

Chapter 3: Numerical Sequences and Series

Author: Meng-Gen Tsai

Email: plover@gmail.com

Exercise 3.1. Prove that the convergence of $\{s_n\}$ implies convergence of $\{|s_n|\}$. Is the converse true?

Proof.

- (1) Since $\{s_n\}$ is convergent, there is $s \in \mathbb{R}^1$ with the following property: given any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is N such that $|s_n - s| < \varepsilon$ whenever $n \geq N$. So

$$||s_n| - |s|| \leq |s_n - s| < \varepsilon$$

(Exercise 1.13). That is, $\{|s_n|\}$ converges to $|s|$.

- (2) The converse is not true by considering $s_n = (-1)^{n+1}$.

□

Exercise 3.2. Calculate $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\sqrt{n^2 + n} - n)$.

Proof.

$$\sqrt{n^2 + n} - n = \frac{n}{\sqrt{n^2 + n} + n} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{n}} + 1} \rightarrow \frac{1}{1 + 1} = \frac{1}{2}$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. □

Proof ($\varepsilon - N$ argument). Let $s_n = \sqrt{n^2 + n} - n$. Show that the sequence $\{s_n\}$ converges to $s = \frac{1}{2}$. Given any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is $N > \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} |s_n - s| &= \left| (\sqrt{n^2 + n} - n) - \frac{1}{2} \right| = \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{n}} + 1} - \frac{1}{2} \right| \\ &= \left| \frac{2 - \left(\sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{n}} + 1 \right)}{2 \left(\sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{n}} + 1 \right)} \right| = \left| \frac{1 - \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{n}}}{2 \left(\sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{n}} + 1 \right)} \right| \\ &= \left| \frac{1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{n} \right)}{2 \left(\sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{n}} + 1 \right)^2} \right| = \left| \frac{-\frac{1}{n}}{2 \left(\sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{n}} + 1 \right)^2} \right| < \frac{1}{n} \leq \frac{1}{N} < \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

whenever $n \geq N$. \square

Exercise 3.3. If $s_1 = \sqrt{2}$ and

$$s_{n+1} = \sqrt{2 + \sqrt{s_n}} \quad (n = 1, 2, 3, \dots),$$

prove that $\{s_n\}$ converges, and that $s_n < 2$ for $n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$.

The convergence of $\{s_n\}$ implies there is $s \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $s_n \rightarrow s$ where $s = \sqrt{2 + \sqrt{s}}$ and $\sqrt{2} < s \leq 2$. WolframAlpha shows that

$$s = \frac{1}{3} \left(-1 + \sqrt[3]{\frac{1}{2}(79 - 3\sqrt{249})} + \sqrt[3]{\frac{1}{2}(79 + 3\sqrt{249})} \right).$$

Proof (Theorem 3.14).

(1) Show that $\{s_n\}$ is increasing (by mathematical induction).

(a) Show that $s_2 > s_1$. In fact,

$$s_2 = \sqrt{2 + \sqrt{s_1}} = \sqrt{2 + \sqrt{\sqrt{2}}} < \sqrt{2} = s_1.$$

(a) Show that $s_{n+1} > s_n$ if $s_n > s_{n-1}$.

$$s_{n+1} = \sqrt{2 + \sqrt{s_n}} > \sqrt{2 + \sqrt{s_{n-1}}} = s_n.$$

By mathematical induction, $\{s_n\}$ is (strictly) increasing.

(2) Show that $\{s_n\}$ is bounded (by mathematical induction).

(a) Show that $s_1 \leq 2$. $\sqrt{2} \leq 2$.

(a) Show that $s_{n+1} \leq 2$ if $s_n \leq 2$.

$$s_{n+1} = \sqrt{2 + \sqrt{s_n}} \leq \sqrt{2 + \sqrt{2}} < 2.$$

By mathematical induction, $\{s_n\}$ is bounded by 2.

