

Machine Learning HW1

Liu Pei PB22061259

September 2024

1 Exercise 1: Bolzano-Weierstrass Theorem

1.1

Prove: Suppose that u is not a upper bound of C , but we know that there is an upper bound of C , let's just call it u' , so we have

$$u' < u, u' = \sup C$$

let $\varepsilon = \frac{u-u'}{2}$, so

$$u - \varepsilon = \frac{u + u'}{2} > u'$$

because $a \in C$, so $a \leq u'$, so it is impossible that

$$a > u - \varepsilon = \frac{u + u'}{2} > u'$$

so the hypothesis is wrong, which means $u = \sup C$

1.2

Prove:

1. Divide the interval $[a, b]$ into two subintervals $[a, \frac{a+b}{2}]$ and $[\frac{a+b}{2}, b]$. By the Pigeonhole Principle, at least one of these subintervals contains infinitely many terms of the sequence $\{a_n\}$. Denote this subinterval by I_1 .
2. Repeat the process of bisecting I_1 into two smaller subintervals and selecting the one that contains infinitely many terms of $\{a_n\}$. Denote this new subinterval by I_2 .
3. Continue this process indefinitely, resulting in a nested sequence of closed intervals $I_1 \supseteq I_2 \supseteq I_3 \supseteq \dots$, where each I_k has length $|I_k| = \frac{1}{2^{k-1}}|I_1|$ and contains infinitely many terms of $\{a_n\}$.
4. According to the Nested Interval Theorem, there exists a unique real number c such that $c \in I_k$ for all k .

5. For each k , choose a term a_{n_k} from the sequence $\{a_n\}$ such that $a_{n_k} \in I_k$. Since $|I_k| \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, by the Squeeze Theorem, it follows that $a_{n_k} \rightarrow c$.
6. Therefore, the subsequence $\{a_{n_k}\}$ of $\{a_n\}$ is convergent with limit c .

2 Exercise 2: Limit and Limit Points

2.1

1. **Boundedness:** Suppose $\{x_n\}$ converges to x . By definition, for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq N$, $\|x_n - x\| < \epsilon$. Choose $\epsilon = 1 + \|x\|$. Then there exists an N such that for all $n \geq N$,

$$\|x_n\| \leq \|x_n - x\| + \|x\| < 1 + \|x\| + \|x\| = 1 + 2\|x\|.$$

For $n < N$, the terms x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{N-1} are all finite vectors in \mathbb{R}^n , so they are automatically bounded by some constant M (e.g., take $M = \max\{\|x_1\|, \|x_2\|, \dots, \|x_{N-1}\|, 1 + 2\|x\|\}$). Therefore, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\|x_n\| \leq M$, showing that $\{x_n\}$ is bounded.

2. **Unique Limit Point:** Suppose $\{x_n\}$ converges to both x and y . Then for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exist $N_1, N_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq N_1$, $\|x_n - x\| < \epsilon$ and for all $n \geq N_2$, $\|x_n - y\| < \epsilon$. Taking $N = \max\{N_1, N_2\}$, we have for all $n \geq N$,

$$\|x - y\| \leq \|x - x_n\| + \|x_n - y\| < 2\epsilon.$$

Since ϵ is arbitrary, we can make it as small as we want, implying $\|x - y\| = 0$, and thus $x = y$. Therefore, the limit is unique.

Second Direction: If $\{x_n\}$ is bounded and has a unique limit point x , then $\{x_n\}$ converges to x .

2. **Convergence:** Suppose $\{x_n\}$ is bounded and has a unique limit point x . Since $\{x_n\}$ is bounded, it is contained in some closed ball $B(0, R)$ centered at the origin with radius R . By the Bolzano-Weierstrass Theorem (or a generalization to \mathbb{R}^n), every bounded sequence in \mathbb{R}^n has a convergent subsequence. Let $\{x_{n_k}\}$ be a convergent subsequence of $\{x_n\}$ that converges to y . Since x is the unique limit point of $\{x_n\}$, it must be that $y = x$.

Now, we need to show that the entire sequence $\{x_n\}$ converges to x . Suppose not. Then there exists an $\epsilon > 0$ and a subsequence $\{x_{m_j}\}$ such that $\|x_{m_j} - x\| \geq \epsilon$ for all j . However, since $\{x_{m_j}\}$ is also a bounded sequence in \mathbb{R}^n , it must have a convergent subsequence, say $\{x_{m_{j_k}}\}$, which converges to some z . Since x is the unique limit point of $\{x_n\}$, it must be that $z = x$. But this contradicts the fact that $\|x_{m_{j_k}} - x\| \geq \epsilon$ for all k . Therefore, our assumption that $\{x_n\}$ does not converge to x is false, and hence $\{x_n\}$ converges to x .

