## Math 325, Section 1

## **Exam 1 Solutions**

1. (20 pts.) What must be true of a (non-empty) set  $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  if  $\inf(S) = \sup(S)$ ?

 $\inf(S)$  is a lower bound for S, so for every  $x \in S$  we have  $\inf(S) \leq x$ .  $\sup(S)$  is an upper bound for S, so for every  $x \in S$  we have  $x \leq \sup(S)$ .

But because  $\inf(S) = \sup(S) = M$ , this means that for every  $x \in S$  we have  $M \le x \le M$ , so x = M (since otherwise either x < M, a contradiction, or x > M, a contradiction!). So  $x \in S$  implies that x = M, which means that M is the only element of the set S; that is,  $S = \{M\} ! \underline{So} S$  contains exactly one real number, namely M.

2. (25 pts.) Show, using the Rational Roots Theorem, that  $\alpha = \sqrt{2 + \sqrt{7}}$  is **not** a rational number.

There are (at least) two ways to show this. Via the Rat'l Roots Thm, we find a polynomial having  $\alpha$  as a root:

$$\alpha^2 = 2 + \sqrt{7}$$
, so  $\alpha^2 - 2 = \sqrt{7}$ , so  $(\alpha^2 - 2)^2 = 7$ , so  $(\alpha^2 - 2)^2 - 7 = \alpha^4 - 4\alpha^2 + 4 - 7 = \alpha^4 - 4\alpha^2 - 3 = 0$ .

So  $\alpha$  is a root of the polynomial  $p(x) = x^4 - 4x^2 - 3$ . But the Rat'l Roots Thm. tells us that the only possible rational roots of this polynomial are 1, -1, 3, and/or -3. But we can either plug all of these into p and note that none of them are roots of p (this is probably the preferred way?), or we can be a little sneakier. Note that  $\alpha^2 = 2 + \sqrt{7} > 2 + \sqrt{4} = 2 + 2 = 4$ , so  $\alpha > 2$ , but  $\alpha^2 = 2 + \sqrt{7} \le 2 + \sqrt{9} = 2 + 3 = 5 < 9$ , so  $\alpha < 3$ . So  $\alpha$  cannot be equal to any of these possible roots. In either case we then know that  $\alpha$ , which is a root of p, cannot be equal to any of the possible rational roots of p, so  $\alpha$  cannot be rational!

Alternate proof: suppose  $\alpha = p/q$  is rational. Then  $\alpha^2 = p^2/q^2$  is also rational, so  $\alpha^2 - 2 = (p^2 - 2q^2)/q^2$  is rational. But! by the work above,  $\alpha^2 - 2 = \sqrt{7} = \beta$  is then rational. But  $\beta$  is a root of  $r(x) = x^2 - 7$ , whose only possible rational roots, 1, -1, 7, -7, aren't roots! So  $\beta$  isn't rational. But if  $\alpha$  is rational so is  $\beta$ ! So  $\alpha$  cannot be rational.

3. (30 pts.) We will define a sequence  $(a_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$  by setting  $a_1 = 2$ , and for  $n \ge 1$  (inductively) setting

$$a_{n+1} = 3 + \sqrt{2a_n} .$$

Show that this sequence is both monotonically increasing and bounded from above (so the sequence converges).

 $a_2=3+\sqrt{2\cdot 2}=3+\sqrt{4}=3+2=5\geq 2=a_1$ , so  $a_2\geq a_1$ , which gets us started on an induction. If we now suppose (as our inductive hypothesis) that  $a_{n+1}\geq a_n$ , then  $2a_{n+1}\geq 2a_n$  (since  $2a_{n+1}-2a_n=2(a_{n+1}-a_n)$  is the product of a positive number (2) and a non-negative one). But then  $\sqrt{2a_{n+1}}\geq \sqrt{2a_n}$ , from a result in class, and so  $a_{n+2}=3+\sqrt{2a_{n+1}}\geq 3+\sqrt{2a_n}=a_{n+1}$ .

So  $a_{n+1} \ge a_n$  implies that  $a_{n+2} \ge a_{n+1}$ , giving our inductive step. So  $a_{n+1} \ge a_n$  for every  $n \ge 1$ , by induction.

To show that the sequence is bounded, we could just pick an impossibly large number and give it a try. Or we could use techniques like we have before to find out when  $M = 3 + \sqrt{2M}$ , and use that. Or we could note that the thing which controls the size of  $a_{n+1}$  is  $\sqrt{2a_n}$ , which for  $a_n$  "large" is a lot smaller than  $a_n$ , for example,  $a_n = 50$  gives  $a_{n+1} = 3 + \sqrt{100} = 13$ , which is a lot smaller than 50.

So let's pick M=50, say, and show that  $a_n \le 50$  for every n, by induction!  $a_1=2 \le 50$  is true, so our base case works. Then if  $a_n \le 50$ , then  $2a-n \le 100$ ; so  $\sqrt{2a_n} \le \sqrt{100} = 10$ , so  $a_{n+1}=3+\sqrt{2a_n} \le 3+10=13 \le 50$ . This is our inductive step;  $a_n \le 50$  implies that  $a_{n+1} \le 50$ . So  $a_n \le 50$  for all  $n \ge 1$ , by induction; so the sequence is bounded above.

Because it is a monotone increasing sequence which is bounded above, it then follows that the sequence converges.

[N.B.: We can, in fact, find the limit of the sequence; as with examples from class our limit properties allow us to conclude that the limit, L, satisfies  $L = 3 + \sqrt{2L}$ , so  $(L-3)^2 - 2L = L^2 - 8L + 9 = 0$ . Using the quadratic formula, we conclude that

$$L = (8 \pm \sqrt{64 - 36})/2 = (8 \pm 2\sqrt{7})/2 = 4 \pm \sqrt{7}.$$

Since  $L \ge a_2 = 5$  (since  $a_n \ge a_2$  for every  $n \ge 2$ ) and  $4 - \sqrt{7} \le 4 - \sqrt{4} = 4 - 2 = 2$ , we conclude that  $L = 4 + \sqrt{7}$ .]

4. (25 pts.) Given sequences  $(a_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$  and  $(b_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ , show that <u>if</u> the sequences

$$c_n = a_n + b_n$$
 and  $d_n = a_n - b_n$ 

both converge, then the sequences  $a_n$  and  $b_n$  also both converge!

Since  $c_n$  and  $d_n$  both converge, we know that  $c_n + d_n = (a_n + b_n) + (a_n - b_n) = 2a_n$  also converges. So  $a_n = (1/2)(2a_n)$  also converges!

But then  $a_n$  and  $c_n = a_n + b_n$  converge, and so  $c_n - a_n = (a_n + b_n) - a_n = b_n$  must converge, as well. So both  $(a_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$  and  $(b_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$  must be convergent sequences.

A somewhat different way to write the same thing is:

If  $c_n = a_n + b_n \to L$  and  $d_n = a_n - b_n \to M$ , then  $c_n + d_n = 2a_n \to L + M$ , so  $a_n = (1/2)(2a_n) \to (1/2)(L+M)$ . In particular  $a_n$  has a limit, so it converges! Then  $b_n = (a_n + b_n) - a_n \to L - (1/2)(L+M) = (1/2)(L-M)$ , so  $b_n$  has a limit, so  $b_n$  converges!

[There are several other, roughly equivalent, ways to see how to build  $a_n$  and  $b_n$  out of  $c_n$  and  $d_n$ , leading to the same conclusions.]