

## Sequences

Def. Let  $(X, d)$  be a metric space. A sequence in  $X$  is a map  $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow X$ .

We typically denote sequence as  $\{a_1, a_2, \dots\}$ ,  $\{a_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  or  $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$

Def. A sequence  $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $(X, d)$  is convergent if  $\exists a \in X$  such that for all  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $\exists n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$n \geq n_0 \Rightarrow d(a_n, a) < \epsilon$$

Equivalently,  $a_n \in B(a, \epsilon) \quad \forall n \geq n_0$

In this case, we say that  $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges to  $a$  and write  $a_n \rightarrow a$ .

If  $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ , we denote the point it converges to by  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n$ .

For example,  $(\frac{1}{n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges to 0 in  $\mathbb{R}$ .

Theo. If a sequence  $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges, its limit is unique.

Proof.

Theo. A convergent sequence is bounded.

(If  $(p_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is convergent, then  $\{p_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  is bounded.)

Proof.

Theo. Let  $E \subseteq X$  and  $a$  be a limit point of  $E$ . Then there exists a sequence  $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $E$  such that  $a_n \rightarrow a$  in  $X$ .

Proof. We have  $a \in E'$ .

For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $a_n \in B(a, \frac{1}{n}) \cap E \setminus \{a\} \neq \emptyset$ .

We claim that  $a_n \rightarrow a$  in  $X$ .

Indeed, given any  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $\exists n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\frac{1}{n_0} < \epsilon$ . Then  $\forall n \geq n_0$ ,  $d(a_n, a) < \epsilon$ .

Theo. Let  $(s_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $(t_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be convergent in  $\mathbb{R}$  such that  $s_n \rightarrow s$  and  $t_n \rightarrow t$ .

If  $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $s_n \leq t_n$ , then  $s \leq t$ .

Proof. Suppose  $s > t$ . Choose some  $\epsilon$  such that  $0 < \epsilon < \frac{s-t}{2}$ . Then let  $n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\forall n \geq n_1$ ,  $|s_n - s| < \epsilon$  and  $\forall n \geq n_2$ ,  $|t_n - t| < \epsilon$ .

Choose  $n_0 = \max(n_1, n_2)$ .

Then  $t_{n_0} < t + \frac{s-t}{2} = \frac{s+t}{2}$  and  $s_{n_0} > s - \frac{s-t}{2} = \frac{s+t}{2} \Rightarrow s_{n_0} > t_{n_0}$ .

This is a contradiction. Therefore,  $s \leq t$ .

Corollary. Let  $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}, (b_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}, (c_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be convergent in  $\mathbb{R}$  such that for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $a_n \leq b_n \leq c_n$ . If  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} c_n$ , then they are also equal to  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_n$ .

Theo.

Let  $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $(b_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be convergent in  $\mathbb{R}$ .

$$\text{Then } 1. \ a_n + b_n \rightarrow a + b$$

$$2. \ a_n b_n \rightarrow ab$$

$$3. \ \left(\frac{a_n}{b_n}\right) \rightarrow \left(\frac{a}{b}\right) \text{ if } a_n \neq 0 \ \forall n \text{ and } a \neq 0.$$

ProofSketch.

1. is left as an exercise.

$$2. |s_n t_n - st| \leq |s_n| |t_n - t| + |t| |s_n - s|$$

Use the boundedness of  $(s_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ .

3. can be proved similar to 2.

Theo.

For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $x_n = (\alpha_{n1}, \alpha_{n2}, \dots, \alpha_{nk}) \in \mathbb{R}^k$  under the  $d_2$  metric.

Then  $x_n \rightarrow x = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_k)$  in  $\mathbb{R}^k$  if and only if  $\alpha_{ni} \rightarrow \alpha_i$  for each  $i$ .

Proof.

Let  $x_n \rightarrow x \Rightarrow \forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists n_0 \in \mathbb{N} \text{ s.t. } n \geq n_0$

$$\Rightarrow d_2(x_n, x) < \varepsilon$$

$$\Rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^n (\alpha_{ni} - x_i)^2 < \varepsilon^2 \Rightarrow |\alpha_{ni} - x_i| < \varepsilon$$

$\forall$  valid  $i$  and  $n \geq n_0$ .

The converse is similar.

Theo.

Let  $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence in metric space  $(X, d)$ . Consider a sequence of natural numbers  $(n_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  s.t.  $n_i < n_j$  for  $i < j$ .

Then the sequence  $(a_{n_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  is said to be a **subsequence** of  $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ .

The limit of a subsequence is called a **subsequential limit**.

Ex. Prove that if a sequence is convergent, any subsequence is convergent to the same limit.

