$\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y} = x_1 y_1 + \dots + x_k y_k \in \mathbb{R}$$

Definition 2.5.3: Norm

$$|\mathbf{x}| = \sqrt{\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{x}} = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^k x_i^2}$$

Definition 2.5.4: Extension to \mathbb{C}^k

For $\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{C}^n$:

- $\mathbf{z} \cdot \mathbf{w} = z_1 \overline{w_1} + \dots + z_k \overline{w_k}$
- $\mathbf{z} \cdot \mathbf{z} = z_1 \overline{z_1} + \dots + z_k \overline{z_k} = |z_1|^2 + \dots + |z_k|^2 = |\mathbf{z}|^2$

2.6 Cauchy-Schwarz

Theorem 2.6.1: Cauchy-Schwarz

If $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in \mathbb{C}$ and $b_1, \dots, b_n \in \mathbb{C}$, then:

$$|\sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j (\overline{b_j})|^2 \leq \sum_{j=1}^n |\alpha_j|^2 \sum_{j=1}^n |b_j|^2$$

Proof

Let $A = \sum |a_j|^2$ and $B = \sum |b_j|^2$ and $C = \sum a_j (\overline{b_j})$.

If $B = 0$, then $b_1 = \dots = b_n = 0$. Thus, $0 \leq A(0)$ holds true.

Suppose $B > 0$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum |Ba_j - Cb_j|^2 &= \sum (Ba_j - Cb_j)(\overline{Ba_j - Cb_j}) = \sum (Ba_j - Cb_j)(\overline{B} \overline{a_j} - \overline{C} \overline{b_j}) \\ &= \sum (Ba_j - Cb_j)(B\overline{a_j} - \overline{C} \overline{b_j}) = \sum B^2 a_j \overline{a_j} - B\overline{C} a_j \overline{b_j} - B\overline{C} a_j \overline{b_j} + C\overline{C} b_j \overline{b_j} \\ &= B^2 \sum |a_j|^2 - B\overline{C} \sum a_j \overline{b_j} - B\overline{C} \sum \overline{a_j} b_j + |C|^2 \sum |b_j|^2 \\ &= B^2 A - B\overline{C} C - B\overline{C} C + |C|^2 B = B^2 A - 2|C|^2 B + |C|^2 B = B^2 A - |C|^2 B \\ &= B(AB - |C|^2) \end{aligned}$$

Since $|Ba_j - Cb_j| \geq 0$, then $B(AB - |C|^2) \geq 0$.

Since $B > 0$, then $AB - |C|^2 \geq 0$ so $AB \geq |C|^2$.

Corollary 2.6.2: $|\mathbf{z} \cdot \mathbf{w}| \leq |\mathbf{z}||\mathbf{w}|$

For $\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{C}^n$:

$$|\mathbf{z} \cdot \mathbf{w}| \leq |\mathbf{z}||\mathbf{w}|$$

Proof

Since $|z_i|^2 = z_i \overline{z_i}$, then $\sum z_i \overline{z_i} = \sum |z_i|^2 = |\mathbf{z}|^2$. Thus:

$$|\mathbf{z} \cdot \mathbf{w}|^2 = \left| \sum z_i \overline{w_i} \right|^2 \leq \sum |z_i|^2 \sum |w_i|^2 = |\mathbf{z}|^2 |\mathbf{w}|^2$$

$$|\mathbf{z} \cdot \mathbf{w}| \leq |\mathbf{z}||\mathbf{w}|$$

Theorem 2.6.3: Properties of \mathbb{R}^k

Let $x, y, z \in \mathbb{R}^k$ where $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$:

- (a) $|x| \geq 0$ where $|x| = 0$ only if $x = 0$

Proof

$$|x| = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^k x_i^2} \geq 0 \text{ where } |x| = 0 \text{ only if } x_1 = \dots = x_k = 0$$

- (b) $|\alpha x| = |\alpha||x|$

Proof

$$|\alpha x| = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^k (\alpha x_i)^2} = \sqrt{\alpha^2} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^k x_i^2} = |\alpha||x|$$

- (c) $|x + y| \leq |x| + |y|$

Proof

$$\begin{aligned} |x + y|^2 &= (x + y) \cdot (x + y) = |x|^2 + 2(x \cdot y) + |y|^2 \\ &\leq |x|^2 + 2|x||y| + |y|^2 = (|x| + |y|)^2 \end{aligned}$$

- (d) $|x - y| \leq |x - z| + |y - z|$

Proof

$$|x - y| = |x - z + z - y| \leq |x - z| + |z - y| = |x - z| + |y - z|$$

3 Construction of \mathbb{R}

There exists an ordered field \mathbb{R} which has the least upper bound property.
Also, \mathbb{R} contains \mathbb{Q} as a subfield.

Definition 3.1: Cuts

Define a cut as any set $\alpha \subset \mathbb{Q}$ with the properties:

- α is not empty and $\alpha \neq \mathbb{Q}$
- If $p \in \alpha$ and $q \in \mathbb{Q} < p$, then $q \in \alpha$
- If $p \in \alpha$, then $p < r \in \mathbb{Q}$ for some $r \in \alpha$

Proposition 3.2: Order of $\mathbb{R} \rightarrow$ ordered set \mathbb{R}

Define $\alpha < \beta$ if α is a proper subset of β .

- If $\alpha \not\subseteq \beta$, then β is not a subset of α .
Then there is a $p \in \beta$ such that $p \notin \alpha$.
Then for any $q \in \alpha$, $q < p$ and thus, $q \in \beta$.
Thus, $\alpha \subset \beta$ and since $\alpha \neq \beta$, then $\alpha < \beta$.
- If $\alpha \not\subseteq \beta$ and $\alpha \not\supseteq \beta$, then either $\alpha = \beta$ or $\alpha \neq \beta$.
If $\alpha \neq \beta$, there are p, q such that $p \in \alpha$, but $p \notin \beta$ and $q \in \beta$, but $q \notin \alpha$.
But if $p \notin \beta$, then for any $b \in \beta$, $b < p$. Thus, $q < p$.
Similarly, if $q \notin \alpha$, then for any $a \in \alpha$, $a < q$. Thus, $p < q$.
Thus, there is a contradiction since $p > q$ and $p < q$ so $\alpha = \beta$.
- If $\alpha \not\subseteq \beta$, then α is not a subset of β .
Then there is a $p \in \alpha$ such that $p \notin \beta$.
Then for any $q \in \beta$, $q < p$ and thus, $q \in \alpha$.
Thus, $\beta \subset \alpha$ and since $\alpha \neq \beta$, then $\beta < \alpha$.
- If $\alpha < \beta$ and $\beta < \gamma$, then since α is a proper subset of β and β is a proper subset of γ , then α is a proper subset of γ . Thus, $\alpha < \gamma$.

Thus, \mathbb{R} is an ordered set with such an order $<$.

Proposition 3.3: Least Upper Bound of $\mathbb{R} \rightarrow$ Least Upper Bound Property

Let $A \subset \mathbb{R}$ and β be an upper bound for A . Let γ be the union of all $\alpha \in A$.

Thus, $p \in \gamma$ if and only if $p \in \alpha$ for some $\alpha \in A$.

γ defines a cut since:

- Since A is nonempty, there exists a $\alpha_0 \in A$ where α_0 is nonempty.
Since α_0 is nonempty, then γ is nonempty.
Since every $\alpha \in A$ is $\alpha < \beta$, then $\gamma < \beta$ so $\gamma \subset \beta$ and thus, $\gamma \neq \mathbb{Q}$.
- If $p \in \gamma$, then $p \in \alpha_1$ for some $\alpha_1 \in A$. If $q < p$, then $q \in \alpha_1$ so $q \in A$.
- If $p \in \gamma$, then $p \in \alpha_1$ for some $\alpha_1 \in A$. Thus, there is a $r \in \alpha_1$ such that $r > p$ so $r \in \gamma$. Thus, there is a $r \in \gamma$ where $r > p$.

Since γ defines a cut, then $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$. Since every $\alpha \in A \subset \gamma$, then $\alpha \leq \gamma$ so γ is an upper bound for A .

Suppose $\delta < \gamma$. Then there is a $s \in \gamma$ such that $s \notin \delta$. Since $s \in \gamma$, then there is a $\alpha \in A$ such that $s \in \alpha$. Since $\delta < \alpha$, then δ is not an upper bound of A .

Thus, $\gamma = \sup(A)$.

Proposition 3.4: \mathbb{R} is a field

If $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$, define $\alpha + \beta$ as the set of all sums $r + s$ where $r \in \alpha$ and $s \in \beta$.

Also, let 0^* be the set of all negative rational numbers which is a cut since:

- 0^* is nonempty and $0^* \neq \mathbb{Q}$
- If $p \in 0^*$, then any $q \in \mathbb{Q} < p$ is a negative rational and thus, $q \in 0^*$.
- Since \mathbb{Q} is dense in \mathbb{R} , then for any $p \in 0^*$, there is a $r \in \mathbb{Q}$ where $p < r < 0$ so r is a negative rational so $r \in 0^*$.

$\alpha + \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ since $\alpha + \beta$ is a cut:

- $\alpha + \beta$ is non-empty since α, β are non-empty. Take $r' \notin \alpha, s' \notin \beta$, then $r' + s' > r + s$ for $r \in \alpha, s \in \beta$. Thus, $r' + s' \notin \alpha + \beta$ so $\alpha + \beta \neq \mathbb{Q}$.
- If $p \in \alpha + \beta$, then $p = r + s$ where $r \in \alpha$ and $s \in \beta$.
If $q < p$, then $q - s < p - s = (r + s) - s = r$ so $q - s \in \alpha$.
Since $q - s \in \alpha$ and $s \in \beta$, then $(q - s) + s = q \in \alpha + \beta$.
- If $r \in \alpha$, then there is a $t \in \alpha$ such that $t > r$. Let $s \in \beta$.
Thus, for any $p = r + s \in \alpha + \beta$, there is a $q = t + s \in \alpha + \beta$ such that $p = r + s < t + s = q$.

$\alpha + \beta = \beta + \alpha$

If $p = r + s \in \alpha + \beta$ where $r \in \alpha, s \in \beta$, then $s + r = r + s = p \in \beta + \alpha$.

$(\alpha + \beta) + \gamma = \alpha + (\beta + \gamma)$

If $r \in \alpha, s \in \beta, t \in \gamma$, then $r + s + t = (r + s) + t \in (\alpha + \beta) + \gamma$ and
 $r + s + t = r + (s + t) \in \alpha + (\beta + \gamma)$.

$\alpha + 0^* = \alpha$

If $r \in \alpha, s \in 0^*$, then $r + s < r$. Thus, $r + s \in \alpha$. Thus, $\alpha + 0^* \subset \alpha$.

If $p \in \alpha$, there is a $r \in \alpha$ where $r > p$. Thus, $p - r \in 0^*$.

Since $p = r + (p - r) \in \alpha + 0^*$, then $\alpha \subset \alpha + 0^*$. Thus, $\alpha + 0^* = \alpha$.

There is a $-\alpha$ such that $\alpha + -\alpha = 0^*$

Fix $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. Let set β be all p where there is $r > 0$ such that $-p - r \notin \alpha$.

$\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ since β is a cut:

- If $s \notin \alpha$ and $p = -s - 1$, then $-p - 1 \notin \alpha$. Thus, $p \in \beta$ so β is nonempty. If $q \in \alpha$, then $-q \notin \beta$ so $\beta \neq \mathbb{R}$.
- If $p \in \beta$, let $r > 0$ so $-p - r \notin \alpha$. If $q < p$, then $-q - r > -p - r$ and thus, $-q - r \notin \alpha$ so $q \in \beta$.
- If $p \in \beta$, let $t = p + (r/2)$. Then $-t - (r/2) = -p - r \notin \alpha$ and thus, $t \in \beta$ where $p < t$.

If $r \in \alpha, s \in \beta$, then $s \notin \alpha$. Thus, $r < -s$ so $r + s < 0$. Thus, $\alpha + \beta \subset 0^*$.

Let $v \in 0^*$ and let $w = -v/2$ so $w > 0$.

Thus, by the Archimedean property, there is an integer n such that $nw \in \alpha$, but $(n+1)w \notin \alpha$. Let $p = -(n+2)w$ so $-p - w = (n+1)w \notin \alpha$ so $p \in \beta$.

Then, $v = -2w = nw + -nw - 2w = nw + -(n+2)w = nw + p \in \alpha + \beta$.

Since $v \in 0^*$, then $0^* \subset \alpha + \beta$. Thus, $\alpha + \beta = 0^*$. Then, let $-\alpha = \beta$.

Thus, if $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\beta < \gamma$, then $\alpha + \beta < \alpha + \gamma$.

Thus, if $\alpha > 0^*$, then $-\alpha = -\alpha + 0^* < -\alpha + \alpha = 0^*$ so $-\alpha < 0^*$.

If $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}_+$, define $\alpha\beta$ as the set of all p such that $p \leq rs$ for $r \in \alpha, s \in \beta$.

Define 1^* as the set of all $q < 1$. Then all multiplication axioms holds with similar proofs as addition. Also, note since $\alpha, \beta > 0^*$, then $\alpha\beta > 0^*$.

Also, $\alpha(\beta + \gamma) = \alpha\beta + \alpha\gamma$ holds through cases were $\alpha, \beta, \gamma >, < 0^*$.

4 Cardinality


4.1 Cardinality

Definition 4.1.1: Onto and 1-1 Mapping

Suppose for every $x \in A$, there is an associated $f(x) \in B$.

Then f maps A into $B = f: A \rightarrow B$.

- If $f(A) = B$, then f maps A onto B .
- If for each $y \in B$, $f^{-1}(y)$ consist of at most one $x \in A$ where $f^{-1}(y_1) = x_1 \neq x_2 = f^{-1}(y_2)$ for $y_1 \neq y_2$, then f is a 1-1 mapping of A into B .



Definition 4.1.2: 1-1 Correspondence

Sets A and B are equivalent ([have the same cardinality](#)) if there is a 1-1 onto function $f: A \rightarrow B$. ([1-1 correspondence between A and B](#)) Then, $A \sim B$.

If $f: A \rightarrow B$ is 1-1 and onto, then there is a $f^{-1}: B \rightarrow A$ that is 1-1 and onto.

Definition 4.1.3: Countability

- A is [finite](#) if $A \sim J_n = \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$
- A is [infinite](#) if A is not finite
- A is [countably infinite](#) if $A \sim J = \mathbb{Z}_+$
- A is [uncountable](#) if A is not finite or countably infinite
- A is [at most countable](#) if A is finite or countably infinite

Example


\mathbb{Z} is countably infinite

Proof

Let $f(n): \mathbb{Z}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} = \begin{cases} \frac{n}{2} & n \text{ is even} \\ -\frac{n-1}{2} & n \text{ is odd} \end{cases}$
 So $1 \mapsto 0$, $2 \mapsto 1$, $3 \mapsto -1$, $4 \mapsto 2$, $5 \mapsto -2$, etc. Thus, $\mathbb{Z} \sim \mathbb{Z}_+$.

Definition 4.1.4: Pigeonhole Principle

If A is finite, A is not equivalent to any proper set of A .



Theorem 4.1.5: Infinite subsets of countable sets are countable

An infinite subset E of a countably infinite set A is countably infinite

Proof

Let $E \subset A$ be an infinite subset. For every distinct $x_i \in A$, let $\{x_1, x_2, \dots\} \in A$.
 Let n_1 be smallest integer such that $x_{n_1} \in E$.
 Then let n_2 be the smallest integer where $n_2 > n_1$ such that $x_{n_2} \in E$.
 Repeat the process to create sequence $f(k) = \{x_{n_1}, x_{n_2}, \dots, x_{n_k}, \dots\}$.
 Thus, there is a 1-1 correspondence between E and \mathbb{Z}_+ so E is countably infinite.

**4.2 Set of Sets****Definition 4.2.1: Union and Intersection**

Let sets Ω, B be such that for each $x \in \Omega$, there is an associated $E_x \subset B$.

- $E = \bigcup_{x \in \Omega} E_x$ only if for every $x \in E$, $x \in E_x$ for at least one $x \in \Omega$.
- $P = \bigcap_{x \in \Omega} E_x$ only if for every $x \in P$, $x \in E_x$ for all $x \in \Omega$.

with properties:

- | | |
|---|---|
| (a) $A \cup B = B \cup A$ | (a) $A \cap B = B \cap A$ |
| (b) $(A \cup B) \cup C = A \cup (B \cup C)$ | (b) $(A \cap B) \cap C = A \cap (B \cap C)$ |
| (c) $A \subset A \cup B$ | (c) $(A \cap B) \subset A$ |
| (d) If $A \subset B$, then $A \cup B = B$ and $A \cap B = A$ | |

Proof

If $x \in A \cup B$, then $x \in A$ or/and $x \in B$.

- If $x \in A$, since $A \subset B$, then $x \in B$. Then, $(A \cup B) \subset B$.
- If $x \in B$, then immediately $(A \cup B) \subset B$.

If $x \in B$, then $x \in A \cup B$ so $B \subset (A \cup B)$. Thus, $A \cup B = B$.

If $x \in A \cap B$, then $x \in A$ and $x \in B$. Thus, $(A \cap B) \subset A$.

If $x \in A$, since $A \subset B$, then $x \in B$ so $x \in A \cap B$. Thus, $A \subset (A \cap B)$.

Thus, $A \cap B = A$.

- (e) $A \cap (B \cup C) = (A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C)$

Proof

If $x \in A \cap (B \cup C)$, then $x \in A$ and $(x \in B \text{ or/and } x \in C)$.

- If $x \in B$, then $x \in (A \cap B)$ so $x \in (A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C)$.
- If $x \in C$, then $x \in (A \cap C)$ so $x \in (A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C)$.

Thus, $A \cap (B \cup C) \subset (A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C)$.

If $x \in (A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C)$, then $x \in A$ and $(x \in B \text{ or/and } x \in C)$.

Thus, $(A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C) \subset A \cap (B \cup C)$.

Thus, $A \cap (B \cup C) = (A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C)$.

$$(f) A \cup (B \cap C) = (A \cup B) \cap (A \cup C)$$

Proof

If $x \in A \cup (B \cap C)$, then $x \in A$ or/and $(x \in B \text{ and } x \in C)$.

- If $x \in A$, then $x \in (A \cup B)$ and $x \in (A \cup C)$ so $A \cup (B \cap C) \subset (A \cup B) \cap (A \cup C)$.
- If $x \in B, C$, then $x \in (A \cup B)$ and $x \in (A \cup C)$ so $A \cup (B \cap C) \subset (A \cup B) \cap (A \cup C)$.

If $x \in (A \cup B) \cap (A \cup C)$, then $x \in A$ or/and $(x \in B \text{ and } x \in C)$.

Thus, $(A \cup B) \cap (A \cup C) \subset A \cup (B \cap C)$.

Thus, $A \cup (B \cap C) = (A \cup B) \cap (A \cup C)$.

Theorem 4.2.2: Union of countably infinite sets is countably infinite

If E_1, E_2, \dots are countably infinite sets, then $S = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n$ is countably infinite.

Proof

For each E_n , there is a sequence $\{x_{n1}, x_{n2}, \dots\}$. Then construct an array as such:

$$\begin{pmatrix} x_{11} & x_{12} & \dots \\ x_{21} & x_{22} & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{pmatrix}$$

Take elements diagonally, then sequence $S^* = \{x_{11}; x_{21}, x_{12}; x_{31}, x_{22}, x_{13}; \dots\}$.

Since $S^* \sim S$ so S is at most countable and S is infinite since E_1, E_2, \dots are infinite, then S cannot be finite and thus, countably infinite.

Alternative Proof


For each E_n , let set $\widetilde{E}_n = E_n - \bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} E_m$ where $m \neq n$. Thus, $S = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \widetilde{E}_n$.

Since each E_n is countably infinite, there exists a 1-1 mapping $\delta_n: E_n \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$.

Thus, for each \widetilde{E}_n , there is a 1-1 mapping $\delta_n: \widetilde{E}_n \rightarrow A \subset \mathbb{Z}_+$.

Let p_1, p_2, \dots be distinct primes. Since for $s \in S$, there exists a unique \widetilde{E}_i such that $s \in \widetilde{E}_i$, then let $f(s) = p_1^{\delta_1(s)} p_2^{\delta_2(s)} \dots$ where $p_k^{\delta_k(s)} = 1$ if $k \neq i$.

Then, by the Fundamental theorem of arithmetic, f maps s to a unique $z \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and thus, f is a 1-1 function so S is at most countable. Since any $E_n \subset S$ is countably infinite, then S cannot be finite and thus, S is countably infinite.



Theorem 4.2.3: The set of countable n-tuples are countable

Let set A be countably infinite and B_n be the set of all n -tuples (a_1, \dots, a_n) where $a_k \in A$.

Then B_n is countably infinite.

Proof

The base case B_1 is countably infinite since $B_1 = A$.

Suppose B_{n-1} is countably infinite. Then for every $x \in B$:

$$x = (b, a) \quad b \in B_{n-1} \text{ and } a \in A$$

Since for every fixed b , $(b, a) \sim A$ and thus, countably infinite.

Since B is a set of countably infinite sets, then B_n is countably infinite.

Theorem 4.2.4: \mathbb{Q} is countable

The set of rational numbers, \mathbb{Q} , is countably infinite

Proof

Since elements of \mathbb{Q} are of form $\frac{a}{b}$ which is a 2-tuple, then by the **theorem 4.2.3**, \mathbb{Q} is countably infinite.

Alternative Proof

For every $x \in \mathbb{Q}$, let $x = (-1)^i \frac{p}{q}$ where $p, q \in \mathbb{Z}_+$.
 Let $f(x) = 2^i 3^p 5^q$. Then by the Fundamental theorem of arithmetic, f is a 1-1 mapping of x to $E \subset \mathbb{Z}_+$.
 Thus, \mathbb{Q} is at most countable, but since $p, q \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, then \mathbb{Q} cannot be finite and thus, is countably infinite.

Example

Let A be the set of all sequences whose elements are digits 0 and 1. Then A is uncountable.

Proof: Cantor's Diagonalization Proof

Let set E be a countably infinite subset of A which consist of sequences s_1, s_2, \dots .
 Then construct a sequence s as follows:
 If the n -th digit in s_n is 1, then let the n -th digit of s be 0 and vice versa.
 Thus, s differs from every $s_n \in E$ so $s \notin E$.
 But, $s \in A$ so E is a proper subset of A .
 Thus, every countably infinite subset of A is a proper subset of A .
 If A is countably infinite, then A is a proper subset of A which is a contradiction.

5 Metric Spaces & Closed/Open

5.1 Metric Spaces

Definition 5.1.1: Metric Spaces

A set X is a **metric space** if for any $p, q \in X$, there is an associated $d(p, q) \in \mathbb{R}$ such that:

- $d(p, q) > 0$ if $p \neq q$
- $d(p, q) = 0$ if and only if $p = q$
- **Symmetry**: $d(p, q) = d(q, p)$
- **Triangle Inequality**: $d(p, q) \leq d(p, r) + d(r, q)$ for any $r \in X$.


For euclidean spaces \mathbb{R}^k , $d(x, y) = |x - y|$ where $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^k$.

Definition 5.1.2: Types of Points and Sets

For metric space X and set $E \subset X$:

(a) Neighborhood

For $p \in X$ and $r > 0$, $N_r(p)$ is the set of all $q \in X$ where $d(q, p) < r$



(b) Limit Points and Closed Sets

Closed set E contain all $p \in X$ where every $N_r(p)$ contain a $q \neq p \in E$

• Limit Points

For point $p \in X$, every $N_r(p)$ contains a $q \neq p \in E$


The set of all limit points of $E = E'$

• Isolated Points

If $p \in E$ is not a limit point of E

• Closed

If every limit point p of E is a $p \in E$



(c) Interior Points and Open Sets

Open set E contains all its p which has a $N_r(p) \subset E$


- Interior Point

For $p \in X$, there is a $N_r(p) \subset E$

The set of all interior points = E°

- Open

If every $p \in E$ is an interior point of E



(d) More about Sets

- Bounded

If there is $M \in \mathbb{R}$, $q \in X$ such that $d(p, q) < M$ for all $p \in E$

- Complement

From E , E^c is the set of all $p \in X$ such that $p \notin E$

- Perfect

If E is closed and if every $p \in E$ is a limit point of E

- Dense

If every $p \in X$ is a limit point of E or/and $p \in E$

- Boundary Point

For $p \in X$, if every $N_r(p)$ contains a $x \in E$ and $y \in E^c$

The set of all boundary points = ∂E


For a metric space X , $\{X, \emptyset\}$ are both open and closed.

Theorem 5.1.3: $N_r(p)$ is open

Every neighborhood is an open set

Proof

Let $q \in N_r(p)$. Then there is a $h > 0 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $d(q, p) = r - h$.
 Then for any $s \in N_h(q)$, $d(s, p) \leq d(s, q) + d(q, p) = h + (r - h) = r$.
 Thus, for any $q \in N_r(p)$, there exists a $N_h(q) \subset N_r(p)$.




Theorem 5.1.4: If a set has a limit point, there are infinite $q \in E$ in $N_r(p)$

If p is a limit point of set E , then every $N_r(p)$ contains infinitely many $q \in E$

Proof

Suppose there is $N_{r_1}(p)$ which contains finitely many $q = \{q_1, \dots, q_n\}$.
 Let $r = \min_{m \in [1, n]} d(p, q_m)$. Then $N_r(p)$ contains no $q \in E$ such that $q \neq p$.
 So, p is not a limit point of E which is a contradiction since p is a limit point of E .



Corollary 5.1.5: Limit points do not exist in finite sets

A finite set E has no limit points. Since $E' = \emptyset \in E$, all finite set must be closed.

Proof


Let p be a limit point of finite set E . By **theorem 5.1.4**, then any $N_r(p)$ contain infinite $q \in E$ so E is an infinite set which is a contradiction since E is finite.
 So p cannot be limit point of E and thus, E has no limit points. Since finite set E contains all its limit points because there are no limit points, then E is closed.

Theorem 5.1.6: De Morgan's Laws

Let E_1, E_2, \dots be a collection of sets. Then, $(\cup E_x)^c = \cap (E_x^c)$.

Proof

If $p \in (\cup E_x)^c$, then $p \notin (\cup E_x)$.
 Thus, $p \notin E_x$ for any x so $p \in E_x^c$ for all x . Thus, $p \in \cap (E_x^c)$ so $(\cup E_x)^c \subset \cap (E_x^c)$.
 If $p \in \cap (E_x^c)$, then $p \in E_x^c$ for all x .
 Thus, $p \notin E_x$ for any x so $p \notin \cup E_x$. Thus, $p \in (\cup E_x)^c$ so $\cap (E_x^c) \subset (\cup E_x)^c$.
 Thus, $(\cup E_x)^c = \cap (E_x^c)$.



Theorem 5.1.7: Open set \rightarrow Closed complement

A set E is open if and only if E^c is closed

Proof

Suppose E is open. Let x be a limit point of E^c .

Then for every $r > 0$, $N_r(x)$ must contain a $p \in E^c$ such that $p \neq x$.

Then, $N_r(x) \not\subset E$ so x is not an interior point of E and thus, $x \notin E$ so $x \in E^c$.

Since any limit point x of E^c is a $x \in E^c$, then E^c is closed.

Suppose E^c is closed. Let $x \in E$.

Since $x \notin E^c$, x is not a limit point of E^c . Then there exists a $r > 0$ such that any $p \in N_r(x)$ is not in E^c . Thus, every $p \in N_r(x)$ is $p \in E$ so $N_r(x) \subset E$ and thus, x is an interior point of E .

Since any $x \in E$ is an interior point of E , then E is open.

Corollary 5.1.8: Closed set \rightarrow Open complement

A set F is closed if and only if F^c is open

Proof

From **theorem 5.1.7**, let $E = F^c$

Theorem 5.1.9: Union open \rightarrow open and Intersection closed \rightarrow closed

- (a) If $\{G_x\}$ is a finite or infinite collection of open sets, then $\cup G_x$ is open.

Proof

If $p \in \cup G_x$, then $p \in G_x$ for at least one x . Let \bar{x} be such an x .

Since $G_{\bar{x}}$ is open, then p is an interior point of $G_{\bar{x}}$ and thus, there is a $N_r(p)$ such that $N_r(p) \subset G_{\bar{x}} \subset \cup G_x$. So p is an interior point of $\cup G_x$.

Since any $p \in \cup G_x$ is an interior point, then $\cup G_x$ is open.

- (b) If $\{F_x\}$ is a finite or infinite collection of closed sets, then $\cap F_x$ is closed.

Proof

By **theorem 5.1.7**, any F_x^c is open. Since $\{F_x^c\}$ is a finite or infinite collection of open set, then by part (a), $\cup F_x^c$ is open.

Thus, again by **theorem 5.1.7**, $(\cup F_x^c)^c$ is closed.

By **theorem 5.1.6**, $(\cup F_x^c)^c = \cap (F_x^c)^c = \cap F_x$.

- (c) If G_1, \dots, G_n is a finite collection of open sets, then $\cap_{x=1}^n G_x$ is open.

Proof

If $p \in \cap_{x=1}^n G_x$, then $p \in G_x$ for all G_x for $x = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$.

Since each G_x is open, then for any G_x , there is a $N_{r_x}(p) \subset G_x$.

Let $r = \min(r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n)$. Thus, $p \in N_r(p) \subset N_{r_x}(p)$ for all x .

So, $N_r(p) \subset \cap_{x=1}^n G_x$ and thus, p is an interior point of $\cap_{x=1}^n G_x$ so $\cap_{x=1}^n G_x$ is open.

Infinite + Closed: $G_i = (-1/i, 1/i)$

Infinite + Open: $G_i = (-i, i)$

- (d) If F_1, \dots, F_n is a finite collection of closed sets, then $\cup_{x=1}^n F_x$ is closed.

Proof

By **theorem 5.1.7**, any F_x^c is open. Since F_1^c, \dots, F_n^c is a finite collection of open set, then by part (c), $\cap_{x=1}^n F_x^c$ is open.

Thus, again by **theorem 5.1.7**, $(\cap_{x=1}^n F_x^c)^c$ is closed.

By **theorem 5.1.6**, $(\cap_{x=1}^n F_x^c)^c = \cup_{x=1}^n (F_x^c)^c = \cup_{x=1}^n F_x$.

Infinite + Closed: $F_i = [-1/i, 1/i]$

Infinite + Open: $F_i = [1/i, \infty)$

Theorem 5.1.10: E' is closed

Let $E \subset X$. Then, $(E')' \subset E'$. Thus, E' is closed.

Proof

If $x \in (E')'$, then for every $N_{r_1}(x)$, there is a $y \neq x$ where $y \in E'$.
 Since $y \in E'$, then for every $N_{r_2}(y)$, there is a $z \neq y$ where $z \in E$.
 Let $r = r_1 + r_2$.
 Then for every $N_r(x)$, there exists a $z \neq x$ where $z \in E$. Thus, $x \in E'$ so $(E')' \subset E'$.

Theorem 5.1.11: E° is open

Let $E \subset X$. Then, E° is open.

Proof

If $p \in E^\circ$, there is a $r > 0$ such that $N_r(p) \subset E$.
 Then for $0 < s < r$, $N_s(p) \subset N_r(p)$ so any $q \in N_s(p)$ is $q \in E^\circ$.
 Since any $p \in E^\circ$ have a $N_s(p) \subset E^\circ$, then E° is open.

5.2 Intervals and Balls

Definition 5.2.1: Segments and Intervals

In \mathbb{R} , a **segment** is an open interval $(a,b) = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : a < x < b\}$

In \mathbb{R} , a **interval** is a closed interval $[a,b] = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : a \leq x \leq b\}$

Definition 5.2.2: Open Balls

In \mathbb{R}^k , an **open ball** of radius $r > 0$ centered at p is:

$$N_r(p) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^k : |x - p| < r\} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^k : d(x,p) < r\}$$

A **closed ball** has $d(x,p) \leq r$.

Definition 5.2.3: Convex

$E \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ is **convex** if for all $x, y \in E$ and $t \in [0,1]$, $tx + (1-t)y \in E$.

Example

Balls in \mathbb{R}^k are convex

Let $x, y \in$ open ball $N_r(p)$. Let $z = tx + (1-t)y$ for $t \in [0,1]$.
 Since $|x - p| < r$ and $|y - p| < r$:

$$\begin{aligned} |z - p| &= |tx + (1-t)y - p| = |tx + (1-t)y - tp + (t-1)p| \\ &= |t(x-p) + (1-t)(y-p)| \leq t|(x-p)| + (1-t)|(y-p)| \\ &< tr + (1-t)r = r \end{aligned}$$

 Thus, $z \in N_r(p)$ so balls are convex. Same proof applies to closed balls.

Definition 5.2.4: Dense

$E \subset X$ is **dense** if every $x \in X$ is either in E or a limit point of E .

Example

Let $X = \mathbb{R}$. Then, $E = \mathbb{Q}$ is dense in \mathbb{R} .

Fix $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $r > 0$. There is a $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $x-r < q < x$. So for any $r > 0$ and $q \in \mathbb{Q}$, $q \neq x$ and $q \in N_r(x)$. Thus, every $x \in \mathbb{R}$ is a limit point of \mathbb{Q} .

6 Closure, Open Relative, & Compact

6.1 Closure

Definition 6.1.1: Closure

Let $E \subset$ metric space X and E' be the set of all limit points of E in X .

Then the closure of E : $\overline{E} = E \cup E'$

with the properties:

- (a) \overline{E} is closed

Proof

Suppose $x \in X$, but $x \notin \overline{E}$. Thus, $x \in \overline{E}^c$.

Thus, there is a $N_r(x) \subset \overline{E}^c$ since else there is always a $p \in N_r(x)$ where $p \in \overline{E}$ so x is a limit point of \overline{E} so $x \in \overline{E}$. Thus, \overline{E}^c is open so \overline{E} is closed by [theorem 5.1.7](#).

- (b) $E = \overline{E}$ if and only if E is closed

Proof

If $E = \overline{E}$, then by part (a), E is closed.

If E is closed, then $E' \subset E$ so $E = E \cup E' = \overline{E}$.

- (c) $\overline{E} \subset F$ for every closed $F \subset X$ such that $E \subset F$

Proof

If closed set F , then $F' \subset F$. Since $E \subset F$, then $E' \subset F' \subset F$ so $\overline{E} \subset F$.

Theorem 6.1.2: $\sup(E) \in \overline{E}$

Let non-empty set of real numbers, E , be bounded above. Let $y = \sup(E)$.

Then, $y \in \overline{E}$. Thus, $y \in E$ if E is closed and $y \notin E$ if E is open in \mathbb{R} .

Proof

If $y \in E$, then $y \in \overline{E}$. Suppose $y \notin E$.

For every $h > 0$, there exists a $x \in E$ such that $y-h < x < y$ otherwise $y-h$ is an upper bound for E which is a contradiction since $y = \sup(E)$.

Thus, y is a limit point of E so $y \in E'$.

If E is closed, then $y \in E$ since $y \in E'$. Also, $y \in \overline{E}$.

If E is open, then any $N_r(y) \not\subset E$ since $N_r(y)$ in \mathbb{R} must contain a $\gamma > y$ so $y \notin E'$.

6.2 Open Relative

Definition 6.2.1: Open Relative

Suppose $E \subset Y \subset$ metric space X .

Then E is open relative to Y if for each $p \in E$:

There is an $r > 0$ such that for any $q \in Y$ where $d(q,p) < r$, then $q \in E$.

Theorem 6.2.2: E is open relative to $Y \subset X$ if $E = Y \cap G$ and G is open in X

Suppose $E \subset Y \subset X$.

E is open relative to Y if and only if $E = Y \cap G$ for some open $G \subset X$.

Proof

Suppose E is open relative to Y .

Then for each $p \in E$, there is a $r_p > 0$ such that for any $q \in Y$ where $d(p, q) < r_p$, then $q \in E$.

Since $Y \subset X$, let V_p be the set of all $q \in X$ such that $d(p, q) < r_p$ and define $G = \bigcup_{p \in E} V_p$.

Since V_p is open by **theorem 5.1.3**, then by **theorem 5.1.9a**, open $G \subset X$.

Since $p \in V_p$ for all $p \in E$, then $E \subset G \cap Y$. Also, by construction, then $V_p \cap Y \subset E$ so $G \cap Y \subset E$. Thus, $E = Y \cap G$.

If G is open in X and $E = G \cap Y$, then every $p \in E$ has a $V_p \subset G$.

Then, $V_p \cap Y \subset G \cap Y = E$ so E is open relative to Y .

6.3 Compact Sets

Definition 6.3.1: Open Cover

An **open cover** of set $E \subset X$ is a collection of open $G_1, G_2, \dots \subset X$ such that $E \subset \bigcup G_i$.

Definition 6.3.2: Compact

$K \subset X$ is **compact** if every open cover of K contains a finite subcover.

If G_1, G_2, \dots is an open cover of K , then $K \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^n G_i$ for some n .

Theorem 6.3.3: A compact set is compact in every metric space

Suppose $K \subset Y \subset X$.

Then K is compact relative to X if and only if K is compact relative to Y .

Proof

Suppose K is compact relative to X .

Let V_1, V_2, \dots be sets open relative to Y such that $K \subset \bigcup V_x$. Then by **theorem 6.2.2** for each V_x , there is a G_x open relative to X where $V_x = Y \cap G_x$.

Since K is compact relative to X , then there is a n such that $K \subset G_{x_1} \cup \dots \cup G_{x_n}$.

Thus, $K = K \cap Y \subset (\bigcup_{i=1}^n G_{x_i}) \cap Y = (\bigcup_{i=1}^n G_{x_i} \cap Y) = \bigcup_{i=1}^n V_{x_i}$.


Since there are open V_{x_1}, \dots, V_{x_n} where $K \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^n V_{x_i}$ so K is compact relative to Y .

Suppose K is compact relative to Y .

Let open $G_1, G_2, \dots \subset X$ such that $X \subset \bigcup G_x$. For each G_x , let $V_x = Y \cap G_x \subset Y$.

Since K is compact relative to Y , there is a n such that $K \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^n V_{x_i}$.

Thus, $K \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^n V_{x_i} = \bigcup_{i=1}^n (Y \cap G_{x_i}) \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^n G_{x_i}$ so K is compact relative to X .



Theorem 6.3.4: A compact set is closed

Compact subsets of metric spaces are closed


Proof

Let compact $K \subset X$. Suppose $p \in X$, but $p \notin K$ so $p \in K^c$.

If $q \in K$, let W_q be a neighborhood of q with $r < \frac{1}{2}d(p,q)$. Let $V_{p,q}$ be a neighborhood of p with $r < \frac{1}{2}d(p,q)$. Since K is compact, then there are finite points q_1, \dots, q_n such that $K \subset W$ where $W = W_{q_1} \cup \dots \cup W_{q_n}$.

Let $V = V_{p,q_1} \cap \dots \cap V_{p,q_n}$, then $K \cap V \subset W \cap V = \emptyset$ so $V \subset K^c$.

Since there is a neighborhood V for $p \in K^c$ where $V \subset K^c$, then every $p \in K^c$ is an interior point so K^c is open. Then by [theorem 5.1.7](#), K is closed.

**Theorem 6.3.5: If closed $E \subset$ compact set K , E is compact**

Closed subsets of compact sets are compact

Proof

Suppose $F \subset K \subset X$ where F is closed relative to X and K is compact.

Let V_1, V_2, \dots be an open cover for F . Let open set F^c be all $k \in K$ where $k \notin F$.

$$K = F \cup F^c \subset V_1 \cup V_2 \cup \dots \cup F^c$$

Thus, $V_1 \cup V_2 \cup \dots \cup F^c$ is an open cover for K .

Since K is compact, there is a finite subcover Ω that covers K and thus, finite subcover Ω covers $F \cup F^c$.

Remove F^c from Ω . Since finite subcover $\Omega - F^c$ covers F , then F is compact.

Corollary 6.3.6: Closed $F \cap$ compact $K =$ compact

If F is closed and K is compact, then $F \cap K$ is compact

Proof

Since K is compact, then K is closed by [theorem 6.3.4](#).

Then, by [5.1.9b](#), $F \cap K$ is closed.

Since $F \cap K \subset K$, then by [theorem 6.3.5](#), $F \cap K$ is compact.

Theorem 6.3.7: Nonempty $\cap_{i=1}^n K_i \rightarrow$ nonempty $\cap K_i$

For compact sets $K_1, K_2, \dots \subset X$ where any finite intersection of K_i is nonempty, then $\cap K_i$ is nonempty

Proof

Fix K_1 . If there is a $k \in K_1$ where $k \in K_i$ for all i , then $k \in \cap K_i$ so $\cap K_i \neq \emptyset$.

Suppose for every $k \in K_1$, $k \notin K_i$ for some i .

Then for every $k \in K_1$, there is a K_i such that $p \notin K_i$ so $p \in K_i^c$.

Thus, K_2^c, K_3^c, \dots form an open cover for K_1 . Since K_1 is compact, there is a n where $K_1 \subset K_{i_1}^c \cup \dots \cup K_{i_n}^c$. But then, $K_1 \cap K_{i_1} \cap \dots \cap K_{i_n} = \emptyset$ which is a contradiction.

Corollary 6.3.8: Nonempty K_i where $K_{i+1} \subset K_i \rightarrow$ nonempty $\cap K_i$

For nonempty compact sets K_1, K_2, \dots where $K_{i+1} \subset K_i$, then $\cap K_i$ is nonempty

Proof

Since each K_i is nonempty and if $i_1 < \dots < i_n$, then $K_{i_1} \cap \dots \cap K_{i_n} = K_{i_n}$ is nonempty, then by **theorem 6.3.7**, $\cap K_i$ is nonempty.

Theorem 6.3.9: Nonempty intervals I_n where $I_{n+1} \subset I_n \rightarrow$ nonempty $\cap I_n$

For intervals $I_1, I_2, \dots \in \mathbb{R}^1$ where $I_{n+1} \subset I_n$, then $\cap I_n$ is nonempty.

Proof

Let $I_n = [a_n, b_n]$ and thus, each I_n is nonempty. If $n_1 < \dots < n_m$, then $I_{n_1} \cap \dots \cap I_{n_m} = [a_{n_m}, b_{n_m}]$ is nonempty. Thus, by **theorem 6.3.7**, $\cap I_n$ is nonempty.

Theorem 6.3.10: $p \in E'$ exists if infinite $E \subset$ compact K

If E is an infinite subset of compact set K , then E has a limit point in K

Proof

If no $p \in K$ is a $p \in E'$, then each p would have a neighborhood V_p contains at most $p \in E$ if $p \in E$. Thus, there is no finite subcover that covers E and thus, there is no finite subcover that covers K since $E \subset K$ which contradicts K is compact.

Definition 6.3.11: K-cells

The set of all $x = (x_1, \dots, x_k) \in \mathbb{R}^k$ where $x_i \in [a_i, b_i]$ for fixed $a_i, b_i \in \mathbb{R}$

Theorem 6.3.12: K-cells are compact

Every k-cell is compact

Proof

Let k-cell I consists of all $x = (x_1, \dots, x_k)$ where $x_i \in [a_i, b_i]$ for fixed $a_i, b_i \in \mathbb{R}$.

Let $\delta = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^k (b_i - a_i)^2}$. Thus, $|x - y| \leq \delta$ for $x, y \in I$.

Suppose there exists an open cover G_1, G_2, \dots of I which contain no finite subcover.

Let $c_i = \frac{a_i + b_i}{2}$. Then each interval splits into $[a_i, c_i]$ and $[c_i, b_i]$ for $i \in [1, k]$ so there now exists 2^k k-cells Q_i whose union is I .

At least one Q_i cannot be covered else I would be covered. Then subdivide Q_i as before and repeating the process so $Q_{i+1} \subset Q_i$ and each are not covered.

However, there is a point $x^* \in Q_{i_j}$ for all j such that $N_r(x^*) \subset G$ so Q_{i_1} is covered which is a contradiction.

Theorem 6.3.13: Heine-Borel Theorem

If a set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ has one of the three properties, then it has the other two:

- (a) E is closed and bounded
- (b) E is compact
- (c) Every infinite subset of E has a limit point in E

Proof

Suppose E is closed and bounded.

Then there exists a $M \in \mathbb{R}$ and $q \in \mathbb{R}^k$ such that $d(p, q) < M$ for all $p \in E$.

Thus, there is a k -cell $K = [-M + q_1, q_1 + M] \times \dots \times [-M + q_k, q_k + M]$ such that $E \subset K$.

Then by [theorem 6.3.12](#), K is compact and thus by [theorem 6.3.5](#), E is compact so (a) \rightarrow (b).

Then by [theorem 6.3.10](#), any infinite subset of E has a limit point in E so (b) \rightarrow (c).

Suppose E is not bounded.

Then there exists $p \in E$ such that $d(p, q) > M$ for any $M \in \mathbb{R}$ and $q \in \mathbb{R}^k$.

Let $S \subset E$ be such points p .

Then S is infinite else there is a maximal p and thus, p is bounded. Thus, S is infinite and contains no limit points in E since any $d(p_1, p_2) > M$ which contradicts that every infinite subset of E has a limit point in E . Thus, E is bounded.

Suppose E is not closed.

Then there exists a $p \in E'$, but $p \notin E$. Since p is a limit point, then there is a $q \in E$ such that $\frac{1}{n+1} < d(q, p) < \frac{1}{n}$ for $n = \{1, 2, \dots\}$.

Let $S \subset E$ be such points q .

Thus, p is the only limit point of S since for $r < \frac{1}{n}$, any $N_r(q_i)$ contains no points of S other than q_i since $d(q_i, q_j) > \frac{1}{n}$ for any $q_1, q_2 \in S$.

Thus, S is infinite, but the only $p \in S'$ is $p \notin E$ which contradicts that every infinite subset of E has a limit point in E . Thus, E is closed. So, (c) \rightarrow (a).

Theorem 6.3.14: Weierstrass Theorem

Every bounded infinite set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ has a limit point in \mathbb{R}^k .

Proof

Since E is bounded, then there exists a k -cell K such that $E \subset K$. Since K is compact, then by [theorem 6.3.10](#), E has a limit point in K and thus, in \mathbb{R}^k .

7 Perfect and Connected Sets

7.1 Perfect Sets

Definition 7.1.1: Perfect Set

$E \subset X$ is **perfect** if E is closed and if every $p \in E$ is $p \in E'$

Theorem 7.1.2: Perfect sets are uncountable

Let P be a nonempty perfect set in \mathbb{R}^k . Then, P is uncountable.

Proof

Since P has limit points, then by **theorem 5.1.4**, P is infinite.

Suppose P is countable. Then let $x_1, x_2, \dots \in P$.

Let V_i be a neighborhood of x_i where $y \in V_i$ for any $y \in \mathbb{R}^k$ such that $|y - x_i| < r$.

Thus, the $\overline{V_i}$ is the set of all $y \in \mathbb{R}^k$ such that $|y - x_i| \leq r$.


Since every x_i are limit points, then any $V_i \cap P$ is not empty where there is a V_{i+1}

(a) $\overline{V_{i+1}} \subset V_i$

(b) $x_i \notin \overline{V_{i+1}}$

(c) $V_{i+1} \cap P$ is nonempty

Let $K_i = \overline{V_i} \cap P$. Since $\overline{V_i}$ is closed and bounded, then by **theorem 6.3.11**, $\overline{V_i}$ is compact. Since $x_i \notin K_{i+1}$, then no $x_i \in P$ is $x_i \in \cap K_i$. Since $K_n \subset P$, then $\cap K_i$ is empty which contradicts **corollary 6.3.8** since each K_i is nonempty and $K_{i+1} \subset K_i$.



Corollary 7.1.3: \mathbb{R} is not countable

Every interval $[a, b]$ is uncountable. Thus, \mathbb{R} is uncountable.

Proof

Since $[a, b]$ is closed and every $p \in [a, b]$ is a limit point, then nonempty set $[a, b]$ is perfect. Thus, by **theorem 7.1.2**, $[a, b]$ is uncountable.

Definition 7.1.4: Cantor Set

There exists perfect segments in \mathbb{R}^1 which contain no segment.

Let $E_0 = [0,1]$.

For E_1 , remove $(\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3})$. Thus, $E_1 = [0, \frac{1}{3}] \cup [\frac{2}{3}, 1]$.

For E_2 , remove $(\frac{1}{9}, \frac{2}{9})$ and $(\frac{7}{9}, \frac{8}{9})$. Thus, $E_2 = [0, \frac{1}{9}] \cup [\frac{2}{9}, \frac{3}{9}] \cup [\frac{6}{9}, \frac{7}{9}] \cup [\frac{8}{9}, 1]$.

Continuing such a sequence, the set of compact sets E_n are such that:

(a) $E_{n+1} \subset E_n$

(b) E_n is the union of 2^n intervals each of length 3^{-n} .

$P = \cap E_n$ is called the Cantor set. P is compact and nonempty.

Thus, any segment of form $(\frac{3k+1}{3^m}, \frac{3k+2}{3^m})$ where $k, m \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ has no points in common with P . Since any segment (a,b) contain a segment of such a form since $3^{-m} < \frac{b-a}{6}$, then P contains no segment.

Let $x \in P$ and segment S contain x . Let I_n be an interval of E_n containing x . Then choose a large enough n so $I_n \subset S$.

Let x_n be an endpoint of I_n where $x_n \neq x$ and thus, x is a limit point. Since P is closed and every $p \in P$ is $p \in P'$, then P is perfect.

7.2 Connected Sets**Definition 7.2.1: Connected Set**

$A, B \subset X$ are **separated** if both $A \cap \overline{B}$ and $\overline{A} \cap B$ are empty.

$E \subset X$ is **connected** if E is not the union of two nonempty separated sets.

Separated sets are disjoint, but disjoint sets need not be separated.

Theorem 7.2.2: All points between points in connected sets exists

$E \subset \mathbb{R}^1$ is connected if and only if:

If $x, y \in E$ and $x < z < y$, then $z \in E$.

Proof

If there exists $x, y \in E$ and $z \in (x, y)$ such that $z \notin E$, then $E = A_z \cup B_z$ where $A_z = E \cap (-\infty, z)$ and $B_z = E \cap (z, \infty)$.

Since $x \in A_z$ and $y \in B_z$, then A and B are nonempty. Since $A_z \subset (-\infty, z)$ and $B_z \subset (z, \infty)$, then A_z and B_z are separated. Thus, E is not connected.

Suppose E is not connected. Then, there are nonempty separated sets A and B such that $A \cup B = E$. Pick $x \in A$, $y \in B$ where $x < y$. Let $z = \sup(A \cap [x, y])$.

Since, $z \in \overline{A}$ so $z \notin B$, then $x \leq z < y$. If $z \notin A$, then $x < z < y$ so $z \notin E$.

If $z \in A$, then $z \notin \overline{B}$ and thus, there exists a z_1 such that $z < z_1 < y$ and $z_1 \notin B$. Then, $x < z_1 < y$ so $z_1 \notin E$.

8 Convergent and Cauchy Sequences

8.1 Convergent Sequences


Definition 8.1.1: Convergent Sequence

A sequence $\{x_n\}$ in metric space X **converges** if there is a $x \in X$ such that:

For every $\epsilon > 0$, there is a $N \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that for all $n \geq N$, $d(x_n, x) < \epsilon$

Then, $\{x_n\}$ converges to x : $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = x$ $\{x_n\} \rightarrow x$

If $\{x_n\}$ does not converge, then it diverges.



Example

- (a) Let $x_n = \frac{1}{n}$ in \mathbb{R}^2 . Then, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = 0$

Proof

For $\epsilon > 0$, there is a $\frac{1}{N} < \epsilon$. Then:

$$d(x_n, 0) = |x_n - 0| = \frac{1}{n} < \frac{1}{N} < \epsilon$$

- (b) Let $x_n = (-1)^n + \frac{1}{n}$ in \mathbb{R}^2 . Then, $\{x_n\}$ diverges.

Proof

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (-1)^n + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (-1)^n$$

Since $(-1)^n$ alternates between -1 and 1, then $\{x_n\}$ diverges.

Theorem 8.1.2: A convergent sequence is unique and bounded

- (a) $\{p_n\}$ converges to $p \in X$ if and only if every $N_r(p)$ contains all, but finitely many p_n

Proof

Suppose $p_n \rightarrow p$. Then for $N_\epsilon(p)$, any $q \in X$ such that $d(q, p) < \epsilon$ is $q \in N_\epsilon(p)$. Since $p_n \rightarrow p$, there is a N such that for $n \geq N$, $d(p_n, p) < \epsilon$. Thus, for $n \geq N$, $p_n \in N_\epsilon(p)$. Suppose every $N_r(p)$ contains p_n for all, but finitely many n .

