

# Short Quiz 1: Solution

Aryaman Maithani

7th August, 2019

---

**Question.** State whether the following statement is true or false. Justify your answer.

If  $S$  is a nonempty subset of  $\mathbb{R}$  such that  $S$  is bounded above and if  $c := \sup S$ , then there exists a sequence  $(x_n)$  of elements of  $S$  such that  $(x_n)$  is convergent and  $x_n \rightarrow c$ . [5 marks]

[2 marks for correct alternative (T/F); 3 marks for correct justification]

**Answer.** T

Justification: It is given that  $c$  is the supremum of  $S$ . Thus, any number strictly less than  $c$  cannot be an upper bound. Thus, given any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $c - 1/n$  is not an upper bound. Thus, there exists  $x_n \in S$  such that  $c - 1/n < x_n$ . As  $c$  is an upper bound of  $S$ , we have it that

$$c - \frac{1}{n} < x_n \leq c \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Thus, by Sandwich Theorem, we can conclude that  $x_n \rightarrow c$ .

---

Common mistakes:

- Many have said that we can take an increasing sequence  $(x_n)$  in  $S$  and then  $x_n \rightarrow c$ .  
This is not true. It is true that such a sequence *will* converge as  $S$  is bounded above but it is not necessary that it converges to  $c$  as  $\sup\{a_n | n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  may not be equal to  $c$ .  
Example:  $S = [0, 2]$  and  $x_n := 1 - 1/n$ . We have it that  $x_n \rightarrow 1 \neq 2 = \sup S$ .
- Many have said that we can take the sequence  $x_n = c - 1/n$ . There is no reason that such a sequence will actually be a sequence in  $S$ . For example,  $S = \{1\}$ .  
Even if we take the case where  $c \notin S$ , the statement need not be true.  
For example, let  $S = (0, 1) \setminus \{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{2}{3}, \frac{3}{4}, \dots\}$ .
- Many have tried to construct a counterexample but it does not work in the correct manner. For example, if you pick a specific set  $S$  and a specific sequence  $(x_n)$  of elements of  $S$  such that  $x_n \not\rightarrow c$ , you have **not** disproved the question. The question asked for the existence of **a** sequence.  
If one did want to give a counterexample, they would have to find a particular set  $S$  which satisfies the hypothesis of the question and show that *every* sequence in that set does not converge to  $c$ .
- Similar to the last point, you have **not** proven the statement either if you choose a specific set  $S$  and show the existence of a sequence there. It must work for every  $S$ .
- Many have not considered that the constant sequence is a perfectly valid sequence for the case when  $c \in S$ .