Hence, $\{s_n\}$ converges since $\{s_n\}$ is increasing and bounded (Theorem 3.14). \square

Exercise 3.4. Find the upper and lower limits of the sequences $\{s_n\}$ defined by

$$s_1 = 0; s_{2m} = \frac{s_{2m-1}}{2}; s_{2m+1} = \frac{1}{2} + s_{2m}.$$

Write out the first few terms of $\{s_n\}$:

$$0, 0, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{3}{4}, \frac{3}{8}, \frac{7}{8}, \frac{7}{16}, \frac{15}{16}, \dots$$

It suggests us

$$s_{2m+1} = 1 - \frac{1}{2^m} \quad (m = 0, 1, 2, \dots),$$

$$s_{2m} = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^m} \quad (m = 1, 2, 3, \dots).$$

Proof.

(1) *Show that*

$$s_{2m+1} = 1 - \frac{1}{2^m} \quad (m = 0, 1, 2, \dots),$$

$$s_{2m} = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^m}. \quad (m = 1, 2, 3, \dots)$$

Apply mathematical induction.

(2) The upper limit is 1.

(3) The lower limit is $\frac{1}{2}$.

□

Exercise 3.5. For any two real sequences $\{a_n\}$, $\{b_n\}$, prove that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (a_n + b_n) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n + \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_n$$

provided the sum of the right is not of the form $\infty - \infty$.

Proof. Write $\alpha = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n$ and $\beta = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_n$.

(1) $\alpha = \infty$ and $\beta = \infty$. Nothing to do.

(2) $\alpha = -\infty$ and $\beta = -\infty$. Since $\alpha = -\infty < \infty$, there exists M' such that $a_n < M'$ for all n . For any real M , $a_n > M - M'$ for at most a finite number of values of n (Theorem 3.17(a)). Hence $a_n + b_n > M$ for at most a finite number of values of n . Hence $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (a_n + b_n) = -\infty$, or

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (a_n + b_n) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n + \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_n$$

in this case.

- (3) α and β are finite. (Similar to the argument in Theorem 3.37.) Choose $\alpha' > \alpha$ and $\beta' > \beta$. There is an integer N such that

$$\alpha' \geq a_n \text{ and } \beta' \geq b_n$$

whenever $n \geq N$. Hence

$$a_n + b_n \leq \alpha' + \beta'$$

whenever $n \geq N$. Take \limsup to get Hence

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (a_n + b_n) \leq \alpha' + \beta'.$$

Since the inequality is true for every $\alpha' > \alpha$ and $\beta' > \beta$, we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (a_n + b_n) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n + \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_n.$$

□

Exercise 3.7. Prove that the convergence of $\sum a_n$ implies the convergence of

$$\sum \frac{\sqrt{a_n}}{n},$$

if $a_n \geq 0$.

Proof (Cauchy's inequality).

- (1) Show that $\sum \frac{\sqrt{a_n}}{n}$ is bounded. For any $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\sum_{n=1}^k \frac{\sqrt{a_n}}{n} \right)^2 &\leq \left(\sum_{n=1}^k a_n \right) \left(\sum_{n=1}^k \frac{1}{n^2} \right) && \text{(Cauchy's inequality)} \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n \right) \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2} \right). && \left(\sum a_n, \sum \frac{1}{n^2} : \text{convergent} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\left(\sum_{n=1}^k \frac{\sqrt{a_n}}{n} \right)^2$ is bounded, or $\sum_{n=1}^k \frac{\sqrt{a_n}}{n}$ is bounded.

- (2) Show that $\sum_{n=1}^k \frac{\sqrt{a_n}}{n}$ is increasing. It is clear due to $\frac{\sqrt{a_n}}{n} \geq 0$.

By Theorem 3.14, $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\sqrt{a_n}}{n}$ converges. □

Proof (AM-GM inequality). Show that $\sum \frac{\sqrt{a_n}}{n}$ is bounded.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\sqrt{a_n}}{n} &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left(a_n + \frac{1}{n^2} \right) && \text{(AM-GM inequality)} \\ \sum_{n=1}^k \frac{\sqrt{a_n}}{n} &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{n=1}^k a_n + \sum_{n=1}^k \frac{1}{n^2} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2} \right). && \left(\sum a_n, \sum \frac{1}{n^2} : \text{convergent} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\sum_{n=1}^k \frac{\sqrt{a_n}}{n}$ is bounded. The rest proof is the same as previous. \square

Exercise 3.20. Suppose $\{p_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in a metric space X , and some subsequence $\{p_{n_i}\}$ converges to a point $p \in X$. Prove that the full sequence $\{p_n\}$ converges to p .