For $\epsilon > 0$, let $N_\epsilon(p)$ be the set of all $q \in X$ such that $d(p, q) < \epsilon$. Thus, there exists a N such that $p_n \in N_\epsilon(p)$ if $n \geq N$. Thus, $d(p_n, p) < \epsilon$ so $p_n \rightarrow p$.

- (b) If $p, p' \in X$ and $\{p_n\}$ converges to p and p' , then $p = p'$

Proof

For $\epsilon > 0$, there exists N, N' such that:

$$d(p_n, p) < \frac{\epsilon}{2} \text{ for } n \geq N \quad d(p_n, p') < \frac{\epsilon}{2} \text{ for } n \geq N'$$

Then for $n \geq \max(N, N')$, $d(p, p') \leq d(p, p_n) + d(p_n, p') < \epsilon$.

Thus, $p = p'$.

- (c) If
- $\{p_n\}$
- converges, then
- $\{p_n\}$
- is bounded

Proof

If $\{p_n\} \rightarrow p$, there is a N such that for $n > N$, $d(p_n, p) < 1$.
 Let $r = \max(d(p_1, p), \dots, d(p_N, p), 1)$. Thus for all n , $d(p_n, p) \leq r$.

- (d) If
- $E \subset X$
- and
- $p \in E'$
- , there is a
- $\{p_n\}$
- in
- E
- such that
- $p = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p_n$

Proof

Since $p \in E'$, then for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, there is a $p_n \in E$ such that $d(p_n, p) < \frac{1}{n}$. For $\epsilon > 0$, there is a $\frac{1}{N} < \epsilon$ so for $n \geq N$, $d(p_n, p) < \frac{1}{n} \leq \frac{1}{N} < \epsilon$.
 Thus, $p = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p_n$.

Theorem 8.1.3: Arithmetic Operations for sequences

Suppose $\{s_n\}, \{t_n\} \in \mathbb{C}$ where $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n = s$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} t_n = t$.

- (a)
- $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n + t_n = s + t$

Proof

For $\epsilon > 0$, there exists N_1, N_2 such that
 $|s_n - s| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ for $n \geq N_1$ $|t_n - t| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ for $n \geq N_2$
 If $N = \max(N_1, N_2)$, then for $n \geq N$:
 $|s_n + t_n - s - t| \leq |s_n - s| + |t_n - t| < \epsilon$

- (b)
- $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} cs_n = cs$
- and
- $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} c + s_n = c + s$

Proof

For $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a N such that
 $|s_n - s| < \frac{\epsilon}{|c|}$ for $n \geq N$
 $|cs_n - cs| \leq |c| \cdot |s_n - s| < \epsilon$

- (c)
- $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n t_n = st$

Proof

Note $s_n t_n - st = (s_n - s)(t_n - t) + t(s_n - s) + s(t_n - t)$.
 For $\epsilon > 0$, there exists N_1, N_2 such that
 $|s_n - s| < \sqrt{\epsilon}$ for $n \geq N_1$ $|t_n - t| < \sqrt{\epsilon}$ for $n \geq N_2$
 If $N = \max(N_1, N_2)$, then for $n \geq N$, $|(s_n - s)(t_n - t)| < \epsilon$.
 Thus, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (s_n - s)(t_n - t) = 0$.

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (s_n t_n - st) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (s_n - s)(t_n - t) + t(s_n - s) + s(t_n - t)$$

$$= 0 + t \cdot 0 + s \cdot 0 = 0$$

- (d)
- $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{s_n} = \frac{1}{s}$
- where
- $s_n, s \neq 0$

Proof

Choose m such that $|s_n - s| < \frac{1}{2}|s|$ if $n \geq m$ so $|s_n| > \frac{1}{2}|s|$ for $n \geq m$.
 For $\epsilon > 0$, there is a $N > m$ such that for $n \geq N$, $|s_n - s| < \frac{1}{2}|s|^2\epsilon$.
 Thus, for $n \geq N$, $|\frac{1}{s_n} - \frac{1}{s}| = \frac{|s_n - s|}{|s_n s|} < \frac{2}{|s|^2}|s_n - s| < \epsilon$.

Theorem 8.1.4: Extension to \mathbb{R}^k

- (a) Suppose $x_n \in \mathbb{R}^k$ and $x_n = (\alpha_{n_1}, \dots, \alpha_{n_k})$. Then $\{x_n\}$ converges to $x = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k)$ if and only if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_{n_i} = \alpha_i$ for $i \in [1, k]$.

Proof

Suppose $\{x_n\}$ converges to $x = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k)$.

Since for any $i \in [1, k]$:

$$|\alpha_{n_i} - \alpha_i| \leq \sqrt{|\alpha_{n_1} - \alpha_1|^2 + \dots + |\alpha_{n_k} - \alpha_k|^2} = |x_n - x| < \epsilon.$$

Then, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_{n_i} = \alpha_i$.

Suppose $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_{n_i} = \alpha_i$ for $i \in [1, k]$.

Then for $\epsilon > 0$, there is an N such that for $n \geq N$:

$$|\alpha_{n_i} - \alpha_i| < \frac{\epsilon}{\sqrt{k}} \text{ for } i \in [1, k]$$

$$|x_n - x| = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^k |\alpha_{n_i} - \alpha_i|^2} < \sqrt{k \cdot \left(\frac{\epsilon}{\sqrt{k}}\right)^2} = \epsilon$$

- (b) Suppose $\{x_n\}, \{y_n\} \in \mathbb{R}^k$ and $\{\beta_n\} \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x_n \rightarrow x, y_n \rightarrow y, \beta_n \rightarrow \beta$.
 $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n + y_n = x + y \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n \cdot y_n = x \cdot y \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \beta_n x_n = \beta x$

Proof

By part a, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_{n_i} + y_{n_i} = x_i + y_i$ so $\{x_n + y_n\} \rightarrow x + y$.

Also, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^k x_{n_i} y_{n_i} = \sum_{i=1}^k x_i y_i$ so $\{x_n \cdot y_n\} \rightarrow x \cdot y$.

Also, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \beta_i x_{n_i} = \beta_i x_i$ so $\{\beta_n x_n\} \rightarrow \beta x$.

8.2 Subsequences

Definition 8.2.1: Subsequence

For sequence $\{p_n\}$, let $\{n_k\} \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ where $n_k < n_{k+1}$.

Then $\{p_{n_k}\}$ is a **subsequence** of $\{p_n\}$.

If $\{p_{n_k}\}$ converges, then its limit is called a **subsequential limit**.

Theorem 8.2.2: $\{p_n\} \rightarrow p \iff \text{Every } \{p_{n_k}\} \rightarrow p$

$\{p_n\}$ converges to p if and only if every subsequence converges to p

Proof


Suppose $\{p_n\}$ converges to p .

Then for $\epsilon > 0$, there is a N such that for $n \geq N$, $d(p_n, p) < \epsilon$.

Let $\{p_{n_k}\} \subset \{p_n\}$. Then for $n_k \geq N$, $|p_{n_k} - p| < \epsilon$. Thus, $\{p_{n_k}\} \rightarrow p$.

Suppose every subsequence converges to p .

Since $\{p_n\}$ is a subsequence of itself, then $\{p_n\}$ converges to p .



Theorem 8.2.3: $\{p_n\}$ in compact space have $\{p_{n_k}\} \rightarrow p$

- (a) If $\{p_n\}$ is a sequence in a compact metric space X , then some subsequence converges to $p \in X$.

Proof

Let E be the range of $\{p_n\}$.

If E is finite, there is a $p \in E$ and sequence $\{n_k\}$ with $n_k < n_{k+1}$ such that $p_{n_1} = p_{n_2} = \dots = p$. Thus, $\{p_{n_k}\} \rightarrow p$.

If E is infinite, then by **theorem 6.3.10**, then there exists a $p \in E'$.

Then there are n_k such that $d(p_{n_k}, p) < \frac{1}{k}$. Thus, $\{p_{n_k}\} \rightarrow p$.

- (b) Every bounded sequence in \mathbb{R}^k contains a convergent subsequence

Proof

Let E be a bounded sequence in \mathbb{R}^k . Since $E \cup E'$ is bounded and closed, then by **theorem 6.3.13**, $E \cup E'$ is compact.

Thus by part a, E contains a convergent subsequence.

Theorem 8.2.4: The set of subsequential limits is closed

The subsequential limits of $\{p_n\}$ in metric space X form a closed subset of X

Proof

Let E be the range of the set of all subsequential limits of $\{p_n\}$.

If E is empty, then E is closed. If E is finite, then E' is empty so E is closed.

Suppose E is infinite. Then, let $q \in E'$.

Since $q \in E'$, there is a $x \in E$ where $d(x, q) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$.

Since $x \in E$, there is a $\{p_{n_k}\} \rightarrow x$ so there is a N such that for $n \geq N$, $d(p_{n_k}, x) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$.

Thus, $d(p_{n_k}, q) \leq d(p_{n_k}, x) + d(x, q) < \epsilon$ so q is a subsequential limit of $\{p_n\}$.

Thus, $q \in E$ so E is closed.



8.3 Cauchy Sequences

Definition 8.3.1: Metric Spaces

Sequence $\{p_n\} \in X$ is a **Cauchy sequence** if:

For every $\epsilon > 0$, there is a $N \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that for all $n, m \geq N$, $d(p_n, p_m) < \epsilon$

Let nonempty $E \subset X$ and $S \subset \mathbb{R}$ of $d(p, q)$ where $p, q \in E$. Let $\sup(S) = \text{diam}(E)$.

If $\{p_n\} \in X$, and $p_N, p_{N+1}, \dots \in E_N$, then $\{p_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence if and only if $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \text{diam}(E_N) = 0$.

Theorem 8.3.2: Cauchy sequences and its closure have the same diam

- (a) If
- $\overline{E} \subset X$
- , then
- $\text{diam}(\overline{E}) = \text{diam}(E)$
- .

Proof

Since $E \subset \overline{E}$, then $\text{diam}(E) \leq \text{diam}(\overline{E})$.

For $\epsilon > 0$, let $p, q \in E$.

Thus, there are $p', q' \in E$ such that $d(p', p) < \epsilon$ and $d(q', q) < \epsilon$. Thus:

$d(p, q) \leq d(p, p') + d(p', q') + d(q', q) < 2\epsilon + d(p', q') \leq 2\epsilon + \text{diam}(E)$.

Thus, $\text{diam}(\overline{E}) \leq 2\epsilon + \text{diam}(E)$ so $\text{diam}(\overline{E}) = \text{diam}(E)$.

- (b) For compact sets
- $K_n \subset K$
- where
- $K_{n+1} \subset K_n$
- and
- $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{diam}(K_n) = 0$
- , then
- $\cap K_n$
- consist of only one point.

Proof

Let $K = \cap K_n$. Since K_n is a sequence of compact sets, then by [corollary 6.3.8](#), K is nonempty.

If K contains more than one point, then $\text{diam}(K) > 0$. But since $K \subset K_n$, then $\text{diam}(K) \leq \text{diam}(K_n)$ which contradicts that $\text{diam}(K_n) \rightarrow 0$.

Theorem 8.3.3: Convergent sequences are Cauchy sequences

- (a) Every convergent sequence is a Cauchy sequence

Proof

If $p_n \rightarrow p$ and $\epsilon > 0$, there is a N such that for all $n \geq N$, $d(p, p_n) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. Thus, for $m, n \geq N$:

$$d(p_n, p_m) \leq d(p_n, p) + d(p, p_m) < \epsilon.$$

Thus, $\{p_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence.

- (b) If
- $\{p_n\}$
- is a Cauchy sequence in compact metric space
- X
- , then
- $\{p_n\}$
- converges to some
- $p \in X$

Proof

Let $\{p_n\}$ be a Cauchy sequence in compact space X .

Let $p_N, p_{N+1}, \dots \in E_N$.

Since $\{p_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence, then $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \text{diam}(\overline{E_N}) = 0$. Since $\overline{E_N}$ is closed in compact X , then by [theorem 6.3.5](#), $\overline{E_N}$ is compact.

Since $E_{N+1} \subset E_N$, then $\overline{E_{N+1}} \subset \overline{E_N}$ and thus, by [theorem 8.3.2b](#), then there is a unique $p \in \overline{E_N}$ for every N .

Since $p \in \overline{E_N}$, then $d(p, q) < \epsilon$ for every $q \in \overline{E_N}$ so every $q \in E_N$.

Then for $\epsilon > 0$, there is a N_0 such that for $N \geq N_0$, $\text{diam}(\overline{E_N}) < \epsilon$.

Thus, $d(p_n, p) < \epsilon$ for $n \geq N_0$ so $\{p_n\} \rightarrow p$.

- (c) In
- \mathbb{R}^k
- , every Cauchy sequence converges

Proof

Let $\{x_n\}$ be a Cauchy sequence in \mathbb{R}^k . Let $x_N, x_{N+1}, \dots \in E_N$.

Then for some N , $\text{diam}(E_N) < 1$. Thus, the range of $\{x_n\} = E_N \cup \{x_1, \dots, x_{N-1}\}$.

Thus, $\{x_n\}$ is bounded.

Thus, the $\overline{\{x_n\}}$ is closed and bounded so by [theorem 6.3.13](#), $\overline{\{x_n\}}$ is compact. Thus, by part b, $\{x_n\}$ converges to some $p \in \mathbb{R}^k$.

Definition 8.3.4: Complete

A metric space where every Cauchy sequence converges is **complete**.

Thus, by **theorem 8.3.3**, all compact and Euclidean spaces are complete.

Definition 8.3.5: Monotonic Sequences

A sequence $\{s_n\}$ of real numbers is:

- (a) **monotonically increasing** if $s_n \leq s_{n+1}$
- (b) **monotonically decreasing** if $s_n \geq s_{n+1}$

Theorem 8.3.6: Monotonic sequences converge if bounded

Suppose $\{s_n\}$ is monotonic. Then $\{s_n\}$ converges if and only if it is bounded

Proof

Suppose $s_n \leq s_{n+1}$. Let E be the range of $\{s_n\}$.

Suppose $\{s_n\}$ is bounded.

Let $s = \sup(E)$ so $s_n \leq s$. For every $\epsilon > 0$, there is a N such that $s - \epsilon < s_N \leq s$ else $s - \epsilon$ would be an upper bound of E which contradicts $s = \sup(E)$.

Since $\{s_n\}$ increases, then for $n \geq N$, $s - \epsilon < s_N \leq s_n \leq s$ so $\{s_n\} \rightarrow s$.

Suppose $\{s_n\}$ converges to s .

Then for $\epsilon > 0$, there is a N such that for $n \geq N$, $s - \epsilon < s_N \leq s_n \leq s$.

Thus, $\{s_n\}$ is bounded from above.

Suppose $s_n \geq s_{n+1}$. Let E be the range of $\{s_n\}$.

Suppose $\{s_n\}$ is bounded.

Let $s = \inf(E)$ so $s_n \geq s$. For every $\epsilon > 0$, there is a N such that $s \leq s_N < s + \epsilon$ else $s + \epsilon$ would be a lower bound of E which contradicts $s = \inf(E)$.

Since $\{s_n\}$ decreases, then for $n \geq N$, $s \leq s_n \leq s_N < s + \epsilon$ so $\{s_n\} \rightarrow s$.

Suppose $\{s_n\}$ converges to s .

Then for $\epsilon > 0$, there is a N such that for $n \geq N$, $s \leq s_n \leq s_N < s + \epsilon$.

Thus, $\{s_n\}$ is bounded from below.

9 Limits and Special Sequences

9.1 Upper and Lower Limits

Definition 9.1.1: Infinite limits

Let $\{s_n\}$ be a sequence of real numbers such that:

For every real M , there is a $N \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that for $n \geq N$, $s_n \geq M$. Then:

$$s_n \rightarrow +\infty$$

For every real M , there is a $N \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that for $n \geq N$, $s_n \leq M$. Then:

$$s_n \rightarrow -\infty$$

Definition 9.1.2: Upper and Lower Limits


Let $\{s_n\} \subset \mathbb{R}$ and E contain all subsequential limits of $\{s_n\}$ plus possibly $\pm\infty$.

Then, the **upper limit** of $\{s_n\}$:

$$s^* = \sup(E) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup(s_n) = s^*$$

Then, the **lower limit** of $\{s_n\}$:

$$s_* = \inf(E) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf(s_n) = s_*$$



Theorem 9.1.3: Upper and Lower limits are unique

Let $\{s_n\}$ be a sequence of real numbers. Let E be the set of subsequential limits and s^* be the upper limit of $\{s_n\}$. Then:

- (a) $s^* \in E$

Proof

If $s^* = +\infty$, then there is a $\{s_{n_k}\} \rightarrow +\infty$ so E is not bounded above.

If $s^* \in \mathbb{R}$, then E is bounded above so $s^* \in E$.

Then by **theorem 8.2.4**, $s^* \in E$.

If $s^* = -\infty$, then there are no subsequential limits in E . Thus, for every M , there is a N such that for $n \geq N$, $s_n \leq M$ so $-\infty \in E$.

- (b) If $x > s^*$, there is a N such that for $n \geq N$, $s_n < x$

Proof

Suppose there is a $x > s^*$ such that $s_n \geq x$ for infinitely many n .

Then, there is a $y \in E$ where $y \geq x > s^*$ which contradicts $s^* = \sup(E)$.

- (c) s^* is the only number that satisfies (a) and (b)

Proof

Suppose p, q satisfy part a and b where $p < q$. Choose x where $p < x < q$. Since p satisfies b, then $s_n < x$ for $n \geq N$. Thus, x is an upper bound for E so $q \notin E$ since $q > x$ contradicting that q satisfies part a.

The same properties are analogous for s_* .

Theorem 9.1.4: Inf & Sup of $s_n \leq t_n$

If $s_n \leq t_n$ for $n \geq N$, then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf(s_n) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf(t_n)$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup(s_n) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup(t_n)$$

Proof

Let E_1 be the set of extended reals x such that $\{s_{n_k}\} \rightarrow x$ for some $\{s_{n_k}\}$.

Let E_2 be the set of extended reals y such that $\{t_{n_k}\} \rightarrow y$ for some $\{s_{n_k}\}$.

Let $s^* = \sup(E_1)$, $s_* = \inf(E_1)$, $t^* = \sup(E_2)$, and $t_* = \inf(E_2)$.

Since there is a N such that $s_n \leq t_n$ for $n \geq N$, then:

$$x \leftarrow \{s_N, s_{N+1}, \dots\} \leq \{t_N, t_{N+1}, \dots\} \rightarrow y$$

Thus, for $n \geq N$, $\inf(s_n) \leq \inf(t_n)$ and $\sup(s_n) \leq \sup(t_n)$.

9.2 Special Sequences**Theorem 9.2.1: Special sequences**

- (a) If $p > 0$, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n^p} = 0$

Proof

For $\epsilon > 0$, let $N > \sqrt[p]{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}$. Then for $n \geq N$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n^p} \leq \frac{1}{N^p} < \frac{1}{\sqrt[p]{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}} = \epsilon$

- (b) If $p > 0$, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt[p]{p} = 1$

Proof

If $p > 1$, then let $x_n = \sqrt[p]{p} - 1 > 0$.

$$p = (x_n + 1)^n = x_n^n + nx_n^{n-1} + \dots + nx_n + 1 \geq nx_n + 1$$

Thus, $0 < x_n \leq \frac{p-1}{n}$ so $\{x_n\} \rightarrow 0$ and thus, $\{\sqrt[p]{p}\} \rightarrow 1$.

If $p = 1$, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt[p]{p} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} 1 = 1$.

If $0 < p < 1$, then $\frac{1}{p} > 1$. From the proof above for $p > 1$, $\{\sqrt[\frac{1}{p}]{\frac{1}{p}}\} \rightarrow 1$.

Thus, $\{\frac{1}{\sqrt[p]{p}}\} \rightarrow 1$ so $\{\sqrt[p]{p}\} \rightarrow 1$.

- (c) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt[n]{n} = 1$

Proof

Let $x_n = \sqrt[n]{n} - 1 \geq 0$. Then, $n = (x_n + 1)^n \geq \frac{n(n-1)}{2} x_n^2$.

Thus, $0 \leq x_n \leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{n-1}}$ so $\{x_n\} \rightarrow 0$ and thus, $\{\sqrt[n]{n}\} \rightarrow 1$.

- (d) If $p > 0$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n^\alpha}{(1+p)^n} = 0$

Proof

Let $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $k > \alpha$ and $k > 0$. For $n > 2k$:

$$(1+p)^n > \binom{n}{k} p^k = \frac{n(n-1)\dots(n-k+1)}{k!} p^k > \frac{n^k p^k}{2^k k!}$$

Thus, $0 < \frac{n^\alpha}{(1+p)^n} < \frac{2^k k!}{p^k} n^{\alpha-k}$.

Since $\alpha - k < 0$, then $\{n^{\alpha-k}\} \rightarrow 0$ so $\{\frac{n^\alpha}{(1+p)^n}\} \rightarrow 0$.

- (e) If $|x| < 1$, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x^n = 0$

Proof

From part d, let $\alpha = 0$.

Thus, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{(1+p)^n} = 0$ and since $p > 0$, then $\frac{1}{(1+p)^n} = (\frac{1}{1+p})^n < 1$.

Also, $-\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{(1+p)^n} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{-1}{(1+p)^n} = 0$ so $\frac{-1}{(1+p)^n} = (\frac{-1}{1+p})^n > -1$.

10 Series and Convergence Tests

10.1 Series

Definition 10.1.1: Series

For sequence $\{a_n\}$, define $\sum_{n=p}^q a_n = a_p + a_{p+1} + \dots + a_q$.

Then associate $\{a_n\}$ with a sequence $\{s_n\}$ such that $s_n = \sum_{k=1}^n a_k$.

Then $\{s_n\}$ is a **series** with partial sums s_n .

If $\{s_n\} \rightarrow s$, then $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n = s$ is the sum of the convergent series.

Note $a_1 = s_1$ and $a_n = s_n - s_{n-1}$.

Theorem 10.1.2: Cauchy Criterion for series

$\sum a_n$ converges if and only if:

For every $\epsilon > 0$, there is a $N \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that for $m \geq n \geq N$, $|\sum_{k=n}^m a_k| \leq \epsilon$

Proof

Suppose $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k$ converges.

Then by **theorem 8.3.3a**, $\sum_{k=1}^n a_k$ is a Cauchy sequence.

Then for $\epsilon > 0$, there is a N such that for $m \geq n \geq N$:

$$d(\sum_{k=1}^n a_k, \sum_{k=1}^m a_k) = |\sum_{k=1}^m a_k - \sum_{k=1}^n a_k| = |\sum_{k=n+1}^m a_k| \leq \epsilon$$

Suppose for every $\epsilon > 0$, there is a N such that for $m \geq n \geq N$, $|\sum_{k=n}^m a_k| \leq \epsilon$.

$$|\sum_{k=n}^m a_k| = |\sum_{k=1}^m a_k - \sum_{k=1}^n a_k| = d(\sum_{k=1}^n a_k, \sum_{k=1}^m a_k) \leq \epsilon$$

Thus, $\sum_{k=1}^n a_k$ is a Cauchy sequence and thus, convergent.

Theorem 10.1.3: Convergent $\sum a_n \Rightarrow \{a_n\} \rightarrow 0$

If $\sum a_n$ converges, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = 0$

Proof

Since $\sum a_n$ converges, then by **theorem 10.1.2**, for $\epsilon > 0$, there is a N such that for $m \geq n \geq N$, $|\sum_{k=n}^m a_k| \leq \epsilon$. Then if $m = n \geq N$, $|\sum_{k=n}^m a_k| = |a_n| \leq \epsilon$ so $\{a_n\} \rightarrow 0$.

Example

$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n}$ diverges

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} = 1 + \frac{1}{2} + (\frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{4}) + (\frac{1}{5} + \dots + \frac{1}{8}) + (\frac{1}{9} + \dots) \geq 1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} + \dots$$

Thus, $s_{2^k} = \sum_{n=1}^{2^k} a_n \geq 1 + k \cdot \frac{1}{2}$ which is unbounded and thus, not convergent.

Theorem 10.1.4: Convergent series \Leftrightarrow Bounded sequence

A series of nonnegative terms converge if and only if its partial sums form a bounded sequence.

Proof

Suppose $\sum a_n$ converges where $a_n \geq 0$.

Since $a_n \geq 0$, then $\{s_n\}$ is monotonic so by **theorem 8.3.6**, $\{s_n\}$ is bounded above.

Suppose $\{s_n\}$ is bounded where $a_n \geq 0$.

Since $\{s_n\}$ is monotonic and bounded, then by **theorem 8.3.6**, $\{s_n\}$ converges.

Theorem 10.1.5: Comparison Test

- (a) If $|a_n| \leq c_n$ for $n \geq N_0$ and $\sum c_n$ converges, then $\sum a_n$ converges.

Proof

For $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a $N \geq N_0$ such that for $m \geq n \geq N$, $\sum_{k=n}^m c_k \leq \epsilon$.
 $|\sum_{k=n}^m a_k| \leq \sum_{k=n}^m |a_k| \leq \sum_{k=n}^m c_k \leq \epsilon$
 Thus, $\sum a_n$ converges.

- (b) If $a_n \geq d_n \geq 0$ for $n \geq N_0$ and $\sum d_n$ diverges, then $\sum a_n$ diverges.

Proof

Suppose $\sum a_n$ converges.
 Then from part a, $\sum d_n$ converges which contradicts that $\sum a_n$ diverges.
 Thus, $\sum a_n$ diverges.

10.2 Series of Nonnegative Terms**Theorem 10.2.1: Infinite Geometric Series**

If $x \in [0,1)$, then:

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} x^n = \frac{1}{1-x}$$

If $x \geq 1$, the series diverges.

Proof

If $x \neq 1$, then using the geometric series $s_n = \sum_{k=0}^n x^k = \frac{1-x^{n+1}}{1-x}$. Let $n \rightarrow \infty$.
 If $x \in [0,1)$, then by [theorem 9.2.1e](#), $s_n = \frac{1}{1-x} (1 - x^{n+1}) = \frac{1}{1-x} (1 - 0) = \frac{1}{1-x}$.
 Also, by [theorem 9.2.1e](#), if $x \geq 1$, then the series diverges.

Theorem 10.2.2: Cauchy's Convergence Criterion

Suppose $0 \leq a_{i+1} \leq a_i$. Then the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n$ converges if and only if the series $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^k a_{2^k} = a_1 + 2a_2 + 4a_4 + 8a_8 + \dots$ converges.

Proof

Let $s_n = a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_n$ and $t_k = a_1 + 2a_2 + \dots + 2^k a_{2^k}$. For $n < 2^k$:

$$\begin{aligned} s_n &\leq a_1 + a_2 + a_3 + a_4 + a_5 + a_6 + a_7 + \dots + a_{2^k} \\ &\leq a_1 + (a_2 + a_3) + (a_4 + a_5 + a_6 + a_7) + \dots + (a_{2^{k-1}} + \dots + a_{2^k-1}) \\ &\leq a_1 + 2a_2 + 4a_4 + \dots + 2^k a_{2^k} = t_k \end{aligned}$$

By [comparison test](#), if $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^k a_{2^k}$ converges, then $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n$ converges. For $n > 2^k$:

$$\begin{aligned} s_n &\geq a_1 + a_2 + a_3 + a_4 + a_5 + a_6 + a_7 + a_8 + \dots + a_{2^k} \\ &= a_1 + a_2 + (a_3 + a_4) + (a_5 + a_6 + a_7 + a_8) + \dots + (a_{2^{k-1}+1} + \dots + a_{2^k}) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2}a_1 + a_2 + 2a_4 + \dots + 2^{k-1}a_{2^k} = \frac{1}{2}t_k \end{aligned}$$

By [comparison test](#), if $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n$ converges, then $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^k a_{2^k}$ converges.

Theorem 10.2.3: P-series

$\sum \frac{1}{n^p}$ converges if $p > 1$ and diverges if $p \leq 1$

Proof

If $p \leq 0$, then by [theorem 10.1.3](#), $\sum \frac{1}{n^p}$ diverges.
 If $p > 0$, then by [theorem 10.2.2](#), $\sum \frac{1}{n^p}$ converges only if $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^k \frac{1}{(2^k)^p}$ converges.
 Since $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^k \frac{1}{(2^k)^p} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^{(1-p)k}$, then by [theorem 10.2.1](#), $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^{k(1-p)}$ converges if $2^{1-p} < 1$ so if $1-p < 0$ so $p > 1$.

Theorem 10.2.4: Log P-series

$\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n(\log(n))^p}$ converges if $p > 1$ and diverges if $p \leq 1$

Proof

Since $\frac{1}{n(\log(n))^p}$ decreases, then by **theorem 10.2.2**,
 $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n(\log(n))^p}$ converges if $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^k \frac{1}{2^k \log(2^k)}$ converges.
 $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^k \frac{1}{2^k \log(2^k)} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k \log(2)} = \frac{1}{\log(2)} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k}$
 Then by **theorem 10.2.3**, $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^k \frac{1}{2^k \log(2^k)}$ converges if $p > 1$ and diverges if $p \leq 1$.
 Thus, $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n(\log(n))^p}$ converges if $p > 1$ and diverges and $p \leq 1$.

Corollary 10.2.5: Log P-series extended

$\sum_{n=3}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n \log(n)(\log(\log(n)))^p}$ converges if $p > 1$ and diverges if $p \leq 1$

Proof

From **theorem 10.2.4**, replace $n = \log(n)$ and multiplying by $\frac{1}{n} \rightarrow \frac{1}{n \log(n)(\log(\log(n)))^p}$.
 Since $\frac{1}{n \log(n)(\log(\log(n)))^p}$ decreases, by **theorem 10.2.2** $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^k \frac{1}{2^k \log(2^k)(\log(\log(2^k)))^p}$:
 $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\log(2^k)(\log(\log(2^k)))^p} = \frac{1}{\log(2)} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k(\log(k \log(2)))^p} < \frac{1}{\log(2)} \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k(\log(k))^p}$
 Since $\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k(\log(k))^p}$ converges by **theorem 10.2.4**, $\sum_{n=3}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n \log(n)(\log(\log(n)))^p}$ converges.

10.3 The Number e**Definition 10.3.1: Summation equivalence to e**

$$s_m = \sum_{n=0}^m \frac{1}{n!} = 1 + \sum_{n=1}^m \frac{1}{n!} < 1 + \sum_{n=1}^m \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} < 3$$

$$e = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!}$$

Theorem 10.3.2: Limit equivalence to e

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right)^n = e$$

Proof

Let $s_n = \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{1}{k!}$ and $t_n = \left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right)^n$. Using the binomial theorem:
 $t_n = \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} \frac{1}{n^k} = \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{n(n-1)\dots(n-k+1)}{k!} \frac{1}{n^k} = \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{1}{k!} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)\left(1 - \frac{2}{n}\right)\dots\left(1 - \frac{k-1}{n}\right)$
 Thus, $t_n \leq s_n$ so $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup(t_n) \leq e$.
 If $n \geq m$, then $t_n \geq \sum_{k=0}^m \frac{1}{k!} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)\left(1 - \frac{2}{n}\right)\dots\left(1 - \frac{k-1}{n}\right)$.
 As $n \rightarrow \infty$, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf(t_n) \geq \sum_{k=0}^m \frac{1}{k!} = s_m$. As $m \rightarrow \infty$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf(t_n) \geq e$.

Theorem 10.3.3: Rapidity of convergence of e

$$0 < e - s_n < \frac{1}{n!n}$$

Proof

$$e - s_n = \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k!} < \frac{1}{(n+1)!} \left(1 + \frac{1}{n+1} + \frac{1}{(n+1)^2} + \dots\right) = \frac{1}{(n+1)!} \frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{n+1}} = \frac{1}{n!n}$$

Theorem 10.3.4: e is irrational

e is irrational

Proof

Suppose r is rational. Then let $e = \frac{p}{q}$ for $p, q \in \mathbb{Z}_+$.

Thus, by **theorem 10.3.3**, $0 < e - s_q < \frac{1}{q!q}$ so $0 < q!(e - s_q) < \frac{1}{q}$.

Since $e = \frac{p}{q}$, then $q!e$ is an integer and $q!s_q = q!(1 + 1 + \frac{1}{2!} + \dots + \frac{1}{q!})$ is an integer.

Thus, $q!(e - s_q)$ is an integer which is between 0 and $\frac{1}{q}$ and thus, a contradiction.

10.4 Root and Ratio Tests**Theorem 10.4.1: Root Test**

For $\sum a_n$, let $\alpha = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup(\sqrt[n]{|a_n|})$.

(a) If $\alpha < 1$, $\sum a_n$ converges

(b) If $\alpha > 1$, $\sum a_n$ diverges

(c) If $\alpha = 1$, unclear

Proof

If $\alpha < 1$, choose β such that $\beta \in (\alpha, 1)$ and $N \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\sqrt[n]{|a_n|} < \beta$ for $n \geq N$.

Since $\beta \in (0, 1)$, then by **theorem 10.2.1**, $\sum \beta^n$ converges. Then by the **comparison test**, $\sum a_n$ converges.

If $\alpha > 1$, then there is a a_{n_k} such that $\sqrt[n_k]{|a_{n_k}|} \rightarrow \alpha$.

Thus, $|a_n| > 1$ for infinitely many n so by **theorem 10.1.3**, $\sum a_n$ doesn't converge.

$\sum \frac{1}{n}$, $\sum \frac{1}{n^2}$ have $\alpha = 1$, but $\sum \frac{1}{n}$ diverges and $\sum \frac{1}{n^2}$ converges by **theorem 10.2.3**.

Theorem 10.4.2: Ratio Test

(a) $\sum a_n$ converges if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup(|\frac{a_{n+1}}{a_n}|) < 1$

(b) $\sum a_n$ diverges if $|\frac{a_{n+1}}{a_n}| \geq 1$ for all $n \geq n_0$ for $n_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$

Proof

If $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup(|\frac{a_{n+1}}{a_n}|) < 1$, there is a $\beta < 1$ and N such that for $n \geq N$, $|\frac{a_{n+1}}{a_n}| < \beta$.

Then $|a_{N+1}| < \beta|a_N|$ so $|a_{N+2}| < \beta|a_{N+1}| < \beta^2|a_N|$.

Thus, $|a_{N+p}| < \beta^p|a_N|$ so $|a_n| < |a_N|\beta^{-N}\beta^n$.

Thus, by the **comparison test**, $\sum a_n$ converges.

If $|a_{n+1}| \geq |a_n| > 0$ for $n \geq n_0$, then by **theorem 10.1.3**, $\sum a_n$ diverges.

Theorem 10.4.3: Ratio convergence \rightarrow Root convergence

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf(\frac{c_{n+1}}{c_n}) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf(\sqrt[n]{c_n})$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup(\sqrt[n]{c_n}) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup(\frac{c_{n+1}}{c_n})$$

Proof

Let $\alpha = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf(\frac{c_{n+1}}{c_n})$. If $\alpha = -\infty$, then $-\infty \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf(\sqrt[n]{c_n})$ holds true.

If α is finite, there is a $\beta \leq \alpha$ and N such that for $n \geq N$, $\frac{c_{n+1}}{c_n} \geq \beta$ so $c_{N+p} \geq \beta^p c_N$.

Then, $c_n \geq c_N \beta^{-N} \beta^n$ so $\sqrt[n]{c_n} \geq \sqrt[n]{c_N \beta^{-N} \beta^n}$. Thus, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf(\sqrt[n]{c_n}) \geq \beta = \alpha$.

Let $\alpha = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup(\frac{c_{n+1}}{c_n})$. If $\alpha = \infty$, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup(\sqrt[n]{c_n}) \leq \infty$ holds true.

If α is finite, there is a $\beta \geq \alpha$ and N such that for $n \geq N$, $\frac{c_{n+1}}{c_n} \leq \beta$ so $c_{N+p} \leq \beta^p c_N$.

Then, $c_n \leq c_N \beta^{-N} \beta^n$ so $\sqrt[n]{c_n} \leq \sqrt[n]{c_N \beta^{-N} \beta^n}$. Thus, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup(\sqrt[n]{c_n}) \leq \beta = \alpha$.

10.5 Power Series

Definition 10.5.1: Power Series

For a sequence $\{c_n\} \in \mathbb{C}$, the series $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n z^n$ is a **power series**.
 c_n are the coefficients and $z \in \mathbb{C}$.

Theorem 10.5.2: Radius of Convergence

For power series $\sum c_n z^n$, let $\alpha = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup(\sqrt[n]{|c_n|})$ and $R = \frac{1}{\alpha}$.
 Then $\sum c_n z^n$ converges if $|z| < R$ and diverges if $|z| > R$.

Proof

Let $a_n = c_n z^n$. Using the **root test**,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup(\sqrt[n]{|a_n|}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup(\sqrt[n]{|c_n z^n|})$$

$$= |z| \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup(\sqrt[n]{|c_n|}) = \frac{|z|}{R}$$
 Thus, $\sum c_n z^n$ converges if $\frac{|z|}{R} < 1$ and diverges if $\frac{|z|}{R} > 1$

10.6 Summation By Parts

Theorem 10.6.1: Summation by Parts

For sequences $\{a_n\}$, $\{b_n\}$, let $A_n = \sum_{k=0}^n a_k$. Then for $0 \leq p \leq q$:

$$\sum_{n=p}^q a_n b_n = (\sum_{n=p}^{q-1} A_n (b_n - b_{n+1})) + A_q b_q - A_{p-1} b_p$$

Proof

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=p}^q a_n b_n &= \sum_{n=p}^q (A_n - A_{n-1}) b_n \\ &= \sum_{n=p}^q A_n b_n - \sum_{n=p}^q A_{n-1} b_n = \sum_{n=p}^q A_n b_n - \sum_{n=p-1}^{q-1} A_n b_{n+1} \\ &= \sum_{n=p}^{q-1} A_n b_n - \sum_{n=p}^{q-1} A_n b_{n+1} + A_q b_q - A_{p-1} b_p \\ &= (\sum_{n=p}^{q-1} A_n (b_n - b_{n+1})) + A_q b_q - A_{p-1} b_p \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 10.6.2: Conditions for convergent $\sum a_n b_n$

Suppose for $\{a_n\}$, $\{b_n\}$:

- partial sums A_n of $\sum a_n$ form a bounded sequence
- $b_i \geq b_{i+1}$
- $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_n = 0$

Then $\sum a_n b_n$ converges.

Proof

Since $\{A_n\}$ is bounded, $|A_n| \leq M$ for all n .
 Since $\{b_n\}$ is monotonically decreasing and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_n = 0$, then for $\epsilon > 0$, there is a N such that $b_N \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2M}$. Then for $N \leq p \leq q$:

$$\begin{aligned} |\sum_{n=p}^q a_n b_n| &= |(\sum_{n=p}^{q-1} A_n (b_n - b_{n+1})) + A_q b_q - A_{p-1} b_p| \\ &\leq M |\sum_{n=p}^{q-1} (b_n - b_{n+1}) + b_q + b_p| = 2M b_p \leq 2M b_N \leq \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

Corollary 10.6.3: Convergent series of Alternating Sequences

Suppose for $\{c_n\}$:

- $|c_i| \geq |c_{i+1}|$
- $c_{2i-1} \geq 0$ and $c_{2i} \leq 0$
- $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} c_n = 0$

Then $\sum c_n$ converges.

Proof

From **theorem 10.6.2**, let $a_n = (-1)^{n+1}$ and $b_n = |c_n|$.

Corollary 10.6.4: Convergent power series at radius of convergence

Suppose for $\{c_n\}$:

- Radius of convergence of $\sum c_n z^n$ is 1
- $c_i \geq c_{i+1}$
- $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} c_n = 0$

Then $\sum c_n z^n$ converges at every point where $|z| = 1$ except possibly $z = 1$.

Proof

From **theorem 10.6.2**, let $a_n = z^n$ and $b_n = c_n$.

A_n of $\sum a_n$ form a bounded sequence since $|A_n| = |\sum_0^n z^n| = |\frac{1-z^{n+1}}{1-z}| \leq \frac{2}{|1-z|}$.

10.7 Absolute Convergence**Definition 10.7.1: Absolute Convergence**

$\sum a_n$ **converges absolutely** if $\sum |a_n|$ converges.

If $\sum a_n$ converges, but $\sum |a_n|$ diverges, then $\sum a_n$ converges non-absolutely.

Theorem 10.7.2: Absolute Convergence \rightarrow Convergence

If $\sum a_n$ converges absolutely, then $\sum a_n$ converges

Proof

Since $\sum a_n$ converges absolutely, then for every $\epsilon > 0$, there is an integer N such that for $m \geq n \geq N$, $|\sum_{k=n}^m |a_k|| = \sum_{k=n}^m |a_k| \leq \epsilon$.

Thus, $|\sum_{k=n}^m a_k| \leq \sum_{k=n}^m |a_k| \leq \epsilon$ so $\sum a_n$ converges.

10.8 Addition & Multiplication of Series**Theorem 10.8.1: Addition and Scalar Multiplication**

If $\sum a_n = A$ and $\sum b_n = B$, then $\sum (a_n + b_n) = A + B$ and $\sum ca_n = cA$.

Proof

Let $A_n = \sum_{k=0}^n a_k$ and $B_n = \sum_{k=0}^n b_k$.

Then $A_n + B_n = \sum_{k=0}^n a_k + b_k$ so $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_n + B_n = A + B$.

Then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} cA_n = \underbrace{A + \dots + A}_c = cA$

Definition 10.8.2: Cauchy Product

For $\sum a_n$ and $\sum b_n$, let $c_n = \sum_{k=0}^n a_k b_{n-k}$ and the product as $\sum c_n$.

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n z^n \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} b_n z^n = (a_0 + a_1 z + a_2 z^2 + \dots + a_n z^n) (b_0 + b_1 z + b_2 z^2 + \dots + b_n z^n)$$

$$= a_0 b_0 + (a_0 b_1 + a_1 b_0) z + (a_0 b_2 + a_1 b_1 + a_2 b_0) z^2 + \dots$$

Theorem 10.8.3: Conditions $\sum c_n = AB$

Suppose

- $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n$ converges absolutely
- $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n = A$
- $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} b_n = B$
- $c_n = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k b_{n-k}$

Then $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n = AB$.

Proof

Let $A_n = \sum_{k=0}^n a_k$, $B_n = \sum_{k=0}^n b_k$, $C_n = \sum_{k=0}^n c_k$, and $\beta_n = B_n - B$.

$$\begin{aligned} C_n &= a_0 b_0 + (a_0 b_1 + a_1 b_0) + \dots + (a_0 b_n + \dots + a_n b_0) \\ &= a_0 B_n + a_1 B_{n-1} + \dots + a_n B_0 \\ &= a_0 (B + \beta_n) + a_1 (B + \beta_{n-1}) + \dots + a_n (B + \beta_0) \\ &= A_n B + a_0 \beta_n + a_1 \beta_{n-1} + \dots + a_n \beta_0 \end{aligned}$$

Let $\gamma_n = a_0 \beta_n + a_1 \beta_{n-1} + \dots + a_n \beta_0$ so $C_n = A_n B + \gamma_n$.

Since a_n converges absolutely, then $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |a_n| = \alpha$.

Since $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} b_n = B$, then $\beta_n \rightarrow 0$.

Then for $\epsilon > 0$, there is a N such that $|\beta_n| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{\alpha}$ for $n \geq N$.

$$\begin{aligned} |\gamma_n| &\leq |\beta_0 a_n + \dots + \beta_N a_{n-N}| + |\beta_{N+1} a_{n-N-1} + \dots + \beta_n a_0| \\ &\leq |\beta_0 a_n + \dots + \beta_N a_{n-N}| + |a_{n-N-1} + \dots + a_0| \frac{\epsilon}{\alpha} \\ &\leq |\beta_0 a_n + \dots + \beta_N a_{n-N}| + \alpha \frac{\epsilon}{\alpha} \end{aligned}$$

Thus, with a fixed N , since $a_n \rightarrow 0$, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\gamma_n| \leq \epsilon$ so $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_n = 0$.

Thus, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} C_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_n B + \gamma_n = AB$.

Theorem 10.8.4: By Cauchy Product, $\sum c_n = C$ implies $C = AB$

If $\sum a_n = A$, $\sum b_n = B$, $\sum c_n = C$ where $c_n = a_0 b_n + \dots + a_n b_0$, then $C = AB$.

Proof

The proof will be provided in Day 15.1: Power Series.

11 Continuity


11.1 Limits of Functions

Definition 11.1.1: Limits of Functions

For metric spaces X, Y , let $E \subset X$, f maps E into Y , and $p \in E'$.

Then $\lim_{x \rightarrow p} f(x) = q$ if there is a $q \in Y$ such that:

For every $\epsilon > 0$, there is a $\delta > 0$ such that for all $x \in E$ where $d_X(x, p) < \delta$, then $d_Y(f(x), q) < \epsilon$



Theorem 11.1.2: Sequence definition of $\lim_{x \rightarrow p} f(x) = q$

$\lim_{x \rightarrow p} f(x) = q$ if and only if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(p_n) = q$ for every sequence $\{p_n\} \in E$ where $p_n \neq p$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p_n = p$

Proof

Suppose $\lim_{x \rightarrow p} f(x) = q$.

For $\epsilon > 0$, there is a $\delta > 0$ such that $d_Y(f(x), q) < \epsilon$ if $x \in E$ and $d_X(x, p) < \delta$.

Choose $\{p_n\} \in E$ such that $p_n \neq p$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p_n = p$.

Then for $\delta > 0$, there is N such that for $n > N$, then $d_X(p_n, p) < \delta$ so $d_Y(f(p_n), q) < \epsilon$.

Suppose $\lim_{x \rightarrow p} f(x) \neq q$. Then there is a $\epsilon > 0$ such that for every $\delta > 0$, there is a $x \in E$ where $d_Y(f(x), q) \geq \epsilon$, but $d_X(x, p) < \delta$. Let $\delta_n = \frac{1}{n}$ and thus, there is a $\{p_n\}$ where $p_n \neq p$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p_n = p$, but $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(p_n) \neq q$.

Corollary 11.1.3: A limit of a function is unique

If f has a limit at p , then the limit is unique

Proof

If $\lim_{x \rightarrow p} f(x) = q$, then by **theorem 11.1.2**, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(p_n) = q$ for every $\{p_n\} \in E$ where $p_n \neq p$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p_n = p$.

Thus, if there exists $\lim_{x \rightarrow p} f(x) = q'$, then there is a $\{p_n\} \in E$ where $p_n \neq p$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p_n = p$, but $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(p_n) = q'$ which is a contradiction.

Theorem 11.1.4: Properties of the Limits of Functions

Let $E \subset X$, $p \in E'$, and $f(x), g(x) \in \mathbb{C}$ so $\lim_{x \rightarrow p} f(x) = A$, $\lim_{x \rightarrow p} g(x) = B$

(a) $\lim_{x \rightarrow p} (f + g)(x) = A + B$

(b) $\lim_{x \rightarrow p} (fg)(x) = AB$

(c) $\lim_{x \rightarrow p} \left(\frac{f}{g}\right)(x) = \frac{A}{B}$

11.2 Continuous Functions

Definition 11.2.1: Continuous Functions

Suppose X, Y are metric spaces, $E \subset X$, $p \in E$, and f maps E into Y .

f is **continuous** at p if:


For every $\epsilon > 0$, there is a $\delta > 0$ such that for all $x \in E$ where $d_X(x, p) < \delta$, then:

$$d_Y(f(x), f(p)) < \epsilon$$

$f(p)$ have to be defined to be continuous.

If f is continuous at every $p \in E$, then f is continuous on E .

f is continuous at isolated points since regardless of ϵ , there is a $\delta > 0$ where $d_X(x, p) < \delta$ is only $x = p$ so $d_Y(f(x), f(p)) = 0 < \epsilon$.



Theorem 11.2.2: Continuity at $p \Leftrightarrow \lim_{x \rightarrow p} f(x) = f(p)$

Suppose $E \subset X$, $p \in E$, and f maps E into Y . Let $p \in E$.

Then f is continuous at p if and only if $\lim_{x \rightarrow p} f(x) = f(p)$.

Proof

If f is continuous at p , then for every $\epsilon > 0$, there is a $\delta > 0$ such that $d_Y(f(x), f(p)) < \epsilon$ for all $x \in E$ where $d_X(x, p) < \delta$. Thus, $\lim_{x \rightarrow p} f(x) = f(p)$.

If $\lim_{x \rightarrow p} f(x) = f(p)$, then for every $\epsilon > 0$, there is a $\delta > 0$ where $d_Y(f(x), f(p)) < \epsilon$ for all $x \in E$ where $d_X(x, p) < \delta$. Thus, f is continuous at p .

Theorem 11.2.3: Continuity Chain Rule

Suppose $E \subset X$, $f: E \rightarrow Y$, $g: f(E) \rightarrow Z$, and $h: E \rightarrow Z$ where $h(x) = g(f(x))$.

If f is continuous at p and g is continuous at $f(p)$, then h is continuous at p .

Proof

Since g is continuous at $f(p)$, then for $\epsilon > 0$, there is a δ_1 such that:


$$d_Z(g(y), g(f(p))) < \epsilon \text{ for } d_Y(y, f(p)) < \delta_1 \text{ where } y \in f(E)$$

Since f is continuous at p , there is a $\delta_2 > 0$ such that:

$$d_Y(f(x), f(p)) < \delta_1 \text{ for } d_X(x, p) < \delta_2 \text{ where } x \in E$$

Thus, $d_Z(h(x), h(p)) = d_Z(g(f(x)), g(f(p))) < \epsilon$ for $d_X(x, p) < \delta_2$ where $x \in E$.

Thus, h is continuous at p .



Theorem 11.2.4: Continuous functions map open sets to open sets

$f: X \rightarrow Y$ is continuous on X if and only if:

$f^{-1}(V)$ is open in X for every open set V in Y

Proof

Suppose f is continuous on X and V is an open set in Y .

Suppose $p \in X$ and $f(p) \in V$. Since V is open, there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that $y \in V$ if $d_Y(y, f(p)) < \epsilon$. Since f is continuous at p , there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $d_Y(f(x), f(p)) < \epsilon$ for $d_X(x, p) < \delta$. Thus, $x \in f^{-1}(V)$ for $d_X(x, p) < \delta$.

Suppose $f^{-1}(V)$ is open in X for every open V in Y .

Fix $p \in X$ and $\epsilon > 0$. Let V be the set of all $y \in Y$ such that $d_Y(y, f(p)) < \epsilon$ so V is open and thus, $f^{-1}(V)$ is open. Thus, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $x \in f^{-1}(V)$ for $d_X(x, p) < \delta$. Since $x \in f^{-1}(V)$, then $f(x) \in V$ so $d_Y(f(x), f(p)) < \epsilon$.

Corollary 11.2.5: Continuous functions map closed sets to closed sets

$f: X \rightarrow Y$ is continuous on X if and only if:

$f^{-1}(C)$ is closed in X for every closed set C in Y

Proof

By **theorem 11.2.4**, f is continuous if and only if $f^{-1}(V)$ is open in X for every open set V in Y . Let $C = V^c$. Since V is open, then C is closed.

Since $f^{-1}(C) = f^{-1}(V^c) = (f^{-1}(V))^c$, then $f^{-1}(C)$ is closed since $f^{-1}(V)$ is open.

Theorem 11.2.6: Continuous functions

Let f, g be complex continuous functions on X .

Then $f+g$, fg , and $\frac{f}{g}$ where $g \neq 0$ for all $x \in X$ are continuous on X .

Proof

If x is an isolated point, $f+g$, fg , and $\frac{f}{g}$ are continuous by definition. If x is a limit point, then by **theorems 11.1.4 and 11.2.2**, $f+g$, fg , and $\frac{f}{g}$ are continuous since

- $\lim_{x \rightarrow p} (f + g)(x) = \lim_{x \rightarrow p} f(x) + \lim_{x \rightarrow p} g(x) = f(p) + g(p)$
- $\lim_{x \rightarrow p} (fg)(x) = \lim_{x \rightarrow p} f(x) \lim_{x \rightarrow p} g(x) = f(p)g(p)$
- $\lim_{x \rightarrow p} \left(\frac{f}{g}\right)(x) = \frac{\lim_{x \rightarrow p} f(x)}{\lim_{x \rightarrow p} g(x)} = \frac{f(p)}{g(p)}$

Theorem 11.2.7: Continuous functions on \mathbb{R}^k

(a) Let $f_1, \dots, f_k: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $f: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ where $f(x) = (f_1(x), \dots, f_k(x))$.