2.2

(a)

1. assume that $x = 2$ is not an isolated point of C , which means that there is a sequence $\{x_n\}$ in C such that $\{x_n\} \rightarrow 2$, so

$$\forall \epsilon > 0, \exists N, n > N, \|x_n - 2\| < \epsilon$$

let $\epsilon = 0.5$, so we have

$$\forall n > N, x_n \in [1.5, 2.5]$$

which against

$$\{x_n\} \in C, x_n \neq 2$$

so the hypothesis is wrong, $x=2$ is an isolated point of C

2. $C' = [0, 1]$:

Let $a \in C'$, so that $\forall \epsilon > 0$, we have

$$a - \epsilon \in [-\epsilon, 1 - \epsilon]$$

and

$$a + \epsilon \in [\epsilon, 1 + \epsilon]$$

so the neighborhood of a is $[a - \epsilon, a + \epsilon]$

which means every neighborhood of a contains a point $a' \in C$

so $C' = [0, 1]$

(b)

let's assume that C' is open

it is easy to know that

$$\exists b, \forall \epsilon > 0, b \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus C', b - \epsilon \in C' \text{ (or : } b + \epsilon \in C' \text{ we just choose one to discuss)}$$

because $b - \epsilon \in C'$, so there is a sequence $\{x_n\}$ in C such that $\{x_n\} \rightarrow b - \epsilon$

such that $\forall \epsilon_1 > 0, \exists N > 0$, when $n > N$

we have

$$\|x_n - b + \epsilon\| < \epsilon_1$$

such that

$$\| \|x_n - b\| - \epsilon \| \leq \|x_n - b + \epsilon\| < \epsilon_1$$

so we have

$$\| \|x_n - b\| - \epsilon \| \leq \| \|x_n - b\| - \epsilon \| \leq \|x_n - b + \epsilon\| < \epsilon_1$$

so

$$\|x_n - b\| < \epsilon + \epsilon_1$$

which means that there is a sequence $\{x_n\}$ in C such that $\{x_n\} \rightarrow b$
 so $b \in C'$, which against our assumption
 so C' is closed

3 Exercise 3: Norms

3.1

a

1. f is nonnegative: because $|x_i| \geq 0$, so $|x_i|^p \geq 0$, so $\|\mathbf{x}\|_p = (\sum_{i=1}^n |x_i|^p)^{1/p} \geq 0$

2. f is definite: if

$$\|\mathbf{x}\|_p = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |x_i|^p \right)^{1/p} = 0$$

such that only if $\sum_{i=1}^n |x_i|^p = 0$
 for $|x_i|^p \geq 0$ so that only if $|x_i| = 0$, we can get $\|\mathbf{x}\|_p = 0$

3. f is homogeneous - in this section, we are going to prove :

$$f(t\mathbf{x}) = |t|f(\mathbf{x}), \text{ for all } \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \text{ and } t \in \mathbb{R};$$

$$\|t\mathbf{x}\|_p = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |tx_i|^p \right)^{1/p} = \left(|t|^p \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i|^p \right)^{1/p} = |t| \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |x_i|^p \right)^{1/p}$$

and that's it

4. f satisfies the triangle inequality - in this section, we are going to prove :

$$f(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}) \leq f(\mathbf{x}) + f(\mathbf{y}), \text{ for all } \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

which means this :

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^n |x_i + y_i|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |x_i|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} + \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |y_i|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

as we all know, this is the famous Minkowski Inequality, of course right
 To sum up, the l_p norm is a norm.

b

we are going to prove:

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathbf{x}\|_p = \|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |x_i|.$$

here, we can try to use Squeeze Theorem:
the right side:

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathbf{x}\|_p &= \lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |x_i|^p \right)^{1/p} \leq \lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |x_i|^p \right)^{1/p} = \lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \left(n \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |x_i|^p \right)^{1/p} = \\ &= \lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} n^{1/p} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |x_i| = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |x_i| \end{aligned}$$

and the left side: considering $|x_i| \geq 0$

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathbf{x}\|_p = \lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |x_i|^p \right)^{1/p} \geq \lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |x_i|^p \right)^{1/p} = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |x_i|$$

so ,by Squeeze Theorem ,we can say

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathbf{x}\|_p = \|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |x_i|.$$

3.2 Operator norms

a

Let $x = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n)^T$, so $\|\mathbf{x}\|_1 = \sum_{j=1}^n |\lambda_j|$