A natural extension to the above is: what sequences have convergent subsequences?

For example  $(-1, 1, -1, 1, \dots)$  is not convergent but has a convergent subsequence  $(1, 2, 3, \dots)$  has no convergent subsequence.

- Theo.
1. Let  $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence in a compact metric space  $(X, d)$ . Then it has a convergent subsequence.
  2. Any bounded sequence in  $\mathbb{R}^k$  has a convergent subsequence.

Proof.

1. Consider  $E = \{a_1, a_2, \dots\} \subseteq X$  as a set.  
If  $E$  is finite, then  $\exists n_1 < n_2 < \dots$  such that  $a_{n_1} = a_{n_2} = \dots$ .  
Then the sequence  $(a_{n_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  is convergent.  
Otherwise, let  $E$  be an infinite subset of the compact space  $(X, d)$ .

$\rightarrow E$  has a limit point  $a$  in  $X$  (by the Bolzano-Weierstrass Th.)

Then for each  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

let  $a_{n_k} \in E \cap B(a, \frac{1}{k}) \setminus \{a\}$

where  $n_1 < n_2 < \dots$ . This is possible since each neighbourhood of  $a$  contains infinitely elements of  $E$ .

Then  $(a_{n_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  is convergent.

2. Any bounded sequence in  $\mathbb{R}^k$  is contained in a closed and bounded interval, which is compact.

By part 1., the sequence must then have a convergent subsequence.

□

Note that the converse is not true; consider  $(1, 2, 1, 3, 1, 4, 1, 5, \dots)$

Def.

A sequence  $(p_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a **Cauchy sequence** if for every  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$d(p_n, p_m) < \epsilon \quad \forall n, m \geq n_0.$$

Theo.

Any convergent sequence is Cauchy.

Proof

Let  $L$  be the limit of a convergent seq.  $(p_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ . For any  $\epsilon > 0$ , let  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  s.t.  $d(p_{n_0}, L) < \epsilon/2$  for all  $n \geq n_0$ .

$$\text{Then } \forall n, m \geq n_0, \quad d(p_n, p_m) \leq d(p_n, L) + d(p_m, L) < \epsilon.$$

The converse is not necessarily true. For example, consider  $(p_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  in

$\mathbb{Q}$  given by

$$p_n = 1 + \frac{1}{1!} + \dots + \frac{1}{n!}$$

Then  $p_n$  is Cauchy but not convergent in  $\mathbb{Q}$ .

Def.

A metric space is said to be **complete** if every Cauchy sequence in it converges.

Lemma

Let  $(p_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a Cauchy sequence. If  $(p_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  has a convergent subsequence, then it is convergent.

Suppose  $(p_{n_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a convergent subsequence that converges to  $p$ .

$$\text{Then } \exists n_1 : d(p_{n_k}, p) < \epsilon/2 \quad \forall k \geq n_1.$$

$$\exists n_2 : d(p_n, p) < \epsilon/2 \quad \forall n \geq n_2$$

$$\Rightarrow \forall n \geq \max(n_1, n_2) \cdot d(p_n, p) \leq d(p_n, p_{n_k}) + d(p_{n_k}, p) < \epsilon$$

for any  $n_k \geq \max(n_1, n_2)$

Theo.

Any compact metric space is complete.

Proof.

Let  $(p_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a Cauchy sequence in compact metric space  $(X, d)$ .

Then  $(p_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  has a convergent subsequence and the previous lemma implies the result.

Ex.

Prove that any Cauchy sequence is bounded.

We can similarly show that  $\mathbb{R}^k$  is complete.

(use the result of the above exercise)

Some more limits.

Theo.

$$1. \text{ If } p > 0, \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^p = 0$$

$$2. \text{ If } p > 0, \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p^{1/n} = 1.$$

$$3. \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{1/n} = 1.$$

$$4. \text{ If } p > 0, \text{ for } \alpha \in \mathbb{R}, \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n^\alpha}{(1+p)^n} = 0.$$

$$5. \text{ If } |x| < 1, \text{ then } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x^n = 0.$$

Proof.

$$1. \text{ For each } \epsilon > 0, \text{ just choose } n_0 = \lceil (1/\epsilon)^{1/p} \rceil.$$

$$2. \text{ If } p > 1, x_n = p^{1/n} - 1 > 0 \text{ for each } n.$$

$$\text{Note that } p = (1+x_n)^n \geq nx_n$$

$$\Rightarrow 0 < x_n \leq \frac{p}{n}$$

$$\Rightarrow \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = 0 \Rightarrow \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p^{1/n} = 1.$$

$$\text{If } 0 < p < 1, \text{ start with the fact that } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (1/p)^{1/n} = 1$$

