

Week 2: 01125 Fundamental Topological Concepts and Metric Spaces

Andreas Heidelberg Engly [s170303], Anton Ruby Larsen [s174356],
and Mads Esben Hansen [s174434]

17th of January 2020



3.17

Proof by contradiction. We assume $\cap_{n=1}^{\infty} K_n = \emptyset$. We then know via De Morgan's Laws:

$$\begin{aligned} M \setminus (\cap_{n=1}^{\infty} K_n) &= \cup_{n=1}^{\infty} (M \setminus K_n) \\ &\Rightarrow \\ M \setminus \emptyset &= M \\ &\Leftrightarrow \\ \cup_{n=1}^{\infty} (M \setminus K_n) &= M \end{aligned}$$

$\{M \setminus K_n | n \in \mathbf{N}\}$ are all open subsets covering M , in particular covering K_1 . K_1 is compact and therefore it has a finite sub-covering:

$$K_1 \subseteq \cup_{n=1}^S (M \setminus K_n)$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} K_1 \supseteq K_2 \supseteq K_3 \supseteq \dots \supseteq K_S &\Leftrightarrow M \setminus K_1 \subseteq M \setminus K_2 \subseteq \dots \subseteq M \setminus K_S \\ &\Rightarrow \\ M \setminus K_S &\supseteq K_1 \supseteq K_S \\ &\Rightarrow \\ M \setminus K_S &\supseteq K_S \end{aligned}$$

Hereby we have a contradiction because for $M \setminus K_S \supseteq K_S$ to be true $M = \emptyset$, and in the exercise we are told the space is non-empty.

□

3.20(2)

Direct proof. Assume f is uniformly continuous in K , then it holds:

$$\forall \gamma > 0 \quad \exists \delta : \forall x, y \quad d(x, y) < \delta \Rightarrow d(f(x), f(y)) < \gamma$$

We further know that all points, $x \in K$, will lie in some open ball with its center at some x_0 and with radius ϵ , such that:

$$d(x_n, x) < \epsilon$$

We can now choose $\delta = \epsilon$ and from here it follows via the definition of uniform continuity that:

$$d(x_n, x) < \delta = \epsilon \Rightarrow d(f(x_n), f(x)) < \gamma$$

We now have a finite covering of the image set $f(K) \in Y$ of open balls with centers in $f(x_1), \dots, f(x_p)$ and all radius γ . Therefore $f(K)$ must by definition be precompact.

□

3.29

1)

Proof by contradiction. Assume $\exists x_0, y_0 \in M$ for which $x_0 \neq y_0$ and $Tx_0 = x_0$ and $Ty_0 = y_0$. Hence it follows

$$d(x_0, y_0) = d(Tx_0, Ty_0)$$

From the definition of a *weak contraction* it follows that

$$d(Tx_0, Ty_0) < d(x_0, y_0)$$

From the assumptions this leads to the contradiction

$$d(x_0, y_0) = d(Tx_0, Ty_0) < d(x_0, y_0)$$

Hence, the assumptions were wrong. It then follows that T does not have two or more fixed points, which implies it has at most one fixed point. \square

2)

Proof by example. Define $T : M \rightarrow M$ to be $Tx = x + \frac{1}{x}$ for $x \geq 1$ where $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Let y be another point in the same interval. By the usual metric in \mathbb{R} we have that $d(x, y) = |x - y|$. At first we want to show that $Tx = x + \frac{1}{x}$ is a *weak contraction*.

$$d(Tx, Ty) = |Tx - Ty| = |(x + \frac{1}{x}) - (y + \frac{1}{y})| = |x - y| \cdot |1 - \frac{1}{x \cdot y}|$$

Since $x, y \geq 1$ we know that $0 < \frac{1}{x \cdot y} \leq 1$. Then it follows that $0 \leq |1 - \frac{1}{x \cdot y}| < 1$. Then we have that

$$d(Tx, Ty) < d(x, y) \quad \forall x, y \in M \text{ for } x \neq y$$

Hence, $Tx = x + \frac{1}{x}$ for $x \geq 1$ for \mathbb{R} is a *weak contraction*. However, since $Tx = x$ would imply that $x = 0$, the *weak contraction* $Tx = x - \frac{1}{x}$ does not have a fixed point. \square