Proof. Given any $\varepsilon > 0$.

- (1) Since $\{p_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence, there exists a positive integer N_1 such that

$$d(p_n, p_m) < \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \text{ whenever } n, m \geq N_1.$$

- (2) Since the subsequence $\{p_{n_i}\}$ converges to a point $p \in X$, there exists a positive integer N_2 such that

$$d(p_{n_i}, p) < \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \text{ whenever } n_i \geq N_2.$$

- (3) Let $N = \max\{N_1, N_2\}$ be a positive integer. So

$$\begin{aligned} d(p_n, p) &\leq d(p_n, p_{n_i}) + d(p_{n_i}, p) && \text{(Definition 2.15(c))} \\ &< \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \text{ whenever } n, n_i \geq N && ((1)(2)) \\ &= \varepsilon \text{ whenever } n \geq N. \end{aligned}$$

Hence the full sequence $\{p_n\}$ converges to p .

\square

Exercise 3.21. Prove the following analogue of Theorem 3.10(b): If $\{E_n\}$ is a sequence of closed and bounded sets in a complete metric space X , if $E_n \supseteq E_{n+1}$, and if

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{diam}(E_n) = 0,$$

then $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n$ consists of exactly one point.

Assume $E_n \neq \emptyset$. It is unnecessary to assume that E_n is bounded since we have the condition that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{diam}(E_n) = 0$.

Note. Every compact metric space is complete, but complete spaces need not be compact. In fact, a metric space is compact if and only if it is complete and totally bounded.

Proof.

- (1) Pick $p_n \in E_n$ for $n = 1, 2, \dots$
- (2) Show that $\{p_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence. Given any $\varepsilon > 0$. There is a positive integer N such that $\text{diam}(E_n) < \varepsilon$ whenever $n \geq N$. Especially,

$$\text{diam}(E_N) < \varepsilon.$$

As $m, n \geq N$, $p_m \in E_m \subseteq E_N$ and $p_n \in E_n \subseteq E_N$. By the definition of the diameter of E_N ,

$$d(p_m, p_n) \leq \text{diam}(E_N) < \varepsilon \text{ whenever } m, n \geq N.$$

- (3) Since X is complete, $\{p_n\}$ converges to a point $p \in X$.
- (4) Show that $p \in \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n$. (Reductio ad absurdum) If there were some n such that $p \notin E_n$. Consider the subsequence

$$p_n, p_{n+1}, p_{n+2}, \dots$$

Note that all p_n, p_{n+1}, \dots are in E_n . By (3), it converges to p . Thus p is a limit point of E_n . Since E_n is closed, $p \in E_n$, which is absurd.

- (5) Show that $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n = \{p\}$. (Reductio ad absurdum) If there were $q \in \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n$ with $q \neq p$, then $d(p, q) > 0$ (Definition 2.15(a)). It implies that

$$\text{diam}(E_n) \geq d(p, q) > 0 \text{ for all } n,$$

contrary to $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{diam}(E_n) = 0$.

□

Exercise 3.22 (Baire category theorem). Suppose X is a complete metric space, and $\{G_n\}$ is a sequence of dense open subsets of X . Prove Baire's theorem, namely, that $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} G_n$ is not empty. (In fact, it is dense in X .) (Hint: Find a shrinking sequence of neighborhoods E_n such that $\overline{E_n} \subseteq G_n$, and apply Exercise 3.21.)