Let A_i be the column vector, so the A can be writed as (A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n)

then

$$\|Ax\|_1 = \left\| \sum_{j=1}^n A_j \lambda_j \right\|_1 = \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j \|A_j\|_1 = \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j \sum_{i=1}^m |a_{ij}|$$

so,we can know that

$$\|\mathbf{A}\|_1 = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}} \frac{\|\mathbf{Ax}\|_1}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_1} = \sup \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j \sum_{i=1}^m |a_{ij}|}{\sum_{j=1}^n |\lambda_j|}$$

thinking that

$$\frac{\sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j \sum_{i=1}^m |a_{ij}|}{\sum_{j=1}^n |\lambda_j|} \leq \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} \sum_{i=1}^m |a_{ij}|$$

so,we have

$$\|\mathbf{A}\|_1 = \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} \sum_{i=1}^m |a_{ij}|.$$

b

Let $x = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n)^T$, so $\|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty = \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} |\lambda_j|$

Let A_i be the column vector, so the A can be written as (A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n)
then

$$\|Ax\|_\infty = \left\| \sum_{j=1}^n A_j \lambda_j \right\|_\infty = \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j a_{ij}$$

so, we can know that

$$\|A\|_\infty = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}} \frac{\|A\mathbf{x}\|_\infty}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty} = \sup \frac{\max_{1 \leq i \leq m} \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j a_{ij}}{\max_{1 \leq j \leq n} |\lambda_j|}$$

thinking that

$$\frac{\max_{1 \leq i \leq m} \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j a_{ij}}{\max_{1 \leq j \leq n} |\lambda_j|} \leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} \sum_{j=1}^n |a_{ij}|.$$

so

$$\|A\|_\infty = \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} \sum_{j=1}^n |a_{ij}|.$$

4 Exercise 4: Open and Closed Sets

4.1

4.1.1 $a \rightarrow b$

if $\text{cl } C = C$, assume the complement of C is not open:

the complement of C is not open, there is a point \mathbf{x} in the complement of C , $\forall r$, whose $B_r(\mathbf{x})$ must contain some points $y \in C$

so we can say

$$\forall r > 0, B_r(\mathbf{x}) \text{ contains some } y, y \in C$$

what if $\text{cl } C = C$, which means

$$\forall y \text{ in } C, x \text{ is a limit point of } C$$

according to

Definition 17. A vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a limit (cluster/accumulation) point of a set $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ if

every neighborhood of \mathbf{x} contains a point $x' \neq \mathbf{x}$ such that $x' \in S$.

here we get \mathbf{x} , whose every r -neighborhood contains a point $y \neq \mathbf{x}$, such that $y \in C$

so, \mathbf{x} in the complement of C is a limit point of C , which is against $\text{cl } C = C$.

To sum up, the complement of C is open

4.1.2 $b \rightarrow a$

if the complement of C (let's call it C') is open, we can get there exists an $r_1 > 0$ such that

$$\forall x \in C', B_{r_1}(x) \subseteq C'$$

the $B_{r_1}(x)$ upside don't contain any point of C , so that $\forall x \in C'$, x is not a limit point of C

we choose a point y in C , pay attention to its r -neighborhood:
if there exist $r_2 > 0$, $B_{r_2}(y)$ don't contain a point $y' \neq y$ in C
we can say there exist $r > 0$, such that

$$B_r(y) \subseteq C', \text{ except } y$$

let $r = \min(r_1, r_2)$, we have :

$$\forall x \in C', B_r(x) \subseteq C'$$

$$\exists y \in C, B_r(y) \subseteq C', \text{ except } y$$

here we can easily find the absurd:

$$\forall y' \in B_r(y), y' \in C', B_r(y') \text{ contains } y$$

which against

$$\forall x \in C', B_r(x) \subseteq C'$$

so, there do not exist a point y in C , whose r -neighborhood don't contain a point $y' \neq y$ in C , which means every point in C , its every r -neighborhood contain a point $y' \neq y$ in C

so every point of C is a limit point of set C , which means $\text{cl } C = C$, and that is the set C is closed.

4.1.3 $b \rightarrow c$

The complement of C (let's call it C') is open: we get there exist an $\epsilon > 0$, $\forall x \in C', B_\epsilon(x) \subseteq C'$

so we can know $\forall y \in C', B_\epsilon(y) \cap C = \emptyset$ for some $\epsilon > 0$
so there we can't find any y in C' that $B_\epsilon(y) \cap C \neq \emptyset$ for the ϵ we say above

so we have if $B_\epsilon(x) \cap C \neq \emptyset$ for every $\epsilon > 0$, then $x \notin C'$, then $x \in C$.

4.1.4 $c \rightarrow a$

If $B_\epsilon(\mathbf{x}) \cap C \neq \emptyset$ for every $\epsilon > 0$, then $\mathbf{x} \in C$.

