Title

D. Zack Garza

Sunday 13th September, 2020

Contents

1	Sun	day, September 13	1
	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 sign-post/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/limsups 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,

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

 $Proof(A \Longrightarrow B).$

- 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

$$a_{n_k} < M \implies \limsup_{k \to \infty} a_{n_k} \le M,$$

• Now note that if $\lim_{k\to\infty} a_{n_k}$ exists,

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} a_{n_k} < \limsup_{k \to \infty} a_{n_k} \le M < \infty,$$

so every subsequence is bounded and thus can not converge to ∞ .

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

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

be the set of subsequential limits.

- Note that $\inf S := \liminf_{n \to \infty} x_n$ 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,

$$|x_{n_k}| \le M \implies \lim_{k \to \infty} |x_{n_k}| \le M,$$

• 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

$$\left| \lim_{k \to \infty} x_{n_k} \right| \le M.$$

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

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

Proof (Using definition (ii)).

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

$$|x_n| \le M \iff -M \le x_n \le M \implies -M \le \inf_{k > n} x_k \le M,$$

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,

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

1.4 3.b

Proof.

- Suppose $\beta < \liminf_{n} x_n$, where by definition (i) we define $\liminf_{n} x_n = \inf_{n} S$ 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

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

• Suppose toward a contradiction that $M < \beta$; then β is of the form M' above and