Then f is continuous if and only if f_1, \dots, f_k are continuous.

(b) If f and g are continuous mappings of X into \mathbb{R}^k , then $f + g$ and $f \cdot g$ are continuous on X .

Proof

Since $|f_i(x) - f_i(y)| \leq \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^k |f_i(x) - f_i(y)|^2} = |f(x) - f(y)|$, then if f is continuous, then each f_i is continuous and vice versa.

Since f, g are continuous, then by part a, each f_i, g_i are continuous. Then by **theorem 11.2.6**, each $f_i + g_i$ and $f_i g_i$ are continuous so by part a, $f + g$ and $f \cdot g$ are continuous.

Thus, every polynomial, rational, and absolute value function is continuous since polynomials are $x_1 \cdot \dots \cdot x_k$ where each x_i is continuous, rationals are polynomials divided by polynomials, and $||x| - |y|| \leq |x - y|$ implies $|x|$ is continuous.

11.3 Continuity and Compactness

Definition 11.3.1: Bounded Functions


$f: E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ is **bounded** if there is a $M \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $f(x) \leq M$ for all $x \in E$

Theorem 11.3.2: Continuous functions from compact spaces are compact

Suppose f is a continuous mapping of a compact metric space X into a metric space Y . Then $f(X)$ is compact.

Proof

Let $\{V_\alpha\}$ be an open cover of $f(X)$. Since f is continuous, then by **theorem 11.2.4**, each $f^{-1}(V_\alpha)$ is open. Since X is compact, there is n where $X \subset f^{-1}(V_{\alpha_1}) \cup \dots \cup f^{-1}(V_{\alpha_n})$. Thus, $f(X) \subset V_{\alpha_1} \cup \dots \cup V_{\alpha_n}$ so $f(X)$ is compact.



Theorem 11.3.3: Continuous functions from compact to \mathbb{R}^k are bounded

For continuous $f: \text{compact } X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$, then $f(X)$ is closed and bounded

Proof

By **theorem 11.2.2**, $f(X)$ is compact. By **theorem 6.3.13**, $f(X)$ is closed and bounded.

Theorem 11.3.4: Generalized extreme value theorem

Suppose f is a continuous real function of a compact metric space X such that $M = \sup_{x \in X} f(x)$ and $m = \inf_{x \in X} f(x)$.

Then there exists $p, q \in X$ such that $f(p) = M$ and $f(q) = m$.

Proof

By **theorem 11.3.3**, $f(X)$ is closed and bounded. Let $M = \sup_{x \in X} f(x)$, $m = \inf_{x \in X} f(x)$. Since $f(X)$ is bounded, then $M, m \in (f(X))'$ and since $f(X)$ is closed, then $M, m \in f(X)$. Thus, there exists $p, q \in X$ such that $f(p) = M$ and $f(q) = m$.

Theorem 11.3.5: If f is continuous 1-1, then f^{-1} is continuous

Suppose f is a continuous 1-1 mapping of a compact metric space X onto a metric space Y . Then f^{-1} is a continuous mapping of Y onto X .

Proof

Let V be an open set in X . Since V^c is closed and $V^c \subset \text{compact set } X$, then by **theorem 6.3.5**, V^c is compact. Thus by **theorem 11.3.2**, $f(V^c)$ is a compact subset of Y so $f(V^c)$ is closed. Since f is 1-1 and onto, $f(V^c) = (f(V))^c$ so $f(V)$ is open. Since from any open set V in X , $f(V)$ is open in Y , then by **theorem 11.2.4**, f^{-1} is continuous.

Definition 11.3.6: Uniformly Continuous

Let $f: X \rightarrow Y$. Then f is **uniformly continuous** on X if:

For every $\epsilon > 0$, there is a $\delta > 0$ such that for all $p, q \in X$ where $d_X(p, q) < \delta$, then:
 $d_Y(f(p), f(q)) < \epsilon$

Theorem 11.3.7: Continuous functions on compact are uniformly continuous

Let f be a continuous mapping of a compact metric space X into metric space Y . Then f is uniformly continuous on X .

Proof

For $\epsilon > 0$, since f is continuous, then for each $p \in X$, there is a $\phi(p)$ such that for all $q \in X$ where $d_X(q, p) < \phi(p)$, $d_Y(f(q), f(p)) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$.

Let $J(p)$ be the set of all $q \in X$ where $d_X(q, p) < \frac{1}{2}\phi(p)$.

Since the set of all $J(p)$ is an open cover of X and since X is compact, then there is a n such that $X \subset J(p_1) \cup \dots \cup J(p_n)$. Let $\delta = \frac{1}{2} \min(\phi(p_1), \dots, \phi(p_n)) > 0$.

Then for $p, q \in X$ where $d_X(p, q) < \delta$, there is a m where $1 \leq m \leq n$ such that $p \in J(p_m)$ so $d_X(p, p_m) < \frac{1}{2}\phi(p_m)$. Thus:

$$\begin{aligned} d_X(q, p_m) &\leq d_X(q, p) + d_X(p, p_m) < \delta + \frac{1}{2}\phi(p_m) \leq \phi(p_m) \\ d_Y(f(p), f(q)) &\leq d_Y(f(p), f(p_m)) + d_Y(f(p_m), f(q)) < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} = \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 11.3.8: Continuous functions from noncompact \nrightarrow uniformly continuous

Let E be a noncompact set in \mathbb{R}^1 .

- (a) There exists a continuous function which is not bounded
- (b) There exists a continuous, bounded function which has no maximum
- (c) If E is bounded, there exists a continuous function which is not uniformly continuous

Proof

Suppose E is bounded so there is a $x_0 \in E'$, but $x_0 \notin E$.

Consider $f(x) = \frac{1}{x-x_0}$ which is continuous on E , but unbounded.

For $\epsilon > 0$ and $\delta > 0$, there is a $x \in E$ such that $|x - x_0| < \delta$. Take t close enough to x_0 so $|f(t) - f(x_0)| > \epsilon$, but $|t - x| < \delta$. Thus, f is not uniformly continuous.

Consider $g(x) = \frac{1}{1+(x-x_0)^2}$ which is continuous on E and bounded since $g(x) \in (0,1)$.

Since $\sup_{x \in E} g(x) = 1$, but $g(x) < 1$ for all $x \in E$, then g has no maximum on E .

11.4 Continuity and Connectedness**Theorem 11.4.1: Continuous functions map connected to connected**

If f is a continuous mapping of X into Y and E is a connected subset of X , then $f(E)$ is connected.

Proof

Suppose $f(E) = A \cup B$ where A and B are nonempty separated subsets of Y .

Let $G = E \cap f^{-1}(A)$ and $H = E \cap f^{-1}(B)$. Then $E = G \cup H$.

Since $A \subset \overline{A}$, $G \subset f^{-1}(\overline{A})$. Since f is continuous, then $f^{-1}(\overline{A})$ is closed so $\overline{G} \subset f^{-1}(\overline{A})$. Thus, $f(\overline{G}) \subset \overline{A}$.

Since $f(H) = B$ and $\overline{A} \cap B$ is empty, $\overline{G} \cap H$ is empty. Similarly, $G \cap \overline{H}$ is empty so G and H are separated which contradicts that $E = G \cup H$ is connected.

Theorem 11.4.2: Generalized Intermediate Value Theorem

Let f be a continuous real function on $[a,b]$. If $f(a) < c < f(b)$, then there exists $x \in (a,b)$ such that $f(x) = c$.

Proof

Since $[a,b]$ is connected, then by [theorem 11.4.1](#), $f([a,b])$ is a connected subset of \mathbb{R}^1 . Thus, by [theorem 7.2.2](#), any c where $f(a) < c < f(b)$ is $c \in f(x)$ for some $x \in [a,b]$.

11.5 Discontinuities**Definition 11.5.1: Right and Left Limits**

Let f be defined on (a,b) .

Then for any x where $x \in [a,b)$, $f(x+) = q$ if:

$f(t_n) \rightarrow q$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for all sequences $\{t_n\}$ in (x,b) such that $t_n \rightarrow x$.

Then for any x where $x \in (a,b]$, $f(x-) = q$ if:

$f(t_n) \rightarrow q$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for all sequences $\{t_n\}$ in (a,x) such that $t_n \rightarrow x$.

Then $\lim_{t \rightarrow x} f(t)$ exists if and only if $f(x-) = f(x+) = \lim_{t \rightarrow x} f(t)$.

Definition 11.5.2: Types of discontinuities

If f is discontinuous at x , but $f(x+)$ and $f(x-)$ exists, then f have a simple discontinuity of the first kind else it is a discontinuity of the second kind.

Thus, a [simple discontinuity](#) is either:

- $f(x-) \neq f(x+)$
- $f(x-) = f(x+) \neq f(x)$

11.6 Monotonic Functions**Definition 11.6.1: Monotonic**

$f: (a,b) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is monotonically increasing if $f(x) \leq f(y)$ for $a < x < y < b$.

$f: (a,b) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is monotonically decreasing if $f(x) \geq f(y)$ for $a < x < y < b$.

Theorem 11.6.2: Right and Left Limits of monotonic functions on (a,b)

Let f be monotonically increasing on (a,b) .

Then $f(x+)$ and $f(x-)$ exists at every $x \in (a,b)$ where:

$$\sup_{t \in (a,x)} f(t) = f(x-) \leq f(x) \leq f(x+) = \inf_{t \in (x,b)} f(t)$$

Furthermore, for $a < x < y < b$, $f(x+) \leq f(y-)$.

Properties analogous for monotonically decreasing functions.

Proof

Since f is monotonically increasing, then for $t \in (a,x)$, $f(t)$ is bounded above by $f(x)$ and thus, by the least upper bounded property, $\sup_{t \in (a,x)} f(t)$ exists.

For $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that $\sup_{t \in (a,x)} f(t) - \epsilon < f(x - \delta) \leq \sup_{t \in (a,x)} f(t)$ for $a < x - \delta < x$. Since $f(x - \delta) \leq f(t) \leq \sup_{t \in (a,x)} f(t)$ for $t \in (x - \delta, x)$, then $|f(t) - \sup_{t \in (a,x)} f(t)| < \epsilon$ for $t \in (x - \delta, x)$ so $f(x-) = \sup_{t \in (a,x)} f(t)$.

For $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that $\inf_{t \in (x,b)} f(t) < f(x + \delta) \leq \inf_{t \in (x,b)} f(t) + \epsilon$ for $x < x + \delta < b$. Since $f(x + \delta) \geq f(t) \geq \inf_{t \in (x,b)} f(t)$ for $t \in (x, x + \delta)$, then $|f(t) - \inf_{t \in (x,b)} f(t)| < \epsilon$ for $t \in (x, x + \delta)$ so $f(x+) = \inf_{t \in (x,b)} f(t)$.

Thus, $\sup_{t \in (a,x)} f(t) = f(x-) \leq f(x) \leq f(x+) = \inf_{t \in (x,b)} f(t)$.

If $a < x < y < b$, then:

$$f(x+) = \inf_{t \in (x,b)} f(t) = \inf_{t \in (x,y)} f(t) \leq \sup_{t \in (x,y)} f(t) = \sup_{t \in (a,y)} f(t) = f(y-)$$

Corollary 11.6.3: Monotonics can only have simple discontinuities

Monotonic functions have no discontinuities of the second kind

Proof

By **theorem 11.6.2**, $f(x-)$ and $f(x+)$ exists and thus, f can only have simple discontinuities and not discontinuities of the second kind.

Theorem 11.6.4: Discontinuities of monotonics is at most countable

Let f be monotonic on (a,b) . Then the set of points of (a,b) where f is discontinuous is at most countable.

Proof

Suppose f is increasing. Let E be the set of points where f is discontinuous. Then for $x \in E$, there is a rational $r(x)$ where $f(x-) < r(x) < f(x+)$.
 Then for $x_1 < x_2$, by **theorem 11.6.2**, $f(x_1+) \leq f(x_2-)$. Then:

$$f(x_1-) < r(x_1) < f(x_1+) \leq f(x_2-) < r(x_2) < f(x_2+)$$

 Thus, $r(x_1) \neq r(x_2)$ if $x_1 \neq x_2$.
 Since there is a 1-1 correspondence between E and a subset of rational numbers which is countable, then E is at most countable.
 If f is decreasing, proof is analogous.

11.7 Infinite Limits / Limits at Infinity**Definition 11.7.1: Neighborhoods in the Extended Reals**

For any real c , a neighborhood of $+\infty = (c, +\infty)$.

For any real c , a neighborhood of $-\infty = (-\infty, c)$.

Definition 11.7.2: Infinite Limits

Let real function f be defined on $E \subset \mathbb{R}$.

Then $f(t) \rightarrow A$ as $t \rightarrow x$ where A and x are extended reals if:

For every neighborhood U of A , there is a neighborhood V of x such that $V \cap E \neq \emptyset$ and $f(t) \in U$ for all $t \in V \cap E$ where $t \neq x$.

Theorem 11.7.3: Arithmetic operations on functions of infinite limits

Let f, g be defined on $E \subset \mathbb{R}$ where $f(t) \rightarrow A$ and $g(t) \rightarrow B$ as $t \rightarrow x$.

(a) If $f(t) \rightarrow A'$, then $A' = A$.

(b) $(f+g)(t) \rightarrow A + B$

(c) $(fg)(t) \rightarrow AB$

(d) $\frac{f}{g}(t) \rightarrow \frac{A}{B}$

12 Differentiation

12.1 Derivative of a Function

Definition 12.1.1: Derivative

Let f be defined on any $x \in [a, b]$.

$$\phi(t) = \frac{f(t) - f(x)}{t - x} \text{ for } t \neq x$$

The **derivative** of f at x :

$$f'(x) = \lim_{t \rightarrow x} \phi(t)$$

if the limit exist as defined by **definition 11.1.1**.

If f' is defined at x , then f is differentiable at x .

Theorem 12.1.2: Differentiability \rightarrow Continuity

Let f be defined on $[a, b]$.

If f is differentiable at $x \in [a, b]$, then f is continuous at x .

Proof

As $t \rightarrow x$:

$$f(t) - f(x) = \frac{f(t) - f(x)}{t - x} \cdot (t - x) \rightarrow f'(x) \cdot 0 = 0$$

Theorem 12.1.3: Arithmetic operations on differentiation

Suppose f, g are defined on $[a, b]$ and differentiable on $x \in [a, b]$.

Then $f+g$, fg , and $\frac{f}{g}$ are differentiable at x :

(a) $(f+g)'(x) = f'(x) + g'(x)$

Proof

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow x} \frac{(f+g)(t) - (f+g)(x)}{t - x} &= \lim_{t \rightarrow x} \frac{f(t) - f(x) + g(t) - g(x)}{t - x} \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow x} \frac{f(t) - f(x)}{t - x} + \lim_{t \rightarrow x} \frac{g(t) - g(x)}{t - x} = f'(x) + g'(x) \end{aligned}$$

(b) $(fg)'(x) = f'(x)g(x) + f(x)g'(x)$

Proof

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow x} \frac{(fg)(t) - (fg)(x)}{t - x} &= \lim_{t \rightarrow x} \frac{f(t)g(t) - f(x)g(x)}{t - x} \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow x} \frac{f(t)g(t) - f(x)g(t) + f(x)g(t) - f(x)g(x)}{t - x} \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow x} \frac{[f(t) - f(x)]g(t)}{t - x} + \lim_{t \rightarrow x} \frac{f(x)[g(t) - g(x)]}{t - x} \\ &= f'(x)g(x) + f(x)g'(x) \end{aligned}$$

(c) $\left(\frac{f}{g}\right)'(x) = \frac{f'(x)g(x) - f(x)g'(x)}{g^2(x)}$

Proof

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow x} \frac{\left(\frac{f}{g}\right)(t) - \left(\frac{f}{g}\right)(x)}{t - x} &= \lim_{t \rightarrow x} \frac{\frac{f(t)}{g(t)} - \frac{f(x)}{g(x)}}{t - x} = \lim_{t \rightarrow x} \frac{\frac{f(t)g(x) - f(x)g(t)}{g(t)g(x)(t - x)}}{t - x} \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow x} \frac{f(t)g(x) - f(x)g(t) + f(x)g(t) - f(x)g(x)}{g(t)g(x)(t - x)} \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow x} \frac{[f(t) - f(x)]g(x)}{g(t)g(x)(t - x)} + \lim_{t \rightarrow x} \frac{f(x)[g(t) - g(x)]}{g(t)g(x)(t - x)} \\ &= \frac{f'(x)g(x)}{g^2(x)} + \frac{f(x)[-g'(x)]}{g^2(x)} = \frac{f'(x)g(x) - f(x)g'(x)}{g^2(x)} \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 12.1.4: Differentiation Chain Rule

Suppose f is continuous on $[a, b]$, $f'(x)$ exists at $x \in [a, b]$, g is defined on interval I containing $f([a, b])$, and g is differentiable at $f(x)$.

If $h(t) = g(f(t))$, then h is differentiable at x and $h'(x) = g'(f(x)) \cdot f'(x)$

Proof

Since f is differentiable at x and g is differentiable at $f(x)$, then:

$$f(t) - f(x) = (t-x) [f'(x) + u(t)] \quad \text{for } t \in [a, b] \text{ and } \lim_{t \rightarrow x} u(t) = 0$$

$$g(s) - g(f(x)) = (s-f(x)) [g'(f(x)) + v(s)] \quad \text{for } s \in I \text{ and } \lim_{s \rightarrow f(x)} v(s) = 0$$

Thus:

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow x} \frac{h(t) - h(x)}{t - x} &= \lim_{t \rightarrow x} \frac{g(f(t)) - g(f(x))}{t - x} \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow x} \frac{(f(t) - f(x)) [g'(f(x)) + v(f(t))]}{t - x} \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow x} \frac{(t-x) [f'(x) + u(t)] [g'(f(x)) + v(f(t))]}{t - x} \\ &= g'(f(x)) \cdot f'(x) + f'(x) \cdot 0 + g'(f(x)) \cdot 0 + 0 \cdot 0 = g'(f(x)) \cdot f'(x) \end{aligned}$$

12.2 Mean Value Theorems**Definition 12.2.1: Local Extrema**

Let real-valued $f \in X$.

Then f has a **local maximum** at $p \in X$ if:

There is $\delta > 0$ such that for all $q \in X$ where $d_X(q, p) < \delta$, $f(q) \leq f(p)$.

Then f has a **local minimum** at $p \in X$ if:

There is $\delta > 0$ such that for all $q \in X$ where $d_X(q, p) < \delta$, $f(q) \geq f(p)$.

Theorem 12.2.2: Derivative at local extrema is 0

Let f be defined on $[a, b]$.

If f has a local maximum at $x \in (a, b)$ and $f'(x)$ exists, then $f'(x) = 0$.

If f has a local minimum at $x \in (a, b)$ and $f'(x)$ exists, then $f'(x) = 0$.

Proof

Suppose x is a local maximum.

Then there is a $\delta > 0$ such that for all $t \in (a, b)$ where $|t - x| < \delta$, then $f(t) \leq f(x)$.

Then for $t < x$, $\frac{f(t) - f(x)}{t - x} \geq 0$. Thus, $\lim_{t \rightarrow x} \frac{f(t) - f(x)}{t - x} = f'(x) \geq 0$.

For $t > x$, $\frac{f(t) - f(x)}{t - x} \leq 0$. Thus, $\lim_{t \rightarrow x} \frac{f(t) - f(x)}{t - x} = f'(x) \leq 0$.

Since $f'(x)$ exists, then $f'(x) = 0$.

Proof is analogous for local minimum.

Theorem 12.2.3: Generalized Mean Value Theorem

If f, g are continuous real functions on $[a, b]$ and differentiable on (a, b) , then there is a $x \in (a, b)$ such that $[f(b) - f(a)] \cdot g'(x) = [g(b) - g(a)] \cdot f'(x)$.

Proof

Let $h(t) = [f(b) - f(a)] \cdot g(t) - [g(b) - g(a)] \cdot f(t)$ for $t \in [a, b]$.

Since f, g are continuous on $[a, b]$ and differentiable on (a, b) , then h is continuous on $[a, b]$ and differentiable on (a, b) . Also, $h(a) = f(b)g(a) - f(a)g(b) = h(b)$.

If h is constant, then $h'(x) = 0$ and thus, theorem holds true for every $x \in (a, b)$.

If $h(t) > h(a)$ for some $t \in (a, b)$, let $x \in [a, b]$ where h attains a local maximum. If $h(t) < h(a)$ for some $t \in (a, b)$, let $x \in [a, b]$ where h attains a local minimum. Then by **theorem 12.2.2**, $h'(x) = 0$ and thus, theorem holds true at local extrema.

Theorem 12.2.4: Mean Value Theorem

If f is a real continuous function on $[a,b]$ and differentiable on (a,b) , then there is a $x \in (a,b)$ such that $f(b) - f(a) = (b-a) f'(x)$.

Proof

From **theorem 12.2.3**, let $g(x) = x$.

Theorem 12.2.5: Sign of derivative determines increasing/decreasing

Suppose f is differentiable on (a,b) .

- (a) If $f'(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in (a,b)$, then f is monotonically increasing.
- (b) If $f'(x) = 0$ for all $x \in (a,b)$, then f is constant.
- (c) If $f'(x) \leq 0$ for all $x \in (a,b)$, then f is monotonically decreasing

Proof

From **theorem 12.2.4**, $f(x_2) - f(x_1) = (x_2 - x_1) f'(x)$ for $x \in (x_1, x_2) \subset (a,b)$.

If $f'(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in (a,b)$, then $f(x_2) - f(x_1) \geq 0$. Since $f(x_2) \geq f(x_1)$ for $x_2 > x_1$, then f is monotonically increasing.

If $f'(x) = 0$ for all $x \in (a,b)$, then $f(x_2) - f(x_1) = 0$. Since $f(x_2) = f(x_1)$ for $x_2 > x_1$, then f is constant.

If $f'(x) \leq 0$ for all $x \in (a,b)$, then $f(x_2) - f(x_1) \leq 0$. Since $f(x_2) \leq f(x_1)$ for $x_2 > x_1$, then f is monotonically decreasing.

12.3 Continuity of Derivatives

Theorem 12.3.1: Intermediate values of Derivatives exists

Suppose f is a real differentiable function on $[a,b]$ and $f'(a) < \lambda < f'(b)$.

Then there is a $x \in (a,b)$ such that $f'(x) = \lambda$.

Statement holds true if $f'(a) > f'(b)$.

Proof

Suppose $f'(a) < \lambda < f'(b)$. Let $g(t) = f(t) - \lambda t$.

Since $f(t), t$ are differentiable on $[a,b]$, then $g(t)$ is differentiable on $[a,b]$.

Then $g'(a) = f'(a) - \lambda < 0$ so $g(t_1) < g(a)$ for some $t_1 \in (a,b)$.

Also, $g'(b) = f'(b) - \lambda > 0$ so $g(t_2) < g(b)$ for some $t_2 \in (a,b)$.

Thus, there is a x where $g(x)$ is a local minimum so $g'(x) = 0$ and thus, $f'(x) = \lambda$.

Corollary 12.3.2: Differentiable functions have no simple discontinuities

If f is differentiable on $[a,b]$, then f' cannot have simple discontinuities on $[a,b]$.

Proof

By **theorem 12.3.1**, $f'(x)$ exists for any $x \in [a,b]$.

12.4 L'Hospital's Rule

Theorem 12.4.1: L'Hospital's Rule

Suppose f, g are real and differentiable on (a, b) and $g'(x) \neq 0$ for all $x \in (a, b)$.

Suppose $\lim_{x \rightarrow a} \frac{f'(x)}{g'(x)} \rightarrow A$. If either:

- $\lim_{x \rightarrow a} f(x) \rightarrow 0$ and $\lim_{x \rightarrow a} g(x) \rightarrow 0$
- $\lim_{x \rightarrow a} g(x) \rightarrow \infty$ or $\lim_{x \rightarrow a} g(x) \rightarrow -\infty$

Then, $\lim_{x \rightarrow a} \frac{f(x)}{g(x)} \rightarrow A$.

Statement holds true if $x \rightarrow b$.

Proof

Consider the case $-\infty \leq A < \infty$.

Choose q such that $A < q$ and r such that $A < r < q$.

Thus, there is a $c \in (a, b)$ such that $a < x < c$ for $\frac{f'(x)}{g'(x)} < r$.

For $a < x < y < c$, then by [theorem 12.2.3](#), there is a $t \in (x, y)$ such that:

$$\frac{f(x)-f(y)}{g(x)-g(y)} = \frac{f'(t)}{g'(t)} < r$$

If $\lim_{x \rightarrow a} f(x) \rightarrow 0$ and $\lim_{x \rightarrow a} g(x) \rightarrow 0$, then as $x \rightarrow a$, $\frac{f(y)}{g(y)} \leq r < q$ for $y \in (a, c)$.

If $\lim_{x \rightarrow a} g(x) \rightarrow \infty$, then keeping y fixed, choose $c_1 \in (a, y)$ such that $g(x) > g(y)$ and $g(x) > 0$ if $a < x < c_1$. Thus:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{g(x)-g(y)}{g(x)} \cdot \frac{f(x)-f(y)}{g(x)-g(y)} &< \frac{g(x)-g(y)}{g(x)} \cdot r \text{ for } x \in (a, c_1) \\ \frac{f(x)}{g(x)} &< r - r \frac{g(y)}{g(x)} + \frac{f(y)}{g(x)} \end{aligned}$$

Thus as $x \rightarrow a$, there is a $c_2 \in (a, c_1)$ such that $\frac{f(x)}{g(x)} < r < q$ for $x \in (a, c_2)$.

Proof is analogous if $\lim_{x \rightarrow a} g(x) \rightarrow -\infty$.

Thus, $\lim_{x \rightarrow a} \frac{f(x)}{g(x)} \rightarrow A$.

12.5 Derivative of Higher Order

Definition 12.5.1: Derivative of Higher Order

If f has a derivative f' on an interval and f' is differentiable, then the derivative of f' is f'' , the second derivative of f . Then, $f^{(n)}$ is the [nth derivative](#) of f .

For $f^{(n)}(x)$ to exist at x , $f^{(n-1)}(t)$ must exist in a neighborhood of x and $f^{(n-1)}$ must be differentiable at x .

If $f^{(n-1)}$ exist in a neighborhood of x , then $f^{(n-2)}$ must be differentiable in that neighborhood and so on until f is differentiable on that neighborhood.

12.6 Taylor's Theorem

Theorem 12.6.1: Taylor's Theorem

Suppose f is a real function on $[a,b]$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $f^{(n-1)}$ is continuous on $[a,b]$, $f^{(n)}(t)$ exists at every $t \in (a,b)$. Let $\alpha, \beta \in [a,b]$ be distinct and $P(t) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{f^{(k)}(\alpha)}{k!} (t - \alpha)^k$.

Then there exists a x between α and β such that $f(\beta) = P(\beta) + \frac{f^{(n)}(x)}{n!} (\beta - \alpha)^n$

Proof

Let M be the number defined by $f(\beta) = P(\beta) + M(\beta - \alpha)^n$.
 Let $g(t) = f(t) - P(t) - M(t - \alpha)^n$ for $t \in [\alpha, \beta]$. Thus, $g^{(n)}(t) = f^{(n)}(t) - n!M$.
 Also since $P^{(k)}(\alpha) = f^{(k)}(\alpha)$ for $k = [0, n-1]$, then $g(\alpha) = g'(\alpha) = \dots = g^{(n-1)}(\alpha) = 0$.
 Since the choice of M gives $g(\beta) = 0$, then by the Mean Value Theorem, $g'(x_1) = 0$ for some x_1 between α and β .
 Since $g'(\alpha) = 0$, then $g''(x_2) = 0$ for some x_2 between α and x_1 .
 Thus, $g^{(n)}(x_n) = 0$ for some x_n between α and x_{n-1} so x_n is between α and β .
 Thus, there exists an $x_n \in (\alpha, \beta)$ such that:

$$0 = g^{(n)}(x_n) = f^{(n)}(x_n) - n!M$$

$$M = \frac{f^{(n)}(x_n)}{n!}$$

12.7 Differentiation of Vector-Valued Functions

Definition 12.7.1: Extending derivative to Vector-Valued Functions

For vector-valued function $f: t \in [a,b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$, the derivative of f at x :

$$f'(x) = \lim_{t \rightarrow x} \left| \frac{f(t) - f(x)}{t - x} \right|$$

if the limit exist as defined by [definition 14.1.1](#).

If $f = (f_1, \dots, f_k)$, then $f' = (f'_1, \dots, f'_k)$ and f is differentiable at x if and only if f_1, \dots, f_k are differentiable at x .

Thus, by [theorem 11.2.7](#), these theorems hold true for vector-valued functions:

- [12.1.2](#): If f is differentiable at x , then f is continuous at x .
- [12.1.3a](#): If f, g are differentiable at x , then $f+g, f \cdot g$ are differentiable at x .

However, [theorem 12.2.4: Mean Value Theorem](#) and [theorem 12.4.1: L'Hospital's Rule](#) does not always hold true since [theorem 12.1.3b/c](#), multiplying/dividing vectors by vectors, is not defined for vector-valued functions.

Theorem 12.7.2: Mean Value Theorem for \mathbb{R}^k

Suppose f is a continuous mapping of $[a,b]$ into \mathbb{R}^k and f is differentiable on (a,b) . Then there is a $x \in (a,b)$ such that $|f(b) - f(a)| \leq (b-a) |f'(x)|$

Proof

Let $z = f(b) - f(a)$ and define $\phi(t) = z \cdot f(t)$ for $t \in [a,b]$.
 Then $\phi(t)$ is real-valued continuous on $[a,b]$ and differentiable on (a,b) .
 Then by the Mean Value Theorem, for some $x \in (a,b)$:

$$\phi(b) - \phi(a) = (b-a) \phi'(x) = (b-a) z \cdot f'(x)$$
 Since $\phi(b) - \phi(a) = z \cdot f(b) - z \cdot f(a) = z \cdot z = |z|^2$, then by the Schwarz Inequality:

$$|z|^2 = (b-a) |z \cdot f'(x)| \leq (b-a) |z| |f'(x)|$$

$$|z| \leq (b-a) |f'(x)|$$

$$|f(b) - f(a)| \leq (b-a) |f'(x)|$$

13 Riemann-Stieltjes Integral

13.1 Riemann-Stieltjes Integral

Definition 13.1.1: Riemann Integral

For $[a, b]$, let $a = x_0 \leq x_1 \leq \dots \leq x_n = b$ and $\Delta x_i = x_i - x_{i-1}$.

Suppose real f is bounded. Then for each partition P , $\{x_0, \dots, x_n\}$,

let $m_i = \inf f([x_{i-1}, x_i])$ and $M_i = \sup f([x_{i-1}, x_i])$.

Then let $L(P, f) = \sum_{i=1}^n m_i \Delta x_i$ and $U(P, f) = \sum_{i=1}^n M_i \Delta x_i$. Thus, over all P :


Lower Riemann Integral: $\int_a^b f(x) dx = \sup L(P, f)$

Upper Riemann Integral: $\int_a^b f(x) dx = \inf U(P, f)$

If $\int_a^b f(x) dx = \overline{\int}_a^b f(x) dx = \int_a^b f(x) dx$, then f is **Riemann-integrable** (i.e. $f \in \mathcal{R}$).

Since f is bounded, there are m, M such that $m \leq f(x) \leq M$.

Thus, $m(b-a) \leq L(P, f) \leq U(P, f) \leq M(b-a)$.



Definition 13.1.2: Riemann-Stieltjes Integral

Let α be monotonically increasing on $[a, b]$.

Then for each partition P , let $\Delta \alpha_i = \alpha(x_i) - \alpha(x_{i-1})$.

For real bounded f , let $L(P, f, \alpha) = \sum_{i=1}^n m_i \Delta \alpha_i$ and $U(P, f, \alpha) = \sum_{i=1}^n M_i \Delta \alpha_i$.

Thus, $\int_a^b f(x) d\alpha(x) = \sup L(P, f, \alpha)$ and $\overline{\int}_a^b f(x) d\alpha(x) = \inf U(P, f, \alpha)$.

If $\int_a^b f(x) d\alpha(x) = \overline{\int}_a^b f(x) d\alpha(x)$, then $f \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$ with value $\int_a^b f(x) d\alpha(x)$.

Definition 13.1.3: Refinement

Partition Q is a **refinement** of P if $P \subset Q$.

For partitions P_1, P_2 , then $Q = P_1 \cup P_2$ is the common refinement.

Theorem 13.1.4: Refinements monotonically increase $L(P,f)$ & decrease $U(P,f)$

If Q is a refinement of P , then:

$$L(P,f,\alpha) \leq L(Q,f,\alpha) \leq U(Q,f,\alpha) \leq U(P,f,\alpha)$$

Proof

Since Q is a refinement of P , then $P \subset Q$.

Suppose $Q = P \cup \{x^*\}$ where $P = \{x_0, \dots, x_n\}$ and $Q = \{x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}, x^*, x_k, \dots, x_n\}$. Regardless of anymore points, the process below will be analogous.

$$L(P,f,\alpha) = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} m_i \Delta \alpha_i + m_{[x_{k-1}, x_k]} [\alpha(x^*) - \alpha(x_{k-1})] \\ + m_{[x_{k-1}, x_k]} [\alpha(x_k) - \alpha(x^*)] + \sum_{i=k+1}^n m_i \Delta \alpha_i$$

$$L(Q,f,\alpha) = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} m_i \Delta \alpha_i + m_{[x_{k-1}, x^*]} [\alpha(x^*) - \alpha(x_{k-1})] \\ + m_{[x^*, x_k]} [\alpha(x_k) - \alpha(x^*)] + \sum_{i=k+1}^n m_i \Delta \alpha_i$$

Since $[x_{k-1}, x^*], [x^*, x_k] \subset [x_{k-1}, x_k]$, then $m_{[x_{k-1}, x_k]} \leq m_{[x_{k-1}, x^*]}, m_{[x^*, x_k]}$. Thus:


$$L(Q,f,\alpha) - L(P,f,\alpha) = (m_{[x_{k-1}, x^*]} - m_{[x_{k-1}, x_k]}) [\alpha(x^*) - \alpha(x_{k-1})] \\ + (m_{[x^*, x_k]} - m_{[x_{k-1}, x_k]}) [\alpha(x_k) - \alpha(x^*)] \geq 0.$$

$$U(P,f,\alpha) = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} M_i \Delta \alpha_i + M_{[x_{k-1}, x_k]} [\alpha(x^*) - \alpha(x_{k-1})] \\ + M_{[x_{k-1}, x_k]} [\alpha(x_k) - \alpha(x^*)] + \sum_{i=k+1}^n M_i \Delta \alpha_i$$

$$U(Q,f,\alpha) = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} M_i \Delta \alpha_i + M_{[x_{k-1}, x^*]} [\alpha(x^*) - \alpha(x_{k-1})] \\ + M_{[x^*, x_k]} [\alpha(x_k) - \alpha(x^*)] + \sum_{i=k+1}^n M_i \Delta \alpha_i$$

Since $[x_{k-1}, x^*], [x^*, x_k] \subset [x_{k-1}, x_k]$, then $M_{[x_{k-1}, x_k]} \geq M_{[x_{k-1}, x^*]}, M_{[x^*, x_k]}$. Thus:

$$U(Q,f,\alpha) - U(P,f,\alpha) = (M_{[x_{k-1}, x^*]} - M_{[x_{k-1}, x_k]}) [\alpha(x^*) - \alpha(x_{k-1})] \\ + (M_{[x^*, x_k]} - M_{[x_{k-1}, x_k]}) [\alpha(x_k) - \alpha(x^*)] \leq 0.$$

**Theorem 13.1.5: Lower Riemann Integral \leq Upper Riemann Integral**

$$\int_a^b f d\alpha \leq \bar{\int}_a^b f d\alpha$$

Proof

For partitions P_1, P_2 , let $L(P_1, f, \alpha)$ and $U(P_2, f, \alpha)$. Let $P = P_1 \cup P_2$. Thus:

$$L(P_1, f, \alpha) \leq L(P, f, \alpha) \leq U(P, f, \alpha) \leq U(P_2, f, \alpha)$$

Thus, over all partitions for P_1 , $\int_a^b f d\alpha \leq U(P_2, f, \alpha)$

Thus, over all partitions for P_2 , $\int_a^b f d\alpha \leq \bar{\int}_a^b f d\alpha$

Theorem 13.1.6: Riemann-Integrability ϵ Definition

$f \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$ if and only if for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a partition P such that:

$$U(P, f, \alpha) - L(P, f, \alpha) < \epsilon$$

Proof

If $f \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$, then $\int_a^f d\alpha = \overline{\int}_a^b f d\alpha = \int_a^b f d\alpha$. For $\epsilon > 0$, there exists partitions P_1, P_2 :

$$\int_a^b f d\alpha - L(P_1, f, \alpha) < \frac{\epsilon}{2} \quad U(P_2, f, \alpha) - \int_a^b f d\alpha < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$

Then for partition $P = P_1 \cup P_2$, then:

$$\int_a^b f d\alpha - L(P, f, \alpha) \leq \int_a^b f d\alpha - L(P_1, f, \alpha) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$

$$U(P, f, \alpha) - \int_a^b f d\alpha \leq U(P_2, f, \alpha) - \int_a^b f d\alpha < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$

Thus, $U(P, f, \alpha) - L(P, f, \alpha) < \epsilon$.

For $\epsilon > 0$, there is a partition P such that $U(P, f, \alpha) - L(P, f, \alpha) < \epsilon$.

Since $L(P, f, \alpha) \leq \underline{\int}_a^b f d\alpha \leq \overline{\int}_a^b f d\alpha \leq U(P, f, \alpha)$, then $\overline{\int}_a^b f d\alpha - \underline{\int}_a^b f d\alpha < \epsilon$.

Theorem 13.1.7: Properties of Riemann-Integrability

(a) If $f \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$, then $U(Q, f, \alpha) - L(Q, f, \alpha) < \epsilon$ for every refinement of P, Q

Proof

By **theorem 13.1.6**, for $\epsilon > 0$, there is a P such that:

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

Then by **theorem 13.1.4**, for any refinement of P, Q , then:

$$U(Q, f, \alpha) - L(Q, f, \alpha) < \epsilon.$$

(b) If $f \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$ where $P = \{x_0, \dots, x_n\}$ and $s_i, t_i \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]$, then:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n |f(s_i) - f(t_i)| \Delta\alpha_i < \epsilon$$

Proof

By **theorem 13.1.6**, for $\epsilon > 0$, there is a P such that:

$$U(P, f, \alpha) - L(P, f, \alpha) < \epsilon$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n M_i \Delta\alpha_i - \sum_{i=1}^n m_i \Delta\alpha_i < \epsilon$$

Since $s_i, t_i \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]$, then $m_i \leq f(s_i), f(t_i) \leq M_i$.

Thus, $|f(s_i) - f(t_i)| \leq M_i - m_i$.

$$\sum_{i=1}^n |f(s_i) - f(t_i)| \Delta\alpha_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^n M_i - m_i \Delta\alpha_i < \epsilon$$

(c) If $f \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$ where $P = \{x_0, \dots, x_n\}$ and $t_i \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]$, then:

$$|\sum_{i=1}^n f(t_i) \Delta\alpha_i - \int_a^b f d\alpha| < \epsilon$$

Proof

Since $\sup L(P, f, \alpha) = \underline{\int}_a^b f d\alpha = \int_a^b f d\alpha = \overline{\int}_a^b f d\alpha = \inf U(P, f, \alpha)$, then:

$$L(P, f, \alpha) \leq \int_a^b f d\alpha \leq U(P, f, \alpha)$$

Since $t_i \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]$, then $m_i \leq f(t_i) \leq M_i$. Thus:

$$\begin{aligned} L(P, f, \alpha) &= \sum_{i=1}^n m_i \Delta\alpha_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^n f(t_i) \Delta\alpha_i \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n M_i \Delta\alpha_i = U(P, f, \alpha) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $|\sum_{i=1}^n f(t_i) \Delta\alpha_i - \int_a^b f d\alpha| \leq U(P, f, \alpha) - L(P, f, \alpha) < \epsilon$.

13.2 Riemann-Integrable Functions

Theorem 13.2.1: Continuous functions are Riemann-Integrable

If f is continuous on $[a, b]$, then $f \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$

Proof

For $\epsilon > 0$, choose $\eta > 0$ such that $[\alpha(b) - \alpha(a)]\eta < \epsilon$. Since f is continuous and $[a, b]$ is compact, then f is uniformly continuous. Thus, for $\eta > 0$, there is a $\delta > 0$ such that for all $x, t \in [a, b]$ where $|x - t| < \delta$, then $|f(x) - f(t)| < \eta$. For partition P of $[a, b]$ such that $\Delta x_i < \delta$ for all $i = \{1, \dots, n\}$, then $M_i - m_i \leq \eta$ for each i . Thus:

$$U(P, f, \alpha) - L(P, f, \alpha) = \sum_{i=1}^n (M_i - m_i) \Delta \alpha_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \eta \Delta \alpha_i = \eta [\alpha(b) - \alpha(a)] < \epsilon$$

Theorem 13.2.2: Monotonic functions are Riemann-Integrable

If f is monotonic on $[a, b]$ and α is continuous on $[a, b]$, then $f \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$

Proof

Since α is continuous on $[a, b]$, let $\Delta \alpha_i = \frac{\alpha(b) - \alpha(a)}{n}$ where $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$

Let partition $P = \{\alpha(x_0), \dots, \alpha(x_n)\}$. Suppose f is monotonically increasing. Thus:

$$\begin{aligned} U(P, f, \alpha) - L(P, f, \alpha) &= \sum_{i=1}^n (M_i - m_i) \Delta \alpha_i = \frac{\alpha(b) - \alpha(a)}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (M_i - m_i) \\ &= \frac{\alpha(b) - \alpha(a)}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [f(x_i) - f(x_{i-1})] = \frac{\alpha(b) - \alpha(a)}{n} [f(b) - f(a)] \end{aligned}$$

For $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a n such that $\frac{\alpha(b) - \alpha(a)}{n} [f(b) - f(a)] < \epsilon$ so $f \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$.

If f is monotonically decreasing, then $\sum_{i=1}^n (M_i - m_i) = \sum_{i=1}^n [f(x_{i-1}) - f(x_i)]$.

Theorem 13.2.3: Bounded functions with finite discontinuities are Riemann-Integrable

If f is bounded on $[a, b]$ with finitely many discontinuities and α is continuous at every discontinuity, then $f \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$

Proof


Since f is bounded, let $M = \sup |f(x)|$ and E be the set of discontinuities of f .

Since E is finite and α is continuous over E , then for $\epsilon > 0$, there are finitely many disjoint $[u_j, v_j]$ where $\sum [\alpha(v_j) - \alpha(u_j)] < \epsilon$ which cover E .

Let $K = [a, b] \setminus \cup (u_j, v_j)$ which is compact. Since f is continuous over compact K , then f is uniformly continuous over K . Thus, for $\epsilon > 0$, there is a $\delta > 0$ such that for $s, t \in K$ where $|s - t| < \delta$, then $|f(s) - f(t)| < \epsilon$.

Let partition $P = \{x_0, \dots, x_n\}$ of $[a, b]$ where each $\Delta x_i < \delta$ and if $x \in (u_j, v_j) \notin P$, but $u_j, v_j \in P$. Thus, $M_i - m_i \leq 2M$ for each i and $M_i - m_i \leq \epsilon$ unless x_{i-1} is a u_j , then:

$$\begin{aligned} U(P, f, \alpha) - L(P, f, \alpha) &= \sum_{i=1}^n (M_i - m_i) \Delta \alpha_i = \sum_K (M_i - m_i) \Delta \alpha_i + \sum_{K^c} (M_i - m_i) \Delta \alpha_i \\ &\leq \epsilon \sum_K \Delta \alpha_i + 2M \sum_{K^c} \Delta \alpha_i \leq [\alpha(b) - \alpha(a)] \epsilon + 2M \epsilon \end{aligned}$$



Theorem 13.2.4: Composite of continuous-integrable functions are Riemann-Integrable

If $f \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$ on $[a, b]$ where $f \in [m, M]$ and ϕ is continuous on $[m, M]$ such that $h(x) = \phi(f(x))$, then $h \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$

Proof

Since ϕ is continuous and $[m, M]$ is compact, then ϕ is uniformly continuous. Thus, for $\epsilon > 0$, there is a $0 < \delta < \epsilon$ such that for all $s, t \in [m, M]$ where $|s - t| \leq \delta$, then $|\phi(s) - \phi(t)| < \epsilon$.

Since $f \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$, there is a partition $P = \{x_0, \dots, x_n\}$ such that:

$$U(P, f, \alpha) - L(P, f, \alpha) < \delta^2$$

For each $i = \{1, \dots, n\}$, let $i \in A$ if $M_i - m_i < \delta$ and $i \in B$ if $M_i - m_i \geq \delta$.

Let $m_i^* = \inf \phi(f([x_{i-1}, x_i]))$ and $M_i^* = \sup \phi(f([x_{i-1}, x_i]))$.

For A , since $M_i - m_i < \delta$, then $M_i^* - m_i^* \leq \epsilon$.

For B , $M_i^* - m_i^* \leq 2K$ where $K = \sup_{[m, M]} |\phi|$.

$$\delta \sum_{i \in B} \Delta \alpha_i \leq \sum_{i \in B} (M_i - m_i) \Delta \alpha_i < \delta^2$$

$$\sum_{i \in B} \Delta \alpha_i \leq \delta < \epsilon$$

Thus:

$$\begin{aligned} U(P, h, \alpha) - L(P, h, \alpha) &= \sum_{i \in A} (M_i^* - m_i^*) \Delta \alpha_i + \sum_{i \in B} (M_i^* - m_i^*) \Delta \alpha_i \\ &\leq \epsilon \sum_{i \in A} \Delta \alpha_i + 2K \sum_{i \in B} \Delta \alpha_i \\ &\leq \epsilon [\alpha(b) - \alpha(a)] + 2K\epsilon < \epsilon [\alpha(b) - \alpha(a) + 2K] \end{aligned}$$

13.3 Integral Properties**Theorem 13.3.1: Integral Additive Properties**

(a) If $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$ on $[a, b]$ and constant c , then $f_1 + f_2, cf_1 \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$ and

$$\int_a^b f_1 + f_2 \, d\alpha = \int_a^b f_1 \, d\alpha + \int_a^b f_2 \, d\alpha$$

$$\int_a^b cf_1 \, d\alpha = c \int_a^b f_1 \, d\alpha$$

Proof

Since $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$, then there are partitions P_1, P_2 such that for $\epsilon > 0$:

$$U(P_1, f_1, \alpha) - L(P_1, f_1, \alpha) < \frac{\epsilon}{2} \quad U(P_2, f_2, \alpha) - L(P_2, f_2, \alpha) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$

Thus for partition $P = P_1 \cup P_2$:

$$U(P, f_1, \alpha) + U(P, f_2, \alpha) - L(P, f_1, \alpha) - L(P, f_2, \alpha) < \epsilon$$

$$U(P, f_1 + f_2, \alpha) - L(P, f_1 + f_2, \alpha) < \epsilon$$

For any partition Q :

$$\begin{aligned} L(Q, f_1, \alpha) + L(Q, f_2, \alpha) &\leq L(Q, f_1 + f_2, \alpha) \leq U(Q, f_1 + f_2, \alpha) \\ &\leq U(Q, f_1, \alpha) + U(Q, f_2, \alpha) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $f_1 + f_2 \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$ where:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_a^b f_1 \, d\alpha + \int_a^b f_2 \, d\alpha &= \underline{\int_a^b} f_1 \, d\alpha + \underline{\int_a^b} f_2 \, d\alpha \leq \underline{\int_a^b} f_1 + f_2 \, d\alpha \\ &= \underline{\int_a^b} f_1 + f_2 \, d\alpha = \overline{\int_a^b} f_1 + f_2 \, d\alpha \\ &\leq \overline{\int_a^b} f_1 \, d\alpha + \overline{\int_a^b} f_2 \, d\alpha = \int_a^b f_1 \, d\alpha + \int_a^b f_2 \, d\alpha \end{aligned}$$

Proof for cf_1 is analogous by replacing $\frac{\epsilon}{2}$ with $\frac{\epsilon}{c}$.

(b) If $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$ and $f_1(x) \leq f_2(x)$ on $[a, b]$, then $\int_a^b f_1 \, d\alpha \leq \int_a^b f_2 \, d\alpha$

Proof

Since $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$, then by part a, $0 \leq \int_a^b f_2 - f_1 \, d\alpha = \int_a^b f_2 \, d\alpha - \int_a^b f_1 \, d\alpha$.

- (c) If $f \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$ on $[a, b]$ and $c \in (a, b)$, then $f \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$ on $[a, c], [c, b]$ and

$$\int_a^c f d\alpha + \int_c^b f d\alpha = \int_a^b f d\alpha$$

Proof

Since $f \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$ on $[a, b]$, there is a partition P of $[a, b]$ such that for $\epsilon > 0$:

$$U(P, f, \alpha) - L(P, f, \alpha) < \epsilon$$

For partition P of $[a, b]$, let refinement of P , $Q = P \cup \{c\}$. Thus:

$$L(P, f, \alpha) \leq L(Q, f, \alpha) \leq U(Q, f, \alpha) \leq U(P, f, \alpha)$$

Thus, let $A = (P < c) \cup c \in [a, c]$ and $B = c \cup (c < P) \in (c, b)$:

$$\begin{aligned} L(Q, f, \alpha) &= \sum_Q m_q \Delta \alpha_q \\ &\leq \sum_A m_a \Delta \alpha_a + \sum_B m_b \Delta \alpha_b = L(A, f, \alpha) + L(B, f, \alpha) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} U(Q, f, \alpha) &= \sum_Q M_q \Delta \alpha_q \\ &\geq \sum_A M_a \Delta \alpha_a + \sum_B M_b \Delta \alpha_b = U(A, f, \alpha) + U(B, f, \alpha) \end{aligned}$$

Since Q is a refinement of P , then $U(Q, f, \alpha) - L(Q, f, \alpha) < \epsilon$. Thus:

$$0 \leq U(A, f, \alpha) + U(B, f, \alpha) - L(A, f, \alpha) - L(B, f, \alpha) < \epsilon$$

$$U(A, f, \alpha) - L(A, f, \alpha) < \epsilon \quad U(B, f, \alpha) - L(B, f, \alpha) < \epsilon$$

Thus, $f \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$ on $[a, c], [c, b]$ where:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_a^b f d\alpha &\leq \int_a^c f d\alpha + \int_c^b f d\alpha = \int_a^c f d\alpha + \int_c^b f d\alpha \\ &= \int_a^c f d\alpha + \int_c^b f d\alpha \leq \int_a^b f d\alpha \end{aligned}$$

Since $\int_a^b f d\alpha, \int_a^c f d\alpha = \int_a^b f d\alpha$, then $\int_a^b f d\alpha = \int_a^c f d\alpha + \int_c^b f d\alpha$.

- (d) If $f \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha_1), \mathcal{R}(\alpha_2)$ and constant c , then $f \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)$, $f \in \mathcal{R}(c\alpha_1)$ and

$$\int_a^b f d(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) = \int_a^b f d\alpha_1 + \int_a^b f d\alpha_2$$

$$\int_a^b f d(c\alpha_1) = c \int_a^b f d\alpha_1$$

Proof

Since $f \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha_1), \mathcal{R}(\alpha_2)$, then there are partitions P_1, P_2 where for $\epsilon > 0$:

$$U(P_1, f, \alpha_1) - L(P_1, f, \alpha_1) < \frac{\epsilon}{2} \quad U(P_2, f, \alpha_2) - L(P_2, f, \alpha_2) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$

Thus, for partition $P = P_1 \cup P_2$:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (M_i - m_i) \Delta \alpha_{1i} < \frac{\epsilon}{2} \quad \sum_{i=1}^n (M_i - m_i) \Delta \alpha_{2i} < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (M_i - m_i) (\Delta \alpha_{1i} + \Delta \alpha_{2i}) < \epsilon$$

$$U(P, f, \alpha_1 + \alpha_2) - L(P, f, \alpha_1 + \alpha_2) < \epsilon$$

For any partition Q :

$$\begin{aligned} L(Q, f, \alpha_1) + L(Q, f, \alpha_2) &\leq L(Q, f, \alpha_1 + \alpha_2) \\ &\leq U(Q, f, \alpha_1 + \alpha_2) \\ &\leq U(Q, f, \alpha_1) + U(Q, f, \alpha_2) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $f \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)$ where:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_a^b f d\alpha_1 + \int_a^b f d\alpha_2 &= \int_a^b f d\alpha_1 + \int_a^b f d\alpha_2 \leq \int_a^b f d(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) \\ &= \int_a^b f d(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) = \int_a^b f d(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) \\ &\leq \int_a^b f d\alpha_1 + \int_a^b f d\alpha_2 = \int_a^b f d\alpha_1 + \int_a^b f d\alpha_2 \end{aligned}$$

Proof for $c\alpha_1$ is analogous by replacing $\frac{\epsilon}{2}$ with $\frac{\epsilon}{c}$.