If $B_\epsilon(\mathbf{x}) \cap C \neq \emptyset$ for every $\epsilon > 0$:

1. if $B_\epsilon(\mathbf{x}) \cap C \neq \emptyset$, \mathbf{x} is the limit point of C
2. if $B_\epsilon(\mathbf{x}) \cap C = \emptyset$, \mathbf{x} is in C

we can easily exclude the second case:

if $B_\epsilon(\mathbf{x}) \cap C = \emptyset$, we can find a \mathbf{y} (different with \mathbf{x}) in $B_\epsilon(\mathbf{x})$, such that $B_\epsilon(\mathbf{y}) \cap C \neq \emptyset$, however, \mathbf{y} is not in C , which against the precondition;

so we can say If $B_\epsilon(\mathbf{x}) \cap C \neq \emptyset$ for every $\epsilon > 0$, then \mathbf{x} in C , we have \mathbf{x} is the limit point of C , and \mathbf{x} in C , that is $\text{cl } C = C$.

4.2

4.2.1 a

first, we know 0 is in $[0, 1]$, but for $\forall \epsilon > 0$, $B_\epsilon(0) = (-\epsilon, \epsilon)$, $B_\epsilon(0) \cap \mathbb{R} = (-\epsilon, \epsilon) \not\subset [0, 1]$, so $[0, 1]$ is not an open set in \mathbb{R} .

$\exists \epsilon = 0.5, \forall x \in [0, 1], B_\epsilon(x) = (-0.5 + x, 0.5 + x)$, $B_\epsilon(x) \cap B \subset [0, 1]$, so $[0, 1]$ is open in B ;

$B \setminus [0, 1] = \{2\}$, so the neighborhood of 2 in B is some points in $[0, 1]$, so $C = \{2\}$, $B_\epsilon(x) \cap B = \emptyset \subset C$ for some $\epsilon > 0$, so $B \setminus [0, 1]$ is open, which means $[0, 1]$ is closed in B

To sum up, it is both open and closed in B .

4.2.2 b

1. If $C = A \cap U$ for some open set U in \mathbb{R}^n , then C is open in A .
we know that U is open in \mathbb{R}^n , so $\forall x \in (U \cap A), x \in U, \exists \epsilon > 0, B_\epsilon(x) \subset U$
Considering $B_\epsilon(x) \cap A$, because $B_\epsilon(x) \subset U$, so, $(B_\epsilon(x) \cap A) \subset (U \cap A) = C$
so we get set C is open in A , if $C = A \cap U$ for some open set U in \mathbb{R}^n
2. If C is open in A , such that $C = A \cap U$, where U is open in \mathbb{R}^n .
Because C is open in A , so

$$\forall x \in C, \exists \epsilon > 0, B_\epsilon(x) \cap A \subset C$$

let $U = \bigcup_{x \in C} B_\epsilon(x)$, Since each $B_\epsilon(x)$ is open in \mathbb{R}^n , U is also open in \mathbb{R}^n (union of open sets is open).

- (a) Define $U = \bigcup_{x \in C} B_\epsilon(x)$. Since each $B_\epsilon(x)$ is open in \mathbb{R}^n , U is also open in \mathbb{R}^n (union of open sets is open).

(b) To show $C = A \cap U$:

- i. $C \subset A \cap U$: For any $x \in C$, there exists ϵ_x such that $x \in B_{\epsilon_x}(x) \subset U$. Since $x \in C \subset A$, $x \in A \cap U$.
- ii. $A \cap U \subset C$: For any $y \in A \cap U$, there exists $x \in C$ and ϵ_x such that $y \in B_{\epsilon_x}(x)$. Since $B_{\epsilon_x}(x) \cap A \subset C$, $y \in C$.

To sum up, If C is open in A , such that $C = A \cap U$, where U is open in \mathbb{R}^n .

5 Exercise 5: Extreme Value Theorem and Fixed Point

5.1

If $f(0) = 0$ or $f(1) = 1$, it is obvious that there is an x such that $f(x) = x$;
 If not, let $g(x) = f(x) - x$, because f is a continuous, so g is continuous too.
 for $g(0) = f(0) > 0$, $g(1) = f(1) - 1 < 0$, and g is continuous, so

$$\exists x \in [0, 1], \text{ such that } g(x) = f(x) - x = 0.$$

that is

$$\forall f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1], \exists x \in [0, 1], \text{ such that } f(x) = x.$$

5.2

$f(x) = x^2$ is a good example:

$$f(x) = x^2, \text{ when } x \in (0, 1), f \in (0, 1), \text{ and for all } x \in (0, 1), f(x) \neq x$$

