

Section 2.4: The Monotone Convergence Theorem and Infinite Series

Juan Patricio Carrizales Torres

Sep 2, 2022

In this chapter we are introduced to the Monotone Convergence Theorem, which is very useful in checking the convergence of sequences of partial sums. Let (a_n) be a sequence. This theorem states that if (a_n) is monotone (either increasing or decreasing), namely $a_n \leq a_{n+1}$ or $a_n \geq a_{n+1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ respectively, and it is bounded, then it converges to some limit. Its usefulness comes in two “flavors”. First, the fact that partial sums of positive real numbers are elements of an increasing sequence. Second, it suffices to show that a sequence is increasing and bounded to conclude that converges without the necessity to come up with a particular limit. We are interested in the convergence of partial sums, since an infinite series

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} a_n$$

is said to converge (equal) some number N if the sequence of its partial sums $(s_n) = (a_1 + a_2 + \cdots + a_n)$ converges to N . One way to show that an increasing sequence of partial sums is bounded is by proving that every element is lower or equal to other element from a bounded sequence. On the other hand, a sequence of partial sums (s_n) is not bounded if for every element k of some unbounded sequence (p_n) there is an element in (s_n) that is greater or equal to p_k . For instance, one can extract another sequence (m_n) from (s_n) such that $m_k \geq p_k$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Let's state this in a clear and clean way. Let (a_n) and (b_n) be sequences. If for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there is some positive integer k such that $a_n \leq b_k$, then $(a_n) \leq (b_n)$. Now, let (s_n) and (p_n) be bounded and unbounded sequences, respectively. Then, the increasing sequence (a_n) is bounded if $(a_n) \leq (s_n)$. On the other hand, (a_n) is unbounded if $(p_n) \leq (a_n)$.

For example, the **Cauchy Condensation Test** uses the infinite series

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} 2^n b_{2^n}.$$

to check the converge or divergence of the infinite series of some decreasing sequence (b_n) of nonnegative real numbers since $(s_{2^n b_{2^n}}) \leq (s_{b_n})$ and viceversa.

Problem 2.4.1. (a) Prove that the sequence defined by $x_1 = 3$ and

$$x_{n+1} = \frac{1}{4 - x_n}$$

converges.

Proof. We proceed by induction. We show that $3 \geq x_n > x_{n+1} > 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that $x_1 = 3$ and $x_2 = 1/(4 - 3) = 1$. Hence, $3 \geq x_1 > x_2 > 0$. Now, assume for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ that $3 \geq x_k > x_{k+1} > 0$. We prove that $3 \geq x_{k+1} > x_{k+2} > 0$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} 3 \geq x_k > x_{k+1} > 0 &\implies \\ 1 \leq 4 - x_k < 4 - x_{k+1} < 4 &\implies \\ 1 \geq \frac{1}{4 - x_k} > \frac{1}{4 - x_{k+1}} > \frac{1}{4}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $3 \geq x_{k+1} > x_{k+2} > 0$. By the Principle of Mathematical Induction, $3 \geq x_k > x_{k+1} > 0$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus, x_n is decreasing and bounded. It converges to some a , and according to the given argument, it seems that $a = \frac{1}{4}$. \square

- (b) Now that we know $\lim x_n$ exists, explain why $\lim x_{n+1}$ must also exist and equal the same value.

Solution Recall that when dealing with convergence of sequences, we are mostly interested in the “tail”, namely, how infinitely but finite many of them behave. Note that $x_{n+1} = (x_n : n \geq 2)$ is the same sequence as x_n minus the first term. We keep infinitely many of them (tail). Hence, for any ϵ such that for any $n \geq N$ we have $|x_n - a| < \epsilon$, there is still some $K \geq N$ such that $|x_{n+1} - a| < \epsilon$ for all $n \geq K$. Thus, $\lim x_n = \lim x_{n+1} = a$.

- (c) Take the limit of each side of the recursive equation in part (a) to explicitly compute $\lim x_n$.