3. Let  $x_n = n^{\frac{1}{n}} - 1 \geq 0$ .

$$\text{Then } n = (1+x_n)^n \geq \frac{n(n-1)}{2} x_n^2 \quad (\text{Same idea as 2})$$

$$\Rightarrow 0 \leq x_n \leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{n-1}} \Rightarrow \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = 1.$$

4. Let  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $k > \alpha$ .

For  $n > 2k$ ,

$$(1+p)^n \geq {}^n C_k p^k = \frac{p^k}{k!} (n \cdot (n-1) \cdots (n-k+1))$$

$$\geq \frac{p^k}{k!} \cdot \left(\frac{n}{2}\right)^k$$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{n^\alpha}{(1+p)^n} \leq n^{\alpha-k} \cdot 2^k \cdot \frac{2}{p^k}$$

Then use (1) to get  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n^\alpha}{(1+p)^n} = 0$ .

5. Set  $\alpha=0$  and  $p = \left(\frac{1}{|x|} - 1\right)$  in (4).

$\limsup$  and  $\liminf$

We define the extended real number line by  $\bar{\mathbb{R}} = \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty, -\infty\}$  where

•

Def.

Let  $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence.

1. We write  $a_n \rightarrow \infty$  if for all  $\alpha > 0$ , there exists  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $a_n > \alpha$  for all  $n > n_0$ .
2. We write  $a_n \rightarrow -\infty$  if  $-a_n \rightarrow \infty$ .

Def.

Let  $(s_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence of reals and let

$$E = \{x \in \overline{\mathbb{R}} : x = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} s_{n_k} \text{ for some subsequence } (s_{n_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \text{ of } (s_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\}$$

$\left( \begin{array}{l} \text{If } s_{n_k} \rightarrow \infty, \text{ we take its lim as } \infty \\ \text{If } s_{n_k} \rightarrow -\infty, \text{ we take its lim as } -\infty \end{array} \right)$

We then define  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n = \sup E$  and  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n = \inf E$ .

For example, if  $s_n = (-1)^n \left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right)$ ,  $E = \{1, -1\}$  so  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n = 1$  and  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n = -1$ .

Let  $a_n = \frac{1}{n}$  if  $n$  is odd and  $n$  if  $n$  is even. Then  $E = \{0, \infty\}$  so the limsup is  $\infty$  and the liminf is 0.

What if  $(s_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is convergent? Then since any subsequence converges to the limit, the lim, limsup, and liminf are equal.

What about the converse?

Lemma: Let  $(s_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence of reals such that  $t > \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n$ .

There then exists  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $s_n < t$  for all  $n \geq n_0$ .

Proof: If there exists  $n_0 \neq n_0$ , then there are infinitely many  $n$  such that  $s_n \geq t$ . If this set is unbounded, then  $\rightarrow \infty$ . Otherwise, there is a subsequence with limit  $\geq t$ . This is a contradiction to the fact that the  $\limsup$  is the supremum of the set of subsequential limits.  $\square$

Def. A sequence  $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of reals is said to be

monotonically increasing if  $a_n \leq a_{n+1} \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

monotonically decreasing if  $a_n \geq a_{n+1} \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Theo. A monotonically increasing bounded sequence converges to its supremum (as a set).

(Left as exercise)

Theo. Let  $(s_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence of reals. Then

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n = \inf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup \{s_m : m \geq n\}$$

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n = \sup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf \{s_m : m \geq n\}$$

(This follows directly from the lemma two above)

Note that the above implies

$$t < \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n \Rightarrow t < \sup \{s_m : m \geq n\} \quad \forall n$$

$\Rightarrow t < s_n$  for infinitely many  $n$ .

Series

Let  $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence of reals.

Def. We say  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n$  converges if  $\left(\sum_{k=1}^n a_k\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges. We then say that it is equal to the limit of this sequence.

For example, if  $|x| < 1$ , then defining  $s_n = 1 + x + \dots + x^n = \frac{1-x^n}{1-x}$ , we see that  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x^n = \frac{1}{1-x}$ .

Theo:  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n$  converges if and only if for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\left| \sum_{k=n}^m a_k \right| < \epsilon$  for all  $n, m \geq n_0$ .

Proof: Letting  $s_n = \sum_{k=1}^n a_k$ , we see that the sum converges iff  $(s_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is Cauchy, which is equivalent to the given condition.

If  $\sum a_n$  does not converge, we say that it diverges.