5.3

First we prove that f is an one to one map. $\forall x, y \in [0, 1]$, if $f(x) = f(y)$, then

$$x = f^n(x) = f^{n-1}(f(x)) = f^{n-1}(f(y)) = f^n(y) = y,$$

Hence f is an injective map. Next we show that f is monotonic. if

$$\exists x, y \in [0, 1], x < y, f(x) \geq f(y),$$

because the range of f is $[0, 1]$, so $f(0) = 0 \leq f(y)$, $f(x) \leq 1 = f(1)$
 $\implies x \neq 0, y \neq 1$. because f is an injection, $x \neq y \implies f(x) > f(y)$, $f(x) \neq 0 \implies 0 = f(0) < f(x)$, $f(x) > f(y)$. According to Rolle's Theorem, there exists $z_1 \in (0, x)$, $z_2 \in (x, y)$, s.t. $f(z_1) = f(z_2) = \frac{f(x)+f(y)}{2}$, which contradicts with the injectivity of f . Thus f is monotonic. If $\exists x \in [0, 1]$, $f(x) \neq x$, without loss of generality, we can assume that $f(x) < x$. Then

$$f^n(x) = f^{n-1}(f(x)) < f^{n-1}(x) < \dots < f(x) < x,$$

which contradicts with the condition. So $\forall x \in [0, 1]$, $f(x) = x$.

5.4

Let $g = \lambda f$. Note that (a) is a special case of (b). Because f is continuous, f is bounded, i.e. $\exists M > 0$, s.t. $|f(x)| \leq M$. Let $\lambda = \frac{M}{2}$ to make sure that $g(x) \in (0, 1)$, thus $g^n(x)$ is well-defined for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. If $g(x) \geq x$, because f is non-decreasing, g is also non-decreasing, $x \leq g(x) \leq g(g(x)) \leq \dots \leq g^n(x) \leq \dots \implies \{g^n(x)\}$ is a non-decreasing sequence and it is bounded, so the sequence must converge to a point $x_0 \in [0, 1]$. So

$$g(x_0) = g\left(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f^n(x)\right) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g^{n+1}(x) = x_0.$$

Hence the sequence satisfy the case (b). Similarly for the case that $g(x) < x$.

6 Exercise 6: Linear Space

6.1

We can easily prove that the vector addition and scalar multiplication in this space satisfy the eight axioms.

$$u = a_n x^n + a_{n-1} x^{n-1} + \dots + a_1 x + a_0$$

$$v = b_n x^n + b_{n-1} x^{n-1} + \dots + b_1 x + a_0$$

and

$$\lambda(u+v) = \lambda u + \lambda v = \lambda(a_n x^n + b_n x^n) + \lambda(a_{n-1} x^{n-1} + b_{n-1} x^{n-1}) \dots + \lambda(a_1 x + b_1 x) + \lambda(a_0 + b_0)$$

so $P_n[x]$ is a linear space.

6.2

a

Assume there are two zero vectors v_1, v_2 , Then $v_1 \xrightarrow{v_1 \text{ is zero}} v_1 + v_2 \xrightarrow{v_2 \text{ is zero}} v_2, \implies$ zero vector is unique.

b

Just like the part a, we can assume there are two vectors v_1, v_2 they are both additive inverse of u . So we have $v_1 = v_1 + (u + v_2) = (v_1 + u) + v_2 = v_2$. Next, we will show that $0 \cdot v = \mathbf{0}$. Let $(0 \cdot v)'$ denote the additive inverse of $0 \cdot v$. Then $0 \cdot v + 0 \cdot v = (0 + 0) \cdot v = 0 \cdot v \implies ((0 \cdot v)' + 0 \cdot v) + 0 \cdot v = (0 \cdot v)' + 0 \cdot v \implies 0 \cdot v = \mathbf{0}$. $v' + v = (-1) \cdot v + v = (1 - 1) \cdot v = 0 \cdot v = \mathbf{0} \implies v' = (-1) \cdot v$ is the unique inverse of v , we denote it as $-v$.

c

We only need to prove that $\lambda \cdot \mathbf{0} = \mathbf{0}$, for the rest part of the problem has been proved in the proof process of (b). Let v' denote the additive inverse of v . Then $\lambda \cdot \mathbf{0} = \lambda(v + v') = \lambda(v + (-1) \cdot v) = \lambda \cdot v + \lambda \cdot ((-1) \cdot v) = \lambda \cdot v + (\lambda \cdot (-1)) \cdot v = (\lambda - \lambda) \cdot v = 0 \cdot v = \mathbf{0}$.

d

If $\lambda \neq 0$, there exists a unique multiply inverse of λ in F , we denote it as λ^{-1} . Thus, $v = 1 \cdot v = (\lambda^{-1} \cdot \lambda)v = \lambda^{-1}(\lambda \cdot v) = \lambda^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{0} \xrightarrow{(c)} \mathbf{0}$.