Solution The sequence (x_{n+1}) is recursively defined by

$$x_{n+1} = \frac{1}{4 - x_n}$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Taking the limit in both sides we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim x_{n+1} &= \lim \frac{1}{4 - x_n} \implies \\ a &= \frac{1}{4 - a}, \end{aligned}$$

by the Algebraic Limit Theorem. Hence, $(x_{n+1}) \rightarrow a$ and so $(x_{n+1}) = \left(\frac{1}{4 - x_n}\right) \rightarrow \frac{1}{4 - a} = a$. Then, $a^2 - 4a + 1 = 0$. Using the quadratic formula, we get $a = 2 \pm \sqrt{3}$. Since $3 \geq x_n + 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, it follows that $3 \geq a$ and so $a = 2 - \sqrt{3}$. Note that $a \approx 0.267949$ which is very near to our initial guess of $\frac{1}{4}$.

Problem 2.4.2. (a) Consider the recursively defined sequence $y_1 = 1$,

$$y_{n+1} = 3 - y_n,$$

and set $y = \lim y_n$. Because (y_n) and (y_{n+1}) have the same limit, taking the limit across the recursive equation gives $y = 3 - y$. Solving for y , we conclude $\lim y_n = 3/2$. What is wrong with this argument?

Solution Computing the first 5 terms of (y_n) we realize that $(y_n) = (2, 1, 2, 1, 2, \dots)$ is a sequence that alternates between 2 values and so it does not converge. The argument is good if the assumption is true, however the statement $y = \lim y_n$ is false.

- (b) This time set $y_1 = 1$ and $y_{n+1} = 3 - \frac{1}{y_n}$. Can the strategy in (a) be applied to compute the limit of this sequence?

Solution In order to be sure that the strategy in (a) can be applied to this example we must show that the recursive sequence converges. One way is using the Monotone Convergence Theorem.

Proof. We proceed by induction. We show that $3 > y_{n+1} > y_n \geq 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Observe that $y_1 = 1$ and $y_2 = 3 - 1 = 2$. Hence, $3 > y_2 > y_1 \geq 1$. Suppose for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ that $3 > y_{k+1} > y_k \geq 1$. We prove that $3 > y_{k+2} > y_{k+1} > 1$. Note that $1/3 < 1/y_{k+1} \leq 1/y_k < 1$ and so $3 - 1/3 > 3 - 1/y_{k+1} > 3 - 1/y_k \geq 3 - 1$. Therefore,

$$3 > \frac{8}{3} > y_{k+2} > y_{k+1} \geq 2 > 1.$$

Thus, by the Principle of Mathematical Induction, $3 > y_{n+1} > y_n \geq 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, (y_n) is an increasing and bounded sequence, and so, by the Monotone Convergence Theorem, $\lim y_n = y$ for some $y \in \mathbb{R}$. \square

Then, it is valid to apply the argument of (a) in this case. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim y_{n+1} &= \lim \left(3 - \frac{1}{y_n} \right) \implies \\ y &= 3 - \frac{1}{y} \end{aligned}$$

since $y_n > 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus, $y^2 - 3y + 1 = 0$ and so, using the quadratic equation, $y = \frac{3 \pm \sqrt{5}}{2}$. Since $y_n \geq 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $y \geq 1$ and so $y = \frac{3 + \sqrt{5}}{2} \approx 2.6180$. This technique is possible thanks to the **Algebraic Theorem of Limits**.

Problem 2.4.3. (a) Show that

$$\sqrt{2}, \sqrt{2 + \sqrt{2}}, \sqrt{2 + \sqrt{2 + \sqrt{2}}}, \dots$$

converges and find the limit.

Proof. Note that this can be expressed as a recursive sequence defined by $y_1 = \sqrt{2}$ and $y_{n+1} = \sqrt{2 + y_n}$. We first show that it is bounded and an increasing sequence. Hence, we proceed by induction and prove that $1 < y_n < y_{n+1} < 2$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that $1 < 2 < 2 + \sqrt{2} < 4$ and, by taking the root, $1 < \sqrt{2} < \sqrt{2 + \sqrt{2}} < 2$. Hence, $1 < y_1 < y_2 < 2$.

Now, assume that $1 < y_k < y_{k+1} < 2$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. We show that $1 < y_{k+1} < y_{k+2} < 2$.

Observe that $1 < 2 + y_k < 2 + y_{k+1} < 4$ and, by taking the square root,

$$1 < y_{k+1} < \sqrt{2 + y_{k+1}} = y_{k+2} < 2.$$

By the Principle of Mathematical Induction, $1 < y_n < y_{n+1} < 2$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and so (y_n) is a bounded and increasing sequence. Thus, it converges to some limit, by the Bounded Monotone Convergence Theorem.