Proof. Given any open set G_0 in X , will show that

$$\bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} G_n \neq \emptyset.$$

- (1) Since G_1 is dense, $G_0 \cap G_1$ is nonempty. Take any one point p_1 in the open set $G_0 \cap G_1$, then there exists a closed neighborhood

$$V_1 = \{q \in X : d(q, p_1) < r_1\}$$

of p_1 with $r_1 < 1$ such that

$$V_1 \subseteq G_0 \cap G_1.$$

Take $U_1 \subseteq E_1 \subseteq V_1$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} E_1 &= \left\{q \in X : d(q, p_1) \leq \frac{r_1}{64}\right\} \subseteq V_1, \\ U_1 &= \left\{q \in X : d(q, p_1) < \frac{r_1}{89}\right\} \subseteq E_1. \end{aligned}$$

- (2) Suppose V_n, E_n, U_n have been constructed, take any one point p_{n+1} in the open set $U_n \cap G_{n+1}$, there exists an open neighborhood

$$V_{n+1} = \{q \in X : d(q, p_{n+1}) < r_{n+1}\}$$

of p_{n+1} with $r_{n+1} < \frac{1}{n+1}$ such that

$$V_{n+1} \subseteq U_n \cap G_{n+1}.$$

Take $U_1 \subseteq E_1 \subseteq V_1$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} E_{n+1} &= \left\{q \in X : d(q, p_{n+1}) \leq \frac{r_{n+1}}{64}\right\} \subseteq V_{n+1}, \\ U_{n+1} &= \left\{q \in X : d(q, p_{n+1}) < \frac{r_{n+1}}{89}\right\} \subseteq E_{n+1}. \end{aligned}$$

- (3) Note that

- (a) E_n is closed and nonempty (since $p_n \in E_n$).
- (b) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{diam}(E_n) = 0$ (since $\text{diam}(E_n) \leq 2 \cdot \frac{r_n}{64} < r_n < \frac{1}{n}$.)
- (c) $E_1 \supseteq E_2 \supseteq \cdots$ (since $E_{n+1} \subseteq V_{n+1} \subseteq U_n \cap G_{n+1} \subseteq U_n \subseteq E_n$).

Since X is complete, by Exercise 3.21,

$$\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n = \{p\}$$

for some $p \in X$.

(4) Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
p \in \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n &\iff p \in E_n \text{ for all } n = 1, 2, 3, \dots \\
&\implies p \in E_1 \subseteq G_0 \cap G_1 \text{ and } p \in E_{n+1} \subseteq U_n \cap G_{n+1} \subseteq G_{n+1} \\
&\implies p \in G_0 \cap G_1 \cap \dots = \bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} G_n \\
&\implies \bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} G_n \neq \emptyset.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Exercise 3.23. Suppose $\{p_n\}$ and $\{q_n\}$ are Cauchy sequences in a metric space X . Show that the sequence $\{d(p_n, q_n)\}$ converges. (Hint: For any m, n ,

$$d(p_n, q_n) \leq d(p_n, p_m) + d(p_m, q_m) + d(q_m, q_n);$$

it follows that

$$|d(p_n, q_n) - d(p_m, q_m)|$$

is small if m and n are large.)

Proof. Given any $\varepsilon > 0$.

(1) Since $\{p_n\}$ and $\{q_n\}$ are Cauchy sequences, there exists N such that

$$d(p_n, p_m) < \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \text{ and } d(q_m, q_n) < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$$

whenever $m, n \geq N$.

(2) Note that

$$d(p_n, q_n) \leq d(p_n, p_m) + d(p_m, q_m) + d(q_m, q_n).$$

It follows that

$$|d(p_n, q_n) - d(p_m, q_m)| \leq d(p_n, p_m) + d(q_m, q_n) < \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} = \varepsilon.$$

Thus $\{d(p_n, q_n)\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in \mathbb{R}^1 (not in X).

(3) Since \mathbb{R}^1 is a complete metric space, $\{d(p_n, q_n)\}$ converges.

□

Exercise 3.24. Let X be a metric space.

- (a) Call two Cauchy sequences $\{p_n\}, \{q_n\}$ in X equivalent if

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(p_n, q_n) = 0.$$

Prove that this is an equivalence relation.

- (b) Let X^* be the set of all equivalence classes so obtained. If $P \in X^*$, $Q \in X^*$, $\{p_n\} \in P$, $\{q_n\} \in Q$, define

$$\Delta(P, Q) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(p_n, q_n);$$

by Exercise 3.23, this limit exists. Show that the number $\Delta(P, Q)$ is unchanged if $\{p_n\}$ and $\{q_n\}$ are replaced by equivalent sequences, and hence that Δ is a distance function in X^* .