6.3

A linear space can one vector, finite vectors, countable infinite vectors or uncountable infinite vectors. A linear space at least have one subspace, which is itself. The linear space $\{0\}$ has one subspace.

7 Exercise 7: Basis and Coordinates

7.1

if scalars μ_1, \dots, μ_n satisfy that $\sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i (\lambda_i \mathbf{a}_i) = 0 \implies \sum_{i=1}^n (\mu_i \lambda_i) \mathbf{a}_i = 0$. Because $\{\mathbf{a}_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ is the basis of $V \implies \mu_i \lambda_i = 0 \xrightarrow{\lambda_i \neq 0} \mu_i = 0 \implies \{\lambda_i \mathbf{a}_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ is also a basis of V .

7.2

If the scalars $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$ satisfy that $\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i b_i = 0$. Let $\mathbf{P} = (p_{ij})_{nn}$, then $b_i = \sum_{j=1}^n p_{ji} a_j \implies 0 = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i b_i = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \left(\sum_{j=1}^n p_{ji} a_j \right) = \sum_{j=1}^n \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i p_{ji} \right) a_j$. Because $\{a_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ is a basis of V , $\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i p_{ji} = 0, \forall 1 \leq j \leq n \implies \mathbf{P}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n)^\top = 0 \implies \mathbf{P}^{-1} \mathbf{P}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n)^\top = 0 \implies \lambda_i = 0, \forall 1 \leq i \leq n \implies \{b_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ is also a basis of V .

7.3

(a)

Notice that $\mathbf{v} = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \mathbf{a}_i = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{x_i}{\lambda_i} (\lambda_i \mathbf{a}_i)$, so the coordinate of \mathbf{v} under the basis $\{\lambda_1 \mathbf{a}_1, \lambda_2 \mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \lambda_n \mathbf{a}_n\}$ is $(\frac{x_1}{\lambda_1}, \frac{x_2}{\lambda_2}, \dots, \frac{x_n}{\lambda_n})$.

(b)

the coordinate of \mathbf{w} under $\{\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n\}$ is $(1, 1, \dots, 1)$; the coordinate of \mathbf{w} under $\{\lambda_1 \mathbf{a}_1, \lambda_2 \mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \lambda_n \mathbf{a}_n\}$ is $(\frac{1}{\lambda_1}, \frac{1}{\lambda_2}, \dots, \frac{1}{\lambda_n})$.

7.4

(a)

If $\lambda \mathbf{c} + \mu \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{0} \implies (-\lambda, \mu) = \mathbf{0} \implies \lambda = \mu = 0 \implies \{\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{b}\}$ is indeed a basis of the two-dimensional space. $\mathbf{v} = (x, y) = (-x)\mathbf{c} + y\mathbf{b}$, so the coordinate of \mathbf{v} under the basis $\{\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{b}\}$ is $(-x, y)$. Because $\{\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{b}\}$ is a basis, the coordinate is unique.

(b)

$(x, y) = v = x'\mathbf{a} + y'\mathbf{b} + z'\mathbf{c} = x'(1, 0) + y'(0, 1) + z'(-1, 0) = (x' - z', y')$, so the coefficients satisfy that $x' - z' = x, y' = y$.

(c)

$(x', y', z')_{l_1} = |x'| + |y'| + |z'| \geq |x' - z'| + |y'| = |x| + |y|$. While the coefficients reach the minimum l_1 norm, $|x'| + |z'| = |x' - z'|$, So $x'z' \leq 0$, $x' - z' = x$, $y' = y$.

8 Exercise 8: Derivatives with matrices

8.1

(a)

$\lim_{\mathbf{z} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z} \neq \mathbf{x}} \frac{\|f(\mathbf{z}) - f(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{a}^\top(\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{x})\|_2}{\|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{x}\|_2} = \lim_{\mathbf{z} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z} \neq \mathbf{x}} \frac{0}{\|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{x}\|_2} = 0$, So f is differentiable and $f'(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{a}^\top$.

(b)

$\lim_{\mathbf{z} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z} \neq \mathbf{x}} \frac{\|f(\mathbf{z}) - f(\mathbf{x}) - 2\mathbf{x}^\top(\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{x})\|_2}{\|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{x}\|_2} = \lim_{\mathbf{z} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z} \neq \mathbf{x}} \frac{\|\mathbf{z}^\top \mathbf{z} + \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{z} - (\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{z})^\top\|_2}{\|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{x}\|_2} = \lim_{\mathbf{z} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z} \neq \mathbf{x}} \frac{\|(\mathbf{z}^\top - \mathbf{x}^\top)(\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{x})\|_2}{\|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{x}\|_2}$
 $\leq \lim_{\mathbf{z} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z} \neq \mathbf{x}} \frac{\|\mathbf{z}^\top - \mathbf{x}^\top\|_2 \|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{x}\|_2}{\|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{x}\|_2} = \lim_{\mathbf{z} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z} \neq \mathbf{x}} \|\mathbf{z}^\top - \mathbf{x}^\top\|_2 = 0$. So f is differentiable and $f'(\mathbf{x}) = 2\mathbf{x}^\top$.