Now, we proceed to find its limit. Note that $\lim(y_{n+1}) = \lim(y_n) = y$ and so

$$\begin{aligned} \lim y_{n+1} &= \sqrt{2 + y} \implies \\ y^2 - y - 2 &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $(y - 2)^2 = 0$ and so $y = 2$. □

(b) Does the sequence

$$\sqrt{2}, \sqrt{2\sqrt{2}}, \sqrt{2\sqrt{2\sqrt{2}}}, \dots$$

converge? If so, find the limit.

Proof. Note that sequence can be expressed as a recursive sequence defined by $y_1 = \sqrt{2}$ and $y_{n+1} = \sqrt{2y_n}$. We show that it is an increasing bounded sequence. Therefore, we proceed by induction and show that $1 < y_n < y_{n+1} < 2$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. First, note that $1 < 2 < 2\sqrt{2} < 4$ and, by taking the square root, $1 < \sqrt{2} < \sqrt{2\sqrt{2}} < 2$. Hence, $1 < y_1 < y_2 < 2$.

Now, suppose that $1 < y_k < y_{k+1} < 2$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. We show that $1 < y_{k+1} < y_{k+2} < 2$.

Observe that $1 < 2y_k < 2y_{k+1} < 4$ and, by taking the square root, $1 < y_{k+1} < y_{k+2} < 2$. By the Principle of Mathematical Induction, $1 < y_n < y_{n+1} < 2$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence, (y_n) is an increasing bounded sequence and, by the Monotone Bounded Sequence, (y_n) converges to some y .

We have that $\lim y_{n+1} = \lim \sqrt{2y_n}$ and so $y^2 - 2y = y(y - 2) = 0$. Thus, either $y = 0$ or $y = 2$. However, since $1 < y_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, it follows that $1 < y$, and so $y = 2$. □

Lemma 1. Let (a_n) be an increasing sequence ($a_n \leq a_{n+1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$) that converges to a . Then, $a \geq a_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. Assume, to the contrary, that there is some $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $a_N > a$. Thus, $\epsilon = a_N - a > 0$ and so $|a_n - a| \geq \epsilon$ for all $n \geq N$ (recall (a_n) is increasing). This contradicts the fact that a is the limit of (a_n) . \square

Problem 2.4.4. (a) In Section 1.4 we used the Axiom of Completeness (AoC) to prove the Archimedean Property of \mathbb{R} (Theorem 1.4.2). Show that the Monotone Convergence Theorem can also be used to prove the Archimedean Property without making any use of AoC

Proof. First, let (a_n) be a sequence defined by $a_n = n$. Note that $a_n = n < n+1 = a_{n+1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and so it is an increasing sequence. Just like the proof from **Section 1.4**, we proceed by contradiction. Suppose, to the contrary, that there is some real number y such that $a_n < y$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus, $0 < a_n < y$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and it is a bounded increasing sequence. By the Bounded Monotone Convergence Sequence, there is some $\lim a_n = a$. Since (a_n) is an increasing sequence, it follows that $a_n \leq a$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Now, consider some $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and so there is some $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $|a_n - a| = |n - a| < m$ for all $n \geq N$. Thus, $a - n < m$ and so $a < m + n$. Because \mathbb{N} is closed under addition, $m + n \in \mathbb{N}$ and so $a < a_{m+n}$ for all $n \geq N$, which contradicts the fact that a is the limit of an increasing sequence. \square

(b) Use the Monotone Convergence Theorem to supply a proof for the Nested Interval Property (**Theorem 1.4.1**) that doesn't make use of AoC.

Proof. Let $A = \{a_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and every b_n serves as an upper bound for A . Also, note that $a_n \leq a_{n+1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ since each $I_{n+1} = [a_{n+1}, b_{n+1}] \subseteq [a_n, b_n] = I_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ (nested). Hence, (a_n) is an increasing and bounded sequence, and so, by the Bounded Monotone Convergence Theorem, it converges to some x . Thus, $a_n \leq x$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ since x is the limit of an increasing sequence.

As we have previously seen, $\lim a_n = x$ must be the lowest upper bound of A (l.u.b for all elements in the sequence), otherwise, it leads to a contradiction. Therefore, $x \leq b_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Now, consider some I_n and so $a_n \leq x \leq b_n$. Hence, $x \in I_n$ and $x \in \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} I_n \neq \emptyset$. \square

These two results suggest that we could have used the Monotone Convergence Theorem in place of AoC as our starting axiom for building theory of the real numbers.