

Chapter 3 Functions of a Real Variable

Arthur Chen

February 4, 2022

Problem 1

Assume that $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfies $|f(t) - f(x)| \leq |t - x|^2$ for all t, x . Prove that f is constant.

Proof: The assumption implies that for all t, x ,

$$0 \leq \left| \frac{f(t) - f(x)}{t - x} \right| = \frac{|f(t) - f(x)|}{|t - x|} \leq |t - x|$$

implies that $f'(t) = \lim_{x \rightarrow t} \frac{f(t) - f(x)}{t - x} = 0$ at all t . The only functions with derivatives that are zero everywhere are constant functions. \square

Problem 2

A function $f : (a, b) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfies a Holder condition of order α if $\alpha > 0$, and for some constant H and all $u, x \in (a, b)$ we have

$$|f(u) - f(x)| \leq H|u - x|^\alpha$$

The function is said to be α -Holder, with α -Holder constant H .

Part a

Prove that the α -Holder function defined on (a, b) is uniformly continuous and infer that it extends uniquely to a continuous function defined on $[a, b]$. Is the extended function α -Holder?

Proof: Let $\epsilon > 0$ and define $\delta = (\frac{\epsilon}{H})^{1/\alpha}$. Then for all $u, x \in (a, b)$ such that $|u - x| < \delta$, we have

$$|f(u) - f(x)| \leq H|u - x|^\alpha < \epsilon$$

since $\alpha > 0$. \square

By Problem 54 in Chapter 2, a uniformly continuous function defined on a metric space S has a unique continuous extension on \bar{S} . Since $[a, b] = \overline{(a, b)}$, $f : (a, b) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ being uniformly continuous implies that f extends uniquely to $g : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where g is continuous. In fact, g is uniformly continuous because it is continuous on a compact.

We claim that g is α -Holder on $[a, b]$. Let $x, y \in [a, b]$. If $x, y \in (a, b)$, this just follows because g extends f .

Without loss of generality, let $x = a$ and let $y \in (a, b)$. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be fixed and arbitrary, and let $\delta > 0$ be the corresponding continuity condition. Then

$$|g(c) - g(a)| \leq |g(c) - g(a + \delta)| + |g(a) - g(a + \delta)|$$

by the Triangle inequality. For the first term, because c and $a + \delta$ are in the interval (a, b) , the Holder condition from f extends to g , so

$$|g(c) - g(a + \delta)| \leq H|c - a - \delta|^\alpha \leq H|c - a|^\alpha$$

because $\alpha > 0$ and $\delta > 0$. For the second term, continuity of g means $|g(a) - g(a + \delta)| < \epsilon$. Thus

$$|g(c) - g(a)| \leq H|c - a|^\alpha + \epsilon$$

and ϵ can be made arbitrarily small. The case where $y = b$, and the case where $x = a$ and $y = b$ simultaneously, are essentially the same.

Part b

What does α -Holder continuity mean when $\alpha = 1$?

When $\alpha = 1$, α -Holder continuity simplifies to Lipschitz continuity.

Part c

Prove that α -Holder continuity when $\alpha > 1$ implies that f is constant.

Let x in the domain of f be arbitrary. Dividing both sides by $|u - x|$,

$$0 \leq \frac{|f(u) - f(x)|}{|u - x|} \leq H|u - x|^{\alpha-1}$$

Let $u \rightarrow x$. Since $\alpha > 1$ the right side goes to 0, implying $\frac{|f(u) - f(x)|}{|u - x|} \rightarrow 0$ and that $f'(x) = 0$ for all x in f 's domain. The only functions with this property are constant functions.

Problem 3

Assume that $f : (a, b) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is differentiable.

Part a

If $f'(x) > 0$ for all x , prove that f is strictly monotone increasing.

Proof: Let $c, d \in (a, b)$, $c < d$. Then because f is differentiable on its domain, the Mean Value Theorem indicates that there is a point $\theta \in (c, d)$ such that

$$f(c) - f(d) = f'(\theta)(d - c)$$

Since f' is always strictly positive and $c < d$, the right side is strictly positive.
 \square

Part b

If $f'(x) \geq 0$ for all x , what can you prove?

We can prove that f is weakly monotone increasing. The proof is the same, except that $f'(\theta)(d - c)$ can be zero.

Problem 4

Prove that $\sqrt{n+1} - \sqrt{n} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Problem 29

Prove that the interval $[a, b]$ is not a zero set.

Part a

Explain why the following observation is not a solution to the problem: "Every open interval that contains $[a, b]$ has length $> b - a$."

This 'solution' does not consider the possibility that there is a union of open sets that cover $[a, b]$ such that their sum of their lengths can be made arbitrarily small.

Part b

Instead, suppose there is a "bad" covering of $[a, b]$ by open intervals $\{I_i\}$ whose total length is $< b - a$, and justify the following steps in the proof by contradiction.

I will define a good covering as a covering of $[a, b]$ by open intervals $\{J\}$ such that the total length of the intervals in $\{J\}$ is greater than or equal to $b - a$.

i

It is enough to deal with finite bad coverings.