Theorem 13.3.2: Integral Multiplicative Properties

- (a) If
- $f, g \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$
- on
- $[a, b]$
- , then
- $fg \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$

Proof

Since $f, g \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$, then $f+g, f-g \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$. By **theorem 13.2.4**, let $\phi(t) = t^2$ which is continuous so $\phi(f+g) = (f+g)^2, \phi(f-g) = (f-g)^2 \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$.
Thus, $4fg = (f+g)^2 - (f-g)^2 \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$.

- (b) If
- $f \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$
- on
- $[a, b]$
- , then
- $|f| \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$
- where
- $|\int_a^b f d\alpha| \leq \int_a^b |f| d\alpha$

Proof

By **theorem 13.2.4**, let $\phi(t) = |t|$ which is continuous so $|f| \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$.
Then choose $c = \pm 1$ such that $c \int f d\alpha \geq 0$. Then:
 $|\int f d\alpha| = c \int f d\alpha = \int c f d\alpha \leq \int |f| d\alpha$

13.4 Change of Variable**Definition 13.4.1: Unit Step Function**

$$I(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & x \leq 0 \\ 1 & x > 0 \end{cases}$$

Theorem 13.4.2: Integrating f over I centered at s

If f is bounded on $[a, b]$ and continuous at $s \in (a, b)$ where $\alpha(x) = I(x-s)$, then:

$$\int_a^b f d\alpha = f(s)$$

Intuition

If $x < s < y$, then $\Delta I = I(y-s) - I(x-s) = 1 - 0 = 1$ else $\Delta I = 0$.

So, $f(x)d\alpha(x) \approx f(x)\Delta I$ have only $f(s)\Delta I = f(s)$ since the others $\Delta I = 0$.


Proof

For partition $P = \{x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3\}$ where $x_1 = s$:

$$L(P, f, \alpha) = m_2 \quad U(P, f, \alpha) = M_2$$

Since f is continuous at s , then for $\epsilon > 0$, there is a $\delta > 0$ where for all $x \in [s, s+\delta]$, then $|f(x) - f(s)| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. Thus, $M_2 - m_2 < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} = \epsilon$ so $\int f d\alpha$ exist where:

$$f(s) - m_2 < \frac{\epsilon}{2} \text{ so } \underline{\int} f d\alpha = f(s) \quad M_2 - f(s) < \frac{\epsilon}{2} \text{ so } \overline{\int} f d\alpha = f(s)$$



Theorem 13.4.3: Integrating f over a step function

If $\sum c_n$ converges where $c_n \geq 0$, distinct points $\{s_n\} \in (a, b)$, and $\alpha(x) = \sum c_n I(x - s_n)$.
Then for continuous f on $[a, b]$:

$$\int_a^b f d\alpha = \sum c_n f(s_n)$$

Intuition

Similar to **theorem 13.4.2**, but over a step function. The $\{s_n\}$ determines where the steps are and the $\{\sum c_n\}$ determines the value at each step.

Thus, $f(x)d\alpha(x)$ have only:

$$f(s_n) \cdot (\text{value}_{\text{current step}} - \text{value}_{\text{previous step}}) = f(s_n) \cdot (\sum c_n - \sum c_{n-1}) = f(s_n) \cdot c_n$$

Proof

Since $\alpha(x) = \sum c_n I(x - s_n) \leq \sum c_n$, then by the comparison test, $\alpha(x)$ converges.

Since $c_n, I(x - s_n) \geq 0$, then $\alpha(x)$ is monotonic.

Since $a < s_n$ for any n, then $\alpha(a) = \sum c_n I(a - s_n) = \sum c_n 0 = 0$.

Since $b > s_n$ for any n, then $\alpha(b) = \sum c_n I(b - s_n) = \sum c_n 1 = \sum c_n$.

Since $\sum c_n$ converges, then for $\epsilon > 0$, there is a N such that $\sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} c_n < \epsilon$.

Let $\alpha_1(x) = \sum_{n=1}^N c_n I(x - s_n)$ and $\alpha_2(x) = \sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} c_n I(x - s_n)$. By **theorem 13.4.2**:

$$\int_a^b f d\alpha_1 = \int_a^b f d(\sum_{n=1}^N c_n I(x - s_n)) = \sum_{n=1}^N c_n f(s_n)$$

$$|\int_a^b f d\alpha_2| = \sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} c_n f(s_n) \leq \sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} c_n \sup(|f(x)|) = \sup(|f(x)|) \epsilon$$

Thus, $\int f d\alpha = \int f d(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) = \int f d\alpha_1 + \int f d\alpha_2 = \sum_{n=1}^N c_n f(s_n) + \sup(|f(x)|) \epsilon$

Theorem 13.4.4: $\int_a^b f d\alpha = \int_a^b f(x)\alpha'(x) dx$

If $\alpha' \in \mathcal{R}$ on $[a, b]$ and f is real, bounded on $[a, b]$, then $f \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$ if and only if $f\alpha' \in \mathcal{R}$.

Then:

$$\int_a^b f d\alpha = \int_a^b f(x)\alpha'(x) dx$$

Intuition

If α is differentiable on $[x, y]$, then by the Mean Value Theorem, there is a $t \in [x, y]$:

$$\alpha(x) - \alpha(y) = \alpha'(t) \cdot (x - y)$$

Since $d\alpha \approx \Delta\alpha(x) = \alpha'(t)\Delta x \approx \alpha'(x) dx$, then $\int_a^b f d\alpha = \int_a^b f(x)\alpha'(x) dx$.

Proof

Since $\alpha' \in \mathcal{R}$, then $\epsilon > 0$, there is a partition $P = \{x_0, \dots, x_n\}$ such that:

$$U(P, \alpha') - L(P, \alpha') < \epsilon$$

By the Mean Value Theorem, there are $t_i \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]$ such that $\Delta\alpha_i = \alpha'(t_i)\Delta x_i$.

Then for $s_i \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]$:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n |\alpha'(s_i) - \alpha'(t_i)| \Delta x_i \leq U(P, \alpha') - L(P, \alpha') < \epsilon$$

Let $M = \sup(|f(x)|)$. Since $\sum_{i=1}^n f(s_i)\Delta\alpha_i = \sum_{i=1}^n f(s_i)\alpha'(t_i)\Delta x_i$, then:

$$\begin{aligned} & |\sum_{i=1}^n f(s_i)\Delta\alpha_i - \sum_{i=1}^n f(s_i)\alpha'(s_i)\Delta x_i| \\ &= |\sum_{i=1}^n f(s_i)\alpha'(t_i)\Delta x_i - \sum_{i=1}^n f(s_i)\alpha'(s_i)\Delta x_i| \\ &\leq M |\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha'(t_i)\Delta x_i - \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha'(s_i)\Delta x_i| = M\epsilon \end{aligned}$$

Thus:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n f(s_i)\Delta\alpha_i &\leq U(P, f\alpha') + M\epsilon & \sum_{i=1}^n f(s_i)\Delta\alpha_i &\geq L(P, f\alpha') + M\epsilon \\ U(P, f, \alpha) &\leq U(P, f\alpha') + M\epsilon & L(P, f, \alpha) &\geq L(P, f\alpha') + M\epsilon \\ |\int f d\alpha - \int f\alpha' dx| &< M\epsilon & |\int f d\alpha - \int f\alpha' dx| &< M\epsilon \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $f \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$ if and only if $f\alpha' \in \mathcal{R}$.

Theorem 13.4.5: Integral Change of Variable: $\int_a^b f(x) dx = \int_A^B f(\phi(y))\phi'(y) dy$

Let strictly increasing continuous $\phi: [A,B] \rightarrow [a,b]$ and $f \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$ on $[a,b]$.

Let $\beta(y) = \alpha(\phi(y))$ and $g(y) = f(\phi(y))$ for $y \in [A,B]$. Then $g \in \mathcal{R}(\beta)$ where:

$$\int_A^B g d\beta = \int_a^b f d\alpha$$

Intuition

Partition of $[a,b] = \{x_0, \dots, x_n\} \sim$ partition of $[A,B] = \{y_0, \dots, y_n\}$ where $x_i = \phi(y_i)$.

Thus, $g(y)d\beta(y) \approx f(\phi(y))\Delta\alpha(\phi(y)) = f(x)\Delta\alpha(x) \approx f(x)d\alpha$.

Proof

Since $f \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$, then for $\epsilon > 0$, there is a partition P such that:

$$U(P, f, \alpha) - L(P, f, \alpha) < \epsilon$$

For partition $P = \{x_0, \dots, x_n\}$ of $[a,b]$, there is a partition $Q = \{y_0, \dots, y_n\}$ of $[A,B]$ where $x_i = \phi(y_i)$. Thus:

$$L(Q, g, \beta) = L(Q, f(\phi(y)), \alpha(\phi(y))) = L(P, f(x), \alpha(x)) = L(P, f, \alpha)$$

$$U(Q, g, \beta) = U(Q, f(\phi(y)), \alpha(\phi(y))) = U(P, f(x), \alpha(x)) = U(P, f, \alpha)$$

Thus, $U(Q, g, \beta) - L(Q, g, \beta) = U(P, f, \alpha) - L(P, f, \alpha) < \epsilon$ so $g \in \mathcal{R}(\beta)$ and

$$\int_A^B g d\beta = \int_a^b f d\alpha.$$

Let $\alpha(x) = x$. Then $\beta(y) = \phi(y)$. If $\beta' \in \mathcal{R}$ on $[A,B]$, then by **theorem 13.4.5**:

$$\int_a^b f(x) dx = \int_a^b f d\alpha = \int_A^B g d\beta = \int_A^B g(y)\beta'(y) dy = \int_A^B f(\phi(y))\phi'(y) dy$$

13.5 Fundamental Theorem of Calculus

Theorem 13.5.1: If $F(x) = \int f(x)dx$, then $F'(x) = f(x)$

Let $f \in \mathcal{R}$ on $[a,b]$. For $x \in [a,b]$, let $F(x) = \int_a^x f(t) dt$.

Then F is continuous on $[a,b]$ and if f is continuous at $x_0 \in [a,b]$, then F is differentiable at x_0 where $F'(x_0) = f(x_0)$.

Intuition

If f is integrable, then $|F(x) - F(y)| = |\int_x^y f(t)dt| < \epsilon$ if x and y are close enough.

If f is continuous at $x_0 \in [t, y]$, then for close enough t, y :

$$\left| \frac{F(y) - F(t)}{y - t} - f(x_0) \right| = \left| \frac{1}{y - t} \int_t^y [f(x) - f(x_0)] dx \right| < \epsilon$$

Proof

Since $f \in \mathcal{R}$, then f is bounded. Let $|f(t)| \leq M$ for any $t \in [a,b]$. Then for $\epsilon > 0$, there is a $\frac{\epsilon}{M} > \delta > 0$ such that for all $x, y \in [a,b]$ where $|y - x| < \delta$, then:

$$|F(y) - F(x)| = \left| \int_a^y f(t)dt - \int_a^x f(t)dt \right| = \left| \int_x^y f(t)dt \right| \leq M|y - x| < M\delta < \epsilon$$

Thus, F is uniformly continuous on $[a,b]$.

Suppose f is continuous at x_0 . Then for $\epsilon > 0$, there is a $\delta > 0$ such that for all $t \in [a,b]$ where $|t - x_0| < \delta$, then $|f(t) - f(x_0)| < \epsilon$.

Thus, for $s, t \in [x_0 - \delta, x_0 + \delta]$ where $s < x_0 < t$:

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{F(t) - F(s)}{t - s} - f(x_0) \right| &= \left| \frac{1}{t - s} \int_s^t f(x)dx - f(x_0) \right| \\ &= \left| \frac{1}{t - s} \int_s^t f(x)dx - \frac{1}{t - s}(t - s)f(x_0) \right| \\ &= \left| \frac{1}{t - s} \int_s^t f(x)dx - \frac{1}{t - s} \int_s^t f(x_0)dx \right| \\ &= \left| \frac{1}{t - s} \int_s^t [f(x) - f(x_0)]dx \right| < \left| \frac{1}{t - s}(t - s)\epsilon \right| = \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $F'(x_0) = f(x_0)$.

Theorem 13.5.2: Fundamental Theorem of Calculus: $\int_a^b f(x) \, dx = F(b) - F(a)$

If $f \in \mathcal{R}$ on $[a, b]$ and there is a differentiable F on $[a, b]$ such that $F' = f$, then

$$\int_a^b f(x) \, dx = F(b) - F(a)$$

Intuition

Since F is differentiable, then by the Mean Value Theorem, there is a $t \in [x, y]$

$$F(y) - F(x) = (y - x) \cdot F'(t) = (y - x) \cdot f(t)$$

Thus, $\int_a^b f(x) \, dx \approx \sum f(t) \Delta x = \sum [F(x_i) - F(x_{i-1})] = F(b) - F(a)$

Proof

Since $f \in \mathcal{R}$, then for $\epsilon > 0$, there is a partition $P = \{x_0, \dots, x_n\}$ of $[a, b]$ such that:

$$U(P, f) - L(P, f) < \epsilon$$

Since there is a differentiable F on $[a, b]$, then F is differentiable over any $[x_{i-1}, x_i]$. Then by the Mean Value Theorem, there are $t_i \in (x_{i-1}, x_i)$ such that:

$$F(x_i) - F(x_{i-1}) = (x_i - x_{i-1}) F'(t_i) = \Delta x_i f(t_i)$$

Thus, $\sum_{i=1}^n f(t_i) \Delta x_i = \sum_{i=1}^n [F(x_i) - F(x_{i-1})] = F(b) - F(a)$.

Since $\sum_{i=1}^n f(t_i) \Delta x_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \sup(f([x_{i-1}, x_i])) \Delta x_i = U(P, f)$, then:

$$|F(b) - F(a) - \int_a^b f(x) \, dx| = |\sum_{i=1}^n f(t_i) \Delta x_i - \int_a^b f(x) \, dx| \leq U(P, f) - L(P, f) < \epsilon$$

Theorem 13.5.3: Integration by Parts

Suppose F, G are differentiable on $[a, b]$ and $F' = f$, $G' = g \in \mathcal{R}$. Then:

$$\int_a^b F(x)g(x) \, dx = F(b)G(b) - F(a)G(a) - \int_a^b f(x)G(x) \, dx$$

Intuition

By the derivative product rule, $(HG)' = H'G + HG'$. Then:

$$\int H'G \, dx = \int (HG)' - HG' \, dx = [HG]_a^b - \int HG' \, dx$$

Proof

Let $H(x) = F(x)G(x)$ where $H'(x) = f(x)G(x) + F(x)g(x)$.

Since F, G are differentiable and thus, continuous, then $F, G \in \mathcal{R}$.

Thus, $H' \in \mathcal{R}$. Then by **theorem 13.5.2**:

$$\int_a^b H'(x) \, dx = H(b) - H(a)$$

$$\int_a^b f(x)G(x) + F(x)g(x) \, dx = H(b) - H(a)$$

$$\int_a^b F(x)g(x) \, dx = H(b) - H(a) - \int_a^b f(x)G(x) \, dx$$

13.6 Integration of Vector-Valued Functions

Definition 13.6.1: Integration of Vector-Valued Functions

Let real f_1, \dots, f_k be defined on $[a, b]$ where $f = (f_1, \dots, f_k)$.

Then, let $f \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$ if each $f_i \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$ where $\int_a^b f \, d\alpha = (\int_a^b f_1 \, d\alpha, \dots, \int_a^b f_k \, d\alpha)$.

Thus, all these theorems hold true for vector-valued functions:

(a) **Theorem 13.3.1a**

If $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$ and constant c , then:

$$f_1 + f_2 \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha) \text{ with } \int_a^b f_1 + f_2 \, d\alpha = \int_a^b f_1 \, d\alpha + \int_a^b f_2 \, d\alpha$$

$$cf_1 \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha) \text{ with } \int_a^b cf_1 \, d\alpha = c \int_a^b f_1 \, d\alpha$$

(b) **Theorem 13.3.1c**

If $f \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$ on $[a, b]$ where $c \in (a, b)$, then $f \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$ on $[a, c], [c, b]$ where:

$$\int_a^b f \, d\alpha = \int_a^c f \, d\alpha + \int_c^b f \, d\alpha$$

(c) **Theorem 13.3.1e**

If $f \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha_1), \mathcal{R}(\alpha_2)$ and constant c , then:

$$f \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) \text{ with } \int_a^b f \, d(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) = \int_a^b f \, d\alpha_1 + \int_a^b f \, d\alpha_2$$

$$f \in \mathcal{R}(c\alpha_1) \text{ with } \int_a^b f \, d(c\alpha_1) = c \int_a^b f \, d\alpha_1$$

(d) **Theorem 13.4.4**

If $\alpha' \in \mathcal{R}$ on $[a, b]$, then $f \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$ if and only if $f\alpha' \in \mathcal{R}$.

$$\int_a^b f(x) \, d\alpha = \int_a^b f(x)\alpha'(x) \, dx$$

(e) **Theorem 13.5.2**

If $f \in \mathcal{R}$ and there is a differentiable F on $[a, b]$ such that $F' = f$, then:

$$\int_a^b f(x) \, dx = F(b) - F(a)$$

Theorem 13.6.2: $|\int f \, d\alpha| \leq \int |f| \, d\alpha$

If $f: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ where $f \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$, then $|f| \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$ where:

$$|\int_a^b f \, d\alpha| \leq \int_a^b |f| \, d\alpha$$

Proof

For $f = (f_1, \dots, f_k)$, then $|f| = (f_1^2 + \dots + f_k^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

Since $f \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$, then each $f_i \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$ so $f_1^2 + \dots + f_k^2 \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$.

Since $x^{\frac{1}{2}}$ is continuous on $[0, \infty)$, then by **theorem 13.2.4**, $|f| = (f_1^2 + \dots + f_k^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$.

Let $y = (y_1, \dots, y_k)$ where each $y_i = \int f_i \, d\alpha$. Thus, $y = \int f \, d\alpha$ where:

$$|y|^2 = \sum_1^k y_i^2 = \sum_1^k (y_i \int f_i \, d\alpha) = \int (\sum y_i f_i) \, d\alpha$$

By the Schwarz inequality, $\sum y_i f_i(t) \leq |y||f(t)|$. Thus:

$$|y|^2 = \int (\sum y_i f_i) \, d\alpha \leq \int |y||f| \, d\alpha$$

$$|\int_a^b f \, d\alpha| = |y| \leq \int |f| \, d\alpha$$

13.7 Line Integrals

Definition 13.7.1: Rectifiable Curves

A curve in \mathbb{R}^k is a continuous $\gamma: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$.

If γ is 1-1, then γ is called an arc.

If $\gamma(a) = \gamma(b)$, γ is a closed curve.

For partition $P = \{x_0, \dots, x_n\}$ and curve γ on $[a, b]$, let:

$$\Lambda(P, \gamma) = \sum_{i=1}^n |\gamma(x_i) - \gamma(x_{i-1})|$$

Then the length of γ is defined:

$$\Lambda(\gamma) = \sup(\Lambda(P, \gamma))$$

If $\Lambda(\gamma) < \infty$, then γ is **rectifiable**.

Theorem 13.7.2: Line Integral of $\gamma = \int_a^b |\gamma'(x)| dx$

If γ' is continuous on $[a, b]$, then γ is rectifiable where

$$\Lambda(\gamma) = \int_a^b |\gamma'(x)| dx$$

Proof

Since γ is differentiable, then by **theorem 13.5.2**, for $a \leq x_{i-1} < x_i \leq b$:

$$|\gamma(x_i) - \gamma(x_{i-1})| = \left| \int_{x_{i-1}}^{x_i} \gamma'(x) dx \right| \leq \int_{x_{i-1}}^{x_i} |\gamma'(x)| dx$$

Thus, for any partition $P = \{x_0, \dots, x_n\}$:

$$\Lambda(P, \gamma) = \sum_{i=1}^n |\gamma(x_i) - \gamma(x_{i-1})| \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\int_{x_{i-1}}^{x_i} |\gamma'(x)| dx \right) = \int_a^b |\gamma'(x)| dx$$

$$\Lambda(\gamma) \leq \int_a^b |\gamma'(x)| dx$$

Since γ' is continuous on compact $[a, b]$, then γ' is uniformly continuous. Thus, for $\epsilon > 0$, there is a $\delta > 0$ such that for all $s, t \in [a, b]$ where $|s - t| < \delta$, then $|\gamma'(s) - \gamma'(t)| < \epsilon$. Then for partition P where each $\Delta x_i < \delta$ and $x \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]$:

$$|\gamma'(x)| \leq |\gamma'(x_i)| + \epsilon$$

Then:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{x_{i-1}}^{x_i} |\gamma'(x)| dx &\leq (|\gamma'(x_i)| + \epsilon) \Delta x_i = |\gamma'(x_i)| \Delta x_i + \epsilon \Delta x_i \\ &= \left| \int_{x_{i-1}}^{x_i} [\gamma'(x) + \gamma'(x_i) - \gamma'(x)] dx \right| + \epsilon \Delta x_i \\ &\leq \left| \int_{x_{i-1}}^{x_i} \gamma'(x) dx \right| + \left| \int_{x_{i-1}}^{x_i} [\gamma'(x_i) - \gamma'(x)] dx \right| + \epsilon \Delta x_i \\ &\leq |\gamma(x_i) - \gamma(x_{i-1})| + \epsilon \Delta x_i + \epsilon \Delta x_i \end{aligned}$$

Thus:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_a^b |\gamma'(x)| dx &= \int_{x_0}^{x_1} |\gamma'(x)| dx + \dots + \int_{x_{n-1}}^{x_n} |\gamma'(x)| dx \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n |\gamma(x_i) - \gamma(x_{i-1})| + 2\epsilon(b-a) = \Lambda(P, \gamma) + 2\epsilon(b-a) \end{aligned}$$

Since $\int_a^b |\gamma'(x)| dx \leq \Lambda(\gamma) + 2\epsilon(b-a) \leq \int_a^b |\gamma'(x)| dx + 2\epsilon(b-a)$, then:

$$\Lambda(\gamma) = \int_a^b |\gamma'(x)| dx.$$

14 Sequences and Series of Functions

14.1 Pointwise Convergence of Functions

Definition 14.1.1: Sequences and Series of Functions

Suppose $\{f_n\}$ is a sequence of functions defined on set E .

If $\{f_n(x)\}$ converges for any $x \in E$, then:

$$f(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(x) \text{ for } x \in E$$

So for $x \in E$ and $\epsilon > 0$, there is a N_x such that for $n \geq N_x$:

$$|f_n(x) - f(x)| < \epsilon$$

If $\sum f_n(x)$ converges for every $x \in E$, then:

$$f(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} f_n(x) \text{ for } x \in E$$

14.2 Uniform Convergence of Functions

Definition 14.2.1: Uniform Convergence

$\{f_n\}$ converges uniformly on E to a function f if for all $x \in E$:

For $\epsilon > 0$, there is a $N \in \mathbb{Z}$ where for $n \geq N$, then $|f_n(x) - f(x)| \leq \epsilon$

$\sum f_n(X)$ converges uniformly if $\{s_n\}$ converges uniformly on E where $\sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x) = s_n(x)$:

For $\epsilon > 0$, there is a $N \in \mathbb{Z}$ where for $m \geq n \geq N$, then $|\sum_{i=n}^m f_i(x)| \leq \epsilon$

Theorem 14.2.2: Cauchy Criterion for sequence of functions

$\{f_n\}$ converges uniformly on E if and only if:

For $\epsilon > 0$, there is a $N \in \mathbb{Z}$ where for $n, m \geq N$ and every $x \in E$, then:

$$|f_n(x) - f_m(x)| \leq \epsilon$$

Intuition

Convergent sequences are Cauchy and Cauchy sequences in \mathbb{R} are convergent.

Proof

If $\{f_n\}$ converges uniformly on E , then for $\epsilon > 0$, there is a N where for $n, m \geq N$:

$$\begin{aligned} |f_n(x) - f(x)| &\leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} & |f_m(x) - f(x)| &\leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} \\ |f_n(x) - f_m(x)| &\leq |f_n(x) - f(x)| + |f_m(x) - f(x)| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} = \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

If for $\epsilon > 0$, there is a $N \in \mathbb{Z}$ where for $n, m \geq N$ and every $x \in E$ so

$|f_n(x) - f_m(x)| \leq \epsilon$, then $\{f_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in \mathbb{R}^k and thus, converges.

Then there is a $f(x)$ where $f(x) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} f_m(x)$. Thus:

$$|f_n(x) - f(x)| \leq |f_n(x) - \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} f_m(x)| \leq \epsilon$$

Theorem 14.2.3: Connection between Convergence and Uniform Convergence

Suppose for $x \in E$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(x) = f(x)$. Let $M_n = \sup_{x \in E} (|f_n(x) - f(x)|)$.

Then $\{f_n\}$ converges uniformly to f on E if and only if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} M_n = 0$.

Intuition

Pointwise convergence implies for any particular x_0 and $\epsilon > 0$ so $|f_n(x_0) - f(x_0)| < \epsilon$.

Uniform convergence implies for every x and $\epsilon > 0$ so $|f_n(x) - f(x)| < \epsilon$.

Thus, uniform convergence implies pointwise convergence, but pointwise convergence might not imply uniform convergence since for $n \geq N_1$, $|f_n(x_0) - f(x_0)| < \epsilon$, but there might always exist $x_1 \neq x_0$ where $|f_n(x_1) - f(x_1)| \not< \epsilon$ until $N_2 > N_1$.

If $\sup_{x \in E} (|f_n(x) - f(x)|) \rightarrow 0$, then x_1 cannot exist and thus, pointwise implies uniform.

Proof

If $\{f_n\}$ converges uniformly to f on E , then for $\epsilon > 0$, there is a N where for $n \geq N$:

$$|f_n(x) - f(x)| \leq \epsilon \quad \text{for all } x \in E$$

Thus, $M_n = \sup_{x \in E} (|f_n(x) - f(x)|) \leq \epsilon$ so $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} M_n \leq \epsilon$.

If $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} M_n = 0$, then for $\epsilon > 0$, there is a N where for $n \geq N$ so $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} M_n \leq \epsilon$.

Since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(x) = f(x)$ for $x \in E$, there is a N_x for each x where for $n \geq N_x$:

$$|f_n(x) - f(x)| \leq \epsilon$$

Since there is a N such that for $n \geq N$ so $M_n = \sup_{x \in E} (|f_n(x) - f(x)|) \leq \epsilon$, then there is $\sup_{x \in E} (\{N_x\})$

$= N$ such that for all $x \in E$ where $n \geq N$:

$$|f_n(x) - f(x)| \leq \sup_{x \in E} (|f_n(x) - f(x)|) = M_n \leq \epsilon$$

Theorem 14.2.4: Condition for Uniform Convergence for Series

For $\{f_n\}$ defined on E , suppose $|f_n(x)| \leq M_n$ for any $x \in E$.

If $\sum M_n$ converges, then $\sum f_n$ converges uniformly on E .

Proof

If $\sum M_n$ converges, then for $\epsilon > 0$, there is a N where for $m \geq n \geq N$:

$$|\sum_{i=n}^m f_i(x)| \leq \sum_{i=n}^m |f_i(x)| \leq \sum_{i=n}^m M_i \leq \epsilon$$

14.3 Uniform Convergence and Continuity

Theorem 14.3.1: $\lim_{t \rightarrow x} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(t) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{t \rightarrow x} f_n(t)$

Suppose $\{f_n\}$ converges uniformly to f on a set E . Let $x \in E$ where $\lim_{t \rightarrow x} f_n(t) = A_n$.

Then $\{A_n\}$ converges where $\lim_{t \rightarrow x} f(t) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_n$.

Intuition

Since $\{f_n\}$ converges uniformly so for any t , then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(t) = f(t)$.

For t near x , then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{t \rightarrow x} f_n(t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow x} f(t)$.

Note uniform convergence is essential since $f_n \rightarrow f$ and $f_n(t) \rightarrow f(t)$ for any t including t near x . Since pointwise convergence possibly $f_n(t) \not\rightarrow f(t)$ for some t near x , then continuity possibly might not hold.

Proof

Since $\{f_n\}$ converges uniformly, then for $\epsilon > 0$, there is a N where for $m, n \geq N$ and every $t \in E$, then $|f_n(t) - f_m(t)| \leq \epsilon$. Then for $t \rightarrow x$:

$$|A_n - A_m| = |\lim_{t \rightarrow x} f_n(t) - \lim_{t \rightarrow x} f_m(t)| \leq \epsilon$$

Thus, $\{A_n\}$ is a Cauchy Sequence in \mathbb{R}^k so $\{A_n\}$ converges to $A = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_n$.

Since $\{A_n\}$ converges to A , then for $\epsilon > 0$, there is a N_1 where for $n \geq N_1$:

$$|A - A_n| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{3}$$

Since $\{f_n\}$ converges uniformly to f , then for $\epsilon > 0$, there is a N_2 where for $n \geq N_2$:

$$|f(t) - f_n(t)| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{3}.$$

Since there is a r such that for $t \in N_r(x)$, then:

$$|f_n(t) - \lim_{t \rightarrow x} f_n(t)| = |f_n(t) - A_n| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{3}$$

Thus, for $t \rightarrow x$, $|f(t) - A| \leq |f(t) - f_n(t)| + |f_n(t) - A_n| + |A_n - A| \leq \epsilon$.

Thus, $\lim_{t \rightarrow x} f(t) = A = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_n$.

Theorem 14.3.2: Uniform Convergence preserve Continuity

If continuous $\{f_n\}$ converges uniformly to f on E , then f is continuous on E

Intuition

If each f_n is continuous:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow x} f(t) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{t \rightarrow x} f_n(t) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(x) = f(x)$$

Proof

Since $\{f_n\}$ converges uniformly to f , then by **theorem 14.3.1**, for any $x \in E$:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow x} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(t) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{t \rightarrow x} f_n(t)$$

Since each f_n is continuous, then:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow x} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow x} f(t)$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{t \rightarrow x} f_n(t) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(x) = f(x)$$

Theorem 14.3.3: Decreasing, continuous sequence over compact converges uniformly

Suppose K is compact and

- (a) $\{f_n\}$ is a sequence of continuous functions on K
- (b) $\{f_n\}$ converges pointwise to a continuous f on K
- (c) $f_n(x) \geq f_{n+1}(x)$ for all $x \in K$

Then f_n converges uniformly to f on K .

Proof

Let $g_n = f_n - f$ so g_n is continuous where $g_n \geq g_{n+1}$.
 Thus, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g_n(x) = 0$ pointwise. For $\epsilon > 0$, let $K_n = \{x \in K : g_n(x) \geq \epsilon\}$.
 Since g_n is continuous and the set of $g_n(x) \geq \epsilon$ is closed, then K_n is closed. Since closed $K_n \subset$ compact K , then K_n is compact.
 Since $g_n \geq g_{n+1}$, then $K_{n+1} \subset K_n$. For any $x \in K$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g_n(x) = 0$ so there is a N_x such that $x \notin K_n$ if $n > N_x$. Thus, any $x \notin \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} K_n$ so $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} K_n = \emptyset$.
 Since $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} K_n = \emptyset$, then K_n is empty for some N .
 Thus, $0 \leq g_n(x) < \epsilon$ for all $x \in K$ where $n \geq N$.

Definition 14.3.4: Supremum Norm

$\mathcal{C}(X)$ is the set of all complex, continuous, bounded functions in metric X .

If X is compact, then bounded is not needed

Then for each $f \in \mathcal{C}(X)$, associate a **supremum norm**:

$$\|f\| = \sup_{x \in X} |f(x)| < \infty$$

where

(a) $\|f(x)\| = 0$ if and only if $f(x) = 0$ for every $x \in X$

(b) Since $|f + g| \leq |f| + |g| \leq \|f\| + \|g\|$, then $\|f + g\| \leq \|f\| + \|g\|$

Then for $f, g \in \mathcal{C}(X)$, let distance $\|f - g\|$ and thus, $\mathcal{C}(X)$ is a metric space.

By **theorem 14.2.3**, $\{f_n\} \rightarrow f$ on $\mathcal{C}(X)$ if and only if $\{f_n\} \rightarrow f$ uniformly on X .

Theorem 14.3.5: $\mathcal{C}(X)$ is a complete metric space

$\mathcal{C}(X)$ is a complete metric space

Intuition

A Cauchy sequence $\{f_n\}$ is uniformly convergent to f .
 Since $\mathcal{C}(X)$ contain continuous functions, then f is continuous.
 Since functions in $\mathcal{C}(X)$ are bounded, then f is bounded.

Proof

Let $\{f_n\}$ be a Cauchy sequence in $\mathcal{C}(X)$.
 Since $\{f_n\} \in \mathcal{C}(X)$, then each f_n is continuous and bounded.
 Then for $\epsilon > 0$, there is a N such that for $n, m \geq N$, then:
 $|f_n - f_m| \leq \|f_n - f_m\| \leq \epsilon$
 Then by **theorem 14.2.2**, $\{f_n\}$ converges uniformly to f .
 Since each f_n is continuous and $\{f_n\}$ converges uniformly to f , then by **theorem 14.3.2**, f is continuous on $\mathcal{C}(X)$.
 Since $\{f_n\}$ converges uniformly to f , there is a N where for $n \geq N$:
 $|f - f_n(x)| \leq \epsilon$
 Since each f_n is bounded, then f is bounded. Since f is continuous and bounded, then $f \in \mathcal{C}(X)$. Thus, every Cauchy sequence $\{f_n\}$ converges to $f \in \mathcal{C}(X)$.

14.4 Uniform Convergence and Integration

Theorem 14.4.1: Uniform Convergence preserves Integrability

If $\{f_n\} \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$ converges uniformly to f on $[a, b]$, then $f \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$ on $[a, b]$ where:

$$\int_a^b f \, d\alpha = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_a^b f_n \, d\alpha$$

Intuition

Since f_n is integrable, then $\int_a^b f_n \, d\alpha$ exist and since $\{f_n\}$ uniformly converges, then for $\epsilon > 0$, $|f - f_n| < \epsilon$. Thus, for a large enough n , $\int_a^b f_n \, d\alpha = \int_a^b f \, d\alpha$.

Proof

Since $\{f_n\}$ converges uniformly to f , then for $\epsilon > 0$:

$$|f - f_n| < \epsilon \quad \rightarrow \quad f_n - \epsilon < f < f_n + \epsilon$$

Then:

$$\int_a^b f_n - \epsilon \, d\alpha < \int_a^b f \, d\alpha \leq \int_a^b f_n \, d\alpha < \int_a^b f_n + \epsilon \, d\alpha$$

Thus,

$$\int_a^b f \, d\alpha - \int_a^b f_n \, d\alpha < \int_a^b f_n + \epsilon \, d\alpha - \int_a^b f_n - \epsilon \, d\alpha = 2\epsilon[\alpha(b) - \alpha(a)]$$

So, $\int_a^b f \, d\alpha$ exists and since $f_n \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$ where $\int_a^b f_n - \epsilon \, d\alpha < \int_a^b f_n \, d\alpha < \int_a^b f_n + \epsilon \, d\alpha$:

$$\int_a^b f \, d\alpha = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_a^b f_n \, d\alpha$$

Theorem 14.4.2: Uniform Convergence preserves Integrability for series

If $f_n \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$ on $[a, b]$ and $f(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} f_n(x)$ converges uniformly, then:

$$\int_a^b f \, d\alpha = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_a^b f_n \, d\alpha$$

Proof

Since $f_n \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$, then $f(x) \in \mathcal{R}(\alpha)$. Since $f(x)$ converges uniformly, then by [theorem 14.4.1](#), then $\int_a^b f \, d\alpha = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n=1}^N \int_a^b f_n \, d\alpha = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_a^b f_n \, d\alpha$.

14.5 Uniform Convergence and Differentiation

Theorem 14.5.1: Uniform Convergence of Derivatives preserves Differentiability

Suppose $\{f_n\}$ are differentiable on $[a,b]$ such that $\{f_n(x_0)\}$ converges for some $x_0 \in [a,b]$.

If $\{f'_n\}$ converges uniformly on $[a,b]$, then $\{f_n\}$ converges uniformly to f on $[a,b]$ where:

$$f'(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f'_n(x) \quad \text{for } x \in [a,b]$$

Intuition

Since $\{f'_n\}$ converges uniformly, for t near x , then by the Mean Value Theorem:

$$\frac{f_n(t) - f_n(x)}{t - x} = \frac{(t-x)f'_n(x)}{t-x} = f'_n(x)$$

Since $\{f'_n\}$ converges uniformly, by the Mean Value Theorem, there is a $t \in [x_1, x_2]$:

$$|[f_n(x_2) - f_m(x_2)] - [f_n(x_1) - f_m(x_1)]| = (x_2 - x_1)|f'_n(t) - f'_m(t)| < \epsilon$$

Thus, $\{f_n - f_m\}$ converges uniformly so if $\{f_n\}$ converges for some x_0 :

$$[f_n(x) - f_m(x)] = |[f_n(x) - f_m(x)] - [f_n(x_0) - f_m(x_0)] + [f_n(x_0) - f_m(x_0)]| \leq \epsilon$$

Thus, $\{f_n\}$ converges uniformly which preserves continuity so for t near x as $n \rightarrow \infty$:

$$f'(x) = \frac{f(t) - f(x)}{t - x} = \frac{f_n(t) - f_n(x)}{t - x} = \frac{(t-x)f'_n(x)}{t-x} = f'_n(x)$$

Note uniform convergence of $\{f'_n\}$ gives $\frac{f_n(t) - f_n(x)}{t - x} = \frac{(t-x)f'_n(x)}{t-x}$. Then uniform convergence of $\{f'_n\}$ with convergent $f_n(x_0)$ leads to uniform convergence of $\{f_n\}$ which gives $\frac{f(t) - f(x)}{t - x} = \frac{f_n(t) - f_n(x)}{t - x}$.

Proof

Since $f_n(x_0)$ converges for some $x_0 \in [a,b]$, then for $\epsilon > 0$, there is a N_1 such that for $n_1, m_1 \geq N_1$:

$$|f_{n_1}(x_0) - f_{m_1}(x_0)| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$

Since f'_n converges uniformly, then there is a N_2 such that for $n_2, m_2 \geq N_2$:

$$|f'_{n_2}(t) - f'_{m_2}(t)| < \frac{\epsilon}{2(b-a)}$$

Let $N = \max(N_1, N_2)$. Then for $n, m \geq N$:

$$|f_n(x_0) - f_m(x_0)| < \frac{\epsilon}{2} \quad |f'_n(t) - f'_m(t)| < \frac{\epsilon}{2(b-a)}$$

Since f_n is differentiable, then $f_n - f_m$ is differentiable. Then by the Mean Value Theorem, there is a $x \in (a,b)$ such that:

$$|[f_n(x) - f_m(x)] - [f_n(t) - f_m(t)]| \leq |x - t||f'_n(t) - f'_m(t)| < |x - t|\frac{\epsilon}{2(b-a)} < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$

Thus, for $n, m \geq N$:

$$|f_n(x) - f_m(x)| \leq |[f_n(x) - f_m(x)] - [f_n(x_0) - f_m(x_0)]| + |f_n(x_0) - f_m(x_0)| < \epsilon$$

Thus, $\{f_n\}$ converges uniformly to $f(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(x)$ where:

$$\phi_n(t) = \frac{f_n(t) - f_n(x)}{t - x} \quad \phi(t) = \frac{f(t) - f(x)}{t - x}$$

Since $\lim_{t \rightarrow x} |\phi_n(t) - \phi_m(t)| < \frac{\epsilon}{2(b-a)}$, then:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \phi_n(t) = \frac{f(t) - f(x)}{t - x} = \phi(t)$$

Since $\{\phi_n(t)\}$ converges uniformly to $\phi(t)$, then by [theorem 14.3.1](#):

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow x} \phi(t) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{t \rightarrow x} \phi_n(t) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f'_n(x)$$

Theorem 14.5.2: Continuous functions can be non-differentiable

There exists a real continuous function on \mathbb{R} which is nowhere differentiable

Proof

Let $\phi(x) = |x|$ for $x \in [-1, 1]$. Then to extend to all real x , let $\phi(x+2) = \phi(x)$. Then ϕ is continuous on \mathbb{R} where for $s, t \in \mathbb{R}$, $|\phi(s) - \phi(t)| \leq |s - t|$.
 Let $f(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (\frac{3}{4})^n \phi(4^n x)$.
 Since $f(x) \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (\frac{3}{4})^n$, then $f(x)$ converges uniformly and since $\phi(x)$ is continuous, then $f(x)$ is continuous. Then for a fixed x and positive integer m , choose $\delta_m = \pm \frac{1}{2} 4^{-m}$ such that no integer lies in $(4^m x, 4^m(x + \delta_m))$. Let $\gamma_n = \frac{\phi(4^n(x+\delta_m)) - \phi(4^n x)}{\delta_m}$.
 For $n > m$, $4^n \delta_m$ is even so $\gamma_n = 0$. For $n \in [0, m]$, $|\gamma_n| \leq \frac{|4^n \delta_m|}{\delta_m} = 4^m < 4^n$.
 Since $|\gamma_m| = 4^m$, then:

$$|\frac{f(x+\delta_m) - f(x)}{\delta_m}| = |\sum_{n=0}^m (\frac{3}{4})^n \gamma_n| + |\sum_{n=m+1}^{\infty} (\frac{3}{4})^n \gamma_n| \geq 3^m - \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} 3^n = \frac{1}{2}(3^m + 1)$$

 As $m \rightarrow \infty$, then $\delta_m \rightarrow 0$, but $|\frac{f(x+\delta_m) - f(x)}{\delta_m}| \rightarrow \infty$ so f is not differentiable at any x .

14.6 Equicontinuous Families of Functions**Definition 14.6.1: Boundedness**

Let $\{f_n\}$ be defined on set E .

$\{f_n\}$ is **pointwise bounded** on E if for $x \in E$ and every n , there is a ϕ where:

$$|f_n(x)| < \phi(x)$$

$\{f_n\}$ is **uniformly bounded** on E if for every n and $x \in E$, there is a M where:

$$|f_n(x)| < M$$

Definition 14.6.2: Equicontinuous

A family of complex functions, $\mathcal{F}: E \subset X$ is **equicontinuous** if for all $f \in \mathcal{F}$:

For every $\epsilon > 0$, there is a $\delta > 0$ such that for all $x, y \in E$ where $d(x, y) < \delta$, then:

$$|f(x) - f(y)| < \epsilon$$

Theorem 14.6.3: Pointwise bounded $\{f_n\}$ over countable sets have convergent $\{f_{n_k}\}$

If $\{f_n\}$ are pointwise bounded, complex functions on countable set E , then $\{f_n\}$ has subsequence $\{f_{n_k}\}$ such that $\{f_{n_k}(x)\}$ converges for every $x \in E$.

Intuition

Any $\{f_{n_k}\} \subset \{f_n\}$ is pointwise bounded so there is a convergent subsequence for a particular x . Let $\{f_{n_{k_1}}\}$ be a convergent subsequence for x_1 . Then find a subsequence $\{f_{n_{k_2}}\} \subset \{f_{n_{k_1}}\}$ which converges for x_2 . Continue the process until every x .

Proof

For each $x_i \in E$, let $\{x_i\}$. For x_1 , $\{f_n(x_1)\}$ is piecewise bounded so there exists a subsequence $\{f_{1,k}(x_1)\}$ which converges as $k \rightarrow \infty$.
 Since $\{f_{1,k}\}$ is piecewise bounded since $\{f_{1,k}\} \subset \{f_n\}$, then there is a subsequence $\{f_{2,k}\} \subset \{f_{1,k}\}$ such that $\{f_{2,k}(x_2)\}$ converges as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Then continuing the pattern:

$$\begin{array}{lllll} S_1: & f_{1,1} & f_{1,2} & f_{1,3} & \dots \\ S_2: & f_{2,1} & f_{2,2} & f_{2,3} & \dots \\ S_3: & f_{3,1} & f_{3,2} & f_{3,3} & \dots \\ & \dots & & & \end{array}$$

 Thus, $\{f_{n,n}(x_i)\}$ converges as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for every $x_i \in E$.

Theorem 14.6.4: Uniform convergent $\{f_n\}$ where $f_n \in \mathcal{C}(K)$ is equicontinuous

If K is a compact metric space where $f_n \in \mathcal{C}(K)$ and $\{f_n\}$ converges uniformly on K , then $\{f_n\}$ is equicontinuous on K .

Intuition

Since $\{f_n\}$ converges uniformly, then there is a N where for $n > N$, then $|f_n - f_N| < \epsilon$. Since $\{f_n\}$ is continuous over compact K , then $\{f_n\}$ is uniformly continuous. So for $d(x,y) < \delta$, then:

$$|f_n(x) - f_n(y)| \leq |f_n(x) - f_N(x)| + |f_N(x) - f_N(y)| + |f_N(y) - f_n(y)| < 3\epsilon$$

Proof

Since $\{f_n\}$ converges uniformly, then for $\epsilon > 0$, there is a N such that for $n > N$:

$$||f_n - f_N|| < \frac{\epsilon}{3}$$

Since f_i for $i \in [1, N]$ is continuous over compact K , then f_i is uniformly continuous so there is a $\delta > 0$ such that for all x, y where $d(x, y) < \delta$, then $|f_i(x) - f_i(y)| < \frac{\epsilon}{3}$.

Then for $n > N$ and $d(x, y) < \delta$:

$$|f_n(x) - f_n(y)| \leq |f_n(x) - f_N(x)| + |f_N(x) - f_N(y)| + |f_N(y) - f_n(y)| < \epsilon$$

Thus, for $\epsilon > 0$, there is a $\delta > 0$ such that for all f_n and $x, y \in K$ where $d(x, y) < \delta$, $|f_n(x) - f_n(y)| < \epsilon$. So, $\{f_n\}$ is equicontinuous.

Theorem 14.6.5: Pointwise bounded and equicontinuous $\{f_n\}$ over compact K is uniformly bounded and have uniformly convergent $\{f_{n_k}\}$

If K is compact where $\{f_n\} \in \mathcal{C}(K)$ is pointwise bounded and equicontinuous:

- (a) $\{f_n\}$ is uniformly bounded on K
- (b) $\{f_n\}$ contains a uniformly convergent subsequence

Intuition

Since $\{f_n\}$ is equicontinuous, for $d(x, y) < \delta$, then $|f_n(x) - f_n(y)| < \epsilon$.

Since $\{f_n\}$ is pointwise bounded on compact K , there are finite x_0, \dots, x_n such that $d(x, x_i) < \delta$ so $|f_n(x)| \leq |f_n(x) - f_n(x_i)| + |f_n(x_i)| < \epsilon + M$.

For a countable dense subset of K , the countability gives a convergent subsequence $\{g_n\}$ and the dense gives $d(x, x_i) < \delta$ for finite x_1, \dots, x_m so:

$$|g_n(x) - g_m(y)| \leq |g_n(x) - g_n(x_i)| + |g_n(x_i) - g_m(x_i)| + |g_m(x_i) - g_m(x)| < \epsilon.$$

Proof

Since f_n is equicontinuous, then for $\epsilon > 0$, there is a $\delta > 0$ such that for $x, y \in K$ where $d(x, y) < \delta$, then $|f_n(x) - f_n(y)| < \epsilon$.

Since K is compact, there are finite $p_1, \dots, p_r \in K$ so for any $x \in K$, there is at least one p_i so $d(x, p_i) < \delta$. Since $\{f_i\}$ is pointwise bounded, there is a M_i so $|f_n(p_i)| < M_i$. Let $M = \max(M_1, \dots, M_r)$. So, $|f_n(x)| < |f_n(x) - f_n(p_i)| + |f_n(p_i)| < \epsilon + M_i < \epsilon + M$.

Thus, $\{f_n\}$ is uniformly bounded on K .

Let countable dense $E \subset K$. By **theorem 14.6.3**, $\{f_n\}$ has a convergent subsequence $\{f_{n_i}(x)\}$ for every $x \in E$. Let $V(x, \delta) = \{y \in K : d(x, y) < \delta\}$ so $|f_n(x) - f_n(y)| < \frac{\epsilon}{3}$.

Since E is dense in compact K , there are finitely many $x_1, \dots, x_m \in E$ such that:

$$K \subset V(x_1, \delta) \cup \dots \cup V(x_m, \delta).$$

Since $\{f_{n_i}(x)\}$ converges for every $x \in E$, there is a N where for $n_i, n_j \geq N$, $s \in [1, m]$:

$$|f_{n_i}(x_s) - f_{n_j}(x_s)| < \frac{\epsilon}{3}$$

Thus, for any $x \in K$, there is a $x_s \in E$ such that:

$$|f_{n_i}(x) - f_{n_j}(x)| \leq |f_{n_i}(x) - f_{n_i}(x_s)| + |f_{n_i}(x_s) - f_{n_j}(x_s)| + |f_{n_j}(x_s) - f_{n_j}(x)| < \epsilon$$

Thus, $\{f_n\}$ contains a subsequence that uniformly converges.

14.7 Stone-Weierstrass Theorem

Theorem 14.7.1: There are polynomials that converge uniformly to continuous f

For complex continuous f on $[a,b]$, there is a sequence of polynomials $\{P_n\}$ that converges uniformly to $f(x)$.

Proof

Let $[a,b] = [0,1]$ where $f(0) = f(1) = 0$ and $f(x) = 0$ if $x \notin [0,1]$.

Thus, f is uniformly continuous over \mathbb{R} .

Let $Q_n(x) = c_n(1-x^2)^n$ where c_n is chosen so $\int_{-1}^1 Q_n(x) dx = 1$. Since:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-1}^1 (1-x^2)^n dx &= 2 \int_0^1 (1-x^2)^n dx \geq 2 \int_0^{\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}} (1-x^2)^n dx \geq 2 \int_0^{\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}} 1 - nx^2 dx \\ &= \frac{4}{3\sqrt{n}} > \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \end{aligned}$$

so $c_n < \sqrt{n}$. Thus for $\delta > 0$, $Q_n(x) \leq \sqrt{n}(1-\delta^2)^n$ so $Q_n \rightarrow 0$ on $|x| \in [\delta, 1]$.

Let $P_n(x) = \int_{-1}^1 f(x+t)Q_n(t) dt$ for $x \in [0,1]$. Since $P_n(x) = \int_{-x}^{1-x} f(x+t)Q_n(t) dt = \int_0^1 f(t)Q_n(t-x) dt$ which is a polynomial so $\{P_n\}$ is a sequence of polynomials.

Since f is uniformly continuous, for $\epsilon > 0$, there is a $\delta > 0$ such that for $|y-x| < \delta$, then $|f(y) - f(x)| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. Let $M = \sup(|f(x)|)$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned} |P_n(x) - f(x)| &\leq \int_{-1}^1 |f(x+t) - f(x)|Q_n(t) dt \\ &\leq 2M \int_{-1}^{-\delta} Q_n(t) dt + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \int_{-\delta}^{\delta} Q_n(t) dt + 2M \int_{\delta}^1 Q_n(t) dt \\ &\leq 4M\sqrt{n}(1-\delta^2)^n + \frac{\epsilon}{2} < \epsilon \quad \text{for a large enough } n \end{aligned}$$

Corollary 14.7.2: There are polynomials that converges uniformly to $|x|$

For $[-a,a]$, there is a sequence of real polynomials P_n such that $P_n(0) = 0$ and $P_n(x)$ converges uniformly to $|x|$.

Proof

By Theorem 14.7.1, there is a $\{P_n^*\}$ of real polynomials that converges uniformly to $|x|$. Since $P_n^*(0) \rightarrow |0| = 0$, let $P_n(x) = P_n^*(x) - P_n^*(0)$.

