

# Homework 5

Kyle Kazemini

October 5, 2020

## 2.5.1

### Problem

Give an example of a nested sequence of bounded open intervals that does not have a point in its intersection.

### Solution

Let  $I_n = (0, \frac{1}{n})$  be a nested sequence of open bounded intervals.  $I_{n+1} \subset I_n \forall n$ . Any element of the intersection  $\cap_n I_n$  must be strictly greater than 0 and strictly less than  $\frac{1}{n}$  for all  $n$ . By the Archimedean Property, no such element can exist. Thus, this is an example of a nested sequence of bounded open intervals such that  $\cap_n I_n = \emptyset$  ■

## 2.5.6

### Problem

For each of the following sequences  $\{a_n\}$ , find a subsequence which converges.

- (a)  $a_n = (-1)^n$ .
- (b)  $a_n = \sin n\pi/4$ .
- (c)  $a_n = \frac{n}{2^{k_n}} - 1$  with  $k_n$  the largest integer  $k$  so that  $2^k \leq n$ .

### Solution

(a)  $\{1, 1, 1, \dots\}$  converges, but it is not a subsequence of  $a_n$  because by Definition 2.5.3, the sequence of natural numbers  $1, 1, 1, \dots$  is not strictly increasing. Similarly,  $\{-1, -1, -1, \dots\}$  converges, but it is not a

subsequence of  $a_n$ . Thus, there is no convergent subsequence for  $a_n = (-1)^n$ . ■

(b) Let  $b_k = \sin(n\pi/8)$ .  $b_k$  is a subsequence of  $a_n$  because for all  $k = 2n$ ,  $b_k = a_n$ . However  $b_k$  does not converge. There is no subsequence of  $a_n$  that converges because for any  $x \in \mathbb{Q}$ ,  $\sin x\pi$  does not converge. ■

(c) Let  $b_n = \frac{n}{2^n} - 1$ .  $b_n$  is a subsequence of  $a_n$  because  $b_n$  doesn't have the same restriction for  $k_n$  to be the largest integer such that  $2^n \leq n$ . So we need to show that  $b_n$  converges to -1. That is, for any  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists a real number  $N$  such that  $|b_n| < \epsilon$  for any  $n > N$ . Take  $N = \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ . This gives:

$$\left| \frac{2^\epsilon}{\epsilon} \right| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$

This clearly holds for all  $n > N$ , so  $b_n$  converges to -1. Thus, it is a convergent subsequence of  $a_n$ . ■

## 2.5.9

### Problem

Prove that a sequence which satisfies  $|a_{n+1} - a_n| < 2^{-n}$  for all  $n$  is a Cauchy sequence.

### Solution

By the definition of a Cauchy sequence, we need to show that for every  $\epsilon > 0$ , there is some real number  $N$  such that for all  $n > N$

$$|a_{n+1} - a_n| < 2^{-n}$$

Take  $N = -\log \epsilon$ . This gives:

$$|a_{n+1} - a_n| < \epsilon$$

Since  $N$  is a real number and not a natural number, the definition of a Cauchy sequence holds for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . ■

## 2.5.11

### Problem

Let  $s_n = \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{k2^k}$  be the sequence of partial sums of the series  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k2^k}$ . Prove that  $\{s_n\}$  converges. Hint: Show that it is a Cauchy sequence.

## Solution

By Theorem 2.5.8, to show that  $s_n$  converges, it is sufficient to show that it is a Cauchy sequence. That is, if for every  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists a real number  $N$  such that

$$|s_m - s_n| < \epsilon \text{ whenever } n, m > N$$

For  $m > n$ , we have:

$$|s_m - s_n| = \left| \sum_{k=n+1}^m \frac{1}{k2^k} \right| \leq \frac{1}{2^{n+1}(n+1)} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^k} = \frac{1}{2^n}$$

Since  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2^n} = 0$ , given  $\epsilon > 0$ , there is an  $N$  such that  $\frac{1}{2^n} < \epsilon$  for all  $n > N$ . Hence  $|s_m - s_n| < \epsilon$  for all  $n, m$  with  $m > n > N$ . Thus  $s_n$  is Cauchy and, hence, converges. ■

## 2.5.12

### Problem

Given a series  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k$ , set  $s_n = \sum_{k=1}^n a_k$  and  $t_n = \sum_{k=1}^n |a_k|$ . Prove that  $\{s_n\}$  converges if  $\{t_n\}$  is bounded.

