

# Math 63: Real Analysis

Prishita Dharampal

**Credit Statement:** Talked to Sair Shaikh'26, and Math Stack Exchange.

**Problem 1.** If  $A, B, C$  are sets show that:

$$A - (B - C) = (A - B) \cup (A \cap B \cap C)$$

*Solution.*

To show that  $A - (B - C) = (A - B) \cup (A \cap B \cap C)$  we first show that

$$A - (B - C) \subset (A - B) \cup (A \cap B \cap C)$$

and then

$$A - (B - C) \supset (A - B) \cup (A \cap B \cap C).$$

1.  $A - (B - C) \subset (A - B) \cup (A \cap B \cap C)$

$$\forall x \in A - (B - C),$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\implies x \in A \text{ and } x \notin (B - C) \\ &\implies x \in A \text{ and } (x \notin B \text{ or } x \in B \cap C) \\ &\implies (x \in A \text{ and } x \notin B) \text{ or } (x \in A \text{ and } x \in B \cap C) \\ &\implies (x \in A \cap \bar{B}) \cup (x \in A \cap B \cap C) \\ &\implies (x \in A - B) \cup (x \in A \cap B \cap C) \\ &\implies x \in (A - B) \cup (A \cap B \cap C) \\ &\implies A - (B - C) \subset (A - B) \cup (A \cap B \cap C) \end{aligned}$$

$$2. A - (B - C) \supset (A - B) \cup (A \cap B \cap C)$$

$$\forall x \in (A - B) \cup (A \cap B \cap C),$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\implies (x \in A \text{ and } x \notin B) \text{ or } (x \in A \cap B \cap C) \\ &\implies (x \in A) \text{ and } (x \notin B \text{ or } x \in B \cap C) \\ &\implies x \in A \cap (\bar{B} \cup (B \cap C)) \\ &\implies x \in A \cap ((\bar{B} \cup B) \cap (\bar{B} \cup C)) \\ &\implies x \in A \cap (1 \cap (\bar{B} \cup C)) \\ &\implies x \in A \cap (\bar{B} \cup C) \\ &\implies x \in A - (\overline{\bar{B} \cup C}) \\ &\implies x \in A - (B \cap \bar{C}) \\ &\implies x \in A - (B - C) \end{aligned}$$

Since,  $A - (B - C) \subset (A - B) \cup (A \cap B \cap C)$  and  $A - (B - C) \supset (A - B) \cup (A \cap B \cap C)$  we can say that  $A - (B - C) = (A - B) \cup (A \cap B \cap C)$ .

**Problem 2.** Let  $I$  be a set and for each  $i \in I$  let  $X_i$ , be a set. Prove that for any set  $B$  we have:

$$B \cap \bigcup_{i \in I} X_i = \bigcup_{i \in I} (B \cap X_i)$$

*Solution.*

To show that  $B \cap \bigcup_{i \in I} X_i = \bigcup_{i \in I} (B \cap X_i)$  we first show that  $B \cap \bigcup_{i \in I} X_i \subset \bigcup_{i \in I} (B \cap X_i)$  and then  $B \cap \bigcup_{i \in I} X_i \supset \bigcup_{i \in I} (B \cap X_i)$ .

$$1. B \cap \bigcup_{i \in I} X_i \subset \bigcup_{i \in I} (B \cap X_i)$$

If  $x \in B \cap \bigcup_{i \in I} X_i$  then  $x \in B$  and  $x \in \bigcup_{i \in I} X_i$ .

I.e.  $x$  is at least in one  $X_j$  for some  $j \in I \implies x \in B \cap X_j$ .

Thus,  $x \in \bigcup_{i \in I} (B \cap X_i) \implies B \cap \bigcup_{i \in I} X_i \subset \bigcup_{i \in I} (B \cap X_i)$ .

$$2. B \cap \bigcup_{i \in I} X_i \supset \bigcup_{i \in I} (B \cap X_i)$$

If  $x \in \bigcup_{i \in I} (B \cap X_i)$ , then  $x$  is at least in one  $B \cap X_j$  for some  $j \in I$

$$\begin{aligned} &\implies x \in B \text{ and } x \in X_j \\ &\implies x \in B \text{ and } x \in \bigcup_{i \in I} X_i \\ &\implies x \in B \cap \bigcup_{i \in I} X_i \end{aligned}$$

$$\implies B \cap \bigcup_{i \in I} X_i \supset \bigcup_{i \in I} (B \cap X_i).$$

Since,  $B \cap \bigcup_{i \in I} X_i \subset \bigcup_{i \in I} (B \cap X_i)$  and  $\implies B \cap \bigcup_{i \in I} X_i \supset \bigcup_{i \in I} (B \cap X_i)$ , we can say that  
 $\implies B \cap \bigcup_{i \in I} X_i = \bigcup_{i \in I} (B \cap X_i)$ .

