



Math for the people, by the people.

converse of Darboux's theorem (analysis) is  
not true

Canonical name	ConverseOfDarbouxTheoremanalysisIsNotTrue
Date of creation	2013-03-22 17:33:51
Last modified on	2013-03-22 17:33:51
Owner	Gorkem (3644)
Last modified by	Gorkem (3644)
Numerical id	6
Author	Gorkem (3644)
Entry type	Example
Classification	msc 26A06

Darboux' theorem says that, if  $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  has an antiderivative, then  $f$  has to satisfy the *intermediate value property*, namely, for any  $a < b$ , for any number  $C$  with  $f(a) < C < f(b)$  or  $f(b) < C < f(a)$ , there exists a  $c \in (a, b)$  such that  $f(c) = C$ . With this theorem, we understand that if  $f$  does not satisfy the intermediate value property, then no function  $F$  satisfies  $F' = f$  on  $\mathbb{R}$ .

Now, we will give an example to show that the converse is not true, i.e., a function that satisfies the intermediate value property might still have no antiderivative.

Let

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{x} \cos(\ln x) & \text{if } x > 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } x \leq 0 \end{cases}.$$

First let us see that  $f$  satisfies the intermediate value property. Let  $a < b$ . If  $0 < a$  or  $b \leq 0$ , the property is satisfied, since  $f$  is continuous on  $(-\infty, 0]$  and  $(0, \infty)$ . If  $a \leq 0 < b$ , we have  $f(a) = 0$  and  $f(b) = (1/b) \cos(\ln b)$ . Let  $C$  be between  $f(a)$  and  $f(b)$ . Let  $a_0 = \exp(-2\pi k_0 + \pi)$  for some  $k_0$  large enough such that  $a_0 < b$ . Then  $f(a_0) = 0 = f(a)$ , and since  $f$  is continuous on  $(a_0, b)$ , we must have a  $c \in (a_0, b)$  with  $f(c) = C$ .

Assume, for a contradiction that there exists a differentiable function  $F$  such that  $F'(x) = f(x)$  on  $\mathbb{R}$ . Then consider the function  $G(x) = \sin(\ln x)$  which is defined on  $(0, \infty)$ . We have  $G'(x) = f(x)$  on  $(0, \infty)$ , and since it is on an open connected set, we must have  $F(x) = G(x) + c$  on  $(0, \infty)$  for some  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ . But then, we have

$$\limsup_{x \rightarrow 0^+} F(x) = \limsup_{x \rightarrow 0^+} G(x) + c = 1 + c$$

and

$$\liminf_{x \rightarrow 0^+} F(x) = \liminf_{x \rightarrow 0^+} G(x) + c = -1 + c$$

which contradicts the differentiability of  $F$  at 0.