(c)

$\lim_{\mathbf{z} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z} \neq \mathbf{x}} \frac{\|f(\mathbf{z}) - f(\mathbf{x}) - (-2)(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{Ax})^\top \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{x})\|_2}{\|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{x}\|_2} = \lim_{\mathbf{z} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z} \neq \mathbf{x}} \frac{\|(\mathbf{Az} - \mathbf{Ax})^\top (\mathbf{Az} - \mathbf{Ax})\|_2}{\|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{x}\|_2} \leq \lim_{\mathbf{z} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z} \neq \mathbf{x}} \frac{\|(\mathbf{Az} - \mathbf{Ax})^\top\|_2 \|\mathbf{Az} - \mathbf{Ax}\|_2}{\|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{x}\|_2} \leq$
 $\lim_{\mathbf{z} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z} \neq \mathbf{x}} \frac{\|(\mathbf{Az} - \mathbf{Ax})\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{x}\|_2} \leq \lim_{\mathbf{z} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z} \neq \mathbf{x}} \frac{\|\mathbf{A}\|_2^2 \|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{x}\|_2^2}{\|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{x}\|_2} = \|\mathbf{A}\|_2^2 \lim_{\mathbf{z} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z} \neq \mathbf{x}} \|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{x}\|_2 = 0$. So f is differentiable and $f'(\mathbf{x}) = -2(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{Ax})^\top \mathbf{A}$.

8.2

$\mathbf{X}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be a matrix and Let $L: \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function. We say that f is differentiable at \mathbf{X}_0 with derivative L if we have

$$\lim_{\mathbf{X} \rightarrow \mathbf{X}_0, \mathbf{X} \neq \mathbf{X}_0} \frac{\|f(\mathbf{X}) - f(\mathbf{X}_0) - L(\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{X}_0)\|_2}{\|\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{X}_0\|_2} = 0$$

We denote this derivative by $f'(\mathbf{X}_0)$.

8.3

Let $L(\mathbf{X}) = \text{tr}(\mathbf{X})$, $f(\mathbf{X}) = \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{X})$

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{\mathbf{X} \rightarrow \mathbf{X}_0, \mathbf{X} \neq \mathbf{X}_0} \frac{\|f(\mathbf{X}) - f(\mathbf{X}_0) - L(\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{X}_0)\|_2}{\|\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{X}_0\|_2} \\ &= \lim_{\mathbf{X} \rightarrow \mathbf{X}_0, \mathbf{X} \neq \mathbf{X}_0} \frac{\|\text{tr}(\mathbf{X}) - \text{tr}(\mathbf{X}_0) - \text{tr}(\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{X}_0)\|_2}{\|\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{X}_0\|_2} \\ &= \lim_{\mathbf{X} \rightarrow \mathbf{X}_0, \mathbf{X} \neq \mathbf{X}_0} \frac{\|\text{tr}(\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{X}_0 - \mathbf{X} + \mathbf{X}_0)\|_2}{\|\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{X}_0\|_2} \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

So, we can assert that it is differentiable, and f' is $\text{tr}(\mathbf{X})$

9 Exercise 9: Rank of Matrices

9.1

a

The rank of a matrix is defined as the dimension of its row space or column space. So, the transposed matrix has the same dimension of its row space or column space. So, we can get :

$$\mathbf{rank}(\mathbf{A}) = \mathbf{rank}(\mathbf{A}^\top)$$

We can use SVD to prove the rest content :

$$A = U_{m \times r} \Sigma_{r \times r} V_{r \times n}^T$$

So we have:

$$\begin{aligned} A^T A &= [U_{m \times r} \Sigma_{r \times r} V_{r \times n}^T]^T U_{m \times r} \Sigma_{r \times r} V_{r \times n}^T \\ &= V_{r \times n} \Sigma_{r \times r} U_{m \times r}^T U_{m \times r} \Sigma_{r \times r} V_{r \times n}^T \\ &= V_{r \times n} \Sigma_{r \times r}^2 V_{r \times n}^T \end{aligned}$$

So, we have

$$\mathbf{rank}(\mathbf{A}) = \mathbf{rank}(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A})$$

By the same token, we can get:

$$\begin{aligned} AA^T &= U_{m \times r} \Sigma_{r \times r} V_{r \times n}^T [U_{m \times r} \Sigma_{r \times r} V_{r \times n}^T]^T \\ &= U_{m \times r} \Sigma_{r \times r} V_{r \times n}^T V_{r \times n} \Sigma_{r \times r} U_{m \times r}^T \\ &= U_{m \times r} \Sigma_{r \times r}^2 U_{m \times r}^T \end{aligned}$$