Definition 14.7.3: Algebra, Uniformly Closed, and Uniform Closure

A family of complex functions on E , \mathcal{A} , is an **algebra** if for $f, g \in \mathcal{A}$, then:

- (a) $f+g \in \mathcal{A}$
- (b) $fg \in \mathcal{A}$
- (c) $cf \in \mathcal{A}$ for complex constant c

\mathcal{A} is **uniformly closed** if:

For any $f_n \in \mathcal{A}$ where f_n uniformly converges to f , then $f \in \mathcal{A}$

Let the **uniform closure**, \mathcal{B} , be the set of all uniformly convergent f from \mathcal{A} .

Theorem 14.7.4: Bounded algebra implies Uniformly closed uniform closure

For algebra \mathcal{A} of bounded functions, \mathcal{B} is a uniformly closed algebra.

Proof

If $f, g \in \mathcal{B}$, there are uniformly convergent $\{f_n\}, \{g_n\}$ where $f_n \rightarrow f$, $g_n \rightarrow g$ and $f_n, g_n \in \mathcal{A}$. Since f_n, g_n are bounded and \mathcal{A} is an algebra, then uniformly convergent:

$$f_n + g_n \rightarrow f+g \quad f_n g_n \rightarrow fg \quad cf_n \rightarrow cf$$

Thus, $f + g, fg, cf \in \mathcal{B}$ so \mathcal{B} is a uniformly closed algebra.

Definition 14.7.5: Separate Points

For family of functions, \mathcal{A} , **separate points** on E:

If for every pair of distinct $x_1, x_2 \in E$, there is a $f \in \mathcal{A}$ where $f(x_1) \neq f(x_2)$.

\mathcal{A} **vanishes at no point** of E:

If for each $x \in E$, there is a $g \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $g(x) \neq 0$

Theorem 14.7.6: Non-vanishing, separate algebra contain all values

Suppose algebra \mathcal{A} separates points and vanishes at no points on E. If x_1, x_2 are distinct points, then for constants c_1, c_2 , there is a $f \in \mathcal{A}$ where:

$$f(x_1) = c_1 \text{ and } f(x_2) = c_2.$$

Proof

Since \mathcal{A} separates points and vanishes at no points on E, then there are $g, h, k \in \mathcal{A}$:

$$g(x_1) \neq g(x_2) \quad h(x_1) \neq 0 \quad k(x_2) \neq 0$$

Let $u = k(g - g(x_1))$ and $v = h(g - g(x_2))$ so $u, v \in \mathcal{A}$ where $u(x_1) = v(x_2) = 0$ and $u(x_2), v(x_1) \neq 0$. Then, $f = \frac{c_1 v}{v(x_1)} + \frac{c_2 u}{u(x_2)}$ have $f(x_1) = c_1$ and $f(x_2) = c_2$.

Theorem 14.7.7: Stone-Weierstrass Theorem

If algebra of real continuous functions on compact K, \mathcal{A} , separates points and vanishes at no points on K, then \mathcal{B} consist of all real continuous functions.

Proof

Claim: If $f \in \mathcal{B}$, then $|f| \in \mathcal{B}$.

Let $a = \sup(|f(x)|)$. By **Corollary 14.7.2**, for $\epsilon > 0$, there are c_1, \dots, c_n such that:

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^n c_i y^i - |y| \right| < \epsilon \quad \text{for } y \in [-a, a]$$

Since \mathcal{B} is an algebra, then $g = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i f^i \in \mathcal{B}$. Thus:

$$|g(x) - |f(x)|| < \epsilon \quad \text{for } x \in K$$

Since \mathcal{B} is uniformly closed, then $|f(x)| \in \mathcal{B}$.

Claim: If $f, g \in \mathcal{B}$, then $\min(f, g), \max(f, g) \in \mathcal{B}$.

Since:

$$\max(f, g) = \frac{f+g}{2} + \frac{|f-g|}{2} \quad \min(f, g) = \frac{f+g}{2} - \frac{|f-g|}{2}$$

then $\max(f, g), \min(f, g) \in \mathcal{B}$.

Claim: For real, continuous f on K and $\epsilon > 0$, there exist $g_x \in \mathcal{B}$ where $g_x(x) = f(x)$ and $g_x(t) > f(t) - \epsilon$ for $t \in K$.

Since $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}$ where \mathcal{A} separates points and vanishes at no points on E, then \mathcal{B} is the same.

Then by **theorem 14.7.6**, for $y \in K$, there is a $h_y \in \mathcal{B}$ where:

$$h_y(x) = f(x) \quad h_y(y) = f(y)$$

Since h_y is continuous, there is an open set J_y such that $h_y(t) > f(t) - \epsilon$ for $t \in J_y$.

Since K is compact, there are finite y_1, \dots, y_n such that $K \subset J_{y_1} \cup \dots \cup J_{y_n}$.

Let $g_x = \max(h_{y_1}, \dots, h_{y_n})$ so $g_x \in \mathcal{B}$ where $g_x(t) > f(t) - \epsilon$ for $t \in K$.

Claim: For real, continuous f on K and $\epsilon > 0$, there is a $h \in \mathcal{B}$ where $|h(x) - f(x)| < \epsilon$.

Since g_x is continuous, there is an open set V_x where $g_x(t) < f(t) + \epsilon$ for $t \in V_x$.

Since K is compact, there are finite x_1, \dots, x_m such that $K \subset V_{x_1} \cup \dots \cup V_{x_m}$.

Let $h = \min(g_{x_1}, \dots, g_{x_m})$ so $h \in \mathcal{B}$ where $h(t) > f(t) - \epsilon$. But, $h(t) < f(t) + \epsilon$ so $|h(x) - f(x)| < \epsilon$. Since \mathcal{B} is uniformly closed, then the theorem holds true.

Definition 14.7.8: Self-Adjoint

\mathcal{A} is **self-adjoint** if for every $f \in \mathcal{A}$, then $\overline{f} \in \mathcal{A}$

Theorem 14.7.9: Stone-Weierstrass for complex functions

If self-adjoint algebra of complex continuous functions on compact K , \mathcal{A} , separates points and vanishes at no points on K , then \mathcal{B} consist of all complex continuous functions on K . In other words, \mathcal{A} is dense in $\mathcal{C}(K)$.

Proof

Let \mathcal{A}_R be the set of all real functions on K in \mathcal{A} .

If $f \in \mathcal{A}$ and $f = u + iv$ for real u, v then $2u = f + \overline{f} \in \mathcal{A}_R$.

If $x_1 \neq x_2$, there exists $f \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $f(x_1) = 1$ and $f(x_2) = 0$ so $u(x_1) \neq u(x_2)$ so \mathcal{A}_R separates points.

If $x \in K$, then $g(x) \neq 0$ for some $g \in \mathcal{A}$ and there is a complex λ such that $\lambda g(x) > 0$. If $f = \lambda g$, then $u(x) > 0$ so \mathcal{A}_R vanishes at no point of K .

Then by **theorem 14.7.7**, every real continuous function on K lies in $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{A}_R}$ and since $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{A}_R} \subset \mathcal{B}$, then every real continuous function lies in \mathcal{B} . If f is complex continuous where $f = u + iv$, then $f \in \mathcal{B}$ since $u, v \in \mathcal{B}$.

15 Special Functions

15.1 Power Series

Definition 15.1.1: Analytic Functions

Power series: $f(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n(x-a)^n$

If $f(x)$ converges for $|x-a| < R$ for some R , then f is expanded in a power series about a .

Theorem 15.1.2: Convergent Power Series are differentiable

If $f(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n x^n$ converges for $|x| < R$, then $f(x)$ converges uniformly on $[-R+\epsilon, R-\epsilon]$ for any $\epsilon > 0$.

Then, f is continuous and differentiable in $(-R, R)$ where:

$$f'(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n c_n x^{n-1}$$

Proof

For $\epsilon > 0$ and $|x| \leq R - \epsilon$:

$$|c_n x^n| \leq |c_n| (R - \epsilon)^n$$

Since $\sum c_n (R - \epsilon)^n$ converges absolutely in $[-R + \epsilon, R - \epsilon]$, then $f(x)$ uniformly converges on $[-R + \epsilon, R - \epsilon]$.

Since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt[n]{n} = 1$, then:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup(\sqrt[n]{n|c_n|}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup(\sqrt[n]{|c_n|})$$

so $f(x)$ and $f'(x)$ have the same interval of convergence so $f'(x)$ uniformly converges on $[-R + \epsilon, R - \epsilon]$. Since $f'(x)$ exists, then f is differentiable and thus, continuous.

Corollary 15.1.3: Power Series have infinite derivatives

On $(-R, R)$, f has derivatives of all orders:

$$f^{(k)}(x) = \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} n(n-1)\dots(n-k+1)c_n x^{n-k}$$

$$f^{(k)}(0) = k!c_k$$

Proof

By theorem 15.1.2, apply derivative k times.

Theorem 15.1.4: Continuity of Power Series at endpoints

Suppose $\sum c_n$ converges where $f(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n x^n$ for $x \in (-1, 1)$.

Then $\lim_{x \rightarrow 1} f(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n$.

Proof

Let $s_n = c_0 + \dots + c_n$.

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=0}^m c_n x^n &= \sum_{n=0}^m (s_n - s_{n-1})x^n = \sum_{n=0}^m s_n x^n - \sum_{n=0}^m s_{n-1} x^n \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^m s_n x^n - \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} s_n x^{n+1} = (1-x) \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} s_n x^n + s_m x^m \end{aligned}$$

Since $|x| < 1$, then as $m \rightarrow \infty$, then $s_m x^m \rightarrow 0$. Let $s = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n$.

Thus, for $\epsilon > 0$, there is a N such that for $n > N$, then $|s - s_n| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$.

Since $(1-x) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} x^n = (1-x) \frac{1}{1-x} = 1$, then:

$$|f(x) - s| = |(1-x) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (s_n - s)x^n| \leq (1-x) \sum_{n=0}^N |s_n - s| |x|^n + \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$

Then choose $\delta > 0$ such that $(1-x) \sum_{n=0}^N |s_n - s| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ for $x > 1 - \delta$. Thus:

$$|\lim_{x \rightarrow 1} f(x) - s| < \epsilon$$

Corollary 15.1.5: Cauchy Product

If $\sum a_n \rightarrow A$, $\sum b_n \rightarrow B$, and $\sum c_n \rightarrow C$ where $c_n = \sum_{k=0}^n a_k b_{n-k}$, then:
 $C = AB$

Proof

For $x \in (0,1)$, let:

$$f(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n x^n \quad g(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} b_n x^n \quad h(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n x^n$$

Then f, g, h absolutely converges. Note $fg = h$.

By **theorem 15.1.4**, then $AB = \lim_{x \rightarrow 1} f(x)g(x) = \lim_{x \rightarrow 1} h(x) = C$.

Theorem 15.1.6: $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_{i,j} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_{i,j}$

Suppose $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |a_{i,j}| = b_i$ where $\sum b_i$ converges, then:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_{i,j} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_{i,j}$$

Proof

Let countable set E contain points x_n where $x_n \rightarrow x_0$. Let:

$$f_i(x_n) = \sum_{j=1}^n a_{i,j} \quad f_i(x_0) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_{i,j} \quad g(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} f_i(x)$$

Thus, each f_i is continuous at x_0 . Since $|f_i(x)| \leq b_i$, then $g(x)$ converges uniformly so g is continuous at x_0 . Thus:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_{i,j} &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} f_i(x_0) = g(x_0) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g(x_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} f_i(x_n) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_{i,j} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_{i,j} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_{i,j} \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 15.1.7: Extension to Taylor's Theorem

If $f(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n x^n$ converges for $|x| < R$ where $a \in (-R, R)$, then f is expanded in a power series about $x = a$ which converges in $|x - a| < R - |a|$ where:

$$f(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{f^{(n)}(a)}{n!} (x - a)^n$$

Proof

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n [(x - a) + a]^n = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n \sum_{m=0}^n \binom{n}{m} a^{n-m} (x - a)^m \\ &= \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \left[\sum_{n=m}^{\infty} \binom{n}{m} c_n a^{n-m} \right] (x - a)^m \end{aligned}$$

Then by **corollary 15.1.3**, $\sum_{n=m}^{\infty} \binom{n}{m} c_n a^{n-m} = \frac{f^{(m)}(a)}{m!}$ so $f(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{f^{(n)}(a)}{n!} (x - a)^n$.

Theorem 15.1.8: Equivalent Power Series have the same coefficients

If $\sum a_n x^n, \sum b_n x^n$ converge in $S = (-R, R)$, let E be the set of all $x \in S$ where $\sum a_n x^n = \sum b_n x^n$. If E has a limit point in S , then $a_n = b_n$ for all n .

Proof

Let $c_n = a_n - b_n$ and $f(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n x^n$. Then $f(x) = 0$ on E .

Let $A = E'$ and $B = S \setminus E'$. Thus, B is open. If $x_0 \in A$, then:

$$f(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} d_n (x - x_0)^n \quad |x - x_0| < R - |x_0|$$

Suppose $d_n \neq 0$ for some n . Let k be the smallest integer where $d_k \neq 0$. Then:

$$f(x) = (x - x_0)^k g(x) \quad |x - x_0| < R - |x_0| \text{ and } g(x) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} d_{k+m} (x - x_0)^m$$

Since g is continuous at x_0 and $g(x_0) = d_k \neq 0$, there is a $\delta > 0$ such that $g(x) \neq 0$ for $|x - x_0| < \delta$. Thus, $f(x) \neq 0$ if $|x - x_0| < \delta$ which contradicts that x_0 is a limit point of E . Thus, $d_n = 0$ for all n so $f(x) = 0$ for all x so A is open. Thus, A and B are disjoint and thus, are separated. Since $S = A \cup B$ and S is connected, then either A or B is empty. Since A cannot be empty, then B is empty so $A = S$. Since f is continuous in S , then $A \subset S$ so $E = S$ so $c_n = 0$ for all n .

15.2 Exponential and Logarithmic Functions

Definition 15.2.1: Exponential Function

Define $E(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{x^n}{n!}$ for $x \in \mathbb{C}$.

By the ratio test:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup(|\frac{a_{n+1}}{a_n}|) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup(|\frac{\frac{z^{n+1}}{(n+1)!}}{\frac{z^n}{n!}}|) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup(|\frac{z}{n+1}|) = 0 < 1$$

Thus, $E(x)$ converges. Then by [corollary 15.1.5](#):

$$\begin{aligned} E(x)E(y) &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{x^n}{n!} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{y^m}{m!} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{x^k y^{n-k}}{k!(n-k)!} \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} x^k y^{n-k} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(x+y)^n}{n!} = E(x+y) \end{aligned}$$

As a result, $E(x)E(-x) = E(0) = 1$. As a consequence:

- (a) $E(x) \neq 0$ for all x
- (b) If $x > 0$, then $E(x) > 0$ and thus, $E(x) > 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$
- (c) $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} E(x) \rightarrow \infty$ so $\lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} E(x) \rightarrow 0$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$
- (d) For $0 < x < y$, $E(x) < E(y)$ so $E(-y) = \frac{1}{E(y)} < \frac{1}{E(x)} = E(-x)$ so $E(x)$ is strictly increasing on \mathbb{R}
- (e) $E'(x) = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{E(x+h) - E(x)}{h} = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{E(x)E(h) - E(x)}{h}$
 $= E(x) \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{E(h) - 1}{h} = E(x) (\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{E(h)}{h} - \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h})$
 $= E(x) (\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h} + 1 - \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h}) = E(x)$
- (f) For $n > 0 \in \mathbb{Z}$:
 $E(n) = \underbrace{E(1) \dots E(1)}_n = e^n$

For $p = \frac{n}{m} > 0 \in \mathbb{Q}$:

$$[E(p)]^m = E(mp) = E(n) = e^n \text{ so } E(p) = e^{n/m} = e^p$$

Since $E(-p) = \frac{1}{E(p)} = e^{-p}$, then $E(p) = e^p$ hold for all $p \in \mathbb{Q}$.

For $x \in \mathbb{R}$, let $e^x = \sup_{x > p} (e^p)$ for $p \in \mathbb{Q}$. Since $E(x)$ is continuous and monotonically increasing, for every $\epsilon > 0$, there is a $\delta > 0$ where $|x - p| < \delta$, then $|\sup_{x > p} (e^p) - e^p|$

$< \epsilon$. Thus:

$$e^x = \sup_{x > p} (e^p) = \lim_{p \rightarrow x} E(p) = E(x).$$

Theorem 15.2.2: Properties of e^x

- (a) e^x is continuous and differentiable for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$
- (b) $(e^x)' = e^x$
- (c) e^x is strictly increasing where $e^x > 0$
- (d) $e^{x+y} = e^x e^y$
- (e) $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} e^x = \infty$ and $\lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} e^x = 0$
- (f) $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} x^n e^{-x} = 0$ for every $n > 0$

Proof

Part (a) is proved by convergent power series while parts (c) to (e) is proved by properties of $E(x)$ above. Since $e^x > \frac{x^{n+1}}{(n+1)!}$ for $x > 0$ and every $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, then:

$$0 \leq \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} x^n e^{-x} < \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(n+1)!}{x} = 0$$

Thus, $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} x^n e^{-x} = 0$ for every $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Since $x^n e^{-x}$ is continuous and $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ is dense in \mathbb{R}_+ , then $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} x^n e^{-x} = 0$ for every $n > 0$.

Definition 15.2.3: Logarithmic Function

Since $y = E(x)$ is strictly increasing on \mathbb{R} , then $E(x)$ is injective and thus, there exist an inverse function $L(y)$ which is also strictly increasing. Since $E(x)$ is differentiable, then $L(y)$ is also differentiable. Then:

$$E(L(y)) = y \quad \text{where } y > 0$$

$$L(E(x)) = x \quad \text{where } x \in \mathbb{R}$$

Then:

$$L'(E(x))E'(x) = L'(y)E'(x) = L'(y)y = 1 \quad \Rightarrow \quad L'(y) = \frac{1}{y}$$

Since for $x = 0$ have $y = E(0) = 1$, then $L(1) = 0$. Thus:

$$L(y) = \int_1^y L'(t) dt = \int_1^y \frac{1}{t} dt$$

As a consequence:

(a) Let $y_1 = E(x_1)$ and $y_2 = E(x_2)$, then:

$$L(y_1 y_2) = L(E(x_1)E(x_2)) = L(E(x_1 + x_2)) = x_1 + x_2 = L(y_1) + L(y_2)$$

(b) Let $\log(y) = L(y)$. Then:

$$\text{Since } \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} E(x) = \infty, \text{ then } \lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} L(y) = \infty.$$

$$\text{Since } \lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} E(x) = 0, \text{ then } \lim_{y \rightarrow 0} L(y) = -\infty.$$

(c) For $n \in \mathbb{Z}$:

$$\text{If } n \geq 0, E(nL(y)) = E(\underbrace{L(y) + \dots + L(y)}_n) = E(L(y^n)) = y^n$$

$$\text{If } n < 0, E(nL(y)) = E(-\underbrace{(L(y) + \dots + L(y))}_{-n}) = [E(L(y^{-n}))]^{-1} = y^n$$

For $p = \frac{a}{b} \in \mathbb{Q}$ where $b > 0$, let $t^b = y$:

$$\begin{aligned} E(pL(y)) &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\frac{a}{b}L(y))^n}{n!} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\frac{a}{b}L(t^b))^n}{n!} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\frac{a}{b}bL(t))^n}{n!} \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(aL(t))^n}{n!} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(L(t^a))^n}{n!} = t^a = y^{\frac{a}{b}} = y^p \end{aligned}$$

For $c \in \mathbb{R}$, let $y^c = \sup_{c > p} E(pL(y))$. Since $E(x), L(y)$ are continuous and monoton-

ically increasing, then for every $\epsilon > 0$, there is a $\delta > 0$ where $|c - p| < \delta$, then $|\sup_{c > p} (E(pL(y)) - E(pL(y)))| < \epsilon$. Thus:

$$y^c = \sup_{c > p} E(pL(y)) = \lim_{p \rightarrow c} E(pL(y)) = E(cL(y))$$

(d) For $y \in \mathbb{C}$ and $c \neq 0 \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$(y^c)' = E'(cL(y))cL'(y) = E(cL(y))c\frac{1}{y} = y^c c \frac{1}{y} = cy^{c-1}$$

Thus:

$$\text{If } c \neq -1, \text{ then } \int y^c dy = \int \frac{1}{c+1} (y^{c+1})' dy = \frac{1}{c+1} y^{c+1}$$

$$\text{If } c = -1, \text{ then } \int y^{-1} dy = \int L'(y) dy = L(y) = \log(y)$$

(e) $\lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} y^{-c} \log(y) = 0$ for every $c > 0$

For $\epsilon \in (0, c)$ and $y > 1$:

$$y^{-c} \log(y) = y^{-c} \int_1^y t^{-1} dt < y^{-c} \int_1^y t^{\epsilon-1} dt = y^{-c} \frac{y^{\epsilon}-1}{\epsilon} < \frac{1}{y^{c-\epsilon}}$$

$$0 \leq \lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} y^{-c} \log(y) < \lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{y^{c-\epsilon}} = 0$$

15.3 Trigonometric Function

Definition 15.3.1: Trigonometric Function

Define for $x \in \mathbb{C}$:

$$C(x) = \frac{1}{2}[E(ix) + E(-ix)] \quad S(x) = \frac{1}{2i}[E(ix) - E(-ix)]$$

Since $E(\bar{x}) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\bar{x}^n}{n!} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\overline{x^n}}{n!} = \overline{\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{x^n}{n!}} = \overline{E(x)}$, then for $x \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$C(x), S(x) \in \mathbb{R}$$

Also, $E(ix) = C(x) + iS(x)$. Then:

$$(a) |E(ix)|^2 = E(ix)\overline{E(ix)} = E(ix)E(-ix) = E(0) = 1 \text{ so } |E(ix)| = 1$$

$$(b) C(0) = \frac{1}{2}[E(0) + E(0)] = 1$$

$$S(0) = \frac{1}{2i}[E(0) - E(0)] = 0$$

$$(c) C'(x) = \frac{1}{2}[E'(ix)i + E'(-ix)(-i)] = \frac{1}{2}[E(ix)i - E(-ix)i] = -S(x)$$

$$S'(x) = \frac{1}{2i}[E'(ix)i - E'(-ix)(-i)] = \frac{1}{2i}[E(ix)i + E(-ix)i] = C(x)$$

$$(d) \text{ There exists positive numbers such that } C(x) = 0.$$

If the claim is false, since C is continuous and $C(0) = 1$, then $S'(x) = C(x) > 0$. Then $S(x)$ is strictly increasing and since $S(0) = 0$, then $S(x) > 0$ for $x > 0$.

Then for $0 < x < y$:

$$\begin{aligned} S(x)(y-x) &< \int_x^y S(t) dt = \int_x^y -C'(t) dt = C(x) - C(y) \\ &\leq |C(x) - C(y)| \leq |C(x)| + |C(y)| = 2 \end{aligned}$$

But if $S(x) > 0$, then $S(x)(y-x) \not\leq 2$ for a large enough y for any $S(x)$. Thus by contradiction, there are positive numbers where $C(x) = 0$.

Since the set of zeros of a continuous function is closed, there exists a smallest positive number x_0 such that $C(x_0) = 0$. Let $\pi = 2x_0$.

Then, $C(\frac{\pi}{2}) = C(x_0) = 0$ and since $|E(ix)| = |C(x) + iS(x)| = 1$, then $S(\frac{\pi}{2}) = \pm 1$. Since $C(x)$ is continuous where $C(0) = 1$ and $C(\frac{\pi}{2}) = 0$, then $S'(x) = C(x) > 0$ for $x \in (0, \frac{\pi}{2})$ where $S(0) = 0$ so $S(\frac{\pi}{2}) = 1$. Thus, $E(\frac{\pi}{2}i) = C(\frac{\pi}{2}) + iS(\frac{\pi}{2}) = 0 + i1 = i$. Then:

$$-1 = i^2 = E(\frac{\pi}{2}i)E(\frac{\pi}{2}i) = E(\frac{\pi}{2}i + \frac{\pi}{2}i) = E(\pi i)$$

$$1 = (-1)^2 = E(\pi i)E(\pi i) = E(\pi i + \pi i) = E(2\pi i)$$

$$E(z) = E(z)1 = E(z)E(2\pi i) = E(z+2\pi i)$$

Theorem 15.3.2: Properties of $C(x)$ and $S(x)$

$$(a) E \text{ is periodic with period } 2\pi i$$

Proof

$$\text{Since } E(z) = E(z+2\pi i), E \text{ has period } 2\pi i.$$

$$(b) C(x) \text{ and } S(x) \text{ are periodic with period } 2\pi$$

Proof

$$\text{Since } C(x) = \frac{1}{2}[E(ix) + E(-ix)] \text{ and } S(x) = \frac{1}{2i}[E(ix) - E(-ix)] \text{ where } E(x) \text{ have period } 2\pi i \text{ so } C(x) \text{ and } S(x) \text{ have period } 2\pi.$$

$$(c) \text{ If } t \in (0, 2\pi), \text{ then } E(it) \neq 1$$

Proof

$$\text{If } t \in (0, \frac{\pi}{2}) \text{ where } E(it) = x + iy, \text{ then } x, y \in (0, 1).$$

$$\text{Note } E(4it) = [E(it)]^4 = (x + iy)^4 = x^4 - 6x^2y^2 + y^4 + 4ixy(x^2 - y^2).$$

$$\text{If } E(4it) \text{ is real, then } x^2 - y^2 = 0. \text{ Thus, since } |E(ix)| = 1, \text{ then } x^2 + y^2 = 1 \text{ so } x^2 = y^2 = \frac{1}{2} \text{ and thus, } E(4it) = -1 \neq 1.$$

- (d) For $z \in \mathbb{C}$ where $|z| = 1$, there is a unique $t \in [0, 2\pi)$ such that $E(it) = z$

Proof

By part (c), for $0 \leq t_1 < t_2 < 2\pi$:

$$E(it_2)[E(it_1)]^{-1} = E(it_2)[E(-it_1)] = E(it_2 - it_1) \neq 1$$

Thus, $t \in [0, 2\pi)$ must be unique. Let fixed $z = x + iy$ where $|z| = 1$.

For $x, y \geq 0$, since $C(x)$ decreases from 1 to 0 on $[0, \frac{\pi}{2}]$, then $C(t) = x$ for some $t \in [0, \frac{\pi}{2}]$. Since $|E(it)| = C(t)^2 + S(t)^2 = 1$ and $x^2 + y^2 = 1$, then $S(t) = y$ so $E(it) = x + yi = z$.

If $x < 0, y \geq 0$, fix $-iz$ instead of z and thus, $E(it) = -iz$ for some $t \in [0, \frac{\pi}{2}]$.

Since $E(\frac{\pi}{2}i) = i$, then $z = -iz(i) = E(it)E(\frac{\pi}{2}i) = E(i(t + \frac{\pi}{2}))$.

If $x, y < 0$, fix $-z$ instead of z and thus, $E(it) = -z$ for some $t \in [0, \frac{\pi}{2}]$.

Since $E(\pi i) = -1$, then $z = -z(-1) = E(it)E(\pi i) = E(i(t + \pi))$.

If $x \geq 0, y < 0$, fix iz instead of z and thus, $E(it) = iz$ for some $t \in [0, \frac{\pi}{2}]$.

Then $z = iz(-1)(i) = E(it)E(\pi i)E(\frac{\pi}{2}i) = E(i(t + \frac{3\pi}{2}))$.

Definition 15.3.3: Unit Curve

Let $\gamma(t) = E(it)$ for $t \in [0, 2\pi]$.

By **theorem 15.3.2(d)** and $E(z) = E(z + 2\pi i)$, then $\gamma(t)$ is a simple closed curve whose range is the unit circle. Since $\gamma'(t) = iE'(it) = iE(it)$, the length of γ :

$$\Lambda(\gamma) = \int_0^{2\pi} |\gamma'(t)| dt = 2\pi$$

Thus, $\pi = 2x_0$ defined earlier have the same geometric significance as π . Then consider the triangle with vertices at:

$$z_1 = 0 \quad z_2 = C(t_0) \quad z_3 = \gamma(t_0) = (C(t_0), S(t_0))$$

Thus, $C(t) = \cos(t)$ and $S(t) = \sin(t)$.

15.4 Algebraic Completeness of the Complex Field

Theorem 15.4.1: Every complex polynomial has a complex root

For $a_0, \dots, a_n \neq 0 \in \mathbb{C}$ where $n \geq 1$, let $P(z) = \sum_{k=0}^n a_k z^k$.

Then $P(z) = 0$ for some $z \in \mathbb{C}$.

Proof

Assume $a_n = 1$. Let $\mu = \inf(|P(z)|)$. If $|z| = R$, then:

$$|P(z)| \geq R^n(1 - |a_{n-1}|R^{-1} - \dots - |a_0|R^{-n})$$

Thus, $\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} |P(z)| = \infty$ so there is a R_0 such that $|R(z)| > \mu$ if $|z| > R_0$.

Since $|P|$ is continuous, then for a closed $N_{R_0}(0)$, by the Extreme Value Theorem:

$$|P(z_0)| = \mu \quad \text{for some } z_0$$

Suppose $\mu \neq 0$. Let polynomial $Q(z) = \frac{P(z+z_0)}{P(z_0)}$ where $Q(0) = 1$, $Q(z) \geq 1$ for all z .

Then there is a smallest integer $k \leq n$ so $b_k \neq 0$ so $Q(z) = 1 + b_k z^k + \dots + b_n z^n$.

By **theorem 15.3.2(d)**, there is a $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $e^{ik\theta} b_k = -|b_k|$.

If $r > 0$ and $r^k |b_k| < 1$, then $|1 + b_k r^k e^{ik\theta}| = 1 - r^k |b_k|$. Thus:

$$\begin{aligned} |Q(re^{i\theta})| &= |1 + b_k r^k e^{ik\theta} + b_{k+1} r^{k+1} e^{i(k+1)\theta} + \dots + b_n r^n e^{in\theta}| \\ &\leq |1 + b_k r^k e^{ik\theta}| + |b_{k+1} r^{k+1} e^{i(k+1)\theta}| + \dots + |b_n r^n e^{in\theta}| \\ &= 1 - r^k |b_k| + r^{k+1} |b_{k+1}| + \dots + r^n |b_n| = 1 - r^k (|b_k| - r |b_{k+1}| - \dots - r^{n-k} |b_n|) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for a sufficiently small r , $|Q(re^{i\theta})| < 1$ which contradicts $Q(z) \geq 1$ for all z .

Thus, $\mu = 0$ so there is a z_0 such that $|P(z_0)| = \mu = 0$ so $P(z_0) = 0$.

15.5 Fourier Series

Definition 15.5.1: Trigonometric Polynomial

A **trigonometric polynomial** is a finite sum where for $x \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$f(x) = a_0 + \sum_{n=1}^N [a_n \cos(nx) + b_n \sin(nx)] = \sum_{n=-N}^N c_n e^{inx}$$

A **trigonometric series** is then:

$$f(x) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} c_n e^{inx}$$

Thus:

(a) $f(x)$ has period of 2π

(b) Since $(\frac{1}{in} e^{inx})' = e^{inx}$ where $\frac{1}{in} e^{inx}$ have period of 2π , then for $n \in \mathbb{Z}$:

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} e^{inx} dx = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} (\frac{1}{in} e^{inx})' dx = \begin{cases} 1 & n = 0 \\ 0 & n = \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots \end{cases}$$

(c) For $m \in \{-N, -N+1, \dots, N\}$, then:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f(x) e^{-imx} dx &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} [\sum_{n=-N}^N c_n e^{inx} e^{-imx}] dx \\ &= \sum_{n=-N}^N [\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} c_n e^{inx} e^{-imx} dx] = c_m \end{aligned}$$

(d) If $f(x)$ is real, then:

$$\overline{c_m} = \overline{\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f(x) e^{-imx} dx} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \overline{f(x) e^{-imx}} dx = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f(x) e^{imx} dx = c_{-m}$$

Thus, $f(x)$ is real if and only if $c_{-n} = \overline{c_n}$ for $n = \{0, 1, \dots, N\}$.

If $f(x)$ is integrable on $[-\pi, \pi]$, then c_m are called the Fourier coefficients and $f(x)$ is a **Fourier series** of f .

Definition 15.5.2: Orthogonal System of Functions

Let $\{\phi_n\}$ be a sequence of complex functions on $[a, b]$ such that:

$$\int_a^b \phi_n(x) \overline{\phi_m(x)} dx = 0 \quad \text{for } m \neq n$$

Then, $\{\phi_n\}$ is an **orthogonal system of functions** on $[a, b]$. Additionally, if:

$$\int_a^b \phi_n(x) \overline{\phi_n(x)} dx = \int_a^b |\phi_n(x)|^2 dx = 1$$

for all n , then $\{\phi_n\}$ is **orthonormal**.

If $\{\phi_n\}$ is orthonormal on $[a, b]$ and $c_n = \int_a^b f(t) \overline{\phi_n(t)} dt$ for $n = \{1, 2, \dots\}$, then c_n is the n -th Fourier coefficient of f relative to $\{\phi_n\}$. Then:

$$f(x) \sim \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} c_n \phi_n(x)$$

Theorem 15.5.3: Fourier Series of f is the best approximation to f

For orthonormal $\{\phi_n\}$ on $[a,b]$, let n -th partial sum of the Fourier series of f , $\sum_{m=1}^n c_m \phi_m(x) = s_n(x)$. Suppose $f \in \mathcal{R}$ and $t_n(x) = \sum_{m=1}^n \gamma_m \phi_m(x)$. Then:

$$\int_a^b |f - s_n|^2 dx \leq \int_a^b |f - t_n|^2 dx$$

where

$$\int_a^b |f - s_n|^2 dx = \int_a^b |f - t_n|^2 dx$$

if and only if $\gamma_m = c_m$ for every $m = \{1, \dots, n\}$.

Also, $\int |s_n(x)|^2 dx \leq \int |f(x)|^2 dx$.

Proof

$$\int f(x) \overline{t_n(x)} dx = \int f(x) \sum [\overline{\gamma_m \phi_m(x)}] dx = \sum [\int f(x) \overline{\gamma_m \phi_m(x)} dx] = \sum c_m \overline{\gamma_m}$$

Since $\{\phi_n\}$ is orthonormal, then:

$$\begin{aligned} \int |t_n(x)|^2 dx &= \int t_n(x) \overline{t_n(x)} dx = \int [\sum_m \gamma_m \phi_m(x)] [\sum_k \overline{\gamma_k \phi_k(x)}] dx \\ &= \sum_m \sum_k [\int \gamma_m \phi_m(x) \overline{\gamma_k \phi_k(x)} dx] = \sum |\gamma_m|^2 \end{aligned}$$

Thus:

$$\begin{aligned} \int |f(x) - t_n(x)|^2 dx &= \int |f(x)|^2 dx - \int f(x) \overline{t_n(x)} dx - \int \overline{f(x)} t_n(x) dx + \int |t_n(x)|^2 dx \\ &= \int |f(x)|^2 dx - \sum c_m \overline{\gamma_m} - \sum \overline{c_m} \gamma_m + \sum |\gamma_m|^2 \\ &= \int |f(x)|^2 dx - \sum |c_m|^2 + \sum |\gamma_m - c_m|^2 \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\int |f(x) - t_n(x)|^2 dx$ is minimized if and only if $\gamma_m = c_m$ for every $m = \{1, \dots, n\}$.

Let $\gamma_m = c_m$ and since $\int |f(x) - s_n(x)|^2 dx \geq 0$, then:

$$\begin{aligned} \int |f(x) - s_n(x)|^2 dx &= \int |f(x)|^2 dx - \sum |c_m|^2 \\ \int |s_n(x)|^2 dx &= \sum |c_m|^2 \leq \int |f(x)|^2 dx \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 15.5.4: Bessel Inequality

For $\{\phi_n\}$ is orthonormal on $[a,b]$ and $f(x) \sim \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} c_n \phi_n(x)$, if $f \in \mathcal{R}$, then:

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |c_n|^2 \leq \int_a^b |f(x)|^2 dx \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} c_n = 0$$

Proof

Since $\{\phi_n\}$ is orthonormal on $[a,b]$ and $f(x) \sim \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} c_n \phi_n(x)$, then by **theorem 15.5.3**, for any integer $n > 1$:

$$\sum_{m=1}^n |c_m|^2 \leq \int_a^b |f(x)|^2 dx$$

Thus, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then $\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} |c_m|^2 \leq \int_a^b |f(x)|^2 dx$.

Since $\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} |c_m|^2$ is monotonically increasing and bounded above, then $\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} |c_m|^2$ converges and thus, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} c_n = 0$.

Definition 15.5.5: Trigonometric Series

Consider functions $f \in \mathcal{R}$ on $[-\pi, \pi]$ with period 2π . Let $\phi_n(x) = e^{inx}$ which is orthogonal and orthonormal when $\phi_n(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{inx}$ by [definition 15.5.1](#).

Thus, by [definition 15.5.2](#), the N -th partial sum of the Fourier series of f is:

$$s_N(f; x) = \sum_{n=-N}^N \left[\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f(t) \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-int} dt \right] \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{inx} = \sum_{n=-N}^N c_n e^{inx}$$

where $c_n = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f(t) e^{-int} dt$. Then by [theorem 15.5.3](#):

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} |s_N(f; x)|^2 dx = \sum_{n=-N}^N |c_n|^2 = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} |f(x)|^2 dx$$

From the Dirichlet kernel, $D_N(x) = \sum_{n=-N}^N e^{inx}$:

$$(e^{ix} - 1)D_N(x) = \sum_{n=-N}^N [e^{i(n+1)x} - e^{inx}] = e^{i(N+1)x} - e^{-iNx}$$

$$\begin{aligned} D_N(x) &= \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2}ix}(e^{i(N+\frac{1}{2})x} - e^{-i(N+\frac{1}{2})x})}{e^{-\frac{1}{2}ix}(e^{ix} - 1)} = \frac{e^{i(N+\frac{1}{2})x} - e^{-i(N+\frac{1}{2})x}}{e^{\frac{1}{2}ix} - e^{-\frac{1}{2}ix}} \\ &= \frac{2i \sin((N+\frac{1}{2})x)}{2i \sin(\frac{1}{2}x)} = \frac{\sin((N+\frac{1}{2})x)}{\sin(\frac{1}{2}x)} \end{aligned}$$

Since e^{inx} is periodic for 2π for each $n \in [-N, N]$, then $D_N(x)$ is periodic for 2π .

Thus, since f is also periodic for 2π , then:

$$\begin{aligned} s_N(f; x) &= \sum_{n=-N}^N c_n e^{inx} = \sum_{n=-N}^N \left[\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f(t) e^{-int} dt \right] e^{inx} \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f(t) \left[\sum_{n=-N}^N e^{in(x-t)} \right] dt = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f(t) D_N(x-t) dt \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f(x-t) D_N(t) dt \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 15.5.6: If f is continuous at some x , then Fourier Series of f converges to f

If for some x , there are $\delta > 0$ and M such that $|f(x+t) - f(x)| \leq M|t|$ for all $t \in (-\delta, \delta)$:

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} s_N(f; x) = f(x)$$

Proof

Let $g(t) = \frac{f(x-t) - f(x)}{\sin(\frac{1}{2}t)}$ for $t \in [-\pi, \pi]$ where $g(0) = 0$. Then by [definition 15.5.1b](#):

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} D_N(x) dx = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left[\sum_{n=-N}^N e^{inx} \right] dx = 1$$

Thus:

$$\begin{aligned} s_N(f; x) - f(x) &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f(x-t) D_N(t) dt - f(x) \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f(x-t) D_N(t) dt - f(x) \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} D_N(t) dt \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} [f(x-t) - f(x)] D_N(t) dt \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} g(t) \sin((N+\frac{1}{2})t) dt \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} g(t) [\sin(Nt) \cos(\frac{1}{2}t) + \sin(\frac{1}{2}t) \cos(Nt)] dt \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} [g(t) \cos(\frac{1}{2}t)] \sin(Nt) dt + \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} [g(t) \sin(\frac{1}{2}t)] \cos(Nt) dt \end{aligned}$$

Since $g(t)$ and $\cos(\frac{1}{2}t), \sin(\frac{1}{2}t)$ are bounded on $[-\pi, \pi]$, then $g(t) \cos(\frac{1}{2}t)$ and $g(t) \sin(\frac{1}{2}t)$ are bounded on $[-\pi, \pi]$. As $N \rightarrow \infty$, then $\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} [g(t) \cos(\frac{1}{2}t)] \sin(Nt) dt = 0$ and $\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} [g(t) \sin(\frac{1}{2}t)] \cos(Nt) dt = 0$ so $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} s_N(f; x) = f(x)$.

Corollary 15.5.7: Localization Theorem

If $f(x) = 0$ for all x in some segment J , then for every $x \in J$:

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} s_N(f; x) = 0$$

Proof

Let $J = (a, b)$. Then for $x \in J$, choose δ such that $(x - \delta, x + \delta) \subset J$.

Thus for any $t \in (-\delta, \delta)$, then $|f(x+t) - f(x)| = |0 - 0| = 0$.

Then by [theorem 15.5.6](#), for every $x \in J$, $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} s_N(f; x) = f(x) = 0$.

Corollary 15.5.8: Equivalent functions on (a,b) have similar Fourier Series on (a,b)

If $f(t) = g(t)$ for all t in some neighborhood of x , then:

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} [s_N(f; x) - s_N(g; x)] = 0$$

Proof

Since $f(t) - g(t) = 0$ for all $t \in (x - \delta, x + \delta)$, then by **corollary 15.5.7**, then:

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} s_N(f - g; x) = 0$$

The Fourier series for $f - g$:

$$s_N(f - g; x) = \sum_{n=-N}^N c_n e^{inx} \quad \text{where } c_n = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} (f - g)(t) e^{-int} dt$$

The Fourier series for f and g :

$$s_N(f; x) = \sum_{n=-N}^N a_n e^{inx} \quad \text{where } a_n = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f(t) e^{-int} dt$$

$$s_N(g; x) = \sum_{n=-N}^N b_n e^{inx} \quad \text{where } b_n = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} g(t) e^{-int} dt$$

Then $s_N(f - g; x) = s_N(f; x) - s_N(g; x)$ and thus:

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} [s_N(f; x) - s_N(g; x)] = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} s_N(f - g; x) = 0$$

Theorem 15.5.9: There are Fourier Series that converge uniformly to continuous f

If f is continuous with period 2π , then for $\epsilon > 0$, there is a trigonometric polynomial P such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$|P(x) - f(x)| < \epsilon$$

Proof

Since $f(x)$ has a period of 2π , then for a fixed $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $f(x)$ on \mathbb{R} can be defined on compact $[x, x+2\pi]$ which is the complex unit circle T by a mapping of $x \rightarrow e^{ix}$.

The set of trigonometric polynomials, $P(x) = \sum_{n=-N}^N c_n e^{inx}$ for constants $c_n \in \mathbb{C}$ and integer $N \geq 0$, is an algebra \mathcal{A} since for $P_1(x) = \sum_{n=-N_1}^{N_1} a_n e^{inx}$ and $P_2(x) = \sum_{n=-N_2}^{N_2} b_n e^{inx}$, let $N = \max(N_1, N_2)$ and $a_n, b_n = 0$ if $n \geq N_1, N_2$ respectively:

$$P_1(x) + P_2(x) = \sum_{n=-N}^N (a_n + b_n) e^{inx} \text{ so } P_1(x) + P_2(x) \in \mathcal{A}$$

$$P_1(x)P_2(x) = \sum_{n=-2N}^{2N} d_n e^{inx} \text{ where } d_n = \sum_{k=-N}^N a_k b_{n-k} \text{ so } P_1(x)P_2(x) \in \mathcal{A}$$

$$cP_1(x) = \sum_{n=-N_1}^{N_1} (ca_n) e^{inx} \text{ where } ca_n \in \mathbb{C} \text{ so } cP_1(x) \in \mathcal{A}$$

Also, \mathcal{A} is self-adjoint since:

$$\overline{P_1(x)} = \sum_{n=-N_1}^{N_1} \overline{a_n} e^{-inx} = \sum_{n=-N_1}^{N_1} \overline{a_{-n}} e^{inx} \text{ where } \overline{a_{-n}} \in \mathbb{C} \text{ so } \overline{P_1(x)} \in \mathcal{A}$$

Also, \mathcal{A} separates points on T since any two points on T are distinct and \mathcal{A} vanishes at no point of T since $(0,0)$ does not exist on the complex unit circle. For $\pi > \epsilon > 0$, since the mapping $x \rightarrow e^{ix}$ is 1-1 from $[x+\epsilon, x+2\pi-\epsilon]$, then \mathcal{A} separates points and vanishes at no point on $[x+\epsilon, x+2\pi-\epsilon]$.

Thus, by **theorem 14.7.9**, then \mathcal{B} , the set of all uniformly convergent $P(x)$ from \mathcal{A} , consist of all complex continuous f on $[x+\epsilon, x+2\pi-\epsilon]$.

So there is a $P(x)$ such that $P(x)$ converges uniformly to f so for all $t \in [x, x+2\pi]$, then $|P(t) - f(t)| < \epsilon$. Since f has a period of 2π , then for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, then $|P(t) - f(t)| < \epsilon$.

Definition 15.5.10: L^p Space

For $p \geq 1$, let $L^p = \{ f: [a,b] \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \mid \|f\|_p = [\int_a^b |f(x)|^p dx]^{\frac{1}{p}} < \infty \}$.

For complex $f, g \in \mathcal{R}$:

(a) **Holder's Inequality**: If $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$ where $p, q \geq 1$, then $\|fg\|_1 \leq \|f\|_p \|g\|_q$

Proof

Claim: If $a, b \geq 0$, then $ab \leq \frac{a^p}{p} + \frac{b^q}{q}$ and equality only if $a^p = b^q$.

Take $y = f(x) = x^{p-1}$ for $x \in [0, a]$ and $x = f^{-1}(y) = \sqrt[p-1]{y}$ for $y \in [0, b]$.

The total area is $\int_0^a x^{p-1} dx + \int_0^b y^{\frac{1}{p-1}} dy = \frac{a^p}{p} + \frac{p-1}{p} b^{\frac{p}{p-1}} = \frac{a^p}{p} + \frac{b^q}{q}$.

Graphing each function on their respective axes, it is shown that regardless if $a^{p-1} > b$ or $a^{p-1} < b$, the total area is greater than ab and equality holds only if $a^{p-1} = b$ so $b^q = a^{(p-1)q} = a^{(p-1)\frac{p}{p-1}} = a^p$.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\|f\|_p \|g\|_q} \|fg\|_1 &= \frac{1}{\|f\|_p \|g\|_q} \int |fg| dx = \frac{1}{\|f\|_p \|g\|_q} \int |f| |g| dx \\ &= \int \frac{|f|}{\|f\|_p} \frac{|g|}{\|g\|_q} dx \leq \int \frac{|f|^p}{\|f\|_p^p} + \frac{|g|^q}{\|g\|_q^q} dx \\ &= \frac{1}{\|f\|_p^p} \int |f|^p dx + \frac{1}{\|g\|_q^q} \int |g|^q dx \\ &= \frac{1}{\|f\|_p^p} \|f\|_p^p + \frac{1}{\|g\|_q^q} \|g\|_q^q = \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1 \end{aligned}$$

Since $a = \frac{|f|}{\|f\|_p}$ and $b = \frac{|g|}{\|g\|_q}$, then equality holds only if $\frac{|f|^p}{\|f\|_p^p} = \frac{|g|^q}{\|g\|_q^q}$.

(b) **Minkowski's Inequality**: $\|f + g\|_p \leq \|f\|_p + \|g\|_p$

Proof

Since $f, g \in \mathcal{R}$, then $|f + g|^p \in \mathcal{R}$. By Holder's Inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} \|f + g\|_p^p &= \int_a^b |f(x) + g(x)|^p dx = \int_a^b |f(x) + g(x)| |f(x) + g(x)|^{p-1} dx \\ &\leq \int_a^b (|f(x)| + |g(x)|) |f(x) + g(x)|^{p-1} dx \\ &\leq \int_a^b |f(x)| |f(x) + g(x)|^{p-1} dx + \int_a^b |g(x)| |f(x) + g(x)|^{p-1} dx \\ &\leq ([\int_a^b |f(x)|^p dx]^{\frac{1}{p}} + [\int_a^b |g(x)|^p dx]^{\frac{1}{p}}) (\int_a^b |f(x) + g(x)|^{p-1(\frac{p}{p-1})} dx)^{1-\frac{1}{p}} \\ &= (\|f\|_p + \|g\|_p) \|f + g\|_p^{p-1} \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 15.5.11: For integrable f , there are continuous g where $f - g \in L^2$

Let $f \in \mathcal{R}$ on $[a, b]$. Then for $\epsilon > 0$, there is a continuous g where:

$$g(a) = f(a) \quad g(b) = f(b) \quad \|f(x) - g(x)\|_2 < \epsilon$$

Proof

Since $f \in \mathcal{R}$, then $|f(x)| < M$. For $\epsilon > 0$, there is a partition $P = \{x_0, \dots, x_n\}$ of $[a, b]$:

$$U(P, f) - L(P, f) = \sum_{i=1}^n (M_i - m_i) \Delta x_i < \frac{\epsilon^2}{2M}$$

Let $g(t) = \frac{x_i - t}{\Delta x_i} f(x_{i-1}) + \frac{t - x_{i-1}}{\Delta x_i} f(x_i)$ for $t \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]$ which is continuous on $[a, b]$ since:

$$g(x_i+) = f(x_i) = g(x_i-) \Rightarrow g(x_i) = f(x_i) \text{ so } g(a) = f(a), g(b) = f(b)$$

Thus, for $t \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]$:

$$\begin{aligned} |f(t) - g(t)| &= |f(t) - \frac{x_i - t}{\Delta x_i} f(x_{i-1}) - \frac{t - x_{i-1}}{\Delta x_i} f(x_i)| \\ &= |\frac{x_i - t}{\Delta x_i} [f(t) - f(x_{i-1})] + \frac{t - x_{i-1}}{\Delta x_i} [f(t) - f(x_i)]| \\ &\leq |\frac{x_i - t}{\Delta x_i}| |f(t) - f(x_{i-1})| + |\frac{t - x_{i-1}}{\Delta x_i}| |f(t) - f(x_i)| = M_i - m_i \end{aligned}$$

Since g is continuous, then $g \in \mathcal{R}$ and thus, $|f(x) - g(x)|^2 \in \mathcal{R}$. Thus:

$$\begin{aligned} \|f(x) - g(x)\|_2 &= [\int_a^b |f(x) - g(x)|^2 dx]^{\frac{1}{2}} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} [\sum_{i=1}^n \int_{x_{i-1}}^{x_i} |f(t) - g(t)|^2 dt]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} [\sum_{i=1}^n \int_{x_{i-1}}^{x_i} (M_i - m_i)^2 dt]^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} [\sum_{i=1}^n 2M \int_{x_{i-1}}^{x_i} (M_i - m_i) dt]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} [2M \sum_{i=1}^n (M_i - m_i) \Delta x_i]^{\frac{1}{2}} < \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} [2M \frac{\epsilon^2}{2M}]^{\frac{1}{2}} = \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 15.5.12: Parseval's Theorem

For $f, g \in \mathcal{R}$ with period of 2π where:

$$f(x) \sim \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} c_n e^{inx} \quad g(x) \sim \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \gamma_n e^{inx}$$

then:

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} |f(x) - s_N(f; x)|^2 dx = 0$$

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f(x) \overline{g(x)} dx = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} c_n \overline{\gamma_n}$$

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} |f(x)|^2 dx = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} |c_n|^2$$

Proof

Since $f \in \mathcal{R}$ on $[x, x+2\pi]$ for a fixed $x \in \mathbb{R}$, where $f(x) = f(x+2\pi)$, then by [theorem 15.5.11](#), for $\epsilon > 0$, there is a continuous h such that:

$$\|f(x) - h(x)\|_2 < \epsilon$$

Also, $h(x) = f(x)$ and $h(x+2\pi) = f(x+2\pi)$ for any $x \in \mathcal{R}$, and since $f(x) = f(x+2\pi)$, then h has a period of 2π . Then by [theorem 15.5.9](#), there is a trigonometric polynomial $P(x)$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$|h(x) - P(x)| < \epsilon \quad \Rightarrow \quad \|h(x) - P(x)\|_2 = \left[\int_x^{x+2\pi} |h(x) - P(x)|^2 dx \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} < \sqrt{2\pi} \epsilon$$

Then by [theorem 15.5.3](#):

$$\|h(x) - s_N(h; x)\|_2 \leq \|h(x) - P(x)\|_2 < \sqrt{2\pi} \epsilon$$

$$\|s_N(h; x) - s_N(f; x)\|_2 = \|s_N(h - f; x)\|_2 \leq \|h(x) - f(x)\|_2 < \epsilon$$

Thus:

$$\begin{aligned} \|f(x) - s_N(f; x)\|_2 &\leq \|f(x) - h(x)\|_2 + \|h(x) - s_N(h; x)\|_2 + \|s_N(h; x) - s_N(f; x)\|_2 \\ &< (2 + \sqrt{2\pi}) \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

Note $\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} s_N(f; x) \overline{g(x)} dx = \sum_{n=-N}^N [c_n \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} e^{inx} \overline{g(x)} dx] = \sum_{n=-N}^N c_n \overline{\gamma_n}$.

