

**MATH 2220 SECTION 203**  
**HW #7**

KIRILL CHERNYSHOV

**Problem 1**

(a)  $f(1, 2) = (1 + \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{1} + 2) = (1.5, 3)$

(b) By definition, we know that

$$\mathbf{Df} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial x} & \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial y} \\ \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial x} & \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial y} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -y^{-2} \\ -x^{-2} & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

$\det \mathbf{Df} = 1 - \frac{1}{x^2 y^2}$ . This matrix is invertible (the determinant is nonzero) at all points  $(x, y)$  where  $x^2 \neq \frac{1}{y^2}$ .

(c) By the inverse function theorem,  $\mathbf{Df}^{-1}(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})) = (\mathbf{Df}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}))^{-1}$ . The linear approximation for  $f^{-1}(x, y)$  near a point  $(a, b)$  is  $L(x, y) = f^{-1}(a, b) + \mathbf{Df}^{-1}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \begin{bmatrix} x - a \\ y - b \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{f}^{-1}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) + (\mathbf{Df}(\mathbf{f}^{-1}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}))) \begin{bmatrix} x - a \\ y - b \end{bmatrix}$ . In this case,  $(a, b) = (1.5, 3)$  and  $f^{-1}(a, b) = (1, 2)$ , so:

$$\mathbf{Df}^{-1}(\mathbf{1.5}, \mathbf{3}) = (\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}))^{-1} = \left( \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -0.25 \\ -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \right)^{-1} = \frac{\mathbf{1}}{\mathbf{0.75}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0.25 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\text{So } L(1.49, 2.9) = f^{-1}(1.5, 3) + \mathbf{Df}^{-1}(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{1.5}, \mathbf{3})) \begin{bmatrix} 0.01 \\ 0.1 \end{bmatrix} = (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}) + (\mathbf{0.04667}, \mathbf{0.1467}) = (\mathbf{1.04667}, \mathbf{2.1467}).$$

**Problem 2**

(a) No. This would be the case if the determinant of the derivative matrix of the function with respect to the vector consisting solely of its third variable, at  $(1, 2, -3)$ . However, since  $\nabla f(1, 2, -3) = (0, 0, 0)$ , this derivative matrix is just  $(0)$ , so its determinant is zero.

(b)  $\nabla f(1, 0, 3) = (0, 1, 0)$ , so the derivative matrix of  $f$  with respect to the vector consisting solely of its second variable is  $(1)$ . This matrix has a nonzero determinant, so it is possible to find a function  $g(x, z)$  such that around  $(1, 0, 3)$ ,  $f(x, y, z) = f(x, g(x, z), z)$ .

(c) By similar reasoning, at  $(1, 2, 3)$  the derivative matrix of  $f$  with regards to the vector consisting solely of  $y$  is just  $(1)$ , so a similar  $g(x, z)$  also exists in this case.

(d)

(e) In this case, we cannot guarantee the existence of such function  $g(y, z)$  such that  $f(x, y, z) = f(g(y, z), y, z)$ , since at  $(1, 0, 3)$  the derivative of  $f$  with respect to  $x$  is 0. This means that the relevant matrix is not invertible.

**Problem 3**

(a)  $f(2, -2, 2) = (2 - 2 + 2, -4 + 4 - 4) = (2, -4).$

(b)

$$\mathbf{Df} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ v+w & u+w & u+v \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\mathbf{Df}(2, -2, 2) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 4 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

(c) We want to check the invertibility of the derivative matrix of  $f$  with respect to the vector  $(v, w)$ . This matrix is  $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 4 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ ; its determinant is  $-4 \neq 0$ , so we know it is invertible. Therefore, the implicit function theorem guarantees the existence of a function  $g(v, w)$  such that near  $(2, -2, 2)$  we have  $f(u, v, w) = f(g(v, w), v, w)$ . Therefore, we can solve for  $v$  and  $w$  in terms of  $u$ .

(d) By similar reasoning, this time we exclude  $w$  from the vector, so the relevant matrix is  $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 4 \end{bmatrix}$ . This matrix has determinant 4 so once again we have  $g$ . Therefore we can solve for  $u$  and  $v$  in terms of  $w$  near  $(2, -2, 2)$ .

**Problem 4 (a)** The vector  $(x, y)$  must be on the unit circle, since  $x^2 + y^2 = 1$ .  $(u, v)$  is tangent to the unit circle, since  $(u, v)$  is orthogonal to  $(x, y)$  as their dot product is 0. Therefore,  $T$  is the set of vectors tangent to the unit circle.

(b)  $f(x, y, u, v) = (x^2 + y^2, ux + vy)$ . By definition,

$$\mathbf{Df} = \begin{bmatrix} 2x & 2y & 0 & 0 \\ u & v & x & y \end{bmatrix}$$

(c) The set of these points is the set of points where the matrix of derivatives of  $f$  with respect to  $x$  and  $u$  is invertible. This matrix is:

$$\mathbf{M} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial x} & \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial u} \\ \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial x} & \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial u} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 2x & 0 \\ u & x \end{bmatrix}$$

This (and any) matrix is invertible iff its determinant is nonzero.  $\det M = 2x^2$ , so wherever  $x \neq 0$ , this matrix is invertible, and therefore by the implicit function theorem there exists a function  $g$  such that  $g(x, u) = (y, v)$ .

(d) We have  $x^2 + y^2 = 1 \implies y = \pm\sqrt{1-x^2}$ , and  $ux + vy = 0 \implies v = -\frac{ux}{y} = \mp \frac{ux}{\sqrt{1-x^2}}$ .

## Problem 5

(a) It is given that  $f(c(x)) = k$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , where  $k \in \mathbb{R}$  is a constant. This means that for all values of  $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{x})$ ,  $f(\mathbf{v})$  is constant, which means by definition that the image of  $c$  is contained in a level set of  $f$ .

(b) By the chain rule,  $\nabla(f \circ c)(t) = \nabla f(c(t)) \cdot \nabla c(t)$ . Since  $f \circ c$  is constant,  $\nabla(f \circ c)(t) = 0$ , so  $\nabla f(c(t)) \cdot \nabla c(t) = 0$ .

(c) In my proof of part (b), I assumed nothing about the dimension of the vectors. The proof holds for any such  $c : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  regardless of the value of  $n$ .

(d) Since the image of  $c$  is contained in a level set of  $f$ , and  $\nabla f(c(t))$  is the gradient of  $f$  at  $c(t)$ , which is in a level set of  $f$ , geometrically this means that the gradient of a function is always perpendicular to the direction of its level set (since their dot product is 0).

(e)