**Problem 3.** Let  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  be a function, let  $A$  and  $B$  be subsets of  $X$ , and let  $C$  and  $D$  be subsets of  $Y$ . Prove that:

1.  $f(A \cap B) \subset f(A) \cap f(B)$
2.  $f^{-1}(C \cap D) = f^{-1}(C) \cap f^{-1}(D)$

*Solution.*

1. Let  $x \in f(A \cap B), x = f(y)$

$$\begin{aligned} &\implies y \in A, B \\ &\implies x \in f(A), x \in f(B) \\ &\implies x \in f(A) \cap f(B) \\ &\implies f(A \cap B) \subset f(A) \cap f(B) \end{aligned}$$

For an arbitrary  $f$  the reverse containment isn't true. To show this, consider distinct elements  $a \in A, a \notin B, b \in B, b \notin A$  such that for some  $c, f(a) = c, f(b) = c$ . Then  $c \in f(A) \cap f(B)$  but  $c \notin f(A \cap B)$ . I.e. equality won't hold unless  $f$  is injective.

2. Let  $x \in f^{-1}(C \cap D), y = f(x)$

( $\implies$ )

$$\begin{aligned} &\implies y \in C, y \in D \\ &\implies x \in f^{-1}(C), x \in f^{-1}(D) \\ &\implies x \in f^{-1}(C) \cap f^{-1}(D) \\ &\implies f^{-1}(C \cap D) \subset f^{-1}(C) \cap f^{-1}(D) \end{aligned}$$

( $\Leftarrow$ )

- Let  $x \in f^{-1}(C) \cap f^{-1}(D), y = f(x)$

$$\begin{aligned} &\implies x \in f^{-1}(C), x \in f^{-1}(D) \\ &\implies y \in C, D \\ &\implies y \in C \cap D \\ &\implies x \in f^{-1}(C \cap D) \end{aligned}$$

**Problem 4.**

1. How many functions are there from a nonempty set  $S$  into the  $\emptyset$ ?
2. Show that the notation  $\{X_i\}_{i \in I}$  implicitly involves the notion of function.

*Solution.*

1. There are no functions from a nonempty set to the empty set. A function needs to assign a definite output to every input. Since there are no elements in  $\emptyset$ , that is impossible.
2. The notation  $\{X_i\}_{i \in I}$  describes a rule from elements of  $I$  to corresponding objects  $X_i$ . This by definition is a function from  $I$  to the set consisting objects  $X_i$ .

**Problem 5.** Prove in detail that for any  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ :

$$-(a - b) = b - a$$

*Solution.*

Because  $R$  is a field, we can say that,

$$\begin{aligned} -(a - b) &= -(a) - (-b) \text{ (Field Property 8)} \\ &= -a + b \text{ (Field Property 6)} \\ &= b - a \text{ (Commutativity)} \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $-(a - b) = b - a$  is true for any  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ .

**Problem 6.** Show that if  $a, b, x, y \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $a < x < b, a < y < b$ , then  $|y - x| < b - a$ .

*Solution.*

$b > a \implies b - a > a - a \implies b - a > 0$ . Hence,  $b - a$  is always positive.

There are 3 cases:

1.  $x = y$

Then  $y - x < b - a$ , is trivially true since  $0 < b - a$ .

2.  $x > y$

$$\begin{aligned} y &< x \\ y - x &< x - x \\ y - x &< 0 \\ y - x &< 0 < b - a \end{aligned}$$

3.  $x < y$

$$\begin{aligned} y &< b \\ a &< x \\ \implies y - x &< b - a \end{aligned}$$

**Problem 7.** Find the g.l.b. and l.u.b. of  $\{1, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{4}, \dots\}$ , giving reasons if you can.

*Solution.*

Let  $S = \{1, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{4}, \dots\} = \{\frac{1}{n}, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ . We know that,  $\forall \frac{1}{n}, \frac{1}{n+1} \in S$

$$\frac{1}{n} > \frac{1}{n+1}$$

From the inequality above, we can see that the larger  $n$  is, the smaller the resulting fraction is. I.e. the largest value occurs at  $n = 1$ . Hence, the set is bounded from above. Because the set  $S \subset \mathbb{R}$  is nonempty, and bounded from above  $y = l.u.b. S$  exists. As the maximum element of the set is 1, **the least upper bound is 1**.

$\frac{1}{n} > 0, \forall n > 0$  (7th consequence of the order property). Hence, the set  $S \subset \mathbb{R}$  is nonempty, and bounded from below by 0. I.e.  $y = g.l.b. S$  exists. To show that 0 is the greatest lower bound, let  $\epsilon > 0$ , choose  $n > \frac{1}{\epsilon}$ . Then  $\epsilon > \frac{1}{n}$  (L.U.B. 2).

$$\implies 0 < \frac{1}{n} < \epsilon$$

Hence, no  $\epsilon > 0$  can be a lower bound for the set  $S$ . Therefore, **the greatest lower bound is 0**.