- (c) Prove that the resulting metric space X^* is complete.
 (d) For each $p \in X$, there is a Cauchy sequence all of whose terms are p ; let P_p be the element of X^* which contains this sequence. Prove that

$$\Delta(P_p, P_q) = d(p, q)$$

for all $p, q \in X$. In other words, the mapping φ defined by $\varphi(p) = P_p$ is an isometry (i.e., a distance-preserving mapping) of X into X^* .

- (e) Prove that $\varphi(X)$ is dense in X^* , and that $\varphi(X) = X^*$ if X is complete. By (d), we may identify X and $\varphi(X)$ and thus regard X as embedded in the complete metric space X^* . We call X^* the **completion** of X .

Proof of (a). Given Cauchy sequences $\{p_n\}, \{q_n\}, \{r_n\}$ in X .

- (1) (*Reflexivity*)

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(p_n, q_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} 0 = 0$$

by the reflexivity of the metric function d .

- (2) (*Symmetry*)

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(p_n, q_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(q_n, p_n) = 0$$

by the symmetry of the metric function d .

- (3) (*Transitivity*) Suppose that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(p_n, q_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(q_n, r_n) = 0$. By the triangle inequality of the metric function d , we have

$$0 \leq d(p_n, r_n) \leq d(p_n, q_n) + d(q_n, r_n).$$

Take limit to get

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(p_n, r_n) \\
&\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (d(p_n, q_n) + d(q_n, r_n)) \\
&= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(p_n, q_n) + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(q_n, r_n) \\
&= 0
\end{aligned}$$

or $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(p_n, r_n) = 0$.

□

Proof of (b).

(1) *Show that Δ is well-defined.* Given any $\{p_n\}, \{p'_n\} \in P$ and $\{q_n\}, \{q'_n\} \in Q$.

(a) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(p_n, p'_n) = 0$ since $\{p_n\}$ and $\{p'_n\}$ are in the same equivalence class.

(b) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(q_n, q'_n) = 0$ (similar to (a)).

(c) *Show that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(p_n, q_n) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(p'_n, q'_n)$.* Since $d(p_n, q_n) \leq d(p_n, p'_n) + d(p'_n, q'_n) + d(q'_n, q_n)$, take limit to get

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(p_n, q_n) &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (d(p_n, p'_n) + d(p'_n, q'_n) + d(q'_n, q_n)) \\
&= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(p_n, p'_n) + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(p'_n, q'_n) + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(q'_n, q_n) \\
&= 0 + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(p'_n, q'_n) + 0 \\
&= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(p'_n, q'_n)
\end{aligned}$$

since (a)(b).

(d) *Show that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(p_n, q_n) \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(p'_n, q'_n)$.* Similar to (c).

By (c)(d), $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(p_n, q_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(p'_n, q'_n)$, or $\Delta(P, Q)$ is well-defined.

(2) *Show that Δ is a metric.*

(a) *Show that $\Delta(P, Q) > 0$ if $P \neq Q$; $\Delta(P, P) = 0$.* It is the definition of Δ .

(b) *Show that $\Delta(P, Q) = \Delta(Q, P)$.* Similar to the argument in (a)(2).

(c) *Show that $\Delta(P, Q) \leq \Delta(P, R) + \Delta(R, Q)$.* Similar to the argument in (a)(3).

□

Proof of (c). Show that $\{P_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ converges to P in (X^, Δ) for any given Cauchy sequence $\{P_k\}$.*

- (1) Take a Cauchy sequence $\{p_n^{(k)}\}_{n=1}^\infty$ to represent P_k for each k . We will construct a Cauchy sequence $\{p_k\}$ in (X, d) such that $\{P_k\}$ converges to P which is the equivalent class of $\{p_k\}$.
- (2) For each k , there exists N_k such that

$$d(p_m^{(k)}, p_n^{(k)}) < \frac{1}{k} \text{ whenever } m, n \geq N_k.$$

Especially,

$$d(p_m^{(k)}, p_{N_k}^{(k)}) < \frac{1}{k} \text{ whenever } m \geq N_k.$$

Let $p_k = p_{N_k}^{(k)}$ and collect all p_k as $\{p_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$.

