Problem Sequence - Solutions

This document will be filled up with the solutions from the problem sequence.

Solution 1. (Greg)

From Axiom 1, there are three cases to consider:

1. p = 0

p is equal to the only element of M. From the definition of limit point, every segment containing p must contain a point of M different from p. However, there are no points in M different from p, so p must not be a limit point of M.

2. p > 0

From Axiom 3, there exists a point a such that 0 < a < p. There also exists a point b such that b > p. Since p > 0 and b > p, Axiom 2 tells us that b > 0. We can then form the segment S = (a, b). Since a > 0 and b > 0, 0 is not between a and b, so S does not contain 0. However, a , so <math>S contains S. Since S is a segment containing S that does not contain any element of S, so S is not a limit point of S.

3. p < 0

(symmetric to the p > 0 case)

Therefore, regardless of our choice of p, we can construct a segment that contradicts the requirements in the limit point definition, so p is not a limit point of M.

Solution 2. (Jeff)

According to Definition 4, we can prove that p is not a limit point of M if we can construct a segment containing p but not a different point of M. Construct this segment as follows:

- 1. If all points of M are on the opposite side of p, choose any value as an endpoint.
- 2. If any point of M is on the same side of p, choose a point between the nearest point of M and p. (Axiom 3 confirms that there will be such a point.)

This segment contains p but will not contain any points of M (with the exception of p, if p is 0 or 1). Therefore, we have found a segment that does not fulfill the requirements of Definition 4, so p is not a limit point of M.

Solution 3. (Erin, solved after Problem 4)

Let a = 0 and b = 1. Then, according to Problem 4, b is a limit point of (a, b). Therefore, 1 is a limit point of (0, 1).

Solution 4. (Erin)

We will prove that b is a limit point of (a, b); The proof for a is similar. Construct a segment (p, q) containing b (p < b < q). According to Axiom 1, there are three cases, and we will deal with two of them simultaneously:

1. p < a

In this case, p < a < b < q, so p < (a, b) < q. Since (p, q) contains every point of (a, b), we have found points that satisfy Defintion 4.

2. $p \ge a$

In this case, $a \le p < b < q$. According to Axiom 3, there is a point d between p and b. The inequality is then $a \le p < d < b < q$. Then,

- a < d < b, so d is in (a, b).
- p < d < q, so d is in (p, q).

This means that (p,q) contains d, which is a point of (a,b).

Therefore, every (p,q) containing b also contains a point of (a,b), so b is a limit point of (a,b).

Solution 5. (Greg)

Choose any point p from S. Construct a segment (x,y) that contains p (ie: x). Put no other condition on <math>y. According to Axiom 1, one of these three cases is true:

1. x > a

Choose a point q between x and p (x < q < p; this exists by Axiom 3). Apply Axiom 2 three times:

- a < x and x < q, so a < q
- q < p and p < b, so q < b
- q < p and p < y, so q < y

so a < q < b and x < q < y. Therefore, q is an element of S inside (a, b) that is different from p.

2. x = a

Repeat the proof for x > a with one change:

- a = x and x < q, so a < q
- 3. x < a

Choose q betweem a and p. Change:

• x < a and a < q, so x < q

(same conclusion as x > a)

In each of these three cases, every (x, y) contains a point q from (a, b). Therefore, we have satisfied Definition 4, so p is a limit point of (a, b).

Solution 6.

Solution 7. (Amber)

Solution 8. (Greg)

Consider a point p. According to Axiom 4, there exists a largest integer M_x and a smallest integer M_y such that $M_x . Then, choose points <math>x$ and y from Axiom 3 such that $M_x < x < p$ and $p < y < M_y$, and consider the segment S = (x, y).

We will try to find an integer different from p inside S. Axiom 1 gives us three cases:

1. n = p (note: this is only possible if p is an integer)

Here, n is not different from p, so we have not found an integer different from p.

2. n < p

Note that n must satisfy $n \leq M_x$; if $n > M_x$, we have contradicted Axiom 4. Then, from Axiom 2, $n \leq M_x$ and $M_x < x$, so n < x. This shows that n is not between x and y, so S does not contain n.

3. n > p

This case is symmetric to the n < p case.

Therefore, S is a segment containing p that does not contain any integers different from p. Since every element of M is an integer, we have proven that there exists a segment S for every point p without any other points of M, so M has no limit points.

Solution 9.

Solution 10.

Solution 11. (Greg)

Construct a segment S = (x, y) that contains 0 (x < 0 < y). Since the reciprocal of a positive number is positive, every element M_i of M is positive, so $x < M_i$ from Axiom 2.

Then, we will attempt to find an element of M that is less than y. Since every element of M is of the form $\frac{1}{n}$ for some integer n, we are looking for $\frac{1}{n} < y$. From the properties of reciprocals, this is equivalent to $\frac{1}{y} < n$. According to Axiom 4, the point $\frac{1}{y}$ has an integer greater than it, so we can find an n that satisfies this inequality.

Therefore, every S containing 0 also contains a point of M, so 0 is a limit point of M.

Solution 12.

Solution 13. (Erin)

First, note that the set $H \cap K$ is a subset of H because every point of $H \cap K$ must be a point of H. Similarly, $H \cap K \subseteq K$.

Then, from Problem 7, since p is a limit point of $H \cap K$, p is also a limit point of H; identically, p is a limit point of K.

Solution 14. (Jeff)

We will use a counterexample to prove that not every interval containing a limit point must contain another point of the set.

Consider the set M of the reciprocals of all positive integers. (This was the set discussed in problems 11 and 12.) We know from Problem 11 that 0 is a limit point of M, so pick the interval I = [i, 0] for any i < 0 and let p = 0.

Since p = 0, which is an endpoint of I, I contains p. However, every point m of M is positive (m > 0), and is not contained by I. Therefore, I is an interval which contains a limit point of M and no other points of M. This shows that not every interval containing a limit point must contain a different point of the set.

Solution 15.

Solution 16. (Fernando)

Let $S_1 = (a_1, b_1)$ and $S_2 = (a_2, b_2)$. Since p is in both segments, $a_1 and <math>a_2 . From Axiom 2, we know that:$

- $a_1 < b_1$
- $a_1 < b_2$
- $a_2 < b_1$
- $a_2 < b_2$

Then, there are only 4 segments that could be the result of the intersection $S_1 \cap S_2$:

- (a_1, b_1)
- (a_1, b_2)
- (a_2, b_1)
- (a_2, b_2)

Since p is in all of these segments, we have shown that the resulting segment will always contain p.

Solution 17. (Greg)

p is not a limit point of H, so there is a segment $S_H = (H_a, H_b)$ that contains p but no point of H different from p. Likewise, there is a segment $S_K(K_a, K_b)$ that contains p but no different point of K. From these two segments, construct $S = S_H \cap S_K$.

Since p was in both of the original segments, Problem 16 tells us that S contains p. However, since there were no elements of H or K in these segments (except possibly p), S contains no elements of H or K. Finally, because every element of $H \cup K$ is an element of H or K, we know that S contains no elements of $H \cup K$.

Therefore, S is a segment that contains p but no other elements of $H \cup K$. We have found a counterexample to the definition of a limit point, so p is not a limit point of $H \cup K$.

Solution 18.