So, we have

$$\mathbf{rank}(\mathbf{A}) = \mathbf{rank}(\mathbf{A} \mathbf{A}^\top)$$

To sum up

$$\mathbf{rank}(\mathbf{A}) = \mathbf{rank}(\mathbf{A}^\top) = \mathbf{rank}(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}) = \mathbf{rank}(\mathbf{A} \mathbf{A}^\top);$$

b

Every column of AB is a combination of the columns of A (matrix multiplication), so

$$\mathbf{rank}(\mathbf{AB}) \leq \mathbf{rank}(\mathbf{A})$$

Every row of AB is a combination of the rows of B (matrix multiplication)

When we consider row rank = column rank, we can get

$$\mathbf{Rank}(AB) \leq \min(\mathbf{Rank}(A), \mathbf{Rank}(B))$$

Let,

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ 3 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$$

So,

$$AB = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ 3 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$$

we get $\text{rank}(AB)=2=\text{rank}(A)$.

9.2

a

Let us consider this: Definition 29. Let $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^m \times n$. The range of \mathbf{A} , denoted $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{A})$, is the set of all vectors in \mathbb{R}^m that can be written as linear combinations of the columns of \mathbf{A} , i.e.,

$$\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{A}) = \{\mathbf{Ax} \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n\}.$$

So we can say $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A}) = \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{A})$, then let us see the definition of rank:

2. The dimension of $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{A})$ is the rank of \mathbf{A} , i.e., $\dim \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{A}) = \text{rank } \mathbf{A}$.

So we can easily get the conclusion:

$$\text{rank}(\mathbf{A}) = \dim(\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A}))$$

b

$$A_{m \times n} X = 0$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & \cdots & a_{1n} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & \cdots & a_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{m1} & a_{m2} & \cdots & a_{mn} \end{pmatrix} X = 0$$

Gaussian Elimination

$$\begin{pmatrix} b_{11} & b_{12} & \cdots & b_{1n} \\ 0 & b_{22} & \cdots & b_{2n} \\ \cdots & & \cdots & b_{rn} \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & & & \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix} X = 0$$

So we can easily find that :

$$\dim(\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{A})) + \dim(\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A})) = n$$

b

Let us take this into 1.b, then we just need to prove

$$\text{rank}(B) - \text{rank}(A) \leq \dim(\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{B}) \cap \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A})).$$

$$\dim(\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{B})) - (n - \dim(\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A}))) \leq \dim(\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{B}) \cap \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A}))$$

$$\dim(\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{B})) + \dim(\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A})) \leq \dim(\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{B}) \cap \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A})) + n$$

We know:

$$\dim(\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{B})) + \dim(\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A})) = \dim(\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{B}) + \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A})) + \dim(\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{B}) \cap \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A})) \leq \dim(\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{B}) \cap \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A})) + n$$

So we have :

$$\text{rank}(\mathbf{AB}) \leq \text{rank}(\mathbf{A})$$

10 Exercise 10: Properties of Eigenvalues and Singular Values

10.1

$$\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{A}) = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}} \frac{\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}}{\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{x}}$$

Thinking that A is a symmetric matrix, we can get :

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{P}^\top \Sigma \mathbf{P}$$

Take this into λ :

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{P}^\top \Sigma \mathbf{P} \mathbf{x}}{\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{x}} \\ &= \frac{(\mathbf{P} \mathbf{x})^\top \Sigma (\mathbf{P} \mathbf{x})}{\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{P} \mathbf{x}} \\ &= \frac{(\mathbf{x} \mathbf{P})^\top \Sigma (\mathbf{P} \mathbf{x})}{(\mathbf{P} \mathbf{x})^\top (\mathbf{x} \mathbf{P})} \end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathbf{P} \mathbf{x}$ be $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \mathbf{y} \neq \mathbf{0}$

We have:

$$\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{A}) = \sup_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \mathbf{y} \neq \mathbf{0}} \frac{\mathbf{y}^\top \Sigma \mathbf{y}}{\mathbf{y}^\top \mathbf{y}}$$

thinking that

$$\frac{\sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j y_j^2}{\sum_{j=1}^n y_j^2} \leq \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} \lambda_j$$

So we have

$$\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{A}) = \sup_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \mathbf{y} \neq \mathbf{0}} \frac{\mathbf{y}^\top \Sigma \mathbf{y}}{\mathbf{y}^\top \mathbf{y}} = \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} \lambda_j$$

And this is the same:

$$\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{A}) = \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}} \frac{\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}}{\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{x}}.$$