- (3) Show that $\{p_k\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in (X, d) . Note that for any k , we have

$$\begin{aligned} d(p_m, p_n) &= d(p_{N_m}^{(m)}, p_{N_n}^{(n)}) \\ &\leq d(p_{N_m}^{(m)}, p_k^{(m)}) + d(p_k^{(m)}, p_k^{(n)}) + d(p_k^{(n)}, p_{N_n}^{(n)}). \end{aligned}$$

Let $k \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d(p_m, p_n) &\leq \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left[d(p_{N_m}^{(m)}, p_k^{(m)}) + d(p_k^{(m)}, p_k^{(n)}) + d(p_k^{(n)}, p_{N_n}^{(n)}) \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{m} + \Delta(P_m, P_n) + \frac{1}{n} \end{aligned}$$

for any m, n (by (2)). Let $m, n \rightarrow \infty$, we establish the result (since $\{P_k\}$ is Cauchy).

- (4) Show that $\{P_k\}$ converges to $P \ni \{p_k\}$. Given any $\varepsilon > 0$. Since $\{p_k\}$ is Cauchy (3), there is $N > \frac{2}{\varepsilon}$ such that

$$d(p_m, p_n) < \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \text{ whenever } m, n \geq N.$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} d(p_n^{(k)}, p_n) &= d(p_n^{(k)}, p_{N_n}^{(n)}) \\ &\leq d(p_n^{(k)}, p_{N_k}^{(k)}) + d(p_{N_k}^{(k)}, p_{N_n}^{(n)}). \end{aligned}$$

For any $k \geq N$, let $n \rightarrow \infty$ to get

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta(P_k, P) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(p_n^{(k)}, p_n) \\
&\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(p_n^{(k)}, p_{N_k}^{(k)}) + \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(p_{N_k}^{(k)}, p_{N_n}^{(n)}) \\
&< \frac{1}{k} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{N} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \\
&< \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \\
&< \varepsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, (X^*, Δ) is complete. \square

Proof of (d).

- (1) Define $\{p_n\}$ by $p_n = p$ ($n = 1, 2, \dots$) for any $p \in X$.
- (2) Show that $\{p_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence. $d(p_m, p_n) = d(p, p) = 0$.
- (3) Take $\{p\} \in P_p$ and $\{q\} \in P_q$. Then

$$\Delta(P_p, P_q) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(p_n, q_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(p, q) = d(p, q).$$

\square

Proof of (e).

- (1) Show that $\varphi(X)$ is dense in X^* . Given any $P \in X^*$, any $\{p_n\} \in P$ and any $\varepsilon > 0$. Since $\{p_n\}$ is Cauchy, there is N such that

$$d(p_m, p_n) < \frac{\varepsilon}{64} \text{ whenever } m, n \geq N.$$

Note that $p_N \in X$. Pick $\{p_N\} \in P_{p_N} = \varphi(p_N) \in \varphi(X)$. So

$$\Delta(P, P_{p_N}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(p_n, p_N) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{64} < \varepsilon.$$

Hence $\varphi(X)$ is dense in X^* .

- (2) Show that $\varphi(X) = X^*$ if X is complete. Given any $P \in X^* \ni \{p_n\}$. Since X is complete, a Cauchy sequence $\{p_n\}$ converges to $p \in X$. Pick $\{p\} \in P_p = \varphi(p) \in \varphi(X)$. So

$$\Delta(P, P_p) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(p_n, p) = 0,$$

or $P = P_p$, or $\varphi(X) = X^*$.

□

Exercise 3.25. Let X be the metric space whose points are rational numbers, with the metric $d(x, y) = |x - y|$. What is the completion of this space? (Compare Exercise 3.24.)

Proof. By Exercise 3.24, we can identify one completion (X^*, Δ) with $(\mathbb{R}, |\cdot|)$ (Theorem 3.11(c) and Theorem 1.20(b)). □

Supplement (Uniqueness of completion). Show that a completion of a metric space is unique up to isometry.