Let $\{I\}$ be an infinite bad covering of $[a, b]$. Because $\{I\}$ is an open cover of compact $[a, b]$, it reduces to a finite subcovering $\{I_i\}$. Thus, either $\{I\}$ reduces to a finite bad covering, or it reduces to a good covering. If $\{I\}$ reduces to a good covering $\{J_i\}$, then $\{J_i\} \subset \{I\}$ and the sum of the intervals in $\{J_i\}$ being $\geq b - a$ implies that the sum of the intervals in $\{I\}$ is $\geq b - a$. Thus $\{I\}$ is an infinite good covering, which contradicts the assumption that $\{I\}$ is a bad covering.

Thus, if $\{I\}$ is an infinite bad covering, it reduces to a finite bad covering. Contrapositively, if there are no finite bad coverings, then there are no infinite bad coverings, and the theorem is proven.

ii

Let $\mathbb{B} = \{I_1, \dots, I_n\}$ be a bad covering such that n is minimal among all bad coverings.

There is at least one finite bad covering, by assumption. $n = 1$ is a lower bound for the size of bad coverings. Then because \mathbb{R} is complete, there exists a greatest lower bound for the sizes of the bad coverings, denoted c .

There must be a finite bad covering $\{C\}$ such that the size of $\{C\} = c$. Suppose not. Then all bad coverings have size $> c$, and since the sizes of the bad coverings must be integers, all bad coverings have size $\geq c + 1$. This contradicts the assumption that c is a greatest lower bound. This bad covering $\{C\}$ is the bad covering with minimal n among all bad coverings.

iii

Show that no bad covering has $n = 1$ so we have $n \geq 2$.

This follows from the observation in Part a.

iv

Show that it is no loss of generality to assume $a \in I_1$ and $I_1 \cap I_2 \neq \emptyset$.

There exists at least one interval such that $a \in I_j$, and we are free to denote that interval I_1 .

There must exist an interval that intersects I_1 . Suppose not. Let d_1 be the right endpoint of I_1 , and let c_2, c_3, \dots, c_n be the left endpoints of the other intervals in the bad covering, and let $c = \min\{c_2, \dots, c_n\}$. Then $\frac{c+d_1}{2}$ is not covered by the bad covering, contradicting the assumption that $\{I\}$ is a covering. Thus, there exists an interval in $\{I\}$ that intersects I_1 . Denote it I_2 . By construction, $I_1 \cap I_2$ is nonempty.

v

Show that $I = I_1 \cup I_2$ is an open interval and $|I| < |I_1| + |I_2|$.

If $I_1 \subset I_2$ or $I_2 \subset I_1$, $I_1 \cup I_2$ is trivially an open interval. Otherwise, $I_1 \cup I_2$ is the open because it is the union of open sets, connected because it is the union of two connected sets with a common point, and bounded because it is the finite union of bounded sets. Therefore $I_1 \cup I_2$ is a open, connected, and bounded subset of \mathbb{R} , and by the theorems shown in Chapter 2 Problem 31, open, connected, and bounded subsets of \mathbb{R} are open intervals.

Lemma 1 *Let $C, D \subset \mathbb{R}$ be (bounded) intervals that intersect, and let $E = C + D$. Then $|E| < |C| + |D|$.*

Proof: *If C is a subset of D or vice versa, the proof is trivial. Without loss of generality, let the left endpoint of C be less than the left endpoint of D . Denote c as the right endpoint of C , and d the left endpoint of D . $d < c$, otherwise the two intervals do not intersect. Letting $\epsilon = c - d > 0$, the total length of E is $|C| + |D| - \epsilon$, which is strictly less than $|C| + |D|$. \square*

By using the above Lemma, we see that $|I| < |I_1| + |I_2|$.

vi

Show that $\mathbb{B}' = \{I, I_3, \dots, I_n\}$ is a bad covering of $[a, b]$ with fewer intervals, contradicting the minimality of n .

Let $x \in [a, b]$. Since \mathbb{B} is a covering of $[a, b]$, there exists $i \in 1, 2 \dots n$ such that $x \in I_i$. If $i \geq 3$, then because $I_i \in \mathbb{B}'$, x is also covered by \mathbb{B}' . If $i = 1, 2$, then $x \in I = I_1 \cup I_2$, so x is still covered by \mathbb{B}' . \mathbb{B}' is a covering by open intervals, because I is an open interval. \mathbb{B}' is a bad covering. $|I| < |I_1| + |I_2|$ implies that $|I| + \sum_{j=3}^n |I_j| < \sum_{i=1}^n |I_i| < b - a$, implying that the total length of \mathbb{B}' is less than the total length of \mathbb{B} . Thus \mathbb{B}' is a bad covering with fewer intervals than \mathbb{B} , contradicting the assumption that \mathbb{B} is the minimal bad covering. Thus, there are no bad coverings of $[a, b]$, coverings of $[a, b]$ can not have arbitrarily small length, and $[a, b]$ is not a zero set.