### Solution

$m \leq t_n \leq p$  for some  $m, p$  because  $t_n$  is bounded. Then for every  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists  $N$  such that for  $n > N$ ,  $|s_n - a| < \epsilon$ . That is:

$$\left| \sum_{k=1}^n a_k - a \right| < \epsilon$$

Take  $\epsilon = p - m \geq 0$ . Then it's easy to see that  $\left| \sum_{k=1}^n a_k - a \right| < \epsilon$  for all  $n > N$  because  $\epsilon$  is strictly greater than 0 and  $p - m \geq 0$ . Thus if  $t_n$  is bounded,  $s_n$  converges to some value  $a$ . ■

## 2.6.1

### Problem

Find  $\limsup a_n$  and  $\liminf a_n$  for the following sequences:

- (a)  $a_n = (-1)^n$ ;
- (b)  $a_n = (-1/n)^n$ ;
- (c)  $a_n = \sin n\pi/3$ .

## Solution

(a)  $\liminf a_n = \lim i_n$  where  $i_n = \inf \{a_k : k \geq n\}$ . In this case,  $i_n = -1$  so  $\lim i_n = -1$ . Thus  $\liminf a_n = -1$ .

$\limsup a_n = \lim s_n$  where  $s_n = \sup \{a_k : k \geq n\}$ . In this case,  $s_n = 1$  so  $\lim s_n = 1$  also. Thus  $\limsup a_n = 1$ . ■

(b)  $\liminf a_n = \lim i_n$  where  $i_n = \inf \{a_k : k \geq n\}$ . In this case,  $i_n = -1$  so  $\lim i_n = -1$ . Thus  $\liminf a_n = -1$ .

$\limsup a_n = \lim s_n$  where  $s_n = \sup \{a_k : k \geq n\}$ . In this case,  $s_n = \infty$  so  $\lim s_n = \infty$  as well. Thus  $\limsup a_n = \infty$ . ■

(c)  $\liminf a_n = \lim i_n$  where  $i_n = \inf \{a_k : k \geq n\}$ . In this case,  $i_n = \sin \pi/3 = 0$  so  $\lim i_n = 0$ . Thus  $\liminf a_n = 0$ .

$\limsup a_n = \lim s_n$  where  $s_n = \sup \{a_k : k \geq n\}$ . In this case,  $s_n = \infty$  so  $\lim s_n = \infty$  as well. Thus  $\limsup a_n = \infty$ . ■

## 2.6.2

### Problem

Find  $\liminf$  and  $\limsup$  for the sequence of Exercise 2.5.6(c).

### Solution

$\liminf a_n = \lim i_n$  where  $i_n = \inf \{a_k : k \geq n\}$ .  $a_n$  is bounded below by 0, thus  $i_n = 0$  and  $\liminf a_n = 0$  (this is equivalent to the justification given in Exercise 2.6.1)

$\limsup a_n = \lim s_n$  where  $s_n = \sup \{a_k : k \geq n\}$ . In this case,  $s_n = 0$  so  $\lim s_n = 0$  as well. Thus,  $\limsup a_n = 0$ . ■

Note: by Theorem 2.6.6, this is equivalent to  $\lim a_n = 0$ .

## 2.6.4

### Problem

If  $\limsup a_n$  and  $\limsup b_n$  are finite, prove that

$$\limsup(a_n + b_n) \leq \limsup a_n + \limsup b_n.$$

### Solution

Let  $C = \limsup(a_n + b_n)$ ,  $A = \limsup a_n$ , and  $B = \limsup b_n$ . Suppose FSO that  $C > A + B$  and suppose that  $\exists \epsilon > 0$  such that  $C - \epsilon > A + B + \epsilon$ . Because  $A$  and  $B$  are finite, by the definition of  $A$  and  $B$ , for some real number  $N$ ,  $\exists n > N$  such that

$$a_n + b_n > C - \epsilon$$

By that same logic, for some real number  $N_1$ ,  $\exists n > N_1$  such that

$$a_n < A + \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$

Similarly, for some real number  $N_2$ ,  $\exists n > N_2$  such that

$$b_n < B + \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$

Now if we take  $N = \max(N_1, N_2)$ , then this gives:

$$a_n + b_n < A + B + \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} < C - \epsilon$$

Thus, contradicting the earlier statement:

$$a_n + b_n > C - \epsilon$$

So by contradiction, we've shown that  $\limsup(a_n + b_n) \leq \limsup a_n + \limsup b_n$  ■