Outline. Suppose there are two completions $\{\varphi_i, (X_i^*, d_i^*)\}$ ($i = 1, 2$) of (X, d) . Let

$$\psi = \varphi_2 \circ \varphi_1^{-1} : \varphi_1(X) \rightarrow \varphi_2(X)$$

be an isometry from $\varphi_1(X)$ into $\varphi_2(X)$. The sets $\varphi_i(X)$ ($i = 1, 2$) are dense in X_i^* . So we can extend ψ (continuously) to a map $\psi : X_1^* \rightarrow X_2^*$.

Proof.

- (1) Given any $P \in X_1^*$, there is a Cauchy sequence $\{P_{p_n}\} = \{\varphi_1(p_n)\}$ in $\varphi_1(X)$ converging to P . Define $\psi(P)$ by

$$\psi(P) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \psi(P_{p_n}).$$

- (2) Show that ψ is well-defined. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_2(\psi(P_{p_m}), \psi(P_{p_n})) &= \Delta_2(\psi(\varphi_1(p_m)), \psi(\varphi_1(p_n))) \\ &= \Delta_2(\varphi_2(p_m), \varphi_2(p_n)) \\ &= d(p_m, p_n) && (\varphi_2 \text{ is isometric}) \\ &= \Delta_1(\varphi_1(p_m), \varphi_1(p_n)) && (\varphi_1 \text{ is isometric}) \\ &= \Delta_1(P_{p_m}, P_{p_n}). \end{aligned}$$

So $\{\psi(P_{p_n})\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $\varphi_2(X)$ if (and only if) $\{P_{p_n}\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $\varphi_1(X)$. Since X_2^* is complete, $\{\psi(P_{p_n})\}$ converges to $\psi(P)$. The limit $\psi(P)$ is uniquely determined since Δ_2 is a metric function.

- (3) Since ψ is an isometry from $\varphi_1(X)$ into $\varphi_2(X)$,

$$\psi^{-1} = \varphi_1 \circ \varphi_2^{-1} : \varphi_2(X) \rightarrow \varphi_1(X)$$

is an isometry from $\varphi_2(X)$ into $\varphi_1(X)$. Besides, $\psi^{-1} \circ \psi = 1_{\varphi_1(X)}$ and $\psi \circ \psi^{-1} = 1_{\varphi_2(X)}$.

- (4) *Show that ψ is surjective.* Given any $Q \in X_2^*$, there is a Cauchy sequence $\{P_{q_n}\} = \{\varphi_2(q_n)\}$ in $\varphi_2(X)$ converging to Q . Define

$$P_{p_n} = \psi^{-1}(P_{q_n}) \in \varphi_1(X).$$

$\psi(P_{p_n}) = 1_{\varphi_2(X)}(P_{q_n}) = P_{q_n}$. Besides, similar to argument in (2), $\{P_{p_n}\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $\varphi_1(X)$. Since X_1^* is complete, $\{P_{p_n}\}$ converges to $P \in X_1^*$. It is easy to verify that $\psi(P) = Q$.

- (5) *Show that ψ is injective.* Given any $P \in X_1^*$ and $Q \in X_1^*$, there are Cauchy sequences

$$\{P_{p_n}\} = \{\varphi_1(p_n)\} \rightarrow P \text{ and } \{P_{q_n}\} = \{\varphi_1(q_n)\} \rightarrow Q.$$

So

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(P) = \psi(Q) &\implies \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \psi(P_{p_n}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \psi(P_{q_n}) \\ &\implies 0 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Delta_2(\psi(P_{p_n}), \psi(P_{q_n})) \\ &\implies 0 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Delta_2(\psi(\varphi_1(p_n)), \psi(\varphi_1(q_n))) \\ &\implies 0 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Delta_2(\varphi_2(p_n), \varphi_2(q_n)) \\ &\implies 0 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(p_n, q_n). \end{aligned} \quad (\varphi_2 \text{ is isometric})$$

Thus $\{p_n\} \in P$ and $\{q_n\} \in Q$ in the same equivalence class. Thus $P = Q$.

□