

# Title

D. Zack Garza

Sunday 13<sup>th</sup> September, 2020

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Sunday, September 13</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	General Notes . . . . .	1
1.2	1.a . . . . .	2
1.3	3.a . . . . .	2
1.4	3.b . . . . .	3

## 1 | Sunday, September 13

### 1.1 General Notes

- If flipping logic and not using a direct proof (contradiction, contrapositive, etc), then signpost/announce it near the beginning of the proof.
- Say what you're assuming at the start of the proof.
- Put any important equations (i.e. major steps of the proof) on their own lines or in displaymath environments.
- Use some whitespace to separate parts of the proof and increase readability.
- Remember that limits of sequences need not exist, but liminfs/limsup always do (just may be  $\pm\infty$ ).
- Try to avoid abbreviating the names of major theorems (example: "AP" can stand for many results, not just the Archimedean property!)
- It's not generally true that  $a \leq M \implies |a| \leq M$ , e.g. take  $a = -1$ . This only holds  $a \geq 0$ .
- A generic set may not contain its inf or sup. Example:  $\inf \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \right\} = 0$  and  $0 \notin \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \right\}$ , or  $\sup \left\{ 1 - \frac{1}{n} \right\} = 1$  with  $1 \notin \left\{ 1 - \frac{1}{n} \right\}$ .
- If there exists some element of a set or sequence with a given property, try to say where it comes from and why the property holds for it.
- Similarly, if a property holds for all elements of a set or sequence, try to say why.

**1.2 1.a**

*Proof* ( $A \implies B$ ).

- Suppose  $\{a_n\}$  is not bounded above.
- Then any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  is not an upper bound for  $\{a_n\}$ .
- So choose a subsequence  $a_{n_k} > k$ , then by order-limit laws,

$$a_{n_k} > k \implies \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} a_{n_k} > \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} k = \infty.$$

■

*Proof* ( $\neg A \implies \neg B$ ).

- Suppose  $\{a_n\}$  is bounded by  $M$ , so  $a_n < M < \infty$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .
- Then if  $\{a_{n_k}\}$  is a subsequence, we have  $a_{n_k} \in \{a_n\}$ , so  $a_{n_k} < M$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .
- But then

$$a_{n_k} < M \implies \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} a_{n_k} \leq M,$$

- Now note that if  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} a_{n_k}$  exists,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} a_{n_k} < \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} a_{n_k} \leq M < \infty,$$

so every subsequence is bounded and thus can not converge to  $\infty$ .

■

**1.3 3.a**

*Proof* (Using definition (i)).

- Suppose  $x_n \leq M$  for all  $n$ , we will show that every subsequential limit is also bounded by  $M$ .
- Let

$$S := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R} \mid x \text{ is a subsequential limit of } \{x_n\} \right\}$$

be the set of subsequential limits.

– Note that  $\inf S := \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n$  by definition (i).

- Let  $\{x_{n_k}\} \in S$  be an arbitrary convergent subsequence (since we are only concerned about subsequences with well-defined limits).
- Then for every  $k$  we have  $x_{n_k} \in \{x_n\}$ , so

$$|x_{n_k}| \leq M.$$

- By order limit laws,

$$|x_{n_k}| \leq M \implies \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} |x_{n_k}| \leq M,$$

- Since the map  $x \mapsto |x|$  is continuous, using the sequential definition of continuity we can pass the limit through the absolute value to obtain

$$\left| \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} x_{n_k} \right| \leq M.$$

- Since the subsequence was arbitrary, we find that  $M$  is an upper bound for  $S$  and so  $\sup S \leq M$ .
- But

$$\inf S \leq \sup S \leq M \implies \inf S \leq M.$$

■

*Proof (Using definition (ii)).*

- Suppose  $|x_n| \leq M$  for every  $n$ , we will directly show that  $\left| \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{k \geq n} x_k \right| \leq M$ .
- By order-limit laws, for every fixed  $n$  we have

$$|x_n| \leq M \iff -M \leq x_n \leq M \implies -M \leq \inf_{k \geq n} x_k \leq M,$$

where we've used the fact that  $x_n \geq -M$  for all  $n$  implies that  $\inf_{k \geq n} x_k \geq -M$ .

- Again applying order-limit laws,

$$-M \leq \inf_{k \geq n} x_k \leq M \implies -M \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{k \geq n} x_k \leq M \iff \left| \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{k \geq n} x_k \right| \leq M.$$

■

### 1.4 3.b

*Proof .*

- Suppose  $\beta < \liminf_n x_n$ , where by definition (i) we define  $\liminf_n x_n = \inf S$  where  $S$  is the set of subsequential limits of  $\{x_n\}$ .
- Then let  $M := \inf S$ , so we have  $\beta < M$  by assumption, and recall

$$M = \inf S \implies \begin{cases} M \leq x & \forall x \in S \\ M < M' \implies \exists x \in S \text{ such that } M \leq x \leq M'. \end{cases}$$

- To the contrapositive, suppose  $M \leq \beta$ ; then  $\beta$  is of the form  $M'$  above and there thus exists a subsequence  $\{x_{n_k}\}$  such that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} |x_{n_k} - \beta| = 0 \iff \forall \varepsilon, \exists K \text{ such that } k \geq K \implies |x_{n_k} - \beta| < \varepsilon.$$

- Since  $M \leq \beta$  are constants, choose  $\varepsilon < \beta - M$  and produce a  $K$  such that the above condition holds.

- Then

$$-(\beta - M) \leq x_{n_k} - \beta < \beta - M.$$