- Theo:
1. If  $|a_n| \leq c_n \quad \forall n \geq n_0$  and  $\sum c_n$  converges, then  $\sum a_n$  converges.
  2. If  $a_n \geq d_n \geq 0$  and  $\sum d_n$  diverges, then  $\sum a_n$  diverges.

# Page 11

18 September 2020 10:06

Theo.  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^p}$  converges for  $p \geq 0$  iff  $p > 1$ .

Proof. For  $p > 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^p} &\leq 1 + \frac{1}{2^p} + \frac{1}{2^p} + \frac{1}{4^p} + \frac{1}{4^p} + \frac{1}{4^p} + \frac{1}{8^p} + \dots \\ &= 1 + \frac{1}{2^{p-1}} + \frac{1}{4^{p-1}} + \dots \quad \text{which converges as } p > 1. \end{aligned}$$

For  $p = 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} &= 1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{4} + \dots \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} + \left( \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{4} \right) + \left( \frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{8} \right) + \dots \\ &\geq 1 + 1 + 1 + \dots \quad \text{which diverges.} \end{aligned}$$

For  $p < 1$ ,

This follows directly as  $\frac{1}{n^p} \geq \frac{1}{n}$  for  $p < 1$ .  $\square$

If  $a_n \geq 0$  for all  $n$  and  $\left( \sum_{k=1}^n a_k \right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is bounded, then  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n$  converges.

(as the seq. is monotonic increasing  
and bounded above)

Theo. [Cauchy's Criterion]

If  $a_n \geq 0$  for all  $n$ , then  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n$  converges iff  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^k a_{2^k}$  converges.

Try showing that either both are bounded or both are unbounded.

Ex. Show that  $\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n \cdot (\log_2 n)^p}$  converges iff  $p > 1$ .

Theo. [Root Test]

For  $a_n \in \mathbb{R}$ , let  $\alpha = \limsup |a_n|^{1/n}$ .

If  $\alpha < 1$ , then  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n$  converges and if  $\alpha > 1$ , then  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n$  diverges.

Proof: Suppose  $\alpha < 1$ . Let  $\beta: \alpha < \beta < 1$ .

$$\limsup |a_n|^{1/n} < \beta$$

$\Rightarrow \exists n_0$  such that  $\forall n \geq n_0, |a_n|^{1/n} < \beta$

$$\Rightarrow |a_n| < \beta^n.$$

However,  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \beta^n$  converges which implies that  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n$  converges.

If  $\alpha > 1$ , then there are infinitely many  $n$  such that  $|a_n|^{1/n} > 1$   
 $\Rightarrow |a_n| > 1$ .

This implies  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n$  diverges.  $\square$

Note that the root test is inconclusive if  $\alpha = 1$ .

Consider  $a_n = \frac{1}{n}$   
and  $b_n = \frac{1}{n^2}$ .

Theo. [Ratio Test]

Let  $\alpha = \limsup \left| \frac{a_{n+1}}{a_n} \right|$ .

If  $\alpha < 1$ , then  $\sum a_n$  converges.

If there exists  $n_0$  such that  $\left| \frac{a_{n+1}}{a_n} \right| \geq 1$  for all  $n \geq n_0$ , then  
 $\sum a_n$  diverges.

Proof

Again choose  $\beta$  such that  $\alpha < \beta < 1$ .

There then exists  $n_0$  such that  $\forall n \geq n_0, |a_{n+1}| < \beta |a_n|$

$$< \beta^{n-n_0+1} |a_{n_0}|.$$

We define  $e$  as

$$e = 1 + 1 + \frac{1}{2!} + \frac{1}{3!} + \dots$$

(this converges as  $\frac{1}{n!} \leq \frac{1}{2^{n-1}}$ )

We then have that  $e = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right)^n$ .

Proof

$$\left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right)^n = 1 + 1 + \frac{1}{2!} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right) + \dots + \frac{1}{n!} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right) \dots \left(1 - \frac{n-1}{n}\right) \leq 1 + 1 + \frac{1}{2!} + \dots + \frac{1}{n!}$$

$$\Rightarrow \limsup \left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right)^n \leq e.$$

Fixing some  $m$ , for any  $n \geq m$

$$\left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right)^n \geq 1 + 1 + \frac{1}{2!} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right) + \dots + \frac{1}{m!} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right) \dots \left(1 - \frac{m-1}{n}\right)$$

$$\liminf \left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right)^n \geq 1 + 1 + \frac{1}{2!} + \dots + \frac{1}{m!} \quad \forall m.$$

$$\Rightarrow \liminf \left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right)^n \geq e$$

However, as  $\liminf \downarrow \leq \limsup \downarrow$ , this implies that the limit is  $e$ .