By Holder's Inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f(x) \overline{g(x)} dx - \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} s_N(f; x) \overline{g(x)} dx \right| \\ & \leq \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} |f(x) - s_N(f; x)| |g(x)| dx \\ & \leq \left[\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} |f(x) - s_N(f; x)|^2 dx \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} |g(x)|^2 dx \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & = \|f(x) - s_N(f; x)\|_2 \|g(x)\|_2 \end{aligned}$$

Since $g \in \mathcal{R}$, then $|g|^2 \in \mathcal{R}$ and thus, $\|g(x)\|_2$ is bounded.

Since $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|f(x) - s_N(f; x)\|_2 = 0$, then:

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f(x) \overline{g(x)} dx = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} s_N(f; x) \overline{g(x)} dx = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n=-N}^N c_n \overline{\gamma_n} = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} c_n \overline{\gamma_n}$$

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} |f(x)|^2 dx = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f(x) \overline{f(x)} dx = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} c_n \overline{c_n} = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} |c_n|^2$$

16 Multivariable Functions

16.1 Linear Transformations

Definition 16.1.1: Vector Spaces

(a) **Vector Space**

A nonempty set $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a vector space if for all $x, y \in X$ and scalar c :

$$x+y \in X \quad cx \in X$$

Null vector 0 is also defined as $0 = (0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^k$.

(b) **Linear Combinations and Span**

For scalars c_1, \dots, c_k , a linear combination of $x_1, \dots, x_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$:

$$c_1x_1 + \dots + c_kx_k$$

The span of x_1, \dots, x_k is the set of all linear combinations of x_1, \dots, x_k .

(c) **Independence and Dimension**

If $c_1x_1 + \dots + c_kx_k = 0$ only if $c_1 = \dots = c_k = 0$, then x_1, \dots, x_k are independent. Any independent set does not contain 0 since $c0 + c_1x_1 + \dots + c_kx_k = 0$ holds true for $c, 0, \dots, 0$ where c is any number, not just $0, 0, \dots, 0$.

If vector space X have r independent vectors, but not $r+1$ independent vectors, then $\dim(X) = r$. The set $\{0\}$ has dimension 0 .

(d) **Basis**

If $x_1, \dots, x_k \in X$ are independent and spans X , then x_1, \dots, x_k is a basis of X .

Thus, for every $x \in X$:

Since x_1, \dots, x_k spans X , there exists c_1, \dots, c_k such that $x = c_1x_1 + \dots + c_kx_k$.

Since x_1, \dots, x_k are independent, then such c_1, \dots, c_k are unique else there are a_1, \dots, a_k where at least one $a_i \neq c_i$ such that:

$$x = a_1x_1 + \dots + a_kx_k \quad \Rightarrow \quad 0 = x - x = (a_1 - c_1)x_1 + \dots + (a_k - c_k)x_k$$

where at least one $(a_i - c_i) \neq 0$ contradicting x_1, \dots, x_k are independent.

The c_1, \dots, c_k are called the coordinates of x with respect to basis x_1, \dots, x_k .

(e) **Standard Basis of \mathbb{R}^k**

Let $e_i = (0, \dots, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^k$.

Thus, e_1, \dots, e_k is a basis for \mathbb{R}^k where any $x = (x_1, \dots, x_k) = x_1e_1 + \dots + x_ke_k$.

Theorem 16.1.2: $\dim(X) \leq (\# \text{ vectors that span } X)$

If vector space X is spanned by r vectors, then $\dim(X) \leq r$.

Proof

If $\dim(X) > r$, then there are at minimum $r+1$ independent vectors that spans X which contradicts that X is spanned by r vectors.

Let X be spanned by $x_1, \dots, x_r \neq 0$. If x_1, \dots, x_r are independent, then $\dim(X) = r$.

If x_1, \dots, x_r are not independent, then there is at least two $c_k \neq 0$ where:

$$0 = c_1x_1 + \dots + c_rx_r$$

since if only one $c_k \neq 0$, then $0 = c_1x_1 + \dots + c_rx_r = c_kx_k$ which implies $x_k = 0$ since $c_k \neq 0$ which is a contradiction. Thus, for $c_k, c_{i_1}, \dots, c_{i_n} \neq 0$:

$$0 = c_1x_1 + \dots + c_rx_r = c_kx_k + c_{i_1}x_{i_1} + \dots + c_{i_n}x_{i_n} \quad \Rightarrow \quad x_k = \frac{-c_{i_1}}{c_k}x_{i_1} + \dots + \frac{-c_{i_n}}{c_k}x_{i_n}$$

Remove x_k from x_1, \dots, x_r and repeat the process until all x_i are independent and thus, $\dim(X) = r - (\# x_i \text{ removed}) < r$.

Corollary 16.1.3: $\dim(X) = (\# \text{ vectors in a basis})$

If x_1, \dots, x_n is a basis for X , then $\dim(X) = n$.

Thus, $\dim(\mathbb{R}^n) = n$.

Proof

Since x_1, \dots, x_n is a basis for X , then x_1, \dots, x_n spans X and are independent.

Since x_1, \dots, x_n span X , then by **theorem 16.1.2**, then $\dim(X) \leq n$. Since x_1, \dots, x_n are independent, then $\dim(X) \geq n$ since there might be another x_i independent to x_1, \dots, x_n and another and so on. Thus, $\dim(\mathbb{R}^n) = n$.

Since e_1, \dots, e_n is a basis for \mathbb{R}^n , then $\dim(\mathbb{R}^n) = n$.

Theorem 16.1.4: Properties of Basis

For vector space X where $\dim(X) = n$:

- (a) n vectors span X if and only if the n vectors are independent
- (b) X has a basis where every basis have only n vectors
- (c) For independent x_1, \dots, x_r where $r \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, X has a basis with x_1, \dots, x_r

Intuition

x_1, \dots, x_m can span X , but not independent since there might be a x_i that is dependent on the other x_i (aka $x_i = a_i x_i + \dots + a_{i-1} x_{i-1} + a_{i+1} x_{i+1} + \dots + a_m x_m$).

x_1, \dots, x_k can be independent, but not span X since there might be another x that is independent to each x_i (aka $x \neq b_1 x_1 + \dots + b_k x_k$ for any b_1, \dots, b_k).

So to get a basis, either remove the dependent elements from x_1, \dots, x_m to get independent or add independent elements to x_1, \dots, x_k to get a span of X . Simply, a basis has a set amount of vectors, but x_1, \dots, x_m has too much while x_1, \dots, x_k has too few.

Proof

Let x_1, \dots, x_n span X . If x_1, \dots, x_n are not independent, then remove x_i until x_1, \dots, x_k are independent as performed in **theorem 16.1.2**. Thus, $\dim(X) = k < n$ which is a contradiction and thus, x_1, \dots, x_n are independent.

For independent x_1, \dots, x_n , add $y_1, \dots, y_k \in X$ so $x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_k$ span X . Since $\dim(X) = n$, then $x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_k$ are not independent. Since any non-independent set can remove elements in its span until it is independent and thus, preserves its span as performed in **theorem 16.1.2**, then each y_i can be removed to reach independent x_1, \dots, x_n which still spans X .

By part (a), any n independent vectors spans X so thus, forms a basis for X . For x_1, \dots, x_k where $k > n$, since $\dim(X) = n$, then x_1, \dots, x_k is non-independent and is thus, not a basis. For x_1, \dots, x_k where $k < n$, since $\dim(X) = n$, there is a $x \in X$ such that x_1, \dots, x_k, x are independent. Then $x \neq c_1 x_1 + \dots + c_k x_k$ for any c_1, \dots, c_k else

$$x = c_1 x_1 + \dots + c_k x_k \quad \Rightarrow \quad 0 = c_1 x_1 + \dots + c_k x_k + -x$$

so x_1, \dots, x_k, x are not independent. Thus, there is a $x \in X$ that is not in the span of x_1, \dots, x_k so x_1, \dots, x_k does not span X .

For independent x_1, \dots, x_r , since $\dim(X) = n$, there are x_{r+1}, \dots, x_n such that x_1, \dots, x_n are independent. By part (a), x_1, \dots, x_n spans X so x_1, \dots, x_n forms a basis which contain x_1, \dots, x_r .

Definition 16.1.5: Linear Transformation

A mapping A of vector space X into vector space Y is a **linear transformation** if for all $x_1, x_2 \in X$ and scalar c :

$$A(x_1 + x_2) = Ax_1 + Ax_2 \quad A(cx_1) = cAx_1$$

Since $A0 + A0 = A(0+0) = A0$, then $A0 = 0$.

If x_1, \dots, x_n is a basis for X , then for any $x \in X$, there is a unique set of c_1, \dots, c_n where $x = c_1x_1 + \dots + c_nx_n$ such that:

$$Ax = A(c_1x_1 + \dots + c_nx_n) = c_1Ax_1 + \dots + c_nAx_n$$

Linear transformation that maps X into X are **linear operators**.

Additionally, if A is 1-1 and maps X onto X , then A is **invertible**.

Thus, there is a A^{-1} such that:

$$A^{-1}(Ax) = x \quad \text{for all } x \in X$$

Since A maps X onto X , for any $x \in X$, then $Ax = y \in X$.

Thus, for all $y \in X$, then $x = A^{-1}(Ax) = A^{-1}y$. Thus:

$$A(A^{-1}y) = Ax = y$$

Also, for any $x_1, x_2 \in X$ and scalars c_1, c_2 where $Ax_1 = y_1$ and $Ax_2 = y_2$:

$$\begin{aligned} A^{-1}(c_1y_1 + c_2y_2) &= A^{-1}(c_1Ax_1 + c_2Ax_2) = A^{-1}(A(c_1x_1 + c_2x_2)) \\ &= c_1x_1 + c_2x_2 = c_1A^{-1}(y_1) + c_2A^{-1}(y_2) \end{aligned}$$

So, A^{-1} is a linear transformation.

Theorem 16.1.6: Linear Operators imply 1-1 \Rightarrow onto

Linear operator A preserves independence if and only if A is 1-1.

Thus, linear operator A is 1-1 if and only if $A(X) = X$.

Proof

Let x_1, \dots, x_n be a basis for X where each $Ax_i = y_i \in X$. So for any $y \in A(X)$, there is $x \in X$ where $x = c_1x_1 + \dots + c_nx_n$ for a unique set of c_1, \dots, c_n such that:

$$y = Ax = A(c_1x_1 + \dots + c_nx_n) = c_1Ax_1 + \dots + c_nAx_n = c_1y_1 + \dots + c_ny_n$$

If A is 1-1, then there is only one such x so in respect to y_1, \dots, y_n , then any

$y = k_1y_1 + \dots + k_ny_n$ must have $k_1 = c_1, \dots, k_n = c_n$. Thus, for $y = 0$, since $0 = A0$ and x_1, \dots, x_n are independent, then $c_1 = \dots = c_n = 0$ so y_1, \dots, y_n are independent.

If A is not 1-1, then there is y where there are at least two distinct such x so in respect to y_1, \dots, y_n , then $y = k_1y_1 + \dots + k_ny_n$ holds true for at least 2 distinct k_1, \dots, k_n so y_1, \dots, y_n are not independent. Thus, A is 1-1 if and only if y_1, \dots, y_n is independent. By **theorem 16.1.4a**, y_1, \dots, y_n span X so $A(X) = X$ if and only if y_1, \dots, y_n are independent.

Definition 16.1.7: Operations of Linear Transformatons

Let $L(X, Y)$ be the set of all linear transformation of X into Y .

Let Ω be the set of all invertible linear operators on \mathbb{R}^n .

(a) If $A_1, A_2 \in L(X, Y)$ and c_1, c_2 are scalars, then for any $x \in X$, define:

$$(c_1A_1 + c_2A_2)x = c_1A_1x + c_2A_2x$$

(b) For vector space Z , if $A \in L(X, Y)$ and $B \in L(Y, Z)$, then for any $x \in X$, define:

$$(BA)x = B(Ax) \in L(X, Z)$$

(c) For $A \in L(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^m)$, define the norm:

$$\|A\| = \sup(|Ax| \mid x \in \mathbb{R}^n \text{ where } |x| \leq 1)$$

(d) $|Ax| = |A(|x| \frac{x}{|x|})| = |A(\frac{x}{|x|})| |x| \leq \sup(|A(\frac{x}{|x|})|) |x| = \|A\| |x|$

If there is a λ such that $|Ax| \leq \lambda|x|$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, then $\|A\| \leq \lambda|1| = \lambda$.

(e) For $A, B \in L(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^m)$, the distance between A and B is defined $\|A - B\|$

Theorem 16.1.8: Operations of Norms of Linear Transformations

- (a) If
- $A \in L(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^m)$
- , then
- $\|A\| < \infty$
- . Thus,
- A
- is uniformly continuous.

ProofFor $|x| \leq 1$:

$$|Ax| = |A(x_1e_1 + \dots + x_ne_n)| \leq |x_1||Ae_1| + \dots + |x_n||Ae_n| \\ \leq |Ae_1| + \dots + |Ae_n| = M$$

Thus, $\|Ax\| \leq |Ae_1| + \dots + |Ae_n| = M < \infty$.Let $|x - y| < \epsilon$ and thus, $|Ax - Ay| = |A(x - y)| \leq \|A\| |x - y| < M\epsilon$ so A is uniformly continuous.

- (b) If
- $A, B \in L(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^m)$
- and
- c
- is a scalar, then:

$$\|A + B\| \leq \|A\| + \|B\| \quad \|cA\| = |c| \|A\|$$

ProofFor $|x| \leq 1$, $|(A + B)x| \leq |Ax + Bx| \leq |Ax| + |Bx| \leq \|A\| + \|B\|$.Thus, $\|A + B\| \leq \|A\| + \|B\|$. Since $|cAx| = |c||Ax|$, then $\|cA\| = |c| \|A\|$.Also, for the distance between A and B , by part a:

$$\|A - B\| \leq \|A + B\| \leq \|A\| + \|B\| \leq M_1 + M_2$$

- (c) If
- $A \in L(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^m)$
- and
- $B \in L(\mathbb{R}^m, \mathbb{R}^k)$
- , then:

$$\|BA\| \leq \|B\| \|A\|$$

ProofFor $|x| \leq 1$, $|BAx| = |B(Ax)| \leq \|B\| |Ax| \leq \|B\| \|A\| |x| \leq \|B\| \|A\|$.Thus, $\|BA\| \leq \|B\| \|A\|$.**Theorem 16.1.9: Operations of Norms of Invertible Linear Operators**

- (a) If
- $A \in \Omega$
- and
- $B \in L(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n)$
- where
- $\|B - A\| \|A^{-1}\| < 1$
- , then
- $B \in \Omega$

Proof

$$\frac{1}{\|A^{-1}\|} |x| = \frac{1}{\|A^{-1}\|} |A^{-1}Ax| \leq \frac{1}{\|A^{-1}\|} \|A^{-1}\| |Ax|$$

$$= |Ax| \leq |(A - B)x| + |Bx| \leq \|A - B\| |x| + |Bx|$$

Thus, $|Bx| \geq (\frac{1}{\|A^{-1}\|} - \|A - B\|) |x| \geq \frac{2}{\|A^{-1}\|} |x| \geq 0$ so $Bx \neq 0$ if $x \neq 0$ so B is 1-1. Then by **theorem 16.1.4a**, B spans \mathbb{R}^n so B is invertible so $B \in \Omega$.

- (b)
- $\Omega \subset L(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n)$
- is open and the mapping
- $T: A \rightarrow A^{-1}$
- is continuous on
- Ω

ProofSince $\|B - A\| < \frac{1}{\|A^{-1}\|}$ for any $B \in \Omega$, then for every $B \in \Omega$, there exist an open subset of $L(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n)$ that contains B so Ω is open.

Since

$$|y| = |BB^{-1}y| \geq (\frac{1}{\|A^{-1}\|} - \|A - B\|) |B^{-1}y| \\ \geq (\frac{1}{\|A^{-1}\|} - \|A - B\|) \|B^{-1}\| |y|$$

then $\frac{1}{\frac{1}{\|A^{-1}\|} - \|A - B\|} \geq \|B^{-1}\|$. Thus, by **theorem 16.1.8**:

$$\|B^{-1} - A^{-1}\| = \|B^{-1}(A - B)A^{-1}\| \\ \leq \|B^{-1}\| \|A - B\| \|A^{-1}\| \leq \frac{\|A - B\| \|A^{-1}\|}{\frac{1}{\|A^{-1}\|} - \|A - B\|}$$

Since $\lim_{B \rightarrow A} \|A - B\| \rightarrow 0$ so $\|B^{-1} - A^{-1}\| \rightarrow 0$, then T is continuous on Ω .

Definition 16.1.10: Matrices

Let x_1, \dots, x_n be a basis for X and y_1, \dots, y_m be a basis for Y .

Then every $A \in L(X, Y)$ determines a set of numbers a_{ij} such that:

$$Ax_j = \sum_{i=1}^m a_{ij} y_i \quad \text{for } j = \{1, \dots, n\}$$

Thus, A can be represented by an m by n **matrix**:

$$[A] = \begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & \dots & a_{1n} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & \dots & a_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{m1} & a_{m2} & \dots & a_{mn} \end{bmatrix}$$

Since the a_{ij} of Ax_j are from the j -th column $[A]$, then Ax_j is called the column vector of $[A]$. Thus, the $\text{span}(A)$ is the span of the column vectors of $[A]$.

For any $x \in X$, there is a unique set of c_1, \dots, c_n such that $x = c_1 x_1 + \dots + c_n x_n$:

$$[Ax] = \begin{bmatrix} (y_1) \{ \overbrace{a_{11}}^{c_1} \overbrace{a_{12}}^{c_2} \dots \overbrace{a_{1n}}^{c_n} \\ (y_2) \{ a_{21} \quad a_{22} \quad \dots \quad a_{2n} \\ \vdots \quad \vdots \quad \ddots \quad \vdots \\ (y_m) \{ a_{m1} \quad a_{m2} \quad \dots \quad a_{mn} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\begin{aligned} Ax &= A(\sum_{j=1}^n c_j x_j) = \sum_{j=1}^n c_j Ax_j \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n c_j \sum_{i=1}^m a_{ij} y_i = \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^m a_{ij} c_j y_i = \sum_{i=1}^m [\sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} c_j] y_i \end{aligned}$$

So $[\sum_{j=1}^n a_{1j} c_j], \dots, [\sum_{j=1}^n a_{mj} c_j]$ are Ax 's coordinates in respect to y_1, \dots, y_m .

Let $A \in L(X, Y)$ and $B \in L(Y, Z)$. Then, $BA \in L(X, Z)$.

Let z_1, \dots, z_p be a basis for Z where:

$$By_i = \sum_{k=1}^p b_{ki} z_k \quad (BA)x_j = \sum_{k=1}^p c_{kj} z_k$$

Thus, B as a p by m matrix and BA as a p by n matrix can be represented:

$$[B] = \begin{bmatrix} b_{11} & b_{12} & \dots & b_{1m} \\ b_{21} & b_{22} & \dots & b_{2m} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ b_{p1} & b_{p2} & \dots & b_{pm} \end{bmatrix} \quad [BA] = \begin{bmatrix} c_{11} & c_{12} & \dots & c_{1n} \\ c_{21} & c_{22} & \dots & c_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ c_{p1} & c_{p2} & \dots & c_{pn} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\begin{aligned} (BA)x_j &= B(Ax_j) = B(\sum_{i=1}^m a_{ij} y_i) = \sum_{i=1}^m a_{ij} By_i \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m a_{ij} \sum_{k=1}^p b_{ki} z_k = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{k=1}^p b_{ki} a_{ij} z_k = \sum_{k=1}^p [\sum_{i=1}^m b_{ki} a_{ij}] z_k \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $c_{kj} = \sum_{i=1}^m b_{ki} a_{ij}$ for $j = \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $k = \{1, \dots, p\}$.

So to get matrix $[BA]$ from $[B]$ and $[A]$:

$$\begin{bmatrix} b_{11} & b_{12} & \dots & b_{1m} \\ b_{21} & b_{22} & \dots & b_{2m} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ b_{p1} & b_{p2} & \dots & b_{pm} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & \dots & a_{1n} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & \dots & a_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{m1} & a_{m2} & \dots & a_{mn} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{i=1}^m b_{1i} a_{i1} & \sum_{i=1}^m b_{1i} a_{i2} & \dots & \sum_{i=1}^m b_{1i} a_{in} \\ \sum_{i=1}^m b_{2i} a_{i1} & \sum_{i=1}^m b_{2i} a_{i2} & \dots & \sum_{i=1}^m b_{2i} a_{in} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \sum_{i=1}^m b_{pi} a_{i1} & \sum_{i=1}^m b_{pi} a_{i2} & \dots & \sum_{i=1}^m b_{pi} a_{in} \end{bmatrix}$$

For $A \in L(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^m)$, since $Ax = \sum_{i=1}^m [\sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} c_j] e_i$ where $x = \sum_{j=1}^n c_j e_j$, then by the Cauchy-Schwarz Inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} |Ax|^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^m [\sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} c_j]^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^m [(\sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}^2) (\sum_{j=1}^n c_j^2)] \\ &= [\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}^2] (\sum_{j=1}^n c_j^2) = [\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}^2] |x|^2 \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for $|x| \leq 1$, then:

$$\|A\| \leq \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}^2}.$$

Theorem 16.1.11: A linear transformation of continuous functions is continuous

If each a_{ij} is a continuous function on S and for each $p \in S$, then $A_p \in L(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^m)$ with entries $a_{ij}(p)$, then the mapping $T: S \rightarrow L(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^m)$ is continuous.

Proof

Since each $a_{i,j}$ is continuous, then for $\epsilon > 0$, there is a $\delta > 0$ such that for $t, p \in S$ where $|t - p| < \delta$, then $|a_{i,j}(t) - a_{i,j}(p)| < \frac{\epsilon}{\sqrt{mn}}$. Thus, for $|t - p| < \delta$:

$$\|A_p - A_t\| \leq \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n (a_{ij}(p) - a_{ij}(t))^2} < \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n \left(\frac{\epsilon}{\sqrt{mn}}\right)^2} = \epsilon$$

16.2 Differentiation**Definition 16.2.1: Derivative Extended to Higher Dimensions**

First, let's redefine the derivative such that it can be extended to higher dimensions. For $f: (a, b) \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$, let $f'(x) = y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that:

$$f(x+h) - f(x) = yh + r(h) \quad \text{where } \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{r(h)}{h} = 0$$

Since $y: h \rightarrow yh$ is a linear transformation from \mathbb{R} to \mathbb{R}^m , then $f'(x) \in L(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^m)$.

Now for derivatives in higher dimensions.

Let $f: x \in \text{open } E \subset \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$.

If there is an $A \in L(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^m)$ such that for any $h \in E$:

$$f(x+h) - f(x) = Ah + r_A(h) \quad \text{where } \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{|r_A(h)|}{|h|} = 0$$

then f is differentiable at x . Then differential of f at x , $f'(x) = A$.

If f is differentiable at every $x \in E$, then f is differentiable on E .

Theorem 16.2.2: The derivative of a function is unique

Let $f: x \in \text{open } E \subset \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$. Let $A \in L(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^m)$ such that for any $h \in E$:

$$f(x+h) - f(x) = Ah + r_A(h) \quad \text{where } \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{|r_A(h)|}{|h|} = 0$$

Suppose $A = A_1$ and $A = A_2$ satisfies such conditions. Then $A_1 = A_2$.

Proof

For any $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$:

$$\begin{aligned} |(A_2 - A_1)h| &= |[f(x+h) - f(x) - r_{A_1}(h)] - [f(x+h) - f(x) - r_{A_2}(h)]| \\ &= |r_{A_2}(h) - r_{A_1}(h)| \\ &\leq |r_{A_2}(h)| + |r_{A_1}(h)| \end{aligned}$$

Since $A_1, A_2 \in L(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^m)$, for any t where h is fixed, then:

$$\begin{aligned} |(A_2 - A_1)(th)| &\leq |r_{A_2}(th)| + |r_{A_1}(th)| \\ |t|(A_2 - A_1)h| &\leq |r_{A_2}(th)| + |r_{A_1}(th)| \\ |(A_2 - A_1)h| &\leq \frac{|r_{A_2}(th)|}{|t|} + \frac{|r_{A_1}(th)|}{|t|} \end{aligned}$$

So as $t \rightarrow 0$, then $\frac{|r_{A_2}(th)|}{|t|} + \frac{|r_{A_1}(th)|}{|t|} \rightarrow 0 + 0 = 0$. Thus, $A_1 = A_2$.

Theorem 16.2.3: Derivative of a Linear Transformation

If $A \in L(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^m)$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, then:

$$A'(x) = A$$

Proof

Since $A \in L(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^m)$, then let $f(x) = Ax$.

$$f(x+h) - f(x) = A(x+h) - Ax = Ax + Ah - Ax = Ah$$

Thus, $r_A(h) = 0$ so $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{|r_A(h)|}{|h|} = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} 0 = 0$. Thus, $A'(x) = f'(x) = A$.

Theorem 16.2.4: Chain Rule in Higher Dimensions

Let $f: \text{open } E \subset \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ be differentiable at $x_0 \in E$ and $g: f(E) \subset \text{open } H \subset \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ be differentiable at $f(x_0)$.

Then $F: E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ where $F(x) = g(f(x))$ is differentiable at x_0 such that:

$$F'(x_0) = g'(f(x_0)) f'(x_0)$$

Proof

Since f is differentiable at x_0 and g is differentiable at $f(x_0)$, then there is a $A = f'(x_0)$ and $B = g'(f(x_0))$ such that:

$$f(x_0+h) - f(x_0) = Ah + r_A(h) \quad \text{where } \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{|r_A(h)|}{|h|} = 0$$

$$g(f(x_0)+k) - g(f(x_0)) = Bk + r_B(k) \quad \text{where } \lim_{k \rightarrow 0} \frac{|r_B(k)|}{|k|} = 0$$

Let $k = f(x_0+h) - f(x_0)$. Thus:

$$\begin{aligned} F(x_0+h) - F(x_0) - BAh &= g(f(x_0+h)) - g(f(x_0)) - BAh \\ &= g(f(x_0)+k) - g(f(x_0)) - BAh = Bk + r_B(k) - BAh \\ &= B(k - Ah) + r_B(k) = B(f(x_0+h) - f(x_0) - Ah) + r_B(k) \\ &= Br_A(h) + r_B(k) \end{aligned}$$

$$\frac{|F(x_0+h) - F(x_0) - BAh|}{|h|} = \frac{|Br_A(h) + r_B(k)|}{|h|} \leq \frac{|Br_A(h)| + |r_B(k)|}{|h|} \leq \frac{\|B\| |r_A(h)| + |r_B(k)|}{|h|}$$

Since f is differentiable at x_0 , then f is continuous at x_0 and thus, $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} k = 0$.

Since $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{|r_A(h)|}{|h|} = 0$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow 0} \frac{|r_B(k)|}{|k|} = 0$, then:

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{|F(x_0+h) - F(x_0) - BAh|}{|h|} \leq \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \|B\| \frac{|r_A(h)|}{|h|} + \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{|r_B(k)|}{|h|} = 0 + 0 = 0$$

Thus, $F'(x_0) = BA = g'(f(x_0)) f'(x_0)$.

Definition 16.2.5: Partial Derivatives: Derivatives along the standard basis

Let $f: \text{open } E \subset \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$.

The components of f are the $f_1, \dots, f_m \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for $x \in E$, then $f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^m f_i(x) e_i$.

Since $e_i \cdot e_j = \begin{cases} 0 & i \neq j \\ 1 & i = j \end{cases}$, then $f(x) \cdot e_i = [\sum_{i=1}^m f_i(x) e_i] \cdot e_i = f_i(x)$.

Then for $x \in E$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, let the **partial derivative** $\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x_j} = D_j f_i$ be the derivative of f_i with respect to x_j . Then for $t \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$f_i(x + te_j) - f_i(x) = D_j f_i(te_j) + r_{D_j f_i}(te_j) \quad \text{where } \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{|r_{D_j f_i}(te_j)|}{|t|} = 0$$

Theorem 16.2.6: Derivative of f is the sum of all partial derivatives

Let $f: \text{open } E \subset \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ be differentiable at $x \in E$. Then the partial derivatives $(D_j f_i)(x)$ exists such that for $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$:

$$f'(x) e_j = \sum_{i=1}^m (D_j f_i)(x) e_i$$

Proof

For a fixed j , since f is differentiable at x , then:

$$f(x+te_j) - f(x) = f'(x)(te_j) + r(te_j) \quad \text{where } \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{|r(te_j)|}{|t|} = 0$$

Then $f'(x)$ exist where:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(x+te_j) - f(x)}{t} = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{f'(x)(te_j)}{t} + \frac{r(te_j)}{t} = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} t \frac{f'(x) e_j}{t} = f'(x) e_j$$

Since $f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^m f_i(x) e_i$, then:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(x+te_j) - f(x)}{t} = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{f_i(x+te_j) - f_i(x)}{t} e_i = f'(x) e_j$$

Since $f'(x)$ exist and $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{f_i(x+te_j) - f_i(x)}{t} = D_j f_i(x)$, then each $D_j f_i(x)$ exists where:

$$f'(x) e_j = \sum_{i=1}^m \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{f_i(x+te_j) - f_i(x)}{t} e_i = \sum_{i=1}^m (D_j f_i)(x) e_i$$

Definition 16.2.7: Matrix of the Differential of f

By **theorem 16.2.6**, $f'(x)e_j = \sum_{i=1}^m (D_j f_i)(x)e_i$ where $(D_j f_i)(x)$ is the derivative of the component f_i in respect to x_j for $j = \{1, \dots, n\}$.

Since $f'(x)e_j$ is the j -th column of $[f'(x)]$, then:

$$[f'(x)] = \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{i=1}^m (D_1 f_i)(x)e_i & \sum_{i=1}^m (D_2 f_i)(x)e_i & \dots & \sum_{i=1}^m (D_n f_i)(x)e_i \end{bmatrix}$$

where each $\sum_{i=1}^m (D_j f_i)(x)e_i$ is a column vector at the j -th column.

Since each $\sum_{i=1}^m (D_j f_i)(x)e_i$ has a coordinate of $(D_j f_i)(x)$ for e_i where each $e_i = (0, \dots, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^m$, then:

$$[f'(x)] = \begin{bmatrix} (D_1 f_1)(x) & (D_2 f_1)(x) & \dots & (D_n f_1)(x) \\ (D_1 f_2)(x) & (D_2 f_2)(x) & \dots & (D_n f_2)(x) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ (D_1 f_m)(x) & (D_2 f_m)(x) & \dots & (D_n f_m)(x) \end{bmatrix}$$

Thus, for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ where $x = x_1 e_1 + \dots + x_n e_n$, then:

$$\begin{aligned} f'(x)x &= f'(x) \left[\sum_{j=1}^n x_j e_j \right] \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n x_j f'(x)e_j \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n x_j \sum_{i=1}^m (D_j f_i)(x)e_i \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m \left[\sum_{j=1}^n x_j (D_j f_i)(x) \right] e_i \end{aligned}$$

Definition 16.2.8: Gradient and Directional Derivative

Let $\gamma: (a, b) \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \text{open } E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and $f: E \subset \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ both be differentiable.

Then by **theorem 16.2.4**, $g: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined as $g(t) = f(\gamma(t))$ is differentiable for any $t \in (a, b)$ such that:

$$g'(t) = f'(\gamma(t)) \gamma'(t)$$

Since $f(\gamma(t)): E \subset \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, by **theorem 16.2.6**, then:

$$f'(\gamma(t))e_j = (D_j f)(\gamma(t)) \text{ for } j = \{1, \dots, n\}$$

Since $\gamma: (a, b) \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \text{open } E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, then:

$$\gamma'(t) = \sum_{i=1}^n (D_i \gamma)(t)e_i = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma'_i(t)e_i$$

Thus, $g'(t) = \sum_{i=1}^n (D_i f)(\gamma(t)) \gamma'_i(t)$.

For each $x \in E$, let the **gradient** of $f: E \subset \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ at x , $(\nabla f)(x)$:

$$(\nabla f)(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n (D_i f)(x)e_i$$

Since $e_i e_j = 1$ if $i = j$, but $e_i e_j = 0$ if $i \neq j$, then:

$$\begin{aligned} [f(\gamma(t))]' &= g'(t) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n (D_i f)(\gamma(t)) \gamma'_i(t) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n [(D_i f)(\gamma(t))e_i \cdot \gamma'_i(t)e_i] \\ &= \left[\sum_{i=1}^n (D_i f)(\gamma(t))e_i \right] \cdot \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \gamma'_i(t)e_i \right] = (\nabla f)(\gamma(t)) \cdot \gamma'(t) \end{aligned}$$

For $t \in (-\infty, \infty)$, let $\gamma(t) = x + tu$ where $x \in E$ and unit vector $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned} (D_u f)(x) &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(x+tu) - f(x)}{t} = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{g(t) - g(0)}{t} = g'(x) \\ &= (\nabla f)(\gamma(x)) \cdot \gamma'(x) = (\nabla f)(x) \cdot u \end{aligned}$$

Let $(D_u f)(x)$ be the **directional derivative** of f at x in direction of u .

For $u = u_1 e_1 + \dots + u_n e_n$:

$$(D_u f)(x) = (\nabla f)(x) \cdot u = \sum_{i=1}^n (D_i f)(x)e_i \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n u_i e_i = \sum_{i=1}^n (D_i f)(x)u_i$$

Also, for a fixed f and x , $(D_u f)(x)$ is maximized when $u = \lambda(\nabla f)(x)$ for $\lambda > 1$ since $x \cdot y = |x||y| \cos(\theta)$ where θ is the angle between x and y .

Theorem 16.2.9: A bounded derivative over a convex space have bounded range

For differentiable f : convex open $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$, there is a $M \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\|f'(x)\| \leq M$ for every $x \in E$. Then for all $a, b \in E$:

$$|f(b) - f(a)| \leq M|b - a|$$

Proof

For fixed $a, b \in E$, let $\gamma(t) = (1-t)a + tb$. Since E is convex, for $t \in [0, 1]$, then $\gamma(t) \in E$. Let $g(t) = f(\gamma(t))$. Then $g'(t) = f'(\gamma(t))\gamma'(t) = f'(\gamma(t))(b-a)$. Thus, for $t \in [0, 1]$:

$$|g'(t)| = |f'(\gamma(t))(b-a)| \leq \|f'(\gamma(t))\| |b-a| \leq M|b-a|$$

Since $g(0) = f(\gamma(0)) = f(a)$ and $g(1) = f(\gamma(1)) = f(b)$, then by the Mean Value Theorem, for $x \in (0, 1)$

$$|f(b) - f(a)| = |g(1) - g(0)| \leq (1-0)|g'(x)| \leq M|b-a|$$

Corollary 16.2.10: If the derivative is 0, the function is constant

For differentiable f : convex open $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$, $f'(x) = 0$ for all $x \in E$.

Then, f is constant.

Proof

Since $\|f'(x)\| = 0$ for all $x \in E$, then by **theorem 7.2.9**, for all $a, b \in E$:

$$0 \leq |f(b) - f(a)| \leq 0(b-a) = 0$$

Thus, $f(b) = f(a)$ for all $a, b \in E$ so f is constant.

Definition 16.2.11: Continuously Differentiable

A differentiable f : open $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ is **continuously differentiable** in E if:

f' : $E \rightarrow L(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^m)$ is continuous

For $\epsilon > 0$, there is a $\delta > 0$ such that for every $x, y \in E$ where $|x - y| < \delta$, then:

$$\|f'(y) - f'(x)\| < \epsilon$$

If f is continuously differentiable, then $f \in \mathcal{C}'(E)$.

Theorem 16.2.12: Continuously differentiable imply continuous partial derivatives

Let f : open $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$. Then $f \in \mathcal{C}'(E)$ if and only if each partial derivative $D_j f_i$ exist and are continuous on E .

Proof

If $f \in \mathcal{C}'(E)$, then f is differentiable. Thus, by [theorem 16.2.6](#), partial derivative $D_j f_i$ where $j = \{1, \dots, n\}$ exists for any $x \in E$ such that:

$$f'(x)e_j = \sum_{i=1}^m (D_j f_i)(x)e_i \quad \Rightarrow \quad (D_j f_i)(x) = f'(x)e_j \cdot e_i$$

Thus, since $f \in \mathcal{C}'(E)$, then for $|x - y| < \delta$:

$$\begin{aligned} |(D_j f_i)(y) - (D_j f_i)(x)| &= |f'(y)e_j \cdot e_i - f'(x)e_j \cdot e_i| = |[f'(y) - f'(x)]e_j \cdot e_i| \\ &\leq |[f'(y) - f'(x)]e_j| |e_i| \leq \|f'(y) - f'(x)\| |e_j| |e_i| \\ &= \|f'(y) - f'(x)\| < \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

Thus, each $D_j f_i$ is continuous.

Since each $D_j f_i$ is continuous, then for $\epsilon > 0$, there is a $\delta > 0$ such that for $|y - x| < \delta$, then for all $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, then $|D_j f_i(y) - D_j f_i(x)| < \epsilon$.

Then for $h = h_1 e_1 + \dots + h_n e_n$ where $|x - h| < \delta$:

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{|f(x+h) - f(x) - \sum_{i=1}^m [\sum_{j=1}^n (D_j f_i)(x)h_j]e_i|}{|h|} \\ &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{|\sum_{i=1}^m [f_i(x+h_1 e_1 + \dots + h_n e_n) - f_i(x)]e_i - \sum_{i=1}^m [\sum_{j=1}^n (D_j f_i)(x)h_j]e_i|}{|h|} \\ &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{|\sum_{i=1}^m [f_i(x+h_1 e_1 + \dots + h_n e_n) - f_i(x) - \sum_{j=1}^n (D_j f_i)(x)h_j]e_i|}{|h|} \\ &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{\left| \sum_{i=1}^m \begin{bmatrix} f_i(x + \sum_{k=1}^n h_k e_k) - f_i(x + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} h_k e_k) \\ + f_i(x + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} h_k e_k) - f_i(x + \sum_{k=1}^{n-2} h_k e_k) \\ + \dots + f_i(x + h_1) - f_i(x) - \sum_{j=1}^n (D_j f_i)(x)h_j \end{bmatrix} e_i \right|}{|h|} \end{aligned}$$

Since each $D_j f_i$ exist, then by the Mean Value Theorem, for each $j = \{1, \dots, n\}$, there is a $t_j \in (0, h_j)$ such that:

$$f_i(x + \sum_{k=1}^j h_k e_k) - f_i(x + \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} h_k e_k) = D_n f_i(x + \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} h_k e_k + t_j e_j)h_j$$

Thus:

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{|f(x+h) - f(x) - \sum_{i=1}^m [\sum_{j=1}^n (D_j f_i)(x)h_j]e_i|}{|h|} \\ &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{|\sum_{i=1}^m [\sum_{j=1}^n D_n f_i(x + \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} h_k e_k + t_j e_j)h_j - \sum_{j=1}^n (D_j f_i)(x)h_j]e_i|}{|h|} \\ &< \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{|\sum_{i=1}^m [\sum_{j=1}^n \epsilon h_j]e_i|}{|h|} \leq \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{|\sum_{i=1}^m [n\epsilon|h|]e_i|}{|h|} = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{\sqrt{mn}\epsilon|h|}{|h|} = \sqrt{mn}\epsilon \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $f(x)$ is differentiable where:

$$f'(x) = \begin{bmatrix} (D_1 f_1)(x) & (D_2 f_1)(x) & \dots & (D_n f_1)(x) \\ (D_1 f_2)(x) & (D_2 f_2)(x) & \dots & (D_n f_2)(x) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ (D_1 f_m)(x) & (D_2 f_m)(x) & \dots & (D_n f_m)(x) \end{bmatrix}$$

Thus, for $|y - x| < \delta$:

$$\|f'(y) - f'(x)\| \leq \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n [(D_j f_i)(y) - (D_j f_i)(x)]^2} < \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n \epsilon^2} = \sqrt{mn}\epsilon$$

Thus, $f \in \mathcal{C}'(E)$.

16.3 The Contraction Principle

Definition 16.3.1: Contraction

For metric space X with metric d , then $\phi: X \rightarrow X$ is a **contraction** if there is $c \in (0,1)$ such that for all $x, y \in X$:

$$d(\phi(x), \phi(y)) \leq c d(x, y)$$

Theorem 16.3.2: Banach's Fixed Point Theorem

If X is a complete metric space and ϕ is a contraction of X into X , then there is a unique $x \in X$ such that $\phi(x) = x$

Proof

Let $\phi(x) = x$ and $\phi(y) = y$. Since ϕ is a contraction, then $d(x, y) = d(\phi(x), \phi(y)) \leq c d(x, y)$ would hold true only if $d(x, y) = 0$ so $x = y$. Thus, such a $\phi(x) = x$ is unique.

For a fixed $x_0 \in X$, let $\{x_n\}$ have $x_{n+1} = \phi(x_n)$. Thus, for some $c \in (0,1)$:

$$\begin{aligned} d(x_{n+1}, x_n) &= d(\phi(x_n), \phi(x_{n-1})) \leq c d(x_n, x_{n-1}) \\ &= c d(\phi(x_{n-1}), \phi(x_{n-2})) = \dots = c^n d(x_1, x_0) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for $\epsilon > 0$, choose N such that $d(x_1, x_0) \frac{c^N}{(1-c)} < \epsilon$. Then for $m > n \geq N$:

$$\begin{aligned} d(x_m, x_n) &\leq \sum_{i=n}^{m-1} d(x_{i+1}, x_i) \leq \sum_{i=n}^{m-1} c^i d(x_1, x_0) \\ &\leq d(x_1, x_0) \frac{c^n}{1-c} \leq d(x_1, x_0) \frac{c^N}{1-c} < \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\{x_n\}$ is a Cauchy Sequence and since X is complete, then $\{x_n\}$ converges to a $x \in X$. Note a contraction is uniformly continuous so:

$$\phi(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \phi(x_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_{n+1} = x$$

Example

For $y' = y$ where $y(0) = 1$, show $y(x) = e^x$ for x near 0.

Take the metric space of continuous functions, $C[a, b]$, with the sup metric as defined in [definition 14.3.4](#) where $0 \in [a, b]$. By [theorem 14.3.5](#), $C[a, b]$ is complete.

Then for each $f \in C[a, b]$, let $Tf(x) = 1 + \int_0^x f(t) dt$ for $x \in [a, b]$.

$$\begin{aligned} |Tf(x) - Tg(x)| &= \left| \int_0^x f(t) - g(t) dt \right| \leq \int_{\min(0, x)}^{\max(0, x)} |f(t) - g(t)| dt \\ &\leq |x - 0| d(f, g) \leq (b-a) d(f, g) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $d(Tf(x), Tg(x)) \leq (b-a) d(f, g)$ so for $b-a < 1$, then T is a contraction. By [theorem 16.3.2](#), there is a unique y where $y(x) = 1 + \int_0^x y(t) dt$. To determine y , use the process defined in [theorem 16.3.2](#)'s proof referred as the Picard iteration. Using any continuous $f(x)$, let's take $f(x) = 1$. Then:

$$T(1) = 1 + \int_0^x 1 dt = 1 + x$$

$$T(T(1)) = 1 + \int_0^x 1+t dt = 1 + x + \frac{1}{2}x^2$$

$$T(T(T(1))) = 1 + \int_0^x 1+t+\frac{1}{2}t^2 dt = 1 + x + \frac{1}{2}x^2 + \frac{1}{6}x^3$$

Thus, by [definition 15.2.1](#), $y(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} T^n(1) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{x^k}{k!} = e^x$.

16.4 Inverse Function Theorem

Theorem 16.4.1: Inverse Function Theorem

Let $f \in \mathcal{C}'(E)$: open $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ where $Df(a)$ is invertible for some (a,b) .

(a) There are open $U, V \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $f: a \in U \rightarrow b \in V$ is invertible

(b) If $g = f^{-1}: V \rightarrow U$ where $g(f(x)) = x$, then for $y = f(x)$:

$$g \in \mathcal{C}'(V) \text{ where } Dg(y) = [Df(g(y))]^{-1}$$

Proof

Since $Df(a)$ is invertible for $a \in E$, then choose λ such that $\|[Df(a)]^{-1}\| = \frac{1}{2\lambda}$

Since $Df(a)$ is continuous at a , there is a $B_r(a) \subset E$ such that for $x \in U$:

$$\|Df(x) - Df(a)\| < \lambda$$

For each $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, let $\phi(x) = x + [Df(a)]^{-1}(y - f(x))$ for $x \in E$. Then $f(x) = y$ if and only if $\phi(x) = x$. Since:

$$\phi'(x) = I - [Df(a)]^{-1}Df(x) = [Df(a)]^{-1}(Df(a) - Df(x)) < \frac{1}{2\lambda}\lambda = \frac{1}{2}$$

Then by [theorem 16.2.9](#), for all $x_1, x_2 \in B_r(a)$, then $|\phi(x_1) - \phi(x_2)| \leq \frac{1}{2}|x_1 - x_2|$.

Thus, ϕ is a contraction so on $\overline{B_r(a)}$ which is complete, then there is a unique $x \in \overline{B_r(a)}$ such that $\phi(x) = x$. Thus for each y , then $f(x) = y$ for a unique x so f is 1-1.

Let $U = B_r(a)$ and $V = f(B_r(a))$ so f maps U onto V . Thus, f is invertible on U .

Then for each $y_0 \in V$, then $y_0 = f(x_0)$ for a unique $x_0 \in U$. Choose t for $B_t(x_0)$ such that $\overline{B_t(x_0)} \subset U = B_r(a)$. Then for $y \in V$ where $|y - y_0| < \lambda t$ and $x \in \overline{B_t(x_0)}$:

$$|\phi(x_0) - x_0| = |[Df(a)]^{-1}(y - f(x_0))| \leq \frac{1}{2\lambda}\lambda t = \frac{t}{2}$$

$$|\phi(x) - x_0| \leq |\phi(x) - \phi(x_0)| + |\phi(x_0) - x_0| < \frac{1}{2}|x - x_0| + \frac{t}{2} \leq \frac{t}{2} + \frac{t}{2} = t$$

Thus, $\phi(x) \in B_t(x_0)$. Since $|\phi(x_1) - \phi(x_2)| \leq \frac{1}{2}|x_1 - x_2|$ for $x_1, x_2 \in \overline{B_t(x_0)}$, then ϕ is a contraction on $\overline{B_t(x_0)}$ so there is a unique $x \in \overline{B_t(x_0)}$ such that $\phi(x) = x$ so for y where $|y - y_0| < \lambda t$, then $f(x) = y$. Thus, $y \in f(\overline{B_t(x_0)}) \subset f(U) = V$ so V is open.

For $y, y+k \in V$, there are $x, x+h \in U$ such that $f(x) = y$ and $f(x+h) = y+k$.

$$\phi(x+h) - \phi(x) = h + [Df(a)]^{-1}(f(x) - f(x+h)) = h + [Df(a)]^{-1}k$$

Since $|\phi(x+h) - \phi(x)| < \frac{1}{2}|h|$, then $[Df(a)]^{-1}k \in [\frac{1}{2}|h|, \frac{3}{2}|h|]$.

$$|h| \leq 2[Df(a)]^{-1}k \leq 2\|[Df(a)]^{-1}\| |k| \leq \frac{|k|}{\lambda}$$

Since $\|Df(x) - Df(a)\| \|[Df(a)]^{-1}\| < \lambda \frac{1}{2\lambda} = \frac{1}{2} < 1$, then by [theorem 16.1.9a](#), then $Df(x)$ is invertible and thus, have an inverse T . Since:

$$g(y+k) - g(y) - Tk = h - Tk = -T(f(x+h) - f(x) - Df(x)h)$$

$$\text{then } \frac{|g(y+k) - g(y) - Tk|}{|k|} \leq \frac{\|T\| |f(x+h) - f(x) - Df(x)h|}{|h|}.$$

As $k \rightarrow 0$, then $h \rightarrow 0$. Since f is differentiable, then $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{|f(x+h) - f(x) - Df(x)h|}{|h|} \rightarrow 0$ so $\lim_{k \rightarrow 0} \frac{|g(y+k) - g(y) - Tk|}{|k|} = 0$. Thus, $Dg(y) = T$ where T is the inverse of $Df(x)$.

$$Df(x)Dg(y) = Df(x)T = I_{n \times n} \rightarrow Dg(y) = [Df(x)]^{-1} = [Df(g(y))]^{-1}$$

Since g is differentiable and thus, continuous and $Df(x)$ is continuous, then by [theorem 16.1.9b](#), $[Df(g(y))]^{-1}$ is continuous.

Corollary 16.4.2: f with continuous, invertible $Df(x)$ at all x is an open mapping

If $f \in \mathcal{C}'(E)$: open $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ where $Df(x)$ is invertible for every $x \in E$, then open $f(W) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ for every open $W \subset E$.

Proof

From [theorem 16.4.1a](#), let $U = W$ contain x . Then, $V = f(U) = f(W)$ is open.

Example

$$xe^{xy} - \sin(y) = a$$

$$x^9y^{10} + 3\cos(xy) = b$$

Prove there is a unique solution for all (a,b) close to $(e - \sin(1), 1 + 3\cos(1))$

Let $f(x,y) = (xe^{xy} - \sin(y), x^9y^{10} + 3\cos(xy))$.

Since each component is differentiable at all x,y, then $f(x,y)$ is differentiable where:

$$Df(x,y) = \begin{bmatrix} e^{xy} + xye^{xy} & x^2e^{xy} - \cos(y) \\ 9x^8y^{10} - 3y\sin(xy) & 10x^9y^9 - 3x\sin(xy) \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\text{Since } Df(1,1) = \begin{bmatrix} 2e & e - \cos(1) \\ 9 - 3\sin(1) & 10 - 3\sin(1) \end{bmatrix} \text{ so } \det(Df(1,1)) \neq 0.$$

Then by the Inverse Function Theorem, f is invertible and thus 1-1. So, there is a unique solution (x,y) near $(1,1)$ for all (a,b) close enough to $(e - \sin(1), 1 + 3\cos(1))$.

16.5 Implicit Function Theorem**Definition 16.5.1: Matrix Components**

For $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $y = (y_1, \dots, y_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m$:

$$(x,y) = (x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_m) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}.$$

For $A \in L(\mathbb{R}^{n+m}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ where $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $k \in \mathbb{R}^m$, let:

$$A_x \in L(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n) \quad A_x h = A(h, 0)$$

$$A_y \in L(\mathbb{R}^m, \mathbb{R}^n) \quad A_y k = A(0, k)$$

Thus, $A(h,k) = A_x h + A_y k$.

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \begin{matrix} \textcolor{blue}{n+m} \\ \left[\begin{matrix} A_x & A_y \end{matrix} \right] \begin{bmatrix} h \\ k \end{bmatrix} \end{matrix} \textcolor{blue}{\}n+m} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} a_{x11} & \dots & a_{x1n} & a_{y11} & \dots & a_{y1m} \\ a_{x21} & \dots & a_{x2n} & a_{y21} & \dots & a_{y2m} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{xn1} & \dots & a_{xnn} & a_{yn1} & \dots & a_{ynm} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} h_1 \\ \dots \\ h_n \\ k_1 \\ \dots \\ k_m \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} a_{x11}h_1 & \dots & a_{x1n}h_n & a_{y11}k_1 & \dots & a_{y1m}k_m \\ a_{x21}h_1 & \dots & a_{x2n}h_n & a_{y21}k_1 & \dots & a_{y2m}k_m \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{xn1}h_1 & \dots & a_{xnn}h_n & a_{yn1}k_1 & \dots & a_{ynm}k_m \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} a_{x11}h_1 & \dots & a_{x1n}h_n \\ a_{x21}h_1 & \dots & a_{x2n}h_n \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{xn1}h_1 & \dots & a_{xnn}h_n \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} a_{y11}k_1 & \dots & a_{y1m}k_m \\ a_{y21}k_1 & \dots & a_{y2m}k_m \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{yn1}k_1 & \dots & a_{ynm}k_m \end{bmatrix} = A_x h + A_y k \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 16.5.2: Every k has a unique h such that $A(h,k) = 0$

If $A \in L(\mathbb{R}^{n+m}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ and A_x is invertible, then for every $k \in \mathbb{R}^m$, there is a unique $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $A(h,k) = 0$. Then:

$$h = -(A_x)^{-1}A_y k$$

Proof

Since $0 = A(h,k) = A_x h + A_y k$ and A_x is invertible and thus, $(A_x)^{-1}$ exist, then:

$$(A_x)^{-1}0 = (A_x)^{-1}A_x h + (A_x)^{-1}A_y k \quad \rightarrow \quad 0 = h + (A_x)^{-1}A_y k$$

Thus, $h = -(A_x)^{-1}A_y k$ is unique.