**Problem 8.** Prove that if  $a \in \mathbb{R}, a > 1$ , then the set  $\{a, a^2, a^3, \dots\}$  is not bounded from above. (**Hint:** First find a positive integer  $n$  such that  $a > 1 + \frac{1}{n}$  and prove that  $a^n > (1 + \frac{1}{n})^n \geq 2$ ).

*Solution.*

We will prove this in two parts,

$$1. \quad a^n > \left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right)^n$$

From (L.U.B. 1) we know that  $\exists n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $n > x$  for any given  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ . Also,

$$a > 1 \implies a - 1 > 0$$

Then, we can say that, for some  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$n(a - 1) > 1$$

Rearranging the inequality gives us,

$$\begin{aligned} n(a - 1) &> 1 \\ a - 1 &> \frac{1}{n} \\ a &> 1 + \frac{1}{n} \end{aligned}$$

Since both  $a$  and  $1 + \frac{1}{n}$  are positive numbers,  $a > 1 + \frac{1}{n}$ , and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we know,

$$a^n > \left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right)^n$$

$$2. \quad \left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right)^n \geq 2$$

$$\left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right)^n = \underbrace{\left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right) \left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right) \cdots \left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right)}_{n-times}$$

We only need to partially expand this to prove the inequality. First we multiply the first term (1) in all of the factors.

$$\underbrace{1 \cdot 1 \cdots \cdot 1}_{n-times} = 1^n = 1$$

Then, we multiply  $\frac{1}{n}$  from the first factor and multiply it with 1 from all of the other factors.

$$\frac{1}{n} \underbrace{1 \cdot 1 \cdots \cdot 1}_{(n-1)-times} = \frac{1}{n}$$

Then, we multiply  $\frac{1}{n}$  from the second factor and multiply it with 1 from all of the other factors.

$$1 \cdot \frac{1}{n} \cdot \underbrace{1 \cdot 1 \cdots \cdots 1}_{(n-2)-\text{times}} = \frac{1}{n}$$

⋮

We do this for a total of  $n$  times. As a result of the partial expansion we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right)^n &= 1 + \left(\frac{1}{n} + \cdots + \frac{1}{n}\right) + D \\ &= 1 + \frac{n}{n} + D \\ &= 1 + 1 + D \\ &= 2 + D \end{aligned}$$

where  $D$  is the difference between  $\left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right)^n$  and 2. Also,  $D \geq 0$  because  $1, \frac{1}{n} > 0$  and summation and product of positive numbers is a positive number. Hence,  $\left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right)^n \geq 2$ .

Now, we have the inequality,

$$a^n > \left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right)^n \geq 2$$

Because raising positive numbers to positive powers, we maintain the inequality. Let  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , then

$$a^{nk} = (a^n)^k \geq 2^k$$

Now, to prove that  $\{2^k\}$  is unbounded by contradiction.

Assume there exists at least upper bound  $y$  of  $2^k$ .

By definition,  $\forall k, y > 2^k$ . By (L.U.B.1)  $\exists m > y$ , and  $2^m > m \implies 2^m > m > y$ . Hence contradicting our assumption! Hence, no upper limits exist. Therefore, by our inequality, the set  $\{a^n, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  is also not bounded from above.

**Problem 9.** If  $S_1, S_2$  are nonempty subsets of  $\mathbb{R}$  that are bounded from above, prove that

$$\text{l.u.b. } \{x + y : x \in S_1, y \in S_2\} = \text{l.u.b. } S_1 + \text{l.u.b. } S_2$$

*Solution.*

If  $S_1, S_2$  are nonempty subsets of  $\mathbb{R}$  that are bounded from above, we know that  $\text{l.u.b. } S_1$ , and  $\text{l.u.b. } S_2$  exist.

Let  $S = \{x + y : x \in S_1, y \in S_2\}$ ,  $\text{l.u.b. } S_1 = l_1$ ,  $\text{l.u.b. } S_2 = l_2$ .

By definition  $\forall x \in S_1, x \leq l_1$  and  $\forall y \in S_2, y \leq l_2$ . Adding the inequalities, we get  $x + y \leq l_1 + l_2$ . Hence,  $l_1 + l_2$  is an upper bound of  $S$ .

Let  $\epsilon$  be an arbitrarily small positive number. Since  $l_1 = \text{l.u.b. } S_1$ ,  $\exists x_0 \in S_1$  such that  $l_1 - \epsilon/2 < x_0$ .

$$l_1 - \epsilon/2 < x_0 \leq l_1$$

Similarly, since  $l_2 = \text{l.u.b. } S_2$ ,  $\exists y_0 \in S_2$  such that  $l_2 - \epsilon/2 < y_0$ .

$$l_2 - \epsilon/2 < y_0 \leq l_2$$

Adding the two inequalities gives,

$$l_1 + l_2 - \epsilon < x_0 + y_0 \leq l_1 + l_2$$

Hence,  $l_1 + l_2$  is the least upper bound for the set  $S$ .