Theorem 16.5.3: Implicit Function Theorem

Let $f \in \mathcal{C}'(E)$: open $E \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+m} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $f(a,b) = 0$ for some $(a,b) \in E$.

Let $A = Df(a,b)$ where A_x is invertible.

Then there are open $U \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$, $W \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ where $(a,b) \in U$, $b \in W$ such that:

For every $y \in W$, there is a unique x such that $(x,y) \in U$ where $f(x,y) = 0$

If $x = g(y)$, then $g \in \mathcal{C}'(W)$: $W \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ where:

$$g(b) = a \quad f(g(y),y) = 0 \text{ for } y \in W \quad g'(b) = -(A_x)^{-1}A_y$$

Proof

Let $F(x,y) = (f(x,y),y)$ for $(x,y) \in E$. Then $F(x,y) \in \mathcal{C}'(E)$: $E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$.

Since $DF(x,y) = \begin{bmatrix} D_x f(x,y) & D_y f(x,y) \\ D_x y & D_y y \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} D_x f(x,y) & D_y f(x,y) \\ 0_{m \times n} & I_{m \times m} \end{bmatrix}$, then

$$\det(DF(x,y)) = \det(D_x f(x,y)) \det(I_{m \times m}) = \det(D_x f(x,y)).$$

Since $A_x = D_x f(a,b)$ is invertible so $\det(A_x) \neq 0$, then $\det(DF(a,b)) = \det(D_x f(a,b)) \neq 0$ and thus, $DF(a,b)$ is invertible. Then by **theorem 16.4.1a**, there are open $U, V \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ such that $F: (a,b) \in U \rightarrow (f(a,b),b) = (0,b) \in V$ is invertible. Let W be the set of all $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that $(0,y) \in V$ so $b \in W$ where W is open since V is open.

Since F is invertible on U so F is 1-1 on U , then for every $y \in W$ so $(0,y) \in V$, there is a unique $(x,y) \in U$ such that $F(x,y) = (f(x,y),y) = (0,y)$ so $f(x,y) = 0$.

For $y \in W$, let g be $(x,y) = (g(y),y) \in U$ and $f(g(y),y) = 0$.

Thus, $F(g(y),y) = (0,y)$ so $f(g(y),y) = 0$ for $y \in W$.

Let G be the inverse of F . Then by **theorem 16.4.1b**, then $G \in \mathcal{C}'(V)$.

$$(g(y),y) = G(F(g(y),y)) = G(0,y)$$

Thus, $g \in \mathcal{C}'(W)$: $W \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ where $b \in W$ so $g(b) = a$.

Let $(g(y),y) = \phi(y)$ so $\phi'(y)k = (g'(y)k,k)$ for $k \in \mathbb{R}^m$.

Since $f(\phi(y)) = f(g(y),y) = 0$ for $y \in W$, then $f'(\phi(y))\phi'(y) = 0$.

For $y = b \in W$, then $\phi(b) = (g(b),b) = (a,b)$ so $Df(\phi(b)) = Df(a,b) = A$.

$$0 = 0k = f'(\phi(b))\phi'(b)k = A\phi'(b)k = A(g'(b)k,k) = A_x g'(b)k + A_y k$$

Since A_x is invertible so $(A_x)^{-1}$ exist, then $g'(b)k = (A_x)^{-1}A_x g'(b)k = -(A_x)^{-1}A_y k$.

Example

$$xu^2 + yv^2 + xy = 11 \quad xv^2 + yu^2 - xy = -1$$

Show (u,v,x,y) close enough to $(1,1,2,3)$ satisfy the system of equations.

Let $F(u,v,x,y) = (xu^2 + yv^2 + xy - 11, xv^2 + yu^2 - xy + 1)$.

Then $DF_{u,v} = \begin{bmatrix} 2xu & 2yv \\ 2yu & 2xv \end{bmatrix}$ so $DF_{u,v}(1,1,2,3) = \begin{bmatrix} 4 & 6 \\ 6 & 4 \end{bmatrix}$ is invertible.

Then by the Implicit Function Theorem, there is an open W where $(2,3) \in W$ with $g(2,3) = (1,1)$ so $(u,v,x,y) = (g(x,y),x,y)$ near $(1,1,2,3)$ satisfy the equations.

17 Lebesgue Integral

17.1 Regulated Integral

Definition 17.1.1: Basic Properties of the Integral

Let \mathcal{V} be a vector space of real-valued functions on closed interval I .

If $f, g \in \mathcal{V}$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$, then $f + g, cf \in \mathcal{V}$

For each $f \in \mathcal{V}$, the integral of f on $[a, b] \subset I$, $\int_a^b f(x)dx$ should satisfy:

(a) **Linearity**: For $f, g \in \mathcal{V}$ and $c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$\int_a^b c_1 f(x) + c_2 g(x) dx = c_1 \int_a^b f(x) dx + c_2 \int_a^b g(x) dx$$

(b) **Monotonicity**: For $f, g \in \mathcal{V}$ where $g(x) \leq f(x)$:

$$\int_a^b g(x) dx \leq \int_a^b f(x) dx$$

(c) **Additivity**: For $f \in \mathcal{V}$ and $c \in [a, b]$:

$$\int_a^b f(x) dx = \int_a^c f(x) dx + \int_c^b f(x) dx$$

(d) **Constant**: For $f(x) = C$:

$$\int_a^b C dx = C(b - a)$$

(e) **Finite Sets**: For $f, g \in \mathcal{V}$ where $f(x) = g(x)$ for all, but finitely many x :

$$\int_a^b f(x) dx = \int_a^b g(x) dx$$

It should be noted that all integrals need not satisfy properties 3, 4, and 5. However, all integrals considered henceforth will satisfy them.

Theorem 17.1.2: Absolute Value

If $f, |f| \in \mathcal{V}$, then if $a \leq b$:

$$\left| \int_a^b f(x) dx \right| \leq \int_a^b |f(x)| dx$$

Proof

Since $f(x) \leq |f(x)|$, then by [definition 17.1.1b](#), $\int_a^b f(x) dx \leq \int_a^b |f(x)| dx$.

Also, since $-f(x) \leq |f(x)|$, then $\int_a^b -f(x) dx \leq \int_a^b |f(x)| dx$.

Since $\left| \int_a^b f(x) dx \right|$ is either equal to $\int_a^b f(x) dx$ or $-\int_a^b f(x) dx$, then:

$$\left| \int_a^b f(x) dx \right| \leq \int_a^b |f(x)| dx.$$

Definition 17.1.3: Step Function

Function $f: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a **step function** if there is a partition $\{x_0, \dots, x_n\}$:

$$a = x_0 < x_1 < \dots < x_{n-1} < x_n = b$$

such that $f(x) = c_i$ on (x_{i-1}, x_i) for constant c_i

Theorem 17.1.4: Integral of a Step Function

If step function f with partition $\{x_0, \dots, x_n\}$ of $[a, b]$ is $f(x) = c_i$ for $x \in (x_{i-1}, x_i)$:

$$\int_a^b f(x) dx = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i (x_i - x_{i-1})$$

Proof

By [definition 17.1.1c](#), $\int_a^b f(x) dx = \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{x_{i-1}}^{x_i} f(x) dx$

Since $f(x) = c_i$, but finitely many x on $[x_{i-1}, x_i]$ (i.e. endpoints):

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \int_{x_{i-1}}^{x_i} f(x) dx = \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{x_{i-1}}^{x_i} c_i dx = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i (x_i - x_{i-1})$$

Theorem 17.1.5: Step Functions form a Vector Space

The collection of all step functions on $[a, b]$ form a vector space

Proof

Let f, g be step functions with values c_i and d_j on partitions $\{x_0, \dots, x_n\}$ and $\{y_0, \dots, y_m\}$ respectively. Let $k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{R}$. Let partition $Z = \{x_0, \dots, x_n\} \cup \{y_0, \dots, y_m\}$. Then each $[z_{k-1}, z_k] \subset [x_{i-1}, x_i]$ and $[z_{k-1}, z_k] \subset [y_{j-1}, y_j]$ for some i and j . Then $k_1 f + k_2 g$ have value $k_1 c_i + k_2 d_j$ on (z_{k-1}, z_k) so $k_1 f + k_2 g$ is a step function.

Theorem 17.1.6: Integral of Step Functions are independent of Partition

Let step function f have value c_i on partition $\{x_0, \dots, x_n\}$ and value d_j on partition $\{y_0, \dots, y_m\}$. Then:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n c_i (x_i - x_{i-1}) = \sum_{j=1}^m d_j (y_j - y_{j-1})$$

Proof

Let partition $Z = \{x_0, \dots, x_n\} \cup \{y_0, \dots, y_m\}$. Then each $[z_{k-1}, z_k] \subset [x_{i-1}, x_i]$ and $[z_{k-1}, z_k] \subset [y_{j-1}, y_j]$ for some i and j . Let $\{z_t^*\}$ be the set of z_k where $[z_{t-1}^*, z_t^*] = [z_{k-1}, z_k] \cup \dots \cup [z_{k+t^*-1}, z_{k+t^*}] = [x_{i-1}, x_i]$.

$$\sum_i c_i (x_i - x_{i-1}) = \sum_t c_i (z_t^* - z_{t-1}^*)$$

$$= \sum_k v_k (z_k - z_{k-1}) \quad \text{where } v_k = c_i \text{ where } [z_{k-1}, z_k] \subset [x_{i-1}, x_i]$$

Let $\{z_t^{**}\}$ be the set of z_k where $[z_{t-1}^{**}, z_t^{**}] = [z_{k-1}, z_k] \cup \dots \cup [z_{k+t^{**}-1}, z_{k+t^{**}}] = [y_{j-1}, y_j]$.

$$\sum_j d_j (y_j - y_{j-1}) = \sum_t d_j (z_t^{**} - z_{t-1}^{**})$$

$$= \sum_k v_k (z_k - z_{k-1}) \quad \text{where } v_k = d_j \text{ where } [z_{k-1}, z_k] \subset [y_{j-1}, y_j]$$

Thus, $\sum_i c_i (x_i - x_{i-1}) = \sum_k v_k (z_k - z_{k-1}) = \sum_j d_j (y_j - y_{j-1})$.

Definition 17.1.7: Regulated Function

Function $f: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is **regulated** if:

There is a sequence of step functions $\{f_n\}$ that converge uniformly to f

Theorem 17.1.8: Regulated Integral

Suppose step functions $\{f_n\}$ on $[a, b]$ converge uniformly to f . Then $\{\int_a^b f_n(x) dx\}$ converges. If step functions $\{g_n\}$ also converge uniformly to f :

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_a^b f_n(x) dx = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_a^b g_n(x) dx$$

Then, the regulated integral of f on $[a, b]$ can be defined:

$$\int_a^b f(x) dx = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_a^b f_n(x) dx$$

Proof

Let $z_n = \int_a^b f_n(x) dx$. Since $\{f_n\}$ converges uniformly to f , there is a N where for $m, n \geq N$ and all $x \in [a, b]$:
 $|f_m(x) - f_n(x)| < \frac{\epsilon}{b-a}$
 Thus:
 $|z_m - z_n| = |\int_a^b f_m(x) dx - \int_a^b f_n(x) dx| \leq \int_a^b |f_m(x) - f_n(x)| dx < \int_a^b \frac{\epsilon}{b-a} dx = \epsilon$
 Since $\{z_n\}$ is Cauchy on \mathbb{R} , then $\{z_n\}$ converges.
 If $\{g_n\}$ converges uniformly to f , then there is a M where for $n \geq M$ and all $x \in [a, b]$:
 $|f_n(x) - f| < \frac{\epsilon}{2(b-a)} \quad |g_n(x) - f| < \frac{\epsilon}{2(b-a)}$
 $|f_n(x) - g_n(x)| \leq |f_n(x) - f| + |f - g_n(x)| < \frac{\epsilon}{2(b-a)} + \frac{\epsilon}{2(b-a)} = \frac{\epsilon}{b-a}$
 Thus
 $|\int_a^b f(x) dx - \int_a^b f_n(x) dx| \leq \int_a^b |f(x) - f_n(x)| dx < \int_a^b \frac{\epsilon}{b-a} dx = \epsilon$

Theorem 17.1.9: Continuous functions are regulated

Every continuous function $f: [a,b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a regulated function

Proof

Since f is continuous on compact $[a,b]$, then f is uniformly continuous on $[a,b]$.
 Thus for any $\epsilon_n = \frac{1}{2^n}$, there is a δ_n where for $|x - y| < \delta_n$, then $|f(x) - f(y)| < \epsilon_n$.
 For a fixed n , choose a partition $\{x_0, \dots, x_m\}$ such that each $\Delta x_i = \frac{b-a}{m} < \delta_n$.
 Let step function $f_n(x) = f(x_i)$ for $x \in [x_{i-1}, x_i)$ for $i = \{1, \dots, m\}$. For $x \in [a,b]$, there is an i such that $x \in [x_{i-1}, x_i)$ so $|f(x) - f_n(x)| = |f(x) - f(x_i)| < \epsilon_n$.
 Thus, $\{f_n\}$ converges uniformly to f , then f is regulated.

Theorem 17.1.10: Lower and Upper Riemann Limit Redefined

Let f be a bounded on $[a,b]$. Let:

$$\mathcal{U}(f) = \{ u(x) \mid f(x) \leq u(x) \text{ for all } x, u(x) \text{ is a step function} \}.$$

$$\mathcal{L}(f) = \{ v(x) \mid f(x) \geq v(x) \text{ for all } x, v(x) \text{ is a step function} \}.$$

$$\text{Then, } \sup_{v \in \mathcal{L}(f)} \left(\int_a^b v(x) dx \right) \leq \inf_{u \in \mathcal{U}(f)} \left(\int_a^b u(x) dx \right).$$

Proof

Since $v(x) \leq f(x) \leq u(x)$, then $\int_a^b v(x) dx \leq \int_a^b u(x) dx$.
 Since $\int_a^b v(x) dx \leq \int_a^b u(x) dx$ holds for any $u(x) \geq v(x)$, then:
 $\int_a^b v(x) dx \leq \inf \left(\int_a^b u(x) dx \right)$
 Also, since $\int_a^b v(x) dx \leq \inf \left(\int_a^b u(x) dx \right)$ holds for any $v(x) \leq u(x)$, then:
 $\sup \left(\int_a^b v(x) dx \right) \leq \inf \left(\int_a^b u(x) dx \right)$

Definition 17.1.11: Riemann Integral Redefined

Let f be a bounded on $[a,b]$. Let:

$$\mathcal{U}(f) = \{ u(x) \mid f(x) \leq u(x) \text{ for all } x, u(x) \text{ is a step function} \}.$$

$$\mathcal{L}(f) = \{ v(x) \mid f(x) \geq v(x) \text{ for all } x, v(x) \text{ is a step function} \}.$$

Then f is Riemann integrable if:

$$\sup_{v \in \mathcal{L}(f)} \left(\int_a^b v(x) dx \right) = \inf_{u \in \mathcal{U}(f)} \left(\int_a^b u(x) dx \right)$$

Theorem 17.1.12: Riemann-Integrability ϵ Definition Redefined

A bounded f on $[a,b]$ is Riemann integrable if and only if:

For $\epsilon > 0$, there are step functions $v(x), u(x)$ where $v(x) \leq f(x) \leq u(x)$:

$$\int_a^b u(x) dx - \int_a^b v(x) dx < \epsilon$$

Proof

If f is Riemann integrable, then for $\epsilon > 0$, there are step functions $u(x), v(x)$:
 $\left| \int_a^b f(x) dx - \int_a^b u(x) dx \right| < \frac{\epsilon}{2} \quad \left| \int_a^b f(x) dx - \int_a^b v(x) dx \right| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$
 Thus:
 $\left| \int_a^b u(x) dx - \int_a^b v(x) dx \right| \leq \left| \int_a^b u(x) dx - \int_a^b f(x) dx \right| + \left| \int_a^b f(x) dx - \int_a^b v(x) dx \right| < \epsilon$

If for $\epsilon > 0$, there are step functions $v(x), u(x)$ where $v(x) \leq f(x) \leq u(x)$:
 $\int_a^b u(x) dx - \int_a^b v(x) dx < \epsilon$
 Since $\sup \left(\int_a^b v(x) dx \right) \geq \int_a^b v(x) dx$ and $\inf \left(\int_a^b u(x) dx \right) \leq \int_a^b u(x) dx$, then:
 $\inf \left(\int_a^b u(x) dx \right) - \sup \left(\int_a^b v(x) dx \right) \leq \int_a^b u(x) dx - \int_a^b v(x) dx < \epsilon$
 Thus, $\sup \left(\int_a^b v(x) dx \right) = \inf \left(\int_a^b u(x) dx \right)$ so f is Riemann integrable.

Theorem 17.1.13: Regulated functions are Riemann Integrable

Every regulated function is Riemann integrable where the regulated integral is equal to the Riemann integral

Proof

Since f is regulated, then for $\epsilon_n = \frac{1}{2^n}$, there is a step function f_n such that for all $x \in [a, b]$ so $|f(x) - f_n(x)| < \epsilon_n$. Thus, $\int_a^b f(x)dx = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_a^b f_n(x)dx$.
 Let step functions $u_n(x) = f_n(x) + \frac{1}{2^n}$ and $v_n(x) = f_n(x) - \frac{1}{2^n}$ so $v_n(x) < f(x) < u_n(x)$ for all $x \in [a, b]$. Then:

$$\left| \int_a^b u_n(x)dx - \int_a^b v_n(x)dx \right| \leq \int_a^b |u_n(x) - v_n(x)|dx = \int_a^b \frac{1}{2^{n-1}}dx = \frac{b-a}{2^{n-1}}$$

 Thus, by **theorem 17.1.12**, f is Riemann integrable. Since:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_a^b u_n(x)dx = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_a^b f_n(x)dx + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_a^b \frac{1}{2^n}dx = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_a^b f_n(x)dx$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_a^b v_n(x)dx = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_a^b f_n(x)dx - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_a^b \frac{1}{2^n}dx = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_a^b f_n(x)dx$$

 Thus, the Riemann integral of f is $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_a^b f_n(x)dx$ so the regulated integral is equal to the Riemann integral.

Theorem 17.1.14: Riemann Intergrable functions form a vector space

The set \mathcal{R} of bounded Riemann integrable functions on $[a, b]$ is a vector space that contains the vector space of regulated functions

Proof

By **theorem 17.1.13**, every regulated function is Riemann integrable so \mathcal{R} contain the set of regulated functions. Let $f, g \in \mathcal{R}$ and $c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{R}$.
 Then for $\epsilon > 0$, there are step functions v_f, u_f where $v_f \leq f \leq u_f$ such that:

$$\int_a^b u_f(x)dx - \int_a^b v_f(x)dx < \frac{\epsilon}{2c_1}$$

 Also, there are step functions v_g, u_g where $v_g \leq g \leq u_g$ such that:

$$\int_a^b u_g(x)dx - \int_a^b v_g(x)dx < \frac{\epsilon}{2c_2}$$

 Since $c_1 v_f + c_2 v_g \leq c_1 f + c_2 g \leq c_1 u_f + c_2 u_g$ where $c_1 v_f + c_2 v_g, c_1 u_f + c_2 u_g$ are step functions such that:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_a^b (c_1 u_f(x) + c_2 u_g(x))dx - \int_a^b (c_1 v_f(x) + c_2 v_g(x))dx \\ &= \int_a^b c_1 (u_f(x) - v_f(x))dx + \int_a^b c_2 (u_g(x) - v_g(x))dx < c_1 \frac{\epsilon}{2c_1} + c_2 \frac{\epsilon}{2c_2} = \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

 then $c_1 f + c_2 g$ is Riemann integrable so $c_1 f + c_2 g \in \mathcal{R}$.

17.2 Outer Measure

Definition 17.2.1: Basic Properties of the Length / Measure of a Set

For bounded $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}$, there is an associated non-negative real number $\mu(A)$:

- (a) **Length**: If $A = (a, b)$ or $A = [a, b]$, then:

$$\mu(A) = \text{len}(A) = b - a$$

- (b) **Translation Invariance**: If $c \in \mathbb{R}$, then:

$$\mu(A + c) = \mu(A)$$

- (c) **Countable Additivity**: If $\{A_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is countable, then:

$$\mu(\cup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n) \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_n)$$

If each A_n are pairwise disjoint, then:

$$\mu(\cup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_n)$$

- (d) **Monotonicity**: If $A \subset B$, then:

$$\mu(A) \leq \mu(B)$$

Definition 17.2.2: Null Set

$X \subset \mathbb{R}$ is a **null set** if for $\epsilon > 0$:

There is a collection of open set $\{U_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ where $X \subset \bigcup_{n=1}^\infty U_n$:

$$\sum_{n=1}^\infty \text{len}(U_n) < \epsilon$$

If X is a null set, then X^c has full measure.

Definition 17.2.3: Outer Measure

Let $A \subset \mathbb{R}$. Let open intervals $\{I_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be such that $A \subset \bigcup_{n=1}^\infty I_n$.

Then the **outer measure** $\mu^*(A)$:

$$\mu^*(A) = \inf(\sum_{n=1}^\infty \text{len}(I_n))$$

Theorem 17.2.4: Null set $A \Leftrightarrow \mu^*(A) = 0$

Let $A \subset \mathbb{R}$. Then, A is a null set if and only if $\mu^*(A) = 0$.

Proof

If A is a null set, then for $\epsilon > 0$, there are open intervals $\{I_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ where $A \subset \bigcup_{n=1}^\infty I_n$:

$$\sum_{n=1}^\infty \text{len}(I_n) < \epsilon$$

Then, $\mu^*(A) = \inf(\sum_{n=1}^\infty \text{len}(I_n)) \leq \sum_{n=1}^\infty \text{len}(I_n) = \epsilon$ so $\mu^*(A) < \epsilon$.

If $\mu^*(A) = 0$, then for open intervals $\{I_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ where $A \subset \bigcup_{n=1}^\infty I_n$:

$$0 = \mu^*(A) = \inf(\sum_{n=1}^\infty \text{len}(I_n))$$

Thus, for $\epsilon > 0$, there is a $\{I_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ such that $\sum_{n=1}^\infty \text{len}(I_n) < \epsilon$ so A is a null set.

Theorem 17.2.5: Outer Measure: Length Property

$$\mu^*([a, b]) = \mu^*((a, b)) = b - a$$

Let $I_n = (a - \frac{\epsilon}{2}, b + \frac{\epsilon}{2})$. Then:

$$\mu^*([a, b]) \leq \text{len}(I_n) = b - a + \epsilon \rightarrow \mu^*([a, b]) \leq b - a$$

Since $[a, b]$ is compact, then for any $\{I_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ where $[a, b] \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^\infty I_i$, there is a M such that $[a, b] \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^M I_i$. Let n be the number of elements in $[a, b]$.

If $n = 1$, then $a = b$ so $0 = \mu^*([a, b]) \geq b - a = b - b = 0$ holds true.

If $n > 1$, then there is at least two intervals I_{n_1}, I_{n_2} that intersect since if $c \in (a, b)$, then only $(a, c), (c, b)$ will not contain c . Let $V_{n-1} = I_{n-1} \cup I_{n-2}$. Then, let $V_i = I_i$ for the I_i where $i \neq n_1, n_2$ and $i < \max(n_1, n_2)$ and $V_i = I_{i-1}$ for the I_i where $i \neq n_1, n_2$ and $i > \max(n_1, n_2)$.

Thus:

$$\sum_{i=1}^M \text{len}(I_i) > \sum_{i=1}^{M_1} \text{len}(V_i) \geq b - a \rightarrow \mu^*([a, b]) \geq b - a$$

Since $(a, b) \subset [a, b]$, then $\mu^*((a, b)) \leq \text{len}([a, b]) = b - a$.

Since $\{I_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ where $(a, b) \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^\infty I_i$ have $[a + \epsilon, b - \epsilon] \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^\infty I_i$, then by process above:

$$\sum_{i=1}^\infty \text{len}(I_i) \geq b - a - 2\epsilon \rightarrow \mu^*((a, b)) \geq b - a$$

Theorem 17.2.6: Outer Measure: Monotonicity Property

If $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}$ where $A \subset B$, then $\mu^*(A) \leq \mu^*(B)$

Proof

Since $A \subset B$, then every open intervals $\{I_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ where $B \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^\infty I_i$ is $A \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^\infty I_i$. Thus:

$$\mu^*(A) = \inf_A(\sum_{i=1}^\infty \text{len}(I_i)) \leq \inf_B(\sum_{i=1}^\infty \text{len}(I_i)) = \mu^*(B)$$

Theorem 17.2.7: Outer Measure: Countable Subadditivity Property

For $\{A_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ where each $A_n \subset \mathbb{R}$:

$$\mu^*(\cup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n) \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu^*(A_n)$$

Proof

For each A_n , there are open intervals $\{I_i^n\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ where $A_n \subset \cup_{i=1}^{\infty} I_i^n$ such that for $\epsilon > 0$:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \text{len}(I_i^n) \leq \mu^*(A_n) + \frac{\epsilon}{2^n}$$

Since $\{\{I_i^n\}_{i=1}^{\infty}\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ have $\cup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \subset \cup_{n=1}^{\infty} \cup_{i=1}^{\infty} I_i^n$, then:

$$\mu^*(\cup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n) \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \text{len}(I_i^n) \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} [\mu^*(A_n) + \frac{\epsilon}{2^n}] = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu^*(A_n) + \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$

Thus, $\mu^*(\cup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n) \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu^*(A_n)$.

Corollary 17.2.8: Countable A $\Rightarrow \mu^*(A) = 0$

If A is countable, then $\mu^*(A) = 0$.

Thus, intervals are uncountable.

Proof

Since A is countable, let $A = \{x_1, x_2, \dots\}$.

Since $\mu^*(\{x_n\}) = 0$, then:

$$\mu^*(A) = \mu^*(\{x_1, x_2, \dots\}) \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu^*(\{x_n\}) = 0$$

Thus, $\mu^*(A) = 0$.

Since $\mu^*([a, b]) = b - a \neq 0$, then A is uncountable.

Theorem 17.2.9: Outer Measure: Translation Invariance Property

If $A \subset \mathbb{R}$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$, then $\mu^*(A + c) = \mu^*(A)$

Proof

There are open intervals $\{I_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ where $A+c \subset \cup_{i=1}^{\infty} I_i$ such that:

$$|\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \text{len}(I_i) - \mu^*(A+c)| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$

Let open intervals $\{I_i^*\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ be $I_i^* = I_i - c$ so $A \subset \cup_{i=1}^{\infty} I_i^*$ where:

$$|\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \text{len}(I_i^*) - \mu^*(A)| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$

Since $\text{len}(I_i^*) = \text{len}(I_i - c) = \text{len}(I_i)$, then:

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mu^*(A+c) - \mu^*(A)| \\ & \leq |\mu^*(A+c) - \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \text{len}(I_i)| + |\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \text{len}(I_i) - \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \text{len}(I_i^*)| \\ & \quad + |\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \text{len}(I_i^*) - \mu^*(A)| \\ & \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} = \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\mu^*(A+c) = \mu^*(A)$.

Theorem 17.2.10: Outer Measure: Regularity Property

If $A \subset \mathbb{R}$ and $\mu^*(A)$ is finite, then for any $\epsilon > 0$, there is an open set V where $A \subset V$ such that $\mu^*(V) < \mu^*(A) + \epsilon$. Thus:

$$\mu^*(A) = \inf(\mu^*(U) \mid U \text{ is open, } A \subset U)$$

Proof

There are open intervals $\{I_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ where $A \subset \cup_{i=1}^{\infty} I_i$ such that for $\epsilon > 0$:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \text{len}(I_i) < \mu^*(A) + \epsilon$$

Let $V = \cup_{i=1}^{\infty} I_i$. Then:

$$\mu^*(V) = \mu^*(\cup_{i=1}^{\infty} I_i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \text{len}(I_i) < \mu^*(A) + \epsilon$$

Thus, $\inf(\mu^*(U) \mid U \text{ is open, } A \subset U) \leq \mu^*(A) + \epsilon$ so:

$$\inf(\mu^*(U) \mid U \text{ is open, } A \subset U) \leq \mu^*(A).$$

Since $A \subset \cup_{i=1}^{\infty} I_i = V$, then $\mu^*(A) \leq \mu^*(V) = \inf(\mu^*(U) \mid U \text{ is open, } A \subset U)$.

Thus, $\mu^*(A) = \inf(\mu^*(U) \mid U \text{ is open, } A \subset U)$.

17.3 Lebesgue Measure

Definition 17.3.1: Sigma Algebra and Borel Sets

Let \mathcal{A} be a collection of subsets of X .

Then, \mathcal{A} is a σ -algebra of subsets of X if for $A \in \mathcal{A}$:

- (a) $X \in \mathcal{A}$
- (b) $A^c \in \mathcal{A}$ in respect to X
- (c) $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \in \mathcal{A}$

Some examples of σ -algebra of subsets of X are:

$$\mathcal{A} = \{X, \emptyset\} \quad \mathcal{A} = P(X) \text{ (i.e. all subsets of } X \text{ (} 2^{\mathbb{R}} \text{))}$$

If C is a collection of subsets of \mathbb{R} and \mathcal{A} is the smallest σ -algebra of subsets of \mathbb{R} that contains C , then \mathcal{A} is a σ -algebra generated by C .

Let \mathcal{B} be σ -algebra of subsets of \mathbb{R} generated by the collection of all open intervals. Then, \mathcal{B} is a **Borel σ -algebra** and any $B \in \mathcal{B}$ is a Borel set.

Definition 17.3.2: Lebesgue Measurable

Let the σ -algebra of subsets of \mathbb{R} generated by the collection of all open intervals and null sets be \mathcal{M} . Then, sets in \mathcal{M} are **Lebesgue measurable**.

If I is a closed interval, then $\mathcal{M}(I)$ is a σ -algebra of subsets of I .

Theorem 17.3.3: Lebesgue Measure

There is a unique μ , the **Lebesgue measure**, from $A, B \in \mathcal{M}(I)$ to \mathbb{R}_+ :

- (a) **Length**: If $A = (a, b)$, then:

$$\mu(A) = \text{len}(A) = b - a$$
- (b) **Translation Invariance**: If $c \in \mathbb{R}$ and $A + c \subset I$, then $A + c \in \mathcal{M}(I)$ where:

$$\mu(A + c) = \mu(A)$$
- (c) **Countable Additivity**: If $\{A_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is countable, then:

$$\mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n\right) \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_n)$$

If each A_n are pairwise disjoint, then:

$$\mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n\right) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_n)$$
- (d) **Monotonicity**: If $A \subset B$, then:

$$\mu(A) \leq \mu(B)$$
- (e) **Null Sets**: If $A \subset I$ is a null set, then $A \in \mathcal{M}(I)$ where:

$$\mu(A) = 0$$

Also, if $A \in \mathcal{M}(I)$ where $\mu(A) = 0$, then A is a null set.
- (f) **Regularity**

$$\mu(A) = \inf\{\mu(U) \mid U \text{ is open, } A \subset U\}$$

Theorem 17.3.4: The Lebesgue measure of set differences

If $A, B \in \mathcal{M}(I)$, then $A \setminus B \in \mathcal{M}(I)$ where:

$$\mu(A \cup B) = \mu(A \setminus B) + \mu(B)$$

Thus, if $I = [0, 1]$, then $\mu(I) = 1$ so $\mu(A^c) = 1 - \mu(A)$.

Proof

Since $A \setminus B = A \cap B^c$ where $A, B^c \in \mathcal{M}(I)$, then $A \setminus B \in \mathcal{M}(I)$.

Since $A \setminus B$ and B are disjoint where $A \setminus B \cup B = A \cup B$, then:

$$\mu(A \cup B) = \mu(A \setminus B \cup B) = \mu(A \setminus B) + \mu(B)$$

$$\mu(I \setminus A) + \mu(A) = \mu(A^c) + \mu(A) = \mu(A^c \cup A) = \mu(I) = 1$$

Theorem 17.3.5: Alternative Definition for Lebesgue Measurable

$A \subset I$ is Lebesgue Measurable if for all $X \subset I$:

$$\mu^*(A \cap X) + \mu^*(A^c \cap X) = \mu^*(X)$$

Proof

Since $X = (A \cap X) \cup (A^c \cap X)$, then by **theorem 17.2.7**, then:

$$\mu^*(X) \leq \mu^*(A \cap X) + \mu^*(A^c \cap X)$$

Theorem 17.3.6: Lebesgue Measure's Regularity ϵ Definition

If $A \in \mathcal{M}(I)$, then for $\epsilon > 0$:

There is a closed $C \subset A$ such that:

$$\mu(C) > \mu(A) - \epsilon$$

There is a countable union of pairwise disjoint open intervals $U = \cup U_n$

where $A \subset U$ such that:

$$\mu(U) < \mu(A) + \epsilon$$

Proof

Since $A \in \mathcal{M}(I)$, then $A^c \in \mathcal{M}(I)$. Thus for $\epsilon > 0$, there is an open set V such that $A^c \subset V$ where $\mu(V) < \mu(A^c) + \epsilon$. Let $C = V^c$ so C is closed and $C \subset A$. Then:

$$\mu(C) = \mu(V^c) = 1 - \mu(V) > 1 - \mu(A^c) - \epsilon = \mu(A) - \epsilon$$

Since $A \in \mathcal{M}(I)$, then for $\epsilon > 0$, there is a open set U such that $A \subset U$ where:

$$\mu(U) < \mu(A) + \epsilon$$

Theorem 17.3.7: Monotonic Measurable Sets

If $A_n \subset A_{n+1}$ are Lebesgue measurable subsets of I , then:

$$\mu(\cup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(A_n)$$

If $B_{n+1} \subset B_n$ are Lebesgue measurable subsets of I , then:

$$\mu(\cap_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(B_n)$$

Proof

Since A_n is Lebesgue measurable, then $\cup A_n$ is Lebesgue measurable.

Let $F_n = A_n \setminus A_{n-1}$, then $\cup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n = \cup_{n=1}^{\infty} F_n$ where each F_n is pairwise disjoint.

$$\mu(\cup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n) = \mu(\cup_{n=1}^{\infty} F_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^n \mu(F_i) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(A_n)$$

Since B_n is Lebesgue measurable, then $\cap B_n$ is Lebesgue measurable.

Let $E_n = B_n^c$. Since $(\cap B_n)^c = \cup E_n$ where each $E_n \subset E_{n+1}$, then:

$$\mu(\cap_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n) = 1 - \mu(\cup_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (1 - \mu(E_n)) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(B_n)$$

17.4 Lebesgue Integral

Definition 17.4.1: Indicator Function

For $A \subset [0,1]$, the indicator function:

$$\mathfrak{X}_A(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & x \in A \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Definition 17.4.2: Measurable Partition

A finite **measurable partition** of $[0,1]$ is a collection $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^n$ of measurable subsets which are pairwise disjoint where $\cup A_i = [0,1]$.

Definition 17.4.3: Simple Function

$f: [0,1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is **simple** if there exists a finite measurable partition, $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and $r_i \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n r_i \mathfrak{X}_{A_i}$.

Then the **Lebesgue integral** of a simple function:

$$\int f \, d\mu = \sum_{i=1}^n r_i \mu(A_i)$$

Theorem 17.4.4: Properties of Simple Functions

The set of simple functions is a vector space where:

(a) **Linearity**: If f, g are simple functions and $c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$\int c_1 f + c_2 g \, d\mu = c_1 \int f \, d\mu + c_2 \int g \, d\mu$$

(b) **Monotonicity**: If f, g are simple where $f(x) \leq g(x)$:

$$\int f \, d\mu \leq \int g \, d\mu$$

(c) **Absolute Value**: If f is simple, then $|f|$ is simple:

$$|\int f \, d\mu| \leq \int |f| \, d\mu$$

Proof

Since f is simple, then there is a measurable partition $\cup_{i=1}^n A_i = [0,1]$ where A_i is disjoint so $f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n r_i \mathfrak{X}_{A_i}$. Then, $c_1 f$ is simple since $c_1 f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n c_1 r_i \mathfrak{X}_{A_i}$.

Since g is simple, then there is a measurable partition $\cup_{j=1}^m B_j = [0,1]$ where B_j is disjoint so $g(x) = \sum_{j=1}^m s_j \mathfrak{X}_{B_j}$.

Then for $c_1 f + c_2 g$, take the measurable partition $\cup_{i=1}^n \cup_{j=1}^m C_{i,j}$ where $C_{i,j} = A_i \cap B_j$.

$$\begin{aligned} c_1 f(x) + c_2 g(x) &= \sum_{i=1}^n c_1 r_i \mathfrak{X}_{A_i} + \sum_{j=1}^m c_2 s_j \mathfrak{X}_{B_j} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n c_1 r_i \sum_{j=1}^m \mathfrak{X}_{C_{i,j}} + \sum_{j=1}^m c_2 s_j \sum_{i=1}^n \mathfrak{X}_{C_{i,j}} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m (c_1 r_i + c_2 s_j) \mathfrak{X}_{C_{i,j}} \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the simple functions form a vector space.

$$\begin{aligned} \int c_1 f + c_2 g \, d\mu &= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m (c_1 r_i + c_2 s_j) \mu(C_{i,j}) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n c_1 r_i \sum_{j=1}^m \mu(C_{i,j}) + \sum_{j=1}^m c_2 s_j \sum_{i=1}^n \mu(C_{i,j}) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n c_1 r_i \mu(A_i) + \sum_{j=1}^m c_2 s_j \mu(B_j) = c_1 \int f \, d\mu + c_2 \int g \, d\mu \end{aligned}$$

$$\int g \, d\mu - \int f \, d\mu = \int (f-g) \, d\mu \geq 0$$

$$|\int f \, d\mu| = |\sum_{i=1}^n r_i \mu(A_i)| \leq \sum_{i=1}^n |r_i| \mu(A_i) = \int |f| \, d\mu$$

Theorem 17.4.5: Measurable Functions

If $f: X \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty]$, then the following are equivalent:

- For any $a \in \mathbb{R}$, $f^{-1}([-\infty, a])$ is Lebesgue measurable
- For any $a \in \mathbb{R}$, $f^{-1}([-\infty, a))$ is Lebesgue measurable
- For any $a \in \mathbb{R}$, $f^{-1}([a, \infty])$ is Lebesgue measurable
- For any $a \in \mathbb{R}$, $f^{-1}((a, \infty])$ is Lebesgue measurable

Then f is [Lebesgue measurable](#).

Proof

Suppose for any $a \in \mathbb{R}$, $f^{-1}([-\infty, a])$ is Lebesgue measurable.

$f^{-1}([-\infty, a)) = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} f^{-1}([-\infty, a - \frac{1}{2^n}])$ is measurable since it's countable measurables.

$f^{-1}([a, \infty]) = f^{-1}([-\infty, a)^c) = (f^{-1}([-\infty, a)))^c$ is measurable since it's the complement of a measurable.

$f^{-1}((a, \infty]) = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} f^{-1}([a + \frac{1}{2^n}, \infty])$ is measurable since it's countable measurables.

$f^{-1}([-\infty, a]) = f^{-1}((a, \infty]^c) = (f^{-1}((a, \infty]))^c$ is measurable since it's the complement of a measurable.

Theorem 17.4.6: Measurable Functions and Null Sets

Let $f, g: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

- (a) If there is a null set $A \subset [a, b]$ where $f(x) = 0$ if $x \notin A$, then f is measurable
- (b) If $f = g$ except on null set A , then f is measurable if and only if g is measurable

Proof

Since $f(x) = 0$ if $x \notin A$, then $f^{-1}([-\infty, 0)) \cup f^{-1}((0, \infty]) \subset A$.

If $a < 0$, then $f^{-1}([-\infty, a]) \subset f^{-1}([-\infty, 0)) \subset A$ so $f^{-1}([-\infty, a])$ is a null set and thus, measurable. For $a \geq 0$, then $f^{-1}([-\infty, a]) = (f^{-1}((a, \infty]))^c \subset (f^{-1}((0, \infty)))^c$ so $f^{-1}([-\infty, a])$ is a complement of a null set and thus, measurable.

Suppose f is measurable. Let $a \in \mathbb{R}$.

$$g^{-1}([a, \infty]) = (g^{-1}([a, \infty]) \cap A) \cup (g^{-1}([a, \infty]) \cap A^c)$$

Since $f = g$ on A^c , then $(g^{-1}([a, \infty]) \cap A^c) = (f^{-1}([a, \infty]) \cap A^c)$ which is measurable. Since $(g^{-1}([a, \infty]) \cap A) \subset A$, then $(g^{-1}([a, \infty]) \cap A)$ is a null set and thus, measurable.

Proof is analogous for g .

Theorem 17.4.7: Measurable Functions and Sequences

Let $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of measurable functions. Then:

$$\begin{aligned} g_1(x) &= \sup(f_n(x)) & g_2(x) &= \inf(f_n(x)) \\ g_3(x) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup(f_n(x)) & g_4(x) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf(f_n(x)) \end{aligned}$$

are measurable.

Proof

For $a \in \mathbb{R}$, $\{x \mid g_1(x) > a\} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \{x \mid f_n(x) > a\}$ which are measurable sets so countable implies measurable and thus, g_1 is measurable.

For $a \in \mathbb{R}$, $\{x \mid g_2(x) < a\} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \{x \mid f_n(x) < a\}$ which are measurable sets so countable implies measurable and thus, g_2 is measurable.

Since $g_3(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup(f_n(x)) = \inf(\sup(f_n(x)))$ where $\sup(f_n(x))$ are measurable so g_3 is measurable.

Since $g_4(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf(f_n(x)) = \sup(\inf(f_n(x)))$ where $\inf(f_n(x))$ are measurable so g_4 is measurable.

Theorem 17.4.8: Lebesgue measurable functions form a Vector Space

The set of Lebesgue measurable functions from $[0,1]$ to \mathbb{R} is a vector space

Proof

Let f, g be Lebesgue measurable functions. For $a \in \mathbb{R}$, let set $U_a = \{f(x) + g(x) > a\}$. Since $\mathbb{Q} = \{r_m\}$ is countable and dense, there is a r_m such that $f(x) > r_m > a - g(x)$. Let $V_m = \{x \mid f(x) > r_m\} \cap \{x \mid g(x) > a - r_m\}$. If $x \in U_a$, then $x \in V_m$ for some m since there is a r_m where $f(x) > r_m > a - g(x)$. If $x \in V_m$, then $f(x) + g(x) > a$ so $x \in U_a$. Thus, $U_a = \cup_{m=1}^{\infty} V_m$ which is countable and thus, measurable since f, g are measurable. Thus, $f+g$ is measurable.

Note for $c \in \mathbb{R}$, $\{x \mid cf(x) > a\}$ is measurable since $\{x \mid f(x) > v\}$ for any $v \in \mathbb{R}$ is measurable including $\frac{a}{c}$. Thus, the measurable functions form a vector space.

If f, g are bounded and measurable, then $c_1f + c_2g$ is bounded which is measurable as proved above so bounded measurable functions is a vector subspace of measurable functions.

17.5 Lebesgue Integral of Bounded Functions**Theorem 17.5.1: Lebesgue Integral of a Bounded Function**

If $f: [0,1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is bounded, then the following are equivalent:

- f is Lebesgue measurable
- There are simple functions $\{f_n\}$ which converge uniformly to f
- If simple functions $u(x), v(x)$ where $v(x) \leq f(x) \leq u(x)$, then:

$$\sup(\int v \, d\mu) = \inf(\int u \, d\mu)$$

Then, $\int f \, d\mu = \sup(\int v \, d\mu) = \inf(\int u \, d\mu)$

Proof

Suppose f is Lebesgue measurable.

Since f is bounded, there are m, M such that $m \leq f(x) \leq M$ for all $x \in [0,1]$. For $\epsilon_n > 0$, take a large enough n such that $\frac{M-m}{n} \leq \epsilon_n$. For $\{c_0, \dots, c_n\}$, let $c_k = m + k\epsilon_n$. Let $f_n(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n c_{i-1} \chi_{f^{-1}([c_{i-1}, c_i])}$ which is simple.

Then for any $x \in [0,1]$, there is a $[c_{i-1}, c_i]$ where $x \in [c_{i-1}, c_i]$ so $|f(x) - f_n(x)| \leq \epsilon_n$.

Suppose simple functions $\{f_n\}$ converge uniformly to f .

Let $\delta_n = \sup(|f(x) - f_n(x)|)$ so $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \delta_n = 0$. Let simple functions $v_n(x) = f_n(x) - \delta_n$ and $u_n(x) = f_n(x) + \delta_n$ so $v_n(x) \leq f(x) \leq u_n(x)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \inf(\int u \, d\mu) &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf(\int u_n(x) \, d\mu) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf(\int f_n(x) + \delta_n \, d\mu) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf(\int f_n(x) \, d\mu) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup(\int f_n(x) \, d\mu) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup(\int f_n(x) - \delta_n \, d\mu) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup(\int v_n(x) \, d\mu) \leq \sup(\int v \, d\mu) \end{aligned}$$

Since $\sup(\int v \, d\mu) \leq \inf(\int u \, d\mu)$, then $\sup(\int v \, d\mu) = \inf(\int u \, d\mu)$.

For n , there are simple functions $v_n(x), u_n(x)$ where $v_n(x) \leq f(x) \leq u_n(x)$ such that:

$$\int u_n(x) \, d\mu - \int v_n(x) \, d\mu < \frac{1}{2^n}$$

Since $u_n(x)$ and $v_n(x)$ are simple and thus, measurable, then $g_1(x) = \sup(v_n(x))$ and $g_2(x) = \inf(u_n(x))$ are measurable. Let $B = \{x \mid g_1(x) < g_2(x)\}$. Suppose $\mu(B) > 0$.

If $B_m = \{x \mid g_1(x) < g_2(x) - \frac{1}{m}\}$, then $B = \bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} B_m$ so $\mu(B_m) > 0$ for some m . For $x \in B_m$:

$$v_n(x) \leq g_1(x) < g_2(x) - \frac{1}{m} \leq u_n(x) - \frac{1}{m}$$

$$\int u_n \, d\mu - \int v_n \, d\mu = \int u_n - v_n \, d\mu \geq \int \frac{1}{m} \chi_{B_m} \, d\mu = \frac{1}{m} \mu(B_m)$$

which contradicts $\int u_n(x) \, d\mu - \int v_n(x) \, d\mu < \frac{1}{2^n}$ and thus, $\mu(B) = 0$ so $g_1(x) = g_2(x)$ except on a null set. Since $g_1(x) \leq f(x) \leq g_2(x)$, then $f(x) - g_1(x) = 0$ except on a null set and thus, by **theorem 17.4.6**, $f(x) - g_1(x)$ is measurable so $f(x)$ is measurable.

Theorem 17.5.2: Uniform Convergence of Simple Functions are Lebesgue Integrable

If simple functions $\{f_n\}$ converge uniformly to bounded measurable f :

$$\int f \, d\mu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int f_n \, d\mu$$

Proof

Let $\delta_n = \sup(|f(x) - f_n(x)|)$. Since $\{f_n\}$ converge uniformly f , then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \delta_n = 0$:

$$f_n(x) - \delta_n \leq f(x) \leq f_n(x) + \delta_n$$

Thus, by **theorem 17.5.1**:

$$\begin{aligned} \int f \, d\mu &= \inf(\int u \, d\mu) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf(\int f_n(x) + \delta_n \, d\mu) \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf(\int f_n(x) \, d\mu) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup(\int f_n(x) \, d\mu) \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup(\int f_n(x) - \delta_n \, d\mu) \leq \sup(\int v \, d\mu) = \int f \, d\mu \end{aligned}$$

Since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf(\int f_n(x) \, d\mu) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int f_n(x) \, d\mu \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup(\int f_n(x) \, d\mu)$, then:

$$\int f \, d\mu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int f_n(x) \, d\mu$$

Theorem 17.5.3: Properties of Bounded Measurable Functions

If f, g are bounded Lebesgue measurable functions. Then:

(a) **Linearity**: If $c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$\int c_1 f + c_2 g \, d\mu = c_1 \int f \, d\mu + c_2 \int g \, d\mu$$

(b) **Monotonicity**: If $f(x) \leq g(x)$:

$$\int f \, d\mu \leq \int g \, d\mu$$

(c) **Absolute Value**: $|f|$ is measurable where:

$$|\int f \, d\mu| \leq \int |f| \, d\mu$$

(d) **Null Sets**: If $f(x) = g(x)$ except on a set of measure zero:

$$\int f \, d\mu = \int g \, d\mu$$

Proof

Since f and g are measurable, then there are simple functions $\{f_n\}, \{g_n\}$ where converge uniformly to f and g respectively. Thus, $\{c_1 f_n + c_2 g_n\}$ converge to $c_1 f + c_2 g$ uniformly.

$$\begin{aligned} \int c_1 f + c_2 g \, d\mu &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int c_1 f_n + c_2 g_n \, d\mu \\ &= c_1 \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int f_n \, d\mu + c_2 \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int g_n \, d\mu = c_1 \int f \, d\mu + c_2 \int g \, d\mu \end{aligned}$$

If $f(x) \leq g(x)$, then since f, g are measurable, then are simple functions v_f, u_g where $v_f \leq f \leq g \leq u_g$ such that:

$$\int f \, d\mu = \sup(\int v_f \, d\mu) \leq \inf(\int u_g \, d\mu) = \int g \, d\mu$$

Since $|[a, \infty)| = (-\infty, -a] \cup [a, \infty)$, then $|f|^{-1}([a, \infty)) = f^{-1}((-\infty, -a]) \cup f^{-1}([a, \infty))$ which are measurable since f is measurable, then $|f|$ is measurable. Also, there are simple functions $\{f_n\}$ that converge uniformly to f . Then by **theorem 17.4.4**:

$$|\int f \, d\mu| = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\int f_n \, d\mu| \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int |f_n| \, d\mu = \int |f| \, d\mu$$

Let $h(x) = f(x) - g(x) = 0$ except on a null set E and is bounded so $|h(x)| \leq M \chi_E$.

$$|\int f \, d\mu - \int g \, d\mu| = |\int h \, d\mu| \leq \int |h| \, d\mu \leq \int M \chi_E \, d\mu = M \mu(E) = 0$$

Definition 17.5.4: Bounded Lebesgue integral over a Measurable set

If $E \subset [0, 1]$ is a measurable set and f is a bounded measurable function, the **Lebesgue integral of f over E** :

$$\int_E f \, d\mu = \int f \chi_E \, d\mu$$

Theorem 17.5.5: Additivity Property

If $\{E_n\}_{n=1}^N$ are pairwise disjoint measurable sets with $E = \cup E_n$ and f is a bounded measurable function:

$$\int_E f \, d\mu = \sum_{n=1}^N \int_{E_n} f \, d\mu$$

Proof

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Since } \chi_E = \sum_{n=1}^N \chi_{E_n}, \text{ then } f\chi_E &= \sum_{n=1}^N f\chi_{E_n}. \\ \int_E f \, d\mu &= \int f\chi_E \, d\mu = \int \sum_{n=1}^N f\chi_{E_n} \, d\mu = \sum_{n=1}^N \int f\chi_{E_n} \, d\mu = \sum_{n=1}^N \int_{E_n} f \, d\mu \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 17.5.6: Riemann Integrability implies Lebesgue Integrability

Every bounded Riemann integrable $f: [0,1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is measurable and thus, Lebesgue integrable. The Riemann integral is equal to the Lebesgue integral.

Proof

Since the set of step functions $\mathcal{L}(f)$ less than f is a subset of the set of simple functions $\mathcal{L}_\mu(f)$ less than f and the set of step functions $\mathcal{U}(f)$ greater than f is a subset of the set of simple functions $\mathcal{U}_\mu(f)$ greater than f , then:

$$\sup_{v \in \mathcal{L}(f)} \left(\int_0^1 v(t) dt \right) \leq \sup_{v \in \mathcal{L}_\mu(f)} \left(\int_0^1 v d\mu \right) \leq \inf_{u \in \mathcal{U}_\mu(f)} \left(\int_0^1 u d\mu \right) \leq \inf_{u \in \mathcal{U}(f)} \left(\int_0^1 u(t) dt \right)$$

Thus, if f is Riemann integrable, then $\sup_{v \in \mathcal{L}(f)} \left(\int_0^1 v(t) dt \right) = \inf_{u \in \mathcal{U}(f)} \left(\int_0^1 u(t) dt \right)$ so $\sup_{v \in \mathcal{L}_\mu(f)} \left(\int_0^1 v d\mu \right)$

$= \inf_{u \in \mathcal{U}_\mu(f)} \left(\int_0^1 u d\mu \right)$ and thus, f is Lebesgue measurable and the Riemann integral is equal to the Lebesgue integral since:

$$\sup_{v \in \mathcal{L}(f)} \left(\int_0^1 v(t) dt \right) = \sup_{v \in \mathcal{L}_\mu(f)} \left(\int_0^1 v d\mu \right) = \inf_{u \in \mathcal{U}_\mu(f)} \left(\int_0^1 u d\mu \right) = \inf_{u \in \mathcal{U}(f)} \left(\int_0^1 u(t) dt \right)$$

18 Lebesgue Convergence Theorems

18.1 Bounded Convergence Theorem

Theorem 18.1.1: Bounded Convergence Theorem

Suppose measurable $\{f_n\}$ on $[0,1]$ converge pointwise to f where $|f_n(x)| \leq M$. Then, f is a bounded measurable function where:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int f_n d\mu = \int f d\mu$$

Proof

Since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n = f$ pointwise, then for any $x \in [0,1]$, then is a N_x where for $n \geq N_x$:

$$|f(x) - f_n(x)| < \epsilon$$

$$|f(x)| \leq |f(x) - f_n(x)| + |f_n(x)| < \epsilon + M \Rightarrow |f(x)| \leq M$$

Thus, f is bounded. Since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n = f$, then by [theorem 17.4.7](#), f is measurable.

Let set $E_n = \{x \in [0,1] \mid |f_n(x) - f(x)| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}\}$. Since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n = f$ pointwise, then $\cup_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n = [0,1]$. Since $E_n \subset E_{n+1}$, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(E_n) = \mu([0,1]) = 1$.

Then, there is a N where $\mu(E_N) > 1 - \frac{\epsilon}{4M}$ so $\mu(E_N^c) < \frac{\epsilon}{4M}$. Thus:

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \int f_n d\mu - \int f d\mu \right| &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \int f_n - f d\mu \right| \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int |f_n - f| d\mu \\ &= \int_{E_N} |f_n - f| d\mu + \int_{E_N^c} |f_n - f| d\mu \\ &< \frac{\epsilon}{2} \mu(E_N) + 2M \mu(E_N^c) < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + 2M \frac{\epsilon}{4M} = \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

Definition 18.1.2: Almost Everywhere

If a property holds for all x except for a null set, then it holds [almost everywhere](#)

Theorem 18.1.3: Bounded Convergence Theorem for Almost Everywhere

Suppose bounded $\{f_n\}$ on $[0,1]$ are measurable and f is bounded such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n = f$ for almost all x . If $|f_n(x)| \leq M$ almost everywhere, then f is measurable where:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int f_n d\mu = \int f d\mu$$

Proof

Let $A = \{x \mid \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(x) \neq f(x)\}$ so $\mu(A) = 0$. Let $D_n = \{x \mid |f_n(x)| > M\}$ so $\mu(D_n) = 0$. Let $E = A \cup \cup_{n=1}^{\infty} D_n$. Thus:

$$\mu(E) \leq \mu(A) + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu(D_n) = 0 \Rightarrow \mu(E) = 0$$

Let $g_n(x) = f_n(x) \mathfrak{X}_{E^c}(x)$ which is measurable since $f_n(x), \mathfrak{X}_{E^c}(x)$ are measurable. Then, $|g_n(x)| \leq M$. Let $g(x) = f(x) \mathfrak{X}_{E^c}(x)$ so $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g_n(x) = g(x)$ and $g(x) \leq M$.

Since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g_n(x) = g(x)$, then by [theorem 17.4.7](#), $g(x)$ is measurable.

Since $g(x) = f(x)$ almost everywhere, then by [theorem 17.4.6b](#), $f(x)$ is measurable.

$$\int g d\mu = \int f d\mu \quad \int g_n d\mu = \int f_n d\mu$$

By [theorem 18.1.1](#), $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int g_n d\mu = \int g d\mu$. Thus:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int f_n d\mu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int g_n d\mu = \int g d\mu = \int f d\mu$$

18.2 Integral of Unbounded Functions

Definition 18.2.1: Integrable Function

If $f: [0,1] \rightarrow [0,\infty]$ is Lebesgue measurable, let $f_n(x) = \min(f(x), n)$.

Then f_n is a bounded measurable function and let:

$$\int f d\mu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int f_n d\mu$$

If $\int f d\mu < \infty$, then f is **integrable**.

Theorem 18.2.2: Unbounded sets of Integrable functions have measure 0

If f is a non-negative integrable function and $A = \{x \mid f(x) = \infty\}$, then:

$$\mu(A) = 0$$

Proof

If $x \in A$, then $f_n(x) = n \geq n\chi_A(x)$. Thus, $\int f_n d\mu \geq \int n\chi_A d\mu = n\mu(A)$.

If $\mu(A) > 0$, then:

$$\int f d\mu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int f_n d\mu \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int n\chi_A d\mu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n\mu(A) = \infty$$

Thus, if f is integrable, then $\mu(A) = 0$.

Theorem 18.2.3: Integrable functions for Almost Everywhere

Suppose f, g are non-negative measurable functions with $g(x) \leq f(x)$ for almost all x . If f is integrable, then g is integrable where:

$$\int g d\mu \leq \int f d\mu$$

If $g = 0$ almost everywhere, then $\int g d\mu = 0$.

Proof

If $f_n(x) = \min(f(x), n)$ and $g_n(x) = \min(g(x), n)$, then f_n, g_n are bounded measurable functions where $g_n(x) \leq f_n(x)$ almost everywhere. If f is integrable, then:

$$\int g_n d\mu \leq \int f_n d\mu \leq \int f d\mu$$

Since $\{g_n\}$ is increasing and bounded above by $\int f d\mu$, then $\int g d\mu$ is finite and thus, exist. If $0 \leq g(x) \leq 0$ almost everywhere, for almost all x so $\int g d\mu = \int 0 d\mu = 0$.

Corollary 18.2.4: If integrable $f \geq 0$, then $\int f d\mu = 0 \iff f(x) = 0$ almost everywhere

If $f: [0,1] \rightarrow [0,\infty]$ is a non-negative integrable function and $\int f d\mu = 0$, then $f(x) = 0$ almost everywhere

Proof

Let $E_n = \{x \mid f(x) \geq \frac{1}{n}\}$. Then, $f(x) \geq \frac{1}{n}\chi_{E_n}(x)$ where:

$$\frac{1}{n}\mu(E_n) = \int \frac{1}{n}\chi_{E_n} d\mu \leq \int f d\mu = 0$$

Thus, $\mu(E_n) = 0$. Let $E = \{x \mid f(x) > 0\}$ so $E = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n$ where $E_n \subset E_{n+1}$ so:

$$\mu(E) = \mu(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(E_n) = 0.$$

Theorem 18.2.5: Absolute Continuity

If f is a non-negative integrable function, then for $\epsilon > 0$, there is a $\delta > 0$ where for every measurable $A \subset [0,1]$ with $\mu(A) < \delta$, then $\int_A f d\mu < \epsilon$

Proof

Let $E_n = \{x \mid f(x) \geq n\}$ so $f_n(x) = \begin{cases} f(x) & x \in E_n^c \\ n & x \in E_n \end{cases}$. Thus:

$$f(x) - f_n(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & x \in E_n^c \\ f(x) - n & x \in E_n \end{cases}$$

$$\int f d\mu - \int f_n d\mu = \int f - f_n d\mu = \int_{E_n} f(x) - n d\mu$$

Since f is integrable, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int f d\mu - \int f_n d\mu = 0$. Thus:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{E_n} f(x) - n d\mu = 0$$

Thus, there is a N where $\int_{E_N} f(x) - n d\mu < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. Then for $\delta < \frac{\epsilon}{2N}$, if $\mu(A) < \delta$:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_A f d\mu &= \int_{A \cap E_N} f d\mu + \int_{A \cap E_N^c} f d\mu \leq \int_{A \cap E_N} (f - N) d\mu + \int_{A \cap E_N} N d\mu + \int_{A \cap E_N^c} N d\mu \\ &\leq \int_{A \cap E_N} (f - N) d\mu + \int_A N d\mu < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + N\mu(A) < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + N\delta < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + N\frac{\epsilon}{2N} < \epsilon \end{aligned}$$
Corollary 18.2.6: Uniform Continuity of the Integral

If $f: [0,1] \rightarrow [0,\infty]$ is an integrable function where $F(x) = \int_{[0,x]} f d\mu$, then $F(x)$ is continuous

Proof

By [theorem 17.7.5](#), for $\epsilon > 0$, there is a $\delta > 0$ where for $\mu([x,y]) < \delta$, then $\int_{[x,y]} f d\mu < \epsilon$.

$$|F(y) - F(x)| = \left| \int_{[0,y]} f d\mu - \int_{[0,x]} f d\mu \right| = \left| \int_{[x,y]} f d\mu \right| < \epsilon$$

Thus, $F(x)$ is uniformly continuous.

18.3 Dominated Convergence Theorems

Theorem 18.3.1: Dominated Convergence Theorem

Suppose non-negative measurable $\{f_n\}$ on $[0,1]$ converge pointwise to f for almost all x . If there is a non-negative integrable g where $f_n(x) \leq g(x)$ for almost all x , then f is integrable where:

$$\int f d\mu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int f_n d\mu$$

Proof

Let $h_n = f_n \chi_E$ and $h = f \chi_E$ where $E = \{x \mid \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(x) = f(x)\}$ so $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} h_n(x) = h(x)$ for all x . Since $h_n(x) = f_n \chi_E \leq g(x)$ for almost all x and g is integrable, then $h(x) \leq g(x)$ for almost all x so by [theorem 18.2.3](#), h is integrable.

For $\epsilon > 0$, let $E_n = \{x \mid |h_m(x) - h(x)| < \frac{\epsilon}{2} \text{ for all } m \geq n\}$. By [theorem 18.2.5](#), there is a $\delta > 0$ where for each measurable $A \subset [0,1]$ with $\mu(A) < \delta$, then $\int_A g d\mu < \frac{\epsilon}{4}$.

Since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} h_n(x) = h(x)$ for all $x \in [0,1]$, then any $x \in E_n$ in some n so $\cup_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n = [0,1]$. Since $E_n \subset E_{n+1}$, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(E_n) = \mu([0,1]) = 1$. Thus, there is a n where $\mu(E_n) > 1 - \delta$ so $\mu(E_n^c) < \delta$. Note $|h_n(x) - h(x)| \leq |h_n(x)| + |h(x)| \leq 2g(x)$ for almost all x . Thus, for any $m > n$:

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int h_m d\mu - \int h d\mu \right| &\leq \int |h_m - h| d\mu = \int_{E_n} |h_m - h| d\mu + \int_{E_n^c} |h_m - h| d\mu \\ &< \frac{\epsilon}{2} \mu(E_n) + 2 \int_{E_n^c} g d\mu < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + 2\frac{\epsilon}{4} = \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int f_n d\mu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int h_n d\mu = \int h d\mu = \int f d\mu$$

Theorem 18.3.2: Fatou's Lemma

If non-negative measurable $\{g_n\}$ on $[0,1]$ converge pointwise to $g(x)$ for almost all x , then:

$$\int g \, d\mu \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf \left(\int g_n \, d\mu \right)$$

Thus, if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf \left(\int g_n \, d\mu \right) < \infty$, then g is integrable.

Proof

Since g_n is measurable and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g_n = g$ for almost all x , then g is measurable.

Let bounded, measurable h be $h(x) \leq g(x)$ for all x . Let $h_n(x) = \min(h(x), g_n(x))$ so h_n is bounded and measurable where $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} h_n = h$. Then by **theorem 18.1.1**:

$$\int h \, d\mu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int h_n \, d\mu \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf \left(\int g_n \, d\mu \right)$$

Since the inequality holds for any bounded, measurable h where $h(x) \leq g(x)$, then let $h(x) = g_m(x) = \min(g_n(x), m)$. Thus, for any m :

$$\int g_m \, d\mu \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf \left(\int g_n \, d\mu \right)$$

$$\int g \, d\mu = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \int g_m \, d\mu \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf \left(\int g_n \, d\mu \right)$$

Theorem 18.3.3: Monotone Convergence Theorem

If non-negative measurable $\{g_n\}$ on $[0,1]$ converge pointwise to $g(x)$ for almost all x where $g_n(x) \leq g_{n+1}(x)$, then:

$$\int g \, d\mu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int g_n \, d\mu$$

Thus, g is integrable if and only if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int g_n \, d\mu < \infty$.

Proof

Since g_n is measurable and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g_n = g$ for almost all x , then g is measurable.

If f is integrable, then by **theorem 18.3.1**, then:

$$\int g \, d\mu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int g_n \, d\mu.$$

If $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int g \, d\mu = \infty$, then by **theorem 18.3.2**:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf \left(\int g_n \, d\mu \right) = \infty \quad \Rightarrow \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int g_n \, d\mu = \infty$$

Corollary 18.3.4: Integral of Infinite Series

For non-negative measurable $u_n(x)$ and non-negative f , let $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} u_n(x) = f(x)$ for almost all x . Then:

$$\int f \, d\mu = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int u_n \, d\mu$$

Proof

Let $f_N(x) = \sum_{n=1}^N u_n(x)$ so $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} f_N(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} u_n(x) = f(x)$ for almost all x . Since $u_n(x)$ is non-negative, then $f_N(x) \leq f_{N+1}(x)$. Then by **theorem 18.3.3**:

$$\begin{aligned} \int f \, d\mu &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \int f_N \, d\mu = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \int \sum_{n=1}^N u_n(x) \, d\mu \\ &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n=1}^N \int u_n(x) \, d\mu = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int u_n \, d\mu \end{aligned}$$

Corollary 18.3.5: Lebesgue Integral: Countable Additivity

Suppose $\{E_n\}$ are pairwise disjoint measurable subsets of I and f is a non-negative integrable function. If $E = \cup_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n$, then:

$$\int_E f \, d\mu = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_{E_n} f \, d\mu$$

Proof

Let $u_n(x) = f \chi_{E_n}$. Since $\chi_E = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \chi_{E_n}$, then $f \chi_E = f \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \chi_{E_n} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} u_n(x)$.

Thus, by **corollary 18.3.4**:

$$\int_E f \, d\mu = \int f \chi_E \, d\mu = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int u_n \, d\mu = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int f \chi_{E_n} \, d\mu = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_{E_n} f \, d\mu$$

18.4 General Lebesgue Integral

Definition 18.4.1: Measurable Function Redefined

For measurable function $f: [0,1] \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty]$, let:

$$f^+(x) = \max(f(x), 0) \quad f^-(x) = -\min(f(x), 0)$$

Thus, $f^+(x)$ and $f^-(x)$ are non-negative measurable functions where:

$$f(x) = f^+(x) - f^-(x)$$

Then f is Lebesgue integrable if $f^+(x)$ and $f^-(x)$ are integrable. Thus:

$$\int f \, d\mu = \int f^+(x) \, d\mu - \int f^-(x) \, d\mu$$

Theorem 18.4.2: For $f = g$ almost everywhere, then $\int f \, d\mu = \int g \, d\mu$

Suppose f, g are measurable functions on $[0,1]$ where $f = g$ almost everywhere. Then if f is integrable, then g is integrable where $\int f \, d\mu = \int g \, d\mu$.

Proof

If f and g are measurable functions where $f = g$ almost everywhere, then $f^+ = g^+$ and $f^- = g^-$ almost everywhere. Then if f is integrable, then f^+ and f^- are integrable so by [theorem 18.2.3](#), g^+ and g^- are integrable where:

$$\begin{aligned} \int f^+ \, d\mu &= \int g^+ \, d\mu & \int f^- \, d\mu &= \int g^- \, d\mu \\ \int f \, d\mu &= \int f^+(x) \, d\mu - \int f^-(x) \, d\mu &= \int g^+(x) \, d\mu - \int g^-(x) \, d\mu &= \int g \, d\mu \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 18.4.3: Integrable $f \Leftrightarrow$ Integrable $|f|$

Measurable $f: [0,1] \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty]$ is integrable if and only if $|f|$ is integrable

Proof

If f is integrable, then f^+, f^- are integrable. Since $|f| = f^+ + f^-$, then $|f|$ is integrable.

If $|f|$ is integrable, then since $f^+, f^- \leq |f|$, by [theorem 18.2.3](#), f^+, f^- are integrable so f is integrable.

Theorem 18.4.4: Lebesgue Convergence Theorem

Let measurable $\{f_n\}$ on $[0,1]$ converge pointwise to f for almost all x . If there is a integrable g where $|f_n(x)| \leq g(x)$ for almost all x , then f is integrable where:

$$\int f \, d\mu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int f_n \, d\mu$$

Proof

Let $f_n^+(x) = \max(f_n(x), 0)$ and $f_n^-(x) = -\min(f_n(x), 0)$. Thus, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n^+(x) = f^+(x)$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n^-(x) = f^-(x)$ for almost all x . Since $|f_n(x)| \leq g(x)$, then $f_n^+(x), f_n^-(x) \leq g(x)$ for almost all x . Then by [theorem 18.3.1](#), f^+, f^- are integrable where:

$$\int f^+ \, d\mu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int f_n^+ \, d\mu \quad \int f^- \, d\mu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int f_n^- \, d\mu$$

Thus, $f = f^+ - f^-$ is integrable where:

$$\int f \, d\mu = \int f^+ - f^- \, d\mu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int f_n^+ - f_n^- \, d\mu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int f_n \, d\mu$$

Theorem 18.4.5: Integrable f can be approximated by a step function

For integrable $f: [0,1] \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty]$ and $\epsilon > 0$, there is a step function g and measurable $A \subset [0,1]$ such that:

$$\mu(A) < \epsilon \quad |f(x) - g(x)| < \epsilon \text{ for all } x \notin A$$

If $|f(x)| \leq M$ for all x , then there is a step function g where $|g(x)| \leq M$.

Proof

Suppose $f(x) = \chi_E$ for some measurable set E .

Let $E \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} U_i$ for open intervals $\{U_i\}$ such that:

$$\mu(E) \leq \mu(\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} U_i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu(U_i) \leq \mu(E) + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \Rightarrow \mu((\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} U_i) \cap E^c) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$

Then choose an N such that for $V_N = \bigcup_{i=1}^N U_i$, then $\mu(\bigcup_{i=1}^N U_i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu(U_i) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. Let $g(x) = \chi_{V_N}$ so g is a step function since V_N is finite. Let $A = \{x \mid f(x) \neq g(x)\}$.

$$A \subset (V_N \cap E^c) \cup (E \cap V_N^c) \subset ((\bigcup_{i=1}^N U_i) \cap E^c) \cup (\bigcup_{i=N+1}^{\infty} U_i)$$

$$\mu(A) \leq \mu((\bigcup_{i=1}^N U_i) \cap E^c) + \mu(\bigcup_{i=N+1}^{\infty} U_i) < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} = \epsilon$$

Suppose simple function $f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n r_i \chi_{E_i}$.

Proof is analogous to proof above except change $\frac{\epsilon}{2}$ into $\frac{\epsilon}{2n}$. For $j = \{1, \dots, n\}$, let step function $g_j(x) = \chi_{V_{N_j}}$ where $V_{N_j} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{N_j} U_{ji}$ where $E_i \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^n U_{ji}$ open intervals. Thus for $A_j = \{x \mid f(x) \neq r_j g_j(x)\}$, then $\mu(A_j) < \frac{\epsilon}{n}$ so $\mu(\bigcup_{j=1}^n A_j) \leq \sum_{j=1}^n \mu(A_j) < \epsilon$.

Suppose $f(x)$ is a bounded measurable function.

Then by [theorem 17.5.1](#), there is a simple function $h(x)$ where $|f(x) - h(x)| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ for all x . As shown above, there is a step function $g(x)$ such that $|h(x) - g(x)| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ for all $x \notin A$ for some measurable $A \subset [0,1]$ where $\mu(A) < \epsilon$. Thus, for all $x \notin A$:

$$|f(x) - g(x)| \leq |f(x) - h(x)| + |h(x) - g(x)| < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} = \epsilon$$

Suppose f is a non-negative integrable function.

Let $A_n = \{x \mid f(x) > n\}$. Then:

$$n\mu(A_n) = \int n \chi_{A_n} d\mu \leq \int f d\mu < \infty \Rightarrow \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(A_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \int f d\mu = 0$$

Thus, there is a N where $\mu(A_N) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. Let $f_N = \min(f, N)$ so f is a bounded measurable function. As shown above, there is a step function g where $|f_N(x) - g(x)| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ for all $x \notin B$ for some measurable B where $\mu(B) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. Let $A = A_N \cup B$ so $\mu(A) \leq \mu(A_N) + \mu(B) < \epsilon$. Note if $x \notin A$, then $x \notin B$ so $f(x) = f_N(x)$. Thus, for all $x \notin A$:

$$|f(x) - g(x)| \leq |f(x) - f_N(x)| + |f_N(x) - g(x)| < \frac{\epsilon}{2} < \epsilon$$

Suppose f is a integrable function.

Since $f = f^+ - f^-$ where f^+, f^- are non-negative integrable functions, then as shown above, there are step functions g^+, g^- where $\mu(A^+), \mu(A^-) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ and $|f^+(x) - g^+(x)|, |f^-(x) - g^-(x)| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ for all $x \notin A^+, A^-$ respectively.

Let $A = A^+ \cup A^-$ and $g(x) = g^+ + g^-$. Thus, for any $x \notin A$:

$$|f(x) - g(x)| \leq |f^+(x) - g^+(x)| + |f^-(x) - g^-(x)| < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} = \epsilon$$

If $|f(x)| \leq M$, take g from before and let $g_1(x) = \begin{cases} M & g(x) > M \\ g(x) & g(x) \in [-M, M] \\ -M & g(x) < -M \end{cases}$.

Thus, step function g_1 is $|g_1| \leq M$ where $g_1(x) = g(x)$ for $|g(x)| \leq M$. For $x \notin A$:

$$\text{If } g(x) > M: \quad f(x) \leq M = g_1(x) < g(x) \Rightarrow |f(x) - g_1(x)| < |f(x) - g(x)| < \epsilon$$

$$\text{If } g(x) < -M: \quad f(x) \geq -M = g_1(x) > g(x) \Rightarrow |f(x) - g_1(x)| < |f(x) - g(x)| < \epsilon$$

Theorem 18.4.6: Properties of the Lebesgue Integral

If f, g are Lebesgue integrable functions. Then:

(a) **Linearity**: If $c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$\int c_1 f + c_2 g \, d\mu = c_1 \int f \, d\mu + c_2 \int g \, d\mu$$

(b) **Monotonicity**: If $f(x) \leq g(x)$:

$$\int f \, d\mu \leq \int g \, d\mu$$

(c) **Absolute Value**: $|f|$ is integrable where:

$$|\int f \, d\mu| \leq \int |f| \, d\mu$$

(d) **Null Sets**: If $f(x) = g(x)$ except on a set of measure zero, then if f is integrable, then g is integrable where:

$$\int f \, d\mu = \int g \, d\mu$$

19 L^2 Space

19.1 L^2 : Square Integrable Functions

Definition 19.1.1: Square Integrable

Measurable function $f: [a, b] \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty]$ is **square integrable** if f^2 is integrable.

Let $L^2[a, b]$ be the set of all square integrable functions on $[a, b]$.

Then define the norm of $f \in L^2[a, b]$, $\|f\| = (\int f^2 d\mu)^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

Theorem 19.1.2: L^p norm: Scalar Multiplication Property

For any $c \in \mathbb{R}$ and $f \in L^2[a, b]$:

$$\|cf\| = |c| \|f\|$$

Also, $\|f\| \geq 0$ where $\|f\| = 0$ only if $f = 0$ almost everywhere.

Proof

$$\|cf\| = (\int c^2 f^2 d\mu)^{\frac{1}{2}} = |c| (\int f^2 d\mu)^{\frac{1}{2}} = |c| \|f\|$$

Since $\int f^2 d\mu \geq 0$, then $\|f\| \geq 0$. If $\|f\| = 0$, then $\int f^2 d\mu = 0$ so by **corollary 18.2.4**, $f^2 = 0$ almost everywhere so $f = 0$ almost everywhere.

Theorem 19.1.3: If $f, g \in L^2[a, b]$, then fg is integrable

If $f, g \in L^2[a, b]$, then fg is integrable where:

$$2 \int |fg| d\mu \leq \|f\|^2 + \|g\|^2$$

Also, $2 \int |fg| d\mu = \|f\|^2 + \|g\|^2$ if and only if $|f| = |g|$ almost everywhere

Proof

$$0 \leq (|f| - |g|)^2 = f^2 - 2|fg| + g^2 \Rightarrow 2|fg| \leq f^2 + g^2$$

By **theorem 18.2.3**, $|fg|$ is integrable so fg is integrable where:

$$\int 2|fg| d\mu \leq \int f^2 + g^2 d\mu = \|f\|^2 + \|g\|^2$$

Since equality holds if and only if $\int (|f| - |g|)^2 d\mu = 0$, then by **corollary 18.2.4**, $(|f| - |g|)^2 = 0$ almost everywhere so $|f| = |g|$ almost everywhere.

Theorem 19.1.4: $L^2[a, b]$ is a vector space

$L^2[a, b]$ is a vector space

Proof

If $f, g \in L^2[a, b]$, then f^2, g^2 is integrable. Since $(c_1 f + c_2 g)^2 = c_1^2 f^2 + 2c_1 c_2 fg + c_2^2 g^2$ where $c_1^2 f^2, c_2^2 g^2$ are integrable and $2c_1 c_2 fg$ is integrable by **theorem 19.1.3**, then $(c_1 f + c_2 g)^2$ is integrable and thus, $c_1 f + c_2 g \in L^2[a, b]$.

Theorem 19.1.5: Holder's Inequality in L^2

If $f, g \in L^2[a, b]$, then:

$$\int |fg| d\mu \leq \|f\| \|g\|$$

Equality if and only if $|f| = c|g|$ almost everywhere for some $c \in \mathbb{R}$

Proof

If either $\|f\|, \|g\| = 0$, then the inequality holds true. Let $f_0 = \frac{f}{\|f\|}$ and $g_0 = \frac{g}{\|g\|}$.

Then by **theorem 19.1.3**:

$$2 \int |f_0 g_0| d\mu \leq \|f_0\|^2 + \|g_0\|^2 = \left\| \frac{f}{\|f\|} \right\|^2 + \left\| \frac{g}{\|g\|} \right\|^2 = \frac{\|f\|^2}{\|f\|^2} + \frac{\|g\|^2}{\|g\|^2} = 2$$

$$\int |f_0 g_0| d\mu \leq 1 \Rightarrow \int |fg| d\mu \leq \|f\| \|g\|$$

where $\int |f_0 g_0| d\mu = 1$ if and only if $\frac{1}{\|f\|} |f| = |f_0| = |g_0| = \frac{1}{\|g\|} |g|$ almost everywhere.

Corollary 19.1.6: Cauchy-Schwarz Inequality in L^2

If $f, g \in L^2[a, b]$, then:

$$|\int fg \, d\mu| \leq \|f\| \|g\|$$

Equality if and only if $f = cg$ almost everywhere for some $c \in \mathbb{R}$

Proof

$|\int fg \, d\mu| \leq \int |fg| \, d\mu \leq \|f\| \|g\|$
 Suppose $|\int fg \, d\mu| = \|f\| \|g\|$ so $\int |fg| \, d\mu = \|f\| \|g\|$.
 If $\int fg \, d\mu \geq 0$, then $\int |fg| \, d\mu = \int fg \, d\mu$ so $|fg| = fg$ almost everywhere. Since $|f| = c|g|$ almost everywhere, then $f = cg$ almost everywhere.
 If $\int fg \, d\mu \leq 0$, then $\int |-fg| \, d\mu = \int -fg \, d\mu$ so $|fg| = -fg$ almost everywhere. Since $|f| = c|g|$ almost everywhere, then $f = -cg$ almost everywhere.

Theorem 19.1.7: Minkowski's Inequality in L^2

If $f, g \in L^2[a, b]$, then:

$$\|f + g\| \leq \|f\| + \|g\|$$

Proof

$\|f + g\|^2 = \int (f + g)^2 \, d\mu = \int f^2 + 2fg + g^2 \, d\mu \leq \int f^2 + 2|fg| + g^2 \, d\mu$
 $\leq \|f\|^2 + 2\|f\| \|g\| + \|g\|^2 = (\|f\| + \|g\|)^2$
 Thus, $\|f + g\| \leq \|f\| + \|g\|$.

Definition 19.1.8: Inner Product on L^2

If $f, g \in L^2[a, b]$, then the **inner product** of f and g :

$$\langle f, g \rangle = \int fg \, d\mu$$

Theorem 19.1.9: Properties of the Inner Product on L^2

For $f_1, f_2, g \in L^2[a, b]$ and $c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{R}$:

- (a) **Commutativity**: $\langle f_1, f_2 \rangle = \langle f_2, f_1 \rangle$
- (b) **Bilinearity**: $\langle c_1 f_1 + c_2 f_2, g \rangle = c_1 \langle f_1, g \rangle + c_2 \langle f_2, g \rangle$
- (c) **Positive Definiteness**: $\langle f_1, f_1 \rangle = \|f_1\|^2 \geq 0$
 $\langle f_1, f_1 \rangle = 0$ if and only if $f_1 = 0$ almost everywhere

Proof

$\langle f_1, f_2 \rangle = \int f_1 f_2 \, d\mu = \int f_2 f_1 \, d\mu = \langle f_2, f_1 \rangle$

$\langle c_1 f_1 + c_2 f_2, g \rangle = \int (c_1 f_1 + c_2 f_2) g \, d\mu = c_1 \int f_1 g \, d\mu + c_2 \int f_2 g \, d\mu = c_1 \langle f_1, g \rangle + c_2 \langle f_2, g \rangle$

$\langle f_1, f_1 \rangle = \int f_1^2 \, d\mu = \|f_1\|^2 \geq 0$ where $\|f_1\|^2 = \langle f_1, f_1 \rangle = 0$ if and only if $f_1 = 0$ almost everywhere by **theorem 19.1.2**

19.2 Convergence in L^2

Definition 19.2.1: Convergence in L^2

$\{f_n\} \in L^2[a, b]$ converges to $f \in L^2[a, b]$ if:
 $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f - f_n\| = 0$

Theorem 19.2.2: Approximating $f \in L^2[a, b]$ with bounded f_n

For $f \in L^2[a, b]$, let:

$$f_n(x) = \begin{cases} -n & f(x) < -n \\ f(x) & f(x) \in [-n, n] \\ n & f(x) > n \end{cases}$$

Then, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f - f_n\| = 0$.

Proof

Since $|f_n| \leq |f|$, then:

$$|f - f_n|^2 \leq |f|^2 + 2|f||f_n| + |f_n|^2 \leq 4|f|^2$$

Let set $E_n = \{x \mid |f(x)| > n\} = \{x \mid |f(x)|^2 > n^2\}$ and let $C = \int |f|^2 d\mu$.

$$C = \int |f|^2 d\mu \geq \int_{E_n} |f|^2 d\mu \geq \int_{E_n} n^2 d\mu = n^2 \mu(E_n) \Rightarrow \mu(E_n) \leq \frac{C}{n^2}$$

Thus, E_n is a null set and thus, measurable. Since $f \in L^2[a, b]$, then $|f|^2$ is integrable so by [theorem 18.2.5](#), there is a $\delta > 0$ where for $\mu(A) < \delta$, then $\int_A |f|^2 d\mu < \frac{\epsilon^2}{4}$.

Since $|f(x) - f_n(x)| = 0$ for $x \notin E_n$, then for n where $\mu(E_n) \leq \frac{C}{n^2} < \delta$:

$$\begin{aligned} \|f - f_n\|^2 &= \int |f - f_n|^2 d\mu = \int_{E_n} |f - f_n|^2 d\mu + \int_{E_n^c} |f - f_n|^2 d\mu \\ &\leq \int_{E_n} 4|f|^2 d\mu + 0 < 4 \frac{\epsilon^2}{4} = \epsilon^2 \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 19.2.3: Approximating $f \in L^2[a, b]$ with step or continuous functions

For $\epsilon > 0$ and $f \in L^2[a, b]$, there is a step function g such that $\|f - g\| < \epsilon$.

Also, there is a continuous function h such that $h(a) = h(b)$ and $\|f - h\| < \epsilon$.

Proof

By [theorem 19.2.2](#), there is a n where $\|f - f_n\| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. Note $|f_n(x)| \leq n$ for all x .

Since f_n is integrable, then by [theorem 18.4.5](#), for $\delta > 0$, there is a step function g with $|g| \leq n$ and measurable set A where $\mu(A) < \delta$ such that for $x \notin A$:

$$|f_n(x) - g(x)| < \delta$$

Thus, for δ where $4n^2\delta + (b-a)\delta^2 < \frac{\epsilon^2}{4}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_n - g\|^2 &= \int |f_n - g|^2 d\mu = \int_A |f_n - g|^2 d\mu + \int_{A^c} |f_n - g|^2 d\mu \\ &\leq \int_A (2n)^2 d\mu + \int_{A^c} \delta^2 d\mu = 4n^2 \mu(A) + \delta^2 \mu(A^c) = 4n^2 \delta + (b-a)\delta^2 < \frac{\epsilon^2}{4} \end{aligned}$$

$$\|f_n - g\| < \frac{\epsilon}{2} \Rightarrow \|f - g\| \leq \|f - f_n\| + \|f_n - g\| < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} = \epsilon$$

Since if f is integrable, there is a continuous h where $h(a) = h(b)$ and a measurable set A where $\mu(A) < \epsilon$ such that $|f(x) - h(x)| < \epsilon$ for all $x \notin A$, then the proof for continuous function h is similar.

Definition 19.2.4: Hilbert Space

A [Hilbert Space](#) is a vector space with an inner product whose associated norm is complete (i.e. Cauchy sequences converge in the norm of the vector space).

Theorem 19.2.5: $L^2[a, b]$ is complete $L^2[a, b]$ is a Hilbert Space**Proof**

By [theorem 19.1.9](#), $L^2[a, b]$ is an inner product space.

Let $\{f_n\}$ be a Cauchy sequence. Then there are n_i such that for $m, n \geq n_i$:

$$\|f_m - f_n\| < \frac{1}{2^i}$$

Let $g_0 = 0$ and $g_i = f_{n_i}$. Then $\|g_{i+1} - g_i\| < \frac{1}{2^i}$ so $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \|g_{i+1} - g_i\|$ converges to S .

Let $h_n(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} |g_{i+1}(x) - g_i(x)|$ and $h(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} h_n(x)$.

$$\|h_n\| \leq \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \|g_{i+1} - g_i\| \leq \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \|g_{i+1} - g_i\| = S$$

$$\int h_n^2 = \|h_n\|^2 \leq S^2$$

Since $h_n(x)$ is monotonically increasing so $h_n(x)^2$ is monotonically increasing converging to $h(x)^2$, then by [theorem 18.3.3](#):

$$\int h^2 d\mu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int h_n(x) d\mu \leq S^2$$

Thus, h^2 is integrable and thus, finite almost everywhere. For x where $h(x)$ is finite, $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (g_{i+1}(x) - g_i(x))$ converges absolutely and thus, converges.

$$\text{Let } g(x) = \begin{cases} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (g_{i+1}(x) - g_i(x)) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g_n(x) & h(x) \text{ is finite} \\ 0 & h(x) \text{ is infinite} \end{cases}.$$

Thus, for almost all x :

$$|g(x)| = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |g_n(x)| \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} |g_{i+1}(x) - g_i(x)| = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} h_n(x) = h(x)$$

Thus, $|g(x)|^2 \leq h(x)^2$ so $|g(x)|^2$ is integrable where $g(x) \in L^2[a, b]$.

Since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |g(x) - g_n(x)|^2 = 0$ for almost all x and

$$|g(x) - g_n(x)|^2 \leq (|g(x)| + |g_n(x)|)^2 \leq (2h(x))^2$$

then by [theorem 18.4.4](#):

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int |g(x) - g_n(x)|^2 d\mu = 0$$

Thus, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|g - g_n\| = 0$ so there is an i such that $\|g - g_i\| < \frac{1}{2^i} < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$.

Thus, for any $m \geq n_i$:

$$\|g - f_m\| \leq \|g - g_i\| + \|g_i - f_m\| = \|g - g_i\| + \|f_{n_i} - f_m\| < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{1}{2^i} < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} = \epsilon$$

Thus, $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \|g - f_m\| = 0$ where $g \in L^2[a, b]$ so every Cauchy sequence converges in the L^2 norm.

Corollary 19.2.6: Convergent $\{f_n(x)\}$ in $L^2[a, b]$ implies convergent $\{f_{n_i}(x)\}$

If $\{f_n\}$ converges to f in $L^2[a, b]$, then there is a subsequence $\{f_{n_i}\}$ such that:

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} f_{n_i}(x) = f(x)$$

for almost all $x \in [a, b]$

Proof

Since $\{f_n\}$ converges to f in $L^2[a, b]$, then $\{f_n\}$ is Cauchy in $L^2[a, b]$.

For [theorem 19.2.5](#)'s proof, there is $g(x) = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} g_i(x)$ where $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \|g - g_i\| = 0$ and $g_i = f_{n_i}$ for almost all x .

Since $\{g_i\}$ converges to g and f in $L^2[a, b]$, then $g(x) = f(x)$ for almost all x .

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} f_{n_i}(x) = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} g_i(x) = g(x) = f(x)$$

19.3 Hilbert Space: \mathcal{H}

Definition 19.3.1: Absolute Convergence

If $\{u_m\}$ is a sequence in Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , then $\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} u_m$ **converges absolutely** if $\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \|u_m\|$ converges

Theorem 19.3.2: Absolute convergence implies convergence

If $\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} u_m$ in \mathcal{H} converges absolutely, then it converges

Proof

Since $\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} u_m$ converges absolutely, then there is a N such that for $n > m \geq N$:

$$\sum_{i=m}^n \|u_i\| \leq \sum_{i=m}^{\infty} \|u_i\| < \epsilon$$

Let $s_n = \sum_{i=1}^n u_i$. Then:

$$\|s_n - s_m\| \leq \sum_{i=m}^n \|u_i\| < \epsilon$$

Thus, s_n is Cauchy so $\{s_n\} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} u_i$ converges.

Theorem 19.3.3: Pythagorean Theorem

$x, y \in \mathcal{H}$ are **perpendicular**, $x \perp y$, if $\langle x, y \rangle = 0$

If $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathcal{H}$ are mutually perpendicular, then:

$$\|\sum_{i=1}^n x_i\|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \|x_i\|^2$$

Proof

Since $\langle x_i, x_j \rangle = 0$ for any $i \neq j$, then:

$$\|\sum_{i=1}^n x_i\|^2 = \langle \sum_{i=1}^n x_i, \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n \langle x_i, x_i \rangle + 2 \sum_{i \neq j} \langle x_i, x_j \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n \|x_i\|^2$$

Definition 19.3.4: Bounded Linear Functional

A **bounded linear functional** $L: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ where for all $v, w \in \mathcal{H}$ and $c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$L(c_1 v + c_2 w) = c_1 L(v) + c_2 L(w) \quad |L(v)| \leq M \|v\|$$

Theorem 19.3.5: Cauchy-Schwarz Inequality for \mathcal{H}

For Hilbert space $(H, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$ where $v, w \in \mathcal{H}$:

$$|\langle v, w \rangle| \leq \|v\| \|w\|$$

with equality if and only if w and v are multiples of a vector

Proof

For fixed $x \in \mathcal{H}$, define $L: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $L(v) = \langle v, x \rangle$. Then L is linear by **theorem 19.1.9** and bounded by **corollary 19.1.6** since $|L(v)| \leq \|v\| \|x\|$ where $|L(v)| = \|v\| \|x\|$ if $v = cx$ almost everywhere for some c .

Theorem 19.3.6: $\inf(L^{-1}(1))$ is unique and perpendicular to $L^{-1}(0)$

For bounded linear functional $L: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ not identically 0, let $\mathcal{V} = L^{-1}(1)$. Then there is a unique $x \in \mathcal{V}$ such that:

$$\|x\| = \inf_{v \in \mathcal{V}} (\|v\|)$$

Also, x is perpendicular to every $v \in L^{-1}(0)$.

Proof

For $x_n \in \mathcal{V}$, let $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = x$.

$$|L(x) - L(x_n)| = |L(x - x_n)| \leq M\|x - x_n\|$$

$$|L(x) - 1| \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} M\|x - x_n\| = 0$$

Thus, $L(x) = 1$ so $x \in \mathcal{V}$ and thus, \mathcal{V} is closed.

Let $d = \inf_{v \in \mathcal{V}} (\|v\|)$ and $\{x_n\} \in \mathcal{V}$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|x_n\| = d$.

Since $\frac{x_n + x_m}{2} \in \mathcal{V}$, then $\|\frac{x_n + x_m}{2}\| \geq d$.

Since $\|x_n - x_m\|^2 + \|x_n + x_m\|^2 = 2\|x_n\|^2 + 2\|x_m\|^2$, then:

$$\|x_n - x_m\|^2 = 2\|x_n\|^2 + 2\|x_m\|^2 - \|x_n + x_m\|^2 \leq 2\|x_n\|^2 + 2\|x_m\|^2 - 4d^2$$

Thus, as $n, m \rightarrow \infty$, then $2\|x_n\|^2 + 2\|x_m\|^2 - 4d^2 \rightarrow 0$ so $\|x_n - x_m\| \rightarrow 0$. Thus, $\{x_n\}$ is Cauchy and thus, converges. Let $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = x$.

$$\|x\| \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|x - x_n\| + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|x_n\| = 0 + d = d$$

Since \mathcal{V} is closed, then $x \in \mathcal{V}$ so $\|x\| \geq d$ and since $\|x\| \leq d$, then $\|x\| = d$.

Suppose there is a $y \in \mathcal{V}$ where $\|y\| = d$. Then $\frac{x+y}{2} \in \mathcal{V}$ so $\|\frac{x+y}{2}\| \geq d$.

$$\|x - y\|^2 = 2\|x\|^2 + 2\|y\|^2 - \|x + y\|^2 \leq 4d^2 - 4d^2 = 0$$

Thus, $x = y$. Suppose $v \in L^{-1}(0)$. For any $t \in \mathbb{R}$, then $x + tv \in L^{-1}(1)$ where:

$$\|x + tv\|^2 \geq \|x\|^2$$

$$\|x\|^2 + 2t\langle x, v \rangle + t^2\|v\|^2 \geq \|x\|^2$$

$$2t\langle x, v \rangle + t^2\|v\|^2 \geq 0$$

Suppose $\langle x, v \rangle > 0$. Choose $t < 0$ such that $2\langle x, v \rangle + t\|v\|^2 > 0$. Thus, $2t\langle x, v \rangle + t^2\|v\|^2 < 0$

Suppose $\langle x, v \rangle < 0$. Choose $t > 0$ such that $2\langle x, v \rangle + t\|v\|^2 < 0$. Thus, $2t\langle x, v \rangle + t^2\|v\|^2 < 0$.

Thus by contradiction, $\langle x, v \rangle = 0$.

Theorem 19.3.7: The bounded linear functionals of \mathcal{H} are unique

For bounded linear functional $L: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, there is a unique $x \in \mathcal{H}$ such that:

$$L(v) = \langle v, x \rangle$$

Proof

If $L(v) = 0$ for all v , then $x = 0$ satisfy the condition. Suppose $L(v) \neq 0$, then by **theorem 19.3.6**, there is a unique $x_0 \in L^{-1}(1)$ with the smallest norm.

Suppose $v \in L^{-1}(1)$. Then, $L(v - x_0) = L(v) - L(x_0) = 1 - 1 = 0$ so by **theorem 19.3.6**, then $\langle v - x_0, x_0 \rangle = 0$. Thus, $x = \frac{x_0}{\|x_0\|^2}$ is perpendicular to $v - x_0$.

$$\langle v, x \rangle = \langle v - x_0, \frac{x_0}{\|x_0\|^2} \rangle + \langle x_0, \frac{x_0}{\|x_0\|^2} \rangle = 0 + 1 = 1 = L(v)$$

Also, by **theorem 19.3.6**, for $v \in L^{-1}(0)$, then $L(v) = 0 = \langle v, x \rangle$.

Then for $w \in L^{-1}(c) \neq 0$, let $v = \frac{w}{c}$ so $L(v) = \frac{1}{c}L(w) = \frac{1}{c}c = 1$.

$$L(w) = L(cv) = cL(v) = c\langle v, x \rangle = \langle cv, x \rangle = \langle w, x \rangle$$

Suppose $y \in \mathcal{H}$ satisfy $L(v) = \langle v, y \rangle$ for all $v \in \mathcal{H}$. Then for every $v \in \mathcal{H}$:

$$\langle v, x \rangle = L(v) = \langle v, y \rangle \quad \Rightarrow \quad \langle v, x - y \rangle = 0$$

Take $v = x - y$ so $\|x - y\|^2 = \langle x - y, x - y \rangle = 0$ so $x = y$.

19.4 Fourier Series

Definition 19.4.1: Orthonormal Family

$\{u_n\} \in \mathcal{H}$ are **orthonormal** if $\|u_n\| = 1$ and $\langle u_n, u_m \rangle = 0$ for $n \neq m$

Theorem 19.4.2: Minimal Distance of $w \in \mathcal{H}$ to orthonormal basis

If $u_0, \dots, u_N \in \mathcal{H}$ are orthonormal and $w \in \mathcal{H}$, then the c_n to minimize

$$\|w - \sum_{n=0}^N c_n u_n\|$$

are $c_n = \langle w, u_n \rangle$

Proof

Let $v = \sum_{n=0}^N c_n u_n$ and $u = \sum_{n=0}^N a_n u_n$ where $a_n = \langle w, u_n \rangle$. Since:

$$\langle v, v \rangle = \sum_{n=0}^N |c_n|^2 \quad \langle u, u \rangle = \sum_{n=0}^N |a_n|^2$$

$$\langle w, v \rangle = \sum_{n=0}^N c_n \langle w, u_n \rangle = \sum_{n=0}^N a_n c_n$$

then:

$$\begin{aligned} \|w - v\|^2 &= \langle w - v, w - v \rangle = \|w\|^2 - 2\langle w, v \rangle + \|v\|^2 \\ &= \|w\|^2 - 2 \sum_{n=0}^N a_n c_n + \sum_{n=0}^N |c_n|^2 \\ &= \|w\|^2 - \sum_{n=0}^N |a_n|^2 + \sum_{n=0}^N (a_n - c_n)^2 = \|w\|^2 - \|u\|^2 + \sum_{n=0}^N |a_n - c_n|^2 \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for any c_n , $\|w - v\|^2 \geq \|w\|^2 - \|u\|^2$ where equality holds if $c_n = a_n$.

Definition 19.4.3: Complete Orthonormal Family and Fourier Series

Orthonormal $\{u_n\} \in \mathcal{H}$ is **complete** if for every $w \in \mathcal{H}$:

$$w = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n u_n$$

The n -th Fourier coefficient of w with respect to $\{u_n\}$ is $\langle w, u_n \rangle$.

Then, $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \langle w, u_n \rangle u_n$ is called the **Fourier series of w** .

Theorem 19.4.4: Bessel's Inequality

For orthonormal $\{u_i\} \in \mathcal{H}$ where $w \in \mathcal{H}$:

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |\langle w, u_i \rangle|^2 \leq \|w\|^2$$

converges

Proof

Let $s_n = \sum_{i=0}^n \langle w, u_i \rangle u_i$. Since $\|s_n\|^2 = \sum_{i=0}^n |\langle w, u_i \rangle|^2$, then:

$$\langle w - s_n, s_n \rangle = \langle w, s_n \rangle - \langle s_n, s_n \rangle = \sum_{i=0}^n |\langle w, u_i \rangle|^2 - \|s_n\|^2 = 0$$

Thus, $w - s_n$ and s_n are perpendicular so $\|w\|^2 = \|s_n\|^2 + \|w - s_n\|^2$. Thus:

$$\sum_{i=0}^n |\langle w, u_i \rangle|^2 = \|s_n\|^2 \leq \|w\|^2$$

Since $\|s_n\|^2$ is increasing and bounded by $\|w\|^2$, then:

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |\langle w, u_i \rangle|^2 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|s_n\|^2 \leq \|w\|^2$$

Theorem 19.4.5: Fourier Series Converge

For orthonormal $\{u_n\} \in \mathcal{H}$ where $w \in \mathcal{H}$, then $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \langle w, u_i \rangle u_i$ converges.

If $\{u_n\}$ is complete, then $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} c_i u_i$ converges to w must have $c_i = \langle w, u_i \rangle$.

Proof

Let $s_n = \sum_{i=0}^n \langle w, u_i \rangle u_i$. For $n > m$, then $s_n - s_m = \sum_{i=m+1}^n \langle w, u_i \rangle u_i$ where $\|s_n - s_m\|^2 = \sum_{i=m+1}^n |\langle w, u_i \rangle|^2$ which converges so $\{s_n\}$ is Cauchy and thus, converges.

If $\{u_n\}$ is complete, then there are c_i such that $S_n = \sum_{i=0}^n c_i u_i \rightarrow w$.

Since bounded linear $L(x) = \langle x, u_i \rangle$ has $|L(x)| \leq M\|x\|$, then $L(x)$ is continuous.

$$\langle w, u_i \rangle = \langle \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_n, u_i \rangle = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle S_n, u_i \rangle = c_i$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=0}^n \langle w, u_i \rangle u_i = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=0}^n c_i u_i \rightarrow w.$$

Theorem 19.4.6: Parseval's Theorem

For orthonormal $\{u_n\} \in \mathcal{H}$ where $w \in \mathcal{H}$, then:

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |\langle w, u_i \rangle|^2 = \|w\|^2 \text{ if and only if } \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \langle w, u_i \rangle u_i = w$$

Proof

Let $s_n = \sum_{i=0}^n \langle w, u_i \rangle u_i$. Note $\|w\|^2 = \|s_n\|^2 + \|w - s_n\|^2$.
 If $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|s_n\|^2 = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |\langle w, u_i \rangle|^2 = \|w\|^2$, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|w - s_n\|^2 = 0$ so
 $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|w - s_n\| = 0$. Thus, $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \langle w, u_i \rangle u_i = w$.
 If $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \langle w, u_i \rangle u_i = w$, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|w - s_n\| = 0$ so $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|w - s_n\|^2 = 0$. Thus, $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |\langle w, u_i \rangle|^2 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|s_n\|^2 = \|w\|^2$.

Definition 19.4.7: Classical Fourier Series

Since $\left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \cos(nx), \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \sin(nx) \right\}_{n=-\infty}^{\infty}$ is a complete orthonormal family in $L^2[-\pi, \pi]$, then the Fourier series of f :

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} [\langle f, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \cos(nx) \rangle \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \cos(nx) + \langle f, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \sin(nx) \rangle \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \sin(nx)] \\ &= \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2\pi} \langle f, \cos(nx) \rangle \cos(nx) + \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2\pi} \langle f, \sin(nx) \rangle \sin(nx) \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \langle f, 1 \rangle 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\pi} \langle f, \cos(nx) \rangle \cos(nx) + \frac{1}{2\pi} \langle f, 0 \rangle 0 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\pi} \langle f, \sin(nx) \rangle \sin(nx) \end{aligned}$$

For $f \in L^2[-\pi, \pi]$, then the Fourier series of f :

$$A_0 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \cos(nx) + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n \sin(nx)$$

where:

$$\begin{aligned} A_0 &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f(x) \, d\mu \\ A_n &= \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f(x) \cos(nx) \, d\mu \\ B_n &= \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f(x) \sin(nx) \, d\mu \end{aligned}$$

References

- [1] Walter Rudin, *Principles of Mathematical Analysis (3rd Edition)*,
ISBN-13: 978-0070542358
- [2] John Franks, *A (Terse) Introduction to Lebesgue Integration*,
ISBN-13: 978-0821848623